Appendix

Ninth Pan American Highway Congress Meets in Nation's Capital—Delegates Seek International Roadbuilding Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, from May 6 to 18, 1963, the Ninth Pan American Highway Congress will be holding its important meetings in Washington, D.C. Four hundred and twenty-five delegates from 21 countries of this hemisphere, including Canada, are gathered here in a useful conference designed to promote international coordination and cooperation in matters of highway transportation.

Transportation being a major tool of economic development, the Ninth Pan American Highway Congress is particularly meaningful at this time of emphasis and effort in enhancing the economic base of the entire hemisphere. An integrated program of highway construction on a regional, national and international basis can do much to advance commerce and industry, and can be of significant value in raising living standards.

En route to the Congress, many delegates took part in an official road tour through Central America, utilizing that portion of the Inter-American Highway from Panama to Mexico City. They were thus able to witness firsthand the benefits brought to that sector of the world through successful programs of international roadbuilding.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Senate Committee on Public Works, it was my privilege to participate in the first plenary session of the Ninth Pan American Highway Congress. After the introduction by Federal Highway Administrator, Hon. Rex Whitton, it was my responsibility to bring to the assembled delegates and official observers the greetings and welcome from the Congress of the United States. I also conveyed the respects of the committees of both the House and Senate which have jurisdiction over matters of highway construction in the United States and in other lands. Likewise, I expressed the best wishes of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, the Honorable Pat McNamara, senior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, I request that my remarks before the Ninth Pan American Highway Congress, May 7, 1963, be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY AND REGIONAL TRADE

(Remarks by Senator Jennings Randolph, Democrat, of West Virginia, chairman, Subcommittee on Public Roads, Senate Public Works Committee, before the Ninth Pan American Highway Congress, Department of State Auditorium, May 7, 1963)

To many of our citizens in the United States, the Inter-American Highway is visualized as some of you saw it on your recent caravan, a long and pleasant trip through scenic country and historic cities.

But to a large extent this great investment of funds, engineering talent, and construction effort is giving its benefits locally to the people who live along its route and in the regions it traverses.

Years ago the Inter-American Highway was called the road that food built. In essence this phrase implied that laborers on the construction of the highway earned respectable wages; they were thus able to buy food for an adequate diet, both in quantity and nutritional value; thus fortified, their work became more productive.

This simple story exemplifies the value of any road and its effect on the economy of the area it serves. The Inter-American Highway is a grand, large-scale example of what has happened since time immemorial, whenever an improved highway penetrates into an area hitherto served only by a dry season road, or none at all.

Our own country has experienced the same process of development. The so-called "Whiskey Rebellion" in 1794 came about for lack of a decent road across the mountains from western to eastern Pennsylvania. Wagon freight cost $5 to $10 per hundred pounds, so farmers converted their grain to whisky, but refused to pay the Federal liquor tax.

That we did not do much about roads, for a long time, is indicated by the cry 100 years later, at the beginning of this century, to "get the farmer out of the mud."

The cost of transportation is among the most important factors in any economy, local or international. In cash value, it can be measured by this comparison: it costs about 4 cents to transport a ton of goods 1 mile, over good roads; moving the same quantity by pack animal over a poor road or trail costs about 20 cents, or five times as much.

The farmer who laboriously packs his produce to the village market on his donkey's back, or on his own, or maybe his wife's, has little incentive to increase production. But with good roads available, a truck can carry his crops farther and faster, and they arrive unspoiled. He has a choice of markets. He has ample reason to grow more; his income is better so he has means to improve his crops. He can also buy the products of the city he could not previously afford.

At the same time, people in urban and metropolitan areas now have more food available and it is better and in greater variety. With lower transportation costs, the food costs less. And the farmer is buying what the city folk produce. Thus we have an interacting economic growth, a lifting by the bootstraps of both country and city.

This is not a new development to any of you, I am sure. Though it does not offer an immediate and dramatic transformation, it is the forerunner of regional and international commerce. It does insure the general elevation of the living standards of all our people. Good transportation, as typified by the Inter-American Highway, is the necessary catalyst for economic expansion, and thus toward the building of a better world.

One aspect of this thought is eloquently expressed in a poem by Ethelyn Miller Hartwich, of South Dakota, which was quoted to me by my colleague from that State, Senator Karl E. Mundt:

> "Great roads the Romans built that men
> might meet, and walls to keep strong
> men apart—secure.
> Now, centuries have gone, and in defeat
> the walls are fallen, but the roads endure."

Sophocles in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of comment recently on the so-called treatment of students and others by U.S. marshals during their takeover of the campus of the University of Mississippi last fall. Fortunately, there were at least some witnesses to this tragedy who were unbiased, unprejudiced, and simply desired to get the facts and report upon them truthfully. One of these was James Jackson Kilpatrick, editor of the Richmond News Leader, one of the largest newspapers published in Virginia.

Mr. Kilpatrick is recognized in the newspaper fraternity as one of the ablest reporters and editors in America. He is also so recognized by the people of Virginia. He is honorable, able, and forthright. He is beloved by all Virginians as one who is determined that the people of his area get the truth and not biased, managed news.

For the benefit of those who are not acquainted with Mr. Kilpatrick I would like to state that he is a native of Oklahoma City, Okla.; and he was graduated from the University of Missouri School of Journalism in 1941. In that same year he went to work as a reporter for the Richmond News Leader. From 1943 to 1948 he was chief of the Capitol staff of the News Leader and in 1949 he became associate editor, serving under the late Douglas Southall Freeman. Following Mr. Freeman's death, he became editor of the editorial page and served as such until he became editor in 1951.

In 1953 Mr. Kilpatrick was awarded the Medal of Honor in journalism by the University of Missouri and in 1954 he received a special editorial award from Sigma Delta Chi. In 1955 he was elected chairman of the National Conference of Editorial Writers.

Jack Kilpatrick, as he is affectionately known by his many friends, is a real statesman, a scholar, and a writer of renown. He is the author of "The Sovereign States," 1957; and "The Smut Peddlers," 1960; and is coauthor of "The Lasting South."

I would like to point out that Mr. Kilpatrick went to Mississippi and viewed firsthand the conflict between Mississippi and the Justice Department of the United States of America. I would further like to point out that a report was made daily on the happenings at Oxford.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include therewith the series of editorials or articles written by James J. Kilpatrick as they unfolded on the scene of action. I desire to do this so that the people of this country who are interested in the truth may know what actually took place as recorded by an honorable editorial writer of unquestioned integrity.

The editorials follow:

Sophocles in Mississippi

"The essence of Greek tragedy," poet Richmond Lattimore once remarked, "is not that it pits right against wrong, but that it pits right against right."

From afar, one watches events in Mississippi unfold like so many scenes from Aeschylus of Sophocles. The antagonists are locked in a struggle from which none can withdraw; pursuing what each conceives to be right, they will play out the drama to the end.

Facts have ceased to matter in this clash of the State and Federal will. If facts mattered, the credentials of James H. Meredith as a senior transfer student, needing only 6 hours for a degree, would be coolly regarded by any college registrar in the land.

Certain elements of law have ceased to matter. If law alone counted, courts would examine objectively the power of Mississippi to decree that no person convicted of certain felony charges may be admitted to a State institution of higher learning. On its face, such a law is entirely valid; on its face, Meredith's conviction for perjury (he falsified a voting record) appears entirely valid. If law alone counted, these obstacles to his enrollment at the University of Mississippi would be reviewed and put to orderly appeal in the ordinary channels of jurisprudence. But neither fact nor law is discussed.

None of this matters. Meredith himself confesses that he has no particular desire for a degree from Ole Miss. At 29, married, a father, he is not certain what he is studying, or what he wants to do. Reporters describe him as "detached." He was reared a Methodist, but now describes his religion as "a mixture of Judaeo-Christian beliefs, with possibly some Buddhism." He is a symbol, an instrument, a part of the Greek pattern, and his application for transfer lies between the antagonists like the unburied body of Polynices outside the walls of Thebes. In the play, Antigone defied the law and buried her brother; and her Uncle Creon, ruler of the city, put her to death. Now the Governor of Mississippi, himself a symbol, has defied a court order, in itself an abstract symbol too; and today the drama builds toward a climax.

It profits little to comment, in the fashion of a gossipy Greek chorus, that substantial law is on the Negro's side. It has been on his side since the Gaines case in Missouri almost a quarter of a century ago; the Sweatt case in Texas and the McLaurin case in Oklahoma further settled the issues in 1950. Another chorus would respond that substantial law is on the side of Mississippi, too—the surpeme law of the land which declares that powers reserved to the States (such as the power, judicially approved for 90 years, to maintain racially separate systems of education) can be prohibited to the States only by amendment of the Constitution.

Neither does it contribute greatly to philosophize that other Southern States, such as Virginia, have managed to control desegregation at the university level simply by disdaining its occasional manifestation. Fire and ice are not the same; and Virginia and Mississippi, by law and temperament and tradition, are not the same; and the Federal System requires us to respect the differences even as we respect the principles of one supreme law for the Republic as a whole.

We do not propose to lecture Mississippi on law or tactics or public relations. Her racial problems are unmatched in the Nation. The State views Meredith not as an isolated individual, needing only 6 credit hours to be gone, but as a wedge by which a long-established order could be cracked and destroyed. On the merits, the State sees no real damage to Meredith's constitutional rights, whatever these may be, by insisting that he complete these few hours at Jackson State.

Neither do we propose to denounce the Department of Justice for its blind unwillingness to distinguish between theory and reality, to follow in this matter the course it follows in countless other constitutional questions of weighing public turmoil against private right. The Department of Justice is caught in powerful pressures also, of domestic politics and global disadvantage. It, too, is pursuing a course that a great many persons conceive to be right.

The drama must be played out, and the audience must be left to reflect, in the end, not on the superficial actions of a Governor and a colored man in the fall of 1962, but upon considerations of race and human behavior that reach back far beyond the Greeks, through the millennia to the time that sapient man first walked the earth. And in this perspective, it becomes evident that whatever happens in Oxford, Miss., this autumn, other scenes, other acts, other tragedies are certain to follow in sequence, as far ahead in time as the human eye can see.

Letter From Oxford

Oxford, Miss., September 28.—As this is written, on a beautiful autumn afternoon in a college town, the conflict between Mississippi and the Union has fallen into one of those battlefield lulls known to fighting men the world over.

It is not an "ominous" silence that hangs over the University of Mississippi campus, though some of the radio boys would have it so. It is a placid, Indian summer silence, and it is driving the correspondents crazy. All day long, the radio-TV people have been coasting unhappily around the campus drives in white station wagons; the photographers, with bandoliers of Leicas strung about their necks, have had nothing to do. The newspaper and magazine writers, restless as hunting hounds, can find no fox to harry. The Negro, James H. Meredith, presumably, is in Memphis; the Governor, Ross R. Barnett, is known to be in Jackson. The Attorney General, Robert Kennedy, is in Washington. The Fifth Federal Circuit Court is fuming in New Orleans. But here in Oxford, in northern Mississippi, the Governor's main forces have vanished, leaving behind no more than a beefy rear guard of sheriff's deputies. They are sitting heavily around the lounge of the alumni house, watching "The Life of Riley" on TV; there is not a helmet to be seen, nor a pistol, nor a gas mask, nor even a billy club. This afternoon in Oxford, Miss., it is a mighty unwarlike war.

If Governor Barnett's embattled forces ever should win this struggle, which seems exceedingly unlikely, it will be by reason of this very calm. Martin Luther King, the apostle of nonviolence, was never more nonviolent than the Governor of Mississippi is right now. The 182 correspondents who have poured into town (including four from London, a man from the Toronto Telegram, and whole coveys of nervous types from New York) are being treated with every courtesy the Old South can muster. On Thursday, as the Federal marshals were organizing their feeling-out expedition, the Governor's aids were passing out box lunches for the press. Mississippi is on her best behavior. There isn't an honest demagog in town.

No one expects this calm to last. Beneath the deceptive surface, like solid oak obscured by Spanish moss, lies a hard determination. To the extent that Governor Barnett speaks for the State (and this is a very large extent), Mississippi appears united in its opposition to Meredith's admission to Ole Miss. The voices of liberalism and moderation heard loudly in Virginia, North Carolina, and Georgia, are muted here—muted or nonexistent. Barnett is seen as a valiant underdog, a David against Goliath. On Thursday he won a spontaneous ovation from the students, of all people, who in the fashion of students everywhere might have been expected to treat him with disdain.

Not many persons expect the Governor to win. The talk is rather of "going to the last ditch," but, after all, David did lick Goliath and the Governor has time working with him; at some point the university reasonably could reject the Negro applicant as a "late registration." And it is observed with some satisfaction, that Mr. Kennedy is wobbling; the Attorney General has telephoned at least twice to propose compromises—that Meredith be admitted for a few months and then eased out or that he merely be registered with an understanding that he would not attend classes. The Governor said "No," and late Thursday Mr. Kennedy sent a convoy of 50 marshals down the road from Memphis with air cover from a plane of the border patrol, but 20 miles from Oxford the word came from Washington: Retreat. After that, the calm descended.

The Mississippians are standing stoutly on what they conceive to be both the law and the evidence. Their argument is that the order to admit Meredith springs directly from the Supreme Court decision in the school segregation case 8 years ago. That decision, in their view, was invalid; the order as to Meredith and the contempt proceeding against the Governor, therefore are seen as invalid also. On the facts, they argue that whatever the manifest destiny of the Negro race may be, here and now in Mississippi, the races are not equal; and they see the admission of Meredith as a precedent by which all their State institutions of learning would suffer irreparable harm.

However irrational these contentions may sound elsewhere in the land, here in Mississippi they take on cogency from the sincerity of the Governor's spokesmen. These are not bigots or rednecks or bullies. They are decent, soft-spoken men of intense courtesy and restraint, deeply conscious of the ill will concentrated against them, and anxious to see this animosity reduced.

The surrounding countryside also contributes to an understanding of the Mississippian's position. Here on the delta, the Negro population is greatest, and these are not the light-skinned Negroes of Harvard seminars; these are the true blacks. They are everywhere—laying brick on a new science building, running the powermowers across this parklike campus, raking idly at the first leaves of fall. This is cotton country, and the visitor who drives down from Memphis sees the Negroes early in the fields. The earth is a bleached khaki, and the plant an olive drab; the countryside is in camouflage, and cotton is everywhere. In the small towns, white and Negro together lounge on the sidewalks as remotely intimate as the red and white squares that advertise Purina chows. The sense of a southern "way of life," lost in much of the urban South, here remains an omnipresent influence.

By the time this appears in print, the story may have outrun this peaceful afternoon. Lulls end and battles too, and neither the Governor nor Mr. Kennedy can back down now without disastrous loss of face. But battles should always be distinguished from wars, and the Mississippian is as patient as the quiet rivers. At the main entrance of the campus stands a bronze monument of the Confederate dead, honoring the heroes of Lafayette County, whose valor and devotion made glorious many a battlefield. It all seems like yesterday in Mississippi; as in a dream, one stirs uncomfortably with the recognition of the same feeling today.

A TIME FOR UNFROCKING

JACKSON, MISS.—The arrogant and presumptuous action of the executive council of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, coming in the midst of the Mississippi crisis, ought not to be overlooked in the rush of more colorful and dramatic happenings. It is high time these self-ordained high priests of education were unfrocked, and their solemn rites of accreditation repudiated altogether.

On Friday, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools gratuitously poked its nose into this situation with a threat to suspend the accreditation of all Mississippi institutions of higher learning unless Governor Barnett eliminated himself forthwith from the controversy at Oxford. If the council's threat should be carried out, 22,000 innocent students would find their educational careers put in jeopardy; hundreds of faculty members, remote from the swirling conflict, would suffer the stigma that attaches to unaccredited institutions. This is blackmail, or very near it, and it is an ugly business.

The pious statement of the Southern Asociation of Colleges and Schools asserts that the association's threat has nothing to do with the admission or nonadmission of Negro James H. Meredith to the University of Mississippi. All those who believe that can go stand in the nearest telephone booth, where they will not find themselves crowded. No, say the accrediting officials, their objection is to the action of the university board in delegating registration powers to the Governor of the State. "Our interest is in the ability of these institutions to achieve their purpose without undue political interference."

But what is to be said of the undue interference on the part of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools itself? On the day this threat issued from Atlanta, the Mississippi institutions had the same faculties they had the day before; they had the same libraries, the same laboratories, the same requirements for academic degrees. Whatever may be said for or against the stratagems of Governor Barnett, his actions certainly have not affected the quality of teaching at this State institution. Where did the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools acquire this power to heave all the institutions of a State into outer darkness?

The answer is that these professional educationalists simply assumed the power. They have hit upon one of the neatest rackets since a shrewd conman set up his tripod in Greece a long time ago, and began doing business as the oracle of Delphi. They have mounded up an Olympus all their own, and there they sit, educational demigods, receiving sacrificial offerings, dispersing indulgences and pronouncing anathema.

The threat of disaccreditation, like a threat of excommunication, hangs heavily over the heads of institutions who fall into sin. College presidents fear the purgatory that lies beyond. To be accredited is to be in a state of grace, and only the boldest administrator will risk offending the hierocracy.

Well, it would be a great blow for freedom if the Southern States, in one rebellious sweep from Louisiana to Virginia, would disaccredit the accreditors—if the States would withdraw altogether from membership in this bogus consistory. If appropriate legislation were passed, prohibiting State-supported institutions from belonging to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, or paying its fees, or acknowledging its existence in any way, the taxpaying people might once again become masters in their own houses of education. The world would not come to an end, and neither the students nor the instructors would be hurt. If a particular southern high school or university were not accredited, the fact would be meaningless, for none would be accredited. The institutions would not have asked to be accredited—indeed, their States would have made accreditation impossible.

These views on our part are not inspired by the Mississippi crisis alone. We have urged this step in the past, when the accreditation of high schools—you will not believe this—was made to depend in part upon the number of stoves in a home economics room and the square feet of floor space on a gymnasium floor. Our strong feeling is that responsible State authorities are perfectly capable of fixing their own standards of sound education, without truckling to a gang of gowned educators bearing holy orders from Columbia Teachers College. If the turmoil at Oxford should prompt a cold reexamination of the role of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and lead in time to a legislative repudiation by private bodies some small good will have come from this monstrous affair.

AND SPEAKING OF LAW

JACKSON, MISS.—In his television address to the Nation Sunday night, President Kennedy made an eloquent appeal for obedience to law. Americans may not like the requirements of a particular law or court order, he said, but they must abide by the law anyhow. Any other course, he said, could lead to anarchy or tyranny.

No responsible person will take issue with the President on these entirely proper admonitions. Ours is indeed a society based upon law, and to the extent that law has been violated by Mississippians (and by some of their uninvited and unwanted guests), their actions stand condemned. Sunday night's riot at Oxford, Miss., was lawlessness incarnate. The staunchest defender of the South, gazing in sadness upon the ravished campus of the University of Mississippi, feels a sorrow too deep for words.

But it might be a most profitable exercise for the President of the United States to put the Mississippi crisis to one side for a day or so, and reflect instead upon his own record of obedience to law. We would ask him to recollect especially his own violent, lawless and tyrannical conduct only a few months ago in the matter of the steel case.

There is not the slightest question that the steel companies were acting lawfully in raising the price on their product. They were abiding by the law, but it was a state of law, in this application, that the President did not like. What example of obedience—of respect for law—did Mr. Kennedy set in April? He routed newspapermen from their beds in the middle of the night to be interrogated by FBI agents. He went far beyond his constitutional authority, in order to prevent free men from acting freely. He cursed, abused, and threatened the steelmakers. The rabble of white trash at Oxford on Sunday threw stones and eggs; Mr. Kennedy in April threw something much heavier and of higher value: The weight of his office.

And the President might reflect also upon the lawfulness of his own actions in Mississippi. Granted that he has a responsibility for seeing that court orders are executed, the moment James Meredith was enrolled at the University of Mississippi, that decree was carried out. The order was enforced.

By what justification are thousands of troops occupying Oxford today? The answer is that they are there to prevent domestic violence. But this is no responsibility of the President of the United States. The Constitution says in words so clear a child could understand them that Federal power may be used to protect a State against domestic violence only upon application of its Governor or legislature, and Mississippi has made no such application.

The Kennedy brothers have suspended civil liberties in Oxford in palpable violation of the constitutional rights of the people. On Monday, bayonet-bearing soldiers and helmeted U.S. marshals rounded up more than 200 persons. Most of them were teenaged youngsters or immature adults. These prisoners were publicly searched and paraded before television cameramen. Then they were herded into interrogation rooms. Then they were publicly prodded into waiting buses, parked where the lingering tear gas was thickest, and there they were left for up to 8 hours. The youngsters had no charges placed against them; they were "temporarily detained for questioning." They had no opportunity to obtain counsel. They were denied access to telephones. They had neither food, water, nor toilet facilities.

Meanwhile, infantrymen closed off the town square of Oxford entirely. Local merchants were not permitted to open their stores. Town residents were denied the use of public sidewalks. Merchants could not even go to the post office to pick up their mail. The county courthouse was closed and all public business suspended. Women with children in their cars were compelled to stop at roadblocks, step out of their automobiles, and stand by while Negro soldiers searched the vehicles from hood to trunk. Private property has been wantonly abused and confiscated by the Federal troops. On a private lawn along Route 6, just north of Oxford, infantrymen on Monday afternoon were methodically digging deep gun emplacements. The trash and litter left by the indifferent marshals baffles description.

No one who has seen the Mississippi crisis at firsthand will doubt the gravity of this affair. It is a tense time. But when admonitions are being handed out from on high, in the name of obedience to law, a troubled country should ask the President some searching questions. Does he come into this court of equity with clean hands? Is his own record so shining that he reflects a perfect example to the Nation?

REFLECTIONS ON MISSISSIPPI

TUCSON, October 4.—I write on a Thursday, in the dazzling cleanness of an Arizona morning. Beyond the balcony of Tucson's Ramada Inn, the sun strikes on whitewashed walls. A tiny bird, scratching in the leaves of a palm, provides the only sound. Across the courtyard, a girl in an orange bikini, sinuous as a cat, walks toward the pool. Far away, yet seemingly close at hand, the Catalinas mountains, like sleeping elephants, raise their lumpy backs against a cloudless sky. Mississippi is 2,000 miles away.

It is a good hour for piecing together the torn and jagged impressions of a week that has telescoped Virginia, Mississippi and Arizona into a confusing compound of old and new, of East and South and West. The States of this Union are indeed separate political entities, as every student of federalism must acknowledge; and this morning the characteristics that distinguish and divide the Republic seem far more striking than the points on which we stand as one.

Where have we been in the South. And where are we going? What is to be said, retrospectively, of the terrible crisis that saw a military heel pressed down on Oxford? The tangled roots of racial inheritance creep through dark primeval ooze. In the mind's eye, one sees the formation of a new Republic under a written Constitution; one recalls the painful incubus of slavery, long years of poverty. We have seen, in our lifetimes, the growth of judicial oligarchy far removed from the governed people. And all these figure in the Mississippi story.

Yet history, in the familiar phrase, is after all no more than the biography of men; and the immediate story is the story of fallible human beings: a President, an Attorney General, a chief marshal, a Southern Governor, a Negro. If some of these men, at one moment or another, had acted differently, had issued other orders, had responded to unheard voices, the story would not have evolved as it did. No one knows. Perhaps it never would have mattered. The fragile membrance that separates lunacy and sanity, love and hate, civility and savagery, was bound to rupture at some point. It ruptured in Mississippi at 7:58 of a Sunday evening in September. The hounds of hell came baying out of a velvet night. Ten thousand troops have whipped them back again.

A number of us who were in Oxford found ourselves musing aloud of what William Faulkner would have thought, or said, or written of it all. Here was the very town square he recreated for his legendary Yoknapatawpha County, with the clock in the courthouse tower striking the inexorable hours. Oxford was filled with Faulknerian figures—imperious aristocrats, impassive Negroes, slackjawed countrymen, women of grace and charm. Here were the stores of a country town: Jones' Feed Store, Shaw and Sneed Hardware, Fred's Dollar Store, the Rebel Cosmetology College, a pharmacy, a bank, a seedy hotel, and here, shockingly, were the occupying soldiers, the square blocked off, a swarthy Puerto Rican sergeant in command, the bayonets erect, symbolic, the air crackling with harsh messages by shortwave radio.

Faulkner would have wrung from this the tragedy, the humor, the sharp sardonic irony of it all. What did Governor Barnett, defending States' rights, manage to prove at Oxford? Only this: the absolute supremacy of the Federal will. But what has James Meredith proved? Only that cold steel is, at least temporarily, the master of all. Yet the bayonets that prodded at the breast of Mississippi never touched the heart.

Barnett is a finely drawn figure in this drama. He reminds a Virignian vaguely of a watered-down Bill Tuck. Even his conversation is oratorical; his courtliness becomes almost a lampoon of courtliness. But where Mr. Tuck could be profane, decisive, colorful, Governor Barnett leaves an impression of mildness, uncertainty and pathos. He was not cast for bigotry. Last Sunday evening, when thousand of Jackson residents were rallying around the mansion, word came that the Governor would appreciate it so much if the crowd would quite down: It was time for the grandchildren to get to bed.

On the other side, the characters are etched more sharply. The Kennedy brothers, with their flat Bostonian accents, presented almost too great a contrast to Barnett's catarrhal drawl. Their very urbanity made the goad more painful. At bottom, the President was right. Of course he was right. Everyone knew in his heart the President was right. But it was like Plutarch's story of the men who grew to hate Aristides: they were simply tired of hearing him called "the just."

Early Monday, an effigy was hung from an overpass in downtown Jackson. The label did not say "Meredith." It said "Kennedy."

A part of the irony is that Mississippi never had anything to win in this affair that others might have thought worth winning. By yielding in good grace to overwhelming Federal force, the State might have salvaged something in the good opinion of mankind. Mississippi, in the final desperate hour, cared not a fig for the good opinion of mankind. That the Oxford riot would create a fruitful field for Communist propaganda, that the violence would react unfavorably around the world—none of this mattered. These considerations figured not at all in Mississippi's thinking.

It is true, of course, that Mississippi may have won a local victory of sorts. It is impossible to imagine that thousands of Negro students will fall in line to follow James Meredith's astoundingly courageous lead. The precedent Meredith set scarcely offers happy examples for immediate emulation. Mississippi may also have won some points in political unity at home; misery loves company and the embittered Mississippians are knowing misery anew.

Politically, the Kennedys will have won a net advantage from their handling of this crisis—or so it seems right now. What they have lost in the South, they will gain back where it counts, in Harlem, South Chicago, Philadelphia, Los Angeles. Here in Tucson, where editorial writers from 38 States have gathered for an annual meeting, the consensus is overwhelming. The visiting editors know what bloc votes can mean in decisive Negro wards. The blocs, they feel, will be heavier and more decisive now.

The Oxford incident carries with it some terrible implications. The ordinary citizen seldom has opportunity to learn at first hand the lessons of Federal power. Before the troops arrived in Mississippi Sunday night, one heard childish talk of real rebellion. One youth rushed into the Citizen's Council offices with a great idea: Get some napalm, and go bomb the Army bivouac from private planes. A 19-year-old remarked that Mississippi couldn't take on the whole United States. "We can try," she wept. "We can try, can't we?"

The military occupation of Oxford reduced these adolescent lunacies to absolute imbecility. At the Oxford airport, Army vehicles occupied the countryside as far as the eye could see. Overhead, the helicopters puttered incessantly. Enormous Globemasters, fat as pelicans, swooped endlessly out of the sky. The troops were cold, disciplined, taciturn. They were there to kill, to capture, to compel obedience. They would ram a court order down Mississippi's throat—a court order commanding the admission of a Negro student to a State university. It was a court order applauded over most of the country. But what if it had been some other court order, some other place, extinguishing some liberty, abridging some right? Has America arrived at rule by court decree and bayonet? Is there not some better, gentler, slower method for achieving government by consent of the governed?

These are the most disturbing aspects of the Mississippi story. What happens to Meredith is incidental; he is a brave man, but in this chapter of history he is a footnote, at name in a lawsuit. Neither will it be remembered whether the Governor profited politically from his sometimes ludicrous defiance. In the long haul, the lessons to be learned from Oxford go to the power of purported law in the hands of powerful men. If the aphorism ever was doubted, it cannot be doubted now: The Constitution is what the judges say it is. And it is what the bayonet says it is, too.

Mental Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I commend to my colleagues the following address by Dr. Ralph T. Collins, which was delivered at a meeting of the Minnesota Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. As Chairman of the Committee on the Mentally Handicapped of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Dr. Collins is eminently qualified to speak to us on a painfully persistent problem.

In spite of a superhuman effort to educate the public in recent years, the stigma of mental disease is still very much with us. Unlike the complete recoveries from dread physical ailments, which have been miraculously achieved and widely acclaimed in this century, the public frequently does not understand that a mental patient usually can be restored to health if adequate treatment is available. Of course, it is encouraging to remember that the public was skeptical of many of our greatest medical advances when they were first introduced, smallpox vaccination being a case in point. But with time and education the "pudding was proved," and today the smallpox vaccine is universally accepted.

However, Dr. Collins' remarks graphically indicate the urgency of this problem. There are literally thousands of useful human beings who are denied the right to contribute to this society because of their medical records. Over and above the individual hardships involved, we should also consider the manpower which is wasted because of an almost medieval fear and ignorance of mental disease.

I hope that all Senators will give this address and this problem the attention which it warrants.

I ask unanimous consent that the address of Dr. Collins be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Ralph T. Collins, M.D., Chairman, Committee on the Mentally Handicapped, the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped and Consultant in Psychiatry and Neurology, Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N.Y., at the First Governor's Conference on Employment of the Handicapped, St. Paul, Minn., March 14, 1963

I have for this audience a most peculiar kind of wish for a psychiatrist to make. It is the kind of wish you would expect more from one steeped in the ministry than from one steeped in the inner workings of that gray shapeless mass we call the brain.

It is the wish that all of us live safely through this decade of the 1960's, and remain alive for many, many years beyond, so many years, that from our vantage point in the future, we shall be able to look back upon this decade with the perspective that only passing time can bring.

From our watchtower of the future, what do you think we shall see? Will the 1960's be the decade of the nuclear bomb? Of Castroism? Of a split between Russia and China? Of American firmness in foreign policy? Of automation? Of equal rights for all races? Of the Jackie Kennedy hairdo? Of what?

We certainly shall see all of these. But I predict we shall see something more—something, I think, that will outshine them all. What will stand out in the 1960's will be a renaissance, a new era, for the mentally ill and mentally retarded of America. I believe the revolution we are beginning to see will loom like a beacon throughout future history. I believe the 1960's will go down as years of progress in man's fight against mental illness and mental retardation.

Today, I want to concentrate on the mentally ill, although the story of the mentally retarded is just as dramatic, with mentally retarded men and women just now learning to live full lives, learning to work, learning to support themselves, men and women who, not so long ago, would be wasting away in America's back bedrooms.

In the field of mental illness, just look at the evidence around us.

The fact that there is a Committee on the Mentally Handicapped of the President's Committee; the fact that there is a Mental Health Subcommittee of your own Minnesota Governor's Committee; the fact that there are similar subcommittees being formed by growing numbers of Governors' committees all over America; the fact that President's committee annual meetings and regional meetings regularly feature discussions of the problems of employment of the mentally restored; the fact that Governors' committees, like this one, give serious consideration to the problem, all these facts, and many more, add up to a new concern, a growing awareness of the problems and prospects of the mentally ill today. Further, all the facts I have cited are new ones. Think back a mere 10 years ago. Could I have said the same things then? Was there a Mental Health Subcommittee in Minnesota?

Look beyond this room and the interests we represent. Look to other aspects of the renaissance of the 1960's.

The President of the United States only last month issued a historic document, the first Presidential message ever devoted exclusively to the mental health and mental retardation problems of our Nation.

One Senator summed up the President's message this way: "Here the President was speaking for an overlooked and discarded fragment of mankind, that has no lobbyist, no voice, no power, no votes even. The President asked not for some little gesture of relief, but meeting the issue broadside, he asked that we seek to conquer it completely with a 'wholly new national approach.'"

I am sure you are familiar with the President's message. A major part of his "wholly new national approach" is to create a network of comprehensive community mental health centers where the mentally ill can receive a variety of services, without having to leave home—diagnosis, cure, rehabilitation. Through this approach, the President said, it should be possible within another 10 or 20 years to reduce the number of mental patients under custodial care by 50 percent or more.

"If we apply our medical knowledge and social insights fully," the President said, "all but a small portion of the mentally ill can eventually achieve a wholesome and constructive social adjustment."

And, I might add, that includes job adjustment, too.

The National Association for Mental Health recently issued figures reinforcing the President's views. Said the association: 7 out of every 10 mental patients can recover partially or totally, if only they can be treated in a first-rate hospital. Further, the chances of getting out of the hospital have gone up dramatically. Back in 1952, you had a 50–50 chance to be discharged within 6 months; today, you have an 80–20 chance.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Administration has an equally hopeful view of the fight against mental illness. Today, says VRA, some 6,600 mental patients are being rehabilitated each year. If the trend continues in the future at the same rate it has in the past, by 1970 about 13,600 will be rehabilitated, more than double today's number. That's not all. If VRA engages in an intensified program of rehabilitation of the mentally ill, the 1970 total will be much higher, between 16,000 and 20,000.

The Veterans' Administration, too, has been reporting a hopeful outlook for the mentally ill. Each year, in about the same number of hospital beds, the VA has been treating more and more mental patients 37,000 in 1957; close to 50,000 today. In the future, the numbers will continue to grow. The key here is turnover. Not only are more patients coming into the hospital, thus whittling down waiting lists; but more patients are coming out. Men who, in an earlier time, would be destined to spend all their lives in the hospital are being restored to their communities. A 66 percent turnover rate in 1955; an 80 percent turnover rate today. A higher percent in the future. Turnover means hope. It means recovery.

There's another noteworthy VA development. Recently, VA approached seriously disabled Korean war veterans, those rated as 100 percent disabled, to attempt to encourage them to take vocational rehabilitation training. Included were 160 with serious mental illnesses, rated as totally disabled. Today, 8 out of every 10 either are still in training or have been rehabilitated. Only 2 out of 10 didn't make the grade. A miracle? Perhaps; but such miracles are happening all over the country.

There are other developments, equally hopeful, in just about every community in our land. Drug therapies, "reaching" mental patients when all other forms of treatment seem useless—"day" hospitals and "night" hospitals, so that patients can either live at home and receive treatment during the day, or work during the day and receive treatment at night—"halfway" houses and day-care centers, staging areas, you might call them, to community living—even the new "walk-in" psychiatric service recently instituted in a couple of cities, where troubled people can drop in any time. Ten years ago, who ever heard of any of these?

We have it within our means to make obsolete the forbidding gray structure on the edge of town, the "institution," that houses all too many of the mentally ill and that can't begin to give them the kind of treatment that would restore them to society. We have the means, now, of operating a new day, a hopeful day, for the mentally ill.

The mentally ill are being rehabilitated, in greater and greater numbers. They are returning home. Men and women who, a mere decade ago, would have nothing to look forward to other than lifelong hospitalization are coming home again. This is the miracle of the sixties. This is the miracle that will live long in history.

This miracle, this renaissance, this dawn of a new day, brings us up against the burning question of the sixties. What about the mentally ill who return home? Will they be able to find employment? Will businesses and industries come to accept them? Will the doors be open? The men and women are being mentally restored, but what about society? Is society in need of being mentally restored, as well? Could society stand a shot-in-the-arm of some sort of wonder drug called "human understanding?" What about the raised eyebrows, the whispers, the shakes of the head? Are society's attitudes toward the mentally restored as healthy as they should be?

I have the uneasy feeling that although rehabilitation and treatment may be suitable for the decade of the sixties, our public attitudes are lagging behind, and fit more readily in the gaslight days of the horse and buggy. Hence the vast importance of the work you are doing, the work the President's committee is doing, the work of all the mental health associations in the Nation, the work of all others who are attempting to change public attitudes.

I do not think I am exaggerating current day backward attitudes.

Two psychologists in New England recently conducted a 3-year study of attitudes of 200 employers in the Boston area. About three-fourths of the employers interviewed said yes, they would be willing to hire ex-mental patients. Hopeful, isnt' it? But listen:

Despite what they said, only 27 out of the total of 200 actually did hire the mentally restored during the 3-year period. One in ten. What about the other nine? A need for attitude change. Definitely.

A psychologist, now on the staff of the National Association for Mental Health, once conducted a study of more than 1,000 manufacturing concerns throughout the United States. According to his study, more than 60 percent of the employers had attitudes ranging from lukewarm at best to icecold at worst, not at all conducive to job prospects for the mentally restored. You could count the warmly enthusiastic with one hand.

Still another study by Dorly Wang, noted researcher in public attitudes, uncovered something else about employers. She found that the average employer had this mental picture of the mentally restored: tense, rather than relaxed; hard to get along with, rather than easygoing; emotional rather than calm; dependent rather than self-reliant.

That certainly doesn't paint a picture of an ideal employee, does it? Of course it's a false picture, not related to fact; yet, how many jobs has this stereotype prevented the mentally restored from filling?

I am a psychiatrist and not a physicist. But I have studied enough physics in school to know that when an irresistable force meets an immovable object, look out. You get an explosion. Think for a moment what we are faced with:

On the one hand, growing numbers of patients leaving hospitals after treatment for mental illness, prepared to live in the community, full of hope, ready for work, anxious to leave the whole episode of their mental illness behind them and start anew, the kind of fresh start any man ought to be entitled to.

On the other hand, backward attitudes toward the mentally restored; the refusal to recognize there can be such a thing as mental restoration, as recovery from mental illness; sharp suspicion that once you are mentally ill, you always are mentally ill, no matter what; closed doors; even, at times, an unwillingness to shake the hand of an expatient.

There you have the situation: More and more mental patients being made ready for work, but being unable to find work because of public attitudes. A dilemma? Perhaps. But there are bright spots on the horizon. Let me give you some.

The Ida S. Latz Foundation in Los Angeles has just made available a sizable grant for the preparation of a book, the likes of which does not exist anywhere today—"A Guide to Job Placement of the Mentally Restored." The author is former children's editor and mental health writer of the New York Times, Mrs. Dorothy Barclay Thompson.

Perhaps you're wondering how a guidebook, aimed at professional placement and rehabilitation specialists, could possibly change employer attitudes. The answer is this:

If, through the guidebook, professional placement techniques can be improved; if, through proper placement, the mentally restored obtain employment where they stand a better than average chance to succeed, then, every such person becomes not just one more successful employee, but something more, a sort of ambassador-at-large for all the mentally restored everywhere. If Mr. A can do it, the reasoning goes, so can Mr. B, and Mr. C.

The first placement is always the most crucial. It is the "icebreaker." It paves the way for others. The guidebook, by bettering the chances for that all-important first placement, actually can help to batter down the doors of prejudice.

Another weapon in the President's committee arsenal is a soon to be published flier for employers considering hiring the mentally restored. This will give an employer the A-B-C's of mental illness and mental health, and enhance his understanding of the mentally restored person he is contemplating taking on.

Still another weapon is a modest single page monthly President's Committee Newsletter, a clearinghouse of workable, imaginative local community programs aimed at broadening opportunities for the mentally restored and mentally retarded. The newsletter started a year ago with a circulation of 1,000; circulation has gone up 10 times to 10,000.

Still other weapons are open discussions of the job problems of the mentally restored at President's Committee meetings and Governors' committee meetings, such as this. At the annual meeting in Washington, for example, on May 9 and 10, a featured attraction will be a panel on employment of the mentally restored, chaired by Philip Ryan, executive director of the National Association for Mental Health.

There's a new weapon, just being formed. at the suggestion of an ad hoc committee of the President's Committee, the Civil Service Commission and the National Association for Mental Health have joined forces to hammer out a vast program of education and orientation for all supervisors in the Federal service. As the Civil Service Commission sees it, persons on the hiring line—"grassroots" supervisors—must be convinced in their own minds and hearts of the capabilities of the mentally restored, if ex-mental patients ever are to be granted equal opportunity. By convincing supervisors, the Commission reasons, opportunities for qualified mentally restored persons in the Federal service should grow appreciably. Purpose of the orientation program, then, is to convince those who hire that mental illness is certainly no ending point to a man's ability.

I have given you but a few scattered examples of the massive attack on prejudice and misunderstanding that is just now being mounted in America. Many, many organizations and agencies are allied in this allout battle. The President's Committee—the National Association for Mental Health—the National Institute for Mental Health, the American Psychiatric Association, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Veterans' Administration, the U.S. Employment Service, the American Medical Association, the National Association of Manufacturers, the AFL–CIO, the mass media of America, the clergy of all faiths, women's organizations—the list is long and impressive.

But the battle will not be an easy one. The roots of prejudice against mental illness run deep. They do not give way easily. Too often, the defense weapon is a "Yes, but—." An agreement for the sake of agreement, yet the doubts remain in the heart.

The ultimate success of the allout battle does not rest with the headquarters of the organizations I have listed. It does not rest with the "they" of the shopworn phrase, "they ought to do something about it." It rests with all of us, in every city and State in the Union. We have to kindle our own enthusiasms first, we have to convince ourselves that the mentally restored are richly deserving of equal opportunity, before we can go out and convince others. Once we are steamed up, we can go out and conquer worlds. And melt prejudice.

The stakes are high. Men and women are coming out of mental hospitals after having spent decades there. The most effective therapy in a mental hospital is the dream: "after I get out of here, I'm going to—". Going to what? Work? Yes? That "yes" is up to us.

So we are caught up in a new day, a renaissance, an exciting era of hope for the mentally ill. A good part of the realization of that new day rests in our hands, yours and mine. For employment is tied up in the resurgence of hope. Employment: our part in the miracle.

If we carry out our part well, and if we live long enough, we shall some day pause to look back upon these exciting times of the sixties, and we shall see the full measure of the revolution going on about us.

Then we shall see plainly the depth and breadth of our role in this ongoing revolution. And then we shall have the greatest of all rewards: the knowledge that we, with our own hands, have helped create a miracle. May we all reap the satisfaction.

House Resolution 121

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution unanimously agreed to by the Missouri House of Representatives, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 121

Whereas the forests of this State constitute one of our most valuable and productive resources; and

Whereas much of the progress in the development and utilization of this important resource in recent years has resulted directly from the capital gains treatment of timber under the Internal Revenue Code of the United States; and

Whereas the substantial elimination of capital gains treatment for the owners of forest lands, in the manner now before the Congress of the United States, would seriously hamper the continued development of Missouri's timber industry; and

Whereas the jobs of thousands of our citizens who depend directly or indirectly on our timber industry would be jeopardized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 72d Missouri General Assembly, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully petitioned and requested to consider the possible effects upon the economy and progress of a great segment of the State of Missouri in enacting any legislation affecting the tax treatment of timber; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house send suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the Members in the Congress of the United States from Missouri.

A Foreign Academy: To Match the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the distinguished and objective American columnist, Roscoe Drummond, has a most interesting and persuasive column in this morning's issue of the Washington Post dealing with the issues raised by the testimony before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on the need for a Freedom Academy.

I ask unanimous consent that the Drummond commentary be printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD. It provides additional reasons why having done too little for too long to try to win the cold war we do not prolong our ineptitude by failing to develop an effective mechanism now so that at long last we can begin winning victories in the nonmilitary aspects of the contest now being waged between communism and freedom.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FOREIGN ACADEMY: TO MATCH THE COMMUNISTS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Following the public hearings, the Senate and House Foreign Relations Committees will soon report to Congress their findings on an administration proposal to create a National Academy of Foreign Affairs. They can reach one of three conclusions:

That the proposed National Academy, designed to make training, education, and research a more effective instrument of foreign policy, is just right and ought to be enacted.

That while the National Academy is a long-delayed step in the right direction, it des not go far enough and ought to include the broader concepts of the Freedom Academy, which already has wide bipartisan backing in Congress.

That there is no need for anything, that both projects—the National Academy and the Freedom Academy—in any combination are unnecessary, that everything is just dandy.

Of these three conclusions the least defensible, the most harmful, would be a decision to do nothing.

The one thing we cannot afford is to look back at the reverses we have experienced in the struggle against communism since the end of World War II and pretend that everything has been going well.

But if we admit that things have not been going well—the Communist bloc has moved its periphery to Cuba—and still decide that we have been doing the best we can, such a decision can only mean that we are unwilling to mobilize our full resources to win.

This is why it would be a grave mistake for either the Senate or House committee to fail to take one step if it is not ready to take two steps.

The National Academy is a welcome and useful first step.

Many, who feel we have marked time too long in matching the resources of Communists in nonviolent conflict and political warfare, would like to see the Government take a much larger first step by combining the concepts of the National Academy and the Freedom Academy.

Not one of the many witnesses who have appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in behalf of the Freedom Academy has voiced any opposition to the National Academy. All have spoken in support of it and have simply proposed measures to strengthen its work.

They want to see an academy which will train both Government and private citizens in the techniques needed to counter communism in the nonmilitary field—since our citizens' interests take them abroad much of the time. They want to see an academy equipped to train non-Americans as the Soviet Union and Cuba to our great anxiety are currently training non-Cubans in Havana.

"If we were to confine this training to a small elite," said William R. Kintner, deputy director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania, "we would leave untapped the immense potential of resourcefulness and ingenuity throughout the Government service as well as our business and private organizations. Only by drawing upon all its human resources can America marshal the ability to solve pressing problems of national survival."

I think the sponsors of the Freedom Academy have the better argument. But there is no good argument in favor of doing nothing.

Ponzi Did It First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, Austen Lake wrote a painfully blunt but very thought-provoking column in the Boston Record American of Thursday, February 14, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PONZI DID IT FIRST

(By Austen Lake)

There is a strange similarity between the audacious swindles of Charles Ponzi in 1920 and the wildcat, owe-as-we-go program whereby the New Frontier is pawning our tomorrows to pay for our todays.

Maybe the reader is old enough to remember the runty, balding, fortyish, Latinesque man named Ponzi, an ex-fruit peddler and stock clerk who had sudden delusions of grandeur and opened a cave-of-the-winds office on School Street late in 1919.

If you don't recall Ponzi, ask your dad. He'll tell you how the dapper little gyp named his firm the Securities Exchange Co., then put ads in the Boston daily papers reading, "I have a new investment system which guarantees 50-percent profit on your money every 45 days." Just that and nothing more.

Well lawzee. Wouldn't you think a barefaced comeallya like that would bring the cops a-running? But no. All over town, the State, and the Nation men and women started to withdraw their life savings and swarmed into School Street to shove their money through Ponzi's wicket, until his dingy office was choked with bundled currency in denominations from $1 to $100.

Ponzi's girl clerks just snapped rubber bands around the stuff and stashed it in barrels, baskets, and cartons like dill pickles, until Ponzi bought the Hanover Trust Co. for a convenient storage bin. How the money rolled in.

Like the deficit spending system in Washington right now, Ponzi's fiscal methods were moronically simple. Not that, at first, he made his operative ideas clear. He pretended to deal in something vaguely called "postal reply coupons" but refused to explain the mysterious flub dub, lest parvenu manipulators might copy this sure-fire plan which, at its peak, had more than 40,000 "investors" for a total of $9 million.

Not until late in 1920 did the law crack down and reveal Ponzi as a crude swindler who had invented a "deficits forever" program, by paying early investors from the boodle which subsequent suckers stuffed into his choppers.

In a minature skeleton form, it was the same fiscal system which the New Frontier is now using on U.S. taxpayers—by pyramiding the national debt to a new peak of $320 billion, on the bland assumption than an ever-expanding national income will cover its ballooning debt, to achieve what it calls a "floating balance," or until the balloon goes bust.

Thus, on the old Ponzi principle that to stay perpetually solvent, all one needs do is to keep paying the running, yearly interest, the New'Deal manipulators are piling today's deficits on tomorrow's debts until the interest alone runs to $10 billion annually and growing bigger every day.

As long as the illusion lasted, Ponzi had a glorious time. He bought a massive mansion in the arch-eyed social section of Winchester, Mass. He imported his aging mother from Italy in a deluxe trans-Atlantic suite and met her on a chartered yacht with full orchestra. He bought control of five Boston banks, all of which went bust later.

Every morning a shiny limousine, driven by a liveried chauffeur, brought him neatly barbered and trimly tailored, to his School Street office where police cleared a path through crowds of huzzahing men and women and Ponzi would graciously doff his fedora and make a brief speech on how it felt to be a public benefactor.

But, by December of 1920, his bubble had burst and he was in Plymouth jail. And by January 8 of 1949 he was dead, as a pauper. Nonetheless he invented the "deficits forever" system whereby, if one parlays the annual interest on a debt, it will never come due for collection—in theory, of course.

But, imaginative as he was, Ponzi never had such an inspirational idea as to call his owe-as-you-go scheme a "minus adjustment," which is Washington fiscalese of today. But he did rediscover the fact that people have a built-in suckerism for easy money, the illusionary free punch, and a deep conviction that something can be derived from zero.

Thus though Ponzi is dead these 14 years, his spirit lives on in the annual messages from Washington's dreamworld where we've had 27 budgets deficits in 33 years, for a grand total of minus $294 billion.

Of course, the New Frontier's hole-0 policies don't promise a 50-percent premium every 45 days. But the total annual spending of Federal, State, and local governments for 1964 is rapidly nearing half of the income of the entire U.S. work force.

So the authorities arrested Ponzi in 1920 for trying to pay off his current liabilities from anticipated revenues. But where are the authorities to grab Messrs. Dillon, Heller, and Kennedy for doing ditto in 1963? Huh! Ponzi would have made a fine White House economist if he lived today.

Dedication of New York World's Fair Press Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair, 1964–65, at the dedication of the New York World's Fair Press Building, at Flushing Meadow, Long Island, on May 4, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR 1964–65, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE PRESS BUILDING, FLUSHING MEADOW, SATURDAY, MAY 4, 1963

Mr. Salinger and representatives of the fourth estate, we open today a fine building with the most modern facilities for a free press. In this building there will be no hour in which the Father will give his beloved sleep. Here day unto day uttereth speech and night unto night sheweth wisdom. The clatter of the news never ceases. This is your club as well as your workshop. We expect to drop in frequently as your guests for informal talks as well as for those inquisitions which you euphemistically call interviews and press conferences. We shall be relaxed, candid and in the best sense clubable.

Bob Considine's film of the fair, which you have seen, has taken the curse off the speaker and makes a long talk by him, especially to professionals, gratuitous, if not intolerable. A good film is more than an overture. When it is finished, there is nothing much left to the opus but amplification and reprise. Therefore I see no excuse for boring you with repetitions and shall confine my remarks to a few subjects of interest to the press.

Practical television was inaugurated here in Flushing Meadow at the 1939–1940 fair. Now it is to be worldwide and eventually in color. They tell me that the images ingeniously transmitted cannot be carried in relays on the surface of the seven seas and must be bounced off stars or carried by cable on the ocean floor. These things are beyond the comprehension of laymen and yet right in the offing. Since Prometheus offended Zeus and brought fire to man, no such potent and awful instrument has been entrusted to your profession, for tomorrow there will be no more dark continents, no more Tibetan monasteries, no more remote blessed isles, no more places to hide this side of heaven where beyond these voices there is peace. It is a Pandora's box entrusted to you and you must control what flies out of it. I don't envy you the responsibility.

A fair, like Caesar's wife, must be all things to all men. To those who build with the latest materials, it explodes into fantastic shapes of stone, glass, steel, aluminum, concrete, plastics, ceramics, rubber, and whatnot. Gone is the simple colonial, Georgian line. The fact that effects are temporary encourages experiment, individuality, boldness, inhibits inhibitions and gives designers who seek a clean break with the past the opportunity to get hopelessly lost or found a new school.

To those of you who build with words, which the poet tells us are more enduring than bronze, the fair is a sort of gigantic game of anagrams. You have the opportunity, which we hope you will embrace, to present the conventional 26 letters in endless, in exhaustible, meaningful combinations. But most of all, we ask you to practice superlatives, for this will be a superlative show. If at times you are inclined to think this pageant of our is pretty insubstantial, reflect that you too in the etymological sense are journalists, creatures of a day, ephemeral, and please have in mind that we are working toward a great permanent city park, just as you build your own Sinais to the everlasting credit of your profession.

To the scientist the fair is the epitome of the age of space, to the artist and educator the cynosure of culture, to the merchant a bird's eye view of the home and common markets. To engineers the fair presents a golden opportunity to build a permanent system of approaches, crossings and highways of the most modern, ingenious design, which will be the pride of the motor age. To the sportsman the fair will be an Olympics of progress open to all in free competition without regard to ideology and protocol. We who run the fair wear overalls, not striped pants, and we strive in strategic political years to avoid domestic as well as international politics.

Finally; the fair marks the 300th anniversary of the founding of the greatest of all our American ports of entry, where the mother of exiles lifts her lamp beside the golden door, a city which our vast hinterland has a tendency to describe as foreign, offbeat, sophisticated and headed straight for pandemonium, but also regards with plain high-minded envy.

New York on the surface is a strange, hectic, overgrown, proud, complex, and in some respects puzzling society, but it represents the success of polyglot democracy, the Tower of Babel if you will, in which we have learned to speak a common language, the magnet which draws its talent from all quarters, the seat of the United Nations, the crossroads of the world. It is easy to characterize a great metropolis as a place of confusion, ruthless competition, wrath, and tears, a world's fair as a mere circus, a gathering of multitudes as a futile gesture to unite a hopelessly divided world, and to picture hospitality as exploitation in disguise.

Whatever its reputation—and no metropolis yields to a single definition—New York is no mean city. You are the chosen instruments to give our city a good name, not to advertise and exaggerate its deficiencies. You can hardly blame the executives of the fair if they complain that often there is little mention in your prints of what we perhaps fatuously regard as minor triumphs and plenty in your columns when something goes wrong. You no doubt have high warrant for such treatment. I recall that there was little said of the 90 and 9 in the fold and much about the absentee in the wilderness, and that the prodigal son, staggering home from riotous living, got the fatted calf while his hard-working brother, who was always around, got the works. It may be that you are simply dispensing Biblical justice.

I don't take too seriously occasional smear stories about the fair. What's wrong? Is it on time? Is it overwhelmed with troubles? Our friends are not misled by such stuff, nor are the distinguished bankers on our finance committee, nor the leading business giants who are investing huge sums in their exhibits, nor the thousands who eagerly write in for information about their vacations here in 1964 and 1965. I might mention also the splendid response of so many States, the aegis of President Kennedy, the support of our three living ex-Presidents, the imprimatur of the churches. The critics, at a safe distance where they can't be intimidated, jeer at those who work. They think, they think, but Mr. Huxley, who was quite a thinker, concluded that the great end of life is not knowledge, but action. We answer the critics by palpable and increasingly visible evidences of progress. One further remark on this subject: Very shortly we shall announce that we have no more space available. This means the fair will enter a period of scarcity. There won't be room even for a critics' Tower of Babel.

We ask you to welcome prospective visitors to the fair with open arms and to urge them to prepare for visits in 1964 and 1965. You can safely promise worldwide education, culture, science, and entertainment. It will be the high point in the lives of this generation, something to look forward to with longing, to enjoy during two golden summers, and to look back upon with found remembrance. Future historians will fix the New York Fair of 1964 and 1965 as the dividing line between the age of discovery and the age of invention, between the shrinking globe and the expanding universe. Please tell your readers and listeners to come to the fair. They will thank you as long as they live.

The fourth estate sits in lordly splendor in the reporters' gallery and, according to the sage of Ecclefechan, exercised a wide world-embracing influence. It furnishes the inspiration as well as the facts for the voice of the people, which we are told is the voice of God. We are emboldened therefore to ask you to give us more than lip service, more than coldblooded justice, more than impartial criticism. Give us a break.

Tribute to the State of Israel on Its 15th Anniversary

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to pay tribute in honor of the 15th anniversary of the State of Israel.

Since its establishment, the State of Israel has made considerable development and is now the most progressive and stabilized country in the Middle East. Its population has been more than doubled by the influx of persecuted refugees from all over the world, particularly from Arab and Moslem countries.

To me, Israel is a foothold of democracy in the Middle East. A strong Israel is important to the security and welfare of the United States. Of all the countries in the Middle East, the State of Israel stands out clearly as the most dependable exponent of democracy. I sincerely believe that our American policy should always be one of close friendship with the State of Israel, which the United States helped to create.

Notwithstanding all the wonderful achievements brought about by the people of Israel, the enemies of Israel continue plotting the destruction of the only truly democratic state in the Middle East. In its struggle, Israel needs the sympathetic and wholehearted support of all right thinking Americans. We must not permit Egypt and the members of the Arab League, which hates Israel, to block the progress of the young, democratic State of Israel. When we help the State of Israel, we are not only helping the people of Israel, but we are making an everlasting friend and ally for the United States.

There must be peace between Israel and the Arab States in the Middle East.

I wish for the State of Israel and its gallant people, a continued future of peace, prosperity, security, and liberty.

One of Uncle Sam's Bad Habits, Trying To Buy Friends, Started Many Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article by Jim Bishop, one of America's outstanding journalists on the subject of foreign aid.

Since the end of World War II, the United States has spent the enormous sum of at least $100 billion in some 70 countries of the world. We have given economic and military aid to dictators who then used this aid to suppress their own people in the name of anti-Communism. We have given to dictators who have indicated by word and deed their affinity for our Communist enemies.

Since we will soon be called upon to vote on legislation authorizing the foreign assistance program for the fiscal year 1964, I believe Mr. Bishop's article is most timely; and I am pleased to call it to the attention of my colleagues:

ONE OF UNCLE SAM'S BAD HABITS, TRYING TO BUY FRIENDS, STARTED MANY YEARS AGO

(By Jim Bishop)

It is difficult to trace the origin of a bad habit. No one wants to remember how it started. However, a little research shows that the United States began to give money away in large amounts in the middle of World War I. It turned out to be a habit, once started, which could not be curbed. When we give money away, nations dislike us. When we stop, they hate us.

In the second term of Woodrow Wilson, the United States began to lend money. It coincided with the emergence of America as a first class power. The money went to friendly powers to help them win the then current war. These nations made solemn pledges to repay the money, plus interest, as soon as the war was over.

As soon as it was won, the diplomatic excuses arrived. Some, like Great Britain, made a pretense of paying the interest but not the principal. Little nations like Finland paid in full, and on time. The Germans, who had been our enemies and killed our fathers, became bankrupt and we sent a man named Owen D. Young to Germany to straighten out their finances.

He did a good job. We sent money to Germany, the nation recovered from its panic inflation, and became industrially strong. The Weimar Republic was assassinated by the National Socialists, whose leader was an Austrian named Adolf Hitler. By the time he was ready to start another war of conquest, Great Britain was pleading for more money. In fact, any nation at all friendly to us measured its loyalty to us by the size of the check we sent.

Franklin D. Roosevelt decided not to lend money outright. It amounted to the same thing but he called it lend-lease. We loaned destroyers, freighters, ammunition, rifles, tanks, planes, wheat, corn, medicine, artillery and the U.S. taxpayers paid for all of these. The Soviet Union soon learned that anyone could play the game so they borrowed and leased $11 billion worth of goods when their nation was bleeding and dying. They were so grateful that, when one of our B–29 bombers landed on their territory, they refused to return it.

They also spied on us and stole our atom bomb. When the war was over, the United States had paid a giant share of the cost, and our fellow victors were hurt when we mentioned that lend-lease meant lend-lease, and how about returning some of that material, or at least paying for it? They made a counter-proposal which seemed fair to Uncle Sam: "How about giving us more money?"

So we did. In the past 17 years, we have doled out $97½ billion in economic and military aid. Billions, that is. Uncle Sam can throw you into jail for owing a little on your income tax, but he has given $8,713,200,000 to Great Britain. Britain's little colony, the Bahama Islands, refuses to give us a submarine test center unless we lend them $5 million so that they can build sewers.

In the past year, I've been around the world once, and to Europe three times. On these trips I get a chance to talk to a lot of people. The only places where I found that we have true friends—I mean people who like us whether we send aid or not—are Spain, Italy, and Thailand. France has taken more than $9 billion from us and spits in our eye.

Vietnam got $2,441 million and flirts with the Soviet Union. India snatched $3,952 million and piously proclaims "We're neutral." West Germany, a loser in World War II as in World War I, has taken $5 billion from us since 1945 and undercuts our prices in the world market. Japan, another loser, took $3,693 million and has expanded economically at a rate as high as 17 percent per year while we're struggling to hit 5 percent.

The habit is irrevocable. We now buy friends. They are expensive, and if we cut the annual blackmail by a million or two, some of them threaten to become satellites of Russia.

Ever hear of a country called Upper Volta? They got $3,200,000. How about Mali? They got $6,100,000. Dahomey? Ever hear of it? $5,600,000. Nationalist China got $4,428 million and I'd like to know how anyone can spend that much on an island the size of Formosa. They also get the protection of the 7th Fleet free.

Year after year, the United States goes deeper into debt as Congress makes a big show of independence in cutting off a few hundred million in foreign aid. Over $52 million went to Cuba until we found we couldn't buy that friend. Russia took the missiles away from the Cubans and still has their loyalty.

Are we so defenseless that we must buy friends? Our children's children will read this page of our history blushing with shame.

Now Is the Time To Act on Electric Intertie Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the Sacramento Bee makes a good point in connection with the pending electric power intertie plans. It is that in order to protect the public interest, Federal intertie legislation needs to be enacted now, before the private companies pick off the benefits—which come from existing Federal power plants.

The reason why this is true is that, fundamentally, whoever controls the transmission of electricity effectively controls power rates and power utilization.

The Sacramento Bee editorial, supporting FPC Commissioner Howard Morgan, was published in the issue of April 18, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORGAN DISSENTS AGAIN

Howard Morgan, who submitted his resignation from the Federal Power Commission to President John F. Kennedy because he feels the Commission is not protecting the public interest well enough, is carrying his dissents to the FPC rulings down to the wire.

One concerns the Commission's recommendation to Congress against legislation sponsored by U.S. Senator CLAIR ENGLE of California, and Congressman JOHN E. MOSS, of the Third (Sacramento County) District, requiring FPC certification of high voltage electric transmission lines.

Morgan termed "naive in the extreme" the Commission's report urging no legislation be enacted until the completion of a national power survey to determine the deficiencies in existing laws in respect to high voltage lines.

He pointed out the FPC, over his dissent, recently approved financing for a private high voltage intertie between the Pacific Northwest and California and that it was the imminence of this line and its implications in respect to the public interest which led to the Engle-Moss legislation.

In other words, the Commission majority in opposing the bill would wait until the horse was stolen in order to prove the lock on the door was not any good.

Experiment Station Research Facilities

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I favor this legislation. A similar bill passed the House unanimously last year. It got bogged down in the other body in the closing days of the session, and hence was not enacted into law. This bill has the support of every land-grant college in the United States and has the general support of all the farm organizations as far as I know. I think it is highly essential in these days when we are confronted with surplus agricultural commodities that we have more research in new uses for agricultural commodities. We should also give more attention to problems of transportation, distribution, and related problems. This is a bill in the right direction and I urge its passage.

The bill will be financed through the regular appropriations process and not through the back-door spending technique which has been proposed in cotton legislation now pending in the Committee on Agriculture.

Defense Not Principal Villain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Carthage (Mo.) Evening Press recently carried two outstanding editorials on major national issues. I submit them for the attention of my colleagues:

DEFENSE NOT PRINCIPAL VILLAIN

What's the cause of the present national debt, the further increase in that debt that is certain to occur this year, and the present level of taxation?

This is not so simple minded a question as it may seem. A common answer is to attribute it to the cost of national defense, in an era when weapons are almost unbelievably expensive. And it is true that national defense accounts for roughly half of the total Federal budget, and is still on the upswing.

But proportionately, as Nation's Business points out in its April issue, defense has not been the principal villain of the play. Since 1952 defense spending has risen 26 percent, or $11 billion a year. But nondefense spending, in the same period, has risen 104 percent, or $22 billion a year, precisely twice as much in dollar terms.

Moreover, Nation's Business goes on to show Federal spending for nondefense purposes, which are in prospect, will rise on a wide variety of fronts. A partial list includes land, water and power projects; recreational facilities; fish and wildlife programs; urban renewal; public housing; rural electrification and telephone loans. And this is by no means the end. The magazine reports that public assistance will run to $3 billion next year, as against $2 billion in 1960—a jump of precisely 50 percent. It will cost more, so far as one can seen now, to support Congress, the judiciary, the Internal Revenue Service, veteran's services—in sum, just about everything the Government does, plans to do, and wants to do. Areas where cost reductions are planned are almost as scarce as hen's teeth, and that is the basic problem that surrounds Mr. Kennedy's mired-down plan for tax reductions.

It is the most obvious of truisms to say that all of us would like to pay less in taxes. Yet the administration program has not found the response that was anticipated, either within or without Congress.

The "why" of that is not difficult to discover. For one thing, some of the changes in tax policy—the alleged reforms—that are part of the package have met with the stiffest kind of opposition. There has been determined objection to the proposal that tax deductions for such costs as mortgage interest and contributions to charity be strictly limited.

On a broader base than this, tabulations show that the proposed cuts in individual income taxes would amount to relatively little for the average family. There is a feeling, in major business circles that a tax program which would substantially spur the economy must be more favorable in its attitude toward the investment community.

On a still broader base, there is a fear that tax cuts without reductions in Government spending would be dangerous and unsound. And there is the real rub.

Nation's Business quotes various people's views on this aspect of the problem. Typical examples: A Kansas City man said, "A tax cut alone would only be like taking an aspirin; relief, but no cure. But a tax cut plus a cut in spending would give the country a boost like we haven't had in a long time." A New York woman said, "I can't afford for our household all the idealistic programs that would be nice for us as a family. And Mr. Kennedy can't afford for my country all the idealistic programs he proposes."

Finally, the influential Senator McClellan has said that "continued excessive spending can only result in chaos and fiscal disaster." He is not alone, by any means, in that view.

A Tax Is Not Insurance

"Insurance" is an attractive word. Almost everyone has some—life, accident, fire, theft, hospitalization, liability. It is protection against adversity.

But the word can be used in a misleading way. And that is true of the current effort to apply the insurance tag to the bill, which got nowhere in the last Congress but is up again in this one, to finance various measures of health care to everyone drawing social security benefits.

The bill is called, on page 1, a Hospital Insurance Act. But if anyone will fight his way through to page 62 (which, one can be sure, extremely few will do), he will find that the payments are described as taxes rather than premiums. And page 62 is the truthful one. Social security payments are taxes and not premiums. Social security offers no contract, as an insurance policy does. The taxes collected for medical care, for example, would not be set aside for the future use of the taxpayers, under an actuarial system, but would be used on present beneficiaries.

The courts have held that these taxes are exactly that—taxes. And so has the Internal Revenue Service, which has placed liens on delinquent taxpayer accounts within the social security system.

Let Government medicine, socialized medicine, be debated to the limit. But let's not accept misrepresentation, which is exactly what calling a tax an insurance plan is.

Church-State Relations in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the "Memorandum on Relations Between Church and State," prepared by Raymond Wise, attorney, former well-known New Yorker and now of Miami Beach, Fla., as a thoughtful contribution to the subject of advancing the effort to develop a fair solution which will facilitate the enactment of Federal aid to education bills.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Memorandum on Relations Between Church and State

This memorandum is intended to clear up some of the misunderstood relations between church and state. Reference to God in connection with such things as currency, coinage, stamps, pledges, oaths, ceremonies, sessions of governmental bodies, the national anthem or other songs, proclamations, the use of chaplains in connection with government and other similar aspects of the tangency of govermental activity and religion do not, of themselves, either establish a religion or interfere with the free exercise thereof.

Also there is a clear legal basis for Federal aid to private schools, whether sectarian or nonreligious schools. If a parent cannot be compelled to send a child to a public school, the principle of equal protection of the laws would seem to require that if there is Federal aid to education to public schools, private schools of all kinds are also entitled to aid. Otherwise the right given under the first amendment to withhold a child from a public school becomes an empty right.

On the other hand the various aspects of the recital of prayers or Bible reading in schools are subjects which require judicial determination.

Therefore the following is intended to cover only those areas in which Congress could and should make a finding of fact and declare a national policy. It is settled law that the Supreme Court seldom goes behind congressional findings of fact which are based on reason.

Many aspects of the proper relations between church and state under the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States are unclear.

The temporal and spiritual welfare of the people of the United States requires clarification of these matters insofar as they may be clarified by the understanding and intent of Congress in respect thereto.

A union of government and religion tends to destroy government and to degrade religion.

Religion is too sacred, too holy, and too personal to permit its unhallowed perversion by a civil magistrate, and if government interferes in spiritual matters it becomes a divisive force.

We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being, and the deeply entrenched and highly cherished spiritual traditions of our Nation were bequeathed to us almost 200 years ago by Founding Fathers who avowed their "firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence" when they proclaimed the Declaration of Independence.

Countless historical documents since the discovery of this continent to the present day affirm and reaffirm that this is a religious nation.

No National, State, or local government or any subdivision thereof can set up a church, compose a prayer, formulate any religious ritual or program or prescribe what shall or shall not be orthodox in religion, or use any tax moneys in support of such activity.

The day this Nation ceases to be free for irreligion, it will cease to be free for religion.

There should be no discrimination against religious activity, no denial of public benefits or of rights, privileges, or immunities on religious grounds and no use of public property or tax money to aid or finance the establishment of religion or to interfere with the free exercise thereof.

The right of each individual to worship or believe according to his conscience, which includes the right not to worship or not to believe in the concept of divinity at all, must be carefully preserved.

Voluntary expression of love for our country by paying respect to historical documents, traditions, or customs which contain reference to the deity does not, of itself, require recognition or acceptance of the concept of divinity.

The general welfare requires that every individual receive as much education as is feasible, and that compulsory education up to the prescribed grades is a requisite of the welfare and security of the Nation.

The freedom of religion guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States by both the 1st and 14th amendments prohibit compelling any parent to send a child to a public, nonsectarian school.

The general welfare and the first amendment compel complete abstention by Congress from enacting any laws which might directly or indirectly effect the establishment of religion or prohibit the free exercise thereof, and yet the general welfare and national security also require provision for the most complete education possible under our laws and our economic system of each individual residing among us.

If the foregoing premises are valid they lead to the following conclusion:

The Congress of the United States should make a legislative determination, and declare it to be the policy of the United States of America that the following acts do not constitute or tend to constitute the establishment of religion, nor do they or any of them prohibit or tend to prohibit the free exercise thereof.

(a) Voluntary reference in speeches or songs to a Supreme Being on patriotic or ceremonious occasions in connection with the operation of or under the auspices of the national or of a State or local government or subdivision thereof.

(b) Reference to the Supreme Being on or in connection with the coinage, currency, postal service, seals, mottos, or other identifying devices, symbols or indicia, of the national or of any State or local government or subdivision thereof.

(c) The use of chaplains in the armed services or in any branch of national, State or local government or subdivision thereof.

(d) Voluntary sessions of or attendance at nonsectarian religious services in the Armed Forces or in prisons, hospitals or other institutions (other than educational institutions) operated or under the jurisdiction of the national or of any State or local government or of any subdivision thereof.

(e) The issuance of nonsectarian religious proclamations in consonance with national or State laws or traditions by the national or by any State or local government or subdivision thereof.

(f) Granting of exemptions or deduction allowances under any National, State or local tax law in connection with property employed for religious use or with donation to religious organizations.

(g) The use of traditional religious objects, such as Christmas trees, in connection with the voluntary observance of official holidays when conducted by or under the auspices of the national or of any state or local government or subdivision thereof, and the use of public moneys in connection therewith.

(h) Reference to a Supreme Being in the national anthem or pledge of allegiance or in any song, pledge, or oath adopted by any state or local government as its official song or pledge or oath or in any song or other utterance used in ceremonies of any such government.

(i) The voluntary use of any reference to a Supreme Being as part of any oath used in any court proceedings or in the taking of testimony or other proceedings before any legislative or administrative body, or the use of the Bible in administering such oath.

(j) Any reference to a Supreme Being in connection with the ceremonious opening of or closing of or conduct of any proceedings or sessions of any National, State or local governmental body.

(k) Furnishing any form of nonreligious nonsectarian aid to students or parents of students, as such, which is general in nature, has no reference to the religion or nonreligion of the students or of the parent and conforms to the due process and equal protection principles of the 5th and 14th amendments to the Constitution of the United States, such as the furnishing of textbooks, lunches, transportation, medical care or other aids to pupil or parent, as such, to further, promote, and assist education, whether in connection with secular or nonsecular schools.

(l) The granting of tax benefits, whether in the form of deductions, special tax credits or other devices to lessen the amount of taxes due from any parent of any student of school age and in attendance at school or other educational institution, whether secular or nonsecular.

(m) Providing of financial or other aid to secular or nonsecular institutions of learning, based on a nondiscriminatory pattern in conformity with the due process and equal protection requirements of the 5th and 14th amendments to the Constitution of the United States, for the purpose of aiding and promoting education in customary and nonreligious subjects, and thereby promoting the general welfare and security of the United States of America.

Respectfully submitted,

RAYMOND L. WISE.

SURFSIDE, FLA., *April 20, 1963*.

Tribute to the Late President of Israel, Itzhak Ben Zvi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I attended the service of prayer in memory of Itzhak Ben Zvi, President of Israel at the Adas Israel Congregation on Thursday, May 2, 1963. The eulogy was delivered by the Honorable Abraham Harman, Ambassador from Israel. The tribute was so impressive that I have included it for the Members to read.

The eulogy follows:

TEXT OF EULOGY OF THE LATE PRESIDENT OF ISRAEL, ITZHAK BEN ZVI, DELIVERED BY AMBASSADOR HARMON, MAY 2, 1963

In the ethics of the fathers of the Jewish faith it is written: "Which is the right course that a man should choose for himself? That which he feels to be honorable to himself and which also brings him honor from mankind." And it is further written: "Say little and do much and receive all men with a cheerful countenance."

Throughout his long and active life Itzhak Ben Zvi did nothing that was not honorable to himself. He said little but he did a great deal and so in the fullness of his days when he departed from us he commanded the honor and love of our people. It is a sad and mournful hour for us when we reflect that he is no longer with us.

Throughout his life there was never a time when he sought public office. He was always thrust forward by others to lead the community because he lived the ideas in which he believed and because these ideas were seen as being vital to the life of the nation.

He was a humble man who never raised himself above the community, nor did he ever separate himself from the congregation.

He was born in southern Russia 78 years ago in czarist times and in his youth he experienced the violent physical persecution of his people. He brought into existence the first organized attempt at Jewish self-defense against the pogroms. Throughout his life he lived by the principle that the will and the capacity for self-defense against aggression are an essential condition of human freedom and dignity.

He came to the land of Israel 60 years ago and joined in the effort to pioneer in the ashes of buried civilizations a new life dedicated to the dignity of man and to the freedom of his afflicted people.

He lived according to the principle of the dignity of labor, of the overriding importance of building the structure of Jewish independence on the foundations of manual work, particularly in agriculture. He lived to see the restoration of the fertility of Galilee, and the graceless brown and gray of the ravaged hills of Judea giving way to the spreading green of sturdy young forests and cultivated fields.

He lived according to the principle that man does not live by bread alone. Learned in the traditions of his people he brought about the conditions in which the Jewish spirit could once again flourish freely giving new and pertinent expression in a modern idiom to its eternal truths.

The gate of his house was always open. Through his effort he lived to see the gate of his country open to those in search of home and freedom. He helped to make the policies designed to raise up the lowly and the underprivileged and to enlarge their horizons of opportunity. In his own personal life he practised these policies. There was no part of our country where he was not known and where his presence and concern did not bring new hope.

Finally, he lived according to the rule of Hillel who said: "Be of the disciples of Aaron, loving peace and pursuing peace, loving thy fellow creatures and drawing them nearer to God's law."

Because he was such a man he was chosen by the representatives of the people on three occasions to fill the office of the Presidency. He was a symbol of the unity of the people and of the values by which they seek to live.

In our hour of sorrow we give thanks that such a man was given to us and that we were privileged to live in his generation. His life was a blessing to us and his memory will be a blessing to us for all time to come.

The Soviet Oil Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, for some months now, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has been conducting an investigation into the Soviet oil offensive and its effects on our national security. We have heard extensive testimony on the Russian plot to invade Western markets with cutrate oil, and to force smaller nations into economic dependence upon Moscow.

The United States has continually pressed for strict controls on this trade. We have protested not only the purchase of Russian oil by our allies, but the sale of equipment and technological data to the Soviets.

Recently, for example, the West German Government agreed to curtail its sale of 40-inch steel pipe to the Russians, material which they need for the construction of extensive pipelines to carry their oil to China and to the sea.

The New York Times carried a small item recently to the effect that Moscow is now looking for plexiglas tubing to transport the oil, since they are having so much difficulty obtaining the pipe. This bears watching, as does the entire Cocom list of strategic materials lest we inadvertently supply the Communist world with the material to attack us economically.

In this connection, a recent column by C. L. Sulzberger, the distinguished New York Times writer, on the Soviet oil problem is particularly illuminating. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

SOVIET OIL TRADE A CONFIDENCE TRICK

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS.—The shrewdest Soviet confidence trick now being played on the free world comes in Khrushchev's skillfully conducted oil trade. Moscow is using its black gold as currency to buy Western capital goods and machinery to develop its own industry.

The West becomes Russia's dumping ground for surplus and, by cutting into the petroleum markets of the Middle East and Venezuela, Khrushchev hopes to foment discontent in those sensitive areas.

SIMPLE TECHNIQUES

The techniques are astoundingly simple. Soviet commerce is wholly state controlled. Prices can be artificially fixed according to political requirement. Neftexport, the oil trading trust, blandly dumps petroleum. The average price charged customers in NATO lands is less than half that charged Moscow's East European satellites.

Russia offers cheap fuel to the West's complex societies, allowing countries like Italy to court popular favor by reducing gasoline prices. In exchange Russia purchases machinery in short supply and steel pipe to construct the massive pipelines Moscow hopes to run from Uralian and Uzbekistani wells right into the NATO region's heart.

Moscow hopes to make selected Western countries increasingly dependent on trade with the U.S.S.R., a trade always subject to sudden political shifts. And, when the pipeline network is completed, it will represent a critically important infrastructure for cold war commercial penetration, or for provisioning armies in case of hot war.

MUCH PRESSURE

For the moment, thanks to much pressure inside NATO, the pace of the Soviet oil offensive has been temporarily checked. Through its trade committee, COCOM, NATO seeks to persuade the Allies to restrict their imports and ban sale of strategic materials, above all heavy steel pipe. When West Germany recently ceased such sales, Moscow immediately protested to Bonn.

The Russians had been working closely with Enrico Mattei, head of Italy's National Fuel Trust, and hoped to link their own pipeline, now extended into Czechoslovakia, with one Mattei was building northward from the Mediterranean. However, Mattei died tragicaly last autumn and Italo-Soviet cooperation seems to have diminished. Furthermore, the Swiss worry about Italian petroleum policy and are holding up pipeline transit rights.

As a result, Russian westward oil exports advanced less rapidly last year than had been feared. But, in retrospect, Moscow's success is little short of amazing. Since 1959 Italy has been the largest purchaser of Soviet oil in the entire world, taking even more than Communist China.

PHENOMENAL PACE

Soviet petroleum production has risen at a phenomenal pace. It was only 44 million tons a year in 1950 and, it is estimated, will be about 265 million tons in 1965. Annual exports to the free world were only 1 million tons in 1950. It is reckoned they may reach 50 million tons in 1965.

West German imports of Soviet oil have risen 1,600 percent in 6 years. Today, 23 percent of Italy's oil, 11 percent of Germany's 38 percent of Greece's and 98 percent of Iceland's comes from the U.S.S.R. All are members of NATO.

The loyalist European allies on this issue have been Holland, Belgium, and France whose recent Soviet trade treaty carefully eschewed sales of big-inch pipe. Moscow is now trying to boost petroleum exports to England in exchange for large building contracts in depressed British shipyards.

POOR POSITION

The importance of this oil offensive simply cannot be maximized. The West is not in a good position to fight any trade war against a monolithic power determined to dump at artificial prices. Furthermore, western economies are highly competitive. Moscow counts on the old Marxist tenet that capitalist rivalries will work against each other to undermine the very social structure in which they flourish.

Nor can the West afford to cut petroleum prices below a certain minimum. Most of its supply originates in Caribbean or Arab areas which would be projected into turmoil were their revenues suddenly depressed.

Oil is one of NATO's essential problems, not so disruptive as the nuclear argument, but ultimately of profound importance. It proves the need for the partners to work together on economic as well as military planning.

For as the alliance succeeds in deterring war, it becomes increasingly faced with the problems of peaceful coexistence. Khrushchev interprets this Russian-made phrase as meaning economic competition with political overtones. Of this, oil is not only a symbol but the principal weapon.

Pentagonese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following item appeared in the Evening News of Newburgh, N.Y., under the dateline of May 6. It is certainly fearful and wonderful to see what some of our bureaucrats can do to what was once the English language. It is also, as the Evening News points out, good for a laugh or two.

[From the Newburgh (N.Y.) Evening News, May 5, 1963]

PENTAGONESE

If the Pentagon ever succeeds in merging the services the way it meshes words, the United States will have history's mightiest military machine.

The Pentagon's latest creation is "deprojectmanagerize." The Army general who outflanked the English language with this one translates it this way: When a project is well enough along to roll on without a manager the Army deprojectmanagerizes it.

If industry adopted the same technique, it could tell a foreman: "Demachineoperatorize at this point." And voila. There would be an employee laid off without even knowing what verb hit him.

It seems a pity that busy military men have to Pentagonize—now there's one they missed—over fresh creations for their cloud-studded lexicon. Maybe they could use a little help. For instance, just offhand:

TFXpellize: To push out of a juicy plane contract.

Deswooshelize: To push the button that destroys an errant missile.

Defidelcastroize: Throw the bum out.

The possibilities are fascinating and limitless. Only it seems odd that the establishment charged with seeing to it that a foreign language never becomes the official tongue in this country should be introducing one by boring from within.

Alaska Ferry System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, last week I flew to Alaska and participated in the inaugural voyage of the MV *Malaspina* through the fabled inside passage of southeastern Alaska. Aboard as the quests of Alaska's Gov. William A. Egan, were the mayors and chamber of commerce representatives from all of the southeastern Alaska cities along the route; Alaska's Senator, ERNEST GRUENING, and State officials; as well as several high government officials from the Province of British Columbia and other prominent Canadians, together with representatives of the press, radio, TV; and leading travel agents from all over our country.

The *Malaspina*, an oceangoing luxury car ferry, is the first of three such vessels for the creation of a marine highway link in the highway systems of Alaska and British Columbia. This development and its significance is ably portrayed by the following article from the May 7 issue of the Wall Street Journal, which I hereby make available for the information of my colleagues, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 7, 1963]

ALASKA GETS INTO FERRY BUSINESS, LINKS TOWNS ON ISOLATED PANHANDLE—STATE LINE AIDS TOURISM, PLANS EXPANSION, BUT CRITICS CALL VESSELS WHITE ELEPHANTS

(By Ray Schrick)

PRINCE RUPERT, British Columbia.—After nearly a 1,000-mile bicycle ride from Seattle, 22-year-old Lewis Nelson recently pedaled aboard a ferryboat here en route to an Alaska vacation.

Aboard the same comfortable, 500-passenger vessel, Banker Frank T. Calvin and his wife parked the new Chevrolet they had purchased in Seattle for the trip home to Sitka, in southeast Alaska.

Neither Mr. Nelson nor the Calvins would have been able to make this voyage before February 1 when the State of Alaska inaugurated its ferry line between Prince Rupert and seven cities in southeast Alaska. They are among several thousand tourists and Alaskans who already have taken advantage of this year-round service to the 49th State's relatively isolated panhandle. And officials figure that traffic will climb sharply with the onset of warm weather.

To accommodate this hoped-for influx, two more vessels are scheduled to join the ferry *Malaspina* on the line—one next week and the other in June. It's planned that each of the three ferries will make two round trips a week between Prince Rupert and Skagway, the line's Alaskan terminus, 490 miles to the north.

Their route follows the inland passage that runs between the mountain-ringed fiords of the Pacific coast and thousands of islands that break the ocean's waves. The ferry line is helping unify an elongated area, about the size of Maine, where the lack of connecting rail lines and highways has forced 35,000 residents to depend mainly on airplanes for travel between cities.

MARINE HIGHWAY

The State-owned system was financed by a $15 million general obligation bond issue. "We couldn't dream of a land highway in 50 years in southeast Alaska," says Gov. William A. Egan. "It would cost $400 million. For $15 million we created a ferry marine highway.' "

"Alaskans are using the ferry like a streetcar," declares Richard Downing, commissioner of the State public works department. A wedding party of 40 took the ferry from Juneau, the State capital, to Haines. A Petersburg lady heard spring dresses had arrived in Juneau, so she ferried 135 miles north to look them over. Wrangell School seniors took an excursion nearly 200 miles to Juneau. And the National Guard uses the vessels for troop movements.

Officials say the service will boost tourism, too. Morris Ford, head of the Alaska Travel Division, says his agency has been receiving about 750 tourist queries a week related to the ferry. Mr. Ford thinks that 1963's tourist totals may top 1962 when the Seattle World's Fair helped attract about 128,000 visitors to Alaska.

The ferry service is featured on a package trip offered by Alaska Airlines, Inc., of State, "The ferries will help the airlines," says Robert Giersdorf, general sales manager of Alaska Airlines. "Tourists taking the ferry cruise can be induced to fly into the interior of the State."

MISS ALASKA RIDES THE FERRY

While intended primarily for passengers and their autos, the ferries also carry freight, provided it is loaded in trailers or vans that can be rolled on and off at terminals. "Miss Alaska," a new brand of bread baked here in Prince Rupert by Van's Bakery, Ltd., recently appeared on grocery shelves in Ketchikan, about 90 miles away. The 39-cent price of a 1½-pound loaf compares favorably with other brands in Ketchikan. Van's bakery ferries "1,000 to 2,000 loaves a week" into Ketchikan.

Alaska Carriers Association, Inc., a trucking group, recently published rates for freight ferried into southeastern Alaska towns in trailers. In some cases these rates are lower than charges for shipping in freight by steamer and barge. But a trucking industry spokesman claims lower ferry tariffs on trailers will be necessary to make the ferry system generally competitive for freight.

Despite the advantages of the ferry service, some Alaskans take a dim view of the operation because of its cost. "The boats should be named after elephants," the Anchorage Times suggested in an editorial. "One could be 'White Elephant' and the other could be 'White Elephant, Two.' The names would then conform to what the boats are going to be as far as the Alaskan taxpayers are concerned."

In an advance study for the State, W. C. Gilman & Co., a New York consulting firm, estimated that the ferries would lose nearly $2 million in the first 3 years before breaking into the black. But Public Works Commissioner Downing points out that the *Malaspina* brought in about $50,000 in its first 2 months. While this figure was below the estimated $90,000-a-month break-even point, it was above the Gilman forecasts for a winter operation, Mr. Downing says.

Says Governor Egan: "It would cost us up to $1 million a year to maintain a highway. We will use the equivalent of highway maintenance funds, if necessary until the ferry pays for itself."

Passengers traveling all the way to Skagway from Prince Rupert pay $30. A berth in a stateroom for the 30-hour trip costs an extra $7.50. The *Malaspina* has only 14 staterooms with 28 berths but more sleeping accommodations will be installed next year under a recent $300,000 appropriation.

Passengers who want to drive into the Alaskan interior pay $118 to ferry normal-size autos from Prince Rupert to Haines, where a road leads to the Alaskan Highway. The *Malaspina* can carry 109 autos.

Some choose to leave their cars behind in Prince Rupert, where Lindsay's Cartage & Storage, Ltd., reports it is picking up business from tourists who pay $1.25 a day or $7 a week to store their autos. Prince Rupert's Crest Motor Hotel, Ltd., also anticipates more customers as a result of the ferry service. Under a $400,000 expansion program the motel is adding a new restaurant and bar and increasing the number of its units to 87 from 46. "We're a happy geographic accident," declares William Murray, president.

Prince Rupert, a town of about 12,000, can be reached by Canadian National Railway Co., by highway, by airplane from Vancouver, B.C., and by water. Northland Navigation Co., Ltd., will begin service May 31 with a new $3.5 million, 110-passenger, 45-car vessel on a 3-day run from Vancouver to Prince Rupert.

Interstate Highway Problems of Our Police Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, over a period of years I have been most interested in the field of highway safety. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I have held many hearings on this subject and have had numerous occasions to understand the excellent job that many organizations are accomplishing in the field of highway safety. I believe one of the most outstanding groups is the International Association of Chiefs of Police. In an editorial of the March issue of the Police Chief magazine is an article entitled "America's Traffic Toll Call: DEath 4–1000," which I would like to have inserted in the Record at this point as I believe it to be one that very clearly indicates the problems that confront the police on the interstate highway system.

The article follows:

[From the Police Chief, March 1963]

America's Traffic Toll Call: Death 4-1000

It is a grim coincidence that as the Federal Government and the States work toward completing 41,000 miles of superhighways, the same number—41,000—human beings were killed in traffic accidents in 1962. This appalling record set a new high for slaughter on the highways and streets of this country.

The 41,000-mile ultimate goal for the Interstate System is, of course, a tribute to public officials at all levels of Government and to associations and other groups deeply interested in safer, more efficient travel for the 90 million licensed motorists in this country.

As this modern network moves toward completion, it would behoove every community and every State to begin considering now how they will cope with the operational problems which inexorably follow the construction work.

The IACP is in the vanguard of those organizations which realize that this nation-girdling system of freeways will not become a reality without some operational problems. These problems center primarily around the question of how this new concept in highway transportation with its controlled access highways can provide the optimum in safe and efficient transportation of people and goods. We are concerned about a primary police responsibility, protection of life and property, a vital police service.

Here are just a few of the difficulties posed to police by the Interstate System: means of giving aid to motorists in distress throughout the 41,000 miles of mostly rural highways; emergency care at accident scenes; crossovers for police and emergency vehicles; police parking and observing areas; safeguards to prevent objects being dropped off overpasses onto vehicles below by vandals; control of speed in approaching egress ramps; rest areas for weary motorists; establishment of police jurisdiction; a uniform system of policies, procedures and standards; and a formula to determine manpower needs.

Highway users on toll road systems today are accustomed to a variety of police services. If this same type of service is demanded by the public, we may need about 12,000 State and highway patrol officers to effectively police the Interstate System when the 41,000 miles are completed. Some areas will naturally require more manpower than others. For instance, one State which now has heavily traveled expressways conducted a study recently which revealed that for adequate police service 59 police units were required for a 50-mile stretch of highway. This, of course, is more than a police unit per mile and while this is an extreme situation, it is indicative of the scope and complexity of the problem.

The IACP and the professional police executives which it represents are acutely aware of their responsibilities in providing maximum protection with minimum interruption to drivers and pedestrians.

A request to conduct research in this hitherto unexplored area of police responsibilities on controlled access highways was made to the Bureau of Public Roads. This Bureau, through its Office of Highway Safety, is to be commended for recognizing the value of this pioneering research and for making a pilot grant to IACP to identify the problems and propose solutions.

The motoring public could neither ask nor receive better allies than their State and local officials, the Bureau of Public Roads and the IACP, representing the Nation's police, all working together to eradicate or minimize the hazards.

Public officials, and particularly police officials, can provide maximum protective services only within a climate of public understanding and support of their efforts. Human life is the most precious of our natural resources. To lose 41,000 of our people in a 12-month period is a national tragedy. The police administrators of IACP are dedicated to the task of reducing the terrible toll of death and destruction and making the highways of America, including the 41,000 miles of Interstate System, a highway transportation network which all Americans can use with safety and pleasure.

Quinn Tamm,
Executive Director.

Tribute to a Distinguished Hoosier: Gerry H. Kisters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, there appeared recently in a Columbus, Ind., newspaper, the Evening Republican, an article about one of Indiana's valiant war heroes. Second Lieutenant Gerry H. Kisters was honored 19 years ago for his extraordinary heroism in action and was recently invited to attend a military reception at the White House along with all living Congressional Medal of Honor winners. Although Mr. Kisters is not originally from Indiana, the Hoosier State is proud to claim him as an adopted son, a man who won not only the Congressional Medal of Honor but also the Distinguished Service Award and the Purple Heart.

I therefore wish to call to the attention of my colleagues this article paying tribute to such a distinguished Hoosier.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Columbus, Ind., Evening Republican, May 1, 1963]

Hero Goes Back to White House: Kisters Attend J.F.K.'s Reception

(By Ann Green)

Mr. and Mrs. Gerry Kisters and three daughters of Bloomington are en route today to Washington, D.C., where Thursday they will attend a military reception at the invitation of President Kennedy. To add a spark to a usually dull reception, the President has invited all living Congressional Medal of Honor winners in the country and their wives to star in this social event.

Recipient of the highest award for valor in battle is Second Lieutenant Kisters, son of Mr. and Mrs. Richard G. Kisters, of 531 10th Street, Columbus. Gerry accepted the Congressional Medal of Honor and in February 1944 the Distinguished Service Cross and Purple Heart for valor in World War II.

The award for Distinguished Service Cross was made by Gen. George Marshall after which Kisters was escorted from the Pentagon to the White House where the President of the United States pinned on the Medal of Honor for "conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of life above and beyond the call of duty" for action on July 31, 1943, near Gagliano, Sicily. That was the day

Gerry learned he was unique, inasmuch as he was the only living soldier up to that time to hold both the Distinguished Service Cross and Medal of Honor.

BOTH IN FUR BUSINESS

Both Kisters are in the fur business; Gerry's father is practically retired now, but he learned the business years ago in Canada after immigrating from Germany, then taught his son. He worked for the Hudson Bay Company and Gerry grew up in Mark Twain country, going to school in Hannibal, Mo. He was inducted into the service before Pearl Harbor, was assigned to the 91st Squadron and went to Africa.

Near Tunis he participated in action routing and putting a German 88 out of action with hand grenades. His outfit's job was to advance, look over the situation, maintain liaison, fill the gap between outfits, advance and hold ground. When it seemed impossible to advance by motor, this group would get out and crawl over the terrain under fire to spot the enemy and secure information.

During the invasion of Sicily, Staff Sergeant Kisters not only knocked out a machinegun nest and took prisoners, but received serious wounds in the leg and arm. First aid was given and the German prisoners he had taken assisted in carrying him back for help. Lieutenant Franklin, with him at this time, said, "I'm putting you in for a commission right now and you'll get an oak leaf cluster for that DSC."

After some months under treatment, being shifted back to Africa to a hospital for operation on the severed nerve in his arm, he returned across the Atlantic in a British transport, arriving in New York, October 10, for treatment at Halloran Hospital. Later in an Ohio hospital he was reunited with his wife, whom he had married in Bloomington when he realized his military service would be extended indefinitely.

If you've wondered why some brave lads get recognition from generals, the reason Kisters got it was for "extraordinary heroism in action on May 1943 near Tunisia. Staff Sergeant Kisters made several individual reconnaissance missions, returning each time with timely and valuable information concerning the location of enemy artillery emplacements. Alone and while subjected to enemy heavy artillery and concentrated machinegun fire and individual rifle fire, Sergeant Kisters crept forward on the artillery piece which was firing on our forces near * * *. By the effective use of hand grenades and rifle, Staff Sergeant Kisters wiped out an entire crew."

And now President Kennedy is recognizing Gerry, his wife and daughters 19 years later at reception in the Nation's Capital.

Law Day, U.S.A.: A Dissent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, a free society must have honest, outspoken, and thoughtful criticism. Americans, understanding this, have made great heroes of their Thomas Paines and Thomas Jeffersons.

I should like to commend to the attention of my colleagues an article written for the Daily Washington Law Reporter by Mr. Lawrence Speiser, the distinguished attorney and director of the Washington office, American Civil Liberties Union.

Mr. Speiser points out what we lawyers should have said, and did not, on Law Day, U.S.A.:

LAW DAY, U.S.A.: A DISSENT

(By Lawrence Speiser, director, Washington office, American Civil Liberties Union)

This article is written more in sorrow than in anger. In preparation for its writing, I called the American Bar Association and received some beautifully and obviously expensively printed booklets, all designed to help make Law Day, U.S.A. a huge success. They suggested such worthwhile topics for speeches or articles as "Why Respect the Law," "How Laws Protect You," and "What Courts Do For You."

Complete plans were given for arranging luncheons (i.e., "perhaps a maximum of two to five guests per lawyer in most instances"). Suggestions for gubernatorial proclamations and news media coverage were included as well as promotional materials, posters, mail stickers, and leaflets. One impressive poster proclaims:

"The law is everyone's business and everyone's protector. It is impartial, swift, without fear or favor * * *. The rule of law is the rule of right, not might. It allows us to live our lives in freedom and in dignity. The Constitution and the Bill of Rights clearly define our rights as citizens. It is hard to realize that only a few hundred years ago most of these rights did not exist. Perhaps it is also hard to realize that, unless the rule of law is maintained, these rights would quickly perish."

There is nothing basically wrong with any of these suggestions nor any of the sentiments expressed, except for one thing. They violate most horrendously the warning in one of the pamphlets, "Lofty abstractions about individual liberty and justice do not enforce themselves." It would be difficult, indeed, to advance programs less likely to promote and expand the rule of law—less likely to make it a living reality—than those suggested in the fine material sent out by the American Bar Association. They have little meaning as well as little persuasiveness, simply because they are designed to avoid controversy. Innocuousness is their greatest virtue. High sounding phrases and impassioned rhetoric mean little to the average citizen.

Most Negroes in Mississippi as well as elsewhere, if they read the poster quoted above that the "law is everyone's * * * protector. It is impartial, swift, without fear or favor", would be totally unconvinced. And most Negroes are dreadfully aware there is something less than the equal application of the rule of law when hundreds can be arrested merely for going into white waiting rooms or for attempting to register and vote.

There are problems in our society today—vital, deep-seated, complex problems involving the rule of law—yet Law Day U.S.A. studiously avoids them. Was not the rule of law placed in the greatest danger in this country in recent times by the refusal of a Governor of a State to abide by a Federal court order? Why isn't this the subject of Law Day?

Recently, Supreme Court Justice Clark in an address at St. Louis University chided the Nation's lawyers, judges, and law schools for failing to meet their responsibilities in providing legal help for poor persons charged with crime. But this is not suggested as a fitting topic for discussion and work on Law Day, U.S.A.

As an indication of the failure of the American Bar Association to meet its responsibility, I need only point to the recent landmark case of *Gideon* v. *Wainwright*, 31 U.S.L. Week 4291 (Mar. 18, 1963), in which the Supreme Court held that the States must provide counsel for indigents in criminal cases. To the shame of the American Bar Association, no brief amicus was filed on its behalf. In striking contrast, 23 State attorneys general—the States' chief law enforcement officers—filed an amicus brief on behalf of the defendant urging the Court to rule as it did. No discussion of the importance of this decision nor the problem which caused it is proposed as the basis of any Law Day, U.S.A. celebration.

A few years ago, Supreme Court Justice Douglas wrote an article, "Vagrancy and Arrest on Suspicion."[1] He pointed out that in 1958, there were 96,740 reported arrests on suspicion in this country according to the Uniform Crime Reports; yet there is no crime known as suspicion, and arrests for suspicion are not countenanced by the Bill of Rights. In fact this figure is probably too low, since many such arrests are not even reported. The number has not diminished. In 1961, similarly, there were 136,114 reported arrests on suspicion—but yet this police practice undercutting the rule of law is not suggested as a topic for discussion.

Studies on the bail system have demonstrated that in practice the poor are systematically being deprived of liberty before being found guilty. In New York City in 1960, a total of 114,653 persons were detained in jail prior to trial, some for as long as a year, while after trial only 30,827 were given sentences. In 1958, a study showed that 28 percent of defendants couldn't raise $500 bail; 45 percent couldn't raise $2,000. Surely such a defect in the administration of justice riddles the rule of law.

There is also something clearly wrong when statistics demonstrate year after year that the Negro and the poor are disproportionately subjected to capital punishment.

If it is felt that these matters are controversial (and, indeed, they are) then what is wrong with planning Law Day as a debate on these subjects, with speakers pro and con? I am not suggesting that there are infallible views on all these topics, but certainly there is a real need for cogent and perceptive discussion and what better day could there be than Law Day, U.S.A.?

The planning guide warns "The event is not a 'lawyer's day' but rather an occasion for honoring the place of law in American life. Care should be taken to avoid giving the public an incorrect impression that the event is intended as an occasion for self-laudation by lawyers." Unfortunately the incorrect impression is the popular one and it has been nurtured by unthinking observances such as those suggested in the planning guide. A day filled with high flown phrases and lofty rhetoric will not increase the stature of either lawyers or the law in the minds of the public—nor will it make the rule of law the living reality it should be.

---

[1] 70 Yale L. J. 1 (1960).

Jesus, the Most Beloved Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Jesus, the Most Beloved Man—The Humblest and Greatest of All," written by one of the most respected citizens of my State, Judge John Park Cravens.

Judge Cravens has long been one of the leading Christian gentlemen of Arkansas.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Jesus, the Most Beloved Man—The Humblest and Greatest of All

(By John Park Cravens)

Today, the hope of the survival of civilization, and all that is dear to it, lies in the teachings of Jesus, the man who was perfect.

Jesus is the most beloved man of all history, which does not record any other character like Him.

Down through the centuries of 2,000 years past, Jesus has been the hope and faith of millions of people who would have become forlorn because of wars and other things injurious to humankind.

"I am the way, the truth and the life," were words spoken by Jesus 2,000 years ago as He lived the truth; and truth is eternal.

Jesus brought to the world God's way of life more than any man has or ever will, and He is the humblest and greatest of all men.

Jesus had a place in the hearts of the most of our Christian forefathers for the past 2,000 years, and from them we have inherited this divine heritage that was theirs, and is now ours.

If millions of little children were asked: "Who was Jesus?" with love in their hearts, and in a voice of reverence they would tell you about Him. Then ask them who Alexander the Great was, also Napoleon, Plato, Darious the Great, Lord Bacon, Confucius, Sir Thomas Moore, Caesar, the Egyptian Pharaohs, and many others who have a place in history, you will find the most of them know nothing about the careers of these men. And if you ask these children, and many elders, to name these men's mothers, you will find that a small percent can name some of the mothers that are of record. Then ask them to name the mother of Jesus.

Mary, the mother of Jesus, is the most adored, beloved, and devoted mother of history. Her hardships, her sacrifices in bringing Jesus into the world and rearing Him, and her watching Him nailed to the cross and die are without parallel in the heartbreaks, sacrifices, agonies, and sufferings of a mother.

There is no other character in history whose life was more sacrificial, more forceful, and more impressive than the life of Jesus.

Jesus was condemned to death before his birth by a tyrant and king. From the manger to the cross death walked with Him. No person's life recorded in history has had a childhood background so humble, innocent, and destined as that of Jesus, nor did their life begin under such adverse conditions as His.

History has no record of any man living a life as clean, as pure and as perfect as Jesus. In His short period of life He gave more to the world for the benefit of humankind than any person has ever given. With 12 humble disciples, men of peace and compassion, He established a kingdom that is eternal.

When God created the heavens and the earth He reserved vast material secrets from the people of the earth. Down through the ages since the beginning of time, God has given to the world a small fraction of His precious secrets in the form of some scientific discoveries and inventions. So long as the world exists, new scientific discoveries will be made, and there will be progress made in the fields of inventions.

When the right time came, after God created the heavens and the earth, He gave to the world His Son Jesus, our beloved Saviour, and the gift of eternal life. "For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on Him shall not perish, but shall have everlasting life." When God gave to the world Jesus He gave the greatest and most precious gift He has ever given or will ever give. And now 2,000 years after Jesus' crucifixion, His followers have grown by millions who place their hope, faith and trust in Him.

During the Dark Ages the only light that survived was the light of Jesus, and His light will ever shine no matter how great the powers of any force is that is against His teachings, and would destroy all the works of God, and plunge the world into the complete darkness of tyranny, war, dictatorship and materialism.

Many are the men recorded in history who have been great in their times during the past several thousand years. They were not interested in the human soul like Jesus, and dwelled on material things. As a teacher Jesus taught to perfect the peoples mind, and He was interested in people of all ages, and of the entire world.

Jesus in His teachings looked to the soul, and regarded character as more important than money. The system of ethics He taught was based on God's truth, and has stood the test of time for 2,000 years, and will stand forever.

Jesus was a teacher, philosopher, preacher and prophet of true greatness. None of His teachings are in contradiction to scientific discovery, explorations, history, and all knowledge and culture during his lifetime, and down through the centuries since. He lived to bless humanity.

Jesus done the most of His preaching in the open, and often He was without benefit of shelter as He slept on a pallet on the ground. "Foxes hath holes, birds of the air hath nests; but the Son of Man hath not where to lay His head." Jesus was poor born, and He lived and died poor and humble, and as innocent as a little child. He was not a man of earthly greatness, and material position with an heir of heirs to take over His property and position of power. He was not a member of a family of earthly power and position, and the night Roman soldiers sought Him, and made Him their prisoner, and took Him before Pilate to be condeemned to the cross, He had nobody on earth to look to but His beloved mother Mary who could not save Him, and whose presence could only comfort Him as He was crucified. He knew not the love of a wife and children of His own like most men, and the pattern of His life from His birth to His crucifixion on the cross could have only been planned and destined by God, His Father, who was well pleased with His Son who lived and died for the sake of humanity and the atonement of sin, and the redeeming of people through His incarnation, sufferings and death.

A few years ago the tomb of an ancient king was discovered and opened. In the tomb where they had been placed about 5,000 years before, was the mummy of the king, jewels, ornaments, and regalia. This king had been a man of great riches and power during his life and reign. He was best known for his pomp, punishment, cruelty, death, destruction and slavery. His power of life and death was over millions of people. And only a few years after his death he was practically forgotten. He lived a life of earthly splendor in a palace, and had been entombed for about 3,000 years before the birth of Jesus. Then it was 2,000 years more before his tomb was discovered. The discoverers were only interested in his tomb and mummy as ancient things of interest, and not in his record as a great man of his time. He is only one of many great persons of past history who left nothing of value to posterity, and the glory of God at their deaths.

Jesus was born in a manger, was reared as a poor child, and was crucified before he was 35 years of age. He was nailed to the cross to die by soldiers of the greatest empire of the earth, and the only thing He left in material things was His homewoven garments colored red by His blood. To establish His kingdom, He defied wealth, political power, prestige and opposition of other forms. His establishing His kingdom changed the world from the way it had been for thousands of years before His coming, and this change will continue forever. He could not have done this without being what He said He was. He is the bravest man recorded in history.

In all the records of the writings of the world none equals Jesus' Sermon on the Mount. The words He spoke, His character, His life and His ideas as to government and His code of ethics are without flaw. Throughout all Christendom many days of the year are in honor of Jesus, Christian leaders and Christian worship. Thousands of churches, cathedrals, educational and other buildings throughout many lands are monuments to Jesus, the Man of Galilee, and the past, present and future of Christian worship.

The name of Jesus has been spoken and appeared in print for the past 20 centuries, more than any other person's name who has a place in history. The voices from the pulpit, the voices in prayer, the voices in song, the millions of copies of the Holy Bible throughout Christian and other lands, the faith of our fathers in Him down through the ages, our love for Him, and our respect for His memory are testimony to our faith in Him as our blessed Saviour.

Only a small percent of the people of the Christian nations during the past centuries knew who their ancestors were any further back than their great grandparents. But they knew Jesus was their heavenly Father, as Christians of today know Him, and now 2,000 years after He was crucified He still lives, He walks with millions who are faithful, He talks to them, and He blesses them, and He has walked with millions, and comforted them unto death when all others had forsaken them.

No man's character and career in all history has shown its relationship to God as much as that of Jesus. When He was crucified, some countries that were inhabited with wild tribes, and worshiped false gods, are today leading countries of culture and Christian worship. The gospel of Jesus was carried to them as it is being carried to remote corners of the earth today. The eternal truth of Jesus took root at the cross of Calvary, and for hundreds of years has grown to many lands throughout the world, and will in time cover the entire earth.

There is no end to the discoveries of science, and the invention of inventions which are now in their infancy, and humankind will never master the secrets of the material things of God completely. But God through His son Jesus has revealed to the world all of the spiritual side of life without reservations.

In the recordings of history there is no person as gentle and forgiving as Jesus and every word He spoke was the truth and cannot be justly criticized in any manner, and His wisdom has never been excelled.

Time has always judged the life and career of every man in history, and God's laws have always governed the rendering of the judgment. Some persons of history, who lived only 200 years ago, are having their lives and careers properly judged by scholars, educators, historians, scientists and other learned persons. Jesus lived 2,000 years ago, and no life and career has been judged as much as His.

Jesus could only have been a divine being.

The Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 Should Be Extended for 3 More Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the progress being made under the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 is encouraging. I join other Members of the House in introducing legislation to extend this act for another 3 years.

This nationwide program was backed by President Kennedy to develop demonstration, training, and action projects across the country to find new ways to deal with the problems of youth. An endorsement of this law was given last week when the House voted the full $4 million appropriation for 1964. The present law will run out in July of 1964 and unless the law is extended, many projects, including one in Minneapolis, will not be permitted to move from the planning stage into the action stage.

In June 1962 Minneapolis secured a grant of $150,000 under the existing law. The grant was given to the Community Health and Welfare Council of Hennepin County which has initiated the Minneapolis youth development project under the staff direction of Larry Harris.

It is evident that the Minneapolis project has enlisted support of many groups in the community and that a keen interest exists in seeing the project completed. The following list of the members of the planning committee illustrates this broad interest:

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COMMITTEE

Chairman, Mr. Alan H. Moore, vice president, 1st National Bank of Minneapolis; board, community health and welfare council.

Guy Alexander, Electrical Workers Union No. 292; board community health and welfare council.

Miriam Alburn, editorial writer, Minneapolis Star and Tribune.

Dr. Margaret Andrews, director of placement, Minneapolis public schools.

Judge Lindsay Arthur, juvenile judge.

Earl Beatt, executive director, Family and Children's Service.

Herbert D. Bissell, president, community health and welfare council; vice president, Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co.

Dr. Peter Briggs, Department of Physical Medicine, University of Minnesota.

Arthur Broberg, manager, Minneapolis Office, Department of Employment Security.

Camillo E. DeSantis, executive director, Pillsbury Citizens Service, Inc.

Marshall Diebold, vice president, Northrup King & Co.; board, community health and welfare council.

Rabbi Meier Eisemann, principal, Torah Academy of Minneapolis; board, Phyllis Wheatley House.

Prof. John R. Ellingston, College of Law, University of Minnesota.

Daniel S. Feidt, attorney, Feidt and Lang.

M. E. Fisher, circulation manager, Minneapolis Star and Tribune.

Sidney Goldish, director of research, Minneapolis Star and Tribune.

Arthur M. Goldman, executive director, Edward F. Waite Neighborhood House.

Robert Gomsrud, president, Central Labor Union.

Arnold E. Gruber, assistant executive director, Henn County Welfare Department.

Thomas F. Hansen, executive director, Wells Memorial, Inc.

Abner Heggerston, assistant superintendent, Minneapolis public schools.

Larry Irvin, planning director, Minneapolis Planning Commission.

Dr. William Jepsen, program director, Minneapolis and Hennepin County Mental Health Clinic.

Russell H. Johnson, director of recreation, board of park commissioners.

Robert Jorvig, executive director, Minneapolis Housing and Redevelopment Authority.

Mrs. Burton M. Joseph, President's Committee on Youth Employment.

Paul W. Keve, director, department of court services.

Judge Theodore B. Knudson, Hennepin County District Court.

Dr. Gisela Konopka, professor of social work, University of Minnesota.

Dr. James Lawton, director of child psychiatry, Minneapolis General Hospital.

Dr. Elio Monachesi, chairman, Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota.

Arthur Naftalin, mayor of Minneapolis.

Col. Robert Nolte, executive director, Volunteers of America.

Dr. Henrietta Saloshin, professor of social work, University of Minnesota; chairman, research advisory committee, CHWC.

Arne L. Schoeller, attorney at law; member, Minneapolis Board of Education.

Henry Thomas, executive director, Phyllis Wheatley House.

Dr. Joel Torstenson, professor of sociology, Augsburg College.

Dr. Walter Walker, president, Barlow Realty Co.

E. I. (Pat) Walling, chief, Minneapolis Police Department.

John Warder, office manager, Litho Supply Depot, Inc.

Miss Elsie R. Weinlick, executive director, Unity Settlement Association.

Robert Williams, executive director, Minneapolis Urban League.

Ray Williamson, captain, crime prevention bureau.

Staff: Omar Schmidt, executive director, community health and welfare council; Larry E. Harris, project director; Dr. Robert D. Wirt, research director; Donald D. Bevis, school services planner; Richard W. Faunce, research associate; Richard W. Moore, youth employment planner.

Mayor Arthur Naftalin has given his full support. The problems of our young people are being studied intensively. A description of the progress in Minneapolis appears in part 1 of the recent hearings of the Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Subcommittee, on pages 840–42.

We must translate these studies into meaningful programs which draw upon the full resources of the community. The Minneapolis Youth Development Project offers the best chance for this. The progress in Minneapolis is highly regarded by the staff members of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency.

I sincerely hope that the Federal law will be extended and that Minneapolis will be permitted to receive the additional Federal funds needed.

Peace in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement of the American Jewish Congress Governing Council on Peace in the Middle East, adopted on April 28, 1963.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Swiftly moving developments in the Middle East make it plain that the United Arab Republic is bent upon an undisguised campaign of territorial and political aggrandizement. Within recent weeks three governments have fallen, at least in part because of the intervention of Egyptian troops or political agitators, and a new federated entity has emerged pledged to the annihilation and destruction of Israel and other presently existing sovereign states in that area.

This program of aggression and expansion has been encouraged by the silence and passivity especially of those governments, including our own, that have a clear national interest in preserving peace in that region. Such governments have a special responsibility to end the continued political and economic aggression by the UAR so that it shall not lead to war. If hostilities do eventuate, responsibility will reside with those who either foment or condone the kind of provocation that will make such hostilities inescapable.

Everyone must welcome genuine efforts by the deprived peoples of the Middle East to reform their political and economic systems and to begin the hard task of national and regional rehabilitation. It is tragic that many of the populations in the Middle East should continue to live amid backward, poverty stricken circumstances and that they should continue to be ravaged by despots who squander the resources of the area on personal or military extravagances. Legitimate efforts to reconstruct the economy, the people, and the land have yet to be seriously attempted.

There is every reason to believe that recent changes in the area are not directed toward such constructive ends. The very first communiques issued by the heads of the new federation of the UAR offered plans for new military adventures rather than plans for economic change and held out the prospect of new wars, not new industries. The sums recently expended by the Government of Egypt to import West German and other scientists and to manufacture new expensive and sophisticated weapons with moneys released as a result of aid programs provided by the United States indicates clearly the temper and objective of UAR leadership.

These developments make imperative the rethinking of fundamental precepts of American foreign policy. We applaud the bipartisan effort now underway in the House of Representatives to insure that guarantees against any use of American economic aid to Arab governments for the purpose of preparing for an offensive war shall be incorporated into the present foreign-aid bill. It is unthinkable that American funds, directly or obliquely, should continue to subvene these aggressive ends.

Unhappily, present State Department policy appears to be oriented in an opposite direction. Top ranking officials of the Department have recently appeared to suggest that the United States must purchase Arab support, almost unconditionally, as the only means of immunizing that area from Soviet influence.

This is the core of the present American position, a position which we believe to be shortsighted and counterproductive. The blackmailer is never satisfied with his last payment. And the compliant disposition of the State Department invites further exploitation and ever more stringent demands. Moreover this acquiescence carries no assurance, even no likelihood, that our country thereby will gain steadfast allies. On the contrary, the Arab States have freely proclaimed their decision to play both sides of the cold war against the middle and to turn to any source whenever expedient.

The one nation in the Near East that has shown an overriding and steady attachment both to the principles of freedom and to the positions of the free world has been the Government of Israel. Yet it is conceivable, unless clear limits are drawn, that the UAR, as a condition for rejecting Soviet assistance, might well demand that the United States remain aloof and detached while the new unified Arab military machine seeks to overrun the State of Israel.

We cannot accept the consoling assurances of those officials in the United States who dismiss the inflammatory, warmongering statements of President Nasser as political pablum intended only for internal demagogic purposes. It will be too late to rectify this error of judgment once Nasser's rockets begin to fly across sovereign borders. There will then be time only for regrets, not for assistance.

As we meet, the UAR is seeking to overthrow more Middle East governments not now included in the new federation of Arab states. These attempts proceed initially by way of infiltration and subversion. This pattern, we may expect, will be followed by the kind of military assault which had its precedent in the Egyptian expedition in Yemen. Unless those governments that can yet be influential in the Middle East, such as our own, express themselves with greater vigor than they have yet demonstrated, we fear these developments are imminent and almost certain.

We are gratified that the Secretary of State and the President have found occasion in recent days to express "interest in the independence and security" of those Middle East governments who are not within the UAR. But these assurances have been casual and intermittent. There is still no clearcut pronouncement of our governmental policy. Above all else, such a declaration is called for now.

The United Arab Republic poses an urgent threat to the security of all of its neighbors, Arab and non-Arab alike. It is therefore vital that our Government reaffirm unequivocally its policy of friendly and peaceful relations with all presently existing countries in the area and serve clear and unmistakable notice that it will respond promptly and decisively to any threat to the peace, or to any provocative military buildup that is intended to precipitate a war.

Our hope is that our Government can thus help procure a long and extended interval of peaceful development for all countries in that much harassed region. We urge the constructive adaptation of American policies in the Middle East to replace regional arms competition with regional economic cooperation. In this way the national interests of the United States can be realized and promoted, the security of the small nations of the area can be protected and the redemption of the masses of underprivileged and deprived peoples of the Middle East can begin in earnest.

Cuba: Through the Eyes of L.B.J. and Through the Eyes of Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I found two articles in the papers over the weekend most interesting in their obviously different assessment of Cuba.

First there was the AP report of Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON's political speech to a $100-a-plate Democratic fund-raising rally in Milwaukee Saturday night.

Then there was Bob Considine's report on an article in Vision, described by Considine as "probably Latin America's best informed periodical."

The subject, in both cases, was Cuba.

According to the AP report, the Vice President "insisted the administration policy on Cuba 'is to get rid of communism and Castro.'" Citing economic ills in Cuba, L.B.J. said this is "a record of proud American responsibility. We are determined that communism in Cuba must go—and shall go."

According to Considine, Vision states, "The Kennedy administration has launched a propaganda campaign to prove its 'isolation' policy renders Castro harmless; that Cuba is just a small pawn in the overall global struggle, and that no decisive action is possible without risking nuclear war," but the Latin American periodical adds that the argument is "demonstrably false."

I now include that portion of the AP story and that portion of the Considine article which deal with this subject:

JOHNSON LABELS CUBA RED FAILURE SHOWCASE

MILWAUKEE, May 4.—Vice President JOHNSON pictured Cuba tonight as "a showcase of Communist failure that is costing the Soviet Union more than $1 million a day to prevent complete and final collapse."

In a speech prepared for a $100-a-plate Democratic fundraising dinner, the Texan attacked the Republican Party and its spokesmen and insisted the administration policy on Cuba "is to get rid of communism and Castro."

Calling President Kennedy "the strong young man in the White House," Mr. JOHNSON said the President "stood up to the aggressor and drew the fangs of aggression."

He listed these as results of Fidel Castro's Cuban Communist regime:

"Cuba's gross national product has fallen 25 percent.

"Agriculture is failing under communism there as everywhere else.

"Food consumption is down 15 percent. The 1963 sugar crop is the smallest since World War II.

"A quarter million Cubans have left Cuba—and we have received 300,000 individual Cuba requests for visa waivers to come to this country.

"Free world trade with Cuba last year was one-tenth what it was before Castro—and it will be only a trickle this year. Trade between Cuba and Latin America will virtually disappear in 1963."

Apparently answering critics of United States policies toward Cuba, Mr. JOHNSON called this "a record of proud American responsibility," adding:

"We are determined that communism in Cuba must go—and shall go."

ON THE LINE

(By Bob Considine)

"Vision," probably Latin America's best informed periodical, dourly concludes in the wake of Castro's triumphant reception in the Soviet Union:

"Years of fumbling U.S. efforts to free Cuba have ended in utter failure. This constitutes the biggest setback to U.S. foreign policy since the fall of China. In Washington, this defeat is recognized but never admitted. The Kennedy administration has launched a propaganda campaign to prove that its 'isolation' policy renders Castro harmless; that Cuba is just a small pawn in the overall global struggle, and that no decisive action is possible without risking nuclear war. All three arguments are demonstrably false.

"In the first instance, Cuba is not isolated at all. Various hemispheric states still maintain diplomatic, trade, and travel connections with the island. A steady flow of young Latin American leftists arrives in Cuba every day, destined for Che Guevara's revolutionary schools * * * nations outside the hemisphere scoff at U.S. pleas to halt Cuban shipping.

"The second point is still more unrealistic—that Cuba is merely a cold war pawn, something like Laos but closer to home. Castro's position atop the Lenin mausoleum last Sunday proves that the Kremlin takes a much different view. The Cuban takeover is a hugely successful Communist penetration right into the zone of prime U.S. interest, the first step along the road to Latin American conquest.

"The final argument—that there is nothing we can do about Castro—is just plain defeatism."

"Vision's" recommendations:

J.F.K. should again declare unequivocally that getting rid of Castro is a cardinal goal of U.S. policy. Create a big Caribbean task force to restore morale inside Cuba. J.F.K. "should publicly warn that the United States will not be responsible for Russian lives nor be deterred by their presence from taking any course of action it deems necessary. A strong promise of aid to post-Castro Cuba should be made, along with a pledge of noninterference in the country's internal affairs."

Indiana Boy Proves Youth Are Not Irresponsible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President there appeared a recent editorial in the Richmond, Ind., Palladium-Item, in which an Indiana youth, Larry Williams, 14-year-old of Centerville, was cited as a responsible boy and a hero.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, Larry is responsible for saving the lives of several of his schoolmates when a careening automobile suddenly lunged toward them when he was on school patrol. Larry is one of several youngsters soon to be given a medal by President Kennedy for his act of heroism.

The editorial also points out that not all boys are juvenile delinquents. Because the editorial is worthy of consideration by my distinguished colleagues I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Youth Dependable, Too

The weighty evidence of juvenile delinquency is proof of one of the Nation's most serious problems. But it is unjust to put the tag of irresponsibility on all youngsters.

Larry Williams, 14-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. James V. Williams, of Centerville, is a case in point. He was on the job as a school safety patrol member last November when an automobile suddenly lunged toward a line of children. With his arms outstretched Larry jumped in front of the children and pushed them out of the auto's path.

After an investigation of the incident, the American Automobile Association awarded Larry its medal for "a lifesaving act involving heroism." President Kennedy will present the medal in ceremonies at the White House next month.

Larry obviously has learned the lessons of responsibility. He took seriously the duties of his safety patrol assignment and his quick thinking may have saved the lives of one or more of the children.

Economy Buying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact I was the originator and author of the legislation which created the two Commissions on the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, better known as the two Hoover Commissions, and was the member of the Commission who devoted the most attention to correction of procurement practices in the Federal Government, especially in the Department of National Defense, I take great pleasure in calling attention of the Congress and the country to the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Star on April 30, which points out the savings being made, and destined to be made in the future, from the implementation of recommendations made by the Hoover Commission on procurement matters:

Economy Buying

One of the major and, as events have turned out, most fruitful recommendations of the old Hoover Commission advocated the consolidation of purchasing activities in the Defense Department. Several days ago, the Joint Economic Committee headed by Senator Douglas concluded a series of hearings to review the effects of the single Defense Supply Agency and other steps initiated along these lines by Secretary McNamara.

The results are impressive. While these programs have been underway for only a little more than a year, savings actually reflected in the defense budget for the fiscal year 1964 amount to about $750 million. In addition, Mr. McNamara expressed confidence that additional actions now under study will increase the rate of savings to over $3.4 billion annually by the end of 1965—savings considerably in excess of the $2 to $3 billion which the Hoover Commission had anticipated might be realized from such action. In discussing the wider ramifications of the subject, the Secretary also had this to say:

"The basic principle that there should be a single agency to procure and manage common items of supply or services for all users is, as this committee has repeatedly pointed out, as valid for the Government as a whole as it is for the Department of Defense. Therefore, in our own efforts to obtain greater efficiency through the consolidation of common logistics support activities, we should not restrict ourselves to Defense agencies alone. Whenever we find that it is more economical to use the capabilities or facilities of other Government agencies, with no loss in military effectiveness, and at the same or less cost, we should not and have not hesitated to do so."

These are encouraging words—and they mark progress. Mr. McNamara is to be commended for taking actions now which should have been taken long ago to avoid waste. These efforts deserve encouragement, and the Joint Economic Committee and other groups should see to it that they receive every assistance.

Former Oklahoma Congressman Celebrates 90th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on April 28, an Oklahoman who throughout his life has served his fellow man with distinguished honor celebrated his 90th birthday. I am speaking of our distinguished former colleague, the Honorable Charles Edward Creager, of my hometown of Muskogee, Okla.

It is a privilege for me to join his legion of friends and admirers in congratulating C. E. Creager on his birthday and wishing him many more happy returns in the years ahead.

Charles Creager is one of the pioneer builders and developers of eastern Oklahoma. He was the second Member of Congress after Oklahoma's statehood to serve many of the counties in the district which I now represent.

C. E. Creager has led a rich and full life for which he can take great personal satisfaction. He was a journalist who reported some of the significant events in the history of our Nation, an author who recorded histories of the Ohio National Guard Masonry in Oklahoma, a public servant who served in Congress and in Indian Service, and a civic leader who authored Muskogee's form of city government under which our community now lives.

Such a distinguished life is enjoyed by few persons. Charles Creager's contributions to society are indeed manifold. It is a life to which every Oklahoma owes a great debt of gratitude.

At this time, I ask permission to insert into the RECORD the text of a story about former Congressman Creager which appeared in the Muskogee (Okla.) Phoenix. This story written by a Phoenix staff writer, Mort Glassner, is a colorful review of the career of this distinguished American:

Colorful Muskogeean Marks 90th Birthday

(By Mort Glassner)

Congressman, Army sergeant, war correspondent, oilman, supervisor of field clerks in the Indian Service, author, schoolteacher, cub reporter, police reporter, political reporter, city editor, oil editor, publisher, Office of Price Administration Chief Clerk, and U.S. oil inspector.

Blend all of the above-mentioned occupations and vocations into one person and you'll come up with one person—Charles Edward Creager, of 6404 West Okmulgee.

Creager, Oklahoma's first Republican Congressman and the State's second Congressman, observes his 90th birthday anniversary Sunday. The tall, slender Muskogeean doesn't plan anything special for the observance. "I and my wife Elizabeth plan to spend a quiet day and I doubt if we have many visitors," Creager said Saturday.

The native Ohioan has one son, one grandson, and four great-grandchildren. Baron Creager, the son, lives in Dallas, Tex., and is Southwest editor for an automobile trade journal. Baron's son is Mack Creager of Tulsa who is a sportscaster. The Mack Creagers have four children.

To say that Creager has been versatile during his 90 years would be understating the case. Creager authored the charter under which Muskogee's managerial form of government operates. As a Congressman, he obtained the necessary $500,000 appropriation to build Muskogee's Federal Building at North Fifth and West Broadway.

It was Creager who persuaded Suma Roseman, a Creek Indian woman from Sapulpa, to sell the old General Hospital building here to the city for practically nothing. At the same time, he talked her into donating $5,000 to the hospital to be used for indigent Indians who might need hospitalization. Creager is an honorary member of the Creek Tribal Council.

Creager served in Congress from 1909 to 1910 after defeating Democrat James Davenport of Vinita who is deceased. However, Davenport turned the tables on Creager in 1910 and won a House seat.

The former Buckeye Stater still keeps active in politics. He was a delegate to the recent State GOP convention but gave his proxy to someone else.

Creager was born near Dayton, Ohio, on April 28, 1873. In high school, he was the top student scholastically in his senior class. "There were only three students in the class," he quipped Saturday.

"I was thrown out bodily from a private military school, flunked out of a normal school and because of boredom I dropped out of the University of Indiana," Creager disclosed.

Somewhere along the way, Creaker says, he migrated "rather innocently" into the Dayton News and went to work as a cub reporter. Seeking more action, he later moved into a police reporter's job on the Columbus, Ohio, Press-Post, working his way up to city editor. He also worked as a political reporter for the Columbus Dispatch but it was during his tenure with the Press-Post that he became a widely read war correspondent.

While with the Press-Post, Creager joined the Ohio National Guard. In 1898, he found himself in Puerto Rico playing a dual role in the Spanish-American War. He was forced to split his time in the service between being a sergeant major (and later captain) and reporting the war to his newspaper back home.

Following the war, Creager returned to his newspaper job in Dayton only to discover he was dissatisfied with his $15 a week salary which he relates, was "hiked two bucks because of my coverage of battleground news during the war."

Eugene Kerr, Joseph A. Phelan, Charles Kipp and Creager had served on the Dayton paper and all later worked for Muskogee newspapers. In fact, Kerr, a major during the war, and Creager moved to Muskogee together. Kerr later bought and edited the Muskogee Times-Democrat.

"During these years, a bunch of Democrats had bought the Muskogee Daily Phoenix from Clarence Douglas," Creager recounted Saturday. "For some reason, they didn't see eye to eye about its operation and I ended up taking a 24-hour option on the Phoenix, hoping to get a Republican paper here," he added.

Creager attempted to sell to Ira Reeves who owned the city's first street car company but Tams Bixby, who had come to Muskogee as head of the Dawes Commission, made the purchase. Bixby later bought the Times-Democrat from Kerr.

As a Congressman, Creager introduced a bill in the House of Representatives to establish a U.S. Department of Health and Welfare. "Fifty years later, it passed," Creager recalls. He also introduced another bill which established the U.S Bureau of Mines.

One of the highlights of his reporting career came when he attempted to interview William Jennings Bryan when the latter was a candidate for President of the United States. Bryan ran for President three times unsuccessfully. Bryan, who refused to see reporters on one occasion while campaigning, was victimized by a Creager "crash" entry into the candidate's apartment. Creager found his prey minus a pair of pants. "But Bryan thought the whole thing so funny that he granted me the interview," Creager said. "it was an interesting sight—interviewing a man who kept strolling around the room in his shorts," the Muskogeean commented.

Creager, who has turned down such jobs as head of the Indian service (he served with that body for 40 years) and Muskogee postmaster, is believed to be the oldest Knight Commander of the Court of Honor in Oklahoma. Three years ago, he was presented a 50-year Knights Templar emblem. He's been active in Masonic work practically all his life and is author of a book entitled, "Masonic History of Oklahoma." He also is the author of another history book on the 14th Ohio National Guard of the Ohio Volunteer Infantry, written soon after the Spanish-American War.

The birthday celebrant has been prominently associated with the McAlester Consistory which he joined in April 1908. In later years, he became active in securing memberships for his order and, in 1917, was advanced to the rank of Knight Commander of the Court of Honor, second highest in the Scottish Rite.

Creager was potentate of Bedouin Shrine Temple in 1921, past illustrious grand master of Grand Council Royal and Select Masters of Oklahoma, and past grand high priest of Grand Chapter of Royal Arch Masons of Oklahoma. He received his 50-year pin from Grand Lodge of Oklahoma and 50-year pin from Grand Chapter of Royal Arch Masons of Oklahoma. Creager is a life member of Muskogee Lodge No. 28.

But that's not all. Last October, Creager was presented the Elks Service Award for outstanding community service.

Creager, starting on his 10th decade, has lost none of that boyish, impish twinkle in his eyes. He hasn't slowed down much, either. During last year's congressional races, Mrs. Creager drove him more than 3,000 miles into six eastern Oklahoma counties where he campaigned for Republicans Bill Sharp and B. Hayden Crawford.

"Both men lost but each carried in the precincts C. E. visited," Mrs. Creager reported.

Creager, who also edited a newspaper in Marietta, Ohio, during his lengthy, varied career, said Saturday his ambition was to edit a house organ for a big manufacturing firm. "I like the newspaper business. I started when I was 12 years old as a correspondent for the Farmersville paper near Dayton," Creager said.

Among his hobbies, Creager lists hunting and fishing but pointed out he hasn't been able to do much of either in recent years.

Muskogee County's legislative delegation in Oklahoma City hasn't forgotten Creager's 90th milestone. Resolutions acknowledging Creager's outstanding career were passed this week in the State senate and house with State Senator Bill Haworth and Representatives Russell Ruby, Bill Bull, and Max Rust authoring them.

For companions, Mr. and Mrs. Creager have two dogs in their comfortable home. They are Duke, a 7-year-old bird dog, and Pooch, a female who is 16 years old.

Federal Charter to Italian-American War Veterans of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of the House to a resolution passed by the New York State Senate memorializing the Congress to enact appropriate legislation granting a Federal charter to the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc. Unfortunately, the resolution passed the senate during the closing hours of the session and consideration by the assembly was not possible.

It is entirely appropriate that the Congress should formally recognize this worthy organization comprising veterans, honorably discharged from World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict. Official standing has already been accorded under the laws of the States of New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island. Last year the Commonwealth of Massachusetts enacted a resolution similar to that of the New York Senate. Furthermore, the Department of Defense, the U.S. Foreign Claim Settlement Commission, and the U.S. Civil Service Commission and other Federal agencies recognize the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., pursuant to laws they administer involving veterans' organizations.

It is hoped that passage of legislation now pending in the Congress that would confer a national charter upon this worthy organization can be secured at this session.

The resolution follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO INCORPORATE OR CHARTER THE ITALIAN AMERICAN WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES, INC., BY SENATOR GEORGE METCALF, REPRESENTING NEW YORK STATE 48TH SENATORIAL DISTRICT

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the legislature of the State of New York hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to incorporate or charter the organization known as the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.; and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the clerk of the assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the presiding officer and clerk of each House of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member thereof from the State of New York.

(Resolution was adopted by the New York State Senate on Saturday, April 6, 1963, in the closing hours of the last day of the 1963 session.)

Foreign Language Institutes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, continued support and assistance for the study of foreign languages is essential if we are to have the trained personnel needed to carry out U.S. responsibilities in respect to the "cold war" and in the developing nations. In the education legislation now under study and consideration there is substantial assistance for this aspect of the National Defense Education Act. At a meeting of university foreign language directors last year, there was unanimous agreement that the assistance given to universities in developing their foreign language programs thus far was extremely valuable and that without this assistance the universities could not have been able to develop their programs as far or as rapidly as they have done. Much more can be done if more means to develop the programs further could be made available. I deeply believe that at least a higher education bill should receive top priority for passage at this session of the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the "Statement of 53 University Foreign Language and Area Center Directors on Title VI of the National Defense Education Act," October 14, 1962.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF 53 UNIVERSITY FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND AREA CENTER DIRECTORS ON TITLE VI OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT, OCTOBER 14, 1962

Title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 was enacted in order to make good the Nation's educational deficiency in modern foreign languages. Many languages of national importance were found not to be available in American education, others were in seriously short supply, others were ineffectively taught. America's commitments during and after World War II made these deficiencies glaringly apparent. As directors of the 53 language and area centers supported under title VI of the act, we feel it proper to express our judgment on the working of the act in its first 4 years, and on the need for its extension.

Title VI established three programs on which we can speak with authority. It has made possible the development of 53 centers in 33 universities, offering instruction in 66 critical languages and related area studies. Each center provides regular courses, frequently through existing university departments, along with specialized library and teaching materials, supplementary lectures, and frequently supporting research. The faculty assembled in these centers, comprising 212 language specialists and 246 specialists in the culture or institutions of the foreign areas, is a national resource of great value.

New language teaching methods and materials have been prepared largely through university research supported by the National Defense Education Act. As a result, language learning is being accelerated, and adapted with precision to the students' needs.

About 1,600 graduate students have been supported in learning the critical languages and the related area subjects through national defense foreign language fellowships. They will, on completion of their training, help fill the Nation's increasing needs for language-trained personnel at home or overseas.

Every dollar of Federal money that supports the centers is matched by a dollar of university funds; in fact universities have spent considerably more than the matching requirement. In this way, Government funds have stimulated the universities to expand their own activities and at the same time have enabled the universities to accomplish a task wholly beyond their own resources. Thanks to the statesmanlike and educationally informed way in which title VI of the act has been administered by the Language Development Branch, Government funds have made it possible for the universities to make a major contribution to the Nation's language resources while preserving their own freedom of action and maintaining their own distinctive character.

These results demonstrate the wisdom of the decision 4 years ago to enact the National Defense Education Act, incorporating title VI. The need to extend and enlarge the provisions of the legislation will in 1963 present the Nation and the Congress with a similar occasion for far-sighted decision. Not only is there need for instruction in critical languages and related area courses to grow in proportion to university enrollments: many critical languages are not yet taught in this country; others are taught only at the introductory level. In spite of the training of new specialists under provisions of the act, we lack sufficient faculty with competence in all the areas of importance to the United States. Upon us will now fall a large share of the duty of training the teachers who will introduce languages in much earlier stages of school and college education. The same considerations of national interest which led to the enactment of the National Defense Education Act in 1958 are more pressing now than then, and call for its extension and enlargement by the next Congress.

Armed the Social Security Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, organization has been said to be a matter of time and eternal vigilance. Such is the case in the area of legislation for our senior citizens who receive social security. In recognizing the need to provide a broader base for these citizens, we have raised the ceiling on their earnings from $1,200 to $1,700. I have advocated complete elimination of this restriction since coming to Congress some 13 years ago. Again, the nationwide response to my bill (H.R. 5254) is gratifying and profuse, and I think it exemplifies eternal vigilance. Among the most sincere notes of appreciation which I have received to date comes from a constituent, Mr. Clarence H. Roane, of 81 Pershing Avenue, Poughkeepsie, N.Y., whose words are, in my opinion, expressive of true Americanism and warrant the consideration of each and every Member. I know of no more worthy right to champion than that which will assist those who have made America the wonderful land we are so fortunate to know today. We owe it to ourselves to provide incentive for these persons as they enter their golden years to insure that theirs is not the era of twilight, but of hope.

Mr. Roane's remarks are as follows:

POUGHKEEPSIE, N.Y., *April 25, 1963.*

Hon. Congressman J. E. WHARTON,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives.

HON. CONGRESSMAN J. E. WHARTON: Your letter as the roving Congressman to hand, enjoyed reading it very much. It shows that you are an American—that you stand on your own feet, and speak the courage of your convictions. You voted for a bill just a few days ago that was OK.

The bill that you have reintroduced to end wage top is a law that should have never been passed. This bill, instead of helping man after he is 65, is a bill that handicaps him and takes from him—makes him helpless before the Government for 7 years from 65 to 72. This part of the social security law is a handicap. When I started paying social security, my boss told me it was like insurance at the age of 65. I would be able to retire if I wished. I paid half and he paid. I thought the money was rightfully mine at the age of 65. I paid it in with my boss when I signed up for it. It had strings attached to it—rubber bands tied around it. I couldn't make but $25 a week. If I made over $1,200 a year or $1,700, I would have to give the Government dollar for dollar. If I kept my job, I would be paying the Government to let me work. Still, the social security is mine. I paid for it—why should I pay the Government to let me work in a free democracy? Is this Russia? I was willing to work and let the Government take the 20 percent cut on my wages but I wasn't going to let them take up in dollars, so I spoke to the man in the social security office. He said if I wanted to keep on working, I could cancel the social security. I can get a steady job now paying about $3,000 a year but I won't take it on that account.

Yours truly,

CLARENCE H. ROANE.

Fish Protein Concentrate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, today's Wall Street Journal contains a balanced and well-written article on the subject of fish protein concentrate, commonly known as fish flour. An excellent source of protein, it is unfortunate that there has been so much delay in making this food product available for distribution throughout the world, particularly to the underdeveloped countries. As the article points out, two-thirds of the world's population is suffering from malnutrition, especially a deficiency or almost complete lack of animal protein. Every second at least one person dies of starvation somewhere in the world. I am hopeful that action will be taken in the near future to make this fine product available, especially in the light of the favorable report by the National Academy of Sciences issued some 6 months ago.

I ask unanimous consent that the article and my remarks about it be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 8, 1963]

FISH FLOUR FRACAS: IT REVOLVES ABOUT PROCESSING OF PROTEIN-RICH DIET AID

(By Clarence Newman)

The Interior Department has asked Congress for more than $500,000 to improve a fish food product the Food and Drug Administration has, in effect, ruled "filthy."

At the same time, leading nutritionists claim that a satisfactory process for preparing the product already exists and, in fact, is in full-scale operation.

At the center of this confusing controversy is fish protein concentrate (FPC), also known as fish flour. Praised by diet experts, Congressmen and its promoters, even the Food and Drug people agree it's an excellent source of protein.

Although the fracas has a certain Alice-in-Wonderland quality, the product at issue could be a strategic weapon in the struggle to feed burgeoning populations—particularly in underdeveloped countries. Two-thirds of the planet's human population suffers from malnutrition, specifically a deficiency or almost complete lack of animal protein. Every second at least one person dies of starvation somewhere in the world.

POLITICAL ASPECTS

Involved in the fish flour controversy are not only humane but important political considerations. At least it's argued that food could play a more significant role in the battle to win the support of uncommitted countries where a substandard diet is the rule rather than the exception.

FDA insists its stand against whole fish flour does not prevent Government agencies or other from shipping FPC to undernourished people abroad whose countries have no rule against it. Nevertheless the State Department, the food-for-peace program, and other food donors are reluctant to run the risk of a violent propaganda attack on the United States which would likely be forthcoming if they should try to feed foreigners something not regarded as suitable for Americans.

To see why protein is so important, consider a few facts on nutrition. Aside from water and minerals, foods consist of proteins, fats, and carbohydrates. If a diet is low on fats and carbohydrates, there is little problem, since the organism can manufacture both out of proteins. But it cannot manufacture proteins out of fats or carbohydrates.

Animal proteins contain more of the essential amino acids than do plant proteins. The best animal proteins are in milk and eggs which generally are in short supply in underdeveloped countries. It's estimated that just the presently unharvested fish in U.S. coastal waters translated into fish protein concentrate would supply sufficient quantities of animal protein to supplement the deficient diets of about 1 billion people for 300 days at the cost of less than a half cent per person per day.

For some time it's been obvious to food technicians that an easy and obvious method of getting bulk protein concentrate would be to take whole fish, clean and defat them, remove the fishy taste and odor and grind them into flourlike substances. Scientists claim there are proven processes for doing this.

VIOBIN'S PLANTS

A Midwest producer of pharmaceutical preparations, Ezra Levin, president of the VioBin Corp. in Monticello, Ill., says he has a plant in New Bedford, Mass., that turns out 14 tons of fish flour daily and a second built in conjunction with other interests on Long Island which will have a 20-tons-a-day capacity.

There have been significant efforts abroad in FPC manufacture. A Swedish firm has invested $1 million in research efforts, technical breakthrough in techniques have been scored in Uruguay and Germany, and Russian-manufactured FPC has been tested in this country. Also, fish protein plants have been operated in Peru and South Africa.

And every year both here and abroad tons of fishmeal are fed to cattle, poultry, and even ranch-raised mink to get maximum growth in the shortest period of time. So in a world where people die for lack of protein and the technical methods to make FPC exist, what is the stumbling block to its widespread production here?

It's section 402(a)(3) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, the FDA says, which bars the interstate shipment in this country of a product that is "filthy, putrid, decomposed, or otherwise unfit for food." The agency's reasoning is that the complete fish—fins, tail, bones, viscera and all—is unclean and, regardless of what is done with it, it is not fit for human consumption under the law.

The fish flour fight prompted by this point of view got underway at the Washington level in 1961 when fishing interests petitioned the FDA to establish a definition and standard of identity for fish protein concentrate and whole fish flour. At that time the agency informally expressed an opinion that it has doggedly held to ever since, that whole fish flour should be regarded as an "adulterated product."

They formalized this view when the FDA issued a standard of identity the following year. It said fish flour would be illegal unless it was made from cleaned fish after discarding heads, tails, fins, viscera and intestinal contents. Bureau of Fishery experts estimate fish flour could be made for as little as 9 cents a pound from whole fish and that using eviscerated fish would increase the price fivefold.

This impasse caused fish flour exponents to redouble their efforts and attracted supporters to their cause. Senator Paul Douglas (Democrat, of Illinois) even went so far as to serve fellow Congressmen a fish flour and rice curry in his office while newsmen looked on.

With a public hearing on the FDA's ruling slated, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall entered the picture. He asked the National Academy of Sciences to have a special panel find out whether fish flour could be safely made, whether such a product now exists and also whether there is a need for inexpensive animal-protein food supplement among low-income groups in the United States. Pending the committee report the public hearings were postponed.

To Mr. Udall's first two questions the special panel answered in the affirmative. To the third query it said that although no one has demonstrated a need for animal protein in the United States, there's the possibility such a product would be of great value both in emergency situations and in meeting worldwide expanding food requirements. And the committee cautioned: "The lack of demonstrable and existing evidence of present need should not interfere with development of new food products."

Although this report was issued 6 months ago, the FDA has adamantly stood on its original evaluation of fish flour.

The agency's attitude in this matter draws a strong response from fish flour proponents. Says one, "It's like telling you that because your hands are dirty, they'll always be dirty no matter how well you wash them."

PERFECTLY GOOD FOOD

Dr. Frederick J. Stare, professor of nutrition at Harvard School of Public Health and one of the world's leading nutritionists, declares simply, "If you grind up the whole fish and if it is cleaned chemically and bacteriologically the resulting fish flour is perfectly good food."

Reports by the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations indicate hundreds of tons of fish flour have been produced and consumed by humans in Sweden, Morocco, and South Africa.

The Bulletin of Atomic Scientists comments: "The FDA maintains that its composition makes fish flour unesthetic and that it will be repugnant to consumers, overlooking the fact products such as gelatin are known to come from raw materials equally unesthetic * * * that fish flour is pure and clean chemically and biologically is not in question."

And it's been noted that the FDA allows the sale of many imported food oddities—canned worms, insects and reptiles—which are esthetically disturbing as diet items to many Americans.

Should the FDA change its mind on fish flour, of course, it would mean a lot to the fish industry and Mr. Levin's VioBin Co. in particular, as well as to other fish processors.

But as long as the FDA holds to its present stand, it's unlikely domestically produced fish flour, whether made by the VioBin method or some improved technique the Interior Department may come up with, will have any kind of market here except as livestock food.

Regardless of what Government agencies do or say about this product, however, there are powerful forces working on behalf of it and other new foods. The world's skyrocketing population is expected to double by the end of the century. And to score even moderate improvements in the substandard nutritional state of the poorly fed portion of the population, food production must be doubled by 1980 and trebled by the year 2000.

Rigging the Wheat Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the Record an editorial from the Rock Island, Ill., Argus concerning the pending wheat referendum.

I am in complete accord with the editorial and also feel this is a rigged referendum. I think it high time our farmers be given the opportunity to express themselves without the fear of intimidation and threats from Government officials.

The article follows:

[From the Rock Island (Ill.) Argus, May 6, 1963]

Rigging the Wheat Vote

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has been accused of exerting undue pressure on wheat growers to get a favorable vote on the department's two-price certificate plan which growers will vote on May 21.

In one instance, the Department's ASC committee in Montana received a letter, which came to the notice of a critic of the program, which the committee regarded as instructing it to work for a yes vote. The Department avows the instructions were to see that farmers were properly informed.

The proposal calls for strict controls on the number of bushels a farmer could market at the top Government support price, $2. Other wheat, much of which would go into export, would get a support price of $1.20.

In addition to the two-price idea, a new feature of this scheme is the control on production as well as acreage.

If farmers disapprove this plan, they can still get around $1.25 a bushel for accepting acreage allotments, or they can trust to the open market on unlimited planting.

The Farm Bureau alone of all major farm organizations opposes this scheme, which it calls another invasion of free enterprise.

Not many Illinois farmers will vote on it, but corn farmers will watch with some concern because much of the low-price wheat would compete with corn as livestock feed; and on the basis of experience, they can well imagine this production exceeding the Department's expectations.

There is some alarm also because of the possibility that a yes vote on wheat would be followed by a proposal to tighten the controls on corn. The Department claims otherwise. The House already has passed a bill for extension of the present feed grain program.

The whole wheat control plan is rigged in favor of a yes vote because of the big difference between what the farmer will get if he approves and what he will be doled out if he rejects it. With a no vote, however, farmers will have the prospect of eventual complete freedom from controls. At least, they will be looking in that direction. If they approve it, they will accept a new form of serfdom in which the Government will be the master of almost everything they do.

The Truth-in-Lending Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent editorial which appeared in the Department Store Journal for April 17, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

This editorial in effect endorses S. 750, the truth-in-lending bill and it signifies, I believe, a change of opinion.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whither the Truth-in-Lending Bill?

Of, all legislation actively pending in Congress, none has caused so much excitement, strident oppositio, or downright anguish as the so-called truth-in-lending bill.

Although S. 750 is known officially as the credit control bill, and has languished in a Senate subcommittee for 3 years, it may well become law soon—next year if not earlier. Recent changes in the Senate and House Banking Committees make this likely. Up to now, the bill's stumbling block has been the opposition in a Senate subcommittee of Republicans and one conservative Democrat, Senator ROBERTSON of Virginia. But the parent Senate Banking Committee voted to cut one GOP member from the subcommittee. If Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, sponsor of the bill, who heads the subcommittee, can sway the vote of wavering Senator MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, he seems sure to free his pet bill.

In the full committee, a Democrat has been substituted for a Republican. Now the balance of power rests with three undecided members: Senators SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, MCINTYRE, Democrat, of New Hampshire and JAVITS, Republican, of New York. If those three refuse to join the opposition, even by abstaining. Senator DOUGLAS will win.

Department stores are vitally concerned with this legislation, and rightly so, because if it passes into law, revolving credit may wither and fade out as quickly as it grew.

The bill would make retailers spell out for consumers in sales contracts the total finance charges and annual interest rates they're being charged on installment purchases. Senator DOUGLAS and other congressional liberals contend most rates are much higher than consumers realize, often exceeding 30 percent annually. Department stores know fully that this is so—most revolving credit accounts charge 1.5 percent interest per month on the unpaid balance, which is 18 percent interest per year. Most customers have no comprehension or realization of this, and in fairness, most do not care. To them, a small monthly charge seems reasonable, but store owners are afraid they would be aghast at being told they are paying 18 percent a year.

Retailers tell me their customers would be scared away by emphasizing misleading interest rate percentages. Moreover, they say it would be excessively burdensome and unworkable. The unworkable argument applies to the typical revolving credit account. They say that although they would have to state the rate as 18 percent, the true rate could be higher or lower, depending on how much the customer pays each month (it could be more than the agreed-upon amount) and whether the payment is made before or after the service charge is assessed. For the computation to be expressed in simple annual rates, they further allege, is impossible without advance knowledge of the exact time and amount of all transactions.

Come now, gents, let's admit these arguments are flimsy and specious indeed. The bill can be complied with by simply stating the annual rate based on the customer's schedule of payments. Senator DOUGLAS agrees with this, remarking that no further adjustment would be required if the customer missed a payment or paid early.

A better case against the bill can be made by simply questioning its necessity, and even here we are on shaky ground. The proposed bill takes in small loan companies too, and also has the administration's solid support. The linking-in of small loan companies, whose abuse of people's gullibility is notorious, makes the bill emotion-packed and difficult to defeat. Even the nickname, truth-in-lending, helps its chance of passage. All in all, it is really not such a bad bill.

Frankly, it appears that disclosure of charges and rates would encourage people to shop around for the best rates, some of which might drop owing to competition. If a recession hits, rates may fall, inducing people to buy or borrow more and thus stimulate the economy; if business improves, rates would likely rise and slow the advance. Further, I think revelation of credit charges would encourage greater use of credit by those who remain afraid of it because of its mysteries.

Opponents of the bill who say people are more interested in dollars-and-cents of monthly payments than in annual interest percentages are doing their cause no service. That's just it; such is the case, which obviously then calls for a remedy. As interest rates are revealed, more of them might at least approach the traditional fair 6 percent true annual rate which is generally considered appropriate.

No Joking Matter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, what started out to have been a joke ended up in dead seriousness, and to the benefit of the taxpayer. I feel it wise that two amendments offered by my distinguished colleague from the 18th Illinois District were attached to the feed grain bill we recently passed.

It is not funny when some farmers taking advantage of Uncle Sam's generosity receive farm payments in excess of the original cost of their land.

Neither is it funny or good business practice to have allowed the Agriculture Department to spend unappropriated funds through the so-called "back door spending" process.

In view of this the amendments offered by the gentleman from Illinois were sound and I am glad this House in its wisdom saw fit to adopt them.

I am pleased to insert an article from the Peoria, Ill., Journal Star which refers to these amendments.

The article follows:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, May 2, 1963]

CITY FOLK WON'T GET OAT SUBSIDY

"I'm sorry I woke the Senator up. The country is much better off when he's asleep."

That was one of Huey Long's classics in the U.S. Senate, but Washington is not without humor these days, too.

An amendment to a feed grain bill which would not only provide payments for farmers to no longer grow—oats, I think it was—but would also pay farmers who never grew oats for continuing not growing oats was offered in the House saying that similar payments could be claimed by city residents for never growing oats, either. It got 157 votes in the House of Representatives.

BOB MICHEL heard about a possible joke amendment providing that no payments could be made in a single year in excess of the full fair purchase price of the farm, and on investigation found that some western farmers did receive payments in 1 year in excess of the original per acre cost of their land, and came up with serious amendment.

It provided that payments could not exceed 20 percent of the full fair market value of the land in any 1 year. He pointed out that at 20 percent or over it would be cheaper for Uncle Sam to buy the farm outright and take it out of production that way—and his amendment passed. In fact, it was only one of two amendments actually made to the feed grain bill.

(The other was also MICHEL's and designed to strike out of the measure a provision which provided a way for the Department to get "advance" moneys without appropriation—"back door" spending, BOB calls it. The House agreed with him and closed the back door. Strikingly, the Agriculture Department's representative in the gallery grabbed his head in his hands with horror when this amendment passed.)

Death of Columnist Ray Tucker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the death of Mr. Ray Tucker removes from the American scene one of the Nation's most outstanding newspapermen—author as well as columnist. He was a credit to his profession and an asset to his country which he served with loyalty and distinction in peace and in war. Mr. Tucker's column was carried for 13 years in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News, the largest newspaper in my Congressional District. On Monday, May 6, 1963, that paper published an article entitled "Ray Tucker's Last Message to Editor." As part of my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, I include this article.

The article follows:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News, May 6, 1963]

RAY TUCKER'S LAST MESSAGE TO EDITOR

When Ray Tucker's column was delivered to the desk of the editor of the Times-Leader Evening News last Februrary 13, it was accompanied by a message, beginning "Today's is the last Whirligig I shall write."

It was quite a jolt, coming 2 months after the death of George Sokolsky. We had known our Washington columnist had been ill, but we were not prepared for this.

The message continued:

"The cancer that hospitalized me a year ago has recurred. Doctors tell me it is inoperable. They tell me that great advances have been made in chemotherapy in recent years and and that, they hope, it will do wonders for me.

"And now I am tired. I want to conserve my strength to fight the biggest scrap of my life. I want to conserve my time for my family and for meditation and prayer. So, no more columns.

"Today, I want to thank the hundreds of editors who have printed my column for their deep understanding and their great help.

NEWS BEHIND THE NEWS

"For 35 years, I have written the Whirligig. Newspaper editors have realized that I have truly been trying to give them and their readers the news behind the news; the facts that add to public understanding of the issues of our time and the truths that helped them evaluate their roles in our great republic.

"I am especially grateful to those editors—and this was all of you at least once—who disagreed with my conclusions but who printed what I had written anyhow because they respected my judgment or, at least, my right to say what I believed.

"I am also grateful to the editors who have chided me when they thought I missed a point and, more so, to those editors who have sent me suggestions, ideas and notes that began, 'Ray, here is something you ought to look into.' From those came some of my best stories.

"I have been privileged as few men have: I have spent a generation in the greatest news center in the world. I had covered the deaths of rulers and the births of nations. I have recorded the heartbeats of this Nation during its saddest and its greatest days so far in history. And during this time—thanks to you, my editors—I have been able to communicate to hundreds of millions of fellow Americans.

"My syndicate has chosen Andrew Tully to carry the Whirligig on. I do not know him personally, but his reputation is great. He is warmhearted, discerning, industrious and courageous. He can be a great columnist in the great tradition. But that will depend on you as much as it will on him."

Now come the sad tidings of Ray Tucker's death at 69 of lung cancer in the District of Columbia General Hospital, not far from where he labored so long and successfully.

There is little we can add today to the sentiments we expressed 3 short months ago on the occasion of his retirement and, far more important, what Ray Tucker wrote on this page for 13 eventful years.

A great many local residents will recall his visit to Wilkes-Barre in 1947 when he addressed a district convention of Kiwanis in St. Stephen's parish house. At that time, DANIEL J. FLOOD, who introduced him, disclosed the noted columnist might have been a baseball star if he followed in the footsteps of his father, Tom Tucker, who was with the National League and numbered among his proteges Big Ed Walsh of Plains and Steamer Flanagan of Wilkes-Barre.

IN ILLUSTRIOUS COMPANY

One of America's top flight newspapermen, author as well as columnist, Ray Tucker was a credit to his profession and an asset to his country which he served with loyalty and distinction in peace and war.

In death, he joins an illustrious company of American journalists—newspapermen like Ernie Pyle, Paul Mallon, Arthur Brisbane, Odd McIntyre, our own Frank Ward O'Malley and Louis Weitzenkorn and scores of others listed in the fourth estate's hall of fame.

Encouraging and Fostering Excellence in a Democratic Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column by Joe Stroud which appeared in the Arkansas Gazette of April 21. His column discusses the problem of encouraging and fostering excellence in a democratic society. It was stimulated by the book entitled "Excellence," by John W. Gardner, president of the Carnegie Foundation. I believe that this column will be of interest to Members of Congress and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Apr. 21, 1963]

MUST EQUALITY HOLD US BACK FROM EXCELLENCE?

(By Joe Stroud)

Can a society be, as ours purports to be, equalitarian and still produce the excellence that is demanded to meet society's needs?

This is a question not only of important philosophical interest, but of pressing practical concern as well. The conflict between egalitarianism and excellence is very urgent in a free society faced with technical and specialized needs. Arkansas, being a part of the tradition of the Southwest, has a spiritual affinity for the egalitarianism of the old frontier but an urgent physical need for the excellence that can solve problems and develop new ideas.

The conflict is examined in a notable book, appropriately entitled "Excellence," by John W. Gardner, who is president of the Carnegie Foundation. In brief, Mr. Gardner concludes that we can be equal and excellent as well, but that it isn't easy. His conclusion is scarcely surprising, but his examination of the difficulties along the way is of interest.

The problem of finding, promoting and encouraging excellence was certainly not first defined in Mr. Gardner's book. It began long before even the Greeks, supplied their peculiar answer to it, and it will not be resolved by a wave of popular demand for Mr. Gardner's book. It is eternal.

CONTEMPORARY, TOO

But there are some reasons to believe that it is especially contemporary too. The dean of one Arkansas college, for example, said recently that the contempt in which students at his institution held excellence is perhaps the severest challenge he faces. He said that his discussions with teachers from abroad led him to believe that this lack of respect for achievement is worse in the United States than in Europe.

The frontier imprint has left many of us with a vague distrust of the egghead or even of the more ambitious worker. The "managerial class" evolves a whole series of status symbols—which promote conformity—and our unions enforce work rules that do the same. We pay lipservice to individualism, yet we want everyone to be individual in precisely the same way we are and with just the same limits. In our schools, "the brains" are sometimes subjected to ridicule, and social ostracism. A member of the Hendrix College admission committee recently told the student newspaper, almost defensively, that Hendrix had never tried to be "a brain school." If not, why not? Isn't the brain what education is intended for?

An undergraduate at Tulane University once broke up a Renaissance history class by observing that the Renaissance seemed to him to be composed of a lot of "individuals" running around living lives that were almost exactly alike. The diversity and brilliance of the Renaissance is done an injustice in this remark, but it applies with a great deal more force to the American frontier. Haven't we seen on television the ease with which the frontiersman is identifiable—and how the more he changes, the more he remains the same?

A LEVELLER AND EQUALIZER

The frontier was a leveler and an equalizer. It yielded many good fruits, such as the contempt for hereditary privilege and the artificial standards of wealth. But if it leveled certain institutions and customs that deserved to be leveled, it also tended to produce a conformist average. Frederick Jackson Turner has explored the diverse effects of the frontier on American culture, and his theories have tended to be verified through the years.

Do we, as heirs of the influence of the frontier, have sufficient regard for excellence and an adequate drive to escape mediocrity? Our public schools do not always seem to suggest so. A fresh look at some of the guidebooks being used in the elementary schools suggests that our children are being fed a lot of pap. Much of it, if followed slavishly by the classroom teacher, would bore the bright child to desperation.

Our college admission policies do not suggest that we are very concerned about excellence. At the State colleges, the admission policies imposed by State legislatures or by customs suggest that we are more disturbed over the egalitarian part of our national creed than about educating the educable. They take all comers, and then a good number wash out after a semester or so, at considerable cost to themselves and the taxpayers. The private schools are somewhat freer about demanding strict qualifications for admission, but they are frequently apologetic about doing so.

A MORE URGENT PROBLEM

At the college level, the problem is likely to become more and more urgent as costs continue to rise and as the press of growing enrollments continues. Societies—and States such as Arkansas—must reconsider periodically what they are doing with their educational opportunities.

We ought to be giving more urgent attention to the kind of education we are giving in our Arkansas schools to the child with special talents. (We have taken the word "exceptional" and made it a euphemism for handicapped in many instances.) Nowhere is the problem more exposed than in the matter of college admissions, but it is by no means limited to there.

Mr. Gardner takes note of all sorts of myths about excellence: the "early bloom, early fade" theory that youngsters showing promise in school fail to produce in later years, that talent usually carries with it instability, that talented are undependable and impractical. Such myths certainly have wide acceptance in our society. But Mr. Gardner debunks them all, and rather effectively.

THE COLD WAR'S IMPACT

The space race and the cold war have caused us to revise some of our attitudes toward talent and toward excellence, but our schools have not caught up. Neither have our public attitudes.

There has been heavy emphasis on the need for greater equality under the law and for more perfect equality of opportunity. This is all to the good. It is as bad to lose talent because an unequal opportunity is offered as to do it in the name of equality. But must we, in trying to achieve equality of opportunity and under the law, accept a bland mediocrity and stultifying conformity for us all?

Mr. Gardner thinks that it is not necessarily so. All of us had better hope he is right.

Poem by Mr. Hyman Pressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, we have just had a most unusual and gratifying election in Baltimore. Theodore McKeldin was elected mayor on the Republican ticket. Also on this ticket was a Democrat, Mr. Hyman Pressman, who was elected city comptroller.

Mr. Pressman has always been active in civic affairs and, by his diligent efforts as a watchdog for the interests of the people, has earned for himself local and nationwide acclaim.

What is not so well known is that Mr. Pressman was born on Shakespeare's birthday and claims that he has an established poetic license which he is currently using under the penname of Hyman "Cassius Clay" Pressman. He is likely to break out in poetry at any time during a political campaign. I ask unanimous consent that a sample of Mr. Pressman's political poetry entitled, "Two-Party System" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

Democrats now know its cricket
To vote for McKeldin's ticket
And the Republicans too
Know that it's the thing to do.
Puppets, marionettes and chessmen
Have no place with Hyman Pressman.
Nor is there a difficult job
That's too hard for Gerstung, Bob.
Hear the clamor for transition
To the party coalition,
There is no more need to grope
For the fusion offers hope.
There will be no need to pity
Our beloved Baltimore City.
Men of every occupation
Will feel the rejuvenation
As the men who fight for right
Drive the bosses out of sight.
Followers of Meredith Boyce
Will have reason to rejoice
And there will be no more woes
For the friends of Angelos.
Democrats are set to stay
With McKeldin election day
Arm in arm and side by side
To assure a big landslide
Higher than the highest steeple
For the ticket of the people.

McLoskey Raps Udall Power Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and able colleague, BOB MCLOSKEY, representing the district adjacent to mine in Illinois, referring to Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall's proposal for a Federal power systems hookup in Western States, called the proposal a "kilowatt Kremlin for the United States."

Congressman MCLOSKEY pointed out that Secretary Udall said on a visit to the Soviet Union that we could learn much from their achievements. In his press release, my colleague indicated that Udall "must have decided to Sovietize our entire system in America" and his proposal for the Western States power hookup was a "gigantic grid of grief for taxpayers."

The May 4 issue of the Rock Island (Ill.) Argus included an editorial regarding the MCLOSKEY release. I think it is most important to call this editorial to the attention of all my colleagues and request unanimous consent that it be included at this point.

The article follows:

[From the Rock Island (Ill.) Argus, May 4, 1963]

MCLOSKEY SOUNDS POWER ALARM

A timely warning against a vast Federal public power extension in 13 Western States has been issued by Congressman ROBERT T. MCLOSKEY of this district. The plan, as announced by Secretary of the Interior Udall, envisions the "inter-connection of areas served by the department's marketing agencies."

Mr. MCLOSKEY slapped the "kilowatt kremlin" label on this scheme, which may cause some people to regard his accusation as on the imaginative side.

It is not imaginative by any means. Let them consider the gradual expansion of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which will celebrate its 30th anniversary on May 18.

The TVA was put through Congress as a flood control scheme, to harness the waters of the Tennessee River. The sale of power was supposed to be incidental. Now it is the flood control that is incidental.

TVA has gone far beyond the dreams even of its original sponsors by building steam as well as hydraulic plants and driving the private power interests out of business in its territory. It can do this because it has the advantage of low-interest loans from the U.S. Treasury and escapes the 52 percent income tax which hits corporate profits in excess of $25,000.

Its continued growth is made possible by a powerful combination of interests using your tax money—one, the bureaucrats who want to expand their own empires and their prestige; two, selfish local interests that want the benefit of Government-subsidized low-cost power.

The only way this business will be stopped is for the taxpayers who are doing the subsidizing to start making more noise about it. We are glad to see that Mr. MCLOSKEY has joined the alarm sounders.

Continuing No-Win Policy Avenue to Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Nashville Banner, of Nashville, Tenn., is one of the most outspoken and courageous newspapers in the United States. This newspaper has continued a relentless campaign against soft appeasement policies which add up to an overall no-win policy in the cold war.

In its May 3, 1963, issue, the Banner printed an outstanding editorial entitled "Continuing No-Win Policy Avenue to Disaster"; and on the same page was printed an editorial cartoon which is most illustrative of our no-win foreign policy. This cartoon was drawn by a man whom I consider to be the No. 1 editorial cartoonist in this country today—Mr. Jack Knox; and I only wish that it could be reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In lieu of this, however, I ask unanimous consent that the Banner editorial, entitled "Continuing No-Win Policy Avenue to Disaster," be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nashville Banner, May 3, 1963]

CONTINUING NO-WIN POLICY AVENUE TO DISASTER

It does not remain for further, costly experiment with it to prove that a no-win policy is the avenue to disaster. Nor does it need road signs to mark the route, with appeasement-minded advisers sitting as copilots next to the driver's seat, and pointing invariably in that direction.

They still are steering that course, charted when it was those agrarian reformers in China whose delicate feelings Mr. Truman's advisory crew didn't want to injure. In the wake of that, with the rug jerked from under Chiang Kai-shek, the great land mass of that former friend in Asia became Red China. The names have changed. In those days the retinue helping weave, or pull, policy strings included Owen Lattimore, John Stewart Service, et al., playing around the State Department fringes. The no-win policy has remained the same, insofar as its liberal adherents are concerned—reinstated with the New Frontier.

The war in Korea was another example of frustration and default when timidity and indecision mark the vital area of official decision. We lost that war, tragically costly in American blood, because almost from the outset the on-win policy prevailed.

In both of those surrenders—ordained not by military men who knew the score, but dictated by appeasement elements—the policy in question producd the hangover threat that still imperils civilization with the Communist conspiracy of conquest. The time theoretically bought with those retreats has not been on the free world's side, but communism's.

Now it is Laos. Notwithstanding W. Averell Harriman's bland expression of hope brought back from a rush trip to Moscow, the Laotian picture can't be improved by a replay, pretty-please spin of that busted troika record. Nor by dispatching a token fire department every time the firebug strikes a match in that jungle.

Soon it will be North Vietnam, again; and eventually the whole of southeast Asia.

Closer home—precariously closer—it is Cuba, where Soviet Russia dared plant rockets and bases; and there is serious doubt still concerning the nature and amount of those armaments withdrawn. There are the troops still there and being rotated, in undetermined numbers, who crossed an ocean to fortify the Communist beachhead inside America's own hemisphere.

Now it is Haiti embroiled in communism's missionary business; and there are strong signs that Brazil will be next.

After that, the deluge.

That is, after that the deluge, if a no-win policy continues to prevail as this Nation's design for security and survival.

You don't win a war, hot or cold, by retreat, and responding with cream puffs to blows on the head. Or by apologetically backing away when the enemy intentionally bumps you with a machinegun in the solar plexus.

The Communist enemy on every front has clearly advertised his intention of winning—and ultimately taking over. There is no nice Nellie concealment of that intention, on the off chance that it might offend somebody, or provoke a free world retaliation.

By what aberration of double-distilled nonsense is it wrong or inadvisable (1) to propose to win this engagement which is for keeps, (2) to adopt and act upon such a determination, and (3) announce it as policy to the whole cockeyed world?

If policymakers can't subscribe to that, we had better change policymakers, and quick. From the days of agrarian reform in China and its catastrophe, to the present proliferation of danger spots all over the world, we have lost all the battles and the ground freedom can afford to lose in a no-win gamble.

Timidity, indecision, and retreat are not in the image of that America of courage and conviction which adorned its earliest flag with the device of warning: "Don't tread on me."

America has won a lot of wars it didn't precipitate—not one of them with a no-win policy.

Law Day Address by the Honorable Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, University of Virginia, May 3, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a scholarly and eloquent address delivered by the senior Senator from Virginia, the Honorable Harry F. Byrd, at the University of Virginia on Law Day, May 3, in which he discusses the basic and fundamental principles upon which our Government is founded.

The discussion is so thorough and so unanswerable that it is a document that should be read and studied by every Member of Congress who believes in adherence to the constitutional principles upon which our Nation is founded.

Senator Byrd's long experience in government; first as a leader in the State Senate of Virginia, next as Governor of Virginia, and for the past 30 years in the U.S. Senate and presently chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, should command the respect and attention of every thoughtful American.

The address follows:

Speech Delivered by Senator Harry F. Byrd, Democrat of Virginia, for Delivery as Law Day Doherty Lecture, University, at Charlottesville, Va., Friday, May 3

It is a high privilege and a great honor to deliver the Doherty lecture on the occasion of Law Day at the University of Virginia Law School. I am deeply grateful for the courtesy of your invitation.

As State senator, as Governor, and as a Member of the U.S. Senate I have been interested in the development of the system of education in Virginia for more than 40 years, and the University of Virginia Law School has always been a source of great pride. It is recognized as one of the best, and worthy of the traditions of Jefferson.

Mixed with the pleasure of being back at the university there is a note of regret in the fact that Dean F. D. G. Ribble is retiring. He has been associated with the law school as student, professor and dean, almost constantly for some 40 years.

He has been dean and acting dean since 1937. He is a friend of long standing. I respect him as do the students who have had the privilege of his tutelage. I am pleased to be among his host of friends who salute him this evening.

What does one say—on Law Day at the University of Virginia—to so many old and cherished friends like Dean Ribble; and to so many newer friends, like Dr. Edgar F. Shannon, president of this great university, who has already distinguished himself in his service here?

I am not a lawyer, but my father was; and he was a graduate of the University of Virginia Law School. He was always a great admirer of Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the University of Virginia, and he never failed to let me know it.

It was from my father that I first learned the sources of sovereign power, the reasons to respect the law under which we govern ourselves, and the principles of our system which Jefferson stated so clearly.

Jefferson sent the model of Virginia's Capitol Building from France. And under Jefferson's dome at the Capitol in Richmond I spent some of the most rewarding years of my life in the service of our great Commonwealth.

It is natural on this occasion that my thoughts turn to Jefferson; and thinking of him, I am reminded of his great and continuing concern about the division of powers in government which he regarded as fundamental to our system.

Largely at his insistence government in this Nation was federally centraliezd to protect our freedom from foreign aggression, and decentralized in the States for preservation of our individual liberties and freedom of action.

This division of power was fundamental to our system of government in the beginning, and it is fundamental now. And throughout our national existence it has remained all-important, but always difficult to keep secure.

As early as 1825, the year before he died, Jefferson, in a letter to William B. Giles, found reason to think his concern over centralization of power in the Federal Government had been justified.

With the development of communication, increase in population, industrialization, and so forth, there is an inevitable tendency toward centralization. If we are to maintain the source of national strength at home which is inherent in decentralized government, there is need for constant vigilance.

It is in the interest of vigilance against excessive centralization of power in the Federal Government that I am speaking this evening. The subject assigned to me is: Massive Federal Spending and Concentration of National Power. And, as we have learned from experience, massive Federal spending and centralization of power feed on each other.

It is time, I think, to examine the extent to which our fundamental principles have been eroded, and the need to reverse the trend by recurrence to them.

On this subject my thoughts are directed to the fundamentals involved. It is natural that I should draw on the experience of my lifetime, and my own knowledge of local, State, and Federal Government. It is not my intention to implicate any Federal administration more than any other, or to be partisan in any degree.

When I am asked what kind of Democrat I am, I reply that I am a Jeffersonian Democrat. I wear that label with pride because I think it marks me as one who fights for the fundamentals on which the finest system of government in history was built. I fight for these fundamentals because I believe in them.

I believe sound progress is the primary purpose in every man's life. Sound progress is the source of strength. But progress is not sound unless it is based on sound financing; this is another application of the checks and balances which have been so useful in our Government and way of life.

I believe in the basic principles of our governmental system which, by written constitution, contemplated State sovereignty, local autonomy, and Federal Government. Three coordinate branches of Government were contemplated at each level. The effort was to avoid encroachment as among the levels, and among the branches. I believe enterprise and strength is stimulated by such a system. It must be preserved and defended wherever it is attacked.

I believe it is the sound productivity and strength developed under this concept that have brought us to world power in relatively few generations. Historically, lives of nations are measured in hundreds of years. I want the life of this Nation to be the longest and the best.

I believe our people generally want our system perpetuated and strengthened. Basically the requirements are: simple honesty and individual initiative, a self-reliance and willing work, constructive production and free competition, and progressive development and sound financing.

Our position as a free world leader, as well as our domestic welfare, depends upon the preservation of the basic sources of strength in our system. It has been our strength, almost alone, which for 15 years has held back the iron curtain around the world.

This country is abundantly blessed with the elements of national strength. We have geographical location, climate, size, resources, population, and form of government designed for freedom and initiative in productive enterprise.

We are leaders in a new era of atomic energy, rockets, and space. Our productive know-how and capacity are unsurpassed. We have the basic requirements for sound progress, economic, social, and in international relations.

I believe with responsible citizenship, with good government, and with fiscal soundness there would be no fear for the future.

But without responsible citizenship, good government, and fiscal soundness there will be neither solid progress nor security with military preparedness. These are the alternatives we face in this Nation today. We are capable of meeting these requirements, but this is not achieved without discipline.

The greatness of this Nation is without parallel. Our capacity for constructive leadership in the world is immeasurable. But I have a feeling of anxiety, and I suspect most of you know it too. Our Government is being challenged from abroad and undermined at home. The Nation is showing signs of weakness when it should be strongest.

We seem to be running deficits everywhere. Take four of them as examples:

First, there is the United Nations deficit. U.N. peace operations in the Congo and the Near East this year are financed entirely from bond issue proceeds, and whether this indebtedness will ever be repaid remains to be seen. All U.N. arrearages on December 31, 1962, totaled $121.6 million.

Second, there is the NATO deficit. Of all 15 NATO nations, only the United States and Canada have met NATO "goals" qualitatively and quantitatively with respect to furnishing troops.

Third, there is the balance-of-payments deficit. We spent $2.2 billion more in foreign countries in calendar year 1962 than we took in from transactions abroad. Our money went out in foreign aid, maintenance of troops around the world, migration of U.S. business, tourist expenditures, purchase of imports, etc. We have run deficits in these accounts for 12 of the past 13 years. This has resulted in the loss of two-thirds of our free gold. Gold backs the dollar.

Fourth, there is the domestic budget deficit. Federal economists are confusing the public by talking in terms of three budgets; there is a deficit in each of them. The deficit in the regular budget is estimated at $8.8 billion this year and $11.9 billion next year—a 2-year deficit of $20.7 billion—and this would be the highest 2-year deficit combination in peace-time history.

In short, we are surrounded by deficits. And with them we have: debt and inflation; we have balance-of-payments trouble; we have dwindling gold reserves; and we have Communists within 90 miles of our shore.

With respect to the domestic budget deficit, there has been reason before now to think we were on a permanent deficit financing basis; now it is proposed to enter an era of planned deficits.

Planned deficits are contemplated under the spending proposal to increase spending and reduce taxes at the same time. The Secretary of the Treasury testified recently that the current tax cut recommendations would create deficits until fiscal year 1966 or 1967.

He said this week that revising the deficit estimate for the coming fiscal year from $12 billion down to $11 billion provided more reason for cutting taxes. He was saying 3 months ago that the tax cut was necessary to prevent depression. Now he is saying taxes should be cut because business is booming.

But any way he slices his reasoning, he still plans deficits for years in the future, and Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Stanley Surrey said it is not possible to cut expenditures.

Our strength is being sapped by paternalism of Federal bureaucracy grown too big; usurpation of power by the Federal Supreme Court grown too mighty; and force of pressure groups grown too arrogant. They are undermining our system, changing our attitudes, and hobbling our will for freedom.

Hope for the future built on confidence is the stimulating force for sound progress. But confidence is not stimulated by expanding Federal paternalism, or Federal usurpation of authority and power, or excessive Federal spending; and we are experiencing all three.

In my judgment lack of confidence in Federal policies, and the fiscal position of the Central Government is a real and serious drag on our progress in all respects. There is a deadening lack of confidence arising from Federal attitudes with respect to huge deficits in our balance of international payments; integrity of the dollar, and loss in our gold reserves; usurpation of power by Federal agencies and courts, with dangerous centralization of authority; lack of a square deal between business and labor; and deficit financing for nonessential Federal expenditures.

The Federal Government's record on these matters does not stimulate confidence. New and enlightened Federal policies, with disciplined positions, are needed with respect to each item I have listed, and with respect to the combination.

For 17 years, since World War II, the United States has been banker, policeman and Santa Claus for the free world. We have spent more than $100 billion in foreign aid, including some $4.5 billion which went to Iron Curtain countries, and foreign aid has contributed to our deficit in foreign transactions.

Promises to eliminate the international payments deficits have not been fulfilled to date; these deficits are continuing despite our generally favorable balance in foreign commercial trade.

Confidence would be stimulated by elimination of nonessential foreign aid in a complete reorganization of the program. This would be a good place to start more effective discipline over all Federal expenditures abroad in the effort to balance our income from foreign countries with our expenditures in them.

The law does not require it, but for years we have given foreign governments and their central banks the option of taking payments for these overseas deficits in dollars, or in gold at the statutory rate of $35 an ounce.

They take gold instead of dollars if their confidence in our money is impaired. They are aware of our domestic deficits, our increasing Federal debt, and the decline in the value of our dollar. They have taken two-thirds of our free gold since 1949.

Gold backs our money and some $12 billion in gold is required for this purpose. We had more than $24 billion in gold in 1949. Now we have less than $16 billion. We are within $4 billion of the amount required to back the dollar, and the gold is still going out.

I regard this as our most serious fiscal and monetary problem. If the time comes when we cannot offer dollars-or-gold convertibility in our foreign transactions, we shall be faced with a catastrophic situation.

It would be dangerous to remove gold as the base for the dollar or renege on the gold-or-dollar option in foreign settlements while the dollar is under the fire of chronic domestic deficits and declining value.

Either or both of these courses would be regarded around the world as a sign of weakness; and other free world currencies tied to the dollar would be jeopardized as well as our own. It is imperative that we stop the drain on our gold. This will not be done without return to sound fiscal principles in the Federal Government.

Meanwhile, the value of the dollar at home is steadily going down. As compared with dollars worth 100 cents in 1939, American dollars were worth 47.3 cents each in March 1960, they were worth 46.6 cents in March 1961, they were worth 46.1 cents in March 1962, and they were worth 45.6 cents in March of this year.

Confidence does not rise with falling gold reserves, or with declining purchasing power of the dollar. The drop in both must be stopped in the interest of restoring confidence among our people at home and among free world governments abroad.

This requires removal of the fear of inflation; and neither domestic nor foreign fears of inflation in this country will be removed so long as the Federal Government continues to embrace huge and nonessential deficit financing. Talk of more inflation is increasing at this time.

Fear of inflation forever lurks in a continuing deficit situation. Bernard Baruch, one of this Nation's wisest counselors and most respected financiers, has testified before the Senate Finance Committee that deficit spending is always to be feared as a dangerous contributor to inflation.

The Federal Government of the United States has been on a deficit financing basis in 27 of the last 33 years, and the value of the dollar has dropped 54.4 cents since 1939. And there is no sign of relief from deficits in the future. On the contrary, they are being planned for years to come.

It is easy to blame war and military costs for this record of deficits, and the tremendous $305 billion debt piled up in their wake. But the combined duration of World War II and the Korean war was about 8 years. There have been 20 deficits in the other 25 years.

In the 10 years since the end of the Korean war we have had seven deficits; the Federal debt has gone up nearly $40 billion, and the annual cost of the Federal Government has been increased by approximately $20 billion, or more than 25 percent.

And within these past 10 years we experienced the greatest peacetime deficit in history. This occurred in 1959, when the deficit reached $12.4 billion. Unfortunately, it appears that this record may not stand unbroken much longer.

Government economists are now telling us that a balanced budget would lead to increased unemployment and general economic decline. They say this would happen whether we reduced Federal expenditures to meet tax collections, or increased taxes to meet expenditures.

The same Government economists say balancing the budget is still a goal, but to balance it any time soon would make us poor because there would be no Federal deficit to make us rich. And to make us richer faster, they think the Government should create bigger deficits by spending more and cutting taxes at the same time.

These ideas don't sound like men looking for new frontiers. They sound like Rip Van Winkle. These economists must have been taking a long nap. If their theory were valid, we have already had enough deficits to make us all rich and employed before now.

The hard fact is that of the $20 billion increase in the cost of the Federal Government since the end of the Korean war in 1953, $17 billion has been for strictly domestic-civilian programs, projects, and purposes, and interest.

This $17 billion increase excludes the cost of military functions, foreign aid and trust fund programs such as those for social security, highways and Federal National Mortgage Association. Federal spending for domestic-civilian purposes and interest in the coming year is estimated at $38.4 billion.

In this country we achieved our liberty, our freedoms, and our greatness by adherence to fundamental principles. They are still the wellspring of our strength; but we are allowing departures from them to accumulate.

All around us there are signs indicating the need for recurrence to our national doctrines as they were laid down in the wisdom of our Founding Fathers. It is becoming urgent that we should take heed.

Thomas Jefferson, in an 1816 letter to Samuel Kerchival, said: "A departure from principle in one instance becomes a precedent for a second; the second for the third; and so on til the bulk of society is reduced to misery without sensibilities, except for sin and suffering.

"The forehorse of this frightful situation," Jefferson said, "is public debt, and in its train there is wretchedness and oppression."

Here at the University of Virginia, almost in sight of Monticello, and not far from Mount Vernon, I think you will agree that Jefferson and Washington were the greatest men this Nation has produced. Jefferson formulated our purposes and our system of government; and Washington put them into operation.

No Nation ever had higher purposes; and no better system of government has ever been devised. It is not a pure democracy; but it is a brilliant and practical approach to it. Its underlying principles must not be chipped away.

They represent fundamentals conceived in revolution against oppression and autocratic power exercised by a remote central government. I cannot imagine that the people of this country want them abandoned.

Our forefathers were willing to fight and die for our national objectives which were liberty, the conditions of freedom, and a system of government designed forever to guarantee these blessings for our people.

We know from the experience of our history that this guarantee requires division of authority in a manner to avoid the evils of centralized power within the Nation, and to utilize the strength of national power outside, in our foreign relations.

Minimum central government for purposes at home, and use of Federal power abroad have been keys to our great domestic progress and the development of our prestige in world affairs. This country was founded on the principle that we were to be a union of sovereign States, federalized for specified purposes.

The purposes of the Federal Government are clearly stated in the national Constitution which the States adopted. And under the Bill of Rights, powers not specified as Federal are retained by the States and the people.

This is in accordance with the wise counsel of Jefferson. As Minister Plenipotentiary to France, he saw at firsthand the reactionary oppression of concentrated power in the nations of Europe.

From Paris he wrote home urging us to "make the States one as to everything connected with foreign relations, and keep them the several States as to everything purely domestic."

Fundamentally, the principles underlying our system hold that people in their local environment are entitled to maximum freedom in the pursuit of happiness with minimum subordination to central authority.

No American has ever been more constructively liberal than Thomas Jefferson, and no one has been more eager for sound progress in furthering the general welfare of the people and the Nation.

But his was a sound liberalism, developed from a conservative base: strong Federal, State and local government in their respective areas, sound financing, republican form of government, informed electorate, et cetera.

These are not deterrents to progress. They contemplate growth in the Nation's size, resources and population. They are capable of providing the freedom necessary for varied approach to worthy objectives.

One of the great fundamentals of our system was the freedom for individual initiative through which our people could start at the bottom and raise themselves to the top unrestricted by stifling paternalism.

Another was its promotion of the competitive enterprise system under which the Nation grew great in sound progress and free competition at the marketplace. This is impossible in a bureaucratic straitjacket.

We are founded on the capitalism of competitive enterprise. Under our form of government this provides the means for our pursuit of liberty, freedom, and independence. How else could we achieve material prosperity with cultural accomplishment?

We do not necessarily defend the status quo; neither do we assume that change is necessarily progress. Basically, I think we wish to solve our problems by methods conforming to our fundamental principles.

There can be no doubt that this Nation was founded in a deeply rooted mistrust of central government. Paternalistic government undermines our principles, limits our freedom, deprives us of the fruits of our labor, and curbs our initiative.

The evils and potential evils of centralized government were clearly seen by both Jefferson and Washington; and Jefferson in particular, warned against them throughout most of his adult lifetime.

He expressed concern over the possibilities of excessive centralization in a letter to Gideon Granger in August 1800. Twenty-one years later, in his autobiography (1821) Jefferson was still cautioning against centralized government in the United States, and he left this statement for our guidance:

"It is not by consolidation, or concentration of powers, but by their distribution that good government is effected."

It is appropriate to recall these views of Thomas Jefferson on this occasion. It is even more appropriate to recall his views with respect to the Federal judiciary. His apprenhensions over the Federal judiciary were second only to his fear generally of centralizing too much power in the Federal Government. And these fears were related.

Let me quote what he said in this respect. In 1823, he told William Johnson that:

"There is no danger I apprehend so much as the consolidation of our Government by the noiseless and, therefore, unalarming instrumentality of the Supreme Court."

Washington also warned us against usurpation of power which he said was the "customary weapon by which free nations are destroyed." And then the First President went one step further when he said our Government "* * * will become despotic only when the people have been so corrupted as to need despotic government, being incapable of any other."

Times and circumstances change, but principles do not. We have abused our freedoms, our form of government, and our system of competitive enterprise which are our national heritage. Under the Constitution, as it was written, ours is still a government originating in the sovereignty of the States.

It is one thing to be free from foreign domination. It is another thing to be free among ourselves, free from domination by a remote central government of our own creation. We will fight foreign aggression without question; but we take our freedoms at home for granted.

Washington is as far from Honolulu as it is from Moscow. Centralize in Washington the power, the Government, and the authority over a Nation so vast in size, and so diversified in interests as ours, and you impair the wisdom of enlightened government and invite destruction of our cherished freedoms.

This is what is happening. We are changing our system of government; not by amendment to the Constitution as provided in our basic law, but by means more subtle which are equally as effective. They are in the form of all kinds of so-called Federal aids, subsidies, decrees, and other tools of power and force.

We are being enticed into centralization by Federal paternalism, forced into centralization by Federal usurpation of power, and driven to centralization under the burden of public debt. I wish it could be said that this trend is abating. It is not. It is continuing with increasing boldness.

Test these tendencies of today, and we find them in violation of our fundamental principles; they lack practical and frugal approach; they are unproductive of sound progress; and they erode our character and confidence.

Consider two of the proposals sent by the President to Congress for consideration during the past year. Under one he could spend public funds without appropriation. Under the other he could cut taxes by executive order. No other President in our history ever asked for such Executive power.

Both proposals would undermine the Constitution which prohibits expenditures except in "consequence of appropriations made by law" and fixes the taxing power of the Government in the legislative branch. Fortunately, Congress had the courage to reject both proposals. But they will be made again.

The very fact that they were so openly made disturbs the confidence of people who would adhere to fundamental principles and believe that concentration of spending and taxing powers in the hands of one man would do violence to the foundation of our system of government.

Consider the Executive crackdown on the steel industry last spring. In that case the Central Government made unprecedented use of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Federal grand jury, and the threat to withdraw and withhold Federal contracts from companies which dared not to conform.

Consider the increasing dominance by the Federal executive branch together with the everwidening usurpation of power, in a continuing line of decisions, by the Federal Supreme Court. Now it is undertaking to dictate and influence formation of political districts within States from which members of State legislatures are elected.

Nothing is further outside of Federal jurisdiction. Gerrymander by the Federal judiciary is something new and dangerous in our form of government. It could be used to destroy the effectiveness of our two-party system, as well as the fundamental safeguards of dual governments under the Constitution.

Consider the fact that the Government of the United States has asked a Federal court to enjoin the State of Virginia from spending its own money in support of all public schools in the Commonwealth for both white children and Negroes, unless one county in the State submits to Federal demands.

The Attorney General of the United States on April 26, 1961, filed a petition in the Federal District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond, asking for Federal injunction to restrain the State of Virginia from: "* * * approving, paying, or issuing warrants for the payment of any funds of the State for the maintenance or operation of public schools anywhere in Virginia for so long and during such period as the public schools of Prince Edward County are closed and a system of public free schools is not maintained within the county."

The Prince Edward school case is still in the Federal courts; but the fact remains that public schools are still operating in Virginia, and the State's money appropriated for this purpose is still being used. But such intemperate Federal action cannot be taken lightly.

It is true that this move for Federal injunctive control over public schools in Virginia involves the Federal effort to force integration of school children, but I would remind citizens in all States that their own school interests also are in jeopardy if such a precedent were set.

In the area of public education, consider the fact that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on Monday, April 29, started hearings on Senate bill 580 which sets forth 24 Federal programs for higher education as well as public education at the lower levels, each with Federal standards to be complied with.

This is an authorization bill; and if it is passed it would be practically useless without subsequent appropriations which would me made in other bills. And provisions in this bill could not control restrictive amendments which might be added to the appropriation bills over the years to come.

Such amendments might reach to matters like textbooks, curricula, teachers' salaries, and so forth. Federal subsidy money could be limited to States with teacher merit systems, or vice versa, or to States with a single pay scale for members of the teaching profession, or vice versa, and so on.

When Federal funds are involved, in the form of subsidies, grants or otherwise, Federal control is inherent. It may be through Federal court injunctions, in substantive legislation, through appropriation bill riders, through Executive orders, or otherwise; but it will be there.

Consider Executive Order 11063 of November 20, 1962, in which the President decreed racial integration in all Federal and federally assisted housing programs. I commend the Virginia Law Weekly, published here at the university, for its editorial of last December 6, entitled "A Regrettable Order."

Consider Executive Order 10925 of March 6, 1961, which, with respect to Federal contracts, in part says: "* * * All Government contracting agencies shall include in every Government contract hereafter entered into the following provisions: in connection with performance of work under this contract the contractor agrees as follows: (1) the contractor will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color or national origin * * *."

Here again, it is true that the two examples I have cited involve integration. But consider the increasing Federal requirement that so-called Davis-Bacon wage rates be applied for construction in which Federal subsidy money is used—examples are schools, hospitals, highways, and so forth.

Davis-Bacon wage rates, as applied by the Federal Government, almost without exception are metropolitan rates. To apply them elsewhere means spending more money for fewer classrooms, fewer hospital beds, fewer miles of highway, and so on. Nonessential expenditures are made mandatory, and local wage schedules are drastically disturbed.

Farmers who participate in the Federal agricultural price support program are subjected to Federal restrictions on their crops. The restrictions are in the form of quotas, acreage allotment or production control, and so forth. There are Federal standards, restrictions or controls, or the combination, in all of these subsidy programs.

Make no mistake; the Federal Government does not become party to expensive projects and programs involving expenditure of so-called Federal funds without, at some time or another, assuming its share, and usually more than its share, of control.

I often wonder whether people, institutions, localities and States, when they apply for these Federal subsidies, stop to realize that the principal source of the Central Government's income is its taxes and other levies on all of us.

It collects the taxes, deducts a high administrative cost, and, in the case of these subsidies, it passes the money back with strings attached; and generally it requires States to match the so-called Federal payments.

I wonder how much people, institutions, localities and States, think about the fact that when they ask for Federal subsidies, they are asking the Federal Government to limit their freedom of action for which the Nation was founded.

Every Federal payment takes its toll in centralized restraint and control. If, as the administration says, the rate of progress in this country has been slowed down in recent years, the cause is too much centralization, not a lack of Government programs.

Thirty years ago when I went to the Senate there was only a handful of programs for grants to States and localities, including those for highways and land-grant colleges. Federal expenditures through these programs at that time totaled about $100 million.

Now Federal payments in the form of grants are going out to States and localities through 60-odd programs, and Federal expenditures for this purpose are totaling $8 billion a year. In addition, there are some 50 programs for payments and grants to individuals totaling $2.5 billion.

Add to these the Federal civilian and military payrolls, and other recipients of Federal largesse, and we find more than 50 million people receiving Federal payments each year totaling more than $50 billion. These recipients, with their families, could total half our population.

In addition, millions of people are benefiting from Federal insurance programs covering housing mortgages and so on. And wherever a mortgage is insured, so is a bank. Think of the businesses benefiting from junk mail which the Government delivers through the Post Office which operates at a loss.

The fact is that we find Federal subsidies flowing to business, industry, private finance, agriculture, transportation, power, housing, health, education, States, localities, private and public institutions, and individuals. Name an area of endeavor, and the chances are there is a Federal subsidy program to go with it.

We know that we cannot suddenly rip all of these Federal programs out of our way of living. Some of them, such as some aspects of the veterans' programs, Federal payrolls, and retirement, and so forth, are legitimately within the Federal province. Others, such as social security and unemployment insurance, are in the nature of contributory trust funds.

But from experience we have learned that the more government is centralized, the more easily it is influenced by leaders of organized pressure groups. Political target areas, the source of authority, and the ruling officials are more centralized and therefore more susceptible to concentrated pressure.

Let me use a few more figures, just to fix in your memory the magnitude of what is going on in Federal domestic civilian programs.

Let me compare budget estimates for next fiscal year, beginning July 1, with actual figures for the year after the Korean war ended 10 years ago. Assuming the budget requests for the coming fiscal year 1964, as compared with actual expenditures in fiscal year 1954:

Federal payments for agriculture and agricultural resources would have more than doubled from $2.6 billion to $5.7 billion; Federal payments for commerce and transportation would have far more than doubled from $1.2 billion to $3.4 billion; Federal payments for health, labor, and welfare would have risen from $2.1 billion to $5.6 billion; and Federal payments for education would have gone from $326 million to $1.5 billion.

Since the first of January the President has recommended at least 12 new grant programs and for them he has asked for $200 million in the first year for expenditures simply to get them organized and ready for the big business which would come later

I regard this steady increase in reliance on Central Government as evidence of weakness, not of strength. I regard it as departure from vigorous initiative and enterprise which have made us great. I regard it as a tendency toward state socialism which is not in the character of the American system.

I would be remiss on the occasion of Law Day at the university founded by Thomas Jefferson, if I did not say that judicial usurpation of power has reached a peak with the Warren Supreme Court. I dislike saying it, but the record of this Court is one of the principal reasons for my feeling of anxiety at this time, when the best of our strength is needed.

Its decisions have invaded homes, handicapped police protection, disregarded State sovereignty, interferred with the authority of the executive branch of the Federal Government, and usurped the powers of Congress.

Some of the best legal minds of the Nation are here this evening. You are familiar with the case documentation. I shall not burden you with the rollcall, but it can be supplied.

For the purposes of this occasion, I shall rely on the chief justices of State supreme courts throughout the Nation. In their 1958 conference at Pasadena, they found reason to urge the Warren Court to restrain itself in the exercise of vast power. Recent decisions have not eased that anxiety.

The action was taken in a 38 to 6 adoption of a report based on the study and findings of 10 eminent jurists. The study was of recent decisions indicating general trends in the area of Federal-State relationships. I shall quote only two brief excerpts. The report said: "Second only to the increasing dominance of the National Government has been the development of the immense power of the Supreme Court in both State and National affairs. It is not merely the final arbiter of the law; it is the maker of policy in many social and economic fields."

And then the report said further: "It has long been the American boast that we have a government of laws and not of men. We believe that any study of recent decisions of the Supreme Court will raise at least considerable doubt as to the validity of that boast."

It seems to me that there can be no doubt that the Federal Supreme Court has been a participant in undermining our system of Government, contributing to centralization of power and authority; and thereby sapping our national strength. This makes us more vulnerable to destructive forces both at home and abroad.

But I do not want to leave the impression that more recent administrations and courts have been totally responsible for the dangerous degree of centralization we have reached. For instance, in consideration of the character and quality of the Supreme Court over recent decades, we can not overlook the packing of the Court which was the issue of the 1930's.

This was about the time that the more recent trend toward centralization of power in the Federal Government started. And it was in 1932 that we Democrats held such high hopes for the strengthening of our system of government as a means of bringing us out of the depression. I shall never forget the 1932 Democratic platform.

I embraced it with great enthusiasm, and in the course of my efforts in its behalf, I became identified as a New Dealer. And to this day I am the most loyal of the original New Dealers in the Democratic Party. Let me quote a few passages from that 1932 New Deal platform to back me up:

"We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party when entrusted with power and the people are entitled to know in plain words the terms of the contract to which they are asked to subscribe."

Now I quote some of the plain words of that contract between the New Deal and the people who entrusted them with power.

"We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of the Government."

There we old New Dealers still stand, admittedly there is not much left to stand on; but then, there are not many of us left standing. Just let me quote again from what that platform said:

"We favor maintenance of the national credit by a Federal budget annually balanced and sound currency to be preserved at all hazards."

And to conclude the quotes from the original New Deal platform of 1932, it said we stood for "The removal of Government from all fields of private enterprise except where necessary to develop public works and natural resources in the common interest."

I cast the Virginia delegation's vote for nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt on that platform. President Roosevelt and I took the oath of office on the same snowy day, March 4, 1933. My first vote in the Senate was on the bill advocated by Mr. Roosevelt "to preserve the credit of the U.S. Government."

It was enacted. It provided for a 15-percent cut in all appropriations. I thought that was a pretty good performance on a campaign promise to cut the budget 25 percent. You know what happened after 6 months of the Roosevelt administration. He reversed himself, went on an orgy of spending, and we have been centralizing authority in Washington ever since.

But here I stand this evening as a veteran of the original New Deal. I have experienced combat fatigue at times; I have taken some shell shock; and I am a battle-scarred veteran from fighting for the promised New Deal. But somehow I have survived, and I am still here defending fundamentals of our great system.

In summary, let me say that since the departure from the pledges of that platform, our system has been increasingly subjected to three subverting trends which must be stopped. These trends are (1) increasing centralization with fiscal deterioration; (2) increasing usurpation of power by the Federal judiciary; and (3) increasing influence of pressure group leaders over Federal authorities.

Reverse these, and I have no doubt about our strength to meet any foreseeable foreign or domestic challenge. It is up to all of us who believe in our system of government to fight for the kind of progress we know to be sound; the kind of progress that is built on the faith in the future that only a nation blessed with our fundamental freedoms can have. That is my purpose, and I am sure it is yours.

"A Trial Balance in Foreign Affairs," an Address by McGeorge Bundy, Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD, the text of a most interesting address by the Honorable McGeorge Bundy, Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

This address was delivered recently at the 55th annual meeting of the Harvard Club of Boston:

A TRIAL BALANCE IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(By McGeorge Bundy)

When I was first asked to say what I would have to talk about this evening, I offered the title "A Trial Balance in Foreign Affairs." It seemed to me certain that there would be something I could fit into that subject 4 months later. But I guessed better than I knew. We are indeed in a period of balance—and also a period of reassessment—in the international political situation. I was talking the other day to that extraordinarily distinguished and influential graduate of Harvard, Walter Lippmann, and he said exactly what many of us have had on our minds and have not been able to put in words (which is, of course, one of his great skills). He said, "You know, I can't remember a period in the affairs of the world in which there has been a clearer sense of pause, a clearer sense that somehow we are between one stage and the next." And as we talked on about it, I had the impression that he would at least partly share the description of this pause which I will offer you, which is that for different reasons, which come together largely by accident at this point of time, the overwhelming majority of the major powers of the world are deeply preoccupied with problems which are not those which were familiar in the late forties, the fifties, and the first years of this decade.

The most important, most interesting and most puzzling of these new problems is probably the confrontation between Moscow and Peiping. I know of no way of exaggerating the significance of it. But let me say at once that I think also that there is no easy way of saying what it means for American policy. For the short run, at least, perhaps the most interesting thing that it means is that the minds of the men in power, in those two extraordinarily important centers, are concentrated more on the problem of Communist division, and less on the problems, so interesting to us, of the Communist against the non-Communist world, or of disagreements within the non-Communist world. What seems to be serious for Khrushchev at the moment is this deeply unsettling appearance of a formidable opposition which in logical, or theological, or neotheological, terms can make its case in a way which is heard, and which shakes throughout the Communist world. That changes his priorities, and it helps to create a pause—which of course might be ended at any moment.

INDIA

The next most important area in which this kind of reexamination and reassessment is going on is India. We used to ask ourselves, in an indecisive way, last October and November, at the time of the great missile crisis in Cuba, whether really that crisis was more or less important than the border war between China and India. And the bets that were made then among friends have not yet been paid.

What is very plain is that the events along the Indian border created a major shift in the premises—and so eventually in the conclusions—of the politics of the subcontinent. Some men in both India and Pakistan (and they are both almost equally involved by this event) have chosen to play in terms of the short-run returns. Others are betting that this episode implies, because it requires, the settlement of differences between the two non-Communist powers of the Asian Continent.

But this is a new political conflict—a new political test—and because it requires a rearrangement of opinion within the two countries, it requires a pause while the new politics works itself out within the countries involved. And that leads me on to say that even in countries which are apparently deeply concerned, and very active in foreign affairs, the same kind of pause exists below the surface, and essentially for the same reason—that men are now turning toward the structure of opinion, and of political support, that is coming, rather than the one that has passed. This penomenon is part of the gradual transition from one generation to another (although I don't think that the age of a statesman is really decisive; his political expectations, his degree of solidity in office, the degree to which his country thinks that something new is coming—these are only marginally related to chronology). Still, if you look at the map of Europe, I think you will see what I mean. What is operating in Germany today is the politics of succession. And in France for different reasons (which may not have anything like the same time frame of decision), and in England, for still other reasons (which could be revered a year from now) and in Italy, these same questions have forced themselves forward: What comes next for the country, politically, at home? What are we, as a nation and a society? Who is our leader? The same thing is true self-evidently in Canada, the largest of our immediate neighbors.

For all these reasons, interlocking, and accidentally connected, there is a international pause.

CUBA

I say that the pause is partly accidental, but I think it also has a cause. And if a single event is to be selected as defining the international plateau in which we find ourselves, it must be the crisis of October over the introduction of missiles into Cuba.

The consequences of that episode are many. But the most important of them is that the world, and especially the non-Communist world, does not believe today that the Soviet Government wants to play the game of "brinkmanship." I myself think that may be too sweeping a conclusion, and that we may be faced at any time with a sudden recurrence of Soviet menace in terms and conditions more favorable to them, on their calculation, at least, than was the case in Cuba. But that is not what is commonly thought. People believe that a breathing spell, at least, has been won. An so policies are framed in terms of a lack of concern for any immediate threat in Berlin and a lack of concern lest the alliance be fully united at a moment of supreme test—for such a test is not expected. Allies are turning to their contests with one another in a way which is only possible in the absence of any immediate fear of war.

As I say, I don't think this process wholly corresponds to reality. But I do think it is a fair and accurate statement of what is thought, in government after government. To put it in another way, I believe that the extraordinary pedagogical importance of the October crisis—its teaching meaning—is that everybody in the West drew from it the lesson he wished to draw from it. Those who believe in the importance and relevance of conventional weapons on the spot conclude—as I think many of us do in Washington—that what was most important here was not the strategic nuclear balance, but the immediate and effective operational impact of the conventional forces of the United States in the Caribbean. But those who believe that any such test is nucleus to nucleus, as many in France prefer to believe, have concluded that the strategic balance inclines to the West and that that is what is decisive—that only the nucleus, and not the conventional force, is what settles matters. Similarly those who believe that it is the challenge of force which produces a backdown feel themselves justified; and those who believe that it is readiness for negotiation which keeps the door open to honorable peace—they also think they were proven right.

I believe that there is a part of the truth in all of these views, and that the only danger is to assume that all of it is in any one of them. But what happens, gentlemen, when after a very great event, all of the parties, and most of the observers, retire with a sense that they understood it before it happened? What happens is that they find themselves on a new plateau, released from the tension and the danger of the moment, reinforced in their existing attitudes, and free to go about their own business. Nevertheless we are not yet on the forward slope of a major new phase in history. We are, I think, still in the backwash of the largest single crisis since the war.

DOING BETTER

For these reasons it is both hard and easy to offer you a trial balance. The thing is in balance, but it is not easy at all to tell in which ways it is better or worse than it has been, or what the immediate requirements upon us may be. Nevertheless, let me try, in two ways. First, let me tell you, in a very summary way, what I think is better, although not yet good enough, in the performance of our country in foreign affairs in the last few years; and then let me suggest to you, in quite a different way, what seem to me to be some of the things we should be giving more attention to, as against things which perhaps we might well be less concerned about.

I believe that we are doing better, but that we are not yet doing well enough. There is no question that, as a power—and power is the root of influence in international affairs—we are stronger, and known to be stronger, than we were 2 years ago. Part of this gain is the result of a change in what is known as against what is. On what we now know, the missile gap was never what it seemed to be to many both within and outside the Government in 1959 and 1960. To this extent improved intelligence, and not weapons production, is the source of our improved position. But production and investment are the source, also of an additional real improvement in our strength which has occurred in the last 3 years. We are stronger, and we are known to be stronger.

There is also a more general phenomenon, not exclusively related to our strategic position: We are, I believe, more respected, and our objectives as a nation are better understood around the world. This is a hard matter to prove, and every time we're about to be able to prove it with polls, we agree to classify them, so that it becomes harder still. But nevertheless I would have to say, in all honesty and on all the evidence, that the whole international posture of the United States is stronger today that it was 3 or 4 years ago. This is not something which should be assigned as credit 100 percent to any one management or any one administration. It is owing partly, as I say, to improvements in our intelligence estimates, and partly also to the fruition of plans some of which were laid before 1961. I'm trying not to argue with you this evening in terms of one administration against another, or of one party against aonther.

I think it is also true, as you look at all the boundaries upon which our force is felt, and all the areas in which our power is engaged, that the relation between our commitments and our power to meet those commitments is better than it was. We have very sharply improved our conventional military forces and our ability to move them around. We have improved our strategic military forces. We have, I think, improved the flexibility and the responsiveness of some of our other instruments of action in foreign affairs. And we are, therefore, less often found with a sweeping pledge and very limited means of meeting it.

This has also implied, in certain areas of the world, a readjustment of our own expectations. The country in which this is most noticeable is, I think, Laos. In early 1961 there was at least a possibility that the United States might find itself engaged in substantial operational military action in that area, for purposes and to ends which were not clear; the harder one looked at them the harder they were to get defined. We have now an uneasy truce, imperfectly observed, but I think the situation which exists corresponds more clearly and honorably with what we can and should do in our own interests than the situation which existed 3 years ago.

I would also argue that the instruments of operation in foreign policy are improved—although I think they still have a distance to go: the Trade Expansion Act, operated now by a Harvard man (whom I shall always think of as Governor Herter); the Agency for International Development, operated now by a Harvard man, Mr. David Bell (whom I shall always think of as the associate dean of the School of Public Administration); the Department of State; the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; the U.S. Information Agency—I think they all can fairly be described as more alert, more energetic, and better pulled together, than they were a few years back. But the moment one says that, one must go on and say that it's not good enough. All of the instruments are improvable. All of the processes require critical attention. Nobody can say that in this process of overhaul we are finished. There is much still for all of us to do.

DECIDING WHAT IS IMPORTANT

The second area in which I would offer you a trial balance is a little bit different. It is the problem of trying to decide what is and is not of really first-rate importance. I would suggest to you, for example, that in the current scheme of international affairs what is happening in southeast Asia, and especially in South Vietnam, is probably more important than most of us in a group like this would think—and that it needs more of our attention. This is a major commitment which we have made, and it is unfinished business. And how it comes out is of the very greatest consequence to a very large part of the globe.

Conversely I would suggest that the question whether we are or are not going to win a particular argument with the great man who is President of France is of somewhat less importance than may appear as we debate and argue over these matters. I suggest further that it is not to our interest, as the greatest of the powers of the West, to allow ourselves to be bated into a slanging match with a man whose personal grandeur is so evident, and whose reasons for whatever mistakes he may make are so understandable.

I think it is clear that the importance of Cuba is less than we think, as a country, at least on the surface evidence of the headlines. I do not mean for a moment to suggest that this is a trivial area; I have already suggested that the crisis in October had a magnitude that is hard to match in the last 20 years. I do mean that the immediate issues of present partisan argument are not the be-all and the end-all of American foreign affairs and are not likely to decide the future of this Republic. And I mean further that the real issue here is not what does or does not happen in marginal daily conflicts with the disgraceful Castro regime. The real question is what happens in the processes of the societies of the Western Hemisphere as a whole.

Few things are more important in our foreign affairs than the development of events in Latin America. Cuba, seen in that setting, is of major significance. But it is not a thing alone to itself. And it is not, while we watch it, an immediate direct threat northward. The test is in Latin America. The test, therefore, is a test of the policy and behavior of Latin Americans, and of our policy and behavior toward theirs. I repeat that I do not mean for a minute to indicate that Cuba is trivial. I do mean to put it in the context of the part of the problem that matters most, and the part of the problem that matters most is the future of the hemisphere as a whole.

EUROPE

Still another area where we need to think in terms of definition is policy toward Europe. Nothing that this country has tried to do in the last 15 years is more important, or gives us more reason for pride, than our effort to help to construct, and then to deal with, a unified Europe. This has been a first principle. But an equally powerful principle is that you cannot deal with a unified Europe when it does not yet exist. What we have to confront, since the extraordinary events of January, is a determination, on the part of one decisive power, that there is not going to be a unified Europe for the present. It would be folly for us to fail to recognize that veto; or to assume that there is, at the moment, in nuclear affairs, political affairs, or economic affairs, a united voice in Europe. It is a disappointing fact—but it is a fact—that that is not the case. Patiently, and with understanding, we must accept this fact, and continue to develop our own policies and purposes with an understanding that while it is most unlikely that any single patriot can turn the whole of Europe to his national purposes, it is very likely indeed—it is, indeed, not so much a probability as a fact—that any one man, at the head of a major power in Europe, can in fact delay the process of European integration. For the moment it is not wise for any of us to assume that if somehow we should appeal to some unified voice of Europe, we would at this moment—in the spring of 1963—get an answer. The process of the integration of this extraordinarily civilized, extraordinarily complex, and extraordinarily divided area turns out to be slower and more difficult than that, and it is a requirement upon all of us that we should accept that fact.

Gentlemen, there is a great deal more that I would like to say to you, but I have talked longer than I should have done. I have tried to give you an honest and up-to-date account of the situation as it appears where we sit. There is an enormous amount still to be done. And when you work in government you very speedily come to a conclusion which is as comforting to you, in the bureaucracy, as it is to your friends who are not in it—you come to the conclusion that fortunately the affairs of the Nation, even its foreign affairs, do not depend altogether upon bureaucrats or administrations. I am very much struck, in this period of pause, this period in which there is reassessment throughout the world, by the degree to which what really happens over the next few years will turn upon forces and decisions, purposes and attitudes, which are not subject to our control. This is a complicated way of saying that if it goes wrong, it will be your fault, not ours. But it is true, in very substantial measure.

What really is being tested in such a moment of pause, is what kind of society makes sense. What society has the values and the power of action which can deserve and therefore command the respect, the assent, and the following of the world as a whole? Within the United States, for example, I would say that the question of generating renewed acceleration of economic growth by a strong tax bill, and the further question whether we can meet the educational, social, and personal needs of our society—these questions, in this moment of pause and of limited victory, have become more important for the effectiveness of the United States abroad than any specific measure of ordinary diplomacy, or intelligence, or military preparation.

The Long, Long Trail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the appendix of the RECORD and to include, as extraneous matter, an editorial of the San Juan Star, of May 1, 1963, and another of the Washington Post, of May 4, 1963, I avail myself of this opportunity to bring them before the attention of this House. Both editorials refer to the following bills: H.R.

5945, by the Honorable Wayne Aspinall, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; H.R. 5946, by the Honorable Leo O'Brien, chairman of the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs; H.R. 5947, by the Honorable John Kyl, member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and H.R. 5948, by myself. These four bills were introduced on April 30, 1963.

On May 1, 1963, the Honorable Jacob H. Gilbert introduced H.R. 5991, and on May 6, 1963, the Honorable Hugh L. Carey introduced H.R. 6047; the Honorable William Fitts Ryan introduced H.R. 6076, and the Honorable Henry Gonzalez introduced H.R. 6083. These eight bills are all identical bills and they are entitled:

> To establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico.

These bills have been introduced in response to Joint Resolution No. 1, adopted by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico, on December 3, 1962, proposing to the Congress of the United States of America the procedure for establishing the final political status of the people of Puerto Rico.

The editorials follow:

[From the San Juan Star, May 1, 1963]

The Long, Long Trail

The resolution introduced in the House of Representatives of the Congress yesterday is an extremely delicate measure. It is also a historical document that proposes to lay the legislative groundwork for a precedent-setting formula for establishing a permanent relationship between citizens and the country of their citizenship.

The resolution contains a number of key phrases long discussed here as indispensable to the enactment of legislation that would give constitutional validity to any compact agreed to by the people of the United States and the people of Puerto Rico.

Before any such compact can have validity, permanence, and irrevocability, the Congress must recognize the sovereignty of the people of Puerto Rico and their inherent right and juridical capacity to enter into such a compact.

Congress is being asked to make such a recognition in the resolution. The purpose of the carefully drafted wording of the measure is to put an end, for all time, to charges of colonialism by the United States in Puerto Rico, and to legalize beyond any doubt the decision of the people when they choose among Commonwealth, statehood, and independence, the final political status of Puerto Rico.

The formula for achieving that desirable end, as represented by the resolution introduced in Congress, is an admirable one. It embodies the principle of democracy by recognizing that the people are the highest authority in the process of self-determination.

We would want to say here that the prospects of success are as good as the formula itself. We cannot, because the long, long, trail between introduction of this sensitive resolution and its approval by Congress has many windings that can come upon tricky detours without warning.

The delicacy of the wording requires that the resolution be approved almost intact, as written. Any one of various amendments could nullify its high purpose, and the Congress is composed of 535 Members who have the right, which they cherish exceedingly high, of making changes that satisfy their sense of duty and responsibility in any legislation that comes before them.

Whether the resolution is approved in a manner that meets the objective of its architects, or is defeated, or dies in committee, should not alter the fact that the job must be done. The status debate will end one day, and it should be terminated as soon as possible.

When all who have an interest have been heard, we sincerely hope the final result will be congressional approval of legislation that will resolve Puerto Rico's political destiny in a manner that meets with the approval of its people.

[From the Washington Post, May 4, 1963]

Perplexities of Status

Three members of the House Interior Committee have introduced a bill that offers the best method of tackling the question of Puerto Rico's status. The legislation would create a 12-member commission that would draft a proposed compact of permanent union between the United States and the people of Puerto Rico.

The compact would go into effect if the following conditions were met: (1) adoption by Congress of authorizing legislation after receipt of the commission's report; (2) ratification of the compact by the people of Puerto Rico in a referendum in which three choices would be submitted—an amended version of the present Commonwealth status, independence and statehood. In the event the majority of voters choose either independence or statehood, the results would be transmitted to Congress "for such action as it may consider appropriate."

The virtue of the commission proposal is that it skates around some fixed constitutional objections and at the same time provides ample time for deliberation. By creating the commission, Congress would not be committing itself or any future Congress to acceptance of the recommendation. The mechanism envisaged by the legislation is essentially a repetition of the procedures used in framing the original measure that created the Commonwealth a decade ago.

It is quite true that Puerto Rico poses some special problems for our Federal system. The question is whether that system is flexible enough to accommodate the needs of a people who want to remain within the United States without acquiring a political status that would be ruinous to the economy of an overpopulated island. Certainly the Founding Fathers did not contemplate the special issues raised by Puerto Rico, but neither did they foresee a trip to the moon. A living constitution must be continually reinterpreted in the light of fresh circumstances. It is in this perspective that Congress should consider the Puerto Rican bill.

Coming Events of Communism in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in all the hue and cry about Castro and Cuba, there are a few outstanding facts which appear clearly to those who take the trouble to analyze the situation.

Coleridge once said:

> If men could learn from history, what lessons it might teach us. But passion and party blind our eyes, and the light which experience gives is a lantern on the stern—which shines only on the waves behind us.

The lantern of Coleridge shines on waves which are now behind us—and we should open our eyes and see what the lantern reveals. We should do this regardless of passion and party, for only in this way can we hope to save ourselves from the consequences of our failure to learn lessons from the past history of the march of communism toward its goal—enslavement of the world and the peoples of the world.

I was impressed with a column written by Eric Sevareid, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, of May 7, "Man and the Times." Mr. Sevareid's article is called "Cuban Issue Not Clear for Debate."

Mr. Sevareid outlined seven facts which we should seriously consider, in all our debate on the pros and cons of Cuba and the handling of that very controversial issue by several administrations. His last point—that "once again, world communism has succeeded in choosing the point of conflict and crisis in the cold war" should be a sobering reminder to all of us that we are not dealing with, nor should the security of this country ever be a partisan issue—but with a long view and an impassionate evaluation of the outcome, as far as Cuba is concerned—of the continuing battle between communism and capitalism.

Under unanimous consent I would like to include Mr. Sevareid's column with my remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

The column follows:

Cuban Issue Not Clear for Debate

(By Eric Sevareid)

Cuba may well be, as now predicted, the prime issue in the national politics of 1964. But unless the issue is clarified far beyond its present state it will be a rhetorical question, not a question for true debate. Alternative policies are required for true debate and all we have on either side, so far, is attitudes.

With justice, the President has insisted that his critics show more precision in their prescriptions for handling Cuba; but with equal justice his critics can insist on more precision from the administration. What we are now witnessing is a collision of two fog banks. This never clears the air, in nature or in politics; it merely produces fog of double thickness.

WHAT HAS GONE BEFORE

How uncertain the future course, there can be little uncertainty about what the immediate past has produced:

1. The Russians now possess a military, political, and propaganda base in the heart of our area of security and influence.

2. Their troops in Cuba constitute a "trip wire," paralyzing to American action, as our troops in Berlin constitute a trip wire there.

3. Cities and installations of the U.S. mainland are now open to damage by conventional weapons, and have become, therefore, in some degree hostage to Communist purposes. Theoretically, at least, the Russians could damage us by proxy, their method elsewhere, without themselves being directly involved.

4. Fidel Castro's physical hold on the island is complete, with the underground movement facing probable extinction.

5. The mass of Cuban manpower in exile is now a "blown instrument," a handicap and thorn in our side, not a weapon for our uses.

6. A foreign policy quarrel of serious proportions is engulfing an administration which has not yet found its feet in the area of its domestic policies and programs.

7. Once again, world communism had succeeded in choosing the point of conflict and crisis in the cold war, and once again, as with South Korea or South Vietnam or West Berlin or Laos, the focus of contention is inside the realm of the free world, not in the Communist realm.

Whatever the precise degrees of blame to be placed on American administrations, past and present, or on Cubans, past and present, the net result is as described above; and in spite of the trade restrictions and the partial efforts of the OAS at diplomatic "isolation" of Cuba, no persuasive evidence has yet developed to justify optimistic assumptions about the future effects of Castroism in the Caribbean and in continental South America.

At the moment Guatemala is holding and in Venezuela the local Communists have been weakened and disorganized. But quick reversals have been a hallmark of the volatile politics of Latin America, and its strains credulity to assume that a general era of stability is now beginning. For countries like Peru and possibly Brazil it is hard to convince oneself that the fundamental forces for integration are stronger than the fundamental forces for disintegration. Latin American Communists believe the contrary, and are relatively quiescent right now only as a matter of strategy, waiting for the time when the United States will relax about Cuba, take its nervous finger off the trigger, and gradually slip into a state of de facto coexistence with Mr. Castro. As we drift in that direction, most Latin governments as well as those European allies anxious to resume trade with Cuba will try to force us further in that direction.

STRATEGY SEEN CHANGING

When northern opinion is adjusted to accommodation, Communist strategies will change again, and with the present electricity dissipated, we shall find it far harder to rouse ourselves to forceful action in the case of some attempted uprising in Cuba or in the case of Communist coups in nearby nations. This is the prospect unless somehow we will find a way to increase our present pressures on Cuba. If they are not increased, they will decrease; it is not in the nature of these things that a status quo can be indefinitely maintained.

Wise and good men are reminding us that a Communist Cuba is not a mortal threat to our vital interests. In and of itself, of course, it is not. But that opens, it does not close, the argument. A Communist Vietnam, or a Communist Laos, or Indonesia, or Venezuela or West Berlin would not be mortal threats, either—in and of themselves and separately considered. But the Communist world strategy of protracted conflict is a strategy of the piecemeal advance. There are only so many pieces on the board. With the capture of Cuba they have taken a tremendously important piece. Dozens of Russian ships would not be plying the Cuban trade and thousands of Russian citizens would not be turned out to cheer Castro, if the Kremlin didn't think so.

Agate Springs Fossil Quarries, Sioux County, Nebr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert a statement in the RECORD in connection with a bill I have introduced today, as a companion bill to one being introduced in the Senate by Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA, of Nebraska, to preserve and designate the Agate Springs Fossil Quarries, located in Sioux County, Nebr., as a national monument in the National Park Service System.

These unique fossil beds are known around the world, and this fame rests principally on the wealth of geologic information and paleontologic information gained from them since their discovery. This may well be the world's largest deposit of prehistoric animal remains, and it is estimated that only about 25 percent have been explored after some 60 years of digging by scientists.

The superintendent of nearby Scottsbluff National Monument estimates that his site now has 96,000 visitors a year and that the Agate Monument could conceivably attract 50,000 per year. The proposed project would include almost 3,000 acres of land, construction of a visitor's center, an Indian artifacts museum, and development of a museum at the fossil quarries. Three stories could be told at the site: First, paleontology of of the area dating back 21 million years; second, pioneer ranching; and third, the Indian experiences of Capt. James Cook—Government Indian scout, cattleman, author and amateur bone collector, who purchased Agate Springs in 1887. It was Captain Cook who earlier discovered the first fossil material in an area now recognized to be one of the world's richest finds.

The Regional Director of the National Park Service, Omaha, Nebr., is now preparing a final report of the Advisory Board of National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments, and both Federal and State officials feel that these fossil beds should be preserved for research and future generations. The area could be developed into a prime tourist attraction in addition to neighboring Scottsbluff National Monument, Chimney Rock, the Black Hills, and so forth.

As presently proposed, the cost of the project would run an estimated $1,750,000—including the acquisition of the land, construction of a visitor center, an Indian artifacts museum, development of a museum at the quarries, and the paving of roads to the fossil sites.

I believe this is a worthwhile project, and I feel it is our duty to protect these fossil quarries for additional research and posterity.

Jobs Going Begging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a recent column by John Chamberlain in the New York Journal-American points to the fact that there are many more jobs going begging in our society than is commonly realized. As Chamberlain says, the long "help wanted" columns in our newspapers indicate the many job opportunities for workers at all levels of the skill ladder.

In order to provide workers, and especially the unemployed, with marketable skills for this age of automation and technological change, we need effective training and retraining programs. It would be a mistake, however, to think that all the job vacancies in our society require a high level of skill. Many persons could qualify if they had the interest and put forth a minimum of personal effort. Mr. Chamberlain presents a thought-provoking column discussing this problem and under unanimous consent I include it in the RECORD at this point:

THE PUZZLE PIECES JUST DON'T FIT

(By John Chamberlain)

The job of us professional commentators, or licensed libertines, as Arthur Krock once called our breed, is to suggest answers to certain perplexing questions. Well, we try. But there are so many contradictions between official claims and statistics, on the one hand, and the evidence of our senses on the other, that the business becomes almost impossible at times.

For example, there are the unemployment figures and the projections therefrom. Automation, so it is said, is putting a hard core of irreclaimable people out of work. Maybe this is true. But the other day I started reading the "help wanted" columns of a daily newspaper. Having just been informed that 50 percent of the unemployed in New England, which happens to be my section of the country, are women, I looked at the "female help wanted" section first.

The results startled me, for, though many of the advertisements called for some kind of training, most of them were asking for a type of schooling or apprenticeship that almost anybody could obtain with even a minimum of get-up-and-go.

How much experience does a woman need in order to act as an attendant in a coin-operated laundromat, for instance? Or to become a cocktail waitress or a part-time counter girl? Or, given a natural gift of sharp eyes, to succeed as a proofreader? Or, given some previous business life, to take a crack at managing a snack bar.

These are some of the jobs that are, at the moment, going begging. And there seem to be scores of openings for typists, and registered nurses, and cleaning women, and dental assistants, and for general office workers, and for waitresses, and for sewing machine operators.

The list of openings for the more obvious types of trained or semitrained women went on and on, occasionally interspersed with a request for some more esoteric skill. Not many, I imagine, could meet the requirements demanded of a mortgage girl or a legal secretary or a claims examiner with a knowledge of surgical instruments. But if such skills are needed in our economy, surely there are good openings for teachers who know how to teach them.

The "male help wanted" columns seemed to be filled with notes of urgency. Barbers, cooks, automobile mechanics, accountants, adjusters, auto seat cover installers, simonizers, concrete masonry workers, countermen, drill press operators, welders, newsboys, dishwashers, steel warehousemen, rate clerks, registered pharmacists, salesmen of all types and descriptions, porters, plumbers, pressmen, clam and oyster openers, tool and diemakers, delivery vehicle drivers, science and mathematics teachers, commercial artists, service station attendants, motel managers, linotype operators—well, the list eventually became a droning bore to read.

Some of these job openings are obviously closed to beginners. But, again, how much ambition or cash does it take to get some training if you really want a job?

Programed Learning—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a new innovation in educational methods is being actively promoted by Dr. M. W. Sullivan, of Sullivan Associates, an organization located in the 10th Congressional District of California. The method is called programed learning, and it presents some extremely worthwhile possibilities for improving instruction.

Because Congress so frequently considers legislation involving education and instruction, I feel it is most important that my colleagues become acquainted with Dr. Sullivan's efforts.

Following is an article which appeared in the Palo Alto (Calif.) Times of May 1, 1963, describing Dr. Sullivan's work. This is the first in a series of three articles appearing on the subject, and I heartily commend it to the attention of my colleagues. The article follows:

PUPILS IN MOUNTAIN VIEW'S WHISMAN DISTRICT DEVELOPING IN READING SKILLS RAPIDLY

(By Derek Schoen)

A first-grade student suprised his parents and teachers by suddenly reading the family newspaper.

A second-grade girl, put into a remedial class because of her inability to read, 6 months later was reading as a third-grade level.

A third-grade boy, unable to read even one word, reached a second-grade reading level in 3½ months.

These are but a few of the more dramatic aspects of a revolution in education already touching one area school district and bidding to sweep the Nation in the near future.

The revolution goes by the name of programed learning. And it is being fomented locally in a pair of weather-beaten wood frame buildings in Palo Alto's foothills.

Occupant of the foothills headquarters is the firm of Sullivan Associates, a tightly knit crew of educators who started out together at Hollins College in Virginia in 1958 and remained a team during a switch to California in 1961.

LEADER

Major domo of the firm is M. W. Sullivan, 37, a lanky, bald, and outspoken individualist who predicts without hesitation that programed learning will sweep out and replace traditional forms of instruction within the decade.

And Sullivan is getting backing these days for his claims from administrators and teachers at the Wisman Elementary School District in Mountain View, where Sullivan Associates reading materials are being used for the first time.

What is programed learning? The technique is easiest to understand if its broken down into its component parts.

1. Information is fed to the students through a series of small steps—usually one sentence or paragraph at a time requiring a single definite answer.

2. The student receives the information in a logical sequence, with each step building on those that came before.

3. Each step requires the student to write an answer—concentration and patricipation are thus insured.

4. The student checks his answer against the correct answer immediately and is thus assured of the correctness of his response.

5. Students work at their own speed and level of ability.

The basis for programed learning can be expressed in a simple formula—response plus reinforcement equals learning.

In the Sullivan Associates materials now being used in several Whisman district classes, the program takes the form of a book with pages divided vertically into two sections.

ANSWER

On one section, the material is presented and the response called for—the student is asked to fill in a blank or circle a correct answer. The second section of the page gives the correct answer. The student keeps the answer section covered with a simple slider until he's ready to check his answer.

The entire technique, explains Sullivan, is keyed to a single idea—learning takes place when the student sees that he has made correct response to a given fact or concept.

"Psychologists and educators have known this for years. That's why teachers ask questions in the classroom or ask students to write answers on a blackboard," says Sullivan.

But until programing evolved, he adds, "there was on method for taking anything like full advantage of what we knew." He notes that while one student was answering a question in the class, the teacher had to hope that the other students were responding mentally.

"You might call that sort of thing vicarious learning. It was hit-and-miss education and it simply didn't and doesn't work except for the very bright student," says Sullivan.

The programed approach forces students to respond—not once or twice a class as in a classroom question-and-answer period, but literally dozens of times each hour.

RESPONSE

Furthermore, the program is written so that the average student makes the correct response about 95 percent of the time. The high proportion of correct answers is attributable to the painstaking, step-by-step methods in which material is presented.

Their success in responding correctly encourages students. And, since each student works at his own pace, the slow student is now constantly reminded that he's falling behind.

"In the normal classroom," says Sullivan, "the teacher has to contend with a wide range of ability. If the teacher pegs his teaching to the brightest children, the slower ones get discouraged and often simply give up. If the teaching aims at the slow students, the bright ones get bored.

"Consequently, teachers and textbook authors have most often tried to satisfy the so-called average student, with the result that both the bright and slow students were neglected," he says.

Because programs require all students to work individually, and at their own pace, the teacher is free to give individual attention to any student who needs it without halting the learning process for everyone in the classroom, adds Sullivan.

Dr. B. F. Skinner, Harvard University psychologist, is generally credited with founding programed learning. Through his experiments with animals, Skinner concluded that learning occurs when the student responds correctly.

PIGEONS

In order to teach pigeons to walk from one point to another, for instance, Skinner rewarded the birds by giving them food for each step they took in the right direction. Thus rewarded, the pigeons quicky learned the trick—and other more sophisticated tricks like playing ping pong and pecking out a tune on a toy piano.

But the human, Skinner also concluded, does not need external rewards such as food or even praise to learn. Just getting the correct answer to a problem is reward enough to reinforce human learning.

The new technique was first applied to the field of teaching machines. Sullivan himself designed, as far back as 1945, a machine that utilized a tape recorder for classroom teaching.

But machines, which are used widely today for teaching such subjects as foreign languages, have several drawbacks, according to Sullivan. First, they are extremely expensive. Secondly, the machines are costly to maintain and are subject to frequent breakdowns.

Thus Sullivan and other programers across the country have turned back to what he terms "the original teaching machine"—the book.

And now, armed with a means for getting programed learning into the schools at relatively small cost, the advocates of the technique feel they're on the threshold of a revolution in education. And the breakthrough, claims Sullivan, may well be under way today in the Whisman district.

White Collar Boom Far Outpaces Blue Collar Job Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the dramatic changes taking place in the composition of the U.S. labor force and the impact of advancing technology are highlighted in an excellent article in the Wall Street Journal of May 7, 1963. This article makes clear that employment in professional and technical jobs and other white-collar occupations has increased at a very rapid rate since the end of World War II and that even now more employment opportunities are opening up in these fields than there are people to fill them.

The article offers persuasive evidence of a fact which I have been pointing out for some time. The increases in white-collar employment would be even larger if trained workers were available to occupy the countless job openings. As one example, the article points out that over 20 percent of the full-time nursing jobs budgeted at non-Federal general hospitals were going beginning at the end of last year.

The growing need for more workers in many white-collar occupations is also shown by the rapid increases in salaries in these jobs over the past few years. It is my own belief that there are probably as many actual and potential jobs going begging in our society today as there are unemployed workers.

Increasing consumer demand in the economy—the heart of the administration approach—will not put the unemployed back to work. What is required is a public and private program of job retraining which will upgrade the quality of our labor force at all skill levels.

In this way, jobs at the upper end of the skill ladder, which are created as a result of advancing technology, can be filled as those workers with moderate skills learn advanced skills. As they move up the skill ladder, jobs for those with lesser skills, including the unemployed, will open up.

In order to further understanding of the real nature of our unemployment problem, under unanimous consent, I insert this article from the May 7 issue of the Wall Street Journal in the RECORD at this point:

WHITE-COLLAR BOOM: GROWTH IN OFFICE FORCE SINCE 1947 FAR OUTPACES BLUE-COLLAR JOB LOSS—PROFESSIONAL AND TECHNICAL RANKS INCREASE FASTEST—SOME JOBS GO BEGGING—AUTOMATION'S IMPACT AT BELL

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

The American economy since World War II has generated about four new white-collar jobs for each blue-collar and farm paycheck eliminated by advancing technology.

And white-collar job generation gains momentum. It's faster now than in early postwar years. It spawns more employment opportunities than there are people able to fill them.

Official head counters now put the white-collar multitude around 30 million. That's half again as big as the 20 million total of 1947, just after the war. The increase of nearly 10 million matches the combined population of Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia and Detroit.

Much more publicized, the contraction of farm-plus-blue-collar jobs over the same period has amounted to only about 2.6 million.

The following job figures tell the story:

	1962	1947
White-collar workers	29,900,000	20,100,000
Farm and blue collar	29,000,000	31,600,000

Not included by Government tabulators in either of the above groups are service workers—household help, waiters, firemen, policemen. Jobs in this area have soared nearly 50 percent since the war, from 5,900,000 to $8,800,000.

The climb of white-collar employment—nearly 50 percent since 1947—is far sharper than the country's 30 percent population increase in the same span. Overall, U.S. employment has risen only 17 percent in the period.

Within the white-collar group, the increase of professional and technical workers has been spectacular. Since 1947, the number of such workers has swelled 112 percent, to 8,040,000 last year.

Other white-collar increases: Managers and nonfarm proprietors, up 28 percent since 1947; clerical workers, up 40 percent; sales workers up 28 percent.

IMPACT OF SELF-SERVICE

The last-mentioned category, it's noteworthy, has contracted slightly in recent years, to 4,346,000 last year from a record 4,439,000 in 1961. The decline stems chiefly from the use of self service at stores, employment authorities say.

The growth of white-collar jobs in the steel industry prompts the Philadelphia Federal Reserve Bank, in its April review of business, to predict facetiously:

"The time may come when it will take a ton of paper to make a ton of steel."

Between 1950 and 1961, the bank observes, white-collar personnel in steel company offices and laboratories climbed to 117,000 from 89,000, reflecting "the growing emphasis upon research, managerial control, public relations, Government reports and other needs for paper work." During the same span, the study notes, blue-collar employment in steel mills dropped from 503,000 to 403,000.

The rise of white-collar employment has been more rapid in the last 8 years than in the previous 8 of the postwar period. The table below shows the percentage increase in 1947–54 and in 1955–62 for all white-collar personnel as well as for each white-collar category.

[In percent]

	Gain in 1955–62	Gain in 1947–54
All white collars	22	18
Professional and technical	39	47
Managers and proprietors	15	7
Clerical workers	21	13
Sales workers	9	16

The pattern seems to belie concern that the growth of white-collar employment is being cut by office automation. The rise of clerical jobs—an especially vulnerable area according to the automation argument—has been particularly sharp in the recent period, the breakdown shows.

The employment record of American Telephone & Telegraph Co. provides a revealing history of automation's impact on white-collar employment.

Largely because of automated dialing techniques, the operator force of A.T. & T.'s Bell System is some 6,000 smaller now than at the start of the postwar period—despite vastly increased business. Yet, total Bell System employment in the postwar period has increased by more than 250,000.

MORE ENGINEERS, SCIENTISTS

Over 20,000 jobs have been added to Bell's engineering department alone since the war. And Bell Laboratories provides some 7,000 more posts for scientists and other highly skilled personnel now than after the war. Nearly all these new jobs are white collar.

The increase of white-collar employment would be sharper still if trained workers were available to occupy countless job openings requiring skill.

There's no overall measure of such openings, but the table below points to the pattern. It lists job openings placed in clearance by State employment security agencies (a process of matching workers in one State with jobs in other States). The figures, of course, represent only a tiny fraction of all openings. End of year totals are used.

	1962	1958	Percent gain
Engineers	4,600	4,175	10
Stenographers and typists	1,904	635	200
Teachers	1,795	1,433	25
Trained nurses	1,331	798	67
Draftsmen	950	295	222
Social workers	777	575	35
Managers	224	109	106
Accountants	216	53	308

"In countless specialized fields, labor is a very scarce commodity today," declares Gertrude Deutsch, an economist specializing in employment statistics at the New York-based National Industrial Conference Board.

Over a fifth of the full-time nursing jobs budgeted at non-Federal general hospitals were unfilled at the end of last year, reports the American Nurses Association. As recently as 1955, only 11 percent of such jobs were unfilled, according to the American Nurses Association.

The rate of such vacancies has increased despite a rise of about 40 percent in the Nation's registered nurse force since 1955. "The nurse shortage is becoming even worse than it has been in recent years," says an American Nurses Association official.

The gnawing need for skilled white-collar workers is reflected by the swift rise of salaries in many occupations.

The average salary of a general duty hospital nurse, for instance, has leaped more than 40 percent since 1955. In the same span, the average salary of elementary and secondary public school teachers has increased about 45 percent and the average salary of clerical workers has climbed about 35 percent.

The average weekly earnings of production workers in manufacturing industries, by comparison, have increased only 29 percent since 1955.

Department of Labor figures pinpoint the rise of white-collar workers in major industries.

In 1947, fewer than one-quarter of chemical company employes were white-collar personnel. About 40 percent of today's chemical workers are in the white-collar category.

Primary metals producers, such as aluminum and steel concerns, now employ one white-collar worker for every four blue-collar workers. Just after World War II, the ratio was only one for nine.

In the petroleum industry, swept by automation, white-collar workers account for some 40 percent of total employment. The 1947 rate: Under 25 percent.

Rubber companies employ one white-collar worker for three blue collars, up from less than one for five in early postwar years.

White-collar jobs make up one-third of the work force in the giant transportation equipment industry—ranging from auto producers to railroad car makers. The 1947 rate: Less than 20 percent.

Idea That Soviet System Is Maturing Is Dangerous Illusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on April 26, Mr. John Davis Lodge, our former Ambassador to Spain and now national president of Junior Achievement, Inc., addressed the Commonwealth Club of California on the subject "Idea That Soviet System Is Maturing Is Dangerous Illusion."

His remarks and advice from the wealth of his experience is very apropos to our problems today:

"IDEA THAT SOVIET SYSTEM IS MATURING IS DANGEROUS ILLUSION"—JOHN DAVIS LODGE

(From address by His Excellency, John Davis Lodge, former Ambassador to Spain; national president, Junior Achievement, Inc.)

"It was the best of times. It was the worst of times. It was the age of wisdom. It was the age of foolishness. It was the epoch of belief. It was the epoch of incredulity. It was the season of light. It was the season of darkness. It was the spring of hope. It was the winter of despair."

Certainly these words, with which Charles Dickens began his "Tale of Two Cities," dealing with the year 1775 just prior to our

American Revolution, summarize our present world situation.

Man—with his great achievements, his staggering scientific discoveries—yet faces the threat of annihilation.

AT EXPENSE OF OLD FRIENDSHIPS

The State Department and indeed the United Nations are obviously trying at the expense of old friendships to be popular with new nations.

The United States is friendlier toward India than towards her victim, Portugal. And this in spite of the fact that India ignored the right of the people of Goa to self-determination, and that Portugal is a small nation compared to India—and that our bases in the Azores came up for renegotiation last January.

The Dutch, the Belgians, the French, the Portuguese, and the British do not enjoy our doctrinaire, somewhat sanctimonious, anticolonial attitude, especially since we don't often talk about the Russian colonies—the greatest and most tyrannical colonial empire in the history of man. Yet we joined Russia in demanding that the U.N. investigate Portuguese Angola.

Last summer, while on active naval duty with the 7th Fleet in the Far East, I had opportunity to observe the dark clouds charging down upon us.

Among our friends and allies there is considerable dismay regarding the drift in our foreign affairs.

CONCESSIONS ENCOURAGE SOVIET "MATURITY"

To suggest, as the administration has repeatedly suggested, that the Soviet Union is maturing, and that concessions will encourage further maturity, is a naive and egregious error. This struggle in 1963 is just as intense, the threat just as menacing, as at any time in the past 17 years.

The theory that Khrushchev represents an evolution, that the Soviet Union is not only at odds with Chinese communism but is moving toward modification and moderation, is a dangerous illusion.

SAME STORY ALL OVER AGAIN

This whole concept is the same story all over again. Russia has a capacity for putting it over which is almost incredible and some have an equally incredible capacity for accepting what Russia is propagating.

In 1961, 3,600 million pieces of Soviet literature inundated us and our friends and allies. We facilitate this in the United States by free postage, decreed by the President. We are paying for it.

Russia is weaker than we are, she has no real internal unity, she is saddled with a colonial empire that detests her, and yet she gains position after position.

It is a catastrophe that we of the Western World should be so drugged with half-truths and distortions, and that public support has not been mobilized to a realization of the imminent and implacable danger.

KHRUSHCHEV LOST FACE BUT GAINED OBJECTIVE

In Cuba, following the disaster at the Bay of Pigs, the obscene Communist dictator Castro has, assisted by his Communist allies and in spite of our brief action last October, built a fortress where tanks, Russian migs, heavy artillery, arms, supplies, and mercenaries in large numbers, constitute an increasing threat 90 miles from our shore.

While Khrushchev temporarily lost face, he has effectively accomplished his objective—not to destroy the United States by nuclear force, but to protect his conquest of Cuba and to help him conquer other nations in our hemisphere.

RED CONQUEST BY GUERRILLA WAR

The fact is that the many millions of people who since World War II have been subjugated by the Communist tyranny have been defeated in no case by nuclear attack and in no case by the contagion of the Communist doctrine.

They have been conquered by guerrilla warfare, a kind of warfare which our gallant Spanish friends understand well. They've been conquered by infiltration and subversion, by blackmail or coercion and bribery, by external pressure and internal force—and we Americans must learn to operate effectively in this twilight zone of action in which the Communists excel. We must also concentrate more on conventional forces (as General Norstad recently pointed out) in order not to be confronted with an all-or-nothing choice.

In Berlin there is a precarious standoff which could be turned against us by reckless and timid miscalculations, such as occurred in the Bay of Pigs. The ransom to liberate 1,113 Cuban heroes certainly appeal to our sense of humanity and brotherhood. Yet, their freedom was obtained by helping our enemy materially and psychologically.

Certainly we had an obligation but the honorable way to rescue them was to help them to carry out theri original noble objectives—to rescue—not bribe them.

In Laos, the troyka coalition government, endorsed at Geneva and organized by the United States, as I said last summer, has done nothing to prevent Communist infiltration—and indeed helped bring the leftists to a controlling position.

The Communist Viet Cong terrorists have warned there can be no peace in Laos while war is being waged in South Vietnam.

In South Vietnam we are heading toward a second Dien Bien Phu some 10 years later, an American version. I think we should make an allout effort to win, or withdraw.

AIDED LEFTISTS AGAINST PRO-WESTERN THAIS

We gave leftist Cambodia economic aid in spite of Thailand's objection. Thailand is pro-Western.

The Prime Minister of Singapore says either there will be a Malaysia quickly or the Communists will take over his city-state and the rest of southeast Asia.

The Indonesian leader Sukarno, having gained West New Guinea, is now threatening North Borneo, Brunei, and Sarawak. the Russians have given Sukarno $1,400 million military and economic aid.

The United States encouraged transfer of West New Guinea from the Dutch to Sukarno, although there is no relationship between the Papuas and the Indonesians. The Indonesians have acted like old-fashioned imperialists.

REDS WINNING SOUTHEAST ASIA

The President of the Philippines stated last year that the Communists were winning southeast Asia. The situation is much worse now.

In the field of diplomacy our pattern of what is called "flexibility" against the Communist threat has produced discouragement and lack of confidence among our friends—and few discernible results favorable to our cause. Perhaps we should be more flexible toward our partners—less flexible toward our enemies.

We might consider whether it might be better to be firm in Berlin—rather against pro-Western Tsombe in the Congo.

Perhaps we should be more indignant against the Russian imperialists in their brutal assault against freedom fighters in their colony Hungary than over the fact that our NATO partner Portugal is determined to resist the Communist-inspired attack against the people of Angola.

Instead of waxing resentment over the fact that General Franco, who has since 1953 cooperated fully with the United States, still rules Spain—prosperous Spain—perhaps it would be better to dewell on the monstrous fiasco of the invasion of Cuba and on the monstrous fact that a Communist dictator threatens us in our entire hemisphere.

UNITE RATHER THAN REFORM

We have stated officially we have no desire to reform our enemies. Let us not then attempt to reform our friends. Let us try to unite rather than to reform.

It is not too late to take effective action, but it will take time. Let us be as resourceful in thinking up reasons why it is to our interest and the entire free world to act as we are in thinking up reasons why it is not.

Let us hope that our leaders in Washington will at long last understand that peace is the product of strength, that war is the result of weakness, and that appeasement merely multiplies the hazards of war.

Castro has taught us a bitter lesson: That he who proclaims himself a Communist can count on help from the Soviet Union—even though he is 9,000 miles away—and he who proclaims himself a lover of freedom can fight and die 90 miles from the shores of the United States—and no one will come to his aid. And now we are helping to make the Caribbean physically safe for the Communists.

U.S. POWER IMMOBILIZED?

Americans are in South Vietnam, just as Russians are in Cuba, yet no orders have gone out to prevent Viet Cong attacks on American soldiers. Russian officers are present in Laos, as advisers to the Red side.

Khrushchev may well convice himself that American fear of a confrontation will immobilize American power in Laos as it has in the Caribbean.

Winston Churchill summed it up for us, as he has many times. He said:

"Still if you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory can be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance to survive. There may even be a worse case: You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory and it will be better to perish than to live in slavery."

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Question (R. Cathcart): "Will Franco survive wave of strikes predicted for summer?"

Answer. Strikes in Spain have been small compared to United States. Spain is very stable, with practically no juvenile delinquency, low crime rate, low suicide rate. Recent strikes were handled with moderation on both sides and I hope that will be the case this summer.

Question (William J. Ebert): "How does Junior Achievement plan to overcome Communist threat at home?"

Answer. The only way it meets the Communist threat is that young people, forming their own corporations under advice of professional businessmen, learn about the free enterprise system by their own experience; manufacture and sell their own products. Polled, 91 percent of Junior Achievement youth were against state taking over business. This contrasted with much lower percentage by those not enrolled in Junior Achievement. This itself leads to healthy dislike of communism and its methods.

Question (Howard C. Ellis): "What is actual condition of Red China militarily and economically?"

Answer. It would be mistake to conclude because she is in bad shape economically, she cannot wage war. We should give as much aid as we can to Nationalists. I was at Quemoy last year while on naval duty. If I were an enemy, I'd hate to have to make a landing there.

Question (W. M. Strother): "Prospects of getting communism out of Cuba?"

Answer. All sorts of things could have been done, still could be, but it is getting more difficult every day. Prospects are good if we decide what we ought to do and do it.

Castro's Moscow Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, Khrushchev is now confident that he has won the battle for Cuba and it is safely behind the Iron Curtain. The invitation to Castro to visit Moscow, the joint insulting statements directed toward the United States, all were intended to demonstrate that Cuba now belongs to Khrushchev and, that as far as the Communists are concerned, the Monroe Doctrine is dead.

The failure of President Kennedy to take a firm stand against Communist aggression in the Western Hemisphere; his refusal to invoke the Monroe Doctrine, his acceptance of Soviet terms on keeping Russian arms and soldiers in Cuba, gave Khrushchev this victory.

We can seize the initiative again in ridding this hemisphere of Communist subversion, but only if the President will demonstrate courage and support the demand of the American people to put the security of the United States ahead of his fears and frustrations. The Monroe Doctrine must be reinstated, the Communists driven out of Cuba and that country returned to its people. If the President is unable or unwilling to be the true leader of the United States, he should so state before it is too late.

The propaganda victory President Kennedy has given to Khrushchev through mishandling the Cuban situation is told in the following article from the U.S. News & World Report of May 13:

WHEN KHRUSHCHEV AND CASTRO GET TOGETHER—WHAT THE MOSCOW MEETING MEANS

Fidel Castro, by his state visit to Moscow, has made formal the position of Cuba as Russia's first satellite in the Western Hemisphere.

Castro traveled abroad, confident of his position at home. He had public assurance against any move by his neighbor, the United States, to cause him trouble at this time. The United States, too, was acting to keep in check anti-Castro Cubans.

It is clear that Khrushchev shared Castro's confidence. Soviet experts say Khrushchev wouldn't have risked his own prestige by having Castro in Moscow if he thought there were any possibility of imminent trouble in Cuba.

Castro was communism's May Day hero in Moscow. But there was more to the trip than public display.

When Khrushchev and Castro got together in the Soviet Union, their objectives were described as varied:

By meeting, the two leaders of Communist states advertised their confidence that they can carry forward an anti-U.S. operation unmolested, right under the nose of the United States. Soviet diplomats proclaimed the death of the Monroe Doctrine shortly after Castro landed in Russia.

There was the opportunity to explore openings and programs to promote communism more aggressively in the countries of Latin America.

Castro was able, at first hand, to sell Khrushchev and others in the Communist hierarchy on the benefits that could flow to them from stepped-up aid to Cuba in armament, food merchandise, and equipment of many kinds.

Khrushchev, for his part, gained an opportunity to seek assurances from Castro that Russian guidance would be accepted to a greater degree in trying to bring some order out of economic chaos on the island. It is known that many top Communists are concerned because what they had hoped to make a show window of Communist success in the Western Hemisphere looks more like a junk heap under Castro.

The Russians, too, by honoring Castro, sought from him a commitment that he would go along with the Soviet Union and avoid ties with Red China on issues that are dividing world communism.

Both men saw the trip as a blow to U.S. prestige in all of Latin America.

THE INVITATION

It seems agreed that initiative for the meeting came from Moscow. There had been a long-standing, generalized invitation to Castro to visit the Soviet Union, but it was vague in terms of time.

There are signs that, when the trip did come, it was planned in a hurry. The purpose may have been to forestall a gesture by Castro that would be regarded as favorable to Red China. Castro could be displayed in Moscow as the symbol of Soviet Russia's first territorial gain since the years just after World War II—and the first such gain under Khrushchev.

In Russia, Cuba is now dealt with as a full-fledged Soviet satellite. In greeting Castro, the Soviet dictator described the bearded Cuban as "the envoy of the first Socialist revolution on the American Continent."

Cuba, as a satellite, is listed in alphabetical order among the Communist-bloc nations. The Communist May Day slogan for Cuba is similar in phrasing with those of other satellites—worded to a pattern made in Moscow.

The Russians seem confident that their American satellite is nailed down. But there is evidence that they are not altogether happy with the way Castro is operating that satellite.

The Communist empire is supplying Cuba with aid that amounts to about $1 million a day. They are pouring in petroleum, meat, rice, fats and oils, steel, wire, tractors, buses, road machinery, and many other things.

Khrushchev has had to tap his European satellites for materials to keep Cuba operating. Czechoslovakia, in particular, is providing a substantial share of this aid—and the Czechoslovaks are publicly grumbling about the burden they bear and about the inefficiencies of Castro and those about him.

SUGAR SHORTAGE

In spite of all the help that Castro is getting, the economy of Cuba appears to be running steadily downhill. Cuba's total output is down 25 percent from what it was 3 years ago, and is still declining. Estimates are that the main trading crop—sugar—will be less than 4 million tons this year. That is just about half what it was in the best years before Castro came to power.

Living standards for larger and larger sections of the Cuban population are dropping steadily. Letters from Cubans to refugees in the United States increasingly plead for shoes, medicine, clothing, food, and other necessities.

Castro needs more help than he is getting. The price he may have to pay is to grant Moscow closer supervision of Cuban affairs so more efficient use can be made of the aid the Soviet Union is willing to supply.

Castro has been a troublesome character for the Russians to deal with right along, as Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan reported last year after his visit to Cuba. Castro is unstable and volatile, and not dependable from the Kremlin viewpoint. It seems clear to experts on Soviet affairs that Khrushchev decided the time had come to summon Castro to Moscow and give him a talking to.

More than just the plight of Cuba is involved in the visit. Communist politics at the highest level enter in.

Official experts in Britain who study such things say the Castro trip is a major move in the mounting competition between Russia and Red China for Communist leadership.

According to these experts, the side that gets Castro's active cooperation will gain a decisive advantage in Latin America. Since Khrushchev announced the withdrawal of Soviet missiles from Cuba last autumn, Castro has been flirting politically with the Chinese Reds.

Khrushchev may have called Castro to Moscow suddenly because he got word that Castro had scheduled a high-level meeting with the Chinese Communists for later this month. With Castro's cooperation, the Chinese Reds have been preparing to make a major bid for the allegiance of all Communist parties in latin America.

The Kremlin, already worried by Chinese successes in the Communist Parties of Asia and Africa, considers it of prime importance to block such gains in Latin America. And the experts say the Castro trip may accomplish that Khrushchev can point out to Castro that China is doing next to nothing for Cuba, while Russia is doing a great deal, and at considerable financial sacrifice.

Specifically, it is believed that Khrushchev wants Castro to drop his plans for a conference in Havana of representatives from underdeveloped countries around the world. The Red Chinese, who induced the Cubans to propose this meeting, have been counting on it as a way to establish a foothold among Latin America's Communists.

Castro is known to be anxious to stay on good terms with both the Russian and Chinese Communists. There has been speculation in Britain, and among some U.S. experts, that he might visit Peiping in an effort to keep himself balanced between the two Communist factions.

But talk of such a visit has been generally discounted, for several reasons, since Castro showed up in Moscow.

For one thing, the Chinese under present circumstances are thought to be unwilling to play second fiddle to Khruschev as hosts to Castro. Another point is that Castro, needing more economic props from Moscow, wouldn't go to China without Khrushchev's approval—which he is not likely to get.

PRICE TAG ON CASTRO

What price is Khrushchev prepared to pay for Castro's help in the power struggle within communism?

American experts disagree, but British officials believe Khrushchev is prepared to promise to keep Soviet troops in Cuba indefinitely—or, at a minimum, until Cubans can be thoroughly trained in the handling of their Soviet weapons.

The logic in this reasoning is that the withdrawal of Soviet missiles and bombers from Cuba has left Castro uncertain as to just how solid are Russian military intentions in the Western Hemisphere. As a means of reassuring Castro, some experts would not be surprised to see the Moscow trip produce a mutual-defense pact between Cuba and the Soviet Union.

If that happens, it will be Russia's first formal military alliance in the Americas—and will raise anew the question of when and where the Monroe Doctrine applies. That doctrine is a U.S. pledge—now broadened to include the backing of the Organization of American States—to prevent the establishment of any foreign system of government in the Western Hemisphere.

Specialists in Soviet affairs—both British and American—do not expect Khrushchev to support or encourage Castro in any action to try to force the United States out of its Guantánamo naval base in Cuba.

They say the Soviet leader knows that the United States, if provoked, could overthrow the Communist regime in Cuba by military action. They also say that, should military force be used, Khrushchev would scream about U.S. aggression, and might even harass the Americans in Berlin—but that he is not willing to risk a war to save Castro.

Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on May 7 and 8, the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station at New Haven marks the 75th anniversary of work in two important fields of science that have contributed greatly to this Nation's eminence in farm technology and its steadily advancing standards of living. The areas of scientific work to be commemorated are botany and plant pathology.

Scientists from numerous States, Canada, Great Britain, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture have gathered at New Haven to present papers and take part in discussions on topics such as the history of plant pathology, biochemical resistance, and plant chemotherapy.

They were welcomed on May 7 by Director James G. Horsfall, himself an internationally recognized plant pathologist.

I am pleased to represent the district which includes this pioneer station. Its accomplishments are legion, and I would like to take this opportunity to mention briefly a few of its many notable achievements.

The Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station is the oldest such station in the United States. Since 1875, its business has been and continues to be the scientific investigation of agriculture's problems and related ones. Its product has been and continues to be discovery in the biological sciences.

The Connecticut station's first director was Dr. Samuel W. Johnson. He fathered the idea on which the American experiment station movement was founded and succeeded. This was "that an experiment station should be near to but not a part of an academy." Johnson had a unique combination of scholarship, ability as a writer and speaker, and missionary zeal for the principle that knowledge needs to be sought before it can be taught. He was one of the active leaders in bringing about establishment of the State agricultural experiment stations under the Federal Hatch Act of 1887, 13 years after Connecticut's "first station in the Nation" was founded.

In 1868, he published "How Crops Grow," a book described at the time of his death in 1909 as more widely read and studied than any other work on agricultural chemistry ever issued. It was translated into German, Russian, Swedish, and Italian, and used as a textbook in those languages. It was followed in 1870 by a second book, "How Crops Feed."

It was, therefore, a fitting tribute when the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station on March 29 announced a series of annual lectures named for its first director, Samuel W. Johnson. The first lecture in the series will be given by an internationally known speaker as the principal address at the annual "Science at Work" meeting, to be held at Lockwood Farm, Mount Carmel, on Wednesday, August 14.

A leaflet issued last year, "The Connecticut Station Story," tells of outstanding accomplishments at the station during its first 75 years. Among them was the corn seed production technique first used by Donald F. Jones in 1917. He invented the four-way cross that made hybrid corn practical. Protein investigations by Thomas B. Osborne led to the discovery of the significance of amino acids in the diet. The Morgan universal extractant, simulating the action of plant roots in removing minerals from the soil solution, made possible the widely used Morgan method for quick-testing soils. The zineb fungicides had their origin in research at the Connecticut station, and organic fungicides generally are originally tested by methods or modifications of methods the station developed. Station research made the tobacco shade tent practical in 1900, thereby creating a new agricultural industry in the Connecticut Valley.

In his report to Gov. John N. Dempsey in 1961, Director James G. Horsfall most ably defined the purpose and nature of the work done by the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station—and by those established subsequently in all the other States—in the following words:

> This station was established as a unique venture of government in 1875. It was to discover knowledge and put it to work. The station is unique today among agencies of government whose reports are included in this digest.
>
> It is true that the statutes assign to the station specific duties, duties that in themselves have little to do with scientific investigations. In this respect the station is like other departments of State government. The station has been given these assignments, however, because they call for the skills and knowledge the station has in putting science to work.
>
> The general mandate, however, the responsibility for science, does not involve execution of manmade laws. It asks rather for discovery of natural laws and meanings of laws, and for information on their application now and in the future. We do not know why these laws came into being, or where, or when, and we are unlikely to find answers to these questions. We do know that natural laws cannot be evaded or repealed. Through organized research, men have made a bold beginning at the gigantic task of understanding how some of these laws work and how the knowledge gained can be used.

I congratulate the station on the occasion of its 75th anniversary, and I am sure that my colleagues in this House will join me in thanking the station and its most able director for its outstanding record of accomplishment and scientific contribution.

Taxes, Spending, and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago today the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, spoke before the chamber of commerce here in Washington, D.C., on the importance of a tax reduction this year.

His remarks explain succinctly the causes of our economy's lack of growth. They set forth the President's tax program as the best means of overcoming this chronic problem. It may serve as an example to those who endeavor to find common grounds for supporting this legislation.

Secretary Dillon's address merits the attention of this body, and under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including his address.

The address follows:

TAXES, SPENDING, AND FREEDOM

(Remarks by the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, Before the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, at the Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., April 30, 1963)

For the second general session of your annual meeting, you have chosen the theme, "Taxes, Spending, and Freedom." It is a theme both timely and significant. Timely, because in a relatively few weeks the House Ways and Means Committee will report out the tax bill it is now working on in executive session. And significant, because there is no more urgent task confronting the Nation today than the adoption of a program of tax reduction and reform, a program that is at once fair, substantial, and fiscally responsible.

There is no doubt in my mind that such a program will be enacted into law this year. The public testimony on the tax proposals has strengthened my earlier belief that tax reduction is essential. It is no surprise that, on an issue so complex, so farreaching and that so deeply affects so many people, there is no unanimity of agreement. What is genuinely remarkable is that the understandable and sometimes sharp disagreement on details has in no way weakened the strong and widespread consensus that only a thorough overhaul of our tax system can provide the lasting impetus our economy needs.

More than 200 witnesses have testified before the House Ways and Means Committee on the President's tax proposals. While their views have differed widely on specifics, only two of these witnesses have disagreed with the central thesis of the President's program, the need for a substantial tax reduction to encourage economic growth. While your organization, for example, has questioned certain details in the President's proposals, it has not questioned its aim.

In fact, you have made it very clear that you strongly support the principle of tax reduction as vital to the continuation of a healthy free economy. The practical question is: What can you actively do to make that goal a reality when you do not agree with all the means proposed to reach it? An excellent answer to that question has just been given by the group of distinguished business leaders who, last week, here in Washington, formed the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963 and who drew up a statement of principles upon which businessmen can unite in support of meaningful tax reduction in 1963.

Certainly, the time is ripe. Four or five months ago, few of us could have realistically expected that the economic conditions for a tax cut would be as favorable as they now seem. For, based upon the performance of our economy in the last few months, our prospects for the year are relatively better than most observers had expected. If the improvement continues, our estimated revenues for fiscal 1964 may well be more than we estimated in January perhaps by as much as a billion dollars, thus reducing the deficit.

Even more important, a tax cut when the economy is reasonably buoyant would be far more effective in carrying us toward full employment than a tax cut when the economy is merely limping along. For the tax program that the President has proposed is designed as a long-range program, a program not merely to shield us from an economic downturn, but to accelerate our economic growth well into the future. The present state of our economy is ideal for the inauguration of that kind of program.

As you are well aware, the aim of the President's tax proposals is to break the iron grip upon our economy of a tax system which helped control inflation during the Second World War and its aftermath, but which now throttles growth. It is a program to promote economic growth by promoting economic freedom. And by economic freedom I mean not only the freedom of the market place, of investment, and of enterprise, but the freedom that is the right of every American, to have the opportunity to work, to grow, and to prosper in accordance with his talents.

Far too many Americans have not had that opportunity for far to long a time. Not for a single month in the past 5 years has unemployment fallen below 5 percent. Yet for the greater part of the preceding 5 years, unemployment was either below or only slightly above the 4-percent level that many regard as reasonably full employment. Last month, 4½ million of our citizens could not find the jobs they sought.

Unless we do something now, the prospects are that many more millions will be unable to find jobs in the future. Next year, those young people who were born in 1946, the first year of the postwar baby boom, will turn 18 and begin to enter our labor force in large numbers. During the mid-sixties our labor force will have to absorb an average annual inflow of around 2,700,000 young people, compared to 1,800,000 during the mid-fifties, an increase of 50 percent. We must be able to provide jobs for all of these young men and women. And we must do it in a time of ever-increasing automation. For the impact of automation that has long been felt among our bluecollar factory workers is now spreading rapidly in the white-collar and service areas.

We welcome the progress of automation. But we cannot accept the unemployment that too often accompanies it. We can, and we must, take steps to meet, with a many-sided response, the twin challenge of automation and a rapidly growing labor force. The Government has a clear and direct responsibility in this area. But it will act only to the extent that the private economy cannot, or does not, meet this challenge.

The President's tax program is evidence of his belief that a free and vigorous private economy can provide our citizens with abundant job opportunities. Should we fail to achieve this kind of economy, let no one imagine that the result would be anything but catastrophic. For instance, Mr. W. P. Gullander, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, recently estimated that, if our economy continues to create jobs no faster than it has during the past 5 years, then, by 1970, our unemployment rate would soar to a shocking 12.7 percent.

The American people could never tolerate such a result. It would inevitably call forth massive governmental action to provide the jobs that our private economy had not provided. The President's tax program is proof enough that such a prospect is as unwelcome to us in Washington as it must be to you.

High unemployment is at once the most enduring and the most unendurable result of our slow growth over the past 5 years, but it is only one of the many ills which flow from an inadequate economic performance. The likelihood is that without a program of substantial tax reduction, our plants will continue to operate below the levels that businessmen themselves feel they need for most efficient production; that there will be no letup in the pressure upon profit margins; that new investment which, in real terms, is just equally the levels reached 6 years ago, will continue to lag, that we will, in short continue to suffer from the many ills that accompany an economy whose resources and incentives for growth are hampered by an overly restrictive tax system.

As long as our economy is so hampered, we are likely to continue to suffer as well from the chronic budgetary deficits that grow because our economy fails to grow. The record is clear that the deficit we now face is the result of an economy which produces too little, rather than of a government which spends too much. Let us briefly review that record:

We are all well aware that within the past 2 years the Soviet rulers felt enough confidence in their power to confront us with a military challenge on a scale we have not seen since the Berlin blockade, 15 years ago. Fortunately, President Kennedy had, in one of the very first moves of his administration, ordered a rapid and substantial buildup of our military power. It was this increased military strength and the steadfastness of our citizens that enabled us to withstand both the Berlin crisis of 1961 and the Cuban crisis of last fall. That military buildup was vital to preserve our freedoms. It was also expensive. Our annual defense budget grew by some $10 billion.

In addition to their military threat, the Soviets have also challenged us in the vast new arena of space. Thanks to a considerable headstart and rockets far larger than ours, they have been able, up to now, to outperform us in manned space flight and to capture the imagination of the world by their feats. But, in the spring of 1961, our Congress agreed with President Kennedy, that we were no longer willing to continue second best in space. It approved a program designed to put an American on the moon before the end of the decade, and hopefully before the arrival of any Soviet space explorer. That decision was extremely costly, but it involved far more than a symbolic race to the moon. It represented our clear determination as a nation that we will not permit the Soviet Union to preempt world leadership in a new and unknown environment whose potential we have scarcely begun to foresee.

These two decisions in defense and space, along with relatively normal increases in other programs vital to the needs of our growing population, have combined to push our expenditures substantially higher than the revenues we collect from our underemployed economy. I mean exactly what I say when I characterize these other increases as relatively normal. Because, for all programs except defense, space, and interest on the public debt, President Kennedy's current 1964 budget recommendations exceed actual 1961 expenditures by only $4.5 billion, as compared to an increase of $4.9 billion in these same programs during 3 preceding years, 1958–61. There can be no question that, if our economy were operating at reasonably full capacity, our tax system would today be producing more than enough revenue to finance our current national needs within a balanced budget. Instead of worrying about deficits we would be enjoying budgetary surpluses.

But the harsh truth is, that unless we release the drag which our tax system now exerts on our economy, we cannot hope to move significantly closer to a balanced budget. In fact, the experience of recent years has shown that exactly the opposite will take place.

Thus, we are faced with what might seem at first to be a paradox: while our present tax rates are so high that they would produce a substantial budget surplus at reasonably full employment, we have little hope of ever achieving that surplus unless we first reduce our tax rates.

Actually, this should not be very mysterious. The explanation is that the major factor in our economic progress, and, indeed, in the progress of any free market economy such as ours, is the vitality of the private sector, both the business community and the consuming public. The across-the-board reduction in our tax rates recommended by the President will stimulate both. We can expect more economic activity, and higher tax revenues, to result. This has been the record in the past, and there is no reason to expect that it will not prove to be the case again. We are not alone in this analysis of the results of tax reduction. One of the clearest statements of this thesis that I have ever seen reads as follows:

"Any appreciable downward revision in tax rates will, of course, cause an immediate reduction in revenues. But there is substantial evidence from the history of tax relief measures, particularly with respect to income taxes, that the initial revenue loss is soon made up by an increase in the tax base against which the lower rates are charged. There is evidence of this not only in our own experience but also in the experience of such countries as Canada, West Germany, and Austria, each of which has enacted several tax relief measures in the post-World War II period."

That statement was made by the National Council of State Chambers of Commerce in its bulletin on Federal Tax Facts, June 4, 1958.

Last year, we took our first important steps in tax relief. They were the enactment of the investment credit and the complete revision and extensive liberaliaztion, for the first time in 20 years, of the tax rules dealing with depreciation. The combined effect of these two actions was to reduce the taxload on business by some $2.5 billion a year, the equivalent of a five-point reduction in corporate taxes.

Today, business is reacting to these two measures as we had anticipated. The enlarged flow of new orders for machinery and equipment that marked the opening months of the year, and the recent striking increase in business appropriations for modernization and expansion, can be tracted largely to these two actions. Most of you, I am sure, have seen the report in the magazine, Iron Age, of the effect of these measures on the steel industry, an increase of 32 percent in depreciation writeoffs.

The investment credit and new depreciation guidelines were a preliminary part of the tax program now under consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee. That program, as you know, offers a broad, top-to-bottom reduction in tax rates, both corporate and personal, accompanied by a number of structural reforms. The overall result would be a reduction of $10.3 billion in taxes, designed to unleash our economy and allow it to reach its full potential.

The President's program is not weighted in favor of any one sector of the economy at the expense of any other. It recognizes the simple fact that a free-market economy requires both supply and demand. It also recognizes the fact that our economy consists of a complex and interdependent network of forces, and that we cannot lift the entire economy onto a new and higher plane of activity by lifting merely one sector of it.

Consider for a moment how the tax reductions are distributed in the President's program: Virtually one-half of the $10.3 billion in net tax reduction would go to taxpayers with incomes of $10,000 and under, and the other half to individuals with incomes higher than $10,000 and to corporations. When you include last year's investment credit and depreciation reform, the corporate share amounts to 40 percent of the administration's long-range tax reduction program. And roughly one-third, or nearly 32 percent, of the net tax reduction goes to middle-income taxpayers, those in the $10,000-to-$50,000 brackets.

The substantial rate reductions in the middle and upper income brackets offer a genuine spur to incentives for effort, initiative, and investment. Yet the rate reductions could not be as large as they are, and remain within the limits of fiscal responsibility, in the absence of the revenue-raising reforms. Without this additional revenue, tax-rate reduction would have to be more modest.

The question of fiscal responsibility has given our people the greatest concern in their consideration of the tax program, a concern implicit in the theme you have chosen today. That is a concern we in the administration fully share. Indeed, it is clearly spelled out in the President's budget mesage, as well as in his tax message.

As I have said, it is our belief that the tax reduction we have proposed will so invigorate the economy that, in a few years, our revenues under the new, lower rate structure will be larger than if we were to continue with our present rate structure, which stifles economic growth. Nevertheless, the first and immediate fiscal impact of tax reduction will be lower revenues and a somewhat larger deficit. This calls for the most careful expenditure control. And that is just what the President has pledged.

Since increases in defense, space and interest on the public debt are unavoidable, he has held fiscal 1964 expenditure levels below those of the current year in the overall civilian programs of the Government. He has specifically stated on more than one occasion that a substantial part of the increased revenues from our expanding economy will be set aside to reduce the deficit until such time as it is eliminated. The significance of this pledge has apparently not been fully understood. As the President stated in his budget mesage, "The prospect of expanding economic activity and rising Federal revenues in the years ahead does not mean that Federal outlays should rise in proportion to such revenue increases. As the tax cut becomes fully effective and the economy climbs toward full employment, a substantial part of the revenue increases must go toward eliminating the transitional deficit." This means that as revenues increase through the stimulus of the tax program and the normal growth of our economy, expenditures will not be permitted to rise as rapidly, leaving a substantial portion of each year's increase available to reduce our present budgetary deficit. The President has already begun to translate his pledges into action. Since January, he has cut expenditure requests by over $750 million, including the recent cut of $400 million in his foreign aid request. This is sure proof of the effectiveness of the program of expenditure control that is such an important and integral part of the President's tax reduction program.

I recognize that there are some who believe that the administration favors budget deficits as being good in and of themselves. This is simply not so. We dislike deficits as much as anyone. But, we are prepared to accept them if necessary to preserve our national security. And we are not prepared to sacrifice effective job-producing programs such as the emergency public works bill, during a period when unemployment remains at unacceptably high levels. We are solidly against waste in Government and welcome efforts to reduce it. But we do not accept the claims of those who would make meat-ax cuts in the budget but are not prepared to justify the details. For instance, it is downright irresponsible to claim, as some have done, that defense expenditures can be cut 5 percent merely because they amount to over $50 billion a year. Secretary McNamara has given us the most efficient operation of the Defense Department that our Nation has ever known, yet, because of the economies he is effecting, he is under attack from many directions. No man has the right to claim that additional defense economies are possible unless he is willing to spell out exactly where and how they can be made. We welcome the advice and help of all our citizens in assuring the most frugal conduct of the Nation's business, but we reject the counsel of those who would sacrifice major national interests and even endanger our national security, merely because our economy has not operated near enough to capacity to produce the needed revenues.

In a further effort to minimize the effect of tax reduction on the budget, its impact has been spread over 3 fiscal years. This does not mean, however, that we have to wait 3 years to feel the economic impact of tax reduction. Quite the contrary. The President's tax program would release a very large amount of money throughout the economy in a very short period of time. If the tax program, for example, became effective in October, then within 9 months the economy would benefit from roughly $6 billion in tax relief, and within 15 months the entire $10 billion reduction would be in effect.

The President's tax program offers strong encouragement to both consumption and investment, to every income group and to every sector of our economy. It meets the need for prompt and effective action to lower rates, to foster incentives and effort, at the same time that it meets the need to keep the budgetary deficit within a tolerable limit. It offers our private economy the freedom it needs to draw upon its own inherent resources for growth, to create the job opportunities we will need in the years ahead, and to provide the revenues necessary to preserve our national security and answer our critical national needs.

It is a program designed to meet our needs today, and to lay the foundation for a better tomorrow. It responds to the challenge of our time in a responsible manner. Some of us may disagree with parts of the program, and with the details of the separate provisions, but all of us will recognize that effective action is vital if we are to meet today's economic realities. I am sure the bill that will come out of the Ways and Means Committee will provide that action, and I am sure that the overwhelming majority of our people will support it wholeheartedly.

May 10: Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, May 10 marks a day of special importance to the people of the subjugated country of Rumania and the Rumanians throughout the world who look with hope to the day when their homeland will once again be free.

Rumania, as we all know, is one of the countries which lies behind the Iron Curtain of Soviet colonialism. Ironically, as the world experiences the birth of many new nations only recently emerging from colonial status, forces are at work through the international Communist conspiracy to impose a new colonialism, upon these new nations and upon others long within the community of free nations.

Each year that passes for these subjugated people can only increase their desire to see freedom once more return to their dominated homelands. I have no doubt that given the chance to choose, the Rumanians and the others now suffering under the yoke of Communist colonialism would choose freedom; this is evident from the continuing flow of those who, despite the danger and despite the fact that they must leave everything behind them, vote with their feet and flee from the Iron Curtain.

I think we must make the free choice of a form of government a keystone of our policy in regard to Rumania, whose Independence Day we celebrate today, and the other nations suffering under Soviet colonialism. The people in these unhappy countries must, to achieve real freedom, be given the opportunity to determine for themselves how they shall be governed. Free elections must be our goal for the Soviet colonies; given the chance, they will choose freedom.

Von Karman, Aviation Pioneer, Dies of Heart Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald-Tribune of May 8, 1963:

VON KARMAN, AVIATION PIONEER, DIES OF HEART ATTACK

AACHEN, WEST GERMANY.—Dr. Theodore von Karman, a chunky little man with bushy white hair, was called the elder statesman of aviation, the father of supersonic flight, the patron saint of the U.S. Air Force. He died of a heart attack Monday night at the age of 81 while here on a sort of pilgrimage.

Since 1951, Dr. von Karman has been chairman of NATO's advisory group for aeronautical research and development.

But from 1912 through 1930, he headed the Aeronautics Institute of the University of Aachen. While holding the post, Dr. von Karman's passion for aerodynamics turned the school into one of Europe's most celebrated centers of advanced research.

His last visit to this ancient Rhineland city was a purely sentimental one; Dr. von Karman would have been 82 years old on Saturday. The students, and the students of the students he taught here during his youth, probably number in the tens of thousands.

Earlier this year, in ceremonies in the White House rose garden, President Kennedy awarded the Hungarian-born scientist the first national medal of science. "No one else," the President said, "so completely represents all the areas involved in this medal—science, engineering and education."

What was Dr. von Karman's greatest achievement?

He formulated a theory that explains the powerful shock wave that, like a huge anchor, forms around a missile or a plane when it plunges through the sound barrier. This is called the Karman Vortex Trail.

Though meaningless to most, the pioneering concept paved the way for all supersonic flight. Just as the theories of Albert Einstein led to the harnessing of atomic power, the theories of Theodore von Karman led to ICBM's and supersonic planes.

Thomas Edison, clearly, was father to the incandescent bulb, and James Watt invented the steam engine. But the great technical breakthroughs of later years have been so incredibly complex, so demanding of scientific resources, it is difficult to pick one man to praise.

Every successful scientist must climb a stairway built of research, a stairway with neither a beginning nor an end. One such stairway leads upward through high-speed flight, through missiles, and the Mercury space flights and onward toward the moon. No single scientist carved more of its steps than did Dr. von Karman.

The deceptively simple looking plane propeller owes its present shape to Dr. von Karman's work in the 1920s. Other theories by the score, conceived, then proved by him in wind tunnels of his own design, are easy to list, hard to explain.

The Karman double-modulus theory of columns, the Karman way of building high-strength structure into lightweight planes, the Karman contra-rotating helicopter rotor, these are but a few things he left behind.

His distinguished following often said, "Never has a genius acted more like a genius," then went on to exchange Von Karman anecodotes.

Though master of seven languages, Dr. von Karman's English was flavored generously with rich Hungarian tones. He punctuated his speech with quick, intricate gestures, as if practicing a sort of scientific sign language.

WORE BLACK CAPE

Often he wore a black silk cape and, while lecturing in the classroom, he would twist and pull and even chew at the handkerchief he always carried.

Born in Budapest in 1881, Dr. von Karman was an assistant professor at the Royal Technical University there in 1903, the year of the Wright brothers' first flight. After teaching aerodynamics at Aachen, he moved to California to do research at the California Institute of Technology. By 1936, he had become a U.S. citizen.

It was at this point that Dr. von Karman began earning a reputation as one of the original absent-minded professors. There were those who said that after a long trip dozens of his mislaid hats would begin filtering back through the mail. One report claimed that during the war he was assigned a special assistant whose job it was to retrieve secret papers that he left in taxis or hotel lobbies.

In Los Angeles—where freeways don't beckon the timid driver—Dr. von Karman's technique behind the wheel also was acclaimed. Once his car sported three smashed fenders. When a friend suggested a visit to the local garage, the scientist said "not yet." There was one fender to go.

The list of honors awarded Dr. von Karman during a career that spanned all of this century seems almost endless. He received, for example:

The Presidential Medal of Freedom and Medal of Merit; the emblem of the French Legion of Honor; the American Society of Mechanical Engineers' Medal; the Kelvin Gold Medal; the Astronautics Award of the American Rocket Society; the Wright Brothers Memorial Trophy; the Daniel Guggenheim Medal; and perhaps the highest honor of all, the National Science Medal, 3 months before his death.

HAD 20 DEGREES

At the age of 81, he held more than 20 honorary degrees from universities in Europe and the United States.

While at Cal Tech during the early 1940's, there was one embarrassing moment when the institute's administration threatened to expel Dr. von Karman for tinkering with "dangerous" rocket fuels. But such experiments intrigued the late Gen. H. H. (Hap) Arnold, the Army Air Force commander, who thought rockets could aid heavy bombers get into the air on take off.

With General Arnold's blessing, Dr. von Karman put his "suicide club" at Cal Tech to work on what later became the JATO (jet assisted take off) bottle.

This lightweight, portable rocket, which the Air Force still uses, probably saved the lives of hundreds of pilots during World War II, pilots who experienced engine failure just after leaving the runway in a loaded bomber.

SPURNED BY MANUFACTURERS

The little group that developed jet assisted takeoff at Cal Tech evolved into the school's highly respected jet propulsion laboratory. But in 1942, when Dr. von Karman sought to interest the big munition-making firms in rockets, he was spurned.

Rather than forget rockets, he and three friends chipped in $1,500 each to form a new company. Jet assisted takeoff rockets were its first product. Fifteen years later, it began turning out the mighty rocket engines that propel the Titan II, most power ICBM in the U.S. inventory.

The company founded by Dr. van Karman is now the Aerojet-General Corp., a subsidiary of the General Tire & Rubber Co., and a giant of the space age. For many years, Dr. von Karman was either its chairman, its president, or its chief scientific adviser.

FEW UNDERSTOOD

Few men could understand the contributions Dr. von Karman made to science. Perhaps the only time he won applause from men in the street was in 1940, when a few puffs of wind blew down the famed suspension bridge over Washington's Tacoma Narrows.

Informed the bridge would be resurrected in accord with its original design, Dr. von Karman promptly wrote the Governor of Washington: "If you build the bridge the same way, it will fall in the same way."

The result: An invitation to serve on the committee set up to investigate the demise of the $6.4 million span.

Dr. von Karman found that the bridge behaved like a poorly designed airplane wing subjected to wind gusts. It heaved up and down, farther and faster, once motion started. To correct the problem, he recommended an open grille in the deck and trusses instead of solid side plates to make the bridge aerodynamically stable.

Dr. von Karman said in his thick Hungarian accent: "I explain all about the wind eddies 46 years ago, but bridge builders, they don't think such eddies cause trouble to something as big as a bridge."

Dr. von Karman was also chairman of the Missiles, Jets and Automatic Fund; chairman of the scientific advisory committee on advanced flight propulsion systems, General Motors' Allison Division; an advanced design consultant to General Dynamics, and a visiting professor at universities ranging from France to China.

A WITTY SPEAKER

So witty was the man that friends sometimes accused him of retaining a gag writer. His speeches and writings are filled with bon mots that charmed the scientific community. Some examples:

His definition of a Hungarian: "A man who goes into a revolving door behind you and comes out ahead."

Speaking of love to a female pilot: "A spin is like a love affair. You don't notice how you get into it and it is very hard to get out of."

On a new hobby: "My latest project is a sailboat. I am making it aerodynamically sound. It vill not have sails."

Changing the Navy Chiefs of Staff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, during general debate today on the military pay bill, my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER], spoke about the failure of the President to reappoint Admiral Anderson to a second term as Chief of Naval Operations. I commend my colleague for his remarks and agree with him that military decisions should be left to the military and not the civilians.

As Chief of Naval Operations and as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Anderson has occupied a tremendous position and through his ability and long experience in matters effecting our national security, he has served his country with distinction. Personally, I have always felt that Admiral Anderson's year of experience and noted integrity was a reassuring influence to all of us who are involved in the security and safety of millions of Americans. Leadership has always been one of the most admirable traits in man and one could not help but feel that our Navy and America itself was in capable hands under the leadership and guidance of Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr.

The decision not to reappoint Admiral Anderson to a second term appears to be a reprisal for either the Admiral's testimony on the controversial TFX warplane contract or his refusal to compromise no principle. Regardless of who was responsible for this decision, I firmly believe the time is long overdue for Congress to look into the usurpation of power which has been delegated by the President to his civilian appointees in the Defense Department. In his column appearing in the Evening Star today, David Lawrence has advocated an investigation on the part of Congress and I commend his article to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

CHANGING THE NAVY CHIEF OF STAFF—DROPPING OF ANDERSON AFTER ONE TERM IN FAVOR OF MCDONALD IS CRITICIZED

(David Lawrence)

Sooner or later, the Congress of the United States will have to assume the responsibility specifically imposed by the Constitution to see to it that military functions are performed hereafter by military men and not by civilian officials.

Was the latest change in the Joint Chiefs of Staff a rebuff to Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., the head of the U.S. Navy, because he courageously refused to agree with the civilian Secretary of Defense on military policies essential to strategy? The episode has focused attention on the confusion in military planning which prevails today.

While the President is designated by the Constitution as the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, it is the sole duty of Congress "to declare war * * * to raise and support armies * * * to provide and maintain a Navy * * * to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

Yet the role of Congress seems to have been relegated to that of an investigator after the damage has been done. Military men with an expert knowledge of strategy are not permitted today to decide what are the best weapons. Civilians, with eyes on the political effects desired by the administration for certain States with big electoral votes, make the final decisions.

The admiral had said unequivocally in his testimony that it was his duty as a naval officer to question the wisdom of the decision of the Secretary of Defense in awarding the TFX aviation contract. As for the merits of this dispute Congress is looking into them now. It seems unfortunate that an impression should be conveyed that Admiral Anderson actually is being punished for adhering to his sincere convictions as a military man.

The White House explanation is that several members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in recent years have served only a single 2-year term anyhow. But it has been taken for granted that competent chiefs still far away from retirement age could be given two terms. It is noted, moreover, that on the same day that the termination of Admiral Anderson's service was announced, it was made known that Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, chief of the Air Force, would get only a 1-year extension of his 2-year term. He, too, had opposed the Secretary of Defense in connection with the award of the TFX contract.

What seems not to have been taken into account is the fact that, as long as the power to extend the tenure beyond the 2-year term exists in a flexible form, a question will be raised as to why a competent and efficient military chief like Admiral Anderson wasn't continued in office, especially since he happens to be only 56 years old and his successor, just appointed, is also 56. The prevailing view at the Pentagon among military men is that Secretary McNamara is demanding absolute conformity to his views. Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, Democrat, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, has just said that Admiral Anderson's concept of the role of the Navy in today's national defense strategy is as sound as any he knows.

There have been conflicts between the civilian and military viewpoints under past administrations, too, but in a period of crisis in the world, it could be a grave mistake to change commanders unless some circumstances make it absolutely necessary. If there is such a circumstance, Congress is entitled to know it. If the incident was the result merely of a failure to please the Secretary of Defense, the country ought to know the risks involved.

The simple truth is that the scheme for a unification of the armed services, which was instituted after World War II, has not worked very well. The Korean war was really lost to the West because the Joint Chiefs were unduly influenced by civilian pressures.

During World War I and World War II, on the other hand, the chiefs of the Army and Navy sat at the President's elbow. There was no one between them and the Commander in Chief. The purpose of Congress in creating the Defense Department was primarily to secure coordination in many matters of administration, especially questions that are largely of a nonmilitary nature. It was never intended that the Secretary of Defense would become virtually a commander in chief of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

But the formula now has been broadened to permit the Secretary of Defense to take over many of the duties of the Commander in Chief and, in effect, decide on the strategy that shall be followed. Thus he decides, for instance, what weapons should be bought. Secretary McNamara, it has just been officially stated, made the recommendation to President Kennedy that Admiral Anderson be replaced and that General LeMay be appointed for only 1 year instead of the normal 2-year term. High officers who dare to oppose the Secretary can be deprived of promotions and otherwise intimidated. It is not a healthy situation for the military operations of the United States. It could impair the morale of military men throughout the country.

A thorough investigation of the usurpation of power by the civilians in the Defense Department, from top to bottom, is really needed. For there is only one civilian who has been given the power under the Constitution to govern the military branch of the Government, and that is the President of the United States—and there is no power in the Constitution which enables him to delegate military functions to anybody but his subordinate military officers.

We Go to Mexico To Get the Truth About the Bracero Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the California Farmer had an editorial in its issue of April 20, 1963 outlining their views on the Bracero program for California and announcing they had sent Don Taylor, one of their reporters, to Mexico City to find out how Mexico feels about this program.

The editorial by Jack Pickett and the article by Don Taylor follow:

[From the California Farmer, Apr. 20, 1963]

WE GO TO MEXICO TO GET THE TRUTH ABOUT THE BRACERO PROGRAM

(By Jack Pickett)

Don Taylor, our associate editor working out of the Fresno area, has just returned from an assignment in Mexico City. We asked Don to find out what the Mexican people and officials thought about the Mexican national program.

We hope that Don's story is picked up all over the United States because it is the first bit of truth released to offset the lies and half truths of the U.S. Department of Labor being planted to destroy this program.

Taylor is well informed on the program and gained some of his background information when he worked for the Council of California Growers. To put it mildly, Don was shocked when he realized how much vicious propaganda has been pushed at the U.S. public by our Department of Labor, labor unions, and Department of State.

Another depressing discovery was that some of the so-called experts in this State who are supposed to know the Mexican national picture have never been there, have never met the men who run the program and in turn are not known by the important people in Mexico who control this program. In fact, some of our people have been duped into dealing with phoney influence peddlers who work for a fee.

In spite of the mountains of propaganda you may have heard to the contrary, the top people in Mexico City who govern the Mexican national program have no desire to change the program, are very happy with the program, and are assuming that it will continue.

Now we realize that this is not what you have been told by your own Government. This country has been saturated with the propaganda that the program is doomed to failure as neither government wants it.

Actually, the small selfish group of organized labor is trying to kill it.

This program is before the House Committee and its fate will be decided there. We just hope we can get enough of the truths of this program into the hands of the right people before that vital vote is taken to save the program. Your messages to your Congressmen will certainly help.

[From the California Farmer, Apr. 20, 1963]

HOW MEXICO FEELS ABOUT THE BRACERO PROGRAM

(An exclusive report by Don Taylor)

The Mexican Government favors a simple extension, with no changes, of the agreement between the United States and Mexico which provides for employment of Mexican farmworkers in the United States on a temporary basis.

Although the Government of Mexico cannot be directly concerned with present efforts in the U.S. Congress to extend the provisions of Public Law 78, Mexican officials who are working with the program say they think it will be continued by both countries, at least for the foreseeable future.

California Farmer gathered this information through personal interviews with the Mexican officials who are directly responsible for the bracero program in Mexico. Interviews with these men were made possible through the assistance of Antonio Islas, Consul of Mexico at Sacramento. Reuben Lopez, manager of Yolo Growers at Woodland, acted as interpreter for the interviews. Lopez was in Mexico City to consult with the Mexican Government on the future of the bracero program.

We talked to Luis G. Zorrilla, Director General of Migratory Workers, in the Department of State of Mexico. Zorrilla is the administrator of the entire bracero program.

To find out how the braceros are recruited within Mexico, we visited Rogelio Flores Delgado, an official of the Department of the Interior of Mexico who is in charge of recruiting workers to go to the United States.

We interviewed Indonecio Sanchez Gavito, chief policy adviser to the Tourist Department of Mexico, to find out how the bracero program ranked with the tourist dollar as a major source of income for the country. We also called on the Bank of Mexico for more information on the economic impact of the program.

To round out our story, we asked the U.S. labor attaché in Mexico City what the official position of our own Government is with regard to the bracero program. And we talked to former braceros, to get their views.

The bracero program was the first real "alliance for progress" between the United States and Mexico. The first braceros came to this country during World War II, to save untold millions of dollars worth of food from rotting in the fields because of wartime labor shortages.

Since 1951, when the program was reinstituted under the provisions of Public Law 78, Mexico has sent hundreds of thousands of workers to this country to harvest our fruits and vegetables.

In turn, the braceros have taken back to Mexico not only money to help them improve their standards of living, but a better understanding of the people on our side of the border.

California now contracts more than half of all braceros who come into the United States. The braceros themselves say they prefer to come to California, because of wages and working conditions.

While mechanization is cutting down on the demand for braceros to a certain extent, there will always be fruits and vegetables grown in the United States that must be picked by hand to maintain quality for the fresh market. This is one of the bases for the opinion of the Mexican Government that the bracero program will be continued by the United States. And as long as the United States needs supplemental farmworkers, Mexico is very willing to supply them.

The Mexican authorities recognize that one of the difficulties faced by the bracero program in the United States is the fact that there is widespread unemployment here. However, they also recognize the difficulties involved in attempting to move domestic workers in the United States across the country for a few weeks of seasonal farm work, and they feel that the U.S. Government will find that this is impractical.

Consul Islas summed up the attitude of the Mexican Government when he told us, "Officials of Mexico concerned with the bracero program are doing everything possible to cooperate in supplying agricultural workers to the United States. All of the consuls of Mexico in the United States, including our special counselor for the bracero program in Washington, D.C., are most happy to cooperate with growers and grower associations to insure smooth operation of the program."

Islas has an extensive knowledge of the bracero program. There are more braceros employed in the area served by the Sacramento consulate than in any other consular area in the United States.

According to Samuel Janney, U.S. labor attaché stationed in Mexico City, the number of braceros used in the United States may increase this year, although some of the Mexican authorities think there will be another slight decrease.

The labor attaché works with the U.S. Department of Labor in negotiating the agreements between the United States and Mexico. Janney says he anticipates no difficulty in renewing the agreement this year. He also says, in his opinion, Public Law 78 will be extended again by Congress.

His views are repeated by Mexican authorities, who say they see no reason to change the agreement at this time. These authorities say the agreement itself can be renewed by a simple exchange of diplomatic notes between the two countries, as soon as Public Law 78 is extended.

The bracero program is an important source of income to Mexico. In 1960, money orders alone from braceros, cleared through the Bank of Mexico, totaled more than $36 million. In 1961, braceros sent home more than $34 million in money orders. This does not include the money they brought home in their pockets when they returned from the United States.

Unofficial estimates by the U.S. Department of Labor, the State Department labor attachés, and grower associations place the total added to the economy of Mexico by the bracero program in 1961 at close to $100 million. These estimates are drawn from interviews with returning braceros. The bracero income is the third largest source of income for Mexico, surpassed only by commercial exports and the tourist trade.

The braceros we interviewed told us the average worker sends or takes home 50 to 75 percent of his net pay. He uses it to buy a small tractor, a mill to grind corn, for improvements on his farmstead or home, or to buy a small buisness of his own. The bracero dollar has a tremendous impact on the economy of the smaller farming communities of Mexico.

Sanchez Gavito, special adviser in charge of foreign relations for the Tourist Department of Mexico, says one means of making the bracero program more valuable to Mexico would be for the Mexican Government to screen workers and send only those who are willing and able to learn. In turn, the local community in the United States, the grower-employers, or the U.S. Government should provide some training in agricultural production techniques for the braceros while they are in the United States wherever possible. This would help to raise the agricultural productivity of Mexico and provide educational opportunities for the braceros.

Gavito also pointed out that the braceros represent an important source of income to many small communities in the United States. He is backed up by farm labor association managers, who say it is quite common for local merchants to call and ask when the first braceros are expected to arrive. The local manager of one of the larger department stores in Woodland says the braceros are one of his most important sources of business. He orders merchandise of special style, sizes and colors to please them.

The portion of the bracero's earnings that he spends in the community where he works, for clothes, sewing machines, even television sets to take back home, represents added income for local merchants.

How are the braceros actually recruited within Mexico, to come to the United States? Requests are received by Gobernacion, or the Interior Department. The Interior Department either wires or calls the Governors of those States where braceros are available. The Governor gets in touch with the mayors of the towns within his State, and the mayors select braceros from a waiting list, on a first come, first served basis. The bracero must provide his own transportation to one of the five recruiting centers in northern Mexico.

Almost all of the braceros own small farms. They do their spring planting, go to the United States while their wives or members of their families tend the crops, then return at harvest time. This schedule is perfect for the Mexican farmer as well as for his U.S. employer.

Around 85 percent of the braceros who come to the United States have been here more than once. Literally translated, bracero means "strong arms." These braceros are experienced, competent workers, accustomed to the ways of the Norteamericanos, and able and willing to perform the many arduous farm jobs that don't appeal to domestic workers.

When economic disaster or widespread unemployment hits an area in Mexico, perhaps because of floods or crop failure, the bracero program really proves its worth. The Government immediately recruits braceros from the area, and their earnings in the United States help to supplement the local economy.

There are no major problems in the bracero program now, in the viewpoint of Mexico. The occasional complaints that do come up concern mainly food and medical attention, and these are becoming fewer. The program is running smoothly and efficiently, according to Mexican authorities, with no major difficulties. The consuls of Mexico and the compliance officers of the U.S. Labor Department work closely together to solve any problems that do come up.

However, the Mexican authorities echo a statement made by former braceros. They say that any abuses of braceros have come mainly from labor contractors, not from growers. They recommend more personal contact between the grower and the braceros he hires.

Most of the problems encountered by growers in obtaining braceros seem to stem from actions or lack of action by our own Labor Department. According to Mexican officials, California growers do a good job of forecasting their labor needs.

The Mexican Government makes every effort to have men available when they are needed. According to the agreement between the two countries, our Government must give the Mexican Government 30 days' notice when requesting braceros. As a practical working measure, Mexico will supply braceros on 2 weeks' notice if necessary. In some cases, such as last summer when a sudden change in the weather ripened the California canning tomato crop overnight, workers have been supplied on 1 week's notice.

It was widely rumored last summer that the delay in getting workers for the canning tomato harvest was the fault of the Mexican Government. We were told in Mexico that the Mexican Government had been informed by our Government that growers hadn't placed their orders for men in time. However, grower association records show that orders were placed well within the deadlines. And records in Mexico show that the delay was not the fault of the Mexican Government.

The Mexican authorities were given only 2 or 3 days to bring in braceros. It is impossible to get word to the smaller villages in the interior, and have people at the recruiting centers in this short a time.

Another story widely circulated in California claimed that the delay in getting braceros to the United States was due to a Mexican regulation that all braceros during the period in question had to pick a certain quota of cotton before they could come to the United States.

We checked this story and found that until 2 years ago, workers from northern Mexico were required to pick cotton for several days in three Northern States. Last year, only those braceros from Sonora had to pick cotton before reporting to the recruiting center at Empalme. This year, the practice may be stopped entirely, at the insistence of the central government. The evidence we gathered shows that any delay in getting braceros to the United States certainly hasn't been the fault of the Mexican Government.

The Government of Mexico, while it is in complete agreement with the workings of the bracero program, is seriously disturbed by the number of Mexican farmworkers who are emigrating to the United States to become permanent residents. These are the so-called "green cards," because of the color of their alien registration cards.

These green card immigrants are admitted to the United States on a permanent basis, when a grower in the United States files a letter with our Immigration Service, offering permanent employment to the Mexican worker. Why would the Mexican Government like to see this practice restricted?

There are several reasons, including the fact that the green card immigrants pose a threat to the bracero program, by appearing to lessen the numbers of braceros required in the United States.

However, the Mexican Government points out that there is no guarantee that the green card workers will stay on the farm. They are free to change employment once they establish residence here, and all too often they move on to a city job after a few weeks or months on the farm.

The immigrants represent a loss of productivity to the economy of Mexico, when compared with the braceros, who bring outside money into the country. The "green cards" have no protection such as the contract between the bracero and his employer, which sets wages and working conditions and is backed up by Public Law 78 and the agreement between the two countries.

The extent of the problem is shown by the fact that some 54,952 U.S. immigration visas were granted to Mexica citizens in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962. From 1957 through 1962, some 222,432 visas were granted. Of this total it is estimated that at least 80 percent were former braceros, entering the United States as green card agricultural workers.

As one Mexican official puts it, "To think that these people solve the U.S. grower's labor problem is an illusion. The bracero is the only practical solution to the problem of peak demand for farm labor that is needed for only a short period."

For these reasons, the Mexican Government has asked the U.S. State Department to exercise more control over immigration of farm workers. According to Labor Attaché Janney, there has been some discussion of placing more control in the hands of the State departments of employment, after the immigrants enter the United States. The two Governments are cooperating in attempts to regulate the problem through stricter controls.

How do the braceros themselves feel about the bracero program? The biggest complaint we heard from the former braceros we interviewed in Mexico was about the difficulties they were having in getting back to the United States, since the number of braceros in use has dropped.

Why do they come here, to the United States? Roberto Valle has been coming to California for the past 10 years. Although present restrictions placed by the United States on the program limit him to field work, he formerly worked as a crew pusher, cook, and in various other capacities.

Roberto looks forward to working in California because he can earn money to buy the extra things for his family that they would otherwise never have. He laughs at the claims that braceros are exploited in California, and says, on the contrary, that he has been treated well by his employers and the townspeople in Woodland, where he worked for a number of years.

Valle's comments are similar to those of other former braceros—Antonio Rivera Delgado, for example. Delgado has 10 children. He first went to the States during World War II, and returned after the bracero program started again in the 1950's.

With the money earned in California, Delgado has been able to buy his own house and a small store. Would he come here again? He'd jump at the chance.

One of the biggest things that impressed these people was the treatment they received in the United States. Before going, they were uncertain how the Notre-Americanos would treat them. They were sure that rich people got a better break from the authorities than did poor people, and they thought they'd be looked upon as slaves.

But they found no discrimination in the United States and they were amazed that the law treated everyone—rich and poor—alike. They found that they didn't have much trouble understanding and getting along with these strangers north of the border.

We wanted to check the stories we'd heard in California, that the Catholic church in Mexico is opposed to the bracero program. We asked the braceros, and they assured us that they'd heard of no opposition to the program by the church.

They told us the church advises them to work hard, hurry back, keep faith, and send money home to their families—but doesn't oppose their going. Also, according to the information we were able to gather, the labor unions in Mexico don't oppose the bracero program.

In fact, the braceros themselves told us that the only opposition to the bracero program they've seen in their own country comes from a small minority who don't understand the program—and from the Communist Party, who wish to embarrass the Governments of both the United States and Mexico.

The bracero program is our best example of the "good neighbor" policy in action. Tangible results of the program can be seen in the mountains of fruit and vegetables harvested each season by braceros in the United States, and in the homes, farms, and businesses of the former braceros themselves.

The bracero program helps provide the United States with abundant food and fiber, brings added income to those who need it most in Mexico, and helps promote increased goodwill and understanding between the people of the two countries. Perhaps that is why the men in the Government of Mexico who are closest to the program predict that it will continue.

Hospital Workers and Collective Bargaining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am a sponsor of H.R. 6123 to amend the National Labor Relations Act to include hospitals within its provisions. Hospital employees should be afforded the basic rights under the National Labor Relations Act which are afforded to other working citizens. In regard to this problem I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article, which appeared in the New York Post on April 17, by one of the most astute commentators of our times, James Wechsler. It discusses the victory of local 1199, Drug and Hospital Employees Union in New York. New York State has enacted a law giving hospital employees in New York City the right to bargain collectively.

The article follows:

[From the New York Post, Apr. 17, 1963]

THE MIRACLE

(By James A. Wechsler)

As one pieces together the inside story of Albany's battle over the bill to give collective bargaining rights to workers in voluntary hospitals, the outcome resembles a local miracle. Admittedly the bill enacted is restricted to New York City, but the crucial breakthrough has been scored.

It was achieved in the face of rough resistance and amid many frustrating paradoxes that dramatize the complexity of our politics. Governor Rockefeller remained faithful to his commitment to the bill while his Lt. Gov. Malcolm Wilson, fought against it bitterly in all the fateful backstage maneuvers. Assembly Speaker Joe Carlino and his aid, Hank Paley, were probably the most persistent, dedicated advocates in the legislative arena. But Senate Leader Mahoney was Wilson's partner in the last ditch fight to bury the bill.

Nor were such discords restricted to Republican ranks. The labor movement was bitterly, almost fatally divided. The State AFL–CIO threw its official weight against the measure on the ritualistic ground that it contained a compulsory arbitration provision, and Ray Corbett, the organization's chief, seemed to view this dreary negative exercise as a holy war.

In fact the true alternative to arbitration was no bill at all; Corbett, who spent so much time in his diversionary crusade, might have more usefully employed his time lobbying for the minimum wage law. But he didn't. Before the battle was over, even AFL–CIO President George Meany had been persuaded to lend his name to the opposition.

Fortunately, the labor bloc proved no more monolithic than the GOP. Harry Van Arsdale and Moe Iushewitz of the city AFL–CIO entered the fight and lobbied aggressively for the bill, despite the stand of the National and State leadership. They were joined by A. Philip Randolph, Dave Livingston, Max Greenberg, and the few other laborites who had espoused the hospital workers' cause in the most difficult times.

The roles of Carlino and Van Arsdale are especially noteworthy because there was a large-scale effort by the bill's foes to depict the conflict of a Catholic issue and thereby intimidate a certain number of nervous legislators. It is true that the Catholic Charities Diocese of Brooklyn circulated a memorandum calling for a barrage of telegrams to both Mahoney and Carlino opposing the bill. There were other intimations that some Catholic dignitaries were putting heat on wavering legislators. But Carlino and Van Arsdale both happen to be Catholics; their efforts, mingled with Mayor Wagner's explicit help, did much to clear the air and to quiet the undercurrents.

There were also the affirmative community endeavors of Eugene Reed, president of the State NAACP, Joseph Monserrat, and Cleveland Robinson.

But there was simultaneous confusion engendered by the behavior of Local 144 of the Building Service Employees Union, whose belated effort to solicit hospital employees has put the dismal label of a jurisdictional conflict on a serious attempt to organize the underprivileged. Local 144 initially condemned the Rockefeller bill and then, without blushing, finally claimed credit for its passage.

Presumably it will continue to push its private war despite the obvious evidence that this victory belongs to Local 1199, Drug and Hospital Employes Union, whose members took up the fight of the hospital workers when that seemed one of the utterly lost causes of the decade, and whose president, Leon Davis, now recuperating from a heart attack, took the real beating, in jail and outside, in this fight. One must wistfully hope there is labor leadership strong enough to end this internecine quarrel.

A preoccupation with the conditions and fate of some 35,000 hospital workers may be indicated here. Admittedly there are other large matters at hand. Yet this fight has assumed large symbolic significance.

It has challenged the pretensions of political and religious leaders who profess to care about the lower depths.

It has underlined the difficulty of obtaining even minimal social legislation in a State that has proclaimed its leadership in such affairs.

It has offered a great test of whether the modern labor movement has the wisdom and selflessness to recognize that what it does for the unorganized man at the bottom, and especially the victimized Puerto Ricans and Negroes, is far more meaningful than the protection of a featherbed.

There are hopeful signs that the consciences of some big labor men such as Van Arsdale have been stirred by this drama. As Moe Foner of Local 1199 recently observed, no small wage rise alone can give the exploited hospital employees a new lease on life. It is only a beginning. But it is in seeking a better day for such people that "big unionism" can recapture some of the sense of idealism and purpose now too often invisible in labor conflicts.

In larger terms the battle over the hospital bill has been a case history in democratic pressures. Its relatively happy ending may suggest that too many men often give up too easily when the big battalions move into action, and that a small army can win a big engagement.

Tyranny Can Spring From the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, dictatorship can come to the United States. The people can actually elect the man who will become the American tyrant. That is why it is so important that we return to constitutional limited government before such an occurrence takes place.

The following article written by that great newsman, Paul Harvey, appeared in Human Events for May 11. I commend it to the attention of every freedom loving citizen of this Nation:

A TYRANT WILL NOT COME FROM OVERSEAS

(By Paul Harvey)

In the early morning hours of April 13, 1962, in Philadelphia, an American citizen was roused from his sleep by a knock on the door. Federal police. Without the knowledge of their immediate superior, without writs or warrants, with no claim of wrongdoing against the citizen, with no questions to ask which could not wait until morning, these Federal police introduced on the privacy of said citizen.

They had a mandate from the Nation's highest law enforcement officer, the Attorney General of the United States. The Attorney General was supposed to be a servant, not the master of the sleeping citizen.

In New York City a similar event took place.

In the following hours a grand jury was impaneled to investigate possible criminal collusion in connection with the increased price of steel.

In the following hours committees of the Congress undertook investigations, one of the stated ends being punishment.

In the Pentagon, orders went out to deny Government business to any steel company which had raised its price.

Now, what had the steel companies done to bring the terrible force and power of the Presidency down around their heads?

They raised prices.

I, personally, was astonished at their incredibly bad timing. Yet what they did was lawful. There is no Federal, State, or local statute against raising the price of steel or toothbrushes or grass seed. We have a free domestic market. Or did have.

If a citizen commits a lawful act and the Government, unlawfully, applies against him the utmost coercive power, what has happened to us?

Have we thought we were safer than we are?

On whose door do the Federal police knock next?

And when might they neglect even to bother to knock?

Mr. Justice Holmes once said, in effect, "if a chap wants to build a slaughterhouse and I look in the book and find nothing that says he can't—let him build the slaughterhouse."

Thus were Americans historically limited by the government and thus was their government limited.

Are we still able to rely on the certainty of a government of laws, or are we now at the mercy of a government of men?

Those who are criticizing the President for his act might better criticize we, the people, who have permitted this perversion of the Presidency—gradually, over the years.

We have asked the Presidency to do many things for us which we should have done for ourselves. To do these things the Presidency had to get bigger and bigger and more powerful. We have tolerated a multiplication of laws, by loose construction of our Constitution, by liberal grants of general powers, by forgetting that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. So the unchecked and unbalanced power we intended for use against our enemies, at the whim of one man, now may be loosed on ourselves.

Mr. Lincoln said that a tyrant would not come to the United States from across the seas. If he comes, he'll ride down Pennsylvania Avenue from his inauguration and take up legal residency of the White House.

We're moving toward that end at a hellish rate. I will not let myself believe we have already passed the point of no return. I have a son. I will not let myself believe it.

But I know it can happen here, and I dedicate whatever is left of my life to seeing that it does not.

College for the Asking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in the Sunday Star of May 15, 1963, Mr. Sidney A. Eisenberg, a distinguished Clevelander, has written a splendid article entitled "College for the Asking: Scholarships Go Begging."

This information is so important and useful to young persons aspiring for a college education that I deemed it mandatory to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article is as follows:

[From the Washington Sunday Star, May 5, 1963]

COLLEGE FOR THE ASKING: SCHOLARSHIPS GO BEGGING—$30 MILLION LEFT UNUSED, LOAN FUND STAYS HUGE

(By Sidney A. Eisenberg)

Each year college scholarships worth $30 million are unclaimed and loans up to $450 million are not asked for.

College education today costs between $2,000 and $3,000 a year. Half of all American families earn less than $5,600 a year. Thus two children in college might require all of a family's income. And college tuition costs are still going up.

Yet statistics show that of the 400,000 scholarships available each year, many are unused. And while 100,000 of our brightest high school students did not go to college last year because of lack of funds, nearly half a billion dollars in loan funds were unused.

The reasons for this situation are: (1) lack of diligence, persistence, and resourcefulness of both the student and the parent and (2) lack of publicity about the scholarship loan that is unused or unclaimed.

Every college, large or small, has some kind of scholarship and loan program. In Ivy League institutions the grants run into millions of dollars.

How does one find out if a college has a scholarship? A prospective student can check with his high school guidance counselor. He can fill out the form supplied by the College Scholarship Service of the College Entrance Board, 475 Riverside Drive, New York 27. He can get a copy of "Undergraduate College Scholarships" from the Office of Education, Washington 25, D.C.. He can write to the college of his choice.

How is a student to know if he is entitled to a scholarship? Two major questions must be answered: Does he have good high school grades? Does he need tuition aid?

New scholarship programs are being set up almost every day. For example:

Wesleyan University, Connecticut, has announced 85 new scholarships from $100 to $2,000 a year. The University of Wisconsin has received a bequest of $1.3 million from John Darwin Manchester to provide loans for premedical and medical students. Tufts University, Medford, Mass., has initiated work scholarships that pay up to $500 a year for 340 hours of work during the college term. The University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., has set up 10 to 15 undergraduate scholarships from $2,000 to $2,400 each Hofstra College, Hempstead, N.Y., has 47 new high school scholarships providing up to full tuition.

I receive thousands of letters telling of unused scholarship and loan funds from colleges. A few random samplings:

An accredited medical school in a midsouthern State has over $6,000 in unused funds;

A fine eastern dental school has almost $20,000 in unused funds every year;

A college in California reported over $12,000 of its $15,000 loan fund unused last year;

A liberal arts college in a mideastern State reported over $30,000 in unused scholarship funds in 2 years.

JUNIOR GI BILL PROVIDES FUNDS

Five major misunderstandings keep eligible children of deceased servicemen from applying for the educational privileges granted them by Congress, the Veterans' Administration reports. Under the junior GI bill, adopted in 1956, scholarships were made available to 160,000 children of veterans who died in, or as a result of, service in the Armed Forces. In 1960, the benefits were extended to children of peacetime veterans.

The legislation provides education for 30 months, or 4 academic years. Those who attend approved colleges, vocational and business schools can receive $110 a month if on full time, $80 on the three-fourths time, and $50 a month for those going on a halftime basis.

A study made by the American Legion's education and scholarship program showed less than half the eligible students have taken advantage of the benefits under this law.

Here are the five misunderstandings that keep many thousands of eligible students from applying for the scholarships under the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act, the junior GI bill.

1. The fact that one parent still lives makes some children believe they do not qualify as orphans. An orphan is a child whose parent is dead as the result of a wound, accident or illness attributable to service in the Armed Forces.

2. The fact that the dead parent had no wartime service makes others believe they are ineligible. If the veteran parent's death resulted from the performance of duty or from extra hazardous service during peacetime, the child is eligible.

3. The fact that they are married makes some believe they are no longer children. Marriage does not affect eligibility.

4. The fact that their living parent, usually their mother, has remarried and their stepfather has adopted them, makes some children believe they are ineligible. This does not affect eligibility.

5. The fact that many children are not planning to go to college makes some believe they cannot take advantage of this benefit. Eligible children may take vocational courses and other noncollege training that will help them earn a living.

The American Legion and its various auxiliary posts offer hundreds of scholarships annually. The Legion's National High School Oratorical Contest provides scholarships from $4,000 to $5,000 for the four finalists. In addition, district and State Legion posts award hundreds of scholarships to the participants.

For further information write to: The American Legion, Education and Scholarship Program, Post Office Box 1055, Indianapolis, Ind.

The Fraternal Order of Eagles Memorial Foundation was founded to honor Eagle servicemen and to provide scholarships for children of members who were killed or died while in the armed services. The fund totals $4 million. For further information write: The Eagles Memorial Foundation, 321 North Michigan Street, South Bend, Ind.

The Elks Emergency Educational Fund serves a similar purpose. It does not give full tuition, but supplements the college costs of needy students. Applications should be made to the lodge of which the father was a member.

The Knights of Columbus has established an educational trust fund of $1 million as a memorial to members of the order. Scholarships are available to sons and daughters of Knights who were killed or disabled as a result of military service during World War II or the Korean conflict. Scholarships are for 4 years and include allowances for tuition, board and room. In addition, many State and local councils of the Knights have scholarship programs. Write to: The Supreme Secretary, Knights of Columbus, Drawer 1670, New Haven, Conn.

The AMVETS annually grant 4-year college scholarships to high school seniors whose fathers are deceased or disabled veterans of World War II or the Korean conflict. Each scholarship provides financial assistance for undergraduate college study at an accredited institution selected by the student. Fellowships are also available for graduate study. Write to AMVETS, National Headquarters, Post Office Box 6038, Mid-City Station, Washington, D.C.

FUNDS AVAILABLE TO WOMEN

There are many scholarship and loan opportunities for women to pursue careers. It is a national disgrace that over 400,000 women in Russia pursue professional and scientific careers, while in the United States fewer than 12,000 pursue these careers.

The AMVETS award scholarships for undergraduate or graduate study to any girl whose father was a veteran or was killed or disabled in World War II. Write to the addresses above.

The American Veterans of World War II award another group of scholarships for women. Write to American Veterans of World War II, 710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Many other organizations offer similar opportunities for women. An 18-year-old girl in Houston won a $4,000 scholarship from the San Jacinto State Bank Foundation. Two girls in Cleveland won Fisher Food Scholarships. The Sears Foundation and the Special Libraries Association also offer scholarships for women. Here are the addresses: The San Jacinto State Bank Foundation, Houston; Fisher Foods, 2323 Lakeside Avenue, Cleveland; the Sears, Roebuck Foundation, 333 Arlington Street, Chicago; the Special Libraries Association, 31 East 10th Street, New York.

For 40 years, Montgomery Ward has been awarding six scholarships. They are arranged and announced by the National 4–H Service Committee, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago.

The Zonta International awards from one to five scholarships up to $2,500 each to eligible women for graduate study in aeronautical sciences. Write to Amelia Earhart Scholarship Committee, care of Zonta International, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago.

The North Carolina Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy has awarded many scholarships to women. Write to North Carolina Division, United Daughters of the Confederacy, Mrs. Robert B. Street, Chairman of Education Committee, North Carolina Division, UDC, R.F.D. 1, Box 405, Huntersville, N.C.

The American Association of University Women, Educational Foundation, awards awards about 50 fellowships at $3,000 to $5,000 each. Write to the American Association of University Women, Fellowship Office, 2401 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington.

The Hattie M. Strong Foundation makes loans without interest or collateral up to $3,000 to students who have finished 2 years of college or to graduate students. Write to the Hattie M. Strong Foundation, Suite 409, Cafritz Building, 1625 I Street, Washington.

The Western Electric Fund Scholarship awards about 170 scholarships up to $800 each with no restrictions regarding sex, race, color, creed, or national origin. Write to Western Electric Fund Scholarships, John G. Payne, Coordinator of College Relations, Personnel Division, 222 Broadway, New York.

The Daughters of the Cincinnati awards about 16 scholarships to high school seniors who are daughters of regular Army, Navy, Air Force or Marine officers. Write to Mrs. Alexander Jay Bruen, scholarship secretary, Daughters of the Cincinnati, 1088 Park Avenue, New York 28.

The Student Aid Foundation has over $100,000 to lend to women at low interest rates. No interest is charged while the student is in college. Write to the Student Aid Foundation, 1025 Clairmont Avenue, Decatur, Ga.

The Delta Delta Delta General Fund Scholarship has assisted over 2,510 women students in the last 18 years, awarding more than $335,000. It operates on 106 campuses, and the applicants need not be sorority members. There is no restriction as to race, creed or color. Write to Vice Chairman of Service Projects, Mrs. G. W. Whiteman, 609 W. Highland Drive, Seattle 99.

The PEO Educational Fund gives financial aid to qualified students as a loan to be repaid when the student is out of school. The maximum loan is $1,250 and the most granted in 1 year is $625. Write to PEO Educational Fund, 3700 Grand Avenue, Des Moines 12, Iowa. These loans are for women only.

NURSING STUDENTS CAN GET HELP

The shortage of trained nurses will increase as our population continues to soar.

Many competent young women are eager to enter the nursing profession but are held back because of lack of funds.

Scholarships, fellowships, grants and loans are available. Here are some of the major sources:

National Foundation, 800 Second Avenue, New York 17, offers nursing scholarships to one or more graduating high school seniors from each State who plan to take up a baccalaureate degree program. Information is available from high schools and from the national foundation.

The Bergen Foundation, 6536 Sunset Boulevard, Mollywood 28, Calif., provides loans for prospective nurses. Apply to the executive secretary.

The Clara Barton Memorial Scholarships Awards, auxiliary to the United Spanish War Veterans, offers help. Information is available from the secretary, 40 G Street NE., Washington 13.

The Children's Bureau, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington 25, has a program to help train professional nurses.

Traineeships to enable nurses to prepare for positions in consultation and teaching in maternal and child care and crippled children's programs may be obtained through the School of Nursing, Boston University and the Division of Nursing Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York 37.

The School of Hygiene and Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, accepts qualified nurses who are preparing for positions in public health programs for the care of mothers and children. Address the dean.

Awards of $1,000 each to assist nurses to prepare for positions in supervision, administration or teaching are offered by the 8 and 40 Tuberculosis Nursing Scholarships Fund, the American Legion Education and Scholarship Committee, Box 1055, Indianapolis 6, Ind.

The Nurses' Educational Funds is an independent corporation administered by the National League for Nursing, with grants scholarships, fellowships, and loans to nurses to equip them for advancement in nursing.

Lists of institutions offering traineeships are available from the Division of Nursing Resources, Public Health Service, Washington 25, D.C.

STUDENTS CAN GET LOANS FOR COLLEGE

It is obvious that if the high school graduate cannot get a scholarship he should get a loan. Almost everyone can qualfy for one, and there are more than enough legitimate loan funds available.

A total of 1,454 colleges and universities in all 50 States and Puerto Rico are participating in the national defense student loan program. All the information, plus a list of participating colleges, is supplied in a free booklet from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington 25. Ask for booklet number GE–55001–62.

The U.S. Aid Funds, a nonprofit corporation which underwrites loans to college students through private banks, has $50 million available in low-interest, long-term loans.

For information write: United Student Aid Funds, Bennett E. Kline, 350 Lexington Avenue, New York 16.

Many colleges have their own loan funds, in addition to participating in the national defense student loan program. Some of these are interest-free while in college. Others bear a very small interest charge.

Many other major loan funds offer millions of dollars. Almost anyone can qualify, regardless of need or class standing. The repayment terms have been geared to a college education. Most of them make loans from the freshman year on up and have maximum amounts of $14,000 to finance college educations. Some institutions will make loans to you regardless of place of residence or college attended.

NEGROES OFFERED ADDITIONAL AID

It is very difficult for many qualified Negroes to go to college. They come from very low income families and need extensive financial aid.

One special source of scholarships for Negro students is the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, which as awarded as much as $12,000 in scholarships, in a single year, with $500 minimums, to selected high school, college, and postgraduate students. For information on scholarships for the next school year, write to: Dr. Clifton S. Jones, director of educational activities, Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Morgan State College, Baltimore.

Dr. W. Montague Cobb, professor and chairman of the anatomy department of the College of Medicine, Howard University, deplores the fact that the number of Negro medical students in colleges throughout the country has dropped. This is in spite of the fact, Dr. Cobb says, that all northern and western colleges and 19 in the South have made their courses available to Negroes. Of the 260,000 physicians in the United States, only 4,000 are Negroes.

What is being done about this?

Last year, 10 outstanding Negro graduates were awarded 4-year medical scholarships with annual payments ranging from $1,000 to $2,000 each, under a program financed by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation and administered by the National Fellowships, Inc., of Chicago.

Known as the National-Medical Sloan Foundation Scholarships, the program is designed to help relieve the critical shortage of Negro physicians and surgeons. Its objective is to make it possible for qualified Negroes to attend leading medical schools.

There are about 24 McCormick Foundation Scholarships and National Medical Scholarships. Applications should be made to: Mrs. Hilde Reitzes, executive secretary, National Medical Fellowships, Inc., 951 East 58th Street, Chicago 37.

The National Scholarship Service Fund for Negro Students awards about 150 scholarships annually. They are renewable for the sophomore and junior years. This fund is designed to provide supplementary financial assistance to Negro high school seniors who are awarded college or other scholarships but need additional financial assistance.

Inquiries should be addressed to the National Service Fund for Negro Students, 6 East 82d Street, New York 38.

The Catholic Scholarships for Negroes, Inc., 216 Central Street, Springfield, Mass., has a limited amount of aid for Catholic Negroes.

Negro law students who attend fulltime at Boston College, Boston University, Harvard, and Suffolk University, may borrow up to $1,000 a year for 3 years directly from these law schools. This program of long-term, low-interest loans to deserving students was set up by the Massachusetts Bar Association.

Negroes are also eligible for loans under the national student defense loan program of the Federal Government, as well as under the many bank loan programs, loans from private institutions, college loan programs, and the various higher education loan associations in many of our States. Such a foundation is the Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York City, which is open to students generally, but especially Negroes.

The Martin de Porres Foundation, 1650 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, has six scholarships for Negro Catholics, of approximately $800 each per year to cover tuition, fees, and books: One each to Immaculata, Rosemont, and Chestnut Hill Colleges for girls, and to La Salle and St. Joseph's Colleges and Villanova University for boys. An applicant must submit his high school record, letters of recommendation from high school principal and pastor, and what he hopes to do with a college education.

SCIENCE STUDENTS' AID IS PLENTIFUL

The Science Clubs of America, with financial support from the Westinghouse Educational Foundation, annually conducts a talent search for outstandingly able high school seniors who are especially inclined toward science. Information can be obtained from science teachers or by writing to Science Clubs of America, 1719 N Street NW., Washington 6, D.C.

General Motors has two undergraduate scholarship plans under which approximately 400 4-year scholarships are awarded annually. Applicants must be secondary school seniors who are citizens. Stipends vary from $200 to $2,000 a year, depending on the need. Write to General Motors Corp., Detroit 2, Mich.

If you already have your master's degree in aerospace and need help for your doctorate, one of the best sources of help is the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's program. Ten universities select ten candidates for the degree you are seeking. The 100 students selected for these studies each receive $2,400 for 12 months, plus expense allowances up to $1,000. Annual renewals depend on students' performance.

These institutions are University of Maryland, College Park, Md.; Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta; University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.; University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; State University of Iowa, Iowa City; Texas A. & M. College, College Station; University of California at Los Angeles; Renssalaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N.Y.; University of Chicago, and Rice University, Houston.

An $8 million loan program has been established by the Ford Foundation to assist doctoral engineering students prepare for teaching careers. Students up to age 40 may borrow up to $10,000 over 3 years. For a list of participating institutions, write to the Ford Foundation, 477 Madison Avenue, New York 22.

The Procter & Gamble Fund provides about 80 scholarships in the sciences. Awards are renewable for up to 4 years and include full tuition, plus an allowance for books, fees, and supplies. For further information, write to the Procter & Gamble Scholarship Program, P.O. Box 599, Cincinnati 1.

The following is a very small sampling of scholarship sources available to prospective majors in science or engineering and is intended merely to show the diversity of these sources.

Alcoa Foundation Scholarships, Aluminum Co. of America, Pittsburgh 19, has 140 scholarships available for study at certain specified institutions.

From 185 to 190 scholarships, limited to specified institutions, are offered by the Foundry Education Foundation Scholarships, Terminal Tower Building, Cleveland 13.

The American Institute of Steel Construction, Inc., Committee for Education, 101 Park Avenue, New York 17, has 10 scholarships for work in institutions accredited to civil or architectural engineering.

The Radio Corp. of America, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, offers 33 science scholarships and 30 scholarships in the science teaching field.

The American Society for Tool Engineers, 10700 Puritan Avenue, Detroit 18, Mich., offers tool engineering scholarships for college juniors and seniors interested in careers in tool engineering.

The Atomic Energy Commission offers fellowships in nuclear science and engineering. Basic stipends are $1,800 the first year, $2,000 the intermediate year, and $2,200 the terminal year. An additional $500 each is allowed for a wife and a maximum of two dependent children. For further information, write to NSE Fellowship Office, Institute of Nuclear Studies, Oak Ridge, Tenn.

The AEC also offers fellowships in health physics with a basic annual stipend of $2,500 and an additional $350 for a wife and each dependent child. Write to: Health Physics Fellowships Office, Institute of Nuclear Studies, Oak Ridge, Tenn.

Industrial hygiene is another field in which the AEC offers fellowships. The basic stipend of these fellowships is $2,500 to $2,700 for fellows having 1 or more years of related graduate study or industrial work. An additional allowance of $350 is made for a spouse and for each dependent child. Address: Industrial Hygiene Fellowship Office, Institute of Nuclear Studies, Oak Ridge, Tenn.

Mr. Eisenberg, in collaboration with Dr. Benjamin Fine, has prepared the following bulletins, available for 10 cents each and a stamped, addressed envelope: (1) Major Sources of Scholarship Aid; (2) Fellowships and Grants; (3) Where To Get Loans; (4) Scholarships for Veterans' Children; (5) The National Merit Scholarship Fund; (6) Scholarships and Loans for Medical Students; (7) Scholarships, Fellowships, and Loans for Nursing Students. Address: College Funds, in care of the Sunday Star, Washington 3, D.C.

Providing That Members of Congress Be Limited to Per Diem Allowances and Necessary Transportation Costs

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 245) providing that Members of Congress shall be limited to per diem allowances and necessary transportation costs in connection with travel outside the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as one who has done quite a bit of traveling and as one who will probably do more traveling, as one who believes in the desirability of congressional travel at home and abroad, I want to point out that there never have been the kind of rules a good many Members seem to think there had. Maybe some Members have not followed the rules but the existing rules do require an accounting. I have thought that requirement was a good thing. I have always filed such accounts. I think it is a desirable thing. I think this requirement is fair. I think it is a desirable thing to require the additional reporting which is provided in the terms of this joint resolution.

I think that probably the most objectionable feature to our travel procedure in the past has been the fact that there was not complete understanding of what was required. I am certain that the great majority of the Members of Congress have handled their travel accounts just as fairly and as openly as any other accounts in or out of Congress. But since some accounts have not reflected in detail what was actually expended, I think the provisions of this joint resolution are sound, that they should be adopted, and that the passage of this bill will have a very splendid effect all over the country. It should help to restore confidence which has been impaired, often without justification. Actually there are those who are trying to destroy our form of government by discrediting the legislative branch. They have often been able to do so by citing what seemed to be improper use of counterpart funds. Indeed this has been done in cases where full accounts were on file. As for my personal travel expenses, I have attended several of the meetings of the Interparliamentary Union. That organization for the last several years has operated with a bonded fiscal officer making the expenditures and preparing expense accounts. The Members do not make major personal expenditures. I think that that fact has been widely misunderstood. In fact, there have been those who have said that members of the Interparliamentary Union have carried their wives along at Government expense. It is true that as in most international meetings the presence of Members' wives is quite important, and the President himself has authorized their transportation on the Government plane which is normally available, there is no extra cost to the Government and the Members have paid their wives' hotel and similar expenses. In fact where the fiscal officer has paid Members' bill which contained an item of expense attributable to the Member's wife that much has been charged back to the Member and I hold cancelled check evidencing my reimbursement of the Government. I am certain that other I.P.U. delegates have also made similar payments. Therefore, the oft repeated charge that Members have taken their wives to I.P.U. meetings, Mr. Chairman, simply is not true and anyone who has taken the reports now on file knows it.

The other type of travel in which I have engaged has been on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture. Where I have made such trips I have filed itemized expense accounts, and several other Members have done likewise, although some have not availed themselves of that privilege. Anyone who wants to see those accounts has my permission to look at them. This bill will simply see that everybody follows this course. I do not think there is any hardship about it. I do not think there is anything unfair about it. I think that it will tend to give a much clearer understanding to those who have had the opinion that all of those who have traveled outside the United States have been doing so without any accounting whatsoever.

Of course, unfortunately most of those who have engaged in this criticism of the Congress have not bothered to look at the record, which are now available to see what accounts were filed. The passage of this resolution cannot make anybody look at the record. Those who do not want to see the accounts that are on file obviously will never see them, no matter what kind of legislation we pass. But if we pass this legislation accounts from all who travel will be available for everybody, and I think it will afford a great degree of protection of the great majority of the Members of Congress who always have carried on their travels on a proper and legitimate basis.

I congratulate the committee and I congratulate the chairman for the good work they have done in bringing this much-needed legislation before us. I join with the gentleman from Iowa in hoping that the other body will see fit to act on this and act favorably rather than simply to pigeonhole it. This bill would treat the Members of each House just the same. It would treat the members of all committees just alike. I think we need the same rules across-the-board. This bill provides such impartial justice.

Programed Learning—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I call to the attention of my colleagues the second in a series of articles appearing in the Palo Alto Times, Palo Alto, Calif.

This tells how Dr. M. W. Sullivan's method of programed learning is being given a trial by the Whisman Elementary School District in California. The classroom application of Dr. Sullivan's programed materials is meeting with success, and I know my colleagues will be interested in the following article from the Palo Alto Times of May 2, 1963:

[From the Palo Alto Times, May 2, 1963]

PROGRAMED READING PLAN OVERCOMES SKEPTICISM

(By Derek Schoen)

Whisman Elementary School District officials were more than slightly skeptical last summer when representatives of Sullivan Associates broached the possibility of inaugurating the firm's first programed reading course in the district.

"Frankly," recalls Superintendent Arthur Tindall, "we were afraid it might be one more of the gimmick techniques—you know, offering to solve all our problems in a few months and then flopping miserably."

But Tindall decided to take a chance and use the new programed materials in one class. His reason?

"If there is a single subject which educators agree is not being put across to students adequately, it's reading. We've been strongly criticized and I'm afraid rightly so, because we've made so little progress in teaching this subject over the last 50 years," he says.

PROGRAM STARTS

So, when school opened in September, one of the three first-grade reading classes at Monte Loma School was started out on the Sullivan program. And within 2 months, at least one teacher was sure the experiment was a mistake.

She was Mrs. Mary Phyl, the teacher selected to use the new materials. Lewis Miller, vice president in charge of public relations for Sullivan Associates, said Mrs. Phyl was chosen to head the experiment "because she told us she would cooperate fully—we had to have someone who had faith in the program and could transmit that faith to the students."

But Mrs. Phyl remembers some days in October and November when she almost lost that faith.

"Frankly, I was a little disgusted. Both the other first-grade classes were reading books and my kids were still plodding along just learning the alphabet and sounds," she recalls.

The reason for the slow start was the emphasis placed by the program on phonics and linguistics. Using lettercards and sound-symbol cards, the teather must painstakingly herd the class through a 6-week session in which the students do nothing more than learn to recognize letters and sounds.

LETTERS

At first, after they've left the prereading stage, the children work with only a few "base" letters—A, M, N, T, I. Once they've learned to associate these letters with sounds, they are ready to begin working with words using the five letters, such as ant, mat, and tin.

Dee Buchanan, the linguistic expert who wrote the reading program, describes her approach as "phonics in its simplest form."

"Standard phonics texts," she said, "have presented far too many conflicting sounds and concepts for students. Most children have learned intuitively to discriminate between the various sounds. But some never learn this so they never learn to read well.

"But we believe that as soon as a child learns three letters, he should immediately begin to read. And once the child learns there is a relationship between letters and words, he can build a vocabulary at a tremendous rate," says Miss Buchanan.

Mrs. Phyl says she noticed significant progress for the first time in December, when she introduced her class of 25 students to their first reader. This was the same reader used by all first-grade classes and it took an average class about 9 weeks to complete it.

"I gave them the reader just before Christmas and was surprised to see that they already knew all the words in it. We finished the book in less than 4 weeks.

"From that point on, they've been reading books as fast as I can provide them. They also started taking more books out of the library to read and started bringing in stories they'd written at home," says Mrs. Phyl.

NEWSPAPERS

But the real surprise came early this year, when the parents of one of the students called the district to report that their first-grade son was reading and understanding complex newspaper stories. Although this news caused excitement in the district at the time, it's now accepted as more or less standard for children in the programed course.

"Quite a few of them are reading newspapers now," reports Mrs. Phyl.

Even more dramatic progress was being made in a remedial reading class being taught at Powell School by Mrs. Dorothy Harrington.

A teacher for 34 years, Mrs. Harrington has been teaching the district's remedial reading classes for 7 years. Her class at Powell School consists of 11 second- and third-graders of at least average intelligence who, for one reason or another, had been unable to learn to read.

Using the same first-grade programed texts as used in the Monte Loma class, Mrs. Harrington reported these results:

A second-grade girl, barely able to read at an early first-grade level, in 4 months was reading at a third-grade level.

A third grader, unable to read a single word, reached a second-grade reading level in 3½ months.

A number of other children made the equivalent of 16 months growth in reading ability between September and January.

TESTED

The evidence of progress, according to Mrs. Harrington, is unimpeachable. The children

Hartley Congressmen were defeated in Pennsylvania.

McDevitt once said that he grew up "more or less a Democrat because in Republican Philadelphia it was the only thing a sincere trade unionist could be." Nevertheless, he could commend Republicans who had been fair to labor and criticized Democrats when they menaced labor's interests. He once commended Republican Gov. Edward Martin for a "glorious triumph" and he once told President Truman he was emulating the dictators when he asked for a "draft labor" law.

Expressing, once, the political philosophy of COPE, he said, "We believe that the well-being, the security, the freedom from economic fear and the dignity of each person should be the first concern of each legislator whether it be in the State capitals or Washington."

In his years in Pennsylvania, McDevitt served on many State agencies under appointment by the Governor. In 1948, he and President Edward J. Leonard (then vice president) were designated by the U.S. Secretary of Labor as representatives of all labor in the United States at the World Safety Conference of the International Labor Organization, held in Geneva, Switzerland.

Jim McDevitt's activities in the fight against intolerance are reflected in the positions he had held on such groups as the executive committee of the State council for fair employment practices, the American Council for Christians and Jews, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the National Trade Council for Palestine.

McDevitt was named a Vice President of the Operative Plasterers' and Cement Masons' International Association in 1954 to fill a vacancy caused by the death of James M. Myles, who also had been a prominent citizen of Pennsylvania. In 1959, President Leonard appointed McDevitt to the general executive board. Jim rendered many services to the international association, not the least of which were given in his capacity as chairman of the constitution committee at international conventions. He took this post following the death of Vice President John Brennan, and his ready grasp of issues and command of parliamentary procedures made him a tower of strength during conventions.

Over the years, a lot of eminent people went out of their way to say nice things about Jim McDevitt. Here are some quotes:

"Jim McDevitt has proven himself a labor-statesman who seeks to advance both the interests of organized labor and the community in which they work," Wayne Morse, U.S. Senator, Oregon.

"I have known Jim McDevitt ever since the days when I was serving in the State senate, and I have long been indebted to him for his ready ear, his sound counsel, his devotion to humanitarian ideals, and his eloquent presentation of labor's point of view," George M. Leader, former Governor of Pennsylvania.

"Jim McDevitt is a man of character, integrity, knowledge and ability. For many years it has been my great privilege to be intimately acquainted with him and like others who have come within range of his influence, I have admiration and affection for him," James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and former chairman, National Democratic Committee.

"Even more impressive than his fierce dedication to the cause of labor, has been his unselfish devotion to the struggle for human rights and civic betterment," Richardson Dilworth, mayor, city of Philadelphia.

"Since I am a card carrying member of the B.M.P.I.U., we have much in common. I have watched Jim McDevitt grow from a mechanic of the trowel trade to the high position he now enjoys. This has been accomplished only by his dedication to the labor movement and his fair dealing with industry over the years," John B. Kelly, prominent Philadelphia builder.

"It has been my good fortune to know some of the top men of the world * * * Jim McDevitt ranks with the best of them," George H. Earle, former Governor of Pennsylvania and U.S. Ambassador.

"He has always been constructive. He is held in esteem and respect by all who have been privileged to work with him," Dr. George W. Taylor, former chairman, National War Labor Board, and well-known arbitrator.

"Jim McDevitt has stood for the ideals of good government, justice and rights of the average American citizen," Joseph S. Clark, U.S. Senator, Pennsylvania.

Meany's tribute: "No one served the trade union cause with deeper sincerity and greater diligence than Jim McDevitt. His contributions over the years, in every sense of the economic and social life of workers, can hardly be measured. Most recently, his leadership of COPE was instrumental in developing the political voice of American wage-earners into a potent instrument, more nearly in keeping with their numbers.

"He will long be missed as a leader and a friend, and his place will be hard to fill."

A solemn mass was held March 22 at St. Bartholomew's Church, Bethesda, Md., the Washington suburb in which the McDevitts resided. That same evening, a wake was held at the Oliver Bair Funeral Home, at 18th and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia. Burial took place the following morning, March 23, at Holy Sepulchre Cemetery, Cheltenham Township, Philadelphia. The survivors include his wife, Margaret Mary, and three children, Margaret Byrne, James L. McDevitt, Jr., and Lt. William P. McDevitt, USAF.

Edward J. Leonard,
John J. Hauck,
Vincent J. Lee,
Edward Holzmann,
B. A. Martinez,
Anthony F. Giordano,
The general executive board.
Chas W. Irvine,
Canadian Consultant for Executive Board.

Inflated Unemployment Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, unemployment statistics overstate the extent of joblessness. Many so-called unemployed actually are part-time workers, temporary unemployed, or passive job seekers. This revealing discovery in the State of Massachusetts was made by Richard Neff of the Christian Science Monitor and published on May 3.

When unemployment statistics are used so extensively to justify political public works spending, let us explore the unemployment myth before doling out snake oil remedies whose cost can fiscally kill the patient.

The article follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 3, 1961]

Jobless Core Hard To Figure

(By Richard Neff)

Boston.—Unemployment statistics list about 153,800 persons as jobless in Massachusetts, or roughly 6.8 percent of the work force.

Yet this figure is harder to put your finger on than a wet cake of soap.

And unemployment figures for the Nation are just as slippery.

No one seems to know how many people designated as unemployed really lack a job despite an earnest search for one, and how many are called "unemployed" for various special reasons.

The latter include workers just temporarily laid off; housewives who would like to have work but are not desperate to find it; retired people who want a part-time job to supplement their pensions; a mother who is expecting a child in 3 or 4 months.

STATISTICS FOUND MISLEADING

A study of the situation in Massachusetts leads the writer to conclude that unemployment statistics, at least on the State level, are heavily watered.

This is not the fault of officials who gather and calculate the statistics. Rather, the fault lies (1) in the system itself, which fails to sort out hard core unemployment, or identify adequately different types of the soft core, and (2) Government officials and other citizens who publicly use the figures without understanding these limitations.

This is an important problem because public thinking is greatly influenced by jobless statistics.

For instance, high unemployment figures are offered as evidence that the State or national economy is sluggish or that specific areas in the State are depressed.

A careful study of the North Adams, Mass., area by Dr. Philip L. Gamble of the University of Massachusetts indicates that the hard core of unemployed in that depressed area is probably less than 15 percent of what everyone thought it was.

NEW BEDFORD STUDIES COMPARED

This is buttressed by:

A statewide study done by the Division of Employment Security in 1950, roughly similar to that of Dr. Gamble, which found that hard core was about 11 percent of total figures;

A limited statewide sample in 1958 indicated a hard core of about 44 percent of the expected figure;

A year-long review in New Bedford—another so-called depressed area—several years ago, showed that well over half of the people who had used up their unemployment benefits were no longer interested in finding a job; many others had found work; and

Only about 15 percent of people currently claiming unemployment compensation in Massachusetts have been out of work more than 15 weeks, and the average person getting such benefits has been out of work only 5 weeks.

CLOSER LOOK AT FALL RIVER

In talks in Fall River, another depressed area, an unusually well informed source stated, "The hard core here is not of any size." A businessman said he was unable to hire the same type of workers who are collecting jobless benefits; a scholar found after extensive interviews with unemployed persons that there is almost no hardship.

Welfare agencies in North Adams, Fall River, and New Bedford report only a tiny percentage of people being on relief as a result of unemployment.

This newspaper's research indicates a need, at least in this State, for more careful studies of the hard core unemployed; expansion and refining of the system of gathering and tabulating State unemployment statistics; a serious study of how unemployment compensation affects unemployment; and more cautious, intelligent use of jobless statistics by management, labor, the public—and Government officials as well.

Poland's Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, many years ago, in our Declaration of Independence, our Founding Fathers acknowledegd the fact that all men are endowed by the Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And throughout our national existence, it has been the conscious policy of our Nation, executed by our Government, to make available and insure the exercise of these rights not only to our own people but to men and women everywhere.

A century ago, a great American President pointed out eloquently that no nation can survive half-slave and half-free. The same, of course, applies to the world at large. To conform to the natural order, to give each man the opportunity to exercise his unalienable rights, the world—all of the nations in it—must be free.

We know that this condition does not obtain today. We know that behind the Iron and the Bamboo Curtains, hundreds of millions of people live in slavery, in cruel bondage to their Communist masters.

One of those nations is Poland whose courageous people are this very day denied the exercise of their unalienable rights.

On the occasion of this anniversary of Poland's famous Constitution of May 3, I want to join with my colleagues in assuring the people of Poland that the American people will not rest until the right to self-determination is restored to them.

I know that words alone are not sufficient to convey our national determination on this score. We should, and we have, provided the people of Poland with more tangible evidence of our friendship, of our concern for their welfare, and our hope for their future.

One of these tangible gestures is a small research hospital for children which is being built today with American funds in Krakow. This is a fine humanitarian project, and it has received congressional support in the past. This support was warranted, and I hope that it will continue. The American Research Hospital for Children in Krakow should be completed as soon as possible to provide the people of Poland with concrete evidence of our continuing concern for their welfare.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I will continue to support this project and I look forward to the day when the people of Poland will once again be free to manage the affairs of their nation without interference from the big brother to the East.

Pennsylvania Senate Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to present, at this time, Senate Resolution 44, introduced by Senators Israel Stiefel, Charles R. Weiner, Martin Silvert, James S. Berger, and Benjamin R. Donolow, in the Senate of Pennsylvania, which was unanimously adopted on April 29, 1963.

I urge each and every Member of the Congress to read the content of the aforementioned resolution:

Where the persistent enmity to religion of the Government of the Soviet Union is a matter of historical record; and

Whereas within the narrow framework of permissible religious practices, discrimination against synagogues and against Jewish worshipers afflicts the devout Jews of Russia; and

Whereas Jewish congregations of the U.S.S.R. are forbidden to organize a central body and are not allowed contacts with Jewish religious groups elsewhere; and

Whereas Yiddish language institutions and the other instruments of Yiddish culture which were destroyed in the Stalin era have not been restored; and

Whereas 46 leading Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and Greek Orthodox clergymen of the United States have appealed to Chairman Nikita S. Khrushchev to end discriminations against Jews, their religion and their culture; and

Whereas both the United States and the Soviet Union have subscribed to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; and

Whereas article 18 of that decalartion declares that, "Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance"; and

Whereas the State Department of the United States has on other occasions protested the infliction of such injustices upon minority groups in Russia and other lands: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Department of State be hereby respectfully memorialized to request of the Soviet Union that it grant to its Jewish citizens the right to freedom of worship; be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States restate the position of the United States in opposition to these acts of discrimination against Jewish citizens and that he instruct the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to make known the sentiments expressed in this resolution in every possible manner; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of the Senate of the Commonwealth, to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Member of Congress from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and to the legislatures of the States in the United States; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Chairman Nikita S. Khrushchev to indicate that the people of the United States deplore the antireligious attitude of the Soviet Union and the mistreatment of its Jewish subjects.

Urban Renewal Goal: Spend 2 Trillion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, why is there so much pressure from the Kennedy administration to push Federal urban renewal and public housing? Perhaps the answer may be found in the report of the National Planning Association calling for an expanded urban renewal program which envisions an expenditure of over $2 trillion in the next 20 years. Beware the Federal planners, the only answer they have for every problem faced by mankind is to spend more money.

The following article by Ken Thompson, editorial staff writer of the Dallas Morning News, deftly exposes what the planners have in mind for you and me and our money in the next 2 decades:

URBAN RENEWAL ON VAST SCALE

(By Ken Thompson)

Why it is, no one could tell you. But it seems to be almost inevitable that whenever a cockeyed scheme fails, its promoters are quick to explain that the failure was the result of limits on its scope and costs. If only the program were bigger and more expensive, it would work.

A typical, if somewhat ridiculous, example of this kind of thinking is contained in a report put out by a Washington-based organization, the National Planning Association.

The report, written by the association's staff economist, Peter Wagner, concedes that urban renewal projects in the past have met with indifferent success, a painless way of saying that they have been dismal failures.

Mr. Wagner maintains that the fault was in the limited approach of the programs, and that to be truly successful, urban renewal and development must be undertaken on the broadest possible scale.

Just what is meant by the "broadest possible scale?" We almost hesitate to explain, because you wouldn't believe it. We didn't until the NPA's report was read and reread several times.

Mr. Wagner calls for a comprehensive, 20-year program of urban renewal and development emphasizing slum clearance and public housing as well as transportation, but touching on education, welfare and recreational services.

How much would all this cost? Sit tight. The figure Mr. Wagner suggests is liable to knock you off balance. Over 20 years, the cost would be $2,133,600 million. That's right, more than $2 trillion (not billion or million); we've rechecked the figures several times.

This represents 12.7 percent (slightly more than one-eighth) of the estimated total gross national product for the next 20 years. It would add up to more than $100 billion per year, which is more than the Federal Government is now spending annually on everything from agriculture subsidies to Zeus missiles.

Where will this money come from? Surprisingly, not all of it would come out of the Federal till. Maybe somebody has told the National Planning Association that the U.S. Treasury is already more than $300 billion in the red.

According to Mr. Wagner's study ("fantasy" would, perhaps, be a better word), the Federal Government would have to put up only $100 billion over the 20-year period.

State and local governments, however, would be tapped for $500 to $700 billion. And the "private sector"—a favorite expression for these birds who seem to be embarrassed whenever the term "private enterprise" is used—would be expected to cough up $1.4 to $1.5 trillion (that's right, trillion).

But this contribution by the "private sector," of course, wouldn't be used for the building of any kind of private industrial plants, Mr. Wagner is careful to note, which makes one wonder why the private-public distinction is of any real importance.

If the Government is going to spend the money anyway, it might just as well take it out in taxes—the whole $2,133,600,000,000 of it.

An interesting sidelight of this report is the fact that its author has chosen to justify the necessity of his dream world project by claiming that it could solve our unemployment problem.

Even if that were true, it would surely be much cheaper to pay executive salaries to all those who couldn't, or wouldn't, find jobs for themselves. We are already doing that, and it doesn't cost $100 billion a year—yet.

But according to his own claims, Mr. Wagner's project wouldn't even begin to solve the unemployment problem. His own guess, and it's probably stretched considerably, is that the 20-year project would create 3 million new jobs.

Today, in order to keep up with the normal increase in the labor market, we already have to provide nearly 800,000 new jobs every year.

And over the next 20 years, economists estimate that we will have to provide nearly 30 million new jobs. That 3 million clearly isn't going to solve the problem.

Even if it would, the cost is ridiculously prohibitive. A $2,133,600,000,000 program to create 3 million jobs comes to more than $700,000 per job. Estimates vary, but private industry is able to create new jobs at a cost of approximately $30,000 in capital investment per job.

Even John Kenneth Galbraith and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., that moonstruck tagteam from Cambridge, probably wouldn't take this NPA scheme seriously. Or would they?

Less Regulation, Not More, Is Agriculture Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in 2 short weeks the wheat farmers of America will vote in a referendum on the 1964 wheat program involving the two-price wheat certificate program conjured up by the Kennedy administration. The propaganda mills at the Department of Agriculture, and certain interest groups seeking more Federal control and handouts, have been overworked for months. As early as December 13, 1962, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, speaking before the National Association of Wheat Growers in Denver, forecast doom and gloom if the referendum was voted down.

According to the Secretary, "utter chaos" will prevail if the referendum loses. The effects on international trade would be disastrous. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the farmers of America are going to be stampeded into accepting another step toward rigid Government control. Rather, I think enough of them have had the unfortunate experience of existing with Federal farm bureaucracy at the national level, and they do, indeed, know what is good for them. It is less Government control, not more.

As an illustration of this realistic attitude, and of these unfortunate experiences, I want to call attention to the following open letter written to Secretary Freeman on January 17, 1963, by Perry E. Moore, a wheat farmer in my district, in Hunterdon County, N.J. Mr. Moore has only praise for State and county agriculture advisers, but can only condemn the efforts of those who would impose their own ideas on the farmer.

The letter follows:

An Open Letter to Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman

January 17, 1963.

Hon. Orville L. Freeman,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: I believe that every U.S. citizen is entitled to his own opinions and the right to express them and those who do not agree with them have the right to criticize him. However, when a citizen becomes an appointed official in the Government and in that office makes recommendations and uses the power of that office to make recommendations that may not be in the general public interest then it is time for the voters and taxpayers of the country to pay attention to the effect of what the officials in the Government are advocating and working for.

In your remarks before the Chicago Board of Trade in Chicago, Ill., dated December 12, 1962—as reported by USDA 4325-62—you expound your philosophy on an agricultural policy for today's world. The goals you recommend are admirable. It is the program of how you intend to reach these goals that is questionable and open to criticism. You say the answer to the problem is "supply management." That to me has a familiar ring. Did not Henry Wallace sponsor the "ever-normal granery plan," which advocated the killing of little pigs and the plowing up of cotton? Since Biblical and early Egyptian times, this plan, whenever adopted, had been a failure. Certainly, I shouldn't waste your time to read and my time to write and tell you that your efforts to control production through reduction of acres have failed, and efforts of the Department of Agriculture in their planned production and distribution have not met with success. The sales and movement of our surplus agricultural commodities have been on a giveaway and not on a commercial basis, so why brag about it, as the taxpayers are the ones paying for surplus production and distribution of most of the five basic commodities.

You are urging from the rooftops that the farmers support your wheat program, and predicting dire results if the farmers do not vote for it. Again, I point out that where the Government has done the planning for agriculture, a large percentage of the farmers producing those commodities have all been in hock to Uncle Sam. Fortunately, they have not been hurt by doing so because the loans they made were nonrecourse loans, with the taxpayers holding the bag. The CCC operations show a total loss of $20.7 billion since it started operations, which equals about one-tenth of our stupendous national debt.

I am going to give you a personal reason why planned supply production is not in the farmers' interest. I own a farm in Hunterdon County, N.J., which is suitable for dairy use, the production of wheat, feed grains, corn, and grasses. There was a 23-acre wheat quota wich had been reduced to 18.5 acres by failure to plant. Unless I plant my wheat I lose my entire allotment. In 1961 I produced 36 bushels to the acre. In 1962, to comply with Department of Agriculture request, I reduced my acreage to 15 acres and rotated my planting so as to build up my lands. In 1963, to cooperate with your request, I planted 11 acres. Now I find that my quota is 18.5 acres that was given to me at planting time, has been reduced after planting time, to 13 acres, by the Department's method of applying planted acres because I planted legumes, trees, and food for wildlife without reimbursement from the Government. So, if I want to remain in the program you are advocating, I will have to plow up wheat already planted, in spite of the fact that I had reduced my acreage by 8 acres, which would only leave me 9 acres to harvest. This information was given me when it was too late to plant my total 18.5 acres for the 1963 crops and hence I was foiled from using my production possibilities and what I had been told would be given me when I entered the 1963 wheat program. Furthermore, I now have to plant enough Spring wheat, a worthless crop in my territory, to maintain my 18.5-acre allotment. Thus, you see that planned supply management and planned economy are not working out for the farmers who try to cooperate.

If the Department of Agriculture will stick to the purpose for which it was formed, viz, to help the farmer produce crops, not market them, it will perform a public service. I can only speak with praise for the help I have obtained from county agent, the Soil Conservation Service, and those in the Department who have given well-chosen advice, while I can only speak with condemnation of the Department of Agriculture where they have tried to impose their ideas in the marketing and disposal of farm production.

Mr. Secretary, how is it that one section of the Agriculture Department is telling the public what dire straits the farmers are in and their heavy losses of income, while another section is giving out figures showing that the income of farm people has increased in recent years much faster than the incomes of nonfarm people? It is stated, according to the USDA, that the average income of nonfarm people increased 17 percent from 1955 to 1961. During the same 6 years the average income of people living on farms went up 43 percent. Thus, the per capita income of farm people went up more than twice as fast as the average of other people. The rise in farmers' incomes was not a 1- or 2-year development; on the contrary, the incomes of people living on farms went up in 5 of those 6 years. It was only in 1959 that farm incomes declined.

Is not the answer to the loss of farm income in the basic crops due to Government interference and controlled production based on the philosophy of "supply management," together with expenditures of U.S. dollars in foreign countries to promote production of crops there that have robbed the U.S. farmers of their markets? If you question this statement, just look at the loss of our cotton markets because of U.S. foreign aid given directly and indirectly through high support loans. Land taken out of cotton production comes in competition with livestock production, grains, et cetera.

Very truly yours,

PERRY E. MOORE.

Programed Learning—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in two previous articles appearing in this issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I have attemped to acquaint my colleagues with a new innovation in teaching methods which is described as "programed learning."

Dr. M. W. Sullivan, of Sullivan Associates, is one of the originators of this method of instruction. The following article, which is the last in a series of three appearing in a Palo Alto Times, will tell of Dr. Sullivan's background and his outstanding achievements in the field of instruction.

I have inserted these three articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with enthusiastic interest. I feel that Dr. Sullivan is making a far-reaching contribution to our educational system, which should be of interest to educators throughout the entire Nation.

The article from the Palo Alto Times of May 3, 1963, follows:

[From Palo Alto Times, May 3, 1963]

TEACHING REVOLUTION PREDICTED THROUGH COURSE PROGRAMING

(By Derek Schoen)

Wasted classroom time, overcrowded classrooms, lack of time for giving needed help to individual students, inadequate curriculum.

All these well-recognized shortcomings in the present-day educational programs of the Nation's public school system can be eliminated quickly through the advent of programed instruction.

That's the claim of one of the Nation's leading programers, M. W. Sullivan, of Palo Alto, who sees programed learning as perhaps the most significant innovation in education since the printing press.

Sullivan, president of the small but active programing textbook firm of Sullivan Associates, bases many of his claims on the still partial results of the firm's pilot reading program being conducted in the Whisman School District in Mountain View.

There, a single class of first graders is making impressively fast progress in reading with programed texts, and to remedial reading classes have made a believer out of a veteran teacher of so-called slow students.

But programed instruction is nothing new for Sullivan or for the nucleus of his staff based in a pair of wood frame buildings in the city's foothills along Page Mill Road.

FIVE DEGREES

Sullivan holds a total of five degrees, including a bachelor's and master's degree in English from Yale, a bachelor's degree in Spanish from the University of Puetro Rico, a master's degree in Spanish from Middlebury College, and a Ph. D. in history from the University of Spain.

He first saw the possibility of programed instruction in connection with teaching machines while serving as a Marine interpreter in Germany after World War II. German advances in the production of quality tape recorders made it practical to conceive of using recorders for the teaching of such subjects as foreign languages.

Sullivan himself designed one of the earliest teaching machines, which he describes as "an intricate electronic device that gave both audio and visual questions and answers in a prepared sequence."

He used the electronic equipment with some success while teaching languages at Connecticut's Choate School, at Yale University, and at Marquette University. Meanwhile, as America began to produce quality tape recorders in quantity, an entire industry evolved around the manufacture of machines for such uses as language laboratories.

Sullivan himself used some of the more advanced machines for language classes at Hollins College in Virginia, where he became head of the department of modern languages in 1958. In the summers of both 1959 and 1960, he directed foreign language institutes at Hollins with funds provided by the National Defense Education Act.

But Sullivan recalls that his experiences with teaching machines left something to be desired. "It became obvious that the machines were far too expensive for normal classroom use—they also displayed a fine knack for breaking down at inopportune moments," he says.

So he, like a number of other programers, turned back to the book as the primary vehicle for carrying the new technique.

One of his earliest efforts at programing instruction without the aid of recorders or other electronic devices was a book on chess, which the Encyclopedia Britannica purchased and marketed in a leatherbound volume.

The book, which guaranteed to teach the complex game in 12 hours, was hailed by chess experts. Encyclopedia Britannica became so enthusiastic about the future of programing that it hired Sullivan and a group of fellow programers away from Hollins and built them a headquarters in the Stanford Industrial Park.

But after a difference of opinion about how programs should be produced, Sullivan and his staff left the encyclopedia firm and moved into the foothills headquarters, where, they work a 7-day weekly schedule.

NO COURSES

Since its formation, Sullivan Associates has turned out a total of 10 programed courses, ranging from the reading program now being tested in the Whisman District to courses in geography, English, linguistics, astronomy, and French. The firm's output now is being published primarily by McGraw-Hill and MacMillian, well-known textbook publishing firms.

All the programs are thoroughly tested in classrooms before being put on the market. And this, says Sullivan, gives programed materials a decided edge over standard textbooks.

"There's never been a truly good way to test educational materials before. An author has simply tried to cram his knowledge about subject matter into a book—and if some of the student's couldn't understand the book, they were either put into remedial classes or ignored," he says.

But since programs consist of step-by-step presentations of small bits of material, each building upon one another toward the complete presentation of a subject, it becomes imperative that the student understand nearly every step before he can proceed.

Therefore, and also because the student's success in answering questions posed by the program provides him with motivation to continue, the program is designed so that the average student should answer correctly about 95 percent of the time.

REWRITTEN

When particular segments of the program are shown by test results to have been too difficult for the student to follow, they are rewritten until the correct percentage of correct answers is recorded.

Students using the materials also are asked to comment on various facets of the program. Thus, says Sullivan, the students participate in designing materials for use by other students.

Since programs are designed to allow students to work individually at their own pace, Sullivan sees them as eliminating waste time in the classroom while a teacher holds up proceedings to answer a single student's question. Now, the teacher can help the individual while the rest of the class continues work.

For the same reasons, he feels, programed materials answer the problem posed to the teacher by the wide range of intelligence in a given classroom.

While the teacher using standard materials must now aim the instruction at the average student—thus risking damage to both the fast and slow learners—programed courses allow students to proceed at the pace that best suits them.

TEACHER'S ROLE

And Sullivan also foresees a major change in the role of the teacher.

Freed from the tedium of presenting material—the programs do that—the teacher will have to become a subject-matter specialist able to serve the wide range of individual needs in a classroom.

"Frankly, teachers are going to have to become better versed in what they teach. They're no longer going to be able to just get by with the knowledge they picked up in college a few years back. The programs will incorporate the latest developments and the teachers will have to stay abreast," he says.

Because it has already been proved that students using programs learn at a faster pace than those using standard materials, increased use of programs could conceivably have sociological repercussions.

For instance, says Sullivan Associates Vice President Lewis Miller, it may be envisioned that programs could cut the basic public school education span from its present 12 years to 8 or even 6 years.

"Believe me, this is not beyond the realm of possibility," says Miller, who sees a blessing rather than a problem in this possible development.

"On the one hand, I'll admit, this raises the specter of children being turned loose from school at age 12 or 14—the question immediately arises, 'What could they do?'

"On the brighter side, however, perhaps we won't graduate students faster—maybe we'll just teach them more in the same number of years. And isn't that what education is reaching for?" says Miller.

Programed courses already have proved to be a boon to the shut-in student. Although unable to attend school, these students can now keep pace with their classmates because the program allows them to work at home.

The success of programs in this area poses another possibility.

"I can conceive of a day in the not too distant future when schools would be nothing more than centers where students would pick up and return their programs, take tests, and see a small cadre of teachers for their individual needs," says Sullivan.

Even under such a system, he insists, the teaching profession would not suddenly be faced with the sudden elimination of thousands of jobs.

"If every student now in college went into the teaching profession, we'd still have a serious teacher shortage in 20 years. Programing isn't going to eliminate teachers—but it may help solve the shortage," says Sullivan.

INTERPRETATION

To date, programers have only tackled those subjects which do not call for individual interpretation. Such subjects as esthetics and literary criticism have yet to be programed.

Administrators and teachers in the Whisman School District are among the bulk of educators who believe that programs can never be designed to present such subjects. Says Whisman Superintendent Arthur Tindall:

"There's no doubt in my mind that properly used, programing will significantly improve the level of education. But I can't conceive that it can ever be used to literature—I just don't think you can make the technique fit these subjects."

But Sullivan, like other programers who believe the new technique will cause a revolution in education, disagrees.

"It may seem impossible now, but just wait and see—anything that can be taught can be programed," he says.

Polish National Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of great pride and privilege for me to join today once again in this most fitting celebration of Polish National Day.

I always eagerly embrace the opportunity on this occasion which the House has recognized now for some years to pay my warm tribute of honor, respect and congratulation to the noble Polish people and their government-in-exile, which is struggling bravely to redeem the freedoms of this great land and noble people.

I have been deeply impressed, in common with true fredom lovers all over the world, by the eloquent commemorative message of His Excellency, August Zaleski, President of the Republic of Poland.

Referring to the original adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, as the "symbol of Poland's freedom and independence," President Zaleski hailed the new Constitution as ending the age-old monarchial dictatorship and removing the barriers to personal liberty which had afflicted the Polish nation and country for centuries prior to the adoption of the new Constitution.

This significant event, as he has so well said, demonstrated the force of a sublime idea inspiring the Polish people and illuminating for them the way to moral, political, and social advancement in their governmental affairs.

Like our own Constitution, the Polish Constitution was clear in its recognition of the divine nature of the moral law, the inalienable right of men and women to be free and to order their own self-government.

It is a curious and significant coincidence that before the original Polish Constitution could be implemented, the Russians invaded Poland on the spurious pretext of "restoring the rights and privileges of the famed Polish nation." It is well for us to note today that this so-called defense of freedom by Russia years ago bears an analogy to the present attitude, methods, and suppression by force and intimidation of Polish liberty by the Soviets in our time and generation.

One would have to be naive indeed to believe that the current dictatorship of Poland, engineered and directed by the Soviets, is designed for the defense of freedom of the Polish people. To the contrary, it is a calloused denial of the ordinary rights associated with freedom and autonomous, democratic government.

As President Zaleski notes in his able discourse, the present behavior of the Russian authorities and their Polish agents toward the free Poles brings to mind the methods used by the old czarist agents.

The Communist conspiracy is shortsighted and unrealistic indeed, if its leaders believe that unceasing oppression and tyranny can ever successfully undermine the lofty ideals of the Polish nation.

These ideals, predicated on firm belief in the Almighty, and a compelling resolute devotion to the principles of freedom, impregnate the very cells of the Polish people.

Liberty is part of their very being; faith in the Lord an indelible stamp of the Polish character.

No superstate, however powerful, and no tyranny, however oppressive, can ever eradicate these beliefs or grind the gallant Polish people into willing minions of the Marxist, slave state.

In Polish hearts, the concepts of liberty, freedom and belief in God will ever remain vibrant, strong and tenacious until the day when Poland shall be liberated from the cruel bondage which now holds them in its grip.

Gallant people, determined to be free under the Divine Master and in the beneficent shelter of free institutions, will never forfeit or give up their birthright, or cease their brave struggle, until their liberties, their rights and territorial integrity and political independence have been restored.

The whole free world deeply sympathizers with the gallant Polish people, and our own great Nation committed, as it is, to human liberty and the rights of man will never abandon the oppressed of Poland and other lands seeking their God-given moral rights to the free way of life.

In every way given to us, we will continue to extend to the Polish people every encouragement and assistance in pursuing their chosen ideals and finally realizing once again the fruits and blessings of freedom.

I am highly privileged, Mr. Speaker, to support my distinguished colleagues in this fitting tribute to mark the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution and I want to compliment and commend the able gentleman from Michigan for his splendid presentation in behalf of the sacred cause of Poland.

Let me say that it is with great pleasure that I join with my friends and colleagues in the House in praising the loyalty and courage of a great people. The Polish people have been fighting the battle for freedom for centuries with a tenacity and courage that could never possibly be surpassed or exceeded. I am grateful for this opportunity to reiterate my unyielding and unceasing support of the Polish cause, to which I have been devoted since I first came to Congress. In this support of Polish freedom, I have simply followed the dictates of my own conscience because it has been clear to me from the very beginning of the unfortunate international situation which fastened tyranny upon the brave, noble and gallant people of Poland that this was perhaps the most unspeakable and brutal tyranny in all history as well as an unvarnished perfidy.

Peace seeking, liberty loving, devoted to the pursuits of peace and the worship of God, this noble people are the victims of unwarranted aggression and tyranny. First it was Hitler and then it was Stalin who terrorized and ravished this great Christian nation. The exploits of the Polish people against cruel, overwhelming enemies were and are among the brightest in the annals of mankind's age-old battle against tyranny, oppression and dictatorship.

The official deliberations and diplomatic surrenders at Yalta, Teheran and Potsdam, which consigned entire nations into the bondage and subjugation of Soviet communism, stand as a gross betrayal of Poland and other freedom loving nations.

What a great tragedy, what a crass violation of human decency and human rights to witness the great, proud, historic Polish nation shackled in Soviet bondage with the acquiescence and action of its own allies.

It is especially appropriate today that we should pledge to the Polish people, and to all small nations suffering under the yoke of tyranny and oppression, our unyielding determination to seek freedom for these unhappy lands. In these tributes by the House today, let it be made known to the great historic Polish people that their fight for freedom is our fight because it is the fight for liberty, democracy, justice, morality and human decency. It is the fight for every precious value of the free world and the free way of life.

It is to the everlasting credit and glory of the Polish people that they have never ceased their resistance to tyranny and are still ready to make continued sacrifices to recover the liberties which were stolen from them by shameless perfidy and armed might. So today in the name of freedom, let us reiterate our loyalty to the sacred cause of Polish liberty. Let us renew our pledge and our prayer that Poland will be liberated from the oppressor and restored to her high and rightful place among free nations.

May the day soon come, pray God, when Poland is free from the chains of slavery and restored to her status as a free and independent nation.

I ask that President Zaleski's message may be inserted as part of my speech.

The message follows:

Message of the President of the Republic of Poland to the Polish Nation on the Occasion of the Polish National Day, May 3, 1963

(H. E. August Zaleski, President of the Republic of Poland, has issued the following message to Poles all over the world on the occasion of the Polish National Day this year.)

At 6 o'clock in the afternoon on May 3, 1791, the Diet of the Polish Commonwealth virtually without dissent enacted a new Constitution law which, though never applied, has been accepted as a symbol of Poland's freedom and independence.

This was so because the new Constitution accomplished at one stroke all that had not been ventured even by gradual stages: it ended the system of electing the kings of Poland, abolished the institution of liberum veto, and took the lower estates under its protection. In such manner, it removed all the ailments which had afflicted the country for the last two centuries.

Many years later, on May 3, 1861, Prince Adam Czartoryski stressed the significance of this act, thus:

"Our nation, in 1 day at once rose to an elevation of spirit, to a moral power, theretofore unattained by any other one. * * * It is conceivable that an individual seized by a sublime idea may rise toward it, but when the whole mass of the people is suddenly illuminated by the power and light of moral excellence * * * such a singular fact cannot be otherwise explained than as due to the special grace of providence."

Unfortunately, despite the enthusiasm the May Constitution evoked amidst the Polish people and its favorable reception in all the countries of western Europe, it was fated never to enter into force.

Russia, who had been warring with Turkey, concluded peace at Jassy on January 9, 1792. Only a few months sufficed for her troops to be transferred to the Polish frontier. And in May of that year, Russian armies again invaded Poland—as the Russian Government announced, "to restore the rights and privileges of the famed Polish nation."

We all know how this defense of freedom by Russia ended. But we should ponder the very evident analogy between Russia's methods of action against Poland in those times and today.

Once again, the Russian Government strives to persuade the Poles and the whole world that she is "the defender of Poland's freedom," though now "against the machinations of imperialists and capitalists." As in 1792, so now are there Poles who either consider Russian intentions toward Poland to be sincere because these happen to coincide with their views on society, or pretend to consider them as such because they answer their personal interests.

Even the behavior of the Russian authorities and their Polish agents toward the free Poles brings to mind the methods used by the old tsarist agents. Their summons to "realism" is, practically speaking, tantamount to a call for resignation from the loftiest ideals of the Polish nation. It is understandable and even necessary that under the present conditions the people in Poland should devote themselves primarily to the reconstruction of their country. But the Poles in other countries must remember they have remained there to demand justice for Poland, not merely to restrict their activities to furthering the extension of economic aid or to enrich the museums of Poland, and so on.

Happily, the great majority of the free Poles maintain their standpoint of protest against the existing state of affairs in Poland under the Communist yoke. I am convinced that this majority will continue to struggle for the restoration of the complete freedom, territorial integrity, and independence of the Polish Republic, and that with divine help it will attain the unity necessary to bring this struggle to victory.

Polonia Paid Tribute in 1962 to Its Civil War Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently, at the annual meeting of the Polish-American Historical Association, Dr. Edward C. Rozanski, Midwest coordinator of the American Polish Civil War Centennial Committee, presented an interesting report emphasizing the contributions of this group to Civil War Centennial commemorations.

In view of the continuing interest throughout the country of Civil War commemorations and historical reviews, I insert a condensed version of Dr. Rozanski's report into the Record at this point:

Polonia Paid Tribute in 1962 to Its Civil War Heroes—The Efforts of the American-Polish Civil War Centennial Committee Brought to Light Much of Our Glorious Past

At the yearly forum of the Polish-American Historical Association, held in December in Chicago, Dr. Edward C. Rozanski, Midwest coordinator of the American-Polish Civil War Centennial Committee gave an interesting report of the activities of this organization during the past year. Addressing the forum on December 27, Dr. Rozanski stressed the fact that the effort of APCWCC brought to light much of the glorious past of Polonia.

Dr. Rozanski in his report stated as follows:

GENERAL KRZYZANOWSKI'S 75TH IN MEMORIAM

In New York City on January 31 at the Kosciuszko Foundation, the memory of General Wladimir B. Krzyzanowski was honored on the exact date of the 75th anniversary of his death. It was a very solemn observance held under the auspices of the American-Polish Civil War Centennial Committee and joined in by some 16 centennial, military, veteran, fraternal, and civil groups. It turned out to be the coldest night of the year, yet an overflow audience attended to hear an inspiring program.

On that occasion the adjutant general of New York, Gen. Charles A. Stevenson, delivered the main address which in fact was a historical paper in which he reevaluated General Krzyzanowski's role in Gettysburg.

Through the American-Polish Civil War Centennial Committee Chronicle, proclamations by Illinois Governor Otto Kerner and Chicago Mayor Richard J. Daley, were issued. Further tributes were paid by Governor Rockefeller, the National Civil War Centennial Commission, Old Guard of City of New York, the Loyal Legion, Congressmen Edward Derwinski and Dan Rostenkowski.

The highlight of this commemoration was the unveiling of the first contemporary portrait of General Krzyzanowski painted in 1937 by the late Jerzy Sudnik of Newark, N.J. Today it hangs in the main gallery of the Kosciuszko Foundation.

POLPEX 1962 HONORS CIVIL WAR POLES

On March 9–10–11, the Polonus Philatelic Society honored the Polish heroes of the Civil War, by issuing a commemorative stamp, honoring General Krzyzanowski and his Polish Legion. The design was based on Walter Krawiec's earlier pen tribute. An 8-page leaflet, giving a short history of the Polish effort in the Civil War, came with the stamp issue. The 22d annual exhibition of the Polonus Philatelic Society was held in the Polish Museum of America, where the Court of Honor featured relics taken out of General Krzyzanowski's grave some 25 years ago by Henry Archacki, American-Polish Civil War Centennial Committee chairman.

Polpex 1962 and its Civil War theme received a good deal of favorable publicity with the national Stamp Magazine of March 3 devoting almost 7 pages with 11 illustrations to the Civil War Poles and kindred subjects.

TRIBUTE TO POLISH NUNS

Another commemorative stamp was issued by the Plewacki Post American Legion of Buffalo. This honored the Polish nuns in the Civil War, particularly Sisters Veronica and Serena of the Klimkiewicz family. When Sister Veronica died at the age of 91 in Baltimore, she was buried with full military honors, a distinction perhaps unique to the order.

PILGRIMAGE TO ARLINGTON

The next event which attracted national attention was the yearly New York PLAV pilgrimage to the grave of General Krzyzanowski in Arlington National Cemetery. This 2-day pilgrimage of April 7–8 brought over 200 patriotic participants, the largest such gathering since the unveiling of the memorial in 1938. The American Polish Civil War Centennial Committee chairman delivered the main eulogy in the absence of ailing Col. Benjamin T. Anuszkiewicz to whom everlasting credit goes for erecting the Krzyzanowski Memorial. It was a very busy weekend as further wreaths and tributes were laid to the memory of Oscar Bielaska, son of Captain Bielaski, who later became of first Polish major league ballplayer. He lies in the Catholic part of Arlington Cemetery. The grave of Maj. Gen. Albin F. Schoepf and the Captain Bielaski family plot in the Congressional Cemetery were covered with wreaths.

Mrs. Ruth Shipley, granddaughter of Captain Bielaski, was presented with the Adam Mickiewicz Centennial medal, given to the Bielaski family by the Societe Historique et Litteraire of Paris. This oldest Polish historical society outside of Poland contains the first papers of Captain Bielaski as an exile from Poland.

On May 4 the Society Historique also honored Gov. Otto Kerner with the Mickiewicz medal and this was presented in person by American Polish Civil War Centennial Committee Midwest coordinator in the presence of John Troike, PRCU, president Stanley Turkiewicz and president Charles Rozmarek of the PNA and Polish American Congress.

AMERICAN POLISH CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL HALL DEDICATED

On May 12th, the new Civil War Centennial Hall in the Polish Museum of America was dedicated. Here in cooperation with the museum administration American Polish Civil War Centennial Committee, we managed to collect enough Civil War artifacts to make an impressive start toward a permanent depository for material and memorabilia on our Polish heroes in the Civil War. The official dedication sponsored by the Illinois department of PLAV brought together in the museum Polonia's leaders.

Unveiled was Carolina Krzyzanowski's headstone, wife of General Krzyzanowski. This neglected memento was found slowly disintegrating on a rooftop shed in back of the Frank J. Dombrowski American Legion post of Brooklyn.

MASSACHUSETTS TRIBUTE

On June 1 the State convention of the Polish American Veterans met in Webster, Mass., adopting the Civil War theme.

H.R. RESOLUTIONS 706–707

In the meanwhile American Polish Civil War Centennial Committee had been working behind the scenes for a Presidential proclamation, declaring July 9, birthday of General Krzyzanowski, as a Memorial Day. On May 3, Congressmen Rostenkowski and Derwinski introduced House Resolution 706–707 to that effect. These resolutions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and it was necessary to rally support for the bills. This was done by a concerted action from Chicago, New York, and Washington. American Polish Civil War Centennial Commitee chairman made a personal appeal at the PAC biennial meeting in Washington, D.C. and canvassed all the members on the Judiciary Committee, the majority were in favor including a written commitment by its Chairman, Emanuel Celler of New York. However, Chairman Celler never brought it up for a vote and our laudable effort expired in a pigeonhole.

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL KARGE

It (APCWCC) suffered a setback in Washington, a great triumph was registered in New Jersey. Here the PLAV of that State, the cosponsorship of the APCWCC and the N.J. Civil War Centennial Commission arranged the greatest tribute ever paid to General Karge at the site of his grave. Over 400 attended the ceremonies there and 300 more attended the memorial dinner with high dignitaries in attendance. New Jersey Gov. Richard Hughes has proclaimed July 4 as General Karge Memorial Day as did Gov. Otto Kerner of Illinois and Chicago Mayor Richard Daley, who proclaimed a whole week in Karge's memory. The end result of this tribute will be the memorializing of Gen. Joseph Karge in a permanent exhibit in the rotunda of the Statue of Liberty where the Immigration Museum is now being established by the U.S. Department of the Interior.

CAPTAIN BIELASKI'S MEMORY HONORED

On November 11 the Illinois PLAV honored Captain Bielaski's memory in Elmwood Park Civil War Memorial after the American Polish Civil War Centennial Committee had unveiled an unknown likeness of the captain on the 101st anniversary of his death on November 7.

PUBLICATIONS

The December 1961 issue of the N.Y.C.W.-C.C. bulletin carried the full text of a speech by Bruce Catton, foremost Civil War historian. Mr. Catton eulogized the Polish Legion, General Krzyzanowski, Captan Bledowski, and the Civil War Poles in general. This bulletin reached all the Civil War groups in 50 States. Further, American Polish Civil War Centennial Committee headquarters sent out over 20 press releases. It also furnished the National Catholic News Service material on General Krzyzanowski, which subsequently appeared in a feature story distributed nationally to the Catholic press. The Polish-American press devoted special pages and much space to Generals Krzyzanowski, Karge, Captain Bielaski, and others.

HOW ABOUT RESEARCH?

This then in effect is a report of the more spectacular activities of the American Polish Civil War Centennial Committee—but how about the other aspect of the committee—serious research? This is a huge undertaking, and here we hope with the aid of PAHA to cover the field in their respective areas. American Polish Civil War Centennial Committee researchers have made field trips to Mound City, Ill., Random, Ill., Washington, D.C., Charleston, S.C., Fort Delaware, Del., North Arlington, N.J., Boston, Mass., Spottsylvania, Va. These trips were in search for information on Dr. Kalussowski, Major Tochman, Col. John Smolenski, Jr., Capt. Gustave Magnicki, Dr. Marie Zakrzewska, and Capt. Joseph Gloskowski. There are a hundred more that need to be uncovered.

Our western Pennsylvania chairman, Joseph A. Borkowski, of Pittsburgh, working independently of Haiman's lists, uncovered 84 more names of Pennsylvania Civil War Poles. We have found actual photographs of General Krzyzanowski, Karge, and Captain Gloskowski in the field, plus likeneses of lesser known officers—all this, my friends, on the smallest research budget imaginable. Imagine then what could be done with some modest funds at our disposal. This then is the work of three of four individuals with a handful of sympathizers. Call them Civil War buffs if you will, but they have managed to get things done for the good of Americans of Polish extractions.

APPEAL

The American Polish Civil War Centennial Committee came into being because of necessity. Because the record of the Poles in Lincolnian America was so remarkable that to neglect it during these centennial years would be a crime. Our committee is a 5-year committee. It does not rival any existing group—it is strictly augmentary and once the centennial is over in 1965, it hopes to publish its findings and deposit all of its material in the Civil War room in the Polish Museum of America.

Thus, we who are studying the Polish past in America, will be remembering at least one Polish historian who brought to light much of that past into the light of the present.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Beg Pardon—Our Mistake—Your Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most distinguished spokesmen of the surviving gold mining industry is Mr. Lewis L. Huelsdonk who is vice president of the Best Mines Corp., in Downieville, Calif.

A short time ago, Mr. Huelsdonk gave an excellent talk on gold legislation. Mr. Huelsdonk, I believe, did an excellent job of pointing up the complications in the overall gold question and that immediate solutions in the international gold situation are impossible.

Mr. Huelsdonk emphasized the necessity of reversing the current disastrous trend in our gold policies.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD excerpts of Mr. Huelsdonk's talk.

The excerpts follow:

BEG PARDON—OUR MISTAKE—YOUR GOLD

I am here not as a critic but as a gold miner with a determination to point out some of the mistakes that our politicians and monetary experts have made, and are continuing to make, because I sincerely believe that these mistakes have not only taken away inherent rights which segregates the gold miner as a lower-grade citizen but they are also raising havoc with the American economy.

Monetary experts universally have agreed on one thing, and that is that gold must be honored as the king of money in the banknote world. For this reason, their decision, by all odds, is right and, whether we like it or not, this international compact has crowned gold, without evasion of international responsibility, as the final authority in our own banknote kingdom. But our own monetary experts have failed to recognize this predominant fact and, as a consequence, they are unable to understand why our king is sick and that he is dying by ounces without an heir apparent to the throne. So they administer to his symptoms only by prescribing all of the mistake medicine that both of our political parties can concoct. They have given many bitter pills, from confidence talks to paper money transfusions, but the king continues to wither because such dosages do not cure. They, like opiates, induce glowing visions with disintegrating relapses. Hence, our remedies have been faddish but false. They have not been able to stop the outflow of our gold, stop the buildup of foreign claims against our gold, balance our payments, stem our inflation, nor maintain international confidence in our dollar. They have, instead, left the United States in dire need of gold with her gold mines closed down under the ridiculous assumption that if they were allowed to run, the dollar may be weakened. Clearly, this shows that mistakes have been made, so let's backtrack and unscramble a few with the hope that this hindsight may help avoid some of the pitfalls in the future.

Beginning in January of 1934, after our Government confiscated all of our gold and prohibited its coinage and use as money in the United States, the Treasury Department licensed the domestic users of gold and kept records of its consumption in the industries, arts and professions. For the next 5 years, to September of 1939 when World War II broke out in Europe while we were living in a peacetime economy, the domestic industrial consumption of gold for our peacetime needs averaged only $436,164 per year. During the next 2 years, with Europe a holocaust, we lived in a semiwar economy. During this period, the domestic consumption of gold went from $4 million in 1940 to $9 million in 1941. During the next 4 years we well can remember that we were living in a full-scale war economy and that all of our industries, crafts and professions were strictly geared to the efforts of warfare, from ration stamps to war production boards. But what we may not remember is that the domestic consumption of gold for use in this warfare economy jumped to $19.7 million in 1942, to $41 million in 1943, to $65.3 million in 1944, and to $102.5 million in 1945, the year the war ended, and that during the year 1946, while our soldiers were still marching around the globe, we consumed over $137 million worth of industrial gold domestically.

Now you may wonder what this has to do with experts or mistakes. But you need not be reminded that when we entered World War II experts were corralled from all of the ivory towers and that these experts had to make decisions whether they could agree or not. One of their memorable decisions was that "bullets could not be made out of gold and, therefore, gold was not strategic to the war effort" and so the American gold mines were ordered closed and gold-mining equipment was even expedited to Russia. Such a decision could be likened to the humor that was prevalent at the time, such as the experts ordering the geologists to find more brass mines, and the bringing in of the horses to take off their shoes at night to save steel, but this decision was no joke. Although the experts could not agree it was in dead earnest. Furthermore, to button down the lid, their statisticians had estimated that this move would release 15,000 to 20,000 miners for copper and other strategic metals. Congressional hearings later showed that only 497 were recruited and only about 300 of these were miners and muckers.

According to Treasury Department figures the total domestic peacetime consumption of gold for the industrial uses during the 5 years just prior to the outbreak of World War II was only $2,180,821 worth, while in the 5 years that we were fighting the war and mopping it up our domestic warfare economy required $365,589,755 worth of gold to build up and maintain our fighting force. If gold is not strategic to a war economy then why did our war economy use over 167 times more industrial gold than our peacetime requirements?

You can draw your own conclusions, but this is not all, these increased requirements were for only the physical uses of gold in our own front yard to provide essentials for an absolute war economy. More important are the monetary aspects of gold in wartime. When we entered World War II in December of 1941, we had a gold reserve of $22,761 million. Against this were $8,310 million of Federal Reserve Bank claims and $3,679 million of foreign short-term balances for total claims of $11,989 million or for a total mortgage of only 52.7 percent against the gold we were holding. This means that we went into war owning outright $10,772 million worth of unencumbered gold, which, according to expert opinion, was not strategic to our war efforts. However after only 3 years of shooting we were left with only $461 million worth of this net gold. Thus in this short time a war economy had siphoned off $2.13 billion worth of our physical gold and increased the mortgage to $20,170 million or to 97.8 percent of what we had left.

Then, in 1945, as we continued to fight, the claims smothered the balance and a conference was called by the experts to inflate our money to cover the mortgage by lowering the gold requirements behind the dollar from 40 to 25 percent.

This was done after Germany had surrendered and the defeat of Japan was plainly evident. Europe was devastated and her recovery facilities lay in shambles, while the plants of the United States were fully intact and geared for the rehabilitation job that was then apparent. This could have meant only one thing in the postwar period, a heavy trade balance for the United States and a heavy inflow of gold that would drastically inflate her economy, and particularly so, if this liberal reduction in gold reserve requirements were put into effect. But despite this, the experts made the move. The gold did come in—$3½ billion worth, from the end of the war until 1949 when England was forced to devalue her pound.

The above facts pose the big question as to whether the war was won because we had so many experts, or whether it was won in spite of the experts, because we had so much gold. If you can visualize most of the gold in enemy vaults instead of ours at the outbreak of another war you may have the answer. Under the present international monetary arrangements American citizens cannot own or buy gold or gold security anywhere in the world to maintain the value of their domestic dollar equal to the set gold value that the United States must guarantee for foreign dollar balances. This may seem like a long way around to give away our gold, but the machinery was set up in 1945 about the same time that our monetary experts began dressing up the dollar to expedite inflation for our postwar economy. In their flurry to do all things for all people, they left the back door open just wide enough for the foreign experts to squeeze in a scheme to divide up our gold. This objective was accomplished under the Bretton Woods Agreement because our experts failed to recognize that they themselves inadvertently had plotted a course of domestic devaluation for our dollar, and then guaranteed its redemption for foreigners only at a set ratio of one ounce of American gold for every 35 American dollars. As a result, the ratification of this agreement has proved more like a disaster for the United States than a mistake by some of our experts because, since its signing, the value of the U.S. dollar has dropped by more than one-half for the purchase of our own goods either by foreigners or by ourselves. Simplified this can mean but one thing. Today our dollar is worth twice as much to the foreigner than it is worth domestically because we are permitted to use it only for inflated pricetags, while the foreigner can still buy the same amount of our gold with it that he could in 1934. As a consequence we use our dollars to buy foreign merchandise because we can get it cheaper than our own goods and the foreigner returns these dollars to buy our gold because he can get it cheaper than our domestic wares.

In our desperate attempt to convince the foreigners that our dollar is still equivalent to gold we have been selling an ounce of our $35 gold for the return of 35 of our 50-cent dollars and, as a result, we give away an ounce of our gold as a bonus through the back door for each ounce that we sell through the front door. If this mistake is not corrected it is inevitable that we will run out of gold.

Last year, in spite of prosperity and high employment abroad, our exports gained only 4 percent while our imports gained 12 percent. Although our semisubsidized trade balance remained favorable, its demise was showing on the horizon and our balance of payments was adverse. I say "semisubsidized trade balance" because a substantial portion of our exports are gained through the sale of our subsidized wheat, cotton, and other products which, in unvarnished truth is an export subsidy at the expense of the American taxpayer. Here, again, we treat symptoms instead of the real ailment. We beg for the removal of restrictions on the importation of dollar goods, beg for assistance in providing military and other aid to foreign nations, put "buy American" stipulations on foreign aid, take out insurance to guarantee export losses through foreign currency devaluations and wars, put restrictions on tourist spending, bring home the families of foreign service personnel, and send supersalesmen abroad to sell our high priced goods into a low priced market.

But, because these opiates fail, our industry has been forced to base factories abroad and hire foreign labor in order to compete in the international markets and today they are employing over 3 million foreign workers and selling nearly one-third of their cheap labor products back into this country while we are embraced with unemployment problems. But our experts continue to work on the symptoms. They are now convinced that our balance of payments deficit is nothing but a big dream that would vanish by the snap of their fingers simply by cutting off foreign aid giveaway programs and cutting down on our military expenditures abroad. But should their fingers snap, they may find that their dream well may be a nightmare as these programed dollars have "buy American" obligations that send them back to us for the purchase of our exports. If we stop sending this kind of money abroad, which now mostly balances our trade, it is almost certain that we still would be left with our payments problem.

The latest fad is to swallow "currency swap" and "Basle group" pills with a promise of international liquidity to wash them down, but this, in a nutshell, means little more than swallowing goldfish. To say that currency swaps will increase the international liquid position of nations is a false hope so long as gold remains as the final money of redemption and its supply fails to pace the disproportionate increases of various currency. For instance, if the United States swaps $50 million for $50 million worth of French francs at the current exchange rate (with a guarantee that the same rate would apply for unswapping) and our dollar begins to lose international prestige through our misgivings of continued deficits, national debts, increased money supply and gold losses, France would become apprehensive. If we used the francs to support the dollar in the currency market and still couldn't defend our domestic position, France would not become anxious about her few guaranteed swap dollars, but about the rest of her dollar holdings. If she couldn't exchange these dollars for other currencies without losses, she could demand conversion into U.S. gold. There is no such a thing as truly convertible currencies unless they are convertible into each other and ultimately into gold at stable rates. Stable rates cannot be guaranteed if currency supplies independently and erratically outpace the supply of gold.

The "Basle group" pill is the toughest to swallow, because it means more backdoor guarantees with U.S. gold. Thus for the United States already has reduced its price of gold to the so-called "gold pool" gang by the elimination of her customary handling charges. The ulterior purpose is to force the price of gold down in the London market. If you will write to the Treasury Department to confirm this statement you will get the following answer:

"This is in reply to your letter. In general, gold and exchange stabilization operations, including official actions in the London gold market, are not disclosed, since that could impede the achievement of the objectives of official action."

God bless our experts, for the mistakes are ordinary man's and experts a repository for the blame. Thank you.

El Paso Literacy Council Helping To Make Better Citizens in Fine Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a highly important job in helping adults become better American citizens is being done with little or no public acclaim, in many parts of our country.

An example of this fine work was reported by Mr. Ken Flynn in the El Paso Herald-Post, Wednesday, March 6, 1963, in an article on the El Paso Literacy Council and some of its outstanding teachers. The president of the council, who is building it into a tremendously effective organization for educating adults, many of whom have only a slight grasp of English, is Guillermo Villareal.

One of the teachers is Mrs. Lily Howard, who will be 86 years old on March 13. In wishing a happy birthday for Mrs. Howard, we wish many happy birthdays to the organization she so ably serves.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the following article "Literacy Council Teacher Is 85; Oldest Student, 75" from the El Paso Herald-Post of March 6, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the El Paso Herald-Post, Mar. 6, 1963]

FIGHT FOR KNOWLEDGE: LITERACY COUNCIL TEACHER IS 85—OLDEST STUDENT, 75

(By Ken Flynn)

Young businessmen, housewives, club leaders—even an 85-year-old retired teacher—are battling to lower El Paso County's high illiteracy rate among adults over 25 years old.

"The world through the eyes of an illiterate is a bleak place," El Paso Literacy Council President Guillermo Villarreal said. "Humble jobs as maids and janitors are hard to find for persons who can't read or write."

Mr. Villareal, since taking over as chairman of the council in January 1926, has succeeded in organizing and recruiting volunteer teachers to conduct classes in English throughout the county.

Last year their efforts resulted in the "graduation" of 500 students.

"It's just a drop in the bucket compared to what needs to be done," Mr. Villarreal said. In El Paso County, according to the 1960 U.S. Census, there are 23,606 persons age 25 and over who have no more than a fourth-grade education, marking them as functional illiterates according to U.S. Department of Education standards.

The job of the literacy council is to find these illiterates and enroll them in a class.

Many of El Paso County's illiterates are literate in Spanish but not in English. A total of 6,808 have no education at all in either language and 16,798 have less than 4 years of education.

The council has 38 classes in operation in the county now. In 1961, when it was organized, no classes were held. The council was about to disband.

Mr. Villarreal, who has served as secretary and treasurer of Lulac Council 132, attended a meeting of the council in January 1962. He was elected chairman and began a drive to get help from civic clubs and others.

"MECCA, the mayor's executive committee of civic associations, has been a tremendous help to the literacy council," he said. "Mayor Ralph Seitsinger has given much of his personal time to the work of the council."

Students do not pay for the classes. They pay only $1.50 for a book which utilizes pictures to teach students to read and write basic English.

Teachers in addition to donating their time and efforts, must pay $6.50 for their books and charts. The council has few funds of its own.

Workshops are held twice a year to instruct the volunteers in the basic rudiments of teaching. Only seven of the volunteers are actual teachers, two of whom are retired.

Mrs. Lilly Howard, 85, teaches a small class twice a week in her apartment at 1207 East Yanell Drive.

"I'd rather teach than eat," she said.

The volunteer was principal of Lincoln School for 18 years and taught for 22 years at Aoy School. She retired from teaching in public schools 20 years ago, but has tutored privately since then.

Mrs. Howard will be 86 years old March 13. She is the daughter of J. A. Smith, founder of the old El Paso Dairy. She has lived in El Paso for 78 years.

The council has a student almost as old as Mrs. Howard.

Mrs. Huerta, 75, attends classes regularly at El Calvario Catholic Church, proving you're never too old to learn.

Many young businessmen and club leaders are also volunteers. Mr. Villareal is an insurance agent.

Five teachers who work with students all day and then put in extra hours with illiterates are:

G. V. Bostik, Ruben Torres, Joel Velez, Tino Valenzuela, and Mrs. Louis White. The other retired teacher-volunteer is Mrs. M. Nolan Brown.

Other volunteers include: Fred Alvarado, Mrs. Guadalupe B. Bachofen, Ruben Candelaria, Ismael M. Diaz, Porfirio Diaz, Mrs. Jean Gilcrease, Bob Garcia, Mrs. R. C. Gutierrez, Mrs. Evalyn Coady, Col. E. A. Hyde, Mrs. Jeanette Janger, Mrs. Alva LaRue, Roberto Luis Lopez, Mrs. Magdalena Monyans, Gerald J. O'Connor, Mrs. Luis Patino, Mrs. E. E. Passon, Mrs. Katherine Reardon, Guadalupe Saenz, Mrs. Carmen Sloat, Mr. Siegloff, Mrs. Sellers, and Mrs. Lucy Telles.

"To be illiterate is a handicap," Mr. Villarreal said. "It condemns a person to second-class citizenship, a dark world where he can never rise above the unskilled labor class, unequipped to take advantages of promotional opportunities."

Mr. Villarreal was recently reelected president of the council and announced an expanded program to wipe out illiteracy in El Paso County.

"Anyone interested in helping is invited," he said. "Volunteers do not need any experience in teaching to conduct classes."

Address of the council is 517 North Campbell Street. Telephone number is KE 3-3890.

Consumer Services Through the Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to have inserted in the RECORD an account of the many, many services performed by the Department of Agriculture not only for the people of agriculture districts, but for the citizens in our urban areas as well. Too many people are not aware of the daily advantages afforded them by the work and efforts of members of the Department of Agriculture.

It is with the hope that all citizens will be better informed as to the many consumer services that they are furnished through the Agriculture Department that I state the following:

CONSUMER SERVICES THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The U.S. Department of Agriculture is steadily increasing services benefiting all of our 188 million citizens with an amazingly small expansion in personnel.

While often associated only with the farming sector of our society, the Department of Agriculture today provides more consumer services than any other agency of Government, and a population which grows at the rate of 8,000 a day adds to the public service demands.

THE PEOPLE-OWNED FORESTS

For example, since 1957 there has been an increase of nearly 100 percent in visits to national forests, and a rise of 46 percent in Forest Service personnel.

The citizens of our country own 155 national forests. The Department of Agriculture, through its Forest Service, has responsibility for the development, maintenance and operation of these areas and 29 percent of the Department's personnel is in this service field.

There is a constantly growing demand for more recreation in, and more timber from, national forests. As recently as 1957 recreation visits totaled 61 million. By 1962 the number had nearly doubled, reaching 112 million. This spectacular rise in forest use requires more facilities and last year 3,204 new family camp and picnic units were added while another 9,818 units were rehabilitated. Thirty-five other recreation areas, including ski areas, swimming areas and scenic overlooks, were developed.

Recreation use of national forests is no longer limited to summer months. Skiing and winter sports visits have jumped from 2.75 million in 1957 to nearly 5 million now, and while there are 167 winter sports areas there is a rising volume of requests for more of them.

Hunting and fishing visits have increased 8 times faster than the nationwide sale of hunting and fishing licenses. All of these sportsmen went to find fish and game in the lakes, streams, and woodlands.

The cut of timber from national forests has increased from 7 billion board feet in 1957 to more than 9 billion in 1962, the result of more effective efforts to prevent tree losses from fire, insects, and disease. While advancements in technology and management have contributed to the reduction in timber losses from fire and other causes, men still play the vital role.

Each activity, whether it responds to public demands for greater year round recreation, more timber for the mills, improved rangeland, or better protection for wood and water and wildlife resources, calls for workers.

FOOD DISTRIBUTION

In urban and rural areas of every State the Department of Agriculture is charged with primary responsibility for purchase and distribution of foods to no-income and low-income families. By June of 1962 the number of persons receiving food from this source had nearly doubled in comparison with 1960, rising from 3.3 million to 6.4 million. There was a corresponding increase of 40 percent in USDA employment in this field of activity, from 169 to 240 man-years.

In the area of improved diets for low income families through privately owned trade channels the Department is now charged with operation of a food stamp plan serving more than 140,000 persons. The food stamp program didn't exist 2 years ago.

SERVICE TO BUSINESS, INDUSTRY

Since 1960 the number of market dealers and agencies registered under the Packers and Stockyards Act has increased by 5,700 and the number of packers supervised by the Packers and Stockyards Division of the Department of Agriculture has grown by nearly 700. In the same period employment in the Packers and Stockyards Division has increased only 34 persons.

Between 1960 and 1962 employment in poultry inspection increased 20 percent while the volume of poultry products inspected made a 38-percent jump. Employment in the meat inspection service has increased about 3 percent since 1960, while the number of plants requiring this service rose 11 percent.

There is a direct tie between expansion in Department of Agriculture services and business growth. The addition of two inspectors at a Sioux City, Iowa, meatpacking plant enabled the plant to add a shift to its operations and employ 30 additional workers, and add 30 regular paychecks to the Sioux City economy. The addition of two inspectors at a Denison, Iowa, meat plant resulted in the hiring of between 30 and 40 new workers and a 40 percent increase in slaughter.

RESEARCH AND THE GENERAL WELFARE

Research in the Department of Agriculture has always meant more than making two blades of grass grow where one grew before. Department research workers who discovered disease could be transmitted by insects inspired investigations which led to the discovery of the causes of malaria, yellow fever, Rocky Mountain spotted fever, and other illnesses. Department of Agriculture scientists discovered an effective, low cost method of producing penicillin. Rutin, an aid to persons with fragile capillaries, was discovered in a USDA laboratory.

There is growing concern among our people about the use of pesticides. In 1962 the Department of Agriculture opened three new laboratories dedicated to the goal of better insect control methods. From these laboratories will come ways in which farmers may move away from complete reliance on chemical pesticides and the residue and toxicity problems inherent in their use.

Two of these laboratories are concerned with grain insects that annually cost the U.S. economy more than a billion dollars in poor quality crops and inefficient production. Both are USDA-State cooperative laboratories and are located at Brookings, S. Dak., and Tifton, Ga. The third new laboratory is on the campus of Mississippi State College and is concerned with the No. 1 cotton pest, boll weevil. Eradication of the boll weevil will benefit cotton producers, consumers and taxpayers by cutting production, utilization, and subsidy costs.

These three research efforts have resulted in an 11-percent increase in the USDA's scientific staff. The additional employees are primarily pharmacologists and chemists.

MEAT SUPPLY PROTECTION

Livestock disease epidemics can create greater havoc on the food supply front than crop killing droughts or floods, because it takes much longer to replace foundation herds than to grow new crops.

Four major developments during the past 2 years have added 411 employees in the Department of Agriculture's Animal Disease Eradication Division.

Because it is the most modern animal research facility in the world, scientists from throughout the world are visiting the new National Animal Disease Laboratory at Ames, Iowa. It has brought into one place laboratory research that was scattered over several locations, and given the researchers the best in tools.

The Congress in 1961 authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to initiate a nationwide program, in cooperation with the States, for the eradication of hog cholera. Funds were made available in 1962. The new program could not be fully staffed with personnel transfers, so 43 veterinarians, 64 livestock inspectors, and 23 administrative and clerical employees were added.

Hog cholera currently costs our economy $50 million a year.

The Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with States and livestock growers, has launched a screw-worm eradication program in Texas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana. The current annual screwworm losses in Texas alone amount to $100 million.

A sheep scabies eradication program has been accelerated during the past 2 years, and as a result 330 more counties have been added to the scabies-free list. State monetary contributions for this effort exceed the Federal contribution, but additional funds provided by Congress have made possible the employment of 50 persons for the expanded activity.

Eradication of livestock diseases means not only greater assurance for all Americans of an adequate meat supply, it also means lower food costs resulting from greater production efficiency.

SAVING WATER, MAKING JOBS

The Congress, in 1954, passed the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. It provided authority for the Department of Agriculture to give technical and financial assistance to local organizations in planning and carrying out multipurpose small watershed projects.

Watershed projects are popular with our people because they offer a way in which all the interests of a rural-urban community can unite in efforts to solve community problems and meet community needs.

A watershed project can provide any or all of these benefits: flood prevention; agricultural, industrial and municipal water supply; irrigation and drainage; wildlife and public recreational developments.

For utilization of this program, legislatures of 40 States have enacted more than 150 pieces of legislation.

As of February 1, 1960, applications for assistance in developing watershed projects had been received from 1,251 local organizations. Of these, 488 had been authorized for planning and 214 for operations. By February 1, 1963, the number of applications had grown to 1,839. Planning authorizations and operation authorizations were just about double the 1960 totals, 830 and 455, respectively.

In this field of protecting and utilizing natural resources the cooperation of State and Federal Governments with local groups often results in a better industrial and business climate.

An example is the Mud River Watershed project near Russellville, Ky. The creation of a water supply was a factor in establishment of a manufacturing plant in the area. A new boat shop was opened to take advantage of the 900-acre recreation lake—Lake Malone. More than 200 building lots have been sold on the lake's perimeter. Fifty cabins and a $45,000 sportsmen's lodge have been constructed. It is estimated that the lake will provide 15,000 man-hours of fishing each year, and that more than 925,000 visitors will use the lake facilities.

Since January of 1961 the Department of Agriculture has built and staffed four new soil and water conservation research facilities. In these laboratories State and Federal research workers are using the tools of modern science to answer two questions vital not only to farmers and ranchers, but to business, industry and the individual citizen:

How can we make more effective use of our scarce supplies of fresh water? How can we better conserve and rebuild the structure and fertility of our priceless soils?

Increases in personnel in the Department of Agriculture have been more closely related to general welfare programs than to strictly farm programs. The contributions have been and are being utilized by consumers, business, industry, public welfare agencies, community development leaders and outdoor recreation seekers.

Election of Theodore R. McKeldin as Mayor of Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, Theodore R. McKeldin was elected mayor of Baltimore this week although the political party of his opponent had a 4 to 1 advantage in registration.

Commenting editorially on this, the Washington Post of May 9 referred to "McKeldin's Comeback." It is obvious what was meant by the editorial writer since, in the past, Mr. McKeldin was Baltimore's mayor as well as the Governor of Maryland for two terms, but in a sense, the word "comeback" is misleading. Even when not in public office, Mr. McKeldin continued to work and fight for his city and his State, and I am sure his new administration as mayor will be one of the highlights of Baltimore's history.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Post editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

McKELDIN'S COMEBACK

Maryland Democrats are still incredulous over the upset in Baltimore, but the returns in Tuesday's election say plainly enough that former mayor and former Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin has succeeded in his long-contemplated comeback. Still more astonishing and inexplicable, according to some Free State politicians, was the victory of Hyman A. Pressman, a Democrat, who ran on the Republican ticket for city comptroller. It can scarcely be said, however, that this traditionally Democrat city experienced a Republican sweep, for Democrat Thomas D'Alesandro snowed under his Republican opponent for the presidency of the city council by a margin of 2 to 1.

In part the misfortune of Mayor Philip H. Goodman may have resulted from the fact that he had held the office only 5 months. In that period he had not had time to make a record on which to stand, and he chose to campaign largely against McKeldin instead of making a strong platform of his own. Meanwhile it appears that Mr. McKeldin, and along with him Mr. Pressman, shook an enormous number of hands, addressed countless audiences and warmed the hearts of numerous minority groups as well as others.

Coming so soon after Governor Tawes' big victory of last November, this overturn has refreshing as well as surprising aspects. Since there were few issues in the campaign, the people of Baltimore must have concluded that Mr. McKeldin as an individual offers the best hope for good government in the 4 years ahead. Once before, in 1943, they made the same decision, and after serving a term as mayor, Mr. McKeldin went on to 8 years in the Governor's chair. Having now made a comeback, will he seek to repeat this performance? No doubt the most reliable answer will be found in the record he is now able to make as mayor.

Tribute Paid to Representative Bob Sikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the service of the Honorable ROBERT L. F. SIKES in the Congress of the United States is without parallel in the history of the great State of Florida. Coming to the Congress in January 1941 in the 77th Congress, he has served for over 22 years, now in his 12th consecutive term in the Congress.

Thus he has served longer in the House of Representatives than any other Floridian.

Today he is one of the ranking members of the Appropriations Committee, and on that committee, as in all of his other service in the House, he renders unselfish and dedicated service, not only to his district and State, but the Nation as well.

Congressman SIKES was my Congressman for most of my life until January of this year when I had the privilege of joining him as a Member of the House from a new district in Florida, which took in eight of the counties he had formerly represented.

When Congressman SIKES came to the Congress, Florida had only 6 Members of the House, while today our great State has a delegation of 12. I can say without fear of contradiction that my colleagues share the great admiration I have for this outstanding American. I know full well what he has meant to me as a new Member of the House, giving freely of his time and counsel, never too busy in his hectic schedule to assist me in learning about the Congress, and this is true of the other members of our delegation, for he is the senior member of our delegation.

His sterling character and devotion to duty have won him admiration and respect on both sides of the aisle of the House. BOB SIKES is one of those dedicated individuals whose entire waking moments are dedicated to the service of his people and to the Congress.

BOB SIKES is loved and respected not only by the people of his district, but by all of the people of Florida. I doubt that there has ever been a Congressman from my great State that has achieved the universal admiration and respect of every segment of our great State, as has this outstanding public servant.

I sincerely believe that the entire Nation is richer for his service as a Member of the Congress, and I know that all of my colleagues in the House share my great admiration and respect for this truly great American.

I am pleased to conclude these remarks with a reprint of a column which appeared in a recent edition of the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union which points out the service he has rendered:

GEORGIA-FLORIDA TIES CONTRIBUTED SIGNIFICANTLY TO DEVELOPMENT OF THE NORTHWEST FLORIDA EMPIRE

(By Pope Haley)

In the whole bright picture of Florida's continuing development as a year-round mecca for tourists seeking rest and recreation, there is no brighter spot than the 100 miles lying along the upper gulf coast between Panama City and Pensacola which has been aptly dubbed "the Miracle Strip."

A survey by the Florida Development Commission last fall showed that of more than 10.6 million vacationing visitors who entered the State during the previous year, nearly 1.3 million, or more than 10 percent, were headed for the Miracle Strip.

In addition to the two large "anchor cities," the 100-mile stretch also embraces the popular and growing resort centers of Destin, Fort Walton Beach, and Pensacola Beach. Panama City and Pensacola each claimed about one-third of the total, while the remaining third were about equally distributed among the other communities.

The number of tourists giving the Miracle Strip as their destination approximately equalled the number who were headed for Miami.

Tourists traveling by automobile, the survey showed, represented 83 percent of the total of more than 12.8 million visitors who, the commission estimated, spent more than $2 billion in the Sunshine State.

Development of the Miracle Strip as a popular tourist center easily accessible to residents of Alabama and surrounding States readily explains Alabama's rank at the head of the list of States in number of residents visiting Florida. The survey showed that of the total number of visitors entering the State, 12 percent came from Alabama, and Georgia ranked second with 11 percent. New York State was third with 6 percent.

Visitors from neighboring Alabama and Georgia, the commission said, stay shorter periods, but come more often, as many as 10 to 12 trips a year ranging from 2 days to 2 weeks.

The survey established for the first time a count of Albamans who were bona fide tourists with sufficient accuracy to prove that State's leadership.

The growing popularity of the Miracle Strip and its mounting contribution to the State's overall tourist economy, therefore, is obviously attributable in large part to its location which makes it readily accessible to thousands of vacationers in the mid-South. For many limited vacation budget families in western Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee who could never contemplate an extended trip to south Florida or even to the east coast, a Florida vacation is still an easy possibility in the relatively short drive to the sunswept upper gulf coast.

Even Floridians themselves sometimes fail to appreciate the distances involved in travel within their own State, such as may be suggested in the fact that the motorist driving westward from Jacksonville, after reaching Tallahassee, is still well short of the halfway point to the State's westernmost border. Birmingham, Ala., vacationers with the Miracle Strip as their destination would nearly double their mileage to reach the east coast and triple it if Miami were their goal.

This distance factor points up the strong community of interests existing between the Florida Panhandle and adjoining Alabama and southwest Georgia. For residents of the panhandle, Mobile, and even New Orleans are the nearest large cities, and for some, the Alabama State capital of Montgomery is closer than their own.

These strong ties, indeed, reflect Florida's own strength in diversity, and no one has ever seriously suggested that the panhandle should rightfully be annexed by Alabama.

The Miracle Strip is visible evidence of the phenomenal development of the region which within living memory was virtually "frontier territory." Highways, bridges, waterway improvements, and the establishment of major military installations have all contributed to the area's emergence as a major segment of the State's economy, which in turn spurred its popularity as a tourist center.

Among those who have contributed to, and watched this era of growth with pride, is Florida's Representative ROBERT SIKES, of Crestview, who has represented the panhandle district in the national Congress since 1940. A native of Worth County, Ga., Representative SIKES received his bachelor's degree at the University of Georgia, and pursued graduate study at the University of Florida where he won his master's degree. He entered the newspaper business in Crestview, from which he launched his career in politics as a member of the Florida Legislature before making his first campaign for Congress. He recently won promotion to rank of major general in the Army Reserve.

As one of the recognized leaders in the political life and economic growth of the northwest Florida empire, Representative SIKES' Georgia background provides just one more example of the close ties binding Georgia and Florida in the mutual advancement of their region's destiny.

Resolution by Senate of Pennsylvania on Anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, among the deceptions practiced by the Soviet Union is the one where it claims to protect the rights of minority groups within the country, whereas it is systematically attempting to obliterate the cultural institutions of the Jewish people who live in the U.S.S.R. Jews are denied any semblance of nationality rights. Jewish synagogues have been closed and synagogue leaders have been arrested on undisclosed charges.

On April 29, the Senate of Pennsylvania, on the motion of Senators Israel Stiefel, Charles R. Weiner, Martin Silvert, James S. Berger, and Benjamin R. Donolow, passed a resolution condemning those practices.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the persistent enmity to religion of the Government of the Soviet Union is a matter of historical record; and

Whereas within the narrow framework of permissible religious practices, discrimination against synagogues and against Jewish worshippers afflicts the devout Jews of Russia; and

Whereas Jewish congregations of the U.S.S.R. are forbidden to organize a central body and are not allowed contacts with Jewish religious groups elsewhere; and

Whereas Yiddish language institutions and the other instruments of Yiddish culture which were destroyed in the Stalin era have not been restored; and

Whereas 46 leading Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and Greek Orthodox clergymen of the United States have appealed to Chairman Nikita S. Khrushchev to end discriminations against Jews, their religion, and their culture; and

Whereas both the United States and the Soviet Union have subscribed to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; and

Whereas article 18 of that Declaration declares that "Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance"; and

Whereas the State Department of the United States has on other occasions protested the infliction of such injustices upon minority groups in Russia and other lands: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Department of State be hereby respectfully memorialized to request of the Soviet Union that it grant to its Jewish citizens the right to freedom of worship; be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States restate the position of the United States in opposition to these acts of discrimination against Jewish citizens and that he instruct the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to make known the sentiments expressed in this resolution in every possible manner; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the senate of the Commonwealth, to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Member of Congress from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and to the legislatures of the States in the United States; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Chairman Nikita S. Khrushchev to indicate that the people of the United States deplore the antireligious attitude of the Soviet Union and the mistreatment of its Jewish subjects.

Still No Rose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, with the consent of my colleagues, I offer for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared on May 2, 1963, in the Marengo Republican-News. This is an independent weekly, published since 1868 at Marengo, Ill., a community of citizens who are likewise independent in their thinking and in their successful pursuit of the American way of life. This editorial reflects the thinking of the overwhelming majority of its readers and supporters. To me, the Marengo Republican-News' editorial is as American as the Fourth of July and its homely philosophy is as commendable as it is challenging.

STILL NO ROSE

Proponents of the King-Anderson Bill—known to the Nation at large as Medicare—have indicated this measure should have another name before the expanded 1963 version comes up for hearings in the House Ways and Means Committee.

This wish is doubtless in recognition of the old adage concerning the fate of a dog that has been given a bad name. But we submit that it is equally true that a skunk's habits are no more socially acceptable when he's called a polecat.

Offensive enough in its original form, the 1963 model would still shortchange the trusting oldster who expects it to pay all or even most of the costs of illness. It would be an even longer step toward the irreparable tragedy of socialized medicine. And existing health facilities for the aged make it unnecessary.

Medicare—as reconstituted, but unreconstructed—would remain a costly appendage of the social security system which is already in financial hot water, with its disability trust fund headed toward insolvency. Thus, even though the immediate increase in the social security tax for both employees and employers were sufficient to meet the first year's costs (if the Government cost estimates on medicare are no better this year than last, it will be just half enough), it is certain to go up and up as costs and "beneficiaries" increase.

The new medicare blanket would cover everyone over 65—forcing every wage earner to pay for all oldsters, including those who neither need nor want it. It would cover the 53 percent of America's 17 million oldsters who are now protecting themselves under some form of health insurance and still another 14 percent who are protected under the Government's old age assistance program, and the remaining elderly indigents would fare better under the State-administered Kerr-Mills medical assistance program passed in 1960 and now in operation in more than half of the States.

As administration forces begin once more to beat the drum for medicare, we may well recall he words of Missouri's Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, one of the best-informed men in Congress on health care. He described this destructive, compulsory, un-American measure as "a financial nightmare of miscalculated costs and skyrocketed taxes."

On the human side it insults the dignity of all and through increased taxation, further threatens the capability of every worker to meet his family obligations in his own way.

The Transport Aircraft Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, one of America's leading aviation authorities, Mr. Wayne Parrish, addressed a meeting of people interested in the subject in Seattle on April 23. The subject of his discussion is of such current interest that I desire to make his paper available to my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LUNCHEON SPEECH BY WAYNE W. PARRISH AT THE SAE TRANSPORT MEETING, NEW WASHINGTON HOTEL, SEATTLE, WASH., APRIL 23, 1963

Mr. Chairman, delegates to this distinguished and important meeting, it is a real pleasure to be with you today, a pleasure because of our areas of mutual interest and a pleasure to be out here in the wonderful West. The Washington I come from is many miles from here and if political philosophy could be measured by the same standards my Washington is also miles from your Washington. Back there we feel the growing gloom of a centralized government but out here freedom abounds and its presence is refreshing.

And now for a few moments of capsule observations on a serious matter, the TFX catastrophe, the Dyna-Soar question mark, and something about the transport aircraft market, all very pertinent to paychecks of a Seattle audience.

The TFX fiasco would be funny if it weren't so deadly serious. Nobody really questions the right and duty of Congress to investigate and to hold hearings and to air what it thinks are scandals, but the present hearings are doing nobody any good, especially the country's military position. I asked Senator MCCLELLAN the other day if an end was in sight. He would only say that the hearings were going on and on and on. He is convinced that the DOD as personified by McNamara made the wrong decision in awarding the TFX contract and he intends to build up a strong record on this even though he knows he does not have the power to force a change in the awarding of the contract.

The truth of the matter is that nobody can really prove in those hearings that McNamara is wrong or that he is right. The truth is that no one can prove that an airplane on paper is good or bad. A major question is whether this country should bulk everything into one compromise design and award the vast bulk contract to one company. On the other hand the administration awards a contract that ultimately will go to $6 billion to one company and on the other hand, it has an army of lawyers at work on antitrust action to bust up big companies.

But the trouble goes far beyond the mere awarding of the TFX contract. It goes back to the original concept for a triservice fighter which nobody in military life wanted but which a businessman decided was the perfect answer from the standpoint of cost and efficiency. One thing led to another, including the laying down of belated requirements and specs, and when you lay down specs on something that any major contractor of given capability can build, and where one compromise leads to another, and where the genius and design skills of individual companies are neutralized or nullified, then the entire contractural machinery is thrown to the winds. Then the decision is likely to be on a different set of evaluations, call it politics or just call it distributing work to needy areas.

Let's focus attention on the real heart of the matter. Mr. McNamara himself is a capable man of personal integrity. He has performed many fine things as administrator in the Pentagon, probably more than all of his predecessors combined. He deserves much credit. He is generally the type of man the Government needs.

But, and this is the focal point, Mr. McNamara did not stop at being the civilian overseer of the Military Establishment. He became a master military strategist as well. And this has led this man into pitfalls that may be exceedingly costly for this country and could easily erase all of his accomplishments in streamlining operations. Military strategy can't be performed by data processing and brilliant but young whiz kids and by the same type of efficiency pattern that rules a production plant or by the same ingenius planning that went into the late unlamented Edsel car. What seemed logical, rational, sensible, and economical to the whiz kids and Mr. McNamara is most likely one of the greatest military aircraft blunders this country has ever made.

The reason is perfectly simply. In the decision to achieve a commonality of design for two services, every known secret, every known design compromise, every detail, and all of the dirty linen, are now easily accessible to the world and including the Soviet Union for reasons of which the TFX was conceived. As a surprise weapon, we might as well scrap the works and start over. If anyone ever turned over to his enemy the proper guidelines for the enemy's own planning, we have done it. All the Soviet Union has to do now is to build two airplanes exceeding the TFX in the two extreme areas in which compromise was forced, and they have us out-matched. This country has never yet entered a war with strong air power. But we always had time to make up for the deficiencies. Next time, if there is a next time, that saving grace will not be present. We have told our adversary exactly what we intend to have, and how we compromised, and I know of no greater gift to an opposing military organization that we could make.

So the TFX in the final analysis is not just an award hassle and sound and fury hearings and all that, it is a questionable concept decision to start with. If there is a scandal, the real scandal is in McNamara's initial judgment as an amateur military strategist trying to make one plane do the work of two. Military strategy belongs to the military. Mr. McNamara was supposed to carry on from there, not start there. What we needed were two or more prototypes embodying the best design talents in the industry for the two or more requirements of the various services. And the record is most awfully clear that Boeing had a design of very great merit and superior in many aspects, which is not to overlook the fact that other companies should have been given opportunities to demonstrate their skills in their areas, too.

There is something else of serious importance in the Pentagon, Shades of the late Charles "Engine" Wilson who opposed all research, the whiz kids in there now are throwing wrenches into the research machinery by trying to use computers where experienced brains are needed. There is an absence of real basic long-range military research and development, the kind that leads ideas into production of hardware.

And now some comments on another subject of special interest in Seattle, the Dyna-Soar:

As everyone here knows, the fate of the Dyna-Soar program is one of the most discussed subjects in Washington these days. Secretary of Defense McNamara has opened a real can of worms with his review of this program.

Mr. McNamara was impressed with the briefing on Dyna-Soar which he received at Boeing. But when he returned to Washington, he told the editor of Missiles and Rockets magazine the very next day that he still felt Gemini and Dyna-Soar could accomplish very much the same mission in orbit.

He brushed off the difference in reentry capability with the comment that he doesn't care how the astronauts get back, it's what they can do while they're up there that counts. As he put it, "they can come back by parachute for all I care."

Let's take a look at something McNamara told Congress before departing on the Boeing trip. He told the House Space Committee, and I'm quoting now: "I guess we will find that Gemini has a greater military potential for us, even though a rather ill-defined military potential, than does Dyna-Soar. Moreover, it will be available much soonor than Dyna-Soar."

He went on to say, and again I'm quoting: "At some point, we ought to give up covering two bases and decide which one we want to cover before we have spent a total of roughly $800 million for Dyna-Soar, rather over $800 million for Gemini, and a total of $1.6 billion. I think we can cut back very substantially."

That is very reminiscent of the language Mr. McNamara used before he lowered the ax on the Skybolt missile. It bodes ill for the X-20 and nothing he has said since returning from Seattle has indicated any change of heart.

That doesn't mean the Air Force has given up; far from it. Only a few days ago, testimony was released which gives some idea of what the Air Force now is attempting to do in this area.

Secretary of Air Force Zuckert told the House Appropriations Committee, and again I'm quoting: "It is up to us in the Air Force, and we certainly are going to endeavor to do it, to convince the Secretary of Defense that the Dyna-Soar program is usefully complementary and that usefully stands by itself as something we should do."

That is where the program is this week. A review is underway and whether the Air Force can succeed in changing Mr. McNamara's mind, only time will tell. They have not shown notable success in accomplishing this in other areas.

Now to point 3 to wind up with air transport in which the session today is most directly concerned.

I see no reason to be other than optimistic about the future of the airlines despite rising costs and increased governmental intervention in everything from enforcement against fare discounting to ratemaking machinery.

What really jolted the major airlines of the world in the past few years is no secret, the very rapid and costly acquisition of jets. The banks and other financial institutions made very certain that they would get their money back. They had first call on all resources. The result was very heavy outgo of cash for a few years to meet payments. But from here on, year by year, the financial situation will be easing in most instances.

But there are other factors to consider. An evolution in transportation has taken place which never occurred in shipping to this extent. There are many new airlines operated by many new countries, participating in longhaul international traffic. Twenty years ago no one could have foreseen a development of this magnitude. Twenty years ago it was assumed that the oldline airlines, the pioneers of the United States and Europe with participation by a few in South America and Australia, would dominate the world's airways. It was assumed that new airlines would operate within their local regions. But the jet, especially, has changed all this. For purposes of foreign exchange if for no other reason, many new airlines are charging about the world grabbing important chunks of traffic which the oldtimers thought they would be carrying.

A still further consideration, one that few forecast correctly 10 years ago, is the continued elimination of smaller stops by major carriers, not only in the United States, but overseas. The jet is a major factor. This has altered the airline pattern, and equipment purchases, to a large degree.

The current battle internationally is between oldline airlines which overbought equipment and have not controlled their costs and who see higher fares as the only way out of their dilemma, and the more efficient airlines, including those of this country, which would prefer to fill up more seats with lower fares and they can do so profitably. This wide disparity in views brought about the historic crisis of a few weeks ago when the Civil Aeronautics Board rejected the proposed increases of fares on the Pacific and Atlantic and thus precipitated the Government of the United States, and of necessity other governments, into the fare structures and faremaking machinery of the world's airlines.

There is much in the air these days about SST but there is more talk than action and more dreaming than reality. The French in their nationalistic drive to be first and foremost are hellbent to be first in SST. They would have done it alone, I was constantly reminded in Paris last month, if they could have afforded the initial $400 million outlay. But they needed a partner and they chose Britain, and due to continued prodding by the French, the British finally came up with a financial commitment. I suspect they will run into many problems and many additional costs before this mach 2.2 project becomes a reality. Meantime, with a billion dollar estimate for an SST in the area of mach 3 in this country, there is a noteworthy lack of enthusiasm everywhere except among certain manufacturers who would like to build the SST if somebody digs up the money. The SST will be built, probably by a government corporation with possible private participation, but such enterprises are inevitably cumbersome and sluggish and we can probably expect no real progress until the net weight of reports and studies and charts and specs exceeds the estimated net weight of the projected airplane.

Meantime, there are many more immediate problems and possibilities:

For example, the same amount of money put into VTOL would create vast new horizons for air transportation, airlines, employment, and passengers. Automatic take off and landing regardless of weather or ceiling, with VTOL for high density short and intermediate haul routes, holds promise of the biggest breakthrough in aviation history apart from the jets.

The BAC-111 and the Douglas DC-9 would seem to occupy a unique position in aviation history. With no future SST to disturb their position, with only minor improvements in operating characteristics possible, these two airplanes would seem to have the biggest and longest continued market in commercial airplane history. The market is slim right now. But the airline business seems to have an enormous capacity for devouring new airplanes despite the financial burdens, and the intermediate range jet should have as ideal a future as any airplane in history. Both should be good. And I should give a nod to the 727 which is bound to be a success in the level above the 111 and DC-9 and below the highly successful 720.

There will be some airline mergers, but the mere idea of bigness is hardly the answer to profitability. It is the regional trunk, or the smaller trunk, that is doing well in this country. And it is the well-managed smaller carrier elsewhere that is doing well, such as Swissair. Airlines can get too big. Airlines require a certain indefinable characteristic of management that is a combination of dedication, devotion and know-how. Where you find a successful airline you find experienced management that is on the job and loves what is is doing. I would not forecast at this time the trend of mergers in the United States except to say that there will be some, and some fairly important ones, and that merger discussions continue at a rapid rate everywhere, but mergers are not the sole salvation of airlines that are troubled by inexpert management.

Much has been said of late about excessive competition by trunk carriers in this country. The jets have further emphasized this critical point and there is no doubt that we do have too much competition in some areas. There is no doubt, too, that the Civil Aeronautics Board weakened to the tremendous pressures, political and otherwise, to permit too much competition.

But it is a fact of life and we are stuck with it. Some of the most vociferous protests against excessive competition come from the very executives who push hardest for new routes and who put on unbelievable pressures to get same. While it is true that the CAB has had the responsibility for orderly expansion of air service, and should have applied the brakes, a share of the blame must rest with industry itself for pulling out all the stops to get a new route come hell or high water.

Mergers will help cure some of the problems, just as mergers are bound to come in the aircraft industry also. Meantime, the leadership in the CAB in Washington is somewhat better than it has been in previous years. As for the FAA, the Administrator of this vast sprawling agency faces a virtually impossible task of administering with efficiency. FAA is too big. It is gigantic. The time is already here, it seems to me, for a new evaluation of FAA in order to break it down into more efficient units. But this requires exploration in greater detail than I have time to do, and I've already talked too long now.

It has been a real pleasure to be here.

U.S. Sea Power: Fleet Versus Ballistic Missile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, ever since the dramatic advent of the atomic bomb in 1945, perceptive military, naval, and scientific leaders have pondered the problems involved in adjusting our Armed Forces to ensuing technological developments. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations with assignment to the subcommittee charged with formulating appropriations for national defense and as an observer of various exercises by the Armed Forces, I have had an opportunity to see some of the practical effects of post-World War II technological progress in weaponry.

These effects have been particularly notable with respect to seagoing elements of our Navy—in design of vessels, composition of the units, and operations. In fact, our fleets are vulnerable to long-range ballistic missiles, which are a challenge that our country must meet or some day it will discover that Soviet power has developed effective antiintercontinental ballistic missiles, leaving our sea power without defense against its missiles and forcing the United States into a wasteful crash program to catch up.

An excellent article on this subject by Capt. Russell S. Crenshaw, Jr., was published in the April 1963 issue of the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings. It is accompanied by the following biographical sketch of its author.

To make Captain Crenshaw's contribution more widely known, I quote it as part of my remarks inviting special attention to the paragraphs near the end of the article, which deal with antimissile missilry.

The article follows:

THE FLEET VERSUS THE BALLISTIC MISSILE

(By Russell S. Crenshaw, Jr.)

(NOTE.—Graduating from the U.S. Naval Academy in the class of 1941, Captain Crenshaw served in the destroyers *Maury* and *Stormes* as executive officer in World War II, took a master's degree in electrical engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1949, and has on several occasions had duty in connection with special gunnery and guided missile projects. The author of Naval Shiphandling (U.S. Naval Institute, 1960), he served as Head, Surface Warfare Branch in the Office of the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Development) before assumming his present duties as commanding officer of U.S.S. *Springfield*.)

Now that the long-range ballistic missile has become a reality, we can look forward to a fuller exploitation of this remarkable weapon. The impact of intercontinental artillery has not previously been considered in the equations of naval war, but the mounting inventories of ready missiles have an ever-expanding significance. On the basis of economics alone, it is probably advantageous to exchange one or several ballistic missiles for any major warship. The question is, "Can a missile hit a ship?"

Not only can ballistic missiles match the capabilities of strategic bombers to strike deep into the enemy's heartland, but their constant readiness, incredible speed, and excellent accuracy open an even greater spectrum of targets than are normally considered suitable for manned bombers. Latitude and longitude and little more are required for the missile shot, and the cost per shot will continue to descend as technology advances and the production run lengthens. Cities, industrial complexes, transportation centers, air and missile bases, seaports, and communication centers are probably already on the target lists of any missile-capable power, and, as the inventory of missiles mounts, we must expect these weapons to be used to destroy any target worth the expenditure of the missiles required.

Though navies have until now been privileged to observe the ballistic missile race with detachment because of the preponderance of lucrative land targets and the dearth of ammunition, this situation is rapidly changing. It is already time to face up to the problem and coldly assess the threat of the fleet in an era of missile plenty. Can the fleet continue to consider itself immune to attack by ballistic missiles?

A recent press release indicated that the cost of the Minuteman force to be completed in 1965 can be prorated at $2 million per missile. Our lastest classes of destroyers have cost in the vicinity of $35 million and carry crews of some 300 officers and men. Even with pessimistic estimates of reliability, accuracy, and lethal radius, one would be hard put to argue that it would be disadvantageous to exchange missiles for destroyers.

Though the missile may be able to hit any spot on the face of the earth, it is necessary to identify the particular spot occupied by the ship. Since the beginnings of history, ships and fleets have slipped over the horizon to become lost to the eyes of the enemy, and this capability takes on new value in the missile age. The sea is vast, an incomparable arena for unrestrained maneuver, and the location of a skillfully handled ship at sea defies prediction. Reconnaissance provided by aircraft, ship, or submarine would seldom meet the requirements for a ballistic shot, for every mile of error in target location is a mile of safety for the target. Maneuvering at sea today against normal reconnaissance, the ship is relatively safe from attack by ballistic missiles.

But as the space age overtakes the missile age, we find we must expect improved reconnaissance. The Transit Navigation System was in operation in 1962, and when this accurate satellite system is linked with an appropriate target detection system, the possibilities for reconnaissance are enormous. For radar, what more distinct target is there than a ship in the open sea? For passive sensors, a ship is normally emitting a variety of radiations helpful in locating and identifying her.

In a few years, if not today, we must be ready to face reconnaissance satellites capable of regularly scanning all of the oceans of the world and of reporting the location of ships at sea with a high degree of accuracy. Reconnaissance satellites will probably become a reality about the same time the ballistic missiles are sufficiently plentiful to be considered for targeting against individual ships.

Even with accurate satellite reconnaissance, however, our ships are not doomed. It is not sufficient simply to locate a target to insure its destruction; it is necessary to predict accurately its position at the moment of missile impact. This latter is a much more difficult task if the target is moving, because there is the dead time (time between last measurement of target location and the actual time of firing) plus the time of flight of the missile which must elapse before the missile strikes. This is a period of grace during which the motion of the target, if different from that predicted, will cause a miss. It is this dead time, plus time of flight which helps clear the bleak picture for the surface ship when reconnaissance satellites are operating as the eyes for ballistic missiles.

For any reconnaissance system, dead time includes the transmission time required to relay the sighting to the control station, the time consumed in converting the target report into meaningful ballistic data, as well as the time required for all of the remaining countdown steps before the actual firing of the missile. In the case of the reconnaissance satellite, transmission time might also include a substantial part of the satellite's orbital period (some 90 minutes), because it may not be able to divulge its findings until it passes near its home territory. From ships and aircraft, the transmission time may also be considerable because of the necessity of relaying the target information through intermediate stations.

The conversion of the target location into useful ballistic data is not only time consuming, but costly. The computation of ballistic settings for shooting a missile from some known launch point to a single fixed target (the normal situation with strategic missiles) is straightforward if somewhat complex and the time required for the computation is of little concern. In the antiship case, where the target may appear anywhere within broad spectra of range and bearing, the problem of computation becomes many times more acute since a ballistic solution for any combination of range and bearing to the target must be produced in a matter of minutes. This dictates that a high speed ballistic computer must be associated with each missile, and this addition will raise both the cost and the complexity of the system.

As for the countdown steps which cannot be completed prior to receipt of the target data, they will depend upon the particular missile system being used. The final countdown for a missile using a volatile nonstorable liquid propellant can be quite lengthy, but even with solid propellants which are always ready, certain last-minute fire control adjustments will be required. It must be remembered that even the direction of the target is not known until receipt of the target location message, so there is little that can be done to preset the missile.

It is difficult to assign a value to dead time for a generalized discussion, because it depends upon the character of the reconnaissance system as well as the missile system under consideration. It would be a very excellent system, however, which had a dead time as short as 15 minutes, but for purposes of this discussion, we shall consider that a dead time of 15 minutes is attainable.

Fifteen minutes also seems to be a good number for time of flight, whether one is lobbing an astronaut several hundred miles down range or whether one is shooting to IRBC range. For shorter shots, the velocities are lower, so the time elapsed for the total flight does not vary as much as one might expect. For the long-range shots in the ICBM range, times of flight of about 30 minutes are usually reported. To cover all cases, we should consider that times of flight can vary from a minimum of about 10 minutes to a maximum of about 40 minutes.

So, if we add dead time to time of flight, we find as a minimum something between 25 and 55 minutes that we can expect to elapse between the last "pinpointing" of the target and the arrival of the missile; but in most cases, the elapsed time will be longer.

Now, if we assume that the sighting vehicle can correctly report not only our geographic position, but our course and speed as well, and if we also assume that we will be unaware that we have been sighted (thus eliminating the opportunity for drastic course and speed change immediately after the sighting), we will be reduced to relying upon passive evasive maneuvers such as zigzagging, continuous turning, or periodic speed changes to give us protection. Even so, we will find the systems which were effective against any but the shortest torpedo runs in World War II will stand us in good stead against the new threat.

As an example, consider a 20-knot ship being fired at by a reconnaissance missile system under conditions such as the dead time plus time of flight being 30 minutes. Assume that the ship has been steering an evasive course and the course made good is 30° to one side of the course she was on at the moment of sighting. This ship would me missed by 5 miles by a perfect shot on the part of the enemy—and the speed and maneuver used in this example are certainly modest.

One might argue that 5 miles is not an adequate margin, that the megaton range warhead has longer lethal arms. Here the environment lends a hand, for a ship which is designed to stand up to the fury of a typhoon has a first step toward preparing it for the nuclear blast. Her metal structure and lack of exposed flammables give her the ability to withstand a much higher intensity of heat flash than can normal structures ashore. The ocean provides a resilient base which allows the ship to heel to the pressure waves and nuclear winds which would shatter a rigid structure. The rugged structure of a warship is a tough target for a blast mechanism and the built-in damage control systems of a warship will help arrest fires and flooding before they become dangerous.

Ships at sea can combine all of the beneficial defensive characteristics so frequently extolled in debates concerning ballistic missile systems; they can be at one time dispersed, hard, and mobile. The surface warship is an evasive, tough target, and naval formations at sea should be thought of as dispersions of evasive, tough targets.

Of course, the enemy can increase his lethal radius by increasing the size of his warhead, but as his warhead grows, so will his missile, and the cost per shot will skyrocket. He might take the shotgun approach and fire a pattern of missiles to cover the whole gamut of possible positions of the target, but this method can quickly become prohibitive. For example, if it is assumed that, for a given warhead, a hit within 1 mile of a warship is required to assure lethal damage, 100 warheads would be required to cover a 20-mile square (1 every 2 miles) which is approximately the area of possible positions of a 20-knot target one-half hour after positioning. Obviously, the economics of the exchange becomes lopsided.

The discussion so far has conceded to the enemy perfect reconnaissance, exact target data, and perfect operation of his missile system, though it has endeavored to point out the difficulty of employing an intrinsically static system to solve a dynamic problem. Reconnaissance, target data, and missile system operation, however, will not be perfect. Though we have glibly conceded the existence of effective reconnaissance satellites, such capability may be far from a reality. Though promising spectacular improvement in many fields of reconnaissance, whether such vehicles will actually be effective in locating, identifying, and tracking ships at sea with sufficient accuracy to be useful for ballistic purposes, remains to be seen.

It should be apparent from the preceding discussion that the purely ballistic missile is not a very practical weapon for use against a maneuvering ship at sea. Given terminal guidance, however, we will have a different story. With a guidance system capable of acquiring the target as the missile plunges back into the atmosphere and of making a terminal correction of some 10 or 15 miles, the effectiveness of the ship's maneuvering will be canceled. With terminal homing in the missile and an effective reconnaissance system in operation, the balance tips drastically in favor of the missile system.

Luckily for the ship, a guidance system which can withstand the eroding heat of reentry and still operate effectively has not yet been developed.

But the design of a reentry body which could penetrate the atmosphere at all was beyond the grasp of technology a few short years ago. At the moment, both sides in the cold war are developing and presumably filling their intercontinental ballistic missile arsenals—a requirement for maintaining the deterrence. By 1965, when the strategic missile force has been completed, attention should be turned toward refinements, and terminal guidance for antiship missiles will certainly be among the candidates. In the late 1960's, we may well be facing a practical and accurate satellite reconnaissance system coupled with a long-range missile equipped with terminal guidance, making it capable of erasing all the effects of dead time, time of flight, and ship maneuver.

And we have been considering only ships maneuvering at sea. Ships in port are already vulnerable to attack by those ballistic missiles with sufficient range to reach them. Even though vigorous efforts are made to keep our ships at sea and moving in a war situation, a large portion of our shipping will be found in port or at anchor, loading, discharging, refitting, etc., and a ship immobile is a target. In a time of missile plenty, even a modest merchantman may be well worth the expenditure of an ICBM.

To recapitulate, though warships maneuvering at sea are not vulnerable to the long-range ballistic missiles as we know them today, a large part of our naval force is, i.e., that part which is in port or immobile within range of the enemy's missiles. It is already economically advantageous to trade missiles for major warships, and as time goes on, it will probably be advantageous to trade a missile for any warship or even for any ocean-going merchant vessel. Finally, as technology advances, even our mobile units at sea will be brought under the missile threat through the development of adequate reconnaissance systems and terminal homing missiles.

Against such a threat, one which menaces the very existence of surface fleets, what is there to do?

There was a time when the British and the Dutch held each other in check by matching battlelines of stately three-deckers. In the early 20th century, the balance of naval power was determined by comparing numbers of battleships and battle cruisers. We built the *Alaskas* to answer the *Mogamis*, the *Missouris* to answer the *Bismarcks*. Is our fleet to be stymied, even in the open ocean, by pairing lines of sullen missiles? Are we to lose the use of the sea, the key to our ability to project U.S. power across the world to the point of our choosing? We will surely lose it if we do not face up to the threat and take positive action to counter it.

The first required step is to examine our fleet operating concepts to see if our static vulnerability cannot be minimized. Can we any longer depend on entering port for fuel, provisions, or repair? Can we afford to marshal task forces or convoys in sheltered anchorages? We have thought out and practiced dispersal in the face of an initial attack with warning; but in a continuing war where the threat is ever present and there is no specific warning, what are the best procedures?

Next we must raise our horizons. We must look up into the sky and above it to grapple the space age enemy in the environment which is ours, too—space. First, to counter his reconnaissance, passively through denying him the radiations which are so useful in detection and identification, and actively by giving him false targets to deceive and to confuse. Next, we must utilize the inherent power advantage we have in ships to "jam" his sensors, to deny information collection or transfer, to screen other friendly units.

Finally, we must develop the capability to destroy reconnaissance satellites by anti-satellite missiles. Satellites swing through space on regular orbits, available for constant tracking and deliberate counteraction; satellites are the space age sitting ducks.

Though destruction of reconnaissance satellites will do much to eliminate the threat to our ships at sea, we still have the ballistic missile threat in port and with the advent of the homing missile, this threat will extend to certain situations at sea. To meet this threat, the Fleet must have an anti-ballistic missile capability. When our ships lie within range of the enemy's battery, we cannot leave them undefended.

Antiballistic missile capability in ships? With enormous effort and expense, this capability has not yet been demonstrated ashore; can it be done at all at sea?

In the first place, defending a single ship or a limited number of ships in a relatively small area is a very much simpler problem than one might at first realize. The direction from which the attack is possible will normally be known and an incoming nose cone will have to appear in a certain sector of the sky at a velocity within certain very narrow limits if it is going to hit the vital zone. The tight boundaries on the location and velocity of a missile do much to simplify our search and fire control problem.

Next, the ballistic missile nose cone is not as difficult a target as is popularly supposed. Though it plunges into the fringes of the atmosphere at fantastic speed, the resistance of the air quickly slows it down to a terminal velocity which is quite modest. We might have as much as 2 minutes in which to counter it from first detection until the warhead reaches its detonate position, and with advanced radars, computers, and missilery, a lot can be done in 2 minutes.

The nose cone, heated a cherry red by air friction, will be an excellent infrared emitter to give us help in detection and tracking under certain conditions, and should the incoming missile be emitting radio energy for homing or fuzing, this will be an additional help to us.

A ship with an anti-ICBM battery will be a complicated and expensive ship. It may be that much of the AICBM equipment, when developed, can be used for other surface-to-air and surface-to-surface work, but the addition of AICBM capability will not be cheap. But when one appreciates fully the alternative of not having this capability—a situation where our whole surface Navy from the strike carriers to the LST's will be vulnerable to shore-based artillery—it is clear that we must take the steps necessary to maintain our seapower.

It seems fantastic to be seriously considering a sea battle involving satellite reconnaissance, anti-missile missiles, thermonuclear warheads, etc., but our ability to use the sea to protect our way of life may well depend upon our readiness for such a conflict. Our use of the sea to protect our interests and to assist our allies has been so effectively demonstrated in the past that a potential enemy could be expected to go to extreme lengths to neutralize our fleet. We are in the midst of a continuing technological explosion and we must continue to move ahead with it if we are to be the effective arm our Nation needs.

The seas cover 75 percent of the earth's surface, but space blankets 100 percent. We must prepare to fight the naval battle to the edge of space and beyond to maintain control of the sea and employ that control to the benefit of free men.

African Students' Bulgaria Exodus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following letter and statement which concerns the recent exodus of African students from Bulgaria:

DEAR FRIEND: The recent exodus of African students from Bulgaria has received a good bit of public notice. I think you may be interested in the enclosed account written by Robert Kotey, secretary of the Ghana Students Union in Bulgaria. This came to us through the Coordinating Secretariat of National Unions of Students (COSEC). I hope this may be helpful to you in giving you further background on what really happened.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE M. HOUSER,
Executive Director,
American Committee on Africa.

EXODUS OF AFRICAN STUDENTS FROM BULGARIA

It has been my unhappy lot to serve as the informal leader of a group of 20 Ghanaian students—all of those Ghanaians studying in Sofia, Bulgaria—who have been forced by circumstances to interrupt our studies and to seek new countries in which to pursue them. It was a painful decision which we and almost all the other African students in Bulgaria have taken, but when denied police protection in the face of a pattern of consistent racial discrimination, when denied the right to organize an All-African Student Union, when our very lives were threatened, it was clearly not possible for us to remain in the country.

My own experience began when I applied for a scholarship to study in my chosen field of economics, and my government, which has worked out scholarship agreements with a number of other governments in both the East and West, selected me for a position in Bulgaria. In December 1961, a number of Ghanaian students—who had been selected solely on the basis of educational qualifications—flew from Accra to Sofia to begin our higher education.

We had come with open minds, and in the beginning we were filled with high hopes. We received a friendly welcome from many Bulgarian people, and we were placed in the same hostels, even in the same rooms, with our Bulgarian fellow students. We set about the formidable task of mastering the Bulgarian language in order that we might be able to understand our textbooks and lectures.

Early in the year, however, we began to experience some difficulties. We had come to Bulgaria to study, and not to live luxuriously, but living conditions turned out to be not nearly so good as we had expected—not as good as they are for university students in Ghana itself. We were unhappy at being cramped 4 in a room which was only 14 by 9 feet, with 4 beds and 1 table in the middle with a chair at either end. It made studying very inconvenient, as some in the room had to sit or lie on their beds in order to read. Our living allowance came to only £24 a month, fully £18 of which had to go for food, and this left little over for books, recreation, transportation, and supplies.

We had all arrived in tropical weight clothing and were given no allowance to purchase clothes, so that simply trying to keep warm in the cold Bulgarian winter posed a real economic hardship.

We brought our problems to the attention of the university authorities, who replied that there was no way out of our difficulties. We later appealed to the Minister of Education, who told us that he would do something to help. He never did, however, and eventually we were forced to turn to the Government of Ghana, which sympathized with us and provided us with an additional living allowance of £10 a month.

As time went on our relations with the Bulgarian students and people took a disturbing turn. We had been impressed from the beginning with the large number of misconceptions and general ignorance in the country concerning modern Africa. From students to professors they seemed in total darkness concerning our continent; all they appear to have been told is that it is "too hot," that we still have snakes in the streets, and the people go about naked. They were very surprised, in fact, when we told them that the suits we were wearing had been made in Ghana. They seemed to expect that we would be wearing leaves to cover ourselves.

After we had been in Bulgaria a short while people kept on questioning us concerning the size and source of our living allowances. They seemed to resent the fact that we received larger allowances than the Bulgarian students, even though they could also receive money from their families and did not have to purchase anew their cold-weather wardrobes. Some said that we lived a bit luxuriously as compared with the standard of Bulgarians and that when we wore neckties with our suits—as we always had done in Ghana—we were being "bourgeois."

African students increasingly became the objects of harassment by some of the Bulgarian students and people. We were called all sorts of names as we walked along the streets, names such as "black monkeys" and "jungle people" which were insults not only to ourselves but to all of Africa. Boys were spat upon from buses and trains, or had water poured on their heads as they walked beneath windows. A vicious rumor was started which alleged that we were all suffering from venereal disease, and boys in the streets would shout "syphilis" at us as we passed. We finally had to demand that we all be given medical examinations to disprove this charge. Although the tests showed that not one of us had such a disease, the government refused to give any publicity to the results.

Racialism in Bulgaria frequently took violent forms. For example, a Nigerian student was waiting for a bus to take him to the hostel when he was approached by a group of Bulgarians who had left a restaurant and who were laughing, spitting, and calling names. Taking them to be happily drunk he did not take offense but joined in their laughter. At this point one of the Bulgarians grabbed him by the collar and gave him a blow, while a policeman standing by made no effort to help. The Nigerian reported the incident and the negligence of the policeman, but nothing was ever done about it. Frequently African students had the experience of being beaten up by Bulgarians while a policeman nearby would protest that he could do nothing because he was assigned to another district, or would merely disperse the crowd while letting the beating continue.

A particularly ugly incident occurred in August 1962. Half a dozen Ghanaian students missed dinner at the hostel dining room and went to a nearby restaurant, the "Chuchuliga." There was music playing, and one of the Ghanaians asked a Bulgarian girl in the restaurant to dance with him. As they were dancing a young soldier went up to the girl and asked her: "Is it not a shame for you to dance with a black monkey?" The Ghanaian did not want to make trouble, so he returned to his table, but just as he was about to sit down another Bulgarian boy pulled his chair out from behind him, and he toppled onto the floor. Before he could even get back on his feet another Bulgarian knocked him over the head with a chair, and he fell over unconscious. By this time the Ghanaians were furious, and a general fight ensued between the dozens of Bulgarians who were in the restaurant and who poured in from the streets and the handful of Ghanaian students at their table. Surprisingly enough, the Bulgarian police who were in the restaurant did not attempt to intervene but left the place immediately. It was only when the Ghanaians appeared to be holding their own against the Bulgarians, despite the fact that they were so seriously outnumbered, that the police returned and broke up the fight. They made no effort to find the young Bulgarians who had started the fight, but rather arrested only the six Ghanaians. Four of the six were wounded in the fight, and they were released by the police the next day. At the request of the Government of Ghana they were immediately flown back to Accra. The two who were not wounded, however, were kept in jail for 1 full month before their case came before any kind of court for a hearing. The only witnesses called were Bulgarians, none of whom had themselves been arrested. One of the students, George Anmah, was sentenced to 1 year in prison and the other, E. A. Attiga, to 3 years. As a result of pressure from the Ghanaian Government they were released and sent home, but the incident created much concern among the African students remaining in Bulgaria. We continued to have some good friends among the Bulgarian students and people, but the Bulgarian Government took no steps to stamp out the hooliganism against us, and this led us to conclude that it was being supported from "above."

Prior to last year there were only a few African students—from Mali, the Sudan, and Guinea—in Bulgaria, and there was, therefore, no need for an all-African students' organization. When we Ghanaian students arrived last year we found ourselves all in the same hostel, and in order to sit together and exchange views we formed the Ghana Students Union, of which I was elected secretary. We never thought to ask the permission of the authorities to form such an organization, and we came to feel that they were prepared to deal with us thus on individual national bases.

We had gone to Bulgaria to study, not to engage in politics, and we had in the beginning resisted the formation of an all-African organization for fear that it might be involved in politics. It was only when we became convinced that an all-African organization in Bulgaria need have nothing to do with politics that we agreed to form one.

When in November and December of 1962, we took definite steps toward the organization of the All-African Students Union, we had several objectives in mind. First of all, we wished to have a means by which we African students could defend our interests in the absence of police protection and look after our welfare in the face of inadequate living conditions. Second, we wished to have an organization which could bring us together in the true spirit of pan-Africanism. We felt that if our various leaders are now fighting to unite all of Africa, as students it was our duty to accelerate this realization in any way we could. Third, we wanted to foster friendship between the Bulgarian youth and the Africans.

By December we had drafted a constitution of our All-African Students Union—which, with the participation of students from 22 countries, represented a true "voice of Africa"—and had elected a list of 7 officers, headed by Tetteh Tawiah of Ghana, a student of philosophy. When the union had been formed, we invited two individuals to patronize it—the Ghanaian Ambassador, and, as an act of good will toward the Bulgarian authorities, the Minister of Education. We were surprised when shortly thereafter Tawiah was called before the Minister of Education and told that he would have to disband the union because it was against the "principles" of Bulgaria. This was all the Bulgarian authorities ever said, then or later, that in some strange way this genuinely pan-African movement was "against our principles."

We did, however, hear rumors that the authorities felt that the All-African Students Union was intended to be a political organization hostile to the Bulgarian Government. We therefore sent a delegation to the Minister of Education to present him with a copy of our constitution and to explain our nonpolitical aims. He took the constitution but made no reply, merely asking us to see him later.

The next thing we knew was that on February 6 Tetteh Tawiah was served with an order of expulsion from the university. He was charged with having been irregular in classes and having failed to take an examination. Actually, in Bulgaria every student has a report book (stydentska kinishka) which his professors and lecturers sign when they are satisfied with his attendance at classes, and in every case Tawiah's book had been signed. It was true that he had missed an examination, but this was because he had been unable to obtain a textbook which was out of stock during the early part of his course and was only able to obtain it 1 month before his examination, which was not sufficient for him to master a difficult Bulgarian text. His professor had quite naturally given him permission in advance to delay the taking of his examination to the next academic term. In spite of the obvious falsity of the charges against Tawiah, we would not have been convinced of the full implications of his case had it not been for the fact that the vice president of the All-African Students Union, Mr. Amlak of Ethiopia, was also warned the next morning that he would be expelled if he did not abide by the regulation of the university. We knew then that the actions of the authorities were not based on the personal conduct of the two students but rather on the hostility of the Bulgarian Government to the formation of an organization which would unite all the African students in the country.

On Saturday, February 9, Tawiah was ordered to leave Bulgaria within 12 hours. As news of the order spread, some 150 African students gathered at the hostel and walked down Lenin Street to the Prime Minister's office. We wished to demand the reinstatement of Tawiah in the university and the withdrawal of the deportation order against him and to insist upon the recognition of the All-African Students Union as the representative voice of the African students. When we arrived at the Ministry, however, we were told by a man who said he was a leader of the Bulgarian Komsomol (Young Communist League) that the Prime Minister was not available but that he would meet with our representatives 9 o'clock Monday morning. Over the weekend, seven students were elected to represent our position before the Prime Minister, and they arrived promptly at 9. After they had waited at the office for 5 full hours without a response, a man who said he was the secretary to the Prime Minister told them that he was prepared to see them only later in the day. The seven students then returned to the hostel to report to us what had happened, and the executive committee of the All-African Students Union met to plan just how our case should be presented to the Prime Minister.

Later that afternoon the Sofia police commissioner arrived at the hostel and informed us that he had been instructed to say that demonstrations of the type we had carried out (we had walked informally together for several kilometers, without carrying any signs or chanting any slogans) were illegal in Bulgaria. He said that persons involved in such demonstrations who had not been warned by the police were liable to 3 years imprisonment, that persons who had been warned were liable to 15 years imprisonment, and that we should consider ourselves to have been officially warned. We told him that our intention had not been to demonstrate but only to obtain an interview with the Prime Minister, and the police commissioner promised that through the Minister of the Interior he would arrange such a meeting for us. The All-African Students Union executive committee thereupon decided to go the next day to the Ministry of the Interior to establish a definite time for an interview with the Prime Minister.

The sincerity of the assurance we had thus received was put to an early test. At 3 a.m. Tuesday morning a large number of policemen—at least 100—quietly surrounded the hostel where we were all sleeping. Fortunately, Bulgarian student friends had warned us that the police might attempt to arrest our leaders. Five of the members of the executive committee had therefore gone to different rooms to sleep, and Tawiah was hiding in my room for safety. Mr. Matthews of Togo, a member of the All-African Students Union executive committee, however, had not switched from his regular room, which was adjacent to mine. I was rudely awakened by the noise of his pounding on my wall and shouting for help as the police were breaking down his locked door. I ran to my door, but as I opened it the policemen outside forced me at pistol point to get back into my room. I then ran to the window only to see police spread throughout the courtyard, and I realized that if I made any effort to help Matthews or to warn the others I would only be jeopardizing the security—and perhaps the very life—of Tawiah. The police told Matthews not to speak to anyone and to pack his belongings, but as they carried him away he shouted, "I have been arrested and I am going, but stand firm for the African Union." That was the last that any of us ever heard of him. His shouting awoke the rest of the Africans in the hostel, and so many of them came out of their rooms that the police had to content themselves with arresting Matthews and Daniel Orfah of Nigeria, the other executive committee member who had made the mistake of staying in his room. As all the Africans milled about in confusion I went to the room where Amlak was hiding to tell him what had happened. He suggested that we all go back to our rooms and wait until daybreak to proceed with further action.

The next morning we virtually all decided that as fighters for African unity we were not interested in staying in a country where the authorities were working so actively against this cause. We therefore agreed that by 8 o'clock we would each pack a bag as a symbol of our determination to leave Bulgaria and would march to the Ministry of Education. There we would demand that if our two brothers were not unconditionally and immediately released we must be given exit visas and air tickets to permit us to leave Bulgaria for good. By 7:45 fully 200 of us—students from 21 different African countries—began our march down Lenin Street through the heavy snowfall. We had covered most of the three-and-a-half kilometers when some 600 jeeps full of 600 to 700 armed policemen circled around us. The policemen poured from the jeeps, and all traffic came to a halt. The police were soon joined by civilians who came down from the halted buses. Together they began attacking us indiscriminately, beating and slapping the girls among us just as hard as they beat and slapped the boys. One Togolese girl was hit so hard on the face that she bled profusely from her nose and mouth, and many others of the students were injured, some of them seriously. The police began arresting us by the dozens, and as civilian informers pointed out the remaining members of the executive committee—the Ethiopian Vice-President, the Guinean Secretary-General, another Togolese and a Somali—they were one by one arrested and hauled into waiting police vans. As a Bulgarian civilian directed the police to Tawiah, however, dozens of African students clustered around him for his protection. It was only by brutally breaking their way through a solid human wall that the police were able to take Tawiah, the last of their 40 to 50 prisoners.

All of the arrested students were taken to cells, but later in the day all were released save the five members of the executive committee of the AASU who had eluded arrest in the raid on the hostel the previous night. Thus by detaining all seven of the officers of the AASU and no other Africans did the Bulgarian authorities once again demonstrate that the unified African student organization was the object of their fear and hence their hostility.

The students then formed a temporary executive committee of the All-African Students Union to see to the unconditional release of the seven arrested students and to obtain exit visas and tickets for all of the African students in Bulgaria (except for the Sudanese, who are political refugees from their country and were alone in wanting to stay.) The government agreed to issue all African students exit visas good only for 3 days, but they refused to provide the tickets which were necessary if the students were to leave and to which they were entitled under the terms of their scholarships. On the second day, February 14, a group of African students went to the Ministry of Education again to demand tickets for their flights. The government responded by sending a delegation of Bulgarian professors and students, who asked us to remain in the country and assured us that conditions would be modified later on. We had had more than enough of such assurances, however, and we resolved to stay in our hostel and not to attend lectures until we were provided with tickets. The authorities finally replied to our demand by saying that if we wished to leave we could go out on our own. Since none of us was able on his own to purchase a ticket, this became a matter of robbing Peter to pay Paul. The Ethiopians left first, followed by us Ghanaians, accompanied by our country's ambassador to Bulgaria, Mr. Appah Sampong. We in turn were followed by the students in Bulgaria from Nigeria, Mali, and Guinea. Other than the Sudanese, any African students who have stayed in Bulgaria have done so only because they have no means to pay their transportation out of the country.

We now face the problem of finding new places and new means of support in order that we may further our higher education. We would be grateful, for ourselves and for our fellow students from other countries, should any benevolent societies or governments be willing to extend a helping hand. We would like to study in any country where educational standards are high, although most of us are not anxious to return to a Socialist country for fear that our experiences might be similar and that our freedom might again be limited.

We are also all concerned about the fate of our seven leaders, of whom we have had no clear word since we left Bulgaria. All student organizations and others concerned with the defense of student rights must demand that the Bulgarian authorities permit these students to leave the country promptly and unpunished, as their only "crime" has been that of working for the unity of Africa. Our experience has convinced us all the more of the potential power of African unity, as demonstrated—if by nothing else—by the determined character of the efforts made against it by those who would deny or subvert its lofty aspirations.

ROBERT KOTEY,
Secretary, Ghana Students Union in Bulgaria.

Portable Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the minority views to the 1963 annual report of the Joint Economic Committee, the six Republican members made the following recommendation:

> In order to ease the impact of automation and other causes of economic dislocation in a dynamic economy, both governmental and nongovernmental means should be considered to encourage the transferability of pensions and other job rights for individual workers who must change jobs.

In my opinion, this is an important principle for improving labor market flexibility by encouraging workers to take advantage of new job opportunities wherever they may open up.

I was pleased to note, therefore, an article in a recent issue of Business Week describing a bill for portable pensions under consideration by the Ontario, Canada, Legislature. This action is likely to influence other legislatures in Canada and the United States.

An effective system of portable pensions such as the one proposed could increase labor mobility and thus serve an important function in a period of rapid technological change. Workers would benefit by retaining their accumulated pension rights while employers would maintain the same pension costs even though hiring older workers.

Mr. Speaker, this short article outlines an idea which I believe deserves serious consideration. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

CARRYING PENSION TO NEW JOB—PORTABLE PENSION MAY SOON BE LAW IN ONTARIO—IDEA COULD SPREAD TO UNITED STATES

There has been much talk, in both the United States and Canada, about so-called portable pension plans—where a worker can take his company pension credits with him when he changes jobs.

A bill setting up such a program is expected to pass the Ontario Legislature in a matter of weeks. If it does, it will be the first to become law—and likely to influence legislatures in other Canadian provinces soon and perhaps some U.S. States eventually. In any case, Ontario's action will be especially significant because that province contains more than 50 percent of Canada's industry—including much U.S. investment.

The basic argument for portable pensions is that they increase labor mobility—chiefly in two ways:

They reduce a worker's reluctance to switch jobs for fear of losing pension rights.

They reduce an employer's reluctance to hire a middle-aged worker for fear of facing steep pension costs.

SUB FOR SOCIAL SECURITY

In Canada, there is still another reason. Portable pensions would be a partial substitute for the elaborate system of social security benefits available in the United States.

Specifically, the Ontario plan provides that all employers with 15 or more employees must institute a pension plan to go into effect by January 1, 1965—including the government and its corporations. The plan must cover all employees working more than 20 hours a week who are over 30 and have 6 months' service.

CONTRIBUTIONS

The minimum plan—covering the first $4,800 of income—in most cases must be fully vested so that employer contributions remain a part of the employee's accumulated pension.

Most pensions now in effect exceed the minimum standards. Employer contributions beyond the minimum would become fully vested after an employee had 10 years' service and was 44 years old. At that time, the full employer contribution would become part of the employee's pension.

With a few insignificant exceptions, the employee's minimum contributions cannot be withdrawn to tide him through unemployment or help put the kids through school. However, he may withdraw 25 percent of the value of any pension accrued over the minimum.

EIGHTY DOLLARS A MONTH

The minimum plan calls for an assured pension of $80 a month at age 70 for employees who have worked 40 years. At 65, the return would be about $70.

The employer has the responsibility for the plan, but he may require up to 50-percent employee contribution.

IN COLD STORAGE

Once the plan gets going, pension credits of an employee who changes jobs can be cold stored with interest with the previous employer, transferred to the new employer if the plans are compatible, or placed with the government's pension commission. The commission will amalgamate and administer an anticipated flood of splinter pensions.

COVERAGE

About half of all Ontario employees are covered by some form of pension plan. Officials think the new law would raise this figure to about 70 percent. An estimated 5,000 to 6,000 Ontario companies with 15 or more workers have no plans at present.

CRITICS

The program has not been without criticism. The Canadian Labour Congress would prefer a national contributory social security scheme on the pattern of U.S. social security. At present, all Canadians past 70 collect monthly pensions of $65, raised through normal tax channels. Most of the political parties in the recent election promised some sort of contributory plan on top of the flat payment.

Now, say union officials, other provinces will probably follow in Ontario's footsteps instead of backing the national legislation they would prefer. Still, half a loaf is better than none, they concede.

Business, too, seems resigned to the plan—although spokesmen attacked it sharply as recently as the Canadian Pension Conference of late 1961.

The Government's position is that establishment of minimum pension plans and their adequate supervision, however important, are secondary to the main goal: easing labor mobility.

Israel Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, and as an American who has descended from forebearers who migrated to this land which has enjoyed independence for almost 200 years, I welcome the opportunity to hail the approaching 15th year of Israel independence, a sovereign state of progressive people.

In many ways, the State of Israel may be considered as a diminutive United States. Within its 7,882.6 square miles, are found mountains and deserts, lakes and rivers, gorges, coastal plains and inland valleys. There are copper mines, steel mills, oil refineries, and phosphate plants. Its Government is democratic and is pledged to the principles of liberty, justice, and peace. Furthermore, the citizens of Israel have political equality, regardless of religion, race, or sex, and freedom of religion and education.

The greatest similarity between this new nation, which is celebrating its 15th year of independence, and the United States, is the people. Both nations were built by immigrants who traveled to a new land of promise from all parts of the globe. One hundred and two countries are now represented in the development of this modern State of the Middle East, one which is regarded as progressive, dynamic, and stable.

The rapid increase of immigrants, however, since the founding of the State, resulted in continuous hardships for the Government, which, if the country were to survive, had to be solved. Unemployment, housing shortages, and insufficient food caused the Israeli leaders to call upon the United States for succor. The request was readily complied with and continues today in the form of development loans. Since the inception of the American aid programs, Israel has received approximately $880 million. With these funds, the Government has built roads, schools, health facilities, factories, and towns. It has fed the hungry, supported the unemployed, and settled the immigrant.

It was money well spent by us and wisely used by the recipients for the greatest benefit to the most people in this new promised land. The most appropriate use of foreign aid money by Israel could well have served as a model for other recipient nations to follow.

Although assistance is still received from the United States, Israel has begun a technical assistance program of its own. With a minimum of expenditures, its development programs to other underdeveloped countries of the world has gained for this Nation many friends and allies. Schools are playing the greatest part in these projects since, from Israeli institutions venture experts and instructors to requesting nations, to help solve development problems arising from independence. Furthermore, to these institutions come the promising young people of these underdeveloped nations, who desire to acquire learning and methods which have proved so successful in the rapid modernization of Israel.

The adaptation to the problems of Israel and the desire for learning to keep pace with the modern growth of the new nation, as demonstrated by immigrants to Israel from all over the world, is but paralleled by our own immigrants of Jewish faith since the early days of the founding of this Nation. They, and those who have followed in posterity, as well as more recent immigrants who fled or survived persecution in other lands, have contributed immensely to the growth, welfare, and tremendous progress of these great United States.

They have distinguished themselves in the professions, the sciences and arts, in the fields of government and commerce, and last but not least in the welfare movements for the benefit of fellowmen. Blessed with an unquenchable thirst for knowledge, the benefits derived therefrom has flown forth in the interest of all mankind.

My own city of Philadelphia represents a typical example where the people of Jewish faith, immigrant and nativeborn, have taken their rightful place in the ranks of good citizens, with a zeal for active participation in the building and strengthening of the community life in a great metropolitan area. It is in this fulfillment of civic pride and civic duty, and a genuine desire to help their fellow citizens enjoy a full life that is repeated all over this land, and has been reflected in the progress of Israel for the past 15 years.

Israel's declaration of independence on May 14, 1948, under our calendar, was the result of years of hard work, of disappointments and unfulfilled promises, of politics and campaigns. Yet, when promulgated, it was the fulfillment of the dreams of world Jewry for a national homeland, a place with which to be identified, a refuge from centuries of persecution and tyranny. And so it is with pride that we salute the citizens of Israel as they celebrate their most treasured remembrance, the anniversary of their independence.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to rise to pay my tribute to the Polish Constitution of 1791 whose anniversary we celebrate on May 3 of this year, tomorrow.

In these days when so much of eastern Europe, including the Polish homeland itself, is under the dark tyranny of Soviet communism, we can well pay tribute again to this great document which shed an early light of liberalism and freedom through Europe.

Although the Polish people have since that time suffered tyranny, oppression and partition on many occasions, they still cherish the ideal of national freedom.

And so, on this great anniversary, Mr. Speaker, as we pay tribute to the great Polish Constitution let us pledge our efforts and our substance to the ultimate goal of wiping out Soviet tyranny and restoring once again the freedom of the great Polish people.

Stonewall Jackson's Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, tomorrow is the 100th anniversary of the death of Gen. Thomas Jonathan Jackson, the matchless "Stonewall," whose military genius was such that his tactics have influenced military leaders for the past century.

Jackson always has been one of my special heroes, not only as a military genius but as a teacher of youth both by precept and by example. To his students and his soldiers, Jackson gave an example of self-denial, which is the root of all religion and of self-control, which is the root of all manliness. Before the war, which he entered reluctantly and only after determining that action was necessary to defend a principle and an ideal of government in which he deeply believed, he was a humble college professor and a devout Sunday school teacher in my hometown of Lexington. He is buried there in the Lexington Cemetery.

I am confident my colleagues recall how Jackson was wounded by his own troops while reconnoitering near Chancellorsville May 2, 1863, after his brilliant encirclement of and attack on Hooker's flank. He died 8 days later.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Bedford, Va., Bulletin-Democrat, containing some interesting sidelights about one of the doctors who attended Jackson during his last illness.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bedford (Va.) Bulletin-Democrat, May 9, 1963]

STONEWALL JACKSON'S DEATH 100 YEARS AGO REMEMBERED

(By Kenneth E. Crouch)

Ceremonies are being held throughout Virginia this week to commemorate the 100th anniversary Friday, May 10, of the death of one of the illustrious leaders of the Confederate Armies, Lt. Gen. Thomas J. ("Stonewall") Jackson.

A simple site on the southside of Bedford County is closely associated with the final days of this military leader and will go unnoticed that day as it has been for the past 53 years.

It is on a knoll on the Burroughs-Mitchell farm on Route 805 (Stone Mountain Road), opposite old Mount Pleasant Academy school just north of Route 626 (Huddleston-Anthony's Ford Road). There in a family cemetery is buried Dr. William Pleasant Thurman, one of the Confederate surgeons who attended General Jackson in his fatal illness.

THE TRAGIC VOLLEY

After a successful Confederate drive against the Union forces near Chancellorsville under cover of the deep dusk, General Jackson on May 2, 1863, led a small group on a reconnaissance expedition. His party, sighted and fired upon by the enemy, galloped back in the direction of their own lines. The Confederates, not knowing that General Jackson was on the field and seeing a number of horsemen dashing madly toward them, loosed a volley in which he was mortally wounded.

He was given first aid and a call was sent for Dr. Hunter H. McGuire, medical director of the corps. He was moved over dark, rough roads, about midnight on the evening of May 2, to a field hospital set up at Wilderness Tavern. The hospital was located several hundred yards from the Wilderness Run, in an open field near the crossing of the old Orange Turnpike over the run.

AN ARM AMPUTATED

There Dr. McGuire, assisted by Dr. Thurman and other Confederate surgeons, amputated the left arm of General Jackson and took a ball from the right hand.

The next day Rev. Tucker Lacy, General Jackson's favorite chaplain, took the dismembered arm, placed it in a box and carried it across the field to a family burying ground located on the "Ellwood" (or Ellwood Manor) home place of the Jones-Lacy family near Parker.

On May 4 it was decided to move the Confederate officer to a safer location as it was feared he might be captured by Union forces. Too ill to be carried to Richmond, the injured leader was painfully loaded into an old ambulance, captured from the Yankees, and taken to the estate of Thomas Chandler near Guinea Station and it was in this cottage that General Jackson died May 10.

Vice Adm. Alvin D. Chandler, honorary chancellor and former president of the College of William and Mary, is a grandson of Dr. Joseph Chandler in whose office General Jackson died.

Jackson's last days had another association with Bedford County. His body was carried from Lynchburg up the James River to Lexington on the paquetboat *Marshall* of the old James River and Kanawha Canal Co. This canal is now generally the route of the C. & O. Railroad up the north side of the County. General Jackson was buried in Lexington, where he had taught for several years at VMI. The old paquetboat now rests in Riverside Park in Lynchburg.

William Pleasant Thurman was born May 20, 1836, at the Thurman home near Mount Pleasant Academy, a son of Robert Jennings and Sophia S. Reese Thurman.

In 1860 he graduated from the University of Virginia and served 4 years in the Confederate States Army, the first 2 years as a private in the Bedford light artillery and the last 2 years as assistant surgeon.

May is a month of anniversaries for the well-known horse and buggy doctor, for on May 11, 1867, he was married to Docia Nelms, daughter of William and Malinda Nelms.

BACK TO BEDFORD

After his return from the War Between the States, he resumed the practice of medicine at the Thurman family home near Huddleston and died March 15, 1910.

Dr. Thurman had eight children, Jessie Key (Mrs. Oscar Wright), William Jennings, James Otis, John Silas, Delia Nelms (Mrs. Robert V. Overstreet), Dr. Allen Granberry, Mary Susan (Mrs. John B. Heptinstall) and Margaret. Dr. Allen G. Thurman was a physician in Appomattox County, Bedford and Vinton and his grandson, Dr. W. Allen Thurman, Jr., and his wife, Dr. Lee Arnold Thurman, are physicians in Vinton.

Dr. Thurman was descended from the Thurman-Leftwich families, active in Virginia history since colonial days. Ralph Leftwich of England, who was born about 1638, patented 300 acres on the Piankatank River in New Kent County of the Colony of Virginia August 10, 1658, the first of the family to settle in the New World.

His grandson, Augustine Leftwich, had 12 children, one of whom was Col. Thomas Leftwich, a captain in the Revolutionary War who was married 3 times and had 19 children.

Thomas Leftwich, born in 1740 in Caroline County, was granted July 20, 1778, 70 acres of land in Virginia by King George III with the grant witnessed by John Blair, president of the council. He was appointed sheriff of Bedford County on December 22, 1794, and died May 3, 1816.

His 19 children included a daughter, Susannah, who married John David Thurman of Franklin County and their son was Robert Jennings Thurman, father of the Confederate Army surgeon.

Civil Rights, United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has great reason to be troubled and concerned about what is happening in certain areas of the United States over the denial of constitutional rights.

Open warfare between peaceful demonstrators for basic and simple constitutional rights and officials whose duty it is to uphold these same rights is an incident we cannot ignore.

It is unnecessary to enumerate the acts of violence and denials that daily occur. They have become common knowledge to every schoolchild and every man and woman in our country. Unfortunately, this evening's newspaper will add additional stories; more of us will become emotional, some sadder, and a few will calmly question their civic responsibilities and moral duties.

Aside from the purely human suffering and costly waste of resources in areas that can ill afford more disabilities, the threat to our national leadership and our moral and legal codes poses an even greater challenge.

Well may we recall the words of Mr. Justice Brandeis:

> In a government of laws, existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. Our government is the potent, omnipresent teacher. For good or for ill, it teaches the whole people by its example. Crime is contagious.

> If the government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy.

Strangely enough, the issue is really not whether we have the basic power to act, or the need. Never before in our national existence have we been more fortified for this moment in history.

Our great judiciary has given new meaning to long cherished ideas of constitutional law, the concept of law both as a shield to protect the innocent and as a dynamic force in modern industrial societies to move us forward.

In recent years we have moved on many fronts to gain acceptance of equality of opportunity as a basic part of the American way of life. In some 20 States, we have passed fair employment practices laws covering over 112 million Americans. In State after State we have moved to desegregate schools and other public facilities.

These and other examples of progress and civil rights, however, must be viewed as the belated accomplishment of what we concluded to be part of our goals over a hundred years ago. Viewed in this light we must learn to understand the impatience to be free, the practical necessity to engage in a gainful occupation, and the urgency to live in human dignity. Little children want education now, men must have jobs to maintain their families now, citizens want to vote in elections now. Human dignity calls for respect now.

Also, whether we like it or not, we have reached a stage in Government responsibility when we must question our own legislative intent and fiscal integrity.

Does the constitutional prohibition against discrimination run throughout the text of every statute which we enact?

If it does—and who will contend we can enact laws otherwise—then our intent is being flouted, with our indulgence, by those who use the law to discriminate in schools, vocational education, libraries, and other Government facilities and services.

We might well recall the words so well spoken that those who dip their hands in the public treasury should not object if a little democracy sticks to their fingers.

If we can spend taxpayers' money to support violations of constitutional provisions and in the face of open defiance of Federal court orders, do we not harm our own fiscal integrity, and allow room in our conduct for other abuses of public funds?

These are but a few of the serious questions raised by events now occuring in our land. Responsible men, both North and South, must give the answers. We have in this Congress many such men. Let us hope that these leaders, not the demagogues, bigots and the extremists, provide the leadership for our great country by proceeding to counsel with each other, and acting on the many measures already introduced in this Congress to uphold our concepts of justice expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, the Federal and most State constitutions.

Ten Years of Red Conquests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the decade since the Korean war, 1953–63, has been featured by a steady succession of Soviet conquests in various strategic areas of the world that have changed the course of history.

In an interesting discussion of this subject in the Evening Star of April 30, 1963, David Lawrence emphasizes that the Soviet game has been to keep U.S. forces dispersed over the world and that the purpose of the Soviet occupation of Cuba was to require large concentrations of American armed might to remain in the Western Hemisphere as well as in other continents.

The indicated article follows:

TEN YEARS OF RED CONQUESTS—ADVANCES CALLED PART OF WORLD-CONTROL PLAN THAT MIGHT TAKE 50 YEARS

(By David Lawrence)

Ten years is just a moment in history—at least it looks that way to the Soviet government, which has used up a whole decade to carry on a series of aggressions in different parts of the world.

The Communists in 1945 grabbed seven independent countries in Eastern Europe and half of Korea. They are still striving to get the other half. In 1953 they began to get control of North Vietnam and now 10 years later they are in the process of taking over South Vietnam as well as Laos. They have their eyes on the Middle East and North Africa. They have a foothold today in Cuba and are driving to establish similar bases in important countries in Central and South America.

Meanwhile, the West is disunited. Its quaking officials cry out, "Who wants a big war?" So they continue to negotiate for the peace that never comes.

It was in the year 1953, after the Korean armistice had been signed in July, that the then Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, said in a public speech to the American Legion convention:

"A single Chinese Communist aggressive front extends from Korea on the north to Indo-China in the south. * * * In Indo-China a desperate struggle is in its eighth year. The outcome affects our own vital interests in the Western Pacific, and we are already contributing largely in material and money to the combined efforts of the French and of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. * * *

"Communist China has been and now is training, equipping, and supplying the Communist forces in Indo-China."

On December 29, 1953, this writer pointed out that the aggression had come in Indo-China, which had been cut in two by a drive of the Communists, begun on Christmas Day.

By the spring of 1954, the Western powers had agreed to a conference at Geneva to discuss the unification of Korea as well as the Indo-China problem. This correspondent went to Geneva to cover that conference.

"Peace," said Secretary of State Dulles at the opening of the conference on April 28, "is always easy to achieve—by surrender. Unity is also easy to achieve—by surrender. The hard task, the task that confronts us, is to combine peace and unity with freedom."

It became obvious that France was not willing to internationalize the war over Indo-China. The United States was naturally reluctant to do the job by itself. This correspondent wrote in July, 1954:

"So now, with Red China in the process of virtually annexing North Korea in defiance of the U.N. resolution declaring her an aggressor and with a virtual annexation of the rich areas of Indo-China, the Communist coalition is advancing to its biggest triumph. * * *It is an hour of great tragedy for the free world."

In that same year, on September 10, this correspondent wrote:

"Predictions were widely published in the press by realistic observers that, after the armistice (Korea) was signed, the military energies of the Communists would be turned toward Indo-China. Solemn warnings were issued by the U.S. Government that this must not be permitted to go unchallenged if it happened.

"But the Communists disregarded all warnings and stepped up the war in Indo-China. The French and British Governments favored appeasement and left America isolated. When the Indo-China armistice was signed, there was another wave of satisfaction expressed by the pollyanna spokesmen of governments that at last the world was going to see an end of fighting.

"But the Communists haven't stopped fighting. They now have started another war—this time against Formosa.

"Again there is a disposition throughout the free world to minimize it as just a few raids in and around a few small islands."

Since those days, the situation in Formosa has periodically quieted down. Some American military forces are, however, still bogged down in the area and cannot leave it. Substantial numbers of American Armed Forces are at the moment being concentrated in southeast Asia. The Soviet game is to keep U.S. military strength scattered all over the world. The setting up of a military base in Cuba was designed to publicize the threat to Latin America, which in turn will require a large concentration of America's Armed Forces in that part of the world, too.

The 1963 negotiations in Geneva with the Soviet Government are really meaningless, as are the talks between Averell Harriman and Premier Khrushchev at Moscow. The Soviets are not interested in seeing any agreements made or maintained. They keep on talking about agreement "in principle," but they do about as they please in violating pledges.

The weakness of the British and French in handling the Indo-China problem has left a legacy of trouble for the free world. It has since become the financial and military responsibility of the United States to take care of southeast Asia. Already at least 80 Americans have lost their lives in the fighting around Laos and South Vietnam. The Eisenhower administration was severely criticized for not taking a firm stand with respect to Indo-China but, without the cooperation of the British and French, it was not possible for the United States to go it alone.

The truth is the people in the Western World have seemed to care very little about what happens in southeast Asia. The relationship of this area to the Far East and to Red China's ascendancy has never been clearly appraised by the peoples of the West. Nor has it been realized that the continuous aggressions in southeast Asia—endangering India and Pakistan—are part of the Communist plan of world conquest which could go on for a half century. The Communists aren't in a hurry. They feel they can wear out the West's will to resist.

Why Taxes Need Cutting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

WHY TAXES NEED CUTTING

The administration's tax reduction program faces a new source of opposition—prosperity. The economy moved up in the first quarter somewhat further than had been forecast by Government experts, and the immediate result is some sentiment in Congress for postponement or elimination of tax cuts. The temptation, as President Kennedy has urged, should be resisted.

If the purpose of the tax cut were to combat a recession, imminent or actual, Congress would be justified in concluding that rising output and incomes makes it less necessary. But the purpose is quite different. It is to counteract those forces which in recent years have placed an automatic ceiling on economic expansion, so that each successive upswing failed to reach the point of full employment and full utilization of capacity.

Nobody can read the future. But the experience of the past suggests that a change in the tax structure is needed to enable the economy to reach new levels of prosperity and employment.

The United States has escaped a major depression since World War II in large part because of the automatic stabilizers built into the economy by modern fiscal policy and social legislation. When private spending fell, tax liabilities also fell, and at the same time Government contributions to demand, in the form of unemployment compensation, social security payments, public works and the like, increased. Eventually these influences enabled private consumption and investment to recover without going to the bottom of a major depression. Our recessions have been frequent, but short and relatively mild.

The automatic stabilizers, however, work on the upside of the cycle, too. At a certain point in the rise of incomes and spending, taxes begin to take proportionately a larger bite, while Government spending contributes relatively less to demand. The expansion levels off while millions are still unemployed, and shortly a downturn begins throwing still more men out of work, and exerting a cumulative effect of contraction.

Thus disposable personal income—the amount of income after taxes which people have available for spending—has tended to hit a ceiling during each recovery, and for the past 5 years that ceiling has kept the economy operating below its full output.

As economics is not an exact science, this analysis by the President's Council of Economic Advisers could prove to be faulty. Perhaps this time the recovery might go through past ceilings even though taxes were not cut. But actual experience, as opposed to optimistic crystal ball reading, does not warrant the assumption that this will happen.

Is it not more prudent to act on the basis of what we know, rather than on hopes of what we may find out later? On the whole, it is wiser to adopt the tax cut now, on the basis of long-term experience, instead of trying to read the meaning of short-term fluctuations which may or may not persist.

Memo to High School Seniors: Sixty Small Colleges Will Admit You—Salem College Provides Quality Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, during May parents and students throughout the land begin to turn their attention toward commencement exercises. For many graduating high school seniors it is also a month when their applications to college are being appraised for acceptance or rejection.

Coincidental with this concern the Congress is again giving consideration to a wide range of legislation which would, if enacted, benefit American education at every level. We are aware of the increasing burden imposed by our population growth not only on our primary and secondary schools but on institutions of higher learning. We are informed that the college enrollment will double in the decade of the sixties, reaching approximately 7 million in 1970.

The so-called prestige colleges and universities, under this great influx, are being forced to refuse admission to increasingly large numbers of well qualified students. Yet many of these youth are not informed of the vacancies which exist in many fine small colleges which have not been as well publicized as the larger and older institutions.

These colleges offer the student wide benefits in the nature of close student-teacher relationships, individualized instruction and counseling, and a cohesive college community which are often lacking in the larger institutions. In this respect, I was delighted to note in this morning's Washington Post an article dealing with a report from the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, in which it is stated that some 60 small liberal arts colleges have "not filled from a fourth to half the available seats for fall freshmen classes."

The story quotes President K. Duane Hurley, of Salem College, W. Va., and also president and founder of the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges. President Hurley crystalizes the values of the small college when he refers to Salem College as a "friendly place, where professors have time for their students."

As a member of the advisory committee to the council, and as an alumnus of Salem College and member of its board of trustees for 40 years, I can speak from firsthand knowledge of the unique benefits available at small colleges. Their contributions are evident when one examines the achievements of their graduates in the fields of science, education, industry, and government, as well as the professions.

A study made by Professors Knapp and Goodrich of Wesleyan University discovered that among the first 50 American institutions, judged by the scientific eminence of their graduates, 39 are small, privately supported colleges. A similar study of 33,500 business executives revealed that among the 88 percent who were college graduates, 71 percent of these came from small liberal arts colleges.

Among the graduates of my own Salem College was the late Senator Rush D. Holt, who was elected to the U.S. Senate at such an early age that he had to wait until his 30th birthday in order to be seated. Also among those who studied at Salem College was the gentleman whose unexpired term I was privileged to fill, the late Senator Matthew M. Neely.

This year, Mr. President, Salem College is celebrating its 75th anniversary, and I am pleased to report that our commencement ceremonies will be highlighted by an address on the afternoon of May 28 by the Honorable Sargent Shriver, director of the Peace Corps.

At this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article on small colleges which appeared in the Washington Post of May 9.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 9, 1963]

MEMO TO HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS: SIXTY SMALL COLLEGES WILL ADMIT YOU

Contrary to what many parents and high school seniors have been led to believe, May is not too late to apply, and be admitted, to college.

More than 60 small liberal arts colleges have not filled from a fourth to half the available seats for fall freshmen classes.

This is the substance of a report made here this week by the board of directors of the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges.

A typical member of the group is Salem College in Salem, W. Va., where 133 places are open in an expected freshman class of 268 students.

President K. Duane Hurley believes that Salem offers its 859 students opportunities for recognition and leadership that would be denied most of them in a large State university, "where one of the few ways of achieving individual notice is to bend your IBM card."

Salem is a "friendly place," Hurley said, "where professors have time for their students." Incoming freshmen are met by upperclass advisers. Youngsters who lack confidence receive special attention in group therapy sessions called "appraisal of the self-concept."

"We don't have as much hustle and tension as an ivy league school," the president commented. "In the therapy session under an experienced guidance counselor a boy has a chance to discover if he really wants to be a doctor or whether he's a premed because his parents have pressured him into it."

Hurley said the school admits a limited number of students "who seemingly aren't college material" because it has found they can make excellent progress under the guidance project. And total costs exclusive of transportation are only $1,400 a year, compared to $2,500 at many private schools.

He feels the leadership opportunities that a small school can offer its students are what have placed two former Governors and two presidents of the National Education Association on Salem's alumni rolls.

A 1938 graduate of Salem, Hurley calls it and the other 63 small colleges in the council America's forgotten colleges.

He founded the council in 1956 to seek a way out of a dilemma faced by many small unaccredited colleges: Without accreditation, foundations will not extend financial support; without money, improvements necessary for accreditation seemed out of reach.

Of its original 51 members, 45 have now been accredited by major accrediting agencies.

ASCS's Role in Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues some very illuminating and interesting facts concerning the work that is being carried on by the Agricultural Stabilization Conservation Service. These facts and figures were brought out in an address by R. V. Fitzgerald, Deputy Administrator, State and County Operations, ASCS, presented at the 18th National Limestone Institute convention, Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.

The address follows:

ASCS' ROLE IN CONSERVATION

Mr. Potts, Dr. Peterson, gentlemen, members of the institute, Bob Koch invited me to appear on your program, and, of course, I was very pleased.

I have long been interested in conservation, first of all because I was born into a family engaged in the retailing of farm implements. Growing up in that business, I soon realized that those farmers who were the best conservationists were generally the ones who could buy the new tractors, and, what's more important, pay for them. Of course, as a farmer, I have been interested in conservation as it is a necessary part of my living. And I am greatly interested in conservation now because, as the Deputy Administrator for State and County Operations of ASCS, I have a major responsibility for success of the Department's conservation efforts. One of the most important divisions in the Office of the Deputy Administrator is the Conservation and Land Use Division, which, among other things, administers the agricultural conservation program.

So, you see, I've had a long personal and official interest in conservation. I am, therefore, pleased to have the opportunity to visit with you today. You people not only help us accomplish our conservation objectives but also have otherwise demonstrated an interest in conservation.

Parenthetically, I might mention that the Administrator of ASCS recently sent a memorandum to all ASC State committees asking that they make a special effort to contact and cooperate closely with, and seek the advice of, agriculturally related organizations such as yours, seedsmen, fertilizer dealers, and all the rest. So I expect that you will be contacted by your State committee within the near future, if you haven't already heard from them, so that they may benefit from your advice and continued help in the future.

One of the major objectives of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and of our agency, is the conservation of soil, water, woodland, and wildlife resources. Some other goals of the Department are equally as important to you and to me as farmers, and as business people. For instance, farm income is of primary interest. Adequate farm income is basic to the success of our conservation efforts. We're concerned with lowering the cost of farm programs to the Government. We're concerned with reducing surpluses, which, as Congressman BASS has noted, may aptly be described as a blessing and, paradoxically, a curse.

I might say that in the time I've been in Washington, I've come to appreciate more fully Congressman BASS' activities on the House Agriculture Committee. There is no one sorrier to see Congressman BASS leave that Committee than the officials of the Department of Agriculture.

I know that you have long been particularly interested in the agricultural conservation program and in its solid achievements through the years. Each year, more than a million farmers participated in this program. In 1961, 1.2 million farmers took part, and they farmed 39 percent of the Nation's cropland. Furthermore, interest in conservation is increasing; indications are that 1.3 million farmers participated in ACP in 1962.

I am convinced that this program has been responsible for keeping many farmers on the land and making many of them better conservationists than they were before or than they would have been without the program. ACP, most certainly has helped farmers change their methods, their way of farming. It has helped them become more efficient and more productive. It has reduced erosion and the silting of streams, rivers, and reservoirs. It has given great impetus to the soil conservation district movement.

In 1962, we tried a little experiment. We tried to get more widespread participation in conservation through the help of ASCS farmer committees and the ACP. We put on a concerted effort to interest, motivate, and assist at least 100,000 farmers who had not been doing conservation work to carry out a worthwhile conservation project. For the purpose of this project, we considered a farmer who had not participated in ACP in from 3 to 5 years a new participant in conservation. Spot checks had indicated that few farmers or ranchers who do not use ACP are going forward with conservation work.

We then went to the ASCS county and community committeemen throughout the Nation and asked their help. These committeemen were friends and neighbors who were familiar with the community, with the soil conditions, and with the needs, interests, and ability of each individual nonparticipant. They also had a personal knowledge as to whether or not their neighbors had taken part in ACP or other programs in late years.

The committeemen were asked to list these nonparticipants by communities, so that each local committeeman could have his own list of farmers to assist. Thus, these farm operators become neighbor-farmers and not merely a county statistic. The committeemen were asked to contact their neighbors and friends on their list, discuss the need for conservation practices on their farms and the benefits they might get from carrying out needed conservation practices, and inform them of the available services they might need, and of the help available through the ACP.

We thought this would be the most effective way to interest and motivate people who were not taking an active part in conservation. We set a goal of 100,000 new participants and hoped this would be a net increase in total participation. This was to be done with no increase in cost-share funds and no increase in administrative expenses. Committeemen were invited to do this on their own time, without any pay for their services. It was to be done as a service to neighbors and as a service to agriculture and the Nation.

Most States carried out a well planned effort. In each such case, committeemen enthusiastically welcomed the opportunity to be of service. The result of their efforts more than doubled our goal. Most of the 90,000 farmer-committeemen in the United States contributed to this experiment.

Not all areas gave it the same emphasis or leadership, nor did all States organize and follow through equally well. The entire southeast area organized thoroughly and did a fine job. This project once again demonstrated beyond a shadow of doubt that local farmer committeemen will accept responsibility and will effectively carry out programs.

Several States provided appropriate recognition for community committeemen who performed outstanding service on this project. In these States, a community committeeman who got 5 to 9 new participants in his community received a certificate signed by the State committee, and a committeeman who got 10 or more new participants received a certificate of merit signed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

For this service, some people called these committeemen "bounty hunters." But since they were advancing the cause of conservation, of farm families across the Nation, I don't suppose they cared very much what they were called.

We expect to repeat and increase this effort this year, and, in the process, get needed conservation started on more farms. The experience in 1962 indicates that this effort can contribute materially to rural areas development where it is getting underway. Many farmers who previously were not interested in conservation, after participating in the ACP and experiencing the benefits of conservation for the first time, become interested in a complete conservation program for their farms. So we think that it is extremely important. We are finding in followups that these new participants need and in many cases are also taking advantage of other USDA services such as those provided by the Farmers Home Administration and SCS.

Because you are interested in conservation, the ACP, and other farm programs, I think you should know about attacks which have been made upon the farmer-elected committee system of administration of ASCS programs.

As a farmer, I am convinced that this is the best possible means of administering our type of farm programs. I do not believe that I would look very kindly on a Federal employee, a bureaucrat, coming to my farm and telling me that, based on my productivity index, I am 80 percent as good a farmer as Bill Smith who lives across the fence. Somebody'd have a fight on his hands.

But when Lawrence Larson, my neighbor and my committeeman, and the other committeemen whom I know and with whom I have worked over the years tell me this is true, I accept it. I feel that they know what they are talking about. We make our living the same way, get up the same time of morning, go to bed the same time of night. We have the same problems with the wind and lack of rain, the same troubles with the same banker. Thus, I am forced to conclude that these people are qualified to tell me that I'm only 80 percent as good a farmer as Bill Smith, and though I don't really clap them on the back, I take it. I do not think I would take it nor would most farmers if a bureaucrat were to tell us that we are only 80 percent as efficient as some other farmer right across the fence.

This committee system of administration of farm programs, including ACP, is therefore extremely important, and we've assumed for many years that it was sort of sacrosanct. This is not the case. With the stroke of a pen, the committee system of administration could be wiped out. It's not handed down from on high, this system isn't written in letters of fire in the sky. It is something which has been made by man, the U.S. Congress, and developed by the Congress and Department of Agriculture over the years.

There are many people throughout the United States, many learned, intelligent, studious persons who believe that this is an impossible means of administering a program.

You may be familiar with the report of the "blue ribbon committee," appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture last summer to make a complete study and report of the committee system of administration of farm programs. If you are familiar with that study and its results, you know the committee majority reported that, after a thorough study, they were convinced that the farmer-elected committee system of administration was the best way to administer the programs. You are also aware of the fact that one or two of the members of that committee—very intelligent, very sincere people—said in effect that this is a hopeless way to administer a farm program and ought to be done away with.

So we, then, are concerned with making the system work even better. We are concerned with demonstrating that farmer-elected committees have in the past and will continue responsibly to carry out the laws enacted by the Congress and the programs formulated by the Department.

As an example, over two-thirds of the community committeemen that I was talking about in regard to our ACP experiment were responsible for one or more of their neighbors becoming interested in and performing some needed conservation. I believe that additional analysis will give us more helpful information regarding the value of this particular little 1-year attempt to activate and strengthen the committee system by asking them to perform needed service to their neighbors. I want you to know that we are particularly interested in carrying on this program. We're going to expand it to every area of the country. We think it is of tremendous importance.

We shouldn't consider conservation of natural resources as a separate problem. The major economic problem facing farmers and all of agriculture today is that there is too much land annually producing surplus crops. You are doubtless aware of the fact that our economists have decided that by 1980 we will need 50 mililon fewer cropland acres to produce all the food and fiber we will need, 50 million fewer acres than we use for corps today. This is because of the great explosion in technology which has taken place on American farms.

There is the matter, then, of deciding what's to be done with this land that must be retired from production of surplus crops. The concept of the present Secretary of Agriculture is a radical departure from previous concepts. It is a basic change in philosophy. To put it simply, the new concept is that we should not retire land from production as such, but find alternative uses for this land that will help meet society's needs.

In the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, the Congress authorized a program to start on this new approach. We have, therefore, selected 13 States throughout the United States in which we will carry out pilot projects in cropland conversion in certain counties. We are urged by the Congress to work closely with local public agencies on recreation developments. We can make adjustment and cost-share payments when land is shifted from annual crops to grass, trees, or wildlife conservation practices, or to income producing outdoor recreation enterprises. Loans can be made for resource conservation and recreation development on individual farms.

This, then, is a start toward implementing the new concept. We don't know how it's going to work, what will be the most successful program or approach to the problem. We are convinced that, in order to keep some of these people on the land, rather than walking the streets in Detroit or Minneapolis, we need to find alternative income-producing uses for this land which is not needed now and will not be needed soon to produce crops presently in surplus. The Conservation and Land Use Division in ASCS has the responsibility for administering this program.

Now, I want to talk for a minute about another thing that is important to agriculture, that you and I must consider as citizens of this country, the importance of farm income. I won't go into it too much. All here know the American farmer's contributions to the strength of this country, militarily, commercially, economically.

We are concerned with his income because we are concerned with conservation and realize that our soil and water resources cannot be conserved without adequate income.

But we are also concerned because we know that the farmer is a tremendous consumer of the things which you and I sell. We are concerned with selling him tractors, fuel oil, and other equipment and essential supplies. We want him to be able to pay the costs of production, to be able to maintain modern equipment.

The stabilization programs of 1961 and 1962 have helped. As a result of these programs, gross farm income increased $2 billion in 1961 and $2½ billion in 1962 as compared with 1960. But farm income is still too low. We believe that supply-management programs are needed at the present time to further increase farm income.

I'd like to talk for just a second about something we've been hearing about lately, the idea that we don't need farm programs, that we ought to get the Government out of agriculture. This proposal was made by a group of experts in management and economics who, about 7 or 8 months ago, issued a report on behalf of the Committee on Economic Development.

Now, these men weren't fools, or mountebanks; they were intelligent, highly educated people. They said get the Government out of agriculture, do away with price supports, marketing quotas, acreage allotments.

There is a farm organization with which I am familiar, which quite recently suggested the same thing. We ought to get the Government out of agriculture, do away with price supports, marketing quotas, acreage allotments. I have found that people least familiar with price supports and marketing quota programs are those most likely to criticize them.

Now, what can we expect if we take this advice, get rid of all farm programs? To begin we should look briefly at what happened in the last 2 years, because the first question is: Do the supply-management programs work? Do they do any good?

I'll admit that if one were to look at the period, 1952 to 1960 alone, he would be justified in saying that they don't work, they're no good. During that period, surpluses piled up in Commodity Credit Corporation inventory, the cost of carrying this inventory rose to an astronomical point, and incomes of farmers were greatly depressed.

Well, I was not particularly responsible for the programs in operation at that time, so I'm going to use as my example, the last couple of years. I think that we can prove beyond a shadow of doubt that the feed grain program and the wheat stabilization program together have lowered taxpayer costs. The 1961 and 1962 feed grain programs will result in the ultimate saving of over a billion dollars. The 1962 wheat program will save about $100 million.

How about supplies? The feed grain program is reducing the carryover of feed grains. We started out in October 1961, as I recall, with a record of 84.7 million tons. We expect that by this fall, this amount will have fallen to 61 million tons. By the end of the following year, we think that we will be down to about 47 million tons, if we have a continued good participation in the feed grain program. We would then be close to the goal, because 45 to 50 million tons is considered needed for security reserve for defense purposes. The wheat carryover this coming July is expected to be down by about 200 million bushels from the July 1961 record carryover of 1.4 billion.

Late this spring, wheat growers will be voting on the 1964 wheat program provided by recent legislation. The new wheat program can reduce wheat supplies, and can make additional savings, if it is adopted in the referendum, and income to wheat producers can be kept at about the 1961–1962 level which was relatively fair.

Well, then, let's see what would happen if we were to take the advice of these people who say get the Government out of agriculture. And, we won't get too fantastic about it, we won't talk about rural free delivery, and some of the other things. Let's consider doing away with acreage allotments, marketing quotas, price supports, and see what would happen.

Studies made by Cornell and Iowa State Universities and two committees of Congress, all show the same thing. Farm income would fall drastically and bring on a prolonged and severe farm depression which would affect the whole economy. Now, a simple average of these four projections shows what could be expected in price drops if the Government got out of agriculture as proposed. I'm going to list a few I think may be of interest to you.

First, wheat prices would fall, or be cut almost in half, from an average of $1.80 a bushel in 1961 to 92 cents a bushel by 1965. Corn would fall 20 percent in price, from $1 to 80 cents a bushel. Oats, from 62 cents in 1961 to 45 cents in 1965. Barley, 31 percent, from 91 to 63 cents a bushel. Soybeans, from $2.50 in 1961 to $1.59 a bushel in 1965, a decrease of 36 percent. Sorghum would fall 23 percent from $1.59 to $1.23 a hundredweight. Cotton prices would decline about 25 percent. Cottonseed by about 37 percent. Rice, from $4.94 to $3.24 a hundredweight, a decrease of 34 percent.

Some of you come from the peanut area. These studies predict the price of peanuts would fall 45 percent, from 11 to 6 cents a pound. Milk prices would drop 18 percent. Egg prices from an average in 1961 of 35 cents to 28 cents, a decline of 20 percent.

Now, many people including some out in my country, assume that doing away with these programs, which are concerned with crop commodities, would have no effect on the prices of cattle, hogs, and poultry. These studies indicated that cattle prices, though not supported by a specific commodity program, would also drop more than one-fourth, from an average price in 1961 of $20 a hundredweight to $14.77 a hundredweight in 1965. Hog prices would fall from $16.60 to $11.75, a drop of 29 percent. Because most of the farmer's costs are fixed, these studies indicate that net farm income would drop 45 percent. I really doubt whether farmers or the other people in the economy are willing to pay this sort of a price to get the Government out of agriculture.

This talk about the farmer losing his freedom confuses me a little bit. Some of the people who say: "We've got to do away with Government-sponsored farm programs, so vote no in the wheat referendum in order to maintain the farmer's freedom," in the same breath get up and cheer the rice program, the cotton program, the peanut program.

Now why in the world is it good for people who raise rice, peanuts, cotton, and tobacco to use quotas and other adjustment programs, and bad for the fellow who raises wheat. This I cannot understand.

At any rate, I think that you business people who deal with farmers to some extent, day in and day out, should be very much concerned. You should see to it that you and the people around you understand what is really being said when they say let's get the Government out of agriculture.

Now, you've got to recall that there are 3.5 million farmers in this country. They represent all parts of the United States, all different geographical locations and climatic conditions, they produce different commodities, and have, therefore, to some extent different commodity interests. They have never been able to get together, as the Congressman pointed out, to speak in a unified voice, and their very own organizations are split or almost diametrically opposed in many instances.

So until such time as farmers are able to speak with some degree of unanimity, it seems to me that we're going to have to rely upon some of the Federal farm programs, distasteful though they may be to some people. Otherwise, the system of agriculture in this country will become unrecognizable, and the farmer won't be able to buy very many of the tractors I see in South Dakota. And neither will he be as good a conservationist as he would if he had a decent income.

Of course, another factor involved in getting the Government out of agriculture is the runaway production which would have a tremendous impact upon foreign trade aspects of agriculture. You know, for instance, we have an International Wheat Agreement. An agreement between the exporting countries and the importing countries, to try to keep the price within a certain range. If we were to produce many hundreds of millions of bushels more than we need or could possibly use for all purposes, the pressure would be irresistible to throw this on the world market. This would violate the International Wheat Agreement, disrupt world prices, and put us in a very difficult position so far as bargaining with the Common Market countries is concerned.

Once again, I appreciate the opportunity to be here. I have enjoyed it. You and I are both concerned with agriculture. We both realize that we have a great deal yet to do in the field of conservation of natural resources, especially soil and water. I think providing opportunities for full employment and decent incomes for farm families is another mutual goal still to be attained.

Thank you very much.

Detroit Salutes Ramon Scruggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, Michigan Bell Telephone Co. was one of our State's first equal opportunities employers. A company which has earned just fame for its supreme services, almost a quarter century ago it selected for placement, from the community, a young man who offered the kind of qualifications for which Bell is noted.

Ramon S. Scruggs was this young man man who became Michigan Bell's first Negro white collar worker. During the course of his 24 years service, which took him to the position of customer relations manager, Mr. Scruggs validated the judgment of Michigan Bell in its leadership to the cause of equal opportunity. Further, he became a principal leader in the expansion of such just opportunities within the company for many others and for the expansion of such opportunities in the Detroit community, generally.

Mr. Scruggs has been an effective community leader and servant to the people of Detroit. Michigan Bell paid tribute to that fact in a recent edition of its official organ reviewing a testimonial luncheon given under sponsorship of a 55-member community leadership committee. It was an occasion for exposing appreciation to Mr. Scruggs and for offering good wishes to him on his new appointment as public relations manager of A.T. & T. New York. I wish to include this article in the Record.

Mr. Scruggs' promotion to A.T. & T. makes him the highest level management person of any Negro employee in the Bell System.

The Detroit community will miss Mr. Scruggs, but his past years give assurance that in his new locale he will be as vital a force in the victorious conclusion of the long and arduous struggle in which he has been such a prominent participant.

I am particularly proud that for many years before leaving for New York Mr. Scruggs was a resident of the 13th Congressional District which I am privileged to represent.

The article follows:

Detroit Salutes Ramon Scruggs for His Community Service

A city, one of the largest in the world, said farewell and thank you to a Michigan Bell man recently.

The man is Ramon S. Scruggs, customer relations manager, who has accepted the position of public relations manager with A.T. & T., in New York.

The city—Detroit—expressed its appreciation at a testimonial luncheon for the many ways in which Mr. Scruggs has served it for more than 23 years.

Ray R. Eppert, president of the Burroughs Corp., acted as the chairman of the 55-member testimonial committee.

Cochairmen of the committee were William T. Patrick, Jr., Detroit councilman; Dr. Samuel M. Brownell, superintendent of public schools, Detroit; Joseph L. Hudson, Jr., president of the J. L. Hudson Co.; Francis A. Kornegay, executive director of the Detroit Urban League; Ernest Shell, assistant agency officer of the Golden State Mutual Life Insurance Co.; and James B. Kaler, assistant vice president, Personnel Relations, MBT.

More than 500 community leaders packed the ballroom of the Statler-Hilton Hotel for the testimonial luncheon.

Eleven speakers rose to give brief expressions of gratitude for the many services Mr. Scruggs had performed for the community. They included Joseph H. Brinton, executive director of the Detroit Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America; John C. Dancy, retired executive director of the Detroit Urban League; Richard F. Huegli, managing director of the United Community Services; Arthur Johnson, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; W. Calvin Patterson, vice president, Public Relations, Michigan Bell Telephone Co.

Other speakers who added their tributes to Mr. Scruggs were W. Earl Prosser, executive vice president, Michigan United Fund; Mrs. Gerard Slattery, president, Board of Trustees of Children's Hospital in Detroit; Donald M. D. Thurber, director of fund raising of the United Negro College Fund, Inc.; R. Conrad Vaughn, president of the Booker T. Washington Business Association; Leven C. Weiss, president of Alpha Phi Alpha fraternity; and C. Gerald Wood, metropolitan executive director of the YMCA.

Mr. Scruggs' longtime interest and work in Detroit's community affairs and charitable activities have been recognized on several previous occasions.

Two of the most recent honors bestowed upon him were the Detroit Urban League's 1962 Equal Opportunity Award for leadership and the National Urban League's commendation for his contribution toward strengthening the cause of equal opportunity. He is a board member of both organizations.

Other awards he has received for his outstanding service to the community include those from the Booker T. Washington Business Association, Alpha Phi Alpha fraternity, and the Michigan Chronicle.

Indicative of his broad community interests is the fact that he is a board member of the Detroit Chapter of the American Red Cross, the Children's Hospital in Detroit, the Michigan Society for Mental Health, and the Michigan United Fund. He also is a member of the public body of the Greater Detroit Area Hospital Council.

Mr. Scruggs joined our company in 1939 as our first Negro white-collar worker. His promotion to A.T. & T. makes him the highest level management person of any Negro employee in the Bell System.

What the New Welfare Legislation Means to Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address delivered by Adelbert C. Long, Chief Consultant, Division of Welfare Services, Bureau of Family Services, Welfare Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Mr. Long's speech was given at the 1963 biennial convention of the National Council of Catholic Men in Atlantic City on April 27, 1963.

The speech follows:

What the New Welfare Legislation Means to Youth

In the early days of World War II, I had lunch one day with a high-ranking officer in one of the Pentagon dining rooms. Some items of food were scarce, the place was still quite disorganized, and we were latecomers to the long line awaiting service. Our meals, when we finally got them to our table, were anything but appetizing. Directly over our table was a food conservation sign which read "Food Will Win the War." With a wry grimace the officer nodded toward the sign, looked at his lunch and snorted, "I believe it. But how are we going to get the Japs and Germans over here to eat it?"

There are within the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962, the potentials of the most constructive youth programs ever offered to the country by the Federal Government, but the question is how are we going to get the States and the communities to do it.

The members of the National Council of Catholic Men include community leaders throughout the country. The purpose of these remarks is to explain briefly some of the possibilities available under this legislation, and to solicit citizen action in the States and communities to encourage some of the programs possible and feasible today under the Social Security Act.

SOCIAL SERVICES

Social services consist of those activities of a welfare agency's social work staff and related specialists which are directed toward helping the individual recipient in one or more areas of his everyday life, such as economic, personal, family and social. The services are intended to help the recipient achieve a stronger family life, social rehabilitation, or self-care and economic independence. Social services may be provided to present, former and potential applicants for or recipients of public assistance.

Among the social services which a State may provide with Federal financial participation are special programs for teenagers with potentials for self-support and for children with special education and employment problems. The services may include such activities as: evaluation of potentials for self-support; obtaining assessment of employment skills and opportunities; necessary medical services; training opportunities; obtaining and maintaining appropriate employment; obtaining and assisting in the use of educational opportunities; assisting older teenagers to evaluate their interests and potentials for self-support and to prepare for and obtain gainful employment.

All necessary supporting services are available to the public welfare agencies to insure the success of these programs, either through maximum use of other public agencies, through adding certain specialists to their staffs, or where necessary, through purchase of services from other State public agencies.

UNEMPLOYMENT OF A PARENT

Congress has provided that the term "dependent child" shall include a needy child under the age of 18 who has been deprived of parental support or care by reason of unemployment of a parent. When adopted, this was a temporary measure for 1 year, May 1961 to June 1962. It was extended in 1962 for 5 years until June 30, 1967.

Among the most far-reaching results of this provision are the prevention of family breakup, the restoration of broken homes, the strengthening of family life, and the availability of special services for children with problems or handicaps, including school dropouts. Unemployed parents and youth in these families can be prepared for a better opportunity for gainful employment in the labor market through a community work and training program.

COMMUNITY WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAM

In 1962, the Congress amended the Social Security Act to assist the States "in encouraging, through community work and training programs of a constructive nature, the conservation of work skills and a development of new skills.

These goals will be achieved through coordinated, maximum use of education, constructive work experience, training, counseling and guidance, special job placement services, and other special activities required to help individuals attain or retain capability for self-support.

Although designed primarily for the unemployed parent, the program is available to youngsters in families of present, former, or potential AFDC applicants or recipients if they request assignment to a community work and training project and if the welfare agency agrees that this step will contribute to a stronger family life and the prevention of dependency. The young volunteers may be assigned only to projects which are designed to develop new or improved skills through the planned coordination of work experience, training, and related instruction, all geared to produce well-trained workers for a competitive labor market. These volunteers receive no pay or allowances. It is hoped that in many communities local funds be raised to provide token reimbursement for them in some way comparable to the operations of the Detroit upgrading plan. The unemployed parent, of course, receives the AFDC assistance grant with additional allowances for working expenses. Under this program, a long-term plan for the improvement of employability can be followed through, including basic education, the development of good work habits, and eventual job training.

SETTING ASIDE YOUTH EARNINGS FOR FUTURE NEEDS

In the past there was very little incentive for a youth in an AFDC family to secure part-time or summer work, because his earnings were then deducted from the family's assistance grant.

The Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 have now provided an incentive for such youngsters. Under the new legislation, the expenses reasonably attributable to the earning of any income must be considered in the family's budget and, most important, the State welfare agency may, subject to limitations prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, permit all or any portion of the earned or other income to be set aside for future identifiable needs of a dependent child.

Thus, a youngster's earnings can be put in trust for his college education, the expenses of a trade school or tools, school clothes or for any other reasonable purpose which will help the youngster get an adequate educational background.

DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

Congress also made provision in this new legislation for experimental pilot or demonstration projects which, in the judgment of the Secretary, are likely to assist in promoting the objectives of the various titles of the act. In the field of youth, this permits consideration of a wide variety of programs. The range of practical, worthwhile projects which might be submitted for approval really staggers the imagination of knowledgeable people concerned with youth.

STAFF TRAINING

The amendments include some far-reaching provisions for training staff in public welfare agencies. The training of personnel to carry out specialized youth programs consistent with the broad purposes of the act is not only possible but should be encouraged.

FINANCES

Federal funds are available to assist and encourage States to carry out these programs, under one or more of the following arrangements:

(1) On a 50–50, $1 Federal for $1 State or local matching funds basis;

(2) Under the 1962 amendments, with 75 percent Federal matching if the State agency provides certain services; this increase means $3 of Federal money for $1 State or local funds;

(3) To a limited degree and on the basis of the approval of submitted demonstration projects, with 100 percent Federal funds.

CITIZEN ACTION

This statement, sketching out some of the provisions of the 1962 amendments which have implications for youth, merely scratches the surface of the many programs and services encouraged by this legislation. They range from child welfare and day-care centers to special programs for the aged. A very serious problem is how to inspire States and local communities to make maximum use of this legislation.

Each NCCM member can make a meaningful contribution in his home community and his home State by emphasizing the potentialities of this legislation to his Governor, his State director of public welfare, and his legislature through all means available to a citizen. He can inform the organizations to which he may belong and his influential friends about it. The Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 are indeed an important milestone, but whether the milestone grows mossy with neglect or points out the path of progress depends in the final analysis on citizens interests made clear and forceful by citizens action.

Delinquents at the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News, May 9, 1963:

DELINQUENTS AT THE U.N.

The United Nations still is deep in the red and its General Assembly will try again next week to find something to use for money. By the end of June the cash shortage will be well above $100 million. The pressure is relieved temporarily through a special bond issue of $200 million. The United States has agreed to buy half if the other member nations buy the rest. But even if all the bonds are sold they won't cover the deficit.

The reason the U.N. has the chronic shorts is simple: A number of members, including some of the most pompously talkative and including some of our allies, simply refuse to pay their dues.

France, Belgium, and Nationalist China all are in arrears, but the chief delinquents are from back of the Iron Curtain. The entire Communist block is in default—the Soviet Union alone for $70 million.

The United States pays approximately a third of U.N. expenses. Our contribution for U.N. peacekeeping activities in the Middle East and in the Congo has been nearly half.

These peacekeeping activities are the main source of trouble. The Congo alone costs $10 million a month, with no one even suggesting this can be cut to less than $5 million in the foreseeable future.

And though these activities were ordered by the U.N. General Assembly, the Soviet Union refuses to pay its share.

The matter was submitted to the International Court of Justice, which ruled last July that all member nations are legally obligated to pay.

The U.N. Charter provides that any nation 2 years or more in arrears on U.N. assessments can be deprived of its vote in the General Assembly. A showdown on this issue is overdue and should be forced at this session.

It will require courage to take action against one of the great powers but unless these countries face their responsibilities this great parliament, dedicated to the exalted cause of peace among men, must founder on the grubby issue of nonpayment of the rent.

America Is Awakening

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the high public interest in the subject of the Government's financial crisis as well as the great concern of Members of this body, I ask under leave to extend my remarks that the attached newspaper editorial of the Crescent City American be made a part of the Record of this body in inclusion in the Appendix section. The writer, Mr. Colan Heninger, has demonstrated a unique and outstanding ability by presenting clearly the inherent problems that arise as a result of improper Federal action and interference.

The editorial follows:

[From the Crescent City (Calif.) American, Apr. 30, 1963]

We've "Goofed" the Fat Years but America Is Awakening

We can fervently thank God that "at last America seems to be awakening" to our country's No. 1 problem, the disease of spendermania that has spread through our National Government in epidemic proportions and sickened the entire structure of our national economy.

Right at home we see a classic example of the result of the wholesale, allout, madhouse spending in Washington; our county has been labeled with the stigma, depressed area, thus clearing the way for our people to grovel in the dirt and beg for a few little driplets of the fat that's gleaned from our own bones every year when the Internal Revenue Department goes on a nationwide income tax pickpocketing binge.

If anyone believes being confined to a sickbed, with a sign on the door reading "No visitors—depressed area," automatically creates a vacuum to suck in Federal funds, they're wrong. Only foreign nations, some of which are dominated by Communists, enjoy a fat flow of free money from the U.S. Treasury.

Crescent City presents another glaring home example; that is, the strength of the cables that bind down the Federal alms put on display in order to tease our Nation's ailing depressed areas.

Not only have Crescent City's planned area redevelopment and accelerated public works beach and waterline development projects cost many thousands of unexpected dollars in order to qualify for the Federal aids incident to the developments, but the floors of the council chambers are literally carpeted with hair, which councilmen and other city officials have torn from their heads trying to figure how to bore their way through a great mountain of bureaucratic redtape.

You can bet your newest smoking jacket there's a reason for Del Norte County being labeled "depressed." The cost of feeding (not curing the disease of Spendermania in Washington has resulted in such inflationary prices that we can't compete with foreign nations on our own markets. Canadian lumber, capturing our eastern markets, is killing the lumber industry, not only in Del Norte County, but in all of the West. The same is happening in other industries where more areas have been tagged "depressed."

Just last week, C. Cleveland Edgett, executive vice president of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association, said, "In 1939, 29 percent of Canada's lumber exports was sent to the United States. By 1961, the total had risen to 79 percent. This represents 15 percent of the total domestic consumption, and it may reach over 18 percent this year."

Let us remember, our country has become speckled with depressed areas during the fat years, not the lean. We have not adhered to the bibliological wisdom of "saving through the 7 fat years to carry us through the 7 lean years."

On the contrary (and there's no excuse for it) we've continued on the mad race toward national bankruptcy. Even as the people stagger under crushing taxloads, the national debt has climbed beyond the $300 billion mark; so big that the interest alone is over $10 billion each year; it is second only to the cost of national defense. The interest payments equal all that 41 million Americans, reporting up to $6,000 per year incomes, pay in income taxes.

No economy could possibly prosper under such colossal abuse. Our wild spending has not only brought about the stigma of depressed areas, but it has driven the gold, the only money with actual value, from the country; it has shaken the very foundation of private initiative and enterprise, and it has stimulated growth of great organizations dedicated to the sole purpose of self-service, "getting more money for the members."

When a government, through taxation, saps up a hog's share of the national income, it's only natural that people organize in attempt to bring political pressures to bear in an effort to get more than their share of what's left—it fosters a big, organized, "dog eat dog" economy.

On the other side of this bleak picture, two recent developments have brought about the greatest American awakening in many years. They are (1) President Kennedy's openly proposed deficit spending, which is similar to filing a petition in bankruptcy, and (2) recent startling revelations about "back-door spending."

Touching on the abominable practice of "back-door spending," Congressman Don Clausen, speaking at a breakfast meeting in Crescent City a week ago Saturday, and referring to the $300 billion plus indebtedness, said that is only a part of the total annually owed: "Do you know what the interest alone on that debt is?" he asked, "$19,000 a minute!"

"I don't think the Government can afford a tax cut this year unless we cut out a lot of spending," Clausen said. "Many people writing to me say that they have trouble balancing their household budgets. I do, too, and I know that I have to pay my bills as I go along or I'm in trouble.

"Now the Government tells us of a new concept where you spend as much as you want and worry about paying for it next year; how can we pay this year's bills and next year's bills next year?" Clausen asked.

Terming the Public Works Acceleration Funds bill that has just been adopted by Congress a "mere political gimmick," Clausen said he voted against it because its sole purpose is to stack this year's public works budget with unneeded supplementary funds in order to scale down and hide some of the tremendous deficit spending planned in an effort to buy next year's election.

"There are $150 million still unspent in this year's budget," he added. "More than is needed for this fiscal year's projects." Clausen indicated he would have voted for needed public works funds honestly assigned to the budgetary year for which they are intended.

Shortly after Clausen had thus spoken, the May issue of the Reader's Digest appeared on the newsstands with an illuminating article that we recommend to all of our readers. It was written by Charles Stevenson, and the article is entitled "The Real Truth About the Federal Budget." The subhead, "Additional billions are embedded in next year's record $98.8 billion. Here are the shocking facts that taxpayers have not been told," is an apt introduction to an ugly story of total fiscal irresponsibility.

Speaking on the impact of President Kennedy's proposed budget in general terms, Stevenson, in part, wrote as follows:

"Legislator after legislator, Democratic and Republican alike, has lined himself up with the ever-increasing number of knowledgeable critics. Washington newspapers report a new flood of mail to the Capitol: worried taxpayers, too, have been indicating alarm. And with good reason. For the advertised $98.8 billion budget—vast as it is—represents only a fraction of what the Government plans to spend in the next fiscal year—and this merely to set the stage for even bigger spending in the years to follow.

"Insistence upon spending more than can be collected in taxes has already swollen our national debt to more than $300 billion. Moreover, this living beyond our money, our savings, our social security. Six times in the past year the cost-of-living indexes hit new highs.

"Yet, by the Administrator's own calculations, spending in the new fiscal year beginning July 1 will run $4.5 billion more than this year, $11 billion ahead of last. This spending will inflate the accumulated deficit for Kennedy's three full fiscal years in the White House to more than $27 billion—a record unmatched in our history except during the most desperate period of World War II."

Stevenson then goes on to detail through bureau after bureau how additional hidden millions and billions are spent through the back door.

As Senator Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, has stated, "Obviously this loose spending must stop. There must be a turning back if we are to endure in the image that we like to think is still our America. The rumblings in Congress and over the country indicate that a lot of people feel it is time to back up. But only if they complain loudly enough, and let their Congressmen and Senators know, will they get action."

Exposure of the naked truth about our fiscal irresponsibility indicates "we've definitely goofed the 7 fat years, but there's evidence that, at long last, America is awakening."

We Aim To Spend More and Earn Less

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, prospects for Federal income and expenditures are causing increasing concern and comment throughout the Nation. Plans to cut taxes at the same time spending is pushed to record peacetime highs are causing widespread misgivings and second thoughts. The consequences of profligacy are sobering questions in the Congress today.

I wish to commend to the Congress the following excellent editorial, from the Mooresville, N.C., Tribune, which discusses this most pressing national issue:

We Aim To Spend More and Earn Less

There is, beyond doubt, heavy support for a Federal tax cut, whatever the differences over methods and details. It comes from groups as diverse as the National Association of Manufacturers and the AFL–CIO.

But, as Life magazine accurately observes, "* * * they almost all agree that the President's program is wrong. What unites most critics of that program is their feeling that a tax cut must be earned by a corresponding control of expenditures."

Administration spokesmen have said there is no possibility of an overall reduction in Federal spending—that, indeed, it may go up. But thoughtful studies have been made of the budget, and specific areas for heavy cuts, which would not touch the national security, and would not reduce or eliminate any really essential Federal duty or obligation, are delineated.

To take one, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has a program for a $9.1 billion cut. Senator Proxmire thinks that $2 billion in subsidies can be eliminated. The House Appropriations Committee proposes a reduction of just under $93 million in funds for the Interior Department alone. And so it goes.

To quote Life again: "The control of unnecessary expenditure is one of the most serious problems facing modern democracy. Government has grown so huge and complex that no individual Congressman can grasp the full dimensions of any budget. But Congress can have a knowledgeable impression of White House budgetmaking, and the current impression is one of carelessness."

And carelessness, of this unbelievably expensive kind, is one thing the Nation simply cannot afford. We aren't that rich.

Activities of Rightwing Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GALE W. McGEE
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the extremists on the right wing of our political spectrum have been much in the news as of late, perhaps in some relationship to their increased activity in the political arena.

As a representative of a State which apparently has been chosen as a target by the rightwing groups, I have watched their activities with growing concern. These people are dedicated to their ends and unfortunately not too concerned about the methods used to obtain them.

The Rawlins Daily Times published an editorial on May 3 pointing out the vigor of these groups in spite of their small numbers. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Daily Times, Rawlins, Wyo., May 3, 1963]

DON'T COUNT OUT THE RIGHTWINGERS

Militant rightists in this country are not troubled over the argument that they constitute a very small minority of the voting population. They believe, with good reason, that they have a lot going for them.

From the past record, few could doubt that they have ample money resources.

But a rather startling prediction that rightwingers will spend more in 1964 than both major party national committees combined may cast the rightwing effort in a somewhat new light.

The forecast comes from Wesley McCune of Group Research, Inc., an agency that keeps tab on rightist activity.

It is notable, too, that rightwing money evidently is being spent these days with more concentrated effect than before. There are persistent reports that powerful assaults are being leveled against a number of moderate to liberal politicians in the Mountain States—where a dollar may go a long way.

Furthermore, the rightist movement is attracting more prestige leadership than ever in its history. Ezra Taft Benson, former Secretary of Agriculture under Dwight Eisenhower, leads an organization called "Ye, the People." Benson's son, Reed, is active in the John Birch Society in western areas. Retired generals and admirals are joining up in larger numbers.

Rightists often have been concerned over a public image given some of them as "freaks and oddities." In recent months they have managed more and more to dispel this image by gaining audiences among business and professional groups of long standing—farm bureaus, and the like.

Robert Welch, head of the Birch Society, who labels Eisenhower a Communist or a Red dupe, won warm response from a top business club in Chicago.

Nor is the rightwing discouraged by talk it is a fly-by-night thing which took severe lickings in 1962 voting and is declining.

Four John Birch candidates for Congress lost in 1962. But two got more than 45 percent of the vote and all got at least 40 percent. If New York's new Conservative Party could duplicate later the 141,000 votes it got for Governor last year, it could decide a close election.

Researcher McCune points out also that aggressive rightist activity did not start with President Kennedy's election in 1960. A whole host of organizations trace their history back to the 1940's and even 1930's. Even Gerald L. K. Smith is still flourishing in the field.

Rightwingers may be on the fringe in terms of relative numbers. But, by a good many other measures, they are right in the thick of the Nation's political combat.

Republican Women Hear Representative Ford Discuss Staffing, Managed News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, late last month, Republican women from throughout the country came to Washington to attend the annual Republican Women's Conference. One of the highlights of this year's conference was the speech by the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the House Republican conference, Mr. Ford. In his speech, the gentleman directed attention to two items of special importance to the group: the inadequacy of minority staffing in Congress and the management of news by the administration.

Gerry Ford made it quite clear that it is the American people who suffer when the Congressional minority is handicapped by inadequate staff help. He called attention to the excellent work of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel] in leading the effort to bring fair staffing to the Congress.

This speech makes some excellent points and I am taking this opportunity to expand its audience by placing it in the Congressional Record:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD, REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S CONFERENCE, SHERATON PARK HOTEL, APRIL 26, 1963.

Today I want to discuss two important issues being faced by the Republicans in the House of Representatives. One has to do with minority staffing of committees and the other with the withholding of vital information from the Congress by the executive branch of the Government.

Republicans in the House have moved ahead on several fronts in the early months of this Congress. The Republican conference has been put to new and potentially significant uses. We have appointed a Special Subcommittee on Nuclear Test Ban Negotiations under Congressman Craig Hosmer of California, the ranking Republican on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The test ban committee has received position papers from such distinguished experts as Edward Teller, former AEC Chairman Lewis Strauss, and Chief U.S. Disarmament Negotiator William C. Foster—and its reports have been given wide press coverage. We have also set up a Subcommittee on Increased Minority Staffing under Congressman Fred Schwengel, of Iowa.

At the opening of the Congress the conference adopted a package of fair play amendments including a demand for equal time for the minority in debating conference committee reports. We didn't win that fight but we did put the Democratic leadership on notice that the minority was going to play a more active role in the future.

The Republicans on the House Appropriation Committee under a special committee headed by Congressman Bow, of Ohio, have reviewed the President's budget in detail with the assistance of former Budget Director Maurice Stans. The Republicans on Education and Labor and Judiciary have developed alternative Republican proposals in important legislative fields. The House Republican Policy Committee under the able leadership of Congressman John Byrnes of Wisconsin, has been doing an excellent job on the vital issues before us.

Yes, this has been a period of new Republican activity—of hard work in reviewing the Kennedy administration's proposals and in developing Republican alternatives. Our batting average has not been 100 percent but we expect to improve our percentage of success in the months ahead.

One of the most important problems we have tackled is the issue of minority staffing. All the rest of the work we are attempting to accomplish presupposes adequate professionaly competent committee staff. There is a limit—a real limit—to how much an individual Congressman or group of Congressmen working in cooperation can accomplish in a given 24-hour period. Each of us has his constituency and its interests to serve. Just keeping abreast of our committee work—preparing for hearings, interrogating witnesses, drafting legislation and reports, handling bills on the floor is a full-time job. And then there are the inevitable social and political obligations of life in the Nation's Capitol as well as in the home district. Time is a Congressman's precious commodity. Staff assistance is essential to us if we are to function effectively.

One of the most serious limitations the Republican minority in Congress has been faced with has been inadequate staff. Last year Roscoe Drummond wrote a series of columns which you may have read dramatizing our position to the Nation. Drummond estimated that we Republicans in the House were being shortchanged 12 to 1 on committee staff although the Democratic-Republican ratio in House membership was closer to 3 to 2. Some readers misunderstood him to mean that there were 12 Democrats on committee staffs to every Republican. This is not the case—most of our committees have professional staff that have served for many years. Some are Republicans that were hired during the early years of the Eisenhower administartion. The point that Drummond was making was that the great bulk of the professional staff on our committees were under the control and responsible to the Democratic majority. This has meant that in too many instances minority views were not being written when bills were reported, that committee investigations were being carried out almost exclusively from the majority point of view. I might add that the worst partisan abuse of the concept of professional nonpartisan staff—as set out in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946—has come on a few committees with large budgets for investigatory staff, such as the Education and Labor Committee. Without minority staff we have not been in a position on certain committees to draft Republican alternatives or to initiate legislation where the administration has faltered.

Because of the central importance of staffing, the Republican Conference unanimously endorsed a proposal by Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL of Iowa which would have given the minority 40 percent of the committee staff on committees where the majority of the Republicans were dissatisfied with the staff assistance they were getting. Congressman SCHWENGEL is now chairing our Conference Subcommittee on Increased Minority Staffing. He and his committee have been performing yeomen's service in gathering data on the staffing problem, in pressing for more staff at the committee level, in arguing our case before the House Administration Committee which approves all committee budgets, and in planning future strategy in the staffing fight.

Congressman SCHWENGEL estimates that we shall have 30 more minority staff members this year than we had in the last Congress, largely as a result of his committee's work. Furthermore the majority leader, CARL ALBERT, as a result of the fight for more minority staff has pledged his party to eliminate partisan abuse in staffing and to abide by the spirit of the Reorganization Act. We intend to hold him to his word.

On the Senate side our big guns have begun to swing into action although I might add after our foot soldiers launched the offensive. We welcome their assistance. You may have seen Senator GOLDWATER's column a few Sundays ago. Senator GOLDWATER said that:

"Insufficient minority staffing makes legislation more dependent than ever upon the statistics, the witnesses, the proposals of the Democratic administration as transmitted through the majority. I would make this point just as emphatically if the situation were reversed and the proper committee staffing denied to the Democrats. The need is for proper policies, properly researched, properly arrived at and understood above and beyond the desires of the particular administration running the executive branch."

Senator DIRKSEN has recently urged all ranking minority members on the standing committees of the Senate to press for more staff assistance to service the needs of the minority.

I have been discussing the problem of minority staff but this is only a part of a much larger problem that the staffing fight has dramatically illustrated. The Congress at large just does not have the staff resources it needs if it is to perform its proper role in our constitutional system. We have seen the gradual and continuing erosion of power from the legislative to the executive in the past 30 years. One of the major intents of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was to reestablish balance to provide Congress with professional staff for its legislative committees. This was a real gain for effective congressional government but we have not kept pace with the times. There are numerous specific examples in both the House and Senate right today and the country is the loser because of this deficiency.

Most Members of Congress would agree on how crucial the staffing issue is not only to a vigorous and constructive opposition but also for the survival of Congress as a meaningful participant in our processes of government.

A good part of the minority staffing problem would be solved with the correction of this broader problem. There is a clear need for a selective increase in the professional nonpartisan staff of the committees in areas of deficiency such as I have just noted. Ultimately we may be moving toward the kind of staffing arrangement that Congressman TOM CURTIS has suggested—a "three-part staff" with the bulk of the staff professional and nonpartisan (i.e., available to all Members regardless of party affiliation) with a few staff members, also professional qualified, under the direct control of the majority and minority respectively—for the purpose of drafting majority and minority reports and assisting the Members on issues of a more immediate party political nature.

What, you ask, can I or my club do to help solve these problems? You can help by writing your Congressmen and Senators be they Democrat or Republican and asking them how they stand on the staffing issue. Congressmen don't vote by weighing their mail but they will certainly sit up and take notice of an issue on which they receive intelligent letters. Particularly in a case such as this where we are discussing a problem peculiar to Congress, its methods of operation, and its public image. Congressmen are especially sensitive to the views and judgments of their constituents. Write and ask your Congressman if he feels that Congress is meeting its responsibilities in reviewing and considering executive proposals for new spending and legislation. Is Congress adequately overseeing the executive agencies? The Billie Sol Estes case is only one example—albeit an extreme one—of how the system can get out of order. Is Congress showing the leadership that the times demand? And within this broader context can Congress function at all without a mature responsible opposition that has the staff resources to perform its role as critic and to assume that more than one side of the issue is considered? These are mighty important questions. We are not dealing in petty partisan politics but in issues that affect the course of our democracy.

I want to move now to another issue affecting the basic principles of our democratic way of life and our constitutional system of government.

One of the least dramatic, but most serious, problems which has come up during the last 2 years concerns the very foundation of our ideals of representative government. It affects me personally, and through me it affects the 462,000 residents of Michigan I represent. But as a matter of fact the principle involved affects all Members of Congress and all their constituents. I am speaking of a little publicized idea called "executive privilege." This is how I came up against it several weeks ago:

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was testifying before our defense appropriations subcommittee about the Cuban situation. We were asking him some important and searching questions about the Bay of Pigs invasion—which I might say will be looked on as one of the darkest pages in the history of American foreign policy and a page written exclusively by the Kennedy administration. Our committee had a right and a need to know how our Government handled that mess, for we pass on all the money spent by the Defense Department and, if they don't use it properly, we have the right and responsibility to know so any corrective action can be taken.

I had been disturbed by some news stories which had been appearing just before our meeting with General Taylor which you may remember—these had to do with what went wrong at the time of the invasion and whether or not the United States ever promised any air cover for the Cuban refugee invaders. I wanted to clear that matter up and to get into some other obvious problems connected with that fiasco which would help our committee decide how to vote when it came time to appropriate money for the Department of Defense and related agencies.

General Taylor was one of the best men in the country to answer these important questions. He had been appointed by President Kennedy to head a four-man board to investigate the ill-fated Bay-of-Pigs invasion and find out what went wrong. The investigation was made and the board informed the President what it found out. Then, according to testimony to us and other public statements, the four were told by the President to say nothing about the investigation.

So what happened? Three of the members of the board did follow instructions. Adm. Arleigh Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations did, Allen Dulles, former CIA Chief did, and General Taylor did. But Bobby Kennedy, the fourth member didn't. In one of the classic examples of news management we have seen in this country, Bobby told his version of the invasion to reporters from U.S. News and World Report and the Knight newspapers. He was in Palm Beach at the time.

Now like all good elephants, we Republicans have long memories. I would like you to recall with me here today some of Mr. Kennedy's own words and compare them with his performance in this very important incident.

First of all, let me read you a section out of the Democratic platform which bears directly on this subject. (Not that the platform makes any difference, you understand, to the Democrats. Its greatest value over the years have been to Republicans who are constantly able to show how hypocritical they are about saying one thing and doing another.) The 1960 platform said: "We reject the Republican contention that the workings of the Government are the special private preserve of the Executive. The massive wall of secrecy erected between the executive branch and the Congress as well as the citizen, must be torn down. Information must flow freely, save in those areas in which the national security is involved." So on the basis of this strongly worded platform, Senator Kennedy campaigned. As a candidate he gave us lots of words about how under his administration the public would be well informed and how their Representatives in Congress would never be denied information they needed to pass the laws of the land.

At one point he said—very eloquently, I think: "The President—who himself bears much of the responsibility for the preservation of American democracy—has the affirmative duty to see to it that the American people are kept fully informed. It is true that in today's world of peril some Government information must be kept secret—information whose publication would endanger the national security. The people of the United States are entitled to the fullest possible information about their Government and the President must see that they receive it.

Also on the campaign he referred specifically to Executive privilege. He said that whenever information is not restricted by specific statute, security needs, or the Constitution, "there is no justification for using the doctrine of Executive privilege to keep information from the Congress and the public." I hurry to add that, in the case of General Taylor's refusal, no specific statute would prohibit him from testifying, no security is involved, and the Constitution gives no justification for his position at all. Continuing down "memory lane," I recall that in his first state of the Union message Mr. Kennedy made every Congressman's and newspaperman's heart warm with this statement:

"For my part, I shall withhold from neither the Congress nor the people any fact, or report—past, present, or future—which is necessary for any informed judgment of our conduct and hazards."

The fact of the matter, from my own personal experience with General Taylor and the Bay of Pigs, is that the President is keeping the Congress and the public in the dark; he is preventing the lawfully elected representatives of the people from making informed judgments of the past conduct of our Government and therefore the future hazards which we face. This, I submit, is contrary to everything representative government stands for, to everything we Republicans stand for and, if we can believe their platform, everything the Democrats themselves stand for.

Mrs. Ungar, World Traveler, Gives Her Impression of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have consistently voted against the huge appropriations for foreign aid since the end of the shooting war.

The record shows that I have been on the losing side; that this country has lavished a hundred billion dollars on friends and erstwhile friends all over the globe, notwithstanding what I consider clear evidence that the gain achieved by these expenditures is not nearly so positive as the condition of our Treasury is negative.

I will not belabor you at this time with my own often-expressed views gathered on personal trips to foreign-aid countries. But I would like to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from a letter written to the Council Bluffs (Iowa) Nonpareil by a constituent of mine, Mrs. Alice Ungar of Council Bluffs.

Mrs. Ungar, accompanied by her husband Leo, has just returned from a 75-day air trip around the world. This is just another in a series of trips this perceptive couple has made. I mention this so that the House will know they are experienced travelers, ones who have visited and revisited many lands and thus have been able to make comparisons.

Periodically during their globe-girdling trip, Mrs. Ungar wrote a chatty and informative letter back to the Nonpareil so readers and neighbors could learn of their progress and their observations. I was pleased to read comments about places and experiences that matched my own recollections about some places.

Thus, I feel I am dutybound to share with all the views Mrs. Ungar included in her final letter, after making an east to west trip through Japan, Taiwan, Hong Kong, southeast Asia, India, Iran, Turkey, Austria, Italy, and Spain.

It is significant to note that the Ungars were in the Far East when the Clay Commission report on foreign aid came out; yet, in her direct and to-the-point critique on the present value of foreign aid, Alice Ungar states in a few words the essential conclusions covered in thousands of words by that illuminating document.

Mrs. Ungar's letter excerpt follows:

In the April 22 international issue of Life magazine we read that American aid to 116 foreign countries would pass the $100 billion mark this year.

In only two countries we have visited—Turkey and Spain—have we heard our aid acknowledged. Our money has been spent in accordance with the point 4 policy; that is, everyone in the world should have healthy living conditions, be educated, live in freedom and be provided with the opportunity to work.

Each country we visited was clean and prosperous, and thousands of apartment houses and new buildings were everywhere. In Hong Kong real estate values were as high as New York City. In Thailand the newspapers pointed out they did not want foreign help or military entanglements. They prefer to help themselves.

In India, we remember a traffic tieup that lasted 2 hours because 6 Indians lay down in the middle of the street and pretended they were dead. They had been notified the slum area in which they lived was to be razed, and they were protesting.

In Vienna, the city is still building spacious housing units for factory workers although they now have 170,000 such flats. The oldest of these may be rented for $4 to $8 a month.

We saw no suburban shopping centers. Old areas in the cities were being torn down and rebuilt. As a result, all the cities we saw were beautiful, and their property values had increased a hundredfold.

In each place I have visited, I have thought of the city in which I live and which I love and I think it is time to stop sending help abroad.

It is time, and past, to do something about our own streets and housing needs and industrial development. I think it is time to turn the fruit of our work to our own benefit, where we can see and enjoy and appreciate the results.

Arthur Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, now that Art Hoppe has hopped back to California after visiting Washington and other geographical points of interest, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD several of his recent columns which I am sure will delight his followers:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 23, 1963]

EYEBALL TO EYEBALL WITH BIRTH CONTROL

(By Arthur Hoppe)

I'm sorry, I mentioned the other day that Mr. and Mrs. Kennedy had separate bedrooms merely to point out that the richer you get, the farther away from your wife you get. And the fewer children you have. I noted that this was geographical birth control—"the only system," I said flatly, "that really worked."

So Mr. Kennedy promptly announced he was going ot Europe in June. Great. And then Mrs. Kennedy announced she was—

Well, it's all my fault. I suppose I should've given more detailed instructions. But that's the whole trouble with all our present complex methods. They require precise directions which you've got to follow to the letter. And in the proper sequence. Or else. Which is why love often conquers all.

But our scientists, thank goodness, are working on it. And I'm deliriously happy to learn that Dr. Carl G. Heller, who's what is called "a reproductive physiologist" at the Pacific Northwest Research Foundation, has made a smashing technological breakthrough. He's come up with a pill for gentlemen that's cheap, safe, harmless to your maleness and guaranteed obsolutely 100 percent effective. It even tastes good. In fact, says Dr. Heller, tests show it's got only one teensy little drawback:

If you take a single drink while on the pills, your eyeballs turn bright red.

Thus his new pills, the good doctor told the American Chemical Society sadly, "probably would not be acceptable to men in the Western World." And back he went to the old drawing board.

Nonsense. Here we are, faced with a population explosion and our faint-hearted scientists are willing to scrap our salvation. All because of one tiny little flaw. Shades of Thomas Alva Edison. Is this what made America great? No.

I say we've got to get out there and sell. For example, we could sell men on the idea of giving up drinking because * * *. Well, we could at least sell them on wearing dark glasses to cocktail parties. But better yet, let's think positively. We will simply sell them on red eyeballs.

Actually, when you stop to think about it, there's nothing inherently wrong with red eyeballs. Not that a little good promotion work wouldn't cure. Ads: "Are your eyeballs pale, tired, colorless?" Drinks: "The new red eye highball." Contests: "Mr. red-blooded American eyeball."

Of course, the ladies would take a bit of convincing. You know how they are. We might start by planting a few pointed articles in the ladies' magazines. Such as True Confessions: "There we were, eyeball to eyeball—and his were white."

Eventually, I'm sure, we'd convince them of the undeniable advantages of such a method. I mean there you are, an attractive young lady. You walk into a cocktail party crowded with handsome young bachelors. Half have red eyeballs, half don't. Which * * * Well, I don't want to go into details. But we'd soon separate the ladies from the girls. And most bachelors will, I know, agree that's an undeniable advantage right there.

Oh, I can hear you saying you don't care. You still don't like red eyeballs. Well let me tell you this is no time for petty aesthetic prejudices. All present methods require diligence or sacrifice. Join your local red eyeball league today. And remember our slogan:

"Better red than bred."

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 24, 1963]

BE A GOOD SPORT—AND KILL THE BUMS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

I have a letter from a gentleman who writes: "The best way to preserve peace is through sports. With more good, clean international competition our boys and their boys will grow to understand each other and to value good sportsmanship and fairplay. Sports transcend petty national interests."

All sports lovers I know feel the same way. And I couldn't agree more. Even though the Cuban baseball team just clobbered our U.S. baseball team 13 to 1.

After all, it was only a game. The fourth Pan-American Games in São Paulo, Brazil, to be exact. And what if baseball is our national pastime? Somebody's got to lose. Even by such a terribly lopsided score as 13 to 1. And it was heartwarming to see where our clean-cut young American players walked over and shook hands with those Cubans after. I mean after we'd been beaten 13 to 1.

So let's be good losers, I say. Let's just admit those Cubans were better. Or, as U.S. Coach Archie Allen put it: "They've got four boys in there that look just too good to be amateurs." But what if half the Cuban team were ringers? It's sportsmanship that counts. I'm sure.

After all, the Cuban manager, Senor Bilerto Torres, was very kind in his evaluation of our team's performance. If "kind" is the word for patronizing. "They were young," he said. Of course, they were also amateurs. But, as I say, there's no need to harp on that.

Nor should we complain about the Cuban rooting section. It would sound picayune. Seeing we were demolished 13 to 1. Besides, there's nothing in the rules against a rooting section constantly banging bongo drums.

The stories were rather sketchy on this point. The Cuba rooters, they merely said, "contributed bongo-drum rhythms from the stands." And I'm sure the constant boomety-boom-boom of bongo drums wouldn't upset anybody. Not anybody who was used to it. Of course, our players weren't used to it. And that's probably why they didn't get a hit off the Cuban pitcher, Senor Modesto Verdura, until the fifth inning. After those Cuban ringers had already knocked three of our amateur pitchers out of the box. Boomety-boom-boom. And Senor Pedro Chavez had already belted in seven runs with two homers. Boom-boom.

But, as a sports lover, I don't think we should let this irritate us. Unduly. Because it's the spirit of fairplay that counts. And if those dirty, rotten, patronizing Cubans deviously want to use illegal bongo drums to beat our clean-cut young amateurs, there's little we can do about it.

Except invade Cuba. And capture Senors Verdura and Chavez for our farm clubs. And overthrow that lousy Mr. Castro, the fountainhead of corrupt bongo-banging baseball. And string that patronizing Senor Torres up by his thumbs. And tar and feather all those ringers. And * * *

Excuse me while I wipe my brow. You see? I got all carried away. Lots of us do. There are the boys down on the field behaving admirably. And here are all of us up in the stands yelling: "Kill the opposition."

Well, maybe that's the moral: Good, clean international competition in sports, politics or economics is grand for peace. And healthy for the participants. But first we've got to get rid of all us emotional rooters.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 30, 1963]

PRESENTING A RIVAL CULTURAL SERIES

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Due to the smash success of our morning television series, "Just Plain Jack" (142 cancellations and 3 bomb threats), we've now got plans for a brand new offering. And this one's bound to please everybody. It's got love.

The script writers have already come up with a plot line and a snappy title: "The Rocky Road To Happiness." That's because the hero's name is Rocky Nelson. Which sounds familiar. And the basic theme is: Can a young man of 54, despite good looks, charm, and fantastic wealth, find love?

As the pilot program opens, we discover Rocky on his knees before the young thing who has captured his heart. Her name is Hysterical O'Brien.

ROCKY. There is a terribly important question I want to ask you, fella.

HYSTERICAL (fluttering her eyelids). Please do, dearest.

ROCKY. Thanks a thou, fella. Well, its—that is——

HYSTERICAL (blushing). Please go ahead, dearest.

ROCKY (blurting it out). Well, do you think if I married you, I could carry Vermont?

HYSTERICAL. Vermont?

ROCKY (rising and pacing). It's crucial. You know how they are in Vermont. The last romantic they had was Cal Coolidge. Ed says you'll cost me 78,000 votes. Of course, Al puts it at 43,000, mostly rural. If so, we could still cop Vermont and hold New England. Except Massachusetts. But I want you to know I'm willing to sacrifice all for you, fella. All of Massachusetts.

HYSTERICAL. Oh, dearest, I cannot stand in your way.

ROCKY. Thanks a thou, fella. But Mass is dundee, anyhow. It's not the church. It's those Harvard absentee ballots. So let's turn to the Midwest. Ed. Al. Bring in the charts.

(Several aides enter and set up charts, graphs, precinct lists and a slide projector.)

ROCKY. Okay, let's run through it once more, fellas.

ED. Well, Chief, she's not going to help you any in the Bible Belt. On the other hand, neither's bachelorhood. Remember Adlai.

HYSTERICAL (hopefully). Maybe if he'd married a nice Episcopalian girl * * *?

AL. Yeah, true. But we ran a sample poll in Iowa between Adlai and Tommy Manville. He being the closest we could come, no offense. And you didn't do so hot, Chief.

HYSTERICAL (wailing). I don't want to marry Tommy Manville.

ROCKY. What about the Far West, fellas?

ED. Better. She wins you Hollywood, but Salt Lake's down the drain.

AL. Actually, marriage or bachelorhood, it's a tossup. Either way, the electoral votes keep coming out 266 to 266. Wait a minute, that's not right. There's one State missing.

ED. Hold it. Here it is. Nevada.

Everybody. Nevada.

(Rocky, Ed, Al, seven aides and three hangers-on rush to Hysterical and fall on their knees before her.)

ROCKY (speaking for all). Will you be my First Lady, fella?

Will Rocky Get Hysterical? More Important, Will He Get Nominated? Can Love Alone Conquer Just Plain Jack? Are You Out of Your Mind?

So tune in to our very next episode, friends. And meanwhile, as you go down the byways of life, folks, remember: Love, Thy Magic Spell Is Everywhere. Except in Vermont, the Bible Belt, Salt Lake City and politics.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, May 3, 1963]

THE DARK HORSE AND WHAT IT'S FULL OF

(By Arthur Hoppe)

SACRAMENTO.—Everybody says my friend, Assemblyman Jesse (Big Daddy) Unruh, is doing nothing but running for Governor. It's not true. He's also very busy running Dr. Max Rafferty for Governor. And that shows how selflessly bipartisan Mr. Unruh is. Because Dr. Rafferty's a Republican.

And yet, there's Mr. Unruh, constantly mentioning Dr. Rafferty's name, zealously keeping him in the public eye. Why, you can hardly go anywhere in Sacramento these days without hearing Dr. Rafferty hailed as the leading Republican candidate for Governor. By the Democrats.

And, boy, is Dr. Rafferty ever grateful. No. As State superintendent of schools, he should be kept out of politics, he says irritably. While he tries to carve up Mr. Unruh. And in fairness to Dr. Rafferty it's true we never had so much politics in education before. Before he was elected, that is.

Well, those of you who are confused by this battle for anonymity have undoubtedly failed to read the book I'm not writing called: "How To Play Politics—The Fun Game." Allow me to quote from chapter XVIII, "A Dark Horse Shines in the End."

"Now that you've decided to lead the people, you must choose which kind of candidate you will be: A leading candidate or a dark horse.

"As a leading candidate, you can count on heavy financial contributions, countless pledges of support and, lastly, wide public recognition. Which is too bad. Because once you're publicly recognized as a leading candidate, all the other leading candidates will naturally try to kick you in the head. Worse, you are in grave danger of arousing voter interest in what you stand for. This is generally fatal.

"The wiser course, therefore, is to become a dark horse. It isn't easy. First, you must win a reputation for vigorous leadership. In either finance, education, military circles or nonpartisan civic affairs. In any field, that is, but politics.

"Indeed, you must eschew politics like the betel nut. Never make a political speech. Look down your nose at all politicians. And never, ever under pain of instant transformation take a stand on a political issue. Merely imply such things are beneath you.

"Six weeks before the nominations, allow yourself to be dragged out of the stable, balking vigorously. Consent reluctantly to enter the race. But only, make it clear, because you wish to save your party from the crass politicians. And if you follow this program assiduously, you will achieve the goal of all dark horses—a place at the public trough.

"The handicap, of course, is that the opposition may recognize a dark horse when it sees one. Oh, how they will flail away at you, trying to drive you out in the open. But you must, above all, resist the temptation to kick back. For then you become half a leading candidate. And, of course, half a dark horse. Which half is obvious.

"So take to heart the one crucial lesson of this chapter: A Dark Horse Shines in the End Only by Constantly Sitting on Its Tail."

Harassment by the Internal Revenue Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following is a copy of a letter written by a constituent of mine to the Internal Revenue Service.

For quite obvious reasons I have deleted my constituent's name, and any other identification from the copy. Had I not done this, I know from past experience that the harassment this citizen would have to endure at the hands of the Internal Revenue Service would be unending and intense.

Mr. Speaker, these petty persecutions at the hands of bureaucracy cost the Government far more money than they obtain. If Government is going to take the attitude that all citizens are dishonest until proved honest, the country will indeed become a lawyer's paradise and an honest man's hell.

The letter follows:

GENTLEMEN: Selection of our return for the 3d consecutive year despite prompt and detailed filing, for one item or another, prompts this formal protest. We are fully cognizant of and sympathetic with the need for impartial audit of some of the millions of returns to effect any kind of actuarial audit control. Consistent or consecutive rechecks ought to be made on any account on record as being previously inaccurate, intentionally or accidentally.

Last year's return (1961) was filed very early and the file apparently lost, as per our consequent correspondence and eventual refund made on July 20, 1962. This year (1962) we mailed our report on March 12 and received request for proof of contributions on May 1. If selection of accounts at random is machine automated, as national publicity indicates, why the obvious time lag?

With the primary objective of first getting off some assumed "suspect list" may we however attempt a constructive suggestion. Since in our case total contributions almost equal 10 percent of gross income, a tithe, some element of surprise might be normally anticipated on the part of one of your auditors who cannot know the individuals involved. Some insurance companies have arrived at an important observation in their annual computations by establishing a status of nondrinker or tee-totaller. To avoid any charges of further interference with personal liberties could not our paternal government deduce some such important conclusion by adding a line, block or two, to be merely checked if taxpayer has paid any (amount not needed) State and Federal taxes on liquors, tobacco and horse racing?

Example? Since we happen not to spend any of our income on the above items, we are able and only so able, to contribute more to the church of our choice, plus all the myriad of deserving eleemosynary agencies so badly in need of public assistance; and this also despite more than normal medical expenditures over the last several years.

The individual taxpayer labors long and patiently over the intricasies of our present tax declarations. Repeated questioning of a return certainly seems contrary to the American premise that one is innocent until proved guilty. Soon it will be necessary for even the small taxpayer to retain legal counsel in order to sleep well—how this affects the national economy (other than the attorneys involved) is a moot question.

Very truly yours,

———— ————.

Business Support for Truth in Lending Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the truth-in-lending legislation sponsored by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and 19 other Senators including myself, and endorsed by President Kennedy, has important backing from the business community. I was pleased to note that the president of the National League of Insured Savings Associations has endorsed this legislation.

The national league president, Mr. Harold P. Halleen, devoted the "President's Page" editorial to the support of S. 750, the truth-in-lending bill. The league has approximately 500 savings and loan association members, whose assets total approximately $17 billion.

I am hopeful that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, will heed the advice of Mr. Halleen and report favorably this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the "President's Page" editorial carried in the May 1963 issue of the National League of Insured Savings Associations Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUTH IN LENDING

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, has opened a new fight in Congress to secure passage of his bill to require disclosure to the borrower of the actual cost of funds secured from a lending institution or a finance company. A total of 20 Senators—an impressive one-fifth of the Senate—already have gone on record in support of the Douglas bill, and there is good reason to believe that both the Senate and the House would pass the measure if it is brought to a vote.

From the beginning the National League of Insured Savings Associations has supported the Douglas bill on the grounds that borrowers are fully entitled to know the cost of credit. This principle is followed assiduously by savings and loan associations everywhere in the United States.

Unfortunately, some lenders have made deception a part of their business practice in a way which has resulted in unfair competition to legitimate lending institutions and hardship to the borrowing public. We have in mind the lender who couples a low rate with a long string of unreasonable and unethical "service" charges.

Under the Douglas bill, the Federal Reserve Board would be given the authority to establish the method by which lenders would be required to disclose the actual interest rate to a borrower. With its knowledge and experience of money and credit, it would seem extremely doubtful that the FRB would promulgate regulations detrimental to the banking system of the Nation.

In this day and age when public knowledge of money and credit is all the more important, the Douglas bill would go a long way toward shedding light on an area of finance often distorted and frequently misunderstood.

HAROLD P. HALLEEN.

Retraining Programs Require Thoughtful Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, attention has been focused upon public and private retraining programs as one means of alleviating the Nation's high unemployment rate. According to two recent Wall Street Journal articles, these training and retraining programs must be thoroughly planned in advance, however, in order to produce maximum results.

In Chicago, there is a new program concentrating upon fundamental schooling on the theory that "basic literacy training for those who need it is the first step on the road to employment." Under this system, classroom attendance is compulsory, since relief payments are stopped for failure to attend. Only after completion of this fundamental schooling is training in a particular skill begun.

New England authorities are approaching job-training programs from another angle. They find it important to screen applicants carefully and, at the same time, maintain an acute awareness of the nature of existing job vacancies. In their opinion, the essential factors in any serious program of vocational training are "close cooperation with industry, careful selection of courses, high admission standards, and concentration on younger people."

These articles from the March 25 and March 29 issues of the Wall Street Journal offer a close look at the operation of specific retraining programs and, under unanimous consent, I include them in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 25, 1963]

RETRAINING WORKERS: TWO STATES FIND IT PAYS TO PICK STUDENTS CAREFULLY

(By Ralph E. Winter)

HARTFORD, CONN.—Retraining idle workers with skills to fill labor vacancies sounds like a simple and noncontroversial solution to at least part of the Nation's unemployment problem.

In Washington, Congress has appropriated money and whipped up blueprints for massive retraining programs. The trouble is, though, that out in the shops and classrooms retraining often proves to be difficult, frustrating and unrewarding. For example, only about half of 5,000 unemployed West Virginians trained in State and Federal programs, often run just for the sake of having a program, found work in their new fields.

This contrasts with results in Massachusetts and Connecticut, where the States began practical retraining on their own long before Federal programs were set up. Nearly all of the 3,700 workers retrained in these 2 States during the last 4 years are working at better jobs.

Retraining officials here, however, long ago lost any Cinderella-like illusions they may have had about retraining magic. "Retraining is a salvage operation to help individuals without a marketable skill, not a real solution to unemployment," asserts Edwin Gooding, Boston Federal Reserve Bank economist who studied retraining in the two States.

"Most of the unemployed couldn't fill the jobs where most openings are if you trained them 100 years," adds John J. Higgiston, manpower coordinator for Connecticut's Education Department.

WASHINGTON'S PLANS

Washington officials apparently do not agree. For, although the size and scope of the Federal effort has not been finally determined, the 1962 Manpower Development and Training Act is designed to retrain up to 570,000 people in the next 3 years at a Federal cost of $430 million.

In addition, the year-old Area Redevelopment Administration plans to spend $14.5 million during the next 4 years on retraining the unemployed in depressed areas. And Congress is considering a youth conservation program involving retraining for young people.

The quality of job retraining, like education in general, is hard to evaluate. Results depend upon intangibles such as the individual's native ability and such pragmatic things as the number and kinds of jobs available. "Paradoxically, retraining is most successful where it is needed least in terms of numbers of unemployed," says Mr. Gooding.

Any evaluation of retraining in West Virginia, for example, must take into consideration the high rate of joblessness, about double the national average, caused by a drop in demand for coal miners and lack of widespread industrial diversification. There just are no jobs even for many of the retrained. Industrialized southern New England offers more varied job opportunities.

Even here, no one claims retraining can make a big dent in unemployment rolls, now accounting for more than 6 percent of the Nation's work force. Only economic expansion that sharply boosts job openings can do that. Most workers now rejected for lack of skill probably would find jobs without Government retraining if business were booming, economists agree.

CONNECTICUT'S RESULTS

However, proper retraining can help many unemployed individuals, provided they want to work. Here in Connecticut nearly 2,100 jobless men and women have completed courses since 1959, ranging from 4 weeks in welding to 18 weeks of typing. Nearly all immediately got jobs in their new fields.

John Perry, Jr., 34, a periodically unemployed father of six from Montville, Conn., is an example. "I was working at construction labor, but I got laid off every winter so I decided to take a pipefitter course," he says. "I'm starting at $1.95 an hour on what should be a steady job," he adds.

Rene E. Theroux, 20, an apprentice electrician, demonstrates the upgrading retraining often gives income. On his last job as a maintenance worker he made $1.60 an hour. As an apprentice he draws $2.11 an hour.

In Massachusetts 1,600 adults have been retrained since 1958. Graduates with a year on the job have increased their incomes an average of $1,000 a year, or 35 present, according to Mr. Gooding, of the Federal Reserve.

Yankee retraining officials attribute the high placement rate to "no nonsense, businesslike programs," in contrast to what they consider a shotgun welfare approach in some other places. West Virginia is an example. Among the factors retraining officials have learned are necessary ingredients are close cooperation with industry, careful selection of courses, high admission standards, and concentration on younger people.

A NUMBERS GAME

"Some Federal people and State politicians are playing a numbers game," observes one State training official. "They just want us to hurry up and get a lot of people in some kind of training."

So far, Connecticut and Massachusetts have resisted such pressure. Connecticut, for example, does not set up classes "until area employers tell us they want a retraining program," says Thomas J. Yoczik, coordinator of manpower training in the State's department of labor. "Then we start with a labor market survey to determine skill needs. And we don't overtrain. If companies say they want 90 machine operators, we train 60 and add more classes later if necessary," he adds.

One result of tailoring courses to employers' requirements: Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics Corp., Groton, Conn., has hired 1,036 trainees so far, often employing entire classes the day after graduation.

"This program has been very good for us because we were consulted in advance," says Lawrence Crowley, trade training coordinator for Electric Boat. "The men we hire work out extremely well because their training covers skills we need." The company sends two of its own training supervisors to the State-run classes at least once a week to answer questions and keep track of progress of individual students.

"We find that the welders who were trained to our specifications work out very well," agrees an official of Crusader Lancer Corp., North Grosvenor Dale, Conn., maker of immersion gas water heaters.

Failure to pin down job openings can cause a fiasco. Rhode Island officials just assumed, without questioning many employers to find actual openings, that growing use of electronic data processing would make it easy for persons trained to operate and program computers to find jobs. But after more than 4 months of training, graduates of the State's computer course found openings scarce.

Another principle New England authorities follow is to avoid the jobless who have records of being unable to hold any job. Unfortunately, many of them can't absorb training either.

"Many of the unemployed are not well educated enough to benefit from what we understand as vocational education," says Mr. Gooding. "To include them we would have to create new courses including basic reading, writing, grammar and arithmetic."

STANDARDS ARE HIGH

Connecticut and Massachusetts officials are convinced that high admission requirements are a major reason for their success. Only persons scoring high enough on general intelligence tests and specific aptitude tests to indicate probable success in the field are allowed to enter a course.

"We select about one applicant out of three for retraining," says Connecticut's Mr. Yoczik.

Even size can be a factor. Massachusetts authorities recently turned down a 275-pound applicant who wanted to train for tree care work involving climbing trees to remove dead or diseased limbs.

"We are not going to be caught dead training people who are inadequate," adds Connecticut's Mr. Higgiston. "That would destroy employer confidence in the program. We can and do drop anyone who has the wrong attitude, doesn't attend regularly or can't do the work."

Another factor aiding success of retraining in the two New England States is concentration on younger workers who have many productive years ahead of them. In Connecticut few trainees are more than 40 years old. In a typical Massachusetts group more than half were less than 25 years old and another 25 percent were younger than 35. West Virginia's placement ratio is held down by a higher proportion of trainees over 40, officials admit.

Although their State-fashioned programs have been successful over a broad range of courses, both Massachusetts and Connecticut were unable to resist the lure of Federal funds. But Connecticut, while welcoming Federal money, has some complaints. "When we ran our own program, starting a new class was simple, but under the Federal program I have to make 26 copies of every document and get 9 different signatures," complains Mr. Yoczik.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 29, 1963]

Chicago Finds Fundamental Schooling Aids Many Jobless

(By Ronald G. Shafer)

CHICAGO.—Like many sixth graders, John Calicott puzzles intently over the questions in an English test he's taking at one of this city's South Side schools. Unlike most sixth graders, however, Mr. Calicott is 46 and has a wife and seven children.

A tall, slender Negro, Mr. Calicott is among some 7,600 Chicago relief recipients in a new, fast-growing program that shows promise of helping him and many thousands of others in his situation get off swelling relief rolls across the country by giving them the basic "three R's" of reading, writing and arithmetic they missed as children.

The Chicago program, which started just 1 year ago with 225 volunteers, is catching the attention of welfare officials in many other cities. Evidence here so far suggests that such a basic education program may be necessary if extensive and costly job retraining programs now getting into gear with heavy Federal aid are to prove effective on any wide scale in making reliefers self-sufficient citizens.

MANY CAN'T READ ADS

"The bedrock problem is ignorance," asserts Raymond M. Hilliard, director of public aid for Cook County, which includes the city of Chicago and most of its suburbs. Of the county's 50,000 able-bodied adult relief recipients, at least half are what he calls "functionally illiterate." That means, he says, that they "can't read a help-wanted ad or write their name on a job application," almost automatically excluding them from any employment beyond the menial odd-jobs category.

At least partly due to this educational barrier, retraining alone failed to stem the relief roll tide in Chicago. Last May, the rolls, including the aged and members of reliefers' families, reached a record 290,000 names, up from about 209,000 in early 1958 when an ambitious job retraining effort was started.

In March 1962, the county welfare department, with the financial backing of the Chicago School Board, launched its back-to-school program for people receiving welfare aid. The students attend two evening classes a week, each 2 hours long. They are taught reading, arithmetic and such other subjects as American history and current events.

"For the moment, we're attempting to upgrade those who attend classes to an eighth grade educational level and the on to more schooling, vocational training or jobs," Mr. Hilliard explains. "Eventually, though, we hope to increase enrollment to 50,000 in grade levels through high school. Getting jobs is our aim and a basic literacy training for those who need it is the first step on the road to employment."

Attendance is compulsory. Relief recipients are told: "You cut classes and we cut your checks." But the compulsory factor has rarely been needed. Even Mr. Hilliard is surprised by the enthusiasm of the students. "Most of them are not only willing, but eager to attend," he says.

Result: While relief rolls nationally continued to expand, reaching 7.8 million on January 31, up 300,000 from a year earlier the number receiving aid in Chicago edged down over the same period by 10,000 to 273,105—1962 was the first year to show a decline in Chicago since 1956. Precisely how much of the shrinkage was due to the schooling and retraining can't be measured but welfare officials say it played a major role.

Welfare director Hilliard calls money spent on rehabilitation "a sure fire investment" in preventing and eventually eliminating dependency. His argument is that "it makes more sense to spend $100,000 a month getting people off relief than to continue spending $16 million monthly just to keep them alive."

The oldest part of the Cook County program is job training. It's carried on in an old, five-story wooden warehouse on Chicago's west side. About 100 public aid department instructors teach over 20 different vocations, from spray painting to metal drilling, and from glasscutting to running a power sewing machine. The rehabilitation center takes on a number of small jobs to help meet costs. This work includes such jobs as welding battery carriers for an automotive manufacturer and sewing diapers for a diaper service company.

At present, over 13,000 are enrolled at the training center. Last year, the center found jobs for a record 12,383 relief recipients.

Mr. Calicott is a good illustration of how Mr. Hilliard's teach-and-train approach works. He went on relief in 1960 after losing his $80-a-week job unloading freight cars for the Santa Fe railroad. With little formal education and no special skills, he couldn't find another job. Last November, after going to school for seven months and taking a 2-week driver training course, he passed a cab driver's examination and landed a job with the Chicago Yellow Cab Co.; he continues his schooling in the night classes. His monthly earnings climbed from $95.79 in November to $238.30 in February and he thinks they'll soon reach the point where he won't need public assistance. Before getting the job, he was receiving $316 a month in relief.

AN UNCAGED "BIRD"

Teachers at the literacy school point out that besides the employment potentials, the school often helps make persons on relief more conscientious parents, lessening the chance that their children may follow their parents' footsteps onto relief rolls. "No kid of mine will ever drop out of school," vows one 53-year-old student with 13 children.

What do people on relief think about going back to school? Matthew Marshall, a 56-year-old former Mississippi cotton picker who couldn't read or write before attending classes, puts it this way: "I feel like a caged bird that all at once got out." Since starting to school, Mr. Marshall has obtained a part-time job washing and waxing cars.

Cook County has inherited many of its welfare troubles from other States and can't prevent new ones from streaming in. More than half the people on relief in greater Chicago were born or educated in the Deep South and 80 percent are Negroes, one recent survey showed.

So Chicago still has a long way to go before its relief problem is solved, if it ever will be, but the education program shows bright promise of helping to lighten the load.

The Wilderness Which Will Endure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, once again the Congress will consider wilderness legislation. I, along with many others, support the principle of setting aside such areas. There is, however, a matter that concerns me. That is the method which would be used to designate our wilderness areas.

It is my belief Congress should have this responsibility. There are others who agree, including Mr. H. R. Glascock, Jr., who is associated with the Western Forestry and Conservation Association.

Mr. Speaker, in a speech before the National Wool Growers Association early this year, Mr. Glascock presented some of the dangers involved in allowing the executive branch to have free reign to determine what should and what should not be designated wilderness. Also, he presented many strong arguments for restoring to the Congress its constitutional responsibilities with respect to public lands.

His speech, Mr. Speaker, should interest each Member of Congress. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the RECORD.

The speech follows:

THE WILDERNESS WHICH WILL ENDURE

(By H. R. Glascock, Jr.)

I count it a real honor and privilege to addresse the members of the National Wool Growers Association who play such an important part in clothing and feeding the Nation. You, like other resources industries, are a service industry providing basic needs of people. Your products enhance our standard of living. Your profits, if any, contribute to building up the land and supporting schools and Government. By use of soil and toil you have helped keep America strong and free. Your part in conservation, like that of other practical conservationists, is to demonstrate that man can use the land and its renewable resources without using them up.

I have been asked to speak to you on the outlook for wilderness legislation. It no longer is meaningful to refer to the wilderness bill. There are two completely different bills and there may well be more before this matter is settled. Furthermore, the subject of wilderness withdrawals is a part of the larger legislative problem of public land withdrawals in general. Of special interest to this convention is the fact that most withdrawals involve grazing in one form or another. When a Secretary of Agriculture or Interior can sign away at the stroke of a pen millions of acres of public lands for exclusive-use reservations, it is something for Congress to worry about; to ask itself if it has overdelegated authority invested in it by the Constitution.

PROBLEM OF ADMINISTRATIVE WITHDRAWALS

Such large administrative assignments of Federal lands to limited use are not engaged in by secretaries from only one political party. Outgoing Secretary of the Interior Seaton 2 years ago penned the proclamation of a 9-million-acre national game range in the Brooks Range of Alaska over the protests of the State's Governor and congressional delegation. And just the other day Secretary of Agriculture Freeman inked the order creating the largest national forest wilderness area in the United States—the 1¼-million-acre Selway-Bitterroot. This dedication is half again as large as that recommended by the local Inland Empire multiple use committee and exceeds the Forest Service's own proposal by some 77,000 acres.

National monuments and many other types of withdrawals can also be created by Executive proclamation. Even Congress has difficulty getting one "unproclamated." Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture have a fondness for this authority and have opposed its discontinuance by Congress. They can be expected to continue to do so.

FIRST THINGS FIRST

Congressman WAYNE ASPINALL, chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, put the whole problem into focus in a letter to President Kennedy of October 15. He wrote:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Because of your frequently expressed interest in extension of conservation measures to our public lands and passage of legislation to provide for preservation of wilderness areas, it is suggested that your Office may be able to facilitate action on these matters during the 88th Congress after it convenes in January 1963.

"The core of the controversy surrounding these problems is the degree of responsibility and authority to be exercised by the legislative and executive branches. This has been the main issue in legislation that has been proposed relative to withdrawal, restriction, and use of public lands as well as in the approach to designating areas to be preserved as wilderness.

"Last year, after receiving conflicting reports from the executive agencies involved, we asked the Bureau of the Budget for the administration's viewpoint. The Committee was advised that the Bureau of the Budget had no objection to legislation that would require an act of Congress for each withdrawal, reservation, or restriction of public lands as embodied in certain bills then pending before Congress. However, we have continued to receive unfavorable comments from other agencies on each of several bills that have been submitted suggesting alternative approaches to the problem.

"I think that any student of the public lands situation will recognize that we have reached a point where it is essential to establish clear-cut legislative guidelines concerning the management, use, and disposition of our public lands. This has come about because of past inaction of Congress, coupled with the growing scarcity of land in the United States and the parallel need to preserve some of our undisturbed areas in their natural setting. While all these matters are intertwined, I have come to the realization that first things should come first. Accordingly, I think that we should, in the interest of orderliness, take up the matter of congressional-executive relationships first; when that question has been settled through the enactment of legislation setting up a pattern for future guidelines we can then immediately turn our attention to wilderness preservation.

"Since we have failed to come up with a formula that can be accepted among all the administrative agencies, we earnestly invite you to submit to the 88th Congress your views as to legislation that would permit Congress to fulfill its constitutional responsibility to make rules governing the use and disposition of Federal property and at the same time not hamper the effective administration of that property in accordance with the time honored conservation principle of effecting the maximum good for the maximum number.

"For my part, I assure you that I shall cooperate to every extent possible to arrive at a mutually satisfactory procedure at an early date, after which I will, within that concept, work earnestly and diligently for the establishment of wilderness preservation areas as a part of our natural heritage.

"Sincerely yours,

"WAYNE ASPINALL."

UNIFORM PROCEDURES FOR WITHDRAWALS

Now in this letter, Chairman ASPINALL was being quite modest. For he and his committee have already come a long way toward a reasonable solution to the problem of public land withdrawals for limited use, including wilderness. After lengthy and objective hearings and intensive study, they drafted and approved a bill late in the last Congress which would, for the first time, establish uniform procedures for withdrawals of public lands for any purpose, specifying acts of Congress for those over 5,000 acres. It is well to recall that national parks have always been created by acts of Congress. Wilderness reservations are singled out for special treatment in the second part of the bill, which students of public lands may feel is unnecessary or superfluous. This was done to give immediate statutory designation to 6.8 million acres of administratively dedicated wilderness, wild, and canoe lands on the national forests.

This House measure, then, can be called a wilderness bill, though it is a much more far-reaching piece of legislation. It is sure to be reintroduced in the 88th Congress. It will pose an embarrassment for many preservation leaders, since it constitutes an extension of the Engle Act which they persuasively supported in the 84th and 85th Congresses. Engaged in promoting the old wilderness system bill now, they have already labeled the new House bill as scuttling tactics.

PRESERVATION LEADERS SUPPORTED PRINCIPLE

Let us see how the testimony of preservation and wildlife leaders before the House Interior Committee in 1955, 1956, and 1957 supports enactment of the new wilderness bill developed by that committee. Mr. Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of the Wilderness Society, who is usually credited with authorship of the original wilderness system bill, told the committee at its hearings on March 16, 1956, relative to withdrawal and utilization of the public lands:

"Now, as I understand your concern here, you are going further along that same line of trying to establish a firm policy with regard to our public lands. I do not think there is anything that you can devote your attention to that is more timely and that is more likely to be of permanent benefit to the public. * * * We are at the place where we need to take a good look at our public land policies and determine what we are going to have for the future for some of these uses that will not be available if we do not exercise the foresight. * * * I anticipate being in a position of supporting the proposals that I understand the committee is going to make."

Mr. J. W. Penfold, conservation director of the Izaak Walton League of America, who has been discrediting the new wilderness bill which extends the Engle Act, wrote House Interior Committee Chairman ENGLE on March 14, 1956 for the hearing record as follows:

"The military seems to have shown a bland disregard of the multiple natural resource values pertaining to the lands they seek for their own single purposes. The military has already had withdrawn vast areas. Is the fullest utilization being made of them? Is there coordination among the various services in the use of these lands jointly? The record doesn't show this to be the case. Shouldn't this kind of multiple use be a firm part of policy?

"We earnestly and respectfully urge your committee, Mr. ENGLE, to seek, formulate, and adopt a policy applicable to military withdrawals which will protect resources, preserve, insofar as possible, the opportunity for their proper utilization and which guarantee that no withdrawal or extension of a withdrawal will be granted prior to full consideration of all elements and interests and precise evaluation of the resources and uses affected. And further, a policy which will insure that every other possibility is thoroughly explored before additional lands are withdrawn."

Mr. Fred M. Packard, executive secretary of the National Parks Association, was asked by Chairman ENGLE at the hearings on March 16, 1956:

"The legislation currently being drafted would * * * provide that major withdrawal must be submitted to the Congress. * * * Do you feel without seeing the legislation and committing yourself to the terminology of it, that the general principles of that sort of legislation are sound?"

Mr. Packard replied:

"Would that legislation have an effect on the application of the Antiquities Act to the establishment of national monuments? * * * That is not a withdrawal in the usual sense of the word. That is one factor we would have to consider. Other than that, I would say emphatically we would support such legislation."

On May 24, 1956 Mr. Packard wrote Chairman ENGLE:

"By formal resolution, the board of trustees stated the support of the National Parks Association for your bill H.R. 10371 and other similar bills, which would return to the Congress the control over withdrawals and reservations made for military purposes, at its annual meeting on May 10."

Again at the March 16, 1956, hearing, Congressman METCALF obtained similar approval from Mr. Charles Callison, then conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation, when he said:

"Pending before another committee is H.R. 5306 and related bills which would require congressional approval for the disposition of wildlife refuge land. This would be only a limited part of the land with which you are concerned in the legislation you are drafting. Mr. Callison and the organizations which he represents, as well as other conservation organizations, have declared themselves in favor of that legislation. I am sure they would be in favor of the broader legislation which would require congressional approval for all withdrawals."

Mr. Callison responded:

"Mr. Chairman, I should like to confirm what Congressman METCALF has said, and also to say in reply to your remarks a moment ago that the challenge which you have laid down to us is certainly a good one and we accept it.

"We have been intensely interested and have been greatly concerned for a number of years with the growing demands or requests of various agencies of the Government and especially the military departments for larger and larger withdrawals of the public lands. * * * We think there are several principles involved. We are pleased to see this committee and Congress going into this matter. One is the matter of the possibility of multiple use of these areas, including the opportunity of the growing army of sportsmen to utilize the game and fishery resources, and including also the important necessity for management of those resources by the proper State game-management agencies. * * * We think that certainly there should be an opportunity and the means for working out a multiple-use program with the military department.

"We have been pleased by discussions that we have heard about proposed legislation which may result from these hearings. * * * That would give Congress greater control over withdrawals of the public lands, and would set up a system for working out multiple-use possibilities on these lands and correct some of the other faults and, what seems to us, apparent abuses of the system of public land withdrawals.

"Just in principle and without having seen the proposed legislation, the National Wildlife Federation is for it and we hope it does come out of this committee. We certainly give it our enthusiastic support because we think it is greatly needed."

The March 16, 1956 hearing of the House Interior Committee also heard Mr. C. R. Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute, testify:

"Several bills have been introduced in recent Congresses to overcome the inequity that follows the withdrawal of public lands for military purposes. These military reservations, with their vast size, oftentimes have become private hunting and fishing grounds for the military. * * * That protective legislation is needed is borne out by the thinking of several of the larger national conservation groups.

"In view of the tremendous number of acres of public lands that already have been withdrawn and reserved for military use, the Institute questions the necessity and advisability of the many additional requests that are being made. * * * Congress should be insisting that all of the services should be making greater combined and coordinated use of the lands already under military control."

And Mr. Gutermuth wrote Chairman ENGLE on April 16, 1956:

"It is hoped that prompt action can be given to H.R. 10371, and the other identical bills that call for congressional action on the withdrawal of public lands for defense purposes. The conservation forces feel that legislation is necessary to curb the continuing demand of the armed services for additional large blocks of Federal land, and you may be sure that the other urgently needed provisions in these bills will have widespread public support."

Chairman ENGLE questioned Mr. George Difani, executive secretary of the California Wildlife Federation, in this vein during the March 16, 1956, hearing:

"Would you say, Mr. Difani, that the California sportsmen and your organization in particular, would favor the general principle of restoring to the Congress control over the public land areas, with particular reference to these huge military reservations?"

Mr. Difani replied without equivocation:

"Yes. I am sure we favor that proposal."

On June 4, 1956, Mr. David R. Brower, executive director of the Sierra Club, wrote Congressman ASPINALL:

"This is to let you know that the Sierra Club approves in principle the bill you introduced which would require congressional action on withdrawals for defense purposes of more than 5,000 acres of land and water, and to require that hunting, fishing, and trapping on such areas be done in conformity with State laws."

GOVERNMENT OFFICERS SUPPORTED PRINCIPLE

In this and subsequent hearings on public land withdrawals during 1956 and 1957, which culminated in enactment of the legislation under consideration, the House Interior Committee recorded numerous supporting statements and letters from State and local outdoor and wildlife groups and State natural resource agencies. Nor was the proposal to put the brakes on administrative withdrawals of public lands without some support from Federal land administrators. At the February 20, 1956, hearing Chairman ENGLE asked Assistant Secretary of Interior Wesley A. D'Ewart, "It boils down to this, does it not? That the Congress through a failure to legislate and through establishment of precedents has for all practical purposes delegated the disposition of huge areas of the public domain to the executive branch?"

Mr. D'Ewart replied, "And I might also add, by action of the Supreme Court in upholding that action."

Chairman ENGLE asked, "In upholding what is regarded as congressional failure to challenge the precedents which have been established for public land withdrawals?"

Mr. D'Ewart replied, "That is correct."

And Congressman Stewart L. Udall of Arizona testified before the House Interior Committee hearing on June 11, 1956, regarding the military withdrawal bill, "I think this legislation is very definitely needed in our area, and I urge the Committee to act favorably with regard to it."

But on August 23, 1962, Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall told a news conference with respect to the new House wilderness bill employing the principle of the Engle Act for all public land withdrawals:

"It would greatly restrict and practically eliminate the power in the President which has really achieved great advances in conservation this century. This power has enabled the President to designate Federal lands as wildlife refuges and national monuments to preserve them for the public."

WIDE CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT FOR PRINCIPLE

Now, all of these statements are a matter of public record contained in the records of the House Interior Committee hearings on the so-called Engle Act. They played a major role in the enactment of the legislation. They argue eloquently for a principle on public land withdrawals which cannot logically stop at defense withdrawals. They point up the inconsistency of many critics of the House Interior Committee approach. Succeeding Congresses have seen numerous bills with wide sponsorship in both Houses amending the Engle Act to require acts of Congress for public land withdrawals over 5,000 acres for any purpose. The concern over undue delegation of congressional responsibilities has been growing.

Last year the Fund for the Republic's Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara, Calif., published a paper by Charles A. Reich, associate professor of law at Yale, entitled "Bureaucracy and the Forests." Among other things, but illustrative of his thesis, Professor Reich states:

"In a democracy, laws and policies, including laws governing publicly owned resources, must theoretically be made in public by the people's elected representatives. But in today's overcomplicated world an overwhelmed Congress has been forced to delegate a large measure of legislative power to specialized executive and administrative agencies the officials of which are not elected or directly controlled by the people.

"When congressional relinquishment of the lawmaking function first assumed major proportions, in the early days of the New Deal, the Supreme Court tried to halt the trend. The Justices declared that legislative power cannot be delegated and that Congress can permit the executive agencies to make 'regulations' only within the boundaries of carefully prescribed standards. But growing Government soon broke through this retaining wall, and eventually the courts ceased to demand strict standards for delegation.

"The standards Congress has used to delegate authority over the forests are so general, so sweeping, and so vague as to represent a turnover of virtually all responsibility. 'Multiple use' does establish that the forests cannot be used exclusively for one purpose, but beyond this it is little more than a phrase expressing the hope that all competing interests can somehow be satisfied and leaving the real decisions to others. The 'relative values' of various resources are to be given 'due consideration,' but Congress has not indicated what those values are or what action shall be deemed 'due consideration'."

ENDURING WILDERNESS AREAS ARE DEFENSIBLE ONES

You may have noted that I have given as the title for these remarks, "The Wilderness Which Will Endure." If you interpret this that I am a wilderness lover and user, you are correct. It is my contention that the only roadless wilderness which will permanently endure is that which is carefull selected as being primarily valuable for this purpose; that which does not project out into productive areas needed by an expanding population struggling to maintain and increase its standard of living, from the land.

I am convinced that this kind of selectivity is not being achieved in wilderness establishment today any more than it was for military withdrawals before the Engle Act. No one argues convincingly that national parks have not been, and are not being, well protected under their separate acts of Congress and the generalized National Park Act. If the need then is for Congress, to have more say on wilderness, let us do it in this proven way and really require congressional scrutiny in the selection and guidance in administration.

THE NEED: A MAGNA CARTA FOR PUBLIC LANDS

The Aspinall bill would do this and restore to Congress its constitutional responsibilities with respect to public lands. The old wilderness system bill would merely give lipservice to congressional prerogatives by statutory endorsement of administrative selections as they are made. Congress could but tacitly approve or arduously veto executive branch withdrawals. These points are clarified in the authoritative chart prepared by the House Interior Committee entitled, "Background, Analysis, and Comparison of Major Provisions, Wilderness Preservation."

Now is the time and the opportunity to assist the evolution of wilderness legislation into a Magna Carta for the withdrawal and utilization of the public lands of the United States, using the principle so properly advanced by CLAIR ENGLE a few years ago.

Cotton Bill Introduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a new cotton bill. It proposes to remove the inequity of the two-price cotton system and to protect the income of cotton producers. Moreover, it would mean great savings on prices paid by consumers for cotton goods.

I emphasize especially the provision for small farms. The bill provides that each farmer will get a price support of up to 10 percent above the general support level. This will cover the total production of approximately 75 percent of all cotton producers. In some States where there are numerous small farms, more than 90 percent of the producers grow 15 bales or less. In my own State of North Carolina, which has more small farms than any other State, the income of 95 percent or more of our cotton farmers will be fully protected under the small farm provision.

Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I am publishing in the Appendix of the RECORD a press statement I issued today upon the introduction of the cotton bill.

The statement follows:

COOLEY INTRODUCES NEW COTTON BILL

Chairman HAROLD D. COOLEY, of the House Committee on Agriculture, introduced in the House today a new cotton bill, aimed at enabling cotton to compete fairly with synthetic fibers and improving the competitive position of domestic mills against imports of cheap foreign cotton goods.

The legislation would make American cotton available to domestic mills at world cotton prices, provide a special price protection for small cotton farms, and launch a crash research program to reduce the cost of producing cotton.

Upon introducing the bill, Mr. COOLEY stated:

"Agriculture is the biggest business in America in dollar value involved and people employed, and the cotton industry is the biggest part of American agriculture. Perhaps more than 10 million persons, almost one-sixth of the Nation's labor force, is engaged in the production of cotton, in ginning, marketing, transporting, milling, and in the manufacture and merchandising of cotton goods.

"Cotton now is in a life and death struggle.

"A flood of cheap textiles is flowing in from abroad, displacing the goods produced by our own workers and demoralizing the domestic markets for our textile industry.

"Synthetic fibers make devastating inroads into markets where cotton never before has been seriously challenged.

"I am sure that the cotton industry recognizes the amount of work the Committee on Agriculture has done and the time spent in attempting to arrive at a solution to the cotton problem. Our Cotton Subcommittee, headed by the Honorable E. C. GATHINGS, of Arkansas, started hearings early in December and we have continued meetings with all segments of the cotton industry, up to this very moment.

"Early in this session of the Congress I introduced a very simple bill to remove the two-price cotton system—wherein foreign mills obtain our cotton at a much cheaper price than our own domestic mills—and thus enable cotton to compete more fairly with synthetic fibers and improve the competitive position of American mills against imports of foreign cotton goods.

"Controversy developed around this legislation, and around other bills which would have permitted the overplanting of allotted acres where a producer was willing to take the world price for cotton produced on the acreage planted in addition to his allotment.

"I then personally sought to bring all elements of the industry, and the administration, into agreement.

"Based on my conversations with producers, the trade and the mills, legislative language was drawn together. This language, in bill draft form, was submitted to the Department of Agriculture for comment, and it was discussed among all elements of the industry, and was considered at a meeting of cotton producers at Memphis on last Monday.

"The bill I introduced today represents the broadest area of possible agreement I have been able to find. This is not exclusively my bill, but it simply represents my best effort to present the thinking developed in my search for a basis of unity among the producers, the trade and the mills, behind legislation which will deal effectively with the very serious problem that confronts cotton and the millions of people associated with cotton.

"There appears to be unanimity of opinion that the payment-in-kind section is the best approach to removing the two-price system, with all its inequities. The mills and the administration are in agreement on this.

"Moreover, there seems to be unanimous support for the crash research on the reduction of cotton production costs.

"I believe that the provision for protection of the smaller farms will receive very general support.

"However, differences developed among producers on a provision in an earlier draft of the bill that would have permitted producers to plant up to 30 percent above their acreage allotments, at world prices for the cotton produced on the extra acres, if such would not increase the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This provision has been omitted from the bill I have introduced.

"I reemphasize to all people associated with cotton the urgency of our situation. Cotton is losing its markets, and once lost they may never be regained. This is hurting everyone concerned with cotton. I am hopeful that the industry—producers, the mills and the trade—will develop solidarity behind this legislation to deal with the crisis we confront."

A concise summary of the bill follows:

PAYMENTS-IN-KIND

The Commodity Credit Corporation, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, would be authorized:

(1) From the date of enactment, until August 1, 1964, to make payments through the issuance of payment-in-kind certificates to persons other than producers in such amounts and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines will eliminate inequities due to the differences in the cost of raw cotton between domestic and foreign users of cotton;

(2) For the period beginning August 1, 1964, and ending July 31, 1967, such payments-in-kind shall be made to persons other than producers in an amount as will make such cotton available for domestic use at a price which is not in excess of the price at which such cotton is made available for export; and

(3) Payments-in-kind also would be provided to make raw cotton in inventory on the date of enactment available for consumption at prices consistent with the purposes of the legislation.

Thus the Secretary of Agriculture would be given discretion in determining the level of payments-in-kind prior to August 1, 1964, but after that date and until July 31, 1967 he would be directed to make such payments in the amount necessary to make cotton available to American mills at the same price American cotton is offered for export. Under the current cotton export program, American cotton is offered for export at 8½ cents per pound lower than the price domestic mills must pay.

SMALL FARM PROVISION

For the 1964, 1965 and 1966 crops of cotton, the Secretary may on up to the first 15 bales of each farmer's production increase the price support up to a level 10 percent in excess of the basic level of price support not in excess of the level of price support in effect for the remainder of the crop, but for the 1963 crop. This would be carried out through simultaneous purchase and sale or similar operations in order to keep such cotton to the maximum extent practicable in the normal commercial channels of trade. This will not involve any direct payments to farmers.

RESEARCH

The Secretary is authorized and directed to conduct a special cotton research program designed to reduce the cost of producing upland cotton at the earliest practicable date, using up to $10 million annually for this purpose. The Secretary then would make such reductions in the level of price support as will reflect reductions in the costs of producing cotton.

UNRESTRICTED SALES

Beginning August 1, 1964, the Commodity Credit Corporation would be authorized to sell upland cotton for unrestricted use at not less than 105 percent of the current loan rate plus reasonable carrying charge. Such sales from CCC stocks for unrestricted use now can be made at not less than 115 percent of the current loan rate.

Wheat Politics: Stick, Bait, and Trap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, both Secretary Freeman's mobilization of an army of employees plus the administration's frantic push for a pre-May 21 extension of the feed grains program are a cleverly designed stick and bait to quarry farmers into voting "yes" on the wheat referendum.

Restricting wheat farmer independence, such as a "yes" vote would be a trap for all farmers.

The following editorial is from the May 9 Wall Street Journal:

STICK, BAIT, AND THE TRAP

As any farm boy knows, there's more than one way to get something to go into a trap. You can drive the quarry into it. You can also use bait.

Both ways, interestingly enough, are being used by the administration in efforts to get a favorable farmers' vote later this month on the proposed new Government controls over wheat. First there's Agriculture Secretary Freeman, using his vast departmental apparatus to propagandize for a two-thirds "yes" vote needed for approval, and the big stick he's waving is the threat that if they vote "no," there will be no new wheat legislation at all. In which case, he warns, the price might plummet to $1 a bushel from the present $2 support level.

But evidently having some doubts about whether this big stick by itself is wholly effective, the administration has put out some bait. This is the feed grain bill it is trying to push through Congress before the May 21 referendum. The bill, already passed by the House, would let farmers grow corn and other livestock feed grains on acreage the tight wheat control plan would force them to remove from wheat production.

The object of all this stick waving and putting out of bait is simply to divert the farmers' gaze from the real issue. And that is whether they're going to vote for the most stringent program ever proposed by Government for a farm commodity. That would lead, as Charles Shuman, American Farm Bureau Federation president, says, "all the way down the road of Government supply management."

No matter whether you use a big stick or bait, a trap is still a trap.

Results of Poll Taken in the Sixth Congressional District of Washington State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently mailed questionnaires to 45,000 residents of my congressional district, which includes all of Pierce County and all of Kitsap County with the exception of Bainbridge Island. It contained 10 questions dealing with issues pending before Congress.

The names of the individuals receiving the questionnaires were selected at random from lists which gave no indication of the political leanings of those people. The number of recipients and the number of returns were sufficiently large to give assurance that a good cross-section opinion of my constituency would be obtained.

To date there has been a much better than average response, indicating an increased interest on the part of my people in the affairs of government. I have received thus far responses from 17 percent of the people who received questionnaires. More returns are expected, of course, but a sufficient number have now been received to determine the general views of the people of my area. I am sure that their opinions will be of interest to the other Members of the House.

A few people have asked why I have sent out questionnaires. The English statesman, Edmund Burke, in 1774 perhaps supplied one answer. He said in a speech to his people:

> It ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinion high respect; their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfaction to theirs; and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interests to his own.

The results of the poll expressed in terms of percentages are as follows:

Results of poll taken in the 6th Congressional District of Washington State

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. The estimated Federal deficit for fiscal year 1963 is $8,800,000,000. The estimated deficit for fiscal 1964 is $11,900,000,000. In view of these figures do you believe there should be a general tax cut this year?	34	60	6
2. If a general tax cut is made, do you believe it should be accompanied by a reduction in Federal expenditures?	83	10	7
3. Do you favor medical care for people over 65 by—			
(a) Increasing the social security taxes upon employees and employers?	34	40	4
(b) Promoting a Blue Cross type plan whereby the Federal Government would assume full financial responsibility only for persons below a certain income level?	35	35	6
(c) Expanding the present Federal-State (Kerr-Mills) legislation	23	23	16
4. Do you favor continuance of our foreign assistance program at its present level of about $4,000,000,000 annually?	21	69	10
5. Do you believe that the Cuban situation has been adequately dealt with by our Government?	24	64	12
6. Should the United States continue its membership in the United Nations?	71	19	10
7. Sould the House Committee on Un-American Activities be continued?	73	14	13
8. Do you favor the establishment of a Domestic Peace Corps?	40	40	20
9. Do you favor Federal financial aid for—			
(a) Elementary and secondary school construction	44	48	8
(b) Elementary and secondary teachers' salaries	23	66	11
(c) Construction of university facilities	40	41	19
10. Would you favor legislation giving the President more flexibility in handling national emergency strikes by providing back-to-work injunctions and compulsory arbitration machinery?	60	30	10

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, among the national holidays of the world, Rumania's must surely be considered one of the most remarkable, for on May 10 in 1866, 1877, and 1881 three milestones were passed in the country's drive for independence.

On May 10, 1866, the Rumanian dynasty, was founded when Charles of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, a member of the Prussian royal family, was proclaimed Prince of Rumania. This event marked the successful outcome of the nation's long fight for the right to elect a prince from one of the nonneighboring royal families as its sovereign. Such a disinterested ruler was needed in order to end the strife and rivalry among Rumanian candidates to the throne and thereby insure a greater degree of unity.

In 1859 the two Provinces of Moldavia and Wallachia had been able to unite under the Rumanian Prince Alexander Cuza as a result of Russia's defeat in the Crimean War and the support of France. It was not until 1866 that the inauguration of a foreign prince was made possible through the intercession of Napoleon III. A nearly unanimous referendum held in the two Provinces elected Charles Hohenzollern, and on the tenth of May he took the oath to a liberal constitution which had recently been adopted. He was also formally invested by the Turkish sultan, who still held suzerainty over the two Provinces. The European powers now joined Turkey in recognizing the union of Wallachia and Moldavia as the Principality of Rumania.

On May 10, 1877, Rumania took advantage of the Russo-Turkish War to break away from the Ottoman Empire. She declared her independence, entered the war on Russia's side, and made a substantial contribution to the defeat of Turkey.

In 1878 the Congress of Berlin recognized Rumania's independence, but the European powers ignored her claim to the predominantly Rumanian Province of Bessarabia. This area, which Russia had been forced to return to Rumania after the Crimean War, was now restored to Russia.

Another landmark in Rumania's history was reached on May 10, 1881, when she was recognized as a sovereign kingdom and Charles was crowned the first King of Rumania. Finally, the events of World War I enabled Rumania to complete her national unification with the addition of Bessarabia and the remainder of Dobruja, Bukovina, and Transylvania.

Rumania has unfortunately lost the sovereign independence for which she struggled for more than half a century. A victim of Russia's historic drive to dominate the Balkans, Rumania is now a satellite in the Communist bloc.

Yet the great national tradition which the events of May 10 symbolize renews our hopes each year that the Rumanian people will once again be able to take the helm of their ship of state.

Tax Action Getting Adverse Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, many of us expressed concern over the foreign investment provisions of last year's tax bill. We warned that the result could be a loss of revenue to the Government. After 6 months the results are coming in and it seems the worst fears will prove to be justified. The following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune should be carefully noted:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 5, 1963]

KILLING THE GOOSE OF THE GOLDEN EGGS

It is more than 6 months since President Kennedy signed the Revenue Act of 1962. And that is more than enough time to discover that the President, by signing it, has stunned the goose of the golden eggs. Wisdom would counsel the administration and the Congress to repeal the act before it kills the goose altogether.

Over a period of 20 years, one tax commission after another, appointed by successive Republican and Democratic administrations right up to the time of the present one, declared itself in favor of tax incentives, especially in the case of American companies doing business overseas. As a result, our companies, free of taxation abroad until they brought their profits home, prospered and multiplied.

Then came the New Frontier, and with it a pioneering instinct to unearth new fields for taxation. Some one discovered that Americans abroad were doing very well, inviting an increasing outflow of dollars to the tax-free green pastures overseas. Our New Frontiersmen went after their game with gusto. They said they wanted to discourage the outflow of dollars, to increase the inflow to the Treasury by making American companies abroad pay the same taxes as those at home and to eliminate abuses by those who established false tax havens beyond our borders.

What has been the result? According to Sidney R. Pine, one of the country's leading tax attorneys, American companies have been placed at a crippling disadvantage in competing with other foreign companies which remain tax free. They are being forced to liquidate their majority holdings overseas so as to free their companies from what amounts to discriminatory American taxes, or they are being obliged to engage in most expensive juggling acts so as to escape the major impact of the Washington blow. Many small and middle-sized firms have been discouraged from going into the foreign field altogether.

In an address to an international trade group in Toledo, Mr. Pine, a member of taxation committees of the American Bar and the New York State Bar Association, came to this conclusion:

"Treasury figures may show increased revenues from foreign operators a year from now, but they will result from liquidations and distributions made necessary by our Revenue Act.

"Over a long-range period, probably 10 years, our foreign tax revenue will drop, our balance of payments may suffer and our competitive position in world trade may be irreparably damaged."

In other words, every one will lose. The Treasury will lose the income it expects to secure. The country will lose one of its major sources of foreign revenue (the inflow of the American earnings in repatriated dollars has been far greater than the outflow in capital investment). And our companies abroad will have to cut back or go out of business.

The Treasury may have a feast if it insists on devouring the goose, but eventually it will suffer the cramps of famine when all the golden eggs are gone.

Senator Nelson Opens War on Detergents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate is fortunate in having as the new junior Senator from Wisconsin, GAYLORD NELSON. Senator NELSON's reputation in Wisconsin as a man of courage with the power of his convictions is firmly established, thanks to two most successful terms as Governor. He has recently introduced a bill which would protect America's water resources against pollution by detergents. The Senator's reputation, and his knowledge and competence in this field, are attested to in an article by Marquis Childs which appeared in the Washington Post of May 8. I ask that this be printed in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

The article follows:

SENATOR NELSON OPENS WAR ON DETERGENTS

(By Marquis Childs)

When they returned recently from their recess within a recess a number of Members of Congress reported they found people back home interested not in Laos or Cuba or even in the Rockefeller marriage and how it may affect the presidential race next year but in something much more immediate. That is how they can be sure of getting a drink of relatively unpolluted water when they turn on the tap.

Pollution of the water supply is becoming a serious problem in area after area. In many communities those who can afford it are buying bottled water. They are becoming accustomed to seeing a deposit of sediment from water out of the tap run into bathtubs and dishpans.

This has a direct bearing on conservation and the survival of fish and game. But as hundreds of newly developed chemical compounds are dumped into streams in industrial waste and used with a heavy hand in insect sprays it is a factor of still undetermined significance in the health of human beings. And as compared to the thousands of scientists at work developing new chemicals and pesticides very little is being done about this wholesale pollution of the environment.

A principal source that has been building up during the past 15 years is the chemical detergents used by millions of housewives in automatic dishwashers. Today 4 billion pounds of detergent a year are used. This chemical dissolves in water only very gradually and so, as it is dumped into sewage systems that in turn pour into streams and rivers, it is a more or less permanent cause of pollution.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin, has put in a bill which would set standards that detergent manufacturers must meet after 1965. New processes are available which at little additional cost would produce soluble detergents. This has been proved out in West Germany which pioneered the chemical detergents. There the parliament outlawed insoluble detergents after a certain date when it was shown that even principal rivers, such as the Rhine, were piled high with detergent foam.

NELSON, who as Governor pushed through a $50 million conservation program to preserve the great recreation resources of his State, told the Senate that chemical detergents had been found to have polluted the underground water in 64 of Wisconsin's 72 counties. He punctured the idea that this was a State problem which could be handled by the State, pointing out that underground water supplies following mysterious underground routes lead for hundreds of miles in all directions from Wisconsin rivers.

He called attention to the effect of detergent foam in clogging sewage plants. This foam becomes impregnated with a high bacteria count and carried by the wind it becomes an immediate health hazard. As early as 1950 the Wisconsin State Board of Health reported a wall of foam on the Mississippi River in western Wisconsin 15 feet high, 35 feet wide and 300 feet long. Some years later helicopters had to be used to blow away foam on the Baraboo River in searching for a lost boy.

The official West German institute for water, soil and air hygiene reported last year finding indications of cancer-producing effects of detergents in the water supply. This is, of course only a tentative finding. But it suggests the unknowns in the release of a vast new volume of chemicals in many environment.

A few scientists in the Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati have been studying the effects of detergent pollution. In a recent report they pointed out how dire the consequences can be as virtually all of this material finds its way into surface and groundwater. Since with the population explosion water supplies must be used over and over, the cumulative volume of detergents can be an ever-increasing menace unless it is checked.

Only the more dramatic instances get into the news. In Suffolk County, N.Y., the tap water came out foaming like beer. At one point the Federal Housing Administration refused to insure mortgages because the quality of well water showed the long-term effects of detergents from septic tank effluent.

NELSON, a freshman Senator, is convinced there is a large body of public opinion deeply concerned about pollution of the air and water and ready to respond to leadership seeking to save what is left of the American heritage and to protect defenseless individuals from poisons discharged at random into the environment. In introducing his detergent bill, he spoke of a battle to preserve the simplest basic elements necessary to human survival. This is a line that may have far more political appeal than is realized here.

James N. Milne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute, to one of the most devoted and dedicated employees this House of Representatives has ever had, James N. Milne, of Fall River, Mass.

Jim is retiring after 38 years of service as administrative assistant to our beloved former Speaker, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts. This may well be the longest continuous relationship between a Congressman and his assistant in the long history of this body. Certainly, it is a record that reflects favorably upon Jim Milne, upon Congressman MARTIN, and upon this House.

Jim Milne was a young Fall River newspaperman back in 1924 when JOE MARTIN first ran for Congress. He believed in this young politician, and he worked for him. He went to Washington with him when Congress convened in March of 1925 and he has been here, working with Congressman MARTIN, ever since.

He was at his side when our beloved former leader rose to the high honor of being elected Speaker of this House, and he was with him at several national conventions of the Republican Party when JOE MARTIN presided as chairman of the convention. He not only sat by the side of history; he has helped to make it.

Jim's retirement is now official, but I would like the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to show this tribute to him, for his lifetime of public service, for his help to many of us, for all that he has added to the good name of this honorable body.

Vessel Building Aid: Our Single Business Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, the very survival of the fishing industry is involved in proposed legislation now being considered by the Senate Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the subsidy bill which would encourage fishermen and others to invest capital in the construction of new and modern type fishing vessels.

A timely editorial in the Gloucester Times of Tuesday, May 7, deals with this vital problem, and I urge every Member to read this article which follows:

Take two farmers. One has modern, mechanized equipment: tractors, harrows, seeders, harvesters, loaders, haybalers. The other a horse, a wagon, a plow, a hayrake and his own two hands. Which can produce the most? Silly question? Well it's not so silly when you consider this is exactly the kind of situation which faces our domestic fishing industry today.

On the one hand you have U.S. vessels—take Gloucester's. Their average age is 25 years. Their equipment is rundown, wornout and often hopelessly out of date. On top of this their number is rapidly decreasing. In the past 5 years here, 35 draggers have been lost, 9 in the last 15 months alone. And, meanwhile, only two new boats have joined the fleet.

On the other hand, the fleets of other nations have grown, rapidly and impressively. In Canada, over 320 trawlers, whose landings are largely imported for American consumers and thus compete directly with ours, have been built since 1947.

Norway, Great Britain, Iceland, and the Soviet Union are also turning out new, ultramodern vessels at a dramatic pace.

And the results, simply and effectively stated last week by Donald L. McKernan, Chief of the U.S. Bureau of Fisheries, in a speech to the National Fisheries Institute: "We have the poorest fishing fleet of any major fishing nation in the world, except Red China."

Our problem then is easy: new vessels. The question is how to get them. Let's look at other nations. How do they do it? The answer: with a generous Government subsidy. Canada presently provides a 50-percent subsidy for replacing steel vessels. Great Britain offers a 30-percent subsidy for either wood or steel construction. And Norway provides long-term loans and price supports which have much the same effect.

Yet in this line the United States offers its fishermen little or nothing at all. A subsidy bill passed 3 years ago, but it was so restrictive it gave birth to only half a dozen new vessels. And on top of this, an anachronistic law, dating back to colonial times, and kept alive by the shipbuilding lobby, actually prevents us from entering a free market when it comes to contracting for new boats. It rules that no vessel built abroad may land fish at an American port. So, in effect, we are penalized twice. The Federal Government won't allow us to take advantage of lower building costs abroad, and yet it offers nothing in return, not even in the form of tariff relief, although it has been recommended by the U. S. Tariff Commission.

Our fishermen desperately need new vessels. The ancient ones they have are so inefficient they are largely useless in world competition. And their age makes them a hazard at sea. Eight men have been added to the long roll of our dead in 15 months. Three of them were lost in a vessel 74 years old. She never should have been at sea.

Yet can we ask these men to stay ashore? Can we penalize them unfairly, in effect, take away their means of livelihood by destroying free competition? No of course not.

All they ask is an opportunity to compete equitably with other nations in the world market. Given half a chance they can.

It is unlikely that the law which allows us to build U.S. fishing vessels abroad will be repealed. Therefore what we ask is simple. We ask the Federal Government to give these men a chance. Equalize the cost of building elsewhere with a subsidy payment of up to 55 percent.

This will encourage new vessel construction, create new employment and help restore our fishing fleet and the Nation's oldest industry to a position of prominence.

Slovakia as a Captive Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. Jan Sydlar, of Elizabeth, N.J., president of branch 49 of the First Catholic Slovak Union, I am pleased to call the attention of our colleagues to a petition adopted by the organization which calls on the Congress to declare Slovakia and Cuba to be captive nations.

The petition is as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States calls for the respect of the fundamental freedoms and human rights of the people of the captive nation; and

Whereas the United States of America has stood firmly on the principle of self determination, welcoming the enlargement of the area of freedom and self government and insisting on the inalienable right of the people to live under government of their own choice; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States in the House Joint Resolution 172, from March 17, 1910 classifies the Slovaks as a nationality; and

Whereas Public Law 86-90 adopted by the 86th Congress as it now stands simply classifies all persons born in Czechoslovakia by place of birth. That sort of classification carries with it no kind of social or scientific value, because everybody understands it to mean a classification by political division; and

Whereas in Czechoslovakia according to the Constitution of that country the Czechs and the Slovaks are two different nations, because of the diversity of customs, language, racial characteristics and history, merging Slovakia with Czechia as one nation would be manifestly unjust to these people; and

Whereas representative citizens of Slovak descendency petitioned U.S. Congress at several occassions to make the classification of nationality in Public Law 86-90, from July 1959, as Czechia and Slovakia, instead of Czechoslovakia; and

Whereas to permit such a classification would not work an unjustice to these people who are universally recognized as belonging to seperate and distinct nationality, but it would ascertain that the meaning of Captive Nations Week is properly understood and interpreted, and that will enable to properly carry out in the course of enumeration and compilation a just and fair classification of all the nationalities of which our population is made up; and

Whereas the establishment of just and lasting peace is inconceivable without restoration of freedom, independence, and national sovereignty to the nations of central Europe without discrimination, which objective the United States of America is determined to pursue by all feasible means; and

Whereas the tragic oppression and ruthless forces of communism prevents these freedom loving people from solving their problems by democratic means and to choose, through free and unfettered elections, national governments of their own free choice: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States reaffirms its belief in the inalienable right of the people of Slovakia to live under government of their own choice; and be it further

Resolved, That Public Law 86-90, from July 1959, which identifies the captive nation by name be implemented, that Slovakia and Cuba be declared the captive nations.

A Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Mobile Register, in its May 7 editorial, sounds a note of warning to the American people, if the trend of the Kennedy administration is permitted to continue, unchecked.

The editorial follows:

MR. ALGER'S GLOOM

In making up a list of personalitics in the Nation's Capital who are furthest from seeing eye-to-eye in politics, it would be a mistake not to include President Kennedy on the Democratic side and Representative BRUCE ALGER, of Texas, on the Republican side.

Mr. Kennedy is hammering on Federal financing for "welfare" purposes, and Mr. ALGER is warning of cradle-to-the-grave Federal intervention in the lives and affairs of the people.

At the beginning of this week, the Associated Press reported from Washington:

"President Kennedy said he was 'astonished as President to see how difficult it is to pass' what he termed 'progressive legislation.'"

He named such examples as Federal aid to education and Federal aid to mass transit.

Mr. ALGER, on the other hand, speaks in terms of alarm over the multiple "progressive" proposals favored by the New Frontier administration.

"If we listen carefully to the many speeches of President Kennedy," he says, "we find a most ominous pattern developing.

"If the plans he outlines in carefully couched terms so as to make them palatable are carried through, the end will be complete Federal control over the lives of every individual citizen and local community.

"Consider for a moment the wide range of human endeavor * * * that is now being drawn into the Federal orbit at the insistence of President Kennedy—programs in education, mass transit, juvenile delinquency, employment training, hometown youth corps, National Service Corps, medical aid, food distribution, employment service. And these do not include the tightening controls around our once free farmers."

A conspicuous fact about these separate comments is the note of gloom in each, but in opposite directions.

In the case of Congressman ALGER, if he feels a sense of gloom today, he may have occasion to feel a deeper sense of gloom tomorrow.

The push for "progressive" legislation seems likely to gain instead of lose vigor in the future unless the outlook is changed by a slowing of present trends. A thoroughly realistic appraisal produces nothing substantial to support an assumption of such a slowing.

So, as a precaution against being caught short, Mr. ALGER might be wise to save some of his gloom for a still rainier day.

As the situation shapes up today, the bulwarks against "progressive" legislation are in for an even heavier pounding.

Fantasyland Figuring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of May 8 is a sharp reminder of the ridiculous fiscal policies of the Kennedy administration and the fuzzy economic advisers surrounding him. Only the most wishful would believe that we can reduce the national debt by changing the system of bookkeeping. Realists and responsible economists know that the only way to reduce the debt is to pay it off by cutting spending and balancing the budget.

The editorial follows:

MAKING THINGS FIT

We see where the managers of the Panama Canal have gone to a lot of trouble dredging channels 6 inches deeper so it can handle ships of deeper draft. Still unresolved is the problem of how to make the locks wider and longer to accommodate today's bigger ships.

We have a small suggestion. Why don't they get the Bureau of Standards to just shrink the dimensions of the standard foot? The locks would then measure more than 110 by 1,000 feet. It's a lot less trouble than excavating.

It's a ridiculous suggestion, to be sure, because changing the measure wouldn't change the facts and everybody would know it. Still, it's a suggestion that puts us right in tune with the times.

Just the other day in Washington some learned gentlemen proposed that the Government solve its debt limit problem by changing the accounting practices. They wanted to reduce the official debt by offsetting against it the cash on hand. Perfectly reasonable accounting procedure, you understand. But while it would change the appearance, it wouldn't change the facts of the Government's debt in the slightest.

Or take some other things we measure in money, like the gross national product.

Anytime the Government wants to create $12 billion or so of new dollars and go spend them, it can increase the GNP. This has lots of advantages. It makes it look like we are growing like crazy. And of course the bigger you make the GNP figure, the smaller you make the Government's deficit and its debt as a percentage of the GNP. And since the deficit and the debt then look smaller, why worry?

Makes us feel sorry for those folks who run the Panama Canal. Steel and concrete are a lot harder to shrink than the people's dollars.

Gov. Pat Brown Speaks Out on Capital Punishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter written by the distinguished Governor of California to the New York Herald Tribune; it is an eloquent statement of the case against the imposition of the death penalty. It appeared in the May 5, 1963, edition of the Herald Tribune.

The letter follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 5, 1963]

CONSCIENCE DEMANDS AN END TO EXECUTIONS

To the HERALD TRIBUNE:

It is my strong conviction that the death penalty should be abolished.

I oppose capital punishment because I am convinced it does not deter crime; because it is more vengeful than punitive; because it is more an act of hate than of justice.

We kill the murderer because we fear him, not because he is beyond rehabilitation or control. We kill him not for his crime, but in the blind hope that others may not commit his crime.

And we can take no pride from the knowledge that we often equate the darkness of a man's crime with the darkness of his skin—his right to live with the rightness of his status in life.

I oppose capital punishment, too, because it brutalizes man; because a society that takes human life cannot invest its citizens with respect for human life. I am giving my full support to a measure before the California Legislature to establish a 4-year moratorium on capital punishment.

The measure excepts from the moratorium those who commit first-degree murder after a prior conviction for the same offense; those who commit first-degree murder involving two or more victims; those who murder in the course of a kidnaping; those who murder while in lawful custody; those who murder a peace officer or a person assisting a peace officer in the performance of his duty.

I accept these five exemptions not because I believe they will deter the crimes in question. I accept them because they remove the most common objections in California to total abolition. It is better that we move one step away from the barbaric practice of capital punishment than not move at all.

The evidence is overwhelming that the existence of the death penalty does not deter crime. The incontrovertible proof is to be found in those States and nations which have given up the death penalty.

The random application of capital punishment in California makes a mockery of the deterrent argument. In 1961 there were 609 homicides in California. But it is probable that only 12 of the defendants actually will surrender their lives to the State—12 of 609. What possible deterrence can there be in a penalty invoked only 2 percent of the time? What person contemplating murder will be stopped from committing the crime when he knows he has 49 chances in 50 of escaping the gas chamber?

In California last year we took the lives of six Caucasians and five members of minority races. Nationally in 1961 civil authorities took the lives of 42 persons. Of this number 20 were Caucasians and 22 were Negroes—a ratio far out of proportion both to population and division of offenses.

Can we deny that capital punishment imposes a further, and fatal, discrimination against those among us who already are the most common victims of bigotry and prejudice?

As for the poor of all races, it is clear we execute them in disproportionate numbers because they lack the resources to retain the most skillful counsel or to press their cases to the ultimate.

I believe we must banish the death penalty as an act of public conscience. I believe California should join those States and nations which recognize that no society is infallible in its judgments and that no man is beyond hope—beyond our power and God's to redeem him.

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor of California.

Rumanian Holiday Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, for many decades May 10 has been a traditional holiday for the people of Rumania. Because their homeland is now occupied, the holiday can only be observed openly by Rumanians outside the country's borders and in the hearts of those still in their native land.

Even though another official holiday has been declared by the occupying forces the importance of the May 10 date cannot be overshadowed. Rumania's independence of the past is a proud memory in the hearts and minds of all Rumanians and this day is a symbol which encourages these people to retain the faith and hope that freedom will once again return to their homeland.

I am proud to join with freedom-loving people everywhere in saluting these courageous people and to assure them that their cause has not been forgotten.

Law: The Way to World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, on May 1 citizens throughout the Nation payed homage to Law Day. Great orations were delivered as some of our most articulate leaders surveyed the past, studied the present, and scanned the future. It was a day when all Americans reaffirmed their belief in a government of laws functioning within the framework of the Constiution.

But the chief value of Law Day would not be achieved if it were only an occasion for laudatory remarks about the Constitution. For while we Americans live in a land of law, we cannot survive as a nation or as a people unless we live in a world of law. The alternative to world law is world war.

Paul Anders, a young man in my district who is a junior at Bonita High School, excellently expressed this belief in words which won him first prize in the third annual Law Day Essay Contest sponsored by the Citrus Lawyers' Wives Club. The scope of Paul's intellectual and writing ability is best illustrated by the fact that he competed with 150 students representing 10 high schools

For his perceptive insight into the world's most critical need, Paul was awarded a personal trophy and a $100 savings bond. A perpetual trophy was presented to Bonita High School, in recognition of its role in the intellectual and moral development of this outstanding young man.

It behooves this Congress to heed the message of Paul Anders, for there can be no doubt that our actions today forge his tomorrow.

The essay follows:

HOW THE LAW AFFECTS OUR LIVES—LAW: THE WAY TO WORLD PEACE

Today the world stands on the brink of a danger so terrible and threatening that it is forced to shrink back in horror: the looming possibility of nuclear war. Its threat is felt in the lives of most humans on the globe. Many plans, both practical and idealistic, have been put forth as possible deterrents to this awful menace.

Heading the list of workable ideas is the possibility of world cooperation under an acceptable system of law, regulating the affairs of all nations. Some consider this to be a utopian concept, not feasible for today's affairs. But is it? I think not. I feel that hope for world peace through world law is the brightest and perhaps the only possibility left to mankind in his effort to solve international differences.

Since history is said to repeat itself, we can look to history in this matter. Man has tried a number of means to gain world peace. Unfortunately, they have, in most cases, been war and conflict. The world has tried war and it has proved to be a miserable failure in gaining prolonged peace. In the past 20 years we have fought two wars. Yet, do we have peace? In recent time war has but changed one set of enemies for another. War has achieved peace for a short period, eventually repeating itself in ever more frightening aspects. Today war is not even considerable as a peace-prolonging agent. The results of nuclear war are all too well known to most of us. We have no recourse but to try a new, more rational road to peace. Law is the paving of this roadway.

It is evident that men in many nations of the world have realized the need for a different approach to solving the problem of world conflict, the approach of world law. A number of steps have already been taken in this direction. The most shining of these is the United Nations and its auxiliary organizations and agencies. This body has proved that it is possible for nations to function in an orderly and legal manner when differences arise. It has provided a common ground for talks on world problems and a rudimentary system of rules and laws by which members are expected to abide. Yet, when one evaluates the organization of world laws in its present form, one notes a need for growth.

For example, it has become increasingly evident that a more advanced legal system is needed to control world affairs. This system must be endowed with powers of enforcement, to back up its laws and resolutions.

Even more basic is a need for a change in national and individual attitudes, as exhibited by the open contempt held by some nations toward the rules of the Assembly. The attitudes of individuals are a fundamental factor in the functioning system of legality. An order of law is only efficient when it commands the respect and obedience of those whom it affects. Only when individual citizens recognize the law, any law, for what it is, the protection of the rights of all people, will that system become the true motivating force toward the order for which it was designed. This applies to world law as much as to any law.

The question then arises, is such acceptance by the world of an international legal system possible? This question would not exist if political, emotional, and sociological boundaries were entirely removed. The fact that such limitations do exist, blocking efforts toward world peace through world law, is painfully evident. However, there is evidence that the future unity of the world is not so impossible as people once thought. Psychologists tell us today that men everywhere have basically the same wants, desires, and aspirations. If this is so, then merely manmade institutions stand in the path of peace. I am not attempting to suggest that such institutions will ever be entirely removed, but it does seem feasible that cooperation and coalition could be achieved to some degree. Herein lies the hope and future of world law and organization.

It is my opinion that it is not only the privilege but the responsibility of mankind, today and in the future, to create truly effective means of controlling world affairs through law. It will not be easy. It is always more difficult to summon the patience and intelligence required to deal with a problem peacefully than to resort to the easier method of force. The situation is not insurmountable. Let us work toward the day when we shall see world peace through world law realized. It is imperative that this be our goal. As a nation, citizens of the world, and members of the human race we must, and I am confident that we will, build the road to world peace.

Fort Lauderdale News Puts Birmingham Situation in Proper Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable comment about the activities of the Negro agitators in the city of Birmingham in the past few weeks. The true picture of what is going on in Birmingham is very hard to ascertain if one relies only on published reports. I have been in touch with the situation ever since its beginning. Yesterday I took the Well of the House to clarify some of the elements of the trouble that is being visited on my home city due to the activities of outsiders who have no stake in Birmingham's growth, welfare, or progress.

I believe the following editorial from the Fort Lauderdale News of Fort Lauderdale, Fla., puts the Birmingham situation into a proper perspective. I insert the editorial by Mr. William A. Mullen herewith.

The editorial follows:

[From the Fort Lauderdale News, May 6, 1963]

BIRMINGHAM SITUATION CAN LIGHT EXPLOSIVE FUSE TO RACE TENSIONS

The situation in Birmingham, Ala., should be of the greatest concern to every American dedicated to the peace and prosperity of the United States.

The danger inherent in the Birmingham racial strife is not confined to the personal safety and well-being of the citizens, Negro and white, in that beleaguered city. A very real fact of the matter is that the planned and carefully executed Negro demonstrations there can be the spark that will explode racial tensions elsewhere in the entire Nation.

To the chagrin and dismay of law-abiding citizens, there have been race riots in the past in some of our northern cities. They are ugly affairs and they leave a trail of dead and injured in their wake, along with a community scar that never is quite healed.

Moreover, the hyper news coverage of the Birmingham demonstrations presents the story with the accent on the activities of the demonstrators and is a choice morsel for the hungry propaganda machine of the Communists.

Especially to be deplored is the use of schoolchildren as innocent "fronts" in a movement that is patently a conspiracy on the part of professional racists and agitators.

Aside from exposing the youngsters to the terror and brutality that can erupt when such demonstrations get out of hand, the exploitation cannot help but be a false lesson to them to take the law in their own hands when a real or fancied purpose is to be served.

This is completely contrary to the established processes of the United States and it makes a mockery of a proclamation issued only last week by President Kennedy in declaring Law Day, U.S.A. as an occasion that contrasts the American peaceful, legal foundations with the dictatorships and violence in Communist-controlled nations.

Leaders of the racial demonstrations cannot help but be fully aware of the fact that they are violating the law in sending wave after wave of their troops to taunt and defy the police.

Those leaders, who include Martin Luther King and officials of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, must fully realize that many demonstrators may be injured, or even killed.

Obviously, they couldn't care less, for one NAACP officer has warned that blood "will flow in the streets" before the racial revolution is over. The sad fact is that he might be correct, and that blood might flow wherever there is a mixed population of Negroes and whites.

That eventually would be the worst setback for racial harmony possible and would have a reverse effect on the desired objectives of advancement of the Negroes. We do not believe that most of our Negro citizens favor this hotblooded approach for that very reason.

The Birmingham demonstrations are not true symptoms of an evil condition in a Southern city because they obviously are the result of a conspiracy of racists and rabble-rousers from elsewhere who have made that city a target.

Validity of the noble purpose of improving the lot of the Negro on the Birmingham battleground becomes more suspect with the United Press International report that King agreed to secret negotiations with Birmingham business and professional leaders to improve conditions for the city's Negroes, then backed out.

The source was Rev. Albert S. Foley, S.J., a sociology professor and chairman of the Alabama Advisory Committee to the U.S. Civil Rights Committee. Father Foley said King at first agreed to his personal appeal to call off the demonstrations in favor of the meetings, then changed his mind without notice.

Father Foley said a member of King's organization told him that its treasury was nearly depleted and that the demonstrations were needed to spark sagging contributions, the UPI report stated.

Now if that is the case, and certainly the truthfulness of a Roman Catholic priest who has dedicated his life to the service of God and His people is to be accepted, then it must be conceded that the entire underlying purpose of the demonstrations places the value of money over the value of the people callously being misled.

No person with a spark of humanity in his soul should condone or support such a conspiracy having a contrived purpose concealed by a false cloak of nobility. And if President Kennedy has had the time to telephone Martin Luther King personally while he was jailed for racial disturbances, then he should take the time to make another call advising the Reverend Mr. King to cease and desist in Birmingham for the common good—before it is too late.

Both Reverend King and the President could set a better example for racial harmony and advancement for the Negro by concentrating their efforts on the District of Columbia, where civil rights without civil responsibilities transform the Capital of the United States into a vicious jungle every night.

WILLIAM A. MULLEN.

Tribute on 50th Anniversary of Southern California Flower Growers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, beautiful, fresh cut flowers decorated the tables at the annual joint dinner of the California State Society and of the California representatives to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce meeting, which was held at the International Inn April 30, 1963. These special touches of living color, which remind so many of us of our native California, were contributed this year, as they have been for the past decade, by the Southern California Flower Growers, Inc., of Los Angeles.

The members of this association are Americans of Japanese ancestry, many of whom served with honor in the Armed Forces of our country during World War II and in Korea. They contribute fresh cut flowers for table decorations and corsages for the ladies every year to remind us that those of Japanese ancestry in this country, as those of similar ancestry in their native Japan, are specialists in the art of growing flowers and in imparting a sense of beauty to the contemporary scene. Moreover, they and their parents before them have contributed much to the development of flower growing as one of California's major industries.

The Japanese flower growers in southern California, some 36 in number, first organized their flower market at Fourth and Los Angeles Streets in Los Angeles in 1913. Their first market space comprised 20 by 60 feet.

This year they celebrate their 50th year of continuous service, except for the war years when persons of Japanese ancestry were evacuated from their west coast homes and associations, by dedicating in September the largest flower market in the United States where producers can gather and sell their products. It will be the only flower market in the Nation built solely for the floral industry. It will be on the spot where for the past 40 years the flower market has flourished—in the center of the wholesale flower district.

This three-story concrete building, which will have a floor area of some 190,000 square feet, costing more than $2 million, and completely air conditioned, will be a living memorial to the American sense of living beauty as expressed in natural flowers and a tribute to the Japanese-Americans who have contributed so much to the development of California and to the flower industry.

Initially grossing only $5 a day, in the past half-century the flower market has grown to the point where it now grosses more than $25 million per year. From some 36 growers in 1913, it grew to accommodate 124 growers in a single year, when the market was incorporated and moved to Fourth and Wall Streets in 1914. In 10 years, by 1923, the market had expanded to serve some 159 members and the market moved to its present location, at 755 Wall Street, in the heart of Los Angeles' wholesale flower market district.

After World War II, when Japanese-Americans were allowed to return to their former homes in California and elsewhere on the west coast, only about a hundred of its former members returned to the flower market. Others returned but did not go back into the flower business because their former properties were no longer available to them, because of their inability to purchase needed land, because of their failure to find qualified help. These moved into other fields, some more lucrative or more appropriate to their talents than horticulture.

In any event, today the flower market services some 100 members, who have nurseries in an area extending from just south of San Francisco to San Diego County. Thes members produce approximately 65 percent of all the flowers sold in southern California. These 100 members, incidentally, now produce with modern and improved technology and mechanization more than the 159 members produced just prior to World War II.

The cut flower and ornamental plants industry of California, whose products are shipped not only to all parts of the United States but to many other countries of the free world is now an $85 million a year operation. There has been a stready growth in production over the years, although the number of producers has decreased. The industry has seen the transition from the family-type nurseries to modern corporations, complete with staffs for research, production, and sales. The so-called small producers today tend to grow the miscellaneous products, with their great and endless variety, while the large producers tend to specialize in the regular sales items, such as stocks, roses, gladiolus, and carnations. As with other American industries, the marginal growers have been dropping out and the industry faces new challenges from plastic flowers and flower substitutes. But the California industry continues to believe that one can say it better with flowers.

In any event, the growth and expansion of the southern California flower growers and its market have paralleled the remarkable and spectacular growth and expansion of all of California, and especially the Los Angeles area.

The development of the market is a commentary on the dedication and conscientious effort of its officers and members over the years not only in trying to grow the most beautiful flowers in the world most efficiently but also in cooperative effort to better serve the flower-buying public at both the wholesale and retail levels. Their success story is another example of combining industry with integrity in the finest tradition of the American frontier.

The present officers of the flower market are Gongoro Endo, president; Kazuo Minami, vice president; George Kobata, secretary; Tom Endow, treasurer; and Frank Kuwahara, general manager.

So, as this unique group of Californians celebrate their 50th anniversary of service to its members and the people of the State and Nation, I know that Members will join with me in congratulating them on their success and achievements in the past half century and express the hope that the next 50 years will see them enjoy continued growth and prosperity.

Resolution by the Propeller Club of the United States, Port of Buffalo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a resolution adopted by the Propeller Club of the United States, Port of Buffalo, expressing opposition to H.R. 4700 and S. 1061 which would exempt railroads from regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission on minimum rates for bulk commodities.

As one who has been vitally interested in the improvement and expansion of our port facilities, I commend the Propeller Club for taking this action against any possible threat to the survival of the water transportation industry which would adversely affect the port of Buffalo, N.Y.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION BY THE PROPELLER CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES, PORT OF BUFFALO

Whereas the port of Buffalo is the major eastern terminus of the Great Lakes system and the western terminus of the Erie Barge Canal; and

Whereas Buffalo in large measure owes its position as an industrial and commercial center to the distinct economic advantages afforded it by low cost transportation of bulk commodities such as iron ore, coal, limestone and grain over the Great Lakes system; and

Whereas such low-cost water transportation continues to be of critical importance to the growth and prosperity of the Port of Buffalo and of the entire Nation; and

Whereas the economies of such water transportation have been preserved by the presence of Federal minimum rate regulation of competitive rail traffic for the benefit of the citizens of Buffalo, the Niagara Frontier and the public in general by the absence of large scale below cost rate cutting on the part of the railroads which by reason of their vastly superior resources could sustain the ravages of such destructive rate practices, to the ultimate elimination of the inherently lower cost water carrier; and

Whereas it is now proposed in S. 1061 and H.R. 4700, now before Congress, to exempt railroads from the regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission over their minimum rates for carriage of bulk commodities; and

Whereas such legislation would seriously endanger the continued survival of the water transportation industry of the Great Lakes upon which the port of Buffalo and the general public so greatly depend: Now, therefore, it is

Resolved, That the Propeller Club of the United States, port of Buffalo, strongly opposes any such measures as contained in S. 1061 and H.R. 4700 withdrawing or diminishing the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission over potentially distructive railroad ratemaking; and be it further

Resolved, That the port of Buffalo directs that its vigorous opposition to these proposals be communicated to the Congress of the United States through its representatives and the appropriate committees.

Take Note

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article from the Pittsburgh Press of May 8, 1963:

TAKE NOTE

(By Gilbert Love)

Anyone who might think he could make money at a racetrack should heed some statistics in the May 6 issue of Sports Illustrated.

Dr. Raymond Hammond, professor of philosophy at Johns Hopkins University and a horse player himself, makes the point that the tax collectors take about one-sixth of the money bet on every race.

The frequent bettor, he says, may be paying a sales tax of 100 percent for the privilege of gambling.

Some other bits of information I've been picking up here and there, in the hope that they might be of some personal interest to you, include a Government report that one-fourth of all American men go fishing. A fifth go hunting.

If you think you'd enjoy some organized hiking, biking, canoeing, etc., this is a good time to find out what's available.

This is American Youth Hostel Week. The Pittsburgh Chapter of American Youth Hostel will put on a canoeing demonstration at the Monongahela Wharf at 6:30 tonight, then adjourn to its headquarters for a canoeing movie.

Tomorrow night at 8 there will be a general open house at headquarters, which is in the Arts and Crafts Center, 6300 Fifth Avenue.

A bumper plate saying "Keep Pennsylvania Clean and Green, can be obtained by sending $1 to the Carrick Sportsmen's Club Box 7917, Pittsburgh, Pa., according to its president, Steve Cupka.

Moving companies—at least the members of the Mayflower organization—have family counselors who can tell a housewife just about anything she wants to know about moving and establishing a home in a strange city. That is pointed out in a letter from Donna Walker, who is counselor with Shanahan-Mayflower here.

The National Safety Council estimates that 5,000 lives a year could be saved if all cars were equipped with safety belts and all autoists used them.

Since 1959 this country has been buying more steel from other nations than it has been able to sell abroad, a pamphlet of the American Iron and Steel Institute points out.

That's not just important to Pittsburgh. The pamphlet says American steelworkers and their families number 2,250,000, and the industry has a million stockholders.

Americans own 1,200,000 vacation houses and they are increasing at a rate of 100,000 a year.

Surprising statistics—

Autos take 41 million Americans to and from work, while buses and trolleys take 2,500,000.

The average family spends $9 a year on postage.

Installment buying has increased 1,000 percent in the past 20 years. Still the delinquency rate is only about 1 percent.

Writing to Your Congressman: The Way and the Wherefore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 9, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE]. The article is full of excellent advice. I commend it to every Member of the House—and to our constituents:

WRITING TO YOUR CONGRESSMAN: THE WAY AND THE WHEREFORE

Any newspaper reporter—whether he be a potential Walter Lippmann still admiring his framed journalism degree or an experienced political analyst in Washington—is familiar with the famous five "W's." Answers to the five questions—who, why, what, when, and where—are the ingredients of a good news story.

Curiously enough, the five "W's" can also be applied to the important business of writing to your Congressman.

The answers to the first two, "who" and "why," nibble at the very roots of American democracy. Every citizen has a right to representation, and his Congressman in Washington is elected to preserve and extend those rights. It is perfectly clear, then, that every citizen has (to coin a phrase) a right to write.

The best reason for writing to your Congressman is to make sure that he is, in fact, representing you and will continue to work diligently for the best interests of both his district and the Nation. Don't forget either that your Congressman represents all the people of his district regardless of their political party. Though your views on some issues might differ, he will still be interested in hearing from you.

"What" should you write your Congressman about? This is a difficult question, and the obvious answer may be the best one. You should write when you are deeply affected by an issue or a bill before the Congress. Chances are—if you actually take the time and trouble to write—you believe deeply in a particular viewpoint or bill. You are expressing the innate desire of man to be understood, to communicate, and to have a voice in all decisions affecting his future.

This said, it is best to write your Congressman as though you were talking to him in person. You should be straightforward, sincere, and brief. A good crisp letter which explains your position in four or five solid paragraphs is more effective than a rambling, three- or four-page speech which exhausts both you and the Congressman. In deciding what to write, individuality should be the first consideration. Your Representative wants to know what you feel as a voter and a citizen.

Your Congressman, naturally, is interested in those local problems which relate to the Federal Government. While he always wants to hear about specific bills before the Congress, he also wants to know how you feel about such important matters as civil rights, foreign affairs, and domestic issues that are not voted on daily, except indirectly. Another thing to remember is that a vast number of issues involve State and local governments and have no relation to the Federal Government. Make certain that the man to whom you write is the one who can be of help to you. Your Congressman can be of little real assistance, for example, in improving the effectiveness of local police. This is strictly a municipal or county matter.

The question of "when" is also vital, as timing always is. A quarterback calls his signals on Saturday and not on Monday. After one game is over, he must begin preparing for the next. Similarly, the time to write is during the strategic preparation stages before a vote of the full House is taken. Obviously, it doesn't mean much to "Monday morning quarterback" a measure after it has been voted on.

Finally, everyone knows "where" to write his Congressman, but often people fail to realize that many have offices in their districts. Find out where his office is and try to meet him. I, for instance, hold office hours in the larger cities and towns as often as possible and maintain a congressional office in my hometown.

A few hints may be in order now that general answers have been suggested for the five "W's." Four basic essentials to keep in mind are: (1) Know what you are talking about; (2) tell your Congressman how the proposed legislation will affect you and your business; (3) believe in the value of a personal letter rather than a form or petition; and (4) don't forget to write legibly and always include your address, even on petitions. This can save both time and temper and assures an answer. Above all, remember that more meaning will be placed on the sincere, individual approach. It is possible that one forthright letter will be more valuable than 10 signatures scribbled on a petition or 20 form letters.

A Congressman receives up to 275 letters a day when pressing issues confront the Nation, with a daily average of 150 letters. Since January 9 of this year, my office has answered 125 pieces of mail each day, in spite of the fact that no major legislation is pending as yet. So you can see how important every minute becomes. More than ever before, a Congressman spends his time helping you—his constituents—bridge the growing gap between the individual and ever-increasing big Government.

To conclude on a personal note, I encourage the closest possible ties with the people of my district. I want to see them when they are in Washington and talk with them at home. When this is not possible, I ask them to write whenever they wish. I am happy to report that the response has been enthusiastic.

In this way, I feel that I am discharging a portion of my responsibilities in the proper manner. I think that I can sensibly judge the thinking and sometimes actually feel the pulse of my district. Only in this way can a Congressman truly represent his people as their agent and deputy before the highest legislative tribunal in the land.

Polish National Holiday

SPEECH
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Poland's contribution to the cause of liberty and freedom throughout the world is second to none. The people of the United States will never forget Poland's sympathy, understanding, and contribution to the cause of the American Revolution. We will never forget her gallant fight on the continent of Europe for individual liberty. The people of Poland fought desperately and valiantly against the unprovoked aggression of the ruthless Nazi armies.

It is fitting and proper that we all pause to honor the great Polish people on the Polish national holiday. All freedom-loving people join in the earnest hope that Poland will soon be free from Communist oppression. We must never forget that when the Nazi armies under Hitler invaded Poland September 1, 1939, almost simultaneously Poland was stabbed in the back by a dastardly invasion from the East by the Red armies of Communist Russia.

Until the day of liberation from communism, the people of Poland will have the prayers and best wishes of the American people.

Tribute to the Honorable Emanuel Celler on the Occasion of His 75th Birthday

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, a child was born in the city of Brooklyn on May 6, 1888. Few people realized at that time that he would be, on his 75th birthday, the dean of the New York congressional delegation. I refer to the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, a man who has served his city, State, and Nation with honor.

EMANUEL CELLER, our colleague in the House of Representatives, attended the public schools and the public high schools of the city of New York. He was graduated from Columbia College and in 1912 from Columbia Law School. He practiced law for about 10 years, and then was elected to the 68th Congress in 1922. He has served in this body in all succeeding Congresses. There is one man in the House of Representatives who has served longer than he, the Honorable CARL VINSON.

It has been an honor for me to know and to serve as a colleague in the House of Representatives with EMANUEL CELLER. In that period of time I have developed a deep respect for him as a colleague and as a personal friend. His integrity, his ability, and his wit have added much to the deliberations of the House of Representatives.

During his 40 years of service, EMANUEL CELLER has sponsored and had enacted into law more than 100 bills. He has been a leader in the fight for civil rights and he has shown courage in his fight in the antimonopoly field. He is presently the chairman of that important Committee on Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

The fact that the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER has been returned to the House of Representatives for these many years shows the high esteem in which he is held by his constituents and by those who know him.

On this occasion of EMANUEL CELLER's 75th birthday, I wish him the best of health and God's blessings for the remainder of his years.

The Remarkable Kadoorie Brothers of Hong Kong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, two of the finest people I know are Lawrence and Horace Kadoorie; I am proud to call them my friends. For many years they have followed the example set by their father by helping people to help themselves.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the story of these good people that appeared in the May, 1963, issue of the Reader's Digest:

THE REMARKABLE KADOORIE BROTHERS OF HONG KONG

(By Clarence W. Hall)

In many parts of the world I've witnessed the shine of pride on the faces of people who have achieved security for themselves and their families, against great obstacles. But never have I seen such radiant faces as those in Cheung Sheung, a village I stumbled upon recently while roving Hong Kong's "New Territories"—that portion of the colony on the mainland which fronts the Chinese border. The villagers, all refugees from Red terror, buzzed about me, eager to show me their lush little farms, their pin-neat homes, their healthy broods of pigs, chickens and geese.

Suddenly over the hubbub I heard a shout, and the crowd left me to surge toward the road where an ancient motorcar was approaching. The car braked to a stop, two white men leaped out and were promptly engulfed by the crowd. One of the men, smiling and businesslike, began asking questions. The other, stocky and merryeyed, handed out little packets of raisins to the children.

It wasn't until I heard a familiar name amid the excited voices that I realized the newcomers' identities: Lawrence and Horace Kadoorie, sons of a multimillionaire Jewish philanthropist, who operate one of the most effective privately sponsored onslaughts on human need anywhere in the world.

In the past 12 years the Kadoorie Agricultural Aid Association has helped more than 300,000 poverty stricken refugees and peasants, turning some 75,000 into independent farmers. Thanks largely to KAAA, the colony's farm production has more than tripled.

Between 1949 and 1951 hundreds of thousands of refugees from Red China, most of them destitute, poured into the city of Hong Kong and the rural New Territories. Government and private relief agencies did what they could. But when the tide swelled the colony's population to nearly three times its postwar level, the Kadoorie brothers knew from past experience that mere relief was not enough. To discover the dimensions of Hong Kong's vast mosaic of misery, they went among the mushrooming squatter settlements to see for themselves. They made two heartening discoveries: First, these refugees were no drifters; they had left their homes because of their convictions. Second, they asked for no charity, only work.

But what kind of work? The answer, since the majority were peasants, seemed to lie in agriculture. In 1951 the Kadoories formed the KAAA, designed to help the impoverished secure a living through farming. The fact that such a program would cost millions did not deter them. The brothers told government officials, "We'll finance it if you make unused Crown land available and give us the aid of your agriculture experts."

To show what could be done, the KAAA transplanted 14 refugee families to a rocky, arid hillside of 3½ acres, with a bombed out structure that would serve as temporary shelter. Each family was given its own plot. "This land is nothing but stones," some protested. "Fine," Horace Kadoorie replied. With these stones you can build pigsties while clearing the land. I'll supply cement, and for every pigsty you build I will give you two pigs."

The villagers soon were in the pork business. Ingeniously, they filled and terraced the rocky slope, constructed irrigation channels, built up soil fertility by adding loam and manure. In their first year they produced not only enough food for their own use but made a gross profit of HK$11,370 (a Hong Kong dollar is 17½ cents in U.S. currency).

At the village of Nim Shue Wan a number of families were settled on land reclaimed from the sea by a seawall. To get them started, the KAAA gave cement, wells, pumps, a sailing junk for transport, and a number of pigs. It also made available to them loans [1] of HK$16,300, interest-free, for expansion. These loans have now been repaid, and the villagers number more than 100 prospering families.

In the beginning, KAAA's contribution was largely in the form of gifts. To make land and future markets accessible, a network of more than 150 miles of roads and paths, plus 142 bridges, was constructed with KAAA materials and village labor. Ferry service was essential for island villages; the Kadoories provided junks and constructed 27 piers. For water supply and irrigation in water-short Hong Kong, 293 dams, 400 wells, 8 reservoirs and 30 miles of channels were built or repaired. Where sea or rivers would wash away fertile farmland, seawalls, culverts and floodgates were built. More than 1,100 villages benefited.

One important achievement has been the Kadoorie experimental and extension farm, started 6 years ago in Park Ngau Shek. Though both European and Chinese agriculturalists declared the steep, stony hillsides of this area valueless, the Kadoories procured 360 acres. Within months a small army of refugees turned these acres into what is perhaps the most impressive agricultural experiment station in the Far East. Here the Kadoories have scotched many old farmers' tales. For one, it had been accepted for generations that citrus fruit would not grow on these barren slops. That theory was exploded when Horace found a tangerine tree flowering there. Today, Pak Ngau Shek grows thousands of citrus trees, has triggered a "village orchard plan" and supplied 80 villages with 25,000 trees.

Also from Pak Ngau Shek come many varieties of vegetables and fruit seldom seen before in Hong Kong. The Kadoories' fat and heavy breasted Pekin ducks and new crossbreed chickens are the finest in the area. And their success in the breeding of pigs has been so great that Hong Kong's pig population has increased from 8,000 in 1945 to around 400,000 today, vastly easing the colony's dependence on pork imports from Red China.

---

[1] In 1955 the Government joined the brothers in a mutually financed loan fund.

The Kadoories choose their beneficiaries almost willynilly; any needy person can apply; none is turned away without being given a chance. Remarkably few fail.

A good example of success: four farmers and their families who made it across the border almost 8 years ago. In jampacked Hong Kong, they lived in tiny cardboard huts with no land and nobody to hire them. The Kadoories gave them deeds to adjoining plots of land, each with a small house and a few pigs and chickens and two cows jointly owned. There were two strings attached: they were not to sell any property for a year, and they were to follow faithfully the advice of agriculture experts.

The four families thrived. In 3½ years, needing more land, they split their holdings to go their separate ways. Each family's share came to HK$35,000. Since then all have prospered.

It was the Kadoorie brothers' remarkable father, Sir Elly Kadoorie, who established the family fortune and philanthropy that has so benefited Hong Kong. Sir Elly was born in Baghdad, Iraq. At an early age he left home for India and China, became a British subject, and built a fortune in rubber, banking, and real estate. Once poor himself, he held a firm belief that "wealth is a sacred trust to be administered for the good of society." He built schools and hospitals in Iraq, Iran, India, Syria, Turkey, France, Portugal, and China. He was the first to provide educational facilities for girls in many parts of the Middle East. For such broad scale philanthropy, he was knighted in 1926 by Britain's King George V.

When Lawrence and Horace Kadoorie took their places in the family firm of Sir Elly Kadoorie & Sons, they continued their father's benefactions. Today there are 36 major institutions spread over the globe that bear the Kadoorie name.

Horace, a 60-year-old bachelor who gives personal management to the KAAA, is usually up and away from home by dawn, his car a familiar sight on roads leading to refugee villages. This way he gets in a few extra hours mingling with KAAA-sponsored farmers, and finding new ones, before going to the office. Says Horace, "There's more fun in showing one man how to stand on his own feet than in creating a dozen successful businesses."

Lawrence Kadoorie, 63, is brisk and energetic, a dedicated believer in the free enterprise system with the inherent responsibility it imposes. "Let the 'have' nations beware," he recently told a group of international diplomats. "Salvation for our free way of life lies not in handouts or charity, but in creating conditions under which those who need help can help themselves."

Last year the Kadoorie brothers received southeast Asia's most coveted recognition—the Ramón Magsaysay Public Service Award. A noted Australian magazine publisher called their work "the greatest two-man stand against communism I have ever seen." The brothers merely smile and quote Edmund Burke: "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing."

Jessica Weis

SPEECH

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it is written in the Book of Job:

> The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord.

Truly blessed were we with his gift to us of Jessica Weis. She enriched the lives of all of us who were privileged to know her and to serve with her in the Congress. She was a lady of great personal charm and unusual ability. Her accomplishments were many, extending beyond these Halls of Congress, for the advancement of the public good. They are a lasting monument to her.

But now, the Lord, in His wisdom, has taken her away. We miss her deeply. We find it difficult to understand why she is no longer with us. We grieve, not for her but for ourselves. We need not grieve for her, for it is she who is now blessed with the peace and the joys in the life hereafter promised to such as she.

Mr. Speaker, Judy Weis was one of the finest women I have known. Her departure is a personal loss. I extend my heartfelt sympathy to her children, her grandchildren and her loved ones.

Jessica McCullough Weis

SPEECH

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I join the Members of this body in an expression of the deepest sorrow over the death of our friend, and former colleague, Jessica McCullough Weis.

I was privileged to know and work with Judy Weis for over 20 years and I can say without qualification that her record of service to this Nation is unsurpassed. Few persons—male or female—have contributed more than our beloved Judy to the good fight to maintain and strengthen the two-party system. Always the lady—an epitome of femininity—her public life was a credit to the women of the Nation. Her great accomplishments will serve as a lasting memorial to her cherished memory. Judy's sincere concern for the welfare of her fellow man and for the future of our Nation, which she loved dearly, led her to direct her many talents and expend her boundless energy along the many avenues of public service into which her wisdom and perceptiveness directed her. She possessed some inate grasp of problems in all their complexity. Her beauty, her charm, her smile seemed to light up a room when she entered to participate in the matter at hand, and, in her wisdom, lead those present directly to the heart of the matter, shedding away the superfluous as if by magic.

I am proud to have been privileged to enter the Congress with this great lady and to have served with her in the subsequent Congresses. I shall always cherish my years of friendship with Judy, and the privilege of serving as her classmate in this House.

It was with heavy heart that I learned last year that she planned to retire on her doctor's advice. Now we are indeed saddened to learn of her untimely passing, but we take hope in the knowledge that her unflagging spirit will be a guiding light for those who carry on her many endeavors and will remain as a lasting tribute to the memory of this wonderful lady.

To her family and friends, I extend my very deep sympathy in this hour of sorrow. Her loss is felt throughout the Nation and we shall always cherish the loving memory of this great lady and fine human being.

The Hatch Act: Political Rights and Duties of Civil Service Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in 1964 the citizens of the District of Columbia will, for the first time, cast their ballots in a national election for President and Vice President. This enfranchisement of District voters is reflected in the increased activity of our major political parties within the District. Since such a high percentage of the residents of the District, and in surrounding counties in Maryland and Virginia, are civil service employees of the Federal Government, it is inevitable that the question of the Hatch Act should become a major item of discussion.

As designed by Congress, the Hatch Act spells out the responsibilities of the Federal employee, as well as guaranteeing him the right to vote and the right to express his own individual opinions. It provides the dedicated civil servant with protection from political pressures, and insures to all Americans impartial administration of the Government.

To answer any questions and clear up any confusion in the minds of civil service employees with regard to the Hatch Act, I am including herewith the substance of an April 11, 1963, lecture by District of Columbia Republican Chairman Carl Shipley to a class in Legal Aspects of Political Activity.

Mr. Shipley's remarks follow:

THE HATCH ACT

This law was intended by Congress to protect Federal civil-service employees. It prohibits the following:

(1) Use of official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting its results.

(2) Taking an active part in political management or in political campaigns.

In addition to the Hatch Act, Federal officers and employees are also subject to laws relating to: (1) Political assessments, (2) political coercion, (3) political discrimination, and (4) purchase and sale of public office.

Each Federal officer and employee is responsible for refraining from prohibited political activity. He is presumed to be acquainted with the legal provisions applicable to him, and his ignorance of them will not excuse a violation. Anyone violating the Hatch Act must be mandatorily and immediately removed from his position and may not be employed again in any similar position. If, however, the Civil Service Commission determines by unanimous vote that the violation does not warrant removal, it may impose a lesser penalty of at least a 90-day suspension. Generally the law applies to everyone in the executive branch of the Federal Government or any agencies or departments thereof, or in the government of the District of Columbia. Only Presidential appointees and persons in the legislative or judicial branches are exempted. The commissioners, recorder of deeds, and public schoolteachers in the District of Columbia have a partial exemption.

What are the principal prohibited activities?

Activities by indirection: An employee may not do indirectly or in open or secret cooperation with others those things he is prohibited from doing independently. For example, a civil service employee is accountable for political activity of a wife, husband or other member of his family by collusion and indirection.

Conventions: Candidacy for and service as delegate, alternate or proxy in any political convention and service as an officer or employee thereof is prohibited.

Primaries; caucuses: An employee may not act as an officer of a primary meeting, mass convention, caucus, or make an address, make motions, prepare or assist in preparing resolutions, assume to represent others, or take any prominent part in primaries, caucuses and similar meetings.

Political meetings: An employee may not perform service in preparing for, organizing or conducting a political meeting or rally, addressing such a meeting, or take any part therein, except as a spectator.

Political committees: A civil service employee may not hold the office of precinct committeeman, ward committeeman or perform service on or for any committee for a political party organization.

Clubs and organizations: Federal officers and employees may not be active in organizing political clubs, or be officers of such a club or members or officers of any of its committees or act as such, or address a political club. They cannot serve as delegates or alternates from such a club to a league of political clubs or any other such organization.

Labor unions: A Federal employee who engages in prohibited political activity under the direction or suggestion of a labor union local will be held personally accountable irrespective of whether he is acting as an individual or as a member of a group, including a union local. Active participation in the activities of a labor union by Federal employees is not prohibited, where the organization is nonpartisan in character and has as its primary object improvement in the conditions of labor. Unfortunately, most of these organizations take on a character of partisan political activity, and Federal employees who become members or officers of this type of organization must take responsibility for seeing that the activities in which they engage do not become partisan in character.

Civic organizations and citizens' associations: Federal employees may not engage in activity in civic and citizen organizations where there is a connection with the campaign of particular candidates or parties.

Political contributions: Federal employees may not solicit, collect, receive, disburse, or otherwise handle contributions made for political purposes. They may not be concerned directly or indirectly in the sale of dinner tickets of a political party organization or in the distribution of pledge cards soliciting subscripitons to the dinners. It is against the law for a Federal administrative official to furnish the names of his personnel and their addresses for the purpose of political solicitation. In addition, certain sections of the criminial code place restrictions on contributions by Federal employees to a person in the Federal service and for solicitation made in a Federal building by anyone whether or not in the Federal service.

Expression of opinion: Federal employees may not express opinions which amount to taking an active part in political management or campaign organization.

Badges, buttons, pictures, and stickers: Federal employees may not distribute campaign literature, bades or buttons. They may not personally display badges or buttons, posters or pictures in their homes or on their automobilies if it is done as part of an organized partisan political campaign.

Newspapers; publication of letters or articles: A Federal employee may not publish or be connected editorially or managerially with any newspaper generally known as partisan from a political standpoint. He may not write for publication of publish any letter or article, signed or unsigned, soliciting votes in favor for or against any political candidate, party or faction. He may not own stock or be a member on a board of directors of a corporation that publishes a newspaper if by virtue of such ownership or membership he participates in controlling the editorial policy or news management of the publication.

Activity at the polls and for candidates: It is a violation of Federal law to pay or offer to pay any person for voting or from refraining to vote or for voting for or against a Member of Congress. It is a violation of the law to solicit or to receive pay for one's vote or for withholding one's vote. It is a criminal offense for any person to intimate, threaten, or coerce any other person in connection with voting in national elections. It is also a criminal offense to promise any employment, position, work, or compensation, or other benefit made possible by an act of Congress as a consideration, favor, or reward for political activities or for the support of or opposition to any political candidate or party. A Federal employee must avoid any offensive activity at primary and regular elections. He cannot solicit votes, help get out the votes on election days or act as an accredited checker, watcher, or challenger of any party or faction, or engage in any other partisan activity at the polls. He cannot transport voters to and from the polls or candidates on canvassing tours, whether for pay or gratuitously. Finally, the publication or distribution of election campaign statements not containing names of persons responsible therefor is prohibited by law.

Election officers: A Federal employee may not become or prepare to be a candidate for elective office in a partisan election, or solicit others to become candidates. (There are some exceptions near Federal areas.)

Parades: A Federal employee may not participate in or help organize political parades.

Petitions: A Federal employee may not initiate a nominating petition in behalf of a partisan candidate or canvass for signatures of others.

In closing, every Federal employee should remember that he has a statutory and constitutional right to vote as he may choose and express his opinion on all political subjects and candidates. However, it is his personal responsibility to make sure that he does not go beyond this point or permit other Federal officers or employees to do so.

Military Pay Increase

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT McCLORY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5555) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to reaffirm my belief that our country's two most fundamental national goals are the maintenance of a strong national defense and the promotion of an honorable peace. Accordingly, I supported the military pay bill (H.R. 5555) with full confidence that this measure is a necessary step toward the attainment of these vital objectives. Certainly, the surest way to guarantee to all Americans a sound, safe, proud, and free country is to insist that this Nation be as militarily strong as it is economically virile.

Most military men and women, instilled with a deep love for their country, desire unselfishly to serve as its protectors at any sacrifice. Nonetheless, it is important that their monetary compensation should be on a scale commensurate with the great worth of their service.

Having studied the various percentage increases, as they relate to the serious retention problems faced by our uniformed services, as well as other important military considerations, I am fully convinced of the need for H.R. 5555, including the equitable recomputation feature. Therefore, I cast my vote for this vital piece of legislation, proud to be counted among the overwhelming majority of my colleagues in the 88th Congress to whom this enactment is simple justice, long overdue.

Milwaukee Journal Pays Tribute to Per Jacobsson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include a Milwaukee Journal editorial tribute of May 7 to the late Per Jacobsson, managing director of the International Monetary Fund. His wise counsel and guidance will be especially missed by those in Congress concerned with international financial and monetary matters.

The editorial follows:

WORLD MONEY IS CONCERN

The one title that perhaps fitted Per Jacobsson best was unofficial—world's financial nursemaid. It was given him by an admirer.

As managing director of the International Monetary Fund, this tall, shambling Swede served as guide and counselor to the currencies of the world. His overriding goal was to help construct a sound world money system upon which international trade would flourish and nations could grow and develop in economic harmony. To this end he devoted most of his adult life.

If any one trait marked Jacobsson more than others, it probably was his optimism. In the hectic postwar years, he prodded and pushed world leaders toward new international financial and economic organizations. His economic touchstone always was faith in the vitality and effectiveness of the marketplace.

When Per Jacobsson died Sunday in a London hospital, the world lost a devoted and respected financial counselor.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Polish Constitution Day, observed widely throughout the free world on May 3 of each year, symbolizes the long struggle of the people of Poland to win and maintain their right to self-government and national independence. The epics of this long struggle are filled with acts of heroism and national dedication unsurpassed in the history of freedom's cause. Partitioned on three occasions by hostile neighbors, occupied by foreign forces for decades, Poland nevertheless rewon its national independence in the aftermath of World War I. That particular epic stands as a tribute to the unbreakable will and spirit of the Polish people. They refused to accept defeat in circumstances which would break the hopes of all but the stronghearted, they refused to knuckle under to enemy occupation despite the loss of thousands of patriots who openly resisted, they rose in rebellion against the alien tyranny of Russia and Prussia when the odds against them were overwhelming, and, they remained bold and proud of their faith when their future appeared to others as hopeless. And for this spirit, sacrifice and will to survive as a nation the people of Poland were rewarded with victory in 1918.

A people do not come by a national spirit such as Poland's by accident. One thousand years of existence as a state rests behind this spirit. In 1966 Poland will, at least the people of Poland, observe 1,000 years as a Christian nation. Over those centuries the people of Poland have developed a distinct and rich culture, taking the best features from the great European advances during and following the Renaissance, leading in the quest for higher and popular education, contributing immortals in the fields of science, art, law, literature and the professions. This millenium of Poland in history and Western culture holds an unbreakable bond with the founding of our Nation and the cause of representative self-government. Many outstanding Polish military leaders, most notably Kosciusko and Pulaski, came to the New World to be companions in arms with George Washington in our fight for national independence. Pulaski gave his life for our national independence and Kosciusko returned to his homeland after victory had been won in the Revolutionary War. It was natural that the leaders and people of Poland should associate their destiny with events taking place in our Thirteen Original Colonies and the founding of the United States of America. The ideals, hopes and aspirations of that struggle were the same which moved the Polish people toward their goal of self-government and national independence.

The Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, expresses the basic principles of popular government. That Constitution was adopted by the leaders of Poland a short two years after we adopted our Constitution in 1789. It was the first venture in Constitutional Government in Central-East Europe, defining the basic rights and duties of every citizen and establishing the foundations for the orderly growth of popular government. So powerful was the appeal of that venture in popular government among the people of the neighboring states that it was not long before the imperial Monarchs in Russia and Prussia became alarmed. That symbol of popular government threatened the "Divine Right of Kings" theory under which autocratic rulers and emperors determined the destiny of the old world. That threat to autocratic government brought about the third partition of Poland in 1795. But, as I have observed, those acts of autocracy did not lessen the aspirations of the Polish people for the blessings of self-government and national independence.

Poland today is passing through but another trial in her long struggle with despotism and foreign occupation. The record tells all who will take the time to study it that the commissars of Moscow who now seek to enslave the historic spirit of the Polish nation are doomed to defeat. Poland will emerge from her present trials stronger and more dedicated to the principles of individual liberty, self-government and the right of all nations to national independence. There is no power on earth which can deter or prevent the attainment of that ages long goal of the people of Poland.

That is the real meaning of this May 3, observance which I am proud to take part in. It is my hope that Poland will soon again be free and self-governing and counted among the truly independent nations of the world.

Kennedy Administration Going All Out To Increase Controls Over Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration stops at nothing to expand Federal influence and controls over the lives of the people. The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of May 9 shows how the administration is using both threat and enticement to lure the farmers into a trap on the upcoming wheat referendum:

STICK, BAIT, AND THE TRAP

As any farm boy knows, there's more than one way to get something to go into a trap. You can drive the quarry into it. You can also use bait.

Both ways, interestingly enough, are being used by the administration in efforts to get a favorable farmers' vote labor this month on the proposed new Government controls over wheat. First there's Agriculture Secretary Freeman, using his vast departmental apparatus to propagandize for a two-thirds "yes" vote needed for approval, and the big stick he's waving is the threat that if they vote "no" there will be no new wheat legislation at all. In which case, he warns, the price might plummet to $1 a bushel from the present $2 support level.

But evidently having some doubts about whether this big stick by itself is wholly effective, the administration has put out some bait. This is the feed grain bill it is trying to push through Congress before the May 21 refererendum. The bill, already passed by the House, would let farmers grow corn and other livestock feed grains on acreage the tight wheat control plan would force them to remove from wheat production.

The object of all this stick waving and putting out of bait is simply to divert the farmers' gaze from the real issue. And that is whether they're going to vote for the most stringent program ever proposed by Government for a farm commodity. That would lead, as Charles Shuman, American Farm Bureau Federation president, says, "all the way down the road of Government supply management."

No matter whether you use a big stick or bait, a trap is still a trap.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

The Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am continually being amazed at the wonders wrought by the Tennessee Valley Authority, which celebrates its 30th anniversary this month.

We have all read and heard about the tinderbox conditions which prevail this spring in the mountains of the Southeast, and about the efforts being made to prevent and control forest fires.

The TVA, whose primary aim is the integrated development of all the resources of the region it serves, has been in the forefront of these efforts. I refer to a portion of the TVA Weekly News Letter of May 8, which tells how liquid fertilizer developed by TVA to speed plant growth is being used to curb forest fires.

I ask unanimous consent that this item be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the material referred to was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Liquid fertilizer, developed to speed plant growth, is finding valuable new use in slowing the growth of forest fires.

Nearly 200 tons of liquid ammoniated phosphate already has been shipped this spring from TVA's National Fertilizer Development Center at Muscle Shoals, Ala., to aerial tanker bases of the U.S. Forest Service in the southern and northeastern regions. It has helped fight dozens of blazes in the Great Smokies, the Blue Ridge Mountains, an on up into the Alleghenies.

Speed is of the utmost importance in fighting forest fires. The liquid 11–37–0 fertilizer from Muscle Shoals, unlike retardant chemicals available in other sections of the country, comes ready for use except for a quick dilution.

The final solution is loaded into planes, such as converted B–26 bombers, and dumped on fires while they are still small, occasionally hours before fire fighters can reach the scene on the ground. Leaves and other fuel coated with the solution will char, but not burn.

In the first 13 trials last year by the Forest Service, the liquid solution stopped fires in their tracks in nine instances and greatly slowed their progress in the other four. This year, with fire conditions the worst in a decade, the retardant has been used more extensively.

Forest Service records prove the value of the material. In one instance, the burn was held to 3 acres although it took 3 hours for the ground crew to arrive and extinguish the fire. Another time the ground crew required 6 hours to travel by boat and on foot to a remote fire. When they arrived, the fire boss reported air drops of the fertilizer solution "100 percent effective on head and flank."

In a series of timed runs, planes were loaded and in the air headed for the fire within an average of 14 minutes after the alert was received. Cruising at more than 200 miles an hour, one plane has as much as 1,200 gallons of solution over the burning area minutes later.

This is enough to cover effectively a strip 50 feet wide and 700 feet long on the fastest-burning edges of the fire. The pilot flies 100 to 150 feet above the treetops to drop the retardant liquid.

As a bonus, the fertilizer solution speeds vegetation regrowth on burned areas. The solution made from liquid fertilizer costs about 7 cents a gallon, contrasted with about 25 cents for materials used earlier.

The use of aerial tankers in fighting forest fires began in the West, and spread to Eastern States in recent years. In 1961 the Forest Service set up five air bases to protect eastern national forest lands. One of them is Knoxville's McGhee-Tyson Airport, with a tanker serving national forests in Tennessee, North Carolina, Georgia, the Great Smoky Mountains National Park and the Cherokee Indian Reservation.

TVA assisted with tests of fire retardant chemicals soon after aerial tankers came to the Valley States. More than a year ago, the agency's foresters arranged a conference between TVA chemical engineers and State and U.S. Forest Service officials which led to Forest Service trials of the material last year.

The story of fertilizers to fight forest fires is one of cooperation among many agencies—the Forest Service, TVA, National Park Service, Air National Guard, Indian Service, State Forestry agencies, and others. It also is a story that is still being written as the agencies continue to evaluate and improve methods for protecting the Nation's forests.

Dorn Happy To Be on Democrat Purge List

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the Congressional Record an article that appeared in the Chicago Tribune, Sunday, May 5, 1963, regarding my colleague the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable William Jennings Bryan Dorn.

Dorn Happy To Be on Democrat Purge List—It Is Victory Insurance to South Carolinian

(By Willard Edwards)

Washington, May 4.—Not many Democrats in Congress are happy these days. Their mail reflects the uncertain temper of a frustrated public. A large number are already worrying about the 1964 elections in which they sense a potential voters' revolt menacing to incumbents.

In the midst of this general gloom, one small group from Dixie is conspicuously cheerful. They are chanting a hymn of thanksgiving to a kindly fate which has placed them on a "purge list" compiled by Kennedy administration stategists.

It was never intended that this list of 13 southern conservatives, marked for revenge because of their opposition to New Frontier programs, should become public. Its wide circulation has not only elated those listed but stirred envy and resentment among some of their colleagues.

"WHY WAS I DENIED?"

"My voting record against the administration is twice as good as some on the list," cried one angry southerner. "Why was I denied this honor?"

A party purge, directed from Washington, is looked upon by southern Democrats as a guarantee of political security. This one is regarded as iron-clad insurance because it is reliably attributed to Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy whose methods of enforcing integration have not endeared him to most southerners.

Any candidate against a Congressman on the purge list, even if he is innocent of administration sponsorship, will be inevitably tagged as "Bobby's boy," it was noted. He will have to fight the charge of sponsorship by a Massachusetts Yankee.

DORN NO. 1 ON LIST

At the head of the purge list is a 47-year-old South Carolina Democrat who rejoices (literally) in the name of William Jennings Bryan Dorn. He earned his No. 1 rating (and the administration's emnity) honestly. His conservative voting record in the House is identical to that of Senator Harry F. Byrd, Democrat, of Virginia, whose 30-year Senate career has been aided, on occasion, by purge attempts encouraged by Democratic Presidents.

How does it feel to be marked for political destruction by your own party? Why was the purge instigated? What does it bode for the future of the Democratic Party? An answer to these questions was sought from the main target of the campaign to rid the southern branch of the party of rebels against the New Frontier.

Dorn was found in his office, busily dictating a long letter to Mary Anne Jupin, an eighth-grade student in the Black Rock School, Bridgeport, Conn. Mary Anne had written a southern Congressman because she was puzzled about a number of things—the Civil War, segregation, and how southern people felt about northern people. She wound up by asking if the Congressman thought there would be another civil war between North and South.

BORN TO POLITICS

Mary Anne was getting as much attention from Dorn as if she had been a South Carolina textile mill owner. His oldest daughter is also in the eighth grade. He would not discuss politics until he had completed a 1,200 word reply to the little girl from Connecticut.

This missive was revealing of one side of Dorn's character. A politician born (his father designated him for a political career before he was able to walk), he could gain no possible political benefit from this exchange. But he was patient and kindly as he sought to inform his teenage correspondent of what must have seemed to her the strange viewpoint of a confirmed segregationist.

The eighth grade class at Black Rock School was obviously in for a heated discussion when Mary Anne produced her letter.

Its young minds could be perplexed by DORN's assertion that integration in the Nation's Capital was "complete hypocrisy" whereas the two races live "side by side" in South Carolina where "I remember as a child sitting on the front seat of the church with a Negro lady who had been born and reared before the Civil War."

REACTION TO PURGE

Another side of DORN came to the fore when he was asked about his reaction to the purge. He became the practical politician who has been running for public office since he was old enough to vote.

"From a political point of view, in my State, it has been the greatest break I could possibly get," he remarked contentedly. "It will be a pleasure to run for reelection against any candidate they might select."

HIGHEST HONOR SINCE—

"This has been the highest honor bestowed upon me since 1947 when Vischinsky, chief of the Russian delegation to the United Nations, called me the 'No. 1 warmonger' in the United States."

He thought the purge was not only incredible but stupid.

PERSONAL FRIEND OF KENNEDY

"I am certain that President Kennedy was not in on it," he remarked. "Some little Caesars around him are responsible and it is ominous that they are asserting this power in cooperation with COPE (the AFL–CIO's committee on political education). Kennedy is too good a politician to divide the party. After he's been reelected in 1964, maybe. But not now."

DORN spoke from intimate knowledge of Kennedy's political qualifications. They were House freshmen together in the "class of 1946" in the 80th Congress made famous by Harry Truman's attack as "the do-nothing" Congress. They became personal friends, bonded together as minority Members in a Republican-controlled Chamber, but they seldom voted together.

It was recalled that James A. Farley once described an attempted party purge by Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1938 as "one of the most serious mistakes F.D.R. made in his career in the Presidential Office." DORN agreed.

"Although it benefits me personally," he said, "I am disturbed by this threat from a political hierarchy against those who will not go along 100 percent with a party platform framed in some convention city hotel room.

KEY TO PARTY STRENGTH

"The strength of the Democratic Party is in its various elements, representing all classes of the American people. It shocks me now that we seem to be on the road to absolute conformity. The slogan is 'follow the fuehrer' or else.

"These people, who now seek to purge the party of conservatives, could not have been elected without the South. We held the party together for 100 years. Now, a ruthless, autocratic socialism, with tremendous slush funds, is trying to take it over.

"This is an attempt to make the House of Representatives of the United States a reichstag, as under Hitler, or a Japanese diet, as under Tojo. It is significant that it is aimed at the House which truly represents the people and must report back to the people every 2 years.

The House far more than the Senate, DORN noted, has been "the stumbling block to socialism."

FATHER ADMIRES BRYAN

Why did he bear so proudly the name of William Jennings Bryan, not noted as a conservative in his day?

"My father named me after BRYAN, not because of his political philosophy, but because he resigned from Woodrow Wilson's Cabinet in 1915 as a protest against Wilson's measures leading to war," DORN explained. "I was born in 1916. My father, a county superintendent of schools, could see war coming. He predicted then that if we got into a European war, we'd be in foreign wars from then on, and that it would eventually be our end as a nation."

RUSSIANS A MENACE

DORN was serving in the South Carolina State senate when World War II approached. He declaimed against U.S. involvement but promptly enlisted after Pearl Harbor, serving 3½ years as a private and corporal. He came out with a GI's scorn of all generals except one—MacArthur.

"If we'd had MacArthur in Europe," he remarked, "He'd not have held back to appease the Russians but would have gone in, occupied Berlin, and then informed Washington that the deed was done. He knew, as all enlisted men knew, that the Russians were as great a menace as the Germans."

In the postwar period, DORN was one of the first to demand strong military power against the Communist threat, earning him the Russian tribute of "No. 1 warmonger."

He was trained for a political career from boyhood. His father introduced him to relatives as "the politician" and he was making speeches to schoolroom audiences at the age of 10.

When he graduated from high school at 17, he did not go to college but went to work on a farm, earning his keep and $10 a month. As soon as he was able to vote, he ran for the State legislature. Ten seasoned politicians were seeking three vacancies. DORN headed the ticket and became the youngest member of the legislature.

STATE SENATOR AT 24

The powers of oratory, which he achieved in his early days, enabled him to sway southern audiences. Two years later, he aspired to the State senate against one of its veteran leaders. He was only 24 and not supposed to be eligible until 25, but he won and was seated under a special vote.

The war interrupted his political career but he resumed it when he came back in October 1945, and promptly began campaigning for a seat in Congress. Again, he defeate a veteran Democrat. At 30, he was one of the youngest Members of the House.

Two years in Congress convinced him he was ready for the Senate but the South Carolina voters like their Senators a little older. He failed to unseat Senator Burnet R. Maybank, the incumbent Democrat, in 1948, although he was runnerup in a field of five. In 1950, he ran for his old seat in the House.

A LITTLE BRASH

"People thought I was a little brash, because I had hardly warmed my seat before I ran for the Senate," he remarked. "I was running poorly, way down. Then, the Korean war started June 25, 2 weeks before the primary.

"Wars usually help an incumbent but I had made a speech in Congress years earlier, mentioning Korea as a danger spot, when hardly anybody had ever heard of it. The people said, 'That boy told the truth' and it elected me."

How did he answer the school girl's question about the possibility of another civil war?

"I do not believe, Mary Anne," he wrote, "that there will be a civil war between the north and south. But there is a possibility of a civil war resulting from class agitation and racial agitation. When powerfully organized pressure groups arise, this can only lead to the formation of counterpressure groups and eventually possible conflict."

"What I was trying to tell that little girl," he said, "was what I told the President last fall—if you leave us alone, we'll solve the race problem. Clemson College is in my district and we admitted Harvey Gnatt (a Negro) without any trouble whatsoever.

"We just don't want northern agitators coming in to tell us how to handle our problems. We don't try to interfere with the delinquency problems of New York, Chicago, and Detroit. We feel that these are local problems which can be handled by the cities and States of the North."

Remarks of Robert Taft, Jr., to University of Akron College of Law Student Bar Association on the Occasion of Law Day, U.S.A., 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, it is with much pleasure that I submit the remarks of the Honorable ROBERT TAFT, JR., to University of Akron College of Law Student Bar Association on the occasion of Law Day, U.S.A., 1963:

President Auburn, Dean Samad, faculty, and members of the Student Bar Association of the University of Akron Law School; this is the sixth annual observance of Law Day in the United States. Giving formal recognition to this custom, the 87th Congress in 1961 designated May 1 of each year "* * * as a special day of celebration by the American people in appreciation of their liberties and reaffirmation of their loyalty to the United States of America; of their rededication to the ideals of equality and justice under law in their relations with each other, as well as with other nations; and for the cultivation of that respect for law that is so vital to the democratic way of life."

There has been chosen for this year's celebration here the theme, "Law: Rule of Right, Not Might." In accordance with this theme, I would like to talk briefly on the rule of law here in the United States and some threats that I see to it here at home, as serious as those that we all know exist throughout the world.

First, we should note that even though we may be members of the legal profession, we recognize that this is not a lawyers' day or any attempt to glamorize those engaged in the legal profession, even though we may have some special charges and responsibilities on that account. Rather, we celebrate the particularly crucial place in law of the past and present in our country and realize that it is essential to our continued enjoyment of liberty and progress. It is crucial because our own progress and the progress of mankind have been and continue to be linked inextricably to a recognition of the individual human being as the important unit of society. This is a unique concept within the Judaeo-Christian heritage, but one which may well be the ultimate key to success or failure in the 20th century battle for man's mind.

Our Declaration of Independence states: "All men are endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Then followed the 5th and 14th amendments prohibiting the deprivation of liberty by government without due process of law. Commenting on these rights, Justice Peck-ham in *Allgeyer* v. *Louisiana*, 165 U.S. 578, said:

"The liberty mentioned in that amendment means not only the right of the citizen to be free from mere physical restraint of his person, as by incarceration, but the term is deemed to embrace the right of the citizen to be free in the enjoyment of all his faculties; to be free to use them in all lawful ways; to live and work where he will; to earn his livelihood by any lawful calling; to pursue any livelihood or avocation, and for that purpose to enter into all contracts which may be proper, necessary and essential to the carrying out of a successful conclusion the purposes above mentioned."

Yet, we recognize that the concept of human liberty does not mean any totally unbridled freedom of individuals to act as their whims may dictate. Without the bounds of law, religion, and personal discipline, chaos would result. Without rules, regulations, or laws governing conduct, the freedom of each person or group to do what he or it chooses, soon impinges upon the freedom of others. Conflicts result that can lead to loss of liberty by both.

Immense changes in human life, which have occurred during the last century and continue, have precipitated individuals into such close, complicated and interlocked relationships that existing and established rules of law and behavior sometimes prove inadequate. Various reactions have resulted, but one of the broadest and most threatening to freedom has been an inclination to abandon and forget the touchstone of the individual as the primary unit of society with which the law should concern itself. We tend, rather, to create authorities and codes which tend to become autonomous, self-perpetuating forces in themselves in derogation of human liberty. They tend to lead us to accept as inevitable requirements of conformity. For peoples and nations who never enjoyed liberty this attitude might be excused. For ourselves, through whom the driving force of freedom created a way of life and of unparalleled progress, to abandon it now would be incredible folly. Our solution must lie in the preservation of individual rights under law. If we fail to preserve those rights, even the most perfect rule of law would be sterile and worthless.

One of the areas in which we see serious threats of individual freedom and the rule of law most clearly is the international scene. By definition and theory communism is the antithesis of individualism. Moreover, the mere military threat which exists, in itself puts demands and restrictions upon individual rights and upon the rule of law that are imposed by high military spending, the application of large portions of industrial capacity to military production, and the demand for military manpower. It is hard to conceive of being more completely and directly deprived of liberty than being drafted into the Armed Forces. Yet, such restrictions most of us recognize to be permissable, and we consent to protect ourselves from total deprivation of our liberty by force from aboard. For this reason we must accept them, but also for this reason it becomes even more vital to turn our attention to areas where threats to our liberty under a rule of law can and should be held in check and repelled.

One area of these threats lies in the constantly increasing size and power of Government and in the breakdown of procedures in the judicial, administrative, and legislative functions of Government. Perhaps because of frustrations with the complicated problems we must deal with and our failure to establish adequate methods of dealing with these complications.

This Law Day, for instance, we are still debating the issues of constitutional law and of executive, legislative, and judicial power and responsibility. Perhaps these debates try our patience. At times we become eager to do things and to move things, and the law and structure of government seem to be stumbling blocks. What we must recognize is that they never really are in the fundamental sense. Rather, they represent proper tests of our actions and restraints upon change merely for the sake of change, a reminder that in a society such as ours the way in which we do things is often as important as what we do.

The failures which we have experienced in attempts to check the trend toward conformity and regulation cannot be put solely at the door of advocates of executive power. President Truman used to have a sign in his office at the White House that read, "The buck stops here."

We in Congress should feel the same way. It is easy enough to pass all responsibility for important decisions that should be spelled out in legislation to the Executive who is to administer a particular program, but to do so is to be derelict in our constitutional duties. We are elected to pass judgments and not pass bucks. We are not elected to scramble after easy solutions and quick cures. We are the jury appointed by the people to decide the course of freedom itself. Congress is not merely a funnel to pour money into one project or another. It is not an auction hall in which we should try to outbid one another for special favors. It is a forum in which our laws are formed.

The law which in this land begins with the Constitution is the very essence of what we call the American way, just as the consent of the governed is the essence of our political structure. We must always remember that in this country we consent to be governed. We do not elect to be ruled.

A part of the trend against which we must guard is related to the constant increase of Federal power at the expense of State and local powers and even problems previously handled by private institutions or individuals. Much has been said in this respect. But I think we must also recognize that the same dangers to freedom may well exist at the local level and have just as detrimental effect as they may have at the Federal level. Certainly it is clear that the Federal courts will not any longer interfere with the local and State regulation of individual activities except in the most extreme cases. For instance, recently the Kansas debt-adjustment case in the Supreme Court should be interpreted as a reiteration and strengthening of the expressed disinterest of the court with local and State regulation of business activities except, perhaps, in areas where the civil rights of individual citizens are found to be involved.

At the same time it is true that the failure of State and local governments to face up to new problems and to try to handle them in a manner consistent with our traditional concepts has led to further Federal Government activity under the excuse that the States and local governments are unable to handle them. Such arguments must always be carefully weighed because it certainly appears that in many cases the fact of the matter is that the State and local governments appeal to and, presumably, the electorate behind those voters in fact has no interest in the program or solution proposed.

But it often is true that the blame for excessive interference with private, local, and State activity is based on economic considerations relating to the more available Federal tax funds. When this happens, the Congress does have a special responsibility which it should fulfill, not to make excessive delegations of power unrelated to standards. Yet, many bills proposed and some that are passed continue to advocate broad regulatory power with few, if any checks upon it, investigations, and the right to demand information without notice and complaints filed or court hearings, and similar proposals for raw power without proper concern for procedures and a hearing for those to be affected.

Even where standards have been prescribed in many situations the growing habits of the administrative bureaus and agencies carry on in spite of the provisions of law. Here it clearly should be up to the courts to protect the rights of those affected, but, unfortunately, there has been a tendency in the opposite direction. For instance, recently as has been mentioned by Governor Romney, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in administering a law which clearly left up to the States the right to determine standards for qualification for payments under a welfare program for the children of the unemployed, refused to make such payments on the basis of standards set by the State of Michigan and tired to require other standards.

In the field of labor relations, the same attitude of disregard for legal limitations has been shown by the President and his labor Secretaries in their interference and dictation of terms of settlement and prices as shown in the steel price crisis of 1962 and, more recently, in the dock strike interference in New York. Under the guise that the public has an interest in important economic decisions of the type involved, the Government is more and more interjecting itself as the third party of the bargaining table, not merely from the point of view of voicing public opinion but, perhaps, for bringing about compulsory arbitration of such disputes with the determination being made by the Government. Compulsory arbitration with labor and management alone involved, in itself constitutes a serious threat to the collective bargaining process that has by-and-large worked so well in our country. To impose compulsory arbitration with the Government also sitting as a party in the dispute would amount to wage and price control whether it is so recognized and sanctified by legislation or not.

The whole field of agriculture, of course, is slipping rapidly toward such complete economic control with little or no voice for those being affected. The wheat referendum of May 21, if it passes, will put another nail in the coffin of any freedom of choice for the farmer who wishes to raise this crop. The medicare and Federal-aid-to-education proposals, while aimed at problems and needs with which most Americans are sympathetic, would contain many elements of compulsion and, in spite of lipservice to the concept of no Federal control, would in fact through powers to prescribe regulations and to administer such programs constitute serious further incursions upon such individual freedoms.

Even in the judicial process, trend has been away from precedent and uniform application of rules of law to factual situations which are generally similar. The primary concept of the rule of law is that Government should be a rule of laws, not of men. Yet, in many cases before it recently the court seems to adopt an ad hoc approach that seems likely to do little for the administration of justice in general. By way of example, such a case as *Fay* v. *Noia* has been accurately described by one of the dissenting justices as a staggering blow to the effective administration of criminal justice in State courts. With almost no limitations, habeas corpus actions can now be brought at any time to review criminal cases even though the time for appeal is passed and the State for all practical purposes may have no basis on which to provide up-to-date proof as to events happening many years previously. Commenting on this recently, Senator STENNIS on the floor of the Senate stated as follows:

"This is another illustration of a departure from what we have always known as constitutional Government and constitutional procedures. * * * What gave the court the power to render its decision today if it did not have the power yesterday? Was a constitutional amendment adopted overnight? Did Congress meet and hurriedly enact a statute? Neither of these things happened. I submit, Mr. President, that there is only one explanation. A majority of the court reached a certain result because of special facts and proceeded accordingly in spite of longstanding precedent."

The threat, then, of our liberty being deprived from us by governmental action here at home is a threefold one. It lies within the three branches of our government at Federal, State, and local levels. To check it will require our devoted and continued attention as legislators and as administrators, judges, and as lawyers. But more than that, it will call for an attitude of concern by the people generally in this country, and such an attitude can be fostered only if the lawyers themselves continue to reemphasize to all of our citizens the importance of law and legal procedures as safeguards to liberty. This is the threat with which we should concern ourselves on this Law Day, for might can be embodied too well in the regimentation of government as in armed force. It is greater perhaps, but just as effective against right. What we must understand and convey to others is that government and every other form of public control is a means to human well-being, not an end in itself. Man was not made for the state, but the state for man, and it derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. No sort of rule can justly rest on power alone. Here is the eternal answer to all forms of tyranny over the person, the property, and the minds of men.

Economic and Social Trends of the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. BYRD or Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a letter addressed to the presidents of Virginia chambers of commerce by Mr. Charles H. Boone, president of the Chamber of Commerce of Salem, Va.

I commend the recommendations of the Congressional Action Committee and approved by the board of directors of the Salem Chamber.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Chamber of Commerce,
Salem, Va., May 8, 1963.

Dear Chamber of Commerce President: Realizing that the action taken by the board of directors of this organization at its regular meeting Tuesday, May 7, 1963, may meet with strong opposition in certain localities and some opposition with tongue in check in other localities, but also in the realization and firm belief that action must begin somewhere this letter is being sent to you and all other presidents of chambers of commerce in the State of Virginia.

It would be easy for me to write an exceedingly lengthy letter giving background history of the economic and social trends of the Federal Government for the past 30 years and its serious future implications upon our society and our freedoms, but you are just as aware of them as I. The real purpose of this letter is to tell you of a recommendation presented to the board of directors of the Salem Chamber of Commerce by its Congressional Action Committee, the unanimous approval of that recommendation by the board of directors and now to urge you and your chamber of commerce to take a similar stand in your community.

The recommendation of the congressional action committee approved by the board of directors is as follows:

"That in an effort to reduce Federal expenditures and more importantly to retard the Federal Government's trend toward statism, the Salem Chamber of Commerce recommends that the town of Salem, the county of Roanoke, and all other communities in the area and throughout the State begin a program of refusing to apply for Federal funds for local projects which should be financed on a local basis."

Copies of this letter are also being mailed to Congressman Richard H. Poff of this district and to Senators Harry F. Byrd and A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia.

Very sincerely yours,

Charles H. Boone,
President.

Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the April 26 issue of Time magazine contains an excellent article about the Tennessee Valley Authority and its achievements during the past 30 years. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Natural Resources—Such a Lovely Green Valley

A lot of unkind things have been said about the Tennessee Valley Authority. When the TVA bill was before Congress in 1933, shortly after veterans' benefits were reduced, Rhode Island's Senator Jesse Houghton Metcalf cried: "How on earth can we justify taking a decent living from the soldiers who suffered on the battlefields of France and pour it into the mudholes of Tennessee?" Arizona's Senator Barry Goldwater today calls TVA "a giant Federal power monopoly—a hoax."

But TVA has survived such criticism. Next month TVA will celebrate its 30th anniversary and if nothing else, it is there. It works.

TAMED AND TRANQUIL

The very mention of its name still triggers theoretical arguments about public power. Yet debates over its theory fade to futility when set against the real-life changes in the valley.

The Tennessee was once a treacherous river, red with the topsoil it carried away by summer, aswirl with the houses, horses and barns its floods destroyed by winter. Today, more than two-thirds of its 900-mile length is virtually one tamed and tranquil lake. Hundreds of recreation sites occupy the valley's 10,000 miles of shoreline. Its waters provide one of the world's finest inland recreation areas, yield fishermen some 10 million pounds a year of 23 species of fish.

These waters—actually a series of reservoirs—were created by 31 major dams (6 of them privately owned), which now function in a highly integrated system. "Today TVA can shut off the Tennessee River when the Ohio is in flood—shut it off just like a faucet," says David Lilienthal, TVA's early crusading Chairman. TVA did just that a few weeks ago, and saved an estimated $100 million flood damage in Chattanooga alone.

Main stem dams have navigation locks, permitting the passage of vessels with 9-foot drafts. Some 13,100,000 tons of traffic moved on this waterway last year. The Tennessee's ports are linked with those in 20 States. TVA officials claim that such navigation has stimulated the investment of some $875 million in shoreline industry in the valley.

EROSION AND MOSQUITOES

To keep the valley's best soil from being continually washed into the river by the area's heavy rains, TVA has coaxed the farmers into using a variety of conservation practices: planting trees, contour plowing, diversifying crops, enriching their land with TVA-developed fertilizers. One byproduct of the reforestation has been the creation of a $500 million private forest-products industry. TVA has also fought mosquitoes to lick the valley's malaria, which in 1934 had infected more than 30 percent of the people living along the river in northern Alabama. Since 1949 not a single case of local origin has been reported along the reservoirs.

POWER

TVA's power production remains the most controversial part of its operation. Its generating capacity of 12,031,060 kilowatts is the largest of any power system in the Nation, amounts to 8 percent of all U.S. capacity. Through contract distributors, it serves 1,513,400 homes and firms. The average valley resident pays 0.96 cent per kilowatt-hour; the national average is 2.43 cents. The authority deliberately slashed rates to stimulate electrical consumption when it first set up shop, and with spectacular results: from 1933 to 1952 the number of homes in the valley using electricity for the first time jumped from 225,000 to 1,065,000, an increase of 375 percent, while the national growth was less than 100 percent. Total demand still is climbing about 10 percent a year.

The authority has been able to reduce rates partly because high production breeds efficiency. It claims that where private utilities average 4.2 mills to produce each kilowatt-hour sold, TVA's cast is 2.1 mills. As the Nation's biggest coal buyer, TVA pays $4.39 a ton for coal to fuel its steamplants, compared to a national average of $6.26. TVA, of course, has had the advantage of not paying Federal taxes (although for years it has paid sums to State and local governments) for interest on its initial capital. It now does, however, pay the Federal Government some $45 million a year in amortization and return on the taxpayers' investment, and finances expansion through its own interest-bearing bonds.

Despite TVA's gigantic operations, there is no evidence that nearby private utilities have been hurt. Most of them benefited from a boom in appliance sales when TVA's low rates first spurred electrical use. Competitively lowering rates, the private companies have kept them low—yet the latest studies show that their common stock earnings are twice as high as the U.S. average.

AWAY FROM WASHINGTON

U.S. taxpayers may always differ as to whether TVA has been worth the $1.757 billion it has cost them so far (although that sum is, for example, barely larger than total U.S. aid to Franco's Spain since 1945). But beyond the matter of dollars, TVA's advocates claim that the project has shown what the residents of a region can accomplish when encouraged. Says present TVA Chairman Aubrey Wagner, recalling 29 years with TVA: "People said to us, you can't go in there and build dams with the labor of those hillbillies. But the thing they didn't realize was that these people, working on the dams, knew they were building their futures. All we have done is to place the tools in the hands of the people here."

Lilienthal says that TVA also proved that it is an advantage to place such complex projects—which require a unified execution—beyond the reach of Washington's many uncoordinated agencies. "TVA is an arm of Government and yet we took it outside, away from Washington, and put it to work in the sticks. We had a valley, a river, an area, not just a plan or a dream—a chance to do something concrete."

One indication of TVA's progress was the remark of a foreign visitor who recently flew over the region. "Oh, isn't it wonderful," he said. "Yes, we must have a TVA. But weren't you lucky to have yours in such a lovely green valley?"

Wisconsin Paper Week Marks Wisconsin Paper Industry as First in Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the week of May 12 to May 18 has been proclaimed Wisconsin Paper Week by the Governor of Wisconsin. This is the first year that paper week will be celebrated in my own State of Wisconsin. It is a fitting tribute to the State's second largest industry because this paper industry is first in the Nation. Of the 47 paper-producing States in this country, Wisconsin leads all the others in sales, tonnage, investments, taxes paid and other categories. I am proud of the many outstanding accomplishments that have marked the history of Wisconsin, and especially proud of the notable record established by the paper industry, not only as regards economics, but also in the development of natural resources, in the areas of paper-related research, and in the many recreational facilities that have been a welcome byproduct of the industry's endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, as a portion of my remarks I include a transcript of my Washington television report to the people of Wisconsin in which I joined with them in honoring one of Wisconsin's great and dynamic industries.

The report follows:

Today I would like to join all Wisconsin citizens in paying a special tribute to one of the State's outstanding industries. As we all know, Wisconsin has been a leader in many areas of State and national life. This year for the first time we have set aside the entire week of May 12 to May 18 to celebrate the significant contributions of the paper industry.

Our paper industry has demonstrated that it is the best in the country. Of the 47 paper-producing States, Wisconsin ranks first. It leads all other States in sales, tonnage, investments, taxes paid, and other categories. Annual sales for example total almost a billion dollars and State taxes alone amount to some $218 million.

The Wisconsin paper industry has grown with the State from the very beginning. The first mill, which made newsprint from rags, was built in 1848 in Milwaukee. Today, on the Fox River alone, the 35 miles between Lake Winnebago and Green Bay has the highest concentration of paper mills of any area in the world. Our own seventh district contains 11 of the 34 Wisconsin communities in which paper mills are located.

In all, there are 197 pulp, paper, paperboard and paper products establishments in Wisconsin. Forty-nine of these are pulp and paper mills. The size and diversity of Wisconsin's paper industry constitutes a vital and significant contribution to the State's economy. In employment, for example, the paper industry supplies jobs to one-tenth of the manufacturing personnel in our State. Their average annual salary is $6,100.

At the same time, there are many byproducts that contribute greatly to other areas of the economy. One of these is the creation of new markets for the State's natural resources. Take pulpwood, for example. A few years ago, the paper industry was unable to utilize large amounts of Wisconsin's hardwoods such as aspen, birch, maple and oak. As a result, they had to rely heavily on the long-fibered pine and spruce trees. These softwoods are now in short supply in our State so the industry had to rely on importing the pulp it needed from other States. Today, new markets for Wisconsin's hardwoods have been opened up in the State thanks to the new uses our scientists have discovered for the paper industry.

In 1962 alone, Wisconsin pulp and paper mills paid more than $18 million for Wisconsin-grown pulpwood. This figure represents about half of all wood used by Wisconsin's 49 pulp and paper mills.

Of course, the benefits to our State derived from the paper industry are not confined to economics alone. Recreation for all of our citizens has been greatly aided by the paper industry's activities. They own, for example, 920,000 acres of Wisconsin timberland. And on these lands, the companies have a total of 710 miles of road. Virtually all of Wisconsin's industrial forests are open to hunters, fishermen, and other recreation seekers. The Wisconsin and Fox Rivers provide another example. The many paper industry-financed dams and reservoirs assure even, controlled flow of the river and year-round utilization of the once-precipitous Wisconsin River for power, production, conservation, and recreation.

All Wisconsin citizens should be proud of the outstanding achievements that have characterized the Wisconsin paper industry throughout its history.

School Patrols Awarded Gold Lifesaver Medals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, May 9, it was my great pleasure to be present at a ceremony in the rose garden of the White House where the President honored eight young schoolchildren for acts of outstanding courage in the line of duty. The seven boys and one girl are all members of school safety patrols.

President Kennedy addressed a short speech of praise to the young people and pinned their medals on them. The awards are gold lifesaver medals provided by the American Automobile Association as part of a general safety program organized and conducted by the American Automobile Association.

Of the eight youngsters, two are from District of Illinois which I have the honor to represent. Alvin Cynova, 13, is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Warren Cynova of 5111 North Glenwood, and Randy Newnum is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Clyde Jenkins of 1305 West Carmen.

The two boys are members of the safety patrol at Trumbull School, Chicago, were cited for pulling an adult school-crossing guard and three small girls out of the path of a speeding car. I would like to take this opportunity to offer my sincere congratulations to Alvin and Randy for their courage and their outstanding response to duty.

New York's General Practitioner of Year Cites Need for Cancer Detection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, about 3 years ago I addressed a national convention of the Survivors of Corregidor and Bataan at Binghampton, N.Y. A former mayor of that city, Charlie Kress, who has been working to improve the administration and effectiveness of the national cancer program, has called to my attention a news story from the Binghampton, N.Y., Press of April 25, 1963, announcing that the New York State Medical Society has named Dr. Raymond S. McKeeby, of Binghampton, as New York State's "outstanding general practitioner of the year."

In a recently published interview Dr. McKeeby made some forthright and illuminating statements which should receive the thoughtful attention of all public health leaders in the Nation. He pointed out that the American public is in dire need of more and better medical general practitioners; that many medical graduates turn to the field of specialization, undoubtedly because the life of a specialist is easier and more profitable than that of a general practitioner.

In fighting the scourge of cancer we hear the medical experts and specialists constantly admonishing the public about the need for early detection and frequent medical examinations. Granting that this is the most desirable safeguard, the average working man pressed by constantly rising living costs, cannot afford the high cost of frequent cancer detection examinations by expensive cancer specialists. It thus becomes more and more important that the family physician, a general practitioner, be capable of conducting effective cancer detection examinations. Dr. McKeeby states that "the American Academy of

General Practice is the only medical organization which has a specific requirement for postgraduate education to keep up the capacities of its members, who must receive 50 hours of formal postgraduate education and 100 hours of informal schooling every 3 years in order to retain Academy membership."

Dr. McKeeby should be congratulated on his frank and courageous stand in publicly proclaiming the national need for more and better general practitioners to protect our country's small-income citizens not only financially, but also healthwise by encouraging them thusly to seek frequent examinations by a family doctor who is a general practitioner, well qualified in skilled cancer detection. And the American Academy of General Practice also deserves public acclaim for its wise and national welfare-serving stand, in requiring its members to keep up to date in the progress of medical science.

And in the administration of the new Presidential aid-to-medical-student program, those in authority should give serious study to devising some means whereby medical students will be encouraged toward careers as general practitioners rather than seeking the more lucrative but less immediately humanity-serving fields of high-priced specialization.

Mr. President, at the close of these remarks I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Binghampton, N.Y., Press relative to Dr. McKeeby be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Binghamton, N.Y., Press, Apr. 25, 1963]

DR. MCKEEBY OUTSTANDING GENERAL PRACTITIONER IN STATE

Dr. Raymond S. McKeeby of Vestal, a Binghamton physician, is the outstanding general practitioner of the year in New York State.

He was chosen for the honor today by the council of the New York State Medical Society, meeting in New York City.

The 51-year-old Binghamton native last month was named Broome County's general practitioner of the year by the Broome Medical Society.

He and his wife, Emily, live at 4504 Forest Lane with their four children: Joan, a junior at Buffalo University; Raymond Bruce, a freshman at Long Island University; Gail Elizabeth, a Central High student, and John Matthew, 3.

Dr. McKeeby, who maintains an office at 94 Main Street, is a member of the National Education Commission of the American Academy of General Practice.

In 1961 he was coordinator for project More in Binghamton, one of the two pilot projects in the United States to test means of interesting more high school students in preparing for careers in medicine.

He is chairman of both the Hospital and Professional Relations and Nursing Education Committees of the State Medical Society and a member of the mediation committee.

Dr. McKeeby, a former president of the Broome society, also is chairman of its policy and planning committee.

He is a graduate of Central High School, Cornell University and Temple University Medical School at Philadelphia. He interned at Binghamton General (then City) Hospital in 1940–41, when Mrs. McKeeby was interning at the hospital as a dietician.

Philippine War Damage Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the House should concur in the Senate amendment to the Philippine War Damage Claims Act of 1962. It provides that any further payments by the United States would go to the Philippine Government instead of to private claimants.

Recent revelations before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of improper activities on behalf of the Philippine war damage claims legislation indicates the need for this amendment as the best way of correcting the situation. It was passed by the Senate on May 1, 1963, by a rollcall vote of 58 to 26, being title IV of the supplemental appropriations bill (H.R. 5517).

This Senate amendment—No. 76—has been reported in disagreement by the conference committee, and a motion will be made for the House to recede and concur when the report of the conference committee comes back to the House.

Believing that the full facts should be before the House at that time, I include as part of these remarks a joint statement by Members of the House:

STATEMENT ON PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE CLAIMS

Recent hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during its investigation of the Foreign Agents Registration Act (hearing of Apr. 18, 1963, entitled "Activities of Nondiplomatic Representatives of Foreign Principals in the United States") disclosed improper activities on behalf of the legislation. This led important members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, including the chairman and Senators SPARKMAN, SYMINGTON, and HICKENLOOPER to state that if the Senate had known the facts disclosed, it would not have passed the 1962 act in the form in which it was passed (hearing, pp. 262–263).

Senator SPARKMAN stated:

"You will recall that I presided over the committee during practically all of the hearings on this Philippine War Damage Claims Act of 1962. We had two bills before us at that time. One was the bill * * * which would have paid the amount directly to the Philippine Government, the full amount. The other was the bill * * * to make the payments to individual claimants.

"I want to say that in my opinion, had the committee been fully advised as to the facts that are before us now, the bill that was passed would not have been approved."

He later stated during the debate on the Senate amendment (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7161):

"Had I known that the former Commissioners were taking advantage of the position they held and the information they had obtained as Commissioners, together with the other officials, I certainly would not have voted for that bill. I would have voted for the bill which would have provided payment directly to the Philippine Government."

The Senate decided that the proper way to correct the situation was to change the 1962 act by amendment into the other form providing for payment directly to the Philippine Government, an proceeded to pass such an amendment by a vote of 58 to 26.

I

The improper activities which led the Senate to change the form of the 1962 act.

1. The testimony before the Senate investigation showed that over a period of years lobbyists had been stirring up a demand for further payments on war claims.

The Congress had been led to believe that there had long been an insistent public demand in the Philippines for further payments. But the testimony before the Senate investigation showed that this demand had in part been stirred up by lobbyists: Mr. O'Donnell, a former member of the Philippine War Damage Commission; Mr. Delgado, the former Filipino member of the Commission (as required by the 1946 act); and Mr. Schein, former chief examiner of the Commission; that Mr. Delgado wrote to Mr. O'Donnell on January 13, 1952 (hearing, p. 178):

"Your letter of December 23, 1952, was duly received and have noted its contents with great interest. I believe you are quite right in your appraisal of the situation there but I am afraid that enthusiasm on the part of the interested parties and the Government here have cooled off. Nothing has been done and no one seems to be interested enough to take the initiative in having some action by the Government on the matter of additional war damage compensation. However, I am writing today to Mr. Lino Gutierrez, president of the Private Claimants Association, and other interested parties on the subject. In addition, in the broadcast which I am scheduled to make on the 18th of this month over the station DEBB, I will discuss the subject in an effort to arouse enthusiasm and start the ball rolling.

"I am of the considered opinion that even if the chances of obtaining the $200 million are not rosy this year, something must be done there to keep up the interest of the administration on the same, as otherwise our probabilities of obtaining additional money next year would be much less."

Addressing the Senate on April 26, 1963, Senator FULBRIGHT said (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6798):

"The evidence taken from Mr. O'Donnell's own files indicates that he and Mr. Delgado promoted the so-called moral obligation to pay further claims, and kept the issue of further payments alive after 'enthusiasm on the part of the interested parties and the—Philippine—Government had cooled off'. * * * That letter is merely indicative of, and an example of, many other letters which indicate the beginning and the pursuance of an activity on the part of these gentlemen to create in the Philippines, and eventually in the Congress, the belief that there was a moral obligation to pay further claims."

2. The testimony before the Senate investigation showed that Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Delgado started to promote legislation for further payments on war claims shortly after leaving the Commission in 1951.

Senator FULBRIGHT said:

"Very soon after his leaving office as a member of the Commission, Mr. O'Donnell made arrangements on his own to represent one group of claimants and his fellow Commissioner, Mr. Delgado, conceived the purpose of obtaining enactment of further legislation which would and did result in great financial benefit to Mr. O'Donnell. As I have indicated, he and his associates have already received in excess of $1 million, and more would come to them if the existing law should be allowed to stand (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6798).

"It is significant that the further payments to be made were upon claims which they themselves had adjudicated as members of the Commission." (hearing, p. 261).

The testimony showed that Mr. O'Donnell sought to procure in Washington a list of the claimants, and wrote Mr. Delgado on February 9, 1952 (hearing, p. 179):

"It is regrettable that we did not make up this list before we left the Commission, but this is little solace now."

3. The testimony before the Senate investigation showed that Mr. O'Donnell, Mr. Delgado, and Mr. Schein spearheaded the testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee in support of the claims legislation without disclosing their strong private interest in it.

The testimony showed that a crucial issue in the consideration of this legislation was as to the meaning and intent of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946; that the testimony of these three men was accepted as coming from men who were experts on that subject due to their work with the Commission; that they had already received large legal fees as a result of other Philippine war damage legislation, and would receive additional large fees if the 1962 act were passed in the form which they desired; namely, with provision for payments to private claimants; that the Foreign Affairs Committee reported favorably a bill in that form on June 27, 1960, despite the fact that the then administration had recommended settlement of Philippine war damage claims with the Philippine Government by a lump-sum payment to that Government.

That bill, H.R. 12078, 86th Congress, 2d session, died in the Rules Committee. In the 87th Congress a similar bill, H.R. 8617, was reported favorably in August 1961, and was defeated in the House May 9, 1962, on a rollcall vote of 201 to 171. Another similar bill, H.R. 11721, was immediately filed, was passed by the House on August 1, 1962, by the Senate on August 24, 1962, and became Public Law 87-616.

During the debate in the Senate on May 1, 1963, Senator HICKENLOOPER suggested an explanation as to why the House chose to support a bill for payment to claimants rather than to the Philippine Government, saying (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7162):

"A bill providing payment to the Philippine Government was ruled out in the other body. No one knew quite why.

"The information that I am about to mention is not yet in the RECORD, but I assure Senators that there is ample reason to know that word went from powerful Members of the other body that unless the State Department and the administration accepted the bill as it was altered to make the $73 million payments to individual claimants rather than to the Philippine Government, there would be no bill at all, and the international complications that had arisen as the result of the failure to pass the original bill in the House would continue."

Comments by Senator FULBRIGHT were (hearing, p. 261):

"Mr. O'Donnell testified before this committee that he did not disclose, in previous testimony before the Congress, that he was acting in fact, if not in law, as the agent of foreign principals, and for his own interests. He spoke as a former official of the Federal Government whose interest was in having that Government pay purportedly legitimate claims. In fact, he was bound to be at least partially motivated by his own financial interest.

"The primary purpose of this investigation, of which today's hearing was a part, is to examine into the terms and the administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act. Today's hearing I think has disclosed significant weaknesses, to the extent that Congress, the State Department, and the Justice Department did not know that a powerful moving force behind the passage of the Philippine War Damage Claims Legislation Act of 1962 was private gain rather than public welfare or national security.

"That they (Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Delgado) have been unduly enriched is of less importance than that the legislative process has been subverted. Both Congress and the Executive were, I believe, deceived."

During the debate in the Senate on May 1, 1963, Senator HICKENLOOPER said (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7163):

"This is a flagrant case. It is a flagrant case of * * * deliberate withholding of personal interest by witnesses before committees of the Congress, which amounts to complete deception.

"They were out drumming up business by international cable, letter, and other contacts to solicit the claims of these people. Then they got busy and stirred up the idea that the United States might be induced to put up $73 million for rehabilitation purposes, but their purpose was to pay it to individuals on individual claims, because they were developing contracts with the individual claimants, and those contracts have been listed in the RECORD. They used a substantial amount of money * * * One of these men came before the committees of the House and Senate, presenting himself as a former member of the Philippine War Damage Commission, and therefore connoting that he was in a special position of sympathy for and knowledge of the poor people in the Philippines—and many of them did suffer—but he never once disclosed that he was a lobbyist who had solicited business for revenue, based upon his service in the Government. * * * He never disclosed his own personal interest in this subject or his own pecuniary interest, or that of his fellow member on the Commission who was equally busy in the Philippines soliciting these claims.

"This was a racket, and a concealed racket. The administration did not know it. It was not revealed until almost collaterally and incidentally to a broader investigation by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations."

II

The House should concur with the Senate amendment

The House was subjected to the same pressures and deceptions as the Senate. The House should conclude, as did Members of the Senate, that, had it known the facts which have since been disclosed, it would not have passed the 1962 act in the form in which it was passed. It should decide that the best way to correct the situation is to change the 1962 act by amendment into the form providing for payment directly to the Philippine Government.

The House has had grave doubts as to making further payments to private claimants. It defeated one bill for that purpose May 9, 1962, by a record vote of 201 to 171. It certainly would not have subsequently passed another similar bill had it known the facts which have since been disclosed.

If it did not pass that form of bill, it would have passed a bill providing for payment to the Philippine Government, as the previous administration had virtually promised such a settlement, and had recommended it to the Congress.

In 1959 the United States negotiated settlement of 19 outstanding Philippine claims, one of which was for additional war damages. In a note of August 4, 1959, to the Philippine Government, under the salutation, "Excellency," it said (Foreign Relations Committee hearing, June 12, 1962, p. 20):

"With respect to the Philippine claim for payment of additional war damage compensation in accordance with the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (Public Law 370, 79th Cong.) the executive branch of the U.S. Government will at the next regular session of the Congress, and in connection with the legislative program for fiscal year 1961, request appropriate legislation enabling the settlement of this matter on the basis of $73 million, which amount reflects the statutory maximum of unpaid private claims according to the reports of the War Damage Commission. By a settlement, made directly with the Philippine Government, the U.S. Government will consider itself completely divested of all responsibility for payment of individual private claims. A memorandum showing the computation of the amount unpaid under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act is enclosed. No further request of the U.S. Government relating to war damage compensation will be entertained other than to supply any records which might be appropriate and be needed by the Philippine Government."

The House should now concur in the Senate amendment which would bring about settlement in that manner—by payment to the Philippine Government.

1. It is not enough merely to attempt to cut off further fees to the lobbyists.

That probably cannot be done effectively, anyway. The right objective is to undo the effect of the improper practices and deceptions which led to passage of a bill for payment to claimants which would not have been passed had the deceptions been known.

Senator SPARKMAN, who presided at the Senate hearings on the legislation said:

"I would not have voted for that bill. I would have voted for the bill which would have provided payments directly to the Philippine Government."

The proper corrective measure is to amend the 1962 act so that it will provide for payment directly to the Philippine Government.

2. Settlement by payment to the Philippine Government is acceptable to that Government.

Under Secretary Harriman told the Foreign Relations Committee, with reference to two bills, one for payment to the Philippine Government, and one for payment to private claimants (hearing, June 12, 1962, p. 14):

"The (Philippine) Government itself has stated that it will accept either bill with good will."

3. Settlement by payment to the Philippine Government would carry out the purposes of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 better than would further payments at this late date to private claimants.

The main purpose of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 was to rehabilitate the war-torn economy of the Philippines. Payment of private claims for war damages (whether caused by the United States or not) was chosen as a means to get the money quickly into the stream of the Philippine economy. The money had to be spent, or have been spent, for replacement and repair of the damages.

The 1962 act contains a similar requirement, but over $30 million will go to 287 claimants who have large claims of $25,000 and over (hearings, Foreign Relations Committee, June 12, 1962, p. 4). It is clear that most of them will long ago have made the replacements and repairs, so that the new payments will be windfalls.

Payment to the Philippine Government on the other hand would be a direct help to the Philippine economy, and so more in keeping with the purpose of the 1946 act.

4. The claimed saving to the United States as a result of paying private claimants is far outweighed by other considerations.

The 1962 act appropriated about $73 million for payment of private claims, with a provision that any amounts left over after such payments would revert to the U.S. Treasury. If settlement of the war damage claims issue were made by payment to the Philippine Government, the money would all be used for such payment.

Those who favor payment to private claimants make much of the possible saving resulting from lost claims caused by disappearance of claimants, etc.

But even if a few more million dollars might go to the Philippine Government, if payment were made to it, than would go to private claimants, that fact assumes slight importance when it is recalled that since 1946 the United States has furnished over a billion dollars of aid to the Philippines and is still furnishing aid in large amounts.

That fact is far outweighed by the consideration that payments now to private claimants would in many cases be windfalls, whereas payments to the Philippine Government would carry out the purpose of the 1946 act of aiding the Philippine economy. Under the Senate amendment providing for payment to the Philippine Government, that Government would be free to use the money for rehabilitation or in such manner as it saw fit.

Fifth. If the House would not have passed the 1962 act had it known the facts recently disclosed, it should now change the form of that act to provide payment to the Philippine Government rather than to private claimants.

Those who oppose the Senate amendment argue that the 1962 act should not be changed merely because of some wrongful lobbying. Other lobbyists, they say, have made campaign contributions and been active in sponsoring legislation. The newspapers have made much of campaign contributions, which make good stories, but it is clear that what moved the Senate to conclude that it would not have passed the 1962 act had it known the facts recently disclosed was mainly based on other considerations: with Mr. O'Donnell's and Mr. Delgado's activities in promoting a demand for war claims legislation, both here and in the Philippines; with their employment on claims legislation shortly after leaving the Commission; with their spearheading of testimony before the Congress favorable to that legislation without disclosing their private interest; and with their efforts to shape the legislation in such a way that it went to individual claimants, resulting in the lobbyists' private gain, rather than to the Philippine Government—in short, with improper pressures and deceptions which led Senator HICKENLOOPER to say. "The situation stinks" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7163).

III

Background facts as to opposition to further payments of private claims

The previous administration strongly opposed further payments to private claimants at this late date, and the House defeated one bill for that purpose.

The crucial issue was as to the alleged moral obligation to make such further payments. The disclosures in the Senate investigation have cast doubt on previous testimony on this issue, much of which came from the three lobbyists mentioned above. They even claimed that a "promise" had been made for further payments, and that such payments were a "debt."

In other respects, arguments previously made against further payments to private claimants have been strengthened and justified by the recent disclosures.

Those arguments were—

1. The private claims being brought forward were not "war damage claims" in the generally accepted sense of those words (which refer to claims based on legal liability—but were based on voluntary gifts made by the United States to rehabilitate the Philippine economy.

2. The real purpose of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 was rehabilitation, and payment to private claimants was a vehicle to accomplish that purpose. The report of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on that act stated:

"The bill is not a private claims measure to reimburse individuals or organizations for damage incurred in war. The primary function of the payments is to assist and encourage rehabilitation and rebuilding of the economy and social structure of the nation."

3. Further payment of private claims would not accomplish the main purpose of the 1946 act. The Bell Mission to the Philippines of 1950 reported (Foreign Affairs Committee Supplemental hearings on June 9, 1960, p. 21):

"That further war damage payments to individuals would not contribute materially to economic development in the Philippines, and that continuing assistance by the United States should be for development projects in agriculture and industry related to the specific needs of the Philippine economy rather than as additional war damage payments to individuals."

Since then over $1 billion of U.S. aid has gone to the Philippines.

On March 3, 1960, Mr. Douglas Dillon, Acting Secretary of State, wrote to the Speaker of the House:

"The executive branch believes that rebuilding, replacement, or repair of war-damaged private property in the Philippines is no longer practicable. Moreover, in view of the time which has elapsed since the original claims were approved, and since the U.S. Philippine War Damage Commission went out of existence on March 31, 1951, it is not considered practicable for the U.S. Government to assume any responsibility for the payment of the balance of approved individual private property claims."

4. The Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 did not create an obligation for further payments of private claims beyond the $400 million then provided.

This was the crucial issue. The 1946 act provided $400 million for payment of private claims. It contained a provision that the balance of the money left after the payment of small claims in full should be used toward payment of certain other claims up to a maximum of 75 percent. The $400 million was insufficient to pay that maximum.

Proponents of the 1962 act claimed that these provisions indicated an obligation to pay up to 75 percent. Opponents maintained that the intent of the 1946 act was to set up a method of disbursing $400 million, and not a method of paying claims up to 75 percent.

The record of hearings, reports, and debates relative to the 1946 act can fairly be said to show that a majority of the members of the committees in both branches did not intend to create a further obligation beyond the $400 million authorized although a few committee members insisted that the intent was to pay up to 75 percent.

CONCLUSION

The only record House vote on this legislation was against further payments to private claimants, a vote of 201 to 171 on May 9, 1962 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7349). Since the recent disclosures in the Senate investigation, there are strong additional reasons for standing back of that vote, and for voting to concur in the Senate amendment.

H. R. GROSS.
WAYNE L. HAYS.
ROBERT R. BARRY.

Cold War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution which was unanimously adopted by the AMVETS National Executive Committee in April, 1963.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas American servicemen are daily risking life and limb on numerous cold war fronts throughout the world; and

Whereas in many instances the service performed by the men serving in these cold war areas is more hazardous than that performed by many wartime veterans; and

Whereas S. 1011 introduced in the Senate of the United States recognizes the hazardous nature of this service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That AMVETS National Executive Committee assembled in Washington, D.C., at the Mayflower Hotel, April 5 through 7, 1963, support S. 1011, a bill to provide wartime benefits to veterans and their dependents who serve in an area designated by the President as an area of hostilities during the period of hostilities.

Bay of Pigs Survivors Get New Ultimatum on Invasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the secrecy which still surrounds the the Bay of Pigs invasion, it seems to me important that the article by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott on this subject be brought to the attention of every Member of Congress.

The article appeared in the Arlington Northern Virginia Sun on May 8, 1963:

ALLEN-SCOTT REPORT—BAY OF PIGS SURVIVORS GET NEW ULTIMATUM ON INVASION

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott

The heroic survivors of the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion are faced with a crushing new ultimatum.

This latest "surrender" demand, as the Cuban veterans bitterly call it, is from the Kennedy administration in the form of a blunt order to completely refrain from having anything to do with attacks against Castro's Communist regime.

Penalty for disregarding this secret edict is immediate loss of the monthly payments they are receiving from the Government.

This harsh crackdown is being explained individually to every member of the Cuban brigade by representatives of Attorney General Robert Kennedy. These officials are conveying their orders orally and with no one present other than the freedom fighter hearing them.

Word of this extraordinary backstage development has reached the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee investigating the administration's failure to get the thousands of Russian troops out of Cuba.

One letter sent the Senators recounts in detail how the invasion veterans are summoned and singly informed that their monthly allowances, ranging from $100 to $250, will be discontinued unless a categoric pledge of "no action" against Castro is given. If an exile balks, his name is forthwith stricken from the payroll.

Significantly, this ironhanded undercover pressure is being exerted on brigade members at the very time Attorney General Kennedy is publicly calling for unification of Cuban refugees in an organization that "could speak with one voice and have some relationship" with the United States and other countries.

Congressional sources close to the White House are saying privately that the Attorney General is spearheading a drive inside the administration to set up a new Cuban "front" under the leadership of Manuel Ray, member of the first Castro cabinet.

Also that only exile groups willing to go along with the President's "let the dust settle" policy are being asked to join this new organization and hold key posts in it.

Main purpose of the new "front" is described as aimed at expanding "contacts" with the Cuban underground which is to receive some financing as long as its operations remain secret. However, the organization will be barred from conducting raids or attacks on Cuba or Russians stationed there.

The administration's action in cutting off the $81,000-a-month allowance to the Cuban Revolutionary Council is part of this unannounced new policy.

Meanwhile, Russia is taking full advantage of the protection the United States is giving its shipping to Cuba. More than a score of Soviet freighters unloaded cargoes in Cuban ports in April.

At least half of these Communist vessels sailed through the Panama Canal, raising speculation among intelligence authorities that Russian may be opening a new Cuban supply route from Vladivostok.

Until last month most of the Red ships came from either Russian ports on the Black Sea or Baltic Sea ports of the satellites.

Military experts estimate that more than half of the Soviet ships are being used to rotate and supply Russian troops in Cuba. Latest estimate of the number of these forces is being revised upward by the Defense Intelligence Agency.

The Anti-Southern Prejudice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Columbia Record, of Columbia, S.C., is recognized in South Carolina and throughout the Southeast for its consistently outstanding editorial page, and I have likewise been impressed with the editorial page of this splendid newspaper. In the May 8, 1963, edition of the Columbia Record, my attention has been called to an excellent editorial entitled "The Anti-Southern Prejudice." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ANTI-SOUTHERN PREJUDICE

One of the Nation's most extensive, pervasive prejudices, antisouthernism, continues to be neglected by behavioral science. Yet the evidences of the syndrome mount daily in the utterances of national leaders and in the publications of the mass communications media.

If social science is truly not "a scholarly arcanum, but an organized part of the culture which exists to help man in continually understanding and rebuilding his culture," then social sciences must explore the prejudice as a preview to understanding.

They must codify and relate the sociology of antisouthernism through American history and the sociology of modern antisouthernism. Its origin, religious and political aspects, economic influences and future must be adequately researched.

The urgent necessity for such a study is brought to mind by three recent stories, two from this country and one from Britain. Each, in its way, is exemplary of antisouthernism.

In a recent editorial, the influential New York Times concluded that emerging Republicans in the South were trying to "outsegregate" Democrats, in complete disregard of the facts. Motivating the Times was the prejudicial belief that all changes in Southern political thought must be intimately involved with the racial question. The Times ignored the basic truth that the South no longer continues to be a political whole and that, in the majority of the States of the old Confederacy, race has ceased to be the major issue.

Republicanism in the South has grown because of the party's appeal to economic conservatism, the necessity for a two-party system, and the enduring dialog over Federal-State-individual relations.

The second item, a story out of London, related that the most controversial show in British television history, "That Was the Week That Was," was going off the air for the summer.

"The bitterest episode" of the BBC series, an account read, "centered on the murder of William Moore, the Baltimore postman shot in Mississippi during a protest march against racial discrimination. In the best minstrel tradition, Millicent Martin, the show's singing star, and a blackfaced chorus, asked to go back to Mississippi, 'where the Mississippi mud mingles with the blood of niggers hanging from the branches of the trees.' "

Here is the anti-South prejudice working at its worst. In the first place, the tragic and deplorable murder of the postman took place not in Mississippi, but in Alabama.

Why, then, did the show err in placing the even in Mississippi? Because, in its propaganda, the Communists have consistently singled out Mississippi as a specific example of southern race relations and because of the recent collision on the Ole Miss campus.

Social scientists should not overlook the countless cartoons of "niggers hanging from the branches of the trees" in Mississippi as pictorial summaries of white-Negro relations in the entire South.

The third item is one of the cover stories of the May 21 issue of Look magazine. On the cover, the reader is asked to inspect "The South's War Against Negro Votes," beginning on page 38.

If one reads the article, he'll find that the story involves only the State of Mississippi and not the entire South, as is alleged by the title. (Southwestern Georgia is mentioned only incidentally.) Despite the fact that South Carolina, and most of the rest of the section, insists upon no discrimination in voter registration and subsequent balloting, the entire South stands condemned by the article and its title.

Nowhere does the author even suggest to the readers that Negro registration and voting rights are being vigorously protected in Florida, Virginia, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Arkansas, Oklahoma, or North Carolina.

The antisouthern prejudice demands that the entire section be condemned.

Antisouthernism is not compatible with American democracy or Western culture. One should hope that its definition and eradication would come swiftly.

A Hospital in Haiti

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, in view of the current events in Haiti, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Hospital in Haiti" by Mr. Clayton Willis.

The article was published in the March 14, 1963, issue of the Fauquier Democrat, of Warrenton, Va. Mr. Willis is a reporter for the paper, and news director for radio station WEER, also in Warrenton.

This well-written article describes the fine work of Dr. William Larimer Mellon, Jr., and Mrs. Mellon, at the Albert Schweitzer Hospital at Deschapelles, about 85 miles from Port-au-Prince in Haiti, which Dr. Mellon founded and operates.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HOSPITAL IN HAITI

(By Clayton Willis)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Clayton Willis has visited Haiti five times. A former Newsweek staff writer, he has traveled throughout Latin America, visiting every country in the Western Hemisphere. He speaks French and Spanish fluently. This is the story of the Albert Schweitzer Hospital in Haiti and the man who built it, Dr. William Larimer Mellon, Jr.)

PORT-AU-PRINCE, HAITI.—One of the most amazing hospitals anywhere is the Albert Schweitzer Hospital. It is located in the disease ridden, poverty stricken Artibonite Valley of Haiti.

I went through the beautifully equipped, one-story glass and stone building with Dr. Willian Larimer Mellon, Jr., a quiet, dedicated man who built the hospital in the sun parched valley in 1956. Dr. Mellon is a cousin of Paul Mellon of Upperville.

The site of the Albert Schweitzer Hospital is about 85 miles from Haiti's capital city of Port-au-Prince and about midway between this city and Cap Haitien, the country's second city.

Except for witch doctors, 52-year-old Larimer Mellon is reported to have been the first regular full-time physician in the densely populated valley.

I saw 10 tiny babies with lockjaw in 1 room of the hospital. A Haitian nurse picked up one of them. It was as stiff as a board. Dr. Mellon said the unknowing mothers use mud packs as antiseptics on the unbilical cords of the babies after birth. Mellon told me that two-thirds of the babies leave the hospital cured. The others just don't make it.

Since most of the patients can't read and write (about 10 percent are literate in Haiti), Dr. Mellon has the signs marking the examination rooms of his hospital painted different colors. He explained that the patient is told to go to a certain colored sign, not to the pediatrics department, because he can't read the word "pediatrics."

The Albert Schweitzer Hospital at Deschapelles, Haiti, asks patients to pay if they can. If they can't, Mellon reaches into his pocket and foots the bill. He has done this so much, in fact, that Mellon has had to have outside help. The Grant Foundation of Pittsburgh, Pa., is a big backer. Public contributions supply the rest.

But, Haiti needs more than a hospital. So, Larry and his wife, Gwen, started teaching English and vocational skills in addition to the work they did in community development. Mellon and his wife, both members of the Disciples of Christ, arranged for religious activities at the hospital. The community development projects stemming from the hospital extend for a 40-mile radius. These include desperately needed schools.

To boot, the hospital has a veterinary shop. In it the burros (the Haitian ambulance in that part of the country) that bring patients are treated. Mellon noted that each burro's saddle is removed when he arrives so that his back can be checked.

Dr. Mellon has made many sacrifices to take on his Nobel Prize caliber work in Haiti. A grand nephew of the late financier, Andrew Mellon, Larimer Mellon in 1947 left a comparatively easy ranch life in Arizona to go to primitive Haiti. His wife Gwen became so ill before Christmas that she had to spend some weeks in a New York hospital getting over a mysterious disease. Mrs. Mellon has resumed her work at the hospital on a part-time basis.

As we were going through the airy building together, I said to the doctor what a wonderful job he had done with his hospital. Humble, soft-spoken Dr. Mellon replied: "I'd like to see 10 more like it in Haiti."

Roy L. Whitman

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, our good friend Roy L. Whitman, Official Reporter of Debates, served his last day in the House on April 30. I join his many friends in paying tribute to the dean of its Reporters.

His magic pen has moved steadily throughout these many years—since 1932—inking the history of the House in debate and recording for all time the business of the greatest deliberative body in the world.

Only an individual of great patience, alert dexterity of hand and finite mind could have survived those many years of trying experiences—noting the ravings of fork tongued orators whose fiery words spilled in multisyllabic phrases that would deaden the blast of a French horn and stultify the mind of even Noah Webster, the ruler of the world of words.

But perhaps the antidote was at hand in the soothing gentleness of the melodious voices of the orators of yesteryear. Their sweet-sounding phrases from melliferous lips must have had a soothing effect on an authority in grammatical instruction like Roy, who revered spiced descriptions of heavenly thoughts as a cultural contribution to the beauty of the language.

Roy was very cooperative in solving the many problems brought to him for solution by Members of the House. He was unselfish and obliging in the correction of statements attributed to the contributor on the floor. He was zealous in calling attention to a slip of the tongue in debate.

His long and varied experience in his profession (over 51 years) established him as an authority.

His long service in the "Cave of the Winds"—enduring the stunning babble of ear-splitting voices and straining for the whispering inaudible nothings of ill-prepared readings earned for him his full retirement. He and his darling wife, Erie, who also was his helpmate in his professional life are deserving of this new happiness—a healthy and permanent vacation. May the blessings of God and well wishes of the Nation keep them with one another and their love of family for many years.

Pentagon Budgeteering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I submit herewith for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article from the pen of Neal Stanford entitled "Pentagon Budgeteering," which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, May 4, 1963:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 4, 1963]

PENTAGON BUDGETEERING

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—Something quite unusual, if not unique, is happening in the Pentagon. For the first time that newsmen can recall, the military brass and the civilian chiefs in drawing up a new defense budget practically see eye to eye at the start.

The budget in question is that for fiscal year 1965, which does not really take shape until next December.

But every year about this time the military chiefs start planning for what they want in the next budget, and since billions are involved it takes not weeks but months to get it all down on paper in final form.

Actually the description seeing "eye to eye" is only figurative. For in the first "go-around" on the 1965 budget now underway the military and civilian bosses in the Pentagon were $2 billion apart.

That $2 billion is hardly peanuts—except by comparison.

As Defense Secretary Robert McNamara told the newspaper editors here last week, it was quite a different story a year ago.

Then, in preparing for the fiscal 1964 budget the three military departments came up with requests for over $67 billion for defense.

After Secretary McNamara and his civilian aids got through with that massive military blueprint they had cut it down to nearly $54 billion.

In other words the difference last year in these first estimates was over $13 billion.

Actually the $54 billion was still $2 billion more than the then current defense budget, though $10 billion more than when Mr. McNamara took over in the Pentagon.

There are a number of explanations why initial expenditure estimates drawn up a year ago by the civilian and military chiefs differed by $13 billion and those drawn up this spring showed only a $2 billion difference.

The two most obvious are: Secretary of Defense McNamara and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Maxwell Taylor.

The service chiefs have had 2 years of learning Secretary McNamara's ways of doing business. They have faced up to his insistence on dollar economy in military planning. They have learned through the innumerable studies he has ordered them to make on weapons costs, manpower needs, strategic concepts, what he expects of them. Presumably, they have adjusted their thinking to his concepts.

Then, Gen. Maxwell Taylor has become Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

General Taylor is an able, articulate, experienced military officer. He has greater prestige than his immediate predecessors. He did not become Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff by moving up from the job of chief of staff of one of the services (the Army, in his case) but by stepping down from his White House post as special military adviser to the President. (Actually he had earlier retired from the job of Chief of Staff of the Army over differences with President Eisenhower.)

It is no secret that it is General Taylor's view that a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff should be more than Chairman in name. Some people have said he must have knocked a few heads together to get such near unanimity so early among the service chiefs as to defense needs for fiscal 1965.

A more reasonable explanation is that by his power of persuasion and his skill and knowledge in military matters he convinced his colleagues that it would be smarter for them to tailor their requests to more nearly what they might get than to let the civilians do it.

There are, of course, other explanations of this unusual situation so early in the defense budget-making picture.

One is the fact that some costly weapons systems programs now in process have passed their peak in cost requirements. Another is that new weapons systems are being explored more fully in the research and development stage rather than being rushed into production.

One example Secretary McNamara cites of money down the drain was development of the atomic airplane, on which $1 billion was spent before it was washed out. Research should have shown up its defects before development got underway.

A third is service agreement on military planning, on joint procurement of many items. With the Army planning on a long war of attrition and the Air Force on a short war of nuclear bombardment, it was inevitable that military demands from the services would be chaotic and conflicting.

The result of all this is little short of astonishing. Rather than the civilian and military chiefs starting some $13 billion apart in defense concepts, as they did last year, they are starting this year only $2 billion apart.

By next December they should really be seeing eye to eye, or should one say "eyeball to eyeball"?

Rose Haven Queen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to announce to my colleagues that one of my constituents recently was chosen Miss Rose Haven for 1963 at the Rose Haven Yacht Club in my home county of Anne Arundel.

The new queen is Miss Vickie Maeder, a resident of Rose Haven and a student in the 11th grade at Southern High School.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by David Kearse from the May 2 edition of the Evening Capital describing this fine occasion, in the Record:

Yacht Club Picks New Queen

(By David Kearse)

A bevy of beautiful girls brightened up Rose Haven Yacht Club last Saturday evening as the members and guests sat around waiting for the piece de resistance of the evening: the crowning of Miss Rose Haven for 1963.

After the judges each personally had an opportunity to meet the four candidates, and after the princesses had paraded around before the judges and the audience, the queen was indeed selected, much to the delight of all who attended.

A Rose Haven girl, formerly of Chevy Chase, was selected this year's queen. She will compete for further beauty honors at Maryland Yacht Club on June 2, when the Queen of the Chesaepake will be named.

The lucky winner was Miss Vickie Maeder, an 11th grade student at Southern High School, who won the judges' fancies with her charm, poise and pleasant personality. Dressed in a white gown, the winner was presented her crown by last year's queen and this year's guest of honor, Miss Betty Sue Plummer.

The 16-year-old Miss Maeder's also received a trophy and bouquet of roses, not to mention a kiss from the yacht club's commodore, Dr. Donald W. Mitchell of Arlington, Va. The master of ceremonies for the colorful event was Vincent Scott and another Scott, this one Charles Scott, a past commodore, was chairman of the judges, who had a hard time, indeed, in selecting only one queen. All four of the girls were "winners" in the real sense of the word, if looks, grace and charm are any indication. Other contestants were Miss Bernie Raley, Miss Helen Burke, and Miss Michele Hecker.

All this reporter can say is good luck next time around, girls, for with your looks and personalities, you're all bound to come up with beauty prizes soon.

Those who attended the gala crowning ceremonies took time out to greet each other and talk over the boating world. Then, too, some of the women who had just returned from various trips had notes to compare.

For instance, Mrs. John Stoneburg ("Little Sarah"), wife of the yacht club's public relations director, just returned from a 6-month visit to California. Also, Miss Billie Kramer was kept busy telling about her exploits at the romantic locales on the Caribbean from whence she just returned.

Speaking of Stoneburg, who is better known to his friends as "Stoney," he gave this reporter a "Cook's tour" of the beautiful yacht club and its facilities, which were very impressive, indeed. He also proved to be very helpful to this reporter's cohort, Lou Granger, who took many a picture and admired many a potentital beauty queen, but then, who didn't?

And Joseph E. Rose was there to take in the evening's event. Rose is builder and owner of the yacht club and its environs, which includes a nice motel next door to the main dining room and bar.

Altogether, yours truly and Granger returned from Saturday night's fun-filled evening very impressed with our visit to the yacht club and Rose Haven itself. It was our first introduction to the club and its delightful members. And congratulations to this year's queen, Miss Rose Haven.

Race to the Moon: Why Is It So Important?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 months, the House Manned Space Flight Subcommittee has been hearing testimony on the U.S. space program.

As a member of this subcommittee, I was happy to read the well-written and informative article by Roscoe Drummond in the Washington Post of May 6, 1963, entitled "Race to the Moon: Why Is It So Important?"

It points out why the United States should be foremost in outer space.

The article follows:

Race to the Moon: Why Is It So Important?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The big, costly, valuable space-exploration program is running into public misgivings largely because it is so often defended for the wrong reasons.

I am convinced that when Congress almost unanimously a year ago greatly stepped up the space program and apparently set it on a course from which it was not to veer, it made the right decision. We ought to stick to it resolutely.

To make it the firm objective of the United States to be foremost in outer space does not seem to me to be a very remarkable decision. Isn't that doing what comes naturally to the American people? That's not out of character. That decision is in the national tradition—or something is very amiss.

But now there is talk about cutting back only a year after deciding to go full-steam ahead. This sort of talk sounds chicken: "Oh, what's the use? And who wants to be first anyway?"

There is danger that there will be a cutback, a grievously mistaken cutback, if the real reasons for the space program are not better expounded.

If we keep on asking the wrong question, we are going to be stuck with the wrong answer. The tendency in defending the space budget is to stress the race to the moon and how important it is to beat the Russians. The honest question which then arises and understandably brings divided answers is: Why is it so important to be first to the moon?

The answer which many Americans tend to give is that it would be nice to beat the Russians to the moon, but that it is hardly worth $20 billion and certainly not $40 billion.

This is a sample of how asking the wrong question produces the wrong answer.

The controlling reason for the size of the space program is not just to try to get to the moon first—however welcome that would be—but to make sure that Americans will be foremost in mastering the new element and the new dimension of outer space.

We talk about competitive coexistence with the Communist world as the best way to win the cold war. Outer space is a vital, perhaps the crucial area of competition. The overriding issue is not who is going to be first to the moon but who is going to be foremost in mastery of the new element of outer space because the mastery of outer space will do more than anything else to determine the shape of our world for many decades, perhaps for several centuries.

There are precedents. Through their mastery of roadmanship the Romans shaped their world for a long time.

Through their mastery of seamanship the British did most to influence the affairs of the world for a century.

Through their mastery of airmanship Britain and the United States turned back the tide of Hitler and Tojo.

Through the mastery of spacemanship—through being foremost in outer space, not just first to the moon—it is now within the reach of the United States to affect greatly the shape of the world for the rest of this century and, I believe, for some centuries ahead.

I am not talking about the United States dominating the world through outer space. I am talking about the necessity of the United States being foremost in outer space so that the Soviet Union cannot dominate the world through its prior mastery of outer space.

The United States is committed to the freedom of outer space as it is to the freedom of the seas. We are prepared to undertake joint explorations with the Soviets and some are in prospect. But when it comes to deciding whether we should continue unwaveringly to mobilize full resources to be foremost in the the new element and the new dimension of outer space, I commend these warning words of the Vice President of the United States:

"If we do not succeed in these efforts—as one great American has put it—we will not be first on the moon, we will not be first in space, and one day soon we will not be the first on earth."

Another View of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, there have been many comments on the Cuban situation ranging from the ridiculous to the sublime. Jim Hudson, editor-publisher of the White Mountain Eagle, an outstanding weekly newspaper in my district, has written a most thoughtful and calm appraisal of the problem which I feel warrants careful study:

The Many Solutions to Cuban Problem

In the past year or so, there have been many solutions to the Cuba—or Cuber, if you will—problem, ranging from downright silly to probably workable. Which one eventually will be utilized is something we will have to wait and see.

We feel that the present administration is following a policy that will accomplish the purpose with the least amount of pain and embarrassment.

We say this because, at the current rate, it will be too expensive a toy for the Soviet Union to keep supporting. At present, the Cuban sugar crop, its only real exportable item, is at its lowest and over 90 percent has been allocated to Russia for past debts. The remainder will not be enough to buy peanuts. At least, not enough to buy vodka and caviar. Or tanks and jets and missles.

In order for Cuba to arm, it will be necessary for the Soviet Union to foot the bill. And the Russians, big and powerful as they are, are having problems of their own.

The United States will not allow the Russians to arm Cuba again, and we will continue to keep pressure on them to remove those Soviets who are left on the island. When the cost of upkeep goes beyond the benefit, you can rest assured the Reds will drop it like a hot potato.

Once the Russians pull out, and we feel that day is not far off, that will be the day for Jose Miro Cardono and his boys to pull out all stops. And we are sure it will not be as long a fight as the July 26 movement from the Sierra Madres was.

The Nonviolent Terrorists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I think it is most appropriate today to offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a timely column by Mr. Thurman Sensing in the May 12, 1963, edition of his weekly column, Sensing the News. This particular column is entitled "The Nonviolent Terrorists" and is concerned with the racial agitation efforts by Martin Luther King and others in Birmingham, Ala. Since this column makes such an important point and is so timely, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NONVIOLENT TERRORISTS

(By Thurman Sensing)

The use of schoolchildren to spearhead massive street demonstrations in a Southern city points up the increasingly revolutionary character of the agitation campaign facing this Nation.

For ordinary Americans, it is hard to believe that citizens of this country would attempt to steer a minority group away from evolutionary progress to the alien and dangerous methods of revolution. Yet the troubles in Birmingham, Ala., are proof of the emergence of revolutionary methods on the American scene. Those who have kept a watchful eye on the race agitation campaigns of the last 8 years are aware of the shift to revolutionary tactics and revolutionary aims.

The growth of the Muslim movement, clearly understood as dangerous to civil order in this country, is only the tip of the iceberg that appears above water. Indeed the menace of the Muslims may not be so considerable as some people fear, simply because they are recognized for what they are. But the various groups that profess nonviolence and use the word "Christian" in their organizational names often are shielded by their pious labels. These nonviolent groups aim at essentially the same thing however. They aim at the incitement to violence, at the stirring of civil commotion and at the breakdown of law and order in this country.

Furthermore, the threat of organized lawbreaking is not confined to the Southern States. Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL threatens the District of Columbia with the worst race riot in history if the authorities do not submit to the demands of the Negroes. Northern communities have been subjected to mass agitation techniques with increasing frequency in the last few years. Moreover, the groups that aim at radical revision of social customs in the South are closely related to groups in the North that protest national defense measures, such as testing of nuclear weapons. So-called nonviolent groups that send agitators into the Southern States also have their people protesting against Polaris submarines in the North. There is an interlocking directorate of radicalism that should be thoroughly investigated by law-enforcement agencies in this country.

The terrible H-bomb riots in London, with the waves of political beatniks, should alert American authorities to what they face from the growth of the professional sitin organizations. The agitators who plan a kneel-in in a Southern church may turn next to an invasion of a missile test center in California or a naval base in Connecticut.

It is not by some freak of behavior that the agitators in Birmingham resort to civil disobedience methods that are alien. Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., who has planned these campaigns, is a senior official of the Ghandi Society. This organization, named after the Indian civil disobedience leader, approaches American domestic problems from the standpoint of an Asiatic agitator group. These new agitators seek to create human waves of demonstrators. They want to ride roughshod over all local and State laws.

But the only form of social protest that American communities can properly accept is demand for justice in the courts. This is the sole, truly American way to accomplish change, except by legislative action. But when a mass agitation leader and his high-powered organization turns to the use of mobs, then you know such action is against everything America stands for.

People in all parts of the United States ought to be deeply concerned by the rise of un-American methods of agitation. The goal is the breakdown of law enforcement. The agitators, many of them wearing clerical collars, set an example of lawlessness to thousands of impressionable youths with little learning and less judgment. The result of such demonstrations, as Martin Luther King led in Birmingham, is the rise of a class of terrorists who have nothing but contempt for the American Government. If youths are taught to be contemptuous of law made by city councils and State governments, it is only a short step to be contemptuous of law made by Congress.

The sowing of dissension in America can profit only one cause—the cause of international communism. Demonstrations against the public order of our cities can only be pleasing to the masters of the Kremlin who want to destroy America from within by dividing the country and encouraging lawlessness. The United States cannot afford to have phony nonviolent groups that masquerade behind the word "Christian" and that promote violence and fan the flames of hatred.

The ordeal imposed upon Birmingham, Ala., Albany, Ga., and other communities is an attack on America itself. The need is for the entire Nation to become alerted to the development of terrorism inside the United States by those who profess to be interested in progress but who only spread disorder.

The Brotherhood of the Jungle Cock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on the banks of Big Hunting Creek, in the town of Thurmont, Md., is a beautiful bronze statue of a man teaching a young boy how to properly cast for trout. This statue was dedicated a few years ago by Justice William O. Douglas, of the Supreme Court, one of our great outdoorsmen. The statue was designed and erected by one of our outstanding sportsmen's organizations, the Brotherhood of the Jungle Cock.

The brotherhood was organized 25 years ago in the Catoctin area of Maryland not far from where the statue stands. Its founders were a few of the great sportswriters of the country who saw a growing need for teaching our youth how to preserve the beauty of the out-of-doors and the great fun of fishing. The jungle cock is a beautiful and fearless bird found only in the jungles of South America whose feathers make the most attractive artificial flies used in fishing.

Each year, around the 1st of May, members of the Brotherhood of the Jungle Cock gather from many States to the beautiful area in Maryland where the idea was first born for their annual campfire. No man may attend without bringing him one or more boys—and he must be responsible for teaching and coaching them during the 3 days of the meeting.

This year the campfire was held on the 3d, 4th, and 5th of May. About 400 attended.

I want to extend to this fine organization my compliments and congratulate the dedicated men who, without publicity, have worked so hard to preserve for later generations the benefits of nature's bounty. May they continue to grow and may their efforts be rewarded. We should all be proud that one of our own Senate employees, Mr. Serge N. Benson, is president of the Brotherhood of the Jungle Cock.

I ask unanimous consent that the creed of the brotherhood, together with the program of activities at this year's campfire, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the creed and program were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CREED

We, who love angling, in order that it may enjoy practice and reward in the later generations, mutually move together toward a common goal—the conservation and restoration of American game fishes.

Toward this end we pledge that our creel limits shall always be less than the legal restrictions and always well within the bounty of nature herself.

Enjoying, as we do, only a life estate in the out-of-doors, and morally charged in our time with the responsibility of handing it down unspoiled to tomorrow's inheritors, we individually undertake annually to take at least one boy afishing, instructing him, as best we know, in the responsibilities that are soon to be wholly his.

Holding that moral law transcends the legal statutes, always beyond the needs of any one man, and holding that example alone is the one certain teacher, we pledge always to conduct ourselves in such fashion on the stream as to make safe for others the heritage which is ours and theirs.

PROGRAM

FRIDAY, MAY 3. AFTERNOON

1. Register, go to office at rear of dining room. Get cabin assignment and name card.

2. Go fishing if you have time. Casting lesson at the pond at 4 p.m. Be back at camp

at 6:30 p.m. for dinner. Late comers get what's left.

3. Dinner at 6:30 p.m. sharp.

4. During dinner: welcome, announcements, instructions, answers to questions.

5. After dinner, daylight permitting, fly-bait and spin casting demonstrations and instructions by some of the world's outstanding experts.

6. Evening: fly tying session with Ed Koch at 8 p.m.; movies and entertainment for all boys. Meeting of the nominating committee.

7. Curfew. Hit the sack boys, daylight and fishin' time will be here afore you know it.

SATURDAY, MAY 4

1. Cabin dads: poll your boys and report to Ad Snider * * * at breakfast * * * where each will be for lunch.

2. Breakfast, anytime between 6 and 8 a.m. You can eat and run if you wish. Be sure your cabin is neat.

3. Fishing. Hours are 6:30 a.m. to 9 p.m. daylight saving time. Be sure your timepiece is adjusted properly. See maps for location of streams and ponds. Our pond is well stocked and competent instructors will be on hand to help.

4. To help shame the litterbugs, bring your collection and bag and turn it in before lunch.

5. Lunch at 12 noon sharp. Served at three locations: Camp Airy, Big Hunting Creek, Fishing Creek. Be sure you are where you told your cabin dad you would be when it is time to eat.

6. After lunch: more fishing, hike if you like, catch up on your napping but have fun.

7. More casting classes at the pond from 3 p.m. until 4 p.m.

8. At the pond, 4:30 p.m., a special and most interesting demonstration of forestry. A special crew is coming in for this show and they are the professionals. See it and learn what you can do to help our forests.

9. At the pond, 5:30 p.m., special fly casting demonstration by world famous Joe W. Brooks, one of our founders. Watch him perform and learn the correct way to handle a fly rod.

10. Campfire at 6 p.m. at the pond. This is the most important event of the year. It is a must for all new boys, though all boys should attend. New boys must be there if they are to obtain their Jungle Cock patches. Tickets for prizes at the evening party will be distributed at the campfire.

CAMPFIRE PROGRAM

Gathering the wood, by the new boys.

Laying and starting the fire, Ken Crawford.

Invocation.

"A Country Is No Better Than Its Boys," president Serge Benson.

"How To Get the Most Fun Out of Life," Joe W. Brooks, founder and honorary life president.

Reading of the Creed, W. H. Triplett, chairman of the board.

Awarding of emblems to new boys, Directors Wright, Balke, Jennings, Lewis, Lutz, Manning.

11. Annual dinner, 7 p.m. sharp. You sure won't want to be late for this one.

12. Recognition of special guests, awards, announcements, nomination of directors. No speeches.

13. After dinner, the big party for all boys—movies, entertainment, prizes galore.

14. Annual business meeting of officers and directors.

15. After the party, curfew, (boy am I tired). Goods sports will be quiet, 'nuff said.

SUNDAY, MAY 5

1. Breakfast 6 to 8 a.m.

2. After breakfast: your time is your own. Church services at nearby towns. See nottices of times and places on bulletin boards.

3. At the pond: casting lessons, 11 a.m. until noon—last chance.

4. Lunch at 12:300 p.m., a big one too. Guests may be invited to attend but we must have notice in advance.

5. During lunch: prizes, special awards. Announcements of new officers and the date for the 1964 campfire.

6. Goodbye to your friends. Clean and tidy cabins. Leave them spic and span.

Check out. Be sure to leave your badge pocket. We'll see you next year.

President Kennedy To See Solid Monument of Vision and Progress in the TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee Valley Authority is now recognized as one of the greatest ideas and practical projects this country has ever developed. It is paying vast dividends in preventing flood damage, promoting navigation, forestry and agriculture of the area, as well as paying dividends in the form of reimbursements into the U.S. Treasury with income from power sales for industrial purposes and agricultural and domestic uses. The TVA is fulfilling the dream of Senator Norris and other men of vision. It is the living monument to the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration and progress.

The Washington Post recently in an article by staff reporter Jules Duscha has pointed out some of the great changes and benefits the TVA has brought to the Tennessee Valley area. President Kennedy will see this progress when he visits the Tennessee Valley area in Tennessee and Alabama this week.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

NEW DEAL HAS SOLID MONUMENT IN TVA

(By Julius Duscha)

KNOXVILLE.—The eager young men who came to Knoxville 30 years ago to remake the Tennessee Valley are old and gray, but the unique Government agency they built is not yet fat and tired.

"It's still fun working for the TVA," Aubrey J. Wagner, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, told me as we talked into the night about dams, the power system, the beautiful lakes, the forests, the chemical fertilizers and all of the other programs that have made the valley bloom.

"Red" Wagner arrived in the eroded and depressed valley in 1934 for what he thought would be a temporary job surveying reservoir sites. But like most of the other young men who came from the colleges of the Midwest and the South to work for the TVA in the midst of the depression, Wagner was soon convinced that nothing was more important than making Senator George Norris' dreams for the valley come true.

NEW DEAL MONUMENT

When President Kennedy visits Nashville and Muscle Shoals, Ala., Saturday to mark the 30th anniversary of TVA, he will be honoring an agency that is much more than a carefully controlled faucet for the once destructive Tennessee River. TVA remains an outstanding success long after most other New Deal agencies have withered or succumbed to hardening of the bureaucratic arteries.

TVA is a success, in Wagner's view, because it has been able to work directly and closely with the people of the valley. The papers are shuffled faster and with more purpose in TVA because the people who run the agency can see the results of their work often by just looking out of their windows.

In the Tennessee Valley, there is no real opposition to the agency. When the U.S. Chamber of Commerce denounces TVA, local chambers quickly fire off protests to the national organization in Washington.

Nationally, the opposition to TVA is led by the privately owned electric utilities. They talk about Federal subsidies, taxes, accounting practices and other details, but what really irritates them is the unquestioned efficiency of the TVA electric system.

Throughout the world, TVA is recognized for the success that it is. More than 3,000 foreign visitors come to the valley each year, most of them from underdeveloped countries of Asia and Africa. They go home with the hope that some day they, too, can make a valley prosper.

Although TVA itself is only 30 years old, its genesis goes back to World War I when the Government began to build a huge dam on the Tennessee River at treacherous Muscle Shoals in northern Alabama.

The Tennessee River begins at the confluence of the Holston and French Broad Rivers just above Knoxville, flows south and west into northern Alabama and then turns north until it pours into the Ohio River at Paducah, Ky. Until the Army Engineers built Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals, the Tennessee was not navigable beyond that point.

The dam was constructed to provide power for the wartime production of nitrate explosives, but World War I was over before the structure was completed. In the 1920's, Wilson Dam became the subject of heated controversy.

On the one side was Henry Ford, who wanted to buy the dam from the Government. On the other side were Southern Congressmen who saw in Muscle Shoals a source of power for the manufacture of chemical fertilizers from nitrate and phosphorous.

FRUIT OF 100 DAYS

Senator Norris, a Nebraska Republican and chairman of the important Senate Agriculture Committee, became interested in the Tennessee Valley. Twice in the 1920's, legislation envisioning a TVA was passed and vetoed. In the famous first 100 days of Franklin D. Roosevelt's term, it was passed again and signed into law.

TVA began by building dams, and today it has 28 on the Tennessee and its tributaries. In the 1930's, TVA reforested and showed the people how to prevent erosion in the hills and hollows of the valley. TVA also eradicated malaria, a longtime scourge there.

In World War II, the Government located its first atomic energy installation at Oak Ridge, Tenn., because of the availability of TVA power. Many private industries have also come to the valley to take advantage of that cheap power.

The agency had some of its most difficult years in the 1950's. Former President Eisenhower called it "creeping socialism." Then came the Dixon-Yates contract, which would have taken the rich Memphis power market away from TVA and given it to private utilities.

Out of the controversies of the 1950's came a new financing setup under which the agency now gets funds for its power operations by selling bonds.

Over the last 30 years, $2 billion in Federal funds has been spent by TVA. About half of the money went for power facilities and the other half for reforestation, fertilizer and other development programs. The $1 billion spent on power will be repaid over the next 50 years.

This year, TVA is asking Congress for only $36 million. It will operate its power program with $400 million from the sale of electricity.

In addition to the ever-expanding power needs of the valley—two-thirds of the electricity is now generated in coal-fired steam plants because all of the river power has been harnessed—TVA is particularly concerned about the development of small tributary streams and recreation facilities around its lakes.

TVA is a giant utility. It is the largest user of coal in the United States. It operates the most integrated system of dams in the world. But the people who are TVA have never lost their idealistic zeal for reform, and the valley's prosperous farms, busy towns and cities and new industries are a tribute to their vision.

Health Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, last spring, as we approached action in the Senate on the President's proposal on health care for the aged, a group of leading physicians assembled in Washington to declare their support for that legislation. Their efforts were most valuable as a clear indication that many members of the medical profession do not share the hostility of their outspoken colleagues toward this necessary approach to this special problem the aged face in meeting hospital bills. The measure suffered a narrow defeat in the Senate last July, but has again been introduced, and I am quite confident we are going to see enactment of the social security approach by this Congress.

On May 6, the Physicians Committee for Health Care for the Aged Through Social Security met in Washington and renewed its support for the President's proposal. I ask unanimous consent that a press release from the physicians committee be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED

A group of the Nation's top physicians today reaffirmed its support for hospital insurance for the aged under social security.

The Physicians Committee for Health Care for the Aged Through Social Security announced today, after a weekend meeting in Washington, D.C., that it would "intensify our efforts to distribute reliable information on this issue to our colleagues and to the general public."

The physicians committee was formed in March 1962 after prominent representatives of the medical profession visited President Kennedy at the White House and pledged their support in his campaign for legislation to finance a health program for the aged through social security. The committee is enlisting assistance from other leading members of the medical profession in support of the program.

The committee includes a Nobel prize winner in medicine, a recipient of the American Medical Association's Distinguished Service Award, a former president of the American College of Physicians, a world famous baby doctor, among others prominent in the profession. (A list of the committee is attached.)

The committee's full statement follows:

"We reaffirm our conviction that a program of hospital insurance, financed primarily through social security, should be made available to American's aged—in the interest of both their health and their economic security.

"We are greatly encouraged in our efforts by the large number of physicians throughout the country who have indicated to us their support of the social security-based hospital insurance program.

"We will, therefore, continue to make our voices heard and to encourage others to join with us in support of this important health measure.

"Our committee, a majority of whom are members of the American Medical Association, met in Washington, D.C., over the weekend and made plans to intensify our efforts to distribute reliable information on this issue to our colleagues and to the general public."

PHYSICIANS COMMITTEE FOR HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED THROUGH SOCIAL SECURITY

Robert H. Alway, M.D., Portola Valley,

E. Michael Bluestone, M.D., New York, N.Y., hospital consultant; recipient of American Hospital Association's 1961 Distinguished Service Award.

DeWitt T. Burton, M.D., Detroit, Mich., medical director, Burton Hospital.

Martin Cherkasky, M.D., New York, N.Y., director, Montefiore Hospital; editorial board, Journal of Chronic Diseases.

Robert E. Cooke, M.D., Baltimore, Md., pediatrician in chief, Johns Hopkins Hospital; professor of pediatrics, Johns Hopkins University, School of Medicine.

Edward P. Crump, M.D., Nashville, Tenn., chairman, Department of Pediatrics, Meharry Medical College.

James P. Dixon, Jr., M.D., Yellow Springs, Ohio. President, Antioch College; health commissioner of Philadelphia, Pa., 1952–59.

Benedict Duffy, M.D., Jersey City, N.J., professor and chairman, Department of Preventive Medicine and Community Health, Seton Hall College of Medicine and Dentistry.

Robert H. Ebert, M.D., Cleveland, Ohio, professor of medicine, Western Reserve University; medical director, university hospitals of Cleveland.

Caldwell B. Esselstyn, M.D., Claverack, N.Y., president, Group Health Association of America; founder and medical director, Rip Van Winkle Clinic, Hudson, N.Y.; attending surgeon, Columbia Memorial Hospital, Hudson, N.Y.

Alfred Gellhorn, M.D., New York, N.Y., professor of internal medicine; Columbia University; associate physician, Presbyterian Hospital.

Morton Goodman, M.D., Portland, Oreg., assistant professor clinical medicine, University of Oregon; visiting staff, Good Samaritan Hospital and Multnomah Hospital.

James H. Graves, M.D., Detroit, Mich.; clinical director, psychiatric division, Detroit Receiving Hospital.

Sven Gunderson, M.D., Hanover, N.H.; associate professor of medicine, Dartmouth Medical College; trustee, American College of Physicians.

R. Francis Jones, M.D., Washington, D.C., medical director, Freedman's Hospital; clinical professor of urology, Howard University College of Medicine.

Lawrence S. Kubie, M.D., Towson, Md., director of training, Sheppard and Enoch Pratt Hospital, Baltimore, Md.

Irving M. London, M.D., New York, N.Y., professor and chairman, Department of Medicine, Albert Einstein College of Medicine; director of medical service, Bronx Municipal Hospital Center; holder of Theobald Smith Award in Medical Sciences, American Association for the Advancement of Science (1953).

Daniel R. Mishell, M.D., Beverly Hills, Calif., chief gynecologist, Beverly Hills Doctors Hospital.

Frederick D. Mott, M.D., Detroit, Mich., executive director, Community Health Association.

Dickinson W. Richards, M.D., New York, N.Y., Nobel Laureate in Medicine and Physiology (1956); Lambert Professor of Medicine, Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons.

David Rutstein, M.D., Boston, Mass., professor of preventive medicine, and head of department, Harvard Medical School.

Ernest Saward, M.D., Portland, Oreg., physician in chief, Bess Kaiser Hospital Foundation.

William A. Sawyer, M.D., Rochester, N.Y., past chairman, AMA Committee on Medical Care for Industrial Workers; past president, American Association of Industrial Physicians and Surgeons; medical director, Eastman Kodak, 1919–51; winner of William S. Knudsen Award, 1942–43; Albert Lasker Award, 1955; and American Academy of Occupational Medicine Award, 1958.

Benjamin Spock, M.D., Cleveland, Ohio, professor of child development, Western Reserve University School of Medicine; author, "Pocket Book of Baby and Child Care."

Alonzo Yerby, M.D., New York, N.Y., executive director of medical care, New York City Health Department; medical welfare administrator, New York City Welfare Department.

U.S. Shipping Found Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Members of Congress an article that appeared in this morning's edition of the Baltimore Sun dealing with the subject of emergency and import needs and the requirements to meet national security needs. This is, in my opinion, one of the most vital subjects that should have the attention of our Secretary of Commerce before it is too late:

U.S. SHIPPING FOUND SHORT—NAVY STUDY CITES EMERGENCY AND IMPORT NEEDS

WASHINGTON, May 12.—The United States does not have sufficient active merchant shipping to meet national security needs, Vice Adm. John Sylvester, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, declared in a report released today.

The study sent to Senator MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, cited the deficiencies in our national sealift capability and predicted that the present rate of new shipbuilding will not offset the rapidly approaching bloc obsolescence of the vast proportion of U.S.-controlled merchant-type tonnage, both active and reserve.

MAGNUSON NOTES AGREEMENT

Senator MAGNUSON made the report public today with the comment he agrees crash building programs in wartime can only be avoided by maintaining a modern and adequate maritime posture in peacetime.

"The report findings in this regard," the Senator said, "will be brought to the attention of the Secretary of Commerce so that this disturbing appraisal of the present vessel replacement program may be given fullest consideration."

The Department of Defense is concerned in the critical merchant ship situation, the report noted, not only from a military point of view in situations of emergency, but in the belief that "the operation of the U.S. economy in peace or war is dependent (and increasingly so) on the continued importation by sea of large quantities of raw materials."

REPORT SAYS 94 PERCENT 15 YEARS OLD

The Sylvester report says 94 percent of the U.S.-flag tonnage of dry-cargo tonnage is more than 15 years old, of which 16 percent is in the 20-year-an-older group, and 70 percent in the 15-to-19-year group.

Only 3.1 percent is under 5 years of age and 1.7 percent is from 5 to 9 years old, it noted.

Despite these figures, the Defense Department study shows, the planned ship replacement program for fiscal year 1963 is 18 ships and for 1964 only 17 ships.

In 1962 the total was 13; in 1961 it was 31; 1960, 13; 1959, 14; and 1958, 15.

The replacement ships referred to above are only for the subsidized operators, who have 310 ships. Of these 223 are more than 15 years old, and only 55 under 5 years.

Although the unsubsidized operators operate 688 ships under U.S. flag, few, if any, have either a comprehensive or long-range plan for the replacement of aging ships on an orderly time schedule.

In speaking of national security, Admiral Sylvester refers not only to wartime situations but to peacetime trading.

'The United States is the world's largest consumer of industrial raw materials," his report stated.

IMPORT OF RAW MATERIALS

"Our industrial economy now depends on sea transportation for import of vast amounts of petroleum, metal ores, and other raw materials, and for export of finished products.

"No other types of transportation can meet these tremendous requirements.

"Therefore, it becomes imperative that, as the world's foremost trader, the United States must control sufficient merchant shipping to transport what it needs, to where it needs it, when it is needed.

"This is true from the standpoint of Department of Defense emergency requirements, and it is also valid when we consider the outflow of dollars in payment for foreign. controlled shipping services."

He noted that U.S. flagships carried only 8.8 percent of U.S. total oceanborne commerce foreign trade in 1961. The figure was that high, he commented, only because the law requires that 50 percent of foreign aid material be moved on American vessels.

Admiral Sylvester said the United States should not rely too heavily on the merchant vessels of the NATO countries in times of emergency.

FAVORS SPEED FOR ESCAPE

Furthermore, any new ships built should have a minimum sustained speed of 20 knots in order to be able to elude submarine and aerial attacks. Passenger or troop ships should have a minimum of 25 knots, the report said.

The freighters should have more modern equipment to handle the cargo in order to reduce the turn-around times of commercial shipping.

The concluding remarks of the report to the Commerce Committee stated:

"In order for the United States to maintain adequate merchant shipping to meet our initial wartime needs, it is important that the ships of both subsidized and nonsubsidized operators be periodically replaced under orderly and progressive programs.

"In so doing, every advantage should be taken of recent and future technological developments. * * *

"Our shipbuilding programs should be planned to insure that ships contracted for in coming years will be actually competitive throughout their economic life span."

Scholastic Excellence Encouraged Among High School Students in Morgantown (W. Va.) Area—Candidates for Scholarship Awards Honored at Reception and Luncheon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there is no subject more satisfying, and few of greater importance, than education and the pursuit of excellence. The attainment of a high degree of academic proficiency provides a strong background for the activities of life which are to follow schooldays, and so it is well for us to encourage classroom achievement among young Americans.

As a former teacher, and one who is intensely concerned with the legislative aspects of the problems which confront education in the United States, I am always pleased to note instances where a community is seeking to stimulate academic endeavor. One such commendable program is being carried forward in the city of Morgantown, W. Va., and is now in its fifth year.

Conceived, organized and administered by the management of the Dominion-News, the widely respected Morgantown newspaper, a yearly competition is held which results in the selection of a high school girl and boy to receive scholarships to West Virginia University. The aim of the contest is to foster among young people a high regard for scholastic excellence equal to their enthusiasm for athletic prowess or social popularity. It is designed to help them retain the proper perspectives of life, and to establish values which will hold true over the years.

Favorable publicity and public opinion resulting from the contest has borne rich fruit. By good friend, "Bill" Hart, editor of the Dominion-News, and founder of the event, reports that competition among local high school students is keen, and that there has been a resultant improvement in the quality of schoolwork.

The pathway to the coveted titles of "Miss Peachy" and "Honor Man" is anything but easy. Some 4,000 high school seniors in the Morgantown area are eligible. Included are the schools in two West Virginia counties, and two counties in Pennsylvania.

The faculties of each of the 15 high schools choose 5 boys and 5 girls, with the final selections made by a vote of the student body. The 30 finalists are then subjected to a challenging 2-day battery of tests by Dr. Walter Jarecke, director of guidance and testing at West Virginia University. The winning Miss Peachy and Honor Man are then presented their scholarship awards at the annual Red Carpet reception and luncheon—events organized specifically for that purpose.

Mr. President, on May 11, it was my privilege to participate in the Red Carpet reception and luncheon in Morgantown, W. Va., and to join with other State and local officials in commending these alert young people on their achievements over the year.

Present on this notable occasion were: West Virginia Governor, and Mrs. William Wallace Barron; Representative Harley O. Staggers, Democrat, of West Virginia; Comdr. Ralph Hooton, speaker that same day at the dedication of the mast of the U.S.S. *West Virginia*, at West Virginia University; Dominion-News editor, Walter L. "Bill" Hart, and City Editor Tom Mills; C. Glenn Zinn, executive vice president of the Farmers & Merchants Bank, which provides the scholarship awarded to the girl winner; Mrs. Samuel Chico, and her son, Samuel Chico, Jr., of Chico Dairy, sponsor of the scholarship presented to the winning boy; Charles Stevenson, superintendent of Monongalia County (W. Va.) Schools; John McClure, representing the superintendent of schools for Preston County, W. Va.; State Adjutant-General Brigadier General Gene Hal Williams; and, Gerald H. Coy, general manager of the West Virginia Newspaper Publishing Co.

These public-spirited individuals were in the receiving line at the Red Carpet luncheon held at the offices of the Dominion-News, and presumably greeted each of the award candidates. Following the reception, Sheriff Clarence Johnson and Police Chief John Lewis arranged a motorcade through Morgantown to the Lakeview Country Club, where there was an attractive luncheon, brief remarks from the guests, and presentation of the scholarships to the winning boy and girl.

Mr. President, West Virginians are happy that this significant program of recognition has resulted in a wider appreciation of academic excellence among high school students. We believe that the community spirit shown by citizens of Morgantown, W. Va., is bearing rich fruit, and that its real effect will be apparent in the better educated, better informed citizens of tomorrow.

I request that the article "Who Are Miss Peachy, Honor Man?" in the May 11, 1963, issue of the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News be printed in the RECORD, along with a list of the 30 candidates for scholarship awards.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO ARE MISS PEACHY, HONOR MAN?

Today is the big day for 30 of the Morgantown area's highest ranking graduating high school seniors.

The fifth annual Miss Peachy and fourth annual Honor Man joint luncheon and awards presentation will take place at noon, starting at the Dominion-News office on Pleasant Street, where all candidates and dignitaries will assemble at 11:30 a.m.

Among those on hand to greet the outstanding boy and girl from each of the Morgantown Trading Territory's 15 senior high schools will be Gov. W. W. Barron, U.S. Senator Jennings Randolph; Congressman Harley O. Staggers; Comdr. Ralph Hooton, of Rowlesburg, speaker today for dedication at West Virginia University of the mast of the U.S.S. *West Virginia*. Mrs. Samuel Chico and her son, Samuel Chico, Jr., of Chico Dairy Co., sponsor of the Honor Man program since its inception; C. Glenn Zinn, executive vice president of the Farmers' & Merchants' Bank, sponsor of the Miss Peachy program, since it was initiated in 1959; Walter L. (Bill) Hart, editor of the Dominion-News and founder of the twin scholarship program designed to encourage and promote greater attainment in education among graduating high school seniors in quest of a college education; Paul Watson, superintendent of Preston County Schools; Charles Stevenson, superintendent of Monongalia County Schools; Gerald H. Coy, general manager of the West Virginia Newspaper Publishing Co.

Dr. Paul Miller, president of West Virginia University, who will attend if a stated meeting of the Board of Governors adjourns in time.

After the reception at the Dominion-News offices, the candidates and guests will be escorted to Lakeview Country Club in a special motorcade provided by members of the Morgantown Automobile Dealers Association.

At Lakeview, the scholarship entourage will dine and learn who the 1963 centennial winners are for both the Miss Peachy and Honor Man programs. (The winning names have been deposited in the vaults of the Farmers & Merchants Bank in sealed envelopes, the contents of which will be known to no one until opened at the banquet. The recipients of the 1-year scholarship were selected on the basis of testing by Dr. Walter Jarecke, director of guidance and testing at West Virginia University.

After the luncheon-banquet, the party will motor to Mountaineer Field where they will be guests of the West Virginia University Athletic Department for the annual Gold and Blue intrasquad game at 2:30 p.m.

The Miss Peachy candidates will be presented bouquets by Coombs Flower Shop, and the Honor Men will wear boutonnieres provided by Gutta Flower Center.

The candidates will also be given the red-carpet treatment. Sanders Floor Covering has provided a red carpet on which the candidates will tread to and from the new automobiles being put at their disposal with chauffeurs provided by Morgantown's new car dealers.

Remarks will be made by the dignitaries, with Congressman STAGGERS being the main speaker with a limit of 5 minutes. Mr. Hart will serve as toastmaster.

Members of the Dominion-News staff who have photographed, reported, and processed the yearlong scholarship programs will also be in attendance.

THE 1963 CANDIDATES

MISS PEACHY

Wilma Simpson Colebank, Fellowville High School.

Delores Jean Short, Rowlesburg High School.

LaDonna Faye Garlitz, Terra Alta High School.

Carolyn Ann Sanetrik, University High School.

Sharon Ruth White, Clay-Battelle High School.

Cynthia Vaughn Hollandsworth, Morgantown High School.

Kathleen Karen Carroll, Albert Gallatin High School, Point Marion, Pa.

Nancy Evelyn Fint, Aurora High School.

Rita Laine Copeman, Bruceton Mills High School.

Karen Sue Huchette, Kingwood High School.

Barbara Rose Burless, Mapletown High School, Mapletown, Pa.

Sharon Faye Poland, Tunnelton High School.

Patricia Louise Wolfe, Newburg High School.

Sophia Patricia Katsakis, Saint Francis High School, Morgantown.

Karen Jean Edwards, Masontown High School.

HONOR MAN

Thomas Richard Haynie, Albert Gallatin High School, Point Marion, Pa.

Carl William Sanders, Aurora High School.

Edward Anderson, Bruceton Mills High School.

Charles Albert Lemley, Clay-Battelle High School.

Guy Cox, Fellowsville High School.

Max Allen Harned, Kingwood High School.

Daniel Lawrence Thomas, Mapletown High School, Mapletown, Pa.

Dale McVicker, Masontown High School.

Ronald Gene Helms, Newburg High School.

Larry Edwards, Rowlesburg High School.

Joseph N. Soos, Saint Francis High School, Morgantown.

Roscoe Gene Hill, Tunnelton High School.

David Golden, University High School.

Richard W. Utt, Morgantown High School.

Ronald Layton, Terra Alta High School.

Law Day, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, as we all know only recently—on May 1—this country celebrated Law Day as a demonstration of our recognition of the need for an effective rule of law. It was a great privilege as president of the Federal Bar Association to participate in this celebration.

Many words were uttered on that occasion, Mr. Speaker, describing the advantages of rule by law, but of all the comments I read or heard, none impressed me so deeply as those made by Judge O. Bowie Duckett, of Annapolis. Judge Duckett, who is a member of the circuit court for the State of Maryland, made his comments before the Kiwanis Club of Frederick. Because his speech expresses most adequately the need for the rule of law, Mr. Speaker, I include it in the RECORD and I urge my colleagues to read it at their earliest opportunity:

LAW DAY, U.S.A.

(Address by Judge O. Bowie Duckett)

Kiwanis International is an ideal organization to sponsor Law Day, U.S.A. As you know, the purpose of your great organization is to promote the adoption and application of higher social, business, and professional standards and the development of intelligent, aggressive, and serviceable citizenship.

Likewise, as aptly stated by former President Eisenhower, the aim of Law Day, U.S.A., is, first, to remind Americans of all ages that respect for law is an essential element in our society upon which rests the well-being of all our people; and, second, to demonstrate to the peoples of the world that the rule of law is the ideal to which this Nation truly is dedicated and toward which we are striving in our relations with other nations.

It has been said that freedom under law is like the air we breathe. We take it for granted and pay little attention until we are affected or stepped upon. Law Day reminds us of this great right.

The origin of law is lost in antiquity. Man has always sought law or, at least, justice. Most of us know about Moses, the great Jewish lawgiver and prophet, who received the celebrated tablets upon the slopes of Mount Sinai, and upon which were were inscribed the laws for the government of the Jewish people.

Coming closer to home, but being somewhat of the same character, was an occurrence on the west coast in 1841. At that time, in the vast area called Oregon, but now composed of the States of Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Oregon, there lived only 250 white settlers; the remainder were Indians. In February 1841 the richest settler died. His name was Ewing Young. His various possessions consisted of a choice ranch, a large herd of livestock, and a sawmill. Upon Mr. Young's passing, as there were no laws or Government officials, the remaining settlers were confronted with the difficult problem of the disposition of the valuable estate. If anyone could have helped himself to Young's possessions, an era of lawlessness would have ensued, which would have endangered the property of all the other settlers and probably resulted in bloodshed. To prevent this, a meeting of the settlers was called promptly after the funeral. One of their members, a Dr. Babcock, was elected supreme judge with probate powers. He thereupon appointed Rev. David Leslie administrator. The estate was duly administered, and in this way law and order were first inaugurated in Oregon.

Before law was created, justice was a matter of self-help, with the strongest generally the victor. Since justice was a matter of self-help, vengence was the universal remedy. If the victim was not strong enough to beat or kill the alleged wrongdoer, he would attack a weaker member of the wrongdoer's family, often resulting in feuds or tribal warfare.

As long as man believed that God made our laws, he had no need for constitutional law. Constitutional law was never intended to protect man against God. Its purpose is to protect the citizen against the excesses of government and of the majorities. Slowly we learned that man could make laws and that they should be based on reason. The people then desired some protection against the frailty of reason and the unbridled excesses of the majority. Constitutional law and the Bill of Rights were the answers to the people's prayers for protection.

Our courts in America are the only ones that have the power to declare a statute or law unconstitutional. The courts may thereby confine every lawmaker, sheriff or official within the authority conferred upon him by law. This assures us of a government by law and not by man. It is a sure means of preventing the ambitions of every would-be dictator.

Gladstone, an Englishman, declared that the American Constitution is the most wonderful work every struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man. It must be realized that our Constitution was not produced during the 4-month session of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787. The great patriots and men of wisdom who prepared our Constitution were students of the past with tremendous vision of the future. Our Constitution represents the wisdom of the ages. The members of the Constitutional Convention merely reduced those principles to writing.

Law is not a set of rules unrelated to the other phases of the social order. Law and the trial of cases are not what we see on television. Our Perry Masons do not always win. Most law cases are decided on commonsense and are not very spectacular.

Law makes freedom and progress possible. It is law that brings order into the affairs of men. It enables us to own property, to develop arts and vast enterprises, and contrary to force, permits us to enjoy life and live in peace with others.

We believe in a government of laws rather than of men. While our legal system was handed down from England, we have created law of our own fitted to the needs of this new country. Such is briefly expressed in a famous jury charge by Judge Andrew Jackson in an early frontier case. He instructed the jury "to do what is right between these parties. That is what the law always means".

Law generally does not create rights. normally, its purpose is to protect the people in the enjoyment of their rights. In the beginning, no one believed that man could make law. All assumed that the origin of law was in supernatural powers.

The fact that our Constitution gives to each of us the greatest freedom to make the most of our talents, accounts in large degree to the strength of America.

Our Government guarantees to all freedom to speak and write without Government censure. Each of us under law has a right to a good education, to live where we please and to work where we want. We have the right to worship as we choose, to a fair and speedy trial, and the right to vote secretly for the judge who tries us as well as for all other elected officials. We have the unlimited right to own property and to manage our own affairs. Not only do we have the right to start a business, but the right to engage in any and all lawful pursuits. This may consist of founding a new religious cult, a new school of thought, the writing of a book or the creation of a new political party. We call this our free enterprise system. Freedom to discover the truth and the freedom of enterprise have greatly contributed to the progress of America.

America has become great, not on account of anything which our Government has built or made, but in large measure, on account of the supreme productive capacity and know-how of the American citizens assured to them by our laws.

In the words of President Kennedy, "Ask not what your country will do for you, ask what you can do for your country." Bygone generations substituted law for vengeance as the means of administering justice in controversies between man and man. We of this generation can attempt to improve our laws and see to it that law and not vengeance becomes the means of settling issues between nations. You as individuals can improve the law by taking an interest in it. Two real enemies of law are ignorance and indifference. You are not ignorant. Many of us are indifferent and take no interest in our laws or the government, be it county, State or National. We should take an interest in what the legislature is doing, and learn all we can about the candidates who are running for office. Make your views known to your elected representatives and take the trouble to vote for the best candidates. You cannot complain if a rascal or an incompetent is elected to office when you do not take the trouble to vote. Consider it your duty and an honor to serve on a jury and a greater honor to serve your country. By electing good men to office, you will not only improve the type of our laws but you will promote the efficient and honest administration of them.

We can set an example for the other nations by improving our own laws and our own Government. If this is accomplished, the other nations are sure to follow, which will be a gift of inestimable value to future generations.

Dr. Theodore von Karman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, last week the world lost one of its most distinguished aeronautical scientists with the death of Dr. Theodore von Karman.

During the adult span of his 81 years he was one of the major contributors to man's knowledge of flight. His list of accomplishments and honors was long and was climaxed earlier this year when the United States bestowed upon him its first National Medal of Science for eminent accomplishment.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the New York Herald Tribune, of May 8, and an editorial from Missiles and Rockets, of May 13, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 8, 1963]

VON KARMAN, AVIATION PIONEER, DIES OF HEART ATTACK

AACHEN, WEST GERMANY.—Dr. Theodore von Karman, a chunky little man with bushy white hair, was called the elder statesman of aviation, the father of supersonic flight, the patron saint of the U.S. Air Force. He died of a heart attack Monday night at the age of 81 while here on a sort of pilgrimage.

Since 1951, Dr. von Karman has been chairman of NATO's advisory group for aeronautical research and development.

But from 1912 through 1930, he headed the Aeronautics Institute of the University of Aachen. While holding the post, Dr. von Karman's passion for aerodynamics turned the school into one of Europe's most celebrated centers of advanced research.

His last visit to this ancient Rhineland city was a purely sentimental one; Dr. von Karman would have been 82 years old on Saturday. The students, and the students of the students he taught here during his youth, probably number in the tens of thousands.

Earlier this year, in ceremonies in the White House rose garden, President Kennedy awarded the Hungarian-born scientist the first National Medal of Science. "No one else," the President said, "so completely represents all the areas involved in this medal—science, engineering, and education."

What was Dr. von Karman's greatest achievement?

He formulated a theory that explains the powerful shock wave that, like a huge anchor, forms around a missile or a plane when it plunges through the sound barrier. This is called the Karman Vortex Trail.

Though meaningless to most, the pioneering concept paved the way for all supersonic flight. Just as the theories of Albert Einstein led to the harnessing of atomic power, the theories of Theodore von Karman led to ICBM's and supersonic planes.

Thomas Edison, clearly, was father to the incandescent bulb, and James Watt invented the steam engine. But the great technical breakthroughs of later years have been so incredibly complex, do demanding of scientific resources, it is difficult to pick one man to praise.

Every successful scientist must climb a stairway built of research, a stairway with neither a beginning nor an end. One such stairway leads upward through high-speed flight, through missiles and the Mercury space flights and onward toward the moon. No single scientist carved more of its steps than did Dr. von Karman.

The deceptively simple looking plane propeller owes its present shape to Dr. von Karman's work in the 1920's. Other theories by the score, conceived, then proved by him in wind tunnels of his own design, are easy to list, hard to explain.

The Karman double-modulus theory of columns, the Karman way of building high-strength structure into lightweight planes, the Karman contrarotating helicopter rotor, these are but a few things he left behind.

His distinguished following often said, "Never has a genius acted more like a genius," then went on to exchange von Karman anecdotes.

Though master of seven languages, Dr. von Karman's English was flavored generously with rich Hungarian tones. He punctuated his speech with quick, intricate gestures, as if practicing a sort of scientific sign language.

WORE BLACK CAPE

Often he wore a black silk cape and, while lecturing in the classroom, he would twist and pull and even chew at the handkerchief he always carried.

Born in Budapest in 1881, Dr. von Karman was an assistant professor at the Royal Technical University there in 1903, the year of the Wright brothers' first flight. After teaching aerodynamics at Aachen, he moved to California to do research at the California Institute of Technology. By 1936, he had become a U.S. citizen.

It was at this point that Dr. von Karman began earning a reputation as one of the original absent-minded professors. There were those who said that after a long trip dozens of his mislaid hats would begin filtering back through the mail. One report claimed that during the war he was assigned a special assistant whose job it was to retrieve secret papers that he left in taxis or hotel lobbies.

In Los Angeles—where freeways don't beckon the timid driver—Dr. von Karman's technique behind the wheel also was acclaimed. Once his car sported three smashed fenders. When a friend suggested a visit to the local garage, the scientist said "not yet." There was one fender to go.

The list of honors awarded Dr. von Karman during a career that spanned all of this century seems almost endless. He received, for example:

The Presidential Medal of Freedom and Medal of Merit; the emblem of the French Legion of Honor; the American Society of Mechanical Engineers' medal; the Kelvin Gold Medal; the Astronautics Award of the American Rocket Society; the Wright Brothers Memorial Trophy; the Daniel Guggenheim Medal; and perhaps the highest honor of all, the National Science Medal, 3 months before his death.

HAD 20 DEGREES

At the age of 81, he held more than 20 honorary degrees from universities in Europe and the United States.

While at CalTech during the early 1940's, there was one embarrassing moment when the institute's administration threatened to expel Dr. von Karman for tinkering with dangerous rocket fuels. But such experiments intrigued the late Gen. H. H. (Hap) Arnold, the Army Air Force commander, who thought rockets could aid heavy bombers get into the air on take off.

With General Arnold's blessing, Dr. von Karman put his "suicide club" at CalTech to work on what later became the JATO (jet-assisted take off) bottle.

This lightweight, portable rocket, which the Air Force still uses, probably saved the lives of hundreds of pilots during World War II, pilots who experienced engine failure just after leaving the runway in a loaded bomber.

SPURNED BY MANUFACTURERS

The little group that developed JATO at CalTech evolved into the school's highly respected Jet Propulsion Laboratory. But in 1942, when Dr. von Karman sought to interest the big munitionmaking firms in rockets, he was spurned.

Rather than forget rockets, he and three friends chipped in $1,500 each to form a new company. JATO rockets were its first product. Fifteen years later, it began turning out the mighty rocket engines that propel the TITAN II, most powerful ICBM in the U.S. inventory.

The company founded by Dr. von Karman is now the Aerojet-General Corp., a subsidiary of The General Tire and Rubber Co. and a giant of the space age. For many years, Dr. von Karman was either its chairman, its president or its chief scientific adviser.

FEW UNDERSTOOD

Few men could understand the contributions Dr. von Karman made to science. Perhaps the only time he won applause from men in the street was in 1940, when a few puffs of wind blew down the famed suspension bridge over Washington's Tacoma Narrows.

Informed the bridge would be resurrected in accord with its original design, Dr. von Karman promptly wrote the Governor of Washington: "If you build the bridge the same way, it will fall in the same way."

The result: an invitation to serve on the committee set up to investigate the demise of the $6.4 million span.

Dr. von Karman found that the bridge behaved like a poor designed airplane wing subjected to wind gusts. It heaved up and down, farther and faster, once motion started. To correct the problem, he recommended an open grille in the deck and trusses instead of solid side plates to make the bridge aerodynamically stable.

Dr. von Karman said in his thick Hungarian accent: "I explain all about the wind eddies 46 years ago, but bridge builders, they don't think such eddies cause trouble to something as big as a bridge."

Dr. von Karman was also chairman of the Missiles, Jets & Automation Fund; chairman of the scientific advisory committee on advanced flight propulsion systems, General Motors' Allison Division; an advanced design consultant to General Dynamics, and a visiting professor at universities ranging from France to China.

A WITTY SPEAKER

So witty was the man that friends sometimes accused him of retaining a gag writer. His speeches and writing are filled with bon mots that charmed the scientific community. Some examples:

His definition of a Hungarian: "A man who goes into a revolving door behind you and comes out ahead."

Speaking of love to a female pilot: "A spin is like a love affair. You don't notice how you get into it and it is very hard to get out of."

On a new hobby: "My latest project is a sailboat. I am making it aerodynamically sound. It will not have sails."

DAVID HOFFMAN.

THE OTHER SIDE OF SPACE

Some weeks ago, just after learning he had been named the first recipient of the new National Medal of Science, Dr. Theodore von Karman took an hour out of his busy day to discuss his elder statesman's view of engineering philosophy with Missiles and Rockets editors William Beller and Frank McGuire.

The interview in Dr. von Karman's suite at the Mayflower Hotel was a casual one, roaming over many aspects of our entry into the space age. We carried the interview in the issue of last February 25.

Before he left for Germany, Dr. von Karman made a date with Beller and McGuire for one of his beloved Hungarian dinners—after his return. He won't be back for the dinner.

Dr. von Karman's death after a heart attack in Aachen last week left a void in the scientific community that never will be filled—although he wouldn't much like our use of that word "scientific." He liked to think of himself as an engineer. Not a scientist or an inventor but a creator of hardware.

"I say hardware because it is not a shameful thing to create hardware," he commented.

He recalled how first he got his engineering diploma in Budapest, 60 years ago. Then, to get the degree and title of engineer, the young Von Karman had to design an entire hydraulic system—not just a machine but a system.

"The old way was good because it showed that the engineer had to create something," he emphasized.

This legacy of devotion to engineering may be one of the finest gifts Dr. von Karman has left behind. Coming from one so highly regarded in the scientific world, it stresses the need for engineering and science to complement each other in our exploration of the universe.

"We should not forget that without the engineer there will be no progress," he warned.

It is a warning we hope will be kept in mind. Today, with scientists taking public stands on public issues far beyond their own realm, it is perhaps well to remember the gap between the scientist and the hardheaded practical engineer.

This past week, 25 of America's 55 living Nobel Prize winners took it upon themselves to criticize the present direction of project Apollo. This dissent from the scientific community should not be taken seriously because it is not within the competence of the Nobel group, however distinguished, to determine how much the United States should spend on its lunar program.

Certainly, as American citizens, they have a perfect right to criticize as they please, privately or publicly. We just hope their fellow citizens don't take them too seriously in the belief that the scientists are indeed qualified to judge this subject.

Linus Pauling, for example, in expressing strong opposition to the U.S. moon program, merely reiterated the same muddle-headed thinking that is confusing many of his fellow scientists. He said: "The contribution will be very small compared to putting that money into several other fields such as medical research or other basic scientific research * * * or in using the funds in underdeveloped countries."

How often is it necessary to point out that cancellation of the lunar program tomorrow wouldn't mean an additional dime for these other pet projects that are continually being put forward? Worthy they may be, but there was ample opportunity before initiation of the lunar program and there is ample opportunity now to fund such other programs. They stand or fall on their own worth—not in relation to what is being spent for space exploration. This country is wealthy enough to fund amply, on its own merits, any program it regards as essential.

The Apollo project is so regarded and so funded.

The wire services didn't provide us with the names of the three Nobel winners who declined comment on the U.S. moon program, saying they did not have enough data on it or that the political and scientific aspects of the program cannot be separated. We would, however, like to laud those three anonymous gentlemen for their uncommon good sense. There obviously were 25 of their colleagues who should have taken the same stand.

Dr. von Karman understood well the need for space exploration. Practical in his approach to the earth on which he lived, he still could look outward to envision the day of flight to the planets and even to other galaxies.

We doubt if even those who knew him well were aware of the full range of his career. After early work as an engineer and professor in Germany and Hungary, he served as an officer in the Austro-Hungarian Air Corps in the First World War. After that war, he was a consultant to the Junkers Airplane Works. He designed a wind tunnel in Kobe, Japan. He was an adviser in aeronautics to the National Tsing Hua University in Peiping, China. His valuable work as consultant to the Army Air Corps and U.S. Air Force began in 1939. His roles at Cal Tech and NATO were well known, of course, together with his founding of the company which was to become Aerojet-General Corp.

But Dr. von Karman's interest and abilities were not limited to aeronautics and astronautics. He applied his knowledge in development of pumping equipment for the Los Angeles water system and in investigation of the Tacoma Narrows Bridge collapse.

He was consultant to a number of aircraft firms and received honorary degrees from universities in Germany, Belgium, Israel, Switzerland, France, Turkey, the Netherlands, and the United States. His list of awards from many nations is staggering. He was truly an international statesman and the senior statesman of our industry.

In his last interview with us, conisdering the subject of intergalactic probes, Dr. von Karman mused: "I will consider this one from the other side of space." And so he will.

We wish him affectionate farewell and Godspeed on that long journey to the other side of space.

WILLIAM J. COUGHLIN.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

COUNCIL FOR THE LIBERATION
OF CAPTIVE PEOPLES FROM SOVIET
DOMINATION,
Minneapolis, Minn, April 21, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: First, may I express to you my personal admiration for the splendid work you are doing in advancing the cause of freedom.

Our council, representing over 6,000 American citizens of Eastern European background in Minnesota, comends you, in specific, for the dedicated efforts and knowledgable action in seeking to establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

Democrats and Republicans alike, have learned to value your work and your uncomprising stand on issues so vital to the Security of the United States and to the extension of freedom to the captive lands.

I am enclosing for your information a copy of a telegram I sent to Secretary of State Dean Rusk on April 18th. It deals with abuses of the Cultural Exchanges agreement by the Soviet Union in using it as a disguise to advance its lies and political propaganda.

To bring you up to date on the entire matter, I am also enclosing photostats from 2 telegrams and news clippings, covering a similar situation a year ago in Minneapolis.

The entire material should be self-explanatory and reveals the double standards used by the State Department in what it professes and what it actually does.

No wonder then that its opposition to House Resolution 14, constitutes a stand diametrically opposed to its professed objectives on the same subject.

In deep respect and admiration.

Very respectfully yours,
ERICK A. DUNDURS, *President.*

GROUP PROTESTS RUSS CHILD ART SHOW

A protest against the Soviet children's art exhibit at the Minneapolis Institute of Arts was sent Thursday to the State Department by a Minnesota organization.

Erik Dundurs, president of the Council for the Liberation of Captive Peoples from Soviet Domination, in a four-page telegram to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, said the exhibit "violates the letter and spirit of the cultural exchange agreement between the United States and Russia.

Dundurs said art work by Latvian, Estonian and Lithuanian children at the exhibit is mislabeled as Soviet "because the United States does not recognize the annexation of these Baltic states."

"It is misrepresentation and a provocative act," Dundurs said. "They are saying, 'Look here—no matter what your Government says, Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania are ours for keeps."

Mrs. Zoya Solodkaya, head of the Soviet exhibit personnel, said the art was not mislabeled.

"Estonia, Lativia, and Lithuania are integral parts of the Soviet Union * * * and enjoy equal rights with all other Soviet Socialist Republics. Therefore the creative work of the children of those republics is equally represented at our exhibition."

Dundurs also charged that the unscheduled activities of the Russian personnel in Minneapolis violates the spirit of the exchange agreement.

He said the Russian guides are trying to "soften American resistance to communism" through speeches at civic and church groups and on radio and TV.

Dundurs said he objected because there is "no reciprocity" in the Soviet Union. "Any cultural exchange between the United States and Russia has been a one-way street," he said.

The Minneapolis insurance agent said he asked the State Department for "corrective measures"—removal of the "mislabeled" art and closer supervision of the activities of the Soviets.

Carl Weinhardt, institute director, said he agreed with Dundurs' point about the Baltic nations.

"However," he said, "the exhibition came to us as a package from the State Department. We have no control over the specific objects in it."

A. A. Granovsky, biology professor emeritus at the University of Minnesota and vice president of the Liberation Council, which claims to represent 6,000 Minnesotans, said he has "serious doubts" that some of the items at the exhibit were made by Soviet children.

He specifically cited a working model of an excavating machine.

Eugeney Voloshin, a Soviet guide at the exhibit, replied: "Believe me, honestly, all labels cover exactly how it is done. The working excavator was made by 16- and 17-year-old boys."

Dunders said Representative Walter Judd, Republican, of Minnesota, and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, received requests from the council to support the protest.

MURROW QUITS ART PREVIEW—WON'T APPEAR AT SOVIET EXHIBIT HERE

USIA Director Edward R. Murrow has withdrawn as representative of the U.S. Government at a formal preview of a Soviet exhibition of children's art because it identifies the Baltic Republics as part of the Soviet Union.

The exhibition, being held under a cultural exchange agreement, is scheduled to open Monday at Wheaton Plaza and continue until April 25. Some 700 guests were invited to a preview at 6 p.m. today.

A statement from the U.S. Information Agency noted that the U.S. Government "does not recognize the forceful annexation of the Baltic Republic by the Soviet Union."

It said the State Department earlier had informed the Soviet Embassy it considered it inappropriate for the exhibition to contain materials which identified the Baltic States as part of the Soviet Union.

"Since they continue to be emphasized in the exhibition, Mr. Murrow feels that he cannot participate in the opening ceremony," the USIA said.

At the Soviet Embassy, a spokesman said there was no comment on Mr. Murrow's withdrawal. Ambassador Anatoly F. Dobrynin was scheduled to speak at the ceremony today.

Informative material issued in connection with the exhibition says it includes work of children of "all the 15 national Soviet Socialist Republics," and lists the Lithuanian S.S.R., the Estonian S.S.R., and the Latvian S.S.R. among them.

"The Department of State and the USIA regret this turn of events but continue to believe that the exchange of exhibitions furthers the aims of the exchange program between our two countries; namely, to acquaint the people of the United States and the Soviet Union with the life, institutions, and ideals of one another," USIA said.

UNITED STATES REPLIES TO CITY RUSS ART SHOW PROTEST

The State Department replied Thursday to a Minnesota organization's protest against the Soviet children's art exhibit at the Minneapolis Institute of Arts.

Erik Dundurs, president of the Council for Liberation of Captive Peoples From Soviet Domination, had complained last week:

That art work by Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian children was mislabeled as Soviet because the United States never had recognized Communist annexation or these Baltic States.

That unscheduled activities of the Russian exhibit personnel were propagandistic, and that there was no reciprocity in the Soviet Union.

Frank G. Siscoe, State Department director of Soviet and East European exchanges, in a wire to Dundurs said, "Differing conditions of closed * * * and open societies necessarily caused obvious discrepancies in permissible activities in each country.

"The U.S. Government * * * is fully prepared to rely on wisdom, maturity, and good judgment of American people in evaluating Soviet propaganda activities in their midst," he said.

The wire also said that the content of the Soviet art exhibit "in no way has support or approval" of the government, which continues nonrecognition of Soviet annexation of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

Siscoe said, "This will be the subject of discussion with Soviet Embassy here."

Dundurs said the State Department answer "implies this question by far is not a dead duck yet."

He said that when the exhibit opens in Washington, D.C., in April, the American Baltic Council, representing more than 1 million people in the United States, "would definitely protest" the exhibit.

CAPTIVE PEOPLES OFFICIAL DISRUPTS PARTY FOR RUSS

(By Peter Vanderpoel)

A farewell party-press conference hosted by a touring Russian group was disrupted Friday by the president of the Twin Cities Council for Liberation of Captive Peoples From Soviet Domination.

The Russians, touring with an exhibition of Russian children's artistic and creative work as part of a Government-sponsored cultural exchange, plan to leave the city today after a 4-week exhibition.

Erik A. Dundurs, Wayzata, who said he is a correspondent for Laiks, an American-Latvian newspaper published in New York, vigorously protested the exhibition of work done by children in Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania.

He said the fact these countries are run by Communist governments belies "the professed humble goals" of the cultural exchange.

Boris Voronov, assistant exhibit director, read a prepared statement thanking the Twin Cities for their hospitality, then proposed a toast to "lasting peace and friendship between the peoples of two great countries—the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A."

He repeatedly declined to answer questions from a number of newsmen, but pressed by Dundurs, grimly defended the cultural exchange.

"Exchanges not only can but do lessen international tensions and improve friendship among peoples, and graphic proof is the success of this exhibit," Voronov said through an interpreter.

"Thousands of Americans," he said, "have understood the goals and appreciated our efforts to improve understanding.

"As for the Soviet Socialist Republics of Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania, they are an integral part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and their children have every right to show their works in an exhibition abroad.

"This is a provocative act in the eyes of the United States," replied Dundurs. "This is turning into a Soviet propaganda session."

A number of the Russians, mostly women who had crowded around Dundurs and newsmen, laughed at his remark. But Eugene Voloshin, who teaches English at a Moscow pedagogical institute, replied angrily, "You are the only person here who has tried to make propaganda."

Forrest Selvig, assistant museum director, broke up the argument. "This is not the time nor place to air grievances," he said. "We do not disagree with Mr. Dundur's goals or ideas, but we disagree with his means. This was to be a going-away party, and Mr. Dundurs said he would not disrupt the friendly relations."

Dundurs said, "The American Baltic council in Washington (where the exhibition is next scheduled) will keep doing the job we began here. Our representative, Walter Judd, has already made the contacts in Washington."

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
March 15, 1963.

U.S. Secretary of State,
Washington D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Counsel for the Liberation of Captive Peoples from Soviet domination, representing over 6,000 Americon citizens of Eastern European background in Minnesota is herewith submitting to you a formal protest regarding the exhibit of art and design by Soviet children, now on display at the Minneapolis Institute of Art. The counsel has further decided to call upon Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and Representative Walter H. Judd to intercede on our behalf at the State Department. I'm submitting to you the following arguments. The Soviet Union in displaying and labeling exhibits from Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania as being Soviet, is violating the letter and spirit of the cultural exchange agreement between the United States and the U.S.S.R. since the United States has never recognized the annexation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union and this has been affirmed by you twice during the last 30 days. This Soviet act constitutes provocation and misrepresentation. We further construe this as a Soviet test balloon to sound out American public opinion. In the absence of vigorous American objections the Soviet Union could then at some future time seek full and permanent recognition of the incorporation. The Soviet task force of 28 persons traveling with the exhibit is constantly engaged in unscheduled activities to soften the resistance of the American people in invading civic and church groups in the Twin City area. Some members of the Soviet group have managed to command American air waves to spread and disseminate lies, distortions, and standard Soviet propaganda. At this very time the Health in United States exhibit in the Soviet Union is being formally denounced by the newspaper of the Soviet Health Ministry as a distortion, allegedly concealing fact known very well by the Soviet people. It is obvious that the goal of the Soviet leadership to downgrade the United States is far distant from the American objective. Considering the above fact it is equally obvious that the U.S. State Department is guilty of appeasement, using of double standards in what it professes and what it actually does, and failure to supervise and screen the Soviet exhibit as to material and activities detrimental to the United States and our national goals. We humbly request immediate corrective measures to stop responsible Soviet authorities from showing mislabeled Latvian, Estonian, and Lithuanian exhibits in Minneapolis and in Washington, D.C.

We also request that the unscheduled activities of the Soviet task force are strictly supervised and limited on a basis of reciprocity, defined in scope, subject, frequently and media. If no corrective measures are taken the exhibition including personnel will serve only the evil goals of international communism aimed at the total destruction of the free world including the United States of America. I have called a press conference for today, 2 p.m., Minneapolis time, at which I will release the contents of this telegram to the news media. Thanking you in advance for your help and cooperation.

I remain very truly yours.

ERIK A. DUNDURS,
President, Counsel for the Liberation of Captive Peoples from Soviet Domination.

ERIK A. DUNDURS,
President, Council for Liberation of Captive Peoples, Wayzata, Minn.:

Your telegram of March 16 to Secretary Rusk has been referred to me for reply.

Please accept Department's assurances that permission granted by U.S. Government for Soviet exhibitions under United States-U.S.S.R. exchanges agreements is based on considerations of reciprocity, although differing conditions of closed, as compared to open, society necessarily cause obvious discrepancies in permissible activities in each country. It is precisely because U.S.S.R. is closed society that our exhibitions there are so important. On other hand, U.S. Government, believing in superiority and strength of democratic institutions of this free society is fully prepared to rely on wisdom, maturity and good judgment of American people in evaluating Soviet propaganda activities in their midst.

Please rest assured that content of Soviet exhibition in Minneapolis having to do with Baltic States in no way has support or approval of U.S. Government which continues nonrecognition of Soviet annexation Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. This will be subject of discussion with Soviet Embassy here.

FRANK G. SISCOE,
Director, Soviet and Eastern European Exchanges Staff, Department of State.

INDIANAPOLIS, *April 20, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Committee of Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

I heartily endorse the House Resolution 14 submitted by Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, Member of Congress, and urge that quick action be taken on establishing a special committee on the captive nations.

I truly believe that the establishing of the Committee on Captive Nations is in the fundamental interest of our Nation.

Respectfully yours,
JENO J. KOCHONSKY.

School Prayers and Religious Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have just had an opportunity to read a very interesting article in the April 23, 1963, issue of National Review, one of our Nation's most eloquent and forthright publications. The article is entitled "School Prayers and Religious Warfare—Did the Supreme Court Realize What Legal Doors It Was Opening in Its Regents' Prayer Decision?" and was written by Mr. Walter Berns. I ask unanimous consent that this provocative article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL PRAYERS AND RELIGIOUS WARFARE—DID THE SUPREME COURT REALIZE WHAT LEGAL DOORS IT WAS OPENING IN ITS REGENTS' PRAYER DECISION?

(By Walter Berns)

Last year the Supreme Court of the United States held that New York could not encourage recitation of the regents' prayer in its schools. The decision was greeted by a great public outcry and was followed by the introduction of more than 50 proposals to amend the Constitution. These, in turn, inspired a statement in favor of the prayer decision submitted to the Senate Judiciary Committee by 132 deans and professors of law and political science, a statement that concluded with these words: "The intrusion of religion upon the public school system both threatens the separation of church and state and challenges the traditional integrity of the public schools. That intrusion, if permitted, will greatly endanger the institutions which have preserved religious and political freedom in the United States and have prevented religious warfare in this Nation. The decision of the Supreme Court in the regents' prayer case has warded off that threat."

If we may be permitted to indulge, for the moment, in the same hyperbole, we would say that the decision is more likely to promote religious warfare. At a minimum, it will thrust religion into the political arena, and whether the resulting discord will be serious depends on what the Court does in the cases spawned by the prayer decision; for, by ruling against the ill-advised religious enthusiasts in New York, the Court has inspired the ill-advised antireligious enthusiasts around the country to mount one legal assault after another on whatever elements of religious establishment they can find, and there are many.

The decision against the New York prayer will surely not in itself be detrimental to religion in this country; any prayer adopted in the schools of a heterogeneous State like New York is likely to be innocuous, if not profane, and the Regents' Prayer was denounced by some leading churchmen on this ground; whereas the schools with a religiously homogeneous student body may very well ignore the decision, just as most of the 2,200 schools with released-time programs for religious instruction apparently ignored the 1948 decision of the Court invalidating the program in Champaign, Ill. There is reason to believe that Federal marshals will not be ordered to swoop down upon the Nation's schoolrooms and arrest teachers leading their children in daily prayer. It could never be omitted officially, but this widespread public rejection of the decision undoubtedly contributed to the upholding of New York City's released-time program 4 years later, when the Court tempered its logic with a greater concern for the "public sentiment" that Lincoln said makes "statutes and decisions possible or impossible to be executed."

This term the Court has agreed to decide whether Maryland and Pennsylvania may permit or require the reading of Bible verses in their schools. Looming up in the future are cases involving the recitation of the Lord's Prayer, and others, such as one decided in the Florida courts last June, involving hymn-singing, observance of religious holidays, the showing of films with religious themes or content, and even the conducting of baccalaureate services tinged (or, to the Unitarian petitioner, tainted) with religious elements. And surely it will not be long before a group of devout Ethical Culturalists will take Justice Dougles at his word, expressed in his concurring opinion in the New York prayer case, and seek to enjoin the use of the Bible in the administration of oaths and of the slogan, "In God we trust," on the coin of the realm.

FACING THE FUTURE

Still further in the future, but logically very present, are cases involving the decoration of public buildings during religious seasons, such as the blue cross that, for a couple of weeks each year, adorns the Olin Library at Cornell, a university with State-supported colleges within it. (A crisis was averted this year by the suggestion that the libirary display a blue shield alongside the blue cross, thus permitting each student who insists upon it an alternative significance.) And surely the courts will soon be asked to enjoin the Post Office from canceling letter stamps with the religious admonition, "Pray for Peace."

It is always hazardous to predict what the Court will do, but it is reasonably certain that decisions against the religious ceremonies and symbols involved in these cases will provoke a storm greater and more sustained than the one that greeted the New York prayer decision. A doctrinarism of one extreme is certain to provoke a doctrinarism at the other, and one can only shudder at the prospect of the reaction—even in this country in the mid-20th century—to a Douglas-inspired decision requiring the Armed Forces to get rid of their chaplains, the mint to issue new coins, the schools to refrain from singing the national songs unless certain lines, such as "God shed His grace on thee," are deleted, or perhaps merely hummed; and requiring both Congress and the States to amend their tax laws so as to deprive the churches of the extensive tax benefits they now enjoy—and probably need.

The policy of separating church and state represented the hope that religious passions, which had been responsible in the past for the most terrible wars and civil discord, would not in this country be transformed into political passions. Surely we should know that such a transformation can be the consequence not only of the attempt to end the separation by requiring adherence to a particular creed—such an attempt, and the New York prayer was not one, is not likely to be made in our time—or by the "intrusion of religion upon the public school system," as the 132 deans and professors put it (as if prayers in public schools were some sort of an innovation). We should also know that it can be the consequence of the attempt to create an absolute separation by removing every official acknowledgment of God, which is what Justice Douglas would have us do, and every prudent statesman would have us avoid. The adoption of the prayer was a mistake on the part of the regents, surely; but the suit to enjoin it was a mistake on the part of the antireligious zealots of New Hyde Park, N.Y. (who but an antireligious zealot would find the regents' prayer sufficiently offensive to justify the hiring of counsel and the expenditure of a great deal of time, money, and energy needed to fight the case through the various levels of the judicial system?); but the biggest mistake, and the one most readily avoided, was the Court's decision declaring the prayer unconstitutional.

To say that the Court made a mistake is not to say that there is validity in some of the harsh things said about the decision by the Court's most vocal critics. The standard of validity of any decision, the standard against which the work of the Court is to be measured, is not so readily ascertained as some of the critics would have it. Not much is gained by saying that this standard can be found in the words of the Constitution. If the process of constitutional interpretation were that simple, anyone with a dictionary could be a judge and, what is more to the point, there would be little criticism of the Court. Who, for example, would be disposed to attack the Court were it to invalidate, say, a Texas statute granting General Walker a letter of "marque and reprisal" entitling him to fit out of a privateer and seize Cuban commerce on the high seas? But no State is likely to do such a thing, at least, not in so many words. What disinterested person would be disposed to attack the Court were it to declare unconstitutional a joint resolution of Congress declaring some impatient member of the Kennedy family not yet 30 years old eligible to serve in the Senate? Congress is certainly not about to pass such a resolution; but if it were to do so, only a blindly partisan person would abuse the Court for striking it down, for such a resolution would be clearly prohibited by the Constitution.

NATION AND STATES

Nor is the standard of a valid constitutional decision always to be found through an examination of historical records to learn the intent of the men who wrote and accepted the words of the relevant clause. There is no doubt that the words, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion," were not intended to prevent a State from encouraging recitation of an official prayer in its public schools, or even from establishing an official church. But much has happened to alter the constitutional relation of Nation and States since those words were written, and when, to cite only a few examples of religious establishment, the Congregationalists controlled Connecticut, Massachusetts required its towns to provide, at their own expense, "for the institution of the public worship of God," and the North Carolina constitution provided that no one except a Protestant was eligible to hold public office in the State. The most important event was the ratification of the 14th amendment after the Civil War. The principal source of constitutional limitations on State power, its most relevant clause forbids States to deprive anyone of liberty without due process of law. What this means in all its manifestations is one of the most hotly disputed points dividing constitutional scholars, but one thing can be said with certainty: the Court has long since held that the religious liberties of the first amendment are part of the "liberty" that the States are forbidden to deprive any person of. Thus, in our time, neither Congress nor the States may make a law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. This "incorporation" of the first by the 14th amendment is so familiar a part of our constitutional law now that Justice Black in his opinion for the Court in the Regents' Prayer case made no more than a casual reference to it. Is the Court to be criticized for doing this? Anyone disposed to do so is required to ponder the desirability in this day of the alternative: States would still be free to disfranchise men and women because of their religious beliefs, or to require persons to subscribe to specific articles of faith as a condition of incorporating a religious body, or to do some of the other things they were doing during the first years under the Constitution.

But New York did not banish recusants from its policy; it did not demand taxes for the support of an official church; it merely encouraged its schoolchildren to say, "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country." True enough, said Justice Black, but, he added in the familiar words of Madison, "'It is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties.'" The reply to this is that there are times when it is prudent to hold one's logic on a short leash, and for its failure to do this the Court deserves to be criticized. One successful suit leads to another (the truly zealous Unitarian will not rest content with a victory in the New York skirmish), and somewhere along the line—whether at the Bible reading, the Lord's Prayer, the tax exemptions, the chaplains, the coins, the prayers at the opening of a session of Congress, or the Bible at the inauguration of a President—Justice Black and his zealous colleagues are going to have to call a halt to their logic, or the people and the Congress will surely do it for them. Where the Court made its mistake was in agreeing to apply its logic at all—that is, in agreeing to decide the case on its merits. What is more, if it had followed precedent, the precedent of a wiser past, it would have refused to decide it.

THE QUESTION OF STANDING

It so happens, and not by chance, that the Court has in its judicial armory a device that permits it to exercise a great deal of discretion as to the cases it will hear and decide. The term for this is "standing," or standing to litigate. When 10 years ago the parents of some New Jersey schoolchildren protested the reading of Bible verses in the public schools of that State, the Court dismissed the case by denying standing to the parents. This is done, or used to be done, when a petitioner cannot show that he has been injured, either as a taxpayer or in a more subtle manner, by the practice complained of. Justice Brandeis, whose credentials as a great judge are accepted by all Liberals, once wrote as follows: "The Court developed, for its own governance in the cases confessedly within its jurisdiction, a series of rules under which it has avoided passing upon a large part of all the constitutional questions pressed upon it for decision." One of these rules, he went on, is the one that the Court "will not pass upon the validity of a statute upon complaint of one who fails to show that he is injured by its operation." There is nothing reprehensible about this; in part it rests on the sound proposition that not everyone who dislikes some law should be able to go to court and ask it to be declared unconstitutional. The Court in the New Jersey Bible-reading case was only quoting from one of its earlier decisions when it said: "'The party who invokes the power (of the Federal courts) must be able to show, not only that the statute is invalid, but that he has sustained or is immediately in danger of sustaining some direct injury as a result of its enforcement, and not merely that he suffers in some indefinite way in common with people generally.'"

What injury was sustained by the parents or their children as a result of the recitation of the regents' prayer? The parents could not show that recitation of these 22 words every morning added to their annual school taxes; the children were not coerced—they could have left the room, arrived late, sat down, turned their backs, or crossed their fingers, and no one would have commented on it. Were they humiliated in some fashion? Neither Black in his opinion for the Court nor Douglas in his concurring opinion rests his opposition to the prayer on that ground, and this is not by chance, for the record is barren of any evidence that the children themselves had protested the prayer recitation. Were the parents injured in the sense of being deprived of the freedom to raise their children to be irreligious—that is, was there some danger that the children would be converted? The Court did not base its decision on this ground which was prudent, because only 10 years earlier Justice Douglas had said in another religious case that "we are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being," from which it follows, logically if not for Douglas, that to convert the irreligious to religion would be good for the polity. Not only did the Court refuse to follow precedent and dismiss the case without ruling on the merits, but the opinion of the Court contains not one word on the question of standing. One wonders why.

PRINCIPLE VERSUS DESIRABILITY

If neither the parents nor the children were required to show that they had sustained, or were in immediate danger of sustaining, some direct injury as a result of the prayer, does this mean that anyone can now get standing in a Federal court to protest some law that in his opinion violates the Constitution? For example, for all that appears in the opinion of the Court, a person who had no children in the schools, and whose interest in the recitation of the prayer was "undifferentiated from the mass of his fellow citizens," might have brought the suit to enjoin its recitation. It is doubtful that the Court meant to go so far, although many persons, including the Unitarians who have protested chapel services at the Naval Academy, and other such practices, have assumed that it ought to do so. (This, too, may prove ill-advised on their part, for what is sauce for the goose can turn out to be sauce for the gander. What is needed as the first step is for someone with the same litigious proclivities to ask the courts to enjoin the States from granting charters of incorporation, with all the considerable advantages of that legal status, to Unitarian Churches.) And if anyone can get standing in a Federal court to protest State practices of or aid to religion, does this mean that someone may now sue to enjoin Federal aid to religion? Specifically (and one wonders if it was not this that the Court had in mind when it ignored precedent and granted standing to the New York parents in order to strike down that innocuous prayer), is the way now open for someone to sue to enjoin an appropriation to parochial schools? The proposed financial aid to church schools is by no means innocuous—to judge from the heat of the debate it has inspired so far—and many persons have claimed it to be a clear violation of the first amendment. Prior to the school prayer decision, however, there was no way for anyone to challenge its constitutionality in the courts. Has the Supreme Court now provided a way of doing this?

Although a ruling on the constitutionality of an issue can sometimes moderate political strife by transforming what had been a question of principle into a question of mere desirability, the example of the Dred Scott decision, which the Court could have avoided by holding that Scott, because he was not a citizen of Missouri, had no right to bring his suit in a Federal court, is sufficient to show that the Court cannot settle every intense political issue dividing the Nation. The Justices are sometimes criticized for using the standing device as a dodge enabling them to avoid issues, but issues like that involved in the Dred Scott case should be avoided by the Court, and the Court acts in its best tradition when it sometimes refuses standing to the party who insists on a proclamation of principle. This is also true when it resorts to the standing device to avoid exacerbating differences, which is what it did not do in the school prayer case; and because it did not, because it was not prudent, it has opened the way to those private groups that are not prudent, and perhaps not even tolerant. One might have thought the 22-word prayer a small price for the general freedom of opinion that prevails in this country, or for the benefits of American life generally; and certainly one can avoid seeing it as an experiment on our liberties or as posing a threat of religious warfare.

Readers of today's sophisticated books will know that some words appear in these books only in inverted commas ("justice," "good," "bad," etc.) to indicate that they cannot be used seriously in a scientific and rigorous vocabulary. If, by its decision in the school prayer case, the Court intended to clear the way for every antireligious zealot who is offended by every public mention or acknowledgment of God, then, to adopt the only supplication permitted, "God" save this Honorable Court.

Rumania's Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, flags were hoisted all over Rumania on the occasion of Rumania's official national holiday. But ironically Rumania's official national holiday commemorates, not some great event in the life of the Rumanian people, but the triumph of Soviet arms at the end of World War II. Thus is a conquered people forced to pay homage to its conquerors.

But as Thursday Rumanians did not page homage in their hearts. It was on the following day, May 10, that Rumanians—quietly and without the hoisting of flags—recalled the freedom and independence that once were theirs and looked forward to the day when their country may again be delivered from foreign domination. For it was on May 10, 1866, that Prince Charles I was inaugurated sovereign of a united people, and on May 10, 1877, that Rumania finally threw off the Ottoman yoke.

The peoples of Eastern Europe differ from one another in history, language, and customs, Mr. Speaker, but they are at one in their love of liberty and in their passionate desire for national independence. We in America share fully their hopes and ideals. On the occasion of the Rumanian national holiday it is a great honor to salute the people of Rumania and to assure them that they have not been forgotten, and will not be forgotten, by freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

The Future for Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a recent article on the U.S. foreign aid program was called to my attention because of the reason and reasonableness of its comment. It says:

> We say that the American people would rally to the support of the U.S. foreign aid program if they were assured that henceforth our assistance would be governed by the principle that all recipients should demonstrate their responsibility and reciprocate our friendship and good will * * * As matters now stand, U.S. assistance is essentially indiscriminate. It makes no distinction between friend and foe.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD "The Future for Foreign Aid" from the winter issue, 1962–63 of the publication of the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FUTURE FOR FOREIGN AID

During the last session of Congress the foreign aid requests of the President were slashed by over $1 billion. In November, the foreign aid program suffered another jolt by the resignation of Fowler Hamilton, Administrator of the Agency for International Development (AID). These must not be regarded as isolated events. On the contrary, they are part of the profound crisis which threatens to undermine the whole program of U.S. aid.

Congress, which is a sensitive weather vane of public sentiment, did not act in a frivolous manner when it overrode the administration's request for funds. Indeed, Congress' decision reflected a deep-rooted suspecion among wide sections of the American people that our foreign aid program has lost all sense of reality.

It is undoubtedly true that the foreign aid setup has suffered from a variety of internal abuses. It has been burdened with a huge bureaucracy; it has attracted the special interests and has created a host of vested interests; it has been subjected to numerous congressional investigations which have not always been constructive; it has been victimized by inexcusable waste and duplication; it has been reorganized and reshuffled over and over again; it has become a political football among the executive agencies of the Government; its functions have been delegated and dispersed and then reconsolidated.

All of this man-made confusion, duplication, inertia, wasted motion are recorded in the fact that the foreign aid program has now had 14 different administrators—only three of whom lasted longer than one session of Congress. Yet, in all of this hectic mishmash the United States has given aid amounting to about $90 billion since the end of the war. In recent years this assistance has been averaging about $4 billion annually. Has all this been in vain? Of course not. The fact is that U.S. postwar aid has been a vital ingredient in the stimulation of the world economy following the devastations of World War II. U.S. foreign aid has been an important symbol of our dedication to help the less fortunate. It has been an unprecedented act of generosity and farsighted self-interest.

Therefore, the growing disenchantment is not due to the fact that Americans regret or depreciate what U.S. foreign aid accomplished, nor, for that matter, is it due to the internal difficulties of administration as outlined above. There is something far more fundamental which is now disturbing America. It is simply the feeling that our aid programs have lost touch with the real world.

Editorial comments in newspapers dwell on the need for major internal reforms of the administrative apparatus of the aid project. There is also repeated emphasis on the need to procure an administrator who is dynamic and forceful. There is no question but that the foreign aid setup could stand a major overhaul under the guidance of an outstanding administrator. But no matter how successful we are in dressing up the foreign aid administration, we shall not be able to make it truly effective until it is anchored to concrete principles which reflect concrete realities.

Let's face it, the "one world" of Wendell L. Willkie is still a dream. Today, 17 years after the defeat of the Axis powers, the struggle for a just and durable peace is still before us. The realities of that struggle leave no room for sentimentalists and/or wishful thinkers. If our diplomacy must be geared to the world as it is, then certainly so should our foreign aid. To put it another way, we do not advance our national interests by enhancing the strength and prestige of those who thrive on cold war tension and exacerbate the dangers posed by our protagonists. Yet, it is precisely on this crucial point that U.S. aid shows an astonishing blindness.

We shall cite one example of this myopia, although there are other situations that could also be mentioned. According to the latest published figures, the United States has given Egypt over $700 million and we are committed to another $500 million in the next few years. Meanwhile, the Soviets have aided Egypt to the tune of about $900 million, one-third of which goes for military hardware. Commenting on this remarkable Egyptian feat, the London Times, August 30, 1962, wrote: "Of the accepted neutrals * * * President Nassar would appear to have been the most successful at playing one side off against the other * * * ." Cairo's neutrality has been succinctly described by Radio Cairo: "There is no difference between dollar and ruble slavery."

Obviously, Egypt is not at all adverse to accepting the kind of slavery which brings forth a steady shower of dollars and rubles. However, when one probes a bit deeper into Cairo's professions of neutrality, one finds a startling contrast between word and deed. Cairo's record at the United Nations, in the Middle East, in Africa, and in the Cuban crisis as well as the definitive statements of Egypt's leaders and propagandists show Egypt in an altogether different light.

Thus, in President Nasser's letter to President Kennedy which was unprecedented in its insulting arrogance and filled with snide remarks (unfortuntaely, the complete text was not published in any U.S. newspaper), Nasser told the President: "I assure you that I shall continue to have much loyalty to the government of the Soviet Union." Commenting on President Nasser's letter, Radio Cairo assured its Arab listeners that Nasser would hold firm to the "supreme Arab interests * * * discarding the enticements and Kennedy's stupidity * * *." Not one head of a foreign government with which we have diplomatic relations, and this includes Premier Krushchev, has ever resorted to such offensive and crude letter writing to the President.

As for the official Egyptian view of the United States, here is the way it was put by Radio Cairo on October 5, 1962: America "is the leader of the capitalist world and the commander of the * * * imperialist camp." Even Radio Moscow could not have said it any better. Only 5 months before this canard was broadcast to the Arab world, the United States gave $20 million to shore up Egypt's deteriorating foreign exchange position and Uncle Sam, so it is reported, contemplates giving another $10 million for this purpose.

In the 15th and 16th sessions of the U.N. General Assembly, Egypt voted four times with the United States in contrast to 37 votes with the U.S.S.R. During the most tense period of the Cuban crisis, Cairo propaganda snarled at the United States, while Egypt's spokesmen at the U.N. made no bones about their sympathy for Castro and company.

Now, when foreign aid is examined against these realities, it loses its meaning no less than its effectiveness. It is totally ineffective because it serves to strengthen Egypt's blackmail policies at our expense. It is also meaningless because it does not help the long suffering Egyptian masses but rather fortifies Egypt's warmaking capacity. In short, foreign aid under these circumstances is not a help but a massive roadblock to the kind of peace that our country strives for.

Though the present crisis in foreign aid is indicative of past failures, it also presents us with a precious opportunity to reexamine the entire concept in the light of the world situation and our national interests. The society has studied this crucial issue for a number of years and has written much on this subject. In memoranda to Congress, correspondence with the executive branch of our Government, in articles and public statements we have warned of the pitfalls of an aid program that is essentially devoid of effective and practical principles.

Because the society truly believes in the need for U.S. aid, we have warned repeatedly that, unless there was a thorough-going reexamination, disillusionment would surely set in among the American people. The debates during the last session of Congress show the direction of the wind.

The basic issue must be faced squarely. Unless U.S. assistance programs draw the line between friends and dedicated foes, there will be increasing opposition to such projects by the people, the Congress and the press. This is bound to drastically curtail U.S. foreign aid—even where it may be justified—or eliminate it completely.

Can one expect American taxpayers to support aid projects which subsidize regimes bent on undermining our prestige and economic interests? The patience of our taxpayers is not eternal. They will not forever acquiesce to assisting those so-called uncommitted governments which kowtow to the Kremlin while besmirching the reputation of the United States and poisoning their people against us.

How do these regimes get away with this double game? The answer is relatively simple. They know that Moscow would react in no uncertain terms if they dared to talk to them as they do to us. But they also know that we fear to take a determined stand, because they have bamboozled us with the threat of turning Red should the flow of dollars cease. Obviously, such "friends" may be more dangerous than avowed enemies. It is, therefore, high time that we call a spade a spade. On this point we believe that Senator Morse expressed the feelings of most Americans when he said:

"I think the time has come for us to make perfectly clear to the Arab countries that we are not going to be blackmailed by them any longer, whether because of oil or because they might go over to the Communists, let them go over and boil in that Communist oil for a while, and see how they like it."

Since the society continues to support foreign aid as an integral part of U.S. foreign policy, we would deplore its complete abandonment at this time. Those who would gloss over its fundamental deficiencies are not furthering the cause. On the contrary, they are contributing to its deterioration which is already at an extremely low point.

Time is running out quickly. The United States must put an end to the policy of submission to blackmail. Our resources are not limitless. That is why they must be employed only to weld the unity of free peoples who prove by deed their devotion to peace tnd their friendship with our country.

We say that the American people would rally to the support of the U.S. foreign aid program if they were assured that henceforth our assistance would be governed by the principle that "all recipients should demonstrate their responsibility and reciprocate our friendship and good will." This is the cardinal principle which we have urged our Government to adopt and to implement. As matters now stand, U.S. assistance is essentially indiscriminate. It makes no distinction between friend and foe. It thereby demoralizes the ranks of our friends, thus weakening our common front and our common cause.

It is our considered judgment that, if our Government adopted the principle of reciprocity which we have urged, it would have an electrifying effect throughout the world. Indeed, it would win the respect of friend and foe alike and, above all, rebuild our prestige and influence. We have no doubt that the American people would rally as one man behind such forthright leadership.

U.S. Military Advantage Dissipated by Political Accommodation of Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the U.S. News & World Report of May 13 proves that the United States is well prepared with military weapons. We are strong enough to defend this Nation and protect our security. There is no doubt that we are much stronger than the Russians.

As U.S. Missile Power Hits Its Stride—

Washington.—The United States now is deploying intercontinental ballistic missiles at a rate of one a day. By the end of this year, more than 500 ICBM's will be in firing position.

This was announced on April 30, as the Air Force accepted the 100th Minuteman ICBM ready for launching from virtually impregnable underground silos near Great Falls, Mont.

A total of 1,184 ocean-spanning missiles has been ordered. Besides Minuteman, they include Atlas, Titan, and Titan II types. In addition, the United States has 144 Polaris missiles aboard nuclear submarines, expects the Polaris total to reach 288 by Jan. 1, 1964.

In the face of this announced military strength, why are the Soviets gaining victory after victory in the cold war? Why is U.S. prestige in the world sinking lower and lower? The answer is very simple. Our military strength and advantage is being dissipated through political decisions which make us appear weak and defenseless and deathly afraid of Soviet threats. President Kennedy and his ill-advisers create the false impression that the United States has no will or determination to protect its sovereignty and that our national goal is peace at any price.

This, of course, is not true. The American people are far ahead of the Kennedy administration in demanding a strong, firm foreign policy that will leave no doubt in the minds of Khrushchev and other Communist leaders that we not only have the military strength to win any war forced upon us, but the will to win it.

As a contrast to the U.S. News & World Report article detailing our military strength, look now at the editorial from the Chicago Tribune of May 13, to learn how we are being weakened by political strategy dictated by Secretary of Defense McNamara and White House confidant, McGeorge Bundy:

NO GROUND RULES IN NUCLEAR WARFARE

The Kennedy administration, having abandoned belief in massive retaliation as a deterrent to nuclear war, now espouses the doctrine of the "flexible response." It offers the President a multiple choice of many conventional weapons for local or limited war before unloosing the nuclear giants.

Carrying this idea even further, Defense Secretary McNamara has espoused the strategy of a "no cities response" to nuclear attack. We would blast only Russia's nuclear missile bases, not Soviet cities. This restraint in targeting on our part, according to McGeorge Bundy, the President's special assistant for national security affairs, should restrain the Russians from a nuclear attack on our great cities.

Such an attempt to set forth ground rules for nuclear war clearly requires agreement with the enemy, and the Russians aren't offering any. As set forth in their new military bible, "Soviet Military Strategy," war in the nuclear age means total, all-out war. Its primary purpose must be to annihilate the enemy in the initial stages of conflict with every ounce of nuclear power available.

Published in Moscow last September, and now translated into English for the first time by the Rand Corporation, "Soviet Military Strategy" places almost all its emphasis on global nuclear war. Ground forces are not neglected—they will be needed to prevent invasion, win on the battlefield, and occupy enemy territory for final victory. But the Soviet military writers, headed by Marshal V. D. Sokolovsky, continually stress nuclear supremacy.

Nowhere, as the American editors point out, do the Russians express any interest in concepts like "controlled response and restrained nuclear targeting, which have been widely discussed in the West." There is no mention of "second-strike counterforce capability," "no-cities response," or "mutual" deterrence—terms which Gen. Thomas D. White, retired former Air Force Chief of Staff calls the quasi-military shibboleths of the Pentagon intellectuals.

Sokolovsky and his 14 coauthors do not explicitly endorse a strategy of attacking population centers with nuclear warheads but the intention is implicit. An enemy's means of nuclear delivery would be the primary target, followed by his military forces, economic base, command and control systems, and other strategic targets.

In the expressed Soviet view, however, it is necessary to attack simultaneously both the enemy's heartland and the zone of military contact. The result, if successful, would be annihilation of the nation attacked.

The idea that such belligerents as the United States and the Soviet Union could or would conduct conventional warfare is not even entertained. Any local or limited military conflict involving such nuclear powers, Sokolovsky contends, would automatically escalate into unlimited nuclear warfare. To the Russians it is inconceivable that such a war could have anything but unlimited political or military goals.

"Soviet Military Strategy" is the first book on this subject to have been published in Russia since 1926. To be openly published, as it was, the work must have official sanction of the Kremlin. It would seem that our own strategists would ignore at our peril the stated intentions of how the Russians will wage war in the nuclear age. Any idea of building our own weapons systems on some nonexistent ground rules would be gambling with our national survival.

Polish National Holiday—May 3

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, all Americans draw inspiration from the annual celebration of the Polish 3d of May Constitution Day. That constitution adopted on May 3, 1791, has been one of the documents in man's history that feeds the fires of freedom and liberty.

Americans of Polish descent—numbering more than 6 million—instill into our Nation's life firm beliefs based upon a great tradition.

The American scene is enriched by the contribution of Polish Americans. As Brown and Roucek tell the story in "One America," there are an estimated 10,000 Polish American societies and organizations in the United States. They are devoted to every imaginable activity: religious, cultural, social, beneficial, patriotic, civic, business, and scholarly. Some are purely local, others national in scope; many are affiliated with parish churches, others are wholly independent of religious ties.

Every Member of this House must be familiar with the Polish American Congress, the Polish National Alliance, and the Polish Women's Alliance of America. In my city of Minneapolis we are especially proud of the Polanie Club of St. Paul-Minneapolis which is devoted to the promotion of Polish art, music, and literature.

Today several hundred Polish-American publications—newspapers and periodicals—function for an estimated 2 million readers serving parishes, organizations and political and business interests. One of the outstanding ones is Nowiny Minnesokie published in St. Paul, Minn.

In the field of politics, of course, Americans of Polish descent have made a great contribution. Outstanding Members of Congress are Polish Americans. In municipal affairs, in political party affairs, in the day-to-day exchange of opinions and organizing to promote better government there are always warmhearted and alert Polish Americans in positions of leadership.

Yes, May 3, the Polish national holiday brings to mind many contributions by this wonderful group of Americans. Their belief in the dignity of the individual has sturdy roots. We thank them for reminding us of the many struggles for human freedom and the unity of mankind throughout the world.

The Old, the New

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Omaha (Nebr.) Sunday World-Herald, May 5, 1963:

THE OLD, THE NEW

"The old order changeth, yielding place to new." Alfred Lord Tennyson said that, and no rational human would disagree.

Two recent Omaha visitors expressed some thoughts about the same subject.

Dr. J. H. Plumb of England's Cambridge University, first "distinguished visiting scholar" at the University of Omaha, told the Honors Convocation: "Rapid social change cannot be stopped."

He went on to say that man is in danger of drowning in a tidal wave of social change if he allows tradition to give him a false sense of strength and confidence in his society. He said he can see danger in the way education tends to strengthen respect for the past. And he warned his listeners to preserve an open-mindedness to evaluate properly and to control the forces which mold his society.

Ronald Reagan, who fought the Hollywood Communists to a standstill, expressed a somewhat different view. He observed in the season's final American Citizens Forum lecture that the U.S. Constitution still is "our contract providing us the most limited and equitable government devised by man." He warned against efforts which are being made to weaken that Constitution through more and more economic controls which he said will lead directly to socialism. He criticized "the widespread belief of liberals that all our problems can be solved by our Government."

Clearly, the tidal wave of social change which threatens to engulf the world today is propelled by the doctrine of Marxist socialism, which would make every man a pawn of the state and deny the right of private ownership of property.

The question which faces those who still enjoy some measure of freedom is whether they shall lie down and let the tidal wave of social change submerge them, or whether they will stand up, and resist, and strive to make certain that the new which takes the place of the old will be well rooted in the best of the past.

Is rapid social change a phenomenon of nature? Or is it brought about by people?

We think the answer is, by people. The Founding Fathers of the American Republic commanded a tidal wave of their time to elevate the aspirations of individual man, and to break the chains of political and economic slavery.

The tidal wave which now threatens to engulf people who would turn them back to serfdom.

We think the American people can avert that fate if they will examine their souls, weed out any false sense of security, and resolve to uphold, and fight for, those basic principles which must be the foundation of any new order which can improve upon the old.

European Nations Loyal, but Distrust U.S. Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate an outstanding editorial column by the distinguished columnist, Constantine Brown, who is now reporting to a number of newspapers across this country while living in Italy. Mr. Brown has approximately 50 years' service as a dedicated newsman, having traveled all over the world many times covering great news events.

I have been particularly impressed with his reporting of events in Europe during his stay in Italy. One of his recent columns entitled "European Nations Loyal, but They Distrust Our Policy" has been published in the May 6, 1963, issue of the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, and because of its importance, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

European Nations Loyal, but They Distrust Our Policy

(By Constantine Brown)

Rome.—Despite the rash of visits by top ranking American officials to NATO capitals, the lack of confidence in our willingness to resist communism, except by words, continues.

In conversations with Europeans, an American will encounter a shaking of heads and shrugging of shoulders when he discusses the role of the United States in the cold war.

The impending visit of President Kennedy to Italy and Germany will be spectacular. The crowds' reception will exceed that given any other American head of Government since Woodrow Wilson.

But Europe's political leaders feel that the United States is following a policy of retreat with graver implications than that of the Eisenhower administration after the death of Secretary of State Dulles.

True enough, American policy is coated with high-sounding phrases and manful gestures. But basically it is obvious that we are retreating or preparing retreats everywhere, allowing the Russians and Chinese to step into the vacuum.

Militant communism is now established within less than 100 miles of U.S. shores. This, to the mind of the European political man, is an unthinkable situation. Hundreds of thousands of little white crosses dot the land from Germany to Korea marking graves of young Americans who fell in combat fighting for freedom.

France's General de Gaulle has stubbornly resisted American pressure to give up his modest nuclear force because he doubted America would be there in a showdown in Europe. In his latest broadcast he stated that America and Russia have enormous nuclear power. "Perhaps," he speculated, "it might be used only in central and western Europe and not on either American or Soviet territory. The two nations might also hurl death reciprocally into each other's heartland."

Under these circumstances France must have the means to strike any aggressor. This capability would contribute to the defense of France's European allies and "who knows," he added, "possibly including America."

There is nobody in France today who claims to have a pipeline to the Elysee Palace. But there are those who reflect some of De Gaulle's thinking. They believe that while he has a deep admiration and a feeling of gratitude for everything the American people stand for, he has a deep suspicion of the goals of the administration. He does not trust its words and conception that the cold war which has been ravaging, morally at least, is not as damaging as a shooting war.

Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, our Chief of Staff and former deputy to the supreme commander of the NATO forces, Gen. Lauris Norstad, was blunt when he told Congress recently that America's European allies do not trust the United States to defend them with nuclear weapons.

General Wheeler said: "To be frank about it * * * they do not trust us."

The decision to withdraw the Jupiter missiles from Italy and Turkey, replacing them with Polaris-carrying submarines, was interpreted by the technicians and specialists in those countries, if not their governments, as another indication that we might renege at the 11th hour. I was told by an American who was present at the dismantling of the Jupiters in southern Italy that the Italian officers "actually wept."

The Pentagon's official statement that the Polaris missiles are far better weapons are accepted politely. But the Turkish Army is now pressing the Inonu Government to demand from the United States additional means to strengthen its conventional forces which have suffered from the withdrawal of the Jupiter.

Hospital Care for Aged Through Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, some newspaper accounts have it appear that the issue of hospital care for the aged through social security is dormant. This may be true if the reference is to the lack of action on the floor at the moment. However, a good deal of discussion on the issue is continuing throughout the country. In the interest of aiding that discussion, I ask unanimous consent that a report on the subject prepared by the Center for Information on America, which has a distinguished editorial advisory committee, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Medical Care for Americans: Who Should Pay the Bills?

The Federal Government is already deeply involved in providing some health services for the Nation. The costs of other services are shared by various levels of Government and private sources. Until now, almost all direct personal medical care has been within the province of the private sector of our economy—the free enterprise system and private philanthropy. President Kennedy and some members of both political parties in the Congress have now proposed that the Federal Government should play a greater role than it presently does in providing direct medical care for the many Americans over 65 years of age.

The concern of many citizens about the proper source of funds for medical care for the aged is clearly related to a broader concern about the proper role of the Federal Government in the individual health care of all our citizens. To understand these issues better, let's consider the following questions:

1. How have the medical needs of the country changed in recent years?
2. What is the present system of private-public support to health services, and how well does it work?
3. What about the aged? What are their special needs, their present chance for assistance? What new approaches to their problems are being considered?
4. What are some of the other questions involved?

CATCHING UP WITH SCIENCE

The 20th century has seen a dramatic change in the state of the Nation's health. In 1900, the average American baby could expect to live 47 years. Today, life expectancy at birth averages 70 years. The major communicable diseases, which were the leading causes of death in the past, have almost all been isolated and remedies for them have developed. Improved diagnostic techniques, together with a greater health consciousness among the people, have made significant progress in the battles against even such stubborn enemies as cancer and heart disease.

The increased life span can have many important social consequences. Family life, for instance, has already been affected. In 1900, the average duration of marriages before the death of one partner was only 13 years. By 1956, parents could expect to live together for 43 years. Widowhood has been postponed to later life, when even the youngest children are usually self-reliant. The figure of the lonely orphan has nearly disappeared from our scene.

But, on the other hand, to preserve life is not necessarily to reduce illness. Indeed, as the death rate has declined and the average life expectancy increased, the Nation's morbidity rate—the measure of our illnesses and impairments—has risen. This paradox is due partly to the fact that so many citizens now survive to the later years when they are most susceptible to illness. Yet at all age levels there is likely to be more sickness, as the once fatal acute attack is replaced by chronic, long-lasting illnesses. And the control of other once fatal diseases, like diabetes, brings with it a lifetime of medical needs.

Medical science, while making its remarkable contribution, has itself undergone a major change. The quantity and complexity of new knowledge and techniques have led to greater and greater degrees of specialization at all levels of medical service. The practice of medicine in this country today bears little resemblance to its counterpart of 1900.

Inevitably, the greater complexity of medical services has also led to higher costs for medical care. How can these costs be met? Some Americans feel that existing public and private sources can pay the Nation's medical bills. Others insist that greater public effort is necessary to meet the needs of at least some of our citizens. Most agree that, one way or another, "society must catch up with science," as President Kennedy put it recently. Some kind of group action—whether private and voluntary or public and compulsory—seems necessary to help the individual and the family provide the medical care that is, ironically, more necessary for more people because science has progressed so far.

PRIVATE AND/OR PUBLIC?

As in other areas of our national life, a balance between public and private responsibility has been attained in the matter of meeting the Nation's health needs. It is generally acknowledged, for example, that public agencies should control those situations that involve danger to the health of the general public. Problems of sanitation, for example, and the control of communicable diseases are accepted as the proper responsibility of public health departments. Provision for medical care for those already receiving public assistance has a long history, dating back to colonial times. And certain other special groups have been recognized as the proper beneficiaries of tax-supported medical services—veterans with service-connected disabilities, for instance.

Public and private efforts work together in the important field of medical research, kith a trend toward increasing Government participation. Between 1940 and 1960, Federal support for research programs increased from $3 million to $380 million, a rise in percentage of total cost from 7 to 53 percent. Thus the Federal Government supports over half the Nation's medical research, with the balance of funds coming from private industry, philanthropy, and State governments. Similarly, the cost of construction of facilities and the training of personnel are shared by various public and private sources.

But with the exception of the indigent and such special groups as eligible veterans, direct medical care has been primarily supported by private sources—by the individual or family involved, perhaps through voluntary health insurance, or by private philanthropy.

This division of responsibility between public and private agencies is clearly in the American tradition, and many citizens believe that this structure as it now exists is adequate to the health needs of the Nation. Others, however, contend that too many Americans still cannot be assured of proper medical care—through their own resources, voluntary programs, philanthropy, or Government help. These citizens maintain that for the low-income groups both public and private programs very too widely from community to community to offer real assurance of adequate care. Certainly it is true that a number of States have not taken full advantage of Federal matching funds in Federal-State assistance programs.

Low-income groups include members at all age levels, but interest has been focused on the medical needs of citizens over 65. Those who believe, as President Kennedy does, that existing programs are not adequate, have called for a new Federal program of health insurance, through the social security system, that would include all citizens over 65. Such a plan would be a new precedent in the history of public participation in American medical care for it would cover an entire age group, regardless of proven need, specific disease, or special obligation (as to disabled veterans, for example).

THE AGED—THEIR SPECIAL PROBLEMS

As one writer has pointed out, "The aged, like younger segments of our population, are a mixture of well and sick people, of well-to-do and impoverished people, of people living alone and living with relatives, of people with assets and those with none." Their difference from younger groups is largely one of degree, but in the matter of medical costs, the degree of difference may loom very large indeed. Most people over 65 are, on the one hand, more likely to need medical care and, on the other, less able to pay for it out of their current incomes than their counterparts in younger groups.

There is some disagreement about the total financial situation of older people. Dr. George M. Fister, president of the American Medical Association, recently cited surveys showing that "the aged on the average have double the assets of younger age groups, have substantially less debt and fewer family obligations." Robert M. Ball, U.S. Commissioner of Social Security, has insisted that, on the contrary, the aged are indeed quite badly off financially. "The aged have somewhat more assets than younger people," he grants, "but it's necessary to distinguish between two kinds of assets: those you'd expect the aged to use up when they get sick and those you'd expect them to keep. The assets that older people have consist largely of their homes, and I do not think anyone would argue that the home should be sold to pay for medical care."

Whatever their assets, it seems likely that most older Americans, with their relatively small, fixed incomes, will have to turn to some kind of group assistance, whether private or public, to meet the rising costs of health care. At present, the most needy may turn to the old age assistance program, if they are considered indigent even before illness strikes, or to the medical assistance to the aged program if they qualify as medically indigent. Various voluntary agencies may offer help; hospitals may adjust their charges; doctors may donate their services.

Other older people, with substantial resources, may benefit from private health insurance programs, supplemented by their own direct payments. It is for the majority of the aged, with only average resources, ineligible for public assistance and unable to afford adequate private insurance, that the problem of medical costs sometimes seems an overwhelming one today. Again we must ask, how can these costs be met?

CAN PRIVATE HEALTH INSURANCE DO THE JOB?

Opponents of further Federal action maintain that, in the words of AMA President Fister, "voluntary health insurance and the prepayment plans are doing an increasingly effective job for the elderly who are financially able to provide for themselves without help from the taxpayers." They point to new "65 plus" policies developed specifically for the aged, and similar major medical expense policies. They note also the growing practice among employers of contributing to health insurance for retired employees. In a few years, they feel, everyone entering retirement will have some kind of coverage.

Again there is disagreement about the urgency of the problem. President Kennedy, in his special message to the Congress on aiding our senior citizens, points with concern to the fact that of the total aged population discharged from hospitals, 49 percent have no hospital insurance at all and only 30 percent have as much as three-fourths of their bills paid by insurance plans. But Dr. Fister, in illustrating the growth of voluntary plans, claims that the number insured over 65 represents nearly 70 percent of all the elderly "who either need or want health insurance, since many can afford to be without it and many thousands of others already get medical care through welfare programs."

Those who contend that private insurance alone cannot meet the needs of the aged say simple mathematics show that old people with high health costs are a high risk group; it costs more to insure them. This higher cost, they submit, must be paid by the old people themselves or by some kind of subsidy. Some insurance programs have shifted the cost of insuring the aged to the younger members of the plan, through a system known as community rating in which each person insured pays an equal premium, regardless of utilization. But younger people are turning more and more to insurance companies which issue experience-rated policies, leaving an even larger proportion of high users in the original plan. This is the dilemma of such nonprofit plans as Blue Cross. Senator Anderson of New Mexico has added, "Further extension of private health insurance protection for the aged must surmount the barrier not only of the generally low-income, high-cost problem of the aged but of the complication that those not now covered include the worst risks and the lowest income people even among the aged."

CAN THE FEDERAL-STATE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE TO THE AGED PROGRAM SOLVE THE PROBLEM?

Spokesmen for the American Medical Association—and many other citizens—believe that, together with expanded private insurance plans, the Kerr-Mills medical-assistance-for-the-aged law (MAA), enacted in 1960, will in time be able to finance medical care for anyone over 65 who needs it. Thus far, 25 of the 50 States have adopted the program, which provides Federal funds in an amount equal to State appropriations. Many feel that more time is needed to give the program a fair trial. Some suggest that at least a few of the States which have not adopted MAA have refrained because their own assistance programs are adequate to their needs. A main point in the argument for reliance on MAA is that its control rests in the State, not the Federal, government and that it is therefore more flexible and responsive to local situations than any Federal alternative could be.

Most of those who support new Federal action also favor retention of the MAA program as a supplement to the proposed basic health insurance program. They feel, however, that the varying fiscal conditions of the States and the many other calls on State resources will make it hardly possible that a truly effective MAA program can be developed in all States

PROPOSED BASIC HEALTH PROTECTION UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Most citizens who feel that the existing private and public mechanisms are not adequate to the problem of medical care for the aged support some form of health insurance through social security. Opposition to such a program takes many forms. First of all, as indicated above, many feel that—given expanded private insurance and MAA—in the words of Dr. Fister of the AMA, "there is no demonstrable need for any other assistance programs."

Many favor an income, or means, test, by which aid can be given only to those who declare, in the AMA president's phrase, that they are "honestly in need of assisance in paying for medical care." Supporters of the means test say that there's nothing inherently disgraceful about stating one's true financial situation—that it is much like the financial statement one provides when one borrows money for other purposes. Opponents of the test call that analogy false. As Senator Anderson has said, "When you or I apply for a loan, to buy a house * * * we go into the interview proudly, with the purpose of establishing that we are good financial risks, responsible, able to provide for ourselves. With the means test, we have to establish that we have not saved enough to meet our needs, that we cannot provide for ourselves—in short, that we are financial failures." Supporters of the test reply that if, in fact, a man cannot provide for himself he he might just as well admit it, to which the opponents respond that in the case of the low-income old person today, it is probably society and scientific progress, not the individual's improvidence, that have brought him to the state of "medical indigence."

Other arguments circle about the means test. Some maintain that wealthy people should not be eligible for assistance they do not need. One response is that the cost of administering an effective means test would be so high that even if the wealthier people were carefully excluded, little money would be saved. An argument against the test that is convincing to some advocates of the private sector relates to its effect on private health insurance. As Senator Anderson has put it, "Under such tests one loses rights to the basic protection in proportion to one's success in securing private pension protection or in accumulating individual savings. Thus an income test is a disincentive to individual voluntary effort and to saving."

Administration and congressional supporters of a new insurance program frequently emphasize that it is intended as a base on which other private programs can be built. Social Security Commissioner Ball explains the relationship of the private and various public approaches this way:

"We have a basic social security program, covering just about everybody. And it does not cover all needs. It's a base to which workers are encouraged to add protection through private pension plans, through savings on their own, and in other ways to build on top of social security. There are today over 30,000 private pension plans which are in a kind of partnership with social security. The third part of the approach is sort of backstop, backing up everything that people do for themselves through social security, through their own savings, and private pension plans. This is Federal-State old-age assistance, which on a means-test basis makes provision for people whose needs are not met through the other methods. This same three-way approach is envisaged in the hospital insurance proposal. The President's insurance proposal was never intended to be a program which would meet all health needs of the aged."

To those who say that any public insurance plan will destroy the private insurance industry, proponents of the public plan argue that when the cost of the basic care of the high-risk aged has been removed from the shoulders of the private companies, the industry may then offer additional benefits that many individuals will be able to afford—thus combining better health with better business. A version of the social security measure, recommended by Senator Javits of New York, will provide for an option under which beneficiaries have a choice of receiving hospital benefit programs through approved private plans rather than through the Federal Government. If this version is adopted, the interrelation of public and private concerns will be even more clearly stated.

JUST THE BEGINNING?

Some critics believe that a Government health insurance program for the aged would eventually be expanded to other groups and that the proposed limited scope of coverage would eventually extend to physicians' and surgeons' fees. Dr. Fister has said:

"No one really argues with much conviction anymore that the administration-sponsored scheme would not be the first step in an expanding program of Government-controlled medicine, eventually embracing the entire population. No principle exists by which the Government can claim responsibility for hospitalization and nursing-home care for the elderly and not their doctor bills, for drugs supplied in a hospital but not those purchased at the corner drugstore—or for medical expenses of the elderly but not for everyone else."

A major objection to such provision of direct medical care for any citizen is that Government control of medical standards and practice is likely to follow. As one writer has put it, "If the Government pays the piper, it is likely to demand that the musicians be qualified." That medical quallifications could be set by Government personnel—whether or not they are themselves doctors—is distasteful to many citizens and most doctors. The direct, private doctor-patient relationship is held in high regard by many American patients and doctors who have accepted or tolerated the presence of a third party only in cases of special need. But there are those who challenge the relevance of nostalgia for the traditional doctor-patient relationship to the facts of medical practice in America today. As one study summarized it:

"The image appears to have degenerated into a public relations stereotype, potentially harmful to patient and doctor—threapeutically, ethically, and financially. These developments are not due to financial and organizational mechanisms that improve access to modern medicine. They are more likely related to futile attempts to perpetuate the past—a past which, for the great majority of sick people, never existed."

Such critics point out that Great Britain's national health service, so often cited by American doctors as the nadir of socialized medicine, actually has been more faithful to the conception of personal physicians than the American system with its trend to greater and greater specialization.

GREAT EXPECTATIONS

Dr. Osler L. Peterson, writing in the Atlantic, has summarized the human needs and expectations involved in the issue of paying for medical care. The patient, he says, needs an interested doctor and kindly care. He needs good care, in the sense of competent care. And he needs to be treated with dignity, "as a respected individual, not as a casually handled body on a hospital assembly line." But the needs of the doctor cannot be overlooked. "He wants to feel responsible for his patients to the limit of his competence. He wants freedom to be the boss of his own office or at the operating table and to practice as best he can. He wants to be paid a reasonable amount as reward for long and difficult training and a rigorous life. However he is paid, he should feel that he is being rewarded because of his individual skills and efforts and not merely as an entry on a payroll."

Will we as a Nation be able to meet these expectations within the frame work of our democratic free enterprise system?

Memorial to Warsaw Ghetto Fighters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, last month a memorial was unveiled in Washington, D.C., to the martyrs of the Warsaw ghetto and other victims of nazism. Similar memorials have been placed in synagogues throughout the United States through the generosity of a man who has dedicated himself to the task of keeping fresh the heroism and sacrifice of those brave men and women. He is Paul Lewis, a Dallas, Tex., businessman and has done outstanding work here.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the address by Paul Lewis, delivered at the Adas Israel Synagogue, Washington, D.C., on April 22, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech by Paul Lewis at the Memorial Service Held in the Adas Israel Synagogue, April 22, 1963

We are assembled here tonight to dedicate a memorial to the 6 million of our brethren, who perished in the greatest bloodbath of all times. This happened in our century, just two decades ago.

It was just yesterday, when a civilized nation, that very same culture which gave the world a Schiller, a Goethe, and a Mendelson; also gave birth to history's greatest monster, who slaughtered 6 million of our people for no other reason than because they were Jews. They were the victims of devices never before known to mankind. Young and old, men and women, even tiny children, all were carried like cattle to be slaughtered; tortured and burned, in the gas chambers and crematoriums of a manmade hell. They suffered inhumanities and cruelties never before known on the face of our earth, and, as a result, our people were diminished by one-third.

The mountains did not move. The oceans did not dry out. Words can never express our grief when we recall the memories of these brutal massacres; these crimes, which occurred in our era.

These of us who were never exposed to this holocaust, and those few who experienced it, and somehow survived, we each have a solemn duty and obligation to preserve the memory of those who perished. It is also our obligation not to allow that these acts should ever be wiped out of human memory. Such memorials as the one we dedicate here today must be built and displayed so that the story of our people should be told. It is our tragic story to the civilized world, which cannot and should not be permitted to be left out when the history of the 20th century shall be written.

This memorial is not intended as a means or device to look for revenge. It is rather a reminder not to forget and not to allow others to forget the greatest tragedy ever to befall our people and all of mankind. This should also serve as a warning and as a lesson to every member of our human family to be on guard, and to beware the delusions of demagogs; who, crazed by their own power can poison a nation with lies; and under the guise of phrases such as "the Master race" can lead them to acts of genocide.

May God grant us a tomorrow that this epoch should be referred to as the darkest and most shameful epoch of this, the 20th century. A tomorrow, when brotherhood will prevail among all the nations of our earth.

When this has been accomplished, then the martyrs who lifted their last breath with the Son of "Ani Mainiim,"—"I believe," proclaiming their conviction and faith in a better world to come, will not have died in vain.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 11, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER)

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

A good example of how the people are sometimes fooled into believing that Congress is making great savings in Federal spending was passage this week of the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill. When this bill was before the House last month, we cut it 12.4 percent under the budget estimates. It then went to the Senate which upped it. (The Senate is sometimes referred to facetiously as the "upper" body because it always ups appropriations passed by the House.) In Conference agreement was reached on 11.2 percent below the budget requests and that is the way the bill came back to the House and was passed. The people are now being told that Congress has saved 11.2 percent, but the joker is that the House increased the amount over last year's appropriation so that even with the 11.2 percent cut in budget figures we will still spend more than we did in the last budget. And there are other examples far worse because there was an effort to cut this bill.

MILITARY PAY BOOST

A bill (H.R. 5555), to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the armed services, passed the House on Wednesday. I voted for the increase because I believe our military personnel are entitled to it. We need to attract and keep the best possible manpower in our military forces. Normally, I oppose Federal spending bills when the Federal Government is deficit financing. That is, borrowing to spend, instead of making both ends meet. My support of the military pay boost was a worthy exception to the rule. It is far more costly to our taxpayers to pay for turnover of military personnel than to pay this pay increase. Furthermore, as I pointed out in debate, a $52 billion defense budget has enough waste, duplication, and uneconomic practices in it, such as occur in sole-source procurement and surplus disposal, that more than enough can be saved to pay for this pay boost.

AMENDING INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

Conservative and liberal Members of the House found amusement in the vote on H.R. 950 to amend the Internal Security Act which saw ALGER voting with some of the more liberal Members. I was glad to share in the lighthearted moment this caused even during a debate on a very serious subject. The bill would grant to the Secretary of Defense power to remove from the National Security Agency, at his discretion, anyone he believed to be a security risk. Of course, I am for protecting the Nation against subversives and I am for removing security risks from their jobs. I am for the objective of the bill. I opposed it because I am against the means.

The most basic principle for which I stand is the freedom of the individual. It is my firm conviction that in order to preserve the freedom of all our people we must jealously guard individual freedom. This bill gave the sole power to take away a man's job to the Secretary of Defense from whose decision there is no appeal and the accused has no right to even know the charges brought against him. I do not believe any single human being is without error and to grant the dictatorial powers of this bill to the Secretary of Defense could mean tragedy to an individual wrongly accused. During debate on the bill I introduced an amendment to create a three-man board to which decisions of the Secretary of Defense could be appealed. It just seems logical that four heads are better than one in guaranteeing the full protection of the Constitution to every single citizen of this land. Of course my amendment was defeated as I expected it would be because I realize, and so stated, that this is not a good way to legislate. I introduced it to make it appear in the RECORD and in the hope that the amendment can be properly drawn by the Senate in committee and remove the objectionable parts of the bill as passed by the House. I know that my position regarding this legislation will be misinterpreted by some, but I made it abundantly clear in the debate that I do not believe we should help Communists or fellow travelers. But I hold most precious individual liberty. It has been said that in order to get a single traitor or subversive it may be necessary to sacrifice some innocent people. I hold the future freedom of all our people is better served if we guard with all our power the liberty of the individual, even if it means that we may miss uncovering a few subversives. We cannot compromise with the principle of liberty and we cannot justify any means to obtain a good end. The safety of all, in a free country, demands the protection of the individual.

TRIBUTE TO BARRY GOLDWATER

The Barry Goldwater testimonial dinner was a great occasion. All Republicans joined to honor the 4-year leader of the Senate Congressional Committee. Senator GOLDWATER was eulogized as a vigorous leader and outspoken champion of a particular philosophy, the limited role of the Government in our lives, and a team worker and supporter of those with whom he occasionally differs. His beliefs and conduct characterize a politician-statesman worthy of emulation by all in public service. BARRY and Peggy modestly accepted the accolades and ovations. Many present agreed that the standing ovations mirror the feelings of the confidence and respect of the American people. There was no questioning the affection of those present.

THE TAXATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

The taxation of natural resources received the attention of the Ways and Means Committee this week, particularly oil depletion. In recapitulation of industry witnesses views which contradict the President's and Secretary Dillon's recommendations as they impose an additional $280 million in taxes. I challenged Secretary Dillion with this bill of particulars. The tax recommendations: (1) Contradict and defeat the President's announced goals, (a) economic growth, (b) relieve unemployment, (c) free up investment capital, (d) increase consumer purchasing power. (2) Treat oil depletion as tax matter rather than resource policy. (3) Result in higher prices for gasoline and other petroleum products. (4) Result in less exploration, and smaller oil reserves, further damaging the oil industry, and indeed our national security, oil being vital to national defense. (5) More inequitable to smaller companies. (6) Add administrative complexity. (7) Lowers oil earnings further which now average 9.1 percent of invested capital as against 10.4 percent of all industry. (8) Further burdens industry which bears 6.7 percent of all taxes—Federal, State, local now totaling $7.8 billion. (9) Weaken our international competitive position. (10) Contradict 1963 aim of oversea investment credit. (11) Places oil industry abroad in separate tax position from all other industry.

It is my hope and effort that before basic tax changes are made "knowledge should go before" and a complete study should be made. Specifically, I have called on the administration to answer the many contradictory criticisms leveled by the industry against the President's recommendation.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE

(One-minute speech from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 8, 1963)

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, Khrushchev is notifying the world that Cuba is branded, packaged, and delivered to Russia as a fullfledged Communist satellite—and he does not expect the United States to do anything about it. That is the meaning of Castro's mission to Moscow. It is a real victory for Khrushchev, even though he is paying quite a price for it.

"Of course, the United States, the leader of the free world, is paying the highest price of all. We are assisting Khrushchev in his anounced goal of burying us. Mr. President, do we have a foreign policy, and if so what is it? What is wrong with reimposing the Monroe Doctrine?"

Congressman James Cleveland Sees Lack of Minority Staffing as One of the Problems Facing an Effective Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed encouraging to note how many of the newer Members of the Congress have discussed the need for adequate minority staffs for congressional committees whenever the opportunity presents itself.

These minority Members, who do not have a great deal of seniority, find themselves under a great handicap because they have the least access to one or two minority staff members that might exist on certain committees.

It is, therefore, with a great sense of satisfaction and pride that I noticed in the Monday, April 22, issue of the Dartmouth a report on a vigorous speech delivered by Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire, on the minority staffing problem. The complete text of the article on his speech follows:

CLEVELAND OUTLINES THE ISSUES CONFRONTING THE 88TH CONGRESS

(By Terence A. Lowe)

"The central issue before the 88th Congress is the issue of war and peace—no issue is more important than this," said New Hampshire Congressman JAMES CLEVELAND before a meeting of the Young Republicans Friday evening.

"On this, there are no easy solutions—I will make no pontification," he said.

The Republican Congressman turned to "the problem of the state of the national economy." "Of course, everyone would like to see a strong growing national economy. But there is a deep split of opinion as to how we will realiez this objective, on this there is a real division between the two parties."

"The Republicans feel that the way to create this condition is to unleash business and to encourage the private sector of the economy.

"I am against the approach of Government finding people jobs in Government initiated programs," he said.

The third problem he considered was the effectiveness of the Congress. "Is it equipped to transmit the will of the people into action?" Mr. CLEVELAND asked. "There is a strong feeling that it is not," was his answer.

"One of the problems is this: Tools of the Congress have not been developed, and this is mainly due to the staffing problem."

"This has been called a do-nothing Congress," observed Mr. CLEVELAND. "But sometimes it is a very intelligent thing to do nothing—especially in cases of wild presidential schemes."

"If Congress is not coming up with constructive alternatives to presidential proposals, it is because of the need for tremendous staffs. For the Congress to come up with constructive alternatives, there must also be staff people responsible to Republicans.

"If the Republican Party is going to perform the historic function of the minority party, it has got to have the staff to do it. In opposition to President Kennedy's organization of over 10,000 men, such a staff is necessary if we are to maintain a government of checks and balances," concluded Congressman CLEVELAND.

SENATOR MONAHAN: NEW HAMPSHIRE SWEEPSTAKES

In a preliminary speech, State Senator Robert S. Monahan spoke out against the New Hampshire sweepstakes bill which has passed both the house and the senate. This, Senator Monahan noted, occurred "despite the fact that the majority and minority leaders of both bodies opposed it."

"Governor King will have 5 days to act upon the bill when it reaches his desk. He has voted for it twice as a house member. He has not taken a position on the present bill, but the general feeling is that he will allow the bill to become law without his signature," said Senator Monahan.

"My own feeling is that it won't be long before Federal marshals will check on transportation of tickets across State lines. The State of New Hampshire will be guilty of encouraging people to violate Federal law which prohibits the transportation of these tickets across State lines," stated Senator Monahan.

Use of Federal Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, my attention has been called to editorial comments in the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., on the subject of the recent report by the State of Mississippi on the use of force by the Federal Government in the incident at Oxford, Miss., last fall. In view of the fact that the use of Federal force is again being contemplated in Birmingham, Ala., I think it is most appropriate that these editorial comments from the Greenville News of May 3, 1963, entitled "Yes, It Was Plain Police Brutality" be included in the RECORD. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YES, IT WAS PLAIN POLICE BRUTALITY

One needs to do no more than read the Associated Press account we published on page 1 recently to know that there is substance to the report of a special Mississippi legislative committee that prisoners taken by the U.S. marshals last fall on the University of Mississippi campus were mistreated.

They were subjected to what is popularly called police brutality which went far beyond that which is generally enough to set Federal agents to scurrying and congressional committees to investigating—all at the instigation of some self-appointed minority advancement or protective group.

The AP story summarized the charges of the committee in the lead, followed with two paragraphs quoting the Justice Department as denying the truth of the report and went on to give more details from the committee report.

That was enough for us at the time, but we now have more information from at least one person who was on the scene, one who interviewed many more who also were there and saw phases of the situation that he did not.

And the Office of Bobby Kennedy can call it slanderous and point out that certain persons, including Federal authorities, were not interviewed by the investigators to its heart's content.

Whatever the provocation, however unruly the mob might have been, the marshals and to some extent, the combat troops who followed them in used unduly and unlawfully harsh tactics in handling prisoners, some of whom were guilty of nothing more than being caught at or near the scene.

They were treated as prisoners would be treated in Castro's Cuba or Khrushchev's Russia. They were lined up, forced to clasp their hand behind their heads and hold them there; and woe be unto him who became fatigued and slipped from this uncomfortable position.

They were virtually stripped to be searched and the officers were as careless with their clubs as they were when they fired the tear gas shells point blank into the crowds.

No one in authority has yet denied the episode of the detainment in a garage-like building of many more prisoners than the place would hold, that they were forced to sit for hours in a cramped position, denied food, water, medicine or sanitary activities and shoved or clubbed if they moved.

These were mainly college students and other young people, mind you, and only a few were toughs from the outside.

Among others the Department of Justice said should have been interviewed were newsmen who were on the scene. Well, we just happen to have an editorial on the subject written by editor James J. (Jack) Kilpatrick of the Richmond News Leader who arrived on the campus on the Monday morning after the worst of the violence.

Here, in part, is how he summarized it:

"We were there at 7 o'clock on the morning of Monday, October 1, while the tear gas still drifted in stinging patches across the university campus. We stayed in the Lyceum, the university's administration building, or very near it, until 4 o'clock that afternoon.

"We were in the front hall of the Lyceum as the marshals lined up their captives. These prisoners were mostly high school and college boys, with a scattering of scruffy hill-types.

"All morning long, the marshals kept them standing in line with their hands clasped on their heads. After so long a time, the position gets to be agonizing.

"One by one, the prisoners were jerked forward and told to lean against a wall. Then a marshal would loosen the captive's belt, pull his trousers halfway down, and dump the pockets on the floor. Thus frisked, the captives then were escorted, or shoved, into an interrogation room.

"After a while, they were marched in groups, hands again clasped above their heads, to another room downstairs. Except in a handful of cases, no charges were filed against any of them. From the downstairs room they were marched to two prison buses parked in front of the lyceum, where the tear gas was thickest.

"And there they sat, all day, their eyes burning, without food, water, or toilet facilities, and without opportunity to seek counsel. Late in the afternoon, most of them were released.

"We were there, in the lyceum, at the stroke of noon, when Gen. Ted Walker was hauled away. One marshal would have been plenty of escort. Mr. Kennedy's burly commander, Mr. McShane, felt five husky deputies were required. They shoved Walker in a bum's rush down the hall, giving him plenty of hard elbow in the kidneys, and piled him into a waiting sedan.

"Then they smacked him with $100,000 bail (convicted Communists, pending appeal, are free on $5,000 bail), and on the say-so of some psychiatrist 2,000 miles away, who read about Walker in the papers, they jerryrigged an order to slap Walker in a nut house.

"We were there in the town square of Oxford that Monday morning, when Federal troops closed off the area and made it their own domain. We were there when MP's with fixed bayonets forced local women and children out of their cars in order to search the automobiles.

"We were there when private merchants, remote from the riot, were ordered to close their shops; we were there when law-abiding townspeople were denied access to their own local courthouse.

"On October 1 and 2, we talked to a score of newspaper, radio-TV, and magazine correspondents who had been physically present on the campus on Sunday night, September 30, when the riot occurred.

"Overwhelmingly, they agreed that experienced police officers could have prevented the riot by keeping their heads. They did not exonerate the students, but they put primary blame on the trigger-happy McShane and his undisciplined deputy marshals.

"This was an ugly riot. We don't propose to pretty it up. But in our own view, 'brutality' is a fair word for the marshals' conduct. If the shoe fits, Bobby, put it on."

Even this isn't all. During Clemson's hours of trial, we spent an entire evening with two newsmen who had been at Oxford and talked with others who had been there. Some of these men received extra pay for enduring the hazards of a riot, but they wanted no part of another Oxford incident.

Also, our State editor interviewed and wrote the story of a student who transferred from Ole Miss to Clemson at the beginning of this semester. This boy was lucky enough not to get caught directly in the disorder, but as he drove away from the Ole Miss campus toward his home, he was stopped on the open highway by troops. He was forced to take all his belongings, clothing and other things one needs in school, out of his car and spread them out in a pouring rain for inspection.

There's no need for us here to draw a contrast between this and what would have happened if the beleagured police in certain Southern cities handled Negro demonstrators even one-tenth as roughly.

The mockery of it is that all of it was done in the name of the law of the land.

Maybe the Attorney General acted out of excessive zeal for civil rights, but he made a shambles of civil liberty.

And unless the administration supplements its denial with hard factual proof, the Mississippi report stands as far as we are concerned. It has been substantially corroborated by what the Department of Justice called objective observers.

President Kennedy Lacks Consistency in Budget Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, much of the confusion in the United States today is caused by the lack of consistency of President Kennedy on fundamental problems facing us. Nowhere has the President been on more sides of the subject than he has when discussing the budget, inflation, fiscal responsibility. It is impossible to know from one day to the next what the "party line" from the White House will be.

To refresh our memories it would be well to study the many views of the President on the budget as reported by Henry J. Taylor in the following column from the Los Angeles Times of May 6.

Perhaps it is time to ask, indeed to demand, that the President stop repudiating his campaign statements and live up to his promises.

The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 6, 1963]

President's Views on the Budget

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Our President must turn against every normal, selfish impulse and return to his spoken guarantees.

It was on these that he was entrusted with the care of our Nation and, indeed, of our very lives.

Many of the guarantees remain unredeemed in both the foreign policy area and economic area. But a start is timely regarding the budget, now under debate in Congress.

Our President is deliberately demanding, promoting, and fighting for an unbalanced budget. His arguments supporting this theory are currently famous. And he is swinging, full punch, at the congressional resistance.

Yet, it is morally and intellectually impossible for our President to unsay his own guarantees:

September 26, 1960: "I believe in the balanced budget."

October 7, 1960: "I said last week I believed in a balanced budget. We can balance the budget unless we have a national emergency or a severe depression."

October 13, 1960: "I state again that I believe in a balanced budget and have supported that concept during my 14 years in Congress. Here is where I stand and I just want to have it on the public record."

October 27, 1960: "Statements have been made that I am in favor of unbalancing the budget. That is wholly wrong, wholly in error. That is not my view and I think it ought to be stated very clearly in the record."

November 2, 1960: "To hold down the cost of living we must strike at inflation on all fronts. To do this we should balance the budget."

Now, this conflict—100 percent—between expressed convictions makes it impossible to know what Mr. Kennedy believes. Does a broken conviction give strength to a second conviction, which is the reverse? Do two broken convictions add up to the truth? Where do we go in the face of a situation like this?

We seek, we need, we must have guidance from our President. Congress seeks guidance. In fact, the whole free world seeks guidance from the President.

We cannot be told one thing on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays and another thing on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays. Neither can the world. And neither can this practice be permitted among responsible subordinates.

When Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon sought confirmation of his appointment before the Senate Finance Committee, he stated, "Everything we do depends on having a sound fiscal system." He called a balanced budget "essential for national security."

Within 90 days he was calling deficits "not a cause for alarm." And to this very day Dillon is calling the continuing deficits "entirely appropriate."

Name this performance anything you wish, it does not contain convictions. For convictions cannot be manufactured to suit a moment, a purpose or a person. Convictions can be right. They can be wrong. But they have to be convictions.

A great storm cloud mounts and darkens and its crimson rim reaches out to suck down the sun. The whole, round earth watches the fire-flinging monsters of the Kremlin, wondering where trouble will come and when.

Instead of the four freedoms we have the four fears: fear of war; fear of inflation. fear of bankruptcy, fear of defeat. It will take much careful performance and a great deal of personal carrying power in the President's great name to carry us through these.

The two indispensable ingredients—absolutely indispensable—are convictions and integrity. The heart these can sing to is the heart of America and the heart of the free world.

In press conferences, on TV, in all media reaching our people, if the President has changed his mind on repeatedly stated fundamentals, we need to be told this. It is not enough, and certainly not permissable, merely to rely on the public's forgetfulness—as about budget convictions, convictions prohibiting the Soviet lodgement in Cuba, etc.—and then break off on a completely reverse course.

If credence goes, everything goes. Nothing is so costly to our authority in the world and, therefore, to peace.

The Kennedy Line on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, for months Republicans in Congress have been calling for an explanation of the administration's lack of positive action in dealing with Soviet influence in this hemisphere. But our criticism and questions have been met with countercharges of "irresponsiblility" and implications that we are advocating war.

It is interesting to me, therefore, to read in the Richmond (Va.) News Leader for April 25, an editorial account of the President's attitude on Cuba by an unnamed member of the National Security Council.

This unofficial line reveals some not-too-surprising attitudes on the part of the Kennedy administration. It reveals what the logical extension of the "twilight struggle" policy on communism as applied to Cuba has accomplished—the tightening of the Soviet grip on the island and the further infiltration of other Latin American countries from the Red base in the Caribbean.

This attitude naively regards any criticism of the President as an indication of lack of confidence or casting of doubt on his veracity. It cannot tolerate constructive criticism by the minority party, yet it never invites Republicans to participate in foreign policy decisions. Then it demands full support of the woefully inadequate policies by all Members of Congress. I believe it behooves every Member of the House and Senate concerned with a workable strategy to end Communist subversion in Latin America to read the following editorial, "The Kennedys on Cuba":

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, Apr. 25, 1963]

The Kennedys on Cuba

A member of President Kennedy's National Security Council the other day treated a reporter friend of his to a frank but nonattributive discussion of just what the official line is on Cuba. While the facts aren't startling, the attitude is.

First of all, the official line is one of indignation against anybody who doubts the President's veracity. When the President last summer was talking about Russian "technicians" and "defensive weapons" in Cuba, that's all that were there. As soon as the President found out for certain that Soviet troops and offensive weapons had been rushed in under closed hatches, he promptly reported to the American people. Persons like Senator Keating who prematurely reported on these same things were either just guessing or were spreading gossip from excitable Cuban refugees.

Next, anybody who worries unduly about the Soviet presence in Cuba lacks "faith" in America. It's just inconceivable that 17,000 Russian soldiers in the Caribbean could endanger the United States. As to the argument that Russians are needed to teach Castro anything about revolutionizing Latin America, that's silly because Castro is a pretty good revolutionist himself.

There are many ways (although none were specified in this talk) by which Cuba can get rid of Castro. But we can't have a Navy blockade and we can't tolerate anti-Communist raiders for one simple reason—some Russians might be killed. If one or more Russians were killed, that would endanger the lives of 60 million Americans who might be incinerated in a nuclear exchange.

Finally, the presence of Russian troops in Cuba is no more alarming than their presence in Berlin. Communism is a worldwide menace, and it isn't at all surprising that it has spread to an island that lies offshore from Florida.

There is nothing new in these revelations. A lot of people who don't like the administration have been saying all along that the Kennedy brothers are peevish about criticism, bankrupt in initiative, disingenuous in finding excuses and timid about taking action. But to hear it from the horse's mouth is pretty distressing. And how we wish it were otherwise.

It would be wonderful to hear from an inside source that the President had kicked himself in the pants over past mistakes and vowed like a man to do better. It would be good to hear that he went into a justifiable rage at the effrontery of Russia's invasion of our hemisphere. We think the implied idea that one Russian death might be avenged by millions of American deaths ought to be reversed. Our enemies ought to be told, and told emphatically, that they will be held accountable for every American life taken or threatened in any part of the world. This is language, and action, they can understand.

The True Meaning of "Aloha"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a speech delivered by Gov. John A. Burns, of the State of Hawaii, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as it exemplifies the real meaning of the Hawaiian word "Aloha." Too much emphasis has been given to that word by way of a commercial interpretation. I think the time is opportune for a real definition of the term which is so dear to the hearts of all in Hawaii.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. JOHN A. BURNS TO THE ASSOCIATION OF HAWAIIAN CIVIC CLUBS, KAILUA-KONA, HAWAII, APRIL 19, 1963

It is indeed a pleasure to be with you here tonight, particularly in this setting and in this place. I have always had a special fondness for Kona, which represents to many of us the idyllic retreat to which we would like to retire when the cares of our more urban pursuits weigh too heavily on us.

It is especially fitting that your association selected this site to convene—to reflect on your achievements to date and to chart your future course and objectives.

The timing of your convention is also particularly appropriate. For, once again, events of recent weeks have focused the spotlight of public attention on the role of our Hawaiian friends and neighbors in our community.

I believe that in the latest and previous public discussion there has been a tendency to overlook or minimize what I regard as the very great contribution which the Hawaiians have made and are making to our culture and our way of life.

Our common and popular standards of accomplishment—our very definition and understanding of success—all too frequently emphasize material wealth and professional and social status.

Fortunately, these values are not accepted universally as the final measure of success.

Who are we to say whether the homesteader at Waimea or on Molokai is not as successful as the business baron of Merchant Street.

In terms of attitude toward the meaning of life and values which cannot be measured by a cash register or a bank account, I contend that Hawaiians are more successful than the rest of us.

The graceful friendliness, the unhesitating generosity, which we recognize as the aloha spirit, are attributes which characterize our Hawaiian people. These qualities have been transmuted throughout the islands and have served to enrich the lives of all of us in Hawaii.

Without this spirit—this quality of friendliness—these islands would be just so many volcanic outcroppings covered with trees and houses and populated by men and women of no specially noteworthy characteristic.

These islands would not be Hawaii.

There are other islands elsewhere just as beautiful or more so.

But there is no other Hawaii, and for this priceless distinction and heritage we are indebted to the Hawaiians.

The fact that "aloha" has been exploited for commercial purposes beclouds recognition of the more important and the more enduring meaning of that word.

The fact that it has very valuable comericial significance cannot be denied, however. Our tourist industry would not have the potential that it has without our Hawaiian spirit aloha.

This same spirit also underlies Hawaii's future as a center of friendly cultural interchange with other Pacific countries.

So here again we find the Hawaiian heritage given new meaning in our life today and offering new hope that these islands can contribute to extension of friendship, understanding, and peace far beyond these shores.

In a world ideologically divided, and at a time when mankind is threatened with extinction, when there is universal yearning for answers to human relations, the friendship standards, tolerances and generosity which we have inherited from Hawaiians are of far more importance than ever before.

In country after country, we have witnessed repudiation of our foreign policy when that policy has been based solely on militarism, materials, and money, which are commonly and mistakenly identified abroad as the American way of life.

But when we have attempted, as we are doing through the Peace Corps, to understand other peoples and their problems and to help them on the basis of simple friendship on a people-to-people basis, we gain acceptance and understanding, and we are able to build for peace.

So, my point here is that even in the heady and complex atmosphere of foreign policy we are rediscovering something that Hawaii and the Hawaiians have known all along: You can't buy friendship.

Success in life—whether it is life in a taro patch or life in the United Nations—has no price tag, in terms of dollar value or cost or material wealth.

Now, having given recognition to the priceless heritage we enjoy from the Hawaiians, let's look at another side of the picture.

Let me be very frank about this. I sometimes question whether we are really benefiting our people of Hawaiian ancestry or the intercultural character of our community by our continued, and at times intensified, emphasis on Hawaiians as a racial group.

I am very proud to have associated with me in the new State administration several individuals of Hawaiian ancestry. I regard these individuals as persons of great competence and integrity.

These include William S. Richardson, the Lieutenant Governor; Kekoa Kaapu, one of my administrative assistants; Edwin Mookini, who I recently appointed as administrative assistant in the new and highly complex field of data processing; Kaipo Kauka, deputy director of the Department of Transportation.

Also, Val Umi Marciel, the State comptroller; William G. Among, director of social services; and Mrs. Edna Taufaasau, personnel director.

We associate with these individuals and work with them as individuals who have the skills, experience, education and character we need in government service.

The State needs them. The community needs people of their talent. They are serving the community as a whole. They do not seek and do not receive special consideration because they are of Hawaiian ancestry.

They very competently meet the challenges of their positions and are secure in the recognition of their abilities.

While I believe in legislation which underlies the purpose and need for our Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, I think that program can be improved administratively and by linking the department's activities more closely with those of the executive.

We can and should develop a more meaningful contribution to our economy from this program.

I would like to point out, however, that when we stop to contemplate what has happened to the American Indian as a result of the paternalistic program of reservation and special treatment and special schools, we have a very sad record of accomplishment.

Paternalism and special protection have really done nothing more for the Indians than to provide them with what amounts to custodial care. The program has not inspired or motivated them, nor has it equipped them to become a real part of contemporary American life.

Moreover, overprotection has led to some cases of exploitation by the more opportunistic minded.

By contrast, the people of Hawaiian ancestry have in large measure adjusted their lives to changing conditions in the environment of these islands.

More important, though, is that they have in the past contributed leadership to change in the broad interest of the entire community and are doing so today, and will continue to do so in the future.

My suggestion is, therefore, that the Hawaiian societies and various organizations, which have such a rich and proud history of endeavor, should not be persuaded by temporary considerations to fall back into a defensive posture.

Answers to the problems facing the Hawaiians, in my judgment, are not so unique that they are to be found in reliance on special protection or paternalistic programs * * * or in self-pity.

Hawaiian societies will be best serving their respected members if their goals are broadened to look forward and outward for opportunities through which the talents Hawaiians have may find room for expression and fulfillment in the interests of the entire community.

We all owe much to the Hawaiians. These islands and the new State would indeed be poor and ordinary without the rich heritage Hawaiians have bestowed upon us and unselfishly shared with us all.

We will continue to move forward as a community and as a State only to the extent we continue to be motivated by the Hawaiian spirit of friendliness and dedication to the common good.

I thank you for this privilege of addressing you.

My best wishes for a most successful convention.

Mahalo.

Shaping the Big Stick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate a very fine article on antitrust in the Common Market, entitled "Shaping the Big Stick," which appeared in Newsweek magazine on April 29, 1963.

I ask unaimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Shaping the Big Stick

One of the most outspoken critics of bigness in American business flew to Brussels last week to take a look at what the European Common Market planned to do about bigness in European business. For Senator Estes Kefauver and his six-man delegation; the tour was prompted by more than academic curiosity: ECM's year-old anticartel policy could eventually have a mighty influence on the ability of U.S. industry to compete in the six-nation area. Despite an attack of Asian flu which kept him in bed for 1 of his 4 days in Brussels, the Tennessee Democrat talked with some 50 ECM officials, lawyers, businessmen, and economists to find out just how the Common Market plans to deal with Europe's age-old tendency toward cartelization.

Those plans are, in fact, only beginning to take shape. The Common Market's anticartel division has strongly worded powers; most agreements in restraint of trade are banned. But the ability of its small, 40-man staff to back up trust-busting decisions is still untested; it could, for instance, levy fines of up to $1 million, but as yet hasn't moved against any violators. Indeed, according to U.S. observers, European policy is roughly where it was in the United States before Theodore Roosevelt started brandishing his big stick at big business.

Hans von der Groeben, of Germany, the Common Market's anticartel commissioner, quickly pointed out that the ECM does not oppose bigness per se. "In many cases," he said, "we favor mergers." But, he added, "we must proceed on several fronts at the same time." His point: The Common Market wants to encourage the industrial bigness needed to supply the growing mass market of its members but it must also prevent abuses that might stem from bigness.

PRECEDENT SETTERS

Of some 40,000 complaints and requests for exemption brought so far (largely by companies and individuals), only 1 has been decided by the ECM's High Court of Justice. In a dispute over exclusive franchises, it established the principle that the ECM's anticartel regulations automatically override the laws of the individual member states.

Another key case now on the docket involves Gründig, a big German radio and tape-recorder firm. In 1958, Henri Keller, a Parisian who sold bridal trousseaux door to door, started to import electrical appliances because the advent of the Common Market allowed him to buy such products in their country of origin and sell them at reduced prices in France. ("I do not consider myself an importer but a wholesaler of European goods," he said.) Authorized French distributors of the appliances haled Keller into court in an effort to halt his operations. After contradictory decisions in the French courts, the matter went to the ECM antitrust section. A favorable judgment for Keller would mean, in effect, that exclusive dealership arrangements cannot be enforced beyond national boundaries.

To keep abreast of such developments, five American law firms have specialists stationed full time in Brussels. They have already concluded that the United States might actually benefit from the anticartel movement, which could well ban existing discrimination against U.S. imports by nations of the Six. Senator Kefauver agrees. "We're delighted to see the determined start that has been made here," he says. "It's much to the good for the free world and for businessmen on both sides of the Atlantic." And the Senator, who intends to hold hearings on the long-range ramifications of the ECM anticartel policy after he returns to the United States, adds that "we in the States have much to learn from the experiment that is going on here. And perhaps the officials of the Common Market can find some use in studying our methods [which are] based on a much longer experience in the antitrust field."

Ronald Reagan Speaks Out on Protecting Our Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 29, 1963, Mr. Ronald Reagan spoke to a large crowd attending the honors day activities in the gymnasium at Dixon High School which is located in my district. Reagan is a graduate of Dixon High.

The Dixon Evening Telegraph gave complete coverage to Reagan's remarks and covered his entire lecture in four installments beginning with the May 1, 1963, issue. Under unanimous consent, I include the first article in today's Record. I will insert the following articles during the next 3 days we are in session.

I commend Mr. Reagan's very timely and stimulating remarks to the attention of my colleagues. The first installment follows:

What Price Freedom?

(Editor's Note.—This is the first portion of a four-part installment on the lecture, "What Price Freedom?" given by Ronald Reagan, Monday, in Dixon.)

(By Ronald Reagan)

Early in this century a President who served in a time of easygoing, no crisis to underline his name in history, revealed something of the gift of prophecy. He said, "A revolution is taking place which will leave the people dependent on Government. Finding markets will develop into fixing prices and finding employment. Next step will be to furnish markets and employment or in default pay a bounty or dole. Those who look with apprehension on these tendencies do not lack humanity but are influenced by the belief that the result of such measures will be to deprive the people of character and liberty."

Today those who "look with apprehension on these tendencies" are not only charged with "lacking humanity" but are, more often than not, assailed as reactionaries and rightwing extremists. Many people of good will stand confused in the highly emotional atmosphere which colors the exchange of charge and countercharge.

The world today is faced with a choice between totalitarianism and freedom. All of us are conscious of the threat of the bomb. Speaking for the enemy Lenin said, "If it should become necessary to kill three-fourths of all the people in the world it would be worth it if the remaining one-fourth were Communist." This kind of threat is easy to understand. Not so simple is the relating of our domestic difference to the world struggle.

We have come to a time for choosing and we should recognize that two contrary philosophies divide us. Either we believe in our traditional system of individual freedom with constitutional limits on the power of government, or we abandon the American Revolution and confess that an intellectual elite in some far distant capital can plan for us better than we can plan for ourselves.

Asked how long our Republic would endure, James Russell Lowell, when Minister to England replied, "It will last just so long as the people retain the ideas of the men who created that Republic." What were those ideas? Very simply—you and I have God given rights, among them freedom and the ability to determine our own destiny. Government's only excuse for being is to see that no individual or group in our midst and no outside aggressor can take this freedom from us. Government is a watchdog, not a cow to be milked.

There have only been a few moments of freedom in all man's history and most of those moments have been ours. But freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction. We can pass it on to our children only if we are determined to defend it and cherish it. The late Judge Learned Hand said, "Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women. When it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it."

From our Nation's beginning we have been warned that freedom can be lost inadvertently by our own acts. A more recent warning was voiced by Nikita Khrushchev when he told the Rumanian railway workers, "I am convinced that tomorrow the red flag will fly over the United States, but we will not fly the flag. It will be the Americans themselves."

Today under the unremitting pressure of the cold war there is a widespread belief that all the problems of human need can be solved by Government. We are told that our traditional system of individual liberty is incapable of solving the complex problems of the 20th century, we must have a Government-controlled and planned economy. Howard K. Smith (rather prominent lately for TV activities), has written, "The market mechanism and the profit motives have outlived their usefulness. * * * The distribution of goods must be effected by a planned economy. The profit motive must be replaced by the incentives of the welfare state."

A U.S. Senator has said, "The Soviet experiment in socialism is no more radical for these times than was the American Declaration of Independence in the time of George III." And White House Adviser Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., writes, "There seems to be no inherent obstacle to the gradual advance of socialism in the United States, through a series of new deals." * * * He sees the cold war disappearing, "through a peaceful transition into a not undemocratic socialism." In other words, we will not stand firm for a choice between our free system and communism but will move to the left and the Communists, losing their fear and mistrust, will come to the right.

What this really means is that we tell a billion of our fellow humans now enslaved behind the Iron Curtain, to give up their hopes of freedom because we've decided to get along with their slave masters.

What of this choice they would offer us as a means of escaping the bomb? True, the Socialists are enemies of the men in the Kremlin—but only because they believe these ruthless men have brutally perverted the teachings of Karl Marx. The Socialists themselves are still dedicated to the abolition of private property, the free economy—indeed, freedom itself as we have known it. And they are not unaware of the tide running in their favor. A member of the English Fabian Socialist Society has written, "Of course, we don't want a Russian victory—but we don't want an American victory either."

They see their Utopian dream coming true through the efforts of Americans who only advocate the liberal welfare philosophy. Now let me make it plain—I don't think the overwhelming majority of liberals would knowingly support a socialist or Communist takeover. I believe they are sincere, patriotic and motivated by the most humanitarian ideals. It would be immoral and foolish to infer otherwise. But it would be equally foolish to let them have their way without opposition. If someone is setting fire to the house it doesn't make much difference whether he is a deliberate arsonist or just being careless with matches—the end result is the same.

Plutarch said, "The real destroyer of the liberties of the people is he who spreads among them bounties, donations and benefits." Thomas Jefferson predicted future happiness for the people if, "We can prevent government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of taking care of them."

Those who see only government as an answer to human misery, should ask themselves, what happens to freedom when the executive branch of government can use the power granted it by the people, and the tax money collected from the people, to coerce the people. Government tends to grow. Government programs take on a weight and momentum of their own, and they assume an immortality that gives the life beyond the duration of the emergency that brought them into being. We see today a permanent structure of government so big and complex it is almost beyond comprehension and beyond the control of Congress.

The Rural Electrification Administration is an example of this seeming immortality. Twenty-five years ago to live on a farm was to be without the advantage of electricity. The Rural Electrification Administration was created and, together with public and investor owned utilities, it has brought about the almost complete distribution of electricity to rural areas. Ninety-eight percent of the farms in America have power. But Rural Electrification Administration does not go into retirement or even settle back to a minor role of supervision now that the job has been accomplished. This year its budget went up another $170 million to almost a half billion per year.

Our government today is engaged in operating and running more than 17,500 businesses covering 47 different lines of activity. These businesses operate tax free, rent free and dividend free. They compete openly with our taxpaying citizens and in the process, each year, they lose almost as many billions of dollars as are collected by the Federal Government from all of the personal income tax.

But some tell us that Government spending is a necessity. That in this near theory of Government it is Government spending that stimulates the economy and brings about growth and prosperity. Well, let's take a look at some of this Government spending and what a stimulant it has been. There has been no greater spending in any single area of the United States than has been done over the last couple of decades by TVA—The Tennessee Valley Authority—the great power trust of our Government. And yet in the 169 counties of that area, in spite of all this spending, the Labor Department declares that 50 percent of those countries are permanent areas of poverty, distress and unemployment.

There are today over 2½ million Federal employees. In 1942 there was 1 top-salaried executive among them for every 89 Government employees. Today there is 1 for every 17. Now I don't mean that this should be taken as a blanket indictment of all those who serve the public in positions of Government trust. As a matter of fact, the many fine public servants employed at all levels of Government are the first to suffer from this unwarranted growth of Government. All too often they're denied a fair return for their labor because of the necessity of sharing public funds with needless employees, with duplication and with waste.

Secretary of Commerce Hodges recently received front-page attention when he said that he could run the Department of Commerce with 10 percent fewer employees than were now in that Department. And 1 month later he'd added 1,600 new employees.

At this moment for every six people earning a living in the United States, one is employed by Government. Every five of us earning a living are paying the full salary of a sixth employee. Today there are 48 million Americans receiving some direct cash payment from Government and 38 million of these are receiving it from the Federal Government. Federal welfare spending in the last 10 years has multiplied and increased eight times as much as the increase in population. Now, in the District of Columbia, in the shadow of the Capitol, they are investigating the recipients of public welfare. Of the people interviewed so far, 58 percent have been found to be receiving public welfare dishonestly.

American People Paying for Castro Buildup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the no-policy of the Kennedy administration, the taxpayers of the United States are pouring billions of dollars into our defenses against communism and at the same time, through the U.N., we are pouring millions into helping to strengthen the Communists. The following editorial from the Chicago Tribune, May 13, reminds us "we are the suckers" in the worldwide shell game:

U.N. Subsidies for Communism

In the face of U.S. objections, the United Nations has gone ahead and signed an agreement to give Communist Cuba $1½ million for an agricultural research institute. The U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization will supply experts for the staff, and it was said no U.S. dollars would be used to pay them.

The money comes out of the United Nations special fund. The United States contributes 40 percent of the fund's financial resources, and in the last 5 years has donated $100 million to the fund. When the U.N. says no American dollars will go to the Cuban project, it is like saying that the money you earn is not being spent when your wife writes checks against the account.

This is only 1 of 16 projects for which Cuba is receiving U.N. aid. Representative Durward G. Hall, of Missouri, has listed some of them. We are paying for the revision of Cuban schoolbooks which will glorify communism. We are paying so that Cubans may learn to fly and service airplanes at a U.N. training center in Mexico City. The planes have military capabilities. We are helping provide a fishery study for Castro which will improve his fishing fleet, a fleet equally useful in running guns to create trouble in Central America. The project also involves improving Cuban ports, which may wind up servicing Soviet submarines.

As the old saying has it, never give a sucker a break. We're the suckers.

Washington: On the Potential Power of the Moderates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the New York Times May 12, 1963:

Washington: On the Potential Power of the Moderates

(By James Reston)

Washington, May 11.—The greatest potential force for commonsense in this country lies with the detached, unorganied, and usually inarticulate moderates.

When these busy but normally quiet men of business are startled out of their personal and professional preoccupation, as they were this week in Birmingham, Ala., they can be immensely effective. But when they avoid the struggle, as they often do, the field is left to the extremists.

Unfortunately, at this period in the Nation's life, commanding national figures in the professions seem to be in short supply. Nobody in the law quite fills the role of the Henry Stimsons or Elihu Roots of an earlier time. There are a few extinguished volcanoes around, like John L. Lewis, but the towering preachers, editors, university presidents, and labor-union leaders of the past seem to have been replaced by more prudent and less outspoken managers.

There are exceptions, of course, but more often than not the best lawyers do not speak for the law, the best doctors do not speak for the medical profession; each group has its political leaders, and the moderates tend to stand aside.

THE QUIET CAMPAIGN

Fortunately, this did not happen to the same extent in Birmingham this week. Moderate opinion was organized. Roger Blough of United States Steel got in touch with the moderates of his vast steel enterprises in Birmingham and appealed for compromise. The leaders of the big chain stores with branches in Birmingham did the same.

Private professional men called to one another across the geographic and racial barriers. Lawyers here and in the South appealed to old classmates in Birmingham. Ministers cried to the Negro preachers there for caution. Top Government officials here called the bankers of the South and urged them to speak out for time, if not for compromise.

Maybe in the end the truce will break down, but the Nation has had a glimpse in this crisis of what could be done if somehow the moderates could find time in their busy lives to work for moderation and reconciliation.

The Government in Washington has an important but limited role to play. The Federal judiciary will continue to speak out. The Federal executive can act when Federal law is violated, as at the University of Mississippi, but many of the difficult problems that remain are likely to respond more to cooperation among moderate private individuals than to pronouncements or troops out of Washington.

Paradoxically, the conservative businessmen of the South are probably having more effect on producing compromise in many of these delicate situations now than the liberal politicians in the North. They may not want racial integration but they want business, and they want the South to benefit from the transforming scientific revolution of the age.

MORALS AND BUSINESS

There have been many other times in the past when the American businessman has found that he had to take part in public affairs to protect his own interests. Sometimes on the old frontier this took the form of buying up legislatures to assure the passage of laws that were not always in the public interest.

Today, however, many businessmen in the South are beginning to see that by serving the public interest and defending the law they are serving their own interests and the development and prosperity of their region.

Beyond the tragic field of racial conflict, however, this moderate force in American life can serve the national interest more than it is. For example, the letters to the editors columns, dominated in so many cities by propagandists and crackpots, are open to the moderate lawyers and doctors and teachers, so many of whom reserve their opinions for the drawing room.

Political life, too, as President Eisenhower has been saying, is too serious a business to be left to the professional politicians. And moderates in business and in labor unions have had the opportunity to see in recent days what can be done if they will not pass by on the other side.

This country is not as divided as it sounds. It only seems so because the extremists organize and speak out and the moderates do not.

Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. DOMINICK

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I recently received an editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer of March 31, 1963, entitled "We Apologize Too Much." The editorial deals with the bewilderment of the people of the United States in connection with our foreign policy apropos of Castro and Cuba. Since the editorial summarizes the feelings of so many frustrated but freedom-loving Americans, I should like to draw it to the attention of Senators. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE APOLOGIZE TOO MUCH

Is the supreme, overriding consideration in Washington to save face for Nikita Khrushchev and his Cuban stooge, Fidel Castro?

Certain events would make it appear so.

Our Government seems to be falling all over itself to curb any sporadic attacks on the new Communist island fortress, lest it enrage Castro and upset our relations with Khrushchev (whatever they may be).

Under the Neutrality Act, we have the right and probably the duty to keep any armed excursions against Fidel-land from being staged on our shores by Cuban patriots.

But what they do beyond our territorial waters is strictly none of our business, and our groveling apologies to Moscow and Havana make us appear weak (and ridiculous) in the eyes of the world.

CASTRO DOESN'T APOLOGIZE FOR HIS ADVENTURES

Has Castro rushed forward with any official apologies for the repeated instances in which Cuban agents have acted against the sovereignty of other Latin-American states? Has he apologized for the confiscation without recompense of many hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of American property in Cuba. No. All he has done is accept an unprecedented ransome for the prisoners of the Bay-of-Pigs fiasco—and to exact a heavy financial tribute from any Cuban-American citizen who leaves his new Communist paradise.

Not one but a number of Americans have been shot down in flights over Communist territory. We don't recall that Castro apologized for the death of the Virginia major whose flight finally established beyond doubt that Russia had sneaked offensive missiles and bombers into ready positions in Cuba—although the major's body was returned as an "act of kindness."

AMERICAN FLIERS NEVER RETURN FROM RUSSIA

A number of American fliers—some of them trapped into flying over the Turkish border into Russia by spurious radio beams—have never been returned, alive or dead.

Yet several weeks ago, Russian planes flew over Alaska for almost half an hour. They were intercepted, but not downed or compelled to land. Our State Department delivered a protest over what it called the first overflight of American territory—and the Russians calmly denied that any such incident had taken place. They said their planes had never been closer than 75 miles to Alaska and our vital installations there.

We accepted the note, while someone in Washington mumbled something about its having been bad weather.

Long-range Russian bombers (used for reconnaissance purposes) have leisurely flown over two of our biggest aircraft carriers, taking pictures to their hearts' content. They were escorted, to use the Pentagon term, by American interceptors, and Washington hastily pointed out that the Russians had every higrt to be there. Our Chief of Naval Operations went on to say that "we learned more than they."

For one thing—although this obviously was not what he meant—the Russians seem to be able to pinpoint our big flattops in the bastness of the oceans. The atom-powered *Constellation* was off Midway and the *Enterprise* was in mid-Atlantic. This was a remarkable performance, alongside our apparent difficulty in spotting hijacked ocean liners and incoming freighters filled with missiles and bombers on their decks. And it is hardly enough to say that in wartime the Russian Bears would have been shot down before reaching the carriers. Under war conditions, once located, the carrier would have been attacked by missiles, not lumbering bombers of the Bear type.

We have photographed the imitation fishing vessels loaded with photographic and electronic gear that have anchored off the coast of Florida and monitored our missile firings, and those that have deployed in the Pacific to check on our atomic tests, but it escapes us what we have gained in the process. If the Russians had an immense new atomic-powered aircraft carrier on the high seas, we wonder if they would have facilitated as many as nine photographic runs over it by American planes. After all, they repeatedly have "buzzed" ordinary transport planes flying the prescribed routes into and out of West Berlin. And never apologized.

On etiquette, we're outdoing them. But the Communist have not yet given any indication that Little Lord Fauntleroy behavior impresses them. Strangely enough, they often interpret it as a sign of weakness.

United Nations Special Session May 14

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the 110 members of the United Nations General Assembly will meet in New York in special session. Their business is to reach agreement on how much each nation will pay to the cost of U.N. police and peacekeeping forces ordered into troubled areas. An excellent summary of the choices facing the Assembly appears in the May 13 Christian Science Monitor.

In slightly shortened form the article reads as follows:

WHO PAYS THE WORLD POLICEMAN?

(By Earl W. Foell)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—When His Excellency Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, the sagely bearded President of the General Assembly, calls that organization to order in special session Tuesday, the United Nations will return once again to wrestling with the thorny question of how to pay the world policeman.

Should the rich pay most of the bill? The poor none or next to none? Should cold-war parties be liable for higher assessments because they magnify the policing jobs? Should aggressors pay an extra penalty? Should victims be exempted? Should the big powers have more say in peacemaking decisions if they pay more?

Or should all the U.N.'s members pay the unexpected costs for policing the trouble spots of the world—the Congos and Gaza strips—at their regular rates of taxation in the world community?

This special session of the General Assembly has been called to find an answer among these questions. Specifically, the U.N. is seeking a solution to the problem of paying the Congo and Middle East bills for the last half of 1963. But beyond the short-term answer, many members of the world organization hope to establish some precedents which will help the U.N. undertake policing duties in the future without risking insolvency in the process. And officials hope to begin breaking the general logjam of unpaid back dues.

After Korea the Soviets lost part of the effectiveness of their veto in the Security Council under the "uniting for peace" resolution which transferred peacekeeping power to the General Assembly when the Security Council is stymied. Ever since, the Communists have been trying to recover control of such operations by asserting that the Assembly had no power to assess members to pay for the policing.

There have been three major points of view here on paying for peacekeeping operations like the Congo, and many variations. Britain's compromise plan is essentially intended to bridge the gap between the American viewpoint and the Afro-Asian-Latin American one. If it does so, the third viewpoint, the Soviet's bloc's (with which France, Portugal, South Africa, and several non-

Nasser Middle Eastern states happen to have been associated), will be left out in the cold.

THREE VIEWPOINTS

Those three main viewpoints with which the world organization again will be faced at this session are:

1. The U.S. conviction that representation without taxation on policing matters is unwise and undemocratic. Washington feels that all member states should pay their assessments—their community "taxes"—for the Congo and Gaza on the same basis as they pay their regular assessments for U.N. operating expenses. These "taxes" are weighted on ability to pay, thus relieving newer and poorer nations of undue burden while they seek to reach the takeoff stage in their economies.

U.S. delegates here have announced that their country will not pay more than its 32.02 percent share of U.N. costs this year unless others pay up their arrears and decide to broaden support for 1963 Congo and Gaza costs. Only then would it consider an additional contribution which must be appropriated by Congress. In the past the United States has paid from 44 to 49½ percent of the bill for these policing jobs.

2. The conviction of many in the underdeveloped world—represented by a seven-nation group—that the main burden for the two operations should rest upon the big powers whose cold war has made essentially local disputes a world threat. These nations have set forth a complex formula under which, after the first $5 million spent on any peacekeeping operation, the underdeveloped states would share costs on an arithmetically decreasing scale, while the permanent members of the Security Council and developed member states would share on an increasing scale. Consideration also is asked for the idea of penalizing aggressors with heavier assessments, and exempting victims.

3. The Soviet bloc conviction that under the U.N. Charter only the Security Council (where the big powers have the veto) should be able to assess costs for peacekeeping operations ordered by the Council.

Their opponents say that chapter IV, article 17 of the charter ("the expenses of the organization shall be borne by the members as apportioned by the General Assembly") was meant to include peace-keeping costs as "expenses." Moscow rejects this interpretation.

However, the Soviet view was turned down by the World Court in an advisory opinion handed down July 20, 1962. That was the first step toward the current special session and the attempt to find a compromise plan that would begin to end the U.N.'s financial problems.

INTERPRETATION DISPUTED

The second and most important step came last December 19, when the General Assembly voted 76 to 17 with 8 absentions to accept the opinion of the Court making Congo and Gaza expenses binding upon members.

This move, in which all but a few members of the Afro-Asian-Latin American world voted for the Court's decision, set the stage for two events: (1) The current session in which members will try to decide how the now-binding costs will be assessed, and (2) the showdown in 1964 when the Soviet Union, if it does not pay at least $9 million of its back assessments, would automatically lose its voting power unless it declares itself financially unable to pay.

COMPROMISE PLAN

Thus we come to the British compromise plan. Its essential feature is acceptance of the American idea of universal assessment combined with acceptance of the developing world's plea for lightening the load on its economies and increasing it on the developed, cold war world. The British plan would accomplish this by assessing the first $10 million of each operation at regular rates, cutting underdeveloped-nation responsibility in half for costs in excess of $10 million, and making up the loss by contributions from the developed nations.

It is hard to tell at this point what the 111 members will decide during the month or more that this Assembly is expected to last.

Man on the Moon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a number of the scientific community recently have been discussing and debating the merit of this Nation's effort to land men on the moon within the decade. The debate has intensified almost in direct proportion to the increase in funds and other resources allocated to Project Apollo. This concern, I point out, is legitimate in keeping with the process of democracy. However, I also point out that the criticism is not unanimous and that there are distinguished scientists who believe the space program and its present pace will be of great value.

The activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, like the operations of any Government agency, are subject to continuing oversight by the Congress because this is a relatively new and literally unexplored area of activity. Perhaps NASA is subject to even closer watching. This is what we are doing in the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The Washington Post, of May 7, published an excellent editorial on the subject of the moon probe, which emphasized that this exploration is far broader in purpose than is indicated by the attention attracted to the lunar landing. This expresses my belief, and I feel that Project Apollo is only a rallying point around which is gathering a scientific undertaking, the potential of which almost defies imagination. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN ON THE MOON

Comment of 25 of America's 55 living Nobel Prize winners on the feasibility and desirability of a crash program to land a man on the moon reflects a division in the scientific community over the wisdom of the $20 billion moon program of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency.

Most of the Nobel Prize winners thought the effort ought to be dropped as a race and allowed to proceed at a more deliberate rate. Some of the scientists wisely acknowledged that the decision has political connotations. Many of them disapprove because of competing claims on the Nation's financial resources.

The dissent is not the first to come from the scientific community as a whole. Misgivings about the moon probe have been heard ever since the project was put on the track. These misgivings spring from diverse sources and causes, all the way from doubts about the general structure of NASA to reservations about the scientific utility of the probe.

The scientific community, clearly enough, is not a conformist society throughout which a single opinion prevails. Those who have the fullest technical information may differ, along with others who have no better criteria than laymen. In fact, there often is a kind of layman's naive assumption that scientists ought to agree; that they are the oracles of the New World. It is no reproach to the scientists that, outside the disciplines of their own specialties, they are no more competent to decide all questions of policy than the businessmen of the twenties who were often consulted on questions of war and peace beyond the range of their wisdom. Each generation has its own Delphic oracles.

Politicians may yearn for a panel of scientists to put an end to these misgivings, hoping for some sort of board of umpires or referees capable of saying how much of the Nation's expenditures on scientific projects should go to each particular endeavor. But in the end, it is not the scientists or the specialists who have to decide first on how much the Nation can spend on scientific development and second how much of that total should be allocated to each project. These decisions have to be made by generalists of whom politicians are among the last survivors. And the scientists can give the politicians no infallible guidance. Such giant enterprises as NASA inevitably arouse concern. We are bound to worry about its claims on national resources, its absorption of scientific and engineering talent, its diversion of productive resources and facilities to a single purpose. We attribute Soviet space triumphs to the Soviet ability to compel the focus of national power on narrow objectives, but we do not necessarily wish to imitate this concentration.

NASA's great moon probe, however, is not as narrow a purpose as imagined. We may not get to the moon first, or we may not get to it at all—but that will not mean all has been in vain. In trying to reach such a spectacular goal, we are developing the rockets that will place us in the forefront of the space age, and in developing the scientific and engineering skills required to achieve this purpose we are enormously expanding the country's capacity to achieve scientific goals as yet unspecified. The skills and talents nurtured at NASA will be making their contribution to the knowledge, the comfort, the convenience and the survival of the United States long after moon landings have been accepted as a commonplace or abandoned as an impossibility. The world was altered by the voyages of Columbus, even though they failed of their planned objectives. And the world is being altered before our very eyes by a new struggle to master man's environment. Enterprises such as this are not to be judged by the ordinary criteria of scientists, economists, or sociologists. They are not to be weighed on the balance against some other more practical and more appropriate or more feasible endeavor. Such heroic enterprises move by their own laws, abide by their own rules, and set their own precedents and when they are over, leave humanity with its knowledge multiplied, its future expanded, its horizons widened, its outlook sharpened and its hopes uplifted by a new sense of man's unending and unlimited possibilities.

Anniversary of the Independence of Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. DOMINICK

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I have been in touch with a number of people who have been in the unenviable position of being exiles from the great country of Rumania. Last Friday was the anniversary of the independence of Rumania. The Rumanian people are now subjugated by the Communist and are no longer allowed to celebrate their anniversary. The Rumanian people outside the Iron Curtain attempt to hearten the oppressed Rumanians at home through appropriate broadcasts over the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe. Through this medium they send messages into Rumania from all over the free world. Their desire for independence and freedom is consistent with our national policy of encouraging freedom throughout the world and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have a brief article sent to me by the Rumanian National Committee printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE 10TH OF MAY: RUMANIA'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

The 10th of May is the national holiday of the Rumanian people. Three great events of its history are celebrated at that date.

On May 10, 1866, Charles, Prince of Hohenzollern-Signmaringen, a scion of the southern and Catholic branch of the Prussian royal family was proclaimed in Bucharest "Prince of Rumania," and thus founded the Rumanian dynasty. It was the successful outcome of the nation's long struggle to acquire the right of electing as its sovereign a member of one of the western nonneighboring reigning families in order to put an end to the strife and rivalries among native candidates to the throne. This ardent wish, though officially expressed as far back as 1857 by the Moldavian and Wallachian Assemblies—known as the ad hoc Divians—convened as a result of the Paris Treaty of 1856, was nevertheless opposed by the Russian and Austrian Empires, equally disquieted by the growth in power and prestige of the young bordering nation they both secretly hoped to absorb some day. It was thanks to the unrelenting efforts made and wise steps taken by Rumanian patriots, and also to the constant diplomatic assistance of Napoleon III, Emperor of the French, to whom Prince Charles was related through the Beauharnais and Murat families, that all political obstacles were gradually removed and that what was to be the prosperous and glorious reign of Charles I could be inaugurated on May 10, 1866.

Eleven years later, on May 10, 1877, during the turmoil of the Russo-Turkish War, the principality of Rumania, until then nominally a vassal of the sultan, proclaimed her independence by severing the old and outdated bonds that linked her with the Ottoman Empire. This independence had to be fought out on the battlefields south of the Danube, where the young Rumanian Army, as an ally of Russia, played a noteworthy part in the defeat of the Turkish forces. The Congress of Berlin of 1878 confirmed Rumania's independence and conferred Europe's official recognition, a bright page in the country's dreary history though marred unfortunately by the loss of Bessarabia, cynically wrenched by Czar Alexander II and his government from the ally who helped them obtain victory over the Turks.

Another 4 years elapsed after the Rumanian people had proclaimed their independence and a further step was taken as they decided to raise their country to the rank of a kingdom. On May 10, 1881, Charles I was crowned, by the will of his people, King of Rumania. A prosperous era, which lasted over six decades, opened on that day for the nation. Its apex was attained when national unity in the historic boundaries was reached after World War I. The socially progressive country had now become a factor of peace and equilibrium in the southeast of Europe.

During all those years and up to the present time, Rumanians have cherished and revered the 10th of May as their national holiday, the anniversary of happy and glorious events in their history, in which achievements of monarchy and people were interwoven. It remains the symbol of their permanency and perseverence through woes and hardships to reach the ultimate end of freedom and well-being.

The ruthless foreign rule which now oppresses the Rumanian nation has not been able to uproot the people's attachment to the traditional celebration of the 10th of May. In order to try to alter at least its significance, official celebrations were shifted from the 10th to the 9th of May, anniversary of the Soviet victory. But, though flags are now hoisted on May, Rumanians in their captive homeland celebrate nonetheless in their hearts the following day, awaiting with faith and courage the dawn of new times, when freedom shall be restored to them.

Congressional Questionnaires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, on April 25, 1963, Mr. John D. Seater, Jr., editor-publisher of the Arizona Record, of Globe, Ariz., which is one of the finest weekly newspapers in my district, wrote a column concerning the questionnaire I have distributed to my constituents.

I am sharing this column with my colleagues not because it refers to the questionnaire, but rather because it constitutes a fine essay on citizenship:

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By John D. Seater, Jr.)

Representative George F. (Duke) Senner is adopting a policy followed by many Congressmen. Going into the mail to families throughout district 3 are some 30,000 questionnaires.

Of necessity a rather lengthy document, Senner's questionnaire covers a wide range of domestic and foreign policies now before Congress, or soon to come before it. In many cases, residents of district 3 can indicate an answer simply by checking a square. In others, however, there may be no answer provided in the choice that adequately describes your thinking.

In any event, any Globite receiving one of the Senner questionnaires should certainly complete it and return it to our Representative. If choices provided do not fill the bill insofar as you're concerned, by all means take the time to write your own answer.

Senner, of course, has his own ideas as to what courses are best to follow in representing his district. But he is, nevertheless, our Representative, and as such he needs to know how the people in district 3 feel about the issues of the day. Without hearing from the people back home, he cannot know their desires.

Some will not take the trouble to answer the Senner questionnaire simply because they're too lazy or apathetic to do so. Others will not answer because they disagree with Senner on issues involved and feel our Representative would not consider their views anyway. Still others, especially those who know Senner personally and like him, feel they can rest assured their Representative is doing and will do a good job in their behalf in Washington.

If you belong to either of these groups, you're shunning your duties of citizenship.

So when you receive your questionnaire from your Representative, extend him the courtesy of answering and returning it to him. And do yourself a favor by exercising some of your responsibility of citizenship.

Speech of His Excellency Avraham Harman, Ambassador of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 5, 1963, I was honored to be a guest at a joint luncheon of the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee and the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington observing Israel's 15th anniversary.

The occasion was especially impressive because of memorial remarks for the late president of Israel, Itzhak Ben-Zvi, and other addresses appropriate to the occasion of distinguished Americans including Senator Kuchel.

However, Mr. Speaker, the response on behalf of Israel by His Excellency Avraham Harman of Israel to the United States were exceptionally significant. I believe because of developments in the Near East and growing tension there that the remarks of the Ambassador should be read by all Members of Congress. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks I include them for printing in full at this point in the Congressional Record:

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY AVRAHAM HARMAN, AMBASSADOR OF ISRAEL TO THE UNITED STATES, MAY 5, 1963, WASHINGTON, D.C.

This has been a very moving occasion for me. I have heard here words of encouragement and support which are of great significance to my country and I am very fortunate indeed to have been placed by you in a position to be able to convey them to my government and my people, at this time when we celebrate our 15th anniversary.

I think it would be appreciated if I make my remarks brief and I think I can do that. So much has been said by you about Israel. And I would stress that what Israel is after 15 years is due so much to the cooperation that there has been between our two countries and our two governments, and to the deep and abiding interest of the free Jewish communities of your country in what we in Israel have been seeking to do with our independence in the interests of the Jewish people and of the Jewish future. In view of that, there is no need for me to speak very long.

We are a small country living in a turbulent area and I suppose it is natural that during the last few weeks in particular people have been asking me primarily about the external problems of Israel. Permit me to say that I don't regard these external problems as being the decisive questions for our future. I hold to the view that in the uncertainty and unpredictability of our times, the factor that is decisive for a people's future and for its destiny is its internal health; the nature of its sense of national purpose; the quality of the dedication of its people to the attainment of that purpose; the degree of its alertness to danger and the extent of the will and the determination of its people to meet that danger.

After 15 years of our independent existence as a nation, I think I can say to you, and not in a spirit of boastfulness, that I can report very positively on those points. The purpose of Israel is positive and not negative. We hate no one. We are not at war with anyone. Our fight in Israel is against the pockets of backwardness among our own people and against the desert area which still remains in our land. Our battle is with disease, ignorance, and the desert. Independence for us is not an end in itself, but an instrument in the hands of the people to improve its condition and assure its possibility of self-expression in freedom. It is in that spirit that we have dedicated ourselves in these last 15 years to the rebuilding of our people and the rebuilding of our land.

In our tradition, the absolute value is life, human life, lived as it should be lived by people who conceive of themselves as having been fashioned and created in the image of God. It is this passion for life which has carried the Jewish people through its tortuous course of history, from Haman through Hitler and past him, and which will carry it into the future.

It is for these reasons that I can report to you after fifteen years in which we have been surrounded by continuous hostility that we have grown stronger, both absolutely and relatively. The diplomatice offensive launched against us has not prevented us extending the network of our diplomatic and friendly relations with countries in all the continents of the world. The economic offensive launched against us has not prevented Israel from sustaining a continuous economic growth. And so I believe I can tell you on this occasion that the evil design of Israel's elimination is not realistic. We in Israel in 1963 are the only people in the Middle East which lives in the same place and speaks the same language as its ancestors spoke in that place 3,000 years ago. We have roots in this place and we have deepened and strengthened those roots during the utilization of our independence in these past 15 years.

We are not blind to the dangers that surround us at the present time. We are not blind to the fact that there is an evil design against us. We are not an anti-Arab people. We recognize the legitimacy of the existence of the Arab states in our area and the legitimacy of their independence. We strive for the goal of Arab-Israel cooperation which in our view could transform the whole character of the Middle East and give fulfillment to the dreams and needs of all its peoples and lift it back again to the proud place which it occupied in the history of human civilization thousands of years ago.

But we see the doctrine of belligerence repeatedly proclaimed around us, the most recent example being the declaration that was made in Cairo on April the 17th, just a couple of weeks ago, by Egypt, Iraq, and Syria, in which there was talk about the liberation of "Palestine" as the central purpose of this new Arab unity idea. Whether there is Arab unity or not in the Middle East and what kind of Arab unity there is going to be is not our concern. How the Arab choose to live among themselves is their business and not ours. What concerns us is whether this is a free expression of independent peoples or the result of an expansionist policy end purpose is to be directed against us, and not only against us in the Middle East. It is inconceivable to us that the world in which the only hope for survival is the doctrine enshrined in the United Nations Charter should tolerate a doctrine of violence completely opposed to the principles and the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations.

The elimination of Israel is an unrealistic goal. We in Israel are not a Warsaw ghetto. The danger to the peace of the Middle East and to the peace of the world lies in the possibility of a miscalculation that those who harbor this desire should be permitted for a moment to feel that the world would tolerate their attempt to put into practice, or the preparation on their part so to do.

And so as I thank you for these sentiments of encouragement and support which have have been uttered here today on the occasion of my country's 15th anniversary, I would like in conclusion, just briefly, to sum up the basic guiding lines of Israel's policy at this time.

We in Israel, despite this unremitting hostility, have kept the minds and hearts of our people wide open to the vision of peace with our neighobrs and we shall continue to do so. We hope that the whole world will never cease to remind the countries living in the Middle East of their obligation to the world to settle their differences and the disputes between them by peaceful means in the process of mutual negotiation.

The second basis of our policy is this, 14 years ago we signed armistice agreements with our Arab neighbors. Those armistice agreements were envisaged, as all armistice agreements should be, as being a transient phase leading from war to peace. We have continuously asked our Arab neighbors to move forward to that next phase, to move forward from armistice to the resolution of the problems between us by negotiation looking toward relations of real peace between them and us. That offer has been spurned. We have been able to live in this situation because by and large, with some violent exceptions, although the armistice has not moved forward to peace, it was marked in recent years by a condition of refraining from the disturbance of our borders by shooting across them. That is the only condition which makes this twilight kind of relationship feasible in our area, as it is the only condition that makes this twilight period in which the whole world is living in at the present time feasible. There is no peace in the world. Life is tolerable in conditions of no peace because there is no shooting. It is the hope of Israel and the purpose of Israel to maintain this condition of no shooting until we can move forward toward the transformation of this situation into a condition of real peace.

Thirdly, we see around us the active preparation of the Arab States for war and we counter these steps on their part by the building up of the defensive strength of Israel. The defense policy of Israel is not aimed at making it possible for Israel to win a war. The defense policy of Israel is designed to make it possible for Israel to deter a war. We have succeeded in this policy in the past 15 years. It is our hope and conviction that the free world will understand the vital importance of making it possible for that policy to continue so as to avoid the point of explosion and remove any kind of basis for miscalculation.

Finally, I would say this. That while doing all that, while keeping itself open for peace, while retaining the measure or quiescence that exists, while deterring the possibility of attack against it in the future, we in Israel as a free people understand that all this is possible only if, in the process of doing this, we continue to build and live the freedom that we are seeking to protect. And we shall bend all our energies in the years ahead to continue along that path: to push back the desert; to replace ignorance by educated civic consciousness; to move forward in our endeavor; to repay to the Jewish people what it has invested in us. And to continue to satisfy the urgent needs of large segments of the Jewish people that look to us for home and for hope.

It is in that spirit, ladies and gentlemen, that I thank you on behalf of the Government and people of Israel for the friendship of your country, of your Government and of the great Jewish community of this land and pledge to you that the freedom which Israel has been living and building these past 15 years will continue to be built and to be lived in the endless time that stretches ahead of us as a free and independent people. Thank you.

Cuba: Showcase of Our Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, one after another high officials of our Government has been saying that Cuba is a showcase of Communist failure.

This "Red herring" can hardly cover up the unpleasant fact that in reality Cuba is a showcase of American failure.

From the Bay of Pigs blot on our history on down to our present admission that there are more Soviet troops in Cuba than previously estimated the administration has continued to take the self-congratulatory view that all is well. The argument infers that President Kennedy scored a great victory when he persuaded Mr. K. to say he would recall his nuclear missiles. Overlooked, of course, is our retreat on promised inspections to assure that the missiles were withdrawn and our unwillingness to insist on the Soviets recalling their troops.

Mr. Speaker, as long as the Soviets hold a Communist beachhead in Cuba and as long as the Monroe Doctrine is being violated—then Cuba is a showcase of our failure.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is an editorial from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer which speaks out clearly on this point:

WE DISAGREE

We beg to disagree with one of our favorite Washington personalities, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Yes; it is pleasant to know that Castro's Cuba is in all kinds of trouble and may more of it happen to the Red murderers who rule the island.

But can you refer to Cuba as a "showcase of Communist failure," as L.B.J. did in a speech Saturday?

Not as long as thousands and thousands of Russian troops—the exact number of thousands is unimportant—remain there to strengthen the hemisphere's Communist fortification with each passing day.

Cuba is a showcase of Red cruelty, repression and brutality.

But it is a Communist "success" until the last Soviet soldier is eliminated one way or another, and until Castro and his bloody killers are themselves overthrown.

A Congressman's Duties as Compared to Those of an Executive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the monthly newsletter of the Carthage, Tenn., Rotary Club recently carried an amusing article entitled "What Is an Executive?" In reading this brief article I was reminded of a speech given several years ago by our late colleague, the Honorable Luther Patrick, of Alabama, who pointed out that a Congressman also has a variety of duties as an executive, a legislator, as well as a multiplicity of jobs unknown and unrelated.

Mr. Speaker, I believe many of my colleagues will enjoy reading the article from the Rotary Club newsletter on "What Is an Executive?" and also will find interesting and amusing Congressman Patrick's remarks about the duties of an elected Representative which might be headed "What Is a Congressman?"

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the excerpts from these statements in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the monthly newsletter of the Carthage (Tenn.) Rotary Club]

WHAT IS AN EXECUTIVE?

He is called by many names: The boss, top management, head man, the chief, president, vice president, treasurer, owner, partner, chairman, his initials, or just plain "Tom" or "Joe." Each day he lives with problems and every day he is on the lookout for solutions. A good executive is understanding, fair, a cajoler, coordinator, arbitrator, listener, and decider. In addition he is efficient, hard-working, patient, impatient, aggressive, ambitious for himself and for his firm.

His constant companions are work, too little time, budgets, taxes, inventory, ideas, new products, production, employee relations, profit and loss charts, marketing, advertising, and company dollars. No one knows better than he the meaning of pressure. He is second-guessed, loved, appreciated, tolerated, respected, blamed, praised, understood, misunderstood, needling and needled, but never ignored.

The executive knows the loneliness of management. For there comes a time for decisions. Despite all the counsel from associates, above and below, it is he who says "yes" or "no." He can't afford to err in judgment, whether it be in the selection of personnel or the kinds of raw materials that go into the product. He is always responsible.

The good executive is the voice of his company—both written and spoken. Thus, he is a reader, student, speaker, moderator, writer * * * as well as the subject of a speech or article. He is the product of business and means business. What he does can produce a ripple or a tidal wave of activity.

Although his collar is white and his shoes are polished, he knows the meaning of long hours and hard work. For this he has learned; to get a better job, keep doing a better job.

That's how executives are made.

WHAT IS A CONGRESSMAN?

(By Luther Patrick)

"A Congressman," he said, "has become an expanded messenger boy, an employment agency, getter-out of the Navy, Army, and Marines, a wardheeler, a wound healer, trouble shooter, law explainer, bill finder, issue translator, resolution interpreter, controvery-oil-pourer, glad hand extender, business promoter, convention goer, civic good will promoter, veterans affairs adjuster, exserviceman's champion, watchdog for the underdog, sympathizer for the upper dog, kisser of babies, recoverer of lost baggage, soberor of delegates, adjuster for traffic violators and voters straying into Washington and into the toils of the law, binderup of broken hearts, financial wet nurse, a good samaritan, contributor to good causes—cornerstone layer, public building and bridge dedicator, ship christener. To be sure, he does get in a little flag waving, and a little constitutional hoisting and spread eagle work, but it is getting harder every day to find time to properly study legislation, the very business we are primarily here to discharge, and it must be done above all things."

Hazardous Duty Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the military pay bill last Wednesday, May 8, I spoke on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] to provide extra pay for hazardous duty. I made the statement:

> I would venture to say that not a single Member of the House had had one letter, one telegram in behalf of combat pay.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a telegram which was delivered to my office while I was present on the floor, and which I had not seen prior to my remarks. The telegram is from Mr. Francis Stover, legislative director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and is in support of combat pay. The text of the telegram follows:

MAY 8, 1963.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Veterans of Foreign Wars greviously shocked that H.R. 5555 excludes hostile fire, or combat pay. Combat veterans are bewildered that reported bill has made no provision for this small group who are doing the fighting and dying but does have over $600 million in extra pay for other types of performance. The VFW urgently requests your support and vote in favor of amendment to have the administration's recommendation to include extra pay for those who are guarding our freedoms all over the globe.

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

California Editor Looks to Barry Goldwater To Give America Needed Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most powerful voices of public opinion in the United States are the community newspapers, published in the small towns of America, most of them on a weekly basis. In the opinions of the nearly 10,000 editors of weekly newspapers we find the real grassroots sentiment of this country, far closer to what America is thinking than in the much publicized opinion polls, sometimes slanted to bring about a desired decision.

I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the smalltown newspapers of this Nation and the courageous editors who have helped shape the destiny of America since the first days of our fight for independence and the establishment of a new kind of government of, for and by the people.

It is because I have such a thorough respect for the opinions of the smalltown editors and their influence in the communities they serve, that I insert as a part of these remarks, the following editorial from the Delano Record, Delano, Calif., concerning the lack of leadership under the Kennedy administration and the need for the kind of leader America will find in BARRY GOLDWATER:

THE OTHER SIDE

(By Mel Baughman)

Where is America going?

The question stems from the current confusion and contradictions in the day-to-day operation of our Nation's Government, which, if their implications were not so serious for the future of this Nation, would almost be funny.

A year ago we were treated to the spectacle of the awesome power of the Presidency being used to deny a hike in steel prices. Today, deeper in the semantic swamps to which we have been taken by the New Frontier, we see that steel makers will be allowed "selective increases" in prices. Government by man's whim and fancy replaces government by law. Forces of a free market economy remain bound by Lilliputian bureaucrats.

Years ago we were told that defense must not be restricted by consideration of the balanced budget. Today, in the TFX affair, tactical and strategic considerations and battle-tested military opinion are ignored in the McNamara monarchy's insistence on "commonality."

Months ago we were told that foreign aid would be essential at the level proposed by the President in his January budget. Yet when the actual foreign aid was requested, the President himself had cut the amount, an open invitation to Congress to follow suit.

We listened last month to the brave and eloquent words of the President in Costa Rica as he proposed a wall of brave men to be constructed around Cuba. And the Nation moved further into a semantic swamp in which elocution replaces action.

Today we watch as our Government thwarts and frustrates in every way possible the efforts of the Cuban Freedom Fighters to free their homelands. It is quite apparent that our articulate, but timid New Frontiersmen have forgotten the Destroyers-for-bases deal of 1940, the Lend-Lease Act, the Eagle Squadron, and the arming of the Atlantic merchantmen, all actions that were taken to give real meaning and substance to the eloquence of the Atlantic Charter and the Rooseveltian declaration that this Nation has a rendezvous with destiny.

America is adrift. America is a ship of state without a competent captain and crew. Does the same fate await America that befell a motor torpedo boat in World War II?

America is being treated to an incredible spectacle that suggests little boys trying to play government. But, alas, the plaything is the land of Lee, Fremont, Franklin, Washington, Lincoln, and the Roosevelts. These were men in whose lives can be read extraordinary achievement.

But what can be read in the lives of the men who lead our country now? What achievements have been recorded? It is one thing to write books outlining a course of action, a strategy of peace. It is one thing to make speeches of criticism. It is quite another thing to implement the course of action. It is quite another thing to turn criticism into accomplishment. Between the promises of 1960 and the performance of 1962 and 1963 a wide gulf yawns.

But apart from the weaknesses of the men who attempt so pathetically and so futilely to lead us, what else is wrong?

Why are American counsels so completely ignored in so many political capitals of the world?

Why is the counsel of our Government so suspect in the economic capitals of our own Nation?

May it not be that the very premises on which our foreign and domestic policies are based are false? May it not be that, in the case of foreign policy, leadership has been confused with friendship, respect replaced by revenue, loyalty defeated by largess?

May it not be that the premise is false that the people are too stupid to take care of themselves and therefore need Government help? How else can one explain the bureaucrats' and the liberals' insistence on all kinds of federally financed and federally controlled and operated welfare programs?

Now, in the spring of 1963, there can be no doubt that the Kennedy administration is incapable of coping with problems besetting this Nation. Our Congressmen are aware of this, and in their reluctance to act hastily on the President's program may lie a decision to mark time and wait for the elections of 1964, when the people will have the opportunity to pass judgment on the administration.

The American people must carefully consider the reasons for the incapacity: the glaring inability of men in high places and the falsity of the basic premises on which they attempt to act.

If America is to survive, the people must find new leadership which is dedicated to the historic principles and premises which have made America the magnet of the world.

The premises are found in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

The leadership will be found in the junior Senator from Arizona, the Honorable BARRY MORRIS GOLDWATER.

Kerr-Mills Medicare Program Working Well in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remraks, I include a resolution approved by the governing council of the Texas Public Health Association. This reveals that the Kerr-Mills program is proving successful in Texas in helping solve the needs of medical care for low-income people. It is unfortunate that all of the States are not taking advantage of this type of Federal aid. Perhaps that is understandable, however, in view of the failure of the Health, Education, and Welfare Agency to assist and encourage more States to participate. In fact, HEW has, by its inaction, discouraged participation, apparently for the purpose of trying to build up a better case for medicare under social security.

It is significant that the Kerr-Mills beneficiaries during the year ending last June more than doubled, from 46,247 to 101,634 and that monthly payments during that period increased from $9,311,027 to $17,215,814.

With the phenomenal increase in private health insurance, couped with the success of the Kerr-Mills program, it is becoming increasingly evident that a solution has been found for the health needs of our elderly people of low income. Sponsors of the proposal to start a new program, to be financed by increasing the social security tax, should recognize this fact and throw their support behind these methods of meeting the problem. More and more, Mr. Speaker, the medicare under social security is becoming recognized as unneeded, unsound, and undesirable. It seems to me that I heard somewhere that taxes are too high in this country and it would help our economy to reduce—not increase—the tax burden of our people.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the Texas Public Health Association has noted the need for adequate health care of the aging population; and

Whereas this problem is now being met through private insurance and Kerr-Mills Federal legislation and the State legislation; and

Whereas the medical vendor program was initiated for recipients of old-age assistance January 1, 1962, by the Texas Department of Public Welfare: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Texas Public Health Association go on record in support of further implementation by Texas of the Kerr-Mills bill by adding medical aid to the aged (MAA); and, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Texas Public Health Association also go on record as opposed to the plan of medical care of the aged through social security; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the American Public Health Association, all affiliated members of APHA and the Texas Representatives in Congress.

Defeat in Laos Tragic Setback

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Dallas News:

DEFEAT IN LAOS TRAGIC SETBACK

(By Robert Morris)

Laos, in southeast Asia, is a little smaller than Oregon, with about 2 million inhabitants. It came into being in 1949 when France signed a treaty reorganizing its sovereignty, but it was not generally recognized until the Geneva accord of 1954.

Strategically situated, it is the hub of southeast Asia. It borders on China, Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, North and South Vietnam. A Communist Laos, like a Communist Brazil, could undermine and overcome the many coutries strung around it.

At Geneva in 1954 the United States—and later SEATO—warned the Communists against further aggressions into Southeast Asia. The warnings were ignored; and the Pathet Lao, the dread guerrilla force led by Prince Souphanouvong, has remorselessly pushed onward.

At first the United States assisted the loyal Laotians who resisted the Communist thrusts. Later, the State Department formed a coalition government in the little country on a troika basis and pressured the loyal Laotians, led by Gen. Phoumi Nosavan, into this coalition. The loyal Laotians knew the treacherous nature of the Communists and resisted our efforts. By cutting off economic and military assistance, the State Department forced General Nosavan to "peacefully coexist" with the Communists on a troika basis: one-third Communist, one-third neutralist, and one-third Western, now generally tagged rightwing.

Later we learned that the idea had been agreed upon by President Kennedy and Dictator Khrushchev in Vienna in 1961. The Geneva accord of July 1962 formalizing this, was signed by 14 nations and was acclaimed as a great effort to achieve a peaceful, independent, and neutral Laos.

This solution of conflict by the creation of a troika has been tried not only in Laos. It is a reflection of the essential approach our planners take toward the United Nations with all its corollary functions such as disarmament.

The U.N. secretariat is organized on a troika basis, and more and more solutions are being offered on the premise. The recent flouting of the Laotian accord by the Communists is not only a violation of the peace in that troubled country but is a challenge to the whole troika concept. It is a challenge to the whole posture of the State Department's planners.

Whereas substantial Communist infiltration of the neutral force and even moderate infiltration of the Western force are weaknesses in the concept, the cornerstone of the principle of the troika is Soviet reliability. Not only have Communists not kept their promises or lived up to almost hundreds of agreements but they appear to be constitutionally incapable of keeping their word.

The Communists are using accords, treaties and promises in the fashion their innermost doctrines dictate—as a means of conquest. The difficulty arises when we attribute to them our standards and our interpretations of words which are antithetical to theirs.

Our leaders work for a peaceful, independent and neutral Laos. So does Khrushchev. But peace to a Communist prevails when all resistance to communism has been broken.

Averell Harriman has come back from Moscow with an assurance from Khrushchev that he is interested in a peaceful, independent and neutral Laos. So our planners become again satisfied that all is well and that Khrushchev will use his influence on the nasty Chinese Communists who are conveniently considered out of step with Mr. K.

The futility of this becomes disturbing when one realizes that not only Laos but the whole fabric of our policy is being openly defied without our even recognizing it.

If our planners would but read the record of China. From the famous Yenan declaration of 1945, through all the resolutions and policy changes both in China and the United States, the Chinese Communists and our planners worked for an independent, democratic, and free China. Both sides even use the same terms. The result was bondage for 600 million human beings.

J.F.K. "Dumbbell" Approach to Atlantic Unity Is Unsound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, President de Gaulle rendered a significant service to humanity 3 months ago by dramatizing the weakness of President Kennedy's Operation Dumbbell approach to Atlantic unity.

Unhappily, the Kennedy administration has failed to bring forward a sound alternative.

Clarence K. Streit, editor of Freedom and Union magazine and author of several books on the Atlantic Community, has written this searching analysis of Operation Dumbbell comparing it with what I consider to be a hopeful and sound alternative—Atlantic Federal Union:

DUMBBELL AND ATLANTIC FEDERAL PLANS—SIX POINTS OF AGREEMENT AND DIFFERENCE

A basic step in ending the prolonged Atlantic crisis is yet to be taken by the administration and press. That step is an objective study of the most available alternative to Operation Dumbbell—the twin-partner approach to European and Atlantic unification which President de Gaulle has so definitely rejected. A point-by-point comparison of Operation Dumbbell with the Federal Union multimember alternative throws more than light on the whole problem; it gives twofold hope for its solution. For it shows that although the Federal approach differs from the Dumbbell one in ways that meet at least some of the Gaullist obstacles, the two approaches have much more in common than most partisans of either, or outside observers, now recognize. Witness the following comparison:

BOTH ARE GRADUAL—DIFFERENTLY

Many have assumed that the Dumbbell answer was the only practical one, because of these two prior assumptions:

A. Practical necessities require a gradual transition to a common market, common currency and common defense force.

B. Dumbbell provides for this transition to be effected gradually, while Federal Union demands a utopian effort to achieve all this at one stroke, overnight. The fact—which Federal Unionists obviously have not made clear enough—is that the Federal approach also assumes the need of gradual transition, and provides for it. The only difference is in the method of carrying out the transition. Comparison of the two methods should therefore help advance agreement.

BOTH ARE BALANCED—DIFFERENTLY

Again, many assume that Operation Dumbbell is more realistic than Federal Union because of two prior assumptions: A. Practical experience proves the need of balance between conflicting interests in any political system. B. Operation Dumbbell offers statesmen the solid balance between two equal weights, with an easy handle to grasp, that a dumbbell offers gymnasts, while Federal Union utopianly disregards this necessity. The fact—which again Federal Unionists have clearly not made clear enough—is that the Federal approach not only agrees with assumption A but also provides a balance between the same conflicting interests as does Operation Dumbbell. Again the only difference is in the method of assuring that the balance will really work—and study of the two alternatives should help assure greater agreement.

BOTH RELY—DIFFERENTLY—ON FEDERALISM

On the other hand, the fact that Operation Dumbbell avoids the word, "federal," in relation to Atlantica as if it were poison, leads many Federal Unionists to assume that it does not recognize that federalism is the best answer to the problem of uniting democracies effectively. Once more the assumption is quite unfounded; the surprising truth is that Operation Dumbbell depends essentially and openly on federal principles. And once more the only basic difference between the two approaches is the way they apply their common principle—and so comparison of the opposing methods should clarify choice between them. Nor is this all.

SIX POINTS OF AGREEMENT AND DIFFERENCE

There are at least three more essentials on which both approaches agree—while differing radically in what they would do about them. The six major points of agreement, and difference, between the Dumbbell and the Federal Union approaches, may be summed up as follows:

1. Piecemeal versus all-together plan. Both approaches agree that the North Atlantic nations have certain common economic, monetary, defensive, and political affairs that are Atlantic rather than purely national, and that require the creation of common institutions to govern them jointly. But the Dumbbell approach seeks to unite Atlantica in these fields piecemeal, separately, successively, one function after another, whereas the Federal Union approach would deal with these functions together, as forming an organic whole.

2. Technocratic versus democratic transition: Both agree that the transition to a common market, a common currency and a common defense force can only be carried through gradually, in stages. But Operation Dumbbell would handle the transition through separate functional, bureaucratic, "technocratic" institutions, whereas Operation Federal Union would set up a democratic political government to work out all the functional transition as a whole.

3. Ending versus starting with political union. Both approaches agree the whole operation involves a fundamental political decision and the creation of common political institutions. Dumbbell would leave this to be taken at the final stage, many years from now when all the functional transition is completed. Federal Union would start by crossing the political Rubicon and constituting an Atlantic federal government, whose first task would be to create gradually an Atlantic market, currency, and defense force.

4. Two-power versus two-house balance: Both agree that solution requires creation of an equitable workable balance between the larger and smaller nations—particularly between those of Europe and the American colossus—to prevent any nation or group of nations from dominating the others. Operation Dumbbell was named by its authors for the gymnastic weight which symbolizes the balance they propose. They would achieve it by federating the European nations so that their weight would equal that of the United States, and then connect the two unions by a bar they call partnership. This political dumbbell stems from the traditional Old World external balance of power between sovereign states.

Federal Union offers instead the internal balance which is the New World's solution of the problem. It would form a single Atlantic Union composed of the existing NATO nations, with a constitution assuring (as does that of the United States) the balance between large and small states by its distribution of voting power. This balance would give the people of the smaller Atlantic nations the majority in the Senate, while in the House, the large nations would have a majority. Voting power in electing the executive and in amending the Constitution would be somewhat similarly weighted to safeguard every member.

5. National versus federal veto: Both approaches seek to assure the maintenance of their balance by a guaranteed veto. Operation Dumbbell would give each of its two sovereign unions, European and American, the same veto power that its Common Market treaty gave President de Gaulle—and which he has used to veto not merely British entry therein but Dumbbell itself. Moreover, during its long years of transition to political union in Europe, each nation would retain, for all practical purposes, the veto that the dogma of absolute national sovereignty preserves for each in the NATO Treaty.

If Atlantica survived the dangers that the De Gaulle veto has shown lie in this system, it would then face still greater peril. If Dumbbell united Europe politically, a man of General de Gaulle's character might well become its president. The deadlock resulting from his use of Dumbbell's veto would then paralyze Atlantica far more hopelessly than it is now. Its power to meet the Communist threat, or to help the new nations to grow in freedom would, at best, be cut in half. It might well be cut to zero through each of the two equally strong unions canceling out the other's power. And if one of the two should put its weight on the Russian side of the scale—for example, by the Europe-to-the-Urals strategy—Atlantica's power would be overwhelmingly divided against itself.

Federal Union would allow an absolute veto to no power in Atlantica—except its senate and house. By giving each of them a veto over the other—through making action depend on agreement by both—it would seek to preserve its balance between the large nations and the small. It would avoid dangerous deadlock between the two houses by various devices, but primarily by keeping the members of both subject to frequent election by the people. Thus Federal Union would, from the start, establish a supreme, uniting power—the sovereign citizens of Atlantica—above the two sides of its balance, whereas Dumbbell would place over its two equally powerful governments no common authority capable of peacefully making them work together.

6. European versus Atlantic federation: Finally, both approaches agree that federation is the best answer to the problem of uniting democratic states, and both depend on it to achieve their goal. But whereas Federal Union would form a multination Atlantic Federation, the Dumbbellers would

unite only Europe federally—and seek to unite Atlantica by the method they reject in Europe as too feeble and unreliable. To make Western Europe strong enough to balance the United States they turn to the federal system as the only equitable and workable way to balance the large and small nations within Europe. But to achieve the workable balance between Europe and the United States on which the lives and liberties of both depend, they reject the federal system and put their faith in the kind of balance General de Gaulle would maintain in Europe too.

Paradoxically, his insistence on maintaining there the balance they reserve for Atlantic has led the Dumbbellers to denounce him bitterly. They say he is obsessed with obsolete ideas of national sovereignty. They blame his policy with blocking both European and Atlantic unification, causing dangerous deadlock, continuing the sterile game of power politics that led the West into two world wars, and aiming at French domination of Europe and Atlantica. It does not seem to have yet occurred to Dumbbell's partisans that their objections to the De Gaulle balance in Europe apply with added force to the balance between sovereign states on which they themselves would stake the future of Atlantica.

Advocates of Atlantic Federal Union disagree with the general's policy even more than do Dumbbell's partisans. It does follow for them, however, that the criticisms the latter direct at the general apply still more strongly to the Dumbbell partnership itself. And so they welcome the general's action as providing a guinea pig demonstration of the dangers inherent in the Dumbbell approach—and forcing a fresh look at the Atlantic problem in time for the Federal alternative to have a chance to prevent catastrophe.

Such are the major points of agreement and of difference between the Dumbbell and the Federal Union approaches. They afford a sound basis on which to tackle the next questions: First, does Federal Union afford a sounder and more practical and promising solution to the underlying problem of Atlantic unification than the wrecked Dumbbell approach? Second, does the federal alternative offer a more hopeful answer to President de Gaulle? Can it open a way through the present crisis?

Federal Unionists answer "Yes" to both questions.

Quality Price Fixing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the iniquitous fair trade bill is again before the Congress for action. All good citizens should be alerted to the dangers of such legislation and should do all they can to help defeat it. I insert herewith in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Daily News of May 8, 1963, on this bill which should be read by all:

QUALITY PRICE FIXING

When the National Council of Senior Citizens was organized a couple of years ago, its chief aim was to push for something like President Kennedy's medicare program.

Now this group has added another purpose: It is out to defeat a price-fixing bill presently before the House Commerce Committee. This is the perennial fair trade measure, dressed up as a quality stabilization bill. The NCSC probably can do more to help many of its members—it claims 1.5 million—by this action than by pushing medicare.

The intent of the quality stabilization bill is to fix prices—at quality levels, of course.

Representative EMANUEL CELLER, longtime chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, testified on this point last week.

Maryland has a so-called fair trade law. The District of Columbia doesn't.

Mr. CELLER said he went shopping in Maryland for toothpaste, aspirin, milk of magnesia, insulin, and other drugs. He paid $10.89 for six items. Then he purchased the exact same items in the District of Columbia—total price, $7.20.

This prevention of price competition is precisely the purpose of the quality stabilization bill, despite the fog of euphemisms, as Mr. CELLER described it, in which it is garbed.

In the elderly years, drug prices become vital items. But this bill would apply to everything, so long as the manufacturer wanted to fix the prices for his retailers. And this price fixing would have the law behind it. No wonder the National Council of Senior Citizens is alarmed.

Rumanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Balkan Peninsula has been the powder keg of Europe in modern times, and the peoples there have always been caught in some conflagration. Such events have been rather common in the long history of these peoples, and the people there have taken these in their stride. Neither as independent and unruly nations, nor as subjects to conquering and powerful oppressors, have they enjoyed peace for any length of time; that gift has been denied to them. The Rumanian people, as one of the larger ethnic groups in the eastern part of the peninsula, form no exception. Their national history has ben eventful and turbulent, but through it all they have managed to maintain their individuality and at times even the territorial integrity of their country.

Early in modern times the peninusla was overrun by the then invincible Ottoman Turks, and Rumania became an Ottoman province. So it remained for 400 years, and the Rumanians endured during that time the oppressive yoke of their conquerors. The country was inconstant turmoil and unrest, and the people always ready to rebel against the Turks. But all efforts to that end failed, because Rumanians by themselves alone were never in a position to cope with their powerful and ruthless adversaries. Each attempt ended in bloody reprisals, sometimes in wholesale massacres of innocent people. In the middle of the last century an international event favored them. The Crimean War between Russia and the Turks, with Britain and France also involved, brought in its wake a certain measure of freedom to the Balkan peoples. The Rumanians secured autonomy, guaranteed by the great powers of Europe. That was in 1856, the first step toward their eventual and complete independence, which only came about some 20 years later.

During the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78 the Rumanians again rose in rebellion against the Turks, proclaimed their independence on May 10 of 1877, and carried on their fight with the effective aid of the Russians. At the conclusion of that war the Sultan of Turkey granted the Rumanian people freedom and recognized their independence. Thus was achieved Rumanian freedom 86 years ago, and since then May 10 has been a Rumanian national holiday. As such its anniversary has been observed throughout the world in all Rumanian communities. Today Rumanians are not free, and of course they cannot properly celebrate their independence day in their homeland, but we in the free world gladly do so, and I am happy to join all Americans of Rumanian decent to celebrate the Rumanian Independence Day.

Imports From Communist Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have just a news release on a speech made by Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON in Chicago, on May 6, 1963, which in my judgment, is absolutely asinine.

In his speech, he condemned what he called misguided critics of trade with Communist countries, and called for increased trade with Poland and other Iron Curtain countries to "encourage freedom and carefully pressure tyranny."

Among other things, Vice President JOHNSON said:

> We believe that people punished enough by their Communist captors should not be—and must not be—punished still more by free men merely because they are involuntary victims of Communist tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable that the Vice President of the United States should publicly condemn organized campaigns to boycott businessmen selling Polish goods in this country, but this is what Mr. JOHNSON is reported by the press to have said in his Chicago speech a week ago last Sunday.

The State Department is reported to have recently circulated within that Department a draft policy paper which suggested among other things that "should a national Communist regime be established, we should make a maximum effort short of military action to permit its survival."

Must we use our military strength to prevent armed uprisings against Communist regimes such as exist today in Cuba, and force our industries and labor out of business in order to make room for imports from Communist countries? What kind of business is this?

Need for Interfaith Conference for Moral Guidance in Television Broadcasting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I commend to my colleagues a noteworth address recently delivered before the National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods by Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

This dedicated religious leader called upon churchmen of all faiths to bring to bear upon television programing the guidance that is indispensable to making it a formidable, positive force for good in American life. He emphasized that leadership, rather than censorship, is the answer; and that the time has come for action, not words.

Rabbi Eisendrath proposed that an interfaith conference be convened, with the heads of the television networks present, to consider means of improving the moral content of television.

Pointing out that television too often has glamorized anti-social behaviour, contributed to the cheapening of human life, and pandered to the tastes of the lowest common denominator, Rabbi Eisendrath urged religious leaders to appeal to the sponsors of programs, the advertising agencies, and the broadcasters, to clean house.

He deplored the announcement by the networks that during the coming fall video season there will be a cutting down on the number of hours devoted to public-service broadcasts. He believes it is time that the major faiths speak out loud and clear in an effort to improve programing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of Rabbi Eisendrath be printed in the Appendix to the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, President of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, April 27, Before the National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods, Cincinnati, Ohio

As pioneers in Jewish religious broadcasting, the National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods and the Jewish Chautauqua Society have captured the vision of what the mass media can mean in transmitting Judaism to the general viewing public. You have been trail blazers in this field and I congratulate you most heartily on your current activities and what I expect will be even greater horizons in the future.

But the American people have learned that the mass media and specifically the magic of television, can be either a blessing or a curse. Our tradition tells us that God has placed before man the freedom of choice: "See, I have placed before you the blessing and the curse. Therefore, choose life." This is the choice with which television confronts the American people: either to allow television to become an instrument for the degradation of the public taste or to make television the instrument of our highest aspirations and spiritual goals as a nation.

In a democracy such as our own, all media, the press, the movies, radio and television, are all protected by the first amendment. The selection of the content of information or programs is left entirely to the owners of the media involved and the Government is prohibited by law from interfering in the selection of the content of the information furnished to the public by the media.

The general policy against censorship embodied in the first amendment is also specifically included in the Communications Act. Section 326 of the Communications Act expressly provides that the Commission shall have no power of censorship over the communications presented by a broadcast station and no regulation or condition shall be promulgated or fixed by the Commission which shall interfere with the right of free speech by means of radio. These provisions place serious limitations on the power of the Federal Communications Commission to control programing or raise the standards of programing. While Chairman Minow and his coworkers may, in exceptional cases, take action which does not constitute censorship, the Commission has no power with respect to the quality of individual programs and while the Commission may encourage broadcasters to improve their programing and may prod them by public declarations, the ultimate power does not rest with the Commission but the broadcaster.

In a system such as ours, where the Government does not determine what is to be broadcast, it is the members of the public who must ultimately influence broadcasters in the selection of programing. The Federal Communications Commission recognizes this by requiring broadcasters to study needs and interests of their communities in consultation with civic leaders and the public at large.

In a system such as ours, religious leaders, both on a national and local level, have a duty to speak out and to make known their views so that programing will improve where it is possible to do so. This interest of religious organizations extends not only to religious programs but also to programing at large.

I despise censorship, and I do not believe that those religious organizations which advocate censorship are serving us well. Yet, the truth is that we already have censorship in television—harsh, rigorous, and destructive. It is the censorship of the dollar, unchecked by the public interest. It is the censorship of timidity which, because of this dollar dictatorship, stifles most controversial social ideas. We must be as troubled about what does not appear on the screen as about what does.

There is already a trend which is discernible on the part of religious leaders to assume the obligations imposed upon them in this respect. It is, however, only beginning and the major faiths have not yet spoken out with sufficient clarity in an effort to improve programing.

The current Chairman of the FCC, Newton Minow, whom we are proud to count as a member of the family of Reform Judaism, has made magnificient strides in exercising his moral leadership to improve the quality of broadcasting. But religion has hidden too long behind the moral cloak of Newton Minow instead of speaking out in our own voice with our own concern for better radio and television.

Religious bodies have contented themselves too long with a negative and carping role, too often giving aid and comfort to those who believe censorship is the only solution. We have not sufficiently encouraged the good and creative programing of some brave producers. We have not been imaginative enough nor sufficiently generous with our admittedly limited funds in our own radio and television programing. We have not come forward with our own constructive ideas and suggestions about what should be done. We have not transcended what divides us to unite in beaming our common spiritual values to those who hunger for moral guidance. It should be a part of our high calling as religionists, of all faiths, to summon the moral stamina which will help the American people to put its own house in order—and to make the television screen worthy of a place of honor and dignity in that house.

Religious leaders should particularly speak out on matters such as the rating scandal in the broadcast industry. It is bad enough that advertisers rely solely upon the dollars and cents value alone of programs to be sponsored by them but it becomes worse when the methods used to determine the value of the program to the advertiser are tainted with improper procedures, if not by outright fraud. Religious leaders have a duty to urge the sponsors of programs, the advertising agencies, and the broadcasters to clean house.

The networks have made considerable note-worthy advances in public service programing. It is deplorable, however, to note that the rumored resignation of Newton Minow was coupled with an announcement by the networks that during the coming video season they will be cutting down on the number of hours devoted to public service broadcasts.

This cutback cannot be allowed to stand. I submit that television has not been a formidable, positive force for good in American life. Too often, when the balance sheet is struck, it has been a veritable invincible factor in the widespread exploitation of crime and violence. It has glamorized the patterns of behavior which are antisocial. It has contributed to the cheapening of human life and the desensitization of the American people. It has pandered to the lowest and meanest tastes and emotions of the public. It has encouraged the American people to squander our leisure in a sodden, bleary-eyed stupor and to wallow in sticky sentimentality, sadism, callous cynicism, in violence, vileness, and vice. Again, with an admitted minimum of notable and noble exceptions—notable primarily because they have been so exceptional—it has exalted the shoddy and has beamed its message at the moron. Above all, at a time when America faces the gravest, most crucial and decisive ideological contest with a resourceful opponent, our mass media have failed to project the highest aspirations and ideals of the democratic spirit, the ideals which alone distinguish us from the totalitarian foe.

What can religious groups do? The time has come for action, not words. We need to mobilize the religious forces of this country to concern themselves with the religious implications of the effects and standards of television with the same conviction of purpose that the National Conference on Race and Religion had when they met in Chicago recently. I therefore propose that a three-faith conference be convened with the heads of the television networks present, to consider with interest and great honesty the mutual problems of concern, to elevate the standards of television to make it worthy of the great promise implicit in that field.

In this task of making our broadcasting system and the magic of our mass media worthy of the best in ourselves, we, all of us, have work to do. Clucking over the salacious scandals and savoring the details of the onrushing drama of muckraking, these are human tendencies. But there is a great work that waits to be done. An ancient rabbi once said: "It is not incumbent upon us to complete the task. But neither are we free to desist from it."

Relationship of Geriatric Institutions to Community Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important problems facing our Nation today is the proper care and treatment of our aged citizens. Mr. Dowell E. Patterson, superintendent of the Union Printers Home in Colorado Springs, wrote an essay on this subject which received a prize from the National Geriatric Society at its recent convention in New Orleans. The title of the essay is "Relationship of Geriatric Institutions to Community Life." I am sure there will be general interest in Mr. Patterson's observations on our obligations to our senior citizens. The essay follows:

RELATIONSHIP OF GERIATRIC INSTITUTIONS TO COMMUNITY LIFE

(By Dowell E. Patterson)

To estimate the value of geriatric institutions to society generally one must evaluate, or at least categorize, that group of citizens commonly referred to as "senior citizens." What are their needs? What their care and needs imply from a sociological, economic, medical, and an extended longevity standpoint.

In each of these classifications the geriatric institution, be it rest home, nursing home, quasimedical establishment, or fully equipped hospital for the chronically ill, must understand the complete ramifications of its responsibility and serve the community fully and acceptably.

During the last two or three decades, the science of furnishing a haven, care and treatment for the aged and aging, has expanded beyond expectation. The sociological need has always been apparent. But only those with means and a few religious and fraternal groups could recognize and cope with the condition in any tangible manner. Even these institutions could only give, to a limited extent, the humane services that were indicated. Many of them had to practice their "charity" in a prudent manner because of financial considerations.

Ostensibly, the sociological aspect of providing care for the aged and aging was unquestioned.

Under the heading of economics there are many facets for care and treatment of the aged and aging. These methods should be brought under strict scrutiny. Developments in economics have brought about, in large measure, the practice of geriatrics in one form or another. Recently, there has been a drastic impact on the social life of practically everyone, due to the need of care and treatment for the aged and aging. In no other field of endeavor is the family more concerned than in the care of the aged and aging. Hardly a household escapes furnishing some form of care for a chronically disabled relative, most of whom are in the elderly group.

Approximately two decades ago, provisions for unfortunate kin were relatively simple. While such care, as was available, might have been inconvenient, it was at least possible for robust members of the family to administer services in their own homes. Occasionally, this care was sentimentally kind, in other instances it was grudgingly proffered. But in most cases, regardless of the manner in which the obligation was accepted, care was economically possible. And, for the following reasons:

1. Families lived in larger houses. Perhaps they were not possessed with all modern conveniences, but they had more space. In these circumstances an aged mother, father, or grandparents, might well have had the privacy of a room, away from the rest of the family. Frequently, these quarters were upstairs out of the way. These older folks were not on display to visitors and were not in the way when other members of the family followed their regular routine pursuits.
2. When older persons lived apart from their families, but under one roof, it was possible they could visit friends, or make excursions to the business district, without endangering themselves in a maze of heavy traffic as exists under present-day atmosphere.

All this has changed during the cycle of modernity. Economics play a tremendous part in making it well nigh impossible for persons, even the most sympathetic, to care for the aged and aging in their own homes today. Because:

(a) Homes are smaller, more compact, even if they do have multiple conveniences. The houses, from an economic standpoint, must be smaller, that is, for the average family. Each square foot of construction has a cost accounting. Because of price, and more conveniences, space is sacrificed. Also smaller compartments are possibly more comfortable and easier to care for. Domestic help is out of the question except for the ultra wealthy. Consequently, there is no place for "gramps" and "granny" in the intimate family circle.

(b) Condensed quarters add to the difficulty of caring for the aged. In most instances, older people have developed either physical or mental characteristics over the years. Many are senile and unsocial. This makes life unbearable for those in the younger age classification. Serious consequences have occurred to cause family quarrels, especially when members of the families are only related as in-laws. Frequent embarrassments by oldsters, sincerely attempting to participate in the family circle, only tend to cause tensions, disagreements, and not uncommonly the breaking up of a family through the medium of divorce. No one really is to blame. It is simply a matter of acute incompatibilty caused by an uncontrollable economic condition.

ARE THEY WORTH IT?

It would be unfair to accuse our younger generation with crass indifference to the needs of their aging relatives. Under the circumstances just described, it might seem that perhaps more importance is being attached to elderly persons who have seemingly "lived their lives" than is justifiable. What are these elderly persons worth to society? Really, what is expected of the younger element in extent of obligation to these old folks?

Before these questions are satisfactorily answered, there must be comprehensive understanding of the needs of older people. Their hopes and aspirations are certainly different from those who look and plan for the future. These people have an entirely different perspective. The greater part of their lives are behind them. But they do have hopes and aspirations. They do have emotions and they are human beings. As individuals, their viewpoints may be different, but professionals understand, in large measure, the ideas and momentary ambitions and restlessness of the older and more mature minds. It must be appreciated that these persons are not primarily concerned with the future. That they are impatiently absorbed in the present. This simple premise is fundamental.

GERIATRIC INSTITUTIONS THE ANSWER

Communities must rely upon geriatric institutions to care for one of the greatest social needs confronting the populace on a national level. Those engaged in this laudable undertaking are too few. Incidentally, those who have pioneered in the field of geriatrics are limited in number, and the needs for caring for the aged and aging differ with time and conditions. Moreover, there are almost as many types under the broad term of "geriatrics" as there are individuals. Rehabilitation of many of those in the older age brackets might be assisted by geriatric institutions who specialize in this particular phase of activity.

Community relations must include an understanding of geriatric institutions. Specialization in the field of caring for the aged and aging is as essential as having specialized hospitals in many of the branches of medicine.

Geriatric institutions are constrained to counteract the popular, but spurious belief, that older people need only to be housed, fed, and kept in out of the rain. This is a brutal conception of the needs of human beings. It borders on the sadistic impulse of getting rid of a problem, an inconvenience, and a nuisance in the easiest way open.

Unfortunately, some institutions calling their work "geriatric," have catered to this kind of thinking for profit. We prefer to believe that the number of such institutions are indeed few in number. It is the duty of the community, and all members of society, including individuals with social problems, to ascertain the type of geriatric institutions operating within their respective communities. With proper community relationships, ethical standards may be established which should eliminate unprofessional institutions while, at the same time, embarrassing into oblivion those individual citizens who desire to get rid of their problems at minimum expense and accomplishing the purpose of remaining respectable withal.

SPECIALIZATION IN GERIATRIC SERVICE

The hope of all those engaged in the study, application, and furtherance of the science of geriatrics, is that eventually there will be a coordination of services under one roof. In other words, the many faceted specialties needed for proper administration to all patient types might be obtained at one institution, or perhaps at the location of a single complex, housing all the equipment and accommodations necessary for progressive care and treatment.

As all cases in the geriatric field need hospital care, and outpatient care, at one time or another, it is well to have the geriatrics department in, or near, a fully equipped hospital. Especially is this true in urological cases most common in geriatric institutions. It is not necessary, or even advisable, that persons be continuously exposed to hospital routine. As a rule, hospital personnel are not trained and, consequently, do not fully understand techniques in caring for the aged and aging, unless they need medical care under hospital auspices.

A hospital geriatrics department, making hospitalization adjacently convenient, is a goal with many advantages. Even under these arrangements assuming they were practical, the geriatrics department should be an integral unit, keeping its complete identity, and remaining unabsorbed.

Despite wishful thinking about all types of geriatric institutions being combined and under one roof, the stark facts are that such an ideal condition is many years away and, indeed, may never be fully realized. Reasons:

First, finances to purchase land close to hospitals, usually in congested, high-priced areas, is impractical for constructing geriatric units.

Secondly, space needed for necessary buildings to house each of the several specialized geriatric departments required would likely be unobtainable.

Presently, and for a long time to come, geriatric institutions must serve their communities in the particular specialty for which they are equipped. Communities must be completely informed concerning the services offered, the extent of them, and limitations of any given geriatric institution. If there is no misunderstanding on this score, much unnecessary and undesirable criticism will be avoided.

Communities must be educated in order that the citizen needing a specific service will know where to find it. It should be the responsibility of the geriatric establishment to assist any citizen or family in making the right selection of the institution best suited to their needs. Proper referrals are advisable and important. It will avail nothing but trouble to accept a patient in an institution not adequately equipped or staffed to handle the needs of a particular type of individual or patient.

It is elementary to say that patients in the geriatric group, needing care, can be classified as follows:

(a) Care for the "vegetable" type in, or nearing, terminal stage.

(b) Senile and irresponsible persons, requiring constant surveillance and possible restraint. This type can, and does, have lucid remissions.

(c) Similar, but less pronounced type than case (b), but requiring recreation, constant attention, and sympathetic understanding concerning restlessness and perspective.

(d) Rehabilitation. With proper environment and selective therapy, older persons may improve to such an extent as to make them acceptable as useful persons.

Of course, one's imagination could develop many more categories to describe but fundamentally, for purposes of public understanding, those above referred to should momentarily suffice.

In community relationships, particularly between geriatric institutions and the general citizenry, the goal should be to either rehabilitate, provide a haven for pleasure and comfort in life for the remaining years of the patient's lifespan, or provide gentle and respectable care in the last days to those who have in the past served the community and the present generation well and faithfully. As a team much along these lines can be accomplished by geriatric institutions with the assistance of the community.

To get community teamwork, a civic organization might be effected. Possibly a "Joint Committee on Geriatric Care." Thus an organization working with, and including the institutions, may be invaluable in clarifying misunderstanding, and in cooperating to bring about better and more humane services.

Let no geriatric institution, or any of its personnel, forget that their patients are those who pioneered in community life; that in most cases they also contributed a great deal to family life and environment, and to the individual members of the family who are presently called upon to provide for them. The family should be ever reminded of these points.

The future beckons to many challenges in the field of geriatrics. Longevity is increasing. As the years pass, the average age of life's span will be raised to higher levels. Population growth will continue. Doubtlessly, economics will play a part in forcing early retirements. It follows that the greater problem of occupation of the aged will be a challenge to professionals in geriatrics. To utilize the valuable intellects and abilities of persons in advanced years, who are yet capable, will be the responsibility of those specializing in geriatrics.

There is much more than medical, physical, and gentle care involved. There is protection of human dignity, encouragement of talent, a helping hand to those who can be stimulated in continuing their work in which they possess an abundant experience, and to minimize depression in those who have given up. These are some of the community relationships with which those skilled in the field of geriatries may encourage to benefit their patients. A field that reaches everyone in some particular way. And, an important one.

The surface in the field of geriatric services has hardly been penetrated. Those who are dedicated to work in this field will find their efforts rewarding. And, more so as time passes and the importance of this science becomes vividly apparent. And, more appreciated.

Communities will, of necessity, establish stronger relations with geriatric institutions, because of the reasons herewith set forth. Much time and effort will be saved if geriatrics institutions accept the challenge which is theirs and immediately initiate a program of public relations, seeking community effort in strengthening, improving, and extending services, and work in a field that has a long way to go, with many potentialities in constructive development.

Communities must rely on geriatric institutions. With improved relationship between the two, practical progress can and will be attained.

Unethical Congressional Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all congressional offices have received a great deal of mail inspired by recent articles in the Parade magazine authored by Mr. Jack Anderson and concerning themselves with unethical congressional practices. We have been impressed in our office by the fact that most of the letters on this subject from our constituents have been thoughtful, reasonable, and articulate. It is also gratifying to note that the majority of these letters indicate that our constituents realize that we in Congress are faced with a very complex problem to resolve in this issue. However, they also express almost unanimously the firm conviction that Congress should take positive action in disciplining itself.

I have selected one letter from my mail that I consider outstanding in respect to a clarity of viewpoint and reflecting the composite opinion of many letters. This letter was sent to me by one of my constituents, Mr. Ray M. Trotter, of Yakima, Wash., and, under unanimous consent, I include it at this point in the Record:

Yakima, Wash., *March 30, 1963.*

Hon. Catherine May,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mrs. May: I am writing this a week after having read the sadly truthful and frank admissions of one of the Members of the most august legislative bodies in the world today in the Parade magazine section of the Yakima dailies. Even having waited a week has not lessened my disgust and contempt for some of these people. To say that I was completely surprised at it all, I am afraid, would not be honest after the recent publicity given to the antics of a certain Member of Congress. However, the scope of such depredations and raids on the public purse by so many of these people elected and trusted by the taxpayers was a lot more widespread than one as calloused as myself had supposed. Please be assured that I am completely confident of the integrity of yourself and a few other of our legislators.

Of course I am aware that it is easy enough to write scurrilous articles and diatribes on those in high places anonymously, and it is a practice not too infrequently participated in by those with an ax of their own to grind, but lack of public denunciation to this article by those accused in it, both by name and inference, has actually lent it even more credence. A few reacted to it, but only to the anonymity and not the truth of its content. One must ask why. I am sure that you too must agree that the reasons for his, or hers, remaining anonymous were unfortunately all too credible.

Most of the informed and thinking constituents of the entire Congress, I believe, are well aware of the many pressures and temptations placed on all of you by the many selfish and dishonest interests, but feel that we have sent people to that great body who can withstand and fend off such pressures in the interest of the many. The fact that so many succumb to such obvious dishonest practices comes as a distinct shock to a great many of us, I am afraid. Frankly, Mrs. May, I can find no excuse for the greatest share of these self-enriching habits practiced by so many of these people.

The psuedochivalric attitude of the Congress to overlook and actually cover up the peccadilloes of their own Members, while chauvinistically attacking other Federal spending bodies and the business world, has long been a matter of considerable concern to me. The fact that I am writing this at this late date is actually a form of self-condemnation for having shown such complacency for so long. Far too many of us are prone to merely simmer and let these things get a cancerous growth before we blow up. I have heard a lot of talk recently about the spending habits of the current administration, and I feel very strongly on this too, but as a result of the aforementioned article, most of the talk has taken a "what else can we expect"? tone. At this time I feel that this is a very bad attitude.

The fact that during this same week I had to spend a day's time, which I could ill afford, gathering receipts and canceled checks to substantiate my contributions item on my tax return for some eager-beaver auditor of the Internal Revenue Service, has of course not tempered my feelings any. (By putting in a day at it I was able to find all of the canceled checks and get receipts for the rest. This character apparently finds the fact of tithing unbelievable.) In any event, these people are spending thousands of our tax dollars running down us "big-time cheaters" while our lawmakers are protected in their habit of picketing hundreds of thousands of these tax dollars. But, as I mentioned, this episode merely added fuel to my already well-fired wrath.

I heartily agree with the answers that the writer of that article put forth to bring this leak and dishonesty to a screeching halt. None of them can stand the light of the truth on their spending, and will go to any lengths to avoid it. All spending of any of the monies paid to Members of Congress, except actual salary, should be made a matter of public fact. The practice of absconding with public funds through the subterfuge of paying it to themselves by the use of other names on their payrolls is no less criminal than any other form of banditry. A businessman doing the same thing would be taken to task by the tax people and be made a public thief in the courts and have his life ruined for far less than the everyday common artifices used and practiced by a vast number of our trusted legislators.

Lobbying of these selfish special-interest groups should also be made public and the amount of money they spend each year, and how, and on whom it is spent should also be published. They too cannot stand the light of publicity. This would in turn take off a large degree of the pressure put on you all. Individual Congressmen could then spend more time and less expense finding the ways to better serve the most of their constituents and the Nation as a whole. These free-spending lobbies only tend to confuse the real issues and further no legislation but that which they have paid for.

The elaborate casualness with which Congress has for many years now, endowed their own membership using public money has long irked many of us and I for one, feel that the time has come to bring this practice to a stop. A great many of the items for which the Congress allows its Members to spend the money entrusted to it can be considered nothing but frivolous. The mere fact that a certain Congressman has gotten away with the spending that he has, and for the length of time that he has, is a disgraceful condemnation of the entire Congress. The flagrant example of his open and legal thievery, while despicable as it is, I am sure you are all aware that it is not by any stretch of the imagination, an isolated case. While I am sure that many of you in no way condone these actions, far too few raise their voices in the Congress to condemn and put a stop to it. Such lack of action can do naught but place each of you in a position of having been party to the whole mess. I am sure that you personally would rather not have to feel party to it.

While I am human to the extent that I grumble about every penny of taxes I pay, I still do not feel that we can afford a tax cut right now. On the other hand I even more deeply resent having the people I have helped to elect, steal these tax moneys, however, legally. If this seems rather strong it is only because that is the way I feel, and the way I intended it to sound. If there is any way in which I can help to alleviate this condition, and be of any service to you in helping you to ameliorate these conditions, please feel free to call on me.

Very truly yours,

RAY M. TROTTER.

How the Federal Government Stymies Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Houston Press illustrates clearly how the Kennedy administration is making it almost impossible for private enterprise to exist in the United States. While paying lipservice to capitalism the policies of the Kennedy administration seem to be directed solely to bringing about socialism in America.

The strength of our economic system is private investment which presupposes a profit. There can be no investment of risk capital without profit and without such investment we cannot create new jobs and new wealth. Only capitalism offers economic growth and expansion and opportunity for the individual. Every socialist society has been forced to restrict the freedom of its people and has created economic barriers which result in deprivation and a lower standard of living for the people.

One of the means by which the Federal Government is forcing an end to private enterprise is to encourage the growth of Federal businesses in competition with private business and in giving tax advantage and outright subsidies to co-ops and other favored enterprises such as REA.

The Houston Press editorial comments on one instance in which Federal help to REA is creating unfair, wasteful, and dangerous competition to a private industry.

UNFAIR AND WASTEFUL

There is a prime example of Government waste in a contract just awarded to furnish electric power for a new radar installation at Eglin Air Force Base in Florida.

The base is served by a private utility. But on apparent differential of a small fraction of a cent a Rural Electrification Administration co-op gets the radar business.

Lines for the purpose will be built parallel to the existing private lines, an obvious waste. The Government will lend the co-op $2.2 million for this purpose, at 2 percent, which is the special rate for REA, fixed by Congress. The Government itself will have to borrow this money, paying approximately 4 percent. The co-op will pay no income or profits taxes. The private utility has to pay 52 percent on its profits.

When it was established, in 1935, REA was supposed to bring electricity to U.S. farms, a job thoroughly and brilliantly accomplished. About 98 percent of farms now are electrified.

But REA has gone on empire building, producing electricity, building lines, and selling current to city homes and factories. This not only is unfair competition with private business, it is an unnecessary drain on Government revenues.

Outstanding Treasury loans to REA—at bargain rates—constitute nearly $3 billion of the national debt.

If Congress is serious about stopping the leaks which multiply the budget and prevent tax reduction, something, finally, should be done about REA.

Happy 28th Birthday, REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on May 11, the Rural Electrification Administration celebrated its 28th birthday and the completion of 28 years of service to the people of rural America and, in a larger sense, to the Nation as a whole. For a strong agricultural economy is vital to the strength of our whole economy, and rural electrification has made a tremendous contribution to the economic and social well-being of our farmers and rural residents. In addition, rural electrification has opened up a billion-dollar-a-year market for appliances and electrical equipment, thus creating more jobs and opportunities for Main Street and city residents.

When the REA program was launched 28 years ago, only 10 percent of the Nation's farms had central station electricity. Today, 98 percent of our farmers enjoy the benefits of modern electric farming and living. Our 961 rural electric cooperatives have 1,400,000 miles of line which stretch out across the prairies, cross mountains and wind through remote valleys, serving 4,800,000 meters. These meters represent service to over 17 million people today, not counting those who have been served at one time or another along these same lines in earlier years, but who have now moved away or passed on.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the fact that Wisconsin's Ninth Congressional District, which I represent in Congress, has 10 rural electric cooperatives and 5 rural telephone cooperatives. The 10 rural electric coops all receive their wholesale power from Dairyland Power Cooperative, La Crosse, Wis., the largest generation and transmission co-op in the world. They are also members of the very fine and progressive statewide association, Wisconsin Electric Cooperative, Madison, Wis., which provides many services including the publishing of an excellent magazine, Wisconsin REC News.

The continuing need for a strong and forward-looking rural electrification program is ably outlined in an article written by REA Administrator Norman M. Clapp for Rural Electrification magazine.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have that article printed in the RECORD.

RURAL ELECTRIC "EQUALIZERS"—WHY THEY ARE NECESSARY

(By Norman M. Clapp, REA Administrator)

People are asking "Why a rural electrification program 28 years later, when central station electric service has been made available to nearly 98 percent of the Nation's farms?" Rural people have a big stake in seeing that the public knows the answer.

If rural people had been willing to disregard price and quality of service, most could have had electric service in 1935. I can recall in my home State of Wisconsin a farmer could get electric service if he was willing to pay around $2,000 a mile for the construction of the line to serve his place, and willing to dig into his pocket each month to pay a similar premium for the service itself.

Under such conditions rural electrification was available to farmers in 1935. The problem was that for 9 out of 10 rural people the price was more than they were willing and able to pay.

This was not rural electrification. The need which President Franklin Roosevelt, and Senator George Norris and Representative Sam Rayburn tackled as sponsors of the Rural Electrification Act, was to make it possible for people in rural areas to have electric service at rates and on terms comparable to those prevailing in urban areas.

INDISPENSABLE KEY

Electric service is an indispensable key to greater convenience, comfort, and better living. Simple fairness would say that it should be as abundantly and reasonably available to rural people as it is to city people. Electric power is also a key to economic opportunity and development—new jobs, better living standards, better community services. Thus rural areas need to achieve a practical parity with urban areas in electric power supply and service if they are to participate in national growth and realize their full economic potential.

Numerical progress in rural electrification has obscured the fact that rural areas still have a long way to go before parity is achieved. The fact that the consumer on the lines of an REA borrower system still has to pay about 20 percent more for 250 kilowatt-hours used in a month than the average city consumer is just one measure of the rural disadvantage.

The truth is it costs more to provide quality electric service in rural areas. Even today the rural systems financed by REA have on the average only 3.3 consumers to each mile of line. The class A and B commercial utilities, and this includes all but the very small companies, have on the average 33 consumers to each mile of their line. The comparison from the standpoint of revenue is even more dramatic. The REA-financed systems in 1960 averaged $414 in annual revenue per mile of line, compared to $6,580 for the commercial companies.

MAJOR HANDICAPS

This low density of consumers—particularly in an industry of high capital requirements—is one of the major handicaps of rural service. It is the product not only of the relative population density—or lack of it in rural areas—as compared with urban areas, but also of the historic development of the industry through which the commercial utilities skimmed off the cream of the rural areas themselves, leaving the REA-financed systems the tasks of picking up what was left. This resulted in the development of many small rural electric systems, relatively isolated from one another. This isolation itself has become another factor in the high cost handicaps of rural service.

When the investment must be high, as in modern electric practice, the only practical way to achieve low rates is by maximum utilization of costly facilities. Development of high load factor, the interconnection and pooling of plant facilities, large-scale generation, and the integration of hydro and steam capacity are principal means of bringing power costs down. Unfortunately, the rural systems have had little opportunity to use these economizers because of the very conditions under which they operate—low density, lack of diversity, absence of protection against pirating of customers or territory, and isolation from one another.

"EQUALIZERS"

Under such conditions, borrowers had to use the available "equalizers," such as long-term, 2 percent REA loans, in their struggle for electrical parity.

The necessity of 2 percent loans is apparent from the fact—surprising to many REA critics—that rural consumers served by REA borrowers pay more for interest per dollar in their power bills than the city consumers served by commercial power companies. In 1961, 7.4 percent of gross revenues of REA-financed systems was required to pay interest charges. Whatever the rate the commercial utilities pay on their bonds, only 6.2 percent of their revenues were required, on an average, for interest charges.

Another equalizer has been supplied by the rural people themselves in the nonprofit operation of the cooperative systems they have built. By organizing into cooperatives they have voluntarily waived the normal claim to profit from their investment, except in terms of lower cost service. The capital they contribute to their growing financial equity in their systems does not draw interest at 6 percent, nor even at 2 percent, but zero percent.

The final major equalizer designed to help overcome the present high cost of rural service is the REA-financed generation and transmission program. The wholesale cost of power accounts for 43 percent of the average cost of providing service through the REA-financed rural electric distribution systems. The rates for which power is available at wholesale are tremendously significant in determining the ability of the distribution cooperative to deliver electricity to its members at retail rates comparable to urban rates. A reduction of a single mill in the average wholesale cost of power for the REA-financed systems across the country would produce an annual saving of over $36 million for their consumer-members.

SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS

From one source or another, the rural electric systems must obtain 100-million kilowatt-hours every day—worth about two-thirds of a million dollars at wholesale. This is substantial business, and it is a growing market, for power companies as well as generation and transmission cooperatives. Recently a rural power system, in paying its wholesale power bill, turned over to a commercial power company the billionth dollar which power companies have received for supplying power to rural electric systems. This is the part of rural electrification they like.

But many of their spokesmen are among the longtime critics of rural electrification who are saying again that it is time to consider the job of rural electrification finished. They argue that rural electric systems financed by REA are simply stopgap devices to serve areas and loads the commercial companies did not choose to serve at one time. Their solution is to dismantle the rural electric systems, section by section as they become attractive to the power companies, leaving the fragmented rural electric systems weak, small, and plagued with high costs.

If the rural systems serve only the leftover loads and territories at the sufferance of the commercial utilities then there will never be an end to the need for equalizers, such as 2 percent loans. In fact, it is more likely they will need even greater equalizers in the future to serve their remaining areas of high cost if this is the course we pursue.

The other way to approach the job of rural electrification is to undertake a vigorous and determined program to strengthen the systems that have undertaken to serve the rural areas, to make them strong enough to stand on their own feet without any special assistance.

This kind of program must include territorial protection. The rural systems must be able to retain the portions of their service territories that experience population growth and provide the benefits of consumer density. They must be able to serve all loads in their territory, developing greater load diversity through large power sales as well as the smaller ones. They must develop greater access to larger scale generation and wider pooling of plant facilities, both public and private, with maximum utilization of power sources.

With the kind of climate where rural systems can do these things, the need for equalizers such as REA's 2 percent financing and technical assistance will diminish and, I am confident, ultimately disappear. This is the course we are pursuing in REA. This is the right course.

While it is possible to approach this job of rural electrification in either of these two fashions, it can't be done both ways at the same time. We cannot expect the rural systems to stand on their own feet while they are denied access to the maximum technological benefits of the industry and left to be cannibalized by the commercial power companies.

CONTRIBUTIONS WILL INCREASE

Where these systems are given the opportunity to develop, their impact in contributing to the total national economy will increase. In opening new markets for sale of electric power, they create a growing market for the sale of new appliances and equipment. For a number of years now, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association has published surveys indicating that such purchases by members of these rural systems have developed into a billion-dollar annual market. During the present year, NRECA reports an expectation that these sales will reach a record $1,250 million. Tens of thousands of new jobs have been created both in the city factories producing this equipment, on Main Street of our small towns and in the operation of the power systems. Electricity has had a big hand in the growing efficiency on American farms.

Most of all, as use of electricity grows in rural areas, the areas themselves can offer new opportunity for people living in them.

These are the basic issues facing rural electrification in the United States today. If rural electrification is going to move forward toward parity with urban service, toward lower power rates and high standards of service, there must be public understanding of the job that lies ahead.

This May Is Better Hearing Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, there are 15 million Americans whose hearing or speech is defective, according to the American Hearing Society. At least 1 out of 10 persons suffers a hearing loss, often unknowingly.

That is why the American Hearing Society, a national nonprofit agency with 170 member organizations throughout the United States, is sponsoring during May Better Hearing Month. Every effort is being made by the society and its affiliates to publicize services which are avilable to the deaf and the hard of hearing.

As Miss Mary E. Switzer, president of the American Hearing Society and U.S. Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation, points out:

> A fine example of service in the society's campaign for a program in the Nation's schools to detect loss of hearing among the more than 3 million children with this handicap. The corrective followup to this program will spare many of these children a lifelong hearing disability.

To emphasize the importance of a hearing checkup for the elderly and middle-aged, as well as the young, Crayton Walker, executive director of the American Hearing Society, and his associates decided upon a slogan for Better Hearing Month: "You'd best invest in a hearing test." All over America this slogan is being communicated to our people, with the support of President Kennedy, Governors, mayors, civic groups, and the Advertising Council through press, radio, television, posters and other media.

In expressing his best wishes for the success of Better Hearing Month, President Kennedy informed Miss Switzer:

> I am happy to wish the American Hearing Society and its member agencies in all parts of the country every success in their efforts during Better Hearing Month, May, 1963, to inform all Americans of steps they may take to preserve their hearing or to minimize the effects om impaired hearing. Every conscientious effort in this direction strengthens the health of the people, and merits the serious attention of all who are concerned with the Nation's well-being.

To date 28 governors have notified the American Hearing Society at its Washington headquarters, 919 18th Street NW., that they have issued Better Hearing Month proclamations of statements.

Honorary national chairman of Better Hearing Month is Miss Nanette Fabray, currently starring on Broadway as the First Lady in the musical, "Mr. President."

Miss Fabray, who has herself overcome the hardship of a hearing loss, has declared:

> A hearing problem is not now a hopeless problem, and certainly no longer one to cause embarrassment or shame. It was acceptable, and a trial to all concerned, when there was nothing that could be done about it. But that was in the era of the ear trumpet. This is the jet age. Advancement in the prevention of deafness, and the aid of deafness, has thankfully kept pace with the age.

Sertoma Club of Washington, D.C., is typical of many civic clubs supporting Better Hearing Month, having contributed $500 for an exhibit of services available to the hard of hearing, which will be routed throughout the country for display.

Another international organization actively participating this year in Better Hearing Month is the well-known barbershop quartet society. SPEBSQSA, with 30,000 members. Barbershop quartets are offering their services in 675 cities where there are chapters to sing a special theme song for Better Hearing Month gatherings, as well as on radio and TV.

Even telephone companies are providing hearing checkups through a method called Dial-a-Test. Hearing aid dealers are exhibiting 25,000 posters all over the country in addition to the many thousands of posters distributed by the 170 member agencies of American Hearing Society.

I wish to add my personal support of Better Hearing Month, and pass along to my colleagues for their repetition at every opportunity: "Hearing is priceless—protect it."

The FDA Should Not Ban the Use of Krebiozen Until They Test It Themselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, all of us have witnessed the highhanded and dictatorial methods of the American Medical Association in the field of medicine and medical politics. The vehemence with which the American Medical Association has attacked Krebiozen makes one wonder if perhaps we do not have another example here of the same type of dictatorship.

I do not now whether Krebiozen works or not; I do know that I will not accept the dictates of the American Medical Association on its usefulness. We have a National Institutes of Health; we have a Food and Drug Administration. Let them test Krebiozen independent of the American Medical Association and then I will be willing to accept the result. That the Food and Drug Administration is going to ban Krebiozen on June 7 without testing it—merely on the say-so of the American Medical Association—is wrong. I strongly urge that they do not do so, that the ban order be rescinded, and that they proceed immediately with the testing of Krebiozen and an objective and impartial examination of the claims of Dr. Andrew Ivy and the people who have been treated with Krebiozen.

The following article, which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle on May 6, states the case for testing and against allowing the American Medical Association to decide the policy of the Food and Drug Administration:

Is Cancer Control by Krebiozen Fact?

Leon Port of the district attorney's office is a friend of mine. On many occasions he has graciously invited me to be his guest at an American Legion meeting, a Jewish War Veteran breakfast, community debates, and even a junior high school sing. He is very active in many community functions.

The other evening I invited Leon to be my guest at a meeting I was going to attend. He hadn't the slightest idea as to where I was taking him. All I can tell you is that I just finished speaking to him over the telephone, "You know," he said, "I couldn't sleep a wink that night. I was so worked up."

I'll tell you what happened, and how it all began.

A letter arriver from a Mrs. Laine Friedman who lives in Flushing. In part it said, "A meeting of the New York delegation of 'cancer survivors' on Krebiozen has been called. The purpose of the meeting is to alert all Krebiozen users in the metropolitan area and the public through the press to our precarious position."

I arrived on time as did Leon. Together we climbed one flight of stairs. In a small room approximately 150 people were seated. They had come to calmly discuss their mutual problem, the day they were doomed to death.

There was no hysteria, no shouts, no cries of anguish. They sat and listened as a charming attractive lady called the meeting to order. It was just as if a meeting of stockholders had assembled. The issue was their very life and perhaps that of millions of others, for these were "cancer survivor" victims of the dread disease that kills one out of every six people and is the fourth largest disease killer.

Many of you have heard the verdict, concerning a dear one, "We're sorry to tell you this but there isn't anything we can do. We have done everything possible. You have the choice of radium therapy or surgery. Either way there's little chance." Some of you may remember the column I did on my mother. We too had to make that decision.

Either way were were fighting for time. No one talked about control or cures. I had come to this meeting out of sheer curiosity. I had gone there devoid of emotion. I am not a fanatic.

On June 7 of this year, the Food and Drug Administration is going to ban the sale of Krebiozen. On the findings of the American Medical Association and the Cancer Society, the drug has been found to be detrimental for human use and consumption.

Yet here was a group of people who were living testimony against those findings. First of the "survivors" in the room to be introduced was Cathy Hodnett. She is a child of seven. When she was stricken, the Fitken Memorial Hospital at Neptune, N.J., diagnosed her malady as Wilms's tumor. This is a rare cancer disease extremely fatal. She was given a few months to live 3 years ago.

Then the audience was introduced to Craig Thompson, a teenage lad of about 16. Craig was a patient at the Neurological Institute of the Presbyterian Medical Center in Manhattan, one of the Nation's outstanding hospitals.

The death sentence he received was "brainstem glioma tumor," as fatal as arsenic. Yet here he was enjoying health, attending school, singing in his church choir and growing stronger every hour.

Rev. A. A. Pierce of the Ridgewood Methodist Church in Brooklyn told of how he had to carry Craig in and out of his automobile. He was a hopeless lad dying. Krebiozen was used. Almost instantly he started to gain his strength and recover. Craig has returned to being a teenage boy again.

Both of these cases are the very worst type of cancer. Both children are living. Others took the podium. Their families had heard they were doomed. Nothing could be done. Now they were telling their case histories, every type of cancer known, all clinically documented. Dr. Allan Rutherford from Lebanon, Pa., a man in his late sixties, introduced a man who had been given the "death sentence." Now he was back at work. Others stood up to declare they were "cancer survivors."

Mrs. Friedman, the sponsor of the movement against the banning of Krebiozen, was one of those who heard her husband sentenced. He was incurably ill, neither surgery nor radiation could offer any hope. Friedman was introduced and told the audience that he had returned to work. Many of those present had been rechecked again at the hospitals and no trace of cancer was found. Others while still cancerous had found themselves restored as humans with their tumors reduced and being controlled.

I trust that you will note that I have only attempted to report what I saw and heard.

I can only say that what was said and what happened at this meeting is all documented by recognized medical men at recognized hospitals.

Under these circumstances don't you think the American Medical Association should become interested to accept those findings or prove that they are false.

Don't you think that if these people had been "saved" from death that perhaps Krebiozen might have saved them? Why is anybody arguing about this instead of attempting to find out if it's true.

If, as these people say, this drug has saved their lives, why should they not be allowed to continue to use it. They were all given up for dead. What other way can they live?

Is the one out of six who will die from cancer to sit by and allow the strong AMA to rule against the acceptance of Krebiozen without a Government agency making its own findings? Why don't they do this and make these findings public? The Krebiozen discoveries have over 4,000 case histories to prove it works. How can anyone ignore this.

Wouldn't a committee set up to check this out once and for all be the best way to settle this controversial issue?

I am sure that when insulin was discovered the same situation existed. Today thousands of people control their diabetes when otherwise they would have died long ago. What would a doctor do if he learned that his wife, child or parent had an incurable or inoperable cancer? Would he use Krebiozen even if it was one chance in a million, or would he turn his back and let them die? What do you think? I'd like to know.

I'm sure Leon Port won't forget that climb of one flight upstairs. I hope you don't either.

Eamon de Valera

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution by the Rhode Island General Assembly:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO OFFER TO THE PRESIDENT OF IRELAND, EAMON DE VALERA, HONORARY U.S. CITIZENSHIP

Whereas those citizens of this great country of ours of Irish ancestry have contributed greatly to its foundation, growth and expansion; and

Whereas Eamon de Valera has for many years been a renowned world leader and has been President of the homeland of those aforementioned citizens of Irish ancestry since 1959; and

Whereas during the tenure of office of President Eamon de Valera our country has enjoyed the best of relations with the Emerald Isle: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations respectfully request the Congress of the United States to offer to Eamon de Valera, President of Ireland, honorary U.S. citizenship; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States earnestly requesting that each use his best efforts to implement as soon as possible the purpose of this resolution.

Attest:

AUGUST T. LA FRANCE,
Secretary of State.

Commemoration of Rumanian Independence Celebration, May 10, 1963

SPEECH
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am continuously concerned with the plight of the captive European nations. The unfortunate people of these nations, who were enslaved by the Russians into the Communist empire and forced under the yoke of the international Communist conspiracy, must not be forgotten. I believe it is important to show these people that we are concerned with their problems and have not written them off for all time.

Today, May 10, is a very special day for the people of Rumania. It marks the anniversary of the three most significant dates in their original struggle for independence—an independence which was won, only to be lost.

During the middle of the 19th century, Rumania consisted of two provinces, Wallachia and Moldavia. The provinces were ruled by local princes but were controlled by the Turks. As a result of the Treaty of Paris in 1856, local assemblies were called for the purpose of unifying the country. While Alexander Cuza, a Moldavian, became Prince of both provinces, factionalism continued.

On May 10, 1866, with the aid of Napolean III, in the city of Bucharest, Charles of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen was proclaimed Prince of all Rumania. The new union was finally recognized by Turkey and the European states. The independence of the Rumanian people was, however, not complete.

All ties with Turkey were broken when, in 1877, Rumania declared its complete independence and entered the Russo-Turkish War as Russia's ally. Despite its efforts on behalf of Russia during the war, upon its conclusion Russia attempted to take control of Rumania.

The final steps toward independence were taken in 1881. The Congress of Berlin recognized an independent Rumania after Russia had usurped Bessarabia with its predominantly Rumanian populace. On May 10, 1881, by national election, Charles was crowned King of Rumania. Thereafter, in an atmosphere of economic and political stability and with a united people, Rumania took its place among the nations of the world.

Rumania's independence was, as we all know, short lived. First came the Germans and then the Soviet Union which was not content with driving out and destroying the Nazi invader. Instead the Soviet Union, by preconceived plan, displaced the Germans and started its eastern European empire.

Today, Rumania and the other captive European nations are under the domination and control of the Soviet Union. Religious freedom does not exist, nor do the other individual rights which all people cherish.

Last year, after conducting lengthy hearings on the captive European nations, the Subcommittee on Europe reported that it was unlikely that there would be any major changes within the Soviet bloc in the near future. Puppet Communist governments continue to exercise effective control in the captive nations. We must, however, continue to give careful study to developments in these nations so that we may be in a position to help their peoples regain their freedom when the ever moving pendulum of world history presents an opportune moment.

Crime in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of misrepresentation and biased reporting about the socalled crime situation in Washington. Let it be said here and now that Washington's crime problem is no different than that of any other community in this country. For an objective and calm job of reporting I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Robert G. Spivack, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of April 28, 1963:

CRIME IN WASHINGTON

(By Robert G. Spivack)

WASHINGTON.—If you have ever been mugged, yoked, assaulted, or simply robbed of your money, the official statistics on crime in Washington, D.C., will be of little comfort and entirely unconvincing.

It is no fun to get hit on the head, whether it is on the New York waterfront, in Mississippi, or a few blocks from the White House.

But now, as a result of recent events, there appears to be a methodical campaign, directed from segregationist sources, to make it appear that Washington is one of the most dangerous cities in America. It might be instructive to put things in perspective.

Crime in the Capital usually means "Negro crime." Those who generalize about it take pains to point out that the Negro population of the District of Columbia is over 54 percent.

From this statistic you are supposed to draw several conclusions. As the segregationists see it this proves that Negroes are more violent than white men, and that they are not yet ready for equal rights.

We are indebted to Berl I. Bernhard, the intelligent and well-informed staff director of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, for challenging these conclusions and the basic data.

To start, the Negro population of Metropolitan Washington, which takes in nearby Maryland and Virginia suburbs, is 24 percent in the whole area—not much different from what it was 100 years ago.

While the crime rate is admittedly bad, some people are exaggerating it to prove their point about Negro behavior. Mr. Bernhard notes that the FBI uniform crime reporting statistics show that Washington, instead of being first in crime, ranks 13th among the Nation's 25 largest cities. While there was a nationwide increase in crime of 7 percent for 1962, in Washington the rate went up 4.9 percent.

No one can find comfort in these statistics, nor is there any need to be complacent about physical violence on the streets, whether in the Capital or other cities. But we need not be carried away by inflammatory propaganda designed to justify the old order in Alabama and Mississippi.

Before drawing hasty conclusions about conditions in Washington, it might be instructive to read "Dusk at the Mountain," an excellent book written by Haynes Johnson, a reporter for the Washington Star. It is an objective, well-written, and thorough examination of the Negro problem in the Nation's Capital. Mr. Johnson is white.

What seems particularly noteworthy in the present hypertense atmosphere is that certain politicians have been exploiting Capital crime for the last 40 years. In 1919 one Congressman, calling for an investigation, said that Washington had "for the past month or so been infested with the vilest criminals in all the land. Larceny, burglary, assaults of various kinds, and attacks on many women have occurred within the shadow of the Capitol Building itself."

In 1939 a House subcommittee concluded: "This investigation has established, on the basis of fact, that Washington has a disgracefully high crime rate and that law enforcement here is neither aggressive nor efficient."

The fact that politicians make an issue of crime does not mean automatically that it ceases to be a problem. But at least we know the present situation is not something new.

Handling criminals is a day-to-day job of the police department, but eradicating or reducing the causes of crime seems to be no different in Washington than any other city.

One Negro minister has summed it up this way: The situation is ugly. Why? Because the city is overcrowded with Negroes who migrate northward looking for work. The husband finds a job, but it isn't much of a job. Rent is high, and two or more families crowd into small quarters. The wife works. When they come home at night they are both tired. Emotional explosions are frequent. The kids are uncared for and run wild.

The road to crime, in Washington as elsewhere, it would appear, is lined with substandard housing and substandard schools. Mix such ingredients with substandard wages, and the wonder is that there are not more explosions along the Potomac.

Per Jacobsson Dies in London

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert an article on the death of Per Jacobsson, Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund:

DR. PER JACOBSSON, WORLD FUND HEAD, DIES IN LONDON—HE STRENGTHENED MONETARY SYSTEM

LONDON, May 6.—Dr. Per Jacobsson, head of the International Monetary Fund since 1956, died yesterday in Middlesex Hospital after suffering a heart attack.

He had entered the hospital a week ago for a checkup while here on a business trip.

President Kennedy last night paid tribute to Dr. Jacobsson, 69, as a "towering figure in the world for more than 40 years."

Mr. Kennedy said in a statement that "all mankind owes a vast debt" to Dr. Jacobsson.

"His role in international affairs has been unique, both in the building of a strong international monetary system and in the creation of a broad public understanding to support and strengthen it," Mr. Kennedy said.

His titles with the Fund were Chairman of the Executive Board and Managing Director. In these capacities, he had control over about $15 billion.

He lived in Washington since he took over the Fund, but maintained his Swedish citizenship.

He began his career as a lecturer on economics in 1918 at Stockholm's Forestry High School.

After World War II, Dr. Jacobsson was named to investigate the financial conditions of Italy, Austria, the Netherlands, and France.

Prior to World War I, he had been with the League of Nations Economic Section, then joined the Bank for the International Settlements in Switzerland.

Mr. Jacobsson also found time to collaborate on two successful detective novels with Vernon Bartlett under the pen name of Peter Oldfield called "Death of a Diplomat" and the "Alchemy Murder Case." Both were made into motion pictures.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert the following article in tribute to Col. Williard F. Rockwell:

LAB DEDICATED TO MAN, CITY, U.S. INDUSTRY—ROCKWELL CITES HOMEWOOD-BRUSHTON REDEVELOPMENT

(By William Allan)

Williard F. Rockwell Research and Development Center will be dedicated today to a man, American industry, and Pittsburgh.

The man is Col. Williard F. Rockwell, who 38 years ago took over the old Standard Eight engine factory in Homewood and built it into a firm farflung in both products and plants.

A plaque, especially created for the ceremonies, places emphasis on industry:

"These laboratories are established to further his [Colonel Rockwell's] program of fostering a free America in a free world by providing facilities to aid in our search for the secrets of nature and in our efforts to improve our standard of living by developing these God-given resources."

Pittsburgh takes up the main part of the remarks of W. F. Rockwell, Jr., president of the company:

"Our principal reasons for selecting this location were our interest in helping redevelop the Homewood-Brushton area, the availability of college and university research personnel plus the availability of facilities for consulting work, a ready pool of skilled model makers and laboratory technicians and the inherent advantages of a central-city location for the college-trained engineers and scientists who will staff the facility."

Coincidentally, the laboratory facilities are located in the very building where Colonel Rockwell began in Pittsburgh in 1925.

It had been built 11 years earlier to make engines for an ill-fated attempt of Pittsburgh to get into the auto manufacturing business.

Colonel Rockwell turned it into a meter plant and, since then, the Rockwell Manufacturing Co. has gone from that 1 plant in 1 city to 28 points in 15 States, 2 Canadian provinces and Europe.

Products range from meters to voting machines.

Gen. Joseph M. Colby, head of Rockwell research, says the expanded facility in Homewood will be the hub of the company's research program, although Rockwell plants in other cities will continue to have their own product development labs.

He added that the lab would mean more jobs for Pittsburgh, pointing up the growth here in service facilities with jobs for trained personnel.

General Colby, who as an Army researcher during World War II, designed many of the Army's tanks and developed such things as the air-cooled engine and torsion-bar suspension system, adds that Rockwell now spends very nearly 4 cents out of every sales dollar on research and development.

The new lab is just part of the $20 million the Homewood company has poured into research in the past 4 years.

Dignitaries to take part in the dedication late today include Lt. Gov. Raymond P. Shafer, the county commissioners, and U.S. Senator HUGH SCOTT.

Newark Observes Hundredth Anniversary of Emancipation Proclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in September 1862, the newspapers in our Nation carried the text of a communication from the President of the United States. This communication became the great, historic Emancipation Proclamation on the following January 1.

With this document, the guarantee of civil rights assured our citizens by the spirit of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution with its first 10 amendments should have become effective for all our citizens, regardless of their race or color. That this guarantee has not become so effective we know all too well. But the Emancipation Proclamation was the milestone for us in future generations to mark our progress.

I am proud that my home city, Newark, N.J., has given the recognition due to President Lincoln's brave inspired proclamation. Under the leadership of our distinguished former colleague and present mayor of Newark, the Honorable Hugh J. Addonizio, the Emanicipation Centennial Committee yesterday observed a public prayer for peace and sponsored a great community parade.

Important though they are in themselves, these events achieve even greater importance when they are properly recognized as manifestations of the healthy outlook of Newark toward the question of civil rights. In Newark, civil rights is not a question. It is a fact—a living example of the ability of people of all creeds and colors and ethnic backgrounds to live and work together. And it is wise that the city should show by such observances that it is a fact.

It is perhaps significant that the Emancipation Centennial should have taken place just 4 days after the Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of which I am a member began hearings on my bill, H.R. 4575, and other similar bills which I hope will become the Civil Rights Act of 1963. With such legislation, we shall be able to offset the widespread effort to deny our citizens their civil rights because of race, color or religion. The right to vote will not be denied, the rights to employment opportunity and housing availability will not be curtailed.

I sincerely pray and shall do all in my power to assist enactment of the civil rights bills now in committee. With the example of my native city, the work of its Emancipation Centennial Committee and its entire government under Mayor Addonizio, I am optimistic that civil rights will become a fact, not a question, for all American citizens.

Railroad Mergers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution by the State of Rhode Island General Assembly:

H. 1881

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to study the merger of railroads and to take action necessary to postpone approval of any further mergers pending the outcome of such study

Whereas various railroads in the United States have initiated mergers to the detriment of other railroads essential to the industry and economy of our Nation and State and to the convenience and well-being of our people;

Whereas these mergers and proposed mergers, if continued, will have further deleterious effects on our economy; and

Whereas determinations of proposed railroad mergers have not always given due consideration to the total effects of such mergers on other factors, including unemployment in the railroad industry as well as in allied industries and in industries dependent on railroad transportation and the rapid transit needs in urban and suburban areas: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island—

That the Rhode Island General Assembly hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to undertake a comprehensive study of the effects of recent and proposed mergers of the various railroads in the United States on the industry and economy of the areas directly affected and of the Nation as a whole and on the convenience and well-being of the people;

That the Congress of the United States take such action as may be necessary to postpone further approval of any pending or proposed railroad merger, including the proposed Pennsylvania Railroad-New York Central Railroad merger, until such study has been made and until such study and any recommendations contained therein shall be considered by the Congress; and

That copies of this resolution, duly attested, shall be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress elected from the State of Rhode Island.

AUGUST P. LA FRANCE,
Secretary of State.

Communist Raises Frightening Prospects of Thinking of Some of President Kennedy's Advisers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

• Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include the following column written by Alice Widener in the Shreveport Journal, Shreveport, La. The frightening implications demand an answer from the President as to just how far he intends to go in following the advice of the people who surround him.

Imagine, thinking that burning some of our military weapons could conceivably aid us in the fight to the finish with communism. Is this type of fuzzy thinking typical of President Kennedy's advisers?

The column follows:

J.F.K.'S SAVONAROLA

(By Alice Widener)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Today nothing is more vital to Americans than to get to know the ideas of Jerome Wiesner, scientific adviser to President Kennedy. A pipe-smoking professor from Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Wiesner bears startling intellectual resemblance to Savonarola, the 15th century Italian monk who—says the Universal Standard Encyclopedia—wrecked the great Renaissance city-state of Florence through "the extravagance of the theories to which his idealism impelled him."

Coincidentally, Savonarola's first name was "Girolamo"—Jerome. To set the world an example of a truly peaceful, Christian commonwealth, he drove Florentines into casting symbols of their wickedness—jewels, swords, works of art—into the flames of public bonfires. Also, Savonarola instituted a city-state spying system for repression of vice.

Today, Prof. Jerome Wiesner wants the United States to fly 30 B–47 jet bombers to a neutral country and burn them as a show of our good faith in seeking disarmament. Moreover, he wants to set up as part of an international arms-control inspection system a psychological spying system to inspect people alleged to be potential violators of an international disarmament agreement. Jerome Wiesner, the modern Savonarola, proposes a variety of means for inspecting the minds of people, including use of interrogation of key personnel and officials, use of lie detectors, drugs.

Columnists Robert S. Allen and Paul J. Scott recently reported on Wiesner's schemes, and on his proposal to ask the Soviets to burn 30 IL–28 bombers in response to our plane burning. The Allen-Scott report said Wiesner approved this Orwellian 1984 type of proposal at the Pugwash Conference in Moscow, December 1960, and he wants our Government to undertake intensive research in this field. But—say Allen and Scott—Professor Wiesner doesn't want the United States to develop the weapon which military experts believe is essential to our successful national defense against Red military aggression—the antimissile missile.

On reading the Allen-Scott Report about Wiesner, April 16, my blood ran cold, for I recalled an article, "International Inspectorate," which I wrote 2 years ago for my U.S.A. magazine. Published April 21, 1961, my article reported on the Pugwash plan for a disarmament II-Corps of peacetime mind inspectors. This plan was mainly masterminded by Prof. Seymour Melman of Columbia University, and was fully described in the March 1961 Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists by Prof. Jay Orear of Cornell University.

The Cornell physicist reported that Melman and the Pugwash group see disarmament as requiring various techniques for inspecting people rather than physical objects. Orear continued, "In the formal discussion at the Moscow Pugwash Conference (attended by Lenin Peace Prize winner Cyrus Eaton, Jerome Wiesner, Walt W. Rostow and others), five Soviet participants endorsed the * * * proposals contained in this paper."

Why not? In the 1940's, George Orwell wrote his famous "1984" about prevailing Communist methods for inspection of people's minds by big brother bureaucrats.

"Inspectors of physical objects may search forever for a hidden (atomic) stockpile without success," wrote Professor Orear. "But if a hidden stockpile exists, there is always one sure place to find it—in the minds of some of the national leaders." He said the Pugwash II–Corps plan admitted that such probing for alleged violators of disarmament would entail "the right to use a lie detector," then punishment for perjury, and then requestioning until the accused persons "were able to tell a consistent story." All questioning would be done by key personnel believing that for the purpose of securing peace, loyalty to a supranational entity or to mankind is a higher value than loyalty to a nation.

Neither Orear nor any Pugwasher posed the ethical question of whether a person willing to be disloyal to his own nation can possess a loyalty of slightest value to mankind or a supernational entitly. Professor Orear asserts, "Many individuals hold some loyalties and beliefs more dearly than loyalty to nation. Loyalty to family is an example." Is this a good example? In undergoing Nazi and Communist torture, should heroic resisters have told all in order to save their own families? Should the late Povl Bang-Jensen have put his loyalty to the United Nations above his sworn loyalty to Hungarian witnesses to Communist atrocities, and revealed their names so that Khrushchev and Kadar could kill the witnesses' companions in defense of freedom?

The Pugwash II-Corps proposal—which evidently is approved by President Kennedy's Savonarola, Jerome Wiesner—would force suspects of arms-control violation to undergo lie detector tests and other testings "conducted jointly by scientists of the East and West."

Scientists Orear and Wiesner claim Khrushchev approves of all this and is willing to cooperate. Believe it or not, they take this as a good omen.

In the near future, if President Kennedy insists on keeping Jerome "Savonarola" Wiesner at his side, the administration might try to set a good faith example to the Soviets by a United States-sponsored auto-da-fe for B47 jet bombers. Perhaps, even, the planes would be burned with "wicked" military-minded bombardiers (or Pentagon generals and admirals) strapped in the seats.

This may sound insane; but I know it isn't. When I researched my 1961 article on the "International Inspectorate" plan for a Pugwash mind-inspecting II-Corps, I could not believe my own eyes. Yet today—according to the Scott-Allen Report—this plan is being pushed by Jerome Wiesner. If he is permitted to remain in his present post, then perhaps he'll wreck our Republic with spyings and burnings "for peace," in the same manner as Girolamo Savonarola wrecked the magnificient Renaissance city-state of Florence with his 15th century zealotry for virtue.

Some Americans, like Pugwash angel multi-millionaire Cyrus Eaton, say they would rather be Red than dead. Would all Americans rather be Big-Brothered than dead? If so, then why did we fight against Hitler?

Our Fear-Ridden Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been impressed with an outstanding editorial which has been printed in the May 12, 1963, issue of the Spartanburg Herald Journal of Spartanburg, S.C. It is entitled "Fear-Ridden City, Our Nation's Capital." Since this should be of particular interest to those of us who make the laws for the District of Columbia, I ask unanimous consent that this editoral be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEAR-RIDDEN CITY, OUR NATION'S CAPITAL

Our Nation's Capital is a fear-ridden city.

Visit Washington, as several local people have recently, and you will find an unhappy place.

People are scared.

Go to a baseball game. You not only feel but you see the uneasiness. And you can remember why. Only a few days before, a gang of young hoodlums attacked fans for no reason at all in a lighted stadium with scores of policemen within shouting distance. Now you can see a doubled security force, alert like a soldier on combat guard.

A friend, well familiar with Washington because he lived there several years, has to go at night to another hotel only three blocks away. The streets are well-lighted and he likes to walk. But he takes a taxi.

You read about a tiny air pistol loaded with tear gas pellets, which women are advised to carry.

Roving packs of thugs have the city at their mercy. No remedy is in sight.

One editor wrote after being in the capital for a convention:

"Every American citizen will buy President Kennedy's view that the National Capital should be a showplace. But to pretend that cultural arts buildings and museums are adequate while hoodlums run wild and make mockery of law enforcement is the height of self-delusion.

"Visitors to Washington are appalled by local conditions and return home sickened at heart by what they see or read * * *.

"A showplace? Anything but."

Another observer comments: "Justice in the Capital is considered the easiest in the land. If the defendant isn't adjudged insane, it is found that he is misunderstood, or suffers from an unhappy childhood. It seems that most of those arraigned aren't criminal, but are misunderstood. The situation is delicate and serious."

A man who attacked and raped a Government worker was found guilty or robbery but beat the rape charge by pleading insanity.

The cause of Washington's trouble is at the heart of tribulations known in other places and throughout the land. The first step in curing a disease is to discover its cause. So far, responsible national authorities and Washington officialdom have refused to take a factual look for fear of seeing the truth.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

The Ways of the White Man Are Strange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the relationship between the Federal Government and the American Indian throughout the history of this country has been beset with many difficulties. There is, sometimes, the temptation to regard such difficulties as confined to the past. However, despite the efforts of many dedicated people throughout the years, there are still areas of misunderstanding that call for our most careful consideration. One of the very fundamental problems that exist has been touched on in an editorial in the April issue of the Ute Bulletin, a publication of the Ute Indian Tribe, Fort Duchesne, Utah. I recommend the editorial to my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

"The ways of the white man are strange. You never know what it is going to cost you for associating with him, or taking whatever he has to offer under the pretense of friendship." This statement was made to the editor years ago by one of the old leaders of the Ute Tribe. Since that time the editor has heard similar statements made not only by some Ute Indians but also by Indians from other tribes. A typical reaction to this type of thinking would be to say that maybe this was true years ago, but we are so much more sophisticated and worldly wise, that this situation would not hold true today.

It is probably true that many young Indian boys and girls are brought to distrust and suspect the white man. Why else the fears and the reluctance to accept the values of the white man? Why the apathy in school and the seeming lack of interest in taking advantage of the many opportunities offered by the benevolent white man? Part of the answer may lie with the kinds of experiences that the Indians have had in the past in their relationships with the white man. Maybe the American Indian discovered that the white man's gifts of bright trinkets and colorful beads were not really offered in a true friendly spirit—in a traditional Indian way of giving or in the white man's own Christian way—but for a price. The price being his lands, his precious furs and other valuable possessions. Maybe the Indian shared a jug with a white man who seemed to be a dear bosom friend, only to find upon awakening with a splitting headache that he had signed away his lands and started on the road to moral ruin; or he might have been offered many promises in exchange for his precious lands; or he may have been induced to accept certain kinds of services and help which would make him civilized and more like the white man, only to discover that he would eventually have to pay the bill.

If an average American were told that the American Indian distrusts and suspects his fellow citizens and his Government in certain ways, the response might be that the Indians ought to quit living in the past, that he ought to come out of his blanket, and stop behaving like a much maligned person—in other words stop being sorry for yourself.

There are of course many American Indians who have accepted and adjusted to their rather dual nature of living and are proud of being American citizens. Right or wrong, they will support and believe in their Government. For those who have certain reservations in this respect, the news which was given to the Ute Indians several days ago only confirmed what they have always believed: The United States Government is not to be wholly trusted and that after hundreds of years, it still operates pretty much in the same way in respect to its relationship with its Indian wards. You cannot blame some of the Ute Indians for saying, "I told you so."

What is the reason for this feeling? Well, the Ute Indians were handed a bill for over a million dollars for certain services provided them by the United States through the Bureau of Indian Affairs roughly between 1950 and 1962. This bill is in connection with the offsets against the recent judgment awarded to the Ute Indians for lands in the State of Colorado. What were the services for? They were for such things as soil and moisture conservation, rehabilitation of rangelands, services of certain technicians, etc., which are usually offered for free to many American citizens and for social services, relocation services, and so on which the average American quite often gets for nothing. The Government would naturally like to charge the Indians for administrative costs such as the superintendent's salary, costs for running the agency, and so on, but it is prevented from doing this because the Indian Claims Commission Act says that you can't charge the Indians for services normally provided other Americans, and ostensibly, this includes the costs of running certain Government agencies.

So, the United States has sneaked in from left field the costs for certain special services which cannot be tabbed as administrative expenses. According to the customs and practices of 100 years or more, naturally, the Indians were not asked to request, pass upon, or offer judgment upon the services allegedly performed.

The latest of the episodes between the United States and the Ute Indians extending back to the 1840's had its origin in 1874 when the Ute Indians were induced to accept a mere pittance of $500,000 for the subsequently rich and teeming San Juan mining area in southwestern Colorado. The Utes have been claiming that they were not adequately compensated and in the court trial at Denver in 1957, they asked for $37.5 million. Early last fall, the Indian Claims Commission awarded the Utes nearly $8 million minus offsets. The award goes to the Confederated Bands of Utes which includes the Utes at the Southern Ute Agency, the Ute Mountain Ute Agency, and the Uintah and Ouray Agency.

When the southern Utes at Ignacio, Colo., heard that they were also being presented a bill by the Federal Government, they promptly asked the superintendent to suspend all Bureau of Indian Affairs services since they were not in a position to pay for them. What are the Utes going to do about it? They are going to disagree completely with Uncle Sammy and ask him to take another look at his absurd statement of accounts and they might haul him into court to account for some of the tribal moneys he may have expended rather unwisely. The Ute Indians may feel frustrated, disgusted and resigned to all of this, but we must remember that we have one privilege as American citizens in a democratic society and that is to disagree with our Government, go to court and hash over our differences, or settle the issues over a conference table. In another system of government, we might lose our heads.

Statement by George J. Burger, Sr., Before Subcommittee on Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, last week a subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee conducted hearings on legislation to change the present system of small business set-asides in the construction industry. One of the able witnesses who appeared before the committee during the hearings was Mr. George J. Burger, Sr., vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business. Mr. Burger presented a strong statement for small business set-asides. I ask unanimous consent to have his statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SET-ASIDES FOR SMALL BUSINESS

I am George J. Burger, vice president, legislative activities, National Federation of Independent Business. We are a national organization composed solely of smaller, independent business and independent professional people. Our home office is San Mateo, Calif. I am in charge of the Washington, D.C., office.

We now have over 190,000 individual, directly supporting, and participating members throughout all 50 States. This number is increasing every week. From the standpoint of number of directly supporting and participating members we are the largest business-professional organization in the country.

Our main function is one of encouraging these independent enterprisers—who are the admitted backbone of our free enterprise system, and who are one of the strong pillars supporting our very liberties—to take a continuing, active, informed interest in Government affairs—State and National—and of providing them with programs to do so in an intelligent, effective manner.

Senators and staff members of this committee are familiar with the federation. Our members set our stands on legislative matters through nationwide mandate polls in which they send signed ballots directly to their Congressmen. Additionally our members advise us of the facts underlying their problems in our regular, yearly factfinding special surveys. Thus federation positions are not determined by any board of directors, or filtered through committees, but rather come right from the members at the grassroots themselves. In other words, we speak authoritatively.

As we advised your subcommittee on June 7, 1962, we have not polled our members on the Metcalf bill. We are, however, committed by membership vote to support all programs which aim to provide fairer and freer opportunities for independents to bid on and win Government contracts.

Now, the bill in question would relieve the Small Business Administration of its power to set aside contracts for small business bidding in the construction contractor industry. As we understand it the industry is clamoring for this action, and that is the reason for the bills and these hearings. But frankly we are a little puzzled.

As you likely understand, we have a representative number of construction contractors among our members. For example, our member-district chairmen broadly represent a cross section of our membership. Of the approximate 1,000 such chairmen who replied to our 1961 special survey on the President's tax revision program, about 3 percent were construction contractors.

Our members, given problems they consider urgent generally take them up with us, either by mail or through our staff field representatives. We receive such mail and reports each and every day of each and every week of the year. We get further information through our special factfinding surveys. We encourage this because it strengthens our ability to serve not only members but those in Government who are interested in small business problems.

With these facts in mind one would expect that we would be getting some volume of mail and reports as to the alleged set-aside problem in the construtcion contractor field. The fact is, however, that we have had perhaps six complaints on this over the past 5 years. Even after we completed and publicized our testimony which we gave to your subcommittee last year, we received perhaps 10 letters of criticism from members active in the field in question, and experienced the resignation of perhaps three such members.

Thus our question: Where is the widespread popular support—therefore need—for these bills in the industry?

As we told you last year, we have followed closely all activities of the Small Business Administration, including its set-aside programs, from the agency's very beginning in 1953. On the basis of this first-hand knowledge we can say that within the potential granted it by the Congress the agency has done a fine job in serving the legitimate interests of the small business community, which in all such cases happen to be identical with the interests of our Nation.

Certainly members of this subcommittee will agree that the direction of Government contract awards, especially in these days of multibillion dollar and still growing Federal spending, decisively affects the shape of our economy and therefore of business units large and small. If there is any doubt of this, think of the TFX controversy.

With that thought in mind consider that since 1957 the share of Government contracts taken by smaller, independent business suppliers has decreased. Significantly, this decrease has taken place during a period when the SBA, by wise and reasonable use of powers granted it by Congress (granted it, by the way, after long and deep study based on years of experience) has greatly increased the number and value of set-asides for the small business community.

For example, during 1954 (the SBA's first full year of operation) smaller firms secured $161 million in defense contracts under the set-aside program. By 1962 the total dollar volume won by smaller firms under the set-aside program had reached $1.8 billion—an increase of over 1,100 percent. Yet as between 1954 and 1962, the small business share of defense contracts (which includes the set-aside figures) dropped from 25.3 to 17.3 percent.

Under these circumstances we suggest that the need is for further strengthening, not for weakening, the hand of the Small Business Administration on Government contracts. Any other course would be sheer suicide from the standpoint of the Nation's independents * * * for the Lord only knows how much smaller this percentage might be today without the agency's assistance to small firms.

Now we want to make it quite clear that we are keenly sensitive to the fact that those in the construction contractor industry deserve the utmost in fair play and in consideration. This is their due as American citizens. You likely recall the SBA moved in that direction about the time of your hearings last year by liberalizing the size standards then prevailing. Perhaps further action is needed along this line. We must say, however, that appearances indicate that the forces behind these bills do not want reasonable treatment under the set-aside program, rather they want complete and utter destruction of the set-aside program for construction contractors.

This is what so deeply concerns us. For the implication seems clear that the drive for this bill may be nothing but a first step in the direction of complete dismantlement of the entire set-aside program. Exempt that industry, and precedent is set for exempting all others. In this sense, the bill directly affects not only those in the construction contracting industry but also those in the electronics field, the precision industries, the clothing field, in fact the entire range of industries in which smaller independents have the desire and capability of supplying the needs of Government. This must not be overlooked by anyone, especially those of the Congress who are members of this subcommittee.

Frankly, we are convinced that it would be a sorry day for smaller, independent business people, who are the backbone of our economy and whose continued existence and fair opportunities are so vitally important to the maintenance of our individual liberties, should the Congress consent to any move which would deprive them of any necessary assistance such as is afforded in the set-aside program.

In conclusion, we do hope that the members of this subcommittee will give long and serious consideration to these facts before reaching decisions on the Metcalf bill now before you.

Let the Members Pay It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time an editorial which appeared in the Friday, May 10, 1963, Bradenton Herald, "Let the Members Pay It." Its writer, Mr. John T. Hamner, is one of the outstanding editors in our State. His words reflect the thoughts of the many people in my congressional district who believe that the United States should no longer bear the excessive cost of financing the United Nations.

I concur completely in Mr. Hamner's conclusion that we are simple minded to continue to pay our enemies' bills in this organization which those people are using to obstruct freedom.

The editorial follows:

LET THE MEMBERS PAY IT

The United Nations General Assembly is going to have another special session next week on money—that being an item which the U.N. is fast running out of.

The U.N. will be somewhere between $110 million and $127 million in debt by the end of June, and the United States has finally given a strong indication that it's getting tired of footing more than its regular share of the bills. Obviously, this is a debt for the members who owe it to pay, not for the United States.

A 21-nation special committee on the deficit reported last month that it couldn't agree on how to finance the peace-keeping operations which have run the U.N. into steady mounting debt. Principal among these operations is the venture in the Congo, which has cost around $300 million.

The end of Katanga's independence movement has led Secretary U Thant to hope publicly that the Congo expeditionary force may be reduced from 19,000 men to 5,000 by the end of the year. But the cost would still be $5 million a month, not counting the cost of underwriting the shaky U.N.-blessed Central Congolese Government.

Indicative of the U.N.'s straited fiscal affairs is the fact that the special General Assembly session must find some $30 to $40 million to keep the reduced force in the Congo the remainder of the year. Apparently it has not occurred to the U.N. to pull the troops out and save all the cost.

The United States told the special 21-nation committee that it's going to end its voluntary payments for the Congo over and above its standard one-third support of all U.N. costs, unless the laggard members pay up their past-due assessments.

The Soviet Union is the principal defaulter. As of March 1, the Soviet owed more than $16½ million on its regular account, $16½ million on the Middle East emergency account, and almost $37½ million on its Congo account. Thus, with $70½ million owed, the Russians account for more than half of the total U.N. indebtedness.

This money problem is a constant plague to the U.N. and the United States has constantly plugged the gaps. Increasing resistance to being the friendly finance man, however, has showed up both in Congress and in public opinion.

Obviously the time has come for the U.N. membership to put the pressure on those who owe money to pay up. And the time is long past due for the United States to quit being so simple minded as to pay its enemies' bills in an international body those enemies use primarily for obstruction in the path of freedom.

Address by Pierre Salinger at Dedication of World's Fair Press Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Pierre Salinger, press secretary to the President, at the dedication of the New York World's Fair Press Center, New York City, N.Y., on May 4, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY PIERRE SALINGER, PRESS SECRETARY TO THE PRESIDENT, AT DEDICATION OF NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR PRESS CENTER, NEW YORK, N.Y., MAY 4, 1963

The people for whom this center was created will follow a distinguished company, going back 110 years to the first New York World's Fair. I am told that exposition was a financial disappointment, partly because it was too far out of town—all the way up the Manhattan countryside to what is now 40th Street. But, according to the most famous of the reporters who first covered a New York World's Fair, it was otherwise a great success. Horace Greeley called the 1853 exposition something to be seen once in a lifetime.

Walt Whitman, native of this now populous island, visited it repeatedly for nearly a year, by his own enthusiastic account. Out of those visits came a memorable poem, "Song of the Exposition," two lines of which might still serve as a theme for the great fair opening here next year:

"Not only all the world of works, trade, products,
"But all the workmen of the world here to be represented."

I understand that with the exhibits now planned, workmen of much of the world will indeed be represented.

The early opening of this communications center, as well as the fair itself, say something significant about the United States and its role in the world. They dramatize again our belief in the uses of knowledge and the free flow of information and ideas. They reaffirm our abiding faith in the future of the open society as opposed to the closed society.

Because we live in an open society—and no one here would suggest we change this—our successes become as well known as our failures. We sometimes yield to the temptation to deprecate our accomplishments. We sometimes fail to distinguish between the dialog of free societies and disarray.

This is not true in the closed society. Their failures are often hidden from view. They often yield to the temptation to restrict free thought and ideas.

But, basically, the future of the world rests on communications and, therefore, on understanding. And anything which impedes this communication—and repression of intellectual activity and the free flow of ideas—restricts this understanding and presents the growing problem of miscalculation and all that can stem from that.

H. G. Wells, no mean practicer of the art, once called great reporting the product of "an interrogative state of mind." In the closed society possession of an interrogative state of mind is a liability, and sometimes a dangerous one.

An underlying goal of American foreign policy, as the President has repeatedly stated, is a world community of free nations, masters of their own destinies, free from outside control. Enlightenment of all kinds—political, social, economic, technical, educational—is essential to that end, and it must be free of both artificial barriers and dogmatic control. The United States is contributing to that enlightenment in many ways in many parts of the world, and I expect those efforts to continue. Next year's fair, and the millions of words that will be written and said about it in the communications of the world, will contribute specifically to that enlightenment.

One of the things done by the present administration to facilitate the dialogue between us and the peoples of other countries was to establish a center for foreign correspondents in New York. It provides both the permanent corps and visiting journalists with a headquarters and an avenue for assistance in pursuing their journalistic ends. Among other things, it helps these communicators with schedules, appointments, contacts, and in arranging for covering specific stories. The officers of the center have already been in touch with fair officials, and we hope to send a lot of foreign journalistic business your way.

I hope this center will be heavily used, by the domestic and foreign press alike. The communications that flow from here will be important to all of us.

Philadelphia Company Helps Johnny To Read

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of concern in recent years over whether or not Johnny can read and the concern has resulted in some good changes in teaching methods.

I am especially pleased that a Pennsylvania company, the J. B. Lippincott Co. has begun publication of a new series of textbooks that accomplish two laudable objectives: they stimulate the young reader because of their interesting subject matter and they salute him by recognizing that he can learn faster than he has in the recent past.

The whole story is told in a news article and editorial which recently appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW TEXTS SEEK FASTER WAY FOR JOHNNY TO READ

(By Daniel Langan)

A new method of teaching which may dispel the "why Johnny can't read" cry of many educators has been evolved in a series of primary reading textbooks now being published by a Philadelphia firm.

Texts and workbooks for the first grade series of "Basic Reading," published by J. B. Lippincott Co., will be put into use at many schools throughout the Nation in September.

INCREASES VOCABULARY

The authors of the book contend that the first grader will have a minimum of 2,000 words at his command at the end of the year, compared with the "look-say" method pupil's vocabulary of 326 words and the "phonic" method pupil's vocabulary of 440 words.

A series for all of the eight primary grades is scheduled for completion in 1965 by the authors, Glenn McCracken and Charles C. Walcutt.

In order to help Johnny read better, the new books utilize the best features of many methods of teaching and provide the pupil with reading material that is both modern and stimulating.

NOW IN JET AGE

The "Run, Spot, Run," which most of today's Inquirer readers were exposed to in first grade, has given way to such exercises as "A Ride in a Jet Plane."

"Jack sat down near the back of the plane. He had a seat belt to make him safe. Jack saw the hostess. Her job was to help Jack if he sent for her," are excerpts from a tale next year's first graders will be reading.

No more does Puff the cat become entangled in a ball of yarn. Nor are the pupils subjected to seemingly endless repetition in their reading exercises. Repeating of one-syllable words is confined mostly to poems where the repetition makes for smoothly flowing rhymes which are recited aloud.

The "Basic Reading" series combines the better features of two teaching methods now in use, the phonics system advocated by modern educators and the look-say or whole-word meaning method by which most pre-Second World War pupils learned to read.

It also offers enough modifications of these methods and enough extras to be called a new method.

Phonics: The science of sound as applied to reading—teaches pupils to read phonetically and learn new words because they know how the letters sound.

Look-say is simply: R-a-n spells ran.

But by learning the whole images of the words from the very start, with all of their letters and sounds, the child studying "Basic Reader" sees the words in the same manner that skillful adult readers do.

They become whole and perfect images; so ingrained as entities that the fast reader may never notice a typographical error as "insitsed" as he devours a story.

In pre-primer, the first book of the "Basic Reading" series, first-grade pupils receive their first lessons in the pronunciation of the vowels and the association of the sound with the gayly colored pictures that accompany the lesson:

Three apples on a branch are depicted above the letters a and A. The teacher stresses the "a" sound as it is pronounced in the word "apple."

Besides learning the letter and its sound, the pupils are offered further learning habits, known to educators as readiness activities. By this, the teacher tells the pupils how to distinguish among first, middle and last, or big, bigger, biggest. The pupil also learns to read the page and its contents from left to right.

It is not until completion of the first five lessons, all of which are devoted to learning the vowels, that the pupil learns his first word.

The sixth lesson deals with the letter "m" and is accompanied by pictures of full, half, and quarter moons. The previously learned "a" is combined with "m" and the pupil has taken his first step into the world of reading.

Progress from that point is rapid and the child moves on to other consonants and couplings, "nd," "st," and "nt."

The authors admit that simple but irregularly formed words as "eye," "one," and "knee" may be omitted from the vocabulary but they state that the exceptional words are easy to master if taken one at a time. They also refrain from using the aforementioned words by writing exercises which do not require these exceptions.

In exchange for these omissions, difficult words at his command at the end of the year are: "puddle," "canal," "vacant," "asleep," "weave," "helmet," "pullet," "hostess," "acorn," "clams," "fifteen," "bucket," "braids," and "monster."

The door also is opened to recognition of words from the child's speaking vocabulary—words he has heard his parents use or has heard on television—but which he would not normally read until he was much older.

"Crisis," "mysterious," and "creation" are words of this type.

Therefore, the publication of "Basic Reading" may furnish the antidote for "Johnny's" reading dilemma, bringing to a halt the cries of college English professors and rendering obsolete remedial reading classes.

"Johnny's progress also may lead to a new cry: "Why can't Johnny's parents read as well as he can?"

HELPING LITTLE JOHNNY TO READ

Introduction in many schools throughout the Nation of a new method of reading instruction—which combines phonics and the whole-word system to boost first-grade reading vocabulary from the present 300- to 400-word level to 2,000 words—suggests that a real gain for education may yet come out of the prolonged controversy over the reading inadequacies of so many U.S. young people.

It seems to us that, quite apart from the question of whether or not youngsters should be taught to sound out syllables, the new reading program is valuable because it recognizes that first graders generally have a much larger speaking vocabulary than the 300 or 400 words to which they are limited by proponents of both the phonics and the whole-word teaching systems.

As a result, the ideas and variety of subject matter in texts advocated by both factions are held to artificial minimums far below the actual mental range of most youngsters throughout the elementary grades.

We are glad that it is a Philadelphia concern, the J. B. Lippincott Co., that is publishing the new series. We believe other textbook publishers would be performing a public service, and find it good business as well, to follow Lippincott's good example.

Outstanding Admiral Anderson Gets Kennedy Ax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, apparently it does not pay to disagree either with the President or the Secretary of Defense under this administration.

An outstanding fighting man, Adm. George M. Anderson, has just gotten the ax. No matter how much President Kennedy tries to gloss over this shocking fact, it is shameful on its face.

We talk about encouraging our military to stay in the service, and yet when we have a gem of a Chief of Staff who has nothing else in mind except how to save his beloved country, he is unceremoniously ushered out.

The American people are now wondering whether or not our Chiefs of Staff must become Kennedy rubberstamps in order to survive. If this be the case, our military posture is due for deterioration.

In yesterday's New York World Telegram, Henry J. Taylor goes into this whole disgraceful action by the President:

RECKLESS AX JOBS IN THE MILITARY

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Nearly 6 years before his retirement age, America loses a first-class, highly trained, forthright fighting man in the head-chop of Adm. George M. Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations.

In Government there are always ways of disagreeing with your boss, most of them dangerous. In the armed services, Congress makes the problem an agony—sometimes tragic—as the pitfall terminating the lifetime careers of fine officers.

The Nation is the loser; our enemies the gainer. Yet what can an honorable man do?

Admiral Anderson was helpless when the Senate subcommittee ordered him to testify in the Boeing-General Dynamics plane dispute. A man like this will always put his view of the national interest first. And Anderson's testimony, unavoidably, contradicted many of Defense Secretary McNamara's statements; politely but with the respected weight of proven competence and long experience.

Air Force Chief of Staff Curtis E. LeMay's expert testimony likewise contradicted the boss. Whatever the reasons, his reappointment is cut to 1 year.

But Anderson was tossed entirely out. For being offered "a civilian place" somewhere in the Government means the end of him—and of the Nation's lifetime training of him—in our Navy.

No other profession, no corporation, and certainly no Government occupation screens and tests men for advancement as continuously and relentlessly as those on the slow, hard way up to top posts in our Armed Forces.

Surely there must be some better way than this to protect America against losing them in their prime.

The problem is complex. It includes other factors. It also is old. But where insubordination is clearly not involved, where defiance of civilian authority isn't at issue, where experienced judgment is demanded and the public is entitled to hear it, even the suspicion of retaliation by the boss is both a personal and national tragedy.

What would happen to the morale of youth studying medicine if fine, competent surgeons' careers were snuffed off and had to be abandoned because some new hospital superintendent didn't like their professional opinions?

A key factor in the present action is Paul H. Nitze, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. As one result, the next question mark is Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Army Chief of Staff. A House appropriations subcommittee ordered him to testify on NATO's ability to withstand a Soviet ground assault.

Along with Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Walt W. Rostow, etc., Nitze is one of our leading assurance-mongers. He is likewise as innocent of military experience as Ferdinand the Bull. And he had followed the fashion by blandly announcing a "myth."

He stated: "It is a myth that the Soviet has overwhelming nonnuclear superiority over the West." Premier Khrushchev's reaction to this novel lullaby is unrecorded. But, alas, the general staffs of the free world can be expected to have their own ideas about Nitze.

"NATO has more men under arms and greater over-all strength than the Russians," he officially opined, "both worldwide (5.8 million) and in Europe (2.2 million). Warsaw Pact countries have 4.3 million men under arms. Soviet active units, not counting satellites, total about 2 million."

Nitze would have knocked his own myth into a dehydrated buttercup by defining "Soviet active units." Surely he knows the Russians can mobilize additional millions trained, equipped, maneuver-tested within a week or two and deploy them pronto on the NATO land mass—no oceans, no nothing.

Chief of Staff Wheeler was not free to ignore Congress' dissatisfaction with Nitze's testimony. He patiently confirmed the famous fact that, on the ground, Russia's available capability is enormous.

He said newly affluent Western European allies should make larger contributions to the defense of their own homelands. He stated the only country living up to its NATO troop quota is the United States.

Then our top Army commander added the final clincher in contradicting the assurance-mongers. The Chief of Staff had no choice but to testify that NATO's ground forces could stop the Soviet "only temporarily."

What will happen to able General Wheeler heaven only knows, but the United States needs all the Admiral Andersons and General Wheelers we can hang onto just now.

Award of the Contract for the TFX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, an article appearing in the Air Force and Space Digest for May sets up a question that has not been adequately developed during the interrogation concerning the award of the contract for the TFX. The question is, Why, if we are spending the vast amount that we are for this aircraft, did we not seek a more sophisticated machine? Or, to put it in the author's language, "It's not up to the state of the art."

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW THE TFX MISSES THE MARK FOR BOTH THE NAVY AND AIR FORCE: IT'S NOT UP TO THE STATE OF THE ART

A unique position in the history of U.S. combat aircraft unquestionably awaits the F–111 (TFX) for it is the first not to make maximum use of the latest technology available for a given mission.

Recent congressional testimony by experts from both U.S. Air Force and the Navy has emphasized that the F–111 will be superior to current operational aircraft in many ways and that the design finally selected is worth buying. However, this testimony, certainly the most detailed and penetrating ever released on a new weapon system, makes it clear that the F–111 does not come close to meeting the original specifications of either the Navy or the Air Force.

Experts at higher levels in DOD have not questioned either service's specifications. So it must be concluded that the F–111, in any of its multipurpose roles, will be substantially inferior to any 1960–63 state-of-the-art aircraft designed specifically for any of these roles.

The most serious compromise forced on the F–111 concerns range and flying time. Years of operational experience have left no doubt that short range and limited endurance are the most critical factors restricting the usefulness of all jet-powered fighter aircraft, regardless of service. For instance, adequate defense of a fleet or any target against modern bombers with air-launched missiles must be conducted several hundred miles from the target. Current fighters are marginal in such roles: their loiter time in the intercept area is short, and they only have the fuel to accelerate to supersonic speeds for a very brief period and usually to make only one pass on incoming aircraft.

Fighter ground attack operations present an even more serious situation today. Improvements in radar and anticraft missiles make it necessary to attack defended targets at very low altitudes and high speeds. Under these conditions the range and time in the air of any jet fighter, with even the smallest wing, is extremely limited.

The new variable-sweep wing on the F–111 is intended to overcome these critical deficiencies in current fighters. It allows the wingspan to be adjusted for maximum efficiency in all flight regimes. The wings will be tucked back with minimum span during on-the-deck supersonic attack. They will be swept back about forty-five degrees during supersonic action against other aircraft at high altitude. And they will be extended straight out to their widest span for loiter, high subsonic speed cruise to a battle area, or for ferry, and for landing and takeoff.

Without the variable-sweep wing there would be no chance for the F–111's performance to be significantly better than that of current fighters. However, the mere inclusion of this device in the design does not guarantee that its maximum benefits will be realized.

The main additional requirement is for a high fineness ratio fuselage—long and thin. During supersonic attack at low altitude, wave drag is extremely critical, as shown on the curve at right. An aircraft with low wave drag must have a long fuselage if it is to have enough internal volume and fuel for long range and loiter time.

Originally the Air Force called for an aircraft about 80 feet long with a fineness ratio about 12. The Navy insisted on a maximum length of 55 feet so the airplane would fit on every elevator in the carrier force. An F–111 the size of the operational A3J Vigilante (now called the A–5), some 70 feet long and weighing 72,000 pounds, was not acceptable. The Navy's F–111 design (fineness ratio between eight and nine), would have had about three times the wave drag and considerably less fuel capacity than the Air Force's and was practically without range on the deck at Mach 1.2.

The compromise F–111 is around 63 feet long, weighs about 60,000 pounds, and has nearly double the wave drag, and much less range at either low or high altitudes than the Air Force proposal.

It is difficult at this juncture to understand why the Secretary of Defense did not exert his leadership in this area. Increasing the F–111 length to nearly 80 feet would not only have met the Air Force needs, but would also have made it possible to meet and in most cases exceed the Navy's major requirements for high loiter time, a large radar dish, and large equipment and armament loads. And it is possible, if not ideal, to move aircraft 80 feet long on the side-deck elevators of most U.S. carriers.

Papa Will Fix

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, those of us in Congress who believe in fiscal responsibility know that increasing requirements of ever-enlarging programs must be met from our economic growth—not at its expense. Efficient, social legislation to serve all the people can be realized on a pay-as-you-go basis. A rational approach to spending is necessary to alleviate the burden of indebtedness to future generations and ultimate ruinous inflation.

I wish to commend to the Congress the following editorial from the Salisbury Times, Salisbury, Md., which aptly discusses Federal spending:

PAPA WILL FIX

Efforts by budget cutting Republicans to hold down authorizations for Federal spending were blocked twice by Democrats last week.

The Senate Appropriations Committee restored $50 million of $69.8 million sliced off the Post Office budget by the House of Representatives. This followed a preview by Postmaster General Day of what he intended to do if his Department was deprived of any of its funds.

Previously, the Senate had rejected a cut in the Kennedy administration's public works program. The House had taken out $200 million of a $450 million request, which was restored in a party line showdown that saw Southern conservatives lining up with Northern spenders.

That is the issue—between spenders and cutters. The Democratic Party is committed to unrestrained spending. The Republican Party has taken the position that spending must be checked. Democrats in the Senate are taking it on themselves to kiss and make well all Republican cuts.

Prospects for Republican success are dim. But far dimmer are prospects for national survival if spending cannot be held in a realistic ratio to Federal income. The ultimate issue is whether to go into national bankruptcy, which would take place under the equally frightening title, "runaway inflation."

Rollcall on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, soon we will be called upon again to appropriate funds for the so-called foreign aid program. Many persons have come to the realization that the program is not effective as its proponents purport it to be. On May 8, 1963, my friend, Mr. William Rynerson, publisher and editor of the Winter Haven News-Chief, printed an editorial entitled, "Rollcall on Foreign Aid."

I have asked permission to place this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope that each of my colleagues will read this rollcall and be enlightened as to how ineffective this program has been in bringing freedom and stability to the 14 nations cited in the article.

The editorial follows:

ROLLCALL ON FOREIGN AID

President Kennedy, in agreeing with the Poet Milton in his foreign aid message to Congress last month that: "Peace hath her victories. No less renowned than was," added: "And no peacetime victory in history has been as far reaching in its impact, nor served the cause of freedom so well as the victories scored in the last 17 years by this Nation's mutual defense and assistance programs."

Well, let's see—and before Congress votes that bargain-basement figure of only $4.5 billion. The survey that follows, compiled by Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, national chairman of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee (to aid American taxpayers), forms another message that every Congressman and Senator should read. We quote:

"Western Europe has prospered with Marshall plan aid. But after 17 years and $41 billion in U.S. aid, Western Europe meets only a fraction of its defense obligation; except for commercial loans, its aid to less developed countries is negligible.

"Argentina ($640 million aid), under indirect military domination, suffers from inflationary chaos.

"Brazil ($1.9 billion aid) is on the brink of communism.

"Cuba ($52 million aid) once enjoyed immense sugar subsidy, has stolen $1 billion in U.S. private investments; her Red satellite status is now guaranteed.

"Haiti ($100 million aid) writhes under a murderous tyranny.

"Indonesia ($670 million aid), her economy wrecked, is an armed dictatorship bent on conquest.

"India ($3.9 billion aid) probably faces Red Chinese attack.

"Iran ($1.3 billion aid) is a monarchy without a parliament.

"Laos ($460 million aid) may soon fall to Communists.

"Poland ($522 million aid) is Communist with all freedom gone.

"South Korea ($5.4 million aid) is ruled by its third military junta.

"South Vietnam ($2.4 billion aid), ruled by a puppet dictator, propped up by the United States, is racked by a Red guerrilla war.

"Turkey ($3.8 billion aid) is politically unstable and is economically weaker than before aid began.

"Venezuela ($274 million aid), despite prodigious oil wealth, is a major target of the Russo-Cuban fifth column.

"Yugoslavia ($2.4 billion aid) is Communist with all freedom gone.

"General Fellers noted that these add up to $65 billion and that the glowing reports to Congress and the dismal facts were never in sharper contrast. National self-respect, fully as much as budget balancing, demands healthy cuts in foreign aid.—U.S.P.A."

President Kennedy Wants More Open Windows in Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago, I placed in the RECORD an article by Victor Lasky about the Committee for the Review of our China Policy.

In a letter to me, dated May 9, former Representative Charles O. Porter, who is the cochairman of this committee, pointed out in a release that "in 1960 President Kennedy, then Senator Kennedy, called for more open windows between the peoples of China and the peoples of the Western Nations" and that his committee wants "to help the President open these windows." In order to be fair, and at the request of Mr. Porter, I include his letter to me of May 9.

I am overwhelmingly convinced that any recognition of Red China would be a tragic mistake, the President's personal feelings to the contrary notwithstanding.

The letter follows:

THE COMMITTEE FOR A REVIEW OF
OUR CHINA POLICY,
Eugene, Oreg., May 9, 1963.

Hon. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR STEVE: I just was sent a copy of the April 23, 1963, RECORD, page A2395, with your insertion of Victor Lasky's article about this committee.

Lasky errs in several of his statements and, if you want to keep the records straight, perhaps you would insert this letter in the Appendix.

Some of Lasky's errors:

1. He says that this committee which I've helped to establish, namely, the Committee for a Review of Our China Policy, is seeking "to make U.S. policy more tolerant of Red China." We seek more discussion of our China policy. If that leads to what Mr. Lasky calls "tolerance," we have to know what Mr. Lasky means by that word.

2. Mr. Lasky says that I told him that I was the one who first proposed the show trials that Castro staged. He is wrong. It was I who told Castro, as we sat together at dinner in February, 1959, to cancel the circus type trials which he did on the next day.

3. Mr. Lasky says that mainland China is now in very difficult straits, whereas, in fact, the harvest this year is beter than for a long time. People like Mr. Lasky who have looked forward to China dying on the vine or collapsing internally are not facing plain facts.

For your information and, hopefully, inclusion in the Appendix, I'm enclosing a copy of our first press release [not printed in RECORD.]

I assure you that the purpose of our committee is not to brainwash anybody into being more tolerant toward China but rather to encourage discussion inside our Government and outside our Government.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES O. PORTER.

Clarifying the Issue of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Francisco Examiner of May 5, 1963:

CLARIFYING THE ISSUE OF CUBA

(By Eric Sevaried)

Cuba may well be, as now predicted, the prime issue in the national politics of 1964. But unless the issue is clarified far beyond its present state it will be a rhetorical question, not a question for true debate. Alternative policies are required for true debate and all we have on either side, so far, is attitudes.

With justice, the President has insisted that his critics show more precision in their prescriptions for handling Cuba; but with equal justice his critics can insist on more precision from the administration. What we are now witnessing is a collision of two fog banks. This never clears the air, in nature or in politics; it merely produces fog of double thickness.

How uncertain the future course, there can be little uncertainty about what the immediate past has produced:

1. The Russians now possess a military, political and propaganda base in the heart of our area of security and influence.

2. Their troops in Cuba constitute a "trip wire," paralyzing to American action, as our troops in Berlin constitute a trip wire there.

3. Cities and installations of the U.S. mainland are now open to damage by conventional weapons, and have become, therefore, in some degree hostage to Communist purposes. Theoretically, at least, the Russians could damage us by proxy, their method elsewhere, without themselves being directly involved.

4. Castro's physical hold on the island is complete, with the underground movement facing probable extinction.

5. The mass of Cuban manpower in exile is now a blown instrument, a handicap and thorn in our side, not a weapon for our uses.

6. A foreign policy quarrel of serious proportions is engulfing an administration which has not yet found its feet in the area of its domestic policies and programs.

7. Once again, world communism has succeeded in choosing the point of conflict and crisis in the cold war, and once again, as with South Korea or South Vietnam or West Berlin or Laos, the locus of contention is inside the realm of the free world, not in the Communist realm.

Whatever the precise degrees of blame to be placed on American administrations, past and present, or on Cubans, past and present, the net result is as described above; and in spite of the trade restrictions and the partial efforts of the OAS at diplomatic isolation of Cuba, no persuasive evidence has yet developed to justify optimistic assumptions about the future effects of Castroism in the Caribbean and in continental South America.

At the moment Guatemala is holding and in Venezuela the local Communists have been weakened and disorganized. But quick reversals have been a hallmark of the volatile politics of Latin America, and it strains credulity to assume that a general era of stability is now beginning. For countries like Peru and possibly Brazil, it is hard to convince oneself that the fundamental forces for integration are stronger than the fundamental forces for disintegration. Latin American Communists believe the contrary, and are relatively quiescent right now only as a matter of strategy, waiting for the time when the United States will relax about Cuba.

Wise and good men are reminding us that a Communist Cuba is not a mortal threat to our vital interests. In and of itself, of course, it is not. But that opens, it does not close, the argument.

A Communist Vietnam, or a Communist Laos, or Indonesia, or Venezuela, or West Berlin would not be mortal threats, either—in and of themselves and separately considered. But the Communist world strategy of protracted conflict is a strategy of the piecemeal advance. There are only so many pieces on the board. With the capture of Cuba they have taken a tremendously important piece. Dozens of Russian ships would not be plying the Cuban trade and thousands of Russian citizens would not be turned out to cheer Castro, if the Kremlin didn't think so.

Northampton-Smith Summer School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, this year will mark the third successive summer of the Northampton, Mass., venture in summer education with Smith College. At a time when admission to college is so difficult, a school of this caliber offers the young student an opportunity to probe deeply into subjects of special interest. It is an important and meaningful school and one which pioneered in summer enrichment programs. It is ably coordinated by Prof. Clifford R. Bragdon of Smith College, one of the Nation's outstanding educational authorities and Mark S. Rand, a distinguished Government teacher at Northampton High School, who acts as principal of the summer school. I would like to include an editorial from the Daily Hampshire Gazette, Northampton, Mass., May 10, in the Appendix.

NORTHAMPTON-SMITH SUMMER SCHOOL

One of the undertakings sponsored jointly by the city and Smith College which has enjoyed great success is the Northampton-Smith Summer School, about to enter its third year.

Many young people in grades 6 through 12 have benefited from this carefully developed plan to provide assistance for those in need of it, and an opportunity for academic exploration for the more talented students.

The deadline for the submission of applications to the principal of summer school is May 15, a scant week from now. The subject of attendance at the summer school has been discussed in many homes. It is now time for a decision on the part of parents.

What does the school offer? That question can be best answered by direct quotations from the pamphlet published for prospective students. "Enrichment courses give you a chance to explore a new field, go deeper into a subject of special interest, add to your grasp of a subject taken during the regular school year," explains the brochure. The remedial courses are described this way: "Remedial courses offer you a chance to make up ground you lost this year or a chance to review a subject you need to strengthen in order to move ahead successfully this coming year."

Under the guidance of Prof. Clifford R. Bragdon as coordinator, and Mark S. Rand as principal, the Smith-Northampton Summer School offers to young people interested in devoting 6 weeks to scholastic improvement an opportunity not so readily available in some communities.

Never have students found competition so keen for admission to colleges, particularly those which are the first choice of the applicant. There are students who will benefit from a vacation from the books. But many others, while not necessarily enthusiastic over giving up 6 weeks of leisure or work, will find that the investment may pay rich dividends in the not too distant future.

It is a well-conducted school taught by highly skilled instructors. Northampton is fortunate to be able to present such an opportunity to her students.

Making It Fit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. WEAVER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House tomorrow will take under consideration a bill to increase the debt limit for certain periods. The request of the administration to increase the debt limit to $307 billion and later to $309 billion is not realistic in light of the budget requests. If budget requests were accepted, an estimated $320 billion debt limit would be required this year. Fixing of the debt limit at $305 billion will require a tightening of the belt by the administration on its spending programs.

The size of our national debt is astronomical. It is beyond the comprehension of most people to think in terms of billions of dollars. The phrases "deficit financing" and "sound fiscal policy" have become familiar to all who are concerned with the operations of the U.S. Government and are the subject of serious debate, as they represent two very differing points of view on financial housekeeping. I believe in sound fiscal policies, and include as part of my remarks an editorial from the Meadville Tribune, Meadville, Pa., which thoughtfully comments on fiscal problems, including the proposed temporary debt limit increase legislation.

The editorial follows:

MAKING IT FIT

Were it not so deadly serious, one might be tempted to view the national debt as some sort of a joke, or a myth, or a kind of skeleton in the national closet—to be brought out once a year and measured up to see whether it would fit in the space allocated to it by Congress.

The House Rules Committee has approved a bill authorizing an increase to $307 billion through June 30. Then it may go to $309 billion through August 31. The present limit is $305 billion.

This same procedure has been followed year after year—each time that the budget ends up in the red and we are forced into deficit financing. It makes one wonder what would haappen if Congress failed go along, and left the administration with an unauthorized deficit. It also makes one wonder how the public can be so indifferent to impending tragedy.

To note the ease with which Congress plays this little game almost every session and to regret the jocular attitude toward the debt—that "oh, well, here we go again" attitude—does not provide a solution to the problem of which the debt ceiling is merely a symptom. The Tribune has rationalized itself into accepting the theory that a tax cut, even though it means a substantial deficit—and thus the need for a further increase in the debt limit next year—is a proper fiscal course for the nation to follow at the present time. Both taxes and spending are entirely too high.

But, in the long run, this recurring need to raise the debt ceiling should sound a warning that someone should heed. The economists once advised President Roosevelt that the Nation could support a debt of $50 billion. Now it's six times that. How far can we safely go?

Republicans, who propose to fight the increase, have no monopoly on fiscal integrity. Both parties are responsible for our predicament. And it's time that both parties assumed responsibility for relieving it.

The Theorists Will Ruin Our Economy Yet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, during the consideration of the tax bill of 1962 the Republican Members warned about our businessmen in foreign countries being discriminated against by certain provisions of the tax bill. Being outnumbered 15 to 10, we lost. Now the Kennedy theoretical chickens are coming home to roost with resulting damage to our American businessmen who believe in the private enterprise system. The New York Herald Tribune of May 8 article comments on this:

KILLING THE GOOSE OF THE GOLDEN EGGS

It is more than 6 months since President Kennedy signed the Revenue Act of 1962. And that is more than enough time to discover that the President, by signing it, has stunned the goose of the golden eggs. Wisdom would counsel the administration and the Congress to repeal the act before it kills the goose altogether.

Over a period of 20 years, one tax commission after another, appointed by successive Republican and Democratic administrations right up to the time of the present one, declared itself in favor of tax incentives, especially in the case of American companies doing business overseas. As a result, our companies, free of taxation abroad until they brought their profits home, prospered and multiplied.

Then came the New Frontier, and with it a pioneering instinct to unearth new fields for taxation. Someone discovered that Americans abroad were doing very well, inviting an increasing outflow of dollars to the tax-free green pastures overseas. Our New Frontiersmen went after their game with gusto. They said they wanted to discourage the outflow of dollars, to increase the inflow to the Treasury by making American companies abroad pay the same taxes as those at home and to eliminate abuses by those who established false tax havens beyond our borders.

What has been the result? According to Sidney R. Pine, one of the country's leading tax attorneys, American companies have been placed at a crippling disadvantage in competing with other foreign companies which remain tax free. They are being forced to liquidate their majority holdings overseas so as to free their companies from what amounts to discriminatory American taxes, or they are being obliged to engage in most expensive juggling acts so as to escape the major impact of the Washington blow. Many small and middle-sized firms have been discouraged from going into the foreign field altogether.

In an address to an international trade group in Toledo, Mr. Pine, a member of taxation committees of the American Bar and the New York State Bar Association, came to this conclusion:

"Treasury figures may show increased revenues from foreign operators a year from now, but they will result from liquidations and distributions made necessary by our Revenue Act. Over a long-range period, probably 10 years, our foreign tax revenue will drop, our balance of paymnts may suffer and our competitive position in world trade may be irreparably damaged."

In other words, everyone will lose. The Treasury will lose the income it expects to secure. The country will lose one of its major sources of foreign revenue (the inflow of the American earnings in repatriated dollars has been far greater than the outflow in capital investment). And our companies abroad will have to cut back or go out of business.

The Treasury may have a feast if it insists on devouring the goose, but eventually it will suffer the cramps of famine when all the golden eggs are gone.

Golden Anniversary Honors of the Fraternal Order of Eagles Are Bestowed Upon Past State President Thomas E. Gosland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, May 13, I would like to bring to your attention and to our colleagues attention the golden anniversary testimonial dinner recently given honoring California past president of the Eagles, Thomas E. Gosland. I wish very much to review some of the work of the Eagles and relate the devoted work of "Mr. Eagle" of California, who has been an Eagle for 50 years.

An Indiana Congressman once observed:

> "There is something about the Fraternal Order of Eagles that is different and distinctive, something not to be found in any other order.

With this statement, I wholeheartedly agree. Other fraternal orders promote good fellowship, do good deeds, and do them well. Other fraternal orders provide death payments or other benefits for their members. But the Eagles go further than that. They reach outside their own ranks to assist in the welfare of all mankind.

Since February of 1898, when the order was founded by six theater owners in a waterfront shipyard in Seattle, the Eagles not only welcomed the average man as a member, but fought for his right to a life of dignity and self-respect.

In 1963 more than 800,000 members of our brotherhood attest to the principles of "liberty, truth, justice, and equality" upon which it was founded. Since the founding date, thousands of communities in our Nation, in Canada, in the Philippines, and in Guam have learned of brotherhood, friendship, and helpfulness from the work of the Eagles.

Fraternal orders have, in many instances, come into existence to provide remedies for some kind of grievance, or because those starting the new organizations were not in accord with the principles or method of conducting some order already in operation.

Strictly speaking, the Fraternal Order of Eagles originated from this latter method, the records tell us that the founders met for the adjustment of a common grievance. From the second or third of these gatherings evolved the great brotherhood of which we are now so proud.

The name, the Fraternal Order of Eagles, was a happy selection, indeed, and very appropriate for an order having liberty as first among its principles, and the flag of our country as it standard. The great bird is indissolubly allied with both, and has always typified the virtue of liberty.

It was on a Sunday, February 6, 1898, that Messrs. John Cort, John W. Considine, H. L. Leavitt, T. J. Considine, and M. Goldsmith laid the foundation stone and began their work.

The word "aerie" came into use at this time, and simultaneously the order was given its present name. It then became obvious to the membership that the operations of the order could be extended beyond the city of Seattle, which had given it birth, and that such extension could be brought about by the creation of a supreme of grand aerie.

With this objective in view, a meeting was held in Seattle on April 20, 1898, which resulted in a grand aerie constitution and the incorporation of the body under the laws of the State of Washington. A charter was secured, the constitution, as prepared, was adopted. Thus the grand aerie came into being and the first charter fee was paid by Seattle No. 1, which was also the first aerie installed under the ritual of the grand body.

The order was now in a position to reach out for new territory, and it was not long before the cities of Spokane, Tacoma, and Portland came under the wing of Eagledom. Organizers were sent to California, Montana, Oregon, and British Columbia.

The interest in Eagledom prospered in California, and the aerie at San Francisco was the fifth to come into existence; San Jose, the eighth; Sacramento, the ninth.

Like every new movement, the early days of the Fraternal Order of Eagles were hampered for want of cash. But from the outset it reached out to assist in the welfare of others. I am aware what the late Congressman Louis Ludlow of Indiana had in mind when he said of the order, "It reaches out and tries to help in solving the distressing and difficult problems of human relief."

The motto of "liberty, truth, justice, and equality" has been applied to every phase of endeavor.

The Fraternal Order of Eagles was a pioneer in calling for programs in discharge of governmental obligations to our people. A substantial factor in the enactment and strengthening of our social security system was the enlightened leadership of the Eagles. Through the persistent calling of the Eagles much needed legislation was enacted to provide for orphan children.

California has not been least among the "doers" in the program of the order. I am reminded of the Memorial Foundation for aiding the children of Eagle fathers who lost their lives in military service. I am reminded of our contributions to the Crusade for Freedom, a role in which Eagles translated their services into balloon launchings to combat communism.

I recall the Eagles efforts in behalf of the Damon Runyon Cancer Fund; local crusades for safety, which have alerted hundreds of communities to traffic dangers; the presentation of Ten Commandment scrolls to local aeries, to reawaken spiritual and moral values.

It is right and proper that we look upon these accomplishments—and many more—as the helping hand of Eagledom which has built for the future.

But, Mr. Speaker, it has taken individual effort to build the order, and to dispense the good things of life to others. Such an individual is Thomas E. Gosland. He has given 50 years of unselfish service to the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

I have reminded you that the superstructure of Eagledom rests upon the foundation of our four cardinal principles, "liberty, truth, justice, and equality." May I further remind you that Tom Gosland has devoted his time, his head, and his heart to the duties of the high offices he has held as State president, local aerie president, and grand outside guard. His early learned the lessons of the Eagles' principles and acquired the characteristics of one who is imbued with brotherly love.

Tom Gosland possesses the abilities of leadership; he has accepted responsibility; he has a deep recognition of the needs of others. He knows that the individual who thinks only of self, spreads gloom and doubt. Those who bring the greatest joy, as well as those who render the greatest service to mankind, are those are oblivious to self, forgetful of personal gain, dedicated in thought and action to the welfare of others. Tom has engendered the love of all Eagledom.

It is with deep admiration and pride that I relate this to our colleagues on the occasion of the recent anniversary testimonial given in honor of Tom Gosland.

Peculiar Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of May 9, 1963:

PECULIAR ECONOMICS

A dollar is a dollar whether the Federal Government holds it or it is held by a citizen. At least, we thought that was the case until the Kennedy administration came along with its New Frontier economics.

These observations are apropos of President Kennedy's argument that the country cannot get along without the present level of Federal spending, that the economy would go into a tailspin if Federal spending were cut to match a cut in taxes. He has indicated his belief that a spending cut of $5 billion would throw a million persons out of work and the Nation into a recession.

That's a frightening forecast. Let's examine it. The Government has no money of its own to spend. The only money it has is what it collects from the people in taxes. If it took less money from the people, they would have more to spend on things they want, rather than on things the Government thinks they want.

If the Government should reduce taxes by $5 billion, the same amount of money would still be in the country. The people would have $5 billion more, the Government $5 billion less. The economy would not be hurt one bit.

But what happens if the Government spends more while taking in less? It borrows the difference. Whenever the Government borrows, inflationary pressures are created that make the money capable of buying less. Dollars buy fewer things. Production and employment are not stimulated at all.

We have been having a Federal deficit quite a while, with the Government spending more than it takes in through taxes and borrowing to make up the difference. If that condition is such a good thing, if it stimulates purchasing power as the New Frontier economists say it does, we should have no unemployment.

California Medical Association Resolution and Statement on the Harmful Effects of Cigarette Smoking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from Dr. Samuel R. Sherman, M.D., president of the California Medical Association, enclosing a copy of Resolution 36, adopted by the California Medical Association house of delegates on March 27, 1963.

In addition, Dr. Sherman also enclosed a statement by the California Medical Association's commission on cancer "On Smoking and Health," as approved by the California Medical Association council, the organization's board of directors.

The increasing concern of all Americans with matters of health and welfare is well exemplified by the California Medical Association's forthright exposition of the serious health hazards posed by continued smoking of cigarettes and other tobacco products.

For this reason, I would like to include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the letter from Dr. Sherman, Resolution 36, and the statement by the commission on cancer.

These documents are as follows:

April 15, 1963.

Hon. Edward R. Roybal,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Roybal: The California Medical Association at its annual meeting on March 27, 1963, adopted a short resolution calling for the education of parents and school children on the health hazards presented by smoking.

This resolution was adopted without dissent. It came after a statement on the subject prepared by the cancer commission of the association was approved by the council, our board of directors.

Apparently news of this resolution was widespread. Since its adoption we have had a number of inquiries about it, some from as far away as Thailand.

Among these inquiries have been several from Members of Congress from States other than California. In view of this expression of interest we felt that you may want to have this material in your own files. We are enclosing copies of the resolution adopted and of the statement of our cancer commission. These may be of interest to you.

Very truly yours,
Samuel R. Sherman, M.D.,
President, California Medical Association.
San Francisco 2, Calif.

Resolution Adopted by the House of Delegates, California Medical Association, March 27, 1963

Resolved, That the California Medical Association take steps on a statewide basis to publicize, particularly in schools and homes, the harmful effects of cigarette smoking.

Statement by Commission on Cancer on Smoking and Health

The Commission on Cancer of the California Medical Association has observed with interest and concern, the accumulation of scientific information on the harmful effects of smoking on health. To date, the commission has not expressed a formal opinion, believing that the evidence speaks for itself. However, since silence may be interpreted incorrectly, the commission feels obligated to affirm that this growing body of data supports the claim that cigarette smoking and, to a lesser degree, other tobacco products, are serious health hazards.

In this short statement, there is neither need nor space to cite the many studies relevant to this conclusion. A number of official, voluntary, and other scientific bodies have reviewed the evidence bearing on this association, and the interested physician is referred to them.

Of relevance here are the objections made to the epidemiological and other studies associating cigarette smoking and cancer of the lung. Each objection has been disproved, from the claim that the rise in lung cancer was the result of improved diagnostic ability to the statement that lung cancer was associated with an underlying somatic factor which caused both smoking and lung cancer. We can find no reason to modify the conclusion that the sum total of the evidence available today is most reasonably interpreted as indicating that cigarette smoking is a major causative factor in the increasing incidence of human carcinoma of the lung.

Much of the confusion and some of the objections have been based on a misunderstanding of the word "cause." Those who choose to use it as meaning that one event is always followed by a second event can say that lung cancer is not "caused" by cigarette smoking. However, causation in lung cancer is more complex than this and more accurately means that the incidence of lung cancer is more frequent in those who smoke than those who do not. Not all who smoke will get lung cancer, nor is it the only "cause" of lung cancer. This second definition is not new to medical science and is true for most biological events.

It is not the intent of this statement to suggest or recommend measures which would reduce the incidents of lung cancer. A habit so deeply ingrained in the population is not amenable to simple preachments. However, any situation which leads to 39,000 deaths in 1 year, a rate which will undoubtedly increase, is serious enough to warrant careful consideration by every physician. The benefits accrued from effective action will reduce suffering and loss of life, and demonstrate to the public how a profession accepts and meets its responsibilities.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—Congressional Record, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the Record:

Cleveland, Ohio.

Subject: Congressman Flood's House Resolution 14.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The establishment of a special committee called by this resolution will provide for the national security and indicate the interest of the United States in the people behind the Iron Curtain. Furthermore, it will implement the policy of President Kennedy: "walk softly and carry a big stick."

We, the undersigned students of Cleveland and Kent, Ohio, urge you to support such a resolution in that it will be a manifestation against Russian colonialism and imperialism.

Sincerely yours,
Ihor A. Kunasz, Zenovia Torezanyre, Stefor Dziubre, Tetiana Fedorowycz, Bohdan Futent, Barbara Whittum, Ilena Maluyk, Romana Wyrsta, Roman Wowk, George Kulczycky, Kevitha Saluh, Tubomyka Steciak, Maria Fur, Oksana Pihulak, Martha Olukeyck.

Ukranian American Youth Association, Inc., Utica, N.Y. Branch,
April 22, 1963.

Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
Member U.S. Congress, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Flood: On behalf of our organization, Ukranian American Youth Association, Inc., Utica branch, we urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration. Such a Committee on Captive Nations is vitally important both for our Government and the American people at large. While Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of "national liberation" in Africa and Asia, we as a nation are not doing much to help the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations which constitute a veritable weakness of the Soviet totalitarian empire.

A special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a reservoir of true and unbiased knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, which knowledge will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,
W. Rabosskyj,
President.
T. Fecouriol,
Secretary.

April 26, 1963.

Representative Daniel J. Flood.

Dear Sir: Have done as you suggested. Read your request in the Tablet.

I have written to Representative Derounian, too. He is an honorable man, a loyal American and a fighter. God bless him.

Thank you for alerting me and God bless you, too.

Cordially,
Mrs. Elizabeth M. Linz.
Glenwood Landing, Long Island.

April 26, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith.

Dear Sir: This letter is written to you because of my deep concern for the survival of our beloved country. You, too, must be greatly disturbed about the critical position this country has been placed in by the advance of communism. Therefore, I ask you to do your utmost to obtain quick passage of House Resolution 14.

As a good American I'm sure you will.

Cordially,

Mrs. ELIZABETH M. LINZ.

GLENWOOD LANDING, LONG ISLAND.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, NEW HAVEN, CONN.,
BRANCH,
April 23, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: On March 23 a political rally was held by American citizens of Ukrainian descent in New Haven. The speaker was the present president of the anti-Bolshevik bloc of nations and former Ukrainian Premier Jaroslav Stetzko.

Your attention is called to the following quoted article, which was part of the resolutions passed unanimously:

"PART II—ARTICLE I

"We citizens of Ukrainian descent of New Haven, gathered at the rally held on March 23, 1963, support the resolution of the U.S. Congress on the Captive Nations Week and ask the House Rules Committee to place before the U.S. House of Representatives the draft resolution of Congressman FLOOD concerning the creation of a Special Captive Nation Committee."

With the wholehearted support of the Ukrainian assemblage demonstrated by the passage of the above resolution, we ask that you as chairman of the House Rules Committee consider favorably the Flood resolution and place it before the U.S. House of Representatives.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

OLEG R. MYKETEY,
Chairman, Ukranian Congress Committee,
New Haven, Conn. Branch.

APRIL 26, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Pursuant to your request (Tablet, Apr. 25, 1963) wrote to Chairman SMITH and to my Congressman, OGDEN REID, of New York, along the lines you suggested. I hope it does some good. In both letters I gave the House Resolution 14 and the title "for a Committee on the Captive Nations." Also in my letter to Mr. REID I requested him to get quick action as the above resolution and asked him if he would submit a similar resolution.

Sincerely,

THEODORE P. MANGAN.

SCARSDALE, N.Y.

WOULD PROBE NATIONS CAPTURED BY SOVIET

Dear Sir: The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and its extensive membership of Americans of Ukrainian ancestry have caused to be published a valuable brochure on the 45th anniversary of Ukraine's independence. The entire project with which I and others were happy to be associated, is in the fundamental interest of our Nation.

The unusual fiery reaction of Moscow and its puppets to the statements in this brochure underscores once again Moscow's fear of our exposing the Soviet-Russian imperio-colonial system in the U.S.S.R. and bringing to full light the status of the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. This evidence I shall soon present in our continued effort for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Congress cannot for long ignore the pressing need for such a committee. To satisfy this need and to advance our position in the cold war, my colleagues and I are fighting for the passage of the measure establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Over two dozen resolutions are now before the House Rules Committee.

You can help us by (1) writing to Hon. Howard W. Smith, Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., urging that quick action be taken on H. Res. 14 (send me a copy of your letter), and (2) having your Congressman submit a similar resolution.

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

WASHINGTON.

Self-Perpetuation in Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the gag rule has been on, now, in the Kennedy administration for many, many months. Apparently not too many officials within the Kennedy administration can speak out unless in their remarks the name "Kennedy" is mentioned frequently.

Ruth Montgomery, in the New York Journal American of April 28, tells us of her experience with the gag experts of the New Frontier.

CAPITAL LETTER: A GAG ON NEWS? WELL—

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—There's trouble in paradise, at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

We stubbed our toe on the snake by accident, at a dinner party where a high ranking White House inmate regaled us with a fascinating experience he had had during the weekend.

Since the incident had nothing to do with national security, nor even with his official job, I said I would call him the next morning to jot down the facts for my column.

Concern clouded his handsome face as he replied quickly: "I'm not allowed to tell you about it, Ruth. The President gets furious if we get any personal publicity. We've been ordered to stay out of the newspapers. Pierre says that's his department."

Inasmuch as the Kennedy administration likes to boast that White House officials are far more accessible to the press now than under President Eisenhower, I called Press Secretary Pierre Salinger to learn the facts of life in paradise.

Withholding the name of the official (our own brand of managed news), I asked if what he had reported about a press gag at the White House was correct. The roly-poly press secretary exclaimed: "Not a word of truth to it. He must have been pulling your leg. If I issued an order like that, I'd be fired. You are perfectly free to talk to anyone at the White House at any time, and report anything he says."

Now thoroughly intrigued, I contacted my original informant and reported Pierre's pearls of wisdom. The guy did a slow sizzle.

"Salinger is lying through his teeth," he snapped. "He not only gave us orders not to get in the papers, but also told all of us not to talk to the press. He said if by any chance such a conversation was unavoidable, we must immediately report to him whom we talked to, where it occurred, what time it was, and what was said."

Surprised, I remarked that this sounded like the same gag imposed by the Pentagon, which has caused such a stir in congressional and political circles.

"It sure is," the White House official said, "only Pierre is a very capable guy. He's too smart to put it out as a written directive."

Asked whether anyone has yet been chastized for disobeying the order, he said he had seen it happen to "three or four staffers, including myself."

Mr. X went on to explain that "five or six people in the White House are permitted to talk to the press, because it's considered part of their jobs * * * ones like speech writer Ted Sorensen. The rest of us are told that it's our business to run our own jobs, and stay away from the press."

The official said he could understand their point of view, because there's nothing in it for them when we get our names in the paper. It doesn't get them anything at all.

All this sounded reminiscent of the controversial directive issued last year by a Commerce Department official who ordered that all press releases thereafter start off with President Kennedy's name.

Ah, well, Eve never should have eaten that apple and spoiled paradise.

Alternative to Digging a Hole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the May 9 American Banker indicates one of the foremost reasons why I established the Republican budgetcutting task force earlier this year.

It describes more eloquently than anything I have read recently what should be our basic national concept of Americanism in this glorious country. I hope every Member of this House will read it carefully:

ALTERNATIVE TO DIGGING A HOLE

Specific suggestions for tax reform caught most of the attention paid by the press to the speech by George Champion, chairman of the board of the Chase Manhattan Bank, to the chamber of commerce in Washington last week.

But Mr. Champion also had some important things to say about the philosophical base of the administration's fiscal policy, and the need for the public and its leaders to reaffirm fundamental principles.

The switch in thinking about the values of a deficit was the center of his target. The new budget policy, he said, "proposes a radical departure; namely, the deliberate creation of larger deficits over the next few years.

"There was a time," he mourned, "when we used to set out hopefully each year to balance the national budget. Sometimes, because of unforeseen circumstances, we wound up in the hole. But now, as I understand it, our policy is to dig the hole first and then jump in on purpose."

The deliberate digging of that deficit hole, through increased Federal spending and a cut in taxes, struck Mr. Champion as a classic case of trying to "have our cake and eat it too."

A tax cut is needed now, desperately, he said. "But better control over expenditures is equally important," he also stated. He called for "a tight lid" on Federal spending immediately, and called for a freeze on budget growth at the present level "until revenues have grown to the point where the budget once again can be balanced."

He maintained that "this limit on expenditures should be a moral commitment on the part of Congress," and should get the "vigorous support" of the executive branch. And furthermore, he added, if defense spending has to rise, then let the increases be offset by compensating cuts elsewhere.

He acknowledged that there are those who seriously claim that "large deficits are necessary in order to speed economic growth," but took vigorous exception to that idea, stating that "surely the creation of a huge deficit will not accomplish such an aim." A more balanced and prudent approach is required, made up of "a proper reduction in taxes, accompanied by discipline and control over expenditures."

By putting the question in the form of a choice between a jump into a hole and a poised step forward, Mr. Champion prepared the ground for a serious examination of public policy. "This overhaul of the tax structure presents us with both a critical choice and an enormous opportunity," he said. "Our people must decide whether to go along with the trend toward a more paternalistic Government—one which spends more and more each year, and adopts loose fiscal policies in the process—or return to the principles of Government that made this Nation the strongest in the world.

"We have to learn that Government can't give us something for nothing—that every man, woman, and child must pay in some way for what he receives. Nor can our Nation live beyond its means, as we see so clearly from the trouble with our balance of payments.

"We need to seize this occasion to start off on a new tack," Mr. Champion declared, going far beyond the mechanics and dimensions of a tax cut. "More than a change in taxes is required. At stake is our whole philosophy of government. We want faster economic growth, to be sure. And the right kind of action on taxes can help us get it. But even more important is a return to those basic principles of government which over the years will maximize our national strength.

"No nation is ever stronger than the sum of the skills, energy, and character of its people. The surest way to cut back on that sum is to permit government to take over responsibility for all welfare—individual, corporate, and community—whether through subsidies, suports, or whatever means. What is needed is a return to those principles which encourage the individual to stand on his own feet, which foster self-reliance, and so doing produce a people proud of their independence and willing to fight for it."

The Monroe Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Philadelphia Bulletin of May 3, 1963:

THE MONROE MYTH—INCONSISTENCY OF PRESIDENT'S SPEECH AT YALE; CUBA ULTIMATUM CITED

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON.—At the 1962 Yale commencement, President Kennedy appealed to the American people to "move on from the reassuring repetition of stale phrases to a new, difficult, but essential confrontation with reality." An abiding mythology, he protested, has retarded the Nation's progress.

He singled out for attack the myths which, he said, dominated "the dialog over economic policy." He did not elaborate on the myths with which politicians, including Kennedy, continue to divert the public from awareness of unpopular realities.

One of these political bedtime stories emerged from a colloquy this week between a great-grandson of James Monroe and an official of the Soviet Embassy. It occurred at Fredericksburg, Va., when Monroe's descendant presented to the Russian diplomat a copy of the celebrated doctrine with the comment that it "is very much alive."

He was answered with the assertion that "the document is completely dead."

He in turn asserted, "It got you out of Cuba."

CASE OF CUBA

The facts are that the doctrine is still "alive," but that it most definitely did not get the Russians "out of Cuba" to whatever degree they and their offensive potential against the United States have been withdrawn.

The basic principle of policy proclaimed by President Monroe was that this Government would view as an "unfriendly disposition toward the United States" any extension in this hemisphere of a European political system. But when President Kennedy demanded the dismantling of the Soviet offensive potential, this extension had already been made by Castro's establishment of a Communist form of government, and by his acceptance of military and economic aid from the U.S.S.R.

The occasion for the President's ultimatums (Attorney General Kennedy recently disclosed there were two) was not the unfriendly disposition of the extension, but the discovery of Soviet nuclear armament in Cuba that constituted a direct threat to the security of the United States.

MEANING CHANGED

The political myth, however, persists that, as expressed to his news conference of August 29, 1962, by President Kennedy, "the Monroe Doctrine means what it has always meant since President Monroe and John Quincy Adams enunciated it."

Sufficient evidence that this was a case of "holding fast to the cliches of our ancestors" (which Mr. Kennedy deplored at Yale) is President Cleveland's militant intervention on the authority of the Monroe Doctrine in a mere boundary dispute between Venezuela and British Guiana because the United Kingdom had sought to effect its colony's claim by armed force. Until London yielded to arbitration, the United States and the United Kingdom were on the verge of war.

ABANDON THE MYTH

In view of the arrival of the military missile and space age, it would be irresponsible for President Kennedy to invoke and expand the doctrine in its liberal sense, as President Cleveland did. But it would be refreshing if he and other politicians would abandon the myth and publicly concede this, as Senator HUMPHREY did some months ago.

"The Kennedy doctrine, as I take it," wrote a high Army officer (retired) in a letter last September, "lays down military offensive as the threat to our peace and safety. This * * * is quite another thing from the extension of European systems condemned by the Monroe Doctrine."

Retiring Schoolteachers Deserve Our Gratitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Carroll (Md.) County Times, commending five Carroll County teachers for many years of devoted service. While we in the Congress must take additional steps to commit more of the financial resources of this Nation to education, it is also important that dedicated teachers receive public commendation from the local communities they have served so well.

The editorial follows:

RETIRING SCHOOLTEACHERS DESERVE OUR GRATITUDE

We have always maintained that in order to be a good teacher one must be truly dedicated to the art of teaching. Otherwise, how could one retire reluctantly after having taught 2,100 first-graders over a span of 42 years?

Retired teachers deserve our heartfelt gratitude.

Today, you hear of many laymen and even some teachers say that all they are interested in is the monetary side of teaching. We are thankful that this group is in the very small minority.

We can understand the minority making such a statement in these modern times, but even a decade ago the statement wouldn't hold water, since teachers' salaries have just come up recently to a fairly decent level.

At the recent annual banquet of the Carroll County Teachers Association, it was a sad sight for this writer to witness the retirement ceremony of five retiring teachers—one in absentia. Here were five teachers, who had given their all for the proper education of your children and ours, and still willing to teach on, if it were not for the little technicality of compulsory retirement.

Superintendent of Schools Samuel M. Jenness, even in his gay moments of telling humorous stories, could not hide the pensive mood, while presenting the plaques to the retirees.

We knew just how he felt, for here Superintendent Jenness was losing five truly dedicated teachers, who cannot be replaced. Oh yes, he will find teachers for assignment to these classes, but actual replacement—never. And to use a George Gobel expression, "You can't hardly get them kind any more." This is not intended to belittle the fine crop of future teachers.

The five teachers, who will be missed by their serveral classes after June 1963, and who deserve the thanks and gratitude of the entire county, are:

Mrs. Corrine Bennett Watkins, Mount Airy Elementary School. Mrs. Watkins taught the first grade of some 50 pupils in each class for 42 years. (In addition to the plaque, Mrs. Watkins received a kiss from Superintendent Jenness.)

Houston G. Curd, vice principal, Westminster Senior High School. Mr. Curd started teaching in Carroll County in 1922 and has been at the Westminster High School for 41 years. He taught an additional 2 years outside the State.

Berkley O. Bowman, Francis Scott Key High School. In addition to teaching outside the State, Mr. Bowman taught for 26 years in Carroll County.

Alvin S. Chilcoat, Francis Scott Key High School. Although Mr. Chilcoat has taught in the public school system of Carroll County for only 5 years, he had been teaching in other areas for over 30 years.

Mrs. Katherine Fringer Borchers, Freedom District School. Mrs. Borchers, in addition to other areas of teaching, taught in the Carroll County school system for 18 years.

A number of schoolteachers, who have retired in recent years, attended the Carroll County Teachers Association banquet at Peter Pan Inn, Urbana, and were recognized by Superintendent Jenness and the audience of some 300 teachers and guests.

Those recognized included:

T. W. Buchman, who taught for more than 45 years and has been a Times' correspondent for 50 years; Arthur Griffee, 48 years; Mrs. Arintha Marsh, 42 years; Mrs. Helen Bowman, 30 years; Miss Olive Mount, 42 years; Ollie Jones, 30 years; Naomi Derr and Mary Stansbury.

Honoring the retired teachers was the highlight of the Carroll County Teachers Association annual banquet, which was so ably arranged by Mrs. Dolores Snyder and her social committee.

Commendations to Don Shinnick for his excellent testimony for Christianity and to Congressman Carlton Sickles for offering his services to Carroll education. Congressman Sickles is a member of the House Education Committee.

The Times salutes all Carroll County retired teachers, those named above and all others, who have served mankind above and beyond the call of duty.

Brig. Gen. Joseph M. Tully

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, a warrior passed away in San Antonio, Tex. This man, Brig. Gen. Joseph M. Tully, devoted his life to the service of this country and his service was distinguished.

General Tully was born in Orange, N.J., on October 4, 1893. He attended West Point and graduated there in June 1916. Commissioned a second lieutenant, he joined the 16th Cavalry which was then stationed at old Fort Travis on the Texas border. In April 1917, he married Miss Fanny Laura Smith in San Antonio, Tex.

Tully held the rank of colonel at the time of the outbreak of World War II and commanded the 4th Cavalry Regiment.

General Tully's troops were the first to land on the beaches of Normandy on June 6, 1944—D-day. His troops then joined the 81st and 101st Airborne Divisions which had landed earlier in a parachute assault.

By October of 1944, Tully was assistant division commander of the 90th Infantry and had attained the rank of brigadier general. He commanded the 80th Infantry Division during the occupation. General Tully was an intimate friend of Generals Wainwright, Marshall, Patton, Collins, and Ernest.

Following World War II, General Tully served as chief of staff of the 2d Infantry Division at Fort Lewis, Wash., and served in that same capacity in Korea. He retired to San Antonio, Tex., in 1951.

General Tully's sons are also military men. Capt. Joseph M. Tully, Jr. is now in Sanford, Fla., while Lt. Col. Larkin S. Tully is at Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala. Lt. Col. Robert Tully is in Washington, D.C., at this time.

Mr. Speaker, we have lost a distinguished warrior, and in this loss we are sorrowful. But he left behind the knowledge that he had led a devoted life. Indeed, he left behind his sons, who also serve as he did.

Where Is There a Lincoln?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an editorial from the Los Angeles Times of May 8, 1963. I do not always agree with the Times, and they apparently do not often agree with me, and they have never endorsed me for a public office. I am pleased, however, that in times of great national perils, Americans of conflicting viewpoints can find constructive, if not complete, agreement on basic issues and principles. In the days ahead, let us hope that such areas of workable understanding will widen, not only in our own great West but in the Southern States as well.

The Times editorial follows:

Where Is There a Lincoln?

Let us this morning gaze upon the truthful, uncompromising face of history, in the context of what is happening on the public streets of Birmingham, Ala.

Exactly 100 years ago President Abraham Lincoln issued his Emancipation Proclamation which, in the midst of a war to preserve the Union, set the slaves "forever free."

Just 98 years ago this heartful action was ratified by the 13th amendment.

And 95 years ago, through the 14th amendment, it was decreed that "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States."

Yet now, a century later, the civil authorities of an American city have turned dogs against their fellow citizens, have jailed children, and have launched a massive drive to prevent freemen from achieving the very rights of freemen.

These citizens, children and men who have been refused admittance to citizenship, happen to be Negroes.

But they are, first of all, Americans. There is no law which can conceivably deny them the simple and basic privileges of citizenship they request. Any law that seeks to set them apart in some sort of second-class limbo would surely be ruled unconstitutional—just as segregated schools have been rejected by the U.S. Supreme Court.

It seems inconceivable that Birmingham, as a part of these United States, cannot feel the weight of shocked disapproval which has greeted accounts of these melancholy events.

It seems equally incredible that other sections of the troubled, stubborn South cannot realize how much unhappy history has already passed, while the Negro remains an American apart in his own land. In Birmingham, for example, Negroes ask these four things:

Improved employment opportunities on a nonracial basis.

Desegregation of downtown lunch counters, public facilities, and stores.

Establishment of a biracial committee to work toward gradual integration of schools.

And the release of some 1,200 Negroes already arrested for demonstrating in behalf of these elementary rights.

But Birmingham is only the overt, ugly manifestation of a problem that is wider spread than Alabama—or even Mississippi, where the Federal Government charges that only 40-odd of almost 7,000 Negroes are deemed eligible to vote by one county's white authorities.

Underprivileged Negroes declare that too much time has elapsed with too little happening in their favor. That is, in favor of Americans whose skin happens to be of a different pigment, but whose blood can be shed just as freely in their country's cause.

We agree.

One full century after the Emancipation Proclamation we must make better progress, or the grim developments in Birmingham will certainly signal a far worse situation, even a catastrophe, in this delicate area of interracial relations.

Senator John Sherman Cooper, a Republican, a Kentuckian, and a thoughtful man, has accused both major parties of paying only "lipservice to the cause of civil rights." Regretfully, we must conclude that the Senator is right.

Perhaps, in this hour of grave trial, another Lincoln is indicated.

Newspaper Awards, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Maryland-Delaware Press Association recently made its awards for excellence in journalism during 1962. In reading the results of this contest, I was greatly pleased to see that so many of the newspapers published in the Fifth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, were singled out for their outstanding work during the past year.

It was particularly gratifying to me to learn that the paper published in my hometown of Annapolis, the Evening Capital, was recognized for its high-caliber work; in the class of dailies it was awarded second place for general excellence and third place for excellence in typography.

It was also a great pleasure to learn that the Maryland Gazette, of Glen Burnie, was awarded third place for excellence in typography for weeklies with circulation over 5,000 and that the News Leader, of Laurel, was awarded first place for general excellence for weeklies with circulation under 5,000 with the Maryland Independent, of La Plata, receiving third place in the same class.

Other recognition received by newspapers, and their reporters, published in the Fifth District included third place for the Maryland Independent for community service; third place to Jack O'Brien of the Evening Capital for spot news writing; third place to Helen de Zayas of the Evening Capital for social news writing; second place to Sue Miller of the Maryland Gazette for spot news writing; first place to Gertrude L. Poe of the News Leader for feature writing; and first place to Robert Grauel of the News Leader for news photography on a weekly.

Independence of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today Israel celebrates the 15th anniversary of her independence. On this memorable occasion, I wish to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency, the Acting President of Israel, Kadish Loz; and His Excellency, the Israel Ambassador to the United States, Avraham Harman.

For 15 years the nations of the world have witnessed the growth of the independent State of Israel. Ever since its establishment on May 14, 1948, we in the United States have been amazed at the industry and perseverence of the people of this country in their desire for progress and success in the world community. From a nation wracked by war and pillage, Israel has now become the shining example for the other newly independent states striving for status and stability.

The internal development of Israel progressed rapidly from the beginning. A succession of extraordinary achievements entitles the Israelis to call themselves citizens of the most progressive, most modern, most developed and most stable nation in the Middle East. In the Negev Desert, new cities are being constructed to house the ever-increasing immigrants who come to Israel seeking a new life. Eilat on the Red Sea has become a bustling port of approximately 7,500 inhabitants. In addition to its harbor facilities, the city now boasts numerous tourist accommodations. Within 5 years, the city planners will have enlarged these facilities so that it will rival the resort towns on the Sea of Galilee.

The Negev has also become important as the center for natural resources. Development within its confines of copper, iron, manganese, and phosphates has enabled Israel to be self-sufficient in these minerals.

Oil, the largest single item of expenditure in imports, has received a priority for development. Recent strikes have permitted the country to eliminate the import of certain crude oils while explorations are now being conducted in the Negev for the possibility of finding sufficient oil to enable Israel to become totally self-sufficient.

As a part of the government's planning, there has been inaugurated a program of technical aid to help requesting nations to achieve development. Begun in 1954, the program now has 83 recipient States and territories. Examples of such aid would include citrus and agricultural development in Liberia, the development of Port Harcourt in Nigeria, salt extraction methods for Ceylon, and the combatting of sand flies in Ethiopia. Additional requests are continually being received. Recently the Congolese government has asked for help in training its army. Furthermore, the head of the nuclear chemistry branch of the nuclear energy laboratories has been requested by the United Nations to give advice to nuclear research institutes in Thailand and the Philippines.

For these remarkable achievements, one must pay tribute to the people of Israel, the worker as well as the government official. The guidance of Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, the representation abroad of Presidents Weizmann and Ben-Zvi, the molding by General Dayan of young Israelis into a unified army, have contributed to the strengthening of their country. Yet it is the laborer who builds the roads and constructs the towns, who mines the rich ores and phosphates, and who plants and harvests the grains and fruits—he is the lifeblood of Israel. His dedication to his country, and his single purpose of advancing his nation have made Israel what it is today. Nowhere, save in the United States, have so many different people come to live and to build for their children a permanent home, free from the persecutions and horrors of anti-Semitism.

We salute the people of Israel on their 15 fruitful years. We express, too, the hope that their nation will continue to progress as it has, and that the friendship between America and Israel will grow in peace and prosperity.

Another Kennedy Cuban Pearl Harbor in the Making?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, we all recall how, last mid-October, President Kennedy confessed to the world that he knew nothing about Russian missiles in Cuba until a few days before his talk to the American people. A very disturbing article by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott in the Long Island Press of May 9 indicates how we have let down our guard in Cuba. If this be true, we can forsee, perhaps in mid-October of 1964, the President making another talk to the American people on how he just found out that Russia was building up to no good.

The article follows:

J.F.K.'s CUBA POLICY BARS CHECKUP ON RED FORCES

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—A potentially highly dangerous intelligence gap—strikingly similar to that immediately preceding the war-fraught missile crisis last October—is again developing in Cuba.

Following is what is transpiring there—with the full knowledge and approval of President Kennedy:

Low-level reconnaissance flights have been suspended since February 9. It was such sorties that produced the irrefutable aerial photos of the medium-range ballistic missiles and IL-28 bombers on the Red-ruled island. The halting of low-level reconnaissance flights since February is on direct orders of the President. No reconnaissance flights of any kind can be made over Cuba without his approval.

High-level U-2 reconnaissance flights are being kept to a minimum, and the aerial photos they produce are raising more questions than they answer.

In recent weeks, at least four wide-hatched Russian freighters have docked in Cuban ports and unloaded their cargoes under cover or darkness and the same kind of drum-tight secrecy that prevailed last year when the nuclear-armed missiles and IL-28 bombers were shipped there.

Several of these wide-hatched Soviet freighters were armed with 3-inch guns. These are the first armed Communist cargo vessels to appear in the Caribbean.

The administration's iron-handed crackdown on refugee raids is seriously impairing the flow of information from Cuba, particularly from the anti-Casto underground that has been an important source of military information. That has been valuable in planning U-2 reconnaissance flights; providing them with specific targets and missions. Inelligence men have worked closely with the raiders and the underground.

Inside explanation for this extraordinary backstage policy is the President's determination that nothing be done to "rock the boat" in Cuba.

That's the reason given congressional leaders who have been appraised of this undisclosed intelligence gap and are greatly disturbed. They have been told the President believes his conciliatory course will lead to the withdrawal of more Russian troops from Cuba.

The congressional leaders have been informed that the President and Premier Khrushchev have exchanged a number of letters on this thorny issue.

The intelligence gap is causing particular concern among U.S. military authorities because of three baffling developments in Cuba.

These showed up in recent high-level photos, but beyond bringing the disturbing discoveries to light no detailed information has been obtained—due to the lack of low-level reconnaissance flights, the drastic curbs on raiders and the adverse effect that has had on contacts with, and the operations of, the underground.

The three disturbing mysteries are as follows:

The appearance of large numbers of Russian tents, some of them big enough to enclose missiles and their launchers.

Heavy transport traffic to and from areas where large caves are known to be. It has long been reported, by refugees and other sources, that the Reds are storing missiles and arms in caves.

Construction of a rail line to a major Soviet camp area. Apparently this camp is to undergo extensive development of some kind.

Intelligence authorities are divided on the reason for the appearance of the armed Russian freighters.

One group is of the opinion the Red's intent is to ward off refugee attacks. Another group sees a great deal more behind this move. It contends the armed cargo ships are Khrushchev's warning to the United States that another naval blockade will not be tolerated. Also that these armed vessels are being used to transport Castro agents to Latin American countries.

Members of the U.S. Intelligence Board, headed by Central Intelligence Director John McCone, are privately making no secret of their uneasiness over this backstage situation.

Let Us Improve Solidarity in the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, recently a young man named Nicholas B. Haley wrote me enclosihg a paper which he wished to have considered for publication. My first impulse was to write a form reply without even reading the paper. But I glanced over the first paragraphs and immediately changed my mind, for this young man showed a remarkable grasp of a most complex problem—inter-American solidarity.

I would not go so far as to say that everything in this manuscript is correct, but I do want to say that it shows a remarkable maturity of thought and expression involving perhaps our most perplexing problems.

If we have very many young men of Mr. Haley's caliber in our high schools, we need not fear for the future.

The article follows:

LET US IMPROVE SOLIDARITY IN THE AMERICAS

(By Nicholas B. Haley, San Antonio, Tex., Texas Military Institute)

The problem of uniting the Americas is not new. In the early days of our country, a wise President foresaw the imperative need of mutual friendship and understanding between the countries in the Americas. The Monroe Doctrine was designed for the specific purpose of fostering unity among the American nations, and keeping out other countries who dreamed of conquest. Since then, we have, in some form or other, been faced with the problem of better harmony between our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. President Kennedy realizes the importance of solidarity.

President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress means the same thing. It is to the mutual advantage of each nation concerned, economically and spiritually, to foster understanding, peace, and friendship. Why should it be impossible for nations to be friendly and kind toward one another? The Dark Ages are gone forever. The light of education has been shining with greater brilliance in the past decades. Ignorance can be wiped out. It is a recognized fact that in the small unit of society known as the family, education plays a tremendously important part in helping its members live with one another in comparative understanding and happiness. We can extend the same principles to apply to nations just as well.

We are consciously aware of several ways to improve our relations with our neighboring countries. We have, and still are trying one method, that of using our dollars to help and improve the situation. Let us see what our dollars have done in four strategic South American countries. Huge amounts of American money are being used in these countries to assist their national economies and to promote social and economic reforms. We see the need for economic aid and we are dishing out the dollars. Alliance for Progress, Aid for International Development, the Peace Corps; all these organizations have one object and purpose: That of improving relations with our neighbors.

Venezuela was scheduled to receive $115 million in 1961. Of this amount, $1,500,000 went for rural housing; $5 million went for aqueducts; $80 million was used to refinance and readjust the complex procedure of repayment. President Romulo Betancourt and his people are friendly toward us. In Venezuela, there is no organized resistance to American help. The Venezuelan president has resettled some 53,000 families under an agrarian reform program started before the Alliance came into effect. There is a great housing shortage, constantly increasing.

In Colombia, the allocated funds have been used to plug the economic gap brought about by the falling of coffee prices. Low-income workers allege that there is too much redtape involved in getting into the new housing projects near the capital city of Bogotá. An effort is being made by our agency to alleviate the situation.

In Peru, the Peace Corps feeds some 182,000 Peruvian children. This has created a favorable impression. Aid to Peru was suspended during the suspension of United States-Peruvian relations in July of last year. However, it was resumed as soon as the suspension was terminated. Plans are underway to develop the Communist-infiltrated Convencion Valley. The Peruvian military government approves American aid.

In Ecuador, of the $64 million made available, a third was used to build hospitals and schools. They have a great housing shortage that is bordering on the acute stage. Plans are not yet available to correct this situation, though a loan has been granted to open the jungles in the interior of the country; $4 million will be used to build 2,000 classrooms and living quarters for approximately 700 teachers.

The United States is pouring millions of dollars into these South American countries. What is the result? In the first place, many of these peoples are not very happy about American aid. They feel that the ultimate purpose of our help is to subjugate them into submission to our will. They should not feel that way. But the majority of them do, even though we have proved to the world that we are not imperialists as we have often been accused by the Communists, and that we are not after territorial expansion, neither by bribery nor by the use of force. All we want is their cooperation and friendship to be able to work together toward a common goal. We would like all peoples of our hemisphere to be free to enjoy the blessings of democracy. We would like to eliminate poverty and ignorance. We would like to elevate the standard of living of the average man. We would like progress to replace medieval civilization.

In the second place, the people on the home front do not relish the idea of helping our neighbors as much as we are doing, in view of the fact that some of these peoples are not happy about our help. Many Americans believe that we should help ourselves and not worry about other countries because other countries are not our business. Recent events in Cuba have proved that it is our business to be concerned about our neighboring countries. Certainly, it is better to have friendly neighbors than hostile ones. A great number of people in the United States have the erroneous idea that we pay high taxes in order to help our neighbors who do not appreciate our help, do not like to be helped, and who do not like us. It is true that sometimes, some of our neighbors act as if they would rather be engulfed by the slaving arm of communism than be assisted in removing the shackles of poverty and ignorance, in order to live in freedom and enjoy the blessings of liberty.

It is obvious that we need to know why our neighbors do not like us. What should we do in this case? We know they need us, they need our help, and we do want to be their friends in word and deed. We need friends who believe in freedom as we do. Someday, perhaps, they will be glad they were our friends. We should try to change our approach. If our present method does not work, it is clear that we should try another way. Let us remember that "Nothing is so strong as gentleness, nothing so gentle as real strength."

I am sincerely convinced that our neighbors want our friendship much more than they want our dollars, even if our dollars are a great help to them. It is time we get off our high horse and stop thinking that the almighty dollar can buy us anything we desire. Friendship has never been bought successfully. Trust and confidence must be earned, not purchased, if we want a friendship that is sincere, genuine, and lasting. Though we are all solid and true Americans with kind and generous hearts, we are all descendants of various racial and cultural backgrounds. We should possess that priceless and invaluable asset of understanding not only ourselves, but other peoples with culture, civilization, and background other than our own. Unfortunately, it is not so, in spite of the very high percentage of educated citizens we claim to have. We should know how to understand other peoples. If we do not, we should be taught.

It is certain that one step toward our goal of firm solidarity among our neighbors in the American Hemisphere is to foster in ourselves and in our children a humanitarian love of people, an understanding of their nature, their way of life, and their process of thinking. We should be taught, and this with great emphasis, from the first grade on up, in all schools, public and private, to respect, like, and understand all peoples. We should learn about their history; their past is a clue to their present way of behavior. Many of us think that only we know how to eat; only we know how to dress; only we know how to do things properly; and only we know how to live. It is not so. Other peoples know how to eat, dress, do things properly, and to live, even though they may not have as many dollars as we have, and even though they may do so differently. We should be taught to blot out arrogance and to accept other peoples as human beings, just as we are.

We are proud of our democracy, earned with the lives and blood of our forefathers; we should make it real and true to be effective. We should not only be tolerant, which is only a form of condescension, we should genuinely believe that other peoples are like we are. When we travel in other countries, it should be in us not to look down on others, laugh at them, belittle them, or brag about what we have. I have personally seen the tragic results of such an attitude. This recalls to mind, an anecdote I once read about the commander in chief of the Japanese Fleet in World War II. In his youth, while he was a student in one of our universities, he was teased, despised, and held in contempt by fellow students for no special reason other than he was different in his physical appearance as well as in his way of thinking. It was then that the seed of hatred and hostility was born in this young man's heart. Silently, he vowed revenge and vengeance against the Americans who thought themselves so superior. Three decades later, he was among the zealous and enthusiastic planners of the attack on the United States.

We should seek true friendship in humility and understanding. When we travel or when our neighbors visit us, we should all be ambassadors of good will. Americans are usually afforded every consideration and courtesy when visiting other countries. We should reciprocate. We should not lose sight of the fact that our neighbors would rather have our sincere love and friendship than our dollars. The dollars should be used to augment our friendship, not to buy it. How very right was President Wilson when he refused to use "dollar diplomacy" as he called it, in Central America. We cannot learn to become true friends to our neighbors in a very short time. It will take time to erase the erroneous opinion some of them have of us. We are really not what we appear to be. We are inherently kind and generous. We are the first to help in any calamity affecting human lives, regardless of where it occurs. We should let our neighbors discover that we do have a right sense of values. We should prove to them that we do know that the almighty dollar is not everything.

Forgotten Page: General Tells of Subversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Indianapolis News of May 3, 1963:

FORGOTTEN PAGE: GENERAL TELLS OF SUBVERSION

(By Ralph de Toledano)

WASHINGTON.—Buried away in the report of the Senate Armed Services subcommittee hearings on the "muzzling of the military" is a brief and chilling quote. It comes from the testimony of Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall, highly respected by his peers, who is also considered a model of moderation by the liberal-labor coalition.

General Marshall's words recalled the stormy era when Senator McCarthy was attempting to investigate the remnants of the Julius Rosenberg apparatus in the Army Signal Corps—and being told by every pundit able to pound a typewriter or a lectern that he was destroying morale and smearing the military. To hint that the Communists had any kind of toehold in the services was considered downright treasonable.

Now listen to General Marshall:

"I have, of course, run into Communists in our uniform overseas, even in my own outfit. I had one officer—two officers—who had to be kept in cold storage. I could not let them see any classified papers."

And then, the shocker:

"In the battle of North Korea you will find one incident, and I don't think it has ever been revealed. But there was one company that folded, one only, in the 25th Division. The captain who surrendered his company had been long suspected as a Communist by the people around him" (p. 1287 of the hearings).

In a war against a Communist enemy, an officer suspected of Communist loyalties was permitted to take his company into battle and to surrender it to the North Korean Reds. In the same war, officers were kept "in cold storage" because they were considered disloyal. If in a time of actual hostilities, Communists and sympathizers were not weeded out, what is the situation today? This is a question General Marshall does not answer and the Senate subcommittee barely scratched.

I do not blame General Marshall for not summarily sending the suspect officers, with their security files, back to Washington with a recommendation that they be dishonorably discharged. Had he done so, the American Civil Liberties Union would have fired off a petition to the Supreme Court, the bleeding hearts would have set up a 24-hour vigil in front of the White House, and the Fund for the Republic would have allotted half a million dollars for a study of blacklisting in the Army.

The men who were captured by the North Korean Reds and underwent the filth and terror of a Chinese Communist concentration camp may not—if they survived—have quite such a tolerant view of the matter. Their lives were entrusted to an officer who was presumably of unquestioned patriotism. In a conflict as treacherous as the Korean police action, the least the Army should have done was to transfer the officer to some innocuous quartermaster job—counting blankets at Fort Benning, for example.

Reading General Marshall's quiet statement, I wondered why no one asked him why the episode had been kept secret—or what reports he had filed to his superiors on the other Communists in uniform who could not carry out their duties because of their untrustworthiness. I was not surprised that those who pored over the report seeking tidbits of information to use against our military leaders passed over the quotation.

And this gets me to the core of the problem. In the past decade, many Americans have been brainwashed into believing that no Communist threat exists, that no Communist infiltration of the Nation's sensitive agencies is possible, and that Communist villainy began fading out with the death of Stalin.

Every new disclosure of the internal Communist menace is either ignored or brushed aside as an isolated case. An unrepentant perjurer like Alger Hiss is given a forum on nationwide TV, and the sponsor who objects is called unpleasant names by television executives and slapped with lawsuits. It has become bad form to take internal communism seriously.

When I am scolded for speaking of the internal Communist threat, I have a simple answer: "If it does not exist, then why is there so much opposition to a thorough and inclusive search in Government and in other sensitive areas of our national life? Why are so much time and money spent to silence the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee? Why is the FBI the Communist underground's enemy number one?"

I have so far gotten no satisfactory answers. The only answers I get are indirect ones—as when General Marshall tells the Congress in 1962 what he should have shouted to the Nation in 1952.

H.R. 5131

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, as a strong supporter of the Youth Employment Opportunities Act, I am delighted to report that the Maryland Congress of Parents and Teachers, representing 253,000 Marylanders, is giving full support to this needed legislation. The text of their recent letter to me on the subject follows:

MAY 6, 1963.

Hon. CARLTON R. SICKLES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SICKLES: The Maryland Congress of Parents and Teachers, with a membership of 253,000 in 826 local PTA's, believes that H.R. 5131 meets the critical needs of our ever-increasing number of young people, no longer in school and unemployed.

At the present time this legislation is in the Rules Committee. We have written Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman, urging the committee to move the bill out onto the floor for action.

May we request that you use your influence in having the bill moved out of committee.

We are confident that when it does reach the floor you will vote in favor of this assistance being made available, not only to the youth of Maryland, but to all youth of our Nation.

Respectfully yours,
Mrs. A. K. ROMOSER,
Legislation Chairman.

There Is No Peace: 18 Years, 57 Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, the Washington correspondent for the Indianapolis News, Lou Hiner, Jr., has performed a real service in compiling for the public a chronology of the many limited wars that have taken place in the last 18 years.

Mr. Hiner points out concerning these wars, "Communists usually have a sinister role." He quotes Khrushchev as calling these limited wars either "wars of national liberation" or "popular revolts."

This compilation should help dispel the thinking of many of our sincere but misguided citizens who still think it is possible to peacefully coexist with the forces of the world Communist movement and not eventually lose our precious freedoms.

Without implying that all the wars listed in this compilation have had a Communist impetus, since it is obvious that some of them did not, it might be useful to recall a pertinent statement in the program of the Communist International adopted by the Sixth World Congress in Moscow on September 1, 1928:

> Between capitalist society and Communist society a period of revolutionary transformation intervenes, during which the one changes into the other. Correspondingly, there is also an intervening period of political transition, in which the essential state form is the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat. The transition from the world dictatorship of imperialism to the world dic-

tatorship of the proletariat extends over a long period of proletarian struggles with defeats as well as victories; a period of continuous general crises in capitalist relationships and growth of social revolutions, i.e., of proletarian civil wars against the bourgeoisie; a period of national wars and colonial rebellions which, although not in themselves revolutionary proletarian Socialist movements are nevertheless, objectively, insofar as they undermine the domination of imperialism, constituent parts of the world proletarian revolution; a period in which capitalist and Socialist economic and social systems exist side by side in "peaceful" [sic] relationships as well as in armed conflict; a period of formation of a Union of Soviet Republics; a period of wars of imperialist states against Soviet states; a period in which the ties between the Soviet states and colonial peoples become more and more closely established, etc.

Since the role of various national wars and colonial rebellions is shown herein to be helpful to the Communist revolution throughout the world, this part of the program was and remains an order to instigate, agitate and further the outbreak of any such conflicts and disorders in order that the Communists might profit from the resulting chaos.

Following is Mr. Hiner's compilation and column in the Indianapolis News titled "There Is No Peace—18 Years, 57 Wars":

THERE IS NO PEACE: 18 YEARS, 57 WARS

WASHINGTON.—Following is a table of "limited" wars since World War II, including both international and internal armed conflicts:

Date	War	Antagonists	Reason and outcome
1945–49	Indonesian	Netherlands versus Indonesia	Demand for Indonesian independence. Successful.
1945–49	Chinese civil [1]	Chinese Nationalists versus Chinese Communists	Seizure of control of China. Communists won.
1945–54	Malayan civil	United Kingdom versus Communist rebels	Seizure of control. Rebels unsuccessful.
1945–54	Indochina	France versus Vietminh	End of French colonial rule. Partly successful. Indochina divided into 2 parts—North and South Vietnam. North is under Communist control.
1946–49	Greek guerrilla	Greece versus rebels	Seizure of control. Rebels unsuccessful.
1947–49	Kashmir dispute	India versus Pakistan	Rule of Kashmir. Cease-fire; still holding U.N. truce lines.
1948	Costa Rican-Nicaraguan dispute.	Costa Rica versus Nicaragua	Costa Rica charges Nicaragua with invasion. Settled by Organization of American States (OAS).
1948–49	Arab-Israel	Israel versus Arab League	Control of Palestine. Israel maintains its independence. Sporadic incidents continue.
1948–53	Colombia civil	Government versus Army rebels	Seizure of control. Rebels successful.
1948	Venezuelan civil	do	Do.
1948	Costa Rican rebellion.	Government versus rebels	Do.
1948	Philippine guerilla	Government versus Communist rebels (Huks)	Seizure of control. Unsuccessful. Soviet Union inspired.
1948	Indonesian internal	Government versus Communist rebels	Do.
1948–51	Burmese internal	Government versus Red rebels and Karens	Do.
1949	India internal	India versus Red rebels	Do.
1950–53	Korean [1]	United Nations versus North Korean Communists and Communist Chinese.	Seizure of South Korea. Unsuccessful.
1952	Bolivian uprising	Military junta versus rebels	Successful. Civilian government formed.
1953	East German uprising.	Rebels versus U.S.S.R. and East German Government	Satisfaction of political demands. Unsuccessful.
1953–54	Burmese internal	Burmese Government versus Karens	Started by Government and Karens brought under control with new state.
1953	Iranian internal	Nationalists versus the Royalists	Nationalists overthrown.
1954	Guatemalan revolt [1]	Rebels versus Communist government	Seizure of control. Successful. Communists overthrown.
1954–present.	Vietnamese guerrilla.[1]	South Vietnam versus North Vietminh	Seizure of South Vietnam by Communist forces. Still undecided.
1955	Costa Rican-Nicaraguan dispute.	Costa Rica versus Nicaragua	Costa Rica charged invasion. Settled by OAS.
1955	Argentine revolt	Peron government versus rebels	Seizure of control. Successful. Peron loses.
1956–62	Algerian revolt	France versus Algerian rebels	End of French rule. Rebels successful.
1956–59	Cuban civil	Batista government versus Castro rebels	Seizure of control. Rebels successful.
1956	Sinai campaign	Israel versus Egypt	Israel raided. Fighting stopped by U.N. cease-fire order.
1956	Suez Canal seizure	United Kingdom and France versus Egypt	Control of canal. Egypt successful.
1956	Hungarian revolt	Hungarian rebels versus U.S.S.R. and puppet leaders	Liberation of Hungary. Put down by Soviets.
1957	Muscat and Oman	Rebels versus United Kingdom	Seizure of control. Rebels unsuccessful.
1957–58	Burmese internal conflict.	Government versus Communist rebels	Do.
1958	Lebanon-Jordan [1]	United States and United Kingdom versus Communist rebels.	Lebanon asked aid after Communists attempted takeover. Rebels lose.
1958	Taiwan (Formosa) Straits.[1]	United States and Chinese Nationalists versus Chinese Communists.	Communists shell the Nationalist islands. Finally terminated.
1958	Pakistan military coup.	Military leaders versus Government	Seizure of control. Leaders successful.
1958	Ceylon civil war	Tamils versus Singhalese (rival religious groups)	Dispute over political goals and control of Government. Military establishes order.
1958	Iraqi coup	Iraq Government versus Kassem-led military	Seizure of control. Successful.
1958	Iraq counterrevotion.	Military rebels versus Kassem government	Seizure of control. Rebels unsuccessful.
1958	Venezuelan uprising.	Jimenez regime versus rebels	Seizure of control. Rebels successful.
1959	Dominican Republic conflict.	Cuban invaders versus Dominican Republic	Overthrow of Government. Invaders lose.
1959	Bolivian uprising	Government versus rebels	Seizure of control. Rebels unsuccessful.
1959	Nicaraguan conflict	Government versus rebels, aided by some Costa Ricans.	Do.
1959–61	Laotian civil [1]	Royal Laotian Government versus Communist rebels	Seizure of control. Neutral government formed (U.S. and U.S.S.R. agreement).
1960–62	Congolese civil [1]	United Nations and several dissident groups	Seizure of all or a part of the Congo. Central government formed.
1960	South Korea rebellion.	Government versus student rioters and groups	Criticism of government policies. New civilian government formed (Rhee out).
1960	Turkish rebellion	Government versus military and student groups	Criticism of Government policies. Army rules nation.
1961	South Korean military coup.	Government versus military leaders	Seizure of control. Military successful.
1961	Ethiopian rebellion	Government versus military leaders	Seizure of control. Military unsuccessful.
1961–present.	Bizerte crisis	France versus Tunisia	Tunisians demand French departure from naval base. Still undecided.
1961	Cuban invasion [1]	Castro government versus Cuban rebels	Overthrow of Communist government. Unsuccessful.
1961	Syrian revolt	Government versus military leaders	Criticism of Government policies. Military won.
1961	India-Goa	India-Portugal Goa	Indian forces invaded and took possession of Goa.
1962	Dutch-Indonesia	Forces engage in sporadic fighting	Territorial claims. Netherlands New Guinea placed under U.N. temporarily.
1962	Thailand-Cambodia.[1]	Forces clash near border	Border dispute. Cease-fire, undecided.
1962	Yemen revolt	Government versus military forces	Control of Government. Military successful.
1962	India-Red China [1]	Forces clash in Tibetan border	Border dispute and invasion by Red China. Cease-fire, undecided.
1963	Argentina	Naval rebellion against Government	Seizure of control. Failed.

[1] U.S. military, technical, or economic aid involved.

U.S. LIVES LOST AROUND GLOBE IN BRUSH CONFLICTS

(By Lou Hiner, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Everyday, somewhere in the world, a man is killed in battle.

That is the record of the peace since World War II.

There have been 57 armed conflicts since 1945.

The 58th appears to have broken out recently, when rebels in Portuguese Guinea, a 36,000-square-mile wedge in West Africa, battled Portuguese soldiers. The rebels claimed they killed 2,000; the Portuguese said 7 soldiers died.

There are the so-called limited or brush wars. Limited, meaning some of them are merely brief skirmishes.

The most serious limited war today is in faraway Vietnam, where U.S.-led freedom forces are battling wily Communist guerrillas.

More than 11,000 American troops are in the southeastern Asian country and should the situation shift to favor the Communists, additional thousands would be on their way to the remote country in a matter of hours.

The limited, brush war began in Vietnam in 1954. Adm. Harry D. Felt, U.S. Pacific

Command, predicted recently that it won't be over for 3 more years and the American-backed government will win.

Seventy-five Americans have died in the battle for control of Vietnam since 1961.

KOREA TOOK HEAVIEST TOLL

The biggest of the post-World War II conflicts, the Korean war, began as a brush war June 25, 1950, when 60,000 North Korean troops invaded the Republic of Korea. Their purpose? Territorial gain and seizure of the government.

By time the United Nations' "police action" was over 3 years later, 33,629 Americans had died in the battle area.

A limited war in Thailand, again involving the Communists, cost seven Americans their lives. Fighting in Laos killed nine. Three Americans were killed in Red China's shelling of Formosa in 1958. Three died in skirmishes in the Lebanon-Jordan brush war.

The gallantry of the American fighting men under fire in the various limited war engagements has been superb. But there are no high decorations, for heroes are forbidden in such encounters.

THESE WARS ARE NO ACCIDENTS

On the basis of available evidence none of the 56 wars since 1945 can be said to have been provoked primarily by accidental causes.

The causes which have led to brush warfare were generally rooted in competing desires for political power between rival groups within a country or between disputing foreign nations.

Some of the conflicts may have begun by miscalculation, wherein the attacking group or nation may have seized what it regarded as an opportunity to gain, its objectives through force, but ultimately failed in its grasp for power.

The Communist forces miscalculated in the Korean war by failing to anticipate the United States entry into the conflict.

Some limited wars also resulted from a correct calculation of power and the insurgents fired their way in and took over control of governments.

COMMUNISTS USUALLY HAVE SINISTER ROLE

Of the 57 wars, the United States has played a role in only 11. Some of those were extremely minor roles. On the other hand, the Communists have had a hand in all but a few of the conflicts.

Soviet dictator Nikita Khrushchev has called these limited wars either "wars of national liberation" or "popular revolts."

In January, 1961, Khrushchev made it clear in a speech that the Soviets consider world wars and even local wars too dangerous; preferring, instead, the "popular revolts" form of armed aggression.

Friendship Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, all Maryland residents, I know, are aware of and concerned about the difficulties experienced by Friendship International Airport in Baltimore since the opening of the Dulles International Airport at Chantilly, Va., last fall. I, and my colleagues in the Maryland delegation, are very concerned about the flights which have been transferred from Friendship to Dulles and we are working for a proper solution to this problem.

Interested groups in Maryland are also working for a solution, including the County Council of Baltimore County. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD at this point the following resolution calling for greater use of Friendship recently adopted by the Baltimore County Council:

Whereas since the construction and opening of the multimillion-dollar air terminal in Chantilly, Va., known as Dulles International Airport, the use of Friendship International Airport as a passenger terminal has been greatly affected; and

Whereas the Baltimore Association of Commerce estimates that Baltimore is losing more than $1,000 per day as a result of unfair competition from Dulles, which they believe results from the FAA acting as both airline policeman and airport landlord; and

Whereas this loss of business to Baltimore is adversely affecting not only Baltimore City, but also the surrounding metropolitan area, including Baltimore County; and

Whereas it is the feeling of the county council the leaders of industry and commerce and the private citizens should be made aware of the need for support of Friendship International Airport and be encouraged to give and promote such support: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the County Council of Baltimore County, Md., this 1st day of May 1963, That industry, commerce, and private citizens be urged to use and support Friendship International Airport exclusively and to foster and promote its exclusive use and support throughout the Baltimore metropolitan area; be it further

Resolved, That the citizens urge their elected representatives to the Senate and Congress of the United States to promote and support an increase of airline service to and from Friendship International Airport; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the two U.S. Senators and eight Representatives to the Congress from the State of Maryland.

Significant Views on Conservation Given by Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, every year the College of Forest, Range, and Wildlife of the Utah State University at Logan, Utah, designates 1 week in the spring as Conservation Week. During this period meetings are held at which the students have the opportunity of meeting with representatives of public conservation groups as well as Federal, State, and local agencies.

As a Representative in Congress from the State of Utah, I am pleased and proud to advise you that Dean J. Whitney Floyd in conjunction with the student leaders of the college had an excellent program this year during the week of April 29, 1963.

We were indeed fortunate to have as the climax of Conservation Week a message from the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, who is chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on which I have the honor to serve. Congressman ASPINALL has devoted his energies primarily on behalf of conservation and conservation measures. He is a recognized authority in the field of conservation, and even those who disagree with him on individual issues recognize this and respect his judgment.

I was very much interested in seeing that Chairman ASPINALL chose as the title of his paper the resounding statement that "Conservation Values Remain Constant." I agree with the chairman of my committee and commend him for having sent this message to those assembled at the conservation banquet at Utah State University at Logan on May 3, 1963. Mr. Speaker, I think that we should all refresh our memories concerning the conservation movement in the United States and its current posture today.

I suggest that all Members of the House as well as all others interested in the conservation of our natural resources and the administration of public lands will benefit from reading Chairman ASPINALL's remarks. Therefore, under leave previously granted, I include the full text of the chairman's address at this point in the RECORD:

CONSERVATION VALUES REMAIN CONSTANT

It is indeed a pleasure for me to be honored as the speaker at your conservation banquet, which tonight climaxes a weeklong observance sponsored jointly by the College of Forest, Range, and Wildlife Management and the Forestry Club of Utah State University. I know that you have, during your discussions, focused attention on the major conservation issues facing the Nation.

I am encouraged by the presence during these discussions of representatives of various groups interested in conservation. Because I realize that many of us would achieve our objectives through different means than those of our coworkers, I think it is particularly beneficial to have these interchanges of ideas among people dedicated to the conservation of our natural resources.

It is my purpose to speak to you this evening concerning the role of Congress in this field. I have stated on other occasions that I believe Congress to be a stabilizing influence in developing conservation policy. I have therefore titled these remarks "Conservation Values Remain Constant."

Everyone here is aware, I know, that conservation as an American philosophy was fathered in the latter part of the 19th century. As developed by Gifford Pinchot and President Theodore Roosevelt in the early part of the 20th century, conservation was both an ideology and an action program, with the dominant concept being wise use.

For the record, let us remind ourselves that the conservation movement began because of an increasing realization that the resources of our abundant continent were not inexhaustible. Decline in forest and fish resources were particularly rapid and noticeable. Pinchot, as one of the few trained foresters in the United States at that period, was in an excellent position to take note of and be deeply distressed by what he saw happening in his special field. Thus it may be said that the work of the Roosevelt conservationists was inspired primarily by the need of preventing waste. We also recognize that because a Federal grand jury, in 1904 and 1905, returned 26 indictments against timber groups, land speculators, locators, and Federal officials, the conservationists were spurred on in part by the frauds and evasions practiced under the existing laws. In summary, the Pinchot-Roosevelt philosophy recognized that notwithstanding our abundant resources, we are not so favored that we can either lock them up on the one hand or either throw them away or despoil them on the other.

Their concept was a positive one of use; conservation to Pinchot and Roosevelt was "wise use." This meant that they favored commercial development of the forest reserves, a system of timber sales, and a timber management plan; grazing of livestock was favored. President Roosevelt in 1901 said:

"The fundamental idea of forestry is the perpetuation of forests by use. Forest protection is not an end in itself; it is a means to increase and sustain the resources of our country and the industries which depend upon them * * *."

Speaking in 1903, Pinchot said:

"The object of our forest policy is not to preserve the forests because they are beautiful—or because they are refuges for the wild creatures of the wilderness—but the making of prosperous homes—every other consideration becomes secondary."

Conservation as "wise use" soon evolved into the idea of multiple use of resources. Resources formed an interrelated unity—it was not possible to control rivers without taking account of the orderly development of other natural resources. Above all, conservation was the wise use of the earth and its resources for the lasting good of people—the foresighted utilization, preservation and/or renewal of forests, waters, lands, and minerals for the greatest good of the greatest number for the longest time.

Some close students of the period find that conservation was not so much a moral crusade or a part of the progressive political revolt against monopoly, not so much the banner of a crusading political march against the interests led by one of the most able, vigorous, and successful President of our century; rather it was a scientific movement, in essence the application of rational planning to promote the efficient development and use of all natural resources.

Now I recognize and am appreciative of the fact that the fabric of American life in the 1960's is quite different from that at the turn of the century. I understand the changes that have taken place and that are taking place in the development of the Nation. From a predominantly agricultural economy we have shifted to a predominantly industrialized nation with most of our population centering around urban and suburban areas. From a nation of 76.2 million people in 1900, we have grown to a nation in excess of 187.6 million, with the prospect of accelerated population expansion highlighted through advances in science. Parenthetically, I note that this year there will be more babies born in the United States than the total population of 3.9 million counted in the first census of 1790.

We are therefore faced with an increased responsibility to satisfy the demands and needs of our people. All of the old needs, such as the homes that Gifford Pinchot spoke of, are still with us, as well as the less tangible things such as areas for mass recreation and primitive and wilderness-type areas to be preserved for man's solitude or for scientific research.

The really big problems that we have facing us, I submit, are: (1) how to develop the principles to guide us and (2) the delineation of procedures to be followed in accomplishing our objective.

The conservation ideas of Pinchot and Roosevelt are as valid today as they were 50 years ago. These ideas are the traditional conservation views of our country. I don't think anyone can or will quarrel with the Pinchot-Roosevelt objective of "the greatest good for the greatest number for the longest time." And I do not think that we can quarrel with the concept of "wise use." The only thing that has happened is that the types of use have increased with the intensified needs of the 1960s.

These concepts of conservation, of course, form the basis of our "multiple-use" philosophy. But this philosophy also recognized that there would be times when there should be limited use or even a single-purpose use of a given area. The U.S. Constitution places in the Congress the responsibility "to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States." In meeting its responsibility and exercising the power placed in it by the Constitution, the Congress has enacted many significant conservation measures. The underlying thread of these enactments has been that all of our public lands shall be administered under the principle of multiple-use, unless the Congress determines otherwise. I need not detail for this knowledgeable group a chronology of these conservation statutes. Let me just remind you for the record that in 1872 Yellowstone National Park was established by Act of Congress to be followed by many individual acts establishing individual parks throughout the country. In 1891, we authorized the establishment of forest preserves even though it was not until 1960 that Congress enacted the Multiple Act to govern the management of national forests.

Throughout the years, Congress met individual situations as they developed. In one after another we find that when called upon to grant delegations of authority to the executive branch, Congress has enunciated the basic principles of the Pinchot-Roosevelt philosophy. The Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, and the Disposal of Materials Act of 1947, as amended in 1955, all enunciate the major objectives of multiple-use to the maximum extent possible.

With the exception of laws specifically authorizing the retention of forest or park areas, all of our public land laws contemplate the ultimate disposition of the unreserved, unappropriated public lands. No general authority has been delegated to the Executive to withdraw lands for permanent retention. So, here too, if basic policy is to be changed, Congress should do so by delineating the areas, if any, to be withdrawn and retained in permanent Federal ownership.

In seeking to satisfy the needs of our expanded population, I think that these basic principles are still valid. I hope and expect the Congress to continue to follow these principles including, when necessary, the reservation of areas for limited or single purpose use. I say that I hope this course will continue because Congress, as the direct representative of the people, is uniquely able to carry out its responsibility to make the decisions necessary in determining that the maximum benefit for the greatest number will result even though all the resources in a given area are not going to be developed until at some future period when the national welfare or security may demand another decision. And, I submit, the Constitution has quite properly empowered Congress alone to make these decisions.

Last October, I asked the President to join with us in a mutual effort to make provision for our current needs. The President's reply of January 17, 1963 recognized the need for a comprehensive review of the public land laws. He designated the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to work with us. I am happy to advise you that we have been engaged in friendly and productive discussions.

I expect that in the not too distant future we will be prepared to place before the American people a program that will permit the enactment of legislation necessary to take care of the immediate needs while, at the same time, a review is undertaken of the patchwork of public land laws to determine the extent to which these laws must be revised in order to meet the demands of the 1960s.

In the meantime let me leave this message with you: Let your representatives in Congress know your views and in our democratic process the will of the people will prevail.

Man of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that the strength and vitality of any community can be measured by the kind of people who first settled it. If this is true, then Gloversville, N.Y., nestled in the foothills of the Adirondack Mountains, is fortunate indeed to have had such a splendid start. The early settlers to Gloversville, who came from all parts of the world, were sturdy, self-reliant men and women who by their upright lives and character, religious beliefs and by the adherence to American ideals, set an example for their children and their children's children. The development of Gloversville followed pretty much the same pattern as the neighboring towns and villages of Fulton County, N.Y. Their beginnings were humble.

Some were destined to grow in size and importance—others to reach only a limited state of development. The history of Fulton County might be said to be the history of the United States, and Gloversville, like every other American community, has had its good times and its bad times. Progress is seldom an unbroken curve upward.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a speech given by Dr. Charles E. Shulman, rabbi of the Riverdale Temple in New York City, at the annual "Man of the Year" program of Gloversville Lodge, B'nai B'rith, when this year's award was given to Jack Schulman, one of Gloversville's leading citizens. I wish to join in the salute to Jack Schulman.

Rabbi Shulman's speech follows:

MAN OF THE YEAR

It is with genuine pleasure that I share the privilege of all of you gathered here tonight to honor Jack Schulman as man of the year in your Gloversville community. Your city bears unique distinction in the life of the Nation and that distinction bears in its train a proud heritage. It derives its name from the art of glovemaking introduced in this area by Sir William Johnson whose home but a short distance from the center of your community is now a tourist attraction. Yours is the only area in the United States devoted almost exclusively to the tanning of leather and the making of gloves and such kindred products as pocketbooks. Your glove workers who settled here came from all parts of the world—Scotland, Germany, Italy, France, Poland, Lithuania, and Russia. They brought with them the heritage of their various ancestries. You have thus an unusual blend of international characteristics as the pattern of your social life.

Jewish people originally settled in this community a long time ago. They were attracted to it because of glovemaking, an art they had learned in the glovemaking centers of Europe—particularly in Poland and Germany. They added considerably to the skills of the glovemaking craft, sharing with their neighbors the pride in the development of the community. Today there are upward of 400 Jewish families in Gloversville and they have left a deep mark upon its commercial, industrial, cultural, and spiritual life. One cannot dwell upon the career of Jack Schulman in your midst and the richly deserved honor you are paying him tonight without touching upon the life of his people here in Gloversville. Jewish life has been an integral part of this city's history as it has been so much a vital element in almost every city in the United States. It has been marked always by honest industry, integrity, civic loyalty, and national pride.

One of the most distinguished names of this community is Lucius N. Littauer whose philanthropies have earned for him a permanent place in national as well as Jewish life in our country. His father was one of the early settlers who started a glove business in your midst and became very successful. He himself was purported to be the first Jewish male child born in Fulton County. Mr. Littauer conceived of his fortune as a means of reinvesting in the development and welfare of his country. He will probably be best remembered for having endowed a chair of Jewish philosophy at Harvard University which brought to the staff of that great seat of learning the brilliant Prof. Harry Austryn Wolfson whose phenomenal mind has for decades stimulated and inspired Greek and Hebrew scholarship in the United States.

The Jewish population of Gloversville embraces the manufacturer, the professional person, the middle man and worker, a cross section of every stratum of society. Many Jewish people who won renown in their enterprises started their careers here. Among them is Samuel Goldwyn who came to your community as a glove worker and later became a glove salesman before embarking on his career in the moving picture industry.

Your guest of honor, Jack Schulman, is typical of the outstanding individuals who have by their life and labors enlarged the horizon of your community and enriched its spirit. He is now a senior member of one of the prominent accounting firms in the State of New York located here and much of the success of his firm can be attributed to his efforts. But Jack Schulman has never been content to rest on his business laurels. He has been in the leading ranks of Gloversville's charitable, civic, religious, and industrial life. He became the mainstay of the Community Chest drive and for years the chairman and guiding spirit of the United Jewish Appeal, that vast enterprise numbering some 5,000 communities in our country of which yours is a vital part, dedicated to the saving of Jewish life abroad and giving it a new opportunity in the reborn State of Israel. He has been in the forefront of every worthwhile endeavor in which you have been involved, and, in the classic phrase, has demonstrated that nothing human could be foreign to him in his active life in this city.

But I think I know a bit more about him that stamps his worth and endows it with greater meaning and character. Jack Schulman is a sensitive, esthetic, and cultured person who loves learning and supports the arts. He has gathered about himself the treasures that stimulate the mind and delight the eye and the ear. His success lies not only in his business undertakings but in all aspects of living. Because of his insatiable curiosity about life and because of his cultural attainments he has given his community intellectual as well as civic leadership. He is that rare individual who combines business pursuits with the development of the mind and heart and spirit. He is the type of person who, living in Gloversville, would, nevertheless extend his range of interests far enough to join my synagogue in New York City as an emblem of his friendship. I therefore feel privileged as his Rabbi, you might say, in sharing with you tonight the joy of honoring him as your man of the year. It is an honor that fits him well and reflects honor in turn on you for planning it. May his tribe increase.

The B'nai B'rith organization under whose auspices this gathering is held has left its deep impress on both the Jewish people and our country, through its many contributions to the cultural, civic, and national causes which have engaged its interest. Here in Gloversville it has served as a strong unifying element among the Jewish people, representing all shades of religious thought and laboring on behalf of al good undertakings. Its large membership in our country has played a significant role in every community in the promotion of civil rights, peace, and social welfare. Its leaders are influential forces in our body politic because of their great capacities. Your guest of honor has been an important member of this organization through which so much community betterment has been achieved throughout the years.

Because we live in tense and difficult times it is important on these occasions that we pause to contemplate our American way of life in order to gain from it such strength as will enable us to renew our faith in our heritage and give to our children the sense of living purpose to be found in our democracy. In the face of incessant attacks levelled against our democratic way of life from without by Communist people in the face of the struggles for civil rights within our borders, in the face of international insecurity and fear caused by the lack of control of atomic weapons and in the face of prejudice and bigotry that seems to retreat so slowly before education, we might well consider our cherished institutions to draw from them the inspiration so necessary for us to continue with confidence and hope toward tomorrow.

Our democracy is today faced with a series of unresolved problem. We can only speak of some of them. One is integration. It is now 100 years since Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation yet the encrusted social layers of social behavior in our land make it difficult, often impossible for the Negro to obtain something better than equal but separate facilities in housing, in employment and education in his environment. We cannot be proud of the memories engendered by such southern cities as Little Rock and Oxford and New Orleans and Birmingham. Nor can we, be proud of memories of violence against integration attempts in such northern cities as Chicago, Detroit, and Englewood, N.J., and New York City. But in spite of the bitterness of such Negro voices as Malcolm X and James Baldwin, despite the frustrations of such Negro leaders as Martin Luther King, our colored population of 18 million knows that its best chances for obtaining its civil rights in the fullest measure eventually are imbedded in our American democratic way of life. When Joe Louis came in American Army uniform to England during the war he was asked how he could fight for a country where his people are discriminated against so cruelly. He answered that there is a lot wrong with America but it wasn't anything that Hitler or Stalin could fix. When Malcolm X in his recent interview in Playboy magazine utters the despairing note of secession from the American white community he indiscriminately links the good element in our society with the bad in calling all white people devils. Mr. Roy Wilkins, the executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (which by the way numbers many distinguished white Americans of all religious beliefs among its founders) expresses what is probably a truer aspect of the large complex American social upheaval of the present when he says that 90 percent of the Negroes do not wish to segregate themselves, but on the contrary, desire integration. Otherwise the sit-ins at lunch counters, the freedom rides, and the efforts toward Negro voter registration in southern communities would not make sense. Mr. Wilkins describes the dominant mood of Negroes as one of impatience. The Negro's attitude may be summed up in a remark made by one of their number that the whole black continent of Africa will be free before a Negro can buy a sandwich at the counter of any American drugstore. Thoughtful Americans are well aware of the slowness in giving our colored people opportunity to live fully as well as equally in our body politic. But they know, too, that substituting one evil for another will not perform the desired miracle. As democracy has consistently shown capacity in dealing with crises in times past—and America has known many crises—so will this vexing problem be solved sooner rather than later within our orderly processes of law.

As with prejudice against the Negro in our national life so with anti-Semitism. We are not free from it. It is practiced against the Jewish people in many forms—even by Negroes. Yet there is one cardinal difference between anti-Semitism in the United States and in the Russian dictatorship. Our Government, in the words of George Washington's famous letter to the Hebrew congregation of Newport, R.I., gives to bigotry no sanction. The Russian Government does give bigotry sanction. The closing of the Jewish houses of worship in Russia is government-ordered and government-inspired. The ban on the Jewish baking of matzos for the Passover and the embargo on shipment of matzos from abroad to Russian Jews comes from the Kremlin. The systematic attempt to destroy Jewish life and culture, the proscription of Jewish schools, the discrimination against Jews in Russian universities, the barring of Jews from government work, the incessant attack on the State of Israel, is the result of official government policy. We in America are disturbed, uncomfortable and inwardly ashamed of our prejudices. They in Russia have incorporated them as part of their philosophy and their educational system. In just such a difference does the shining hope of democracy offer us the possibility of a better tomorrow and the removal of the psychological and social ills that plague us at this time and cause us to be badly misunderstood in the eyes of people abroad.

Democracy stresses the importance of individual responsibility in the promotion of the commonwealth where every person, black and white, Jew and Christian, native born and naturalized can be equal sharers of the national problems. This is not true under a dictatorship where there is no freedom and no voice on the part of the people, where election results can be announced the day before the election takes place. A story which illustrates this lack of individual liberty under the Communist overlords has recently come to us from Europe. It tells about a Jew, Horwitz, who was given permission to travel abroad. He first visited some Communist centers. When he came to Warsaw he sent back a postcard to Russia reading "Greetings from free Warsaw." When he came to Prague he sent back a postcard to Russia reading "Greetings from free Prague." When he came to Budapest he sent back a postcard to Russia reading: "Greetings from free Budapest." And when he came to Paris he sent back a postcard to Russia reading: "Greetings from free Horwitz."

On occasions of this character when we honor an outstanding American citizen for civic achievement and for righteousness in character it is good to rehearse the qualities of the American vision that has given freedom in the fullest sense of the term to majorities and must finish the task by giving that same kind of freedom to minorities within its vast borders. Here we can remember that the seat of government is not in Washington, not in the capitols of the several States of our Union but in the hearts of our people. When the people have caught the sight of the truly great drama that the politics of democracy can display they will be able to correct the abuses before which they ofttimes appear to be helpless. They will be able to respond to the call of the Negro Poet Langston Hughes for a rededication of America to her traditional ideals:

"Let America be America again.
Let it be the dream it used to be.
Let it be the pioneer on the plain
Seeking a home where he himself is free.
Let America be the dream that dreamers dreamed—
Let it be that great strong land of love.
Where never kings connive nor tyrants scheme
That any man be crushed by one above.
O let my land be a land where liberty
Is crowned with no false patriotic wreath.
But opportunity is real, and life is free,
Equality is in the air we breathe.
O let America be America again—
The land that never has been yet—
And yet must be—the land where every man is free."

The Rock Creek Watershed Work Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce into the RECORD the following resolution adopted late last month by the Montgomery County Council reaffirming its support for the Rock Creek watershed work plan, now under consideration by the Public Works Committees of both Houses:

Whereas the citizens of Montgomery County having a vital and continuing interest in the future development of Rock Creek which traverses a large portion of Montgomery County; and

Whereas the development of the Upper Rock Creek watershed in accordance with the watershed work plan approved by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the Montgomery Soil Conservation District, the Montgomery County government and the U.S. Department of Agriculture will provide significant benefits to the citizens of Montgomery County; and

Whereas the Montgomery County Council has approved the assumption of the role of a sponsor by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission and further authorized the Montgomery County government to participate with the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Montgomery Soil Conservation District in the sponsorship of said project; and

Whereas the county council has appropriated funds for the county government's participation in this project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the County Council for Montgomery County, Md., That the county council hereby reaffirms its support for the Rock Creek watershed work plan and requests that the Members of the Congress of the United States from the Free State of Maryland support this project and urge its approval by the Congress in order that this project may proceed; and the clerk to the council is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to the Maryland Members of the Congress.

Attest:

JAMES MICHAEL BAILEY,
Clerk to County Council for Montgomery County, Md.

APRIL 23, 1963.

Seven Myths About Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, a precondition to a valid appraisal of the Alliance for Progress by the American people is an adequate knowledge of Latin America, its problems and accomplishments.

Unfortunately, the tendency has often been to view Latin America as one monolithic and more or less uniform area.

The following article in the May 6, 1963, edition of U.S. News & World Report entitled "Seven Myths About Latin America," attempts to dispel some of the current false conceptions about this vital area:

SEVEN MYTHS ABOUT LATIN AMERICA

(By David B. Richardson)

BUENOS AIRES.—People are finding their attention forced more and more toward happenings in the countries of Latin America.

Yet there is a lot of misunderstanding in the United States about those countries. That, at least, is the impression a North American takes back to his base in South America after 2 months in the United States.

Take a look at seven popular myths about Latin America, statements commonly heard in the United States. Then examine the facts. You find quite a difference.

Myth No. 1. All of Latin America is pretty much alike these days.

Of all generalizations one hears in the United States, this is perhaps the most common—and one of the most misleading.

Latin America differs markedly, not only from region to region, but from country to country, and differences are very important. Take one example: The total per capita output in Bolivia is $65 a year. It is $1,040 in Venezuela.

In some parts of Latin America, life is as primitive today as it was centuries ago. But, in others, industry, merchandising, and housing are as modern as anywhere on earth. São Paulo, Brazil—the biggest industrial center in Latin America—is bigger than Detroit, Pittsburgh, and Cleveland combined.

There are wide swings of the economic pendulum. Some countries have experienced wild inflation—such as Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, and Chile. Others have done quite well economically—Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Dominican Republic, and Venezuela. Some of these nations have had smaller rises in living costs than has the United States.

Private investment in some countries and in some individual industries has been curtailed. But industrial investments in other countries are still sizable. Over all, manufacturing investment has not fallen at all.

Governments, too, vary greatly. In Paraguay and Haiti, old-line dictatorships prevail. Within the year, military men have taken control in Argentina, Peru, and Guatemala. Mexico has only one major party. In Uruguay and Colombia the system is for two parties to share control after each national election.

Then, look at the differences in racial stock: About a third of Brazilians and most Haitians are Negroes. But whites predominate in Costa Rica and Uruguay. And Argentina—with a largely European population—has been called "the whitest nation south of Canada." In Peru, Ecuador and Bolivia, people of Indian blood are in the majority.

It's a mistake to think of all Latin America as being "right next door." Actually, New York is 155 miles farther from Rio de Janeiro than it is from Moscow. Chicago is closer to Istanbul than it is to Buenos Aires. Such distances explain why many South Americans still look to Europe as much as to the United States.

Myth No. 2. There have been more Latin American revolutions than ever lately.

True, if every schoolboy riot, barracks revolt and cabinet shakeup is called a revolution, as the headlines frequently do. But apply the real definition—a complete overthrow of a government or social system—and you find revolutions on the decline.

Over the last 4 years—starting with Fidel Castro in Cuba—there have been seven revolutions in Latin America. There were twice that many in the preceding 4 years—1954–58.

This is not to say that Latin America is becoming a place of peace and tranquillity. But the fact is that more governments have come to power through elections in recent years than ever before in Latin American history.

Myth No. 3. Military men in Latin America are all out to grab power—and, when they do, it is to check the Communists.

As a generalization, neither is correct. Actually, there are few places left where officers still display an overriding ambition for political power. And while they do seize power sometimes in the name of anticommunism, as often as not the real motives are something else.

In Guatemala, recently, officers moved against the danger of communism. But in Argentina the military is more worried about the backers of ousted dictator Juan D. Perón. In still other cases, the fear is simply that weak civilian leadership is creating a power vacuum. Frequently, officers have moved primarily to block what they considered a threat to the institution of the armed forces.

Often one of the first acts of officers after a successful military revolt is to call for new elections with safeguards against extremism.

Myth No. 4. Latin Americans come in two classes—rich landowners and impoverished peasants—and that's the root of all trouble.

Wrong again. The growth of a middle class has been one of the striking developments in Latin America over the past few decades. Streets of Buenos Aires, São Paulo, Santiago, and Mexico City teem with white-collar workers.

According to one recent survey, the middle class now accounts for 45 percent of the population of Argentina, 30 percent in Chile and Uruguay, 15 percent in Brazil and Mexico.

Former peasants by the millions have been joining a growing industrial force for the factories springing up in many parts of the area. Together, white-collar and blue-collar classes are having an important say in several countries.

At the same time, the rich landowners are losing much of their power. This process of rapid change is behind much of Latin America's turmoil.

Myth No. 5. Communists dominate all student movements in Latin America.

It is true that there are Red-dominated movements in university after university. But there are also anti-Communist movements. What's more, there are signs that the appeal of communism among students is on the wane.

In several student elections at important universities recently, moderates gained and pro-Red factions lost.

Within the year, student movements opposed to Castro and communism have won elections at the Universities of Mexico, Buenos Aires, Caracas, Honduras, and the technical institute of Chile—all places where Communist-dominated movements held sway in the past.

Myth No. 6. Get rid of Castro, and the Communist danger will end in Latin America.

Not likely. Experts on Latin America say that freeing Cuba would not wipe out the many social and economic problems that tend to make the rest of Latin America a fertile feeding ground for communism. Nor would it cripple Communist subversive activities beyond the point where they could recover.

True, the loss of Castro's Cuba would deprive Russia and Red China of a valuable advance base for troublemaking in the Americas. But the Reds have alternative means through which they can operate. While they would lose the use of the Cuban Embassies in five Latin-American countries as centers for subversion, Russia has diplomatic missions in four countries that could carry on. If Havana radio were stilled, Moscow and Peiping broadcasts would continue to come in loud and clear.

The most that many experts will say is that the liberation of Cuba would remove the direct and immediate threat of Communism in the Caribbean area and would disrupt Red activities throughout Latin America, at least temporarily. But it would not end the danger.

Myth No. 7. It is now "1 minute to midnight" in Latin America.

This slogan, coined by officials of the Alliance for Progress and widely echoed in the United States, hardly squares with reality.

The fact is that only two or three Latin-American countries are in such dire straits that U.S. aid alone keeps them from collapse. And, even in those countries, it is open to serious question whether communism would follow collapse automatically.

This is not to downgrade the problems of Latin America, which are staggering, or the overall Communist threat, which is real. But it is to say that the job of bringing broad prosperity to the area is bound to be a long, slow one—with problems, country by country, often as different as night and day.

Mr. Khrushchev on Modern Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the May issue of Current magazine contains a reprint from a British monthly, Encounter, of a stenographic account of Soviet Premier Khrushchev's confrontation with modern art. The reaction of the Communist mind to innovation and experimentation is well displayed in this article, "20th Century Puritanism in Practice," and I included it in the Record at this point:

Twentieth Century Puritanism in Practice

Khrushchev (pausing in front of a picture by a Russian artist named Falk): "I would say that this is just a mess. It's hard to understand what this still-life is supposed to represent. I will probably be told that I have not reached the point where I can understand such works—the usual argument of our opponents in culture. Dmitri Stepanovich Polyansky told me a couple of days ago that when his daughter got married, she was given a picture of what was supposed to be a lemon. It consisted of some messy yellow lines which looked, if you will excuse me, as though some child had done his business on the canvas when his mother was away and then spread it around with his hands."

(Then, further along): "I don't like jazz. When I hear jazz, it's as if I had gas on the stomach. I used to think it was static when I heard it on the radio. I like music a lot and often listen to it on the radio. I even went so far as to carry a little Japanese radio around in my pocket. They make them very well there * * *.

"Or take these new dances which are so fashionable now. Some of them are completely improper. You wiggle a certain section of the anatomy, if you'll pardon the expression. It's indecent. As Kogan once said to me when she was looking at a foxtrot, 'I've been married 20 years and never knew that this kind of activity is called the foxtrot' * * *.

"People tell me that I am behind the times and don't realize it, that our contemporary artists will be appreciated in 100 years. Well, I don't know what will happen in 100 years, but now we have to adopt a definite policy in art, emphasizing it in the press and encouraging it materially. We won't spare a kopeck of government money for any artistic daubing * * *.

"As long as I am President of the Council of Ministers, we are going to support a genuine art. We aren't going to give a kopeck for pictures painted by jackasses. History can be our judge. For the time being history has put us at the head of this state, and we have to answer for everything that goes on in it. Therefore we are going to maintain a strict policy in art. I could mention that when I was in England I reached an understanding with Eden. He showed me a picture by a contemporary abstractionist and asked me how I liked it. I said I didn't understand it. He said he didn't understand it either, and asked me what I thought of Picasso. I said I didn't understand Picasso, and Eden said he couldn't understand Picasso either."

V. A. Serou (pointing to "The Raftsmen," by Andronov and "The Geologists," by Nikonov): "Some connoisseurs claim that these pictures are programmatic. We dispute that."

Khrushchev: "You are entirely correct." (Then, in front of "The Geologist"): "He can paint and sell these if he wants, but we don't need them. We are going to take these blotches with us into communism, are we? If Government funds have been paid for this picture, the person who authorized it will have the sum deducted from his salary. Write out a certificate that this picture has not been acquired by the Government. * * *

"But who ordered it? and why? This painting shouldn't have been hung in the exhibition. Pictures should arouse us to perform great deeds. They should inspire a person. But what kind of picture is this? One jackass is riding on another * * *.

Khrushchev, after a quick look at some formalist paintings: "What is this anyway? You think we old fellows don't understand you. And we think we are just wasting money on you. Are you pederasts or normal people? I'll be perfectly straightforward with you; we won't spend a kopeck on your art. Just give me a list of those of you who want to go abroad, to the so-called free world. We'll give you foreign passports tomorrow, and you can get out. Your prospects here are nil. What is hung here is simply anti-Soviet. It's amoral. Art should ennoble the individual and arouse him to action. And what have you set out here? Who painted this picture? I want to talk to him. What's the good of a picture like this? To cover urinals with?" (The painter, Zheltoxsky, comes forward.)

Khrushchev: "You're a nice looking lad, but how could you paint something like this? We should take down your pants and set you down in a clump of nettles until you understand your mistakes. You should be ashamed. Are you a pederast or a normal man? Do you want to go abroad? Go on, then; we'll take you free as far as the border. Live out there in the free world. Study in the school of capitalism, and then you'll know what's what. But we aren't going to spend a kopeck on this dog * * *. We have the right to send you out to cut trees until you've paid back the money the state has spent on you. The people and Government have taken a lot of trouble with you, and you pay them back with this * * *. They say you like to associate with foreigners. A lot of them are our enemies, don't forget."

Khrushchev, in front of a painting by Gribkov: "What's this?"

Gribkov: "It's the year 1917."

Khrushchev: "Phooey. How much the state has spent on you, and this is how you repay it. My opinion is that you can all go to hell abroad. This is an art for donkeys * * *.

"Comrade Ilichev, I am even more upset by the way your section is doing its work. And how about the Ministry of Culture? Do you accept this? Are you afraid to criticize?

"They say that some of our writers praise these pictures and buy them. That's because our honoraria are high. Our writers are too prosperous and have money to throw away."

Belyutin, one of the ideologists of the formalists, comes up.

Khrushchev: "Who are you? Who are your parents?" Belyutin answers.

Khrushchev: "Do you want to go abroad? Who supports you?"

Belyutin: "I'm a teacher."

Khrushchev: "How can such a person teach? People like him should be cleared out of the teaching profession. They shouldn't be allowed to teach in the universities. Go abroad if you want; and if you don't want to, we'll send you anyway. I can't even talk about this without getting angry. I'm a patriot."

(In front of a painting by Shorts): "Why aren't you ashamed of this mess? Who are your parents?"

Shorts gives information about his parents, mentioning that his mother is dead.

Khrushchev: "It's a pity, of course, that your mother is dead, but maybe it's lucky for her that she can't see how her son is spending his time. What master are you serving anyway? Our paths are different. You've either got to get out or paint differently. As you are, there's no future for you on our soil."

One of the bystanders says, "These are graphic artists. They do these pictures in their spare time to improve their skill" (general laughter).

Khrushchev: "I remember the Ukrainian satirist, Ostap Vishnya. In one article he gives the following conversation: 'Do you believe in God?' and the answer, 'At work I don't, and at home I do.' That's what these scratchings of yours are like * * *.

"I used to be on friendly terms with the sculptor, Merkuryev. He was a great man, a real man. Once, in the Dresden Gallery, he pointed to some paintings of the Dutch masters and told me that our artists maintain that to appreciate a painting you have to stand back from it. The Dutch masters painted differently. You can look at their pictures through a magnifying glass and still admire them. But your paintings just give a person constipation, if you'll excuse the expression. They don't arouse any other feelings at all."

(Turning to Zhutovsky): "Do you want to help us build communism? No, what you want is for people to consider you a misunderstood genius—a painter whom the future will appreciate. You are a hypocrite."

(In front of Zhutovsky's self-portrait): "Externally there is no resemblance. The picture is unnatural. But there is certainly a spiritual resemblance between the portrait and the original. You are stealing from society. You are a parasite. We have to organize our society so that it will be clear who is useful and who is useless. What right do you have to live in an apartment built by genuine people, one made of real materials?"

Zhutovsky: "But these are just experiments. They help us develop."

Khrushchev: "Judging by these experiments, I am entitled to think that you are pederasts, and for that you can get 10 years. You've gone out of your minds, and now you want to deflect us from the proper course. No, you won't get away with it * * *.

"Gentlemen, we are declaring war on you." ("Khrushchev on Modern Art," Encounter, April 1963)

Krebiozen Should Be Tested, Not Banned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the Food and Drug Administration is acting capriciously in their decision to allow Krebiozen to be banned when the new drug act goes into effect on June 7. This drug—which its discoverers and users claim can control cancer—has not been objectively tested by the National Cancer Institute; it has been rejected solely on the advice of the American Medical Association.

I do not know whether or not Krebiozen can cure or control cancer, but fairness demands that it be tested by a disinterested organization. If we are going to allow the AMA to make these decisions then we might just as well save the taxpayer a lot of money and abolish the Food and Drug Administration, the National Institutes of Health, and the National Cancer Institute.

The following article by Bob Farrell appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle on May 11, 1963, and demonstrates the interest this controversy has engendered:

KREBIOZEN'S FIGHT SO OTHERS MIGHT LIVE

(By Bob Farrell)

I never wrote a column that produced as many letters as the one I did on the Krebiozen drug that is about to be banned on June 7.

When you realize that one out of every six people die from cancer, you can easily understand why Krebiozen is a drug that claims and has proven that it can control cancer. All of the phone calls and letters began the same way, "My mother is dying from cancer."

As we know, once you are affected with this dread disease if surgery can't cure it or arrest it, or if radium therapy can't help, then you are doomed.

Many doctors know about Krebiozen. A few thousands have used it to produce 4,500 documented clinical histories. Many claims have been made on cures. Others have been helped to be able to go back to work and to living.

Most doctors will haev no part of Krebiozen. They state that the American Cancer Society and the American Medical Association have advised them against using it. That it is in fact unproven and dangerous.

I cannot recommend its use. I have no right to say anything about Krebiozen, excepting that I was a witness to hearing and seeing people whose clinical histories at some of the very best medical institutes testify that they had cancer that was inoperable and incurable. That their families thought there was nothing else to do but to wait and watch and see them die. That they would be made as comfortable as possible, and pain killers would help.

To date I have spoken to many doctors. Few go along with the Krebiozen treatment. They have been brainwashed by the American Medical Association's findings. They quote it and are afraid to do anything about it. They haven't and won't fight it. However there have always been brave men and these are putting up a valiant fight.

An important man, the head of a large hospital here in Brooklyn, suggested I investigate a story about the AMA when the drug was first discovered by Dr. Durovic in 1947 and in 1953 when with Dr. Ivy they first presented it to the AMA for investigation. I didn't have to investigate it because Herbert Bailey, the author of the book "A Matter of Life and Death," made the following statement.

"In the case of Krebiozen there is more than professional jealousy involved. There was a definite conspiracy on the part of high officials of the AMA, who perceiving the value of Krebiozen in the treatment of cancer, attempted to gain control of the substance, and when failing in their efforts, put Krebiozen on the blacklist by means of falsified articles in the Journal of the AMA."

It is not my purpose to get involved in this controversy. Who did what to whom is none of my business. What is my business and your business is—does this drug work? Does this drug do what Dr. Durovic and Dr. Ivy says it does? If that is true then the people of this country and the whole world ought to know about it. Now and at once.

On June 7 this drug is being banned from use. Those who are now using it to control their malignancies and who are living because of Krebiozen will have to either break the law to get it or they will have to die because of the lack of it.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois, PAUL H. DOUGLAS, has interested himself in this issue. He has placed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech concerning Krebiozen.

He said, "I believe that the National Institutes of Health has become bureaucratic. because of the great amount of money that has been poured into it and has fallen into the control largely of the pundits of the American Medical Association and is ruled by the prejudices of organized medicine.

"We know that Dr. Semmelweis was virtually driven out of medicine. We know that Lord Lister was nearly driven out of medicine. The great German, Dr. Robert Koch, was likewise nearly driven out of medicine. The great Jenner was persecuted and only rose over many objections to become a leader in the medical profession."

Senator DOUGLAS also pointed out in this speech, part of which I have reported, on the following expenditures of the National Institute of Health (I am just listing a few): the health and social characteristics of the Pima Indians, $22,504; role of behavior of frontol monkeys, $15,998; studies of the disease of the giant snail, $20,092; investigation and information contained in echoes, $13,387.

I'll refrain from any comment.

Senator DOUGLAS said "I ask unanimous consent to have printed into the RECORD at this point a table entitled 'Improvement objective and subjective in 35 tumor types treated with Krebiozen,' a letter written by Dr. Ivy and his associates (ed. note—Dr. Andrew Ivy is considered one of the most eminent scientists of our time) to Dr. Kenneth M. Endicott of the National Cancer Institute, Public Health Service, a summary entitled 'The Hypothesis and Theory on which the production and study of Krebiozen is based.' "

The Senator concluded his speech with "I hope that this will be carefully studied."

Don't you agree that we, as Americans whose lives are at stake in this issue, should have Senator DOUGLAS's suggestion carried out. Isn't that what the discoverers and medical men for Krebiozen want.

Let's forget about any quarrels of the past. Let's look forward to the future. The American people, I repeat, one out of six will die from cancer, have the right to know,

The world is looking for a drug that will control cancer and fight it. If Dr. Durovic and Dr. Ivy have that drug it should be given the study it rightfully deserves. The lives of these dedicated men should not be mistreated. They are not quacks. They are men of science who may have made a serious breakthrough. They are outstanding men with over 4,000 clinical findings made by over 3,000 doctors. A proper evaluation of these findings must be made. Little did I ever dream that the printed paper that was once handed to me years ago, outside the Waldorf-Astoria one night when the AMA was being picketed and at which I glanced at for a brief moment, before I discarded it, would become a cause that I am now fighting for.

The Story Behind the Decline of the Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, if we continue the spending programs and fiscal irresponsibility of the Kennedy administration long enough we will solve the question of the purchasing power of the dollar, it will be worthless.

The following table is an analysis by our honored colleague from the other body, Senator HARRY BYRD, of why the value of the dollar declines, as it appeared in the Washington World:

WHY VALUE OF DOLLAR DECLINES

Here's BYRD's picture of the U.S. fiscal situation:

Foreign aid expenditures:

Fiscal year:	*Billion*
1961	$3.6
1962	3.9

Balance-of-payments deficits:	*Billion*
1960	$3.9
1961	2.5
1962	+2

The Dollar Decline. Worth 46.7 cents in October 1960, worth 46.3 cents in October 1961, worth 45.7 cents in October 1962 (based on 1939 index).

Government by Indirection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a recent column by Henry Gemmill in the Wall Street Journal of April 15 suggests that a trend is taking place away from the traditional principle of the rule of law to a rule of government by indirection, ambiguity or even sleight-of-hand.

According to Mr. Gemmill, recent Executive decisions are bypassing not only the law, but also Congress. The philosophy and practice of Presidential power are being determined by the President himself with little regard to legal limitations and congressional authority.

This increasing Executive power, however, rarely stirs popular protest. Instead, charges are made that an inefficient and uncooperative Congress constitutes an almost insurmountable roadblock to the enactment of the Presidential program.

Important issues are discussed in this article and under unanimous consent I include Mr. Gemmill's column from the April 15 issue of the Wall Street Journal in the RECORD at this point:

GOVERNMENT BY INDIRECTION—THE RULE OF LAW IS OF DIMINISHING CONSEQUENCE

(By Henry Gemmill)

WASHINGTON.—A good deal gets printed about President Kennedy being thwarted by Congress, and there is some truth to it, but it is not a great truth.

In the first place, he does get legislation—most of all, appropriations of staggering size. Look at the free-spending "temporary" public works bill, moving through Congress over all obstacles at a time when economy was thought to be somewhat in fashion.

More importantly, any realist must observe that government by rule of law is of diminishing consequence in this Republic. Even though the number of laws on the books increases, the rising power of the Presidency depends less and less upon them. The modern trend is to government by indirection, government by ambiguity, one might almost say government by sleight-of-hand. To the extent that we now have this type of government, law may be irrelevant, or vague legislative sanction is sufficient, or the old body of law may be used for new purposes remote from original legislative intent; in any case no detailed legislation is needed.

AN OMINOUS THREAT

A fresh sample of the technique was exhibited at week's end after a steel company decided to try initiating a price rise. As in similar circumstances a year earlier, the Government could cite no law making a price rise illegal; it did not wish Congress to pass any such law; it was even standing on a proclaimed doctrine that prices should be set in the market. Yet, in fact, it does intend to practice sporadic price control.

So a White House source lets a mood of anger against the price increase become publicly, though unofficially, apparent.

The President delays a flight to Florida—and this becomes not merely a token of his concern but a threat of impending action. A threat the more ominous to steel executives pondering their own pricing decisions because it is unvoiced, nameless.

One Senator—KEFAUVER of Tennessee—holds a press conference, creating once again the optical illusion of legislative will.

These few preliminary moves, lacking in drama, are enough to evoke steel industry memories of the 1962 storm, when the President turned upon them not only his personal vitriol but the power of old antitrust and military procurement laws bent to purposes hardly envisioned by Congress.

And then the President does speak out, indicating that on this occasion "selected" steel price increases could be acceptable, while insisting a "general" rise will not. A rather foggy doctrine to interpret, perhaps, but one which conveys the impression of a President in the saddle, still holding the reins. Executive authority is asserted just as much in bestowing the privilege of a limited price rise as in forbidding a greater one.

For a pragmatic President, this extralegal approach offers the advantage of extreme flexibility. If wage-price stabilization had been written into law, it would have had to be fairly consistently applied. Government by indirection and ambiguity has permitted winking at many a price hike for many a product other than steel. It has permitted many a wage boost beyond the Federal "guideposts"—in some cases with active Government encouragement.

The settlement of the east coast dock strike provided not long ago an example of how little Presidential power rests upon law. A literal reading of the Taft-Hartley Act would have suggested that after exhausting the 80-day cooling-off of the strike, Mr. Kennedy should have thrown this strike problem to Congress. Had he done so, he would very likely have obtained legislation—law which might well have sustained the wage stability theoretically desired on the docks, but one objectionable to the unions.

Instead, the President freewheeled, merely choosing one highly atypical member of Congress, Senator MORSE, to lead a Federal intervention—settled the dispute on terms raising labor costs so sharply that a rise in shipping prices was assured.

The philosophy and practice of such Presidential power extends far beyond wage-price policy. Mr. Kennedy's most notable action in behalf of Negroes, for instance, may not have been the pressing of civil rights legislation but the issuing of an Executive racial antibias order which alters the application of old law which had nothing to do with civil rights—changing the nature of the vast housing and home-finance program. There have been other less-noticed maneuvers.

Many a prospective rail and airline merger may be affected by just one of these. This is not a field where law was lacking; transport mergers have long been thoroughly governed by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board. But without benefit of new legislation a Presidential Committee has superimposed sweeping guidelines. And these could turn upside down the traditional procedures, which have been based on two principles: It is up to individual companies to decide for themselves the form of merger proposals. It is up to the regulatory agencies, in a judicial capacity quite independent of the executive branch, to rule upon proposals, case by case.

Naturally enough, the Presidential Committee was explicit in declaring that a guideline must be based not merely on statutory requirements but should leap on to enforce evolving concepts of such matters as protection of labor.

It would be a mistake to think that Government by indirection is all part and parcel of liberalism, and thus automatically offensive to business. It is a technique which, like legislation, can be aimed at any purpose—and, in fact, it is now often used for conservative ends, bringing cheer to industry.

What is it, for instance, which protects U.S. factories from the sharpest edge of foreign competition, imports from Japan? Not tariff legislation, certainly, but voluntary restrictions which the Japanese have themselves imposed on many of their key exports. And these are voluntary in precisely the same sense as the past year's price freeze on the American steel industry.

CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Presidential power which skims in scant contact with law may be something different from what the Founding Fathers had in mind, but rarely does it stir popular outcry. In part this may be because it is often less visible than law; in part because it can so easily twist whenever its course seems heading toward unpopularity; in part because a good President is now equated with a "strong" one—and this is "strength."

Or perhaps the trend just seems inevitable. The President must operate a vast foreign intelligence network—so never mind the fact that Congress, which is constitutionally supposed to appropriate all moneys, lacks the faintest notion of how much the Central Intelligence Agency is spending for what. The President must hold back Communist aggression—so never mind that Congress, which is supposed to declare all wars, has not declared any in South Vietnam.

Depending upon the viewer, this picture may seem horrifying; it may seem exhilarating; it may seem an odd patchwork of necessity, inspiration and folly. But it is hardly the portrait of a President rendered impotent by Congress.

The Plan To Use Summer Interns as Political Patronage Positions by the Kennedy Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, several of us in this body, both Republican and Democrat, have for several years tried to promote the custom of using summer interns in congressional offices. I have personally employed interns from St. Lawrence, Syracuse, Colgate, and George Washington Universities, and I have introduced H.R. 2631 which would create a student summer intern position in the office of each Member of Congress.

To those of us who have worked for these intern programs it was most dismaying, if not unexpected, to learn earlier this year that the Kennedy administration sought to control the selection of summer interns in the executive branch, and treat this program, not as a nonpartisan opportunity to stimulate intelligent students toward public-service careers, but as a blatant method of patronage for the Democratic Party.

Under permission granted to me of April 24, I include an article from the May 10 newsletter of Advance magazine, "Advance Notice" which comments on this subject. I heartily commend my colleague Representative WIDNALL and the American Political Science Association for their suggested reforms of the intern program.

The article follows:

EDUCATION OR INDOCTRINATION—KENNEDY TARGET: SUMMER INTERNS

Every summer thousands of college and graduate students descend upon Washington to work in various governmental departments and agencies and for Congressmen on Capitol Hill. Many of these may decide on careers of public service as a result of their summer's experience.

It is hardly surprising that the propaganda corps of the Kennedy administration has its eye on these students. If last summer is any guide, the Kennedys will be seeking not only to encourage the students' entry into Government, but on the Democratic side of the fence.

The first evidence that the Kennedy administration was willing to exploit the students for political ends came last summer. All young people working in the Federal Government, and some who weren't, were invited to a series of White House seminars (i.e., lectures) to give them a broader view of Government operations. It developed that the breadth of views the administration was presenting ran all the way from Senate Democratic Leader MANSFIELD to House Democratic Leader MCCORMACK. The nonpartisan National Center for Education in Politics reported the meetings had definite "political overtones."

Ironically, it never occurred to the White House to invite a Republican leader, for his presence might inject a political note. The White House, however, did not think the presence of Lawrence O'Brien, chief patronage assistant to the President, injected any politics into the seminars.

It also happened that students working for the Republican National Committee were denied admission to the seminars (too political), but that their roommates and friends at Democratic headquarters and at the AFL–CIO were allowed to attend.

Satisfied with the impression it had made with the seminars for student jobholders, the administration this winter determined to go a step further and help decide on a political basis who would get the jobs in the first place. Every student who applied for a job with the Federal Government in Washington was to be given clearance by a special department in the President's office. Although the maneuver was apparently contrary to civil service regulations, the system's chairman, John W. Macy, at first could see nothing amiss in the White House plans, even though he had not been properly consulted about them.

By spring vacation students were being told that whatever their qualifications for the posts they sought, the White House would have to okay them, and there was great confusion as to how and when this would be done. Career officeholders began to complain in private that political commissars from the White House were planning to decide just which student got what job, and Republican spokesmen such as Representative WILLIAM WIDNALL, of New Jersey, Senator MILWARD SIMPSON, of Wyoming and National Chairman WILLIAM E. MILLER attacked this latest White House usurpation.

When the President's office sent out a form—for coordinating purposes—asking among other things by whom the student job applicant was recommended, and when the young Democrats sent a newsletter to their members outlining just how to pull the proper strings to land a summer job, Civil Service Commission Chairman Macy courageously decided to crack down, politely but firmly. All temporary hiring was frozen until the respective departments and agencies could demonstrate that politics, and especially White House interference, would not determine hiring policy.

It was only last week that all the departments were able to meet these requirements. The delays, uncertainty, and suspicion caused by the White House's abortive usurpation will mean that many fewer jobs will be opened to students this year and countless numbers needlessly will have suffered the loss of a rare and valuable experience. In the future, fortunately, all summer job applications will be handled through the Civil Service Commission.

In fairness to the White House, however, it must be said its summer seminar program directors still claim they had no malicious intent in keeping Republicans out of the program last year or in trying to give clearance on Government summer jobs this year.

Republicans would be willing to concede the administration's sincerity—or at least stop challenging it—if the White House currently were showing greater interest in several reforms of the program suggested by Representative WILLIAM WIDNALL and the American Political Science Association (APSA). At this writing, however, the White House is ignoring these suggestions. Some of the proposed reforms are:

1. The White House should see that the interns of Republicans as well as Democratic Congressmen, and the student employees of both national committees are invited to participate in the summer seminars.

2. Republican as well as Democratic spokesmen should be asked to address the summer seminars on the functioning of the Federal Government.

3. In light of past abuses, the White House should either appoint a bipartisan committee to plan the seminars or turn the program over to a nonpartisan organization such as APSA or the Civil Service Commission.

Rather than injecting politics into the program, these suggestions, if implemented, would remove the taint of partisanship that now exists. If the White House wants to teach good citizenship to the young leaders of tomorrow, it will cooperate with Republicans and good-government organizations like the Civil Service Commission and the APSA to guarantee a honest presentation of our national government. If their objective is political indoctrination of the next generation, Republican and nonpartisan spokesmen should actively counter the propaganda this summer, and perhaps even run some seminars of their own.

Pioneer Norwegian Institution Observes 80th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call the attention of the distinguished Members of this House to the 80th anniversary of the Norwegian Lutheran Deaconesses' Home and Hospital. This hospital has served the community long and well. On behalf of the people of my district, I would like to express public appreciation for the fine work of the doctors, nurses, and professional people who staff the Norwegian Hospital. I am certain, Mr. Speaker, each Member of the House will find the history of this fine institution interesting to read and I am pleased to include in the RECORD the following statement prepared for the anniversary ceremony and including a short account of the significant program:

PIONEER NORWEGIAN INSTITUTION OBSERVES 80TH ANNIVERSARY

The Norwegian Lutheran Deaconesses' Home and Hospital, the oldest institution of its kind among Norwegian Lutherans in America, observed its 80th anniversary on April 19, 1963. Organized by Norwegian immigrants under the leadership of the then local seamen's pastor, Rev. Karsten Hansteen and Rev. Mortensen. It first functioned under the name of the Norwegian Relief Society for the purpose of ministering to Norwegian seamen hospitalized in the port of New York, and Norwegian residents.

The social and economic status in those early days differed widely from our present-day experience. At that time, there was no workmen's compensation, widow's pension, social security, Blue Cross, or other community resources to come to the aid of the aged, the sick, and the needy. Something had to be done. However, the sponsoring committee realized that, in order to do effective work, a full-time worker would have to be secured and this led to the calling of Sister Elizabeth Fedde, a deaconess attached to the Deaconess Motherhouse in Oslo, Norway. In the letter of call sent by the committee, they issued this challenge: "Can you, will you, dare you come to our help?" Sister Elizabeth could, would, and dared come, and on April 9, 1883, she stepped ashore in New York ready to go to work. The organizing committee met to make final arrangements for her work on April 19, 1883, and the institution officially dates its beginning from that date.

This was also the beginning of the deaconess work within the Norwegian Lutheran Church in this country. Sister Elizabeth soon realized that the challenge was too great for one person to cope with. Also, to do effective work she would have to have a place temporarily to care for the sick that came to her door. Fortunately, other young women came to her aid by enlisting in the Diaconate and within a short time a small house had been rented to care for the modest number of nine patients. But here again, the committee faced a challenge. The accommodations were already too small for the number of persons applying for admission and this led them to take the necessary steps to acquire property and erect the first hospital in the Bay Ridge section of Brooklyn.

By now the committee had ventured into a community effort as well as local work within the Norwegian group as such, and this again led to the necessity of a change of name. Consequently, the name Norwegian Relief Society was changed to the Norwegian Lutheran Deaconesses' Home and Hospital. About this time, the committee also voiced its feeling of loyalty to America in the following noble statement:

"Said name signifies to us the duty which we, as Norwegians and as Lutherans, owe to the community and the country in which we live. If we share the blessings of our adopted land, it is certainly also our duty to help carry its burdens and to shrink from no responsibility resting upon us."

This was written 69 years ago and the institution has consistently endeavored to live up to this declaration. Many years later a group of Lutherans of German background organized the Lutheran Hospital of Manhattan and, in 1956, this institution was merged with the Norwegian Lutheran Deaconesses' Home and Hospital under the name of the Lutheran Medical Center.

The growth of the institution can best be judged by the increase in the number of beds and ancillary services from 9 beds in 1885 to about 300 beds in 1963. Also to the various ancillary services such as Camp Norge (fresh air camp for children), Medical Records Librarian School, School of Nursing, internship program, residency training in all major specialties, mental health service, chaplaincy training program, community clinics, emergency service, diaconate, and industrial medical program.

Back of this work is a long line of faithful and devoted men and women, lay and professional. It has never been a moneyed institution, but rich in the number of friends among the people it has served all these years.

The 80th anniversary was observed by a gathering in the Deaconess Motherhouse on April 19, 1963. Mr. Alfred Jacobsen, Jr., president of the board of trustees, bade the audience welcome and remarked upon the historic occasion which brought them together, after which there was a memorial service held in the little chapel of the Sisters' residence. At this service, proper recognition was made of the founders of the institution, especially Sister Elizabeth and Mrs. Anna Bors, wife of the Norwegian Consul General, without whose financial help it is doubtful whether the work would have succeeded. Other outstanding men and women were mentioned, many of whom had served as members of the board of trustees, as well as having membership in the hospital association, deconesses who had played a prominent part down through the years, doctors—many of whom had atained an enviable position in the medical field, nurses, and other personnel who had served long and faithfully—all of whom have contributed to the work and growth of the institution. Also remembered were the many faithful women who shared in the work through membership in the various auxiliary organizations. It is safe to say that were it not for their contribution in time and means, the work would not have prospered as has been the case. Of them all it may be said, "They have not lived in vain who humbly did their best and in the Master's name served where life's duty called. They labor not in vain who, unknown to the world, bend down to help a brother in distress. They labor not in vain who patiently toil on, not asking for the world's acclaim, but that some soul be won for Him who gave His life to save us all."

The chapel service was conducted by Rev. Alvin C. Grieb, interim chaplain.

Liberals Hold the People in Contempt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the so-called champions of the people—the liberals—actually hold the people in contempt. The Kennedy administration, while making a great public display of its concern for the people, at the same time in the statements and actions of its officials show their mistrust of the people.

In an editorial from the Wall Street Journal, which I include as a part of this statement, we find one of the foremost liberal leaders complaining about public ignorance.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in the people of the United States, believe in their integrity, their intelligence, in their ability to govern themselves better than any bureaucrat. I commend the editorial as must reading for those who would know how impatient the liberals are with people.

The editorial follows:

AN IMPATIENCE WITH PEOPLE

It's a little disconcerting how dogmatically Government officials sometimes assert their positions, while in effect charging any critic with ignorance.

Defense spending, for one example, is climbing steeply; the rise is nearly $10 billion in the brief space from fiscal 1961 through 1964, for which year it is projected at a fairly staggering total of $55.4 billion. Yet President Kennedy flatly declares the defense budget is very hard, and a cut of even $1 billion would be a serious mistake.

Secretary McNamara, it is argued, had already cut $13 billion from the requests of the military services before the defense figures went into the total budget. This is presented as practically the epitome of thrift, when in fact all Defense Secretaries have to slash service requests for the simple reason that the services always ask for everything possible in the expectation of being cut back.

It is not necessarily stupid to suggest that $55.4 billion is hardly a sacred and untouchable figure just because officials say it is. Or even, as some experts contend, that the Nation's defenses might be in better shape if the Pentagon were given less money and had to be more careful with what it had.

The moon shot is a similar case. The view of its official sponsors is that the United States must complete this project no matter what the cost. But the wisdom of the undertaking is increasingly questioned elsewhere.

As Mr. Gemmill summed it up recently on this page: "The benefits of a moon landing are not identifiable as economic, say the economists; not military, say top defense officials; not really scientific, say some scientists." Certainly it verges on intellectual arrogance to insist, in the face of such criticism, that the lunar effort is worth any price.

Then there is the Government's fiscal theory, that heavy planned budget deficits, plus rapidly rising spending, plus tax cuts pave the way to solid economic growth. It is a theory at best, and a highly questionable one since it does not conform to the experience of individuals, businesses, other levels of government or, indeed, the uphappy flings many nations have had with inflation.

Yet this dubious theory is offered as gospel. So much so that officials profess amazement that a great many people just can't seem to grasp its logic.

In still another connection, Senator FULBRIGHT was also complaining about public ignorance the other day. He said opposition to foreign aid, among other things, is indicative of a lack of public understanding. The truth is more the other way around; those in Congress and elsewhere who have seriously studied the program are so familiar with its shortcomings they believe it can and should be substantially reduced and tightened up.

President Kennedy added a foreign aid footnote in vigorously supporting, at his press conference, a much-criticized proposal. This is the question of U.S. assistance for a proposed new steel mill in India.

The criticism is on several grounds. One is the economic feasibility of the mill. Another is the belief that the U.S. Government should not be in the business of subsidizing state-owned enterprises that compete with private ones. Even our own foreign aid officials had not decided to go ahead with it.

All this Mr. Kennedy brushed aside. India needs the mill, he said without qualification; therefore we should help.

Now it is one thing for officials to plead, and plead forcefully, for the things they want or believe in. What is not quite so palatable is this fairly frequent and impatient assertion of them as unquestionable tenets, with the impression that anyone who disagrees doesn't know what he's talking about. People aren't really all that dumb.

Vatican Says It Remains Foe of Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, since Pope John the 23d issued the encyclical, "Pacem in Terris," a great deal of public controversy and discussion has developed concerning the precise principles set forth in that historic document.

One point of the controversy revolves around claims in some quarters that Pope John advocates coexistence with communism and acceptance of a status quo with the evils of tyranny. Because the promotion of this misunderstanding was getting out of hand, the Vatican took steps to clarify the stand of the Roman Catholic Church on communism. It should be clear to all that the Roman Catholic Church continues to oppose communism as an ideology harmful to mankind. The following article from the Washington Post of May 8 bears on that point:

VATICAN SAYS IT REMAINS FOE OF REDS

VATICAN CITY, May 7.—Two Vatican organs—the radio and the daily newspaper—today reemphasized the Roman Catholic Church's opposition to communism in the wake of election gains by Italy's Communist Party.

The gains had been attributed in part by some circles to recent contacts between the Vatican and the Kremlin.

L'Osservatore Romano said the church has not changed its position toward communism and no conciliation is possible "because truth cannot make pacts with error."

The Vatican daily took issue with an editorial today in the Rome daily Il Tempo. The right-of-center newspaper suggested that the Communist gain was partly the result of a "moral disarmament of Catholicism" after the audience Pope John XXIII granted to Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's son-in-law, Alexei Adzhubei.

The Vatican radio called for an intensified battle against communism and said it must be fought as an ideology on all fronts, not just on an economic level.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the English translation of the latest papal encyclical carries many inaccuracies. This accounts for some of the confusion created in the United States concerning the precise principles set forth in the encyclical. The Reverend E. A. Conway, S. J., an authority on the peace program of the Popes, has stated he has found no fewer than 40 faulty renditions of the original Latin. In the interest of truth and accuracy, I insert in the RECORD the observations of Father Conway as published in the Creightonian on May 10, 1963:

TRANSLATION INACCURACIES CITED IN PEACE ENCYCLICAL

The English translation of the latest papal encyclical, Pacem in Terris, is so inaccurate that it should be withdrawn, the director of the Creighton University Center for Peace Research said.

The Reverend Edward A. Conway, S. J., an authority on the peace program of the Popes, revealed that he found "no fewer than 40 faulty renditions of the original Latin" in 28 paragraphs, 14 devoted to disarmament and 14 devoted to world government.

"These paragraphs," Father Conway stated "comprise only a tenth of the encyclical, but they treat the two topics on which the present Pope's position has been long and eagerly awaited."

Few of the inaccuracies are actually mistranslations. But, several seriously misrepresent the mind of the Pope as expressed in the Latin of the official text. This is especially regrettable because, according to press reports, the encyclical is being more widely read and quoted than any other papal message in modern times, he said.

This is probably because it deals with the all-engrossing problem of world survival and because it was addressed not only to Catholics but to all men of good will. Many of the latter will be reading their first encyclical. If they read it in the current English translation, they are bound to be confused, said Father Conway.

"The English version is vitiated," Father Conway continued, "not only by mistranslations, but by omissions of ideas, by additions of others, and, especially in the section on the need for a world authority, by repeated refusal to give proper weight to the words of the original text."

Since it is in this section that the Holy Father advances considerably beyond the position of Pope Pius XII on the matter of world government, the apparently calculated "softpedalling" of this distinctive contribution to the current debate does an injustice to Pope John and to those who are seeking courageous leadership of the movement toward peace under enforceable world law, he said.

Asked who was responsible for the combination of mistranslation and misinterpretation in the English version, Father Coway replied, "the trouble lay with the person or persons who translated the Latin into Italian. Whoever did the English version followed the Italian almost literally. He or they should have used the original Latin. I have checked the English text against both the Latin and Italian, and the English text faithfully reflects, except in a few instances, the shortcomings of the Italian."

Father Conway cited a mistranslation which, he said, "seriously distorts Pope John's position on a question of utmost delicacy—nuclear testing. The English text reads: '* * * or is to be feared that the mere continuance of nuclear tests, undertaken with war in mind, will have fatal consequences for life on earth.' This is literal translation of the Italian. The original Latin however, literally translated, states that 'it is to be feared that the very testing of atomic weapons undertaken for the sake of war, may seriously endanger various kinds of life on earth.' "

Obviously, there is a vast difference between saying that testing will do something, as the English has it, and that it may do something as the Latin states. And, what is more important, there is a vast difference between asserting flatly that tests will have fatal consequences to life on earth, and saying that they may endanger or jeopardize various kinds of life on earth. Father Conway said.

"Everyone I have tested on the English version has understood it to mean that nuclear testing alone, if it continues indefinitely, will wipe out everyone in the world. Apparently, this interpretation is already being capitalized on by assorted disarmers and pacifists, such as the Aldermaston marchers in England, to prove that the Pope supports way said:

Turning to the section of the letter on world government, Father Conway charged: "This Italian translator was at pains to tone down the language in which Pope John argues the need for a single world authority capable of coping with worldwide problems the individual nation-states can't handle.

Every time he calls for "a public authority," the Italian translator for some reason, makes him call for "public authorities." Three or four times the Holy Father writes about "this universal authority." This is too pointed for the Italian translator, who ignores the singular number and comes up with this confusing masterpiece: "the public authorities of the world community." The English translator hits upon a neat compromise of "a public authority of the world community." Here, I submit, the art of translation nears its nadir, Father Conway said.

Misrepresentation of a more subtle sort occurs in the section devoted to the United Nations. Pius XII usually referred to the organization in general terms. John XXIII discusses it in specific terms and finally expressed his fervent hope that it may grow stronger.

"Obviously, the Italian translator disapproves of the eloquent and fulsome sentiments expressed in the original Latin," he said.

It is the Holy Father who says that he desires vehemently that the United Nations may grow more and more equal to the tasks confronting it. Ignoring the word "vehementer," (which is turned in the English by earnest) the Italian translator uses what is probably the weakest word available, "auspichiamo," which means literally "we augur" or "we wish—but not too strongly." And this is the word used to translate, "expetimus," the first meaning of which is, "we long for."

"What I might call 'cooling off His Holiness' continues even more brazenly. In a new sentence, the Pope expresses another wish that is almost an appeal—even a prayer: 'Would that the time may come as soon as possible when this organization can effectively safeguard the rights of the human person.' The Italian version ignores the exclamation and tacks this second desire on to the first, so that the Pope simply augurs also that 'the day may come, etc.' When does he hopes the day will come? He doesn't say, either in Italian or in English," Father Conway said.

Father Conway conceded that it is too late to do anything about the hundreds of thousands of English translations already circulating in booklet form. He suggested, however, that no more copies of that text be printed, and that expert linguists prepare an English translation of the official Latin text.

Croatian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 28 Croatian National Independence Day was observed at a great public rally in Cleveland, Ohio. It was my pleasure to send a message of greeting to that observance, which means so much to all Americans of Croatian origin and to the Croatian people in their homeland. By leave granted, I insert in the RECORD the message I sent on this occasion:

I send warm greetings and salutations to all who are gathered in Cleveland to celebrate Croatian National Independence Day. This is a day of great significance to Croatians everywhere, throughout the free world and in the homeland, because it symbolizes the long struggle of the Croatian people to be masters of their national destiny. It serves to remind all that Croatia was once free and independent. It causes us to recall the manner in which Croatian national independence was destroyed by the Tito Communists, with the help of imperial Russia. And it heralds the resolve of Croatians everywhere to fight on for victory over the forces of imperial communism which victory will bring a return of national independence to Croatia.

The struggle against Tito imperial communism has been long and trying. Our camp, the camp of freemen, has been beset with confusion and error in judging the character of the regime which now controls the Yugoslav Empire. Tito has been the most effective Trojan Horse in the history of mankind's struggle to be free. His mission as advance agent and provocateur for imperial Russia is clear to anyone who will take the time to review his record. Time and time again Tito has publicly stated his allegiance to the cause of Moscow. His actions in support of Moscow's global plans of conquest are too numerous to recite. In moments of crisis threatening the plans of Moscow it has been Tito who came to the forefront as the most faithful servant of imperial Russia. On no count does Tito's record provide evidence that he has in any way diverged from the solid Moscow line—in ruling over the Yugoslav Empire or as Russian agent in international political affairs. That record makes him the most effective Trojan Horse in history.

Despite that record there are people in the free world who refuse to believe the obvious truth about Tito. Regretfully, some people holding high office in the Government of the United States are most adamant in refusing to face up to these facts. Perhaps the most notable in this regard is George Kennan, who has been as consistently wrong in his opinions about imperial Russia as he has been about his strange hopes for Titoism as an experiment in national communism. His resignation as Yugoslav Ambassador, recently announced in the press, results, so the story goes, from his inability to influence foreign policy in the Kennedy administration and his disappointment with Tito's firm allegiance to Moscow. President Kennedy deserves applause for rejecting Mr. Kennan's attempts to influence American foreign policy. We are in and have long been in serious trouble internationally as a consequence of Mr. Kennan's influence on all matters relating to the basic Russian problem. Mr. Kennan's disappointment in Tito's continuing allegiance to Moscow suggests that he is either unable or unwilling to understand the harsh realities of international political affairs. His tragedy is that he was born too late because his political outlook corresponds to that common during the era of empires, when the concert of monarchs maintained a balance of power and a precarious peace in Europe. His outlook is hardly in tune with the global spirit of national independence which is rapidly reforming both political life and geography on all continents. Let us hope that his passing from the diplomatic scene will open wide the doors for a complete and realistic revision of our policy toward imperial Russia.

Looking to the new spirit which is reforming international political life we observe that morality in international life is now returning to the forefront. That morality is based upon a growing recognition of the nature of man, an increasing acceptance of the dignity which attaches to all human beings and a striving for civil order which corresponds with the nature of the human family. Pope John XXIII, in his great encyclical "Pacem in Terris," calls out for a new order among men and nations based upon morality common to all men by their nature as children of God. Defining the rights and duties of man, the encyclical then prophesies the universal blessings of national independence for all peoples. This quote from "Peace on Earth" is most pertinent to this 22d anniversary of Croatian national independence:

"Finally, the modern world, as compared with the recent past, has taken on an entirely new appearance in the field of social and political life. For since all nations have either achieved or are on the way to achieving independence, there will soon no longer exist a world divided into nations that rule others and nations that are subject to others.

"Men all over the world have today—or will soon have—the rank of citizens in independent nations. No one wants to feel subject to political powers located outside his own country or ethnical group. Thus in very many human beings the inferiority complex which endured for hundreds and thousands of years is disappearing, while in others there is an attenuation and gradual fading of the corresponding superiority complex which had its roots in socioeconomic privileges, sex or political standing."

These words add new hope and vigor to the cause of the many nations held in bondage by imperial Russia and its colonial system—including the imperial Yugoslav appendage. Those who have claimed that Croatia has no right to national independence or who have turned their backs on the struggle of the Croatian people would do well to reflect upon these words of Pope John. As surely as day follows night this moral prophesy will be fulfilled. Let us, together, redouble our efforts to hasten that happy day. In so doing we advance the cause of genuine peace on earth.

Long live Croatia and her gallant people who struggle ever onward toward the goal of national independence.

Twelfth Annual Congress of the American Latvian Association of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the 12th Annual Congress of the American Latvian Association of the United States was held in New York City on April 26, 1963. It was my pleasure to send a message of greeting to the delegates gathered for that congress from various parts of the United States. My message was as follows:

> I am pleased to send warm greetings and best wishes for success to all the delegates attending the 12th Annual Congress of the American Latvian Association of the United States.
>
> Your congress will, I am confident, turn a major part of its deliberations to the central issue of ways and means whereby Latvia may regain its freedom and national independence. It is natural that you should do this because the future of freedom throughout the world, including the United States, is in large measure dependent on the future of freedom in Latvia and the other captive nations. This imperatively underscores the importance of your deliberations as well as the need for concerted and united action by all who share the responsibilities for freedom's cause. I need not point out to you that every American citizen is duty bound to assume his or her full responsibilities in this cause. Some of us are privileged to assume a larger share of this responsibility by virtue of our position, training, or special knowledge of the issues. I would point out here that delegates to your congress have a greater citizen responsibility because so many of them have a firsthand knowledge and experience with the basic issues, which requires them to assume a leadership role in pointing up ways and means to return Latvia to her rightful place in the community of free nations.
>
> It is in this spirit that my remarks are presented to your congress meeting.
>
> I am confident you will agree with me that the prospects of liberating Latvia alone from the grip of Russian imperialism are small if not entirely lacking. To look at the present plight of Latvia as an isolated or singular problem of our time would deny the realities of contemporary international political affairs as well as condemn the people of Latvia to perpetual slavery. Obviously, no rational person would fall into this trap.
>
> I am confident you will agree that liberation of the three Baltic Republics—Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania—is equally improbable if we restrict our thinking and plans to this limited area of the overall problem. It is true that the Baltic States have much in common, that they suffered a common aggression at the hands of imperial Russia in 1939, and that there is need for a strong regional cohesion among the peoples of these nations. But more than this is necessary to bring a return of freedom and national independence to these nations.
>
> Looking further, we observe that in recent years the Baltic States have been grouped with Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria in many, if not most, of the nongovernmental actions calculated to advance the freedom of all those nations. In particular I have reference to the Assembly of Captive European Nations. While this grouping reflects a degree of unity, it nevertheless tends to obscure the total problem of captive nations. Moreover, this arrangement, whatever its origin or motivation, puts a false limit on the historical meaning of Europe by excluding other European nations which are no less a captive of imperial Russia. I have particular reference to Byelorussia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, and several other nations. The result of this false and arbitrary division of Europe is to divide and weaken the cause of all the captive nations. Nowhere are evidences of this dangerous division of freedom's cause more evident than in the confusion which attends the present efforts to establish a House Committee on Captive Nations. This confusion serves no other purpose but to prolong the agony of the captive nations and provide comfort for imperial Russia.
>
> It is my opinion that none of the captive nations will regain their freedom and national independence until all of them do. This judgment corresponds with a practical appraisal of the imperial system which holds them in captivity. That system must be broken, not one chain at a time, or several chains in isolated action, but all the chains in one concerted and unified program of international political action. I am confident that history provides adequate testimony for this judgment. We need only to look at the lessons learned in East Germany or Hungary. For those who are weighted down with continuing doubts or may be persuaded that a privileged few will be able to escape from the Russian prison house of nations, I would ask these questions:
>
> 1. How secure would Latvia and her sister Republics of the Baltic region be if regaining their national independence they were required to coexist with the U.S.S.R.?
>
> 2. How secure would the Baltic States and the Central European nations—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria be if regaining their national independence they were required to coexist with the U.S.S.R.?
>
> 3. Can peace with freedom be secure for any nation so long as imperial Russia is allowed to maintain its despotic rule over other nations?
>
> I have other reasons for raising these questions before your congress delegates. I am convinced that an objective examination of these questions will serve to identify the source of the captive nations problem and underscore the urgent need for unity among all the non-Russian nations now held in captivity by Moscow. The human power in all these non-Rusian nations, taken as a collective force for freedoms cause, is much more powerful than all the nuclear bombs and missiles possessed on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Once this human power is fully unified and harnessed in the cause of freedom and independence for all nations, all threats of war will pass and peace will prevail on earth.
>
> I know your congress meeting will make a significant contribution to this objective.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert in the RECORD my remarks on the occasion marking the 86th anniversary of Rumanian national independence held in Cleveland on May 11:

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Today we again observe Rumanian independence day as a tribute to the Rumanian people and their dedication to the cause of liberty, freedom, and self-government. This day has great meaning to the people of Rumania because it signifies three epics in their centuries long struggle against foreign occupation culminating in victory. All these epics remind us that the present foreign occupation of Rumania is transitory because no foreign power has ever been able to conquer the spirit of the Romanian people. It is the people and not governments which make up a nation. Governments come and go, but the people live on forever.

This 86th anniversary of Rumanian national independence presents an appropriate opportunity to review U.S. policy toward the captive nations and to raise several pertinent questions about it.

To begin with it appears as though we have two policies toward the captive nations.

The first is that enunciated by President Kennedy in numerous public statements of policy—at the United Nations, in reply to a Russian ultimatum on Berlin and Germany, in his state of the Union messages and in numerous other ways. That policy, briefly stated, is support for the universal application of the principle of national self-determination and opposition to all forms of colonialism and imperialism. President Kennedy, in his address before the United Nations, called for free and unfettered plebiscites in all quarters of the globe. He challenged the Russian imperialists to a debate in full on the issues involved. The Russians of course backed down from the challenge because their position as the world's leading imperialists is well known to all informed people. Nevertheless, President Kennedy has continued to stand up for justice and freedom for all nations and peoples. The public record is clear on this point.

The second policy is that being manipulated by the Department of State, rather I should say certain people in the Department. That policy is the same old bankrupt containment concept, dressed up in the fancy new phrase of political evolution. That policy holds that any action taken by the United States to support the aspirations of the now Russian nations behind the Iron Curtain for freedom and national independence will cause world war III. They argue the Russians will not give up any of their colonies without a fight. This leads to the obvious conclusion there is nothing we can do but accept as permanent the enslavement of Rumania and the other captive non-Russian nations. And that conclusion has led to an acceptance of a status quo with the Russian Empire—which the Russians refuse to accept because they have set upon a course to conquer the world. The evidence of failure of that constant and covert policy of the "Russian experts" in the Department of State are to be seen on all sides—in Laos, in India, in the Middle East, in Tito's Yugoslavia, and more lately in Cuba. The Russian imperialists cannot be "contained" and they will not evolve into civilized people.

I have long maintained that the covert Russian beach head on American foreign policy established in the Department of State is a greater threat to the security of the United States than is imperial Russia. That entrenched group of Russia firsters have tied a Gordian Knot on our moral and political principles—paralyzing our Government from taking any meaningful political action against imperial Russia. They are more dangerous to our survival than 200 Red military divisions. The war in which we are engaged is not being fought by classical military methods—it is a political fight, an ideological fight in which all the powerful weapons in our American political arsenal are either outlawed or made inoperative.

Permit me to point out that Congress as the direct voice of the people has made its position clear with regard to the captive nations. That position is set forth in Public Law 86–90, the Captive Nations Week resolution. As is well known, that resolution makes crystal clear the political realities of the war in which we are engaged. It names imperial Russia as the enslaver of nations and the only threat to world peace. It finds that the aspirations of the people in the captive nations for freedom and independence is the most powerful deterrent to world war III and our best hopes for a just and lasting peace. That is why Congress called upon the President to proclaim Captive Nations Week each July and urged all our people to support the aspirations of the people in the captive nations. Congress thus put itself on record as opposed to a status quo with despotism and rejected the bankrupt concept of containment and its fancy dressed cousin political evolution.

It is fair to question who makes U.S. policy toward the Russian Empire. Is it President Kennedy or the Russian beachhead in the Department of State? Our Constitution says President Kennedy is responsible for setting that policy—that is the reason the American people decide every 4 years who will be and who will not be President for each 4-year term. Otherwise why have an election? Yet, the evidence is conclusive that President Kennedy's public statements of policy toward the Russian Empire have been put under the "Gordian Knot" in the Department of State.

It is equally fair to question whether the opinion of Congress, as expressed in a resolution enacted by that body, has any weight in law or practice. The Russian experts in the State Department have not only ignored the expressed wishes of Congress on this vital question, but they express a contemptuous disregard for the political principles and realistic findings of that law. Do those Russian experts in the State Department expect Congress to rubber stamp their defeatist notions and proven failures of the past as the basis for victory of freedom's cause? I say to you that as far as I am concerned, as a Member of Congress, the only stamp proper for them is exposure and dismissal from the Government.

Let me make this equally clear. There is no conflict between the public statements of policy made by President Kennedy and the findings of Congress in Public Law 86–90. The facts are, they are in harmony—like two peas in a pod, they move toward the same objective, both reflect a desire to use to the fullest all the weapons in the political arsenal of American democracy.

The final question is—in language all of us understand—who is boss of American policy toward the Russian Empire?

Until we get a clear and unqualified answer to that question the cause of human freedom will be delayed and the peril to our security as a Nation will grow more serious.

I am sure you will agree with me that until the issue of who makes and directs our policy toward the Russian Empire is settled, the return of freedom and national independence to Rumania remains in a dark shadow. You and I know that Rumania's independence depends upon concerted, coordinated action by the peoples of all the captive non-Russian nations, supported by the moral and political power of the United States. No one nation can escape from the Russian prison house of nations—but all of them working together against the common enemy possess a power many times more powerful than all the atomic weapons in the world. It is true to say that 90 million Russians cannot maintain their Empire without the acquiescence of the leaders of the free world. That truism stands as a challenge on this 86th anniversary of Rumanian independence.

I join with you in looking forward to the early emancipation of Rumania and all the captive non-Russian nations. You have my assurance that I shall continue to do all in my power to hasten that inevitable day.

The Kennedy Cuba Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, a very fine and discerning article by William V. Shannon, of the New York Post, appeared in the April 11, 1963, issue. I think it deserves the attention of the Members of the House, and therefore include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CUBA FAILURE

(By William V. Shannon)

The Kennedy administration's rupture with Jose Miro Cardona, coming on the second anniversary of the mismanaged Bay of Pigs invasion, brings to a close a cycle of defeat, political ignorance, and moral confusion in America's relations with the Cuban revolution. Everything has now been surrendered, including honor, and we have no policy nor recourse save to wait for whatever good or bad tidings the future may bring. Events have passed out of our hands.

It is instructive to recall the state of affairs when Mr. Kennedy took office. Castro, having been in power for 2 years, had already aligned himself with the Communists, broken with the liberal elements in the revolutionary coalition, and was far advanced in transforming an indigenous radical uprising into a self-shackled Communist dependency.

A brave and active underground movement against the dictator was spreading. Exiles in Florida were alive with hope for his early overthrow. The United States, which had encouraged Batista to depart and which had originally extended a sympathetic tolerance to the Castro government, was in a strong position to influence the course of events, both in its own national interest and in the interest of the freedom of the Cuban people. There were then no Soviet troops and no short-range Soviet missiles in Cuba.

The Kennedy administration took office seemingly committed to a clear and sound policy that this country would not permit a Communist Cuba. Since the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, the United States had taken the consistent position that we would not allow foreign countries to establish new colonies or export alien systems of government to this hemisphere. Since Castro had turned out to be only a stalking horse for the Communists, we had no alternatives except to force his departure or compromise our historic position.

There were only two ways to get rid of Castro. One was to organize a mixed invasion of Cubans and Americans under the aegis of a government-in-exile which we would recognize. The other was to organize sabotage, political subversion and economic pressure. This program could only have succeeded if the administration had been willing to make bold political decisions. In a revolutionary situation, the most effective alternative is usually a group only a shade less radical than the faction one is trying to overthrow. What was wanted was a political leadership for the Cuban underground-and-exile movement that shared most of Castro's original radical social and economic program but disavowed his terrorism and his links to Moscow. We shall never know if a left-of-center alternative, properly supported by the United States, could have brought Castro down. The President and his brother Robert and their CIA and State Department advisers lacked the political sophistication and imagination to attempt it.

President Kennedy chose the more direct alternative of an invasion. Since the Cuban exiles ranged from radicals to reactionaries, a temporary coalition was pasted together under the presidency of Miro Cardona, an honorable man of centrist sympathies. But this coalition was not recognized as a government-in-exile. The administration also held back from providing the U.S. troops and planes necessary to bolster the exile force. Moreover, the CIA, with extraordinary political obtuseness, placed most of its reliance on the sons of the wealthy and on the supporters of the fallen Batista. In short, the White House policymakers avoided the political choices and the CIA made the wrong ones.

There was nothing wrong, in my judgment, with a mixed Cuban and American military intervention to throw out Castro except that once embarked upon, it could not be allowed to fail. President Kennedy did allow it to fail.

But there was no reason, after that single defeat, for panic or despair. The political alternative could still be attempted, although now under less favorable circumstances, or a second successful invasion could be properly planned and carried out. Instead, the administration did nothing. The 18 wasted months from April 1961 to October 1962, are in my opinion, a worse offense on the administration's record than the defeat of the Bay of Pigs invasion. What had appeared to be a firm resolve to get rid of Castro proved, after only one setback, to be made of jelly.

The only conclusion drawn from the events of April 1961 was that clandestine operations are impossible in a democracy. The exiles and the underground were simply written off as too divided and unmanageable. Micawberism—"maybe something will turn up"—reigned.

What turned up were the Russian missiles. Khrushchev had not wasted those 18 months. Mr. Kennedy was able to force the Russians to withdraw the missiles by going to the edge of nuclear war. We are all grateful to him that his resolute firmness in October succeeded, but he is scarcely entitled to any credit for handling Cuban affairs in such a way that they produced a nuclear crisis. The introduction of the Soviet missiles completely exposed the shallowness of those, in the administration and in the general public, who thought we could happily coexist with a Communist Cuba. Because we permitted Castro to stay in power, Khrushchev very nearly outflanked us on our defenseless southern border.

The long-range missiles are presumably gone, but Cuba is far stronger militarily than it was 2 years ago. We cannot get rid of Castro because his safety has now become linked with Khrushchev's prestige. Cuba has become like Berlin, a hostage in the cold war. The suppression of the Cuban raiders and the dropping of poor Miro Cardona constitute the final admission that we have met total defeat on the Cuban front. The Cuban people have been left to the mercies of their bearded tyrant.

Dogs Versus Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Detroit (Mich.) Chronicle of Saturday, May 11, 1963 entitled "Dogs Versus Human Rights."

This shows the feelings of people throughout the United States about the denial of fundamental human rights and the uniquely difficult situation which our Negro citizens find themselves in in Birmingham.

The time is late for a settlement of our problems of racial discrimination in this country and unless vigorous action is taken the future presages more rather than less difficulty with citizens uniting to achieve their legitimate rights under the laws of the Constitution.

The editorial follows:

DOGS VERSUS HUMAN RIGHTS

The use of fire hoses and police dogs on Negro children, women and students protesting racial segregation in Birmingham, Ala., can best be described as bestiality at its worst. Some of the demonstrators were so seriously bitten that they had to be hospitalized.

This monstrous exhibition of raw racialism has inflicted deep wounds that will not soon heal. It is beyond human understanding that white Southerners who trumpet their racial superiority have to resort to brute force rather than cold logic to uphold their supremacy.

In their blind prejudice, they under-rate the march of history. They misread the mentality and the will of the new Negro. He registers his impatience by demonstrating against the snail's pace of desegregation.

So far, the demonstrations have been peaceful and orderly. There have been no instances of serious physical resistance to local police, even in the face of provocation and insufferable molestation.

Unceasing exhortation of fearless Negro leaders such as Reverends King and Shuttlesworth, and equally fearless community support have swollen the ranks of the prayer-marchers and increased the frequency of their demonstrations.

How long the peaceful demonstrators will remain passive when fire hoses and vicious police dogs are turned on them, is problematical. Tempers are getting short, and we predict that force will meet force in the next confrontation.

In the Birmingham fray, women were kicked in the stomach, children sustained head wounds that caused their blood to mix with their tears. And all were carted away in police wagons and school buses like dead deer.

There are limits to human endurance and forbearance. Patience ceases to be a virtue and becomes a crime when human dignity and human rights are violated at will. There'll be much mental anguish, and much blood spilled until the social denials and the economic wrongs are redressed.

This is the moment of truth. All those who believe in social justice and equal opportunity wherever they may be and whosoever they may be, must join hands with our brothers in the struggle for liberation and recognition. As Franklin D. Roosevelt used to say: "Damn the torpedoes, full speed ahead."

Federal-State Partnership in the Growth of Eastern Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address I delivered on Monday, May 13, 1963, before the Greater Middletown Real Estate Board of Middletown, Conn., on the subject "Federal-State Partnership in the Growth of Eastern Connecticut." The address reads as follows:

FEDERAL-STATE PARTNERSHIP IN THE GROWTH OF EASTERN CONNECTICUT

(An address by Congressman WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, of Connecticut, before the Greater Middletown Real Estate Board, May 13, 1963)

Many years have now passed since the professors and the social workers realized that large centers of population in the urban areas provided our free society with problems which are not easy of solution and not solvable by themselves. In the largest cities of the Nation families crowded together in slum conditions were proof positive that the American way of life was but an empty dream for too many hundreds of thousands of youngsters.

Since our children are the greatest asset which this country has, because they are the ones who will carry on when our generation leaves off, it became imperative that something be done to alleviate at least the worst conditions in order to give all families an opportunity at life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. City blight was first seriously attacked in the Housing Act of 1949. The years that have intervened have given us an opportunity to assess the progress that has been made and a chance to look forward into the future to see whether steps already taken have headed us in the proper direction.

Let us, therefore, examine the Federal-State partnership in dealing with these conditions particularly how it is helping in the growth of eastern Connecticut. First, a look at the local picture.

The State of Connecticut has once again proven to be a leader in this nationwide fight to improve living conditions. As we review renewal activities in Connecticut, we are impressed by several facts which emphasize thhe success of the renewal effort in our State:

1. By the end of 1962, there were 7 completed projects and 31 projects in execution, covering nearly 2,000 acres of land. An additional 1,500 acres of land in 23 projects were in the planning and preplanning stage of the renewal process.

2. During 1962, six renewal projects were completed and at least another six were approaching virtual completion.

3. A total of 235 acres of land in redevelopment areas have been disposed of by sale, lease or dedication.

4. Commercial and industrial reconstruction now underway or completed in renewal areas approaches 4 million square feet.

5. A total of 850 housing units have been provided or are under current construction in renewal areas.

6. Investment in reconstruction in redevelopment areas—mostly of a private nature—currently totals $100 million, and this investment may well reach $1 billion within the next decade.

7. Over 6,000 families from predominantly substandard housing have been relocated in renewal areas.

8. Redevelopment in Connecticut involves the expenditure or commitment of public funds totaling nearly $300 million, of which the Federal Government is providing $200 million, the State $43 million and the local governments $55 million.

The success of urban renewal as a means of revitalizing our communities was established in 1962. As I mentioned earlier, 6 urban renewal projects were completed in that year and, of the 31 projects in execution, several were approaching completion. Substantial rebuilding was underway in Ansonia, Hartford, New Haven, Putnam, Seymour and Torrington.

There is a multiplier effect in urban renewal which serves as a significant factor in promoting economic activity. Statistics developed by the U.S. Housing and Home Finance Agency indicate that the expenditure of $1 of public funds for redevelopment purposes generates an expenditure of over $3 of private capital. Since the net costs of renewal projects in Connecticut approximate $300 million of Federal, State, and local funds, private investment in urban growth resulting from these renewal projects will probably approach $1 billion in the next 10 years.

The value on completion of current construction in Connecticut's urban renewal areas is now approximately $100 million. New buildings valued in excess of $3 million have been erected in four of Connecticut's seven completed projects. Buildings valued at nearly $97 million are under construction or have been completed in 11 projects still in execution, in many of which more new construction will be undertaken in future months. In addition to 850 housing units, this investment involves the financing of approximately 4.5 million square feet of new commercial, industrial, and public floor space. This reconstruction exerts a significant impact on the economy of the State in terms of employment, production and business activity.

The revitalizing influence of urban renewal extends, however, much beyond the limits of the project areas themselves. Land, near or adjacent to the project areas from which the blight has been eliminated often provides choice sites for new commercial enterprises and new realty developments. This is sometimes described as peripheral redevelopment, and I am sure you know of many examples of such development which had a beneficial effect on the community and on private enterprise.

Unless large parts of redevelopment areas are used for nontaxable public purposes, there usually are substantial tax increments for the municipality when blighted land with substandard buildings is redeveloped and new residential, commercial, or industrial buildings are erected.

Business relocations, of course, have many ramifications in terms of loss of ethnic trade in the older neighborhoods, in difficulties in securing financing for new ventures, and in reluctance on the part of older business people to start anew in different surroundings. However, while marginal companies encounter such difficulties in adjustment, most business firms can adjust fairly readily and many of them grow and expand markedly after they relocate from blighted areas.

Let me cite just one example. As a result of urban renewal in Hartford's Front street and Windsor street areas, 260 commercial and industrial firms were assisted in successful relocations; and an additional 190 firms were relocated by reason of the East-West highway, which in some instances overlaps these project areas. Only 56 firms went out of business during these operations. That's about 10 percent of all firms in the area, and many of these went out of business because of the age of the owners.

The 61 redevelopment projects in Connecticut, which I listed earlier as either completed, in execution or in planning, involve public funds in the amount of some $300 million. Of this total, I pointed out that the Federal Government provides $200 million, the State $43 million, and the local governments $55 million. By the end of 1962, the State had advanced to the communities grants totaling $12.5 million as its share of the cost of renewal. The balance of State participation consists in contracts for further assistance in the amount of $7.5 million, and in reservations for projects not yet covered by assistance agreements in the amount of $21.8 million.

The basic principle of the urban renewal process is that slums and blighted areas must be eliminated from the American scene. An underlying feature of this concept is that safe and sanitary housing should be available to all. In Connecticut we have over 3,500 acres of blighted land under renewal treatment. By now, more than 6,000 families have been assisted in relocating from predominantly substandard housing in redevelopment areas.

By the elimination of slums, and particularly slum housing, urban renewal makes possible the attainment of a higher standard of living for those who live, work, and seek rest and recreation in our urban areas. To the slum child, born in squalor and reared under the degrading influence of the slum environment, integration into a new community may do much more than provide standard housing, it brings him into contact with a way of life to which he had previously never been exposed. It helps to do away with the influence of the slum and, in its place, implants those standards which are the birthright of most Americans. Meaningful exposure to these standards is not possible for those living in slum conditions.

Many of our citizens in the blighted areas not only live but often work and seek recreation within the depressing confines of the slum. This confinement creates a dangerous condition involving not only fire and health hazards, but also social unrest and crime requiring continuing surveillance by municipal agencies. These social problems can be overcome only by the elimination of the slum and giving these people an opportunity to rebuild their lives in a new environment.

Integration of slum residents into standard neighborhoods may involve many problems, but the social gains to be realized through this integration will eventually justify the effort. Solution to the problems relative to this transition may be a lengthy process. State and local social organizations should take an active role in assisting the residents of blighted areas to become adjusted to their new environments.

While the elimination of blight is the basic and ultimate objective of urban renewal, there are a number of social goals which go beyond the leveling of slum buildings and the relocation of their inhabitants. These goals include also the establishment of parks, schools, and cultural and recreational facilities which will benefit the whole community. This aspect of renewal helps to create a living environment conducive to healthy growth and to the establishment of strong moral and spiritual values for all.

Smaller communities will encounter difficulties in financing these facilities. While tax increments resulting from the revitalization of business districts are not the major objective of renewal, they sometimes become an important factor since they help to provide the resources by which overall community renewal may be achieved.

As renewal programs progress toward the elimination of blight in our State, large tracts of land are being made available for industrial and commercial use. Land proposed for industrial and commercial use now totals 900 acres and if present patterns are continued and maximum redevelopment is achieved, industrial and commercial acreage opened for new use may total over 8,700 acres. The existence of this land with all essential utilities readily available throughout urbanized areas in the State will be a significant factor in the continuing growth and development of our economy and in the financial stability of our communities.

Although rehabilitation and conservation are considered essential to the renewal process, they have not been given as much recognition as has been accorded clearance and reconstruction. One example, however, is New Haven's Wooster Square project which has won national recognition for its rehabilitation work. As the most blighted areas are cleared and rebuilt, there is a growing awareness of the benefits of rehabilitation. A larger number of our communities are taking steps to insure against the recurrence of blight by establishing and enforcing sound housing and building codes and zoning regulations.

We now have over 3,500 acres of land under treatment for urban renewal in Connecticut, but estimates made by the Connecticut Development Commission indicate that there are nearly 15,000 acres of blight where no action toward renewal has been undertaken. Of this total, 2,400 acres are located in 29 communities which to date have shown no great amount of interest in urban renewal.

The existence of this blight is a challenge to the State and to its municipalities. While a limited amount of renewal may be undertaken by private interests, such as those who carry out peripheral projects, the vast bulk of this renewal must be carried out by public agencies if the needs are to be met. The Development Commission's studies point out that, if renewal is to continue at the present rate, by 1980, the blight may be reduced to between 6,000 and 8,000 acres, provided steps are taken to prevent the incidence of new blight.

This review of renewal achievements shows that during the 7 years since Connecticut first participated with the Federal Government and the local municipalities in the financing of urban renewal, much has been accomplished toward eliminating slums and revitalizing Connecticut's cities. At the same time, let us not ignore the fact that much blight still exists and much remains to be done if we are to achieve complete renewal. The need and the challenge are clear.

This need and challenge can be met by even closer cooperation on the three levels—local, State, and Federal. I am very happy that my background and experience in urban renewal are proving most helpful to me in Washington in discussions which I have had and continue to have with the administrators of urban renewal and public housing.

In this connection, I was very happy to vote last month in favor of the amendment to restore the sum of $450 million for the accelerated public works program for projects which are not a waste or boondoggle, but on the contrary, give to our communities, especially the small- and medium-size towns and cities, an opportunity to construct sanitation facilities, water systems, roads, harbor facilities, city streets, bridges, and municipal buildings. It is quite clear that without this Federal assistance the communities involved could not undertake such projects. These expenditures by the communities and the Federal Government later will pay for themselves over and over through more employment, improved services, better health, better living conditions, and happier communities.

The State of Connecticut, which, until the end of January of this year, received a total of $3,963,000 for various projects under the accelerated public works program, is vitally interested in legislation of this sort.

During the few months that I have been in Washington, I am happy that I have been able to intercede with the Administrators and the Commissioners of the Public Housing Administration, the Community Facilities Administration, the Urban Renewal Administration, the Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Agriculture, the Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army, and the Small Business Administration on behalf of our communities, our industries, and farmers, to furnish the necessary liaison and help between our National Capital and the communities of the Second District.

Probably the best example to be cited is the case of the city of Norwich, where 6 lives were lost and $3 million property damage done in the disastrous flood in March of this year. As a result of this type of intervention, it is expected that the city of Norwich will be granted matching funds for the reconstruction and improvement of the destroyed dam. This aid is expected to be expanded so as to provide additional fire protection facilities and recreational facilities for the population of that community.

I was recently able to call to the attention of the Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power of the Government Operations Committee of the House of Representatives the very serious problem of water pollution in the State of Connecticut, especially as it affects our second district. It is my sincere hope that the subcommittee will see fit to hold hearings in the very near future within the district. The pollution which exists in our rivers and streams has been a serious deterrent in some communities to the expansion of housing and industrial facilities.

There are many communities in eastern Connecticut that have sufficient water, but what is necessary is that this water be purified. I believe that this will result in making available to our State and our communities additional Federal funds, first to control and then to eliminate this pollution. This will help toward improving our living conditions, our opportunities for attracting new industry and creating the new jobs which are needed so badly, so that we may be able to absorb the graduates of our schools who are going to crowd the labor market within the next few years.

All of these activities, with honest, sincere cooperation on the part of our local, State, and Federal authorities, will result in making eastern Connecticut a better place in which to live.

Labor's Abuse of Power Hurts United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, irresponsible labor bosses have helped give the Soviet Union an unearned advantage in the missile race. The man-hours lost through strikes to secure unreasonable demands at the expense of all the taxpayers will never be regained. The actions of a few have tarnished the reputations of millions of honest, patriotic American workingmen and women.

Labor, like all other segments of our society, must earn respect and this will be achieved only through responsible action, not in flaunting economic power based only on strength without regard to justice or reasonable demands.

What the strikes at missile sites and test sites have done is starkly revealed in the continuity of the following advertisement by the Warner & Swazey Co. in this week's issue of U.S. News & World Report. I am confident the majority of union members share my concern with actions which have resulted in increasing Russian strength and putting the security of our free land in jeopardy.

"To Russia, With Love"—A 162,000 Man-Day Missile Gap

At Cape Canaveral and other missile construction and test sites there have been 325 strikes and similar work stoppages in the past vital 4½ years, resulting in loss of 162,872 man-days—810 man-years—time vital to the safety of this country; a completely free gift to our enemies.

Patriotism was flaunted, to make work and invent overtime. Ditch diggers collected as much as $287 a week.

Pipe fitters refused to allow the use of manifolds property made by experts at the factory. But they permitted (if you please) the use after the workers sat around at full pay for the time it would have taken them to do the work already done. They cynically called it blessing the manifolds.

Production was as low as 40 percent of a normal day's work.

One authority believes that at Cape Canaveral alone tens of millions of dollars were wasted in such needless charges.

Remember all this when you pay your next and next and next tax bills for the rest of your life.

Tax Reduction and the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposals for tax reduction continue to command major attention throughout the country. Many people express some honest doubt about the actual impact tax reduction will have on the economy. Support for the position that a major cut will have a valuable and far-reaching effect has come from an extremely respected quarter. In a letter to each member of the Ways and Means Committee, Charles E. Walker, executive vice president of the American Bankers Association, points to the notable success of last year's changes in tax treatment of investment credit and depreciation as an additional argument for a tax cut.

I include the letter in the Appendix of the Record under leave to extend and revise my remarks:

The American Bankers Association,
New York, N.Y., May 8, 1963.

Hon. Wilbur D. Mills,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Seldom in the field of economic policy has an analytical judgment been so quickly and decisively confirmed by the trend of events as the enactment of the investment credit and the revision of the depreciation guidelines. As is pointed out in the enclosed statement, businessmen attribute almost half of the projected 7-percent rise in capital spending for 1963 to the faster writeoffs and the tax credit.

Consequently, your committee is to be strongly commended for enacting the credit in the face of business and labor opposition. The Treasury should also receive strong commendation for proposing the credit and revising the guidelines. I am proud that spokesmen for The American Bankers Association supported both of these actions last year.

As is also emphasized in the statement, this experience strongly supports the conclusion we reached in our testimony before your committee on March 18 that "* * * dollar for dollar, the major and most lasting contribution to growth stemming from tax-rate reform lies in the area of the corporate income tax." The reasons for this conclusion, including special emphasis on how investment spending creates jobs, are spelled out in the statement.

My purpose in writing to you now, at the time your committee is considering the tax legislation in executive sessions, is to urge you and your associates to give serious consideration to a larger reduction in the corporate tax rate than the President has proposed. We are convinced that the additional reduction, even if postponed to 1966 and 1967 in order to reduce the short-term fiscal impact, will pay dividends many times over in the form of more jobs and faster growth.

One other point: A few weeks ago a press report indicated that the larger business corporations were objecting strongly to the speed-up in the payments proposed by the President. As important as corporate cash flow is, in my judgment it is not nearly so important as the level of after-tax profits. Thus it seems to me that the large corporations would be well advised to think more in terms of broadening long-term profit horizons through tax-rate reduction rather than in terms of the short-run impact on cash flow of the proposed speed-up.

Needless to say, a further staged reduction in the corporate rate to, say, 42 percent by 1967 would do much to convince business leaders of the economic efficacy and fairness of the overall tax reduction—including the proposed speed-up in taxpayments by large corporations.

If not too late, I would like to request that this letter and statement be placed in the record of the hearings. In any event, I respectfully call it to the attention of you and your associates on the committee. Copies of the letter and the statement are being sent to all members of your committee, to the Secretary of the Treasury, and to a few other administration officials.

Yours sincerely,
Charles E. Walker,
Executive Vice President.

When the Largest Employer in Town Shuts Down the Factory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that is disturbing me a great deal is the closing down of several mills and factories in my district. In recent days, for example, the Cyril Johnson Woolen Co., of Stafford Springs, Conn., announced that it will close down its plant within the next few months. This means that some 250 people will be thrown out of work.

In relatively small communities of this kind, which are dependent on employment and income obtained at these factories, a shutdown has a terrific impact and often very serious repercussions on the whole general area. I have, therefore, requested the Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training of the Department of Labor to look into the situation with the idea of establishing a retraining program for these 250 employees. I believe that if the preparatory work for setting up such a retraining program can be done now while these people are still employed, perhaps it will be possible to train them for other employment and the community will not be too drastically hit when the plant is closed down.

I am hopefully waiting for the decision of the Department of Labor in the matter, as are also the families of these 250 workers and the whole community of Stafford Springs and its vicinity.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with this situation, there appeared an excellent article which conveys the feelings of the people in a community when it suddenly loses its major source of income and what has been done under such circumstances in some instances. This experience could serve as a guide for other communities. The article is written by Lou Edman of my hometown of Putnam and was published in last week's issues of the Windham County Observer-Putnam Patriot and the Stafford Press of Stafford Springs, Conn. I am very pleased to insert the article into the Record and commend it to the attention of my colleagues and the public generally. It reads as follows:

LOU EDMAN DESCRIBES

Last night, around 10 o'clock, a friend called me up to say that the largest employer in his town had announced that the factory was shutting down. Today, this was headline news in all the area papers.

There is nothing more devastating to a small community than to have its principal employer suddenly go out of business, particularly a firm that has been in operation for three-quarters of a century. It is likely that as many as three generations of townsfolk have worked in this plant. "The mill," as it was probably called, could always be looked upon as a place to find a job, when a kid got out of school and didn't want to leave town.

I know little about the company, aside from what was in today's papers, but I'm willing to bet that the local people always considered it their ace in the hole. And if the firm was like so many others which dominate the local industrial community, almost everyone in town had worked there at one time or another. Perhaps it was a short stint, during the summer vacations from school; perhaps for the women, during the interval between high school and the first babies. Others started there at their first jobs and tonight, are wondering where or whether they will ever find another one.

It is small consolation for me to write that what has happened is not unique; that this has been going on all over New England for the past two decades, especially in towns that depend on textiles for their livelihood. However, there have been some remarkable comebacks from what seemed ultimate disasters for small communities similarly affected.

One of the foremost examples is North Grosvenordale, where the Cluett-Peabody Co. plant employed as many as 1,200 people, up to 1955. As an example of the factory's importance, the population of the town it was located in was approximately 5,000. In 1955, the company closed its plant for good.

As a result, hundreds of workers were left without employment and no other skill except those learned in the textile trade. In the center of the small town stood a factory with several hundred thousand square feet of vacant industrial space. To make the situation more hopeless, the nearest city, Putnam 8 miles south, had lost three textile plants through fire and flood in the same year.

Corny as it may sound, local businessmen and citizens rolled up their sleeves, formed a corporation and bought the plant. It was a combined effort by people who had a choice of sitting on their hands and moaning about how bad things were, or taking action into their own hands.

Seven years later, toward the end of 1962, the last square foot of factory space had been rented. It took time, but today, North Grosvenordale is in better shape than at any time in its history. At least a dozen diversified industries occupy the old Cluett-Peabody mill. In an article a few weeks ago in an area paper, it was reported that the average income of North Grosvenordale citizens had increased 89 percent over a like period in 1955.

Strange to say, most of the workers employed by the dozen or more companies which now occupy the former textile mill, are engaged in jobs far removed from textile operations. Some have become expert furniture producers, for Jens Risom, a firm that moved in late in 1955 and trained its own people. Some run plastic molding machines for Colt's Plastics Co., Inc., which came from Hartford in the same year. Others are bending aluminum tubing to make furniture for O. D. Bending, a later arrival.

Most of these people felt the world had ended, when Cluett-Peabody left the area. Today, there is a different feeling. The town is prosperous, there are jobs and new skills have been acquired. It didn't happen overnight, but it did happen.

Tonight, with 250 people facing the loss of their jobs in another town, it may not help for me to recollect that the same thing took place in 1955 in North Grosvenordale. What is reassuring is that in the long run, if Stafford Springs follows the pattern set by other towns which have been faced with the same problem, it may be the best thing that has occurred in years.

When a town has factory space and people to work in it, you have a combination attractive to all industry. Just don't hide the fact; let the world know. North Grosvenordale proved the point.

Loving Us to Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, my very good friend and colleague from Missouri, Dr. Durward Hall, recently sent out an excellent newsletter to his constituents in Missouri's Seventh District. In it he analyzes how the political concept of liberalism has changed, how the political label "liberal" has grown away from the liberalism of thought and spirit which gave it birth, how today's political liberals have come full circle to embrace the very thing against which the spirit of liberalism arose—regimentation by a central authority. Now this regimentation is expressed in terms of concern for our fellow man, destruction of the individual is justified as the only way to his salvation.

Durward Hall has done an excellent job of pointing up these things in his newsletter. I believe it should be shared with the entire Congress and for that reason, under unanimous consent, I include it in the Record at this point:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

The differences that divide Members of Congress on most major issues today are based on much more than mere party affiliation.

Senators and Representatives tend to become identified either as "conservatives" or as "liberals" but over the years these labels have meant different things to different people.

The root word or derivative of liberal is the same as liberty. A few decades ago, those called liberal fought to take the power away from the kings and emperors and to give it to the parliaments; now it is the liberals who are anxious to give more and more power to the Executive at the expense of the legislative branch.

Jenkins Lloyd Jones, in a recent syndicated column, took note of the change that has taken place in liberal philosophy, saying that they are capable of a great degree of dogma, while imagining themselves to be the foes of dogma.

One of the chief characteristics of the professional liberal in America is his naive belief in the corrective power of law. (The attempt to solve a problem with a study group which inevitably recommends the problem be solved by "burying" it with money.)

Every time the liberal sees social maladjustment or a personal tragedy he wants to pass a law to correct it. Gradually, and with the best intentions, he weaves a web of do's and don'ts that paralyzes the individual.

If you keep on passing laws to obviate every possible or alleged injustice you arrive eventually at the ultimate injustice, the police state.

Although the liberal often professes contempt for money, he has almost a childlike faith in its power. What he can't cure with a law he thinks he can cure with an appropriation.

When taxpayers occasionally balk at such expenditures at the local level, he demands that the Federal Government take over, on the theory that the farther the taxing agency is removed from the individual, the more chance there is that the individual will be complacent about the tax. (It's easy to appear before the city council, but how many taxpayers can afford to go to Washington?)

The argument: "If Missouri doesn't take the money, Maine will," is a potent one. Even those who oppose the idea can be excused for their efforts to get some of their hard-earned tax dollars spent back home.

Therefore, the liberal arrives quite illogically at his advocacy of centralized power and bureaucracy. Centralized power is the device by which the normal caution of the taxpayer is overwhelmed by his desires. It outflanks our traditional system of checks and balances, and often negates patriotism.

Federal aid to all schools, the liberal believes, will provide more funds without raising school taxes. (Never mind that every school board in the country is far more solvent today than the Federal Treasury in terms of indebtedness.)

Ninety percent Federal highway money means, the liberal says, that he won't have to pay for a bond issue. Federal welfare, he thinks, means that local responsibility can be shirked. (A good way to avoid a nagging conscience when the Community Chest drive falls short of its goals.)

Under this same philosophy, no one pays for his own medical care, but everyone pays for everybody else's.

One problem with the liberal is that he's getting way behind the times. He can't adjust his dogmas to new forces. He is furious at the price raising attempt by United States

Steel, but unable to comprehend the cost-fixing powers of the United States Steel workers. (He is unable to be responsibly progressive.)

He is irate about the greed of corporations and the evils of stock options. But he pleads that the criminal in the park who stabs for $20 is a deprived person who wouldn't have gone wrong, if there had been enough social legislation.

In his effort to cure injustice, he forgets that all the great struggles for freedom have been directed against the overblown force of big government.

The liberal, with minor interruptions, has been in power in America for 30 years. He won't admit error. He has concocted his medicine, and as our colic increases he merely calls for bigger doses.

"The liberal is a nice guy—but he is loving us to death."

The mass of laws and expenditures proposed by the New Frontier makes Jenkins Lloyd Jones look like a prophet. We have been regimented too long. We have subjected an entire generation to credit-card living.

Bills have been introduced in Congress to solve every problem—as though we could ever legislate our way to happiness.

It's so easy to spend at the Federal level where there are no worries about whether income equals outgo. And so we have a $300 billion national debt, an increasing outflow of gold, and a growing demand by everyone to get some of that free money said to be available in Washington. The Santa Claus complex has stifled self-help. It's still not too late to wake up—but the time is getting shorter.

Durward G. Hall,
Member of Congress.

April 30, 1963.

Thomas Vail Named Cleveland Plain Dealer Publisher and Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, one of the most outstanding and highly regarded newspapers in the United States, has a new publisher and editor, Mr. Thomas Vail. Mr. Vail, while only 36 years of age, is highly experienced in the newspaper field. He is the great grandson of the late Liberty E. Holden, one of Cleveland's great public spirited citizens who founded the morning and Sunday Plain Dealer. Mr. Vail will carry on the fine tradition of this great Ohio paper.

Under leave granted, I insert in the Record an article which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer announcing Mr. Vail's appointment as publisher and editor:

Thomas Vail was named yesterday as publisher and editor of the Plain Dealer.

For the past 2 years he has been vice president of the Forest City Publishing Co. Prior to that he was a reporter, political writer and legislative correspondent, and later worked as advertising solicitor, labor negotiator and in the accounting office and dispatch room.

The post of publisher is a newly created one. As editor he succeeds Wright Bryan, who resigned Tuesday.

Vail, who is 36, is the great-grandson of the late Liberty E. Holden, founder of the morning and Sunday Plain Dealer.

I. F. Freiberger, chairman of the board, described the appointment as an "ideal combination of responsibilities."

"Tom Vail's enthusiasm and drive are sure to inspire the staff in both editorial and business offices to reach new heights," said Freiberger. "We look forward to one of the brightest periods in the long history of the Plain Dealer."

Commenting on his appointment, Vail said:

"This appointment is a great challenge and a greater responsibility. We intend to give the city and the State vigorous and responsibile leadership. We will continue a reputation for integrity and excellence established over these many years by our loyal and able staff."

Vail was graduated cum laude from Princeton University in 1949, after previous education at University School and Deerfield Academy. He enlisted in the Navy in 1944, coming out as an ensign in the Naval Reserve.

He is a director of the Art Gravure Corp., director of the Holden Estates Co., trustee of the Ohio Newspaper Association, member of the conference board of This Week magazine, member of the board of directors of the Bureau of Advertising, and of the press communications committee of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, trustee of the Cuyahoga unit, American Cancer Society, member of the advisory board of St. Vincent Charity Hospital, trustee of the northern region, National Conference of Christians and Jews, director of the Cleveland Convention and Visitors Bureau, captain of Team 3, United Appeal, and Welfare Federation representative to the Community Fund.

He is a son of Herman L. Vail, attorney and president of the Forest City Publishing Co., and the late Delia White Vail. He and his wife, the former Iris Jennings, of New York, have three children, Siri, 10; Thomas, Jr., 7; and Lawrence, 4. They live in Hunting Valley.

Negro Will Head Hudson Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, in 1938 a young physician, Dr. Clement M. Jones, then recently graduated from the Howard University Medical School, and having done postgraduate work in surgery, settled in my home city, Bayonne, N.J. For a quarter of a century this man has cared for the ill and disabled of our city with skill, devotion, dedication, and kindliness. He has earned the love and respect of all who know him. As a leader in many civic projects, he has made contribution to the community outside of medicine. Bayonne is indeed a better place for his coming 25 years ago, and staying.

On May 7, Dr. Jones was inducted as the president of the Hudson County (N.J.) Medical Society, which has a membership of 600. He is the first Negro to be so honored.

I include the following article that appeared in the Newark (N.J.) News on May 7 in the Record, as follows:

NEGRO WILL HEAD HUDSON DOCTORS

(By Robert Kilgore)

Bayonne.—Dr. Clement M. Jones, a doctor here for 25 years, will be installed tonight as 1963–64 president of the Hudson County Medical Society. One of 600 doctors in the county organization, he is the first Negro to be elected president of a county medical society in New Jersey.

Sitting at his desk in his office, the doctor's calm and unhurried manner belies a sign on the wall that says: "Please state your case quickly, the next person may be sicker than you.

Dr. Jones seems to find time for everyone. He explains: "I take enough time and never had to fear a patient's return because I didn't."

Probably the struggle to become a doctor tempered him. "It wasn't easy," he admitted on the eve of his elevation to an honored post in a society founded in 1851.

However, most of the hardships have been economic—not racial, according to the doctor. He worked his way through two predominantly Negro universities to get his medical degree. A graduate of public high school in Nashville, Tenn., he earned his AB degree at Lincoln University in Chester County, Pa., in 1930. "That was the depression and times were tough," he said. He was graduated 4 years later from Howard University College of Medicine, Washington, with his doctor of medicine degree.

As a student, he held various jobs during the year. He was a porter during the summers in Albany, N.Y. I always had a part-time job in college, anything I could get. I also worked during the Christmas mail rush in Philadelphia."

After serving his internship and surgical residency at hospitals in St. Louis, Mo., he completed a course in surgery at New York University Postgraduate School and Cook County School of Medicine of the University of Illinois, Chicago.

He began his private practice in Bayonne in the fall of 1938. His patients include both Negroes and whites. "You see my waiting room," he said, "that's my answer." It was full, with about half of each race.

Active in civic affairs for many years, Dr. Jones attended by invitation a 1960 inauguration of his undergraduate classmate, Dr. Namdo Azikiwe, the first native governor general and commander in chief of the armed forces of Nigeria, following the independence of that new African nation.

Despite his busy practice and his active interest in several medical societies and local charities, such as the Bayonne Youth Center, of which he was president of the board of directors, Dr. Jones finds time to fish and golf. "I like deep sea fishing especially," he said, showing a picture of a nasty looking shark he caught recently. "It's relaxing, all you can see is water all around you."

SON MEDICAL STUDENT

The doctor lives at 454 Hudson Boulevard, with his wife, the former Lena B. Wood, of Pittsburgh, Pa. They have two children, a son, Merwood, 23, a medical student at Howard, and Adelyn Oliver, 21, a student at Boston Museum of Fine Arts.

The Prize and the Risk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the U.S. News & World Report of May 20 reminding the Negro people what they stand to lose if they insist we substitute special privilege for the rule of law.

There are few, if any, who deny that injustices have been practiced. There are few who would deny equal protection and opportunity under the law to all our people. No minority, no segment of our society can retain for all time its freedom if, in our attempt to correct injustices, we abort the procedures of law and order and bring about contempt for law enforcement agencies.

I hope that all who are concerned with the future of this Republic will read "The Prize and the Risk" which follows:

The Prize and the Risk

(Newspapers which have sympathized with and supported the objectives of the Negro organizations that seek to eliminate segregation in the public schools and in other public facilities are beginning to question the tactics of some of the Negro leaders. The editorial which is reprinted below was written by Joseph E. Evans, associate editor of the Wall Street Journal, and appeared in that newspaper on May 9. Mr. Evans has put his finger on the risks that these Negro leaders run in alienating public opinion. For certainly in their public demonstrations demanding what they deem to be constitutional rights, it is inconsistent for them to be engaged in practices which violate the customary rules of law designed to help a community maintain order and prevent a state of anarchy.—David Lawrence.)

For years now the cause of the Negro people has rightly enjoyed widespread sympathy and support. Most of us in this country, including many white people in the South, do not believe in segregated public facilities or in interfering with any citizen's voting privilege. The inevitable problems of change have turned chiefly on the speed and manner of desegregation.

The Negroes have had more than a general feeling working for them; they have had the specific advocacy of the most influential commentators, religious leaders, and Government officials. Especially since the 1954 Supreme Court decision they have had the Nation's legal system—indeed, the whole instrumentality of Government—geared to the achievement of their objectives.

For all these reasons the pace and peacefulness of desegregation so far has been little short of astonishing. There has been slowness in some places, violence in others, but by and large the Nation can be proud that it has adjusted so well to such difficult changes. The Negroes can be proud that, in seeking their ends, they have been acting as though they prized the world's good opinion.

That is why we believe they should now be wary lest they risk losing that prize.

From the small, sporadic, scattered and relatively quite sit-ins of a few years ago have grown large organized marches on cities. The invasion of Birmingham came under the label of nonviolent demonstrating, but it was all too likely to degenerate into violence by the very nature of the undertaking.

Without question, the Birmingham authorities have long been intransigent. Without question, the jailing of little children is a sorry spectacle. But it must also be asked who first threw the little children against the police lines.

Or can it seriously be argued that a community should do nothing whatsoever when a couple of thousand organized people—be they women ban-the-bomb marchers or Negroes with a cause—come in, parade up and down the streets and finally erupt in a spree of stoning the police? That can only be an argument for anarchy.

There is much danger in this snowballing effect. The bigger the mobs the worse it gets; some signs suggest the Birmingham mobs have got beyond the control of the leaders. Yet even so, the leaders themselves appeal for funds from all over the country to carry on the Birmingham fight. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has called for demonstrations against the Birmingham authorities in 100 key cities from Massachusetts to Texas. It doesn't take much perception to see where these tactics can lead.

Violent defiance of established authority is a last resort in civilized society. Men do resort to it when all legal recourses have been exhausted and they are still left with great grievances and no hope. But that is not at all the case here. We have all these elaborate legal steps so that men will not have to use the last resort.

Certainly in the case of the Negro cause the legal and other channels are more than open. School after school, and many other public places and facilities, have already been desegregated by legal means. Though violence finally came to the University of Mississippi, the lengthy process which led to the admission of Mr. Meredith was a legal one. Left to legal means, the completion of desegregation in time is a foregone conclusion.

It is understandable that the Negro leaders feel they are gaining so much that now is the time to push for everything, to rivet the Nation's and the world's attention on their problem and so solve it once and for all. But it could be unfortunate for their own cause; if they turn now to violence in city after city, North and South, even though the law and so much else is with their aspirations, they risk slowing the course on which good will has sped them.

If mob violence is a last resort, then it is no less true that a decent respect to the opinions of mankind is one of the most powerful arms in the Negroes arsenal. We hope that, under the spell of a dangerous and uncertain weapon, they will not let go of that prized possession.

Cut Spending—Taxes Will Go Lower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I was impressed, as I am sure my colleagues will be, by the words of a Minnesota editor, on the subject of spending and taxes. Orville Olson, editor of the Gibbon Gazette, had the following to say in a recent issue:

Cut Spending—Taxes Will Go Lower

What's the cause of the present national debt, the further increase in that debt that is certain to occur this year, and the present level of taxation?

This is not so simple-minded a question as it may seem. A common answer is to attribute it to the cost of national defense, in an era when weapons are unbelievingly expensive. And it is true that national defense accounts for roughly half of the total Federal budget, and is still on the upswing.

But proportionately, as Nation's Business points out in its April issue, defense has not been the principal villain of the play. Since 1952 defense spending has risen 26 percent, or $11 billion a year. But nondefense spending, in the same period, has risen 104 percent, or $22 billion a year, precisely twice as much in dollar terms.

Moreover, Nation's Business goes on to show Federal spending for nondefense purposes, which are in prospect, will rise on a wide variety of fronts. A partial list includes land, water and power projects, recreational facilities, fish and wildlife programs, urban renewal, public housing, rural electrification, and telephone loans. And this is by no means the end.

The magazine reports that public assistance will run to $3 billion next year, as against $2 billion in 1960—a jump of 50 percent. It will cost more, so far as one can see now, to support just about everything the Government does, plans to do, and wants to do. Areas where cost reductions are planned are almost as scarce as hen's teeth, and that is the basic problem that surrounds Mr. Kennedy's mired-down plan for tax cuts.

It is the most obvious of truisms to say that all of us would like to pay less in taxes—at all levels. It seems a cut in spending is the first line of attack before a tax cut can be made.

A Kansas City man said, "A tax cut alone would only be like taking an aspirin: relief but no cure. But a tax cut plus a cut in spending would give the country a boost like we haven't had in a long time." A New York lady said, "I can't afford for our household all the idealistic programs that would be nice for us as a family. And Mr. Kennedy can't afford for my country all the idealistic programs he proposes."

The influential Senator McClellan has said that "Continued excessive spending can only result in chaos and fiscal disaster."

Ronald Reagan Speaks Out—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to insert the second of a series of articles, dated May 2, 1962, appearing in the Dixon Evening Telegraph. The articles include the text of Mr. Ronald Reagan's lecture at Dixon High School on April 29, 1963.

The article follows:

What Price Freedom?

Last May speaking on NBC, the well-known American Socialist Upton Sinclair said, "I don't think we've ever been as near socialism as we are at this hour. I'm satisfied to call it progressive or advanced democracy, or whatever you please."

Recently John Kenneth Galbraith, our Ambassador to India, addressed an Indian audience. He told them that under their Socialist government they had only managed to nationalize 13 to 14 percent of their economy. And then he boasted that in America already one-fifth of the industrial capacity of our Nation is planned, fully controlled and disposed of by Government. A government may be the most benevolent, the most well-meaning in the world, but when it attempts to control the economy and operate the production of a nation, it must eventually use coercion and force to achieve its purposes.

Under Urban Renewal we have seen protection of the ownership of private property diluted until today public use is whatever Government planners decide it shall be. The Cleveland Plain Dealer reported that the

Federal Housing Administration stopped the construction of an $8 million apartment building because it might compete for tenants with a nearby Urban Renewal program.

Since 1933, the Congress of the United States has passed laws governing us that fill 11 thick volumes. At the same time, the agencies and bureaus of the Government have passed regulations controlling us that fill 59 such thick volumes. Many of these regulations permit agencies to bring a citizen before the agency for punishment. Many of them are "final and not subject to review by any courts." We have virtually lost the fourth amendment to the Constitution—our protection against search and seizure. How many of us realize that today Federal agents can invade a man's property if they suspect him of violating a regulation—not a law, a regulation—and they can impose a fine without a formal hearing, let alone a trial by jury? And if a fine isn't paid, they can seize and hold his property or sell it at auction to enforce the payment.

Last summer a man in New York State—dairy farmer by the name of Stalker—found his cows weren't giving enough milk to satisfy his customers needs. He went into the market and bought cream in 20-quart containers to augment his supply. He has been fined $21,000, the fine not subject to review by any court. The fine? Because he violated a regulation of the dairy program that said in buying the cream he shouldn't buy it in anything larger than 2-quart containers.

In the South a farm valued at $300,000 is sold at auction by the Government for $60,000 to enforce payment of a penalty for violating a rice-planting quota.

A boy with a 5-acre cotton allotment overplants by a fraction of 1 acre. His penalty is $52, but in the meantime weather destroys his crops so he plows it under and joins the Navy. The Government spent $61 sending a man to San Diego to collect the $52.

It's no wonder farmers are in trouble. One bulletin takes 750 words to define a farm and another 700 words to explain how to apply the definition. Try this on for size—"Cotton MQ bulletin 1 Handbook 501 (Rev. 3). 722.2 Definitions as used in 722.1 to 722.51 and in all documents and forms in connection therewith. Unless the context or submatter otherwise requires, the following terms shall have the following meanings and the masculine shall include the feminine and neuter genders and the singular shall include the plural." Well, you know, if exciting reading like that catches on—television's going right out the window.

We've had 30 years to see the connection between subsidy and control; 30 years in which our Government has invaded a section of our economy—the agricultural area—trying to control the production of a surplus. Today the surplus is bigger than ever and so is the program. We've paid a billion dollars to farmers not to plant. We've spent $4 billion paying them to fertilize and telling them how to increase the crop yield per acre. In 10 years, the farm support program has cost the Americans $26 billion in an effort to control this surplus—surplus?—and yet in that same period we have imported farm products from foreign countries valued at $42 billion. Each year we pay enough for not growing wheat to buy eight loaves of bread for every person in America every day of the year.

Recently a reclamation project was dedicated that's going to take water from the west slope of the Rockies and tunnel it through to the east slope. It's the Arkansas Fryingpan reclamation project. It will prorate out at a cost of $296 for every acre irrigated. But there's a Government agency standing by waiting to pay them $40 an acre not to plant the land after they get the water. In Blair, Nebr., the country club had 14 acres of ground it didn't need, leased it to a neighboring farmer who planted corn. Now they've decided to enlarge the golf course so they took the 14 acres back and the Government sent the country club a check for $288 for taking cornland out of production.

In the past 3 years six Government agencies have spent upward of $35 million telling poultry raisers how to increase egg production. At the same time a seventh Government agency has spent $12 million buying surplus eggs. We adopt a feed grain program to protect the family farmer and some of the family farmers we are saving—well, the Louisiana State Penitentiary gets $45,000 a year from this program, the Waterloo, Iowa, Airport $5,800, and the Kearney, Nebr. Airport $6,700. The city of St. Louis is a family farmer to the tune of $12,000 a year.

Only 20 percent of the farm economy is in this program of regulation and subsidy. Eighty percent of farming is still out in the open market, governed only by the laws of supply and demand. Most farmers believe today and have testified that they believe farming should be returned to this free competitive system. But Government never admits that it can be at fault and so the Government revealed what its thinking was as it suggested a cure to the farm mess in the omnibus farm bill defeated last year by Congress.

The 80 percent of free farming should be brought into the program with the 20 percent and to that end they demanded a program requiring a Federal license for the planting, the harvesting, and distribution of all the 256 agricultural products in this Nation. This program would have meant that even a housewife couldn't have planted a backyard garden without getting a Federal license before she put the seeds in the ground.

In the same bill they asked for the right to fine and imprison farmers who would not keep books as prescribed by the Federal Government. The Secretary of Agriculture asked for the right to buy farms at his discretion through condemnation, forced buying, and to resell them to private individuals if he so choose. They also asked for the right to turn over all food surplus and the receipts of the sale of all such surplus to the United Nations.

Now we have a depressed areas bill and we see more Government red tape unfurl. There's a little town in central California, an agricultural community, that has just established a record for prosperity—that is, by virtue of retail sales and personal bank deposits—but under this new bill the Government has declared it a depressed area. It seems that in the summertime in this agricultural community a canning company opens to can the vegetables. Some of the housewives get a few weeks work there and pick up some fall spending money. Then someone pointed out that after the canning company closed they were eligible for unemployment insurance so they've been doubling their take. Now they're depressed because, under this bill, the Labor Department determines depressed areas on the basis of applications for unemployment insurance. Now they're really going to be depressed because the entire prosperity of the community depends on importing migrant farm pickers—crop pickers—every spring and they cannot do this under the depressed areas bill so they have a committee in Washington asking that they be declared undepressed and the Government says, "lie down and be depressed."

On the international scene we find the same pattern of uncontrolled and unreasoning growth. We set out to help 19 war-ravaged countries. Today we are helping 97 and we have spent over a $100 billion.

I think that Christian charity—charity of the God of Moses—requires that we should share of our superfluous goods with our needy neighbor, but I don't think it requires us to go into debt to see that he has an egg in his beer. Dr. Howard Kershner, speaking to the Prime Minister of Lebanon recently, reported a conversation in which the Prime Minister said that his little country had balanced its budget every year, had no debt, no deficit, no inflation, and had increased its gold holdings from $20 to $170 million. When he had finished, Dr. Kershner said, "Mr. Prime Minister, my country hasn't balanced its budget in 26 out of the last 32 years. Our debt is greater than the combined debt of all the nations of the world. We're losing gold so fast that the very stability of our currency is in danger. We have chronic inflation. Do you think that under these circumstances we should continue to give your country millions of dollars each year?" And the Prime Minister said, "No, but if you're foolish enough to do it, we're going to keep on taking the money."

While Congress debated lending $100 million to the United Nations our State Department gave the United Nations $217 million out of aid funds and the United Nations used a part of that money to pay the dues of other nations in the United Nations. One of the countries we helped in this way—Castro's Cuba. Government outside of its legitimate duties does nothing as well or as economically as the private sector of the economy.

No one would challenge the fine purpose or noble goal of the Peace Corps. Indeed, we've proven this over a long period of years with our support of missions to every corner of the world. One such endeavor sponsored by a religious order sends volunteers abroad and cost of training and maintenance is $900 a year for each volunteer. The Peace Corps started at a prorated cost of $9,000 per volunteer and already that cost has gone to $22,000.

Navy Nurse Corps Celebrates 55th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, today is the 55th anniversary of the Navy Nurse Corps. I am proud to give honor to this team of capable, dedicated, and courageous women, who have so well served the men and women of our Nation's Armed Forces.

I am especially pleased to have this opportunity to salute the director of the Navy Nurse Corps, Capt. Ruth A. Erickson, who is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Erickson of Virginia, Minn. Her parents, her hometown, the State of Minnesota, and the whole country can well be proud of Ruth Erickson.

Having served 2 years at Colonial Hospital, Rochester, Minn., Captain Erickson entered the Navy Nurse Corps on July 27, 1936. Stationed in Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, in 1940, she witnessed the Japanese attack on the island on December 7, 1941, and she was in Pearl Harbor on the day the war with Japan ended.

Captain Erickson was promoted to the grade of captain on July 1, 1960, thus becoming the third officer in the Navy Nurse Corps to be promoted to that rank by a selection board. She holds the Navy Unit Commendation, American Defense Service Medal, Asiatic-Pacific Service Medal with one star, American Theater Medal, World War II Victory Medal, Navy Occupation Service Medal, and the National Defense Service Medal. She became director of the Navy Nurse Corps on May 1, 1962, and I know she has been doing and will continue to do an outstanding job.

Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted I insert in the RECORD at this point a brief history of the Navy Nurse Corps and the anniversary greetings which have been extended to the corps by Captain Erickson and by Rear Adm. E. C. Kenney, Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery of the U.S. Navy.

Navy Nurse Corps Celebrates Its 55th Anniversary

The Nurse Corps, U.S. Navy, was established by an act of Congress on May 13, 1908. Fifteen months later Esther Voorhees Hasson was appointed the first superintendent. By October 1, 1909, 20 nurses, later called the "sacred 20," reported to the U.S. Naval Hospital in Washington, D.C., for orientation and duty.

The first nurses regularly assigned to transport duty reported aboard the U.S.S. *George Washington* in December 1918 on which President Wilson sailed to France, although nurses previously were assigned briefly to transport ships in 1913.

During the past 55 years, Navy nurses have served in hospitals, dispensaries, schools, aboard ship, and with air groups all over the world. In addition, they have organized and directed schools of nursing for native women on Guam and Samoa. First members of the Navy Nurse Corps to serve outside the United States reported to the Philippines in 1910 and shortly after to Guam, Honolulu, Yokohama, Samoa, Virgin Islands, and Cuba. Legislation was enacted on July 1, 1942, which gave nurses relative rank from ensign through lieutenant commander grades. In 1944 actual rank was established. The Army-Navy Nurses Act of April 1947 created and established the Nurse Corps as a permanent staff corps of the U.S. Navy. Capt. Nellie DeWitt became the first director of the corps as a permanent staff corps. Legislation passed by the 85th Congress in August 1957 created three additional billets in the rank of captain. At present the three captains other than the director of the corps are: Capt. Alberta Burk, Capt. Edwina Todd, and Capt. Dorothy Monahan.

Known as Public Law 85-155 this legislation also provided an increase in promotions by removing the limitations in selection in the grade of lieutenant commander; increasing selection in the grades of commander to 5 percent of Nurse Corps officers on active duty.

During World War II the Nurse Corps was extended to 11,086 including both members of the Regular and Reserve Corps on active duty. Nurses within continental limits were assigned to 40 naval hospitals, 176 dispensaries and 6 hospital corps schools. They brought nursing care to the frontlines, aboard 12 hospital ships, in air evacuation of casualties and to foreign lands where American women had never been seen before. At land based establishments overseas they were assigned to naval activities in the Aleutian Islands, Alaska, Australia, New Hebrides, New Zealand, New Caledonia, Russel Island, Solomon Islands, Admiralty Islands, Marianas Islands, England, Africa, Italy, Newfoundland, Cuba, Bermuda, and Trinidad. When the surrender was signed abroad the U.S.S. *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay, Japan in August 1945, nurses were stationed aboard the three hospital ships of the 3d Fleet, waiting to go ashore to administer care to the allied prisoners and to evacuate them from Japan.

Down through time's unfailing past Navy nurses have proven themselves equal to their leader's fondest hopes. Their sacrifices, courage, devotion to duty, as well as their achievements, earned them the respect and love of the fighting men and of their countrymen. During World War I, four Navy nurses were awarded the Navy Cross for outstanding service, three posthumously; two others won Army citations for "special, meritorious and conspicuous service." In World War II Cmdr. Ann A. Bernatitus, now retired, was the first person in the naval service to receive the Legion of Merit for service with the Army on Bataan. In January 1945, a destroyer, the U.S.S. *Higbee*, named for Lenah S. Higbee, the second superintendent of the Nurse Corps and one of the first four women of the Navy to receive the Navy Cross, became the first fighting ship named for a woman in the service. During this period 13 nurses were awarded Bronze Star Medals for meritorious achievement and service in the performance of duty; 11 received Gold Stars in lieu of a second Bronze Star Medal; and 7 received Commendation Ribbons for outstanding service in both European and Pacific theaters. Twelve nurses wear the Distinguished Unit Badge of the Army for especially meritorious service in the Philippines, and 42 have unit commendations for distinguished service aboard the U.S.S. *Solace* and at the Naval Hospital, Pearl Harbor, at the time of the Japanese attack. Letters of Commendation have been awarded to several nurses for meritorious service aboard hospital ships. During the Korean conflict three Navy nurses won the Bronze Star, one a letter of commendation with ribbon and combat "V" while six received letters of commendation.

Currently, approximately 2,100 Navy nurses serve at home, at sea, and abroad. A majority of these nurses had the opportunity through further education and assignment to become proficient in numerous areas. They serve in the clinical areas of medicine, surgery, pediatrics, psychiatry, and maternity. Other nursing specialists are assigned to areas of administration, supervision, research, nuclear nursing, blood bank, operating room, procurement, anesthesia, education, and clinical specialties. The Navy Nurse Corps officers maintain their superiority professionally and educationally by keeping abreast of current developments in nursing and allied arts, by attending continuous inservice programs in all naval hospitals, by assignment to universities, short courses and workshops and through participation in professional organizations and community programs.

Capt. Ruth A. Erickson, the director of the Navy Nurse Corps assumed her office on May 1, 1962. She, along with her predecessors, added to the Nurse Corps history by her assignments and her achievements. From November 1938 until April 1940, Captain Erickson was assigned aboard the hospital ship, U.S.S. *Relief*. From May 1940 until July 1942, she was stationed at the U.S. Naval Hospital, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, during which time she witnessed the outbreak of World War II and the attack on Pearl Harbor. She accompanied the first war casualties who were evacuated to the United States aboard the U.S.S. *President Coolidge* on December 19, 1941. From April 1945 until March 1946, she was again assigned aboard a hospital ship, the U.S.S. *Haven*, as Chief of Nursing Service, and arrived at Pearl Harbor on the day hostilities with Japan ceased. Thus she was in Pearl Harbor on the day when World War II began and ended.

Greetings to Nurse Corps Officers

As the historical date of the 55th anniversary of the establishment of the Navy Nurse Corps approaches, I am pleased and happy to extend my greetings and heartiest congratulations to each of you.

The occasion of this anniversary affords all of us an opportunity to reflect proudly on the achievements of nurses serving faithfully through the years and to view, as well, the professional progress of our corps. Each decade in the past 55 years of the corps' existence presents vivid illustrations of the devotion to duty, personal sacrifices and professional superiority of our members. We have an illustrious heritage, and one of which we may be justifiably proud.

On this anniversary, I am sincerely grateful for your individual contributions, your loyal support and your concern with the improvement of nursing. As Navy Nurse Corps officers, you are recognized for your proficiency in your profession and your marked ability in leadership. All of these have been instrumental in maintaining high standards of nursing service which is in keeping with the traditions of the Navy and will contribute, I feel certain, to the success and future progress of our corps.

My warmest personal regards and sincere best wishes for a very happy anniversary.

RUTH A. ERICKSON,
Captain, Nurse Corps, U.S. Navy,
Director, Navy Nurse Corps.

To the Officers of the Navy Nurse Corps:

On this memorable occasion of your corps' 55th anniversary, I extend greetings and hearty congratulations to all of you.

As very important members of the medical department team, your devotion to duty and your contributions to the health of the people of this Nation and throughout the world, lend strong support to the accomplishment of our mission.

You have adapted nursing practice to support the needs of a nuclear-powered Navy and a technological age and continue to keep stride with the rapidly changing concepts of medical and nursing service.

Your record of achievements has been a source of pride to all members of the medical department, and your lustrous history should provide inspiration and a large measure of satisfaction to the thousands of professional women who have served in the Navy Nurse Corps during the past 55 years.

Happy birthday.

E. C. KENNEY,
Rear Admiral, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy,
Surgeon General.

The Way of Our Schools: The Politics of Religious Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that one of these sessions the demand of our Nation for better education will activate the Congress to act in its appropriate constitutional role of legislators for the general welfare. When it does so it is inexorable that we will be drawn further into the conflict—the needless but evident conflict on religion in education. We will have the choice of assisting only the nonreligionists—thereby advancing their specific religiosity or aiding all approved and accredited schools regardless of their sectarian, nonsectarian, or sectless public nature. I leave it to the wisdom of my colleagues as to which route best fits the compass of the general welfare.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues a brilliant and well-reasoned note on the question of religion in education which appears in America magazine under the title "The Politics of Religious Equality":

The Politics of Religious Equality

(By Francis Canavan)

"Constitutional law," said Justice Frankfurter, "is not a science, but politics."

Sometime late this spring, the U.S. Supreme Court will hand down a decision in two cases involving Bible reading and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer in public schools. Unless the Court loses its nerve and retreats from the position it took last year in the New York prayer case, it will declare these practices unconstitutional. Popular reaction to this decision in many parts of the country is likely to be as vehement as it was last June.

The reaction will also be a confused one. We have a peculiar habit in this country of turning religious, moral, social, and economic conflicts into cases in constitutional law. There are many advantages in this way of handling potentially disruptive disputes. But it often serves to obscure the true point at issue.

Thus, in the prayer and Bible reading cases, the question is thought to be one of religious liberty, which is resolved into an inquiry into the meaning of "an establishment of religion." I suggest that the question is at bottom not one of liberty but of equality, and that it is a political rather than a legal question. What we are really arguing about is, not the interpretation of a constitutional clause, but the application of a principle laid down in the Declaration of Independence: "All men are created equal."

For, with all our faults and despite the glaring inequities that mark our society, there is no doubt that we are committed to the principle of equality. That is why, slowly and against enormous resistance, we are nonetheless moving toward interracial justice. It is also the basic reason why church-state relations are increasingly engaging our attention.

Church-state is frequently a misnomer; in the New York prayer case, for instance, no church was involved. But in litigation in this field there is always a question of the constitutional relationship between government and religion. In all of these cases, too, what is at issue is the meaning and application of our commitment to equality as it affects the standing of our different religious groups before the law.

That church-state relations are being argued with a new intensity is due, first of all, to the rise in numbers, wealth and influence of non-Protestant groups in the population. Catholics on the one hand and Jews and secular humanists on the other are asking with mounting insistence for more equal treatment in the administration of governmental institutions and the distribution of public funds. These claims affect the whole range of laws and institutions that make up the modern welfare state. But the demand for a new interpretation of religious equality is pressed hardest in the field of education.

Jewish and secularist groups want the last traces of religious activity removed from the public school. As originally established in the 19th century, the public school was an interdenominational Protestant school, nonsectarian rather than simply secular. State constitutions obliged it not to teach the distinctive tenets of any sect, but it reflected the religious consensus of what was then the great majority of the American people by teaching common precepts of Christian morality and by such exercises as Bible reading and hymn singing. The public school has now been secularized to a large extent in the urbanized parts of the country. But many Jews and presumably all secularists, supported today by a good number of Protestant spokesmen, want the process carried to completion, on the principle that the only way to treat all beliefs equally is to exclude them all from education.

Catholics, who once opposed religion in the public schools as Protestant, now generally favor retaining what little of it is left, on the premise that the acknowledgment of God's existence is part of the national tradition and helps, in a small way, to preserve the public school from a bias against religion. Many Protestants and some Jews agree with this view.

The major interest of Catholics, however, is to get all schools, their own included, recognized as serving a public interest in the education of children and to make this recognition practical by having nonpublic education included in any general Federal program of aid to education.

The second reason why church-state relations are now the subject of more public dispute than before is a development in our constitutional law. The first amendment to the Constitution, of itself, binds only the Federal Government. "Congress," says the amendment, "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The States were left free by the amendment to regulate the relation between government and religion as they chose. But most of the areas in which religion comes into contact with government lie within the jurisdiction of the States rather than of the Federal Government. Such are marriage and the family, public morals, the protection of life and health, some parts of criminal and civil law and, supremely, education.

In 1925, however, the Supreme Court began to interpret the 14th amendment as meaning that the first amendment was binding on the States as well as on the Federal Government. It was not until 1947, only 16 years ago, that the Court for the first time undertook to apply the establishment of religion clause of the first amendment to the States and their administrative subdivisions, such as counties, municipalities and school districts.

Prior to 1947, the Court had decided only three cases under the establishment clause. All three had involved the Federal Government, and in each of these cases the Court upheld the Government against the charge that it had acted in such a way as to establish a religion.

But when the Court undertook, in 1947, to apply the establishment clause to the activities of State and local governments, it opened up a wide range of litigation. Prof. George W. Spicer, of the University of Virginia, remarked a few years ago:

"The task of the Court today is complicated not only by the absence of applicable judicial precedents, but also by the fact that the intentions of the framers of the establishment clause have been obscured by the passage of time, and that diverse attitudes and traditions have arisen to confuse the accepted meaning of the clause, if such can be said to exist. Even more important is the fact that the modern application of the clause involves situations which were unknown to the framers and could not have been foreseen by them," ("The Supreme Court and Fundamental Freedoms," Appleton, 1959).

In a word, in determining the meaning of the establishment clause, the Supreme Court is sailing on a largely uncharted sea. Since 1947, the Court has marked off a few reefs and a few channels. We now know that it is constitutionally permitted for a State or locality to pay the bus fares of parochial as well as public and other private school pupils, to allow released-time religious instruction classes outside of public school buildings and to enact Sunday-closing laws. We also know that a State is forbidden to permit released-time classes in public school buildings or to write a school prayer. A State may not require a declaration of faith in God as a condition for public office, either.

But these decisions tell us comparatively little about the meaning of "an establishment of religion." Moreover, it is hard to find any consistent principle running through them. Leonard W. Levy, professor of constitutional history at Brandeis University, has criticized the Court as "extremely inconsistent, even erratic in its interpretation of the establishment clause" (Commentary, September 1962). Many who do not share Professor Levy's faith in a perfect separation between religion and government as the clear meaning of the Constitution would still agree with this criticism.

William B. Ball recently found ("Religion in Education: A Basis for Consensus") that there are principles in existing Supreme Court decisions on which the Court could base an equitable solution of the problem of religion in education. But he would not venture, I suspect, to predict that the Court will in fact follow those principles consistently in future decisions.

An important conclusion follows from all this. It is that we are making up the meaning of the first amendment as we go along. One certainly cannot accept the plea, which is sometimes advanced, that when people bring a case in court under the establishment clause, they are only seeking to protect their constitutional rights. They are usually, in fact, asking the court to write into constitutional law their conception of what their rights ought to be. Incidentally, they are also asking for a new definition of the relationship between government and religion, which is a public matter and not merely a question of individual rights.

One cannot blame people for doing this. But we should realize that for all practical purposes the establishment clause of the first amendment is in large part still to be written. And when it is written, it will not be composed by the Supreme Court acting in a vacuum. The Court hears arguments and studies briefs submitted by the opposing parties and by organizations interested in a case. From these briefs the Court usually draws the arguments which it uses to justify the decision it hands down. The constitutional law of the United States does not result from unilateral court decrees, but from a dialog between the courts and the legal profession.

It would also be unrealistic to think of the legal profession as acting in the "church-state" field simply as the defender of helpless individuals against the power of government. In "A Review of Church-State Legal Developments, 1961–62," which he wrote for the National Conference of Christians and Jews (NCCJ Background Reports, September 1962), George R. La Noue said:

"In the church-state field, the American Civil Liberties Union, American Jewish Congress, Protestants and Other Americans United, the National Catholic Welfare Conference and, more recently, Citizens for Educational Freedom play important roles in the process of getting these issues into court. A rough estimate would be that in at least half of the cases discussed one of these organizations played a role in initiating or developing the case through counseling, providing funds or legal talent, or submitting an amicus curiae brief."

Last fall, the executive secretary of Citizens for Educational Freedom assured me that his organization had not taken part in any cases. I have also been told on good authority that the National Catholic Welfare Conference is reluctant, as a matter of policy, to encourage court action. That would indicate that the other three organizations named by Mr. La Noue are the ones most active in this field.

Be that as it may, we live in a pressure-group democracy. Church-state cases for the most part do not come spontaneously before the Supreme Court. They are started or at least helped along the way by organizations. This fact is not mentioned in order to condemn it as "a bad thing." It is simply a reality which we ought not to ignore.

Organizations have policies, for the advancement of which they take cases to court. Where the case demands an interpretation of the establishment clause, the organizations taking part in the case are seeking to write into constitutional law the interpretation of governmental relations with religion which most favors their interests as they see them.

Former Justice Felix Frankfurter once remarked that "constitutional law * * * is not at all a science, but applied politics." He had a good point. In deciding litigation concerning the establishment clause, the courts are engaged in an essentially political process. They are trying, though without striking success so far, to determine the conditions on which the diverse religious groups that make up our Nation can coexist on truly equal terms.

Because we have a national commitment to the principle of equality, each contending group argues for the interpretation of religious equality which best suits the needs of that group. Naturally, it is prepared to offer equality on the same terms to all other groups. But it does not follow that the definition of equality that pleases one group will seem like genuine equality to all other groups. The Supreme Court will eventually have to choose among the contending versions of equality or, more likely, will come up with a compromise solution that will fully satisfy no one.

The concept of religious equality which is being advanced most vigorously today belongs to an alliance of groups which we may describe generically as secularizers. Not all of these people are secularists in their personal beliefs. But they agree in wanting a complete separation between religion and government, that is, a total secularization of American public life and especially of education.

The secularization of education was the broad issue involved in the New York prayer case and was the reason why the Supreme Court's decision evoked so strong an emotional response, from both opponents and partisans of the decision. The case concerned the recitation of a prayer, composed by the State Board of Regents, in New York State public schools.

The court might have found this practice unconstitutional, had it so chosen, as a violation of the free exercise of religion clause of the First Amendment. In that event, the court would have decided that there was some degree of coercion of school children to join in the recitation of the prayer, despite the rather elaborate provisions made for leaving children free not to recite it. But the court deliberately excluded that argument as the basis of its decision and chose to find that recitation of the prayer in public schools was an unconstitutional establishment of religion.

"The establishment clause," said the Court, speaking through Justice Hugo Black, "does not depend upon any showing of direct governmental compulsion and is violated by the enactment of laws which establish an official religion whether those laws operate directly to coerce nonobserving individuals or not." But in the present case, the Court said, supplying the minor premise of its argument, "There can be no doubt that New York's State prayer program officially establishes the religious beliefs embodied in the Regents' prayer."

The court thus seemed to find itself in disagreement with the author of the first amendment, James Madison. During the debates on the first amendment in the House of Representatives in 1789, Madison said that he "apprehended the meaning of the words to be, that Congress should not establish a religion and enforce the legal observation of it by law, nor compel men to worship God in any manner contrary to their conscience."

But one quotes Madison in church-state cases only when he is useful and serves a purpose. It was not Justice Black's purpose in this case to show that an establishment of religion implies coercion in favor of a particular religious belief. He aimed rather at making the establishment clause of the first amendment a rigid and abstract norm, whose application should be independent of the question whether in fact anyone had suffered any tangible injury from an alleged establishment of religion.

The year before the Prayer Case, in 1961, Justice Black had stated the content of this norm in the case of *Torcaso* v. *Watkins* (367 U.S. 488), where he said:

"Neither (a State nor the Federal Government) can constitutionally pass laws or impose requirements which aid all religions as against nonbelievers, and neither can aid those religions based on a belief in the existence of God as against those religions founded on different beliefs."

In a footnote, Justice Black explained: "Among religions in this country which do not teach what would generally be considered a belief in the existence of God are Buddhism, Taoism, Ethical Culture, Secular Humanism, and others."

In allowing Justice Black to propound this thesis, the Court wrote itself into a verbal mess, as Charles M. Whelan remarked in these pages last week ("Religion, Orthodoxy, Public Schools"). Presumably, we all want public schools to teach children to be kind, honest, decent, democratic and, in a word, moral beings. But if the public schools may do nothing which relates these moral values to belief in God, then the schools must teach moral principles on a purely independent and secular basis. That is the basis on which Ethical Culture and Secular Humanism inculcate moral values—and the Supreme Court has gone out of its way to declare that they are "religions" in the constitutional sense. Thus the attempt to achieve a radical disestablishment of theistic religion results in the establishment of nontheistic religion—paid for, of course, by taxes.

The conclusion that logically should follow from the Court's position is that the religiously neutral public school is a contradiction in terms. The truth is that the public school, by its nature, is an institution about which a religiously divided community cannot afford to be overly logical. To say the least, a school which attempts to educate children of different religious and cultural backgrounds in the same classroom has taken on a difficult task. That such a school exists and functions at all is due only to the willingness of the population at large to accept certain working compromises.

The nature and content of these compromises change with evolving social conditions. The 19th century working arrangement, adopted by the predominantly Protestant population of that day, was the interdenominational Protestant public school. Catholics and Jews could take it or leave it as they chose, but it was the only school recognized as serving a public purpose. That arrangement no longer works. But it can be replaced only by a new compromise which all major groups find acceptable in practice, if not in theory.

But there is no such word as "compromise" in the lexicon of the secularizers. They know what the first amendment means; and what it means, in their ideology, is the absolute secularization of all education which is supported by public funds. Nothing less will do.

Secularization implies three main consequences. The first is that the public school may neither perform nor allow the performance of any religious activity within its walls: no prayer, no Bible-reading, no Christmas carols, etc. Secondly, the public school may not cooperate with religious bodies in religious instruction through released-time classes, either within or outside of the public school buildings. Finally, no private school may receive public funds, directly or indirectly, if it includes religious instruction or practices in its teaching.

Secularization thus understood goes far beyond protecting children from being taught a religion other than their own. The three principles stated above have to be taken together and in conjunction in order to grasp the true meaning of the secularizers' policy. It amounts to saying: What we don't want for our children, you can't have for your children, unless you pay for it out of your own pocket.

The practical difficulty with this conception of religious equality is that, to too many people, it seems like inequality and discrimination against them. For that reason, it is hard to believe that the secularizers' thesis will ultimately prevail.

As a political institution, the Supreme Court must reflect the deep convictions of the people about what is just. In our democractic system, justice connotes equality among all citizens in their basic rights. This principle must furnish the premise of all discussion of church-state relations in the United States.

But many Americans will not easily accept the secularizers' purely negative conception of equality; the least common denominator of the religions of America, after all, is not unbelief. In my opinion, at any rate, the American people will eventually see the need for a more positive equality among religious groups. It will consist in equal recognition of the deeply felt needs of all, including the need, felt by many Americans, for religious training as an element in the education of their children.

Boston's Plan for Juvenile Decency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the current hearing in the Educational and Labor Committee on the subject of juvenile delinquency has once again focused attention on this most disturbing problem that engulfs increasing numbers of our young people.

Fortunately, the 87th Congress took an initial but giant step forward in an effort to head off what Dr. Conant has called this "social dynamite" in our cities. Through the enactment of the

Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act, funds were made available to organizations in our cities to plan for the prevention of juvenile delinquency.

The city of Boston has received such a planning grant. Its community organization—Action for Boston Community Development—has undertaken the enormous task of developing plans to prevent our young people from heading in the direction of crime. Rather than researching the causes of juvenile delinquency, the focus of their efforts has been on developing long-range community plans that will prevent juvenile delinquency in the future.

An article recently appeared in the Sunday edition of the Boston Herald concerning the progress that Action for Boston Community Development has made in its study of juvenile delinquency prevention. The plans that have been formulated to date are very encouraging and I believe offer substantial hope of meeting this problem in the future. Action for Boston Community Development's program for prevention stresses the need for job and educational opportunities for our young people between the age of 13 and 18 years.

In the near future, Boston will be ready to move into the action stage of its program—a program that I believe is well thought out and offers great promise of success.

Under unanimous consent I include feature story from the Boston Herald at this point in the Record in order that my colleagues may read what my city is doing to combat the spread of juvenile delinquency:

Five Thousand Youngsters in Police Hands Yearly—Action for Boston Community Development To Study Whys, Wherefores of Delinquency

Every year, 5,000 Boston youngsters fall into the hands of police, 1,700 go to court and 200 are committed to the Youth Service Board.

Why has a city with such a proliferation of public and private resources failed its young so spectacularly?

FROM 3½ TO 21

A fledgling organization, Action for Boston Community Development, has taken on the outsized job of trying to find out, and then of trying to find out what to do about it.

In the process, ABCD will work with tots of 3½ years and young men and women of 21. It will, perhaps, step on the toes of some of our most revered agencies. It will profile the potental and full-fledged delinquent, and in doing so will profile the neighborhood in which he lives, studies, and plays.

The youth program of ABCD, an agency conceived to attack the major social problems of urban life, was outlined this week by Daniel I. Cronin, youth program director; Robert Perlman, program development chief; and Clarence C. Sherwood, research director.

Starting on a $159,400 shoestring provided by the President's juvenile delinquency control program—and with financial help to be sought from the Ford Foundation and a variety of other agencies—ABCD will create no bureaucracy of its own, but will work with existing agencies. It will be supported by specialists from virtually every phase of youth activity in the city.

Target areas—low income, high in delinquency and property deterioration—will be Roxbury, Charlestown and the South End. Here will be concentrated the ABCD's programs, which will be tailored to prevent delinquency rather than to cure its symptoms.

ABCD's definition of a delinquent, Perlman said, is a youth who has had contact with the law for offenses that would be considered criminal if he were adult.

WIDE RANGE

"Many look on a delinquent as somebody who is out of step with society and has to be returned to the mold," he said. "Our idea is to change the institution to handle the youth, without necessarily bringing about any deep fundamental changes in the person."

The range of the ABCD plans is extremely wide; it will work in the school, the home, the welfare agency, with the courts and police. The program is in the earliest planning stages. Statistics and surveys will come first, new ideas and action later. The first version of the planning should be completed by fall.

"We're trying to pull together existing data," Sherwood said, "In any given agency you find a number of different kinds of kids. Some are fine, some are not. And it isn't just the agencies. Little is being done to study parental control. We want to find out what a neighborhood as a whole is doing."

The end product, the ABCD leaders suggested, may be recommendations involving where stress should be placed and money spent, where effort is being stinted and where wasted.

In the delinquency study, specific youngsters will be used; it will not be all statistics. "If we can get a sample of kids on their way to trouble, and find out what agencies have contact with them, who spotted them, who's trying to help and who isn't and should, that should be useful," Perlman said. "A lot of them slip through the community service net. We want to try to plug the holes."

JOBLESS YOUTH

Because the jobless youth is trouble-prone, ABCD expects to spend considerable effort in this area, working with Federal and State labor departments.

"We'd like to learn what spots can use more young people and how; and we expect to do this with the help of the State employment service," Perlman said. "We hope for funds to help set up centers to get hold of kids out of work, determine their capabilities and provide training and other services."

ABCD will study, too, the question of whether the young are being trained for jobs from which automation and other factors will remove them; and whether unemployment among the young is a matter of job shortages or a variance between skills and available jobs.

In this region, the delinquency program is expected to dovetail to some extent with a school program sought by the Boston school system but not yet approved by ABCD's board. Should the anticipated board approval be given, Ford Foundation funds will be sought to put the program in action.

The Boston school committee recently voted $23,000 as its share of a start on several programs—none new, but each a little different from anything now being done here.

No Federal funds will be used for the school program if it is approved, Cronin said.

Effort is contemplated in five directions on the school level.

Starting at the bottom, the school department wants to see created prekindergarten schools for youngsters 3½ to 4½ years old in disadvantage areas. Service agencies and the schools would choose children with demonstrated learning problems. The object is to get them off to an even start with their young peers at kindergarten time.

At the junior high school level, the demonstration program would use full-time guidance advisers, Cronin said, with a particular view to preventing dropouts "through the use of such community resources as youth counseling and employment centers where special testing and help may be obtained."

ABCD pointed out that today's school dropouts are tomorrow's unemployables and potential sources of trouble.

PROBLEM YOUTHS

Problem youngsters would be handled with school adjustment counseling, chiefly on the elementary level. The schools would like to see several full-time specialists with teaching and social work backgrounds enlisted for this.

These experts would work not only in the school but also with the family. One function would be to establish criteria for the youngsters most likely to get into real trouble later. Boston schools have such a program but it is spread very thinly, and educational leaders are eager to learn if a saturation effort would make a difference.

In the belief that school dropouts, and to some extent delinquency, may have their beginnings in a simple inability to read well, the school department has asked ABCD to generate two programs in this field.

Remedial reading. There are now about 50 teachers, but they are few compared to the need. Authorities want to test the idea that intensive remedial reading teaching can reach those with lower intelligence quotients than is possible with present resources.

Developmental reading. Up to now, reading has been generally considered a "subject" only to the sixth grade. In this program, it would be actively taught at the junior high level with all teachers participating, and it would extend into all areas of study.

Free Labor Menaced by Government Intervention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the strength of the American labor movement has been in the protection of its freedom. Now, along with all other segments of our society, labor is faced with the inevitable result of looking to the Federal Government for special consideration—the inevitable result is dictatorship.

Short-sighted labor leaders, spurred by a lust for power, have not hesitated to use the Federal Government to shift the balance in collective bargaining to their side. It is true that they can make gains in this way, but only at the expense of their freedom.

The final result of the road we are following in labor relations—the "Road to Futility"—is summed up in an editorial from the Wall Street Journal which I include at this point in my remarks:

ROAD TO FUTILITY

"Neither the traditional collective bargaining procedures nor the present labor dispute laws are working to the public's satisfaction, at least so far as major labor controversies are concerned. * * * If collective bargaining can't produce peaceful settlements of these controversies, the public will."

Thus does Labor Secretary Wirtz, writing in the newspaper of the Masters, Mates, and Pilots Union, sum up a problem confronting not only the maritime industry but others as well. Already, several of the public's representatives in Congress are urging, as a solution for maritime disputes, a system of compulsory arbitration by Government-appointed boards—in effect, Federal dictation of settlements.

Mr. Wirtz, together with union leaders and most management officials, rightly opposes this proposal. But few people seem to pay much attention to the roots of the current muddled situation.

In the maritime and other industries, labor contract negotiations once were a matter for a single employer and representatives of his workers, both sides deeply interested in the preservation of the enterprise that provided jobs and profits. But unions, with Government encouragement and governmental exemption from antitrust laws, soon grew so big that they acquired power to close down whole industries. So it is that strikes, once matters of limited local concern, can become national emergencies.

In its efforts to deal with such emergencies, the Government has been stepping in ever earlier. Both labor and management now expect such intervention and have far less incentive to freely settle their own disputes. This is especially true of unions, since the Government's proposals of late—as in the east coast dock strike—tend to lean heavily toward labor's side.

If it is impossible to get back to realistic bargaining on a local basis, then more Government intervention is inevitable. But at least everyone ought to see where the road is leading and why. And they should also see the futility of trying to solve a problem largely caused by Government involvement by embracing outright Government dictation.

Is the Kennedy Administration Going To Sell Out to Castro Further by Abandoning Guantanamo?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, recent events give rise to the question, is the Kennedy administration going to sell out further to Castro and the Communists by abandoning Guantanamo?

This question might seem improbable, but all signs point in that direction. Why did Castro after making this as one of his demands on October 28, 1962, when the blockade was barely withdrawn, secure from Khrushchev recently a restatement of this demand by Khrushchev on his recent visit to Russia if it was not their intention to press for this removal?

Why did the Jackson killing of the Cuban spy incident come to light at this specific time?

Why are the Cuban Communist border patrols around Guantanamo suddenly causing incidents of rock throwing, without provocation?

Why is the administration asking for $18 million to further improve Roosevelt Roads in Puerto Rico which would be able to house the facilities presently at Guantanamo?

If we gave in on Castro's demand for stopping all exile raids on his country, which was made at the same time as the demands to remove Guantanamo, what reason do we have to believe that the second demand will not be given in to in that the first was conceded?

These are all startlingly and alarmingly important questions and they all point to the conclusion that the foundation is being laid for the surrender of Guantanamo to Castro. This would be one of the blackest days in the history of our country.

This is a view shared by many and I site the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News as proof thereof:

HAS DEAL FOR GUANTANAMO BEEN MADE?

The report that the Pentagon is requesting $18 million to expand Navy facilities in Puerto Rico has touched off speculation that the United States may be preparing to withdraw from Guantanamo. It is claimed that President Kennedy may have agreed to pull U.S. forces out of the Cuban base in his correspondence with Soviet Premier Khrushchev last October, or that U.S. military authorities are merely preparing an alternative site in the event that Castro should force us out of Guantanamo.

Whatever the actual facts on the Cuban base, it does seem strange that such a large increase in our Puerto Rico naval facilities is being asked at this time. Several Members of Congress insist that there is no indicated need for this increase—unless we are preparing to move Navy and Marine forces from Guantanamo.

Legally, of course, the United States cannot be forced out of the Cuban base. In 1903—after the Spanish-American War—we were granted a 99-year lease on "Gitmo." The original treaty set an annual rent of only $2,000 for the base, an exceptionally low figure that was indicative of Cuban gratitude to the United States for its help in winning Cuba's independence from Spain.

In 1934, this treaty was renewed and expanded, granting the United States a perpetual lease on Guantanamo which could be nullified only by the consent of both Cuba and the United States or if we voluntarily abandoned the site.

Considering the value of the base and its strategic location, it would be sheer stupidity to abandon it. An old installation, Guantanamo today is one of the most modern American naval bases in the world. Its facilities are valued at approximately $76 million. It is regarded as an ideal fair-weather training center for the Atlantic Fleet. Its harbor is well fortified and extensive enough to accommodate 50 of this country's largest warships. The mere presence of American forces on Cuban soil, of course, is of important psychological value and a tremendous embarrassment to Castro.

That is why Fidel listed U.S. withdrawal from Guantanamo as one of his five major demands last October 28. The ultimatum, however, was primarily a face-saving maneuver and designed for local consumption in Cuba. There is good reason to suspect that Castro is not really that anxious to see the United States pull out of "Gitmo."

Castro badly needs the American dollars he receives for our occupation of the base. Every year Fidel makes a big point of refusing to cash the annual rent checks—now about $3,400. But he never fails to cash the much larger check we give him for our water supply—amounting to about $178,000. Much more important to him, of course, are the dollars he receives from the 3,400 Cubans employed on the base. The annual payroll comes to about $7,500,000.

If it were not for his desperate need of these dollars, Castro naturally would be anxious to see us leave Guantanamo. He may, in fact, feel that our departure would be more valuable than this revenue. And we can be sure of one thing. If and when we do leave the base, Castro will blow up the move into one of the biggest propaganda victories in history.

That is why we cannot, under any circumstances, even entertain the idea of allowing our forces to be pushed off the base, much less giving up the facility voluntarily.

Huck Finn Not for Educational Bureaucrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Samuel Clemens was one of America's greatest authors and his Huckleberry Finn has become a classic not only in this country but around the world. No book gives a better picture of the steamboat era of our own Mississippi River, and a character study of its inhabitants.

In a manner so ridiculous it would be funny if it were not tragic, Philadelphia school bureaucrats have decided that they can improve upon Mark Twain's Huckleberry Finn.

The St. Louis Post Dispatch published this editorial on April 30:

MONKEYSHINES WITH HUCK FINN

Literary vandalism seems to be as endless as the making of books itself, as witness the Philadelphia school officials' rewriting of Mark Twain's "Huckleberry Finn," along with other classics, with the avowed intentions of toning down violence, simplifying the dialect and eliminating unfavorable references to Negroes.

Sam Clemens would have written a scorcher of a philippic about that one. He would have been even more amazed to learn that he was considered unfriendly to Negroes than he would have been to hear that Philadelphians considered themselves authories on southern speech.

One is reminded of James Thurber's reply to a publisher's invitation for him to draw new illustrations for "Alice in Wonderland," Sir John Tenniel's drawings for which have become a classic on their own account and inseparable from Lewis Carroll's fantasy. "Let's let the Tenniels stand," he said, "and I'll re-do the text." Mr. Thurber thought that was about as ridiculous as one could get, but then he hadn't heard the latest news from Philadelphia.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Turmoil in the North Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on April 6, 1963, Mr. Edward W. Allen, senior member of the Seattle law firm of Allen, De Garmo, and Leedy, delivered in Vancouver, British Columbia, at the Northwest Pacific Regional Conference on International Law at the University of British Columbia, a speech which he entitled "Turmoil in the North Pacific."

Mr. Allen is one of the most distinguished and able attorneys in the United States on the law of the sea. His contributions to his subject by way of original thinking and expression have been many and important. "Turmoil in the North Pacific" is an important paper on this general subject. It is with pleasure that I incorporate it now with my remarks, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TURMOIL IN THE NORTH PACIFIC

(By Edward W. Allen)

Although the sudden death of my friend George R. Clark, late Deputy Minister of Fisheries of Canada, is a source of personal sorrow which I cannot forget, the invitation to come to Vancouver was very welcome, not merely because I like it here but because it affords an opportunity to bring down to date the last talk that I gave in this beautiful city. It was in June 1951 when I spoke on "International Fish and Law" to the Canadian Bar Association (British Columbia section).

Much has happened since then. At that time the Food and Agriculture Organization estimated the world catch of ocean fish at 40 billion pounds. The estimate is now more than twice that figure.

At that time the famous case of *Great Britain v. Norway* was pending in the International Court of Justice. It was not known that Great Britain would concede Norway's contention for a 4-mile width for its territorial sea and I had irritated my friends in the Department of State by expressing the opinion that Norway should and probably would win on that issue and had suggested that instead of standing pat on 3 miles it would be well to reconsider our position. I hope you will forgive me if I quote:

"The Court may, therefore, consider serveral alternatives. It may say that a majority of nations, including those with big navies, having chosen 3 miles, that is it. This would have the merit of definity. The Court may say, there being no international accord in this matter, any nation can do as it pleases. This would have the demerit of complete confusion. Or the Court may say that each nation is bound by and privileged with, its historical position" (the advocate, July–August 1951).

I need not dwell upon the present state of confusion.

One may be in complete sympathy with the attack by Hugo Grotius upon monopolistic claims of ownership to huge portions of the high seas, but even Grotius did not contend that a coastal nation had no rights whatever beyond its shoreline. The subsequent recognition of ownership of territorial seas is in effect a compromise. I pointed out that freedom of the seas is not absolute in scope but that recognition of extraterritorial rights in ocean waters had frequently been successfully asserted, hence it was not illogical to extend the concept to coastal fisheries under the designation "historical right." Our Government that very year had been urged to assert such rights in the Peace Treaty with Japan, but had refused.

At that time the phrase "to abstain" had little reference to water. As relates to its subsequent use in the Tripartite Treaty it was but a glint in the eye of the Special Adviser on Fisheries and Wildlife to the Under Secretary of State. But that fall the concept became a split-off from historic rights. It was the maximum that the Department of State would permit its delegation to espouse, and came to be known as abstention.

So later that very year negotiations at Tokyo between delegations from Canada, the United States, and Japan resulted in the fisheries treaty which I will discuss later. May I, however, point out here that neither claims for historic rights to coastal fisheries, nor of abstention, included any assertion whatever of ownership of the Pacific Ocean, as one of our own officials erroneously inferred not many months ago.

Also since 1951 we have had the United Nations Rome meeting on fisheries in 1955, and in 1958 and 1960 the two Geneva Conferences on the Law of the Sea. The success of these three meetings seems to be evaluated differently by different people, but the U.S. Department of State has recently taken an interesting position. On January 15, 1963, in response to assertion by the State of Alaska of extended territorial claims, Dean Rusk referred to the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone proposed at the 1958 conference, and stated:

"Although the convention is not yet in force according to its terms because the 22 states have not yet ratified or acceded to it, nevertheless, it must be regarded in view of its adoption by a large majority of the states of the world as the best evidence of international law on the subject at the present time."

But perhaps the most significant change of conditions, and the one most pertinent to the topic of this paper, is the almost unbelievable increase in the Soviet and Japanese fleets and the huge expansion of their areas of exploitation. With the most modern fishing vessels and equipment these two nations have expanded their operations throughout the oceans of the world.

In considering the present North Pacific situation it must be remembered that however binding the statement of Dean Rusk may be on one of the States of our country which has ratified all four of the proposed Geneva treaties, neither Japan nor the Soviet Union consider themselves bound by treaties which they have not approved and which have not even come into legal effect because not yet ratified by a sufficient number of nations.

Coming now to the Tripartite Treaty which has been the subject of so much recent publicity, two features are particularly significant; the provisions relating to abstention and to termination. Before discussing these, however, it should be pointed out that the Japanese complaint that they were coerced into entering into the treaty is without foundation. A representative of the U.S. Government advised the Japanese delegates that although the peace treaty had not yet been ratified they, in negotiating the fishery treaty, should consider themselves free to act as if it had been, and they did. The treaty was not what the U.S. fishing industry was demanding though it was better than some of the industry members of the U.S. delegation feared that they would have to accept in view of the unenthusiastic attitude of their own Government. Although the Japanese did agree to abstain from catching halibut originating along the American coast and salmon east of 175° west longitude—from which agreement the term "abstention" as a principle was derived—it will be found that those provisions of the treaty which are favorable to Canada and the United States are hedged around wih severe qualifications to which both nations are bound by having ratified the treaty.

In this connection it is interesting to note the address of the Honorable Ryuji Takeuchi, Minister Plenipotentiary of Japan to the United States at the time of the initial meeting of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission held in Washington, D.C., February 1 to 12, 1954, wherein he said:

"The draft of the International Convention concerning high seas fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean was agreed upon at the Tripartite Fisheries Conference held in Tokyo in late 1951 as a result of 40 days of painstaking labor and was signed together with the regulations and request of the conference under the candlelights in the Foreign Ministry in Tokyo on December 14, 1951. We are extremely happy that in this document were clearly laid down the principles which provide a sound basis for the orderly development and exploitation of the high seas fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, and we are confident that the principles will also be a guiding spirit of the conduct of fisheries in the other areas of the high seas."

The principle of abstention to which the Japanese fishing industry now objects so strenuously cannot be so very bad, for it had such an appeal to the representatives of the various nations at the 1958 Geneva Conference on the Law of the Sea that it met with the approval of a two-thirds vote in the Fisheries Committee and came close to a favorable two-thirds vote in the plenary session. In discussing the matter with the members of other delegations the argument which seemed especially to appeal to them was that abstention provided the incentive for practical fishery conservation, which they deemed to be of utmost importance for the future welfare of the world.

The difference between "historic rights" and "absention" is the additional requirements of the latter. Both require that the nation (or nations) asserting the right should have initiated the coastal fishery which is claimed, and has pursued the fishery without successful interference over a long period of time. The additional elements which our own Department of State injected in order to constitute ground for abstention were three:

1. Full utilization consistent with perpetuation of the stocks.

2. Scientific research.

3. Conservation regulation based on scientific research.

Except as hereinafter noted as to Bering Sea, there has been little really serious question but that Canada and the United States have complied with the treaty requirements as to scientific research and regulation, so the Japanese have concentrated their attacks on adequate utilization. This requirement is expressed in the treaty as follows:

"With regard to any stock of fish which the Commission determines reasonably satisfies all the following conditions, a recommendation shall be made as provided for in article III, section 1(b).

"(1) Evidence based upon scientific research indicates that more intensive exploitation of the stock will not provide a substantial increase in yield which can be sustained year after year."

The three fisheries mentioned in the annex to the treaty, salmon, halibut, and herring, were presumed to comply with all requirements for the first 5 years. After that it was incumbent upon the Nation benefiting by abstention to prove compliance with the foregoing qualifications for continued abstention by the Japanese from any particular fishery.

Canada and the United States have literally spent millions of dollars in research to provide the proof thus required. As a result probably no equivalent ocean area has ever been subjected to such thorough scientific research. The scientists of both nations, as well as their government agencies and their members of the commission, have felt satisfied that reasonably conclusive proof of compliance with the treaty had been adduced as to all Pacific Coast salmon and halibut of the Pacific Coast of North America, excepting only as to the halibut of eastern Bering Sea. The United States in 1959 abandoned herring because it recognied that its proof was inadequate. Canada abandoned its northern herring in 1962 for a similar reason.

As to eastern Bering Sea halibut, although included in Japanese general attack on all Canadian and United States cases, it was not until recent years that the Japanese concentrated their attacks on this area. This was partly due to our lack of defense, but principally to the fact that in the recent huge development of the fishery for groundfish in eastern Bering Sea the Soviet trawlers could retain the halibut they caught whereas the Japanese fishing in the same area were, under the treaty, required to throw back the halibut they caught. All efforts by the scientists of Canada and the United States to make a defense having completely failed, in November 1962 not only all the scientific advisers of both their sections, but the heads of the national fishery departments of both, and all four commissioners from each, were forced to admit that they had no case.

There was no secret about the matter. It had been given intensive consideration over the last few years and it had been hoped that some reasonable proof would be forthcoming, but when it came to a showdown, as it did in November 1962, the only question was whether Canada and the United States would deliberately and knowingly refuse to comply with the express terms of the treaty. The eight commissioners chose to comply, unpopular though they knew that this would be.

This was no hasty action. The matter was thoroughly discussed by the U.S. Commissioners with the members of their advisory committee created pursuant to law and representing all Pacific Coast State fishery departments, as well as all substantial elements of the coastal fisheries. Seven members were from Alaska. The exceedingly able representative of the halibut fleet and the well known and respected representative of the Alaska Fishermens' Union spoke long and forcibly against the proposed action. Their inability to make converts was simply because they had no case, and because a basic principle of these commissions has been to disregard politics and pressures.

It should be noted that the great bulk of halibut fishing has been in the Gulf of Alaska and southward, but the Commission's recent action related only to halibut of eastern Bering Sea where no substantial halibut fishing had been done until the last few years and where there has been no comprehensive research.

It should also be noted that in connection with the recent action the Japanese agreed that their fishermen, as well as those of Canada and the United States, should be subject to conservation regulations in this area such as Japanese fishermen have never before known and that scientific research should extend clear across Bering Sea.

The other pertinent treaty matter in this convention relates to the provision that the treaty should "continue in force for a period of 10 years and thereafter until 1 year from the day on which a contracting party shall give notice to the other contracting parties of an intention of terminating the convention, whereupon it shall terminate as to all contracting parties." The 10-year period expires June 9, 1963.

It is the sincere belief of the U.S. commissioners that the treaty has well justified its existence. Under it the American fishermen have occupied a favorable position with reference to salmon and halibut, but on the other hand they were entitled to it. Japan has no just ground for complaint. It is only because of the millions of dollars spent in research and protection and the rigid restrictions upon our own fishermen that these fisheries have been conserved. Both fisheries could soon be hopelessly depleted like similar fisheries in the Atlantic. It was here in the Pacific Northwest that the greatest and most successful advancement has been made in ocean fishery research and cooperative international conservation management.

Equitable principles and justice should have their weight in international relations as well as elsewhere. The Japanese have every reason to be appreciative of American attitudes and not wish to antagonize their most friendly international connections for some temporary and inequitable gain. But they could not reasonably be expected to continue a treaty which so many of their people now seem to dislike if the other parties to it deliberately violate the provisions put in the treaty for Japanese protection. The action of the Canadian and United States commissioners in living up to the express treaty requirements not only was right, it was sound policy.

The United States has now approved the Commission's recommendations and has done so with reasonable promptness. Whether or not Canada also approves them, the fact that the United States has done so shows its good faith and places this country in a favorable bargaining position with Japan.

Bearing upon the North Pacific situation in another way is the recent demand of the Fisheries Council of Canada that Canada unilaterally declare for a 12-mile fisheries zone including a 6-mile territorial sea, straight baselines from headland to headland, and the 1960 proposed Canadian-United States compromise which lost at Geneva by one vote. Alaskans are also asking for the 12-mile width similarly based. U.S. Senators are proposing another world conference wholly on ocean fisheries. The question arises whether any of the proposals will meet the aggressive exploitation of fisheries by Japan and the Soviet or the more general problem of ocean fishery conservation.

The most practical method of ocean fishery conservation has been through regional treaties. These now are being threatened by the intrusion of outsiders with their unlimited range of fishing vessels. Yet as it is only these treaties which in the present state of international law give conservation protection, they should at least be maintained as long as possible. Had the American commissioners deliberately violated the Tripartite Treaty and thereby brought about its termination it is a serious question whether the halibut and salmon treaties with their marvelous records of accomplishment could have long survived. What are the alternatives?

Lawyers may well ask themselves whether the Law of the Sea, and particularly the arbitrary interpretation of the concept of freedom of the seas as developed before the advent of steampower, refrigeration, radio, sonar, nylon web and other matters which have completely revolutionized the entire character of ocean fishing, should not be subjected to more basic reconsideration than received at the Geneva Conference.

SUPPLEMENT

The following quotations from the address of George R. Clark, the late Deputy Minister of Canada, add some pertinent factual detail:

"Those who were present at the meeting the Canadian Section convened in Vancouver on April 10, 1962, and those who read our statement presented at that meeting will recall that we pointed out that it would be necessary to give special consideration to whether the stock of halibut in the eastern Bering Sea and the herring stock off the west coast of the Queen Charlotte Islands did continue to qualify for abstention.

"Let me give you some further factual information, bearing in mind all qualifications for continued abstention. After much persuasion Canadian halibut fishermen, in limited numbers, started only in 1958 to fish the eastern Bering Sea in a few localized sectors of that area. The production during the 10-year period 1952–61 has been:

Year	Canada	United States	Total
1952		251,000	251,000
1953		227,000	227,000
1954		41,000	41,000
1955		45,000	45,000
1956	84,000	183,000	267,000
1957		47,000	47,000
1958	1,211,000	969,000	2,180,000
1959	2,391,000	1,722,000	4,113,000
1960	3,368,000	2,320,000	5,688,000
1961	1,879,000	2,040,000	3,919,000

"The Canadian halibut fishery for all halibut areas has averaged 27,365,000 pounds during the same period. The total Canadian-United States halibut production for all areas has amounted, on the average, to 66,104,000 pounds for these same years.

"Regardless of the misinformation and misleading statements which have been circulated in recent weeks, Bering Sea production is not lost to Canadian fishermen. There is no reason why Canadian fishermen cannot continue to fish halibut in the eastern Bering Sea. If the governments approve the Commission's recommendation it is expected that adequate halibut conservation measures will be applied and Canadian fishermen in the past have demonstrated that they are able to compete in any fishery."

Strength Through Stockpiling Strategic Minerals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Strength Through Stockpiling Strategic Minerals," prepared by Charles Will Wright, former Chief of the Mining Division of the U.S. Bureau of Mines, and presently a consulting engineer. The statement deals with a most important topic, and deserves the attention of Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRATEGIC MINERAL STRENGTH THROUGH STOCKPILING

FOREWORD

The importance of minerals—the basis of industrial power—is not sufficiently realized and not much is being done in regard to the seriousness of the situation. Today we are living among nations with diversified goals, individual and national, for specific objectives, such as putting a man on the Moon, and dominating the whole world—which is Khrushchev's visionary objective.

All goals require a great amount of planning, resources, and cooperation. To maintain freedom we, and our allies, must start working more as a team to build up combined industrial, moral, and military power to conquer communism, mankind's cruelest enemy.

Both our industrial and political power lie in our ability to produce and acquire raw mineral products. Elmer W. Pehrson in "Survival Through Mineral Strength" published in the November issue of Mining Engineering attacks publicity against stockpiling and urges recognition of stockpiling as an essential part of our preparedness. But our stockpile surpluses are being questioned and legislative changes are being prepared to dispose of a $3.4 billion Federal stockpile of strategic minerals from aluminum to zirconium that are considered surplus to defense needs. Shouldn't we consider our industrial needs and the probability that certain of these minerals now in the stockpile may not be available from abroad a few years hence and then only at higher prices? It is better to err on the side of a safe abundance than risk an unpredicted shortage. In an emergency such as the Korean war, when certain metals were in short supply, the cost of acquiring them was greatly increased.

In contrast to stockpiling grain, amounting to $3.8 billion in value and costing our taxpayers a million dollars a day, or 10 percent a year, the cost of stockpiling strategic minerals which do not deteriorate, and valued at about $8 billion was $12.5 million a year or one-fifth of 1 percent.

DANGERS AHEAD

We may not have a third world war of the shooting kind, but an aggressive economic trade war is in progress and we are in danger of being cut off from foreign sources of metals essential to our industrial progress. The probability that certain metals, in which we are deficient, may not be available from such sources at the end of this decade is a real danger. At the present time nationalization of foreign industries is depriving us of supply sources. We are in danger of losing our main source of cobalt if the Communists take over Katanga; and of tin, for which we depend entirely on imports, by incursions into southeast Asia of the Red Chinese. As tin production in the Western Hemisphere amounts to less than 7 percent of the world's output, the decision to sell U.S. stocks of tin and other strategic minerals and metals is most unwise. Such procedure will adversely affect employment, commodity prices, development of new resources and relations with other producing nations.

Russia, Red China, Germany, and Japan are carrying out plans to meet their industrial requirements for metals by encouraging development of domestic ore deposits and increasing imports by barter trade agreements with mineral producing companies abroad. They are thus depriving us of certain sources we have depended upon and are strengthening their mineral position. Our Government should do more to encourage our mining companies, by way of taxation, depletion, and depreciation allowances and protection against confiscation without just compensation.

OUR STOCKPILES

We have stockpiles of silver ingots which may soon be insufficient to back up our paper dollars. We also have stockpiles of copper, lead, and zinc which should be increased. Thirty years ago we had a surplus of these metals for export. In 1962 to meet industry's demands our imports of copper amounted to 470,000 tons, or 30 percent of our requirement; of lead 409,000 tons or 38 percent, and of zinc 470,000 tons or 47 percent. As our self-sufficiency in these metals will be much less in 1970, isn't it time to start importing larger tonnages of these and the other metals we will need, while they are still available?

We are the world's largest consumer of nonferrous metals and we are gradually being deprived of certain traditional sources abroad. And there is a growing desire among free nations to be independent of imports and where possible, to produce the metals locally rather than ship their ores to smelters abroad and import these metals in manufactured form.

For our future industrial strength and military power we must start now to increase stockpiles of strategic minerals which we will eventually need before shipments from foreign sources of supply are discontinued, keep what we now have and thus add to our mineral strength.

GROWING MINERAL POTENTIAL OF THE SINO-SOVIET BLOC

It is essential that all Allied Powers awaken to the fact that the metal potential of the Sino-Soviet countries is growing rapidly. A comparison in percentages of world production in 1954 and 1962 shows an increase in the output of iron ore from 25.6 to 35.6; that of steel from 17 to 31 percent; that of coal from 39 to 54 percent; and they have now displaced the United States as the leading producer of iron ore and coal; of manganese ore, 46.9 to 53; chromite, 19.3 to 33.5; nickel, 19.6 to 32.5; tungsten, 38.9 to 53.4; aluminum from 13.4 to 23.9; antimony, 28.8 to 44.8; copper, 12.1 to 16.7; lead, 14.3 to 26.6; mercury, 11.7 to to 22.2; platinum, 12.1 to 35.1; tin, 5.4 to 26.5; zinc from 15.9 to 23.5.

These increases are most disturbing as there has been a corresponding decrease in the free world nations in the output of these metals. To counter this unfortunate trend and for survival every effort must be made by the Western Powers, not only to produce and acquire metals for industrial needs but to prevent shipments of metals and metal products to Communist countries.

Although the Sino-Soviets may never catch up with the expanding industrial power of the Allied Nations, we must nevertheless realize that freedom and prosperity can be maintained only if the Allied Nations as a unit, are alert, and prepared to meet disturbing situations with justified countermeasures and the establishment of definite plans for an assured supply of metals. By such cooperation we may look forward to the time when the Allied Powers will be ready to dig the grave for the burial of Khrushchev and his gangsters who are planning to bury us.

CONCLUSIONS

In their attempt to dominate the world, the Russians together with the Red Chinese are waging a trade war which apparently they are winning. The Western Powers have no well-defined trade policy and some of the powers who prefer today's trade to tomorrow's security, are supplying the Russians with materials they lack—a paradoxical situation which should be corrected before it becomes serious.

United States Must Hold Guantanamo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include as a portion of my remarks the article from the San Diego Union entitled "United States Must Hold Guantanamo":

UNITED STATES MUST HOLD GUANTANAMO—RED APPEASEMENT HINTED

Is the strategic U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo a pawn on the international chessboard of intrigue?

This suspicion was planted in the American mind last October during the Cuban crisis. There were reports that U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson favored a conciliatory approach in settling the ominous argument.

The administration has denied that appeasement ever was considered as a solution. Developments since then provoke uneasy thoughts as to what actually was involved in the Soviet's agreement to withdraw nuclear missiles from Cuba.

Were there secret giveaways by the United States, possibly related to Guantanamo?

A look at the record is provocative. America's 45 Jupiter intermediate-range missiles have been removed from Turkey. Similar weapons will be removed from Italy and England.

It now has been disclosed that the United States is negotiating with Great Britain for a naval station on Andros Island near Nassau. The reports say that such a base could be used if "U.S. forces ever abandon Guantanamo."

Also, the Defense Department is seeking $18 million to expand the existing facilities at Roosevelt Roads in Puerto Rico. Rank-and-file citizens of the United States would welcome another naval base at Andros Island and improvements at Roosevelt Roads or whatever steps the Navy deems necessary to bolster our defense posture.

They must be obtained, however, without the sacrifice of Guantanamo as part of any agreement the administration may have worked out with the Communists.

A hint of the administrations' attitude toward Guantanamo is seen in the remarks of Senator STEPHEN YOUNG, Democrat of

Ohio, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

The United States "does not need Guantanamo," he said. "The base is as obsolete as Fort Bliss near El Paso and other Indian frontier posts we garrisoned as late as 1930."

The naive nature of such statements is appalling. Apart from its intrinsic value as a key naval base in the Caribbean, Guantanamo is the fort that protects the invaluable Windward Passage to the vital Panama Canal. In hostile hands it could become a setback to naval maneuverability and merchant shipping.

House Armed Services Committee members have declared Guantanamo will remain a major U.S. Navy base in the foreseeable future.

But uneasy Americans are entitled to firm assurance from the administration itself that the United States is not going to lose Guantanamo in the veiled intrigue of international politics.

To Curb the Junketeers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, as one who has called for the end of profligate spending on congressional junkets since I first came to Congress, I am highly pleased that the essence of many of my own proposals has been embodied in House Joint Resolution 245 which passed the House last week.

It can no longer be said that the House of Representatives has remained oblivious to valid criticism. As the following editorial from the May 9 Washington Star points out, the House did "a fine day's work in its overwhelming vote to put a curb on junketeering." It is now incumbent on the Senate to do likewise.

TO CURB THE JUNKETEERS

The Senate may not follow suit, but the House has done a fine day's work in its overwhelming vote—384 to 2—to put a curb on junketing Members of Congress. The action has been long overdue. It lays down rules that are at once simple and sensible. Under them, Senators and Representatives would no longer be outrageously favored on their travels abroad. They would still enjoy certain advantages, of course, but they would have to give an accounting of them, and that would be an excellent thing.

Thus, if the House bill becomes law, Congressmen on foreign trips will henceforth have the same per diem expense account—from $12 to $30—as employees of the executive branch. Further, they will have to report their expenditures in detail and support them with receipts and other documentation whenever they exceed the per diem rate. As a further check the State Department will be required to file an exact accounting of counterpart money (the currencies of the countries visited) handed out to each congressional visitor in Paris, London, Copenhagen, Stockholm, and ever so many other places that our national legislators find delightful on "investigating" tours.

The reform envisioned here seems self-evidently wholesome. But the Senate may balk at it. After all, in the world's greatest deliberative body, there is an historically ingrained reluctance to give up special privileges of any kind. Even so, abuses have their limits, and the American people have good reason to demand that an end be put to the scandalous junketeering of some of our Congressmen. The House has shown the way for the Senate.

For Law, Order, and Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the following editorial from the May 13 edition of the Philadelphia Inquirer is both thoughtful and timely. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR LAW, ORDER, AND JUSTICE

Bomb-throwing bigots in Birmingham—vicious white-supremacy addicts whose acts of violence and hatred advertise their own inferiority—have unleashed such an atrocious and defiant series of assaults upon exponents of reason and moderation that the Federal Government has no honorable choice, in our opinion, but to take effective action, possibly including the use of troops, to maintain law and order and safeguard lives and property.

Widespread eruption of rioting in that beleaguered city Sunday, set off by the bombings of a Negro home and motel, give grim proof that the "Bull" Connors of bias and prejudice in present-day Alabama—whose ignorance and unenlightenment is such that they have no more sense of justice than the whip-wielding slave-drivers of centuries past—are unable or unwilling to preserve the peace and uphold the rights of every individual in accordance with principles of justice and equality.

Voices of fairness and decency in Birmingham, which have pleaded for a solution to problems on the basis of truce terms announced last Friday, cannot be heard above the derisive sneers emitted by public officials who have the duty to maintain law and order but refuse to recognize any sincere effort toward lawful and orderly solutions.

The so-called law-enforcement authorities in Birmingham have contributed heavily to the city's troubles by heaping scorn on all, both white and Negro, who have made an honest attempt to bring racial injustices to an end. Public officials, by deriding peace moves, have fomented violence. They have fanned the flames of intolerance with reckless mouthings of hate.

America is deeply stirred by tragic and disgraceful events in Birmingham, as shown by rallies in Philadelphia and elsewhere. The common goal that should bind together all citizens of good will—of all races, all creeds, all sections of the country—is the goal of equality under the law achieved by means within the law.

It seems to us that the situation in Birmingham has deteriorated to the point where law is dangerously close to giving way to complete anarchy.

The Kennedy administration should ask itself frankly and courageously whether the time has not come to abandon watchful waiting—and to assume responsibilities for law and order and justice which irresponsible officials in the city of Birmingham and the State of Alabama have relinquished by calculated incitement and deliberate default.

Twins Have a Cultural Twin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out on May 6, one of the most significant events in the history of the American theater occurred in the city of Minneapolis with the opening of the Tyrone Guthrie Theater last week. I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues two articles from the May 11 Washington Star and the May 12 Washington Post which further mark the significance of that occasion:

[From the Washington Post, May 12, 1963]

TWINS HAVE A CULTURAL TWIN

(By Leo Sullivan)

MINNEAPOLIS.—Well, Minnesota is really in the big leagues now. The Tyrone Guthrie Theater opened last week as a further symbol of the decentralization of America's theater and as an example of the new exciting, functional playhouses of our time.

Last Tuesday, as baseball fans were warming themselves with the Twins' victory over the New York Yankees and cultural committees prepared for last night's Minneapolis Symphony Ball, the Twin Cities were also experiencing major league theater. And the town was alive to the occasion.

Down Nicollet Avenue traffic moved under banner after banner proclaiming the Big G. Even the most sportsminded Twin Citian knew that this was not a spring pep rally for the University of Minnesota's Gophers. The Big G stood for Guthrie, a proclamation declared on every piece of mail leaving the State, on posters in the shop windows and on the blazers of the ushers recruited from the University of Minnesota, across the Mississippi in St. Paul.

Hamlet opened the not quite finished theater on Tuesday with a splash swirled by such names as Governor Rolvaag, the Theater Guild's Warren Caro, restaurateur Vincent Sardi, producer Richard Barr and Director Alan Schneider, who hurried back to Washington to finish his production of "The Threepenny Opera," opening this week at Arena Stage. TV's Pernell Roberts, a surprise member of the opening night's bonanza, only added to the Washington contingent that was very much a part of the new theater's success.

George Grizzard was the Hamlet. A North Carolina boy who grew up in Washington and developed his career with the Montgomery Players, the Westmoreland Players, the McLean Theater, Crossroads and, ultimately, Arena Stage, Grizzard was as much Washington's contribution to Minnesota's culture as the Nats were last year to the Twins' baseball standing. His performance as the Prince of Denmark was something both Washington and these Twin Cities could be proud of.

But first and foremost, this was a Tyrone Guthrie production. Just as this tall Britisher has done at Stratford, Ontario, he has placed the stamp of his genius, and that of designer Tanya Moiseowitsch, on the theater named for him on Minneapolis' Vineland Place.

Like that theater north of the border, this one is centered around a three-tiered-apron stage which carries its actors out into an auditorium graced with row after row of seats upholstered in reds, greens, blues, and yellows, which bring the theater to life even before the magnificent array of lights goes on.

AN ELIZABETHAN TRICK

The "Hamlet," done in modern dress and virtually full length, was played on a rather stark stage relieved only by a wooden bench of multipurpose use and an inner stage which provided an upper level in the Elizabethan fashion.

On Wednesday night this same stage became a more decorative but still free-form setting for comedy, as Douglas Campbell's production of Moliere's "The Miser" decked it out with a carnival canopy and colorful, easily maneuverable trappings.

Baffles flying high over the 1,437 seats give the theater quite admirable acoustics, although there are certainly dead spots. Intermissions seemed to be filled with those who were thrilled with the sight lines and the acoustics which made intimacy possible, and those who were off in upper Siberia where little could be heard, let alone felt. But this is an adjustable house, where the word can be channeled to the audience by trial and error.

Also to be adjusted is the performance of "Hamlet." While the audience was rising to a roar of bravos for Grizzard and the rest of the cast, early deadline reviewers were writing of admiration for the institution with real reservations for the interpretation.

As Grizzard passed through the opening night reception in the roomy foyer hearing such remarks as "I'm drinking champagne tonight because of a glorious new Hamlet, a man I can understand," reviewers were writing that this young actor who achieved a particularly admired niche on Broadway was not prepared vocally to sustain the long Shakespearean role.

This viewer saw a Hamlet to identify with, a conception that has the warm humanity of the Tony-type Romeo of "West Side Story." Jessica Tandy's Gertrude, fashioned in a more traditional way, and Ellen Gear's Ophelia, which erratically climbs to shuddering validity in the mad scene, give this Hamlet healthy—and stirring—support.

Nicolas Coster is the production's Laertes, a fine, emotionally taut foil for Grizzard. Like the young star, Coster was seasoned at arena stage, as were such other members of the cast as Clayton Corzatte and Ed Preble.

"Hamlet" and "The Miser," which stands on a truly virtuoso performance by Hume Cronyn, will carry the repertory season until June 18, when "The Three Sisters" joins the alternating schedule. On July 16, "Death of a Salesman," with Cronyn in the title role, opens to add a modern touch to the season, which is set to run through September 22.

Obviously, this summer will offer visitors to Minnesota more than its touted 10,000 lakes to enjoy.

A CITIZENSHIP TRIUMPH IN THEATER

(By Max Freedman)

MINNEAPOLIS.—The Tyron Guthrie Theater in Minneapolis, which has just made such a splendid start, is a new answer to one of the oldest problems in American culture. The dominance of New York in the theater has been a burden as well as a blessing. The concentration of talent in one city has produced the occasional triumph which forms the glory of the New York stage. But in the process, New York has drained other cities of their gifted people and become an almost morbid symbol of success.

Now in Minneapolis a regional theater has been created with the purpose of presenting plays worthy of the best traditions of the stage. It is a triumph of citizenship, and the pride of the people of Minneapolis could not be greater if the Minnesota Twins had won the World Series.

There has never been any doubt of the hunger for the theater that exists right across the United States. Go into any theater of New York and you will find many of the seats filled by visitors from all parts of the country. But they cannot find what they seek in their own communities.

The usual answer has been to organize a small amateur group and hope that it would grow in time into a competent company. Even where something more ambitious has been tried, it has almost always been a determined director or resourceful actor who has stirred the stagnant waters. In Minneapolis something very different, and vastly more encouraging, has taken place. The initiative came from representative groups in the community itself. In the best sense, it was an organized communal effort.

What is more, it had the inspiration of a high aim—a fact which the Ford Foundation recognized and which led to its support. This city wanted a theater to which people from the entire Midwest and beyond, could come in the knowledge that they would see noble plays, whether old or contemporary, presented in a tradition of excellence. It has this kind of theater now, and it intends to put it to constructive use.

For the theater not only will use its professional cast to present classical plays. The building will be used for poetry readings, for performances by local artists and visiting groups, for all the arts which quicken and sustain the human spirit. The theater leads easily and naturally to the Walker Art Center. In this happy union there is a prophecy of the enduring unity and cooperation which the theater will nourish in many diverse cultural activities.

The true theater is a temple in which the creative spirit finds abiding expression. That is why it was appropriate that this particular theater should be consecrated to public service at a religious ceremony. With no small purpose, the Tyron Guthrie Theater has begun to take up its mandate in this gracious and grateful city.

On the merits of the opening production of Hamlet there has been no agreement, either among the critics or the public . That in itself is a tribute to the vitality and originality of the production. Here was no decorous homage to a dead masterpiece but but an audacious and exciting play, not always successful, but tingling with energy and reposing on no timid conversations. It requires no intolerable leap of imagination to picture Shakespeare himself at the Mermaid Tavern, perplexed but interested, questioning Sir Tyron Guthrie on the reasons behind the stagecraft.

Whatever doubts or reservations may have remained after the first night were triumphantly removed by the inspired production of Moliere's "The Miser," with Hume Cronyn giving a performance in the title role that surely belongs to the enduring folklore of the American theater. This was supreme acting which lifted others in the cast to real distinction. London or New York would have been honored by such a presentation of a classical comedy.

In the long future that now awaits the theater there will, no doubt, be disappointments as well as triumphs. But one must have a churlish and darkened spirit to doubt that the triumphs will far outweigh the failures. Where Minneapolis has given the noble lead, other cities should be eager to follow; and in the end there will be a renaissance of the theater in America.

Not the Money, Just the Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Steubenville Herald-Star, Steubenville, Ohio, of May 13, 1963, which probably sums up as well as anything the controversy over the use of counterpart funds:

NOT THE MONEY, JUST THE PRINCIPLE

Only two votes were cast against a resolution in the U.S. House of Representatives to curb junketing expenses.

With 384 affirmative votes, the resolution is expected to draw similarly strong support in the Senate. It's one of those propositions no one would want to oppose anyway. It will let everbody breathe easier.

Representatives and Senators can't really be blamed for most of the junketing expenses that have been disclosed. They were spending counterpart funds.

These funds are available to them under foreign aid agreements. They are the only way the United States can get any direct return on the huge sums it has spent on foreign aid in some instances.

A junketeering Representative or Senator always can reassure himself when spending this money that it behooves him to get all he can get because America has it coming.

With a little persuasion he can persuade himself he is doing U.S. taxpayers a favor by getting them a nominal return on their investment. Yet when the junkets are held up to examination it never is the counterpart money that's called to attention—only the total sum involved.

Members of the House are tired of being pilloried for a practice that always is going to be misunderstood, misinterpreted, and maligned.

Isn't there some other way to get some of the money back, though—like offering counterpart funds as rewards for the first 10,000 taxpayers to file income tax returns each year, the same to be used for trips abroad, fully transferable, no questions asked just go to the nearest U.S. embassy and say, "Sam sent me."

Tribute to Radio Free Europe on Its 14th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the most powerful weapons the free world possesses in the unceasing cold war with communism is truth, as transmitted by the spoken word. Broadcasts beamed by Radio Free Europe to the enslaved peoples of Eastern Europe are doing much to bring this message of truth, of hope and of encouragement.

Radio Free Europe is celebrating its 14th anniversary, and I am delighted to have this opportunity to salute John Richardson, the able President, and all the other fine people involved in this undertaking for the valuable work they are doing. As an editorial in the New York Herald Tribune of May 13 noted, this medium brings "a breath of fresh air from the West every day of the year."

This is a cause which deserves the support of all Americans who believe in human dignity and human freedom. By keeping alive the spirit of liberty behind the Iron Curtain, Radio Free Europe plays a key role in the cold war, and I wish them every success in carrying on with their work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the Herald Tribune editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RADIO FIGHTERS FOR FREEDOM

On its 14th anniversary, the best tribute we can pay to Radio Free Europe is to recall the one it recently received from Moscow. Radio Free Europe broadcasts have proved so penetrating (in every sense) that the five satellite countries to which they are beamed had to appeal to Moscow for support. The support took the form of additional transmitters, operating from within the Soviet Union, to supplement those being used in the satellite states in an attempt to jam Radio Free Europe broadcasts.

But Radio Free Europe's powerful transmitters continue to break through the Iron Curtain, and several million Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, Rumanians and Bulgarians receive a breath of fresh air from the West every day of the year. It helps sustain their spirits and nourish their hopes that they, too, some day will be free.

We join the silent millions of Eastern Europe in wishing president John Richardson, Jr., and his staff additional tributes from Moscow in recognition of increasingly effective work.

Domestic Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following concurrent resolution was adopted by the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina.

I commend this timely and forthright resolution to the Members of Congress and to the people of this country:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OPPOSING A DOMESTIC PEACE CORPS

Whereas the General Assembly of South Carolina has been informed that an effort will be made to enact a statute by the Congress of the United States creating a Domestic Peace Corps; and

Whereas the members of the general assembly believe that a Peace Corps for domestic purposes is wholly unnecessary and may involve the expenditure of large sums from the Public Treasury which will be sorely needed to balance the national budget; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that if the passage of some type of legislation on this subject becomes inevitable, then the congressional delegation from South Carolina should make every effort to amend the statute to prohibit the Federal Government from sending any members of the Corps into any State except upon the invitation of the Governor of the State concerned: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from South Carolina in the Congress of the United States are hereby requested to vigorously oppose the enactment of any legislation creating a Domestic Peace Corps; and be it further

Resolved, That the delegation from South Carolina in the Congress is further requested that if the enactment of such legislation becomes inevitable, then the delegation is requested to make every effort to amend the bill to prohibit the Federal Government from sending any member of the Domestic Peace Corps into any State except upon express invitation from the Governor of the State concerned; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from South Carolina in the Congress of the United States.

Aiding Farmers in Foreign Lands Soul-Satisfying Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Arkansas Gazette of March 27, 1963, entitled "Aiding Farmers in Foreign Lands Soul-Satisfying Work" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This article relates some of the experiences of Mr. A. C. Hale, of Camden, Ark., who has spent a great deal of time abroad completing various projects for the U.S. Agency for International Development. We are often reminded of the shortcomings of our aid program by critical articles about American personnel abroad. It is refreshing to find emphasized information about many of the fine accomplishments of the program and the dedicated public servants who are laboring daily to carry out its aims.

It is a pleasure for me, therefore, to ask that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIDING FARMERS IN FOREIGN LANDS SOUL-SATISFYING WORK

Ten years work with the peoples of foreign lands have taken A. C. Hale of Camden from the rice paddies of Thailand to the mountainside farms of Ecuador and British Guiana. He's home on leave now, awaiting his next assignment to somewhere in the world that hasn't been revealed to him yet.

Hale was in Little Rock yesterday and stopped by the Gazette to tell me of some of his experiences. We had been in correspondence in recent months. I had asked him for an interview at first opportunity.

Hale was a veteran of 31 years in vocational agriculture, teaching in Arkansas when he became a State Department employee in the spring of 1953. Since then, he has had two tours of duty in Thailand and one each in Ecuador and British Guiana. He's a native of Boone County and a graduate of the University of Arkansas, also of Colorado State College.

His long career as a teacher at Cane Hill, at Forum, and at Camden taught him a great many things that proved useful after Uncle Sam sent him overseas for the Agency for International Development. One of these certainly was a working knowledge of how to get along with people, despite differences in languages, customs, soil and climate, and the like. He didn't have to tell me this. I could detect it in the story he told of America's efforts to help its friends improve their educational and farming conditions.

On going to Thailand 10 years ago, Hale worked in the area around the city of Surin, which is only about 50 miles from the border of Cambodia, but is some 200 miles from the Thailand capital of Bangkok. The government had an agricultural school there, its students all boys from around 17 to 20 years of age. During the course of 4 years—two tours of duty—he worked with teachers of this and other schools, giving suggestions on teaching and farming methods, helping them plan courses of instruction, and so forth.

Rice is the predominant crop in Thailand, but the government of the country is seeking to diversify its agricultural production. Hale consequently was engaged at times in helping with other crops, including corn, which was virtually unknown in the area where he was located. It was so unknown, in fact, he recalled, that hogs had to be encouraged to eat it when first fed to them.

An improvement in corn raising that Hale suggested, and which got good results, was to clear the fields of trees and other obstructions. Yields went up substantially, and in fact, he said, an average of 72 bushels an acre was achieved.

The hogs, incidentally, had been getting only rice bran for food.

Hale also influenced his Thailand friends to raise grain sorghum for poultry feed, something that was not being done. Seed for such introductory planting was sent from the United States.

Of his many experiences in the Far East, Hale recalls one with special pleasure. He had heard of an American missionary's efforts, in the northern part of the country, far from Hale's location, to get the farmers to raise something besides poppies for the opium trade. Hale sent the missionary some seed potatoes. He had a letter from the man last year saying potatoes now are outstripping poppies.

While in Ecuador, on his next foreign assignment, Hale sent the missionary seed from wild blackberries that flourish in the high valleys of the Andes Mountains. Thailand has similar valleys, he explained. The word from the missionary is that the berries are doing well, too.

Hale went to Ecuador in 1958 and worked with teachers in public schools in the Quito area. The cultivation of home gardens was stressed, he said. Also, Ecuador is trying to alter the old system of vast land holdings to bring about the establishment of more small farms. The problem is a major one, Hale commented.

Hale was sent to British Guiana, at the far side of South America from Ecuador, in late 1959. At the time, there was no agricultural school in the colony but plans for one were in process. He assisted in the drawing of plans for tools equipment for this school, but went to work meanwhile at an agricultural experiment station, helping with drainage and irrigation projects. Sugarcane is the prevailing crop in British Guiana, he told me. However, near the Brazilian border is pastureland where beef cattle are raised.

Hale went there, too, to assist in pasture improvement experiments.

Hale has collected hundreds of photographs during his 10 years in the three countries, most of which he has made himself. Many show the crudest of farm machinery and methods, while others record the trend toward mechanized farming. The picture of the farm woman "ginning" cotton, which accompanies today's column, was made in Thailand. Hale took the picture one day while traveling from one work location to another.

Among other photos that he prizes are several he took at the Equator in Ecuador, 8,000 feet above sea level where the imaginary line crosses the Andes. In his work in that country, he said, he crossed the Equator often and saw in the distance the snow-covered cap of Mount Cayambe, almost 20,000 feet high. For those of us who think of the Equator's being a symbol of torrid climate, the thought of snow along it seems incongruous—but so it is, as Hale's pictures well prove.

TVA's 30th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the eminent columnist, Mr. Peter Edson, has taken note of the 30th anniversary of the Tennessee Valley Authority in a most laudatory column which appeared in the Washington Daily News on May 13.

Mr. Edson recognizes, as many others have done, that "The best justification of TVA is that it works" and that "the competitive private enterprise system owes a great debt to the Tennessee Valley Authority."

I ask unanimous consent that this columbn by Mr. Edson be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TVA's 30TH BIRTHDAY

(By Peter Edson)

Tennessee Valley Authority will be 30 years old come May 18. Celebrations and oratory are being planned. Literature on the TVA "experiment" is appearing, pro and con.

Whether you approve of it or not, TVA is admittedly one of the seven wonders of America and an eighth wonder of the world. When the King of Morocco came to the United States he stopped to see TVA before coming to Washington.

At the end of World War II a party of European journalists came here direct from TVA at the end of a transcontinental junket. They were all from different political parties and they had seen through partisan eyes the great Tennessee River with its dams and powerlines, electrified farms, navigation channels and flood-control works.

To the liberals, TVA showed what a democratic government and society could do when they went to work for the people. To the Socialists TVA was pure Marxism. To the Communists it was fulfillment of the Leninist-Stalinist dream, only Russia could do it better. But to the conservatives this was big business that could be created only in a free enterprise, capitalistic economy. They all got into such a heated argument about it that when they reached Washington they weren't speaking to each other.

This illustrates as well as anything the point that TVA is controversial. And in its 30th anniversary observance this month there will probably be some sour notes that it is so anti-American it should be broken up and sold to the private power companies.

The best justification of TVA is that it works. But as a matter of speculation, if a completely unbiased jury could be given the case, it might be found that the competitive private enterprise system owes a great debt to Tennessee Valley Authority.

TVA woke up the private power industry to its potential. It showed what could be done with rural electrification. It showed that lower power rates will increase consumption and increase the sale of electric appliances many times over. It promoted growth.

When TVA legislation was before Congress in 1933, E. A. Yates of Dixon-Yates fame testified in opposition to TVA because there was already a 66 percent over-production capacity of private power in the area and he could see no market for more. But within 7 years TVA had doubled the private consumption level. By 1953 it had increased 17 times. Today TVA's total steam and hydroelectric power capacity is over 50 times what it was in 1933.

TVA's purchases of low bid foreign electric generating equipment caused American manufacturers to sharpen their pencils and become competitive. Publicizing identical bids submitted by American manufacturers on furnishing TVA with electrical equipment resulted in antitrust charges with heavy damage suits still pending and the restoration of real, competitive, free enterprise. TVA engineers have also led the way in design of larger and more efficient hydro and steam generating units, dams and locks.

But of far more value than its pioneering in the electrical industry, TVA has set a national and international pattern for multiple-purpose water control, flood prevention, navigation, recreation, reforestation and the shift of agriculture from row crops like corn and cotton to cover crops that conserve water.

Before Congress now is a bill to provide $20 million for financing water resource research and planning to meet the needs of America's still increasing population. If this money can be used as efficiently as TVA has used its funds over the past 30 years, it should be an investment paying multiple dividends.

The 39th Anniversary of FBI Director Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I pointed out to the Members of the House that the following day, May 10, 1963, marked the 39th anniversary date of the appointment of John Edgar Hoover as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

No man in the history of this great Nation has enjoyed a greater reputation for integrity and devotion to public service than Mr. Hoover. His continued service, and reappointment by the successive Attorneys General since 1924, regardless of their political affiliation, amply demonstrates the high regard in which Mr. Hoover has been held over the years.

Moreover, his active, objective, and devoted service in today's operation of the FBI continues to reflect his enthusiastic and vigorous capabilities to remain at the helm of the Bureau for years to come.

The FBI stands second to none as an efficient organization of outstanding men and women who are dedicated to public service in enforcement of laws relating to Federal crimes, as well as protecting the national security and the future of America.

The reputation of the Bureau stands as a living monument to the man who is responsible for that very reputation—J. Edgar Hoover—America's man of integrity.

Mrs. Elmo T. Nostrand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, the scourge of cancer is a problem that has deeply affected every member of this Nation. Its eradication is the goal of everyone. However, some people have dedicated more time to the eradication of this disease than others. These people, I maintain, should be given recognition of the highest honor. Such a person is Mrs. Elmo T. Nostrand, 17 Fairview Road, Farmingdale, Long Island, N.Y., who for 15 years has given of herself unsparingly as a volunteer worker for the American Cancer Society. Over the years, she has held every position in the Nassau County Chapter of the American Cancer Society, and recently she was honored by the American Cancer Society when they presented her their scroll for distinguished service. Because I believe in the importance of the work that this good lady, with her many other thousands of associates are doing, it is my pleasure to honor her by reciting her achievements in the RECORD.

On March 21, 1963, Mrs. Nostrand was awarded the American Cancer Society Bronze Medal for Distinguished Service in Cancer Control. There were 13 such awards given in the United States by the National Board of Directors of the American Cancer Society—only three to women—one woman from Philadelphia, one from New York and Mrs. Nostrand. She is to day vice president of the Nassau division of the American Cancer Society and chairman of their volunteer activities for the district.

Mrs. Nostrand has been active as a volunteer with the Nassau Division of the American Society for 15 years, serving in all volunteer capacities from village crusade blockworker and village crusade chairman to her present positions as a member of the division board of directors, vice president of the Nassau division, member of the executive committee and chairman of volunteer activities for the Nassau division.

Mrs. Nostrand has made an outstanding contribution to the society through the development of a volunteer organization and local cancer units which conduct the year-round education, patient service programs, and the annual Cancer Crusade.

She has also developed a year-round training program for volunteers in all phases of the society's work.

In November of 1960, Mrs. Nostrand was one of seven volunteers in the United States chosen by the National Office of the American Cancer Society to participate in a 1-week special conference held in Williamsburg, Va. This committee of seven, along with members of the national staff, studied all phases of volunteer activity in the society.

Mrs. Nostrand was the recipient of the 1960 Long Island Business and Professional Women's Club Exceptional Volunteer Service Award in honor of her outstanding achievements and dedication to the Nassau Division of the American Cancer Society.

Mrs. Nostrand has put in over 500 hours each year in volunteer activities.

Without Law We'd Have Anarchy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, as part of the observance of Law Day, U.S.A., on May 1 this year, the Wichita (Kans.) Bar Association sponsored an essay contest for high school students on the subject of "The Importance of Law in Our Daily Lives." The winner was Ann Elisabeth Brazelton, who is a senior at Southeast High School in Wichita.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to commend Miss Brazelton for her constructive and thought-provoking essay and recommend it to my colleagues in the House for their perusal:

THE IMPORTANCE OF LAW IN OUR DAILY LIVES

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—As part of the observance of Law Day (Wednesday) this year, the Wichita Bar Association sponsored an essay contest for high school students on the subject of "The Importance of Law in Our Daily Lives." Winner was Ann Elisabeth Brazelton, 17, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. L. F. Brazelton, 8114 Morningside Drive. Her essay is published here.)

Laws governing life have been in existence ever since the first plantlife survived on the surface of the earth. One law has sufficed to rule the lives of all societies since life first began. This law is the law of the survival of the fittest.

However, laws governing people in the modern world, since the time of the Egyptians, are those which have distinguished a barbaric society from civilization. Whether it is recognized or not, even the most lawless of people today are governed by a modicum of laws. These laws are the laws which society places upon each person. Even a fugitive from justice, in a mentally sound condition, would never think of burning a fellow human at the stake, or other such barbaric practice. The idea is horrendous to him because of basic training as a child.

Greeks and Romans had their educated lawmaking bodies, as well as their traditions and social mores which defined the laws for their civilization. We of the United States have our representative legislative bodies to dictate our public laws to us, with our approval, and as earlier civilization have social customs and mores.

A rebellious child is spanked for his misdemeanors; a delinquent juvenile is sent to a correction home or placed on directed probation; adults are punished according to the dictum of the law. Without these correction factors the laws which protect our civilization and our daily lives would be meaningless. Without laws there would be no civilization.

Anarchy is difficult to visualize in the mind's eye. Yet without the forces of civilization, laws and social mores, that is the condition under which we would live. The results of such a system are impossible to comprehend because of the comparative rigidity of the social conventions which govern our actions, although largely without conscious thought by people involved.

The protection of the various freedoms of all the people of the world today is exercised by law and by the "hand" of the law, which enforces its authority. Law in our everyday lives is not recognized or even thought of. It is the cause of secondary reactions, that is actions without conscious thought, because even from childhood, people are taught that this is right and that is wrong. When this is the case, without a reflex reaction occurs, and, habit if nothing else, prevents the breaking of a formal law or social more.

The law, in its formal aspect gives to us a great deal of freedom, and though we do not realize it in the course of a day, or even a year, or perhaps a lifetime, it is the reason that man has survived today, and that he can live in an organized society, where unheralded we aid in our fellow man's advancement and comforts. We do these things seemingly for our own benefit, things so small as slowing for a school zone, or stopping for a red light, or patronizing the corner grocery store. Without law or social mores we could happily mow down rows of school children, run red lights, jam traffic and cause accidents, and cheerily rob our neighborhood grocery. However, without law, it is doubtful that there would be cars and schools, and the grocery would never even be opened. Life would necessarily revert to cave man standards.

As our lives daily grow more complex, so do our governing systems. We blithely proceed on our way, quite unaware that anything could be or would be changing. Yet, each day sets new precedents which we file in our mental library and continue from then on to use in our reflex of actions. Formal law protects us in every way possible and provides a checkrein far more gentle than those which society would employ when we find ourselves out of sorts with its rules.

Perhaps life should be considered a game, the laws which govern its orderliness the rules of the game, and our social mores and customs could be called the general honest nature and the conscience of the players. If one facet of the rules are removed, or waived, then an equal facet of the honesty necessary to achieve winning status in the game is set aside. Then the game will become a general free-for-all, as the largest part of the rules will crumble or be waived. But by adding more rules, the same game becomes a little more complex, requiring more thought, and becoming more strictly ruled by the conscience which forbids cheating, as cheating becomes more difficult and honesty becomes the byword. Then in this manner the honest, intelligent man will win his game, and will be duly rewarded for following the rules of the game and exercising moral judgment in playing it. It becomes an exciting challenge to him to do better in the game—a challenge to follow the rules more closely and to protect his material assets with the rules by which he is called upon to play the game.

Therefore, it may be said that law is that element of daily living which influences us in all we do, think and say. Law is not only that which is printed upon paper and enforced by the governing powers, but it also includes the social elements of living. It includes the everyday courtesies exhibited by those people schooled in good manners and proper social conduct. Law has its rewards. Law brings with it happiness, and freedoms unknown to lawless, barbaric societies. Law in all its myriad forms is civilization. The very meaning of the word, "civil"—courteous, urbane, and ordinarily polite, pertaining to private rights of individuals in a community—represents the governing of people and their actions by an organized body of law and social customs.

It may never be said that living things in numbers of more than one have existed without law. For without customs, mores, and formally instigated and enforced laws, still Nature rules her world with her great all-encompassing law, the law of the survival of the fittest. No society, however base and ungoverned, has ever existed without at least this single ruling maxim.

Governor Scranton Proclaims Slovak Catholic Federation of America Week in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Slovak Catholic Federation of America is holding its 42d national convention at Hotel Sterling, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., on May 14 and 15, 1963.

Gov. William W. Scranton, of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in honor of this national convention proclaimed the Slovak Catholic Federation of America Week from May 12 to 19, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that the proclamation be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SLOVAK CATHOLIC FEDERATION OF AMERICA WEEK—MAY 12–19, 1963

Whereas the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has among its population a large number of Pennsylvanians of Slovak descent, who have contributed much to our progress and achievement in all areas of endeavor; and

Whereas many societies, churches, schools, and other institutions have been established in Pennsylvania during the past century in honor of SS. Cyril and Methodius, apostles of the Slovaks, whose 11th centennial is being observed this year; and

Whereas the Slovak Catholic Federation of America will meet in the city of its founding, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., May 14 and 15, 1963, for its 42d national convention, paying special tribute to SS. Cyril and Methodius:

Now, therefore, I, William W. Scranton, by virtue of the power vested in me as Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, do proclaim and pronounce the week of May 12 to 19, 1963, as Slovak Catholic Federation of America Week, encouraging friends and neighbors of Slovak Pennsylvanians to rejoice with them in this commemoration, and pray with them for the liberation of their homeland, Slovakia, from the yoke of communism.

William W. Scranton,
Governor.

By the Governor:

George I. Bloom,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Peace in Laos Appears Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following from the Fort Lauderdale News of May 6, 1963:

Red China Threat: Peace In Laos Appears Myth

(By James Marlow)

The idea of peace in Laos is a myth.

If you were weak but getting stronger and figured time was on your side, you could afford to inch along to get what you wanted. A delay of even a decade or two wouldn't mean much.

The Red Chinese are in that position.

Since they operate on the theory that a communized world is inevitable, they don't have to rush. Since the policy of communism is expansion, what they naturally want is everything in sight.

Laos, right next door and on the road to all the rest of southeast Asia, is the easiest and weakest obstacle and therefore the logical first step.

The United States, concerned that unless the Laotian fighting stops the Reds will triumph, appeals to Premier Khrushchev to help arrange the truce which was supposed to keep anyone from winning.

Naturally, since the rest of the world is watching and listening, he says he's all for law and order. But he doesn't say he'll step in to be sure no one takes over.

And, if he did, it wouldn't mean much. It would be only a pause. The fighting would begin again, in a month, 6 months, a year. It's impractical to think Red China will not try to take Laos, if only by a step at a time.

It doesn't even have to use its own troops, in a country as primitive, confused, and divided as Laos, local Communist guerrillas are plenty good enough when helped, encouraged, and no doubt directed by Red China.

The Red Chinese would be far more direct and far more overbearing and overwhelming if they had now a plentiful supply of the nuclear weapons they are trying to put together. That time almost certainly will come.

That's why the Asia of today, troubled as it is, in a few years will look like an area of comparative calm. The worst days are ahead.

As of now, lacking nuclear weapons, Red China has stopped blustering about seizing Formosa where the United States' nationalist allies, under Chiang Kai-shek, are protected by American air and sea power and its modern weapons.

The present reticence of the Red Chinese about Formosa will also change when they feel strong enough for a showdown with the United States over Formosa. It's particularly easy to understand why in this case.

Right now Americans are incensed that communism has a stronghold in Cuba, 90 miles from the United States, even though this country never claimed Cuba as its own.

But the Red Chinese do claim Formosa, 100 miles from mainland China. So Americans who feel irritated about Cuba can understand how the Red Chinese feel about Formosa.

But, because neither side will budge on Formosa, a clash eventually seems inescapable just as it probably will be over Cuba unless Fidel Castro is toppled from within. And that doesn't look likely.

The Red Chinese don't have to wait to get stronger in order to try to absorb mainland Asia just south of them and right next door. Here they don't have to attack directly, as they would with Formosa.

For example: The local Communists in Laos are doing pretty well. After Laos, if it falls, the story will be repeated in one form or another with Burma, Thailand, and Cambodia.

The Middle Incomes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, now that almost all of us have gone through the annual arduous exercise of collecting our bills and receipts while preparing to give Uncle Sam his due in taxes, it is perhaps the best possible time to take a serious, analytical view of expanded Federal spending.

It is no economic secret that the overwhelming majority of our income tax dollars come not from the few very rich or from those with low incomes, but from America's populous middle class. Mr. William Sumner, Washington correspondent for the Ridder Publications, has asked in his St. Paul Pioneer Press column of May 8 just how far we can go in taxing our middle-class citizens before we reach a breaking point in their ability to pay. As Mr. Sumner so ably points out, there is no "horn of plenty" from which our tax dollars are collected, and that ceiling at which point taxation becomes not a necessary fact of life but a hardship is rapidly compressing on the backbone of our economically middle-class wage earners.

The article follows:

The Middle Incomes

(By William Sumner)

Washington.—Having put the final sweeping flourish on the bottom of the tax form, the form in an envelope and the envelope in the mailbox, I am convinced that the only economy I cold possibly have stimulated last year was that of government. Heaven help the private sector.

This month and a half—between the filing of the Federal tax return and estimate and, finally, giving the Commonwealth of Virginia another healthy cut—has been a period of discontent. The President had a rough winter. I have shared his view of his winter, but quite obviously he can't have shared the spring of my discontent.

Not only is he seeking to start projects which will rise from lowly beginnings down in the millions to glorious programs ranging in the billions. He also seeks to reward those who help think up these projects, and staff them, with rather handsome pay hikes. So it is apparent that he feels that all is well down there in the middle incomes and that we are ready for more.

Many are not, and it is not a matter of doctrine so much as it is a feeling of despair called, by a Kennedy adviser, our Puritan ethic. It is rather old hat to feel there is merit to matching income with outgo, and it is indeed embarrassing to bring it up. But the facts are that we will catch it in the end, and pay for it.

No one who has seen some of the dismal areas of unemployment in the land can say with any conviction that those of the middle incomes are truly suffering much beyond frustration at this point, but it is frustration with some cause.

While the Federal Government duns us rather heavily for a social security program certain to expand in cost in so-called new benefits and through its built-in structure, payments to private life, and health insurance plans become more burdensome.

While it is un-American not to be for more and better education, and while it probably is evil to disapprove of spending $17 million or so on research in the field of education, more concern develops in a person's reactionary years on the financial means of educating his own offspring.

Again, while it has been clearly demonstrated that the automobile is an unsatisfactory vehicle for commuting, one who not only pays an income tax, but handsome State gasoline taxes as well might be excused from thinking that these last named funds—rather than still more than the Federal horn of plenty—could be used for development of rapid transit systems rather than the outmoded freeways.

The fact is, of course, that there is no horn of plenty and that there is a stiff ceiling beginning to form and harden over these salaried people who entertin visions of a life with less economic anxiety.

Some would say, of course, that the ceiling has been around for a long time, but is now beginning to compress. A frightful thought indeed for the middle class, the alleged backbone of the Nation, and probably too gloomy at that. There is paper and green ink in abundance, and no doubt the price of chewing gum will remain stable no matter what happens.

Salute to the Emerson Public Library of Emerson, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, an informed people can do much to advance the cause of freedom. One of our institutions, the public libraries, is making great efforts in achieving that goal.

I should like to salute the Emerson Public Library, of Emerson, N.J., one of our fine libraries, on the occasion of their having received an Honorable Mention Award of $1,500 from among 97 libraries in competition for a 1963 Book-of-the-Month Award to small public libraries.

This award, in recognition of meeting the high criteria of the American Library Association, cites the Emerson Public Library for providing more and better library services. The Emerson

Library is the first in New Jersey to receive this honor since the award was established on a national basis.

By being selected as one of the 10 outstanding public libraries in the Nation, not only the community but the entire State of New Jersey is enriched by this demonstration of library leadership. I am mindful too of the wholehearted support of the citizens and leaders of Emerson who contributed their time and talents to the success of this activity.

This fine achievement sows the seeds for future honors and should be an inspiration to all small public libraries throughout the State.

Republican Progress in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, over the past several months a great deal of discussion has developed concerning the future of the Republican Party in the South where single party domination has existed for a hundred years.

In an effort to shed further light on this issue, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for my colleagues' information, a copy of a speech made by Horace E. Henderson, chairman of the Republican Party of Virginia, at the University of Virginia on May 9, 1963.

I commend Mr. Henderson's speech to all those interested in the progress being made in advancing Republican ideals and Republican representation in the South:

REPUBLICAN PROGRESS IN THE SOUTH

(By Horace E. Henderson, chairman, Republican Party of Virginia, University of Virginia, May 9, 1963)

It is clear that the South and its century-long domination by the Democratic Party is now undergoing a basic political realinement. A number of factors are responsible for this overdue development: (1) the economic and social patterns of the past are changing; (2) the rapid growth of urbanization and the influx of transient populations; (3) technical, economic and social pressures for change and progress; (4) the elimination of the segregation issue as an overriding political factor; (5) the increasing conflict between the liberal control of the Democratic party and the fundamental conservative beliefs of the people of the South; (6) the forthcoming elimination of the poll tax; (7) rural legislative control being upset and dislocated by reapportionment; (8) enlarging retirements of older Southern political leaders; and (9) the new and younger leadership of the Southern Republicans which more actively and effectively advocates vigorous political action necessary to preserve conservative principles and to meet the need for progress and leadership by changing demands and mounting populations.

These diverse forces combine to create a current situation of confusion and uncertainty as to the political future of the South and its important influence on the determination of national political policies in the Congress and the White House in 1964.

Historically, the South represents the greatest political paradox since the founding of the Republic. While in the past it has been the most consistent area in the Nation solidly dedicated to the preservation of fundamental conservative governmental principles, it has been the blind devotion of the South to one party which has largely enabled the Democratic Party to control the determination of national policies in the Congress for 29 of the past 35 years and to control the Presidency for 22 of the past 30 years, a period during which most of the conservative principles of the South have been under constant assault by the liberal national Democratic Party.

At a time when it has become increasingly apparent that areas, groups, and blocs are being exploited for political expediencies, the people of the South are recognizing that in the interest of the principles in which they believe, they no longer will permit the South to be taken for granted and further exploited by the Democratic Party. Thus the South now appears to be up for grabs by the national political parties in the future and, after a century, the benefits of two-party political competition has come for every southern citizen at long last.

The problem and the challenge for the Republican Party in the South is to recognize the needs and interests of the people of this area in this period of change and adjustment, and to seek to provide the application of principle and the promotion of progress which will enable the South to successfully compete in an advancing modern world toward goals of opportunity for increased private and personal responsibility, dynamic economic development, and essential citizen services which local and State government can best provide.

We of the South must not only aspire to the legacy of the past, but we must fulfill the promise of the future. For we can do much now to determine the future of the South and its influence upon the Nation. While change is inevitable, let us not seek change for mere political expediency, but rather let us meet the irresistible forces of time and circumstance with reason and control rather than resistance and chaos. Let us work for unity and harmony among all segments of our population, let us take great pride in the traditions and accomplishments of our States, and let us work efficiently and enthusiastically together to assure the best opportunity for all citizens to assume their responsibilities for the progress of our people, principles, and products.

We are rightfully proud of our heritage. We must be determined that we shall do as much to advance this heritage as did our forefathers with its creation. And, while we must never compromise our basic principles and constitutional rights, we shall also recognize that the application of these rights and principles is affected by time and circumstance, and we shall not be so rigidly conservative nor so inflexibly liberal that the application of principle becomes irrelevant and impossible. We know nothing remains unchanged by time and circumstance—our task today is to eliminate the unjustifiable and to adjust realistically to the essential public factors necessary for the extension of freedom, opportunity, and responsibility.

We must remember that freedom is our goal at every level of public concern—and freedom perishes before reactionary conservatism just as before socialistic liberalism. The political challenge of our time is not a choice between these equally disastrous extremes—for our survival as a self-governing democracy demands that we preserve and extend freedom, maintaining fundamental absolutes upon which the democratic system of government is founded, yet aggressively applying those principles for the creation of ever increasing opportunities for the assumption of greater responsibilities by all free men with dignity and justice.

We must work for an objective and constructive conservatism. For if conservatism is to reassert itself as a national political philosophy it must be the dynamic champion of the rights and the responsibilities of the individual which alone can fully develop our greatest opportunities for progress in human affairs. We must effectively pursue the dynamic application of fundamental governmental principles to the ever-changing and rapidly expanding problems of the present.

We Republicans in the South must be concerned about the legitimate problems of human beings and we must place the national interest first. We must be willing to make whatever sacrifices as are necessary for what is best for America and her future survival as a Republic. We need only leadership. Leadership with the courage to stop making dependent delinquents of adult Americans, leadership with the conviction and determination to convince Americans to do for themselves what government should not do, to lead this Nation back to an appreciation of, and practice of, time-proven absolutes of self-government, rights, and responsibilities.

And we must be more than negative. When we talk about constitutional rights we must also talk about individual rights. When we shout for freedom we should deserve freedom by fulfilling our individual responsibility for self-government in our community, State, and Nation. We must say, "Do not ask what your country can do for you"—ask rather what you can do to become a better and more responsible citizen for a better and stronger America.

We are right to oppose increasing intervention of Government into individual and States rights, yet let us make sure that first we accept and exhaust individual and State responsibilities which can often remove the opportunity for Federal power to expand its control of more and more of our daily lives and fortunes. Let us determine that we shall clean our own houses, and when we attempt to tell others that self-help is preferable to Federal aid, let us not be demogogs who at the same time hold out our hands for our share of the loot. When we extoll individual rights, let us remember that rights are inseparable from responsibility, and that rights with responsibility know no barrier of race, opportunity, or dignity.

We must convince our fellow Americans that the choice for survival is between responsibility and freedom, or self-indulgence and slavery; between absolute principles of sound government, or increasing dictatorial power.

The Republican Party in the South will become the dominant political force for our Southern people in the near future if it fulfills its great opportunity for being the party of progress. We shall continue to rapidly increase our strength and influence if we espouse reasonable political alternatives to the invested politicians of the Democratic Party in the South; if we work objectively to expand the opportunities for a dynamic economy, better employment, needed services and facilities, greater efficiency in lieu of increased taxes, sound fiscal integrity, and the full public exposure of governmental decisions and public operations. We must conduct a constant public discussion of public issues. We must provide the competition of candidates for public office. We must advocate and support legislation for progress. We must enlarge the opportunity for responsibility for all our citizens. And we must create and promote public unity and enthusiasm which will permit our States to prosper for the mutual benefit of us all.

The South needs leadership. The GOP in the South must be prepared to lead the South into a new and dynamic future. It must meet the need of our people for a political leadership of integrity and statesmanship. The greatest tragedy of our times is that we citizens have permitted ourselves to be politically manipulated into the public position wherein statesmanship can seldom be recognized nor maintained in public life.

No politician today can be elected to public office without compromise to expediency. And since the public now demands it, it receives the kind of mediocre leadership it deserves, and nothing more. If this Nation is to survive the life-and-death struggle with international communism; if we are to preserve the democratic principles based on fundamental religious absolutes upon which our system of self-government is based; if we are to maintain our national character and Western civilization over the threat of socialism and communism so that we may advance the progress of opportunity and responsibility for all Americans, with their rights and freedoms intact; then we must preserve, maintain, and expand those constitutional absolutes and essential principles of self-governmental responsibilities necessary for the advancement of the vital interests of the American people. In this era of challenge to freedom we can no longer accept government by political expediency, leadership for political exploitation, or representation only for reelection. The very continued existence of our American society demands representative political leadership, a rejection of representation by seniority, and an end to the manipulation of self-interested groups and minority blocs for political expediency.

The survival of America demands statesmanship. Statesmanship which will reject the popular but improper. Courage to support the unpopular but just. We Republicans must develop and follow leadership, of principle and conviction if our American way of life is to be maintained, and if we are to avoid enslavement by socialism and communism.

Enlightened leadership is the only practical answer to the problems which beset a changing world. It is the need of the day and the necessity of the Nation. We have no right to seek political power merely because we are the opposition. We must meet the need for enlightened leadership for the people of our State and Nation. We do not need to offer people more for themselves. We need only to fulfill our responsibility for leadership for greater opportunity and responsibility for our fellow citizens. The best possible way to conserve our American heritage and our constitutional system of individual freedom is to expand the opportunity for greater responsibility by every citizen. Only a citizen who possesses freedom will fight for freedom. Let us plaçe our community, State, and Nation first—for what is good for America is good for each of us.

The Republic Party has an unlimited potential in the South. Thousands and thousands of Southerners are crossing over to the Republican Party because the liberal Democratic Party is intent upon changing all that is, or has been, America. They know that an active and strong conservative Republican Party working effectively at the community, State, and National levels for a Republican President, and the Republican control of Congress is absolutely necessary to reverse the trend toward a socialistic welfare state by the national Democratic Party. The Republican Party in the South strongly opposes the violation of our constitutional rights and due processes of law, and we oppose the destruction of the responsibility of the individual to his community and fellow citizens. And we strongly support the expansion of freedom of opportunity for all men, for without opportunity there can be no responsibility; without responsibility there can be no rights; and without rights, there can be no freedom.

The people of the South now know that the Republican Party must become the dominant political party in America, as the only means of conserving that which must be—and remain—a form of government of laws and not of men.

"Out, Damned Spot, Out, I Say * * * What Need We Fear Who Knows It, When None Can Call Our Power to Account"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I suppose most of us at one time or another have put things into words—or in print—that a month or year or so later we would just as soon not be reminded of. That is why I chose the well-known quotation from Macbeth to illustrate my remarks today.

It is good occasionally to review some of the things which have been said or printed—because they can have an oddly therapeutic and even humbling effect—which may be "good for the soul."

In that connection I would like to include with my remarks today an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday, December 8, 1959—at a time when the Democratic advisory council was busily preparing statements of high principle, prior to adoption of the Democrat campaign platform of 1960. The council soundly belabored President Eisenhower, as well as the entire Republican administration, for what it called incompetent administration, willful maladministration, and even deliberate refusal to administer.

The entire editorial—I feel—is priceless when read again during this particular time in our administrative history, under the New Frontier. I would like especially to commend the last few lines of the second paragraph to the attention of the House membership and the public—in view of pending legislation to once again raise the national debt limit. The last four words of that same paragraph are also noteworthy, in view of present attempts to sell the public on "tax cuts" without corresponding reductions in governmental spending.

The third paragraph—need we add—is also noteworthy, in view of the countless good will tours taken by Kennedy family members either in official or semiofficial status—as well as other New Frontier representatives.

Then—the closing lines of the editorial—which says: "they make interesting reading, even though not widely remembered at voting time." It may well be that the New Frontier administration will find itself "hoist on its own petard" because they have been so diligent in publicizing all their actions and programs that the public may well remember some of the more embarrassing things at voting time.

At any rate, we will be glad to jog their memory from time to time, if it will help.

I would like under unanimous consent, that the editorial entitled "The Need to Elect," appearing in the Tuesday, December 8, 1959 Washington Evening Star—be included in my remarks today in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE NEED TO ELECT

As a partisan political document, the policy statement of the Democratic Advisory Council leaves little or nothing to be said. It indicts the Republicans on every possible ground—from age-old affinity for the moneyed interests, neglect of the common man, hostility to new ideas, a lingering bent toward isolationism and even to distrust of government itself. It charges the Republican executive with incompetent administration, willful maladministration and even deliberate refusal to administer.

To counter this bleak evaluation of national life under a GOP administration, the council offers a lengthy series of reasons why the United States "needs a Democratic President." The reasons range from the much-debated one of achieving "growth and full prosperity" to the less-debated one of developing the "cultural and artistic life of the Nation." Included, too, are the goals of better facilities for education, improved health services, prosperity for the farmers, security and dignity for the aged and "a decent home for every American family." All of these, and more, are within reach if the voters vote right. Furthermore, although virtually all of the recommendations on purely domestic welfare issues would involve substantially higher Federal spending, the council assures that the money for these "essential needs" can be raised without deficit spending and without increasing tax rates.

On foreign affairs, the council wishes the Republican President well on his present peace mission abroad and emphasizes that making "partisan capital of peace is deceitful, damaging and dangerous." Still, it adds, "good will tours are an inadequate substitute for solid policies and programs." Actually, the council thinks that the administration of President Eisenhower has "sadly damaged America's strength and prestige abroad"—although the lengthy section dealing with foreign affairs reportedly was toned down in the course of being drafted.

This is, of course, the precampaign season for statements of high principle from each political party. The Republicans recently labored through a whole series, prepared by its Committee on Program and Progress. The Democratic Advisory Council promises more to come. Presumably, each party will reach a climax at this sort of thing when campaign platforms are adopted at next summer's conventions. They make interesting reading, even though not widely remembered at voting time.

Dividends From a $4 Billion Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, evidence accumulates daily indicating much of our foreign aid money might as well be dumped into the Potomac. By doing this we would at least know where we placed it.

The following editorial from the York (Pa.) Dispatch is further evidence of what one friend thinks of our generosity:

Four Billion Dollars Wasted

You would think that Brazilian Government officials, having watched while the United States poured $4 billion into their country since World War II, would have some kind word for our efforts.

Such is not the case, apparently.

Latin labor leaders meeting in Bogotá, Colombia, heard Brazilian Labor Minister Almino Alfonso declare that Latin America's problems cannot be solved with "works of charity," and that Brazil has little to show from the Alliance for Progress.

Asked to explain what has happened to the $4 billion, the Brazilian delegation to the labor conference sat in silence.

The U.S. foreign aid program has been operated on the theory that if we don't help the have-nots of the world, the Russians will ultimately absorb them.

Brazil is a good example of why we think the theory is ill-founded. If Uncle Sam wants to be the banker of the world, let him act like a banker—who demands results from money invested.

Speak Up, Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the participation of scientists, business leaders, and State and Federal officials in the Space Month activities in Illinois, which have just ended this past weekend, has emphasized the ability of the Midwest to contribute more than it has in the past to the national space and defense effort.

Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted, I wish to include the following editorial on this subject which appeared in the May 10 issue of the Chicago Sun-Times:

Speak Up, Illinois

As Space Month ended in Illinois, Gov. Otto Kerner made a stirring speech to the Midwest Space Conference Panel. The Governor is concerned, and rightly so, because Illinois does not have more than a minuscule portion of the multi-billion-dollar space contracts now in force.

Most of the space contracts and expenditures are allocated to the east and west coasts and to one or two locations in the South. Those few contracts in Illinois have been solicited by energetic manufacturers and some of these are performed outside Illinois by local firms.

There is no gainsaying the fact that Illinois (and the Midwest) have the brains; there are great universities here and manufacturing facilities that will measure up to any demands. Governor Kerner makes special mention that Illinois would welcome an electronic research center and that a nuclear propulsion center, to study the best methods to harness nuclear power for propulsion, would be a natural for this area where the atomic age was born.

One difficulty was not mentioned, perhaps because the Governor is a bit chary. Illinois has no Vice President of the United States—and that may be why some $150 million is being spent in Texas for a manned spacecraft center, a facility which could easily have been placed anywhere in the country, and why $200 million is being spent on a Saturn test facility in western Mississippi.

Nor has Illinois ever had any Senators with the bold drive and acumen that Massachusetts has had—which may be one of the reason that Massachusetts now bristles with electronic complexes and is the recipient of giant Government contracts.

The art of politics is, as always, the art of the possible. The mere possession of brains and facilities does not mean that Government will automaticlly award contracts—after all, the brains and facilities can easily be persuaded to go where the contracts go.

Governor Kerner is right, Illinois does not have its fair share of space contracts. The State is losing income and employment to other areas less able to do the work.

In his speech Governor Kerner asked the NASA officials just what they wanted, what conditions did Illinois have to meet in order to attract space contracts and what must be done to justify the placing of a major NASA development in Illinois.

Governor Kerner has been in office since 1961. He is the chief political officer of this State. We might ask of the Governor—why has he waited until now to find out what is needed? Other States, other regions, have obviously learned what is needed and have met the conditions.

Why not Illinois?

Appointment of Former Representative Frank Smith of Mississippi to TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the people of the Tennessee Valley were most delighted and very grateful when President Kennedy saw fit to appoint the distinguished former Representative from Mississippi, Mr. Frank Smith, to the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The President has since nominated Mr. Smith to a full 9-year term on the Board, and the Senate has since consented to the appointment. For this, too, we in the valley are thankful, as evidenced by an editorial which recently appeared in the Chattanooga Times.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Full Term for Mr. Smith

Frank Smith, former Mississippi Congressman, has been a member of the Tennessee Valley Authority board of directors for less than a year. He has spent much of the time since his appointment to fill out an unexpired term in familiarizing himself with his administrative duties and in visiting various TVA installations over the valley.

Now President Kennedy has nominated Mr. Smith for a full 9-year term on the TVA board. It was an expected expression of White House regard for the liberally inclined Mississippian whose support for the President's policies in Congress contributed to his defeat in last summer's primaries.

Although Mr. Smith's political leanings may have been a factor in his selection for the TVA board, there is also reason for the choice on the basis of geographical representation. TVA serves almost a fourth of Mississippi with power generated on the Tennessee, and soon will be linked on an exchange basis with the two private companies operating in the rest of the State.

He knows the region and its people and shares with them their continuing objective of balanced growth. With a full term now afforded him, subject to Senate confirmation, he possesses a fine opportunity with his TVA board colleagues to serve the region through encouraging a rounded development of all its resources.

We congratulate him on the appointment and wish him well in the fulfillment of his duties.

Elkton (Va.) Jaycees Encourage Student Interest in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, I had the pleasure of a visit from Barry Hensley, a student at Elkton (Va.) High School, who was selected by the school faculty to spend a day at the Capitol observing the legislative process.

Young Mr. Hensley visited a committee session with me, accompanied me to the Pentagon and then returned to spend most of the afternoon in the House galleries, observing the proceedings on the floor.

Barry was the first Elkton student selected to participate in a new program of the Elkton Jaycees, and the hope is that other young people from Elkton will have opportunity to come to Washington in this program to spend a day with their Representative in Congress.

Escorting Barry yesterday was Mr. Norman Workman, State director of the Elkton Jaycees. Mr. Workman, as well as Herbert Baugher, president, and other officers of the Elkton Jaycees, are to be complimented on the development of this fine program for training in citizenship. It is just one more example of the enthusiasm and energy to be found in the Jaycee movement for any project contributing to community betterment or civic awareness.

Young citizens such as Barry soon will acquire shares in the responsibility for carrying forward our representative form of government, and it seems particularly fitting that as many of them as possible be afforded an opportunity to observe firsthand how representative government functions.

The system is not faultless, we know, but improvements have a direct relationship to the breadth of public concern for the effectiveness of a mechanism which remains the best hope of representative, nonoppressive government. It is to the Barry Hensleys that we must look for the maintenance and advancement of the principles of individual freedom on which our governmental structure is based, and I salute the Elkton Jaycees on the inauguration of this program for student observation of the Congress.

The Great Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of Congress the excellent historical essay for which Gordon Schwenk, a young neighbor of mine, recently was accorded top honors in a nationwide contest sponsored by the Daughters of the American Revolution.

A fifth-grade student at the York Avenue School, Lansdale, Pa., Gordon won both a local and State contest with his essay, "The Great Treaty," prior to successfully competing with 49 other essayists in the nationwide contest.

Gordon wrote about the importance to Pennsylvania of the treaty signed by William Penn and Lenape Indians in 1683. His essay follows:

THE GREAT TREATY

(By Gordon Schwenk)

The place: Shackamaxon, Pa. The great elme tree, 155 years old.

The time: In June 1683.

The boat is coming up the river, red flag at its prow. The Governor wears a gray suit, broad hat and blue sash of silk. Indians assemble and the kings and the people await the coming of "Onas," (William Penn—the Indians' name for him). The Indian kings and councilors wear their faces painted and their blankets decorated with fantastic designs and their plumes dance in the air.

The Indians welcome the Governor and then go apart by themselves to prepare for the solemn ceremony of receiving the great treaty. The great chief of the Lenapes arises and stands in solemn silence. He then advances a few steps and takes up a chaplet like a Greek or Roman crown of oak leaves or laurel. The thorn was the emblem of power among the Delawares. When a chief wore the chaplet with the thorn, all things were supposed to become sacred around him. When the thorn was on his head, no persons could be molested; all must be harmony and peace.

Taminent, the lord of the Delawares, takes a thorn and sets it in the chaplet as if it were a gem. He lifts the chaplet and thorn and puts it upon his head. There is a deep silence.

The Indians lay down their arms and the young men take away out of sight the bows and arrows. Taminent stands there self-crowned, the lord of the hills, the caves, the far mountains and the near waters. Then he sits down and the aged warriors form a semicircle around him and the young Indians a like circle around them, the women and children a wider half circle. The Indian assemblies now represents the half moon. It was a sacred figure.

Governor Penn was at that time a young man of 38 years. William Penn comes and stands near the semicircle with a parchment in his hand. The Governor speaks and part of his words were these:

"Brothers, there dwells with us that great and eternal spirit who holds the heavens, that receives our souls at the hour of death. He knows that we are men of peace, that our desires are for peace, that today is a day of good will and that we have no other thought than to serve each other. We have come to you with open hearts. Everything here is to be openness, brotherhood, and love."

He unrolls the parchment that contains the written treaty. He reads the treaty.

The treaty declared that from that day, the nations of the Lenni Lenapes and the children of Onas should eternally be friends.

That all roads should be free and open to each other.

That the doors of the white men should be open to the red men and the doors of the red men open to the white men.

That they should never believe evil of each other and should seek to correct any evil report.

That should any white man wrong a red man or any red man a white man, the case should be adjudged by 12 men, 6 of them should be white and 6 red men and in this way, justice to all men was to be sought and approved.

They kept this treaty for 70 years and the white people were the first to break the covenant. No drop of Quaker blood was ever shed by an Indian in the colony.

It is the Shackamaxon Treaty, which marks the highest level of Penn's fame. That speech by the elm tree was the speech of no imperialist filled with false pride of race; it was the plain speech of an honest man with a true vision of human brotherhood.

Voltaire, a man in his twenties when Penn died, wrote of the great treaty in his "Dictionnaire Philosophique" as an absolute fact and called it the "only treaty between those nations and the Christians which was never sworn to and never broken." As for the purpose of the great treaty, the Quaker message is a peace message, and Penn's first effort would have been to establish peaceful relations with his new neighbors and guarantee to them the peaceable ideas of the immigrants who had already arrived and the many more who would follow.

William Penn was one of humanity's truly great men and his achievements are proved by the things such as the great treaty which he promoted and left for posterity. Generation by generation since his time, the ideals which he cherished and partially realized more than two and a half centuries ago are being carried through in public and private life.

The signing of this great treaty can be traced in Pennsylvania's history as a most important fact in its rising to a strong and powerful State.

How could a State fall that was based on "openness, brotherhood, and love"?

Military Pay Increases

SPEECH

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5555) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, today the House of Representatives has the opportunity to rectify an unfair provision of the Military Pay Act of 1958 and, thus, repair a breach of trust with a group of the most dedicated citizens of this great country.

The military pay bill of May 20, 1958, which went into effect on June 1, 1958, provided that no one retired prior to June 1, 1958, could compute his retirement pay under the new pay scales contained in the 1958 Pay Act.

It seems to me that if those who retired before 1958 are entitled to recompute, a man who retires after 1958 should be entitled to recompute also. I support the recomputation amendment because it avoids disparities in rates of retirement pay between retirees having the same grade and length of service.

This amendment relieves the individual of the burden of extending his term of service to assure himself of an increase in retirement pay. Under the proposed amendment an individual knows that his retirement pay would be the same whether he retired before or after a pending pay increase.

The amendment also serves as a desirable incentive to retain the mature and experienced men needed during this period of crisis and cold war. It should be passed by the House and enacted into law.

Drug Patent Law Likely in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, American pharmaceutical companies have made great strides in research and discovery of lifesaving, wonder drugs since World War II. One of the chief reasons for this miraculous progress has been our Nation's strong patent system which encourages our scientists by affording them protection for their discoveries.

At the same time, our American drug companies have also been forced to contend with foreign manufacturers, not restricted by patent laws of our country, and nonexistent patent laws in their own countries, who reap the benefit of American research and development without involving themselves in the costly processes of scientific laboratories and high-priced research talent.

Italian drug manufacturers have been involved in this area, and have copied many costly American formulas at little or no expense because of the lack of Italian patent restrictions.

The State of Indiana is a great drug manufacturing State with many outstanding pharmaceutical firms being located within our State's borders. Thus our State has been most cognizant of this inequity to the American drug industry imposed by lack of patent laws in Italy.

It is most encouraging to note that the Italian Parliament which convenes May 16 will consider proposed drug patent legislation.

My own legislation, entitled H.R. 1707, has been introduced before the 88th Congress and referred to the House Judiciary Committee. It provides protection for American manufacturers from the pirating or copying of their patents by foreign manufacturers.

Mr. Charles Vaughan, the very capable and knowledgeable business editor of the Indianapolis News, has written a detailed account of the problem faced by American firms and the prospects of Italian legislation which would benefit our drug industry.

Mr. Vaughan's article appeared in the Indianapolis News of May 8, 1963, and, under unanimous consent I include this article in its entirety, as follows:

DRUG PATENT LAW LIKELY IN ITALY

(By Charles Vaughan)

American pharmaceutical companies, including Eli Lilly & Co., are watching the coming session of the Italian Parliament with unusual interest. The reason for this interest is possible Parliament action affecting the free world's drug patent laws.

When the new Parliament convenes May 16, it will face a proposed drug patent law, the first for that country. Italy and Turkey are the only two major countries of the free world that do not have this patent protection. Small Italian companies, without research programs or a research staff, can duplicate and imitate the results of expensive research and even compete with companies making the discoveries.

Another important point is that while Italian pharmaceutical firms patent between 400 and 500 products a year in other countries, they are unable to protect their products in their own country.

The patent law, long sought by responsible Italian drug firms, had reached the Cabinet before Parliament was dissolved February 15. Under the Italian system, the Cabinet, after approving a bill, sends it to Parliament for voting. How fast Parliament will act on this proposed law is speculative but many Italian industrialists believe it will go into effect before the year ends.

Dr. Guido Zerilli, one of Italy's leading industrialists and head of Lepetit, the country's largest pharmaceutical firm, has been an outspoken supporter of the proposed law.

"All those interested in public health and welfare are looking forward to passage of this law," he says. "Everyone hopes that it will, at last, put an end to the abnormal situation in which anyone disguised as a 'drug maker' can produce imitations and copies of products introduced by Italian and foreign companies after great effort and expenditure on research and development."

SIXTY U.S. FIRMS IN COUNTRY

American pharmaceutical companies, which have been attracted to the prospering Italian market since World War II, also will benefit from passage of a patent law. Some 60 American drug concerns—led by Lilly, Squibb, Chas. Pfizer and Parke, Davis—are operating in Italy either as independent producers or jointly with Italian interests or through marketing agencies.

Except for oil, American investment in Italy in chemicals and pharmaceuticals is higher than that of any other industrial sector. It is estimated that the U.S. companies are selling about $60 million annually in the Italian market, including direct importations from the United States, and the volume is growing steadily.

A side effect of the patent situation was pointed up recently by George E. Frost, a patent attorney. Frost reported that in a 6-year period from 1955 to 1961, there were 25 new drug discoveries in the United States, which has strong patent protection. There were only 11 discoveries in all other foreign countries with weaker laws and none at all in Italy and Turkey, where no protection is given.

The conclusion certainly can be drawn that only when manufacturers have strong patent protection can they afford to invest the vast sums of time and money necessary to find new and improved products.

Yet, at the same time, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, is proposing to weaken U.S. drug patent laws by reducing the life of drug patents from the present 17 years to 3 years. U.S. drugmakers contend Kefauver's law would ruin the industry.

As Italy wakes up, they fear we may fall asleep.

Important Function of the SBA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal recently printed a letter to the editor complimenting the Small Business Administration. The letter was written by an Ohio businessman. Since praise for the SBA is not too frequent in the Wall Street Journal, under unanimous consent I include the letter to be printed in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 25, 1963]

IMPORTANT FUNCTION OF THE SBA

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

I am writing to comment on your January 15 editorial "Bad Political Business," which does give a surface treatment dealing with any politically oriented agency and the inevitable motivation to expand its services and influence. I feel that this is an element of our type of democracy in action that has gone on from the start and will continue as long as funds are available.

However, as a so-called small business company with considerable experience dealing with the Small Business Administration and the Government procurement agencies, I can cite instance after instance where SBA activities have contributed to tremendous purchase savings by introducing broader competition both in the open competitive field and in negotiated type of contracts for material and equipment.

The sums that are being expended are so vast that the easy way has been to call in some large, prominent manufacturer, quickly negotiate a contract or have them write proprietary specifications. They are able to maintain large sales and engineering staffs in the areas of heavy governmental purchasing.

In the research and development area, vast sums have practically been forced on these larger companies which have strengthened their new product development and technical know-how far out of proportion to their capabilities by expenditure of their own funds.

There is no greater natural resource to be tapped in this country than the ingenuity and resourcefulness of the smaller manufacturer. However, they must be taught and guided how to handle this type of business on a profitable basis and, in particular, how to get at it, which has been an important function of the SBA.

GORDON J. BERRY,
President, the Electric Products Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

More Jobs Than Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, one of the anomalies of life in America today is our struggle with an abnormally high unemployment rate among our people when at the same time we have more jobs available than we have workers. The problem with adults is essentially a carbon copy of that with unemployed youth. Those who are in need of work are not trained to handle the responsibilities of the jobs which are going begging for want of qualified takers.

Those who oversimplify the problem by repeatedly stating that our only deficiency is that we have more workers than jobs, that automation is the main cause of our unemployment, are mistating the case and misleading the American public, as is pointed out in the following Wall Street Journal editorial of May 14.

MORE JOBS THAN WORKERS

With all the discussion of unemployment, relatively little attention is paid to the sizable shortage of workers that exists side by side with it.

As Mr. Malabre's article in this newspaper the other day indicates, there is no great mystery about the seeming paradox. Since World War II the economy has generated about four new white-collar jobs for each blue-collar and farm job lost to technology.

There are some 10 million more white-collar jobs (not even counting employment in service industries) than there were in 1947, while the decline in blue-collar and farm jobs amounts to only 2.6 million. The growing number in the white-collar category would be much greater if there were people to fill the openings.

Most of those officially classified as unemployed are people with few or no skills, and it obviously isn't easy to qualify them as engineers, stenographers, draftsmen or for the other activities where the openings are. But the white-collar boom does tend to discount some current beliefs.

One is the notion that advancing technology is the great killer of jobs, particularly clerical ones. Despite office automation the rise of clerical jobs has been particularly sharp in recent years. Though Bell System, for instance, employs 6,000 fewer operators than at the beginning of the postwar period, its total employment has increased by more than 250,000.

Another is the idea that any economy with more than 4 million people estimated as unemployed must be in pretty terrible shape. On the contrary, an economy with acute labor shortages, which for all anybody knows may total more than the jobless figures, might be said to be thriving.

Yet because of the unemployment statistics, the deceptive impression is left that the American economy has somehow failed millions of citizens and Washington must embark on new spending programs. It is indeed a sad thing that so many of those who are genuinely jobless seem unable to improve themselves. But an economy able to employ them, if only they were able, is hardly an inefficient machine that can run only with growing Government support.

Government Medicine and Fiscal Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed clipping from Government Medicine and Fiscal Truth, was forwarded me by J. H. Allen, M.D., F.A.C.S. of Springfield, Mo. I concur in his thinking that it is interesting that both Canada and England had a much greater cash outlay than the public is led to believe, for their government support type of medicine. It is worthwhile that this be brought to all Members of the Congress so that this type thing, which constantly erodes free enterprise and the private practice of doctor-patient relationship involving personal service, cannot happen here:

GOVERNMENT MEDICINE AND FISCAL TRUTH

Opponents of Government-controlled medical care plans have charged for years that the true costs of such programs are rarely, if ever, understood by the people who are taxed to support them. This viewpoint has now been corroborated by none other than the Deputy Minister of Health of Great Britain, Dr. Daniel Thompson.

In a recent discussion reported by Dr. Edward R. Annis, president-elect of the American Medical Association, Dr. Thompson admitted that the head of the average British family pays far more for medical services than the widely quoted figure of $1.48 per week.

COMMENT

After conceding that the $1.48 figure covers only 12½ percent of the total cost of Britain's medical scheme—with 87½ percent coming out of general revenues—Dr. Thompson made this startling comment:

"The people of England don't understand this. If you went down the streets of London and stopped 9 out of 10 Britishers—no, 10 out of 10—and you asked them what it cost, they would tell you $1.48 a week."

Citizens of Great Britain's sister country, Canada, seem to be equally ill-informed about the real costs of Government medicine. D. E. Kilgour, president of Canada's Great-West Life Assurance Co., recently wrote in the New York State Journal of Medicine:

"Today, virtually every citizen of Canada is entitled to free hospital care * * * Canadians regard the typical premium of $48 per family per year as not unreasonable. They rarely think of the typical 3-percent provincial sales tax as a hospital tax, and almost never reflect that the Federal contribution costs 13.8 percent of the total revenue from personal income tax."

Isn't it about time that British and Canadian citizens were told the fiscal truth about their nationalized health schemes? Or do bureaucrats in those countries realize that a full explanation of these fiscal realities would lead to public disenchantment with Government medicine?

Foreign Aid—Dismal Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the man who knows more facts on foreign aid than anyone else, in or out of Congress, is our distinguished colleague from Louisiana, OTTO E. PASSMAN. In an article published in the May 21 issue of the National Review, Mr. PASSMAN spells out in detail the utter folly of the foreign handout program.

Soon the Congress will be acting on the administration's request for $4.5 billion in aid for fiscal 1964—this in addition to the $120 billion the handout program already has cost American taxpayers.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD "Foreign Aid: Success or Failure?" from the National Review of May 21, 1963:

FOREIGN AID: SUCCESS OR FAILURE?

(By OTTO O. PASSMAN of Louisiana)

My contention is that foreign aid is a complete and dismal failure, and I shall briefly outline here some of the reasons I think this is so.

During all history, there have been poor nations and rich nations, and various types of "isms," such as exist today. Our own country, which started as a poor nation, became great and free and respected because, among other basic reasons, of individual initiative, hard work and high integrity; and because, also, we pursued the course suggested by our Founding Fathers, and had a firm but fair foreign policy substantially based upon trade. But today as is becoming increasingly clear, we are resorting to a concept bordering on appeasement, giving away our wealth in a misguided and futile effort to buy friends to accomplish the objectives which made us strong and wealthy and free in the first place. We are trying to make the dollar do what it was never intended to do, and making a miserable mess in the effort.

The so-called mutual security part of our aid abroad for this fiscal year, as presented to Congress, covers economic assistance for at least 73 nations and 7 British or Dutch territories or possessions and military assistance to at least 58 nations. Over all, it has been determined that 101 of the other 112 nations of the world have been, are, or will be recipients of assistance from the United States since the end of World War II. Including all categories of aid (mutual security, U.S. assistance through international organizations, oversea military construction) and counting the interest on the money we have borrowed to give away—the cost to our country of this postwar aid has amounted to more than $120 billion.

Through the years, this uncontrolled—and in its existing form and scope, uncontrollable—worldwide spending program has become an ever more serious threat to the U.S. dollar and to our country's gold reserves. Our dangerous balance-of-payments problem has developed in large part as a result of foreign aid.

It is generally recognized, that all nations, both old and new, earn dollars or other convertible currency from their exports. But, when nations are credited with foreign-aid dollars against which they can place orders for goods and services, the invoices for these goods and services are then sent to the U.S. Treasury for payment—from the taxpayers' till—rather than to the government which received the shipment. In normal commercial practice when the United States sells a nation goods or services, the United States receives something in return—dollars, gold, or goods and services. Under the foreign-aid program, however, it is a one-way street—the goods or service go out, the U.S. Treasury pays the bill, and the United States receives nothing of a tangible commercial nature in return.

A program such as this can only be a drain on either an individual's or a nation's resources. This statement is borne out by the outflow of gold from the United States in the past 10 years, as well as by the increase in foreign dollar holdings during the same period.

So great, in fact, has been America's outpouring of wealth to foreign nations that many of them have accumulated dollars far in excess of their needs for commerce. Consequently, they have demanded gold in exchange for the dollars, and since 1952 have reduced our gold reserves from in excess of $23 billion to less than $16 billion. Furthermore, as of today, they also hold short-term dollar assets amounting to $23 billion-plus for which they can demand gold. If such a demand should be made the United States could not meet it, but would fall short by about $20 billion in the amount of gold needed to fulfill those claims and maintain the reserve that is required to support our own currency.

SUBSTITUTE FOR SELF-HELP

Foreign aid also has created a pattern of international charity out of the dollar—inculcating the belief in less-favored nations that the United States is morally, and as a matter of principle and duty, responsible for bringing the world up to our standard of living and freedom with our taxpayers' money. While we are bleeding our own citizens with burdensome taxation in order to give to others the majority of the aid-recipient countries do not and will not tax their own people at rates even remotely close to the U.S. rates to assist in bringing about the improved standards which we say we are trying to help them attain.

However, we either largely ignore or sweep under the rug the fact that our aid is treated rather generally by recipients as a substitute for internal initiative and effort, or that in many cases our aid cannot be effectively utilized. As a result of this fiscally irresponsible action, our annual budget deficits increase, and our public debt—already exceeding by $23 billion the combined public debts of all the other nations of the world—continues to rise at an alarming rate. Our free-enterprise system has not been able to produce enough profits to pay for our foreign aid so we are having to borrow the money to meet these expenditures, without any plan or suggestion as to when, if ever, this money is to be repaid.

The aid program has become not only an added tax to our producers, but a bountiful subsidy to our foreign competitors. It not only rapidly depletes our own wealth and resources, it has also been a primary reason for our ever-increasing noncompetitive position in world markets. Our prices are now so high that we cannot compete successfully in world trade without the Federal Government subsidizing our exports by as much as 28 percent; and even with the subsidies, our trade balance is steadily dwindling.

Not only is our foreign aid program literally shot through with waste, extravagance, foolish planning, unsound operations, and ineffective results—of which there is abundant evidence—but it has contributed to and fostered widespread misuse of aid dollars on the part of innumerable people in recipient countries, in many instances serving to make the rich even richer and the poor even poorer.

Unquestionably, the program has been the cause of much envy and resentment abroad—directed not only toward America, the donor, but among various recipient countries as well. Also, it has led to some questions as to our ability effectively to operate our own economic and monetary systems.

SHORTCOMINGS STATED

Briefly stated, here are a few of the more readily evident shortcomings of the operation, or administration, of our foreign aid:

The absence of adequate advance planning in the past, in the form of technical and financial plans, and the failure to reach definitive understandings with recipient countries on essential project elements, have led to overprograming and premature obligations. Lack of foresight has also frequently resulted in delays in the execution of project aid and in increased costs.

In several countries, the official exchange rates used by the U.S. Government have substantially overvalued the local currencies. The use of such rates has unduly increased the dollar cost of our aid; and also, in some of the countries, the use of these unrealistic exchange rates has resulted in windfall profits to the importers of the country and provided incentives for speculation and irregular practices.

There has been dispersal of assistance efforts over too wide an area and too large a number of projects in individual countries.

There has been an inadequacy of qualified personnel and an oversupply of unqualified, or poorly qualified, personnel; of impractical theorists, at all levels of the program, who have never worked in free enterprise, who have never met a free-enterprise payroll or created a free enterprise job.

Deficient property management is widespread.

In the military program, the objectives have not been sufficiently clarified so as to distinguish between forces which are justifiable on the basis of military roles and missions and those which are equipped and maintained for other than military considerations.

Substantial quantities of material have been delivered which are, and will be, in excess of recipient countries' needs or capabilities to utilize.

On and on, such a summary could be continued—such as:

Many nations, including those which are newly independent, seek prestige by building huge dams, steel mills, superhighways, and national airlines, all of which are financed by the U.S. taxpayer. As a result, the U.S. aid agency—now the Agency for International Development (AID), prior to this the International Cooperation Administration (ICA), and prior to that another name, with a multiplicity of different designations since the beginning—has agreed to far too many requests for such projects. Entirely too much emphasis has been placed on meeting personal desires of political leaders of recipient governments or in carrying out the unsound schemes of our own people; and too little emphasis has been given to commonsense thought and action.

Documentation of these charges can be had by the hundreds, and many of them are chronicled in detail in the thousands of pages of the record of the hearings fo the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriations (which it is my privilege to serve as chairman). Such things as these:

Six hundred technical aid projects in one country, and more ready to be started before completion of the existing ones.

A highway in Vietnam on which the costs skyrocketed from an original estimate of $18 million to more than $129 million before completion.

A fertilizer plant in Taiwan, started with foreign aid money and estimated to cost $34 million, which was inoperable because equipment did not meet the specifications for the desired operations.

Radio towers installed in Saigon which had not been put in operation because their utility was undetermined and their location in doubt.

Three million, one hundred thousand dollars for an air-conditioned yacht for the Emporer of Ethiopia.

Four hundred thousand dollars for battery-powered TV sets in remote jungle villages. (Merry-go-rounds driven by children would recharge the batteries.)

Independence Day gifts to new African countries * * * gifts to Guinea and Mali because of their "changing political attitudes" * * * $5.6 million to Indonesia for completion of a road to an athletic stadium—all from, of all places, the President's Contingency Fund, which was appropriated by Congress for the purpose of taking care of crises which were unforeseen at the time the funds were approved.

The shipping of millions of dollars worth of navigational equipment to countries incapable of using it.

Supplying enough rifles to one country so that each soldier could have, on the average, one and one-half rifles per man, and programing enough rifles and carbines in another country to provide an average of two weapons per soldier.

Plans to supply additional aircraft to a country with a shortage of trained pilots.

Fighter planes for and a loan to an African country to buy jet airliners.

Pouring into Korea $200 million a year, which is beyond the capacity of the country's economy to absorb productively or of its Government to administer efficiently, the result of which has been to encourage corruption and hamper development.

The transfer of military funds to the contingency fund, and then a further transfer to economic programs.

MIST FROM FOGGY BOTTOM

Notwithstanding these, and other foreign aid facts of record, the administration proposes again this year to increase the spending. The foreign aid bureaucracy in Washington has assembled a powerful lobby to help promote its efforts. Among other things, it has made sure that contracts, in most cases lucrative ones, are awarded to colleges and universities in every State of the Union, to trade schools in practically every State, and to influential segments of industry, all of which are busy mustering support for the program.

One of the myths advanced by the administration in attempted justification of its foreign aid policy is the claim, addressed to the American taxpayer, that approximately 80 percent of the dollars appropriated for the program are spent in the United States. The fact is, 100 percent of the dollars appropriated for foreign aid will ultimately have an effect on the U.S. economy—in one of these three ways: For the payment for goods and services shipped free of charge to foreign countries; for the purchase of U.S. gold by foreign nations as a result of the free dollars that we have credited to them; or for speculation.

A question we might well ask is this: if 80 percent of the foreign aid dollar is spent in the United States and this expenditure is beneficial to our economy, would there be more prosperity in America if expenditures for the program were doubled or tripled? The answer is, of course, that our own resources would soon be depleted, our false prosperity would come to an abrupt end, and we would be a bankrupt nation.

Another myth used by the administration to sell foreign aid to this country is that the program provides employment for approximately 600,000 people. But, looking at this matter objectively, it should be understood that the wages and salaries of these 600,000 people are not paid by the foreign governments, but by checks drawn on the U.S. Treasury from funds provided by the American taxpayers.

Still another myth about the aid program is the widely held belief, fostered by the administration, that we are now making loans, rather than grants, for development assistance abroad. The truth is that a realistic analysis of our so-called development loans makes it clear that appropriations for this purpose are no different, actually, than for the aid programs of the past. Although this aid is represented as being on a "loan" basis and "repayable" in dollars—obviously intended to make the program more palatable to the taxpayer—even a superficial examination of the terms of these "loans" makes it clear that, in reality, this is essentially a grant-aid program. Most of the "development loans" are repayable over a period of 40 years with no interest, but the agency does impose a service charge of three-fourths of 1 percent a year. After a 10-year grace period the recipient country is then supposed to start paying 1 percent a year on the principal. As frankly acknowledged by Mr. Fowler Hamilton, the most recent former administrator of a long and ever-changing procession of administrators of the aid agency: "[It] is more than half grant to begin with, if you figure in the cost of the money."

(Eleven different directors have served an average tenure of 17 months before finally leaving the post in frustration and despair.)

In addition, these "loan" repayments, in such amounts as they may be, do not go into the general funds of the U.S. Treasury to help relieve the tax burden of the citizens of the United States, but are plowed back into the program for further "loans."

MORE MIST

Continuing to look at this same category, not only is this grant aid covered with the cloak of a "loan," but it is even more completely removed from congressional control than had been the case prior to approval in 1961 of the current arrangement. Funds are now committed, up to 5 years in advance, to a country "plan," and after the funds are appropriated the aid agency then determines what specific programs or projects under the "plan" will be financed by the United States. In addition to this broad authority granted to AID to obtain funds on a "blank check" basis, the agency also has authority to deobligate and re-obligate funds and initiate new projects or programs without prior justification to the Congress, and to transfer funds from one appropriation category to another.

In contrast to this flexibility of operations, it is interesting to take a look at the procedural steps involved—which may, and often do, cover a period of years—on, for example, a Corps of Engineers project in the United States. Here is a simplified summary:

1. Survey of the project is authorized by Congress.
2. Funds are requested for a survey.
3. After the survey report is completed it is—
   (a) Reviewed by the Rivers and Harbors Board.
   (b) Reviewed by the State, or States, involved.
   (c) Reviewed by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior and other interested departments or agencies.
   (d) Reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget.
4. Construction is authorized by law (if the project has a favorable ratio of benefits to costs).
5. Funds are requested of Congress for advanced planning.
6. Funds are requested for construction.

The steps are, of course, a sound and reasonable procedure, so it is doubtless too much even to hope that similar requirements will ever be made applicable to foreign aid. It is not, however, too much to hope, and even to expect, that the spending for the program—whether it is referred to as mutual security, international socialism, world-wide welfare, or outright giveaway—be drastically reduced.

The time to act is now.

House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriations Hearings, 1962:

"One thousand 23-inch TV sets were ordered for use in community education programs in underdeveloped countries overseas at a cost of $400,000 for areas with no electric power supply.

"Foreign aid funds were used to buy suits for undertakers in Greece.

"U.S. aid to Kenya was used to buy extra wives for government officials.

"A stockbreeding farm was erected in Lebanon with U.S. aid. Nine stalls were built for each bull.

"The Peace Corps sent a man, his wife and nine children to the Philippines. One-way fare cost $13,190. The corpsman's salary is $10,190."

Continuing Inaction on Wool

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, at their 98th annual meeting in New York on May 9, 1963, adopted an eloquent resolution setting forth the views of the domestic woolen industry. I think it is hard-hitting and very clearly set forth. I should like to ask unanimous consent that their resolution appear in the Appendix of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOOL MANUFACTURERS, NEW YORK, N.Y., May 9, 1963

Whereas the already critical import problem of the Wool Textile and Apparel Industries grows increasingly grave, with no prospect of relief available other than through action of our Government; and

Whereas the President of the United States, in promulgating his textile program in May 1961, affirmed that it was then "time for action" to alleviate this problem; and

Whereas in August of 1962, the policy of the U.S. Government was stated officially to encompass limitation of wool-product imports to prevent market disruption; and

Whereas such imports are now substantially in excess of the level at which our Government has announced to this industry and the world that they will be held: now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Association of Wool Manufacturers at its 98th annual meeting held in New York City, May 9, 1963, cognizant and deeply appreciative of the concern of the President and his administration for the plight of the wool textile industry, none the less deplores the lack thus far of definitive action to alleviate the plight of the industry and its workers in accordance with the policy unequivocally enunciated by our Government, and does hereby respectfully urge the administration promptly to make use of the resources at its command to provide this industry and all dependent upon it with the relief promised and to which they, in justice and in the national interest, are entitled.

Vocational Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial which appeared in the May 2 edition of the Times-Crescent, published in La Plata, the seat of Charles County, Md., describing the very serious need for an improved vocational education system in this country.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, and I know in the view of many of my colleagues, the unemployment problem is the most critical aspect of our over-all economic situation. And the key to the unemployment problem, I am convinced, is the development of an educational system which will train today's youth—so many of whom, unfortunately, are going on the relief rolls as soon as they leave high school—to handle properly the complex jobs that need to be filled. While it is true that we need to continue our efforts to improve regular academic training and prepare students properly for college, the really urgent need lies in the establishment of a proper vocational educational system.

I would like to compliment the owner and publisher of the Times-Crescent, Mr. James C. Mitchell, the managing editor, Mr. John F. Fennell, and the other members of the staff of that newspaper for bringing this very serious problem to the attention of its readers.

The editorial follows:

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The causes of unemployment are numerous and varied. The most obvious one is general depression or recession—those of us who were around during the 1930's will fully understand this. Another is changes in demand and use for products, which result in the decline and the ultimate elimination of industries—like, say, harnessmaking. The impact of these is usually found in particular limited areas where these industries congregated in their palmy days. A current and tragic example of this is found in the coal mining districts of West Virginia and elsewhere. Still another is technological unemployment, where the machine replaces the man, and more efficient and economical production is the result. And as a cause of unemployment the trade situation is certainly an element in a world which becomes ever more competitive, and in which goods can be moved back and forth almost instantly.

Then, there is another—and it is one which has been given scant attention so far. The lead article in the April issue of Harper's magazine, written by Edward T. Chase, a consultant and writer on public affairs, deals with it. It consists of the way in which American education is turning millions of young people into unemployables—because it is training them for jobs that are in diminishing and even vanishing supply.

Mr. Chase calls this situation a "national scandal." As he sees it, an archaic system of job training has sabotaged or ignored the 80 percent of American youth who do not go to college. In his precise words, "It is a system that produces unneeded farmers, cabinetmakers, and weavers, while the demand is rising for business-machine repairmen, chefs, auto mechanics, and electrical servicemen—to mention only a few of the skills in short supply."

He reports a chilling fact—that, in many cities, unemployment among young people equals and is even far higher than the depression rate. Unemployment in this age category has outrun the level as a whole. And the blame, says Mr. Chase, falls on "a self-serving lobby of vocational educationalists (which) perpetuates * * * training in moribund trades."

The figures, as he quotes them, are chilling. Ninety percent of our schools provide no training for jobs in industry, and 95 percent offer none in selling or merchandising—fields in which there are now more job opportunities than in production. As a corollary, he writes that "* * * the Federal Government spends 10 times as much on the national school lunch program as on vocational education—which demands only 4 percent of all current expenditures on public education."

Mr. Chase also disputes the recently held official view that there was "no unemployment problem which could not be cured by a rise in our economic growth rate." For this view does not give sufficient consideration to the two sides of the problem—that is, the demand side on the one hand, and the supply side on the other. There have to be openings in specific kinds of jobs—and there have to be people with the right kind of skills and training to fill them.

The outlook, finally, is not all bleak. There has been, of late, a considerable upsurge in interest in vocational education—the kind of education the Nation will require in the future. Mr. Chase's concluding words: "Today rational education must include training pertinent for the 80 percent of all young Americans who enter the labor market without college degrees. To ignore their vocational training is a reverse twist on the Eskimo's fabled custom of pushing their unproductive senior citizens onto the icepack. That practice at least has a certain economic logic. Our system is managing to be at once inhumane and economically suicidal."

Hartsfield Gets His Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, for more than 20 years the Honorable William B. Hartsfield served as mayor of the city of Atlanta. During that period, Atlanta was transformed from the moderate-sized capital of Georgia to the progressive capital of the Southeast. It became the industrial, economical, and educational leader, setting examples for others to follow.

Of course, this was not accomplished without controversy. Through it all, Mayor Hartsfield proved to be a leather-tough warrior and an eloquent orator in the political arena. Many called him an old warhorse, and the title was not wasted.

Mayor Hartsfield retired from public life 2 years ago. However, his voice is still heard and his name still appears in headlines.

For my colleagues who know him, and for his many friends and admirers throughout the Nation, I ask unanimous consent that an article which recently appeared in the Atlanta Constitution be printed in the RECORD.

HARTSFIELD GETS HIS MEMORIAL

(By Eugene Patterson)

As one who once vainly proposed that the municipal airfield be named the William B. Hartsfield International Airport, I confess to feeling a certain comedown in grandeur had been suffered by the former mayor when the following stately invitation arrived in the mail: "The Department of Sanitary Engineering, city of Atlanta; Robert & Co., architects and engineers; Johnson Drake & Piper, contractors; International Incinerators, Inc., cordially invite you to attend the dedication ceremonies of the William B. Hartsfield Incinerator."

Of course it was good to know they were finally going to name something for old Bill.

But a slight disappointment lingered, unmitigated even by the cheering note inside the fancy invitation: "The addition gives the city of Atlanta a total garbage disposal capacity of approximately 1,500 tons per day."

That is a lot of garbage. Not many men are so honored as to have their names memorialized in connection with an undertaking of that sheer tonnage.

Still, at first, it seemed they could have hooked Hartsfield's name to something a bit more uptown—the William B. Hartsfield Seal Baths at Grant Park, perhaps, or a Hartsfield Haven for Old Horses at Chastain.

Even the ring of the thing seemed wrong initially. The William B. Hartsfield Incinerator. Taken in the context of a data processor or a potato dicer, the whole intent and aim of the fiery furnace would be subject to misinterpretation by his political opposites who have been consigning him to hellfire oratorically for years already.

But relieved second thoughts crowded in, like Phoenix rising from the ashes.

After all, what more appropriate monument could be raised to the hottest tempered old tyrant in the municipal annals of benevolent despotism than a roaring, 1,500-ton fountain of blue blazes?

Where is the man who has done more slow burns, roasted more enemies alive, thrown up more smokescreens or carried more coals to Newcastle than the former mayor who will be honored with this incinerator by a city that was shaped brick by brick in the kiln of his irascible genius?

Bill Hartsfield never cooled off in 23 years as mayor; now his temperature belongs to the ages.

Bunsen had his burner. Sherman had his Atlanta. Bill has an incinerator. Resurgens.

Judges in Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal of May 2, 1963, carried an article on extra judicial activities by Federal judges entitled, "Judges in Business."

This article, written by Jerry Landauer, brings to light some disturbing facts about judicial membership on the boards of directors of banks, insurance and industrial companies. It already has induced some serious thinking about the problem. I commend this most informative article to the serious attention of Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDGES IN BUSINESS: ETHICS DEBATE STIRRED BY FEDERAL JURISTS WHO SIT ON COMPANY BOARDS—DIRECTORS OF ILLINOIS BANKS, EQUITABLE LIFE SAY THEY AVOIDED INTEREST CONFLICTS—BUT BAR ASSOCIATIONS FROWN

(By Jerry Landauer)

WASHINGTON.—Federal judges in substantial numbers have moved into a no man's land of judicial ethics by accepting jobs as directors of corporations, banks and insurance companies.

Though national and local bar associations frown on the practice with various degrees of severity. Federal judges are not barred by law from maintaining extrajudicial business connections. Except for stock ownership, most judges avoid them.

Some, however, earn substantial sums outside the courthouse. Judge John C. Knox, senior judge of the Southern District of New York, for example, earned $111,425 from 1948 to 1961, as a director of the Equitable Life Assurance Society. He retired from the Equitable post at the end of 1960. Since 1945, Judge Knox has also been a trustee of Union Dime Savings Bank of New York. He continues on that board.

In some years, as for example in 1953 when the Equitable directorship earned him $12,600, Judge Knox depended nearly as much on Equitable for his livelihood as on the Federal Treasury. (His judicial salary then was $15,000; all district judges were raised to $22,500 in 1954.) In 1954, when he was Equitable's most active board member, Judge Knox received $11,900. To earn that sum he must have attended 119 meetings (at the rate of $100 each), or one meeting every other working day of the year. The judge served on Equitable's finance and executive committees.

BANK CONNECTIONS

In Chicago, three of the six judges on the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals serve as bank directors. Judge Elmer J. Schnackenberg is a director of the South Chicago Savings Bank; Judge Latham Castle is chairman of the Sandwich State (Ill.) Bank, and Judge Win G. Knoch is chairman of the Naperville (Ill.) National Bank. (The president of the Naperville bank is a State court judge, M. F. Abrahamson.)

The American Bar Association's canons of judicial ethics don't bar bank directorship in so many words but an interpretive opinion by the A.B.A.'s committee on professional ethics does. "It is improper for a judge to serve as director of a bank," the seven-man committee held unanimously in 1943, the first and only recorded instance in which the question was posed to the committee. The New York City Bar Association, in a 1956 ruling, held that membership on an insurance board is also contrary to the judicial canons.

All banks publicize the names of their board members to some degree, according to the A.B.A. committee, and "this might create the reasonable suspicion that the judge was utilizing the prestige of his office to persuade others to patronize the bank." The New York City Bar Association notes in addition that banks and insurance companies are continually involved in litigation: "it might reasonably be expected that in the normal course of events cases involving the institution of which the judge was a director would come before him."

The absence of statutory standards places the judiciary somewhere between Congressmen and officials of the Federal executive branch in determining what business connections are permissible. Senators and Representatives operate freely in business and some do not hesitate to vote for legislation that may aid them financially. The theory is that if constituents don't like it they can run the Congressman out of office at the polls.

STIFF EXECUTIVE STANDARDS

Officials in the Government's executive branch, on the contrary, are almost always prohibited from engaging in business of any kind and may not hold stock in any company that deals with the official's agency. Even the breath of suspicion may drive an official from office. Thus, Robert T. Ross, Assistant Secretary of Defense under former President Eisenhower, was pressed into resigning by the coincidence that clothing firms run by his wife and brother-in-law obtained Defense Department contracts. No evidence was ever produced that Mr. Ross sought to influence the contract awards.

Congressional scrutiny of the judiciary is far less severe. Statutes covering judicial behavior are aimed chiefly at protecting a litigant's right to a fair trial. They deal with possible conflicts of interest in the vaguest of terms, leaving it to the judge to decide whether a conflict exists between his judicial duty and his personal interest.

Congress, moreover, has tried to insulate judges from political or economic pressure by providing full salary after retirement. Yet, a Federal judge may inject himself into commercial relationships to any degree he likes, and he need not report or disclose his out-of-court affiliations. In the final analysis, then, as long as he does not engage in the practice of law, a judge may do pretty much what he regards as proper.

Thus, District Court Judge Royce Savage retired from the bench on November 1, 1961, to become general counsel of Gulf Oil Corp. less than 2 years after he had granted Gulf Oil's motion for acquittal in a major antitrust suit.

JUDGE EXPLAINS TEST

Judge Schnackenberg regards it as proper to preside over a case in which a litigant is represented by a fellow board member of South Chicago Savings and, in fact, has presided over a case in which a litigant was represented by the bank's counsel. He explains his yardstick for determining where propriety ends: "If any case came up in which the bank had the slightest interest I would disqualify myself instantly. That's the test here." The judge also believes he needn't disqualify himself from hearing suits involving South Chicago's banking competitors. "I never give any thought to the fact that I'm a bank director," he says.

According to Morgan Fitch, Jr., South Chicago Savings' attorney, Judge Schnackenberg is often drawn into discussions of legal problems at directors' meetings. "He participates actively * * * but he's very touchy about discussing a case on which he's working," Mr. Fitch says.

Mr. Fitch explains that it is as natural for Judge Schnackenberg to discuss legal matters as it is for Chicago Alderman E. V. Pacini, another director who is chairman of the City Council's zoning committee, to discuss zoning problems as they apply to the bank's investments.

Judge Schnackenberg and his associate on the appeals bench, Judge Knoch, disagree vigorously with the American Bar Association's advisory ban on bank directorships.

Both regard their directorships as public service positions; Judge Knoch says the American Bar Association committee's opinion smacks of "sermonizing."

WIDE RANGE OF AFFILIATIONS

Beyond banks and insurance companies, the corporate connections of Federal judges range across the business world. Often the business affiliation predates the judge's elevation to the bench; some are listed in Who's Who or other reference guides. No Federal judge is known to be a labor union officer or trustee.

Judge Archie O. Dawson of the southern New York district, retained three directorships when former President Eisenhower named him to the bench in 1954. He helps direct Giant Portland Cement Co., of which he had been general counsel; he was a director of Southwest Natural Gas Co. before its merger in 1961, and he sat on the board of now-defunct American National Finance Corp.

Judge Casper Platt of the eastern Illinois district is a director of American Savings & Loan Association, Danville, Ill.; Judge Allen B. Hannay of the southern Texas district helped direct Lorain Coal & Dock Co., Columbus, Ohio, a concern now in process of liquidation. Judge Edwin D. Steel, Jr., of the Delaware district, is a board member of Kaumagraph Co., Wilmington. He represents minority stockholders in the closely held company.

In the South, Chief Judge Seybourn H. Lynne of the northern district of Alabama joined the boards of Ingalls Iron Works Co., Birmingham, and its subsidiary, Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp., Pascagoula, Miss., in 1959 on the request of banks that were trustees for much of the voting stock. The judge was named to the bench in 1946 and became chief judge of his district in 1953.

The iron works had sustained operating losses prior to Judge Lynne's becoming a director. He and two other new independent directors, the judge says, helped the company back to health in part by selling the shipbuilding firm to Litton Industries. In 1962, when the Ingalls company showed an operating profit, the directors—Judge Lynne didn't attend the meeting—voted him retroactive compensation of $5,000 for 1960, $5,000 for 1961 and $5,000 for 1962. He also is paid modest fees for attending board meetings.

FAMILIAR WITH FIRM'S AFFAIRS

The judge believes he was asked to help stabilize the companies because he had become familiar with their affairs while handling suits arising from legal warfare among members of the controlling Ingalls family. "I finally agreed after some soul searching," the judge says, recalling that he gave up vacations from the bench to conduct corporate affairs. "At no time did I attend any meeting during my official business hours," he adds.

Judge Knox, the former Equitable Life director, is 81, has served one of the longest terms on the bench of any living Federal judge and is among the most respected. He was honored this week by the 23 Federal judges in the southern district of New York on the 45th anniversary of his appointment to the bench in 1918. His colleagues presented him with a scroll saying: "He has served the cause of justice with conspicious ability and added to the lustre of this court. A man of broad sympathy and deep understanding, he has been an ideal judge." Despite official retirement in 1955, he still serves on the bench in a limited capacity.

Judge Knox's parallel role as a district court judge and long-time director of Equitable Life points up the New York City Bar Association's belief that insurance companies are likely to be involved in Federal litigation. Equitable's assets exceed $10 billion. As a member of the company's finance committee, Judge Knox considered loan applications totalling hundreds of millions of dollars. Equitable's interest in industrial companies or utilities is so widespread that the judge couldn't know whether Equitable might have an indirect interest in a pending law suit; he says he would disqualify himself if anyone called such an interest to his attention. "I never made any disposition to the best of my recollection in any case involving Equitable," he says.

PRETRIAL PROCEEDING

Judge Knox insists that his disclaimer applies to a pretrial proceeding, in which Equitable was a defendant, that came before him in 1954 and 1955. Several policyholders had sued Equitable in Federal and State courts to recover losses allegedly growing in part from nepotism and other actions by Thomas Parkinson, former president. In the State suit, Judge Knox and his fellow directors were specifically named as defendants.

Early in 1954 Equitable moved to stay the Federal suit until the State courts had acted. District Court Judge Thomas Murphy granted the stay; but then the Federal case came before Judge Knox on the pretrial calendar and on six different occasions the matter was adjourned. Court records show this entry on May 18, 1954: "Special pretrial before Knox. Hearing held. Adjourned." Further adjournments followed on October 14, December 7 of that year and on March 3 and June 2, 1955. On November 9, 1955, this entry appears: "Special pretrial before Knox. Hearing held. Case marked off pretrial calendar."

Judge Knox explains that he did not feel compelled to disqualify himself from a case in which Equitable was a defendant because there was no controversy to be adjudicated at the pretrial stage; his actions were purely mechanical, the judge says. The policyholders' suit never came to trial in the Federal courts; the State court suit was dismissed in 1959.

None of this is to suggest that a judge's judicial behavior, or his philosophical view of the law, is necessarily influenced by his business affiliations. No one expects judges to live or work in a vacuum. But there are many in the bar and on the bench who would favor more precise rules of conduct and, at the very least, believe it desirable for Federal judges to list, on some public record, the economic company they keep.

The Tidal Wave—Another View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of S. 580, the administration's National Education Improvement Act of 1963, I was particularly interested in an article entitled "The Tidal Wave—Another View" by Dr. Alfred D. Donovan, vice president for student personnel services at Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J. It appeared in the spring, 1963, issue of the university's alumni magazine.

Dr. Donovan, a distinguished educator whose broad experience and high ability recently was recognized by his election to the vice presidency of the New Jersey Association of Colleges and Universities, is an eloquent spokesman for his profession—a profession which I would say is about the most highly respected and poorly rewarded in our supposedly enlightened society.

In this article, Dr. Donovan makes a strong case for broad Federal assistance to public and private colleges and universities. Particularly interesting, I believe, is his conviction that without substantialy increased financial help (help which only the Federal Government can now afford to give) many of our private institutions may find it impossible to survive as they struggle with the college-age population boom of the next few years. He and I share the view that or Federal effort should be directed to saving and building those institutions rather than to watching as they lock their doors and board up their windows.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Dr. Donovan's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TIDAL WAVE: ANOTHER VIEW

Unprecedented problems will face American colleges and universities in the next few years. Some of these institutions will emerge stronger and more vigorous than they have yet been. Others will unquestionably find it impossible to survive and will go out of existence. Many others, less fortunate than the former and somewhat more fortunate than the latter, will have to struggle for survival as never before. The plain fact is that a large segment of American higher education is facing a period of crisis. How it weathers this crisis is of tremendous importance to the American people.

The central fact of the situation is well known and will receive only summary treatment here. For years, practically every medium of communication has pointed out that a "tidal wave" of students will descend on higher education in the midsixties and thereafter. There are some differences of opinion as to how large this wave will be, but the only argument can be concerned with the size and not the fact itself. The purpose of this article is to point out some factors of the situation which have not been so widely publicized and have not been given the attention they deserve.

GENESIS OF THE TIDAL WAVE

In the decade which preceded 1940, on the average about 2½ million babies were born each year in the United States. Beginning in 1941 this rate started to climb steadily. It continued upward until 1957 when it began to level off. By 1950 more than 3½ million babies were being born annually; by 1957 the number had reached 4¼ million.

Inevitably, as time passed, this increase in the birth rate began to effect a proportionate growth in the number of children of school age, first elementary, then secondary. The time is now upon us when it will have a corresponding effect on the number of young people of college age. In 1962 there were about 10.3 million youths of college age (18–21) in the United States. This number will increase every year in the foreseeable future. By 1972 it will have reached 14.6 million, and by 1978, 16 million.

If, therefore the percentage of all youths of college age who actually attend college should remain constant, it is clear that the number of college students would greatly increase. It is an American phenomenon, however, that this percentage does not remain the same. It grows steadily. In the country as a whole it has been increasing at the rate of approximately one percent per year. There is every reason to believe that it will at least continue at this rate and, more probably, be accelerated.

WHAT HIGHER EDUCATION FACES

What higher education must prepare for is a larger percentage of a larger age group who will seek college admission. A very conservative estimate is that college enrollments will increase by 80 percent in the next decade and will continue to grow for some years thereafter.

These facts are widely known. It is no secret that higher education will be suffering growing pains for a long time. What has not been so widely publicized is the fact that concomitant with this growth another change of great significance is taking place in higher education. This change has implications which need to be given wider and more careful attention than they have yet received.

To accommodate the multitudes who will be seeking admission to college will require vast expansions of existing facilities and the establishment of many new institutions. But unless massive new support is found for our private institutions it seems almost inevitable that practically all the predicted increases in college population will occur in tax-supported colleges and universities.

In 1947 the President's Commission on Higher Education suggested that private higher education might continue to accommodate the same number of students as it then served, and that the then projected increase in college enrollments should be absorbed entirely by institutions publicly controlled. The Commission reported that the probable economic factors of the situation made this outcome probable.

That prediction was not fulfilled, but factors on which it was based have continued to operate. Unless effective measures are found to stem the present trends it seems realistic to predict that the "tidal wave" will leave the total number of students in private higher education stagnant at best.

STUDIES, SURVEYS, AND STATISTICS

In the 15 years since the Commission's report the number of students in tax-supported institutions increased at a rate of 104 percent which is more than 3½ times the rate at which students in private higher education increased 29 percent. When the report was written, our college population was divided almost equally between private and public institutions. In 1947 50.7 percent of all college students attended institutions which did not receive tax support. This percentage has decreased annually since that time. By 1954 it was 44. By 1961 it had fallen to 39. There are many indications that it will fall much lower in the years just ahead. Unless greatly increased support for private higher institutions is forthcoming it seems likely that students in public higher education will outnumber students in private higher education by four to one in the foreseeable future.

To some this will seem like a prediction which is unduly pessimistic. To them it should be pointed out that a preponderance of this proportion, or close to it, already exists in some parts of America. In 1960 more than 78 percent of all Michigan college students attended tax-supported institutions; in California the percentage was 84; in Kansas it was 80.

Relevant to a consideration of this question are the findings of a survey recently completed at the University of Michigan. The study is based on a national sample of 2,800 families. It indicates that 78 percent of the parents who expect their children to go to college believe they will go to public institutions, while only 22 percent expect them to attend private institutions. In areas where only public colleges exist 90 percent of the parents expect their children will attend public colleges. In areas where there are neither public nor private institutions the choice is 85 percent in favor of public institutions. Even where only private colleges exist the choice is still preponderantly in favor of public colleges.

A QUESTION OF ECONOMICS

It is not difficult to assess the factors which are bringing about this shift in higher education. For many thousands of our young people private higher education is being gradually priced out of the market. The costs of services and materials which a college must pay for, like everything else in the American economy, have mounted steadily. Private colleges have made valiant efforts to keep their charges at a minimum, but it is an extremely rare one which has not had to increase its fees two or three or even more times in the last decade.

Public colleges, on the other hand, charge very low rates if, indeed, they charge anything at all. Because the major part of their support comes from tax funds, their direct charges to individual students are so low that private institutions cannot, on this basis, compete with them. Many parents, already taxed to support public higher education, find it next to impossible to bear the added financial burden of sending their children to private institutions, which receive no benefit from the taxes the parents pay.

Unless drastic measures are taken, many estimable private institutions of higher education will be unable to survive. Parents will find it increasignly difficult to send their children to the ones which do.

TWO AMERICAN TRADITIONS

Let this point be clear: the young people of our country are its most precious resource. It is in the best interests of the individual and of the Nation that every American youth have the opportunity for education to the highest degree consistent with his talents and interests. The ability of America to prosper, indeed to survive, depends in substantial measure upon the educational attainment of our people. It is absolutely essential that facilities for higher education be vastly expanded to accommodate the ever-growing number of students who seek a college education. Any other course would be violative of one of our most precious traditions of opportunity for all.

But there is another, a parallel tradition which is equally precious, that is in real danger of being lost. This is the tradition of free choice by the student and his parents of the kind of institution he will attend. It would be tragic if this freedom were to be maintained only for the economically privileged. Freedom is the paramount value of our American way of life, but it does not exist in the abstract. There is freedom only where a choice can be made. The freedom of a student to choose the kind of college he wants to attend will be destroyed unless our great private institutions remain strong and unless the economic barrier inherent in rising tuition costs can be controlled. Where the gap between the cost of attending a private college and that of attending a public college becomes exceedingly wide the freedom of choice is correspondingly limited. It ceases to exist for the student without substantial financial resources.

Only to the extent that the great imbalance between what those who attend private and those who attend public colleges must pay for their education can be redressed can we find hope that freedom of choice can be preserved.

FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Fortunately, much can be done to preserve our private institutions of higher education. Only the cynical or biased will deny that herculean efforts must be directed to that end.

First of all, Congress should recognize the responsibilities of the Federal Government in this regard. Low-interest loans and matching grants should be made available for the construction of libraries, dormitories, science laboratories, gymnasiums, and other needed facilities, without regard to whether the institution concerned is public or private. There seems to be little doubt that ways of achieving this end can be devised well within constitutional limitations—if there is the good will to do it.

In many fields there is a serious shortage of men and women educated to the doctorate. The Federal Government itself employs thousands of such people and many thousands more will be needed as college teachers. A broad program on the Federal level to make more of our capable young people financially able to complete graduate work would make a lot of sense and would be of great service to all higher education.

THE EXAMPLE OF NEW YORK

While the individual States have all recognized their responsibilities for public higher education, disappointingly few of them have done much to help their residents attend private colleges. New York is a noteworthy exception. For more than half a century that State has had an outstanding scholarship program. Annually upward of 17,000 New York residents receive scholarships with stipends large enough to make college attendance at the institutions of the students' own choice economically feasible.

Last year New York adopted a scholar incentive program. With regard for the taxable income of the student's family and the tuition charged by the institution the student attends, this program makes grants of varying amounts available to practically every resident of New York who attends a college in that State. This is a first step in the direction of facing realistically the disparity between the costs of attending a private institution and those of attending a tax-supported one.

SOME STATE SOLUTIONS

New Jersey adopted a State scholarship plan in 1959. This was a good beginning, but the number of awards provided (5 percent of the number of high school graduates) and the annual stipend ($400 maximum) are both inadequate to make more than a modest contribution toward solving the problem.

A number of other States have adopted scholarship programs of various kinds and varying degrees of effectiveness. It is to be hoped that 1963 legislatures in several States will set up new programs or expand and improve existing ones.

A few States have adopted measures to foster the construction of needed facilities on the campuses of private institutions. In New York a private corporation, the so-called dormitory authority, was established to facilitate the sale of bonds bearing low interest rates, for building laboratories, libraries, classroom buildings, housing and feeding facilities, etc.

The Maryland State Legislature has provided matching funds for the construction of various kinds of college buildings at several private institutions in that State. It is a most significant fact that this same legislature recently provided for the appointment of "a committee to study and make recommendations to the 1963 legislature on a State policy for grants to private schools and institutions."

OTHER SOURCES OF ASSISTANCE

American business has a great stake in higher education. It must look to our colleges and universities for the production of most of its leaders. Even more important, it reaps the tremendous benefits of the American economic system. This system could not be sustained without the millions of men and women, highly educated in many fields, which higher education makes possible. Enlightened business leaders have long recognized this fact, but American corporations are not supporting higher education to the extent that they can and should.

In 1960 the total contribution made by American firms to all charitable, educational, and other exempt organizations was less than one-quarter of the amount which would have been tax deductible if it had been contributed. If American business could be persuaded to contribute only 1 percent of its net profits to higher education, this would result in support amounting to half a billion dollars annually. This would seem to be an amount reasonably to be hoped for in the years ahead.

Our colleagues and universities make their strongest claim upon those who have enjoyed the fruits of higher education most directly—their alumni and former students. In recent years the number of contributors from this group and the total amount of their gifts have been increasing steadily. But much more must be done.

It is shocking that in our country as a whole only one out of five alumni contributes to his alma mater. It may seem paradoxical, but it is a fact, that nonalumni individual contributors give more money to higher education than alumni do. In the emergency which confronts many private institutions their sons should be the first to respond and they must do so more liberally than they have yet thought possible or necessary.

THE WORRY—AND THE HOPE

The needs of our private colleges and universities are desperate. Their survival is in the balance. But they can be preserved and strengthened if we have the vision and determination to do it. The entire Nation—Government, philanthropic foundations, business, industry, and private individuals—must first understand the magnitude and urgency of the crisis and then be mobilized to meet it head on. Working in cooperation and good will, this is a task for all Americans. Let us get on with it.

The Tail That Wags the Dog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I was distressed to note in the following editorial which appeared in the May 7 issue of the Chicago Tribune, that the Governor of Illinois, in denouncing Republican efforts to cut the President's budget, is urging that this Nation go deeper into debt so that the Federal Government can help solve local and State problems.

Governor Kerner proposes to set up a State government branch office in Washington to make sure that the problems and needs of the State of Illinois will have the attention of Washington officials, who today are only too willing to advise and plan how to spend the taxpayers' money—in fact, how to dispense it.

If my daily congressional mail is any indication of the thinking of the citizens of Illinois, I can say with assurance that they do not support the Governor's position. Over 50 percent of the letters that come to my office are appeals to the Congress to cut Federal spending and to curb further intrusion of the Federal Government into State, local, and individual affairs.

Mr. Speaker, by such pronouncements, the Governor of Illinois abdicates the responsibilities of his office and assists in promoting the administration's patently erroneous theory that we can "spend ourselves rich."

The editorial follows:

THE TAIL THAT WAGS THE DOG

Governor Kerner wants to establish an office for the State of Illinois in Washington, D.C., on the theory that that's where the money is. Apparently the Governor fears that the State isn't getting its full share of Federal handouts; so a bill has been introduced which will enable his administration to haunt the head office.

The bill would provide $100,000 to locate a Washington office for the Governor's board of economic development. The board was created in 1961 to process applications of local governments for Federal grants and to help industries seek money from the Federal Area Redevelopment Administration.

The Washington bureau's function would be to protect and enhance the economic development of the State of Illinois by serving in a liaison capacity.

Governor Kerner coupled this idea with a statement denouncing Republicans for trying to cut President Kennedy's $99 billion budget. The Governor said any retrenchment would hurt employment and services in Illinois. The statement appears to have been suggested by the White House to Democratic Governors, and Mr. Kerner's staff rewrote the draft provided by Washington.

Well, obviously, if the Kennedy budget were cut, there would be fewer dollars for Governor Kerner's Washington bureau to pursue. If Government spending were really chopped down to size, there might not be any reason for even establishing such a bureau and, evidently, the Governor thinks this would be very bad.

In contrast to Governor Kerner, the Republican Governor of Montana, Tim Babcock, is doing everything he can to fight off Federal proposals to construct 11 dams in the State. He said they could cost $1 billion and were designed to perpetuate the existence of Federal departments which are in the dam-building business. He added that these departments exist on the basis of tax moneys which all of us send to Washington.

Governor Babcock's stand that dams should be rejected if they do little more than flood good land and displace families has been upheld by businessmen and ranchers of Montana cities to whom Government officials outlined their dam-building plans last week. The people of Montana, unlike Governor Kerner, recognize that there is no such thing as free Government money.

To us it is more than a little shameful that the States had been made so subservient that they have to go begging to the paymaster in Washington for what charity they can hope to collect. It does not seem to occur to Democratic Governors like Mr. Kerner that if the Federal tax bite wasn't so big, Illinois and other States might be better fixed to take care of their own needs.

Rail Mergers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on May 8, my very able and long-time friend, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, made an excellent speech concerning recent developments with respect to rail mergers. Senator DOUGLAS' thought-provoking words, and artistic oratory, I am told, were the highlight of the convention of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers in Detroit, before whom he spoke. I am particularly pleased with the glowing reports which I have received about our colleague from Illinois, but in addition, I am most grateful to him for his acceptance of this speaking task at the last minute when it appeared that a virus I had contracted would not permit me to address the brotherhood on the historic occasion of its 100th anniversary.

I want to say I was most disappointed that I could not be out in Detroit with my good friends from railway labor, but that my thoughts were indeed with them at what I have since learned was a tremendously successful convention.

Mr. President, the speech given by my friend from Illinois is a most important one with respect to the railroad merger problem. It not only brings us up to date on what has been happening, it emphasizes the increasing strength which "public interest" forces have been marshaling to straighten the record, and to work for a sensible solution to railroad redevelopment. Because of the wisdom and vital facts contained in the speech, I should like to ask for unanimous consent that it be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that all Members of Congress can benefit from it.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF SPEECH BY SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS, DEMOCRAT OF ILLINOIS, BEFORE THE BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS, DETROIT, MICH.

For over 2 years now, the American railroad industry has been carrying on an extraordinary public relations campaign to convince the public that giant railroad mergers, however they are merged, are an immediate necessity and must be approved.

We have been warned almost daily by railroad spokesmen that these mergers are crucial because there is an impending financial crisis in their industry. Yet, at the same time, we find that most of the larger rail trunklines are substantially wealthy, that their earnings are considerably better than their publicity would have us believe, that traffic has increased over prior years, and that their net total investment in road and equipment is at an alltime high.

We have been lectured by railroad officials about the great need to combine systems in order to shrink rail service in the interest of greater profits. They talk of ripping up trackage and facilities, laying off workers and eliminating jobs, and reducing freight and passenger schedules when, at the same time, our economic scholars and political leaders are pleading for expanded growth, increased employment and the diversification of plants and industries to encourage regional development, all of which goals depend upon the expansion, not the contraction, of transportation.

We have been counseled by railroad financial and economic experts on the need to eliminate competition among major trunklines, and to develop regional monopolistic rail systems with little or no public interest regulation. We have received this counsel, when at the same moment the executive branch of our Government is advocating a transportation policy which will at the rate of approximately one percent per year. There is every reason to believe that it will at least continue at this rate and, more probably, be accelerated.

WHAT HIGHER EDUCATION FACES

What higher education must prepare for is a larger percentage of a larger age group who will seek college admission. A very conservative estimate is that college enrollments will increase by 80 percent in the next decade and will continue to grow for some years thereafter.

These facts are widely known. It is no secret that higher education will be suffering growing pains for a long time. What has not been so widely publicized is the fact that concomitant with this growth another change of great significance is taking place in higher education. This change has implications which need to be given wider and more careful attention than they have yet received.

To accommodate the multitudes who will be seeking admission to college will require vast expansions of existing facilities and the establishment of many new institutions. But unless massive new support is found for our private institutions it seems almost inevitable that practically all the predicted increases in college population will occur in tax-supported colleges and universities.

In 1947 the President's Commission on Higher Education suggested that private higher education might continue to accommodate the same number of students as it then served, and that the then projected increase in college enrollments should be absorbed entirely by institutions publicly controlled. The Commission reported that the probable economic factors of the situation made this outcome probable.

That prediction was not fulfilled, but factors on which it was based have continued to operate. Unless effective measures are found to stem the present trends it seems realistic to predict that the "tidal wave" will leave the total number of students in private higher education stagnant at best.

STUDIES, SURVEYS, AND STATISTICS

In the 15 years since the Commission's report the number of students in tax-supported institutions increased at a rate of 104 percent which is more than 3½ times the rate at which students in private higher education increased 29 percent. When the report was written, our college population was divided almost equally between private and public institutions. In 1947 50.7 percent of all college students attended institutions which did not receive tax support. This percentage has decreased annually since that time. By 1954 it was 44. By 1961 it had fallen to 39. There are many indications that it will fall much lower in the years just ahead. Unless greatly increased support for private higher institutions is forthcoming it seems likely that students in public higher education will outnumber students in private higher education by four to one in the foreseeable future.

To some this will seem like a prediction which is unduly pessimistic. To them it should be pointed out that a preponderance of this proportion, or close to it, already exists in some parts of America. In 1960 more than 78 percent of all Michigan college students attended tax-supported institutions; in California the percentage was 84; in Kansas it was 80.

Relevant to a consideration of this question are the findings of a survey recently completed at the University of Michigan. The study is based on a national sample of 2,800 families. It indicates that 78 percent of the parents who expect their children to go to college believe they will go to public institutions, while only 22 percent expect them to attend private institutions. In areas where only public colleges exist 90 percent of the parents expect their children will attend public colleges. In areas where there are neither public nor private institutions the choice is 85 percent in favor of public institutions. Even where only private colleges exist the choice is still preponderantly in favor of public colleges.

A QUESTION OF ECONOMICS

It is not difficult to assess the factors which are bringing about this shift in higher education. For many thousands of our young people private higher education is being gradually priced out of the market. The costs of services and materials which a college must pay for, like everything else in the American economy, have mounted steadily. Private colleges have made valiant efforts to keep their charges at a minimum, but it is an extremely rare one which has not had to increase its fees two or three or even more times in the last decade.

Public colleges, on the other hand, charge very low rates if, indeed, they charge anything at all. Because the major part of their support comes from tax funds, their direct charges to individual students are so low that private institutions cannot, on this basis, compete with them. Many parents, already taxed to support public higher education, find it next to impossible to bear the added financial burden of sending their children to private institutions, which receive no benefit from the taxes the parents pay.

Unless drastic measures are taken, many estimable private institutions of higher education will be unable to survive. Parents will find it increasignly difficult to send their children to the ones which do.

TWO AMERICAN TRADITIONS

Let this point be clear: the young people of our country are its most precious resource. It is in the best interests of the individual and of the Nation that every American youth have the opportunity for education to the highest degree consistent with his talents and interests. The ability of America to prosper, indeed to survive, depends in substantial measure upon the educational attainment of our people. It is absolutely essential that facilities for higher education be vastly expanded to accommodate the ever-growing number of students who seek a college education. Any other course would be violative of one of our most precious traditions of opportunity for all.

But there is another, a parallel tradition which is equally precious, that is in real danger of being lost. This is the tradition of free choice by the student and his parents of the kind of institution he will attend. It would be tragic if this freedom were to be maintained only for the economically privileged. Freedom is the paramount value of our American way of life, but it does not exist in the abstract. There is freedom only where a choice can be made. The freedom of a student to choose the kind of college he wants to attend will be destroyed unless our great private institutions remain strong and unless the economic barrier inherent in rising tuition costs can be controlled. Where the gap between the cost of attending a private college and that of attending a public college becomes exceedingly wide the freedom of choice is correspondingly limited. It ceases to exist for the student without substantial financial resources.

Only to the extent that the great imbalance between what those who attend private and those who attend public colleges must pay for their education can be redressed can we find hope that freedom of choice can be preserved.

FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Fortunately, much can be done to preserve our private institutions of higher education. Only the cynical or biased will deny that herculean efforts must be directed to that end.

First of all, Congress should recognize the responsibilities of the Federal Government in this regard. Low-interest loans and matching grants should be made available for the construction of libraries, dormitories, science laboratories, gymnasiums, and other needed facilities, without regard to whether the institution concerned is public or private. There seems to be little doubt that ways of achieving this end can be devised well within constitutional limitations—if there is the good will to do it.

In many fields there is a serious shortage of men and women educated to the doctorate. The Federal Government itself employs thousands of such people and many thousands more will be needed as college teachers. A broad program on the Federal level to make more of our capable young people financially able to complete graduate work would make a lot of sense and would be of great service to all higher education.

THE EXAMPLE OF NEW YORK

While the individual States have all recognized their responsibilities for public higher education, disappointingly few of them have done much to help their residents attend private colleges. New York is a noteworthy exception. For more than half a century that State has had an outstanding scholarship program. Annually upward of 17,000 New York residents receive scholarships with stipends large enough to make college attendance at the institutions of the students' own choice economically feasible.

Last year New York adopted a scholar incentive program. With regard for the taxable income of the student's family and the tuition charged by the institution the student attends, this program makes grants of varying amounts available to practically every resident of New York who attends a college in that State. This is a first step in the direction of facing realistically the disparity between the costs of attending a private institution and those of attending a tax-supported one.

SOME STATE SOLUTIONS

New Jersey adopted a State scholarship plan in 1959. This was a good beginning, but the number of awards provided (5 percent of the number of high school graduates) and the annual stipend ($400 maximum) are both inadequate to make more than a modest contribution toward solving the problem.

A number of other States have adopted scholarship programs of various kinds and varying degrees of effectiveness. It is to be hoped that 1963 legislatures in several States will set up new programs or expand and improve existing ones.

A few States have adopted measures to foster the construction of needed facilities on the campuses of private institutions. In New York a private corporation, the so-called dormitory authority, was established to facilitate the sale of bonds bearing low interest rates, for building laboratories, libraries, classroom buildings, housing and feeding facilities, etc.

The Maryland State Legislature has provided matching funds for the construction of various kinds of college buildings at several private institutions in that State. It is a most significant fact that this same legislature recently provided for the appointment of "a committee to study and make recommendations to the 1963 legislature on a State policy for grants to private schools and institutions."

OTHER SOURCES OF ASSISTANCE

American business has a great stake in higher education. It must look to our colleges and universities for the production of most of its leaders. Even more important, it reaps the tremendous benefits of the American economic system. This system could not be sustained without the millions of men and women, highly educated in many fields, which higher education makes possible. Enlightened business leaders have long recognized this fact, but American corporations are not supporting higher education to the extent that they can and should.

In 1960 the total contribution made by American firms to all charitable, educational, and other exempt organizations was less than one-quarter of the amount which would have been tax deductible if it had been contributed. If American business could be persuaded to contribute only 1 percent of its net profits to higher education, this would result in support amounting to half a billion dollars annually. This would seem to be an amount reasonably to be hoped for in the years ahead.

Our colleagues and universities make their strongest claim upon those who have enjoyed the fruits of higher education most directly—their alumni and former students. In recent years the number of contributors from this group and the total amount of their gifts have been increasing steadily. But much more must be done.

It is shocking that in our country as a whole only one out of five alumni contributes to his alma mater. It may seem paradoxical, but it is a fact, that nonalumni individual contributors give more money to higher education than alumni do. In the emergency which confronts many private institutions their sons should be the first to respond and they must do so more liberally than they have yet thought possible or necessary.

THE WORRY—AND THE HOPE

The needs of our private colleges and universities are desperate. Their survival is in the balance. But they can be preserved and strengthened if we have the vision and determination to do it. The entire Nation—Government, philanthropic foundations, business, industry, and private individuals—must first understand the magnitude and urgency of the crisis and then be mobilized to meet it head on. Working in cooperation and good will, this is a task for all Americans. Let us get on with it.

The Tail That Wags the Dog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I was distressed to note in the following editorial which appeared in the May 7 issue of the Chicago Tribune, that the Governor of Illinois, in denouncing Republican efforts to cut the President's budget, is urging that this Nation go deeper into debt so that the Federal Government can help solve local and State problems.

Governor Kerner proposes to set up a State government branch office in Washington to make sure that the problems and needs of the State of Illinois will have the attention of Washington officials, who today are only too willing to advise and plan how to spend the taxpayers' money—in fact, how to dispense it.

If my daily congressional mail is any indication of the thinking of the citizens of Illinois, I can say with assurance that they do not support the Governor's position. Over 50 percent of the letters that come to my office are appeals to the Congress to cut Federal spending and to curb further intrusion of the Federal Government into State, local, and individual affairs.

Mr. Speaker, by such pronouncements, the Governor of Illinois abdicates the responsibilities of his office and assists in promoting the administration's patently erroneous theory that we can "spend ourselves rich."

The editorial follows:

THE TAIL THAT WAGS THE DOG

Governor Kerner wants to establish an office for the State of Illinois in Washington, D.C., on the theory that that's where the money is. Apparently the Governor fears that the State isn't getting its full share of Federal handouts; so a bill has been introduced which will enable his administration to haunt the head office.

The bill would provide $100,000 to locate a Washington office for the Governor's board of economic development. The board was created in 1961 to process applications of local governments for Federal grants and to help industries seek money from the Federal Area Redevelopment Administration.

The Washington bureau's function would be to protect and enhance the economic development of the State of Illinois by serving in a liaison capacity.

Governor Kerner coupled this idea with a statement denouncing Republicans for trying to cut President Kennedy's $99 billion budget. The Governor said any retrenchment would hurt employment and services in Illinois. The statement appears to have been suggested by the White House to Democratic Governors, and Mr. Kerner's staff rewrote the draft provided by Washington.

Well, obviously, if the Kennedy budget were cut, there would be fewer dollars for Governor Kerner's Washington bureau to pursue. If Government spending were really chopped down to size, there might not be any reason for even establishing such a bureau and, evidently, the Governor thinks this would be very bad.

In contrast to Governor Kerner, the Republican Governor of Montana, Tim Babcock, is doing everything he can to fight off Federal proposals to construct 11 dams in the State. He said they could cost $1 billion and were designed to perpetuate the existence of Federal departments which are in the dam-building business. He added that these departments exist on the basis of tax moneys which all of us send to Washington.

Governor Babcock's stand that dams should be rejected if they do little more than flood good land and displace families has been upheld by businessmen and ranchers of Montana cities to whom Government officials outlined their dam-building plans last week. The people of Montana, unlike Governor Kerner, recognize that there is no such thing as free Government money.

To us it is more than a little shameful that the States had been made so subservient that they have to go begging to the paymaster in Washington for what charity they can hope to collect. It does not seem to occur to Democratic Governors like Mr. Kerner that if the Federal tax bite wasn't so big, Illinois and other States might be better fixed to take care of their own needs.

Rail Mergers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on May 8, my very able and long-time friend, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, made an excellent speech concerning recent developments with respect to rail mergers. Senator DOUGLAS' thought-provoking words, and artistic oratory, I am told, were the highlight of the convention of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers in Detroit, before whom he spoke. I am particularly pleased with the glowing reports which I have received about our colleague from Illinois, but in addition, I am most grateful to him for his acceptance of this speaking task at the last minute when it appeared that a virus I had contracted would not permit me to address the brotherhood on the historic occasion of its 100th anniversary.

I want to say I was most disappointed that I could not be out in Detroit with my good friends from railway labor, but that my thoughts were indeed with them at what I have since learned was a tremendously successful convention.

Mr. President, the speech given by my friend from Illinois is a most important one with respect to the railroad merger problem. It not only brings us up to date on what has been happening, it emphasizes the increasing strength which "public interest" forces have been marshaling to straighten the record, and to work for a sensible solution to railroad redevelopment. Because of the wisdom and vital facts contained in the speech, I should like to ask for unanimous consent that it be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that all Members of Congress can benefit from it.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF SPEECH BY SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS, DEMOCRAT OF ILLINOIS, BEFORE THE BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS, DETROIT, MICH.

For over 2 years now, the American railroad industry has been carrying on an extraordinary public relations campaign to convince the public that giant railroad mergers, however they are merged, are an immediate necessity and must be approved.

We have been warned almost daily by railroad spokesmen that these mergers are crucial because there is an impending financial crisis in their industry. Yet, at the same time, we find that most of the larger rail trunklines are substantially wealthy, that their earnings are considerably better than their publicity would have us believe, that traffic has increased over prior years, and that their net total investment in road and equipment is at an alltime high.

We have been lectured by railroad officials about the great need to combine systems in order to shrink rail service in the interest of greater profits. They talk of ripping up trackage and facilities, laying off workers and eliminating jobs, and reducing freight and passenger schedules when, at the same time, our economic scholars and political leaders are pleading for expanded growth, increased employment and the diversification of plants and industries to encourage regional development, all of which goals depend upon the expansion, not the contraction, of transportation.

We have been counseled by railroad financial and economic experts on the need to eliminate competition among major trunklines, and to develop regional monopolistic rail systems with little or no public interest regulation. We have received this counsel, when at the same moment the executive branch of our Government is advocating a transportation policy which will promote and protect balanced competition, not only between railroads, but between railroads and other modes of transport.

Millions of dollars have been spent by the railroads in this country to get across the message that the Nation's existing trunkline carriers must be consolidated into huge monopolistic systems, and that their capacities and services must be reduced and reformed to put these "public service" carriers on a profit basis similar to manufacturing and other industries. As one spokesman for railroad interests has told the Congress, "despite (the railroads') 'public utility status,' we cannot, under present market conditions, expect the railroads to subsidize social goals any more than we expect this of industry generally." (Testimony of Merrill J. Roberts, representing the Association of American Railroads, before Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee June 19, 1962.)

In asserting this position, the big railroads are saying, in effect, that they intend to pursue a reorganization of their industry primarily to the advantage of railroad owners and lenders, and only secondarily to the advantage of the public. Their merger proposals which are now before the ICC for approval represent little more than an industry plan for monopoly control of the transportation industry. There have been no alternative plans proposed, and no attempt to study or investigate some better approach. Seventy-five percent of the assets of the Nation's railroads are now involved in these industry plans. Railroad management have taken advantage of the promerger climate which has been building over the past few years, and have decided that the time is now ripe to obtain a restructuring of the rail network. Personally, I think the time is long overdue when the railroads could compete more effectively with their opposition through such things as train load rates. I would have no objection to an orderly balanced realinement of systems similar to that proposed during the 1920's, or even subsequent proposals, but that is not the way it is being done today. As Senator ESTES KEFAUVER said recently in a speech on the Senate floor (February 28, 1963), and I quote it here because it sums up excellently the transportation pattern which the big railroads are attempting to force on this Nation:

"The industry pattern is to merge the strong with the strong, create monopolies, shrink capacity, and squeeze out increased profits, leaving the poorer roads to their own demise and loss of service to the communities affected. This is negative business thinking, and it is dangerous to a growing country. It is a type of planning which is not in the public interest. It is a long step in the direction of concentration of private economic, social, and political power. It is inimical to our basic concepts of competitive enterprise and business freedom. But most of all, if these industry plans are allowed to be consummated, there will be no turning back to try it a better way. The pattern and policy of surface transportation for the future will be irrevocably determined by the type of reorganization presently contemplated by the rail industry. That pattern is monopoly, and that policy is railroad dominance to the detriment of other modes of transportation."

I know you are all by now quite aware of the problem created by the proposed railroad consolidations and mergers. You know by this time it will mean the loss of many jobs—200,000 employees are estimated to be affected by present merger plans, if they are allowed to go through. Tens of thousands of miles of trackage are to be ripped up. Hundreds of stations are to be abandoned. Many communities will be left without service. Large areas, rural and industrial, will be reduced to secondary line stations. The great potential of a great nation may be nipped in the bud by these private planners who want only to cut down transportation service in the interests of profit and monopoly power.

However, my friends, in the last 2 years there has developed slowly, but persistently, a vital, moving force of challenge to this grand design of the railroad industry. It is a challenge, which comes from the people, and in many ways represents a growing trend in this country with respect to economic and social decisions. It is the voice of the public interest which is finding its way into regulatory commission proceedings, administration decisions, congressional studies—a voice too long muffled by industry-oriented agencies and past executive leaders. I doubt whether the railroad industry ever expected this voice to be so strong in this particular field, to be represented by such a variety of spokesmen, and to reach such intensity as exists today. And it is this voice which may well turn the promerger tide.

Now, as a matter of interest to all of us, let me review some of the events over the last year or so which have contributed measurably to the development of this new, aggressive public challenge to the railroads' efforts to restructure our transportation plant on their own terms.

First, it was railway labor which, spread thin in money and manpower, and going far beyond its own expertise, sought to take on the volume of self-serving opinion, statistics, and other economic data which was literally poured into the records of these massive merger cases by petitioners before the ICC. Neither labor nor the communities and smaller shipper organizations which sought to raise the public interest issue were strong enough, or well organized enough to meet the fast-moving power of the big railroads and their many lawyers who, with the help of some friendly hearing examiners, were intent upon getting the mergers processed as soon as possible and up to the Commission for rubber stamp approval.

This plight of these public interest proponents at the earlier stages of the big merger cases before the Commission was described vividly by Commission experts in their staff study of "Railroad Consolidations and the Public Interest" published only 1 year ago by the Interstate Commerce Commission. These experts stated:

"Proponents and opponents of individual mergers present their views adequately in most instances; but no voice speaks before the Commission for the public as a whole in rail consolidation cases. Thus the question arises as to whether the Commission receives all of the evidence it requires respecting the overall public interest as differentiated from the various private interests."

No voice spoke for the public—even the Commission's staff admitted this. No voice spoke for the communities, the little shippers, the unemployed, the consumers, the local governments, the people, and agencies whose social and economic powers stand to be destroyed or improved substantially with the reorganization and realinement of our railroad and transport network.

However, the Department of Justice has become concerned with these rail merger proposals. It asked the Interstate Commerce Commission for a general investigation of eastern rail mergers, and for a policy with respect to consolidations in general. This was rejected. Like labor, the Department was apparently spread think, but it managed to get observers at the merger hearings. Lately the Department has stepped up its participation to full-time staffs in the merger cases. An Office of Public Counsel has been established to consider complaints, and to prepare interventions, in many branches of regulation. The Department is now directly concerned not only with antitrust safeguards, but with the protection of communities and the improvement in the lives of people, and, of the greatest importance, the development of a record of evidence at the agency level, so that these economic and social decisions can be made in the public interest.

As an example of the results of Justice Department digging in these cases, it has now filed briefs opposing or attacking all major merger applications or decisions except that of the Pennsylvania-New York Central, where the hearings have not ended. A key case (the B. & O.–C. & O. application), is being challenged by the Department in the Federal Courts on the ground that the Commission rendered a judgment unsupported by the evidentiary record. Thus, the Justice Department is asserting itself, finally, with vigor to protect our public from the dangers of monopoly and railroad contraction of service.

Congress is now alarmed, and strong legislation is being proposed to halt this continuing movement to decide these merger cases and instead to conduct an investigation into the problem. Led by my good and long-time friend, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER in the Senate and the ranking Republican member of the House Commerce Committee, Representative JOHN BENNETT, from your State, this call to Congressional action is increasing in its intensity.

Last session, the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee conducted a probing series of hearings into the railroad merger problem. They called before their body some of the most knowledgeable and experienced railroad experts of the day. The majority of this subcommittee, after analyzing over 1,650 pages of hearing record, concluded that the situation was so serious as to warrant an immediate moratorium on rail merger decisions by the ICC and a "penetrating inquiry" by Congress into the need for additional public interest criteria and safeguards which should be met before any merger could be approved.

That subcommittee report, which in my opinion is one of the more comprehensive reports on basic economic problems coming from a congressional committee, charged that the ICC lacked the ability to protect the public interest in passing on railroad consolidations. It scolded the Commission for refusing to define any policy with respect to railroad merger. It questioned the process of deciding these crucial economic issues through the "adversary" case-by-case method, especially where petitioners' evidence was many times not tested by any significant opposition. It produced substantial evidence that the so-called "financial plight" of the railroads which the railroad industry has been raising as the specter of its deterioration was in no way as serious as alleged. Finally, this report recommended the inclusion of specific antitrust safeguards in the Interstate Commerce Commission Act to assure this Nation that mergers would only be approved on the basis of preserving and strengthening competition between railroad systems and the development of balanced economic power for the enhancement of competition between all modes of transport.

Now I am pleased to observe that legislation is being introduced by my colleague, Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana calling for the establishment of a select committee of the Senate to make a full-scale investigation not only of the financial condition of the American railroads but of the merger problem and the matter of just what large financial interests own or control the Nation's railroads.

Just last weekend some nine New England Senators sent a letter to President Kennedy petitioning him for a special study to be made by the Commerce Department with respect to the impact of the presently proposed rail merger upon New England's transportation future. It is indeed understandable that these Senators are concerned over the future of their area of the country. The proposed New York Central-Pennsylvania merger, if approved could well place a monopolistic ring of rail transportation around New England and the opportunity for growth and transport improvement for this region would be subservient to the whim and caprice of this extraordinarily large rail carrier.

I must also mention that the President's Interagency Committee, which was specially created to formulate administration policy on transportation mergers recently came forth with the warning that the Interstate Commerce Commission must maintain competition and prevent monopoly to the greatest extent feasible in passing on these merger cases. This committee said that the public interest concept implies competition between carriers in the same mode of transportation as well as between different modes. It further warned that each proposed merger must be considered in the light of longrun structural patterns and long-term economic requirements. It is now my understanding that the administration and this committee will put forward their policies representing the public interest before the Interstate Commerce Commission through presentation by the Department of Justice.

An excellent example of what I hope will be a forthright policy of the Kennedy administration to carry out these policies is the recent determination by the Justice Department to confess error in the C. & O.–B. & O. case and to challenge the Commission's findings in connection with the record made in that case. I have little doubt that the C. & O.–B. & O. decision will find its way eventually to the Supreme Court. And it may well be that the intensive effort by those who represent the public interest to put this case in its proper perspective will result in a decision by the Court of far-reaching significance with respect to these Eastern railroad mergers.

Let me sum up what has been happening. First of all, Senator KEFAUVER has introduced a bill, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor, which would put a moratorium on all those major merger decisions which would substantially lessen competition or tend to monopoly in the railroad industry, until December 31, 1964.

Secondly, at the same time, Senator MAGNUSON has introduced a bill which would put an absolute moratorium on all merger decisions until that time. While Senator KEFAUVER has been criticized by the railroad industry for his bill, one should know how conservative and reasonable he has been, for his bill would not stop the smaller and perhaps necessary mergers, nor those which involve companies in bankruptcy, nor those which meet the tests of section 7 of the Clayton Act.

I am always astounded at the moderation of Senator KEFAUVER in these matters.

Thirdly, there is the Hartke bill which would provide an opportunity for a select committee of Congress to go forward with a full-scale investigation into the financial conditions and ownerships of the railroads. Let us really see if the major railroads are in the dire financial conditions they claim.

Fourthly, as I have said, the Department of Justice has now begun to move and has presented its opposition to all of the major mergers where hearings have been concluded. And, in the case of the B. & O.–C. & O., the Department has now moved to put these cases into proper perspective before the appellate courts.

Finally, let me mention one other problem. Involved in these mergers are the jobs of thousands of human beings who face the possibility of being cut off without jobs and without a future career almost overnight. I say to you that it is not enough to prove that the railroads are in financial difficulties. For even if they are, some constructive and humane way must be found so that the jobs and the skills of thousands of people may not be lost overnight both to the economy and to the country.

I have cited these examples of public interest participation in the rail merger issue—and these examples are by no means exhaustive—in order to assure you members of the Brotherhood, that the voice of the people is finally being raised. It is getting stronger. With your help, and the help of all our good citizens who have been aroused by the railroads' bold attempts to plan our transportation network to their own liking, I hope that your voices will flood the halls of Congress this session and bring forth corrective legislation.

John W. Anderson on Quality Stabilization Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I hereby submit a significant and powerful statement on the need for a nationally applicable quality stabilization law was submitted this week to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee by John W. Anderson, president of the Anderson Co., Gary, Ind.

Mr. Anderson is also president of Quality Brands Associates of America, Inc., a national public relations organization and the pioneering supporter of the quality stabilization bill which has been introduced by me and approximately 25 other Members of the House.

In simple language, Mr. Anderson makes clear the compelling need for a uniformly applicable nationwide quality stabilization law and points out there is no conflict between this bill and States' rights. He shows the support of this measure by the housewives of America as reflected in a national opinion poll reaching into every congressional district of the country. And, lastly, Mr. Anderson recites 10 concise reasons why the quality stabilization law would be 100 percent consistent with our free, competitive enterprise system.

The statement of Mr. Anderson whose headquarters are in the great Calumet district which I represent is based upon more than 50 years of manufacturing and merchandising experience. He is one of America's great business leaders. I commend to you the reading of his statement, excerpts from which follow:

STATEMENT OF JOHN W. ANDERSON, PRESIDENT, THE ANDERSON COMPANY AND QUALITY BRANDS ASSOCIATES OF AMERICA, INC., BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND FINANCE, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, IN SUPPORT OF THE QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL

Mr. Chairman, under the supremacy clause of the U.S. Constitution, every congressional act may effect a modification of State constitutional and statutory law—unless in the Federal act the contrary is provided. This is axiomatic under our Federal-State system.

Since the quality stabilization bill does not authorize the exercise of any rights and remedies that would permit horizontal price-fixing agreements, there of course is no conflict between the quality stabilization bill and any State constitution or State law forbidding horizontal price fixing.

Of equal importance is the fact that the quality stabilization bill does not modify, overrule, or conflict with any State law—for the reason that State law does not deal with the subject matter of direct brand-name control, as does the quality stabilization bill. The differences between the quality stabilization approach and fair trade emphasize the lack of conflict between State law and the quality stabilization bill.

The quality stabilization bill permits the establishing of a protective resale price by private action—but only as a condition of the use of the brand. The right of a discounter to cut the price is carefully preserved—his right to continue to misuse the brand (the property of the manufacturer) over the protest of the manufacturer is all that is affected. This poses no problem whatsoever of conflict with State law.

In 1919 the Supreme Court held in the Colgate case that a seller, acting alone, could announce the prices at which he desires a buyer to resell his branded products, and, acting alone, refuse to sell again to any buyer who did not observe his established resale prices.

Under Colgate, the trademark owner (the manufacturer) may neither exact nor accept from any reseller, as a condition of any sale to a reseller, any promise or agreement that the goods will be resold at the manufacturer's preferred prices. But the manufacturer can refuse to sell again—"for any reason or for no reason at all."

HERE'S WHY QUALITY STABILIZATION IS A MUST

Many manufacturers make their trademarked products available to retailers only through wholesalers. Wholesalers often supply—to each of many retailers—many products. So wholesalers—understandably—cannot undertake to discard a retailer customer because that retailer may have failed to conform to a single manufacturer's ethical standards.

That's why—to protect the good reputation of his quality product, and to protect all ethical resellers and the public—the quality manufacturer needs the quality stabilization bill to enable him to reach past his wholesalers and terminate all use of his trademark by a subordinate reseller who abuses it.

Thus the quality stabilization bill merely gives effect to a logical extension of the principles of the Colgate decision—to retailers who, as a matter of convenience to them, are made subordinate to a manufacturer's direct wholesale customers.

An important thing to note is that operation under the Colgate doctrine has never been considered price-fixing in any antitrust sense. Legally speaking, price-fixing, of whatever category, has always been limited to arrangements based on agreement either expressed or implied.

Under Colgate, a seller (manufacturer) can suggest a resale price, saying to the buyer, "If you don't maintain the resale price, you will lose the privilege of buying or selling my products." Similarly, under the quality stabilization bill, the seller (manufacturer) says, to all who resell his products, "If you don't protect my good name by maintaining my price, you will lose the privilege of making any further use of my trademark."

The effect of the quality stabilization bill, as to stabilization of prices, is, and clearly should be, no more undesirable than a manufacturer's refusal to deal, under the Colgate doctrine, with a primary reseller. Fair trade rests upon a contractual system of price maintenance. The Colgate doctrine, as honored in the quality stabilization bill, rests solely upon the independent action of the trademark owner. That means no contract, no agreement, as to prices.

Therefore, since Colgate is not price fixing, neither is quality stabilization price fixing. And since quality stabilization neither condones nor requires any agreement, written or oral, between a manufacturer and any reseller, relating in any way to prices, quality stabilization cannot in good conscience be called fair trade.

Quality stabilization is, instead, a clean and lawful defense for the quality manufacturer who is unwilling to have his trademark—his good name—used as store-traffic bait, and who is unwilling to break faith with his resellers—and with the public—by squeezing quality and value out of his product to meet the demands of cannibalistic retail monopolists for lower and lower prices with which to destroy the traditional American system of distribution through ethical resellers.

THE QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL DOES NOT CONFLICT WITH STATES' RIGHTS

To allege that the quality stabilization bill is an invasion of States' rights is superficial and misleading for the reason that the intrastate application of the Sherman Act and other antitrust statutes over the last half century have created the compelling need for this legislation at the Federal level.

Since the 1911 decision by the U.S. Supreme Court in the *Dr. Miles* case (200 U.S. 373), the Sherman Act has been held to ban resale-price maintenance contracts.

Thus State policy as to this subject matter has been subordinate to Federal policy for at least half a century.

Among those making this illogical argument that the quality stabilization bill is an invasion of States' rights is the Department Justice.

If the Department of Justice followed through on its line of thinking, it would call also for the repeal of the Sherman Act as it affects retail transactions, and by the repeal of the Sherman Act thus restore the entire area to State control.

Viewed in the proper light, the quality stabilization bill represents an attempt to restore in a limited area the status of the common law before the Sherman Act preempted the field.

Such restoration can only be done by an act of Congress.

The central concept of the quality stabilization bill is that the trademark used to identify goods constitutes a separate property interest severable from the goods themselves and, like other property interests, entitled to be protected by law.

The U.S. Supreme Court in *Old Dearborn* in 1936 (299 U.S. 183) explicitly recognized this concept, saying:

"We are here dealing not with a commodity alone, but with a commodity plus the brand or trademark which it bears as evidence of its origin and of the quality of the commodity for which the brand or trademark stands. Appellants own the commodity, they do not own the mark or the goodwill that the mark symbolizes. And goodwill is property in a very real sense, injury to which, like injury to any other species of property, is a proper subject for legislation."

Congress by its enactment of the Lanham Trademark Act in 1945 recognized upon practical considerations the essential interstate characteristics of a registered trademark.

The quality stabilization bill in essence is a statutory confirmation and implementation of the Old Dearborn decision and is consistent in jurisdictional scope and in underlying philosophy with the Lanham Act.

The quality stabilization bill enables the trademark owner to protect his property, his trademark, by denying its use to those who abuse it.

The quality stabilization bill is consistent with State constitutional concepts and State laws that property rights are entitled to protection.

No State has ever enacted legislation dealing with this property control approach as applying specifically to trademarked goods; therefore there is no overruling or overriding of State policy as to the concept of law provided in the quality stabilization bill.

The quality stabilization bill is applicable only to trademarked goods in or affecting interstate commerce.

SHOULD STATES BE PERMITTED TO "SECEDE" FROM THE UNION IN THE MATTER OF PATENT RIGHTS?

Property rights in patents—in trademarks—and in copyrights—are identical in their constitutional significance. They provide the incentivism to creative service to meet public needs.

To emphasize the absurdity of an amendment for exclusion of State-by-State from the provisions of the Quality Stabilization Act, it is only necessary to ask what would be the result of a similar amendment to our patent laws.

Would it not be equally destructive of incentive to create new and useful products to provide by law that any industrial State, whose legislators wanted to free its manufacturers from the necessity of respecting patents owned by others, could do so simply by an act of its legislature excluding that State from any need to honor the patent laws?

How long would the U.S. Patent System—recognized as the prime catalyst of our entire economy—have any significance, or be of any value in promoting science and the useful arts, if such exclusions, State by State, could be made effective?

Any Federal legislation that imposes arbitrary economic imbalance between States is essentially destructive legislation. In fact one of the great economic advantages of the proposed Quality Stabilization Act is that it provides for uniformity of application throughout all the States.

If any State-by-State "exclusion" amendment were included in the Quality Stabilization Act, Congress will have done little more than perpetuate, by Federal law, the present "checkerboard" system of random States in which orderly marketing of trademarked products is permitted.

"Checkerboard" marketing is impractical and costly. Most manufacturers have found it an impossible system of distribution. That is why they have abandoned fair trade and, as a practical matter, would not be able to use a Quality Stabilization Act similarly disabled.

RETAIL MONOPOLISTS SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED LICENSE TO HIDE BEHIND A MISTAKEN CONCEPT OF WHAT CONSTITUTES "STATES' RIGHTS"

The adoption of any State-by-State "exclusion" amendment in the quality stabilization bill would, in effect, subvert the right and duty of our Nation to stand firm and in orderly economic unity to meet new and serious threats confronting its people.

Problems have arisen from intensified foreign economic competition strengthened by an unprecedented economic alliance of industrial nations of Europe. Those allied nations now move, under uniformly prescribed conditions, to create among them what is, in economic effect, a United States of Europe, free from import duties and other restrictions that have impeded heretofore the "interstate" movement of merchandise across their borders.

They call this their "common market." It is much more than that. It is also a common organized source of competition with our United States for the markets of the world.

In that competition we of America find ourselves at a serious disadvantage as to competitive costs of production. In the European common market, labor rates, both skilled and unskilled, are far below labor rates in the United States. Our regulations governing imports into our country permit nations of the common market, as well as Asiatic nations with even lower labor rates, to penetrate our market in such volume as to help us not at all in our present shaky unemployment conditions. Those conditions—understandably—are aggravated also by the rate at which retail monopolies in America are driving out of business each day, and often into profitless inactivity, literally thousands of citizens experienced in distributive and related services.

America's security can endure only through a continuation of America's economic strength. Yet we have found good Americans misguidedly advocating a disabling so-called "States' rights" amendment to the Quality Stabilization Act, which amendment would make impossible the maintenance in America of anything like the economic unity, in method and purpose, wisely embraced by the increasingly industrious and prosperous nations of the European "common market."

Such an amendment clearly would introduce, in and among the States, an unrelenting ideological fight for and against State-by-State legislative action to withdraw the State from the united economic front proposed under quality stabilization. Thus would be concentrated on individual State legislatures, in predetermined sequence, the full power of organized retail monopolists—striving to persuade its legislature to make each State a "Casbah" in which they may practice all the evil arts intended to be restrained by the quality stabilization bill.

The quality stabilization bill is intended to, and in unamended form would, permit, under Federal law, throughout all of the United States, at the will of any manufacturer of a competitive product bearing his brand, name, or trademark, the establishment of certain uniform conditions governing production and distribution of that product.

Under the proposed act to establish such uniform conditions each State is recognized as having, as a State, a right to be protected against unfairly disruptive competition originating outside its borders.

Enacted without crippling amendment, the quality stabilization bill will enable manufacturers to compete, throughout all of the United States, on uniform terms and conditions, and without exposure to (a) bait-merchandising practices, (b) deceptive pricing policies, or (c) published misrepresentation concerning the manufacturers' trademarked goods.

Is it believable that our United States could long maintain its economic supremacy, against competing nations united solidly under uniform conditions affecting production and distribution, with our country operating from a confusing and disrupting crazy quilt of competitive conditions?

Dare we ignore the right of each and every State to be protected from unfair encroachment from other States that promote the growth of retail monopolies, against which the public would otherwise have no defense?

LOOK WHO WANTS QUALITY STABILIZATION DEAD

Quality stabilization has been an issue of growing importance to the public since 1959, when it was first revealed by Quality Brands Associates as perhaps the only soundly based approach to the establishment of a constitutional Federal policy capable of resisting, and perhaps reversing, the age-old and merciless drive of conscienceless men seeking monopolistic control of retail sales. These men strive constantly to attract gullible customers by parading, in their windows, and in their advertisements, at uneconomic prices, honored branded products.

Quality Brands Associates proposes no new restraints upon a manufacturer of a brand of merchandise he intends resellers shall price, up or down, as they may please.

However, Quality Brands Associates is joined, by much more than 70 national trade associations whose members resell trademarked products, in an urgent request that Congress, by enactment of the quality stabilization bill, encourage manufacturers of good intent to invest their trademarked products with that additional 10 percent or so of prime cost by which the product carries to the public often a bonus of 50 percent or more in miles of service and satisfaction.

We all, or no doubt most of us, have read of the cry of desperation emanating from the recent national conference in California, of representatives of the National Association of Consumer Organizations (NACO), the questionable name chosen for itself by the only national discount organization. The President of the association was quoted in the trade press as saying the quality stabilization bill "threatens our very existence and is the largest danger facing the industry today."

These words of the President of the National Association of Consumer Organizations seem rather incongruous since the quality stabilization bill is not directed at any class of reseller—whether discount house, a cooperative, a chain store or whatnot—but is aimed instead toward the cannibalistic abuse and misuse of the goodwill of an honored trademark regardless of who commits such degrading practices.

The obvious conclusion is that among those who wish quality stabilization dead are the retail monopolists themselves, possibly some financial institutions that have overloaned to the retail monopolists, certainly including the susceptible newspaper that relies on local advertising of retail monopolists for an important part of its income, and the manufacturer who relies upon the retail monopolist's discrediting of competitive quality products—to create storetraffic that is diverted to the purchase of his inferior product.

NOW LOOK WHO WANTS QUALITY STABILIZATION

That the homemakers of America overwhelmingly want the quality stabilization bill enacted soon is authoritatively established by the certification by Ernst & Ernst, nationally known and respected certified public accountants, of results of a massive survey of national opinion showing that 81.1 percent of homemakers are asking for this proposed legislation.

A total of 15,295 homemakers selected at random (and in equal numbers) from every congressional district in the United States were interviewed. This work was done for American Issues Press, Inc., by experienced pollsters working out of more than 200 offices—of Manpower, Inc.—throughout the United States.

The total included is more than 10 times the 1,500 citizens customarily questioned by opinion survey organizations as adequate to provide—within 1 or 2 percentage points—a dependable cross sectional result.

Question No. 6 of the American Issues Press survey presents the true essence of the quality stabilization bill, H.R. 3669, in text and in purpose. Of the opinions expressed on that question, a total of 81.1 percent of housewives voted, in clear effect, for the quality stabilization bill.

That question No. 6 read as follows:

"Do you believe that the manufacturer who really wants to give you the highest quality, highest dependability, and highest value, in his trademarked products, should be permitted to protect that quality and value for you . . . and protect his own good reputation . . . by lawfully preventing any change, either up or down, by any storekeeper, in the retail price such quality manufacturer may name to be paid for his quality product everywhere?"

Federal legislation permitting (but not requiring) price and quality stabilization—of a trademarked product—by its manufacturer—is supported by the American housewife as sorely needed for the protection of her family. She needs that help—and she knows it. She appreciates those who support her interests as a homemaker. She finds it difficult to understand people who are unable—or unwilling—to support quality stabilization as a firm solution of her greatest economic problem.

HOUSEWIVES ASKED FOR THE SAME PROTECTION IN 1952. THEY KNOW NOW WHY THEY DIDN'T GET IT

In a smiliar national survey 11 years ago covering more than 10,000 housewives—with results also tabulated and certified by Ernst & Ernst—78.6 perecnt of the American housewives polled said they preferred that the manufacturers of their favorite trademarked products "set—and lawfully enforce"—the prices of those products.

In that 1952 survey—a total of 10,279 houswives answered the following question:

"Would you rather have the storekeeper fix at any time to suit himself all the prices you pay for all the products he sells you or would you rather have the manufacturers of your favorite trademarked products set and lawfully enforce the prices of those products?"

A total of 8,080 housewives—78.6 percent—said they wanted the manufacturer (not the retailer) to set and lawfully enforce the prices of their favorite trademarked products.

The American housewife knows what helps her—and what hurts her. She is learning, surely, who helps her, and who hurts her. The proof is overwhelming that she wants the quality stabilization bill enacted by this Congress.

The housewife is believed to be entitled to the full support of both Houses of Congress—on the basis of her overwhelming expression of serious need for protection from the cannibalistic proclivities of retail monopolists.

There is no more crushing form of monopoly than is retail monopoly. Retail monopoly extorts at will from the consumer, while it dictates, to the manufacturer, downgrading product specifications, then fixes the price it will pay.

Some influential leaders, in one State or another, have expressed bewilderment that citizens claiming for long to be opposed to all harmful monopolies, and to be strong supporter of our antimonopoly laws, now stand out so amazingly and shout against quality stabilization.

THERE IS ONLY ONE READY ANSWER

The quality stabilization bill, when enacted, will give each manufacturer the power to protect his trademarks, protect his resellers—and protect the public—against predatory price cutting for bait purposes—and against misrepresentation of the merchandise.

The enactment of the quality stabilization bill can mean a great deal to almost any man's family—through its protection against depreciation of the quality of well-known trademarked products—protection through stabilization of retail prices—by any manufacturer who so elects.

It is high time we gave back to the ethical independent reseller the opportunity to offer to the public only products protected against the degradation forced by retail monopolists.

Quality stabilization is based upon a well-established concept of protection of property rights of the manufacturer in his trade name and in the goodwill it represents. This is a clearly constitutional approach based upon unassailable considerations of property rights well established by the U.S. Constitution and by the Federal judiciary.

After all—the same concept that makes unlawful a malicious personal attack upon your own good name, leading to a restraining court action and the recovery of damages, differs not at all in principle from the quality stabilization concept, which likewise protects the good name and good reputation (the going value) of a manufacturer from practices that would destroy him.

Under the Quality Stabilization Act the owner of a trademark may deny its use to those who would defame it. This is completely consistent with the law of property that has developed over the centuries to encourage citizens to increase their capacity for public service.

To own property as a means of better serving public interest would offer no incentive unless the property is recognized as investing the owner with the right to determine the conditions under which others may make use of, or may be excluded from the use of, such property.

FACTS ABOUT THE QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL BRING MILITANT SUPPORT

Public support for the quality stabilization bill is becoming more militant whenever the following facts begin to be understood:

1. The proposed act can be applied only to trademarked products the makers of which have chosen to give their trademark—and the citizens who have learned to trust the mark—protection from those who would abuse the mark.

2. No manufacturer is required to bring any of his products under the act.

3. No reseller or consumer is required to purchase any product stabilized under the act. There must always be other products offered for the same purpose—to give the public a choice—or the price of the product cannot be stabilized under the act.

4. A price-stabilized product must compete with all price-stabilized products available for the same purpose.

5. A price-stabilized product must compete also with all nonstabilized products available for the same purpose.

6. Thus the public has the full benefit of both price competition and quality competition.

7. Fully authenticated reports of the vast national housewives' survey mentioned herein and exhibited herewith show that the public can be trusted—under any competitive condition—to determine, from neighborhood gossip and from experience, which product constitutes the best—and which the worst—buy for the need at hand. Obviously, any manufacturer who overprices his product soon feels the pinch of withdrawal of support made certain by decisions of this grassroots court of last resort.

8. The public knows many times more about its needs and its budget capacities than any sheltered theorist. The public can best find for itself suitable values—once protected by the proposed act against retail monopolists' trickery. The public needs the wider range of choice of products and the trend toward stability of identified values the proposed act will provide.

9. Under the proposed act there will always be made available, for retail monopolists to sell, products to compete, at fully flexible prices, with every important stabilized product offered. The retail monopolists will be deprived only of the chance to force an honored quality product to destroy its own honestly earned popularity—as the retail monopolist degrades it and destroys confidence in it.

10. The proposed right of a manufacturer to stabilize his resale prices—as a means of protecting his property rights in the public

good will earned by him and symbolized by his trademark—is well within the framework of his unquestioned right to make the product wholly unavailable to the retail monopolist—or to the public—at any price. Any manufacturer, with complete impunity, can do just that by simply closing his plant and going out of business—as retail monopoly otherwise might easily force him to do. Such action is clearly within what has been referred to as the citizen's inalienable right to drop dead.

The Remarkable Apple

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, those of us privileged to live in the Virginia apple country learn early of the nutritive values to be derived from regular consumption of the apple and its products.

Our pride in the Viriginia apple is not merely a regional reflex action. It springs from the secure knowledge that claims made by partisans of this remarkable fruit have stood up under unemotional scientific scrutiny. I take the liberty, therefore, in bringing to the attention of the House an interesting study by Drs. William G. Way and Joseph M. Damron of Winchester, Va., as reported in the Virginia Medical Monthly for March 1963.

It will be my hope to offer later the balance of the published report by these physicians.

The report follows:

SUPPLEMENTARY JUICE FOR INFANTS

(By William G. Way, M.D.,
Joseph M. Damron, M.D.)

Nearly two centuries before ascorbic acid (vitamin C) was isolated by Szent Gyorgyi in 1928 and identified 4 years later by King and Waugh as the antiscorbutic principle, a British Naval officer, Joseph Lind, massed convincing evidence that scurvy was a disorder of nutrition rather than a disease of occupational or infectious origin. He further concluded that it was a disorder of deficiency rather than excess and his "Treatise on the Scurvy" published in 1753 was responsible for the introduction of citrus juice into the diets of British seamen.[1]

A recent survey of hospitals in the United States maintaining a pediatric residency revealed the incidence of infantile scurvy to be approximately 1 case for each 3,300 pediatric hospital admissions. The incidence of scurvy in Florida and California was of particular interest because of the large crops of citrus fruits grown in those States. Whereas in California there was only 1 case per 9,590 admissions, in Florida 1 case occurred for each 1,317 admissions.[2]

Schaffer was able to find only three completely verified cases of congenital scurvy on record. These occurred in children born to mothers whose diets had been so devoid of vitamin C that neither her tissues nor those of her infant contained any stores of ascorbic acid.[3]

Although the exact function of vitamin C in the body is not fully understood and its relationship to enzymes is not yet clear, it is known to be essential in growth processes and is found most abundantly in actively growing tissue. Vitamin C is probably necessary for all living cells. The effects of deficiency are noted chiefly in the bones, blood vessels, and teeth. The pathological changes of scurvy are the results of marked deficiency. The most outstanding clinical manifestations are produced by hemorrhages due to increased capillary fragility which result from growth failure of connecting tissue supporting structures and perhaps loss of cement substance between cells.[4]

The efficient and highly specialized food processing industry operating today provides many benefits which often are taken for granted. Consider the problems of the enlightened mother of several generations ago in her attempt to find adequate year-around sources of vitamin C for her young. In the minds of many, vitamin C, the antiscorbutic factor, and freshly squeezed citrus juice became thought of as synonymous terms. With the advent of nearly universal use of supplementary vitamins in infants and in young children, the addition of fruit juice to the diet has become less important as source of vitamin C and has become more important as a dietary supplement. As a wholesome in-between-meal food that satisfies hunger temporarily but does not interfere with normal appetite, fruit juice has no comparable competitor. In addition the practice of giving vitamin C fortified fruit juice to sick infants and children is sound for the requirements of both vitamin C and fluids are increased by infection.

Many types of "infant" juice (apple, apple-grape, apple-pineapple, apple-prune, grape, orange, pineapple, etc.) are now available, and, recognizing the importance of ascorbic acid, processors have supplemented them with synthetic vitamin C. The usual amount of added ascorbic acid to "infant" juices is 50 mgm. per 100 cc. It has been shown that synthetic ascorbic acid is as well tolerated, utilized, effective, and stable as the natural occurring.[5]

Little has been written or studied regarding the tolerance or acceptance of citrus juices by infants in early life. This study is an attempt to compare various observations in two groups of infants. The first group received infant prepared citrus juice (orange juice) and the second group received infant prepared noncitrus juice (apple juice).

SOURCE OF PATIENTS

This study was carried out by two board-certified pediatricians in private practice for a period of 2 years beginning January 1960. Both full term and premature infants were included. For the most part, children who became ill enough to require medication, children of parents who had failed to follow instructions, and those who failed to return for followup evaluation and observation were excluded from the study.

METHOD OF STUDY

The study was conducted on private patients who were born in the Winchester Memorial Hospital who came under the care of the authors between January 1960 and January 1962. As it was to be a long-term study, no attempt was made to use alternate patients, but rather, mothers were told at random to give "infant" apple juice or "infant" orange juice beginning at age 3 weeks. For the first 3 weeks of life the child received only milk and throughout the study only five types of milk were used. The milks used included breast milk, homogenized milk, evaporated milk, Similac, and Enfamil. When the infants were brought to the office for their 6-week checkup, data was recorded on index cards regarding six observations as noted by the mother for the 3-week period during which the child received only milk and juice. The six observations were as follows:

1. Appearance of rash.
2. Onset of colic.
3. Excessive flatus.
4. Change in stools.
5. Spitting or vomiting.
6. Acceptance of the juice.

During the 6 weeks period the child was given no supplementary vitamins and for the most part no solid foods. In a few cases unusually hungry babies were started on single grain cereals before the 6-week evaluation. If there was any question regarding untoward reaction associated with starting juice at 3 weeks of age and starting cereal at or about the same time, these cases were excluded. Other factors were held as constant as possible, inclfuding general skin care, type of soap, type of clothing, preparation of formula, etc. In general, then, the first 3 weeks of life the infant received only milk and the next 3 weeks received only milk and either apple or orange juice. At 6 weeks of age he was evaluated for changes that had occurred after the introduction of juice into his diet.

On occasion an infant would either not accept or had a definite intolerance to the initially designated type of juice and was "switched" to the other juice included in the study. When possible, observations were noted regarding the "switch" for possible significant trends.

RESULTS

A total of 379 infants satisfactorily met the above specifications. In order to determine whether the recorded observations indicated any statistically valid conclusions, John R. Thompson and Co. of Washington, D.C., performed a statistical study of the available data.

The data was tabulated on spread sheets and was assumed to relate to four parameters:

(*a*) Type of juice.
(*b*) Type of disorder.
(*c*) Type of milk.
(*d*) Sex of the subject.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I will skip the detailed data and reserve it for later presentation, in order to emphasize now the doctors' conclusions and summary, as follows:

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the statistical study of the collected observations the following conclusions are offered:

1. The rate of occurrence of the six observed disorders is independent of the type of milk fed the subject and the sex of the subject.

2. The rate of occurrence of rash in subjects fed only orange juice is significantly higher than in infants fed only apple juice.

3. Significantly more subjects fed only apple juice exhibited no disorders than did subject fed only orange juice.

4. Significantly more subjects would not accept orange juice than would not accept apple juice.

---

[1] Cecil, Russell L., and Loeb, Robert F.: Textbook of Medicine. Philadelphia, W. B. Sanders Co., 1951.

[2] Report of Committee on Nutrition, American Academy of Pediatrics: "Infantile Scurvy and Nutritional Rickets in the United States." Pediatrics 29: 646, 1962.

[3] Schaffer, Alexander J.: "Diseases of the Newborn." Philadelphia, W. B. Saunders Co., 1960.

[4] Marriott, W. McK., and Jeans, P. C.: "Infant Nutrition." St. Louis, C. V. Mosby Co., 1941.

[5] Reid, M. E. in Sebrell, W. H. and Harris, R. S.: "The Vitamins," V. 1, Academic Press, New York.

5. In the case of subjects fed both types of juices, rash and colic disorders and all disorders taken as a group occurred at a significantly higher rate when the subjects were being fed orange juice than when they were being fed apple juice.

SUMMARY

Since citrus juice per se is no longer "essential" as a source of ascorbic acid in infants and young children, an attempt was made to compare its tolerance and acceptance with a noncitrus juice in 379 infants. The conclusions drawn from the statistical study on the observations would seem to indicate that the noncitrus juice (apple) was more readily accepted by the infants than the citrus juice (orange). In addition, those infants fed the noncitrus juice exhibited less disorders of rash, colic, excessive flatus, change in stools and spitting than those who received the citrus juice.

Keith Covelle Retires From Okmulgee Tech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HOWARD EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission at this time to express my personal appreciation and the thanks of thousands to a friend and fellow Oklahoman who has recently announced his retirement after devoting the major part of his life as an educator and administrator.

This man has contributed more to the field of technical and industrial education than perhaps any other person in the Nation.

Anyone who follows the great work being carried on today in technical and industrial education knows that I am speaking of Keith Covelle, who will shortly retire as director of Oklahoma State Tech at Okmulgee.

For the past 17 years—from the inception of Okmulgee Tech—Keith Covelle has been its guiding hand as director, principal educator, and tireless "ambassador of good will."

Keith Covelle has spent nearly a half a century stressing the great need and importance of developing the trade and technical skills of our citizens.

His deep conviction that every man should be trained to be a productive citizen has been proven true in the great work being carried on at Okmulgee Tech—and every member of our society has been the direct beneficiary of this conviction.

In 1946, Keith Covelle left his position as vocational specialist at Oklahoma State University at Stillwater to inaugurate his ideas at Okmulgee Tech. He acquired the Army's old Glennan General Hospital at Okmulgee to be used for the plant facilities and opened the doors to 211 students who enrolled in 11 different trades.

The overwhelming success of this bold venture in a relatively uncharted area of education is borne out by the number of graduates from Okmulgee Tech and the strategic positions these graduates occupy in cities and towns throughout the United States.

During the past 17 years of Okmulgee Tech's existence, more than 18,000 persons have learned a trade, business, or occupation in the school. This year enrollment is approximately 1,500 and the school operates the year around on a three-semester plan.

The success of trade, technical, and industrial education, not only at Okmulgee Tech but at other institutions throughout the Nation, is due in a large measure to the personal leadership and zeal of Keith Covelle. For his many friends, admirers, and former students, I express a heartfelt "thank you."

I know that Keith Covelle can justifiably take great personal satisfaction in knowing that he has made an outstanding contribution to society, the enduring benefits of which stand as a living tribute to him.

Allan Frederic Saunders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I would like to have the following testimonial in honor of Dean Allan Frederic Saunders of the University of Hawaii printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Dr. Saunders, in my opinion, is one of the outstanding educators not only in the State of Hawaii, but throughout the United States.

There being no objection, the testimonial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALLAN FREDERIC SAUNDERS

Seldom do we take the time to honor those who have taught us in our academic careers. In a sense this is quite understandable. Teachers are usually taken for granted in the same way, perhaps, as we take the educational processes and opportunities we have today for granted. There was a time when the chance of going to school beyond the elementary grades was an extreme rarity.

I would like, however, to pay homage today to a person who probably has influenced more public servants in Hawaii than any other educator. Amongst these, there are those who now serve as representatives and senators in the State legislature. These are men who hold responsible positions guiding the political, economic, and social destinies of our islands. In this list are names too numerous to single out individually, but I am sure that each one of them today appreciates the insights and perspectives which have been afforded them through contact with this educator.

Similarly, there are those who serve in the administrative branch of the State government who owe a great deal to this person. There are those in our public school system, as well as in our universities, both on Hawaii and on the Mainland, who remember the exposure to a mind keenly sensitive to bringing out the best in students. In other areas, for example, such as business and professional pursuits, there have likewise been individuals strongly influenced by this man.

And I need not mention the fact that there are those such as I, in the U.S. Senate, who have been the recipient of sage and balanced counsel during our time as students under his guidance. It is also interesting to note that his influence extends to the congressional aides who serve under our Senators and Representatives on Capitol Hill. Our two Senators plus one Congressman all have legislative assistants who were onetime students of his.

This list of individuals whom he has had as students in his classroom is, I am certain, an incomplete one. But be that as it may, it is nevertheless a most impressive one. I have not even begun to enumerate those whom he has taught in various academic institutions such as Minnesota, Scripps College, Stanford and Amherst. I am quite positive that if a similar testimonial were to be held for him in mainland cities the list would be equally impressive.

I am equally positive that such a list would reflect the basically objective tenor of his classroom approach in that it would contain as many Republicans as Democrats.

In trying to analyze the gift for education which he undoubtedly has, I find myself seeking clues not so much in his educational background as in his dedication to relate the practical socio-economic world to his classroom insights. For example, I remember him as being one of the originators of community organizations such as the Hawaii Chapter of the American Association for the United Nations. I find him to be actively engaged in politics as for example when he chose to run in the Hawaii State Constitutional Convention and barely missed making the victory list.

In short, Dr. Allan Frederic Saunders is not an academician in vacuo. He is an academician in the best sense of the term—one who combines good teaching in the classroom together with practical application in the community at large. The validity of this combination can be best attested to by the products which we all know are assuming more and more responsible positions.

The greatest of institutions is oftentimes measured in terms of its continuing influence. I am sure that the legacy bequeathed the University of Hawaii in the form of complete freedom of choice in the wearing of whatever colors may strike the aloha shirt fanciers, will be felt for a long time. I am also sure the legacy bequeathed by Dr. Allan Frederic Saunders to the State of Hawaii in the form of dedicated government, business, and professional personnel will be felt for a very long time.

Missouri's Sixth District Legislative Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I recently completed tabulation of the returns in my annual legislative questionnaire poll of the Sixth Congressional District of Missouri and a majority of my constituents who returned questionnaires indicated they believed deficit spending by the Federal Government should be ended before tax reductions are made.

Proposals providing medical care to aged through the social security program and general Federal assistance to public schools were opposed by most of the persons who responded.

Approximately 38,000 questionnaires were sent out and more than 6,100, or about 16 percent, were returned.

The results follow:

[In percent]

Questions	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Medicare: Do you favor bill to provide part payment of hospital costs for persons over 65, but no doctors' bill, through increase in social security?	32	65	3
2. Tax cut: Do you believe deficit spending by Federal Government should be ended before tax reductions are made?	76	19	5
3. Foreign aid: Do you favor—			
(a) Aid programs similar to those in the past?	23	------	------
(b) Aid to Allies but no assistance to neutral nations?	40	------	22
(c) No foreign aid at all?	15	------	------
4. Aid to education: Do you favor bill to provide Federal grants for school construction and increased teachers' salaries?	37	60	3
5. Urban affairs: Do you favor bill to provide new Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing?	20	69	11
6. Domestic Peace Corps: Do you favor bill to establish group whose volunteer members would perform services in United States similar to those now performed overseas by Peace Corps?	38	55	7
7. Farm legislation: Generally speaking, which of these courses do you believe farm legislation should take:			
(a) Continue present programs for basic commodities under which price supports and mandatory acreage allotments are provided if approved by ⅔ of farmers voting in referendum?	33	------	------
(b) Discontinue price supports and acreage allotments for basic crops, substituting system of land retirement payments for farmers who wish to participate?	23	------	20
(c) Abolish all Federal assistance, acreage allotments, and price supports for basic crops?	24	------	------
Answers to question No. 7 by operating farmers:			
(a) Continue present programs	40	------	------
(b) Discontinue price supports	29	------	11
(c) Abolish all Federal assistance	20	------	------
Answers to question No. 7 by nonfarmers:			
(a) Continue present programs	25	------	------
(b) Discontinue price supports	17	------	29
(c) Abolish all Federal assistance	29	------	------

Congress Must Pass Effective Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement to the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member, on the important subject of civil rights. The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. JACOB H. GILBERT, OF NEW YORK, MAY 8, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to thank the esteemed chairman of our committee for scheduling hearings on the numerous legislative proposals relating to the various aspects of civil rights which are now being considered.

In my recent statement to the general subcommittee on Labor, on the subject of equality of opportunity in employment, I pointed out that inasmuch as the Emancipation Proclamation was signed 100 years ago, it is high time that we proceed, with alacrity, to do the job that should have been done generations ago. The legislation here under consideration is of equal importance, and the same urgency for prompt and effective action exists. Every vestige of discrimination based on race, color, religion, nation origin, or ancestry, must be completely wiped out—and without delay.

I feel certain that you, my colleagues, are sickened, as I am, by the current newspaper headlines and pictures describing the recent outrage in Alabama. The violation of human rights in Alabama is causing grave harm to all Americans, and irreparable damage to our Nation's prestige on the international scene has been inflicted. The barbarities committed by Alabama police authorities against Negro and white demonstrators for civil rights, the use of police dogs and high pressure fire hoses to subdue schoolchildren as well as adults is indeed a national disgrace. The jailing and placing in detention homes of many hundreds of teenagers and even younger schoolchildren because they are merely demanding their birthright of freedom must bring a blush of shame to the cheek of every right-thinking American.

All these disgraceful and inhuman proceedings are now front-page news in Europe, and we may be sure that they are being played up in Africa and Asia. We can be certain that the Communists will capitalize on these latest sins against our Negro citizens; what powerful propaganda we are furnishing them. We must remember that the United States is the most thoroughly reported country in the world, and to the world we have proclaimed and professed to have high standards of equal opportunity and treatment for all our citizens. When those abroad see these horrible pictures, how incongruous and how inconsistent our efforts to promote the democratic ideal must seem; how deceptive they must consider us when we ask the new emerging nations to emulate us and our form of government.

We must recognize that a revolution is underway throughout our country; every large city is fearful of the increasing racial tensions now prevalent. We can no longer close our eyes and hope that the trouble will go away; it will not. Negroes and other minority groups have reached the end of their patience over the insurmountable barriers which still keep their lives segregated and submerged; which prevent their obtaining jobs, promotions, decent housing, and education. They are tired of the degredations to which they have been subjected for so long. They are now demanding the full equality and freedom guaranteed them under our Constitution, and they mean to have them.

My bills, H.R. 187, H.R. 5603, H.R. 5604, and H.R. 185 are before our committee now. H.R. 187 provides for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching. In my opinion, it is most important that this protection be provided to assure that no citizen will be deprived of his right to orderly proceedings under the law and that no person will suffer violence or death at the hands of vengeful mobs.

My bills H.R. 5603 and H.R. 5604 are identical with those introduced by our chairman; I introduced them to indicate my strong support of the legislation. H.R. 5603 includes four specific provisions which would implement the recommendations of the President; it would correct many abuses and lessen the delays which many citizens face in attempting to exercise their right to vote. It would establish a presumption in voting suits that any person who has completed the sixth grade in an accredited school where instruction is predominantly in the English language possesses sufficient literacy to vote in any Federal election.

H.R. 5604 would extend the Civil Rights Commission for 4 more years and would authorize it to serve as a national clearinghouse to provide civil rights information and technical assistance to requesting agencies. It would also make it possible for the Commission to concentrate its efforts upon those problems within the scope of existing law which require the most attention.

H.R. 185 prohibits the application of unreasonable literacy requirements with respect to the right to vote and provides that an arbitrary or unreasonable test, standard, or practice with respect to literacy shall mean any requirement designed to determine literacy, comprehension, intelligence, or other test of education, knowledge, or understanding, in the case of any citizen who has not been adjudged an incompetent, who has completed the sixth primary grade in a school accredited by any State or by the District of Columbia. This would assure voting rights now denied to millions of our citizens.

I urge this committee to discharge its responsibility to the countless Americans whose rights are now denied them and who must look to us for help. I urge that we approve strong, effective, civil rights legislation, and I am hopeful that the Congress will recognize its clear duty to enact it into law. Only by laying a firm foundation of equality and freedom now can we hope to build here the true democracy and a society which recognizes the equality of all of our citizens, all of which we profess to have now but in reality do not have. The moment of truth has come; crises are upon us which must be met by law and order; Federal action is required to avert catastrophe. When individual States refuse to recognize their responsibilities, then the Federal Government must take the initiative in providing the equality, protection, and rights to all citizens as guaranteed under our Constitution.

Personnel Security of the National Security Agency

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 950) to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, in the present earnest debate as to the merits of legislation before us, I think it is worthy of note that the bill comes to us from the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Understandably, this committee receives most of its public notice through its investigative activity. Less well known is its function of legislative recommendation.

I need not review the unfortunate circumstances, revealed in detail in congressional hearings, which gave evidence of inadequate personnel security controls in the National Security Agency, a highly sensitive establishment. The revelations of individual cases made headlines, but little public attention attached to the subsequent painstaking analysis of the personnel selection and management problems which culminated in the drafting of the pending bill. The membership and staff of the Committee on Un-American Activities merit the approbation and thanks of this House, I believe, in addressing themselves to the problem in a dispassionate way and arriving at legislative recommendations which give promise of greater protection for the sensitive functions of the National Security Agency without doing violence to basic principles of fairness which all can agree should be applied in the Federal service.

The 50th Anniversary of the Rockefeller Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House that this year marks the golden anniversary of a great American philanthropy.

The Rockefeller Foundation is one of the oldest and largest of the great philanthropies which express the concern of private wealth for advancing human welfare. During the last half century, it has expended a total of $763,646,542 in the areas of medicine and public health, agriculture, the natural and social sciences, and the humanities. With genuine modesty, the trustees point out in their anniversary statement that "this sum by itself could have accomplished relatively little. The real accomplishments have been brought about by the inspired and dedicated efforts of thousands of talented and learned men and women who needed financial support at critical moments in their determined endeavor to improve the lot of their fellow men." Deserving as this tribute is, however, we would do well to remember that it was the foundation which provided not only the initial material resources, but the intangible encouragement and in many cases the pioneering inspiration necessary for these programs to go forward.

I know many of my colleagues join me in saluting the Rockefeller Foundation on its 50th anniversary and extending best wishes for continued success in its goal of promoting the well-being of mankind throughout the world.

I include the following excerpts from the trustees' statement in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

The Rockefeller Foundation's 50-year record has helped demonstrate the role of a private foundation in meeting contemporary human need. A private foundation can take initiative; it can pioneer; and, by mustering available knowledge and human competence, it can identify causes and experiment with solutions. It can move without the political complications created when governments are involved with other governments. It can encourage cooperative effort across national and political boundaries. It can bring a high order of individuality and diversity of viewpoint into the field of human betterment. It can provide a decentralization of social initiative and responsibility. And it can enlist the interest and support of vigorous, enterprising, and public-spirited benefactors.

The opportunities for effective work toward the well-being of mankind through the systematic dispensing of private resources are today enormous. For in attacking the momentous problems he faces, civilized man has at hand means that were unavaliable 50 years ago—a great improvement and broadening of education; a vast storehouse of new scientific knowledge and techniques for applying this knowledge; and a general awakening among the peoples of the earth to the fact that man can improve himself and his environment if he has the will and patient determination to do so.

As it begins its second half-century, the Rockefeller Foundation adds to these new means for human advancement an experienced faith in the validity and the vitality of the philanthropic idea. Those whose devotion to the betterment of mankind gave the foundation its half-century of success have established, it seems to us, that private wealth can be responsibly and effectively expanded by private institutions devoted solely to the public good.

To perform this urgent task with increasing effectiveness will be the continued aim of this foundation.

United States Honors Memory of Ignacy Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday a most impressive ceremony was held at Arlington National Cemetery at which time a marker was dedicated to honor the resting place of one of Poland's greatest statesmen, patriot and world-renowned musician, Ignacy Paderewski. I was present on that occasion and heard the stirring tributes paid to Paderewski by President Kennedy and Charles Rozmarek, a native of my congressional district, and now president of the Polish American Congress and the Polish National Alliance. Mr. Rozmarek now makes his home in Chicago and is an attorney at law. The Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, the largest newspaper in my district, paid editorial recognition to that impressive ceremony in its editions of Friday, May 10, 1963, and as part of my remarks today I include the aforementioned editorial:

U.S. HONORS MEMORY OF IGNACY PADEREWSKI

President Kennedy and Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish American Congress and the Polish National Alliance, voiced the sentiments of the American people yesterday when they paid tribute to Ignacy Paderewski, the former referring to him as "one of the overwhelming figures of our century, a great Pole, a great musician, a great statesman and, above all, a brave and compassionate human being" and the latter stating "Paderewski belongs not only to Poland, but, through his genius, to America and the world."

The stirring words were uttered at the dedication of a plaque in Arlington National Cemetery where the body of the famed Polish patriot and musician rests temporarily. His heart is in a crypt at Cypress Hills, N.Y., where it is to remain, according to terms of his will, until Poland is liberated when it will be returned to his native land. The body, too, will be returned to Poland at that time.

Paderewski is not the first Pole to die in exile rather than abet the cause of his country's oppressors. No less a personage than General Thaddeus Kosciuszko, who fought for freedom here and elsewhere, died in Switzerland in 1817. The list is long and distinguished, for Poland, though enslaved frequently, is a cradle of liberty because of the fate that overtook her.

Mr. Rozmarek, a resident of Chicago and a native of Wilkes-Barre, reminded his countrymen that "it is for us, the living, to hasten the day of the liberation of Poland and work for a just peace and justice among nations." We who are indebted to Poland for the contribution of its heroic sons and the role 7 million of our countrymen of Polish extraction are playing currently, echo the cry today and will continue to echo it until the objective is reached, for so long as Poland is enslaved America is menaced.

The Late Honorable Jed J. Johnson

SPEECH

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the memory of the late Jed J. Johnson, who passed away in New York on May 7, has been eulogized by his former colleagues in the House. I wish to associate myself with the many expressions of admiration for that distinguished American. Jed Johnson served in the House for many years and was one of the most respected Members of this body. He was known for his courage, his devotion to the office he filled, and his untiring efforts in behalf of good government. The country has suffered a heavy loss.

Judge Johnson will be remembered by those who knew him as a friendly, affable, courteous gentleman of the old school. He will also be remembered for his statesmanship and his fight for economy and fiscal responsibility during the time he served so ably on the Committee on Appropriations. I feel that I have lost a valuable friend in his passing. I extend to the family my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Rollcall on Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose herewith an editorial from the Camden Chronicle, Camden, S.C., of May 10, 1963:

ROLLCALL ON AID

President Kennedy, in agreeing with the Poet Milton in his foreign aid message to Congress last month that: "Peace hath her victories—No less renowned than war," added: "And no peacetime victory in history has been as far-reaching in its impact, nor served the cause of fredom so well as the victories scored in the last 17 years by this Nation's mutual defense and assistance programs."

Well, let's see—and before Congress votes that bargain-basement figure of only $4.5 billion. The survey that follows, compiled by Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, national chairman of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee (to aid American taxpayers), forms another message that every Congressman and Senator should read. We quote:

"Western Europe has prospered with Marshall plan aid. But after 17 years and $41 billion in U.S. aid, Wetern Europe meets only a fraction of its defense obligation; except for commercial loans, its aid to less developed countries is negligible.

"Argentina ($640 million aid), under indirect military domination, suffers from inflationary chaos.

"Brazil ($1.9 billion aid) is on the brink of communism.

"Cuba ($52 million aid) once enjoyed immense sugar subsidy, has stolen $1 billion in U.S. private investments; her Red satellite status is now guaranteed.

"Haiti ($100 million aid) writhes under a murderous tyranny.

"Indonesia ($670 million aid), her economy wrecked, is an armed dictatorship bent on conquest.

"India ($3.9 billion aid) probably faces Red Chinese attack.

"Iran ($1.3 billion aid) is a monarchy without a parliament.

"Laos ($460 million aid) may soon fall to Communists.

"Poland ($522 million aid) is Communist with all freedom gone.

"South Korea ($5.4 billion aid) is ruled by its third military junta.

"South Vietnam ($2.4 billion aid), ruled by a puppet dictator, propped up by the United States, is racked by a Red guerrilla war.

"Turkey ($3.8 billion aid) is politically unstable and is economically weaker than before aid began.

"Venezuela ($274 million aid), despite prodigious oil wealth, is a major target of the Russo-Cuban fifth column.

"Yugoslavia ($2.4 billion aid) is Communist with all freedom gone."

General Fellers notes that these items add up to $65 billion and that the glowing reports to Congress and the dismal facts were never in sharper contrast. National self-respect, fully as much as budget balancing, demands healthy cuts in foreign aid.

Saving the Test Ban Talks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I would like to include herewith an editorial which appeared in this morning's New York Times, entitled "Saving the Test Ban Talks."

I am hopeful that with the continued interest and urging of responsible individuals, the United States will make further efforts to arrive at a satisfactory test ban agreement.

The editorial follows:

SAVING THE TEST BAN TALKS

In another move to save the 5-year-old nuclear test ban talks from collapse and avert another East-West testing race, the United States has now canceled the three minor tests it had scheduled for later this month. This is a wise and welcome decision.

In fact, considering President Kennedy's determined efforts to reach a test ban agreement, the scheduling of the tests in the first place poses a mystery. It may be explicable as a compromise in the infighting now going on in Washington between the proponents and opponents of new tests. For the beneficial scientific value of the tests could be only minimal; but their adverse political and psychological effect was bound to be great.

As might have been foreseen, the U.S.S.R. promptly pounced on the tests to accuse the United States of starting a new round in the nuclear arms race. The Soviets threatened to retaliate with a massive test series of their own, which they are suspected of already preparing. The cancellation of our tests deprives them of any propagandistic pretext for resuming theirs.

But cancellation is not enough. Even more determined efforts are necessary to break the present deadlock. President Kennedy has found new and powerful support in such an effort from 27 distinguished scientists, including three Nobel laureates. They have issued an appeal to Congress and the public to back a test-ban treaty as being in the best interests of the United States and of world peace. They urge, as does this newspaper, that the risk of continuing the arms race without a test-ban treaty is considered greater than the risk that a ban might be violated by secret testing. For such a treaty would stop immediately all aboveground tests; and though some uncertainty might remain regarding underground tests, these have been found of lesser military value. Detection techniques are already such as to make it too risky for the Soviets to cheat. The treaty might not last, but as long as it lasts, it would leave our nuclear deterrent capacity intact, reduce the speed of the armament race, help to inhibit the spread of nuclear arms, reduce the likelihood of nuclear war and prevent further lethal fallout.

Other scientists, of course, and most military men disagree, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They argue that further tests are necessary to perfect our defensive weapons, in particular an antimissile missile in which a Russian breakthrough could neutralize our whole nuclear arsenal. Also the Russians must still clarify the methods of the three inspections they are ready to admit. Many issues are still to be resolved; but the stakes are too high for either side to let the talks end in failure.

The J. M. McDonald Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this week there came to my desk the annual report of the J. M. McDonald Foundation, Inc., of Hastings, Nebr.

This foundation was established 11 years ago by the late James M. McDonald, a successful businessman with an extraordinarily keen awareness of his obligations to those less gifted and less fortunate.

The capital funds for the foundation were gifts principally made by Mr. McDonald during the course of his lifetime, and the bequest of a portion of his estate.

Always interested in his fellow men, he was never too busy to respond to those, young and old, who sought his advice in determining careers, business problems, or personal problems. His acts of thoughtfulness and generosity continued to the hour of his death.

Mr. McDonald's interests were broad. Better educational institutions and greater educational opportunities for deserving boys and girls challenged him, as did the problems of physically and mentally handicapped children. He was concerned with the problems of aging. Research, with its vast potential for human betterment, had his attention.

The establishment of this charitable trust was assurance for Mr. McDonald that his humanitarian interests would be continued and expanded.

A total of $1,264,147.93 has been allocated to 90 institutions, in 16 States, by the J. M. McDonald Foundation, Inc., during the past 11 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the cumulative record of grants from 1952 through 1962 by the J. M. McDonald Foundation.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cumulative record of grants, 1952–62

Organization	Amount	Number of years	Years in which contributions were made
AGED			
Homer Home for Aged Women, Homer, N.Y.	$19,000.00	10	1952–56, 1958–62.
Sunnyside, Inc., Hastings, Nebr	6,000.00	7	1952–58.
Total	25,000.00	------	
BLIND AND DEAF			
Christian Record Benevolent Association, Lincoln, Nebr.	12,443.75	2	1959 and 1961.
Pilot Guide Dog Foundation, Chicago, Ill	7,000.00	7	1955–61.
Total	19,443.75	------	
CHILDREN AND YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS			
American Child Guidance Foundation, Boston, Mass.	9,000.00	2	1958 and 1960.
Camp and Conference Committee of the Presbyterian Synod of Nebraska, Lexington, Nebr.	15,000.00	1	1962.
Camp Merrill, Fullerton, Nebr	750.00	1	1961.
George Junior Republic, Freeville, N.Y	16,000.00	11	1952–62.
Grace Children's Home, Henderson, Nebr	1,000.00	1	1962.
Home Guard, Cortland, N.Y	100.00	1	1955.
Hope Training School for the Handicapped, Hastings, Nebr.	250.00	1	1962.
Junior Police, Cortland, N.Y	1,500.00	3	1955, 1957, 1959.
Kahabi Council of Camp Fire Girls, North Platte, Nebr.	2,500.00	1	1962.
Lariat Boys Ranch, Stapleton, Nebr	4,000.00	2	1960, 1962.
Nebraska Children's Home Society, Omaha, Nebr.	1,000.00	1	1962.
Starr Commonwealth, Albion, Mich	3,000.00	3	1952–54.
Thornwell Orphanage, Clinton, S.C	9,000.00	5	1952–56.
White House Youth Committee, Omaha, Nebr.	1,000.00	1	1960.
Total	64,100.00	------	
EDUCATION AND SCHOLARSHIPS			
Bacone College, Bacone, Okla	10,000.00	1	1962.
Berea College, Berea, Ky	15,000.00	1	1959.
Charlton School, Albany, N.Y	42,500.00	3	1957, 1959, 1961.
Clarkson School of Nursing, Omaha, Nebr	5,000.00	1	1960.
Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y	75,000.00	5	1958–62.
Creighton University, Omaha, Nebr	45,000.00	3	1958–60.
French Camp Academy, French Camp, Miss	3,000.00	3	1952–54.
Hastings College, Hastings, Nebr	152,000.00	6	1953, 1954, 1959–62.
Keuka College, Keuka, N.Y	10,000.00	1	1962.
Nebraska colleges and universities student loan funds. In 1961 grants were allocated to— College of St. Mary, Omaha. Concordia Teachers College, Seward. Creighton University, Omaha. Dana College, Blair. Doane College, Crete. Duchesne College, Omaha. Hastings College, Hastings. Luther Junior College, Wahoo. McCook Junior College, McCook. Midland College, Fremont. Municipal University of Omaha, Omaha. Nebraska State Teachers College, Chadron. Nebraska State Teachers College, Kearney. Nebraska State Teachers College, Peru. Nebraska State Teachers College, Wayne. Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln. Scottsbluff College, Scottsbluff. Union College, Lincoln. University of Nebraska, Lincoln. York College, York. In 1962 grants were allocated to the abovenamed colleges and universities with the exception of Luther Junior College and McCook Junior College which did not participate in the national defense student loan program.	10,000.00	2	1961, 1962.
Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln, Nebr	8,000.00	1	1962.
Northwestern Military and Naval Academy, Lake Geneva, Wis	$35,000.00	3	1960–62.
Northwood School, Lake Placid, N.Y	25,000.00	1	1962.
Piney Woods School, Piney Woods, Miss	1,500.00	2	1953, 1954.
J. M. McDonald Planetarium, Hastings, Nebr	24,891.80	2	1958, 1959.
Platte Valley Academy, Shelton, Nebr	9,367.50	3	1958, 1959, 1961.
Presbyterian scholarship, Hastings, Nebr	5,000.00	2	1957, 1958.
Reinhardt College, Waleska, Ga	4,000.00	4	1953–56.
School of the Ozarks, Point Lookout, Mo	262,800.00	11	1952–62.
St. Cecilia's Building Fund, Hastings, Nebr	5,000.00	1	1961.
University of Nebraska Foundation, Lincoln, Nebr.	2,500.00	3	1960–62.
Total	750,559.30	------	
HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CARE			
American Nurses Foundation, New York, N.Y	500.00	1	1961.
Cortland Memorial Hospital, Cortland, N.Y	51,200.00	1	1956.
Mary Lanning Hospital, Hastings, Nebr	500.00	1	1952.
Occupational Training Center, Lincoln, Nebr	1,000.00	1	1962.
Shriner's Hospital for Crippled Children, Minneapolis, Minn.	69,500.00	7	1952–58.
Total	122,700.00	------	
RELIGIOUS AND CHURCH ACTIVITIES			
Christophers, The New York, N.Y	6,000.00	3	1954–56.
Church of God, Kearney, Nebr	2,480.25	1	1962.
Church of God, Sioux Indian Missions, Scottsbluff, Nebr.	1,000.00	1	1962.
Church of the Nazarene, Hastings, Nebr	2,000.00	1	1959.
Cortland County Council of Churches, Cortland, N.Y.	2,000.00	1	1961.
Evangelical United Brethren Church, Hastings, Nebr.	10,000.00	1	1959.
First Presbyterian Church, Cortland, N.Y	40,000.00	2	1957, 1958.
First Presbyterian Church, Hastings, Nebr	36,625.00	7	1952–54, 1956–59.
Homer Avenue Methodist Church, Cortland, N.Y.	500.00	1	1961.
Open Door Mission, Omaha, Nebr	1,000.00	1	1962.
Second Presbyterian Church, Hastings, Nebr	1,000.00	1	1957.
Seventh-day Adventist Church, Hastings, Nebr.	1,889.63	1	1960.
Protestant Council, New York, N.Y	17,000.00	9	1954–62.
Total	121,494.88	------	
RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS			
Child Research Council, Denver, Colo	5,000.00	1	1962.
Institute of Applied Biology, New York, N.Y	8,800.00	3	1956, 1957, 1959.
New England Institute for Medical Research, Ridgefield, Conn.	15,000.00	3	1957, 1961, 1962.
Total	28,800.00	------	
SAFETY AND HEALTH			
Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kans	82,500.00	10	1952–61.
New York Committee for the Prevention of Alcoholism, Rochester, N.Y.	1,000.00	2	1955, 1956.
State of New York, Cortland, N.Y	32,500.00	1	1958.
Total	116,000.00	------	
NONCATEGORICAL			
Community Chest, Hastings, Nebr	1,500.00	5	1958–62.
Eisenhower Library, Abilene, Kans	5,000.00	1	1959.
Fort Atkinson Foundation, Fort Calhoun, Nebr.	1,000.00	1	1961.
Hastings Womans Club, Hastings, Nebr	1,000.00	1	1962.
Nebraska Food for Peace Committee, Hastings, Nebr.	300.00	1	1962.
Ravenna Seattle World's Fair Band Committee, Ravenna, Nebr.	250.00	1	1962.
Salvation Army, Hastings, Nebr	2,000.00	1	1961.
Willa Cather Pioneer Memorial, Red Cloud, Nebr.	5,000.00	1	1960.
Total	16,050.00	------	
Total contributions	1,264,147.93	------	

Lotteries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement I made on the television program, "Congressional Conference" broadcast over WOR–TV, channel 9, New York, on Sunday, May 12, 1963, concerning the recent New Hampshire law legalizing lotteries. My statement follows:

It is difficult to understand how the sovereign State of New Hampshire could have passed a law legalizing lotteries. The scandalous history of lotteries in many of our States during the early days of the Republic should have stayed the hand of the New Hampshire Governor from signing this sweepstake bill. That history is replete with chicanery, bribery, and plain thievery. Tickets were forged, races were rigged, and proceeds diverted. Officials were corrupted. For example, in Louisiana, a New York syndicate was organized to run the lottery. It paid some $40 million for the privilege and reaped the staggering reward of $2 billion. It accomplished this by bribery and all manner and kinds of skulduggery. Scandals mounted until the sordid business became a stench in the nostrils of decent citizens and the Louisiana lottery law was repealed in 1894.

Just as Louisiana and other lottery States could not prevent syndicates of gamblers from muscling in, New Hampshire will not be able to stop mobsters and gangsters from using this lottery as a feeding ground for underworld characters.

This venture will be patterned on the Irish Sweepstakes and will be based on two horse races a year. Tickets will cost $3 and a winner could collect upward of $200,000 and tickets will be sold in State-operated liquor stores. There are only about 600,000 residents of New Hampshire. If one-half of these people bought lottery tickets, there would be less than a million dollars to pay for the prizes and running expenses, making the race hardly worthwhile. New Hampshire, therefore, will depend largely on the sale of tickets to tourists and out-of-State residents.

New Hampshire fails to reckon with her host. There are on the statute books today Federal laws passed as a result of the lottery scandals which deny the use of the mails to further any lottery. These laws make it a crime to carry lottery tickets across State lines. Newspapers conveying news of the lottery sweepstakes cannot be deposited in the mails. Federal statutes regarding lotteries are very pervasive. It is illegal to use interstate wire communication facilities for transmission of bets or betting information on penalty of fine or imprisonment. There is a similar ban on foreign lotteries such as the Irish Sweepstakes. Also, the Postmaster General may forbid the payment to a person receiving "lottery mail" or winnings as a result. It is also unlawful to broadcast any lottery information on radio or television. Thus, interstate facilities cannot be legally used in connection with lotteries. It shall be the duty of the Attorney General of the United States to enforce these laws. It will be difficult to do so but as long as they are on the statute books, they must be adhered to and sanctions must be invoked against the offenders.

The lottery may bring New Hampshire easy money to meet an ever-rising budget, but who are the victims? The poor and the indigent who can least afford it. Lottery panders to those afflicted with the disease of gambling. The hope to win, however remote, is ever present. It is wealth at the end of the rainbow. It is argued that we have bingo, parimutuel horse racing, therefore, why not a lottery? It is true we have forms of legalized gambling, but why widen the opportunities any further? What we have is bad enough. Why expand the encouragement to easy riches, to the will-o'-the-whisp of easy money? And why lure racketeers to a new legalized form of gambling? New Hampshire's example may be followed in other States. Rhode Island and Vermont are already considering a lottery bill.

Governor King, of New Hampshire, promises honest administration. I tell him that it will take a miracle if he can have any kind of honest administration of a lottery because the opportunities for crookedness are so pervasive.

Hot Line Could Be a Trap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, because of the failure of President Kennedy to deal realistically with Khrushchev, I fear the proposed hot line between Washington and Moscow could be a trap which would cost the United States dearly. Without the foundation of a firm and bold policy on our part and some evidence the President will not be taken in by Soviet duplicity, I believe we should move very cautiously in this area.

Somewhat the same fears are set forth in an editorial from the Dallas Morning News of May 12, which I include at this point:

THE HOT LINE

Technical studies got underway in Geneva the other day on the proposed hot line to link Washington and Moscow. The purpose of the direct telephone line is to prevent the triggering of a nuclear war by accident.

High hopes are held in some quarters for the linkup, but it's hard to see why. The Russians are no more likely to be truthful over a telephone or teletype than they are over a conference table.

It has long been a Communist maxim that promises, like pie crusts, are made to be broken. With this approach, the Reds have bamboozled the West many times in the past two decades, but the magic is wearing off. Few people in this country now believe anything the Communists say.

Last October 18 Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko and Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin went to the White House and assured the President that Cuba was not receiving offensive weapons.

The Russian officials knew that Cuban missile sites were then in the final stages of construction. They also knew that American photo planes had spotted the bases, yet they looked the President in the eye and lied like troopers.

If the President ever has to make the decision to launch or not to launch our nuclear weapons, surely he will not give much weight to promises by men of this stripe, whether they are given in person or over a hot line.

The Kremlin's strategy is unchanged since the Bolshevik revolution and the solidifying of Communist principles and power by Lenin in the early twenties. That strategy, in Lenin's words, is "to delay, to deceive, to lie and conceal, to advance one minute and retreat the next."

Washington continues to spar, and to hope, for a change in that strategy. But Moscow's goal of world domination is pursued relentlessly, regardless of strategies, and irrespective of whether the boss is Lenin, Stalin, Malenkov, or Khrushchev.

The hot line is just what it says. It is hot—for us—if we permit ourselves to be duped and misled.

House Doctor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Dr. George W. Calver has served with distinction as Capitol physician for the past 35 years and it was, therefore, most gratifying to read the fine feature article that appeared in the Capitol Hill newspaper, Roll Call, in its edition of Wednesday, May 8, 1963, which expresses the sentiments of the membership of the House and Senate very well, I am sure. It gives me a great deal of personal pleasure to submit for today's RECORD the aforementioned article from Roll Call.

The article follows:

Keeping the Nation's lawmakers fit and healthy has been the job of Capitol Physician George Wehnes Calver for the past 35 years.

Known as the dean of Federal physicians, Dr. Calver was honored at a luncheon Friday by House Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and a group of Government physicians.

For the spry and well-liked Calver, the event was something of a culmination of his many years of service to Congressmen and Senators. It was one of the few times he had received even a slight bit of public recognition.

Actually, the ceremonies in his honor at the luncheon were a complete surprise to Dr. Calver. The event was sponsored by the Council of Federal Medical Directors for Occupational Health, a new organization devoted to improving on-the-job medical treatment in the Government.

When he joined his medical colleagues for lunch in the Senate banquet room of the Capitol, Dr. Calver was presented with a certificate of honorary life membership in the Council.

The award was made to Calver "in recognition and appreciation of his inspiring leadership in the promotion and elevation of the profession of occupational medicine and for his great worth and distinction as a physician and benefactor of humanity and service to the United States of America."

Vice President JOHNSON told the luncheon that Dr. Calver had been his personal physician for years, and that he had the highest respect for him. These sentiments were echoed by the Speaker, who also said he had known the doctor for many years.

Dr. Allen S. Cross, Council president and physician at the Government Printing Office, to the luncheon that Dr. Calver has faced numerous challenges in his Capitol career.

"Watching over the health of the Nation's legislators as they carry out the responsibilities of their high office, he has frequently been on round-the-clock duty during continuous sessions," Cross said. "Although his role is not unlike those of an occupational health physician serving employees in commerce and industry, the significance of the work * * * has often imbued his ministrations with a sense of drama."

Dr. Cross cited the case of one asthmatic legislator, in obvious distress, who insisted on staying at the Capitol until the vote on a vital measure. Caring for such determined public servants is one duty of Dr. Calver, whose prospective patients are subject to more stress than almost any other group.

In another case during Calver's long career, a down-but-not-out lawmaker demanded that he be brought to the Capitol on a stretcher so that he could cast his vote.

Taking care of the 535 Members of Congress also imposes a greater than normal need for strict medical discretion. Aware that speculation on the health of a Congressman can be a campaign issue, he refuses to discuss any of his work with anybody but the patients themselves.

One recent case which must have come under Dr. Calver's care was former Speaker Sam Rayburn, who suffered for months of malignant cancer unknown to anybody but his closest associates. After seeing through a large part of the President's legislative program in 1961, Mr. Sam left for Bonham, Tex., where the cancer ultimately claimed his life.

While he was in Washington, however, the veteran Speaker's secret was never revealed.

Treating the ailing lawmaker is important when the mortality rate is 10 to 15 per Congress. In the 87th Congress, 7 percent of the Senate and eight Representatives died.

Dr. Calver regards prevention of sickness as one of his most important functions. As Dr. Cross put it Friday, "He has carried out the best traditions of occupational medicine by fostering a higher quality of preventive care and strengthening the teamwork of the occupational and personal physician."

Dr. Cross pointed out that the life of a Member of Congress, as that of anyone else, cannot be measured in terms of dollars. But he said the Nation has a vested interest in conserving its leadership resources.

In his preventive work, Dr. Calver places primary emphasis on the prevention of coronary heart disease, and each Member of Congress is urged to have an electrocardiogram taken and a thorough physical examination made each year.

Some measure of the success of this program may be found in the 70-percent reduction in deaths from coronary disease among Congressmen since Dr. Calver took office 35 years ago.

Another phase of the prevention program involves physical fitness, a legislative branch activity which Dr. Calver sponsored long before it became the vogue at the White House.

Dr. Calver stresses a weight control schedule and physical exercise. This has been encouraged by the installation of a gymnasium in the New House Office Building with equipment purchased largely from the Members' own pockets.

When the new Rayburn House Office Building is opened next year, it will include an expanded gym with better facilities for exercise—as well as the old handball court.

Matching a swimming pool now used by Senators, the Rayburn building will boast a pool for House Members. When the public last year found out about the planned House pool, the initial reaction was adverse. Then Congressmen revealed that it was urged by Dr. Calver for health reasons, and there's been hardly a word of criticism since.

A naval career officer since 1913, Dr. Calver comes from a long family of physicians. His father was a doctor. His two daughters are married to doctors, one a Navy captain stationed in Florida and the other the dean of the U.S. Navy Medical School. His wife is not a doctor but, as chairman of the Gray Ladies of the Red Cross in Washington, supervises 600 women.

Dr. Calver was born in Washington, D.C., where he received his medical degree from George Washington University in 1912. He took his residency at Providence Hospital before becoming a service physician.

As the result of a resolution passed by the House, the Navy assigned Dr. Calver to duty at the Capitol in 1928 to be in attendance on the sessions of Congress. The lawmakers must have liked him, because in 1931 Congress passed legislation to prohibit his transfer unless otherwise provided by law.

The doctor has been here ever since, although he has risen to the rank of rear admiral, retired, in the Navy.

West Virginia Postmaster Wins Outstanding Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Emery Woodall, postmaster of Hamlin, W. Va., has performed long and honorable service to the people of the Lincoln County area. There have been so many occasions that he has risen above the traditional call of duty that many have come to expect the unusual from Mr. Woodall as a matter of course.

Therefore, it came as no surprise to many when this fine West Virginian rose to the occasion when the emergency flood situation struck southwestern West Virginia on March 12 and 13, 1963. I was highly pleased to learn that Postmaters Woodall was summoned to Washington, D.C., for a special presentation ceremony recently. At this ceremony, Mr. Woodall was presented by the Post Office Department with a superior accomplishment certificate.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Woodall serves an area where some of the finest people in the Nation live. Hamlin for many years has been the home of Col. Charles E. "Chuck" Yeager, the first man to fly a plane faster than the speed of sound, whom this House honored with a special "Chuck" Yeager Day not long ago. Many wonderful people make up this community. Not the least of these is Postmaster Woodall's charming family. I am very proud of his beautiful North Carolina-educated daughter, now doing graduate work in France, who exceeded anything North Carolina could produce in carrying off many beauty crowns while away from home.

But I want to get back now to talk a minute about Hamlin's famous postmaster. When faced with a dangerous jobs to do during the critical flood situation, he did what every West Virginian would do under the circumstances: he did his duty. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the text of the letter written to Emery Woodall by A. E. Newton, Regional Director of the Post Office Department, dated April 26, 1963:

APRIL 26, 1963.

Mr. EMERY WOODALL,
Postmaster,
Hamlin, W. Va.

DEAR MR. WOODALL: I take great pleasure in presenting with this letter a superior accomplishment certificate in recognition of your outstanding performance during the emergency flood conditions in the Lincoln County, W. Va., area March 12 and 13, 1963.

During this period several incidents of exemplary service were reported. However, the most outstanding were your personal efforts during this crisis. Your determination and courage to act under the most trying conditions represents the epitome of dedication. When the highway became too flooded for motor vehicles to operate, you personally carried the mail by foot over the mountain from Hamlin to West Hamlin so that it could be dispatched to Huntington. This is one of the many instances in your long postal career which is indicative of your loyalty to the postal service and to the patrons whom you have the honor to serve.

During the past 30 years there have been many similar flood conditions in your area, and you have always managed to get the mail through personally by foot, boat, or other means.

I wish to personally commend you and express my appreciation, as well as the appreciation of the Postmaster General, for a job well done.

A copy of this letter will be filed in your official personnel folder.

Sincerely,

A. E. NEWTON,
Regional Director.

Msgr. John S. Middleton, Pastor-Educator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I note the passing of a distinguished priest and educator from the archdiocese of New York, Rt. Rev. Msgr. John S. Middleton, pastor of St. Peter's Roman Catholic Church in New York City. Monsignor Middleton was well known as a teacher of philosophy in many institutions of higher learning. It is significant that, since 1952, he was the pastor of the oldest church in New York City and the parish where the first parochial school was established in 1800. Monsignor Middleton served as Cardinal Spellman's secretary of education from 1947 to 1950, preceding his appointment to St. Peter's. It was the clarity of vision and spiritual insight of Monsignor Middleton and many men like him that has made the parochial school system a strong contributor to the well-being of our Nation. His voice is now stilled but his spirit will live on as an inspiration to those who believe the strength of our school system must not be diminished by embracing material realities to the exclusion of spiritual realities.

I include Monsignor Middleton's obituary from the New York Times, May 15, 1963:

Msgr. John Stanislaus Middleton, Roman Catholic educator, author, and pastor of St. Peter's Church at 18 Barclay Street for the last 11 years, died yesterday at the Benedictine Hospital in Kingston, N.Y. He was 63 years old.

Monsignor Middleton, who was ordained 40 years ago, was a frequent speaker at communion breakfasts, graduation ceremonies, and various public events. He spoke out often and sharply on such subjects as birth control, secularism, communism, the instruction of youth and juvenile delinquency.

Born here, the cleric attended Fordham Preparatory School and Fordham University, where he received a doctor of philosophy degree in 1926. After completing his undergraduate education at Fordham, he studied at St. Joseph's Seminary in Yonkers and at the Catholic University of America.

After his ordination in 1923, Monsignor Middleton was chaplain and instructor at the Newman School in Lakewood, N.J., and was a lecturer in philosophy at Georgian Court College there, and at Fordham University. Later he was vice president of the Catholic Summer School of America and archdiocesan director of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. In 1931 he became professor of philosophy at St. Joseph's Seminary, and taught there until 1949.

HELD EDUCATION POST

In 1947 Monsignor Middleton was appointed secretary of education to Cardinal Spellman, and he held that post until 1952, when he became pastor of St. Peter's.

In 1947 he was one of seven priests in the New York Archdiocese named by Pope Pius XII as private chamberlains with the title of very reverend monsignor. Six years later, Pope Pius XII named him prothonotary apostolic with the title of right reverend monsignor.

Monsignor Middleton lashed out at American higher education in a baccalaureate address at the College of New Rochelle in 1932, charging that American colleges and universities had "robbed man of his soul."

"Atheism," he asserted, "walks about our American institutions of learning decorated with the multicolored doctor's gown. An unhinged ethics clothes itself in soft garments and is camouflaged by grand manners."

WARNED AGAINST MATERIALISM

To a graduating class at Fordham, Monsignor Middleton advised against embracing material realities to the exclusion of spiritual realities. He said that a liberal degree was a mere formality if it did not make of the graduate a spiritual man.

In 1950, Monsignor Middleton asserted that prohibiting aid of any kind of religion in any form indirectly gave aid and comfort to the forces of irreligion.

"The complete separation of church and state," he said, "will result eventually in the separation of government and religion. In the United States at the present time a privileged place seems to be granted to those who have no religion."

Monsignor Middleton was the author of "Recent Realism in American Philosophy" (1926), "Christ and the Priest" (1928), "Living for God" (1934), "A Handbook of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine" (1937) and "Her Silence Speaks" (1942).

Monsignor Middleton is survived by two sisters, the Misses Dorothy and Mae Middleton, of Yonkers.

A pontifical mass will be celebrated by Cardinal Spellman at St. Patrick's on Friday at 10 a.m. Burial will be at the Gate of Heaven Cemetery, Hawthorne, N.Y.

West Village: A Test Tube in City Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the need for an imaginative timing and planning for city renewal and in particular city housing. Recently a group of citizens in the Greenwich Village area of Manhattan did something positive and constructive about it. Having first opposed a plan for massive bulldozing of their residential and small business community, they then came up with a sensible and less expensive plan of their own for the rehabilitation of the neighborhood. The group is known as the West Village Committee and its spark is Mrs. Jane B. Jacobs, author of an important book on urban planning entitled "The Death and Life of Great American Cities."

On Sunday, May 12, Jerome Zukosky of the New York Herald Tribune wrote a thoughtful and provocative story on the work of the West Village Committee. It is well written and highly readable. I am sure that my colleagues in the House who are interested in urban renewal and city planning will find Mr. Zukosky's article of great interest, possibly to their own communities.

The article follows:

WEST VILLAGE: A TEST TUBE IN CITY PLANNING

(By Jerome Zukosky)

The rundown manufacturing and warehouse district along the Hudson River piers of lower Manhattan may seem hardly more than another piece of land that in time will also go the way of most other obsolete areas on this everchanging island.

Change is certain. The land lies along the western fringe of Greenwich Village. Several blocks to the east, the rebuilt 19th century brick row houses and new luxury apartments mix with well maintained tenements, coffee and book shops, Italian grocerystores and cafes that help give the Village its peculiar charm and make it one of the finest high-rent residential neighborhoods of Manhattan.

The existence of the underdeveloped, relatively cheap land side by side with the burgeoning Village guarantees change. What will take the place of the parking lots and old buildings, however, has become the subject of one of the most fascinating battles over urban renewal and housing ever waged in New York City. And because of a peculiar circumstance, the land has been turned into a test tube in which are mixed elements of an increasingly bitter national debate over the techniques and theory of urban renewal and city planning.

The experiment: Can a neighborhood, using its own resources, plan its redevelopment and improvement alone without the usual financial and planning aids from city agencies and more satisfactorily than if such aid had been used?

A small group among the roughly 2,000 residents of the West Village, as the neighborhood is called, last week came up with a plan designed to prove a community can do just this.

In scope, the plan at first glance may seem insignificant. The West Village committee proposed a project of up to 475 five-story apartment buildings for the open land along the west side of Washington Street. Until recently the site has been roofed with a trestle carrying an abandoned railroad freight spur.

RAISED FUNDS TO FINANCE PLANNING

The community worked hard during the past 15 months to raise more than $3,500 to finance the planning, much of which was performed by the White Plains, N.Y., office of the respected Chicago architectural firm of Perkins & Will.

The advantages of the plan, it is claimed, are that it will displace no one, yield middle-income housing (at about $30 a room a month), require no public funds to buy land, and preserve the character and human scale of the surrounding neighborhood.

Although one might quibble with the prospective delights of living in a five-story walkup in such an area, the West Villagers are confident such housing is attractive enough to win tenants easily. They may be right.

The circumstances that transforms this modest experiment into something else again is the fact that in the heart of the West Village, in a modern townhouse rebuilt from a candy store, lives Mrs. Jane B. Jacobs, author and chief ideologue of the West Village Committee. Late in 1961, Mrs. Jacobs published "The Death and Life of Great American Cities," a powerful denunciation of public housing and urban renewal planning whose imagery is now commonplace among critics of urban planning.

INHUMAN IMAGE OF PROJECTS

Within the last few years, the theory and practice of urban renewal and planning have entered the domain of serious intellectual exercise. A large body of the new criticism, that of Lewis Mumford, for example, has found support for a critique that roundly condemns Government-aided redevelopment and the forces at work in contemporary urban society perceived by the critics as molding renewal efforts.

The image of projects as inhuman barracks, for example, owes much to the popular work of critics such as Mrs. Jacobs. Her book also made axiomatic the view that centralized planning by local and Federal officials must produce these massive and sterile ranks of huge buildings, segregating families by income and destroying existing communities.

Mrs. Jacobs' book also propounded a novel idea: if such planning were carried out and controlled by residents of small communities or neighborhoods within the city without outside interference, the result would be superior planning and gradual improvement of housing conditions without expensive subsidies or bureaucratic redtape.

This ideology has had a wide audience. The ideas have attracted reformers well to the left on the political spectrum as well as intransigent opponents of any centralized government intervention in American life on the far right. To opponents of Mrs. Jacobs' school of thought, the critique smacks too much of a simple desire to preserve the status quo in any given neighborhood for a variety of self-interests. To an alarming degree, they say, the critique has become part of a dangerously widespread distrust of the ability of government to work with citizens to improve living conditions. At bottom, they maintain, it is a more or less explicit attack on the viability of the democratic process.

AN AREA FOUND TO TEST IDEAS

Unlike most academic arguments, this one has entered the earthy and contentious world of real life. Shortly before her book came out, Mrs. Jacobs and her colleagues in the West Village found a perfect area in which to test their ideas. Sixteen blocks of the West Village, from Hudson Street on the east to the Hudson River on the West; West 11th Street on the north to Morton Street on the south, were designated by the city planning commission as blighted and suitable for urban renewal.

Mrs. Jacobs and others—attorneys, storekeepers, artists, writers of everything from advertising copy to novels, housewives—formed the Committee to Save the West Village. To save it, that is, from urban renewal.

The committee managed, throughout 1961, to stage a remarkable series of protests at city hall and within the community unlike any ever seen here during a community debate over renewal and housing.

The group charged that the city had actually planned a large-scale demolition of most properties in the area and had made agreements with private builders to permit huge apartment houses. Proposed renewal of the West Village, the committee argued, would duplicate all other renewal projects being built here at that time and in most other cities as well.

The city planning commission, then under the chairmanship of James Felt (who is still a member but no longer chairman), steadfastly denied any concrete plans had been formulated, nor would any be until a thorough study of the area was made and after consultation with the neighborhood leadership. The designation was to permit the city to apply for $350,000 of Federal funds to undertake the study.

The commission, at one key public hearing that began early on July 7, 1961, and lasted without pause until 4 the next morning, promised that any new housing would not cause demolition of sound existing buildings, would be built to fit into the character of the neighborhood, would provide a variety of rent levels and would in addition eliminate the unsafe patterns of streets choked with heavy trucking and eliminate most of the garages, filling stations, truck terminals and decrepit commercial buildings that now litter the neighborhood.. In addition, park areas now absent would be provided.

Such techniques are now being used in the design of new renewal projects here.

This new emphasis on community consultation, in fact, is one reason behind the lengthy delays that plague most new large-scale renewal projects.

Unfortunately, as the commission conceded, every renewal project then under construction had been planned under the aegis of Robert Moses, whose slum clearance commission had directed renewal in New York until early in 1960, when Mr. Felt succeeded, after 5 years of struggle, in reorganizing and reforming both the personnel and planning of renewal, Mr. Felt also set up the housing and redevelopment board as the new agency to carry out the plans.

In effect, both the new planners and the outraged villagers shared the same view of past renewal efforts. The only difference was that the citizens of the West Village simply did not believe anything different was possible.

"It had a certain unreal and almost dreamlike quality," said the official commission report of the hearing on the long night in midsummer, 1961. The report went to unusual lengths to attempt, as it put it, to get to "the heart of the issue and the nature and underlying basis of the opposition" in what has since become a classic study of community rebellion against renewal in the city.

FEARED BULLDOZING OF ENTIRE AREA

To the commission members, the issue was not simply "ignorance or misunderstanding" of the city's proposal to study the area. It noted that many of the 61 speakers against the proposal were apparently certain it would lead inevitably to bulldozing the entire area.

"But this was not the nature of the criticism expressed by the highly sophisticated and articulate opposition leadership," the report continued. "They knew what the commission was proposing. They had read all the proposals, all the statements. Indeed, they gave evidence of having analyzed them paragraph by paragraph, sentence by sentence, word by word. Their opposition was based on two premises which, whether explicity or implicity stated, provided the basic theme for most of their statements. * * *

"The first premise was that neither the city planning commission nor the housing and redevelopment board nor, by implication, any public officials, mean what they say, can be believed or can be trusted to do what they say they intend to do. * * *

"The second premise, less widely shared but still pervasive, was that any public intervention for renewal is per se harmful, that all public renewal and housing programs are by nature destructive and that only local residents, if left to their own efforts, without the interference of government, can bring about the renewal of the city. This might be considered the laissez-faire theory of urban renewal."

Whatever the motive for suspicion, the report said, it had been "fanned into the consuming fire of irrational opposition."

MAYOR ORDERED REPLANNING END

Ignoring the report, Mayor Wagner, then in the midst of a mayoralty campaign, ordered the commission to drop any replanning of the West Village. Early last year, the commission dropped the designation of blight also, although to the last it maintained that the charm, diversity and mixture of shops and apartments in one part of Greenwich Village was not the same as the mix of garages, warehouses, tenements and other land uses in the western fringe.

In effect, one neighborhood seceded from citywide efforts to replan Manhattan. Since then another, and somewhat similar, neighborhood, called the Cobble Hill section of Brooklyn Heights, also forced the abandonment of proposals to redevelop the area.

But the West Villagers have gone one unique step further. "The West Village Plan for Housing," a detailed brochure issued last week, fulfilled their promise that the neighborhood would direct its own improvement. With luck the experiment may bear fruit.

The West Village committee is seeking a sponsor to invest $870,000, which its brochure indicated would be needed to finance the venture. They have submitted the plan to the joint pension fund of the International Longshoremen's Association and the New York Shipping Association and last week Thomas Gleason, counsel to the fund, which he said contains over $30 million, said the plans are receiving careful scrutiny by the bank that administers the fund.

The West Village plan figures that the land it requires should be available at $12 a square foot or less and even with generous allowances for rising construction costs, apartments could rent for about $30 a room. The only public aid required for financing would be low-interest mortgage loans for 90 percent of the total $8.7 million cost that would be provided by the New York State Division of Housing and Community Renewal.

PLANNERS' APPROVAL IS REQUIRED

City Planning Commission approval would be required of two moves. One is rezoning the land from manufacturing, which it is now, to residential. The second would be approval of the site for low-interest mortgage loan financing. Both approvals are expected to be forthcoming easily if no substantial technical or legal problem is raised.

The plan presents an impressive challenge. The West Villagers also hope to use the proposed apartments for longshoremen and other working families and thus retain the population mix of an area rapidly changing into an upper income and middle-income neighborhood. The old Irish who make up the bulk of the tenement dwellers in the area have been moving away. St. Veronica's elementary school will close next month. Only 165 pupils remain; two decades ago more than 1,000 children attended. Whether longshoremen, who bring home about $120 a week, will find the walkups at $30 a room a month attractive is another question. Some critics, notably James J. Kirk, business agent for Local 947 of the International Longshoremen's Association, a Villager for 62 of his 66 years and a leader among civic groups there, are skeptical; he figures the proposed housing will fill with the "arty" people and small property owners that provide the support of the West Village Committee, the newcomers to the Village along the docks.

Is It Time To Abandon Nuclear Weapons Secrecy and Security?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, two events in the past few weeks seem to bring into focus the question of whether or not this Nation should abandon policies of secrecy and security respecting its nuclear weaponry. One was the announcement of publication in the near future of a book by Ralph de Toledano entitled "The Greatest Plot in History." The book narrates the chilling story of Soviet espionage which transmitted America's nuclear secrets to the Kremlin during the late 1940's. The other was the recent announcement of Dr. Robert Oppenheimer as this year's recipient of the prestige laden as well as lucrative Fermi Award. Should the award be followed up by restoration of Dr. Oppenheimer's security clearance as has been hinted, would not this amount effectively to abandonment of nuclear weapons secrecy and security? Those who are now taking very seriously their obligation to protect the Nation's nuclear secrets might surely have cause to wonder why they do so. That is why I feel the policies of secrecy and security of nuclear weapons are coming up for reexamination. Unfortunately that reexamination is not a direct one, but comes in rather an oblique way. Directly or obliquely, my feeling is that these secrets should continue to be safeguarded.

The following item appearing in the Indianapolis News on May 10, written by its editor, Stan Evans, contributes some understanding to the issue:

[From the Indianapolis News, May 10, 1963]

HOW MOSCOW STOLE THE A-BOMB

(By Stan Evans)

The recent dispute over Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer has revived the long-dormant issue of internal security in the U.S. atomic energy project.

Too few Americans know the full story of Soviet espionage and policy subversion in our nuclear establishment, or the appalling laxness of U.S. officialdom in protecting our most vital secrets. Part of the reason is that the story has never been told in one place in all its detail.

Fuchs, the Rosenbergs, May, Pontecorvo; these and other names in the galaxy of nuclear plunder have appeared only in what seem to be isolated episodes. They are viewed as random cases, individual spies who were caught or exposed and whose history is over and done with.

Yet these people were in truth small segments of a vast apparatus which, far from disappearing into the past, still exists and still threatens American security.

How the various elements meshed together has now been put down on paper in one place where it is accessible to the public. The job has been adroitly undertaken by the News columnist, Ralph de Toledano, in a forthcoming book entitled "The Greatest Plot in History (Duell, Sloan & Pearce). In it, Toledano traces the various threads of the Soviet espionage network from the 1930's to the present. It is a dismaying chronicle of Communist deceit and non-Communist vapidity.

Moscow's theft of the most awesome weapon of the ages is not merely absorbing history; the saga contains important lessons for the here and now, as the attitudes which allowed this unparalleled larceny to happen are being revived all over again. The $50,000 award to Oppenheimer, in particular, has been the occasion for a flood of the old rhetoric which haunted U.S. security officers in the 1940's.

We are now being told that we ought to be nice to Oppenheimer and repent our security mania of 1954 because, after all, "there is no secret" where things like atomic energy and space technology are concerned. So why be beastly to Oppenheimer just because he was a little careless in choosing his friends? This was, of course, the line adopted by many atomic scientists in the early days as an argument against having tight security regulations in the first place.

With a few honorable exceptions, the idea of keeping Communists out of our high-priority governmental affairs was sneered at by those then entrusted with the national destinies. Toledano quotes Col. John Lansdale, Jr., security officer in the atomic energy program, concerning the atmosphere in which antisecrecy enthusiasms took root and flowered:

"In the War Department I was being subjected to pressure from military superiors, from the White House and every other place, because I dared to stop the commissioning of a group of 15 or 20 undoubted Communists. * * * I stood up in front of General McNarney then Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, and had him tell me that I was ruining people's careers and doing damage to the Army because I stopped the commissioning of the political commissar of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, and he guy was later commissioned on direct orders from the White House."

With such addled notions dancing in official heads, and with the Communists working overtime to steal anything portable, it is not surprising the Soviet apparatus harvested the best fruits of our atomic project; there was in fact "no secret" for the simple reason that Moscow rapidly learned everything know to our own technicians.

The antisecrecy argument was premised on the fact that the principle of atomic fission was widely understood. But as Toledano points out, the purpose of the U.S. nuclear project was to translate principles into performance. The secret of the bomb was a matter of engineering technique. It was a real secret and a crucial one. It was stolen by the Communists in large part because security was disparaged, ridiculed, and crippled by a passel of arrogant scientists—who, incidentally, did a very good job of keeping the same secret away from the Nazis.

Those are a few facts to keep in mind as the pro-Oppenheimer agitation floats anew the old arguments of the 1940's. As an antidote to much foolish propaganda, Toledano's excellent survey of these facts is highly recommended.

Repeal Wartime Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois, Representative DERWINSKI, one of the oustanding Members of Congress, appeared recently before my Committee on Ways and Means in support of the repeal of wartime excise taxes. He believes, and I agree wholeheartedly, that the time has come to abolish these taxes for which there is no longer any justification.

I submit for the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Blue Island Sun Standard of Illinois, following Mr. DERWINSKI's presentation:

> WORLD WAR II IS OVER
>
> Congressman EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Fourth District, Illinois, who maintains his district office in the Blue Island Post Office Building, appeared before the Ways and Means Committee in Washington last week, and asked their support in helping to repeal the wartime excise taxes which are still in force in these United States.
>
> These were imposed as World War II emergency measures, but are still on the books, all these years later. Our Congressman's attempt, at this time, is not his first to try to abolish these taxes, and he thinks, as do many others, that such taxes still being collected by the Federal Government are a decided deterrent to the country's economy.
>
> The biggest winner of all, if his effort is successful, will be the consumer. Practically everyone in the country periodically and frequently buys products carrying these excise taxes. But DERWINSKI's job ahead is not an easy one, due to several factors. One is the muddled tax situation in general. Another is the apparent indifference in some influential circles to the problem.
>
> The Secretary of the Treasury, commenting on the matter, has said that once the major tax bill is out of the way, "I certainly think there should be a general look at excises to see if there is not a better way to rearrange them or if some of them should be modified, changed, eliminated, or have something done to them." This, as a spokesman for the American Retail Federation observes, is "hardly a comfort." It is vague, and it shoves the problem into an indefinite future.
>
> Expressions of consumer feelings, which certainly must be on the side of repeal of the wartime excise taxes, would be extremely helpful—there are a lot more consumers than there are makers and sellers of the goods involved. And a strong case can be made that repeal of emergency taxes, now that the particular emergency has long passed, should be part and parcel of the tax reform program.

The Debt Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, although I think that we should retain the requirement of a ceiling on the national debt, I am not convinced tht we can consider the debt ceiling as such either as a valid indicator of the fiscal condition of the U.S. Government or as a major tool of fiscal policy. True, requiring a debt limit can be useful if it focuses the public mind on the general problems of fiscal policy.

We must remember, however, that the debt ceiling is only a minor part of the whole complex fiscal picture. By focusing only on it and by making it the whole picture, we may well be led to promote inflexible policies which could cost us very dearly.

Today's rapidly changing world dictates flexibility in fiscal matters and not tight inflexibility. Managing the Government's fiscal problems is a day-to-day operation characterized by fluidity. In this context setting rigid limits on the debt can force the administration to deal in fiscal subterfuge. This was most graphically demonstrated during the Eisenhower years when the administration made such a major issue out of reducing the debt that to increase the debt ceiling naturally was embarrassing even when they needed the money. To get that money the administration at times resorted to devices that circumvented the usual appropriation process and the debt ceiling. That these devices of subterfuge which the Eisenhower administration was forced to use were costly is clearly illustrated by the figures found on page 11 of the Legislative Analysis of H.R. 6009 by the American Enterprise Institute in a paragraph which I now quote to you.

The AEI notes that—

> On several recent occasions these devices were specifically used to circumvent the debt ceiling. In 1954, for instance, the Commodity Credit Corporation went into the money market and borrowed slightly over $1 billion in short-term notes and turned this money over to the Treasury. Because it was the CCC, and not the Treasury doing the borrowing, interest rates were higher. According to one estimate, the additional cost of this operation was about $10 million. In 1957 and 1958, during the debt ceiling difficulties of that period, the Federal National Mortgage Association was utilized as a go-between to provide cash for the Treasury. Fannie Mae borrowed by issuing its own notes and the cost of this operation was said to have amounted to approximately $24 million more than would have been paid if the Treasury had done the borrowing itself. The Federal Government used its secondary lines of credit and—as a result—paid a higher cost for this credit. From time to time, the Treasury has also turned some of its gold into new money to meet debt ceiling fiscal problems. This occurred in 1953 and again in early 1958, and can be said to have had undesirable effects upon our gold stock.

This should not be construed as an argument for unlimited spending and a ceilingless debt. It is simply a case for allowing the administration the necessary flexibility to manage the debt efficiently and properly in order to get the money it needs to keep going. Certainly no one is more concerned about the problems generated by the debt than I am. The service charges on the debt which are, after all, the real burden here now constitute the second highest item in the budget surpassed only by expenditures for national defense. This means that money which could be spent in the private economy or on useful and needed public projects is being drained off into servicing the debt. Moreover, the interest on the Federal debt represents a drastic shift in wealth from the lower income groups to the higher income sectors of the economy.

Certainly then, the burden of the debt is of great concern to me. However, I believe that the proper way for Congress to deal with the problems of debt and fiscal policy is through the appropriation process not by clamping costly rigidity on the national debt. To appropriate money for the administration and then to force the administration into expensive subterfuge through debt ceilings is downright irresponsible and Congress should not do it.

A Thought About Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. ABELE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. ABELE. Mr. Speaker, the serious problems confronting our young people in obtaining employment merit more serious consideration by public officials, civic leaders, and educational authorities.

A constructive and realistic approach to this problem is contained in an editorial in the Gallipolis Daily Tribune, April 18, 1963. The editor does not succumb to the temptation of placing all the blame for this problem on the parents and schools, but correctly points out that along with the parents, schools and industry, our youth have a responsibility to utilize their energy and resourcefulness to leave no stone unturned in their efforts to prepare themselves for useful employment.

The editorial follows:

A THOUGHT ABOUT YOUTH

There is a growing hue and cry throughout the country concerning the terrific increase in the number of youth in our country that are unemployed. It should also be the concern of the residents of Gallia County. We predict that it will get much worse before it gets better because it is going to take special attention and the retooling of much of our educational program to bring about the change. In an area like our own the school systems are hard pressed to even keep up with the minimum standards of education as set by the State. In a country not too far away they are about to close down some substandard high schools that cannot meet those standards. How can we expect a fringe area to do much more than the minimum, and in some instances they cannot even mount the minimum.

There is the charge that American education is turning millions of young people into unemployables because the jobs that they are being trained for, jobs that are in a diminishing, and in some instances, vanishing supply. There are some that say it is even a national scandal. In some respects we feel that the statements are a little out of line when they say that 80 percent of the youth are being ignored, and the reference is to that group who do not go to college. We find that there are even many people coming out of college who are not prepared for the situation that faces them. Many students are getting their degree and then find that they have to go on to graduate school to prepare for something specific. That is a story that is as old as the hills. Its only solution is in the constant guidance of youth into fields of interest that they are fitted for and will take into account the constant changes that are taking place in the job opportunities in the future.

There are some Government planners that say that there is no unemployment problem which could not be cured by a rise in the economic growth of our country. There is some truth in that statement but such growth is not always spread evenly and what might help persons in one part of the country would not filter through to those where it is most needed. Recently we were staggered by a report coming out of a neighboring State where over $100,000 was spent by the Government to train painters and welders for jobs in a plant with a big Government contract. Maybe we are all wrong but there has always been an opportunity to learn such trades in specialized schools and in the normal labor channels. The total blame should not be placed on the schools. A young person who wants to be assured of a job could no doubt approach many craftsmen and certain concerns right here in Gallia County and gain part-time experience that would be good insurance against unemployment. Often too is the overlooked fact that the basic things learned in school, while seemingly impractical are essential tools. The ability to read a set of instructions and understand them.

Challenges of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Senator from Indiana, the Honorable BIRCH BAYH, addressed the annual convention of the California Federation of Young Democrats in San Francisco. His remarks indicate a clear insight to the challenges of the future, and are so noteworthy I recommend them to my colleagues:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR BIRCH BAYH, OF INDIANA, AT ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE CALIFORNIA FEDERATION OF YOUNG DEMOCRATS, SAN FRANCISCO, MAY 4, 1963

I am happy to have been invited to join you tonight at this annual convention of the California Young Democrats. I am proud to be a young Democrat and prouder still of the work our organization is doing in support of the programs of the Democratic Party and of the administration of John F. Kennedy. The work of the Young Democrats in the State of Indiana during the past year contributed greatly to the success we had at the polls last fall and in my election to the U.S. Senate. We can be proud and we can be thankful that the Democratic Party has always looked to the young people in our party and asked them to join in the programs of progress for the country. I believe the reason our party has become the oldest political party in the world is the fact that it has had the courage and the wisdom to look to its younger members for new ideas, new ways of solving the problems of each day.

In his inaugural address in 1961, President Kennedy accepted for our generation the torch of freedom and pledged that we would carry it proudly, successfully in the challenging days that lie ahead. In the days which have followed that ceremony he has certainly carried the torch high and led our country and the free world well. He needs our support, he needs the support of all the people in this Nation in order to bring the progress that is needed to keep America strong and free and to develop a world in which freedom can flourish.

As a nation we are moving into a period of unprecedented challenge and one of unprecedented opportunity. We, as younger people, must share the challenge just as we will benefit from the opportunities which will be provided.

The challenge is simple to define. We are faced simply with the problem of providing the benefits of our prosperous society and our way of life for the ever-increasing numbers of citizens in America. We must do this in a time when science and technology is rapidly displacing the need for human skills and human energy. Those most severely affected by this problem are the young people and we as young people must do our part in providing the answers and solutions which will be necessary.

Before the end of this decade we will become a country of more than 200 million inhabitants, and by the end of the century we will be a country of nearly 300 million inhabitants. We must provide the homes, schools, and most importantly the jobs to keep pace with this dynamic growth in population. The statistics of growth are staggering. During the next 8 years 26 million new young workers will come into the labor market. At the same time, machines are replacing people at a fantastic rate. To provide employment for both new and displaced workers and to solve the unemployment problems by 1970, we must create 250,000 new jobs each month during this period.

The need for unskilled labor has reached a minimum level and we cannot expect any rise in this demand in the future. Additional skills and training will be needed by anyone who seeks employment. Yet during the decade ahead, we can expect that 3 out of every 10 school children will not finish high school. Only 2 out of 10 now in grade school will finish college. Employment projections on the other hand indicate that the best job opportunities will occur in professional and technical areas that require post-high-school training.

In education we must seek to improve the quality of instruction—cope with the tremendous problem of additional numbers of children coming into the schools in the future. We must increase the opportunities and incentives for all Americans to develop talents, complete their education, and continue self-development through life.

The quality of education is determined primarily by the quality of the teacher. We are fortunate in having thousands of well-trained and dedicated teachers in this country today. Yet one out of every five teachers in the United States has either not been certified by the State as qualified to teach or has failed to complete 4 years of college study. In the field of English, between 40 and 60 percent of the secondary schoolteachers lack the minimum requirement of a college major in that subject. Thus it is not surprising that, largely because of unsatisfactory elementary and secondary school instruction, our colleges and universities are now required to devote a great amount of their resources on remedial English courses.

Good teachers, moreover, need good schools in which to teach. Last year over 1,500,000 children were in overcrowded classrooms and an estimated 2 million others were studying amid grossly substandard health and safety conditions.

In many areas the education of the economically disadvantaged, the culturally deprived, the physically or mentally handicapped and the gifted required specially designed programs which simply are not available at all.

The value of a proper education cannot be overstated. President Kennedy summarized distinctly the value of education in his message to Congress on education earlier this year. Education, he said, is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress. Nothing has contributed more to the enlargement of this Nation's strength and opportunities than our traditional system of free, universal elementary and secondary education coupled with the widespread availability of college education.

In order to maintain the arch of freedom, we must be prepared today to move forward to more aggressive programs of education. The President has presented a comprehensive national education program.

This is not a Federal thought control program. It is rather a program designed to enable the U.S. Government to assist State and local school units to meet the serious problem which is of great national interest. State and local school units will still control their own programs. However, more overall resources will be utilized in the vital area of education.

During my tenure in the State legislature, I did everything I could to increase the emphasis on education in the State of Indiana. Yet we were almost universally opposed by those Republicans who would pinch pennies and sacrifice a first-class educational system. If State governments and local communities will not meet the needs of educating their young, then we must move forward and move forward rapidly to provide the type of comprehensive educational program presented by the President.

In addition to this increased emphasis on our educational system, we must provide opportunity for those people now in the labor market who have not had the advantages of proper vocational training and we must also provide for those people who will not secure adequate training from high school either because of poor counseling or dropping from school prior to graduation. To do this the President has presented a program for youth opportunities. We in the Senate have passed the Youth Employment Opportunities bill which will provide more job training opportunities for young people. This program is designed for those young people who are in need of help * * * the unemployed * * * the unskilled * * * the unwanted. It is intended to boost the economy, reduce unemployment, reduce juvenile delinquency and train more young people who would otherwise be idle.

The Youth Conservation Corps will employ 15,000 young men in forest recreation areas. Federal funds will be provided for half the wages and related costs for young people employed on local projects offering useful working experience in nonprofit community services. This program is modest and it is essential. It is a cooperative, local-Federal approach. I am hopeful that the House of Representatives will act and act favorably on this program during the next few weeks.

In addition to those programs to train and retrain the youth of America, let us not overlook the program which has been initiated by the administration to rehabilitate those older workers who are presently unemployed because they do not possess the skills needed by space age industry. The manpower training program, although still in its infancy, is designed to take idle workers out of the unemployment line and return them to the production line. This is another effort presently being made under President Kennedy's leadership to provide a work force which is sufficiently skilled and trained to meet the challenge of the future.

We as Democrats, to be worthy of our tradition as a party of the people, must remain dedicated to these and other important programs which are essential not only to the strength of our great Nation but also to the future of each individual American.

Japan Furnishes Cuba With Five Fishing Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, Communist Cuba has acquired from Japan five modern, long-range fishing trawler-type ships equipped with all technical equipment according to a news report.

Eighty Japanese technicians are reportedly in Cuba to teach the Cubans in the use of these boats. Ostensibly these vessels are to be used to develop a Cuban tuna industry.

In addition to the significance of the creation of a Cuban tuna fleet on the tuna industry generally, which requires cooperation among all interested parties as a means of preserving and developing tuna resources—something we can hardly expect from Castro—there are serious implications to the Cuban Government acquiring modern, electronically equipped trawlers which can be used for many illicit purposes such as to perform espionage missions and related activities for the Communists. It is possible that this is the type of trawlers which were observed off Cape Canaveral attempting to gather information on our space launching today.

What action did the State Department take to attempt to prevent the furnishing of these vessels to Castro? What other examples along these lines are taking place even though we supposedly are making an effort to prevent the flow of goods of this nature to Cuba? The news report is based on a Havana radio broadcast. Does this mean that if our authorities had this information, it simply wasn't released?

The action by Japan in sending these ships to Cuba certainly runs counter to the interests and welfare of the United States. It calls for an intensification of our efforts to stem the flow of goods which will be used to build up Castro's ability to entrench his Communist government further and to arm Cuba for aggression and subversion in Latin America.

Under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a news story on the shipment of Japanese vessels to Cuba by Mr. Charles Keeley of the Copley News Service:

WASHINGTON.—Japan has sent ships and technicians to Cuba to establish a tuna industry.

The State Department says it assumes the Cuban-Japanese agreement is probably to provide partial payment by the Japanese for Cuban sugar.

Japan is the free world's largest importer of Cuban sugar. It bought $26,575,859 worth in 1961, according to Department of Commerce, and $15 million during the first 6 months of 1962.

The agreement calls for 80 Japanese technicians and 5 modern, long-range ships, each with a 200-ton capacity, according to an official announcement by Havana radio.

Cuba has never had a tuna industry. Bonito, lobster, and shrimp are canned and exported, but tuna was imported from the United States.

The Japanese action appears contrary to U.S. efforts with its Western Allies to seal off Cuba economically. But the Commerce Department says Japan, in accordance with U.S. requests, is attempting to find other sources for its sugar needs.

The Japanese technicians will remain in Cuba for 1 year, according to the official Cuban announcement. Already, it adds, they have helped double Cuban fishing quotas. The 5 Japanese ships, each manned by 15 Japanese and 18 Cubans, brought in 1.5 million pounds of tuna and other fish during their first 30-day trip to sea, Cuban officials announced.

When the Japanese leave, they say, "Cuban youths * * * graduates of the fishing school Victoria de Giron * * * will take charge of the ships."

The announcement said the Japanese ships are equipped with the latest electronic gear and 50-mile trotlines. The tuna is packed in 9-ounce cans, while other fish will be sold, unprocessed, to the public, the Cubans said.

In 1962, Japan imported 431,482 metric tons of Cuban sugar, according to Commerce Department figures.

Cairo Maintains Buildup in Yemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the amendment I recently proposed to sever American assistance to the nations like the United Arab Republic, which expend their own resources for the purchase of Soviet military equipment or engage in the proliferation of missile weapons systems, jeopardizing world peace, I wish to direct attention of the Congress to additional evidence of President Gamal Abdel Nasser's duplicity. I refer to an authoritative new report published in the New York Times and have requested permission for its insertion in the RECORD.

The Times report shows how Nasser reneged on an agreement worked out by the United States for a withdrawal of Egyptian troops from Yemen and actually only rotating Egyptian units, thus betraying the United Nations which is seeking to bring about disengagement of the contending forces and deceiving the United States. This illustrates how appeasement of Nasser only encourages his attempts to subvert, infiltrate, and overthrow by aggression his neighboring states in his drive for power and domination.

This provides further evidence of the need to end subsidizing of this dictator who is no more trustworthy than Duvalier of Haiti or Castro of Cuba.

The New York Times article of May 15, 1963, follows:

CAIRO MAINTAINS BUILDUP IN YEMEN

(By Max Frankel)

WASHINGTON, May 14.—United Arab Republic troops have been moved into as well as out of Yemen in the last 2 weeks despite Cairo's promise to reduce its involvement in Yemen's civil war.

Reports from the Middle East indicate that there has been a recent rotation of about 2,000 Egyptian soldiers in Yemen. Hardly any reduction of the total United Arab Republic force of 28,000 men has been effected. The Egyptians have been the main prop of the antimonarchist regime of President Abdullah al-Salal, who is under attack from royalist tribesmen.

Administration officials had no comment on the reports, although there were indications that they had similar information. They intend to continue to press President Gamal Abdel Nasser for compliance with the agreement worked out by the United States and turned over to the United Nations, but say that they have little power to alter the Yemen situation.

The disengagement accord was represented as a compromise to prevent a war over Yemen between the United Arab Republic and its principal Arab antagonist, Saudi Arabia. Officials have acknowledged that the agreement was merely a diplomatic ratification of a Saudi defeat in the dispute.

The agreement was worked out by Ellsworth Bunker, a retired U.S. diplomat, after 6 months of fighting in Yemen threatened to spread beyond the frontiers of the primitive nation on the Red Sea.

Under the terms of the agreement, United Nations observers would be stationed along the border between Yemen and Saidi Arabia to prevent Saudi assistance to the more than 20,000 royalists tribesmen. In return, President Nasser pledged to begin a phased withdrawal of his forces in the next 6 months, but there was no time limit for the evacuation of all Egyptian troops. The agreement also sanctioned an Egyptian military "training mission" in Yemen, without defining its size.

The United States recognized the Yemeni regime of President al-Salal soon after it deposed the Imam, Prince Mohamad Saif-al Islam al-Badr, last September. It is generally acknowledged, however, that ident al-Salal could not control the country without the assistance of about one-third of President Nasser's regular army.

Washington's quick recognition of the pro-Nasser regime last fall and its sponsorship of the disengagement accord have been elements of the debate here about the administration's general policy in the Middle East. The United States has made plain its support of the integrity of Israel and its desire to halt the arms race between the United Arab Republic and Israel.

A dozen liberal Senators, including some without sizable Jewish constituencies, called on the administration 2 weeks ago to reduce economic aid to Cairo. Some officials in the executive branch also have advocated a tougher stance toward President Nasser, warning that acquiescence in his recent policies would only encourage assault upon the remaining monarchies in the Middle East.

CAIRO TIES DEFENDED

The administration, on the other hand, has contended that its diplomatic and economic ties to Cairo must be maintained if it is to exert any moderating influence.

The report on Egyptian troop movements suggest that elements of four battalions had been withdrawn from Yemen since May 1. At full strength, these would comprise about 3,000 men. The belief is that more than 2,000 men were evacuated.

At the same time, however, infantry and airborne troops have been sent into Yemen. An Egyptian passenger ship is said to have landed 1,500 men at the Yemeni port of Hodeida May 5. The troops, plus about 35 military vehicles and crates of ammunition were unloaded at night and moved out of the port.

The Egyptian forces are reported to have improved their effectiveness in the Yemen war since the end of the rainy season in mid-March. They have virtually taken over the campaign against the tribesmen while President al-Salal's regular force has been allowed to dwindle to about 3,500 men.

Hon. Jed J. Johnson

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad heart that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of one of the finest and most capable members I have ever known, the Honorable Jed J. Johnson, of Oklahoma. I considered Jed one of my best friends, and was indeed shocked when I first learned of his passing on May 8, 1963, by telephone from the Honorable Webster J. Oliver, Chief Judge of the U.S. Customs Court.

Jed Johnson was my first chairman of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations. When I was elected to the House Committee on Appropriations in January 1945, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], then, as now, chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, assigned me to the Interior subcommittee of which Jed was chairman. I learned quite a bit about appropriations procedure from him. He was a highly respected gentleman who represented the people of his beloved State of Oklahoma with dignity and honor; first as a State senator in Oklahoma and then for 20 years as a member of this House from the Sixth District of Oklahoma. His public service did not stop there, however, for he was appointed by President Harry S. Truman judge of the U.S. Customs Court where he diligently labored until his passing.

His good deeds and his many fine qualities will long be remembered by all who were privileged to have known Jed Johnson. His beloved wife, his son, and his daughters have my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

Who Put Nasser in Business Anyway?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the May 3, 1963, Bulletin of the East Midwood Jewish Center, which is located in my congressional district.

The author, my good friend Dr. Harry Halpern, has received a form letter from the national chairman of the Republican Party stating that Colonel Nasser—the would-be dictator of the Middle East—is buying Russian military equipment with aid from the United States. Rabbi Halpern's comments on this letter place the matter in its proper perspective.

The letter follows:

FROM WHERE I STAND

The national chairman of the Republican Party has sent me a letter. This does not confer any particular distinction upon me because the letter was a printed one and I am quite sure that it was sent to many if not all of my colleagues. It deals with a subject which the writer feels should concern me, and he is correct in his assumption.

The matter involved is the foreign aid policy of the United States. The chairman calls attention to the fact that our country is extending help to Colonel Nasser which he uses to purchase arms from Russia. This is something which the writer of the letter feels, should be ended. I agree completely, but, in all fairness, I must point out certain facts, which are particularly timely in view of our present celebration of the establishment of Israel.

Mr. Nasser is today a power in the Arab world and a potential source of trouble for us and for the Western World. But who put him in a position of leadership? Who enabled this scheming, ruthless politician to become a world figure? Has the Republican national chairman forgotten that when this same Nasser defied the world, and when he was within an inch of being overthrown by the combined forces of Britain, France, and Israel, it was the titular head of the Republican Party, the then President of the United States, who called a halt to the Sinai campaign? Is our memory so short that we cannot recall how we helped to rehabilitate a broken-down nonentity and made him into a hero?

I hear the unspoken query. Did I want to embroil our country into a war with Russia because of Israel? The answer is an emphatic negative. But it would never have come to that. Certainly the English and French did not want a war with Russia and yet they went on with their campaign against Egypt. The truth of the matter is that we played the Arabs' game, regardless of the effect on Israel. For the Republican national chairman to be concerned now over Nasser's treachery is a little bit late.

It may be cynical for me to suggest that the letter sent to me and other rabbis was intended to show a concern for Israel. Let others speculate why it is important for me to be aware of this concern. But let me ask whether the real motive is to protect the Jewish State or to attack the foreign aid policy of a democratic government.

Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, hearings will begin tomorrow before the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs on the bills introduced by various Members of Congress in an attempt to decide what shall be done about Puerto Rico.

I have obtained a translation of an editorial which appeared in the newspaper El Mundo on Thursday, May 2, 1963.

I feel certain that this editorial will be of interest to all persons:

UNTIL WHEN?

Puerto Rico now knows all about the resolution introduced in Congress which is supposed to pave the way "toward a quick, democratic decision on the political status" of the island.

These words have a hollow sound. The fact is that the resolution indefinitely postpones the final solution of our status.

Governor Muñoz-Marin worked himself into a deadend by promoting a partial plebiscite supposed to reaffirm and strengthen the present Commonwealth status and he hopes to escape by way of the resolution. As a result of all this, it is Puerto Rico that finds itself wandering in a maze.

The proposed procedure would establish the following:

1. Congress would consecrate Puerto Rico's right to negotiate, under ostensibly sovereign powers, the permanent union of both peoples on the basis of a "culminated" Commonwealth.

2. Congress would appoint a commission to undertake a complete survey in depth of the potentialities of the so-called Commonwealth.

3. The people of Puerto Rico would be allowed to vote for statehood and independence, as well as for the culminated Commonwealth.

This congressional Commission would draft a proposed pact that would cement the permanent union between the Government of the United States and the people of Puerto Rico.

The "sovereignty of the people of Puerto Rico" would be recognized and ratified on the basis of such a permanent union.

Not to mince words, this is just an attempt to camouflage the Commonwealth so that it may share equal billing with both statehood and independence.

Plainly speaking, this is just an endeavor to create a formula of permanent union which would be consecrated at the same time that the so-called sovereign powers of Puerto Rico are recognized.

The only real and lasting union would be as a State and this so-called permanent union would pretend to be its equal.

The proposition is for Congress to invent a way of achieving permanent union other than Statehood. This would seem to be some sort of permanent union under which Puerto Rico would assume and exercise so-called sovereign powers.

All this is just another effort to find a way out of the maze. There is no doubt that this novel formula was still-born. Congress would never vote for such a substitute for statehood, for it would make a mockery of the very essence of the Constitution. A permanent and sovereign union can exist only as a part of the Nation, one and indivisible. To enjoy such permanent and sovereign relations, Puerto Rico would have to become a State of the Union.

Summing up, we can only say that we are still wandering along the tragic trail of our pathetic uncertainty.

We repeat what we said in our editorial printed on August 4, 1962: "We face the painful truth that a real, legitimate plebiscite is about to be frustrated."

We would like to have been wrong then. We would like to be correcting ourselves now.

Unfortunately, the facts as they have come to be known, confirm our reasoning.

What remains of the idea of a plebiscite as put forth by Governor Muñoz-Marin last year? What is left of his announcement, so warmly applauded by us, that made it possible for us to nourish our hopes? Nothing, absolutely nothing remains but disappointment and anxiety.

Thus we again find ourselves staggering along the tragic trail of our irresoluteness. Thus we blindly stagger, on and on, for we do not seem to want to follow straight through to our true destiny.

Puerto Ricans, until when?

U.N. Special Session—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the U.N. General Assembly session now being held in New York will decide fateful questions about the power of the U.N. to keep the peace. Russia hopes to get a pocketbook veto over General Assembly action. The Soviets want to see the General Assembly financially on the ropes and unable to send a U.N. force to trouble spots of the world.

Earl W. Foell, United Nations correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, has written an excellent summary of the background of this Soviet power play. It appeared in the May 3, 1963, issue of the Monitor, as follows:

PEACE ROLL: COST TO THE U.N.

(By Earl W. Foell)

As the United Nations hauls down its flag in West Irian and prepares to raise it over the mountains of Yemen, the problem of financing U.N. peacekeeping operations is thrown into sharp relief here.

In West Irian (formerly West New Guinea), which has just been turned over to Indonesia, the two parties to the dispute—the Netherlands and Indonesia—paid the umpire's bills.

In Yemen, Secretary General U Thant has indicated that the U.N. will pay its own.

SOVIETS SAY "NO"

These are expected to be small. Current estimates place the cost of a helicopter and jeep patrol for 40 or 50 U.N. observers at perhaps half a million dollars. The Yemeni task of disengaging United Arab Republic and Saudi Arabian opponents is, like the West Irian job, expected to take only a matter of months.

But the Soviet bloc is on record as opposing U.N. assessments for the cost of operations undertaken at the behest of the General Assembly rather than the Security Council.

This Communist objection applies not only to large operations like the Congo, but to any such operation of whatever size. Last fall the Soviet bloc supplied the negative votes in a 93-to-11 passage of the measure under which U Thant now proposes to finance the Yemen observation force. That resolution allows the Secretary General to finance operations of up to $2 million in cost at will.

The Yemen solution achieved by the Under Secretary Ralph J. Bunche and special U.S. negotiator Ellsworth Bunker (author of the West Irian settlement) is considered a popular one here. The Arab nations concerned favor it. Asian and African sentiment appears enthusiastic.

STUMBLING BLOCK

So far the Soviets have not objected to it specifically. But there is a strong feeling here that once again, as in the cases of the United Nations Emergency Force in Gaza and the U.N. force in the Congo, Moscow and its allies will not pay when they are assessed for even the relatively minor Yemen bill.

Moscow has termed this a matter of principle. It is the stumbling block on which a special session of the U.N. General Assembly is about to convene May 14. At that time the United States, which pays the heaviest U.N. regular assessment, will once again seek to have all members of the Assembly pay for actions authorized by Assembly majority votes.

The Soviets have shown no inclination to yield on their stand that only Security Council peace-keeping operations are subject to assessment.

The West Irian operation, in which the U.N. served as a kind of caretaker government while the Dutch got out and the Indonesians prepared to take over, avoided this financing problem because the two disputants paid the small U.N. cost.

Homeownership Would Thwart Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on May 9, the Washington Daily News carried an article by Rice Odell describing the efforts of Alan Carnoy to encourage private homeownership in Latin America. This is an interesting example of the role of private enterprise in economic development and under unanimous consent I am inserting it in the Congressional Record.

HOMEOWNERSHIP WOULD THWART REDS

(By Rice Odell)

Most men would be bitterly discouraged by 6 fruitless years of trying to sell an idea.

But not Alan Carnoy, a fiery, indestructible little man who has spent that long in unwavering dedication to a plan for upending communism in Latin America by stimulating home ownership thru private enterprise.

He has been relentlessly prodding Congressmen, foreign aid officials, and Government men in Latin America. Last year he also published a book, "Democracia Si." to explain himself. And yesterday he passed through Washington again on one of his frequent trips from his Mexico City home.

Mr. Carnoy, who escaped with his family from his native Poland in 1939, came to the United States and began working as an advertising man for a soap company. It was a short step to homebuilding, and in the years 1946–56, Mr. Carnoy was one of the major home developers in Westchester County, N.Y.—and a very successful one. Why, then, the move to Latin America and the long campaign for individual homeownership there?

AGREES

He would not deny the profit possibilities, but he has agreed to a limitation of 10 percent with "open books." And he adds earnestly: "I've made enough money to allow myself this luxury of being useful."

Mr. Carnoy looks with juandiced eye upon the government-controlled, government-financed public housing which is such a major part of programs in Latin America. All together, these are "like putting a drop of water in the ocean and then looking to see if the level goes up or not," he said.

A big obstacle to the Alliance for Progress, he said, is the "estadismo" (statism) which is ingrown in countries of Latin culture. He said it is a "socialism without ideals * * * in which a small group decides what is to be produced and how much.

Mr. Carnoy feels it is essential to "duplicate the American way of creating homeownership"—not through government-to-government loans. His conviction is based on a special concept of the value of owning homes:

THE EFFECT

It has an important psychological effect, he said. "Home ownership makes a capitalist out of the poor man overnight. He has a stake in society."

Thus he said, it is most significant that there are few Communists in countries where homeownership is available, whereas in countries where the laws do not encourage it, the Communist vote is large. This is true even in such highly developed countries as France and Italy, with their large Communist parties.

HOW?

How do Mr. Carnoy's ideas work?

American builders must be encouraged to go to Latin America so a program can be planned by men experienced in creating homeownership. It could be started with a pilot project through loans to mortgage banks to finance home purchases.

Such loans should carry a 100-percent guarantee, Mr. Carnoy said, rather than the 90 percent the U.S. is giving. This would not oblige the builder to cover the extra 10 percent, thus forcing him to increase the price of his homes.

By giving good value in homes for small downpayments and monthly payments, Mr. Carnoy believes, a cycle of savings, would be started. Latin Americans, who have little or no savings, would be encouraged by the homes available to save for a downpayment. This would start a flow of public savings into banks. These savings, as well as the monthly payments coming in, would create funds for the banks to give mortgages.

Transportation and Industry in the Eastern United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, earlier today I attended an interesting luncheon and meeting marking the second anniversary of the Canton Co., of Baltimore, attended by many individuals interested in transportation and industry in our Eastern United States.

I was particularly struck by the timely, wise, and thoughtful speech of the main speaker at the luncheon, Mr. A. J. Greenough, president of the Pennsylvania Railroad.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am sure I speak for all of us in thanking the Canton Co. for its hospitality here today. I was particularly pleased that railroad transportation was called upon for inspection of the Canton properties, for it seemed to me a gracious way to acknowledge the important role that Baltimore's railroads have played in the long and continuing growth of Baltimore's port and general economy. Directly or through predecessor companies your three trunk line railroads have been contributing to the growth of the city and the port for over a century—the B. & O. since the 1820's; the Pennsylvania since the 1840's; the Western Maryland since the 1850's; and in addition, of course, the Canton has been serving you since 1906. The phenomenal and rewarding growth of your industries and your port clearly indicates that you have, in effect, made your business activities and the creative spirit behind them what might be called "Gateways to Progress."

Incidentally, I mentioned the Canton Railroad as beginning in 1906. As we all know, the Canton Co. was bringing business to Baltimore long before that—134 years ago, in fact. And as early as the 1870's the Canton people constructed a railroad of their own for that purpose: the Union Railroad and its tunnel, which my own railroad acquired in the 1880's and is still using today.

Since all of us here today are interested in doing the same thing—making free enterprise do a productive job for our people and for our way of life generally, I would like to report to you briefly on how the railroads are making out in their efforts to open their Gateways to Progress. Transportation, as I am sure you realize, is a complex business and few other activities are so sensitive to so many different influences. Economics, politics, big business, little business, labor, national interests and local interests are all interwoven in a complex pattern in which everyone is right, everyone is wrong, and nothing is clear-cut. Transportation comprises the greatest single combination of economic activity in the Nation—thus severe financial illness among some of its major operators is, I believe you will agree, cause for considerable alarm.

The Pennsylvania-New York Central merger proposal has dramatized the profound troubles besetting the country's railroads and so, too, have 14 earlier railroad merger applications now in various postures before the Interstate Commerce Commission. It has been said that only the life of Abraham Lincoln has been the subject of more research studies than the transportation industry, and Commerce Secretary Hodges has stated that there are over $2 million worth of studies on file in his Department alone.

Nevertheless, we are meeting with some success in solving our problems. We have, after a 16-year battle, been successful in eliminating the wartime tax on both freight and passenger travel. How many billions of dollars of business these two discriminatory taxes drove to other forms of transportation, we will never know. How many billions they took out of the public's pocket, we'll never know. The point is, however, that a deliberate and unfair handicap to railroad growth has finally been removed.

One of our toughest nuts to crack has been the passenger deficit—the money we lose on passenger services, both suburban and long distance. The Transportation Act of 1958 gave us some limited assistance in taking off hopelessly losing trains, but after 16 postwar years the industry still loses around $500 million annually on passenger services. Last year the Pennsylvania alone lost $38 million, which wiped out over 68 percent of our income from freight operations. The B & O with a much smaller passenger service than ours reported a loss of $10 million—so you can see we are not talking about chicken feed, but real cash dollars. In today's highly competitive economy freight shippers like to complain about the extent to which they feel they have been forced to subsidize the railroads' passenger deficits. Actually, however, the bulk of the passenger losses since the end of World War II have been made up from losses to stockholders, from liquidation of railroad property and from reduction in working capital. In other words, from the railroads' basic resources. But, these resources are about exhausted and wil not be available in the future. It seems to me that the way to reduce these deficits is very simple—just let the railroads operate passenger service with ordinary business freedom. Other industries are not forced to continue money-losing products and services, so why should the railroads be? But we have been making progress. Last year's industrywide deficit of around $500 million was considerably under 1957's peak loss of $724 million. It may seem odd to you that anything with that much red ink can be called an improvement—however, when passenger service has been so government-regulated, government-super highwayed, government-airported, and government-taxed year after year, any reduction in the deficit is most welcome.

Speaking of taxes, a classic example is the Washington, D.C., Union Station, jointly owned by two of your Baltimore railroads—the Pennsylvania and the Baltimore & Ohio. That station was built with $32 million of our own money and carries the highest tax assessment of any single piece of property in the District of Columbia, with an annual tax bill of almost one-half million dollars. On the other hand, Washington National Airport, also built at a cost of $32 million—but of taxpayers' money, pays no property taxes—and heaping further insult on injury, another $100 million of public funds has already been spent, as you well know, for the new Dulles Airport at Chantilly.

Notwithstanding our severe passenger losses, those railroads that are still furnishing substantial amounts of heavily losing suburban services have been much encouraged by recent developments. Around Philadelphia and New York, where my railroad alone loses almost $14 million a year, we are beginning to receive limited financial aid from the communities to keep the services going. Also Congress, at President Kennedy's urgent request, has been considering similar help from the Federal Government to individual localities, and Senator PELL of Rhode Island has proposed a public authority to assist with the rail-passenger problem in the whole crowded Washington-to-Boston corridor. With such high-level attention, the passenger problem may well be on the way to a satisfactory solution—and if so, one really productive gateway to railroad progress will be opened.

Another promising gateway to progress lies in the application of technology. The Nation's railroads are today in position to take advantage of the benefits of research and advancing technology more quickly and more completely than almost any other large consolidated industry. Among developments to date the diesel-electric locomotive has probably been the most revolutionary. Improvements on the diesel locomotive continue and further research is expected to result in even greater efficiency and savings. The Navy's success in utilizing nuclear power to replace diesel power in submarines has suggested the possibility of nuclear power for locomotives. However, the 10-foot-wide by 15-foot-high dimension limitations of the locomotive predetermined by existing clearances, present a challenging design problem. In addition, the shielding problems in a locomotive are radically different from those of a submarine. Locomotives would have to rely on air cooling while a submarine has unlimited quantities of water for cooling. All in all, the job of designing an atomic locomotive will be even more demanding than the extremely difficult and costly job of designing our atomic submarines.

But, there are signs on the horizon that should serve as an economic warning to us: Both the Soviets and the Japanese are already applying technological advances to their railroads that are temporarily foreclosed to us in this country. If we are not to be left behind in ways that will ultimately make us a second-class power, we are going to have to overcome two principal obstacles to advancing technology which have very little, if anything, to do with our scientific capability. One, of course, is the lack of investment dollars in the railroad industry. Due to their generally poor earnings position and the decline in their ability to pay dividends, railroads have found it increasingly difficult to obtain new capital from private sources—capital that is so badly needed to take advantage of technological progress. With very few exceptions, the railroads are unable to sell either preferred or common stocks and many large and small investors are even avoiding railroad bonds. Most railroad financing today must be accomplished by means of equipment trust certificates which, as you know, are nothing more than mortgages on specific consignments of new cars and locomotives.

Another fundamental barrier blocking a real gateway to progress for the railroads and the entire American economy is, as you know, the out-dated work rules imbedded in labor agreements which cost our industry some $600 million each year for work not needed and even not done, but for which payment is required by agreements going back to the steam locomotive and the hand-operated switch.

President Eisenhower, in the closing days of his administration appointed a 15-man Commission of representatives of management, labor, and the general public to study the rules and recommend changes to modernize them. This Commission submitted its recommendations in February of 1962 after 13 months of investigation and study. The railroads offered to accept them in their entirety, but the unions rejected them out of hand and obtained a Federal injunction to stall off any changes. A little more than 2 months ago, the U.S. Supreme Court ordered the injunction dissolved and the railroads announced their intention of putting the proposed new rules in effect. In order to forestall a threatened general strike, President Kennedy appointed a three-man Emergency Board to mediate the dispute and recommend terms for a settlement. Under the Railway Labor Act, this required that both sides maintain the status quo while the Board investigated the dispute and for 30 days after the Board's report to the President. Like you and the public generally, I can only hope that the unions will soon face up to their responsibilities and that the work rules will be modernized without further needless and costly delay. If they can be, it will help open other gateways to progress—including the gateways to more business and to more investment capital on which jobs in the railroad industry depend.

Most productive of all, perhaps, of our gateways to progress will be the one labeled "mergers." You all know what you expect the recently approved alliance of the C. & O. and B. & O. to do for the customers and communities of those two fine old railroads. In my opinion, you can look for the same results from the other two big Eastern mergers, the Norfolk & Western-Nickel Plate-Wabash, and the Pennsylvania-New York Central. For a while, I know, some Baltimore folks had their sincere doubts—perhaps some still do. But our case has been fully documented before the ICC, and I believe that careful study of the evidence will clearly show that no damage will be done to Baltimore, its port, or the State of Maryland.

The merger will halt the financial decline of one of your three trunk railroads without in any way hurting the other two. It will cause no loss of service, facilities, traffic, or employment to the city, the port, or the State: in fact the whole idea of merger is to increase and improve service, facilities, traffic, and employment. It will cause no loss in taxes or reduction in property values. It contemplates absolutely no diversion of freight from your area and port. We'd look pretty silly taking a shipment or a cargo meant for a Baltimore pier up to Philadelphia or New York instead, on the ground that we felt Philadelphia or New York should have the business. A railroad could lose a lot of customers that way, although I doubt if we would have a chance to do it a second time.

The simple fact is, as I am sure most of you know, that shippers and consignees route the freight, not the railroads. They tell us where to take it. And you may be sure they tell us to take it where they want it taken.

So much for any fear, real or imagined, that we would deliberately divert business from Baltimore and from our facilities here—on which we have already spent millions of dollars, and on which we hope to spend millions more in the future. We may be hard up but we aren't crazy.

As you know, the stockholders of the Pennsylvania and the New York Central have voted overwhelmingly in favor of the merger, and shippers, the people who pay the freight bill, have been unanimous in vigorously supporting it. Opposition has principally reflected a manufactured attempt on the part of the rail unions, in a carefully organized and directed campaign, to generate unwarranted fear and confusion on the subject. Obviously, the only way a railroad can prosper is by serving its customers and continually using every means within its power to serve them better. The only way a railroad can improve its profit position is to increase its traffic throughout the entire economic region it serves and through the prosperity of the businesses and industries within that region.

It is my earnest opinion that, in the end, you will find that the Pennsy-Central merger will be extremely beneficial to Baltimore's economy and to the progress of your port. For the fact is that Baltimore is very much a gateway to progress for the Pennsylvania just as it is for your other railroads—and just as your port, as developed by the Canton Co., the Maryland Port Authority, the Baltimore Association of Commerce and others, is Baltimore's own gateway to progress.

I'd like to end right on that note. In my opinion, the railroad industry and its customers and communities are approaching a beginning—not an end. When our passenger problems have been resolved, when we become truly modern, not only in our technology but also in the work rules that are so important to our competitive position, and when basic mergers are accomplished, the benefits will flow through to all concerned and among those that should be the happiest about the whole thing will be Baltimore, its railroads and the people of both.

Thank you very much.

Housing for Latin Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words today about an article which appeared in one of the Washington papers, and which deals with a part of our Alliance for Progress effort—the part which relates to housing needs of our neighbors to the south.

The U.S. Government cannot solve the entire housing problem of Latin America. This problem can only be solved by the people of Latin America themselves.

We can, however, and we should, show them how they can solve their housing problem and get them started on the road to that goal.

How can we accomplish this? In only one way: By generating enthusiasm for homebuilding and homeownership in Latin America—and by providing the impetus for the development of local, national housing programs.

We can accomplish this by showing the people of Latin America, their builders and entrepreneurs, that the American free enterprise system has developed the technique, the method, which brings homeownership within the reach of even those with modest incomes.

We have done this in our country through the operation of the free enterprise system, and with the help of constructive government policies. The Latin Americans, with our help, can do the same.

We should not, therefore, in our Alliance for Progress aid program, strive to build houses as such in Latin America—or to encourage government construction and ownership of housing. Homes privately owned, built, and financed by free enterprise, should be our goal.

The other day, I noticed an interesting article on this subject by Mr. Rice Odell in the Washington Daily News. It elaborates on this idea. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

HOMEOWNERSHIP WOULD THWART REDS, HE SAYS

(By Rice Odell)

Most men would be bitterly discouraged by 6 fruitless years of trying to sell an idea.

But not Alan Carnoy, a fiery, indestructible little man who has spent that long in unwavering dedication to a plan for upending communism in Latin America by stimulating homeownership through private enterprise.

He has been relentlessly prodding congressmen, foreign aid officials, and government men in Latin America. Last year he also published a book, "Democracia Si!" to explain himself. And yesterday he passed through Washington again on one of his frequent trips from his Mexico City home.

Mr. Carnoy, who escaped with his family from his native Poland in 1939, came to the United States and began working as an advertising man for a soap company. It was a short step to homebuilding, and in the years 1946–56 Mr. Carnoy was one of the major home developers in Westchester County, N.Y., and a very successful one. Why, then, the move to Latin America and the long campaign for individual homeownership there?

AGREES

He would not deny the profit possibilities, but he has agreed to a limitation of 10 percent, with "open books." And he adds earnestly: "I've made enough money to allow myself this luxury of being useful."

Mr. Carnoy looks with juandiced eye upon the government-controlled, government-financed public housing which is such a major part of programs in Latin America. All together, these are "like putting a drop of water in the ocean and then looking to see if the level goes up or not," he said.

A big obstacle to the Alliance for Progress, he said is the "estadismo" (statism) which is ingrown in countries of Latin culture. He said it is a "socialism without ideals * * * in which a small group decides what is to be produced and how much."

Mr. Carnoy feels it is essential to "duplicate the American way of creating home ownership"—not through government-to-government loans. His conviction is based on a special concept of the value of owning homes:

THE EFFECT

It has an important psychological effect, he said. "Home ownership makes a capitalist out of the poor man overnight. He has a stake in society."

Thus, he said, it is most significant that there are few Communists in countries where home ownership is available, whereas in countries where the laws do not encourage it, the Communist vote is large. This is true even in such highly developed countries as France and Italy, with their large Communist parties.

HOW?

How do Mr. Carnoy's ideas work?

American builders must be encouraged to go to Latin America so a program can be planned by men experienced in creating home ownership. It could be started with a pilot project through loans to mortgage banks to finance home purchases.

Such loans should carry a 100-percent guarantee, Mr. Carnoy said, rather than the 90 percent the United States is giving. This would not oblige the builder to cover the extra 10 percent, thus forcing him to increase the price of his homes.

By giving good value in homes for small down payments and monthly payments, Mr. Carnoy believes, a cycle of savings, would be started. Latin Americans, who have little or no savings, would be encouraged by the homes available to save for a down payment. This would start a flow of public savings into banks. These savings, as well as the monthly payments coming in, would create funds for the banks to give mortgages.

Boxing Is Not a Sport: It Is a Contest Which, by Its Very Nature, Must End in Injury or Death for Many of Its Participants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 578, which would ban the broadcasting or televising of boxing matches. I have introduced this bill because of the brutal deaths and maiming injuries which occur in the ring each year.

The following editorial concerns this problem of ring deaths and points out the foolishness of those who say we should also ban golf or Little League baseball since more deaths occur among those who participate in those sports. If people are killed playing golf or baseball it is invariably an accident.

Ring deaths are the direct result of attempting to beat an opponent senseless.

The following editorial appeared in the Washington Star of March 27, 1963:

BOXING'S BLACK EYE

Every new death or injury tragically testifies that boxing is little less barbaric now than when the early Greeks and Romans (and the Mesopotamians 3,000 years before them) were clouting one another into oblivion. The injury that finished Davey Moore could have been equally lethal in the Colosseums of Rome or Los Angeles.

Because he was a popular champion, Moore's death predictably has touched off a fresh round of indignation and protest. And just when the air was clearing from the hulabaloo raised over the fatal beating of another champion, Benny Paret—a shocking spectacle viewed on national television a year ago.

In fact, on the very eve of Moore's death, it became known that a New York Joint Legislative Committee was giving the fight racket the go-ahead in that State despite Paret's death. And the Moore incident? "A regrettable thing," said Committee Chairman Plumadore, "but an isolated accident."

Let us see just how isolated. Ring magazine lists 14 boxing deaths last year and 216 since it began its obituary files in 1945. These are fatalities; there are no records on the number of brain-fogging injuries. But back to Mr. Plumadore: "If you're going to abolish boxing you might as well do it in other sports with a record of more deaths such as golf, Little League baseball, football, and tennis."

What this does not say is that boxing is the only sport in which two men, armed with lightly padded fists, have only one immediate objective in life—to knock somebody senseless. And if it should end in death—well, too bad, it was an unfortunate accident. Nor does Mr. Plumadore say that boxing, more than any other sport, has been shot through with corruption as the special plaything of the underworld.

Once again Senator KEFAUVER is calling for a National Boxing Commission. Once again cries of outrage are heard from as far away as the Vatican. The American Medical Association pleads for safety measures such as stricter examinations and headguards. Polls show that half the country would like to see boxing outlawed. But we suspect that, when the latest furor has blown over, it will not be hard to find two men clubbing each other under a bright light, surrounded by a group of frantic people screaming, "Knock him out! Knock him out!"

Unpopular Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest political miscalculations of the Kennedy regime has been the stern rejection by American citizens of a tax cut if not accompanied by a similar cut in spending.

Sneered at by the administration as an illustration of the Puritan ethic, as if this were either evil or stupid, America's desire for thrift seems to grow.

West-central Illinois citizens were asked on my recent questionnaire, "Should income taxes be cut if Federal spending is not cut?" The first returns showed 8,278 opposed to a cut in income taxes without cuts in Federal spending. Only 1969, less than 1 out of 4, favored the tax cut alone.

Robert and Helen Haller, publishers of the Hamilton (Ill.) Press, wrote this pertinent editorial on May 9:

NATIONAL DEBT

The American people are sick and tired of an ever-increasing national debt. In contrast, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Presidential adviser, recently made the public statement that no reputable economist is opposed to continued deficit spending. But it is the people who must bear the burden of big Government, deficit spending and mounting national debt, not the "reputable" economists. Since the people must pay the debt, the "disreputable" American taxpayer ought not to have his fears and misgivings lightly brushed aside.

Every housewife, every worker, every businessman knows that to keep his financial head above water he must not pile debt on top of debt, completely beyond his ability to repay. It is quite natural for the people to ask, "Why should the Government be exempt from the most elementary laws of debt and spending?" To them, the "reputable" economists who urge even greater debt just do not make sense.

The national debt now stands at more than $300 billion. There is little doubt that the legal debt ceiling will have to be raised again by the Congress. Interest on this staggering debt amounts to some $10.5 billion yearly. And who gets this interest money? How many foreign banks, and even governments, hold interest-bearing U.S. bonds?

Walter Heller, the administration's chief economic adviser, has disparaged what he calls the "remarkable Puritan ethic" that makes the American people afraid of tax cuts to be financed by additional deficits and higher national debt.

Here again, there is a strong contrast between the desires of the people and the attitudes of the Washington planners. The people need tax relief—there is no doubt of that. In addition to high personal income taxes, the people are being hit with $2.2 billion in additional social security taxes this year. Preliminary budget estimates indicate that the 47 State legislatures meeting this year will seek an additional $2.5 billion in State taxes. And 33 States are now studying ways of increasing taxes even more. Businesses are also feeling the brunt of high taxes.

But in spite of this, the people are "puritanical" enough not to want relief at the expense of some $10 or $12 billion added to the national debt, which will have to be paid by future generations, who may have their own ideas as to how reputable or disreputable we of this generation have been. The reputable economists would do well to remember that the puritan ethic they disparage goes back a long way in the history of this country. It was Benjamin Franklin, for example, who said, "better go to bed supperless than run in debt for a breakfast."

Another scheme the planners have in mind that will add further to our national deficit is the so-called "medicare" program, defeated in the last session of the Congress but already reintroduced under another name. We suggest that a more appropriate label might be politicare and briefly here are our reasons.

In their attempt to whip up the Nation's emotions to a solid support of a system of nationalized health care, the spokesmen for this program have consistently portrayed citizens over 65 as a mass of helpless, sick human beings who are unable to cope with the problems of their later years. Is this portrayal true?

Fifty-five percent of all Americans over 65—and that is 9½ million persons—have private insurance plans to protect them from the cost of illness. In a few years, this figure is expected to go up to 90 percent. Most of the elderly citizens of the United States do not need the Government to play the role of mother hen for them. They have capably demonstrated their spirit of self-reliance.

But the planners have billed themselves as champions of humanitarian concern. And in order to maintain this image, they have had to paint a pathetic picture of our older citizens. They have made them out to be helpless, weak, dependent, and by implication, rather addlebrained. All of this, mind you, in order to push through their visionary program of social legislation. It is, on the very face of it, a cynical manipulation of the deepest sympathies of the American people.

How great is the emergency posed by the medical needs of our aging citizens? The planners say it is an urgent situation. But if medicare had passed in the last session of Congress, it would not have become effective until 1964. If the needs are so urgent, how would those needs have been met between 1962 and 1964? Where were all these desperate, needy people going to get help until the next presidential election year? Would they have to "suffer in silence"? Obviously, the emergency was not as great as it was portrayed. The measure didn't pass in 1962—did its failure create a national social disaster?

Under the medicare proposals not all the health needs of older people would be met. Doctor and surgery bills would not be paid. And the elderly, even the most needy among them, would be forced to pay the first $90 of their hospital bill, plus $20 for a hospital diagnosis. How could these people—consistently pictured as financially helpless—raise the 75 percent of their illness cost not covered by the medicare plan? Again it is obvious that the program or socialized medicine does not square with the arguments made to support it.

Is somebody merely playing politics with human need? That appears to be the case. The ultra-humanitarian social crusaders are making a bold bid to buy the votes of the Nation's older citizens by taking credit for offering them hospital care—paid for with tax dollars, and unwanted, and unneeded by most of them. It's the old "something-for-nothing" political shell game—played with human suffering, hope and dignity.

My friends, manifested humanitarian concern begins and ends with the sympathy and actions of individual human beings. You cannot collectivize human problems, then collectivize their solutions, without having socialism.

Pennel, Walker To Enter Coliseum Relays May 17

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my distinguished colleagues in the House of Representatives to the young man Louisiana hopes will help carry America to victory over Russia in the next Olympics.

John Pennel of Northeast Louisiana State College holds the world's record in the pole vault and will attempt to break that record this weekend when he competes in the Coliseum Relays in Los Angeles.

I am delighted that Louisiana papers and broadcast stations are covering this story, and a sample follows from the Monroe Morning World, May 8, 1963:

PENNEL, WALKER TO ENTER COLISEUM RELAYS MAY 17

John Pennel, world record holder in the pole vault, and unbeaten quarter-miler Randall Walker of Northeast Louisiana State will compete in the giant Coliseum Relays in Los Angeles, Calif., May 17.

Pennel's and Walker's acceptance of invitations to the 23d annual Coliseum meet was announced today by Northeast State Coach Bob Groseclose and Athletic Director Jack Rowan. The two athletes' expenses will be paid by the Coliseum Relays.

Both Pennel and Walker are seniors, the only 4-year men on the Northeast team.

Walker, from Hallsville, Tex., is unbeaten in the 440 for the past 2 years. He has won the Gulf States Conferences quarter the past 2 years and also won the 220-yard low hurdles in the 1961 meet. He holds both the GSC and Sugar Bowl Meet 440 records, 47.4 in the GSC and 47.8 in the Sugar Bowl.

Walker's career best in the quarter is 47.3, run last Saturday in the Northeast Invitational here, but he is considered by his coach to be capable of much faster times with strong competition.

Pennel set the world record of 16 feet and 6¾ inches in the vault in a dual meet here April 30 and has cleared 16 feet or better seven times, more than any other vaulter in the world.

He set a world record March 23 with his first 16-foot vault, a 16 feet 3 inches in the Memphis Relays, and raised his own reecord to 16 feet 4 inches April 10 in Natchitoches, La. He went 16¼ in the Southwestern Relays April 13.

In the Coliseum Relays, Pennel will be shooting for the meet record, now held by John Uelses, the first man to clear 16 feet, with a 16¼ last year. A strong field has been lined up to face the Northeast star, including Fred Hansen of Rice, C. K. Yang of UCLA, Rolando Cruz, Ron Morris of the Los Angeles Striders, and Dave Tork—all of whom have cleared 16 feet once or more.

Tork and Pennel have met once this year, Tork going 16 feet 2¼ inches to beat the Northeast vaulter's 15 feet 7¼ in the indoor Telegram-Maple Leaf Games in Toronto, Canada, January 25.

Hansen and Pennel met in the Southwestern Relays with Pennel winning, 16¼ to 16 feet 6 inches. Pennel uses a fiber glass pole he borrowed from Hansen just before the Memphis Relays when he set his first world record.

The Coliseum Relays record in the 440 is 46.0, set by Ulis Williams of Arizona State in 1962.

John XXIII's Latest Miracle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most thoughtful article concerning the recent encyclical, "Pacem in Terris," of Pope John XXIII.

The author of the article is the Reverend George H. Dunne, S.J., assistant to the president of Georgetown University.

The article was published in the May 4, 1963, issue of the journal, Ave Maria.

The article follows:

JOHN XXIII'S LATEST MIRACLE

(By Rev. George H. Dunne, S.J.)

John XXIII continues to perform miracles. That a man of his age, in his state of health, in the midst of the limitless preoccupations engenered by Vatican Council II could publish two such encyclicals as "Mater et Magistra" and "Pacem in Terris" is surely an astounding performance that almost defies the laws of nature.

If there was little in "Mater et Magistra" to comfort the bitter-end defenders of the status quo, there is even less comfort in "Pacem in Terris." The very possibility of standing pat is rejected, even a "judicial structure which has been prudently and thoughtfully established is always inadequate for the needs of society" and consequently civil authorities must adapt legislation "to the changing social scene" and to its "new problems." A general acceptance of this luminous principle in the United States might get this country really moving again.

What those who expected little from Pope John, whether confidently or despondently, overlooked in this man was his unbounded love for people and his profound faith. They also overlooked the fact that, if not an intellectual, he was intelligent, educated, and widely experienced. Perhaps most of all they overlooked the fact that there is a quality of simple directness about his mind which penetrates the web of ambiguities and internal contradictions in which the more sophisticated intellect enmeshes a problem.

The latest encyclical is about peace, but it discusses many things besides war. Not everything in it is new. Much of it, naturally, is a restatement of well-established and quite familiar Catholic doctrines about the dignity of the human person, about human rights, about the nature and role of government. But even the repetition of old doctrines contains fresh insights, new elaborations.

There is also much that is new. Although Pius XII had spoken sympathetically of world federalism, the explicit call for "a public authority, having worldwide power and endowed with the proper means for the efficacious pursuit of its objective, which is the universal common good in concrete form," surely strikes a new note and one not apt to arouse cheers in the chauvinist camps.

Speaking directly to the subject of peace what does the Pontiff say? He says that "it is hardly possible to imagine that in the atomic era war could be used as an instrument of justice." He demands in the name of justice, right, reason, and humanity an end to the arms race, the simultaneous and equal reduction in armaments by both sides, the banning of nuclear weapons, an end to nuclear testing.

Many of course will say that the Russians will never agree to these demands. That may be, but it may also be relevant to ask how really ready Americans are to agree to these demands. But it would be better neither to say the one nor to ask the other, for this is to enter into the fruitless area of polemics.

This would be diametrically opposed to the whole spirit of this encyclical. For this is one of its most striking characteristics. There is not a single polemical note in it. There is only an immense desire to point out where truth lies, where peace is to be found, where is the road "in lucem quam inhabitas."

This is not to say that John XXIII is blind to the existence of tyranny. "There are some political regimes which do not guarantee for individual citizens a sufficient sphere of freedom within which their souls are allowed to breathe humanly." Would it be possible to describe tyranny with greater truth and at the same time with greater charity?

This is the heart of the man. He is incapable of hatred. So was Christ. I know a man, a priest, who has suffered at Communist hands. He hates them. He devotes much of his time to urging people to hate them. This is understandable, but it is sad, sadder by far than anything he suffered as the victim of their hatred. For it means that they overcame him in the end and the triumph is theirs.

There are those among us who still think that war can be the instrument of justice, who, whether they explicitly avow it or not, think that Hungary, or Poland, or the Ukraine can be liberated by means of war and who nourish the hope of eventually precipitating a war of liberation.

This is sheer folly. John XXIII knows it as such. He knows that in the atomic age war as an instrument of justice is unimaginable. That thermonuclear power may be a deterrent to atomic war he recognizes, but he also sees the danger that "the conflagration may be set off by some uncontrollable and unexpected chance." So he insists that "the fundamental principle on which our present peace depends must be replaced by another, which declares that the true and solid peace of nations consists not in equality of arms, but in mutual trust alone."

And, in a profession of confidence which as well as anything reveals the wondrous spirit of this man he adds: "We believe that this can be brought to pass." Perhaps not in a day, nor a year, nor a generation. But it can be brought to pass. And the time to start is now.

Utah's Dixie Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, on May 7, 1963, the Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the full Senate Interior Committee conducted hearings on the proposed Dixie project for southwestern Utah.

I have long regarded this project as one of the most important and significant reclamation projects within the State of Utah and, therefore, seized upon the opportunity to testify in support of it.

In order to give my colleagues in the Congress an opportunity to understand some of the problems involved, as well as a little historical background of the area, I am submitting herewith my testimony given that morning:

THE DIXIE PROJECT

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you to testify in support of what I have long considered one of the most significant and important reclamation projects proposed for the State of Utah. Not only is this project important to southwestern Utah, but it would have many indirect benefits to the entire Nation. The proposed project will be located in the southwestern portion of the State of Utah in an area commonly known and referred to as Utah's Dixie.

Gentlemen, this area and the country with which you will be concerned in your discussion of this project is not an ordinary one, and the people who settled and developed Dixie were not ordinary people.

As you recall, Utah was settled by the Mormon pioneers as they traveled West seeking refugee from persecution and mob violence. They settled in the desolate territory which was to become known as the Territory or State of Deseret, and later the State of Utah. Needless to say, many of those early pioneers must have been bitterly disappointed when they emerged from the mountains on the east of the Salt Lake Valley and stood on the hill surveying the desert, to hear Brigham Young say, "This is the place"; and he instructed them to settle there, build their homes, and till the soil.

Even at the time the Mormons came into the Great Salt Lake Valley, the area referred to as Dixie was of considerable importance. Fremont used the Old Spanish Trail in 1843 and 1844; Father Escalante in 1776; and Jedediah Strong Smith in the early 1800's passed that way in his expedition. The gold seekers from the East used it as a thoroughfare in their trek to the goldfields of California. Brigham Young, the great colonizer, recognized the advantages of settling this area, and certainly paramount among these advantages was the opportunity for the Mormons to become a self-sufficient people. Brigham Young was convinced that the climate and fertile soil made possible the growing of cotton, figs, sugarcane, tobacco, and other semitropical agricultural products; and even raising silkworms, making their own cloth, and becoming a highly self-sufficient community.

One of the first settlements of any significance in Dixie was the Indian Mission on the Santa Clara near the present city of Santa Clara. The mission was established in the winter of 1854 by some of the hardiest of the Mormon missionary settlers. In a few years, the settlement showed great promise. In early accounts of a visit to the area by Brigham Young and other church leaders, records show that the settlement consisted of some 30 houses, and approximately 250 acres under cultivation, with flourishing orchards of apples, peaches, apricots, nectarines, plums, figs, grapes, and a promising crop of cotton. There were even cooperative farming arrangements with the Indians. But in the winter of 1862 came the rains and a flash flood of the Santa Clara, like a "thief at night," to completely wipe out the settlement with its crops, orchards, and homes. These hardy people stayed on to rebuild their farms and orchards, suffering from food shortages, sickness, disease, and other setbacks. History tells us that just 2 years later this same Santa Clara River that overflowed its banks and wiped them out, dried up in midseason, leaving the crops and orchards to burn up in the heat of the summer sun.

In the meantime, Brigham Young had determined that the settlement in Dixie had not grown and flourished as it should, and during a church conference in Salt Lake City, he called over 300 men on a mission to Dixie; a mission to grow cotton and develop the area. Nearly 250 of those called responded to the call and left their homes and farms in the Salt Lake Valley and journeyed to Dixie to start all over again. Most of these people settled in St. George, which is now a thriving community in Dixie, and is today the county seat of Washington County. One of the first, and certainly one of the most important, problems of these people was getting water from the Virgin and Santa Clara Rivers onto the land to quench the thirst of their crops and orchards. And just as important as securing water was the problem of controlling the rivers so that they would not again be wiped out by floods.

A review of the history of this area will reveal that these people endured great hardship over extended periods of time. They built dams on the Virgin and Santa Clara Rivers, only to have them washed out by the raging torrents, sometimes twice in 1 year. They dug canals and tunnels, only to have them filled with mud and debris. They suffered droughts, but these hardy people faced the hardships and resolved their problems the best they could. The only certainty in their lives was uncertainty itself. They had good years and bad years, and these ups and downs were expressed in a son written by Charles L. Walker, which he called, "St. George and the Drag-On," which they sang to Brigham Young when he visited from Salt Lake City. The song included the following verses:

"Oh, what a desert place was this
When first the Mormons found it;
They said no white man here could live
And Indians prowled around it.
They said the land it was no good,
And the water was no gooder,
And the bare idea of living here
Was enough to make one shudder.

CHORUS

"Mesquite, soaproot, prickly-pears and briars,
St. George ere long will be a place that every
one admires.

"Now green lucerne in verdant spots
Bedecks our thriving city,
And vines and fruit trees grace our lots
With flowers sweet and pretty,
Where once the grass in single blades
Grew a mile apart in distance,
And it kept the crickets on the go,
To pick up their subsistence.

"The Sun it is scorching hot,
It makes the water siz, sir,
And the reason why it is so hot,
Is just because it is, sir.
The wind like fury here does blow,
That when we plant or sow, sir,
We place one foot upon the seed,
And hold it till it grows, sir."

Dixie had great potential, and these settlers knew it, but there were some real problems involved. They knew these problems well. They worked and sacrificed and adapted themselves, and they gradually tamed the elements to a point where they could survive and provide for themselves and their families. In more recent times it has been asked, "What do you grow in Dixie?" The answer is, "Men and women."

Gentlemen, here we are, a hundred years later, and some of the most basic problems of this area have not been resolved. There is still a shortage of water; there is still a threat of floods and drought; there is a shortage of electrical energy, and hence a shortage of employment opportunities. This is truly unfortunate, because Dixie is not an ordinary area. It is a delightful garden spot, with beautiful scenery, fertile soil, and a most desirable climate. Brigham Young often left the cold, wet winter climate of Salt Lake City to spend the winter months in Dixie. Those who live in Dixie claim that this is where the summer sun spends the winter. With the benefits that will be derived from the Dixie project, this area will become one of the most desirable and sought after places in the Nation. A wonderful opportunity is before us, and those acquainted with the area can realize this fully. I appear here this morning to tell you these things and to request your support and authorization for the Dixie project.

The Bureau of Reclamation will testify, I am sure, that the project has engineering feasibility, that it is economically justified, and that a large percentage of the cost of the project will be repaid by those who reap the direct benefits, such as water and electric power. The citizens of this area are not asking for a Government handout; they fought this problem alone for several generations. They are asking for Government assistance in the form of a loan to develop this area for the benefit of the entire Nation.

I have prepared a short summary of this proposed project, including the location, the purposes, the benefits to be derived, together with the cost and economic problems. I request permission, Mr. Chairman, to include this in the RECORD.

LOCATION

The land and location to be served directly by the Dixie project are in southwestern Utah, principally in Washington and Iron Counties, in the vicinity of the Virgin and Santa Clara Rivers. The surrounding area will also receive many direct benefits that will naturally arise from this bonanza to Washington and adjacent counties in Utah, Nevada, and Arizona.

PURPOSES

The puropses of the project are fivefold:

1. To provide adequate water to 11,615 acres of land not now under irrigation; supplemental irrigation water to 9,445 acres of presently developed land; 5,000 acre-feet of water to the city of St. George annually for domestic purposes (this water will be supplied from the Virgin City Reservoir); and 8,000 acre-feet annually to Cedar City for domestic purposes pursuant to existing agreement.

2. Provide adequate drainage on land now with too high a water table and with an excessive collection of surface water.

3. Control floods and prevent drought.

4. Provide the needed electrical energy in the southwestern corner of Utah.

5. Provide a substantial increase in fisheries benefits, and some increase in wildlife benefits, together with an unlimited potential in the field of recreation.

NEEDS OF AREA—BENEFITS

Aside from the water needs and water storage facilities, which are considered to be the primary needs of the project area, a shortage of electric power at reasonable rates presents a problem in connection with both expansion of existing industrial operations and also in bringing new industry into the area. This, in turn, is reflected in the overall employment opportunities, a lack of which have been largely responsible for an almost static population in Washington County for the past 20 years.

Under present plans, three powerplants will be constructed in the Dixie project. To fulfill these needs, the three plants will be located as follows:

1. The Virgin powerplant to be located on the south bank of the Virgin River immediately below the Virgin City Dam.

2. The Bench Lake powerplant, to be located on the main canal at the foot of the Bench Lake escarpment.

3. The Warner power plant, to be located along the main canal at the foot of the Warner Ridge near the site of the present diversion dam, from the St. George and Washington Canal.

COSTS AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

As a general rule, the economic justification of constructing a Bureau of Reclamation project is determined by making a comparison of the benefits which will accrue from the services provided with the cost of constructing the project features. The benefit-cost ratio of the Dixie project has been computed by the Bureau of Reclamation to be 2.1 to 1.0 for a 100-year period of analysis, or, in more specific language, the project will produce economic benefits in double the value of the costs involved in construction, when measured over a long period of time.

The costs are divided into two categories: reimbursable costs, which include irrigation power and municipal water; and nonreimbursable costs, which include flood control, fish and wildlife, and recreation. The reimbursable costs will be repaid to the Federal Government within 50 years, plus appropriate development periods after completion of each project feature.

The nonreimbursable costs, conversant with long-established policy, will not be repaid to the Government but will be absorbed in the public interest.

After the initial expenditure by the Federal Government, the State or local agencies will meet the annual costs associated with reimbursable functions of the project.

The total cost of the project is $44,867,800; and the construction period is approximately 5 years. During this period, many jobs and job opportunities will be provided for the residents of Washington County and the surrounding area.

CONCLUSION

The Dixie project is of the utmost importance to Utah, and particularly to the southwestern part of the State. It has been determined by all agencies concerned that the project has engineering feasibility, that the project is economically justified, that the reimbursable costs can be repaid within the standard 50-year repayment period, and that construction of the project would be a forward step in the comprehensive development of the Colorado River Basin, and in the conservation and utilization of the lands and water resources of the entire West.

This project is of major interest to the State of Utah and, therefore, of major interest to me; and I have pledged my full and untiring support to the project.

A Document for the Political Archives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege for the past 17 years to have known the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, the Honorable CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, of New York. I have served with him and now under him as a member of that committee. CHARLIE BUCKLEY, I am proud to say, is a friend of mine and is, furthermore, a distinguished Member of this House and one of its great chairmen. It therefore gives me a feeling of great personal pride to note that the eminent columnist of the New York Times, Mr. Arthur Krock, has called attention to Mr. BUCKLEY's position in the Congress and in the Nation in an article which appeared in the May 14 edition of the New York Times.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this fine article by Mr. Krock:

A DOCUMENT FOR THE POLITICAL ARCHIVES

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 13.—There has to be a first of everything, and one of the congratulatory messages to Representative CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, of Bronx last week, on the occasion of the dinner in his honor, is surely the first of its kind in American—perhaps in any other—politics. Conveying congratulations on the Bronx Representative's public service, warm personal affection, and appreciation of assistance in critical times, the telegram was signed simply "Joe, Jack, Bobby, and Teddy Kennedy" belongs in the imperishable archives of a proud Nation.

Can any political historian produce its match? Has a President of the United States in company with a celebrated father, and two brothers who are, respectively, the Nation's Attorney General and a Member of the Senate, ever before bestowed such a public accolade on a fellow partisan, particularly in a critical hour of his power contest with another? Until its like can be produced, the family telegram to the Democratic boss of the Bronx must be assigned first place in its own category with the famous messages of encouragement in battle that echo in schoolrooms all over the world.

"Soldiers," said Napoleon to his troops poised for descent into the valley of the Po, "Beyond the Alps lies Italy." "My right has been rolled up"; Foch signaled to Joffre, "My left has been driven back; my center has been smashed; I have ordered an advance from all directions." "Here I am, and here I stay," cried Marshal MacMahon or somebody else (in French, natch) after he had stormed the frowning fortress of Malakov in the Crimean War. And whatever was Eisenhower's rallying cry to Bradley's troops in the Battle of the Bulge, it could not have been more eloquent and effective than the First Family's message to the commander of the Battle of the Bronx.

For personal services rendered in the nomination contest preceding the Democratic National Convention of 1960, and later as the shepherd who often has brought into the administration's fold the laggard urban Democratic sheep of the House of Representatives, the message was no less than the due of the guest of honor at the testimonial dinner. The gratitude of Presidents is rare enough in politics to those who have helped them in times of need. But when, as in this instance, it is publicly demonstrated with full awareness of controversial consequences, and also bears the imprint of all the chiefs of the reigning and affluent clan, something new has been added.

The "Joe, Jack, Bobby, and Teddy" telegram to Representative BUCKLEY merits, therefore, a glass-enclosed case of its own in a new exhibit of Presidential papers to supplement the nonpolitical originals in the Library of Congress and in the National Archives. The only arguable objection to this historical rating is its lack of the dozen-plus signatures that would give to posterity a complete clan roster—for the time being.

LIKE INVENTING THE MODEL T

But for present purposes, especially those of the Democratic organization of the Bronx and its boss, the telegram will meet any reasonable requirement. Whether or not the critical chorus, including the Wagnerian section, is singing in tune with the overall national comment on the telegram, Washington at least is full of politicians who envy its recipient. This department today tested the reactions of a number of veterans of battles for office. And even those who questioned the good judgment of a clan endorsement, in which the President of the United States was only one participant, agreed that Representative BUCKLEY can make wonderful use of it in his particular circumstances.

Former Representative Evan G. Howell, of Springfield, Ill., who retired undefeated after four terms, was one who made this particularized evaluation. "In many States and districts," he said, "the intervention of even a popular President for a local party leader has been resented on the principle of the folk adage that 'We don't need any outsider to tell us what to do.' When I was a candidate, I found it best to limit this help to my party leaders in the House, and to the usual letter from the Republican congressional campaign committee chairman. This I would advertise, but dwarfed by big black headlines such as 'Tribute to Constructive and Experienced Public Service.' For a big city, especially a New York City, Democrat, though, a Joe-Jack-Bobby-Teddy endorsement ought to be as profitable an innovation for him as the combustion engine was for Henry Ford."

Capital Punishment Is Legalized Murder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, New York has abandoned the mandatory death penalty for premeditated murder and kidnaping. Let us hope that the headline appearing on the following article from the May 6, 1963, edition of the New York Herald Tribune will come true and that the execution cells at Sing Sing will indeed soon be empty. I have introduced H.R. 545, which would abolish the death penalty in all Federal jurisdictions except under the provisions of the Uniform Code of Military Justice and except for treason. Support for the abolition of the death penalty has been growing and soon our country may be free from the stigma of killing its citizens.

The Herald Tribune article follows:

EMPTY EXECUTION CELLS? MANDATORY DEATH LIFTED

ALBANY.—The six-cell dance hall in which prisoners await execution at Sing Sing Prison, and the death chamber next to it, may soon be gathering dust.

New York has become the last State to abandon the mandatory death penalty for premeditated murder or kidnaping.

Governor Rockefeller's office announced yesterday that one of the last bills he signed this year removes the penalty. It provides instead that the sentence shall be life imprisonment unless the jury, in a separate second stage proceeding, recommends execution.

The new law also permits the court to accept guilty pleas from those charged with first-degree murder or kidnaping, subjecting themselves to an automatic penalty of life imprisonment. Previously, any guilty plea by a person charged with such crimes had to be rejected by the court and the case set down for trial.

The new law will take effect with trials beginning after July 1. Until then, the old provisions still apply.

In his memorandum, Mr. Rockefeller noted that enactment of the new statute leaves unimpaired the Governor's traditional power to grant executive clemency in appropriate cases.

Sing Sing Prison, at Ossining has housed the State's only execution chamber for more than a half century.

The six-cell dance hall is for those whose execution is scheduled within 24 hours. There are 33 other cells for those condemned to death and yesterday, according to Sing Sing officials, they had 17 inmates. These prisoners were not affected by the law change although all, of course, are eligible for executive clemency.

Ronald Reagan Speaks Out—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to insert the third in a series of articles publishing the text of Mr. Ronald Reagan's lecture, "What Price Freedom," given April 29, 1963, in Dixon, Ill.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with the impact the first two insertions have had among those who read the RECORD, and I know that this article and part 4 are anxiously awaited by many. I have received numerous phone calls and letters praising Reagan's remarks and requesting copies of his lecture.

The article appearing in the May 3, 1963, issue of the Dixon Evening Telegraph follows:

WHAT PRICE FREEDOM?

(By Ronald Reagan)

All of us, I'm sure, accept our responsibility for those less fortunate. Who among us would not agree that no one, regardless of age, should be denied medical attention because of an inability to pay? Yet the advocates of medicare answered all arguments against this plan with the charge that their opponents were against the humanitarian goal. This is nothing less than dishonest evasion of legitimate debate.

With all of us agreed on the necessity of solving the problem, shouldn't we begin by determining the extent of the problem? A great social revolution has taken place almost unnoticed in this last decade. Today more than 40 million Americans have some kind of medical or hospital insurance. This is an increase of 4 million just since last year and it includes more than 50 percent of our senior citizens. Nine percent of the population is over age 65. This 9 percent can't be entirely destitute because they receive 8 percent of all the personal revenue in the United States. As nearly as can be determined, not quite 10 percent of this age group would be unable to meet medical expenses of $500 or more.

Under the recently adopted Kerr-Mills bill one State is meeting its problem in a highly satisfactory manner. Public funds are used to buy insurance in Blue Cross with the premiums paid in full or in part, depending on the individual's needs. Thus a patient can choose doctor or hospital and there is no way to tell whether his insurance was provided by himself or by public funds.

In spite of this, supporters of medicare insist the only solution for the needy 10 percent is a compulsory program of Government insurance covering all citizens—even those now insured and those possessed of great wealth or ample income. They advance social security as a proven example of compulsory Government insurance and one capable of carrying the added burden of medicare. Surely then they can't object if we examine this proven example.

No responsible person would suggest that our senior citizens who reach their nonearning years without savings or pensions should be denied a livelihood. You and I have been told that we and our employers are paying into a fund and that someday we will call upon this, our own money to see us through. A hundred million pieces of literature, published by social security since 1939, tell us that this is an insurance program, but the Supreme Court has ruled that it is not an insurance program and that the dues are not insurance premiums but a general tax for the use of the Government and the Government has used that money. There is no fund in the accepted sense of such terms.

An actuarial expert of social security has admitted that, as of this moment, social security is $298 billion in the red. We pass this fiscal irresponsibility on to our sons—not to an unborn generation—because the young man going into the work force at an average salary will find that he and his employer are today paying in $1.69 for every dollar he can hope to receive back in benefits. That same amount of money would buy him an insurance policy paying $220 a month when he reaches age 65, instead of the $127 he will get from the compulsory Government program.

Early in this century a great labor statesman, Samuel Gompers, founder of the AFL, described Government social insurance as a "menace to the rights, the welfare and the liberty of the workingman." Can we take the risk out of living without denying the freedom of choice? A national labor paper recently carried this banner on its front page, "The time has come to put into effect a single integrated Federal system guaranteeing cradle-to-grave security against the hazards of illness, disability, work injury and old age." Adolph Hitler said his national socialism would give every German "freedom from want and cradle-to-grave security." More than a hundred years ago the constitution of every slave State in the South specified that masters must provide adequate housing, food, medical care and old age benefits for all slaves. The only way they could lose security was by becoming free.

Always the Central Government seeks new areas for its participation. With our system based on government at the local level we have created the greatest public school system in the world. At the moment this system is beset by problems aggravated by the increase in population, inflation and the halt in building during the war years. Suddenly we are told that only Federal aid will solve our problems. This is, of course, the familiar cry and is based on the idea that money provides the answer to all problems. If this is so, has the Federal government found some new supply other than our pockets? And if the government increases the amount it takes from those pockets, is it not decreasing the amount left for local taxation and voluntary contributions to private educational institutions?

Here again we look at the actual problem and find it isn't in the dire emergency class some would have us believe. In the last 10 years we've increased spending on schools at the local level one and a half times as much as our personal income has increased. Less than 1 percent of our school districts have reached the limit of their bonded indebtedness. Since 1959 we have increased the average teacher's salary from $3,200 to $5,400 a year and we've reduced the ratio of pupils per teacher. At the height of the debate we were told we must start a crash program to build 60,000 classrooms a year for the next ten years and then discover we've been building 70,000 classrooms for each of the last 5 years.

During all of the debate there was denial that Federal control was ever to be a part of Federal aid, and then Congress discovered a book already printed for use in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare called A Federal Education Agency for the Future. The plain truth is that Federal control and nationalized curriculum and school system is the unquestioned end result of Federal aid to education.

Prof. Alexander Fraser Tytler, a noted historian wrote "A democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the voters discover they can vote themselves largess out of the public treasury. From that moment on the majority always votes for the candidate promising benefits from the public treasury with the result that democracy always collapses over a loose fiscal policy always to be followed by a dictatorship."

Unfortunately the professor was not writing a prophecy which we could choose to ignore. When he wrote this we were still a colony of Great Britain, and he was writing to explain what had destroyed the Athenian Republic more than 2,000 years ago. We are running out of time. We are in about the same position as the man who had a complete physical examination and said to the doctor, "I can take it—give it to me straight. How much time have I got?" The doctor said, "Well let me put it this way—eat the best part of the chicken first!"

This year we have projected another eight billion dollar deficit. Interest payment on the debt calls for $18,000 every 60 seconds, 24 hours of the day, day in and day out. But that's only the part showing above the surface. Already in legislation enacted into law, our Government is obligated to pay out one and a quarter trillion dollars. This is an amount equal to four times the assessed valuation of all the real estate and all the tangible property in the country.

For some time past a number of people, including myself, have urged tax reform as a means of reducing the size of Government. Now many of those who have criticized such talk as "extremist" are themselves suggesting tax reform. Somehow though, my cup doth not run over. Perhaps because many of those in Government urging this reform do not accept the fundamental concept that taxation is for the purpose of raising needed revenue. It is not an instrument of social revolution by which, under the guise of taxation, Government can secure reforms which the people would not knowingly approve if presented in their true colors. Senator CLARK (JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania), for example, has referred to the "tax issue," as, "at heart a class issue" and he wants the Federal Government to step into this class struggle and "redistribute the wealth downward."

A number of other individuals high in policymaking circles, appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee to advocate reduction in rates, but the closing of loopholes. In many instances the so-called "loopholes" were legitimate deductions without which the personal income tax structure would have long since proved unworkable.

One man has explored the idea that those who own their own homes escape something because they don't pay rent. He has suggested that you should estimate the rent you're not paying and pay an income tax on the estimated amount. Well, don't laugh at that one. The gentleman who explored that idea is Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in charge of tax policy.

Is not the Government crackdown on business entertainment and expense an invasion of the privileges of management with no assumption of responsibility. Granted no one should be allowed to deduct personal pleasures under the pretense they are business necessities, but the Internal Revenue Bureau hasn't stopped there. In effect it has said to every businessman, "We'll tell you how much money you can spend in the operation of your business."

We have been told that in our affluent society we wallow in luxury at the private sector while the public sector is starved for funds, that the function of Government is to take our money from us through taxation and buy for us the welfare programs we are too stupid to buy for ourselves. In the last fiscal year governments in and out of the United States spent $173 billion. This prorates out to $3,050 for every family in the Nation.

For defense, yes. But last year cost for national resources went up to $100 million, housing and community development, $350 million; commerce and transportation, $440 million; health, labor, and welfare, $1.6 billion.

And how do we explain away thousands of dollars for research on oral health of the Icelandic peoples, red tuna and yellow fat disease in the cat, and a stereostatic atlas of the beagle brain?

I, for one, am willing to leave the beagle alone if he'll leave me alone.

Alabama Legislature Praises Mrs. Elizabeth Beamguard, State Librarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the Alabama Public Library Service, under the outstanding direction of Mrs. Elizabeth Parks Beamguard, has brought to the people of our State libraries of unusual quality and proximity. An example of the quality of libraries in Alabama is the fact that the Eufaula Carnegie Library, Eufaula, Ala., received the 1963 Dorothy Canfield Fisher Award for Alabama.

The legislature of our State, both houses concurring, has officially resolved to commend Mrs. Beamguard for her leadership in this connection and I am pleased to insert herewith copy of that resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 17:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 17

Whereas under the able leadership and direction of Mrs. Elizabeth Parks Beamguard, director of the Alabama Public Library Service, library facilities and services in the State, and particularly in the small towns and rural areas, have recently been tremendously expanded and improved; and

Whereas the naming of the Eufaula Carnegie Library as the recipient of the 1963 Dorothy Canfield Fisher Award for Alabama, brings nationwide acclaim to Alabama's public libraries, for this award is given in signal recognition of the excellence of both the facilities and the services of libraries in counties or in cities of less than 25,000; and

Whereas the Eufaula Carnegie Library is only one of the many excellent libraries currently available to Alabama citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of Alabama, (both houses thereof concurring), That we hereby commend Mrs. Elizabeth Parks Beamguard, director of the Alabama Public Library Service, for her outstanding public service in promoting the extension and development of public libraries in this State: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Mrs. Beamguard.

I hereby certify the above is a true, correct and accurate copy of Senate Joint Resolution 17 by Messrs. Roberts, Clark, and Adams adopted by the Legislature of Alabama May 1, 1963.

J. E. SPEIGHT,
Secretary of Senate.

Sending Federal Troops to Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the threatened use of Federal troops in Alabama under present circumstances not only has no legal basis but can worsen rather than improve race relations in my State.

Columnist David Lawrence's recent article on Presidential action in sending Federal troops into Alabama deserves the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives. His article follows:

SENDING U.S. TROOPS TO ALABAMA: PRESIDENT'S ACTION CRITICIZED IN ABSENCE OF FEDERAL COURT ORDER OR STATE REQUEST

(By David Lawrence)

When Senator John F. Kennedy was campaigning for the Presidency in 1960, critics said he was youthful and impulsive. They now will say the same thing as they read that Mr. Kennedy issued a statement Sunday night ordering Federal troops to mobilize in Alabama to deal with future rioting or local disturbances.

The President didn't think this one through. In the case of the disputes with Governor Faubus at Little Rock, Ark., in 1957 and Governor Barnett at Oxford, Miss., in 1962, there was at least an alleged basis for the use of Federal troops—a supposed unwillingness on the part of the local authorities to obey a Federal court order. But Mr. Kennedy himself told his news conference only last week that no Federal statute was involved in the controversy at Birmingham, Ala. Nor have there been any Federal court orders whatsoever issued in this case.

Now the President is in the position of having nevertheless threatened the use of Federal military power to deal with local disorders that may arise. There is not the slightest legal basis for the use of such power under the Constitution unless requested by the State government. No statute grants such authority to the Chief Executive under the circumstances which have been reported from Alabama. For anyone in the Government to order the use of Federal troops or any part of the Air Force for any purpose not sanctioned by the statutes is in itself a penal offense. A Federal law says:

"Whoever, except in cases and under circumstances expressly authorized by the Constitution or act of Congress, willfully uses any part of the Army or the Air Force as a posse comitatus or otherwise to execute the laws shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both."

The "United States Code Annotated" for 1963 contains a footnote referring to an opinion of the Attorney General dated November 7, 1957, which says: "The President's authority to use Federal troops under sections 332 and 333 of title 10 is not impaired by this section."

But this was an opinion rendered in connection with the use of troops where a Federal court order had been issued. There is a dispute among informed lawyers as to whether troops can ever be used to enforce even a court order and they contend that it is really the responsibility of United States marshals. At least in that case a controversial legal point was involved.

So the whole action of President Kennedy rests on the foundation that he described in his public statement—namely, "rioting, personal injuries, property damage and various reports of violence and brutality."

But it is not the function of the Federal Government to maintain order inside a State unless there is an insurrection against the United States. To preserve order is the responsibility of a State. Indeed, in the same morning newspapers in which the American people read of the President's orders to dispatch Federal troops to the Birmingham area, there was published a message to President Kennedy from the Governor of Alabama, George Wallace. It was sent an hour after the President's announcement was made and read in part as follows:

"The Constitution of the United tSates * * * states that the Federal Government may send troops to quell domestic violence upon application of the State legislature or the Governor of a State.

"The legislature of this State has made no request, nor have I. May I ask by what authority you would send Federal troops into this State?

"The situation is well in hand and law and order prevail * * * Your complete bypassing of State officials and me as Governor are affronts not only to me as Governor but to the people of Alabama."

An examination of the Federal statute cited later by the President—section 333 of title 10—shows no justification for the use by the President of Federal troops just to quell a local disturbance or to prevent one from arising. It applies only if a State government refuses or fails to grant protection. This hasn't happened.

The President in his reply to Governor Wallace says, in effect, that he didn't really intend to use Federal troops in Birmingham, but only wants to warn the State authorities that they had better maintain order and prevent violence. If any threat to use such power is vested in the President, he can at any time intimidate a Governor or mayor or local official, or he can mobilize troops to threaten reprisals and punishment if anyone in a local government doesn't do his bidding. This is an autocratic power, the exercise of which the framers of the Constitution specifically sought to prevent so that no dictatorship could arise in America through the threat to use military force.

If Mr. Kennedy feels that he has the power to prevent violence anywhere in the country, then it will be asked why no Federal troops were mobilized or why the same threat of military force was not utilized before Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and his associates organized the demonstrations which, in turn aroused the antagonism of other citizens and thus produced the conditions under which local disorder arose.

If the President actually has the power of prevention, the time to start is before the local police and the paraders clash or threaten to become involved in riots. There is a right, of course to a peaceful demonstration, but anything which produces a disturbance is subject to police action by the local and not the Federal authorities.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—Congressional Record, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the Record:

VINELAND, N.J.,
April 26, 1963.

Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Flood: I have today sent the enclosed copy of letter to Hon. Howard W. Smith, chairman of Rules Committee, in reference to formation of Committee on Captive Nations.

It would seem that the captive nations have been all but forgotten by this administration.

With all good wishes, I remain,
Sincerely yours,
Edw. New.

VINELAND, N.J.,
April, 26, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: It is greatly to be desired that House Resolution 14, establishing a Committee on the Captive Nations, be released to the floor of the House for its consideration.

We must do all in our power to help these too long neglected captive peoples.

Thanking you, I remain,
Sincerely yours,
Edw. New.

April 26, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
House of Representatives.
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: On behalf of the Ukranian Congress Committee of Phoenix, Ariz., we urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration. Such a Committee on Captive Nations is vitally important both for our Government and the American people at large. While Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of "national liberation" in Africa and Asia we, as a Nation, are not doing much to help the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations which constitute a veritable weakness of the Soviet totalitarian empire.

A special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a reservoir of true and unbiased knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, which knowledge will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We strongly urge you, Congressman Smith, to give your full and unqualified support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,
Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Phoeniz, Ariz., State Branch,
By Walter Chopiwskyj, *President.*

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: On behalf of our organization we urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration. Such a Committee on Captive Nations is vitally important both for our Government and the American people at large. While Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of national liberation in Africa and Asia, we, as a nation, are not doing much to help the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations which constitute a veritable weakness of the Soviet totalitarian empire.

A special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a reservoir of true and unbiased knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, which knowledge will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We strongly urge you, Congressman Smith, to give your full and qualified support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,
Mrs. Myroslawo Petryshuk,
Chairman of Ukrainian National Women's League of America, Inc.
Minneapolis, Minn.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 26, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Honorable Representative: The spectacle of congressional apathy in the face of Communist-aiding policies instituted by the President's advisers, grows more hideous and loathsome every day.

Defense actions have never won any war and are manifestly losing the war that we are in right now. Were it not for General Patton's realization of this simple fact, we might still be fighting Hitlerism in Europe. Had General De Gaulle's admonition against maginot line thinking been heeded, we would not have had to fight in Europe in the first place.

Let's put an end to the administration's stupidity about building walls around South America and begin a program designed to free the captive nations from Communist Imperialism.

Please support House Resolution 14.
Sincerely yours,
Daniel M. Canavan.
Ellen Canavan.

Congressman Daniel J. Flood,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Congressman: As a member of the Armenian Youth Federation, a patriotic national organization, dedicated to the eventual freedom of our fatherland, I am sincerely interested in the passage of House Resolutions 14 and 15, which calls for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House. I feel that the formation of such a committee will bring to light certain pertinent and true facts relative to Armenia, which are so frequently misunderstood by others.

Understanding that this bill (H. Res. 14 and 15) remains in the custody of the Rules Committee pending a final decision, I have contacted Congressman Howard W. Smith, head of the Rules Commitee, urging him to release this bill to the House floor for its inevitable acceptance.

May I take this opportunity in commending you for your stand in this regard, and to assure to you of my support of your measure.

Sincerely,
Arsen Hagop Russian.

Sam Spal: A Man Who Served

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOE M. KILGORE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, the death of Sam G. Spal has affected me deeply.

Although I am no longer a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, my memory of my service on that committee is still fresh and warm and strong. Sam Spal is an important part of that memory.

He had a vast store of wisdom and experience in his chosen field. I never knew him to thrust his wealth of ideas upon any Member. Yet, he was always on hand, always ready to go to work, when his special background was needed. He was a constant source of responsible information and firm judgment. Men of his competence are rare. To me, he embodied the true spirit of the ideal committee staff member.

It is difficult to honor Sam Spal because—through his years of selfless service—he has brought so much honor upon himself.

I miss him now. I will continue to miss him.

Mrs. Eloise Cissell Lewis Receives the President's "E" Award for Export Excellence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to attend the award ceremony on March 26, 1963, when Draper Daniels, the National Export Expansion Coordinator, presented—on behalf of President Kennedy—the President's "E" Award for Export Excellence to Mrs. Eloise Cissell Lewis.

This award is presented for "unusual increases in exports and the opening of new foreign markets by introducing U.S. products into international trade." Mrs. Lewis, president of the W. M. Cissell Manufacturing Co. of Louisville, Ky., modestly accepted the "E" Award on behalf of the Cissell Co. and its employees. Her remarks follow:

REMARKS BY MRS. ELOISE CISSELL LEWIS UPON PRESENTATION OF THE PRESIDENT'S "E" AWARD, HOTEL SHERATON CARLTON, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 26, 1963

I'm so overwhelmed I can hardly talk. I never expected to see the day when I'd get a Presidential award and I'm thrilled. I'm especially thrilled because I'm a woman. This event proves that in this great country it is possible for a woman to compete freely and equally with men and be recognized and be rewarded. It is also possible in my industry or in any industry to compete freely and have the same opportunities for making a profit, living as well and being as happy as any man. That's what makes America great and why I'm so proud of being an American.

I'm proud of having children who are growing up in a free land that I hope will be even better for them than it was for us * * * a land where the youth will have an opportunity to develop and lead us into new wonders of the space age.

Our company is an example of how small business can grow and prosper in the United States. My father, Cissell, inventor of the commercial electric steam iron, started manufacturing in a garage. He prospered and now the company is housed in a modern, efficient plant. When he died the company was left to the family and I was given management authority.

Now we are being presented with the President's "E" award and are truly honored. I am so astounded to find myself in the same room with so many very important people that I'm awed. I'm wondering if it's true and this really is Eloise Cissell Lewis or whether I'll wake up and find myself back in Louisville getting ready to drive my daughter to school.

I'm not going to attempt to make a speech because I don't know how; this is my first try and I want to make good. What really thrills me is all the honored women guests here, women who really have made good—made real contributions to our society. I've read about many of you—like Dr. Kelsey, who helped save our country from thalidomide babies—the heads of the military services—the new Director of the Mint, Miss Adams. I guess I can't ask her for a sample of money—but I would like to ask Mrs. Granahan, the Treasurer of the United States, to endorse a dollar bill for my daughter and one for me. There so many of you, like the Director of Research of the Bureau of Home Economics, Dr. Faith Clark. Back in Louisville we read some of the booklets she's gotten out and they help us plan meals and run our homes. All you other people doing wonderful and exciting work are likewise an inspiration to the women of America. I'm especially thrilled with meeting the women of the press—Patti Cavin, Margaret Davis, and all you others who daily prove that Nellie Bly was a good first choice. And I'm delighted to meet the diplomats from the 40 countries where we export.

I've never thought of my job as being glamorous until this morning. Actually, it isn't—but it is exciting and stimulating and challenging to me. We have a union shop—our workers belong to the International Brotherhood of Machinists—and I know them all. They work in a clean plant because after all our whole job centers around cleanliness. We make drycleaning and similar equipment in a modern plant with modern manufacturing techniques and equipment. I believe that having a clean, cheerful place in which to work makes it easier for the men to work without accidents. Besides, it's pleasanter.

I'm sure you know that when we at the Cissell Co. started planning our export program, we never had any idea that we'd receive a Presidential award. We think exporting to foreign countries is good business for us, as the President thinks it's good business for the Nation.

Mr. Draper Daniels, the National Export Expansion Coordinator of the United States, emphasized this while making the President's award to me. He said, "Through an imaginative and energetic program of product development and marketing, the Cissell Manufacturing Co. increased oversea sales to 22 percent of its total business * * * making innovations in its pressing machines to meet particular area marketing needs, demonstrating equipment at trade shows, supporting its oversea dealers with advertising, and pushing a vigorous promotion and sales program against severe competition. The company established a record which reflects credit on our private enterprise system and represents a significant contribution to the export expansion program of the Government of the United States." That is a wonderful tribute and we are most grateful.

This award, I am proud to say, is not just to Eloise Cissell Lewis; it is to W. M. Cissell Manufacturing Co., and so it coems to the men in the plant, to the girls in the office, and to the suppliers of our materials, equipment, and services.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Keith Covelle Retires From Okmulgee Tech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission at this time to express my personal appreciation and the thanks of thousands to a friend and fellow Oklahoman who has recently announced his retirement after devoting the major part of his life as an educator and administrator.

This man has contributed more to the field of technical and industrial education than perhaps any other person in the Nation.

Anyone who follows the great work being carried on today in technical and industrial education knows that I am speaking of Keith Covelle, who will shortly retire as director of Oklahoma State Tech at Okmulgee.

For the past 17 years—from the inception of Okmulgee Tech—Keith Covelle has been its guiding hand as director, principal educator, and tireless "ambassador of good will."

Keith Covelle has spent nearly a half a century stressing the great need and importance of developing the trade and technical skills of our citizens.

His deep conviction that every man should be trained to be a productive citizen has been proven true in the great work being carried on at Okmulgee Tech—and every member of our society has been the direct beneficiary of this conviction.

In 1946, Keith Covelle left his position as vocational specialist at Oklahoma State University at Stillwater to inaugurate his ideas at Okmulgee Tech. He acquired the Army's old Glennan General Hospital at Okmulgee to be used for the plant facilities and opened the doors to 211 students who enrolled in 11 different trades.

The overwhelming success of this bold venture in a relatively uncharted area of education is borne out by the number of graduates from Okmulgee Tech and the strategic positions these graduates occupy in cities and towns throughout the United States.

During the past 17 years of Okmulgee Tech's existence, more than 18,000 persons have learned a trade, business, or occupation in the school. This year enrollment is approximately 1,500 and the school operates the year around on a three-semester plan.

The success of trade, technical, and industrial education, not only at Okmulgee Tech but at other institutions throughout the Nation, is due in a large measure to the personal leadership and zeal of Keith Covelle. For his many friends, admirers, and former students, I express a heartfelt "thank you."

I know that Keith Covelle can justifiably take great personal satisfaction in knowing that he has made an outstanding contribution to society, the enduring benefits of which stand as a living tribute to him.

How My Community Benefits From the Abilities of the Handicapped Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I would like at this moment to call attention to an accomplishment registered by a young Indiana student whose concern for the handicapped matches that of many adult leaders in the fight for employment of the handicapped. Seventeen-year-old Jeffrey Hesler, 6187 Crittendon Avenue, Indianapolis, Ind., was a recent visitor in my office because he won a trip to the Capitol by winning first place in Indiana in the 1962–63 National Ability Counts contest, sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped and the Commission for the Handicapped, Indiana State Board of Health. Young Hesler's fine essay was recently judged the best of those submitted by pupils in 24 public and parochial schools in Indiana and was entered in national competition. He also won $150. Jeffrey is a student at Our Lady of the Lake Seminary, Syracuse, Ind., I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD young Hesler's winning essay entitled "How My Community Benefits From the Abilities of the Handicapped Workers."

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MY COMMUNITY BENEFITS FROM THE ABILITIES OF THE HANDICAPPED WORKERS

(By Jeffrey Hesler)

This 20th century era of progress permeates our lives. And yet a quarter million Americans become disabled annually despite our significant advances in medicine and industrial safety.

Eighteen million Americans are now impaired to some degree by physical disabilities. Eighteen million more suffer from mental or emotional diseases requiring phychiatric treatment. Finally, our country houses some 5 million persons who are mentally retarded.[1]

These people, the handicapped, possessing the same God-given rights and inherent dignity as their unimpaired neighbors, are confronted with a staggering task—that of proving their worth and ability. They, like their fellow citizens, ardently desire to support themselves and to contribute to the welfare of the community. But, nevertheless, some 20 percent of impaired workers, capable of employment, are yet jobless. This is lamentable since these might prove to the public, as their now employed handicappd confreres are proving, that "ability counts."

Rehabilitation (the program consisting of recognizing the handicap, correcting it or modifying it through surgical procedure, physical therapy, or aritificial appliances, and/or training and placement in a suitable occupation)[2] is an important year-round duty of the community, cooperating with governmental agencies and working through its own private groups and committees.

The community, again acting through coordinating committees, next functions as an intermediary between the rehabilitated worker and the prospective employer. Hereby it performs a dual role: first, employing the handicapped and, second, supplying the employer with competent workers.

Using their abilities, 8 million physically handicapped Americans, employed in commerce, industry, agriculture, medicine, education, and other fields, are today benefiting themselves, their employers, and their communities. This statement, however, requires elucidation. First, how have the handicapped proven their abilities? Second, how do they benefit?

Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, answers the first question. "Handicapped workers have proven their ability by achieving equal or superior records for production, stability, concentration, and safety."[3]

The existence of these four qualities in the work of the impaired laborer, proof of his ability, are further substantiated by surveys of the Department of Labor and the Veterans' Administration.

Impaired workers, realizing that a job is a real privilege and therefore giving their all, usually produce at slightly higher rates than unimpaired workers on the same jobs. As Mr. Hunt of the Indianapolis Goodwill Industries, Inc., states:

"Usually there is an abnormal motivation on the part of the handicapped worker to excel in his skill. Concern and effort are usual. In addition, he is usually a more stable and dedicated worker."

Mr. Richard Stafford of the Indiana Employment Security Division corroborates this when he says: "Handicapped people have the ability quite often equal, or superior, to other workers."

---

[1] "Jobs for the Handicapped," the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Program Guide 1962–63, pp. 4–5.

[2] "Opportunity for the Disabled Through Vocational Rehabilitation," Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Indiana Department of Public Instruction.

[3] "Mr. Employer—You Need Able Workers, So Hire the Handicapped," pamphlet of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

When the disabled individual is properly placed in a position suitable to his ability, no job handicap exists. For example, deaf mutes, unaffected by office distraction, make better than average file clerks because of their concentration abilities; blind workers, possessing a highly developed sense of touch, make excellent assemblers, inspectors, and sorters; paraplegics work very productively on assembly lines. "No single job requires all the faculties of the normal person." [4]

Impaired workers, furthermore, have fewer disabling injuries than unimpaired ones when exposed to the same work hazards; they have the same minor injury rate. An excellent example of this is found in the Hughes Aircraft plant, employing 6,000 handicapped workers, where in 1960 17 million man-hours of work passed without a single lost-time accident.

Now let us examine some individual impaired workers. Consider the case of Emik Avakian, the Handicapped American of 1961, who, though paralyzed, made astounding contributions in the field of data communications systems in electronics processing; or the case of the young lady paralyzed from the waist down, who heads the traffic department for a large radio station in the great Northwest.[5] Blind girls who are actually switchboard operators in Evansville, Ind., produce another significant example of how the handicapped are developing and exercising their abilities. Through the scientific advances of the Bell Telephone Laboratory, a new field is now open to the blind.

Are companies satisfied with handicapped abilities? Listen to P. S. du Pont III, secretary, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.:

"We believe the utilization of the abilities of the handicapped is good business, and our experience supports that belief." [6]

Yes, the handicapped have proved and are proving their abilities. But what about the resulting benefits? The employed handicapped worker produces benefits for three recipients: (1) For himself—economic independence and self-respect; (2) for employer—business health engendered through his capable abilities; (3) for his community and country—the removal of his name from relief and unemployment rosters, its addition to the tax rolls, an increase of goods and services, and a stronger State and Nation.

In summation, if the handicapped are hired according to their ability, not their disability, according to their assets, not their liabilities, the handicapped person himself, his employer, and the community in general will never regret the outcome.

---

[4] "Cooperation—the Key to Jobs for the Handicapped," American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

[5] Program guide 1962–63, op. cit., pp. 3–4.

[6] "Mr. Employer—Remember Ability Counts," the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

Two Senators Versus One Representative on the Test Ban Trap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, here, for the Record, are the texts of two letters dated May 15, 1963, and dispatched to their colleagues by two Members of the other body and one Member of this body:

May 15, 1963.

Dear Colleague: During the past several weeks, a great deal has been said about the supposed ineffectiveness of President Kennedy's draft treaty banning further nuclear testing made at the test ban negotiations in Geneva.

On April 4, 1963, Congressman Hosmer sent a letter to all Congressmen and Senators asserting the existence of a big hole in our inspection and identification proposals which, he has said, would permit the Soviets to cheat in perfect safety. The fact that the Soviets have shown little disposition to accept our proposals, and have, in fact, become increasingly intransigent in the negotiations, is probably adequate rebuttal in itself. Nevertheless, we would like to set the record straight on the facts upon which Congressman Hosmer apparently relies, so as to dispose of the big hole theory once and for all.

What the facts really show is that the big hole theory is as empty and insubstantial as its name suggests. In a letter to the President dated March 18, 1963, Congressman Hosmer alluded to "an area of at least 2½ million square miles in the interior of the U.S.S.R.—and probably twice that size—in which significant secret Soviet underground tests can be carried on wholly without fear of detection."

The scientific fact is that it makes no difference how deep within the borders of the U.S.S.R. the Soviets try to hide their tests, since "the detection capability is, for all practical purposes, constant with respect to the distance from explosion to seismic station in the interval of 600 to 6,000 miles. For this reason, no part of the Soviet Union is unseen by our seismic stations outside the Soviet Union."

That statement was made by Dr. Harold Brown, the former head of the Atomic Energy Commission's Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, and the man presently in charge of all the Defense Department's research and engineering programs. It was contained in the administration's response to Congressman Hosmer's letter to the President. Yet, so far as is known, it has never been made public by Congressman Hosmer.

Apparently, Congressman Hosmer now concedes that unlawful Soviet tests, even very small tests, could be detected from outside the U.S.S.R. But, he says, such tests can be made too small to permit their positive identification by purely seismic means. This, it appears, is the principal foundation for his assertion that a "big hole" exists in our detection proposals.

There are two answers to this, and both of them were made in a letter sent to Congressman Hosmer by the White House on March 29. First, as Dr. Brown pointed out, tests as small as those envisioned by Congressman Hosmer would not provide a substantial military advantage to the Soviets. Not much advance could be made in the field of strategic weapons, and any innovations made in tactical weapons would have little effect in altering the cold war balance. Second, seismic detection would not be the only means employed to uncover surreptitious testing. In addition to on-site checks, all the other facilities of intelligence would be brought into play. Thus, the Soviets, in order to sneak their tests through the "big hole," would have to make them so small as to be not worth the very real risks of being caught, in full view of the world, in a flagrant violation of the test ban treaty.

The net result is that there is no big hole.

Congressman Hosmer's fears of the administration's test ban proposal have no valid basis in fact. The proposal is for an effective treaty which holds every reasonable prospect of reducing the risks inherent in the present freedom of both our country and the U.S.S.R. to test at will.

The Congressman's fears seem all the more groundless in the light of his latest proposal. In a sharp turn-about, he now suggests that we demand absolutely no on-site inspections whatever, and that we seek a treaty banning all nuclear tests in outer space, underwater, and in the atmosphere, but permit each side "a dozen or so" underground shots per year. We fail to understand how Congressman Hosmer can be concerned about underground cheating under a system that provides for on-site inspections to catch cheating, yet apparently be unconcerned about underground cheating which might escape discovery under a treaty which did not provide for any on-site inspections at all.

Sincerely,

Hubert H. Humphrey.
Joseph S. Clark.

Dear Colleague: This is to correct errors of fact and logic contained in a letter of even date to you from Senators Humphrey and Clark.

Their letter asserts I have charged there is a big hole for clandestine underground Soviet cheating in present test ban treaty proposals by the administration. This is 100 percent correct.

Although seismic signals from Soviet cheat tests in the U.S.S.R. could be detected by the administration's monitoring proposals, if the tests were at low yields or conducted in underground cavities, the signals would be so small they could not be identified as cheat tests. The suspicions of monitors would never be aroused—on-site inspectors would never be dispatched.

Dr. Brown's memo relied upon by the Senators says the tests would not go "unseen." It does not claim they would be recognized.

There is no question that the big hole is really there.

The AEC's Director of Military Applications testified to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that all weapons of tactical interest and a substantial fraction of all weapons of strategic interest could be developed in the big hole.

Dr. Brown and the Senators may not believe clandestine advances which could give the Soviets nuclear superiority could be developed by this kind of cheating, but just look at the only weapons which cannot be developed by it: An unsubstantial fraction of strategic weapons. What are these? The big super-yield H-bombs the Reds have already developed anyway.

Their logic just does not make sense.

"Why don't the Soviets snap up our offer if it's so full of holes?" the Senators ask. The reasons should be obvious to the Senators. In the first place, the Soviets want to get another round of atmospheric tests out of the way before they go underground. In the second place, from the administration's past performance they well know they can expect even more concessions and an even weaker treaty if they hold out a while longer.

In that context I proposed earlier this week that if we were to have such a treaty where we stopped all weapons progress and just relied on a Communist promise to do likewise, we'd better get an escape hatch written into it if we do not want to face a nuclear Pearl Harbor or a "surrender or die" ultimatum after the Soviets have cheated their way to nuclear superiority.

So I suggested: "Let's write in a provision giving us a dozen or so fallout free underground tests every year."

That way we can make some progress. Our topnotch weapons scientists can be persuaded to stay at work in the labs. Without testing at all, President Kennedy admits they will not stay with a "dead end" program. If our security measures are any good, the

Kremlin will never be sure how much progress we are making. This means the Soviets will not be sure they have bootlegged their way to nuclear superiority and they might be deterred from attacking us or issuing that terrifying ultimatum.

Without this escape hatch, what the Senators and the administration propose is a sure course toward nuclear disaster.

The Senators incorrectly stated I proposed we drop demands for on-site inspections. As a matter of fact, I would like to see many more than the token number they approve. It is unlikely, however, that anybody can get the administration to demand them.

Sincerely,

Craig Hosmer,
Member of Congress.

It is to be noted that the second letter does not bother even to discuss the Senators' claim that "facilities of intelligence" would be brought into play to discover Soviet cheating. It was believed unnecessary to do so, since almost everybody recalls that "facilities of intelligence" are unable to tell us what is going on in Cuba, right on our own doorstep, let alone in the vast, 8½ million square miles, two continent, Eurasian land mass comprising the U.S.S.R.

Unduly Privileged Position of Labor Unions in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, the American Liberal Association addressed a letter to the President on March 8 expressing its proposals for legislative changes to correct what it terms "an unduly privileged position" of labor unions in the United States. I have been requested to insert the association's letter in the Record in order to acquaint the Senate with the organization's views in this area.

I, therefore, Mr. President, ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

American Liberal Association,
New York, N.Y., March 8, 1963.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Labor unions, which are voluntary associations of workers, were created as a result of the imperative need and the justifiable determination of the laboring man to improve working conditions and obtain job security through responsible collective bargaining. Since 1933 many unions have acquired an unduly privileged position in the social structure, unnecessary for the attainment of their original aim of collective bargaining. As has been said, "While originally unions sought the power of persuasion, they now posses the persuasion of power".

The recent work stoppages in strategic industries, hazarding the public interest and welfare and, at times, the national security, have an adverse effect upon the general public incommensurate with the importance of the issues in conflict. Under present laws labor unions are privileged and mainly immune from legal accountability. Under the umbrella of congressional protection unions have achieved disproportionately great political power and economic dominance. Federal legislation dealing with these problems is urgently necessary and should provide the following measures:

1. The appointment by the President of a nonpartisan and impartial commission when there is an industrial dispute and the threat of work stoppage in an industry affecting the general welfare. Such a commission should be empowered to examine the differences between the positions of labor and management, with access to all records, and to publicize both positions, with a recommendation for a settlement of the issues in conflict. The pressure of public opinion should be able to bring about an equitable agreement.

2. As some labor union leaders place the interest of the unions above the welfare of society and use their vast funds to restrict the normal flow of trade, labor unions should be subject to antitrust laws as are corporations when their power to restrain commerce endangers the public interest.

3. Labor union exemption from Federal income tax liability on income received from investments should be removed while preserving tax deductibility for expenditures for charitable and educational purposes such as pension funds, etc.

Although the function of labor unions in collective bargaining is important, these proposed measures are urgent lest unions have the power, without effective restraint, to violate our traditional concept of fair play and to imbalance our social structure, threatening our economic stability and political well-being.

Sincerely yours,
Harry J. Carman, *Chairman.*

Bootstrap Slips

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the fears of small businessmen about the possible dominance by labor leaders in affairs of Puerto Rico are discussed in an editorial which appeared in the Cheney, Wash., Free Press on April 26, 1963.

This editorial points out that union presidents are chairmen of the Commonwealth's House and Senate Labor Committees. The fact that union presidents are chairmen of these committees raises the question of possible conflicts of interest.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this might well be a matter to bring to the attention of the House Committee on Insular and Interior Affairs.

Although it is not the function of a Member of Congress to question the electorate of a State or of Puerto Rico, the expressions of the editorial does cause some concern.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial in the Record:

Bootstrap Slips

Not long ago Puerto Rico's Operation Bootstrap, a campaign to attract industry and investment to that island, was being cited as a glittering success. But now the glitter shows signs of tarnish.

Recently, a distinguished Puerto Rican businessman warned the government of Gov. Munoz Marin that the local small businessman was worried and insecure. The cause: the runaway power of labor.

Puerto Rico finds itself in the unhappy position of having union presidents as chairmen of the Commonwealth's House and Senate Labor Committees. This is akin to having Jimmy Hoffa as chairman of the House Labor Committee and Walter Reuther as chairman of the Senate Labor Committee in the Congress of the United States. All of this happening in a land once hailed as the showcase of democracy in the Caribbean.

If the Commonwealth government isn't upset by this obvious conflict of interest, Puerto Rico's Economic Development Administration (Fomento) should be. When local businessmen are worried about labor's takeover, how can Fomento expect any outside businessman to consider seriously the location of a plant in Puerto Rico that would be subject to unbridled labor harassment?

Fomento seems to have slipped, anyway, since Teodoro Moscoso, who created Operation Bootstrap, left. Moscoso is running the Alliance for Progress but perhaps Puerto Rico had better call him home to straighten things out since the aging Munoz Marin apparently can't handle the situation.

Dr. William H. McCorkle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the Congressional Record an editorial broadcast over the air by WCYB television station on April 30, 1963, regarding Dr. William H. McCorkle.

I thought that the editorial portrayed the outstanding record of Mr. McCorkle in such a fine way that I wanted others to know about this great man with whom I have been acquainted for many years. He is a distinguished American and a great religious leader.

The editorial was written by Mr. Walter Crockett, editorial director of WCYB-TV, who has an outstanding record in this field.

The editorial follows:

Bristolians, Presbyterians, and people in other cities where he has served, know Dr. William H. McCorkle as a topflight pulpit orator; a preacher intensely interested in the welfare of his congregation, of the community in which he lives, and a man wholly devoted to service in the ministry.

We join with the thousands who are delighted with the election of this dedicated man as moderator of the Southern Presbyterian Church.

Dr. McCorkle is pastor of the 1,100-member First Presbyterian Church in Bristol, and Bristolians know many things about the energetic man who is so widely admired—but let's refresh ourselves.

Dr. McCorkle was a U.S. Navy chaplain in World War II—and one of its most decorated chaplains.

He received the Silver Star for rescuing a wounded Marine from a battlefield in Bougainville; a Purple Heart for the wound he suffered in the rescue act.

In 1944 on Guam he received a Bronze Star for heroic achievement.

As the New York Times put it: "He was with the lonely, the wounded, and the dying all the way through the Pacific to Guam."

He was sent to Annapolis in 1945 as a chaplain; he wore four combat medals at the time; and he was a lieutenant commander when the war ended.

He has served, with distinction, churches in Kingsport, Knoxville, and St. Louis, Mo. For a Bible course he inaugurated at Knoxville he was honored with an honorary degree by King College.

Many of us know that he is the son of a good broker, of Rock Hill, S.C., who lost his eyesight—later went to Congress—and the son was his page in Washington.

What most of us do not know, is that Dr. McCorkle taught school for 2 years after he graduated from The Citadel; that he then went into the insurance and was earning $10,000 a year.

Then came the decision, one night in May 1925 at Greenville, S.C., the insurance salesman decided to go into the ministry; he began studying theology in the fall of that year; he met his wife while both were students at Union Theological Seminary in Richmond and they were married after he received his master's degree at Princeton Seminary.

The former insurance salesman says that for 34 years he has been in the higher life-insurance business.

His accomplishments in the field have enriched the lives of many people.

Trade Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a recent editorial in the Daily News of New York City calls attention to and strongly commends a constructive suggestion proposed by Mrs. Alice Widener, the publisher of U.S.A. magazine, in the April 29 issue of Barron's Financial Weekly. It is a suggestion which merits careful and thoughtful consideration.

For the information of the Congress and the country, I ask that the Daily News editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MORE AMERICANS IN U.N.

Some days ago, an advisory committee of very solid citizens urged the U.S. Government to take vigorous measures aimed at putting qualified Americans into a lot more important United Nations posts.

We're the biggest single bankroller of the U.N., to say nothing of our putting up extra dough for U.N. peacekeeping efforts when such deadbeat nations as Soviet Russia refuse to contribute their fair shares.

Yet the proportion of U.S. citizens in U.N. agencies and technical assistance programs runs only from 8 percent to 12 percent of the total personnel, whereas we are entitled to twice those percentages.

To this committee's advice, Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland made reply that the Government is beginning to take the steps recommended, and it is hoped that more—a lot more—Americans may be on guard at key U.N. posts before very long.

U.N. Secretary General U Thant also was cordial about it all, saying he "welcomed any measures" the United States might take to get more U.N. jobs for qualified U.S. citizens.

So all is rosy in this respect, at least to outward appearances, and it's to be hoped the good work will proceed as reported by Mr. Cleveland and endorsed by Mr. Thant.

It is particularly important that it should proceed, because of a big trade conference which is coming up early next year under U.N. auspices, and which was requested by Soviet Russia.

Mrs. Alice Widener, enterprising publisher of U.S.A. magazine, has been digging into the plans for this get-together, and has reported her findings in detail in the authoritative Barron's financial weekly (issue of April 29).

PLOT AGAINST U.S. COMMERCE

According to Mrs. Widener, the U.N. International Conference on Trade and Development, as it is officially named, has heavy undertones and overtones of a Soviet conspiracy to undermine and disrupt capitalist markets and trade throughout the world.

If that could be accomplished, the Red slave empire would hope to grab a lot of this trade and these markets—especially from the United States.

At the U.N. trade conference, Mrs. Widener predicts, the Russians will slander and libel the United States in every way their fertile imaginations can dream up—painting this country as an economic aggressor and an exploiter of backward nations and the good old Soviet Union as the only true friend the underdeveloped countries have in this wicked world.

We see no reason to doubt the Widener predictions. They jibe neatly with Kremlin practice in all of such situations.

Therefore, we hope the U.S. business community, beginning just about now, will pressure the State Department to take four steps which Mrs. Widener says must be taken if the United States is to have a fair break at the U.N. trade conference next year.

These steps are:

1. Request Secretary General U Thant to appoint an experienced American businessman as U.N. Under Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs;
2. Scrutinize the caliber and security of U.S. nationals now holding executive economic policy and research posts in the U.N. secretariat;
3. Strengthen American business representation within the U.S. mission to the U.N.;
4. Appoint an outstanding business executive, with broad experience in international trade, as chief U.S. delegate to the United Nations International Conference on Trade and Development.

PLANNING IN SELF-DEFENSE

These proposed measures look to us like the plainest commonsense.

The Soviets are busy already on plans for turning the U.N. trade conference into just another propaganda circus for their exclusive benefit.

We should be equally busy making plans to defeat the Soviet scheme, for our own self-defense and for the benefit of trade and business all over the free world.

The State Department is the proper spearhead for such U.S. planning; and how about State getting busy—now?

Kennedy as Solon Talked Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Kennedy as Solon Talked Sense" by Victor Lasky of the North American Newspaper Alliance as it appeared in the New Hampshire Sunday News of May 12, 1963.

It contains some remarkable and striking quotations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

KENNEDY AS SOLON TALKED SENSE—FREQUENTLY SIDED WITH REACTIONARY ECONOMY BLOC

(By Victor Lasky)

NEW YORK, May 11.—How times have changed.

In 1950, a young congressman told a charity fund dinner in Boston, "the scarlet thread running through the thoughts and actions of people all over the world is the delegation of great problems to the all-absorbing Leviathan—the state.

The Congressman was John F. Kennedy.

And he added that charity was a priceless ingredient of modern civilization and, as such, is a direct responsibility of a free society.

"I suppose," said the son of Joseph P. Kennedy, "it would be easier for us if we requested that the Government assume the responsibility for the money we are seeking to raise (for charity). Yet only by doing the work ourselves, by giving generously out of our own pockets, can we hope to maintain the authority of the people over the State, to insure that the people remain the masters and the State the servant.

"Every time that we try to lift a problem from our own shoulders and shift that problem to the Government, to the same extent are we sacrificing the liberties of the people."

ACCEPTS NEW GOSPEL

Needless to say, John F. Kennedy was to discard the jargon of the Hayeks, the Von Mises and the Fertigs to adopt the whole Galbraithian gospel calling for "public supervision" over the ecomony, bigger government, more revenues to support the "public sector," and changes in the economic system to foster a "welfare society."

As a result, it takes a long reach of memory to recall that in his congressional years John F. Kennedy frequently sided with the "reactionary" House economy bloc in efforts to curtail excessive Truman Fair Deal spending.

In 1950, for example, Kennedy departed from the Democratic leadership to support a proposal by Congressman John Taber, the grand old Republican watchdog of the Treasury, for a $600 million across-the-board cut in Federal spending.

"How long," Young Jack then demanded of the House of Representatives, "can we continue deficit financing on such a large scale with a national debt of over $285 billions?"

ANTIWASTE VOTES

So opposed was Kennedy to what he termed "wasteful spending" that he voted against a bill that would have provided Federal assistance to local libraries. In 1950, he voted against doubling hospital construction grants under the Public Health Service. In 1951, he was 1 of only 26 Democrats in the House who voted to sustain President Truman's veto of a veterans' pension bill.

All through that period, Congressman Kennedy was vociferously opposed to most Federal aid programs on the premise that they were doing New England much more harm than good and they invariably favored other sections of the country.

Thus he voted regularly against appropriations for various flood control, navigation and atomic power projects around the country. His most significant vote—in view of his later ambitions—was one in 1952 in favor of slashing $14 million for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

VERSUS ROONEY

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 20, 1950, there appeared this colloquy between the Bay Stater and Brooklyn's JOHN F. ROONEY.

"KENNEDY. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not he feels that it is more dangerous to carry a deficit of $6 billion in a prosperous year like today, or cut some of these appropriations by 10 percent? I do not see how we can go on carrying a deficit every year. I should think it would be much more preferable to cut some of these appropriations by that figure.

"ROONEY. I do not believe in further cutting this appropriation, which is for a vital service, in one of our most important departments, the Department of State.

"KENNEDY. How are we going to bring that deficit of $6 billion down to a reasonable figure unless we make some of these cuts? * * * does not the gentleman think that very important item in the cold war is the economic stability of our country so that we will have resources in case of war?"

On May 15, 1951, arguing for his amendment to slash a flood-control appropriation from $8 million to $2,500,000, young Kennedy said:

"Today the dollar is a strategic material and its use for nondefense purposes must be stopped."

The Kennedy amendment was defeated.

No one took Kennedy very seriously in those days. Not even Kennedy, himself, according to Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. Most of his colleagues considered him a pleasant young man merely voicing his father's views.

Nevertheless, John F. Kennedy appeared to have made more fiscal sense as a Congressman than he does today as President of the United States.

Unique Education Plan To Service Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, Northeastern University, located in Boston, Mass., has devised a program to offer further educational opportunities for employees of Greater Boston's research-oriented industries. Construction of a new $1 million suburban Northeastern campus in Burlington, Mass., to be built on a Government surplus Nike site, will start this summer and will be ready to begin operation in January of 1964.

The university's plan is an unusual example of an urban institution taking the initiative to meet industries' requests for a college campus in their own environment. According to Northeastern's president, Dr. Asa S. Knowles, the program will establish new cooperation among higher education, research-oriented industries and the residents of the area who are vitally concerned with continuing educational opportunities at the advanced level.

Courses will be conducted on an intensive short-term basis, leading to graduate degrees in the fields of the physical sciences, engineering, and management. Not only will the plan help to educate and to retrain manpower already residing in the area, but also it will encourage high-grade personnel and new industries to locate in this region. It is hoped that the new campus will provide facilities for attracting distinguished scientists and for holding meetings of learned societies.

The advantages of this university's undertaking will benefit both students and industries. It is a step in the right direction in our efforts to cope with the increasing challenge to our society in this demanding technological age. I commend Northeastern University for the establishment of such a worthy program, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the April issue of Industry magazine entitled, "Unique Education Plan To Service Industry." This article more fully describes this new education plan.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIQUE EDUCATION PLAN TO SERVICE INDUSTRY

Plans for a $1 million suburban campus off Route 128, designed for employees of Greater Boston's research-oriented industries and residents of the area, were announced today by Dr. Asa S. Knowles, Northeastern University president.

Under study for more than a year, the plan initially calls for the construction of 10 classrooms, parking facilities for up to 500 automobiles, an auditorium for 250 persons, offices, a small library, conference rooms, student lounges with a canteen-cafeteria, and related facilities on a 15-acre site on South Bedford Street, Burlington, Mass.

The suburban campus will be an extension of the Huntington Avenue campus and the courses to be offered will be under the control of the Northeastern University faculty and deans, now responsible for these particular programs.

COURSES FOR EMPLOYEES

The 1,000 students to be enrolled each semester will be considered regular students of the university and will be subject to the same regulations and requirements for degrees.

In addition to the standard courses, many short courses and intensive programs of special interest to Route 128 industries will be offered.

It is anticipated that courses leading to master of science degrees in engineering, physics, and mathematics will be offered. Other graduate courses in the fields of business, science, education, and the arts will be given, if the demand for them becomes evident. Major portions of the part-time program leading to a bachelor of science degree in electrical engineering will also be taught in Burlington.

Courses in engineering technology leading to associate in engineering degrees, and management courses leading to the B.S. degree are also planned. Day courses—including "released-time" programs—are also a possibility, if it is determined there is a need and interest in them.

The 15-acre area is part of a former Nike site which has been declared surplus by the Federal Government. Northeastern's application for the property has been approved by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The town of Burlington, which initially had considered seeking the property for recreational and park facilities, agreed to withdraw its petition for the property after a meeting with university officials.

The university now has a permit to enter the Burlington property. It expects to acquire title to it in the near future.

"We believe this campus could become the focal point for many of the intellectual activities which are so important to the research-oriented industries in this area," Dr. Knowles said.

INCENTIVE FOR EDUCATION

Furthermore, he noted, the conveniently located campus will provide a service to the large percentage of college graduates in the area.

INCENTIVE FOR INDUSTRY

"The greatest asset the Route 128 area has is not its fertile soil, its minerals, or its climate, but residents who are well educated and who are keeping up to date in engineering and physical science," Dr. Knowles said.

"So that this asset may be maintained and replenished, a college campus is needed in the region," he added.

In the area towns the campus will serve, Northeastern found that the percentage of engineers in the total population is about four times as large as it is for metropolitan Boston as a whole.

"For these people education is not over when they finish high school or college; they must continue their education. They must commute daily, not only to their place of employment, but also to a college campus," Dr. Knowles explained.

INDUSTRY OFFERS SUPPORT

Proposals for the campus have already been fully explored at meetings with representatives from business and industry. More than 40 industrial firms have indicated a willingness to support the development of such a campus, Dr. Knowles said. Several Federal agencies are also interested in the project, he added.

It is expected that the total investment in the campus will eventually be $1 million or more.

The construction will begin as soon as working drawings are available. The ground breaking will be no later than this summer.

The first students should be using the facilities by January 1964.

Until then, Northeastern expects to continue to use Weston High School for some of its part-time evening graduate programs. More than 1,000 students have been enrolled in the past 2 semesters in 39 courses taught by the Northeastern University graduate school faculty in engineering mathematics, engineering, and physics. The high school facilities have been leased under an arrangement with the school committee.

"It is my firm belief that the educational facilities we are planning will be of immense benefit in helping to attract new industries to the 128 area," Dr. Knowles said.

"I envision this not only as an educational center, but also as a convenient location for business conferences, seminars, and scientific institutes, Dr. Knowles said. "It could be the forum for distinguished scientists and provide the facilities for meetings of learned societies," he added.

The proposed campus would offer "special advantages" to both students and industry, Dr. Knowles said.

NEEDED FOR LEADERSHIP

The convenient and accessible location would permit students and faculty members to avoid traffic and parking problems. By providing competent faculty and staff and the general stimulation of the university atmosphere, the graduate programs would assist area firms in recruiting high-grade personnel, many of whom are seeking to further their education and professional competence.

"This campus will also provide the facilities and services for retaining and upgrading present personnel," Dr. Knowles said.

"To be truthful, I see such an educational center as a virtual necessity, if Greater Boston is to maintain its leadership in science-based industry," he added.

"Already other cities and regions are trying to copy the unique complex we have here, because they realize that continued economic health and industrial expansion in this technological age require a unique pool of trained and educated manpower," Dr. Knowles said.

"So that this asset may be maintained and replenished, a college campus is needed in the region," he added.

The suburban campus, he added, would merely be an extension of existing adult programs now offered by Northeastern.

Northeastern University now enrolls: 3,600 part-time graduate students, including those enrolled at Weston High School; 3,400 part-time students enrolled for associates degrees in engineering and chemistry; 300 part-time students working toward a B.S. in electrical engineering; and 4,600 part-time (evening) undergraduates students in business and science.

A high percentage of the undergraduates and graduate part-time students are employees of organizations located on or near route 128.

For instance, a recent survey conducted by Northeastern University disclosed that the Western Electric Co. had 162 students in evening programs; the General Electric Co., 257; Avco, 307; and Raytheon, 1,289. Similar figures are available for hundreds of other companies.

Northeastern which was established in 1898, will also be drawing on years of know-how in providing courses and programs for the adult employed. This is reflected in a large administrative staff specifically appointed to administer part-time academic programs and to counsel part-time students.

Affiliated Young Democrats of New York Honor Speaker McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following announcement of a very important ceremony honoring our beloved Speaker on April 10, 1963.

The report follows:

The Affiliated Young Democrats of New York State honored Speaker of the House of Representatives JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Congressman from Massachusetts, by presenting him with their annual award and plaque of 1962, for his outstanding and great service to the people of our country.

This plaque was presented in the office of Speaker MCCORMACK at the Capitol, on Wednesday afternoon, April 10, at 3 o'clock, with the Democratic Congressmen present, most of whom are members of the Affiliated Young Democrats. Also, a large delegation of members of the Affiliated Young Democrats from New York were present at this presentation to honor Speaker of the House of Representatives JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

Harold R. Moskovit, State president of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York introduced Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., Under Secretary of Commerce, a member and honorary member of the Affiliated Young Democrats and a former Congressman from New York, to present this plaque to Speaker MCCORMACK.

The plaque reads as follows:

"AFFILIATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS, INC., OF NEW YORK STATE—MERITORIOUS CITATION TO HON. JOHN W. M'CORMACK

"In appreciation for faithful, unswerving, untiring and extraordinary service on behalf of the Democratic Party.

"Admired, venerated, and honored by our members for your outstanding assistance and guidance given to us and all young Democrats for many years by helping us to promote the highest ideals of our young men and women, the future leaders of our country and party.

"Given this 10th day of April 1963, at the Capitol, Washington, D.C.

"HAROLD R. MOSKOVIT,
State President."

REA: Uncle Sam's Beanstalk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to decide whether any Federal agency may receive Federal money and in turn loan it to private industry at a rate approximately one-half of the cost of the money to our Government. It is my belief that no agency has such a right and I believe that it is time Congress took steps to end this practice. I believe that the following editorial appearing in the Wyoming State Tribune will be of special interest:

REA: UNCLE SAM'S BEANSTALK

In 1930, the rural population of this country stood at 53.8 million persons; 30 years later, following the greatest population expansion in U.S. history, it was 54 million.

In three decades of growth then, the rural population of the United States virtually stood still. It did not actually, since people who live on the farms and in the small towns of this country are as prolific as the urban dwellers. What resulted was a mass exodus from the farm to the urban communities because of a drastic change in the economic way of life in this country.

Today the urban percentage of the country's population is nearly 70 percent. The rural percentage is 30 percent. In 1910, it was 46 urban and 54 rural.

Yet, 25 years after the founding of the Rural Electrification Administration, effort is being made to greatly enlarge and expand this agency which was originally conceived as a means of bringing power to the farm and to small isolated rural communities.

REA is in the process of becoming a goliath in the utilities industry in this country. We say that it has passed the point of existing purely as a rural power agency; it is the beachhead in a series of moves designed to put the Federal Government wholly into the power generating and distributing business for all segments of America.

The impact that this would have on our economy and on the millions of investors who have staked their funds on the private power industry is incalculable. Its implications would be fully as dramatic as anything that has occurred in this country in the past half century.

Recently two Members of Congress have spoken out sharply on the subject of the REA. One is Senator GOLDWATER who said in Denver a few days ago that the REA either ought to be abolished or its functions revised, that it be curbed to operate on the basis for which it was intended—furnishing of electric power to the rural communities of this country.

Just 2 days ago Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL, an Illinois Republican, said essentially the same thing.

"This agency," said Mr. MICHEL, "is using the taxpayers' money to do things and go off in directions never contemplated by law. The appointed officials running the agency seem to think that Congress will not take any action to require compliance with the law because REA still claims to operate under the phony cloak of being primarily a program to help the farmer. In reality it is only using the good name of the American farmer to spread bureaucratic control over more of our citizens and the Nation's economy."

Mr. MICHEL says the time has come for Congress to come to some decision about the REA.

We think so, too. The time to act is now, this year, during the present session of Congress. There must be a complete spelling out of REA's blueprint for the future. And these questions must be answered once and for all time:

Is REA to continue as a primarily rural power-supplying concern?

Or is it to be allowed to feed on the money of the taxpayers including those who are its prime targets, the private utility industry of this country, and grow into a supergovernmental utility industry?

Only Congress can decide this vital question. The fate of the country insofar as this vital turning point is concerned, is in its hands.

Surrender to British Dictation of Higher Transatlantic Air Fares

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement I made on Tuesday, May 14, 1963, deploring the surrender to British dictation of higher transatlantic air fares. The statement follows:

Transatlantic jets are now flying more than half empty, thanks primarily to high fares. Our Civil Aeronautics Board and U.S.-flag carriers have been balked in their efforts to reduce transatlantic fares, in order to attract more passengers, under threat by Great Britain to close its airports to our airlines and to seize their planes if they refuse to raise the already high transatlantic fares as Great Britain insists.

Our Civil Aeronautics Board has determined that higher transatlantic airline fares are not in the public interest.

But the State Department apparently has yielded. It has succumbed to unilateral British dictation and threats. The State Department has thus overruled the CAB's decision that higher transatlantic air fares are not in the public interest.

Great Britain, apparently, is not greatly interested in airline revenues since its transatlantic jets are owned by the British Government. By contrast our American aviation policy and our Federal Aviation Act contemplate private, not nationalized, airlines. To survive our airlines must have sufficient revenues and adequate profits. It is indeed hard for them to operate profitably if their expensive jets must operate half empty.

The State Department has now surrendered the interests of U.S.-flag airlines, and their stockholders and the American traveling public which constitutes more than half of the transatlantic air passengers.

This regrettable episode underscores the wisdom of the recommendations of the Antitrust Subcommittee in its 1957 report on the airlines industry, and the recent White House statement on International Air Transport Policy that:

"To provide for more effective governmental influence on rates, Congress should adopt legislation which would give the Civil Aeronautics Board authority, subject to approval by the President, to control rates in international air transport to and from the United States."

Transatlantic airline fares which are set by agreement of the international airlines themselves, through the ratemaking machinery of the International Air Transport Association, are not subject to the free play of competition. The sky may indeed be the limit if one government can now dictate that our airlines shall charge, and our passengers shall pay, even higher fares in the very teeth of the CAB's decision that higher fares are not in the public interest. Today's action by the State Department overruling our CAB is the more unfortunate since Canada apparently remains steadfast in protecting the pocketbook of her own traveling public by refusing to permit higher fares to be imposed upon them.

The Big, Evil Plot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, Harre Demoro is a columnist who writes for the Morning News and Alameda County Democrat, a courageous and intelligent newspaper serving the northerly portion of the Ninth Congressional District.

I always look forward to Harre Demoro's columns. He is the kind of critic we need. He loves and admires our way of life but he is not complaisant about the areas where the quality of our society can and must be improved.

I think my colleagues will enjoy and perhaps benefit from Harre Demoro's column as set forth below:

> The Big, Evil Plot
>
> (By Harre Demoro)
>
> The Federal Government is growing in power and influence over the States and we are on the road to socialism and all sorts of evil things that are calculated to make our forefathers spin in their graves.
>
> Unions have usurped the control of business and industry and it's no longer easy to make a fast buck by stepping on someone.
>
> The old stand says we're in trouble. Deep trouble. There aren't as many soup lines as there used to be because people are not required to stand on their own feet. The Government is going to take care of them anyway.
>
> And that United Nations. It's full of Negroes, Arabs, and Jews. Can't trust an outfit like that. Especially since many of the nations represented are trying to learn how to read and write. That could be dangerous.
>
> The whole world is heading for destruction. Things are really in a mess thanks to a benevolent government which is creating a vast "welfare state."
>
> "Local control" is gone. Look at Mississippi. Who does Bobby Kennedy think he is forcing the South to obey the Constitution of the United States? Local control is lost, isn't it?
>
> It's no longer possible to get 9 hours of work in 8 hours thanks to organized labor. People think the world owes them a job and their children are supposed to be entitled to an education. Whatever happened to initiative? Kids these days don't know how lucky they are to have shoes.
>
> Look at unions. They have made it possible for the working man to buy automobiles, washing machines, electric stoves, houses, clothes, heaters, and all sorts of things they don't deserve.
>
> Just what would happen to the firms building such items if the worker couldn't afford them has somehow been lost in the struggle.
>
> The important argument is that we are headed towards socialism. And we know what that means.
>
> Social security is most certainly an evil designed to put us in the Communist camp. Everybody knows elderly persons who are not starving and who have not lost their self respect are excellent targets for Soviet subversion.
>
> And our courts ruling that Jewish children and other non-Christians are no longer required to recite a Christian prayer in school is horrible. These children have been embarrassed about taking part in such services in public schools since 1776. Why change now? Send them all back. This is America. Our land.
>
> Despite these gloomy predictions, there is hope.
>
> Last year the American Medical Association saved the Republic with a successful campaign to retain the coveted American right to die in a county hospital.
>
> The fact that county hospitals are publically owned, which isn't very capitalistic, seems to have escaped them in their campaign to defeat medicare.
>
> As we ride to work on A. C. Transit, another socialistic vehicle, let us reflect on the problems confronting us.
>
> Of course, we don't have much time to reflect. A. C.'s socialistic buses give better service and we get to work quicker than in the old days. We also don't have to wait for a bus so long.
>
> Things sure would be better if we turned the clock back.

President Kennedy for Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy in his remarks to the Committee for Economic Development greatly encouraged those of us who believe in free enterprise development of river sites. I commend the President for the following response to a question as reported in the Wall Street Journal of May 10:

> In deciding whether a specific dam site should be publicly or privately developed, "I would put the burden of proof upon the Federal Government to prove that the site will not be adequately developed, that the service would not be satisfactory, and that only the Federal Government can do it, before I would support the project."

Miami Beach Mayor Ken Oka—"The Friendly American"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, there have been so many tales that traveling Americans present a distorted rather than an ideal view of "what is an American really like?" that I welcome an opportunity to tell the other and truer side of the picture. I am sure this story can be duplicated many times but, nevertheless, I feel that the 17-year self-assigned mission of Kenneth Oka, mayor of Miami Beach, Fla., is unique.

Mayor Oka has made many trips abroad, usually accompanied by his family. His wife is an accomplished linguist and speaks French, Spanish, German, and Italian; Oka himself speaks fluent Spanish, a smattering of Japanese, and a few neighborly phrases in other languages. In his "unofficial ambassador" travels, Oka alternates between dispensing a maximum amount of 100-percent American good will and selling the virtues of one of the most renowned winter and summer resorts in the world—his home community of Miami Beach.

Back home in Miami Beach, Oka has made a frequent practice of quietly introducing himself to visiting tourists, not only important foreign dignitaries or travel agents, but everyday average people, and dispensing Florida's well-known hospitality.

All of his personal "good will" tours, of course, are in addition to the usual official trips as mayor of one of the most glamorous cities in the world.

Mayor Oka has also been active in the famous "Operation Amigo," sponsored by the Miami Herald, which brings Latin American youngsters to the Greater Miami area for educational visits.

It is a pleasure for me to salute this enterprising and fine American, and to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article detailing his activities which appeared in a recent issue of the Miami Herald:

> Travelin' Mayor Sells the Beach
>
> (By Jack Anderson)
>
> One evening not long ago they hoisted Miami Beach's Mayor Kenneth Oka to the top of a camel in the lobby of the Colony Theater.

It was a playful gag, celebrating the opening here of the desert film opus, "Lawrence of Arabia." More than most onlookers realized, nobody feels more at home on, under or beside the flora and fauna of faraway places than Oka.

The mayor and his handsome wife, Gertrude, have been almost everywhere. They are probably the most traveled municipal chief executive and first lady in the world.

"We haven't made Australia or Tibet yet," Oka said in a travel-reminiscent chat the other day, "but it may be only a matter of time."

They make their many trips abroad, the mayor said, for two reasons. One is that they like to travel and the other is that the mayor has one of the most renowned winter resorts in the world to sell.

In the current campaign sparked from Washington to tease the runaway gold back to Fort Knox through tourism from abroad, Miami Beach, Oka feels, has to fish or cut bait. He likes the fishing approach.

The past several years have found the tall, pipe-smoking Oka selling his resort city and dispensing good will in such assorted capitals as Copenhagen, Paris, Geneva, and Tokyo.

Wherever there is a lode of nice, hard pounds, marks, francs, or yen that might conceivably help to keep the United States and, specifically, Miami Beach, green, that's where the mayor is apt to turn up.

He makes official visits, too, to a great many countries—some in South America, for example—where the currency is too anemic at present for foreign travel. His theory is that when they recover from economic bad health, Miami Beach will be on their must-see list.

"You have no idea what legendary places Miami Beach and Miami—they think of them as one—are in other parts of the world," said the mayor.

"They want to come here. The problem is to convince them they can afford a visit and that there won't be a language barrier."

The mayor admits that striking pay dirt where European and Asiatic tourism to this country is concerned is slow business. He expects a trickle of visitors at first that will eventually become a sizable volume.

"Sometimes a selling job is a delayed action sort of thing," said the mayor. "I attended travel seminars in 17 cities in the Scandinavian area back in 1961.

"The pay-off is coming just this February. The tour ship, SS *Hanseatic,* is coming here under charter with 630 Europeans on board. It has a waiting list of 150 it couldn't accommodate in 1 trip."

This propensity for travel and his interest in international relations have made him an enthusiastic booster of such projects as the Herald's "Operation Amigo" which brings Latin American youngsters here for educational visits.

The Okas were hosts themselves to one of the visitors—17-year-old Marta Lopez—who came here last October with a contingent of Mexican students for a 2-week stay in Miami Beach.

This is Oka's 6th year on the Miami Beach City Council and he has been twice mayor.

The mayor is not only at home abroad but abroad at home on many occasions. He is a Miami Beach diplomat with an invisible but portable red carpet ready for instant use.

Any hour, any day, Oka will slip into his jacket, tamp a fresh load of tobacco into his pipe, and welcome a visiting foreign group of dignitaries, travel agents or just ordinary tourists sticking a toe into the posh resort for the first time.

This usually bowls over the visitors. The mayors in other countries are not much given to glad-handing anybody but their peers or better.

Last summer a bevy of Swiss hotel owners reacted to Oka's sudden materializing in their midst as if the "Herr Burgermeister's" name were Kennedy rather than Oka.

The Oka memory is so retentive of where he has been and what he has seen abroad that he can beguile the surprised visitor the more with some recollection of the visitor's hometown.

Whenever possible the mayor welcomes the visitor in his own language. He is fluent in Spanish, knows a smattering of Japanese and can speak a few appropriate phrases in other languages.

Mrs. Oka is an accomplished linguist—fluent in French, Spanish, German, and Italian. She is currently mastering Japanese.

She had acquired enough facility in it 3 years ago that when she and the mayor made an official visit to Fujisawa, Japan, a sister city of Miami Beach, she was able to respond nicely to the welcome of the Fujisawa city fathers in their own tongue.

The study of languages has been a preoccupation in the Oka home since the first odyssey abroad of the mayor and his wife 17 years ago.

Barbara, 19, their oldest daughter, now in her second year at Barnard College, speaks Spanish like an Argentine. Jonathan, 10; Stephanie, 15; and Michele, 17; are coming right along with their own mastery of Spanish and French.

The only rival enthusiasm to travel in the mayor's life is music. He is bats about the subject. A violinist, he played with the University of Miami Symphony in the mid-thirties on a scholarship.

The Miami Beach Civic Orchestra was the mayor's baby and he has on occasions conducted it. He can whip together a musical aggregation right at home. Jonathan plays the violin, too. Stephanie is a pianist. Barbara is a guitarist.

Michele settles for painting. Mrs. Oka is the family travel researcher. She does a preliminary study of a forthcoming destination so thoroughly that when they arrive there she knows exactly where they can buy a slice of apple pie.

Mrs. Oka did one of these minute research jobs once on Luxembourg, recalls her husband. "We even knew where we would have lunch the day we would arrive there. The trouble is we never made the trip," he postscripted.

Alliance Is Pushing Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 7, the New York Times carried an illuminating article by Ben F. Meyer of the Associated Press based on an interview with Teodoro Moscoso, head of the Alliance for Progress.

In view of the disappointment many of us feel in regard to the initial accomplishments of this agency I believe the article by Mr. Meyer is encouraging, for it reveals that the agency head himself is impatient with the speed at which the Alliance for Progress is moving.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON, MAY 6.—The Alliance for Progress, hailed as a dream plan to cure Latin America's ills, has become a painful process, but Teodoro Moscoso says that in spite of everything it is pushing ahead.

Considering the enormous problems to be met, it is not surprising it has had difficulties, Mr. Moscoso says.

If the Alliance plan, now about 2 years old, "proves to be only half a success, it will accomplish more for Latin Americans than a great many of the revolutions of the past," he said. The U.S. Government is putting $1 billion a year into the program.

Following are some viewpoints expressed by Mr. Moscoso during an interview:

"Question. Why is it that nearly everyone, including yourself, expresses impatience at the speed with which the Alliance for Progress is moving?

"Answer. The problems are so enormous. Pulling up underdeveloped economies in which people and attitudes in many instances have to be changed is not a job to be done in one year, not in one decade.

"TIMING DISCUSSED

"Question. The way things have been going lately in some parts of Latin America suggests the Alliance may have started too late. What do you think?

"Answer. It would have been an easier, faster job, if we had begun something similar 10 to 12 years ago, before prices of basic commodities dropped capriciously after the Korean war.

"Now we have to combat not only the century-old distortions that have been caused by colonialism and semifeudal governments, but also the drop in prices of commodities.

"Question. Of the 19 Latin American countries other than Cuba, how many, would you say, are doing what they can to get the Alliance program into full-steam operation?

"Answer. I would say, with the possible exception of three or four, they are trying. The ability to move forward in many instances depends on the political climate, on the stage of their development, and on the quality of the political leadership.

"So, you have to judge performance by the potential.

"What makes your heart ache is where the potential is great, and the movement is not as fast as the potential would allow.

"REMARKS CALLED PREMATURE

"Question. Archbishop [Jaime Cardinal de Barros] Camara of Brazil was quoted as saying the Alliance is dead because "the selfishness of many rich people of Latin America, and their blindness, is a much more serious and urgent problem than communism itself.' Will you comment?

"Answer. Well, I think Archbishop Camara has pronounced the death of the Alliance much sooner than warranted. But he does have a point when he says the problem of the leader classes of great wealth and better education is undoubtedly one of the great stumbling blocks.

"The countries where this leader class has recognized the social responsibility. * * *

"Question. Is that happening in any country?

"Answer. It is.

"Question. Can you name one or two?

"Answer. In El Salvador, for instance, the leader class has recognized the social responsibility of moving the economy forward and I believe they are achieving a very constructive understanding with the Government.

"Question. Could you name two or three countries among others doing an outstanding job on the alliance?

"Answer. Venezuela and Colombia.

"Question. Could you name two or three countries not doing so well, or is that asking too much?

"Answer. I think that would be asking too much. One reason I would not like to say this is that some of these countries are changing rather quickly in their attitudes toward the alliance.

"Question. From time to time there have been rumors that you may be planning to resign, and that you felt that the old-line bureaucrats in some government departments are throwing rocks in your path. What is your answer?

"Answer. No, to both questions.

"Question. Is Congress giving adequate support to the alliance in your judgment?

"Answer. Yes. I am astonished at the tremendous interest that the Members of Congress have in Latin America in general, and the program as a whole.

"Question. Was the alliance perhaps oversold at the outset in Latin America?

"Answer. I don't think it is a question of really overselling. For many, many years Latin American political leadership had urged the United States to lend it a hand in its economic and social development. Therefore, the hopes of the people were raised pretty high when finally the United States agreed to participate.

"Question. Do you think the people in the United States have been undersold on the alliance? For example, do you believe the average citizen in Portland, Oreg., Portland, Maine, or Iowa, or Rock Hill, S.C., likes the alliance idea and wants to see it move ahead?

"Answer. Intuitively, even those who do not know the details are in favor of the alliance.

"Question. President Kennedy on various occasions has appeared to be prodding the Western European nations and Japan to get into the act with aid to Latin America's economic and social development. Do you see any signs of expansion of help from those sources?

"Answer. Yes.

"There is a $150 million loan by France to Mexico, and there is the possibility of very substantial aid by Italian participation. And the Germans have already started to participate in the development of Bolivia in a strong fashion.

The Japanese have come in rather heavily with private investment despite the apparent political instability which makes some of our American private entrepreneurs shy off.

"Question. Will the European Common Market restrictions on imports damage the economy of Latin America and offset what the United States is doing through the alliance?

"Answer. The discriminatory practices which may emerge out of the European Common Market might very seriously hurt the alliance.

"Question. In every program of such proportions, mistakes have a way of plaguing administrators. Have you built any roads that go nowhere, or found evidence of any breakdown, shakedown or corruption in administration of the program?

"LITTLE BLEMISH CAN HURT

"Answer. Up to now, thank God, I haven't. And I am very grateful because I know how much damage even a small blemish can do to a program of this kind.

"Question. Is the Alliance for Progress doing much for countries such as Bolivia where the conditions are chronically difficult both economically and politically?

"Answer. We are now embarked on a truly developmental program on Bolivia. What we had before was a holding operation.

"Question. What about the big countries, say Argentina, Brazil and Mexico? Is the alliance doing much for them?

"Answer. Yes. I think that there is a substantial movement for it that can be attributed if not to funds from the alliance, then to the psychology of the alliance. If they help themselves we are there to assist them. Our help may be marginal, but substantial. Colombia, Chile, Brazil and Argentina have stabilization programs and we are assisting them.

"I would like to mention something that is a pretty bright spot in this whole picture, and that is the Central American movement toward economic integration.

"I feel pretty optimistic about this thing taking hold to move up."

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—Congressional Record, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the Record:

Brightwaters, Long Island, N.Y.
April 28, 1963.

Editor,
The Chronicle,
Spokane, Wash.

Dear Sir: Every mother should take heart.

There is a way to prevent war and preserve freedom at the same time. And Congressman Dan Flood has been trying to tell us this for more than 2 years.

The Congressman from Pennsylvania wants to establish a Captive Nations Committee of the House of Representatives. How will this prevent war? Well, the plausible theory is that if a strong message of freedom and hope is carried to the captive peoples, they will take heart. Khrushchev and company will have to keep their eyes peeled to the home front, and will not be able to devote so much time to enfeebling the rest of the world.

Congressman Flood's plan makes sense and ought to be given a chance. Yet he has been fighting for this in the House for more than 2 years without succeeding in getting the bill out of the House Rules Committee. I have been writing to the Rules Committee, and its distinguished chairman, Representative Howard Smith, for more than a year. Will you help, with a letter to your own Congressman and the Honorable Mr. Smith, and, if possible, a copy to Representative Flood? Address for all is simply House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Freedom from war? Should be worth a nickel. Or a 4-cent card?

Sincerely,

E. Lee North.

Phoenix, Ariz., *April 26, 1963.*

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
House of Representatives,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: We, the citizens undersigned, urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration. Such a Committee on Captive Nations is vitally important both for our Government and the American people at large. While Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of national liberation in Africa and Asia, we as a nation, are not doing much to help the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations which constitute a veritable weakness of the Soviet totalitarian empire.

A special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a reservoir of true and unbiased knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, which knowledge will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We strongly urge you, Congressman Smith, to give your full and unqualified support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

Amelion Thouerychup.
B. Lytrfymshyn.
Jerry Sysyn.
Alexander Linewych.
M. Linewych.
Walter Bosworth.

Demer & Dunson,
Cleveland, Ohio, May 1, 1963.

Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
Congressman, 11th District of Pennsylvania,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Enclosed you will find copies of letters I have sent to Congressmen Smith and Minshall regarding House Resolution 14.

Very truly yours,

John A. Demer,
Attorney at Law.

May 1, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I have just returned from a trip to Europe, and I had occasion to see at firsthand the manner and mode of living and the system under which the East Germans live. I hope that we, in this country, are never shackled with a similar type of government.

Therefore, I feel that in behalf of the security of our country and the free world, Congress should pass the bill creating a Special Committee on Captive Nations, House Resolution 14.

Very truly yours,

John A. Demer.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *May 2, 1963.*

Hon. DAN FLOOD,
New House Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Once again you are to be commended for your House Resolution 14 for forming a Committee on Captive Nations. It is obvious that the work of the subcommittee of a subcommittee of the foreign relations group was merely a token effort for the record and insults the intelligence of people.

I have noticed the correspondence, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, written to you and H. W. SMITH all during last session and this session. My observation is that Mr. SMITH does not respect people's letters. Or, to make a play on words, do those three magic letters—JFK—override the thousands of letters of people of America?

Sincerely,

C. J. DRAZDAUSKAS.

MAY 1, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: We wish to urge that prompt action be taken on House Resolution 14 in regard to establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. It is unthinkable that these poor people should go on living such an existence day after day, almost devoid of hope, and we do nothing to try to put an end to their enslavement. If Russia is sincere about her mouthings in regard to peace, let her begin here, by putting an end to ruthless domination of free people.

Sincerely,

FLORENCE H. DUQUETTE.

The Comparability Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, last year the Congress enacted legislation which carried with it salary increases for all civil service and postal employees. This legislation, you will recall, was widely recognized as being the most important Federal pay bill ever enacted because it embodied into the pay system the principle of comparability. Under this system, Federal pay scales are supposed to be kept at levels comparable to the salary levels paid for similar work in private industry. The law provided that the executive branch review pay scales each year, following which it would send its recommendations for adjustments to Congress for implementation.

This is the year of trial for the comparability principle, Mr. Speaker, for this is the year that we will find out if this is a system that everyone can live with. The administration has already completed its review and forwarded its recommendations to Congress and now it is up to us to act. If we don't pass legislation based on the administration's recommendations, the historic achievements of last year mean nothing; if we do, the precedent will be established and comparability will become a living, working principle.

I hope we make it a living, working principle, Mr. Speaker.

In connection with this, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD an editorial from the May 10 edition of the Government Standard, published by the American Federation of Government Employees, which calls for prompt action on the administration's recommendations in order to put comparability into motion.

The editorial follows:

PROMPT ACTION NEEDED ON PAY

Time, as the saying goes, is of the essence. No statement could more accurately reflect the current situation on Federal employee pay. The so-called comparability principle is now part of the Federal pay law. This means that, generally speaking, Federal pay scales are supposed to be maintained at levels close to salary rates paid in private industry.

For Federal employees, there is a built-in disadvantage in this system. This stems from the time lag between the gathering and compilation of salary statistics on private industry pay rates and the enactment into law of new Federal pay scales.

Some time lag seems inevitable. Any unnecessary delay in translating higher pay in private enterprise into government salary increases merely compounds the inequity.

Under President Kennedy's pay plan, the new rates would go into effect next January. These rates are based on information collected during the winter of 1961–62 by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. From this it is easy to see that prompt action by Congress is necessary if Federal employees are to derive any real benefit from the comparability principle.

Failure by Congress to complete action on pay this session would seriously compromise the comparability principle in the first real test of its workability.

In working on pay legislation this year, Congress will have an opportunity to improve the salary structure in a number of important ways. The administration's pay proposals in the lower grades are inadequate. The private industry statistics for many of these jobs reflect non-union wage scales and can only be described as substandard. The Government should not be a party to substandard pay and we will ask Congress to increase the proposed salaries for these positions.

The stretchout in the time it takes an employee to reach the top of his grade as the result of last year's pay legislation should be eliminated.

And now that the true meaning of the level-of-competence provision has been brought out in the open Congress will undoubtedly want to take a long and critical look at it, especially since its impact was never revealed by the Civil Service Commission during last year's pay deliberations.

Temporary Increases in the Public Debt Limit

SPEECH
OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6009) to provide, for the periods ending June 30, 1963, and August 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Chairman, there are those who argue that the annual ritual of raising the public debt limit is a useless process. At times their argument, from an operative standpoint, might appear to be valid; however, the administration's sensitivity on this subject clearly indicates that this is an area which they would like to ignore because it is an irritant to their spending proclivities.

Many of the young men who represent the upper echelon of the present administration are indeed fortunate in that they have never been saddled with the financial woes which beset the average American. The realization that the Nation's debt and inflationary trends are interrelated is gaining recognition even among these philosophers. This suggests that an inflationary raise in the public debt is not in the best interests of the Nation.

Under the proposed legislation, we have a choice of going along with the spenders or calling a halt to their nefarious operations. Frankly, I prefer the latter.

We are warned of dire consequences in case the Government is faced with even a temporary halt to its accelerated spending program; many will miss their regular Government remittance.

The ways and means of living within our budget are at hand—if necessary, let us start at the top and skip a few payments at the executive level; next might well come the Judiciary and the Congress, just to drive home the general idea. By this time, I am sure ways and means could readily be found for the Government to live within its income. To those who scream "oversimplification," may I remind them that the House, even within the past few days, has passed some practical bills and the rising tide of resentment in the course of this annual ritual provides ample justification for a negative vote against further deficit spending.

The Honorable Jed Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters from Judge Ross Rizley, former Congressman, and from Will Rogers.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA,
Oklahoma City, May 15, 1963.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Member of Congress
House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR VICTOR: Last Saturday afternoon Mrs. Rizley and I drove to Chickasha, Okla., to pay our respects and attend the last rites of the Honorable Jed Johnson, who passed away quite suddenly in New York on May 7.

Jed, as you know, was a U.S. district judge and had the distinction of receiving two appointments for the job. He was first appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who asked him to refrain from taking the job for a short time in order to finish very important work that he was doing as a member of the Subcommittee on Interior, and later the appointment was again made by President Harry S. Truman. Judge Johnson served approximately 20 years on the court, and I think the best tribute that could be paid to him was the fact that four of his colleagues on the bench made the long trip from New York to Chickasha, Okla., to publicly pay tribute to his honesty, integrity and citizenship from the pulpit of the First Baptist Church in that city.

My acquaintance with Jed preceded my becoming a colleague of his in 1941, when I was first elected to the Congress of the United States. Subsequently, of course, we were closely associated and no finer Christian gentleman has ever graced the Halls of Congress than he.

His wife, his three daughters and his son, Jed Jr., were all able to be present at the funeral. Notwithstanding the fact that he has been away from Chickasha most of the time since 1927, the large Baptist church was filled with his old-time friends, as a further token of their esteem and friendship for him.

I appreciate the opportunity you have afforded me to join with my former colleagues in paying tribute to our late colleague, the Honorable Jed J. Johnson.

Very truly yours,

ROSS RIZLEY.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, May 15, 1963.

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR VICTOR: Your thoughtfulness in advising me of the passing of our former colleague the Honorable Jed J. Johnson is deeply appreciated. During my 10 years service in the House, as a Representative from Oklahoma, Jed Johnson was like a father to me. He was my closest counselor and adviser. We campaigned together always under his leadership and guidance. We shared our problems, with him making mine easier to solve. Whatever success I achieved in my service to our mutual constituents was due in a large measure to the help he rendered me. He was more than a colleague to me, he was my friend at all times. I mourn his passing and extend my deepest sympathy to his family and our mutual friends.

Sincerely,

WILL ROGERS.

We Are Not a Vanishing Breed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "We Are Not a Vanishing Breed" which appeared in the May 9 issue of the Hancock Clarion of Hawesville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

WE ARE NOT A VANISHING BREED

We would like to add our voice to the opinion expressed by our good friend and fellow editor, J. Earle Bell, of the Union County Advocate, of Morganfield, when he protests the title of the recent TV presentation of Landon Wills and the McLean County News. The title of that presentation was: "A Vanishing Breed."

Like Editor Bell, we are sure the country newspapers and their publishers and editors are not vanishing breeds. Not so long as there are small towns with typical individual atmosphere that requires a close and intimate presentation, and there are those who have talent and persistance to maintain weekly newspapers for their readers who are appreciative of their efforts.

So long as there are those of our breed who have the initiative and native ability to consistently, and with little financial incentive, work at a trade that offers such attractive way of service to our people, our breed will always be found ready to undergo the hardships and difficulties to furnish country newspapers. If and when such a day should come when our breed fails to hold on and to mature, and those old timers, so to speak, have departed this sphere, then and ony then will we be a "Vanishing Breed." But we cannot foresee such a day in this Nation of ours.

We believe there will always be those dedicated individuals who can and will hold on to the publication of our country newspapers, regardless of the meager financial support that is characteristic of the profession. So long as type shall be the means of expressing the thoughts and actions of mankind we believe there will be those who will continue to employ that means of communication; and with their departure from the stage of this world others as devoted and as dedicated will rise up to take their places, and the country newspaper will live and endure.

There are perhaps as many as 10,000 small town newspapers now being published in the United States, each of them devoted solely to their restricted communities and furnishing those communities a means of communication that they could not have otherwise. The big city dailies with their thousands and even millions of readers do not and cannot furnish the town and country communities with the local atmosphere that the weekly newspapers afford. Items of interest to the smaller communities that are sometimes spoken of in terms of ridicule by the sophisticated, are as important as that of the city dweller of supposedly higher lights. The happy wedding of a small town or rural community, or otherwise unknown character, is of as much news and of equal importance as that of the rich debutante that may be elaborately displayed in the city daily. The death of a lowly farmer or his wife, who toiled through life to produce the food that must sustain the city dweller, is of as much importance to record as that of the wealthy banker of political leader of the metropolitan areas.

In fact the backbone and sinew of America today, and always are and we think will continue to be, that of rural and small community America. Those of the sparsely settled areas who toil and strive to make their lives worthy and worthwhile are of as much importance in this Nation of ours as those of the cities and thickly inhabited areas who many think should dominate our American life. It is to this strata of American life that the country newspaper had its roots that we believe will continue to stand firm against all the pressure and even ridicule of those who think we are a vanishing breed.

R.I.D.

David, Panama, and Homestead, Fla., Are Now "Kin" in Sister City Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last March 25 to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tribute to the initiative and effort of a small band of bicycling enthusiasts of Homestead, Fla., which had aroused national attention.

It is again my privilege, Mr. Speaker, to make my colleagues aware of the good citizenship and example of active proof of the democratic ideal shown by residents of this fine Florida community which, I am proud to say, is in the Fourth District which I have the honor to represent.

I wish at this time to draw the attention of my fellow Members to a recent editorial in the News Leader of Homestead, Fla. This tells the story of how the Homestead Woman's Club, working in cooperation with the sponsoring U.S. Information Agency, made David, Panama, Homestead's "Sister City."

This is just a first step in what is expected to be a series of exchanges on the lives of the citizens of the two "united in friendship" cities, one in Panama and one in Florida, U.S.A.

Again, we have proof that our foreign policy program can be served well by organized community effort and individual citizens toward the ultimate goals of greater understanding of each other's similarities as well as tolerance for our differences.

As a tribute to the high citizenship standards demonstrated by residents of Homestead, Fla., and in the hope that other communities throughout our Nation may be encouraged to prove that forging the bonds of personal friendship between North Americans and Latin Americans is a tremendous aid in creating better understanding, and in the world struggle, I call my colleagues' attention to the following editorial of the News Leader:

SISTER CITY PROGRAM FOSTERS CLOSER LATIN AMERICAN BONDS

Living proof that a people-to-people exchange program can do much a promote better understanding between foreign nations, cities, and individuals is being vividly demonstrated by the Homestead Woman's Club.

This club, through its International Affairs Department headed by Mrs. Irving Peskoe, was instrumental in making David, Panama, Homestead's "Sister City."

The sister city program is sponsored by the U.S. Information Agency, but exchanges between the cities are not controlled by them.

Tuesday night the club presented a colorful program on Panama which is illustrated in pictures in today's News Leader-Post.

Copies of this paper and our recent golden progress edition depicting 50 years of Homestead's growth are being sent to David so that city may become better acquainted with Homestead.

We understand that the David newspaper is planning to salute Homestead. As this program grows we plan to print stories of life in Homestead's sister city.

It is through exchanges like these that our country can make lasting ties with Latin America. There are few ties closer than the bond of personal friendship.

A Mother Lode County Looks at Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a century ago, the county of Mariposa was the southern end of the booming mother lode gold country. Today the county's gold producing area is dotted with ghost towns which point out all too clearly the effects of the death of the gold mining industry.

A few days ago, the Mariposa Chapter of the Western Mining Council, in cooperation with the Mariposa Chamber of Commerce and Mariposa Board of Supervisors, initiated a program aimed at advising the people of the impact of an artificially controlled price of gold; a price which has not been permitted to be changed since 1932.

In this connection, the people of Mariposa has printed a brochure for distribution to visitors to the county.

I would like to submit this excellent statement for insertion in the RECORD at this point for it explains the serious condition of our domestic gold mining industry:

GOLD—AN INTENSIFIED INCREASE IN THE PRODUCTION OF NEWLY MINED DOMESTIC GOLD ON A NATIONAL SCALE IS VITALLY NECESSARY IN THE STABILIZATION AND SECURITY OF OUR NATIONAL ECONOMY

The national gold reserve on hand as of January 1963, is less than $16 billion, the lowest in many years, and a decrease of more than $8 billion since the 1949 total of more than $24 billion, and now short by several billions of dollars to balance the legitimate claims against it.

The amount of gold being used in the dental, jewelry, and other industrial uses, including that used in the space missiles programs in the United States, yearly, is twice the amount being produced in our Nation.

The one, and only way to replenish the dangerously low and steadily declining gold reserve is the prompt rehabilitation of the mining operations of the vast developed and proven gold deposits of the Nation, and at the same time creating new jobs for many thousands of persons throughout the United States.

Such operations, when resumed throughout all the gold mining areas of the United States, would substantially increase tax revenue, both local and national, also the production of new national wealth, thereby contributing very materially to the economy and financial security of our Nation.

The many proven large gold ore deposits of the United States being mined in 1942 when closed by Governmental Order L-208 were not, and are not depleted.

However, to make it feasible to reactivate the former gold mining operations of the Nation in the production of newly mined domestic gold it will be necessary to raise the present price of $35 per ounce, as fixed in 1934—28 years ago—to $105 per ounce because the cost of labor, equipment, material and supplies, taxes and other operating costs have increased 300 percent, or more, since 1934 and about 200 percent since 1942 when the gold mines were closed down by Governmental Order L-208.

There is plenty of gold in the proven extensive gold deposits of the Nation that will be mined when an equitable price for newly mined gold, sufficient to offset increased operating costs is established.

Upon the resumption of gold mining operations it would be necessary to reequip the mines with the necessary hoisting, pumping, drilling, milling, assaying, electrical, and other equipment which has been removed during the period of inactivity. Also vast quantities of underground mining tools and equipment including rail, loaders and haulage locomotives, explosives and chemicals used in milling and assaying. There would also be an almost unlimited demand for forestry products for use in underground timbering, surface mine buildings, and other uses.

The handling and treatment of concentrates and other by-products from milling operations would require trucking and railroad facilities in the transportation of such products from the mines to the various smelters of the Nation.

A gold mining operation produces nothing, except perhaps, the water pumped from the underground workings and sand from milling operations that can be used in connection with operations, therefore, a gold mining operation necessitates the purchasing of all operational material and supplies outright and continuously, thereby contributing to the purchase of merchandise and the employment of labor throughout the Nation.

Gold mining, a noncompetitive industrial operation engaged in the production of new national wealth, actually helps other types of mining operations of all kinds, because of the necessity of purchasing products made from copper, iron, lead, zinc, tin, mercury, and many other minerals and fuels used in every day operations, also the consumption of very large quantities of electrical energy.

Research has indicated that the employment of 1 miner inures to the direct benefit of 10 people, and indirectly to hundreds of persons in connection with services and patronage.

A very important factor to remember is that at times of stress and recession, when employment tends to drop, conditions become even more favorable for mining operations and this affords a very convenient and effective cushion to smooth out the unemployment curve.

Gold is the only commodity extensively used in the United States today that must be sold to one customer only, the U.S. Mint, and at a fixed price of $35 per ounce, and which cannot be held, owned or accumulated by a citizen of the United States even after having mined and processed it, at his own expense, from his own property.

There are only two basic industries: Upon them all business and industry is dependent. They are mining and agriculture, and while mankind might exist without mining, all the progress that has been made, or ever will be made by the human race has been, and will continue to be, basically, completely dependent upon mining.

Should I Study Vocational Agriculture?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am proud to insert a winning speech by a well-informed American lad, Roger Christensen, of Audubon, Iowa, winner of a gold award at a district speech contest held in Iowa recently.

Roger points out the leading part our farmers play in the basic prosperity of our Nation, and the importance to our entire Nation which the study of vocational agriculture demands.

I congratulate Roger on this fine, timely speech, which follows:

SHOULD I STUDY VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE?

Agriculture is the Nation's single largest industry, using more steel, rubber, gasoline, and manpower than any other business. Over 22 million workers are employed in agriculture and agricultural industries or more than 38 percent of the labor force in the United States. During 1960 the value of all farm assets exceeded $206.1 billion. It is estimated that the total value of the agriculture industry is equal to seven-eighths of the value of all stocks listed on the New York Stock Exchange. Every country is dependent upon agriculture and the United States is certainly no exception. By 1975 it is expected that the United States will need 58 percent more beef, 49 percent more pork, 40 percent more milk, 18 percent more poultry, and 35 percent more eggs. Many people fail to realize the importance or size of American agriculture.

I would like to quote from Daniel Webster, "Let us never forget that the cultivation of the earth is the most important labor of man. Unstable is the future of any country which has lost its taste for agriculture." America's wealth and greatness rests on the productivity of the American farmer for we have won two great world wars on the tremendous producing capability of our soil.

How does the farmer get know-how? Many farmers learn from their fathers and dad is right most of the time, but often the little details are overlooked. When enough little things are missed they grow bigger and bigger and can result in serious problems which may make the difference between profit and loss in a farm business.

Today 1 hour of farm labor puts out four times as much as 30 years earlier. Now a farmer feeds himself and 25 others, but it is estimated in 1980 he will have to feed 30 others with 3 percent fewer farmers. Only through improved management and increased efficiency was this accomplished, but our already excellent farming measures must be improved upon to meet the demands of the future.

In agriculture changes come about slowly and are the results of careful research gathered by some of the Nation's top scientists. But what good is this vast fund of information unless it is used in actual production.

This is where vo-ag and FFA enter into the picture. In classrooms all across America the Nation's youth are being taught the scientific methods of farming and agriculture. In this era of the "space age" farming has become more and more complicated. The capital requirements to farm has skyrocketed from an average of $40,000 to nearly $60,000 in the last 10 years and it is further estimated this figure will leap to $90,000 to $100,000. All of this merely points out the need for more formal training in farming. Where will we be 10, 20, yes, even 50 years from now if we fail to train a fair share of our most talented rural youth for a future in this great occupation of farming.

Perhaps former President Eisenhower has said this better than I can and so I would like to quote our former President from a speech given in 1953. "Our great cities, our mighty industries, our business and professional accomplishments, our educational institutions, our high living standards, are possible because of the efficiency and productivity of the American farm."

Yes, indeed, the need for formal training in vocational agriculture is greater than ever before. Vo-ag can help with this problem of supplying sufficient agricultural leadership.

This can be done if the farm youth, their parents, educators, and others who advise farm youth learn of the great future there can be in agriculture and help point out these possibilities to our farm-reared boys.

Vocational agriculture can help the farm youth by giving him instruction in—

1. Establishment in farming or farm training, with practice and study.
2. Leadership.
3. A formal background that will help in employment for farm related occupations.
4. Build a cash reserve that will help for getting started in farming, other business, or pay college expense.
5. Preparation for more advanced training.

I urge you not to sell vocational agriculture short. The latest studies of high school graduates show vocational agriculture graduates hold a decided edge over nonvocational agriculture graduates now engaged in farming. For example, they average larger farms, grown 22 more acres of corn, save more pigs per litter, use more of the newer, more productive methods of farming and average from $1,500 to $2,000 more net income than nonvocational agriculture graduates.

When looking for a job actual experience is the best qualification. The first part of our motto points this out: "Learning to do; doing to learn."

Our FFA chapter gives valuable experience in leadership. All members are urged to take part in contests for learning by doing is an important factor in training.

Vocational agriculture can provide training for other occupations besides farming. Each year my adviser receives several phone calls asking for references for such jobs as management in grain elevators, gas stations, and farm corporations. Employers have often stated that vocational agriculture graduates possess skills that are needed for successful management. Local FFA chapter members, at the end of their senior year, had an average net worth of $2,340 more than other seniors. The cash reserve is possible because of money invested in livestock and farming instead of cars. This cash reserve or increased net worth can be used for an actual start in farming, a business, or pay for part of 1, 2, 3, or even 4 years of college.

Recent studies have shown that vocational agriculture graduates do decidedly better in agriculture college and equally as well in general college as nonvocational agriculture graduates.

Farming is our largest industry. If you want to farm your chances are doubled if 3 years of vocational agriculture are taken. Vocational agriculture teaches leadership, management, farm training, and college preparation. I am sure that there is a future in agriculture for you if you are interested. Make use of your rich heritage of farm living and fully investigate farming and agriculture before you decide your future. A satisfying, rewarding, and exciting future awaits those who train for a future in agriculture.

Are We Taking Our Eyes Off Cuba?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration has sharply curtailed reconnaissance operations in Cuba at a time when we badly need every bit of information obtainable about "what is going on in Cuba?"

The administration's decision to follow this course while negotiating with Khrushchev and Castro is shortsighted and absurd. I commend the editorial from the May 12, 1963, issue of the Denver Post, Denver, Colo., for your reading:

ARE WE TAKING OUR EYES OFF CUBA?

Now what's going on in Cuba? A Miami newspaper reports that U.S. military officers are worried about the appearance of large numbers of Russian tents—some big enough to enclose a missile and its launcher—in Cuba, and heavy transport traffic from areas in Cuba where there are known to be large caves.

What's worse, the Miami Herald reports, the Kennedy administration has so sharply curtailed our intelligence operations that military leaders don't know any details on this latest Soviet activity in Cuba.

There have been no low-level reconnaissance plane flights over Cuba since February 9, the Herald reports; there have been only occasional high-level U-2 plane flights, and U.S. suppression of anti-Castro guerrilla raids has cut off the flow of information from those sources.

Why the cutdown on reconnaissance flights? Because, the Herald reports, President Kennedy is determined that nothing shall be allowed to "rock the boat" while he is attempting to negotiate the Russians out of Cuba.

If so, this is ridiculous. Whether Khrushchev or Castro like it or not, the United States has the strongest kind of right—that of simple self-defense—to keep the closest, most intrusive kind of watch over Soviet activities in Cuba.

Whatever negotiations Kennedy may be carrying on with the Soviets—and there is certainly not the slightest sign that they are productive—they should not be allowed to immobilize our continuous day-by-day inspection of that island so near our shores.

Such inspections, in the light of what happened there starting last July and climaxing October 22, are not only a right, but a duty.

A look at our files shows that on August 8, 1962, the Post carried its first report of Russian troop landings in Cuba. The troops, a Miami radio broadcaster said then, had landed in Cuba late in July, 8 days after Fidel Castro's brother, Raul, returned from a 10-day visit to Moscow.

On August 21, there was another story, this time from official Washington sources, that 14 Soviet ships had docked secretly in Cuba, and unloaded mysterious cargoes at night. Three days later, from another Miami source, came the first report that Soviet personnel were setting up a rocket or missile site in Cuba.

We know now what was going on—those were the first Soviet troops, missiles, and missile-site crews. But "administration specialists in Cuban affairs," the August 21 story said, doubted that those Russians were combat troops—just technicians.

The point is, those administration specialists didn't know what they were talking about, because they didn't have the facts. We were only running two U-2 flights over Cuba monthly in those days, although we did have detailed reports from the Cuban underground.

Now, if the Herald's reports are true, we are back on the two-U-2-flights-per-month schedule. But now we don't even have as good a flow of information from the Cuban underground as we did then, for which this administration may bear some blame, and Castro has just returned from another long visit to Moscow.

This reconnaissance letup is, we repeat, foolish and dangerous. The Soviets being the kind of tricksters they are, it is the administration's first duty to know what is going on in Cuba, no matter what effect intensive reconnaissance may have on any negotiations.

If the Soviets have nothing to hide, they will not object. If they do object, that is proof positive that reconnaissance is essential.

Russian Strength Increasing in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Spokane Spokesman-Review of May 10, 1963:

RUSSIAN STRENGTH INCREASING IN CUBA

Senator KEATING's claim that Russian military strength in Cuba is 10 times greater than it was last July points up a situation apparent in the Federal administration which should be changed immediately.

Officials are constantly releasing information regarding Cuba which either is refuted or challenged to the point where most people have little idea as to the magnitude of the Cuban threat.

This fact was apparent last fall when administration and congressional leaders made comments throughout the Nation that there was no threat of aggressive action from Cuba. Yet, while these comments actually were being said, President Kennedy made his dramatic announcement involving Soviet missiles being installed in Cuba.

Administration leaders have frequently reported that Soviet troops are being withdrawn. But other sources, including Senator KEATING, claim that the actual number on the island has increased.

There may be legitimate reasons why certain information should not be made public. If there is a security risk involved, certainly no one would be critical of such a policy.

But congressional leaders, regardless of political parties, should either be given accurate information or informed that there is sufficient risk so that no statements should be made on the subject.

Reliable sources recently reported the arrival of 6,000 Russian troops in Cuba, quartered in underground barracks. There have been other reports that the original Russian goal was 100,000 troops in the island this year.

Keating is a frequent critic of Communist infiltration in Latin America and of Democratic policy in Cuba. He may not be as critical if the administration would inform him of all the knowledge they have on the matter. Apparently, the lines of communications in Washington, D.C., are not functioning well.

Until his claim concerning Russian military strength just 90 miles off our coast is officially refuted, however, we must assume that the information he has received on his own is accurate.

Do It Gradually—It Is Far Less Painful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, when an editor wrote in the March 30 issue of Baking Industry he must have, by some super-natural power, predetermined the action of this House, Wednesday, May 15.

The complacent frog was heated gradually in water until he succumbed. Yesterday this House gave the general public more of the same but in gradual steps, hoping to lull it—the public—into complacency so no voice will be raised. To increase the debt ceiling from $305 to $307 to $309 billion appears to be the painless way, but when the full impact of the heat is felt, Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer will undoubtedly raise a voice in protest that might well reecho in the Halls of Congress and reecho it should. Let's learn from the lesson of the frog.

The editorial follows:

The Complacent Frog

If you should ever want to boil a frog alive and make him enjoy the whole thing, just follow this simple advice. Above all else, don't do it all at once. If you drop froggy into a pot of boiling water, naturally he will jump right out.

Instead, place him in a pot of lukewarm water. The unwary frog will find the water more comfortable and probably relax and take a nap. Increase the heat slightly, but not too much. He may wake up, but since the water still is not too hot, he will probably go right back to sleep.

Continue making the heat changes, always making them gradual and pretty soon the water will actually be boiling. You will have boiled the unsuspecting frog without his even knowing it. As a matter of fact, he actually slept through it all, a victim of his own complacency.

There are forces in America today which are raising the temperature of our political and social environment while we sit back not noticing the gradual changes. One day we will wake up to find that we have been "boiled alive" and are living in an environment of Federal control and regulations. When this time comes, we will have nowhere to place the blame except on our own complacency.

Most politicians are well aware of the public's apathy to most governmental and legislative affairs. Just as the frog slept unaware of the changes going on around him, we sleep unaware of the creeping encroachment of federalism and socialism which one day may control our lives and destroy the freedoms which we value so highly.

The lesson of the frog is clear—we must remain alert to the political and economic forces that seek to destroy our freedom. We must let our elected representatives know that we are not asleep and that we will not tolerate the gradual eroding of these freedoms.

The frog could have done something about his plight if he had not been so complacently asleep. How about us? Are we going to be asleep?

Who Manages What?—Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. GILL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, accepting the principle that it depends on whose ox is being gored, I can understand, but not condone, many of the newspaper editorials which have been written about management of news.

It is indeed refreshing when a newspaper editor is willing to examine the substance of this issue and make his own unmanaged judgment.

On May 13, Mr. George Chaplin, editor of the Honolulu Advertiser, wrote an editorial which I think deserves the attention of those people who have been flailing away on this subject.

Under unanimous consent I include the editorial in the Appendix of the Record.

The editorial follows:

Who Manages What?

There was some discussion of "managed news" at the recent editors' convention in Washington and the publishers' convention in New York—but, in every instance, the antidote was the same.

The antidote is the capable, sharp-nosed reporter, possessed of a healthy skepticism and the determination to seek out the facts behind official releases.

Any government—whether city, State, or national—tries to maintain the most favorable image possible. Its news announcements and its answers to questions by the press will always be in this framework.

This is old stuff, as old as the Republic and the whole issue of managed news would never have arisen as emotionally as it did if Assistant Secretary of Defense Sylvester had not put into words what had long been silently acknowledged—that in the most critical emergencies a government will go to the most extreme lengths to create the kind of news it feels is needed to serve its policies.

Some of the most pertinent comment we've seen on this is in a New Leader magazine article by George E. Herman, the White House correspondent for CBS.

He calmly notes that news management, always with us, hit no great new low in the Eisenhower administration and has risen "to no great new peak today."

Museums "contain castings of a monolith on which, 5,000 years ago, a Pharaoh published an account of his great victory in a battle which he actually lost.

"Gen. Douglas MacArthur once fired a censor who permitted me to report that American troops had 'retreated' under pressure; the correct word, it turned out, was 'withdrew.'

"James Hagerty did his best to keep reporters from letting the public know that President Eisenhower had caught more than his legal limit of trout in a Colorado mountain stream * * *." President Kennedy's activities in the news field, he observes, are "well established."

But Herman says that Kennedy's "'cold,' the fiction which brought him back to the White House during the Cuban crisis, was no worse a deception that the 'stomach trouble' which President Eisenhower's aids already knew to be a heart attack.

"Certainly Kennedy had more right to mislead the Russians over Cuba than Eisenhower did to lie about the U-2 plane (which the United States first maintained was only a weather research vehicle). Cuba presented a clear and present danger of war; the U-2 did not.'

The smoke following the recent explosion over news management is rapidly lifting. When it's all gone, Herman feels "perhaps we will find a healthier state of affairs, with newsmen and officials confronting one another with new alertness, each side trying to protect its own interest and guess what sly gamit the other fellow is trying to conceal."

Hon. Jed Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Daily Oklahoman in tribute to former Congressman Jed Johnson:

Former State Congressman Jed Johnson Dies at Age 74

Jed Johnson, 74, former Oklahoma Sixth District Congressman and a U.S. Customs Court judge since 1947, died in a New York City hospital Wednesday of a heart attack.

He suffered a previous attack Sunday and had been hospitalized since.

Funeral will be in Chickasha at 3 p.m. Saturday in the First Baptist Church, with Brown's Funeral Home in charge of arrangements.

Johnson, a Democrat, served in Congress 20 years. He had maintained a legal residence in Chickasha since moving to New York City to take the court appointment made by former President Truman.

Johnson's life was a colorful one. Although he was a lawyer, he was interested in farming and started a breed of turkeys which now bears his name.

Born in Ellis County, Tex., Johnson came to Oklahoma as a boy in 1888. As a youth, he worked as a rural mail carrier. Later, he was a salesman, then a schoolteacher, and subsequently, a country newspaperman with a string of weekly newspapers.

He was first elected to Congress from the Sixth District in 1926 and served six consecutive terms. Johnson was twice a delegate to the Inter-Parliamentary Union at Geneva, Switzerland, once in 1927 and again in 1929.

Among the champion "go-getters" in Congress, Johnson fought successfully to keep Fort Sill and acquired the Federal reformatory at El Reno for Oklahoma.

Johnson had the distinction of being the first person appointed to the same position by two U.S. Presidents.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt nominated him for the U.S. Custom Court judgeship in 1945. Johnson, who was deeply embroiled at the time in a personal feud with

Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes, turned down the nomination to remain on a House appropriations subcommittee of which he was chairman.

In 1947, he was nominated to the same postion by President Truman.

Johnson worked his way through the University of Oklahoma Law School and topped off his classes in L'Universite de Clermont, France. After his admission to the Oklahoma bar, he set up an office at Anadarko.

He saw service in France with the AEF during World War I.

From 1919 to 1926, he served as a member of the Oklahoma Senate. He married Beatrice Luginbyhl of Chickasha in 1925.

Johnson is survived by his wife, three daughters, Mrs. Jean Fisk, Norman; Mrs. Joan Stauffer, Tulsa, and Mrs. Janell White, San Francisco; a son, Jed Johnson, Jr., New York City; two brothers, Carroll Johnson, Guthrie, and Dr. L. L. Johnson, Shawnee, and five grandchildren.

Four brothers and a sister preceded him in death.

From Cuba to Laos: U.S. Foreign Policy Smacks of Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the following reprint from Barron's is particularly appropriate at this time. It brings into focus weaknesses in our foreign policy from Cuba to Laos and points up again the dangers of appeasement:

FROM CUBA TO LAOS: U.S. FOREIGN POLICY SMACKS OF APPEASEMENT

The Kennedy administration, as its most ardent critics must admit, has consistently displayed admirable skill in the use of words. Last week the President himself was in rare rhetorical form. After keeping the Nation in mounting suspense for 36 hours, Mr. Kennedy on Thursday snapped the tension—and sent the stock market skyrocketing—with one of the most adroitly phrased political pronouncements on record. While remaining firmly opposed to "across-the-board" increases in steel prices, he stated, the powers-that-be are willing to accept "selective adjustments up or down, as prompted by changes in supply and demand." The day before the steel crisis, at a ceremony conferring honorary American citizenship upon Sir Winston Churchill, the Chief Executive rose to the occasion no less nobly. In a glowing tribute to his new compatriot, the President said in part: "In the dark days and darker nights when England stood alone, he mobilized the English language and sent it into battle. Whenever and wherever tyranny threatened, he has always championed liberty."

In saluting the verbal prowess of Sir Winston, the President was speaking not merely as head of state but also as one professional to another. Since taking office John F. Kennedy more than once has sought to rally his countrymen with stirring calls to arms; at times he has succeeded in sounding almost Churchillian. Unfortunately, however, the resemblance ends right there. For in translating words into deeds, the Kennedy administration has acted not with the boldness of the great Prime Minister, but with the irresolution and timidity of his inglorious predecessor. In Latin America, southeast Asia and in the heart of Europe, the White House, despite an occasional flash of spirit, has been pursuing a policy of appeasement. Day by day and step by step, in consequence, the Communist tyranny has gained ground; the forces of freedom, contrariwise, have been in steady retreat. In a desperate quest for "peace in our time," as the author of "Why England Slept" must know, Neville Chamberlain unwittingly paved the way for World War II. To prevent history from writing a catastrophic sequel, the President and his official family would do well to learn from it.

A prerequisite to learning, of course, is the willingness to face facts. On this score the White House and its advisers have proved sadly deficient. A case in point is Walt W. Rostow, a man whose global knowledge of economic and political affairs is matched only by his apparent lack of insight. In a far-ranging speech in Philadelphia recently on the cold war, Professor Rostow (who serves as Counselor and Chairman of the Policy Planning Council, Department of State) reported progress on all fronts. To be sure, he conceded, "none of the crises on the national agenda as of January 1961 has been finally and satisfactorily settled. The treaty arrangements in Laos remain precarious, still violated by the continued presence in that country of Vietminh units under the control of Hanoi. * * * West Berlin stands firm, confident and prosperous, but the threat to its future remains. And evidently the crisis over Cuba is not at an end." Nonetheless, in a stunning non-sequitur he proceeded to conclude: "We have achieved something substantial in these 26 months: the momentum of Khrushchev's post-Sputnik offensive has been halted, and in the vast areas which have been threatened by it free men breathe easier."

More dangerous nonsense would be hard to come by these days. Under the hapless leadership of the New Frontier, as even its stanch supporters now concede, the free world has suffered a dreary succession of defeats. Regarding Cuba, for example, William V. Shannon, Washington columnist for the leftwing New York Post, recently pulled no punches. Two years ago, he observed last week, "a brave and active underground movement against Castro was spreading. Exiles in Florida were alive with hope for his early overthrow." Since then, however, their hopes have been dashed by one betrayal after another, from the Bay of Pigs to the incredible blockade imposed by the U.S. Coast Guard, not against the Communist regime in Havana, but against its mortal foes. Such perfidy now has led to the rupture of friendly ties between Washington and the Cubans in exile, a denouement which, wrote Mr. Shannon scathingly, "Brings to a close a cycle of defeat, political ignorance and moral confusion. Everything has now been surrendered, including honor."

In Laos, too, the once-firm U.S. posture has developed a perilous sag. Until 1961 this country actively supported a regime in Vientiane which, despite its defects, was pro-Western and willing to resist the thrust of Communist aggression, launched years before by native Reds aided and abetted by North Vietnam and Red China. However, in the ill-founded hope of restoring peace to the embattled land, the Kennedy administration, through its roving Ambassador, W. Averell Harriman, began urging—and finally pressuring—its Laotian allies to form a coalition government with a neutralist group and the local Communist Pathet Lao. Last summer at an international conference the three factions signed an agreement which established such a troika government and demanded the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Laotian soil.

Describing the settlement as a calculated risk (Barron's chose at the time to call it a witless gamble), Washington promptly complied. The Reds did not. On the contrary, they quickly set about demonstrating once again that every treaty with a Communist is an open invitation to trouble. The Pathet Lao first tried assassination—one of the trusted lieutenants of Kong Le, the misguided neutralist who originally launched the revolt, was murdered a few weeks ago. Next came subversion, a tactic revealed last month when a loyal Laotian soldier shot the Foreign Minister and denounced him as a traitor. Finally, in early April the Pathet Lao launched an unprovoked attack against the neutralist forces on the Plaine des Jarres, capturing several strongholds and other strategic real estate.

To the latest outburst of naked Communist aggression, the New Frontier reacted with its customary vigor. Even as his diplomatic handiwork was collapsing, Averell Harriman was promoted to Under Secretary of State. His boss, Dean Rusk, appealed for a cease fire. And the SEATO Alliance, at United States behest, announced plans to stage an impressive show of force, not in Laos, where the shooting happens to be, but in neighboring Thailand, where free men (Mr. Rostow to the contrary notwithstanding) today surely breathe no easier.

"Don't worry, they're still 90 miles away," proclaims a satiric Republican car sticker. Evidently Washington hasn't gotten the message. Even as fighting broke out afresh in Laos, the White House was recording its elation over another dubious diplomatic stroke, the tentative agreement to set up a direct line to the Kremlin. Even as President Kennedy was eloquently hailing a now-retired champion of freedom, the cause of freedom was suffering. Appeasement is an ugly word, and one which even Nelson Rockefeller, who sounds more like a party standard-bearer every day, backed away from last week. History has no such qualms. Unless the current disastrous course of events is reversed, there will be only one place in history for the Kennedy administration. And it won't be among the profiles in courage.

Maryland University Given Data System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to announce that the University of Maryland Computer Science Center has recently acquired an IBM computer system valued commercially at $3 million. The computer system is described as an all-transistorized computer with a high speed memory capacity of 32,768 words. The on-line equipment consists of a card reader, a card punch, a printer and 10 magnetic tape drives attached to two input-output channels.

The installation, known as the IBM 7090/1401 computer system, was made available under the IBM educational allowance program. Part of the research of this outstanding center is supported by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Federal grants and contracts awarded to individual departments of the University for computer-related research provides other support.

Departments of the university who will utilize the new system include physics and astronomy, psychology, sociology, speech, animal and dairy sciences, and the school of medicine. The ultimate goal of the Science Center is to establish an educational program, with concepts and computer applications being integrated into existing courses.

This fine center, located in College Park, was established in February of 1962 and is under the direction of Werner C. Rheinboldt and his assistant director, John P. Menard. Twenty administrative programing and operating personnel complete the staff.

Government-Run Lotteries of Argentina, Bolivia and Brazil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, while we in the United States continue to wear blinders and stubbornly refuse to accept the obvious, most of the civilized countries throughout the world recognize the wisdom of a national lottery.

Out of all the countries with which we maintain diplomatic relations, 77 of them utilize a government lottery not only as a compromise with the gambling problem but as a revenue-raising device as well.

All 77 countries have found that restraining rather than prohibitive measures are best, as with most other moral legislation.

Today, I would like to point out three countries in Latin America which utilize government-run lotteries as the best possible revenue-producers.

Argentina, in 1962, took in over $39 million. The government's profit came to $17 million which was used for emergency medical centers, for the underprivileged, for construction of the San Martin General hospital and for other public works and social programs.

Bolivia, last year, sold almost $870,000 worth of lottery tickets. The net income to the government was about $128,000 which was used for the Red Cross, public health and welfare programs, and for mental health institutions.

Brazil, in 1962, the gross annual receipts amounted to $5,356,000. After payment of prizes which represented 70 percent of the receipts, the balance of over one-half million dollars was earmarked for municipal projects such as water supply and sewer projects and the building of schools, hospitals and housing.

Mr. Speaker, if we opened our eyes and followed the example of these countries as well as the example set by New Hampshire, we could easily, painlessly and voluntarily pump into our U.S. Treasury over $10 billion a year in much needed revenue. If we had the courage to capitalize on our own people's gambling thirst, we could raise over $10 billion a year which could be used to cut our taxes and reduce our national debt. What is wrong with us?

Talk Instead of Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the New York Times in an editorial approved of the cancellation by the United States of three small nuclear tests which were scheduled for later this month. The editorial points out the minimal scientific significance of the tests. The effect of these tests would have been further to undermine the effort to achieve a test ban agreement and to stimulate a new round of nuclear testing with more contamination of the atmosphere.

Mr. Speaker, the nuclear test ban talks must continue. As the editorial points out, "the stakes are too high for either side to let the talks end in failure." It often requires years of prolonged negotiation before an agreement can be reached between major world powers. The road to disarmament under effective international control will be rocky, but it must be traveled if mankind is to survive.

The New York Times editorial follows:

SAVING THE TEST-BAN TALKS

In another move to save the 5-year-old nuclear test-ban talks from collapse and avert another East-West testing race, the United States has now canceled the three minor tests it had scheduled for later this month. This is a wise and welcome decision.

In fact, considering President Kennedy's determined efforts to reach a test-ban agreement, the scheduling of the tests in the first place poses a mystery. It may be explicable as a compromise in the infighting now going on in Washington between the proponents and opponents of new tests. For the beneficial scientific value of the tests could be only minimal, but their adverse political and psychological effect was bound to be great.

As might have been foreseen, the U.S.S.R. promptly pounced on the tests to accuse the United States of starting a new round in the nuclear arms race. The Soviets threatened to retaliate with a massive test series of their own, which they are suspected of already preparing. The cancellation of our tests deprives them of any propagandistic pretext for resuming theirs.

But cancellation is not enough. Even more determined efforts are necessary to break the present deadlock. President Kennedy has found new and powerful support in such an effort from 27 distinguished scientists, including three Nobel laureates. They have issued an appeal to Congress and the public to back a test-ban treaty as being in the best interests of the United States and of world peace. They urge, as does this newspaper, that the risk of continuing the arms race without a test-ban treaty is considerably greater than the risk that a ban might be violated by secret testing. For such a treaty would stop immediately all aboveground tests, and though some uncertainty might remain regarding underground tests, these have been found of lesser military value. Detection techniques are already such as to make it too risky for the Soviets to cheat. The treaty might not last, but as long as it lasts, it would leave our nuclear deterrent capacity intact, reduce the speed of the armaments race, help to inhibit the spread of nuclear arms, reduce the likelihood of nuclear war, and prevent further lethal fallout.

Other scientists, of course, and most military men disagree, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They argue that further tests are necessary to perfect our defensive weapons, in particular, an antimissile missile in which a Russian breakthrough could neutralize our whole nuclear arsenal. Also the Russians must still clarify the methods of the three inspections they are ready to admit. Many issues are still to be resolved, but the stakes are too high for either side to let the talks end in failure.

Man Overboard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the News of May 14:

MAN OVERBOARD

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Nearly 6 years before his retirement age, America loses a first-class, highly trained, forthright fighting man in the head-chop of Adm. George W. Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations.

In government there are always ways of disagreeing with your boss, most of them dangerous. In the armed services Congress makes the problem an agony—sometimes tragic—as the pitfall eliminating the lifetime career of fine officers. The Nation is the loser; our enemies the gainer. Yet what can an honorable man do?

Admiral Anderson was helpless when the Senate subcommittee ordered him to testify in the Boeing-General Dynamics plane dispute. A man like this will always put his view of the national interest first. And Admiral Anderson's testimony, unavoidably, contradicted many of Defense Secretary McNamara's statements; politely but with the respected weight of proved competence and long experience.

Air Force Chief of Staff Curtis E. LeMay's expert testimony likewise contradicted the boss. Whatever the reasons, his reappointment is cut to 1 year. But Admiral Anderson was tossed entirely out.

A key factor in the present action is Paul H. Nitze, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. As one result, the next question mark is Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Army Chief of Staff. A House Appropriations Subcommittee ordered him to testify on the Nation's ability to withstand a Soviet ground assault.

Along with Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Walt W. Rostow, etc., Mr. Nitze is one of our leading assurance-mongers. He is likewise as innocent of military experience as Ferdinand the Bull. But he had followed the fashion by blandly announcing a "myth."

He stated: "It is a myth that the Soviet has overwhelming nonnuclear superiority over the West." Premier Khrushchev's reaction to this novel lullaby is unrecorded, but the general staffs of the free world can be expected to have their own ideas about Mr. Nitze, alas.

Chief of Staff Wheeler was not free to ignore Congress' dissatisfaction with Mr. Nitze's testimony. He patiently confirmed the famous fact that, on the ground, Russia's available capability is enormous. He said newly affluent Western European Allies should make larger contributions to the defense of their own homelands. He stated the only country living up to its NATO troop quota is the United States.

Then our top Army commander added the final clincher in contradicting the assurance-mongers. The Chief of Staff had no choice but to testify that NATO's ground forces could stop the Soviet "only temporarily."

What will happen to able General Wheeler heaven only knows, but the United States needs all the Admiral Andersons and General Wheelers we can hang onto just now.

St. Louis Globe Democrat Says End the Test Ban Illusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, nuclear tests are presumably scheduled to meet the military requirements for the protection, preservation and safety of the United States of America. The Communists very much would like to see us not conducting such tests and their reasons are quite obvious. If they can stop our nuclear progress while continuing their own, they can achieve military superiority. If they cannot stop our progress, their next best move is to slow it down. Once again Washington officialdom has permitted them to do this. Tests scheduled in Nevada have been canceled by the President. The excuse is that the Communists would make propaganda out of them. Apparently the administration's philosophy is that the military security of the United States comes second to Communist propaganda. Well knowing this, Mr. Khrushchev now finds himself in the enviable position of being able to veto U.S. moves to maintain its military muscle. Score another one for Nikita. Once this fact gets around very much amongst the countries of the world, it would seem much more destructive to us than some more Communist propaganda. But that is not the way they look at it down at the White House. It makes one wonder.

Here is a bit of wisdom editorially contributed to the issue on May 11 by the St. Louis Globe Democrat:

End Test Ban Illusion

Now that President Kennedy has frankly admitted he sees no hope of achieving a nuclear test ban, perhaps there is at last some hope the United States will not trade down safeguards against secret tests to the point of nonexistence.

More than 3 years ago our Government presented a foolproof, scientific plan for a test ban treaty. It provided for 650 to 700 seismic stations, including 21 in Russia. It provided for an unspecified number of onsite inspections to be determined by scientific criteria.

If the Soviet Government had any desire whatsoever for a ban on nuclear tests under adequate safeguards against violations, there was the workable arrangement made to order.

But neither then nor since has Khrushchev given the slightest indication that he wants any treaty which would provide a check on nuclear explosions by Russia. Test ban talks have droned on and on without the Soviets coming any closer to accepting any proposal.

Meanwhile, our Government, frantically seeking an agreement which Khrushchev clearly doesn't want, has virtually scrapped the foolproof, scientific safegards it devised.

Long ago, it cut down the number of seismic stations required from between 650 and 700 to 180. It dropped the number of onsite inspections first to 20, then to 12 and on down. Its latest proposal, which the Russians have now rejected, was for 30 over a 7-year period—averaging just over 4 a year.

If Mr. Kennedy really has given up his illusion, we would say it was barely in time—before this country abandons all safeguards entirely.

Now, perhaps, he must face up to the reality he has been trying to avoid and proceed full speed with whatever atomic tests are needed to keep this Nation's protective nuclear arsenal ahead of Russia's.

The Remarkable Apple

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I directed the attention of the House to an interesting study by Drs. William G. Way and Joseph M. Damron of Winchester, Va., indicating a high degree of tolerance of apple juice by infants.

I stated at that time that I intended to supply significant supporting data, as contained in the paper of Drs. Way and Damron, published in the Virginia Medical Monthly for March 1963. The additional material follows:

The Remarkable Apple

In order to increase the size of the sample used in reaching conclusions regarding the effect of the type of juice (and thereby increase the confidence level of the test) the occurrence of the disorders was hypothesized to be independent of, (1) the sex of the subject and, (2) the type of milk fed the subject. The validity of these hypotheses was then tested as follows: Sex—table 3 presents the observed data grouped by sex and type of disorder observed. Of the 379 observations, 191 are of male subjects and 188 are of female subjects. If the hypothesis being tested is true, it would be expected that 191/379 of all observed disorders to be for males, and 188/379 of all observed disorders to be for females. For example, it would be expected that 19.2 of the 38 observed cases of rash would be for males and 18.8 would be for females. Actually 18 and 20 cases of rash were observed for males and females, respectively. The test of the hypothesis is whether the difference between the expected value (19.2) and the observed (18) data can reasonably be attributed to chance. Application of Chi-square testing procedures indicates that in the case of rash, a difference of at least as much as 19.2 to 18 will occur 70 percent of the time when the hypothesis is true.

Similar tests were run for each type of disorder and for all the disorders grouped together. In every case except one no significant difference existed between the sexes. The one exception is colic, which involves a difference that would occur by chance only 5 times out of a 100. However, it must be noted that the observed number of cases of colic (22) is less than the observed number of cases of each of the other disorders. This tends to reduce the reliance that may be placed in the data in the test. Therefore, even though a statistical significant difference exists in the observed data, it is felt that additional observations would tend to reduce the sex difference. We choose, therefore, to reject the test result and state that the rate of occurrence of disorder is independent of the sex of the subject.

Type of milk: The Chi-square test procedure was also used to test the hypothesis that the type of milk fed the infant had no significant effect on the rate of occurrence of the disorders. The observed data, grouped by types of milk is presented in table 4. The test indicates that no significant difference exists between the observed data and the expected values. This was the case for each type of disorder and for all disorders treated as a group.

TESTS FOR THE EFFECT OF TYPE OF JUICE

Once the subject's sex and type of milk were removed as significant parameters in the study, it was possible to group the data as shown in tables 5 and 6.

The hypothesis of independence was refuted in table 5. The analysis indicated that the physical condition of the subject with regard to "rash" and "acreptability" is dependent upon the type of juice taken. Significantly, higher rates of occurrence of these disorders were found (at the 2 and 5 percent level respectively) when the subject was fed orange juice. In addition, when the effect of the type of juice upon those cases which show "no disorder" was tested, it was found that a significantly greater number (at the 5-percent level) of subjects that had been fed apple juice had no disorders.

The data of table 5 also indicates that subjects fed only apple juice exhibited significantly fewer disorders (i.e., all six disorders treated as a single parameter) than did subjects fed only orange juice.

As further evidence of the dependent relationship between the type of juice taken and the physical condition of the infant, table 6 shows the rate of occurrence of the six disorders among infants fed first one type of juice and then the other. In every case the number of disorders observed while the subject was "on" apple juice was less than the number that would be expected if the rate of disorder occurrence were independent of the type of juice. In the case of "rash" and "colic" the difference was sufficient to meet the definition of significance. This was also true of all disorders taken as a group.

TABLE 1.—*Summary of observed data, type A*

[M—Male, F—Female, Y—Yes, N—No]

	Rash				Colic				Gas				Unusual stools						Vomiting				Acceptability			
	M		F		M		F		M		F		M			F			M		F		M		F	
	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Dia	Nor	Con	Dia	Nor	Con	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Apple juice only:																										
Breast	1	10	0	6	1	11	0	6	0	11	0	6	1	10	0	0	6	0	0	11	0	6	0	11	0	6
Homogenized	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Evaporated	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enfamil	3	45	1	43	2	46	3	41	3	45	1	43	4	44	0	0	44	0	1	47	1	43	3	45	1	43
Similac	0	9	0	10	0	9	1	9	2	7	0	10	0	9	0	0	10	0	0	9	0	10	0	9	0	10
Orange juice only:																										
Breast	1	8	3	13	0	9	1	15	1	8	1	15	0	9	0	0	16	0	0	9	0	16	0	9	3	13
Homogenized	0	4	1	5	0	4	0	6	0	4	0	6	0	4	0	0	6	0	0	4	1	5	0	4	1	5
Evaporated	5	46	2	32	1	50	1	33	6	45	1	33	2	49	0	3	31	0	2	49	1	33	5	46	0	34
Enfamil	3	21	5	13	2	22	0	18	2	22	2	16	2	22	0	2	16	0	0	24	2	16	3	21	3	15
Similac	2	9	0	12	0	11	1	11	0	11	1	11	0	10	1	2	10	0	1	10	1	11	1	10	1	11

TABLE 2.—*Summary of observed data, type B*

[M—Male, F—Female, Y—Yes, N—No]

	Rash				Colic				Gas				Unusual stools						Vomiting				Acceptability			
	M		F		M		F		M		F		M			F			M		F		M		F	
	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Dia	Nor	Con	Dia	Nor	Con	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
APPLE AND ORANGE JUICE																										
Breast																										
Apple	0	4	1	9	0	4	0	10	1	3	2	8	0	4	0	1	9	0	1	3	1	9	0	4	3	7
Orange	0	4	2	8	0	4	0	10	1	3	4	6	0	4	0	0	10	0	1	3	2	8	1	3	3	7
Homogenized																										
Apple	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	1	1
Orange	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	1	1
Evaporated																										
Apple	0	11	0	9	0	11	0	9	2	9	2	7	0	11	0	0	9	0	1	10	0	9	2	9	4	5
Orange	2	9	2	7	1	10	2	7	3	8	2	7	3	8	0	1	8	0	1	10	1	8	2	9	4	5
Enfamil																										
Apple	0	5	1	15	0	5	2	14	3	2	1	15	2	3	0	0	16	0	0	5	2	14	0	5	3	13
Orange	0	5	4	12	0	5	5	11	1	4	4	12	0	5	0	1	15	0	1	4	4	12	1	4	5	11
Similac																										
Apple	1	2	0	5	0	3	0	5	0	3	0	5	0	3	0	0	5	0	1	2	2	3	0	3	0	5
Orange	0	3	0	5	0	3	2	3	0	3	1	4	0	3	0	0	5	0	2	1	1	4	0	3	2	3

TABLE 3.—*Type of disorder by sex*

Type of disorder	Male		Female		Total
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	
Rash	18	19.2	20	18.8	38
Colic	6	11.1	16	10.9	22
Gas	21	19.2	17	18.8	38
Unusual stools	15	12.6	10	12.4	25
Vomiting	10	12.6	15	12.4	25
Acceptability	17	20.7	24	20.3	41
No disorder	104	96.0	86	94.0	190
Total	191		188		379

TABLE 4.—*Type of disorder by type of milk*

Type of disorder	Breast		Homogenized		Evaporated		Enfamil		Similac		Total
	O[1]	E[2]	O	E	O	E	O	E	O	E	
Rash	8	5.7	1	1.5	11	10.5	15	15.3	3	5.0	38
Colic	1	3.2	0	0.8	5	5.0	12	12.9	4	3.0	22
Gas	7	5.7	0	1.5	12	10.5	15	15.3	4	5.0	38
Unusual stools	2	3.7	0	.9	9	6.9	11	10.1	3	3.4	25
Vomiting	3	3.7	2	.9	5	6.9	9	10.1	6	2.4	25
Acceptability	7	5.1	3	1.6	11	11.3	16	16.5	4	5.5	41
No disorder	29	28.0	7	6.5	52	52.8	76	77.8	26	25.0	190
Total	57		13		106		154		50		379

[1] Observed.

[2] Expected.

TABLE 5.—*Type of disorder by juice, type A data*

Type of disorder	Apple juice only		Orange juice only		Total
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	
Rash	5	11.0	22	16.0	27
Colic	6	4.9	6	7.1	12
Gas	6	8.2	14	11.8	20
Unusual stools	5	6.1	10	8.9	15
Vomiting	2	4.1	8	5.9	10
Acceptability	4	8.6	17	12.4	21
No disorder	100	85.0	108	123.0	208
Total	128		185		313

TABLE 6.—*Type of disorder by juice, type B data*

Type of disorder	During apple juice		During orange juice		Total
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	
Rash	3	6.5	10	6.5	13
Colic	2	6.0	10	6.0	12
Gas	11	13.5	16	13.5	27
Unusual stools	3	4.0	5	4.0	8
Vomiting	8	11.0	14	11.0	22
Acceptability	14	17.0	20	17.0	34
Total	41		75		116

The Farmers' Electric Cooperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I include in the RECORD an address by Mr. Ernest C. Wood delivered at a breakfast sponsored by the Missouri State Electrification Association, Mr. John Davenport, general manager, presided over by President Orma E. Mackey and attended by members of the Missouri congressional delegation.

The address follows:

I want to discuss with you some of the legislative problems that confront us, more specifically some of the charges that are being made that we think are unfair. I'm sure you all recognize, you who are here in Washington, that we say things about the power companies that they wish we wouldn't say, and they say things about us that we wish they wouldn't say, and when it's all done, we have had some pretty good arguments.

We do think that in their appearances before your committees this spring they have said some things that are completely unfair, and I might add, you veterans from Missouri who were up here 10 to 15 years ago when we got approval of our G. and T. projects, heard the same statements substantially then, primarily from the power companies in Missouri.

I'd like to take just a minute to clarify to you the two different kinds of cooperatives that we have. Everybody here, with the exception of a few managers, represent the distribution cooperatives; those are the retail cooperatives; they sell the power to rural people. Then we have what we call the G. and T. cooperatives, which are generation and transmission; they are the wholesale cooperatives; they either generate power or they acquire it from Government projects, and sometimes they combine the two, the self-generated power and the hydropower, and market to us the combination of the two. I am from the area of the Northwest Electric Power Cooperative, a G. and T.

Mostly the discussions are concerning the G. and T. cooperative, because it becomes apparent that the companies are more opposed to our entry into the power-production field than they are that we are serving rural people. Within the past 30 days representatives of 12 companies, primarily from the southern part of the United States, have appeared before your committees here, and they have made many charges that we think are unfair.

They have said that the G. and T. loans are illegal. In other words, REA was set up to serve people who are unserved; once we have served them with a distribution cooperative, then when we borrow money to build a generation and transmission cooperative, it does not serve anybody not previously served.

This might be like the young man who goes into the farming business. He starts into producing crops and livestock as a small operator—he hires his trucking done, he hires a commercial firm to haul his livestock to market. Maybe he expands successfully over a period of years and decides "well, I'm going to buy my own truck and haul my own livestock. I market enough now that I can justify doing it."

That is our position. Once our power requirements increased enough we determined that we could generate our own power and studies proved that we could do it economically. The interesting thing in this whole controversy of the legality of our generation and transmission, is that under a competive concept it would be all right for us to own our own generation and transmission, just like the farmer can own his own truck. But from the strictly monopolistic concept, which does exist in the power business, they hold that we cannot own our own truck; our own generation and transmission.

They say that G. & T. loans are made in secret. There is nothing secret about them. We were 3 years developing plans for Northwest Electric Power Cooperative and the companies had the opportunity to make offers, and they did. None of their offers equalled what we could accomplish through Northwest Electric Power Cooperative. True, we didn't call them in and lay our plan out before them. We did consider their offers, but did not consider it prudent to disclose the details of our plan.

Significantly their final desperation offer spelled out a difference in their thinking on generation and transmission. Their final offer was to dump power in the central part of northwest Missouri. We could build our own transmission lines and deliver to our load centers. So in that offer they were not objecting to the transmission but they were trying to keep us from generation.

They are saying that these interchange arrangements between our G. & T. cooperatives and the Federal power projects are wrong—even immoral. That's the combination by which we merge—the hydropower with steampower and get a more efficient market for both of them. And incidentally in our area in Missouri, the power companies are participating in that very arrangement—they are benefiting from it.

They are saying that their utility investments are threatened once and they have delivered power to a cooperative, they say they made an investment there and when we go into the generation and transmission business we are threatening their investment. And that, if the co-ops are allowed to continue to do this, we are going to drive the private utility straight out of business.

And then, they are accusing us of unfair competition, which includes the fact that we do not pay income tax because we are nonprofit cooperatives, and that we have an interest rate which they say is a subsidy.

Out in Missouri we are getting the same objections. We have attempted to secure legislation and they are saying that we provide subsidized electric power—that we are attempting to invade the cities and towns. I am sure you will realize that when a city extends its corporate limits, and the power company rides piggyback on the coattails of the extension of the city limits and say "we're going to serve all of the new city limits area," they are invading us, but they accuse us of trying to invade the towns and cities.

They are saying that we have no right in Missouri, under existing law, to interchange power with municipal utility towns. In northwest Missouri we have connected with many small municipal towns and have worked out beneficial arrangements that are helping those towns to save their generating plants. Where they have to rely on high priced oil for generation, some of those city plants would now be in serious trouble. They can't compete with the modern trend toward larger generation, and more efficient generation. And so it has been a benefit to all parties concerned.

I mentioned a minute ago that the power companies in Missouri have changed a little in their thinking. There are six G. & T. cooperatives in Missouri and they have gotten together and formed Associated Electric Cooperative—we call it AEC. They created amongst themselves a power pool. Then for the most efficient use of the hydropower out of primarily Table Rock and Bull Shoals Dams they invited three power companies in western Missouri to participate in that pool. The companies have a greater problem on peak usage, seasonally through the summer, than the electric cooperatives have. And so Kansas City Power & Light Co., Missouri Public Service Co., and the Empire District Electric Co. have joined the cooperatives in that pool. And by the arrangements, these three companies will get a lot of value and a lot of power and energy out of those hydro projects through the summers when they have their big peaks and they in turn firm up our power requirements for the remainder of the year when we have our peaks.

The president of Kansas City Power & Light recently made this statement "that it's an advantageous arrangement to all concerned."

Now significantly, as I said, you have heard some of these tales before. I want to go back to 1950, and years immediately following. Officials of Missouri companies repeatedly appeared before your committees, with the same accusations you are now hearing. Some unfounded charges they made include the following:

On March 16, 1950, Mr. Warren L. Porter, vice president of the Kansas City Power & Light Co. had this to say: "There will be no opportunity for any of the hydroelectric energy which SPA purports to sell to Northwest, to flow northward from Bull Shoals [dam] to Northwest. This $5 million line can contribute nothing whatever to the supply of energy of these cooperatives."

Ironically, this past summer Kansas City Power & Light suffered a major failure in its generation. They would have suffered a major outage, but power was fed into the city and customers noticed only a flicker. Congressman BOLLING, had you been in Kansas City at the time you wouldn't have realized the company had a generation failure. The transmission line of Northwest Electric Power Cooperative, from Bull Shoals was so overloaded with power it's a wonder the conductors weren't smoking. The many interconnections to the Northwest Electric Power Cooperative line, and the Clinton substation, made it possible to pick up emergency power from the Federal projects, Arkansas Power & Light Co., Empire District Electric Co., Missouri Public Service Co., and others.

The city of Springfield suffered a similar generation failure and the same interconnected pool prevented the city from suffering a serious outage.

On May 30, 1951, Mr. D. A. Merrifield, vice president of St. Joseph Light & Power Co. testified: "The fact is, however, that this line was never intended to bring hydroelectric energy into northwest Missouri."

On March 7, 1952, Mr. D. C. McKee, president of Empire District Electric Co. testified: "Neither of the Northwest or Central transmission lines—will provide a power supply not now available in the State of Misouri."

On May 13, 1953, Mr. Carl J. Mason, vice president of Missouri Public Service Co. testified: "* * * the Clinton substation project was never necessary and is not now necessary to meet the power requirements of rural cooperatives within the entire west central Missouri area" and " * * * the Missouri Public Service Co. has opposed all reqeusts for funds to construct this substation (Clinton)."

Yet the tie-in of Missouri Public Service at the Clinton substation and the tie-in of Kansas City Power & Light there, plus other tie-ins, made it possible that Kansas City didn't suffer a serious outage. That substation is moving lots of power. It is on the Northwest Electric Power Cooperative transmission line and the Central & KAMO G. & T. systems are also connected to it.

They refer to subsidized electric power. Now what does subsidy mean? If you refer to Webster he says to subsidize is "to aid" and "to assist." The most aided and assisted segment of the electric utility industry is the private utility sector. Especially if you compare them to the electric cooperatives. Our interest rate right now does not equal the average cost of Government-borrowed money. It is not far below it.

I was talking to an important businessman recently and he was surprised that 20 years ago when Government money probably averaged under 1 percent that we weren't allowed to borrow at 1 percent. We paid nearly 3 percent until 1945. So we built up considerable credit and we don't hesitate to defend 2 percent interest, at least until our credit may be exhausted. And there were other factors involved when the 2-percent interest rate was approved, principally an obligation on the rural electrics to serve all rural areas.

The Internal Revenue Code of 1954, devised under wartime conditions, was designed to encourage increased industrial capacity and production. It permits the electric utilities to operate under two sets of books.

One set of books is for ratemaking purposes. Rates are established to secure enough revenue to cover all normal operating expenses, including operation, all taxes, depreciation, cost of capital and their assured profits. All of these purposes are collected from their customers.

The second set of books is for taxpaying purposes. The code permits the companies to increase their operational costs by use of accelerated allowances for depreciation. This book increase of operating costs results in a decreased tax obligation to the Government.

Thus, under book 1, the companies collect, in their rates, more taxes from their customers than they pay to the Government under book 2. This retained overcharge is interest free to the companies—no interest is paid on it. It constitutes interest-free funds for capital purposes. In many instances it is allowed to flow through to surplus and is then passed on to stockholders as tax-free dividend. Even though it is calculated overcharge rarely do regulatory commissions require its return to the customer, from whom it was first extracted.

It is presumed that at some future date this retained tax money must be paid to the Government. Many persons doubt that it will be. Assuming that it is paid, in the meantime the use of millions and millions will accrue into values of billions of dollars to the utilities, from its use free of any cost.

Already, in a few short years the private utility industry has collected $1.5 billion in taxes from their customers which they have not paid into the Federal Treasury.

Last year Congress passed a tax investment credit bill. In it the private utilities are allowed to retain 3 percent and invest it in plant. Many hold this isn't necessary since the utility business is not a risk business—by law it is allowed to plan to meet its risk obligations by an assured rate of return, above costs of operation, of normally 6 percent. Ironically it has not spurred utility growth—the utilities have cut back their investment plans by 19 percent for the second and third quarters of 1963.

In turn, their returns on investment have been excellent—in many cases well above the 6-percent normal. And the disposition of those overcharges is in many cases surprising. The business editor of the Pittsburg Post-Gazette recently wrote: "The entire subject is difficult to explain—for example, Union Electric Co., St. Louis, said on February 1 that it estimated 51 percent of its 1962 dividends were nontaxable—there are many factors which enter into the taxability of dividends and while they revolve around depreciation in the main, the entire subject is difficult to explain."

I suppose all of your offices here in Congress have had a letter from Union Electric Co. that Senator SYMINGTON referred to. Three electric cooperatives, including the one that I manage, purchased Consumers Public Service Co. It's a small utility, strictly in rural areas, as defined in the REA Act. The largest town is 600 population. Two neighboring cooperatives, and the cooperative I manage, purchased it. The factors involved were that the utility was small, it was squeezed in by the existing companies. The owner had pioneered rural electrification when the companies that are interested now, did not pioneer it. He was pioneering rural electrification before we, the cooperatives, even got started.

So he had a difficult operation—he was small—he couldn't keep his system up to date. For instance, we ran over 500 voltage charts and they ranged from a low of 87 volts to a high of 146, not on the same chart. But that gives you an idea of the spread of the voltage. The accepted utilities standard is 110 to 127. Naturally being small he had high rates.

The charges say that we paid too much for it. That's according to whose standards you use. We had consulting engineers—that advised us as to a reasonable value to pay for it. If I could have brought along an overlay map that's being prepared now, and you could see how those lines of the company who bought crisscross over and under the lines of the three cooperatives, you could understand the value to us, that might not exist to anybody else. It will not extend the service area of any one of the three cooperatives by 1 foot. It fits in with minor modifications that take care of power requirements, etc., and therefore there are values there—that wouldn't accrue to any utility, including the one making the charges, but do accrue to the cooperatives.

Significantly, the very company that complained, or I'd say its subsidiary company, because Union Electric has made the complaint in the interest of Missouri Power & Light, which is 100 percent owned by Union Electric. Missouri Power & Light operates in the area, and sells power to Consumers, as the letter spelled out. Would it surprise you to learn that this sympathetic company has been charging Consumers a holdup rate for power? I bought power from Missouri Power & Light in 1953–54 and paid them 9 mills, but they have charged Consumers, and still continue to charge them 12 to 14 mills per kilowatt-hour on an improved load-factor requirement. They have had a captive customer and charged accordingly. Now they want his property.

Missouri Power & Light refused to serve the very rural areas that Consumers is now serving. I have letters in my files from farmers who said that they tried to get Missouri Power & Light to build rural lines to them but the company demanded a $500 contribution from every one wanting rural service. Those farmers then turned to Consumers and secured service.

Missouri Power & Light moved into a town that had refused for 13 years to renew its franchise to Consumers because of its high rates and lack of good service. In the absence of a franchise, Missouri Power & Light moved in and tried to take the town away from us. They got a franchise ordinance out of the council and in the election that followed the people rejected them 144 to 90. So there are many angles, including very bitter resentment at the attempts of Missouri Power & Light to horn in on our deal.

As I said the companies don't want us generating power. They don't want us to get the power that is produced by the Federal Government at its projects and they don't want municipal utility towns to generate power. If they could prevent all those things and have a monopoly on power production, I'm sure they would be happy, they wouldn't be complaining to you, and they would like us. But you know that each of the three segments of the industry that I mentioned provides measuring standards; and you need them. It would be a sad thing in these United States if we didn't have these comparative measuring yardsticks. Our feeling is that you men in Congress have this problem to evaluate as to where a fair medium is and to protect both sides, because both sides are needed.

We think it would be a calamity if you permit our generation and transmission program to be harmed. There can be limits as to how far it has to go. But there's been instance after instance where the generation and transmission program has done a tremendous job.

I have a little booklet prepared in Texas that pinpoints the value to us of the G. & T. program. In 1940, in eastern Texas, five cooperatives got together and organized a generating cooperative. The area power company, in a matter of a few months, implemented a rate decrease from 12.9 mills to 8.7 mills per kilowatt-hour, a 4.2-mill decrease. The cooperative decided to withhold its construction program and probably had to because of wartime scarcities. In 1947, they renewed their plan to build. The company retroactive to 1945 reduced the rate to 6 mills per kilowatt-hour. That company is not hurt—it's one of your more prosperous companies in the United States. Its financial statement is real good, in fact, its net profits increased 239 percent in 10 years.

I would like to conclude this on their charge that we are going to drive them out of business. I have a booklet put out by Tri-Continental, Inc. It's an investment company and the title of this booklet is "Electric Utilities—Relatively Undervalued Growth Stocks." They say in this booklet that where most investment firms buy the general market, they have concentrated on electric utility stocks and, as a segment of industries, they have more electric utility stocks than any other type. And I want to read to you what this booklet says. "Using 1938 as 100, the index for the Dow-Jones Industrial Averages had risen to 398, as of December 31, 1960. During the same period the index of the value of Tri-Continental's electric utility portfolio had risen to 1,931." Then they go on to say "the general thinking has held that since an electric utility's rate of return is limited by regulation its growth in earnings is bound to be slower than that of companies in unregulated industry. This thinking ignores the fact that competition and overcapacity in unregulated industry not only limits the rate of return but often actually lowers it. The economic law of supply and demand is a tougher taskmaster than political law limiting the rate of return for the utility."

This bears out the fact that one of the most ridiculous charges is that we are going to drive them out of business. Our generation is less than 1 percent of the total generation in the country—it's only 16 percent of our needs. And so we have no fear that they are going to be harmed. In fact, the figures for 1962 show the class A and B utilities, nationwide, as having enjoyed about the biggest profit they have ever had. They had an increase of 10 percent in their net profits in that 12-month period.

And so we think that our program is not going to harm them. True, they will wail long and loud every time we become independent of their monopoly. But where the figures prove that we need those projects, we need them badly.

Time is beginning to prove that what we've done in Missouri can benefit everybody. It takes many years to forget the many charges that you had 10 to 15 years ago about what we in Missouri were trying to do. Those same charges are being revived now by utilities from other States.

Thank you for being patient.

The East-West Center and International Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. GILL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Congress established the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West in Hawaii, in October 1966, this educational institution has organized its scope of operations in order to carry on the intent of Congress that the Center strengthen mutual understanding among the peoples of Asia, the Pacific area, and the United States. Three programs have been established at the Center which make the achievement of this goal possible. They fall under the headings of student programs, technical interchange and advanced projects.

Although there is much to be said about the accomplishments of each of these three programs, I should like to take this opportunity to call the attention of my colleagues to a recent article which appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, describing the work of one, the Institute of Advanced Projects. I think they will find that this program is helping to achieve the purpose of the Center by promoting educational interchange at the professional and advanced professional level.

The above-mentioned article follows:

DIVISION OF EAST-WEST CENTER DEVELOPING GLOBAL LINKS

(By Hildegaard Verploegen)

The East-West Center's think industry—the Institute of Advanced Projects—will soon be getting advice from a corps of consultants around the world.

The Institute is rapidly developing a network of agreements with individuals, foundations and professional societies, and Asian, Pacific, and U.S. educational institutions.

The first National Advisory Panel recently was appointed in Japan, as was the first regional representative for the Philippines, Taiwan, and Hong Kong.

Dr. Edward W. Weidner, Advanced Projects vice-chancellor, pictures these developments as major steps forward under the twin themes of international development and world understanding.

MAIN DIVISIONS

The Institute of Advanced Projects, which stresses educational exchange at the advanced professional or scholarly levels, is one of the East-West Center's three main divisions. The other two are Student Programs adn Technical Interchange.

Weidner readily admits there is somewhat of an "ivory tower" characteristic to the Advanced Projects program but said it does not, in any way, operate in a vacuum.

The Institute has been called the "brain trust" of the East-West Center since it does deal in high-powered thinking and research.

Weidner points out that the Institute is not a bunch of high-brow intellectuals working for years at Government expense on obscure, isolated projects that will be interred in the dusty basement of some library.

MAJOR PROBLEMS

The scholars are working on major problems facing mankind, such as international development and peaceful relations among the peoples of different countries, Weidner said.

Likewise, the Institute has planned objectives and frequent reexamination, he said.

The links now being established with other educational institutions and foundations are definite attempts to avoid duplication and needless competition among the maze of organizations already working to ward the same goals in international education.

They also are attempts to coordinate the institute's programs with those of other organizations, Weidner said.

TWO-WAY STREET

Weidner pictures it as a two-way street of cooperation and mutual assistance.

At present, the Institute of Advanced Projects is using five basic approaches toward coordination. They are:

1. National Advisory Panels in each of the Asian countries.
2. Regional representatives in the Asian and Pacific areas.
3. Teams of U.S. consultants.
4. Formal agreements with United States, Asian, and Pacific universities and educational institutions.
5. Formal agreements with Asian, Pacific, and United States professional organizations and associations.

The Japan National Advisory Panel will have its first meeting in that country on June 17 and 18.

The panel "will coordinate our program and select those things which seem especially applicable to Japan," Weidner said.

The panel will make recommendations to suit the institute's programs to Japan's needs, nominate Japanese for the scholar-in-residence program in Honolulu, and review Japanese scholar nominations made by other sources.

The first three members of the Japan National Advisory Panel all were formerly scholars-in-residence in Honolulu. They are:

Dr. Masayoshi Yamaguchi director, Ministry of Labor, Kawasaki, Japan.

Dr. Iwao Ayusawa, International Christian University, Tokyo.

Dr. Hajime Nakamura, department of Indian Philosophy, University of Tokyo.

Three new members will be appointed each year for 3-year terms so that the panel eventually will stabilize as a nine-member board.

Dr. Yoichi Maeda, of the University of Tokyo, a member of the International Advisory Panel to the East-West Center, is an ex-officio member of the Japan National Advisory Panel.

FILM TO DIET

When the Japan Nationall Advisory Panel meets in June, the institute will present 28 reels of microfilm to the National Diet Library.

For the past year, the institute has had a scholar working at the University of the Ryukyus microfilming materials which are available only at that university.

Most of the material is in Japanese, Weidner said, and the presentation to the National Diet Library is a gesture of good will and cooperation.

The institute's regional representatives will study all educational opportunities available in the areas to which they are assigned, make recommendations to suit the institute's programs to the needs of these areas, and nominate scholars.

REPRESENTATIVE

The first regional representative, Mrs. Marjorie Ravenholt, begins work in July with headquarters in Manila, the Philippines. In addition to the Philippines, her area includes Hong Kong and Formosa.

Mrs. Ravenholt's husband, Albert Ravenholt, is a member of the American Universities field staff and has specialized in the Far East since World War II.

The institute's third approach deals with the American side, Weidner said, explaining the series of continuing consultants.

These consultants spend their 3-year-terms working at the mainland institutions with which they are affiliated, with scholars-in-residence in Honolulu, and make at least one trip to Asia.

Weidner calls the consultants "our eyes and ears" on a particular subject or field of study.

He said three consultants already are at work. They are:

Dr. Cole Brembeck, Michigan State University, working in development education.

Dr. Gabriel Almond, Yale University, working in development politics.

Dr. Ferrel Heady, University of Michigan, working in development administration.

The next two consultants will work on educational exchange and development economics.

The institute is trying to relate its programs to universities in Asia and the United States by means of formal institutional agreements, Weidner said, explaining the fourth approach.

These agreements will involve the use of the institute's resources as well as those of the other university signing the contract. Also involved are conferences, research translations and library facilities and scholars.

The fifth approach is agreements with professional organizations and associations.

Two such organizations already cooperating are the Comparative Administration Group of the American Society for Public Administration and the Eastern Regional Organization for Public Administration in Asia.

Through these projects, the institute and the professional societies will coordinate plans, exchange resources and cosponsor projects.

An upcoming project in this area is the Asian-Pacific National Science Information Centers' conference in Hong Kong on June 10–14. It's jointly sponsored by the Institute of Advanced Projects and the American National Academy of Sciences.

The conference will examine and attempt to improve and increase science information centers located in Asia and Pacific area countries.

Congratulations to Magazine Publishers Association and Charles D. Ablard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Magazine Publishers Association has just announced the appointment of Mr. Charles D. Ablard to be its vice president. I should like to congratulate Magazine Publishers Association, and its distinguished president, Mr. John K. Herbert, on their fine choice.

Mr. Ablard is a constituent of mine and lives in Alexandria, Va. He is a former judicial officer and Post Office Department Board of Contract Appeals Chairman. With another constituent Mr. Marion Edwyn Harrison, Mr. Ablard has been a partner in the firm of Ablard & Harrison. Mr. Harrison is also an authority on postal matters and is a former Associate General Counsel of the Post Office Department and member of its Board of Contract Appeals.

Attack on Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the timely and forceful editorial by William S. White, of the Washington Evening Star, on criticism of our space program:

ATTACKS ON U.S. SPACE PROGRAM

(By William S. White)

As though on signal, a subtle and many-sided attack is rising against this country's $30 billion space program, and notably upon its efforts to reach the moon ahead of the Soviet Union.

The antispace program alliance is made up of strange bedfellows, indeed. There are conservative budget cutters, whose motive is at least quite rational and understandable, if in this case also quite wrong. For to settle for second place in space, considering the giant steps of the Russians in this field, would be like settling for second place in atomic armament.

There are reformist politicians—who would never agree with the conservatives on anything else whatever—who don't want this money spent simply because in their opinion not enough is being done for projects like "urban renewal." Such men no doubt would have screechingly stopped development of the airplane a lifetime ago if, in the meantime, the streetcars in New York were in any way inadequate and the slums in Chicago or Philadelphia had not been totally replaced by public housing.

There are military men who resent that space is under control of civilians. These fellows, though short sighted here, at least grasp the towering truth that the military security of the United States would be fatally breached if the Communist political system should gain dominion over space, and thus over weather, over communications, and over weapons systems in the infinite yonder. Because of the immense military application of this thing they don't want it run by civilians like James Webb, the Chief Administrator, backed by Vice President JOHNSON.

BIG SCIENTISTS FOR PROGRAM

But, most important, there are "the scientists." From much that is read one would assume that scientists generally opposed the moon project. The truth is that here—as in every step in the past years in the atomic energy program—most of the really big scientists are wholly in support of this costly but indispensable search for national safety.

They are aware that the nation which is first and dominant in space will infallibly be first and dominant also in this world, just as the really big scientists before them were aware that we simply must go on with the multibillion hydrogen bomb development if we intended to guarantee this Nation's physical life.

LIBERAL TYPES

"The scientists," as they were a decade ago, are generally those vaguely "liberal" types who tend to pooh-pooh the manifest determination of the Russians to dominate this earth and who suppose that scientists capable of building admittedly complicated gadgets are also capable of taking over this country's high policy from its elected leaders.

The fact is that "the scientists" are no more up to directing our public affairs than are the electricians and welders who assist them in this machine-making. And they are no more entitled to be held in public awe and veneration as the source of all utimate wisdom—in all fields.

Ever since the atomic era opened we have offered national cult-worship to "science," as though a man who truly understood physics necessarily was anointed from above to give us all the final answers to all mankind's whole field of life—including the art of government. It is an absurd notion. Scientists are splendid and brilliant and irreplaceable fellows—but in narrow fields having to do with things and not men and government. If we had listened to "the scientists" 10 years or so ago against the hydrogen bomb we should now be enslaved or dead.

Now, it may be argued that the space program should be cut back here or there. But if so, it should never be done at the will of "the scientists," but only of the elected leaders of this country, the Congress and the President. And it should never be done simply because reformers want more slum clearance. The decision should only be made by the proper people on the proper criteria, that is, economic and political and security criteria.

Trotters Shoals Rejected by Governor Russell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Donald Russell, of South Carolina, after a very thorough study, has rejected a proposal to build another huge Government dam on the Savannah River at Trotters Shoals. I commend Governor Russell for his earnest and sincere conclusions. The Legislature of South Carolina unanimously opposed a Government dam at Trotters Shoals. Governor Russell's immediate predecessor, Governor Hollings, rejected a Government dam at Trotters Shoals. The overwhelming majority of the South Carolina congressional delegation opposes Trotters Shoals.

Now is the time to proceed with industrial development of the Savannah River to provide jobs, payrolls, tax revenue and opportunity.

Governor Russell's decision opposing Trotters Shoals is contained in the following letter to the distinguished and able Gen. W. K. Wilson, Jr., Chief of Engineers:

MAY 14, 1963.

W. K. WILSON, Jr.,
Lieutenant General, U.S. Army, Chief of Engineers, Headquarters, Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL WILSON: I have reviewed the tentative plans for the construction of what is known as the Trotters Shoals Reservoir on the Savannah River near Calhoun Falls, S.C. Such reservoir is part of a larger plan, developed by the Corps of Engineers originally in 1944 and intended to cover the entire Savannah River Basin. Already, as a part of this overall plan, dams have been constructed at Clarks Hill and Hartwell on the Savannah River. The present project would cover the approximately 30 miles of the Savannah River between the Clarks Hill and Hartwell developments.

There is a difference of opinion in this State with respect to the wisdom of the proposed project and its impact on the industrial growth of this State. I understand that this plan was not approved by my predecessor in office; I am requested to alter that decision. In order to obtain all facts and information available to guide me toward a wise judgment in this regard, I held two public hearings, affording all interested citizens and groups an opportunity to present their views on this project.

After due consideration, I am of the opinion, as Governor of South Carolina, that I cannot approve the plan for the Trotters Shoals Reservoir as presented to me by the Corps of Engineers.

I shall not review the conflicting arguments submitted to me at the hearing. I shall confine myself to some of the reasons which prompt my decision.

I

Both those supporting and those opposing the project are largely in agreement that they desire to see a proposed steamplant of Duke Power Co. completed on the upper part of the Savannah River involved in the Corps of Engineers project. This steamplant will require a small dam across the Savannah River. It is the position of the proponents of the Trotters Shoals project that this Duke steamplant is compatible with the Trotters Shoals project; and they accordingly support both projects. And the report of the Corps of Engineers, submitted in February 1962 states flatly that the construction of the Duke steamplant is compatible with the construction of the Trotters Shoals Reservoir.

The Duke plant offers many advantages to South Carolina and subdivisions. It is estimated that this plant will add approximately $7 million per year to the taxable revenue of this State and its subdivisions. On the other hand, it is disputed whether Trotters Shoals, if constructed, would add anything appreciable to the taxable revenues of the State. Moreover, it would produce almost 25 times as much electric power as the proposed Trotters Shoals Reservoir. South Carolina accordingly has an important stake in the successful construction of this Duke plant.

The difficulty is that, while the Corps of Engineers asserts that its proposal is compatible with the Duke plant's construction, Duke has not concurred in this conclusion. Duke cannot be compelled to accept the judgment of the Corps of Engineers. At the hearings before me Duke pointed out that, if the Corps of Engineers should in its final plans construct the Trotters Shoals project with a certain height or other features, the Duke project, in its judgment, would not be compatible either from an engineering or an economic viewpoint. Since there is no agreement between the Corps of Engineers and Duke on the compatibility of the two projects, the State of South Carolina has not assurance that the Trotters Shoals project will not continually preclude the Duke construction. South Carolina would not wish to put in jeopardy the Duke project.

II

In another vital area, the report of the Corps of Engineers leaves open a matter which might be of serious consequence to many municipalities and industrial plants now using the Savannah River and its tributaries for waste discharge. Thus, on page 32, this report states:

"No specific items of local cooperation are proposed due to the nature of the project and benefits. Several communities and industries in the area use the river and its tributary streams for the disposal of raw and partially treated domestic and industrial wastes. For example, the city of Anderson, S.C., discharges partially treated domestic and industrial waste into a branch of Rocky River and into Big Generostee Creek; the city of Elberton, Ga., discharges raw sewage and industrial waste into Beaverdam Creek; and the Rocky River plant of the Bigelow-Sanford Carpet Co. dumps partially treated industrial waste into Rocky River. While the situation is currently permitted or tolerated the pollution of streams and related problems is a matter within the responsibility of State and local government agencies and this responsibility would not be altered by construction of the Trotters Shoals project. A detailed survey has not been made specifically for this report of all sources or the magnitude of existing pollution problems in the area."

This same point is emphasized anew in the letter of January 28, 1963, from the Chief, Corps of Engineers, to me in these words:

"The U.S. Public Health has stated that the effects of existing and foreseeable waste discharges on possible recreational, municipal and industrial water supplies should be studied. This matter will be investigated further during preconstruction planning if the project is authorized. At that time, correction of any adverse effects on waste treatment plants or water intake structures for which there may be a project responsibility, such as plant alterations necessitated by the rise in water surface will be planned in detail. However, Federal responsibility is not considered to extend to participation in the cost of constructing new or expanded waste treatment measures solely because a reservoir is provided, unless this is the more economical way of correcting a condition which otherwise would be a Federal responsibility."

What steps the city of Anderson and other municipalities might subsequently be required to take in connection with their waste disposal and who would bear the expense of the same, if this project is constructed, is a matter of substantial importance to the taxpayers of Anderson and the other municipalities which might be involved. These and other related questions are unanswered.

Further, this proposed development, with its control over the water resources of the area, will affect the industrial growth of an important area of our State. The rules which the Federal Government will apply in connection with waste discharges will be of considerable interest to any industrial prospect. It was suggested at the hearing that one industry already located in the area would, if this reservoir is constructed, have to spend three-quarters of a million dollars on waste controls. Certainly, any new industry would want to know what would control the use of the water impounded in the reservoir. The plan submitted leaves all this to future review.

III

Many opponents of the proposed project base their objection on the ground that the project, if constructed, would eliminate the possibility of a large paper and pulp plant, now under consideration for this area by the Mead Corp. It seems agreed that this plant could not be built on a site now owned by the Mead Corp. in Abbeville County, if the Trotters Shoals Reservoir is built.

The Mead Corp., through its chief executive, appeared at the hearings to oppose the Trotters Shoals Reservoir. It stated that it expected to build a new plant in the next few years and this Abbeville area seemed an excellent location. It pointed to its purchase of a substantial amount of timberlands in this area as evidence of its serious intentions. It was, however, unwilling to commit itself definitely and indicated that its decisions would be determined by future demands for pulp products.

The value of a pulp plant in the Abbeville area is recognized. It would provide a market for the pulp produced in volume in this section of our State. Moreover, it would contribute substantially to tax revenues and employment in this State.

IV

It should be noted that the Trotters Shoals development is part of a general plan developed in 1944. Many changes have taken place since that time. It is entirely conceivable that a fresh review of the overall development plan for the Savannah River might alter this plan. Recent years have given greater urgency to wise and judicious use of water both for domestic and industrial purposes. The letter to me from Dr. Jones, hereto attached, emphasizes this point and suggests that the State of South Carolina might well conduct such a review.

The economic justification of the project was seriously questioned in the hearings. To discuss such questions would unduly prolong this letter. I have already stated my conclusions on the plan as presented.

Very truly yours,

DONALD RUSSELL.

Ronald Reagan Speaks Out—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD part 4, the concluding article in a series publishing the entire text of Mr. Ronald Reagan's lecture, "What Price Freedom," delivered April 29, 1963, in Dixon, Ill. These articles have appeared in the Dixon Evening Telegraph, this last one being printed in the May 4, 1963 issue.

Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan was born February 6, 1911, in Tampico, Ill. This is a small farming community located in the northwestern part of the State. Throughout this area one can find the rural American scene with its customs, its pleasures, its chores, and its close-knit unity. The people from this area speak plain words, easy to understand, pleasant, deep in philosophy, and courageous. Mr. Reagan graduated from high school in nearby Dixon and went on to receive an A.B. degree from Eureka College, located in Woodford County. For a time he served as a sports announcer at station WHO in Des Moines, Iowa. He served in the Army Air Force from 1942 to 1945 and attained the rank of captain.

Mr. Reagan's outstanding career as an actor is well known. He was subsequently honored by his colleagues by being elected as president of the Screen Actors' Guild. More recently, his distinguished role as host for the "General Electric Theater" has received wide acclaim. Mr. Reagan has been a longtime resident of Hollywood, Calif., and I must say that Illinois' loss was California's gain.

Mr. Speaker, in reading over Mr. Reagan's lecture, one cannot help but note his intense patriotic emotion. Moreover, his lecture signifies an all-embracing observation, a Shakesperian perception of motives, shall we say, of those who would sell our freedom for a mess of pottage. I am sure Mr. Reagan is more than able to comprehend the great American tragedy that is being written by some of the schemers in our Government.

Mr. Speaker, the reports that I have been hearing that Mr. Reagan will be the next Republican candidate to oppose Senator ENGLE in 1964 are very pleasing. I feel sure that he would do an outstanding job of representing that great State in the U.S. Senate. Perhaps this is not Mr. Reagan's ambition, but at any rate, in view of public reaction to his lecture series which I have inserted in the last 4 days, I know many will urge him to remain active in politics and continue his speaking program throughout California and the Nation.

The concluding article of the series follows:

WHAT PRICE FREEDOM?

(By Ronald Reagan)

No nation in history has ever survived a tax burden that reached a third of its national income. Today 33 cents out of every dollar earned is the tax collector's share and of that 33 cents—23 cents goes to the Federal Governnment, leaving a dime to be divided between the State, county and local community.

Is it any wonder that whatever we need, they tell us to turn to the Federal Government for a grant in aid? One Congressman has described Federal aid as the case of a man giving himself a blood transfusion in the right arm by taking blood from the left—and spilling half of it on the way across.

We must have tax reforms within the framework of our traditional belief that tax policy is nothing more than an equitable means of raising needed revenue. We must reduce the percent of personal income government is withdrawing from the economy but we must accompany this with an end to deficit spending. In this way we can put the responsibility for economy where it belongs—on bureau chieftains and department heads who will be forced to stay within the limit of government income.

Our tradition is one of proportionate taxation. No one would suggest we should prorate the cost of government equally among all people even though a case of moral justification could be made for such a sharing. But there is no relationship between proportionate taxation and the progressive system we have in our income tax—a system Karl Marx hailed as the prime essential of a socialist state.

While we can't be so optimistic as to believe the income tax will be restored to this proportionate policy all at once, reform certainly should set us on the road to such an eventuality. This is essential if we are to preserve the great American dream that wealth is prohibited to no one: that any one of us can round a corner and find the "pot of gold." No American Government could persuade the people to vote a ceiling on earnings, yet we have virtually accomplished this with our tax beginning at 20 percent and rising swiftly to 91 cents out of the dollar a man can earn by his own ability.

When passing years make it apparent to some they will not themselves realize the dream, they reinvest the dream in their children, scrimping and saving to provide an education and improved possibility.

Well, let me turn to sports for an example of what has happened to that American dream. Thirty years ago the graduate of an orphan's home and a reform school, but a fine fellow, named "Babe" Ruth received the highest salary ever paid in baseball for hitting 60 home runs. Eighty thousand dollars a year he received from the New York Yankees. Three short decades later, with certain changes in the income tax laws, a fellow named Roger Maris hit 60 home runs. If Maris had received the same take-home purchasing power "Babe" Ruth received, and had been able to pay his income tax on that amount, his paycheck from the Yankees would have had to read $960,000 for the season.

Democracy is an accepted method of achieving desired goals, but it is nothing more than mob rule and dictatorship unless it is accompanied by a set of ground rules protecting the inalienable rights of the individual. Our ground rules are to be found in the Constitution.

The individual citizen can't keep up with the thousands of pieces of legislation suggested each year nor should he be expected to. It isn't his job to be a legislative expert. Our salvation lies in chaining down government to certain specific constitutional functions. The Constitution is still our contract providing for the most equitable and limited government ever enacted by man. It has been ignored, misinterpreted and denounced by those who place security above freedom. We must restore its force and remove from government the unconstitutional powers it has taken from us.

Now, of course, that tags me as a Neanderthal man. The Constitution is supposed to be outmoded and old fashioned. Senator Fulbright, speaking at Stanford University, referred to the President as our moral teacher and our leader, and he said "he is hobbled in his task by the restrictions of power imposed on him by a constitutional system designed for 18th century agrarian society." And we've been told that the talk of taking the country back to the Constitution is talk of taking it back to the days of McKinley. Well I, for one, don't think that's a bad idea. Under McKinley we freed Cuba.

Daniel Webster said, "Hold on, my friends, to the Constitution of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands. Miracles do not cluster. What has happened once in 6,000 years may never happen again. Hold on to your Constitution for if the Constitution shall fall there will be anarchy throughout the world."

It has been said that if we lost this way of ours, this traditional freedom, history will report with the greatest astonishment that those who had the most to lose did the least to prevent it happening.

Well we can do something about it—first by undertaking the choice before us and making up our minds that here has been created the newest idea in man's relation to man. Those who suggest government by an intellectual elite in some distant capital are merely presenting the same old feudalism in a new coat—the idea that security is preferable to control of one's own destiny. We can make this choice known by our selections at the polls and by expressing our ideas to those already in office. Either we run Government as the Founding Fathers intended we should, or Government runs us. To those of you who fear participating in politics because of possible retribution in your business or professional life, understand one thing clearly—you can't go on feeding the crocodile hoping he'll eat you last.

You and I have a rendezvous with destiny. We'll meet the challenge in the days ahead or we'll trail in the dust the golden hope of mankind for years to come. Are we a different breed of American? Has life become so dear and peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Or, will we pledge our lives and our sacred honor? Can we accept compromise with an enemy who seeks total destruction of our freedom? Wouldn't compromise mean we are willing to give up voluntarily some of that freedom hoping the enemy won't insist on the rest? Hasn't the time come for us to remember we are "the last best hope of man on earth?" Should we not tell those who represent us that we want no meeting on Berlin—until the wall comes down?

Are missile bases enough or will we insist on freedom for all Cubans? Can we go to the summit without insisting that we discuss the freedom of all those people enslaved behind the Iron Curtain? We're not warmongers. We're not trying to send other people's sons to war; we have sons of our own. We believe in peace, but we know that appeasement does not give a choice between peace and war, only between fight or surrender.

I commend to you the words of wisdom of Winston Churchill who said: "If you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly, you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival. There may even be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no chance of victory because it is better to perish than to live as slaves."

The Oppenheimer Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on May 11 the Tulsa Tribune discussed the Oppenheimer case under byline of John Chamberlain as follows:

He Wasn't Wronged

(By John Chamberlain)

When J. Robert Oppenheimer, the wartime director of the Los Alamos atomic energy project, was named as the 1963 recipient of the Government's Fermi Award of $50,000 for outstanding work in atomic science, it was hailed in certain quarters as the vindication of a reputation. According to the ADA—Americans for Democratic Action—Oppenheimer had been foully slandered back in 1954 when, by a 4-1 vote, the Atomic Energy Commission deprived him of access to atomic secrets on the grounds that he was a security risk. This denial of security clearance, so said an ADA spokesman, was part and parcel of a "bad hangover of McCarthyism."

Since Dr. Oppenheimer has been spending his time in recent years meditating at Princeton on the moral climate of our times in mellowed isolation, this column has no desire to hurt him by bringing up old charges. But the imputation that the charming "Oppy" was a victim of "McCarthyism" is too much to let pass without comment. The fact is that the panel headed by educator Gordon Gray, which sifted the whole problem of Oppenheimer's behavior as head of Los Alamos, was very antithesis of "McCarthyite."

The truth about Oppenheimer, as is emphasized in a forthcoming book by Ralph de Toledano called "The Greatest Plot in History; How the Reds Stole the A-Bomb," is that he was a softie in a position that demanded hard intelligence about the danger of giving critical jobs to scientists who might have been dupes of the Communists. In the period before he was tapped to organize the atomic energy project at Los Alamos, Oppenheimer had had friendly social relations with admitted Communists and fellow travelers. His wife and brother had both been members of the Communist Party, and he himself had contributed part of his salary to Communist coffers even up into the time of the Hitler-Stalin pact. All of this might have been neither here nor there if Oppenheimer had been careful to make a clean breast of his associations when he was in a position to affect the hiring and firing of Government atomic energy personnel. But the Gray committee found he had been "less than candid" in testifying about his old pals of Berkeley, Calif., days.

During the war, when the Communists were our allies, it could have been represented as the part of wisdom to make use of Oppenheimer's knowledge of atomic physics in order to push the atomic bomb to completion. Speed was of the essence in those days, and questions of security vis-a-vis the Russians had not yet become obviously critical. But after 1945, when the Soviets were our newest enemies, the business of employing brilliant physicists who happened also to be political innocents could not be regarded in the rosy light of 1941–45.

Oppenheimer was treated gently.

Legitimate Questions Raised on President's Action in Sending Troops to Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the rights of all our citizens, including Negroes and other minorities, can best be secured by strict compliance with the Constitution. Once we abort the Constitution for political advantage or to gain an immediate objective, however right that objective appears to be, we revert to the law of the jungle where only might makes right. History has proved that justice is not founded upon a government of men, but only upon a government soundly based on law.

The Constitution of the United States has been the rock upon which the freedoms of all Americans have been built. If we weaken the basic law of the land by irrational actions, then the whole structure of constitutional government is threatened as are the liberties and the rights of individuals.

It is to be hoped that President Kennedy, in his desire to help minority groups, will not skirt the constitutional powers of his office. To do so may invite disaster for all of us.

The question of constitutional power of the President to use U.S. troops in local situations has been brought to the fore by the President's order sending troops into Alabama when, by his own admission, no Federal law is involved at this point. An intelligent discussion of the President's action and its legality follows in a column by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star of May 14:

Sending U.S. Troops to Alabama—President's Action Criticized in Absence of Federal Court Order or State Request

(By David Lawrence)

When Senator John F. Kennedy was campaigning for the Presidency in 1960, critics said he was youthful and impulsive. They now will say the same thing as they read that Mr. Kennedy issued a statement Sunday night ordering Federal troops to mobilize in Alabama to deal with future rioting or local disturbances.

The President didn't think this one through. In the case of the disputes with Governor Faubus at Little Rock, Ark, in 1957 and Governor Barnett at Oxford, Miss., in 1962, there was at least an alleged basis for the use of Federal troops—a supposed unwillingness on the part of the local authorities to obey a Federal court order. But Mr. Kennedy himself told his news conference only last week that no Federal statute was involved in the controversy at Birmingham, Ala. Nor have there been any Federal court orders whatsoever issued in this case.

Now the President is in the position of having nevertheless threatened the use of Federal military power to deal with local disorders that may arise. There is not the slightest legal basis for the use of such power under the Constitution unless requested by the State government. No statute grants such authority to the Chief Executive under the circumstances which have been reported from Alabama. For anyone in the Government to order the use of Federal troops or any part of the Air Force for any purpose not sanctioned by the statutes is in itself a penal offense. A Federal law says: "Whoever, except in cases and under circumstances expressly authorized by the Constitution or act of Congress, willfully uses any part of the Army or the Air Force as a posse comitatus or otherwise to execute the laws shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both."

The "United States Code Annotated" for 1963 contains a footnote referring to an opinion of the Attorney General dated November 7, 1957, which says: "The President's authority to use Federal troops under sections 332 and 333 of title 10 is not impaired by this section."

But this was an opinion rendered in connection with the use of troops where a Federal court order had been issued. There is a dispute among informed lawyers as to whether troops can ever be used to enforce even a court order and they contend that it is really the responsibility of U.S. marshals. At least in that case a controversial legal point was involved.

So the whole action of President Kennedy rests on the foundation that he described in his public statement; namely, "rioting, personal injuries, property damage, and various reports of violence and brutality."

But it is not the function of the Federal Government to maintain order inside a State unless there is an insurrection against the United States. To preserve order is the responsibility of a State. Indeed, in the same morning newspapers in which the American people read of the President's orders to dispatch Federal troops to the Birmingham area, there was published a message to President Kennedy from the Governor of Alabama, George Wallace. It was sent an hour after the President's announcement was made and read in part as follows:

"The Constitution of the United States * * * states that the Federal Government may send troops to quell domestic violence upon application of the State legislature or the Governor of a State.

"The legislature of this State has made no request, nor have I. May I ask by what authority you would send Federal troops into this State?

"The situation is well in hand and law and order prevail. * * * Your complete bypassing of State officials and me as Governor are affronts not only to me as Governor but to the people of Alabama."

An examination of the Federal statute cited later by the President—section 333 of title 10—shows no justification for the use by the President of Federal troops just to quell a local disturbance or to prevent one from arising. It applies only if a State government refuses or fails to grant protection. This hasn't happened.

The President in his reply to Governor Wallace says, in effect, that he didn't really intend to use Federal troops in Birmingham, but only wants to warn the State authorities that they had better maintain order and prevent violence. If any threat to use such power is vested in the President, he can at any time intimidate a Governor or mayor or local official, or he can mobilize troops to threaten reprisals and punishment if anyone in a local government doesn't do his bidding. This is an autocratic power, the exercise of which the framers of the Constitution specifically sought to prevent so that no dictatorship could arise in America through the threat to use military force.

If Mr. Kennedy feels that he has the power to prevent violence anywhere in the country, then it will be asked why no Federal troops were mobilized or why the same threat of military force was not utilized before Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and his associates organized the demonstrations which, in turn, aroused the antagonism of other citizens and thus produced the conditions under which local disorder arose.

If the President actually has the power of prevention, the time to start is before the local police and the paraders clash or threaten to become involved in riots. There is a right, of course, to a peaceful demonstration, but anything which produced a disturbance is subject to police action by the local and not the Federal authorities.

The Honorable Jed Johnson

SPEECH

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it was with real regret that I learned of the passing of Judge Jed J. Johnson. I was associated with him in this House closely for a number of years. He was my benefactor at the time I started my work in the House. He was ever ready to give me information that was most valuable and helpful to me as a fledgling Member of this body. One of the first appearances I ever made before a committee of the Congress was on the occasion of my appealing to the Subcommittee on Interior of the House Committee on Appropriations headed by Jed Johnson, of Oklahoma. This was in behalf of the allocation of funds for the building of a fish hatchery at Corning, Ark. It was a real inspiration and joy to me when, by and through the assistance and efforts of Chairman Johnson, the subcommittee approved the request. The fish hatchery was built, and as a result, hundreds upon hundreds of people from a wide area have enjoyed good fishing in nearby streams due solely to the generosity and influence of the subcommittee chairman in providing the money for this project.

Jed Johnson's family and my family have been close friends throughout these years. His son, Jed, Jr., and my daughter, Tolise, are the same age.

It was a genuine delight for him to help others. I believe his happiest moments were when he was being of service to his constituents or to his colleagues or friends. I do not recall who it was that composed these words: "Strow gladness on the paths of men, you cannot pass this way again."

During his service in the House of Representatives, Jed Johnson brought happiness to untold members, including myself. He was a Representative in the truest sense of the word. That is to say, he typified the type of person that our Founding Fathers had in mind when the legislative branch, as well as our Government, was established under the Constitution. He served his district with zeal and determination during his long tenure in the House.

Mrs. Gathings and I extend sympathy to Mrs. Johnson and her fine family in the passing of this great and good man.

Review of Financial Position of World Health Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it is very refreshing indeed to find an international organization which keeps its finances in a current and sound condition. One such organization is the World Health Organization, which now has 118 members. All but 21 of them are fully paid up to date; and most of the 21 are only slightly behind in their contributions to the Organization.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a review of the financial position of the World Health Organization, which was presented to the 16th World Health Assembly by Milton P. Siegel, Assistant Director-General of the World Health Organization.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Review of the Financial Position of the Organization

(Statement by Mr. Milton P. Siegel, Assistant Director-General)

Mr. Chairman, among the important responsibilities of this committee is its annual review of the financial position of the Organization as reflected in the financial report, which is a supplement to the annual report of the director-general. In carrying out that review, members of the commitee are able to examine the administrative and managerial, as well as the financial, affairs of the Organization, and the way in which they have been conducted. This year—the 15th anniversary of the Organization—the committee has an opportunity to examine the experiences of the past years, and on the basis of that examination to form a judgement for the future. The Secretariat of your Organization looks forward each year to the comments on, and criticisms of, its work which are made during the Health Assembly. We are still learning all the time, and those comments and criticisms help us immensely in our constant efforts to improve. It will, I am sure, come as no surprise to the committee that the philosophy which continues to pervade the whole of the work of the Organization is that of "ideal realism," which I described to this committee 5 years ago.

I am sure that all members of the committee welcome the fact that in the past year Algeria, Furundi, Jamaica, Rwanda, Trinidad and Tobago, and Uganda have become members of the Organization, which now has 118 members, including one associate member. Five years ago there was 88 members and associate members. In February of this year, Hungary informed the director-general of their resumption of active participation in the work of the Organization; it is to be hoped that the two remaining inactive members will soon do so, as well.

I am pleased once more to report to you, on behalf of the Director-General, on his management of the financial affairs and resources of the Organization. It is somewhat difficult for me to report, as I have done in many past years, that the financial position is good, at a time when the Organization requires additional financing for its headquarters building, as recommended by the executive board, a matter which this committee will be considering under item 3.11 of its agenda. However, leaving aside for the present the problem of completing the financing of the headquarters building, the financial position of the Organization continues to be sound.

The collection of contributions as at December 31, 1962 was 94.2 percent of the total assessments on active members. The corresponding percentages for 1960 and 1961 were 96.08 and 93.90 percent respectively. But for a delay in payment by one of the larger contributors because of parliamentary procedures, the percentage would have been even larger than for 1960. Since January 1 of this year, further contributions have been received, and details will be reported to the committee when it deals with agenda item 3.8.2—status of collection of annual contributions and of advances to the working capital fund.

Briefly, payments amounting to $718,695 relating to arrears for 1962 and prior years were received during the period January 1 to April 30, 1963. Payments of contributions relating to the 1963 budget, received during the same period, were 27.15 percent of the total contributions due. The corresponding percentage for 1962 was 23.92.

Despite the generally satisfactory situation with respect to the payment of contributions, as at April 30, 1963, 21 members had not paid all or part of their contributions for 1962 and prior years. Eight were in arrears for a part of their 1962 assessment; four, for all of 1962; two, for more than one but less than 2 years; four, for 2 years; and three for more than 2 years.

When the committee deals with agenda item 3.8.1 (financial report on the accounts of WHO for 1962, report of the external auditor, and comments thereon by the ad hoc committee of the executive board) it will be interested in the information on budget performance for 1962. In summary, $24,164,650, or 97.19 percent of the effective working budget, was utilized, leaving an unused budget balance of $699,150. As only 94.2 percent of the contributions for 1962 was collected, there was a cash deficit of $582,939, which has been more than covered by contributions received between January and April 1963.

Obligations in 1962 from other sources of funds available were: from the expanded program of technical assistance, $7,334,842; from the malaria eradication special account, $2,538,656 (not including $2 million transferred from the regular budget); from the subaccounts of the voluntary fund for health promotion, $1,185,353. In addition, $497,792 was obligated for projects financed from the United Nations Special Fund, and $87,338 from the revolving sales fund. Furthermore, $2,586,419 was disbursed for the health program in the Congo (Leopoldville), against reimbursement by the United Nations.

In total, therefore, the World Health Organization in 1962 financed from the various sources of funds, not including the headquarters building fund, activities amounting to $38,395,050. It may be of interest to mention that administrative services costs in that year were $2,150,763, or 5.6 percent of the total.

Important as are the financial resources of the Organization, conservation and improvement of its human resources are even more vital to the success of the Organization. Special attention has been given during the past year to the expansion of opportunities for senior key personnel of the Organization to develop in the knowledge and understanding of their functions, their place in the total structure of the Organization and, most importantly, in the history, current policies, and prospective developments in the Organization itself. Two training courses of several weeks each have been conducted for WHO representatives, the first in the autumn of 1962 primarily for a group newly appointed to the position, the second in January 1963 primarily for a group who have been carrying out this function for some time. A third such course is foreseen for the autumn of this year. In addition, the orientation of newly appointed senior staff at headquarters is now being undertaken on a more systematic basis through a group presentation and discussion. Special training courses continue for particular groups of new appointees such as staff for the malaria eradication program. In this same trend, furthermore, there has been an additional important development in the organization of a French language university course in sanitary engineering for present and prospective staff members at the University of Naples.

Management surveys were started or continued in three regional offices, and several WHO representatives' offices were visited by our management staff. At the same time increasing attention was given to the improvement and development of administrative procedures and other matters at headquarters. In this connection, you may be interested to know that a broad management program aiming at further mechanization of some administrative and other procedures was prepared. It was started in cooperation with an outside consultancy firm, and so far the results have been encouraging. It is expected that the implementation of this program will be reached by gradual and orderly stages over a period of some years.

During the past year, the new headquarters building has progressed from the stage of design and planning to the stage of execution. Work on the foundations for the main building has been completed and, as members who care to visit the site will see, the building is beginning to rise. There have been, and continue to be, problems of work organization and of financing, which I have already mentioned and which are dealt with in detail in the report which the director-general is making to the Assembly about the building.

The purchasing service rendered by the Organization to member governments continues to be a form of assistance appreciated by a number of them. For one such government, the purchase of 3,900 different items for a single public health laboratory will be completed this year. Prompt action in the purchase and dispatch of such supplies as vaccines and drugs when appeals are made by governments for help in emergency health situations is another service which is provided. The stimulation of manufacturers of X-ray equipment to develop safer and more efficient TB and general diagnostic X-ray equipment continues to be an activity which hopefully may result in a lasting global contribution to the quality of radiological examinations and an important contribution to the protection of medical workers and patients against radiation hazards.

The task of coordination of the work of WHO with that of other organizations, to which I referred in some detail in last year's report to this committee, continues to occupy a considerable amount of the time and attention of the director general and his staff. There continue to be advocates of the substitution of direction for coordination in the relationship between the United Nations and the specialized agencies. However, the coordination and cooperation among the secretariats of the various organizations have continued to function well on administrative as well as program matters. Five years ago I was able to report that, in the 10 years of its existence, the Organization had, with the other members of the United Nations family, worked out in detail, with a good deal of mutual adjustment, common administrative practices through the Administrative Committee on Coordination, its subcommittees and the Technical Assistance Board. Today I am pleased to report that only last week the Administrative Committee on Coordination approved detailed plans to be submitted to the International Civil Service Advisory Board, which would enable it to serve as an independent interorganization body to make judgments—free of the pressures of the immediate political problems and expediencies—when problems arise in the administration of the common system of conditions of service for staff. If the new terms of reference and authorities are approved by all concerned, it will become one of the most important steps yet taken to improve coordination in administrative matters. This committee will be able to review and comment on this development under item 3.19 of its agenda—Decisions of the United Nations, Specialized Agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency affecting WHO's activities.

The development of the structure of the World Health Organization over the 15 years of its existence has been continuous. It has progressed from the establishment of a headquarters staff to the coming into being of strong regional organizations, and now to the general provision of WHO representatives at the country level. During the past year, sustained efforts have been made to increase the number of WHO representatives, to extend their functions and, as I mentioned earlier, to insure their adequate preparation to carry out the functions assigned to them. WHO operations at the country level have become of ever-increasing importance, as the Organization is committed by the constitution to furnish technical assistance upon the request of governments; it is involved in the United Nations development decade; and it has recently become increasingly concerned to provide assistance to governments, on request, in national health planning as a part of overall planning for economic and social development. The needs for regional offices to maintain close contact with ministries of health and, together with regional committees, to have detailed knowledge of local conditions and practical problems have similarly increased.

The increase in the number and complexity of health activities undertaken by governments, often with the assistance or advice of WHO, has occurred at a time when multilateral and bilateral aid programs directly or indirectly connected with health program have been expanding. To provide the assistance which health ministries require in coordinating their national health plans and national health programs as a part of the over-all economic and social development plans and programs of the government, the WHO representative serves as an outposted part of the regional office, representing the regional director, and works closely with the resident representatives of the Technical Assistance Board and local representatives of other multilateral as well as bilateral agencies. This arrangement can greatly enhance the leadership which health can provide in international action for economic and social development.

Within the last few years, economists have become increasingly aware of the fact that human resources form one of the major sources of economic growth. The inseparability of social, economic and health factors has, of course, been recognized explicitly by the Executive Board and the World Health Assembly since 1952, and implicitly even earlier. One eminent economist, Prof. Simon Smith Kuznets, has observed that for "the study of economic growth over long periods and among widely different societies—the concept of capital and capital formation should be broadened to include investment in health, education, and training of the population itself, that is, investment in human beings." Some economists now refer to "human capital" as distinct from "physical capital," which provides more emphasis to the importance of the people of each country to its economic development.

A certain amount of basic research has been done on some aspects of investment in human beings, but so far relatively little has been done on the health aspects of that investment. However, Dr. Selma J. Mushkin, another economist, in a paper entitled "Health as an Investment" prepared for the Exploratory Conference on Capital Investment in Human Beings, sponsored in the United States of America by the Universities-National Bureau Committee for Economic Research, stated "The concept of human capital formation through both education and health services rests on the twin notions that people as productive agents are improved by investment in these services and that the outlays made yield a continuing return in the future. Health services, like education, become a part of the individual, a part of his effectiveness in field and factory. The future increase in labor product resulting from education or from health programs can be quantified to an extent useful for programing purposes. While there are apparent limitations to such measures, these limitations can be identified." Further along in her paper, Dr. Mushkin states: "In a modern economy biological selection is no longer an acceptable method of investing in health, not only because our humanitarianism instincts rebel against it, but because it costs too much. The cost of foregoing the productive contribution of those who die early is now too great." She also states "health programs use economic resources—men and materials; they also create economic resources. Viewing expenditures for health programs as an investment helps to underscore the contribution of health programs to expansion of income and economic growth."

I have quoted these few excerpts from studies by economists on the subject of "human capital" because I think it relevant to the structure, as well as the functions, of our Organization that economists are beginning to be concerned about the importance of health to economic development. If this incipient concern of the economists is to have practical effect in the lives of people it must do so through planning at the national level. As I have indicated earlier, there is no lack of agencies, multilateral or bilateral, willing to provide assistance to the developing nations. As the framers of the WHO constitution recognized, however, it is essential that governments be assisted in the evaluation and projection of their health needs and in the establishment of an orderly program of priorities for meeting those needs from the various forms of assistance available. This is the role which WHO is designed to play and it is in large measure through the WHO representative on the spot that the Organization can render this service. I think it is significant that the normal maturing of our own Organization brings us to an effective level of capability in this respect at that moment in time when it appears that the significance of health to the total economy is beginning to be recognized even in those quarters which had not previously done so. This is both an encouraging reflection on past achievements and a hint of the challenging responsibilities which lie ahead for WHO.

During this year, which marks the 15th anniversary of the Organization, it is clear that the Organization must continue to grow and develop along the lines so wisely laid down by the health assemblies and the Executive Board over the years—the alternative is stagnation and failure to fulfill the high hopes of a better life held by so many millions of human beings throughout the world. It is clear, too, that we must be adaptable to changing conditions in this rapidly evolving world. We must, too, continue boldly with the great adventure which is the pursuit of the principles and the objective so clearly set forth in the Constitution. We must have the courage to progress from where we are now to our established goal.

Are Americans Becoming Helpless Digits in a Punchcard Society?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, in every community there are leaders of thought who inspire us to recognize the spiritual and moral import of both the old and new in our lives. The Very Reverend George O'Pray, of Jamestown, N.Y., is one of this country's finest examples of courageous, forthright community leadership, tinged with wisdom, and always permeated with genuine love for his fellow man. I offer for the record the following newspaper report of Reverend O'Pray's sermon in St. Luke's Episcopal Church in Jamestown on April 21, 1963. The report appeared in the April 24, 1963, edition of the Jamestown Post-Journal. I believe it merits the earnest contemplation of all my colleagues.

America is in danger of becoming a punchcard society with individual freedom and dignity destined to be the subtle but powerless prisoners of regimentation and conformity.

This is the warning sounded by the Very Reverend George F. O'Pray, rector of St. Luke's Episcopal Church.

Mr. O'Pray cited the growing use of huge electronic machines for accounting procedures, giant corporation complexes and mighty government bureaucracies, where the individual becomes a perforation in a card.

He said the danger of man's loss of freedom is not immediate "like an enemy invading" but is "a subtle thing like creeping paralysis whose progress is not discernible from day to day but whose end result will most surely leave its victim completely immobilized."

Mr. O'Pray mentioned record and book clubs, which, he said, "send you everything under the sun unles you send a rejection card by a stipulated date." He added: "The burden of proof is on you—you must not 'fold, tear, mutilate, or staple'—but the rejection card is not provided with a self-addressed, stamped envelope. It is of a size that will not fit into envelopes used for ordinary correspondence.

"So you must fill out the card, somehow find an envelope and address it, stamp it and return it by the stipulated date.

"We are rapidly being forced into becoming a nation of rejectionists—causing us to give up the freedom to say what we want and making us say what we don't want."

Mr. O'Pray, who made his remarks in a sermon Sunday, recalled a personal incident. He said sometime ago he received a gift subscription to Reader's Digest shortly after he had sent in his own. Since last December, he said, he has been carrying on a correspondence with the magazine attempting to straighten out the matter without success.

"Since they can't run me through a machine personally, they apparently don't know what in the world to do with me."

He listed a similar experience with a mail-order house, which sent him innumerable statements, although he had paid his bill promptly after the merchandise had been received.

He said the firm finally wrote a letter, acknowledging a mistake in accounting but 3 days later he got another bill. "The machines hadn't got up with me," he said.

Mr. O'Pray also charged the State and Federal Government with ruling by regimentation and offering aid at the cost of conformity.

As a member of the Jamestown School Board, Mr. O'Pray noted that it operates yearly on a budget of about $5 million yet has control over only about 10 percent of the money.

"What happens," he said, "is that the State (not the Department of Education) says it will give us back some of our own money to support our educational system but—we can only have our money back when we do exactly what it tells us.

"What the State says in effect is this: 'We have the Jamestown system down on our cards as number 7694, two round holes, one square and three slots. That's the way we can run you through our machine.

"And if you insist on changing the number, or being one round hole, two squares and no slots—then we've got to destroy your card—and that means you can't have any of your own money back.

"Your school board has terrible temptations at times to tell the State what to do—but if it does it's in a real jam with the local citizenry because every penny we don't get from the State has to come out of our already hard-pressed taxpayers."

Mr. O'Pray quoted from an article, titled "The Decline of the Individual," and written by Adm. Hyman Rickover, Admiral Rickover listed several changes in society, which the admiral said are diminishing man's freedom.

One change listed was the replacement of the Protestant ethic, which says man shapes his own destiny, by the Freudian ethic, which holds that man is ruled by unconscious drives and external pressures and thus is not responsible for his acts.

Mr. O'Pray also cited a warning contained in the "Peace on Earth" encyclical of Pope

John XXIII, who said: "Any society, if it is to be well ordered and productive, must lay down as a foundation, this principle, namely, that every human being is a person, that is, his nature is endowed with intelligence and free will.

"By virtue of this, he has rights and duties of his own, which are therefore universal, inviolable and inalienable. Any society established on relations of force must be regarded as inhuman, inasmuch as the personality of its members is repressed. Human society is realized in freedom."

Mr. O'Pray concluded, saying: "We who claim to be on God's side have an obligation to preserve—freedom and dignity—to use it—to refuse to conform—to rebel against being controlled—to destroy the slotted cards—to make our own choice and decisions—to stand up and be counted for humanity—to maintain the eternal vigilance which shall ever be the price of freedom.

"We are free. We can, if we want, have our cradle to the grave security. We can revert to group conformity. We can be holes, squares, slots and numbers on a cheap piece of cardboard.

"We can let our moral and spiritual fiber rot. We can be irresponsible parasites on the face of the earth. We can be molded into senseless, spineless things. But if we use our freedom to choose for these the ultimate inevitable result is that we shall lose all the freedom and dignity that makes man what he is—the crowning glory of God's creation—and true humanity shall have perished."

New Strides Toward the General Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday evening, May 3 of this year the Honorable Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, delivered an excellent and timely address before the American Public Welfare Association Regional Conference in Milwaukee, Wis. Mr. Cohen has had a long and distinguished career in the field of social welfare. For many years he has served in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as Director of the Division of Research and Statistics in the Social Security Administration, as chairman of the Tripartite Committee on Health, Welfare and Pensions of the Wage Stabilization Board, and as a member of the Advisory Council on Public Assistance and the Committee on Pension Costs and the Older Worker. He is also a professor of public welfare administration at the school of social work at the University of Michigan and is the author of many books and articles dealing with social security and public welfare. We in Wisconsin are particularly proud of Wilbur Cohen because he was born and bred in Milwaukee and is a distinguished graduate of the University of Wisconsin. Now at the peak of his career, Mr. Cohen is legislative adviser to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in which capacity he plays a crucial role in the development of legislation in the field of health, education and welfare.

In his speech, Mr. Cohen demonstrated the compassion and straightforward approach to the problems of our citizens which have marked his long and distinguished career. It is an excellent blueprint for action in these fields and I commend it highly to my colleagues. The text of the speech follows:

NEW STRIDES TOWARD THE GENERAL WELFARE

(By Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, before the American Public Welfare Association Regional Conference, Milwaukee, Wis., May 3, 1963)

Today many new challenging problems confront all of us. There are new scientific inventions each day which bring with them new demands on all of us. The stark realities of the thermonuclear world are vastly different from the world of 35 to 40 years ago when I grew up as a boy some 8 or 9 blocks from where I am now speaking.

I am glad I grew up in the "gemuetlichkeit" Milwaukee world of the twenties. I am glad I shared in the "melting pot" atmosphere of the Prairie Street, Vliet Street, and Jefferson Street Elementary Schools and Lincoln High School. This experience helped me in my understanding of the aspirations of people—people in politics, people on welfare, all kinds of people—and, most of all, how to work with and even understand Congress and Congressmen and our American political system.

When I left Milwaukee to go to the University of Wisconsin at Madison in 1930—and that was a pretty big journey for my family and me in those days—I absorbed from the great teachers I had there something the board of regents of the university had said in 1894:

"We cannot for a moment believe that knowledge has reached its final goal, or that the present condition of society is perfect. We must therefore welcome from our teachers such discussions as shall suggest the means and prepare the way by which knowledge may be extended, present evils be removed and others prevented. We feel that we would be unworthy of the position we hold if we did not believe in progress in all departments of knowledge. In all lines of academic investigation it is of the utmost importance that the investigator should be absolutely free to follow the indications of truth wherever they may lead."

What the University of Wisconsin board of regents said nearly 70 years ago is still good today.

We have a great country—but it is not perfect. We have great knowledge—but we need to know more. We have made great progress—but we can make more.

That is why I am proud in my small way to be helping President Kennedy and my country in the new strides we are making to improve the health, education, and welfare of all the American people.

This year, the President of the United States has sent to the Congress five special messages outlining his recommendations for improving the health, education, and welfare of all the people of our Nation.

Three of these messages are especially significant because they represent subjects on which for the first time a President has sent a special message to the Congress. These three messages deal with mental health and mental retardation, youth, and aging. In addition, the President sent special messages on education and health, as he had done in each of the 2 previous years.

The President's special messages on health, education, and welfare represent, in my opinion, a progressive and fiscally responsible program for strengthening the general welfare of all Americans. It is in harmony with the constitutional authority for the Congress to provide for the common defence and promote the general welfare of the United States."

These messages set forth both general goals and specific priorities. For probably the first time in our history, a President has announced both a broad and a specific program for meeting the Nation's urgent health, education, and welfare needs. Appropriate bills have been introduced in the Congress to carry out the general recommendations. Thus, it is possible for you to support, oppose, analyze, criticize, or suggest amendments to the general concepts, the financing, or substantive provisions of any proposal of the administration.

I want to touch briefly upon the proposals to meet needs in health and education before discussing with you in somewhat more detail the tasks ahead in public welfare.

HEALTH LEGISLATION

All of you are well aware of this administration's profound commitment to the health of the Nation. In his special health messages to the Congress this year and last, President Kennedy stressed that progress must be made in strengthening all elements of a sound health program—"people, knowledge, services, facilities, and the means to pay for them."

This is an exciting challenge to all welfare and health agencies. They have participated in the dramatic advances in medical care which have characterized our recent past. They will participate in the broader and deeper application of medical knowledge which will, I believe, characterize the near future.

Medical science exists to serve people. As long as the products of medical science are not available to the people who need them because they cannot afford to pay for them or because we lack professional personnel or because our patterns of delivery are outmoded, we are failing in our central purpose.

We hope for prompt and favorable action in the current session of Congress on a carefully developed program of Federal assistance for the education of more physicians, dentists, nurses, and public health personnel. A bill to carry out this program (H.R. 12) has already passed the House of Representatives and is pending in the Senate. Legislation providing for Federal grants for the construction of community mental health centers and community mental retardation centers has been considered in committees in both the House and the Senate.

We also look forward to favorable action on a broad program to improve maternal and child health and crippled children's services. This would include a doubling of the annual authorizations for grants for maternal and child health and crippled children's programs and the provision of project grants to stimulate public awareness of the problem and the development of comprehensive plans for dealing with it.

As I look back over the almost 30 years since I began studying medical economics at the University of Wisconsin, it seems to me that we are beginning to see fundamental changes in attitudes. We are due for some important changes in the financing, organization, and availability of medical services if the powerful potential of American medical services is to be realized in benefits for all our people. Public welfare personnel can be followers or leaders in this effort. I feel sure that you can and you will be leaders in both thought and action in this important task.

We made a good start in health legislation in 1961 when the Community Health Services and Facilities Act was passed. The additional Federal funds authorized by this legislation are helping States and communities to develop new and improved community health services, to build more nursing homes, and to provide better care in the homes of patients, as well as in nursing homes.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

But this is only a start. We are still sadly lacking a satisfactory means whereby older people can purchase the basic hospital services essential to their health. People over 65 have medical costs twice as high as those of younger people, yet their annual incomes, on the average, are only half as large. During any year they can expect to spend between three times as many days in the hospital as younger people. One-half of all the aged do not have any kind of hospitalization insurance, and a high proportion of those who have it receive only small benefits under limited conditions.

These facts are not news—least of all to people like you who daily see the neglect and deficiencies. And the corollaries of these facts are clear—that prolonged illness can wipe out an elderly couple's lifetime savings, that enormous financial burdens are transferred to their children or to welfare agencies, that the tragedy of ill health is often accompanied by sacrifices of dignity.

Older people need protection against the costs of hospitalization and related health services. They want this protection, not as a gift or as charity or public assistance but as a statutory right, earned and established by their own efforts during their productive years. Therefore, to make this possible, the President, in his special message on elderly citizens, asked the Congress to add a hospital insurance program for aged persons to the social security system. For those now over 65 who have not had an opportunity to participate in the social security program, the President has recommended that the cost of coverage be paid from general tax revenues. The coverage of all the aged for hospital insurance should reduce the long run cost to the States for medical assistance to the needy.

The President has stressed that his insurance program is not a program of socialized medicine. Every person will choose his own doctor, his own hospital. The proposed insurance program would simply be a means of paying for health services, not a means of providing them.

The need is clear and present. The instrument is at hand, designed not to threaten but to protect fully the essential elements of high-quality medical care. From my personal contacts over several years, I strongly suspect that a majority of hospital administrators favor the use of the social security mechanism to pay some of the hospital costs for the aged. I am confident that our older people soon will enjoy more and better health protection earned as an insurance right. In my opinion, it will help preserve the voluntary system of hospitals in this country.

Occasionally, the Department is accused of not showing sufficient leadership in urging the States to adopt the program of medical assistance for the aged which was authorized by the Kerr-Mills Act of 1960. I can state unequivocally that we hope every State will adopt the MAA program, including every State in this region. That is part of our program for 1963, as it has been part of our program in each year since the legislation was passed by the Congress.

We recognize the financial difficulties which the States face in taking advantage of this legislation in a broad and comprehensive manner. But it should be noted that there is no dollar ceiling on the amount for which States may claim matching, as there is in old-age assistance, for example. There is no limit on the quantity of medical care, such as days of hospital care or number of physicians' visits. No State receives less than 50 percent from the Federal Government for its MAA program. And the Federal share can go up to 80 percent, depending upon State per capita income.

We do not regard the proposed hospital insurance program as a substitute for medical services for the needy under public assistance. The two programs supplement one another. At present 25 States and 3 territories have MAA programs in action. Three more States will start programs July 1. Legislative proposals are under consideration in 17 other States, several of them in this region. The Department encourages and welcomes this interest and activity. We provide consultation and planning help to States at every opportunity.

But we cannot agree with critics of the social security approach that the problem of costs of medical care in old age will be solved solely by MAA or through private health insurance plans.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON of Wisconsin is one of the sponsors of the Anderson-King bill. I am sure that he as well as the other sponsors of the hospital insurance proposal agree with what President Kennedy has said, "Health insurance for our senior citizens is the most important health proposal pending before the Congress. We urgently need this legislation—and we need it now."

FINANCING SOCIAL INSURANCE

One important task before all of us is to organize our facts to combat the attacks on the financial soundness of the social security system. These attacks seek to discredit this Nation's basic social insurance system as part of their campaign to defeat health insurance for the aged through social security.

These groups have a right to oppose the addition of hospital insurance for the aged through social security, but we should not permit them to tear down existing institutions so necessary to our free society in their attacks on the financial integrity of our social security system.

No aspect of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program has received more careful consideration by Congress than the financing of the system. Mr. R. A. Hohaus, the vice president and actuary of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., has said:

"This financing method has proven sound because Government has been alert to the need for constant vigilance, due to the very nature of social insurance itself and the dynamic character of our society and our economy."

The old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program has always been fully supported by the social security contributions paid by covered employees and their employers; it has never received a subsidy from general revenues.

The most recent Advisory Council on Social Security Financing, established under the 1956 amendments to the Social Security Act, "for the purpose of reviewing the status of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and of the Federal disability insurance trust fund in relation to the long-term commitments of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program," issued a report of its finding on January 1, 1959. The Council's "major finding" was as follows:

"The Council finds that the present method of financing the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program is sound, practical, and appropriate for this program. It is our judgment, based on the best available cost estimates, that the contribution schedule enacted into law in the last session of Congress makes adequate provisions for financing the program on a sound actuarial basis."

The availability of adequate health services and facilities is another problem troubling many welfare officials. Today, when hospitals have more to offer people than ever before, when lifesaving miracles are commonplace, hospitals are beset by soaring operating and construction costs, obsolescence, personnel shortages, and—perhaps most distressing of all—an audible undertone of public discontent with hospitals and hospital practices.

A considerable part of this discontent is directly traceable to the swift upward spiral of hospital expense for the consumer. In 1946, at the end of World War II, the average cost of hospital care per patient-day was $9.39. In just 5 years, it had climbed to $16.67. Since 1950 it has more than doubled that figure—rising to $32.23 per patient-day in 1960 and $34.98 in 1961. If this rate were to continue, the average daily hospital costs would be $60 to $65 a day by 1970.

To what extent this rise, which has far outstripped the general rise in consumer prices, is preventable or reversible, you are in as good a position to judge as I am. In some areas, we find hospitals are filled and there are waiting lists, while in others, we have too many empty beds. For certain facilities, such as long-term care and community-based mental health centers, we continue to be plagued by critical shortages.

Some of these problems can be traced directly to the haphazard growth and placement of facilities in many of our cities. Others spring from phenomena in our society over which hospitals have little or no control. In any case, I believe we must reexamine our total hospital needs, resources, and objectives for the coming decade. To encourage such appraisals, the President has recommended legislation to authorize grants to public and other nonprofit organizations to assist in developing comprehensive, areawide plans for the construction and operation of all types of health facilities.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH

One of the areas in which the Kennedy administration is giving continued emphasis this year is the expansion of opportunities for youth—in the field of employment, training, education, and for their more effective participation in our national destiny.

It is difficult to see how a high school student can begin to gain a sense of responsibility and participation in this Nation's economy when he is so frequently and consistently denied jobs on account of his youth. The problem is the more acute for minority youth who encounter discrimination on account of race as well as because of their age. And the situation becomes all the more critical when teenagers, tempted to drop out of high school, feel an understandable futility about staying in school in the face of such widespread unemployment among their peers.

The administration has already begun an intensive effort to see that jobs are available to young people. The U.S. Employment Service is giving special attention to counseling services in urban areas of high youth unemployment. The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 provides for the training or retraining of workers whose skills are obsolete because of shifts in the economy or technological advances.

A singularly important part of the President's youth program is the youth employment bill of 1963. One of the provisions of this bill would give employment opportunities to some 60,000 youths in their home communities, with Federal funds financing half their wages. Another provision—for a Youth Conservation Corps—would take about 15,000 jobless youths off the streets and give them work in our national parks and other places where their services are needed.

Finally we come to the third portion of the President's program, a portion which has enormous symbolic significance because it challenges youth to join actively and with dedication in this Nation's mission as leader of the free world.

The best known aspect of this part of the program is the Peace Corps. Although it has been operating just 2 years, it has won world renown. Now, the administration is urging a National Service Corps whose members—senior citizens as well as young people—will work with those Americans in greatest need, help expand the attack on poverty here at home, stimulate volunteer services, and inspire more people to make a career in the helping professions.

EDUCATION

In the area of education, the President has outlined a bold and realistic program for American education. In his message to the Congress, the President pointed out:

"Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress. Nothing has contributed more to the enlargement of this Nation's strength and opportunities than our traditional system of free, universal elementary and secondary education, coupled with widespread availability of college education."

It is the belief of this administration that the doors to the schoolhouse, to the library, and to the college lead to the richest treasures of our open society: To the power of knowledge—to the training and skills necessary for productive employment—to the wisdom, the ideals, and the culture which enrich life—and to the creative, self-disciplined understanding of society needed for good citizenship in today's changing and challenging world.

The administration's program includes Federal aid for elementary, secondary, and higher education. It emphasizes improvements in both the quality and quantity of education.

A free nation can rise no higher than the standard of excellence set in its schools and colleges. Ignorance and illiteracy, unskilled workers and school dropouts—these and other failures of our educational system breed failures in our social and economic system: Delinquency, unemployment, chronic dependence, a waste of human resources, a loss of productive power and purchasing power, and an increase in tax-supported benefits. The loss of only 1 year's income because of unemployment is more than the total cost of 12 years education through high school. Failure to improve educational performance is thus not only poor social policy; it is poor economics.

Only 10 percent of our adults had a high school or college education at the turn of the century. Today, such an education has become a requirement for an increasing number of jobs.

Yet, nearly 40 percent of our youths are dropping out before graduating from high school, only 43 percent of our adults have completed high school, only 8 percent of our adults have completed college, and only 16 percent of our young people are completing college.

The twisting course of the cold war requires a citizenry that understands democratic principles and problems. It requires skilled manpower and brainpower. It requires a scientific effort which demonstrates the superiority of freedom. And it requires an electorate with sufficiently broad horizons and maturity of judgment to guide this Nation safely through whatever lies ahead.

From every point of view, education is of paramount concern to the national interest as well as to each individual. Our Nation requires a new standard of excellence in education, matched by the fullest possible access to educational opportunities, enabling each and every citizen to develop his talents to the maximum possible extent.

It is our conviction that education should be a local responsibility. The participation of the Federal Government should be selective, stimulative, and, where possible, transitional.

The program proposed by President Kennedy offers Federal assistance without Federal control. It provides for economic growth, manpower development, and progress toward our educational and humanitarian objectives. It encourages the increase of the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and critical intelligence necessary for the preservation of our society. The President hopes for your active support for this vital measure.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE ELDERLY

We have almost 18 million senior citizens for whom the President also has proposed a dynamic program.

In addition to hospital insurance for the aged, the President has called for a new grant program to assist State and local agencies and voluntary organizations in planning and developing various services for older people which cannot be financed by any of the existing grant programs. Grants also would be authorized for research, demonstration, and training projects leading to new or improved programs to aid older people, and for the construction, renovation, and equipment of public and nonprofit multipurpose activity centers for the elderly.

Other measures proposed include tax reforms whch would lower the Federal income tax liabilities of older people by about $790 million; changes in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program which would raise the maximum earnings base from the present $4,800 to $5,200 and thus bring slightly higher benefit payments to those who retire in the future; measures to increase employment opportunities for older people; more support for senior citizens' housing and for the construction of nursing homes; and improvements in the programs of medical assistance for the aged and old-age assistance.

PUBLIC WELFARE

Public welfare turned toward hope-filled new directions with the public welfare amendments of 1961 and especially of 1962. I hope all States will take appropriate action to carry out the new provisions.

In formulating its welfare proposals, this administration is guided by certain general principles. They are:

1. Public welfare must become more service oriented. It must put a new emphasis on social rehabilitation and the prevention of dependency.

2. Public welfare must provide services, not only to persons receiving assistance but to persons who are potentially dependent or former recipients when they seek help.

3. Public welfare must coordinate its services more effectively. An important step in this direction was taken at the Federal level in January when, as you know, the Welfare Administration was created as a major operating unit of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. All the Department's programs that have a major welfare component are now brought together as an operating entity so that there will be greater coordination of the services or the Bureau of Family Services, the Children's Bureau, the Office of Aging, the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, and the Cuban refugee program. Dr. Ellen Winston, an outstanding leader in APWA and former public welfare commissioner of North Carolina, is the Nation's first Commissioner of Welfare.

4. Public welfare must be more community conscious. It must explain more effectively to the general public what it is doing and why—and why it is not doing many things that are necessary. It must explain to welfare recipients what welfare is and what it is trying to do.

5. Public welfare must reexamine its operations and methods to make sure that administrative procedures do not limit its response to the service needs of recipients.

6. Public welfare must be more experimental, more creative, more research minded.

Goals for public welfare which seemed visionary only a few years ago have been brought within reach through passage of the public welfare amendments of 1962. This legislation is a new landmark in the history of public welfare. Much has been said about its potentials for greatly strengthened and improved welfare operations.

States are moving to carry out the new provisions and to take advantage of the greater financial incentives and more flexible policies now available.

We will be seeing the results of this legislation for many years to come. In a number of key areas—such as the provision of social services to welfare recipients and those likely to become dependent, in the training of welfare staff members in the skills needed to provide these services, and in the extension of child welfare services throughout each State—the development will come over a period of several years.

All persons engaged in the field of welfare services and all citizens interested in more effective and efficient public welfare operations should be working for the full implementation of these amendments in their States and home communities. We are engaged in an attack upon poverty and dependency. While we are pressing to reduce the need for assistance among those already receiving public aid, we are also seeking actively to prevent future dependency. This is in the American tradition of helping people to help themselves.

Among all recipients of public assistance—it must be remembered—only a small minority can be considered employable. For them, our task is to marshal helpful counseling services and appropriate community resources to overcome personal, social, or vocational handicaps, to equip them with skills which have value in today's job market, and to help them find employment.

For those who have skills which have become obsolete, this will mean retraining. For many who are unqualified for anything but unskilled labor, it will mean fundamental education so that they can fill out application blanks, find their way about a city, follow instructions, and learn a trade.

But the vast majority of recipients will continue to be too old or too young for work or blind or disabled or needed at home for the care of young children. They will continue to need financial assistance as well as services.

The new amendments stress the provision of social services by able workers with reasonable caseloads to reduce and prevent dependency. Self-support is one but not the only goal. Services can make existence less restricted and more useful for those whose poverty or disability may have isolated them from the normal life of the community.

The inducement to States to step up services is very great. The Federal Government may now pay 75 percent of the cost of providing services which have been identified by the Secretary as necessary or desirable for constructive help. The Federal Government has been investing in such administrative costs on a dollar-for-dollar basis with the States. The legislation makes it possible for a State to receive $3 for each dollar it invests in this area.

Similarly, the costs of training to equip staff with the knowledge needed to deal successfully with complex individual and family problems can now be matched at the higher level. After July 1, however, these extra funds will be available only if the States are providing the minimum package of services prescribed by the Secretary.

Many States are exhibiting new interest this year in the expansion of their programs of aid to families with dependent children to include needy children of the unemployed.

This expansion is urgently recommended by this administration. It was first authorized by the Congress in 1961 as a temporary 1-year provision. Last year, the Congress extended the authority for 5 years. There seems to us no reason why the Federal-State program of assistance to needy children should reach youngsters whose fathers are dead or disabled or absent from the home but reject children equally needy but with an unemployed father in the family.

In the 15 States where children of the unemployed are receiving AFDC financial assistance and services, the program has been of great value in stabilizing family life and easing the hardships of economic dislocation.

I would like to say a few words about the issue which has arisen over the definition of unemployment used by the State of Michigan in enacting legislation to expand its AFDC program. The Michigan definition limited eligibility to children of unemployed persons who had worked in jobs covered by unemployment compensation.

The general counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare advised us that while a State is not required to accept the broad definition of eligibility possible under the language of the Federal law, any restrictive classification of potential recipients must be reasonably related to the objectives of the program—namely, aid to needy families with dependent children—and that the latitude given the States by Congress to define unemployment did not justify occupational exclusions even when presented under the guise of a definition of unemployment.

Other States affected by this Federal policy are North Carolina and Oklahoma. Administrative changes in its program are being undertaken in Oklahoma, and North Carolina is considering new legislation.

We are extremely hopeful that States will take advantage of still another feature in the new legislation. This is the community work and training program for employable adults receiving AFDC. Federal support is now available for assistance payments for persons assigned to these programs, which are intended to provide constructive experience in training and retraining.

As a group, assistance recipients are more severely handicapped by lack of education and training than others in the population. Therefore, many are not able to meet the qualifications for such other programs as manpower development and training. Community work and training programs can give them a foundation for acquiring a marketable skill.

We are going through a period of seemingly intense attack upon welfare operations and the recipients of public aid. When you consider how many recipients of welfare endure urban poverty, social isolation, and racial discrimination it should not be surprising to find among them families whose behavior does not fit accepted community standards. The marvel is that so many of these deprived families manage their small resources so well. At no time should criticism of the program or of persons receiving assistance be allowed to develop into a disregard for the rights of needy persons to justice and fair treatment, particularly where dependent children are involved.

The Federal Government and the States are now engaged in a carefully designed review of eligibility in the AFDC program, a review undertaken at the request of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Both State and Federal personnel have worked conscientiously and diligently in this endeavor. We have no information yet on what the results of this very thorough study will be. Other studies of AFDC are also underway. The Welfare Administration is now assembling data on the most recent survey of the circumstances and characteristics of AFDC recipients. The American Public Welfare Association will soon release its new report on the program.

Out of this increased and detailed knowledge of dependent persons and the social and economic forces which affect them should come constructive new proposals for meeting their need.

If this program—which serves more children than all other child welfare programs combined—is to become an even greater force in the lives of the children it supports, we must not accept the "easy answers" for solutions to the problems recipients suffer. There are no easy answers. And many so-called "solutions" might only intensify the hardships of recipient families, destroy natural family ties, and deprive the victims of repressive measures of any hope for restoration to self-sufficiency.

As public welfare agencies throughout the country and all the related professions and organizations interested in the basic assistance programs increase their efforts to combat the stubborn social and economic problems our society suffers, we will need the support and understanding of the general public.

Naturally, the public will expect welfare agencies to make prompt and effective use of the new legislative measures and the additional funds which have been voted. Results will be expected. It may be that too much will be expected too soon. The goal that we seek, however, is the rehabilitation of every person for whom such an objective is feasible. I am certain that our achievement would be far less if we underestimated the potentials of the social rehabilitation approach. And if we should fall short of our goal, we will at least have made a better attempt than if we had set our sights too low.

At every step along this difficult and challenging road, I hope that you will make sure that the public is fully informed of what you are doing and why you are doing it. There should be a clear realization of the problems that need to be conquered as well as of the means employed to deal with them.

Public welfare has suffered from too little constructive attention and understanding. Busy with the thousand demands to operate programs with limited funds and staff shortages, welfare workers have tended to give low priority to the necessity for enlisting public advice and community interest and support.

Public assistance is far more than billions of dollars and millions of recipients. It is a program which has met family and individual crises, kept families intact, guided children and adults to independence, and alleviated the hardships and loneliness of old age and disability. The success public welfare has realized should be reported to the community just as fully as the costs and the problems it involves.

Let me remind you, in summary, that for years we have been saying that, with the necessary legislation, money, time, and manpower, public welfare could become one of the Nation's strongest positive forces in creating and strengthening family life, economic independence, and the individual well-being of the old, the young, and the disabled.

Now that we are being encouraged to move along these lines and have received new support and legislation, we must turn our words into deeds.

The Grave of the Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, last week in Arlington National Cemetery President Kennedy dedicated a memorial marker to Ignace Jan Paderewski, the great Polish patriot and musician who died while in this country in 1941. This ceremony was a tribute to the man who served his nation and the world so well; it also provides official recognition of the fact that his body rests in Arlington Cemetery until Paderewski's homeland is once more free.

Among those who attended were many Polish-American leaders, including Mr. George Otlowski, publisher of the Polish-American newspaper in Perth Amboy, N.J. Mr. Otlowski has written a sensitive and very descriptive editorial about the ceremony. He also reminds us that "the simple ceremony on May 9 rekindled the flickering light of freedom."

Mr. President, the editorial expresses the deep feeling of friendship and affection felt by people of two great nations. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GRAVE OF THE FREE

(By George Otlowski)

The green hills of Arlington National Cemetery echoed the dull thud of a booming cannon as it signified the entrance of the President of the United States with a 21-gun salute.

Thus, President John F. Kennedy began the official ceremonies at the Paderewski Memorial on a clear sunlighted morning of May 9 as a marker was placed on the heretofore unmarked resting place of the Polish musician-statesman, Ignace Jan Paderewski.

Initiated by Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS of New Jersey, the annual ceremony had its birth in a column of a Washington writer who inspired it.

The pilgrimage—that's what it was this year, since leaders of Polish extraction came from all over the country to pay homage to Paderewski and freedom—was given special significance by President Kennedy's participation.

Another President of yesterday, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in ordering Paderewski's burial in Arlington, stipulated that the interment be temporary until Poland was freed, when Paderewski could be buried in his homeland with other Polish patriots.

The simple ceremony on May 9 rekindled the flickering light of freedom.

The music and life of Paderewski needed freedom for their very existence. Even his grave needed it.

Sherman Mine in Chisholm, Minn., Receives National Safety Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior has announced the awarding of one of the six "Sentinels of Safety" trophies for 1962 to the Sherman Mine in Chisholm, Minn. I am pleased and proud to offer my congratulations to the officials and employees of the Sherman

Mine for their excellent and impressive accomplishment.

Competing with 156 entries in the open-pit mining category in this national safety competition, Sherman won first place for achieving the best safety record for the calendar year 1962. Determination of the best safety record is made by calculating the number of injury-free man-hours per operation, and the mine turning in the greatest number of injury-free man-hours receives the coveted trophy. The Sherman Mine, of the Oliver Iron Mining Division, United States Steel Corp., operated 716,563 man-hours without a disabling injury, thus topping the field of 68 entrants who reported injury-free operations in the open-pit category. The Sherman Mine first entered competition in 1958.

As a reward for its outstanding safety record, Sherman will be given possession of one of the famed "Sentinels of Safety" trophies for 1 year. The company will also be presented with a large green and white flag inscribed "National Safety Competition, 1962," to be flown as a triumphant symbol of its achievement. In addition, all employees and officials at the mining operation will receive certificates of accomplishment in safety. At the end of the year the mine will receive a replica of the trophy for permanent display.

Presentation date for the trophy and the certificates will be arranged by agreement between the company and the joint sponsors of the competition—the Bureau of Mines and the American Mining Congress.

The Army Times Guide to Army Posts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, coming to my desk the other day from the hands of John Ford, Washington correspondent, was the recently published Army Times Guide to Army Posts, a book edited by Tom Scanlan which seems to me to have great value to Army families—in fact it is designed for such families who want to discover as much as they can about housing, school and general living conditions at their next post. I have read with great interest about posts where I have been stationed while I was in the armed services or which I visited since I have been on the House Armed Services Committee and it seems to me an excellent job has been done in putting this book together and a job very useful to those in the armed services it seems to me.

It is my honor to represent a town which is very much interested in military affairs and so when I read the comments of this book I did so with the background of living in a town of this sort and having had an active service in the Army and the background from the House Armed Services Committee. It is my impression that the book should be useful to all Army families and to many others who may wish to make a general study of living conditions in the Army.

The U.N.'s Cash Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, at the time the House of Representatives was considering legislation in the 87th Congress to give the United Nations $1 million in order to keep it from going bankrupt, a lot of pros and cons were tossed about on whether or not this was a wise move on our part.

Most will recall that the Republicans took the lead in insisting that we should not underwrite the financial problems of the United Nations unless or until the delinquent member nations paid their fair share of assessments, such as the Middle East and Congo expenses.

Most will also recall that those of us who protested the United States being forced into a position of almost singlehandedly supporting the United Nations, without any guarantee of like effort made by other member nations were accused of trying to wreck the U.N.

It is fairly clear by now that those who helped bring about this financial crisis have not as yet indicated any sense of responsibility toward this organization, even though they continue to use its facilities for propaganda purposes, among other things.

It is also fairly clear by now that the United Nations carries within it the seeds of its own destruction—regardless of how hard anyone tries to gloss over this fact, or how valiantly those who support the organization for its worthwhile goals refuse to admit it.

The World Court advisory opinion, which was to have solved the financial problems of the U.N., has—as many of us knew—failed to achieve this goal.

I would like to say here and now that many small and poor nations made a valiant effort to do their share in making pledges or actual payments in order to match U.S. contributions. They deserve a lot of credit for this effort.

The large nations who have taken advantage of the facilities of the United Nations, but who have not been willing to foot their share of the bills, deserve more censure than anyone seems willing to aim in their direction.

Sooner or later the financial problems of the United Nations will once again be brought before the U.S. Congress, and I am equally certain that the old charges of some trying to wreck the U.N. will be rehashed. But this time I do not believe the American public will be so gullible as to swallow that kind of political propaganda so readily. Either the charter will have to be amended, or the duties and responsibilities of the United Nations—as a worldwide organization—will have to be more clearly delineated. We would all hope that this effort would be made within the organization, rather than it being forced upon them from the outside.

The Washington Evening Star of May 14 carried an editorial entitled "The U.N.'s Cash Crisis" pretty fairly analyzes the problems as well as the possibilities for the future of the United Nations. I commend it to the attention of the Congress and the public, and ask unanimous consent that it be included in its entirety with my remarks today in the Appendix of the RECORD.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 14, 1963]

THE U.N.'S CASH CRISIS

The special session being convened today by the General Assembly is a rather desperate thing. Its objective is to save the United Nations from the bankruptcy that will surely hit it unless its financially delinquent members have a change of heart and start paying what they owe.

These members include the Soviet bloc, most of the Arab States and such other countries as France, Belgium, and Portugal. Up to now they have steadfastly declined to meet their assessed share of the cost of the U.N.'s peacekeeping operations, in either the Congo or the Middle East or both. As a result, with the operations involving an outlay of over $12 million a month, the world organization is running deeper and deeper in the red, to the point of real financial crisis.

The situation has been taken care of thus far with budgetary juggling, extra contributions from the United States, and a $200 million U.N. bond issue, half of which has been bought up by our Government. But all such improvisions and stopgap measures are inadequate at best, and they have about run their course. By way of example, influential voices in Congress and the executive branch have been warning that American largess has its limits and that our country is going to stop footing most of a bill that others—particularly the Soviet Union—are defaulting on.

This warning is well supported by the World Court's 9-to-5 "advisory opinion," as handed down last July, holding that all U.N. members are obligated to meet special assessments to finance emergency action like that in the Congo. In reality, however, the opinion is unenforceable and cannot bind any power choosing to ignore it or deny its validity, as the Soviets have done. At most, therefore, it has value only to the extent that it may exercise some moral suasion or be used effectively in the field of propaganda.

Beyond that, in terms of specific action, there appears to be little that can be done to make delinquent members pay up. True, the General Assembly might vote to deprive them of their voting rights, but such a penalty could bring about the breakup of the world organization. The breakup may come anyhow. Certainly the United Nations cannot survive as a bankrupt.

Students Organize for Atlantic Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, students from Georgetown University established on May 9 an organization to work for the Atlantic Union of freedom-loving peoples. They passed a resolution urging action on Atlantic Union, as did chapter No. 1 at American University.

The purpose of the Young Federalists is:

> The purpose of the Young Federalists is to further the understanding of federalism among students and to advocate a federation of Atlantic nations to be built on the foundations of NATO. Through Federal Union, Inc., they are affiliated with the International Movement for Atlantic Union, which includes on its honorary council such Atlantic leaders as the two former Secretaries General of NATO, Lord Ismay and Paul-Henri Spaak; Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands; former Prime Minister of England, Sir Anthony Eden, and present Prime Minister of Canada, Lester B. Pearson; former Secretary of State Christian A. Herter and former Under Secretary of State Will Clayton of the United States; and former foreign ministers Gaetano Martino of Italy and Heinrich von Brentano of Germany.

The resolution of the Georgetown group is as follows:

RESOLUTION OF GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY CHAPTER, YOUNG FEDERALISTS FOR ATLANTIC UNION

Whereas the Atlantic Convention of NATO nations, comprising more than 90 citizens officially appointed by the legislatures of the NATO countries but with power only to recommend, meeting in Paris in January 1962, called for the creation within 10 years of "a true Atlantic Community," expressing in political forms the growing interdependence of the Atlantic peoples; and set down as its major recommendations the appointment of a special commission, representing the governments of the NATO nations, to prepare and propose a program for that purpose; and

Whereas former U.S. Secretary of State Herter, the elected president of the 1962 Atlantic Convention of NATO nations, is urging that the major recommendation of that convention be implemented; and

Whereas we believe with Dean Eugene V. Rostow of the Law School of Yale University—"No line of action available to our foreign policy could more effectively improve our security as a nation. Our Government should take the lead in carrying out this recommendation;" and

Whereas as the internal and external relations of NATO become more painfully and dangerously entangled, there is a widening demand for action to be taken promptly to change the confusion and weakness of our acknowledged but unimplemented interdependence into the strength of unity: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the Georgetown University chapter, Young Federalists for Atlantic Union, this 9th day of May, 1963, That we support the Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations in its call upon the governments of the NATO countries, and in particular call upon the Government of our own country, to appoint members of a special governmental commission on Atlantic unity at the earliest possible moment; and be it

Resolved, further, That we formally express the hope that this special governmental commission on Atlantic unity will give prompt and full consideration to the possibility as well as the desirability of Atlantic federation; and, finally, be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States of America, the Secretary of State, and all Members of the Congress of the United States of America; and to the president of and all delegates to the Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations.

HELEN HILL,
Acting Secretary.

MAY 9, 1963.

And the resolution of the American University group states:

RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITY CHAPTER, NO. 1, YOUNG FEDERALIST FOR ATLANTIC UNION

Whereas the Atlantic Citizens Convention, held January 8-20, 1962, in Paris, with 90 delegates from 14 NATO countries, urged, as its major recommendation, the creation of a special governmental commission to propose organizational changes for NATO; and

Whereas former U.S. Secretary of State Herter, the elected president of that convention, is urging that the major recommendation of that convention be implemented; and

Whereas the internal and external relations of NATO have become painfully and dangerously tangled; and there is a widening demand that action be taken to change the confusion and weakness of our interdependence into unity and strength: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the Young Federalists for Atlantic Union Chapter No. 1, American University, That we support the Atlantic Citizens Convention in its call upon our Government to draw up plans before the end of 1963 for the creation of an Atlantic Community suitably organized to meet the political, military, and economic challenges of this era; that to this end we urge the appointment, within the earliest practicable period, of a special government commission on Atlantic unity.

JOE CAVINATO, Jr.,
Secretary.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *May 7, 1963.*

The Wheat Referendum—Farmers To Make Free Choice, and This Will Be Final

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the national wheat referendum will be held next Tuesday, May 21. Farmers then will be making a very important decision. They will cast their ballots in a free and democratic election to determine the level of wheat prices in 1964.

If 66⅔ percent of the wheat farmers vote "yes" the 1964 price for the greater part of their production will be $2 a bushel. If they vote "no" there will be no restriction on production, surpluses will build up again, and the support price will be only $1.25 a bushel—and that only for those who abide by their acreage allotments. Those who do not stay within their planting allocations will have no price protection at all. With a "no" vote and no effective production adjustment, supplies would be such that, farm economists predict, the market price for wheat may drop as low as $1 a bushel.

Last year we passed a bill which gave farmers the opportunity to decide the kind of program—and, therefore, the price levels—which they will operate under for the 1964 crop of wheat.

This law was sponsored and supported by Members of the Congress who are dedicated to the proposition that farmers are entitled to a fair level of income along with others of our citizens.

Those out of the Congress who oppose our efforts to assure reasonable and stable income for wheat farmers, in a program that also forestalls production of wasteful and costly surpluses, have created considerable confusion about the Congress changing that basic law.

Wheat farmers are being told that if they vote down the present program, the Congress will pass a new pie-in-the-sky type of wheat program for the 1964 crop. This is pure demagogery. I hope that no wheat producer will be misled.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to give the House an example of what happened under very similar circumstances in the most important crop grown in my home State—tobacco.

On that occasion, in 1938, tobacco growers in the Flue-cured belt decided they did not need marketing quotas any more. Not a majority of them but enough voted "no" so that marketing quotas were defeated for the 1939 crop.

The resulting overproduction—plus the withdrawal of the British buyers because of impending war in Europe—resulted in just one thing: the market collapsed. Things got so bad that in the two Carolinas, where the crop was still to be sold, the markets were closed entirely by the respective Governors.

Congress took the position that, despite the fact that the tobacco farmers had voted their own ruin, they had made their own free choice, and the Congress did not interfere with the will of the producers.

A referendum was subsequently scheduled to determine marketing quotas for the 1940 crop. When this time came, growers knew then for certain what they wanted—and so did everybody else. Even businessmen in parts of the Carolinas took out paid newspaper space and bought radio time to urge a "yes" vote.

The growers did vote "yes"—90 percent of them. And in every referendum since that time Flue-cured tobacco growers have voted overwhelmingly for marketing quotas with price protection. They have not made the same mistake twice.

Wheatgrowers never have voted down marketing quotas.

The choice they have on May 21 is exactly the same one they have had in every previous referendum—marketing quotas with a relatively high level of price supports, or no quotas and price supports at 50 percent of parity to cooperators who plant within their acreage allotments.

Propaganda that the new law establishes quotas in bushels is untrue. Quotas are on an acreage basis, as they always have been.

Bushels are used only to compute the producer's eligibility for the $2 price support—exactly as they are used to compute payments for farmers under the voluntary wheat and feed grains programs in effect in 1963.

This is in fact the most nonrestrictive quota law the Congress ever has written. It will give wheat farmers a choice—at their own option—whether to plant wheat or feed grains on their wheat acreage, or wheat on their feed grain acreage. No other quota program in history has provided such freedom of choice.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my policy in the past never to tell a farmer how he ought to vote in a program referendum, and this is my policy today. However, as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, I do feel a responsibility to see that wheat farmers are not misled by demagogery.

Regardless of how the farmers may vote on May 21, the law has been passed and the die is cast for the 1964 crop of wheat. A "no" vote in the referendum will destroy the price protection for the 1964 crop and the income of wheat farmers will fall to bankruptcy levels.

There is no plan to write a new wheat law for the 1964 crop. No one has come forward with a better program than that now being presented in the referendum. The Congress has met its responsibility to wheat farmers. The determination on the level of 1964 wheat production and prices now is entirely in the hands of the farmers themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I favor no Government controls as such, on agriculture. I do approve of the Government providing the machinery which farmers may use, at their own election, to hold their production in line with market requirements, as industry adjusts its output to market demands. I favor Government price stabilization programs for food and fiber only where farmers approve and are willing to cooperate in such production adjustments programs as will prevent market gluts, the piling up of surpluses and large costs to taxpayers. Farm programs of the last 30 years have proved that when farmers receive reasonable income the efficiency of agriculture increases by leaps and bounds, so that today Americans are the best fed people the world over and they pay a smaller part of their income for food than any other people anywhere.

A Rebuttal on the Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been drawn to an article entitled "The Real Truth About the Federal Budget," which appeared in the May 1963 issue of the Reader's Digest. In this article the editors of the magazine purport to reveal "shocking facts" about the budget which the taxpayers allegedly have not been told. It appeared to me that, in all fairness, the responsible officials of the Bureau of the Budget should have an opportunity and a forum to reply to the allegations made in this article. I therefore contacted the Bureau of the Budget and obtained from them the following communication which I commend to you:

COMMENTS ON AN ARTICLE IN THE READER'S DIGEST FOR MAY 1963, "THE REAL TRUTH ABOUT THE FEDERAL BUDGET" (PP. 49 TO 54)

The article, "The Real Truth About the Federal Budget," is essentially a compilation of half-truths which together sum up to a very misleading view of the Federal financial situation. An extravagant use is made in the article of color words, and many things are left unsaid which would not serve the writer's purpose.

The editors of the Digest have said in the subtitle of the article: "Here are the shocking facts that taxpayers have not been told." What is said in the article seems shocking, primarily because so much of the information given is misleading and has been lifted out of perspective and context. The article does not set forth any facts that were not made public in the Budget document.

SIZE OF THE BUDGET AND THE PUBLIC DEBT

With respect to the budget in general, the article maintains that (1) the total of administrative budget expenditures is higher than any previous President has "dared" to propose, (2) our national debt has "swollen" to more than $300 billion, resulting in high interest charges and inflation, and (3) nondefense spending has "soared" under the present administration.

There is no mention of the fact that our economy is larger, and our population greater, than under any previous President. By the end of fiscal 1964, there will be 10 million more Americans than there were the day President Kennedy took office. This means that we will add to the United States in this short time more people than half the population of Canada.

There is no mention of the fact that economic growth and a rising population mean an increasing Federal workload. For example, between the fiscal years 1962 and 1964, the number of tax returns will rise 2.5 percent; the volume of mail will grow 6.4 percent; visitors to our national parks will increase by 7 percent; the number of veterans or survivors receiving pensions will rise by 10 percent; aircraft landings and takeoffs at airports with Federal towers will go up by 11 percent; beneficiaries under the old-age and survivors insurance program will increase by 16 percent; the number of patents granted will rise by 20 percent; and passports issued will increase by 25 percent.

There is no mention of the fact that about 80 percent of the "swollen" public debt was incurred during wartime, and that Federal debt since the end of the Second World War has grown very modestly (18 percent) compared with the growth in State-local net debt (400 percent), corporate net debt (204 percent), or personal net debt (382 percent).

There is no mention of the fact that Federal nondefense spending in the administrative budget is a smaller proportion of gross national product than it was in 1939 and 1949, and is the same proportion of gross national product as it was in 1959.

There is the misleading implication that the President went back on his word that, "I will hold total expenditures for all other purposes (than defense, space, and interest on the debt) below this year's level." Immediately after quoting this pledge, the article cites figures which split expenditures simply between national defense and all other expenditures, with the result that "all other" is shown as rising by $2 billion. This $2 billion (actually $1.8 billion) includes an increase of $2.1 billion for space and interest. Thus the article seeks to imply that the President violated his pledge when the facts are otherwise. It also fails to mention the fact that, apart from defense, space, and interest, budget expenditures for all other programs will increase less between 1961 and 1964 than they did between 1958 and 1961. Further, there is no mention of the fact that defense, space, and interest account for more than 70 percent of the increase in expenditures since 1961.

Finally, the article indicates that Federal budget deficits have eroded more than half the pre-World War II value of money, savings, and social security. In this respect the article erroneously assumes that there is a direct relationship between Federal administrative budget deficits and a reduction in the value of the dollar. For example, since 1958 there have been deficits in 5 of the 6 years. Yet wholesale prices are now lower than in 1958, while consumer prices have risen less than any like period since World War II.

DISCLOSURE OF THE FULL SCOPE OF GOVERNMENT SPENDING

The article implies that the President's budget fails to disclose the full scope of Government spending. In particular it criticizes (1) bookkeeping practices which, it alleges, reduce $23.5 billion of public enterprise fund expenditures to $3.5 billion by "juggling and consignment of huge losses to limbo," (2) the fact that proposed sale of assets is taken into account in computing the net expenditures of Government enterprises, and (3) the fact that $28 billion worth of trust fund payments are not included in the administrative budget.

The fact is that the $23.5 billion of public enterprise fund expenditures are clearly disclosed, both in great detail in the budget appendix, and in a summary tabulation on page 333 of the budget document itself. The two Kennedy budgets have provided a special analysis covering the public enterprise funds (Special Analysis B, page 332 of the 1964 budget), a fuller disclosure than was made in previous budgets.

The fact is that the difference between the $23.5 billion gross expenditures and the $3.5 billion net expenditures of the public enterprise funds represents receipts, rather than "huge losses" consigned to limbo. These receipts of $19.9 billion consist of $16.2 billion of hard cash coming into the Treasury from the operations of the funds, and $3.7 billion of receipts from appropriated funds which do business with the public enterprise funds.

Thus the budget is making an honest disclosure of the expenditures which are chargeable to the taxpayer; it would be dishonest to leave the impression that all of the $23.5 billion must be paid by the taxpayer.

Similarly, there is no concealment in the budget of the fact that the administration proposes to step up the sale of Government assets, such as mortgages and other loans. With respect to the Commodity Credit Corporation, not only do the schedules in the budget disclose the situation, but the President's budget message specifically observed that the proposed reduction in net payments for 1964 results largely from anticipated substantial sales of cotton. Certainly it is sound fiscal practice to dispose of unneeded assets, and to obtain cash therefor. And it is sound budgetary practice to disclose the administration's intentions with respect to asset sales. The budget correctly reflects the President's proposal to increase the sale of assets such as mortgages and commodities. The projected sale of mortgages is soundly supported by experience in the current year, when actual sales are running far ahead of estimates and are expected to be more than double the estimates for 1963 included in the budget.

It is especially ironic to find the Reader's Digest author alleging that $28 billion worth of trust fund payments failed "to see the light of day in the administrative budget." Rather than concealing the trust fund expenditures, the Kennedy budgets have given more emphasis to them than ever before in American budget history. The $28 billion of trust fund expenditures are specifically shown in the budget message on page 9 of the 1964 budget. In keeping with recommendations of a U.S. Chamber of Commerce committee and other private groups, the President emphasizes in his budget message the consolidated fund total, which includes both the administrative budget and the trust funds, and draws attention to the fact that this provides a more complete picture of governmental activities than does the administrative budget. The Reader's Digest article is also in error in failing to eliminate the duplication involved in payments between the funds—a duplication of $4.2 billion. The elimination of this duplication and other adjustments makes the correct total spending figure $122.5 billion rather than the $127.5 billion mentioned in the article.

DISCLOSURE OF COMMITMENTS OF FUTURE SPENDING

The article makes the point that expenditure figures do not tell the whole story, since the Government will commit itself during fiscal year 1964 for certain spending in future years; the author seeks to make the reader believe that the budget conceals this situation. He also implies that there is something deceitful about seeking new obligational authority which will lead to future spending. Furthermore, he would apparently like to have the reader believe that expenditures and new obligational authority are the same thing, even though they are quite different.

In any discussion of the Federal budget it is necessary to make a clear distinction between expenditures and new obligational authority. It is an essential feature of sound fiscal control that Congress must grant authority before Government agencies may enter into obligations leading to future spending. This authority is requested and granted by Congress in the form of new obligational authority. Expenditures occur as the Government pays for goods and services received under the obligations previously incurred. The two transactions are quite different; their sums cannot be added and the amounts of each, in any one year, have no direct relationship. Expenditures in 1964 will be based partly on new obligational authority provided in 1964 and partly on new obligational authority provided in earlier years. New obligational authority provided in 1964 will be spent partly in 1964 and partly in later years. To add together 1964 new obligational authority and expenditures is like saying that a dollar contains 10 dimes or 20 nickels, for a total of $2.

Contrary to the implication in the article, the budget makes a full and complete disclosure of the new obligational authority which the President has requested. This shows in the detailed tables and in summary tables, and the President's budget message has a separate section (p. 28) discussing the new obligational authority which the President is recommending. All of the figures which the article mentions with respect to new obligational authority and future commitments are taken from the budget document.

It should have been obvious to the author that some of the requested new obligational authority cannot be spent in the year in which it is granted. There is necessarily a substantial timelag between commitments and expenditures for many of the things that the Government buys. For example, a nuclear powered submarine cannot be ordered and delivered in the same fiscal year; either can the construction of a new office building be undertaken and completed within the same fiscal year. Surely the author would not have the Government depart from the sound financial policy of making expenditures only as the service is performed or the goods delivered. He would doubtless view with alarm any Presidential proposal to spend within the same fiscal year all of the new obligational authority he is requesting.

THE MATTER OF BACK-DOOR SPENDING

At several places in the article, there is an attack upon so-called back-door spending with the indication that is it deceitful, that it is used to conceal costs, that it is a devise to which President Kennedy clings despite its being termed "fiscal insanity" by the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, and that it is a devise for bypassing Congress.

Back-door spending does not bypass Congress. It comes about when Congress decides to make new obligational authority available for a program in substantive legislation considered by legislative committees rather than the Appropriations Committees. The practice was instituted in the Hoover administration in 1932. Such legislation normally is considered by four congressional committees: the substantive committees of both the House and the Senate, the House Rules Committee and generally a conference committee. In this process, it would go twice to the floor of each House of Congress.

Back-door spending grows out of congressional procedures and rules over which the executive branch has little control. In the latter years of the Eisenhower administration, the President proposed in some cases a switch from back-door spending to ordinary appropriations, but Congress switched back to back-door spending. In general, the practice of the Kennedy administration has been to seek ordinary appropriations (front-door spending) for new programs, and to follow whichever legislative route the Congress had previously established for the continuation of older programs. Which committees Congress uses to examine and bring to the floor the administration's proposals for programs and monetary authorizations is a matter primarily for the determination of the Congress and is not under the control of the administration.

The budget makes an open and full disclosure of all spending, including so-called back-door spending. The spending which is covered by that term is included within the various budget schedules and within the budget totals. There is no concealment, no coverup, no hiding of any of the facts.

Noting that capital is being requested for the Export-Import Bank in 1963 and not in 1964, the article alleges that the administration for this reason is claiming a $2 billion saving in 1964. There has been no claim of savings in this or any other case where new obligatory authority is lower in 1964 than in 1963. It is customary for some programs to be financed in one year and not in others.

With respect to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the article alleges that it had a $13.7 billion spending authority last year and all but $300 million of this was through the back door. Actually, about $9.7 billion of the $13.7 billion mentioned in the article were provided by acts of Congress before President Kennedy took office, much of it during President Eisenhower's administration. A substantial portion of the figures mentioned represent balances accumulated from the past, which have already been obligated or committed for loans and other activities, but on which the drawdown has not finally occurred.

Again, the article says that "the Commodity Credit Corporation * * * will actually obligate $9.5 billion, mostly back-door borrowing * * *." This is a false statement. In fact, more than half of the CCC obligation mentioned will be financed by receipts of the CCC from farmers, buyers of commodities and others. All CCC financing in recent years, beyond its own revenues, has been from congressional appropriations. It has not had back-door financing in this administration or in the latter years of the previous administration.

The article further indicates that President Kennedy tried to shove through enactment of $30.9 billion of back-door spending authority and got $20.1 billion worth. The $30.9 billion figure is actually quite misleading. It apparently includes some items for which the administration never submitted a proposal to Congress for back-door spending, some of which are in effect a duplicate counting in part of funds otherwise available, and some which cover a 4 or 5 year period.

SOME CRITICISMS IN THE ARTICLE

The article indicates that President Kennedy's proposal to place the Rural Electrification Administration on a revolving fund basis would enable the REA to bypass the Congress and cause an immediate loss to the taxpayers of $151 million. In truth, the proposed REA legislation involves neither any bypassing of the Congress nor any loss to the taxpayers. Under it the loan repayments received will be usable only as authorized by Congress annually, and the amount of new money requested from the Congress for the REA program has been reduced by the expected loan repayments. The proposal has no effect whatever on the amount of the budget surplus or deficit, on the amount of the public debt, or on the amount which the taxpayers now or subsequently will be called upon to pay. The charge that the proposal means a loss to the taxpayers is wholly in error.

The article is critical of the defense production fund which has accumulated stockpiles of strategic and critical materials, and has incurred net losses in connection with some of its operations. This fund was created and given its capital of $2.1 billion during the Korean conflict some 13 years ago. The law creating it recognized specifically that it would not be self-sustaining, and that there would be ultimate losses; in fact the law provided for "probable net cost" to be a significant factor in measuring and determining the extent to which the fund could enter into commitments in the area of defense production.

While some of the commitments and expenditures of the fund, particularly under the previous administration, have come under criticism in congressional committees and elsewhere during the last 2 years, it seems quite inappropriate for the article to criticize President Kennedy for losses, most of which occurred before he took office, and for the fact that a fund which was not intended to be self-sustaining turned out not to be self-sustaining.

The President's proposal for waiving the interest due between the Defense Production Fund and the General Fund of the Treasury, rather than to seek appropriations for this intragovernmental transaction, was merely an attempt to provide a sounder fiscal basis for the fund's operations during the course of the liquidation of prior contracts and programs. No good purpose would be served by requesting the Congress to make an appropriation merely to be paid back into the General Fund in connection with losses sustained as a result of actions undertaken some years ago.

THE "BLUEPRINTS" FOR CONTROL OF SPENDING

The article suggests four "blueprints" for the improvement of expenditure control.

The first of these is to eliminate back-door spending. Since this is mainly a question of which committees in Congress handle certain spending proposals, it is a matter for congressional determination. The administration has made no proposals in the 1964 budget for back-door financing to support new programs.

The second of these proposals is that Congress act on appropriations in a single bill each year, instead of acting on about a dozen separate appropriation bills. This too, is a matter for congressional determination. The President submits a single comprehensive budget to the Congress, covering the various agencies and programs of the Government. The Appropriations Committees and the Congress presently split their consideration of the budget into a series of separate appropriation bills. Whether this should be done or whether there should be a single appropriation bill is not a matter within the control of the executive branch.

The third blueprint is to "require the President in sponsoring legislation to estimate the ultimate cost of his proposals." Under a law enacted in 1956, and followed by the executive branch since that time, proposals for new legislation and agency reports on pending legislation include estimates of the additional expenditures and manpower which would result from the enactment of such bills at least for the ensuing 5 years. In the case of legislation which authorizes one-time projects, such as construction, the estimates normally cover the total cost. This legislation is applicable to legislative proposals which would involve an estimated annual expenditure in excess of $1 million each. The author of the article seems to be unaware of the existence of this law.

The fourth and final proposal of the article is to require Congress to limit by law the amounts to be spent annually for each Government program. The author explains this by saying that "Congress at present only determines how much it will give an agency to spend, not when and how it will spend."

Government expenditures are the natural result of the obligations and commitments which are entered into in order to carry out Government programs. The significant point of congressional control is and necessarily must be control over the obligations and commitments. Once the Government has entered into a contract for a building to be constructed, for a submarine to be built, or for a loan to be made, the expenditure would normally follow in due course. To delay the expenditure or to refrain from making it would merely mean the Government is delaying or refusing the payment of its bills. This would cause a loss of faith in the Government and chaotic relations between the Government and the business community. Congress could not rightfully expect to authorize substantial amounts of obligations and then fail to authorize the necessary payments to liquidate those obligations. The means are already at hand for appropriate control of Federal finances through the exercise of congressional judgment on how much it will give each agency for incurring obligations and for making expenditures—the system presently in effect.

The 15th Anniversary of the State of Israel

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my distinguished colleagues in commemorating the 15th anniversary of the State of Israel.

The creation of the State of Israel in 1948, following the termination of the British mandate of Palestine, fulfilled the hopes and dreams of millions of persons of Jewish faith and ancestry all over the world.

Many of them were survivors of the most calculated attempt at genocide in the history of mankind. They dreamed of a state which would stand as a haven of democracy, freedom and peace for themselves and their children. They dreamed of a modern day "land flowing with milk and honey."

But these people were more than mere dreamers. They were practical men and women of action. They gave unstintingly of their labors in order to make the deserts bloom and the cities prosper. We all are aware of how well they have succeeded.

In the 15 years which have elapsed, the State of Israel has given its citizens individual liberties and material prosperity. Unfortunately, its efforts to bring peace to its people have been unsuccessful. The Middle East, traditionally a region beset by strife and turmoil, has continued to be in ferment. Ancient emnities have survived to imperil the tranquility of the area.

Even today events are taking place which once again cause us to look to that part of the world with apprehension and concern. As we extend our best wishes to the State of Israel upon this important milestone in its history, it is our earnest hope that the nation and its neighbors may soon find solutions to their conflicts and embark upon an era of mutual cooperation which must, of necessity, benefit all.

VFW Adopts Resolution Urging Committee on American Ideals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a part of its Americanism program, the Veterans of Foreign Wars has adopted a resolution asking the President of the United States to establish a Committee on American Ideals. I feel that other Members may be interested in this resolution; therefore, I am inserting the full text of the resolution in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION FOR AN AMERICAN IDEALS CORPS

Whereas it appears that there is in the United States today a growing tendency to devaluate, or ignore, the richly patriotic heritage from which were derived our national character and the fundamental freedoms of the American way of life; and

Whereas an increasing variety of disturbing philosophies, of both foreign and domestic origins, strive to downgrade clear thinking, loyal and dynamic American patriotism; and

Whereas the continued impact upon our citizens of all such divisive influences may impair or destroy our national unity and security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, through its Commander in Chief and its National Committees on Americanism, Loyalty Day, and Community Service, urge the President of the United States to create and activate an official Federal committee identified by such appropriate name as the "President's Americanism Corps," or the "President's Ambassadors of Loyalty," or the "President's Committee for American Ideals"; and

That the President instruct his special body to establish and direct a vigorous nationwide campaign, implemented by volunteer patriotic individuals, organizations and institutions, to the end that all loyal citizens, in every community of our land, may demonstrate vigorous, positive adherence to historically tested, old-fashioned American ideals and practices; and be it further

Resolved, That the Veterans of Foreign Wars urges its 1,300,000 members and all other loyal citizens to give their wholehearted support to such a movement as a most effective patriotic countermeasure against any effort to compromise, weaken or destroy our American way of life.

(Adopted unanimously by Veterans of Foreign Wars National Committees on Americanism, Loyalty Day, Community Service, and by Conference of National Officers and Department Commanders April 1, 1963.)

Big Spending Paid for by Those in Lower Income Brackets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, one thing the social planners and those who advocate deficit financing, more Federal spending and more welfare state programs neglect to tell the people is who pays the bill. Too many think that all the so-called gifts from Washington come out of someone else's pocket, but the fact is it is those in the middle income and lower income brackets who pay the bill.

In the copy of an advertisement by the Union Oil Co. of California in Sports Illustrated issue of May 20, it is pointed out an employee who earns $600 a month now pays the Government $32,486.40 in his working life. A minor cut of 10 percent in income tax would save this average employee $7,000 and if we reduced taxes by one-third, he would save $24,000.

There is only one catch to a tax cut—it will mean nothing unless accompanied by a cut in Federal spending because the Federal Government cannot have unlimited power to spend without taking it from the taxpayers in one form or another at some later date.

Just to remind the average taxpayer that big government and big spending is costing him, I include at this point the editorial copy from the Union Oil Co. ad:

HOW MUCH TAX WILL YOU PAY OVER 40 YEARS?

Both Democrats and Republicans seem to agree at this point that U.S. income taxes are too high. So do most taxpayers, regardless of party.

But we doubt if very many U.S. citizens realize what their income taxes really add up to.

Take a Union Oil employee, for example, who earns $600 per month. With a family of four, his Federal income withholding tax each month is $67.68.

Just to get an idea of how much these taxes amount to in a working lifetime, we made some hypothetical assumptions.

Supposing our Union Oil employee started to work for the company at the age of 25 and retired at 65. Suppose further, for the sake of simplicity, that he earned the same salary throughout his career—$600 a month.

At $67.68 per month his taxes would amount to $812.16 per year. Over a 40-year period, this would total $32,486.40. But this isn't all the story.

What would happen, we asked, if our Union Oil employee didn't have to pay any Federal income taxes at all? Say he put his $67.68 each month into a savings account paying 4 percent interest compounded semiannually.

By the time he reached 65, he would have accumulated $79,300.

Now, obviously, very few people are going to advocate that this country do away with the Federal income tax completely. However, when we realize not only what the average American pays out of pocket during a lifetime, but also what it costs him in addition by not having the use of his money, any tax cut assumes a great deal more significance.

If Federal expenditures could be cut to the point where taxes could be reduced by 10 percent, for instance, it would be worth about $7,000 to our Union Oil employee. If taxes could be reduced one-third, it would amount to over $24,000.

It seems to us that these sums of money are significant enough to the average U.S. taxpayer to demonstrate the importance of constant vigilance in regard to Federal expenditures and taxes.

Economic Development of Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an article by Mr. Fred A. Orleans, a well-known international attorney, prominent authority on Latin American affairs, and the first U.S. citizen to be elected a full member of the Mexican Academy of International Law. The article deals with problems of economic development in Mexico and is the third in a series written by Mr. Orleans, the first two having dealt with constitutional rights and international policy of Mexico. I am very pleased to commend this series to the attention of my colleagues and to all those interested in improving our Latin American relations. The article, published in the Mexico City Daily Bulletin, April 24, 1963, reads:

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT—PART III

(By Fred A. Orleans)

The United States shares a continent with Canada and Mexico, and although people in the United States know quite a bit about Canada, few know much about Mexico, and in many cases, what is known is erroneous.

Very few people in the United States realize that Mexico is the third largest country in area in Latin America and the second largest in population. Present population of Mexico is approximately 36 million persons with anticipated population of 100 million people by the end of the century. Varied climate and geographical conditions make possible a highly diversified agriculture, including important crops of coffee, wheat, fruit, beans, and corn. The large mineral resources of Mexico include sulfur, petroleum, iron, coal and various nonferrous metals as silver, gold, and copper. Stock raising, timber resources, and fisheries are also important to the national economy. Mexico has been most successful in maintaining a well-diversified export structure. The Central Plateau of Mexico is the most important economic region, with high population density, most of Mexico's industrial production, and a considerable percentage of its agricultural and livestock production.

In 1961 Federal Government revenues in Mexico represented about 8 percent of gross national product (GNP). Revenues at all government levels represented nearly 11 percent of the GNP, while Fedearl tax collections were equivalent to 9 percent of GNP that year, as compared with 6.4 percent in 1950. An increase of around 10 percent should be shown for 1962 as a result of higher levels of economic activity and the initial effects of tax reform legislation. It is anticipated that the income tax constituted approximately 38 percent of all Federal Government tax revenues in 1962. There has been a marked and important trend in Mexico toward reliance on direct taxes, and a corresponding reduction in the relative importance of taxes on gross output, sales, and consumption.

The structure of expenditures of the Federal Government in Mexico is characterized by high proportions for economic development and social services. In 1960 economic development, including investment in railways, highway, irrigation, and others accounted for 44 percent of the total, while social services, education, and health accounted for 29 percent. The proportion devoted to national defense in 1960 was 8.7 percent, a ratio which has been declining over the years.

Gross domestic fixed capital formation, including both private and public investment, increased from 14.3 percent of GNP in 1950 to about 15.6 percent in 1960. It is estimated that in 1961 approximately 36 percent of gross capital formation originated abroad. In December 1961 the Mexican Congress passed a comprehensive tax reform modifying the income tax and substantially increasing its scope. At the same time, legislation was passed abolishing the inheritance tax. Various improvements in tax collection procedures through the years are reflected in the rising ratio of tax revenues to GNP in the last decade, while the tax structure has remained relatively unchanged.

Recent Federal Government budgets in Mexico have been placing greater emphasis on social programs in the fields of education, health, and social welfare. For example, the 1962 budget allocated 34.7 percent to this purpose, as compared with 27.4 percent in 1959. Public investment, after increasing at a relatively slow rate during most of the fifties, rose sharply in 1960 and 1961. Total public investment rose from about 5.6 percent of GNP in 1959 to 6.5 percent in 1960 and approximately 7.6 percent in 1961. The most important part of the recent increase is in the investment programs of the autonomous organizations and state enterprises such as the National Railways, and Federal Electricity Commission and PEMEX, the petroleum enterprise, which increased more than 80 percent from 1959 to 1961.

In recent years Mexico has developed mechanisms to attract savings and channel them into development purposes. Private financial institutions collect savings, largely through the sale of time obligations, and make loans to industrial and commercial firms. Banks compete vigorously for savings deposits, and the Government, through the sale of Nacional Financiera certificates of participation and Federal Government savings bonds, has mobilized considerable resources for investment in economic infrastructure and basic industry.

In the 9 months ending September 1961, the outstanding securities of Nacional Financiera and other Federal financial institutions increased by the equivalent of approximately $50 million. Another measure taken in 1961 by Nacional Financiera was an increase in its authorized capital to permit the sale of its shares to the public and thereby broaden its ownership and obtain more resources. An important matter related to the mobilization of financial resources is a stabilization program adopted by the Government in 1961, the objectives of which include continuation of the price stability that has been maintained since the first half of 1960, together with strengthening of the balance-of-payments position of the country.

The monetary policy of the Mexican Government is designed to direct available financial resources toward productive activity within a climate of monetary and exchange stability and a fully convertible peso, and to encourage domestic savings and strengthen the country's balance of payments. Domestic savings have financed some 90 percent of gross investment in recent years.

Perth Amboy News Sparks Drive To Help Kentucky Flood Victims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, when floods caused widespread hardship in Harlan County, Ky., this year, the citizens of several New Jersey communities hundreds of miles away decided that they should do something to help. Working with them were the editors of the Evening News in Perth Amboy. That spontaneous effort shows what can be done when a newspaper and citizens decide that they have a responsibility to give help when it is most needed. When the drive was completed, an estimated 10,000 people had contributed more than 8 tons of clothing. Some of them had lined up and waited to make their donations.

A story in the Jersey Publisher of May 1963 gives a good account of the campaign and the response. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERTH AMBOY NEWS SPARKS DRIVE TO HELP KENTUCKY FLOOD VICTIMS

The rain-swollen Cumberland River rolled over its banks into Harlan County, Ky., just after midnight on Monday, March 11.

More than 1,500 families fled their homes before the rising floodwaters. Local officials described the flood as the worst ever to hit the economically-depressed coal mining area. Damages were estimated at $21 million.

Hundreds of miles away in Edison, N.J., a young mother of five children read about the plight of the flood victims. Many had lost their homes and all their possessions.

Kentucky-born Mrs. Betty Sexton knew the Harlan area. She had seen the effects of former floods while visiting friends in Harlan. So she decided to help the flood victims by collecting clothing, linens, and bedding.

Mrs. Sexton visited the Evening News in neighboring Perth Amboy on Wednesday afternoon. Executive Editor Kenneth Michael told her the newspaper would be glad to help if an appeal were made from Harlan. He suggested that Mrs. Sexton call the editor of the Harlan newspaper.

Mrs. Sexton called R. Springer Hoskins, editor of the Harlan Daily Enterprise. Hoskins told her Harlan could use all the help she could send.

"We need clothing, bedding, and linens," Hoskins said. "Children's clothing and shoes are especially needed."

Hoskins then called Michael to confirm his conversation with Mrs. Sexton. Dr. S. McMaster Kerr of the Harlan County Ministerial Association also called the Evening News to emphasize the need for help.

Michael called Edison Mayor Anthony M. Yelencsics and Perth Amboy Deputy Mayor Joseph J. Soporowski to get the campaign started. The two mayors gave their consent to use municipal trucks and buildings in the drive.

Advertising Director John W. Burk and Michael next called James F. Roosevelt, Edison business administrator; Joseph Ruggieri, superintendent of Edison schools; Anthony V. Ceres, Perth Amboy school superintendent, and Stephen Bandola, administrator of the Perth Amboy Department of Parks and Public Property, to arrange for truck and drop areas.

By Friday night, 4 days after the flood, the drive was set. It would open Tuesday, March 19, and close at noon Friday, March 22. Residents could drop their donations at all schools and firehouses in Edison, at all Perth Amboy elementary schools, and at all circulation branch offices of the Evening News.

The Saturday edition of the Evening News ran the story of Mrs. Sexton's appeal across all nine columns of the newspaper above the masthead. Readers were told of Mrs. Sexton's role in starting the drive, and where they could leave their donations.

By Monday morning, before the campaign officially started, a trickle of clothing started coming in to the drop areas. Mrs. Sexton had received 13 calls to pick up clothing from people who could not make it to the drop points.

The campaign was given added emphasis Monday by a report from Harlan. Another flood had swept into town, damaging 500 homes.

All during the week, the Evening News ran front page stories about the campaign. On Tuesday an editorial praised Mrs. Sexton for starting the campaign and urged residents to contribute.

Wednesday's edition, in addition to the usual front page story, carried a page of flood pictures from Harlan and an inside story written by John M. Molley, news editor of the Harlan newspaper.

By Tuesday night clothing began to pile up at the drop areas. It became apparent that the drive was a success. Mrs. Sexton's appeal had caught the imagination of Evening News readers.

In Harlan, Dr. Kerr agreed to coordinate relief help from the two communities. He arranged to distribute clothing from the National Guard armory. Local civic and fraternal organizations volunteered to sort and hand out clothing.

With the drive swinging along at full speed, Michael started making arrangements to carry the clothing to Harlan. Mason-Dixon Transport Lines of Kingsport, Tenn., donated a tractor-trailer.

The Evening News stories documented the increasing success of the campaign. The early trickle soon became a torrent. People carried in clothing in boxes, bags, and draped over their arms.

Edison and Perth Amboy municipal trucks carted the clothing from the drop points to the Perth Amboy Tennis Club for sorting and packing. Eventually, the tennis club looked like a military clothing depot.

An estimated 10,000 people had opened their hearts and wardrobes to the people of Harlan. More than eight tons of clothing were collected. Although the drive was focused in Edison and Perth Amboy, residents of a half dozen neighboring communities contributed.

The Evening News wrapped up the Harlan drive on Tuesday and Wednesday, March 26–27, with a front page story and pictures describing the reception of the clothing in Harlan.

Dogs Widely Used To Control Crowds and Rioters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I think that many Members of the House will be interested in seeing the enclosed article by Associated Press Writer Martha Cole concerning the widespread use of police dogs. Although some people have been critical of the use of police dogs by the Birmingham police force, it is apparent that the unruly, hostile crowds could not have been controlled without the dogs.

I submit herewith the article which appeared in the Birmingham News that sets the record straight on the use of police dogs in various American cities:

USE OF POLICE DOGS WIDESPREAD

(By Martha Cole)

WASHINGTON.—Police dogs have sprung into the news and into controversy.

Last week Birmingham police used them against Negro demonstrators. A blood-chilling picture of a snarling German shepherd leaping a demonstrator was seen all over the country. There were protests in Congress and from civil rights groups.

Providence, R.I., authorities used dogs last week to block an invasion of the downtown area by several hundred youths, many of them college students, on a spring fever foray.

London police used dogs, too, over the weekend against ban-the-bomb demonstrators.

The thinking behind use of dogs in crowd control is humans' innate fear of them, according to a spokesman for the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc. The dogs are intended primarily as phychological devices rather than for attacking, he said.

Their use is relatively new in this country. Some police officials contend dogs are a bona fide technique. Others feel they are of dubious value.

Nonetheless, in 10 years K9 corps have become a part of many big city police departments.

London has been using police dogs for about 20 years and is a sort of focal point for their training and use. Baltimore and St. Louis sent men to London to study before setting up their police canine corps in 1956 and 1958, respectively. These two cities also assist police of other cities in training dogs.

Training is a sort of cooperative affair among police," said the spokesman for the police chiefs association.

Each city adapts the dogs for its own use. They are used for patrolling, scenting out hiding criminals, guarding prisoners and dispersing crowds.

Boston imported nine shepherd dogs from Germany earlier this year for the specific job of tracking down the man or men responsible for the unsolved stranglings of nine women in Greater Boston since last June.

St. Louis has one dog, Duke I, trained as a narcotics sniffer to locate packets of narcotics on a person.

Police dogs usually are German shepherds, sometimes Doberman Pinschers, two breeds that can be highly trained for the work. Usually one dog becomes the partner of a specific officer and lives at his home.

The dog is drilled to react immediately to a command. Basic obedience includes sit, down, stay, bark on command, retrieve on command and jump on command.

Sometimes he is taught to stop a fleeing man by barking until his handler can arrive at the scene. This sometimes requires gripping the man's sleeve.

The Police Chiefs Association has no official policy on use of the dogs and keeps no list of cities which have them.

An incomplete list includes Birmingham, Chicago, Miami, Houston, New Orleans, Atlanta, St. Louis, Baltimore, the District of Columbia, Salt Lake City, Richmond, Va., St. Paul, Cincinnati and the Virginia and Deleware State police.

Conquest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to the Washington Post editorial which pays tribute not only to Maj. Gordon Cooper and his fellow astronauts but to all the dedicated people engaged in advancing our country's position in the exploration of space.

The editorial follows:

CONQUEST

It is not yet quite like taking the shuttle plane to New York or Boston. Words like "gantry" and "cherrypicker," like "countdown" and "nosecone," have become commonplaces of our vocabularies. The routine of preparation for takeoff has become a little bit familiar, and outer space has lost a little of its mystery. But when Maj. Leroy Gordon Cooper left this planet at about 9 o'clock yesterday morning for his long and venturesome journey round and round the earth, countless American eyes were fastened in awe upon his capsule as it rocketed into orbit; countless American hearts beat faster with pride and anxiety and hope; countless American prayers for his safe return went up silently to the Ruler of all the universe.

Major Cooper is reported, at the time this is being written, to be seeing the sights of the solar system comfortably and at leisure. He has already circumnavigated the world half a dozen times in less than half a day and will continue, if all goes well, to circle it again and again, observing all its seas and continents from afar until he is ready to return with an account of the wonders he has beheld.

How small and irrefragably integrated the world must seem from where he views it. Differences of race and color must be hard to discern; and perhaps they seem altogether unimportant. Even differences of nationality must seem rather trivial; and it may be that in his majestic survey Russians are indistinguishable from Americans.

What is he doing out there, this mariner of the skies? He is engaged, of course, in a pattern of what is called "conquest"—in a part of man's incessant and multifarious striving to conquer, which is to say, to understand, the universe in which he has been placed by a power far beyond his understanding.

Conquest is knowledge. The conquest in which Gordon Cooper is now playing his dramatic part began with Ptolemy and Copernicus and Tycho Brahe and Galileo—and indeed, long, long before—and will go on as long as man is endowed with the zest and will to learn, which are the marks of his divine origin. This kind of conquest can never come in a single triumph; it is a continuum, knitting together past and present, enlarging but never finishing. Gordon Cooper will tell us a little more than we learned from the astronauts who preceeded him—an indispensable little, opening the way for enlargement by future astronauts.

All of us have a part to play in this conquest. For it is we, the earthbound, who must learn from what he discovers. He may bring back knowledge; it is we who must absorb it. Like one who fled the Hound of Heaven—like any of us—Gordon Cooper may say:

"Across the margent of the world I fled,
And troubled the gold gateways of the stars,
Smiting for shelter on their clanged bars;
Fretted to dulcet jars
And silvern chatter the pale ports o' the moon."

But it is we who must say what it means when he returns. It is we who must complete the conquest. In the end, it is we who will say whether the planet which he has looked at as part of a larger creation is to survive. It is we who will have to learn that the great conquest in which we are engaged must be, finally, a conquest of ourselves, of our ignorance and folly.

Mead's Site on the Savannah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the statement of Ford T. Shepherd, vice president of Mead Corp., before the House Public Works Flood Control Subcommittee drew national attention. Governors, Senators, publications, planning boards, newspapers, and many others have requested copies of Mr. Shepherd's excellent presentation. In view of this widespread interest, I commend to the attention of Congress Mr. Shepherd's complete statement:

Statement of Ford T. Shepherd Before the Subcommittee on Flood Control

My name is Ford T. Shepherd. I am a vice president of the Mead Corp., Dayton, Ohio. Mead manufactures paper, paperboard, woodpulp, corrugated containers, folding boxes, packaging cartons, and technical papers at 40 operations in 17 States. Mead employs approximately 17,000 men and women. Net sales in 1962 amounted to $435,116,370.

Because Mead owns a site on the Savannah River which would be affected by the construction of the Trotters Shoals dam and reservoir, I requested the opportunity to present the facts as we know them before this committee. I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear here today.

There are probably a score or more of practical locations for large papermills in the Southern States. We know of some; and have no doubt that in the next 15 or 20 years, a number of new mills will be built. But, of the various possible locations, it is our opinion that our site on the Savannah River at Calhoun Falls, S.C., is one of the most attractive for many reasons.

On July 26, 1956, we announced the purchase of a plant site of 1,000 acres located 3 miles west of Calhoun Falls on the Savannah River. In November 1959, and February 1960, we made further statements regarding the plans for the use of that site. Since our first announcement, we have invested $1 million in timberlands—and we have made commitments through leaseholds amounting to an additional $2 million over the years.

These actions, we believe, make it manifestly clear that we have every intention of using this site for the purpose for which it was purchased.

With your permission, I want to describe the physical nature of a papermill and indicate what it would do for the economy of that area in South Carolina and Georgia.

In the first place, an economic unit, in our judgment, involves a pulpmill and a paper machine, together with the associated powerplant, which will produce at least 800 tons daily of the product. A paperboard operation, producing linerboard, for example, would cost close to $40 million. The construction crew, at peak employment, would involve about 1,400 men—and the payroll during construction would come to about $10 million alone. But, that is not all.

Even after the mill is finished, new capital investments will be required, year after year, to keep the property up to date and competitive. What this will be we can't forecast, but our past experience indicates that we have to plan on at least a million or more dollars every year in new investment money.

After such a mill is in operation, the regular employment would involve from 600 to 650 people—the annual payroll close to $5 million every year—that is, for the papermill itself.

Of course, there is the wood to be considered to supply the mill. Such a mill would require from 400,000 to 450,000 cords of pulpwood each year—worth perhaps $8 to $9 million delivered at the mill. To produce this huge volume of wood, we figure, would require something like 2,500 men—working on the farms and in the forest lands outside the plant.

Referring back to those employed in the mill itself, I would like to emphasize the point that these 600 people or more would have to be trained people—there is very little work of the type we used to call common labor any more. With the equipment and machinery today, many of the jobs call for highly skilled men: electricians, pipefitters, millwrights, engineers, and, of course, foremen and supervisors—there are literally dozens of specialized jobs. Part of our responsibility would be the training for these jobs. And, a going concern will provide skilled employment for the young people of that area year after year. These skills pay good wages today.

The quantities of pulpwood, and the many other materials, as well as the shipment of finished product, will produce real activity for the railroads as well as the truck movements. We estimate that the movement of freight alone would involve some 18,000 rail carloads a year.

State and local taxes are additional items well worth consideration—a conservative estimate is some $500,000 annual income from a papermill operation such as I have described. Federal income taxes depend on earnings and, for that reason, of course, are very difficult to forecast. If we should earn as much as the Mead Corp. as a whole averaged last year—and the rate of Federal taxes remains at 52 percent—the Federal income taxes on the operation I have described would amount to about $3,300,000 which, added to the amount of $500,000 for State and local taxes, amounts to a total of close to $4 million a year.

Now, as to the essential elements necessary to achieve successful operation of a great project such as this type of papermill.

First, I have already mentioned the large amount of capital involved. The financing of $40 to $50 million is a very major undertaking. To obtain such sums we go to the great banks and insurance companies—who handle the investment funds of thousands of people.

Foremost among the requirements is the market to consume the production of such a plant. It takes many years to develop the marketing organization to distribute such large volumes of goods, and to keep them sold, month after month, year after year. We have that in Mead, fortunately, and it is one of the most important factors which would be considered by those who provide the funds.

We also have the engineering staff and knowledge to construct such a plant, with all its complex ramifications. We have the men who know how to put together the operating force and to train the employees in the many different kinds of jobs which are needed to coordinate the operations.

The location of a papermill site must be considered in relation to the raw material supply—the available forest lands which provide the pulpwood. Obviously, the area in question is, in our opinion, the most suitable in this respect.

The movement of the pulpwood to our mill site is assured by the fine network of highways, and by the railroad connections.

Another vital factor is the water supply—which is the important question here today. This proposed plant would require possibly 30 to 40 million gallons daily, depending on its size, to be used in processing our pulp, and the many steps required in making paper. When we acquired the site, the flow of the river was ample, many times the quantities needed. We were advised of the plans for the Hartwell Dam, and were assured that the minimum average regulated flow would be 3,560 cubic feet per second. This is something over 2 billion gallons daily—so we felt that our maximum needs of 30 to 40 million gallons were covered amply.

All the water used in a papermill, of course, runs out into the river again. The effluent, as indicated by the above figures, would be diluted at least 50 to 1 during the absolute minimum conditions. So, here again, we felt we were amply covered, as long as our effluent received proper treatment to remove solids and objectionable matter. Of course, if the river were to be shut off at the upper dam for any length of time, these conditions would not exist, and any mill operations would be impossible.

Now, a new dam is under consideration at Trotters Shoals. It is my understanding that, if constructed as planned, this would flood our mill site. Naturally, this would make an industrial development such as ours impossible.

The benefits of a papermill such as I have described sum up to something like this:

1. The construction of the plant, involving up to 1,400 men, and a payroll of $10 million, would provide jobs and that much direct buying power in South Carolina during the 2-year period while the plant was being built.

2. The plant in operation would furnish steady employment to some 600 people or more, an annual payroll of possibly $5 million in the area.

3. The wood requirements, depending on the size of the operation, could well run to 450,000 cords of pulpwood. Some of this would undoubtedly flow in from Georgia; but a very substantial part of it would be purchased in the neighboring counties in South Carolina.

4. A papermill of the type I have been describing is not just another industry in the community. A papermill is unlike a great many manufacturing industries found in agricultural communities. The usual industry has all or most of its raw materials shipped in for the manufacture of its products. Such an industry does not use local natural resources for its raw materials.

A papermill uses the local natural resource—wood—perpetually. The natural resource grows constantly and its annual growth is even increased by reason of the fact that the cutting and use of an old tree causes the growth and development of a number of new trees. The farmers sell trees selected from their lands to the papermill and receive an income for these trees—on an annual crop basis. The papermill produces a ready and continuing market for the farmer's product—wood, a natural resource.

As a consequence, a papermill in a community is a joint enterprise of farmers and the paper company which gives steady employment and supplies a good livelihood to the community's people, and, in addition, creates good employment for numerous other people engaged in supplying materials, services, and transportation.

The economic wealth of the agricultural community having a papermill is substantially greater than that of an agricultural community without a manufacturing industry, and greater than that of an agricultural community with some other types of manufacturing industry.

5. Furthermore, the steady market for pulpwood provided by this papermill, together with the intensified cultivation of the forest lands which would develop from this new business, would mean establishing new values on present properties in the area of the mill—just as it has happened in other localities in the South.

In conclusion, I would like to point out the following:

1. As we understand it, we will not be able to use our site on the Savannah River if the Trotters Shoals Dam is built.

2. We intend to use the site for the purpose for which it was purchased when economic conditions justify the huge investment involved. However, this important decision cannot be made until we are assured of our water supply and a flowing river for the adequate treatment and processing of our effluent.

3. After the decision is made to build an operation of the kind described, and after the financing has been arranged, approximately 2 years would be required for the construction of a mill.

Race to the Moon: Why Is It So Important?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, Mr. Roscoe Drummond, one of the most respected columnists in the United States, wrote an article entitled "Race to the Moon: Why Is It So Important?"

I commend this article to all of you because it states quite succinctly some of the reasons why we should go to the moon.

I wholeheartedly agree that by asking the wrong question you can evoke the wrong answer. While we are naturally interested in being first and beating the Russians, our reasons for going to the moon are that in so doing we will develop the techniques of further exploration of outer space.

A greater knowledge of the moon is important in the field of science and will help us interpret some of the unsolved questions pertaining to space.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mr. Drummond's article which appeared in the Washington Post:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 6, 1963]

RACE TO THE MOON: WHY IS IT SO IMPORTANT?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The big, costly, valuable space-exploration program is running into public misgivings largely because it is so often defended for the wrong reasons.

I am convinced that when Congress almost unanimously a year ago greatly stepped up the space program and apparently set it on a course from which it was not to veer, it made the right decision. We ought to stick to it resolutely.

To make it the firm objective of the United States to be foremost in outer space does not seem to me to be a very remarkable decision. Isn't that doing what comes naturally to the American people? That's not out of character. That decision is in the national tradition—or something is very amiss.

But now there is talk about cutting back only a year after deciding to go full-steam ahead. This sort of talk sounds chicken: "Oh, what's the use? And who wants to be first anyway?"

There is danger that there will be a cutback, a grievously mistaken cut-back, if the real reasons for the space program are not better expounded.

If we keep on asking the wrong question, we are going to be stuck with the wrong answer. The tendency in defending the space budget is to stress the race to the moon and how important it is to beat the Russians. The honest question which then arises and understandably brings divided answers is: Why is it so important to be first to the moon?

The answer which many Americans tend to give is that it would be nice to beat the Russians to the moon, but that it is hardly worth $20 billion, and certainly not $40 billion.

This is a sample of how asking the wrong question produces the wrong answer.

The controlling reason for the size of the space program is not just to try to get to the moon first—however welcome that would be—but to make sure that Americans will be foremost in mastering the new element and the new dimension of outer space.

We talk about competitive coexistence with the Communist world as the best way to win the cold war. Outer space is a vital, perhaps the crucial area of competition. The overriding issue is not who is going to be first to the moon but who is going to be foremost in mastery of the new element of outer space because the mastery of outer space will do more than anything else to determine the shape of our world for many decades, perhaps for several centuries.

There are precedents. Through their mastery of roadmanship the Romans shaped their world for a long time.

Through their mastery of seamanship the British did most to influence the affairs of the world for a century.

Through their mastery of airmanship Britain and the United States turned back the tide of Hitler and Tojo.

Through the mastery of spacemanship—through being foremost in outer space, not just first to the moon—it is now within the reach of the United States to affect greatly the shape of the world for the rest of this century and, I believe, for some centuries ahead.

I am not talking about the United States dominating the world through outer space. I am talking about the necessity of the United States being foremost in outer space so that the Soviet Union cannot dominate the world through its prior mastery of outer space.

The United States is committed to the freedom of outer space as it is to the freedom of the seas. We are prepared to undertake joint explorations with the Soviets and some are in prospect. But when it comes to deciding whether we should continue unwaveringly to mobilize full resources to be foremost in the new element and the new dimension of outer space, I commend these warning words of the Vice President of the United States:

"If we do not succeed in these efforts—as one great American has put it—we will not be first on the moon, we will not be first in space, and one day soon we will not be the first on earth."

Birmingham Police Inspector Says Rioting Due to Heavy Drinkers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I think that many Members of the House will be interested in seeing the enclosed article from the Birmingham Post-Herald for Tuesday, May 14, 1963, which contains the comments of Birmingham Police Inspector William J. Haley, that indicate the Saturday night riots in Birmingham were the result of heavy drinking. The police inspector reports that most of the people arrested in connection with the riots were drinking heavily.

I submit herewith the article from the Birmingham Post-Herald:

MOST OF RIOTING SATURDAY BLAMED ON HEAVY DRINKERS

Saturday night's bombing of the Gaston Motel and the home of the Reverend A. D. King happened on "the worst night of the week" before the bars and night spots closed, Police Inspector William J. Haley said yesterday.

Inspector Haley said many of the persons arrested in rioting which followed the bombings were from the Fourth Avenue, North district, and were drinking heavily.

These were the ones who caused most of the trouble, he said.

He said the area was sealed off at the time of the rioting for the protection of the residents of the area and their property.

Haley said three fires were set and two Negro men were caught leaving one store with some loot after a fire had been started in the building.

He said police stopped the fire before it did damage after a large drum of kerosene had been poured on the floor and ignited.

The two men were charged with arson and larceny, Haley said.

NEGROES CREDITED

He gave considerable credit to a group of Negro civil defense auxiliary police who faced angry mobs of their own people to assist outnumbered white policemen and firemen.

Capt. James E. Lay, 35-year-old Negro postal worker, was credited with disarming and overpowering a knife-wielding Negro attempting to slash policemen.

He later was injured when a brick smashed a portable speaker he was using in an attempt to stop the mob throwing bricks and stones.

Another Negro civil defense worker, Sylvester Norris, drove a fire truck through the rioters after a barrage of stones had prevented firemen from putting out a blaze set by arsonists.

Col. U. N. James, director of the Birmingham Civil Defense, said the fire captain sent him a note reporting the work of the Negro unit was invaluable.

Lay said more than 100 Negroes had volunteered to join the 62-man unit yesterday.

Haley said that considerable rioting damage resulted to police equipment with about eight windshields smashed, several back seat glasses shattered and tires slashed.

Resolutions Adopted by the 72d Continental Congress, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, on every hand we see actions which, in my opinion, lead to the destruction of our Nation. We see the executive and the judiciary join in actions which are not in accord with the balance of powers between the legislative, judiciary, and executive intended by those who founded our Constitution. On every side we see the lessons of history ignored, as Federal force is used to destroy States' rights and the rights of all the people.

I, therefore, think it most appropriate at this time that we reflect upon and take to heart the resolutions adopted by the 72d Continental Congress, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, April 15–19, 1963.

Under leave to extend my own remarks, I hereby present such resolutions to the Congress:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE 72D CONTINENTAL CONGRESS, NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, APRIL 15–19, 1963

APPRECIATION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, assembled for its 72d Continental Congress, acknowledge with much appreciation the message from the President of the United States of America.

THE HERITAGE OF PRAYER

Whereas the acknowledgement of God is a fundamental concept of our national heritage evidenced in the Declaration of Independence, the motto "In God we trust," the oaths of office prescribed for public officials and the announcement opening sessions of the Supreme Court of the United States; and

Whereas in the custom practiced in the openings of the Congress of the United States, there is precept and example for beginning the deliberations of the day with spiritual thought; and

Whereas to permit children and young people to share similar nondenominational opening exercises in public schools provides an experience valuable in self-development of character and is a right inherent in the "free exercise" "of religion" clause of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, commend those States which by statute or permission afford to pupils attending public schools the right to participate in nondenominational opening exercises and call upon its membership to work toward the establishment of this custom in all States.

DISARMAMENT AND THE TEST BAN TREATY

Whereas in April 1962 at Geneva, Switzerland, the United States submitted an outline of basic provisions of a treaty on general and complete disarmament which provides for the eventual abandonment of U.S. military forces and for creation of a United Nations Peace Force so powerful that no nation could challenge it"; and

Whereas if this treaty outline were adopted, it would establish the United Nations as a world government from which there would be no escape and would leave this Nation defenseless; and

Whereas a nuclear test-ban treaty is regarded by its advocates as a necessary first step to complete and total disarmament and international control of the military, and in order to obtain such a treaty the United States has offered the Soviet Union appeasing concessions which would endanger national security; and

Whereas without a treaty approved by the Senate of the United States, it appears that the United States of America has embarked upon a program of unilateral disarmament which threatens national security and includes planned reduction of the National Guard, dismantling of missile bases in Turkey and Italy as demanded by the Soviet Union, elimination of the Skybolt program and phasing out of the entire manned bomber program: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge that this Nation be restored to a position of strategic superiority and oppose disarmament of this Nation by ratification of a test-ban treaty or by other means.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AND OTHER NEWS MEDIA

Whereas an accurately and fully informed citizenry is essential to the governing of a free nation; and

Whereas government manipulation of news is a form of censorship inconsistent with freedom of the press, the abridgement of which is prohibited by the Bill of Rights; and

Whereas the plea of "national security" has been offered to excuse "managed news," a device sometimes resorted to for political purposes: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, protest the use of "managed news" and urge adherence to the constitutional provisions of freedom of the press—one of the greatest safeguards of a free people.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE AND HEMISPHERIC DEFENSE

Whereas the Monroe Doctrine, since 1823, has been recognized as a cornerstone of American foreign policy; and

Whereas the subservience of the United States to the United Nations has permitted communism to become entrenched 90 miles off our shores in Cuba, which has become a base for hemispheric subversion; and

Whereas control of the strategic Panama Canal is a major Communist objective, and any surrender of our treaty rights, including the right to fly the flag of the United States of America exclusively in the Panama Canal Zone, is a grave threat to the defense of the Western Hemisphere: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge that the treaty rights of the United States of America in the Panama Canal Zone be maintained and the principles of the historic Monroe Doctrine be reinstated and implemented lest Cuba and other Latin American countries fall irretrievably to communism; be it further

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, declare that payment of international blackmail and failure to enforce the Monroe Doctrine corrupt the individual and collective conscience of America, undermine the will of the free nations to resist inroads of communism, and frustrate the hopes of all oppressed people.

FEDERALISM

Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America guarantees complete sovereignty and specific rights and privileges to its citizens and to the respective States; and

Whereas article X of the Bill of Rights states that "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people"; and

Whereas over the years there has been progressive encroachment upon the constitutional rights of the several States of the Union with serious impairment of their vested rights, liberties, and control of their institutions; and

Whereas Federal courts through recent decisions have directed reapportionment of legislative districts, thereby usurping the rights and powers of the legislatures of the several States, which decrees could ultimately divest the States of their sovereign rights and powers in the execution of their own internal affairs: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge cessation of these encroachments and a return to the States of their sovereign rights as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States of America.

NATIONAL SOLVENCY

Whereas the national debt of the United States of America now exceeds $300 billion, with annual interest of almost $10 billion; and

Whereas Federal taxation and expenditures have reached an all-time high which seriously threaten economic growth and the fiscal solvency of this Nation; and

Whereas foreign aid has created unfavorable balance of international payments with resultant loss of gold, thereby causing loss of confidence in the dollar at home and abroad; and

Whereas confidence in the dollar can be restored only through sound fiscal policies, balanced budgets and favorable international trade balances: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, alert its members to the need for their interest and effort toward attaining:

1. A revision of the Federal tax structure which will encourage individual, industrial, and business incentive.
2. A limit to Federal appropriations to Federal income so as to end deficit spending, except in time of national emergency.
3. Drastic reductions in foreign aid and other oversea spending so as to insure a favorable balance of payments, arrest the loss of gold, restore confidence in the dollar, and thereby insure economic growth and national solvency.

THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT OF 1952

Whereas a determined assault by leftwing forces has been launched to destroy the Nation's immigration law restrictions as embodied in the protective Immigration and Nationality Act; and

Whereas proposed legislation, if enacted, would increase the quota from 154,000 to 250,000 annually in addition to nonquota numbers which always are 2½ times quota numbers and transfer unused quotas from northern and western Europe to overpopulated areas of the world whose people are less easily assimilated into our culture and would place increased discretionary power in the hands of the then Attorney General to nullify barriers against undesirables and to suspend deportation of aliens guilty of crimes; and

Whereas increased immigration will add to our Nation's unemployment, housing, education, security, and other domestic problems: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, continue to support the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 and oppose weakening or liberalizing amendments.

UNITED NATIONS

Whereas, under the Uniting for Peace Resolution of 1950, much of the business of the United Nations was transferred to the General Assembly where the United States of America has one vote and no veto and where, in conjunction with the Soviet Union and her satellites, an anti-Western majority can be organized by which the interests of the United States and her associates can be consistently thwarted; and

Whereas the United Nations, established in 1945 ostensibly to keep the peace among nations, has demonstrated itself to be a political organization of force by its attack upon the subjugation of Katanga, thereby establishing a dangerous precedent for future action; and

Whereas all military affairs concerning the United Nations and its regional organizations, including those of NATO, which was primarily established to combat communism, pass through the hands of the Assistant Secretary of the Political and Security Council of the United Nations which office, by agreement, is now and always has been held by a Communist, thus making it possible to place these military decisions in the hands of the enemies of the United States of America; and

Whereas acquiescence of the United States of America in the evolution of the United Nations into a superstate, either through disarmament or gradual accrual of power by the United Nations, would destroy the constitutional Government and the national sovereignty of the United States of America: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, again state that the survival of this country as a free and independent nation depends upon its withdrawal from the United Nations.

COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

Whereas the 50 States of the United States of America contribute financially to the Council of State Governments, a subsidiary of the Public Administration Clearing House, where plans are made for uniformity in State laws; and

Whereas the Council of State Governments strongly advocates as primary legislation, public housing, urban renewal, metro government and other socialistic measures, which could take from individual communities their right of self-government; could add to the centralization of Federal power, to the violation of individual and property rights; and through its mental health affiliations infringe on the constitutional rights of our citizens: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, bring to all of its members information regarding this agency and of the tremendous influence exerted by it, in order that the members may alert the citizens of their respective States to the dangers posed by the Council of State Governments.

ATLANTIC COMMUNITY AND THE DECLARATION OF PARIS

Whereas there are powerful forces in this Nation calling for the creation of a regional supergovernment for the "Atlantic Community of Nations" with consequent loss of sovereignty of the United States of America; and

Whereas this plan, outlined in the Declaration of Paris, calls for the creation within 2 years of a true Atlantic community with harmonizing political, military and economic policies on matters affecting the community as a whole, and recommends an Atlantic High Court of Justice; and

Whereas such an Atlantic Community would be a forerunner to world government and would not be developed free of the United Nations, since the Declaration of Paris recommends that the governments of Atlantic Community countries accept compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice (World Court) with consequent loss of the protection of the Connolly reservation: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, reiterate its opposition to participation in any regional or international supergovernment in the belief that the hope of continuing freedom in the world depends upon the survival of the United States of America as a sovereign nation under constitutional government.

PERSONALITY TESTS

Whereas personality testing has become a nationwide industry conducted by self-styled guidance experts; and

Whereas hundreds of thousands of children, without their parents' knowledge or consent, as well as millions of employees of business and government are compelled to answer questions of a prying and intimate nature which violate their constitutional rights against search and seizure when applied to their minds; and

Whereas many of these questionnaires suggest deleterious ideas to the young that may never previously have entered their minds; and cause adults to resort to subterfuge and to "handle" tests rather than to answer them; and

Whereas the information garnered by these tests is stored in files or on electronic tape where it remains a threat of possible later misuse as blackmail by unscrupulous persons: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge its members to awaken their communities to the dangers and hazards of mass testing so as to rectify this usurpation of the freedom of the individual, this invasion of private family life, and this violation of constitutional guarantees.

DOMESTIC YOUTH CORPS

Whereas certain bills now pending in the Congress of the United States include: (1) The establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to enlist young men for made-work tasks in Federal and State forests, parks and public lands; (2) a youth public service corps program under which the Government would pay half the wages of approximately 15,000 persons to be expanded to 60,000 or more in 5 years at an annual outlay of $4,000 per enrollee, involving a possible total expenditure of $240 million for work in hospitals, clinics, community settlement houses, welfare agencies and recreation centers; (3) a national service or domestic Peace Corps under which young people would volunteer to work for meager pay among the Nation's needy, distressed and underprivileged; and

Whereas such Youth Corps would endanger and undermine the existing private youth organizations which have made outstanding contributions to the political, social and religious activities of this Nation, and would lead to substantial curtailment of local and private charity and voluntary social service; and

Whereas service rendered by the clergy, teachers, social workers and public and private agencies now provides assistance at the ratio of 1 worker for every 13 young men and women in the United States; and

Whereas creation of a governmentally sponsored Youth Corps for which there is no public demand could not only be manipulated as a political weapon but result in endangering the future of private youth organizations and delay the entrance of the youth of this Nation into the field of free enterprise: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, oppose the adoption of legislation creating domestic Youth Corps: Be it further

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, recommend the expansion of State and local vocational educational systems with emphasis on skills needed by the economy of the United States of America.

REDEDICATION

Whereas this Nation has a priceless heritage of faith in and dedication to the principles of justice and freedom established by our Founding Fathers as set forth in the Constitution of the United States of America; and

Whereas we face a critical period in the history of our country because the international Marxist-Socialist and world government advocates would weaken and destroy this Nation through subversion of this greatest of all documents;

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, rededicate itself to the preservation of our constitutional Republic and the fundamental principles upon which it was built so that we will be worthy of the sacred trust placed upon us by our forefathers who founded this country upon their faith in God, hard work, individual initiative and free enterprise: Be it

Resolved, That in carrying forward the objectives of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution we must "Be strong and a good courage."

APPRECIATION TO THE PRESIDENT GENERAL

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, express sincere gratitude to Mrs. Robert V. H. Duncan, for her excellent leadership throughout the year, the efficient manner of conducting this 72d continental congress, her kindly consideration at all times and dedication to the ideals of our society.

COURTESY RESOLUTION

Whereas the 72d continental congress of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution has been informative and enjoyable; and

Whereas this is due to the combined efforts of those planning the program and the participants: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, express its sincere appreciation to the officers, the chairmen and their committees, the pages, and all who had any part in the program, and especially to: Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones for his timely speech and to the Honorable JOHN G. TOWER for his dynamic message, the members of the staff for their loyal and courteous service during this congress and throughout the entire year; the U.S. service bands for their fine concerts, the musicians, artists, and choral groups and their accompanists for their contributions; the news media for their coverage of the 72d continental congress; the police and firemen for their courtesy, care, and protection; and everyone contributing to the success of this 72d continental congress.

APPRECIATION TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, express sincere appreciation to the chairman of the resolutions committee for her fulfillment of these exacting, and difficult duties, and recognizing her excellent work in this respect, express deep appreciation to Mrs. Elizabeth M. Cox for her considerate and faithful leadership.

The Future of American Seapower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most excellent and timely speeches on the subject of seapower was delivered by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], at the May 3 dinner of the American Society of Naval Engineers here in the Nation's Capital. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a copy of the speech in the RECORD with the hope that every Member of Congress will read it. The importance of seapower to our national defense cannot be overemphasized. What such an authority as Mr. VINSON has to say on the subject is worthy of consideration by everyone who is interested in the defense capabilities of our country.

The address follows:

THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN SEAPOWER

(Address by Hon. CARL VINSON, of Georgia, May 3, 1963)

Admiral Burke, Admiral Brockett, distinguished members of the American Society of Naval Engineers, and distinguished quests, it is a very great privilege to join with you on this historic occasion of your diamond jubilee.

There is no technical society in this Nation that can equal, or approach, your 75 years of dedicated service to our country.

I have known many members of your society in the past, and I know many of your members today.

I can say, with complete sincerity, that my life has been enriched by my association with the many members of your society who have done so much to further our way of life, and to preserve the heritage of our forefathers.

I am delighted to renew here tonight old friendships of many years, and that, in itself, gives me great pleasure.

But to be privileged to speak to you tonight is indeed an honor that I shall never forget.

There are among you here this evening many persons who have made outstanding contributions to our national security and our economy.

Some have received high honors in the naval profession.

Others have achieved great distinction in the design and construction of merchant and naval vessels.

But everyone present here tonight has one thing in common:

That is, a full appreciation of the importance of the sea, not only as a highway of commerce, or the outer defense of our mainland, but also because the resources of the ocean, its surface, and its depths, contain untold possibilities and challenges for the future generations of the world.

Today, we are making great strides in the conquest of space.

Travel above the sea, on the sea, and under the sea is now an accepted part of our daily life.

But we are merely on the threshold of knowledge of what the sea contains and what it still holds in store for all of us.

It has been my great privilege for many years to be closely associated with the development of our naval capabilities.

I became convinced in the 1930's that we had no choice but to engage in a substantial naval construction program in order that we might defend ourselves against the very real threat that was developing in the western Pacific.

We began that program, and I might say, none too soon.

Many members of this society here tonight will remember those days, for you played an important role in that vital naval expansion program.

I frequently find myself wondering what would have happened if we had not had a substantial number of naval combatant vessels under construction and near completion at the time of Pearl Harbor.

But those days are past and now we must look to the years ahead.

We must plan for the future, and remember that we achieved victory in the past because we exercised foresight long before the challenge was imminent.

But sometimes our memories are short.

At the end of World War II there were some who felt that the era of naval seapower had become a moldy page in history.

There were even a few who felt that amphibious operations were obsolete.

But it soon became apparent to others that the age of seapower was merely in its infancy.

Unfortunately, however, the importance of retaining the capability of defending our sealanes; of being able to conduct amphibious operations; and of being free of international complications as we transit the sea highways of the world, is a fact that must be constantly retold lest it be forgotten.

For reasons that I have never been able to fully understand, our naval superiority and capability seems to be taken for granted.

There are some who fail to realize that ships at sea or in mothballs do wear out.

There are others who do not seem to be convinced that technological progress in hull designs; new sources of power; longer cruising ranges; increased fire power; better maneuverability; and greater carrying capacity, must be constantly improved if we are to retain the one superiority we possess that no one can question.

And the Nation looks to you gentlemen for those indispensable improvements.

Today, thanks to you, we have the greatest Navy in the world—but, it is not necessarily an assured naval monopoly.

It is being challenged by the Soviet Union and unless we are willing to appropriate the funds that are necessary to preserve this superiority, we may one day awake to find that the challenger has surpassed us.

On any single day, 2,000 ships are engaged in traversing the sealanes between America and Europe. The cargo that is carried on the high seas is fantastic.

In 1961, approximately 300 million tons of cargo were carried by 100,000 shiploads to and from Europe and America.

More than one-third of the entire industrial production of the world, and one-half of the world production of raw materials is channeled to the needs of the economy of the United States.

Of 72 strategic and critical commodities indispensable to our economy in time of war, more than 40 are entirely imported from foreign sources.

Today, more than 75 percent of the commerce of the world is carried by some 16,000 ships of all flags.

By 1975, ships will probably carry annual cargoes in excess of 1,750 million tons.

And the significance of this forecast has not been lost by the Soviet Union. Since 1950, the seaborne foreign trade of the Soviet bloc has more than doubled.

It is impossible for anyone today to study a map of the world and not be made conscious of the importance of seapower.

But in studying a world map, there are certain road signs that cannot be overlooked.

The other day as I drove on a four-lane highway, I noticed a sign that said "Pavement narrows." A little further on, another sign said "Caution, one lane traffic only." And as I approached the single lane of traffic, a car broke down in front of me. In a matter of a few minutes all traffic on an otherwise beautiful, four-lane highway, going in both directions, came to a complete halt.

Translate that situation to the Straits of Gibraltar; to the Panama Canal; to the Straits of Malacca; to the Windward and the Leeward Passages; and that narrow strip of land between Denmark and Sweden, so narrow that even now a bridge connecting the two countries is under consideration.

These are vital areas of the world and if they are controlled by an enemy, a substantial portion of our world trade could be affected.

On the other hand, these same one-lane highways of the sea provide a great advantage to those who possess a naval capability, because each bottleneck is accessible to the sea.

Every area I have mentioned can be approached from the sea, and American seapower can be brought to bear whenever the control of the international sealanes is challenged.

In the years ahead, a large portion of the world will undoubtedly be sustained by the now untapped food sources that are contained in the sea about us.

Any nation that can deny hungry masses access to the sea may well control the world.

The indispensability of seapower is not waning—instead, it is waxing to a far greater extent than ever before.

If we will learn from the lessons of the past, we need only remember that our own victory at Yorktown was made possible by the blockade of the Chesapeake Bay by a French fleet.

If we go back further, we find that an English amphibious operation at Cadiz a year before the sailing of the Spanish Armada contributed greatly to the eventual defeat of the Spanish Fleet by Sir Francis Drake and others.

We need only look at Inchon and Lebanon, to be reminded of the fact that amphibious operations are not a thing of the past.

And in even more recent times, we need only the vital importance of the 7th Fleet and its ability to contain the Chinese in their desire to seize Formosa.

If there are still those who doubt the importance of seapower, let them refresh their memories on the quarantine of Cuba.

If there is one conclusion that can be drawn from this history of the past, it will be found on the Archives Building here in Washington where there is chiseled in granite the words—"What Is Past Is Prologue."

Today the Soviet Union is expanding its merchant fleet at a rapid rate. They are showing a very keen interest in the depths of the seas. And they are continuing to expand their submarine force and their surface craft.

They have not underestimated nor minimized the importance of seapower. Instead, they are readying themselves for the possible day when they may seek to challenge our seapower.

In my emphasis of the importance of seapower, I do not want to be considered parochial in any way.

The control of the seas, the urgency of continuing to expand our naval capability—under, on, and above the sea—is merely one element of our national security.

This was demonstrated clearly and unmistakably in the recent Cuban crisis.

Our intercontinental ballistic missiles stand as our major deterrent to nuclear war. With each passing day our missile capability increases.

But these are knockout weapons that would probably only be used as a last resort.

Long before that day arrives, and I pray that it will never arrive, the conflicting philosophies of the world will have matched their capabilities in a variety of ways.

It is for that reason that we must continue to modernize our Army so that it may possess both a conventional and nuclear capability.

It is for this same reason that the Strategic Air Force will, for years to come, play an essential role in our nuclear, limited nuclear, and conventional warfare capability.

But in addition, we must be ready to cope with guerrilla activities and all from of counter insurgency.

And because we know that there are other forms of mass destruction, we must continue our research in the fields of biological and chemical warfare.

Cuba proved the wisdom of the unified command structure system. It also demonstrated that the four separate services, each with its particular skills and techniques, can and do work together as a team under the overall direction of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and the President.

And Cuba proved the wisdom of maintaining the separate identity of each of the four services.

What we have in our Armed Forces today is a variety of specialists, all of whom are qualified, in one way or another, to practice the skills of the military profession, but each an artist in his own field.

Fortunately, we have not succumbed to the desire of some that all of our services be reduced to the lowest common denominator.

For many years, the Joint Chiefs of Staff system has been under attack. The argument in favor of a single Chief of Staff sounds quite plausible. If one man makes a decision and there is no one to argue with him, it is obviously the correct decision.

This may be a fine philosophy for bachelors, but I doubt if it would work very well for the average husband and wife.

And for the same reason—in order that conflicting views may be considered—it would not work well in assuring our national security.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff system brings together the leaders of each of the separate services in order that their opinions may be expressed and all proposals considered. No single prevailing concept can throttle the advocates of another concept while the Joint Chiefs of Staff continue to function.

I have become more thoroughly convinced with each passing year that it is the finest military decisionmaking body any nation has ever possessed.

And so long as we maintain the separate identity of the four services, and preserve the present Joint Chiefs of Staff system, I am convinced we will possess and expand our military and naval versatility.

And with each passing day I become more fully persuaded that our ability to respond to any type of challenge is our greatest deterrent to war.

So long as we have modern naval forces, ready to meet any aggressor;

So long as we can deliver from the air a substantial number of troops equipped and ready to fight;

So long as we can keep on station, for long periods of time, submarines capable of discharging their missiles from underwater;

So long as we maintain mobile, trained divisions equipped with modern weapons;

So long as we keep in an alert status our manned bomber force whose pilots possess that unique human ability to make or be responsive to a decision;

So long as we have 190,000 fully trained Marines ready to land in any part of the world accessible from the sea;

And so long as we back all of this with an awesome missile might—then we will preserve the peace of the world.

But if we ever permit ourselves to be lulled into the adoption of a single defense concept and lose our flexibility to respond to any type of aggression, then we will threaten the peace of the world.

The challenges that lie ahead in the areas of the ocean alone, without regard to space and land, are fantastic indeed.

While we have made great progress, nevertheless we have not yet perfected an underwater detection technique that will pinpoint the location and identity of every submarine.

We are only beginning to learn something about the physical features of the vast land area that is submerged under 300 million cubic miles of water.

And somehow or other we must face up to the fact that we have no choice but to accelerate the replacement of our aging fleet.

The average age of our naval vessels in the active fleet is more than 15 years. The average life expectancy is 20 years.

No degree in mathematics is required to conclude that we have a fleet that is rapidly becoming obsolescent, and in a few years will become obsolete.

We are going to have to engage in an expanded naval shipbuilding program. And we cannot take comfort in the naive conclusion that a modern naval vessel can do the job of two older ships.

Life doesn't work that way. We can never assume that enemy capabilities remain dormant while ours improve.

But beyond that is the obvious fact that the ocean is playing an ever-increasing role in the ambitions of Communist imperialism.

Today our naval vessels are needed in the Atlantic, the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf, the Indian Ocean, the Straits of Formosa, the Pacific, the Caribbean, and even as far south as the Antarctic Ocean.

As our problem areas expand, the requirement for seapower expands correspondingly to meet these threats to the peace of the world.

Recently we witnessed the invasion of India by China. There can be little doubt that further difficulties can be expected in this area.

We may very well have to commit a portion of our fleet to that part of the world, but if we do so now, it will have to be at the expense of weakening our capabilities in other parts of the world.

Mankind is becoming increasingly dependent upon the natural resources of the sea.

Our ability to utilize and protect these resources will depend upon the decisions we make now.

It is my considered judgment that seapower and our continuing ability to preserve the freedom of the seas and the availability of its products may well determine the future destiny of this Nation, and perhaps of all mankind.

The control of the seas is indispensable to our progress—and our survival.

The members of this great society have a tremendous responsibility—for the future of this Nation may well rest upon your ability to produce the ships that will maintain the freedom of the seas for generations of Americans yet unborn.

Industrialists Tour Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, eastern Connecticut was host for 2 days this week to about 150 industrialists, real estate brokers and development experts from New York who came to look over the area for the possible location of industrial sites. They visited 43 towns, most of them in my district in the eastern part of the State, and, according to newspaper reports, "they liked what they saw." They were the guests of the Connecticut Industrial Development Council and were warmly received by all.

There is no question that this area is extremely well suitable for industrial sites. It has fine rivers and harbors, excellent locations, plenty of space, good highways, many other facilities—and, above all, an excellent labor force which includes many people possessing various occupational skills. In addition, the area has ideal recreational facilities and probably the best educational institutions in the country. It is no wonder that this region is one of the fastest growing areas in the country today.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert into the RECORD an excellent editorial published in the Norwich Bulletin of May 14, 1963, and a news story which appeared in the same newspaper, dealing with the tour of the industrialists and brokers through eastern Connecticut. I am sure that their experiences and the welcome given them by the people of Connecticut will be of interest to other firms who may be in the market for a possible industrial site.

The editorial and the news story are as follows:

Welcome to Eastern Connecticut

We who live in eastern Connecticut and who take an intense interest in the industrial development of this area welcome the visit of some 115 out-of-State industrial real estate brokers, consultants, engineers and development experts as they embark on a 2-day rail tour of Connecticut. We sincerely hope that their visit to the area may have fruitful results and that they may gain some useful knowledge of available industrial sites along the route they will follow.

We realize that it is impossible for the visitors to make on-spot inspection of sites as they are scheduled to visit some 43 towns during their 2-day stay in Connecticut. However, we know that with transportation facilities available in this area, both rail and water, there are plenty of industrial sites along the Thames River and the central Vermont railroad which can be seen from the train. We urge the real estate men and the State development officials to pay special attention to these desirable sites.

The Connecticut Industrial Development Council has prepared a brochure listing some 63 sites available for industrial development which will be given to the visitors. Supplementing the brochures there should be emphasis put on the fact that Connecticut, being the industrial State that it is, has a labor force that is as skilled as any area in the country.

While the train is moving through this area the CIDC officials will explain the availability of the industrial sites, the topography of each site, and the ready access to transportation via our fine roads in the State's highway network. These verbal explanations should give the visitors a clear picture of the industrial potentials of the State, especially the eastern Connecticut area. While it is conceded that the area east of the Connecticut River is the fastest expanding area in the State we who live here know that there is room, as well as a need, for more industry.

Without seeming to be overoptimistic we know that the country along the Connecticut shoreline, along the Thames Valley and points north to Stafford Springs can provide industrial sites that are the equal of any in the Nation. Two railroads, the Central Vermont and the New Haven, provide rail transportation. The Thames River is a navigable river from New London to Norwich with railroads on each side. Good highways are able to care for overland transportation to accommodate any of the needs of industry. The eastern Connecticut area is approximately halfway between Boston and New York on the Connecticut Turnpike, which already has brought some industry to the area.

Besides all this, eastern Connecticut is blessed with fire elementary and secondary schools and other institutions of learning at the college level. We have ideal recreation facilities including beaches and parks. There is an excellent airport at Groton; a fine harbor at the mouth of the Thames River.

All in all this area is extremely well adapted to the location of new industry, whether light or heavy, and we sincerely hope that the visitors will gain something of value by their visit to Connecticut. We wish them a pleasant and profitable journey.

Industrialists and Brokers Tour Eastern Connecticut

Some 150 Connecticut and New York industrialists, bankers, and brokers left New York City's Grand Central Station early Tuesday morning with one object in mind—"let's look at Connecticut."

And, when the group returns to New York City tonight they will have toured 43 of Connecticut's 169 towns.

Guests of the Connecticut Industrial Development Council, the group of industrial real estate brokers and consultants viewed, or will view, more than 100 choice industrial sites, ranging from locations in modern industrial parks to underdeveloped farmland surrounding urban centers. Statisticians estimate some 80,000 acres of land have been specifically prepared for industrial use. Many thousands more are being developed for that purpose. Indications are they liked what they saw.

The special train first touched Fairfield County's industrial center of which Bridgeport is the pivotal city. Along the tracks of the New Haven Railroad, the tour passed through New Haven, then up along the shore route to New London where the Bulletin representative boarded the train.

At New London, the train switched to the Central Vermont Railroad and headed up the Thames River. As they left New London railroad station attention focused on General Dynamics Corp.'s Electric Boat, the Charles Pfizer Co., and the submarine base.

Much interest was noted when the train slowed for views of the area's newer residents, Dow Chemical in Ledyard and Olin Mathieson's United Nuclear Division in Montville.

Traveling north from New London into Norwich, tour directors focused attention on the city's harbor. They stressed Norwich's urban renewal program and told the Water/Commerce Streets renewal project story.

The city's industries were described and where possible, particular buildings were pointed out to brokers and developers. (We were sitting next to a New York City broker who took much interest in the city's Hollyhock Island as a potential industrial site. "You know," he mused, "I might have a client interested in a site like this.")

Each tour participant upon boarding the train was handed an illustrated brochure describing not only the site visited, but pertinent facts about the city itself.

NORWICH INDUSTRIAL SITE

The Goor-Hilderbrand and Joberg sites—some 59 acres under three owners—fronts Otrobando Avenue, Wawecus Street, and the Central Vermont Railway, near the Connecticut Turnpike. It is described as natural clear land, mostly level, with sand and gravel subsoil.

It was in Yantic that the group of industrialists got an enthusiastic welcome by members of the Yantic Fire Department. The train slowed to a crawl while the many top executives nodded approval at the "spit and polish" of the company's century-old hand pumper.

Heading toward Willimantic, the Dawley-Beebe site in the Fitchville section of Bozrah was pinpointed.

In Lebanon, some 125 acres of natural, clear, rolling land located at Lebanon station was described as ideal for industry. So was land owned by the Czaekes, some 107 acres of it situated on Route 32.

It was in North Windham train riders witnessed the greatest enthusiasm. As the diesel engine whirred its way along the tracks, townspeople carrying placards telling what a great place North Windham is—lined the right of way.

UP TO MASSACHUSETTS

As the train approached Willimantic much of the conversation reverted from Astronaut L. Gordon Cooper's postponed 22-orbital flight to "Where is American Screw Co. located"?

The 429,500 square-foot plant, now standing vacant and for sale on a site near the Willimantic River, brought many inquiries from some of the industrialists aboard.

The tour continued through Mansfield, Willington on to Stafford Springs where it then retraced itself to Willimantic.

A New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad crew came aboard at Willimantic and the train departed for Hartford and an overnight stop at the Tobacco Valley Inn.

The group attended a dinner and reception Tuesday night where they were welcomed by Governor Dempsey.

Wednesday morning tour guests will travel by bus to Brainard Field, from where they will resume rail travel along the New Haven Railroad's armory branch, viewing the sites north of Hartford to the Connecticut-Massachusetts line.

John J. O'Donnel, director of industrial relations at Combustion Engineering, Inc., Windsor, will address the group during a noon luncheon in the Terrace Room at Bradley Field, Windsor Locks.

The tour is the eighth such undertaking held in recent years, by the CIDC, which includes: Central Vermont Railway, Connecticut Bank and Trust Co., Connecticut Development Commission, Connecticut Development Credit Corp., Connecticut Light & Power Co., Fairfield County Trust Co., First New Haven National Bank, Hartford Electric Light Co., Hartford Gas Co., Hartford National Bank & Trust Co., New Haven Railroad, Southern New England Telephone Co., and United Illuminating Co.

Community Benefits From Abilities of the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate the prize-winning essay, written by a young lady from Mount St. Joseph Academy in West Hartford, Conn. Her name is Maureen Sennett and her essay was the winner in the State of Connecticut contest sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Maureen and her parents attended the annual meeting of the President's Committee in Washington on May 9 and 10 as guests of the Connecticut State Labor Council AFL–CIO. She received a prize of $500 which was donated by Connecticut industry through the cooperation of the Manufacturers Association of Connecticut.

Maureen's essay points up remarkable contributions being made to our communities and our businesses by handicapped people. It is a thoughtful, perceptive and informative article about a subject upon which every American should be informed. It is an encouraging report of the progress that State-Federal programs of vocational rehabilitation are making in aiding handicapped persons to help themselves and to make a full contribution to our economy.

I congratulate Maureen Sennett on her essay and in order that it may be widely read I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MY COMMUNITY BENEFITS FROM THE ABILITIES OF THE HANDICAPPED

(By Maureen E. Sennett)

"Community exists where there is an ordered participation in a structured society; a sense of community is a feeling of participation in one or several such communities, and a community culture is one whose members are able to participate in a harmonized series of communities (family, tribe, work group, city church, nation)."[1] The key word to this statement is "participation" for without a sharing of interests and responsibilities no community can exist.

The community is composed of individuals, persons who by their nature as human beings need to belong to a group. No man is self-sustaining; he needs others. So, too, whether it be directly or indirectly, others feel the void left by the laxity or inability of a single person. A community is only able to succeed as long as the individual members or citizens contribute. Each must become aware of his own goals and assume the responsibility to move toward them. He must strive to understand, to guide, and to correct, if necessary, the group of which he is a part. This task is difficult to accomplish in the complex societies of today.

The handicapped person as a member of the community is subject to responsibilities which he must bear himself or which must be assumed by others. By leading a life as close to normal as possible, the disabled individual benefits his community. The obstacles he faces in reaching toward normality greatly exceed the confusion, indecision, or financial difficulties opposing a more average citizen. He must compensate for his own handicap and surmount the general public's failure to understand and appreciate his skills. Many have overcome their handicaps and lead nearly normal lives. They are examples and sources of strength to those still trying to prove their worth.

Sources of rehabilitation are available to the handicapped. During the 1961 fiscal year, 92,000 disabled persons were employed through the State-Federal program of vocational rehabilitation—thus marking the sixth consecutive year of gains in the number of people aided by this program.

Disabled individuals are good workers. "What the handicapped lose in flexibility because of their disability, they make up by concentrating on a single job, or a few jobs, learning to do them better."[2] They compensate for their losses and make advantages of their remaining faculties.

Many employers feel that workers with physical disabilities are better-than-average employees. Adjectives describing the handicapped used by personnel directors in a "Survey of Employers' Practices and Policies in the Hiring of Physically Impaired Workers" are: "More reliable," "more conscientious," "and sometimes even healthier than able-bodied workers." These words are tributes to the disabled worker. Moreover, they are backed by facts. For example, at Abilities, Inc., a subcontracting plant employing only the handicapped, there has been only a 4-percent rate of rejection (as compared to a normal rate of 40 percent) in the manufacture of delicate units for aircraft radar equipment. Here, also, the rate of absenteeism based on 100 average working days has been established at 0.03 days as compared to 3.3 days for the normal worker.

A physical impairment is not a guarantee to accident proneness and absenteeism. "* * * An accurate knowledge of physical conditions is really the safest condition possible * * *"[3] in the opinion of some employers. The exact capabilities of the physically impaired are known; they work within their physical limitations at jobs suited to their abilities. Often the disabled are safer than the seemingly normal worker who is without sufficient medical care.

In 1961 10 handicapped persons began the first home-work program in the Hartford area. They aided in the manufacture of disposable veterinary syringes produced by Silver Fuller Industries. "In addition to helping themselves the workers have helped Silver Fuller avoid buying some $20,000 in machinery it would have otherwise needed."[4]

Other members of the Hartford community are also proving their ability to lead nearly normal lives. St. Francis Hospital presently employs a blind young woman to process film in the darkroom of the X-ray department. There her blindness does not prove to be a handicap. Her supervisor states:

"The quality of her work is superior to that of other people who do the same type of work. This is due to her attention to detail in the processing of film and one can be certain that instructions given to her are followed to the letter. An additional aid in her work is an acute sense of hearing. At times progress of the films is stopped by jamming. She is aware of this instantly from a change in the type of noise in the machines."

In addition to working efficiently, this young woman is able to travel to and from the hospital, and move through its corridors unassisted.

Disabled persons are able to become productive community members. Why? These people have overcome great crises in their lives and have lifted themselves back to normality. According to most standards it seems that the handicapped individual has lost much. Truly he has gained. He is a deep, full individual who has proved to himself his own dignity and abilities. He feels his losses but he is able to compensate for these; more important—he values and uses his remaining faculties. He has formed the strong character of the type citizen this Nation and each of its communities need.

---

[1] Andrew M. Greely, "Strangers in the House," first edition (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1961).

[2] "Hiring the Handicapped," Time, Apr. 25, 1955, p. 96.

[3] Walter P. Muther, "Proof That Hiring the Handicapped Can Be Good Business," Industry, April 1958.

[4] Whitney Jacobs, "Handicapped Begin First Home-Work Program," the Hartford Times, Sept. 16, 1961.

Financial Support for the Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a nation is judged by its values as well as its technology. It is no secret that artists in the United States sometimes feel that they live in a feast or famine world—they are either the well-paid leaders of a popular fad, or they work unnoticed at honest attempts to express experience, feeling, or representation in ways that have not been expressed before.

Obviously, government has only a small part to play in any artistic effort. On the other hand, that small part can be an essential part, because it indicates that the citizens of a nation or a community feel strongly enough about their culture to give public attention and some support.

A thoughtful editorial in the May 14 edition of the Camden Courier-News explores our present stalemate in Congress on one of the key proposals for a national policy on the arts. It also expresses some hope that President Kennedy's Advisory Arts Council will help us find the way. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR THE ARTS

Although it has bipartisan support, a proposal to create a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts appears unlikely to make much headway in the present Congress.

President Kennedy has decided not to await legislative action, which he would have preferred. He soon will appoint such a council on his own initiative. It will consist of 20 to 30 Americans distinguished in the arts. It will have no appropriation and will serve until Mr. Kennedy leaves office.

One prominent prospect for appointment to the council is Dr. Howard Hanson, director of the Eastman School for Music at Rochester, N.Y. In considering what contribution the council can make to the arts, Dr. Hanson sees three possibilities:

1. It could serve as a fact gatherer for the arts. There now is no place in Government where one may go for full data on the arts. Only recently the Office of Education appointed an official on music data.

2. It could and should make a factual study of the creative and performing arts so there would be no need of speculation over the adequacy of artists' salaries, aid for aspiring students, and financial support for the arts.

3. It could serve as a focal point to provide moral support for those engaged in or interested in taking part in the arts.

Authorities agree that America is in the midst of a cultural boom. Yet behind it lies a disturbing paradox. Artists feel—with reason—that they are financially neglected.

In a country traditionally opposed to financial support of culture except for libraries, subsidies are nevertheless one answer, however dubious.

Dr. Hanson, who describes himself as conservative, says he is reaching the reluctant conclusion that Government support must come if the arts are to attract the talent demanded by an arts-conscious nation. He suggests that the support be administered on a city-State matching basis so that communities cannot default on their own responsibilities.

This point is academic so long as Congress declines even to create an advisory council. But the key issue obviously is how the arts are to be fostered and supported if they are to surmount financial barriers.

Perhaps President Kennedy's appointment of his Advisory Arts Council will help focus nationwide attention on this cultural dilemma.

Security Firing Without Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the House recently passed H.R.

950, to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950, by a large 340-to-40 majority. I voted with the minority.

Last year the House also passed an identical bill, H.R. 12082, by an even larger majority, 351 to 24. However, the Senate failed to take action and the measure died with the end of the 87th Congress.

I know of no one who has any dispute with the stated objectives of this bill: To establish a legislative base for enforcing a strict security standard for the employment, and retention in employment, of persons in the National Security Agency; to achieve maximum security for the activities of the Agency; and to strengthen the capability of the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the Agency to provide such security.

The first section of the bill—301—provides that all employment by, detail to, or assignment to NSA, as well as access to classsified information must be "clearly consistent with the national security." Certainly, there is no quarrel with this section.

The second section—302—provides for a full field investigation before a new employee of NSA is cleared and establishes a board of appraisal to review cases in which the Director of NSA feels there is doubt whether access to security information would be clearly consistent with the national security. Again, there is no objection to these provisions.

The third section—303—provides for termination of employment of any officer or employee of NSA by the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, "whenever he considers that action to be in the interest of the United States, and he determines that the procedures prescribed in other provisions of law that authorize the termination of the employment of that officer or employee cannot be invoked consistent with the national security."

This same section indicates that "such a determination is final."

Subsection (b) of this section indicates that an employee discharged under the provisions of the section will have to obtain a certificate of eligibility from the Civil Service Commission in order to seek or accept employment with any other department or agency of the United States.

The meaning and implications of this third section of H.R. 950 is what disturbed me and caused me to cast my vote against passage of the measure.

This section vests the Secretary of Defense with the summary and unreviewable power to discharge any employee of the National Security Agency. No hearing whatever is to be granted the employee. No matter how many years he may have been employed, he is not entitled to know what the charges are against him, nor who made them. The only standard by which the Secretary is to be guided is that his action is "in the interest of the United States."

I thoroughly and emphatically disagree with this procedure. For I do not believe that the requirement that an employee receive a full and fair hearing before termination of his employment need in any way jeopardize the personnel security of the National Security Agency.

In my opinion, the firing of Government employees, under security stigma, without charges, without opportunity to answer, without confrontation of accusers, without counsel and without fairness, is an affront to the historic American concept of due process of law.

This kind of legislation is not only not necessary for our national security, it can be an open invitation to punitive and vindictive personnel action.

The procedure for hearings, appeal and review established in other sensitive agencies of the U.S. Government are effective and workable. They are an asset, not a liability, because they strengthen morale and diminish the chance of mistaken identity, prejudice, and other serious errors of judgment.

These adversary proceedings grow out of a long Anglo-American experience in the administration of justice—out of a knowledge that confrontation and cross-examination are invaluable devices for discovering the truth.

H.R. 950 abolishes the necessity to conduct hearings; it abolishes the normal right of an employee to have stated to him the reason he is being fired. The bill abolishes an employee's normal right to submit a statement on his own behalf, whether it be in secret or whether it be in public hearings. And it waives all of the existing provisions of law contained in the United States Code designed to give an employee minimum safeguards in the Government service.

Moreover, H.R. 950 abolishes any right of court review. Finally, there is the power of the Secretary to delegate this vast power to any subordinate employee he chooses.

When we are dealing with the ever-increasing power of the Central Government, proper and adequate procedures are often as important as the substance of the law being applied. And when you gather together this amount of potentially arbitrary dismissal power in the hands of the Central Government, with no review, no hearing, no check, and no appeal, then you have created something of which we all may well be afraid.

In short, the third section of this bill violates basic American constitutional concepts and is inconsistent with the principles of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence.

It gives the Secretary of Defense the authority to summarily fire any employee of the National Security Agency without the benefit of the hard-won and jealously guarded rights of administrative due process—one of the hallmarks of our civilization.

H.R. 950 is a product of cold war hysteria, a hangover from the regrettable days of McCarthyism. We do not need this kind of inquisitorial legislation in America. Our strongest weapon against totalitarian communism is our own Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

H.R. 950 is offensive to these concepts of justice and fair play. It does not contribute one iota to our security, but rather sets an extremely dangerous precedent threatening the liberties of our fellow Americans.

We are ill advised to fight communism by adopting the star-chamber techniques developed to a fine point by world communism itself. Nor will we advance the cause of freedom and liberty by voluntarily and unnecessarily restricting and circumscribing our precious heritage of constitutional provisions guaranteeing those freedoms and liberties.

Mayor Tate on the State of the City of Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, on April 18, 1963, the distinguished mayor of the city of Philadelphia, the Honorable James H. J. Tate delivered a message on the state of the city before the Council of the City of Philadelphia. The message shows such progress in our great city that I feel every Member can read this message with great interest.

The message follows:

A MESSAGE ON THE STATE OF THE CITY BY MAYOR JAMES H. J. TATE, APRIL 18, 1963

To the President and Members of the Council of the City of Philadelphia:

This is the second time it has been my privilege to come before you to render an accounting of my stewardship as mayor. My first appearance before you in this capacity was a new experience, even though I had served with your honorable body for 10 years, including 6 as your presiding officer.

At that time, I had held the high office of mayor for slightly longer than 3 months.

At that time, the state of our city was such that we could stand firmly on the foundations built by a decade of enlightened government.

At that time, there was—and quite naturally so—some question of whether this administration would build upon these foundations, or let them weaken and crumble.

At this time, the state of our city message, a year later, provides the answers—the answers that I bring you today. The answers should satisfy the severest skeptics. They should fortify the sincerest supporters.

A DYNAMIC PATTERN

The state of our city shows clearly that we are not only building upon the foundations of our city's renaissance, but that we are breaking new ground with the same foresight that fashioned our current progress. Essentially, it has been a year of continuation—continuing not only the projects that had been started, but continuing the dynamic pattern of government administration in concert with dedicated citizens and groups—always receptive to change, to improve, to act and to react, in the public interest.

I stated last year that my message was not a swan song of an era, but a fanfare—a preview of things to come. And they came.

I said we needed more police protection. We got it.

I said we needed more parking spaces. We began to acquire them.

I said we had to pay some more serious attention to the business of government and administration. We have done this.

I said our financial stability and growth factors would enable us to plan new programs without necessitating any increases in taxes at all. We did not raise taxes. Indeed, we were able to lower our water rates as the result of a study directed by your honorable body.

But the file is not closed on any of these accomplishments. They are being further expanded.

PUBLIC SAFETY STRENGTHENED

In the field of public safety, increased appropriations and administrative changes made possible the assignment of more than 500 additional uniformed police to district on-the-street work.

An additional crime deterrent is our program for accelerating the installation of high-intensity mercury vapor lights at a cost of nearly $1 million for which city council provided the initiative. Over the next 3 years, every residential neighborhood in the city will have these brighter lights, which will add substantially to the public safety.

We must not be content to write off the problem of crime as a natural part of urban living. Despite the fact that our crime rate is the lowest of all the other major cities in the Nation, we must recognize that our victims of crime do the same amount of suffering as elsewhere. We are, therefore, pledged to maintain our policy of placing the maximum number of able-bodied uniformed men on the street, while limiting administrative functions of the department to civilians wherever possible.

PARKING—RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL

Our efforts in combating the problem of parking show progress, although we have not, quite frankly, come near to a solution—if one is ever to be found. We did increase the number of city-sponsored facilities by 25 percent, providing spaces which were used a half-million times last year.

This year, we were finally able to start an off-street parking program for residential neighborhoods. It has been slow starting due to the many problems involved, but it is underway. This has become a real responsibility of Government. It is our responsibility to meet the public needs in changing times, and to do it quickly. The problem of parking in residential neighborhoods is no less serious than in commercial areas. We are preparing the acquisition of 16 sites in residential areas which will be converted for off-street parking. Legislation to accomplish this will reach you shortly. We are confident this program will alleviate some dangerous congestion. It is a problem that can't be ignored. It can't be put off. It won't go away. It must be met.

GOVERNMENT ETHICS AND EFFICIENCY

Nor can we ignore any internal problems of administration. I pledged last year that I would run a taunt ship. Since then, the lines have been drawn, clearly and cleanly, and in the proper direction. I instituted a series of directives based upon recommendations of the Fordham committee to improve the course and climate of the Government. I believe this purpose will be fulfilled.

Our strength lies in the confidence of a knowledgeable public. We cannot conceal. Nor can we shade the facts as they are. Our job is to make sure, however, that the facts are what they should be. When they are not—and realistically they can't always be right—we must move forthrightly in the public interest to correct them. This is true in an election year, or any other year. When you move boldly in a spotlight, your interest in the public's behalf will be unmistakeable. Only when one moves in a shadow, is there any question as to motivation.

There will be distractions and controversy. The sounds won't all be applause. The notices won't all be raves. But this show—this business of running the Government—must go on with conviction, doing the greatest good for the greatest audience, unmindful of the taunts of a few, or the repercussions from necessary decisions made in orderly fashions.

We should not be deterred from carrying out our responsibilities, simply because of the fear that our actions might be exploited for partisan gain by detractors.

PROBLEM OF UNEMPLOYMENT

For example, we must face up to the fact that probably the most serious problem facing our city today is unemployment. To ignore this and dwell only upon the shining accomplishments would not be giving you an accurate picture.

This problem was not born overnight. It has been with us—with 9 to 12 percent unemployed—ever since the recession of 1954. Although our economy is comparatively prosperous, there is a depression on for each man and woman who is out of a job. The Federal Government, of course, has primary responsibility for easing this problem, but we also must feel a local obligation to each citizen.

What have we done about it? We have moved in this past year on a number of fronts to attack this socio-economic problem.

The unemployed, bracketing both sexes in all age groups, have a common characteristic. More than half are unskilled or semiskilled. Most of them either never entered high school, or dropped out before completing their studies.

As one means of approaching this problem, I appointed a manpower utilization commission to spearhead a broad-scale program of training and retraining. This commission has three goals—finding means of getting people back to work now, studying skills that will be needed in the next 5 years, and a 10-year projection aimed at training for boys and girls who are now in school.

It is a paradox that despite the numbers of unemployed, there are actual shortages of workers for newly developing jobs requiring special skills. We therefore moved promptly last year with State and Federal assistance to establish training and retraining classes. Although the program is still developing, at least 70 percent of those who have used it to date have found related jobs.

At still another level, I immediately adopted the report of the mayor's advisory commission on higher education calling for establishing a 2-year community college. I have made this an important plank in our city's legislative program, because it is necessary to fill the gap between the high school and 4-year college level. It is being developed by a bipartisan citizens committee, and we are awaiting favorable action by the State legislature.

In yet another approach, the city's fast action through a special task force I created to take advantage of the Federal accelerated public works program has provided jobs for some 1,500 workers, with more to come. This involved moving up a series of projects in our capital program to make applications which could bring us some $10 million in Federal funds.

Our full participation in this program, therefore, not only has saved a very substantial sum and provided additional employment, but it has also speeded the overall development of our city.

This awareness, this alertness, this willingness to act, to test the untested, to lead the way in attacking the problems besetting our urban economy, pioneering without waiting for someone else to show us how it is done, are consistent with the dynamic pattern of government administration that Philadelphians expect, and I have pledged to continue.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

This has been demonstrated by the results of our industrial development program, which is creating thousands of jobs and millions of dollars of new tax ratables to sustain and to advance our economic growth. We can say today, without qualification, that there is no great exodus of industry from Philadelphia. We can say today, without qualification, that the trend is for local industry to expand in Philadelphia, and for outside industry to move into Philadelphia.

Throughout last year we had delegations from major cities, including New York City—the Nation's largest—visiting us to learn what has made our program so successful. To date, the Philadelphia Industrial Development Corp. has been responsible for saving 10,000 jobs in the city, creating more than 4,500 new jobs, and promoting the investment of some $40 million of private capital. It is just beginning to operate in high gear, since its organization in 1958.

However, citations, commendations, and records are only worthwhile if they serve as building blocks to more and greater accomplishment. Our good business climate has been acclaimed by the Harvard Business Review and Fortune magazine. But we must move positively to keep that climate, and even seek further improvement.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

With this in mind, I launched a program to utilize further the high concentration of academic and scientific capacity in our area. The Philadelphia area leads the Nation in training advanced scientific brainpower for business, for industry, for defense and space technology. We have, in fact, been described as the brains capital of the Nation.

I would like to see the recipient of this training remain here and work here. To do this, we are working to obtain more research and development contracts for Philadelphia businesses and institutions. Several months ago I met with leading business, industry, educational, scientific, and government representatives to set this program in motion. And only last week, I asked officials of the Commercial Communications Satellite Corp. to consider our well-documented proposal of Philadelphia as the logical headquarters for this new organization with its expected 5,000 employees. We must be alert to every such opportunity. We must constantly be prepared to exploit properly our tremendous assets.

Such public-interest-minded aggressiveness has marked talks underway with several different Government agencies in an attempt to have them locate facilities here. The dividends are apparent, in the new Internal Revenue Service Data Processing Center in the Northeast, in the $42 million Federal Office Building, and in the new $17 million mint. All will bring new purchasing power and more jobs.

NEED FOR EDUCATION

It is not enough, however, to create new jobs, without a qualified labor force to fill them. Inherent in any employment study is education. As I have already noted, more than half of the unemployed never entered high school, or failed to finish. The problem of education has been brought into sharper focus in Philadelphia recently with a financial crisis that confronts the school board but concerns every citizen.

It is of primary concern to this administration. This has been demonstrated this past year more than ever before, when at my direction, the city administration for the first time worked together with the board of education on a regular basis in planning and finance, to the extent that such cooperation could be achieved without infringing upon the autonomy of the school board.

The board's current financial crisis has been approached in a fitting bipartisan manner, and the resultant tax proposals should have everyone's support. Whatever drawbacks any tax proposals might have should pale in the light of the overwhelming responsibility that is ours, to prepare our children for tomorrow.

MASS TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

Such planning has been the guiding force of our city government. For example the distant tomorrows in the field of mass transportation which were being planned a few short years ago are here today in Philadelphia. We are unquestionably the national leaders in providing fast, economical, convenient, and balanced transportation. But we have even bigger plans, which are necessary for our future.

Last year, I advanced the construction schedule for extending the Broad Street subway into the northeast as a companion project with the extension into South Philadelphia. As a result, we have received $770,000 in Federal planning funds for this top priority improvement, and we have applied for additional funds.

Our commuter railway program, which we resurrected from rust and regression, has spread to new stations, as we inject new equipment and new service into this rejuvenated form of transportation.

We have demonstrated what can be done in the field of mass transportation in Philadelphia, and will see further results later this month when the first of 55 new, air-conditioned railway commuter cars will be completed for testing.

Our commuter lines expanded through the southeastern Pennsylvania transportation compact last year, with immediate and enthusiastic public response. All of this, we now feel, has set the stage for a regional mass transit agency to operate a unified and correlated system. Such a system would tie in, of course, with the Delaware River Port Authority's high-speed transit line that will connect Philadelphia with nearby communities in south Jersey.

Such a system would include not only our commuter lines, but also the subway, elevated, bus, and streetcar lines. Such a positive approach became markedly apparent last year following the disastrous public transportation strike, which is now history.

The factors in the dispute were an old story, of course, to Philadelphians. I did not believe that our fare riders should be used again as pawns in such a dispute, and our refusal to surrender to a general fare increase at least resulted finally in keeping our school fares from rising. I do not honestly believe that any antistrike legislation would solve this recurring problem. Warnings against such regressive and negative legislation have been sounded by former Labor Secretary and Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg. Rather than apply stopgap measures of questionable merit, I believe we should survey the entire scope of the problem, and then move boldly and firmly on a program calculated not only to correct drawbacks but to meet increasing future needs. For this reason, I dispatched a special task force of the city's financial, legal, and transit experts on a cross-country tour to survey other mass transit systems. Their studies will enable us eventually to establish a regional agency that will embody the best features. I look to your honorable body, which in the past has provided the know-how, approval, and support to enable us to pioneer in the field of transportation, to continue your most necessary cooperation.

FEDERAL LEGISLATION

Our experience in this field has been studied by the Federal Government in its consideration of mass transportation legislation. Last month, for the second time within a year. I was called to Washington to testify on this legislation before congressional committees. The Senate bill passed a few weeks ago, and we are hopeful that the legislation will have similar success in the House.

One of the projects we hope to speed up with resultant Federal assistance is the underground link between the Reading and Pennsylvania Railroad stations in Center City. This would enable thousands of officeworkers, shoppers, and businessmen to travel into town and home again with a maximum of convenience and a minimum of expense.

This will be a vital link connecting Penn Center and development on West Market Street, with Market Street East and Independence Mall. In Market Street East, for which plans for further development were announced early this year, our objective is to make it one of the world's prime tourist and shopping centers.

I think you will agree with me, that when we in Philadelphia speak of such superlatives, we mean it. We have only to look at what we have done, to realize what we can do.

CENTER CITY PROGRESS

A significant milestone in the progress of Center City was marked this week by breaking ground for the first new construction in Independence Mall—the $10 million headquarters office buliding of Rohm & Haas. Within the past 2 weeks plans were announced for yet another major improvement in Center City—two new office buildings, a parking garage, and commercial space at 15th and Market Streets representing an investment of more than $50 million.

The state of our Center City—heartland of our great community—is one of rejuvenation, rebuilding, from Penn's Landing on the Delaware to the Schuylkill Park. To meet the economic offshoots of this programing we moved last year to plan a new exhibition hall at the trade and convention center. By utilizing the same "surefire" approach that we have used successfully so many times before, we named a topflight citizens committee to study the proposal. As a result, we have begun a $15 million improvement program which already is bringing inquiries that will boost our convention and trade show business.

STRENTHENED NEIGHBORHOODS

But Philadelphia has pushed much further than Center City, which is basically the original "Greene Country" town. It has long since become a city of homes, of neighborhoods, and it has been our objective to see that these vital areas also remain healthy and thriving—from Point Breeze to Bustleton, East Poplar, Southwest Temple, Roxborough, Strawberry Mansion, University City, West Poplar, Tioga, Frankford, Morrell, Torresdale, Pine Road, Chestnut Hill, Morton, Eastwick. All of these areas have benefited over the past year as a result of programs of this administration supported by legislation approved by your honorable body.

The strengthening and improvement came in many forms. It came in $173 million worth of new construction—just short of an all-time high. It came in more than $35 million worth of urban renewal projects. It came in new streets. It came in new sewers and libraries, new recreation facilities, and fire equipment. It came in the completion of house-to-house inspections aimed at preventing blight.

And it came in the second straight year that was free of paralytic polio.

FINANCIAL STABILITY

There is more to come, and it will come without any increase at all in our local taxes. I say this again and again, and with your help, we can all say it with conviction.

It will come with our built-in growth factor which has brought the city's real estate valuation to a record high of $4.2 billion. It will come with our urban renewal program which marked a turning point in 1962—the last year, in which more tax ratables were removed from the assessment rolls, than were added, by new redevelopment construction. From this year onward, there will be a steady increase in the ratable properties producing genuine and active tax revenues.

This solid state of our city was reflected just this month when a municipal bond issue totaling more than $37 million was sold after intense competition to the leading Midwest and west coast financial institutions for the first time, at the lowest interest rate we have had to pay since 1958. This reaffirms our sound credit, our reputation as a city that knows what it is doing and where it is going.

We are going ahead on all fronts in this second decade of Philadelphia's renaissance, with the same boldness of vision, and soundness of purpose that marked our activities during the first decade. The cooperation at the administrative, the legislative, and the popular levels has been the keynote to our accomplishments.

AREA COOPERATION

This keynote must be sounded, with increasing regard for our neighbors in the days to come. The megalopolis today is more than just a big word. It is developing daily, and it is incumbent upon us to recognize this, by working with our neighboring communities for our mutual benefit. As a member of the regional conference of elected officials, I firmly believe we should direct increasing consideration to problems as they affect the entire area, because of our growing interdependence. The number of cooperative agreements we have with neighboring communities will continue to grow, and there is no reason, except perhaps in the small, partisan mind, to believe that we cannot, or should not, support this trend to our mutual advantage, without subverting local authority.

We are indeed fortunate that there was no shortsighted thinking during the first decade of our renaissance. This past year, as we ventured into the second decade, we have demonstrated that there is still no room for such myopia, and we do not intend to make room for any.

TWO MILLION REASONS FOR SUCCESS

The reason for this lies not in our programs, or their results. Plans, to be effective, need a human approach, an energy born of enthusiasm and enriched by participation. We have 2 million reasons for our success * * * 2 million Philadelphians, whose spirited support and cooperation in these efforts have rewarded them with a city of which they can be proud * * * A city which we will show off to the world in 1976, when we hope to commemorate the bicentennial of the Nation, here where the Nation was born, with a World's Fair.

We are now a strong city, and we are growing stronger by the week, the month, the year, and the decade.

The state of our city today is not measured by the moment at hand. The true measure is its ability, its readiness to meet the challenge of tomorrow. Philadelphia is able. It is ready to go ahead. We are going ahead. With your help we will continue to make and to realize the pattern and the path of progress. We will be actually, with your help, one of the world's wonder cities when we have our World's Fair in Philadelphia in 1976. We plan now, we work now. But we do so with conviction and purpose. It is all for the glory of a Philadelphia that is moving ahead with honor.

Address of James J. Rowley, Chief of the U.S. Secret Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, this afternoon James J. Rowley, chief of the U.S.

Secret Service, delivered a notable address before the Civic Club Council of Newark, N.J.

Mr. Rowley spoke of encouraging developments in Newark and across the country concerning community activities for young people in the campaign against juvenile delinquency.

I was pleased to note that Mr. Rowley paid tribute to a teenage nonprofit employment service called Summers Unlimited, which has been established by two mothers in Westport, Conn. This service already has a listing of 300 youngsters who have registered for paid and unpaid work during the summer.

Mr. Rowley deals in an interesting manner with the questions of juvenile delinquency, law enforcement and the task of the secret service in protecting the lives of the President and the Vice President.

I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by James J. Rowley, Chief, U.S. Secret Service, Before the Civic Club Council of Newark, at the Military Park Hotel, Newark, N.J., May 16, 1963

It is a great pleasure and honor to address this distinguished gathering of outstanding students and grownup leaders in civic affairs. I congratulate these gifted and industrious students for having won awards for outstanding citizenship. I am sure that the adults in the audience have provided the inspiration and example for these young people to emulate. I read with great interest that Newark was the first city in the Nation to establish an annual Youth Week celebration and thus honor the community's most valuable asset—its young people, who are now preparing to become the leaders of tomorrow.

It would be impossible to overemphasize the importance of young people forming a habit of civic service early in their lives. Not only does such activity broaden their horizons, but it also trains them for responsibilities in years to come. Moreover, an interest in public affairs will keep youngsters occupied in a healthy way that just about precludes their getting into trouble.

It is almost axiomatic that bad news is more newsworthy than good news, but I have been struck recently by several accounts that show, with heartening warmth, that groups of young people are staying out of trouble by working for causes in the public interest.

For example, in Washington, D.C., teenagers have formed an organization called High School Students for Better Education. The objective of the group, which started with a small nucleus of public minded students and now has citywide representation, is to improve the public schools in the Nation's Capital. Delegates from the organization have gone to the source of power to improve them: the Congressmen on Capitol Hill who hold the purse strings for District affairs. The students pointed out the crowded and otherwise unsatisfactory physical conditions of classrooms. They underlined the fact that textbooks were out of date to such an extent that they were, in effect, propeller-driven biplanes in an age of supersonic jets. They did other things, such as appearing on public service television programs so that more Washingtonians would know about the condition of the public school system. There is no doubt that they have made an impression on Capitol Hill.

Another group, just across the Hudson from here—on West 37th Street near 10th Avenue—is showing that not all youngsters on the streets are in street gangs. Some 30 teenagers have banded together for the purpose of preventing crime and delinquency. They have the help of a Harvard psychologist, but essentially this is a do-it-themselves project. The objective is to score what the psychologist calls "clean man days." This means no arrests or incarcerations of the members, and remember that this is an area of Manhattan where trouble usually prevails over tranquility. The program started in January of this year. In February, there were nearly 100 police actions in the area, but in April there was not one. The boys proudly display a calendar on which the days no one gets into trouble with the police are marked with gold seals. The calendar glitters.

In Westport, Conn., two mothers have established a teenage, nonprofit employment service called Summers Unlimited. They have a list of 300 youngsters who have registered for paid or unpaid work, and they have placed several in jobs that will keep them well occupied during the summer.

And, of course, the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, headed by the Attorney General, is spurring cities into tackling the problem anew—many cities have had programs for some time. Federal funds are being matched in 15 cities toward the end of preventing juvenile delinquency. The method is first to draw up a plan for the underprivileged in the slum areas of large metropolitan centers. All the resources of the area—schools, police courts, health, and other services—are drawn on. The objective is to find opportunities for young people toward eventual self-support, and meanwhile they are off the streets. New York's plan already is underway, with New Haven and Cleveland scheduled to do the same before the end of the year.

So it seems to me that encouraging progress is being made. But in the final analysis, the only individuals who can stamp out juvenile delinquency are the juveniles themselves. I believe there is too much emphasis on the few who go wrong; I have vast faith in the great majority of American youth.

I am sure that Newark's Youth Week and the awards for citizenship we are celebrating today, will serve as an inspiration to young people in other cities who are trying to accept their responsibilities as junior members of the community. Any young person who learns to take on responsibilities early in life is preparing himself for the leadership he should be expected to show when he becomes an adult.

Just what are those adult obligations? I suppose everyone has his own ideas, and I am sure that in this audience, composed so overwhelmingly of those who believe deeply in public service, there are common views. But please let me run down the list as I see it.

First, I believe that one should do everything he can to get out the vote for the party and candidate of his choice. Voting should be almost a requirement for membership in a community. It is not at all uncommon in Europe for more than 90 percent of the populace to vote in an election, but even in a presidential year in the United States the percentage is only a little over 60.

But just to vote blindly, or do as one is told, doesn't exercise the franchise properly. Everyone should know the issues, and then make up his mind on what seems to him to be the answers. Here again the students who have won the awards today are preparing themselves to take on the task of analyzing the problems that face your community and the Nation, and trying to find solutions that will work best for everyone concerned. To understand just what is going on today is far more difficult than it was a decade ago, to say nothing of two or three decades. And, of course, to know what the solutions are has become increasingly complicated. But there lies the great challenge and the opportunity with it, for you who will be responsible for the destinies of the Nation in which you live, and the world to which you will contribute.

It seems to me that the third characteristic of a good citizen is one who is willing to take an honest and firm stand on an issue even though to do so may be unpopular in the context of the time and circumstances. The extremists have always had a following, and probably always will, but throughout the history of this Republic, reason has eventually ruled. The people who have made that possible have been the great majority of Americans to whom truth and right come close to being synonymous.

And so this citizen with those three characteristics—there are many more attributes, of course—is prepared to pledge himself to a government that is a trustee for all Americans, regardless of their party, for he knows that power of government derives only from those God-given rights, that he, as a citizen, possesses.

To exercise those rights properly requires a number of characteristics, but there is still another that applies particularly to the students here today and their colleagues. Already these awardees have channeled their energies into healthy activities, and by that I mean both mental and physical. The two aid and abet each other. That is why I believe so strongly in the President's Council on Youth Fitness, which is sponsoring programs to convert the flabby American into the physically rugged individual his ancestors were. Mr. Kennedy has said that: "The strength of our democracy and our country can be no greater than the well-being of our citizens. The vigor of our country, its physical strength and energy will be no more advanced nor more substantial than the vitality and will of our countrymen."

The President then went on to say that: "In recent years we have seen many evidences that the physical fitness of our citizens—strength and ability to endure long hardships—lags far behind that of other peoples of the world. The poor scores made by our schoolchildren in simple physical fitness tests, the number of military service rejections for physical reasons, the obesity and physical inactivity of much of our adult population—all are indications that this Nation must take positive steps to revitalize our physical resources before it is too late."

In this day of supersonic flight and intercontinental ballistic missiles there can be a tendency to lose sight of the fact that a man with a rifle on his shoulder is still the essential military power; without him no nation can hold or take a piece of territory. I share the feeling of most Americans that war in this age is too horrible to contemplate, yet there is no denying the fact that we must be ready, and that man with the rifle still must be physically and mentally capable of playing his role.

Just as the infantryman is the basic essential to the military, so, too, is the police officer to law enforcement. He is not only enforcing the law, he is the symbol of the law, and a constant reminder that he is there for the equitable protection of everyone, regardless of race, creed, or national origin. That is one reason, in my opinion, for treating those officers with the respect they are due, for once high regard for law and order breaks downs, the whole fabric of society rips apart.

I should like to take this opportunity to say that I hold local law enforcement officers here and abroad in the highest esteem. Their cooperation has made it possible for the Secret Service to accomplish missions that otherwise never could have been completed. Over the years I have seen a rising level of professionalism in law enforcement, a development that I believe will continue.

I have seen this, of course, in the Service to which I have devoted most of my life, and also in municipal, State and other Federal enforcement personnel. The strong-arm mentality among police officers has gone the way of celluloid collars and cuffs. Today, scientific methods time after time have produced results that are infinitely more telling than anything one could have expected 25 years ago when I began my career, which I look back on with a feeling of having been privileged to serve.

A large part of that quarter century was devoted to that all-important mission of the Secret Service—protecting the President and his family. The Service has discharged this responsibility, which is at once awesome, enjoyable and exacting, since 1901. Also, Congress recently extended the same protection to the Vice President; previously he was protected only at his request.

You may wonder why the Service is in the Treasury. The reason is that it was formed in 1865 to suppress the counterfeiting of our Nation's currency which was then rampant. The Secret Service is the oldest, and for a long time was the only Federal investigative agency, and it frequently made investigations for other departments. It was natural, then, that Presidential protection should fall to the Service.

The Secret Service still arrests counterfeiters and forgers of Government checks and bonds. While criminals are making more money today, they are enjoying it less. The reason: the Service is running them down before they can get the bogus bills into circulation. Last year the Service seized seven out of every eight counterfeits that were manufactured. The spurious money had a face value of more than $3.5 million, which is the potential loss from which the public was saved.

Important as the suppressing of counterfeiting is, it ranks second to the primary assignment of protecting the President.

Now this is a subject that the Service doesn't often discuss publicly for a number of reasons. One is that we respect the President's privacy. But also, if we should publicize an incident, some mentally disturbed person or a practical joker might try to repeat it.

Before the Secret Service was assigned to protect the Chief Executive, three Presidents had been assassinated in 37 years. Fortunately, there has been no recurrence of those tragedies since the Service assumed its protective role. But unsuccessful attempts have been made on the lives of our Presidents. The President and his family are also subjected to danger in which no harm is intended. For instance, in a crowd of people the President may be endangered merely by the overenthusiasm of friendly and well-meaning people.

The President is protected around the clock, 7 days a week. The primary responsibility centers on the White House detail, which is supervised by a special agent in charge, and his assistants. The detail is a small, closely knit organization whose members have been trained intensively in protective techniques. The duties of these agents are exacting, and each man must function as an integral cog in the machinery of protection. Before the President goes anywhere outside the White House, the details of how he is to be protected are worked out, with each agent assigned specific duties that must be carried out with precision.

Whenever an occasion requires more agents than are on the detail, agents from field offices in 64 cities throughout the 50 States and Puerto Rico help out. Nearly all agents in the Service have worked on protective assignments at one time or another.

Making advance security arrangements for the public appearances of the President, both in and out of Washington, ranks as one of the most important elements in our work. This is usually done a week to 10 days before the event by agents from the detail, with the help of the special agents in charge for the district in which the President will be visiting. We must determine how the President will travel, the route he will follow, the location and physical layout at events he will attend, and the security posts to be established. We then have a plan for each movement the President will make, and figure out how to provide the maximum of security for him. This is the greatest part of the protection given him.

All eventualities are taken into account in setting up the advance arrangements, including the likelihood of last-minute changes in the President's schedule which might require deviation from the adopted plan.

So you can see that the planning is tremendously important. The activities of the Secret Service in the protection of the President being comparable to an iceberg: only one-tenth of it is seen, the rest remains unobserved.

Protecting the President is the Service's paramount responsibility and it cannot be delegated to any other organization. However, in every city and State the President visits, local law enforcement officers furnish full cooperation and assistance to insure that no incident threatens his personal safety. Invariably they do a fine job and it is a pleasure to work with them.

I should like to observe that we shall not have fully satisfactory police work throughout the Nation until the need for high professional standards at every level is recognized. We must build on what we have learned in the development of the Federal investigative agencies and the many fine State and local police forces. We must seek professional standards of training, ability, conduct, and effectiveness for all policemen. We must grant them adequate material rewards and far more recognition and respect than we have in the past.

To the students we are honoring today, I wish the best of luck and Godspeed. Thank you.

Test Ban Letters to Colleague

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, interest has been revived in letters I sent to colleagues last month under dates of April 3 and April 4 on the test ban issue. They were triggered by a communication to the Members from William C. Foster, Disarmament Agency Director. In order that the content of these letters be available to anyone interested, I have asked that they be reproduced in the Record as follows:

Congress on the United States,
House of Representitives,
Washington, D.C., April 3, 1963.

Re nuclear test ban treaty.

Dear Colleague: Yesterday you received a letter from the Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, mentioning the risk of "surprise abrogation" inherent in test ban treaty.

This would be the situation if Soviets prepared clandestinely in their laboratories for a vital testing series. This could be done over a period of years behind the secrecy of the Iron Curtain. The Soviet Union then would suddenly announce withdrawal from the treaty and capitalize on this surprise factor by conducting intensive tests.

The Director states the risk of Soviet achievement of nuclear superiority in this manner could be reduced by a U.S. policy of maintaining readiness to test in such eventuality.

However, the impossibility of keeping U.S. progress up under these circumstances was adequately stated by President Kennedy on March 2, 1962, in announcing U.S. test resumption following the breach of the then existing informal testing moratorium.

The President's words were as follows:

"In actual practice, particularly in a society of free choice, we cannot keep top-flight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place on an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some other nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly and found it impossible of execution."

The Director's letter briefly mentions arguments for a test ban treaty. A more complete and fair discussion can be found at page A1078 of the Congressional Record of February 28, 1963.

The subject also is covered in the American Security Council's March 18, 1963, Washington Report which accompanies this letter.

Sincerely yours,

Craig Hosmer,
Member of Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1963.

Dear Colleague: If a nuclear test ban treaty will serve to reduce the world's risks, it is only an effective treaty which will do so—one which in fact stops nuclear weapons progress equally on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Negotiation of an ineffective treaty would surrender the benefits an effective one might achieve.

Disarmament Agency Director William C. Foster wrote you on April 2 declaring "significant Soviet advances" by cheat testing "would require a series of tests." He added that under present U.S. treaty proposals "the probability is high that any meaningful series would be discovered by seismic and intelligence means."

I respectfully differ with Mr. Foster based on scientific facts brought to light during recent hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The AEC's Director of Military Applications testified that all nuclear weapons of military interest except very large super H-bombs, which the Soviets have anyway, can be developed by underground tests which create seismic signals of very small size.

The Defense Department's seismologist testified about the inherent limitations on seismic instruments to detect and identify as cheat tests signals of this very small size (10 millimicrons and less).

The net effect of this testimony was that intelligent Soviet cheating would create signals which might be detected outside the U.S.S.R. but would be too small to identify as cheat tests. This is because such signals cannot be distinguished from the seismic signal of hundreds of small earthquakes occurring annually in Soviet territory.

Therefore, there exists a "big hole" for cheating and clandestine development of

Soviet nuclear weapons superiority under U.S. nuclear test ban treaty proposals.

This "big hole" can be closed, and an effective treaty achieved, only by U.S. insistence on manned seismic stations inside the U.S.S.R. Unmanned "black boxes" won't do the job because they are not tamperproof.

Although Mr. Foster mentions "intelligence" as another means to spot cheating, when one recalls the difficulties even of finding out what is going on in nearby Cuba, wisdom dictates little reliance be placed on this alternative.

Sincerely,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

The American Security Council March 18 Washington Report referred to in the first letter was reproduced in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 25 at page A1697.

Breaking Through the Cancer Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the most ardent leaders in the fight campaign against cancer is George E. Stringfellow of East Orange, N.J. He has served as president of the New Jersey division of the American Cancer Society since 1946. His name is associated with an annual statewide contest which honors those editorial writers who have contributed the most to public education about the dangers and treatment of cancer. Mr. Stringfellow has been awarded the New Jersey Academy of Medicine Annual Citizens Award, and he is an honorary member of the New Jersey Medical Society.

Recently, Mr. Stringfellow wrote a "visiting editorial" for the Jersey Journal of Jersey City. This editorial expressed confidence about the future, and it showed that we have already traveled a long road in the fight against this tragic disease. The editorial is an informative, helpful summary by one of the pioneers who have helped advance us to our present stage of progress. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BREAKING THROUGH THE CANCER CURTAIN

(NOTE.—In keeping with its policy of presenting all sides of questions, the Jersey Journal, from time to time, prints visiting editorials, written by qualified persons on specialized topics. Today's is by George Stringfellow, president of the New Jersey division of the American Cancer Society, past president of the chamber of commerce and civics of the Oranges and Maplewood, recipient of the American Cancer Society Award, honorary member of the New Jersey Medical Society, recipient of the New Jersey Academy of Medicine Annual Citizens Award, past imperial potentate of the Shrine.)

Because many people know that I am one of the eldest of the fighters against cancer, they sometimes ask me, wistfully or petulantly, when we shall celebrate our great breakthrough against a disease that will kill one in four of us if we don't kill it first.

I could say, "I don't know."

I could say that whenever I have asked scientists this question during a cancer-fighting career that ranges back to the establishment of the New Jersey division of the American Cancer Society in the middle 1940's and which has honored me three times with the presidency of the division—I could say that scientists agree that the prevention and cure of cancer is just around the corner. They just don't know which corner. That is why researchers spend $11 million a year exploring every avenue and every alley of biological science.

I could say, I think with some support from the realistic scientists, that we shall never wholly understand the mystery of cancer until we have unlocked nature's innermost secret and stared in awe and reverence on the mystery of life itself.

But when in my April rounds in the annual crusade I am asked about breakthrough, I ask people instead to look at the breakthrough we are making every day.

We have broken through the wall of ignorance and superstition and terrified apathy that once kept people mute about their knowledge that something in them or their way of life had changed.

People now know our danger signals. People do get to the doctor's office in time. There was a time when cancer was absolutely and invariably fatal. Today we save one of three. We could save 100,000 more this year alone. We have broken through and annihilated human complacency with cancer.

We have broken through in the science of surgery, radiation, chemotherapy—doctors are doing brilliant things these days to save cases that would have been abandoned as incurable only yesterday.

We have broken through in detection, the Papanicolaou smear test has almost wiped out cancer of the cervix. Breast self-examination has reversed the direction of that death rate among women and the ACS film and literature has taken a hand in that.

We have broken through in other kinds of education—just now emphatically in putting before young people our statistical correlation between cigarette smoking and cancer of the lung and in asking them whether the habit is worth the cost.

We are fighting our way now to break through an immunology in virus research, in the direction of some distant day when perhaps a single vaccine or a series of inoculations may confer lifelong immunity against a disease we need not even then quite understand.

And we have broken through, with our program of service to the cancer patient and his family, into the presence of the killer, itself. Our free dressings, our pain-relieving medications (free to the medically indigent), our clinics and motor-corps service and skill in organizing the resources of the community against the impoverishment of the stricken family—these are breakthroughs in the deepest sense of the word.

It is a long war, it is a hard, bitter war. But we have managed to make a fight of it. We have managed to shape some victories. In our own implacable way we are happy warriors.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Farmers Should Vote "Yes"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 17, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in view of the widespread interest of those engaged in agriculture in the coming wheat referendum on May 21, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., under date of May 13. I commend this editorial for the edification of all who have interested themselves in this coming referendum.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS SHOULD VOTE "YES" FOR $2 WHEAT—"NO" VOTE WON'T SOLVE FARM PROBLEM

The Nation's wheat farmers will vote Tuesday, May 21, on the wheat program for 1964.

What a "yes" or "no" vote means in the wheat referendum has been the subject of much debate and controversy in recent weeks.

Basically, wheat farmers will decide whether they want price supports or essentially unsupported prices—production geared to market needs or unlimited production.

If farmers vote "yes" their acreage will be cut 10 percent. They will get $2 a bushel on about 80 percent of their normal production and $1.30 on all other production. Their gross national income will be about $2.3 billion from wheat. The total production will be about 1.1 billion bushels. A marketing certificate plan will be used.

If farmers vote "no," price supports will be about $1.25 per bushel to farmers complying with allotments. There will be no support to noncomplying farmers. The national gross income from wheat will be about $1.6 billion. National production will be about 1.5 billion bushels.

IMPACT ON SOUTH DAKOTA

Wheat has been a problem in the United States since World War I. It is a problem because our efficient wheatgrowers can produce more wheat than (1) we can eat, (2) we can feed, (3) we can market abroad, or (4) give away. The increase in yields per acre has risen from 12.4 bushels in the 1930's to a present average yield of 25 bushels per acre. The surplus has piled up.

The domestic U.S. market for wheat today averages about 600 million bushels. We export about 600 million bushels each year. Each bushel that is exported is subsidized. In 1961–62 this included some 220 million bushels sold abroad by commercial exporters and 490 million bushels in the food-for-peace program.

If the wheat program is approved, South Dakota's 1964 income from wheat would be over $64 million. This is based on harvest of the State's quota of about 33 million bushels. If the program is not approved, farmers could expect about $1 a bushel for wheat. They would have to raise 64 million bushels to equal the income they would get from 33 million bushels.

The wheat program requires a two-thirds vote across the Nation for approval. This year farmers who have wheat allotments of 15 acres or less will be eligible to vote. There are 1.2 million farms in the Nation in this category. There are 14,600 growers eligible to vote in South Dakota for the first time.

Wheat is raised on 43,800 farms in South Dakota. All persons with a direct interest in wheat produced on the farm may vote. This makes many more persons than the number of farms eligible to vote. Eligible voters include landlords who rent on a share basis, their wives if they are named in the lease or deed; tenants, their children, etc.

CONTROLS, SUBSIDY GO TOGETHER

We do not share the beliefs of those who see a "No" vote as a means of taking Government out of the farm program, or getting a better one.

In fact, the United States would still have a problem of what to do with increased stocks of grain if production controls are removed. South Dakota and other States in the Wheat Belt would face a grave loss of farm income. The effect of cheap wheat could further pull down livestock and other farm prices. The country would have 300 million more bushels of surplus wheat and no place to put it or sell it.

Farmers obviously can't have unlimited production and price supports, paid for by the Government. If they accept the idea of Government price supports, they have to accept the idea of Government controls. The controls for 1964 are necessarily more strict than before. It is this additional degree of control which has drawn the principal objections.

Most industrialized nations of the world subsidize their agriculture. This is particularly true of the Common Market nations and Great Britain.

We do not believe that the time is here when the U.S. Government can get out of the farm program, without jeopardizing the economic welfare of the Nation's agriculture. To throw the American farmer on the world market is no solution. It would bring more problems.

LOOK OUT FOR OUR OWN FIRST

Let the opponents of stricter wheat controls come out and say they favor unlimited production of livestock, cotton, peanuts and the other basic American crops. Let them say they'll put the American farmer at the mercy of unrestricted imports of Argentine and Canadian beef and wheat and Australian and New Zealand wool and mutton. If they want the world price to govern all wheat, they should let the world price govern everything else in this country from automobiles to meat.

We think the Federal Government should look out for the American farmer first. We don't care to advise the farmer to throw himself on the world market, while American industry enjoys the benefit of the built-in subsidies of tariffs and other advantages.

Dollar wheat and unlimited production won't solve the Government's farm and surplus problems here or abroad. It could result in greatly expanded livestock production and lower livestock prices and returns.

We think the choice for the South Dakota farmer boils down to $2 wheat or $1 wheat. We think he should vote "yes"—for $2 wheat.

Texas Barbecues: 1903 and 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Austin American-Statesman, J. Frank Dobie wrote a wonderful story of Texas barbecues held 60 years apart. I recommend the article to my colleagues not only for their reading enjoyment of a warm, delightful tale, but more particularly because all those who endeavor to assess the true problems and values of our day will find inspiration in the intelligence, sincerity and courage of our Vice President, for the article well illustrates how the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON truly practices what he preaches:

TEXAS BARBECUES: 1903 AND 1963

(By J. Frank Dobie)

I don't know whether to begin this piece with a barbecue on the Nueces River in southern Live Oak County in the summer of 1903 or with a barbecue at the LBJ ranch on the Pedernales River, west of Johnson City in the spring of 1963.

The recent barbecue would be simpler in a way, for Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON was born very near the LBJ ranch, where he and Lady Bird Johnson reside at times and entertain guests from around the world as well as from cedar brakes close at hand. In another way the barbecue of 1903 would be simpler, for life was much simpler then. Both barbecues are out of my own experience.

When I was a ranch boy in Live Oak County, ranch people of the region had a picnic every summer under great live oak trees near what used to be Barlow's Ferry but came to be named Dinero, on the Nueces River. Dinero consisted of a store and a post office to which a man on horseback brought mail.

The four main features of the barbecue that I remember were: (1) New tubs filled with lemonade around great chunks of ice that sold at 5 cents a glass—a big glass at that—and took whatever nickels I had. (2) The barbecuing of beeves over big pits. (3) Tournament running in which the rider who speared the most rings received a new saddle as a prize. (4) The musicians.

These musicians were two, sometimes three, Mexicans with fiddle and guitar. They didn't sing as I recall. They stood and played near the wonderful tubs of ice cold lemonade. They played "La Golondrina," "Over the Waves," and other waltzes. I didn't want to hear anything else. I heard nothing else, and for days and nights after this barbecue strains of the music would haunt me.

At that period nobody thought of calling a Mexican anything else than Mexican unless it was some derogatory word. "Latin American" was decades away. There would be a few Mexican workers around the barbecue. There would be the musicians.

Far more Mexican families than Anglo-American families lived on the ranches, but no Mexicans except the musicos and the laborers would be at the barbecue. No Mexican could go into a restaurant or an ice cream parlor at Beeville, 20 miles away, and sit down with what were called white people to refresh himself. Yet his music and his lore were then accepted as a part of the cultural inheritance of the country.

About 20 years after 1903 I began gathering legendary stories told by Mexicans, writing them down and putting them into books. The Mexicans' contributions in music, song, story, history, and labor, especially as vaquero anteceding cowboy, entered into the life of English-speaking Texas people long before the Mexicans themselves entered into that life. Individuals of Mexican antecedents now teach in the University of Texas. In 1903 very few indeed attended the University of Texas. In many towns, Mexican schoolchildren were segregated.

It was some years after I become acquainted with barbecues that I heard Negroes sing spirituals before white audiences. This was before John A. Lomax and Carl Sandburg had made America more aware of the beautiful and the vital in Negro folksongs. It was not before Joel Chandler Harris had transmuted into Uncle Remus the primary creations in story—Negro story—of the American folk. While these Negro creations were accepted by whites as a part of the land's cultural inheritance, the creators themselves were not admitted into white social and educational institutions.

It was a long, long time before the makers of Bre'r Rabbit stories, of Negro worksongs, of "All God's Chillun Got Shoes," "He Holds the Whole World in His Hand," "Were You There When They Crucified My Lord," "Roll, Jordan, Roll" and other great spirituals entered doors to where all colors learn science and are touched alike by the cultures of the world.

We come now to the barbecue on April 27, 1963, on the LBJ ranch. It honored delegates to the United Nations from 25 countries scattered over the two hemispheres. These U.N. delegates spoke Portuguese, Spanish, English, Norwegian, Rumanian, Japanese, Congolese, Arabian, Turkish, and other languages. They were in color white, black, brown and other shades. The delegate who responded to Vice President JOHNSON's welcome spoke in English cultivated at Oxford or Cambridge University. He was from Ceylon.

To this cosmopolitan barbecue came as invited guests several civilian Negroes and Mexicans of Texas. I met Porfirio Salinas, artist of San Antonio. I and Mrs. Dobie sat at the table where Vice President JOHNSON sat and where also Mr. and Mrs. M. J. Anderson, highly cultivated colored people from Austin, sat. HENRY GONZALEZ, Congressman from San Antonio, and his wife, came to the LBJ ranch to escort the U.N. people to a welcome in San Antonio.

Marian Anderson was not at the barbecue, but after she sang in Austin a few weeks ago she was a guest at the LBJ ranch. It has been 24 years since the Daughters of the American Revolution denied Constitution Hall to her. Cheered on by the John Birchers, they might deny flying of the United Nations flag there now. No matter. We are progressing away from country-mindedness to world-mindedness.

I suppose that some of the Texas legislators and senators now passing a law prohibiting the flying of United Nations flags on any property owned by the State of Texas would not have felt at ease at the LBJ barbecue. Some of them might feel more at ease at a Ku Klux Klan barbecue. Change is ceaseless; evolution is forward. I had a brighter time at this barbecue than I had drinking ice cold lemonade when it was an annual treat only at barbecues on the Nueces River in Live Oak County 60 years ago.

Louisville Takes a Historic Stride in Race Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 17, 1963

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the May 16 issue of the Louisville Courier-Journal entitled "Louisville Takes a Historic Stride in Race Relations." I should like to read the first paragraph:

> Louisville has taken another historic step in race relations. Passage of the ordinance forbidding racial discrimination in public accommodations announces to the Nation that Louisville rejects the spirit of Birmingham and Oxford. All of those who believe in this community, and its basic respect for human rights, can hold their heads a little higher today.

The people of our State, and particularly the city of Louisville, are very pleased about this historic step. I do not live in Louisville. My colleague [Mr. MORTON] is a resident of Louisville. I am sure he would join with me in speaking of this great and courageous step taken by the board of aldermen under the leadership of Mayor William Cowger and County Judge Marlow Cook in their support of the ordinance.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOUISVILLE TAKES A HISTORIC STRIDE IN RACE RELATIONS

Louisville has taken another historic step in race relations. Passage of the ordinance forbidding racial discrimination in public accommodations announces to the Nation that Louisville rejects the spirit of Birmingham and Oxford. All of those who believe in this community, and its basic respect for human rights, can hold their heads a little higher today.

Credit must go, first of all, to the Aldermen, who had to make the ultimate decision. It wasn't an easy one. They could have heeded the counsel of the timid, the fearful, the blindly stubborn, and the rabble-rousers, and tried to evade and postpone decision. They refused to take this course, and if this board does nothing else it will be long remembered for this week of decision.

A full measure of credit must go, too, to the city human relations commission, which carefully prepared the way; to Mayor William Cowger, who when the chips were down put his prestige on the line in backing the ordinance; and to County Judge Marlow Cook, who supported Mayor Cowger in urging their Republican colleagues to do the right thing.

The ordinance addresses itself to services of business establishments, forbidding the withholding of service in "any place of business offering or holding out to the general public services or facilities for the peace, comfort, health, welfare, or safety of such general public." This means, for example, that petty forms of discrimination such as refusing to let Negroes try on wearing apparel, while according this privilege to other customers, must be eliminated. It means, further, that bowling alleys serving the public must do just that, and not confine their service to a portion of the public according to skin color.

None of the adjustments should be difficult. Where they have been made, the transition was smooth. The ordinance does not take effect until mid-September, but there is no reason why business establishments covered by the ordinance should wait until then to conform to the spirit of the law.

Although passage of the ordinance was a signal victory over discrimination, let no one be lulled into believing that the job is done. Discrimination in housing and employment poses formidable challenges, and even now the Human Relations Commission is moving in these areas.

Moreover, the writ of the public-accommodations ordinance runs only in the city, not in its environs. What is needed is a State law banning discrimination in services provided by establishments licensed to serve the general public. This newspaper has urged enactment of such a law in the past, and we hope the General Assembly at its regular 1964 session will take this step.

Bureaucracy Berserk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to find in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, of May 8, the following column by Holmes Alexander, commenting on my April 30 speech in which I revealed how the USES is cheating the unemployed of the United States:

BUREAUCRACY BERSERK

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—In Toledo, an Ohio spokesman for the U.S. Employment Service gave the following television comment to the question of whether his Government bureau was in competition with the private enterprise employment agencies:

"I have no compunction about competing with private employment agencies," said this public servant, one Milton Davidson. "I want to make it very uncomfortable for those fee-charging agencies."

You could hardly find the bust-business policy of Federal bureaucracy more ruthlessly expressed. Here is the profit system frankly denounced.

Here is the implicit socialistic philosophy which says that government enterprise can do things better than private enterprise.

Here is the diametric reversal of Lincoln's celebrated statement of governmental purpose:

"The object of government is to do for a community of people, whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all or cannot so well do for themselves. * * *"

Today, there are 4,100,000 unemployed persons in the United States, and a good many of them evidently cannot find work. It goes without saying that the purpose of the tax-supported Employment Service is to guide such hapless persons into jobs. But there are 68,100,000 people who do have gainful positions, proving that they are not hapless.

And what do we find USES doing? We find at the latest report that, during 1962, USES got three new jobs for employed persons as against two jobs for the jobless.

Some of the positions which the USES was brokering ran upward of $20,000 a year. It seems obvious that a man in that bracket hardly needs or deserves socialized job placement.

So here's the Government helping people who didn't need help more than it was helping people who did.

What else? The Government was actively threatening the jobs and incomes of persons who make a living in the employment agencies. It is a small American industry, but a socially useful one. I learn that there are roughly 4,500 firms which specialize in job-finding, that these firms engage 25,000 workers whose average income is a modest $5,000 a year.

These agents find themselves competing with a Federal bureau that charges no fee for job placement but which spends $160 million a year out of tax-supplied revenue.

Wondering if Mr. Davidson's TV statement represented official thinking, I contacted the Labor Department and got a startling viewpoint. I was told:

"There is a moral question of whether a man should have to pay to find a job."

The implication is plain that profit seekers in the field of job placement, often a very specialized form of counseling and aptitude testing, are the equivalent of social bloodsuckers.

You could walk all over the New Frontier and not come up with a better example of why businessmen continue to regard this administration as antibusiness.

One Republican, Congressman Frank Bow, of Ohio, goes further. He sees the USES as an empire-building bureaucracy, intent upon total control and placement of American manpower, from the humblest job to the highest.

Of course, the administration spokesmen don't subscribe to Mr. Bow's definition.

But if private agencies are badly injured or destroyed, and if any large segment of the labor force must turn to Government to find employment, we would be living under a socialized monopoly that wouldn't smell any sweeter by any other name.

Cab Driver Stabbed by Rioters Thanks Negro Who Saved His Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, in all the news coverage that has come out of Birmingham concerning the demonstrations brought on by those racial agitators of the southern leadership conference, certain elemental aspects of courtesy and humanity have been overlooked. Last Saturday night a Birmingham taxicab driver, W. A. Bowman, of 916 24th Street SW., was unprovokedly attacked by rioting Negroes. However, a Negro civil defense worker, ordered to duty by local civil defense officials, came to Mr. Bowman's rescue. The civil defense worker fought off the cab driver's attackers and put him into a car that took him to a hospital.

Last Tuesday, May 14, 1963, Mr. Bowman left the hospital saying he owed his life to that Negro civil defense worker.

I think that this article should help reestablish the fact that in Birmingham there is respect for human life and that among the rank and file of Birmingham's citizens, colored and white, there is little feeling of animosity.

All the Members of the House will be interested in reading the enclosed article, which appeared in the May 16, 1963, issue of the Birmingham News:

Owes Life to Negro Civil Defense Worker, Says Cabbie, Hurt in Riot

A Birmingham taxicab driver, stabbed in rioting Saturday night, said today he owes his life to a Negro civil defense worker.

"I wish I knew who he was so I could thank him," said W. A. Bowman, of 916 24th Street SW., Yellow Cab driver. "I wouldn't be here today if it wasn't for him." He was discharged Tuesday from University Hospital.

Bowman said that when he was attacked by a crowd of Negroes, the unknown Negro civil defense worker came to his rescue, fighting off the attackers and getting him into a car that took him to the hospital.

"I was coming back from taking a fare to West End and and didn't know what was going on," Bowman said. "When I got into this area on Sixth Avenue they jumped me."

Bowman said he was stabbed several times, in the side of the head, shoulders, elbows, and other parts of his body. He also was hit with stones.

Bowman was one of two men sent to hospitals Saturday night with stab wounds. The other man, Police Officer J. N. Spivey, was stabbed twice while getting out of his car near the Gaston Motel which had been dynamited.

Spivey, who is in West End Baptist Hospital, spent a quiet night Tuesday and was reported in satisfactory condition today.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

West Virginia Centennial "Parade of Flags" Salutes the President and Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the President of the United States honored the State of West Virginia today when he accepted from our Governor the flag of our State. The Chief Executive expressed the desire to have it flown over the White House on the West Virginia centennial birthday, June 20, 1963.

In a ceremony at the White House, Gov. William Wallace Barron, accompanied by West Virginia Centennial Commission officials and staff aids, and by members of the State's delegation in the Congress, presented to President Kennedy the West Virginia Centennial Parade of Flags as well as a West Virginia State flag.

Following the ceremony in the new flower garden, the parade of flags demonstration was brought to the Capitol where, at the noon hour on the east front steps of the Senate wing, the colorful and efficient parade group gave a public performance.

In presenting the centennial parade of flags, Government Barron described it to President Kennedy, as:

> A group of Senior Boy Scouts and high school students formed for the purpose of representing West Virginia in various ways during this our centennial year. They are carrying with them the flag of the State of West Virginia and a 35-star American flag, the 35th star, of course, representing West Virginia. They wish to honor our sister States and to that end they are carrying a flag for every State in this great Nation of ours, including that of the District of Columbia, and reproductions of the historic flags from the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812.
>
> And now, Mr. President, it is my privilege and honor to present to you the flag of the State of West Virginia in recognition of our 100th anniversary and I am taking the liberty of proposing if it is within regulations that the flag of the State of West Virginia be flown at the White House on our centennial birthday which is June 20 of this year.

President Kennedy's response was a warm tribute to the State of West Virginia, as well as to the Boy Scout movement and the Scouts who represented West Virginia in the "Parade of Flags." A text of the President's acknowledgment was supplied by the Office of the White House Press Secretary.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks by the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Governor, Senators, Congressmen: I want to express my warm appreciation to you for this flag. I don't know whether it is regulations or not, but in any case it is going to be, because we will certainly fly this flag over the White House on the June centennial day or any other day that West Virginia wants it flown. And after that we will frame this flag and put it in the White House in my office, because there is no State whose flag I would rather have.
>
> I want to express my great appreciation to all of those of you who are Scouts for coming here this morning. We are very proud of the Boy Scouts and I am particularly glad that we have so many of them in West Virginia, so many of them in the country. I can't imagine better training for our younger citizens and I hope that this impressive evidence this morning of their strong patriotic feeling will be an inspiration to thousands of other young boys who, themselves, can become Scouts and demonstrate their desire for citizenship and also their strong love of their country.
>
> But most especially I am glad to welcome you here because this is part of a very important historic event, the centennial of West Virginia. The State motto of West Virginia is that mountaineers are always free. West Virginia was born out of a desire to be free and there is no State in the Union which, in the wars of this country, has given a larger percentage of their sons to the defense of their country, suffered a larger number of casualties and in a hundred battlefields scattered around this world has demonstrated that mountaineers will continue to be free.
>
> This is a great State which I know very well from top to bottom, from east to west, and it has some of our most devoted citizens in it. And, therefore, I was particularly glad to have a chance to welcome all of you here this morning. We welcome you to these very historic grounds here at the White House. This House behind you is identified with the great moments in American history and one of the greatest moments in American history was the birth of West Virginia in an entirely different world, but a world which still carries with it the imprint of the struggles which brought freedom to West Virginia.
>
> West Virginia is free, the United States is free, and that freedom is maintained by the desire of the people of your State and country and by your willingness to meet all these challenges. So we are glad to have you Governor, Senators, and Congressmen, and, most especially, citizens of West Virginia who are among the best citizens of the United States. Thank you.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in addition to Governor Barron and Members of the West Virginia delegation in the Congress, the State was represented at both the White House and Capitol functions by Chairman Charles Hodel of the West Virginia Centennial Commission and Executive Director Carl Sullivan, Lloyd Calvert, and Don Flesher of the Centennial Commission staff.

The "Parade of Flags" organization is a flexible marching and display unit developed for the West Virginia Centennial by a committee headed by William C. Handlan of Fairmont, who was capably assisted by fellow Fairmonters Joseph E. Hoffmann, Forest R. Stalnaker, Jack Carpenter, Quin Terry, and Mayor William G. Meyer. Their outstanding work was admirably complemented by that of the parade director, Earl W. McConnell; the tour leader, Frank DeGarmo; the Scout drillmaster, L. Jay Smith; and group leaders, W. F. Criss, Vernon Whetzel, Herman Bartholow, Jr., and Carmen D'Amico, all of Fairmont.

The Monongah High School of Marion County supplied the 31-member band, while the "Parade of Flags" participants from Marion, Monongalia, and Preston Counties numbered 90 Boy Scouts.

Chairman Handlan and his Fairmont associates performed an exceptionally commendable service in bringing the group together and developing their demonstration into one of color and historical significance. The "Parade of Flags" will richly enhance the West Virginia Centennial Celebration which will begin officially on "Statehood Day," June 20.

Control of Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, in an editorial in its May 7 issue, properly expresses alarm over the increasing domination of the Nation's total research effort by the Federal Government.

It would indeed be ironic, as the Bulletin editorial suggests, if this trend continues to the point where the Washington bureaucracy has complete control of all scientific research, for this is the system of state planning practiced by the Communist world with which we are competing.

The Congress has a responsibility to see that it does not happen, and we would be well advised to heed the warning signals raised in the Bulletin editorial, which follows:

> CONTROL OF RESEARCH
>
> A trend that is perhaps inevitable but nonetheless alarming is the increasing domination of the Nation's total research effort by the Federal Government.
>
> The Government is now spending at the rate of about $12 billion a year on research and development. Although most of this is spent by way of contracts through universities and corporations, the Government's influence over what projects are to be pursued and over the allocation of resources and talents is almost complete.

The ironic thing is that while the necessity to compete with the Communist world provides the main impetus for Government domination of our research efforts, the result is that we get closer and closer to the Communist system of state planning—a system in which all major research decisions and all decisions concerning the utilization of the Nation's pool of scientists are made by the Government bureaucracy.

We thus lose one of the basic strengths of our system, which is determination of activity by the free market.

Granted, some of the benefits derived from Government-sponsored research spill over and can be used in the private sector, but too often this is more a result of chance than of intention.

Among the weaknesses inherent in Government domination of research—or of any other activity, for that matter—are the reluctance to abandon projects which look less than promising, the susceptibility to political as opposed to economic considerations, and the absence of the type of cost consciousness which prevails in the private sector.

Hopewell Baptist Church, Smith County, Tex., Looks Forward to 105th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Mr. Earle Walker, Sunday editor of the Tyler Courier-Times-Telegraph, has written an interesting feature story on the eve of the annual memorial service at the cemetery of the Hopewell Baptist Church, Smith County, Tex. This account was printed in the Sunday, May 5, 1963, edition of the Tyler Courier-Times-Telegraph.

Hopewell Church is one of the old churches in Smith County. It has a historical treasure in its minutes, as the church possesses its original manuscript minutes complete, going back to its original date of foundation, and running the 105 years to date. These minutes were carefully guarded and preserved for years by Mrs. Charles L. Duncan.

This church first met in the building housing the cotton gin of Harvey Yarborough, who served as the church's first secretary, serving in that capacity a total of 9 years. I attended the centennial of this church in 1958.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Walker's article entitled "Hopewell Baptists' Century of Faith" from the Tyler Courier-Times-Telegraph of May 5, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOPEWELL BAPTISTS' CENTURY OF FAITH

(By Earle Walker)

Standing in quiet dignity among nature's greenery 2 miles north of Swan on the old Tyler-to-Lindale highway, the white and steepled Hopewell Baptist Church represents 105 years of the Christian faith.

The congregation was organized September 25, 1858. That same year land for the Hopewell Cemetery and for a building location was donated.

Annual memorial service honoring those who lie at rest in the cemetery will be held Sunday, June 2, at 10:45 a.m. A special sermon will be preached, a collection taken for cemetery maintenance and "dinner on the ground" served. The public is invited.

Plans for the memorial event are in charge of the following officers of the Hopewell Cemetery Association: Clarence Clark, chairman; J. T. Gibson, vice chairman; H. L. Ray, treasurer and work superintendent; Harold Linnstaedter, assistant to Ray; Mrs. Charlie L. Duncan, finance chairman; J. W. Shank, secretary; Henry Chambless, lot sale superintendent, and Mrs. Henry Chambless, recorder of deaths.

Early in 1857 Rev. J. S. Bledsoe began to preach under an arbor in a post oak grove near Drury Smith's house.

It was on September 25, 1858, at the request of a number of the brethren, that Elders J. S. Bledsoe, J. V. Wright and J. S. Valentine met at Drury Smith's home to organize the Baptist church for Hopewell community.

CHURCH FORMED

Charter members of Hopewell Baptist Church—the brethren and sisters who presented letters at the organization meeting—numbered 23. They were: John Spear and Elizabeth Spear, both from Bethel; James Coker, Mary E. Coker, Levi Speer, Harvey Yarborough, Margaret Yarborough, Tarleton Bond, Martha Bond Mary J. Coker, Richard Yarborough, Frances E. Dorsey and Sanders Coker, all from Antioch; Harriet E. Smith and Jane Stedham, both from Carmel; Penelope Speer, John W. Speer and Joseph Speer, all from Bethel; John G. Felton, Dorothy F. Felton, Francis C. Felton, Robert Alex Felton and James G. Williams, all from Lebanon Church, Georgia.

A church covenant, abstract of principles, and rules of decorum were presented, read and approved. Also on the program of that organization meeting were an address by the Reverend Bledsoe, a hymn and hand of fellowship.

The same day the brethren and sisters, having been recognized as a Gospel church, met in conference. The Reverend Bledsoe acted as moderator, and J. V. Wright as clerk. The name "Hopewell Baptist Church" was unanimously adopted; Harvey Yarborough was elected church clerk, and Reverend Bledsoe was called as the church's first pastor by acclamation.

In the year of the church's founding—1858—Harvey Yarborough, one of the charter members and grandfather of today's U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, deeded free of charge to the deacons and their successors 10 acres of land for the church building site and burial ground.

Oldtimers say that the first person buried in Hopewell Cemetery was a child of Dick Yarborough.

Many of the early graves were never marked, however—apparently during the first 14 years of the cemetery's existence.

The oldest marker in the cemetery is dated 1872 and is that of the Powell family, related to the George York family.

MORE LAND GIVEN

In 1912 Mr. and Mrs. J. D. Goodjoin donated to the deacons and their successors 4.1 acres of ground adjacent to the then existing cemetery to be used as additional burying area.

On May 2, 1922, 2 more acres of ground, situated between Hopewell Cemetery and the Negro cemetery, was purchased from the Rodgers heirs to permit another expansion of the Hopewell burial grounds. Tom Swann surveyed this land, staked it off into eight-grave plots, and made a map of the same, numbering the lots—which system is still in use.

Through the years Hopewell and surrounding communities have provided many men for the military forces of the Confederacy and of the United States. Buried in Hopewell Cemetery are 22 Civil War veterans, 1 Spanish-American War veteran, and numerous veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war.

By the end of 1858 the church had 30 members and its pastor, and in January 1859 it began to move to raise money to build a house of worship. The congregation had been meeting under a gin house, having moved there from a brush arbor. The new building, 30 by 40 feet, was finished and occupied late in 1859.

The present building was dedicated August 14, 1891. The cornerstone was of sandstone hewn from a quarry and engraved by Thomas E. Perdue.

SLAVES JOIN, TOO

Some time after the organization of Hopewell Baptist Church with 23 charter members, the members brought their Negro slaves into the church to hold membership along with them. A record book lists the names of 31 of those slaves, together with their owners.

Oakland High School was organized at Hopewell by Walter E. Dean, January 1, 1888. Dean was the first principal, and was succeeded in 1890 by Mrs. Mary Winn. Mrs. Winn and her schoolboys planted a magnolia, which today is an extremely huge tree and stands in Hopewell Cemetery. When the school was consolidated with Tyler (later with Lindale), Hopewell Baptist Church succeeded in getting the old school building and making an annex for the church.

Church discipline and doctrinal points were taken very, very seriously in bygone days of Hopewell Baptist Church. Committees were kept busy with disciplinary problems, but later the offenders were cited directly before the church.

Among other things, dancing gave much trouble. A young sister was arraigned for dancing but denied it positively, and the rumor was denounced as false. At next meeting a brother and relative of the young lady brought a charge against her of misrepresentation. She answered that she did not call it dancing, but as others did, she made acknowledgment, said she was sorry and would not do it any more. The church forgave the offense. Twenty years later she was charged again with dancing; acknowledgments were made, and the church still agreed to bear with her.

LITERAL DOCTRINE

Strict observance was made of the Baptist doctrine of close communion; that is, restricting the taking of the Lord's Supper to the membership of that particular congregation. While the Rev. J. H. Roland was pastor—1867 to 1871—his instructions that only the local members should take the Lord's Supper at Hopewell Church were taken literally, and Deacon Felton even passed up the pastor in administering the Lord's Supper, because the Reverend Roland's church membership was elsewhere.

The colored membership of Hopewell Church was large and was treated with great consideration by the white members, an oldtimer in the community said.

The Rev. C. D. Schmidt is the present pastor.

Early-day pastors of Hopewell Baptist Church included the Rev. J. S. Bledsoe, 1857 to 1859; Rev. Milton Carter, 1860 to 1866; Bledsoe again 1866 to 1867; Rev. J. H. Roland, 1867 to 1871; Rev. H. E. Callahan, 1871 to 1874; Bledsoe again, 1874 to 1877; Rev. W. G. Caperton, 1877 to 1883; Rev. D. J. Bedell, 1883 to 1889; Rev. J. C. Jones, 1889 to 1891.

Hopewell Baptists remain strong and active in the practice of their faith and good works in the handsome, white and spired church house.

Problems of the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITLD STATES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a well-written letter from Mr. Robert M. Evanson, a North Dakota farmer, which is addressed as an open letter to the Congress of the United States. Mr. Evanson, as is so typical of farmers, is an independent thinker and one who has made a considerable study of farm problems.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, N. DAK.,
May 12, 1963.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES—CARE OF HON. SENATOR MILTON YOUNG

HONORABLE GENTLEMEN: If farmers had the opportunity to vote on plan A, B, or C, that would be a choice. When Congress persists in passing the buck to the farmers year after year in the absurdity of a choice, you are due for a reaction. In effect, Congress asks, would you rather have less or lesser in a bitter or a sour pill? Many members of Congress will realize that a "no" vote means no confidence, yet I suppose a few legislators who have never treated themselves to the simple arithmetic of the farmers' 2 cents share of a loaf of bread will say, "why those ingrates, after all we have done for them.

Let's see just what we have to be grateful for after a decade of wheat allotments. According to the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, it now takes 4 years' profit to make up 1 year's loss but 10 years ago (before present allotment system), we could make up 1 year's loss in 2 years. We should be grateful for that?

We are now asked to realize even less profit under either choice and so increase the farmers' cost-price squeeze, while the inflationary trends seem destined to continue. We are supposed to be grateful for that?

We are asked to put all the price-fixing power into the hands of those who are politically motivated and pressured. We must be grateful for this?

How can we be grateful for injustices, both individually and regionally which were instituted and propagated under the present system of allotments and are only slated for continuation.

Congressmen may blame any administration they like and they deserve it for their dogmatic tunnel vision but the charge of legislative power is yours and year after year you ignore the mistakes of the past, slough over the work required to right the mess and lack the political courage to accompany the effort. What other way have you given us to express our dissatisfaction except to vote for the on-the-surface illogical choice. It's most likely to turn out to be the logical choice after all. I have never had a moment's anxiety that Congress would not come up with another wheat program and hopefully a better one if this referendum failed to pass. At least they require a second chance. Congress is demonstrating right now, the speed that they can push legislation through when motivated to do so. Congress would have to act, simply because our present economy could not stand an agricultural depression.

What are some of the mistakes which Congress conveniently shunts aside or forgets when farm bill time comes around? The technological handwriting was on the wall years ago with rise in production due to the unusual stimulus of two wars, mechanization of the farms, and stepped up production-research. The obvious way to cope with this for the farmers and the country's good, was to jump into market development, new uses and new crops and it was done in a minor way, but production-research continued to expand through bigger and bigger appropriations. How extremely illogical to expand our production for relatively stationary markets. To Congress the easy way to solve this was to cut off production at the farm of the crops in surplus and thus were many continuing injustices imposed. The acres of the surplus crop were naturally transferred to other crops, which then got into trouble.

I know I am telling you nothing you don't know but in the last decade, how much has the ratio of appropriations changed between production-research and the research of marketing, new uses and new crops? Why have you waited until we need a crash program? If in the considered judgment of those who believe greater production-research is in the national interest, why haven't you seen fit to charge part of the cost to the industries which enjoy our surplus of lower prices due to this research? We get the blame for the costs of research while others are much the greater beneficiaries. Now, doubling the corn yield through new genetic material and doubling wheat yields through hybrids is on the agenda. I tell you we do not need it, if it is used as an excuse for the farmers further subjugation.

Industry, too, has a short-sighted approach in their private research. Du Pont, for instance, whose best customers may be farmers, now brag that they have an artificial leather superior to natural leather. Do you think it dawned on them to make the product from animal skins? Oh no. Far more challenging to make it out of coal, air and cosmic dust.

I could go on and on about the errors Congress has made as could any farmer but you know of these mistakes and should at least be willing to admit them, so for the sake of brevity I will dwell on only one more at this time.

Much is made of supply-management and the fact that industry controls its supply is used as an illustration, but that's the whole point—they control their own supply. Not a Government agency. Not someone who could set their price below the cost of production—with inflation or poor crops this could happen. Not someone in a position to play politics or God.

The only real bargaining power the farmer ever had was through the law of supply and demand. Those who were thrifty enough or lucky enough prospered by it. The Commodity Credit Corporation was designed to smooth out the marketing and make the good mechanics of this simple economic law available to all who would use it and it worked fine in times of normal supply. In times of deficit supply we did not really need CCC. In times of surplus CCC, the so-called third market, became a market depressing agent. The fact that the supply was there in one big bunch was enough to fix the price. Erratic Government selling distorted the market further. This was evident to Congress but they did not have the courage to change the situation. They did not resist the pressure of the commercial grain storage interests and the Billy Sol Esteses whose only logical reason for lobbying was for more surpluses to justify more storage capacity to be paid for out of Government funds for storing the preceding surplus.

We are often told of the "blessing of this abundance." We are guilty of producing more to meet the cost-price squeeze and so it is no blessing to us. This situation should have been changed and still can be if Congress has the gumption to resist the narrow pressure groups—to get this surplus out of the big targets and onto the farms where it is produced. To make the farmer responsible for his own storage and his own grain; to relax storage requirements to a 10-year life, rather than 30 or 40; to leave the intangible delivery date to the farmer, whether it be 1 or 7 years. Then we could have some control on price. No prospective buyer could delay his bid for CCC delivery dates. When the price became reasonably in line with our costs don't worry, we would sell and we probably wouldn't have much grain more than 1 year old. Our surplus could then be a blessing, dispersed throughout the country and would serve as an extra deterrent to any would-be aggressor. Don't concern yourselves about the commercial grain storage people. They can use these tax-paid for monuments for tax write-offs, which was likely their object in the first place.

Until the crash program for markets, new uses and new crops becomes effective, what about acreage retirement? Yes, I'm afraid it's necessary to live with this sin but it should be applicable to all who have used the Government loan programs and on an equitable percentage basis, probably according to a simple county rainfall average during the average growing season to arrive at a normal fallow acreage—after which the percentage of equal retirement is assessed. I think the Government should not make any payment more than equal to the taxes and the loss in investment. The care of the land is the penalty we will have to pay for our apathy of previous programs. It cannot be too strongly emphasized, the cropping plan must be entirely left to the good discretion of the individual farmer. Local storage and the law of supply and demand will rapidly brings things into balance. Since the acreage retirement will work a greater hardship on the small farmer who has already been hit hardest by the cost-price squeeze, I believe that any bona fide farmer who makes at least two-thirds of his gross income from farm production should be allowed to retire less acres according to a formula considering his previous year's net income.

As for export commodities—let this be raised by those who will, on land (exempted from retirement) expressly for this purpose and to be contracted for and sold by the farmers' own marketing associations or companies, who will do a far more effective and particular job of grading, cleaning, promotion, and telling than could any all-encompassing Government agency.

The Secretary of Agriculture should have power only to set the acreage once a year, according to a set formula, taking into account—the average previous years' prices above or below a parity index and releasing or adding acres to the acreage retirement for the upcoming year.

If the Government requires its own reserve of commodities, after this reserve is reached, it must not be allowed to sell without buying an equal amount of the commodity.

When we finally, in some future decade, dispose of all our surplus and they have no more retirement acres to dole out acocrding to the formula, the Government's role in the market will be done and they will quietly fade away.

We want to be self-supporting. We're tired of being everyone's goat who is unable to defend himself. A day of reckoning will come if we are played off against the rest of the economy. If you want a responsible farm program, try asking the farmer. We're not professional economists, but we know the cost-price squeeze. We're not lawyers, but we recognize injustice. We're not politicians, but we understand good legislation. We will carry our share of the load, but you've got to give us the chance.

With all due respect.

ROBERT M. EVANSON.

Revive the True Concept of Competitive Bidding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, bureaucratic burglars in the Pentagon can be checked by a Congress operating in a 100 percent nonpartisan manner. Working together for just a few hours last week, my colleague the gentleman from Texas, Congressman KILGORE, and I were able to prove the truth of my statement. After we had proved it, Mr. KILGORE stated he is interested and is going to stay interested in cleaning up the procurement mess in the Defense Department.

I am elated over the success we attained, and I rejoice at the prospect of receiving even more help in my efforts to save the taxpayers' money in the purchase of military equipment.

Prior to the attack late last week, the autocratic Navy Department was in effect withholding vital information from prospective bidders on a proposal to overhaul airplanes that had been flying almost half the time since the Wright Brothers first took off at Kitty Hawk.

Arbitrary action by Navy paper shufflers was assuring that there would be no real competition for a job to overhaul World War II-type DC-3 and DC-4 aircraft. Stubborn refusal to allow the force of competition to work to the advantage of the taxpayer was allowing someone in the Navy Department to push the award toward two manufacturers who had done the work before. The result would have been another inflated Navy contract and another hole cut in the pocket of the taxpayer.

Today, I am happy—I might even say thrilled—to report that this scheme has been foiled. If you want to call what happened the "Joe and Earl caper," I can assure you it will be all right with the Congressman from Indiana, and I feel safe in saying it will also be OK with the Congressman from Texas.

Prior to last Wednesday, some middle-grade Navy Department specialist in charge of keeping out competition and gouging the taxpayer had things rigged in two Bureau of Weapons procurements numbered 5192-53 and 5193-63. They called for overhaul of a total of 104 of the World War II workhorse transport aircraft, 58 DC-3's and 46 DC-4's. As a part of each of these two proposals, the Bureau of Weapons placed on exhibit four documents. Each was up to 800 pages in length—the "pages" being IBM paper folds. These documents contain detailed descriptions of literally thousands of pieces of equipment to be used in the overhaul. They range from set screws to powerplants, and there are columns and columns of Government stock numbers, parts numbers, prices, application of parts and the like. To be succinct, Mr. Speaker, these documents are immense, intricate and involved.

Every single item listed in these documents will be furnished to the contractor who wins the award to overhaul the flying boxcars. Any remaining material needed must be purchased by the successful contractor. You can understand, therefore, that the prospective bidder, in order to bid intelligently, must know what he is to get from the Navy as Government-furnished equipment and what he must buy himself.

I think we can all agree additionally that since the DC-3 and DC-4 have been around for over 20 years, there should be a wealth of information on hand about them. The military should have detailed descriptions and lists of every part and ample copies of these lists.

This is the farthest from the actual circumstances. I was told by Mr. James O'Connor, Legislative Affairs Officer of the Bureau of Weapons, that only seven—count them, seven—copies of these vital documents existed for the use of bidders. These seven copies of parts lists and Government-furnished equipment are not even "formally printed" copies; they are duplicates of IBM runs—long, long lists of thin sheets of paper, folded and refolded to look like a book. If you stretched them out, they would extend thousands of feet.

The seven copies, Mr. O'Connor told me, were located thus—two at San Diego, Calif., two at Norfolk, Va., two at Pensacola, Fla., and one here in Washington, D.C. There they could be inspected by potential bidders.

They could be inspected, he said. But the Navy also stipulated they could be copied by hand only. No electric or electronic copying process might be used. Physical possession of the documents was not allowed, and a task force hand-copying operation was also ruled out.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, some Navy civil or military servant was building a brick wall around this procurement to keep out all but past contractors. The reasons for this could be many—ranging from stupidity, through inefficiency, to a calculated attempt to see that a sweetheart company gets the work.

One manufacturer who wants to bid on the work went so far as to offer to have all documents reproduced at his own expense—with as many copies as the Navy wanted—for use of any and all bidders, in order to assure competent, intelligent bidding. I am told the Navy Department turned him down because it said it could not accept such gratuities. Gratuities, indeed. I only wish I could express my disgust at learning this.

I learned of this brick-wall technique as a part of my continuing study into military procurement, and I asked Mr. O'Connor if I could have overnight possession of this material. After some hours of sparring, feinting, and dickering, he was able to secure the documents I requested and deliver them personally to my office. Attached to the documents, however, was a letter stating that they were furnished to me "with the specific understanding they will not be made available to personnel outside your personal staff." The quotes are the Navy's. Any outside dissemination of the material, I was told, verbally, might give a bidder an unfair advantage.

What should have been said was that any outside use of the material would put other bidders on a par with the company favored by someone in the Navy.

My colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE], had been working with me to get this material broken loose from the Navy. One of his constituent companies desired to bid on the work. I called my colleague and told him we had been at least partially successful.

We agreed that the Navy should release this information to any and all interested bidders in as complete and efficient a manner as possible. After inspecting the documents and after conferring at length about the problem, we took the next step.

Mr. KILGORE called the Department of Defense, the Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense in Charge of Installations and Logistics, which office is held at present by Mr. Thomas D. Morris. Mr. KILGORE can tell you at length what transpired in his conversations with people in Mr. Morris' office.

I am happy to report that he prevailed upon these people to take another look at the idiotic policies of the Navy Department. By Thursday evening, Mr. KILGORE had been told by the Defense Department that the procedure had been changed—slightly.

Any prospective bidder could now journey to San Diego, Pensacola, Norfolk, or Washington and bring in electronic copying equipment to make copies of the information so desperately needed to bid intelligently. The copies still can not be taken out and copied. The Navy still will not relent and make enough copies to go around—the unnatural seven will stay as it is. But American industry has gotten this very small break, and some bidders will no doubt take advantage of it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay high compliment to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] for his efforts in this case on behalf of American industry and in behalf of competitive bidding. It has indeed been a pleasure to work with him and realize success.

He agrees with me, I am sure, that in all such cases as this, the military should maintain an open-door policy. It should supply all the information needed to bid intelligently and make it possible for the full force of competition to be brought to bear on all possible procurement matters. I think we all can agree that the Navy, while taking a timid step to admit its policies are something less than a model of efficiency, still has a long way to go before it can claim it is doing its best.

Mr. Speaker, the efforts of which I have spoken have removed a part of the unfair advantage contained for certain companies in this procurement. These two firms, one in Texas and one in Alabama, have had previous contracts for this work. They have all the information they need to bid intelligently. But for our action last week, all other companies would bid in the dark if they bid at all.

Now that the Navy Department has opened a crack in the door, it should go all the way. The opening dates for bids on this procurement should be set back from May 29 at least 2 weeks to mid-June. The Navy should make copies of all the needed information available at cost. If this true competitive course is followed, the contract cost will go down. I will stake my reputation on that. In fact, if experience is any indicator, the savings from competition will far exceed whatever cost is involved in making enough copies of the Government furnished equipment list to give to all interested manufacturers, on action that should have been taken years and years ago.

Mr. Speaker, this is an illustration of the way in which a bipartisan or nonpartisan approach to waste in military procurement problems can get results. It is direct evidence that the bipartisan procurement watchdog committee I have suggested in my bill—H.R. 4409—will mean savings of billions of tax dollars for America and bring about true competition in military purchasing. It is a graphic illustration of the way in which Members of this Congress, working together, can flush out the inefficiency and corruption of our procurement people, reveal it wor what it is, and bring about needed changes.

The Secretary of Defense, himself, has confirmed what I have been saying for the past 2 years—that tremendous savings can be effected when the military finally wakes up and starts buying products and services competitively. I think his estimate of a 25 percent saving is by far too conservative. The savings to be realized can be much more dramatic.

This case is also a perfect illustration of what I have contended for 2 years now, and that is that certain companies have strong friends inside the military purchasing departments who put them on an inside track, give them a favored position, if you will, for lucrative Government contracts at inflated prices.

Certain middle-grade bureaucratic burglars in the billion dollar a week club in the Pentagon are just as determined to protect these favored firms as the Secretary of Defense is determined to save money and improve procurement procedures. The goals of the two wind up poles apart and what the Secretary decides to do is often turned about-face 100 percent by the time action comes at a lower level.

The lower level civil and military servants put certain companies in the catbird seat for contracts through all sorts of sleight of hand and rigging of specifications.

Their payoff may only be a lunch or a dinner. It may be a night out on the town. It may be, as in the late 1940's a deep freeze or a mink coat. These undercover gifts—they call them gratuities—wind up costing the taxpayer a thousand times over what they are worth in inflated costs for defense items.

What Secretary McNamara decides to do and what is done at the lower levels are two distinct and different things. It is almost as though he puts in a piece of white paper and it comes out red. Until these bureaucratic burglars in the military purchasing areas are brought up short, there can be no hopes for any real savings.

Again today I have pointed to a way in which true competition can be achieved in a procurement. It will not cost the Government an extra cent. It will give American industry a chance to really compete, and it will remove two former contractors for this work from their favored positions. It will also result in the savings of some dollars for our taxpayers—and the way we are spending money in this Nation today, any relief is certainly welcome.

Tribute to Jessica McCullough Weis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on May 2 on the floor of the House a number of the Members paid tribute to our beloved ex-colleague, Judy Weis. For me the passing of Judy Weis meant saying goodbye to a much-loved close personal friend, as well as an ex-congressional colleague. Frankly, therefore, I found it quite impossible at the time of this ceremony to attain the emotional composure that would permit me to join in this public tribute.

Today I find it just as difficult to put together suitable remarks to express the real depth of my feeling. Instead, I would ask permission to have reprinted here a letter I wrote last February to a group of Judy's friends in Rochester when they honored her with a special "This Is Your Life" party. The letter is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 11, 1963.
MRS. HAROLD ROTHSTEIN,
President, 12th Ward Women's Republican Club, Rochester, N.Y.

DEAR MRS. ROTHSTEIN: It has come to my attention that your Republican Club is planning a "This Is Your Life" program to honor our mutually beloved friend, Judy Weis. As one who had the privilege of sharing the 4 years of Judy's life in Congress in a rather special way, I hope you will permit me to participate in the evening's festivities with this letter.

Judy and I did not meet until we both came to Congress in 1958 as Members of the Freshman 86th Class. However, many of our Republican women in Washington knew her personally, and all of us were aware of her outstanding reputation as one of the most charming and able women on the national political scene. It will come as no surprise to any of her friends that I became a Judy Weis admirer at our first meeting. Then followed 4 wonderful years in which Judy and I shared the pleasures and the problems, the laughter and the tears, and the frustrations and the confusions of congressional life. Even more, a great part of this time we shared a house together. As a result, life gave me the very precious gift of special friendship that one does not usually expect in maturity.

It would be natural to assume that two women who had established their pattern of life in home and family might face many difficulties in trying to fit their independent personalities into a "housemate" situation. Amazingly enough, about the only time Judy got cross with me was when I left the top off the ice bucket (which I invariably did) and the only cause for contention was a constant debate over the comparative qualities of her New York apples and my Washington apples. Beyond this, Judy's delightful and zany sense of humor struck a responsive appreciation in me and our life was blessed with many hilarious moments during which we whooped like cranes at the risk of being thought addlepated by our more serious-minded colleagues. Looking back I realize that it was Judy's gift of laughter that helped many of us over the rough spots of our hard-working, problem-filled congressional life. I believe that one of the reasons Judy was held in such high respect by her colleagues in Congress was her uncanny ability to see through the phony idea, puncture the pompous with a quip, and put a problem in perspective with a turn of phrase.

There are so many ways that Judy Weis has served her community, her party, and her Nation that I cannot begin to count them. But, on tonight's occasion it would seem most fitting to just thank Judy for serving her friends so well. Thank her for sharing her love, her warmth, her wisdom, and her wit with those of us who are privileged to call her friend. And bless her for living with us—not only in harmony but in melody.

Sincerely,

CATHERINE MAY,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I also insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial that was written following Judy's death which appeared in the Rochester Democrat-Chronicle:

JUDY WEIS

The press corps in Washington knew that the lady was not well; she never said a word, nor did any of her friends, but you cannot keep a thing like that entirely secret.

Never a complaint. Never a whimper. Never a trace of solicitation of sympathy.

Only a short time before she announced her decision not to run again for Congress, a newspaperman from Rochester asked her to lunch in Washington. It might have been the last thing she wanted to do that day; but she tossed a tweed coat across her shoulders with that well-bred carelessness that was characteristic of the lady, and joined him for lunch. He remembers two things from that luncheon.

The first was her reply to a question about some deep aspect of politics.

"Don't get me into philosophical fields like that," she smiled. "I'm a practical politician; that's what I want to be, because a practical politician who is also an honest person is the one who can get things done which need to be done."

The other memory was when they parted after lunch.

"I'll walk back to my office alone if you don't mind," she said. "I can use a little air." And she walked away slowly, so very slowly, but she even did this with class.

A person reading the career of Mrs. Jessica McCullough Weis, who is dead at the age of 61, is struck by the extraordinary amount of activity and of dedicated public service that she packed into her lifetime. The record of her life proves the claim of wise men: It is not how long you live that counts, it is what you do with your life.

Judy Weis, Congresswoman for two terms, passed on with the image of dignity and breeding and great helpfulness unmarred. The lady had class.

I think this shows a true and genuine understanding of the wonderful lady to whom it is directed.

Freeman Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE SKUBITZ
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, written by Editor Stewart Newlin, appeared in the May 13 issue of the Wellington (Kans.) Daily News. This editorial very properly denounces Secretary Freeman's use of the taxpayers' money to influence a yes vote on the wheat referendum. As this editorial points out, there is a vast difference between information and propaganda:

FREEMAN PROPAGANDA

As evidence piled up last week that Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman was campaigning with taxpayers' money to influence a yes vote in the May 21 wheat referendum, criticism of his tactics mounted, and calls for his resignation by Republican Congressmen increased.

In a hard-hitting attack on Freeman's pressure tactics, the House Republican conference last week said: "We condemn and deplore the blackjack tactics of the Secretary of Agriculture who is attempting to deny the farmer his right to free choice by misrepresenting the issues and the intent of Congress with half-truths and by improperly using the taxpayers' funds to prejudice the referendum, mislead the farmer, and turn the referendum into a Freeman "pressurendum."

"We feel that the wheat farmer himself should decide his own economic destiny in choosing between the two Democratic wheat alternatives that this administration is presenting to him. We feel that he will express in intelligent answer in the wheat referendum if left free of intimidation. In the event the referendum fails, however, we pledge our support toward, and will demand action on, sound and constructive legislation during this session of Congress."

As the furor increased, Freeman went before the Senate Agriculture Committee to defend his feed grains program and deny that he was trying to influence the referendum. He was, he piously declared, just trying to spread information about the wheat vote. The kind of information he was spreading, however, could hardly qualify as purely informative. For example, a television clip featuring Freeman started out by saying: "I can assure you that the Secretary of Agriculture would not presume to tell any wheat farmer how to vote." This statement, however, was followed with: "If anyone tells you that a no vote in the referendum will mean a better wheat program passed by the Congress this year, do not believe that statement."

Then, without telling them how it would come about, Freeman advises his TV audience: "May I give you a quick recap of the consequences of a yes-and-no vote? A yes vote—$2 producer wheat per bushel. A no vote will cost the wheat producers close to $700 million of income."

Earlier this year, Secretary Freeman made a tour of wheat areas and bluntly warned farmers he would dump tons of Government surplus wheat on the market and drive down prices if his referendum failed. At present, organized pressure groups, such as the National Farmers Union's Citizens Wheat Committee, are flooding farm areas with propaganda aimed at convincing farmers they should vote "yes" in the referendum. Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service Committees are using public funds and personnel to campaign for a yes vote.

Articulate Fuzziness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the President's speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the Marion (Ohio) Star commented on his allusion to "Random Village." Although the editorial appeared sometime ago, I think its logic is forceful and its reference to the frugal record of the Rhodes administration in Ohio is timely.

The editorial follows:

ARTICULATE FUZZINESS

The articulate young man in the White House was rephrasing old arguments the other day when he told the American Society of Newspaper Editors that any sizable cut in his budget would imperil the economy.

President Kennedy's presentation should be articulate—he's said it many times before. But his thesis makes no more sense now than it did when he started hammering away at it last year.

What he has been saying right along is that a tax cut will touch off some sort of phenomenal surge in the rate of national growth; a surge powerful enough to offset the mushrooming deficit from continued spending increases.

That still sounds like awfully fuzzy economics. The whole idea cuts harshly across the grain of accepted and orthodox economic practice.

The President alluded to "an average family man" in a so-called "Random Village" to illustrate the effect his proposal would have in stimulating jobs and personal income.

But if this same average family man in "Random Village" applied the Kennedy technique to his own budget, how far would he get? How could he wriggle out of the financial chaos that would be certain to follow a spend-more-earn-less policy? He would be off to the "Random Village" poorhouse in short order.

An essential difference, of course, is that Mr. Average Family Man is spending his own money. The Government doesn't have any money of its own to spend. It, too, is spending Mr. Average Family Man's money.

And that is one of the places where Mr. Kennedy's up-spend-down-tax proposal falls flat. Since the Government can spend only what it gets from the taxpayer, wouldn't the taxpayer benefit if the Government spent less?

It makes sense to let the taxpayer spend his money for what he knows he wants instead of signing it over to bureaucrats who spend it for what they think the taxpayer should have.

Kennedy told the editors that "the right way to a balanced budget is to seek first a balanced economy. The tax cuts I have proposed, and the level of expenditures I have proposed, have been carefully fitted together with that chief objective in mind."

That is like trying to put two magnets face to face with the idea that they'll come squarely together and stick. But it doesn't work that way. The tax cut magnet, designed to pull dollars back to the taxpayer, doesn't jibe with the spending magnet which pulls dollars in the other direction.

The President might be well advised to take a look at what an Ohioan named James A. Rhodes is doing in the budget-balancing business. The aim is the same—stimulate the economy and bolster employment—but there the similarity ends.

It will be interesting to see who makes the biggest strides toward the goal. If you're inclined to betting, better double check the odds before putting your money on Kennedy.

The New Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have been pointing out for sometime that the crux of our unemployment problem in America today is not more workers than jobs, but most often a lack of trained workers for many of the jobs which are available. This condition applies equally to adults, recent high school graduates, and current high school dropouts.

Consequently, two of the necessary requirements for solution to current unemployment are expanded vocational education programs in our schools, and a willingness on the part of former farm laborers and blue-collar workers to try new kinds of work—sometimes in a new location, as is indicated in the following editorial from the May 13 Minneapolis Tribune:

THE NEW JOBS

While farm jobs and the so-called blue-collar jobs have been diminishing in number, thanks largely to the progress of automation, the number of white-collar jobs in the United States has multiplied.

The figures are impressive. For every job eliminated in the shrinking classifications, about four new ones have opened up at the white-collar levels—including professional and technical workers, managers and proprietors, clerical and sales workers. Moreover, in many categories of professional work and office work, jobs are going begging for lack of applicants with the right training, experience, and apitude.

Recent employment reports emphasize once more that although unemployment now is serious, it need not be as high as it is. Education, specific vocational training, willingness on the part of workers to try new kinds of work, in new locations, and to prepare themselves for new jobs are keys to the conundrum.

As the empolyment picture changes with technological progress, the people who do the work must make adjustments. This isn't easy—it never has been. But for many perons the shifts are possible, and ultimately rewarding.

The Use and Misuse of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, in these days, one can hardly pick up a newspaper, listen to the radio, or watch the TV, and not be seeing or hearing something about the delinquency of our youth. This often generates a pessimistic feeling that the future of our country is greatly dimmed because of the reported caliber and character of our youth.

Consequently, it was with a feeling of new encouragement that I read a speech given on May 9 by one of our country's leading businessmen, W. A. Patterson, president of United Air Lines, at the Ninth Annual Future Unlimited Banquet of Junior Achievement in Hollywood, Calif.

The title of Mr. Patterson's speech was "The Use and Misuse of Freedom" and carried a message which I wish all the youth of our country could hear, understand, and follow. Mr. Patterson could not have had a finer audience for his powerful message. These young men and women, and their thousands of counterparts across our land, are the hope and assurance of the future of America. These youth truly represent the best of America and I am confident that they will be the leaders of tomorrow in our country and are the best guarantee that the freedom which our forefathers envisaged for those who followed them will continue to be used wisely and not misused so that our democratic way of life will be preserved.

I am proud to insert Mr. Patterson's speech as part of my remarks and I trust that my colleagues will take the time to read this inspiring message to the youth of our country by this dynamic, progressive American.

THE USE AND MISUSE OF FREEDOM

(An address by William A. Patterson)

Confidence and enthusiasm are regarded as attributes of youth, just as caution and prudence are ascribed to age. Young people are characterized as ambitious, venturesome, and prone to act without brooding over the possibility of failure.

That's the general conception but I think it's reasonable to say that, though many young people have such qualities, they also have doubts—doubts about their abilities, doubts about the world they live in. And if these doubts are nurtured by frustration and disappointment, they smother out confidence.

In this very month 30 years ago, the confidence of both young and old was being tested. There were 16 million unemployed—about a third of the total labor force. And the gross national product, which had risen to more than $103 billion in 1929, was down to less than $56 billion in 1933.

The outlook was very bleak and to some it seemed hopeless. The validity of long-respected institutions was called into question. Old leaders were put aside and spokesmen of despair arose. The days of private enterprise were over, they said. The door of opportunity had slammed shut forever, according to them, and the American economic system was ready for the junkpile.

Impressionable young people accepted this message of defeat and despair. The seedling of confidence planted in them as part of their heritage drooped and withered. They gave up their aspirations, they gave up their desire to improve themselves. And they emerged from those depression years maimed in spirit, lacking confidence in themselves and the promise of this Nation. They became resigned to a future of minimum challenge. And many of them have gone their way through life never grasping an opportunity, never daring to test the full range of their talents and abilities.

There were other young people who maintained their faith in the restorative powers of private enterprise. The time were slack but they believed the times would change. And they waited until the economic storm passed over and then found the opportunity they desired. Meanwhile, some who were perhaps less patient, more aggressive, searched out industries that were holding their own and even growing amid the general stagnation.

One of these, as I well remember, was air transportation. In addition to the depression, the airlines at that time were contendwith deep-seated public reluctance to accept a new form of travel. But in spite of this extra hindrance, the air transport industry inched ahead in those grim years. And if it hadn't, it's quite possible you'd be hearing a different speaker tonight.

The Nation's progres since the thirties has been remarkable by any standard you apply—employment, wage, rates, productive output, per capita wealth. To compare the 1933 economic structure with what we have today is to compare a log cabin with a penthouse. And to those of us who experienced the depression, it would seem the business horizon is now relatively clear of any clouds that could darken the outlook of any young person.

That's the way it seems to those who carry the scars of experience. But let's put experience aside and consider some of the things young people hear about the business world.

They hear that business is struggling in the coils of monopolistic unions; that business is harassed by government probes of everything from prices to expense accounts; that business is burdened by taxes rising to confiscatory levels; that business is caught in the price-cost squeeze and profit margins grow leaner; that business is constantly warding off attacks on its freedom.

And so on down the list.

To top it off, I know of gentlemen who, in speaking for business year after year, have yet to sound a single note of optimism and cheer. They view the future with alarm until it is safely past and then, in retrospect, it becomes the good old days. I've heard a few of them hold forth on loss of freedom to the point where I've looked at their wrists to see if they wore shackles.

I happen to be associated with an industry that's been government regulated for many years. I assure you I wear no shackles. Our company and the other trunk airlines are self-sufficient. They don't receive a dime in government subsidy. We're subject to the same economic forces that affect business in general. And we have some requirements that are far more demanding than in other types of business. One, for example, is the heavy investment in electronic equipment related to safety. Another is the necessity for large expenditures in personnel training, particularly flight personnel.

As a regulated industry, we make profits, suffer losses, report to stockholders and, in short, conduct our affairs in the same way as any other business organization. And, if you think that regulation eliminates competition, you haven't been reading our advertising. The airlines are constantly striving to develop service features and new technology to gain the advantage in attracting customers. Competition is so keen that even trivial advantages are disputed. At one point, you may recall, several airlines battled it out on the score of which provided passengers with the best sandwich.

One of the pitfalls to be sidestepped in a regulated industry is the tendency to blame all your troubles on the government agency. It's easy to transfer the responsibility for errors onto some other person or thing. It's easy but it's self-deluding. I've had occasion to criticize the actions of our regulatory board many times. No one has ever questioned my right to do so. But before speaking out, I've always asked, "Is this something of our own making, or is it simply a case of passing the buck?"

Airline management, naturally, is nettled at times by regulatory restrictions. However, restrictions and all, we still have elbow room to use initiative and imagination in expanding our share of the market. I'm not for a moment suggesting that other industries should apply for membership in the Regulatory Club. I'm merely saying that if we who are regulated have considerable freedom, then surely those who are unregulated have greater freedom.

As for the problems common to air transportation and other industries, I live with them day after day and accept them as part of the challenge in doing business. Taxes are heavy, yes. Government policies are irksome, yes. Costs are high and profits increasingly hard to come by. True, all true. But I know that business copes successfully with problems and gets the job done. And year after year, in spite of obstacles, reverses and frustrations, American business provides the people of this Nation with the world's best standard of living.

One of the special advantages of junior achievement is that young men and women learn for themselves that problems can be solved. They also come to appreciate the service concept of our economic system—which simply means that it is designed to serve many, rather than to enrich a few. And they experience, firsthand, the excitement, uncertainty and satisfaction of bringing a product to the marketplace where consumers are free to choose or reject it. Most important, they obtain an understanding of the vital function that risk-capital performs in a free society.

I say "free society" fully aware that some will maintain this term hardly applies. They would point out, perhaps emphatically, that the area of business liberty has been consistently narrowed by legislation, beginning in the 1880's and increasing in recent decades. And they would say, "Try running your business in your own way and see what happens."

Well, I'm familiar with the various restrictions but it seems to me that some persons tend to overlook the fact that liberty operates within the framework of authority. Absolute liberty—the unqualified right to do as we please—is held in check on every side. The conduct of the individual is limited by the authority vested in parents, teachers, moral codes, the police power, government and other sources.

The small boy, disciplined by his father for playing in the street, cries out for liberty—the right to play where he chooses. Students in high school, assigned to an extra large amount of homework, want liberty—the right to study as they please. The factory worker, punching a time clock and held to production quotas, wants liberty—the right to work as he pleases. Employers, hampered by labor legislation, want liberty—the right to operate their business as they see fit.

As Americans, it's part of our tradition to become irritated when anyone interferes with our personal activities and conduct of life. After all, we began our national existence by overthrowing the authority of England. But I would point out that English authority was not of the people's choosing. It was imposed on them and they were subjected to harsh measures that eliminated basic liberties. Such measures were flouted by men of conscience and principle. The English authorities regarded the Colonists as lawless barbarians. Well, they weren't lawless and they weren't barbarians. They merely wanted freedom.

Later, when Americans chose their own political system with its guarantees of freedom, George Washington said this: "Respect for government and compliance with its laws are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty."

The desire for business liberty impelled many Americans to support the War for Independence with their money, their property and their lives. English colonial policy had been designed to suppress commerce and manufacturing in the New World. As a result, prior to adoption of the Constitution, there were only 21 business corporations in this country. And of that meager number, two were trading companies and one was a manufacturing enterprise. The others were engaged in banking, insurance, and the construction of bridges and turnpikes. They existed at the pleasure of the King who had power to close them out at any time.

We all know it was the King who finally was closed out. And since that time, understandably, Americans have been wary of any encroachment on business liberty.

Yet, there has been loss of business liberty. Why has it happened?

I've given this question considerable thought over the years. I've seen many of the executive agencies come into being—the Securities and Exchange Commission, National Labor Relations Board, the Federal Trade Commission and others. Once they're born, they're here to stay. And I've concluded that the moral to be drawn from their existence is this: When you abuse liberty, you lose liberty.

Trace the events that led to the establishment of agencies which have restrictive authority over some phase of business. You'll invariably find that a few men, or a group of men, choose to interpret liberty as the right to do as they pleased, without regard to ethics or the interest of others. Their operations antagonized the public and Congress took action. It's as simple as that.

Many of us are inclined to resent directives from officials of Government agencies. We bristle at their interference. And we call them choice names—bureaucrats, busybodies, snoopers. I believe these gentlemen act in good conscience. They have the facts, the knowledge. But they sometimes lack the experience that can only be acquired on the firing line. Theories that seem logical in discussions around long tables in august chambers may prove faulty in the world of real people, real problems and real competition.

Grousing about loss of liberty will not cause restrictive Government agencies to go away. They're here and here to stay, so far as I can see. And unless the facts behind their origin are understood, there may be others.

Self-regulation is better than imposed regulation. To be honest in character is far better than to be kept honest. That may sound like some of the handy maxims people relied on many years ago—such sayings as "the used key is always bright"; "keep your shop and your shop will keep you." And, of course, "honesty is the best policy." Maxims are out of date. Cynics describe them as old-fashioned platitudes. That may be, but no one—no one—has disproved their basic wisdom.

I'm not suggesting that members of junior achievement revive the old maxims. (Although I wouldn't be surprised if some young man or woman in this audience is wondering right now about the sales possibilities of similar slogans, handsomely printed on placards.) I think it would be rewarding, however, for young Americans to become acquainted with the unpretentious philosophy of their forebearers as summed up in so-called platitudes. I think it would be refreshing to learn that "honor," "integrity," and "responsibility" are more than just words—that they, in fact, embody concepts of behavior sorely needed in modern life.

Many of you who participate in junior achievement are destined to become leaders of the business community. In that capacity you will have the opportunity to preserve private enterprise for your children. It is a social trust of great importance. If fulfilled honorably and constructively, this Nation will be strengthened. But if ethics are ignored and excesses committed, private enterprise will be further undermined, with further loss of liberty.

Teenagers are often pictured as wholly given over to the pursuit of pleasure, with no sense of purpose in life and no goals higher than the acquisition of the latest rock-and-roll record. I wish that people who have that notion would take time to interest themselves in the work of junior achievement.

I'm sure they would join me in saying that I have caught a glimpse of the future of America in the energy and confidence of the young men and women here tonight—and that future looks better than the past.

Its Own Backyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Arkansas City (Kans.) Daily Traveler explains that this Government might conceivably find the solution to the unemployment problem by looking in its own backyard:

ITS OWN BACKYARD

People have watched through the years the never-ending battle between management and labor and believe that management is making a concerted effort to do away with as much manpower as possible, while labor is seeking to end the profit system and place free enterprise under Government rule.

There is a feeling that automation is the answer to management's dream and that it will get labor out of management's hair once and for all.

A close look at the relationship between people in industry might reveal that bitterness is not as extensive as the country is led to believe. The parties concerned are only protecting their interests. Management has found profits are not what they used to be and consequently would reduce expenses by decreasing the number of employees. Labor would meet the challenge by calling for a shorter workweek and thus make more jobs necessary.

The problem that has been created can be attributed to State and Federal Government. It's a case of too much government.

The obligations forced on management by State and Federal Governments add to the cost of operating a business or industry. First there is the social security payment which must match the contributions of each employee. Such insurance as workmen's compensation must be paid out along with unemployment insurance costs. These benefits are for the employee. These are in addition to regular operating expenses.

Next comes the income tax which has been hiked out of reason and takes the cream after the forced expenses are paid. The privilege of being in business is a costly one.

It might be reasonable to ask why unions do not assume part of the burden of protecting employees instead of placing it with management. All wage earners are not in unions, of course, but the reason management carries the load is because State legislators and the U.S. Congressmen have put the burden on business.

A going firm now sees half of its profits go to income tax after the other necessities have been paid. Where can expenses be cut? By reducing the labor force. Machines do not require unemployment insurance or workmen's compensation or social security. But half of any money saved by machines is going to income taxes for sure.

So the differences between management and labor should not be regarded as issues that prompt ill feeling between men. This boils down to economics. While wages are usually the most costly item on the expense budget, the costs forced by Government cannot be overlooked. When Government stews about unemployment it has only to look in its own backyard.

Gordon Cooper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Colorado-connected astronaut, Gordon Cooper, who successfully completed our most ambitious venture into space. All Americans experience a special pride in the courage, ability, and resourcefulness of this great young American.

Gordon Cooper joins the ranks of other American heroes who have inscribed their names on the Nation's honor roll. By skillfully and successfully guiding *Faith 7* through 22 orbits and back to a pinpoint landing on earth he has made a genuine contribution to our space knowledge.

The courage of Gordon Cooper was demonstrated when he made this simple statement before the flight:

> I'm ready. All we have to do now is to load, lox, and launch.

About his reentry he stated, "Right on the old bazoo."

These words, demonstrating the confidence, the dedication, and determination that are so typically American will rank with other heroic statements such as, "Don't fire until you see the whites of their eyes" and "We have just begun to fight."

We in Colorado are proud of Gordon Cooper. We congratulate his wife, Trudy, and their two fine children, Camala and Janita. All our astronauts, including another illustrious Coloradan from Boulder, Scott Carpenter, have brought great credit to our Nation. It is a privilege and an honor to commend them before the House of Representatives.

Beef Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to call to the attention of the House the fact that more beef was imported into this country last year than was produced and marketed in the States of South Dakota and Wyoming combined.

The records I have just received from the Department of Agriculture indicate that South Dakota marketed a record production of 1,277,320,000 pounds of beef in 1962, and that Wyoming handled 420,810,000 pounds making a total for the two States of 1,698,130,000 pounds.

I am happy to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this is an increase of the production in 1960 and previous years. But even with this record figure, the production and marketing of beef in the States of Wyoming and South Dakota was 26,870,000 less than the 1,725 million pounds imported during the 12 months ending January 1, 1963. It would take the entire production of these two States and six counties in the State of North Dakota to equal last year's imports.

The North Dakota beef marketing last year was 558,040,000. This added to that of South Dakota would equal 110,360,000 more than the total imports. But excluding marketings from Pennington, Perkins, and Tripp Counties, imports were equal to the production of these two great beef States.

Why, Mr. Speaker, is there not greater concern over this situation? When imports are equal to the production of two of the top beef producing States in the Nation, how can anyone expect anything but slumping beef prices?

The administration's policy of allowing this flood of foreign beef is a calculated effort, instigated by the Secretary of Agriculture, to bring economic pressure on the American cattleman who has been the major stumbling block in the New Frontier effort to socialize our farm industry.

The policy of "managed news" is bad enough, but the problem of "managed markets" is worse.

I would point out again, Mr. Speaker, that one out of every 10 pounds of beef that went onto the American tables last year was raised in some foreign country, and displaced an American farmer and rancher.

Under the humorously titled Trade Expansion Act of 1962, Congress made provision for financing of taking the farmer off of the land and giving him industrial training so that he would be ably trained and equipped to compete with the other 4½ million unemployed Americans who are looking for jobs.

Is it the program of the New Frontier to break the farmer and put him out of business with noncompetitive foreign imports so that he too will be dependent upon subsidies and doles and grants?

Managament of News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, responsible newsmen throughout the Nation, leaders in all the information media have indicated, in growing numbers, reactions along a spectrum from dissatisfaction—to deep concern—to grave alarm over the manner in which the administration is dispensing the news. Great power for good or ill resides with those who decide which news shall or shall not become public record. The temptation to suppress information of administrative errors, or to decide that bad news is not "good for the country" must be difficult indeed to resist, and a case can always be made for the point of view that it is in the "national interest" that the party in power be returned to office, if the information officer is sufficiently dedicated. But aside from that very natural threat to the democratic ideal of "freedom of the press" we have been faced with official statements that indicate use of the news which comes even closer to the cynical policies of dictatorship. We have learned that we were given deliberate falsehoods by our Government during the Cuban crisis. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House a thoughtful editorial which appeared in the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal on Friday, May 17, an editorial in the great tradition of American journalism, which explores fully the dangerous consequences of deliberate interference with the public's "right to know."

The editorial follows:

[From the State Journal, Lansing, Mich., May 17, 1963]

Management of News

There is cause for much concern over the manner in which the people are being denied their right to know what is going on in their Government nowadays.

It is a matter that cannot be shrugged off with a comment that a hardworking reporter will get the news somehow, or that newspapers manage the news, why not the Government. It is true that outstanding jobs of digging up the news have been performed in the past, all of which has redounded to the benefit of the public. But, it is still a fact that much news has been suppressed in instances where its free dissemination at the earliest stage of its development might have prevented gross error and lasting regret.

One of the best explanations of the evils inherent in the so-called management of the news, at the Federal Government level was given recently by William J. Coughlin, president of the Aviation and Space Writers Association, in a statement made before the Government Information Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, better known as the Moss committee on governmental secrecy.

Coughlin attacked the argument that little has been lost to date by the management of news. He branded such statements as outright lies.

"We have lost the confidence of the world in our Government's honesty in reporting Cuban developments—not concerning policy as it was made but concerning events as they were concealed," said Coughlin. "We have lost it because reporters were not present on the scene."

"We have lost what can never be recovered. Where, I ask you, are the dramatic eyewitness stories of the Cuban crisis which brought the world closer to annihilation than any event in World War II? It has not been written and it will never be written because there were no U.S. reporters on the scene.

"Do not talk to me about what we will lose; we already have lost. One of the most dramatic chapters in history has gone unrecorded by objective newsmen because this administration chose a course that never was undertaken in the Civil War, World War I, World War II, or Korea. It kept reporters out of action.

"This is an act of shame—not a future possibility of management of the news, but a disgraceful reality of past management of the news by this administration. It is irreparable * * *.

"These people in Government are about the taxpayer's business and any information which is not classified for justifiable security reasons should be available on inquiry by the press. Yet, today, withholding of such information is not questioned."

These, of course, are the views of a working newsman, based on his experience over many years as a writer on military affairs. He is currently editor of the Missiles and Rockets magazine.

It might be noted, however, that similar views are held by the chairman of the subcommittee before which Coughlin testified. This subcommittee, of which Congressman George Meader and Robert P. Griffin, of Michigan, are the ranking Republican members, is headed by Representative John E. Moss, California Democrat.

Representative Moss is not a newspaperman, his background has been in business as a retail merchant and real estate broker but he has been waging a long and determined fight in behalf of "the public's right to know."

At first he was inclined to be gentle with the Kennedy administration. He apparently was convinced, from the statements of the President and other high administration brass, that more, rather than less, freedom would be accorded the press in prying news, even of the embarrassing type, from the Federal bureaucracy. But his attitude has changed notably over the past few months as he has grown more and more critical of the administration performance.

Within the past week, Moss wrote to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara in protest against the growing tendency of military authorities to keep reporters and photographers away from the scene of military aircraft accidents which occur in civilian areas.

Moss pointed out that as early as 1958 his committee had analyzed pertinent military regulations and concluded that Armed Forces personnel could not bar the press from such accidents in civilian areas, could not seize photographic plates or equipment, or use physical restraints to prohibit the taking of pictures of a crash.

In his protest to Secretary McNamara, the California Congressman asserted: "Military authorities are acting in an outrageous manner when they take it upon themselves to violate civil rights in areas where they have absolutely no legal powers."

Much was made of the brash statements, several weeks back, of Arthur Sylvester, the Defense Department's Chief Information Officer, calling news management a part of the Nation's "weaponry" and defending the Government's right even to lie to its citizens under certain circumstances.

But perhaps more ultimate damage to the people's right to know about the performance of their public servants can come from the constant nibbling away of press freedoms, particularly the curbing of the reporter's opportunity to be a witness to events, great and small, which are shaping the world's future.

No newspaperman worthy of the name would jeopardize the Nation's security by disclosing information of obvious value to its enemies. But press responsibility to the public extends far beyond the negative duty of withholding security information. It is even more importantly duty-bound to inform the citizenry of inefficiency, shoddy conduct, and ill-founded judgments within governmental ranks.

And no agency within our democratic system of government should be permitted to curb, either by force or by brainwashing blandishment, the constitutionally protected rights of the public to that service which only the press can provide.

News Management or News Laziness?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing much of late about a practice that is represented as a new and startling development on the national scene—something called news management. Quite a number of my colleagues and various newspaper editors at national conventions have addressed themselves to this presumably grave threat to our freedoms.

Is news management something new, or are we, once again, engaged in a battle of words, a semantic scrimmage? Mr. William C. Epler, editor of an obscure newspaper in a little-known corner of Arizona—the Brewery Gulch Gazette of Brewery Gulch in Bisbee, Ariz., has taken note of this debate and, I think, shed some light on it. In an editorial published May 2, 1963, Mr. Epler wrote:

IT TAKES WORK

Much is heard these days about news management by the present administration in Washington. From many quarters comes the cry the American public is deliberately being misinformed, that the truth is not being told and that the administration is not being cricket with reporters.

Press and editorial associations, numerous reporters in the Nation's Capital and a host of editors across the country have waxed hot and heavy in their castigation of the administration. Charges and countercharges have flown thick and fast.

All of this, I find quite amusing.

To hear all the cries, you would think there were something new about this news management business. The fact is it has been with us since the conception of our country, and it will likely always be around. If for no other reason than it is human nature to play up good news, hold back bad and to try to get the most favorable impression across to the public whether or not it is the complete truth.

The real problem in all this lies not with the administration, but rather with the calibre of the reporters who comprise the press in Washington. Too many of them, in our opinion, are just plain lazy. Over the years they have come to depend upon the formal press conference, the mimeographed news releases handed out by the stack and the qualified-to-death comments of the public relations expert or press agent hired by Government agencies.

Only one nationally-recognized reporter, to my knowledge, had the insight and courage in all the recent hub-bub to put a finger on the trouble. In effect, he said the news is still there, as it has always been, but the reporter has to dig for it, as every good reporter will do, and not expect to have it handed to him on a silver platter.

Every reporter worthy of the name, covering city, county, and State governments throughout the land, digs for his stories and looks with tongue-in-cheek at mineographed press releases. Why should it be different in Washington?

The truth of the matter appears to be simply that many of the reporters in Washington, especially those howling the loudest and longest, are just plain lazy. They should stop crying and get to work, without worrying about "being in" with the White House. They would be surprised how many good stories would be filed with their office. They would also discover the label reporter is a work permit, not just a free ticket for the gravy train of prepared handouts.

Theoretical Baloney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial entitled "Shall We Jump for Joy?" the Tulsa World on May 5 appropriately describes the New Frontier economic policies as "theoretical baloney." As the World editorial points out, the "more the Nation produces, the more the big government boys want to spend."

I commend the World editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

From Treasury Secretary Dillon comes the fiscal news of 1962: The Federal deficit may be $1 billion smaller than expected next year.

This word may spawn dancing in the streets all along the New Frontier, but we are able to restrain our joy at a point short of hysteria. Yes, of course it's good to hear the economy is brighter, and naturally we're glad the red-ink situation looks improved. But should we be deliriously ecstatic over the fact the deficit will be only $10.9 billion instead of $11.9 billion?

Speaking before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in Washington, Dillon cited the economic upturn as added reason for a tax cut by Congress. This is one of the Administration's key measures—to stimulate the economy by reducing income taxes.

As we have said before, we would welcome a lowering of taxes as much as anybody. But before Congress cuts the Federal intake, shouldn't something be done about reducing the outgo?

Government spending is what we're talking about. Secretary Dillon didn't say much about that—but what he did say makes us even less disposed to join the Kennedy cheering section.

". . . the deficit we now face is the result of an economy which produces too little—rather than of a Government which spends too much," the Secretary stated.

"There can be no question that if our economy were operating at reasonably full capacity, our tax system would today be producing more than enough revenue to finance our current national needs within a balenced budgetary surpluses."

There is only one thing wrong with this argument. It's theoretical baloney. The more the Nation produces, the more the big Government boys want to spend. President Kennedy himself has endorsed the principle that the higher the gross national product, the higher the deficit it will support.

Let's get one thing straight: We are going to have Federal deficits just so long as the Government is run on the theory that deficits are just dandy. We will never get rid of them until we start regarding them as an insufferable burden.

A $10.9 billion deficit is better than an $11.9 billion deficit—but it's still a deficit and nothing to be proud of. We'll be glad to join the street dancing—just as soon as the Kennedy administration begins to match Federal spending cuts.

Lotteries of Spain, Germany, and France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, out of the 77 foreign countries which operate Government-run lotteries, three European nations have found that lotteries not only yield high revenues but also have eliminated underworld problems.

These lotteries are an excellent indication of the success that may be had in bringing gambling under the control of government.

Spain soaks up approximately 90 percent of all potential gambling money in the nation. Although Spain is not a rich country, the national lottery brought in over $112 million last year. The government's income was over $32½ million.

Germany also gathers large revenues from their lottery operations. Total gross receipts of lotteries came to $395 million in 1962. The total net income to the state government amounted to about $160 million that year. At least one-half of the proceeds were earmarked for such purposes as support of youth activities, sports and health.

France also does very well. In 1962, the total gross annual receipts came to $144 million. After prizes, the net income received by the government was $46 million. The French attitude is that since gambling is inevitable, it should be kept clean, orderly, and profitable to the state.

Mr. Speaker, we would do well to profit from the experiences of these countries. Now, more than ever, the United States needs a national lottery which could, easily and painlessly, pump into our Government coffers over $10 billion a year in additional income. It would not only be an alternative to higher taxation but it would help to cut our heavy taxes and at the same time help to reduce our national debt.

Why can we not be as smart as these countries or even as smart as the State of New Hampshire?

Arthur Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better way to start the week than to give the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the benefit of the humorous articles of Art Hoppe which are often inserted and thoroughly enjoyed from all reports coming to my attention.

Three of his recent columns from the San Francisco Chronicle follow:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, May 6, 1963]

HAPPINESS IS A SIMPLE PLURALITY

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Goodby, Mr. Nixon. Farewell, farewell. Lots of luck in New York. And as you trudge off eastward into the sunrise of a new day, let me say I think you're right: if you can't win in California, try a smaller State.

Oh, I know. It takes a lot of old-fashioned courage to set forth on a new path. Especially one going in that direction. Because our whole success-obsessed culture demands we keep climbing ever upward to greater challenges.

But you and I know this ratrace philosophy is false. There's a lot to be said for being a big frog in a small puddle.

Besides, it isn't as though the trail you have taken is unmarked. And when skies seem gray, when you feel lost in the thickets of doubt, you can always hold aloft as a shining beacon the name of the man who blazed the way before you: Mr. Harold Stassen.

I'm sure his example was much in your mind when you made your grave decision. Remember how he arose out of Minnesota like a comet and burst on the Washington scene? In no time, he was running for Vice President. Heir apparent to Mr. Eisenhower. The White House itself clearly within his grasp.

And after that, of course, he moved down to Pennsylvania and ran for Governor. And after that he ran for mayor of Philadelphia. And after that * * *. But, as you and I know, who is to say he is not the happiest of men today. Wherever he is.

Yet here are all we Americans, striving to get ahead, seeking status, accumulating tail fins and ulcers. And whose fault is it? Our leaders. Being successful they naturally demand we follow them. And so they drag us ever upward from one hollow triumph to the next. Until we crack. Is this happiness? No.

And that, Mr. Nixon, is why I wish to pay tribute today to the only two true leaders of our time. You and Mr. Stassen. For only by emulating you can we Americans discover the direction in which true happiness lies: downhill.

Thus I have faith you will find happiness at last in New York. What, may I ask the cynics, is wrong with running for mayor in Scarsdale? It is a decent and honorable job, a job worth doing. Or, hopefully, failing that, a spiritedly unsuccessful campaign for county selectman? As you have so ably pointed out, it is the desire to serve, not the status of the job, which counts.

Perhaps, with a bit of luck, you will be able to struggle onward. Then finally, the ultimate: "Dick Nixon for precinct vice captain —experience counts."

Ah, and when you have lost the last campaign, how blessed you will be by true inner peace, true contentment, true—just a minute.

"Dick Nixon for precinct vice captain?" I think I've gone too far. Maybe I ought to revise my thesis and put it this way: Only by rejecting the success ratrace can all we Americans find true happiness. All we Americans, that is, except politicians.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, May 7, 1963]

SAVE MANKIND—STAMP OUT EGGPLANT

(By Arthur Hoppe)

As you know, the Planned Parenthood League and I have been waging an all-out campaign against the population explosion. Independently, that is. They have their methods and I have mine.

I inherited mine, you may recall, from Dr. Carl G. Heller, a reproductive physiologist, who discovered a grand pill for gentlemen which works almost perfectly. Except for one little hitch: if you take a drink while on the bills, your eyeballs turn bright red.

So Dr. Heller, an easily discouraged man, said the hell with it. And it was left up to me to save humanity by promoting red eyeballs. Under the slogan "better red than bred."

But already I've run into trouble. Eggplant seeds. The May issue of the National Geographic, on page 659, reports that the kathakall dancers of southern India have discovered they can artificially color their eyeballs bright red "by placing eggplant seeds under the lids." Artificially. Well, there goes the old eyeball game.

For in my selfless work to promote red eyeballs as high fashion, nothing concerned me more gravely than the delicate choice they would inflict on young ladies. Should a demure maiden publicly select a young man with flashy red eyeballs? In preference to a young man with old-style white eyeballs? Or would she thus be tacitly admitting more than a young maiden should tacitly admit?

But I concluded, I'm sure rightly, that we had stumbled at last on a foolproof way of separating the ladies from the girls.

How simple! How clear-cut. A method with advantages for all. But that was before eggplant seeds. Oh, I know the deviousness of our predatory young men. And the danger from eggplant seeds is not, as you might think, that a predatory young man will artificially color his eyeballs red. It is that he will artificially color only one eyeball red.

You can see the insidiousness of this scheme. Our predatory young man enters a cocktail party—one eyeball a devilish fiery red; the other a pure and innocent white. He sizes up the nearest member of the opposite sex. Is she a sweet young lady? Or a hotsy-totsy girl? He decides. And then—oh, untrustworthy satyr that he is—he closes one eye.

Which eye, of course, depends on how he's sized her up.

The lure is out, the hook is set and her fate, in all likelihood, is sealed. Worse, this artificiality will do not a whit to snuff out the population explosion. To, if I may put if obliquely, the contrary. And thus my life's work of creating a better world for us all through red eyeballs now seems self-defeating.

Isn't that the way it goes? Every time man marches grandly forth to alter some cosmic force he doesn't quite understand—like desire—he trips over some incredibly formidable obstacle. Like an eggplant seed.

But wait. Should we not have more faith in American womanhood? Properly forewarned, won't they be as invincible as * * * As * * * Well, as usual?

We must sound the tocsin. Beware, young ladies, of the man in the Hathaway shirt. Scrutinize each new admirer with care. Does he have a suspicious lumpiness under one eye? Does it rattle? Is he growing eggplant in his windowbox? Keep your eyes open. Keep his eyes open. Both of them.

Remember our motto: "Why be half safe?"

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, May 8, 1963]

DICK, HAPPY, ROCKY, MARY, PAT, CHECKERS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

I'm all in favor of the way our social betters strive to face such things in a very civilized fashion. But, like everybody else, I can't help worrying how it'll all turn out at 810 Fifth Avenue. What with Mr. and Mrs. and Mrs. Rockefeller and Mr. Nixon all in the same boat. If that's the word for it.

Such high-class goings-on confuse me. But if I've got it straight, Mr. and (old) Mrs. Rockefeller used to have the top triplex. But she won custody of the 13th and 14th floors. So Mr. and Mrs. (new) Rockefeller have to make do by expanding the 12th for her four kids. And now Mr. Nixon's moving into a modest $200,000 flat below them.

Which all makes sense. To anybody who reads the society pages. But what about the elevator?

There's Mrs. (old) Rockefeller and her four (old) children in the down car. And it stops at 12. Enter Mr. and Mrs. (new) Rockefeller and the four (new) children.

"Oh," says Mrs. (old) Rockefeller. "Oh," says Mrs. (new) Rockefeller. "Oh, oh," says Mr. (suddenly looking very old) Rockefeller. "Now let us all behave in a very civilized fashion." Which is what men always say in such circumstances.

But before he can introduce everybody—in case he was thinking of it—the elevator stops again. And in step Mr. and Mrs. Nixon, their two Nixonettes and Checkers. "Oh," says Mr. Rockefeller. "Oh," says Mr. Nixon.

"I would like to welcome you into this elevator as a distinguished American," says Mr. Rockefeller nervously. "And I hope you will enter local politics. At the ward level." 'I am just here to practice law," says Mr. Nixon with dignity.

"May I introduce you," says Mr. Rockefeller, wiping his brow, "to my wives and children. I mean these are our children and those are her children who are now my children and this is Mrs. Rockefeller." "How do you do," says Mr. Nixon politely, "Not that one," snaps Mr. Rockefeller. "This one." "I'm just here to practice law," says Mr. Nixon. "Is that a crack?" says Mr. Rockefeller angrily.

And right then the elevator breaks down.

Well, if you've ever been trapped in an elevator, you know how the confinement tries one's soul. Even with strangers. Twenty minutes would be awful. What a scene.

Of course, the kids, being kids, are probably playing 20 questions to idle the time. And the ladies, being ladies, are getting on fine. 'Make him some good hot chicken soup," Mrs. (old) Rockefeller is saying. And Mrs. (new) Rockefeller is thanking her for how nice and clean she left everything.

But there's Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Nixon, eyeball to eyeball. "Look here, fella," Mr. Rockefeller is shouting. "The way you shafted me with the delegates in 1960." "Me, shaft you?" cries Mr. Nixon. "Who wouldn't run on my ticket? Who wouldn't lift a finger for me in New York? Who knifed me in order to have a clear field in 1964? If I had elbow room, I'd point an accusatory finger. And furthermore."

Well, I'd be surprised if both ever reach ground alive. Which all goes to prove we common people are right. Being civilized is fine. But no apartment house is big enough to house the memories of old passions. And Mr. Nixon ought to be gentleman enough to move out to Bronxville instead.

Coal's Big Stake in Low Rail Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Coal's Big Stake in Low Rail Rates" which appeared in the May 13 issue of the Messenger of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

COAL'S BIG STAKE IN LOW RAIL RATES

The National Coal Policy Conference has strongly endorsed legislation to give to the Nation's railroads authority to establish minimum rates on bulk commodities, free of Government regulation, as one means of strengthening the competitive position of good old soft coal in major markets.

Joseph E. Moody, president of the conference, which embraces all segments of the vast industrial complex built around coal, pointed out that the legislation sought would place coal in better position with regard to dumped foreign residual oil. He also pointed out that railroads are the only mode of transportation now subject to ICC regulation of bulk commodity rates, and said:

"By freeing railroads from this form of regulation, Congress would enable the rails to enter into long-term contracts for hauling coal that would result in more substantial savings in transportation costs."

(When transportation costs are lowered, coal's potential market is automatically widened to that extent, it needs to be pointed out, and when coal's market is widened there is more operating time and hence better job opportunity for people who work in the industry.)

Mr. Moody pointed out that railroads today are using existing equipment in high speed, large volume unit trains to move coal from mine to consumer at rates for below those that have to be charged for a single car in conventional train haulage.

Development of the integral train, which would use specially-designed and more efficient equipment, can mean even greater rate reductions, Moody suggested.

Under present regulations, however, railroads have no assurance that low rates established as a result of these new concepts will not be suspended by the ICC, either as a result of protests of rival carriers or on its own initiative.

Thus, the fact that the unit train development is making favorable headway at this particular time, and holds high promise of a better day for mining, does not imply that it might not at some future time run into resistance under present regulatory practices.

It was interesting to note in Mr. Moody's presentation to the congressional committee that he made the following points:

Coal moves by various means, including barge and trucks, but more than 70 percent of all coal mined in the United States must depend on the railroads for delivery.

Rail revenue from hauling coal amounted to more than $1 billion, or 12.1 percent of the total freight revenue of all class I railroads in 1962.

In coal-producing areas everywhere the progress of this move to allow the rail people to fix minimum rates on bulk commodities like coal will be watched with deep interest. A lot of running time for mines, and a lot of days of employment for miners and for suppliers of mines and such, are involved in the matter.

And the average fellow cannot for the life of him see why the roads should not be permitted to fix rates which will spur the coal business or the wheat or corn business, or anything else shipped in bulk, at the same time gaining needed revenue for their own operations.

The railroads need the business, too, and need to be permitted to survive and to modernize, against the day when sudden war would find us utterly dependent upon them again for the vast volume of transportation which war emergencies require.

Creeping Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the April 27 issue of Human Events included an article by Mr. Fred De Armond of Springfield, Mo. I had the opportunity to hear Mr. De Armond discuss the criteria for recognizing socialism at a recent meeting of the Greene County Republican Women's Club. He is a keen observer of the American scene and I commend his views to my colleagues.

CREEPING SOCIALISM

(By Fred De Armond)

When you mention socialism the liberals will probably react in one of two ways. They either deny that specific instances of welfare statism are socialistic, or they simply say, "OK, so it's socialism. Well, what of it?" So, we have on one hand the categorical denial, and on the other hand the implicit view that socialism is inevitable.

In this article I propose to deal with economic dialectic as it affects the first group, the more numerous of the two. With them, terminology and labels and definitions are at the heart of the discussion.

WHAT IS SOCIALISM?

If we are to demonstrate, as I believe can be done, that the American economy has gone a long way toward socialism, and is headed progressively in that direction, we must begin by defining what we're talking about. I could cite a whole page of definitions of socialism, but the one that seems most meaningful is this: "Modern socialism is the assumption by the state of responsibility and authority for control of the economic system."

Now, by this standard, what is the evidence that socialism has made a partial conquest of the United States? Can we establish any gage as to how far we have gone? There are a number of criteria by which to measure this change.

One was supplied by Merle Thorpe, for 28 years editor of Nation's Business. Thorpe said a country has been socialized when the central government has established controls over (a) the people's earnings, (b) their savings, (c) their hours and conditions of work, and (d) the prices they pay.

How far we have gone in these four directions will become apparent as we look at a second criterion—the Socialist Party platform of 1932. Of 47 planks in that platform, 26 are now in full effect; 13 have been partially enacted; and 8 have not been realized in any degree. If we regard the 13 as halfway accomplished by the reformers—a very rough approximation—that would mean that the Socialists have been successful in selling some 70 percent of their program to the country.

GOVERNMENT COMPETITION

As everyone knows, a determined effort is being made by the present administration to fasten a compulsory medical care bill upon us. Creeping socialism is reaching out greedily for public ownership of utilities, nuclear energy development, and certain additional financial functions. The Federal Government is now generating approximately one-fourth of all electric power supplied by the Nation. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States was moved to say:

"The Government is the Nation's biggest electric power producer, the biggest power consumer, the biggest employer, the biggest insurance company, the biggest landlord, biggest tenant, and biggest publisher. In fact, Uncle Sam owns more wheat than all the wheat farmers, more grassland than all the cattlemen, and more trucks than General Motors."

Questions frequently asked and believed to be most disconcerting to a libertarian are: "Well, aren't these publicly owned and operated enterprises successful? Aren't people better off by reason of the Government-encouraged cooperatives, the fertilizer plants, the municipal utilities, and all the other? Isn't there a place in a matured economy such as ours for public as well as private enterprises?"

BUSINESS PAYS

Under analysis this proves to be a superficial view of the situation. The public or cooperative enterprise thrives only because there are enough private businesses to pay the taxes. The public group is riding on the backs of the private group.

In his "Human Action," Ludwig von Mises goes so far as to assert that in reality there can be no such thing as a mixed capitalist-Socialist economy. The great economist explains that "these publicly owned and operated enterprises are subject to the sovereignty of the market. They must fit themselves, as buyers of raw materials, equipment, and labor, and as sellers of goods and services, into the scheme of the market economy." But the moment they have become big enough to dominate the market economy, we will suddenly wake up to the fact that we are a full-blown Socialist state.

In addition to those we have been analyzing, at least three other clues help to determine how far the Nation has gone down the Socialist road.

One is the measure of the tax bite. The total "take" of government in the United States has been placed by Adm. Ben Moreell, former chairman of the Board of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., at 36 percent of our annual earnings. That is well past the danger mark. It is in fact more than the National Socialist (Nazi) government of Germany was taking at the outbreak of World War II.

On his return from a recent visit to Yugoslavia, Dr. Milton Friedman, Chicago University economist, wrote that "Yugoslavia is introducing much capitalism under the banner of socialism, while we (the United States) are doing the reverse." The difference between the two systems is not so great, he added. Yugoslav enterprises must turn over something like 70 percent of their net returns to the Government. Our enterprises kick in 52 percent for Federal income tax alone.

Still another measure is the satisfied expression of Earl Browder, long-time secretary general of the Communist Party, U.S.A. "State capitalism (socialism) has progressed further in America than in Great Britain under a Labor government," said Browder.

An expression of concern over these trends often evokes this response from liberals: "As long as we have free elections every 2 or 4 years, why be worried? Are you not willing to submit to the will of the majority as voiced at the polls?" This raises a fundamental question which every believer in American constitutionalism should be prepared to answer.

FALSE LABELING

No political or economic measure offered the people ever bears the honest label "socialism" or "socialistic." Invariably these reforms are disguised in the sheep's clothing of humanitarianism, social justice or some other misleading brand name. It's the old Trojan Horse, camel's-head-in-the-tent strategy—as ancient as Ulysses but still effective.

The Rural Electrification Administration is a good example of how indirection works in government. Originally it was designed only to distribute electric power to farmers in isolated areas where it was uneconomic for the existing private utilities to serve them. The organization was to be self-liquidating. It would lend money to local cooperatives and the taxpayers would not be out anything.

Next, with plenty of cheap Government power at its disposal, REA began to reach out and offer to supply local municipal distribution systems at rates the private utilities, with all the taxes they had to pay and the prevailing interest that new capital cost them, could not match. REA is lending money to the local co-ops at 2 percent—capital that the Government must pay 4 percent to hire. The difference is a hidden subsidy charged to the taxpayers.

IS IT SOCIALISTIC?

Our reform intellects should be working on a new type of truth-in-fabrics act that would give us correct labeling for new collectivist legislation. Let us protect the unwary consumer of ideas with honest labels by the factory, such as: "Guaranteed 80 percent socialism, 20 percent capitalism." Or, "In laundering, do not expose to high temperatures of fiscal logic."

What are the signs by which we can determine whether a proposal is essentially within the pattern of American capitalism or would carry us farther down the low road of creeping socialism? Below are nine questions, the answers to which, while not fully definitive, will assist to guide us in buying or turning down a socialist proposition.

A GUIDE TO HELP YOU DECIDE

1. Is it something that could be performed by private enterprise? The burden of proof should always be placed on the innovator who wants to put the Government deeper into business.

2. Will the measure add to our tax load, directly or indirectly?

3. Will it fan the fires of inflation?

4. Does it encroach on the areas reserved to the States and local units of government?

5. Is there a genuine unfilled need, or only a do-gooder's dream?

6. Is it one of those compulsory welfare moves, and if so, can it not be placed on a voluntary basis?

7. What would it cost my State, and how much could we expect to get back from it?

8. Did it originate in the aspiration of a special interest voting bloc—or, what is more likely—in the ambition of a political friend of man to ingratiate himself with such a minority?

9. Is the reform complete as presented, or merely a foot in the door that can be expected to call for continuously larger appropriations in the years ahead?

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *April 26, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, House of Representatives, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: On behalf of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Presentation of the Lord, of Phoenix, Ariz., we urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration. Such a Committee on Captive Nations is vitally important both for our Government and the American people at large. While Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of "national liberation" in Africa and Asia, we as a nation, are not doing much to help the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations which constitute a veritable weakness of the Soviet totalitarian empire.

A special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a reservoir of true and unbiased knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, which knowledge will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We strongly urge you, Congressman SMITH, to give your full and unqualified support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,
LEONID DOLYNAKY,
Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Presentation of the Lord, of Phoenix, Ariz.

MAY 1, 1963.

Re House Resolution 14.
Hon. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
Congressman, 23d District of Ohio, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just returned from a trip to Europe, and I had occasion to see at first hand the manner and mode of living and the system under which the East Germans live. I hope that we, in this country, are never shackled with a similar type of government.

Therefore, I feel that in behalf of the security of our country and the free world, Congress should pass the bill creating a special Committee on Captive Nations, House Resolution 14. I would appreciate it if you would submit a similar resolution.

Very truly yours,
JOHN A. DEMER.

ARMENIAN YOUTH FEDERATION
OF AMERICA,
Needham, Mass., May 1, 1963.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. Representatives From Pennsylvania, House Rules Committee, House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. FLOOD: The Somerville "Nejdeh" Chapter, Armenian Youth Federation of America is very much concerned with the fate of its homeland, Armenia, which is caught in the grasp of the Soviet Union. We are wholeheartedly in favor of your bill, House Resolution 14, and Congressman EDWARD DERWINSKI's identical proposal, House Resolution 15. The entire chapter feels sanguine that these important proposals will not be overlooked by the Rules Committee and that these proposals will reach the House of Representatives for immediate plenary action.

Respectfully yours,
THE SOMERVILLE "NEJDEH" CHAPTER, ARMENIAN YOUTH FEDERATION OF AMERICA.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N.Y., April 28, 1963.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Please accept our full support to your strong action in the House of Representatives against Communist Russian imperialism by submitting to the House Rules Committee of your resolution calling for creation of a special Captive Nations Committee.

We believe, this is a very important step toward the achievement of the final goal: The victory of the free world over Communist Russian imperialism, and reestablishment of freedom to all nations in the spirit of justice, which is and always has been the spirit of American Nation.

Please accept enclosed copies of the letters, which we send to Congressman SMITH and four Colorado Congressmen. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

ROSS KUZMYCH,
President, Denver Branch of U.C.C.A.

CHICAGO, *April 1963*.

Hon. Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please forgive me for calling upon you and asking you to do something for my unfortunate country.

The American Government, according to my knowledge, has consented to have the case of Hungary taken off the calendar of the United Nations and have same entrusted to the Secretary of same organization. I am acknowledging this fact with sorrow; the matter is not in the proper hands. After past performance, I have my doubt about this person. My fears are not only concerning the fate of Hungary, but I feel that all the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain will loose their hope to a legal and just settlement of their future.

I would like to ask you to use your influence at the White House and all over to have a House and Senate committee set up at the earliest possible date to keep a continuous vigil over the fate of the captive nations.

Please accept my sincere thanks for your kind help, I, remain.

Cordially yours,

HALMAY JANOS,
Former Member of the Hungarian Parliament.

Integrity, Devotion to Duty Mark the Honored Career of Senator Spessard Holland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House and Senate who has worked with Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND on legislative matters, or who has come to know him on a more personal basis, holds him in the highest regard.

The members of the Florida congressional delegation have just reason to be proud of the distinguished service of Florida's Senior U.S. Senator.

Senator HOLLAND has served the citizens of Florida as a county judge, State legisaltor, and Governor of Florida prior to coming to Washington. He devotes his full time and energy to his duties and has earned the respect of all who know him.

Editor Jack Gore of the Fort Lauderdale News took editorial note of some of the qualities exemplified by Senator HOLLAND, on the occasion of a dinner given in honor of the Senator by the Fort Lauderdale Historical Society.

Because Mr. Gore puts into words the feelings of so many of us who know and greatly admire Senator HOLLAND, I, under unanimous consent, include his editorial in the RECORD:

INTEGRITY, DEVOTION TO DUTY MARK THE HONORED CAREER OF SENATOR SPESSARD HOLLAND

In this day and age when so many of our political leaders and public servants are under a steady drumfire of criticism for words and actions which are hardly in the public interest, it is truly refreshing to see an outstanding person in public life given the credit he deserves.

Such was the case here Monday night when Florida's senior Senator, SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, was guest of honor at the Fort Lauderdale Historical Society's annual dinner, and was paid the high tribute he has so well earned from more than a dozen different organizations.

Senator HOLLAND's career in public life is long and varied. He has been a judge, a prosecutor, a State Senator, Governor of this State and now senior Senator. He is a native-born Floridian and all during his years of active service in behalf of the people we cannot recall a single incidence where the hot breath of scandal ever touched him.

If Senator HOLLAND has a mission in life we sincerely believe it can be summed up in his desire to be truly informed on the issues he is called upon to decide so that when he finally makes up his mind as to the course of action he will follow, that decision is based upon facts, upon sound reasoning and upon the conviction that what he does is in the best interest of those he represents.

It takes but one visit to Senator HOLLAND's office in Washington to realize that here is one of the hardest working men in the U.S. Senate today. As a member of several of the most important Senate committees he has a job that goes far beyond merely appearing on the floor and taking part in the sometimes long and acrid debates that mark the deliberations of this body.

Much of a Congressman's work these days is involved in committee hearings where vital legislation is first considered; where public testimony for and against the legislation is taken, and where a limited number of legislators act as the eyes, the ears and sometimes the conscience of the entire House or the entire Senate.

That Senator HOLLAND performs this work well can easily be ascertained by the stellar reputation he enjoys among his fellow Senators. He is not a publicity seeker as so many are in Washington these days. He is quite spoken and seldom aroused to anger but when his temper is aroused over what he considers to be a particularly bad piece of legislation he can be a most articulate and most effective objector to it.

What Senator HOLLAND was honored for here Monday, however, was not particularly his fine work in the Senate but for the major role he played in the acquisition and development of Hugh Taylor Birch State Park and Everglades National Park.

It was during Senator HOLLAND's term as Governor of Florida that Hugh Taylor Birch, then drawing near to the end of a most productive life, conceived the idea of deeding some of the extensive property holdings he had acquired here to the State for park purposes. It was on Pearl Harbor Day in 1941 that Governor Holland first came to Fort Lauderdale to talk to Mr. Birch about this idea. Because of Mr. Birch's advanced age, there were many difficulties that had to be worked out and many legal technicalities to overcome but after months of negotiations the gift was finally consummated, thus bringing into being what has since become one of the most heavily used State parks in our entire system.

Senator HOLLAND played an even more vigorous role in the creation of Everglades National Park as his desire to donate State-owned lands to the Federal Government for development as a national recreational area was bitterly opposed by his own attorney general. Despite legislative approval of the transfer, the attorney general refused to sign the required deeds and even filed a court suit to block the transfer. He failed to do so, however, and then Governor Holland and other devoted supporters of the national park idea took on the task of convincing Federal park officials they had an admirable site for a great national park and should lose no time in starting its development.

Today Senator HOLLAND's foresight in this respect has been well justified. Everglades National Park, despite its relatively short existence, is already bringing many sportsmen and visitors to this State to take advantage of its facilities and its popularity and reputation is growing with each passing year.

With these accomplishments under his belt it is no wonder his fellow Floridians gathered here Monday night to pay Senator HOLLAND the honor and the tribute he so richly deserves. It is men of his caliber, his integrity and devotion to duty and principles that keep our political system from falling into complete disrepute, and we only wish there were more men like him in the Congress and in other high places of Government.

JACK W. GORE.

The Era of the Negro Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Evening Star, WASHINGTON, D.C., May 14, 1963]

THE ERA OF THE NEGRO MOVEMENT—RACIAL ISSUE BELIEVED GIVING THE TIMES THEIR IDENTIFYING MARK IN HISTORY

(By Eric Sevareid)

By its dominant voices, its most unforgettable faces and its chief acts of bravery does a generation recognize itself and history mark it.

For America this postwar period is surely the era of the Negro passion. The most moving voices are now those of Negroes; the most searing, lasting words are put on paper by Negro writers; their music is the American music most penetrating and persuasive to other parts of the world; no cause is now so fundamental to the health and integrity of this society as the Negro cause; of no other leaders are so much stamina and courage demanded as are now required of Negro leaders.

They are bound to win, somehow, not only because their present aims are so limited and unarguable, but because they have succeeded in involving us all, whoever we are, wherever we live within the Nation's frontiers. They have caught the attention of the whole American people and more than that, they have caught up the conscience of the whole people, however many of us may try to deny this to ourselves. A newspaper or television picture of a snarling police dog set upon a human being is recorded in the permanent photo-electric file of every human brain.

This generation is not likely to find surcease from the Negro passion; its source springs and the resistance to it are too deeply grounded for easy resolution, and its present outburst too long delayed. Its more violent manifestations are not going to be confined to the Deep South. The head of black steam building up in places like New York, Washington, and Chicago are finding outlets too few and too small, at the present rate, for the permanent avoidance of combustion.

Because this unfolding drama involves the automatic reflexes of the instinctive sense of justice, because it involves namable, hearable, countable individual persons of flesh and blood, it is going to dwarf the general and social pageants of this domestic era, whether they be the struggles to nationalize the inchoate megalopolis, to preserve the open spaces, to eradicate a disease, to "conquer" space, or whatever.

This time is coming soon when the Negro passion will truly dominate American politics. It is going to change the prism through which we consider the problems of far-off nations; romanticism will have to give way to realism. Liberalism of the academic or cafe society brand—the motivations of those who rhapsodize over the Peace Corpsmen in Ethiopia or journey 6,000 miles to sit at the feet of Dr. Schweitzer, but who would never dream of visiting the night police court in their own city and observing the impulses are going to lose their present status in the hierarchy of the virtues. There will be a noticeable dearth of hiding places for those professing belief either in their religion or the American Constitution.

An education in the facts of life and history is in store for those pained by the messy contradictions built into the Negro passion. Those bewildered at the Negro uprising ("after all, they had made a lot of progress") may learn that this is one of the eternal lessons from past rebellions against oppression. It is not when the oppression is most complete that these revolutions begin to revolve, but when concessions are given, hopes are born, light is glimpsed at the end of the dark tunnel. It is when an oppressed people feels close to its goal, not far off from it, that their action becomes frenetic.

Those who are cynical or upset by the moral duality in the Negro phenomen, by the spectacle of lofty courage and self-sacrifice among the Negro leaders, side by side with the spectacle of spreading crime and moral squalor in the slum-bound masses of the Negro poor, may learn that the first is a direct reflection of the second, its natural, not its unnatural partner. Desperation, like war, ennobles some among its victims and debases others. No true people's revolution was ever neat, clean or devoid of sad anomalies.

If the Negro passion of today is not a true peoples revolution, it is as close to one as we have ever known in our land.

Results of the First Arkansas District Poll on Various Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, people have an eye on Washinton. This is indicated by the increased participation in the survey taken in the 10-county eastern Arkansas district on significant issues confronting Congress.

There was a 17 percent questionnaire return as against 14 percent in the district in 1962.

Many comments were added by penned views or separate letter dealing with the subjects covered. The newspapers and radio stations aided the effort.

The questions asked and replies received in percentages follow:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
DOMESTIC PROGRAMS			
Do you favor or oppose—			
(1) Domestic Peace Corps?	24	58	18
(2) Armed services pay increase?	41	44	15
(3) Federal aid to assist cities to establish and operate mass transit systems?	15	76	9
(4) Tax reduction if coupled with equal reduction in Federal spending?	90	8	2
(5) An increase in the national debt limit above the present $308,000,000,000 to finance the proposed tax reduction and additional costs of the Federal Government?	10	86	4
(6) Compulsory medical care for aged citizens tied to social security?	11	85	5
(7) Federal aid for public schools?	24	71	5
(8) Tax credits to parents for college tuition costs?	68	29	3
(9) Spending vast sums of money to be the first to put a man on the moon?	10	82	8
(10) President Kennedy's handling of the Office of Chief Executive?	20	66	14
FOREIGN PROGRAMS			
Do you favor or oppose—			
(1) Expansion of foreign Peace Corps?	24	63	13
(2) Full support of United Nations?	39	50	11
(3) Maintaining of foreign aid program at about present level?	21	69	10
(4) Substantial or sizable reduction in foreign aid?	80	12	7

Agriculture at the Washington Level

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. SECREST

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Robert M. Koch, president, National Limestone Institute, Inc., before the Cleveland Farmers' Club, Affiliate, Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, May 10, 1963:

AGRICULTURE AT THE WASHINGTON LEVEL

I am very pleased to have the opportunity to visit with you this afternoon about the topic which has been assigned to me—"Agriculture at the Washington Level."

May I begin by supplementing the material already sent you about me. Not so much that you are necessarily interested in me, but rather to help you evaluate some of my comments. After my initial training and experience in several agricultural fields, I became affiliated with what we commonly call a "trade association." I currently represent over 550 limestone producers and, as I am sure you know, it is a very able member of our executive committee, Bob Bemis, of your city, who is responsible for my being here today.

While our members are very much interested in the Nation's highway program, and while we service them in this area as well as in the field of taxation and other areas of interest to American businessmen, I am, of course, not going to discuss these subjects this afternoon.

During the course of my work, it is my privilege to travel all over this Nation of ours and come in contact with people from all walks of life in all of our States. Practically everyone realizes that agriculture is in trouble. It seems to me that the overwhelming majority of people in this Nation today feel that it because of the "meddling of Washington" in the farmers' business that we are having these difficulties. And, I venture to say that the majority of people in this Nation feel that the quicker the Washington officials turn the agricultural business over to the farmers of the Nation—and, as they say "leave them alone"—some sense can be made out of a chaotic condition. Furthermore, many feel this would save the taxpayer literally billions of dollars.

Of course, nothing could be further from the truth. If Washington should abdicate its responsibility to the American farmer tomorrow, I am sure everyone in this room realizes that the depression of the early thirties would seem like a mild dip, compared to what would happen if the farmers were turned into the marketplace for the answer to the present problem.

So much has been said and reported about the very few number of farmers needed today to produce the food and fiber we need that the majority of the people, with whom I come in contact, have the impression that agriculture is a very small part of our economy. Do you realize that the agricultural materials produced in this country last year grossed $20 billion? Mineral materials grossed another $20 billion. And all other materials added up to $5 billion. If the value of pasture were added in and if the finished value of livestock, rather than the feed value, were used, agriculture would clearly be in the lead.

Our Nation's farmers are the largest consumers of steel, the largest consumers of rubber and I could go on with a great many other items.

Today the average American farmer produces enough food and fiber to feed and clothe 27 other persons. Seven years ago 1 farmer could provide for 20 persons. Twenty years ago the ratio was 1 farmer to 11 persons. As Secretary Freeman has so aptly put it, this is the outstanding success story of the American economy. One farmer today in 1 hour can produce what four farmers could produce in the same time shortly after World War I. The same farmer increased his productivity three times as fast as the worker in industry between 1947 and 1958.

Here we have a group of people who are only 8 percent of our work force, providing for 92 percent who engage in other activities. In Europe 25 to 30 percent of the working people are farmers. In Russia 45 percent of the people work on the farms to provide the necessary food and fiber.

What does this mean to the American consumer? The average American consumer will use only 19 percent of his earnings to buy food. This is the lowest figure at any time in our history and lower than any other Nation. Just 10 years ago food accounted for over 23 percent of the average family income. Putting it another way, the average factory worker can today purchase his monthly food needs with just 37 hours of work. Ten years ago it took 51 hours of work to purchase the same amount of food. Shortly after World War II, the worker had to put in 61 hours for the same monthly food basket. In most other nations in the world food costs take 40 to 50 percent of the average worker's wage. And in some nations, as you know, food costs are so great that they leave very little income for the family to spend. In fact two-thirds of the world's population will go to bed tonight hungry.

Here we have one of the greatest success stories of the world's history. And yet, what is the status of the men who have brought this about? Do we look up to these men for the efficiency they have developed? Does our economy provide them with their rightful share of net worth? I am sure you all know the answer. In my opinion no group in America is more maligned than the farmers are today. Most people consider that they are subsidized by all the rest of us. That they run to the Government for help in running their business, when in reality they ought to stand on their own two feet and stop taking Government checks. There is little justice in agricultural workers reciving less than 82 cents and hour while factory workers avera $2.29 and those working in the food marketing field average $2.14.

It is interesting to note that if the cost of food had increased as much as the overall cost of living during the 1950's, the housewife would pay over $1.17 for $1.00 worth of food today. Therefore, by taking less for his time and investment than any other segment of our economy, the farmer is actually subsidizing the consumers rather than being subsidized as the general public feels.

Let us take a quick look as to how we got into this predicament and some possibilities for how we might get out of it. My staff and I have been contacting Congressmen concerning the agricultural conservation program. This, in case you don't know, is a program that was inaugurated in 1936 and is a partnership arrangement where the Government and the farmer both put up 50 percent of the cost of long-range conservation practices to insure the conservation of our soil and water resources of this Nation. So far, we have seen 368 of the 435 Congressmen. As you know, there are all shades of views in both parties. As we visit, we, of course, cover many other areas besides the particular one we are there to discuss. I can assure you that every single Congressman is most anxious to have our so-called agricultural problem solved. I can also assure you that if anyone had a foolproof plan, it would be adopted literally tomorrow. Unfortunately, it is most complex. And I am sorry to say that our democratic processes in this country of using compromises instead of taking drastic action has complicated the problem. I hope I am not misunderstood—I am not advocating we abandon democratic processes, but merely want to point up they have contributed to this particular problem at this time.

As long as we have over three million individual farmers who consider themselves rugged individualists who decide how and what they are going to grow; as long as crops put in in the spring cannot be cut back halfway in the summer (as a businessman would close down his factory), as long as cows are milked two and three times a day regardless of what the demand is for their product, as long as animals go on eating the food in their feed lots and pastures 365 days a year; and as long as our agricultural colleges and technicians have developed the technical know-how to make our farmers the most proficient in the world so that they are able to produce more than we can possibly use, the agricultural community will be in constant difficulty—unless we have some controls. When supply and demand sets the price and when the supply is in excess of the demand, obviously, the price is always going to be lower than the cost of production as three million farmers attempt to salvage something from their year's work out of crops and products which they have several months', if not years', effort in.

Do you remember back in 1932 and 1933 when corn was 25 cents a bushel? Up in my area of the country, milk was 80 cents a hundred and tobacco was down to a nickel a pound. Have you forgotten that just prior to the AAA being passed the farmers in Minnesota, South Dakota, and some other States lined up with shotguns to prevent the serving of foreclosure papers by the sheriffs? This condition in 1932 was brought about by overproduction. Today, we not only have overproduction but also we have tremendous surpluses built up over the last decade that would completely ruin the agricultural community and those who depend on it if Washington dropped all of its agricultural programs.

During the 1950's, the policy of having so-called flexible price supports instead of rigid price supports completely failed. For, while it paid the farmers a lesser amount per bushel, this policy did not restrict the total produtcion that the farmers might grow. The feed grain carryover rose during the 9 years from 838 million bushels to a peak of 3 billion bushels by 1961. Wheat carryover rose from 250 million bushels in 1952 to 1.4 billion bushels in 1961.

In reply to Secretary Freeman's request, the Congress authorized a feed grain program 2 years ago which has materially helped to solve part of our present problem. And, in my view, fortunately passed the continuation of this program just this past month.

In the last 2 years, the Nation's stockpiles have been reduced by 1.1 billion bushels. This is resulting in a savings of $920,000 a day in storage costs alone. On May 21 there is to be a vote by the wheat growers of the Nation to determine whether or not they are going to sharply curtail not only their acreage but also the bushels that they produce.

There has been much partisan bickering over this program and the American Farm Bureau Federation is unalterably opposed to it. On the other hand, the Grange and the Farmers' Union and several other organizations are supporting it.

Frankly, in view of the situation we currently have, I can't understand why anyone, much as we dislike controls, can honestly think or say that there is any other alternative but to have the growers of these critical commodities adopt measures which will put their house in order. Otherwise, I certainly don't see why they should expect the Federal Treasury to bail them out. And yet, the American Farm Bureau Federation says that if this control program is voted down; the Congress will pass a reasonable program with reasonable supports. I might add that there are some in the present administration, and a great many Congressmen in both parties, who feel that if the farmers vote down this program to put their house in order, they should be granted no support at all.

As some of you may know, the tobacco growers of the Nation have been operating under a very tight control program for a number of years. These strict control programs require a 66⅔ percent vote of the farmers growing the commodity to approve it before they are put into effect. A few years ago the tobacco growers in the Middle Atlantic States decided that they wanted their so-called freedom from Government interference and voted the program out. One year was all it took. They now vote 93 to 97 percent in favor of this program, which requires strict acreage control and strict poundage control as well. This program costs the taxpayers practically nothing and has brought order out of chaos for the tobacco farmer.

Let me point out that this is no different than Ford or General Motors laying off their men and closing their factories when there is no longer a demand for their cars. And it is no different than the oil industry's control of their production. In Texas there is a commission which determines how many days and how many hours of a day oil can be pumped each month. No one expects the automobile industry or the oil industry to operate at a capacity to produce 20 percent more than we need. Why should the farmers?

If the farmers of this Nation are to receive their fair share of what they contribute to the Nation's wealth, I frankly don't see any hope for Washington getting out of the agricultural picture. I am confident that we can do a better job than we have been doing, but I would be less candid if I indicated that it would be in the forseeable future. Until our legislators of both parties can put aside their political differences and get together for the good of the Nation, I think we are going to continue to muddle along. I have a distinct impression, however, as I indicated earlier, that the unusually high costs of the excesses of the last decade are going to force drastic action within the next decade.

Now it would be very easy, because of our agricultural problems, to commit the same error which most other nations have made down through the ages, and that is to neglect to take care of our soil and water resources which are so essential to any civilization. With the average farmer concerned primarily with the maintaining and educating of his family, and with falling or inadequate income, it is inevitable that he will neglect conservation practices.

As the former chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, Clifford Hope, Republican, of Kansas, said, "The people of China 2,000 years ago knew much of what we know about methods of stopping soil erosion, and yet much of the best land of China has washed into the sea. If there is one lesson that comes down to us through the pages of history, it is that the nation which neglects its soil and water resources will die, and that the fall of nations in the past has been due more to erosion than to war, more to loss of soil fertility than to loss of battles."

Mr. Hope and many other far-seeing Congressmen of both parties brought about the passage of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act in 1936. This act provides for developing and coordinating a partnership basis from the county, State, and national levels, between farmers and their Government, to conserve these two great natural resources, soil and water. These programs are based on the theory that the Nation has an obligation to preserve and build up our soils so that future generations may be able to provide for themselves. This was a reversal of the philosophy which, of course, had made this country great. As our new frontiers opened, we exploited the greatest natural resources any nation on the face of the earth had the good fortune to be blessed with.

While the surpluses of our present period tend to cloud the long-range picture, more and more of us are becoming aware of the so-called population explosion. Our Nation had 180 million people in 1960, and by 1980 we will have 245 million mouths to feed. In the year 2000, there will be over 330 million people in these United States.

In my opinion, without the leadership from Washington, this Nation would not have embarked on the great conservation programs of the last quarter-century which have reversed the trend that had become so thoroughly established up to that time, of primarily exploiting our soils without putting back any of the things necessary to conserve their fertility.

I would like to further add that, while we have been doing this conservation job, we have been taking acres out of production to put them in soil conserving crops and thus partially alleviate our overproduction. As I indicated before, it is going to take more drastic action than that available under our conservation programs to solve the overproduction problem.

The industry which I am privileged to represent makes a major contribution to these conservation programs. Agricultural limestone is absolutely essential to the production of our most important soil conserving crops, clovers and alfalfas. While it is preparing the soil for the proper conditions for optimum growth of these crops, it is also getting into the soil and into these crops the most important single element to all life, namely, calcium. During the 25 years of this program, about a half a billion tons of agricultural liming material have been applied to the Nation's soils. Prior to that time, instead of the present 22 million ton annual average, the Nation was using from 1 to 3 million tons a year. There are comparable figures for all other conservation practices which have been established for each State by a committee under the leadership of the agricultural colleges in the respective States.

I want to stress again that this world renowned record of conservation accomplishments has been brought about through a partnership program whereby the farmer and the Government match dollars, and the farmer adds his labor and equipment. While these are considered agricultural subsidies in the mind of the average consumer, the benefits accrue to the Nation in better soils and to the consumers in better quality of food. When we go back to the percent of our population, 8 percent on the farms and 92 percent off the farms, we can readily see that this expenditure of Federal funds is benefiting 92 percent of our people, who do not live on farms.

I would also like to mention a very important byproduct of the agricultural conservation program practice of liming. All of us are more and more aware in this day and age of atomic fallout. While we still have a lot to learn about how much tolerance the human body can build up to strontium 90, we do know that heavy doses of it affect our bodies and that it also affects the genes which we pass on to our children, after it reaches certain levels in our bodies. While we are in no danger yet, we do know that more and more of this insidious element, strontium 90, is finding its way into our food, and eventually into us, from fallout which lands on our soils.

It was right here in your State at your Agricultural College at Wooster, that a team of scientists, working under a grant from the Atomic Energy Commission, ascertained that the proper liming of soils materially reduces the strontium 90 which our plants pick up and which eventually gets into us through the food that we eat.

Calcium and strontium 90 are very similar atomically. Happily for us, the plants prefer calcium to strontium 90 when calcium is available in the soil. These scientists proved through their experiments that adequately limed soil produced crops which had 60 percent less strontium 90 in them than the crops which were grown on unlimed soils. Consequently, while the agricultural conservation program has been encouraging farmers to use agricultural limestone to establish sound soil conservation practices, we have this most significant byproduct, that all these soils in the humid area which have been adequately treated with liming material are producing crops which contain 60 percent less strontium 90 than they would have had if this half-billion tons of limestone had not been utilized over the last quarter of a century. I am sure you will agree with me that the conducting of this type of a national conservation program is a proper function of the Federal Government which, as Lincoln said, "should exist to do those things for the people of our Nation which they cannot accomplish individually."

Another agricultural program which has recently been inaugurated is the rural areas development program. As you know from the notice about this meeting, it is my privilege to serve on the National Advisory Committee for this program. It is the aim of the rural areas development program to help rural areas solve some of their economic problems, much as the urban renewal program has done in the cities. While a great many people think that our agricultural problems can be solved by moving farmers off the farms, I am sure all of you realize this would result primarily in increasing our unemployment situation in the cities. One of the big untapped resources in our Nation is the providing of recreational facilities for our rapidly expanding population. Much has been accomplished in the last year in this area, and plans are rapidly going forward on many other projects, some individually controlled and some under the control of communities.

In closing, I would just like to say that I feel rather strongly that all of us in this Nation owe a real debt of gratitude to the farmers who have provided us with the highest standard of living in the world at the lowest relative cost. Instead of being sharply critical of him and his problems, which his abundance has provided, we who benefit daily from his plentiful production and efficiency need to see that he gets a fair return for his labors. He should have as good an economic opportunity as the other parts of our national economy. While I don't want to say it can never be done, in my humble opinion the agricultural segment of our economy can never be put in order nor maintained there without strong leadership from our Congress and the Department of Agriculture. I want to stress however, that I do not mean dictation from Washington, but merely that the mechanics should be provided so that the farmers, through their duly elected county and community committeemen can have a strong voice in developing national farm policies.

What Is a Farmer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, if there are any Members of the Congress seeking to learn what a farmer really is, they will find it in the following editorial which recently appeared in the Journal-Free Press, of Osage City, Kans.

WHAT IS A FARMER?

He's a big man; he's a small man; he's a laughing, working tall man. He comes in all assorted shapes and sizes. He's happy, sad, wide, and lean.

He's tomorrow's breakfast with a grin on his face. He's the Nation's breadbasket.

He wakes at dawn to feed the world. He holds the earth in his hands and lives by the sun and the rain.

He's America riding a tractor, democracy wearing a hat. He is freedom holding a hoe. He's the future of the world in a pair of blue overalls.

He's a day laborer and capitalist, handyman and boss, toolmaker, mechanic, weather forecaster, and good neighbor.

He likes the smell of alfalfa fields and the sound of cattle in the meadow. He likes the breath of air filtered through growing fields. He likes the look of corn shucks at autumn time and the smile of a harvest moon.

He's the meat and potatoes of a nation, the ham and eggs on the menu at a restaurant. He's Hallowe'en pumpkins and cold watermelons at a Fourth of July picnic, and the turkey and yams on a Thanksgiving Day dinner table.

He's a gambler. He throws his seed like dice on a giant gambling table of land. He bets his muscle and his know-how on the heat of the sun and the turn of a rain-cloud. Sometimes he wins, sometimes he loses.

His hands toll the church bells on Sundays. He builds schools and lives by the code of the land and never refuses a helping hand to friends or stranger.

He's America's best customer and the world's most constant hope. He's a farmer.

Tax Relief To Stimulate Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, a number of us in Congress are cosponsoring legislation to give tax relief to those who are putting themselves through college or who are underwriting the costs of higher education for our young people. This is an area in which I feel the Congress should devote a great deal of attention. The mounting costs of education are presenting serious handicaps to many of our young people who are finding a college education necessary in order to contribute their full potential to society.

In this regard I feel my colleagues will be interested in a letter recently received from Mr. C. Gardner Shaw of Pullman, Wash. Mr. Shaw makes some excellent points with regard to taxation and higher education and I feel his views merit consideration.

The text of Mr. Shaw's letter is as follows:

PULLMAN, WASH., *March 20, 1963.*

Congresswoman CATHERINE MAY,
House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MAY: Examination of your files will indicate that I am not one addicted to writing to my Senator or Congresswoman at every whim. However, one aspect of our current tax structure as it relates to higher education concerns me deeply. Tax reduction is now a matter of consideration; the relationships between taxes and higher education should be considered.

There are available, from various Federal agencies, an ever increasing number of fellowships for outstanding students. The stipends these fellowships provide vary, but in general range from $1,800 to $2,000 per year. From the size of these grants, it can only be concluded that the Federal Government recognizes it costs a student approximately $2,000 per year to attain education at either the undergraduate or graduate level.

Let us now consider a by-no-means hypothetical situation. Two applicants of almost equal ability and potential apply for a fellowship. After careful consideration, one receives a fellowship, the other does not. Unless this Nation becomes far more socialistic than it is at present, the Federal Government cannot provide more than a small fraction of the worthy applicants with fellowships.

Our two candidates may be so closely matched that there is no satisfactory basis for selection between them. Indeed, because of failure by one of those supporting one candidate to do him full justice, the poorer of the two candidates may actually receive the fellowship.

The unsuccessful candidate, not to be deterred from his goal, applies for, and receives an assistantship for which he must perform services. Or he takes any job available so that he may continue his education. On any income he earns, (over $600 per year) he must pay taxes, unless he is fortunate enough to receive an assistantship at an institution that ignores the strictest interpretation of the definition of "income." Washington State University does not, but others do. Thus, one individual seeking an education ends up supporting another with the same goal who is receiving a "free ride" from the Federal Government.

One cannot legislate out of existence all possible inequities. However, a most logical step which would go far to eliminate this existing inequity and simultaneously support higher education, without subsidies, would be to recognize that it does cost $2,000 per year to attend college and grant to any individual, whatever the source of his income, a tax exemption of $2,000 per year. I would go so far as to urge that even if good old dad is footing the bill for his offspring's college education, dad should get this exemption.

The present $600 tax exemption per person is totally unrealistic, on any basis.

A special tax exemption for any individual seeking higher education, in my opinion would do far more to support the educational goals of this country than would doubling the number of Federal fellowships. Furthermore, it would be much more in keeping with the philosophy of rewarding individual initiative, rather than penalizing the latter, as our present tax structure does, both in this regard and others.

Special exemptions as herein proposed are nothing new. Those over 65 and those with certain infirmities already receive double the normal exemption.

Sincerely,

C. Gardner Shaw.

Maryland School Yearbook, Newspaper, and Magazine Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to announce that three schools located in the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland, won top awards at the 17th annual convention of the Maryland Scholastic Press Advisers Association on May 11, 1963.

Andover Junior-Senior High of Linthicum, Md., was awarded a plaque and trophy for being rated the best junior-senior high school paper in Maryland This, I believe, is quite an accomplishment since their publication, "The Arrow," is not yet 2 years old.

Glen Burnie High School took two first place awards, which included the best yearbook in the State for their publication, "Le Souvenir," and the "Glen Burnian" was rated the best newspaper in the State. Among magazines, their "Impressions" placed fifth in the State. Annapolis Senior High won third place for its newspaper, "Tally Ho."

My sincere congratulations for a job well done goes to these fine schools in Maryland.

Jeers and the Red, White, and Blue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an article from the Washington Daily News of May 2, 1963. It refers to a constituent, Vincent C. Baron, of Wayne, N.J. I am proud to have a citizen like Vincent Baron in the congressional district which I represent.

The article follows:

Drivers Wouldn't Be Flagged Down

(By Julian Morrison)

Among visitors in Washington Tuesday were the Grand Duchess Charlotte of Luxembourg and Vincent C. Baron, of Wayne, N.J.

For the Duchess, flags were displayed—United States, Luxembourg, and the District's—from light poles on Constitution Avenue and Memorial Bridge.

GREETINGS

Mr. Baron was simply by the high late-afternoon winds.

Mr. Baron is an engineer who deals in statistics and he's in town trying to land a job with the Federal Aviation Agency and having a reunion with his brother, Bill, in Arlington.

He was on his way back to his brother's house from town about the end of the afternoon rush hour and by the time he got half way across Memorial Bridge he was probably the maddest man in Washington.

"I was driving over the bridge when the wind blew one of the American flags off the pole and onto the car in front of me. The driver slowed down until it fell off. He kept going."

Mr. Baron stopped his car, and got out to pick up the flag. Motorists behind him "began honking their horns and jeering at me. Can you imagine? Jeering at a man who's picking up his country's flag."

PRIDE

"I don't want to sound like one of those professional flag-waving patriots, but it got me. Well, I drove on and before I got to the other side I noticed five more flags down and everybody just driving right over them."

Mr. Baron pulled off onto the grass at the end of the bridge and counted. A half-hour went by. So did 600 cars by his count and nobody bothered to retrieve a single flag.

Mr. Baron did.

Then he went to his brother's house and wrote the Washington Daily News a letter. Yesterday, he brought us the flags.

His letter says, in part:

"It seems to me that some of us have lost track of the numerous small prerequisites which form, or are supposed to be the foundation for the honorable success of our prodigious efforts.

"I speak with great concern when I ask who, among the hundreds passing over these flags, felt dutybound to pick up their flag? Or who felt that perhaps the Duchess of Luxembourg might be travelling over the bridge at this precise time and see one of her own flags being run over by nonsensitive motorists?

"Making an issue out of a small and insignificant incident such as seeing half of Washington passively drive over perfectly visible U.S. flags is not really important—or is it?"

That's all of Mr. Baron's story except for one final "small and insignificant incident."

On his way back across the bridge from our office Mr. Baron saw cars driving over four more flags. He stopped to pick them up. Drivers behind him honked impatiently.

Profits and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, with every passing month since January 1961, the people of this country are increasingly appreciative of the kind of economic commonsense and reliability which characterized their Government during the administration of Dwight D. Eisenhower. This good sense was summed up in a speech General Eisenhower delivered before the business council on October 20, 1962.

Our former distinguished colleague, Dr. Walter Judd, of Minnesota, has described the Eisenhower remarks this way:

> It is not new doctrine but it is true doctrine. It must be said over and over, by everyone and on every occasion.

Following are the Eisenhower remarks in part:

Profits and Politics

For some strange reason businessmen and politics have long seemed to be something like water and oil in their inability to combine.

I can remember, 60 years ago, hearing merchants in my little town saying in my hearing, "Not for me—I stay away from politics." In those days, my conception of politics comprehended nothing more than a vague understanding that membership in the school board or the town council was a matter of politics—so my eavesdropping was not very enlighting. But, the implication of such remarks was that, though it might be respectable and customary to acknowledge membership in a political party, any personal contact with the affairs of politicians would certainly be disagreeable and possibly contaminating.

Though we frequently express our awesome recognition of the vast economic, political, scientific, and social changes we have lived through in the past half century and recognize the resulting penetration of government into all our affairs—we still hear men of business and trade say—"No politics for me."

Such men are not always rich, nor connected with what is called "big business." Within the week, I heard an intelligent farm hand express this identical thought. Some of this attitude is undoubtedly instinctive, but some results from cold calculation.

More than one businessman has said to me, "I cannot afford to get into politics, in my business I sell to members of all parties."

To this I invariably retort, "You had better get into politics, or you may not be selling to anyone."

In using the term "businessman," I mean to include not only those who own or manage productive institutions, but advisers, consultants, scholars, and professional men and women who participate in American enterprise.

When the 19th was giving way to the 20th century, there may have been some excuse for this reluctance to take an active part in the Nation's political life: Secondary and higher education was then less general than now; life and our economy were less complex; we were not yet familiar with the human and social problems growing out of mass production, or the consequences of these developments in bringing government increasingly into our daily lives; we had never heard of a graduated income tax; we had not yet become entangled in international situations that, later, involved us in three major wars and practically forced us into a position of free world leadership against Communist imperialism and in promoting free world cooperation.

All this comfortable, and somewhat naive, isolation from political realities is now gone; a fact we must clearly realize.

A famous Frenchman once said, "War has become far too important to entrust to the generals."

Today, business, I think, should be saying: "Politics have become far too important to entrust to the politicians."

I believe that the good of our Nation demands that each of us—whatever his station or calling—should inform himself as well as possibly concerning the political and economic facts of his time and exercise whatever influence he can bring to bear to produce the political climate in which he wants to live.

This is a personal responsibility.

This is the meaning of a government by the people.

Politics and business are not only mixing today, but the marriage is here to stay—there is no going back to the good old days of bachelorhood.

Moreover if the business-political marriage is not to share the fate of most unions of the shotgun variety—if business is interested in making the association endurable if not agreeable—it has got to discard the remnants of its instinctive "Politics is not for me."

I am thinking of the alarming imbalance that exists between fundamental elements in our economy, in part occasioned, I am persuaded, by government—that is, by political action.

The lack of militant interests and participation in the affairs of both parties—at all government levels—by business people is, I am sure, at least partially responsible for this situation.

This, in turn, results in all kinds of patchwork expedient and theoretical experimentation in a costly and fruitless effort to establish an artificial equilibrium, such as we sought in the thirties.

Now, I present a few simple facts regarding our economy merely to point up the basis of my arguement that business is not sufficiently political.

During the past 10 years the gross national product has increased substantially—from 347 billion in 1952 it is now reaching toward the 550 billion level.

Personal income and wages have increased over 75 percent—but profits have had difficulty in remaining stationary.

Even if it could be shown that at the start of the decade profits were too high in relation to wages and national product, convincing proof that they are today too low is found in the fact that the investment out of profits in new capital goods has been, according to expert testimony, woefully short of the amount needed to replace obsolete with efficient plants and machines and to provide for needed expansion and future growth.

The drag in plant efficiency has been further aggravated by work rules and fringe provisions in contracts that unions have won from a sometimes frustrated management—a development that I suspect will one day be deeply deplored by working men themselves.

Incidentally, I've noted in conferences, with leaders of management and labor, when both were present, that the latter group seems far more single-minded and politically motivated than the former.

There may be some significance in this observation.

In any event, businessmen have seemed to me to be difficult, if not timid, in shouting from the housetops some of the obvious facts detrimental to our economic life.

All of us should be preaching the basic truth that only profits can provide full and profitable employment. Profits make jobs.

First, I call your attention to the attitude of so many people including some of the professorial group, respecting "profits."

Some seem to think the word is so wicked as practically to deserve elimination from the movies and television because of an alleged immorality of profits, as an incentive to work and progress. Demagogs tell working men that profits merely rob labor of its just share of earnings.

Moreover, far too many of us inferentially admit the validity of these accusations by failing to move to the counterattack.

Let us consider first what profits mean to the Federal Government.

The National Government is now handling aggregate annual expenditures hovering around the $100-billion mark, a sum of almost incredible size, with the great bulk of it coming from taxes on profits and on employment income.

No more lethal blow could be dealt to Federal revenues than to permit profits and profitable income to diminish seriously, and for a long period.

For a while the Nation could depend largely on deficit spending.

But we need no economist to tell us that such a practice, long continued, can have but one result—disastrous deterioration in the value of our currency, with great dislocation in the economy and in our international trade.

Any return from such a situation would require radical measures, probably even the destruction of any freedom whatsoever in our economy.

Government must not let this happen.

Another of the functions of profits is to keep the productive plant up to date and expanding; American production must be so efficient that in a competitive market its sales will be so voluminous and its profits so sizable that (aside from satisfying the voracious and insatiable appetite of government for pocket money) there will be enough over for reinvesting in new machinery and in needed capital goods.

Barbara Ward, the well-known British commentator, has pointed out that the economic decline of the British Empire started in the twenties when it failed to maintain the rate of capital reinvestment established in the pre-World War I years.

Many hold that our own prolonged depression of the thirties was due to our failure to maintain the rate of capital investment established in America during the twenties.

We do know that our rate of unemployment in the thirties set an all-time record that continued until World War II broke out in Europe.

Thinking on these experience—permit me to loosely paraphrase that distinguished Harvard philosopher, George Santayana—to the effect that if we choose to ignore history, we may be condemned to relive it. Most of us do not want to relive the 1930's.

A third function of profits is to pay an adequate dividend—or rent for money employed—so as to attract a continual flow of outside capital needed for expansion of plants, as population increases and expanding markets justify.

So, we can agree, I think, that to sustain solvency in government, to renew capital goods, to induce adequate investment for expansion—adequate profits are mandatory.

They are vital to the functioning of the American economy.

Even if, in the days of great monopolies and trusts, profits and dividends may have been too high in some cases, and the other elements of the economy too much neglected, the shoe is now on the other foot.

Today, the enforcement of antitrust laws is so vigorous as to assure the existence of a competition that becomes more potent whenever profits in any organization tend to rise beyond a reasonable or even minimum level.

Government, as the first and principal beneficiary of profits, would seem to have as almost its first domestic concern, that of keeping profits at a reasonable level.

But rarely do we hear profits accorded such a high place in governmental discuson.

Understandably, the politician's impulse is to thing first of voters, for whom he urges high wages and full employment.

These are wonderful and primary objectives, but few politicians are ready to take the political risk of arguing that only profits can assure their attainment.

The politician knows that most humans would rather get a dollar now than to be assured of a steady flow of dollars at some future time through reasonable profits accumulated today.

So, production costs go up, profits drop and the inevitable consequences follow.

The Government goes into a tailspin of spending, of tinkering, and of emergency unemployment payments—all to little avail.

Some recovery is experienced but usually at the cost of higher living costs, additional deterioration in the dollar's value, higher production costs, and a loss of more of our competitive market.

This must end somewhere.

We owe it to ourselves to see that it does not end in disaster.

The imbalance in our economy must be restored before we can achieve a healthy and sound growth.

Considering only these corrective measures that involve government, the first obvious requirement is for Washington to spend less.

We are supposed to be a self-governing nation.

Are we doing our part—our whole best—to get these facts understood by all citizens, particularly those who stand to lose jobs if we don't have profits?

If we cut expenditures only reasonably, the next obvious step is to lower taxes, measurably.

Experts have argued whether these actions should take place simultaneously or not—whether the two should be roughly equal or otherwise—whether we can cut taxes in the same legislation as we attempt reform in the tax system or, leave this latter essential objective for later treatment.

I believe firmly, for one important reason, that we should have an expenditure reduction and tax cut simultaneously, even if the magnitude of the latter is much greater than the former.

Having had some experiences in Washington, I am skeptical—and I am sure most of you are too—that any cut in a governmental expenditure program will rarely, if ever, be accomplished except under some compelling reason like the obvious need for a tax cut.

I could cite for you many disappointing instances to prove the point.

A modest decrease in appropriations, to accompany tax reductions, would at least prove that our cost curve is not compelled to mount, without interruption, always higher.

This would create more confidence than any words, no matter how eloquently, or by whom, spoken.

Why then, don't these things happen?

I'm sorry to have to say it—but part of the reason is you.

It is you—and all your associates all across the land who understand the basic relationship of profits to a prosperous and expanding economy—and all who believe that we must produce a more satisfactory marriage between government and a free productive enterprise than has existed under our hodgepodge of laws and regulations.

All of us, including farmers, of whom I am one—unsuccessful it is true—must delve deeper into government and political affairs.

And, I'm not talking merely about a political participation limited to a more or less generous donation to the political party of your choice.

I mean working at politics at all levels, from bottom up.

Though local government has already surrendered too much political power to Washington, city councils and State legislatures still wield part of the influence that Government exercises over the economy.

Does anyone here think that the scandals in big cities which all too often rock our Nation could occur if all citizens—particularly those in industry—would participate actively in the processes of self-government.

Yet, these scandals add to the tax bite and cut into profits.

If presidents and chairmen of industries are too busy to attend political meetings at precinct, county, and State levels, they can assign intelligent subordinates to the task of participating in conclaves of the party of the individual's choice, who can then report to their bosses.

Why cannot industry make its influence felt in the making of party platforms, both at the National and State conventions?

It is said that such platforms are merely mousetraps for the unwary, but if their economic planks become documents for nationwide debate and argument until replaced by new ones, their significance would be vastly increased.

Why cannot industrialists charge themselves with responsibility for meeting and talking with candidates—long before these present themselves to conventions or primaries for selection as the standard bearers of their respective parties?

Why should not businessmen participate in making the choice of the men believed equipped for the job?

Indeed, why do not more businessmen take the direct plunge into candidacies for political positions?

Doesn't it seem likely that a leaven of intelligent, vigorous courageous businessmen on every political slate would help bring to the fore the importance of some business sense in politics?

How often have I heard men say, "Well, in any case, my wife and I can live out our days; if we have to face economic chaos someone else will have to worry more about it than we."

Now, no one truly means this. In the first place, how do you know you can run out your days in ease?

History has seen many sudden and cataclysmic changes in a nation's life.

Next—we are not—cannot be—concerned only with ourselves.

The purely selfish individual is rarely encountered.

All of us do care about the future, proximate, and long range.

You are important leaders in America's economic life; you can save and strengthen the American system if you do not allow embarrassment, lethargy, timidity, or risk to deter you.

The pursuit of such a purpose, I hold, is worthy of all that's best in every loyal American, and is necessary to the growth and strength of American enterprise and the perpetuation of representative government.

World Will Be Ruled From Skies Above

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert an editorial from the May 17 issue of Life magazine. This thought-provoking article sets forth the reasons in clear detail for our program of landing a man on the moon.

The editorial follows:

WORLD WILL BE RULED FROM SKIES ABOVE

Is landing a man on the moon worth $20 billion? Is the whole U.S. space effort worth several times $20 billion? Should this kind of money be reallocated to terrestrial needs?

Senator FULBRIGHT implies that he would give the unemployed a higher priority than the unexplored. British Astronomer Fred Hoyle calls the moon race "stupid." Oxford's Max Beloff finds space "totally uninteresting and uninspiring." General Eisenhower has his doubts about the U.S. program. So do some American scientists who think instruments can do a better job in space than human beings and do it cheaper. So do many ordinary laymen who would enjoy $20 billion worth of tax cuts spread over the next several years. A great many people, for a wide variety of reasons, now have second thoughts about the massive U.S. commitment on which a near-unanimous vote by Congress reflected the broad national consensus less than a year ago. Was that commitment a mistake?

Life does not think so. True, there is an awesome mass of unfinished business on earth with strong claims on our resources. Never was there so much for talented men to do, whether in politics, science, art, business, or even speculations on the nature of man. But the same could have been said of Europe near the end of the 15th century, when the renaissance was opening new doors to human thought and experience. A time of challenge always produces skeptics and nay-sayers; Isabella of Spain had advisers who tried to talk her out of financing Columbus' voyage. But the bold spirits of that time did venture into the unknown. And they turned their age, already exciting enough, into an era of unprecedented exploration and discovery which changed the history of the world.

Now the United States can be foremost in another and greater adventure—or abdicate its own national greatness by not doing enough. Unfortunately the argument about whether space is worth it has been muddied by an increasing popular tendency to talk only about the race to the moon. Roscoe Drummond recently put the broad case very well: "The overriding issue is not who is going to be first to the moon but who is going to be foremost in mastery of the new element of outer space * * * (and) determine the shape of our world for many decades, perhaps for several centuries."

The issue is much bigger than a moon race, although of course we plan to land on the moon. The U.S. commitment to space seems a natural undertaking for the American people, who are a venturesome lot. Indeed it makes sense for military, technological and prestige reasons, viz.:

Military. Three months ago Soviet Marshal S. S. Biryuzov said flatly, "It has now become possible to launch, at a command from earth, rockets from a satellite, and this at any desirable time at any point in the satellite trajectory." It may be signficant that since he made this statement Biryuzov has been named chief of staff of the Soviet armed forces. In the United States Lt. Gen. James Ferguson of the Air Force has advised a House committee that an orbital space vehicle, armed with a nuclear warhead, could execute an attack in half the time required by an ICBM. The wartime advantage to any nation which could have the exclusive use of space, General Ferguson concludes, "would be enormous."

Technological. Do we need man in space? Yes. It is argued that instruments can do a more efficient job than the manned vehicles envisaged under the Gemini and Apollo projects. But the most sophisticated scientific instruments we (or for that matter the Russians) can now build have an application limited by what man knows on earth. "Machines," Britain's Sir Bernard Lovell argues, "cannot display the most important capabilities of man in these explorations. The machine cannot make on-the-spot judgments; neither can it discriminate and select from alternatives which have not been anticipated by its designers. The ability to adapt to the unexpected situation or discovery is a vital factor in exploration."

Prestige. Our stature in the eyes of other nations depends not just on the immediate achievement, not just on today's headline, but on the resolution, patience and skill devoted to clear and enduring purposes. Prestige is not a 100-yard dash; after all, it may be that we will not succeed in landing a man on the Moon before the Russians do. But U.S. prestige would suffer a really heavy blow if we decided space was not important. Britain's Richard Crossman thinks the Labor Party would have to make peace with the Russians "right away." French General Pierre Gallois says, "You got a challenge and you've got to face it. You have to keep up, compete, or you lose everything." A German industrialist warns, "There are other areas where you could spend moon research funds. But years from now the decision about where the United States stands will depend on where it stands in space." Around the world the United States gets much the same answer: "Sure, we know it's expensive. But you've got to do it."

It's expensive, all right. A total of $7.6 billion has been requested for the U.S. space program in fiscal 1964, and Congress is now looking at the figures skeptically. But there is also a problem of priorities within the space program itself—that is, where to spend the money first.

The space program as a whole should have a top priority. We must first stake out a claim to that nearer sector of space, 100 miles or so up, "which immediately bands this earth, our home" (Life, Aug. 24, 1962). Fortunately the United States is about to start just that with the Gemini program, for which the Air Force is using NASA's canned vehicles which, hopefully, can be clustered together as space platforms. It is in this area that a prior military breakthrough by an enemy could pose an early threat of Western society's physical extinction. So we are right to be in a hurry.

Of course nobody's military, including ours, is sure about what varieties of weaponry can be adopted to space conditions.

The fact that we are not sure is all the more reason to go up and look: we cannot fold our hands and let the enemy look all by himself. "Whoever breaks through in space," a pro-American European authority warns, "is going to rule the world."

Maybe. We don't know yet. But the military reasons are compounded by others just as compelling—man's eternal thirst for knowledge, the call of human adventure. That is the Promethean impulse which now beckons men like Gordon Cooper (pp. 90-96) into space and which will eventually take such men to the moon and beyond.

Nevada, the Battle Born State, To Commemorate Its 100th Anniversary of Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the Congressional Record the following remarks which I made before the House Banking and Currency Committee's Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs in behalf of my bill which provides for the striking of a commemorative medal on the occasion of Nevada's Centennial.

Nevada, as one of the last frontiers joined the Union at a most interesting time in our Nation's history, and I take this opportunity to make a few highlights of Nevada's history a part of the Record:

Statement by Walter S. Baring, Before the Banking and Currency Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, in Behalf of H.R. 2380, Providing for Striking of a Medal in Commemoration of the 100th Anniversary of Nevada Statehood, May 20, 1963

Madam Chairman, I am pleased to appear before your subcommittee today in behalf of my bill, H.R. 2380, providing for striking of a medal in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of Nevada's statehood. I shall not take much of your time, but I would appreciate your favorable consideration of this bill, for as you know Nevada was one of the last frontiers and it became a State during time of strife and discontent in this Nation. We are thus referred to as the Battle Born State, and sometimes as the Silver State.

Nevada became a State on the 31st of October 1864, but the incidents leading up to Nevada's statehood are most interesting.

Nevada was the last Western region to be explored in this country. Probably not more than one or two parties crossed Nevada before 1800 and they did not stop to explore. A few trappers explored parts of the area in search of new fur sources, but the great natural wealth of the region remained unknown until 1843 when an expedition led by John Fremont surveyed the Rocky Mountain Divide. In 1859 two prospectors discovered unusually rich gold deposits at Virginia City, Patrick McLaughlin and Peter O'Riley, and soon they took in Henry Comstock, a trapper, as partner. These deposits became known as the Comstock Lode. The gold was found to be mixed with extremely rich veins of silver, and miners rushed to the area and the real development of the region began. Later discoveries of gold, silver, copper, and other minerals established mining as Nevada's most valuable industry.

At the time the Comstock Lode was discovered, Virginia City was a very small settlement, but the news of the discovery spread like wildfire and miners and adventurers from California and the East flocked to the diggings to see if they could strike it rich, and in a very short time Virginia City became a bustling mining center, and the population of the entire section increased from 1,000 in 1859 to more than 6,800 in 1860.

By 1861 so many settlers had moved to the mining camps that President James Buchanan declared the area a separate territory, and when President Lincoln took office the same year, he appointed James W. Nye, a politician from New York City, as the first Governor of the Nevada Territory, and on July 11, 1861, Nye proclaimed the establishment of a territorial government.

In 1862 the territory was enlarged, and again after Nevada became a State (1864) was the area enlarged in 1866 to the present size, this is of particular interest, for in 1866 the barren dry desert land which was then added to the State was not particularly welcome and it took a couple of sessions of the legislature to come to agreement, but this barren dry desert land is where Las Vegas now lies, a booming metropolis and a tremendous asset to Nevada and the Nation.

Territorial life in Nevada was far from comfortable. The first settlers in mining camps lived in tents, in rough stone huts or in holes in the hillsides, and all their supplies had to be hauled over the mountains from California. Prices were almost unbelievably high and lawlessness and disorder often ruled in the mining camps. To make matters worse, Indians went on the warpath from time to time between 1861 and 1864 the Army built forts to protect the settlers against the Indians, while the Army at the same time began to enforce law and order in the mining camps.

This was the picture of Nevada when it came into statehood, but the silver and gold of Nevada's mines became vitally important to the Federal Government when the Civil War started in 1861, and these precious metals provided much of the funds necessary to finance the war. In addition the Union needed another antislavery State to make sure that amendments to the Constitution urged by President Lincoln would be passed. For these reasons, Lincoln became a strong supporter of statehood for Nevada, even though the territory had less than a third of the 127,381 residents required by Congress for statehood.

On March 3, 1863, Congress passed an act allowing a constitutional convention to meet in Nevada in preparation for statehood. The convention met in November 1863 but disputes developed over taxation and in the election in January 1864 the voters failed to approve the proposed constitution. Congress then had to pass another law authorizing a second constitutional convention. This new convention completed its work in less than 4 months and to speed statehood for Nevada the convention telegraphed the entire constitution to Washington at a cost of $3,500. Thus on October 31, 1864, Nevada became a State, and Henry G. Blasdel a mining engineer and a Republican became the State's first Governor, and the new State's estimated population was some 21,400 souls.

Although Nevada came into statehood through its richness in minerals and prosperity in its mining industry this picture has since changed. The richest silver deposits began to run out in 1869 and during the early 1870's silver prices began to fall on the international market. Discovery of the "Big Bonanza" in the Comstock Lode in 1873 provided a new source of high grade ore, and in 1878 Congress passed the Bland-Allison Act to keep mines with lower grade ore in operation.

By this time cattle raising grew in importance and as mines closed cattle ranchers became the richest men in the State. In 1893 President Cleveland called a special session of Congress and forced the repeal of the Bland-Allison Act. This caused more mines to close. Thousands of persons left Nevada to find work elsewhere and once thriving communities became ghost towns.

Again in 1900 prospectors found huge new deposits of rich silver ores at Tonopah and although silver prices were low the ores were so rich that mines could make a profit and hundreds of miners thus rushed back to the State to share in this new wealth. That same year rich deposits of copper were discovered near Ely, Ruth, and Mountain City, and the discovering of gold in Goldfield in 1903 caused a rush of people to this area.

World War II brought other booms to Nevada for munitions factories needed large quantities of the State's copper, magnesite, manganese, and tungsten, and in 1941 a large magnesium plant opened in Henderson.

However, Nevada is no longer a busy mining State, and a drop in the price of tungsten in the 1950's was a serious blow to Nevada's mining industry, and by 1959 all but one tungsten mine had closed.

Since then foreign aid programs have imported minerals mined with cheap labor elsewhere, while the Nevada mines stand vacant and the miners without a way of life.

Nevada is proud of the many famous people it has produced, and people who have lived there. Mark Twain worked as a reporter for several years on the Territorial Enterprise, a Virginia City newspaper, and he made that paper famous.

Francis Griffith Newlands served Nevada both as a Representative and a Senator for over 25 years, and is the sponsor of bills for reclamation of the arid lands in the West.

Senator Key Pittman was Senator from Nevada from 1913 until his death in 1940 and he strongly supported the free coinage of silver and was the author of the Silver Purchase Act.

And the colorful, fighting Senator Pat McCarran who fought for silver with his dying breath.

And, William Morris Steward a lawyer and U.S. Senator who sponsored national mining legislation, and who was the author of the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which allowed qualified Negroes to vote in national elections.

Thus, Nevada has made a tremendous imprint on our Nation's history and we wish to have a commemorative medal struck in the State's honor on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of statehood.

Thank you.

Judge Jed Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

Remarks of Wilburn Cartwright of Oklahoma, Former Member of Congress

Among the few close personal friends I made at the University of Oklahoma, Jed Johnson was the closest. We studied together, and we compared notes. It was found that we thought and acted about alike. In other words we developed a real appreciation of each other's character and a friendship which became very dear to me.

We were poor boys. Jed had been a farmer, turkey-raiser and rural mail carrier. I had been a farmer, country schoolteacher, and had just been elected to my first term in the State legislature. Jed was planning to run for the State senate and so was I.

I roomed in a cow-barn at Aunt Stella's place, because I could get it for free. The room was nice enough but it was in a barn over several milk cows. Jed quite often came over and studied with me at night, because I had a good electric light and it was usually very quiet there. We got to writing our names, Jed Johnson, M.C.; Wilburn Cartwright, M.C., meaning Members of Congress. Jed said he was going to beat me to Congress. I suggested that we compromise and both go at the same time. I was elected for a second term to the legislature. Jed was elected to the State senate. Two years later I was elected to the State senate and we served there together. We both ran for Congress in 1926 and we were both elected.

For 16 years we were very closely associated in Congress. Jed served with distinction as a member of the important Committee on Appropriations while I served on other committees. We voted together, we took long walks together, our families were close.

In 1942 I was defeated for reelection to Congress and immediately volunteered for service in World War II. For 4 years I was out of politics, serving in North Africa, Italy, and wtih the Veterans' Administration. Jed and I kept up a close correspondence.

Jed was defeated for reelection to Congress in 1946, the year I was elected Oklahoma's secretary of state. President Truman then appointed Jed as a member of the U.S. Customs Court in New York where he served until the time of his death. I have continued in State political office, but we kept in close touch with each other.

As an indication of the esteem in which his fellow judges held Jed, six of the nine members of the customs court came with the body to Oklahoma. Each of the judges made a short talk which served as a funeral sermon.

I must say that Jed Johnson has been closer to me than any of my brothers. It was a very sad call for me to serve as a pallbearer at his funeral.

To know Jed Johnson was to respect him. He was well prepared for public service; a Christian gentleman, a splendid lawyer, with a realization of the obligations of a member of the bar, to the public, and especially to our Government. Broad experience and reading of good literature made him an entertaining and an interesting conversationalist. He stood well with his fellow man, and in his passing we lose a true friend, a distinguished colleague, and his place cannot be filled.

Jed Johnson's splendid career of public service has been a beckoning inspiration to me as I have undertaken to perform my duties in public office. The good which Jed did and tried to do will never die, whether it be recognized or unrecognized as such, for it lives and will live since no truth or goodness attributable to man ever dies or can die.

I like to ease somewhat the irreparable loss to Jed's devoted wife, Beatrice, three daughters, Jean, Joan, Janelle, and son, Jed, Jr., and my own grief by feeling that Jed has just "lain down to pleasant dreams" and we'll meet him again "in the sweet by by."

I know of no epitaph to be applied to my departed friend and colleague more appropriate than the words of Mark Anthony as he looked down upon another who lay still in death:

"His life was gentle and the elements
So mixed in him that nature might stand up
And say to all the world,
'This was a man.'"

Press Comments Concerning the 30th Anniversary of the TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, permission has previously been obtained to have reprinted in the RECORD the text of the address by President Kennedy on the occasion of his visit to Tennessee on Saturday last.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include editorials and news stories from the press regarding President Kennedy's visit in connection with the celebration of the 90th Anniversary of Vanderbilt University and the 30th Anniversary of the Tennessee Valley Authority to be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The excerpts follow:

TVA AT 30 REACHES FOR NEW HORIZONS—SHORES, TRIBUTARIES BECKON TO BUILDERS

(By Nat Caldwell)

The people of the Tennessee Valley and the Federal agency uniquely their own—TVA—these days are reaching for some new horizons just as they were in 1933.

The people of the valley were confident that President John F. Kennedy, flying down for their 30th birthday celebration for TVA, would be stimulated by what he saw.

They were confident, too, that they would be stimulated by what he said. Both assumptions proved to be correct.

The President's words, shaped no doubt, by his own thoughtful weighing of possible new scientific and economic demonstrations by TVA, were provocative.

The President said:

"We are saluting the 30th anniversary of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which transformed a parched, depressed and flood-ravaged region into a fertile, productive center of industry, science and agriculture."

Later, at Muscle Shoals he said, "There are those who say that the TVA has finished its job and outlived its challenge. But all of the essential roles of TVA remain, their importance increasing as the importance of this area's atomic energy, military and commercial activities increase. And new opportunities, new frontiers to explore are opening up every year—including work on the smaller upstream tributaries—reclaiming land scarred by coal strip mining—new types of national recreation areas and new studies of flood land zoning and planning, to name but a few.

In short, the work of TVA will never be over.

GOOD TIMING

The timing of the 30th birthday party for TVA could not have been better. By design or accident the celebration synchronized with another demonstration of American scientific pioneering that gripped the world's attention.

Maj. Gordon Cooper's conquest of space, indeed, could be comfortably equated with the Tennessee Valley Authority's conquest of natural forces such as floods and the re-direction of these forces for the benefit of many.

David E. Lilienthal, one of the early directors of the TVA Board, saw the parallel between the two achievements but he saw it as a warning.

GREAT ACHIEVEMENT

In a speech last night in Decatur, Ala., Lilienthal warned:

"We are beginning to neglect the needs of our own country * * * we are overspending our emotional energy on binges about Russia, India, Cuba, the moon—everything except what happens here where we live."

TVA, Lilienthal said, is one of the truly great achievements of the American people. It is one that is close to the hearts of underdeveloped nations because it shows them what can be done by the people for themselves.

"The reason I think the Tennessee Valley has become a kind of Mecca for visitors from all over the world is that what you have done here represents the kind of achievement that is most meaningful in the daily lives of the people of these countries."

To paraphrase the former moving force in TVA, in 1933 a river was running unused and spreading fear and havoc across the face of the South. By 1963, this and other rivers have been bridled and are producing untold benefits to the Nation.

BORN IN WAR

TVA was a war-born baby although nobody back in 1917 had any thought of developing the Tennessee Valley. It was U.S. dependence on Chilean nitrates that brought about construction of Wilson Dam and two nitrate plants at Muscle Shoals during the final months of the war.

Nitrates were necessary to the Government for manufacture of explosives, and a few far-sighted individuals even then saw the value of such plants to American farmers in the peace-time production of cheap fertilizer.

The nitrate plants were completed too late to make much contribution to the war effort, and the dam was not completed until after the war. With the coming of peace utilization of the Muscle Shoals installations became a political football, kicked vigorously back and forth by contending parties which included Henry Ford and the Alabama Power Co.

In 1922 Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, opposing the offers of Ford and Alabama Power Co. for operations at Muscle Shoals, introduced the first of a series of bills providing for public development of the power complex and fertilizer plants, and looking to the development of the Tennessee River and its valley.

For 10 years Norris battled, striking an impassable road block in the form of a veto by President Herbert Hoover. Muscle Shoals became an issue in the Presidential election of 1932. Franklin D. Roosevelt's victory assured the passage of the Norris plan for comprehensive, multipurpose development of the waters of the Tennessee Valley.

Early in 1933 Senator Norris and President Roosevelt visited Muscle Shoals and as they stood on Wilson Dam, President Roosevelt said:

"This should be a happy day for you, George."

"It is, Mr. President," replied the Nebraska Senator. "I see my dreams come true."

But the past "is the prolog to the future."

And the future for TVA is toward parallel developments carried out by local governments.

Paul Hughes, Somerset, Ky., president of a three-county Area Redevelopment Council in economically distressed east Kentucky, lives just outside the realm of low-cost TVA power. Hughes spoke of the significance of the Presidential visit:

"President Kennedy, like Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, and like Senator Norris, has shown an awareness of the challenging opportunities offered America—not just the perils of the times."

"When President Kennedy came into office he pushed for TVA's board to consider a steamplant for distressed east Kentucky. We began to think of TVA as more than cheap power and good fishing for a favored area."

Recognition of the advantages of TVA installations to restore potential to the distressed coal mining area has caused Hughes and others to call for a new Appalachian area development authority.

Joe Sir, Fayetteville, who like Hughes is a smalltown department store owner, agreed with the Kentuckian that provision of new markets for coal "is great."

"But the wonderful new thing about TVA that President Kennedy saw as he visited the Tennessee Valley is the now rushing Beech River development. He saw this just minutes before he flew into Muscle Shoals.

"I am sure his attention was called to the first new lake now building at Lexington. I am sure someone pointed out to him the green of 60 million pine trees planted against the eorsion-scarred red hills of Henderson County."

Sir is president of the Elk River Development Association which has a goal of dam-building and full economic redevelopment for the Elk, a river that drains seven Tennessee and two north Alabama counties.

A NEW TVA

"The tributary development ideas gives us what amounts to a new TVA. Bigger, brighter, better, and supplementing the giant power program that President Kennedy saw functioning over the weekend," Sir said.

He offered to define what he meant by a new program:

"Cheap power is there and it is big.

"But, no longer is power alone going to command all the national and international attention TVA gets and the best efforts of the agency's brains."

In the 2 years of the present administration, Sir points out tributary development programs have been spelled out for Elk River, Duck River, Sequatchie River, Clinch River, and half a dozen other tributaries.

FOR SMALL DAMS

These programs, he insists, can fit areas like the distressed Appalachian highlands of Kentucky and West Virginia better than the old TVA program.

"Two or three small dams on a small stream can store water, nourish new recreation industries, provide cooling water for steamplants, but one big TVA-type dam might flood out all liveable country in these small, deep gorge rivers."

What is the real difference between the 1963 model TVA and the 1933 model?

County Judge Lunn McKeel of Humphreys County answered:

"Tributory development was thought up by local people. Dick Barry, a Lexington lawyer and Speaker of the Tennessee House of Representatives, was the brains of the Beech River Authority just as Joe Swidler and George Wessonauer were behind the steamplants."

McKeel said he believes the difference in the source of the new proposal for intensive development of smaller watershed probably accounts for the accent on "do-it-yourself," and "help-pay-for-it-yourself."

"The really revolutionary ideal in this program is the knowledge that these areas need to have attractive sites along the waterway for industry developed, ready for the plant to move in. You've got to have planned, zoned, orderly developed sites for homes for their workers, if they are an enlightened industry."

McKeel said that most of the TVA lake shore line and most of the shorelines of other man-made lakes in the United States simply have been havens for real estate promoters.

"If industry came in it was a piece of luck," he added. "Then the Beech River boys decided they wanted their 14 lakes and the dredged bargeway from Kentucky Lake to Lexington. They wanted it with all the land for a mile or so back from the waterway owned by Henderson and Decatur Counties. That would assure that the land would realize its fullest potential. An agency of the two local governments would own and control it and sell it only for the uses to which it is best suited."

McKeel, who learned the hard way at Johnsonville how difficult it is to create industrial subdivisions 10 years after the real estate promoters have had their fling with the land said:

"This is the real revolutionary thing about the tributary development plans for the Beech, Elk, and Duck Rivers. Grassroots, public agencies own the land, plan its use, zone it, and sell it to private enterprise. They use the income to pay a sizeable share of the cost of all the dams that the TVA will build.

NEW WRINKLE

"This is the new wrinkle," McKeel said, "Bill Batt, President Kennedy's Area Redevelopment Administrator, told me the other day that he had told the President about it.

"Batt said: 'It's the sort of thing that a New England Yankee like the President really believes in. It's helping pay your own way.' "

Is there anything in the new idea for small TVA waterways that would be contradictory of the principles of Republicans like Senator Norris and Democrats like President Roosevelt who chartered the original TVA plan?

THE NORRIS PLAN

William Staggs, a druggist at Dunlap, a little village in the Sequatchie River valley, answered:

"No, sir. It might not appeal to real estate promoters from Chattanooga, if we get a dam or two but I think that the multipurpose development idea that Senator Norris fought for 50 years in Congress is really the basis of the present plan we are asking for.

"Local governments want to have a means by which they can contribute to the cost of these big projects. If they can get that money by owning and selling off the shoreline, it's all to the good."

Staggs, who was reared at Portland, Tenn., was asked if he considered such a device might possibly be called "socialism."

"Look here," he said. "That's silly. Things like that aren't socialism. They are commonsense. Just a few miles from here nobody did anything about the shoreline of the big TVA lake near Chattanooga.

"Today it's a wild hodge podge of every kind of use. One thing sure is that there's no room for new industry. We want to avoid those mistakes if we get a real development of our river.

"If that means some kind of local government agency will own the shoreline first and will make some money out of it so it can pay back TVA for some of its expenses, that's helping yourself. And helping yourself is free enterprise."

The President's Call of Leadership Summons Us to "Unlearned Lessons"

In his visit here and at Muscle Shoals yesterday, President John F. Kennedy spoke eloquently and forthrightly of a Nation whose goal is progress and whose burden is change.

Saluting the Tennessee Valley Authority, Vanderbilt University and touching off construction on two new Corps of Engineer dams, the chief executive noted that "if there is one unchanging theme that runs through these separate stories it is that everything changes but change itself."

Saying that the Nation is now engaged in a continuing debate about the rights of a portion of its citizens, the President noted that an equally important but frequently unlearned lesson is the responsibility of citizens. And he spoke of the responsibility education imposes on those who benefit from learning. The President called on citizens to meet their obligations—obligations to the pursuit of learning, service to the public and to the law of the land.

Such obligations paved the way for a great University such as Vanderbilt whose role has been education and "an enduring mission of reconciliation.".

Vanderbilt University was born in the crucible of change—in a country torn by civil war. It has come far, but its role is still one of imparting knowledge and wisdom in time of change. It was clear from his message that the President has no fear of change. And he urged his listeners to be participants—not spectators.

Change brings controversy, doubters and skeptics and hostility. There were those, the President said, referring to the beginnings of TVA 30 years ago, "who said it shouldn't be done. Some said it wouldn't be done * * * but today, 30 years later, it has been done and there is still more for TVA to do."

And there is much more for this Nation to do in building a better place for generations yet unborn, he said.

In a sense, the TVA is something also of an unlearned lesson for this Nation. Some complain, the Chief Executive noted, that this national asset serves only the people of the valley. But the country is only as strong as its weakest link, and the TVA has made this link strong. The agency has served the Nation in a myriad of ways from creating a vast marketplace to aiding navigation, providing a yardstick for electrical production, and helping national defense.

The great irony of the TVA is that its value is given more recognition abroad than at home. It is a shining symbol of progress in a democracy. It is an idea we have exported with tremendous success. It draws a steady stream of visitors, as the President said, "the kings, the prime ministers, the students and technicians, the undecided and the uncommitted who gain an impression of vitality and concern for human well-being which cannot be matched anywhere in the world."

With the TVA the Federal Government is no intruder, no adversary but a partner with the people for progress of all.

A part of the unlearned lesson of TVA is that it has meant progress for all within the valley, including those involved in the continuing debate about rights of citizens. With one aspect of progress come the yearnings and desires for further progress.

The debate, as the President said, will go on and rights of all will expand until the standard first forged by the Nation's founders has been reached. For progress achieved, there remains more to be achieved.

This Nation or no segment of it can rest on its laurels. For 8 long years the TVA had a hostile administration and its energies were chiefly spent in maintaining the status quo. Out of those years grew something of a sense of lethargy in its ranks, and a dimming of vision by some within the agency.

For these, too, there is an unlearned lesson. The administration in Washington is not an adversary but a supporter of TVA. It does not seek to hold the TVA back but to prod it on.

At Muscle Shoals President Kennedy had this ringing declaration of direction: "There are those who say that the TVA has finished its job and outlived its challenge. But all the essential roles remain * * * and new opportunities, new frontiers to explore are opening up every year—including work on the smaller upstream tributaries—reclaiming land scarred by coal strip mining—new types of national recreation areas and new studies of flood land zoning and planning to name a few. In short, the work of the TVA will never be done."

President Kennedy's addresses constituted a clarion challenge to educators and education, a cry of "forward" to the Tennessee Valley Authority, and a fervent plea for responsibility on the part of all citizens.

It was an eloquent call for all to reflect on the unlearned lesson of our time: that in cooperation and knowledge and with a sense of special obligation, the people can move forward to the destiny that is theirs.

THOUGHTS ON TVA FROM OUTSIDE VALLEY

There have been times—a good many of them—in the past 30 years when it appeared that the Tennessee Valley Authority was about to be done in by its enemies. But one way or another it survived, and it continues to operate successfully, a world-famous model for the wise use of natural resources.

President Kennedy will visit the TVA area this weekend to speak at ceremonies observing the agency's 30th anniversary, and no doubt he will catalog the triumphs of these eventful years. But basically TVA's success has been due to two things: a practical and inspiring concept, and a dedicated staff.

No one who has seen the great hydroelectric dams and mammoth steam power plants, the lakes and forests, prosperous farms, and humming industries in the valley can escape the feeling that here is a thrilling adventure in what man can do to bring nature into harmony with his own goals.

Those who work for TVA have never failed to be infected with this spirit, summed up quite well the other day by Aubrey J. Wagner, TVA Chairman who has been with the system in one capacity or another for 29 years: It's still fun working for the TVA."

The genesis of TVA actually is back in World War I. In that period the Government started construction of a dam at Muscle Shoals on the Tennessee River, in northern Alabama, to produce nitrate explosives. After the war Henry Ford tried to buy the dam; he was opposed by southern Congressmen who saw in it a source of cheap chemical fertilizer.

Senator Norris of Nebraska, then chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, became interested. Twice in the 1920's TVA legislation was passed and vetoed. It was again passed in the "first 100 days" of President Roosevelt, and signed into law. And of all the New Deal proposals adopted during that period, and now generally accepted, TVA remains perhaps the most controversial.

Why should this be so? Those who live in the valley are the strongest supporters of the agency. Yet throughout the country the privately owned electric utilities still talk about Federal subsidies and tax benefits. But the taxes which the utilities boast of paying are in reality paid by their customers, and such subsidies as bookkeepers can attribute to TVA have been justified many times over by the economic growth of the region it serves, which helps the Nation as well as the region.

TVA was and is a bargain for the Nation. President Eisenhower was never more wrong than when he denounced it as "creeping socialism" and sanctioned the Dixon-Yates deal to cripple it.

Out of the 1950's came a new method of financing power operations and restrictions on TVA expansion, but they have not proved handicaps. It is true that the spectacular days are on the wane. The rivers are harnessed by 31 dams which control floods and have a generating capacity of 4 million kilowatts; steamplants produce 8 million more. And the average valley resident pays 1 cent a kilowatt-hour for electricity, as compared with the national average of 2.3 cents.

But if the basic job is done, there are still new fields to conquer. Small tributaries await development and experiment; recreational facilities need expansion; increasing power demands must be met; ways must be found to do better what has already been done well. The challenge is not the challenge of the 1930's, but it is still there. We hope the agency is still fired with the zeal to meet it.

THE NEW YORK TIMES

By coincidence a special report by the Tennessee Valley Authority is published almost simultaneously with adoption by the U.S. Senate of a research bill aimed at the problem of assuring the country an adequate supply of usable water. TVA has achieved precisely this result for the 41,000 square miles in the Tennessee River drainage basin, and its present report is a dramatic account of what can be accomplished through a unified approach to water management.

Streamflow regulation has created more than 600,000 acres of water surface in the Tennessee Valley. Floods have been prevented. Vast new sources of hydroelectric power have been created. Irrigation projects have flourished. Recreation facilities have been developed, and business in the great valley has prospered.

It is now 30 years since Congress created TVA, and over the years, whether under a Democratic or a Republican administration in Washington, the prestige of this pioneer agency has mounted. To be sure, it is still the target of criticism directed against it by many privately owned electric power interests; these interests contend that, even though TVA makes payment to States and counties in lieu of taxes, it is so set up as to provide an unfair yardstick of production and service costs, in comparison with the record of the private power companies.

Nevertheless, despite such criticism, the opinion has certainly gained ground that some water-control and power-production projects are too large and too complex to be undertaken by private capital, that the TVA nexus is one of these, and that in this case Federal initiative, backed by vigorous local cooperation, has built an enduring success.

Here, certainly, is relevant material for any congressional investigation of the problem of developing an adequate supply of water for the years that lie ahead.

Statement by Former Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson Relative to Wheat Referendum, May 21, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD a statement by former Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson relative to the wheat referendum.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY FORMER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EZRA TAFT BENSON RELATIVE TO WHEAT REFERENDUM, MAY 21, 1963

The wheat certificate plan would reduce farmers' freedom to manage their own farms, decrease their efficiency, restrict markets, and encumber the whole wheat marketing process. It should be defeated.

The choice is between Government regimentation and freedom. I hope farmers choose freedom and vote "no" in the wheat referendum May 21, 1963.

We have gone a long way down the road of socialism when public funds are improperly used to influence and rig a free election. A "no" vote will help to reverse this dangerous trend.

What farmers want and need is more freedom and less Government in agriculture.

The real issue is, who will manage our farms—farmers or the Federal Government?

The farms of American cannot and should not be run from a desk in Washington. A "no" vote May 21 will be best for our farmers and best for our country.

Congress Should Check Funds on Hand Before Appropriating More Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, last week the House voted to raise the debt limit in spite of the facts presented showing that a much lower figure would have been enough. The administration continues to ask for appropriations far in excess of actual need and Congress gives the President the money.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is about time we exercise some responsibility in spending the peoples' money and demand a better accounting from the administration. Before we appropriate new billions, it is just good horsesense to ask how much there is left in unexpended funds already appropriated.

The following editorial from today's issue of the Chicago Tribune points out some of the billions in the "Rainy Day Fund," at the President's disposal:

THE FEDERAL MONSTER'S RAINY DAY FUND

If the ship's boatswain wanted 50 gallons of paint, back in our own seagoing days, he would requisition 100 gallons. He knew that the supply officer knew that he was ordering more than was necessary [he very likely had 50 gallons from the last order still stored in the boatswain's locker] and that the requisition would be automatically cut in half.

This was [and perhaps still is] a common practice, and it worked well all around. If the boatswain should run out of paint, he could blame the supply officer. The latter, meanwhile, could show his superiors how painstakingly he guarded against the waste of Government property. The danger was that an inexperienced supply officer might fill the requisition in full, in which case the boatswain would have more paint than he could store. Some of the surplus might disappear in exchange for favors and other considerations—sometimes, we suspect, alcoholic.

Much of the same system applies when the executive department of the Government asks money from Congress. But Congress has not done the proper amount of trimming. Senator BYRD has called attention to the shocking accumulation of unspent money in appropriations granted to the various Government departments.

By the end of the present fiscal year in June, according to the administration's own estimates, it will have $87 billion in unexpended balances on hand from this and previous years' appropriations. There is existing authority to spend this amount, whether it's included in the budget or not. If the administration is granted the $108 billion in new spending authority which it seeks for the fiscal year beginning July 1, it will have authority to spend $195 billion—a figure which, to Senator BYRD, is "almost beyond comprehension."

Not much more than half of the $87 billion backlog is even "obligated" or earmarked for specific use. The $87 billion also includes about $12 billion representing our commitments to the World Bank, the Export-Import Bank, and the International Monetary Fund. These, Mr. BYRD points out, bring to $21.3 billion the amount which has already been appropriated for foreign aid and not spent.

There will be a balance of $782 million on June 30, in funds appropriated directly to the President for purposes other than defense and foreign aid. These purposes include emergency allocations by the President for welfare and disasters. At the recent rate of spending, the balance on hand will last about 20 years.

The Agriculture Department will have an unexpended balance of about $3 billion. The Rural Electrification Administration is an example of how the money accumulates. Its appropriations—granted for 1962 and 1963 and requested for 1964—amount to $1.3 billion. Expenditures for these years are expected to come to only $913 million. The difference will bring the unexpended balance to more than $1 billion.

The Defense Department will wind up the present fiscal year with $31 billion in unexpended balances; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with $2.3 billion, and so on.

None of the Government's stockpiles of critical materials is as outrageous as this accumulated stockpile of appropriations. If there ever was an invitation to the reckless spending of money, this is it. Mr. BYRD is entirely reasonable in demanding that Congress look into this backlog of spending authority and cut the present requests by at least $7 billion. He is doing only what a responsible guardian of the public interest ought to do.

Hon. Jed Johnson

SPEECH

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with regret that I noted the passing of a former Member of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Jed J. Johnson, a Representative from the State of Oklahoma from 1927 to 1947.

I had the privilege of serving with Jed Johnson for a number of years. He was one of the sincerest, most able Members of Congress that I have ever known. He was highly respected by all his colleagues and was a dedicated, patriotic American.

Jed Johnson, his wonderful wife and fine children were very popular with Members of Congress and their families. In other words, the Jed Johnson family was one the entire Congress was very proud of.

Jed Johnson served his country well and was properly referred to as a great American.

Renting to Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Williamston (Mich.) Enterprise of May 15 contained an editorial entitled "Renting to Kennedy," which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House. It is particularly timely, with the American wheat farmers voting tomorrow in their referendum. I call it "recommended reading" for those Members of Congress who have been concerned with this referendum. The editorial follows:

RENTING TO KENNEDY

Wheat farmers will go to the polls on May 21 to decide whether they want continued Government price and acreage control.

Government programs of this kind have, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, cost the taxpayers billions of dollars.

In view of the wheat referendum, an editorial this newspaper published in July of 1962 is significant enough to reprint this week. It follows:

An article in the July 2 issue of the Detroit Free Press indicated that the Federal Government has just paid $765 million to farmers for reducing acreage under the 1961 feed grain program.

Over 40 farmers in Michigan got checks for more than $5,000 each. A Niles farmer got $11,936. A Vandalia farmer, $10,884, and a Pinconning farmer, $10,170.

Texas farmers really hit oil. Thirty-one received more than $20,000 each.

All for growing nothing.

The writer just returned from a vacation. In Nebraska, farmers laughed about the Government program. "I get $50 an acre for not planting a thing," one farmer said. "Heck, I can plow, seed, cultivate, and irrigate all summer and can't net that much, so why should I grow anything?" he asked.

"We call it Kennedy land or renting to Kennedy," he laughed.

The American farmer is certainly politically blessed. Can you imagine a weekly newspaper publisher getting $4 per subscription for not printing a newspaper?

Ironically, not all farmers are for bureaucratic controls, supports, and handouts. For instance, the Idaho Potato Growers Association for years has opposed Govenment controls and only last month unanimously reaffirmed opposition to Federal intervention.

The association's top officials have long contended that the return to a free market is the only answer. But the majority of politicians running the Government don't see it that way.

With each election comes big speeches. With each administration comes the soil bank, the feed grain program, the Benson plan, the Freeman plan, or what have you. The cost of administering each plan is staggering. The result is a Farmers Investment Co. in Arizona picking up a check for $94,092. Or a Billy Sol Estes or two.

Otherwise, nothing really seems to be accomplished.

It really ought to be worth a try to go back to the old days of supply and demand.

What Tax Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, ever since the President's tax message to the Congress, early in the year, the American people rarely know what the Kennedy policy on taxes is. Every day of the week brings forth a different attitude. Today's New York Herald Tribune, in an excellent article by Donald I. Rogers, shows the shiftlessness of the Kennedy economists who are groping in the dark for something—they know not what.

The article follows:

WHAT'S WITH THE TAX PROGRAM?

(By Donald I. Rogers)

With the end of the Government's fiscal year little more than a month away, it is time for a reassessment of the tax program which for more than 6 months dominated the President's public utterances. It has gone nowhere. It is locked tight in congressional committee. Perhaps deadlocked is a more accurate word.

Last fall President Kennedy promised the voters there would be tax cuts and tax reform—revamping of the crazy-quilt patchwork of regulations that make the U.S. tax code the most complicated law in the history of mankind.

Viewed in the perspective of chronology, it may be seen that the administration and not Congress is at fault, and that only the administration can be blamed for the lack of a tax bill which will meet the requirements of the ever-changing evolving American economy.

First, the administration introduced its proposal with the admonition that these, and only these, recommendations answered the needs of the Nation. None other would do. Take the whole package, Congress and the people were advised, or there'll be trouble from the White House, as well as the Treasury. From experience gained the preceding year when they balked at the administration's budget, Congressmen knew that this could mean pressure from the Defense Department and the Pentagon, with threats of lost contracts for defense plants employing their constituents.

Nevertheless, Congress, upon reading the tax program, found it wasn't what it was labeled. The President had been saying one thing about the tax program at the same time that he was preparing legislation that would have an exactly opposite effect.

The President stressed the need for investment and the incentive to invest and blamed existing taxes for stifling incentives. His program, however, was directly aimed at shifting more of the tax burden to the middle and higher income brackets, the only significant source of investments.

In an unusual foray into sleight of hand, the administration offered tax cuts but also requested some tax reforms (don't forget that word) which, it insisted, must accompany the cuts. The reforms would have made the net taxes for many persons, and for most investors, either the same or even higher.

So Congress balked.

Upon reflection, said the President in a speech in New York, he now believed it was the tax cuts that were important and maybe we could get along without his heretofore mandatory reforms.

He had also submitted a budget, however, which would have created a deficit of over $11 billion, and since the Government's only source of income is from taxes, prudent Congressmen couldn't see how the Government could expect to run in the red by $11 billion at the same time it was planning to reduce its income.

So the President shifted his tactics. The tax cut was now needed, he told the Nation, to forestall a threatened recession. The recession of 1963 became, overnight, a bogeyman stalking all economic halls. He had forgotten all about investment incentives by this time.

The economy, rarely cooperative with tinkerers, did an unpolitic thing. Business took an upturn. Figures began to pour in showing that 1963 may well turn out to be the most prosperous year in history, or, at the very least, the second most prosperous year in history.

With that argument nullified, the President needed a new tack, and, finding none, switched the whole affair back again to the need for growth.

The Treasury, accordingly, lined up what it thought was a group of tame business leaders, expecting they would indorse the whole administration proposal, reforms and all. The reforms were needed to keep revenues high, else the budget would be threatened. The businessmen turned out to be more practical than tame. They met and reported that, while the tax cuts were needed, the reforms were not, and if Congress cut that big administration budget, it would be a good thing.

This wasn't the report they had been looking for. The administration then decided to convene a citizen's panel which, the plotters hope, will be more agreeable to the idea of reforms.

That's where the matter stands.

Major Anderson: Brave Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a ceremony to dedicate a memorial to Maj. Rudolph Anderson, Jr., a South Carolinian killed while obtaining evidence of the Soviet missile buildup in Cuba, was held Sunday at Greenville, S.C.

The Honorable Donald Russell, Governor, lawyer, scholar, and statesman, painted in gripping words the heroic gallantry of this American flier to his family, his friends, and his fellow South Carolinians.

Under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby insert Governor Russell's remarks so that all America can know of this eloquent tribute to Major Anderson:

REMARKS OF GOV. DONALD RUSSELL AT THE DEDICATION OF THE MAJ. RUDOLPH ANDERSON, JR., MEMORIAL, GREENVILLE, S.C.

Friends and relatives of Major Anderson, ladies and gentlemen, we are here today to honor a distinguished and courageous American, a defender of the Nation. As I stand viewing this memorial to Maj. Rudolph Anderson, Jr., there is admiration in my heart—an admiration that I struggle to translate into appropriate phrases. It is no easy task, because my deep respect for Major Anderson's contribution to his country is touched with great sadness. I mourn with you the loss of this fine son of South Carolina, a loss keenly felt by his State and his country. Most of all, the loss is felt by his family—his parents, his wife and children, and his sister. Mr. and Mrs. Anderson, to you and your family I extend my deepest sympathy.

And I gently remind those of you gathered here that while we applaud the noble virtues which prompted this man's bravery, let us not forget that a South Carolinian has died; a great American is gone.

The dedication of a monument such as this will serve its purpose, which is to remind present and future generations of one man's singular devotion to duty and to the peace and security of the free world.

The events which preceded and followed the death of Major Anderson are now slipping into history. The Cuban crisis of 1962 will in future years be cited as one of those perilous moments in history when men almost began again to war against one another, though that tragedy was narrowly averted.

The Cuban crisis came swiftly upon the Nation in a Presidential television broadcast October 22, 1962, and only a few weeks later it was over. The threat of immediate war with Russia subsided. It was a tense and dramatic moment in history, and following it, the world silently offered gratitude to the Almighty that a nuclear holocaust had been avoided.

In retrospect, the heroes of the Cuban crisis were those gallant men who flew their aircraft over hostile territory, aiming, not guns, but cameras. These cameras were the eyes of America—the eyes that found danger and alerted our powerful military forces to the missile threat only 90 miles from the U.S. mainland. Of those aviators who vigilantly guarded our country, one gained fame—and he lost his life in so doing.

Major Anderson was the sole official American casualty of the Cuban crisis of 1962. He died on a reconnaissance mission over Cuba.

It was November 6, 1962, at the major's funeral, that the full impact of his role came to the attention of the Nation. Gen. Thomas S. Power, commander in chief of the Strategic Air Command, revealed that Major Anderson and other reconnaissance pilot "obtained the first conclusive evidence of the Soviet missile buildup in Cuba."

"Major Anderson gave his life while performing one of the most vital and hazardous duties connected with the Cuban crisis," General Power said. "As grievous as his loss is to all of us, his selfless devotion to duty, honor, and country should be a source of pride and comfort to his family and friends. It is because of men like Major Anderson that this country has been able to act with determination during these fateful days."

Major Anderson has been posthumously honored in other ways since the tense days of 1962 when he died in defense of peace and freedom. The Armed Forces of this country awarded him the highest peacetime decoration for bravery, the Distinguished Service Medal. Closer to home, the Greenville City Council, on November 13, 1962, honored and paid tribute to the life, courage, and valor of Maj. Rudolph Anderson, Jr., and his great contribution to the preservation of our country and world peace. "We express our deep and heartfelt grief in the loss of the life of this great American, our friend and fellow citizen, and we extend to his family our most sincere sympathy," the Greenville City Council proclaimed.

Now we have another memorial to Major Anderson's sacrifice of his life for his country. President Kennedy and the Secretary of the Air Force have made available this F-86 jet fighter for permanent display in Major Anderson's hometown.

This fighter is an instrument of warfare—but you have appropriately selected a peaceful and serene site for its home. I say you have appropriately selected such a site for this reason: Major Anderson's flights over Cuba were in the interest of preserving the peace in this shaky and precarious world in which we live. He died in order that the United States might have full knowledge of the dangerous situation which existed near its shores, and take appropriate countermeasures. Those countermeasures we fervently hope led to the withdrawal of missiles from Cuba, lessening the tension between two military powerful nations.

Major Anderson's death is vivid evidence that he has discharged his duties to his country in the highest fashion. As we remember him today, we should be reminded that we also have a duty to our country. Though we may not be called upon to act in so bold a fashion as Major Anderson, our responsibility for the ideals for which he died is no less. As Abraham Lincoln so wisely said on an occasion similar to this 100 years ago:

"It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to that great task remaining before us, the from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

President Lincoln uttered these words at Gettysburg in 1863. The task which he placed with the living is still incumbent upon us. Most assuredly, government of the people, by the people and for the people is not yet secure for all time from its foes. We live in an era when the challenge to democracy is greater than at any time in history.

That challenge has been answered by the Major Andersons of America. It must also be answered by you and me. We must attend to the duties of citizenship in a democracy; we must support those legitimate activities of government which serve the interests of the people; we must bear the burden of taxation, though at times it becomes heavy. And most of all, we must work for a lasting and enduring peace in which men live, one with another, in friendship and freedom and where nations seek the improvements of the lives of their people—not the aggrandizement of power and territory.

Should our efforts to keep the peace with honor fail—and may God forbid this—we must stand ready to render the ultimate sacrifice for our country. Major Anderson did so—and our pledge today is that we shall not falter in upholding that for which he died.

Success Becomes Routine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the international recognition justifiably voiced upon the achievement of Major Cooper brought forth various comments appropriately recorded by newspapers throughout the world.

The Chicago Daily News in a concise, practical editorial comment summarizes one obvious aspect of our space achieve-

ments, and, under leave previously granted, I insert this editorial from the Friday, May 17 issue, into the Record at this point:

Success Becomes Routine

"We see with sympathy and follow with prayers of benediction the space flights which are ever more perfect. We wish that the flights be successful and contribute to fraternity and civilization."

Thus Pope John XXIII voiced the hopes of people everywhere in the final hours of Astronaut Cooper's magnificent achievement. Particularly notable, however, was the Pope's perceptive awareness of the increasing perfection of space voyages. It was the same insight as that written from Cape Canaveral by Vermont Royster for the Wall Street Journal:

"The space age yesterday stepped over an invisible line from fantastic adventure to disciplined routine * * *. It is now the known danger, as when a jet airplane slams through the sound barrier or a submarine starts its descent into the sea. The chances of disaster remain * * * but these are now risks that men accept with experience and confidence."

This conclusion is strengthened by the ability of Major Cooper to sleep for some 75,000 miles whirling through space. One of the principal purposes of the flight was to find the effect of sustained strain on the astronaut. The strong first impression is that if all are as iron-nerved as Cooper, the moon is not the limit of future flights.

The value of it all is for future determination. For the moment it is sufficient to rejoice in the safe recovery of Major Cooper, and to take pride in the splendid success of a combination of scientific brains, technical skill, human teamwork and individual courage.

James L. McDevitt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial and article from the April issue of Plasterer and Cement Mason:

James L. McDevitt

Hard knocks come when you least expect them.

The death of my close friend of many years standing, Jim McDevitt, came as the hardest knock I have had in many a year. Many other people that I know have experienced the same sense of loss at the unexpected passing of this stout son of Pennsylvania, who always gave his best to this union and to the labor movement as a whole.

All of us in Pennsylvania in the early days recognized that Jim McDevitt had unusual capacities. Moving from the State level, as the head of the largest State federation in the country, to the national level as director of the Committee on Political Education, was a move that Jim McDevitt took in stride. He wore a big pair of shoes.

The general executive board has recounted some of the highlights of Jim McDevitt's fine career in the labor movement. Reading that story, you will see that a lot of distinguished people, both in and out of Pennsylvania, had many fine things to say about Jim McDevitt. As one who knew and worked with Jim for over 35 years (he was business agent of Local 8, Philadelphia, when I was business agent of Local 31, Pittsburgh), I am here to testify that all the fine things said by these distinguished citizens—including Senators and Governors—are true. While he moved, at the end of his career, in the highest political circles, Jim never lost the common touch and he was as quick to shake the hand of the man with the trowel as he was the hand of the President of the United States. He moved comfortably in all circles, which was yet another indication of his stature as a man.

I have lost my close friend, who was a man of the highest principles. With a heavy heart, what more can I say?

Sincerely and fraternally,
Edward J. Leonard,
Editor and General President.

Passing of James L. McDevitt Leaves Void in Ranks of Labor

James L. McDevitt, vice president and executive board member of the Operative Plasterers' and Cement Masons' International Association, who died March 19 in Oklahoma City following a cerebral hemorrhage, was an outstanding labor leader at the local, State, and National levels.

As the director of the Committee on Political Education, Jim's particular union affiliation perhaps was not important to the large and varied groups of people he met all over the country, but his Operative Plasterers' and Cement Masons' International Association membership always remained important to Jim. And Operative Plasterers' and Cement Masons' International Association members everywhere were glad and proud that he was a member of their union.

Jim had gone to Oklahoma City to preside oevr one of a series of COPE regional conferences. He suffered a stroke on the morning of March 19 and another late that afternoon. He died the following morning.

Jim McDevitt was born in Philadelphia on November 3, 1898, the son and grandson of plasterers. His grandfather, Charles McDevitt, came to this country from Ireland in 1849, at the age of 12 and settled in south Philadelphia. He was apprenticed out as a plasterer and in 1873 helped to found the Operative Plasterers' Mutual Protective Association. Charles had two sons, John and William, and both became plasterers and trade unionists. Jim was one of the five children of William McDevitt.

In 1923, when Jim became a candidate for recording secretary of Local No. 2, it was said jokingly that his family vote was enough to elect him. He had been apprenticed in 1916, but his apprenticeship was interrupted by World War I. He enlisted in the Army in 1918, saw service in France and was honorably discharged in July 1919. He resumed his apprenticeship and became a journeyman plasterer in July 1920.

After being elected recording secretary of Local No. 8, he went on to become president and business representative. It was during these days that he first met up with President Leonard, then business agent of Local No. 31, Pittsburgh, and secretary-treasurer John J. Hauck, then business agent of Local No. 582, Philadelphia. In 1928, he was elected president of the Philadelphia Building Trades Council.

In 1938, when AFL leaders in Pennsylvania needed someone to hold together a State federation badly split, they turned to McDevitt, who was then only 40 years old.

McDevitt's first years as State Federation president were stormy, and the federation was so impoverished by the split in labor that McDevitt continued on the Unemployment Compensation Board of Review so that he could forego his salary as federation president.

In 1940, during the third-term campaign of President Roosevelt, McDevitt's voice was one of the most powerful and persuasive raised in support of Roosevelt in Pennsylvania.

In 1947 the Pennsylvania State Federation established a permanent Committee on Political Action. Its purpose was to put the federation's political activities on an effective and continuing basis. The first test came in the 1948 elections. The committee set out to reach the federation's 700,000 membership. It sponsored mass meetings, bought time on radio stations and space in newspapers and published quantities of its own literature to get its message across. McDevitt predicted that the liberal-labor vote in Pennsylvania would defeat 10 Congressmen who had voted for Taft-Hartley. Experienced reporters covering the campaign thought he was talking through his hat, but the returns showed that 11, not 10, Taft-Hartley Congressmen were defeated in Pennsylvania.

McDevitt once said that he grew up "more or less a Democrat because in Republican Philadelphia it was the only thing a sincere trade unionist could be." Nevertheless, he could commend Republicans who had been fair to labor and criticized Democrats when they menaced labor's interests. He once commended Republican Gov. Edward Martin for a "glorious triumph" and he once told President Truman he was emulating the dictators when he asked for a "draft labor" law.

Expressing, once, the political philosophy of COPE, he said, "We believe that the well-being, the security, the freedom from economic fear and the dignity of each person should be the first concern of each legislator whether it be in the State capitals or Washington."

In his years in Pennsylvania, McDevitt served on many State agencies under appointment by the Governor. In 1948 he and President Edward J. Leonard (then vice president) were designated by the U.S. Secretary of Labor as representatives of all labor in the United States at the World Safety Conference of the International Labor Organization, held in Geneva, Switzerland.

Jim McDevitt's activities in the fight against intolerance are reflected in the positions he had held on such groups as the Executive Committee of the State Council for Fair Employment Practices, the American Council for Christians and Jews, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the National Trade Council for Palestine.

McDevitt was named a vice president of the O.P. & C.M.I.A. in 1954 to fill a vacancy caused by the death of James M. Myles, who also had been a prominent citizen of Pennsylvania. In 1959, President Leonard appointed McDevitt to the general executive board. Jim rendered many services to the international association, not the least of which were given in his capacity as chairman of the constitution committee at international conventions. He took this post following the death of Vice President John Brennan, and his ready grasp of issues and command of parliamentary procedures made him a tower of strength during conventions.

Over the years, a lot of eminent people went out of their way to say nice things about Jim McDevitt. Here are some quotes:

"Jim McDevitt has proven himself a labor-statesman who seeks to advance both the interests of organized labor and the community in which they work."—Wayne Morse, U.S. Senator, of Oregon.

"I have known Jim McDevitt ever since the days when I was serving in the State senate, and I have long been indebted to him for his ready ear, his sound counsel, his devotion to humanitarian ideals, and his eloquent presentation of labor's point of view."—George M. Leader, former Governor of Pennsylvania.

"Jim McDevitt is a man of character, integrity, knowledge, and ability. For many years it has been my great privilege to be intimately acquainted with him and like others who have come within range of his influence, I have admiration and affection for him."—James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and former chairman, National Democratic Committee.

"Even more impressive than his fierce dedication to the cause of labor, has been his unselfish devotion to the struggle for human rights and civic betterment."—Richardson Dilworth, mayor, city of Philadelphia.

"Since I am a card carrying member of the B.M.P.I.U., we have much in common. I have watched Jim McDevitt grow from a mechanic of the trowel trade to the high position he now enjoys. This has been accomplished only by his dedication to the labor movement and his fair dealing with industry over the years," John B. Kelly, prominent Philadelphia builder.

"It has been my good fortune to know some of the 'top' men of the world * * * Jim McDevitt ranks with the best of them," George H. Earle, former Governor of Pennsylvania and U.S. Ambassador.

"He has always been constructive. He is held in esteem and respect by all who have been privileged to work with him," Dr. George W. Taylor, former chairman, National War Labor Board, and well-known arbitrator.

"Jim McDevitt has stood for the ideals of good government, justice and rights of the average American citizen," Joseph S. Clark, U.S. Senator, Pennsylvania.

Meany's Tribute; "No one served the trade union cause with deeper sincerity and greater diligence than Jim McDevitt. His contributions over the years, in every sense of the economic and social life of workers, can hardly be measured. Most recently, his leadership of COPE was instrumental in developing the political voice of American wage earners into a potent instrument, more nearly in keeping with their numbers. He will long be missed as a leader and a friend, and his place will be hard to fill."

A solemn mass was held March 22 at St. Bartholomew's Church, Bethesda, Md., the Washington suburb in which the McDevitts resided. That same evening, a wake was held at the Oliver Bair Funeral Home, at 18th and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia. Burial took place the following morning, March 23, at Holy Sepulchre, Cemetery, Cheltenham, Township, Philadelphia. The survivors include his wife, Margaret Mary, and three children, Margaret Byrne, James L. McDevitt, Jr., and Lt. William P. McDevitt, U.S. Air Force.

EDWARD J. LEONARD,
JOHN J. HAUCK,
VINCENT J. LEE,
EDWARD HOLZMANN,
B. A. MARTINEZ,
ANTHONY P. GIORDANO,
The General Executive Board,
CHAS. W. IRVINE,
Canadian Consultant for Executive Board.

Remarks of Hon. Robert R. Barry, of New York, at Garden Party, National Woman's Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday afternoon I was privileged to be guest speaker at ceremonies dedicated to a courageous, unsung heroine of the Revolutionary War, Sibyl Ludington. The event transpired on the grounds of the National Women's Party at their historic building—the Alva Belmont House—located at 144 Constitution Avenue NE., where a statute of Sibyl Ludington by the well-known sculptress, Anna Hyatt Huntington was unveiled by two young ladies from Carmel, N.Y. It was a great pleasure to participate in this tribute to honor this 16-year-old girl who rode 50 miles on April 26, 1777 to alert and assemble a 400-man militia under her father's command. It was especially rewarding since Sibyl Ludington's home was historic Putnam County which is in my congressional district. Mr. Speaker, under previous permission, I place in the RECORD my remarks made at the unveiling. I would like to add the text of the ballad entitled "The Ride of Sibyl Ludington," written by Mrs. Marjorie Barstow Greenbie, and arranged and movingly sung at the ceremony by Mr. and Mrs. Charles Perdue, of Fairfax, Va.

At the ceremony a resolution was unanimously passed by approximately 300 members of the National Woman's Party and distinguished guests which said:

The best tribute we can bring to Sibyl Ludington is to go forward ourselves in the present-day campaign for the complete freedom of American women—with the same courage, the same determination, the same intensity of conviction that the heroic young Sibyl Ludington displayed in her famous ride for the freedom of the American colonists from the control of the Government and laws of England.

Be it resolved, therefore, That we send from this gathering a group of spokesmen to urge the Senate Committee on Constitutional Amendments, to give its powerful aid, with all possible energy and all possible speed, to bringing to final victory, through the passage of the equal rights amendment, the struggle of more than 300 years by American women for complete release from the bondage of the ancient Common Law of England, which largely controls the lives of American women today, even as in still greater degree it controlled the lives of American women in the days of Sybil Ludington, 186 years ago.

We want also to express our gratitude to the women leaders in Congress who under the chief sponsorship of the Honorable KATHARINE ST. GEORGE have done so much to bring the movement for the freedom of women to the stage where ultimate victory seems so close at hand. On this occasion we remember with especial appreciation the devoted, able and long-continued championship, in Congress and before, of the equal rights amendment by the late Jessica McCullough Weis of New York.

Mr. Speaker, the essence of the resolution introduced by Congresswoman ST. GEORGE and the late Congresswoman Jessica Weis which I also have the honor of cosponsoring follows:

Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

REMARKS OF HON. ROBERT R. BARRY, OF NEW YORK, AT THE GARDEN PARTY, NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY, 144 CONSTITUTION AVENUE NE., MAY 18, 1963

As the congressional Representative of Putnam County, N.Y., where Sibyl Ludington made her historic ride, I am pleased to join you today in paying tribute to American girlhood and womanhood in the person of this unsung heroine of our American struggle for freedom.

Here with me is Miss Stephanie Saunders and Miss Laurie Birch, who will unveil the statue of Sibyl Ludington which was created and generously donated to the National Woman's Party by Anna Hyatt Huntington.

These lovely young ladies, like our heroine Sibyl Ludington, hail from Carmel, N.Y., which is located in Putnam County—bounded on the south by Westchester County, N.Y., and on the east by Fairfield County, Conn.

A simple headstone in the old Presbyterian cemetery at Patterson, N.Y., bears this brief inscription:

"In Memory of Sibbelle Ludington, wife of Edmond Ogden, who died February 26, 1839. Age 77 years, 10 months, and 13 days."

Henry Wadsworth Longfellow has immortalized the "midnight ride of Paul Revere"—a ride of a dozen miles or so through the quiet New England countryside on the night of April 18, 1775, accomplished by a vigorous man of 40, well able to take care of himself.

Almost unknown to fame is the ride of Sibyl Ludington 2 years later. The aim of both rides was similar—to alert the militia against a threatened British invasion. Sibyl Ludington's feat appears the more remarkable when we reflect that it was a ride of 50 miles through wild country beset by guerrilla bands and hostile Indians, and that Sibyl was a slight girl of 16 at the time.

On April 25, 1777, British regulars, 2,000 strong, had landed at Compo Beach, near Fairfield, Conn. Their objective was the destruction of patriot stores at Danbury—the same errand that started Prescott's redcoats on the road to Concord.

Marching inland virtually unopposed, they reached Danbury on April 26 and destroyed stocks of salt, meat, flour, hay, tents, uniforms, powder, shot, and muskets. The soldiers became drunk with looted spirits and many private homes were set on fire.

The nearest available aid was a scattered militia regiment commanded by Col. Henry Ludington, a veteran of the French and Indian War, who operated a gristmill at Ludingtonville, near Carmel, N.Y., about 20 miles to the west.

That night about 8 o'clock a messenger appeared at Colonel Ludington's door to gasp the tale of the destruction and pillage of Danbury. The need to assemble the regiment posed a difficult problem. The colonel must remain at home to muster in those who reported. There was no one to ride the circuit and rouse the men except his daughter Sibyl who had only recently passed her 16th birthday.

It is no exaggeration to say that Sibyl's accomplishment required a courage and fortitude greater than did that of Paul Revere. But she successfully performed her task, guiding her father's big bay with only a hempen halter as she rode through the night bearing news of the sack of Danbury and calling the regiment to arms.

As the regiment fell in at daybreak, the last troops marched in. With them came Sibyl, to slide exhausted into her father's arms.

Colonel Ludington's regiment joined Generals Silliman, Wooster, and Arnold and the other militia detachments they had been able to collect. They attacked the retreating redcoats at Ridgefield and transformed the orderly British retreat into a panic-stricken rout. At Compo Beach the British were driven into their waiting boats in such utter confusion that many were drowned.

At the age of 23, Sibyl Ludington married her childhood sweetheart, Edmond Ogden. Two of her sons became officers in the Army. One of them, E. A. Ogden, served with distinction through the Blackhawk, Seminole, and Mexican Wars, and founded Fort Riley, Kans., where a monument has been erected to him.

Two years ago a statue of Sibyl Ludington on horseback was erected on the shore of Lake Gleneida in Carmel. The statue to be unveiled here today by Laurie and Stephanie is a bronze replica of the one in Carmel.

I hope that all of you here today will have an opportunity to visit Putnam County and trace Sibyl's ride where even today there are lonely stretches in the route from Ludingtonville to Carmel and Mahopac, across to the Peekskill Hollow Road, to Tompkin's Corners, then up the Wicopee Road to the Stormville Road, and thence back to Ludingtonville.

THE RIDE OF SIBYL LUDINGTON

(By Mrs. Marjorie Barstow Greenbie)

Come and listen, good people, and you shall hear,
Of a girl who rode, like Paul Revere,
'Long the borders of Connecticut and New York,
Where the Yankees stored rations of flour and pork.

We were ready to fight the Redcoats to the ground,
If they came from their ships stranded out on the sound,
They, in vain, thought to keep us from being free,
And to keep us in the bondage of George 'cross the sea.

Colonel Ludington summoned his men and did say,
"Your winter service is over, not to need you, I pray,
For we have new recruits who are both willing and strong,
To keep the Hudson Highlands you've guarded so long."

"So take up your plough and lay by your guns,
Return to your homes, to your wives and your sons,
Give thanks to the Lord for this moment to seize,
To plant all your crops and to take your ease."

In Danbury now there is food; there is rum,
We've plenty to eat if the Redcoats should come,
There is flour, molasses and bacon in store,
To keep us as we fight them to Hell's own front door.

General Wooster at Ridgefield can stop them cold,
Give them nothing at all to have or to hold,
But a last, long sleep in Connecticut ground,
If those Redcoats should land from their ships on the sound.

Sibyl Ludington stood by her father's side,
Sixteen and lovely, the Colonel's own pride,
The eldest of twelve, she had to cook and sew, too,
And at home with her family had plenty to do.

But she often found time with the soldier's to spend,
To their joys and their sorrows a willing ear she did lend,
As they now were sent back to the homes whence they came,
She spoke to them all, and called them by name.

Now Sibyl was everywhere cheering the men,
With news of their homes, their families and friends,
She gladdened their hearts with hot coffee and bread,
For the long journey home that she knew lay ahead.

That night in her home o'er a well filled board,
She and her family gave thanks to the Lord,
For the family was safe; no Redcoats in sight,
And many fathers and sons were home safe that night.

When the rest of her family had gone to bed,
Sibyl at last could rest her tired head,
She lay neath the quilt, with her sister, at rest,
And peacefully dozed in the family nest.

She woke with a start at a crashing noise,
At the door below she heard her father's voice,
"The Redcoats in Danbury? Did I hear you right?"
Then she heard a man saying, "They surprised us tonight."

"The people are fleeing! The town is aflame!
I spread the alarm 'long the road as I came,"
Then the colonel was saying, "Go muster the men,
We must get them together, our country to defend."

Now Sibyl was standing by her father's side,
She saw that the man was too weary to ride,
"Let me go," she said, "to call the men out,
If I get there in time, then the Redcoats we'll rout."

Her father objected to this long, hard ride,
Through country where British deserters might hide.
He knew of the danger and his manner was grave,
When at last his permission to Sibyl he gave.

While she dressed and made ready, he saddled her steed,
He kissed her goodbye and bade her Godspeed,
He gave her a stick to knock on their doors,
She could sound the alarm without leaving her horse.

A murky, spring mist cloaked every star,
And red, to the eastward, dim and far,
The fires of Danbury gloomed on her sight,
As Sibyl rode into the soft April night.

But the air was sweet with fresh April smells,
And the voices of peepers like tiny, gold bells,
Made vibrant the night as she skirted the pond.
And searched for the path that she knew lay beyond.

She got angled awhile in briar and brush,
And bogged in a swamp where the grasses grew lush,
But she would save all the people from suffering harm,
So onward she struggled to spread the alarm.

Out of the forest, over hill and through vale,
She raced to Mahopac by way of Carmel,
Then around to Farmers' Mills and back she flew,
Through Stormville to her home * * * her brave journey was through.

Now Yankees were men not easily ruled,
By hearsay or panic they'd not be fooled,
So some of them acted a little too slow,
To pull on their boots and get ready to go.

"I've been roused too often for nothing," one said,
"Why should I leave a good, warm bed?
"Who is it now that's raising a storm?
"It's the Colonel's daughter Sibyl * * * she's sounding the alarm."

"Forty miles through briars and swamps she has gone,
"So get up and get out * * * we march at dawn,"
They pulled on their clothes, and they got out their gear,
Then joining their neighbors, gave Sibyl a cheer.

But she was too tired when she got back home,
To realize the worth of the deed she had done,
Four hundred men stood ready to fight,
Where Danbury lay charred in the dawn's early light.

General Tryon awoke in the bed of a Tory,
Mission accomplished, but without any glory,
'Midst the chaos and ruin of that fateful night,
His men all lay drunk; not ten fit to fight.

They had found the food for which they had come,
Bacon, molasses, flour, and rum,
The molasses ran sticky in every gutter,
They swizzled the rum; burned the bacon and butter.

That's how it was, you all know the rest,
Ludington's men were now at their best,
They fell on the Redcoats. The Redcoats retreated,
Their pride in the dust and their plans defeated.

The Yankees harried their rear and then,
Ludington proudly marched forth his men,
To join General Wooster and without pity or plea,
They pushed all the Redcoats back to the sea.

In that year of seventeen seventy-seven,
The people rejoiced and they all thanked heaven,
That the land lay secure in the soft summer light,
And that Sibyl Ludington had ridden that night.

The Measure of an Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of New Orleans had the privilege on Armed Services Day to have as their honored guest the Secretary of the Army, Cyrus R. Vance.

It was their privilege to hear delivered an address of depth on "The Measure of an Army" by a Service Secretary who demonstrated that he is no square peg in a round hole but the right man in the right place. Over a period of more than two decades I have had the opportunity to observe service secretaries in all the military branches and it is reassuring to recognize in Secretary of the Army Vance a truly great talent which is making a definite contribution to the defense posture of America.

It was my privilege and pleasure to introduce Secretary Vance to my people. It is with equal honor and privilege that I commend to you the text of the address which he made.

Secretary Vance said:

THE MEASURE OF AN ARMY

In other days, this was the season when each service evoked its own history with ringing pride. The glory of the past remains an inspiration; service pride is yet the wellspring of esprit de corps. But we must recall Will Rogers' advice: "Don't let yesterday use up too much of today." These are newly complex times. Today presses upon us, while the future poses so many challenges that we must face it rather than the past. And we must face it together, all of us.

As I speak to you citizens of this vibrant and historic city, I am reminded of Kipling's statement that "There is but one task for all—what stands if freedom fall?" This is the Army's concept of the ultimate task of all our services; this is its understanding of Armed Forces Week. Immensely proud, secure in the knowledge of its essentiality, confident of its ability, it recognizes this celebration as honoring equally the Navy, the Marines, the Air Force, the Coast Guard, and indeed, all of the citizens of this land whose total efforts are vital to its life and liberty. It is, then, as a highly essential but integrated part of this national force that the Army reports to the Nation during Armed Forces Week.

Today it is faced with a multitude of missions, critical in importance, diverse in nature, worldwide in scope, and calling as much as ever in its history for dedication and self-sacrifice. At the same time, it is confronted by a future of uncertain outline but of certain need for the soldier. To meet its responsibilities, the Army is striding ahead in the fields of mobility, materiel, and manpower. I want to report briefly today on this forward march.

This progress is occurring at a moment when there is a resurging awareness of the need for an Army. Ironically, it is within the shadow of the hydrogen bomb that this need is most clearly visible.

In the highest circles and across the Nation there is increasing recognition of the necessity for flexibility, options, and rational choice in national strategy. To our great air strength and supreme seapower, we are adding the land force, conventional as well as nuclear, which is essential if we are to counter all the threats with national power suited to each challenge. We cannot respond to strategic nuclear attack with a rifle squad, but neither can we strike guerrillas with an ICBM.

The Army's essential tasks are to contribute to deterrence and to fight to victory if called upon. Deterrence depends upon the visible credibility of our force. Victory requires the use of superior combat power at the decisive point, at the decisive time, and with maximum surprise to the enemy. Therefore, we must deploy combat-ready forces in critical areas, supported by regional reserves, and strongly reinforced by highly mobile units within the United States. To enable these forces to deter war or gain victory, it is imperative that the Army have both strategic and tactical mobility. It relies upon the Air Force and the Navy for the former. The latter is the Army's business.

We have come a long way since the muddy trenches of World War I. The land battle of the Second World War saw imagination, resourcefulness, and daring unshackled by new tools of tactical mobility—the truck, the halftrack, the tank, and the airplane. But both men and forces must be dynamic, not static, ever questing rather than self-satisfied, and so we continue to seek ways to improve.

The Army now has a tank with vastly improved engine, range, and firepower. It has self-propelled artillery with similar improvements. It has an amphibious, armored personnel carrier which enables infantry to close rapidly on the enemy in concert with other arms. It has logistic vehicles of increased capacity and flexibility. And the work moves steadily onward.

All of these advances, however, still suffer from the constraints imposed by friction with the earth's surface. It was to avoid this restriction that the Army, about the time of Korea, turned to air mobility. Years of study, the experience of foreign armies, tests and experiments, and practical work in field exercises resulted in embryonic concepts for air mobile war which are now being refined through further testing.

In the simplest terms, the air mobility which we are seeking means giving the Army a capability to move men, suplies, and firepower within the Army's battle area by the most modern of means—helicopters, for example. In so doing, we will gain new freedom of maneuver, new ability to resupply fighting forces, new capabilities for battlefield reconnaissance, and new opportunities to apply decisive force with tactical surprise. These gains are vital necessities.

This is as inevitable as the turn from the horse to the truck. It is as necessary as the addition of the Honest John rocket to our weaponry. We need older tools for certain operational spheres, but new means are essential if we are to gain a mobility differential over our enemies. Air mobility may ultimately produce a tactical revolution as profound as the initial mechanization of land warfare. It is certainly indispensable to a modern ground force.

At the same time that these steps are being taken, the Army is engaged in up-dating the entire range of its materiel—communications, weapons, ammunition, clothing, food and fuels. The range and the pace of modern conflict require vastly more than the semaphore or the field telephone. Firepower has to be greater, more abundant, and largely air-transportable. Our soldiers need and deserve equipment and supplies which satisfy the differing demands of operations of all types in all areas of the world.

The Army is also applying its brainpower to the unique requirements of today. There is now no army in the world with so much recent field experience—World War II, Korea, the deployed forces in other lands, the supporting missions in southeast Asia and the strategic forces and reserves at home. This experience is being tapped at every level, for every idea which will lead to a stronger force in the future.

To exploit new concepts and equipment, the Army is reshaping the organization of its combat forces. It will soon be able to tailor them with speed to fit varying missions, areas, and threats. Within a year, when this is completed, we will have a more versatile, more adaptable, and more powerful Army, unit for unit, than has ever worn the khaki or the green.

As you can understand, these changes, the increasing complexity of military operations, and the swiftening tempo of our times call for a new soldier. Along with the fundamental values of loyalty, dedication, courage, and integrity, he must be educated and possess abilities far beyond the demands of other days. You may be surprised to hear that 73 percent of our enlisted men are high school graduates as contrasted with a national figure of 24.6 percent for men over 25 years of age; 69 percent of the Army's officers are college graduates, against a national figure of 7.7 percent for men over 25; and nearly 20 percent of these officers have undertaken graduate study.

The soldier today is an engineer bringing new skills to South Americans, a laboratory technician, an infantryman in Korea, a tanker along the Czech border, a missile specialist, a helicopter pilot over Vietnamese jungles, a multilingual paratrooper, or the leader of quarter-million men. He defends his land and is prepared to die for it. This is a man's role, but not a profession for ordinary men.

In May of 1963, then, the U.S. Army is a tough, skilled and alert combination of yesterday, today, and tomorrow. It cherishes the heritage of America; it defends the land today; and its eye is on the missions of the morrow. Together with its proud and glorious sister services it stands ready to defend freedom wherever it may be challenged.

Above all, it is essentially human, for we remember what Francis Bacon had to say: "Walled towns, stored arsenals and armouries, Goodly Races of Horses, Charriots of Warre, Elephants, Artillery and the Like. All this is but a Sheep in a Lion's skin except the breed and disposition of the people be stout." Our breed of soldier is stout; no finer men have ever filled our ranks. This measure of them, in sum, is the measure of the Army today.

Too Far Left

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an article from the Arizona Republic of May 11 entitled "Too Far Left." This editorial is an interesting analysis of the far-reaching effects of this administration's attitude toward the non-Communist left, as reflected in the recent Italian elections.

The editorial follows:

TOO FAR LEFT

Perhaps the most important lesson Americans can learn from the results of Italy's recent election is one which is unlikely to be well received in Washington. Namely, that U.S. preoccupation with the "non-Communist left" may prove to be the Communist's surest path to achieving political power in nations not already under Communist rule.

Washington's heart was definitely with the center-left coalition which has ruled Italy for the past 15 months. In fact, immediately after the election, Italian newspapers made clear their displeasure with New Frontier interference in an election which gave the Communists slightly more than 25 percent of the almost 33 million votes cast, a gain of 1 million votes over 1958.

Rome's center-right Il Tempo charged that President Kennedy's "inopportune declarations" favoring the center-left "helped the whole left." Giornale D'Italia said that Kennedy advisers misunderstood Italy's Communist problem, a problem it said the center-left helped enlarge: "Kennedy's advisers, who are full of categorical conclusions, but basically are rather stupid youngsters, were led to believe that the Communist advance could be checked only by collaborating with the old ally of the Communists, the Socialist Party."

And a rightwing satirical weekly. Il Bogrhese, described Kennedy's praise of the center-left experiment as a "magic formula to be exported throughout the world as the antidote to communism." It said the U.S. administration "made the same mistake in South America—now our poor country is destined to become the Cuba of the Mediterranean."

Washington's support of Italy's "opening to the left" ("apertura a sinistra") is in keeping with the American Government's affinity for governments of the non-Communist left. But here as elsewhere the opening turned out to be merely a foot in the door and center-left coalition finds itself in trouble.

For already Pietro Nenni's Socialists are hinting that they will raise the price of their support for Premier Amintore Fanfani's middle-of-the-road Christian Democrats. That price may turn out to be withdrawal of Italy from NATO, followed by a policy of neutrality. In a recent article in his party's newspaper, Nenni made it plain that he would tolerate no rupture between the Socialists and Palmiro Togliatti's Communist Party. Therefore, should the Socialists decide at their national convention next month to line up with the Reds, this will give the two Leftist parties a powerful 40 percent power bloc.

The Christian Democrats then will be faced wtih the alternative of moving even further leftward to placate the Socialists, who innocently cling to their Marxian doctrine, or risk a difficult class struggle by turning to the liberals for a small and unstable majority.

No one can say what the results of the Italian election would have been even if the United States had refused comment. For certainly other factors—notably Pope John XXIII's "Pacem in Terris" encyclical and his audience with Khrushchev's son-in-law, Aleksei Adzhubei—were involved. But the outcome should cause some serious second thoughts among U.S. officials about the wisdom of blindly supporting the non-Communist left.

Anniversary of the Polish Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. WEAVER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, great historic documents are the genuine expression of lofty ideals conceived and formulated by men of vision and foresight. Such documents make landmarks in national histories and leave their permanent impression on national institutions. Our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution mirror our national character. The Polish Constitution of May 1791, also reflects the liberal and progressive character of Poland's leaders in the late 18th century.

After the first partition of Poland in 1772, Polish leaders knew well that Poland could not escape eventual dismemberment in the hands of her foes. They therefore thought that, in the absence of effective outside aid, their best chance of forestalling such a sad eventuality rested in the overhauling and strengthening of Poland's government. With that objective in mind a committee of the Diet—the Assembly—was appointed to draw up a constitution. The work was begun in 1788, and by early 1791 the drafted document was ready. It was promulgated and adopted on May 3 of that year, and thenceforth became known as the Constitution of May 3.

That memorable and historic document embodied many liberal and progressive ideas, and represented a decisive advance over anything yet attempted in Poland. By its provisions Poland emerged from an antiquated medieval system of government and entered into one with many modernistic features. Autocratic Poland became a constitutional monarchy. Ministerial responsibility was introduced and a cabinet type of government was established. The obstructive features of the old system were abolished, and certain class distinctions were eliminated. The barriers separating the nobility from the rest of the people were drastically lowered. Personal privileges formerly reserved to the gentry alone were now made available to all townsmen, and the peasantry was placed under the protection of the law. The powers of the upper house were reduced and those of the lower—the popularly elected—house were increased. Freedom of conscience and of speech were guaranteed. These democratic features made the Constitution of May 3 a model instrument, and as such it was widely hailed both in Poland and by Poland's friends in other lands.

In brief such are the provisions of this historic Constitution which reflects the valiant attempt made by Polish leaders to salvage their country from eventual dismemberment, and its failure is no discredit to its wise and patriotic drafters. Soon after the Constitution was proclaimed, Poland's implacable foes made war upon her, and finally brought her independent existence to an end. The Polish people never had the good fortune to live under their new Constitution, and perhaps it is why they have looked upon it as a memorable, almost sacred, document embodying their unrealized dreams and long-cherished hopes. One hundred seventy-two years after its adoption all patriotic Poles regard the spirit of that document as the genuine expression of their ideals and celebrate its anniversary as their national holiday.

I join with the more than 16,000 Polish-Americans in the Mercer-Crawford-Erie District, which I represent, who this month are observing this historic anniversary, and in their hopes that the people of Poland will one day be free to enjoy the rights and privileges set forth in their Constitution.

Back Down: A New Frontier Habit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, for all the vigor the President is supposed to have, he certainly knuckles under when the chips are down.

Here again, with respect to the threats from our foreign international air carriers, President Kennedy has instructed the CAB to force the American air traveler to pay more for his international fares. In the New York Times of May 17, Arthur Krock squarely places the blame on our weak-kneed President:

In the Nation—The Growing Sequence of Threat and Backdown

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 16.—The headlong retreat of the Kennedy administration in the course of 1 day in the dispute with the British over increased transoceanic airline fares lacked the excuse that has been offered for its several previous surrenders on firmly asserted policy. This excuse, which perhaps was employed by the administration more ingloriously than on any other occasion as a defense of its major role in effecting Indonesia's forceful annexation of Dutch New Guinea, is that retreat was necessary to avert a confrontation with the U.S.S.R. which could trigger a nuclear war.

The argument has been a great favorite of McGeorge Bundy, Averell Harriman, and Adlai E. Stevenson to justify administration revisions of proclaimed policy in areas where these officials have had special responsibilities. It was used to account for this Government's backing of the United Nations in interpreting the Charter to authorize internal war as an instrument of U.N. peacemaking in the Congo, as well as for assuring the success of Indonesia's militant violation of the Charter. But in the matter of the transoceanic airline fares that Senator MAGNUSON characterized "as a complete surrender without a fight," it is impossible to find the slightest potential of a "confrontation" which could lead to nuclear war.

In this instance a threat in the House of Commons, that the American air carriers would not be permitted to land, and risk seizure if they did, by continued resistance to the round trip economy fare increase imposed by European airlines, was sufficient. The new policy, which the President proclaimed earlier last Tuesday, when he asked Congress to give power to the Civil Aeronautics Board to retaliate in such circumstances, was forsaken a couple of hours afterward by Secretary of State Rusk. He "advised" the inquiring CAB to withdraw its opposition to conformity by U.S. airlines with the 5-percent increase, and to authorize this where seizure was threatened.

This rapid retreat has since been explained on two grounds by Abe Chayes, speaking as the legal adviser of the State Department: That to force a showdown with the British Government on its threat would create "more serious acrimony that would be fruitless"; and that, anyhow, the Executive had no legal authority to retaliate if the threat were executed by foreign governments. The response of Senator MAGNUSON and other members of his committee to these representations is pertinent to their validity as law and to their quality as policy the world will respect.

THUNDER IN THE PREFACE ONLY?

"I may not be much of a lawyer," commented MAGNUSON, "but I do know that the power to grant landing rights and other privileges to foreign airlines in this country implies the power to take them away * * * [and] I'm telling you that the legal right as well as the power reside in the executive branch because we put it there in section 402 of the Federal Aviation Act. [In any event] the President certainly has it under the Constitution."

What would have happened, Senator HARTKE then asked Chairman Boyd of the CAB, if this Government had retaliated in kind to execution by any foreign government of the British threat? And Boyd promptly agreed to MAGNUSON'S intervening reply: "Why, there would have been a start on international consultations in half an hour."

Nevertheless, all this will amount to no more than thundering in preface if and when the American carriers, now freed of the CAB restraint, impose the 5 percent fare increase. Meanwhile, the added cost to American air travelers will be at the rate of $20 million a year, for the special benefit of the foreign governments that either own or heavily subsidize the carriers which compete with ours for the transoceanic trade. Furthermore, if Congress in the interim gives retaliatory power to the CAB, the immediate record does not assure that the administration will authorize its employment.

It is noteworthy also that the President's failure to find either legal or constitutional authority in this instance contrasts with the initiative he took in moving Federal troops into Alabama. For this action he has, at least, no incontestable statutory warrant. And, as he himself has stressed, no Federal question is involved.

U.S. Employment Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Employment Service has established an outstanding record of performance on behalf of the workers of this country. Especially at the present time, in the face of long-term and widespread unemployment, and considering that State regulation of the fee-charging agencies is either nonexistent or wholly inadequate, it is evident that a strong and effective public employment service is essential to the national interest.

In the past few weeks, many of us have received letters and other communications designed to discredit the Employment Service. These attacks are now being made on the public employment service by a group of fee-charging private employment agencies who have amassed a slush fund to discredit a Government agency and thereby insure greater profits for themselves. It is being directed by a paid lobbyist who virtually promised that a congressional investigation of the Employment Service was almost a certainty, as was a cut in appropriations, if the fee-charging agencies engaged in a properly conducted campaign against the public agency.

The campaign is at its height. It is well timed. The time was not set for a certain month, nor for a certain season. The time was set to correspond with appropriations request time in the House and Senate.

I shall limit my remarks to what I consider to be one of the worst of the distortions in their propaganda barrage. I refer to the statement by the fee-charging agencies that 60 percent of the job placements by public employment offices last year were of people already employed. This is not true and is a deliberate misuse of statistical data contained in a recent statement by Mr. Robert C. Goodwin, Administrator of the Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor. Using data from a Bureau of Census household survey, Mr. Goodwin said that out of every five workers newly hired by employers all over the Nation, three were employed workers changing jobs, one was unemployed, and one was a new entrant to the labor force. This means that of all new hires from any source—hiring at the gate, hiring through friends—or in fact from any source, three out of five were people seeking other jobs. There is no relationship between the statement made by Mr. Goodwin and the number of placements made by the public employment offices at any time.

The Wagner-Peyser Act which created the present Federal-State employment service provides for service to men, women, and juniors who are legally qualified to engage in gainful occupations and who want assistance in securing employment. It does not distinguish between service to the unemployed and service to employed. In other words, according to its charter, it must provide service to the employed who for many reasons are seeking other employment.

The public employment service occupies a key role in our fight against unemployment. Last year in the United States, it made more than 6.7 million nonfarm and almost 8.5 million farm placements. In my own State of Minnesota, the totals for the year were 109,800 nonagricultural and 46,400 farm placements.

This is only part of the story. The U.S. Employment Service provides extensive counseling, testing and placement services to youth, older workers, handicapped, and veterans. It also has a principal role in the administration of the Manpower Development and Training Act, the ARA Act, and the Public Works Acceleration Act. It would be extremely unfortunate if this service were impaired because of the unfounded allegations and distortions of a self-serving group of private employment agencies.

I hope my friends and colleagues in both the House and the Senate will approve the full amount of the budget requested by the Employment Service for 1964.

School Dropouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal in recent years of the problem of school dropouts. We all know that the failure of young men and women to complete their high school education means that the United States will have in future years an increased number of citizens not qualified to perform efficiently in a world that will demand better trained personnel in all areas of endeavor. Of further concern, of course, is the increase in unemployment caused by large numbers of dropouts throughout the country.

I am pleased to report on an effort being made in Jersey City, N.J., that has attracted considerable attention.

Among those who have expressed an interest in this project are: the Honorable Robert C. Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Administration, and Mrs. Marie McGuire, Public Housing Commissioner. Others who were most helpful and encouraging to those responsible for the program were Clarence R. J. Weeks, intergroup officer of the New York office of the Public Housing Administration, Samuel DiFeo, chairman of the Jersey City Housing Authority, and Joseph E. Connolly, executive director.

A report on the project was carried in the Jersey Journal of Jersey City, N.J. It and the editorial comment are printed below:

[From the Jersey Journal & Jersey Observer, May 3, 1963]

VOLUNTEER TUTORS: COLLEGE STUDENTS LAUNCH DROPOUT FIGHT

(By Judson Hand)

Jersey City State College's new tutorial corps goes into action today.

Three seniors at the college are set to teach outside classes to 20 Snyder High School ninth graders who grades aren't up to snuff.

Both tutors and students are volunteers. Nobody pays and nobody gets paid.

"This is a pilot program, just a beginning," said Eugene Flinn, an English professor at the college.

"We hope a much bigger corps can tutor potential school dropouts from housing projects as well as elementary schools during the next school year."

Two seniors, Mary Ann Gogliucci of Jersey City and Carol Collins of Union City, teach English and social studies, their college majors. Olivia Falcone of Hoboken teaches math and science.

The Snyder volunteers report to classrooms at the college for an hour and a half on Mondays and Fridays after regular school.

The Jersey City State College seniors try to play the part of big sisters, not schoolmarms.

Originally, the idea for the corps came from Conrad Vuocolo, head of tenant relations in Jersey City public housing.

Vuocolo said he was disturbed by the high dropout rate in the projects and he thought a tutorial corps would be just the thing to inspire youngsters to stay in school.

President Michael Gilligan of Jersey City State College supported the plan from its beginning. So did William Liggitt, head of the college social science department, and James Vocalis, professor of education.

Liggitt recruited the corps from his own classes. Then he sold Gerald Guterl, principal of Snyder, on the plan.

Guterl asked for volunteers from his own ninth grade. The students came from all social and economic levels. Not all were failing, but all were making grades far below their potential.

Enthusiasm for the corps runs high. The three seniors plan to continue tutoring after their graduation, until the high school year is over.

Dr. Vocalis already is exploring the possibility of setting up a corps for School 24 next year.

"Who knows?" said one professor. "The corps may be able to convert a potential dropout into a potential winner in the science fair that the college sponsors with the Jersey Journal."

[From the Jersey Journal & Jersey Observer, May 4, 1963]

THE FLOW OF NEWS: SOME WONDERFUL

Every so often—happily, often enough to keep newspapermen from becoming discouraged with the world—there comes along a heartwarming story. Yesterday we had a real one like that. It was a story about various elements of the community getting together to do something positive about a disturbing condition.

The problem: School dropouts. There are more all the time and each becomes a new unit in the army of undirected young people who ask: "What do we do now?"

Conrad Vuocolo of the Jersey City Housing Authority pondered: Why not prevent some dropouts by tutoring while they still can be salvaged for school work? How about having student teachers help them?

Next he took the idea to Jersey City State College and got the backing of President Michael Gilligan, the staff, and the students.

Snyder High School's principal, Gerald Guterl, was willing to experiment. So were Snyder students who felt they could use some help.

Now the volunteer student-teachers are tutoring volunteer pupils. The ones will be better teachers, the others salvaged students. In any event, win or lose, it is a heartening try and worth all encouragement.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 18, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT, MAY 18, 1963

FOREIGN TRAVEL FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District of Texas)

Congressional travel, the trips of Members of Congress outside of the United States, has frequently been criticized. No more so than recently when the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor took two secretaries on a foreign trip. House Resolution 340, to authorize four Members (including the Education and Labor Committee chairman again) to travel to the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva, and further to permit a second member of the committee to proceed on to Greece, Israel, Rome, and twice to Paris, was defeated in the House this week. I was among those voting against. Never justified in debate was what benefit there is to us from the International Labor Organization in the first place. Nor was there adequate assurance that foreign countries can yield information for us in labor relations. Our problem is the abandonment of proper collective bargaining, replacing it with Federal coercion and control, through labor leader influence and/or control of administration policy and congressional legislation. We were warned that the State Department would foot the bill and send the Members if the House failed to pass this measure. So we shall see. Overlooked in this entire matter is the legitimate need for our country to have well traveled Members of Congress who report their findings to colleagues and the Nation. Such study trips, however, need not include night club excursions and vacation travel at taxpayers' expense.

FEDERAL CONTROL MUST FOLLOW FEDERAL SPENDING AND RESPONSIBILITY

A bill, H.R. 4274, to discipline students in the public schools of Washington, D.C., passed the House 277 to 53. The bill amended existing law to permit reasonable force in discipline and to override the school board's present law which states, "Corporal punishment is not permitted." Granted the Congress acts as a city council in District of Columbia matters, it should be noted there is a duly constitued board of education in the District and Congress found it necessary to override a School Board decision. This points up another clear maxim—Federal responsibility means Federal control—Federal aid demands Federal responsibility and will, therefore, be followed by Federal control. Once the local schools are bound to Washington through Federal aid, Washington will reach into every school district accepting such aid. Washington bureaucrats, not local school boards, will dictate policy.

FEAR AND FRIGHT

Fear and fright are words heard in Washington this week. Liberals decry what they term, "conservative's fright mail." Conservatives repeat Roosevelt's famous, "we have nothing to fear but fear itself." The exchange points up a basic difference between modern liberals and conservatives. As columnist Henry Taylor puts it, we have replaced the four freedoms with the four fears: Fear of war; fear of inflation; fear of bankruptcy; fear of defeat. Conservatives recognize the validity of these fears if the radical-liberal profligate spending, materialistic, bureaucratic, regimented programs are followed. Conservatives know that free people can lick these problems and in this knowledge we are unafraid. The real fear is seen in the lack of leadership by an administration which quails before any blustering show of force on either the foreign or domestic front, which offers an unrealistic tax program and threatens depression unless it is adopted in its entirety, and other dire predictions. Public reaction to liberals' decrying the conservatives' concern over today's Kennedy-liberal Democrat course of government is well represented by a post card received this week from California which contains "The liberals' It-never-happened list." Among the items listed as real causes for fright: "Sell out of Laos, Cuba, China, Hungary, Poland (all of Eastern Europe); betrayal of the Cuban freedom fighters; protecting Castro's Commie gang; the Berlin wall (human shooting gallery in Berlin); suicidal unilateral disarmament; U.N. Trojan horse controls over our foreign policy; giveaway of our gold supply; suicidal planned deficit spending; billions of aid to Communist governments; all-out smears against all anti-Communists."

INCREASING THE DEBT LIMIT

The House passed, by a narrow margin, H.R. 6009, to increase the public debt limit to $307 billion until June 30 and to $309 billion for July and August. The increase was sold as a "temporary" increase in the debt limit. All of us know, of course, there is nothing so permanent in our national life as a temporary increase. The Republican position supported unanimously by the Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee, was to peg the increase at $305 billion and remove the word "temporary." We recognize, of course, that we should do something about lowering the debt ceiling, but the facts are Congress has already authorized certain spending—the administration has committed the spending of it and the bills have to be paid. We wanted to serve notice on the spenders that we have reached a point where we will no longer support unlimited authorization and appropriations.

Democrats tried to charge Republicans with changing their position under the Kennedy administration as opposed to the Eisenhower administration. I was singled out on the day prior to the debate as well as on Wednesday, as a special target of this charge. In answering for the members of my party, I said in part: "There is a vast difference in what we seek today in debt ceiling increase compared to what we had under the Eisenhower administration * * *. You will find many Republicans who said, 'we are picking up the tab for a lot of big spending. We regret that, because we do not believe in big spending.'" (It should be remembered by all that only the 83d Congress in the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration was controlled by the Republicans. In all other years we have had a Democrat Congress.) Continuing excerpts from my remarks on the debt ceiling debate: "* * * We reasoned that when you run up the bills you have to pay them. That was at a time and during a period of an administration that believed in a balanced budget, that believed in paying the bills when they came due rather than indulging in deficit financing, a planned deficit in financing our Government, which is now the proposition before us."

Further, as to history, I pointed out that after the many times I supported the debt increase it is wrong to run up the bills and in 1961 I warned on the floor of the House: "It is now obvious that the restraint on spending has to come from the Congress because this administration unlike the previous administration, is designing a deliberate program and policy that plans for a deficit. * * * I no longer see any attempt on the part of this administration to pay as we go or to have a balanced budget." All the facts brought out in debate proved beyond a doubt and by any test of fiscal soundness, based upon the amount of money on hand, $305 billion is enough to get this Government through the period of this fiscal year. All of a long and complicated debate on such a vital subject as the national debt cannot be discussed in the limited space of a newsletter. Important to remember—there must be an end to unlimited spending if we are to avoid national bankruptcy and economic disaster. Congress must make the start toward fiscal responsibility and a good place to start is by serving notice there will be no further increase in the debt ceiling. This must be followed by refusal to authorize any new projects or programs at a time of deficit spending. We must have a balanced budget, tax reform, and tax cuts in all brackets.

Do-Nothing Now Standard Kennedy Administration Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, if the President used 10 percent as much pressure on our enemies as he has on American business, the cold war would have long ago evaporated and we would be the true leader of the world. While the Russians continue their buildup in Cuba, the President and his Secretary of State tell the American people that we must do thing to disturb Khrushchev.

The degree of alarm which this do-nothing policy has caused the American people is well stated in today's New York Herald Tribune by both David Lawrence and Roscoe Drummond.

ON RUSSIAN ARMS IN CUBA AND THE ALARMED SENATORS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—The greatest danger to the security of the United States today is in Cuba. There is enough Soviet military strength remaining on the island to launch an attack on this country.

Yet the American people are being led to believe that Soviet military strength in Cuba is negligible and that an attack is as unthinkable as the missile build-up last year was supposed to be.

This was the reasoning used by government agencies here in the autumn of 1962 to minimize the meaning of the Soviet troop movement and of the preliminary steps for the setting up of missile bases.

The most important official document on the Cuban situation has received only passing attention in the last 11 days from the American people. No announcement has been made of what the Kennedy administration intends to do about the facts that have just been disclosed. There are no signs that the Soviet government is being prodded to get its troops, technicians and military equipment out of Cuba, or that any demand is being made to permit on-the-spot inspection in order to find out whether any missiles are still concealed inside the island.

The latest word to the American people about the gravity of the Cuban situation comes not from Republican critics trying to make a political issue but from a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the U.S. Senate headed by a Democratic chairman, Senator John Stennis, of Mississippi. All seven members—four Democrats and three Republicans—signed the unanimous report. It tells the unvarnished truth about what has happened and points out a lesson for the future. Here are some extracts from the report, dated May 9, which was written after hearing for many weeks secret testimony given by the intelligence agencies of the government, civilian and military:

"While a reasonably competent job was done in acquiring and collecting intelligence information and data, in retrospect it appears that several substantial errors were made by the intelligence agencies in the evaluation of the information and data which was accumulated. * * *

"GREATEST URGENCY

"Even though the intelligence community believes that all (strategic missiles) have been withdrawn, it is of the greatest urgency to determine whether or not strategic missiles are now concealed in Cuba. The criticality of this is illustrated by the fact that, assuming maximum readiness at pre-selected sites, with all equipment pre-located, the Soviet mobile medium-range—1,100 miles—missiles could be made operational in a matter of hours. * * *

"Some other sources—primarily refugee and exile groups—estimate that as many as 40,000 Soviets are now in Cuba. Bearing in mind the lack of hard evidence on the question and the substantial underestimation of last fall, we conclude that no one in official United States circles can tell, with any real degree of confidence, how many Russians are now in Cuba and we are of the opinion that the official 17,500 estimate is perhaps a minimum figure. * * *

"The evidence is overwhelming that Castro is supporting, spurring, aiding and abetting Communist revolutionary and subversive movements throughout the Western Hemisphere and that such activities present a grave and ominous threat to the peace and security of the Americas. * * *

"It is agreed that iron-clad assurance of the complete absence of Soviet strategic missiles in Cuba can come only as a result of thorough, penetrating on-site inspection by reliable observers. * * *

"The importance of making every effort to ascertain the truth with respect to this matter cannot be over-emphasized. The criticality of it can best be illustrated by the fact that the testimony established that, upon the assumption that all missiles and associated equipment and the necessary personnel were readily available near preselected sites in a state of complete readiness, mobile medium-range missiles could be made operational in a matter of hours. Thus, if these missiles and their associated equipment remain in Cuba, the danger is clear and obvious.

"Assuming without deciding that all strategic weapons have been withdrawn, there is the ever-present possibility of the stealthy re-introduction of strategic missiles and other offensive weapons, using the Soviet forces still in Cuba as camouflage and security for the activity.

"Potentially, Cuba is a base from which the Soviets could interdict our vital air and sea lanes. It can now be used for the air, sea, and electronic surveillance of our military activities in the southeast United States and the Caribbean.

"Cuba's airfields could serve as recovery air bases for planes launched against the United States from the Soviet Union."

This means that the range of certain Soviet military planes has been increased substantially. They need fly only one way in a surprise attack, drop bombs on the United States and land in Cuba.

Yet in the last few weeks nothing has been done to insist upon on-site inspection in Cuba by the United Nations or by any other agency. The Kennedy administration has retreated on this point, and only an informed public opinion in the United States and throughout the world can bring about an advance—to verify what has actually happened.

Unresolved Cuban Crisis: Red Missiles May Remain

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Washington.—When John J. McCone, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and all of the intelligence chiefs of the Pentagon combined are unable to convince the preparedness investigating subcommittee of the Senate that Soviet offensive weapons have been withdrawn from Cuba, something needs to be done about it.

I believe that something can be done. Before attempting to suggest one course of action, I want to point up the central findings of the Stennis committee and to examine whether these findings are supported by responsible, fair-minded men.

After taking exhaustive, secret testimony from the entire intelligence community of the Government, including State, Defense, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, plus more than 70 non-official witnesses, the Senate committee unanimously concluded: "Strategic weapons may or may not be now in Cuba. We can reach no conclusion on this because of lack of evidence."

All of the witnesses and all of the testimony from the administration said just the opposite—that strategic missiles and offensive weapons have been removed. But the Stennis committee was unpersuaded. It has grave doubts that it is true.

The committee has grave doubts not only because the evidence of withdrawal is inconclusive, but also because our own past surveillance had these serious shortcomings:

There were several substantial errors in evaluating the intelligence because top officials were subjectively convinced that the Soviets wouldn't try to put missiles in Cuba.

Not until long after their arrival, not until after the President had spoken on October 22, did we confirm Soviet ground combat battalions were in Cuba.

Even into late October we were more than 100 percent off in our estimates of the number of Soviet personnel on the island.

There is inadequate information today on the number of Soviet troops leaving Cuba—and the number arriving. Some sources estimate that as many as 40,000 Soviets are now in Cuba.

With these doubts in mind, the Senate committee reports as follows:

"To a man the intelligence chiefs stated that it is their opinion that all strategic missiles and bombers have been removed from Cuba. However, they readily admit that, in terms of absolutes, it is quite possible that offensive weapons remain on the island concealed in caves and otherwise. They also admitted that absolute assurance on this question can come only from penetrating and continuing onsite inspection by reliable observers and that, based on skepticism, if nothing more, there is reason for grave concern about the matter.

When a Senate committee reaching this conclusion is predominantly manned by such able and objective people as Democratic Senators John Stennis, of Mississippi, Stuart Symington, of Missouri, Henry Jackson, of Washington, and Republican Senators Leverett Saltonstall, Massachusetts, and Margaret Chase Smith, Maine, it cannot be ignored.

Why shouldn't President Kennedy renew his urgent exchanges with Mr. Khrushchev to establish the onsite inspection which the Soviet Premier himself proposed?

If the offensive weapons have been removed—as stated—and if Soviet troops are to be withdrawn, as promised, then onsite inspection should be welcome to Moscow.

Unless Castro, in objecting to onsite inspection, is doing exactly what Moscow wants, he is now in no position to refuse to fulfill Premier Khrushchev's promise to President Kennedy.

The time is opportune to reopen the inspection issue—and to reopen it with urgency.

I think most Americans will agree with the Stennis committee's unanimous appeal:

"The entire Cuban problem, both military and political, should be accorded the highest priority by our governmental officials to the end that the evil threat which the Soviet occupation of Cuba represents will be eliminated at an early date."

The National Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following timely comments on the administration plan to establish a National Peace Corps. This plan is proposed in H.R. 5625 pending before the House Committee on Education and Labor with hearings scheduled to open tomorrow before a Special Subcommittee on Labor. The editorial was written by Sam H. Day and appeared in the May 12, 1963, edition of the Lewiston Morning Tribune, published at Lewiston, Idaho. I commend the editorial for perusal by my colleagues:

New Horizons for the Peace Corps

Of the many innovations of the Kennedy administration, few have met with more success and acclaim than the Peace Corps. Perhaps no other project undertaken by the administration in its first 2 years has given greater promise of making a mark by which the administration will be remembered. It has struck a deep response in the American people and won the acceptance of all but an insignificant minority of the administration's critics. Its supporters include many who greeted it initially with hoots of derision.

Having won an assured place with the public, the Peace Corps has begun to move into significantly new fields. Conceived originally as a movement for young people, it now includes the old as well. And it has begun to turn its attention to the domestic scene, casting off its original role as a technique to be used exclusively in foreign fields. Both of these new avenues are ones which spring logically from the Peace Corps idea. Both hold the promise of a success fully as exciting as the success it has already achieved.

The Peace Corps has been successful because it employed a combination of practicality and idealism suited to the task which it understood. The task was the furtherance of U.S. foreign policy objectives by creating conditions under which the underdeveloped nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America could become stable and democratic societies. The Peace Corps has been of great practical help to those nations because of its emphasis upon imparting the technical skills which are their greatest need. The idealism of the Peace Corps, in which the volunteer shares the hardships of those with whom he works, has gained for the Corps the ready acceptance abroad it could not otherwise have gained.

By hitting upon a people-to-people approach on the international level, the Peace Corps struck a spark which was never lit by conventional diplomatic techniques nor by massive military and economic aid programs. It was the first real American answer to the time-tested and highly successful Communist technique of infiltration at the village level in underdeveloped societies. Moreover, it promised further success because it tapped for the first time an immense pool of Yankee know-how and Yankee idealism. It provided Americans at last with a method of portraying an image which does them justice.

Some 350 Americans over 50, and some even in their late 70's, now are serving successfully in the Peace Corps. Special efforts are underway to recruit more of the elderly who have skills to offer and the will to offer them. The elderly have been found to be of special value because of their maturity and long experience. The response, not surprisingly, has been enthusiastic. The Corps has offered a unique opportunity for many who have been thrust arbitrarily into retirement at the peak of their vocational or professional careers.

As the Peace Corps makes its mark abroad, the need for similar work to be done at home is becoming more and more apparent. The underdeveloped societies of Tanganyika and Brazil have no monopoly on problems which can best be approached through techniques of practicality and idealism. If it takes the Peace Corps to "get through" to the people of Burma and Nigeria, then perhaps it will also take the Peace Corps, or something like it, to reach those among us who are no less underdeveloped and no less hard to reach. Our metropolitan jungles, our rural slums, our underprivileged classes, and the culturally deadened segments of our society present problems in human underdevelopment which we have not yet begun to tackle seriously. If the Peace Corps should provide us with fresh heart to face long-neglected challenges at home it will indeed have made an enduring contribution.

State Department Whitewash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the State Department has written a book about itself, called "State Department 1963: A Report to the Citizen." Apparently, since the higher-ups in the Department have nothing to brag about insofar as actual results are concerned, they are now trying, through the printed page, to tell the American people how lucky they are not to have a foreign policy on anything.

Today's New York Daily News demolishes the conclusions of this book of State Department self-aggrandizement.

REPORT OF THE FOGGY BOTTOM MUTUAL ADMIRATION SOCIETY

Some months or weeks ago, the U.S. State Department peered into a looking glass and asked: "Mirror, mirror on the wall, who is the fairest of us all?" Then quick as a wink, State said: "Me."

What the mirror would have said if given time to answer is unknown.

But State's reply suited State right down to the ground, and very soon the Department headquartered in Foggy Bottom, Washington, D.C., was busy—furiously busy, my dears—at fleshing out that reply for all the world to ponder.

These labors produced a big, handsomely printed, lavishly illustrated 151-page book, entitled "Department of State 1963: A Report to the Citizen," which you can get, you lucky whatnot, by sending $1.50 to Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

Considering the taxes you pay to support Secretary of State Dean Rusk and all the other Federal bureaucrats, you might think yourself entitled to a copy free of charge, and to a reasonable fee for reading the thing. But if you talked that way, the liberals would call you a Fascist if not a John Bircher, so you'd better keep such dangerous thoughts to yourself.

Anyway, your reporter has read most of the book, and will now summarize it for you.

Essentially, "Department of State 1963" is a long song of love and praise for the "dedicated men and women" (President Kennedy's phrase) who work for that same Department of State. There are some 8,700 of these selfless saints now, as against 1,600 in 1929 and 5 clerks plus Thomas Jefferson in 1790.

YOU NAME IT—STATE'S GOT IT

They are engaged in an enormous number of activities, which are detailed in this book.

Walt W. ("Russia is mellowing") Rostow chairs the Policy Planning Council, which dreams up U.S. policies (and what dreams and what policies) toward every foreign nation under the sun.

State is up to here in the Alliance for Progress—the President's plan to uplift and improve Latin America with some 20 billion U.S. dollars plus whatever pesos, cruzeiros, and bolivars the Latin Americans may deign to kick in.

The State Department runs a big intelligence operation, as if the Central Intelligence Agency weren't equal to its job. In this book, State takes no little credit for having advised the President on what to do when he became convinced last October that Khrushchev was parking missiles, missile launchers, and long-range bombers in Cuba.

State has fingers in virtually all of the United Nations special agencies, in foreign aid, in the Far and Middle East, in Africa, and in various Caribbean and Central and South American countries.

For all the wealth of information that this book contains, there are certain omissions. Most of these concern the reasons why U.S. foreign policy so often falls on its tin ear while tens of millions around the world roar with ungodly laughter.

The book talks as if the Cuba problem were all but solved, though it is obvious that Khrushchev has anchored a base in Cuba which it would take a major military operation to root out.

SKILLFUL WHITEWASH

We gather from the volume that virtually everything in Laos is coming up roses, which may or may not be so, but most likely isn't.

West Berlin? Well, sir, you read this book (p. 105) and you get the impression that West Berlin has sunk to the level of a minor problem which Secretary Rusk could solve singlehanded any afternoon before teatime.

The book, in short, is a skillfully done, expertly edited self-whitewash of the State Department and of the many bobbles, boners, and booboos it has committed since John F. Kennedy became President—or let's make it since John Foster Dulles died and was succeeded by Christian Herter as Secretary.

It would be funny in spots and unimportant throughout, if it were not for the fact that the U.S. State Department's operations affect the lives and destinies of all of us for better or for worse, and may eventually determine our survival or our finish as an independent nation.

That fact makes "Department of State 1963" the most ominous and sinister book we've seen thus far in 1963.

No Matter How You Figure, Government Spending Is Going Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, basic to all the problems we face as a nation is the continued increase in Federal spending. The big-spending advocates of the Kennedy administration try to play down the increase by use of percentages and figures tied to the gross national product. No matter how the figures are juggled the fact remains we are spending more than we should to maintain a solvent economy and spending is still going up.

A current article in the U.S. News & World Report shows what is really happening. I include the article as a part of these remarks and point out to you the following: First, the increase in nondefense spending has been greater than defense and military spending, contrary to statements by Kennedy spokesmen; second, Federal payrolls have increased in greater proportion than State and local payrolls, contrary to administration claims, and third, per capita Federal spending is greater in 1963 than it was in 1940, again contrary to administration figures.

Mr. Speaker, is not it time we come to our senses and put a stop to Federal extravagance before it is too late and we find ourselves bankrupt?

The U.S. News & World Report study follows:

ANOTHER WAY TO MEASURE GOVERNMENT SPENDING

How big has the Federal Government grown—in spending, in payrolls, in debt? Has this growth outstripped that of States and localities?

President Kennedy thinks that many Americans are baffled by these questions because they lack the necessary facts. "Government seems too remote, too big, too complex," the President told a group of editors on April 19.

To get the facts, the economic unit of U.S. News & World Report traced trends in Government jobs and spending back to before World War II.

Results of this new study are set forth for you in the charts on these pages.

DEBT

The big jump in Government debt, since the end of World War II, has been in States and localities. Just since 1958, State and local debt has soared nearly 50 percent, while Federal debt has climbed less than 10 percent.

Behind the sharp rise: Heavy local borrowings to provide schools, roads, parks, water and sewer facilities, police and fire protection for a burgeoning population.

SPENDING

Outlays at all levels of government have been trending steadily higher.

To see where spending has been rising fastest, however, you need to take a close look at the figures.

For example, State and local spending of cash has jumped 82 percent in the past 8 years. That's a bigger percentage increase than the rise in total Federal cash outlays since 1955—as the chart on page 71 shows.

But that's not the whole story.

Break down the spending figures and you find that the nondefense side of the Federal cash budget has been outpacing all other outlays.

Thus, Federal spending on such items as social security, veterans' benefits, farm price supports, carrying charges on the debt, and other civilian programs has skyrocketed 114 percent since 1955.

This Nation, of course, has grown larger in size, better able to support more spending and debt.

Cash outlays by the Federal Government this year will account for about 21 percent of total public and private spending in the country—about unchanged from 10 years ago.

Back in 1948, however, the Federal share of total spending was below 15 percent. It was only 10 percent in 1940.

And note from the chart on page 71 that the rise in Federal spending has outstripped the increase in population.

JOBS

Government payrolls—excluding military personnel—have grown fastest at the State and local level.

In the past 5 years, States and localities have added 1.4 million workers—a 24-percent increase. Additions to the Federal payroll, in the same period, totaled 175,000—up 8 percent.

When measuring growth in Government, thus, you need to be careful.

Overall figures can be tricky, even misleading.

One broad conclusion is safe: Government, at all levels, has grown steadily—and seems destined to grow still larger in the years ahead.

Government debt: Steady rise and no end in sight

[In billions]

End of fiscal year—	Federal debt	State and local debt
1940	$43.0	$20.3
1948	252.3	18.7
1953	266.1	33.8
1958	276.3	58.2
1963 (estimate)	303.5	87.0

Source: U.S. Treasury and Census Bureau; For 1963, Federal debt is estimated officially, State and local debt estimated by U.S.N. & W.R. economic unit.

(Federal debt skyrocketed during World War II. Since then, it has risen more moderately—20 percent since 1948. Debt of States and localities dropped during the war, but has jumped 365 percent since 1948. Financing problems persist, and debt at all levels of government will keep rising in years ahead.)

WHERE SPENDING OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS IS RISING FAST

Since 1955, 2 years after the Korean war, Federal cash spending has been rising almost continuously. The record of this 8-year period:

	Billions
Federal cash spending, all programs:	
8 years ago	$70.5
Now (estimated)	116.8
Increase, 65.7 percent	46.3
Federal cash spending for national security:	
8 years ago	40.9
Now (estimated)	53.4
Increase, 30.6 percent	12.5
Federal cash spending for civilian programs:	
8 years ago	29.6
Now (estimated)	63.4
Increase, 114.2 percent	33.8
By comparison—State and local cash spending:	
8 years ago	27.0
Now (estimated)	49.2
Increase, 82.2 percent	22.2

Basic data: U.S. Census Bureau and Budget Bureau; for 1963, Federal spending is estimated officially, State and local estimated by U.S.N. & W.R. economic unit.

(The big jump in spending, thus, has been for Federal programs other than national security. The cost of these civilian programs, which now account for well over half of the Federal cash budget, has gone up far faster than either security costs or State and local spending.)

Jobs in Government: More and more civilians on the payroll

Average in—	Federal	State and local	Total
1940	996,000	3,206,000	4,202,000
1948	1,863,000	3,787,000	5,650,000
1953	2,305,000	4,340,000	6,645,000
1958	2,191,000	5,702,000	7,893,000
1963 (1st quarter)	2,366,000	7,084,000	9,450,000

Source: U.S. Department of Labor; for 1963, figures are 1st quarter averages, seasonally adjusted.

(Employees of States and localities have nearly doubled in number in the past 15 years. Those on the Federal civilian payroll have increased by 27 percent.)

Federal cash spending: How outlays have outstripped population growth

	Cash spending (billions)	Population	Cash spending per capita [1]
1940	$9.6	132,594,000	$180
1948	36.5	147,208,000	356
1953	76.8	160,184,000	600
1958	83.4	174,882,000	519
1963 (estimated)	116.8	[2] 189,200,000	617

[1] Adjusted to 1963 prices.

[2] Estimated.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau and Budget Bureau; for 1963, cash spending is officially estimated; population is for July, estimate by U.S.N. & W.R. economic unit.

(But: When related to the growing size of the Nation's output, Federal spending has held steady since 1953. Ten years ago, Federal spending accounted for just over 21 percent of total spending—gross national product. Today, the Federal-spending share is just under 21 percent.)

At Celanese, Working Backward Pays; We Find Out What the Consumer Wants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have brought to the attention of the Congress, and, I hope to the world, through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, facts about industries located in my district. I am proud of each and every industry that I have the privilege of serving, by virtue of being a U.S. Congressman, the industries located in my district. Among these is the Celanese Corp. of America which has a large, efficient, and productive plant at Celriver near Rock Hill in York County in the Fifth Congressional District of South Carolina. This industry adds much to the economy of my district and we are happy that they chose York County for their location.

In the Charlotte, N.C., Observer of Sunday, May 19, 1963, one of the feature writers had a very fine article about this company. I have clipped the article from that paper and include it in the RECORD for the erudition of all who might be interested. Again, let me express my happiness that this fine plant is in the Fifth South Carolina Congressional District.

The article follows:

AT CELANESE, WORKING BACKWARD PAYS; WE FIND OUT WHAT THE CONSUMER WANTS

(By Harry Snook)

"The problem," said Dr. Reiner Stool, "is to market what people want, rather than to sell what we would like to manufacture."

Stoll, executive vice president of the Celanese Fibers Co. here, was contrasting his firm's modern approach to manufacturing with the entirely different situation that existed when the parent Celanese Corp. of America was born.

It took more than three decades from the creation of a synthetic yarn to the mass production of man-made fabrics. The new product had to be perfected, and it had to be sold—not only to the mills but also to the public.

"We started with something new and went out to convince people they wanted it," Stoll smiled. "Today we find out what the consumer wants, then make it for him."

For a firm like Celanese Fibers Co., which makes no finished products for consumers, this "working backward" entails a tremendous amount of coordination.

To give the consumer what he wants, mills must both be able and willing to make the goods. Retailers must undertake to sell the goods.

The basic materials and the processes for handling them must be refined to practicality. This refinement begins in a laboratory and, for Celanese, never really gets away from the labs.

"We call it the fiber that keeps its promise," said Stoll, speaking generally of any of dozens of different synthetics. "Even the finished product is watched all the time, tested again and again, if it has the Celanese label on it."

Even the best fiber, Stoll said, can be ruined by the wrong spinning of the yarns, cutting of the fabric, styling of the garment, or even merchandising of the product.

Improper spinning might destroy essential characteristics such as minimal strength or a certain stretch in yarn. Bad cutting by a garment maker could prevent a material from giving in the usual squeeze and then returning to its original shape.

Poor styling might result in the use of the wrong fabric, so that a pretty but poor-wearing material is used at some point of much abrasion.

And in merchandising, a fabric requiring a lukewarm washing or no ironing could be ruined without excuse unless precise instructions are on the label.

"You might say we sell each pound of yarn five times," said Stoll, referring to the chain from yarn to the fabric weaver or knitter, dyer, garment maker, retail store and, finally, the consumer.

Basically, Celanese Fibers Co. makes synthetic fibers and yarns from wood pulp cotton linters or petroleum. (Rayon comes from wood, nylon from petroleum.)

"We provide the construction materials," Stoll said. "That is it."

Battalions of salesmen, chemists, engineers and physicists work together in a highly complex organization of diverse talents at Celanese to produce the "fiber that keeps its promise"—whatever the particular fiber, for whatever particular job.

"The shape of the fiber has a great deal to do with its character, as well as the molecular composition or its chemical makeup," said Joseph H. Anderer, textile processing manager.

A fiber may be required to stretch, or not stretch. It is required to last under the expected conditions of manufacture and use. It must take and retain colors. It may be required smooth and glossy, or fluffed and dull—there are infinite variations.

"It's not only that our own fibers must perform to specifications," Anderer said. "We also are always concerned with the differential of one fiber to another. In blends, for instance, we must protect the other fellow's fiber, too."

Beyond the broad green lawns and the clean brick-and-glass walls of the 240,000-square-foot Celanese facility on Barclay Downs Drive, there are executive offices, sales offices, personnel offices, accounting offices, testing laboratories—and countless miniature mills.

Some of the mills are spinning. Others are weaving. Still others are knitting. A couple are tufting carpets. Others are taking fibers and working them into dense mats from which such things as auto door interior panels, air filters and dinner-table place mats are made. A fluffing operation becomes a pillow stuffed with a downy, resilient, quick-return continuous fiber that leaves no loose ends to work through the case and irritate a sleeper.

"We don't leave it to chance," Stoll said. "We make certain ourselves that it works."

Nearby, in the sprawling buildings of the Charlotte Development Laboratories on Archdale Drive, rows of elaborate machines and dozens of Celanese engineers meet rigorous schedules in dyeing and finishing yarns and fabrics—among other things.

These "other things" are competitive secrets, evidenced by the high fence and serious guard at the gate.

"It is sometimes 18 months from the yarn to the customer," Stoll said.

Of the more than 700 Celanese employees in Charlotte, about 200 work at the development laboratories.

Their concern goes beyond the domestic market, since Celanese is a worldwide operation.

"This makes problems," Stoll said sadly. "Fabrics must stand up to automatic washers in the United States. In Europe, though, wives like to boil the devil out of everything."

Stoll grinned. "It is a challenge to solve problems like this."

Private Enterprise Replies to RECA Charges of Overcharging by Investor-Owned Public Utilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming abundantly clear that the Rural Electric Cooperative Association is smarting for a battle with investor-owned, free enterprise electric utility companies.

The association has attacked a number of investor-owned electric utilities with overcharging their consumers, by establishing an unrealistic, arbitrary figure above which profits, in their opinions, should not exist.

And, in their efforts to discredit private enterprise, they inaccurately interpret the tax laws and fail to mention that all utility companies already come under State and Federal regulatory agencies and that they must comply with these agencies' rate and other regulations to stay within the law.

As the Rural Electric Cooperative Association is an outgrowth of the REA, an agency of the Federal Government which in effect distributes low interest Government loans to members of the Rural Electric Cooperative Association, we find here an instance of where taxpayers' dollars are being used to fight and criticize competitive free enterprise, an extremely dangerous precedent.

Because I believe that private enterprise has a right to reply to the charges made by the RECA, I am herewith inserting in the Record a statement by W. J. Clapp, president of Florida Power Corp., St. Petersburg, Fla., and insertions as well as two additional letters; one from the mayor of St. Petersburg, Hon. Herman Goldner, and the other from the mayor of Salt Lake City, Utah, Hon. J. Braken Lee, relevant to this subject:

STATEMENT OF W. J. CLAPP, PRESIDENT OF FLORIDA POWER CORP., ST. PETERSBURG

On February 21, 1963, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association issued a news release from its Washington office accusing 38 investor-owned electric utilities of overcharging their customers by more than $1.25 billion in a 5-year period between 1956 and 1960. This release included the allegation that Florida Power Corp. overcharged its customers by more than $36 million during this period.

The conclusions reached by the legislative and research department of NRECA could only be reached by ignoring the Federal tax laws, the intent of Congress in passing these laws, and the interpretation of the laws by the judicial branch of our Government. By ignoring the intent of Congress and official endorsements of Florida Power Corp.'s accounting procedures on accelerated amortization, this association has set itself up as an authority above the Federal and State regulatory commissions, and has assumed a posture of opposition to the Congress. NRECA, by its accusation, denounces the actions of official State regulatory bodies in determining what is a fair rate of return for individual electric utilities operating in varying circumstances. The association arbitrarily establishes itself as the sole judge of the proper rate of return, overruling the professional and technical opinions and decisions on this matter built up by conscientious State authorities over the years.

Congress has made it abundantly clear that, in authorizing the temporary deferral of income taxes, it is encouraging acceleration of investment in new plants—and this is precisely what has happened in rapidly growing Florida. The propriety of Florida Power Corp.'s accounting for deferred income taxes should not be subject to unwarranted damaging publicity through statements in the Congressional Record prompted by an association antagonistic to the investor-owned electric utility industry, especially in view of the fact that:

(a) The Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission Order No. 3312, Docket No. 6308-EU, directs that Florida Power Corp.'s accounting on Federal income taxes shall concur with the instructions prescribed by the Federal Power Commission on this matter.

(b) The Federal Power Commission instructions are clearly stated in its Uniform Classification of Accounts effective January 1, 1961, and Florida Power Corp. is following these instructions with respect to provisions for deferred income taxes.

(c) The Securities and Exchange Commission, the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, and Florida Power Corp.'s outside auditors (Arthur Andersen & Co., Atlanta, Ga.) all have approved and/or endorsed the method used by Florida Power Corp. of accounting for deferred income taxes.

Attached, for insertion in the Record, are (1) a letter from Arthur Andersen & Co., Atlanta, Ga. (outside auditor for Florida Power Corp. as well as for a number of the other companies accused by NRECA of overcharging); (2) Order No. 3312, Docket No. 6308-EU, of the Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission, directing Florida electric utilities under its jurisdiction to concur with instructions prescribed by the Federal Power Commission with respect to accounting for temporarily deferred Federal income taxes; and (3) a copy of an article on this matter from the industry's trade journal, Electrical World, of March 25, 1963.

We are certain that our local rural electric cooperative friends throughout the 32-county area we serve do not endorse this attempt by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association to discredit Florida Power Corp. and other investor-owned companies throughout the Nation.

In a further effort to divert the attention of Congress from its current efforts to close tax loopholes, to eliminate some of the special Federal tax and postal privileges, and to discontinue other unwarranted preferential treatment now enjoyed by rural electric cooperatives, NRECA attempted to enlist the aid of local and State political leaders to support its allegations of overcharging. Attached, for insertion in the Record, are the replies of the mayors of St. Petersburg, Fla., and Salt Lake City, Utah, to NRECA, flatly declining to endorse its efforts in this regard.

Rural electric cooperatives throughout the Nation had a total operating margin of almost a billion dollars during the 5-year period 1956 through 1960, but paid only about 3 percent of revenues in taxes while investor-owned companies were paying 24 percent of revenues. The current investigations of

Congress into this tax inequality should not be diverted by the irresponsible allegations described above.

Cordially yours,

W. J. Clapp,
President.

Arthur Andersen & Co.,
Atlanta, April 8, 1963.

Florida Power Corp.,
Florida Power Building,
St. Petersburg, Fla.

Gentlemen: This letter summarizes our comments on your company's method of accounting for the temporary deferral of Federal income taxes resulting from the write-off for tax purposes of the cost of certain electric facilities over periods which are shorter than the service lives used for book depreciation of the assets.

Certain electric facilities are being amortized for Federal income tax purposes over periods of 60 months under Certificates of Necessity issued to Florida Power Corp. by the Office of Defense Mobilization of the U.S. Government. An accelerated method (declining balance) is used in computing depreciation for tax purposes on certain electric facilities constructed in 1954 and later years, as permitted by the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

For book and financial reporting purposes the cost of the above-described electric facilities is depreciated by the company over the estimated service lives of the facilities on a straight-line basis.

The amount of income tax deferred because of using accelerated amortization or depreciation for income tax purposes is being currently charged to income and credited to an account the balance of which is restricted for future income taxes. This same account is currently being charged and income credited with the increase in current income tax payable as a result of such amortization of certain properties having been completed or such accelerated depreciation of other properties having become less than normal depreciation.

Florida Power Corp.'s accounting for the temporary deferral of Federal income taxes is in accordance with the accounting:

1. Prescribed by the Federal Power Commission in its uniform system of accounts for public utilities and licensees.

2. Prescribed by order of the Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission.

3. Recommended by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

4. Approved by the Securities and Exchange Comission.

In our opinion, your company's accounting for the temporary deferral of Federal income taxes is the only proper method under the circumstances. Reference is also made to our "Accountants' Opinions" which accompany the financial statements of Florida Power Corp., included in the company's annual reports to stockholders, for our overall opinion thereon.

Very truly yours,

Arthur Anderson & Co.

Order Revising Accounting Practices and Procedures—Before the Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission—Docket No. 6308–EU, Order No. 3312

In re accounting practices and procedures in connection with the use of accelerated depreciation for income tax purposes; Chairman Wilbur C. King, Commissioner Jerry W. Carter, and Commissioner Edwin L. Mason each participated in the disposition of this matter

By the Commission: In orders No. 2225 and 2422 in dockets 4285–EU and 4302–EU, this Commission prescribed the accounting practices and procedures to be followed by electric utilities under its jurisdiction in connection with the use of accelerated depreciation for income tax purposes. Subsequent to the issuance of said orders, the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Federal Power Commission have adopted accounting practices to be followed by electric utilities reporting to said agencies which are not in harmony with the practices and procedures previously prescribed by this Commission. In view of the fact that electric utilities operating in this State are required to report to this Commission on Federal Power Commission forms, and due to the further fact that Federal Power Commission and our own Classification of Accounts are identical, with the exception that the Federal agency's classification makes provision for this accounting while ours does not, we have concluded that uniformity in this regard will simplify reporting and accounting for the utilities and at the same time be in the public interest.

In consideration of the foregoing we caused a formal notice to be issued to all electric utilities operating under our jurisdiction directing them to file with this Commission in writing any objectons they might have to the proposed revision. The various utilities have responded as directed and we find that the proposed revision should be approved: Now, therefore, in consideration thereof, it is

Ordered by the Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission, That all electric utilities operating within the State of Florida, and subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission, shall forthwith revise their accounting practices and procedures in connection with the use of accelerated depreciation for income tax purposes in conformity with the following requirements:

1. During a period when liberalized depreciation or amortization of depreciable properties results in a deferral of Federal income taxes, accounting therefor shall concur with the instructions prescribed by the Federal Power Commission Uniform Classification of Accounts effective January 1, 1961. Charge to account 410, "Provision for Deferred Income Taxes," current accruals for deferred income taxes and a concurrent credit to "Accumulated Deferred Income Taxes," accounts 281, 282, or 283, as applicable.

2. During a period where liberalized depreciation or amortization of depreciable properties results in increased Federal income taxes, account 410 shall be credited with the amount over the normal tax calculated on the straight line method of computing depreciation and accounts 281, 282, or 283 debited in offsetting amounts, it is further

Ordered, That all previous orders issued by this Commission concerning accounting practices and procedures in connection with the use of accelerated depreciation for income tax purposes be and said orders are hereby amended so that each of them shall be consistent with the requirements of this order.

By order of Chairman Wilbur C. King, Commissioner Jerry W. Carter, and Commissioner Edwin L. Mason, as and constituting the Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission, this 6th day of February, 1962.

[seal]

Bolling C. Stanley,
Executive Secretary.

St. Petersburgh, Fla.,
Office of the Mayor.
April 18, 1963.

Mr. Kermit Overby,
Director, Legislation and Research Department, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Overby: This will acknowledge your letter of March 13, attaching a copy of a study of investor-owned electric companies financial data.

I am reliably informed that the purported overcharges shown in this report are a result of a biased and inaccurate interpretation of the tax laws which is not in keeping with decisions of the courts on this matter.

The electric utilities in Florida are following the intent of Congress by using deferred income taxes to help finance the building of badly needed generating facilities. Their deferred Federal income taxes are being accounted for strictly in accordance with the Federal Power Commission's uniform classification of accounts for public utilities, as prescribed by order of the Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission, as recommended by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, and as approved by the Securities and Exchange Commission. Our local utility, Florida Power Corp., in the written opinion of its outside auditors, Arthur Andersen & Co., is accounting for the temporary deferral of Federal income taxes in the only proper method under the circumstances.

By copy of this letter to Florida Congressmen, I am suggesting that a more fruitful investigation would appear to be the questioning of the need for continuation of 2 percent loans to rural electric cooperatives when the Federal Government must pay approximately 4 percent for these funds.

The present Federal program for subsidizing rural electric cooperatives with money, with preferential postage rates, with preferential use of federally generated power, with venture capital for questionable rural development projects, and with exemption from all Federal income taxes is discrimination against urban America and against the entire free-enterprise system. This subsidization should cease, and these tax loopholes should be closed, in the best interests of all Americans.

Very truly yours,

Herman W. Goldner.

Salt Lake City Corp.,
Office of the Mayor,
Salt Lake City, Utah, March 29, 1963.

Kermit Overby,
Director, Legislation Research Department, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Overby: I have your letter of March 13 and your pamphlet entitled, "A Report on Over-Charges of 38 Major Electric Utilities." For your information, I do not own any stock in any utility of any kind, anywhere. I would be the first to admit that many of the utilities in the 1920's and 1930's did many things that were detrimental to the public. I would also admit that the original idea of rural electrification did much good for many people at a time when public utilities did not have the money to extend electric service to those in rural areas.

To better clarify my position, I want to state without equivocation that I support the theory that the freedom of the American people has been attained and is based upon the free enterprise system with as little government as possible. And while there are many arguments for governmental intervention there are, in my opinion, stronger arguments in favor of the free enterprise system.

One of these arguments is the fact that the human greed which exists in the hearts of too many of our people always results in the exploitation of the many by the few. All of us, I am sure, recognize that free enterprise, in many instances, does bring about exploitation by corporations and must be curbed by government. When utilities and other companies took advantage of the people in the 1920's and 1930's, or prior to that time, the people were able to appeal to their government to protect them from this exploitation. Now, when government enters the field of running utilities, such as the one you represent, it displays the same greed and selfishness that is found among some of those who operate free enterprise. The same tendency to exploit the people exists in your group as would exist under the free enterprise system.

Because your group has, as a semigovernmental agency, been granted privileges, authority and advantages not granted to free enterprise, the thing I fear most is who is going to protect me and the rest of the American people from being exploited by you. In plain English, I would rather keep my government out of business and have it as a means of protecting me from exploitation by others than have it become the exploiter, as appears to be the goal of your organization.

I am rather amused that you take a figure of 6 percent as what you consider to be a fair rate of return on investment and then endeavor to fool the people of this Nation into believing that 38 privately owned electric utilities are cheating the American people out of $1,359 million. Why did you not use 5 percent and prove that this cheating was over $2 billion, or 4 percent and prove that it was better than $3 billion? Or why not 1 percent, because any amount of profit in the eyes of some would be excessive? Or, by the same token, why could we not say that 8 or 9 or even 10 percent was a fair return upon the investment and in that way prove that the American people were cheating the power companies.

Here in Utah the Public Service Commission made a thorough audit of the records of the power company and its expenditures and then decided that a net profit of 6.3 percent was fair. Are you assuming that only you, who are in opposition to the private power companies, are the sole judges of what is a fair profit insofar as your own competitor is concerned?

If there are any injustices today that concern a great majority of the American people, it is the fact that your organization has been given preferred consideration under the law which favors a few at the expense of the many. As an illustration, under the Tennessee Valley Authority, all of the people getting electric service in that area get a preferred rate brought about by the fact that you do not pay the same rate of interest on your borrowed money as your competitors. Nor do you pay an equivalent amount of tax, thus making it possible for a lower rate to your consumer, which means that all of the other people in the United States not only pay their own bills for electricity but pay a portion of the bills of those who are under your rural electrification program.

I know, as another illustration, that the American people are paying interest on our national debt at the rate of 3.8 percent; yet, our Government, dishonestly and corruptly, loans money to your organization and those whom you represent at the rate of 2 percent. When we consider that approximately $4 billion of the people's money is costing the American taxpayers 1.8 percent more than Government charges a preferred group like yourselves, those of you who participate in this giveaway should hang your heads in shame, instead of spending the people's money to misrepresent the facts and spread your misleading propaganda in a pamphlet such as you have mailed to me.

Personally, I get sick to my stomach when I note the greed that is displayed by many of the leaders in our country today. But I think what makes me the sickest is when I see a group like yourselves putting into practice your greed and selfishness under the protection of a Government that is sworn to protect all of its people. How in the world can you honestly and with a straight face accuse others of greed and selfishness when the record of those you represent is far worse?

I am sending a copy of this letter to as many Congressmen and Senators as I feel might be interested. I repeat once more that I prefer to have my government curb the abuses of its citizens when they exploit one another than have my government become the exploiter which is the goal you apparently seek. I can defend myself against a corrupt neighbor, but I have no defense against a corrupt government.

Sincerely submitted,

J. Bracken Lee.

A Versatile Air Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an excellent article entitled, "A Versatile Air Fleet" which appeared in the May-June issue of Weapons Technology. The article was written by Col. J. H. Reinburg, U.S. Marine Corps, retired. The author of this timely and challenging discussion is well qualified to discuss aircraft types. A veteran of World War II, Colonel Reinburg was credited with several Japanese planes and was later made a group commander. It is believed he is one of America's leading authorities today on this subject. The article follows:

A Versatile Air Fleet—Reduction of Aircraft Types Could Solve Numbers-Cost Dilemma

(By Col. J. H. Reinburg)

Modern aerodynamic advances have expanded the speed spectrum of manned aircraft from about 30 to 440 knots of the pre-World War II days to zero to 1,600 knots-plus today, using air-breathing engines. The costs of producing and operating present day aircraft have risen proportionately. Expenditures are further increased by the fact that more types of aircraft are required for effective and efficient utilization throughout this exploded velocity band.

Successful modern warfare techniques and practices indicate that many aircraft are needed for multitudes of missions to support armies and fleets. Due to the exorbitant costs of our aviation requirements, we have insufficient numbers of aircraft to ensure that we could win a major war even though our individual machines are the best in the world.

A case in point is Nazi Germany which had aircraft with performance superior to ours, but we then had so many more sufficiently useful craft that we were able to win by sheer numbers.

To overcome the cost-numbers dilemma, we must closely scrutinize all our required manned aircraft missions in order to design each flying machine type to encompass as many of these jobs as possible. In this way we may be able to have and operate adequate numbers.

Today, for all practical purposes, we have reached a plateau for flying in our atmosphere because of engine availability. The reciprocating engine using pistons is essentially obsolete for modern military aircraft and has been replaced by the gas-turbine engine. Configured as a turbojet, or fan, it can push the flying machine along at better than 1,600 knots at about 45,000 feet of altitude. At sea level, however, it has difficulty getting past about 900 knots. The limitation of speed is not aerodynamics but engine temperature. As better metals are perfected, greater flying speeds will be possible.

The gas-turbine engine with a propeller geared down from its turbine shaft becomes a turboprop or propjet powerplant. Speed restriction here is established by propeller-tip speeds, thereby limiting the aircraft to about 500 knots.

The turboshaft version of the gas-turbine engine has proved to be excellent for helicopters.

Ramjet engines are available that can push aircraft along much faster than turbojets, but they are very difficult and uneconomical to use with aluminum aircraft. Mounted on stainless-steel flying machines, ramjets can hit mach 4 at about 80,000 feet of altitude. They show little promise for modern useful manned warplanes.

Considering that the gas-turbine engine will be the mainstay powerplant for operational manned military aircraft for the next decade, we can make economical speed groupings accordingly. Any military missions that can best be done in the speed band of 0–150 knots belongs to the helicopter. Missions that can best be done in the area of 150–400 knots will get the best service out of turboprop-powered aircraft. Missions requiring higher speeds clearly belong to turbojet-powered aircraft.

Of great influence on military aircraft designs today is VTOL (vertical take-off and landing) capability because aircraft of this type obviate the need for long and expensive runways.

The helicopter is the original VTOL machine and is still the simplest and cheapest. It performs very well from zero speed to about 150 knots. Certain types can come close to 200 knots, but this seems to be near the aerodynamic limit for rotary-wing aircraft.

The next types of VTOL machines in order of top speed possibilities are those whose engines turn propellers, ducted or unducted. Level flight speed will have the usual limitation of propellers, about 480 knots.

A third category of VTOL flying machines is powered by jet engines depending solely upon the blast of gases for propulsion. These airplanes can fly as fast as 1,500 knots, if so designed.

A common set of problems to the above two types of VTOL aircraft is that extra mechanism is required for the combination of vertical and horizontal flight transition which induces an obvious payload reduction. This also increases fuel consumption thereby curtailing combat radius when compared with fixed-wing airplanes using runways.

If VTOL aircraft are capable of rolling along a runway to gather speed for a moving takeoff, they can encompass the STOL (short takeoff and landing) requirement and carry a greater payload under such conditions. Such airplanes are sometimes called V/STOL types and usually slightly compromise the best qualities of the two.

STOL airplanes are fixed-wing (which includes tilt-wing) vehicles that make the most of artificial lift devices such as flaps, slots, leading-edge droop, and boundary-layer control. With such help they can take off and land on a short length of runway.

STOL runway length definitions vary somewhat because it is difficult to be firm about the distance; however, present general opinion seems to accept the 1,000-foot figure.

Although some people might differ in terminology, the basic military missions today are: Movement of personnel (including casualties) and cargo, paratroop and supply dropping, observation, surveillance, artillery spotting, naval gunfire spotting, surface-to-surface missile spotting, close air support, armed reconnaissance, airborne artillery, helicopter escort, bomber escort (including transports), all-weather air defense, interdiction, photography, electronic countermeasures, antisubmarine warfare, airborne early warning, torpedo dropping at sea, strategic bombing, in-flight refueling, administration, and training.

Most of the above missions also are naval aircraft requirements, especially when supporting the Marine Corps. Of special note is the fact that most naval aircraft must be capable of operating from aircraft carriers.

Aircraft that are designed to carry cargo also can be configured to carry personnel, including casualties. These same aircraft are best for the dropping of paratroops and supplies with little performance compromise. Speed is important because it increases the mobility of land and sea forces.

We now have excellent cargo- and personnel-carrying aircraft, including rotary-wing as well as fixed-wing vehicles. They are excellent and adequate for all the above jobs. Any or all of them easily can be modified to perform inight refueling missions and must be selected according to the performance of the aircraft to be refueled.

The cargo-personnel helicopters now use turbine power and cruise at about 150 knots. The other types of these cargo-personnel airplanes are of the fixed-wing variety and use either piston or gas-turbine engines, but the piston variety are rapidly being replaced.

The turboprop-powered transports have STOL qualities and have a maximum cruising speed of about 350 knots. The turbojet (fan)-powered airliners can cruise about 550 knots, but they require long and expensive runways because of their great weight and fast takeoff speeds.

VTOL cargo-personnel fixed-wing aircraft now are being prototyped that will cruise about 300 knots for about 1,000 miles, and in a few years these aircraft may be useful for this intermediate job. In the meantime, STOL aircraft and helicopters are available, and it appears that it will be a long time before it will be practical to replace them.

Low-altitude close-air-support (LACAS) aircraft emcompass the following missions: close air support, armed reconnaissance, airborne artillery, helicopter escort, observation, gunfire spotting, missile spotting, antisubmarine warfare, surveillance, and inflight refueling (using the buddy system).

To perform these missions properly, aircraft must fly close to the surface. Slow speeds are best for human observers to see as much as possible. However, if there is any chance of enemy return fire with guns or missiles from the ground or hostile aircraft, speed, maneuverability, and terrain coverage must be utilized to the fullest.

Combat experience has proved that hostile action always must be expected, but if speeds between 200–400 knots are maintained along with terrain coverage and maneuverability, adequate immunization can be achieved. Beyond 400 knots, low-flying aircraft frequently will be subjected to severe and dangerous air turbulence, and very little ground activity can be scrutinized and comprehended by the human eye.

A great deal of progress is being made in electronic equipment for observation and surveillance. When such equipment becomes operational, faster speeds may be in order. However, it will be a long time before the human eye is completely replaced by electronic means. In the meantime, safety and sighting confines LACAS operating speeds to 200–400 knots.

Modern armies and ocean fleets cannot be successful in battle without the direct support of many aircraft performing these LACAS missions. One basic type of airplane using turboprop power and having STOL performance can handle these missions adequately.

This is by far the best compromise between cost and performance so that adequate numbers always will be available. Good progress is being made in research and development for a VTOL jet aircraft that could accomplish some of these LACAS missions. However, costs always will be greater along with reduced payloads and the ever-present ground-impingement problem so their use will be confined to the special and sometimes tougher missions.

A small turbine-powered helicopter will be very useful on the LACAS missions where hostile fire is weak or nonexistent. Plans always must be ready to substitute the faster armored and armed fixed-wing airplane for the helicopter where hostile fire is expected or encountered.

All evidence seems to indicate that military aircraft which cannot cruise faster than 200 knots should be helicopters because they have the much desired VTOL capabilities of the simplest and cheapest design.

The LACAS missions can be mutually and properly covered by one basic helicopter and one fixed-wing airplane.

The air-defense, interdiction, and photographic (ADIP) missions are related, and all require supersonic speeds at one phase or another in their work. On air-defense missions, the capability of catching and destroying all enemy aircraft, theoretically, is a must, so the airplane used should be the fastest in the stable.

Experience has shown that the best air-defense airplane can be fitted with ordnance racks under the wings and thereby also become the best airplane for the interdiction missions. Also, when modified for cameras, it becomes an excellent photographic vehicle.

Supersonic flying will consume excessive fuel so that economical cruising will be done at high subsonic speeds. High subsonic speeds will be the limit when interdiction aircraft are attacking ground targets due to the dense air at low altitude. Target approach and retirement often will dictate the fastest supersonic speeds possible.

These three very important combat aircraft employments are essential to land armies as well as ocean fleets. Since one basic type of aircraft can encompass all three missions, a great saving in money can be realized.

The strategic bombing mission requires a large aircraft for long ranges and great ordnance loads. Part of its job now has been taken over by the strategic surface-to-surface missile. However, it would appear to be folly to eliminate the manned strategic bomber in the next decade. Wars always involve men, and their presence in such a strategic vehicle will be useful where the missile has its shortcomings or political or moral restrictions.

The airplane for this mission should be the fastest and highest flying airplane that can be built commensurate with its huge size. Because it will be large and must be strong for supersonic flight, it will be expensive. Consequently, a great deal of money can be saved by using one basic type of airplane.

There is a limited requirement for a SAC reconnaissance-photographic airplane that is, in essence, a jet-powered glider that can fly higher but not faster than any other airplane in the atmosphere. The required numbers are so small that it should have a special and secret label.

The antisubmarine-warfare mission at the present time uses several types of special airplanes. One is a turboprop-powered, subsonic airplane adapted from an airliner. Consequently, this mission also could be performed by a turboprop cargo airplane. The second special airplane is smaller and capable of operating from aircraft carriers.

It may be difficult to convince some people, but the LACAS fixed-wing airplane modified for carrier operations could replace this airplane. The helicopter also is useful for ASW work. The torpedo-dropping mission can be done by the LACAS fixed-wing or ADIP airplane as well as it has ever been done by any airplane in the past.

The electronic countermeasures mission requires extensive electronic equipment which can be mounted in many airplanes. Depending upon the performance desired, most any aircraft designed for other missions can be used.

The airborne early warning mission also requires a great deal of electronic equipment with large external antennas. Most large cargo-passenger aircraft can be modified to do this work.

The administrative mission should not be classed as a combat job, but it is very necessary in peace and war. Courier duties and the movement of a few important people are vital.

The small helicopter and the LACAS fixed-wing aircraft fill the requirement for administrative types rather neatly. Such aircraft already will be in production for combat organizations, and larger production orders will reduce the unit costs. The small helicopter will be useful on trips up to about 200 miles while the LACAS vehicle will be excellent for trips up to about 1,000 miles.

In the foreseeable limited or conventional wars, military aircraft will be in three categories: (1) Turbine-powered helicopters covering the operational speed band from 0–200 knots; (2) turboprop-powered airplanes covering the operational speed segmentof 200–400 knots; and (3) turbojet (fan) powered fixed-wing airplanes covering the operational speed spread of about 400–1,500 (plus?) knots.

In the first category, three basic types of helicopters will be required:

1. A small helicopter weighing about 6,000 pounds maximum gross for hauling light cargo or a few passengers. It will be useful for observation, surveillance, spotting, armed reconnaissance, airborne artillery, helicopter escort, and administrative missions.

2. A medium-size helicopter with a maximum gross weight of about 25,000 pounds for hauling cargo and personnel. It might be used for paratroop and cargo drops and might be armed for helicopter escort and possibly even for inflight refueling.

3. A heavy helicopter with a maximum gross weight of about 50,000 pounds to haul cargo and personnel.

In category 2, three types of airplanes will be needed:

1. The low-altitude close-air-support (LACAS) airplane with a maximum gross weight of about 9,000 pounds. It will be the workhorse for close air support, observation, spotting, armed reconnaissance, helicopter escort, surveillance, and administrative flights.

2. A medium cargo-passenger airplane with a maximum gross weight of about 30,000 pounds.

3. A heavy cargo-passenger airplane with a maximum gross weight of about 150,000 pounds.

These latter two cargo-passenger airplanes also will be used for paratroop and cargo drops. All three of these turboprop-powered aircraft will have STOL performance. They also will have quick modification capabilities for inflight refueling.

In category 3 there is an obvious requirement for three types of aircraft powered by turbojet (fan) engines:

1. A fighter-bomber for air defense, interdiction, bomber escort, and photographic missions. This airplane will have a maximum gross weight of about 30,000 pounds and operate comfortably in the 400–1,500-knot area. Besides its regular missions, it will be useful on close-air-support missions considered too heavily defended for the LACAS airplane. It also will be capable of the buddy type of in-flight refueling.

2. A strategic bomber, the fastest that can be designed to carry large bomb loads be-

tween continents. Its maximum gross weight will be in the neighborhood of 200,000 pounds, and supersonic speeds are desired. In-flight refueling capabilities must be present.

3. A transport airplane for the long-range hauling of cargo and personnel. A version of this airplane should be configured as an in-flight refueler.

In conclusion, it appears that, for the best effectiveness and acceptable costs, our military aircraft stable would be adequately served by nine very versatile and distinct types of aircraft: three turbine-powered helicopters, three turboprop-powered airplanes, and three turbojet (fan)-powered airplanes. Logistics will be greatly simplified by the all-gas-turbine fleet. To keep this stable modern, expensive research, and development work must be continuous, and the above operational aircraft must be replaced as technical advances and new military tactics dictate.

Voting for Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, written by Editor Frank Boyd, appeared in the May 16 issue of the Overbrook (Kans.) Citizen. Here is more and plain evidence that the great majority of our people believe that the answer to the farm problem does not lie in New Frontier socialism.

VOTING FOR FREEDOM?

Farmers will vote Tuesday in the wheat referendum.

This is the best chance they've had in a quarter century to get out from under Government control, but they probably will not accept the challenge to manage their own business.

The vast bureaucracy of the Department of Agriculture is "running scared" in the face of increasing discontent with its operation of the country's most vital industry. The USDA has loosed its horde of employees and all its publicity resources in the greatest propaganda campaign in its history.

Not only farmers, but also city taxpayers, who have no voice in the matter, are footing the bill as Federal employees, in violation of the Hatch Act, stump the country in favor of a "Yes" vote. They are paying the bill as the Department abuses its free mailing privilege to distribute misleading information.

The most vicious aspect of the campaign is the USDA's use of subterfuge, half-truths and veiled threats of chaos. According to the Department's propagandists, approval of more rigid controls will insure high incomes for farmers, while a "No" vote will result in the immediate return of a disasterous agricultural depression.

The fact is that the new plan guarantees $2 a bushel for only part of the wheat grown, and that part can be reduced "at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture."

The USDA has made a great play for the vote of the 15-acre wheat farmer in the belief that he is not seriously in the business anyway so he will vote for any sort of handout.

To make sure he was hooked in advance, the Department required that he sign up with the acreage allotment plan befor he could vote in the referendum.

Farm organizations echoing the Government's propaganda line are those that owe their existence to socialistic legislation, although they hotly deny it, partly through ignorance of socialism.

Standing almost alone in firm opposition to the Government's plan for greater controls is the Farm Bureau, last stronghold of the independent farmer.

This is not a "take it or leave it" issue, as the Department of Agriculture would have the farmer believe. Congress is still in session, and if enough farmers get up on their hind legs to vote down the current plan, the lawmakers will come up with something more acceptable.

So far, the farmers reluctantly have approved increased Government controls in in every wheat referendum—and remained unhappy with the results.

Isn't it time to try an alternative?

Sokol Milwaukee Gymnastic Association Celebrates Its 95th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, May 18, 1963, saw the celebration of the 95th anniversary of the Sokol Milwaukee Gymnastic Association at Bohemian Hall, Milwaukee. From its founding in 1868, the Milwaukee Sokol has worked hard and successfully for the twin goals of physical fitness and human brotherhood. At the 95th anniversary celebration on May 18, addresses were given by Master of Ceremonies Fred C. Stankovsky, President August A. Shabart of the Milwaukee Sokol, President James Simaner of the Central District American Sokol Organization, President Karel Prcal of American Sokol Organization, Vice President Blanche Cihak of the American Sokol Organization, President Ethel Pivonka of the Sokolic Milwaukee, Judge Rudolph Mudrock of Milwaukee County Court, Sheriff Michael Wolke of Milwaukee, and Representative Henry S. Reuss.

An excellent history of Sokol Milwaukee, 1868–1963, was presented by Mrs. Emily Stankovsky:

In June 1868, 95 years ago, a sagacious body of Czech people organized the Sokol Milwaukee Gymnastic Association which is now the fourth oldest Sokol organization in America. They fully realized that the keystone of life is youth, and that upon its rests the burden of future progress. The aims and ideals were not only to attain physical perfection in youth, but to advance physical and moral standards of every man and woman. Great emphasis was placed on the development of the body since a healthy body has a healthy mind. These principles and ideals have never been altered, but have been handed down year after year in the same unfaltering spirit which inspired our fathers to champion the brotherhood of man and the cause of human liberty. The need for them is as great, if not greater, than 95 years ago.

It is beyond the scope of this article to describe fully the various activities of the organization. It is worthwhile to record a few of the outstanding events. The first which occurred was the opening of the gymnasium in January, 1869, at which time Frank Bures became its first instructor. The first gymnastic exhibition was held in March of the same year. In August of 1872 the Bohemian School was founded.

The Sokol Ladies Gymnastic, Association came into being in 1890 and became a part of Sokols. This position was maintained until 1899 at which time the ladies founded their own organization. Too much praise cannot be given to the ladies for their splendid cooperation and zealous efforts to promote the welfare of both organizations.

In 1891 Sokol Milwaukee played host to the National Sokol Organization which held its meet in our city. Later in the same year, the ground on which the present hall is situated was purchased. In September of 1895, the laying of the cornerstone was celebrate and the Bohemian Hall was officially opened and dedicated to its purpose in December of the same year.

At the fifth international meet which was held in Prague, Czechoslovakia, in 1907, Albert Kostlan represented Sokol Milwaukee. Our representative at the ninth international meet in 1932 was Edmund Falarsh.

Sokol Milwaukee celebrated its 50th anniversary in 1918 by presenting a gymnastic exhibition at Washington Park. From that time to the present, the following have devoted, unselfishly, many years as instructors of our gym classes: Frank Stepanek, Charles Richter, Fred Stankovsky, and Emily Falarsh. Others who also gave of their time to teach during these years were Joseph Ondracek, Joe Slavata, Jerome Zelenka, Mildred Liska, Joe Klint, Howard Washic, Norma Suchy, and Vera Mojko.

On our 80th anniversary we played host to visiting gyms from various States. During all these years our teams took part in numerous meets and exhibitions and won many first, second and third place trophies. In competitive meets with the German Turners (five organizations) we placed first for 3 consecutive years, thus winning the team trophy permanently.

We also presented gymnastic numbers and folk dances in all of the international folk fairs which are held annually at the Milwaukee Auditorium-Arena as well as TV and PTA programs. In fact, our 80th anniversary exhibition was the first Sokol activity to be televised.

The International Institute of Milwaukee inaugurated a folk ball at which all nationality groups selected a princess to represent them. At the peak of the evening one of the princesses was crowned folk ball queen and reigned for a year. Our princesses were: Jean Falarsh, 1960; Vera Macek, 1961; Dorothy Greiner, 1962, who was crowned folk ball queen, and a lovely poised queen she was, and Carol Greiner, 1963. We were proud of all of our princesses and felt they were all truly queens.

Another contributing factor to the success of Sokol Milwaukee is the sewing circle which is composed of women who work diligently the year round creating and producing handicraft items which are sold at the annual folk fairs.

Our present physical directors' board has worked together assiduously for many years. Fred Stankovsky has retained the position of chief physical director for the past 30 years and Emily Falarsh has been our chief physical directress for 35 years. Enduring credit must be given to this group and the officers of both organizations for retaining the Sokol idea alive in Milwaukee.

We owe a debt of gratitude to all of our members who have worked so hard for Sokol Milwaukee. Let us, therefore, be encouraged by the past, inspired with the ideals our fathers loved, rejoice in our inheritance and resolve to carry them on for those who follow.

Appendix

Another Crisis Building Up in Cuba While White House Fiddles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, last October the failure of President Kennedy to recognize the buildup of a crisis in Cuba brought us almost to the brink of war. Unfortunately, the firm stand enunciated by the President at that time was immediately replaced with a return to a policy of accommodation of the Soviet Union with the result that a new Cuban crisis is developing. The same dangerous lack of intelligence and the same tragic misunderstanding of the situation by the White House seems to be taking place.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we face the realism of Cuba. The President must tell the American people the truth about Cuba and the Soviet buildup there. He must take positive action to end Communist aggression in this hemisphere by reimposing the Monroe Doctrine, by enacting an effective blockade to halt the shipment of strategic materials into Cuba, including oil, by setting a time limit for Khrushchev to get all the Russian troops and weapons out of Cuba.

The dangerous intelligence gap now existing is exposed in the following article by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott in the Washington World. Apparently, President Kennedy unilaterally, through limited surveillance, is denying us information on missile, arms, troops buildup, and on the export of subversion. If these buildups are indeed going on, President Kennedy is guilty of both withholding information from the American people and failing to protect them from the military danger.

The article follows;

CONCILIATION CAUSES INTELLIGENCE GAP ON CUBA—TRUCK TRAFFIC HEAVY TO AND FROM CAVES; HUGE TENTS ARE ERECTED, RAIL LINE BUILT

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

A potentially highly dangerous intelligence gap—strikingly similar to that immediately preceding the war-fraught missile crisis last October—is again developing in Cuba.

Following is what is transpiring there:

Low-level reconnaissance flights have been suspended since February 9. It was such sorties that produced the irrefutable aerial photos of the medium-range ballistic missiles and IL–28 bombers on the Red-ruled island. The halting of low-level reconnaissance flights since February is on direct orders of the President. No reconnaissance flights of any kind can be made over Cuba without his approval.

High-level U–2 reconnaissance flights are being kept to a minimum and the aerial photos they produce are raising more questions than they answer.

In recent weeks, at least four wide-hatched Russian freighters have docked in Cuban ports and unloaded their cargoes under cover of darkness. The same kind of drum-tight secrecy prevailed last year when the nuclear-armed missiles and IL–28 bombers were shipped there.

Several of these wide-hatched Soviet freighters were armed with 3-inch guns. These are the first armed Communist cargo vessels to appear in the Caribbean.

The administration's iron-handed crackdown on refugee raids is seriously impairing the flow of information from Cuba, particularly from the anti-Castro underground that has been an important source of military information. That has been valuable in planning U–2 reconnaissance flights, providing them with specific targets and missions. Intelligence agents have worked closely with the raiders and the underground.

"DON'T ROCK THE BOAT"

Inside explanation for this extraordinary backstage policy is the President's determination that nothing be done to "rock the boat" in Cuba.

That's the reason given congressional leaders who have been apprised of this undisclosed intelligence gap and are greatly disturbed. They have been told the President believes his conciliatory course will lead to the withdrawal of more Russian troops from Cuba.

The congressional leaders have been informed that the President and Premier Khrushchev have exchanged a number of letters on this thorny issue.

The intelligence gap is causing particular concern among U.S. military authorities because of three baffling developments in Cuba.

These showed up in recent high-level photos, but beyond bringing the disturbing discoveries to light no detailed information has been obtained—due to the lack of low-level reconnaissance flights, the drastic curbs on raiders and the adverse effect that has had on contacts with, and the operations of, the underground.

THREE MYSTERIES

The three disturbing mysteries are as follows:

The appearance of large numbers of Russian tents, some of them big enough to enclose missiles and their launchers.

Heavy transport traffic to and from areas where large caves are known to be. It has long been reported, by refugees and other sources, that the Reds are storing missiles and arms in caves.

Construction of a rail line to a major Soviet camp area. Apparently this camp is to undergo extensive development of some kind.

Intelligence authorities are divided on the reason for the appearance of the armed Russian freighters.

One group is of the opinion the Reds' intent is to ward off refugee attacks. Another group sees a great deal more behind this move. It contends the armed cargo ships are Khrushchev's warning to the United States that another naval blockade will not be tolerated, and that these armed vessels are being used to transport Castro agents to Latin American countries.

Members of the U.S. Intelligence Board, headed by Central Intelligence Director John McCone, are privately making no secret of their uneasiness over this backstage situation.

FIVE SOURCES OF DATA

They point out that information about Soviet military activities in Cuba is now being obtained chiefly from five sources, as follows: (1) U–2 reconnaissance flights, which are not effective when camouflage is extensively used and when such flights are made infrequently; (2) Cubans allowed to leave by the Castro regime; (3) naval surveillance of ships going to Cuba; (4) newsmen and others invited by Castro; (5) foreign embassies in Havana.

All these sources have serious shortcomings. This is graphically demonstrated by the fact that none of them has been able to provide any definite information on the number of Soviet forces in Cuba.

The totals range from President Kennedy's 13,000 to 60,000 reported by a former Cuban bus driver. Before coming to the United States recently, he traveled extensively throughout the island and carefully noted the number and size of Russian camps and their forces.

Maryland Community Racial Armistice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, a Maryland circuit judge, who secured an armistice in a racially disturbed community in Maryland, has come in for some worthy praise in the lead editorial of yesterday's issue of Washington (D.C.) Evening Star. Under the heading "Uneasy Armistice," the newspaper editor refers to the role of racial negotiator assumed by Circuit Judge W. Laird Henry, Jr., in Cambridge, Md. The editorial points out that the armistice secured by Judge Henry is a vitally important and necessary step toward negotiation and ultimate settlement. Mr. President, in my own opinion, the action prompted by the Maryland judge is definitely a step forward.

I ask unanimous consent to have the Evening Star editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNEASY ARMISTICE

Circuit Judge W. Laird Henry, Jr., of Cambridge, Md., has shown that he is both a moderate and a sensible man.

He emerged as a moderate when he took the lead in trying to arrange a settlement between Negroes who have been directing demonstrations in Cambridge and white elements of that small Eastern Shore community. It could hardly have been easy for Judge Henry to assume this role. A descendant of Maryland's first Governor, he had been an opponent of integration. And since the judgeship he holds is an elective office, he is taking an obvious personal risk. The great need, however, is for moderates on both sides to assert themselves in racially troubled communities, and Judge Henry is to be commended for the example he has set.

The judge has also shown himself to be a sensible man in saying that what prevails in Cambridge is an "armistice"—not a settlement.

This, of course, is true. But without an armistice, one could hardly hope for that climate in which useful negotiations become possible. Now, in Cambridge, negotiations can go forward. Judge Henry will continue to take the lead, and unless extremists on one side or the other kick over the traces a settlement is at least possible. Eventually, a negotiated settlement will come. Judge Henry's big contribution is that he has made this possible now—and without further racial strife.—Editorial, The Evening Star, Washington, D.C., May 20, 1963.

The Secrecy Boomerang

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Aviation Week and Space Technology, March 18, 1963:

THE SECRECY BOOMERANG

The Kennedy administration is obviously bewildered by the persistence and the scope of attacks on its major policies in the field of foreign relations and defense that have driven it back into defensive positions at a time when it expected to be basking in the sun of public plaudits for its actions. Its bewilderment over why this has happened is rather sad, because it is obvious to most of its critics and questioners that the primary reason for this state of affairs has been the boomerang of its policies of official secrecy and attempted management of the news. Top level administration officials from the President through the Defense and State Departments feel the heavy impact from this boomerang, but don't appear yet to know that it was launched many, many months ago from their own hands.

The Kennedy administration began its tenure with an amateurish approach to the problems of military security, perhaps because so few of its top-level policymakers had had much prior experience with this subject in its modern context. They were horrified by the amount of information available through normal channels, and they had no real appreciation of what was genuine military security and what information was really necessary to lubricate the wheels of technical progress in the type of society we are dedicated to maintaining. They looked enviously at the tight information control in the closed society of the U.S.S.R., and, whether deliberately or subconsciously, they began to emulate many of its worst features. There is also a theory that these administration information policies stemmed from the Boston Brahman tradition that even though democracy prevailed, it should be operated by a special class of superior people who should tell those they governed as little as possible about what is really being done with their tax dollars, and Government.

POLICY OF DECEPTION

At any rate, when the first major crisis of the Kennedy administration broke in the Bay of Pigs, it adopted the policy later advocated so shrilly by Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, that the Government has a right to lie in an attempt to deceive an enemy even if this also means deceiving its own people. It is now evident that the Government did a great deal of lying about what went on just before and during the Bay of Pigs fiasco. While this official lying may have been intended to deceive the enemy, we think it would be difficult to make a valid case on this score. The subsequent record suggests that it was really motivated by a self-serving desire to preserve a governmental image that the facts would not support.

In any event, the administration made its decision at the time of the Bay of Pigs invasion to manage the news to suits its own ends, and it has continued to try to do so in every major international crisis since. In a free society with a free press it is difficult to suppress the facts for long, and it is impossible to manage the news very effectively to maintain the desired image for very long if the facts do not support it. Thus the facts have been popping up about what really occurred in Cuba from the Bay of Pigs to the missile crisis of last fall, and each new fact pulls a prop out from under the version dispensed by the official news managers and their talented amateur assistants. Each new fact that proves to be at variance with the official stories told at the time also erodes public confidence both at home and abroad in the integrity and credibility of the public officials involved.

This is why the Kennedy administration is receiving precious little credit for any of its recent maneuvers even when those maneuvers, if fully and honestly explained, would merit plaudits instead of brickbats. The entire problem of NATO nuclear deterrent forces has been handled with the same cavalier disregard for the facts and crudely managed attempts to conceal what is really occurring. From the Skybolt cancellation through the Polaris submarine and surface ship NATO deterrent proposals, it is difficult for anybody here or in Europe to follow the swift shifting of contradictory justifications under which real motivations and policy are thinly concealed.

SUSPICION ABROAD

There is now a widespread suspicion in Europe as a result of all this that there is some secret or tacit agreement between the White House and the Kremlin involving a U.S. nuclear disengagement in Europe in exchange for the Soviet withdrawal of missiles and troops from Cuba. Certainly the net result of the Skybolt fiasco was to take Britain out of the effective nuclear deterrent business for a long time. When the real costs of Polaris submarines are faced in the British defense budget, this proposed force will disappear like a mirage. The withdrawal of Jupiter IRBM's from Turkey and Italy appears to be part of this pattern, even though the administration stoutly denies it. The ire directed against the French effort to maintain a nuclear striking force under its own flag also lends credence to this theory.

It is ironic that the louder the Kennedy administration now denies these rumors, the more credence they gain because people remember the similar denials and assurances given at the time of the Cuban crises that later proved to be deliberate errors of fact justified in the name of expediency.

This Nation is still a free society and its policies must rise or fall on their degree of public support. The people of this Nation are not used to being deliberately deceived by their elected or appointive officials, nor will they tolerate it for long. Until the Kennedy administration recognizes this simple fact and revises its methods of explaining its policies to the American people, it is likely to encounter increasing suspicion of its motives and diminishing support for its policies.

ROBERT HOTZ.

Mast of the Battleship U.S.S. "West Virginia" Dedicated as a Memorial to War Dead in Impressive Ceremonies at State University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 11, 1963, West Virginia University was the scene of a significant tribute to the gallant crew of the U.S.S. *West Virginia*, and to all those West Virginians who have so nobly served in the Armed Forces of our country.

More than 1,000 spectators gathered on the campus as the mainmast of that once mighty battleship was dedicated as a memorial. The ceremony brought to successful climax a project which captured the imagination of the student body, and which required the coordinated efforts of private industry and public officials and faculty members.

Taking place during West Virginia's centennial year, 1963, and as a part of the university's greater West Virginia weekend, the dedication ceremony was impressive in its direct simplicity. Adm. Felix B. Stump, U.S. Navy, retired, from Parkersburg, W. Va., was the principal speaker. Following his remarks, the mast was officially presented to university president, Dr. Paul A. Miller, by Lt. Comdr. Ralph L. Hooton, U.S. Navy, of Rowlesburg, W. Va. The Preston County hero gave meaningful remarks reminiscent of the ships stirring battle encounters. Lieutenant Commander Hooton was stationed aboard the U.S.S. *West Virginia* when she was sunk by enemy action at Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941.

Also in attendance on this notable occasion were: the Honorable W. W. Barron, Governor of West Virginia; Joseph C. Gluck, past department chaplain of VFW, and now director of student affairs at West Virginia University; officials of the West Virginia Department of Veterans of Foreign Wars; leaders of the American Legion in West Virginia; faculty members; and representatives of the student body. It was indeed a privilege for me to be present and to have the opportunity to participate in the dedication of a memorial so rich in history and meaning.

The 55-foot spar, which weighs 8 tons, stands in the center of a beautifully landscaped terrace centrally located on the university's main campus. As an 18-gun salute boomed, and flags of the United States, the State of West Virginia, and West Virginia University flew at half-mast, an appreciative and reflective audience watched the proceedings.

In the crowd was Jack Bowman, a third-year law student who, in 1959, had interested the student government in the project of acquiring the mast. The student newspaper the Daily Athenaeum editorially recommended a memorial to the 105 men who lost their lives in the sinking of the huge battleship—and thus the idea gained widespread support.

Raised from the waters of Pearl Harbor and reactivated as a fighting warship, the "Wee Vee" was removed from active service in 1948. When readied for scrapping it was owned by a New York firm, was located on the west coast, was being scrapped by a concern from Chicago, and operations were being delayed by a longshoremen's strike. Surmounting these complications, the student body launched a lengthy fundraising campaign to pay for shipping charges and reassembly of the mast. Costs were estimated at $2,500.

However, through efforts of sympathetic citizens, free transportation was arranged on the Baltimore and Ohio, Northern Pacific, and Burlington railway lines. I was happy to cooperate in this endeavor. Attorney Robert H. C. Kay, a distinguished alumnus of the university, of Charleston, W. Va., was most helpful.

Additionally, the State Veterans of Foreign Wars and the State Association of Chambers of Commerce lent their valuable support, and a private construction company moved the mast from Huntington to Morgantown.

Thus, on May 11, the mast of the battleship U.S.S. *West Virginia* was enshrined as a memorial to the valor of the men who died aboard her in a terrible war. May this symbol remind us that we must never relax our vigilance, or diminish our efforts to achieve peace and freedom for all the world.

Mr. President, I request that remarks by Dr. Paul A. Miller, president of West Virginia University, and Admiral Felix B. Stump, U.S. Navy, retired, at the dedication of the mast of the U.S.S. *West Virginia*, May 11, 1963, at Morgantown, W. Va., be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEDICATION OF MAST OF U.S.S. "WEST VIRGINIA"

(By Paul A. Miller)

William Butler Yeats, no stranger to the understanding of man, once wrote, "We begin to live when we have conceived life as tragedy." More than two decades ago, the United States was forced into one of the most devastating conflicts ever conceived by mankind. This mast was there. It has been pulled from the mountains of scrap and brought back here, to the place which gave it a name, to assure us that these dead shall not be forgotten. It stands here as a memorial to the tragedy of man; man who has persisted in his refusal to learn how to live, preferring to die. Would that this mast take root here and join the living as an affirmation of life, of humaneness among men; or will it only be poised there, propped up by man, cold, mute, uncomforting. Symbols die too. They rust and fall and join the rest. The hope is that one day, above the ash heaps, there will be those who have learned from this symbol, and its meaning will be full within them, and they may say, "It was right, after all; then men struggled to survive; but before long their children learned to endure; and now, from all of them, we have learned to prevail." Today, let the living revere this mast for its meaning sent up from the past, and honor it for all it symbolizes for the future. Let it be a living symbol for this land and for this people; and for West Virginia, let it stand for a resurrection and new life, with deepening hope and future promise. Most of all, may man learn from the tragedies of his life to cherish and to honor men, both the living and the dead.

ADDRESS BY ADM. FELIX B. STUMP, U.S. NAVY, RETIRED, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE MAST OF THE U.S.S. WEST VIRGINIA, WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY, MORGANTOWN, W. VA., MAY 11, 1963

Governor Barron, Senator Randolph, President Miller, Mr. Haslem, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor and a pleasure to return to my native State on this worthy and patriotic occasion. West Virginians are, I believe, universally proud of their West Virginia heritage and I have found that none are less proud than those of us who by force of circumstances live outside the State. West Virginians can be proud of this great university, students of which took the lead in preserving the mast of the U.S.S. *West Virginia* as a permanent memorial to West Virginians who have served in the Armed Forces of their country, many of whom have made the supreme sacrifice to preserve for future generations the freedom won for us by our forefathers in war and peace.

The *West Virginia* was the last of the super dreadnaughts. Some 14 others under construction were destroyed in various stages of completion in a fruitless international disarmament agreement.

The *West Virginia* was first commissioned on December 1, 1923, under the command of Capt. T. J. Senn, later to rise to four-star rank, and the position of commander in chief. A succession of outstanding officers commanded the *West Virginia* throughout its active life, many of whom have risen to high rank.

The *West Virginia* was always known as a happy ship of which the officers and crew were proud. It was always known as an efficient ship and five times won the battle efficiency pennant given annually to the most efficient battleship in the fleet.

West Virginians should have nothing but pride for this fine ship which was named after their State.

At Pearl Harbor the *West Virginia* was sunk by a combination of torpedoes and bombs. One hundred and five officers and enlisted men lost their lives, but there was not one case of any member of the *West Virginia's* crew who did not perform with heroism and efficiency. The captain was mortally wounded.

As the torpedo hits were on one side, the ship took a heavy list which was corrected without orders by the damage control officer by counterflooding so that when the *West Virginia* settled on the bottom it was right side up which made possible its later raising and recommissioning and which also greatly reduced the loss of life.

Many of the officers and men were on shore but made every endeavor to return to their ship to assist in manning the antiaircraft batteries and in fighting the flames. One young ensign from the *West Virginia* upon returning found that he could get aboard only one ship, the *Phoenix*, a cruiser, which was immediately moving out of the harbor. He reported to the captain and asked if he had any need for a turret officer, and upon being told that none was needed, he dove off the *Phoenix* into the water as that ship passed the *West Virginia*, and swam back to his ship and climbed aboard.

The *West Virginia* was raised in 1943 and under her own power steamed back to the Bremerton Navy Yard to be rebuilt. The *West Virginia* returned to the fleet in the western Pacific in the early fall of 1944 after which this fine ship participated in the most important battles against the Japanese, such as, Leyte, Surigao Straits, Mindoro, Lingayen, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa—finally entering Tokyo Bay to witness the surrender of the Japanese on board the U.S.S. *Missouri* in September 1945.

During this time, the *West Virginia* fired in anger over 3,000 16-inch shells, over 2,400 5-inch shells, and over 33,000 smaller antiaircraft projectiles.

In the Battle of Surigao Straits alone the *West Virginia* through its accurate fire in the darkness with radar control sank a large Japanese battleship in 6 minutes. The first salvo was a hit and in this battle alone, the *West Virginia* more than paid back to the Nation the millions of dollars that had been spent on her original construction, on her maintenance through the years, and in her reconstruction after Pearl Harbor.

The highly efficient performance of duty by the U.S.S. *West Virginia* throughout the war, and especially at the Battle of Surigao Straits, was in itself a great tribute to the splendid character, versatility, training, discipline and courage of the type of officers and men who manned the U.S. Navy during the war. During the Surigao Battle, there were on board the *West Virginia* very few officers and men who had even seen battle before and very few, relatively speaking, who had even seen naval service before the war. In fact, most of them had only a little over 2 months' training at sea in the *West Virginia* before they were called upon to demonstrate the efficiency that might be expected from a well-trained crew of professionals.

You can be sure that this mast came from a ship which had always performed in a way that reflected credit upon the U.S. Navy and upon the Nation while carrying the proud name *West Virginia*.

The erection of this mast and its preservation as a monument will remind students and others who come here that our Nation stands ready to fight to preserve its freedom and that the word "patriotism" is not obsolete, but that patriotism represents a dedication to our beloved United States which West Virginians and other Americans will carry foremost in their hearts in the years to come.

The Attorney General in Dixie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate and violent reactions to the race problem in Alabama has focused the attention of this Nation and the greater portion of the world on this area. Our newspapers have portrayed the incidents in pictures, print, and editorials. One such editorial in the April 27 issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer has drawn my attention. It is a good editorial and does credit to the subject. However, I cannot help but disagree with that portion which indicates the Attorney General should have laid more stress on the legal and moral basis underlying the equality of civil rights to which all Negroes are entitled when he recently visited several Southern States.

Certainly the Attorney General has stressed these legal principles in all his public utterances on the subject. Our courts have constantly stressed it in the various decisions rendered over the past several years. In fact, it is there, prevailing above all else, and cannot be cast aside by misinterpretation, or by those who fail or refuse to recognize it. It is a basic fact of law, it has been decided, and should not be an issue at this late date.

The Attorney General's visit to the South was predicated on reason, a mutual understanding of the problem, an appeal if you will, to the better emotions of those involved in the struggle, and above all a forthright effort to avoid the unfortunate incidents which came about, to the shame and discredit of all of us.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks I insert the above-mentioned editorial in the RECORD:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL IN DIXIE

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy has shown courage, wisdom, and reasonableness in his visit to South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama for public addresses and private conversations on racial problems.

His call to responsible southern leadership for active support of moves to end injustices against Negroes is timely and appropriate. This is a juncture in history when fair-minded southerners need to rise to the challenge. They no longer can afford to maintain an attitude of passive indifference to the evils of bias and bigotry in their midst. It is the duty of public officials and private citizens in the South, as in all sections of the country, to breathe life and meaning into the hallowed principles of equality for all Americans, regardless of race or creed, by practicing and defending the principles in their own States and their own communities.

Mr. Kennedy, speaking as head of the Justice Department, gave credit where credit is due when he commended those people of South Carolina and Georgia who have given full measure of their energy to comply peaceably with the U.S. Constitution and court orders stipulating the abolishment of racial segregation in educational institutions and elsewhere. This is, as the Attorney General noted, in contrast to the situation in Mississippi where Gov. Ross Barnett has led the State down a shameful road of violence and defiance.

Unfortunately, Mr. Kennedy seems not to have received much encouragement in talks with authorities in Alabama. He is said to have described that unhappy land as being "like a foreign country." If he did make that comment it was no exaggeration. The unenlightened views of Gov. George C. Wallace and other white supremacists in Alabama are wholly alien to the American way of life in the mid-20th century. If Governor Wallace has in mind turning Alabama into "another Mississippi" he will win nothing but discredit for himself and the disgust of the Nation.

We believe that Attorney General Kennedy might have been more effective if his addresses to southern audiences had put greater emphasis on the legal and moral rights of Negroes to equality of opportunity in education, in voting, in employment, in housing, etc., instead of stressing the desirability of avoiding agitation and bloodshed. Even if there were no prospect of unrest or violence the entitlement of Negroes to equal justice under the laws of God and country should be upheld under all circumstances and in every State.

The South shall move beyond the crossroads. The Negro shall be free and equal not merely in theory but in fact. Southerners who accept this historic truth and pledge their lives and their honor to its fulfillment are destined to emerge as the leaders of a new and better South.

The Orange Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the fight against racial discrimination takes different forms to meet specific situations. In my home State of New Jersey, one of the major questions raised within recent years has been whether de facto segregation creates the problems similar to those caused by official, entrenched segregation.

Governor Hughes has long been alert to this question. In a letter written to an Englewood councilman on June 18, 1962, the Governor defined the problem and gave his own views on the problem:

> De facto segregation—

He wrote—

> is a term used to denote a racial imbalance generated other than by an intentional gerrymandering of school districts to cause segregation. It results, almost automatically from residential patterns which in turn are based upon social and economic factors. While unintentional, it is equally harmful, as though it were intended. While de facto segregation may be no one's fault, its attempted correction must be everyone's business, if the American and New Jersey's pledge of equality of educational opportunity is to be fulfilled.

The Governor also said that the neighborhood school policy has much to recommend it, and that he was "unconvinced that the neighborhood school policy is so static, unyielding, and inadaptive as to reach this result," to prevent de facto segregation.

On May 16 the State Education Commissioner, Frederick M. Raubinger, ruled that "extreme racial imbalance" in public schools of New Jersey is illegal even though it may be unintended.

This decision, reached after long, patient, and lawful efforts by many persons concerned about true equality in education, set a precedent that will, I am sure, be heartening to everyone who is working for justice in our schools and in all parts of our society. As Governor Hughes said, it was the first time to his knowledge that such an opinion has been reached in any part of the country.

An editorial in the Newark Evening News of May 17 explores some of the other implications of the decision. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ORANGE DECISION

In ordering the Orange School Board to end the "extreme racial imbalance" in Oakwood School, Education Commissioner Raubinger has laid down principles applicable in many communities beset by de facto segregation in their school systems. As a conspicuous example, Governor Hughes mentions Englewood.

The commissioner's conclusion—that segregation has a baneful effect on successful learning—has its origin in the Supreme Court decision of 1954. There the Court, too, held that segregated education is unequal education.

The Court was talking about a school system purposely created to separate pupils according to race. Certainly this is not the design in Orange or in other communities of New Jersey. Here, when excessive racial imbalance occurs in classrooms, it is the product of residential concentrations. Unfortunately, the deleterious result, as in Oakwood School, is the same.

The cure cited by Mr. Raubinger is an obvious one: Eliminate segregated neighborhoods. But, as the commisssioner notes, residential patterns are beyond his office's power to adjust.

In attempting to cope with neighborhood segregation, the legislature has placed a fair housing law on the books. But concentrations remain and as long as they do the school's problems will be aggravated in greater or lesser degree.

Commissioner Raubinger recognizes, as reasonable persons must, the basic advantages of a neighborhood school system. It holds less inconvenience and far fewer traffic hazards than extended travel across town. Consideration also must be given the loss of extracurricular activities and the handicaps imposed by separating school and neighborhood relationships.

But in such cases as Orange, Mr. Raubinger applies the fundamentally sound judgment that 99 percent Negro enrollment constitutes a deprivation of educational opportunity. He calls upon the school board to come up with its own solution by July 1 or accept his recommendation of combining the enrollments of Oakwood and Park schools. This would not produce an ideal solution, but it would level the Negro enrollment at 72 percent.

If we are to learn anything from the Orange controversy it is that negotiation is preferable to litigation in the resolution of community disagreements. This dispute could have been resolved months ago with far less abrasion to community relationships.

There is nothing in the Orange and Englewood situations that can not be solved.

Producer Livestock Program

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, we have here a situation where the Congress is asked to ratify and endorse a practice where on the rancher who sells livestock is assessed an additional tax imposed upon him without his clear consent. The function of this amendment is simply to require that where such a deduction is made by private persons the individual who has the deduction made from his commodities or from the price that he receives shall first give his assent.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple amendment. I think no Member here should object. The seller of livestock who has a deduction of this kind made from a commodity sold by him should have first the opportunity to indicate his assent. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I note that this bill is one that is offered by the Farm Bureau. I know the Farm Bureau has been the great champion of the rights of individuals throughout the years. I know they have been particularly active in protecting the rights of trade unionists from the trade unions themselves. So, Mr. Speaker, I think they would be entirely agreeable and in accord with the purpose of this amendment and they would endorse the idea of having the seller of livestock protected and see to it that when there is a deduction from proceeds of the sale by private parties the seller gives his consent. As a matter of fact, this language is taken practically verbatim from the language of the Wyoming right to work law which was just lobbied through by the National Association of Manufacturers and by the Farm Bureau. So this is an amendment which the Farm Bureau members should wholeheartedly and enthusiastically support since it has been taken from the language of their own bill and since it does nothing but say that when an individual sells property before any portion of the proceds of the sale of his property is taken from him, he has a right to give his full assent and even have his wife consulted, as is done under the right to work statute of which the Farm Bureau and the National Association of Manufacturers are so very very fond.

There is no inconvenience imposed on the promoter by this amendment that the committee bill would not impose on the seller. The amendment outlaws private taxation, even if for a most worthwhile purpose, without consent of the taxed, a principal for which our forebears fought.

On big shipments and little shipments the sales contract will need only indicate a place where the rancher who sells can indicate his assent. To do other than to approve this amendment is to sanction a situation fraught with all manner of possibility of rascility.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Address by Governor of Hawaii Before Hawaii Language Teachers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech delivered by Gov. John A. Burns, of Hawaii, before the Hawaii Language Teachers Association. The speech not only reflects the multilingual composition of the new State of Hawaii, but also is to be commended for the manner in which this linguistic capability can be used in a most productive manner for the progress of the State.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR JOHN A. BURNS BEFORE HAWAII LANGUAGE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION, PRINCESS KAIULANI HOTEL, MAY 10, 1963

It is a great privilege for me to address you language teachers tonight. I must confess I feel at least a little bit inadequate in your company, knownig that each of you has at your command at least one other language besides English. I do have a passing acquaintance with a few phrases in Japanese, Chinese, Filipino and Hawaiian; as a result of my upbringing in our multilingual community, but my knowledge of these languages is not an academic one.

The language in which I think, read and write is English. This is the case with most Americans, and herein lies, in my judgment, one of the major problems facing the Western World today—our indifference and unwillingness to make a real concerted effort to learn other major languages.

My interest in language—any language—is a natural one, having spent most of my life in Hawaii and having been exposed to the melodious rhythm of Filipino dialects, the lively diction of Portuguese, the disciplined monotone of Japanese, the sing-song tones of Chinese and the warm and gentle language of our native Hawaiians.

And as a politican, my interest in language has always been a keen one. Cut a politician's tongue off and you'll be left with a retired statesman.

Seriously though, I have had a lifelong interest in languages, and that is why I am particularly grateful for this opportunity to talk with you tonight.

You represent a class of teachers that I regard as one of the most important in our educational system. It is my hope that eventually, all of the children educated in our public schools will have the opportunity to become fluent in at least one other language besides English. To achieve this, there must be opportunity to expose our schoolchildren to foreign languages at an early age, to begin to unlock for them the mysteries behind different tongues before their minds become more rigid.

I believe it is a commonly accepted conviction in some academic circles that we Americans have been somewhat remiss in our obligation to really get to know people of other tongues. We have been criticized—and not without reason—for depending on people of other cultures to learn our language, without meeting them halfway.

In the high schools of Pakistan, students study English for an hour every day. That is the law in that country. In Japan, students are required to study English also.

So it is that many foreigners have learned and are learning English. This knowledge, however, has not been accompanied by a concomitant understanding of our culture. Through a study of English, foreigners find out about our culture, but this does not mean they understand it.

And in the same manner, most American tourists who visit abroad, unless they speak the language of the countries they visit, do not get a real insight into the peoples they meet.

You have read, I am sure, of some of the proposals this administration has been talking of in the areas of international relations in the Pacific and of our emphasis on education and economic development in Hawaii.

You know then that communications will be an important factor in bringing about the conditions that will improve the lives of all of us and of our children and our children's children.

As language teachers, you thus have an important role to play in the fulfillment of the hopes and aspirations of the people of Hawaii.

There has been a tremendous amount of discussion in our newspapers, magazines, radio, and television about the European Common Market. Nearly everyone agrees that the Common Market will put Europe on a new economic footing and perhaps even set the stage for an eventual United Europe. And this all began with an agreement among certain nations to form a European Coal Community.

The same prospect awaits the emerging nations of the vast Pacific and the continents bordering along the ocean in this hemisphere. We have but to see the opportunities in it and to have the patience to work steadfastly toward the peaceful formation of what could amount to a Pacific Common Market.

And how does all this affect Hawaii? Let me answer by asking a few rhetorical questions:

Where should the headquarters for a Pacific Common Market or an International Trade Center of the Pacific be located?

Does not such a center need established mass communication facilities?

Would it not be logical for such a center to be centrally located and easily accessible and in a climate suitable for year-round operation?

Would it not be logical to place such a center where, over a long period of time, the people have been exposed to a variety of ethnic traditions and cultures, particularly those of the Orient and the Pacific?

Would it not also be logical to establish a center in a cosmopolitan area where there is already a wealth of business, professional and educational experience?

I have naturally been describing Hawaii in the criteria I have just mentioned. To me there is no more logical place to start building an International Trade Center Complex than in our islands. And such a center can be the foundation on which a true Pacific Common Market, based on economic and political ties, can be established.

There are other sites in the Pacific equally suitable, by virtue of physical and geopolitical reasons, for a meeting place of peoples from different lands.

But Hawaii has the basic resource that no other place has—and that is our people. We have the talent to do the things necessary to move a concept and make it a reality.

As we move toward our goal of assuming economic leadership in the Pacific, there will be a need for us to communicate efficiently and thoroughly with peoples of different tongues.

The success of negotiations between people of different languages frequently rests on a complete understanding of minds. Direct, face-to-face communication is the best way to achieve this.

And if the person on the other side of the desk speaks our language only haltingly and we know nothing of his basic language, negotiations are apt to break down.

At no time has there been a more imperative need for competent, intelligent leaders who are fluent in languages other than English. The languages of Asia, of Europe, and of Africa must be mastered by large segments of our people in order for us to understand and appreciate and evaluate the culture, the psychology and the aspirations of the people we need to deal with in this age of fast-moving international economic and diplomatic relations.

Your special responsibility, as language teachers, is that of impressing on our students the importance of understanding and appreciating foreign cultures and languages.

As your Governor, I share this responsibility with you. I ask that you assume most of the load because you are on the line, so to speak, and in direct touch with those of our people who will be our leaders tomorrow.

A vocabulary is sometimes likened to an intellectual checking account, an instrumentality by which we bank our learnings and draw upon at will.

There are those who advocate a universal language, one bank in which all of our accounts would be held. This is not really a bad idea.

But consider how much richer we would all be if each of us had several checking accounts in different language banks. Exchanges with others would be more frequent. And since our vocabularies are built up largely to express ourselves more efficiently and more accurately, consider how much more extensive the exchange of ideas would be as the number of checking accounts grew. With a freer flow of ideas, it naturally follows that there will be greater understanding among the peoples of the world.

And is this not what we all seek? Peace and understanding?

I recognize I have rambled about somewhat tonight in offering you some of my thoughts on languages. Let me conclude by quoting some words of Prof. Charlton Laird, of the University of Nevada. Professor Laird, in his book "The Miracles of Language," says:

"Language is, and since its invention or discovery always has been, the most important tool man ever devised. Man is sometimes described as a tool-using animal; language is his basic tool. It is the tool more than any other with which he makes his living, makes his home, makes his life. As man becomes more and more a social being, as the world becomes more and more a social community, communication grows ever more imperative. And language is the basis of communication. Language is also the instrument with which we think and thinking is the rarest and most needed commodity in the world."

Arigato. Salamat. Merci. Do che. Gracias. Mahalo and thank you.

The Brittle Brilliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Aviation Week and Space Technology, April 15, 1963:

THE BRITTLE BRILLIANCE

It is sad for anybody who watched President John F. Kennedy inaugurated that frosty January day in 1961, with the words of his address glittering with the same brilliance as the bright winter sun reflecting from the snowbanks on Capitol Hill, to measure the low estate to which this administration has fallen as it passed midcourse and headed down the homestretch toward the 1964 accounting with the electorate.

So much of that early brilliance has proved too brittle under the stress and strain of international and domestic pressures; so much of that intelligence lacked sufficient control to prevent its growth into smart-aleck antics; so much of that apparent candor and refreshing frankness degenerated so quickly into the sly half-truth, the calculated falsehood and the crude stage management of news; so many of the early achievements have proved so much less substantial under the erosion of time and truth; and so many of them have been exposed for simple political legerdemain in lieu of the courageous national leadership that was promised.

When the epitaph of the Kennedy administration is written, certainly "Cuba" should be chiseled in the largest letters. From the Bay of Pigs invasion through the latest phase of curbing anti-Castro guerrillas this administration has flimflammed the American people in a shameful manner. This, more than anything else to date, has backfired with such vigor that the administration's original popularity has hit the skids. It is difficult for the American people to stomach the spectacle of this Government and its allies doing Castro's police work for him while at the same time permitting him to export saboteurs and Communist agents by the thousands all over Latin America.

SKYBOLT JOLT

The jolt of the Skybolt cancellation is still reverberating among our allies and has further reduced the credibility factor of this administration. Other nations must wonder at the administration logic that scrapped Skybolt before its test program has reached full stride while at the same time it placed its major nuclear force into the Minuteman missile which, after 2 years of intensive testing and frantic developmental fixes, still cannot meet its range and payload requirements.

If the administration's antics over Bomarc were intended to measure how severe a strain United States-Canadian relations could endure without breaking, they accomplished their purpose.

Despite all of the fast-talking presentations on economy in the Defense Department, this budget continues to climb sharply. The Senate investigation of the TFX contract award has revealed just how spurious most of this Pentagon cost-effectiveness doubletalk really is. The TFX investigation has also raised the question as to how a Secretary of Defense who is so obtuse in his relations with the legislative branch of the Government can really be as infallible as he claims on other more complicated issues. It is evident that no matter how brilliant their computer exercises or back-of-envelope pencil calculations may seem to them, the top civilian leaders of the Pentagon have failed to win the respect, loyalty and confidence from the working levels that any commander needs from his troops to operate successfully. This is a situation that the country cannot safely endure for very long.

SPACE BUDGET PROBLEMS

After a brilliant, courageous start in the space business, the adminstration is being effectively challenged both on the management of this vast expenditure of public funds and also on the value of the goals it has set. It is doing an increasingly bumbling job of handling these criticisms and explaining to the taxpayers what the space race is really all about. Its original thin veneer of ballyhoo has become transparent and there appears to be no solid substance to replace it. Again the Nation will be the ultimate loser if these space technology goals are lost because of an ineffective defense of their validity.

Now, to give the American people further wonderment over what kind of people they have governing them, comes the episode of the Starad satellite, where the launch of a purely scientific satellite and the results therefrom were kept secret for months by administration scientific advisers. This certainly looks like another clumsy attempt to conceal bad news about the effects of a basic technical miscalculation. Perhaps the men who tried to keep these results secret will eventually come forth with a more cogent reason for this cloak and dagger technique but the odds are against it.

As this administration flounders toward 1964 and its day of reckoning at the polls, it can look back on an incredible trail of political, technical and moral wreckage that will leave even its most ardent supporters wondering how it all could have happened since the snow-sparkling brilliant promise of inauguration day.

ROBERT HOTZ.

Tribute to Miss Ada Taylor: Miss Atlantic City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the city of Atlantic City, N.J., is this week honoring Miss Ada Taylor, one of its distinguished citizens. Miss Taylor is well known for her leadership in civic activities and for continuing support for community enterprises. Her outstanding contributions to the cause of greater cooperation during thousands of miles of travel have justly earned her the affectionate title of Miss Atlantic City, accorded her by the people of her native city. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Honorable Joseph Altman, mayor of Atlantic City, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATLANTIC CITY, N.J.,
May 7, 1963.

Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senator
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Atlantic City is paying its respects to one of its daughters, Miss Ada Taylor, who through the years has brought wide attention to Atlantic City. Just recently Miss Taylor has spread the name of our community from coast to coast. She was selected by students of the Hotel Administration School of Washington State University as the Hotel Salesman of the Year, the first person so honored. She was selected from some 700 persons nominated for this honor.

In going west to receive the honor, Miss Taylor made many talks to chambers of commerce, hotel associations, civic groups, fraternities, and sororities, and she met with many mayors and city officials. One of the main objects of her tour from coast to coast was to bring the east and west coasts more closely together by having display signs reading that Route 30, which starts in Atlantic City, ends in Portland and Route 40 ends in San Francisco.

Miss Taylor has instituted an olympics among the hotel staffs of Atlantic City which this year marks its 10th anniversary. It would not be possible to list all of the activities in which Miss Taylor has provided leadership and active participation but the following organizations should be listed:

President and organizer of the Pen Women of Atlantic City.

Charter member and past president of the Soroptimist Club of Atlantic City.

Charter member and past president of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Atlantic City.

President of the Atlantic City Figure Skating Club.

Past president of the Ambassador Swimming Club.

Organizer of the Antique Collectors Club of Atlantic City.

Former chairman of the Women's Olympic Swimming Committee.

Former chairman of the Amateur Athletic Union Women's Swimming Committee.

Life member of the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States.

Life member of the National Institute of Social Sciences of New York.

Member of the board of the Family Service Association.

Member of the board of the Visiting Nurse Association.

Member of the special gifts committee of the Cancer Society of Atlantic County, the American Red Cross, and the Community Chest.

The author of two books of philosophic essays, and of several one act plays for amateurs.

She has received the Woman of the Year Award from the Soroptimist Club, the Business and Professional Womens Club, and the Models Guild of Atlantic City. Also the Sons and Daughters Award from Washington, D.C.

Good luck and best wishes for health and happiness.

Friendly yours,

JOSEPH ALTMAN,
Mayor.

Southern Bell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Southern Bell is an outstanding example of what can be accomplished through free enterprise. This great company is privately financed and operated, receives no Government subsidy, and no guaranteed profit. The success of other businesses, large and small, Government business, people in every walk of life, and even our national security, depends upon the dedication and efficiency of those who operate our superb telephone and telegraph system throughout the United States.

Southern Bell is a vital part of the best telephone and telegraph system in the world today. Southern Bell is a business of people serving and helping other people.

Kelly Mosley, Southern Bell assistant vice president of public relations, outlined in the May issue of the Southern Telephone News a few pointers for those associated with Southern Bell. I commend to the Congress, our staffs, and all Government personnel the following recommendations of Mr. Mosley to Southern Bell employees:

1. Help every customer who has a request or a problem and accept the personal responsibility to help resolve it.
2. Use good judgment in answering requests and handling problems.
3. Demonstrate the desire and flexibility which will enable every customer's request for service to be satisfied.
4. Demonstrate at various levels of supervision a sincere interest and an awareness of service problems and the need to solve them, thus encouraging others to use the initiative and judgment necessary to do the same.
5. Be alert to our present responsibilities and prepare ourselves to face the challenges of tomorrow.

The 25th Anniversary of the Hatch Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, besides being an election year, next year will mark the 25th anniversary of the Hatch Act, which governs the political activity of Federal employees. There have been many important trends in this country during the last quarter-century, not the least of which is a healthy trend toward increased political activity on the part of our citizens. Federal Government employees have not been full participants in this trend because of the restrictive effect of the Hatch Act.

Since 1939, when the Hatch Act was enacted, we have had two Hoover Commissions study the organization of the executive branch of Government. I think it is time to create a little Hatch Act Commission to make a complete review of legislation limiting political activity by officers and employees of the Government. While it is generally conceded that complete elimination of legislative restrictions on political activity could undermine the merit system, I think that a review of the laws limiting political activity is needed at this time.

To make this review, I am introducing a bill to establish a bipartisan Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel. The purpose of this Commission would be to study Federal laws limiting political activity and make concrete legislative recommendations regarding any suggested revisions in the law. While there have been minor revisions in the Hatch Act over the years, a thorough review of this law, in the light of almost 25 years of experience, would be very beneficial.

I would hope that the Commission would place special emphasis on the kind of political activity that Federal employees should be allowed to undertake at the local and State levels. At the present time, some political activity is permitted, but the issue is both complex and confused.

In my own State of Maryland, at the latest count we now have 86,412 Federal employees. Most of these employees are concentrated in only a few areas; for example, in Montgomery County there are 21,833; in Prince Georges County, 15,420; in Baltimore City, 11,022; in Baltimore County, 10,433; in Harford County, 9,025; and in Anne Arundel County, 7,135. Many of these people are extremely skilled in the techniques of government and knowledgeable regarding public affairs. Unnecessary Federal restrictions governing their political activity at the State and local level have deprived many of our local communities of the services of these talented individuals.

In summary, the time has come for a thorough review of the laws limiting political activity of Government employees. I have introduced legislation to establish a bipartisan Hatch Act Commission to accomplish this purpose. The final result of this review should be legislative proposals which would enable our Federal employees to participate more fully in the activities that make up the foundation of our democratic form of government.

It's Your Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time, an editorial, "It's Your Money," which appeared in the Okeechobee News, one of the outstanding weekly newspapers in the State of Florida.

I have long been convinced that if the American people would realize that the Federal Government has no income but the money it takes from them in taxes the people would not ask so much of the Federal Government. I would follow the recommendation of this editorial writer and refer only to Federal funds as "taxpayers' money." Perhaps then the people would awaken to the fact that it is our money that we spend.

The editorial follows:

IT'S YOUR MONEY

Of all the lost causes I have pushed I think none is recalled more often than the unsuccessful attempt to do away with the expressions "at Government expense" or "paid for by Federal funds" and similar phrases.

Scarcely a day passes but what the newspapers report on some project which the "Government will pay for." Quite often a politician will explain gleefully to his constituents how he has saved them money. The new bridge or highway or municipal building or what have you will not, says the politician, cost his beloved taxpayers anything but a simple fee.

"The big expense," he tells his audience, "will be taken care of by Federal funds."

Now, except for their own contributions through personal tax, politicians don't spend their own money. When the President or the Congress approves a gift or a loan of millions or billions of dollars, inside the country or outside, the money being spent doesn't belong to them. It isn't President Kennedy's money that's being spent, any more than it was President Eisenhower's money or President Truman's money or George Marshall's money under the Marshall plan.

The money is taxpayers' money, it is your money and mine, and for a long time I have scorched with a slow burn when the loot is referred to as Government money.

The implication is when there is a joint financing of some project, any part contributed by the Federal Government is "found" money. As long as Federal funds are used, nobody has to pay.

It seems to me it is about time somebody put to use the known facts of financial life, the most prominent being that there are no such things as Federal funds in the sense the Government owns the money. The Government doesn't earn a dime unless you include some of the unintentional profits it makes from its intrusion into business.

Because of this, I have suggested more than once that the phrase "Federal funds" be changed to "taxpayers' money." Instead of accepting a statement that the United States is spending $500 million for development of a river in South America, I think the American Society of Newspaper Editors ought to agree to print such an item as follows: "The taxpayers of the United States today sent, etc. * * *"

Instead of telling how the Federal Government is paying for some new building in Catchall, Kans., through generous loans at low rates, the item ought to read: "The taxpaying citizens of 50 States today chipped in $43 million so that the people of Catchall could have a new downtown development."

In the first place, I think the people who come up with the scratch, not the gents who spend it, should get proper credit. In the second place, drumming home the point, day after day, that there are no Federal funds but only taxpaying citizens' contributions might cause more people to zipper up the national purse strings. At least, it might get recognition abroad for the hard-working folks who make it possible for our agents to play Santa Claus.

Federal funds? Nuts! That's our dough.

Charlie Russell's Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, one of many Montanans who has achieved success in the journalism profession is John K. Hutchens, literary critic from the New York Herald-Tribune. Mr. Hutchens recently visited his home State to speak at a meeting of the Montana State Library Association in Great Falls.

When he returned to New York, Mr. Hutchens recalled for readers of the Herald-Tribune his impressions of Great Falls, which he calls Charlie Russell's town. Mr. Hutchens describes Charles Marion Russell as "the greatest artist of of the American Old West, painter and sculptor, cowboy, and storyteller, who never had an art lesson in his life—and who didn't have much use for any form of progress that altered the West he knew."

Mr. President, Charles M. Russell lived and worked in Great Falls until his death in 1926. And while we are proud of our State and its progress, Montanans—especially the people of Great Falls—reserve a special spot in their hearts for the world-famous cowboy artist. In a very real sense, I agree with Mr. Hutchens. Great Falls is Charlie Russell's town.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hutchen's article, "Charlie Russell's Town," from the May 20, 1963, issue of the New York Herald-Tribune, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLIE RUSSELL'S TOWN

(By John K. Hutchens)

GREAT FALLS, MONT.—It's a bustling, beautiful place, this most populous (60,000) of Montana towns, 3,333 feet up in the plains that roll on north to Canada and build westward into the Rocky Mountain majesty of Glacier Park. It's justly proud of its size and energy, its huge copper and zinc refineries, its Malstrom Air Force missile base, a key one in the Strategic Air Command's Northwest system.

But when all the proper salutes have been made to progress, Great Falls is still Charlie Russell's town, these 36 years after his death.

Charles Marion Russell, that is, the greatest artist of the American Old West, painter and sculptor, cowboy and storyteller, who never had an art lesson in his life—and who didn't have much use for any form of progress that altered the West he knew.

All around the town, you seem to sense his presence. At 12th Street and 4th Avenue are the Charles M. Russell Gallery and, adjoining it, his log cabin studio, easels still standing, the brushes lying about. In the gallery are some, by no means all, of his finest pictures, and books by and about him. Downtown, on busy Central Avenue, is the Mint Cafe, somewhat prettied up since the days when it was the Mint Saloon where Russell and his friends of the open range talked the nights away.

For instance, he would raise a shaggy eyebrow could he know that the old gambling tables have been succeeded by a soda fountain. He himself went on the wagon early in the century, but not for reasons advocated by the WCTU. A double-chocolate dip with whipped cream? It would have ranked with barbed wire on the cowboy-artist's list of abominations.

Just the same, the Russell era is all over the Mint—in the reproductions of his greatest pictures that line the walls, in the glass-encased Russell memorabilia, guns, spurs, lariats, photographs of Indian and plains life. And the greater part of the Mint's clientele, too, would be familiar to him.

Weatherbeaten horse wranglers, with the rolling gait of men who have spent more hours in the saddle than out of it, mingle with half-breed Indians at the long bar. At that bar a drink of bourbon calculated to lift the hair on the head as effectively but more pleasantly than these Indians' forebears did, costs all of 40 cents.

Not only the Russell era but Russell himself, in a manner of speaking, is almost visibly present. For if you hang around the mint long enough, and it is distinctly no hardship, you will hear the Russell stories that the veterans like to dwell on. Some of them came to know him not so many years after he rode into the Judith Basin in 1880, the wiry 16-year-old from St. Louis who soon became known as "Kid" Russell—not the ablest cowboy on the range by a long shot, but a game, likable lad.

To be sure, he was "different." Although the towheaded Charlie tried to look tough, in a beaded buckskin shirt, and carried a sheath knife and a Winchester, he never was a real hunter. He was known actually to like Indians. And there were those pictures he was always drawing, comic ones of his pals, and bright little flowers painted on sugar scoops for the girls in the "houses." Some of the ladies, grown old and respectable, had a way years later of bringing these objects around to Charlies and asking him to brighten the pictures up a little. Or so the old-timers say.

The story they tell oftenest, however, is of the terrible winter of 1886–87 and the picture that made him famous overnight throughout the cattle country. To the ranch where "Kid" Russell was working, and an unprecedented blizzard had decimated the herd, came a message from the owner in Helena asking the foreman how the cattle were doing.

"I'll make a sketch to go with your answer," said Russell, and dashed off a watercolor, post-card size, of a starved cow collapsing while hungry wolves looked on and waited. "The Last of 5,000," he called it.

"Hell," said the foreman. "The boss don't need a letter. That picture'll do it."

It did.

For 6 months Russell lived with the Northern Blackfeet in Canada, and learned their sign language. At the mint he painted the pictures that paid for his food and drink or sold for $10 each; they make up the collection that Amon Carter, of Texas, later bought for $250,000. Charlie wrote the illustrated letters his friends cherished, and the stories gathered as "Trails Ploughed Under," which in their misspelling and shaky grammar make an invaluable phonetic record of the speech of the fading frontier.

He married a lady who dealt briskly with dealers and fetched prices he had never dreamed of. But Charlie Russell didn't change. He hated "skunk wagons" (automobiles). He wore his Stetson and red sash everywhere. Reformers and, especially, dry land farmers and their fences irked him.

"Thank God I was here first," he used to say.

What the oldtimers around the mint chiefly recall, though, is the kindness. He wouldn't even go fishing.

"A fish doesn't feel pain?" he would observe ironically. "That's why he jumps 6 feet out of the water when he gets the barb in his eye."

And somebody recalled that he didn't care for so-called "justice." If everybody got it, that asked for it, he is quoted as saying, "they would think they were terribly abused and would find out they wanted a little mercy instead."

It's still Charlie Russell's town, all right, and all the signs are that it will remain so.

Heaven Help Our Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of April 16, 1963:

HEAVEN HELP OUR FRIENDS

David E. Bell, chief of the foreign aid program, has made the long-hoped-for administration announcement that our foreign aid program is to be curtailed.

Guess who is going to be curtailed. It is none other than Greece, Israel, and Formosa—three of the best friends we have.

Is aid to be curtailed for our sworn enemy, Tito of Yugoslavia? Don't be silly.

Or Gomulka of Poland, who rests cheek by jowl on every issue with Khrushchev? Not so you could notice it.

Or Sukarno, who paid homage—yea, obeisance—to the rules of Red China last week and said they are the deliverers of the world? No, siree.

This is in character with the present administration, which pulled the rug out from under Prime Minister Harold Macmillan—who may have his limitations but, we suspect, will be a much more willing partner than Harold Wilson, if he becomes Prime Minister of Great Britain.

It is in character with the public thrashing given Diefenbaker of Canada, which caused the fall of his government.

It certainly follows right along in the tradition of pushing our good friends, the Dutch, out of New Guinea; pressuring our ancient allies, the Portuguese, in Angola; and publicly humiliating the British and French in Africa; crushing Katanga, the only pro-white, pro-West state in Africa, to aid the leftist Congolese—or of aiding India, and thus antagonizing the only real friend we have on the Asian subcontinent, Pakistan.

It is in character, too, with the public honors heaped on Dr. Robert Oppenheimer, who was rejected as a security risk, by giving him a $50,000 atomic energy prize.

No one has ever stated that Dr. Oppenheimer was a Communist, but members of his family and many of his associates have been—with the result that, however badly the Government wanted his genius in 1953, we couldn't afford the risk.

Now, the Kennedy administration is taking him out of mothballs and apparently hopes to rehabilitate this confused man, as if we didn't have enough security problems already.

Again, this is in character with the administration—which apparently has guaranteed sanctuary to Khrushchev and the Communists in Cuba, but bats down the attempt of Cuban patriots to regain their homeland by the same initial methods by which Castro won it from them.

A perplexed American public might well say, as Mark Antony did in his funeral oration for Caesar: "O, judgment! Thou art fled to brutish beasts, and men have lost their reason."

President Kennedy and Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following is from the May 13 edition of the New York Times:

KENNEDY GAINING BUSINESS FAVOR

(By Ellen Shanahan)

HOT SPRINGS, VA., May 12.—The Nation's top corporate executives are less nervous today about their relation with the Kennedy administration than at any time since Mr. Kennedy's election.

This was the consensus that emerged from a 3-day meeting here of the Business Council.

The industry leaders are also optimistic about business conditions. A large majority foresees a period of economic expansion lasting throughout 1964.

The Business Council is made up almost entirely of the presidents and chairmen of large corporations.

BASIS FOR CONFIDENCE

The group's feeling of relative confidence in the Kennedy administration appeared to be based largely on one event of the last week and two earlier developments. They were:

The fact that the administration did not attempt to stop the steel industry from raising its prices this year, as it did in 1962.

The administration's advocacy of reduction in corporate tax rates and in top bracket personal income tax rates, which businessmen feel are sorely needed if the economy is to expand.

President Kennedy's statement in Washington on Thursday that the Federal Government would not undertake any new electric power projects unless there were compelling reasons for it to do so.

What impressed council members most was the President's declaration that "the burden of proof is on the Government" to demonstrate that Federal financing and ownership are the best means of power and resource development in a particular area.

While some council members expressed skepticism over the extent to which Mr. Kennedy meant what he said and whether his subordinates would implement his instructions, most felt the President had enunciated a policy of noninterference by the Government that had implications for all of industry and not just electric power companies.

While they do not foresee any soaring boom in the months ahead, nearly all of the council looked forward to a lengthy period of rising orders and sales extending through the end of next year.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ARMENIAN REVOLUTIONARY FEDERATION,
Elmhurst, N.Y., May 14, 1963.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The Yeprem Committee of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation informs you that a resolution has been passed by our unit supporting passage of House Resolution 14, submitted by you, which calls for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Recent developments worldwide and in Washington make the formation of such a committee imperative to the security and welfare of the United States, and will bring added hope to the tyrannized peoples of the once free nations today in Soviet bondage.

We are, in addition to this letter, contacting our Congressman as well as Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, head of the Rules Committee, urging him to release your resolution to the House floor for quick debate and passage.

May we take this opportunity to commend you for your stand in this regard, and to assure you of our energy support of your measure.

Respectfully,
ARMEN SHAMAMIAN,
Secretary for the Yeprem Committee of New York.

WEST ROXBURY, MASS.,
May 14, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: The Boston Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., endorses House Resolution 14, introduced by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, which calls for the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. We strongly urge you to (1) place the resolution on the agenda of the committee; (2) open public hearings on the proposed legislation; (3) give your own support to the resolution.

Our support for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations stems from the following considerations:

1. There is no single agency, in the Executive or Legislative branches, that would handle the affairs of the captive nations. The Captive Nations Week Resolution of 1959 enumerates 22 nations in Europe and Asia under the Communist dictatorship. We believe that a single body should deal with these nations;

2. On the basis of historical facts, we refuse to accept the position of our State Department that Ukraine, Georgia, or Armenia, should not be considered as captive nations. This statement of our State Department alone proves that a committee on the captive nations is needed;

3. Since our State Department failed to endorse House Resolution 14 or propose further action for the captive nations, we think that it is the duty of our House of Representatives to establish a workable body which would prepare methodic fact-finding

studies on captive nations and avail these objective studies to our Government. Consequently, our Government would be able to work out an effective policy toward the captive nations.

Although this request does not come to you from your district, we believe that our fight with communism and support for the captive nations is of national concern and must have the support of all Americans.

Your action and support in this matter will do much for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

Sincerely Yours,
UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC., BOSTON BRANCH.
MICHAEL VINTONIV, *Chairman.*
WOLODYMYR FLUNT, *Secretary.*
OREST SZCZUDLUK, *Public Relations.*

LONG ISLAND CITY,
May 12, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I have written a letter to the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH strongly urging him to submit your resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by the House Rules Committee. I felt that the American people have a right to know of Soviet Russia's suppression of the non-Russian nations within the Iron Curtain.

Sincerely,
CATHERINE A. SHARABURA.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, BRANCH IN FLINT, MICH.
May 4, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member, U.S. Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: On behalf of our organization and a group of citizens signed below, we urge earnestly to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable support. Such a special committee on the captive nations is vitally important both to our Government and the American people. While Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of "national liberation" in Africa and Asia, we as a nation, are not doing much to help the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations which constitute a vertitable weakness of the Soviet totalitarian system.

A special committee on the captive nations in the House of Representatives would become a center of true and unbiased knowledge and information on all the captive nations which information will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We strongly urge you, sir, to give your full and unqualified support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,
Rev. Myhola Dielydy, Michael Lyekolat, Stefan Stefaniw, A. Maschak, Teodor Krosnyanry, John Lewandowskyj, M. Draganczuk, Macewko Theodore, Anton Hanczaryk, Drozg Stefan, John Doscjchenko, Prokip Nicpon, Michael Staty, Sr., Wasy Leschuk, S. Szumke, Hmyta Dosij, Anna Rudiak, I. Ptaszuyk, Taras Bohay, George Mahohon, Twan Kapec, Morhpen Dubyehyj, Sauka Joey, Stephan Kraus, Dmytro Kostymuick, Vasyl Cyveiszak.

MAY 14, 1963.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: This is a copy of the letter (petition) which I sent to Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH:

"We the undersigned urge that quick action be taken on House Resolution 14 regarding the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. We want the status of the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union to be fully exposed."

Following were 16 signatures.

Sincerely,
NORMA ULIVO.
ASTORIA, N.Y.

A Tale of Two Attorneys General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Columbia Record on Monday, April 29, 1963:

A TALE OF TWO ATTORNEYS GENERAL

This is a tale of two Attorneys General of the United States, of a southern capital, of politicians, and of the healing elements of time.

Chapter 1 begins in Columbia, S.C., on a Thursday morning—November 3, 1960. At Shaw Air Force Base, 40 miles from the capital, an American Airlines jet chartered by the Republican National Committee lands and a presidential candidate, Vice President Richard Nixon, disembarks. He departs in a motorcade for a rally in Columbia.

Remaining inside the jet, busying himself with telephone calls, correspondence, and other campaign details is the Attorney General of the United States, William Rogers.

He does not know it, does Mr. Rogers, but Young Democrats of Richland County have asked his friend, the Vice President, to answer questions in Columbia that involve him. The Democrats had challenged Mr. Nixon the day before to say whether he "would continue using bayonets and Federal troops to force integration in the South." Mr. Rogers had been blamed for Little Rock.

And the final of four questions to Mr. Nixon is: "Will you continue to recommend to your friend, Attorney General Rogers, the sending of Federal snoopers into South Carolina counties to pry into our State and county election machinery"?

Mr. Nixon speaks in Columbia, and after 3½ hours in the Palmetto State, wings away for another campaign stop

The following night, Friday, November 4, then Gov. Ernest F. Hollings and Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON attack the Vice President and the Attorney General. Each charges that Mr. Nixon was ashamed to present the Attorney General to South Carolinians and had left him aboard the jet.

Hollings says in a television appearance from Greenville that the Vice President knew the people of South Carolina "couldn't stomach" Rogers. Senator JOHNSTON growls that Nixon was "ashamed" of Rogers, in a Rock Hill speech.

On the following Monday, Democrats return to the attack on the Vice President, allying him with the Attorney General. In a November advertisement, the "Dollars for Democrats" organization queries: "Why did Attorney General Rogers stay on Nixon's plane in Sumter—and where is Sherman Adams?"

Chairman of "Dollars for Democrats" is Terrell Glenn.

Chapter 2 begins in the same place—Columbia, S.C.—on the same day of the week—Thursday. But the date is Thursday, April 25, 1963.

At Columbia Airport, an airplane lands and another Attorney General steps out, Robert Kennedy is greeted by Terrell Glenn, now a district attorney. He shakes his hand and welcomes him to South Carolina.

No one advertises, asking young Mr. Kennedy whether he'll "continue using bayonets and Federal troops to force integration in the South." The tragedy of Little Rock has been followed by the tragedy of Oxford.

Republicans have not challenged Mr. Kennedy's coming to South Carolina. The only bombast has come from isolated members of Mr. Kennedy's own party, in the general assembly.

The Attorney General is greeted with cordiality and a respect for his office. He speaks on several occasions—directly and forcefully—of the racial situation, "the most difficult internal problem this country has—not just in the South, but in the North, too." He speaks of the compelling necessity for progress, although he does not delineate precisely what will constitute "progress."

He speaks of States' rights and declares that South Carolina's peaceful desegregation of Clemson College under irrevocable court compulsion is an example of "States' rights at its best." The Nation, he asserts, would do well to follow Carolina's example.

At the end of a busy day, he visits in the home of Terrell Glenn, sleeps, and the next day he climbs aboard the plane to visit Atlanta.

There, he will say that moderates in the United States must prevail or the racial situation will be seized by the extremists. Although he does not condemn a group of young people who will resume an interrupted march through Alabama, he declares that their energies could be diverted elsewhere.

Two Attorneys General. Each came; each went.

Two and a half years separated their visits.

Farley, Active at 75, Sees Kennedy Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am including a splendid article written by Mr. John W. Finney, editor of the Daily Herald, published in Columbia, Tenn., which carries a most intimate and personable interview that Mr. Finney had with former Postmaster General James A. Farley. All of us who have known the distinguished Postmaster General over the years recognize that he has an uncanny and remarkable ability to remember names, places and instances. Indeed, he is just as quick in his thinking and as qualified to make political predictions as he was in the days of his more active participation in national politics.

The interview follows:

FARLEY, ACTIVE AT 75, SEES KENNEDY WIN

(By John W. Finney)

One of the highlights of my trip to New York last week to attend the convention of the American Newspaper Publishers Association was the opportunity which popped up unexpectedly to interview a notable personage, whom I had interviewed previously on the occasion of his trip to Columbia.

The personage was James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States, and the guest of honor for the big Mule Day of 1940 when he not only "threw his hat in the ring" as a presidential candidate (for the benefit of photographers) but laid the cornerstone for the U.S. courthouse here, and dedicated the only new post office to be opened in Maury County in this generation, Monstanto, Tenn.

W. D. Hastings, publisher of the Daily Herald, was general chairman of Mule Day that year, as always, and Farley's host. The two struck up a friendship which has continued to this date.

So it was more than coincidence when Glenn McNeil, manager of the Tennessee Press Association, introduced himself to Mr. Farley after the two had finished breakfast one morning last week, that Mr. Farley immediately asked about Mr. Hastings. Told by McNeil that Mr. Hastings was fine but that I was attending the ANPA, Mr. Farley asked that I phone him at his Coca-Cola Export Co. office. This I did as soon as the message was relayed to me by Glenn.

Farley wasted no time. "How is Walter?" was his first question. On learning that Mr. Hastings was in fine health, he asked about politics and was told that many Tennesseans weren't entirely sold on the New Frontier. "Maybe so, but Kennedy will be the winner, easily, in 1964" said Farley who will be 75 May 30, isn't looking back at all, but to the future.

Who will run against the Democratic nominee? Farley is sure it will be Nelson Rockefeller (whom we were to hear in a disappointing dull speech later in the week) and that Kennedy will win easily.

Romney doesn't want the Republican nominee, according to Farley, and he thinks GOLDWATER is much more likely to be a candidate in 1968 when there would be a better chance of winning.

And don't discount Farley. It was "Big Jim" who predicted, correctly, in 1936 that Franklin D. Roosevelt would carry 46 of the 48 States.

Speaking of Kennedy, Farley said: "I just can't see anything to prevent his reelection. He has shown fine qualities of leadership under the most trying circumstances. He is probably the greatest campaigner this country has ever produced" (That from the man who masterminded Franklin D. Roosevelt's first campaigns.)

Mr. Farley and I missed seeing each other in person, although staying at the same hotel, but he sent me a letter expressing his joy at hearing firsthand about Walter Hastings.

"Talking with you", he wrote "brought back memories of the day in Tennessee back in 1940, when I "threw my hat in the ring". "I will never forget that visit to Mule Day, and I recall vividly scenes of that parade as we went down the street. I am sorry you do not have Mule Day any more as there are not enough mules to go around".

Elmo Roper Calls William L. Clayton "Our Greatest Living American"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, William L. Clayton of Houston is described in an article in the Saturday Review, reprinted in the Houston Chronicle, by Elmo Roper, as "our greatest living American."

I ask unanimous consent that this article by Mr. Roper describing something of the life and views of this great Texan and American, and the originator of the Marshall plan and founder of Anderson, Clayton, & Co., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNREMITTING EFFORT—TRADE EXPANSION PASSAGE IS HOUSTONIAN'S LONG-TIME DREAM

(NOTE.—This article by Elmo Roper, public opinion analyst, consultant, and author, is reprinted from the Saturday Review. Mr. Roper is one of the men in position to know the part Houston's William L. Clayton played in originating the Marshall plan. Mr. Clayton is a founder of Anderson, Clayton & Co., and is a former Under Secretary of State and Assistant Secretary of Commerce.)

(By Elmo Roper)

Whatever the 87th Congress failed to do, it produced one outstanding bipartisan achievement: the passage of the Trade Expansion Act, the first fresh trade legislation in nearly 30 years. Behind this newest step toward lifting obsolescent trade barriers lie long years of unremitting effort by one man who has devoted himself, more than any other living American, to the cause of free international trade.

The man is William L. Clayton. He has left his mark upon enough, being fully appreciated by his contemporaries. America owes him more than it knows.

DREAMS OF PEACE

For the better part of a long lifetime (he is 83), Will Clayton has fought patiently, persistently, and with unshakable conviction for a dream. The dream is of a world living in peace and prosperity, linked by the ties of free trade. His devotion to that dream has led him far beyond the traditional free trade philosophy of his southern origins to espouse radical innovations in America's relationships with the world. His story is one of old-fashioned American virtues, enlightened by the insights of a deeply inquiring mind, enriched by compassion, and lifted to the point of greatness.

His career began in a familiar American mold. Born of poor parents on a cotton farm near Tupelo, Miss., he left school at the 7th grade to help support his family, and ended up a multimillionaire in the cotton trade.

Yet he was always something more than the hero of a Horatio Alger saga, and the "something more" was the quality of his mind and vision. His breadth of outlook led him inevitably to an involvement in the national scene. He early became convinced of the folly of economic nationalism, and in the late 1920's and early 1930's he became a champion of free trade.

During World War II, as he served in a series of Government assignments, the second central idea in Clayton's thinking took firm hold: the interdependence of free nations. In the years just after the war, as the first Undersecretary of State for Economic Affairs, he had the opportunity to develop both stands of his thought, and to work for their expression in Government policy.

HELPED INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION

In the spring of 1947 he lent his ideas and energies to the formation of the International Trade Organization, which he hoped would result in multilateral tariff reductions and free the currents of international trade. But the times were not ripe: in a world recovering from war, the tide of economic nationalism was running high.

The other stream in Clayton's thinking came to more fruitful expression. Convinced that Europe was on the brink of political and economic disaster, he wrote a memorandum to his friend Secretary of State Marshall in the spring of 1947, urging "prompt and substantial aid from the United States." He specified the amount of aid needed, insisted that America could well afford to provide it, and urged that both the Secretary of State and the President "make a strong spiritual appeal to the American people to sacrifice a little * * * to save Europe from starvation and chaos."

The Secretary responded, made his historic Harvard speech, and the Marshall plan—which might well have been called the Clayton plan—was born. Men high in political life in Europe know of Clayton's role, but in the United States Clayton has never been given proper credit for this achievement—through no fault of General Marshall, who spoke many times of Clayton's enormous contribution to the European recovery program.

Clayton also felt that another step was needed for full European recovery: European economic federation. Quickly he expanded this concept to include the United States and joined the Atlantic Union movement to work for closer ties among the world's democracies. He became one of its stanchest supporters, and when I succeded to the presidency of the Atlantic Union Committee following the death of Justice Owen Roberts, there wasn't a week when I didn't need—and get—the help of Will Clayton. One incident I shall never forget is a visit we paid together to persuade General Marshall to join our movement (which he did).

General Marshall proved receptive to our philosophy but at one point he turned to Clayton and asked him this question: "If you unite only the NATO nations, you will have a white man's club—do you plan to stop there or will the gates be open to other democracies?"

Knowing Clayton to be a lifelong southerner and at that time never having discussed the subject of race with him, I was anxious to take him off the hook and so answered Marshall myself. I said that the Atlantic Union Committee had no official position on this question but that I could speak for the 9 out of 10 members who felt it would indeed be open to any experienced democracy that wanted to join.

Marshall was satisfied with this and started to go on to another question, but Clayton at that point leaned forward and interrupted to say, in his quiet southern accent, "I just want to add that I think it is more like 10 out of 10 who feel as Elmo does, and that certainly includes me." Will Clayton needed no "northern liberal" to take him off the hook on the subject of race relations.

In recent years, Clayton has been commuting regular from Houston, Tex., to meetings in Washington of the Atlantic Council, and in late 1960 he visited most of the NATO capitals in Europe, using his tremendous influence there to help set up the NATO Citizens Convention.

With Christian Herter, he was cochairman of the U.S. delegation to the convention, which recommended the outlines of supranational institutions for the Atlantic world; and he didn't miss a meeting. A year ago he spoke out again for his first love, free trade, urging the passage of the Trade Expansion Act, for which the 1961 Herter-Clayton report on Foreign Economic Policy had served as background.

The act has passed, and it only remains to translate its intentions into trading reality. What had, in 1947, seemed a nostalgic dream of the past was in fact a vision of the future.

It is impossible to pigeonhole Will Clayton; his life and thought are shot through with paradoxes. A hard-headed businessman, he has given great sums of money to liberal causes in which he believed. In many ways a conservative, he initiated and supported programs that broke new ground in business, Government, and international relations. These are some of the paradoxes of a man, who drew great inner strength from his origins, and then went on to transcend them. He kept what he found good in the past, discarded what was irrelevant, and went on to become one of the outstanding economic thinkers and statesmen of our century.

His vision has always been broader than that of those about him, and he has been true to that vision. Once convinced that a course of action was right, he has never wavered. Undiscouraged by misunderstanding or opposition, he has been prepared to spend years gently and courteously convincing others of its wisdom.

Often he has stood alone—but not for long, because the vigor and vision of his ideas attracted followers, and one of Will Clayton's chief assets is his ability to get the best of these followers to become leaders. So it never seemed to be his ideas that won: for Will Clayton always keeps himself to the background, caring only that the right thing be done and not who gets the credit. He is the most modest man I have ever known, and, in my opinion, our greatest living American.

The Man in Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, congratulations are in order for "The Man in Missouri" referred to in last weeks issue of Time magazine. The article concerns Mr. Dillard A. Mallory, superintendent of schools in Buffalo, Mo., and his approach to the problem of financing education. I have known Dillard Mallory and his family for many years and indeed had the privilege of speaking at his school last fall.

I hope that every member of the Education and Labor Committee, of the House of Representatives, will read this article because it clearly shows that where there is a will there is a way in solving education problems without going to the Federal trough.

I commend the article to your attention:

THE MAN IN MISSOURI

Whenever it seems that money is the root of all good in U.S. education and that only the Federal Government can provide it, the U.S. taxpayer can consider the case of Dillard A. Mallory, a gentleman of 56 who superintends the schools of rural Buffalo, Mo. (population 1,700). This month Buffalo will acquire three sorely needed school buildings costing $115,000. The source of the windfall is not the town, not the State, not Uncle Sam. It is Superintendent Mallory, who personally put up the money on a yearly salary of $12,000.

"People ask me why I did it," says Mallory. His answer goes back to the way education was valued in southern Missouri when he grew up on a farm with eight brothers and sisters. From a one-room school, Mallory and three brothers went on to the nearest high school 10 miles away by renting a shabby room nearby and living on pork and beans. While in high school, he taught grade school to pay his way. "Those were challenging days," he remembers. "Some of the children were older than I." When he at length became a much respected rural school superintendent, Mallory refused better paying jobs with urban glamor. "I had an idea that you could work out as good a program for children here as anywhere else," he says.

A "TEACHERAGE"

In 1947 the tiny Buffalo school district hit its debt limit and ran out of money. Without blinking, Mallory used his 20-year savings of $10,000 to buy a 1-acre lot adjoining Buffalo High School. Leasing it to the district for $1 a year, he borrowed $32,000 on his signature, bought some surplus Army barracks, and built a school annex housing a library, cafeteria, and home economics classroom.

While paying off the debt with proceeds from the cafeteria and athletic events concessions, Mallory borrowed again to buy lumber from an abandoned Army hospital, used it to construct a science and industrial arts building costing $11,000. Then in 1957, to solve the housing shortage that repels teachers from rural areas, Mallory again cannibalized the Army hospital and built a $72,000 "teacherage" with apartments renting for a maximum of $60 a month.

LAST INSTALLMENT

Down went Buffalo's teacher turnover and up went its school rating—Triple A is the grade it gets from the State education department. In the past decade, 50 surrounding school districts have voted to be annexed by Buffalo, which now serves 1,550 students in a 500-square-mile area and is thus richer than ever. As a result, Buffalo in 1959 floated a $240,000 school bond issue and so improved Buffalo High School that last month the satisfied citizens voted overwhelmingly to hike the school tax by 20 percent.

Worried about a U.S. drift toward complacency and indifference, Mallory meanwhile used the experience of a 1960 tour of Russia to make 350 speeches all over Missouri—thus earning another $4,500 to set up a college scholarship fund for youngsters aiming to become American Government teachers. This month he will pay the last installment on his school buildings and formally turn over the deeds at commencement. Says he: "We've got to get back to greater effort on the part of the individual."

Great To Listen to 31-Knot Burke Letting Off Steam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Detroit Free Press of May 17, 1963:

GREAT TO LISTEN TO 31-KNOT BURKE LETTING OFF STEAM

(By John C. Manning)

I know very little about the constant political infighting at Washington between our Pentagon leaders and Army and Navy executives. I do happen to know that Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, retired admiral and Chief of Naval Operations, who addressed Detroit's Economic Club this week, was one of the most impetuous battlers.

Following World War II and the Korean war he tried his darnedest to make the Pentagon as dangerous a battle area as had been the South Pacific and the ocean waters at Korea. He was usually getting in trouble with Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy.

He frequently infuriated them and their Secretaries of Defense. Down in their hearts though, they admired him because they knew there was not a phony hair in his head. When he publicly blurted embarrassing charges he was telling the truth as he saw it, regardless of how it might hurt him.

Our Presidents and Defense Secretaries suffered many headaches endowed by Admiral Burke. But they appreciated how our Government needs courageous executives like him and Admiral Rickover.

In his Economic Club speech the other day at Veterans' Memorial Building, Admiral Burke branded our U.S. State Department as an incorrigibly stupid bureau.

AN AD LIBBED POLICY

Burke criticized what he called American indecisiveness and lack of clearly formulated goals—which is the responsibility of the State Department—in our foreign policy. I endorse his hint that we only sort of ad lib our foreign policy.

"We don't really know what kind of United States of America we wish to preserve or what kind of a world we want," he declared.

"We are losing our economic leadership in the world arena. We say we want partners in Europe, but we deny nuclear weapons to our allies.

"We should definitely formulate our objectives and then employ our economic and political strength to erode communism and shove Communists from positions of power all over the world."

He indicated scornfully and truthfully that our State Department either is scared itself of calling communism's bluffs, or feels it is proper to make us citizens scared. He presented as an example the Soviet operation in Cuba which he described as "a prime job of nuclear blackmail which scared the hell out of us even though the missile bases were unimportant militarily."

But, he pointed out, "they focused U.S. attention on a dramatic objective and at the same time accomplished a more mundane objective. It was establishment of a Communist government in Cuba with our permission—a subversive center for all of Latin America. They kidded us into forgetting that part while we were worrying about the missiles."

MAJESTICALLY ENCRUSTED

I can't for the life of me understand how U.S. Presidents ever since the F.D.R. New Deal period have allowed the State Department to run our show and do it badly. It is such a majestically encrusted bureau that even its Secretary bosses can't boss it and call its signals the way they should.

I have heard that Secretary Rusk does not approve a lot of the State Department house rules. There is so much redtape, however, that it would be hard for him to improve the Department program.

The late John Foster Dulles was not an ideal Secretary of State. He did, however, realize the wishy-washy policies brewed by his underlings. That's why he raised so much heck with them that they tried to make him historically unpopular and unsuccessful.

Actually he believed, as did Cordell Hull, Elihu Root, and Charles Evans Hughes, that the U.S. foreign policy should be as simple, just, and internationally known as that of every historic world power used to be.

Also if we just think back it might astonish us to realize that despite what enemies of Dulles called his "brinkmanship" our Nation handled fewer emergency crises than we do these days.

I do wish we had more Federal officials with the commonsense and courage of Arleigh Burke and Admiral Rickover. If we did and they spoke up when they felt it necessary, our country would be more respected around the world, even by Jack-in-the-beanstalk giants like Castro and Sukarno.

McNamara Puts Teeth in Civilian Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I know of no more demanding or sensitive position in the Federal Government than that of Secretary of Defense. The man who occupies this position must of necessity make decisions on weaponry and military organization that go to the heart of the national security and which, because of the enormous sums involved, have a profound influence upon the national economy as well. Robert McNamara has been shouldering these enormous responsibilities for more than 2 years. It has been a time of crisis and ferment with grave new problems arising to complicate and inflame those inherited from the past. Mr. McNamara, as have all his predecessors, carries out his duties amid storm and controversy and perforce has often been made the target of abuse, the like of which would crush or drive to distraction even the most extraordinary of men. Therefore, I am pleased to place before you an editorial assessment of Mr. McNamara written by Mr. J. Willard Hoffman, editor of the Trentonian, a daily newspaper published in the city of Trenton. The editorial, which appeared in the May 20 edition of that newspaper, is as follows:

MCNAMARA PUTS TEETH IN CIVILIAN CONTROL

(By J. Willard Hoffman)

No one who has happened upon the Washington scene in many years has evoked as much enthusiasm in this corner as has Robert McNamara.

He is a truly big man—plenty big enough to be an outstanding Secretary of Defense.

He is bigger than the generals and admirals who are trying to cut him down to their size.

And he is bigger than the Congressmen and Senators who are trying to make him cater to their own selfish vote-getting desires.

The taxpayers of this Nation have ample reason to be grateful to Mr. McNamara. So far as we can ascertain, everything that he is doing—and for which he is being harassed by Congress—is designed to save money, or at least to make sure that what money is spent on defense is spent as wisely as possible.

He is attempting to make unification of the Armed Forces fact instead of fiction, and it should be remembered that his endeavors along that line contributed in large measure to his TFX decision, which has embroiled him in a lusty debate with the U.S. Senate.

A prime example of Mr. McNamara's judicious planning is the fact that he has lopped $12 billion off the cost of the 5-year plan of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for missiles. There are many others, including a study of the future organization of the Navy which has a lot of admirals walking down Uneasy Street.

The Constitution guarantees us that our military organization will be under civilian control. In the past, this has been accorded little more than lipservice, except in the cases of a couple of distinguished Defense Secretaries. Mr. McNamara obviously construes "civilian control" to mean exactly what it says, and leaves no doubt that he is in control.

By no means do we mean to say that he can do no wrong. Neither do we believe that the generals and admirals should be denied the right to disagree with him, for the defense of the Nation is their business and they would be derelict in their duty if they did not stand by their own convictions.

But it goes much further than that in Mr. McNamara's case. Some people are out to "get him." That's why the "conflict of interests" ball has been tossed at Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric on the grounds that a New York law firm with which he was connected received $300,000 in legal fees from General Dynamics, the firm which was given the $6.5 billion contract to build the TFX fighter plane. At the moment, the issue is vague, to say the least. But it has been seized upon by his opponents as another means of trying to keep Mr. McNamara on the hot spot.

Fortunately, the sniping doesn't bother the Secretary. He continues to work in the best interests of the American people.

Wool Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of concern in my State of Massachusetts regarding the serious wool import problem. This concern, Mr. Speaker, is compounded by the unwillingness of this administration to move effectively despite President Kennedy's assertion in May 1961 that it was "time for action."

Recently, at the 98th annual meeting of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, a resolution was unanimously adopted which called on the administration to limit imports as it has promised to do so.

The resolution confirms the increasingly dangerous plight of the wool textile industry and places the burden of responsibility upon this administration.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the resolution to my colleagues:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT THE 98TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOOL MANUFACTURERS, NEW YORK, N.Y., MAY 9, 1963

Whereas the already critical import problem of the wool textile and apparel industries grows increasingly grave, with no prospect of relief available other than through action of our Government; and

Whereas the President of the United States, in promulgating his textile program in May 1961, affirmed that it was then "time for action" to alleviate this problem; and

Whereas in August of 1962, the policy of the U.S. Government was stated officially to encompass limitation of wool-product imports to prevent market disruption; and

Whereas such imports are now substantially in excess of the level at which our Government has announced to this industry and the world that they will be held: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Association of Wool Manufacturers at its 98th annual meeting held in New York City, May 9, 1963, cognizant and deeply appreciative of the concern of the President and his administration for the plight of the wool textile industry, nonetheless deplores the lack thus far of definitive action to alleviate the plight of the industry and its workers in accordance with the policy unequivocally enunciated by our Government, and does hereby respectfully urge the administration promptly to make use of the resources at its command to provide this industry and all dependent upon it with the relief promised and to which they, in justice and in the national interest, are entitled.

Recognition of Dickinson College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on April 25, 1963, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., one of the first colleges in America to receive its charter, was presented a certificate and bronze marker designating it as a registered national historic landmark.

"Old West"—

In the words of the architectural historian, Talbot Hamlin, is—

> one of the most distinguished, and certainly the most subtly designed of all early American college structures, for its distinction is founded not on ornament but on solid qualities of functional planning, good proportion, and excellent materials beautifully used.

It was in recognition of this historical building that Dickinson has received this honor. Following are the remarks and words of praise given by friends and distinguished guests at the special convocation held at the college:

RECOGNITION OF DICKINSON COLLEGE

THE INVOCATION

(By Samuel H. Magill)

Eternal God, our Father in Heaven, we praise Thee, for Thou art the Lord of history and the sovereign Lord of us all. Thou has required much from us, for Thou art a righteous God, but we have not nearly measured up to Thy expectations. Forgive us, we pray, and strengthen us now.

On this day of recollection and rededication, we thank Thee for raising up those men of old who demonstrated their confidence in the future of this Nation and their recognition of the need for an educated and morally sensitive citizenry by contributing of their treasure to the construction of this hall of learning. We are grateful, too, for preserving it, and the college, through times of great hardship and suffering that it might come to stand both as a symbol of the enduring values of our heritage and a living challenge to us to continue the task set before us.

Grant, O Lord, that those who would participate in the rebirth of this college might engage in their task with the same courage, confidence, and wisdom that characterized John Dickinson and Benjamin Rush. Raise up in our day, too, men and women who will see the need as clearly and respond as generously as did the architect of this building, Benjamin Latrobe, and those who made its construction possible.

Finally, we invoke Thy blessing upon those gathered here today. May they be loyal sons and daughters and friends of this seat of liberal learning. We offer this prayer in the name and for the sake of our Lord, Jesus Christ. Amen.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS BY HOWARD LANE RUBENDALL, PRESIDENT OF THE COLLEGE

Mr. Rubendall. It is a pleasure to extend a word of welcome to the guests, friends and family of Dickinson who have gathered on this occasion of recognition of the great heritage of this college.

Today we remember the past. Someohe has called the word "remember" the most dynamic word in human speech. This judgment is based on faith in the power of retrospective thought, and the belief that one's heritage can work mightily to determine one's destiny.

It is in this faith that we introduce our speakers on this significant day.

I now present to you the Honorable George A. Goodling, our Representative to the Congress of the United States. Horticulturist, businessman, churchman, as well as sterling representative of his constituency, Mr. Goodling is among those who were instrumental in bringing today's recognition to our "Old West."

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN GEORGE A. GOODLING

Mr. Goodling. On August 31, 1935, the Historic Sites Act became law. Its purpose was to designate and register historic landmarks possessing exceptional value in commemorating and illustrating the history of the United States. The responsibility for carrying out the provisions of the act rests with the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior.

Carlisle is rich in tradition. Several weeks ago I participated in similar ceremonies when the Carlisle Indian School, now Carlisle Barracks, was designated a national historic landmark.

Today we gather on a similar occasion and I am happy to share with you the drama and glamour as we dedicate "Old West" as a national historic landmark.

Few academic institutions share the historical ancestry, or have been so deeply involved in the growth and development of our Nation from earliest times.

When Dickinson received its charter in 1783, there were but 11 other chartered colleges in the Thirteen Colonies. Dickinson's claim to greatness and its significance as a national historic landmark can be measured only partially by its age. Unique because of the mission it was created to fulfill, the mission of Dickinson College today is just as vital and urgent as it was 180 years ago in 1783. Need through the years has greatly expanded rather than diminished.

Our Founding Fathers were men of vision, men with a purpose who dared to be different in a cause to which they were dedicated. Do we today display that same devotion when the crowd stands against us? Can we with the bridgebuilder of old say:

"There followeth after me today
A youth whose feet must pass this way.

This chasm that was as naught to me
To that fair youth may a pitfall be.
He, too, must cross in the twilight dim,
Good friend, I am building this bridge for
him."

Dr. Benjamin Rush, Dickinson's founder, was a bridge builder. He saw the liberal arts college as an essential part of a program of culture reform to which Americans were committed by the Declaration of Independence. Having signed that document, this college was Dr. Rush's attempt to apply its principles. He was interested not only in government, but in education, medicine, science, letters and social reforms.

Shortly after Dickinson had been granted its charter, Dr. Rush wrote an article entitled, "The Mode of Education Proper in a Republic." In it he said, "the business of education has acquired a new complexion by the independence of our country. The form of government we have assumed has created a new class of duties of every American."

These duties to which he referred were the duties of responsible citizenship without which the Declaration of Independence might have been just an expression of noble ideals. From Dickinson's halls, Rush declared, "rays of knowledge" would issue which "shall finally reform our Constitution and laws and humanize even the half-civilized of the western counties of Pennsylvania." What would be his counsel were he here today?

Our primitive frontiers have gone, but Old West proudly stands as a symbol of the tremendous influence education has played in the development of our free society and our free institutions. But, as this dedication today summons us to the greatness of our past, we dare not for a moment forget that our Nation today even more urgently needs the same quality of devoted dedication to the principles upon which Dickinson was founded and which Dickinson has, throughout these intervening years, attempted to maintain.

Dickinson is one of the Nation's outstanding small colleges. This is attested to by its long list of distinguished alumni.

Old West, as a national historic landmark, must always serve as an inspiration to our people.

The following inscription appears on the Archives Building in Washington and I think it is most appropriate in today's ceremonies: "The heritage of the past is the seed that brings forth the harvest of the future." Dickinson College is well equipped to help make that harvest a bountiful one.

I congratulate you and trust Dickinson may continue to render dedicated service for another 180 years.

Mr. Rubendall. It is a special privilege to present to you Dr. Whitfield J. Bell, Jr., scholar, teacher and writer; a Dickinsonian who not only had a spectacular career as an undergraduate on this campus, having earned Phi Beta Kappa honors as well as having served as editor-in-chief of the Dickinsonian, but one who will always be known as one of the great teachers in Dickinson's long history. A member of Dickinson's faculty for 13 years, his appointment to the Boyd Lee Spahr Chair of American History in 1950 marked him as the youngest person ever to hold an endowed chair at the college.

Happily for his college, his present scholarly work with the American Philosophical Society keeps him in the neighborhood of alma mater so that we can call on him from time to time to enrich our work.

OLD WEST—DICKINSON COLLEGE

(By Whitfield J. Bell, Jr.)

Mr. Bell. Most Dickinsonians during the past 50 or 75 years, I suppose, have thought of Old West as a historic building. The college catalogs, handouts, and official history have all exclaimed in varying terms of extravagance on its priority—"the oldest college building west of the Susquehanna"—its beauty, and the unique events that have occurred in it. In comparisons with bigger, richer, more famous institutions, Dickinsonians could reflect that their enterprise was like Mark Hopkins'—a boy and a teacher on a log; but a log with a fanlight doorway. So, while they are not insensitive to the formal designation of this structure by the Federal Government as a historic building, Dickinsonians may be excused for feeling that this is only the recognition of something they have always known.

They are not entirely without reasons for this conviction. After all, interesting people have lived and worked in West College. That undisciplined child of enlightenment, Thomas Cooper, taught chemistry in one of the apartments of the West College—taught it with such single-minded attention and success that he even had the students in for experiments on Sunday mornings, to the great scandal of the godly President Atwater. Moncure Conway lived in room 47 in his senior year, 1848–49. The world knew him as a persuasive and influential exponent of liberal religion, a sound historian, and an early advocate of world peace, and Dickinson should honor him for these achievements; but it is his fate to be remembered here forever as the man who had President Peck confined in an insane asylum. (A modern college president, after a day with his faculty or the interfraternity council, might wonder whether Peck found the company so very different.) And James Buchanan, pride of the Union Philosophical Society and later President of the United States, lived in room 34 (according to a plaque—cast iron, not bronze—that used to hang in the east basement entrance to West), the room that is now Mr. Shuman's office.

If Old Buck's (I am quoting, not being familiar)—if Old Buck's presidential style was not the one that appears now to be generally approved, it ought at least be said in explanation of his inclination to compromise that James Buchanan was a Pennsylvania politician of the early 19th century, and only an adept at compromise and evasion could manage a state and party composed of as many irreconcilable and competing interests as Pennsylvania and its democracy—the old agriculture versus a rising industry; the Philadelphia bankers versus the debtors of the West; the farmers versus the canal—and railroad builders; the Germans versus the Scots-Irish. Politician or statesman, a great President or weak, the occupant of room 34 has a place in Dickinsonian history. Though often told, the story may be worth telling again.

1. Buchanan, U. P., appointment of the valedictorian.
2. Mediation after Jacob Rheem's funeral.
3. His rejection of the "James Buchanan professorship."

Some of the events that happened in West College are no less worthy of notice and remembrance than the occupants. I pass over all the student high jinks: the theft from Union Philosophical's rooms of their secret ritual and regalia by members of Belles Lettres, an abstraction once known from West to College Streets as "the great outrage"; the occasions on cold nights when students climbed into the cupola, turned the bell upside down, filled it with water and held it so until the water froze—so that the 6 o'clock chapel would not ring next morning; and more recent episodes when bicycles and banners have been hung on the mermaid's tail and the creature herself has disappeared for short vacations. On an academic occasion like this, I should speak of more significant events in West College; and so mention the McClintock Riot.

Even now, after more than a century, the facts are not clear. Suffice it to say that on June 2, 1847, three runaway slaves belonging to a Colonel Kennedy, of Hagerstown, Md., were apprehended in Carlisle and carried into court, where their master proved his ownership. Dr. John McClintock, professor of Greek, joined the swelling crowd in the courtroom; and for some reason both the judge and the crowd got the impression that he was in active sympathy with the Negroes' cause. When Colonel Kennedy and his slaves came out of the courthouse, the crowd surged forward, separated the slaves from their owner, and carried them away. When it was all over, the Negroes were nowhere to be found and Kennedy was lying mortally wounded in a pool of his own blood in Market House Alley. McClintock and 18 free Negroes were indicted.

The indictment of a clergyman and professor for riot, conspiracy, and murder would be a sensation under any circumstances. What made it worse at Dickinson was that half the student body came from slave States. The southerners assembled in the chapel in West College, signed a statement angrily declaring they would never attend a college which allowed an abolitionist on its faculty, and called on McClintock for an explanation and apology. He came, told them what had happened, and left without arguing or appealing. The southerners stayed. Meanwhile, of course, the trustees learned about the riot, which the newspapers now called after its most prominent participant. Abolitionism was a hot issue in 1849, and anyone who seemed to give it aid and comfort was, of course, "controversial." To a meeting of the board a month after the riot—and before McClintock's trial—President Emory stated the college's attitude: "The duty of professors, he declared, is to teach their subjects, not to be partisans or propagandists of any peculiar creed in politics or religion. * * * We would not seek the discussion of vexed questions, whether in politics, morals, or religion, but if they come up naturally and properly, we would not, as honest men and faithful teachers, withhold the frank statements of our opinions."

The board endorsed this principle, and left McClintock alone. College trustees have not always been so wise and generous, and it should be a matter for some pride here that West College was the scene of this victory of reasonableness.

But it is not only for reasons of biography and history that the Department of the Interior has designated West College a historic building. The structure has importance as an architectural monument. It is still singularly satisfying, "chaste, elegant and imposing," in the words of President Morgan; a striking contrast to the unadorned plainness of East College and the ugly, graceless, pretentious 20th century copies that have arisen to the west and southwest of it. The story of the origins of West College as a building is moving and thrilling. Having decided to move from the shabby brick building in Liberty Alley where classes had been taught since 1784, the trustees laid the cornerstone of a commodious "college house" in 1799. The building was just completed when it was totally destroyed by fire in February 1803. Most of the trustees were discouraged, and President Nisbet, to whom they owed several years' salary, took a bitter satisfaction from the disaster: "But it could not stand, as it was founded in fraud and knavery." Colonel John Montgomery and a few others, however, were undismayed. They opened subscription books—Thomas Jefferson, Aaron Burr, and Chief Justice John Marshall were contributors—and began a new building. At this juncture Judge Hugh Brackenridge, a trustee, holding court at Easton, heard that Benjamin H. Latrobe, the ablest architect in the United States, was about to leave Philadelphia for Washington, where he was architect in charge of the public buildings. Mounting his horse and, as he reported, riding "with the speed of an express," Brackenridge pounded his way to Philadelphia in a single day, laid Dickenson's case before the great man, and within a week had drawings for a new college building. Latrobe's gift was of incomparable worth, as anyone can see who more than glances at the building.

It was slow in being completed; but in 1805 was ready for classes. The finished apartments were on the south side, where, as a local newspaper cheerfully observed, they would be comfortable with but little aid from artificial warmth on all but the coldest days of winter. In the ensuing century and a half, the uses of the building have varied—faculty members lived in it, literary societies had their libraries and meeting rooms there, dining rooms and kitchens were in the basement, and it contained dormitory rooms until 1927. Most of the space now absorbed by the offices of administration was once devoted to the business of education.

It used to be generally believed that in its construction West College had somehow got turned around. The hall system, the doorways that were on the north side, the inconvenience of the broad fanlight doorway as an entrance, all suggested that the north facade should have faced High Street. Needless to say, this belief fathered some wry speculations and might have provided the text for a sermon. For colleges do sometimes get turned around—not necessarily physically, of course—and face in other ways than their founders or the Nation might have wished. Arrogant laymen, irresponsible politicians, narrow-minded churchmen, cynical faculties, have the power to turn colleges around. Colleges have certainly been turned around when football coaches or public relations men or business managers become more important than deans, and deans more important than professors. They are facing the wrong way when the fanlight is more important than the log with its teacher and student. In short, they are facing the wrong way when anything but teaching and learning come first. And once a college has been turned the wrong way around, it is the labor of a dozen Hercules to get it facing right again; and all that pushing and turning probably weakens the foundations permanently.

But to return to West College—the truth, as we now certainly know, is that it stands as Latrobe meant it to. Architecturally, it never turned around. Though more subtly than many old college buildings, it faces the town, as most colleges of its period did. The buildings of the "Brick Row" at Yale, for example, stood shoulder to shoulder like so many phalanxes of light and truth, proudly facing out; so do the "old Mains" of a score of hilltop colleges in this State and the older Middle West. I do not want to labor the point, or see significance where there is none; but I think that the position of American college buildings is symbolic of an age and attitude. There was a time—the founding of West College belongs to it—when the doors and windows of American colleges opened on the town, and the town's paths led through the college yards; a time when learning and democracy were regarded as supports each of the other and men of profound scholarship—John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, John Quincy Adams—held the highest offices of state. Things changed about midcentury. Egalitarianism with its suspicion of excellence, ostentatious wealth, a sentimental attachment to the European past, unsureness about the American tradition produced an alienation of colleges from the community and of the community from its centers of learning. College architecture reflected this. Quadrangles were built, as colleges turned their backs to the towns, looking in upon themselves. Nowhere was the shift more apparent than at New Haven, where the Brick Row was razed to make way for the great quad where the freshmen now live; and the residential colleges Yale built in the 1920's and 1930's carried this trend to a peak.

For many years college planners have favored this style, for it has much to recommend it; but if it keeps the students together, it also pretty effectively keeps them away from the rest of the community. It is encouraging to note there are many signs that the period of withdrawal is coming to an end, and we may expect to find the growing integration of learning with democracy reflected in collegiate architecture.

Be this as it may, of West College one can say that it has stood, as it will probably continue to stand, through many changes of style and tone. It is a historic building if only because it has survived so long; but, thank God, it is not a shrine—it is still in daily use, still used daily for purposes like those for which it was built. It is not simply a mute witness to what has gone before, but a place where things are done and plans made; and the highest honor you can pay it, I submit, is to go on using it with intelligence and respect. Keep Old West that way—a place where today and every day for years to come, the students and faculty of this college demonstrate by their work that learning and wisdom, no less than righteousness—that learning and wisdom, which are righteousness—shall exalt the nations.

REMARKS BY DANIEL B. BEARD, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE ON PRESENTATION OF REGISTERED NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK DESIGNATION TO "OLD WEST," DICKINSON COLLEGE, CARLISLE, PA., APRIL 1963

Mr. BEARD. It is an honor for me to represent the National Park Service of the U.S. Department of the Interior upon this important occasion in the history of Dickinson College.

The movement for public agencies to preserve historical properties in this country began about 1850 when the State of New York acquired Hasbrouck House which was Washington's headquarters at Newburgh. Since that time, State and local historical societies, interested individuals, patriotic groups, Civil War veterans and others, spurred public bodies into action on historical preservation. In 1906, the Antiquities Act was signed, bringing the Federal Government strongly into the movement.

It was not until 1935, however, that a unified directive was given to one public agency, the National Park Service, to seek out our most important historic sites, evaluate them and take appropriate action to preserve them. This was the Historic Sites Act which stated: "That it is hereby declared that it is a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings, and objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States."

This action brought two related activities into being: the National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings, and the Historic American Buildings Survey. Thus, Uncle Sam began to systematically study, evaluate, and sort out his historic heritage. Except for the period around World War II, the work has continued ever since with excellent results.

The Registry of National Historic Landmarks is an outgrowth of the national survey. Sites selected through the survey studies, recommended by the advisory board, and approved by the Secretary of the Interior as having exceptional value in illustrating and commemorating the history of the United States are eligible for the Registry of National Historic Landmarks. The registry is the means through which the Federal Government recognizes sites of national importance irrespective of ownership. Such sites are not units of the National Park System. The registry identifies these important segments of American heritage and brings them to the attention of the American public. The owner, if he wishes, may receive free of cost a certificate and plaque from the National Park Service designating the historic property as a national landmark. This registry, we feel, provides encouragement to a number of organizations and individuals to preserve the Nation's historic and archeological properties. "Old West" is well qualified for such a designation.

The origin of Dickinson College goes back to the very roots of our independence as a Nation, the institution having been incorporated by Pennsylvania in September 1783. With the granting of the charter, the trustees of the school held their first meeting at the Philadelphia home of one of their members, John Dickinson, president of the Supreme Executive Council of Pennsylvania. It is from this illustrious patriot, the "Penman of the Revolution," that the new institution took its name. Another trustee was Dr. Benjamin Rush, who, first and foremost, is recognized as the founder of the college.

At the request of a committee charged with obtaining plans for a new building, Hugh Henry Brackenridge, justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court and a noted satiric author of the time, went to Philadelphia and approached the architect, Benjamin H. Latrobe, explaining to him the nature of the town, the college site, and the probable funds available for the new construction. Latrobe accepted the commission and in the middle of May 1803 preliminary drawings were submitted by the architect, accompanied by a long letter explaining the principles and purpose of his design for the building. The preliminary plan, two drawings of which survive in the collection of Dickinson College, was followed by the working drawings, now lost. Early in 1804 work on the building was well underway, but as contributions lagged, so did the construction. Although some of the rooms were finished in 1805, not until 1821–22 was West College, as it was called, ready for full occupancy.

"Old West," the original building of Dickinson College, has been described as "one of the most distinguished, and certainly the most subtly designed, of all early American college structures, for its distinction is founded not on ornament but on solid qualities of functional planning, good proportion, and excellent materials beautifully used."

In addition to its architectural distinction, "Old West" is a notable example of the struggle to provide higher education for the youth of the Republic in the generation after independence. Of this aspect of "Old West's" significance it has been written: "Perhaps no other building today can lay better claim to representing the courageous purpose of the men who committed themselves, in spite of great difficulties, to providing worthy educational institutions, in America."

With the presentation of this plaque and this certificate signed by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, "Old West" is now recognized as a registered national historic landmark because this distinguished building, still in use, has been classified as of exceptional value as commemorating and illustrating the history of the United States.

REMARKS MADE BY MR. MASLAND AT FOUNDERS DAY AT DICKINSON

Mr. MASLAND. On behalf of Dickinson College, I accept this certificate with deep appreciation of its significance. I am sure that national recognition of the jewel that is ours will stimulate an already limitless pride; cement our determination to preserve it inviolate, and instill in generations to come a regard for the courage and convictions of our Founding Fathers.

Mr. Beard, we do indeed appreciate your representing the Park Service here today. We ask you to convey our greetings and our appreciation to the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the Park Service.

A Time for Sorting Ourselves Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Evening Star, Washington, D.C.:

MAN AND THE TIMES—A TIME FOR SORTING OURSELVES OUT

(By Eric Sevareid)

This, I'm afraid, is a short-range arrow aimed only in the general direction of a long-range target.

It is part of the unsorted impedimenta left over from recent travels. No one can visit modern Greece without revisiting ancient Greece through its written classics, and no one can do that without looking, of a sudden, at his own society with different, if not wiser, eyes.

It is an absurdly long jump from the golden age of Periclean Greece and the reasons for its failure in the end, to the New Frontier of John F. Kennedy and the reasons for its failure in the beginning. If there is any connection, it is to be found only in general thoughts about the social biology of nations.

The thought here is that the United States has reached middle age as a nation, knows this in its bones but not explicitly in its mind and therefore does not reflect it in its speech, including the programs of political leaders.

The familiar explanation for his Government's failure to climb the steep passes of the New Frontier is not enough—the simple argument that Congress balks and that it balks because the mood of the country, which the Congress and election statistics accurately reflect, favors no great exertions. The argument adds that the American people have always behaved this way, between wars and between depressions.

They have, but to be content with this explanation is to explain modern America only in terms of the short-range cycle of years and decades. Yet a case can be made for the proposition that a long-range cycle of generations and centuries is also at work, that the evidence for it is now abundant and can explain even such transient phenomena as the fate of the New Frontier.

YOUTH KNOWS

All previous American generations have considered their country as synonymous not only with perpetual motion but with perpetual youth. The youth of today, even more than their elders, know better, even if they can't express it. They know that quantities have little to do with qualities, that our traditional slogan of "bigger and better" is a non sequitur.

The essence of middle age for a person is that he knows he must begin to live within his means, physical, financial, and spiritual. It is the same for a society. At middle age a person struggles to realize his final personality and a society struggles to give form, not merely dimensions, to its life.

This has little, if anything to do with conservatism or liberalism. It has to do with reason, which the ancient Greeks revered, and a concept of the good life which they institutionalized.

REASON'S SUBDUED PROTEST

Today, in America, reason is crying many halts, if only sotto voce. In the most obvious, measurable realm of natural resources, it cries halt to the depletion of water levels in the name of more and more factories. It cries halt to the indiscriminate spreading of pesticides, in the name of shinier red apples. It cries halt to the vast use of barbiturates and tension relievers in the name of momentary nirvana. It cries halt to engulfment of us all by more and more news when we can hardly grasp the meaning of the present news. Its gathering instinct is to cry halt to free immigration if this is to mean the compounding of tragedy, Harlem upon Harlems. It would like to cry halt to the piling of weapon upon weapon to kill enemies 10 times over; to the fantastic spending for outer space when the problem lies in inner man and on terra firma. Reason says that we are overextended in foreign places, not in terms of our money but in terms of our comprehension, and our attention span; reason tells us our moral obligation to help others cannot extend beyond our practical capacity to do so. Reason would cry halt to further increases in our population.

It tells us that more and more superhighways, bridges, and parking garages in the already dense megalopolis is a self-defeating process; for the automobile, thus encouraged to proliferate, always saturates the temporary margin of space.

Reason says the 50-mile hike is silly.

The trouble with America is not hardening of the arteries. Its trouble is merely that it has grown up, reached maturity, and, like the ex-athlete of middle age, is feeling bewildered and annoyed.

America knows, in its subconscious at least, that more bursts of "vigah" are likely to produce nothing more positive than a heart attack. It knows that what it really wants to do, what it really must do, is to slow down and sort itself out. For 300 years it has been told what it was going to become. Now it wants to know what it is.

Michigan's Legislature and Governor Cooperate To Steer State Back Onto Road of Fiscal Soundness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Michigan are witnessing an encouraging change in climate in their State.

A spirit of optimism has replaced gloom and hopelessness which has prevailed after many years of controversy over the political philosophy of a bossed Democrat administration and a Republican legislature.

The Michigan Legislature is now in interim recess and what has been accomplished through cooperation between this legislature and Gov. George Romney has amazed the skeptics.

Publisher Joseph Grim, of the Farwell News, reviews the situation in an editorial in the current issue of his newspaper.

The editorial follows:

Legislature Shows Its Usual Independence

The Michigan Legislature, now in interim recess, has been praised by just about all hands, except the Democrats, for a job well done. Unless you deliberately blind yourself to the facts, you have to admit that the 1963 session was something unusual. Much more was accomplished than even the most optimistic expected when the second Wednesday of January saw the twq houses of the legislature called to order for the 1963 session.

Almost the first thing they heard was the Governor's message, which asked for a "short, action-packed session, to care for the immediate needs of State government and appropriating the necessary money for the operation of the departments and services of government."

The political sages wagged their heads in disbelief, from long experience they had learned that there is no way to hurry a legislator in the performance of his lawmaking duties. The more pressure that was applied the less haste there was to complete the job.

To top it all off, Gov. George Romney, the fair-haired hero of a lot of people, was no such idol of the legislature. It was almost an even bet that he would get little more cooperation than had his predecessor, who's batting average was almost a minus zero. It was an entirely new crew and no time to train for their job.

There was litle disagreement with the Governor's idea for a short session, and then to come back in the fall to struggle with fiscal reform. Some of the older hands shook their heads in disbelief when they saw the size of the "grist" that the Governor and others tossed into the legislative hopper.

That they accomplished a near miracle is not due to any one factor. Governor Romney succeeded in getting better cooperation than he could have reasonably expected. He found out that the members of the legislature were as sincere as he was, about getting Michigan back on the road to fiscal soundness and better job and business climate.

Governor Romney is no miracleman, he never said he was one, but he did what few governors before him have done, he took off his coat (literally) and went to work. It can be truthfully said that there was no harder working employee of the State than its Governor.

As the session progressed the Governor began to get the feel of the thing, and the gears clashed less often. Instead of lambasting the legislature because of the things they didn't do, which he had asked for, he praised them for the things they had done. It was a strange and rare tonic for those who had never known anything but criticism from the Governor's office.

To say that Governor Rommey has subdued the legislature to his will would be a gross misstatement of fact. He recognizes that it is a separate department of government. He seems to be learning how to handle the various controls that get production instead of scrap out of the machinery of State government.

Without doubt, there were times when Governor Romney wondered why he ever got mixed up in politics, when his job as head of American Motors seemed serene and uncomplicated, compared to the job of running the State of Michigan.

Outside of his office each Thursday gathers an assortment of citizens, who have come to talk with him. It just isn't the kind of people that most of us would want to sit down with and discuss the affairs of State government. Some are undoubtedly sincere, and from some he may actually get some ideas. Most of these who watched this new citizen participation in State government for the first few weeks fully expected him to find some excuse to discontinue these chats which must provide a severe drain on his time, and patience. Now we are not so sure he even wants to discontinue them.

George Romney is a new phenomenon in Michigan State government. It is reasonable to suppose that he has had at some time some practical experience in political affairs, which is not generally known. It is also equally obvious that whatever it was, it did not acquaint him with the politically run government on a State level.

Much of the troubles that he has had resulted from the lack of knowledge about these things on both his part and the part of those he has had around him. At least the Governor learned fast. There is little doubt about the need for doing so. Ahead of him is one of the most difficult sessions of the legislature in its history. It could wreck every chance for a political future for the Governor.

The legislature is as independent as ever. It will take understanding and cooperation to get the job done that must be done. There will be much politics mixed up in any solution which will be offered, which is not necessarily bad. If Governor Romney succeeds as well in this coming fiscal reform session as he did in the 1963 regular session, he will have compiled a record in his first year as Governor, of which a far more astute political figure could well be proud.

What is more important, the people of Michigan will be the real gainers in such an outcome. Michigan is just beginning to cast off the bindings that have held back the growth and expansion of industry and business in this State. It is not a time for bickering and quarreling. Governor Romney can become one of Michigan's greatest Governors if he can provide the leadership that is needed now. If he tries to drive instead of lead, the outlook is dark, indeed. In his first 4 months as Governor he shows signs of being capable of developing the kind of leadership his party and his State need.

"To Russia, With Love"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, it appears fitting that as we await the arrival of a great American and through him, pay tribute to an all-America team, we also pause and turn our attention to some darker pages in modern history.

The following advertisement, "To Russia, With Love"—A 162,000 Man-Day Missile Gap, was inserted as a full page ad in a trade magazine by Warner & Swasey, a Cleveland, Ohio, industrial firm:

"To Russia, With Love"—A 162,000 Man-Day Missile Gap

At Cape Canaveral and other missile construction and test sites there have been 325 strikes and similar work stoppages in the past vital 4½ years, resulting in loss of 169,872 man days—810 man years—time vital to the safety of this country; a completely free gift to our enemies.

Patriotism was flaunted, to "make work" and invent overtime, Ditchdiggers collected as much as $287 a week.

Pipefitters refused to allow the use of manifolds properly made by experts at the factory. But they permitted (if you please) the use after the workers sat around at full pay for the time it would have taken them to do the work already done. They cynically called it "blessing the manifolds."

Production was as low as 40 percent of a normal day's work.

One authority believes that at Cape Canaveral alone tens of millions of dollars were wasted in such needless charges.

Remember all this when you pay your next and next and next tax bills for the rest of your life.

Rev. Gerard M. Santora

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, it is our good fortune in Jersey City, N.J., to have as pastor of the Holy Rosary Church, a beloved member of the Roman Catholic clergy, the Reverend Gerard M. Santora. On Sunday, May 12, 1963, members of his congregation, many friends and colleagues in Christ, as well as public officials, gathered at the Hotel Robert Treat in Newark, N.J., to pay tribute and honor to Reverend Santora on the occasion of his 25th anniversary in the priesthood. Significantly, all of these 25 years were spent at Holy Rosary Church, with the exception of a few months after his ordination in 1938 when he was assigned to Mount Virgin Church, in Garfield, N.J.

The esteem and affection felt for Father Santora was evidenced by the vast number of spiritual bouquets bestowed upon him.

The citizens of Jersey City extend to Father Santora their sincere and best wishes and express the hope that he will have many more meaningful, rewarding, and happy years at Holy Rosary Church.

Father Santora is held in highest regard by his parishioners as is clearly seen in the following tribute paid to him on the evening of his anniversary which I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The tribute follows:

Rev. Gerard M. Santora

"Ecce sacerdos." "Behold the priest." Rev. Gerard Michael Santora, who, born on May 19, 1912, in Montclair, N.J., was destined to fulfill his destiny in the service of God. Father Santora was to become a pastor, caring for his sheep in a humble, growing parish, Holy Rosary. After completing his education at Seton Hall and Immaculate Conception Seminary, Father was ordained on June 11, 1938, in St. Patrick's Pro Cathedral by the late Most Reverend Thomas J. Walsh, first archbishop of Newark. His first assignment was at Mount Virgin Church in Garfield, where he served for 7 months. The hand of God intervened on January 19, 1939, when Father Santora was transferred to Holy Rosary as assistant pastor. From this day on, Reverend Santora exercised his priestly authority and was loved and respected by all.

At Holy Rosary, father rolled up his sleeves and set to the task of development and growth of his new parish. He was made moderator of the Holy Name Society, Sodality of Our Blessed Lady, and of the mother's auxiliary. Also interested in the youth of the parish, father was assigned to moderate over the fife and drum corps, the CYO, and altar boys. He became parish administrator in 1946, and after 8 years, the Most Reverend Thomas A. Boland, Archbishop of Newark, elevated this humble, respected, and well deserving priest to the office of pastor.

As pastor, Father Santora soon gained the admiration and loyalty of his parishioners as well as from his fellow citizens of Jersey City. For father did not limit his activities to his parish alone, but worked for the betterment, development, growth and vitalization of the downtown district of Jersey City. Why? Because although he was pastor of Holy Rosary, his was the job of a shepherd in the flocks of the Divine Father. The care for his sheep did not stop at the doorsteps of Holy Rosary, but went further and touched even the lowliest of sheep, who was also a child of God.

In July 1953, he was given the Outstanding American Award by the John R. Longo Association, "for his magnificent contribution to the moral, spiritual and economic uplift of our fellow citizens in the downtown area of Jersey City and because he is a firm believer that education is the foundation of our democratic institutions." This was only one of the recognitions received by Father Santora, for on July 22, 1954, father was presented with a Benefactor's Award for the Advancement of Education. On November 10, 1958, the parishioners of Holy Rosary honored father with a testimonial in honor of his 20th anniversary to the holy priesthood. And again in January 1962, the C.W.V. organization presented Reverend Santora with the Gold Award, as the outstanding religious. Father at present is the chaplain of Conception Council, Knights of Columbus, and also the chaplain of the Friendly Merchants of Jersey City, and is active in almost every phase of life, both spiritual and public.

This is the public father, but how many know the "real" father, pastor of his children?

This side of Rev. Gerard Michael Santora can often be seen walking the streets of his parish, either fondly, but humbly gazing upon his accomplishments, such as the new convent, new rectory, renovated church, or the additions to Holy Rosary Grammar School, or he can often be seen strolling around the church area, reading his sacred office, or stopping to chat with his parishioners. "Ecce sacerdos," the pastor gently caring for his sheep, in the service of the Almighty for 25 years, and with the grace of God for many more.

The International Coffee Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in the debate in the other body yesterday on ratification of the International Coffee Agreement—on which a vote is scheduled for 5 p.m. today—I noted at page 8555 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that a letter to me from Assistant Secretary of State Frederick G. Dutton, dated October 3, 1962, was included in the debate. This communication indicated that the American coffee consumer does not have to fear any excessive increases in coffee prices growing out of the ratification of the agreement.

I sincerely hope the State Department's optimism on this point is valid. I have always taken the position that we should help the producers to obtain a fair price for their product, but sometimes these support programs tend to control excessive price fluctuations in one direction only—that is, while going down, but never while shooting up.

Mr. Speaker, since the Department letter to me of last October is now an important piece of evidence in the International Coffee Agreement ratification debate, I would like to have the RECORD also show the reasoning which prompted me to write to the State Department last September, and my comments at the time of making the reply public in the Appendix of the RECORD for last October 5, as follows:

WILL PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT PREVENT EXCESSIVELY HIGH AS WELL AS EXCESSIVELY LOW PRICES?—EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, OF MISSOURI, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1962

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as one who has always tried here in the Congress to reflect the consumer point of view, I have, however, never opposed fair treatment for the farmer in assuring decent prices for the food he produces. The consumer is not benefited in the long run if prices to the producer of food are so ruinously low as to drive the farmers off the farm.

Similarly, while I have vigorously opposed the recurring—and sometimes successful—attempts to boost prices of coffee to the American consumer on the basis of fake shortages or rumors of shortages, I would certainly not want to give the impression that I think the Latin American producers should not be helped to get fair and reasonable prices for their coffee. Far from it.

The unconscionable speculative price increases of January 1954 did not have much chance to help the individual coffee grower; the subsequent collapse of the wholesale price 6 months later, after the disclosure of the market excesses and irregularities, hurt the coffee grower very much, however. Thus, violent upswings in prices are a problem to both consumer and producer, just as depressed prices are a problem, particularly when the economy of a whole country rests heavily on just one commodity.

With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I wrote to the Secretary of State last month asking what provisions were being included in the proposed international agreement on coffee which would protect the American consumer—who forms the main market for Latin American coffee, and who is also the individual who is going to have to pay for most of the cost of any stabilization agreement—what provisions were included to protect our consumers against unconscionable price increases, in case today's surpluses should conceivably turn into tomorrow's shortages. There are circumstances under which such a thing could happen, of course.

WHAT PROTECTION FOR CONSUMER AGAINST RUNAWAY PRICES?

Mr. Speaker, I think the correspondence is self-explanatory. We all remember during price control days in this country that while it was politically possible to put a floor under farm prices, it became almost impossible politically to put any effective price ceilings over them once circumstances drove these prices from far below parity to way above parity. I had that in mind when I addressed the following letter to the Secretary of State on September 13:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 13, 1962.
The Honorable DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State, State Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Ever since I raised an alarm over runaway coffee prices in the United States in 1954, setting off a Federal Trade Commission investigation which disclosed widespread evidence of specilative price excesses and futures trading irregularities, I have been attempting to keep in touch with developments in this field which might foreshadow possible gouging once again of the consumer. Just recently, I called the attention of the House, and of the housewives of the country, to a news report from Brazil implying that some frost damage to the new crop would, or might, result in higher coffee prices in the United States. I warned that any wholesale or retail price increases based on such a scare story would be utterly unjustified, in view of the tremendous stocks of coffee on hand.

My purpose in writing to you is to do two things: first, to assure you and your aids that my concern is directed primarily at unwarranted increases in coffee prices based on false reports and speculative excesses, rather than on any opposition on my part to any reasonable international program for stabilizing coffee prices at prices which are fair to both producers and consumers; and, secondly, to ask what safeguards are being written into the proposed international agreement which would serve to protect the American consumer in case crop controls and other measures should result in inordinately high prices to the American consumer.

We have long followed a policy in this country of encouraging reductions in farm production when prices are ruinously low, so I do not subscribe to the idea that any attempt to stabilize coffee prices for Latin American producers is necessarily a disservice to the American consumer, particularly if it should mean any substantial improvement in incomes and living conditions for the people of Latin America, and thus a reduction in the amount of aid we would have to give there.

On the other hand, it has been the sad experience of the American consumer in both World War II and Korean war days that after having gladly cooperated in building a floor under farm prices, the consumer was denied any effective ceiling over those same prices once inflation became virulent. I fear that if a stabilization program should be adopted for coffee, it would require our consumers to support the idea of a floor under coffee prices, but would give them no protection over excessive increases if unexpected circumstances should precipitate sharp increases in price.

Perhaps this matter has already received departmental consideration, and the necessary safeguards have been included in the draft agreement. If so, I would be glad to know about it. If not, I certainly trust some proviso is included to permit reasonable restraints on excessive price rises as well as on excessive price declines. Since we are the biggest customer-country involved in the negotiations, and since the American consumer will largely pay for the international stabilization program in terms of higher prices for coffee in the stores, I think our consumers are entitled to the kind of consideration I have outlined.

May I have your thinking on this.
Sincerely yours,
LEONOR K. (MRS. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress,
Third District, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I have now received a reply to this letter from Assistant Secretary Frederick G. Dutton outlining the provisions of the proposed new agreement which could possibly operate to protect the American consumer in case of sudden inflation in coffee prices.

I think this information will be highly useful to us in assessing the desirability of Senate approval of the agreement. If the safeguards here outlined do not appear strong enough, perhaps we can then take whatever steps might be necessary to assure adequate protection for the American consumer.

SAFEGUARD PROVISIONS IN PROPOSED AGREEMENT

I again want to make clear, as I have tried to do in all my past discussions of coffee prices, that I favor helping the coffeegrowers, particularly those on family sized acreage, to obtain a fair price for their product. A cup of coffee would taste bitter, indeed, if it represented starvation returns for the men and women who raise and gather the beans. But excessive speculative price increases in the commodity exchanges must also be prevented, and any runaway inflation in coffee prices, no matter how improbable such a thing might seem at the moment, is something our consumers must nevertheless be protected against.

Mr. Speaker, the State Department reply to me on this issue was as follows:

Department of State,
Washington, October 3, 1962.

The Honorable Leonor K. Sullivan,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mrs. Sullivan: I want to thank you for your letter of September 13, 1962, addressed to the Secretary, with regard to the new international coffee agreement which is now before governments for consideration. I am sorry that our reply is somewhat tardy; our workload in the closing days of this Congress has been exceptionally heavy.

At the beginning I want to say that the officials of this Department concerned with the coffee problem are sincerely appreciative of the constructive view you have taken in this matter. Accordingly they want me to assure you that they have been mindful throughout the long negotiations with foreign governments that our first duty is to protect the American consumer. The advisory committee appointed by the National Coffee Association to work with the State Department during the negotiation of the new coffee agreement has, of course, always maintained that the U.S. consumer must be protected in any coffee agreement. Toward this common objective we have managed to secure a number of provisions in the new agreement which should fully protect our interests.

Before describing these specific provisions, it is noteworthy that the tremendous stocks of coffee now held by Brazil and Colombia would seem adequate assurance that no substantial advance in green coffee prices could be sustained in the foreseeable future. Stocks are also building up in some African countries, and present productive capacity everywhere is in excess of any likely demand over the next 5 years. Thus the supply and demand situation as presently known argues against any marked increases in coffee prices.

The new international coffee agreement does not have any specific price objective in the sense that it will endeavor to maintain prices for the various kinds and qualities of coffee at certain cents-per-pound figures. It does provide that through the fixing of quotas, the members agree on the necessity of assuring that the general level of coffee prices does not decline below the general level of such prices in 1962. We consider this price objective a realistic one in view of the burdensome stocks overhanging the market. In the light of the price trend it is also a reasonably modest one, as coffee prices have been declining steadily in recent years. During the first 8 months of 1962 the price of Brazilian coffee averaged about 34.3 cents a pound, compared with 36.6 cents in 1960 and 48.4 cents in 1958. The decline set in immediately after 1954, when you will remember the severe frost damage in Brazil resulted in prices averaging 78.7 cents per pound.

Consumer protection against any unwarranted price increases is assured by a number of specific provisions in the agreement. Probably the most important are the provisions relating to the establishment and adjustment of export quotas. Export quotas are intended to control the amount of coffee that may be made available to the market by the producing countries during a given period, and thus they directly influence the price. The agreement provides that all decisions on the establishment and adjustment of export quotas shall be taken by a distributed two-thirds majority vote, i.e., a concurrent two-thirds majority of the importers and exporters voting separately. As the United States has 400 votes this in effect gives us a veto power over decisions of the Council. We would to make the veto effective need only one other importing country voting with us. The number of votes held by it would be of no consequence as we alone have more than one-third, but it was felt desirable to provide that one country alone could not exercise a veto. We cannot conceive of any situation in which the United States advocated a veto where we could not persuade at least one other importer of the merit of our position.

In addition to the voting provisions of the agreement with regard to export quotas, two other provisions are noteworthy, in that they specifically recognize the undesirability of marked changes in coffee prices for whatever reason, and provide for corrective action under voting procedures which are easier to attain than the standard procedure of a distributed two-thirds majority. These two provisions are quoted below for your information.

"(5) All members recognize that marked price rises or falls occurring within brief periods may unduly distort underlying trends in price, cause grave concern to both producers and consumers, and jeopardize the attainment of the objectives of the agreement. Accordingly, if such movements in general price levels occur within brief periods, members may request a meeting of the Council which, by distributed simple majority vote, may revise the total level of the quarterly export quotas in effect.

"(6) If the Council finds that a sharp and unusual increase or decrease in the general level of prices is due to artificial manipulation of the coffee market through agreements among importers or exporters or both, it shall then decide by a simple majority vote on what corrective measures should be applied to readjust the total level of the quarterly export quotas in effect."

In the unlikely event that unforeseeable circumstances might arise in the administration of the agreement which would operate against the interests of our consumers or our coffee trade, the United States could always withdraw from the agreement. It is provided that any government, after September 30, 1963, may withdraw by giving written notice, such withdrawal to be effective 90 days after notification. As the agreement would collapse without our participation, this possibility is the final assurance that our views on the operation of the agreement must be respected.

If I can be of any further assistance in furnishing information please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Frederick G. Dutton,
Assistant Secretary.

GOP Freshman Fights Porkbarrel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Indianapolis News of May 14, 1963:

GOP Freshman Fights Pork Barrel

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

Washington.—It takes political guts for a freshman Congressman representing a marginal district to vote "No" on porkbarrel legislation.

Particularly when that Congressman is the first Republican to represent his district in 42 years. Particularly when unemployment is high and passage of that bill would mean jobs—building sewers and pumping stations and roads, 15 projects in all.

But Bill Brock, a 32-year-old businessman from Chattanooga, Tenn., did just that. Rejecting the advice of colleagues older and presumably wiser, Brock opposed the President's $450 million emergency public works bill earlier this session. He explains why:

"For every dollar sent to Washington, Chattanooga residents would receive less than 75 cents back in the form of short-term public works projects.

"I feel strongly that the same amount of money spent for new industry and more jobs could go a long way toward solving unemployment problems."

Dark-haired Bill Brock, in Washington only 3 months, is deeply distressed. "I have been tremendously disappointed," he says, "in the number of Congressmen whose only question about any legislation is: 'How-many votes will it get me?' "

"My criterion is different: Can we afford it? Do we need it? Will it promote individual freedom and responsibility?"

Of the several score freshman Congressmen now learning the Washington ropes, Brock has impressed leaders on both sides of the aisle as one of the most promising. He demonstrated why in a whirlwind campaign last year that frankly surprised GOP officials who had written off Tennessee's Third District as lost.

Brock began to work in November 1960 starting with a campaign nucleus of 30 people, aiming toward November 1962. There is no indication that he planned, at the time, to be the candidate.

By early 1962, Brock had decided to run. When a brash young liberal won the Democratic primary, defeating a middle-of-the-road incumbent, the scene was set for a bitter fight.

Well financed, Wilkes Thrasher received ample administration support in a campaign that served as a proving ground for the electoral popularity of medicare. Thrasher made medical care under social security his key issue. Brock opposed it.

The two were divided on almost every issue: deficit spending, aid to Communist nations, Federal aid to education.

When the ballots were tallied Brock had won an amazing victory. In a district where only 15 percent of the voters are thought to be Republicans, Brock won 51.1 percent of the vote.

His volunteer organization, which at first numbered only 30 people, had grown by leaps and bounds. The Congressman-elect wrote 4,500 thank-you notes to workers who helped his campaign.

Representing a marginal district, Brock has kept his ear close to the grassroots. He sees his constituents as alarmed by "do-nothing foreign policies" of the administration. "They want leadership," he says. "They want victory in the cold war and they're not getting it."

Six months after his first race for public office, Brock is being urged to run for the U.S. Senate. Tennessee voters must decide the fate of Albert Gore in 1964 and of Estes Kefauver 2 years later. Both are liberal Democrats and would get quite a race from Representative Brock.

Active in young Republican affairs for many years, Brock favors Barry Goldwater for President. "The Republican Party," he says, "is the conservative party and Goldwater our leader."

The Death Penalty Does Not Prevent Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Justice Michael Musmanno has written a letter to the New York Herald Tribune which concerns the abolition of the death penalty. It is an excellent statement from personal experience and supports indirectly the theory of my bill H.R. 545, which would abolish the death penalty in all Federal jurisdictions.

I commend Justice Musmanno's letter, which appeared in the April 30, 1963, edition of the Herald Tribune, to the attention of our colleagues.

The letter follows:

DEATH PENALTY DOES NOT PREVENT CRIME

To the Herald Tribune:

I am opposed to capital punishment even though I advocated the execution of Adolf Eichmann. If this seems an inconsistency, it is the inconsistency between a Sergeant York who, in civilian life, would never have even slightly harmed another human being and yet in war on 1 day singlehandedly killed 20 Germans and would have killed 130 more if they had not surrendered. It is the difference between killing aggressively and killing in self-defense.

Adolf Eichmann was not simply a murderer. He was a devasting force like a plague, an erupting volcano, a tiger on the loose. Eichmann did not kill only on 1 day, he killed day after day. For 4 years, he murdered thousands after thousands until the total of those he slew exhausted the possibilities of a six-digit adding machine.

If Adolf Hitler had survived the war he would absolutely have had to be hanged as a matter of necessity for world order. So long as he walked the earth, he would have been a rallying figure for the Nazis ready to renew the slaughter of aggressive war and the bestial horrors of the concentration camps and extermination mills.

If Eichmann had continued to live, he would have remained a symbol of encouragement to the genocides and the race of haters ever eager to harass, persecute, and even kill those they regarded as inferior.

I am opposed to capital punishment in the true sense of that phrase: the execution of a human being convicted of a single murder. I oppose capital punishment firstly because of the possibility that government, in the name of the law, may commit an appalling, irretrievable error and kill an innocent man.

I was within several hundred feet of the death chamber in Boston when Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti were executed while evidence of their innocence still pyramided. But by this time, political considerations, expediency and false pride had become so much a part of the case that the guilt or innocence of the shoemaker and the fish peddler had developed into wholly secondary issues. Had Sacco and Vanzetti been sentenced to life imprisonment, they would today be freemen because no one can possibly read the record of that amazing case without concluding that, at the most, the prosecution had produced only a case riddled with torturing doubt. Every identifying witness has today been irrefutably proved to have agonizingly blundered in identification of the doomed men.

Only last year Governor Brown of California pardoned Warren K. Billings who had been sentenced to death (with Tom Mooney) for a 1916 "Preparedness Day" bombing. The key witness against Billings repudiated his testimony and admitted perjury. Tom Mooney was pardoned in 1939. The Washington Post, commenting on the Mooney-Billings case, said: "This history ought to give pause to those who support capital punishment. If the pair had been executed, there would have been no one left to pardon when evidence of their innocence came to light. Society would have compounded the crime of the bombing by the murder of two innocent men."

I am opposed to capital punishment for another reason. The main purpose of government is to restrain violence and, by example, inculcate respect for the ways of peace. But what can be more violent than to take a helpless human being, strap him into a monstrous device, and shoot thousands of volts of electricity into him while his body writhes and moans, and his eyes plead vainly for understanding?

Those who defend capital punishment have yet to prove that it deters the commission of capital crime. If someone told me that in Hawaii people live to be 150 years old, I should think he would present a few 150-year-old people to prove his case. Until it can be established with some fair measure of accuracy that capital punishment does benefit society, it can only be regarded, as indeed it is, a blundering medieval method of sovereign coercion which is wholly inconsistent with every teaching of modern criminology, penology and humanity.

MICHAEL A. MUSMANNO,
Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.
PITTSBURGH.

The Cadmium Imbroglio—What Went Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat difficult to distinguish the red faces of some Federal officials through the red tape with which they surround themselves.

But there most certainly is reason for embarrassment because of the mess in which the cadmium market finds itself following the disposal of certain federally-owned stocks of this metal.

For the information of my colleagues, I am including in my remarks two articles on this situation: one by Freeman Bishop from the American Metal Market and the other from Metal and Mineral Markets. I think the mismanagement of an essentially simple problem is almost unbelievable.

The articles follow:

[From the American Metal Market, May 20, 1963]

THE CADMIUM IMBROGLIO—WHAT WENT WRONG

(By Freeman Bishop)

WASHINGTON.—Major problems for further sales of metals from the Government's stockpiles unquestionably have been generated by the General Services Administration's handling of cadmium disposals.

Cadmium producers and processors and metal finishers—the largest users of cadmium for plating—allege that GSA has made a mess of its handling of two recent offerings, each of 150,000 pounds of cadmium. The metal industry protest has received important backing in Congress from Representative Bill Broomfield of Michigan. Thus, the further disposal of 1.7 million pounds of cadmium—the balance of the 2 million pound sale authorized by Congress—may be in for a rough time.

Just prior to the first stockpile offering of cadmium, the going market price for the metal, used in plating and battery making, was $1.85 to $1.90 a pound, with some distributors reportedly fetching premiums of 25 to 30 cents a pound over this price.

At the first Government offering of 150,000 pounds of cadmium by GSA, bidders paid $2.36 to $2.75 a pound. When the second round of metal was offered to small business, prices were another 10 to 15 cents a pound higher, with bids ranging from $2.50 to $2.87 a pound. Second sale awards have been made on only 118,000 of the 150,000 pounds offering, pending investigation of the authenticity of some bidders' claims to status as small business.

Congress' general wishes in passing the cadmium disposal bill were that it would help to stabilize the price, and would benefit small platers. This was also the general hope of responsible, large producers of the metal. In fact, the reverse has taken place. Prices have been driven above the levels prevailing before the Government offerings. And custom platers have not shared in the awards to the extent that was originally intended.

THE BACKGROUND

By way of background, it will be recalled that Representative Broomfield started the cadmium legislation rolling early last year when the shortages started to hurt platers and finishers. Initially, he could get no action out of GSA on his proposal to dispose of 2 million pounds of cadmium. At the end of 4 months, GSA endorsed the proposal, but too late for any action in the last Congress.

As this Congress opened, Mr. Broomfield found the field of cadmium disposers considerably broadened with GSA in the forefront of those ready to sell off the 2 million pounds of cadmium.

Massachusetts' Representative Philip Philbin pointedly asked GSA spokesmen at the hearings early this spring if they could prevent the cadmium from being gobbled up by traders and sold abroad for a fat price.

GSA indicated to Mr. Philbin that "every precaution" would be taken to assure that the Government's cadmium would go to domestic users.

But hardly was the ink dry on the first contract when metal finishers said they had been squeezed out.

TRADERS WON OUT

In retrospect, there seems little doubt that experienced sharp-eyed traders bid more expertly and successfully for the stockpile cadmium on the first offering. As international dealers in metals, they were also in a position to beef up their bids in the knowledge that cadmium is fetching prices as high as $3 a pound in Europe. Whether, in fact, most of the stockpile cadmium purchased by these traders will find its way abroad remains to be seen. It may be good for our international balance of payments, but it doesn't have the slightest appeal for domestic electroplaters. They feel that the Government has crossed them by allowing the cadmium to go into export markets, instead of passing into their own shops at lower prices.

The administration, for its part, had a strong desire to prove that the surplus could be disposed of at a profit. The first sale was primarily intended to determine the real market price for the metal. For this reason, it was not restricted to certain categories of buyers. What the administration did do, however, was to undertake the sale on its own, rather than using regular market channels.

The metals industry originally offered to assist in the cadmium disposal and predicted they could hold the price at around $1.85 to $2 a pound. The industry's view was ignored in Washington, as was its contention that the cadmium was initially bought by the Government as insurance, and not for crash sale programs on open markets.

As a result of the imbroglio, it appears that officials from the Interior Department are going to sit down this week with the Office of Emergency Planning, the General Services Administration, and other Federal officers to discuss further sale of cadmium. It's also possible that Representative PHILBIN may ask GSA to explain in a closed hearing of his armed services subcommittee what happened in the cadmium disposal.

In the meantime, many metal officials and Members of Congress must be questioning once again the administration's desire to gain more control over the disposal of stockpiled materials.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, in the yearlong hearings of the subcommittee that became identified with his name, frequently said his objective, and that of the White House, was to find more expedient ways to dispose of the Government's stockpiles by delegating more power to the administration.

Time and again, the Symington subcommittee was told by metal firms of the difficulties of disposing of the stockpiled metals without disrupting markets.

With cadmium, it looked as though the administration would have a good chance to prove its arguments and to set an example for subsequent disposals. But the recent course of events hardly encourages such confidence in the ability of Federal agencies to handle disposals.

[From the Metal and Mineral Market, May 13, 1963]

Congress, Platers Critical of U.S. Cadmium Sales

NEW YORK.—For a genuine marketing mess, witness the sale of cadmium from the U.S. stockpile. Inept administration of the project has unnerved the entire nonferrous world, which is also looking beyond to other weighty surpluses.

Congress authorized release of 2-million pounds for the sole purpose of seeing that distressed U.S. electroplaters, hit hard by the shortage of metal, would get some relief at a reasonable price. A mistake was made when it did not make specific stipulations but chose to let governmental agencies handle the details.

An initial offering of 150,000 pounds, open to everyone, was made with bids running from $2.36 to $2.55, with a single emergency bid at $2.75—this, despite requests from both Houses that no metal be allowed to be exported. It was explained that the first bid would establish world market tone and the price at which small U.S. business would be awarded metal. Metal and Mineral Markets' Washington office, Representative WILLIAM BROOMFIELD, Republican of Michigan and many small platers were told recently this would be the case. Last week "small" (not clearly defined) businesses bid for 207,000 pounds at prices up to $2.87. GSA indicated it would sell 150,000 pounds to the highest bidders. Awards have been held up while qualifications of some bidders are studied.

One New York source said there was a good deal of cheating to conform to the "small business" stipulation. "Small" firms reportedly bid—for a consideration—as agents for larger, non-qualified companies.

The National Association of Metal Finishers wrote to President Kennedy complaining about "unwitting or calculated profiteering by GSA * * *." The complaint, written before last week's bids, was based on $2.36 a pound.

Representative BROOMFIELD was furious. "These people [GSA] are apparently ignoring the intent of Congress," he told Metal and Mineral Markets. He was terribly upset that release thus far had hurt small business and driven the producer price up 50 cents a pound. He considers $2.36 a pound too high.

John G. Harlan, Jr., deputy commissioner, Defense Material Service of GSA, shrugged off the shower of criticism. "We get a lot of that stuff * * * it doesn't bother us at all," he said. GSA now feels free bidding would follow the pattern of legislative history.

It is ironic that small business, which watched metal go in the main to merchants at $2.36 to $2.55, may have to pay up to $2.87. Conflicting and indefinite information from Government sources has compounded the situation. Many bids were obviously shots in the dark. Commentary to this office has indicated just how far some normally alert firms have drifted from the Washington situation.

To confuse the issue further, GSA this week received a D.O. (Defense order with procurement priority) from a prospective cadmium buyer who has a bona fide defense contract. By law, D.O.'s are to be handled first when surpluses are being sold by the Government.

Next month's offering, according to one official, may be as high as 500,000 pounds. If demand continues, Congress may authorize sale of several million more pounds. An undisciplined flow from the stockpile could cause an equally violent reaction downward.

Producer sales policies to distributors vary. Hence, the distributor-consumer range is continued.

Tax Reform and Spending Cuts Make Good Economic Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the New York Times of May 13, 1963, makes some useful and pertinent observations about how the recent upturn in economic activity should affect tax and expenditure policy.

The editorial points out—correctly, I believe—that the upturn in activity weakens the argument for an immediate and massive tax cut without tax reform. The danger of massive tax reduction is overstimulation of the economy, which could lead to inflation. At the same time, the current economic situation makes the case for tax reform, including some rate reduction, more persuasive, according to the editorial.

The editorial goes on to say that another effect of the upturn in activity is to make the administration's proposals for increased spending more difficult to justify. While extreme cutbacks in spending are not called for, the editorial says that some cuts are definitely in order and that tighter controls over spending should be instituted.

It is important that we constantly keep in mind the state of the economy in considering tax and expenditure policy. For that reason, under unanimous consent, I include the New York Times editorial in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

The Economy's New Look

The atmosphere at this year's spring meeting of administration officials and industrialists belonging to the business council is markedly different from that prevailing a year ago. Hostility between the White House and the business community has faded, along with doubts about the business outlook. Yet the new look in the economy has not brought any change in their conflicting views.

Businessmen still insist that a big and immediate tax cut, unhampered by any tax reforms, is essential. They are continuing their perennial campaign for a cutback in Government spending, which they regard as the key to eliminating the budget deficit.

The administration is exhibiting similar stubbornness. In defending his spending program, Mr. Kennedy has warned that any reduction would increase unemployment and imperil the Nation's defense efforts. He also has reaffirmed his belief that tax reductions, accompanied by reforms, would keep the deficit from getting out of hand.

These fixed positions ignore the vigorous upsurge in the economy. There is no need for the massive and immediate tax cut demanded by businessmen. The objective is to sustain activity, not to overstimulate it. With expansion continuing, the administration's proposal for combining reductions and reforms, beginning this year but stretched out until 1965, makes sense.

The administration's spending proposals are, however, harder to justify. During the winter, the President raised the specter of recession to combat any reductions; now he is predicting new Russian successes in space to bolster support for his program. Extreme cutbacks are not called for under current conditions of relatively high unemployment and a growing population in need of social services. But now that the economy is expanding so rapidly, some cuts are in order. The race-to-the-moon project is only one area where cuts could be made without jeopardizing economic expansion or national security.

Instead of merely reiterating their previous policies, administration and business would do well to reexamine them in the light of the economy's surprising performance. The upsurge has strengthened the case for tax reductions and reform. It also lends support to the view that tighter controls over spending are necessary.

Congressman Serves as Part-Time "Missileer"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of May 19, 1963:

CONGRESSMAN SERVES AS PART-TIME "MISSILEER"

(By Robert L. Asher)

Representative JAMES F. BATTIN, Republican, of Montana, is one Congressman with a hard hat and a soft spot for intercontinental ballistic missiles.

And he's proud of that hat. It goes with his Air Force Reserve major's uniform and marks him as a "missileer"—class of 1962 from the Air Force's Minuteman ICBM Operational Readiness School.

BATTIN's role as a reservist means that he could be called from Capitol Hill to active duty at any time to serve alongside Regular troops manning Minuteman sites across the Nation.

The Congressman-major who began his military career in 1943, explains that as a Member of the House, he has a voice in decisions relating to the country's military posture and wants to be informed.

But his penchant for missiles is also an outgrowth of his constituency, he notes.

"I chose the Air Force because I experienced growing pains of the officers and airmen assigned to our Montana bases. It was sort of an adoption through association," BATTIN says.

One such base in his home State, Malmstrom, was the Nation's first operational Minuteman ICBM wing installation. It will be BATTIN's home for 2 weeks this summer, too, when he dons the blues for camp.

To BATTIN, the 60-hour missile course at Vandenberg Air Force Base Calif., was just another step in his continuing military career.

During World War II he served in the Pacific theater as a Navy gunner aboard merchant vessels and with a photo interpretation unit. When released from active duty in 1946, he was wearing two battle stars for action on Saipan and Okinawa.

While practicing law and serving in various city and county posts in and around Billings, Mont., BATTIN became interested in the Air Force. Montana's bases were growing from air ferrying centers into vital Strategic Air Command installations.

He received a commission as a major in the Air Reserve in 1961, a year after his election to Congress.

And his commander turned out to be a colleague from across the Hill—Brig. Gen. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, Republican Senator from Arizona. GOLDWATER's 9999th Squadron is composed of Senators, Representatives, and congressional aids.

BATTIN earned his hard hat by undergoing the Missile Combat Crew Operational Readiness course, at Malmstrom and later with the missile squadron at Vandenberg.

"I burned the midnight oil," the 38-year-old Representative recalls, "because I was determined to do as well or better than those younger officers. It was a challenge, but I enjoyed every minute of it."

The minutes were devoted to classes, checkouts, and briefings on the Minuteman transporter-erector and reentry vehicle and guidance control vans.

BATTIN also toured Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman launch complexes, and took notes on tracking station procedures. His reaction to the men and their program is enthusiastic:

"Theirs is a peculiar lot, marked by the normal monotony of remote duty, sites, and devoid of the usual sense of accomplishment by seeing their 'bird' return home, mission accomplished. We owe a debt of gratitude to these men because the life they lead isn't easy."

And neither is Congressman BATTIN'S; for his Reserve duty is far from over. In addition to camp, the "distinguished major from the great State of Montana" yields to a meeting each Tuesday of his unit here.

Keep the Space Lanes Open

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, within a short while, this body will be asked to consider both the authorization and appropriation bills for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Recently the budget for this agency has been pointed to as one of the places where substantial reduction can be made because much of it is based on "scientific dreams" to get America to the moon first.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include this article by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, which appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, May 19, 1963; and I commend it to every Member of the House.

The article follows:

A MATTER OF PREEMINENCE—KEEP THE SPACE LANES OPEN

(By Roscoe Drummond)

How would you have felt if, after Astronaut Gordon Cooper, Jr. had got *Faith 7* nicely into its first orbit, the order had gone up from Cape Canaveral: "Come back, Congress has lost faith. Return to earth"?

At the moment this is an imaginary incident. But something dismayingly like it is in the making if the three major antispace program pressure groups can persuade Congress that the attempt to be first in outer space is either just too much for the United States—or not worth it.

What these pressure groups want is not to reel in the next astronauts, but to reel in the whole space program, cut back the budget, which makes it possible, cut back the scientists, cut back the use of resources; anyway, cut back.

The advocates of cutting back have diverse and conflicting motives.

There are some Democratic liberals who want to save money on the space program in order to spend more money elsewhere; spend more "on the unemployed and less on the unexplored," one of them puts it.

There are some Republican conservatives who see cutting the space budget as the easiest way to balance the budget.

There are some scientists who are critical of the space budget because they want more Federal money for other sciences.

The core of the answer to such arguments is this:

If we concede preeminence to the Soviet Union on the way to other planets, we will be conceding preeminence to the Soviet Union on this planet. If we do not make it our priority objective to achieve mastery of outer space, we will not be first on the Moon, we will not be first in space; and the time will come when we will not be first on Earth—and then the problem of dealing with other unfinished business will really be secondary; then the unfinished business will be survival under the worst of all conditions.

Nothing could more misstate the concept and urgency of the Nation's stepped-up space program than the remark of the Republican Senate Campaign Committee that the determination to be foremost in outer space is "an adolescent desire to beat the Russians."

We have been tardy in grasping the baton of this crucial race. One reason is that when the Soviets stunned the world by putting the first sputnik into orbit in 1957, the mood of the Eisenhower administration was summed up by a high official who remarked: "That's no more than reaching for a high score in a basketball game."

A year ago the President and both parties in both Houses of Congress agreed overwhelmingly that the American objective must be to be first, not second, in outer space and to do whatever is necessary to achieve it.

The mission is going well. This is no time to cut back or to look back. This is the period to keep at it without flinching. Other things will be important, but this is the dimension in which the cold war may be won—or lost.

Vessel Aid Plea to President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, the Gloucester, Mass., Daily Times on Saturday, May 18, published an extremely timely and interesting letter by Wilbur J. Gross, president of the Gloucester Fisheries Association, to President Kennedy with reference to the Vessel Subsidy Act, and I feel compelled to insert same in the RECORD because it outlines clearly the vital needs of the fishing industry today. The article follows:

Startling developments in the fishing industry in recent years are spelled out in a letter to President Kennedy by Wilbur J. Gross, president of the Gloucester Fisheries Association, as follows:

Hearing on Senate Bill 1006—the "Vessel Subsidy Act" as it is referred to will be held before the Senate Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries beginning May 7. It is most vital that this bill be passed.

I am sure you are cognizant of the general deterioration that has taken place in the Massachusetts fishing fleets in recent years because of inadequate tariff protection. As a former Senator, you joined with us in appearances before various committees of Congress seeking relief which never was forthcoming. We hope it may be possible for you in some manner to urge passage of this bill.

The situation as it applies to the Gloucester fishing fleet is referred to generally in the following statements.

The second trade agreement negotiated between this country and Canada in 1939 provided a duty of 1⅞ cents per pound on imports of fresh and frozen groundfish fillets up to an annual quota of 15 million pounds or 15 percent of the average U.S. consumption of these species in the 3 preceding years, whichever was greater. This agreement set a 2½ cent per pound rate on imports above the quota with no limit. (Groundfish fillets include the following species—cod, hake, haddock, cusk, pollock, and ocean perch.)

Commenting on this trade agreement, State Department releases at that time stated in effect that "Groundfish fillets are safeguarded by a quota"—and, "the domestic industry is thus assured of a dominant share in this expanding business." What has happened in succeeding years shows how far wrong this forecast was and what its effects have been on the New England fishing fleets.

Imports of groundfish fillets in 1939 amounted to 9,426,000 pounds. By 1945, these imports had increased to 43,169,000 pounds, and by 1950 to 64,800,000 pounds.

What has happened over the past 10 years is more startling. By the end of 1952, imports of fresh and frozen groundfish fillets, blocks, and slabs, had increased to 107,401,000 pounds. Domestic production amounted to 132,662,000 pounds which represented 55 percent of the total U.S. consumption of groundfish fillets for that year.

In 1962, just 10 years later, these imports had more than doubled, increasing to 221,440,000 pounds, while domestic production decreased to 90 million pounds. The domestic industry's share of the total U.S. consumption dropped from 55 percent to 29 percent. (The yield in processing fillets from whole fish is approximately one-third. Multiplying the preceding figures by three will give the poundage of whole groundfish represented in the amounts of imports and domestic production.)

During the years following 1946, hearings repeatedly were held before various congressional committees, the Committee for Reciprocity Information, and the Tariff Commission. It was pointed out again and again that the New England fishing fleets would gradually disintegrate unless this Government did something to stem the increasing flow of imports into this country, either by quota or increasing the duty rate, or compensating for subsidies granted by these countries to the north for the building of fishing vessels, shore plants, providing fishermen with nets and gear, and even assisting in the matter of transportation. These hearings were fruitless. Duty rates remained unchanged. No compensation for subsidies was given.

In 1950 upward to 250 vessels operated in the fisheries from the port of Gloucester. Today, there are not more than 125 vessels. These vessels range from 45 feet length, 5 tons net, to 104 feet length, 198 tons net. Only 42 boats in the Gloucester fleet are over 90 foot lentgh.

Within the past 5 years, only two new vessels have been built for the Gloucester fleet. During this same period, 35 vessels have been lost either by fire, sinking at sea, or abandonment. Nine vessels have been lost at sea within the past 15 months.

Most vessels in the Gloucester fleet are marginal. The average age of these vessels is 25 years. Vessel owners and fishermen have hardly been able to maintain necessary repairs to keep vessels operating. Many, if not most of these vessels should be replaced with larger, modern vessels to compete especially with the up-to-date Russian trawlers presently operating on fishing grounds on which our own vessels operate.

The Canadian Government presently provides a 50 percent subsidy on vessels of steel construction as replacements. Until March 31 of this year, new vessels added to the Canadian fleet were granted a 40 percent subsidy, either steel or wooden. This subsidy since has been reduced to 35 percent. (A replacement means a vessel to replace one that has been burned, lost at sea, or abandoned.)

Great Britain grants a 30 percent subsidy on construction of commercial fishing vessels, either wooden or steel. Norway does not grant any actual subsidy, but the Norwegian Government provides long-term loans and price supports so that the effect of these two could be equal to a substantial subsidy. Added to these subsidies is the fact that wages and material costs in these countries are much lower than in ours, so that the final result could be substantially more than the 50 percent subsidy requested in Senate 1006.

Representatives of the fishing industry who have appeared in Washington from time to time to stress the need of added tariff controls feel this Government in large measure is responsible for the present plight of our fishing fleets. We feel the least this Government can do now to avoid further disintegration is to grant the 50 percent subsidy which this bill intends. This will be an encouragement to fishermen and to others to venture capital in the construction of new and modern type fishing vessels. Such a program should help start building up the Gloucester and the New England fishing fleets from which this Government eventually will benefit in proportion to the degree these vessels can be efficiently operated.

We hope very much the committee will approve Senate 1006 and that it finally will be passed by Congress.

WILBUR J. GROSS,
President,
Gloucester Fisheries Association.

The Space Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Massapequa Post, a prominent weekly newspaper in Massapequa, N.Y. It is important because it shows the grassroot thinking on the subject of space, at a time when Congress must consider the enormous burdens of the Federal budget to sustain this program:

THE SPACE RACE

Do we need a space flight program? It's incredible to us that anyone could seriously question the importance of our space efforts. Theretically, a case can be made for holding off on space until we have conquered the world's problems of disease, hunger, illiteracy, and so on. Practically speaking, however, the race for space is here and we had better win it.

We don't live in a vacuum. We live in a competitive world and our competition is giving us a hard time. The United States must know at least as much about space as the Soviet Union, to say nothing of Red China a few years hence. Anything less would first reduce us to a minor power, then render us subject to the Communist yoke. Russia has already put a man in orbit for 4 days, has orbited two men at the same time, and is now aiming for the moon.

More than prestige is involved here, although we do not discount the importance of prestige. Practical military considerations are at stake. A nation in command of the space around this planet can deliver its missiles where, when, and how it desires, without regard to retaliation. Surveillance of the rest of the world would soon be possible to such a nation. Big Brother will have become a fact.

Doesn't history show that overindulgent, complacent civilizations are invariably swept away by vigorous, warlike peoples? Let's not civilize ourselves right out of existence. In the abstract, we agree that schoolhouses are more important than space probes, but let's make sure that we retain the freedom to control the education in them.

Dr. Paul J. Raver: A Life Affected With a Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 22, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 6 of this year, the Pacific Northwest and the entire country lost a great public servant. Much of the credit for the historic progress of river and power development in the Columbia River Basin must go to Dr. Paul Jerome Raver. Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD at this point a tribute to Dr. Raver which appeared in the May issue of the Pacific Northwest Public Power Bulletin:

DR. PAUL J. RAVER: A LIFE AFFECTED WITH A PUBLIC INTEREST

"Dr. Raver was a man of great intellectual capacity, with a well-trained, disciplined mind. He was a man of integrity; strictly honest, open and above board. He was a man of mature and significant faith. He was the kind of man ministers sought out for a friend. His faith was carefully thought through. There was nothing superficial about it. And his devotion to the public welfare, as well as the absolute integrity of his life, was due to his religious faith. It was the center and motivating power. He believed in religion in action, the life of faith lived in the world. That faith sustained his life, lent him courage to speak his word and live by his convictions. His great natural gifts achieved fulfillment because of his faith."

Rev. Dr. THOMAS A. BROWN,
University Christian Church.

These words from the funeral oration for Dr. Paul Jerome Raver, Tuesday, April 9, 1963, epitomize "the life affected with a public interest."

Over 300 years ago Lord Justice Hale of England wrote his scholarly opinion about businesses which were not just private, but which were affected with a public interest. These businesses we know today as public utilities.

In his 44 historic years as student, professor of utility economics, regulator, and administrator, Paul Raver witnessed and greatly helped to bring about the transition from the excesses of Samuel Insull to the present state of the art of providing people with electric service.

His life chronicles the quest for the elusive ingredient of the public interest in the field of public utilities.

This quest preoccupied his last few years. He keynoted the 20th annual convention of the Northwest Public Power Association at Eugene in 1960 on the subject "Community Service Opportunities of Electric Utilities." (Reprinted in June 1960 bulletin.) On this forward-looking note the 23d annual NWPPA convention on April 18, 1963, established the Paul J. Raver Award for community service and awarded it posthumously to Raver for 1963.

His career evolved from the futility of utility regulation to the solid achievements of 15 years, 1939–54, as Bonneville Administrator, and 9 years as superintendent of Lighting of Seattle City Light.

Dr. Raver died April 6 of a heart ailment. Born in Logansport, Ind., April 27, 1894, he received the B.S. in civil engineering, University of Nebraska, 1917; MBA, Northwestern University, 1927; Ph. D., 1933. He worked as an evaluation engineer, 1919–23, then with Chicago Surface Lines Co. as estimating engineer, 1923–27; research associate of the Institute for Economic Research, 1927–33, and advanced from instructor to professor of public utilities, 1927–39; meanwhile becoming supervisor of the section on rates and research of the Illinois Commerce Commission, 1933–37, executive officer, 1937–39, and chairman, 1939.

He received the Purple Heart in World War I.

He was a member of the Illinois State Rural Electrification Committee, 1935–39, on the staff of the Joint Congressional Committee To Investigate TVA, 1938, and served on many boards. He received the Distinguished Service Award of the Department of the Interior and similar awards from APPA and NWPPA.

Outstanding among his BPA accomplishments are his role in organizing BPA, driving through the World War II construction, urging construction of Hungry Horse Dam and achieving a large measure of hydraulic and electrical integration through the U.S. Columbia River Power System. In BPA he achieved both high morale and efficiency in his staff.

At Seattle City Light he rebuilt and expanded the City Light Building, completed Gorge Dam, started Boundary Dam, initiated the shift to 26,000 volt distribution, completed a $6 million underground program and enhanced the role of Seattle City Light in many community activities.

He served as a mentor and friend to big and small alike. He encouraged the struggling little consumer-owned electric systems and helped build the morale of public and cooperative electric systems.

Leadership inspires people to have confidence in their leader. Great leadership inspires people to have confidence in themselves. Raver helped people to have faith in themselves and with this heritage he leaves us enriched.

Louisville, Ky., Signs Antidiscrimination Ordinance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of last week the mayor of the city of Louisville signed into law an antidiscrimination ordinance which is the first such legislation passed by any major city in the South in the field of civil rights.

Two years ago Louisville, like many southern cities, was torn by race misunderstandings. We experienced many distasteful demonstrations, wholesale arrests of Negro leaders and demonstrators. About 14 months ago, our mayor, the Honorable William O. Cowger, called together the Negro leadership in Louisville and asked them to cooperate with the city administration in an experiment of trust and understanding. Since that time, we have had no demonstrations in Louisville. In May of last year, our city administration under the leadership of Mayor Cowger formed, by ordinance, an 11-man human relations commission. This commission worked for many months on voluntary integration and met with a respectable degree of success. It eventually became evident that an antibias ordinance should be attempted, and this legislation was passed by the board of aldermen of the city of Louisville on last Tuesday night and signed into law by the mayor on Wednesday.

We, in Louisville, are proud of our progress in human relations under the leadership of our distinguished mayor, William O. Cowger, and our distinguished county judge, Marlow W. Cook, and I would hope that the leadership of both the white segments of our population and the Negro segments of our population to the south would look to our good city of Louisville as an example that reasonable leaders can sit down and negotiate civil rights without the threat of riots and violence.

I am confident that the leadership of our city would be willing to be of service to any of our sister cities in assisting them with their problems in race relations as it is evident that we, in Louisville, have the leadership among both our leading white and Negro citizens to cope with the problems that confront us.

In Drinking Water or Revenue, States Should Avoid Taint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "In Drinking Water or Revenue, States Should Avoid Taint," which appeared in the Detroit (Mich.) News of April 19, 1963. The article is as follows:

IN DRINKING WATER OR REVENUE, STATES SHOULD AVOID TAINT

(By Ralph McGill)

Notes made on a quiet evening in Middletown, Conn.: A gentleman in this attractive college-industrial city said to a thirsty guest that he would serve him some good spring water. It was, he said, delivered on order by an enterprising local company which obtained the water from a spring high in the hills.

When asked if he knew whether or not the spring had been tested by reliable health officers, the resident said he did not. He went by taste, he said, and the spring water tasted better and was also an improvement in highballs.

From the ensuing conversation one learned that the well-run city of Middletown has to put chlorine into the water that it draws from the Connecticut River. This affronts the taste buds of some of the residents, especially those who prefer what is called branch water and bourbon.

There were also complaints about the traffic in Middletown, which, it is said, at the peak hours obtains the density or mass of New York City crosstown taxi, truck, and car congregations.

To a visitor just out of Washington, D.C., the evening was a reminder that Government is many things other than that in the National Capital. There likely is more average talk about the water supplies of municipalities, the garbage service, schools, and the quality of other civic services than there is about Laos, Berlin or, for that matter, Cuba.

States also are staggering under the burden of public obligations, including that of relief for the aged, care of the burgeoning number of mentally ill, crowded universities, the need for new highways, and maintenance of old ones, unemployment, and the imperative political need to respond to new and increasing public demands.

New taxes everywhere are needed. Dishonest or cynical candidates and self-proclaimed experts talk glibly of economies and of reducing State and city taxes. This is simply not possible. What is reduced must somehow be found in other places.

The cities carry the same burdens. They each have heavy loads of relief, urgent needs for extra law enforcement, demands for new parks and recreational facilities, and expanded municipal services generally. Their schools are crowded. Their teachers are, with few exceptions, underpaid. They do not have vitally needed vocational schools.

To each city has been added in the past two decades the problem of a large group of unemployables, young, middle-aged, and old. They are men and women who, for reasons of environment, birth, and genes, bad luck or bad habits, and lack of education are finished insofar as effective participation in citizenship is concerned.

This group is producing most of the dismaying crime increase. Its members give us the disturbing figures of high unemployment among young people. It is important we understand that the statistics of youth unemployment, educational lacks, and crime increases are directly related.

That our rivers and lakes are all polluted is a fact we would like to sweep under the rug. They everywhere are soiled and poisoned by industrial waste, and sewage from towns and cities which do not wish to tax their citizens with cost of sewage disposal plants, or who fear they will drive away a payroll.

Some of the water that comes out of the Nation's water taps would set off epidemics if it were not for chlorine. American tourists who go to Europe, Asia, and Africa anxiously ask, "Can you drink the water?" The answer in many places is "No."

Now we are faced with the uncomfortable fact that this question, in time, is going to be a proper one to ask about a number of American communities, and if pollution continues the answer will be "No."

The State of New Hampshire has turned to a State lottery to raise new tax revenue. The history of State lotteries in America makes one shudder to think of their return. The argument has a certain surface plausibility. It links a good cause with bad support.

The argument is that millions in this country buy Irish Sweepstakes tickets. Legal lottery, it is argued, will take the money from illegal gamblers. All this is true, but State lotteries also inevitably will set up patronage and evils of corruption. They will, in turn, open the door for the presence and existence of other forms of gambling, and gambling is the father of vices and attendant evils.

All of this adds up to the fact that the people don't want to pay for what they must have, and the politicians encourage them in it.

Teacher's Appreciation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, today as we are preparing to welcome Maj. L. Gordon Cooper, America's man about the world, to the Congress, the State of New York is marking Teacher Appreciation Day. I am certain Major Cooper would credit a measure of his success to the dedicated men and women who taught him the lessons he exemplified in his latest feat.

As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor I will introduce legislation to institute a National Teacher's Hall of Honor. Our Nation does all too little to hail its men and women of merit who devote their lives to the foremost task of preparing our students for the space age. On the other hand we are quick to mark and prompt to note any deficiency in education, too often laying the blame on the teacher rather than our own neglect of interest.

I fully realize a national award or symbol is no substitute for the adequate pay and other incentives necessary to provide good teachers. That is why I am also pleased to sponsor, in addition to other school bills, the quality educational bill H.R. 6013 to increase proficiency of teacher training for teachers in elementary and secondary schools, public and private, in subject matter areas found to be critically below standard.

On this Teacher Appreciation Day I feel we should look to positive ways to attract and maintain the best possible teachers in our schools. The national average length of service in the public system is about 10 years. In a business firm a personnel system which lost its trained welders and salesmen every 10 years would be bankrupt. Our schools will fare no better. Sound business in education demands at least these concrete steps:

First. Broader recruitment to attract more qualified college students from the upper class quadrants. I have never seen a recruiting poster to attract career teachers pointing up a chance to see the world or learn a skill or probe in space—things we cannot do without good teachers.

Second. Search out unused manpower resources for intensive training in elementary and secondary instruction in these principal areas. First, among young mothers who either have teacher experience or potential skill by giving them adequate care, stipends, and facilities to maintain their children during the class day. Secondly, seek ways to bring the disappearing male back to the classroom. There is nothing like a man—as a symbol of authority at the head of the class, especially in secondary schools. I mean no offense to the ladies—but if it is nice to have a man around the house it is just as fine to have a few men around the school. On today's scale of pay a father of three children must leave the teaching profession to get the income to educate his own children. More pay for dads and less educational doo-dads will yield dividends. A family cost of living increment would be one approach if we cannot sell the professionals on merit pay.

Third. Promote teacher status among those who desire ways to achieve equality. The civil service system has done much more than any other single factor to promote racial equality in employment. Classroom service should have the same effect. While we are about the business of integration in our schools I feel we need to develop teaching strength to a far greater degree among racial minorities and Spanish-speaking groups.

Finally, good professional teachers must be paid as good professionals and demean themselves as professional persons. I find it almost profane that teachers deem it necessary and may find it necessary to strike against the community, themselves, and their pupils. There must be a way for the world's richest Nation, for the sake of its own dignity, to pay our teachers in every school, public and private, an income in keeping with the value we place on the lives of our children. On this Teachers' Appreciation Day if we want our children taught like teachers' pets we had better be prepared to give good classroom teachers a pat—in the pocketbook.

Equal Pay: A Dissent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, both in the last Congress and in the 1st session of this 88th Congress a proposal has come up for women working in our private industries. Its title certainly is appealing and, without analysis, its terms might seem admirably fair. Deeper analysis is required, however, to ascertain what the real economics of pay discrimination between the sexes are. One of my constituents, Mr. A. G. Swaney, recently contacted me about this bill and pointed out very well the deeper considerations in it. I should like to place Mr. Swaney's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point to help highlight the considerations which it raises.

The letter follows:

ANCHOR HOCKING GLASS CORP.,
Lancaster, Ohio, May 6, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: As a district manager of Anchor Hocking, I wish to voice my strenuous objections to the Federal equal pay bill which is presently being considered by both the Senate and House. Since the House bill (H.R. 3861) and Senate bill (S. 910) are identical, my comments and views apply to both of them.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Federal equal pay bill because it goes far beyond the mere prohibition of wage rate discrimination. The bill would require the raising of wage rates, even though the existing rates had been negotiated by the collective bargaining agents of the employees in question. If, as everyone seems to assume, a substantial part of the work force consists of women who are receiving lower wages than men for identical work, bringing about equality by raising the wage rates of these women will cause employers to reduce employment. Economically, it couldn't be any other way, and women (for whom the proponents of the bill have such high regard) will be the very ones to suffer. The only, alternative available to employers would be to increase prices, and this might backfire if the buying public resisted these higher prices.

Further, the bill does not take account of the higher costs generally of employing women because of greater turnover and absenteeism, State laws limiting hours of employment of women and placing restrictions on lifting, longer lunch and relief periods for women, higher insurance costs for women, and the cost of providing women with special facilities.

I also object to the unprecedented delegation of power granted to the Secretary of Labor by the bill and the fact that "place of employment" is not defined to mean a single establishment of an employer.

Still another objection is that the reference to equal work and equal skills is ambiguous. Some people interpret "equal" to mean "comparable" whereas others consider it to mean "identical." Then too, the bill completely ignores the fact that 22 States already have their own equal pay legislation, which means that Federal equal pay legislation is totally unnecessary in these States and employers in these States would be subject to two different equal pay laws.

However, if there is to be some form of Federal equal pay legislation, and I am firmly convinced that the need for such legislation does not exist, I earnestly believe that Congress should give careful consideration to the following principles and incorporate them in the legislation:

1. Instead of referring to equal pay and equal skills, the bill at the very least should read "regularly perform identical work."

2. The greater cost of employing women should be recognized and provision should be made for justifiable differences in pay attributable to these costs.

3. An employer should be permitted to adjust wage rates either upward or downward to comply with the bill.

4. The bill should apply separately to each establishment of an employer. Establishment should be defined as being a distinct physically separated place of employment of such employer.

5. The personalized wage structure of each employer should be recognized, rather than merely providing for a seniority or merit increase system exception. Most employers have no system.

6. The bill should contain specific guidelines and restrictions to be used as the basis of any rules and regulations issued by the Secretary of Labor and his rulemaking should be limited to this act only.

7. Investigations by the Secretary of Labor should only be made upon receipt of written complaints from aggrieved persons and should not extend beyond the facts set forth in such complaints.

8. Instead of a 2-year period, the retroactive provisions should be limited to not more than 6 months.

9. The punitive provision with respect to damages should be eliminated.

10. With respect to each affected employer, the act should not take effect any sooner than the expiration date of the collective-bargaining agreement under which he is presently operating.

Again may I say that Federal equal pay legislation is not needed and, in my opinion, should be opposed by you and your colleagues in Congress. To me, this bill contains numerous inequities and represents an encroachment by the Federal Government in an area which the various States can adequately handle themselves.

Respectfully yours,

A. G. Swaney.

Address of Hon. Irving Maness to the Electronic Industries Association, April 23, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, my good friend the Honorable Irving Maness, Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration, has long been known as a friend of small business. On April 23, 1963, he made an interesting address before the Electronic Industries Association at Los Angeles. He discussed the concern of the Administration about the downward trend of small business' share of defense subcontracting and the Government's responsibility in seeing to it that small business receives a higher share of such subcontracting.

Mr. Maness' address follows:

Address by Irving Maness, Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration Before the Electronic Industries Association, Los Angeles, Calif., April 23, 1963—"The Role of the Small Business Administration"

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you and the gentlemen assembled here for the opportunity to participate in this symposium. I also wish to commend your chairman, Mr. Silberman, and all those who served with him so untiringly and unselfishly in making this symposium possible. My special compliments go to the gentlemen who spoke before me for the very thorough reports which they submitted. I am confident that the contribution of those who will speak after me will be no less enlightening.

These reports will be, I am certain, most helpful and, from what I have heard thus far, I can readily see that their authors have fully utilized their wealth of knowledge and experience in assessing the problem at hand—"Keys to Profitable Subcontracting."

Ours, as you know, is a profit-conscious society. Profits are not only an inducement to enterprise, but they are also a reward for success. Profits measure the performance of the enterprise and give it forward momentum. It is profit that creates jobs, generates resources and strengthens the security and well-being of the Nation. This relationship is clear cut and basic. As profits decline, unemployment rises, and vice versa.

It is important that people realize these basics and, especially, the fact that any business that fails for lack of profits engenders a chain reaction which affects many others, ultimately even those who are operating profitably. Therein, I submit, also lies the key to reversing our present downward trend in small business subcontracting—an activity in which the Small Business Administration (SBA) has a direct and vital interest.

Legislation has been enacted, as you know, directing SBA, the Department of Defense (DOD) and the General Services Administration (GSA) to develop a subcontracting program.

This legislation places three distinct responsibilities upon designated Government agencies. Two of these responsibilities are placed upon the SBA alone. The third is placed jointly upon the Department of Defense, GSA, and the SBA.

The responsibilities placed by the statute upon the SBA alone require the agency to make annual reports to the President and to certain designated congressional bodies. These reports are to include "information, and such recommendations as it (i.e., the SBA) may deem appropriate, with respect to the administration of the small business subcontracting program" (Small Business Act, sec. 8(d)(3)). In order to enable the SBA to perform this task the law (Small Business Act, sec. 8(b)(5)) provides that it shall be the duty of the SBA "to obtain information as to methods and practices which Government prime contractors utilize in letting subcontracts."

In addition to this information-gathering and reporting responsibility, the Small Business Act section 8(b)(5) also provides that it shall be the duty of the SBA "to take action to encourage the letting of subcontracts by prime contractors to small business."

Separate, and distinct from these two sole SBA responsibilities, the act imposes upon the DOD, GSA, and SBA joint responsibilities which require them to develop cooperatively a subcontracting program (Small Business Act, sec. 8(d)(1)). This subcontracting program does not confer upon SBA authority to compel a prime contractor to subcontract to small business in a certain manner or on a certain percentage basis. Neither does it compel any procuring agency to direct a prime contractor to establish a particular type of small business subcontracting program. However, prime contractors in this small business subcontracting program are required, where an appropriate clause is inserted, to notify the contracting officer before soliciting bids or quotations on any subcontract in excess of $10,000 if no small business concern is to be solicited. Such notification must include the reasons why no small firms are to be solicited, and must be made as early in the procurement cycle as possible so that SBA may have a reasonable period to suggest potentially qualified small business firms through the procuring agency (Armed Services Procurement Regulation 1–707.3(b). Small Business Subcontracting Program Clause (a)(5)).

An integral part of this subcontracting program is the make-or-buy requirement. As you know, this requirement prevents a prime contractor from making or providing the products or services (a) when he does not regularly make or provide them, and when they are equally available from other firms at no higher price; or (b) when he does regularly make or provide them, but they are equally available at a better price from other firms.

It is hoped that, in addition to providing new opportunities for cooperation between large and small business, on the one hand, and the SBA and the procuring agencies, on the other, this make-or-buy requirement will broaden small business subcontracting opportunities. Specifically, participation by SBA in the make-or-buy decision will provide the opportunity to channel buy programs to small business.

In addition, the statutory subcontracting program requires each procuring agency to help SBA obtain such reasonably obtainable information and records concerning the subcontracting by its prime contractors and subcontractors as the SBA may deem necessary. Accordingly, appropriate studies and surveys are periodically made as deemed necessary by the procuring agencies, or upon request of the SBA. They may be made by the contracting officers or their representatives, separately, or together with representatives of the SBA. These studies and surveys enable the SBA to make recommendations to the procuring agencies regarding methods for increasing small business participation in subcontract awards. At the operating level, SBA and the procuring agencies freely interchange information resulting from these surveys (ASPR 1–707.6).

As regards the SBA's statutory responsibility "to encourage the letting of subcontracts by prime contractors to small business concerns at prices and on conditions and terms which are fair and equitable," we have initiated a voluntary program designed to provide just such encouragement to prime contractors. This voluntary program is supplemental to that which has been prescribed by Public Law 87–305. Accordingly, we have proposed that, in implementation of this voluntary program, SBA representatives periodically visit prime contractors with a view to jointly determining what components, assemblies, subassemblies, and parts could be made further available for subcontracting to small business.

I have no doubt that this voluntary program will substantially contribute to a reversal of the present unfavorable trend in subcontracting. You are aware, no doubt, that the small business share of defense subcontracting has increased from 15.7 percent during the first 6 months of fiscal year 1962 to 17 percent for the equivalent 1963 period, but that reports for the first 8 months of the current fiscal year show that participation of small firms has declined again to 16.7 percent.

This situation places a constant and relentless economic pressure upon the small businessman—a concern not only to us in the Small Business Administration, but to the President and Congress as well.

The President, in a letter dated April 2, 1963, addressed to the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, expressed again his desire "that the participation of small business firms in military procurements be increased to the greatest extent possible." As to the Congress, proceeding from the premise that providing profit is the best method of achieving desired results, Congressman Abraham J. Multer, Democrat, of New York, introduced on January 9, 1963, a bill designed to encourage subcontracting to small business by providing incentive rewards in the form of fair profit allowances in determining "excess profits" under the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended.

If the Congressman's assumption is correct that the solution to the all-too-modest share of small business participation in Government subcontracting lies in incentives for subcontracting, I would further suggest that profit is not the only incentive available to the Government for the purpose. Since time, however, does not allow me to discuss too many of the other possibilities which occur to me, I shall only point out that consideration might be given to award of parallel contracts for the same effort with the understanding that future stages of the program will be awarded to the producer with the largest amount of small business subcontracting. Here, the incentive involved is not the prospect of greater profits on the contract being performed, but the prospect of additional profits on future business to be acquired by excellent small business subcontracting in the present work. Such a system would accomplish the aims of the profit incentive contract without the necessity for actually using a contract as administratively complex as a profit incentive contract.

Suggestions along these lines, but to accomplish other purposes, were made in the National Security Industrial Association Report of Cost Reduction Study (1962) and by Prof. Ralph C. Nash, Jr., of the George Washington University, Washington, D.C. He points out the appropriateness of the latter above method, in that it uses competition as the inducement to achieve the desired result. Permit me to point out, in this connection, that another possible use of this future business incentive is provided in the Small Business Act (sec. 8(d)(1)) which provides for a contractor rating system based on past small business subcontracting performance, to be used in evaluating contractors during the selection process for future work.

There are, of course, other incentives of an administrative character, both related and unrelated to profits, which could be devised. What is most important, however, in my opinion, is not so much how to increase small business subcontracting, but a firm resolve by all concerned that it must, and will be increased.

Over 8,100 on Payroll To Administer Farm Programs in Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, over 8,100 employees are on the Federal payroll to administer Federal farm price support programs in Illinois. When we realize that Illinois is but 1 of 50 States, the bureaucratic tentacles of the U.S. Department of Agriculture are enough to scare the wits out of the taxpayers.

Here are excerpts from a report prepared by George Thiem, Pulitzer Prize winning newspaper reporter, for the agribusiness committee of the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce:

Over 8,100 Employees on Payroll To Administer Federal Farm Price Support Program in Illinois

One of the most striking aspects of the Nation's farm price support programs is the massive bureaucracy needed to carry it out at the regional, State, and local levels.

In Illinois alone 1 full-time or part-time Federal employee for every 19 farm operators is required to administer programs of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

In 1962 in this State, some 1,340 full-time Federal employees and approximately 6,790 part-time employees were engaged in the various programs and drawing taxpayers' money.

For State and county offices, the employee figures cited above are exactly as reported by ASCS officials, with the exception of the conservative estimate of 1,500 part-time field personnel who are not already being paid as community committeemen.

The work of regional, State and county ASCS offices involves signing farmers on contracts, checking compliance, maintaining bin sites, measuring cribs and fields, keeping records, and handling grain storage and loans.

MANY OTHER EMPLOYEES NOT INCLUDED IN THIS TABULATION

The figures related here do not include Illinois' portion of the vast agricultural bureaucracy in Washington nor such offices in the State as the U.S. Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Forest Service, the U.S. Agricultural Extension Service, or the Farmers' Home Administration.

As of March, 1963 the U.S. Department of Agriculture had 102,847 full-time employees and was asking for 5,000 more. This is a far cry from 33,000 USDA employees in 1933 when forerunners of present price support programs were launched.

While the Federal agriculture bureaucracy was tripling, the number of farms and farmers in America was steadily going down.

PART-TIME EMPLOYEES

At the request of U.S. Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL, Republican, of Peoria, a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, Willard E. Upp, State executive director of the Illinois ASCS Committee, submitted State and county payrolls and figures on daily rate employees as follows:

"Per diem employees composed predominantly of elected committeemen and field personnel such as farm reporters are reported to this office in total by number of man-days worked and total salary paid. The following is a summary of this per diem employment for all county ASCS offices in Illinois for the 1962 fiscal year, the last full report period:

Daily rate employees	Number	Man-days	Wages
County committeemen	306	24,969	$400,564.52
Community committeemen	4,449	10,821¾	139,803.10
Field personnel	(1)	253,213¼	4,034,267.01
Total		289,004	4,574,634.63

[1] The number of field employees represents a considerable overlap of community committeemen and is not required under existing reporting procedures. Therefore, in the interest of expediency, we are furnishing you that information which is immediately available to this office.

In a check test commonly used in auditing procedures, the State chamber's investigator interviewed representative county ASCS office managers on the number of persons other than community committeemen employed as farm reporters, sealers, etc. In 6 counties, the managers reported 146 part-time, per diem employees who were not county or community committeemen. Three were large counties with substantial grain storage programs, and three were smaller counties. If this average of 24 employees were multiplied by the State's 102 counties, the total would be nearly 2,500 rather than the conservative 1,500 figure used in this report.

The inquiry developed the fact that college students, high school graduates and school teachers are largely employed during June and the summer months in checking compliance. Even among the corn sealers and bin site maintenance men there is little overlap, according to county ASCS office managers, of community committeemen.

It should be noted that the item of $4,034,267.01 spent for field personnel in the counties last year as reported by Mr. Upp is approximately equivalent to the cost of 1,000 full-time employees at $4,000 a year.

ALLOCATION OF REGIONAL OFFICE EMPLOYEES

A top official in the Evanston regional office of the Commodity Credit Corporation, said about one-third of the 800 employees and $5.6 million operating cost last year could reasonably be charged to Illinois, the leading State in originating corn for the cash market. The nearby internal audit control office has 95 employees and an annual budget approximating $1 million. An informed source said at least 12½ percent of the total could be allocated to Illinois; seven field auditors spend all their time in the State. These two offices account for 252 full-time employees and $1,805,000 of expense allocated to Illinois.

RECAPITULATION OF EMPLOYMENT

The recapitulation of employees of regional, State and county offices follows:

EMPLOYEES NEEDED TO ADMINISTER ASCS PROGRAMS IN ILLINOIS

Operating unit	*Employees*
County ASCS offices:	
Full time	1,031
County committeemen	306
Community committeemen	4,449
Bin site workers	527
Field personnel	1,500
Total	7,813
State ASCS office:	
Full- and part-time officials and employees (see p. 7 for breakdown)	70
Regional CCC and ASCS offices in Evanston allocated to Illinois:	
Full-time employees	[1] 240
Do	[2] 12
Total	8,135

[1] CCC.

[2] ASCS.

A description of the duties of the various ASCS offices with facts about their operation follows:

THE STATE ASCS OFFICE IN SPRINGFIELD

Located on the second floor of the Federal (post office) building in the State capital, the State ASCS office is under the supervision of the State ASCS committee. Members of this committee are Edward J. Meagher of Gilberts, chairman, a Kane County dairyman active in his soil conservation district; George McKeown of Route 3, Lawrenceville, a livestock buyer and member of the Farmers' Union; and Henry Van Tuyle of Roodhouse, also a stockman and active in the National Farm Organization.

The State committee acts as a review board of appeals to settle disputes in the counties over crop acreage allotments, normal yields, pay rates, etc. for acreage adjustment and conservation programs. The State committee also audits and supervises the administration of farm programs in the counties. It seeks to improve efficiency, conducts statewide meetings of county committeemen, and carries out orders received from Washington.

The State ASCS chairman draws $49.44 a day plus expenses when actually employed; the salary schedule includes $12,845 set up for him which figures out at the day rate for 260 days.

The other two State committeemen draw $42.96 daily plus expenses when they work, or $11,150 annually, at the 260-day rate.

In a letter to Representative MICHEL, Chairman Meagher explained that the three State committeemen and five State compliance investigators, in a given year, may work from 40 to 70 percent of the time.

State performance (compliance) investigators draw from $5,725 for one supervisor, to $4,565 for assistants plus mileage and expenses.

The State ASCS staff of 67 persons is directed by the State committee and an executive director whose salary is $12,845 a year. Program specialists and managers of various divisions are paid salaries varying from $10,420 down to $6,900. Most are in the $8,840 to $10,420 bracket.

Ten district fieldmen and 10 assistants—a total of 20—are assigned to instruct county committeemen hold meetings and help generally in promoting Government programs. They also carry the torch for new programs the administration in Washington may think are good for farmers.

District fieldmen assigned 8 to 10 counties each are paid an average of $8,159 a year plus mileage and travel; field assistants salaries range from $8,025 down.

State ASCS salaries totaled $420,376 during the 1962 fiscal year.

NEW COUNTY ASCS OFFICE BUILDINGS, GROWING NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES MARK 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF FARM PROGRAMS

In the cash grain area of Illinois where programs to influence corn and wheat prices have been running for 30 years, county ASCS offices have as many as 28 regular full-time employees and additional part-time workers in the busy season. Operating these county offices costs more than a million dollars a month.

Expenses for salaries, travel, rent, heat, light, supplies and repairs may run upwards of $225,000 annually in large counties. Pensions for regular employees are a hidden additional expense to the taxpayers.

Should rigid acreage and commodity control programs be approved at some future time, many students of farm economics believe the agricultural bureacracy would be doubled.

In Illinois, Iroquois County's ASCS office has 28 full-time employees including a $5,540 bin site supervisor. Four day men are employed additionally the year round and three extra men or more repairing and painting grain bins and doing general maintenance work in spring and summer.

Champaign County has 27 full-time employees, McLean County, 28; LaSalle, 26; Livingston, 25; Vermilion, 24; Christian, 22; and Macon 21. Counties with fewer farms such as Alexander, Calhoun and Massac get along with four persons each.

Federal farm programs have attained such status that county offices today frequently occupy entire new buildings usually in the county seat. These buildings, customarily of one-story, flat-roof masonry construction, have adjacent parking areas. The buildings are erected by local investors and leased to the Government under term contracts.

The county ASCS committee apportions acreage allotments between the townships and communities, fixes normal yields on such crops as corn and wheat, hears appeals of farmers for better treatment, arranges meetings and assists in signups.

County committeemen are paid $17 a day plus mileage to and from their homes. In Coles County, committeemen were paid for 78.8 days during the year 1962 and drew approximately $1,340 each plus mileage money and expenses to and from statewide meetings. These figures are typical of the number of days worked and income of similar county committeemen over the State.

The signup and paperwork figuring farm acreage allotments and pay for idling land is done mostly by women employees working under an office manager. He or she customarily draws a salary of $8,000 to $9,600 a year; newer employees earn less, and clerical pay varies from $3,000 to $5,000 a year.

Township or community committeemen who number 4,449 (3 times 1,483 communities) get $14 a day when actually employed. This may be 4 or 5 days a year unless they serve also as field reporters who measure acreage, check performance, measure corncribs, etc. Compliance checkers earn from $12 to $20 a day on a piecework basis.

State ASCS office personnel by position—1962 fiscal year

		Salary
6	office of State committee	$45,203
3	administrative supervisors	25,299
11	acounting and statistical clerks	54,131
13	program specialists	103,716
12	clerk-stenographers	45,993
10	fieldmen	81,595
10	field assistants	37,784
5	duplicating and stock control clerks	23,655
	Total	402,376

State ASCS office personnel by position—1962 fiscal year—Continued

FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES OF COUNTY OFFICES OF THE AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION SERVICE[1]

County:	*Full-time employees*
Adams	10
Alexander	4
Bond	7
Boone	7
Brown	6
Bureau	13
Calhoun	4
Carroll	5
Cass	10
Champaign	27
Christian	22
Clark	9
Clay	7
Clinton	9
Coles	14
Cook	6
Crawford	6
Cumberland	8
DeKalb	8
DeWitt	11
Douglas	15
DuPage	6
Edgar	15
Edwards	6
Effingham	7
Fayette	8
Ford	13
Franklin	7
Fulton	12
Gallatin	6
Greene	8
Grundy	12
Hamilton	6
Hancock	11
Hardin (See Pope-Hardin)	
Henderson	8
Henry	10
Iroquois	28
Jackson	6
Jasper	9
Jefferson	8
Jersey	6
Jo Daviess	7
Johnson	5
Kane	8
Kankakee	15
Kendall	8
Knox	10
Lake	6
La Salle	26
Lawrence	7
Lee	11
Livingston	26
Logan	20
McDonough	12
McHenry	8
McLean	28
Macon	21
Macoupin	12
Madison	12
Marion	8
Marshall-Putnam	12
Mason	14
Massac	4
Menard	8
Mercer	9
Monroe	7
Montgomery	13
Morgan	12
Moultrie	12
Ogle	6
Peoria	11
Perry	7
Piatt	13
Pike	9
Pope-Hardin	6
Pulaski	5
Putnam (See Marshall-Putnam)	
Randolph	8
Richland	8
Rock Island	5
St. Clair	10
Saline	8
Sangamon	19
Schuyler	7
Scott	6
Shelby	17
Stark	8
Stephenson	8
Tazewell	15
Union	6
Vermilion	24
Wabash	6
Warren	11
Washington	7
Wayne	8
White	6
Whiteside	10
Will	11
Williamson	6
Winnebago	7
Woodford	12
Total	1,031

Footnote at end of table.

[1] Taken from officials personnal lists from county offices, dated mainly in January 1963.

Address of Theodore R. McKeldin Upon His Second Inauguration as Mayor of the City of Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, in his inaugural address today Theodore R. McKeldin rightly told the people of the city of Baltimore that a restoration of the spirit of leadership must precede a material rebirth of the city. He pledged himself to lead the city at the high level established by the giants of the past to even greater heights of economic and cultural attainments. What Mayor McKeldin has said to the people of Baltimore is equally applicable throughout the nation and I am privileged to append his second inaugural address:

ADDRESS OF THEODORE R. MCKELDIN UPON HIS SECOND INAUGURATION AS MAYOR OF THE CITY OF BALTIMORE, IN WAR MEMORIAL PLAZA, BALTIMORE, MD.

To be inaugurated Mayor of Baltimore is a solemn and auspicious experience. I would be less than frank if I did not confess that this is a very great moment for me personally. This is an office I sought. This is an office I asked of my fellow Baltimoreans. I am profoundly grateful for your confidence and support. I now have the opportunity to fulfill the pledges upon which my administration will stand. With God's help, I will devote my entire energies to see that they are accomplished.

However, any success must and will be a joint success.

It will result from a harmonious effort on the part of the executive and legislative bodies of our city to accomplish our aims. I am quick to recognize the party differences that exist between parts of these two arms of government. This does not mean, however, that municipal progress cannot be accomplished. This type of government relationship is not uncommon to me. It has worked on the city and State levels in the past.

It will work again in the future.

I ask, therefore, that all citizens—Democrats and Republicans, but more importantly, Baltimoreans—pledge with me today to conduct the government of our great city, not as a power struggle or a method of personal achievement, but as a means of accomplishing sincere aims and lofty goals for all of our people.

Twenty years and three days have passed since I delivered my first inaugural address as Mayor of Baltimore, so, naturally, I have been thinking of the contrast between conditions then and now.

At that time the Nation was fighting for its life, and not for its life only, but for the survival of liberty.

Inevitably, interest in purely municipal affairs was muted.

Loyal citizens at that time had no choice; they were compelled to put the safety of the Nation first, so it necessarily became the leading theme of my address.

But the war was won, and since the victory, no armed enemy has undertaken to destroy us by military power. Today I am free to invite your attention to the affairs of Baltimore with an insistence that would have been inappropriate in 1943.

Yet, I do not harbor the delusion that because no armed enemy fires on the flag today, therefore, our responsibilities, and specifically the responsibilities of a mayor of Baltimore, are reduced.

On the contrary, they are increased, for if we fail in our civic duty today, we can no longer plead, in extenuation, that the Nation's danger demanded our first attention.

Therefore, it is with no trace of complacency that I have approached today's ceremony. I am well aware that the task I am undertaking is harder, not easier, than it was 20 years ago. The mere increase in the size of the city would assure more work for the mayor; but in addition to the increase in size, it has increased in complexity, because so much of the growth is beyond the old city boundaries, thereby complicating every administrative problem.

Because of this situation—and not in spite of it—we are an especially fortunate people, we Baltimoreans of 1963.

Why? Because, I think, we have been blessed by the Almighty with a special responsibility, for never in our history have our challenges been so great and our goals so eminently worthy of attainment.

There was a time we know when the fire-ravished Baltimore of 1904 faced a decision somewhat comparable to the one confronting us today—that is, whether to make the supreme effort required to achieve the type of prize reserved solely for the bold, the valiant, the imaginative and the dedicated.

The decision in 1904 was clear and positive.

The result of that decision was a new Baltimore.

Now, in this year of 1963, we find that a Baltimore recently reduced in spirit, to ashes by the smoldering fire of neglect, is once again rising in renewed pride and splendor.

The Charles Center, our State office buildings, the new office and apartment buildings which punctuate our skyline, these are proof in mortar and steel that men of foresight and determination are translating the Baltimore spirit of old into a vibrant new hope for tomorrow.

But these modern structures which we see around us, these monuments to the initiative of private citizens, are only a beginning, an introduction to the history of our new Baltimore.

To us has been entrusted the enormous responsibility of completing the task.

Toward this end we must utilize the fresh wave of enthusiasm which is sweeping from Curtis Bay to Hamilton, and from Highlandtown to Mount Washington, and we must harness it for specific tasks.

Where crime runs rampant we must combat it through a fully staffed and adequately paid law enforcement department.

Where confusion and economic distress plague our citizens as a result of vacillation in our planning for public works projects, we must act promptly, decisively, wisely, making changes for the common good with a minimum of inconvenience to those persons required to make adjustments.

We must assure an adequate system of mass transportation, for each undue delay in transit makes a mockery of our efforts to utilize our priceless time in a rewarding and effective way.

We must staff our schools with teachers of special skills and high dedication * * * teachers who are properly compensated.

We must widen or reroute certain major arteries while the land required for such work remains undeveloped.

We must establish greater efficiency and economy in government.

But these are old problems, familiar problems, problems that we willingly accept as the initiation through which we must pass today to merit the new Baltimore of tomorrow.

We can solve them, I am sure.

We must solve them.

But when we have done so, we will merely have provided belated remedies for ills which seem almost ancient. We will merely have brought ourselves up to date.

What I want especially to share with you today is my enthusiasm for those new and fascinating challenges which we shall courageously select for ourselves.

For instance—envision with me, for a moment, a new Baltimore with three soaring centers of activity—the State office buildings, where Maryland conducts so much of her official business, the Charles Center, the hub of our business and commerce, and a third focal point, a new Municipal Center, with city accommodations worthy of this great metropolis.

Is this too visionary? Too much composed of the stuff of dreams?

I think not.

In fact, the very demands of practicality cry out for new arrangements to replace the antiquated, inefficient, expensive hodge-podge of municipal offices which now sprawl so awkwardly throughout our downtown area.

The City Hall, for instance, is in a condition not merely deplorable, but actually dangerous. We must do something about it very soon; and I hope that when we act, we shall not make a patchwork job.

As Governor, I took the lead in starting the project that has resulted in the three great buildings in our city in which are concentrated most of the State's business offices. We spent a lot of money there, but the rise in property values in the adjacent area has already returned much of it and is steadily returning more. It is my firm belief that within the next 10 years, the increased revenue will reimburse us for the initial outlay.

We can observe the same process in Charles Center. This is primarily private enterprise, but the city is already assured of a handsome return on its relatively small investment.

But now that the State and private business are forging ahead, why should the city lag behind? Why should we not seize the opportunity to create around the War Memorial Plaza a municipal center worthy of comparison with the business center and the State center? Since we must do something about the City Hall anyhow, why not plan to draw together the offices that are now scattered all over town at great expense and inconvenience? I favor such a program and shall do my best to advance it.

Envision with me, too, a new inner harbor area, where the imagination of man can take advantage of a rare gift of nature to produce an enthralling panorama of office buildings, parks, high-rise apartments and marinas. In this we have a very special opportunity, for few other cities in the world have been blessed, as has ours, with such a potentially beautiful harbor area within the very heart of downtown.

Too visionary, this?

Too dreamlike?

Certainly not, for our new Baltimore is beginning to throb again with the resolution of the Calverts and the Carrolls, and to glow once more with the civic pride of the Peabodys, the Pratts, the Walters, and the Hopkins.

We, the heirs of those civic giants of old, must prove ourselves worthy of the flaming spirit of purposeful adventure which is our legacy.

In doing so, however, we must not forget—as we have been prone to do in the past—that many of the assets bequeathed to our generation are not visible and tangible, but that, properly exploited, they might be more valuable than all our land and buildings.

We have history and beauty and culture and charm—ingredients for which many a midwestern community would pay a king's ransom—but we have neglected them, or used them in a halfhearted way.

For instance, there is the frigate *Constellation*, that could be a national shrine, but we have allowed it to remain merely a local curiosity.

We did save the Flag House, but at Lombard and the Fallsway we are allowing the city-owned Charles Carroll mansion—built by Charles Carroll for his daughter, and the home in which he died, the last surviving signer of the Declaration of Independence—to crumble into ruin.

Through our streets Washington's and Rochambeau's legions of freedom marched on their way to Yorktown, and Lincoln passed on his journey to martyrdom and immortality.

Here lived the first American bishop of the Roman Catholic Church and the man whom most of us still regard as the American prince of the church, James Cardinal Gibbons, who was born on that very spot where the War Memorial Building now stands. Lovely Lane Meeting House was the cradle of Methodism, and Otterbein and old St. Paul's Episcopal Church and others are not less hallowed in our minds.

Nor can we forget the old Lloyd Street Synagogue, the first-built synagogue in Maryland, which the Jewish Historical Society intends to restore to its original beauty as one of our most magnificent examples of Grecian architecture.

Such martial, political, and religious history clusters around Baltimore, and there is more, for I have not even touched the economic history, which, from Ross Winans' railway truck and Morse's telegraph, to Martin's space-age marvels, is a synopsis of the industrial development of America.

What Boston would have made of all this passes imagination.

What little we have done must make all of us hang our heads in shame.

Yet we live in the presence of remnants of a city that culturally and intellectually led the Nation. Long before the Johns Hopkins became the first modern American university, in the days when the Battle Monument was erected, and some what later, the Washington Monument was built, Baltimore citizens did not hesitate to put their money and their labor into the creation of municipal beauty, believing as firmly as Pericles did in ancient Athens that the adornment of a city constitutes one of its chief values.

I am for urban renewal in the sense of redemption of blighted areas. But I am still more strongly for urban renewal in the sense of a revival of that spirit which was Baltimore in the days when Charles Carroll was laying the cornerstone of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, when the famous Baltimore Clipper ships were sailing the seven seas, and when Pratt and Peabody and Hopkins were accumulating the money that, planted in the cultural life of the city, was to blossom in music and art and learning. For I am convinced that a renewal of that spirit would bring us riches far exceeding anything we can achieve with steel and glass and concrete.

I confidently expect to see Baltimore steadily increase in economic riches and power. But that is not the limit of my aspiration for her, and I ardently hope that my administration may help to increase her wealth in other things. For I am not ashamed to admit that I share the feeling of Charleston's poet, DuBose Heyward, when he wrote:

> "They tell me she is beautiful, my city,
> That she is colorful and quaint, alone
> Among the cities. But I, I who have known
> Her tenderness, her courage, and her pity,
> Have felt her forces mould me, mind and bone * * *
> How can I think of her in wood and stone."

Ours is an enormous task.

It excites us.

It lures us forward, upward.

And, in our recognition of our human limitations, it strikes fear into our zealous hearts, for we know that we cannot succeed unaided.

It is to the Almighty that we must turn our minds and our hearts, and it is in His providence that we must seek assistance.

And so once again I dedicate myself as the humble and loyal servant of God, and with the help of our Lord, I shall earnestly do my best to serve Him and you.

To have the opportunity of sharing in the creative development of our beloved city as its chief executive is a supreme privilege.

I trust that all of us may consider ourselves as fellow workers in the constructive task of making this city the home of an ever-happier and more prosperous people.

Let it be known too, in every clime and to the ends of the earth, that here in Baltimore—the sixth largest city in the Nation, the largest city in the Mason-Dixon line, in the South—on the soil of Maryland, every man is of sacred worth as a child of God, and all share equally in the responsibilities and blessings of freedom.

To that end we dedicate ourselves anew to the further advancement of human values as the greatest contribution we may make to our day and age.

Therefore I solemnly dedicate myself not only to preserve and uphold the charter of our city, but to maintain and strengthen its noblest traditions as well, the traditions of tolerance, brotherhood, and human freedom without limitation.

Sincerely and earnestly do I ask your prayers, my fellow citizens, as indeed I pray for all of you.

Accomplishments of U.S. Travel Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, several days ago the Secretary of Commerce filed his third semiannual report on the U.S. Travel Service. For those of you who have not seen this report I would like to take this opportunity to review some of the major accomplishments of this agency in the short time—less than 2 years—since it was established by an act of Congress.

As the author of a bill to inaugurate a Federal travel promotion program and as a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which brought out the legislation creating USTS, I have followed the progress of this agency with keen interest. When the idea of setting up another new Government bureau, to promote international travel to this country, was first proposed, I was, frankly, quite skeptical and said so at the time. We have all seen how easy it is for Washington to dream up a new Federal activity, with the net result of adding more dollars to our tax burden, more people to the Government's payroll, more bureaucracy—but adding little else. The Travel Service could easily have followed this pattern, but because I saw that it might also accomplish some real good I supported its creation. I support it even more today because of its concrete achievements under Secretary Hodges and its director, Voit Gilmore.

Two years ago Congress gave USTS the job of encouraging more people from around the world to come and see the United States, spend their vacations here, or bring their wives and families on business trips here. We had two primary objectives in mind: to narrow the "travel dollar gap" by bringing back a higher percentage of the $2 to $3 billion spent abroad every year by U.S. tourists, and to have more of our friends from overseas see the American way of life at first hand. The Travel Service has certainly done this job, and done it well.

During its first 6 months USTS was busy getting organized; recruiting, testing and training a staff, and setting up its offices abroad. It was not until calendar year 1962 that results could fairly be measured. Those results are contained in the Secretary's report to which I have referred.

In 1962 the United States received a total of 604,000 business and pleasure visitors from all oversea countries. This was 89,000, or 17 percent more than visited us in 1961. The year 1962 not only produced a record number of foreign visitors, but the actual increase in travel, both numerically and percentagewise, also established a record. As a matter of fact, 1962's increase of 17 percent was almost exactly double the average annual increase recorded during the previous 10-year period.

These are figures for all oversea countries. Looking at the 1962 statistics from just those 45 countries covered by USTS the record is even more impressive. From these areas travel to the United States was up 23 percent over 1961, compared with an actual decline of 8 percent from all other oversea countries.

The results for 1963 are even better. During the first 4 months of this year we received a total of 179,504 business and pleasure visitors, 22 percent more than arrived during the same period of 1962.

Since the travel program is a frontal attack on our country's balance-of-payments difficulties, it is important to note that each visitor to the United States spends here an average of $470 over and above the cost of his transportation to get here. Our new visitors from abroad bring hundreds of millions of U.S. travel dollars "back home."

These figures should speak for themselves. But let us not make the mistake of assuming that these new visitors to our country just "happen" to come here instead of going somewhere else or staying home. Behind the statistics lies a tremendous amount of intense and dedicated effort by personnel of the Travel Service, by the travel industry, and by the many, many others who have joined the "Visit U.S.A." team.

Some examples of this effort are given in the Secretary's report. But I would also like to highlight some others which are not spelled out in detail. Beginning with the Travel Service itself, here are a few of the things which help to explain why the "Visit U.S.A." program has been a success.

In less than 2 years the USTS has—

Opened 6 tastefully designed and well-equipped travel information centers in London, Paris, Frankfurt, Mexico City, Tokyo, and Sydney;

Assigned additional travel promotion officers to Foreign Service posts in Rome, Bogotá, Colombia, and Sao Paulo, Brazil;

Staffed each of its 9 offices with professional travel promotion personnel drawn from private industry. Every individual assigned overseas was tested on his knowledge of the United States and required to achieve a State Department rating of fluent in the language of his country of assignment;

Helped organize and participated in over 30 industry-sponsored promotional tours and travel seminars abroad; addressed oversea groups of travel agents, carrier personnel, businessmen, travel club members, and community leaders totaling over 20,000 people; placed oversea travel displays in over 100 trade fairs, travel exhibits, hotels, department stores and other business firms; and held over 200 showings of travel films with a total audience of more than 30,000 persons;

Produced and distributed over 500,000 posters showing 24 different scenes of U.S. travel attractions;

Produced and distributed over 12 million separate pieces of travel promotion and information literature—maps; regional folders; special events calendars; tour planner boxes for travel agents; special brochures on food, industry, and outdoor attractions; bill stuffers; shell folders and window displays. Almost all of this material has been printed in 8 different languages;

Procured and distributed another 5 million pieces of travel literature supplied by the 50 States, the chambers of commerce or convention bureaus of every major U.S. city, and principal travel trade associations;

Supervised on-the-spot travel market research surveys in 17 foreign countries involving the compilation of thousands of attitude questionnaires and hundreds of depth interviews of past and prospective travelers to the United States;

Conducted major travel advertising campaigns in the consumer press of 8 principal national markets, covering 375 insertions in media yielding over 300 million separate advertising message impressions;

Conducted travel trade advertising in 3 countries with 30 separate insertions;

Placed 135 professionally written "Visit U.S.A." articles in 142 oversea publications having a combined circulation of over 100 million readers.

Planned and conducted a 13-State tour by leading travel writers from 9 countries, resulting in the publication of approximately 50 articles of locally-created "Visit, U.S.A." material;

Arranged or assisted in over 50 U.S. tours by travel agents, journalists, television teams and carrier personnel from abroad.

In addition to these promotional activities, the Travel Service has also been busy helping to facilitate travel to this country, to create a more friendly welcome for our visitors and to improve our knowledge of international travel habits. As examples, USTS has:

Led the drive for cutting redtape at our borders, with such advances as the waiver of personal appearance requirements for tourist visa applicants, the institution of oral baggage declarations at major ports of entry, accelerated screening of Mexican visitors by Government inspectors and noticeable improvements in the overall efficiency and courtesy with which all incoming travelers are processed by Federal officers;

Designed and erected 12 welcome signs at our principal ports of entry, featuring a message from President Kennedy;

Visited nearly every State, contacting civic leaders, community service organizations, travel industry associations, and other local groups urging them to begin or strengthen grassroots hospitality programs for guests from abroad.

Produced and distributed over 10,500 "community kits" containing a variety of informative material on how localities can become better hosts to guests from abroad;

Mounted a nationwide advertising campaign, built upon the theme "Company's Coming," utilizing prime media space and time donated as a public service by magazine and newspaper publishers, and radio and television station owners through the cooperation of the Advertising Council. This award-winning campaign, stressing how individual Americans can make a visitor's stay more enjoyable, has so far commanded over $2 million worth of advertising space given at no cost to the Federal Government;

Produced and distributed over 8,300 copies of the first comprehensive industrial plant tour guide of the United States for use by foreign and domestic travel agents as well as the individual traveler;

Collected and published detailed statistics on the pattern of tourist travel to the United States, including the results of three comprehensive surveys of 875 departing visitors conducted by USTS at the New York and Honolulu international airports and aboard the cruise ship *Canberra*.

Topping the list of its accomplishments, I believe, has been the Travel Service's foresight and skill in catalysing the efforts of private industry in support of the "Visit U.S.A." program. Working through a 36-man Travel Advisory Committee, representing leading elements of the U.S. tourist and transportation industry, the Travel Service has been instrumental in aiding, developing and promoting a broad range of private programs for the benefit of increased foreign travel. A few leading examples include the $99/99-day bus ticket, the flat-rate fare plans offered by eight local-service airlines to foreign visitors, the 15-percent railroad coach discount, the reduced-rate accommodations given by three major hotel chains, the extensive foreign visitor welcome program launched by the American Hotel Association, the scores of extraordinary advertising and special promotion programs undertaken by U.S. and foreign-flag carriers to sell more travel to the United States of America, and many others.

The most remarkable thing about the Travel Service story is that all of this has been accomplished by one of the smallest agencies in Washington. Compared with the multitudes employed by most of our other international agencies, the USTS worldwide professional staff of 24 persons—12 in the United States and 12 overseas—can only be described as tiny. As a matter of fact, 59 of our 79 foreign-aid missions individually employ a larger number of U.S. citizens than the total complement of USTS personnel assigned abroad. Our economic-aid mission to South Vietnam alone is 20 times larger than the entire oversea staff of USTS. The Travel Service's current budget of $3,350,000 is less than one-tenth of 1 percent of our foreign-aid budget.

I cite these figures simply to show that the U.S. Government does not have to create a giant agency to get things accomplished around the world. Whatever else it may stand for, the U.S. Travel Service is a proud and encouraging example of that fact. Paraphrasing a well-remembered statement by our "fellow citizen," Winston Churchill, it can be said of the U.S. Travel Service that never in the history of Federal bureaucracy has so much been done, with so little, by so few.

United States Still on Sucker List

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, the United States continues to be the chief patsy for all wanting an easy handout.

Just as I predicted, Brazil has literally thumbed her nose at the United States. In statements to this House, I pointed out the futility of granting Brazil the $400 million loan the State Department approved on the 25th of March of this year.

I stated on numerous occasions prior to that date that Brazil would use the money to enhance her trade with Russia and that in effect after she got her hands on the money she would do with it just as she saw fit.

Now Brazil has signed a new 5-year trade agreement with Soviet Russia involving more than $600 million and although she denies any U.S. dollars were used, the terms of the contract were, oddy enough, spelled out in U.S. dollars.

Furthermore, one of the so-called declared purposes of the loan was to help Brazil fight inflation and Brazil promised the United States in writing, that she would eliminate subsidies on wheat and petroleum products so as to reduce the cash deficit of the Brazilian Treasury. Brazil promised a policy of containment in budgetary expenditures for 1963 and to attempt to hold wage increases to actual cost-of-living increases and salary adjustments for public employees to 40 percent.

Now what has she done after the United States bailed her out based on her promises—why Brazil has done a complete about-face. Brazil in effect has doublecrossed the United States.

Brazil has restored federal subsidies on food and oil and agreed to a 60-percent increase in pay raise for Government employees and the army. Thereby insuring a new round of inflation and breaking faith with the United States. Proving the U.S. loan was an exercise in futility.

Mr. Speaker, Virginia Prewett, in an article in today's Washington Daily News, factually and vividly calls attenton to this breach of faith. I included her article called "Subsidizing Brazil's Doublecross" in my remarks and urge my colleagues to read it.

SUBSIDIZING BRAZIL'S DOUBLECROSS

(By Virginia Prewett)

Brazil is a huge, beautiful, and underdeveloped country whose rulers for over 2 years have bucked U.S. foreign policy for Cuba whenever we took a firm tone toward Castro. Today, Brazil's rulers have embarked also on an open course of bucking U.S. foreign policy for Brazil.

Within the past 2 months, Brazil's President Joao Goulart and his Foreign Minister Dr. Francisco San Tiago Dantas have quite spectacularly broken a vital agreement with the Kennedy administration.

THEY KNOW

The speed with which they have splintered solemn promises solemnly made to Washington is almost without parallel. Thick-skinned Norte-Americanos may not know that by this action Brazil has flung the United States a challenge. But Brazil's Latin American neighbors know.

The incident turns on the recent financial bailout granted Brazil by the United States. In March, President Goulart sent Dr. Dantas to Washington to plead that Brazil might soon have to default on official and commercial debts—the equivalent of national bankruptcy. To get a U.S. bailout of $398 million, the Goulart-Dantas team promised in writing to curb Brazil's rampant inflation.

Within short weeks, the two Brazilian leaders have done the opposite. They've restored federal food and oil subsidies, and agreed to a 60-percent pay raise for government employees and the army. A new round of inflation is assured.

President Goulart and Dr. Dantas solemnly tell U.S. newsmen that political pressures forced them to do this.

PAYOFF

The truth is that the Goulart-Dantas following is powerful in the government employees union that spearheaded the wage-increase demand, so the two leaders in effect "pressured" themselves. The huge raise will pay off a political debt to the army—which sustains Sr. Goulart's power—and is insurance for Dr. Dantas' election as Sr. Goulart's successor in 1965.

President Goulart is often described as an opportunist. But his heir-apparent, Dr. Dantas, is wedded to his own set of principles. He remains viscerally anti-American, with a political philosophy little changed since he was a uniformed Brazilian Nazi before World War II.

President Goulart and Dr. Dantas have maneuvered the United States into subsidizing their political ambitions. Latin America is watching to see what President Kennedy's team does about it now.

Cuba: A Major Threat to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, that Cuba poses a major threat to the United States is a view shared by one of America's most outstanding and capable news columnists, Mr. David Lawrence, editor of U.S. News & World Report. In a May 20, 1963, syndicated column, Mr. Lawrence discusses this problem in view of the Stennis committee report and presents a point of view that I too share. I recommend this column to my colleagues and am asking that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

CUBA HELD MAJOR THREAT TO U.S.

(By David Lawrence)

The greatest danger to the security of the United States today is in Cuba. There is enough Soviet military strength remaining on the island to launch an attack on this country.

Yet the American people are being led to believe that Soviet military strength in Cuba is negligible and that an attack is as unthinkable as the missile buildup last year was supposed to be.

This was the reasoning used by Government agencies here in the autum of 1962 to minimize the meaning of the Soviet troop movement and of the preliminary steps for the setting up of missile bases.

The most important official document on the Cuban situation has received only passing attention in the last 11 days from the American people. No announcement has been made of what the Kennedy administration intends to do about the facts that have just been disclosed. There are no signs that the Soviet Government is being prodded to get its troops, technicians, and military equipment out of Cuba, or that any demand is being made to permit on-the-spot inspection in order to find out whether any missiles are still concealed inside the island.

The latest word to the American people about the gravity of the Cuban situation comes not from Republican critics trying to make a political issue but from a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the U.S. Senate headed by a Democratic chairman, Senator JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi. All seven members—four Democrats and three Republicans—signed the unanimous report. It tells the unvarnished truth about what has happened and points out a lesson for the future. Here are some extracts from the report, dated May 9, which was written after hearing for many weeks secret testimony given by the intelligence agencies of the Government, civilian and military: "While a reasonably competent job was done in acquiring and collecting intelligence information and data, in retrospect it appears that several substantial errors were made by the intelligence agencies in the evaluation of the information and data which was accumulated * * *.

"Even though the intelligence community believes that all (strategic missiles) have been withdrawn, it is of the greatest urgency to determine whether or not strategic missiles are now concealed in Cuba. The criticality of this is illustrated by the fact that, assuming maximum readiness at preselected sites, with all equipment prelocated, the Soviet mobile medium-range—1,100 miles—missiles could be made operational in a matter of hours.

"Some other sources—primarily refugee and exile groups—estimate that as many as 40,000 Soviets are now in Cuba. Bearing in mind the lack of hard evidence on the question and the substantial underestimation of last fall, we conclude that no one in official U.S. circles can tell with any real degree of confidence, how many Russians are now in Cuba and we are of the opinion that the official 17,500 estimate is perhaps a minimum figure * * *.

"The evidence is overwhelming that Castro is supporting, spurring, aiding, and abetting Communist revolutionary and subversive movements throughout the Western Hemisphere and that such activities present a grave and ominous threat to the peace and security of the Americas * * *.

"It is agreed that ironclad assurance of the complete absence of Soviet strategic missiles in Cuba can come only as a result of thorough, penetrating on-site inspection by reliable observers * * *.

"The importance of making every effort to ascertain the truth with respect to this matter cannot be overemphasized. The criticality of it can best be illustrated by the fact that the testimony established that, upon the assumption that all missiles and associated equipment and the necessary personnel were readily available near preselected sites in a state of complete readiness, mobile medium-range missiles could be made operational in a matter of hours. Thus, if these missiles and their associated equipment remain in Cuba, the danger is clear and obvious * * *.

"Assuming without deciding that all strategic weapons have been withdrawn, there is the ever-present possibility of the stealthy reintroduction of strategic missiles and other offensive weapons, using the Soviet forces still in Cuba as camouflage and security for the activity * * *.

"Potentially, Cuba is a base from which the Soviets could interdict our vital air and sealanes. It can now be used for the air, sea, and electronic surveillance of our military activities in the Southeast United States and the Caribbean.

"Cuba's airfields could serve as recovery air bases for planes launched against the United States from the Soviet Union."

This means that the range of certain Soviet military planes has been increased substantially. They need fly only one way in a surprise attack, drop bombs on the United States and land in Cuba.

Yet in the last few weeks nothing has been done to insist upon on-site inspection in Cuba by the United Nations or by any other agency. The Kennedy administration has retreated on this point, and only an informed public opinion in the United States and throughout the world can bring about an advance—to verify what has actually happened.

The Battle Over Capital Punishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the May 7, 1963, edition of Look magazine.

A moving narrative of what happens when a man is put to death, it is one of the best arguments for the enactment of my bill H.R. 545, which would abolish the death penalty in all Federal jurisdictions except the military services and the treason statutes.

The article follows:

THE BITTER BATTLE OVER CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

"The death penalty isn't punishment—it's revenge." These grim words sum up the feelings of Jack R. Johnson, tough warden of Chicago's Cook County Jail, a man whose job it is to press the switch of an electric chair and a man who is unalterably opposed to capital punishment. A growing number of lawmakers, governors, and penologists agree with Warden Johnson and want to do away with the death penalty. Opposing them are police officials and other authorities who fear that abolition would encourage murder. The reformers argue that the threat of execution does not deter. They also ask this disturbing question: Most killers are spared. Why should others die?

EIGHT-YEAR JOURNEY TO DEATH: THE CASE OF VINCENT CIUCCI

Capital punishment is neither swift nor certain nor just, argue those who would outlaw it. There are around 8,600 murders a year, for which some 6,000 to 7,000 persons are tried—but less than 50 of them are executed. During Warden Johnson's 7½ years at Cook County Jail, he has had to electrocute only 3 of 33 condemned men. Some of the others are still awaiting appeals and new trials, but most have already won new trials and had their sentences reduced to prison terms.

Among the few whom Johnson executed was Vincent Ciucci, 36, a Chicago grocer. The prosecution charged that Ciucci shot his wife and three young children and then set fire to the house so that he could hide the crime and marry another woman. It took four trials before the State could obtain the death penalty. One ended in a mistrial. At another, Ciucci got 20 years for the slaying of his wife; at a third, he received 45 years for the killing of a daughter; at a fourth, the death penalty was finally imposed for the murder of his 8-year-old son. Warden Johnson pleaded with the State pardon board to spare Ciucci. "We gain nothing by imposing a death sentence," he said. A prosecutor, opposing mercy, countered: "If Ciucci doesn't deserve the chair, then nobody does." With death imminent, Ciucci made public a story he had never told at his trial, known before only to his priest, lawyer, and the warden. He actually had killed his wife, he said, but it was in a rage after she herself had shot all three children during a fit of jealousy.

Executions have a mood of their own. Late on a raw March night a year ago, seven newspaper reporters watched while a guard ran electric clippers over the hair on Ciucci's head and along his right leg, where the electrodes were to be attached. On the dark street below, a lone student from Northwestern University paced, brandishing a cruedly lettered sign that read "Capital punishment is legal murder." A few motorists halted near the jail's concrete wall, hoping to see "the lights dim." A policeman ordered them away: "Anyway, the lights don't fade out like in the movies," he told them. Inside, Ciucci was asking, "Do you think it's fair to deny a dying man's request? People don't want to know the truth of the thing." He was talking about the authorities' refusal to give him truth serum. One of the newsmen started sobbing as they filed out of the cell and down the corridor to their seats facing the electric chair. In the jail lobby, Ciucci's mother stood stoically on a stairway, with a woman chaplain at her side. She did not have to wait long. A few minutes after 12:06 a.m., the witnesses' duty was done, and they walked out past her.

AND ANOTHER DOESN'T

The muscular man, raising a heavy prison cot over his head for exercise, is a convicted murderer named Paul Crump. This 34-year-old Chicagoan was found guilty of killing a guard in a 1953 payroll robbery. He was supposed to be executed a few months after Ciucci, but instead had his sentence commuted to 199 years by Gov. Otto Kerner of Illinois. The reason was unprecedented: Crump convinced the State pardon board that he had become "completely rehabilitated" during his 9 years in jail while awaiting execution. "Under those circumstances, it would serve no useful purpose to society to take this man's life," said the Governor. However, the real issue in the Crump case may well have been the growing revulsion against capital punishment. Two hundred persons, testifying before the pardon board in his behalf, seemed to be saying that even if Crump was guilty of murder, he didn't deserve to die. Warden Johnson said that Crump had changed "from a savagely hostile man who wanted to strike out against society to a decent person." With the warden's encouragement, he had begun to read books, write poetry and even published a novel, "Burn, Killer, Burn." He also studied the Bible, became a convert to Catholicism and helped to care for some of the crippled inmates. "To execute him," said Johnson, "would be to commit capital vengeance, not punishment."

Immediately after an execution, Warden Johnson has to play host at a sort of reception for those reporters and official witnesses who can eat. The warden himself has little appetite at such a time. "I'm no softy," he says. "I'm not up there on cloud nine. I'm not a bleeding heart. But I absolutely oppose capital punishment. It's a complete waste of a human being."

Johnson believes that it takes "somewhat of a dual personality" to execute a man. "I'm opposed to the electric chair, but I'm also the executioner," he says, "and I have to accept the responsibility of my office. The prisoners understand this. They seem to know even more than I what my duty is."

"I'M THE EXECUTIONER"

To be merciful, Johnson conducts an execution as rapidly as possible. In a matter of seconds, the prisoner is clamped by his head, legs, and arms to the chair. "I have never had a man beg for mercy," Johnson says. "I try to impress on him he should die with dignity." Three guards stand tensely, crowded against Johnson's bulk, their thumbs aimed at a panel with four red buttons. At the signal, Johnson and the three guards push their assigned buttons. For 8 seconds, 1,900 volts of electricity course through the prisoner, then 900 volts for 52 seconds, 1,900 volts again for 4 seconds and, finally, 900 volts for 56 seconds. By now, the man in the chair has been dead for 2 minutes—the law takes no chances. A doctor and a chaplain do what they have to do. The execution is over.

"I have learned a lot from these men under sentence of death," says the warden. Inmates come and go in a county jail—the only longtime residents are the condemned men. At first, Johnson was shocked by their hatred for society. "They overflowed with animosity for the system," he said. "It was they who considered themselves the victims."

When Johnson first came to Cook County jail in 1955, he was too busy to spend much time in Death Row. The 6-foot-1-inch, 257-pound ex-marine, then a captain of sheriff's police, had been called in to put down rioting at the jail and remained as warden. His first act was to strip the guards of their brass knuckles and blackjacks.

"Somebody back in the 14th century must have thought up the leg irons with heavy dragging chains that the men under death sentence had to wear," he says. "And I didn't like their being segregated on Death Row." The warden did away with the leg irons and scattered the condemned men all through the institution.

"I really got to know those fellows," he said. "I had them come up to my office, all five or six of them at a time, and we had bull sesions on every conceivable subject. They got so interested that one day they came in at 4:15 p.m., and they wouldn't go back to have dinner until I chased them out at 8 p.m." Soon the bull sessions became, in effect, group-therapy sessions, with a psychiatrist and the prison chaplains participating. "We accumulated a file as thick as a telephone book on each man," said the warden. "Soon we began to notice a slow but sure change in some of them."

Paul Crump, for example, came to the defense of a guard who was attacked by an escaping inmate. Another condemned man studied the prison security system with a practiced eye and made useful suggestions for a more efficient relocation of guard stations. All of them seemed more thoughtful, more interested in learning and less inclined to hate.

"The hell raising stopped on the tiers," says the warden. "Until now, most of them felt they had nothing to lose by making trouble. 'Put your gripes on paper,' I told them. Most of them learned for the first time in their lives they could get something by persuasion."

Warden Johnson is unhappy that he cannot do for all 1,984 inmates what little he has done for this small group. "A prison is supposed to be a correctional institution," he says. "God, I wish we had the resources to do some correcting."

THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST DEATH

The campaign against capital punishment is a continuing one, but it is taking on a special intensity this spring as State legislatures around the Nation debate the abolition of the death penalty.

In Massachusetts, the new Governor, Endicott Peabody, has pledged to commute the death sentences of all convicted murderers. Massachusetts law now makes electrocution mandatory only in cases of murder committed during a rape or attemped rape. Actually, since 1947, Governors have commuted all death sentences with approval of the executive council. "It's the best bargain the Boston strangler and the criminal element could get," criticized State Senator Francis X. McCann. Public Safety Commissioner Frank S. Giles said, "I differ emphatically with the Governor." Undismayed by his critics, Peabody promised to sign any new legislation doing away with the death penalty. Several such bills are now being considered.

In Iowa, the legislators have considered stopping all executions, except for kidnapping. In Tennessee, the lawmakers heard Gov. Frank Clement give them his "personal feeling" against capital punishment as they considered repeal. In Illinois, the abolitionists are back again with proposals for a moratorium on executions, despite previous defeats in 1957, 1959, and 1961. "We want to make Illinois a civilized State," says State Senator Robert McCarthy, chief sponsor of the bill. "Times have changed since 2000 B.C.," he said. "It's no longer all right to take an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth."

In New York, the legislature solidly backed a bill making the death penalty no longer mandatory for premeditated murder. The nine-man commission that recommended the change may go even further and take a general stand against capital punishment when it makes its report this summer.

The most emotional battle, however, is going on in California, where Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown has asked the legislature to try a 4-year experiment that would limit the death penalty to such homicides as multiple murders, kidnap slayings and cop killings.

As a young district attorney in San Francisco, Brown had not opposed the death penalty for the killers he prosecuted. But now he feels differently—after 4 years in office during which some three dozen men and women have gone to San Quentin's gas chamber. He says, "We kill the murderer because we fear him, not because he is beyond rehabilitation or control. We kill him not for his crime, but in the blind hope that others may not commit his crime."

Execution is an uncertain deterrent, he told the legislators. "It is probable that only 12 of the 609 murders who killed in California in 1961 actually will surrender their lives to the State," he said. "What possible deterrence can there be in a penalty we invoke only 2 percent of the time?"

Governor Brown charges that capital punishment is hit or miss: Men die for crimes for which women do not. A murderer who shoots his victims is more likely to be executed than a killer who uses poison.

"It is a fact that we sentence to death members of minority races, the poor, the unintelligent, and the friendless for crimes we are prone to minimize in defendants who are more like ourselves," says the Governor. He notes that more than half of the persons executed in America are Negroes and that defendants who can afford expensive lawyers hardly ever pay with their lives.

"Getting tough" with killers doesn't work, says Brown. The Governor points out that "12 Southern States, all of whom enforce the death penalty vigorously, have the highest incidence of murder." Eight States—Alaska, Hawaii, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin—have, in effect, given up the death penalty. Their homicide rate is no worse, and sometimes better, than the average.

"I oppose capital punishment," declares Governor Brown, "because it brutalizes man; because a society that takes human life cannot invest its citizens with respect for human life."

The U.N.'s Budget Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, last year the U.S. Congress authorized our Government to participate in the purchase of United Nations bonds. We did so because we realized that the financial problems of the United Nations urgently required solution, and because we felt that the peacekeeping and other operations of the United Nations were too important to be allowed to lapse through lack of funds. But despite the success of the bond issue, the United Nations organization remains in financial difficulties. The causes and possible solutions of these difficulties were described by an editorial and an article in the May 19 issue of the New York Times. Under unanimous consent, I insert these two items in the RECORD. I would draw the attention of Members particularly to the statement in the editorial that, whereas the world spends upward of $120 billion on armaments, the United Nations is in jeopardy for the lack of a mere $100 million.

The editorial and article follow:

THE U.N.'S BUDGET PROBLEM

The General Assembly of the United Nations is meeting in special session to deal with a crisis that threatens it with financial and moral bankruptcy. Considering the stakes, the actual amounts involved fully justify the ironic quip that "never have so many talked so much about so little." The world spends upward of $120 billion a year on armaments. But the United Nations is in jeopardy for the lack of a mere $100 million.

This is the present size of its rapidly growing deficit. It has this deficit mainly because nearly half of its 111 member nations have refused or have failed to pay their share of the special assessments for one or both of the peacekeeping operations in the Congo and the Middle East, the biggest delinquents being Soviet Russia and France. The bond issue (of which about $150 million has been bought) is providing funds for the moment. But unless both repayment of the bonds and collection of the assessments are assured, the present peacekeeping operations will have to stop and future operations of this sort will become impossible.

The United Nations has no power of taxation. But the Charter is explicit in depriving of the right to vote in the General Assembly any member whose payments are in arrears to the amount of 2 full years' contribution. An advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, accepted by the General Assembly, makes unpaid special assessments part of such arrears. The threat of suspension has prompted nations already subject to this penalty to pay up or promise to pay up. It must be taken seriously by all delinquents, including the Soviet Union and France.

The difficulty is that the suspension of the voting rights of such powers would precipitate a new crisis in the U.N. Furthermore, some of the smaller nations really are short of funds. Efforts are therefore underway to find other solutions to avoid a showdown. Some promise is being held out by a British plan which would assess all members on the same percentage basis as their regular budget assessments, up to the first $10 million needed for peacekeeping operations, but, beyond that figure, would permit the underdeveloped countries to pay only half their dues. The wealthier nations would pay the balance.

This arrangement would undoubtedly increase the U.S. contribution beyond the approximately 30 percent that is our theoretical limit. However, it would still cost the United States less than the nearly 50 percent of U.N. expenses that we are now actually meeting. And it would certainly not be too high a price to insure that the United Nations play its proper role as a potent force for peace.

U.N.'S FISCAL WORRIES—FAILURE OF SOME MEMBERS TO PAY THEIR ARREARS ENDANGERS ITS PEACE ROLE

(By Thomas J. Hamilton)

The financial difficulties of the United Nations, which were only a cloud no larger than a man's hand before the intervention in the Congo, have now reached the point where they are a serious threat to the usefulness of the organization. Secretary General Thant said last week that the financial situation was perhaps "the most vital issue" confronting it.

This was not the first time that the Secretary General had called attention to the difficulties raised by the $106 million in unpaid assessments for the Congo and Midle Eastern forces. He had previously warned that the United Nations would not be in a position to embark upon new peacekeeping interventions unless it solved the financial problem.

The gravity of the situation was brought home to all by the vacant chairs of the Haitian delegation immediately in front of the rostrum when the General Assembly opened its special session Tuesday on the financial problem.

Just before it began, five other members had paid a few thousand dollars each to avoid coming under article 19 of the charter, which provides that a member 2 years behind in payments loses its vote in the Assembly.

The Haitian Government, beset with internal problems, finally sent word Friday that it would pay within 48 hours the $23,000 needed to avoid application of the 2-year rule. Meanwhile, its delegation stayed away and the President of the Assembly, Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, arranged to avoid taking a vote on any subject. Thus he avoided the necessity of announcing that, for the first time in the history of the United Nations, the penalty for nonpayment had been imposed.

SOVIET STAND

This procedure raised the possibility that the Soviet Union, which will become liable to the 2-year rule next year unless it pays about $9 million in overdue assessments for the Congo and Middle Eastern forces, would claim that the Assembly had allowed the rule to lapse by failing to apply it against Haiti.

Not only the Soviet Union and the Soviet satellites, but France, Nationalist China, Belgium, and other Western allies will become liable to action under this rule by 1965 unless they pay part of their arrears on one or both of the peacekeeping forces. Forty members of the United Nations have never paid anything on their Congo assessments.

The fact that they themselves will come under Article 19 eventually makes it even less likely that members of the Assembly will invoke it against one of the two most powerful members of the organization.

The Charter authorizes the Assembly to waive enforcement if it feels that a member's arrears are due to circumstances beyond its control. But it would be humiliating to the Russians to be excused on these grounds.

Indeed, some delegates from the Communist bloc are now dropping hints that next year, after the Congo force is withdrawn, the Soviet Union will make a voluntary donation to the United Nations without saying what it is for, and that it can be used to pay the costs of the Congo and Middle Eastern forces.

NEW HOPES

Meanwhile, there are hopes in Washington that France and Belgium will find a way to pay their assessments without conceding that they have changed their views and that Nationalist China, which is determined to hold on to its membership, will pay enough to avoid coming under Article 19, if no more. If all this happens the arrears would be reduced to only a few million dollars and the situation would be saved.

There are two reasons for serious doubts as to whether these optimistic expectations are borne out: the size of the deficit and the belief of other members that the United States, which has made large contributions to the Congo and Middle Eastern forces over and above its assessment can still be depended upon to come to the rescue rather than allow a shortage of money to cripple the United Nations.

Although the General Assembly was called into special session to deal with permanent arrangements to finance peace-keeping interventions, it has already abandoned this task and is now confronted with a relatively simple issue: raising $42,500,000 for the Congo force and the Middle Eastern force between July 1 and December 31.

DROP IN BUCKET

Even if this problem is surmounted, the Assembly is confronted with the results of its failure last year to impose any assessments for the 12 months ending next June 30, together with the problem arising from unpaid assessments for previous years. This means that by December 31 the United Nations will have spent all of the $137,285,762 it has raised from selling bonds, will owe $14 million and will have only $10 million in the treasury.

This crushing debt places in doubt the capacity of the United Nations to act if the situation in Angola, for example, becomes critical.

In comparison with President Kennedy's $90 billion budget, of course, the United Nations' deficit is so small that other delegates have believed, understandably enough, that the United States will always supply the funds when the situation gets really difficult. Until now, the United States, instead of paying a third, the proportion it was assessed for the Congo force, has paid 47.5 percent, and thus has paid 50 percent of the assessments on some underdeveloped member countries and 80 percent of those imposed on others. It has done the same thing in the case of the Middle Eastern force. This policy was based on the Kennedy administration's belief that peacekeeping interventions by the United Nations were too valuable to allow financial considerations to stand in their way.

However, pressure from Congress forced the U.S. delegation to serve notice last spring that hereafter it would pay nothing more than its assessments for the two peacekeeping forces unless there was substantial improvement in the collection of arrears. Although the delegation has relaxed this stand somewhat, the effectiveness of the United Nations will be greatly impaired unless the United States continues to shoulder most of the financial burden.

Health Care in Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the March issue of the New England Journal of Medicine, a report of the Massachusetts Medical Society's Special Committee on National Health Legislation was printed. It dealt with important questions in relation to the currently proposed plans to provide health care for the aged under Government auspices. This is the type of information which we must develop in order to gain a sound understanding of where our society stands in this field and where further improvement can be made.

I have taken some passages from this report which deal with the economic status of our elderly population, both nationally and in the Boston area, and the medical expenses for families in the Boston area. They put into better perspective the questions of the financial position of our elderly and the increased medical expenses which face our retired citizens. Although I am only placing a portion of this report of the Massachusetts Medical Society in the RECORD, I would urge those with a real interest in the question of assuring topflight health care for all our people to read the entire report.

Also, in the same area of interest, there is a recent article in the New York Journal of Commerce commenting on the benefits paid by health insurance companies, over $5.2 million a day for hospital expense benefits in 1962.

The items from the Massachusetts Medical Society and the May 7 issue of the Journal of Commerce follow:

[From the New England Journal of Medicine, March 1963]

ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE AGING

The alleged economic plight of the 17.5 million over-65 population is chiefly based on income figures alone, while assets, employment and debt status are subordinated. No reference is usually made as to whether income data are computed before or after taxes. Hence, the frequently quoted statement that 52.7 percent of the over-65 population earn less than $1,000 is misleading on the one hand, and, on the other, it only affirms that, through Federal and other compulsory regulations, this age group has been forced to surrender its earning freedom regardless of desire and ability to work.

Nevertheless, about 4 million (23 percent) of the over-65 population are wage earners.

The total income of this group (9.2 percent of the total population) from all sources in 1958 was estimated at $30 billion, equivalent to 8 percent of $367 billion, the national income.

Complete economic appraisal shows that the net worth of an OASDI recipient, with a wife also entitled to benefits, has increased 71 percent from 1951 to 1957. This value in 1957 was computed at $9,616.

Moreover, this group enjoys special tax benefits such as tax-free social security benefits, railroad retirement benefits, and veterans' pensions, double personal exemption on taxable income, full deduction on medical and drug expenditures.

The impulse to minimize the significance of the total assets and net worth merely highlights the apparent unwillingness to recognize that profligate fiscal policies have resulted in dollar devaluation with its severe impact upon the senior citizen's thrift, and hence upon his health problems.

The survey of consumer finances by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center showed—

(a) The median income in 1961 of families whose head was 65 and over was $2,897 compared with $5,905 for families whose head was under 65.

(b) The median value of total assets was $8,349 in 1960 as compared with $4,839 for all other age groups.

(c) The median value of home equity was $4,559 compared to $1,028 for younger families.

(d) The median value of liquid assets was $1,102 compared with $460 for the younger groups.

(e) Homeownership was recorded at 64 percent of the over-65 families compared with 53 percent of the younger group families; 53 percent of the former were mortgage free compared with 18 percent in the latter.

(f) In 1959, 74 percent of over-65 families had no debt compared with 34 percent of the younger group. Only 3 percent of the older group owed over $1,000 compared with 20 percent of the younger group.

(g) The same report showed further:

Sixty-three percent of the over-65 families held total assets of $5,000 or more.

Forty-one percent of the over-65 families held total assets of $10,000 or more.

Eighteen percent of the over-65 families held total assets of $25,000 or more.

Over a period of 20 years (1940-60) the rise in medical expenditures showed the following analysis:

Total, 114.9 percent; hospitalization, 343.1 percent; physicians' fees, 94.6 percent, surgeons' fees, 74.6 percent; drugs, 47.6 percent.

In comparison, the per capita income rose 274 percent in the 20-year period of 1940-60.

Further, the work period required to pay for a unit of medical services has been reduced 38 percent with the result that a unit of medical services costing 1 hour's work in 1940 cost 37 minutes' work in 1960.

Hospital stay

In 1960 the nationwide daily census was 1.4 million patients of all ages. The over-65 patients comprised 18 to 19 percent of this total daily census.

In 1957 hospital utilization by the OASDI beneficiaries was as follows:

	Percent of beneficiaries
General hospital	1.1
Long-stay institution	2.3
Nursing home	1.3
Other	1.0
Total	15.7

Hence, these studies show an even lower percentage of this over-65 group requiring hospital or institutional care.

The average hospital stay for under-65 patients in short-term hospitals was 7.6 days in 1957-58. For over-65 patients the average hospital stay was 14.9 days.

The length of hospital stay for OASDI beneficiaries (including multiple admissions) in 1957 was as follows:

Days in hospital during year:	*Percent beneficaries hospitalized*
1 to 30 days	81.9
31 to 60 days	12.4
61 to 90 days	3.2
91-plus days	2.5
Total	100.0

It is apparent that the great majority of OASDI patients (81.9 percent) utilize 30 days or less.

In 1959 Colorado instituted a $10 million dollar State-supported medical care program for the aged, covering 33 percent of the over-65. Hospital utilization by this group showed the following:

Number of days hospitalized	Number of admissions	Percent
1 to 30	20,825	94
31 to 50	998	5
51 or more	290	1

Thus is demonstrated even more clearly that the overwhelming majority (94 percent) of indigent patients require a short stay of 30 days or less, with, as will be shown, a corresponding nonmajor cost.

ECONOMIC STATUS (BOSTON)

The economic status of Boston for the year 1960-61 as compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics may be used, ceteris paribus, as an index for the State.

	Income before taxes	Total receipts before taxes	Income after taxes
Average family	$8,008	$8,122	$6,869
Family with head 65 to 74	5,714	5,519	5,142
Family with head over 74	3,325	3,533	3,298
Family with retired head	3,609	3,916	3,485

The average income for all families of $8,008 before taxes shows a good economic condition in Boston.

The importance of breaking down the over-65 population is again demonstrated in the difference in incomes before taxes, $5,714 for the 65 to 74; $3,325 for the 75 plus.

Only 2.8 percent of all families reported incomes of under $1,089 before taxes, or under $1,000 after taxes.

Medical expenditures of Boston families in 1960

	Medical expenditures	Percent of all expenditures
Average family	$321	5.3
Family with head 65 to 74	283	6.0
Family with head 75 or over	190	6.2
Family with head retired	234	6.5

It is apparent that medical expenditures per family actually decrease with age from $321 for the average family to $190 for family with head over 75. The surprisingly low figures for medical expenditures for the 65 and 75 groups are a revelation in the face of the catastrophic picture painted by HEW and its supporters.

On the other hand, the average family in Boston spent $348 annually on personal insurance as compared with $321 on medical care.

Further, families with head 65-74 spent $203 on personal insurance, with head 75 and over $80, as compared to medical expenditures of 0283 and $190 respectively.

Moreover, this report stated: "With this wider margin between incomes and expenditures, Boston families were able to put larger amounts into insurance and savings, and to make larger gifts and contributions in 1960. The most significant shift in family spending in Boston was for automobile purchase and operation which increased from 7.6 percent in 1950 to 12.1 percent in 1960."

[From the Journal of Commerce, May 7, 1963]

RISE OF HEALTH BENEFIT COSTS NOTED BY HII

The American public received an average of $5.2 million a day from insurance companies during 1962 to help pay for hospital care, the Health Insurance Institute has reported.

The $5,201,000 average daily payments added up to a total of $1,899 million paid out in hospital expense benefits during the year by insurance companies, the institute said. It pointed out that the benefits included payments made under hospital expense policies as well as that portion of benefits under major medical expense policies which went for hospital bills.

These benefits helped to pay, said the institute, for hospital room and board, drugs and medicines, laboratory services, X-rays, nursing, operating room charges, and other hospital services.

With the inclusion of health insurance payments for other than hospital care, insurance companies last year distributed benefits of some $3.8 billion, a 10.8-percent climb over 1961. The grand total of health insurance benefits paid out during 1962 by all insuring organizations was estimated by the institute at $7.1 billion, up from $6.4 billion in 1961.

In recent years there has been tremendous growth in the amount of hospital expense benefits paid by insuring organizations, stated the institute in reporting on an analysis of hospital benefits paid during 1952 and 1961, the first and last years for which complete data are available.

In 1952, all insuring organizations combined paid a total of $1,072 million in hospital expenses benefits, said the institute. This figure climbed to $3,725 million in 1961 for an increase of 247 percent.

Over the same 1952–61 period, the amount of hospital expense benefits paid out by insurance companies rose from $437 million to $1,686 million, an increase of 286 percent, said the institute. Hospital expense benefits paid by Blue Cross, Blue Shield, and all other health care plans rose over this span from $635 million to $2,039 million, a boost of 221 percent.

Bracero Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article in the Waco Tribune-Herald of Sunday, April 28, 1963, relating to the bracero program.

Each year it has become increasingly hard under existing regulations to secure adequate farm labor in my district. Every word in the following article is true as many farmers in that area have contacted me each year for assistance:

MUDDLED BRACERO PROGRAM HAS FARMERS UP IN ARMS

(By Clark Bolt)

"If I have violated the law it was error of the head and not of the heart, you know the average farmer knows little else than to cultivate and harvest crops. I will be doubly careful in the future to see that no laws are violated whether I am away from home or at home."

At first glance this may sound like a letter from a down-trodden farmer in a Communist country pleading for mercy to his farm supervisor.

But it is in fact a letter from a Texas cotton farmer to the U.S. Government pleading for the right to hire laborers so the farmer can make a crop.

The farmer is Frank Cotropia, Route 1, Hearne in Robertson County who farms 260 acres of cotton in the Brazos bottoms. And this is but one of countless letters from farmers in Robertson County and other parts of Texas to the U.S. Department of Labor asking for an appeal in regard to the hiring of Mexican nationals usually called braceros.

For the past 10 years, Robertson County farmers (more than 400 of them on the average) have waded through acres of Government redtape in order to get bracero laborers. A bracero is a citizen of Mexico who is allowed to work in this country under strict restrictions and supervision.

Robertson County farmers right now could use 200 braceros in their fields. During the peak season, they need 3,000 to 4,000.

But as things stand now, Robertson County is not eligible to get a single laborer. Just why this is so is not clear.

"We were told the county is not eligible because of the Area Redevelopment Act designation for this county," Sylvan B. Jones, Hearne insurance man, said. Area Redevelopment Act is another Government program which provides in some cases Federal grants to counties with low income and below average employment.

"Thirty farmers wrote Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH recently asking him to get Robertson County off the Area Redevelopment Act program and get us a bracero quota," Jones said. YARBOROUGH wrote back, said the Area Redevelopment Act designation had nothing to do with a county receiving bracero workers.

Said Jones: "This is but one of many examples of the run-around these farmers get with this bracero program. The U.S. Department of Labor sets itself up as a little czar, and farmers have to go literally begging on their knees to the Department explaining they are not violating the law. Why, it's worse than during the reconstruction days."

Robertson County farmers stand to lose $250,000 in farm income this year without braceros because they will not be able to cultivate their fields properly. "And the loss to the business people in Hearne and surrounding towns will be many times this," Jones said.

Because of more restrictions and violations, only 300 to 400 braceros were eligible for work in Robertson County last year. Here's what it takes to get a bracero worker:

A farmer must certify he is unable to get local help, then provide housing which must meet strict standards, then apply through the Texas Employment Commission for the braceros.

The cost per bracero to the farmer is $42 in Robertson County. The farmer must pay the bracero 70 cents per hour. He must provide 34 square feet of bedroom space per man, the house must be screened and must be painted white inside and out; there must be 200 feet distance from the house to the toilets, and there must be a concrete path to them. There must be hot and cold running water in the house at all times; there must be one shower head for every five men, and one toilet for every five men plus a number three tub for every five men, and the house must be provided with a fan or air conditioner. Ice water must also be provided.

"These are better living conditions than many farmers and even some city dwellers have in this country," Jones said. A farmer remarked once: "I'll move my family to the bracero quarters, and let the bracero have my house."

The braceros are contracted for a set period of time. If the bracero wishes, he can quit any time he chooses. But if the farmer decides to let the bracero go, he must give him three-fourths of his salary, regardless of whether or not he works that long.

Farmers must also abide by all rules and regulations. They cannot let braceros drive tractors. Braceros can do only stoop labor. Any violation, no matter how trivial, can result in the farmer losing his eligibility to hire them.

Cotropia said he lost his eligibility this way: While he was driving one of his laborers to the doctor, a bracero ran out of the work he was doing, and drove a tractor, without Cotropia's knowledge. This was reported and Cotropia was blacklisted.

Other violations, according to Jones, include:

Keeping improper records; the farmer cursed the bracero; the farmer would not take the bracero to the doctor because the bracero complained of a stomach ache; the farmer would not take the bracero to town to buy groceries; the farmer did not provide the bracero with running water at all times in his house; the farmer worked the bracero before sunup and the bracero got wet with dew.

"And remember this, too. In all the hundreds of cases I know about, the Government has never taken the farmer's side," Jones said. "The Government always taken the Mexican's side."

Then why bother to hire them?

"We cannot get local labor to work," said Cotropia.

Said Jones: "There are 300 to 500 people in Robertson County drawing unemployment compensation. They claim they are skilled workers, and claim they cannot get a job so they draw unemployment compensation while farmers here are scouring the area looking for laborers."

Cotropia said they will not work for farmers at any price. "They won't work for us because the farmer cannot pay if it is raining, and the worker is unable to perform his duties. They'd rather work in town where they can get paid for inside work when it does rain," he said.

For the most part, the braceros are excellent workers. "The farmers tell me a bracero can make water run uphill," Jones said.

Jones said all the trouble about the bracero program is coming from labor unions which do not want them in this country, and form some manufacturing firms who produce mechanical cottonpickers.

In order to get around the bracero and local labor problem, farmers are turning to the use of chemicals and complete mechanization to produce cotton.

Cotropia said he is not too sure about the future of this, either. "It may be that we are ruining our land putting on so much chemicals," he said.

"But in the meantime, what else can we do?" he asked.

Address by D. Brainerd Holmes, Deputy Associate Administrator, and Director of Manned Space Flight, NASA, Before the American Ordnance Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by D. Brainerd Holmes, Deputy Associate Administrator, and Director of Manned Space Flight, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, before the American Ordnance Association, Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C., May 16, 1963:

On January 18, 1962, the NASA Administrator, Mr. Webb, addressed this chapter of the American Ordnance Association. Events are occurring with great rapidity in space, and a great number of things have happened in the 16 months since then. Thus it was with some surprise that I observed on reading his remarks that they are still timely today.

One of Mr. Webb's comments deserves particularly to be repeated. Speaking of the growth of the space program, he said; "Nothing has become clearer than that as we engage in this very large program, we are contributing to the holding together and, in many cases, the building up of the industrial base to which the Ordnance Association is so deeply devoted."

Developments in the last 16 months have punctuated this point particularly. In the President's budget document for fiscal year 1964 we are told that the development, test, and evaluation of most large strategic weapons systems, currently contemplated, will have been essentially completed or will be in the final and less expensive stages by 1964.

As Mr. Webb noted, we have found the contractors phasing out of heavy military procurement programs eager and anxious to use their resources in the space program. We had requirements for such resources and, therefore, it has been possible to keep together many of these experienced research and development teams.

Today, I want to discuss with you the manned space flight program that is occupying so many of these teams. I'd like to describe briefly what we are doing and discuss some of the reasons why man is of considerable value in space. Finally, I want to illustrate this tremendous importance we attach to having men in space with examples from Gordon Cooper's mission.

As you know, the space program is divided into four major categories, science, advanced technology, applications, and manned flight. Although the titles are almost self-explanatory, I will describe each portion in sufficient detail that it may be identified.

The space science effort is concerned with obtaining basic knowledge about conditions in space and on other astronomical bodies. At the present time, the science program makes use of unmanned sounding rockets, satellites, and deep space probes as tools with which it gathers information.

In advanced technology, we are carrying out research to improve propulsion, electronics, materials, structures, and other elements of space systems, to enable us to undertake more difficult space missions in the decades to come.

In applications, we are employing space systems to produce benefits in the present or in the near future in such areas as communications, navigation, and weather observation.

Manned space flight is a form of technology, in which we are providing a tool that will be used for a variety of purposes. In the current phase, manned space flight is more expensive than unmanned flight because a manned vehicle is heavier and more complex, and requires a more powerful booster vehicle to launch it into a space trajectory. Later, I will explain why I believe manned space flight will not always be more expensive.

In the manned space flight program are three approved projects—Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo—with which we are proceeding step by step in the development of broad capabilities.

This week's news has renewed your familiarity with Project Mercury, in which we have produced a system that combines a modified form of the Atlas ICBM as the launch vehicle and a one-man spacecraft weighing 3,000 pounds, about as much as a compact car.

We have learned many things in Project Mercury, but the most important lesson is that the conditions of space flight do not interfere with the ability of a trained man to attend an automatic machine and to improve its reliability. In the orbital flights of John Glenn, Scott Carpenter, and Wally Schirra, we learned that weightlessness is no problem for periods lasting as long as almost 9 hours. The Cooper flight, extends this experience to 34 hours.

Our second manned space flight program, Gemini, will make use of a new and more powerful booster, the Titan II, which will provide sufficient thrust to launch into orbit payloads weighing 7,000 pounds.

The Gemini spacecraft will carry a two-man crew on flights lasting up to 2 weeks, and it will have propulsion, guidance, and navigation equipment with which the astronauts will be able to make limited changes in their flight path. Thus they will be able to carry out experiments in rendezvous.

Another important characteristic of the Gemini program is that the work is directed at an operational spacecraft system, with which manned flights will be carried out on a comparatively routine basis; this in contrast with Mercury, in which each spacecraft is different, and each flight an experiment.

The first manned Gemini flights are planned for next year. Rendezvous experiments are scheduled to begin in 1965. The system will be operational in 1966.

The largest of our programs is Apollo, in which we will begin the manned exploration of the moon before the end of the decade. Landing the first Americans on the moon will certainly be the most dramatic moment of this program. Perhaps it is understandable, therefore, that there is an impression abroad that achieving the first landing on the moon is the only object of Project Apollo. This is very far from being the case.

The primary goal of Project Apollo is to develop a safe, reliable system for transporting men repeatedly and routinely in the space environment at as low a cost as practical, and—in the process—to make the United States preeminent in manned space flight. It may very well develop that we will reach the moon before the Soviets. If so, this will provide a very welcome demonstration of our preeminence. But winning a race is not our primary purpose.

Many of the elements of United States preeminence will be produced along the way, long before a man of any nationality sets foot on the moon. Later this year, for example, we will conduct the first two-stage flight of the Saturn launch vehicle, carrying a payload weighing 18,000 pounds, heavier than anything the Soviets have placed in orbit to date.

Next year, the Saturn I will carry into orbit payloads weighing as much as 22,000 pounds, and it will be employed in 1965 as the booster for the first manned earth-orbital flight of the three-man Apollo spacecraft.

Also in 1965, we will begin flight tests of the Saturn IB, a vehicle with an improved second stage, which will provide the thrust to carry into earth orbit payloads up to 32,000 pounds, almost 11 times the weight of the Mercury spacecraft. This vehicle will be operational in 1966, in time for manned earth-orbital flights of the entire Apollo spacecraft—including the two-man lunar excursion module, a special purpose vehicle that will be employed to shuttle two men between the moon's surface and the parent spacecraft in orbit about the moon. This two-man craft will fill a function similar to a small boat carrying passengers from a ship anchored offshore to an island.

To provide launch power for lunar flights, we will develop in Project Apollo the giant three-stage Saturn V, with a first stage generating 7½ million pounds of thrust, five times as much as the Saturn I and IB, the equivalent weight of 80 Mercury spacecraft or 16 times the mass of the largest payload the Soviets have claimed to have orbited.

In Project Apollo, we are developing a spacecraft weighing 45 tons—as much as the largest tractor-trailer on the highway, fully loaded, which will have the ability to carry three men on earth-orbital flights lasting 2 weeks or more, and to engage in extensive maneuvers in space. It will be constructed to protect its crew in flight between the Earth and the Moon, and will carry the lunar excursion module.

We are constructing in Project Apollo facilities all across the United States and we are building a launch complex for assembling the entire space vehicle indoors, protected from weather and salt spray, and for transporting the vehicle in a vertical position to the launch pads more than 3 miles away. A high firing rate will be made possible by the availability of three pads and four assembly bays inside the building.

Finally, in Project Apollo we are establishing a primary earth station for control of manned space flight missions, at which we are installing modern equipment programed to enable a mission director to make decisions almost instantaneously in a vast number of contingency situations.

These facilities, skills, techniques, and hardware will be available to serve the Nation for many years after the first explorers step onto the Moon. They will provide great flexibility in carrying out whatever operations in space may be required by the national interest.

Frequently, the question is asked, why man in space? Can we not do as much with automatic instruments, at less expense than with man? The answer to these questions is that, both on earth and in space, there are many functions better performed by machines than men. A machine never gets bored and, if we provide proper maintenance, it does not quickly get tired. Any job that must be performed repeatedly, without variation and without imagination, is usually done better by machine.

But a machine has no judgment. It does only what we program it to do. It deals only with situations that can be predicted in advance. It cannot deal with the unexpected.

Furthermore, the reliability of a complex machine is limited. As its complexity increases, its inherent unreliability increases accordingly. If a trained man is present, however, he can determine how to deal with malfunctions. He may be able to get the equipment back into working order. If not, he may be able to shift to another operational mode.

As we attempt more difficult tasks in our flight programs, the role of man will grow continually. The pilots will carry out essential functions in the rendezvous procedures in Project Gemini. In Project Apollo, they will check out the spacecraft, navigate, correct course en route, and fly the lunar excursion module to an altitude of several hundred feet above the moon to take a close look before landing. If they find evidence of hazard, they will be able to move as much as 1,000 feet sideways before landing.

On the moon, the explorers will emplace equipment, collect samples, make photographs, and take notes. They will look for the unexpected. When they find it, they will decide what to do about it.

If necessary, we could design and program machines to do all of these things. If we did, however, I believe the machines would be as large, as complex, and as expensive as manned spacecraft. Furthermore, I am certain they would not be as reliable. Consequently, we would have to carry out more flights to gain the same amount of information, and the cost of exploring the moon with unmanned instruments might well be greater than with men.

Perhaps the role of man in space will be a little clearer if I describe for you some of the things Gordon Cooper is doing.

Altogether, he has 11 experiments to perform during his 34 hours in orbit, in addition to helping us evaluate how his system reacts to the conditions of space flight. He did about half of the work yesterday, and was scheduled to do the rest today.

Several of these are concerned with determining the ability of the human eye to see. During the third orbit yesterday, for example, he released into space a device with a very bright flashing light.

He was scheduled to begin observing the light immediately after sunset, as he crossed the African coast. However, for some reason we do not yet understand, he could not find the light. We raised the question of whether the device really was deployed into space.

Cooper was very insistent on this point. He felt it when the squib exploded, and he heard the noise. Mercury Control was dubious, however.

An hour and a half later, we learned that the astronaut was right. At sunset on the fourth orbit, he saw the reflection of the sun's rays off a shiny object several miles away. Then he observed it flashing. He watched the blinker all through the 45-minute flight on both the fourth and fifth orbits.

I think this incident illustrates why a man is needed. Cooper was not immediately able to use his sense of sight as originally intended. But his senses of hearing and touch, combined with his judgment, enabled him to make the decision that the experiment had not failed. And so he kept looking. He says he could see the light up to about 12 or 13 miles away.

A related experiment was the observation of a very bright light on the sixth orbit as he passed over South Africa. The purpose was to compare the ground light with onboard light source and to measure its intensity to calculate atmospheric absorption. Cooper reported this experiment was also successful.

He had less success with an attempt to deploy a 30-inch orange-colored balloon to test its visibility and to obtain information on the drag resulting from the few molecules of atmosphere at that altitude. He tried twice yesterday to release the balloon, but we will have to wait and see whether he is able to try again today.

Another experiment performed yesterday was a rather simple one. During the fifth orbit, he turned off the cooling fan in the spacecraft and disconnected the cabin temperature control, to determine whether the temperature remains within tolerable limits without using electrical power to maintain it. The information we have from the experiment indicates that such a procedure is feasible.

Today, he was scheduled to take a great number of photographs, of space, of the horizon, and of the earth below him. The photographs of space will enable scientists to establish the nature of Zodiacal light. The horizon pictures are intended to obtain information that will help us navigate more precisely on the way to the moon. The earth photographs, in infrared light, will enable us to do a better job of weather observation and prediction. In another experiment today, he was to investigate how to point a high-frequency radio antenna to improve communication with ground stations.

Throughout the flight, he has been taking radiation measurements on crossing the South Atlantic, to measure radiation created by high-altitude nuclear explosions. Also throughout the flight, he has been operating an experimental television camera, transmitting crude images of himself to selected ground stations.

I believe the amount of experimentation on this mission is a harbinger of the future. In earlier flights in Project Mercury, the time available was limited, and the astronauts' first concern had to be with operating the spacecraft and learning to solve the problems associated with operation.

In future programs, the situation will be similar. First, we will perfect the mechanics of flight. Then we will use the system as a tool, for scientific observation and for other purposes.

Thus far, I have confined my remarks to the peaceful exploration of space. As those in this room know well, other activities, whose aims are not so peaceful, can also take place there.

The Department of Defense has not fully defined the role man should play in its space activities. However, under an agreement between Secretary McNamara and Mr. Webb, reached in January 1963, NASA will manage the Gemini program to assure the fulfillment of both DOD and NASA requirements, and the DOD will contribute funding, in an amount to be determined later. When the Gemini system becomes operational in 1966, it will of course be available for use by any agency of the Government having work to do in space. When the Apollo system becomes operational by the end of the decade, it will be similarly available.

In summary, we are proceeding step by step to develop broad capabilities in manned space flight.

We have learned in Project Mercury that the conditions of space flight do not interfere with man's ability to tend and improve the reliability of an automatic system.

We will develop in Project Gemini a two-man space system, with which we will conduct experiments in long-term weightlessness, learn the techniques of rendezvous, and improve our general proficiency of flight. The system will be operational by 1966.

In Project Apollo, we will produce a system of safe, reliable transportation between the earth and the moon on a routine basis and, in so doing, we will make the United States pre-eminent in space. We will begin maned exploration of the moon before the end of the decade.

Man is of value in space because his presence increases the reliability of the system. Although manned flight is more expensive than unmanned flight in the development phase, the increased reliability of a manned vehicle will ultimately enable us to carry out complex tasks in space more effectively and, very possibly, at less expense than with automatic equipment.

Thirteen years ago, the late William Faulkner made a comment that may apply to the present discussion:

> "I believe that man will not merely endure; he will prevail. He is immortal * * * because he has a soul, a spirit capable of compassion and sacrifice and endurance."

In exploring the moon and planets, I am convinced with Faulkner that man will prevail.

The Smile of Safety, or "What Are We Being Told About Cuba?" or the Use of "Soft Soap" in Dispelling the Communist Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, an article entitled "The Smile of Safety: What Are We Being Told About Cuba?" by Charles Burton Marshall, surprisingly appearing in the New Republic of May 25, 1963, and is one of the finest analyses of the "soft soap" technique of the New Frontier in salving over and dispelling the Communist threat 90 miles from our shores.

This article is written by a confessed Democrat who says in the article:

> I, for one, feel put off by much of what the administration and friendly publicists have been saying to allay misgivings about Cuba—nothing partisan, for I am a Democrat.

The pointed and thoughtful way in which Mr. Marshall disposes of the numerous and fallacious arguments and excuses offered on Cuba by the administration apologists and professional explainers deserves the attention of the House.

Marshall disposes of the "smiles of safety" that emanate daily from the New Frontier on Cuba, such smiles being on the subjects: first, that it is better to have Russians than Cubans in charge of weapons; second, that options are available and a choice of one can be deferred; third, that Khrushchev really is not so bad, he is being pushed; fourth, that the Russian military forced Khrushchev on missiles in Cuba; fifth, that Freedom Fighter raids encourage Russians to remain in Cuba; sixth, that the real test of correctness is the support of other nations; seventh, that there is some good in Cuban communism—a showcase for failure, and a costly operation; and eighth, our policy is to prevent another "Hungary" in Cuba.

This article follows:

THE SMILE OF SAFETY: WHAT ARE WE BEING TOLD ABOUT CUBA?

(By Charles Burton Marshall)

The Communist buildup in Cuba, as Hans Morgenthau noted in Commentary some months ago, is detrimental to the intellectual and emotional health of our body politic. One aspect of this important ill effect concerns the discourse of our Government and of those who undertake to interpret its attitudes to the public. To understand this, one must take into account the predisposition of ruling groups.

It is not enough for high officials to have their policies, if the term is apt, made binding. In that sense public support is not even a problem. The Kennedy administration clearly has the authority to carry through on whatever course it elects to follow in Cuba. No one of us would know how to undercut it even if we would. Beyond adherence, however, a government covets admiration. This is due only in part to pride and vanity. An administration must strive to maintain inner morale, to hold to a sense of serving faithfully and well in matters entrusted to its keeping. An obvious and immediate measure of success is general consent to its undertakings. For its own sake, an administration must cultivate the public and weigh its opinion.

In fantasy, one might picture this administration appealing for indulgence regarding Cuba. It might own to the difficulties of having had some of its top men learning on the job. It might concede a want of prudence or a sag of nerve at the time of the Bay of Pigs. It might confess to a default of timely warning against Soviet deployment of conventional forces to Cuba. It might admit to having improvidently eased off the October crisis on the narrow issue of missile placement without achieving a broader and more durable solution. It might candidly say that it has tended to underplay opportunities up to now but hopes to do better.

An administration would never speak thus. It must insist on having played its cards well even in view of dwindling chips. In a frustrating instance like Cuba, it may be tempted to try to make the best of things by making them out a little better than is warranted by realities. The result is both to mislead the credulous and to leave discriminating souls wondering whether the administration takes a proper measure of its problems. I, for one, feel put off by much of what the administration and friendly publicists have been saying to allay misgivings about Cuba—nothing partisan, for I am a Democrat.

I cite as an initial example the premise that Soviet armed forces in Cuba, whatever their numbers, present no military threat. That premise was conveyed recently as a point of information to our Armed Forces abroad by the Department of Defense. The idea is plausible only if the key term is construed in a narrow, technical sense. Back in Dean Acheson's days in State and George C. Marshall's in Defense, use of the term military or its counterpart political in so sterile a way was forbidden to subordinates. Why employ it now in so technical and misleading a sense just to butter up the troops?

Another illustration of bad discourse about policy relates to "options"—a conjuring word on the New Frontier. I heard a high figure in this administration describe policy as a recondite business designed to keep down risks by minimizing the stakes at issue and deferring choice. He then lauded our Cuba policy on the basis of this supposed measure of statesmanship. Nonsense. It only distorts policy to represent it as the art of backing away from issues wherever feasible.

This brings me to a point about interpreting the Soviet Union, especially as personified by Nikita Khrushchev. Our policy seems often to treasure a certain presupposition about him. The Camp David kewpie—rough but tractable, not a bad fellow down underneath—is taken for authentic. That other side to the man—pressing hostile aims at every safe opportunity—is supposed to be aberrant and reluctant. It is all reminiscent of Harry Hopkins' faith that the real essence of Stalin was the genial banquet host, not the ruthless seeker of advantage in negotiation.

Thus the stealthy deployment of Soviet missiles to Cuba is attributed to pressure on Khrushchev from others. The withdrawal of them is accounted for as an act of man's true self in response to an opportunity provided by our armed interposition. His gesture of giving in a little on terms for a test-ban inspection is supposed to show his true colors. The subsequent reversal is explained as due to dire compulsion on him. He who smiles and says what we want to hear about Laos is sincere, but the unremitting pressure on neutralists in Laos is Mao's mean doing.

Such persistence in optimistic appraisals showed in the President's explanation of the need to curtail maritime raids by Cuban exiles: they might deprive the Russians of an opportunity to go home—as if the Russians were tarrying out of pride rather than for advantage, awaiting only a moment for graceful exit.

Devotion to looking on the sunny side was carried to even greater lengths in a recent article by Joseph C. Harsch—this time in anticipation of a long Russian sojourn in Cuba rather than an early exit. In the Christian Science Monitor, he expounded, without endorsing a theory that vindicating Cuba's freedom to go and to stay Communist would somehow serve an exemplary purpose in establishing a right for other Communist satellites to break away and to overturn masters—a bit like admitting wolves to the fold so as to set a precedent for sheep to go raiding.

It is said to be less risky for phlegmatic Russians rather than Cuban hotheads to be in charge of weapons on the island. On reading this idea in the writings of three journalists, I attributed it to private heresy. Then I heard it uttered by an administration thinker. What can one say? Maximilian might have been less risky in Mexico than the Mexicans. Is policy to be beguiled by the smile of safety?

Another characteristic of the administration's conduct is a preoccupation with consensus—the notion that the main test of a policy lies in getting enough other governments to go along with it. Again and again, I have heard administration spokesmen try to vindicate our policy by citing the size of a vote garnered in the Organization of American States. I heard one such man the other day count the Russian deployment in Cuba as a positive boon because it had alined so many Latin American governments with us. The critical question here involves not the outward disposition of these allies but the inner power and durability of the government concerned. Consider the recent conference at San Jose, Costa Rica, where three presidents of Central American States joined ours in an avowal on behalf of constitutional processes. A few days later one of them was expelled by unconstitutional process.

In a recent speech Vice President JOHNSON made a big thing of the idea that Cuba is a showcase of Communist economic shortcomings. What Communist country has not been? The rub is that such a showcase is all too likely to display something else—namely, the feasibility of taking over a society, deliberately depressing consumption, and using stringency in combination with monopoly of supply as an instrument of control. Communism has subsisted not on a reputation for generating affluence but on its effectiveness in holding on to power once installed.

What conclusion are we to draw from the exodus of a quarter of a million refugees from Cuba? A recent speech by the Secretary of State interpreted this phenomenon as ominous for the man in Havana, an achievement for U.S. policy. Communist regimes, however, have generally permitted or even abetted the emigration of intractable elements when feasible. When otherwise, as in the instance of China, the regime got rid of opponents by massive executions. The drain may get out of hand and have to be stanched as in the instance of the Berlin wall. That extreme is not in sight for Cuba. Short of it, the exodus of refugees helps more than it hinders in remolding a society.

In the New York Times, James Reston has alluded to secret U.S. assistance to guerrillas in Cuban backlands: stuff too deep for officials to own to, but with signs of having come from the horse's mouth—yet not necessarily conclusive, for the horse may be the same as prompted Reston to write 17 months ago that "obviously the United States would not tolerate a Communist regime in Cuba, no matter how freely elected, if that regime allied itself to Moscow and exercised its sovereign rights to maintain a Soviet military base." Let us, however, assume the authenticity of Reston's later report. What it prompts me to say is this: Proxy war does not exempt a nation from obligations. In such concerns a government must not trifle. Encouraging guerrillas is no substitute for policy. Such warfare is not an end but only an early, contingent step toward taking over. The crunch comes with the approach of success. Would we then sustain what we had abetted? Our statesmen must ask themselves this question and answer it in a conclusive affirmative before indulging in any such experiments.

This brings me at least to reflect on an oft-heard assertion that there must be no Hungary in Cuba. The noble cliché begs question. Any situation like Hungary or Cuba is sui generis. What is the precise relevant significance of Hungary? Seen in one way, the Hungarian tragedy of 1956 was a rising against Communist rule quelled by outside force while others withheld success. In another perspective Hungary represented the interposition of enough Russian forces to save a minion regime under internal threat. In the first sense, the Budapest phase may have occurred in Cuba more than 2 years ago, at the time of the Bay of Pigs invasion. In the second sense, Soviet forces to cope with any internal uprising are probably the ones already in Cuba—the ones whose lingering presence our officials both publicly deplore and privately explain as having a brighter side.

Fringe Benefits Create Hidden Paychecks—May Aggravate Unemployment Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the family paycheck is no longer an accurate indicator of the American breadwinner's income. In recent years, fringe benefits have increased dramatically, thus offering our workers greater security and hidden income.

According to a Wall Street Journal article of May 14:

> Wage and salary payments have almost tripled since World War II * * * [while] employer payments don't show up in paychecks, so-called fringe benefits, have increased nearly sixfold.

These benefits, which vary among companies, include such services as insurance and pension programs, free lunches, price discounts and country club privileges.

> From 3 percent of wages and salaries in 1946, these employer fringe payments have swelled steadily—to a record 7 percent last year—

According to the article.

The steady increase in these benefits may have some serious economic implications, particularly with regard to unemployment. Some opinion holds that because of larger fringe benefits employers prefer to work their existing employees overtime, when required, rather than hire new employees. This view is supported by a recent Labor Department study which showed that 7 percent of all manufacturing work is being done on an overtime basis while more than 4 million persons are jobless.

In addition, there is evidence that the rise in fringe benefits may be contributing to immobility of labor. As the article points out, less than 4 percent of U.S. production workers switched jobs last year compared to 7 percent in the postwar period. As workers become increasingly mindful of the nonwage rewards of seniority, labor mobility—an essential condition for dynamic economic growth—may decline.

In a speech before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce on April 30, George P. Shultz, dean of the Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago, discussed the need for a smoothly functioning labor market and the important contribution this could make toward easing our unemployment problem. Dr. Shultz also discussed fringe benefits and their relation to overtime work, the age distribution of the labor force, voluntary mobility and the overall problem of unemployment.

Because of the important contributions which the Wall Street Journal article and Dr. Shultz' speech can make to a serious discussion of our unemployment problem, I include them in the RECORD at this point:

THE CHALLENGE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

(An address by George P. Shultz, dean, Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago, to the annual meeting, United States Chamber of Commerce, Apr. 30, 1963)

A new willingnes is abroad in the land—to reexamine the operation of labor markets and to experiment with a variety of devices to improve their efficiency. This new look can, in the long run, provide a vital part to an overall solution of the unemployment problem. I will emphasize it here because it tends to get lost in all the discussion of tax cuts and the stimulation of total demand. Please don't misunderstand me. Like a great many others, I favor an immediate and substantial net reduction in tax rates, but I argue that steps such as this—which operate at the aggregate level— have the best chance of producing full employment with a reasonably stable price level if they are accompanied by improved operation of labor markets. My thesis, then, is "policies for full employment and for efficient labor markets go hand in hand."

At the same time, it is necessary to recognize the short-term pressures arising from the unemployment of the present and recent past. The practical problem is that the fact and the fear of unemployment—a genuine fact and a justified fear for all too many people today—may lead to solutions of expediency, solutions which move away from the conditions for a healthy labor market. The challenge of unemployment is to design private and public policies that raise employment and that are consistent with long-term goals.

CURRENT UNEMPLOYMENT AND FUTURE DEMANDS ON THE LABOR MARKET

Two facts about current unemployment are particularly impressive, to me at least. The first bears on the seriousness of the problem, and the second on its composition.

Each month the Department of Labor announces that employment for that month has reached a record high. This is an important observation, and deserves emphasis. But, coupled with questions about the statistics on unemployment—questions directed largely at inclusion of groups with a loose attachment to the labor force, such as youths looking for part-time work or secondary earners looking for a spell of employment—it has led many people to wonder how serious the unemployment problem really is.

I call your attention to one group of people whose experience has special significance. They are labeled, with one of those well-turned census phrases, "married males, spouse present." This is a large group, approximately half the labor force. The men in it are primary earners, usually responsible for the support of a family. They want full-time jobs. The rate of unemployment among them is typically half to a third that of other men, doubtless reflecting in part superior skill and a greater drive for productive employment as well as a different age distribution. How have they fared recently?

Last March over 1½ million such men were unemployed, an unemployment rate for this group of about 4½ percent. This rate has been consistently above 4 percent since 1958 and has exceeded 6 percent in a number of months since then. In the years 1951–57, by contrast, this rate ran generally under 3 percent, including some extensive time periods when the rate was between 1 and 2 percent. Even in the 1954 downturn, it did not stay long at the 4 percent level.

The experience of this group, the core of the labor force, indicates to me a problem of serious concern.

If the problem is serious, it is also diverse in its characteristics. Some people are unemployed because they are in the process of a voluntary shift from one job to another. Such shifting about is basically healthy; indeed, one of the costs of a high level of unemployment is that it inhibits voluntary changes in jobs. Some are unemployed because they have not learned how to search for a job effectively—youths or women entering the labor force or men laid off after a long period of work with one employer. Some find that skills they possess are no longer marketable or, if they never acquired a special skill, that the market for unskilled labor is not good. Some are located in the wrong area of the country or have a strong attachment to an industry and hope—often a vain hope—for a call back to work. Some are unemployed because of characteristics other than their qualifications for work. Of course, there are others who will be reemployed when work in their industry picks up again.

No doubt much of this unemployment will disappear with a rise in aggregate demand. But some of it is best cured by a combination of adequate demand with improved location, training, information, or treatment. It is in this sense that labor market or manpower policies designed to bring about such improvements are the handmaiden of a full employment policy. To neglect the operation of labor markets and the institutional arrangements which shape their character is to invite an approach confined to the aggregate level, likely to be inflationary, and therefore employed with a timidity inappropriate to the seriousness of the problem.

THE LABOR MARKET APPROACH

The demands made upon the operation of labor markets wil surely be greater in the next 10 years than in the last. Change, we here with tiresome frequency, is the order of the day, though it should be as frequently pointed out that this is as much the result of shifting consumer tastes and sources of raw material as it is of new technology, and that, without this change, our standards of life let alone our position in the world would rapidly deteriorate. In addition to the shifting about of workers induced by economic change there are some clearly foreseeable trends within the labor force itself. It will be growing at a relatively rapid pace and shifting sharply in its composition. Growth will be most rapid among those under 25 and over 45 years old. It may be noted that relative growth, that is compared with the last decade, will rise sharply for the under 25 age group, the only age group where the rate of increase will be more rapid than the past decade. We will return to the implications of this fact in a few moments.

It is important, then, from the standpoint of meeting long-term manpower developments as well as immediate unemployment problems to make the labor market process as efficient as possible. We are talking here, of course, about human beings and their movement to the places and jobs in which they can be most productive. But, while human beings are involved, what they are involved in is a market process—a fact hard for many to accept, since so much has been made of the idea that "labor is not a commodity." Nevertheless, we ignore at our peril the fact that this market like others relies on good information about supply and demand, the possibility of movement away from one industry, occupation, or area and of entry into others, and that the price of labor in a given market will have impact on the quantity demanded.

The labor market approach also has in it an element of frustration in that we are constantly talking about policy shifts of apparently small dimension. We seem to be in the position of responding to large and important problems with small bits and pieces. How much more satisfactory it is to have one big solution that will solve all the problems. But, I must say, how aggravating it is to me to read statements that "only 15 percent of the unemployed workers were able to benefit" by such and such an approach, and that therefore the approach was hardly worthwhile. What we must do is work on as many bits of the problem as possible knowing that in total these bits will add up to something worthwhile. And in this adding up, the objective of general improvement in labor market processes can provide a theme and a guide to the adjustment of private and public policies.

Let me now take up by way of example two areas where attention is being and can be further focused to improve our labor markets. In each, we see a combination of public and private policies, and in each we see possibilities for improvement.

RETRAINING, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE POLICIES

Great attention has been focused in the last year or two especially, on the idea of retraining, of adjusting and upgrading the skills of the labor force to fit the composition of demand for labor. Three pieces of Federal legislation, the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, all provide help to individuals seeking retraining, and the Trade Expansion Act provides some help in relocation.

In general, the retraining approach suggested by this legislation strikes me as a good one, in keeping with the objective of improving the operation of labor markets. The concept involved is one of adjustment to the difficulties of an area, industry, occupation, or group of people, by expanding individual skills and job horizons. In addition and as a side benefit it puts pressure for better performance on the employment service, as an agent for the collection and dissemination of information. And it helps dramatize the inadequacies of our system of vocational education, and so, we may hope at least, will lead to improvements.

This approach contrasts sharply with that so frequently found in private and public policy: the approach of protecting the status quo. If I may be permitted a critical aside here, it seems to me that businessmen who extol the virtues of free enterprise and decry governmental intervention are often the most vocal in demanding protection, aid, and comfort when competition pinches. But let me also acknowledge that similar comments could be applied in a meeting of farmers, labor leaders, or for that matter, educators.

If the retraining approach has the merit of emphasizing adjustment in the right direction, it also has built into it many problems. But the approach is right so the problems are worth analysis and discussion. Information in the Manpower Report transmitted by the President to the Congress in March 1963, suggests some of these problems and points up the issue of defining the appropriate role for public and private responsibility in this area.

Consider first two types of information found in the tables included in this report. Table F–3 tells us the age and education levels of those receiving training under the Manpower Act in 1962. Ten percent of the 6,315 persons involved were 45 years of age or older. About two-thirds were in the age range 22 to 44. The education level of the total group was predominantly (60 percent) 12th grade or better and 90 percent had an 8th grade or better education.

By contrast, the really disadvantaged groups, the ones who present the greatest difficulties for training and placement, are the older, poorly educated workers. Too often they have ben displaced after long service with one employer and are completely bewildered by the task of finding a new line of work and a new job. To be sure, the training program that takes them in will not show so good an apparent record in terms of proportion of trainees placed, but it may make a greater contribution to the most difficult aspects of the readjustment problem.

The implied suggestion here, that retraining efforts should concentrate more on the people who need help and less on the numerical record scored, is supported, in effect, by the figures in table F-5 of the report, showing the number of workers in training programs operated by private concerns in the spring of 1962. The establishments surveyed covered the full range of industries and include over 36 million workers, half the labor force. About half of the workers covered by the survey were in establishments with training programs and 7 percent were actually being trained at the time of the survey. The number of people involved in training, if extrapolated to a national estimate, certainly exceeds 3 million. This is truly a massive program, going on all the time, more important in large companies than small, and no doubt following the normal course of private incentives, emphasizing skills useful to the firm and workers best able to acquire these skills—the younger, better educated workers.

In looking to the future, then, we must recognize that a great many employers find it in their interest to provide training for their employees and we can infer that such training will help those in the median age ranges and with higher educational attainments to acquire specific skills. Many more employees will receive job training this way than through any governmental program, however grandly conceived. Yet the role of the Government program is a vital one. It should help those who fall outside the natural scope of private efforts. In so doing the Government takes on the toughest problems—but these are just the problems that would otherwise be neglected. The Government program, then, should be conceived not as massive and general, but as directed to special objectives derived from inadequate formal education and the residue of displacement left from a changing economy. The unskilled and the unschooled are most in need of help and least likely to get it from the present array of Government training programs.

THE STRUCTURE OF COMPENSATION

As a sample of an entirely different area of policy, let me comment on the developing structure of compensation; that is, the division of total income received by an employee as between direct money payments and items tied in one way or another to length of service and continued employment with a firm. Roughly speaking, we may say that some 20 percent of total income falls in the second category. For some industries or companies, the fraction may go to one-third or even higher.

What are the labor market effects of such a structure? Certainly it may inhibit the process of voluntary movement, an essential ingredient to the use of manpower at maximum productivity. This is only partly because of the grip of the existing job. At least as important is the knowledge that a new job starts on the bottom of the ladder, in terms of benefits as well as direct compensation. That is, especially for the older worker, if a comparable new job can be found.

For what does an employer naturally do, faced with the economics of the labor market. The age distribution of his labor force affects his benefit costs, which, like any other cost, he seeks to minimize. In addition, the benefit structure is a sort of overhead cost which he must pay as a cost of hiring an individual. He is obviously encouraged, within limits, to work his existing force longer rather than take on extra employees. By and large, those already employed want the overtime and the employer has an incentive to adjust in that direction. The unemployed, unrepresented, unwanted, and, in the sense described above, overpriced, are left out—out of a job and out of a myriad of indirect benefits that go with a job, yet place an economic barrier around that job.

I suggest, therefore, that the structure of compensation be reexamined, to see if the proportions make sense and, indeed, if the particular benefits, which have been developed for a work force gradually growing older, are really what is wanted by the youngsters now streaming into the labor market.

This is as much a matter for public policy as for private. After all, the tax laws have provided a powerful incentive to the development of private benefit plans, and payroll taxes are not the only way to finance the social insurance system. No—I am not arguing that all this should be changed but that it should be examined—and examined with implications for the labor market sharply in view.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND LABOR MARKET POLICY

This is a short statement about a problem of great and continuing magnitude. I have tried to make a point of general importance and to illustrate its impact through discussion of two rather different policy issues, among many possible examples.

Unemployment today is a serious problem. Most discussions of how to deal with it quite understandably emphasize aggregate aspects of economic policy. These aspects are obviously of great importance.

I have emphasized the operation of particular markets because I think this side of the coin is too widely neglected. My side of the coin has an overall design: respect for the general contours of the economics of employment, as it appears to the individual employer and employee in particular labor markets the country over. A clearer figure in the design requires long and painstaking effort, where small and sometimes individually insignificant bits and pieces are sharpened and integrated. But the implications are broad. And the task at least has the appeal of being one in which every person in this room can contribute directly and in his own hometown.

FRINGE BENEFITS IN UNITED STATES INCREASE MUCH FASTER THAN WAGES, SALARIES—PENSION, INSURANCE OUTLAYS UP 700 PERCENT SINCE 1946—TREND HELPS CUT JOB SWITCHING—COUNTRY CLUBS, FREE LUNCHES

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

The American breadwinner's income is rising far faster than his paycheck indicates.

Wage and salary payments have almost tripled since World War II. But employer payments that don't show up in paychecks, so-called fringe benefits, have increased nearly sixfold.

This nonpaycheck pay is now somewhere above $20 billion a year. It's far larger than the $16 billion in dividends paid yearly by all the Nation's corporations. It's half again as big as the $13 billion income of all the Nation's farms.

"If the growth of fringe benefits continues at anything like the current rate, we may have to start calling wages and salaries the fringe area," speculates one economist.

The $20-billion-plus figure doesn't tell the whole story. It just represents about all the Government calculators can keep track of. It covers primarily employer-paid insurance against sickness, death, or joblessness—plus pension money for retirement.

BEYOND-THE-FRINGE BENEFITS

It does not encompass more paid holidays and longer paid vacations. Nor does it cover such beyond-the-fringe benefits as:

Plush employee country clubs (Du Pont Co.'s sprawling employee club boasts 4 golf courses, 16 tennis courts, a staff of 100).

Free employee lunches (Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. feeds 18,000 daily at its New York City headquarters).

Sizable price discounts for employees (R. H. Macy & Co.'s 15,000 workers can buy wares at Macy stores at prices as much as 20 percent under what the public pays).

To dramatize the magnitude of fringes, Royal McBee Corp.—among other corporations—has recently conducted "hidden paycheck" contests. Savings bonds were awarded employees making the most accurate estimate of their fringe earnings.

The sixfold climb of employer fringe payments reflects more than simply corporate benevolence. It denotes a growing preoccupation, especially by unions, with job security—against sickness, against old age and, in the era of automation, against unemployment.

RETAINING TALENTED MANAGERS

At the executive level, through stock option plans as well as lesser lures, it reflects a business effort to attract and retain talented managers in a time of what some critics believe are incentive-killing tax rates.

The impact of the rising volume of unseen pay to employees is observed across a broad spectrum.

It is seen in sharply reduced job-changing by a work force increasingly mindful of the nonwage rewards of seniority. (Less than 4 percent of U.S. production workers switched jobs last year, down from 7 percent early in the postwar era.)

It is seen in an economy buttressed against deep depression by social security and pension and insurance plans to sustain purchasing by the aged, by unemployment compensation to keep alive spending by the jobless, by health insurance to prevent the attrition of savings of the sick.

The postwar rise of employers' nonpaycheck payments to employees that can be precisely gaged is shown below. Dollars are in billions and the 1962 total is an estimate:

Fringe payments:	*In billions*
1946	3. 8
1948	4. 7
1950	6. 5
1952	8. 5
1954	9. 7
1956	12. 3
1958	13. 8
1960	18. 0
1961	18. 6
1962	20. 6

From 3 percent of wages and salaries in 1946, these employer fringe payments have swelled steadily—to a record 7 percent last year. Just since 1961, the table shows, the total has grown $3 billion, or nearly an eighth of the rise of all wage and salary payments in the period.

Within the $20.6 billion total, employer payments for Government-administered old-age, survivor, and disability insurance have soared sevenfold since the war's end—to last year's record $5.9 billion.

The increase of payments to private pension and welfare plans, such as Blue Cross and life insurance, has been explosive—up nearly 700 percent since the war to a record $9.6 billion last year.

"Laggards": Compensation payments to injured workers and unemployment insurance payments have merely tripled in the postwar span—to $1.5 billion and $3.6 billion, respectively, in 1962.

The rise of fringe benefits dwarfs the 27-percent increase of U.S. jobs since 1946.

More of the Nation's work force is receiving benefits paid for partly or wholly by employers.

INSURANCE AND PENSIONS

Some 80 percent of U.S. workers are covered by employer-financed life insurance plans, up from 56 percent as recently as 1954. Three-quarters are protected by some form of employer-financed health insurance, up from 58 percent in 1954. About half are helped by employer-financed pension arrangements, up from 31 percent in 1954.

And beyond the spread of payments detailed above are these proliferating benefits:

Paid vacations, given to some 95 percent of factory workers now, up from less than 50 percent in the early postwar period (a quarter of these workers get at least 3 weeks off with pay a year).

Paid holidays, almost unknown at factories before the war, are now enjoyed by over 90 percent of production workers (nearly two-thirds receive seven or more paid holidays yearly).

Du Pont's country club, carpeting 710 well-groomed acres near Wilmington, Del., exemplifies a type of fringe benefit also on the increase.

The National Golf Foundation lists 106 company-operated golf courses for workers, about double the total a decade ago. And additional employee courses are coming at a record pace, the foundation reports—10 under construction, 13 in planning.

Activities, besides golf and tennis, for the Du Pont club's 9,500 employee-members include bowling-on-the-green, movies, and dancing nights. The club costs Du Pont roughly $240,000 yearly, an official estimates. Without this help from the company, he says, the $10.60-a-month dues would be "much higher."

Du Pont's overall spending on fringe benefits typifies the general trend. Last year's fringe spending by Du Pont hit a record $168 million, or 27 percent of Du Pont wages and salaries. The 1953 total: $88 million, or 20 percent of wages and salaries.

Free lunches constitute a fast-spreading employee benefit not recorded on any paycheck. The increase can't be pinpointed. But one Government expert believes the practice is approaching "gargantuan proportions."

Metropolitan Life alone spends an estimated $7.5 million a year feeding free 18,000 employees at its New York City headquarters. A typical meal: Soup, lamb chops, vegetables and salad, ice cream, coffee. Several choices are offered for each course.

Says the happy wife of one "Met" employee: "My husband fills up at lunch, so I don't have to prepare him hot evening meals—it cuts our food bills down and saves me work."

The rise of free lunches has prompted the Internal Revenue Service to consider adding the estimated value of such meals to employee's gross income. Such a move could increase the taxable income of workers receiving free lunches by as much as $60 annually, some tax authorities calculate.

"The extra revenues we'd collect would be sizable," says one IRS official.

And free lunches aren't the only fringe benefit attracting the hungry eye of tax collectors. President Kennedy's current tax proposals, now before Congress, include such measures as stricter taxation of income received through stock options and taxing certain company-financed insurance payments not now subject to tax.

Equality Is Earned Through Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the editorial by Jenkin Lloyd Jones, "Double Standards Cut Two Ways," should be read carefully by all the self-styled champions of Negro rights. Mr. Jones rightfully points out that setting a double standard of morality and responsibility which condones every act of lawlessness as a result of the white man's injustice, will in the end hurt the very cause for which the Negroes are fighting.

Mr. Speaker, the Negro race is not helped when young thugs who commit murder are freed because of sentiment or to enhance the position of a fancied leader or to garner Negro votes. The earnest, hard-working, responsible Negro youngster is sacrificed in the fostering of racial hatreds because violence will not solve problems of injustice and inequity. The Negro citizen can be guaranteed his full rights under the Constitution in the same manner as the white citizen, under a government of law. If we accept as a fact that mob action or the threat of mob action is all that is needed to reach a desired goal by the Negroes, then freedom will die in America and only those who can raise the biggest and most vicious mob will enjoy privileges.

The extremists on both sides of racial tensions, and those, both white and Negro, who use the tragedy of injustice for profit or for political gain, are bringing upon America a war between the races which will force those who believe in law and justice to line up with their own race in a battle which cannot be won, but must destroy this land of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of all American citizens, white and black, I hope the double standards now being urged by administration officials and agitators of all types, will be foresworn and we solve whatever problems exist in a reasonable manner within the framework of the Constitution. Mr. Jones' well-written article follows:

DOUBLE STANDARDS CUT TWO WAYS—ENDLESS SETBACKS SEEN FOR NEGROES IF RESPONSIBILITIES ARE GLOSSED OVER

Among the worst enemies of American Negroes today are many who proclaim themselves as the Negroes' best friends.

These are the people who gloss over, alibi, explain away or attempt to cover up a rising tide of Negro misbehavior in America's big cities. They represent the "It's-all-the-white-man's fault" school. Down this road lie endless disappointments and setbacks for America's Negro citizens. The inevitable reaction will be particularly rough on those young colored kids who are really trying to better themselves.

A once-submerged race doesn't rise on a record of irresponsibility. Unpunished crime is not the way to obtain social acceptance. Illegitimacy, family abandonment and relief loafing by preference are pretty sure methods of drying up good will. No amount of fair employment legislation will overcome the disastrous results of a record of bad citizenship.

Yet these are the net result of a peculiar social philosophy that has attempted to tell Negroes that they are not responsible for their actions.

Following a riot at the Washington baseball park last month in which a group of young Negro toughs attacked white fans for no reason, Mrs. Agnes Meyer ascribed the outbreak to frustration.

"The Negro is sick and tired of being kicked around 90 years after passage of the 14th Amendment, which promised him equality," said Mrs. Meyer. She called for a new outpouring of Federal money to meet the "social, educational and economic problems" of Negroes in the District of Columbia.

Well, the Negro certainly has been kicked around. He needs better schools and wider job opportunities. But he also needs a greater sense of responsibility. Washington news stories are drearily repetitive about young muggers and purse-snatchers who are "released to the custody of their parents." What kind of parents?

People don't walk in the Washington parks after dark anymore. These are parks that belong to the whole Nation. When the sun goes down, upper Central Park in New York City is deserted and the policemen patrol in pairs. Sure, there's plenty of white juvenile delinquency. But the comparative crime rates make chilling reading even though the NAACP has made every effort to have racial designations suppressed on the police records.

There is too much sly hypocrisy in the effort to assure Negroes that, however they behave, they are merely innocent victims of white biogtry.

Under our outmoded electoral college system, Negro votes in the large States are rich prizes. You can help gather these prizes by thundering oratory against the little Alabama town where integration would result in Negro majorities in all the schools. Yet there isn't a single politician in Washington of either party who has school-age children who couldn't, if he wished, send them to schools where Negro children are in the majority. How many do?

The southern whites have plenty to answer for. One of their great errors was the acceptance of a racial double standard of behavior. Southern courts were notoriously lenient with Negroes who stole from Negroes or killed Negroes. It was only when Negroes transgressed against whites that retribution was swift and often brutal.

But the northern sentimentalists have set up a double standard in reverse. The little candy store owner who is beaten to death by colored thugs draws only mild tongue-clucking and perhaps an editorial, "Where Have We Failed?" Yet the riotous white kid on the Ol' Miss campus who throws eggs at James H. Meredith is photographed for a four-column spread on Page One and treated as a national menance.

Race relations are not going to improve in America until we climb off these double standards. Crime is crime. Whites and Negroes, alike, have a right to be protected. And they have equal obligations in crime prevention.

In this respect, American Negroes who count themselves among the leaders of their race have been doing a terrible job. They have been long on self-pity and short on self-criticism. It has been more fun to organize marches into Dixie than to level with their people about the end result of the attacks on police in Harlem.

This failure of leadership has been immensely damaging to Negro aspirations. The shenanigans of Adam Clayton Powell have hurt Negroes at least as badly as the stubbornness of Gov. Ross Barnett. It is ironic that the only strong voice calling for better Negro behavior comes from the Black Muslims, who are as racist as the white citizens councilities, but are in favor of black supremacy.

Better opportunities may be presented to Negros by court action, but they can be retained and expanded only by demonstrating reliability. A court has ordered Continental Airlines to hire a Negro pilot. Hooray! There isn't any reason why a Negro shouldn't fly a transport plane. But if he shows up at operations disheveled and hung over he'll betray his people.

Many Americans now concede that it is an outrage to keep a good pilot on the ground because his skin is black. But no one will want to fly with a bad pilot who is in the cockpit by court order merely because his skin is black.

It's as simple as that. Second-class citizens will never become first-class citizens by behaving like third-class citizens. American Negroes need more friends who are honest with them, and more leaders who are ready to go to war against all double standards—even those that have been comfortable.

What Makes the Russian Bear Tick?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an article from the Washington Star of May 20, 1963. It is a very able review of a book which my good friend and colleague, Congressman BRAY, of Indiana, authored. I believe that the Members of the Congress will find it interesting and full of valuable information in light of the serious Communist menace which is threatening our Nation today:

BEAR FACTS

(By John W. Brabner-Smith)

Intellectuals, including public school teachers and ministers, continue to search for the philosophy, dogma and doctrine in Marxist socialism. It took some of us 10 years, via Hegel, Hobbes, Rousseau, et al., to realize the blind alley of this approach to communism. A few eventually sought the views of the official interpreters, Lenin and Mao Tse-tung: "The Marxist revolutionary theory is not a dogma. It is found only in close contact with practice in a movement that is truly revolutionary." Marxism is social revolution through "an organization with the will to conquer power for itself, which can create a revolutionary situation in the masses" (a manufactured revolution). Others like the late Professors Earle of Princeton and Neumann of Leipzig, analyzing obscure writings of Marx and Engels, realized sooner that the prime concern was not economics, social welfare, or philosophy; it was practical—the development of the strategy and tactics of revolution, and of political conflict in general. These ideas were equally available to Hitler, Churchill and Roosevelt as they were to Lenin, Stalin and Khrushchev.

A few practical men, and a few students who had been exposed to communism in practice, limited their study to historical cases of the advance of an identifiable movement—an analysis of facts rather than a study of theories. A Pole, Baczkowski, did this, exiled in the Middle East during the last war. He arrived at his "Toward an Understanding of Russia," which correctly anticipated Russia's postwar policy. Nobody knew the work existed. A Congressman from Indiana, having a sniff of "agrarian reformers" and "Russian compatriots" for 4 years in the Asiatic theater of war, also decided to find out what made the Russian bear tick. He started out with Genghis Khan, in actual travel as well as literature. After 10 years he has produced "Russian Frontiers: from Muscovy to Khrushchev." You visualize a pattern of expansion by an organization that knows no frontiers—a pattern so monotonously repeated that ignorance is the only excuse for political failure of the losers. To the bear, gorged and exhausted with undigested lands from Urals to Korea, south to India, and west to middle Europe, the strategy and tactics of Marx and Engels was a happy dish in 1917. With each historical act of expansion, Congressman WILLIAM BRAY quotes the accompanying propaganda song or threat. The Congressman's colleagues should cooperate to give this easy-reading account better attention than that received by the Polish diplomat's prophetic exposition of 20 years ago.

The Future for Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of May 19, 1963:

THE FUTURE FOR COAL

The coal industry has an assured longtime position as the chief supplier of fuel for electrical power generation. And, according to industry authorities, that position is destined to grow in the years ahead, even though atomic energy is entering the field as a competitor.

Even more exciting to those who look to the coal industry for their economic wellbeing is the prospect for changing the chemical composition of coal to produce synthetic natural gas and synthetic gasoline.

This is no pipedream. The Germans did it long ago and during World War II that oil-short country relied on this source for gasoline. The processes have been proved; the only thing that holds back the development of this field for coal is cost.

America's wealth of oil and natural gas reserves have given the Nation these fuels in abundance at prices that could not be matched by the synthetic product. But what of the future?

Experts who spoke here at meetings of the American Gas Association foresaw that the rising demand for natural gas will make it necessary for synthetic gas-from-coal to supplement the natural product, one of them predicting that 50 percent of the market will be supplied from coal by the year 2000.

As to gasoline-from-coal, President Kennedy's 1963–64 budget contains a request for $10 million for the Office of Coal Research to set up a pilot plant in West Virginia to operate with processes developed by Consolidation Coal Co.

Just at present, nobody sees this development as putting the oil industry out of business. But coal people beleive that the synthetic processes can, in the future, be made sufficiently competitive to sell their product in the populous Northeastern U.S. market.

They point out that the Government has put some $200 million into generation of power by atomic energy, which may be considered as an "anticoal" activity, and that further development of the synthetic coal procesess can be a balancing factor.

There's enough coal in the country, according to current rates of consumption, to last another 2,000 years. The exact life of our oil and gas reserves is a matter of conjecture; certainty if declining reserves increased exploration cost, the cost ratio between oil and gas and synthetic fuels would be altered.

If the cost barrier is overcome, either by reducing the cost of the synthetic process or by a changed cost ratio with natural fuel, the coal industry could open a vast new market which would not only aid employment in the coal fields but also in the processsing industry.

The history of the coal industry shows its ups and downs. The industry which our elders knew as "King Coal" is sometimes prosperous, sometimes sick. But it is never in order to count the industry out. Just now, it has a stable market in the growing power industry, and the future may hold much bigger things.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Hydroelectric Power in the Nuclear Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, for too long the New England States have been at a competitive disadvantage for want of a modern system for the generation and transmission of electric power. My colleague, the junior Senator from Maine, [EDMUND S. MUSKIE] in a recent address before the American Public Power Association, has pointed to changes in technology that will improve this situation in the near future. The use of more efficient high voltage transmission lines will enable the States of northern New England to seek low cost power sources which will benefit the region in industrial expansion and residential consumption of power. With foresight and imagination Senator MUSKIE has pointed the way for all the New England States in the development of this most critical resource. I am pleased to call your attention to his remarks on the revolution in electrical technology and ask unanimous consent that Senator MUSKIE's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HYDROELECTRIC POWER IN THE NUCLEAR AGE

No discussion of our energy needs is meaningful, unless it is undertaken in the context of our position as a world power. The strength of nations, today, depends on their industrial capacity and resources. The conduct of our diplomacy and the adequacy of our defense structure are vital to our future, but each depends, for its effectiveness, on the industrial and economic strength of the Nation. That strength, in turn, is rooted in our developed energy resources.

If we are to maintain our position as the leader of the free world; if we are to make significant advances in our productive capacity and in the employment of our human and natural resources; we must make bold strides in the expansion of our electrical energy output. This is a matter of national importance and concern.

Two facets of this problem interests me, today: nuclear power and hydroelectric power. Some view them as competitors; I see them as complementary systems.

What will be the role of nuclear powerplants in the next 40 years?

Recently, the Atomic Energy Commission reported to President Kennedy its estimate that, by the end of the century, nuclear power will be assuming the total increase in national electric energy requirements and will be providing half the electric energy generated.

Such long-range predictions can only be tested by time. Opinions concerning the advent of economic atomic power have run the gambit from dazzling predictions to dark pessimism.

Today, there are no nuclear plants on the line which are competitive with comparable conventional generating facilities. We are still in the position of judging nuclear power on its promise not its performance. But the promise is very great, and must be taken into account in power planning.

Nuclear energy is unique in its widespread availability, and radically different in character from sources of energy that man has used in the past. Usable world reserves of nuclear fuels are estimated to represent an energy potential 15 to 20 times as great as deposits of coal, oil, and gas; with controlled fusion of hydrogen, the earth would have at hand an unlimited supply of energy. Nuclear fuels are highly concentrated forms of energy, capable of providing enormous amounts of potential power from relatively small physical quantities. But nuclear energy presents hazards to health and safety not associated with conventional fuels; radiation released with power reactors is a far more serious type of contamination than the usual industrial pollution because it can destroy living cells and mark future generations through harmful mutations.

In view of these and other special attributes, including its role in weapons production, nuclear energy has been properly vested with a public interest. The Federal Government has expended approximately $25 billion in the development of nuclear energy for war and peace, and continues to closely supervise its application for both purposes.

Even if the Atomic Energy Commission's predictions for the turn of the century prove correct, it is likely that, for at least several decades, steam power plants using heat from coal, oil, or gas will remain the principal source of electricity in this country. Today such steamplants represent about 80 percent of our power supply; this percentage will likely increase as feasible hydro sites diminish and demand for electricity rises.

Despite these qualifications, the potential of nuclear power is of particular interest to those of us who live in New England. Electric bills in our part of the Nation are among the highest in the country, although our use of electricity has not kept pace with other regions. In 1961, the average residential customer in New England used 3,113 kilowatt hours—23 percent below the national average—and paid approximately 3.47 cents per kilowatt hour—which is more than 15 percent above the national average.

We have no coal mines, oil wells, or gasfields to supply a source of low-cost fuel. Average fuel cost of New England steam plants in 1961 was 36.9 cents per million Btu. compared with a national average of 26.7 cents.

Federal Power Commission Chairman Swidler pinpointed one of the basic reasons for our area's poor showing electrically when he told the Electric Council of New England: "New England in the past has built and still relies on too many small and inefficient generating units and on too few of the large, low-cost units. The evidence suggests that New England's electrical progress is restrained by the chain of high costs, which in turn leads to high rates, which delays growth of energy use and thus tends to keep costs high."

Mr. Swidler advanced several suggestions for solving this dilemma, including increased integration of facilities and operations, more efficient use of fuel, and greater use of power through power use promotion. I would like to discuss a fourth proposal he made for a review of the economic feasibility of many of the area's undeveloped hydropower sources, for additional blocks of capacity on the basis of power pooling for the region as a whole and in cooperation with neighboring regions.

The Northeast has millions of kilowatts of undeveloped hydroelectric capacity. In New England alone, FPC studies show a potential of 2.8 million kilowatts. This is an extremely conservative figure. It does not include, for example, the potential 1 million kilowatts of peaking capacity at the Passamaquoddy Tidal project.

Hydropower can—and should—be developed now. Unlike atomic energy, the technology is already perfected and feasible sites have been surveyed. The major cost of a hydro project is in building the dam to form the reservoir. This expense is subject to escalation as price levels rise; thus, the sooner these projects are constructed, the lower the anticipated price tag.

Today, the States of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont are supplied in about equal amounts of hydro and thermal generation. The predicted power supply pattern of the future calls for large generating stations integrated through extra high voltage transmission grids.

Some say that giant, low-cost steampower—especially in nuclear energy plants—has doomed the future of hydroelectric generation. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The expanded use of nuclear energy and modern high capacity fossil fuel plants accentuate the opportunities for hydroelectric power. It is growing more and more important as a source of peaking power. The inherent characteristics of a hydropower plant permit wide variations of load in extremely short intervals of time. This is ideal for peaking purposes. On the other hand, high capacity thermal powerplants using energy from either fossil fuels or from nuclear sources do not possess this flexibility. The heat balance required under the high pressures and high temperatures encountered in the large thermal units does not permit wide variations in output within short intervals of time. The high investment and operating costs of these units require practically continuous operations at full-rated output with only minor shutdowns for maintenance purposes to obtain economical outputs.

The outlook of the power industry is, I think, well exemplified in the present plans by the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York. This system has in the active planning or early construction stages three generating plants with an output of 1 million kilowatts each. One of these plants will be hydroelectric, operated on a pumped storage basis to provide peaking requirements. Of the remaining two plants, one will utilize conventional fossile fuels, and the other will be supplied by nuclear energy.

Several large generating units are under construction for operation in the utility systems of southern New England. The largest plant is rated at 340 megawatts and will be installed at the L Street station of the Boston Edison Co. Unit operation is scheduled for July 1965.

Two hundred and twenty-five megawatt power plants will be installed at the Brayton Point plant of the New England Power Co. The first 225 megawatt power unit is scheduled for operation in July 1963, and the second is scheduled for operation in July 1964.

The Hartford Electric Co. also has a large unit scheduled for initial operation in 1964. This is the Middletown Unit No. 3 and will have a capacity of 220 megawatts. Initial operation is scheduled for October 1964.

One method of meeting peaking needs for such plants involves pumped storage. In a recent issue of the Electrical World, the Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp. announced plans for development of a 600,000 kilowatt pumped storage hydroelectric project. The site is at Breakneck Mountain overlooking the Hudson River south of Beacon, N.Y., and is directly across the river from the 1 million kilowatt pumped storage project of the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York.

The Taum Sauk project by the Union Electric Co., of St. Louis, Mo., is another prime example of what is happening in the hydro field. In this project, the top of a mountain was literally blown off to provide a manmade reservoir so that a pumped storage hydroelectric power project for peaking functions could be constructed.

In my own State of Maine, we have the potential of a unique hydroelectric power development. This could benefit Maine, New England, and the Maritime Provinces of Canada. In this case, the waterfall or head is not provided by the natural terrain of the country and the streamflow from rainfall but by the lunar forces responsible for the tides.

This unique hydroelectric power development has certain problems, to be sure, but it can also boast of features that are not present in a riverflow hydroelectric power development.

The tides are produced by gravitational forces between the Earth and the Moon and the configuration of the land area. In view of the absolute determinability of the relative position of the Earth, the Sun, and the Moon, it is possible to accurately calculate and to predict the amplitude of a tide at any time in the future. With the exception of a few tidal storms, there are no physical factors which can destroy these predictions. Thus, instead of having a source of hydroelectric power depending upon the vagaries of rainfall and terrain, we have a source of power which can be absolutely predicted.

In many of the earliest studies of Passamaquoddy, attempts were made to match the tidal cycle to the solar day with relatively little success. In the most recent concept developed in the IJC report, Passamaquoddy was proposed as a source of dependable hydroelectric energy.

In contrast, the studies by the Department of the Interior indicate a great need in the future for peaking capacity. The two-pool concept developed in the IJC report provides an excellent opportunity for developing peaking power of the characteristics which have been historically experienced in the marketing area considered by the Department of the Interior. This embraced the New England States, eastern New York, and the maritime Provinces of Canada, particularly New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

Computer studies are being made as part of the overall Passamaquoddy review to determine the optimum peaking capacity that could be developed at the Passamaquoddy Tidal Powerplant. We understand these studies are progressing satisfactorily and they will show the number of hours' peaking capacity of various magnitudes could be provided by the Passamaquoddy development, both on the basis of isolated operation and on the basis of interconnected integrated operation with power generated on the St. John River. We understand the studies are being made for various capacities from 500 megawatts to 1 million kilowatts.

Studies already made by various people indicate that the development of the Upper St. John River is entirely economical and makes good financial sense. If it can be demonstrated that Passamaquoddy can stand on its own feet, certainly the coordination of power capacity of the Passamaquoddy with the Upper St. John River will be an even better development. On this basis, the dependable capacity of Passamaquoddy could be calculated on the basis of the potential output from the average tide of 18 feet, rather than from the lowest tide of about 13 feet.

I, and I am sure many of you, are anxiously awaiting the results of the studies in progress by the Department of Interior. We have every assurance that the report to the President will be completed by July 1, 1963. Should this report demonstrate the feasibility of Passamaquoddy operating on its own, I will recommend that serious consideration be given to this potential resource.

As we consider these and other potential sources of hydroelectric energy, we must not let the glamour of the nuclear age obscure the new look in hydroelectric power. Hydro is the partner of modern steam generation, not its enemy. By applying imagination, hard work, and determination to the potential of hydroelectric peaking plants, large-scale steam plants, and efficient high-voltage systems, we can open a new day in the sound development of our economic, natural, and human resources. We will also demonstrate to the world the power for growth in a free society.

Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent improving trend in our economy is provoking a great deal of discussion about the need, and potential value of a tax cut. Two recent editions of the Christian Science Monitor carried very thoughtful comment which is helpful in giving an understanding of the issues involved. I include them, under consent, at this point in my remarks:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, April 24, 1963]

CUT TAXES, MAYBE LATER, BUT CUT

Most business indicators are moving up. The possibility of a recession this year seems almost entirely erased. Even unemployment, while bad, is not quite as bad as it was. These facts are being cited by some as reasons for postponing the effective date of a Federal tax cut, if not the cut itself.

But Members of Congress should remember that fighting a recession was only an incidental reason for the legislation now in the House Ways and Means Committee, never the main reason for it. The main reason why business as well as labor in the United States favors a reduction in the tax take by the Government is that that take has been too large to favor a necessary rate of economic growth in the country. This is a long-range, not a short-range, reason.

Considering the circumstances, it may be conceded that President Kennedy will not get his tax cut retroactive to January 1, as recommended. He would perhaps be fortunate to have it apply to income earned after July 1 or even October 1 this year. There is talk in Washington of not making the reduction effective until January 1 next year.

This is all right. Fortunately the changes in depreciation allowances last year plus the investment tax credit have given enough stimulus to plans for capital investment by industry to support the present economy rather well. Possibly the effective date of a tax cut can be postponed to the end of the year without serious damage.

But the main point is that, to keep things moving, there should be tax-cut legislation this year. A bill to this end should be enacted by the House of Representatives and the Senate, so that business, industry, and everyday taxpayers may know what to expect. Let the effective date be July 1, October 1, or January 1, but let there be a Tax Revision Act of 1963 before this session of Congress adjourns.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 3, 1963]

THAT INVESTMENT CREDIT

(By Richard L. Strout)

Opponents said it wouldn't work. Some called it a tax gimmick. Now after an appropriate interval first reports are coming in of the results of the tax cut given to business last year to encourage modernization and expansion of plant and equipment. This was the so-called 7 percent investment credit against tax liability in the Revenue Act of 1962. It was a tax cut which the recipients generally pooh-poohed or opposed altogether.

Nations of western Europe have been giving heavier tax benefits to corporations that modernize their plants for a long time. A few years ago, Americans awoke to the surprising discovery that in many cases their factories were out of date compared to Europe's; many American steel mills, for example, can't compete successfully.

Spurring plant expansion and modernization has an economic advantage; it stimulates the economy by expenditures it releases. Nearly all western nations press this stimulant to a degree greater than the United States.

President Kennedy and Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon proposed such a stimulant in 1961 and it was mulled over in Congress for months. Simultaneously, the administration liberalized its treatment of depreciation, which is a technical way for saying that the Government used the power it already had to stimulate private investment by more advantageous depreciation allowances. This second step was achieved by modernizing obsolescent rules in so-called schedule "F."

A politically strange coalition fought the first Kennedy proposal, the investment tax credit. Organized labor spoke against it, in the fear that more modern plants would speed up automation and reduce jobs. It asked for certain safeguards which were not forthcoming.

Many segments of business attacked the proposal as a gimmick, based on several arguments. It was charged that the program was cumbersome, would work unevenly, might not work at all, would lose important revenue, and might prevent the achievement of faster depreciation schedules.

In Congress the Revenue Act of 1962 passed the House March 29, by a 219-to-196 rollcall, with the modified investment tax credit the heart of the measure. Only one Republican supported it on final passage.

In the Senate an effort to throw out the investment credit provision was rejected

30 to 52. Republicans voting 13 to 15 against dropping it, and the Democrats, 17 to 37.

How has it worked? Most evidence indicates that the combined faster depreciation writeoff schedules and the tax credit are already playing a part in stimulating plant expansion and modernization. In turn, the plans of business to expand are one of the most favorable factors in the current economic front.

The McGraw-Hill economics department makes periodic nationwide surveys of the amount of money which industry plans to put into new plant and equipment. These and similar surveys carry great weight. Its latest survey shows a sharp upturn of capital spending plans, with a prospective $40 billion this year, setting an alltime record. The agency took a similar survey last November, and finds a 3-percent gain since then.

The survey (and the Commerce Department-Securities Exchange Commission forecast last month) puts a smile on the face of most businessmen.

"How much of your 1963 capital spending is due directly to the new faster writeoffs and tax incentive programs?" the corporations were asked by McGraw-Hill.

According to survey, the corporations responded that "despite early skepticism, they added some $1.2 billion to their 1963 spending plans to take advantage of the programs."

According to Business Week, the liberalized depreciation guidelines added $639 million in extra spending to their plans, and $526 million is due to the investment credit. "The credit," the magazine thinks, "may prove to have a bigger effect in the long run." This is because the depreciation guidelines had their major impact last year.

Take it all in all, the gimmick so far seems to be working out.

Justice Honors Leftist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a very disturbing article which has been printed in the Cincinnati Enquirer has come to my attention. It is entitled "Justice Honors Leftist" and was written by Mr. Jack Lotto. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTICE HONORS LEFTIST

(NOTE.—To help its readers keep on guard against propaganda, the Cincinnati Enquirer brings you this authoritative weekly report.)

(By Jack Lotto)

A U.S. Supreme Court Justice has paid tribute to a man with admitted Communist-front affiliations who is leading the fight to destroy a congressional committee.

The jurist sending the accolade was Justice Hugo L. Black. The recipient was Aubrey W. Williams, of Montgomery, Ala. The scene was the annual meeting in Chicago of the National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, headed by Mr. Williams.

The congressional subversive-probing body has named six top officials of the national abolition group as identified Communist Party members. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has described as "under control of the Communist Party," the organization in Los Angeles, Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedoms, which shared its offices with the Williams group.

Mr. Williams is also president of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, headquartered in New Orleans, La., and active in Southern States.

Both the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Un-American Activities Committee described the Southern Conference Educational Fund as an organization set up to promote communism throughout the South.

A report in a leftist publication on the meeting of the national committee to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities told of the ceremony honoring Mr. Williams. It said he was presented with a recently published compilation of Justice Black's Supreme Court opinions. According to the National Guardian story, inside was the inscription "To my friend Aubrey Williams with admiration and great respect for the courageous life which he has given to his country." It was signed Hugo L. Black, and dated April 24, 1963.

A Williams citation of a different sort was written in a 1954 formal report of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which disclosed that Mr. Williams was identified by a witness as one who had been a member of the Communist Party. He was also identified by another witness as one who accepted the discipline of the Communist Party.

"Mr. Williams denied that he had ever been a member of the Communist Party or that he had ever accepted Communist Party discipline, but he admitted that he had been connected with a number of Communist-front organizations.

"He admitted also that on September 11, 1947, he made the following remarks in an address at Madison Square Garden, New York City, with reference to the Government's loyalty program—'What they demand is that any man who admits to being a member of the Communist party be fired immediately on the grounds that no man can be loyal to the United States and be a Communist. It is my belief that it is precisely at this point that we take our stand and defend the right of any Communist to maintain his position as an employee of the Government of the United States. To take any less position than this is to throw overboard such primary rights as the freedom to think and to hold whatever beliefs one chooses.'"

Working as field secretary of Mr. Williams' Southern Conference Educational Fund is Carl Braden, of Louisville, Ky., an identified member of the Communist party, who served a prison term for contempt of Congress.

Executive director of the National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, of which Mr. Williams has just become honorary chairman, after 2 years as chairman, is another identified Communist. He is Frank Wilkinson, of Los Angeles. Like Mr. Braden, he also served a jail sentence for contempt of Congress.

At the Chicago conference, the national committee made plans to build "stronger and more localized organizations" to help wipe out the Congress body.

Future Homemakers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, while in Dallas, Tex., recently, I had an opportunity to attend the State convention of the Future Homemakers of America. While there, I listened to the State president, Miss Ann Lynch, present her message to the group.

Her message, entitled "What Does Your Mirror Reflect?" was a most inspiring and enlightening one and certainly reflected to the audience the type organization this is. To me it is one that does more to promote good citizenship than any I know.

The address follows:

WHAT DOES YOUR MIRROR REFLECT?

(By Ann Lynch)

Ever so often it is well that an organization such as the Future Homemakers of America take a look at ourselves—past, present, and future. And just as important is the image which your mirror reflects as an individual FHA member.

Let us look back for a moment into our history. It was in March of 1944 that home economics leaders from 29 States met in Chicago to develop plans for our national organization. As long as 25 years before, there had existed various State and local clubs of high school homemaking students, known by different names and functioning under various plans. In June of 1944, the American Home Economics Association and the Home Economics Branch of the U.S. Office of Education became cosponsors of our organization. In 1945, Texas joined six other States to become a charter member of the Future Homemakers of America; and in July of 1948, a Texas delegation attended our first national convention, held in Kansas City.

By that time, 42 States had a membership of almost 100,000 homemaking students. As of last July, 50 States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia, with 521,126 members in 10,466 chapters, sent delegates to the 14th annual meeting held in Salt Lake City.

In this same period of 17 years, the Future Homemakers of Texas has grown to include 60,000 members in 1,200 chapters. So never let it be said that FHA is not living up to Texas tradition and reputation.

Much of this growth has been due to organization and purposeful planning. Our four national objectives for the next 3 years are pertiment to the needs of today's youth. Indeed, they are geared to the overall goal of FHA members—helping individuals to improve personal, family, and community living now and in the future. Just so, these objectives are personalized; that is, they are geared to fit every individual FHA member. They are a guidepost to your own growth into maturity. Herein, I believe, lies the greatest value of FHA.

Let us explore "Discovering Myself and My Worth to Others." You and I are in that period of our lives in which we are supposed to grow into adults. As we have grown physically, we have gradually increased our mental and emotional stature. Because social acceptance is important to both teenagers and adults, growing up socially becomes important; and we must learn to recognize the signs by which social maturity is judged.

What I want to say to you now is keyed to meeting the challenge of growing up. We have heard much discussion on the value of developing our individual personalities. I should like to say that we do not have a personality; we are a personality. Just so, a philosophy is more than thinking about life; it is the way we act about life. People judge other people by the way they look, by the way they talk, and the way they act. I do not believe that teen years are merely a waiting period for the time when we become adults. I believe that it takes lots of practice and purpose to achieve maturity. By this, I mean our ability to get along with people, to work with others democratically, to accept and adjust to the rules and laws of the group of which we are a part, and to make contributions to the world about us. I think it is well to remember that popularity does not always go hand in hand with character. I believe that every mature person owes society a debt of loyalty and truth.

The Reverend Roy Sherrod, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Waco, told a recent group meeting of the PTA's of that city that insecurity is a dominant characteristic of today's teenager. He went on to say that this insecurity manifests itself either in hostility or frustration. Not being able to recognize what we believe in promotes this insecurity.

Our members bring numerous and varied problems to our organization—from how to maintain individuality to questions on honesty and religion. There is no one answer for any of these problems. Each FHA member must determine what is right for her, but we all are encouraged to do so through discussion, and sharing. Problems identified by local chapters seem to indicate that Texas FHAers basically value self-discipline, responsibility, honesty, respect for the individual, independence, belonging to the group, and religion. We are learning to realize the importance of values in making decisions—and we are learning to recognize what we believe in.

Our second objective is "Contributing to the Joys and Satisfactions of Family Living." Here, we are exploring how relationships among family members affect the stability of the family. We are developing ways to show appreciation to family members. We are analyzing ourselves when we fail to communicate with our parents. May I quote the following statistics: There are today 21 million teenagers in the United States. Thirty-five percent of the boys and 22 percent of the girls work part time. Teenagers spend $14 million per year. Six million under 19 have drivers' licenses. Sixty-nine percent have no idea what preparation they should be making for college entrance or what vocation they plan to follow. Forty-nine percent of last year's brides were teenagers.

The 60,000 FHA members in Texas are faced with a dual responsibility as we work toward achieving this second objective. We need to find ways of contributing to the joys and satisfactions of our families today, and we need to gain an understanding of the skills and attitudes that will help us as homemakers in the future. This objective seems highly appropriate for a group whose overall goal is to help individuals improve personal, family, and community living.

The word "home" is bigger than the duties of a homemaker. Home is the people who live in it. It is important for you and me to look at ourselves as family members today and as members of homes of our own making in the not-too-distant future.

Let us look at our third objective, "Strengthening My Education for Future Roles." It has been said that man's mind is his richest resource. It is estimated that knowledge doubles every 15 years. At this speed, it is essential that we gain an education to become useful members of society, for each of us has something to give. Modern women actually lead three lives: homemaker, wage earner, and community servant. Did you know that today one-third of all women in America are wage earners? And that 55 percent of these wage earners are married? Ninety percent of today's FHA members will use homemaking in their own homes.

What is the role played by today's homemaker? In a changing America, whose very roots will always be in the home, this role has taken on increased magnitude. If our homes are to remain strong and fulfill their growing obligation, today's homemaker must be a mathematician and budget maker, personnel manager, banker, politician, dietitian, fashion designer, interior decorator, nurse, landscape artist, engineer, teacher, and spiritual leader.

Is there a more important, more demanding career or combination of careers for today's American woman?

Whether you become a homemaker, whether you choose a professional career without marriage, or whether you combine the two, living to the fullest today requires education and intellectual curiosity. It is impossible to achieve mental, emotional, and social maturity without knowledge and the ability to excel in at least one line of endeavor. Does your mirror reflect a growing resource here?

One writer has said that teenagers face three challenges in growing up. The first is attaining a mature relationship with the opposite sex. Second, we must become independent from our parents and family. Third, we must choose and prepare for a vocation and assume our responsibilities as citizens.

So we approach our fourth objective, "Launching Good Citizenship." I shall not soon forget the words of Dr. Walter Kerr at his giant youth rally in Dallas last October. Dr. Kerr spent several months last year in Europe and the Far East, speaking to youth groups. It was natural that he should be asked many things about today's American teenagers. Dr. Kerr said that the youth of these countries think of us as selfish, spoiled, and lazy, with an abundance of material possession—and the gift of having been born in America, a magic word. You and I are sometimes branded by our own adults as cynical, selfish, and lacking in patriotism and responsibility. They say that we are rushing into teenager marriages because we are insecure. That we have lowered our moral standards. That we are replacing honesty and integrity with cheating, in school and out. That we have no interest in God.

I do not know to what extent these things are true. But why should you and I fail to train our minds and our bodies? Why can we not accept material possessions and use them to advantage? Why do we cheat ourselves by lowering our morals? Why are we ashamed of patriotism? And why do we hide our faith in God? We are of God, His own creation.

You and I have been given the heritage of America's past; and whether we are ready or not, our country's future has been given to us as our obligation. This I know.

And this I also know. Perhaps today is the time when you and I need to look into our own personal mirrors. I think each of us will find one thing there—a sense of direction which has become our gift through membership in the Future Homemakers of America.

Employ the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Mr. E. B. Whitten, formerly the State director of vocational rehabilitation in Mississippi and now the very able and devoted executive director of the National Rehabilitation Association.

This address by Mr. Whitten was delivered on May 10, 1963 at the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. The Committee, under the chairmanship of Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, provides a year-round national public information and education program, in cooperation with public and private groups to encourage and facilitate the hiring of properly qualified handicapped persons.

Approximately 3,000 community leaders, professionals, employers, members of Governors' and community committees, officials of State employment services, and Federal and State rehabilitation agencies, and others from every State in the Union were in attendance at the May 9–10 meeting. The effect of automation on employment of the handicapped, the problems of workmen's compensation as they relate to the handicapped, progress made by government and private industry in employing persons with severe disabilities, and the outlook for the mentally handicapped were among the subjects discussed.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REHABILITATION AND WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

(Address by E. B. Whitten)

Mississippi was the last State in the Union to have a workmen's compensation act. It was passed in 1948 while I was serving as State director of vocational rehabilitation. Many people wondered how the bitterness and recriminations of long years were so suddenly resolved. I believe it was because for the first time all of the groups concerned with workmen's compensation legislation began thinking at least in part about rehabilitation. The emphasis upon the need of injured workers to be rehabilitated served as a catalyst around which previously contesting groups could resolve their differences and agree upon what is considered, I think, one of the best workmen's compensation laws in the Nation.

All too frequently, even in 1963, discussions of workmen's compensation break up in arguments in which suspicion and vested interest play a major part. We believe that this is usually because discussants start out on emphasizing their differences rather than their agreements. This conclusion was justified by experience in the National Institute on Rehabilitation and Workmen's Compensation conducted in the summer of 1962 under the sponsorship of the National Rehabilitation Association, International Association of Industrial Accident Boards and Commissions, and Group Health Association of America, through the National Institute on Rehabilitation and Health Services. This institute brought together over 100 individuals from the fields of workmen's compensation administration, vocational rehabilitation, business, labor, medicine, and insurance. A more distinguished group of experts on workmen's compensation has probably never assembled in this country. These were strong minded men and women, approaching the problems of workmen's compensation and rehabilitation from different viewpoints, but all of them believed in the rehabilitation principle and all of them wanted to see the injured worker get a fair break, a real opportunity to make a comeback.

This institute was a most enlightening experience. Instead of breaking down on the differences in viewpoint, the institute found that representatives of all the varying groups shared many common viewpoints with respect to the direction which workmen's compensation and rehabilitation must take in the years ahead. In fact, there were no major areas of difference found with respect to many important approaches that can be made to assure much greater emphasis upon rehabilitation in the workmen's compensation process. By emphasizing major areas of agreement, rather than disagreement, a strong and invigorating report was prepared. It is about ready for release, being edited by Dr. Monroe Berkowitz of Rutgers University. This report will be used as a basis for much I have to say. I shall not often quote it directly, but I urge all who hear this talk to get a copy of the report as soon as it is available. It will no doubt be considered one of the most authoritative pieces of literature in the workmen's compensation-rehabilitation field.

REHABILITATION

In the past, when we have considered workmen's compensation and rehabilitation, I am constrained to believe that we have put all of our emphasis upon workmen's compensation, usually upon its deficiencies, and not enough upon rehabilitation. It should be axiomatic that if injured workers are to receive maximum rehabilitation benefits, regardless of the adequacies or inadequacies of workmen's compensation, rehabilitation opportunities must be available in the communities where the injured workers live. This means there must be a well-administered, well-staffed, and well-financed division of vocational rehabilitation capable of providing rehabilitation services to injured workers when the need for such services first appear. It means that these agencies must be liberal in their philosophy of service, flexible in their approach to meeting the needs of the handicapped individuals, and anxious to cooperate with workmen's compensation agencies in working out the multitude of problems that may serve as a barrier to cooperative effort.

In addition, the community must have the facilities in which vocational rehabilitation services can be provided. This means comprehensive rehabilitation centers providing a coordinated professional approach to the solution of problems brought about by disability. It means specialized rehabilitation facilities capable of meeting the specific needs of certain categories of the disabled. Among these are amputee clinics, speech and hearing centers, visual aid clinics, and so forth. For many injured workers there must be workshops in which they can be trained or retrained to perform the functions required in employment. In some instances, these workshops will have to provide extended employment for those who shall not be quickly able to return to open employment. These specified rehabilitation services and facilities will, of course, supplement a broad spectrum of health, welfare, and educational services which are required in every community. There remains much to be done by rehabilitation agencies, public and voluntary, to prepare themselves for doing the complete job that they will be required to do.

Let us now turn to consideration of workmen's compensation. It shall not be possible in the brief time alloted to me, to make any detailed analysis of problems confronted by workmen's compensation agencies in providing services to injured workers. Neither will it be possible for me to enumerate in great detail all of the recommendations made by the Institute on Rehabilitation and Workmen's Compensation for the solution or partial solution of these problems. I shall endeavor, however, to point out some of the elements which practically all appear to agree are essential reforms that must be undertaken by workmen's compensation agencies, if they are to properly serve injured workers for whom they have responsibility.

BROAD RESPONSIBILITY

In the first place, we shall discuss some general considerations. It should not be necessary to say it, but I believe it is, that workmen's compensation agencies must accept to a greater degree the total responsibility for the welfare of the injured worker. Workmen's compensation agencies have responsibility for disseminating information about workmen's compensation programs, for enforcing coverage in insurance requirements, for supervising claim settlements, for supervising medical and rehabilitation provisions, for promoting safety, and for collecting and analyzing data relative to injuries. It is a cause for concern that many workmen's compensation agencies fall far short of accepting these broad responsibilities.

In the realm of uncontested cases, workmen's compensation administrators appear to have abandoned administrative responsibility. In the realm of contested claims, they are cast in the role of adjudicators. Neither role appears to allow much leeway for seeing that workers receive prompt and adequate medical care and effective rehabilitation services. Until workmen's compensation agencies have accepted responsibility for the broad program envisioned in this paragraph, they cannot be expected to make much contribution toward assuring the rehabilitation of the injured workers.

PERSONNEL

In the next place, much needs to be done to assure that workmen's compensation agencies will have the type of personnel that is needed to do the kind of job we are trying to describe. Personnel must be adequate and must be adequately compensated. There must be reasonable tenure for employees. In connection with rehabilitation, well trained employees must be given specific responsibilities in the rehabilitation field. Much has been said about the rapid turnover of personnel in workmen's compensation agencies. Many people seem to take for granted that workmens compensation commissioners and administrators must be political appointees, serving at the whim of State Governors, and moving on when Governors change or at least when party control changes. I refuse to accept the viewpoint that this must always be so. This situation does not exist for many State officials whose responsibilities are no more professional in nature than those of administering workmen's compensation. We believe that a determined effort could result in reforms in many of our States. There is much that can be done, however, even if the top administration countinues to be political. In fact, it is more important than ever that something else be done. There must be a hard core of professional employees in medical and related fields, with high qualifications for employment and with adequate compensation and reasonable tenure in office. If such a corps of professional workers is developed, it can do much to overcome the weaknesses imposed by political top administration.

STATUTORY LIMITATIONS

It is generally agreed that in many States statutory limitations constitute a recognizable barrier to the provision of rehabilitation services. Most important are statutory limitations which flow from medical care provisions, the time limitations on the filing of claims, and the problems arising from the operation of subsequent injury funds.

Many jurisdictions do not yet provide for unlimited medical benefits. Because of the importance of adequate medical services, most people can agree that full and adequate medical services should be provided under workmen's compensation laws. There may be many reasons for this; certainly, effective rehabilitation services depend to a large extent upon the adequacy of this provision. It is also felt that rehabilitation of the injured worker will be enhanced if time limitations in the filing of claims does not begin to run until the employee has knowledge of the disability and its relation to his job. There is no question that a good subsequent injury fund law encourages the employment of handicapped workers, or at least removes the obstacles which workmen's compensation laws themselves have posed to the employment of the handicapped. Present subsequent injury fund laws vary greatly from State to State. It is evident that the "hand, foot, eye" type of subsequent injury fund is not sufficient. It is generally agreed that subsequent injury provisions should assure broad coverage, and adequate financing. It is also generally agreed that there must be much better understanding on the part of the employers of the nature and use of second injury laws. Workmen's compensation commissions share with other organizations in the community the responsibility for the dissemination of such information.

LITIGATION

Experts in the workmens compensation field do not find it difficult to agree that litigation can be a serious barrier to the rehabilitation of the injured worker. Designed to avoid the inequities and litigiousness under the system of common law and employer liability, these programs lack much in achieving this end. The largest number of controversial issues relate to whether or not the accident arose in the course of employment and the cause and relationship between the alleged accident and existing disability. The second broad category relates to the nature and extent of the disability, ranging from such questions as to whether any disability exists at all, to rather fine distinctions between total and partial disability.

There is a general feeling among students in workmens compensation fields that lack of supervision and protection offered by the administrative agencies is an important reason for excessive litigation. When agencies themselves do not assume the supervisory role, workers turn to lawyers and legal contests to insure that they receive what is due them under the statute. If payment for services is uncertain and liability has been contested, then services of a nonemergency nature will be delayed until the question of liability has been resolved. Rehabilitation experts have always recognized that the process of rehabilitation is most successful when it starts early in the course of disability. The second deterrent which litigation poses for rehabilitation is that the context of medical care becomes forensic rather than clinical. There is a tendency for diagnosis, therapy, and prognosis to be formulated with the future hearing in mind rather than the return of the claimant to productive employment. A third deterrent is the litigation may encourage the claimant to demonstrate the maximum amount of dependency if the claim is adjudicated, thus creating attitudes on the part of both claimant and employer which militate against reemployment.

Several recommendations are being made in an effort to overcome the deenergizing effect of litigation on the rehabilitation process. It is recommended, for instance, that rehabilitation should commence immediately without reference to the eventual fixing of liability, if a "color of right" appears. To make this practical, it is thought necessary that a fund be established, supported by Government appropriations, which will provide for initial payment for medical and rehabilitation services in cases where there is controversy. The employer, or carrier, if eventually held liable, should reimburse the fund for expenditures made on behalf of the worker. There is also general agreement that no disability should be finally rated until after workmens compensation agencies find that the worker has achieved maximum rehabilitation. It is also felt important that no lump sum settlements should be allowed, and no individual shall be allowed to compromise his rights to full medical care under a compromise and release settlement, unless the workmens compensation agency approves such a settlement on the advice of the State vocational rehabilitation agency or the rehabilitation unit within the compensation agency.

STRUCTURAL BENEFITS

It is also possible that cash benefits can be so structured as to provide additional incentives for rehabilitation. As this audience knows, three schools of thought have emerged in regard to the criteria of the workers loss, the measurement of the loss and the compensation for it. These are known respectively as the whole man theory, the loss of earning capacity theory and actual wage loss theory. It is generally agreed that whatever criteria is used in a jurisdiction, the real problems in structuring cash benefits to provide incentives for rehabilitation lie in the area of permanent partial disability awards. It is not felt that these should be eliminated but rather that an attempt should be made to minimize whatever obstacles to rehabilitation are inherent in the practice of making these awards. Earl Cheit, in a paper entitled "Compensation Permanent Disability" which was based on excerpts from his volume, "Injury and Recovery in the Course of Employment," suggests that a disabled worker be rated in 1 of 8 or 10 groups, each spanning approximately 10 percent rated capacity. Once the worker is rated within one of these groups he becomes entitled to two types of benefits; one, an indemnity benefit the size of which would increase with each disability category to be paid in the conventional manner; and, second, an incentive insurance to help guarantee his reemployment, the duration of which would increase with the seriousness of the injury. In this connection, the reemployment insurance would simply provide that any employer who does not rehire a permanently disabled worker after his condition is rated stationary, becomes liable for a sum equal to the employees cash benefit, and this liability cannot be passed on to the carrier. The employers would be given an opportunity to show cause why they cannot discharge this responsibility.

James J. Reed, a member of the South Carolina Industrial Commission, proposes an adequate system of temporary benefits to sustain the employee during the period of healing and until maximum medical rehabilitation can be achieved. He advocates a delay in the rating of a permanent physical impairment with safeguards for the employee who has not returned to work in the interim. Other suggestions have been made.

In summary, it becomes clear that rehabilitation of injured workers will be enhanced if temporary total income benefits can be provided under statute during the entire period of rehabilitation. In addition, special living expenses and all other costs incident to the disabled workers rehabilitation should be provided. Permanent disability benefits will then be provided for anatomical loss or loss of the use of time when optimum recovery has been achieved. If there is continuing wage loss, income benefits should be provided in seriously disabled cases for the total period of disability. Consideration should also be given to incentives to the employer to encourage the rehabilitation and employment of injured workers:

SUPERVISION OF MEDICAL CARE

It has already been stated that the provision of medical care without limitation is an obvious first step in the universal provision of high quality medical services. It is necessary to go further and to say that medical services which may be authorized by law must actually be provided at the time and in the manner which best promotes the rehabilitation of the injured worker. This requires the assumption of the responsibility of supervision of medical services by workmen's compensation agencies. It is significant that representatives of all professional and economic groups can agree that this is essential. The supervision of medical services is not thought of primarily as a police function, with punitive implications directed at the small proportion of professional and other persons who may attempt to abuse the program. The major objective of supervision is the improvement of care, not the detection of offenders. The workmen's compensation agency, which has been delegated the operation of workmen's compensation under the law, must accept the responsibility of supervising the adequacy and quality of services furnished in pursuit of its legal obligations. This requires the agency to be concerned with the injured worker from the moment of accident or the onset of disease until it has satisfied itself that all possible efforts have been made to return him to gainful employment. It is recognized that there is much additional that needs to be known with respect to just how this objective can best be accomplished. Certain essential principles, however, stand out clearly. Workmen's compensation agencies must have an administrative structure that provides for adequate supervision of medical care and related services. To supervise and evaluate effectively the services provided, written standards must be developed. Machinery must be developed to enable the workmen's compensation agency to identify those cases which require special handling in order to insure complete restoration of function. The agencies must also conduct periodic medical audits in selected cases in order to obtain information on the adequacy of the care provided by the program. Supervisory responsibility of the workmen's compensation agency for an individual case must not cease with the referral of the case to another agency or with the settlement of the claim. There must be formal written agreements with the several cooperating agencies specifying such subjects as services to be provided by each agency, procedure for referral and followup and procedures for exchange of information.

Let us conclude this statement by returning to the area of rehabilitation, with which we began. In this country, medical care is the legal responsibility of the employer, whereas vocational rehabilitation, with limited exceptions, is not the employers responsibility. The latter function is the legal responsibility of the State vocational rehabilitation agencies. Although it may be anticipated that these agencies will continue to provide the definitive vocational rehabilitation services for injured workers, there certainly should be in every workmens compensation agency a rehabilitation unit among whose functions is to identify claimants who need rehabilitation services, make arrangements with other agencies for providing vocational rehabilitation services and to work with such agencies to assure that needed services are provided as promptly and effectively as possible. The provision of vocational rehabilitation services by the State rehabilitation agencies should not be construed as a substitute for the essential responsibility of the workmen's compensation agency for the rehabilitation of the injured worker. This brings up the inevitable problem of how to most effectively finance vocational rehabilitation services. Both State and Federal financial support has been increasing rapidly in recent years, and most State rehabilitation agencies are in far better position to finance adequate service than ever before. Much remains to be done, however, before it can be said that such agencies are adequately financed to provide the required services at the time such services are first needed. It is not likely that a uniform solution to this problem can be found in the present framework of operations. There appears to be no logical reason why the responsibility for vocational rehabilitation of workers with employment connected disabilities may not properly be assigned to the employer. If this is true, public funds of the State rehabilitation agencies can be looked upon as supplementary source of support, rather than the sole support. State rehabilitation agencies have the additional problem of adequate staffing to meet the needs of all of the disabled for which they are responsible. Training programs currently underway should contribute to the relief of this situation as years go by. There remains, also, a dearth of rehabilitation facilities to serve the severely handicapped, including the industrial injured. It is the communities responsibility to see that such facilities are provided. Legislative proposals now before the Congress, if enacted, may contribute substantially to the solution of this problem.

It is generally recognized that workmens compensation as a method of providing an essential social service is being severely questioned in the United States today. There are those who feel that other approaches, principally through the social security mechanism, can be more effective in assuring that the total needs of all disabled persons can be met. Relatively simple amendments to the Social Security Act could, in one sweep, remove from the workmens compensation area a high percentage of the persons who are now its responsibility. How workmens compensation agencies measure up to their responsibilities for the true rehabilitation of the injured worker may very well determine the future that such agencies have in the total pattern of social services in this country. It is a challenge that is worth our best efforts.

Clem Miller Memorial Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nature Conservancy is a nonprofit organization dedicated to the preservation of natural areas for present and future generations.

I recently received a letter from this organization, which now numbers over 6,000 members, with particular respect to a memorial fund established in honor of our late colleague, the Honorable Clem Miller.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us who had the privilege of serving with Clem will feel this is a fitting tribute to a man we admired and respected. I am including the letter so that the House will be aware of the progress of the fund.

THE NATURE CONSERVANCY,
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1963.

Hon. JEFFERY COHELAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COHELAN: Thinking of your great admiration for the late Clement

Miller, and of your support for the Point Reyes National Seashore project which meant so much to Mr. Miller, it will be gratifying to you we are sure to know that at this time the Nature Conservancy has received a total of 132 contributions to what we term the Clem Miller Memorial Fund. This amounts to $2,445. The fund will be used in the program of land acquisition for the National Seashore project, as a special and practical tribute to the statesmanship of Mr. Miller in the conservation field.

In order to make certain that you have our background let me say that the Nature Conservancy is a nenprofit membership corporation dedicated to the preservation of natural areas for present and future generations. It seeks, by gift or purchase, to acquire lands that are important for scientific, scenic or educational reasons, and to hold such places for public good. Often we fit into the natural area protection and preservation effort where no other organization is able to function effectively enough or quickly enough. The organization reaches back to 1917. Today we have approximately 6,000 members drawn from all walks of life, including scientific, professional and business fields.

About 10 percent of the lands we have acquired have been transferred to schools and universities. In some instances we act as the agent of other groups, including governmental agencies, who for one reason or another—usually the reason is lack of funds with which to act promptly when opportunity arises—in acquiring and holding properties until they can take over.

Mrs. Miller suggested the memorial fund and we are deeply honored that our organization was the one chosen to handle it. We have already entered into the Point Reyes National Seashore work in close cooperation with the Department of the Interior and National Park Service, and some of the land owners within the project, by participating in negotiations for Federal land acquisitions pending appropriation of Federal funds. We have been helping to hold land costs down in price and in getting a few of the key holdings admitted to the project.

As a constituent of yours I am well aware of your own splendid work for the Point Reyes National Seashore project, and other conservation objectives. We want to thank you for what you have done and are doing, and to give you our best encouragement for the future. Please call upon us here at home, or through our Washington, D.C. office at any time.

Cordially and sincerely,

D. F. Leonard,
Governor.

No Call for Mrs. Jimenez

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been impressed with the very timely and well written comments in the May 20, 1963, issue of the Columbia Record on the actions which have been taken by the U.S. Government against the former President of Venezuela, Mr. Marcos Perez Jimenez. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial entitled "No Call for Mrs. Jimenez" be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

No Call for Mrs. Jimenez

A brunette mother of four children sits bitterly in her Miami Beach home today. Her husband sits alone in a jail cell, where he was placed last December 12 by a Federal court order. Soon, he may be ordered back to Venezuela where he will be killed.

The telephone does not ring, with a long-distance operator saying, "We have a call from the White House." And President Kennedy does not say, "We understand your heartache, Mrs. Jimenez, and in the spirit of American justice, I've arranged for American reporters to talk to your husband."

No. The telephone does not ring, although the President has been known to call the wives of imprisoned men.

But Mrs. Jimenez called in reporters last week, breaking a self-imposed silence of half a year. "Your Government has denied the general the privilege of speaking to the press," she said. "So as he sits alone in a jail cell, I will speak for him."

She accused the U.S. Government of signing her husband's "death warrant" if it sends him back home next month. The reporters present knew she was right.

She pointed out that in 1954 President Eisenhower had given her pudgy, balding husband the Legion of Merit. "This was for his backing of the United States in its Latin American problems, and for the fact that the General always protected the rights and property of U.S. citizens in Venezuela."

She didn't quote other sections of the citation. She should have. It read:

"His Excellency Col. Marcos Perez Jimenez, in his position as President of the Republic of Venezuela, as well as prior to his assumption of that office, has shown an outstanding spirit of mutual aid and friendship toward the United States. His healthy policy in economic and financial matters has facilitated the extension of foreign investments his administration thus contributing to the greater welfare of his country and the rapid development of his immense natural resources.

"This policy, carefully combined with public works programs of far reach, has accomplished notable improvements in education, health, transportation, housing, and other important basic necessities. The total program has raised the general well-being of the Venezuelan people. Furthermore, his indefatigable energy and firmness of purpose has greatly increased the capacity of the armed forces of Venezuela for participation in the collective defense of the Western Hemisphere. The measure taken under his direction to prepare for the 10th Inter-American Conference, in Caracas, constituted a decisive determining factor towards its success. His constant vigilance before the problem of Communist infiltration has kept his government alert for the removal of the menace existing against his own country and the rest of the Americas; in addition, his recognition of the similarity of interests shared by the United States and Venezuela has permitted their traditionally cordial mutual relations to grow to the point where today they are stronger than ever."

Fighting back the tears, Mrs. Jimenez bit her lips and added: "Now your Government has taken a violent action by jailing him * * * how can this happen in America?"

Nearby stood the youngest of her children, 6-year-old Flor. "It tears my heart," she said, "to have little Flor see her father sitting there in jail. She has repeatedly asked the sergeant, 'When are you going to let my father go?'"

When? If the Kennedy administration has its way, after a 25-day grace period to allow Jimenez to appeal from a Supreme Court decision, he will be "let go" to Venezuela—and certain death.

Extradition and execution of Jimenez, the State Department feels, will improve relations with Romulo Betancourt.

Extradition will constitute a precedent-shattering reversal of policy of political asylum. When Jimenez sought the hospitality and protection of this country, he should have been refused the sanctity—if that had been the judgment of Washington. Having been extended asylum, he should not be ordered back to Venezuela.

He probably will go to his death, however. And Mrs. Jimenez, as she sits in her Florida home, must not expect the telephone to jangle with a compassionate President on the other end.

City of Hartford Adopts Resolution in Support of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, many of us in the House of Representatives have been concerned for some time by developments in the Middle East. The recent statements by some statesmen and by official outlets have breathed aggression into the air. The sensitive nature of the relations between the comparatively new State of Israel and her neighbors is well recognized.

I have discussed this problem with the State Department and brought my views to their attention. It should be noted that the Common Council of Hartford has also discussed this matter and passed a resolution which has added the voice of this body to the warnings which have been expressed on this problem, and I offer the text of the resolution for publication in the Record:

Hartford, Conn.,
May 14, 1963.

This is to certify that at a meeting of the court of common council, May 13, 1963, the following resolution was passed.

"Whereas the State of Israel is the only democratic government in the Middle East, and

"Whereas there have always been close ties between the people of the United States and the people of Israel, and

"Whereas the new Arab federation has officially declared that it intends to destroy the State of Israel: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the court of common council of the City of Hartford hereby expresses its support for the State of Israel and calls upon the President of the United States, Congress, and the State Department—

"(a) To make known to the Arab States that the security and independence of the State of Israel is a part of the foreign policy of the United States;

"(b) To take positive action to bring a halt to the arms race in the Middle East; and

"(c) To take the initiative in bringing the Arab States and Israel together at the peace table, and that copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Senator Abraham A. Ribicoff, Congressman Emilio Q. Daddario, and Congressman Bernard Grabowski."

Robert D. Delaney,
Deputy City Clerk.

Address of Hon. Victor L. Anfuso at Kings Point Maritime Association Dinner on May 9, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, just yesterday, Palmiro Togliatti, secretary general of the Italian Communist Party, threatened that nation with agitations, riots, and possible bloodshed if another center-left government were formed, which would evidently be a move to isolate the Italian Communist Party. This action was predicted in a speech by the Honorable Victor L. Anfuso at the Kings Point Maritime Association dinner in his honor on May 9, 1963, and under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his speech:

SPEECH OF HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO AT KINGS POINT MARITIME ASSOCIATION DINNER IN HIS HONOR AT THE HOTEL ASTOR, MAY 9, 1963

Harold, I hardly recognized myself after that very fine introduction. But let me return it in kind—this dinner would never have been the success that it is without you. The U.S. merchant marine and the association of which you are president owe you a great debt of gratitude. As a matter of fact this dinner should not have been tendered to me, it should have been tendered to you for your self-sacrifice on behalf of the boys of the academy. From now on I am going to call you "Mr. Merchant Marine." Now before I say what I want to say this evening I should like to make some very brief observations regarding the merchant marine.

The loss of the *Thresher* recently focused attention upon the sea and the ships and the men who sail them. Without the merchant marine, the Navy, the Army, and the Air Force would never have been able to accomplish their missions.

One of the most heroic feats I can remember was during the Normandy invasion when 1,000 merchant seamen volunteered to take crippled merchant vessels to Normandy where they were deliberately sunk in order to form the foundation for emergency harbors and break-water piers for the landing troops. All this was done under heavy shelling by enemy shore batteries.

I believe in a strong merchant marine in times of peace and in war. I strongly believe in this academy which is producing these men who go to sea and that they should receive all of the benefits that are accorded to other academies. Second-class citizenship in our services is just as bad as second-class citizenship in our political life.

And Franklin, I can't tell you how grateful I am for accepting my invitation to be the guest speaker here tonight. You and I have been friends for many years, worked together for the things we both believe in. Your job has been more difficult than mine, however, because you are the son of the greatest President that has ever served these United States and therefore a lot more was demanded of you. I well remember when we served together in Congress how you were called to speak in every distant city in the Nation because you were Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Jr. You answered all of these calls and satisfied your audiences but your critics, who were also the critics of your father, instead of giving you credit made the most dastardly attacks upon you. But that's all over now. Today you've come back on your own and from where I stand you look mighty good to me. There's no stopping you now, F.D.R.

Ladies and gentlemen since I have occupied this lofty position of a Supreme Court justice I've often been asked am I really happy? Do I miss Washington? Of course I like my position—who wouldn't. But I also miss Washington. I've never been one to stand still while an injustice was being committed against my fellow man.

Now as a justice of the Supreme Court I read assiduously what's going on in the Congress and elsewhere in the world. I don't like many of the things that are happening and I wish I was back again lending a helping hand to strengthen our Democratic forces in the fight against a calculating enemy which is working day and night in its aim to destroy us.

I'm convinced that we cannot win this battle by having a greater number of intercontinental or intermediate ballistic missiles alone. The real struggle throughout the world is an ideological one. If we wish to win this struggle, we must fight for the equality of man be he white, yellow, or black. It's a shame that some of our leaders have not as yet recognized this world movement to attain human dignity for all peoples. This world will never be really free until we do. There can be no distinction between justice for the whites and justice for the Negroes—or yellow people—for that matter—on the calendar.

Another thing we must fight for, which we are neglecting of late, is religious freedom and against the persecution of any people because of the way they worship God. I am a Catholic but I love my Jewish and Protestant neighbors because they believe in a Supreme Being. I guess more than anything else my experience on the space committee convinced me of this. Here we are trying to conquer the Moon and settle on other planets. I don't know how many decades or scores of years it will take for us to do that. But if it took us a million years we will never duplicate what God has already created—the universe itself.

It is my firm belief that as Christians and Jews we must fight with deeds and not words those who believe that there is no God and that man is supreme on earth. This was the thinking of the Kaiser, Hitler, Mussolini, and is now the thinking Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung. On this issue between the believers and the nonbelievers we cannot lose if we follow God's principle of equal justice for all. And we don't need intercontinental and intermediate ballistic missiles to do it. A fight for principle in my opinion is more potent than any hydrogen or atomic bomb.

When you come right down to it what we are really seeking in this country and elsewhere in the world is a better life. I like to call this a movement toward the center—away from the selfishness and greed and the extreme rightists and away from the Godlessness and myth of the extreme leftists. I don't care what you call the extreme rightists—whether you call them land barons, capitalists, plutocrats or anything else—the fact is that they have been hard giver-uppers. They want to keep everything for themselves. This has formed fertile grounds for the extreme leftists who promise the subjugated peoples of the world the things that every man and woman longs for—their own piece of land, their own homes, better working conditions, health benefits, education, etc. The Communists have scored victory after victory throughout the world because of this approach even in strong religious countries.

The best example I can give of this is Italy. But before talking about Italy, I'd like to pause a bit and welcome for the first time in the United States—at least at a public function—the new Consul General of the Republic of Italy—the Marquis Vittorio Cordero di Montezémolo.

Italy today has the largest and strongest Communist Party outside of Russia. I recall the many talks I had after World War II with Degasperi, its first prime minister under the Republic and later with his successor Fanfani. We discussed this great vacuum in the center which needed to be filled. I told Fanfani when he was Secretary General of the Demo-Christian Party, before he came here in 1956, "Why don't you do what F.D.R. did in this country when he became president in 1932? At that time our farmers and working people in the cities were having the same trouble with the hard giver-uppers. Many of you will recall that the Socialist Party formed a threat at that time. For example, social security, minimum wages and many other humane benefits were first in the platform of the Socialist Party. What did F.D.R. do? He adopted this platform of the Socialist Party, made it the platform of the Democratic Party and actually brought these benefits into being. This spelled the end of the Socialist Party in this country. In Italy, I suggested, you can do the same thing." Fanfani tried it and was successful. Whereas a coalition government used to rule the country by a bare 3 vote majority, he was able to win by more than a 125-majority vote. But now, in this last election in Italy, made a violent and very expensive campaign against this movement toward the center, toward the creation of a happy middle class. The result: Confusion among the voters with the Communists gaining an extra 1 million votes. I knew this was going to happen following my talks last year with Fanfani and the new Secretary General of the Demo-Christian Party, Signor Aldo Moro. Mr. Moro was well aware of the split within the Demo-Christian Party and its resulting consequences. He gave me a priceless letter which I showed to responsible people in Washington. It is very likely that either Mr. Fanfani or Mr. Moro will be called upon to form a new cabinet. I hope that whoever gets this assignment that he will succeed in bringing an F.D.R. type of democracy in Italy.

After all, my friends, Italy's Republic is only 15 years old. It already has made the greatest advances in all of Europe and has proven itself to be our greatest ally, in spite of the fact that it has been made the center of attack in Europe by Communist ingenuity and plenty of money.

Some time in the future, my friends, I hope to be able to tell you of the plans I had for NATO, SEATO, Cuba, Haiti, Uruguay, Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, and all Latin America.

So you say to me—what's new? How do you like being a supreme court justice and I say I like it fine—but I still miss Washington.

Power Empire Signs Reemerge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, it has been apparent for the last 2 or more years that there is a real struggle between the Federal Government, the Rural Electrification Administration, and investor-owned public utilities for the control of power in the Nation. It is also quite apparent that through the various systems of distribution of electric power generated in the tremendous lignite coal fields of North Dakota, the Federal authorities are attempting to take control of the national distribution of power away from the REA as well as from the investor-owned companies.

An editorial in the Bismarck Tribune, Bismarck, N. Dak., for May 20, points out some of the factors involved in the dispute over who is to own and operate the distribution of this electricity. This editorial points out the feeling of the unbiased people who are living in the midst of this power struggle.

I therefore include this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

POWER EMPIRE SIGNS REEMERGE

Partially forgotten suspicions that the Kennedy administration is seeking to construct a huge public power empire in this region have been revived.

First, there was the reported denial of a loan to a northern Minnesota cooperative, called United Power Association, to build a generating plant near Stanton.

Rural Electric Administration rejection of the United Power loan is credited by many to oblique intervention by Basin Electric, which already has a loan for a plant at Stanton and would like to supply power to United.

When United Electric made its loan application, Basin interposed an invitation to United to forget its own plans and throw in with Basin. But United Power, determined to provide the cheapest possible power to its customers, wasn't about to let itself be swallowed up in any such arrangement.

The indications are, however, that United Power's independence doesn't fit into the grandiose public power scheme cooked up by Interior Secretary Udall's underlings. So United's leaders are turning to nongovernmental sources for a loan, with good hopes of getting it.

Now Minnkota Power Cooperative, an eastern North Dakota and western Minnesota generating and transmission group, has been denied a $3½ million REA loan to improve and expand its facilities.

But theres' a strong hint that Minnkota could get the loan if it cast its lot with Basin.

All this could be an extension of the same power play that killed a North Dakota combine, Lignite Electric, which was denied a Federal loan about the same time that Basin Electric got one.

There is nothing in Federal law that says that only one giant powerplant, owned and controlled by one outfit, must generate all the power to be supplied to all cooperatives in the North Central States. But this seems to be the objective of the Kennedy administration power empire builders.

REA Chief Norman Clapp, with Mr. Udall cooperating as needed, appears to be revising REA loan criteria, and interpreting them, to fit his ambitions for Basin as each new proposal in the region arises.

The idea that REA might loan money to build another generating unit near Stanton if that unit is a Basin unit, but won't if it isn't a part of the Basin system, doesn't square at all with long-established REA philosophy and policy.

Basin should be wished all success; but the fact of its existence should not be permitted to foreclose all opportunity for others who desire to serve themselves.

Ernie Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, sports lovers everywhere were saddened this weekend by the untimely death of the brilliant halfback, Ernie Davis. Along with the rest of Cleveland football fans, my family and I followed his amazing record on the playing field for Syracuse University and welcomed the prospect of his bringing his skill to the Cleveland Browns. My sons are particularly proud of the autographs he gave them.

For 13 months Ernie fought a quiet, courageous battle against leukemia, marking a place for himself in our memories far beyond the great sportsmanship and ability he demonstrated in football. I am pleased to learn that the Browns have proposed establishment of the Ernie Davis Foundation for Leukemia Research. His mother, Mrs. Arthur Radford of Elmira, N.Y., has asked that in lieu of flowers for the funeral, contributions be sent for the foundation to Western Reserve University research center.

The feeling we in Cleveland have about Ernie Davis is summed up in the following tributes from the Cleveland Plain Dealer and Cleveland Press:

[From the Plain Dealer, May 19, 1963]

WHAT WE KNOW ABOUT ERNIE DAVIS

Ernie Davis might have been one of the greatest professional football halfbacks in game's history. He might have been a failure, because the pro game is not the same as college football where Ernie won all the top prizes. It often happens that a standout collegian is no star in football's paid ranks.

We never will know this about Ernie because the leukemia which struck him down last summer resulted in his death early yesterday. The former Syracuse University star, first Negro to win the coveted Heisman Award, never had the chance to wear a Cleveland Browns' uniform.

But we do know something about Ernie Davis. He appeared at banquets and events around town where his presence had been requested. He was a fine-looking young man, well-dressed, pleasant but quiet. His superb body, trained by the demands of sports competition since his youth, retained its outward appearance of grace and strength.

Davis, as he knew and as his friends and his audiences knew, was living on borrowed time. But there was a wonderful sort of brushoff given the knowledge of the impending tragedy. Ernie Davis faced up to his losing battle with cancer but he didn't let it interfere with the realization there were other things in this world than his illness.

All credit to the Browns for the considerate, wise way they handled the Davis affair. While neither they, nor we, nor the public ever will know if Ernie could have made the grade on the pro field, we do know something about Ernie Davis. He was a real man.

[From the Cleveland Press, May 20, 1963]

ERNIE DAVIS

Cleveland area football fans never really got to know Ernie Davis. Leukemia prevented his making the Browns' lineup last fall, and now he is dead.

Thoughts turn to the mother of this great athlete, who won so many honors while playing at Syracuse. She was widowed when he was a little boy, had to go to work. She was tremendously proud of this son who seemed certain to become an outstanding professional football star.

Suddenly, at the age of 23, he is dead—his life's bright promise unfulfilled. His mother, now Mrs. Arthur Radford, will need all the courage and sympathy her relatives and friends can offer to support her in the days ahead.

It would be a splendid thing if a memorial—perhaps a scholarship fund—could be established in Ernie Davis' name, to help other young men fulfill future promise—something this tragic young man was not permitted to do.

We've Got a Lot To Learn About Living Here on Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Mr. Jack Lemmon, manager of the Santa Rosa, N. Mex., Chamber of Commerce, has long been an outstanding and respected member of the business community of Santa Rosa. On May 16, 1963, some very astute observations by Mr. Lemmon appeared in the Santa Rosa News, which I feel warrant consideration by all responsible citizens.

The observations follow:

WE'VE GOT A LOT TO LEARN ABOUT LIVING HERE ON EARTH

What an age of paradoxes we live in. Race riots in the South are in progress at the very moment we are completing preparations for orbiting a man around the earth.

Imagine the teamwork it takes to place a man in orbit and imagine the lack of tolerance it takes to become involved in a race riot. Americans in both cases. In the first, demonstrating their great sophistication and ability in working together for progress. In the second, demonstrating their ability to band together for the degradation of the dignity of fellow Americans.

What mixed emotions these two accomplishments produce in us all. Pride and shame, joy and sorrow, and envy and sympathy.

When I think of the man in space, I almost burst my shirt buttons with pride at being an American. When I think about the race riots, I shrink down just a little. I'm not at all sure that I'd like to try explaining to the rest of the world just how this sort of thing can come about in America.

I'm not saying that I'm ashamed of being an American. I'm just saying that I feel a little embarrassed and dismayed that Americans could become involved in anything as debasing and uncivilized as a race riot.

To me, it's simply incredible that men could become bent on mayhem solely because of the pigmentation of another man's skin. White, black, red, yellow, or even purple, it makes no sense.

Seems like even though we can orbit a man in space, we've still got an awful lot to learn about living here on earth.

A Golden Fiscal Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year the Kennedy economists advised the Nation that because the economy was in such bad condition we needed to increase Federal spending so as to stimulate economic activity. Now they are telling us the economy is much improved and things look pretty good after all. But we find no corresponding change in the Kennedy pressures for more spending and for a planned budget deficit. The opportunity now presented to the President is spelled out in the following article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of May 22, 1963:

A GOLDEN FISCAL OPPORTUNITY: RISING ECONOMY IS CALLED A RARE CHANCE FOR PRESIDENT TO TRIM BUDGET AND DEFICIT

(By Richard Wilson)

If President Kennedy were to follow his own formula of dynamic, and adjustable, leadership he would go before Congress and say something like this:

"When I last addressed you in January, conditions were different than today. We could not then foresee clearly the rising strength of the economy. It is, in any case, difficult, to peer 18 months into the future as we must do in the formulation of a Federal budget.

"We see now, however, a heartening rise in most of the reliable business indicators on a scale likely to carry well into next year if not beyond.

"I saw in January, as I see now, the necessity of a general reduction in taxation to release the brake on economic growth.

"But the improved economic outlook no longer justifies a rate of Federal spending to produce a $12 billion deficit as a spur for increased economic activity.

"It is still relatively early in the congressional session. Action has not been taken on most of the appropriation bills. I believe that the Congress would be justified in cutting on the average of 5 to 10 percent from the original budget submissions except in those areas where the Federal Government has fixed obligations."

Unfortunately, there is no sign that Mr. Kennedy will make such an address to Congress. But he would do so if he carried out his own ideas of a flexible response to changing conditions in the process of using Executive powers to control the economic climate.

On the contrary, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, hails the improved economic prospects as likely to so increase Government tax revenues that the prospective $12 billion budget deficit will be cut by $1 billion. It would be possible to cut it much more by a sensible attitude toward Government expenditures in every field, including foreign aid, space, and defense.

When he addressed Congress on January 15, Mr. Kennedy proposed to pour more money into the national economy and take proportionately less out. Now there is certainly less economic justification for the planned deficit program than in January, and every justification for the adoption of stabilizing economic policies.

Moreover, there is more reason now, with the increased economic activity, to believe that lowered rates of taxation might result in increased Government revenues.

Mr. Kennedy thus has at this moment a golden opportunity to move away from the huge planned deficit of January into a soberer and sounder program of spending and taxation.

He appears to be caught, however, as he has been in other instances, in the webs of his own rhetoric. He has anticipated, in hard-to-swallow syntax, conditions that did not materialize. He tends to become frozen into doctrinaire positions from which he has difficulty receding, perhaps because he has formulated them so well in words.

The idea of a "sophisticated" Western Europe approach to planned deficits on a large scale is one of these fixations in spite of new evidence that these doctrines are getting the Western Europeans into trouble.

France, at the moment, is going through a painful economic period of adjustment and reaction to its planned-deficits policies. Business credit is being curbed, prices are being frozen, retail profit margins limited, and income taxes increased in a convulsion that adversely affects the popularity of General de Gaulle's grand economic design.

Mr. Kennedy can no longer point with any satisfaction to Western European economic policies as an example for the United States.

Inability to perceive and respond quickly and accurately to changing economic trends is the inner weakness of the modified economic planning policies which appeal to President Kennedy. His predecessor, Mr. Eisenhower, no genius in economic matters, erred perhaps on the side of not responding at all, in the conviction that conditions would probably have changed before his action could have its effect.

Mr. Kennedy's attitude is, in part, a reaction against the Eisenhower let-it-alone policy; but the President need not be controlled by such compulsive feelings.

He could act now, promptly and surely, toward more rational fiscal policies, which probably would be heartily welcomed in Congress and make his way easier in his entire legislative program.

Mass Persecution of Hungarian Minority in Communist Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, recent reports from Eastern Europe have revealed a new campaign by Communist Rumania directed at the complete and permanent subjugation of the Hungarian minority living in Rumania.

These Hungarians, numbering some 2 million people, live mainly in Transylvania.

Following the Hungarian revolt in 1956, and the resurgence of a movement for an independent Transylvania among Rumania's Hungarians, the Bucharest Government instituted a series of oppressive, terroristic actions. There were mass arrests, deportations, and hundreds of executions.

Today, this unfortunate minority continues to suffer under a brutal tyrannical Communist Rumanian Government.

There is no doubt that these tortured people are wholly without representation in the United Nations. The Hungarian and Rumanian representatives to the U.N. are completely dominated by the Soviet-Communist Government. It is impossible, therefore, for the Hungarians to rely upon these delegates for the preservation of their liberty and freedom.

In conformity with the principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, the United States should do everything possible to protect the human freedoms of these Hungarians.

On May 21, 1963, I wrote to the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. I asked Mr. Stevenson to take such action as may be appropriate to bring these persecutions and oppressions to the attention of the United Nations.

On April 15, 1963, the Washington Post carried an article by Mr. Edward Crankshaw, concerning the renewal of the political, cultural, and religious persecution of Hungarians in Rumania. I wish to commend Mr. Crankshaw for his factual chronology of events which is of great interest and concern to freedom-loving people throughout the world.

Mr. Crankshaw's article follows:

WEST GETS APPEAL FROM HUNGARIANS LIVING IN RUMANIA

(By Edward Crankshaw)

LONDON.—An appeal to the West smuggled out of Rumania has lifted a corner of the veil between Eastern and Western Europe to reveal a glimpse of yet another racial tragedy.

The appeal comes from the Hungarian minority in Transylvania, 2 million dour, sober, stubborn people who believe they face biological extermination.

The authors of the appeal speak in the name of the "Independent Transylvania" movement, which has existed a long time. Today even to fall under suspicion of being involved in it is enough to bring 7 years' imprisonment.

Transylvania, with is broad river valleys, is a little Switzerland, and there have always been Transylvanians to aspire to this status. Under the Hapsburg monarchy Transylvania belonged to Hungary, and with its large mass of Rumanian peasants and its ancient settlements of Saxons, was run by Hungarians for the benefit of Budapest. Since 1918, when it went to Rumania, the boot has been on the other foot.

After the Communist seizure of power in Rumania the Hungarian minority was at first highly privileged. It provided the bulk of the civil servants in Transylvania as well as a number of leading government functionaries. The trouble started in 1956, after the failure of the Hungarian uprising.

According to the appeal, the Hungarian revolt had strong echoes in Transylvania. So much so that the Soviet Union had to abandon its first plan of using Czech and Rumanian troops to put down the revolt: The presence of so many Hungarians in the Rumanian army produced doubts about the loyalty of the army as a whole.

Once the revolt was put down in Budapest by Russian tanks, the Rumanians decided to use the occasion to smash their own Hungarian minority in Transylvania. There were mass arrests, heavy prison sentences (10–25 years) and many executions. The families of the condemned men often were deported to other parts of Rumania, above all to the malarial marshes of the Danube delta.

Then in the summer of 1959 the Hungarian University at Cluj was closed down and a few months later the ancient college at Alud followed suit. Its famous Hungarian library was scattered and partly burned. Some professors committed suicide. But the responsible leaders of the Hungarian minority drew up a memorandum to the United Nations. The Rumanian Government stepped in, most of the signatories to the memorandum were shot, and the United Nations remained in ignorance.

Since 1959, the Hungarians, both Catholic and Protestant (as opposed to the Rumanian Orthodox) have been forbidden under pain of heavy imprisonment to practice their religion openly (Rumania is harsher in this matter than any of the satellites).

In 1961, the so-called autonomous Hungarian territory in Transylvania, established in 1952 (while Stalin was still alive), was broken up. Originally it included the three counties most densely populated by Hungarians—they made up 79 percent of the total. Now a third of this area, with its Hungarian population, has been attached to other administrative regions; adjacent, mainly Rumanian area, has been added to it, and the party administration has been purged of Hungarians.

Last year under the influence of Premier Janos Kadar's thaw in Hungary, a number of intellectuals of Transylvanian origin, long settled in Hungary, came together to see what could be done for their Transylvania cousins. But the Rumanian Government got wind of their activities and sent a stiff note to the Hungarian Government asking it to take action unless relations between the two countries were not to be seriously affected.

Kadar decided to act and arrested Sandor Puski, George Bodor, and Guyla Szigmond, who were sent to prison on a charge of "incitement to illegal organization."

Until now no one in the West could understand why Kadar had imprisoned these men at the very moment when he was trying hard, and successfully, to liberalize his system.

It is widely believed that the Soviet Union has been siding with the Rumanians in this matter, partly because it regards the Hungarians as difficult subjects partly because in the Carpathian Ukraine it has a 200,000-strong Hungarian minority of its own.

According to the appeal, a group of representatives of the banned Catholic and Protestant churches in Transylvania recently sent another appeal to Moscow asking the Soviet Union to annex Transylvania rather than leave it to the mercy of the Rumanians—the new appeal said that signatories of the one to Moscow were sent to prison for 25 years.

Clifford R. Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues who have served with former Congressman Clifford R. Hope, and who have come to honor and respect this distinguished American, will be interested in knowing he has retired to a more leisurely life, and has submitted his resignation as president of Great Plains Wheat, Inc. He was instrumental in organizing Great Plains Wheat, after his voluntary retirement from 30 years' service in the House of Representatives in 1957.

Mr. Hope, who I proudly claim as a constituent, has a most illustrious career in agriculture, and has done more for the advancement of agriculture, and welfare of our Nation's farmers than any other living American.

His statement announcing his resignation to the Board of Directors of Great Plains Wheat recently, follows:

> In less than a month, I will observe my 70th birthday which marks the span of life allotted to man in the Bible and somewhat past the usual retirement age in business and industry. Mrs. Hope, whose health has not been good, although improving, feels very strongly that we have both reached an age where we should spend more time together, and I must agree with her.
>
> Also, like all of us, there are many things I have hoped to do which I have not been able to work into a busy life. If I do them at all, they can't be put off much longer.
>
> Right now I'm about 2 years behind with my rose gardening and even further behind in visiting my grandchildren, to say nothing of the stack of books gathering dust while I'm trying to find time to read them.

Mr. Hope's statement was followed by these comments from the Great Plains Newsletter of May 20, 1963:

> In accepting the resignation, Board Chairman Otis Tossett said that Hope is virtually irreplaceable. "His experience, his ability, and his talents were invaluable to our association in its formative years."
>
> Tossett pointed out that Hope served 30 years in Congress, including two terms as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture. "From this vantage point, he witnessed the revolution in farm technology. And he played a leading role in shaping farm programs and policies through depression years, the wartime boom, and the critical postwar recovery period."
>
> In 1954, Hope spearheaded congressional work on Public Law 480 which later formed the base for the Nation's Food for Peace efforts. The bill contained two basic concepts—that America's farm abundance should and must be used to produce a better world and that U.S. agriculture, in order to remain vigorous and healthy, must seek foreign markets for its products.

For the benefit of my colleagues and others who have not been privileged to know him, and benefit from his associations and broad knowledge of agricultural matters, I submit also the following statement which appeared in the September 22, 1959, issue of the Northwestern Miller:

> INTRODUCING CLIFFORD R. HOPE
>
> No one could be better qualified by birth, upbringing, or experience to speak for the wheatgrowers of the Great Plains than Clifford R. Hope. Born an Iowan, a move in early boyhood turned him temporarily into an Oklahoman, but in 1906 he settled for Kansas and he has been a distinguished Kansan ever since—though a year in college at Lincoln might have brought disaffection from Kansas and a yearning to be a Nebraskan. Beyond that, his education was purely Kansan.
>
> As Lieutenant Hope, U.S. Army, in World War I he learned to work with men; as Lawyer Hope, he learned the skill of negotiation; as State Representative Hope he dipped his feet into political waters and as Speaker Hope in the Kansas House of Representatives he learned to control debate. Then, as Congressman Hope he learned the intricacies of political life on the Federal level. As Chairman Hope of the House Agriculture Committee he learned the problems of the farmers vis-a-vis the Government * * * and vice versa.
>
> As the recipient of many degrees he is Dr. Hope, one of his doctorates having been conferred by what is now known as Kansas State University * * * and K-State honors not lightly.
>
> It was in 1920 that he was first elected to the Kansas House of Representatives and after subsequent reelections he ended his State political career as speaker in 1926, thence to move to Washington as a Kansan Representative. He was chairman of the House Agriculture Committee in the 80th Congress, 1947–48, and in the 83d Congress, 1953–54.
>
> He had a part in the formulation and enactment of all agricultural legislation during the period he served in Congress—from 1927 to his voluntary retirement on January 3, 1957, the longest period ever served by a Representative of Kansas. Additionally, he served as a member of the House Committee on Labor and other important committees including the important Committee on Post War Economic Policy and Planning in the 78th Congress. As a member of this committee he visited Russia, Iran, Egypt, Greece, Italy, and most countries of Western Europe.
>
> Mr. Hope's interests range worldwide. He was a member of the U.S. delegation to the first meeting of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations at Quebec in 1945, and attended similar meetings in the same capacity in Copenhagen, Washington, and Rome between 1946 and 1955. He was a member of U.S. delegations on other matters, and was congressional adviser to the American delegation to international wheat conferences in 1948–49 and in 1952.
>
> Since January 1, 1959, he has been president of the Great Plains Wheat Market Development Association with headquarters at Garden City, Kans., where he makes his home. Home is presided over—surely Mr. Hope has no time to preside over it—by the former Pauline E. Sanders of Topeka whom he married in 1921. There are two children, Clifford R. Hope, Jr., practicing law in Garden City, and daughter, Martha, now Mrs. Frank West of New York. And to complete the Hope clan there are eight grandchildren.
>
> Spare-time activities? It is a lengthy list—church affairs, Masonic Orders including Consistory and Shrine, Odd Fellows, Elks, American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Kiwanis.
>
> Such is the man who now speaks for the wheatgrowers of the Great Plains and their laudable efforts to "help themselves" and their country to greater prosperity.

Productivity Expert Calls Technological Advances Employment Boon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a familiar theme—one which often emanates from administration spokesmen—is that the advancing rate of technological change in our society will bring mass unemployment unless vigorous action is taken by

Government. These gloom-and-doom theorists see the job displacement caused by automation, but often fail to take account of the new jobs which automation creates and the other benefits which it bestows.

While technological change requires continuing adjustments in our labor force, including greater worker mobility and constant upgrading of our Nation's skills, which Government frequently impedes, we should not lose sight of the need for and benefits of advancing technology.

At the annual meeting of the National Industrial Conference Board recently in New York City, Prof. John W. Kendrick, of George Washington University, one of the Nation's top authorities on productivity, made a strong case that rapid productivity advances and technological innovations reduce our unemployment rather than increase it. Professor Kendrick pointed out that insofar as increased rates of innovation and productivity advances widen profit margins, they stimulate increased investment which in turn boosts overall demand and employment.

The points which Professor Kendrick has developed require careful consideration at a time when the tendency too often is to regard technological advancement with fear rather than hope. Under unanimous consent, I include a newspaper article from the Washington Post of May 18, reporting on Professor Kendrick's speech, in the RECORD at this point:

TECHNOLOGY CALLED EMPLOYMENT BOON

(By Frank C. Porter)

The present high rate of productivity advance and technological innovation may help to reduce today's distressing level of unemployment rather than raise it, the closing session of the National Industrial Conference Board's annual meeting was told yesterday

The assessment was made by Prof. John W. Kendrick, of George Washington University, one of the Nation's top authorities on productivity trends.

"Labor has nothing to fear from accelerated rates of technological advance," Kendrick said. He repeated testimony given earlier before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress to the effect that periods of accelerated productivity advance in the past have been periods of less-than-average unemployment rates and vice versa.

Kendrick's optimism contrasts sharply with Kennedy administration thinking. The President, Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz, and Walter W. Heller, chief White House economic adviser, in particular, are concerned that the high rate of technological advance may displace workers faster than increased demand for goods can reabsorb them into the work force.

Implicit in the George Washington economist's arguments is the assumption that the current high level of joblessness may be the result of low productivity gains in recent years. Output per man hour rose an average 4 percent annually between 1947 and 1955, a period of unusually low unemployment, he noted yesterday. But in the past 8 years, productivity increases have fallen to an average annual rate of 2 percent.

This rate is now in a strong upsurge. Kendrick said Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates show a 3-percent gain in 1962, better than any other recovery year since 1955.

This has given the present recovery a new lease on life, Kendrick continued, and if it continues it may presage a general acceleration in the Nation's growth in output of goods and services. Insofar as increased rates of innovation and productivity advance help to widen profit margins, further increases in investment are stimulated and, these in turn, boost overall demand, he added.

"Historically, it is the industries with greater-than-average productivity advance that have tended to increase employment more than average," Kendrick pointed out. "What the country has to fear is the unprogressive employer or industry."

Another National Industrial Conference Board speaker, H. W. Balgooyen, executive vice president of American and Foreign Power Co., Inc., cited several factors which he said point to improvement of the general economic outlook for Latin America. "These include," he said, "better prospects for exports and a halt in the downtrend of commodity prices, steps toward freer trade among Latin American nations, growing concern over inflation, and a growing sense of social and political and social responsibility shown by Latin America's business leaders."

The Supreme Court's Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I take pleasure in calling to the attention of the Members of this body two editorials on the Supreme Court's decisions of last Monday on the sit-in cases. One editorial is from the Augusta Chronicle dated May 22, 1963, entitled "Danger in Court Decrees" and the other is from the Greenville Piedmont dated May 22, 1963, entitled "Disaster for Business." Both of these editorials point out the dilemma in which these Court decisions place American businessmen aside from the impact which these decisions have on the right of local self-government by all the American people. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont, May 22, 1963]

DISASTER FOR BUSINESS?

The U.S. Supreme Court ruling on seven sit-in demonstrations by Negroes in southern establishments serving the public could possibly result in the closing of every restaurant and eating place, not only in the South but in all the United States.

Fanciful? Exaggerated?

Then consider this:

The Supreme Court ruled Monday that a State or city may not interfere in any fashion with peaceful racial integration sit-ins in public places of business.

Imagine this situation: A group of Negroes, with real or fancied grievances against a lunchroom, enter the lunchroom. They take all vacant seats. They do nothing to disturb the peace, but they just sit there.

The proprietor cannot ask police to clear his premises. His only possible recourse is to ask them to leave after they have had time to eat or drink what they ordered.

If they do not choose to leave, he possibly could fall back on the laws of trespass, but he would have to enforce them himself. If he has the Negroes forcibly evicted, he would lay himself open to suit.

But the Negroes could avoid any entanglement with trespass laws by organizing another group to take the places of the first group when they leave. This could go on indefinitely, and there would be but one result. The business would be forced to close.

All of this envisions a determined, revengeful Negro organization with the will to arrange such sit-ins. At least two of these are at hand, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the Congress of Racial Equality.

No reasonable persons wants this to happen. But it could happen, with the full approval of the Supreme Court of the United States.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, May 22, 1963]

DANGER IN COURT DECREES

Acting ostensibly to erase State-enforced racial discrimination in private establishments, the Supreme Court Monday wrote a potential discrimination of its own into legal precedent.

Moreover, the court, in the view of one of its own members, undermined for the first time the basic right of a private businessman to operate his establishment as he sees fit.

Chief Justice Earl Warren, speaking for the court majority, was not satisfied with saying that State laws requiring segregation in private businesses are unconstitutional. That much of the ruling could have been anticipated by anyone familiar with the court's pattern of support for all moves to break down legal racial barriers and its utter disregard for the constitutional rights of States.

But Warren and the concurring associate justices did not stop there. They also declared unconstitutional any action by a public official considered to coerce private establishments to segregate. This includes, the justices said, the actions of New Orleans city officials who condemned sit-ins and urged that they be halted. Even though no New Orleans ordinances required segregated restaurants and lunch counters, Warren ruled that the officials' statements constituted Government action and thereby made the arrest of sit-in demonstrators in that city unconstitutional.

Therein lies the seed of inconsistency in the Supreme Court edict. Permitted to germinate, it can produce court verdicts which effectively discriminate against certain States, particularly those of the South. Moreover, it can bring the weight of the court's most recent decisions to bear in Georgia, which appears at first blush to be virtually unaffected.

If the expressed opinions of two city officials are to be regarded as coercion against private business, the way is left open for coercion to be charged in any number of municipal or State actions. The Court set no limits on the use of this precedent.

Justice Department attorneys, arguing in behalf of the Negro plaintiffs in the New Orleans case, contended that State laws requiring segregation in other areas of activity constitute State action regarding private lunch counters, even though there are no laws in that State relating to lunch counters. While the Court did not necessarily give credence to this point in the current decisions, it set the stage for possible subsequent implementation of that view. According to a Justice Department attorney, the Court may still decide in future cases that a law requiring segregated State parks, for example, is coercion on owners of private eating establishments. Should the Court rule ot that effect, as an Atlanta Constitution writer pointed out, a private restaurant in Georgia could not be segregated where segregation is historically customary, but could be in Montana where it isn't.

The coercion precedent, in sum, again takes the basis for Supreme Court rulings out of the realm of law and into the area of sociology, where the Court's own whims and prejudices against the South can easily produce inconsistency and injustice.

An even greater potential danger in Monday's sweeping sit-in edicts is the doubt cast over the heretofore well-established right of a private businessman to serve whom he pleases.

Chief Justice Warren professed to defend this right, declaring in the Greenville, S.C., decision that "Private conduct abridging individual rights does no violence to the equal protection clause unless to some significant extent the State in any of its manifestations has been found to have become involved in it."

But Justice Harlan, in a combined concurrence and dissent, expressed the view that the majority decision has, in fact, placed the private businessman's rights in serious jeopardy. He wrote:

"Although the right of a private restauranteur to operate, if he pleases, on a segregated basis is ostensibly left untouched, the Court, in truth, effectually deprives him of that right in any State where a law like the Greenville segregation ordinance continues to exist."

Runaway Film Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to extend my remarks in the RECORD in regard to the runaway film production that has affected the economic life and balance of the Hollywood films studios. Many thousands of labor people have been thrown out of employment in Los Angeles and other areas of the United States because of this runaway film production which has developed in the last few years.

It is time that the American people are told about those stars and directors and producers who have been lured to Europe by the lower taxes that are imposed upon their earnings, and also the many, many attractive offers of assistance to the producers in the way of cheap labor, free rent, and other benefits that are naturally not available in a free economy such as ours. The huge programs for subsidizing many of the actual expenses of these film companies is unheard of in any other line of industry or endeavor. The offers, of course, look most attractive on the surface; but once the talents and crafts and most of all the know-how of American studios have been dissipated and scattered to other parts of the country—as they have been to some extent already, since some individuals formerly in the picture industry have had to leave to seek other employment—then will these lucrative offers from foreign countries begin to drop. The foreign film companies will have disrupted one of our basic industries.

The following remarks by Joan Crawford which appeared in Variety magazine do much to tell us about individuals who have fled to Europe for the tax sanctuary and of those loyal individuals who have remained in the country willing to pay their just part to their free government, under whose existence they feel they have gained and enjoyed a wonderful life. It behooves all of us to remember well the names of those individuals in the motion picture industry who have remained in this country to produce their films. These are the ones who should receive the patronage of our presence when we are looking through the motion picture ads to see which show we will attend.

Naturally loopholes exist in our tax laws to make this sojourning in Europe for the production of films possible. In order to close some of them, the gentleman from California, Congressman KING, has introduced H.R. 6425. This bill would in effect make the residential requirements much longer for those seeking the tax havens in Europe and would thereby close one of the largest loopholes.

The Hollywood Joint Labor-Management Committee on Foreign Film Production has been working hard to relieve unemployment and economic distress in Hollywood which is the direct result of the "runaway" foreign production. The committee has had several meetings with Assistant Secretary of Labor George L. P. Weaver and his aids, and also with the representatives of the U.S. Departments of States, Commerce, and Treasury here in Washington. The committee is now in the process of compiling additional statistics to show the immense impact that this is having on the economic life of this industry. Upon completion of this survey another meeting is scheduled with the Labor Department.

The following remarks are from the story in Variety as presented by film star Joan Crawford:

JOAN CRAWFORD RAKES RUNAWAYS—CHARGES THOSE WHO WENT ABROAD TO SAVE ON TAXES DID HOLLYWOOD DISSERVICE

Joan Crawford yesterday blasted fellow actors who, she said, have hurt themselves at the b.o. because of mediocre pix they have made while living abroad as runaways. She also zeroed in on American runaway producers, as she tackled the subject in an article in Screen Actors Guild's mag.

Miss Crawford raked those producers who have found it cheaper to make films abroad, and actors who have sought an answer to taxation by moving to Switzerland.

That runaway actors have "harmed themselves can be seen by the mediocrity of so many of the films they have made and the boxoffice popularity listings, and that is their business. They have also hurt Hollywood and that is my business," declared the star.

HAVE HURT THE UNITED STATES

They have hurt the United States financially, and that is the business of all of us. The millions of taxable dollars that disappeared into Switzerland before the U.S. Treasury stopped the drain last year were not written off with a shrug by our tax people. The debt was spread around among those of us who remained here.

Miss Crawford said on the list of the top 10 moneymaking stars in the United States and Canada, only 1, Elizabeth Taylor, has settled in Europe. And "Liz is so unique, both as a star and as a phenomenon, that I doubt whether she can be categorized in any list at all," she commented. Doris Day, Rock Hudson, Cary Grant, John Wayne, Elvis Presley, Jerry Lewis, Frank Sinatra, Sandra Dee, and Burt Lancaster, the others on the list, are liked best by Americans because their roots are "firmly here in the United States," she said.

REPORTS HOLDEN SKID

She noted the omission from the list of William Holden, terming him "one of my favorite actors and favorite people." She said he "was the pacesetter of the runaways, and benefited most from the loophole in the tax laws. He led the boxoffice list for years. Last year he is not in it at all." She added she didn't blame Holden for seeking to provide maximum security for his family, noting she once grossed over $500,000 in 1 year, and taxes plus expenses left her with just over 4 percent of it.

LAUDS CURTIS, LANCASTER

Actors lost something of themselves when they move abroad, she argues, in that they have no sense of belonging, are "bored to distraction." On the other hand, she pointed to Tony Curtis and Burt Lancaster as examples of actors who started in Hollywood, have remained, and today are considered two of the best thesps in the world. "Hollywood alone provided a yardstick of measurement. It is impressive to observe Curtis and Lancaster at work. They give not a damn about salaries or taxes. All they are concerned about is their own professional and artistic fulfillment," she said, adding she doubted either would have come so far had they run away to Switzerland or Rome, brooding about taxes instead of career.

Exempting the producer who actually goes abroad for authentic locales, Miss Crawford believes the producer who treks overseas to save money, "abandons Hollywood with its expertise, its professional movie population who depend on him for work, its unique place in American life, and elects to adopt the inferior, the shoddy, the gimcrack.

"For every 'El Cid' there are a dozen so-called 'spectaculars" made by runaway producers and runaway stars, with papier-mache sets," she said, adding that such pix as "Cid," "Ben-Hur" and "The Longest Day" could only have been made in Europe. But then quickly pinpointing other pix for "Technicolor as raw as a bloodshot eye, dubbing that doesn't synchronize, 50 horses photographed to look like 5,000 * * *."

TAKE MONEY, NOT TALK

One cannot live without any roots, which is what the runaways are trying to do, she contends. "They are seeking to live off a foreign country while having no part of it. They will accept the country's currency, but they won't learn its language. They plan big deals, which do not enrich the country of their adoption, and actively help to impoverish the industry at home," she stated.

Hollywood itself is not blameless, because a decade ago Hollywood was too complacent, Miss Crawford observed. "Technicians were cutting off their noses in their astronomical wage demands. The producers got fat. Everybody got fat. Airily they sold good films to TV, doing themselves an almost unimaginable disservice. Inefficiency has ruined many American industries.

RUSSIAN ROULETTE

"It was not inefficiency that ruined Hollywood. It was something much more macabre, something without precedent. It was a game of Russian roulette in which the prize was TV dollars. The trouble was that Hollywood was playing the game with itself. It was committing coldblooded, deliberate suicide.

"The major studios, then controlling everything, saw suddenly what they had done and fled to Europe, Asia, Africa, anywhere to escape from the time bomb which they had so imprudently tied to their own shoelaces.

"I believe the turning point has been reached. The recent tax legislation that has stopped the appeal of Switzerland for runaway stars will also affect the producers sooner or later. It will be good for everybody when they come back * * * just so long as Hollywood does not draw the wrong conclusion, that it was right all along, and resume its bad old ways. Somehow I don't think it will. The shock has been too severe," said Miss Crawford.

Today's Military Man: A Tribute by Air Force Secretary Eugene Zuckert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, last night Air Force Secretary Eugene Zuckert was the featured speaker at an annual banquet in honor of the Armed Forces sponsored by the Omaha Chamber of Commerce Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. Zuckert's remarks were of great interest to me, and I believe they will be to all who have an interest in the well-being of this Nation. He spoke on "Today's Military Man" and paid high compliment to the hundreds of thousands of men and women who serve our country in uniform.

In view of the recent discussions about the role of the military man in the planning and decision making process, I think this thoughtful speech by one of the top civilian officials in our Government merits the attention of all in Congress.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to include Secretary Zuckert's speech and I join him in applauding two outstanding military men—Gens. Curtis E. LeMay and Thomas S. Power—who in Mr. Zuckert's words, "exemplify the finest qualities of the U.S. military man. They are experienced, versatile, practical, responsible, dedicated, farseeing."

The text of Secretary Zuckert's speech follows:

TODAY'S MILITARY MAN

(Address by Hon. Eugene M. Zuckert)

It is a pleasure to join the military affairs committee of the Omaha Chamber of Commerce in paying tribute to the members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in this area.

I sincerely welcome this opportunity to speak to all of you representatives of the people of Omaha. The friendly, cooperative relationship between the people of this community and members of the Strategic Air Command here has been ideal. By innumerable acts of thoughtfulness and genuine understanding you have made a very difficult military task easier for our Air Force people and definitely have contributed to the strength of the Strategic Air Command.

SAC and the Air Force have been fortunate to have the headquarters of the strategic aerospace force located in Omaha. And I know that you agree with me that you have been fortunate in having two men like our Chief of Staff Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, and Gen. Thomas S. Power, the commander in chief, Strategic Air Command, as the top commanders here for so many years.

Both men exemplify the finest qualities of the U.S. military man—they are experienced, versatile, practical, responsible, dedicated, farseeing.

Does this sound like unwarranted praise for the U.S. military man? You who know the backgrounds of Generals LeMay and Power know that they have all these attributes and more. Yet probably not many know, for example, that the Air Force Chief of Staff not only was the innovator of bombing techniques in World War II, organizer of air operations for the Berlin airlift, and builder of SAC in its first 10 years—he also is a graduate civil engineer, was the Air Force's first Deputy Chief of Air Staff for Research and Development, and played a major role in leading and supervising development of our ICBM force.

But what about "military men," in general, throughout the services? Does the so-called military man—the man with the "military mind" actually exist to any significant extent in the U.S. Armed Forces? From my more than 15 years personal experience with the military services, I say that the stereotype of the "typical military man" is a myth.

Certainly, as in any large organization, there are conservative men along with the dynamic advocates of new ideas and methods. But neither the advocates of change nor the advocates of the slower approach have been smothered in this vast organization. Each element has been either sharpened or tempered by the other, and the military sword is stronger and sharper because of a surprisingly great degree of freedom of ideas and actions.

Then who is this "military man" we hear about? Is he a Maj. Gordon Cooper, or a Lt. Col. John Glenn? Is he a General Eisenhower, a General MacArthur or a General Marshall? Is he a General Bradley or a General Vandenberg? Is he a General Gruenther or a General Norstad?

Does he look backward instead of forward? Or does he have the vision of a Gen. "Billy" Mitchell, or a Gen. "Hap" Arnold? Is he narrow in his interests? Or does he have the broad interest of a Gen. "Jimmie" Doolittle, General Spaatz, a General White, an Admiral Rickover?

Of course, you know that these outstanding military men are only a few of hundreds of exceptional American military leaders in all the services that you and I together could name.

Last year, in a major study, the Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery commended the kind of training and job experiences that military leaders are given to prepare them for a broad grasp of national security problems. The armed services, says the report, "have recognized the requirement for military generalists. The career patterns followed by promising officers expose them to problems of their service as a whole. And today, attendance at the National War College or its equivalent, together with a tour of duty in a joint or international command is virtually required of those reaching general officer rank."

However, what counts most in evaluating the military man is his record of achievement. I believe that the Air Force record in this respect has been especially noteworthy. It reflects anything but a tendency to "rely on the weapons of the last war to fight the next one." I cite the Air Force record most particularly because I know it.

It was a group of like-minded people within the Army in the early part of this century who saw the great potential of aviation and worked together to develop it, with the aid of industry. This organization of airpower enthusiasts developed into the Air Corps, and then the Army Air Force, and then the U.S. Air Force.

It was proved in World War II what airpower could do.

Even before World War II ended the Army Air Forces began to work on guided missiles. After the war the Air Force also began work on ballistic missiles, but had to cancel the program in 1947 for lack of funds. Four years later it gave a contract that led to work on the Atlas ICBM. This was before the thermonuclear breakthrough that led the Air Force Strategic Missiles Evaluation Committee to recommend a strong program for accelerating development of intercontinental ballistic missiles. The Air Force approved the recommendation and assigned the program the very highest priority.

Today we see the results of the most massive and complex research, development and management undertaking of all times—the Air Force-industry production of the Thor, Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman ballistic missiles. These, along with Polaris, have given our Nation a clear military superiority in strategic missiles. But more than that, Air Force missiles have provided the space boosters for the larger space vehicles, including the Mercury capsules, for our national space program.

The credit for this great national achievement must be shared by many farsighted, dedicated military men—and civilians, both inside and outside of government. Much credit must be given to Gen. "Hap" Arnold, who pioneered Air Force use of some of the Nation's best scientific brains to help keep us ahead of any potential aggressor. In 1944 General Arnold set up a scientific advisory group under the direction of the late Dr. Theodore von Karman. He told them he wanted them to think ahead 20 years to consider any phases of aviation that might affect the development and employment of airpower. General Arnold also set up Project RAND in 1946. One of its first studies was on space satellite systems.

Military men also developed the concept of the weapon system as integrating weapon, people, and all other supporting elements into a manageable unit for planning purposes; they developed the concept of concurrency, involving the compression of time-scheduling from the start of the development of the weapon until it reaches the inventory stage. Imagine the job of managing simultaneously the many facets of missile development, test site construction and deployment at a couple of dozen bases in 18 States—building 3 different ICBM systems in 7 basic configurations, using hundreds of contractors, more than 30 labor unions, more than 400,000 people.

Concurrency has greatly reduced weapon system acquisition lead time. The Thor IRBM became operational in 4.3 years from the time of approval; Atlas ICBM in 5.2 years; and the Titan ICBM, in 5.8 years. The relatively simple, but highly sophisticated Minuteman ICBM was ready in just 4 years. In only 5 years since the first contract was signed, the 100th Minuteman missile site has become operational. ICBM's are becoming operational in the Air Force inventory at the rate of more than one a day. This has been an unprecedented achievement under any terms of comparison.

The military departments often run ahead of the civilian economy in the introduction of management techniques. One example is the use of computers for planning and programing. The Air Force started the use of computers back in 1948 when General Rawlings, then Air Force Comptroller and now president of a major corporation, provided the leadership to bring in the first computer to be used in defense programing.

As Vice Chief of Staff since July 1957 and Chief of Staff since July 1961 and the Commander of SAC for nearly 10 years before coming to Washington, General LeMay has contributed most extensively to the Air Force as we know it today. Last week I had a brief summary prepared listing the major tasks the Air Force performs in support of national objectives. It gives a picture in quick, broad-brush strokes of what the military man in today's Air Force, together with the civilian employee, is doing.

With about 39 percent of the Defense budget, the Air Force provides our Nation not only with the Strategic Air Command and its more than 80 percent of the free world's strategic nuclear delivery capability, but it also provides some 70 percent of the personnel for the North American Air Defense Command, and the greatest portion of the facilities for defending our skies against attackers.

In addition, the Air Force provides—

The greatest portion by far of the Nation's global military airlift and assault airlift;

Air support for the Army;

The primary air arms for our Armed Forces in Europe, the Pacific, the Far East, Alaska, and the Caribbean area; and

The major Department of Defense support of the National Space Program.

The Air Force Communications Service operates and maintains a global network of more than 5 million miles of communications channels and a worldwide system of more than 1,500 electronic aids of air navigation and air traffic control.

The Military Air Transport Service maintains a 115,000-mile system of military air routes on a wartime readiness basis.

The Air Force Systems Command, which is involved in coordinating the Nation's military and scientific efforts toward development of aerospace weapon systems, administers, at any given time, 60,000 contracts.

Air Force Logistics Command processes more than 26 million supply demands each year. Its stock of technical items is subject to random demands from some 15,000 organizations and units worldwide.

The President's report to Congress on Aeronautic and Space Activities shows that of the 54 satellites orbited by the United States in 1962, 40 were launched by the Air Force.

I know that most of you here are familiar with many other examples of value received for the Air Force portion of the Defense budget; the ballistic missiles; the X-15 program being conducted in cooperation with NASA; and air crews on constant ground alert and those overhead in the air.

At the same time that the Air Force is working on projects such as the Dyna-Soar piloted aerospacecraft, the Titan III space booster and with NASA on the Gemini manned space effort, it is involved in the more down-to-earth tasks of training and using air commandos and training Vietnamese pilots in actual air operations.

At the heart of all these activities and systems are the people who envision them, who develop them, manage them, maintain them, plan their employment and operate them. These are the people you know—the officers and the airmen.

These comprise the so-called military man.

This is the military man I am talking about. He is not the military man you will find in some history books. He is not the military man of some other country. He is the American military man of the 1960's—shaped by our institutions and controlled by his understanding of these institutions by our governmental checks and balances, by our free press and by the Congress.

Some of these military men you know are air crews and support personnel working 70 to 80 hours a week—sometimes even longer. Some SAC and Tactical Air Command crews rotate routinely between stateside and oversea bases. Air Force transport crews fly great distances to many places on the planet. Families are separated for long periods of time. But all these people know that what they are doing is important. As you know, others of our military men are away from the day-to-day flying and missile operations—involved in the extremely difficult business of planning, of helping the Defense Establishment to arrive at sound decisions on the composition and deployment of our forces simultaneously for today, tomorrow, and the day after tomorrow.

The responsibility for today is maintaining the present posture of our strength. Today's job for tomorrow is to bring to fruition the plans and the weapon systems conceived years ago.

The job for the day after tomorrow is to make decisions now that will result in the weapon systems of the 1970's designed to maintain our superiority against any potential enemy.

I have always been struck by the duality of the military man's responsibility—not only must he be able to think clearly about long-range plans for war in the future, but also, he must maintain a keen edge of readiness to respond instantly to an emergency that could arise at any moment.

Our military men, working with the civilian leadership in the Department of Defense, are coping with the most difficult factors—attempting to balance knowns against unknowns: technological advances; possible scientific breakthroughs; enemy intentions; arms control; nuclear testing; actions of our allied nations; international economics and countless other factors.

Naturally there will be sources of disagreement. No one in our system would expect the decisionmaking process to be otherwise. But I have noted a tremendous improvement since my previous tour in the Pentagon in the machinery for isolating problems, putting them in focus, analyzing them, discussing and arguing the pros and cons. This process provides the best foundation for decisions. Decisions are based on national and international policy considerations as well as military considerations and are quite properly the responsibility of the Secretary of Defense or the President. Most important in this decision-making process is an understanding by the military of the responsibilities of the civilian leaders and an appreciation by the civilian leadership of the unique experience of our military leaders.

This country is fortunate to have officers like Generals LeMay and Power in key positions in its defense forces. Their experience, knowledge, and calm resolution contribute the kind of strength we need in these trying times. Knowing war well, they want to know peace even better.

Last year a distinguished European, Andre Malraux, French Minister of State for Cultural Affairs, paid a great tribute to our Nation. It seems to me that in doing so he unconsciously paid high tribute to the U.S. military man, as well as to our system of government with its checks and balances, and to the moral strength of our people.

He said that ours is "the only Nation that has waged war but not worshipped it, that has won the greatest power in the world but not sought it, that has wrought the greatest weapon of death but has not wished to wield. * * * May it inspire men with dreams worthy of its action."

To the noble words of this tribute to all Americans I would like simply to add these: May this Nation continue to inspire military men with actions worthy of its dreams.

Building the GOP Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in addition to having good candidates, a constructive, forward-looking Republican Party needs a positive platform. Although there will be much discussion about the platform next year, it is interesting to note that already letters to editors are beginning to appear about this matter. In the New York Herald-Tribune of April 22, Mr. Bruce K. Chapman, the editor of Advance magazine, a Republican publication, issued here in Washington, discussed his ideas regarding a platform.

As we have different points of view about this matter, this letter to the editor is certainly well worth reading. Below follows the complete text of Mr. Chapman's letter to the editor:

BUILDING THE GOP PLATFORM

To the HERALD TRIBUNE:

Almost every Republican leader today is calling for party unity as the 1964 elections approach. Factional vendettas, they declare, only help the Democrats.

Unhappily, pious pronouncements at fundraising dinners will not achieve party unity, for all of these assume there are no real causes for the very evident party disunity. Surely some party problems can be traced to personal or sectional grudges, but there also exist important and unresolved disagreements as to party strategy and even party philosophy. To bury this fact today in a gush of loyalty oaths is to invite disaster later on.

How the party proceeds in the cities and in the South, and in facing national issues, will have to be discussed at the 1964 convention, if not before, and there is heartfelt disagreement on these matters. At the moment we are headed for a convention donnybrook to make the 1960 platform fight seem placid, with morbid dissension proceeding into the campaign and beyond.

In 1960 there was at least the work of the Republican committee on programs and progress, headed by the young Illinois businessman, Charles Percy. The Percy committee's preconvention preparations saved the platform deliberations from chaos. But the Percy committee was disbanded and thereafter its proposals virtually ignored by Republicans in Congress. Right now would seem a propitious time to revive the Percy commitee with the objective of composing intraparty viewpoints in the next national convention.

For the long run the All-Republican Conference made up of leaders from every part of government who met almost a year ago, offers the greatest hope of resolving party differences. The conference, which has yet to hold a second "quarterly" meeting, would provide proponents of conflicting views a chance to persuade each other, compromise on some matters and agree to disagree on others. More important the ARC would give the party a mechanism for developing a positive program for the election.

It is certainly true that the New Frontier has flopped, but pointing to that grim fact won't be enough for the GOP in 1964. The Republicans must have an identifiable counterplan to offer the voters. Indeed, the negative critique will be hardly believable if not followed by positive proposals.

These positive proposals in turn should be supported by a united party, but they will not unless the whole party is included in their development.

This letter is aimed at Republican workers, contributors, and just plain voters. Our leaders all of them, have given us overdoses of elemental party philosophy—free enterprise, balanced governmental power, equality, and freedom for the individual. These principles alone however we cherish them, are insufficient to unify our actions in the future. We have had medicare for elderly slogans, when we have needed to see these slogans reappraised and reapplied to the problems of the day.

Reviving the All-Republican Conference and the Percy committee will do more to assure a vibrant and harmonious Republican effort in 1964 than an eternity of $100-a-plate demands for unity.

BRUCE K. CHAPMAN,
Publisher, Advance.
WASHINGTON.

Address by the Vice President of the United States, Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner, Oklahoma City, May 20, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to preside at a great Democratic fund raising banquet in Oklahoma City on the night of May 20. Citizens of Oklahoma were honored on that occasion by the presence of the eminent and distinguished Vice President of the United States, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON. We were also privileged to hear the Vice President deliver one of the most outstanding speeches I have ever heard.

The distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma, MIKE MONRONEY, presented the Vice President. His remarks on the occasion were a fitting tribute to our honored guest.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include both Senator MONRONEY's introductory address and the address of Vice President JOHNSON.

TEXT OF SENATOR A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., MAY 20, 1963

I am very grateful for this opportunity and privilege of introducing our principal speaker of the evening. This is one of the few genuine rewards of seniority that I have discovered.

This will go down in history as one of the greatest Jefferson-Jackson dinners ever held in Oklahoma. It has been made possible through the hard work of Speaker J. D. McCarty and President Pro Tempore Roy Boecher. They have had the loyal and diligent assistance of their colleagues, including State Senator Don Baldwin and State Representative Bill Skeith, and of the county chairmen and cochairmen and other county, district, and State party officials. All of the hard-working Democrats who helped make this event what it is deserve our gratitude and appreciation.

I and the other members of the congressional delegation were very grateful when our distinguished guest accepted our invitation to come here and make this address. But at the time he accepted, quite frankly, our gratitude was tempered with a certain amount of worry and anxiety.

Every Democrat in this audience, Mr. Vice President, will understand the reason for our worry and concern. Democrats—whether they be Oklahoma Democrats, Texas Democrats, Massachusetts Democrats, or Democrats of any kind—go about their business of party organizing and party functioning in strange and wonderful ways. Sometimes they are worrisome ways born of primary stresses. Sometimes of disappointments in general elections. Sometimes in stresses generated by issues or by rival candidates.

A strong political party is not born in sweetness and light and it does not survive that way. It survives in the heat of battle. It survives in the struggle within itself to find its true mission and its means of obtaining same. It survives and grows in its travail.

The Democratic Party in Oklahoma is now in a terrific struggle with its Republican foe, and financing has always been one of the major problems of our party. Let's face it. Our financial needs promoted this Jefferson-Jackson dinner campaign. As Democrats we are not ashamed to admit this. Democrats always have had more trouble raising money than Republicans because Democrats as a party represent all the people—not a privileged few.

In fact, money is so hard to come by for Democrats that we are compelled to put aside our differences over issues and candidates and get down to work for our survival as a party. And, as a matter of fact, in adversity we have seen Democrats set aside their differences and close ranks as real Democrats. Mr. Vice President, these are the Democrats you see here tonight. Our efforts in what we feel will be a successful fund raising campaign have furnished a unity of purpose and a new sense of determination. The loss of one battle does not mean we have lost a war.

Mr. Vice President, we were grateful for your accepting our invitation. Your confidence in us made us work harder.

This has become a victory banquet. All across the State, in precincts and counties, Oklahoma Democrats have worked hard to make this event a success. The response at the local level by individual Democrats contacting their neighbors and friends has been terrific. Your coming here has lit the lamp of victory, a lamp that will lead us to success in 1964 for the entire Democratic ticket.

Introductions are easy when you have such a guest as we have here tonight. The principal task is one of editing, condensing in order to give even a brief summary of hundreds of important items in the speaker's distinguished record.

We are also tremendously honored that Lady Bird Johnson has accompanied her husband to Oklahoma for this occasion. Few people yet realize the tremendous contribution that is being made in important areas of national and international life by the Vice President's partner—his charming wife Lady Bird. Her gracious and intelligent activity and leadership in dozens of important areas of American life, in causes where women can best serve, is setting a new high for this administration. She is carrying on in the great tradition of the late first lady of the world, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. Her love for human beings and respect for human dignity are a part of Lady Bird Johnson, just as these qualities were a part of Mrs. Roosevelt.

One cannot begin to describe our Vice President without referring to two of his closest friends and colleagues who are no longer with us. I refer, of course, to the late Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn, and the late senior Senator from Oklahoma, Robert S. Kerr. One of Bob Kerr's favorite stories, which he told time and again to audiences around Oklahoma, recalled the occasion when Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, the Republican leader in the Senate, learned that LYNDON JOHNSON, who was then the majority leader, had had a mobile telephone installed in his automobile. Bob Kerr would recite the procedures through which the leaders of the Senate exercised such prerogatives and how after a telephone call or two to the right functionary, Senator DIRKSEN obtained a telephone for his limousine.

A few days later, driving through the heavy Washington traffic enroute to the Capitol, Senator DIRKSEN saw the majority leader's limousine at a distance and decided to try out his new telephone.

"This is Senator DIRKSEN. Please give me the majority leader's automobile," the story went.

After a few seconds, according to the way Bob Kerr told it, a pretty feminine voice came on the line to Senator DIRKSEN and said, "This is the majority leader's automobile. May I help you please?"

"This is Senator DIRKSEN. I am calling from my automobile. Let me speak to the majority leader please."

From the automobile in the traffic a short distance ahead Senator DIRKSEN heard this report from the secretary, I am sorry Senator. Could you hold the telephone? The majority leader is talking on another line."

Bob Kerr used that story to illustrate LYNDON JOHNSON's industrious and go-getting personality. L.B.J.'s drive to get things done is his trademark.

Long before we had such great astronauts as Leroy Gordon Cooper, LYNDON JOHNSON gave some clear indication of these magical things to come. Certainly years before we put a man in a Mercury capsule, LYNDON was in orbit in the House and Senate chambers. Some indications of the speed and accuracy of a Mercury flight came from the legislative performance of LYNDON JOHNSON as a leader under Speaker Sam Rayburn in the House of Representatives and as his own leader of the U.S. Senate.

With all the dexterity and coolness of a present-day Major Cooper, LYNDON proved again and again that he had the ability to give "manual" control to the mercurial Senate and to effect a safe re-entry accurately and without too much heat in the splashdown target area.

It is certainly no exaggeration to couple Rayburn and JOHNSON, two Texans, as the two greatest legislative leaders of the two Houses. As first a protege of Sam Rayburn and later as an equal partner in the House and Senate leadership team, the pair set a new high note in responsible leadership of the two Houses of Congress.

It was during these 6 years that the youthful rapid-fire leadership, the new JOHNSON techniques of Senate organization, and the spectacular knowledge and energy of the leader set new records and new goals.

Old timers of the press—and in the Senate Chamber—who had watched the Senate procedures for scores of years, found it difficult to understand what had happened to the Senate's pace and to understand the Senate's willingness to follow—eagerly—the program and timetable of the young, aggressive leader.

Even the press was amazed when, despite all indications to the contrary, LYNDON announced he would pass civil rights legislation even if it meant breaking the filibusters of his friends of the deep South. He not only announced that he would pass it—he did pass it. This was the first breakthrough in nearly 75 years.

What a temptation it is to go on and on with the record of achievements in the Senate—and of the renovation which occurred in that body during the JOHNSON leadership.

LYNDON JOHNSON has been unpredictable in many of his big decisions. His upsetting all the political pundits to accept the Democratic nomination for the Vice Presidency was one of the biggest. Few could envision that his desire for activity and leadership would end in the quiet regime of the Vice Presidency. They didn't know LYNDON.

LYNDON JOHNSON knew that his strength was great where the presidential nominee had his most severe weakness. Thus it was that Southern and border State votes, where LYNDON's influence was greatest, brought the needed margin for the Democratic victory in 1960. I have always felt that LYNDON JOHNSON was willing to make the sacrifice of the job he loved, majority leader of the Senate, if it would help elect a Democratic administration.

L.B.J.'s proven ability and influence soon led President Kennedy to assign many new important duties to his new administrative partner. In the same way LYNDON JOHNSON revolutionized the leadership role in the Senate, he has changed the Vice President's role from one of respectable obscurity to one of dynamic action.

In the President and Vice President we have a pair of champions who put their duty to the Nation far ahead of party loyalty or self-aggrandizement. As majority leader of the Senate LYNDON JOHNSON has written: "I am a free man, an American, a U.S. Senator, and a Democrat—in that order."

LYNDON JOHNSON, along with Sam Rayburn, proved that the best politics was the dedication to national responsibility and not any short-term gain by sharp or destructive partisanship.

That was the reason that for nearly 30 years the Republicans have won so few victories and the Democrats have won so many.

LYNDON was and is a natural born doer. If things were quiet, he sought action. If the policy of drift threatened progress, he reversed the course. If the bill was in danger, he dug up the votes—or added on a new amendment.

His legislative record is filled with landmark bills of outstanding achievement. Strength in military preparedness was one of his earliest concerns as a House Member, as the Senate leader, and now as Vice President.

He was the first to recognize our loss to the Communists of leadership in space. He sought to correct this loss and created and became the first Chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. Much of our progres today is due first to LYNDON's establishment of the committee, his enlargement of the scope of the program, and his enlistment of Bob Kerr as his successor.

His interest in conservation—of both human and natural resources—in rural electrification, and in water development projects marked him as a leader in our national development of industrial as well as military strength.

Thus, he now heads up important sections of the administration program, such as chairmanships of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, and the Peace Corps Advisory Committee. He is also a member of the National Security Council. Whenever a new crisis develops, there's apt to be a new oversea diplomatic assignment for L.B.J.

In addition to all the administrative and legislative duties so ably performed by the Vice President, he has become the principal spokesman of the Democratic Party in its efforts to re-elect a Democratic administration and Congress in 1964. He is the most sought-after speaker in the party.

Oklahoma is honored to have been able to bring the Vice President here for our Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner. This has been a vital challenge to the Democrats of Oklahoma. And now, knowing the Vice President's urge for more action and less talk, it's time for you to hear our distinguished guest.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Vice President of the United States.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., MAY 20, 1963

Fellow Democrats, neighbors, it is always a pleasure to return to Oklahoma.

You State has been blessed with abundant resources of vitality and leadership.

Your colorful history has provided us with colorful and able leaders.

Many of our more learned Senators today still shy away from using long, flowery words in their speeches because they remember too well how much the beloved Bob Kerr enjoyed pulling out his dictionary, stopping the Senate proceedings and thumbing through the dictionary's worn pages to check the meaning of a word.

Just as Bob Kerr checked the meaning of a word to bring his colleagues down to size, he always checked the meaning of every bill, every piece of legislation, to weigh its effect on Oklahoma, on the Nation, on our party.

Bob Kerr is gone from Washington. The leadership he typified is not.

Men like MIKE MONRONEY and HOWARD EDMONDSON can be seen daily digging into the legislative storehouse for something to benefit Oklahoma, the Nation, and our party.

In the House of Representatives CARL ALBERT, TOM STEED, ED EDMONDSON, JOHN JARMAN, and VICTOR WICKERSHAM form a strong, cohesive team that is willing to take on all comers for benefit of Oklahoma, the Nation, and our party.

Of course, we are not unmindful that there is an occasional accident when someone from that other party slips into office here. It does happen "when the corn is as high as the elephant's eye."

I am going to present our party as a party of action. The other party is a party of opposition.

I am going to present our party as a party that moves. The other holds back.

I am going to present our party as one which lives with hope. The other party lives with doubt.

I am going to present our party as a spokesman for the people. The other party is the spokesman for property.

Before I contrast the two parties, however, allow me to contrast the two ideologies that must be the concern of both parties.

There is a struggle today between two great philosophies—the philosophy of freedom and the philosophy of communism. The issue of the kind of leadership our party can provide is all-important.

We must understand that if we just call the roll on the differences between our country and the Soviet Union, the balance sheet in terms of resources and population does not guarantee success.

Here are a few examples:

1. In terms of population, the Soviet Union has a distinct edge—221 million people to our 187 million people.

2. In terms of arable land, the Soviet Union again has a distinct edge—585 million acres compared to our 188 million acres.

3. In energy fuels—oil and coal—Soviet reserves are definitely larger than ours, even though our production is more efficient and we make better use of our resources.

4. In many vital minerals—perhaps the best example is manganese—the Soviet Union has far larger reserves.

5. In overall food supplies, we are far ahead—but this is efficiency of production and not resources, and we could be overtaken.

6. In housing our people, we take the lead: In 1960 we constructed 1½ times as much.

7. Soviet steel production is below ours, but at the present rates of growth, we could be overtaken by the end of the decade.

8. In the field of space, the Soviets took an early lead in constructing the big booster rockets, and we have not caught up to them yet. And, they are also ahead of us in experience gained from manned space flights, although the recent magnificent achievement by one of your native sons, Maj. Gordon Cooper, helped narrow that gap significantly.

9. In electric power we are far ahead of the Soviets.

10. But in one vital field there is a disturbing trend which could be decisive—the field of education. In 1950 we graduated 52,000 scientists and technicians while the Russians graduated only 36,000. Ten years later, in 1960, we graduated only 38,000, and the Russians graduated 111,000.

When we look at these trends, I think it is apparent to all of us that we cannot sustain freedom merely by statistical superiority. What counts is the superiority of freedom as a way of life and the willingness of people to work and to sacrifice for it.

This they will do only if we make our system work.

And it is in this field—making our system work—that we must really choose between the two parties.

Let us look at the record of seven of America's problems—every one of which our administration—a Democratic administration—offers a program.

1. Education: It has been said that the educated mind is the guardian genius of democracy. It is not theory. It is fact.

2. In addition to Russia's outstripping our efforts to produce more scientists and technicians, other statistics should be noted.

At our present rate, the United States will be short 90,000 doctoral degree holders by 1970. We need to be turning out 2½ times more Ph. D.'s in engineering, mathematics, and the sciences.

We need a wider dispersal of the graduate schools from which such degrees are obtained, because today three-fourths of all Ph.D's are being granted by a handful of universities located in only 12 States, and the region we so proudly call the Great Southwest turns out fewer than any other region in the Nation.

There must be an answer.

The Democratic Party has the answer, a comprehensive education program, but it has been decimated and successfully bottled up by members of the other party, joined by a few diehards of our own party.

2. Care for the aged: When the 20th century began, only 1 out of 20 Americans was over the age of 65. Now, it is 1 of 10. There are 1,000 more Americans past 65 tonight than there were at this hour last night.

Fifty-six percent of the aged couples live on less than $2,000 a year. Eighty percent suffer chronic diseases. One in five aged couples have hospital bills each year—and half the time the bills exceed $700—one-third or more of their total income.

There is a need.

There must be an answer.

The Democratic Party says "Yes."

We have an answer.

The Republican Party says "No."

Eighty-six percent—let that penetrate—86 percent of the Republican Senators voted to defeat and succeeded in killing—medical care for the aged.

They don't want to let the employee and employer each contribute $1.50 each month under social security to assure the aged of some peace of mind after retirement.

3. Youth: at the other end of the age spectrum, 40 percent of our population today is under 21. We have 1 million more 16-year-olds alone this year than last. Eighteen percent of our unemployed are boys and girls under the age of 21.

We must in this decade provide 26 million new jobs—and we are running far behind. Unemployment among young workers is two and a half times higher than the national average and it will grow worse if we don't act.

There must be an answer.

The Democratic Party says "Yes."

The Republican Party says "No."

The youth opportunity bill is designed to alleviate part of this problem. Twenty Republicans voted against it. Only seven voted for it.

4. Resource development: Oklahoma has taken the lead in developing its resources. But vast areas of our Nation lag behind.

Thirteen million acres of Dust Bowl lands need to be revegetated.

Two hundred millions acres of rangeland need to be cleared and planted.

Our rivers still run red to the bottom carrying away topsoil—if not detergents.

There must be an answer.

The Democratic Party says "Yes."

The Republicans say "No."

Eighty-eight percent of the Republican Senators—88 percent—voted to cut funds for America's water resources.

5. Public works: Closely related to resource development. Additional public works projects mean more employment, more funds in circulation, benefits to everyone upon completion. But Republicans make public works projects one of their prime targets for budget cutting, merely for the sake of opposing.

6. Space: This has gained the lion's share of publicity—and justifiably so.

When we talk of space and space research, there are those who raise the question that our efforts cost too much. Certainly American leadership in space is not cheap. We are now spending 20 cents per week per capita on our national space program.

Other Americans ask if our space efforts are worthwhile.

I can answer in terms we can all understand. While the space age is not yet 5 years old, more than 5,000 companies and research organizations have been or are now involved in our space effort. We have produced more than 3,200 space-related products, many of which are already being put to use.

But, many prominent Republicans are questioning the value of the program. A former Republican President has referred to our moon project as a "stunt."

I can answer that simply: I do not believe that this generation of Americans is willing to resign itself to going to bed each night by the light of a Communist moon.

7. The farm program: Something close to every Oklahoman's and Texan's heart. In production, the strides our farmers have made have been fantastic.

One farmer in America today feeds 27 people.

In Russia, only five or six people can be fed by one farmer's output. But, it is costing our Government to keep our surpluses in storage and to help diminish them.

The feed grain program, which was debated hard and long in the Senate last week, will help reduce the surpluses—will raise the farmer's income—will keep him from moving from the farm to the city.

It is a program the Democratic Party believes in.

We say "Yes." It will work.

The Republicans say "No." Eighty-four percent of them voted against it.

When I speak of these things, I speak with strongest personal feelings.

The test of our parties—and of their service to our people—is how well and how faithfully they are serving America and the opportunities of America's future.

We are Democrats because we believe America is still master of its own destiny.

We are Democrats because we do not believe America must pull back from the world or pull out from the pursuit of a better life for all its people at home.

As Democrats, we can hold our heads high in the company of any Americans. And we must go among them all—we must knock on every door—and carry to responsible Americans the story of a responsible party—responsibly serving all the people at home and in the world.

U.S. Gift Aids Wide Sex Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post, dated May 18, announcing that the United States is contributing, for the fifth time, $500,000 to finance a world study of "sex and human reproduction."

This makes $2½ million American taxpayers have contributed to the World Health Organization without their knowledge or, for that matter, without the direct approval of the Congress. The announcement was made by Mr. Luther L. Terry, U.S. Surgeon General.

Here is another example, Mr. Speaker, of how taxpayers' money is spent without the consent of Congress or the knowledge of the people. This results, of course, from the fact that we appropriate money in lump sum to the Departments and they spend it about any way they want to spend it. This should be stopped.

The text of the article follows:

U.S. GIFT AIDS WIDE SEX STUDY

GENEVA, May 18.—The United States put up $500,000 today for a world study of sex and human reproduction. But it avoided any mention that the funds should be used to further birth control.

The gift went to the 100-nation World Health Organization which virtually rules out discussion of birth control because of objections from many predominantly Roman Catholic member states.

India and other overpopulated nations have been seeking an international scientific investigation of human reproduction with a view to finding a cheap, simple, and effective means of reducing the birth rate.

The U.S. gifts—the fifth half-million dollar donation of its kind in 5 years—was announced by Dr. Luther L. Terry, U.S. Surgeon General.

He said the United States has selected human reproduction among several other projects because it remains one of the least known fields of medicine.

"The lack of scientific knowledge has, in fact, led to controversy. Much of this controversy would disappear if more scientific knowledge were available," Dr. Terry said.

Later, Dr. James Watt, U.S. Assistant Surgeon General, told newsmen in response to questions on birth control:

"Whether more or fewer children are desired, the fact is that there is very little scientific information today on which a family can make a decision."

In his announcement, Dr. Terry said: "The information gained from such research would in time benefit thousands of presently sterile couples and possibly prevent the malformation, crippling, and retardation of hundreds of thousands of innocent babies."

He said the United States believes that "this is an area of such importance as to require a specially designated research component."

A Distinguished Visitor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the students and faculty at Alameda County State College were privileged to have as guest speaker Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, Under Secretary for Special Political Affairs, United Nations.

The lead editorial of the May 10, 1963, News Register, our local newspaper serving Fremont, Union City, Newark, and Milpitas, described the felicitous occasion of Dr. Bunche's visit to southern Alameda County far better than can I, and I hereby insert in the RECORD, for the pleasure of my colleagues, this editorial:

A DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

Seldom in its history has south Alameda County had the opportunity to meet on such a close basis as distinguished a visitor as Dr. Ralph Bunche.

This urbane and erudite statesman, a ranking official of the United Nations, left some succinct and thought-provoking statements, with those who heard him speak at Alameda County State College Wednesday.

Many of his comments are worthy of direct quotation to which any interpretations of ours would be presumptuous.

Among those we found to be particularly noteworthy:

"No subject today is more vital than preserving world peace."

"Those who denounce the United Nations have the obligation to offer a constructive alternative."

"If the alternative is war, how can you reconcile with good judgment or good reason, solving the problems of the world by eliminating the people of the world."

Defending the concept and activities of the United Nations Bunche said:

"It has preserved a world for us to live in for 17 years. I believe in the United Nations, not blindly but on a demonstrable record.

"There can be a world order based on law.

"Extreme nationalists are the main obstacle. It would be good if all nations could cease making a fetish of sovereignty; if people in government could but realize how much behind times is the concept of sovereignty. I'm not talking about surrender of sovereignty, but excessive use of it. however I'm afraid the world will be old fashioned on this score for some time.

"The United Nations does not aspire to subvert the authority of independent states, instead it supports at international level, the preservation of the common well-being.

"Because of the progressive policies of the United Nations it is the hatred target of the extremists—The John Birch Society, supporters of the National Review and the Daughters of the American Revolution.

"The basis for their hatred is not because the United Nations is trying to preserve the peace, but because there are too many foreigners in it."

We all might well heed such sane, rational and constructive thoughts as expressed by Dr. Bunche and shy from the siren call of the demigogs.

Most So-Called Excess Capacity Is Obsolete

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a favorite assertion of administration theorists is that there is a large amount of "excess plant and equipment" in our economy which, if utilized, would close the so-called gap between actual and potential output. The additional point is then made that consumer demand should be increased sharply in order to get these idle plants producing again.

It has been my contention that much, if not all, of the capacity which the administration says is excess is actually obsolete. A recent survey by McGraw-Hill, for example, showed that 22 percent of all manufacturing facilities are regarded as technologically outmoded. Another estimate has been made that 64 percent of all American metal forming and cutting machines are more than 10 years old and probably obsolete in terms of design and performance.

An editorial in the Wall Street Journal of May 16, 1963, discusses some of the reasons why so much of our industrial capacity is obsolete and points to the dangers of trying to pump up consumption artificially while skimping on investment in new, modern, and competitive plant and equipment.

In view of the importance which the administration attaches to the "excess capacity argument," under unanimous consent I insert the Wall Street Journal editorial in the RECORD at this point.

I might add that similar analysis of the unemployed reveals that the highest incidence of unemployment is among the unskilled and semiskilled. Rapid technological advancement creates increased obsolescence of human skills just as much as it creates obsolete plant and equipment. The lowest skills which we tend to categorize as semiskills or no skills suffer the greatest incidence of obsolescence. Pumping up consumption artificially while skimping on training, retraining and general education will not bring useful employment to the unemployed, but only create inflationary pressures in the demand for the new labor skills which already are in short supply.

The editorial follows:

EXCESS TOOLS AND IDLE THEORIES

America's steel industry, now operating at only a little more than 80 percent of capacity, nevertheless plans to spend about $1.2 billion this year on new plant and equipment, an increase of 11 percent from 1962.

Nor are the steel makers alone. U.S. industry generally has a great deal of unused production capacity, and yet companies this year expect to spend a record $39 billion to acquire still more factories, machines and tools of all sorts.

Such plans must seem foolish to some people. In Washington, anyway, the reasoning is that industry already has plenty of plant capacity; what we need to promote solid economic growth is more consumption. So the administration aims its tax-cut proposal primarily at lower income groups and, just to be sure there's enough money around, steps up its deficit spending, and encourages even more easy money. Once demand is inflated enough, the theory goes, the idle plants will start humming again.

But will they? Industry must have its doubts, or it wouldn't be spending so much on new facilities. And logic lies largely on industry's side.

In the first place, much of the excess capacity, in present circumstances at least, is a mirage. As a machine tool authority pointed out the other day, 64 percent of all American metal-forming and cutting machines—basic to much of industry—are more than 10 years old, and thus in all probability obsolete in design and performance. The percentage of obsolescence, moreover, is growing; 5 years ago it was 60 percent.

The trend in machine tools is mirrored throughout industry. Among those "excess" factories are some that date back a half-century or more. With steadily rising wage rates and tightening price competition, most of these older plants no longer can be operated economically. The steel companies, among others, have begun shutting down some such plants for good.

So some plants stand idle because they no longer are capable of producing products at prices people will pay. Still others have slipped into the excess category because they're geared up to turn out products that few people want to buy. Suppose a factory were tooled up to turn out 1953-model automobiles; it would have to be retooled to be of any use to an auto maker in 1963.

This, then, is the best way to stimulate consumption—by continually reshaping industry to provide the goods that people want at prices they are willing to pay. And not only people in the domestic market; modernized industry is better able to hold its own in expanding markets abroad. Along the way, industry provides more jobs for more people and thus builds demand for its products.

To approach the problem from the other end, by trying artifically to pump up consumption while skimping on investment, is not only foolish but dangerous. Rising savings totals at banks and other institutions attest that there's already lots of money in the economy; pushing the totals even higher will not create many customers for products of obsolete, high-cost factories. Ever-bigger deficit spending and easy money pose the constant threat of price inflation, which would drive American goods off markets abroad and make them less able to compete with imports at home.

All this suggests that the formula for solid economic growth includes a tax program that permits increased investment, plus monetary and fiscal policies that promise some chance that such investments won't be eroded by future inflation.

Businessmen clearly recognize the need for new and better factories. It would be a good thing if Washington could re-tool its theories to produce better economic policies.

Address of the Honorable Philip M. Klutznick Before the 55th Annual Order Day Dinner of B'nai Zion, New York City, February 10, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1963, I was honored to serve as the chairman of the 55th annual Order Day Dinner of B'nai Zion. On that day B'nai Zion honored Ambassador Philip M. Klutznick, in recognition of his outstanding contributions in the service of our country and the United Nations, and for his eminent record of achievement on behalf of the Jewish people.

Among the many messages of tribute and esteem for Philip Klutznick was one from President Kennedy and another from the Prime Minister of Israel, David Ben-Gurion.

Our distinguished colleague from the other body, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], delivered the principle address on this occasion; our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, and our majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma, CARL ALBERT, as well as many other Members of this House sent messages in recognition of Philip Klutznick's great work.

Others who honored Ambassador Klutznick were the Foreign Minister of Israel, Mrs. Golda Meir; the Israel Finance Minister, Levi Eshkol; the Israel Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Avraham Harmon; Moshe Sharett, chairman, Executive of the Jewish Agency; Katriel Katz, Ambassador and Consul General of Israel in New York; Gov. Nelson Rockefeller; the Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Luther Hodges; Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg; the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. Fulbright; the distinguished minority leader of the Senate, Mr. Dirksen; Mayor Robert F. Wagner; Emanuel Celler; the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the Honorable Jacob J. Javits; the Honorable Kenneth B. Keating; and Thomas E. Morgan, the distinguished chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Our colleagues from New York joining in tribute to Ambassador Klutznick were the Honorable EUGENE J. KEOGH, the Honorable JACOB H. GILBERT, the Honorable BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, the Honorable CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, the Honorable JOHN M. MURPHY, the Honorable JOHN V. LINDSAY, and the Honorable WILLIAM F. RYAN.

For more than a quarter of a century Philip Klutznick has given of himself for the betterment of his fellow man and the welfare of our Nation; he has served our Government under four administrations and when he retired was the U.S. representative to the United Nations Economic and Social Council with the rank of Ambassador. As President Kennedy wrote in his message:

> His talent and ability won him the respect of his colleagues and the appreciation and thanks of his country.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the address given by Ambassador Klutznick on the subject of American-Israel relations that night:

AMERICAN-ISRAEL RELATIONS

(By Philip M. Klutznick)

At your annual dinner a few years ago, you honored a Senator who later became President of the United tSates. He discussed American-Israel relationships in positive and candid terms. He amplified these views during the campaign for the Presidency in a brilliant and constructive address in August 1960. In it he set some difficult and challenging goals for himself. In my 2 years of intimate concern with events inside the administration affecting American-Israel relationships, I found no gap between President Kennedy's views as he stated them earlier and his earnest and dedicated performance as our Nation's Chief Executive.

As a consequence, I am saddened by rumors attending my recent resignation. In the English-Jewish press in Canada, the United Kingdom and Israel, and through some editorial comment in the United States, it was suggested that the real cause of my resignation was my alleged dissatisfaction with the administration's attitude toward Israel. Such rumors are complete and unfounded nonsense. In a matter so vital, I would not play fast and loose with either the administration or the Jewish community. In spite of problems that have arisen and may again arise, I am proud to have been associated officially with the administration. I am convinced that President Kennedy is performing in the best interests of the United States and in keeping with a positive, progressive and constructive policy in American-Israel relationships.

I appreciate fully your desire to do me honor. The devotion of Bnai Zion to the Jewish National Fund I have shared since boyhood. My mind goes back to the days when in countless Jewish homes the only positive symbol of hope for the realization of the dream of centuries was the little blue box—the pushka of the JNF. It is for this and reasons of long friendship that I am honored to be here tonight. I knew when your committee called on me that I would be leaving the Government service at the end of 1962. I felt that I would want to make public expression on American-Israel relationships. This was the platform from which our President chose, while he was a Senator, to clarify his views on the subject. It certainly is an appropriate place for an American, who is a Jew, to do likewise. This is especially true after 2 years in which diplomatic propriety demanded a high measure of public silence.

Let there be no illusions about my official role. My duties as a U.S. Ambassador in the United Nations concerned economic, social and financial matters. The politically surcharged item of American-Israel relations was never assigned to me either at the Permanent Mission or during General Assembly sessions. Whatever I did in that regard was informal either at the request of my superiors or at my own suggestion. But, I was always guided by the proprieties of relationship within a government.

It has been an edifying experience for me to watch the American-Jewish community for the first time in years from a relatively detached vantage point. No less interesting has been the opportunity to observe the performance of Israel and its diplomatic corps at close quarters and in its natural habitat where we met as fellow diplomats each with unalloyed commitment to serve different though friendly countries.

It is my conclusion that the State of Israel and its personnel have matured and grown rapidly both in their understanding and in their performance in the international arena. On the other hand, the American-Jewish community seems to be floundering. We are still trying to understand our own role within this our own country and in our relationship to Israel and other Jewish communities of the world. This is not a criticism. It is a sincere observation made in good faith out of the hope that we can do something about it.

There is an enormous reaction in our Jewish community when incidents involved in American-Israel relationships arise. Therefore, trying to anticipate and to understand this relationship may be the very key to an accelerated maturity as well as a more effective role for the American-Jewish community. For all problems are by no means solved.

By now, we know that regional tensions like those in the Middle East, are more difficult, if not impossible, of solution, so long as the struggle between the West and the East is unresolved or unstabilized. There is just too much room for competition for temporary favors sought and granted by competing sides to permit solid and lasting solutions.

We are living in an unusual epoch. Big powers possess the greatest and most destructive military strength in history. But it remains virtually immobilized while big powers compete for the friendship of small, weak, and poor nations. The meek have truly inherited the earth. Any sane and reasonable attitude toward American-Israel relationships must reflect intelligently on this reality. Whether we approve of certain relationships or not, it must be expected that our Nation, in its own national interest, will maintain friendly and helpful contacts with many nations, including not only Israel but Arab, African, Latin American and Asian States which appear to merit such consideration. The peace of the world requires it.

Another aspect is self-evident but bears repetition. On many issues, Israel alines herself with the West (she has one of the best, if not the best, records of voting on the same side as the United States in the United Nations among nontreaty states). Yet Israel is sovereign and as such acts as she should in what she considers her own best interest. It is no less true of our own Nation. Israel is not a satellite of the United States or of the West; nor is the United States a satellite of Israel. Both nations are blessed with able, intelligent, and energetic leadership. Where energy, intelligence, and movement are present, possibilities for occasional differences arise even while the fundamental relationship is sound and friendly.

Then again, the United States maintains relationships with many friendly nations, some of which are unfriendly to one another. The Israel-Arab situation is not unique. The United States is friendly to both Pakistan and India. Has this solved the Kashmir bitterness? The United States did its best to help set at rest the West Iria conflict between the Netherlands and Indonesia. During the process, Indonesia moved closer to the Soviet and the Dutch publicly berated us at home. Or one might ponder on the discomfort of trying to be a constructive friend to Portugal and to South Africa while trying to maintain the United States' historic belief in the self-determination of peoples. This has not made life with either Portugal or South Africa or, for that matter, with some of the new African nations, a bed of roses. Need one make the point more effectively than to note the occasions when the United States found itself at odds with its oldest ally, France, including the startling events of recent days and, with its close and old ally, the United Kingdom. In an overwrought, exceedingly tense and fluid world, we must expect momentary incongruities. These are usually passing phases with little impact on long-term interests and more profound mutualities.

The closest of friends among the nations of the world go through periods of disagreement, and foes find moments of agreement. Consequently there is always the possibility that differences can arise between the Governments of the United States and Israel. When in the judgments of the governments of states that are friendly national interests conflict, it is not tragic so long as basic and fundamental relationships remain sound.

It is dangerous to elect the role of a prophet but our people have a tradition that encourages the Jew to try prophecy. There are several areas that in the future could bring about momentary or ephemeral differences between the United States and the State of Israel even with as friendly and understanding an administration as that headed by President Kennedy. I would hope that this will not happen but in today's world, anything can happen. Let us examine a few possibilities for a moment.

1. This administration believes deeply in the right and the duty of a state to defend itself from actual or threatened aggression. The recent most classic example is Cuba. At times in the past, and possibly in the future, there have been different approaches to this question by the United States and by Israel. Our Government has held that a member of the United Nations should exhaust the opportunities which that organization affords for peaceful settlement before actually shooting at the other side or shooting back in retaliation. Even in the case of Cuba, the United States took steps short of gunfire when its whole existence was threatened until the Organization of American States and the Security Council of the United Nations examined the problem.

Israel has openly expressed doubt that it can rely on the Security Council to protect it against Arab States. She has felt, not without some cause, that the Soviet veto is always available so long as the Soviet-Arab flirtation continues. Our country has felt that anticipating a veto does not justify refusing to present a case before retaliation.

It is my estimate that currently there is a better understanding on this question between the United States and Israel. Hopefully, this, with all of its implied risks, might avoid the kind of misunderstanding in the Jewish community that arose in the spring of 1962 when the Security Council censured Israel. But if Israel honestly fears its chances in the Security Council and therefore avoids initiating Security Council's processes when attacked, there is the danger of a repetition of the unhappy events of last year. If this should happen, the important thing will be to determine whether it actually affects the long term friendly relations between the two countries or is it only an unfortunate, but nevertheless passing phase.

2. Let us take a calm but brief look at the Arab refugee problem. The United States and Israel would both like to see this problem solved. Both countries are generally moved by humanitarianism. But sovereign states cannot afford generosity if other vital interests are seriously and adversely affected. Israel properly fears for its security in the event of large scale repatriation. The sine qua non of sovereignty is the security of a nation's people. I am completely sanguine that the Kennedy administration would never deliberately and consciously encourage a plan which would endanger the security of Israel, no matter how urgent it regards

the desirability of an Arab refugee solution. Yet, it is inconceivable that the Congress will continue to make substantial appropriations for UNWRA much longer without evidence that a solution is being actively sought or is on the horizon. It seems patent that both countries agree completely on three things:

(a) It is politically desirable that the problem be solved;

(b) A solution must not adversely affect the security of Israel; and

(c) That simple humanitarianism demands that the problem be solved.

But there can be differences dictated by differing exposures and accountabilities of the governments involved. These differences, if they arise, can only yield to patient and painstaking negotiation between the governments involved. The substitute of polemics will only complicate, not clarify.

Recent events tend to negate the prospect of a serious split on this issue. On a particular amendment in the General Assembly, the United States and Israel stood alone in voting against it. The reasons differed, but the fact created much comment in the halls of the United Nations. The debate in the 17th General Assembly and the voting pattern suggest that maybe basic and overt differences can be avoided. Nevertheless, I am convinced that, in keeping with his public pledges, the President and this administration will try for achievable solutions but with sincere and intelligent regard for Israel's security as well as the welfare of the refugees.

3. In another area of potential static—assistance to states not friendly to Israel—I feel more at home as a result of my recent work. One of the oldest foreign aid debates is whether a donor state should dispense aid to states unless they are allied with it formally and informally. This question loses some of its steam if foreign aid is approached from a moral point of view. The United States is the richest and most powerful nation in the world. Like a rich and powerful individual, it has some responsibility to those less fortunate. How and to what extent it discharges this is within its own control. But, if it acts for selfish reasons alone, the decisions may be self-defeating. Just like philanthropy distributed for self-aggrandisement loses its flavor, so foreign aid used to buy friendships rarely succeeds.

On the other hand, one must candidly recognize that if foreign aid strengthens a country, such added strength can be used for better or for worse. A nation sincerely trying to develop economically has little time and less resource for military adventure. Self-defense is all it can afford at best. Some States have not yet learned this truth.

I believe that the hope for peace in the world depends on the elevation of the economic and social standards of many peoples. This is a fundamental objective of the United Nations Charter. It has symbolized the policy of the United States in this post-war era. It can be honestly argued whether aid extended to certain Arab States will blunt the edge of their antagonisms toward Israel or feed the flame of their hostility. But it cannot be disputed that the presence of a constructive U.S. influence should tend to lessen potential troubles.

This is a disturbing problem. When a state that proclaims belligerence and threatens hostilities against a neighbor is provided food and credits, it is reasonable to assume that it is strengthened to commit war even though the aid itself is directed to other channels. A historic analysis of such situations will demonstrate that there are risks in either aiding or withholding aid in a dangerous world. On balance, the odds should favor establishing a constructive U.S. influence if possible and in elevating the economic and social level of the people themselves. It is foolhardy to do so recklessly without careful and rational examination accompanied by constant review.

So long as the United States is in the position of making choices and decisions that could affect the cause of peace and the interests of the free world, questions will continue to arise as to whether our policy at a given moment promotes the easing or heightening of tensions in the Middle East. We must be careful to relate what happens to policy objectives, to the degree of caution that is exercised and to the frequency of the review of potentialities. Perhaps, under such circumstances, any open split involving friends of Israel will be averted.

But actually it is not these dramatic and isolated issues that provide the basic tests of American-Israel relations any more than they do of U.S. relations with many friends. The real tests rest on far more fundamental matters than votes in the United Nations or whether a little more or a little less aid should or should not have been given to a country not friendly to Israel or whether solutions for the Arab refugee problem should be sought in one way or another openly or clandestinely. The real question is, will a great power help a relatively new and struggling small state to maintain its independence and its sovereignty if its security is endangered, and will it help that state overcome an adverse economic balance so it can escape national poverty?

In these matters of real life or death, I speak with complete conviction. The indedendence and security of Israel are an element of the U.S. foreign policy. This is not a new policy. But in recent months it passed the acid test. The United States has never provided major arms assistance to the State of Israel. Other countries have done so. There has been occasional provision of small facilities, but essentially it has been the position of the United States that while it supports the independence and security of Israel should it be in danger, others must provide the hardware with which to do it. When the President of the United States openly and frankly conceded that there was a prospect of a perilous change in the delicate balance of military power in the Middle East, he ordered that Israel receive the Hawk, the prize Western defense missile.

I was among those privileged to be in Washington to listen to President Kennedy explain what he proposed. As usual, it was an extraordinarily busy day for him. He excused himself from a major international meeting long enough to see a small group of Jewish leaders. It is regrettable that his statement was extemporaneous and no recording was made. Briefly, in excellent prose and with perfect logic, he traced the history of the U.S. policy and commitments in the Middle East. He then announced his determination to provide the Hawk to redress what might appear to be a developing and dangerous lack of military balance.

Other than President Truman's prompt recognition of Israel on its birth, this is the highlight in the relationships between the United States and Israel. In something more than words it expressed the United States vital concern with Israel's security. This is a severe and meaningful test of genuine friendship.

Now let us look at another phase. The United States has demonstrated a firm and unaltering commitment to help Israel overcome its natural handicaps and to attain a self-sustaining economic growth. It can be said to the everlasting credit of Israel's people that the confidence which the United States has placed in them has been fully justified. The economic achievements of Israel, with virtually no natural resources, stand out among all developing states. It has a great asset—the love of the people for the land—an indefinable, nevertheless, precious resource. It has another—a people that had seen the entrance to the gate of eternity and had returned from death, as it were, to reclaim an eternal land. But even with this, it has taken energy, intelligence and devotion beyond any recorded in the post-war era to achieve the measure of economic status which is Israel's today. If it had not secured the loans, grants, and other assistance of the United States and of other friendly states, Israel could not have reached this point in so short a time. It now faces the new challenge of the European Common Market. Recent shocking events, not unexpected by some of us, seem to momentarily close the door of the Common Market to the United Kingdom. It may have opened the door to a bitter struggle between large economic units. In a crushing competition small nations, like Israel, dependent on a growing trade, could receive damaging blows to their economic strength. We who believe in Israel's economic future should be aware of the implications of this era of economic revolution. I am proud of our country's outgoing and forward-looking attitude which solidly embraces concern with the trade problems of developing countries like Israel. In this critical and difficult period when the lifeline of such small states may be exposed to traumatic blows the protection and support of the United States may be the one great hope against economic disaster. Applying the hard core test of economic aid, it can be said that under this administration, American-Israel relationships are on a very solid footing.

Yet, the problems of Israel, no more than those of the United States, are not going to be solved in a few years. There will continue to arise challenges that will occupy the time and energy of American Jewry. It is for this reason that I am concerned with the need to clarify the role of the American Jewish community in American-Israel matters. Confusion about this can be more serious than the problems of the friendship between our two sovereign states, the United States and Israel.

As Israel matures, there should be less occasion to worry about American Jewish attitudes and problems of relationship. I begin to believe that for a period the reverse will be true unless we step back and look at ourselves deliberately and calmly. Out of the welter of recent personal experience, let me express a few brief thoughts.

The progress and security of a state like Israel committed to freedom and democracy, small though she is, is in the interest of the United States and the free world even as is the progress and security of India, large though she is. This is not an American Jewish rationalization nor an emotional catharsis. I believed this before I returned to government service; from what I have learned I believe this as much today.

Next, most American Jews have a profound emotional as well as practical attachment to the hope for a safe, secure and free Israel. This is natural and normal. It is understood by right thinking non-Jews of America, even when they do not agree with details. In this situation it is not only proper for American Jews to make appropriate representations to their government when they feel the need to do so, but it is their bounden duty in a free and democratic America where its citizens are the masters—not the servants of our government.

Whether it is with respect to American-Israel relations or any other public issue, our country can only be as strong as the interest of its people in public affairs. All but a few government officials understand this, even when they are overburdened by their own responsibilities, or even when they must disagree with representations. I counted myself a better representative of the United States when I listened and learned even things I did not agree with, than when I spent my time talking without listening.

But, there is a reciprocal obligation on citizenship. It must recognize that the government while it should listen must ultimately do what its responsible officials deem best. Therefore, even special interest group, and there are many—our community is only one—should fight hard for what it believes, this should be within the framework of decency and respect for our government and its personnel no matter what party is in power. Personal vendettas are unfair and improper and profitless. Today's opponent can turn up as tomorrow's best friend.

Permit me to discuss a personal experience which I believe illustrates an important general idea. In April 1962, I delivered a speech at the NJWB Convention Dinner on the subject that they asked me to talk about—Internal American Jewish life in the decade ahead. Afterward, a very competent commentator criticized me for discussing what he termed "trivial considerations while I occupied a new and more august capacity," at a time when the Security Council has censured Israel in response to the Syrian complaint. Assuming that I was free to discuss classified and confidential matters of State publicly while I was serving my country, the idea that a discussion of the organization or reorganization of the American Jewish community in the decade ahead was a trivial consideration caused me to make a mental note that the first chance I had I could challenge this thoughtless, if not fatal concept.

Since I resigned my Government post some commentators have flatteringly suggested that I undertake the task of bringing greater unity to American Jewish life. Without conceding the propriety of this nomination it is interesting to observe that this was precisely the subject to which I addressed myself last April. It was the first of what I hope will be at least one or two more speeches on that topic in which I hope to delineate some of my ideas in greater detail. Let me say only briefly—that we here face a new situation in Jewish life for which history affords no apt parallel. Talk of congresses and kehillahs are a sure fire way of destroying any constructive approach to this problem.

If we mean to create greater orderliness and produce more efficiency in our huge voluntary community we must discover a new form of art of attaining common consent without the need or force of compulsion. Instead of chewing over old and defeated ideas we need new thought and ingenuity. More of this at a later time.

No matter how serious other matters may be, it is neither trivial nor inappropriate nor untimely to consider the most fundamental issues of Jewish life in America itself. We must not permit ourselves to become a second-rate community because external problems exist that require our help for solution. I yield to no one in my hope to see Israel secure, progressive, and self-sustaining but it would be an irreparable tragedy if, in the process achieving that end, this enormously successful and exceedingly resourceful American Jewish community lost its sense of purpose. This would be a disservice to the people of Israel and to posterity.

Irrespective of any post I ever occupy in the Jeweish community, or in any other public service, I shall never consider the examination of our Jewish community and its potential a trivial consideration to be subordinated to other matters, no matter how important. If there is any criticism I could level at some of my Jewish colleagues who have gone into government or general service, it is that too many have severed themselves from active Jewish life, its hopes and aspirations. No matter how much we believe in other causes, we have a desperate need to keep constantly concerned with whether or not this extraordinary and unique Jewish community is doing the best job that it can. Jewry wherever it is can only benefit by such an approach.

CONCLUSION

I have spoken at length. There is an accumulation of unsaid things still on my mind. These will be said at appropriate times and places—elsewhere. Doubtless, some will question the need for all this. It would have been easier and safer to have made a polite brief response. But, I consider the honor you do me would have been tarnished if I had treated it so lightly.

My friends—

1. I believe with all my being that our United States is destined (even with moments of pain) to lead this world to a peace with greater justice for all. For this I shall labor.

2. I believe in such a world that security, hopes, and ambitions of small states with small numbers of people, among which is the blessed recreation of Israel, will be more fully realized.

3. I believe that we Americans of the Jewish faith with a proud history and a splendid record of deeds have a challenge and yes, the opportunity, to reach yet unforseen heights in deepening our culture and in the effectiveness of our performance.

Believing all this I felt I owed it to you as well as myself to give you a glimpse at what is inside of me. How else could I thank you for the honor you bestow. Whether I deserve it or not, others decided—that I cherish it I hope you now understand. Thank you from the bottom of a grateful heart.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—Congressional Record, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the Record:

Ukrainian Congress Committee of
America, Branch of Auburn, N.Y.
Auburn, N.Y., May 6, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: On behalf of our organization, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Auburn Branch, we urge you to submit the Flood Resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your Committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration. Such a Committee on Captive Nations is vitally important both for our government and the American people at large. While Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of "national liberation" in Africa and Asia, we as a Nation, are not doing much to help the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations which constitute a veritable weakness of the Soviet totalitarian empire.

A Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a reservoir of true and unbiased knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, which knowledge will be of vital importance to our government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We strongly urge you, Congressman Smith, to give your full and qualified support to the Flood Resolution in your Rules Committee. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,
Jaroslaw Kowal,
President.
Michael Kosiak,
Vice President.
Iwan Torous,
Secretary.

Cold War Council,
Los Angeles, Calif., May 11, 1963.

Hon. Daniel Flood,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Flood: I was glad to see a recent report on your criticism of the State Department in connection with its opposition to the creation of a House Committee on Captive Nations.

You may be interested in my comments on this whole area in the enclosed testimony before a House Foreign Affairs Committee, page 104.

Sincerely,
Henry Mayers.

West Roxbury, Mass.,
May 7, 1963.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman McCormack: On behalf of the Boston branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America Inc. I am very pleased to express our appreciation for your excellent comments on the Ukrainian Independence Day on January 24, 1963.

I am sure you will agree with me that our support for the freedom of the Ukraine and other captive nations must be properly organized through a committee. Last January Congressman Daniel J. Flood reintroduced House Resolution 14 which calls for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations. Congressmen DERWINSKI, PHILBIN, CONTE, and many others, introduced similar resolutions.

Presently, House Resolution 14 is pending before the House Rules Committee.

In the spirit of your remarks and continuous efforts to help the captive nations, we ask you to—

1. Introduce a similar resolution of your own;
2. Support House Resolution 14 introduced by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD;
3. Use your influence in the House Rules Committee and especially with the chairman of the House Rules Committee, HOWARD W. SMITH, to initiate action on the proposed legislation by opening public hearings and consequently bringing the measure to the floor in the House of Representatives.

We are preparing plans to observe the Captive Nations Week in July. This year's observance would be greatly enhanced by the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

I trust that we can continue to count on your support in this matter, so important to all of us.

Sincerely yours,
UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC., BOSTON BRANCH,
OREST SZCZUDLUK, *Public Relations.*

HOUSTON, TEX.,
May 6, 1963.

Representative DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I believe we should never forget the captive nations and would appreciate it if you would send me a copy of a bill creating a House Committee on Captive Nations or any literature pertaining to captive nations.

Sincerely,
MRS. MARGARET NORDIN.

MAY 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: We are writing to you to express our interest in the House Resolution 14 providing for the establishment of a Permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

Needless to say, such a committee is long overdue. One of the greatest problems confronting our Nation today is the Soviet Union, a prison house of many nations and peoples. The fate of these peoples is a very important matter which has not received sufficient attention in our country. These nations, ever eager and wanting to escape Soviet Russian slavery and despotism, constitute perennial weaknesses, and work to multiply them.

A Committee on the Captive Nations would serve as a reservoir of information and data on the various enslaved nations in the U.S.S.R., which information could be made available to the U.S. Government and its various agencies. Its main function, however, would be to inform the American people and the world at large on the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain and assist the Government in formulating its policies with respect to the captive nations. We urge that quick action be taken on House Resolution 14.

Sincerely yours,
WASYL SOLIMA.

(This is a copy of the letters which we sent to our two State Senators—JACKSON and MAGNUSON—and Representative HOWARD W. SMITH. Many people signed them.)

Our Local Transport Airlines: Progress and Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, in view of its timeliness I should like to call the attention of the Members of the House to an address made by our distinguished colleague and hard-working member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Representative WALTER ROGERS, of Texas, before the Association of Local Transport Airlines, Fort Worth, Tex., May 9, 1963.

Among other pertinent and significant comments Mr. ROGERS refers to the long-standing interest of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the problem of securing a successful replacement for the DC-3 workhorse aircraft, especially for use by local service airlines.

Mr. ROGERS' address follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Association of Local Transport Airlines, distinguished visitors and guests, it is always a pleasure and an honor to visit with you, and I am especially honored to join you at this quarterly meeting in the discussion of vital problems affecting our country.

To get right to the point, let me call to your attention that the Congress has charged the Civil Aeronautics Board with the responsibility of developing a national system of air transportation which, among other objectives, will "* * * recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of * * * and foster sound economic conditions in, such transportation * * * and * * * encouragement * * *." Certainly the Congress, in fixing this responsibility, knew or, by the exercise of reasonable foresight, should have known that Government help would be required. In other words, there would be need for substantial subsidies. Air transportation as we know it today was born during the lifetime of many of us here in this Hall. As an economic infant, it was no different from a human infant in its need for attention, assistance, and care to bring it to maturity. Its growth has been incredible, and when we look back across the few short years to the World War I "Jenny," it is difficult to believe the progress that has been accomplished. I remember quite vividly my first flight in the two-seated "Jenny" in the 1920's, and the time I took my life in my hands and rode in a Ford trimotor. We then graduated step by step to the DC-3. Many considered this plane as the acme of perfection in engineering and development. The unbelievers refused to acknowledge that such a large plane could be a continuing success, and they were certain that no longer plane could ever be built and lifted into the air. I think of the story of the hillbilly boy in Arkansas, who had refused to accept motor transportation. He was watching the driver of a Model-T trying to get it out of a mudhole in which it had become mired. The hillbilly boy was shaking his head and repeating to himself, "He'll never get it started. He'll never get it started." About that time, as flivvers were sometimes likely to do, one of the wheels struck a hard object and the Model T literally leaped out of the mudhole and sailed off down the road. The country boy continued to shake his head, but began to say, "He'll never get it stopped. He'll never get it stopped."

I think this is applicable to the air transportation industry. It was most difficult to get it started, and it will be much more difficult to get it stopped. No one individual or small group of individuals can take credit for these outstanding developments. Certainly the CAB would be the last to try to assume such a role. I am sure that this agency would readily admit that on occasion they have probably hindered the advance of aviation, but not intentionally so. In carrying out the responsibility of the CAB in implementing Government participation in the development of this industry, it was necessary for the agency to weigh each step with great care because they owed an allegiance not only to the promotion and development of this industry, but also to the taxpayers of this Nation who provided the vital funds. Many think that the CAB has followed too rigid a policy in failing to provide proper subsidy to insure full development of a national air transportation system that would extend into the small cities and the thinly populated areas, as well as to provide connections between the metropolitan centers. In any event, and I am sure that the point is debatable as to whether or not the Federal Government has participated as fully as intended in the solution of this problem, in my opinion, we do not now have the national air transportation system intended to have been created by the Congress. Although the tremendous strides forward, the unbelievable development and the unanticipated achievements in air transportation have been the result of a unified effort on the part of all segments of the air transportation industry and associated groups working in conjunction with the Federal Government, our present national air transportation system is a divided rather than a unified system. Two classes of carriers and certainly two general classes of service have emerged from what has been done in the past. One of these is the domestic trunkline carrier, which is presently occupying the status of being self-supporting. The other is the local service carrier which is not self-supporting, and is in a quandry at times to know just what status it does occupy, which calls to mind the story of the baboon who walked about his cage carrying a Bible under one arm, and a copy of Darwin's "Origin of the Species" under the other. One spectator inquired as to the cause of such actions. The keeper advised that the baboon was confused because he couldn't make up his mind whether he was his brother's keeper, or his keeper's brother. I am sure you local service people understand the dilemma. Whatever your status, let it be said that you are true pioneers wrestling with a problem to which the proper solution is of great interest to this Nation just as was the need for success in the westward movement of wagon trains.

I am sure that none of you enjoy being on subsidy. In this age of semantics the word "subsidy" has been turned into a dirty expression. There are, no doubt, many areas and instances in which Federal subsidy should be condemned, but certainly not in the local service air carrier system. As I pointed out earlier, you are, relatively speaking, an infant growing to maturity. If your body is to be sound, and your mind keen, proper provision must be made to build this industry on a sound basis, and opportunity must be afforded to bring about that end. Perhaps I will offend the trunkline carrier by what I am about to say, but nevertheless, in my opinion, it should be said. Until the trunkline carriers were able to confine their operations to the cream of the market, they too were on subsidy. If the local service carriers were taken out of business either by the canceling of certificates or by bankruptcy, and the trunklines had to assume the present responsibilities of the local service carriers in order to provide a national air transportation system, they would require a substantial subsidy; probably more than is presently going to the local service carriers. In other words, it seems rather unfair to me to charge the local service carriers with being the recipients of a Federal subsidy, if the dictates of the Congress for the creation of a national air transportation system are to be carried out. The matter should be viewed as one system as important to the welfare of this Nation as the communications system and the Postal Department. The records will reflect that in 1962, public service payments amounted to $66 million. In turn, it can also be pointed out that the local service carriers originated $69 million worth of revenue for the trunklines of the United States. Five hundred and seventy-seven cities having a population of more than 116 million people were served by these carriers. Of these cities, 341 received their only air service from the local carriers. Two hundred and fifty-two military bases received service from the carriers, and of these, 69 were entirely dependent upon the local airlines for their commercial air service. The last decade has seen passenger traffic increase fourfold in these operations, and it has increased 130 percent in the last 5 years. Some 14,000 people depend upon paychecks totaling $91,500,000 per year for their livelihood, their sustenance of themselves and their families. The local service industry paid more than $2,250,000 in State and Federal taxes on fuel and oil, and collected over $10 million in transportation taxes for the Government during 1962. At the same time and during the same period, additional services that were being provided by the local service carriers and public benefits for each dollar spent have increased some twofold in the past 5 years. This in spite of the deflated dollar. Many statistics can be provided to show that the local service carriers are receiving less subsidy than did the trunkline operators during their time on subsidy. However, it is not my purpose here tonight to try to generate a controversy between two segments of a great and vital industry. It is my purpose to lend what assistance I can toward unity in the industry with proper participation by the Federal Government in providing the national security safeguards so closely associated with the air transportation industry and to properly foster the full economic expansion of this business.

Although great strides have been made as I have heretofore indicated, there are many soft spots that are in need of treatment. It is my feeling that these soft spots have been created by the Government rather than by the industry. I do not mean to indicate that the industry is free of just criticism. There are many things that the industry can do and should do in the furtherance of the solution of the overall problem. However, I do not think that they should be called upon to respond to such criticism until the Government measures up to its full responsibility. I am also of the opinion that perhaps the CAB is in a state of confusion as to the role the Congress expects it to assume. In order to bring the overall problem into clear focus, I think it would be well if the Congress could enunciate a policy to the effect that the national air transportation system is a national problem and a problem that must be treated as a single problem. Certainly there are many facets and fragments to be dealt with, but it should be understood that each of these are to be tied together and properly equated with the whole. It is only by this procedure that we can insure proper service, proper defense, and proper economic growth to our country in its entirety. And it is only by this procedure that the full potential of the aviation industry can be brought to bear for its contribution to the growth of our Nation. If expanded participation by the Federal Government in supporting the local service airlines is necessary to bring about the needed results, this obligation on the part of Government should be squarely faced. It would be disastrous to permit the feeder lines to slip backward into poor financial conditions and to try to cure such an ailment by further curtailment of service to the thinly populated areas. It is my understanding that all of the local service airlines made a little bit of money last year. This fact standing alone does not mean that that segment of our economy is in a healthy condition and it does not mean that subsidy payments should be promptly reduced. You will agree with me that getting these local service lines into the black was, to some extent, at the expense of service. The people in the United States are widely scattered throughout our country from the single-family isolated farmer or rancher to the thickly congested metropolitan areas. They are all Americans and they are all entitled to consideration in this or any other problem which faces us as a Nation. If the local service airlines are to be graded solely on the basis of a good balance sheet, then there will be many citizens of our country who will not have available to them the transportation services to which they are entitled. We all know of the substantial curtailment of rail passenger services, as well as limited bus schedules in many of the thinly populated areas. America is today living in an air age and our people in all walks of life are entitled to the opportunity to participate. To condemn the local service airlines because they require subsidy in order to provide needed transportation services is utter folly. Until the local service problem is answered, there will be a great untapped market. Many millions of our people have never been in an airplane and many others would be in an airplane more if the services were available. It is the age-old problem of which comes first, the chicken or the egg. Every industry and severy segment of that industry, like a human being, must crawl before it walks, and it must walk before it runs. If more attention is paid to the solution of the problem than to the condemnation of these small struggling corporations, success would be nearer.

One of the crying needs of the industry at this time is a modern aircraft geared to the needs of the feeder line. This is not a new difficulty, but one that was anticipated several years ago. A difficulty about which nothing concrete has been done. I well remember in 1955 an investigation made by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives of which I was a member. This investigation concerned this very problem. It was obvious at that time that the aircraft builders in this country were moving toward the development of aircraft that could fly nonstop around the world in the shortest possible time. The plane was to further conquer the oceans and the vast land expanses to move the air traveler from one metropolitan center to another, from one continent to another. The trunklines moved from the two-motored DC–3 to the larger four-motored craft, and then into the very expensive jets. The DC–3 that had been the workhorse of the trunklines continues to be the workhorse of the local service lines and remains today as a stalwart ship that is bearing this load. The 1955 investigation took our committee to Amsterdam, to Paris, and to London in search of an answer to the short-haul problem. Of all the new aircraft that we viewed, only the F–27, then the Fokker-Friendship, appeared to be a possible solution to the problem. Several of our local carriers, including two Alaskan carriers and one Hawaiian carrier, have testified to the economic benefits derived from this aircraft, which is presently manufactured in this country by Fairchild-Stratos in Hagerstown, Md. The record on this craft is written and can be reviewed by those seeking machines for the short-haul purpose in this country. There is no doubt but that it does afford a solution to part of the short-haul problem. Some say that there are other available aircraft on the market today to meet the low density problem in the short-haul category. Frankly, I have not yet seen the plane that will answer all functions of the short-haul problem. It is my feeling that if we can find an answer to the low density portion of that problem, we will be in the vicinity of a breakthrough. I would hope that effective action in that area would be of great service to the small cities where it is most badly needed and where the basic answer to this problem lies. It would certainly not be out of line for Congress to provide funds for experimental and developmental work on this subject. It would be an investment rather than a subsidy; an investment that would pay substantial dividends. Perhaps we need two planes in order to attain success—one of which would service the "third level" type of operation and create a several-phase situation in air service, each of which would complement the other. This would also provide the smaller communities with a weapon to meet the "use it or lose it" criterion fixed by the CAB. Frankly, I do not feel that this criterion is the answer to the problem. Once the local service group becomes healthy and the cities being served have the opportunity to utilize air service fitted to their needs, there may be a sound basis for the "use it or lose it" idea. However, as long as this type of service is in the embryonic stage, it should be helped, not hindered.

It is indeed encouraging to know that Postmaster General Day is feeding out more first-class mail to the local service lines for movement on a space available basis. This will provide a much needed service especially in those areas where surface transportation is slow and inadequate. There are other ways that the Government can help in the solution of this problem other than the subsidy route, and on a value received basis such as the postal service. I, of course, feel that the Members of Congress will address themselves to greater participation by the Government in this area.

I yield to no one in my dsire to see Government in business as little as possible. I yield to no one in my desire to see a balanced budget and marked reductions in Federal expenditures. I yield to no one in my desire to avoid every possible Federal subsidy. But I am equally aware of the fact that any country intending to be and remain strong must have and maintain a strong, healthy, and vigorous communications and transportation system. Each segment of these general categories presents different requirements and different challenges. It is only by a unified approach on a national basis that these challenges can be met and a vigorous free enterprise industry built. It is one of the responsibilities of the Congress to take such step as necessary to insure that end, in keeping with the general philosophy of the Government under which we live.

We all know the difficulties of wrestling with economic feasibility in high cost air operations. I do not think that the Congress should be penny wise and pound foolish in trying to solve a national problem. Once the local service problem has been substantially answered and that segment of the industry begins to enlarge its muscles, it can assume and absorb some of the services now being handled by the trunklines, which the trunklines would like to get rid of. This would, of course, contribute measurably to the stability of the overall industry and all of its segments and associated businesses and speed the day when subsidies can be discontinued—a day we would all welcome. It is a problem that, in my opinion, cannot be put off, and I would hope that you who are in the front line trenches would do your best to bring forward a sound and well based program containing your suggestions and observations so that the Congress may move forward at an early date on the subject matter. I would conclude by calling to your attention that we have a representative form of Government, and I know of no Member of the Congress who does not have some direct or indirect concern with the local service airlines and their associated industries. I do not presume to tell you how to proceed, and I certainly do not want to burden my colleagues in the Congress with additional mail. But I would point out that in my judgment, the local service airlines, the Alaskan carriers, the Hawaiian carriers, and the Caribbean carrier have many friends in the Congress. It has always been my experience that when one is in trouble, he should see his friends.

Order in Birmingham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, the city of Livermore adjoins the lovely foothills of the California coast range. Its vineyards produce the finest vintage wines in the world, and I include the products of Burgundy, of Champagne, and of the Loire Valley in this comparison. Two great atomic energy laboratories add their vitality and sophistication to this city.

Mr. Speaker, like good people everywhere, the men, women, and children of Livermore are concerned over the welfare and well-being of their fellow citizens in every part of our country. The following editorial from the May 10, 1963, edition of our local newspaper, the Herald and News, expresses the feelings of our friends in Livermore regarding the recent events in Birmingham:

ORDER IN BIRMINGHAM

Birmingham, Ala. is a long way from Livermore. But what is going on in Birmingham right now is as important to Livermore as if it were happening in the next county.

In the process of working out our racial differences, the United States has given itself a black eye and the eye is going to get blacker if we don't restore order in Birmingham and insure that it is maintained throughout the rest of the South.

President Kennedy acted decisively in the Oxford, Miss., situation and won wide support throughout the Nation.

The President probably isn't merely waiting for a reading of public opinion before he acts in the Birmingham situation, but an expression of support from the public certainly can help him reach a decision.

A group of Livermore residents has already sent a telegram to the President, urging him to preserve order in Birmingham and offering support for his actions.

Strangely, in the segregation issue in the South, preserving order does not mean preservation of segregation. It probably means the end of segregation, for the Negroes in the South have the moral and legal right, at least ultimately, on their side.

If the rednecks, and the sincere southerners who find it so hard to change their way of life, can be prevented from intimidating and jailing Negroes who demand their rights then the Negroes will be able to attain their rights.

Even though we are 2,000 miles away, we here in Livermore can make at least a small effort for preservation of order and right by urging the President to act.

A.L.H.

Iowa General Assembly Views on Workmen's Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution adopted by the Iowa General Assembly regarding workmen's compensation laws:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 23

Whereas the U.S. Congress by a series of amendments to the Social Security Act during the period 1956–62 has extended and broadened the Social Security Act to provide disability and other benefits for work-connected injuries and disease; and

Whereas the workmen's compensation laws were designed to be the basic and exclusive method and remedy providing benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases, and their administration has for over 50 years been the function of the several industrial accident boards and commissions, based on the accepted principle that benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases be tailored to fit social and economic conditions at the local level; and

Whereas the extension of the Social Security Act to provide benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases has resulted in duplication of benefits; and

Whereas legislation resulting in further intrusion into the field of work-connected injuries and diseases will constitute a severe threat to the survival of the State-administered workmen's compensation programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate, the house concurring, That the General Assembly of the State of Iowa is opposed to any legislation by the U.S. Congress which would infringe on the right of this State to enact and administer its own workmen's compensation laws, and to further Federal encroachment into the field of State-administered workmen's compensation programs, and strongly urges that the U.S. Congress again affirm that the workmen's compensation system is the basic program for compensating work-connected injuries and disease; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to forward a copy of this resolution to each member of the Iowa delegation in the Congress of the United States.

W. L. MOOTY,
President of the Senate.
CARROLL A. LANE,
Secretary of the Senate.

American Bar Association Joins the Opposition to "Quality Stabilization"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the American Bar Association has joined with others in registering its concern over the so-called quality stabilization bills pending before the Congress. Prof. Glen Weston, of the George Washington University Law School, recently expressed the American Bar Association's opposition to "any proposed legislation which would attempt to create a Federal right of enforcement of resale price maintenance by private persons." Professor Weston's own analysis of the legislation now before the Congress is so cogent and so forceful that I take this occasion to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

The analysis follows:

STATEMENT OF GLEN E. WESTON, PROFESSOR OF LAW, THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, PRESENTED TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND FINANCE, OF THE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, APRIL 25, 1963

My name is Glen E. Weston. I am a professor of antitrust and trade regulation law at the George Washington University Law School here in Washington, D.C. I am a member of the bar in the District of Columbia and in Virginia. I have taught law since 1949 and trade regulation law since 1952. Before becoming a full-time teacher I practiced law with the law firm of McFarland & Sellers in Washington, D.C. I appear here today on behalf of the American Bar Association. I am currently chairman of the subcommittee on fair trade and implementing Federal legislation of the section of antitrust law of the American Bar Association. I am grateful to you for affording me this opportunity of presenting the views of the association, the antitrust section, and my personal views.

On August 9, 1962, at the annual meeting of the American Bar Association in San Francisco, Calif., the house of delegates of the American Bar Association adopted the following resolution, upon the recommendation of its antitrust law section:

"*Resolved,* That the American Bar Association disapproves of and opposes Senate Joint Resolution 159, 87th Congress, and any proposed legislation which would attempt to create a Federal right of enforcement of resale price maintenance by private persons; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the officers and council of the section of antitrust law are directed to urge such opposition and disapproval upon the proper committees of Congress in connection with any legislation embodying any such concept."

While the resolution referred to Senate Joint Resolution 159 of the 87th Congress, may I call your attention to the fact that it expresses opposition to "any proposed legislation which would attempt to create a Federal right of enforcement of resale price maintenance by private persons." The officers and council of the section of antitrust law, who were directed to urge such opposition upon the proper committees of Congress, are of the opinion that H.R. 3669 and the various other quality stabilization bills currently pending are clearly within the terms of the house of delegates resolution. For this reason I was requested by them to appear before you today to represent the association in urging disapproval of these bills.

The policymaking body of the American Bar Association is its house of delegates, composed of some 250 members, about one-half of whom are delegates elected to represent State and local bar associations. Resolutions, when approved by the house, become the official policy of the American Bar Association. The comments and supporting data included in reports of sections or committees of the association are not a part of the official policy but are the views of the section or committe submitting them. The council of the section of antitrust law submitted a report to accompany its recommendations to the house of delegates.

I do not want to take your valuable time today reading this entire report, but will merely summarize the conclusions for you, and invite you to read the fuller statement which is attached as an appendix to this statement.

First. The section of antitrust law feels that there are significant uncertainties in the bill. Although a right of revocation and to sue is given for "bait merchandising practices" and "misrepresentation" these terms are undefined. This could provoke considerable trivial litigation and thus result in harassment and injury to business concerns. "Bait merchandising" in particular is an uncertain term. If it were defined merely to include the flagrant type of loss-leader selling it would be somewhat less objectionable but its vagueness may lead to attempts to apply it to many other types of practices and could result in harassing litigation that might injure business concerns whom the proponents desire to protect.

Second. The most fundamental objection of the Section of Antitrust Law is to the granting of power to brand owners to control resale prices. This goes far beyond any requirements needed to control loss-leader selling and is inconsistent with basic antitrust policy of reliance upon price and other competition. Exemptions should be enacted only in compelling circumstances.

Third. The antitrust law section feels that the quality stabilization bills would be an unwarranted intrusion upon the public policy of the States. There are now about 27 States plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico in which resale price maintenance enforcement against nonsigning dealers is considered contrary to the State's legislative or constitutional policy. Moreover, the present bills by asserting a paramount Federal policy probably deny to the States the right to legislate in this significant area of economic policy. Indeed, in some States such as Montana, Utah, and perhaps Idaho (where the question is pending on appeal), there are State constitutional provisions which prohibit resale price fixing. Other States such as Texas prohibit such practices by statute. H.R. 3669 and similar bills would therefore impose upon these States a price maintenance system that such States have declared contrary to their policy. The Federal courts would also have transferred to them the burden of policing resale price maintenance through litigation without regard to the amount in controversy.

Finally, speaking only for myself as an individual and a teacher of trade regulation law I would like to give my further personal reasons why I think quality stabilization should not be enacted. The remainder of my statement is not to be attributed to the American Bar Association or its antitrust law section. And let me first assure you that I am not paid or retained by anyone. My only interests are those of a teacher, consumer and citizen who is interested in the maintenance of a strong, free, private competitive enterprise system. I think that the general objectives of those who have introduced these bills of trying to help small businessmen, improve quality and protect consumers against deception are laudable. As a teacher of trademark law as well as antitrust law I also believe that a system of reasonably strong protection of trademarks is a sina qua non of free competitive enterprise. But I believe that these quality stabilization bills will not achieve the objectives that some of you in good faith think that they will. Instead, you are asked to enact one of the most drastic departures from a free enterprise system that has ever been before Congress. It would in reality throw the baby of price competition out with the bath water of the loss leader and bait merchandising. I am confident of the sincerity of those who have introduced these bills but in my opinion the very name "quality stabilization" is misleading because it erroneously implies that the bill will achieve quality control and obscures the stark truth that this is primarily a price-fixing bill. At the moment consumers are blissfully unaware of the purport of this bill. If the real effect of this bill were made known to the American public, Congress would be inundated with protests by consumers. If it is enacted and put into effect I think you are going to witness a severe reaction from consumers all over the Nation.

These quality stabilization bills are designed to aid three classes of persons: brand owners, small dealers, and consumers. However, I sincerely believe there are substantial unanticipated problems in the bills that can boomerang and cause trouble for each of these groups:

A. QUALITY STABILIZATION PRESENTS SEVERE PROBLEMS FOR BRAND OWNERS

There are severe problems for brand owners in these bills that ought to make them think twice about supporting these bills or using them if enacted.

1. Since these bills do not authorize any agreement or combination a brand owner may find himself violating the Sherman Act and FTC Act when his dealers in complete good faith try to cooperate in enforcement. These bills thus create a dangerous trap for brand owners. Unlike fair trade, the trademark owner is the only person authorized to bring suit or enforce the provisions of the bills. This means the brand owner alone must bear the cost of enforcement of his price stabilization system. While he may do this by revocation of the right to sell as well as suit against the price cutting dealer it is doubtful whether he can either invoke or accept any assistance from dealers in detecting violations and policing. Nothing in the bill authorizes agreements with dealers or indicates that dealers may help. Under *United States* v. *Parke, Davis & Co.*, 362 U.S. 29 (1960), a refusal to deal must be kept strictly unilateral to keep it from becoming an unlawful "combination" to fix prices violative of section 1 of the Sherman Act. Unsolicited aid from dealers in detecting violations or even oral assurances by dealers that they will adhere to a manufacturer's suggested prices are unlawful as some persons interpret the Parke, Davis case. While an amendment might be drafted to overcome this, such an amendment would convert the bills into a mere authorization of price-fixing agreements and also destroy the claim that the resale price maintenance provisions are voluntary with the brand owner. Such an amendment would also unwisely permit dealers to pressure brand owners into price fixing even though brand owners do not desire to do so.

2. A second danger for brand owners in this bill is that it may cause a substantial increase in product liability claims against them. This danger arises partly from the provision in paragraph (10) of the bill (H.R. 3669) that subjects the brand owner to jurisdiction in every Federal district in which his goods are sold. This jurisdiction is solely for purposes of suits by consumers arising out of alleged misrepresentations by the owner as to size, capacity, quality, condition, model, or age of the goods. Although this does not expressly create a right of action, it seems to imply the existence of one. While I do not quarrel with creation of a right of action on behalf of consumers for misrepresentation by brand owners, this provision, coupled with other provisions in the bill giving some control over retail dealers, may arguably go much beyond that. They may result in a substantial increase in the trend toward absolute liability for any defects in the goods, particularly in those States that still cling to the so-called "privity" doctrine. In other words, the control over dealers provided in this bill may create "privity" between the brand owner and the retail purchaser that will make the brand owner liable to the ultimate consumer for any defects in the product. Now this may be good; in fact, I think it probably is. But is this what you intend, and do brand owners realize its potential effect? Do they realize it could result in substantial increase in their insurance costs? I doubt whether they have even thought about it much.

3. A third problem for brand owners is increased difficulty in complying with the Robinson-Patman Act. Normally a brand owner who sells to wholesalers is not responsible under the Robinson-Patman Act for price or service discrimination resulting from the wholesaler's resales to retailers. Retailers who purchase from wholesalers are not considered purchasers or customers of the brand owners. But under cases such as *American News Co.* v. *FTC* (300 F. 2d 104 (2d Cir. 1962)) (certiorari denied) the control that this bill gives to brand owners over retail dealers who purchase from independent wholesalers may be enough to make such dealers be considered purchasers from the brand owner. This could mean that some brand owners will have hundreds or thousands of new purchasers or customers to whom they must proportionalize all advertising allowances and all promotional services or facilities. It may also arguably make the brand owner liable for any discrimination practiced by his wholesalers. Again I doubt seriously if brand owners have realized this problem.

4. Another serious drawback for many brand owners is that this bill may preclude a brand owner from selling private brand goods to mass merchandisers even through the price differential is fully cost justified or is made to meet competition. Paragraph 11(B) of H.R. 3669 creates a defense if the dealer shows that plaintiff has sold the same kind of goods of like grade and quality to another person similarly situated under more favorable terms or at lower prices. This would create a Robinson-Patman type defense of discrimination. But there is a notable complete absence of mention of any cost justification or meeting competition privilege. From this it may be interpreted to mean that a brand owner who tries to keep small dealers happy by fixing resale prices with high margins while still maintaining his volume by selling private brand goods may find himself in difficulty. I do not know whether this is intended by the drafters of the bill or whether it is a "sleeper" planted by someone who does not like private brands. They are permissible under Robinson-Patman when any price differential is cost justified and there is no sound reason why this proposed legislation should in effect, preclude them under such circumstances.

5. Brand owners may find quality stabilization very expensive and troublesome to enforce. The superimposing of quality stabilization on top of State fair trade laws and the Miller-Tydings and McGuire Acts creates a lot of confusion and uncertainty. Some types of conduct will thus be permitted under some State laws and other types under Federal law. Suits may be pending in both State and Federal courts dealing with similar conduct. The many unanswered legal problems arising out of such a situation will mean many attempted defenses and subterfuges and a high cost of enforcement. Moreover, the bill is completely silent and therefore ambiguous concerning the status of such things as tradein allowances and trading stamps which have caused a great deal of trouble in fair trade States. Finally, since discount houses are thoroughly entrenched in most States it is going to take a long, expensive litigation effort to halt their discounting—if it can be accomplished. Such subterfuges as covering the trademark with tape, making a few scratches on an appliance and calling it damaged or secondhand, overvaluing tradeins and the like are likely to be employed.

B. PROBLEMS FOR SMALL DEALERS IN QUALITY STABILIZATION

There are some ways in which small dealers may be injured as a result of quality stabilization:

1. Dealers may be prosecuted under the Sherman Act or be sued for treble damages for "combining" with brand owners if they attempt to help in reporting violations or cooperate in enforcement. As I mentioned earlier these bills do not contain any authorization for agreements or combinations between brand owners and dealers. The Parke, Davis rule requiring strict unilateral action by the brand owner is presumably still in effect. In a recent Federal district court case, *Klein* v. *American Luggage Works, Inc.*, 206 F. Supp. 924 (D. Del. 1962), two retailers were held liable for treble damages along with the brand owner because they "volunteered assistance in the ascertainment of noncomplying dealers" in a refusal-to-deal price maintenance system. The present bills do not contain anything that would change this part of the rule of this case. Therefore there is real danger to dealers under quality stabilization.

2. Quality stabilization may give some substantial advantages to chain stores, mail order houses and large department stores. In some ways quality stabilization may give mass merchandisers advantages over independent dealers. It should give greater incentive for the use of private label merchandise by such mass merchandisers. The independent dealer will find his hands tied by quality stabilized pricing so that he is unable to meet the price competition of such private brand products. A surprisingly large percentage of the suits brought under fair trade laws have been against small dealers—not just chain stores or discount houses. Chain stores and other mass merchandisers also have greater capital to invest in advertising or in servicing stabilized products and thus may grow even more rapidly with guaranteed margins.

3. The lack of a right of action for competing dealers makes them dependent solely upon the brand owner for enforcement. If brand owners are slow to bring suit, the dealer may suffer losses for which he has no right of action against anyone. Experience under fair trade has shown that many brand owners are not enthusiastic about maintaining such litigation since it is expensive and is largely for the benefit of the dealer rather than the brand owner. Small dealers may find themselves afraid to cut prices because of fear of revocation under quality stabilization, afraid to complain of price cuts by competitors because of possible Sherman Act claims against them, and unable to bring suit on their own behalf. What recourse do they have under such circumstances?

4. Small dealers may find themselves faced with threats of revocation of their right to resell trademarked articles. There is no requirement that price cutting or "bait merchandising" be intentional to be grounds for revocation. Mistakes by employees or salesmen might be grounds for revocation of a dealer's right to resell. And since brand owners must use diligence in enforcement, there is some question as to how far they may go in overlooking such violations. Consequently there may be some danger that small dealers may find themselves cut off from their sources of supply or being named as defendants in litigation under this proposed legislation.

C. CONSUMERS WILL BE DAMAGED BY THIS PROPOSED LEGISLATION

1. Although one of the stated purposes of this legislation is to protect consumers against bait merchandising and misrepresentation, the bills do not provide effective remedies for this purpose. Why is the consumer given no right of action for such practices? More significantly, why isn't the Federal Trade Commission's jurisdiction enlarged to reach such practices merely "affecting commerce" if the real purpose is to protect consumers? Why aren't competitive dealers given a right of action? These significant omissions make the bait advertising and misrepresentation provisions of these bills ineffective as a means of protecting consumers and create a suspicion that their principal purpose is to soft-pedal the price-fixing provisions by equating discounting with misrepresentation.

2. There is a strange omission of any requirement, guarantee or assurance of high quality products, except for the pretentious title "quality stabilization" which seems to imply a paramount intention to achieve quality control. Why isn't it a good defense to a suit by the brand owner for the dealer to show the brand owner's product was of poor quality? Why aren't consumers who will be required to pay fixed prices given recourse against the brand owner who sells a poor quality product? There is little reason to believe that these quality stablization bills will aid materially in improving quality since the bills signally fail to contain adequate means of assuring quality.

3. Consumers will be damaged because resale price maintenance on trademarked commodities facilitates horizontal price fixing between competing brands even in the absence of actual agreement. These bills purport to permit only the elimination of intrabrand competition but they will significantly lessen competition between rival brands since they contain insufficient safeguards. There is nothing to prevent rival brand owners from announcing stabilized resale prices that are identical or virtually so, as long as they did not agree among themselves to do so. The only limitation in the bill is the "free and open competition" requirement but under fair trade this has sometimes been interpreted as being met even though there were only two competitive producers. Professor Walter Adams, the most sophisticated economist favoring fair trade, has advocated more stringent interpretation of the "free and open competition" limitation, but the only State that has applied it with any degree of strictness is Pennsylvania. Instead of the greatly inadequate "free and open competition" requirement, why don't you write into this bill a requirement that there be "free and effective price competition" between the stabilized commodity and similar products produced or distributed by others? This would limit price stabilization to products where a substantial degree of interbrand price competition exists and the consumer has real alternatives. The courts or the FTC could then preclude resale price maintenance when there was insufficient interbrand competition.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, let me emphasize my personal opinion that the objectives of this proposal are good but the means employed are unsound. A far more effective means of dealing with the loss-leader problem, if you feel new legislation is needed, would be a Federal sales-below-cost statute modeled after those in effect in about one-half of the States (such as S. 1804 of the 87th Cong.). Misrepresentation and bait merchandising affecting interstate commerce could be more effectively dealt with by such legislative proposals as the Lindsay-Javits bill (H.R. 4651 and S. 1038) that would create a right of action for "unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce." The quality stabilization bills are drastic proposals. They go far beyond fair trade because they would create a nationwide price-fixing system enforceable in the Federal courts. They are so replete with legal problems and pitfalls that the main beneficiaries will be lawyers not brand owners, dealers or consumers. What kind of answer can you give to the unemployed workers, the low wage laborers, the retired pensioners, the disgracefully underpaid public school teachers and the underprivileged in our society if they find themselves required to pay higher prices for such items as packaged foods, clothing, aspirin, first aid supplies, toothpaste, shaving cream, razor blades and other necessities? I have read a good many economic studies concerning the effects of fair trade and they are conflicting in their conclusions; perhaps no one can say with complete certainty exactly what the long-range effects will be. In my opinion the most objective and reliable studies point to the probability that consumer prices will be materially increased. At any rate it seems to me you should not enact this drastic departure from a free enterprise system unless you are quite certain it will not have such an undesirable result. Can you honestly say that you are certain it will not increase consumer prices? I do not see how anyone can.

American Bar Association, Section of Antitrust Law—Recommendation

The section of antitrust law recommends that the house of delegates adopt the following resolution:

"*Resolved,* That the American Bar Association disapproves of and opposes Senate Joint Resolution 159, 87th Congress, and any proposed legislation which would attempt to create a Federal right of enforcement of resale price maintenance by private persons; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the officers and council of the section of antitrust law are directed to urge such opposition and disapproval upon the proper committees of Congress in connection with any legislation embodying any such concept."

REPORT

1. Background

On May 18, 1959, the board of governors of the American Bar Association adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved,* That the American Bar Association disapproves of and opposes any amendment of the Federal Trade Commission Act which would further expand the philosophy of so-called fair trade acts and create a Federal right of action in the enforcement of fair trade contracts; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the officers and council of the section of antitrust law are directed to urge such opposition and disapproval upon the proper committees of Congress in connection with any legislation embodying any such amendment."

In February 1962 a proposal by the antitrust section to update this recommendation as a current expression of the association was considered at the midwinter meeting of the ABA's house of delegates in Chicago. At that meeting consideration of a proposal by the antitrust section to oppose legislation creating a Federal right of action in the enforcement of fair trade contracts was postponed to the August meeting of the house of delegates. (During the 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses, several bills had been introduced which would create in some form a Federal right of action for the enforcement of fair trade contracts entered into under State law.)

Since the February 1962 meeting attention has been directed to Senate Joint Resolution 159, the Quality Stabilization Act proposal introduced by Senators HUMPHREY, CAPEHART, and others on February 21, 1962.[1] While hearings were held on S. 1722 on July 25 and 27 and August 28, 1961, it is understood that they will not be printed in the light of the shift of interest to Senate Joint Resolution 159. Hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 159 have been held by the Senate Committee on Commerce. In the course of the hearings the heads of the two principal antitrust enforcement agencies (Lee Loevinger, Assistant Attorney General in Charge of the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, and Paul Rand Dixon, chairman, Federal Trade Commission), testified in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 159.

2. Provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 159

The resolution opens with six recitals setting forth legislative statements of objectives. A key recital refers to unfair or deceptive acts or practices "such as * * * store-traffic baiting and misrepresentation as to the size, capacity, quality, condition, model, or age" of branded goods, "all tending to destroy unfairly the value" of brands[2] to their owners, to smaller resellers, and to the public. Among the effects of these practices recited is a tendency to diminish the volume of branded products moving in commerce, thereby reducing producers' incentive to maintain the value of their goods and producing other value-diluting consequences ("substitutions of inferior labor and materials forced by the downward spiral of unrestrained predatory pricing on popular identified products, in the fields of goods, drugs and beverages, endanger public health, and in other fields, endangers (sic) public safety"). Recognition of the property right in a brand and the goodwill associated therewith is also recited.

The operative provisions of the resolution would amend Section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 15 U.S.C.A., Sec. 45(a), by adding eight new paragraphs, (7) to (14). The new paragraphs may be summarized as follows:

7. A brand owner is deemed to retain his property rights in the brand and associated good will regardless of any transfer of the goods to which the brand relates. Any person who resells branded goods in commerce may use the brand but only in effecting resale of such goods, and subject to (8).

8. When goods usable for the same general purpose are available to the public from sources other than the brand owner, the right of any person to use the brand in reselling may be revoked (on written notice) by the brand owner on the ground that the reseller (a) has used branded goods "in furtherance of bait merchandising practices"; (b) has with notice advertised, offered for sale or sold such goods at prices other than at the brand owner's currently established resale prices; or (c) with intent to deceive, has "published misrepresentation concerning such goods."

9. Nothing in (8) shall abridge the right of the reseller, in the regular course of his business and within a reasonable time after revocation, to sell the goods in his possession on the date of revocation, so long as he does not violate (8) in so selling. A procedure is established for the reseller to offer his inventory to the brand owner at the price he paid for them; if the offer is not accepted, the reseller may sell the goods without restriction as to price so long as his advertisements or offers state the fact of revocation as to goods not in his possession on the revocation date.

10. A reseller who sells under the brand name after revocation commits an act of unfair competition and is liable in a civil action for damages and injunctive relief by the brand owner, in any U.S. district court in which the defendant resides or is found or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy; the owner may recover the cost of suit including reasonable attorneys' fees.

11. Lack of due diligence in revoking as to competing resellers who are violating (8) is specifically set forth as a defense.

The other paragraphs are saving and definitional provisions, and include antitrust exemption language and a statement that the Miller-Tydings and McGuire Acts, inter alia, are not modified or repealed.

3. Objectives of Senate Joint Resolution 159

Senator HUMPHREY's statement introducing the quality stabilization resolution emphasized the following reasons in support of the legislation:[3]

1. The resolution is merely an extension of the trademark laws enabling a brand owner to protect his property rights through channels of distribution.

2. The resolution would permit a reseller to remove the brand from the product—"thus separating the physical property, which he owns, from the goodwill, which is another's property"—and then sell at any price.

3. The legislation would be permissive and would leave decision as to enforcement in the hands of the brand owner.

4. The proposal would permit the continuance of independent retailing and provide assurance to consumers that quality tested and reliable products will continue to be available.

5. In the light of increasing numbers of bankruptcies of small business concerns, the proposed legislation is essential to competitive survival of hundreds of thousands of independent businessmen.

Several of these reasons have been equally appropriate in past consideration of fair trade legislation and have been reviewed in detail by many commentators in the past. The most compelling reason now offered in support of the quality stabilization proposal would seem to be the reference to the current plight of independent retailers, particularly in the light of the present phenomenon of widespread discount selling. The inroads of discount operations on sales of traditional retail stores have no doubt been substantial—"Last year, according to trade sources, discounters grossed more than $4 billion in sales."[4]

The extent to which there has been a substantial causal relationship between retailing of branded goods at prices below those established or suggested by manufacturers and small business failures is, of course, a difficult factual issue involving many and complex considerations. Wholly apart from the question whether the proposal is the appropriate solution, reliable probative evidence of such a relationship would undoubtedly be significant in any differentiation of the present setting from that confronting Congress during its consideration of proposed Federal fair trade legislation in recent years.

4. Relationship to other legislation

The three practices condemned in paragraph (8) as proposed by the joint resolution deserve separate comment.[5]

(a) Bait merchandising: The scope of this term, not defined in the resolution, is somewhat vague and uncertain. Ordinarily the concept "bait merchandising" would be thought to embrace only the use of "loss leader" selling by which certain branded goods are offered for sale at less than cost in order to bait customers into a store in the mistaken belief that all goods in the store are being sold at comparably low prices. This practice may already be subject to various State unfair practices statutes, sales below cost statutes, or fair trade statutes, or to condemnation under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act or common law principles as a species of false advertising or unfair competition. As so limited, prohibition of the practice would seem to be consistent with traditional antitrust or trade regulation principles.

(b) Resale price maintenance: While the Miller-Tydings Act of 1937 and McGuire Act of 1952 created a condition permitting State fair trade laws to be effective by providing exemption from Federal antitrust legislation, fair trade is not available in a number of States where no fair trade legislation has been enacted or where fair trade legislation has been rendered ineffective by adverse holdings on constitutional issues.[6] An apparent objective of the proposed legislation would be to supplement the remaining State laws by creating a Federal right of brand owners to effect resale price maintenance on certain goods.

While the proposed legislation provides that "No exercise of any rights or remedy provided (herein) shall be construed to be a violation of any of the antitrust acts", it is not clear whether this language is intended to immunize arrangements between manufacturers and retailers as to prices or enforcement of rights or remedies of the brand owner. A significant aspect of this problem is that while a principal reason advanced in support of the joint resolution is the plight of small independent resellers, the rights and remedies are given only to brand owners, who will presumably be urged by resellers to enforce the statutory rights and remedies.

(c) Misrepresentation: The proposed legislation would create a limited private cause of action providing for relief against commission of acts of misrepresentation which would probably be considered to fall within the scope of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, which prohibits unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce. In consideration of the effects of the proposed law, the elastic scope of section 5 as it would bear on the content of the private right to proceed against "misrepresentation concerning such goods" and the problems attendant to possible overlapping of or conflict between privately obtained injunctions and the cease-and-desist order authority of the Federal Trade Commission, would be significant.

5. Observations and Conclusion

The basic principle of the quality stabilization resolution appears to be that certain desirable national objectives will be maintained by providing specific private rights against three types of activities asserted to be detrimental to maintenance of a valuable property right in a brand name.

With respect to the protection against "bait merchandising practices," a prime difficulty is the lack of precision of the term. If flagrant "loss leader" selling is all that is encompassed by the term, the natural ques-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

tion would be whether the practice is sufficiently prevalent and serious to warrant Federal legislation, and whether the legislation would be effective in its apparent objectives to protect small retailers against the competition of discount or other operations which may sell all items at a low markup over cost. Substantively there is probably general agreement among most antitrust students that the flagrant type of loss leader selling should be actionable. But it is unclear whether the scope is to be interpreted as so limited.

With respect to misrepresentation, again a fundamental problem is that the scope of the prohibition should be sufficiently defined. Private enforcement to supplement Federal Trade Commission authority against flagrant types of misrepresentation directly injuring a producer or brand owner, such as undisclosed substitution of goods, might well be useful. But without precise delineation of the scope of the term, problems of vagueness and provocation of trivial litigation[7] similar to those presented by Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act could be expected.

With respect to resale price maintenance, the proposed legislation differs in language considerably from existing Federal and State fair trade statutes; however, the fundamental approach seems to be the same—to permit a brand owner to control prices at which resellers may sell branded goods. Since at least 1912 the subject of resale price maintenance legislation has been highly controversial; during this 50-year period retailing and distribution have adapted to a series of drastic innovations. While the fundamental question of the desirablility of such legislation may be an economic issue,[8] any such legislation would have important legal ramifications as well. The belief that a general resale price maintenance system goes beyond the requirements for protection against practices such as loss leader selling and the basic antitrust reliance upon price and other competition, with exemptions enacted only in compelling circumstances, have been strong factors in the opposition to extension of Federal resale price maintenance legislation beyond the enabling principle of the Miller-Tydings and McGuire Acts. In fact, a majority of the Attorney General's National Committee to study the antitrust laws in 1955 recommended congressional repeal of the Miller-Tydings and McGuire Acts. The Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission have consistently opposed fair trade legislation, and recently specifically opposed the quality stabilization proposals.

Apart from the problems of the judicial administration which may be posed by transferring to the Federal courts the burden of policing resale price maintenance through litigation brought without regard to the amount in controversy, the creation of a Federal cause of action for the enforcement of resale price maintenance would appear to represent one more step in the intrusion of Federal legislative power into the area of control of the public policy of the several States. As noted above, in 24 States as well as the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, resale price maintenance is incompatible with the State's legislative or judicially construed constitutional policy. Under the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 159, the right to legislate under the McGuire Act with respect to this significant area of economic policy in the interest of its own citizens is denied the several States by the assertion of a paramount Federal policy in the exercise of the constitutional power over interstate commerce.

There can be no doubt that many small independent businesses are faced with effective "price cutting" competition by discount houses and others which may cause them significant loss of trade. Assuming that maintenance of the traditional independent business part of the retailing and distribution structure is an important national objective, alternative methods of alleviating the situation should be considered. Examples would include Federal legislation designed to prohibit retail selling, of at least specified categories of goods, at prices below defined cost, or additional financial assistance by the Government to small business; such measures might suffice to alleviate the situation depicted. But it would seem that to date the strong factual justification required to overcome traditional reluctance of Congress and the enforcement agencies to endorse Federal resale price maintenance legislation has not been shown.

A copy of Senate Joint Resolution 159 is attached as an appendix.

Respectfully submitted,

S. Chesterfield Oppenheim,
Chairman.

(Paul Rand Dixon and Lee Loevinger did not participate in the consideration or voting on this matter.)

Appendix

[87th Cong., 2d sess.]

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 159

In the Senate of the United States, February 21, 1962, Mr. Humphrey (for himself, Mr. Capehart, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Johnston, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Scott, Mr. Randolph, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Mundt, and Mr. Case of South Dakota) introduced the following joint resolution; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Joint resolution to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes.

Whereas it is recognized that, in the chain of distribution of products so identified, there may be encountered resellers having predatory interests and committing, in the resale of such products, unfair, or deceptive acts or practices (such as, but not limited to store-traffic baiting, and misrepresentation as to the size, capacity, quality, condition, model, or age of the goods), all tending to destroy unfairly the value to its owner, to smaller resellers, and to the public, of the brand, name, or trademark, and tending to disable and destroy competition, thus to create monopoly of retail distribution, contrary to public interest; and

Whereas the above-recited deceptive acts and practices and unfair methods of competition tend to diminish the volume of such identified products moving in commerce by adversely affecting the demand for such goods, thereby impairing the producer's ability, and reducing his incentive, to maintain and increase, with relation to price, the value of such goods to the public, or to maintain and increase opportunities for employment, or pay rates for labor, in his factory; and

Whereas substitutions of inferior labor and materials forced by the downward spiral of unrestrained predatory pricing on popular identified products, in the fields of foods, drugs, and beverages, endanger public health, and in other fields, endangers public safety; and

Whereas it is recognized that unless fair competitive practices can be maintained in all appropriate stages in the distribution of such identified products, the marketing of such identified products is depressed and the quality thereof tends to deteriorate; and

Whereas the distinguishing brand, name, or trademark of a product, and trade and public goodwill associated therewith, constitute property, the rights to which are entitled to protection by the owner thereof despite transfer of the product itself; and

Whereas in order to remove the above-recited obstructions to commerce, and to remove the quality-deteriorating and value-diluting pressures resulting therefrom, in the manufacture and resale of products bearing distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, it is found and declared that it is in the public interest to define, confirm, and implement said property rights: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) this act may be cited as the "Quality Stabilization Act."

(b) Section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding, at the end thereof, paragraphs (7) to (14), inclusive, as follows:

"(7) The owner of a brand, name, or trademark shall be deemed to retain his property rights therein, and in the trade and public goodwill symbolized thereby, regardless of any sale or transfer of the goods to which such brand, name, or trademark relates, and no such sale or transfer shall be deemed to diminish or extinguish any such rights. Any person who resells in commerce goods identified by a distinguishing brand, name, or trademark, either on the label, container, dispenser thereof, or otherwise, may rightfully employ such brand, name, or trademark, but only in effecting the resale of such goods, and subject to the provisions of paragraph (8) hereof.

"(8) When goods usable for the same general purpose are available to the public from sources other than the owner of such brand, name, or trademark, the right of any person to employ such brand, name, or trademark in effecting resale of goods so identified may be revoked by the owner of such brand, name, or trademark, on written notice, for any of the following reasons:

"(a) that the person reselling such goods has employed goods bearing the brand, name, or trademark in furtherance of bait merchandising practices;

"(b) that the person reselling such goods, with knowledge of the owner's currently established resale price or prices, has advertised, offered for sale, or sold such goods at prices other than such currently established resale prices; or

"(c) that the person reselling such goods, with intent to deceive purchasers, has published misrepresentation concerning such goods.

"(9) Nothing herein shall be interpreted to abridge the right of a person, in the regular course of his business and within a reasonable time after the date of any revocation pursuant to paragraph (8) of this subsection, to sell all such goods of which on such date he is possessed: *Provided,* That in such sale he shall commit none of the acts described in paragraph (8) of this subsection: *Provided, however,* That if and in the event that such person, promptly upon such revocation, shall have supplied to the owner of said brand, namer, or trademark a correct itemized listing of said inventory with a statement of the price paid per item and the total price paid therefor, together with a firm offer to sell and deliver all said inventory to said owner at any time within ten days thereafter upon payment of said total price, then such person, upon expiration of the ten-day term of said offer without acceptance, may so sell such goods in said inventory, in the regular course of his business and within a reasonable time thereafter, without restriction as to price, in which event each advertisement of, or offer to sell, such goods, shall state plainly that the right of the reseller, offering such goods, to employ in any way the brand, name, or trademark carried by the goods has been revoked as to

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

any such goods not in that reseller's possession at the time of such revocation.

"(10) Any person whose right to employ a brand, name, or trademark has been revoked by the owner thereof pursuant to the provisions of paragraphs (8) and (9) of this subsection and who thereafter, without the express written consent of said owner, first had, resells such goods so identified, or who otherwise employs such brand, name, or trademark in effecting resale of such goods or any other goods, shall be deemed to have committed an act of unfair competition and shall be liable in a civil action for damages and injunctive relief by the owner of the brand, name, or trademark, to prevent and restrain further violations of this Act. Such owner may sue in any district court of the United States in the district in which defendant resides or is found or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy, and may recover the cost of suit including reasonable attorneys' fees.

"(11) In any proceeding under paragraph (10) it shall be a defense to the charge of unfair competition for the defendant to establish that the plaintiff has not used due diligence in revoking the right of all other persons in substantial competition with the defendant who are known to plaintiff to be committing any of the acts set forth in subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c) of paragraph (8) hereof.

"(12) No action pursuant hereto shall preclude action otherwise provided by law for wrongful use of a brand, name, or trademark.

"(13) Paragraphs (7) to (12) hereof shall apply to all acts and transactions in or affecting commerce which Congress may lawfully regulate, and to all acts and transactions in any territory of the United States or in the District of Columbia. As used in paragraphs (7) to (12) hereof, the term 'person' means any individual, partnership, or corporation.

"(14) No exercise of any right or remedy provided in paragraphs (7) to (13) inclusive of this subsection shall be construed to be a violation of any of the Antitrust Acts, and all such rights and remedies shall be also available to any owner of a brand, name, or trademark who, in the resale of goods identified by such brand, name, or trademark, shall compete, at any level of distribution, with any reseller offering such goods: *Provided*, That such owner shall sell such identified goods at any level of distribution at the price established for that level of distribution: *And provided further*, That nothing in this Act shall be deemed to modify or repeal the Lanham Trademark Act, Public Law 489, approved July 5, 1946; the Miller-Tydings Act, Public Law 314, approved August 17, 1937; the McGuire Fair Trade Act, Public Law 342, approved July 14, 1952, or any State law described therein."

---

[1] Companion proposals and those who introduced them include H.J. Res. 636 (Harris), H.J. Res. 637 (Mack), H.R. Res. 639 (Tollefson), H.R. 10517 (McMillan), and H.R. 10335 (Madden). (A joint resolution is used ordinarily to effect temporary extension or suspension of existing statutes.)

[2] This report uses the "term brand" as a reference to "brand name, or trademark" as used in the resolution.

[3] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 2479–2482 (Feb. 21, 1962). A list of over 50 national trade associations supporting the measure was appended to Senator HUMPHREY's remarks.

[4] New York Times, Jan. 30, 1962, p. 32.

[5] The legislation would apply "to all acts and transactions in or affecting commerce which Congress may lawfully regulate," in territories and in the District of Columbia.

[6] Alaska, Missouri, Nebraska, Texas, Vermont, and the District of Columbia do not have fair trade laws. Puerto Rico's fair trade law was repealed in 1959. The laws of at least 19 States have been held in part or generally unconstitutional at some time. See chart 2 Tr. Reg. Rep. par. 6041.

[7] See dissenting opinions of Commissioner Elman in matter of Gimbel Bros., 3 CCH Tr. Reg. Rep. par. 15,748 (1962); and Judge Friendly in *Exposition Press, Inc.* v. *F.T.C.*, 295 F. 2d 869 (2d Cir. 1961).

[8] "Whether a producer of goods should be permitted to fix by contract, express or implied, the price at which the purchaser may resell them, and if so, under what conditions, is an economic question. To decide it wisely it is necessary to consider the relevant facts, industrial and commercial, rather than established legal principles." Brandeis, J., concurring in *Boston Store of Chicago* v. *American Graphophone Co.*, 246 U.S. 8 (1918).

The Better of the Old and the New

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, herewith is the monthly editorial from the latest bulletin of the Greene County Medical Society. It is by the editor, Wilfred E. Wooldridge. M.D., and relates much of the traditional concept and past image of communication transportation, and our family doctors to modern techniques of available specialists bearing in mind the confidential and privileged relation between doctor and patient. I commend it to the Members of this body for complete absorption and reflection of judgment:

THE BETTER OF THE OLD AND THE NEW

Sometimes we hear a person lamenting the passing of yesterday's horse-and-buggy doctor but we do not know of a single tear shed for the horse.

By such token we find that those who harken to the past would generally not wish the calendar turned back except for the things they want. They would not be interested in yesterday's doctor if it also meant harnessing Old Dobbin each morning and hanging up the keys to the chrome-plated "behemoth eight."

We would not wish to belittle the physician of two generations past. He was a fine, dedicated person; a patient and kindly man, not covetous of his time. But let's face it. His treatment consisted of calomel, quinine, and a pat on the back. He had never heard of appendicitis, his cases of coronary thrombosis died of acute indigestion and if he sat by the bedside all night while waiting for the crisis in a case of pneumonia, it was only because he had no penicillin in his bag. He would have preferred to be home in bed but he was doing the best he could do.

In those days the physician did not need to be a businessman. Ten dollars paid on account was $10 tucked away in the mattress. There was no reckoning with the IRS. Office overhead amounted to less than the wage of the farm girl who helped his wife at home.

Maybe it is unfortunate that this is no more. However, to be as financially successful as his grandfather, the present-day physician must be busy and efficient of his time. The rolltop desk, Old Dobbin, and the ways of the physician of 1900 have been sacrificed to progress. One can no more return than the other, nor should they.

But there is one remnant of yesteryear's physician which our grandfathers inherited from their grandfathers and which is not likely to be replaced in this or any other age. The smile, the pat on the back, the extra moment beyond that which is strictly necessary will continue to cure as many patients in this harried and troubled time as do our miracle medicines. Love heals a great deal of trouble.

WILFRED E. WOOLDRIDGE, M.D.

Women's Advertising Club of Washington Honors Mrs. Kay Hanson as "Advertising Woman of 1963"—Representatives Leslie C. Arends and A. S. Herlong, Jr., and C. Bedell Monro Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITEL STATES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is difficult to measure the effect of advertising in the everyday life of the average American. Each of us is repeatedly reminded, influenced, and aided by advertisements, and our decisions and actions are determined in part by the appeal and scope of a particular publicity approach. Advertising is a significant part of American business, and millions of dollars are flooded into the economy each year by firms which wish to publicize their services, wares or capabilities.

In the Nation's Capital, there exists an efficient and effective organization devoted to the field of advertising, which brings together individuals concerned with that aspect of commerce. The group, the Women's Advertising Club of Washington, has among its membership women of demonstrated ability and imagination in ad making.

Annually the club holds an award luncheon, at which time homage is expressed to the woman who, in the past year, has made the most outstanding contributions to the advertising field. Honoree for 1963 is Mrs. Kay Hanson, secretary-treasurer of United Service Associates, and a woman experienced and respected in the techniques and requirements of advertising.

Mr. President, it was my privilege to attend the 1963 Advertising Woman of the Year Luncheon, sponsored by the Women's Advertising Club of Washington, at the Washington Hotel, May 23, 1963. It was my opportunity to greet and congratulate Mrs. Hanson, a cherished friend, on this meaningful recognition of her abilities and accomplishments. Likewise, it was gratifying to meet other leaders in the advertising area.

Principal speaker was Hon. LESLIE C. ARENDS, Republican, of Illinois, who has been re-elected to the House of Representatives each term since the 74th Congress, and with whom I served in that body.

Also participating in the program and commending the achievements of Mrs. Hanson were U.S. Representative A. Sydney Herlong, Jr., Democrat, of Florida, and C. Bedell Monro, president of United Service Associates. Mr. Monro is a personal friend with whom I was associated when he was president of Capital Airlines.

Sharing recognition were the following ladies who in the past have been named Ad Woman of the Year: Mrs. Julia Lee, 1962 recipient, who made this year's presentation to Mrs. Hanson; the 1959 winner, Miss Kathryn Bowers, who is with the Public Relations Department of the National Bank of Washington; Miss Ruth Sheldon, honored by the club in 1957; Mrs. Ruth Cotting, of Woodward & Lothrop, award winner in 1956; Miss Vi Sutton, of the Hecht Co., named in 1954; and the 1952 Ad Woman of the Year, Mrs. Jean Ambrose Schulthies, of Ohio.

Presiding was Mrs. Margaret K. Scott, president of the Women's Advertising Club of Washington. Mrs. Scott introduced guests at the head table: U.S. Representative Charlotte E. Reid, Republican, of Illinois; Representative Herlong; noted newspaper columnist George Dixon; Robert Bowerman, president of the Advertising Club of Metropolitan Washington; Wallace Carroll, president of the American Gauge & Machine Co.; and Mrs. June Miller, program chairman of the event.

Mrs. Scott read congratulatory telegrams from well-know personages, including former President Dwight D. Eisenhower. Also quoted was a gracious hand-written message from Bernard Baruch, which praised Mrs. Hanson, and said in part: "I hope that the future will continue to shine on you."

Also in attendance was the former U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania, Hon. James H. Duff.

I request that excerpts from the address by Hon. Leslie C. Arends at the 1963 Advertising Woman of the Year Luncheon, at the Washington Hotel, Washington, D.C., May 23, 1963, be printed in the Appendix, and also remarks by C. Bedell Monro, president, United Service Associates.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS OF MR. C. BEDELL MONRO

It is not only a pleasure but a real privilege to say a few words about the guest of honor, particularly since as secretary-treasurer of our company she has worked for me and with me for some 16 years. That alone is a terrific accomplishment which deserves special recognition—at the very least a bronze plaque attesting to Kay Hanson's extraordinary courage and heroism.

Aside from that, at the very start of her association with our company she wasn't satisfied with the onerous duties of her office but made herself useful, in fact invaluable, as account executive for public relations, advertising and promotional programs, and legislative information for a certain of our client companies.

In her spare time, whenever that may have been, she devoted much effort to the affairs of the Women's Advertising Club of Washington, of which she was president for three terms in the last decade. Further, she continues to be active in political and civic endeavors.

We in United Service Associates are proud of Kay Hanson and deeply pleased that she is being so honored. I am certain that her many friends and associates join with us in extending the sincerest best wishes for her continued success far into the future.

SPEECH OF REPRESENTATIVE LESLIE C. ARENDS AT THE WOMEN'S ADVERTISING CLUB OF WASHINGTON

You are asking yourselves: Why should I—a common, ordinary, garden variety of politician—be the guest speaker on an occasion such as this?

That's a good question. I don't know the answer. And it is most unlike a politician to admit that he doesn't know the answer to any question.

There is this possibility: While politicians are plentiful in Washington—all eager with words to extol and cajole, to commend, and condemn—I am of the political species with which some of you may not be too well acquainted.

Maybe that's why I was invited to this luncheon: That you might see and hear a rather rare type of politician—rare in the sense of scarcity. There are all too few of us in the Congress—all too few of us in this New Frontier city.

Frontier life at best is hard and trying for any one. New Frontier life is unusually hard and trying for some of us. It is a constant struggle for us to survive.

We are rare. We are unique. We are not too plentiful. Maybe that's why I was accorded this privilege. But I hardly think my being a diehard Republican is the answer. I certainly wasn't invited here to make a Republican speech—not even a nonpartisan Republican speech. Those are the only two kinds of speeches I have occasion to make. And I like to make them.

I do not know why I was asked, though I do know why I came. Not that I for a moment thought I had much to offer at a luncheon of this character, but I welcome this opportunity to express my admiration for the women of the advertising profession and, particularly, to congratulate and publicly pay my respects to Miss Kay Hanson, the Advertising Woman of the Year.

I propose to make some observations with respect to the use of slogans and labels in politics.

It may appear presumptuous of me, as a Member of Congress, to talk to you who are professionals in the field of advertising about the use of labels and slogans. While I know next to nothing about advertising principles and techniques, nonetheless I have witnessed firsthand how skillful advertising has influenced elections and legislation. It is to this, based on my own observations and experience as a Member of Congress, that I propose to make some brief comments.

Much of which I have to say, you may already know. I will be content if I contribute in some degree to a deeper appreciation of how important advertising is—with its slogans and labels—not only in the sale of products but in the sale of ideas that enter into national policy and the making of both laws and lawmakers.

When one thinks of advertising, he invariably recalls various slogans and the products associated with them. H_2O is water to the scientist, but 99 44/100ths percent pure is Ivory Soap to the housewife. If you would ask the man who owns one, you wouldn't need to walk a mile for a Camel. You would get there in a Cadillac. But it could well be that even your best friend won't tell you where the seductive young lady lives who has repeatedly and alluringly said, pick me up and smoke me sometime. Whatever you do or propose to do, don't make a move without calling Smith, not even for a pause that refreshes.

Reach for a Lucky instead of a sweet. But what man wouldn't really prefer "a sweet"—if you know what I mean? "They satisfy," and I don't mean Chesterfields. That I don't smoke is immaterial. After all, there is "the skin you love to touch."

"They laughed when I sat down at the piano, but when I started to play." To tell you the truth, they laughed when I first ran for Congress 28 years ago, but when the votes were counted I was the talk of the party—the Republican Party—in my district that is.

"First he whispers. Then he shouts." That applies to Congressmen as well as to Big Ben. Not infrequently we have to shout to awaken our audience to the next point in our speech.

The point of all this is simply to indicate to you ladies of the advertising profession the extent to which your profession has conditioned the mental processes of all of us. The important point I wish to next make is that this conditioning of public thinking is not solely in the area of consumer goods but also in the larger area of governmental policy. Labels and slogans employed to secure public acceptance and enthusiasm for a product are likewise employed to secure public acceptance and enthusiasm for an idea—a political concept or an economic theory.

We all know that the spoken and the written words have had a tremendous impact on the course of history. Informing people and persuading people is not new. Cicero's orations in the Roman Senate had basically the same purpose as the orations delivered in the U.S. Senate. And I have no doubt that the Congressional Record is read with no more relish by many than we relished having to translate as students the orations of Cicero. I might add, parenthetically, that there are some speeches in Congress that also require some degree of translation to be understood.

The effect of the novelists, the poets, the playrights, the philosophers and the pamphleteers on the course of history is generally fully recognized. They were, for the most part, engaged in informing people of conditions they believed should be corrected. Such novels as "Oliver Twist," as "Uncle Tom's Cabin," "Main Street," "Oil," "Grapes of Wrath"—to mention just a few that immediately come to mind, and there are numerous others—contributed to the molding of public opinion. The writings of Marx, Tolstoy, Plato, Aristotle, Voltaire, had their impact in the formulation of public opinion.

All this we learned in our high school and college days. But this doesn't—it seems to me—tell the whole story. As professional advertising advisers you know; and I, as a Member of Congress all too well know, it is one thing to inform people but quite another to get them to act. It is not enough that you obtain acceptance of the merits of a product or idea. We must persuade them to buy the product. We must persuade them to act. From your point of view, action is doubtless the actual purchase of the item you through advertising seek to sell. In my field of endeavor, action would be at the ballot box.

How better can a people be moved to action than by an inspiring sentence—a Churchillian "blood, sweat, and tears" or a Rooseveltian "four freedoms"—or by a pithy phrase or some impelling slogan—Ben Franklin's "Unite or die."

We know how important slogans are in consumer advertising. Did you ever consider how important they have been and continue to be in political advertising? Apparently very few have, or I overestimate the importance of slogans in history, for I have not been able to find anywhere—not even in the Library of Congress—any book on the subject. The pages of history are replete with slogans, rallying men's minds to a cause and inspiring them to action. But no one has seen fit to put them all together as a subject for a book.

Everyone seems to be writing a book these days and seem to be finding it quite lucrative. Someone of you advertising ladies might profitably to your profession as well as to yourself, dollarwise and otherwise, try your literary talents on a potential "best seller" entitled "Slogans in History." And I might add, as a special inducement, earnings from a book have been known to get a special treatment under our income tax laws.

Governments have been destroyed and governments born behind a slogan. "Liberty, Fraternity, and Equality" was the banner in the French Revolution. "Taxation without representation" was the cry for independence in the American Revolution. In this connection I might say that if our Founding Fathers had visualized the present day situation and had known what taxation with representation would be like, they would probably have said—"let's forget the whole thing and go along without the representation."

Before coming here today I sat down with a pad and pencil and jotted down what slogans I could recall as being important, in one way or another, in the history of the United States itself. These are some that came to mind, and you can doubtless think of others. Without taking the time to put them in chronological order or to classify them, here they are, simply as they came to mind:

"Fifty-four, forty or fight."

"Tippecanoe and Tyler too."

"Rum, romanism and rebellion."

"Remember the Alamo."

"Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute."

"Crucified on a cross of gold."

"Give me liberty or give me death."

"We all hang together or we hang separately."

"No entangling alliances."

"To make the world safe for democracy."

"A war to end wars."

"Back to normalcy."

"Chicken in every pot."

"New Deal, Fair Deal."

"New Frontier."

"Bundles for Britain."

"America First."

"Honest Abe."

"The happy warrior."

"The economic royalists."

The "Brain Trust" and so on.

Some are slogans. Some are labels. Some are designed to inspire; others to deride. Some were effective. Some were not. The mere listing of only those I recalled suffices to say, without any explanatory comment on any of them, that slogans and labels with which the professional advertising counselor daily deals play a major role in marketing ideas as well as products.

I should like to digress for a moment to call your attention to an interesting historic fact which came to my notice about a year ago when reading William L. Shirer's classic book entitled, "The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich." While not actually a slogan, as we commonly think of the term, the "Heil, Hitler," salute of Nazi, Germany served, as have so many slogans in history, as the symbol of unity of thought and purpose.

Hitler's father was the illegitimate son of a peasant woman whose name was Maria Anna Schicklgruber. Accordingly, Schicklgruber was the official name of Hitler's father until he was 39 years of age when, for some unknown reason, an elderly man by the name of Hitler officially acknowledged paternity of the 39-year-old Schicklgruber. Adolf's father thus became legally known as Hitler instead of Schicklgruber.

Mr. Shirer speculates whether Hitler could have become master of Germany had he been known as Schicklgruber. Can one imagine the frenzied German masses acclaiming Schicklgruber with thunderous "heils."

"Heil Schicklgruber."

This is not only one of the oddities of history. The story is pertinent to our discussion here as it points up how slogans, names, and symbols can be used to influence men's minds and to motivate action. It also points up the great importance of the slogan, the label, and the name being appropriate to the desired end. The proper phrasing, just the right words, at the right time, place, and circumstances—these and many other factors are doubtless a part of the technique of advertising. They are indeed factors entering into the formulation of political strategy.

Now, if you will, I should like to comment briefly on the use of slogans and labels in the legislative processes based on my personal experience as a Member of Congress. Some bitter battles have been fought in Congress over a bill against which or for which people have been aroused to action largely because of a descriptive slogan cleverly used by the proponents or opponents of the measure. Some of these legislative slogan campaigns have caused many a Member of Congress to tremble for his political future and, in the aftermath, a Member's vote on the measure has caused his defeat.

In the early days of the New Deal the Congress had presented to it the public utility holding company bill. It was a very complex measure, directed at the public utility investment empires, whereby a few individuals through the pyramiding of company on company, one company owning the stock of the others, were able to realize a substantial profit on a relatively small investment. The Insull empire would be a notorious example. Those on top the pyramid controlled through this device, with interlocking directorates, the operating company forming the base.

The passage of this legislation would bring an end to these financial manipulations. Those who profited by the holding company device were called economic royalists, and those who conceived the proposed legislation were called the brain trust. The question that confronted the Wall Street barons, as they were derisively called, was how to create a public opinion to which the Congress would react. It is no easy matter to get people interested in, much less vigorously expressing their opposition to, a complicated financial investment measure of this character.

But it was done, and it was done with a slogan behind which were rallied in a well financed, highly organized campaign, everyone who owned a single share of stock of any kind in a public utility. Even people who didn't have any such investment joined in the campaign.

The public utility interests, doubtless well advised by some members of your advertising profession, seized upon a provision in the bill, that was really the heart of the measure, and labeled it the death sentence clause. It was represented as being a bill which would destroy the companies in which you have invested, make your investment valueless, and destroy the hard-earned savings of the people.

Letters and telegrams poured into the offices of Members of Congress, urging, appealing, demanding that we vote against the "death sentence clause." Many, if not most of those who wrote knew very little about the bill itself, not even its title. All they knew was that they were against the "death sentence clause." It would hurt them. It would hurt the little man. It would deny the elderly their old-age income. It would discourage anyone investing in our country's future. It would retard free enterprise. It was a sentence of death to everything we here in America stand for.

A Senate committee held hearings to expose those conducting the campaign against the "death sentence clause." Sam Rayburn, then Chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, who guided this highly controversial bill through the House, became "the man of the hour," so to speak. He later became Speaker, as you know. The Member of Congress from Pennsylvania who brought to public attention that many of the talegrams were fraudulent, and exposed the utility interests, lost his seat in Congress in the next election as a result of a well financed and organized campaign against him as a reprisal.

This is but illustrative of the power of a slogan in the legislative processes. It also gives you some idea of the problems that confront a Member of Congress in seeking to do what he considers right and, at the same time, reflect the view of the people he represents.

Another example, and one with which most of you are no doubt familiar, is the legislative battle over the Taft-Hartley Act. It was characterized by the labor union leaders as a slave labor law. If you were to ask the average workingman to tell you in just what way the bill would make him a slave or deny him any rights, he couldn't tell you. Nor could the labor union leaders point to a single section of the bill that would deny labor its rights. And yet many a battle was fought in the political arena over a slave labor law which, as it turns out, is actually labor's bill of rights.

It goes without saying that labeling and packaging—what you call a product and how you dress it up for display in the store window, the showcase or for sale on the supermarket shelf—is rudimentary in marketing and advertising. As you alert ladies of the advertising profession are aware, there are a number of bills pending in the Congress dealing with labeling and packaging. I do not know how far these mesaure go, but I do not want the American schoolboy of today being denied one of my boyhood pleasures of discovering the prize in the box of Cracker Jack.

If you require putting on the label what the prize is in the Cracker Jack box, something will pass that was American. And this possibly is a point I think should be made to the committee members handling product labeling legislation.

If we are going to legislate in this area, I think it would be helpful if we require all prices above $100, let us say, be stated in even dollars. It would be much easier for everyone, particularly for the party writing the check, if the price of the used car were an even $2,000 instead of $1,999.98. Perhaps an even better idea for legislation in this area would be to require the price to be stated before taxes and after taxes. Such a requirement would certainly be helpful to us Republicans in our efforts to make the American electorate budget conscious and tax conscious. This income withholding tax procedure has hurt our cause.

But, quite seriously, just as labeling is important in securing public acceptance of a product, it is important in the field of legislation. Much ado has been made about the public not knowing from the label what the package actually contains. And I tell you from my own legislative experience that bills are enacted that might not otherwise be enacted were it not for its title. Not infrequently the title of the measure is misleading—deceptive, if not actually fraudulent.

Let me give you an example. You will recall that following the launching of sputnik by Soviet Russia, there arose a great hue and cry from the party out of power about how our missile program had been so seriously neglected, which, however, was not true in fact. Throughout the country there was an atmosphere of hysteria. We must do something to develop scientists, engineers, mathematicians, linguists, that we may insure our defense security for the future.

And so, the National Defense Education Act was expeditiously enacted by the Congress. Who would risk his political future by voting against a measure to assist in developing scientists so necessary to our national defense? To do so would be voting against both education and defense. Politically, that would be like voting against God and motherhood.

So now we have on the books what is known as the National Defense Education Act. You can imagine how startled I was when, upon looking over a list of the university fellowships awarded under this act, I found that comparatively few were for the advanced study of mathematics, or engineering, or chemistry; and that most of them were for the study of such subjects as church music, comparative religion, comparative literature, Buddhism, Mohammedanism, philosophy, world history, poetry, and so on.

Those are interesting subjects, to be sure. But I cannot for the life of me see what relationship they have to our national defense. Nonetheless, this is the education program being carried out under what is labeled the National Defense Education Act. If we change the label—if we change the title so that it described accurately what the bill really pertained to, that the people would know just what this legislative package contained—I think there would be considerably less support for this Federal expenditure of the taxpayers' money.

Let me conclude with just one thought. It is an informed public opinion that makes the wheels of democracy turn. You in your profession, and I in mine, as a Member of Congress, are in this important work. Ours is a representative form of government. Each individual Member of Congress actually speaks only for the people who sent him to Congress to speak for them. Each Member must, therefore, consider not only what he personally may feel is the best course to pursue, he must take into account the sentiment—the wishes and wants—of the people he represents. Public opinion on a national level may be quite different from the public opinion in some one congressional district.

Thus, while a Member of Congress necessarily reflects public opinion, as he should, he also must mold public opinion. He must not simply be a follower. He must also be a leader.

And let us always remember these words of John Stuart Mill: "If all mankind minus one were of one opinion and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind."

My best wishes to all of you. And my heartiest congratulations to Miss Kay Hanson, your wonderful advertising woman of the year.

The Pieces All Fit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Thursday, May 23, 1963

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, in light of the vote on the wheat referendum Tuesday, the editorial appearing in the June issue of the Farm Journal is particularly interesting:

THE PIECES ALL FIT

The wheat referendum May 21 is only one piece of a larger picture, and the pieces are all fitting together. What they add up to—and have been adding up to ever since this administration came into office—is a determination to put farmers under the control of the Secretary of Agriculture. Whether farmers happen to like it, who could care less?

If you think this statement is overstrong, read our Washington page this month. Note how the new feed grain bill would give the Secretary a bigger club to use on feed grain farmers. Note the Secretary's new ruling that County ASC committeemen must now sign a pledge to support government farm programs. Not just administer them, support them. Farmers can "elect" their committeemen—if they are the right fellows.

Referendums are rigged, ASC committees are packed. The whole democracy pose becomes phony. The pieces are fitting neatly together.

Secretary Freeman Should Take Note of the Northeastern Dairy Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I include the remarks which my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York, Congressman Alexander Pirnie, made this past Monday during hearings on Federal Milk Marketing Order No. 2 in New York City.

His description of the dairy situation in general and the plight of the farmers in particular is, in my opinion, accurate and his plea that the market administrator recommend an adequate producer return is most worthwhile. In my own 28th District, a similar situation exists, and recent statistics revealing the fact that no fewer than 4,000 dairy farms have closed during the past year in New York State reinforce his contention. Under such conditions, our farm purchasing power is seriously diminished and thousands are thereby forced into the growing ranks of unemployment.

While a solution must be pursued, and the sooner it is found the better off we will all be, I believe that today's sentiment demands less rather than greater intervention by the Federal Government in the farmers' affairs. This week's vote on the wheat referendum is a case in point. The farmer is not ready to accept the logic of the computer as a substitute for good management and industry. Mr. Pirnie's testimony:

TESTIMONY OF HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE, REPUBLICAN, OF NEW HARTFORD, N.Y., AT THE MILK MARKETING HEARING, INVOLVING 10 NORTHEASTERN MILK ORDERS, NEW YORK CITY, MAY 20, 1963

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear personally at this hearing involving 10 milk-marketing order areas in the Northeast. I understand that many issues are to be considered but I wish to direct my remarks to the prices now prevailing for reserve milk in the New York-New Jersey marketing area.

At the present time dairy farmers of our milkshed are in danger of losing a substantial portion of their markets due to the present unrealistic pricing of milk used for manufacturing purposes. I propose that appropriate action be taken to meet an emergency situation and to preserve and, hopefully, to increase dairy farm income. My apearance has no other objective and I will leave the technical aspects to others who are better qualified.

In recent months it has become evident that a modification of the class III price is necessary if the market is to be cleared of this milk. It is my understanding that producers and cooperatives are virtually unanimous in their request to modify the class III price by adding a butter-cheese adjustment.

Because of the current price level, proprietary handlers are threatening to refuse milk since they are finding it very difficult to break even—much less make a profit. Moreover, buyers of milk have reduced premiums and hauling subsidies and are refusing to pay handling charges sufficiently adequate to reimburse farmers and their cooperatives for their cost of running country plants. Many plants have already closed, eliminating convenient outlets for producers. Cooperatives have had to accept an increasing quantity of milk. Many dairy farmers have been forced to accept less than the established price and have had to invest in expensive milk-handling facilities.

The dimensions of this problem are great, since slightly over half of the milk production in the New York-New Jersey market is utilized for manufacturing purposes. The situation will be further aggravated on July 1 of this year, when the class III price is scheduled to be increased by 14 cents per hundredweight.

I make no claim to being an expert in the technical aspects of our milk-marketing order, but there are over 4,000 producers in my congressional district whose milk is marketed under order No. 2 and I am reliably informed as to the situation I have described. Dairy farm income has already declined to critical levels and I do not believe it fair to require producers to assume the additional burdens imposed by the current price situation. Moreover, I am confident that the Congress, which has delegated authority for detailed marketing regulations to expert agencies, does not intend that farmers be forced to dump their milk, nor that their cooperatives be required to suffer substantial losses. Therefore, it is hoped that this hearing will result in the establishment of a more realistic price level for class III milk, thereby assuring markets and income for dairy farmers.

Finally, I urge that there be no lowering of class I prices. Such a move would seriously aggravate the already depressed economic circumstances of dairy farmers. A few weeks ago I personally urged the Secretary of Agriculture to defer consideration of fluid milk pricing since the present problem essentially involves the class III price structure. Therefore, I earnestly hope that the class I price will be maintained at current levels.

Government Lotteries of Australia and New Zealand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to tell the Members of this House about two more foreign countries which operate government-run lotteries. Both of these countries have found that lotteries not only yield high revenues but also help eliminate underworld problems.

Australia has four state-controlled lotteries which, last year, brought in over $88½ million. The net income to these states amounted to over $27¼ million in 1962. It might be interesting to point out that the 1962 gross receipts exceeded the previous year's sales by more than $15 million.

It is apparent that the Government of Australia sees nothing wrong with properly regulated and controlled lotteries. Last year's Government profit from its lottery operations were earmarked for hospitals, child and motherhood welfare, mental institutions, and for financial help in constructing the Sydney Opera House.

Mr. Speaker, the other country which neighbors Australia is New Zealand. Although New Zealand is a small nation, it is long on financial wisdom, for it, too, has had the sense to recognize the merit of harnessing the gambling urge so as to make it work for the public good.

Last year, the gross sales amounted to $13,300,000 and after prizes, almost $4 million was distributed for youth and sporting organizations, community projects, charitable objects, and other worthwhile projects.

Why, Mr. Speaker, can we not exercise the same kind of wisdom in this country? Why can we not capitalize on our American people's urge to gamble? Why can we not cut our taxes and reduce our national debt with a Government-run lottery which can easily raise over $10 billion a year in additional revenue? Let us grasp this financial wisdom of our friends—it is never too late.

Sukarno Imperialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, realistically, perhaps the biggest single result of our aid to Indonesia has been to shore up the position of the Sukarno regime. In view of the evident partnership binding Sukarno to Communist China, it is obviously not in our interest to support Sukarno any longer. Elimination of our aid programs may be the only hope we have of aiding the people of Indonesia in fending off the Communist attachment.

Our foreign aid efforts in Indonesia have been well motivated but fruitless, and have even worked against our objectives. It is time we recognize this, and act accordingly.

It is incumbent upon the Congress to put a stop to this ill-conceived application of foreign assistance. Consequently, I commend to my colleagues the following editorial from the May 16 St. Paul Dispatch:

SUKARNO IMPERIALISM

Recent activities of President Sukarno—his establishment of closer ties with Red China and attempts to undermine the formation of the Federation of Malaysia—raised serious questions about future Indonesia-United States relations.

The United States has provided Indonesia with about $700 million in various types of assistance since 1945 without halting its drift into the Communist orbit and, just as important, without curbing its imperialistic designs.

Now that Indonesian forces are entrenched in their newest territory—West New Guinea—Sukarno is looking toward the island of Borneo and the principalities of Sarawak and North Borneo. These areas are scheduled to enter the Malay Federation later this year but Indonesia, working with dissident groups in the territories, has threatened the use of force to prevent the federation.

In view of this background, the question arises as to whether it is in the national interest of the United States to continue offering aid to Indonesia. The answer of the Clay Committee, appointed by President Kennedy to study the overall foreign aid program, would be "No," unless some changes are made within the Sukarno government.

The Clay report, referring to Indonesia, said: "We do not see how external assistance can be granted to this nation by free world countries unless it puts its internal house in order, provides fair treatment to foreign creditors and enterprises, and refrains from international adventures."

The President has said that U.S. aid programs will become increasingly selective and be based on performance standards. Indonesia may be a good place to begin applying those higher standards.

Seal Harbor Postmaster Retires With Record of 30 Years' Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Lyda Carter of Seal Harbor, Maine, has retired after 30 years' service in the postal service.

Her record in postal work is one of which she well can be proud, and I sincerely wish that her retirement brings her the rewards that are her due for her many years of dedicated public service.

I insert into the RECORD an interesting account of Mrs. Carter's service, as it appeared in the May 2 issue of the Bar Harbor Times:

SEAL HARBOR POSTMASTER RETIRES WITH RECORD OF 30 YEARS' SERVICE

Mrs. Lyda Carter, Seal Harbor postmaster retired Tuesday after a 30 year stint with the postal service.

"I'm going to garden, gad, have an interesting life, and do housework," she said.

Mrs. Carter's career in the post office has brought her several marks of distinction including a dinner by the Hancock County League of Postal Workers at which she was guest of honor.

In 1956 she was selected for Maine's first Postmaster-of-the-Year and entered a competition for similar honors at the national convention of the Postmaster's League in St. Paul.

She was the first postmaster in a third class office to institute the use of uniforms for herself and the clerk. They were post office-blue jumpers, which she designed, worn with a white blouse and the postal insignia.

She organized the Hancock County League of Postal Workers and has held several offices in it. She has also been active and held office in the Maine branch of the National League of Postmasters.

She helped to set up the State postal workers' paper, Dirigo Postmaster, and selected its name. The paper is published by Hollis Smith of Mount Desert.

At the recent meeting of the Hancock County league she received a purse of money from her county colleagues and a book on gardening to help her with the project she is now looking forward to.

Richard A. Smith, postmaster at Northeast Harbor and president of the county organization spoke appreciatively of her record as postmaster.

Earl Bagley, postal real estate officer out of Portland, representing the Post Office Department, presented her with a certificate, signed by Postmaster General J. Edward Day, commending her "for 30 years of devoted and efficient service." She also received a letter of congratulation from Regional Director Donald P. Steele of Boston.

John B. DeMott, formerly regional director, and Mrs. DeMott were special guests. Other out-of-county guests were Mrs. Bagley, Mrs. Ethel B. Batson and Russell Batson of West Jonesport; Postmaster and Mrs. Ashton Mabee, Eastport; Postmaster and Mrs. George Evans, Sherman Mills; and Postmaster Arthur I. Davis of Canaan.

Born in Center, Mrs. Carter moved to Seal Harbor in 1922 and started her career with the post office as a clerk in 1930. At that time the hours were 7:30 a.m. to 7:30 or 8:30 p.m. and the weekly salary was not to exceed $14.50.

She became acting postmaster in 1944 and postmaster in 1945.

Knowing Seal Harbor about as well as anyone in the community, she has a way of guarding her clients against those who would intrude. * * * A number of years ago a tourist burst into her office asking how she could locate the home of the Vanderbilts.

"We have two Fords and three Rockefellers," Mrs. Carter said laughing, "but we are fresh out of Vanderbilts."

Mrs. Beth Short, Press Aide to Senator Monroney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, a recent edition in the Tulsa Tribune contains an article entitled "Woman Press Aide to Monroney Long Talented in News."

The article sets forth many of the experiences of Mrs. Beth Short, a native Oklahoman who is the valued press aide of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mrs. Short has long been one of the staff favorites of the Oklahoma congressional delegation. She is widely known in Oklahoma both for her competence and for her warm cheery nature.

I believe the article will be of interest to my colleagues:

WOMAN PRESS AIDE TO MONRONEY LONG TALENTED IN NEWS

(By Jenk Jones, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Senator MIKE MONRONEY's press aide is short in stature and short in name, but she's long on fascinating experiences.

Beth Campbell Short is a 5 foot, 2 inch, 54-year-old newswoman who has covered or worked with many of the famous people of the last 30 years.

She even got a fast start on fame. She was born on a farm near the old site of Alluwe, Okla., land which is being inundated by Oologah Dam. The neighboring farm belonged to the Will Rogers clan, and Beth's father knew the famed humorist.

Springfield, Mo., was the stepping stone that started Beth down the path that would lead to the Franklin D. Roosevelts, the Harry S. Trumans, and scores of other famous persons.

After graduating from Oklahoma University with a degree in English, she went to work for the Springfield Leader. Her experiences there led from virtual starvation to Red-tinged danger.

The former occurred when her managing editor told Beth to try subsisting on 25 cents worth of food each day for 10 days. He wondered whether women working for $10 a week in produce houses got enough money to eat properly.

Beth did so, running a daily box on the calories and minerals she consumed. "I lost only about a pound, but I got quite anemic," she said. Eventually the girls' salaries were raised.

She once wrote a column saying local sermons didn't do religion justice and that she could do better. She was dared to give one—with less than 3 days' notice—and did so to a packed house. (Beth said her sermon was no better than the others).

Everything from murders to mountaineer feuds came her way. Once she even had to dress up as a fat woman, including pillows, as a disguise to get evidence on a crooked police chief.

During the height of the depression a "hunger march" (in battered trucks) was organized to go to the State capital at Jefferson City.

Beth said the people who went along were fine. But the march was run by two Communists, who even taught Red songs to the unsuspecting travelers.

When the party camped outside Jefferson City she had to crawl through dark ditches to escape the Communists' vigilance and to write her story exposing the situation. She was damned by the Communist Daily Worker for her pains.

After 5 years in Springfield, she went to Oklahoma City (Monroney was also an Oklahoma City reporter at an earlier time) to cover a variety of assignments.

Once there was an elevator strike in New York City. To see how conditions must have been there, Beth climbed up and down the stairs of the 30-plus floor Ramsey Tower.

"I then went home and slept for 14 or 15 hours without moving," she said.

The Associated Press became interested in her and sought her for its Washington office. Her wily managing editor, Walter M. (Skipper) Harrison, let her go—but only after he made the AP promise to double her salary.

When Beth stepped off the train in Washington at 8 a.m. on a Monday morning, she was greeted by an old Oklahoma friend, Sigrid Arne, and the perplexing question of whether she knew the words to "Silent Night."

Beth said she did.

"Good," said Sigrid, "you're going to sing it at the White House tonight."

She wasn't fooling. Beth took part in a pre-Christmas show for women newsmen and the wives of male gridironers.

She arrived there with a hastily pressed dress and no belt. The AP hadn't even given her time to unpack, but put her to work as soon as she could reach the office from the station.

A newspaperwoman was more than rare around the AP office then. Beth was the only female there, working with 87 men.

Sound like an ideal situation for a single girl? It was. Her husband-to-be was Joe Short, a deskman and presidential politics writer, whom she met there.

But marriage was in the future, and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt was immediate.

A woman was needed to cover Mrs. F.D.R. plus a multitude of woman-related government agencies. Mrs. F.D.R. was enough—Beth recalls following her for 16 hours of continuous engagements (and hence stories) just 3 days after reaching Washington.

Of Mrs. Roosevelt she said, "She had the most wonderful knack with poor people" for not talking down to them. "They felt natural and at home with her."

She was also a newsmaker. "There were from two to eight stories from each of her press conferences."

She added, "When you covered her you covered an awful lot of other things."

One of her prize assignments was to cover the King and Queen of England at a garden party so posh that many of the socially elite didn't even get invited.

Another time she met and was entranced by Mrs. John Nance Garner, wife of F.D.R.'s first Vice President, "Cactus Jack." Mrs. Nance not only served well as her husband's secretary, but used to cook him breakfast and lunch right in the vice presidential office.

There were also Supreme Court and cabinet wives, plus the spouses of other high government officials, to cover.

Not all of her assignments worked out smoothly.

She was assigned to write a "who was there" story on the guests sitting on the platform when F.D.R. was inaugurated in 1936.

She had only been in Washington for a month and faces were still strange, so she had to attend receptions for 3 weeks running to meet famous persons.

When the great day dawned, she mounted her stand with an envelope full of tickets needed to gain entry to the various newsmaking events. She also stuffed her notes into the envelope as fast a she jotted them down.

Of course, she lost the envelope. No notes, and no entree to the main events.

The minute the ceremony ended, she jumped from her perch (a 9-foot drop), collared Mrs. Woodrow Wilson (whom she had never met) and chatted amiably with her as she strolled past the guards at the Capitol door. They didn't even ask for her ticket.

After filing her story about the inauguration, she ducked under the crowd by using the Senate subway and caught a cab that, by accident, just happened to have a sticker that permitted it to get close to the President's reviewing box. The sticker had been lost by another newsman earlier.

She sneaked onto the reviewing stand, covered the parade, then climbed the White House fence (which unfortunately, had just been painted) and bluffed her way in to that building for the day's final events.

Such frantic doings came to an end when she married Joe and settled down to have their three children, Sandy, Stephen and Vicki.

Joe quit newspapering and went to work for President Truman as his press secretary. He died unexpectedly on September 21, 1952.

Truman named Beth to the post of correspondence secretary. She was the boss of 27 men and women in the correspondence section, in charge of cranking out some 15,000 letters a week.

There were times when she had to sign 1,000 letters a day. And she also reserved to herself the task of writing replies to letters critical of the Truman administration.

She had to work into the final minutes of his term, as letters from foreign leaders that arrived the last day had to be answered while Truman was still President.

Truman still is her favorite (excluding MONRONEY) of all those she has covered or been close to. Her wall decorations even today are an autographed picture of him, a picture of Truman and MONRONEY and a proclamation of her appointment, signed by H.S.T.

She went to work for MONRONEY in January 1957 after a brief spin with a magazine and service with the Democratic Senate campaign committee.

But she doesn't consider her present task, ministering to the needs of newsmen, any sort of comedown from her previous work.

"There's a feeling of participation in working for a Senator," she said. "You can take pride in his accomplishments."

She always recalls the final day of the Truman administration as an example of how fast one can tumble from power.

Regarding President Dwight D. Eisenhower's inauguration and the end of the Democratic regime, she said:

"We rode to the Capitol in a limousine, and came back on a streetcar."

"But," she grinned philosophically, "that's democracy."

Citation for Mr. Edgar M. Bowers, Jr., District Manager for Social Security Administration, at Lafayette, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, helpful and understanding relations between Members of Congress and the Federal agencies with which we transact business are necessary to the welfare of our constituents and to the successful operation of Government.

In this connection I have in mind particularly those agencies which we have occasion to call upon most frequently, such as the Social Security Administration. My contacts in that direction have been pleasant and valuable and I am happy to join in congratulations to Mr. Edgar M. Bowers, Jr., who, on Tuesday, May 21, received the commissioner's citation for outstanding service as District Manager at Lafayette, La., during ceremonies at the Social Security Building at Baltimore. Mr. Bowers was among 75 employees of the Social Security Administration selected from among those throughout the Nation upon whom citations were conferred by Commissioner Robert M. Ball. Former Commissioner Arthur Altmeyer was the speaker during this program.

Mr. Bowers has been with the Social Security Administration since October, 1947, when he became a field assistant with the Galveston, Tex., office. Later he was employed at various Texas points, including Corpus Christi, Waco, Sherman, and Austin, also at San Angelo where he was District Manager and at Victoria where he opened a District Office. Since October 1958, he has been District Manager at Lafayette for an area comprising St. Martin, Iberia, Lafayette, and Vermilion Parishes—counties—in the Third Congressional District of Louisiana, which I have the privilege of representing, and St. Landry, Acadia, and Evangeline Parishes in the Seventh District represented by Congressman T. A. THOMPSON.

Mr. Bowers and his efficient office have helped with the problems of many of the people of the two districts mentioned above, while the Parishes of Assumption, Lafourche, St. Mary, and Terrebonne, in the Third District, and the community of Grand Isle, in Jefferson Parish, in the Second District represented by Congressman HALE BOGGS, are also ably served by District Manager J. H. Simpson and his office at Houma, in the Third District. The Lafayette District Office, established in 1950, and the Houma District Office, opened later, are in the Social Security Administration's region 7, composed of Louisiana, Texas, New Mexico, Arkansas, and Oklahoma.

West Virginia Centennial Banquet of Weirtonian Lodge of Order Italian Sons and Daughters of America Addressed by Maj. Gen. Andrew R. Lolli

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Order of Italian Sons and Daughters of America is a responsible and respected nationwide organization which devotes itself to fraternal, civic, and community service activities. Numbered among its members are some of this country's outstanding citizens of Italian origin; men and women who are proud of their American heritage, and yet conscious of their ties with that land of creative tradition.

The world of today is indebted to Italy for lasting contributions in virtually every field of human attainment. Art and music, philosophy and literature, commerce and exploration, religion and the rule of law: all have been strongly influenced by the leadership and vision of Italians.

In America we continue to feel keenly our indebtedness to that sunny Mediterranean country because such a large number of our citizens are of Italian extraction, or have come from Italy to make their homes in the United States. Theirs is a valuable contribution to the prosperity and progress of this land; indeed, they are a vital force in our continuing position of international responsibility.

On May 11, 1963, it was my privilege to meet with a large group of Italian-Americans and their guests at the 1963 Centennial Banquet of Weirtonian Lodge No. 183, Order of Italian Sons and Daughters of America. It was held in the Community Center building, Weirton, W. Va. This eighth annual event was attended by approximately 450 persons, and was dedicated to West Virginia's centennial, 1963.

It was a pleasure to be present and to have had the opportunity to participate in the program with Michael Sinicropi, civic leader and Weirtonian Lodge president; Maj. Gen. Andrew R. Lolli, commanding general of the XX U.S. Army Corps, and principal speaker; Judge Ruggero Aldisert, of Pittsburgh, Pa., and national Italian Sons and Daughters of America president; Richard W. Kyle, technical assistant to the Governor of West Virginia, and Hon. David T. Frew, mayor of Weirton.

General Lolli gave an inspiring address in which he commented on the current effectiveness of American fighting forces, and the rapid strides that have been made in the missile field in recent years. Judge Aldisert commended the Weirtonian Lodge No. 183 on achieving a high level of community consciousness, and praised local efforts in worthwhile projects. Mr. Kyle brought greetings from the Governor, and Mayor Frew welcomed all on behalf of the city. It was my happy responsibility to present to President Sinicropi and the lodge members and American flag which has recently flown over the U.S. Capitol Building.

Among guests were: Bishop John K. Mussio, of Steubenville, Ohio; the Reverend Fr. Phillip A. Clarke, executive vice president of the College of Steubenville; Hon. John H. Kelley, West Virginia State Treasurer; Hon. Joe Burdette, West Virginia Secretary of State; Hon. James G. McClure and Hon. Ralph Pryor, judges of the First West Virginia Judicial District; Hayden Harris, administrative vice president of Weirton Steel Co.; Norman Ferrari, Sr., Civil Defense Director of Hancock County; Martin Fahey, chairman, Hancock County Centennial Committee, and Bonn Brown, a well-known attorney from Elkins.

The festivities were especially enjoyable because of the efficiency and effectiveness of Toastmaster Robert M. Rine. Mr. Rine is employed in the Industrial Relations Department of the Weirton Steel Co.

Mr. President, I request that the remarks of Maj. Gen. Andrew R. Lolli, at the centennial banquet of the Weirtonian Lodge No. 183 of the Order of Italian Sons and Daughters of America, May 11, 1963, be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. ANDREW R. LOLLI, COMMANDING GENERAL, XX U.S. ARMY CORPS, AT THE CENTENNIAL BANQUET OF WEIRTONIAN LODGE NO. 183, ORDER ITALIAN SONS AND DAUGHTERS OF AMERICA, MAY 11, 1963, WEIRTON, W. VA.

I welcome this opportunity to report to my bosses—the American people. It is a pleasure to be able to report to our stockholders on the condition of your Army.

A year ago, all attention was focused on Berlin where the Communists were concentrating their efforts to destroy confidence in American leadership and to begin the destruction of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

This year the threat against Berlin continues but Communist offensive weapons reached Cuba where our strength and determination faced down the Red challenge. Bloody action in Laos, Vietnam and India have headlined Communist aggression but the threat is everywhere. The Soviet Union's vast nuclear strike capability is deterred by our retaliatory power.

The immediate military threat facing us is land power. We must be able—together with our allies—to defend the land of the free world with superior land power and, if necessary, to seize and hold the enemy's heartland.

Your Army is prepared to meet any threat this Soviet power can impose. To be ready means to continually move ahead. This your Army is doing. This is the report I want to give to you stockholders.

Your Army is a powerful Army—a modern Army, ready for anything, anyplace, anytime.

Only 3 years ago we had 14 divisions but only 11 were ready for combat. Eight of these eleven were overseas; the other three formed a Strategic Army Corps in the United States. We were lean but not as mean as we would have liked.

Today, we have 16 combat-ready divisions; instead of 3 divisions in the strategic Reserve, we now have 8. Today, Strategic Army Corps can cope with simultaneous outbreaks of fighting in widely separated points.

By June 1964, all of these units will be reorganized to provide the greater flexibility and mobility we need for modern warfare. We will be leaner and meaner.

This progress has been more than matched by improvement in the quality of our manpower. For example, 10 years ago only 48 percent of our enlisted men were high school graduates; today, 73 percent have diplomas. The percentage of our officers who are college graduates has risen from 60 to 69 during the same period. During the past 15 years, over 5000 Army officers have obtained graduate degrees in civilian universities. This is real progress.

The Army today confronts Communist aggression throughout the world. And now we have strength in reserve—not only in STRAC—but in the Reserve component units that are better trained, better equipped, better organized and more combat-ready than ever before.

Twice—our strength and determination—have caused Khrushchev's advisers to warn "Not today, Mr. K, not today." Let me add this advice, too: "Nor tomorrow." Twice—in Berlin and Cuba—our readiness to fight has prevented war.

We are proud of our past and have confidence in the future. We stand with all Americans because we're all in this together. There is no place for a bystander. Together, we have the strength to defeat any enemy. Together, we have the strength to deter war and to preserve the peace.

Wheat-Potato Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week the wheat farmers throughout the Nation voted in a referendum to determine the type of program they desired to be in operation in 1964. The alternatives were clearly presented and debated throughout the Nation.

Coming from a State where agriculture is still our major industry, and from a district where agriculture is not only a way of life, but is life itself, I was very much interested in the decision farmers would reach on Tuesday.

I must say that I was surprised at the decision and do not understand the reasons back of the decision reached. In my district we grow practically all agricultural commodities. Flue-cured tobacco, of course, is the principal commodity, but we also produce substantial quantities of peanuts, cotton, feed grains, potatoes, fresh vegetables, livestock, and practically anything that can be named in the agriculture field. The wheat producers made a choice on Tuesday to accept an alternative program which provides unlimited production at market prices, or for those who desire to plant within their acreage allotment, a guaranteed price support of 50 percent of parity. It is ironical to me that the wheat producers would reject marketing quotas with guaranteed higher prices. I say this is ironical because producers of Irish potatoes are at the present time and have been for more than a year trying to secure legislation which would authorize acreage allotments without guaranteed price supports. The producers of potatoes are entitled to this legislation. They have learned that they cannot exist with unlimited production much in excess of market demands.

Since wheat producers have made their choice, I sincerely hope that it is a wise one and that no action will be taken by this body to adopt a different program from that which they have elected to accept. I also urge this body to hasten consideration of potato legislation which has been urgently requested by potato producers.

Russia Uses Fishing Boats in Exporting Revolution From Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the following revelations by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott give considerable weight to the concern that many of us have about Mexico being the next Central American country to embrace communism. It also proves that Cuba is the focal point of Communist infection which is spreading to Central and South America, and unless something positive is done to prevent this disease from spreading and to eliminate the focal point of the infection, we will find ourselves in a most serious situation in the Western Hemisphere. The article by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, which appeared in May 22 issue of the Arlington (Va.) Northern Virginia Sun follows:

RUSSIA USES FISHING BOATS IN EXPORTING REVOLUTION FROM CUBA

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

Russia is using a fleet of several hundred high-speed fishing boats to export Fidel Castro's Communist revolution to other Latin American countries.

These oceangoing trawlers, which can sail rings around the World War II naval vessels of neigboring Caribbean nations, are transporting arms and Red-trained guerrillas to Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Guatemala, and Brazil.

The fishing boats—constructed so they can be quickly converted for military use—have a carrying capacity of 150 to 250 passengers, or 300 to 550 gross tons of fish or arms. Their speed ranges up to 30 knots.

In the past 6 weeks, U.S. patrol vessels and aircraft have regularly sighted these Soviet trawlers making high-speed runs from Cuba to Mexico, concentrating on areas close to Guatemala and Venezuela.

Several of these powerful Russian "fishing boats" were spotted early this month unloading arms and men in an isolated cove of Margarita Island off the coast of Venezuela. The weapons and Communist-trained guerrillas were en route to camp near Caracas, only an hour-and-a-half by air from Margarita.

Significantly, it was on Margarita Island that Simon Bolivar, famed South American patriot, proclaimed himself leader of the rebel army that ultimately overthrew Spanish rule.

The U.S. Consul in Veracruz, Mexico, has informed the State Department that 30 Russian fishing vessels are operating in the Gulf of Mexico, making regular trips to Cuba and using Veracruz as a base for supplies.

Many of these "fishing boats" have the latest electronic gear—far in excess of that normally deemed necessary for fishing operations. The ships are manned by Soviet crews, but usually carry Cuban and other Spanish-speaking passengers.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, led by outgoing Chief of Naval Operations George Anderson, are so disturbed by this growing new Russian threat that they have quietly launched a drive inside the administration and Congress to induce President Kennedy and his policymakers to take prompt and forceful countermeasures.

The military commanders stress that despite the President's public pledge to Caribbean leaders at the recent Costa Rica conference to formulate plans to build a "wall of men" around Cuba, nothing has yet been done to make this a firm policy.

It is pointed out that the U.S. Navy, the only force powerful enough to halt this expanding arms and guerrilla traffic, has not been committed to do that. The Navy has neither directives nor orders to take such urgently needed action.

Naval operations in Cuban waters are now strictly limited to the surveillance of Russian shipping. Even that is far from effective because of the immense area to be covered and the small number of ships assigned to the job.

In a private meeting with members of the House Military Appropriations Subcommittee, Admiral Anderson declared frankly it would take a large-scale naval blockade to halt the Communist traffic of guerrillas and arms from Cuba to other Latin American countries. He emphasized this was his own opinion and not the administration's.

President Kennedy and his policymakers have ruled out a blockade as the solution. Instead, they have embarked on a series of conferences with the threatened nations to determine what they can do to combat this intensifying menace to them.

Fidel Castro's trip to Russia is directly linked to the build-up of Soviet "fishing boats" in Cuban waters.

Intelligence authorities note that a majority of advisers accompanying the Cuban dictator are connected either with naval operations or guerrilla training. Also, instead of touring Russia with Castro, these officials have remained in Moscow for conferences with Soviet experts in these fields.

The 172d Anniversary of Polish Constitution of May 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to present to this House a resolution adopted by the Combined Organizations, Clubs, and Societies of the Black Rock Section of the City of Buffalo, commemorating the 172d anniversary of the adoption of Poland's Constitution of May 3.

I congratulate these societies upon their recognition of the great need for a dedication on the part of this Nation to seize the initiative in the war against international communism. Only in this way can the Polish Constitution of May 3 be given new life, purpose, and meaning.

The resolution follows:

At a mass observance, held on the 5th day of May 1963, under the auspices of the Combined Organizations, Clubs, and Societies of the Black Rock Section of the City of Buffalo, at the Polish Cadets Hall, 927 Grant Street, Buffalo, N.Y., commemorating the 172d anniversary of the adoption of Poland's constitution of May 3, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the 172d anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3, is an occasion for freedom-loving people everywhere to reflect upon the meaning of freedom and independence; to hope for its restoration in those lands and for those people from whom it has been taken away, and to dedicate themselves to protecting the heritage of freedom here and encouraging it throughout the world; and

"Whereas the late 18th century witnessed extensive blood letting occasioned by the rise of serf movements in European countries plagued with the ills of this caste system; and

"Whereas the adoption of the constitution on May 3, 1791, was a landmark in the history of freedom and self-government marking a historic bloodless transition of a nation from despotic monarchism to an era of constitutional monarchic democracy. This document is and will remain a classic as an inspired statement of the nature of people, the origin of authority, the role of law, and the proper function of government; and

"Whereas said constitution, while no longer in force, is a living classic forever holding before the people of Poland and the people of Polish descent, the ideal, the goal, the vision of justice and opportunity, and the right to live in peace and freedom; and

"Whereas the people of Poland and the United States are united by the bond of an unyielding opposition to the inhuman tyranny and oppression of world communism; and

"Whereas we as Americans feeling a kindred concern for the people of Poland, are appalled at the shocking revelations of the West German newspaper Der Spiegel of master NATO plans to reduce in the event of war, the territory of Poland into an atomic wasteland, in order to create an uninhabitable buffer zone between the Soviets and the Western nations of Europe, and

"Whereas the world watches in admiration and awe the continued resistance of the Polish people, their courageous display of independent minds and unbroken spirits in their successful resistance to attempts to force upon them indoctrination with Communist philosophy, and

"Whereas this unique situation prevails in Poland because of the courageous stature, will, and posture in opposition to communism of the Catholic primate of Poland, His Eminence Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, and

"Whereas the shores of our sister States of Florida and Alaska, neighbor except for narrow waters, with lands under control of international communism: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That we assembled at this commemorative observance of the 172d anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of May the third, call upon our fellow citizens of our great and beloved United States of America to reflect upon the lessons derived from history; that our danger from international communism is real and not imaginary; that greater intensified vigilance for national security has to be fostered against these dangers from within and without; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That we register our strongest protest possible in forms of condemnation against the military strategists in NATO for conceiving as part of their master plan the damnable strategy as revealed by the Der Spiegel newspaper to destroy the people and the territory of Poland in the event of world war III, that these people have suffered enough in each of the past world wars; we Americans have it upon our conscience that we let these valiant allies down at Yalta, and Teheran; do we desire this added burden upon our conscience that we participated in their ultimate destruction and reducing their lands and possessions to atomic ashes? and be it further

"*Resolved,* That as Americans dedicated to the lofty idealism of freedom of all nations, we feel dutybound in the name of justice, equity, and international morality to take a firm stand in the defense and continuation of the present assistance in forms of foreign aid to our historic allies, the people of Poland whose true voice is silenced by Soviet Russia; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That while we in the United States are free to celebrate Polish Constitution Day, the people of Poland are not. In their place, we plead ourselves never to forget that freedom is the right of every man, never to abandon those who are fighting to preserve their independence, never to give up hope that Poland someday will be free again; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That we commend and express our affection for the greatest independent spiritual leader in the world today, His Emminence Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, for his courage, his zeal and dedication to the cause of freedom for the Polish people. God in His infinite wisdom saw fit to designate Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski as protector of the Polish people's spiritual life and also destined him to chart the course for his people's temporal living under a godless regime forced upon them. May God guide the actions of this great charterer of his people's spiritual and temporal destinies and protect him from the ever threatening harms about him; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That we call upon our President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and our elected representatives in Congress to heed Senator KEATING's warnings with respect to Cuba; we call upon them not only to take steps to prevent the further spreading of international communism's influence in South and Central Americas but to take such steps as necessary to loosen the Soviet grip on Cuba with the view to rid our continent of this menace and restore the principles of the Monroe Doctrine that the Americas are for the Americans and that the United States will not permit the spreading of Soviet colonialism or any other upon the American continents; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That we as loyal citizens of the United States of America, hereby repeat our pledge of loyalty and allegiance to our great and beloved country; and be it finally

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded with dispatch to the President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, Hon. Senator Jacob Javits, and Hon. Senator Kenneth Keating, and our area Representatives in Congress, Hon. Thaddeus Dulski, Hon. John Pillion, and Hon. William A. Miller.

"WALTER T. SERDZAT,
"*Chairman, Resolution Committee.*
"WALTER WROBEL,
"*Secretary.*"

BUFFALO, N.Y., *May 5, 1963.*

Freedom Through Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Henry L. Lyon, Jr., pastor of the Highland Avenue Baptist Church of Montgomery, Ala., recently delivered one of the main addresses at the Southern Baptist Convention in Kansas City, Mo.

The address, "Freedom Through Responsibility," deals with the history of freedom in our country and the manner of preserving our freedom through the preservation of the 50 sovereign States.

I commend this sermon to the membership and to the general public:

FREEDOM THROUGH RESPONSIBILITY

(Address by Dr. Henry L. Lyon, Jr.)

For you were called to freedom, brethren; only do not use your freedom as an opportunity for the flesh, but through love be servants of one another.—Galatians 5: 13.

Our text emphasizes a very precious word in all the languages spoken by men—"freedom." As I wrote the words of this manuscript my TV screen vibrated with a special news bulletin carrying live moving pictures of a mob in Nicaragua demonstrating a boiling desire for freedom. The front page of my morning newspaper, as of February 5, spoke urgently about a real threat to the security of the Canadian Government involving a vociferous surge toward freedom by thousands dissatisfied with the status quo; President Kennedy proposing to the Congress bold, broad programs to free hundreds of thousands of mental patients from hospital beds and lighten the tragic toll of mental retardation at an initial cost of over $31 million; the mart nations of Europe voicing defiance for the alleged tyranny of France in the operation of the European Common Market; the Voice of America soon to dedicate with fanfare a $23 million installation whose massive transmitters are said to be 96 times as powerful as the strongest American commercial radio station—making possible the propagation of freedom's message to men around the world.

We have only to close our eyes and open our ears to hear freedom's voice in the yesterdays. The Supreme Council, Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction, U.S.A., has recently published a challenging and enlightening booklet, "The Road to Freedom." It is a very fine production—the result of much research and study. Every pastor of this convention should have a copy. You can have one for free by writing the Supreme Council, Washington, D.C. Listen with me to a vivid description of "The Road to Freedom" and the contributions men and women have made to the cause of freedom through the years. "The word 'freedom' has come from the lips of men in every language. The ideal of freedom has been extolled in the world's great oratory, and celebrated in poetry, drama, and song. Men have prayed for freedom, fought for it, died for it, lived to enjoy the fruits of freedom, and to pass on to their children the heritage of government organized to preserve freedom. If all the peoples of all times spoke in one voice with one word which best expressed the deepest aspiration of the human soul, that word would be freedom. No nation has won completely; some scarcely at all.

"The road to freedom for humanity has been long, tortuous, difficult and bloody. Only a relatively small portion of our human race has been able to travel it successfully. For the great mass of mankind the struggle for freedom has proven too difficult. In the United States those who negotiated the road and won the rewards of liberty did so by pledging to each other their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor.

"Many centuries have come and gone since man's earliest aspiration for freedom manifested itself. Oceans of blood, sweat and tears have been expended in the long struggle for the freedom of the human body, mind, and soul, and many milestones have been erected marking the advances which have been made along the way."

At Athens on his world good will tour, President Eisenhower defined freedom as a state "in which, under the rule of law, every human will have the right and a fair chance to live his own life, to choose his own faith, to work out his own destiny." Daniel Webster once said, "Liberty exists in proportion to self-restraint." Listen to the voice of Lord Byron:

> "For freedom's battle, once begun
> Bequeathed by bleeding sire to son
> Though baffled oft, is ever won."

Dr. Ray Rozell magnifies several dimensions of freedom: "For example, physical freedom has a mobile dimension. It permits a person to move or to go about as he desires. Intellectual freedom has a nonconditional dimension. It permits a person to think along whatever lines he desires. Social freedom has a privilege dimension. It allows one to move in a society of his own choosing. Religious freedom has a freewill dimension. It allows anyone to choose and practice his own faith. Political freedom has a self-determination dimension. It allows the citizen to choose his own political party, leaders, or government."

In a highly organized society such as the one in which we live, many personal freedoms must be sacrificed or even denied. We must not be indifferent to the well-being of others. Everyone who receives the protection of society and the advantages that result from living in it must make sacrifices on his own part for those benefits. There is no room for a privileged individual or group in the United States before our courts of law in the various States, in the Congress, before the President and before the Supreme Court of our country. Many of you may disagree with me at this point. That is your sacred privilege as a Southern Baptist. If you will think it over, you will discover the statement to be true. Every citizen has an obligation to observe a line of conduct not injurious to the liberties of the other members.

Let us now consider some of the ancient milestones on the road to freedom:

1. A concern for freedom was expressed early in the realm of the human family.

A code of ethical behavior involving one member of the family controlling his own freedoms and respecting the freedoms of others was contributed from the brush of Ptah-Hotep about 3500 B.C.

2. The code of Hammurabi, about 2000 B.C., preserved for the world 282 laws and aided many to obtain freedom from the tyrannical rule of many unjust kings.

3. Long after Hammurabi, about 1300 B.C., a great lawgiver named Moses received from God by far the greatest code involving the complete freedom of man. Through Moses God gave to humanity the direction for personal and lasting freedom.

4. The Athenian state was saved from anarchy in 621 B.C. by Draco writing and publishing the laws of the people.

5. After Draco came Solon accepting the task of remodeling the Athenian state. He brought about a compromise between the rich and poor characterized by Will Durant as "one of the encouraging miracles of history." Under this new government all Athenians who had already been sold into slavery for debt were set free.

6. Years later a similar struggle was waged in Rome. A commission of 10 magistrates called Decemvirs was chosen to prepare a code. This was the first stop in the development of Roman law, which has greatly influenced many of the legal systems of the modern world.

7. Justinian, 527-567 A.D., was one of the most distinguished Emperors of Rome. He appointed a Commission to assemble law literature of the Empire produced since the time of Hadrian, 117-138 A.D. It was through these textbooks that Roman law was most effectively passed to posterity for an orderly society.

8. King John, son of Henry II, came to the English throne violating the feudal obligations in the laws imposed upon the English by William the Conqueror, and also the old Anglo-Saxon laws long respected by the English. He was called to account by 25 of his barons accompanied by 2,000 knights, beside horse soldiers, attendants and foot soldiers on the field of Runnymede near the Thames River, and forced to seal the Magna Charta, called by political scientists the most important instrument of English constitutional history. The Magna Charta is held sacred as the safeguard of English liberties. One of the original copies of the Magna Charta was placed during World War II in Fort Knox to protect it from possible destruction by German bombs.

9. The petition of rights was placed by Parliament before Charles I in 1628 stating: "By the statute called the great charter of the liberties of England it is declared and enacted that no freeman may be taken or imprisoned or be disseised of his freehold or liberties or his free customs, or be outlawed or exiled or in any manner destroyed, but by the lawful judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land."

10. No story of the road to freedom would be complete without a reference to the declaration of the rights of man, a document of the French Revolution (1789-99) which pinpointed the oppressions which incited conflict, and which was the source of much of the influence which the French Revolution had upon human liberties, then and since.

11. Then came the code of Napoleon in 1804, which was to be the instrument by which some of the principles of the French Revolution were to be carried to other countries in behalf of freedom.

The American road to freedom is our priceless heritage.

1. The first permanent English settlement at Jamestown in 1607 included enough men aboard the three small vessels that made the first trip to Jamestown who were looking for freedom and a new day politically to enable the little band of settlers to endure almost incredible suffering and survive. These men declared "that the Governor shall not lay any taxes upon the colony in any other way than by the authority of the general assembly. This was a very important step toward an American milestone on the road to freedom—no taxation without representation.

2. The settlement of Plymouth brought men to America seeking to enjoy the liberty of their conscience without hazard to themselves and offense to others. Their character written on the *Mayflower* May 11, 1620, was an agreement for orderly government functioning in complete freedom.

3. Virginia was the first of the Colonies openly to revolt against the heavy hand of England, exactly a century before the War of Independence began. Sir William Berkeley, Royal Governor of Virginia in 1641, boasted "there are no free schools nor printing, and I hope we shall not have them for a hundred years * * * God keep us from both." Nathaniel Bacon, a great lover of freedom, led a rebellion which cost Governor Berkeley his job and gave the people a little more freedom.

4. A group of brave men disguised as Mohawk Indians dumped 342 chests of tea valued at $90,000 into Boston's harbor in rebellion against "taxation without representation—bringing the Colonies closer to independence.

5. In the year of 1775 the die was cast. On March 23, Patrick Henry was saying to the Virginia convention at St. John's Church in Richmond, "I know not what course others may take, but, as for me, give me liberty or give me death." Lexington and Concord came April 19. On May 31 Mecklenberg County, N.C., resolutions asked for the suspension of the Royal Government. On June 10 the Second Continental Congress appointed George Washington Commander of the Continental Army. On June 17 was Bunker Hill. The next year General Washington drove deep into enemy territory. On July 4 the great bell in Pennsylvania State House proclaimed liberty throughout the land. At last—America is on the road to freedom.

6. The Declaration of Independence declared, "that these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States * * * and that, as free and independent States * * * to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do. And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." The emphasis is upon individual free sovereign States. Brethren, in view of what is happening today to our sovereign States we need to ring again the great bell in Pennsylvania State House—calling all Americans back to the road to freedom. We have no America without 50 sovereign States.

7. Finally, we come to one of the greatest byproducts of Christian influence—the Constitution of the United States. The first 10 amendments constitute the American Bill of Rights. We must remember that the Constitution focalizes attention upon the individual citizen and the individual State. Both of these are cemented together to effect real freedom, not false freedom and rights based on political greed, for all men of our great country.

The road to freedom must be kept open by all Americans meeting their individual responsibility. This responsibility is met at the ballot box; expressed through a maintenance of law and order; shared by respecting the rights of others; and rewarded as we preserve true representation of the will of the people in the affairs of State. The road to freedom is closed by a great nation allowing a powerful few to substitute judicial interpretation and Executive order for constitutional government.

Today, we have walked the road to freedom together from its beginning unto the crossroads of our present hour. Today, the cry for freedom is more vociferous than ever before. In spite of codes, declarations, and constitutions we clamor for freedom. Southern Baptists have a responsibility to listen to every cry for freedom. We must be impartial. They come from the North, South, East, and West in America. They come from every race. The nations of the earth cry for freedom. All must be heard—even those we count as our enemies. It is our obligation to listen now. We must have all of the unbiased facts of humanity's present plight. It is possible to listen too late. While we are trying to make up our minds whether we will listen or not, let us be reminded that there are four distinct groups, other than our Christian forces, not only willing to listen—but aggressive and eager to give an answer and direction to those crying for freedom:

1. We have godless communism. Under the banner of the Communist Party march men, women, and young people dedicated with a fanatical passion to their obligation to indoctrinate the world. J. Edgar Hoover in "Masters of Deceit" quotes word for word the objective of communism, "We are to dress up like other people and stand outside churches in our neighborhoods and use the slogan, 'Peace on earth, good will toward men.'" Men are induced to demand peace at any cost. If we surrender here, we are doomed. May we never forget that there are some things in our heritage of freedom so sacred that we can well afford to protest, debate, fight, and even die rather than be crucified on a cross bearing the inscription peace at any cost.

2. We have the selfish greedy politician and his kind promising everything to the restless masses. Those who follow these unworthy leaders are sure to experience the most ruthless exploitation of humanity ever recorded on the emblazoned pages of history.

3. The forces of political ecclesiasticism are ever alert to increase their financial income and to enslave humanity in the power of superstition and ignorance of the truth. Today, these forces are making their most subtle approach to the masses. The searchlight of truth is our only defense against their fast-growing operation.

4. There is the tremendous group of the misinformed. We are living in a day of superpropaganda. The daily mail of every American, especially that of the pastor, is flooded with tracts, booklets, confidential reports on certain individuals, surveys, photocopies of articles taken from newspapers, magazines, etc. Many of our citizens have become slaves to the untruths hidden in these publications without making an investigation of the source. Many of these misinformed citizens are seeking to direct America in her present hour of crisis.

It is our obligation as Christian Americans to preserve our democratic way of life for the good of humanity around the world—now and for the tomorrows. In so doing, we must recognize that democracy is a gift of Christian faith to the world. Again, J. Edgar Hoover in "Masters of Deceit" reminds us of six aspects to our democratic faith:

1. A belief in the dignity and worth of the individual, a belief which today is under assault by the Communist practice which

regards the individual as a part of the class, the mass, and a pawn on the state;

2. A belief in mutual responsibility, of our obligation to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and care for the less fortunate, which is affronted by Communist policies of calculated ruthlessness;

3. A belief that life has a meaning which transcends any manmade system, that is independent of any such system, and that outlasts any such system, a belief diametrically opposed by the materialistic dogma of communism;

4. A belief in stewardship, a feeling that a great heritage is our sacred trust for the generations yet to come, a belief that stands today as the competitor to Communist loyalty to Marxism—Leninism;

5. A belief that the moral values we adhere to, support, and strive toward are grounded on a reality more enduring and satisfying than any manmade system, which is opposed by the Communist claim that all morality is class morality.

6. A belief, which has matured to firm conviction, that in the final analysis love is the greatest force on earth and is far more enduring than hatred; this forbids our accepting the Communist division of mankind that by arbitrary standards singles out those fit only for liquidation.

Southern Baptists are obligated by their faith in Jesus Christ and their uncompromising belief in the divinely inspired message of the Holy Bible to inform the last man on earth that the only way an individual can discover the real meaning of freedom is through a personal experience of salvation in Jesus Christ. Jesus offers complete freedom of the soul to all men. Every local church of our convention is organized for the purpose of meeting this obligation. The spiritual condition of our world calls us to rededicate ourselves to the business of obeying every mandate of the great commission. This constitutes our task and message.

All of us have thrilled today as we have considered the milestones on the road to freedom. Every Southern Baptist knows by personal experience of another milestone—the sacrificial atoning death of Jesus Christ on Calvary's Cross. "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." (Romans 5: 8) "Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God our Father." (Galatians 1: 4) "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." (John 8: 36) We are now considering God's provision to make all men free in the truest sense. It is our responsibility to make known to all men the provision of God's Divine Grace. Fellow messengers to this convention, I believe with all my heart every social, political, and spiritual problem of our day can be solved by our turning now to our responsibility of making all men free by leading them to a saving experience in Christ. When we are so working for the Lord, we will glorify God's Son and bring freedom to humanity.

The plea of our text is that we "do not use your freedom as an opportunity for the flesh." Someone has given the following challenge for the proper use of our freedom: "to love our country; to reverence the constitutional laws of our land; to treat with respect those in public office; to exercise our voting privilege as a sacred trust; to aid in the spread of sound knowledge; to strive for the elevation of the moral and spiritual level of our world. This prescription is effective. Let us try it for the glory of God and the good of humanity.

Freedom in Christ carries with it responsibility. Every believer in Christ is a priest before God. He not only has opportunity before God, but he has a responsibility to exercise this personal priesthood. The responsibility is realized in pressing personal evangelism; being a colaborer with Christ and other Christians; applying Christian principles to our daily problems with self and others; and by our loyalty to Christ.

Baptists around the world have demonstrated their love for freedom by enduring imprisonment, the public whipping post, the hardships of trailblazing, public scorn, the necessity of walking lonely roads with the minority. Baptists have done well for the cause of freedom in the pulpit, in the pew, in institutions of learning, in the mission station, in the Congress of our country, in the courts of law, and on the field of battle. May we ever be true to our sacred heritage.

Our text exhorts us "through love be servants of one another." Dr. Kyle M. Yates has said, "No end can ever come to love. It never fails in defeat. It never fails to reach the full completion of its purpose. It survives everything. Love began with God; it will go on through all eternity." Quintin Hogg has said, "Love seeks not to limit its devotion but to find opportunities of expressing it. Would you know God? I say to you, discover what true love means. Get your heart so full of it that it will send you forth in God's spirit seeking to save the lost, yearning to redeem the erring, and sinful, binding up the brokenhearted, drying streaming eyes, and comforting them that mourn; get such a love as that into your soul and you need look no further for an image of God. Moreover, not only is it true that every one that loveth, knoweth God, but it is equally true that you will know God just to the extent that you really love and no more."

May it be our prayer and determination to help make this hour freedom's crowning hour. Listen to challenge of Owen Seaman:

"Ye that have faith to look with fearless eyes
  Beyond the tragedy of a world at strife,
And trust that out of night and death shall rise
  The dawn of ampler life;
Rejoice, whatever anguish rend you heart,
  That God has given you for a priceless dower,
To live in these great times and have your part
  In freedom's crowning hour;
That you may tell your sons who see the light
  High in the Heavens—their heritage to take—
I saw the powers of darkness put to flight,
  I saw the morning break."

Improving Government-Business Relationships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, a special supplement of the current issue of the Prentice-Hall Executive Report contains an article written by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] entitled "Improving Government-Business Relationships."

The article points out the need for Government-business cooperation and provides examples of the steps being taken by Government agencies and the Congress to bring about this arrangement.

I believe this article by the distinguished chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business will be of interest to all my colleagues:

IMPROVING GOVERNMENT-BUSINESS RELATIONSHIPS

(By JOE L. EVINS, Member of Congress, chairman, House Small Business Committee)

Our economy is moving swiftly both here and abroad. To keep apace with these momentous changes, we must reappraise some of our views.

We should think anew about the relationship between public and private business. There must be a growing partnership. This is no time for pointless division and conflict.

We are confronted with new trade problems with the advent of the European Common Market, the passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and the flow of goods from the Far East. Our views must be adjusted to meet these changes.

All too often in this century, extremists have pictured our Federal Government as a monster bent upon the destruction of our society. Congress has been maligned and defamed; yet the Congress is a mirror of the public's needs, the public's wants and the public's aspirations. Business itself has been most vocal in its attacks upon the Executive and the Congress. American industry and business at times also has been the object of attack.

Certainly this Nation has matured to the point where we can and should lay aside bickering and recrimination and get down to the business of doing business.

On a number of occasions the President has said that the Federal Government and business should work together in harmony and cooperation and in partnership in a joint enterprise.

This certainly does not mean that all of the cooperating must come from business. The various branches of Government also must play a major role to insure that the Government-business partnership will be an effective means by which the economic potential of our country will be realized.

The legislative branch of Government shares a great responsibility in bringing about a fuller understanding of what the Government's role will be in this partnership.

There is no doubt that over the decades there has been a growing amount of regulation and organization. This is due to the growing amount of specialization and complexity of our economic structure plus its accelerated tempo. Congress has been called upon to enact legislation of a positive nature in a wide area and range to assist business in the overall public interest. The business community has not always accepted this assistance with enthusiasm. A better understanding of this partnership is needed.

Initially, the banking fraternity sharply opposed the creation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. But today, bankers consider the FDIC as a stabilizing influence on their activities. Indeed, they advertise boldly and proudly that their deposits are insured by FDIC.

GOVERNMENT POLICING NEEDED

Certainly there is a continuing need for a certain amount of policing by the Federal Government. In some instances it has become necessary to issue regulations curbing certain practices because of the actions of a few irresponsible members of an industry.

In retrospect, it cannot be fairly said that this legislation and these regulations have retarded our growth and development. We have developed the greatest and most vibrant economy of any nation in the world. We are the envy of our allies and of our adversaries. All this has been attained within the general framework of free enterprise with due regard to the public interest and protection.

As chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business it is my belief that our free enterprise system must be preserved and extended and that the public-private partnership concept can and should be accelerated.

Congress and the executive branch can be helpful to business. And conversely, business can be helpful to the Congress and to the departments and agencies of the Federal Government by coming forward with their particular ideas and suggestions for solving various problems that face industries and government.

Congress is called upon to consider legislation that will assist business in overcoming obstacles to growth and prosperity. Proposed legislation is considered by appropriate congressional committees. Public hearings are held to determine whether the particular legislative proposal is needed and will have the desired effect. It is at these hearings that the representatives of business, Government, labor, farmers, consumers and the public generally have an opportunity to express their views and to suggest changes and amendments which, in their view, will strengthen the bill under consideration.

It is not necessary to come to Washington, or to hire someone to lobby for your views. A letter or postcard to your Congressman or Senator is enough to show your interest. But, if do come to Washington, you will find that Members of Congress—and their staffs—are accessible.

Our Small Business Committee membership has always sought to serve, encourage and promote American small business in the hope that in due course it will become big business. The concept of our committee is that what is good for small business, generally, is good for all business, and good for the public at large. Our committee is not against big business as such; it is rather pro small business.

TAX AND TRADE HELP

We have promoted tax policies and trade policies favorable to small business. We have worked to secure a greater share of Government defense and other contracts and subcontracts for small business. It is my expressed hope that we may be able to serve American small business generally and in a broader field by encouraging and guiding small businessmen to enter into export trade—thus expanding American business and helping to improve our balance-of-payments situation. We must continue to do this in the light of the quickening changes of the times.

In promoting this public-private partnership, we should consider what the various agencies of the executive branch of our Government are doing and can do to be of assistance. Many businessmen are not aware of what is available, just for the asking.

I wish to mention two agencies in particular—the Department of Commerce and the Small Business Administration.

ROLE OF THE SBA

The Small Business Administration was created in 1953 on a temporary basis to promote, stimulate and assist small business firms in both foreign and domestic commerce. By 1958, SBA had proved so necessary and effective that the Congress gave it permanent status.

One of the functions of the House Small Business Committee is to review the operations of the Small Business Administration. My committee recently, during extensive public hearings, received a comprehensive report from Mr. John E. Horne, SBA Administrator. His report made several impressive points, illustrating how effective the Small Business Administration has been in carrying out the mission assigned to it by Congress.

The Small Business Administration—with a loan authority of $1.5 billion—cooperates closely with banks in making financial assistance available to small business.

As fresh evidence of the determination of SBA to cooperate with the Treasury Department and to encourage the private banking industry to help itself and at the same time help small business, a regulation has recently been issued authorizing commercial banks holding Small Business Administration deferred participation loan certificates to use them as collateral for Government deposited funds. As Mr. Horne explained, the Small Business Administration's role is to supplement the private credit available to small business and "to lead the way in demonstrating the term loans and other sound loan innovations are of positive economic value to the local community."

The legislation enacted by Congress that created the Small Business Administration requires that agency to insure that a fair proportion of Government contracts are placed with small business.

SMALL BUSINESS SET-ASIDES

In fulfilling this assignment SBA cooperates closely with other Government departments, and as a result, there has evolved a set-aside arrangement whereby a substantial portion of Government procurements may be purchased only from small business concerns.

By act of Congress, SBA also is empowered to protect a small business concern that has submitted a low bid on a Government procurement. For instance, if the mailman who brings the mail to your residence rides a little scooter, the chances are that this little scooter was made by a small business firm whose low bid initially had been rejected because of an apparent lack of ability to perform. SBA inquired into the matter, however, and found the small business firm to be fully capable of delivering on schedule. As a result, the procuring agency was required to accept the bid and award the contract to the small business firm.

This proceeding is doubly beneficial. It helps the small business manufacturing concern and it helps the taxpayer. It demonstrates good government in action.

Savings to the taxpayers of at least $4.5 million were directly attributable to this program for fiscal year 1962. These savings, in procurement costs to the Government, which represent the difference between the small business' low bid and the amount of the next highest bid, more than covered total annual administrative costs for all of SBA procurement and technical assistance programs.

Another important development associated with this SBA procedure rests in the fact that although SBA has reversed the procuring agencies in many instances, experience shows that SBA has been right 97 percent of the time.

The Department of Commerce is primarily concerned with the promotion, encouragement and stimulation of commerce and trade, both domestic and foreign. Within the Department there are specialists in every field of business activity. They are able men who are dedicated to the promotion and improvement of American industry.

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT ROLE

Of special significance at this time is the determined effort being made by the Department of Commerce to increase our export trade and thereby give a major assist to halting the outflow of gold from the United States. There has been created within the Department a special branch to deal with this problem, and industry is being encouraged and urged to engage in export trade.

The impetus behind the drive for greater export trade markets stems from the passage of the Trade Expansion Act. This legislation has the support of such diverse groups as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the AFL-CIO, and many farm organizations. The Bureau of International Business Operations and the Bureau of International Programs, both in the Department of Commerce, are primarily responsible for promoting foreign trade and are doing much in this field. These facilities of the Department of Commerce are available to all classes of business, regardless of size.

WANTED: EXPORT ADVICE

In the export expansion drive, the Government is pleading for advice from business. In a recent speech, Mr. Eugene M. Braderman, Director of the Department's Bureau of International Commerce, asked businessmen to write detailed briefs on their difficulties in export trade. He pointed out that these facts were essential to the Government as it moves into negotiation under the Trade Expansion Act. This is an example of the interdependence of Government and business. It is one facet of the partnership that needs recognition.

All American businesses—whether large or small—have a very high stake in the future of international trade. Some may talk about a rising tide of foreign trade. But there is also a rising tide of foreign competition. I urge business management to participate more actively in this competition for foreign trade. It should be pointed out that Government provides many programs of assistance.

For instance, the United States operates three Trade Centers abroad—in London, Bangkok, and Frankfurt. A fourth has just been opened in Tokyo. In these centers, the products of different American industries are displayed. The Department of Commerce supervises these exhibitions.

SBA INVITES EXHIBITS

The Small Business Administration, through its Foreign Trade Division, has invited more than 1,000 small manufacturers to exhibit their products. The types of products exhibited include toys and games; automotive service and maintenance equipment; industrial instruments and laboratory apparatus; small farm machinery and irrigation equipment; and business machines and office equipment among others.

Our Government is also sponsoring trade missions consisting of groups of business specialists who have volunteered to carry specific business proposals to international markets. Upon their return, the mission members discuss trade and sales opportunities which the mission has developed abroad. The Small Business Administration encourages small business concerns to participate in this program by becoming mission members and by submitting business proposals.

Another aspect of Government-business cooperation is exemplified in foreign trade fairs. The United States will be represented this fall in commercial-type fairs in such diverse places as Turkey, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and West Berlin. The Commerce Department's Bureau of International Commerce has full information about such events. This is available on request from the Department.

FREE COUNSELING

Our Government is also providing free counseling assistance to private business with regard to foreign trade possibilities. For example, last year, a St. Louis firm with 27 employees, was assisted in a joint endeavor by the Small Business Administration and the Department of Commerce. The firm manufactures firetrucks and firefighting equipment. It purchases truck chassis and builds firetrucks with all the necessary components. The businessman concerned was hesitant about entering the export market, but was persuaded to mail out price lists and brochures. The firm has since made sales in Lima, Peru; Damascus, Syria; and Bangkok, Thailand. In addition, the company participated in a trade fair and now has an agent in Peru. This is an example of what can be done in the export trade in partnership with Government.

Over a span of years, there have been areas of disagreement between Government and private business and undoubtedly there will continue to be some areas of disagreement. However, business and Government must work for more areas of cooperation and accord and a better partnership in the interest of both. In our new horizon, we should look forward to a patient public-private partnership, with peace and cooperation and prosperity for all.

Government Versus Consulting Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when this Nation is endeavoring to generate and spread employment it seems to me that the Government is pursuing a wrong policy by having engineers in the employment of the Government depriving the consulting engineers in private practice from work to which they are entitled. The report by the Consulting Engineers Council, Committee on Private Enterprise, concerning "Government Versus Consulting Engineers" follows with specific examples of this infringement by the Government engineers.

A REPORT: GOVERNMENT VERSUS CONSULTING ENGINEERS

FOREWORD

This report has been prepared by the Consulting Engineers Council at the request of its members, professional engineers in private practice throughout the United States who are concerned with the inequitable competition offered them by various agencies of the Federal Government.

INTRODUCTION

In the past 30 years the Federal Government has brought to bear a continually increasing influence on the affairs of the private businessman. Perhaps it was the necessities of depression, and then war, which "mothered" this intervention, but now that the critical period of the "illness" has passed, the cure has become the affliction.

A great American once said, "That government governs best which governs least." If we were to judge today's government by this standard the judgment could not be "best."

Federal regulations and controls are difficult enough for the American businessman to bear, but when you add direct competition—from Federal agencies—the burden becomes unbearable.

This report concerns itself with only one field of endeavor in which the Government has become a ruthless competitor.

Consulting engineering is a business practiced by professional engineers. As such it contributes its full share of financial support to the cost of operating the Government. Part of this contribution goes to pay the salaries of the thousands of professional engineers now in Federal employment. When the agencies employing these engineers openly solicit engineering services, which could and should be performed by private consultants, we have the unhappy picture of one businessman paying another to take his livelihood away from him.

This report contains actual provable cases in which tax-supported Government agencies have openly negotiated contracts for engineering services from other Federal, local, or State departments, or non-Government clients. If this situation is allowed to continue and expand—for expand it will, as expansion seems to be Government's most important product—the state will be in business, as well as in politics, and private enterprise will face extinction.

It is not anarchy to cry, "Get the Government out of business," it is the job of every exponent of the free-enterprise system to fight for just and equitable safeguards for that system. Consulting engineers are not asking for handouts or concessions; they just want a business climate in which, by the grace of their ingenuity, enterprise, and hard work, they can be free to practice their profession, which is so essential to our Nation's technological progress.

THE CONSULTING ENGINEER

Professional responsibility

A consulting engineer is a graduate professional engaged in the private practice of engineering. He makes his services available to both public and private clients within the States where he is duly registered. These services may include advice and guidance in determining the feasibility of a proposed engineering project; the subsequent stages of design, possibly through to the supervision of construction to insure compliance to the design specifications. Being responsible only to his client and his profession, and possessing no profitmaking connection with any supplier of materials, the consulting engineer can make decisions free from bias and prejudice.

Services as needed

Consulting engineers function in each of the many diversities of the profession. They provide only those services necessary to fulfill their client's engineering requirement on a project-by-project basis. The consultant's fees are agreed upon beforehand through negotiation; competitive bidding is not engaged in by professional engineers.

Economy to client

The employment of a consulting engineer relieves the client of the necesity for maintaining a full staff of professional engineers of diversified capabilities. With salaries being the largest item of overhead in most businesses, the savings realized here are obvious. The same fact applies to both private and public clients.

Public agency staffing costly

If a public agency is staffed—for engineering purposes—beyond a reasonable level necessary to insure continuity, effective planning, administration and control of public works projects, engineering costs soon become out of proportion. This situation also results in the misuse of professional talents, on subprofessional tasks, when the engineering workload is light. In addition to being materially impractical, this practice produces a degradation of the professional's morale.

Government competition

Overstaffing in engineering departments has caused some governmental agencies to solicit engineering assignments from other departments and in some instances from semipublic bodies and even private industry. This is in direct competition with the consulting engineer in private practice, and an almost criminal waste of this country's most valuable resource.

Private enterprise committee

To explore the extent of this encroachment, and obtain documentary evidence wherever possible, a few years ago the Consulting Engineers Council established a private enterprise committee. Since 1960 this group has been collecting, categorizing and analyzing dozens of reports from engineers complaining about Government competition. It has searched through Government records and other sources of data to compile a full documentation of specific cases. Due to the abundance of material available to the committee and the limitations of space, this presentation will only attempt to summarize those cases which are most illustrative of Government encroachment on private practice engineering.

THE CONSULTING ENGINEER VERSUS THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Permanent staff of engineers

The Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, employs a permanent staff of engineers who account for practically all of the design work on Bureau projects. In recent years it has expanded its engineering services to include project designs for private land improvement groups who are eligible for long-term Government loans. In some instances, undue pressure and unethical practices were used to urge the client to use the Bureau's engineers rather than private consultants. A summary of a typical case in point follows.

1. The Brady case: In December 1961 the Gering-Fort Laramie Irrigation District, a group of private landowners in Nebraska, met to discuss with Bureau of Reclamation personnel a proposed rehabilitation and betterment project, to be financed with loan funds secured by the Bureau.

Government engineering fee 23⅔ percent

Five members of the irrigation district board of directors were present, and six Bureau representatives attended. Two objections were entered by the irrigation district to the contract which was proposed, (1) the 35-year repayment schedule, and (2) the fee for engineering and administration proposed by the Bureau, equal to 23⅔ percent of the project cost.

Private engineering fee 6 percent

Irrigation district representatives had already discussed this engineering project with a consulting engineer, Mr. Fred D. Brady of Spearfish, S. Dak., and felt that his fee for this same project, approximately 6 percent of construction costs, would be preferable to the Bureau's 23⅔-percent fee. By resolution adopted January 4, 1962, the irrigation district accepted the revised rehabilitation and betterment contract with the United States, "with the express understanding that this district has the right to hire private engineering services if this district so desires."

Government pressure too much

The district met again on January 31, 1962, at the special request of the Bureau of Reclamation "to further consider the district's application for rehabilitation and betterment loan." Again high-level Bureau personnel outnumbered irrigation district representatives. The official minutes show that Bureau of Reclamation representatives advised that the rehabilitation and betterment contract as presented had in mind the provision of all engineering by Bureau personnel, and that the retention of a consulting engineer would require redrawing of the contract. "This would take several weeks," advised the Bureau, "and by the time the new form had been approved by the Director and the Commissioner, it could be too late to get it "in the appropriations bill" that year.

In case the hint was not strong enough, the Bureau further stated that the resolution of January 4 had been discussed with the regional director, and that in his opinion "* * * perhaps such a contract could not be approved."

Irrigation district surrendered

Finding the obstacles erected by bureaucracy too much to overcome, the irrigation district reluctantly agreed to the retention of the Bureau as the engineering firm. Appeals by Mr. Brady to Members of Congress, the Interior Department, and the White House evoked a great deal of sympathy, an investigation of the Bureau by the Bureau, and exoneration by the Bureau of its own personnel.

Bureaucracy in action

The Brady case is a tragic demonstration of bureaucracy in action. A bureaucracy which, with its seemingly unlimited time and funds, and officers with lofty titles, is calculated to impress its will upon the humble taxpayer. Here we have the unhappy picture of a tax-supported agency, purportedly dedicated to serving the people, but instead openly competing with the taxpayers who support all of our Government's functions. In this case the group of small businessmen were forced to pay more and get less, because the moneylending power of the Government was misused by an agency of the Government.

Government provides consultant services

2. The Bureau as a consulting engineer: On June 6, 1962, the Bureau of Reclamation announced establishment of a southern California development office at San Bernardino to carry out water resource investigations in that area. The office will be headquarters for long-range planning to meet the water needs of southern California. In addition to their long-range planning, the news release also stated: "An additional responsibility of the San Bernardino office will be the review of loan applications under the Small Reclamation Projects Act, to provide consultant services to applicants approved for construction." "To provide consultant services to applicants" is a clear statement of a policy of direct competition to the consulting engineer in private practice.

Engineering specialists loaned

3. The Bureau as a "talent" agency: The Bureau of Reclamation has embarked upon a policy of loaning engineering specialists to other agencies of the Government and to private organizations indicating that they have personnel in excess of their actual needs to perform the services outlined under the original authorization act. Some of these "on loan" projects are listed as follows:

(a) Surveys, designs, specifications for a $517,000 rehabilitation program for the Sunnyside Irrigation District, Washington.

(b) Consulting engineers services to the Villamontes irrigation project in Bolivia.

(c) Consulting engineering services for the water development needs of the Piranhas River Basin in Brazil. This team includes the Chief Design Engineer at Reclamation Headquarters in Denver, Chief of the Division of River Control, Region IV, and a complete consulting staff.

(d) A water resources study in Central Luzon Philippines, including the services of seven Bureau of Reclamation officials.

(e) Consulting supervision of a survey of the Mekong River Basin in Thailand which required the services of the Chief of the Reclamation Bureau, Salt Lake City, Division of River Control.

(f) Consulting services to the Puerto Rican Resources Authority for a study of sedimentation problems incident to the South Coast irrigation project in Puerto Rico.

(g) Consulting services, including an evaluation study of the Zula Plain irrigation project in Ethiopia.

THE CONSULTING ENGINEER VERSUS THE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Aggressive self-promotion

This branch of the Department of Agriculture is aggressively promoting its own engineering services to small, independent irrigation and drainage districts and privately owned irrigation systems throughout the arid western areas. Some of the projects for which it is providing complete engineering services are:

(a) Delta Canal Co., Delta, Utah.

(b) Melville Canal Co., Delta, Utah.

(c) Georgetown Creek Irrigation Co., Georgetown, Idaho.

(d) Practically all of the small farm dams and ponds in Oregon.

(e) Smith's Fork, Wyo., Irrigation District.

THE CONSULTING ENGINEER VERSUS THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The Veterans' Administration apparently has a policy which requires the use of only their own architect-engineering staff on Veterans' Administration projects, regardless of the magnitude of the project. An example of this policy in action is contained in a report from the Gulf Institute of Consulting Engineers.

Revision in policy?

It was decided to construct a $2½ million addition to the VA hospital in New Orleans. The original buildings were designed by a local architect-engineer firm, and it would certainly have been most logical and economical to employ their services on the addition. However, the VA elected to provide the design and engineering from within its own staff. When this decision was brought to the attention of officials of the Gulf Institute, they registered a protest both to the Veterans' Administration and to the Louisiana congressional delegation. The VA replied as follows, "In preparing the preliminary drawings, it became necessary for us to obtain more substantial information than usual and to develop the project further than we normally do when contracting with an architect-engineer firm to prepare the working drawings and specifications. For this reason, and in keeping with our policy, it was decided to finish the project within our own organization." It does not appear that the reasons stated in this reply are valid except for the phrase, "and in keeping with our policy." This is apparently a revision in policy by the Veterans' Administration to expand their professional organization to the extent that they can provide all design services within the organization without utilizing the consulting engineer or architect in private practice. The maintenance of this size staff for a project of this magnitude will result in an overstaffing for their normal workload.

THE CONSULTING ENGINEER VERSUS U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Unsolicited free service

This agency of the Interior Department performs surveys, investigations and research covering the topography, geology, mineral and water resources of the United States for the Federal Government and publishes this information as a public service.

The agency recently offered their services, in direct competition with competent private engineering firms, to the Colorado State Highway Department for geological survey work at the Straight Creek tunnel site. During the time that the Colorado State Highway Department was negotiating with a consulting engineering firm in Denver, Colo., for the necessary professional services, they received an unsolicited offer to perform these services for a fee from the U.S. Geological Survey. In response to this unsolicited offer, the State highway department indicated their intention to award the contract to a private engineering firm. The Geological Survey then approached the highway department with an offer to perform the assignment at no cost except for core borings. They explained that the survey area had been declared a study area between the time of their original proposal and their offer to perform the service at no cost which allowed them to perform a full-scale investigation from their operating funds. The State highway department accepted this offer for the free service. Protests from the consulting engineers involved were rejected by the Director of Geological Survey with the statement: "Our interest has been in obtaining the maximum amount of geological data in order to utilize the opportunity provided by the tunnel construction to develop and demonstrate geological concepts."

Government engineer cost $2 per day

Other instances of similar competition have been reported: In April 1962, a water diversion suit was entered in the Boulder, Colo. district court. An engineer employed by the U.S. Geological Survey appeared in court in behalf of the city of Boulder; while a farmers' group was represented by an engineer in private practice, compensated at the rate of $100 per day. The Geological Survey charged the city $2 per day for the service of its employee.

It is reasonable to suppose that the Government engineer received more than $2 per day in salary and expenses and that the difference was absorbed by the Bureau (and the taxpayers).

Oversea survey assignments

This agency also is looking abroad for survey assignments, despite the fact that it was originally intended that only studies of U.S. geological and hydrological resources would be conducted. A paper presented at the 22d annual meeting of the American Congress on Surveying and Mapping, held in Washington, D.C., March 12–14, 1962, is entitled "Field Mapping." It describes the development of topographic maps covering 30 or 40 square miles in the vicinity of the city of Talz by a party of Geological Survey engineers. The mapping required 78 days and culminated in a three-color, bilingual map printed on U.S. Geological Survey presses.

CORROBORATIVE FINDINGS

Commission supports private enterprise

1. The Hoover Commission: In its investigations into the organization of governmental agencies, the Hoover Commission came to certain conclusions as to the agencies' encroachment upon private enterprise:

(a) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government should not initiate nor carry on any program which provides services regularly obtainable from firms or individuals engaged in private enterprise.

(b) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government should not solicit nor accept engineering works from private industry or from other Government agencies, if such works can be accomplished by private engineering firms.

Limitations of Government engineers

(c) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government should permanently employ only those professional engineers necessary for the performance of normal functions such as research, planning, supervision, and management.

The Commission's task force on real property management issued a report which contained certain conclusions.

Government cost out of line

The cost to the Government of its design and construction activities is abnormally high and out of line with the cost of similar work in private industry. This results from having so many offices independently engaged in architectural and engineering work; from overstaffed, permanently retained technical groups; from the many different standards and management practices; and from the absence of operating data which would provide a means of comparing the effectiveness of the numerous Federal design and engineering organizations.

Private firms effective at all times

Private architect-engineer and construction organizations are geared to a broad base of diversified work and to the efficiency and flexibility of large scale competitive construction activities. In times of peace and of national emergency, they have effectively and efficiently met the demands of industry for private construction.

AEC operating efficiency

By contracting to private architect-engineer and construction organizations all phases of design and construction work on Government construction projects, relatively small supervisory engineering organizations, in the executive agencies, could furnish the preliminary study, preplanning and budgeting, and the supervisory management and control essential for all Government projects, without maintaining through periods of fluctuating demands the present costly overhead for complete engineering and construction staffs. With minor exceptions, the AEC has been operating under such a program. "If other Federal agencies could attain the operating efficiency of the AEC, the savings to the Government in just the cost of design and supervision of construction, on the basis of present volume of business, would be more than $100 million annually.

"Recommendation No. 19: That the Federal design and construction organizations (a) retain in their own organizations only the personnel required for preliminary study, preplanning and budgeting, and essential supervisory management and control, and (b) contract to private architect-engineering and construction firms design and supervision of construction to the maximum extent consistent with national security."

Private firms: "Logical and economical"

3. Mr. Robert Moses, New York City construction coordinator: In an article entitled "Should Private Firms Plan Public Works?" (New York Times magazine, Nov. 16, 1958), Mr. Moses stated, "Government employees must take care of budgeting or programs, routine construction, overhead policy decision, supervision, review and coordination of plans, maintenance and other essential overhead work. Thereafter, the use of outside professional firms and technicians is the logical and economical method of progressing engineering and architectural design and supervision of most large construction proqects."

A COMPARISON OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE ENGINEERING

Engineering costs high in California

The differences in cost betwen public and private engineering are illustrated by a comparison of highway construction costs in California where private consulting engineers are rarely used—to those of other States who generally do use consultants. "The following figures are abstracted from the 12th Annual Report of the California Division of Highways, dated January 1959. Excluded from the figures are all administrative expense, 'Highway planning' and 'Planning.'

"The total expenditure for the latter two items for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, was: 'Highway planning,' $1,178,000; 'Planning survey,' $1,161,099.

"An examination of the report indicates that 'Preliminary engineering' includes:

"1. Preliminary route location and reconnaissance survey.

"2. Final route survey.

"3. Preparation of construction plans.

" 'Construction engineering' includes construction, supervision and material testing.

"California makes practically no use of consultants on the highway program.

"Years	Volume of construction	Preliminary engineering		Construction engineering		Total engineering percent of construction
		Total cost	Percent of construction volume	Total cost	Percent of construction volume	
1912–52	$870,930,478	$60,287,042	6.92	$67,576,093	7.76	14.68
1952–53	94,130,979	11,648,494	12.37	9,385,309	9.97	22.34
1953–54	110,025,902	14,735,724	13.39	11,906,251	10.82	24.21
1954–55	132,210,121	17,200,386	13.01	12,382,526	9.37	22.38
1955–56	144,124,391	19,737,032	13.69	15,227,790	10.57	24.26
1956–57	195,115,702	25,168,692	12.90	18,757,035	9.61	22.51
1957–58	213,083,114	29,158,262	13.68	21,894,487	10.27	23.95
Total to 1958	1,759,620,688	177,935,631	10.11	157,129,491	8.93	19.04
Average for past 6 years						23.27

Other States costs low

"Representative toll highways—the following information taken at random from official reports of toll highway agencies is illustrative of engineering cost on highway work where services are performed to a large extent by private consultants. The engineering costs for these projects include 'Preliminary engineering' and 'Construction engineering' within the meanings accepted in highway work. Also included are costs of the supervisory engineering staffs of the respective authorities:

"Source—Texas Turnpike Authority:

"Financial statements of construction and operation, month of December and calendar year 1959:

"Construction cost	$36,136,929.80
"Engineering cost	$3,044,984.82
"Egineering cost percentage of construction cost	8.43

"Source—The Illinois State Toll Highway Commission:

15th quarterly progress report, Sept. 30, 1959:

"Construction cost	$289,810,370.00
"Engineering cost	$26,131,045.00
"Engineering cost percent of construction cost	9.02

"Source—West Virginia Turnpike Commission:

"Statement of construction costs, as of Feb. 29, 1960:

"Construction cost	$95,042,623.65
"Engineering cost	$8,301,767.56
"Engineering cost percent of construction cost	8.96

"Source—Indiana Toll Road Commission:

"1959 annual report:

"Construction cost	$167,218,375.83
"Engineering cost	$16,871,334.61
"Engineering cost percent of construction cost	10.09

"Source—New York State Thruway Authority:

"10th annual report and letter, dated April 4, 1960:

"Construction cost	$799,663,799.00
"Engineering cost	$76,894,371.00
"Engineering cost percent of construction cost	9.62

"Source—Richmond-Petersburg Turnpike Authority:

"15th progress report:

"Construction cost	$49,130,282.56
"Engineering cost	$3,536,904.28
"Engineering cost percent of construction cost	7.20

"Source—Florida State Turnpike Authority:

"Sunshine State Parkway, Miami to Fort Pierce section, final engineering report, dated July 1, 1958:

"Construction cost	$42,903,786.00
"Engineering cost	$3,368,636.00
"Engineering cost percent of construction cost	7.85

"NOTE.—The above Florida project is particularly noteworthy in that the entire project, 108 miles in length was completed and opened to traffic in 19 months after proceeds from the bond issue were received. The short time duration resulted in savings to the turnpike authority in excess of the total cost of engineering by virtue of savings in bond interest."

ADVANTAGES OF USING PRIVATE ENGINEERS ON PUBLIC PROJECTS

1. The agencies can choose from a wide variety of expert engineering specialists.

2. The necessity for maintaining large government engineering staffs is eliminated.

3. Personnel roles are stabilized resulting in better morale and increased efficiency.

4. The agencies' operating overhead is reduced; fewer facilities are required.

5. The necessity for make-work projects is eliminated.

6. Consulting engineers are employed only when their services are needed.

7. Cost comparisons show savings result from the use of private consulting engineers.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of its private enterprise committee, the Consulting Engineers Council has adopted the following conclusions:

1. Public agencies overstaffed with engineers: The public agencies are staffed with engineers in excess of reasonable requirements for safeguarding the public interest and carrying out the traditional governmental functions of advance planning, budgetary control, supervision of engineering and construction operations and the coordination of engineering with other functions.

2. Loss of market to private engineers: There has been a consequent loss of market to engineers in private practice who have been, in the past, effectively and economically able to perform engineering services for public agencies.

3. Government lending engineering services: Many agencies of Government, mostly at the Federal level are now extending engineering services to other agencies of government, Federal, State, and local, and to private clients. In most instances, these services are connected with the granting or lending of Federal funds.

4. Government engineering costs increasing: Engineering costs are increased by these practices and the tax base is suffering considerable loss at a time when additional revenues are desperately needed to provide a

sound fiscal operating base for the Government.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Fully utilize private engineers: The administrative agencies of the Federal Government should be specifically directed to fully utilize the services of private consulting engineers in every instance where the best interests of the American public may be served by such employment.

2. Continuing study of Federal policies: The concerned committees of the Congress of the United States should effect a continuing study of the policies of the Federal administrative agencies which tend to put Government into competition with engineers in private industry.

3. Enact dollar-limit legislation: The Congress should enact legislation establishing specific limits on the dollar value of the engineering works accomplished by the various Government agencies.

Hollywood American Legion Opposes Ineffective Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution opposing ineffective test ban treaty terms was passed by the Hollywood Post No. 43 of the American Legion on May 8:

HOLLYWOOD POST NO. 43, THE AMERICAN LEGION

RESOLUTION

Whereas the press has recently carried reports of statements by officials of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to the effect that, although there has been no manifest change in the position of the Soviet negotiators, an agreement is momentarily expected which will lead to a treaty banning nuclear testing; and

Whereas years of negotiation with the Soviet on this subject has resulted in the abandonment of point after point on our part, with no material concession by the Soviet, so that today the position of the United States has no relation to our original position, and no relation to reality; and

Whereas the act of negotiation on the part of the Soviet is not a prelude to a treaty, but a means of improving the position of the Communist, economically, politically, and militarily, as was demonstrated by our previous test ban suspension in which the Soviet completed all the preparations for elaborate and comprehensive nuclear testing while the United States slept, thus permitting them to drastically reduce our lead in the nuclear field; and

Whereas any treaty signed with the Soviets will be observed scrupulously by ourselves and secretly violated by the Soviet, or openly abrogated whenever the interests of the Soviet wil be served by such action; and

Whereas the quartering of Soviet troops in the Western Hemisphere, 90 miles from our coast is not an act of peaceful coexistence, but an act of war; and

Whereas we may live with the threat of nuclear war, weakness on our part will make such a war a certainty; and

Whereas it is in America that the concept of the freedom and dignity of man has reached its highest level, and the future of mankind in this respect is dependent upon maintaining this Nation as a bulwark, economically, politically, and militarily, against the onslaught of the Communist slave system, which would return all of mankind to chains; therefore, we should not permit our representatives, imbued with the delusion of peace in our time to commit us to a nuclear test ban which will reduce us to impotency, so that not only our way of life will be destroyed, but the hope of the enslaved peoples of the world and the future of all mankind will be blighted for centuries to come: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Hollywood Post No. 34, the American Legion, at its regular meeting held on May 8, 1963, That this organization is utterly opposed to any nuclear test ban treaty which cannot be completely policed, so as to insure that the United States shall maintain its lead over the Communist conspiracy, militarily, economically, and politically; and be it further

Resolved, That the adjutant is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to all Congressmen from the Los Angeles area, to the two U.S. Senators from California, and to the district, State, and National headquarters of this organization.

PAUL DENNEY,
Commander.
WILLARD STEWART,
Adjutant.

Independence of Jordan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 25 Jordan will celebrate the 17th anniversary of her independence. On this memorable occasion, I wish to extend warm felicitations to His Majestey King Hussein of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan; and His Excellency, the Jordanian Ambassador to the United States, Saad Juma.

The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan gained its independence on May 25, 1946, after the culmination of many years of gradual autonomy. Great Britain, as advisory power, had been in control since World War I when the then-called Transjordan fell under its sphere of influence. As a part of the Ottoman Empire, the people were nomadic and authority rested with the tribal leaders. There was little industry and farming to warrant great interest in the country by either the Porte or British authorities. Within the Palestine towns later occupied by Jordanian forces, home industries, such as needle and silverwork, did exist and were famous throughout the world as artistic treasures.

However, from the beginning of World War I, the people allied themselves with Britain. With the guidance of T. E. Lawrence, the tribes were effective in cutting supply lines and disrupting communication. During World War II, Jordan once more declared its allegiance to the allies when the ruling Prince, Amir Abdullah, pledged himself and his people. It was at this time that the country became important because of its strategic location, its proximity to the Suez Canal and the oil fields of the Persian Gulf.

As an independent Kingdom, Jordan is most noted for its tourism. Much of what is called the Holy Land is now within its borders. The old city of Jerusalem has been contested for centuries for its religious connections. It is the center of three religions—Christianity, Judaism, and Islam. Within its walls, Christians may visit the Mount of Olives, the Via Dolorosa, and the Holy Sepulcher. A Jew may search for and find the ruins of Solomon's Temple and David's Tomb. And the Muslim may pray within the confines of the mosque of the Dome of the Rock, the third most sacred place in all Islam.

To the lovers of antiquity, Jordan offers a more fertile area of study in the south. The magnificent city of Petra, carved from the cliffs, is a mute testimony of the grandeur of its ancient past. Situated on the main route between Damascus and Arabia, Egypt and Babylon, the city prospered and became an empire.

The Romans, who were to cause the downfall of Petra, left behind them the ruins of Jerash, one of the best preserved of all Roman cities. Mosaic floors, a columned street, a triumphal arch, the Forum, and other buildings lie exposed to the weather and the discerning eye of the visitor.

Another Roman city is Amman, the capital of the country, the once proud city of Philadelphia. Here can be seen an amphitheater which dominates the entire city, as well as other ruins.

Not all Americans who come to Jordan are tourists. Many have been sent by our Government to help in the development of the country. Our aid projects provide assistance in the fields of agriculture, industry, transportation, health, education, and community development. We are also helping to finance certain development projects which will, when completed, benefit greatly the economy of the state. One such project is the East Ghor Canal, which will provide water from the Yarmuck River for the irrigation of thousands of acres of desertland.

Another project in which the United States has taken a financial interest is road construction. These new roads will enable agricultural produce to reach quickly the markets while still fresh. They also facilitate the movement of machinery used in the development of the country. Furthermore, tourism has benefited greatly since the discomfort of travel throughout Jordan has been to a large extent eliminated.

The present monarch, King Hussein, has remained a steadfast friend and ally of the United States. Although recent disturbances have left his country less stable than usual, the King continues to pursue his policy of anticommunism and support for the United States. On this their 17th anniversary of independence, I salute the King and the citizens of Jordan on their accomplishments and extend to them the wish for continued progress and prosperity.

The Legacy of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the American Security Council has published an outstanding article in its May 20, 1963, Washington report entitled "The Legacy of Cuba." In view of the attention which has been focused on the problem of Cuba by the Congress, and particularly by the Armed Services Committee's Preparedness Subcommittee, I recommend the reading of this article to my colleagues. I therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEGACY OF CUBA

"If communism should obtain a permanent foothold in Latin America * * * then the balance of power would move against us and peace would be even more insecure." (John F. Kennedy, September 14, 1960.)

"I think it is clear that the importance of Cuba is less than we think * * * on the surface evidence of the headlines. * * * The real issue here is not what does or does not happen in marginal daily conflicts with the disgraceful Castro regime. The real question is what happens in the processes of the societies of the Western Hemisphere as a whole." (McGeorge Bundy, as quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 8, 1963.)

Today, communism does have a permanent foothold in Latin America. The 1960 prophecy of candidate Kennedy has come dismally true. But President Kennedy's advisers, such as Mr. Bundy, are engaged in a massive effort to deny the truth of the President's earlier prophecy.

This truth cannot be denied. It smothers and stultifies every constructive cold war policy of the United States, including the heavily stressed effort to promote social and economic reforms in Latin America. Mr. Bundy argues further, in the speech quoted from above, that "the whole international posture of the United States is stronger today than it was 3 or 4 years ago", and that "we are known to be stronger." This was true for a brief period last October, but not now. Communist power in Cuba and the present U.S. reaction to it is destroying the healthy image of U.S. strength created by our October action. The present truth is much more accurately described by Senator Margaret Smith (in a Senate speech on May 9, 1963):

"How can the United States of America ever again claim to be the leader of the free world or ever hope to achieve the respect of other peoples so long as we tolerate—whether willingly or begrudgingly—the presence of this festering infection so very close to home?"

Mr. Bundy admits that his claim of increased U.S. strength is based mainly on improved intelligence data which reveal that the "missile gap," estimated 3 years ago, never existed. This is correct, and it is one of the reasons why the Soviets put their missiles in Cuba and one of the reasons why they backed down before U.S. power last October. However, the "quantity gap" in our favor is a transitory thing and is becoming steadily less real and less important. Technologically, the Soviets may already be ahead of us in the arms race. (See WR 63-8.) Furthermore since last October there have been many indications that those in the Kremlin who favor a quantitative increase in Soviet nuclear strength have won their point. The so-called pause in Soviet policy has ended—if it ever existed. A hardening of the Soviet position on all issues is apparent. An even grimmer period of the cold war almost certainly lies ahead.

This turn of events is at least partly the direct result of the administration admission that it is deterred from a blockade or other employment of force in the Cuban situation out of fear of war with the Soviet Union. This position has been carried to the tragic extreme of denying to the Cuban people even the right to take up arms to help liberate their homeland. Two years ago, when a different policy prevailed, the President declared that, "The American people are not complacent about Iron Curtain tanks and planes less than 90 miles from our shores." Now there are many more Soviet planes and tanks in Cuba and large numbers of Soviet troops as well. Regardless of whether or not there are still offensive missiles in Cuban caves, the fact remains that a major Soviet military presence has been solidly established. There is not the slightest indication that this force is going to be removed, and not the slightest indication that the United States intends to force its removal. Unless this is done, communism cannot be overthrown by Cubans.

On May 9, 1963, the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, headed by Senator STENNIS, reported the results of its preliminary investigation of the Cuban situation. On the mater of Soviet troops in Cuba, the unanimous subcommittee report downgraded administration claims that the figure has been reduced to 12,000–13,000 men. The official intelligence estimate remains at 17,500, even though 4,000–5,000 have been seen to withdraw since the first of the year. This is because (a) the original estimates were very imprecise, and (b) there is evidence that the Soviets are merely rotating their forces, with at least as many coming in as going out. The Soviets make a very obvious show of removing people, but can easily bring them in clandestinely. Meanwhile, estimates by refugees and those who have traveled extensively in Cuba put the figure at 30,000–40,000 Soviets still in Cuba.

Senator Stennis' personal conclusion, expressed in the Senate on May 9 is very significant:

"I am convinced that the No. 1 priority of our national and foreign policy should and must be the complete removal of all Russians from Cuba and the adoption of a firm and hard plan which once and for all will rid our hemisphere of this threat.

"To those who say that this involves risks and the danger of war, I reply that there comes a time—as it did last October—when risks must be taken in order to protect and preserve our vital national interests. The risks of doing nothing—of allowing this Communist threat to fester and grow and perhaps subvert nation after nation—are infinitely greater."

Mr. Rusk, however, disagrees. He denies flatly that the Soviet Union can be forced out of Cuba without war, and he denies that the threat now posed by a Communist Cuba warrants military action. In Mr. Rusk's words:

"Let's not kid ourselves that waving missiles is going to cause the other side to roll over and play dead. If you want to do all sorts of drastic things on the assumption that no shooting will result just don't entertain any such illusion. It is necessary to incur very great risks in order to meet great threats * * * But it is not my judgment that the threat in Cuba at the present time warrants the escalation of violence which would be involved in direct military action against that island." (April 22, 1963, State Department press release No. 213)

The Secretary of State's statement, first of all, serves to nullify Bundy's claim of a more powerful United States. How does the assertion that the Soviet Union is both capable and willing to fight a war in the Caribbean (or to risk nuclear war by aggression someplace else) cause anyone to believe that the U.S. is now stronger than 3 or 4 years ago? And how does such an admission that we dare not use force serve to promote the cause of "moderation" within the Kremlin? If anything, it may cause them to wonder if we were not bluffing after all last October.

Most important is the implication running through administration statements that Cuba without offensive missiles is not a direct threat to U.S. security and, therefore, does not require any form of military action. This change of outlook is very typical of the containment policy. We say we will defend our vital interests by force if necessary, but we do not now consider Communist control of Cuba as contrary to our vital national interest. Two years ago, we did. The only thing that has changed in the interval is the evaluation of the risk of defending that vital interest by force. So the administration now denies that a vital interest is any longer involved.

In contrast, here are a few of the points made by the Stennis subcommittee in summarizing the Russian threat to the Americas:

1. "Cuba in an avanced Soviet base for subversive revolutionary and agitational activities in the Western Hemisphere, and affords the opportunity to export agents, funds, arms, ammunition, and propaganda throughout Latin America."

2. "Assuming, without deciding, that all strategic weapons have been withdrawn, there is the ever present possibility of the stealthy reintroduction of strategic missiles and other offensive weapons, using the Soviet forces still in Cuba as camouflage and security for the activity."

3. "Cuba serves as an advanced intelligence base for the U.S.S.R."

4. "Potentially, Cuba is a base from which the Soviets could interdict our vital air and sea lanes. It can now be used for the air, sea, and electronic surveillance of our military activities in the Southeast United States and the Caribbean."

5. "Advanced Soviet submarine bases could be established in Cuban ports with very little effort." (Exiles report that two submarine bases are now in operation at Banes and Mariel.—Editor.)

6. "Cuba provides a base for training agents of other Latin American countries in subversive, revolutionary, agitational and sabotage techniques." (Just one example: Every month, groups of Columbian students leave for Cuba for such training. They fly by chartered plane to Curacao and are picked up there by Cuban airlines.—Editor.)

7. "The very presence of the Soviets in Cuba affects adversely our Nation's image and prestige. Our friends abroad will understandably doubt our ability to meet and defeat the forces of communism thousands of miles across the ocean if we prove unable to cope with the Communist threat at our very doorstep."

The last point is perhaps the most crucial. It affects the psychology of the cold war—the credibility of U.S. willingness to aid and defend its friends. When we refuse to aid the Cuban freedom fighters and actually prevent them from acting on their own—even when based outside U.S. territory—and when we not only betray the hopes of the exile leader, Miro Cardona, but also heap personal abuse on his head because he dares to speak out at last, we do infinite disservice to the cause of truth, liberty, and peace.

Neither did we improve our standing in Latin America by our recent performance in Costa Rica. Contrary to the expressed wishes of the Presidents of the Central American countries involved in the conference—particularly Guatemala and Nicaragua—President Kennedy insisted in advance that a tough policy toward Cuba was not to be a topic of discussion. The result was predictable mediocrity—effusive and empty rhetoric signifying almost nothing.

We do, of course, have a Cuban policy. It is to isolate Cuba diplomatically, and ruin it economically. This, we hope, will shut off the flow of subversion and induce the voluntary withdrawal of Soviet power from Cuba, because it will be too expensive to maintain.

There have been limited and superficial successes for these efforts. Most of the hemispheric nations have severed diplomatic relations, although the most important nations—Brazil and Mexico—have not. And the Cuban economy has degenerated sharply. Sugar production is at a new low. But Cuban supported subversion continues, and there is no sign of any internal crackup of the regime. Soviet forces make any internal uprising impossible.

Overall, our Cuban policy is failing and is bound to fail. This is because the Soviet Union has both the will and the capability to ensure that it fails. Cuba may very well be a "showcase of failure", and it may cost the U.S.S.R. $1 million daily to maintain it, but this is a very cheap price to pay for the tremendous political, military, and psychological gains which Cuba provides to communism. The triumphal reception given Castro in Moscow should dispel any wishful ideas that the Soviets are about to pull out of Cuba.

Cuba is important to Khrushchev and to communism generally. It is enormously important. It is impossible to overestimate this. The solidification of Soviet control of Cuba is the most shattering defeat for American policy since the cold war began. Cuba is now the fulcrum of the cold war, the center of the chessboard. We have long been prepared to fight a thermonuclear war if necessary to keep the Soviets out of West Berlin. Why? Not because their presence there would constitute any additional military threat, but because of the devastating psychological consequences which would flow from a retreat on a firm commitment. In this sense, Cuba is the West Berlin of the Western Hemisphere. It is the breach in the center of our line, and the Soviets are throwing the whole weight of their offensive through that breach. For more than two years now, we have been formally pledged to the elimination of this Communist base, but it still stands. This is the overarching fact which dominates the Latin American and even the world scene. It will loom larger and larger as time passes.

There is no painless way to eliminate either the Soviet presence in Cuba or, more important, the Castro regime itself. There are many prescriptions being offered, but one truth stands out: Some element of force or the clear and unequivocal threat of force is going to be required. This is because the imperative for the United States to remove communism from Cuba is matched by an equal imperative of Soviet policy to maintain it there if this can be done without war. The interests of the United States and U.S.S.R. are basically irreconcilable on Cuba. Khrushchev has invested far too much and committed his prestige far too deeply to ever give it up voluntarily. Only the possibility of war will—as last October—induce him or his "hardline" colleagues to withdraw.

On the other hand, if we continue to reject the use of force in the Caribbean, there is only one logical alternative and ultimately we will take it. There cannot be a permanent status-quo. If pressures are not increased, they will decrease. If Castro is not eliminated by diplomatic and economic warfare, support for even this policy will crumble. Then we will resume diplomatic relations with Castro, probably give up our Guantanamo base, and treat Cuba as we now treat the east European satellites, hoping for "Titoism" or some form of evolution to solve the problem.

There are already indications that such a shift is in the wind. Roosevelt Roads, in Puerto Rico, is being refurbished, possibly to handle the naval forces now based in Guantanamo (U.S. News & World Report, May 20, 1963); Prisoner Negotiator Donovan is looked upon by some as a possible ambassador to Cuba; Castro has gone out of his way to praise the crackdown on the Cuban exiles and to say that he would be willing to try to find "the basis" for better relations with the United States. The State Department is even now softening up Congress and public opinion for the resumption of relations with Hungary. There will be ample precedent.

Such a full circle in policy would only compound the disaster and open wide the floodgates to communism throughout the hemisphere. But even as it is, current American policy toward Cuba constitutes the broadest possible invitation to the Communist world to intensify the cold war, to resist efforts at genuine disarmament, and to instigate further major tests of U.S. determination to resist its advances. It provides strong support for the Chinese hardline" argument, because it tends to show that we are, after all, only paper tigers. It will inevitably encourage as well those within the Kremlin who perhaps favor a more militant policy. Neither so-called isolation of Communist Cuba nor coexistence with it—if that should be the next policy turn—is the road to peace. It is, rather, the road to eventual war.

We would do well, in thinking of Cuba, to remember the words of Winston Churchill, uttered before the outbreak of World War II:

"Still if you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory can be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance to survive. There may even be a worse case: You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory and it will be better to perish than to live in slavery."

The legacy of Cuba is a witch's brew which contains the most mortal threat to the security and the survival of this Nation.

FRANK J. JOHNSON,
Editor.

Maryland's Young Jobseekers Total Rising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the tragic aspects of the growing problem of unemployment in America is graphically presented in a news story which appeared in the Sun on May 20, 1963. It is significant in pointing out that the unemployment problem will bear heavily upon jobseekers whose problems are already challenging the statesmanship of this Congress. The article is appended:

STATE YOUNG JOBSEEKERS TOTAL RISING—ONLY FOUR OTHERS EAST OF MISSISSIPPI EXCEED MARYLAND RATE

The number of Maryland teenagers seeking jobs is rising sharply in Maryland, faster than in all but four other States east of the Mississippi, according to a report released by W. Willard Wirtz, U.S. Secretary of Labor.

The Department of Labor study showed that between 1960 and 1965 the 14- to 19-year-old labor force in Maryland would grow from 101,800 to 129,700, an increase of 27.4 percent. Meanwhile, the national teenage labor force would climb from 6,200,000 to 7,658,100, a growth of 23.5 percent.

Of States east of the Mississippi, only Florida, Delaware, Ohio, and Connecticut are expected to show sharper gains. But most of the Mountain and Pacific Coast States will record faster increases, with Nevada, Alaska, and California showing the quickest growth.

CALLS IT PRESSING PROBLEM

The report termed the increase in young job seekers "one of the most difficult and pressing manpower problems this Nation has ever faced. It called on "educators, parents, representatives of management and labor, and government officials both on a local and national level," to "face the challenge of developing action programs to equip these young people for work."

It called special attention to the "handicaps faced by racial minorities, school dropouts, juvenile delinquents, physically or mentally disabled young persons, and rural youth." It noted especially the problems on nonwhite youth, and said nonwhite young women had a more difficult task finding work than any other segment of the labor force.

The report warned "the employment problems of many youths are complicated by inadequate training, lack of vocational guidance, poor motivation, and frequent job changes."

Youth Accomplishment Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia chapter of the Federal Bar Association was a pioneer in the law observance program which has taken a good hold in all the chapters of the country. Now the two architects of the law observance program have developed a new pilot program for the Philadelphia chapter called the youth accomplishment program. The story about Harry D. Shargel, Esq., and Norris S. Harzenstein, Esq., and their work in initiating this new program appears in the May issue of the Federal Bar News.

I have included the material for the Members to read because I feel that many communities can use this type of program for their youth.

YOUTH ACCOMPLISHMENT PROGRAM INITIATED

On April 3, at a meeting held at the Defense Clothing & Textile Supply Center, attended by representatives of youth service and recreational agencies, public and parochial schools, organized labor, business and industry, as well as law enforcement and other Government agencies, the Law Observance Committee of the Philadelphia Chapter, Federal Bar Association, initiated a youth accomplishment program which should serve as a pilot project for all the chapters of the association.

The youth accomplishment program is designed to direct youthful drives into constructive channels, provide a sense of accomplishment and appropriate recognition to young people, regardless of their relative capabilities. Youngsters are invited to select their own projects and accomplish them to the best of their ability under the supervision of existing youth-serving organizations. A certificate of recognition is awarded to every child who completes a project to the best of his own ability. There is no competition between the participants. Emphasis is placed on reaching the children who will not compete and to afford them an incentive and an opportunity to develop their talents.

Those who receive certificates also become eligible for a drawing by lot to participate in tours of industrial plants, places of historical interest, law enforcement and other Government agencies and places of educational value. The awards are designed to afford as many youths as possible the opportunity to realize the values and opportunities of our society and that there is a future in their lives.

A prospectus of the program was printed and furnished to the various participating organizations and a brochure describing the program and providing an application form was made available for distribution to the children. A badge evidencing participation in the project will be awarded to each child upon registration and a certificate will also be awarded to the agencies that participate.

The project is a result of ideas presented by Chairman Harry D. Shargel, and his Philadelphia chapter cochairman, Norris S. Harzenstein, with the assistance of U.S. District Court Judge Francis L. Van Dusen, Jr. Dr. Allen B. Weter, Philadelphia public school superintendent, who participated in the initial formulation of the program, has advised that it will become part of the school curriculum.

The initial prospectus was donated by Allen, Lane & Scott, while the application, brochures, certificates and badges are being donated by the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, AFL–CIO. The Strawbridge & Clothier Department Store is providing clerical and administrative support and will act as the headquarters. James Gassaway, the store superintendent, is acting as executive director of the program. The Crime Prevention Association, the Health & Welfare Council and the Philadelphia Recreation Department, together with the school representatives, have been the major sources of youth experts who helped devlop and implement the program.

Excerpts from an article in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of April 15 further describes the program:

"This is the way it works: a youngster who is in the fourth to ninth grades may apply for the program at the local cooperating organization. His project, of his own choosing, may be woodworking, hobby collection, art and craftwork, writing, scientific project, sports or even participation in a group cleanup program.

"When the project is completed—the deadline is May 17—it must satisfy the supervisor that it represents sincere, sustained effort, the best the individual can do.

"Shargel looks at the project as a delinquency preventive. 'Youngsters who are eager to compete usually do well, are kept busy and stay out of trouble. But there are a great number of children who, though they may have ability, are bashful and lack the self-confidence to enter into competition. This is a great pool of children available to get into trouble,' he said."

America at Its Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers of the Nation have been filled this past week with tributes to Astronaut L. Gordon Cooper and to the vital space program of which he is a member. One tribute in particular has come to my attention which seems to sum up in a few words the feelings we have all shared during this momentous time. It is entitled "America at Its Best," and it apeared as an editorial in the Shreveport Times last Thursday, May 16:

AMERICA AT ITS BEST

Once Tuesday's nightmare of a balking diesel motor at Cape Canaveral and a faulty radar setup at Bermuda had been overcome, Maj. Gordon Cooper and his *Faith 7* spaceship got off yesterday into an earth-orbiting ride which should thrill the heart of every American—assuming the flight is carried on to the successful end indicated by the log of the journey up to this writing.

Faith 7 went into the most perfect orbit of any of America's Mercury projects—so perfect that it was capable of making at least 92 orbits instead of the 22 which had been set as the limit. Thus the spaceship easily could have exceeded Russian claims as to the numbers of orbits made on its supposedly most successful venture. Further, all of the highly delicate and sensitive and almost unbelievable electronic experimentation equipment in *Faith 7* seemed to be working perfectly; so perfectly that as early as the second orbit of the flight, Major Cooper dozed into a comfortable nap.

Here was something of which America could be proud. It was American knowhow, American science, American engineering, American courage—and both the individual and collective ability and determination of American people—at their best in every way. It was a nation living up to a reputation for superiority which it had built through decades, by the perfection with which it carried on achievements in fields of venture and exploration—though others got off to a head start in this particular field.

All of our astronauts deserve the laudations of the Nation, yet sometimes there may be a little too much effort—entirely natural; entirely commendable—to lionize them. Courage always has been standard equipment of true Americans. So has desire for venture, willingness to move with open eyes into the unknown; and so has faith. It is especially fitting that Gordon Cooper's spaceship should carry that name; for faith is the foundation of our kind of living and our outlook on existence itself.

It is therein that we differ so tremendously from the Russians. They have faith only in themselves; our faith is in an Omnipotent. From Him comes our faith in our own ability to conquer whatever has to be conquered; our willingness to make the attempt no matter how uncertain success may be.

Tragedy could strike this flight before its scheduled ending this afternoon. It could have struck even between the writing of this and the reading of it. If so, the Nation will accept that with faith also; something that somehow had to be. In the meantime we offer our prayers that all will be well through the day. And somehow we are sure that it will be.

Senator Sam Ervin, of North Carolina, Urges Congress To Implement Sixth Amendment by Enactment of Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently in the American Bar Association Journal, one of our distinguished and learned colleagues, the Honorable Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], wrote an article urging congressional attention and enactment of legislation.

This scholarly thesis is worthy of all of our attention, and I therefore, Mr. President, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at the close of the extension of my remarks.

The senior Senator from North Carolina, a former practicing attorney and judge qualifies him exceptionally to speak out on the subject about which he has written. The article is titled "Uncompensated Counsel: They Do Not Meet the Constitutional Mandate," and it basically states that Congress should implement the right-to-counsel guarantee of the sixth amendment by enactment of legislation under which Federal districts may establish compensated-counsel systems to provide representation for indigents charged with crime.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNCOMPENSATED COUNSEL: THEY DO NOT MEET THE CONSTITUTIONAL MANDATE

(By SAM J. ERVIN, JR., U.S. Senator from North Carolina)

"If we are to keep our democracy, there must be one commandment: Thou shalt not ration justice."

These words of the late Judge Learned Hand remind us that justice is a keystone of our democracy and that we must be ever vigilant in providing for just and democratic processes. Unfortunately, we as a nation have not adequately provided for the administration of justice. In a very real sense, justice is being rationed in this country as a result of Congress failure to appropriate funds to guarantee counsel for indigent defendants in Federal courts.

The financial resources of a defendant should be irrelevant to the administration of justice. If equal justice under law is to be more than a hollow phrase, then indigent defendants must be afforded adequate counsel. A fundamental principle of our Nation is that law, not force, maintains the social order. And yet each year thousands of defendants are brought before the Federal bench without benefit of paid counsel. The forces of the Government, with experienced prosecutors, trained investigating staffs, and expert witnesses, are pitted against a defendant whose appointed counsel must find the spare time to defend without compensation.

The Constitution of the United States speaks for these defendants through the sixth amendment, which in part provides: "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right * * * to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defense." In 1938 the Supreme Court defined the rights of an accused to representation in the Federal courts. In *Johnson* v. *Zerbst* (304 U.S. 458 (1938)), the Court held it was necessary, even to establish jurisdiction of the trial court, that the accused be granted the right to counsel; without that right any judgment against him is void. The Court's holding was very clear: "The sixth amendment withholds from Federal courts in all criminal proceedings the power and authority to deprive an accused of his life or liberty unless he has or waives the assistance of counsel." The *Johnson* case did not answer all the constitutional questions involving the right to counsel in the Federal courts; but it clearly stated that, if a defendant wished counsel and could not afford it, counsel must be provided.

Twenty-five years have passed since that decision was pronounced, breathing life into the sixth amendment. And what has been done by the Federal Government to implement the decision? The answer is: very little.

In 1946 Congress recognized the constitutional mandate for counsel when the sixth amendment provision for counsel was restated in rule 44 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure:

"If the defendant appears in court without counsel, the court shall advise him of his right to counsel and assign counsel to represent him at every stage of the proceeding unless he elects to proceed without counsel or is able to obtain counsel."

However, with the exception of legislation passed in 1960 providing for a Legal Aid Agency in the District of Columbia, Congress has done nothing to allow compensation for those lawyers or agencies representing the poor in federal cases. The system of appointing uncompensated counsel has placed a great burden on the shoulders of the legal profession. The profession has performed admirably through the years, but the system has proved unsatisfactory both for the defendant and his counsel.

Some years ago when I was a young practicing attorney in North Carolina, I was appointed counsel for an indigent defendant in a capital case. The trial resulted in a conviction; I was awarded a fee of $12.50 by the court. After I filed notice of appeal, however, it cost me $84 for a transcript of the record. A local newspaper published an editorial saying, in effect, that the defendant was obviously guilty and that his lawyer was only appealing because of the huge fee involved. I was elected to the State legislature shortly thereafter, and my first bill was one authorizing the State to pay for the trial transcript of an indigent defendant appealing to the North Carolina Supreme Court. This, of course, was a State case, and the laws in North Carolina are considerably different today. But the situation I faced is analogous to that confronting many lawyers practicing in the Federal courts today.

There is no provision even to reimburse counsel for out-of-pocket expenses; there are countless cases in which attorneys have borne heavy personal sacrifices to be certain that the defendant received a fair trial. Even an accused charged with a capital offense does not have the benefit of compensated counsel in the Federal courts.

The following statement from the 1961 study of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights clearly sets forth the constitutional problem:

"The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights wholeheartedly endorses legislation designed to assure competent legal counsel for indigent defendants in all Federal courts.

"The subcommittee believes that this is necessary to achieve full compliance with the mandate of the sixth amendment to our Constitution that 'in all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right * * * to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.'

"The subcommittee believes further that the right to counsel as guranteed by the Constitution is a hollow right indeed if it is not accompanied by proper safeguards that all accused persons will be represented by adequate counsel—even those who cannot afford to pay for it."

There are many examples I could cite of unfairness to the accused because of lack of funds for defense. One in particular is illustrative. It was related to a House of Representatives subcommittee in 1959 by William Reece Smith, Jr., past chairman of the American Bar Association Junior Bar Conference:

"[This] involves a young attorney from Philadelphia, who was appointed to represent an indigent who was unable to speak English. This particular assigned counsel states that he was practically as indigent as the defendant, and for that reason was unable to afford an interpreter in order to converse with his client. He, of course, sought the services of an interpreter through the court and eventually the Government did provide the interpreter. However, this provision was not made until the day of trial. And so for the first time both counsel and court heard the defendant's side of the story while in the courtroom in the course of the trial.

"It so developed in this particular instance that there was a witness to the event who might have been of great importance in the defense of the case. This witness was not made available, could not be made available under the circumstances, and in counsel's opinion the defendant was convicted as a result of this development."

This example is a startling one, but it is only one of a long list—all evidence that the constitutional guarantees are not being satisfied in the Federal courts.

YOUNG, UNPAID LAWYERS FREQUENTLY APPOINTED

The accused is defended frequently by a young lawyer who either may take the case for experience or may have no yearning whatsoever for courtroom advocacy. Many judges understandably are inclined to appoint young lawyers rather than other members of the bar with crowded schedules. This is not an indictment by any means of young lawyers or the Federal judges and their procedures. Most young lawyers meet their responsibilities in the courtroom with zeal and imagination. Generally speaking, the young man provides a good defense, but certainly in extremely serious matters the accused is entitled to the same defense as the person of means who can and will retain only a seasoned attorney.

In addition to the constitutional problem, there is the great burden which is placed on members of the legal profession. In the 1959 House of Representatives hearings the story was told of a lawyer in Wyoming who had long experience in criminal law and was in practice by himself. He was appointed to defend in a Federal criminal case which involved 10 days and 3 nights of actual trial time, plus considerable preparation. The Government presented 114 witnesses. For practical purposes the lawyer was required to close his office for 6 weeks. As a result, he was practically bankrupted. The lawyer himself should not fear indigency while defending the indigent. This unfairness to the accused and hardship on the bar are intolerable. They are not at all conducive to the effective administration of justice.

Several years ago, in considering this matter, the distinguished chairman of the Judicial Conference of the United States, Judge Augustus N. Hand, spoke for the Conference:

"To call upon lawyers constantly for unpaid service is unfair to them, and any attempt to do so is bound to break down after a time. To distribute such assignments among a large number of attorneys, in order to reduce the burden upon anyone, is to entrust the representation of the defendant to attorneys who in many cases are not proficient in criminal trials, whatever their general ability, and who for one reason or another cannot be depended upon for an adequate defense. Too often, under such circumstances, the representation becomes little more than a form."

Congress not having acted to provide practical implementation of the sixth amendment, the legal profession has attempted to alleviate the problem in some instances by utilizing defender services established for State and local courts. The Legal Aid Society of New York, for example, established as a local service by private funds, will assign a lawyer to represent those accused of Federal crime. But funds are so low within the local defender services that most of the 115 now existing throughout the country can barely manage the heavy load in the State and local courts, much less be expanded to include the Federal system. (The National Legal Aid and Defender Association reported 115 defender services throughout the United States as of March 1963. Twelve of these are financed completely by private funds and a few others by a combination of public-private funds.)

LEGISLATION IS NEEDED TO FULFILL REQUIREMENT

As population expands, society becomes more complex, and the legal profession becomes more highly specialized. We can no longer expect the bar alone to implement what is a requirement under the Constitution. Legislation providing for reasonable compensation has been before the Congress for more than 20 years. Support has come repeatedly from the Judicial Conference and the American Bar Association. Both deserve praise for their tireless efforts. Every Attorney General since 1937 has asked enactment of legislation allowing compensation for counsel to represent the poor.

Legislation which would permit appointment of public defenders in populous districts and compensated assigned counsel in others has passed the Senate three times—in the 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses. However, these measures have never been reported to the House of Representatives for consideration.

This year, for the first time, a President has been alloted a portion of his state of the Union message to this problem, stating: "The right to competent counsel must be assured to every man accused of crime in the Federal courts, regardless of his means." With this encouragement of the administration and with the wholehearted support of the lawyers of the country, I am optimistic over the chances for passage during this Congress.

On the same day that President Kennedy's message was delivered, Senator KEATING, Senator COTTON and I joined Senator HRUSKA in introducing S. 63, "a bill to provide for representation of certain defendants in the Federal courts." This is the same proposal we cosponsored last year and which passed the Senate.

More recently, the President has sent to Congress a proposal which Senator EASTLAND introduced and Senator HRUSKA cosponsored as S. 1057. The same measure was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman CELLER as H.R. 4816. This proposed legislation, the Criminal Justice Act, is the product of months of study by the Special Committee on Poverty and the Administration of Federal Criminal Justice, under the chairmanship of Prof. Francis A. Allen, of the University of Michigan Law School. It differs in some respects from S. 63; however, the objectives are the same, and I am confident the differences can be resolved satisfactorily in committee.

ACT MAKES LOCAL OPTION IMPLEMENTING KEY

The Criminal Justice Act provides for compensated counsel plus auxiliary defense services. Local option is the implementing key to the bill, as each Federal district may choose a method of representation tailored entirely to fit its own needs and conditions. The choices authorized are these: (1) Appointing private practitioners to be paid up to $15 an hour for each individual case; (2) establishing a Federal public defender office with appointing power in the judicial council of the circuit after recommendations from the Federal court; (3) appointing attorneys from local bar associations or legal aid societies at the same rate as assigned individual counsel; or (4) providing for any combination of these.

Counsel is guaranteed at every stage of the criminal proceedings, beginning with the initial appearance of the accused before the U.S. commissioner and extending through the trial, sentencing, and appeal. The plan for each district will make provision for furnishing investigative, expert and other services to assist the defense counsel in preparing and analyzing his case. These services may be employed either on an individual basis or through a defense-services agency.

The proposal would apply to the defense of those persons financially unable to obtain an adequate defense. This would allow some defendants to defray part of the costs of their defense if they were able.

To me, this act, and the essentially similar S. 63, presents the best plan to meet an acute national problem. Their greatest asset is flexibility. In some Federal districts the crime rate is very low and there is no need for full-time defenders. In other districts the need is already being met to some extent by private agencies. In still other metropolitan districts, the crime rate is so great that only a full-time staff of public defenders could provide an efficient and satisfactory answer. The important point is that each year more than 9,000 defendants (not including those in the District of Columbia), or more than one-third of all criminal defendants in Federal district courts, are not able to provide for their defense. Congress must act for them. The proposal under consideration allows each locality to choose its own method: The choice will be up to the area judicial conference and the local district judge. This provision is designed to eliminate political interference. By the same token, politics will be absent from the choice of defenders, since the administration will have no voice in the appointments, as it does with U.S. attorneys.

SOME OBJECTIONS RAISED TO PUBLIC DEFENDERS

The biggest objection to our approach, as I see it, concerns the provision allowing districts to adopt a public-defender system. Many feel that placing the defense in the hands of the Government would be a step toward a police state. This danger should not be minimized. After years of unsuccessful searching, however, it appears impossible to find an effective and economical means of guaranteeing counsel other than through an organized service. Experience with long-established defender organizations, furthermore, has shown their attorneys to be competent, zealous, and no more apathetic than their colleagues in the prosecutor's office. I feel certain that the local bar associations can be counted on to see that the defenders perform their duties properly.

Another frequent objection is that a public-defender system would eliminate the traditional freedom in choosing an attorney. However, I fail to see how an accused individual, friendless and penniless, now has any choice. Of course, we know that he does not under the present system of appointing uncompensated counsel.

Under present statutes, rules, constitutional provisions, and recent court decisions, the rights of a defendant are many. If anything, it would appear from some cases that the criminally accused in Federal court today is in many ways better protected than society.

For instance, under the Supreme Court ruling of 1957 in *Mallory* v. *U.S.* (354 U.S 449), it was held that a voluntary confession of a convicted and self-confessed rapist was inadmissable as evidence because of the delay in taking him before a committing magistrate. The Court held that a delay of 7½ hours in arraigning the prisoner violated Rule 5(a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, which requires that an arrested person be taken before a committing officer without "unnecessary delay." Recently in *Killough* v. *U.S.*, No. 16,398, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit greatly extended the *Mallory* doctrine. In *Killough* the court not only used the *Mallory* doctrine to throw out a voluntary admission of the accused made prior to his arraignment, but extended this doctrine to invalidate an admission made after arraignment on the ground that it was prompted by the first admission, which was inadmissible under *Mallory*. Thus, the first confession, which the court of appeals felt was obtained in violation of Rule 5(a), was deemed to invalidate the later confession, even though the second confession was obtained in full compliance with the Federal rules and there was never an allegation by the defendant that the confession had been anything but voluntarily given.

Notwithstanding the many rights of criminal defendants in Federal courts today, a defendant's financial inadequacy must not preclude his having an adequate defense, as guaranteed by the sixth amendment.

Society is not well protected when an accused is convicted due to inadequate representation and is thereby embittered over our legal process. When a prisoner is released from confinement, he is worth something to himself and society only if he returns with a desire to find his place, make proper adjustments, and live a productive and useful life.

Until a prisoner's bitterness over an unfair legal process has been overcome, the correctional process will not work. If a poor prisoner leaves the courtroom with hate for a legal system because he rightly believes he has been defended inadequately, the chances for his rehabilitation are meager indeed.

Nor is society protected when defendants are released because of a technical error in the legal process. Law enforcement officers and prosecutors strongly prefer that adequate defense be available for persons accused of crime.

Chances are lessened for the overruling of convictions on error when adequate defense has been provided. In addition, most prosecutors prefer to enter the courtroom knowing that the conduct of trial will not be interrupted or prolonged by incompetent or unwilling defense counsel.

Society and the defendant both are protected by the right to counsel as guaranteed in the sixth amendment. If a defendant is to take advantage of his legal rights, he must have competent counsel; in the Federal system today, such counsel is not guaranteed. The defendant's rights are useless to him if he does not know what they are or how to use them.

The wealthy defendant need never fear an inadequate defense. It is now up to Congress to eliminate that fear for the indigent. In these days when our Nation is spending billions in aiding the poor of a multitude of other countries, when we are forced to spend more billions for national defense, I believe we can and must afford the cost to defend the basic rights of the poor here at home.

Hiring the Handicapped Is Good Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, more than 500 handicapped persons are in the employ of Pan American World Airways. The company has been cited by the American Legion and by the Handicapped Veterans of America for its conscientious desire to place in productive positions our less fortunate citizens who, through no fault of their own, would have found it difficult to be placed in gainful employment were it not for the untiring efforts of Pan American and similar firms.

Mr. John S. Woodbridge, comptroller of Pan American, has told me on numerous occasions that these handicapped individuals are just as productive—and in some instances more so—than their more fortunate brethren.

Recently, the Pan American Jets, a wheelchair basketball team originated by Mr. Woodbridge, toured Israel, playing games and putting on exhibitions all over that little country. Mr. Woodbridge, I am pleased to say, took time out from his busy schedule to accompany the team.

More than 9,000 persons throughout the State of Israel turned out to watch this series of international games performed in wheelchairs by American and Israeli athletes.

The competitions, staged in desert outposts, small villages, and major cities, were designed to demonstrate the ability of the handicapped to rise above their disabilities.

Participating in the events along with the Pan American Airways team of wheelchair athletes, the Pan Am Jets, was the Israeli team, sponsored by the Spewack Club, an agency of the Israeli Polio Foundation endowed by Bella and Sam Spewack, the American librettists.

The Israeli team had invited the Pan Am Jets to Israel to help publicize hiring of the handicapped and the work of the Spewack Club. The invitation developed from friendship formed throughout the years between members of the Israeli team at the annual Paralympics in England.

The tour had special impact since an entire generation of youngsters in Israel is marred with polio following an epidemic which blanketed the country in 1951. At each stop, hundreds of young polio victims came out on crutches and in wheelchairs to watch the games.

Madame Ben Zvi, wife of the recently deceased President of Israel, received the Pan Am Jets in the President's residence and called the contests an example of Israeli-American friendship. She added, "Those who are physically afflicted have an inner spirit of understanding and ability."

Walworth Barbour, our Ambassador to Israel, described members of the team as envoys of Americanism and congratulated Pan Am for its efforts on behalf of the handicapped.

While in Israel, Mr. Woodbridge made a few appropriate remarks concerning the tour. I think they are important enough to be called to the attention of every Member of this body:

> We are here as a salute to your noble country and to its great ideals, to join with your own wheelchair athletes in demonstrating throughout your land that the will and ability to live fruitfully need not be denied those less physically blessed.
>
> Many will come to see these wheeled warriors in action, prepared and braced to be piteously wrenched. They will stay to marvel at the true skill displayed and the absolute freedom from false emotion, losing completely their initial heart-rendering fears. These spectators will be the missionaries of the gospel of equality in opportunity which is the goal of the physically handicapped; these audiences will consist of people whose vocal espousal of this righteous cause will proclaim them as genuine and productive citizens of this land they love.
>
> We in Pan American employ some 500 physically handicapped people, not in a spirit of compassion, but because we know it is good business to do so. We do not actively seek such people to fill our ranks, nor do we actively decline their employ. We have found them generally to be stable and reliable, not restlessly anxious to be changing jobs constantly but desirous of continuity of work with their respective employers, returning full measure for their wage.
>
> The factor of their economic vulnerability due to physical failure grows increasingly remote as time goes by and their ability becomes recognized by businessmen. This factor is the hardest hurdle, which we aim to help dispel by dramatizing the physical ability of this small group of our clerical employees and of their counterparts here, in this series of international matches taking place this week in Israel.
>
> As these representative physically handicapped people display their ability on the playing fields, let all remember, and not only remember but actively pass the word along, that their ability and potential are not confined to the field of sports but also to the field of business and to other fields of their daily life. Such lively reaction will be tremendously rewarding, not only to the handicapped thus aided, but to yourselves and, most of all, to your magnificient country.

Hon. Fritz Lanham To Leave Washington After 40 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great reluctance that we realize our former colleague and most able and distinguished friend, Fritz Lanham, is leaving Washington after some 40 years.

Congressman Lanham served with us in the House for 28 long and important years. During my service in the House I do not think I have ever had the privilege of knowing a more capable, effective, or more dedicated and patriotic person than Fritz Lanham. All of us will miss him and his lovely wife, Hazel. They have a host of friends in Washington and all of us will regret their departure.

Another Castro in the Dominican Republic?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, a very alarming report is made in yesterday's issue of the Atlanta Journal concerning the possible Red takeover of the Dominican Republic. I wonder if the President is showing any more concern about this country than he has about Cuba.

The report follows:

DOMINICAN REDS THREATEN TAKEOVER

(By Hal Hendrix)

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, May 22.—Subtle and peaceful Communist penetration of the Dominican Republic is progressing with incredible speed and efficiency.

There is ample evidence—ominous evidence—that Communist forces closely alined with Cuba and the Kremlin, aided by naive supporting leftist elements, are working both openly and covertly to turn this country into a second Communist-dominated bastion in the Caribbean.

It is not a noisy and spectacular transition such as the world witnessed in Cuba. It is being accomplished with considerable sophistication and has managed so far to use a number of well-meaning Americans and Latins as dupes.

Echoes and reflections of Cuba in mid-1959, a few months after Fidel Castro catapulted to power in Havana, are becoming increasingly audible and visible. Missing from the Dominican scene are the "barbudos," Castro's bearded gun-toting guerrillas, and the quick elimination of the organized armed forces at the Castro-type execution walls. Otherwise, many of the sounds and sights are alarmingly similar to those which punctuated the early, "social revolution" days of 1959 in what has since become a Communist regime in Cuba.

The transformation process is being unhampered by the often proclaimed democratic government of President Bosch, which was inaugurated only 2 months ago and hailed by the U.S. Government and some Latin American nations as a "champion of democracy."

Top officials and behind-the-scenes advisers in the Bosch government steadfastly deny that communism here poses any real threat or that its influence in Dominican politics and life is growing.

These officials argue vigorously that after 31 years of dictatorial rule by Rafael Trujillo and a year of council-of-state government, the Dominican Republic is at last becoming a "true democracy," and that contrary statements are only the work of last year's election losers. However, behind this smokescreen, the government of the Dominican Republic today is slipping rapidly into Communist control.

One Western diplomat, familiar with the Communist takeover in Cuba, declares that the situation here "is moving 10 times faster than it did in Havana, and this has been called a 'showcase of democracy.'"

There is, unfortunately, puzzling evidence that Washington, which has extended its wholehearted support and praise to the Bosch regime, is not being candidly advised by U.S. Ambassador John Bartlow Martin of the sustained Communist developments here.

Sources closely familiar with the American Embassy confide that full reports on the gravity of the situation here have not been transmitted by Ambassador Martin to the State Department or to the White House.

And it is known that one of Bosch's key advisers, Rumanian-born Sasha Volman, who is a naturalized U.S. citizen, has a direct line to a presidential aide in the White House to press the Bosch government's position, philosophies and line. The Western diplomatic colony here, apart from the American Embassy, feels that Washington consequently is getting a "snow job."

The lack of accurate communication between the American Embassy here and Washington is viewed by some responsible observers as another echo of Havana in mid-1959, when the U.S. envoy, Ambassador Philip Bonsal was bottling up significant trends and developments.

As a result, U.S. policy planners in Washington gravely misjudged Castro and the unfolding pattern in Cuba for a prolonged period.

Many responsible Dominicans and others here fear that the State Department and White House now are similarly miscalculating the true Dominican picture and development.

They point out that the deception taking place in the Dominican Republic is made easier because, relatively speaking, the historically troubled nation which shares the turbulent island of Hispanola with Haiti has experienced a remarkably peaceful period in the wake of the assassination of Dictator Trujillo 2 years ago May 30.

There was no great bloodbath after the collapse of the prolonged one-man dictatorship, even though long pentup hatreds made it susceptible. The chances also were enhanced by the power vacuum which was Trujillo's principal legacy.

While a seven-man council of state ruled the country last year, an orderly and free election was held last December and Bosch, who had spent more than half his life out of the country as a political exile, won the Presidency as head of the Dominican Revolutionary Party (PRD).

It had been expected that after the death of Trujillo, the Communists would move in quickly to take advantage of the anticipated chaos and confusion. They were only moderately successful in their infiltration schemes.

Last fall, during the October crisis over Soviet offensive missiles and bombers, secretly implanted in Communist Cuba, the ruling Dominican council of state ordered deportation of known Communists under an emergency law.

A substantial number of Communists were expelled, but the council was somewhat lax in carrying out its announced cleanup of known Red troublemakers.

However, since President Bosch's inauguration, more than 150 of the deported Communists have been allowed to return and circulate freely.

Some have found government jobs. Others are teaching in a new Communist-front school called the Institute of Social Sciences and Economic Planning. Still others have infiltrated into labor organizations and the University of Santo Domingo.

Many of the returning Communists came from Cuba. Others are known to have returned from Prague. Some came from the Soviet Union and various Iron Curtain countries by way of Paris.

"You can bet your life that these Communists just aren't sitting around enjoying the sunshine after the trips to Havana and Eastern Europe," commented a responsible and concerned Dominican professional leader.

Since the Communists began returning last March, the Bosch government has laid the foundation for a civilian militia. Ostensibly this organization is supposed to merely be for the purpose of protecting sugar cane fields from fires. But many observers here point out there is no need for firefighting vigilantes to have political indoctrination and militia-type drill instruction.

There also is puzzlement over the need for 17,000 of the so-called fire watchers.

There are continuing reports that there has been some Communist infiltration in the ranks of the Dominican Army, especially among the lower-ranking officer corps and enlisted personnel. A similar toehold is suspected in the police ranks.

Military and police field grade officers are frankly worried about the visible Communist gains in political and public fields—and the lack of a firm stand against it by President Bosch.

There is growing whispered conversation that the day soon may be approaching when the military will demand that Bosch adopt a firm position against the Communists.

The Dominican business community is plainly scared about the Communist direction in the country.

Foreign investors also are apprehensive. There has been no new foreign investment in the country for the last year, and the Bosch regime did nothing to encourage it by driving the Standard Oil Co. (Esso) out of business here shortly after taking office.

"There won't be 10 centavos' worth of new investment in this country until Bosch speaks out in favor of Western policies and against the Communists, especially against Communist Cuba," declared one Dominican business executive.

Irrigation in the Snake River Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the May issue of Reclamation Era contains a fascinating short history of irrigation in the Snake River Valley written by Lynn Crandall, who served as watermaster on the river from 1930 until his retirement in 1958. Senators who served on the Interior Committee during any of those years will remember Mr. Crandall as an absolutely dependable source of factual, impartial, and complete information on reclamation and water resource projects in the area.

Mr. Crandall's article is preceded by a short introductory statement about him written by Harold Nelson, the Bureau of Reclamation's Regional Director in Boise, Idaho. I ask unanimous consent that both articles be printed, following these remarks, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REGIONAL DIRECTOR LAUDS SNAKE RIVER'S CRANDALL

This being the Idaho Territory Centennial Year, I think it apropos to mention that the colorful history of this great State is inextricably entwined with the great rivers of the State, and with pioneering men who, over the years, became known as "mountain men" and "river men." One such man is Lynn Crandall, who, like many an easterner who came West, qualifies with this caliber. He came to the Snake River country in 1916, liked what he saw, and became inseparable with the Snake River Basin from that time forward.

Mr. Crandall's contemporaries have tried, on many occasions, to express their appreciation for his life's work. Every year, beginning in 1930, for 29 years, the water users of District No. 36, without a dissenting vote, elected and reelected Mr. Crandall as their watermaster, until his retirement on December 31, 1958. During the same period, with the required special approval of the U.S. Congress, he served as district engineer for the U.S. Geological Survey.

His remarkable career has included many other water-related and arduous assignments. In 1920, he was appointed commissioner of the court in charge of water distribution in the Big Lost River Valley. At the time the controversies over water in this valley were so heated and rough that, in themselves, they provided the subject matter for many colorful Idaho chapters.

Sometimes serving jointly, Mr. Crandall was Custer County surveyor; city councilman and school board member for the town of Mackay; U.S. mineral surveyor for Custer County; and Federal court commissioner in charge of water distribution on the Salmon River and on the Little Lost River.

Mr. Crandall is a rugged individualist, a man who always says what he thinks in as few words as possible—let the chips fall where they may. He believes in answering every letter that comes across his desk the day it is received.

In 1923, he received the Fuentes Gold Medal from Cornell University and, in 1958, the Distinguished Service Gold Medal from the U.S. Department of the Interior.

Mr. Crandall has always taken a lively interest in all natural phenomena and in collecting unusual items. He has gathered an outstanding collection of Indian artifacts. He became interested in the early stage lines of Idaho and acquired an interesting collection of early-day Wells-Fargo and other express company covers.

In anticipation of the centennial of Idaho Territory, he has gathered an unusual collection of old maps showing the evolution of Idaho Territory from the Louisiana Purchase to the present.

Retirement did not lessen his interest, but simply gave him the opportunity of transferring more of his waking hours to each of them. He became a consultant on many underground and surface-water problems, not only to the Federal Government but to a number of canal companies. He accepted an assignment as referee in bankruptcy.

Certainly, if there is any one man today who is qualified to discuss the Snake River, that man is Lynn Crandall.

H. T. NELSON,
Regional Director, Boise, Idaho.

A SAGA OF THE SNAKE—RATIONING AN IDAHO TREASURE

(By Lynn Crandall)

Fifty-odd years ago, smoke from burning sagebrush in the Snake River area in southern Idaho was commonly seen. Homesteaders had loosened the brush on the land by dragging railroad rails through it, then they raked it into windrows and burnt it. The skyline became blotched with thick sagebrush smoke.

Because most of the settlers were restricted financially and operated only with horse-drawn equipment, it took 20 years or so to get all the land of the larger projects into cultivation.

During the 1870–80 decade, irrigation development on the Snake River tributaries had a small start. In a few years, the first diversions were made from the main river. By 1905 about 581,000 acres were under irrigation on the river and tributaries upstream from King Hill.

Largely due to the Minidoka government project and the Twin Falls North and South Carey Act projects, together with several smaller Carey Act projects, the irrigated area above King Hill doubled by 1915 to 1,170,000 acres. By 1920 this had increased to 1,400,000 acres and remained at about that figure until 1934, when there was a gradual increase to about 1,600,000 acres by 1950.

Since 1950 there has been a development of something like 600,000 acres of new land above King Hill irrigated by groundwater pumping so that probably there are now about 2¼ million acres of land being irrigated on the Snake River above King Hill.

Early projects were ordinarily able to secure fairly adequate supplies of water from the natural flow of streams, as crops at that time were mostly about 50 percent alfalfa and 50 percent grain. It was not until the Minidoka project started construction in 1905 that provision was made for stored water supplies from Jackson Lake and Lake Walcott Reservoirs.

In 1915, Twin Falls and North Side projects arranged for doubling the storage capacity at Jackson Lake by the Bureau of Reclamation under provisions of the Warren Act, and the dry year of 1919 led to building of Henrys Lake in 1922, and of American Falls Reservoir completion in 1926.

The dry years of the early 1930's, coupled with increasing production of such crops as potatoes and sugarbeets, which required more late season water, resulted in demands for still more storage water as insurance against drought. Island Park and Grassy Lake Reservoirs were built in 1938 and 1939 on Henrys Fork watershed, and Palisades Reservoir began storage in October 1955.

All reservoirs on the Snake River watershed above King Hill have a present total usable capacity of nearly 5 million acre-feet. But in years of deficient runoff, the available water supply is not sufficient to fill them all to capacity.

In earlier years a number of the reservoirs were built by Carey Act construction companies or groups of water users, but for the past 35 years or so, high costs of construction and complex conflicting interests have resulted in construction by the Bureau of Reclamation.

The more complex reservoir projects have involved long, costly, and detailed studies by reclamation, followed by negotiations with water users to secure agreement with the proposed plans, then trips by witnesses to Washington to testify before congressional committees, with possible testimony by opposing interests.

At the time of authorization by the Congress of American Falls Reservoir in the early 1920's, the reclamation program was at such a low level of congressional support that the Congress provided in the authorization bill that canal companies desiring to buy storage in the reservoirs would have to pay cash in advance of construction. Canal companies and irrigation districts floated bond issues and raised the money to comply with this requirement.

Large sums of money are often spent both by Government and by interested individuals before authorization is finally secured from the Congress to build some particular project.

It took over 20 years of investigations to start construction on the Palisades project on Snake River, involving the negotiation of a compact between Wyoming and Idaho, securing agreements between various groups of Idaho water users, and getting congressional approval.

Only when a person has spent the major part of his adult lifetime going through one of these struggles to get some new project authorized and built, can he appreciate all that lies behind a nice-looking dam and powerplant located on one of our Western rivers.

The gradual development of natural flow and storage water rights on Snake River over a long period of years has resulted in many hundreds of such rights now in existence, embodied in court decrees, State of Idaho water licenses and contracts between the Bureau of Reclamation and canal companies and irrigation districts.

OPERATION AND MANAGEMENT

Under Idaho water laws, the State is divided by the State reclamation engineer into water districts, each district comprising an area having a common water supply. Some of these districts located on an isolated small stream may comprise an area of only a few thousand acres or less, while the largest district, such as District No. 36, on the main Snake River includes an area of 1¼ million acres.

On the first Monday of each March the water users in each of these districts meet to elect a watermaster, adopt a budget for the ensuing year, and act on any other matters affecting the operation of the district. Larger districts usually have established an advisory committee to assist the watermaster in passing on controversial questions.

These committees have no established authority, but they usually are able to reach unanimous agreement and are of great assistance to the watermaster in dealing with controversial matters such as stored water transmission losses, reservoir evaporation, bank storage, etc.

The Committee of Nine on Snake River acted as the Idaho Compact Commission in negotiating the Snake River water compact with Wyoming and has also proved to be an effective representative of water users' opinions in dealing with the Bureau of Reclamation on details of repayment contracts, schedules for reservoir operation during both the irrigation and nonirrigation seasons, and other similar questions relating to operations on Snake River.

A much more satisfactory operation results from such a program of prior full discussion by all parties concerned, rather than to have someone clothed with arbitrary authority in charge of river operation.

It is only a question of time when our western streams will be fully developed from a water supply standpoint and we will be obliged to give serious consideration to a comment once made by Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes of the U.S. Supreme Court when he said, "A river is more than an amenity, it is a treasure and offers a necessity of life that must be rationed among those who have power over it."

COMPACTS VERSUS THE FUTURE

Our experience on Snake River indicates that full trust can be placed in democratic processes of allowing all kinds of water users at the grassroots level to be freely represented in determining the policies of river operation and in selecting persons to have charge of such operations.

There has been much discussion during recent years of the desirability of interstate water compacts. In many cases there are good reasons for having such compacts, particularly in the case of small amounts of water and land areas and in allocations on international streams between different countries.

However, one objection to such compacts between States in the case of large areas and complex problems is that no one can lift the curtain that veils the future. No one can predict what river runoff will be 50 years from now, nor what the most pressing need will be for the available water supply in the future.

Experience with the Colorado River compact affords definite evidence that adoption of a compact on a stream is no guarantee against future troubles with water development.

Over the years, dry seasons occurred, demonstrating that promoters of some projects had been unduly optimistic in their original estimates of water supply, based on too few years of actual runoff records.

Substantial reductions in irrigated acreage had to be made on some projects, generally as the result of litigation between the settlers and the construction company when the matter could not be settled by mutual agreement. Practically all canal companies, except a few with the very earliest natural flow rights, have been obliged to purchase stored water rights to furnish an adequate water supply during late summer months.

The principal new developments underway at present are individually financed projects for ground-water pumping on newly irrigated lands. It is difficult to accurately estimate what additional acreage might be so irrigated, but it may be of the magnitude of another one-half million acres during the next 20 years in the area upstream from King Hill.

Joint studies by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers also indicate that perhaps some 30 new projects on the Upper Snake may be found feasible of construction before the area's water resources can be considered to be fully developed. A number of these proposed projects, however, have controversial features connected with them, and it will take many years to resolve the conflicting interests.

The 50 Years of Equity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, this week, May 20–26, 1963, is National Actors Equity Week. An editorial in the Christian Science Monitor—May 15, 1963—pays tribute to Equity's notable 50-year history. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE 50 YEARS OF EQUITY

> A recent Broadway spectacular—"the best people doing the best scenes and the best numbers of the last 50 years," according to Jean Dalrymple, producer—commemorated the birth of the most significant influence on the American theater, Actors' Equity Association (the actors' union) 50 years ago.
>
> Someone has said, "The theater is the people's sweetheart. It is a rational, beautiful amusement, a great emotional power." Yet the role of Equity has been long and rough, but with perseverence, education and bulldoggedness Equity has accomplished, in large measure, what it set out to, namely, protection of the exploited actor:
>
> A standard contract and minimum wage are secure. No extra performances are permitted without pay. Now a road show can't close in Peoria leaving its cast stranded, for transportation back to New York is guaranteed. And just last year Equity desegregated the National Theater in the Nation's Capital in its fight against racial discrimination, deciding that no member would play a segregated house. Also a welfare fund and pension plan is theirs.
>
> Writing of Equity's first strike (the famous actors' strike of 1919) its first president, Francis Wilson, said: "There was no question of wages, great or small, but simply of the abatement * * * of injustices which had grown with increasing severity. * * * The actors won their victory by their loyalty, by the force of public opinion, by the aid of their allies who stood by them unfalteringly, and by the justice of their cause."
>
> Today's president, Ralph Bellamy, emphasizes "Equity is the responsibility and the reflection—of each actor."
>
> Vive l'Equity.

Secretary Zuckert Addresses Meeting of American Ordnance Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on May 9, 1963, the Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert, Secretary of the Air Force, addressed a dinner meeting of the American Ordnance Association at the Mayflower Hotel. Mr. Zuckert's first service to our Government more than 20 years ago was that of a management expert. Through the intervening years Mr. Zuckert has served our country in various positions of high responsibilty in the Government. All of his efforts have been characterized by an active interest in effective management. I am pleased that in his present area of responsibility he continues to emphasize improved management in dispensing the Air Force share of the gigantic expenditures that are necessary for the defense of our country.

In his speech Mr. Zuckert makes it quite clear that effective management is a product of leadership:

> There is nothing magic or basically different about management in the aerospace age. It demands, as it always has, that the people at the top level of an organization apply the principles of leadership—that the top level staff concern themselves more deeply with the actual workings of their organization.

In speaking to the industry leaders gathered for the American Ordnance Association meeting, Mr. Zuckert also made interesting points concerning the responsibility of industry. I take this opportunity to place the entire speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REMARKS BY HON. EUGENE M. ZUCKERT, SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, AMERICAN ORDNANCE ASSOCIATION, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C. MAY 9, 1963

> The 45th annual meeting of any national organization can be an appropriate occasion to take a quick look at where we've been as well as a closer look at where we are going. This is particularly true in the case of the American Ordnance Association, whose primary interest is not the past, but a present and future intimately related to our national security.

The year 1918—45 years ago—was "the year of victory in the war to make the world safe for democracy."

Ironic as those words may sound, I believe history will confirm that it was such a war. History will also record that at least one major war and several minor wars were fought later in the 20th century for the same basic principles.

Some of you have been members of this organization during all the years since its founding. Perhaps we should study the lessons to be learned from nearly half a century of defense activity.

One is that there is no such thing as making the world permanently safe for democracy. The world will be safe for the growth of the ideas and institutions of democracy only if freemen keep it that way by constant effort. I believe it will be an unending task.

Another lesson is that war is not the best way of making the world safe for anything—although it is sometimes the only way to defend freedom once aggression has begun.

Our experience with this painful lesson of history in two World Wars and in Korea finally convinced us that we must maintain superior military strength to deter any aggressive power from launching a major attack against us or our allies.

Our national policy of trying to serve, expand and defend the goals of freedom—a policy which has evolved from such lessons—rests on three foundations.

The first is to strengthen the resources and the benefits of true, responsible freedom both at home and abroad.

The second is to make an unstinting effort to identify and remove the causes of war.

The third is to maintain as long as necessary the military strength clearly sufficient to deter or defeat any aggressor who might otherwise employ force against the interest of our Nation.

As Secretary of Defense McNamara has said, our unavoidably vast Military Establishment "exists for one purpose and one purpose only: to act as the servant of U.S. foreign policy. Our responsibility is to provide this Nation with the means to safeguard its legitimate interests and to meet its commitments at home and around the world. The Defense Department exists to serve that purpose, and to serve none other."

The Department of Defense budget totals nearly $54 billion. I would like to call your particular attention to the importance of proper management of the Air Force portion of that budget. We have made considerable progress since 1961, and, with the full cooperation of industry, we can further increase the value received from every tax dollar.

But any consideration of further management improvements must be made against the background of the pressent Air Force utilization of defense funds. The Air Force record—in which industry fully shares the credit—is one of which all Americans can be proud.

With about 39 percent of the Defense budget, the Air Force not only provides our Nation with the Strategic Air Command (SAC) and its more than 80 percent of the free world's strategic nuclear delivery capability, but it also provides some 70 percent of the personnel for the North American Air Defense Command, and the greatest portion of the facilities for defending our skies against attackers.

In addition, the Air Force provides—

The greatest portion by far of the Nation's global military airlift and assault airlift;

Air support for the Army;

The primary air arms for our Armed Forces in Europe, the Pacific, the Far East, and Alaska;

The major operational and research, development and engineering programs in the Department of Defense space effort;

The major Department of Defense support of the national space program;

Plus many other functions that contribute to our national strength.

Forgive me if I mention only the Air Force contributions. I do so with full awareness that you and I agree that the most powerful aggressor forces would have to be dealt with on land and at sea as well as in the sky. Each department has its speciality and none is more essential than another.

I could continue on at length with what I believe is remarkable evidence of great value received for the dollar spent.

For example, the Military Air Transport Service maintains a 115,000-mile system of military air routes on a wartime readiness basis.

The Air Force Communications Service operates and maintains a global network of more than 5 million miles of communications channels and a worldwide system of more than 1,500 electronic aids to air navigation and air traffic control.

The Air Force Systems Command, which is involved in coordinating the Nation's military and scientific efforts toward deevlopment of aerospace weapon systems, administers, at any given time, 60,000 contracts.

The President's report to Congress on Aeronautic and Space Activities shows that of the 54 satellites orbited by the United States in 1962, 40 were launched by the Air Force.

More than 150,000 young men and women are given primary and advanced technical training by Air Training Command every year.

Air Defense Command's 9th Aerospace Defense Division provides NORAD with the trained people who maintain a constant watch to detect and identify all objects in orbit around the earth.

I know that most of you here are familiar with many other examples of value received for the Air Force portion of the Defense budget: The Thor, Atlas, the Titans, and the Minuteman; the X–15 program being conducted in cooperation with NASA; the Agena satellite; the air crews on constant ground alert and those overhead in the air.

At the heart of this great national defense effort, of course, are the people who perform these military tasks. These Americans deserve more than we are giving them. This, fortunately, is being recognized; I fervently hope that the military pay increase now moving through Congress will emerge in a form adequate to reduce our serious losses of valuable men who see greener pastures outside the Service.

When you consider the vastness and complexity of this global enterprise that is the U.S. Air Force, you can see why careful management of all our resources is so vital.

And whose responsibility is this management of national defense resources? The Air Force itself has a heavy responsibility, of course. But I say it is also industry's responsibility to a much greater degree than many businessmen realize.

You in this association who hold key positions in defense-related industry make many decisions affecting the final cost of military systems. How you manage your organizations and your contracts can have a profound effect on defense expenditures and on the time it takes for our Nation to obtain operational systems.

The cost of military preparedness continues upward. Every possible measure must be taken to control it and to assure a maximum of return from the investment. This is where an organization such as yours has been and can be most helpful.

All of us believe that the national will is better served, the public interest better protected, and the job more efficiently done under a system of producing our defense goods outside the house of Government but subject to its direction and control.

We all agree on the necessity of Government controls, but we also recognize the danger of their interfering with the job. The record of defense procurement for the past 15 years indicates that we haven't always had the very best controls, or that our procurement processes were not as sound as they might have been, or that we were not careful enough in the way we managed the business.

It seems to me we have not sufficiently adjusted the crisis-type procedures which emerged during wartime—both World War II and Korea—to the long-range requirements of the cold war.

I believe cost overruns and delays in development are as much a problem for industry as for the Government.

All of us want to take advantage of the developmental and productive capability of the free enterprise system, which rewards imagination, enterprise and efficiency. To do so fully we must have more input from industry to the discipline of defense procurement.

Discipline in defense procurement means the same thing that it does in combat—prompt response to orders, skill in execution of the job, and individual responsibility for efficiency and effectiveness of the operation.

In defense procurement we must build the kind of discipline that will improve cost estimates, delivery scheduling, and quality control; that will improve design and test procedures to keep down change orders and retrofits; and that will improve procedures to reduce maintenance costs.

We in the military have committed our share of errors of omission and commission in our management of resources. But there are soft spots in management in industry, too, which only you can eliminate.

More than ever before, defense contractors are going to find that the defense agencies are frugal and careful customers who will demand the best. At the same time, the best managed companies stand to gain.

Secretary of Defense McNamara reemphasized this policy recently in a statement to the Defense Industry Advisory Council. Generally, the Defense Department is in favor of somewhat greater profits in defense work through incentive awards based on performance.

"But if profits are to increase," Mr. McNamara said, "they must increase by increases in efficiency."

The best managed companies stand to gain by increasing their efficiency an so does the national security. The gain could be felt in much more than dollars saved—in much more than cost-effectiveness. For example, an across-the-board increase in reliability of the myriads of parts in our missiles and space boosters—in fuel systems, guidance and electronic systems, and all the other components—would mean significant improvements in our effective missile strength as calculated by the Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff. It would also save critical time and dollars in our national space program.

I believe that what we really are looking for when we talk about developing better management practices in Government and industry is mostly a change in attitude. It is a change demanded inevitably by the complex new technology and vastly greater cost of aerospace systems. Better management is not to be achieved by new slogans or gimmicks, but by our making sterner demands of ourselves and by our motivating our subordinates to join wholeheartedly in the overall effort.

There is nothing magic or basically different about management in the aerospace age. It demands, as it always has, that the people at the top level of an organization apply the principles of leadership—that the top level staff concern themselves more deeply with the actual workings of their organization.

I know it's a tough job. We find that it is. (Some of you here heard General Gerrity and others discussing it at length this morning.) It means constant probing and self-examination and stimulation of new ideas among your people—who, actually, are your most valuable resources. It means meticulous program control and scheduling as well as ingenuity and vision in achieving realistic cost estimates.

As I said, we find it a constantly demanding and challenging part of the Air Force mission. And we find it rewarding. For example, we recently surveyed 10 of our bases to find out how their newly mechanized supply accounting function was working out. We found that, on the average, each base has been able to reduce its inventory value by $6.3 million because of better inventory control. And we found that supply support of the flying mission at the bases had also been improved.

We are constantly realizing new benefits from our electronic data processing equipment. We are continually amassing detailed information and analyzing it electronically to enable us to identify inspection requirements and to better evaluate the reliability of items and the requirement for replacements. It is paying off handsomely. Our increased analysis of maintenance data has shown us, for example, that we were guilty of overinspecting aircraft parts and components. On one aircraft type alone we reduced inspections to less than one-third of the original requirement.

Another effort that has shown gratifying results is what we call Project MINT, for material identification and new item control techniques.

Through this project we have reduced the number of line items in the Air Force supply system by 80,000 from an all-time peak of about 2 million last June. We are screening all new items being introduced into our inventory and eliminating duplicate line items. These many thousands of reductions should mean significant savings, considering that the average annual cost to manage a line item in the Air Force's inventory is about $100.

These are only a few examples of time consuming, detailed management jobs we are doing to increase our efficiency and military effectiveness. As you can see, they are more indicative of an attitude and a firm purpose than any unique ingenuity. I might add that they were prompted mostly by necessity—by the realization that we had to adjust our organization simultaneously to the long, hard pull of the cold war; to the new complex, high-cost systems; to sudden advancements in weapon systems and sudden obsolescence; and to an intensified control of the aerospace dollar.

The Air Force must have effective systems, delivered on time, at costs in keeping with objectives. What you in industry must have are reasonable profits. We both want the best national defense obtainable. Contractors will be judged by their performance—their product, their schedules and costs and the soundness of their management.

We believe that we are getting more today than we have in the past for the Government's dollar, through our own efforts as well as yours in industry. But this still is not enough. We are faced with immense problems in the next few years that make it mandatory that we achieve even more economies, more reliability and more performance, and at the same time, maintain a creative atmosphere in which the inevitable and indispensable new generation of weapon systems can be achieved.

We ask you to share, to the fullest extent, this mutual responsibility to achieve our national defense objectives.

Progress in Michigan Under Gov. George Romney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an interesting and informative address by Gov. George Romney, of Michigan, before the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., on May 22, 1963, on the achievements and progress of our great State. Governor Romney is doing an outstanding job for the people of Michigan in straightening out the State's fiscal instability—a mess he inherited from two previous administrations. I hope other members will find time to read this interesting summary:

ADDRESS BY GOV. GEORGE ROMNEY, OF MICHIGAN

I came here today to sell Michigan, and I hope that while I succeed in that, I will also succeed in convincing you that that is my only purpose.

I appreciate the opportunity to tell the Nation through you what Michigan is doing to extricate itself from its difficulties of the past few years.

Just as Michigan's economic troubles, its financial crises and its political deadlock received national attention through the 1950's, so should its recovery from these difficulties be recognized and publicized in the sixties.

Important changes are taking place in Michigan.

The people of Michigan are showing new concern and determination. Indeed I believe I accurately express their viewpoint when I say that they expect Michigan, with all its talents and resources, to be the best State in the Nation.

As in the story of an ancient king we are seeking the answers to achieving that goal.

The story is of a newly crowned king who wanted to be the best king his country ever had, so he traveled far and wide seeking the answer. His search was fruitless until he approached a schoolhouse in which the children were singing. Their song supplied the answer. Its lyrical message was:

"The best kings are those,
In this and all other lands,
Who tackle the problems under their nose,
With the tools that are under their hands."

I want to tell you today about the tools we have and how we plan to use them in our desire to be the best State in the United States.

Few are aware of Michigan's immense size. It is the largest State east of the Mississippi River in land and water area combined. It is almost as far from Ironwood to Detroit as it is from Detroit to New York City. Ironwood, in the Upper Peninsula, is as far west as St. Louis; Hancock is as far north as Montreal, Canada; and Port Huron is as far east as Greenville, S.C., or Asheville, N.C. With Detroit as the center, a circle that includes Ironwood also includes Ottawa, Philadelphia, Richmond, Knoxville, and St. Louis.

We are an inland State, and yet we have four times as much water area as any other State. We have a coastline longer than this Nation's Pacific coast and as long as its Atlantic coast. As if that weren't enough water, the Creator endowed us with 11,000 inland lakes and 36,000 miles of streams.

Opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway in 1959 made Michigan the principal maritime State on the Nation's fourth seacoast. Now 80 percent of the world's merchant fleet can reach Michigan's seaports.

Most of its nearly 8 million people would agree, I think, that one of Michigan's principal virtues is its fantastic diversity.

Michigan is an unmatched combination of industrial empire, recreational paradise, and diversified agriculture.

We are, as everybody in this room knows, a major industrial State. Our State has 13,432 manufacturing establishments with 809,590 employees.

Michigan manufacturers turn out everything from wooden shoes and ball-point pens to atomic power and missile parts, from carpet sweepers for the homemaker to minesweepers for the Navy.

Our industry is already highly diversified. Most people think of Michigan as a place where cars are made, and that is right. But it doesn't go far enough. Eighty-seven percent of all types of industry are found in Michigan. In addition to motor vehicles and parts, Michigan ranks first in cereals, first in public building furniture, first in gray iron foundries, first in nonferrous castings, in special dies and tools and in machine tool accessories, and we make nearly all the aspirin in the country. It is the home of many world famous firms.

1. Dow Chemical Co. at Midland, Mich., is one of the world's greatest chemical producers. It is the source for over 700 chemical products.

2. The world's largest single portland cement plant is operated by the Huron Portland Cement Co. in Alpena.

3. Colon is recognized as the "Magic Capital of the World" because Abbott's Magic Novelty Co. is headquartered here.

4. Some of the Nation's largest papermills are located in Kalamazoo.

5. The Huron Milling Division of Hercules Powder Co. at Harbor Beach is the world's largest producer of wheat starch and wallpaper paste.

6. Sturgis is the drapery hardware capital of the world. Kirsch Co. produces more drapery hardware than any other manufacturer.

7. Shaw-Walker, of Muskegon, is the world's largest exclusive maker of office equipment.

8. The Upjohn Co. of Kalamazoo operates the largest pharmaceutical plant, under one roof, in the world. It contains more than 1,600,000 square feet of floor space and covers over 21 acres.

9. The Wolverine Shoe & Tanning Corp. of Rockford, with plants in six Michigan communities, is one of the Nation's leading producers of footwear.

10. Three of America's billion-dollar industrial corporations and 16 of its $100 million businesses are headquartered in Michigan.

11. Michigan has a highly diversified skilled-labor force, manning 365 different types of industry found within the State. Michigan's labor unions and labor leaders are world renowned.

While most people would readily concede the extent of our industrial might, they would be surprised to learn that Michigan is also a mighty agricultural State. Growing a greater variety of foods and leading the Nation in many, Michigan comes closer to setting the table, completely, than any other State.

Right now, during Michigan Week, a bevy of agricultural queens is touring the East to remind people of this. They were here on Monday.

The annual retail value of Michigan's agricultural output is over $2 billion.

1. Michigan leads the Nation in the production of red tart cherries, field beans, blueberries, cucumbers for pickles, gladioli bulbs and eastern White Winter wheat.

2. Michigan's No. 1 crop in value is corn, with production attaining 110 million bushels in some years. Second to this comes hay and pasture, and from these crops stem livestock and livestock products that make up two-thirds of Michigan's agricultural income.

3. Michigan produces and sells 75 percent of all the small fruit plants marketed within a 600 mile radius of its borders.

4. Michigan produces two-thirds of the Nation's supply of eastern White Winter wheat used in pastry and crackers, and as a blender for other flours. Good demand, sometimes at premium prices, keeps it from being a surplus item.

5. Michigan ranks 2d in the production of plums; 3d in apples, pears, celery and grapes; 4th in peaches; 5th in onions and carrots; 6th in sugar beets; 7th in milk; 9th in potatoes, and 10th in corn and oats.

Michigan is also one of the leading tourist States, and no wonder. Again, variety is the spice of our life. The 10 million travelers who come to Michigan every year can go trout fishing in April, lie on our white sand beaches in July and August, drink in the beauty of our fall foliage in October, and ski at 1 of our 84 ski centers in January.

Our tourist attractions and our folklore are frequently tied together. On the Leelanau Peninsula, beautiful Sleeping Bear Dunes tower 660 feet above Lake Michigan. Indian legend tells us of the mother bear and her two cubs, swimming through the water. The two cubs lag behind, and the faithful mother bear sleeps on the shore, vainly waiting for her babies, which are out in the water as Big Manitou and Little Manitou Islands.

Michigan ranks among the top three States in the combined sale of hunting and fishing licenses. In 1961, Michigan sold 1,086,506 hunting licenses and 927,627 fishing licenses.

Michigan leads the country in the number of State parks and prepared campsites. Our State has 60 State parks and recreation areas, 23 State forests, 5 national forests, and 150 county and municipal camping parks.

During the 19th century, much of the forest that blanketed the greater part of Michigan fell to the lumberman's ax. But we still have plenty left and have grown more—19 million acres, more or less, and 6 million of these are in State and national forests for the people to enjoy.

Natural resources: Our copper country in the Upper Peninsula is the largest commercial deposit of native copper in the world. We have iron in abundance, our salt mines provide 20 percent of the Nation's salt, we lead the Nation in the production of gypsum, and Michigan has the greatest variety of minerals—metallic and nonmetallic to be found in any similar sized area in the world.

Beauty: Michigan has this in abundance, too.

Our scenic wonders are not limited to the mighty spectacle of Ford's River Rouge plant or Detroit's towering skyline, impressive as they are.

Less than a day's drive from the industrial wonders of the southeastern part of the State lie the magnificent view of two peninsula's from our mighty Mackinac Bridge, the graceful sweep of sand dunes along the Lake Michigan coast, the sparkling rush of the Au Sable River through quiet forests. Further north, more breathtaking scenes—the Lake of the Clouds in the Porcupine Mountains, the Tahquamenon Falls where Longfellow tells us the Chippewa Chieftain, Hiawatha, built his first birch bark canoe at Munising, the historic riches of the copper country.

Well, I could go on about Michigan's natural assets, but unfortunately, time isn't as unlimited as my enthusiasm. What is more important than the natural favors which God bestowed on Michigan is our people—people who have been drawn to its high rewards since the Frenchman, Etienne Brule, a scout for Samuel de Champlain, searching for a route to the Orient, reached what is now Michigan's Upper Peninsula in 1618, two years before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock.

Without the spirit, the intelligence, the skill, the courage and the imagination of these people and their organizations, Michigan would be nothing more today than the green wilderness which Brule found in the 17th century.

There was no compelling reason why Michigan should become the center of the world's automotive industry. Favored as we were with natural resources, there were other areas of the Nation that could more easily have become the world capitol of the auto industry.

What made the difference was the imagination and energy of men like Ford, the Fisher brothers, Olds, and the other auto pioneers. Nor was that combination alone enough to create the industrial miracle. It took the thousands of people who flocked to the State from all parts of the Nation and world, Danes, Belgiums, Negroes, Poles, Germans, Italians, the Irish—their sinews and brains—to translate the dreams of a few into the reality of many.

People make a state, and people can unmake it. Through their laxity, through their devotion to selfish aims at the expense of the public good, through an allergic reaction to the idea of reasonable concession, through a dismal unconcern for the affairs of government, they can bring their state's government and its economy into disarray.

Everybody knows that this happened to Michigan in the late fifties. The polarization of our economic strength into the forces of big business and big labor extended into the political arena, and our State government sank into the deadlock which ended in the infamous Payless Payday of 1959.

But Michigan people would not long tolerate this kind of stalemate.

The spectacle of a State government that had become immobilized through the intransigience of two powerful groups was too much for the millions of Michigan citizens whose loyalty to Michigan transcended their loyalty to economic groups or political affiliation.

These people went to work and attacked the roots of the problem—excessive partisanship, political deadlock, and an antequated State constitution that kept our State government shackled to the 19th century. Overcoming the formidable obstacles of well-organized opposition and natural inertia, these public-spirited citizens called a constitutional convention into being—a convention that produced the most modern, most effective revised State constitution in the land.

That constitution has now been adopted and will soon be put into effect. It will reshape the baroque design of our State government into a functional structure well suited to the needs of the 20th century. It contains model provisions for the apportionment of legislative seats, model provisions in civil rights, in education, in the executive branch and in the structure of local government. Michigan has demonstrated that there is no power on earth like the power of an aroused coalition of concerned citizens.

I am happy to say that the newspapers, the commentators and critics who were laughing at Michigan a few short years ago—and with good reason—are now eyeing our State with envy and admiration.

Editorialists joined in this envy and wrote editorials with headlines like these: "Michigan Blazes a Trail," "Michigan Goes Ahead," "Michigan Sets Good Example," and "Michigan Shows the Way."

As if our success in discarding a crippling constitution were not enough, other things have been happening in Michigan to prove that there is a rhythm to the affairs of a State, just as there is to the affairs of a nation.

That rhythm is becoming increasingly spirited.

Our legislature has just completed the most productive session in its recent history.

Our economy is booming. The automobile industry is headed toward the best year in its history. Nonfarm employment was up 113,000 in March of this year over last year. Unemploment was down over 62,000 over the same period. The automobile manufacturing companies are planning to invest more than $1 billion in facilities and equipment in Michigan this year and the five major utility companies will spend more than a quarter of a billion for development.

Legislation passed during the recent session should accelerate this boom. We have passed bills to reorganize our Economic Development Department, allow local communities to build plants to be leased to industry, committed additional funds to finance more job-creating research at our universities.

Confronted with a strong challenge from California, our legislature acted within 3 weeks to pass the key bills enabling Michigan to secure its claim as the United States nominee for the 1968 Olympic games.

Speaking of research, the theme of this year's Michigan Week is "Spotlighting Research and Science for Our Future."

Michigan industry is becoming increasingly aware that if it is to meet the competitive challenge of other States, it must channel some of the resources once concentrated on production into research. And it is making great progress in this direction.

National Science Foundation studies show that research and development expenditures per research person were higher in the auto industry in 1959 than in any other industry.

Michigan's two largest drug manufacturers spent $31 million on research in Michigan last year, or 12½ percent of the industry's total research and development expenditure.

Research conducted at the University of Michigan is growing at a more rapid rate than at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the University of California, or the California Institute of Technology.

At the present time, the University of Michigan ranks third in the Nation in funds available for research.

Wayne State University is establishing an institute for biological systems engineering and an institute for surface studies. The University of Detroit is planning a $1,250,000 biological research center.

The pace of industrial research is accelerating rapidly. Thirty-one research and development laboratories have been established in Ann Arbor in recent years. Lear Siegler, Inc., of Grand Rapids has a contract for a new space control display instrument panel for the X-15. Chrysler Corp., the University of Michigan, and Conductron Corp. have developed an advanced reentry vehicle which has successfully passed two Air Force tests.

Michigan is on the move, but we are moving in a way that we have never moved before. We have proved our capacity for leadership in industry, notably during World War II when we became known as the arsenal of democracy. Our network of outstanding colleges and universities is solid proof that we are leaders in education. Michigan has been a leader in the arts, and the names of men and women who were born or lived in Michigan attest to that—names like Ernest Hemingway, Edna Ferber, Robert Frost, Carl Sandburg, Ring Lardner, James Oliver Curwood, Thomas Schippers, Norman Bel Gaddes, Marie Dressler, Joseph Maddy, Julie Harris.

What I hope Michigan is doing, in fact, what I believe Michigan is doing, is proving that it can become a leader in the art of government.

Leadership in government is essential to economic strength, cultural excellence, and the maintenance of freedom.

Michigan has already taken an important step in asserting this leadership by adopting its new constitution.

And it is taking another essential step—the reestablishment of its financial integrity. We will complete the fiscal year on June 30 with a general fund operating surplus of approximately $40.5 million—a surplus which will go a long way toward reducing our deficit. Let me say, too, that it is getting increasingly difficult for the leaders of State and local governments to argue successfully for the old-fashioned virtue of financial integrity in the atmosphere of deficit spending and financial irresponsibility which mark the national scene.

The things we have started in Michigan are exciting, and I am proud to tell you about them. We are proud of our resources, proud of our people, proud of our industrial and agricultural leadership. Our new constitution, our balanced budget, and a constructive legislative session attests to the fact that Michigan citizens are leaders in the art of self-government.

We in Michigan hope, too, that we can demonstrate that the States are more than just political subdivisions of an all-powerful Federal Government—that there is still a vital and progressive role for States to play in our constitutional structure.

As we consider the future of the States, I think we should judge them by the standard against which all governments should be judged—their capacity to meet the needs of the people.

Too many people, it seems, are for State's rights because they want to keep things from happening. They are afraid or opposed to change. They want to make States into roadblocks on the path to progress.

Our concern should not be for some abstract concept of States' rights. It is absurd to preach States' rights if the States are citadels of inaction. General Eisenhower put it aptly in his address to the Michigan Constitutional Convention when he said, "It is idle to champion States' rights without upholding States responsibilities as well."

And further:

"Never under our constitutional system could the national Government have siphoned away so much State responsibility and authority without the neglect, acquiescence, or unthinking cooperation of the States themselves. Every State failure to meet a pressing public need has created the opportunity, developed the excuse, and fed the temptation for the national Government to poach on the State's preserve."

I agree with these statements because I believe the approach to the problem of intergovernmental relations should depend primarily on the strengthening of State and local governments. The way to increase State and local power and responsibility is to reinvigorate State governments, rather than to emasculate the national Government.

Therefore, I want to go on record as being firmly opposed to current proposed amendments to our national Constitution which would turn the clock back to the mid-18th century.

I am referring to the suggested constitutional amendments being promoted by the Volunteer Committee on Dual Sovereignty.

These suggested constitutional amendments would allow the States to amend the Constitution without approval of Congress, to deny the Supreme Court's jurisdiction in apportionment cases, and to establish a court of the union above the Supreme Court.

If adopted, they would almost turn the country back to the days of the Confederation of altering the fundamental balance of power between State governments and the national Government. This balance of power is as vital to the effective functioning of our Government as the balance between the legislative, judicial, and executive branches which was one of the most ingenious inventions of our Nation's founders.

The mutilation of the Federal Government is not the answer to the growing problem of centralization. The answer is the strengthening of local and State governments.

Michigan hopes to lead the way in this field. It hopes to be as widely recognized in the future as a problem-solving State, as it has been in the immediate past as a problem State.

What are some of the guidelines a problem-solving State must adopt if it is to meet responsibilities which the Federal Government might otherwise be forced to meet? I would list these:

1. It must stimulate and support individual responsibility and voluntary cooperation in meeting as many needs and solving as many problems as possible.

2. It must take action to protect and extend the means of grassroots citizen participation in the political life of the community, State, and Nation. Political parties should be made subject to popular control by the people themselves. Continual attempts must be made to elevate the level of political debate particularly through relevant discussion in political campaigns of the basic issues.

3. It must seek bold solutions for its problems, daring to innovate and strike out in new directions. It should not be content with traditional ways of doing things. It should not leave creative experimentation to the national Government.

4. It must act vigorously to protect and enlarge all civil rights that are guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution, or by the State, or by act of Congress or State statute.

5. It must not hesitate to reject Federal programs which, in its own independent judgments, appear to be ill-conceived, ill-timed, unduly restrictive, or unnecessary, and seek effective joint action by the States themselves to reverse the excessive concentration of power and responsibility in the Federal Government.

By following these guidelines, I believe the States can effectively fulfill the responsibilities which the Founding Fathers intended them to bear.

Michigan has had a glorious past. It has excelled in many of its contributions to the Nation's strength. It is our determination to do more in the future. We believe the Nation's strength can be no greater than the combined strength of the 50 States. A State can be no stronger than the combined strength of its local communities. And the strength of each community rests upon the combined strength of its citizens.

Building a stronger Michigan will be premised on building stronger communities and stronger citizens. Michigan wants to be the best State in the United States and we believe we have the tools to do it, and the people to do it.

The Problem of Aid to Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the question of aid to Indonesia has become a most controversial issue. The United States has cut off major aid to Indonesia pending action by the Government of that country to increase economic and political stability.

However, in recent months small amounts of aid have gone to Indonesia, amounting to some $20 million. President Sukarno, while not a Communist, has said that Indonesia and Communist China are "comrades in arms."

He hardly sounds like a very safe bet as a friend of the United States.

At the same time, however, we must not fail to remember that the Republic of Indonesia stands out as one of the most important countries in Asia.

This nation, with a population approaching 100 million, is the fifth largest in the world. It supplies a large share of the world's requirements of rubber, tin, and oil. Strategically it occupies a position of crucial importance to the security of the free world, flanking the southeast Asian mainland and controlling the key passages between the Pacific and Indian Oceans. Politically it has become the target of a massive Communist bloc campaign to win it away from its proclaimed policy of noninvolvement and cold war neutrality.

Recent events in Indonesia have been cause for concern by the United States and our allies. The Indonesian economy has been deteriorating at an alarming rate. A complex of motives and fears has led the Indonesian Government to take an adamant stand in opposition to the formation of Malaysia, which we see as the best solution to the problem of the region's security. Visits by top leaders from Russia and Communist China have underscored the determination of the Communist bloc to push ahead with its all-out efforts to subvert the independence of this vital country.

There is a tendency among some circles in this country to recoil from the facts, to assume that the battle to preserve Indonesia's freedom has already been lost. Eminently it is not lost. We are still in the midst of that battle, and our chances of success will depend on our staying power. We have, in fact, a great advantage over the Russians and Communist Chinese in this battle, because we want nothing from Indonesia other than what the people of Indonesia themselves want: independence, freedom from foreign influence, and a better material life. Our job is to make this clear to the Indonesian people.

Rather than wringing our hands over Indonesia's impending loss, rather than castigating the Indonesian Government for its actions—which often serves simply as a goad to inexperienced and sensitive Indonesian leaders—I suggest we get on with the real job, that of helping the people of this rich, strategically vital nation to resist Communist blandishments and pressures.

In this connection, I wish to include the following editorial from the respected Singapore Straits Times of May 10, 1963, which presents a sound view of what we have at stake in Indonesia from a source on its very borders:

AID FOR JAKARTA

Indonesian leaders see in Malaya and Malaysia a menace which does not exist. The threats and insults which have poured out of Jakarta have in turn had their effect on the Malayan image of Indonesia. There is some tendency to refer to Indonesia as though it has already slid rather more than halfway into the Communist camp, with D. N. Aidit manipulating Ministers like marionettes and preparing to take over the show altogether. This is no less a distortion. However heavily confrontation may press upon Malaya, it is necessary to make an effort to see Indonesia in a truer perspective. The Communists are stronger than might be wished, but are by no means in a position to seize total power. To behave as though they are bound to win is to help them to win.

If this holds true from the point of view of a wise regulation of Malayan diplomatic attitudes toward Indonesia, it is even more true in a world context. The American Senators and Congressmen who are presently working themselves into a rage over the recent grant of U.S. $17 million to the Indonesia Government from the President's Emergency Foreign Aid Fund betray remarkable shortsightedness. One Representative has gone so far as to imply that it would be treasonable to offer Indonesia another cent in view of President Sukarno's recent fraternization with Communist China's Chairman Liu Shaochi. While here is every excuse for American irritation the temptation to apply the obvious punishment should be resisted. The effect of shutting off aid will be to hasten Indonesia's economic deterioration. The result will not be to chasten the anti-American elements, but to strengthen the Communists. A wiser policy is that enunciated by President Kennedy's aid administrators. If Indonesia makes a real effort to put her economic house in order, so that aid can be put to effective use, further applications will be favorably considered. If not, they will be refused. In the latter case, the injection of American dollars would produce no worthwhile results and the money might as well be saved.

The Wheat Referendum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday's wheat referendum was a resounding mandate to the Congress and the administration that our people want less Government, fewer controls, and an end to this cycle of having the Government do more for its citizens. The people of this country want to solve their own problems without the do-gooders and bureaucrats from Washington interfering.

In the questionaire which was just completed, the farmers in the Third District of Nebraska voted 68.8 percent against this wheat referendum. Their reaction to the Domestic Peace Corps is 69 percent "no"; to the Youth Conservation Corps, 78.6 percent "no."

If the Congress and the administration will heed this referendum and interpret this wheat vote correctly, plans for more new programs such as mass transportation, urban renewal, Domestic Peace Corps, National Youth Opportunities Act, education bills, Medicare—and yes, even tax cuts as long as we are running a deficit—will be dropped. If a referendum could be held on all of these spending programs, the voters would overwhelmingly reject them as they did the wheat program Tuesday.

I trust that the Congress will give pause and reflect somberly on this vote of Tuesday and carry the mandate into other fields of legislation.

University of Chicago Awards Doctorate to Woman From Nigeria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is a close bond between Africa and the University of Chicago, the graduates of which are scattered among many of the new African nations. I am happy to announce that at the university's recent convocation a doctorate for the first time was awarded a woman from Nigeria. This is especially interesting because the director of the American AID mission in Nigeria, his assistant and the program director, with their wives, all are graduates of the University of Chicago. I envision Nigeria as one of the great nations of the world in the foreseeable future.

Dr. Banta of Nyasaland, whom I place high on my list of African leaders who are building on the African Continent an enduring fortress of freedom and human dignity, is a former student at the University of Chicago.

I am extending my remarks to include the following news article from the Hyde Park Herald of May 15, 1963:

EARNS FIRST DOCTORATE EVER AWARDED NIGERIAN WOMAN

The first Nigerian woman to become a doctor of philosophy earned the Ph. D. degree here at the University of Chicago.

Grace Alele, 30, 1414 East 59th was awarded the degree in comparative education at the university's 301st convocation.

President George Wells Beadle, 5955 University, in ceremonies at Rockefeller Memorial Chapel, handed her the diploma and bid her "welcome to the community of scholars."

Miss Alele, who has remained here this spring, plans to return to her native country to train teachers.

She wrote her dissertation on "The Dynamics of Education in the Birth of a New Nation: Case Study of Nigeria."

Raised in the delta region of western Nigeria, Miss Alele attended elementary school in the town of Marri. She went to Queens College in Lagos for her secondary education and then entered the University of Ibadan where she earned two degrees—a BA in general studies and a BA honors in mathematics, awarded her through an external examination by the University of London.

Miss Alele did her graduate work under the guidance of C. Arnold Anderson 5650 Dorchester. He said her dissertation was "a most interesting and informative assessment of the social factors influencing the development of education in Nigeria."

He added that "her study also throws considerable light upon the key role that educated men have played in the emergence of the Nigerian Nation and upon the contrasting influence of American and British educated men."

Miss Alele's mother, Mrs. Mary Alele, who lives in Warri, Nigeria, is a former elementary school teacher. Her brother John is a practicing attorney in Lagos. A second brother Christian, is senior registrar at Lagos University teaching hospital.

U.N. Special Session—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, recently listed some of the accomplishments of the United Nations in keeping the peace over the years. The current special session of the General Assembly seeks agreement on a formula for sharing the costs of this vital work.

In a message to the people of Sweden on April 30, 1963, the Secretary General stated, in part, as follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS AS A FORCE FOR PEACE

The United Nations has responded in a practical way to a variety of crises in its 18 years of existence, and has, in the process, developed practices and precedents which have greatly enlarged its capacity to deal with emergencies.

One of the most encouraging of the pragmatic developments that I have mentioned has been the increasing use of the military personnel of member states for the maintenance of the peace in various parts of the world under United Nations auspices and the adaptation of the military art to the task of maintaining the peace.

Methods of using military personnel productively on a far smaller scale than is envisaged in the charter have been evolving since the early years of the United Nations. These relatively modest enterprises have all been directed to the control of explosive situations before they get out of hand and spread. In Greece in 1947 and 1948 the military attachés of the members of the United Nations Commission proved themselves invaluable as an observer group in checking on infiltration into Greece from her northern neighbors. In Kashmir, an observer group of military officers was formally set up by the Security Council and is still operating.

The first truce agreements in the Palestine war in July 1948 were enforced on the ground by some 700 United Nations military observers working under the United Nations mediator and his chief of staff. This team later developed into the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization after the conclusion of the armistice agreements between Israel and her Arab neighbors in 1949. This organization played, and is still playing, a vital role in keeping the peace in the Middle East and in regulating frontier incidents in such a way that they do not develop into much more serious conflicts.

A far larger scale and more unusual international peacekeeping organism was evoked by the critical situation which arose in October 1956 following the armed intervention in the Suez Canal area of the forces of

Israel, France, and the United Kingdom—the creation of a United Nations police and peacekeeping force, the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East, which allowed for a peaceful withdrawal from Egyptian soil of the armed forces of France, the United Kingdom, and Israel, and the clearance of the vital waterway—the Suez Canal. The Force still watches over the peace on the once troubled frontier between Israel and the United Arab Republic. It presents one major problem—it is so useful and necessary that it is hard to envisage a date when it can be withdrawn from the area.

The Lebanon crisis of 1958 evoked another kind of United Nations military organization, a corps of 600 observers to watch over the borders of Lebanon for foreign infiltration, but it was in July 1960 that the United Nations was confronted with its most complex and pressing peacekeeping task to date.

So much has been written about the Congo and the United Nations involvement there in the past 2½ years that I shall do no more here than to mention the general proportions of this problem, which have a tendency to be obscured by a wealth of dramatic and controversial detail. On the appeal for help by the new Government of the Congo, the United Nations, literally at a few hours notice, undertook to be the guarantor of law and order, and the watchman against external interference from many sources. It also became the counsellor of a newly independent state which had had little preparation for independence, on all the problems that beset a country the size of Western Europe, which occupies a vital, strategic, and economic place in the world, and which, by its very potential wealth and possibilities, is a target for a bewildering variety of foreign interests.

There is still a long and difficult road ahead both for the Government and people of the Congo and for the United Nations which is assisting them, but given the fearsome complexity of the problem and the crosscurrents and conflicts of interests at all levels, from the global level to the tribal level, which afflict the Republic of the Congo, it is remarkable that this pioneering effort by the community of nations has not only saved one of its members, the Congo, in its time of trial, but has turned a situation of great potential danger to Africa and to the world into a most promising experiment in world responsibility. Sweden has done more than its share in the support of this historic effort.

Another operation, also involving an unprecedented role for the United Nations, has meanwhile passed off peacefully and successfully and, as is the rule with successful peacekeeping operations, has attracted virtually no publicity whatsoever. It has in fact been successfully and formally concluded on this very day. I refer to the transfer of West Irian from Dutch sovereignty, through an interim period of United Nations administration safeguarded by a United Nations force, to the sovereignty of Indonesia, the entire operation taking place with the mutual agreement of the parties concerned. This is the first time in history that an international organization has assumed direct administrative authority for a territory in the process of historic transition.

I hope that the United Nations operations I have mentioned may, in their modest way, be a pointer in the right direction and an encouragement in the constructive future use of the military art. They are the first gropings, imperfect admittedly, toward the kind of international authority which is one of the inescapable conditions of agreed disarmament.

I said last year at Uppsala that the United Nations must ultimately develop in the same way as sovereign states have done, and that, if it is to have a future, it must eventually assume some of the attributes of a state. It must have the right, the power, and the means to keep the peace. We are only in the beginning and the process will surely take several generations. But the peacekeeping operations already conducted by the United Nations provide the hope that we are on the road to these essential developments.

Air Rate Issues Loom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, for 11 years the transpacific air-route case has been in progress, with several starts, stops, and false hopes raised along the way. The outcome of this case is of high interest to people residing in all parts of the country, but it is of particular interest to those on the west coast, whose cities serve as gateways to the far corners of the Pacific.

We of the Northwest have been watching the progress of this case with keen interest because a change in the pattern of air service in the Pacific could greatly enhance the U.S. ability to improve American-flag service for all Pacific air travelers and shippers. Three years ago a Civil Aeronautics Board examiner filed a report with the CAB with specific recommendations which would greatly strengthen the economy of the Northwest and better suit the convenience of the traveling public as a whole. Unfortunately, a change in administration precluded bringing this recommendation to its final conclusion, as such recommendations require Presidential approval.

The case is again before the Civil Aeronautics Board and has been reopened for updated testimony. I hope there will be speedy action in bringing this case to a conclusion along the lines urged by the CAB examiner.

Mr. Speaker, an informative editorial on this subject appeared in the May 19 issue of the Seattle Times and, under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD:

AIR-ROUTE ISSUES LOOM

Last week the 11-year-old transpacific air-route case returned to the public eye when the Civil Aeronautics Board permitted attorneys for concerned airlines and communities to add new arguments to thousands of pages of testimony already accumulated.

Recently, the Kennedy administration promulgated a general policy governing U.S. oversea commercial airline operations.

These and related air-route developments should be watched carefully for their impact on both the national and local economies.

From the national viewpoint, there is reason for concern in the growth of subsidized, nationalized foreign airlines at the expense of American carriers.

Locally, Seattle must be alert to threats to the city's air-gateway status in an era when technological advancements are changing the world's air maps.

The administration's newly pronounced air policy seeks to strengthen the United States' competitive position by a modified "one-around-the-world-carrier" concept, under which Pan American World Airways would have access to world markets on—in the words of the policy statement—"a scale comparable to that of the flag carriers or combinations of carriers of other major civil-aviation powers."

The policy does permit other American airlines to continue to be authorized to serve certain oversea areas in competition with the single U.S. global carrier.

This point touches directly on the issues involved in the long-drawn-out transpacific route case.

An attorney for Northwest Orient Airlines last week urged the board to drop the whole case on the grounds that the public is well served by the existing Pacific route structure.

It cannot be disputed that much of the evidence accumulated in the case now is out of date.

But if the CAB does decide to change the Pacific pattern, a readymade blueprint is at hand. This is the report filed nearly 3 years ago by a CAB examiner who recommended, among other things, that Pan American be permitted to make traffic stops at Seattle on North Pacific flights between California and the Orient, and that Northwest be allowed access to the Central Pacific route to the Orient.

Such changes would improve Seattle's air-gateway status and provide better American-flag service for all Pacific air travelers and shippers.

As such, they represent a fortunate blending of national and local interests.

A Golden Fiscal Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, numerous economic reports and analyses have been received in recent weeks which indicate the recession predicted by some administraiton spokesmen has not developed and that the economy is in a substantially sound condition, witnessing considerable growth.

Since this development contradicts the expectations and motivations for many of the administration policies, the thought has occurred to many that a change in New Frontier philosophy would be in order.

This thought has been very well expressed in an article by Columnist Richard Wilson in the Wednesday Washington Evening Star, which I place into the RECORD at this point, feeling it speaks for itself, containing practical, constructive suggestions for the President:

A GOLDEN FISCAL OPPORTUNITY

(By Richard Wilson)

If President Kennedy were to follow his own formula of dynamic, and adjustable, leadership he would go before Congress and say something like this:

"When I last addressed you in January, conditions were different than today. We could not then foresee clearly the rising strength of the economy. It is, in any case, difficult to peer 18 months into the future as we must do in the formulation of a Federal budget.

"We see now, however, a heartening rise in most of the reliable business indicators on a scale likely to carry well into next year if not beyond.

"I saw in January, as I see now, the necessity of a general reduction in taxation to release the brake on economic growth.

"But the improved economic outlook no longer justifies a rate of Federal spending to produce a $12 billion deficit as a spur for increased economic activity.

"It is still relatively early in the Congressional session. Action has not been taken on most of the appropriations bills. I believe that the Congress would be justified in cutting on the average of 5 to 10 percent from the original budget submissions except in those areas where the Federal Government has fixed obligations."

Unfortunately, there is no sign that Mr. Kennedy will make such an address to Congress. But he would do so if he carried out his own ideas of a flexible response to changing conditions in the process of using executive powers to control the economic climate.

On the contrary, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, hails the improved economic prospects as likely to so increase Government tax revenues that the prospective $12 billion budget deficit will be cut by $1 billion. It would be possible to cut it much more by a sensible attitude toward Government expenditures in every field, including foreign aid, space, and defense.

When he addressed Congress on January 15, Mr. Kennedy proposed to pour more money into the national economy and take proportionately less out. Now there is certainly less economic justification for the planned deficit program than in January, and every justification for the adoption of stabilizing economic policies.

Moreover, there is more reason now, with the increased economic activity, to believe that lowered rates of taxation might result in increased Government revenues.

Mr. Kennedy thus has at this moment a golden opportunity to move away from the huge planned deficit of January into a soberer and sounder program of spending and taxation.

He appears to be caught, however, as he has been in other instances, in the webs of his own rhetoric. He has anticipated, in hard-to-swallow syntax, conditions that did not materialize. He tends to become frozen into doctrinaire positions from which he has difficulty receding, perhaps because he has formulated them so well in words.

The idea of a "sophisticated" Western Europe approach to planned deficits on a large scale is one of these fixations, in spite of new evidence that these doctrines are getting the Western Europeans into trouble.

France, at the moment, is going through a painful economic period of adjustment and reaction to its planned deficits policies. Business credit is being curbed, prices are being frozen, retail profit margins limited, and income taxes increased in a convulsion that adversely affects the popularity of General de Gaulle's grand economic design.

Mr. Kennedy can not longer point with any satisfaction to Western European economic policies as an example for the United States.

Inability to perceive and respond quickly and accurately to changing economic trends is the inner weakness of the modified economic planning policies which appeal to President Kennedy. His predecessor, Mr. Eisenhower, no genius in economic matters, erred perhaps on the side of not responding at all in the conviction that conditions would probably have changed before his action could have its effect.

Mr. Kennedy's attitude is, in part, a reaction against the Eisenhower let-it-alone policy, but the President need not be controlled by such compulsive feelings.

He could act now, promptly and surely, toward more rational fiscal policies, which probably would be heartily welcomed in Congress and make his way easier in his entire legislative program.

Israel's Concern Over Arab Buildup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include a dispatch in the Christian Science Monitor of May 22, 1963, from the oversea editor of that newspaper, writing from Jerusalem. The dispatch follows:

Israel Alerts United States on Arabs

(By Henry S. Hayward)

JERUSALEM.—Israel has no doubt of American good intentions in the Middle East—but it is deeply concerned lest the United States wrongly interpret what Egyptian President Nasser is capable of doing.

"Remember Cuba," an Israel official pointed out. "America came perilously close to being fooled by Castro and the Soviet rockets—and Cuba is so close to your country it is an offshore island.

"So how can Washington be so positive it is correct about Nasser's true intentions here in the far-off Middle East?"

Comments such as this epitomize the gnawing apprehension over Arab—particularly Egyptian—military potential which one hears expressed over and over again by ordinary Israel people, by government sources, and by Premier David Ben-Gurion himself.

MILITARY CAPABILITY OBSERVED

They say things like this:

When did anyone else have it so good as President Nasser? He has United States economic aid, Soviet military aid, and German scientists. What other nation, except nonalined India, has received aid like this from both East and West? they ask.

How can Israelis trust Mr. Nasser when he speaks openly in his book and in speeches of obliterating their country? Why not believe him? After all, he is getting, or already possesses, the military wherewithal.

By this means they remind a visitor that the Cairo regime now has ground-to-ground rockets allegedly capable of reaching all Israel territory in a matter of seconds, plus bombers (Soviet TU–16's) which could be over Israel cities and defense zones within 6 minutes from their Sinai bases.

Israel, on the other hand, has no known military rockets (aside from promised U.S. Hawks, which are short-range, defensive ground-to-air missiles) and no bombers, although it has excellent French Mirage 3's to counterbalance Egypt's MIG 21's (and expected MIG 23's).

QUICK WAR HELD POSSIBLE

They add that Arab Legion tanks, in theory at least, could push across the narrow waist of Israel at Natanya, where it is only 12 miles wide, in half an hour, thereby cutting the country in half and splitting industrial Tel Aviv from the main port of Haifa.

Any war Israel starts or wins will not be the last war with the Arabs. Israel has neither the desire nor the potential to wipe out some 30 million Arabs and take title to their vast territories. The Arabs, by contrast, would start every attack upon Israel as a war of annihilation whose optimum objective would be utterly to destroy the Israel State and its 2 million people.

Informed and serious Israel experts are apparently honestly convinced it is latent and implied in every Nasser move, in every commitment to the Arab world, that another all-out Arab attack sooner or later will be launched. They simply cannot believe the Egyptian leader will choose the peaceful course—or that he will be too preoccupied with building Arab unity to make war on Israel for years to come.

"The moment he has the necessary arms and is convinced he can win, he will attack," I was told repeatedly during the course of a 2-week tour of Israel.

At the root of the Arab-Israel trouble today is the fact that in Jerusalem and Tel Aviv Mr. Nasser seems to tower like a powerful new Goliath, larger than life. That he actually is beset by problems with quarrelsome neighbors and has 23 million hungry mouths at home to consider does not register here.

NOTICE TO NASSER ADVOCATED

The distorting mirror likewise makes Arabs regard tiny Israel—variously compared in size to Massachusetts or New Jersey, Belgium or Wales—as constituting a tremendous threat to their future, as a military giant able to cut through Arab forces like butter, backed by all the might of the United States and the American press. Yet Israel itself thinks it is badly neglected and poorly equipped in all these departments.

What then does Israel recommend the United States should do to preserve peace in the Middle East that it has not already done? This question I asked many times, and the following is the essence of the replies:

Israel feels Mr. Nasser should be put on definite notice that if he alone or a group of Arab powers attacks another Middle Eastern nation, the United States will come to the aid of the nation attacked.

It is Mr. Ben-Gurion's publicly expressed opinion that if the United States and the Soviet Union would tell Mr. Nasser to make peace with Israel, emphasizing that there would be no more arms forthcoming, that there should be no more threats of obliterating the Jewish national state, then the Egyptian leader would have no alternative but to comply.

Legitimate Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, recently the New York World-Telegram & Sun published an excellent editorial on the question of propriety of Members of Congress holding Reserve or National Guard commissions. A resolution recently introduced by two of our colleagues in this body and also by the other body calls for a judiciary inquiry into the matter. It is high time such an inquiry takes place. I commend the New York World-Telegram & Sun for its timely editorial:

Legitimate Question

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, who also is a Reserve Air Force major general, believes there is a legitimate question whether a Member of Congress can, with propriety, also hold military rank.

The framers of the Constitution specifically provided that "no person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House."

They also made Congress the sole judge of its own membership.

Until recent years, Congress consistently ruled that Members could not retain their seats if they accepted military commissions. Virginia's fiery John Randolph successfully demanded expulsion of a fellow Member who violated this precept. There must be, Randolph told the Seventh Congress, "no shadow of executive influence" on the Hill.

Some 175 Congressmen today hold Reserve or National Guard commissions. Reservists have their own congressional training units. Three Congressmen are Reserve major generals. Two congressional staff members are Reserve brigadiers.

Congress has apparently just drifted into this state of affairs. If nothing else, it dramatically highlights the change in national moods and attitudes.

The Senate has ordered its Judiciary Committee to begin an inquiry into the matter.

Nobody suggests reservist-Congressmen are up to anything illegal or immoral. It is only important that the proper committees consider the matter and report promptly.

A legitimate question has been raised and needs answering.

Mother Alberta, Humanitarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, our hearts go out always to those whose efforts are directed toward serving their fellow man. We have seen the universal acceptance and admiration for such American endeavors as project *Hope* and the Peace Corps. Yet, antedating these noble causes has been the dedicated and often unknown work of men and women of the church. And it is about one of these fine people that I would like to talk today: Mother Alberta, of Newark, N.J., and Africa.

Mother Alberta was born in Newark, N.J., where she attended St. Lucy's Grammar School. During her early schooldays she was known to be a fun-loving tomboy—who put aside her baseball bat and gloves to enter a convent at the age of 14. She graduated from St. John's Villa in Staten Island and furthered her education at Fordham University. She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Albert Stango. Her parents left Italy during their childhood and have resided in Newark, N.J., up to the present time.

Mother Alberta was called to the Religious Life in the Congregation of the Sisters of St. John the Baptist, and spent 4 years in New York doing parish work. From her early youth, Mother Alberta demonstrated a great human quality—a sincere dedication to the welfare of others.

As a missionary nun of the St. Francis Mission, she has spent the last 14 years in Northern Rhodesia. What started as a simple mission—the first of its kind in this part of Africa—is now a full grown orphanage-clinic-school. Under her guidance a school for homecraft has been established and a religious novitiate has been set up for girls. There, in deep Africa, she has worked tirelessly and has cared for and ministered to thousands of people. Her day begins at 5 o'clock in the morning when she rises and together with the six nuns on her staff, ends the day's work at 10 o'clock at night.

In her dedication, she is unmindful of physical dangers, remarking in an interview, during a visit here about 2½ years ago when she returned here as Mother Superior:

> The leopards and elephants stay pretty much away from us, but we worry about the snakes.

She further stated that—

> We need penicillin more than anything else. Our clinic, at which we have a nun who is a graduate nurse, has 50 to 60 patients a day. At our school we have 200 children.
>
> We have 20 orphans living with us. Their mothers died in childbirth.

Mother Alberto left this message before her leave to return to Africa, "There is much to be done—but we are making progress."

A short time ago, Mother Alberta was honored by Amita, Inc., of New York, rereceiving the award of humanitarian of the year.

Amita was founded in 1956, by Lucile De George, for the purpose of giving public recognition to American women of Italian background for conspicuous service to their communities and nation. In the past, outstanding women in science, medicine, business, arts, education and the Armed Services have been among the recipients of the award. But the award to Mother Alberta was the first to one who has so dedicated her life to improving the lot in life of a people far from her native soil.

I believe that the nobility of this gracious lady is best captured by her own words, in responding to her notification of the award:

> I really don't know where to start to thank the Amita for their kindness in giving me the Amita Award.
>
> The reason I consented to have my name put in, was with the hope that through this, many people would get to know of our mission and the many works, and maybe would be inspired to help. There are many generous and big hearts that would only be too willing to help if they knew the need was great.
>
> There are many things missionaries could do if the funds were available. I do sincerely hope that through this, our mission will be known, and not poor little me. I have derived more peace and happiness than I could ever wish for.
>
> May God bless you for the wonderful work you are doing.

For an insight into the unusual nature of some of the circumstances faced by Mother Alberta and her fellow Sisters in carrying out their work, I would like to read into the RECORD a story by Sandy Constantinople, which appeared in a recent issue of the Italian Tribune, published in Newark:

HEAVEN KNOWS MOTHER ALBERTA

Many of us have heard or read about Mother Alberta of the African Mission, and many of us have been fortunate enough to know her personally. But I'm sure after reading Fr. Sylvester Bruggeman's story about one of her adventures, anyone would certainly recognize her in a crowd even without an introduction. She is the daughter of Albert Stango of Clifton Avenue, Newark. Today this brave Nun can be found tearing around in the jungle and brush as if she were walking in a convent garden. "Mother Alberta" is one of the Baptistine Sisters who conduct the hospital at the mission in Chingola and who do such marvelous work among the Africans there. She has a magnetic personality, is always happy and gay, pleasant and calm even under the most trying circumstances. Her physical appearance is also impressive and there is enough of her to command attention in any group. This last remark may not sound very gallant but actually her stature plays a very important part in the grand missionary work which she accomplishes. But let's get on with the story. A short time ago news came from the Sisters at St. Francis Mission in Solwezi that they were in dire need of supplies for the hospital there. It was an emergency call and Mother Alberta answered it in the only way she knew. Loading the supplies herself, and Sisters Zelia and Mary Magdalene into the car, she blithely took off on the 120-mile trip. The new Solwezi road was still in good condition but no one would advise a group of Sisters to set out on a tour, even a mercy errand, through the jungle, as though they were starting on a picnic over a super-highway in the States. The trip to Solwezi was uneventful but when they started back, the picture changed completely. About 10 miles from the mission, where the termite-eaten logs serve as bridges across the three rivers, a bit of smoke was noticed coming from the engine.

While resting one ample elbow on the steering wheel, after careful study, said Mother Alberta to Sisters Zelia and Mary Magdalene: "'Tis steam." Upon opening the door to the engine (I am using sister terminology), they say that the pipe from the radiator to the engine was split open and the radiator was empty. Sister Mary Magdalene, this being her very first trip through dangerous wilds, exclaimed: "What shall we do?" Mother Alberta withered her with the look of a veteran of many mishaps in the bush. "We shall pray. Prayer has always been better than a knowledge of cars." So they prayed. Three minutes later an African came along on his bicycle. "Car is sickey, sickey? Me fix." With pieces of tree bark, strips of a Sister's apron and mud, he fixed. "But me better go along 5 miles to the village of Chief Capijimbanca where we fix better. I can bring things?" Whereupon he unfolded to the horrified gaze of the sisters the fresh hide of a newly killed leopard, complete with head. Mother Alberta convinced him that it would be better to leave the hide and the bicycle there in the bushes. When they had the car fixed at the village, the sisters would drive him back to his hiding place. But alas, long before they reached the village they discovered that mud and bark and parts of aprons do not restrain steam. Hoping that the car would hold together, they continued on their way and in the middle of clouds of smoke, they came to a stop in front of the chief's house. Chief Capijimbanca was very courteous and hospitable. First, the sisters had to sit down and have a cup of tea. Then the chief offered the use of his car and driver to the sisters for a trip to Solwezi Boma town, to locate a new pipe for the radiator. Since it was now dark and people in those parts have been known to borrow parts of cars, Sister Zelia volunteered to stay with the car at the house of the chief while the other two went pipe hunting. In the town, the two sisters knocked on door after door with no success. Either the occupants were not at home or they had no pipe. Finally Mother Alberta decided to return 30 miles to St. Francis Mission and there discuss the situation with the fathers in the morning.

But a few miles from Solwezi town they noticed a bright light shining through the trees. Telling the driver to wait, they left the car to go on foot to the house. Having no flashlight they stumbled along until they aroused the dogs. With great bellowing and snarls these animals were holding them at bay and ready to tear them limb from limb. Said Mother Alberta to Sister Mary Magdalene: "Tis dangerous." Replied Sister Mary Magdalene from her place of safety behind Mother Alberta, "Tis indeed."

To crown a remarkable career of unselfish accomplishment, Mother Alberta hopes to someday build a convent in northern Rhodesia.

I am sure that my colleagues will join with me in adding our tribute to the brave, dedicated, humble and bright-spirited Sisters, who work in lands beyond normal communications under conditions that would be difficult for even soldiers, asking no reward other than success in their labors.

Victory for Farmers—Defeat for Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, now that the wheat farmers of America have rejected the administration's wheat program, it is incumbent upon the Congress to take the necessary steps to correct its past mistakes.

I commend to my colleagues the following editorial from today's issue of the Chicago Tribune:

VICTORY FOR FARMERS; DEFEAT FOR KENNEDY

The Kennedy administration's farm policy has been dealt a crushing defeat by the landslide referendum vote of the wheat farmers against the plan to impose strict Federal controls on them in return for high prices. The extent of the defeat can be measured by the fact that not only did the administration's proposal fail to win the required two-thirds majority, but failed to gain even a simple majority. All the important wheat States rejected it, and only 47.8 percent of the total vote favored it.

The results and the record outpouring of voters that produced them are clear indication that farmers overwhelmingly oppose the type of dictatorial management the administration sought to force on them. For this, they are to be congratulated and commended by taxpayers and consumers. The Kennedy plan would have made wheat farmers permanent fixtures on the Federal payroll. The vote showed farmers don't want it that way.

It took courage to vote "no," knowing it might mean only $1 a bushel for wheat, when a "yes" vote would have brought a guarantee of $2 a bushel. The big "no" vote should dispel any lingering doubts among those few city people who might regard farmers as a greedy lot, willing to vote their pocketbook and exchange their freedom to farm for a check from the Federal Treasury.

As the only foe of the Kennedy plan among major farm groups, the American Farm Bureau Federation deserves much credit for its all-out fight against the price fixers and interventionists in and out of government. Its president, Charles B. Shuman, can consider as an accolade the derisive nickname, One Buck Charley, which opponents hung on him. Only the farm bureau accurately gaged the mood of the farmers.

Having failed for 2 years to get its phony supply management policies through Congress, the administration's strategy was to put the issue directly up to farmers in the obvious belief they would accept it. It rigged the referendum for a "yes" vote by establishing an unreasonably wide disparity in the choice of prices, then proceeded to mount a propaganda campaign that was a scandalous waste of taxpayers' money and a shameful misuse of the administration's power and prestige.

But the administration misjudged the wheat farmers, just as it did the turkey growers last year when they soundly trounced a Federal control scheme in a referendum.

The responsibility of Congress is clear. It should enact new legislation, not to "bail out" farmers but to correct its own mistake. The legislation ought to provide protection aaginst the economic hardship that might befall many if prices are allowed to drop to $1 a bushel and should have the ultimate objective of getting the Government out of farming. The farm bureau's proposals for such a program, long ignored by Democratic leaders, now deserves a fair hearing.

In the wake of the vote, President Kennedy, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, and other administration leaders have reiterated that they won't support new legislation. Senator ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, even carried his pique so far as to assert he will do all in his power to prevent a new law.

Congress should ignore such soreheads. It has a mandate from wheat farmers and should proceed to act on it.

More Money Down the Drain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Area Redevelopment Act has been in effect for almost a year with very little resultant employment and at prohibitive cost.

The Rules Committee has just cleared another authorization bill of almost half a billion dollars to continue this boondoggle. In the Atlanta Journal, of May 21, Alan Emory summarizes some of the reasons why this bill will operate as just another slush fund for the President and his political friends:

GOP GUNS LOADED FOR ARA BATTLE

(By Alan Emory)

WASHINGTON, May 21.—Republicans are preparing to give one of the Kennedy adminisration's favorite programs—Area Redevelopment (ARA)—a real going-over in Congress.

The administration has proposed authorizing another $455,500,000, and Republicans in the House are fighting mad. The GOP says 24 percent of the loans approved between July 1, 1962, and March 25, 1963, went to finance motels and hotels. They claim that was never the intent of Congress.

The ARA program is designed to help private firms provide jobs in areas of high unemployment and to assist in fiancing public facilities in these areas.

One distressed area listed is Mineral County, Nev., where the median family income is $5,946 a year. The county's population went up 13.8 percent between 1950 and 1960, while in the county seat, the town of Hawthorne, it rose 52 percent.

ARA granted $75,200 to help modernize the Hawthorne Municipal Airport, providing five new jobs, and local newspaper reports said the important part of the airport's business was derived from visitors who came to gamble at the Hawthorne Casino.

The Republicans cite a February 1 loan to the Ponchartrain Hotel in Detroit for $1,894,525 to help finance a 432-unit motor hotel. The idea was to provide 450 new jobs.

Detroit's hotel occupancy rate last year was only 54 percent, and the GOP predicted the new facility would not add a single hotel job in the city.

Another hot spot is a proposed ARA loan for a $2 million plant to process soybeans into poultry feed in Dorchester County, Md. The area's share of the poultry business has slumped to less than 10 percent, while Georgia, Alabama, and other States with cheaper access to feed have picked up.

One report quoted area grain and soybean dealers as saying more than 25 full-time grain dealers and helpers would be thrown out of work, while the new plant would employ only 22 persons.

Of the money for public facility grants, almost one-third went for a convention auditorium in Duluth, Minn., "to supplement convention, entertainment, recreation and cultural facilities." The cost of the 22 permanent jobs figures out to $277,272 per job.

Although the Democrats maintain the program has helped many communities and States, the Republicans will battle to prevent authorizing any more money on these grounds:

1. For every $2 of aid going into hard-core industrial depressed areas $3 is going into loosely designated rural areas of lesser need.

2. ARA has used only 21.6 percent of money authorized for urban area loans, only 20.6 percent for nonurban area loans, 25.1 percent of public facility loan money, 22 percent of public facility grant money and still has on hand percent of the annual authorization for technical aid.

Sonny Writes to His Mother in Heaven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, while Mother's Day of 1963 is still fresh in our minds, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following article from the May 9 North Hennepin Post, published in Minnesota's Third District.

H. O. Sonnesyn, the editor of this and three other papers and the author of this "Letter to Mother," is one of those thoughtful humanitarians who is not ashamed to openly express those ideals, customs, and values in our society which we cherish so dearly.

He is a shining example to the youth of today as a man who truly honored his parents while they were living, and honors their memory in death. The article follows:

SONNY WRITES TO HIS MOTHER IN HEAVEN

Dear Mother: "her children arise up, and call her blessed; her husband also, and he praiseth her—Proverbs 31: 28."

I do not know of a more appropriate passage from the Good Book to use in paying tribute to my own late mother and to all other mothers, living or dead.

I think the custom of each year setting aside the second Sunday in May to honor mothers is a beautiful one. Mothers are the ambassadors of God. The little tribute we can pay them is certainly deserved.

I can hardly believe it is now nearly 33 years ago since our family doctor, Dr. W. W. Will at Bertha, Minn., called me and said your brave and courageous heart had stopped beating and you had taken the final journey from which no person returns.

One of the most vivid recollections in my mind is the last time I saw you alive. Because your speech had been affected you had for months been practicing on pronouncing my name. You tried so hard between the tears of both of us to pronounce it when I did arrive home. It was not quite perfect, but to me it sounded like heavenly music sung by the angels.

Because of your illness and so they could more easily comb it, they had bobbed your hair. Bobbed hair was just then becoming the vogue. Although your means of communication were limited, you made me understand you wanted to know if my new girl friend, Marg, also bobbed her hair. I told you she did. Then you put your fingers up to your mouth to indicate you wanted to know if she smoked. I told you she did not and you nodded your head up and down and made me understand you were very pleased.

As you know I have since married her. Mrs. Sophie Stussy, her mother, joined that celestial mother's club of which you are a member, 3 years ago. New members are joining it each day.

We have been very happy since our marriage and both believe you two have blessed our little home. We pray for both of you each night. Marg has taken over in caring for me where you left off.

Only a few weeks ago Mrs. Fred Miner, our next door neighbor, joined your mother's club. I am sure that by this time you have met her and heard about the many good times the ladies in our block had during their coffee breaks. It was rather mindful of you because you loved nothing better than to have neighbors drop in for coffee.

I sat in the church in Clarissa, where we resided for so many years among those fine people and saw those who loved you so well pass by the casket to review your remains. There was genuine grief and sorrow expressed on their faces because all of them loved you.

I again sat at the second services in the little Prairie Queen Church near Nunda, S. Dak., in which as a young girl you sang in the choir. They sang some of your favorite numbers, "Den Stora Hvide Flok" ("The Large White Flock"), "The Little Brown Church," "Beautiful Saviour," and "A Mighty Fortress Is Our God." I can still remember your beautiful soprano voice. I am sure you are today a member of the Heavenly Chorus.

I was a little bitter against nearly everything after you died. A calmer and far more enjoyable form of living has replaced those former thoughts. I suddenly came to realize this was not the way you would have wanted me to honor your memory. I also realized I could not follow out the precepts you taught me unless I changed my attitude.

You loved people and never wanted to hurt anyone. I remember one particular summer when you entertained three Ladies' Aids of our town—your own and two others—because you did not want any of them to think they were being slighted.

You had a deep respect for all religions. The greater part of my conception of religion was learned from you. As a young girl you were reared in the religious faith of your parents, which was to become your lifelong religion. After you left home as a young girl you were employed by, and lived with a member of another faith, until your marriage to dad. You never forgot how kindly they treated you and never tried to interfere with your religion.

You believed and taught me all men and women could be good neighbors and friends regardless of race, creed, or color. You emphasized I should always have a deep respect for the other man's religion, but at the same time should demand equal respect for my own faith. You taught me God created man in His own image.

I often marveled at your knowledge of religion. I guess most mothers are like that. You taught me it was not necessary to be sissy in order to pray or lead a life based on His teachings. You taught me to pray.

You told me many times prayer was the contact with God to ask Him for guidance and foregiveness of any sins I had committed. You told me God had a lot of things to do and He could not listen exclusively to my prayers. You told me I would have to do a few things myself.

We prayed at our home. We were taught to say grace before meals, give thanks for our food and ask Him to bless it. We held family devotions on many occasions. There was always a Bible in our home. There are today many homes which do not have one.

I am thankful to both you and dad for bringing me the facts of life at an early age. Knowing my devotion for you, dad emphasized how badly you would feel if I became involved in some offcolor incident. You explained that when I was on a date I should behave like I would want other fellows to behave when they were out with my sister. It was good reasoning and far more effective than a long dissertation on the subject would have been.

You never had any training in medicine. Yet you knew how to bandage bruised knees, stubbed toes that had been hurt when I went barefooted. You made babies out of us all when there was the slightest touch of an ailment. Where did you learn all these things? Is that part of the makeup of every mother?

You had a way with animals. Of all the dogs we ever owned, and we owned a lot of them as well as cats over the years, Liberty was your favorite. Dad bought his first Liberty bond on the day he brought Liberty home. We at first called him Liberty Bond, but that was shortened to Liberty.

Like your son he was nuts about baking powder biscuits you made. One day while you were carrying in the summer wood, you gave him a stick to carry up to the house. You rewarded him with a baking power biscuit. Just a few moments later, you heard him scratch on the door. He was back with some more wood. From that time on he used that trick to get his biscuits. He was devoted to you and when he was not digging for gophers or chasing rabbits was always with you. I can't remember he was ever successful in any of his hunting expeditions of which he made many into adjoining open spaces.

You were the kind of housewife who could make your home shine. For many years you made all of your own clothes and later those for my sisters and even a few articles of wear for me.

And lady, you had class. Everything you wore looked nice and neat. You had dark hair, which was slightly graying when you died. You had snappy black eyes. When you were trying to conceal your amusement after I had told you a story, you had the habit of covering your mouth with your hand and looking down on the floor. You never fooled me, you rascal.

It was not until we arrived at Clarissa that my sister, Cora, came to live with us. I was only 6 years old when she was expected. You told me I was going to have either a sister or brother soon. I will have to confess I was not much impressed when you showed me the little bundle of flesh that had just arrived.

As much as I objected there were times in later years I had to take my little sister with me on sleigh rides and to other functions. She turned out to be a wonderful sister.

If you were living today you would not only be a grandmother, but also a great-grandmother. Cliff, Cora's husband, is no longer with us on this planet. He, too, was called to the Great Beyond. He was good to your daughter and a splendid family pro-

I don't know what Heaven looks like because I have never heard it described. Neither have I ever read anything about what it looks like. Yet I know there is an afterworld that is glorious because you told me there was one. You never lied.

You were not an unreasonable parent. You did demand discipline and a proper respect for our parents and all of God's laws. That was why your two children always respected your word and listened to your advice.

Aunt Laura, your youngest sister, is still with us. She always reminded me of you. Both of you had many of the same characteristics. When we get talking about old times and the big liar Uncle Ole was, we both have to laugh. They were innocent lies and never hurt anyone. Although he was a bachelor, who died at the age of 91 years, I still remember how he shocked grandmother when he came home from North Dakota, where he had been working that summer, and told her he had been married for many years and had a daughter.

Greet everyone I know up there, Mother O'Mine. I have in this letter tried to pay tribute to not only you but to all mothers. I believe mothers are made out of a special mold by God. If you were here today I would take you out to Sunday dinner May 12. We would also invite Soph and Mrs. Miner. I think all mothers, particularly the living ones, should be fussed about on May 12.

Although you have gone, to me you are still alive and as vivid in my memories as if you were standing at my desk today. I shall always cherish the days I spent with you. I know you will forgive me for any trouble I may have caused you. I love you more as each year goes by.

Love,

YOUR SON.

Mr. Larry E. Doyle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, last evening in Philadelphia my good friend and constituent, L. E. Doyle, was installed as president of Sales and Marketing Executives—International. This is a distinct honor and one in which I share his pride. In inserting these remarks in the RECORD I attempt to show Larry Doyle just how proud I am of his achievement in this regard and offer my sincere congratulations.

Sales and Marketing Executives—International is a nonprofit organization with more than 30,000 business executive members, organized in 230 clubs in 36 countries of the free world. Larry Doyle is vice president of the sales division of Forest Lawn Memorial Parks, Glendale, Calif., and has been associated with Sales and Marketing Executives—International for the past 23 years. He is recognized as one of the top sales executives throughout the cemetery and mortuary industry. He has also been a leader in his own community and for this reason the honor of the presidency of this fine organization is doubly meaningful.

I reiterate my pride in men like Larry Doyle who contribute to the outstanding quality and character of my 20th Congressional District in California.

The Herbert J. Pascoe Educational Scholarship Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important assists to the youth of America in its achievement of higher education is the foundation. And, one of the most important and outstandingly successful foundations in the State of New Jersey is the Herbert J. Pascoe Educational Scholarship Foundation. Last Sunday, this foundation celebrated its 10th anniversary, and it was my pleasure to extend the following greeting to the members attending the anniversary dinner at the Military Park Hotel in Newark:

> The American foundation is a unique institution which opens doors of opportunity and enriches human existence everywhere. Philanthropy in the field of education is perhaps one of the most rewarding of foundation activities. At the time when education has been termed "our most important national resource," when the extension of educational opportunity is essential to our national goals and to our very survival, private efforts on behalf of education are vitally important to our American way of life.
>
> Thus, it is particularly gratifying to pay tribute to the 10 years of development and success of the Herbert J. Pascoe Educational Scholarship Foundation, which has created wider educational opportunity for deserving young people throughout the State of New Jersey. With your scholarship awards in the field of education which encourage and assist qualified students to enter the noble profession of teaching, you strengthen the school system itself. Your endeavors richly honor the memory of Herbert J. Pascoe, a dedicated public servant who also served the cause of better education.
>
> This decade since your founding has seen a new awareness of the value of education and a growing need for assistance to our schools and young people if we are to maintain our position of leadership in the free world. I am sure you are all familiar with statistics describing the spiraling costs of higher education, the serious shortage of facilities, and the inadequacies of our schools. Vigorous and unceasing efforts at all levels are necessary if we are to complete the tasks confronting us in the future. The interest and support offered by this foundation for both higher education and excellency in teaching will continue to grow even more valuable in this crucial decade ahead.
>
> With a very special pride in my membership in the Herbert J. Pascoe Educational Scholarship Foundation, I send my sincere congratulations for 10 years of fruitful and dedicated activity and good wishes for your continued success.

From England Came a Great Texan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a most distinguished citizen of Texas celebrated his 85th birthday anniversary. He is Mr. Montagu Kingsmill Brown of Pampa, Tex., who, on April 30, 1963, celebrated the anniversary of his 60th year in the Lone Star State.

Montagu Kingsmill Brown, affectionately known to his friends young and old as "M. K.," was born in Eastcote, Middlesex, England, on May 22, 1878, the 7th child of 12 born to Margaret Kingsmill and Thomas Davy Brown. He attended traditional English schools where, in addition to academic courses, he studied music and manners and, among other subjects, how to sit a horse properly—an accomplishment which was to be useful to him in later life.

After completing his education, M. K. went to work in a London bank. Agriculture interested him, and as a young banker he dreamed of leaving England to take up farming in Australia or Canada.

In 1899, the Boer War started in Africa. Queen Victoria sent out a call for recruits. Thus presented with an opportunity for travel and adventure, young M. K. Brown enlisted in early 1900 as a cavalry trooper in the Yorkshire Yoemanry. During distinguished service in Her Majesty's Royal Cavalry in Africa, M.K. rose to the rank of regimental sergeant major. When the war ended in 1902, he returned to the London bank but, after tasting adventure in Africa, found the banking career unsatisfying. The enterprising M. K. Brown landed a job with the English-owned White Deer Land Co. in far-off Pampa, in the Texas Panhandle, and booked freighter passage to the United States, thus beginning a long love affair with his adopted country.

M. K. Brown's ship docked at New Orleans on April 26, 1903, and there he boarded a train for Texas. On April 30, 1903, he stepped off the train onto the vast plains of the Texas Panhandle. He was home.

During his early years in the Panhandle, M. K. Brown worked in all phases of the land and cattle business—as a surveyor, bookkeeper, secretary, and general troubleshooter for his company. The record shows that his civic and community accomplishments began early in his Texas residence. He was elected Pampa's second mayor; he was a member of the first band organized in the Panhandle; he was the driving force behind early cultural, civic, and religious achievements in the Pampa area.

From the time of his christening in the Church of England Parish Church in Ruislip, England, M. K. Brown was a devout and active member of the Episcopal Church. He help from his arrival to provide a Christian atmosphere in Pampa. In the absence of a duly ordained minister, he conducted the first Christian funeral service in Pampa.

On August 30, 1922, M. K. Brown married Miss Josye Barnes of Pampa. If, in the nearly 20 years he had been in the United States his English relatives still had doubts about his plans to remain, certainly his marriage to this lovely Texas girl was final proof that he loved everything about Texas. Mr. and Mrs. Brown made many trips back and forth to England before World War II but, as much as he loved the land of his birth, his roots remained firmly planted in Texas soil and he was never tempted to return to his native land.

Through the years M. K. worked diligently for community improvement. It would require pages to list the activities, organizations and individuals he has helped and supported by personal effort or financial assistance, or both. Perhaps no man has given more of himself to the development of the Texas Panhandle than M. K. Brown. M. K. has provided aid to the buiding of churches of all denominations, to hospitals, to education. He has helped countless young persons with their education. The Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts are his devoted friends and admirers.

M. K. Brown's untiring efforts have resulted in making his home community and his adopted country a better place in which to live. Although he has become a true Texan in every sense, an aura of his English background still is to be found in his habits, his manners and his speech. His manners have the flavor and gallantry of the Old World; he is still a great walker, covering at least 5 miles of walking every day of his life, and his military training is still evident in his gait and his erect posture. He has a quick wit, and his speech is a fascinating mixture of Texas twang and British clipped cadence.

Shortly after he "retired" in 1938 he and Mrs. Brown started dividing their time between their homes in San Antonio, where he still spends his winter months—although Mrs. Brown has passed on—and Pampa, but he has always considered Pampa his home and retirement is a word that means little to him. He has remained active in the life of each city, active in business and civic affairs.

I have known M. K. Brown for many years and I consider him to be a loyal friend and fine Christian gentleman who truly cares for his fellow man. He loves his adopted country and the institutions which have brought the United States to greatness. In his dedication to Texas, M. K. Brown recently provided funds necessary to publish a set of six volumes of the State's early range history.

The people of Texas and of the United States owe this fine citizen a debt of gratitude for the wonderful contributions of his life's dedication, energy and resources. It is with great pleasure that I wish M. K. Brown a happy 85th birthday and wish for him many more of them.

Uncle Sam: Biography of a Symbol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a well-documented article on "Uncle Sam" Wilson, the progenitor of America's national symbol of "Uncle Sam." This article, entitled "Uncle Sam: Biography of a Symbol," is the product of extensive and careful research by scholars in this field.

This article, which appeared in the October 1962 issue of the national publication Country Beautiful, adds one more authoritative documentation of Arlington, Mass., as the birthplace of "Uncle Sam" to an imposing list of sources. All scholarly researchers of note, from those in the Library of Congress to the Arlington (Mass.) Historical Society, clearly establish that the town of Old Menotomy, now known as Arlington, is the birthplace of Sam Wilson. Arlington, Mass., steeped in the memories and traditions of the American cause, deserves recognition as the birthplace of "Uncle Sam" Wilson, who is recognized all over the world as the personification of the United States of America.

The article follows:

Uncle Sam—a long-jawed, flamboyantly dressed Yankee who has pointed a stern finger at millions of Americans to remind them of their heritage—will be 150 years old on October 2, 1962. During the War of 1812, Samuel Wilson was a U.S. meat inspector in Troy, N.Y., when Gov. Daniel D. Tompkins was shown through Wilson's plant. On the wharf, the Governor's party saw meat barrels ticketed for Army camps and stamped with the initials "U.S." Someone asked what the letters represented. A workman replied facetiously that they stood for kindly Mr. Wilson, who was known as "Uncle Sam."

Conceived in jest, a symbol was born on that soggy Friday morning—October 2, 1812—in upstate New York. For Sam Wilson, who had fought as a "service boy" in the American Revolution, epitomized the plain American with his devotion to honesty and self-reliance as well as a passion for justice—not only for himself, but for all men. It was appropriate for him to stand for our new Nation. Perpetuated by recruiting posters, editorial cartoons, and patriotic pageantry, Uncle Sam outgrew ancestors like Yankee Doodle and Brother Jonathan. He has outlasted come-latelies like John Q. Public, although he still has enemies in high places: Prof. Allan Nevins, the renowned historian, once called Uncle Sam "antiquated and provincial * * * an infantile folk image."

Uncle Sam, however, retains an enduring place in the American heart. And he has influential friends. Richard M. Nixon has said: "Each of us would do well to emulate the original Uncle Sam in our daily lives and thereby make sure that the symbol which has come to represent America at home and abroad will continue to be an inspiration. * * *"

On September 15 of last year, the 87th Congress passed a resolution saluting the "strength and idealism" that characterized the life of Samuel Wilson and officially designating Uncle Sam as a national symbol. Congress noted that "in a world largely hostile to the idea of freedom and [at] the moment in our history when we need all our sense of purpose and capability to match the challenge of disciplined communism, some say that 'Uncle Sam' is archaic and should be disowned." But the Congress of the United States declared instead that because Uncle Sam "was evoked out of the needs of a young nation and is linked to a grassroots character," it is altogether fitting and proper that he be granted permanent status as a symbol.

The Army has reactivated James Montgomery Flagg's famous "Uncle Sam Needs You" sign. The Post Office Department says it will issue an Uncle Sam stamp. And, on Uncle Sam's 150th birthday, Samuel Wilson's city of Troy will give President Kennedy a gold Uncle Sam medallion at a White House ceremony.

Samuel Wilson himself—a tall, slender man with a nutcracker face—had just observed his 46th birthday when he was reborn as Uncle Sam. Many Americans mistakenly believe Uncle Sam to be a creation of a cartoonist's pen, but the man Samuel Wilson was a proud and devoted builder of the American heritage. "The big thing," he once remarked, "is not what happens to us in life, but what we do about what happens to us."

Today, when we may well be oversaturated by slogans and superpatriots, why does America need Uncle Sam? This is an age in which William Faulkner lamented: "What has happened to the American dream? We dozed, slept, and it abandoned us." Samuel Wilson, however, lived the American dream—and helped to fulfill it.

He lived from 1776 to 1854, 88 years spanning a crucial period in our history. When he was born in Menotomy (now Arlington), Mass., the British North American Colonies were some 1.8 million people clustered uneasily around the eastern seacoast and the broad tidewater rivers. When he died in Troy, the United States was an independent nation of 29 million Americans forging ever westward.

Samuel Wilson was the fourth son of a Scots-Irish farmer who eventually sired 13 children. When young Sam was still crawling around his family's unpainted wooden house, the spacious kitchen resounded to a catchy but controversial melody that later became known as "The Liberty Song." It was sung regularly at the anti-British Sons of Liberty meetings, which Sam's father and oldest brother attended. Sam Wilson was only 3 years old when British troops in Boston (8 miles away) fired into a crowd of jeering colonists and killed three of them, but Sam's parents felt it was important that they take their little son to the burial of the Boston Massacre's martyrs. On another occasion, 3 years later, Sam's father dressed up like an Indian—but not to play with his son. He risked his neck and his family's security to attend the Boston Tea Party.

By the spring of 1775, when he was not yet 9, Sam Wilson had become a passionate American patriot in miniature.

At 1:40 in the morning of Wednesday, April 19, 1775, a horse clattered through the quiet streets of Menotomy, its rider shouting that the British Redcoats were coming.

The Wilson home lit up. Sam Wilson, struggling into his clothes as he went, tugged a drum almost as big as he was to the village green, where he and other drummers echoed Paul Revere's hasty warning.

Sam's father and eldest brother were among the Minutemen who rushed with muskets and powder horns to the Battle of Lexington. They also fought at Bunker Hill. "I want to come along as your service boy," Sam Wilson begged his father.

"You're too young, Sam," he was told.

The boy stayed behind to look after his family, help operate the farm, make bullets, weave cloth, and run errands. When the British retreated through Menotomy, Sam lead the Wilson women away from the line of fire.

But when two wagonloads of British soldiers arrived in town with supplies for the retreating Redcoats, Sam Wilson shouldered a musket. Menotomy's old men and children rallied to fight them off. The Britishers—about a dozen strong—were only momentarily amused by the motley array of youth and age that confronted them. Thanks to numbers if not skill, this ragged fife-and-drum corps killed two Redcoats and captured the remainder. Sam Wilson killed one of them.

As a boy growing up in perilous times, Sam Wilson played an active part in American history. He served as a messenger for the Committee of Public Safety in the Boston area, where he traveled freely among such Founding Fathers as John Hancock, Samuel Adams, and John Adams. In 1780, when he was fourteen, he enlisted in the Continental Army as a service boy. Moving cattle on the hoof and delivering messages for General George Washington's staff, Sam Wilson was in on the American Revolution from its exciting beginning to its triumphant end.

By the time he returned to civilian life in 1782, his parents had moved to Mason, N.H., and he joined them there. Sam Wilson came of age in a town with too many Tories and pessimists who moaned that the new debt-ridden Republic could not survive without British help. Its paper currency was almost worthless. The prophets of doom were in full cry.

But Sam Wilson, 18, in 1784 was at that rare age when a man can be passionate about both people and causes. He declared that he would not allow the betrayal of America's independence. And at a Federalist rally, he met a strong-willed young woman named Betsey Mann. She was beautiful and as ardent a patriot as Sam Wilson—and, being a woman in politics, more intense than any man. She had organized a chapter of the Daughters of Liberty. She was leading a regional boycott of British goods. Sam and Betsey fell in love.

There was, however, a money problem: Betsey was the daughter of the wealthiest man in Mason, if not all New Hampshire. (Her father, Col. Benjamin Mann, was also a Bunker Hill hero whose six companies of militia had inflicted heavy casualties on the Redcoats.) Sam was poor and he deemed himself unworthy of Betsey. She reminded him that Americans should be the last people on earth to measure men by their wealth. And she added, in a letter:

"We have helped to bring forth a new nation; together we can give thanks for having found each other in this great creative movement that is still gathering strength in God."

Sam agreed, but he still had to prove himself. He was already a skilled farmer. He was learning the bricklaying trade. But the opportunity to rise above one's station was limited along the depressed east coast. In 1789—after a 5-year courtship—Sam asked Betsey if she would wait while he ventured westward to seek his fortune. She said yes. She waited almost 8 more years.

Betsey had many admirers while Samuel Wilson was away. One of them was a younger man who, like Uncle Sam, was destined to become a folk figure. His name John Chapman, of Leominster, Mass., and he was a distant cousin of Betsey's. He aspired discreetly to win her hand, but he realized eventually that it was out of reach of any man but Sam Wilson. And, just as Sam Wilson had headed west to make his fortune, Chapman may have wandered into the wilderness to forget Betsey and find himself. He reappeared in western Pennsylvania around the turn of the century. He planted apple orchards all the way from the Allegheny Mountains to central Ohio. The pioneers christened Chapman "Johnny Appleseed" and he, like Samuel Wilson, became a legend.

Samuel Wilson, 22, had set out along the westward wagon trail in 1789, shortly before George Washington's inauguration. His brother, Ebenezer, 26, had accompanied him. The Wilson boys possessed neither wagon nor property, but they had strong legs. Trudging behind the more fortunate travelers, it took them 2 weeks to reach Troy, N.Y.

Troy→which, until a month earlier, had been named Van Der Heydens Ferry—was a small hamlet of 12 farms at the confluence of the Mohawk and Hudson Rivers. Sam Wilson watched the settlers' covered wagons fording the rivers. He and his brother decided to go no farther. Sam envisioned Troy as a thriving supply post for pioneers headed west. Penniless but optimistic, the Wilson brothers settled in Troy.

They lived frugally and worked long hours at any job that would pay. After 2 years, they had enough money to start their own brickyard. Troy needed bricks to build homes, churches, a courthouse—and, of course, a jail.

The Wilson brothers thrived. Soon they had 500 men working for them. They sailed sloops along the Hudson River and sold bricks that built other communities, Sam Wilson's enterprises expanded to include a general store, a slaughterhouse, and a meatpacking business. His company slaughtered a thousand cattle per week for a growing community and an unending stream of pioneers. Many of the first families to settle in Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Ohio began their perilous journeys stocked with Samuel Wilson's beef.

By the end of 1796, Sam Wilson was ready to return in triumph to Mason, N.H. He rode back comfortably over the route he and his brother had covered on foot. The next year he married the patient Betsey Mann. He took her to Troy and there they raised a family of four children.

In his thirties, Sam Wilson was a kindly man with a quizzical smile that ordinarily masked his determination. He was deeply religious and served on the board of trustees of Troy's Baptist Church before switching to other Protestant denominations. His family Bible was worn to tatters in his lifetime. Perhaps the most heavily underscored passage was in John 10: 10: "I am come that they might have life and that they might have it more abundantly."

Unlike many pious employers of his time, he was also a humble man. There was no protocol or formality at any of the Wilson plants. His competitors were quite astonished to hear that he was actually treating his own employees according to the popular principle that all men are equal. When a particularly difficult task arose, Sam Wilson would roll up his sleeves and plunge in, telling his workmen: "Come on, boys, let's do it together."

He was fond of youngsters. He was often willing to interrupt his work and tell a child a funny story. And, because their fathers spoke so well of him, the children of his employees were the first to christen him "Uncle Sam."

There were, however, matters that Uncle Sam Wilson couldn't resolve—and they made his blood boil. From 1805 on, British ships would accost American vessels on the high seas and shanghai their sailors to fight in England's war against Napoleon. In June of 1807, when the H.M.S. *Leopard* attacked the American ship *Chesapeake*, three of the *Chesapeake's* sailors were killed and four kidnaped. By 1810, the British had seized a total of 4,000 American sailors. Samuel Wilson at first went along with those who favored diplomatic persuasion, but he grew more militant as British aggression continued. "The rule of British power must be curbed forever," he asserted.

In June of 1812, Congress declared war on England. The War of 1812 was favored by westerners, southerners, planters and farmers, who saw it as a crusade for free trade and seamen's rights. It was not, however, a popular cause in New England and parts of the Troy area. The eastern shipping interests had lost thousands of seamen to the arrogant British, but they opposed the war because it would disrupt their businesses even more drastically. In the first dark months—when American defeat followed American defeat—the sanest and least shrill voice in the Troy area seeemed to be Sam Wilson's: "We have tried the bickering, the hatreds, the selfishness, and it has brought us to the brink of destruction. Can't we ever become united in time? It starts with every one of us giving a little more, instead of taking and getting."

That summer, Samuel Wilson was appointed an inspector of provisions for the army of New York. Governor Tompkins placed him under the authority of Col. Elbert Anderson, Jr. As a matter of fact, the full initials on those fateful meat barrels that confronted the Governor's party on October 2, 1812, were "E.A.—U.S." The initials "E. A." stood for Elbert Anderson.

The War of 1812 not only solidified the gains of the American Revolution, but it contributed at least three enduring symbols to Americans: A national anthem, "The Star-Spangled Banner," which Francis Scott Key began on the back of an envelope during the bombardment of Fort McHenry, Md.; the dying words of Capt. James Lawrence, "Don't give up the ship." and Uncle Sam, a symbol that crystallized the yearnings of a new nation.

The rapid spread of Uncle Sam's "image" should be studied by Madison Avenue today in silent awe. Nineteen days after "U.S." was identified as Uncle Sam, he turned up in a patriotic ballad. Caricatures depicting Samuel Wilson—clad in uncustomary top hat, tailcoat, and striped pants—began to appear in cartoons and lithographs during late 1812.

Youngsters from the Troy area—who had long known Samuel Wilson as Uncle Sam—had grown up and were serving in Army camps. With varying degrees of sincerity and superstitution, they came to believe that their old friend symbolized the United States and the civilian life they had left behind. Those stationed near Troy insisted they would eat no meat but Uncle Sam's. Soon, even Sam Wilson's competitors were forced to put out their own "Uncle Sam" brands of meat and other products. By 1813, newspapers were referring to troops as "Uncle Sam's men."

The War of 1812 ended in 1815, but its symbols lingered on. A few years later, a visiting French journalist wrote home from the United States: "Americans are waking up to the fact that their Uncle Sam is a fine big gentleman." By the 1820's, civil servants in Washington were fond of saying (just as they say today): "We work for Uncle Sam."

Uncle Sam was the fifth important national symbol to emerge from American history. In the 17th century, images of Pocahontas—the Indian heroine who saved Capt. John Smiths' life—had represented the New World on many maps of the time. Around 1710, Pocahontas had been replaced in sculpture and art by Columbia, a stately white woman garbed in flowing robes and a peaked hat crowned with stars. She derived her name from Christopher Columbus. Later, when American colonists and British redcoats were fighting side by side in the French and Indian War, a British Army doctor had set new lyrics to an old English song—and Yankee Doodle had flashed across the national consciousness. Yankee Doodle's British origins, however, had made him suspect among the patriots of the American Revolution, so Brother Jonathan had been invented. He resembled Yankee Doodle—a blank-faced New England country boy whose sleeves and trousers were too short for him—although he also had some of the attributes of Jonathan Trumbull, a Connecticut patriot of the times. But by the early 19th century, sophisticated city dwellers in Philadelphia and New York were tiring of Brother Jonathan's hayseed charm.

From 1825 on, Brother Jonathan characters in stage plays and other pageantry began to sprout white bell-crowned hats, blue coats with long tails, striped trousers, and long bootstraps. Prodded by the Sam Wilson publicity, Brother Jonathan gradually was evolving into Uncle Sam.

Samuel Wilson the man continued to thrive—both as a businessman and as a patriotic figure. He resisted the pomposity that afflicts men who become national heroes in their lifetimes. Whenever he spoke out, he had something urgent to say. In a Fourth of July speech in 1851, he said: "The American Revolution was something new under the sun * * * and it will not be complete until the ideals of freedom, equality, and independence are a reality not only for Americans, but for all the people throughout the world."

He died 3 years later, but he had time to witness the first important acceptance of Uncle Sam by America's opinion-making intelligentsia. A political cartoon by Frank Bellew, "Raising the Wind," appeared in the influential New York comic weekly, the Lantern, in 1852. It depicted an economic struggle between British and American shipowners in terms of John Bull vs. Uncle Sam. Bellew's Uncle Sam was clean-shaven, but he wore beaver top hat, boots, and striped trousers.

In Harper's Weekly of the 1860's, Thomas Nast—perhaps the most influential cartoonist in American history—added whiskers to Uncle Sam's chin and stars to his vest. Even today, however, the Uncle Sam we know bears an adequate resemblance to the original Samuel Wilson of Menotomy, Mason, and Troy.

In death as in life, Uncle Sam has seldom been very far away from controversy. At various cynical moments of the 20th century, even his origins have been questioned.

In 1928, Congressman David J. Hogg, of Indiana, introduced a bill in Washington that would have designated a Samuel Wilson, of Merriam, Ind., as the original Uncle Sam. A granddaughter of the eastern Sam Wilson rushed to her ancestor's defense. Mayor Cornelius J. Burns, of Troy, formed a citizens' committee to establish and spread the truth behind the Uncle Sam legend. Congressman Hogg's bill was shelved. Since then, there have been similar flurries between Hoosiers and Yankees, but the validity of Troy's claim was recognized by the 87th Congress. Since 1959, by proclamation of Gov. Nelson Rockefeller and State legislative action, New York State has observed September 13—Samuel Wilson's date of birth—as Uncle Sam Day.

But the controversy pointed out irony that has haunted the grave of Samuel Wilson for more than a century: Uncle Sam is a recognizable national figure, but Samuel Wilson has remained, until recently, almost as anonymous as the Unknown Soldier.

In 1962, however, the veils are lifting. The qualities that made Samuel Wilson a national symbol 150 years ago are proving as durable as granite. Billy Graham, noting that Russia has 90 slogans to promote its ways of life, recently asked: "Where are the American slogans?" The answer may yet be that one good American revolutionary named Samuel Wilson is worth 10,000 slogans.

The Kinsey Stables, Johns Island, S.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 18, the Preakness was run. This is one of the most important horse races in America. However, Mr. Speaker, there was another event equally dear to the hearts of those who still retain an affection for horses and horse races. On Saturday at Johns Island, S.C., the inauguration of a modest and simple racetrack took place. C. A. Kinsey inaugurated the Kinsey Stables Racetrack. Some 1,200 South Carolinians thronged to this event.

About the same time of the Preakness, a gallant stallion by the name of Chief thundered home by a neck to beat Meteor Flash in a very interesting race. This was one of the seven scheduled races and these were the first in Charleston in approximately 200 years.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I hereby include a newspaper account of the event:

Charleston Horse Races—Preakness?
Chief Wins Johns Island Race

(By Don Rutledge, Post-Courier sports writer)

Who cares if Candy Spots won the $180,000 Preakness yesterday in some foreign country called Maryland?

About that same time, on the peaceful island called Johns, a gallant stallion by the name of Chief thundered home by a neck to beat Meteor Flash in a $150 winner-take-all race.

The event was one of seven horse races held at the Kinsey Stables Racetrack, and a crowd of more than 1,200 sun-drenched spectators turned out to cheer on their favorites.

The races were the first in the Charleston area in approximately 200 years, and the large turnout was so encouraging that C. A. Kinsey, owner and director of the Kinsey stables and racetrack, plans to have several more throughout the year.

Kicking off the day's program was the running of the class C one-quarter mile race which offered $25 to the winner, $10 for place, and $5 show. First place honors went to King Ring's Ace, owned by George Hendley and ridden by Al Walker. Tarzan took second and Lady Luck took third.

The class C one-half mile was captured by Rebel, ridden by Wendall Weeks of Johns Island. The horse covered the distance in a time of 59.7 seconds. Bambi, ridden by David Branch, took second, and Smokey won third with colorful Karl McMillan in the saddle.

The B class quarter-mile was won by Lee Dude, a registered quarter horse ridden by J. E. Harvey, and owned by Beaufort's Roger Roberts. The winning time of :26.0 seconds was the fastest time of the day. King Ring's Ace finished second and Sparkle took third.

Ralph Pye's Ginger won the class B half-mile event and $50 in prize money with Bubba Pye mounted in the saddle. Bambi picked up $15 for second place and Glo was third.

In the class A races, Alton Brown's Tony won $100 in the quarter-mile race while Running Blond took second and Miss Misty Eva was third.

In the feature race of the day, the class A half-mile, Karl McMillan on Meteor Flash was beaten by Al Walker on Chief in a two horse race for $150. Meteor Flash gave Chief a 50-yard handicap at the start and closed the gap to within a yard at the finish line but it was not quite enough.

In the pony race for children under 14, Kelly Joseph, Jr., won first place, Lee MacKeach took second and Rusty Crea was third.

Augmenting the exciting races were the showing of several show horses and jumpers. T. C. Limehouse showed American Eagle, a five-gaited saddle horse, Grasshopper, a jumper, and Expressway, a three-gaited show horse that pulled a surrey.

Fruits of Sugar Act Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 3, 1963, the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle carried a very interesting editorial by its talented executive editor, Louis C. Harris, based on the recent increases in the cost of sugar. I have protested about this increase myself but think that the following is such an excellent portrayal of the problem it should be put in the Congressional Record. It is indeed encouraging when a newspaper editor takes the time to study the facts of an issue and sets out his own judgment so clearly.

I recommend this story to every Member of the House of Representatives:

Fruits of Sugar Act Folly

Last December, less than 5 months ago, the wholesale price of refined sugar in the southeastern United States was $184 a ton. Last week the price was $222. Wednesday it was $232. Today it is $242. Tomorrow it may be even higher.

The drastic upward trend in sugar prices has sent the U.S. market to its highest level in 40 years. There is no sign of an end to the spiral. The relatively stable sugar market the United States has enjoyed for several decades appears doomed. The countless industries which consume large quantities of sugar, including a number of Augusta firms, already are suffering. The housewife has just begun to feel the pinch. The price jump, if it continues unchecked, could contribute heavily to a new wave of inflation throughout the country.

In almost any other basic commodity, a 32-percent price rise in less than half a year would have occasioned widespread public concern and some form of congressional or Executive action from Washington. Much smaller price boosts in steel created a nationwide furor last year and, to a lesser degree, again this year.

But comparatively little has even been said about skyrocketing sugar prices.

One reason for the difference is that much of the sugar increase has not yet been passed on to the consumer. Another is the complexity of the sugar price situation, which defies simple explanation and clearcut definition of its causes.

Part of the problem has its roots in the basic law of supply and demand. While authorities disagree on whether there is a raw sugar shortage in the world today, there is no question but that the supply situation is tight. The failure of communism and Castro's farm program in Cuba has halved the output from the world's largest sugar producing nation in just 3 years. The 1960 Cuban crop was 6.8 million tons of raw sugar; the current estimate of its 1963 crop is 3.5 million tons.

Another world factor is the heavy winter freeze in Europe, which reduced that continent's supply of beet sugar for the second consecutive year.

A large part of the blame for the sugar price spiral, however, lies closer to home than the world market's fluctuations. Specifically, it is traceable to the Sugar Act of 1962, which was passed by Congress and signed by President Kennedy last July.

With the enactment of this measure, the Nation cancelled what House Agriculture Committee Chairman Harold D. Cooley of North Carolina appropriately calls the "sugar insurance policy," which for 30 years had assured American consumers of ample sugar supplies at a stable and reasonable price.

This policy, in essence, was a provision in former acts that sugar suppliers who enjoyed the benefits of the U.S. market must continue to make their regular quota shipments, at the U.S. price, during periods when the world market price was higher than the domestic price. If not, they forfeited that part of their quota which they did not fill. The practicalities of this arrangement virtually guaranteed that the United States could import all the foreign sugar it needed at the established American price.

The new Sugar Act retained, for the most part, the strict quotas for countries from which U.S. firms buy sugar. But it dropped the "insurance policy" provisions, thereby subjecting a significant portion of the U.S. market to the fluctuations of an unstable, unregulated world market.

Changes in the new law were engineered by the administration and a Senate majority, over the protests of Cooley and his committee. The House had passed an Agriculture Committee-sponsored bill that would have continued provisions of the former acts.

When the new Sugar Act was passed, its proponents apparently assumed that the world market price of raw sugar—which was then 2.86 cents per pound—would remain at that low level indefinitely. Instead, it began almost immediately to climb, as Cooley and others warned it would. Today that price has reached almost 10 cents a pound, and the domestic price has virtually kept the pace. This explains why the refineries have had to push their prices up almost weekly since the first of the year.

The sugar price spiral is now approaching the critical stage. No changes in the sugar supply situation are anticipated before the end of this year, at the earliest. The new law leaves the Department of Agriculture virtually helpless to remedy matters.

Thus far, Congress has shown no inclination to act. Neither has the administration. But if responsible men in responsible positions do not find a solution soon, the alarm now being expressed in the sugar and related industries will be justifiably shared by every American.

Legislation Needed To Combat Unemployment Due to Internal Revenue Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to amend sections 162 and 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to the deductibility of certain business entertainment expenses, and so forth. My bill is identical to a number of others currently pending before the Committee on Ways and Means.

Ever since the Internal Revenue Service's regulations were published in final form in the Federal Register of December 29, 1962, I have received ever-increasing complaints from businessmen whose enterprises in large part depend on the promotion of good will by means of legitimate entertaining, etc., and also from the restaurant, hotel, motel and entertainment industries generally. These communications represent the protests of both management and labor in these industries, not to mention the related food and meat suppliers, who are also seriously affected.

However, early in April, the real impact of this problem was brought to my attention by representatives of the National Restaurant Association from my State of Washington. These gentlemen came to Washington, D.C., to draw attention to the serious economic problem facing their industry, not only in the State of Washington, but also in the Nation as a whole.

This problem has been created primarily by reason of the incomprehensible and complex regulations imposed by the Internal Revenue Service in connection with the new expense account law, which in turn has resulted in confusion on the part of businessmen, leaving them foundering in a state of uncertainty.

For example, in the city of Seattle, during the months of January and February 1963, alone, there has been a job loss of 605, directly related to the restaurant industry, involving a wage loss of $359,160. This does not include allied businesses, which have also been adversely affected by the uncertainty of the Internal Revenue regulations. A countrywide survey by the National Restaurant Association during the same period of time points up a job loss of some 44,000 persons, which, if projected on an annual basis, will amount to approximately 140,000 persons, and will involve a loss to the industry itself for the same period in excess of $1 billion.

Some entrepreneurs in the industry with whom I have consulted favor the National Restaurant Association's position which supports specific legislation to remedy the confusion. However, up until now, I have been loathe to follow this course, because, in view of the major tax legislation pending before the House Ways and Means Committee, it seemed to me that the enactment of special legislation to cope with the problem was not practical. More realistically, I believed that once the Internal Revenue Service was presented with all the facts, it would be persuaded to handle the matter administratively.

After considerable correspondence with Mr. Caplin on this subject, however, I found that I had been unduly optimistic. He either cannot or will not correct the uncertainty created by these new regulations.

Certainly, IRS regulations which, on the basis of all indications, will result in such a substantial loss of jobs and sales volumes, are self-defeating—taxwise—and obviously not in the best interests of the Government.

Consequently, it appears the only way the matter can be handled to correct this confusion and relieve an already distressed industry, is by the passage of legislation such as I have introduced, which would impose a standard of reasonableness to govern the deductibility of business and entertainment expenditures, together with a reasonable recordkeeping program.

The matter is critical and I urge early consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Pesticides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, since it is my privilege to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce it is with a great deal of interest and relief that I learned of the President's recent order calling for the Government to take immediate steps to cut down the health hazards resulting from the widespread use of pesticides.

The reckless and, in some cases, uncontrolled use of lethal chemicals in so-called bug-killers has been a source of real concern to me, as it has to many others, for quite some time. Everyone remembers the cranberry scare only a couple of Thanksgivings ago. Unfortunately it became almost a joke and the public, in general, felt that a mountain was being made of a molehill. However, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this was a warning bell which we must heed in the interest of something as basic as human survival.

Mr. Speaker, the excessive and increased use of certain chemicals in today's pesticides are, while not as sudden in their action as the atomic bomb, are just as lethal and actually far more insidious. We already know what some of these chemicals in larger doses have done to birds, fish, soil, and animals. As a result, Audubon and garden societies all over the Nation are rising in protest over indiscriminate spraying of thousands upon thousands of acres of our land and foliage. Of course, some kind of pest control is very necessary. But, Mr. Speaker, in spite of some claims, pesticides simply cannot discriminate between honeybees and gypsy moths—fish and budworm—crab grass and mocking birds—San Jose scale and you and me. So, without proper controls the use of pesticides borders so close to an "imbalance of nature" that we run the risk of eliminating the words "future generation" from our vocabulary.

Mr. Speaker, some action has already been taken by the executive branch of the Government. This is the result of the work of the President's Science Advisory Committee with more than modest motivation by one of our brilliant authors, Miss Rachel Carson. It is my understanding that Miss Carson will testify before one of the committees of the other body the latter part of this month and I am sure I will be most interested in hearing what she has to say.

Mr. Speaker, because I am fully aware of the effect any legislative action will have on commerce as well as the health of our people—because the lack of coordination among the various Government agencies involved in the use of pesticides, I pledge my full support and seek active participation on the part of my colleagues in the Congress, in formulating legislative and technical controls on the use of pesticides. Through apathy, Mr. Speaker, let us not turn the word pesticide into genocide.

I might add one thing further, Mr. Speaker, and that is that my subcommittee is currently holding hearings on the reorganization of the Public Health Service. We have heard testimony from the top officials in all the various agencies of the Public Health Service and we hope to have the pleasure of hearing testimony from Dr. Jerome Weisner, Chairman of the President's Science Advisory Committee in the near future at which time we sincerely hope to obtain further information on the use of pesticides and determine the best course of action to follow in this area.

A Man of Courage—Ernie Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Elmira (N.Y.) community—which I have the honor to represent—paid its last sorrowful respects to one of the finest young men it has ever been my privilege to meet. Ernie Davis, who died last week in Cleveland, was not only a great athlete and a fine sportsman; he was a gentleman, in every sense of the word.

All of us have sustained a real loss, for Ernie's potential for contributing to our society extended far beyond the confines of the football stadium and into the difficult and complex arena of human understanding—where must still be fought the battle for the basic rights of citizenship for all Americans.

The mark that Ernie Davis has made, his achievements in the world of sports—these things are a matter of the record and they will be long remembered. What we will never know, now, would be the record of achievements that Ernie, with his courage, his modesty and his many other fine, human qualities, might have posted in this other and vastly more-important contest. I happen to believe it would have been equally outstanding.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I now include an article by Alfred Wright in the current issue of "Sports Illustrated" entitled "Ernie Davis, A Man of Courage"; and a column "You Don't Cry—," by Cove Hoover, managing editor of the Elmira Sunday Telegram.

Ernie Davis, a Man of Courage

(By Alfred Wright)

When all his now-fabulous records are broken, as they surely will be someday, when the story of his personal tragedy is no more than an occasional recollection in the mind of an aging generation, Ernie Davis will still be remembered as the first Negro to win the Heisman Trophy. This award is given annually by New York's Downtown Athletic Club to the best college football player. Of all such tributes it has come to be regarded as the most important. Sportswriters and broadcasters across the country select the winner, and the award implies something more than just ability on the playing field. It suggests character, too, a quality that Ernie Davis owned in abundance.

Ernie Davis was only 23 when he died last week in the Lakeside Hospital in Cleveland. During his short lifetime he had not had time to accomplish anything outside of sport; in fact, he had not even had time to fufill his prime ambition in sport. From the time of his early athletic successes in high school, Ernie had set his heart and mind on being the best professional football player anywhere. He was a shy and quiet young man, and through football he could articulate his pride and the longing for respect and success that burned inside him like a roaring furnace.

Although every college that covets championship football would like to have had Ernie for a student, he chose Syracuse. "I wanted to play in the big time," he explained recently, "and a lot of people including Jim Brown persuaded me that I'd have better opportunities there." When Ernie took over Brown's old positon as the Syracuse halfback, he proudly wore Brown's No. 44 jersey and during the next 3 years proceeded to break most of Brown's records for ground gaining and point scoring.

Ernie followed Jim Brown to the Cleveland Browns as a pro, and, after the financial arrangements had been made, everyone thought that the pairing of these two strong, swift, and elusive runners would return the Browns to their former eminence in the National Football League. There was to be a delay, however. Just as last season was about to begin, Ernie Davis was hospitalized with "a blood disorder." It turned out to be acute monocytic leukemia, the most virulent form of blood cancer.

Davis was treated with a drug known as 6–MP, and within weeks his illness was in a state of total remission. No one knew if it would recur.

Wherever he went in Cleveland last fall, Ernie Davis was as much of a celebrity as if he had been scoring touchdowns for the team. "Hi ya, Ern," "Hi, Ernie," "How ya feeling, Ernie?" the fans would shout at him as he hurried, head down, through the stadium on the way to the team's dressing room. A flicker of a smile would cross Ernie's usually solemn face as he acknowledged a greeting or reluctantly paused to sign an autograph. He often sat on the bench with the team, one of them in all but uniform. "This is when it's really frustrating," he said one afternoon during the Browns' game with the St. Louis Cardinals. "I'm in real good shape now. But it's too late in the season to take the time during practice to work me into the setup."

After the game Ernie went back to the dressing room to congratulate his victorious teammates, and many of the happy players slapped him on the back as if he had been a part of the triumph. Art Modell, the youthful president of the Browns, came up to Davis and said, "Ernie, why don't you take the Thanksgiving weekend off? You could go spend some time with Helen." Modell winked at this reference to Ernie's girl, Helen Gott, a Syracuse University senior from New Jersey.

Later Davis talked about the future in his diffident way, as if every hesitant word were being pulled from within him by the greatest effort. "Starting next year," he said, "I expect to play 10 or 11 years and then go into business. I'd like to get into purchasing or marketing, something like that where I could use what I learned in college." Jimmy Brown got Ernie started before the winter was over, helping him land a job with Pepsi-Cola. In his spare time, Ernie played basketball to stay in shape.

Last week Ernie Davis paid a call on Art Modell at the Browns' office and said that he had to go into the hospital briefly for some additional treatment. They talked about the future of the football team and how Ernie believed this would be the year the Browns would regain the championship. Ernie apologized, as he often had, for the expense that his medical care was causing the Browns. He entered the hospital on Thursday and went into a coma on Friday. Early the next morning he died in his sleep, and the news of his death shocked everyone who admires courage and sportsmanship and the many other good, human qualities that Ernie Davis brought to his surroundings.

You Don't Cry—

(By Cove Hoover)

I wanted to cry.

But the man, himself, had taught me not to.

He'd done it in lots of ways over the years. Little comments. Little actions. His expressions.

And the smile. That shy, warm smile.

Those were the ways in which the Elmira Express—Ernie Davis—carried the mail. The message, way back as a boy, was stamped "Inspiration."

Oh, he carried the mail on the gridiron. He toted a football around, into, over and under opposing players with a galloping, crushing brilliance.

He even carried the mail, real mail, for the Post Office during a Christmas vacation. It probably was the only time Elmirans ever had, or will have, an All America halfback run the "scissors play" on their mailboxes.

Ernie saw nothing odd about it. It didn't ocur to him that he was a bigname sports figure carrying letters to people. That, too, was a part of him. Humbleness.

He excelled in sports. But it was football—his greatest love—that took him to the heights as a two-time All America, first Negro to win the Heisman Trophy and the honor of being the Nation's outstanding college football player.

Bold and daring on the field, he was shy off.

Last fall he journeyed from Cleveland to sit on the bench with his old teammates as they faced rugged Penn State in one of football's annual hard-nosed clashes. Only 17 days earlier the world had been told Ernie had leukemia.

When the near 47,000 fans in Beaver Stadium were told at halftime that he was sitting on the bench, they gave him a thunderous ovation. Shyly, reluctantly, he hesitated, then finally stood and nodded to the crowd after the PA announcer said, "Ernie, will you take a bow?"

He was great at playing before 47,000 people, just as he had done on the same field 1 year before; gallantly, almost singlehandedly, keeping a badly crippled Syracuse team in the game—although they lost 14–0—against one of Penn State's greatest teams. Yet, he was embarrassed over taking a bow.

There was also a day under the stands at Archbold Stadium in Syracuse when a sweaty dirt-smeared Ernie—who had scored two touchdowns and run for well over 100 yards in leading the Orange to victory—declined to accept pats on the back.

"I didn't have it," he said. "I messed up that lateral in the second quarter."

By his standards the one play meant imperfection. Everything else he had done that day was meaningless.

And there was the time on the first play from scrimmage against Boston University when he bolted over the right on the scissors and ran 80 yards to score, leaving the last defender 20 yards in his wake. Told it was a beautiful run, he smiled. "I didn't do it by myself you know. Those blockers wiped everyone out * * *. A little kid could have run that one."

He traversed the country. He was as big a hero in Miami and Dallas as he was in Los Angeles and New York. But he always came home.

There was always time to sit down and talk; if you can call "yes" and "no" or six to seven word sentences talking.

No matter the achievement, his hat always fit.

If he had been honored, the reason for it lie in some spiritual help. He thanked God for what he had been given.

No matter how rushed, a few minutes with a youngster or group of youngsters was available. He told a boy once, "You don't cry if you lose * * * you just go out and do better."

In his 23 years Ernie Davis did more than most people do in a lifetime. Toward the end he knew, and experienced, disappointment and frustration.

He didn't cry.

That was part of the inspiration of Ernie Davis all along. From the time he was a little boy.

Thank you, Lord, for giving him that much.

Who's in Charge?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, many Members of this body, including myself, feel that some form of home rule for the District of Columbia is both necessary and desirable. Thus, it is a cause for real concern, when we find the small base of authority that the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners does have at the present time eroded by administrative officials who fail to support the decisions of the Board of Commissioners. A Washington Post editorial dealing with this subject follows:

WHO'S IN CHARGE?

Police Chief Murray, an unreconstructed old frontiersman, clings tenaciously to the ways that won the West: he prefers posses to more policemen and would rather arm the law abiding than try to disarm the lawless. In recent testimony before the House District Subcommittee on Crime, at any rate, he resisted efforts to enlarge his police force and opposed legislation for licensing the possession of pistols.

His views on guns in particular run directly counter to those held by the District Commissioners and by the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia. The Commissioners, with ardent support from the U.S. attorney, devised a modest pistol registration proposal which would operate in some measure—not perfectly or infallibly, you understand, but in some small degree—to keep these lethal weapons in the hands of responsible citizens and keep them out of the hands of infants and idiots, crackpots and criminals.

The President of the Board of Commissioners went up to the city's guardians or foster fathers, the House District Committee, and asked it in the nicest way to pass this pistol permit law. But the Chief of Police followed the Commissioner and promptly told the Congressman that he thinks the proposed legislation would tend to disarm law-abiding citizens rather than lawbreakers.

We think this is nonsense on its face, since the legislation is cast in terms requiring the Commissioners to issue permits to anyone who can satisfy reasonable criteria, and places upon them the burden of justifying any denial. Even if it restricted in no more than minor degree the indiscriminate distribution of pistols by mail order merchants and drugstores, it would at least help to fix responsibility for the ownership of a weapon when it is used, as it was the other day in the District, by a 4-year-old boy, who didn't know it was loaded, to shoot a 2-year-old girl.

The conflict between the Chief of Police and the Commissioners is not novel. It is simply one more illustration of the difficulty of running the District of Columbia under two governments. But Chief Murray adds to the chaos, which is itself related to the city's law-enforcement problems, when he fails to support decisions thoughtfully made by the District's chief executives, with full knowledge of his views.

New Jersey's 50th

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we have heard considerable discussion in this Chamber about our military posture, including the reorganization of certain Reserve and Guard components. The effect of this reorganization is to reduce the Army Reserve and National Guard divisions in number and the assignment of most of those remaining to support regular Army divisions.

New Jersey, however, has a National Guard division that will retain its identity—the 50th Armored. This honor was not granted by chance, or for any political consideration; it was the result of the 50th's high state of readiness and efficiency. In an editorial of last Friday, May 17, the Newark Evening News paid a proper tribute to the 50th, which I would like to read into the RECORD at this point:

Defense Secretary McNamara's controversial plan to streamline the National Guard and Army Reserves has been completed with none of the furor that attended its announcement. Congress, where the cutbacks were greeted with the kind of anguish usually reserved for pork barrel reductions, appears resigned.

Net effect of the McNamara plan has been to reduce National Guard divisions from 27 to 23; the Reserves from 10 to 6. Most will be assigned to support regular Army divisions. But six have been given priority status that qualifies them for independent missions.

In this respect, New Jersey has cause for pride. Its 50th Armored Division is one of the elite 6, chosen on the basis of tougher qualification tests instituted after the 1962 Berlin crisis exposed flagrant weakness in guard and reserve readiness.

Its special status enabled the division to be maintained at 80 percent of war strength, or 11,682 men, and receive the latest equipment rolling out of military arsenals. Selection of the 50th Armored is a tribute to the high state of efficiency it has sustained in war and peace. Its officers and men are to be congratulated.

Hibbing, Minn., Establishes Technical Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, one of the major domestic challenges today facing our Nation, and particularly its young people, is the need to develop the new technical and industrial skills required for employment in the current labor market. Progressive localities in this country are rapidly becoming aware of their responsibility to provide for their men and women, and especially for the young, the proper facilities and training they need to compete successfully for the jobs now available.

The sudden transition to new skills in this era of accelerated industrial change has resulted in the grave unemployment situation confronting our Nation. One of the more obvious reasons our men and women are failing to find work is that they have not been properly prepared to meet the tests of the times. Their education and training are unsuited to the new requirements of our industries. It is, therefore, our very grave obligation to reassess our educational and vocational training methods and curriculums and to transform them until they satisfy the requisites of today and of the future.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Congress to a creative educational venture which has been inaugurated in Hibbing, Minn., a community ready to meet this challenge. Leaders in Hibbing, recognizing the gap between skills being developed and job opportunities available, have opened the Hibbing Area Technical Institute. The new program being offered at the institute seeks to aid any person, and particularly any recent high school student, to develop an employable skill. Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an article from the Minnesota Journal of Education for May 1963 describing this excellent community project:

HIBBING LAUNCHES BOOTSTRAP OFFENSIVE

(By William E. Magajna)

A bootstrap educational program that reflects a small town's resourcefulness is underway at Hibbing. Faced with a steady decline in mining operations that have traditionally provided the community's principal economic prop, Hibbing leaders took a farsighted look at the situation. They decided to mount an offensive. The result: education aimed at helping the town's 18,000 inhabitants toward new and more promising career opportunities.

On March 4, the new Hibbing Area Technical Institute admitted its first students, post high school students seeking retraining to replace obsolete skills and young people intent on employment in a growing industry. The vocational curricula is pointed directly at the rosy job picture in such burgeoning fields as computer technlogy, automotive service trades, and medical laboratory assistants.

The project is largely financed through the Federal Government's National Defense Education Act and George Barden Act, but also received help from State and local funds. The aggressive action of Hibbing officials is attracting national attention and is being closely watched by towns scattered across the Mesabi Range, which face a similar situation.

George Eddie, superintendent of public schools in Hibbing, emphasized the careful selection of curricula offered by the institute. He said, "We think we are on the right track in providing a course in data processing, for example. American business and industry are adopting computers and data processing systems at a rapid pace. The demand for trained people to program and operate this equipment is strong now, and is bound to continue strong in the foreseeable future."

A post high school course in data processing is designed to equip students to meet fully the requirements of a computer programer, an occupation increasingly in demand.

One of the Nation's leading business machines corporation has made available to the school a computer card system under terms of their provision to implement the program. The 2-year data processing course, open to high school graduates with a year or more of algebra, will include "hands on" training with the computer, comparable in speed and capacity to the finest commercial systems. Classroom and laboratory instruction is tailored to give the student a well-rounded education in modern business methods and in data processing technique.

An 18-month's course in automobile mechanics divided into three separate programs is also provided. The first of these is for students who will receive training in all phases of the mechanic's occupation. The second will provide students who aspire to become auto technicians with the opportunity to specialize in electrical systems or automatic transmissions. The third program offers training in the management aspects of the auto service industry for those who would like to become service shop owners or managers.

Later this year, the school will add a medical laboratory assistant's program. These will round out the three initial preparatory programs of the institute. Additional programs in pre-employment and in service training will be put on the curriculum as the need arises and as facilities become available.

The electronic data processing course, now housed in an elementary building, will offer both day and evening classes and can accommodate about 20 students per course per session. At present there is one full-time instructor who gets instructional support drawn from the Hibbing Junior College staff. Another full-time instructor is slated to join the faculty in the fall.

Officials expect student enrollment to come primarily from three segments of the Hibbing area population: (1) recent high school graduates seeking to learn an employment skill; (2) persons 4 to 5 years beyond high school age who have not yet acquired a desirable skill; and (3) persons employed in business offices who have some clerical or accounting training, but desire additional education to equip them for computer type occupations.

The Hibbing Area Technical Institute will work closely with the Minnesota State Employment Office in securing employment for the school's graduates. The school itself is approved by the Minnesota State Board of Education and the State department of vocational education, and, therefore, must meet certain Federal and State educational requirements.

Treasury Secretary Dillon Discusses Both Debt Limit and Tax Cut Before University Awards Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, just yesterday, Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon discussed both the proposed tax program of the administration and the ceiling of the national debt limit at the University of Connecticut's sixth annual Loeb Awards presentation affair in New York City.

Because the Treasury Secretary's remarks are timely, they are worthy of consideration of my distinguished colleagues, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text of Secretary Dillon's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF HON. DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT THE SIXTH ANNUAL UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT LOEB AWARDS PRESENTATION LUNCHEON

I am delighted to take part in the presentation of the Loeb Awards for distinguished business and financial journalism. It gives me an opportunity to pay tribute both to my friend, Gerald Loeb, who founded these awards, and to their recipients, who can take justifiable pride in this recognition of their excellence in the practice of a demanding craft.

I have had considerable opportunity to observe newsmen at work, both at home and abroad, in the most difficult and sensitive of fields. I have a high regard for them and for the skills they employ in the public service.

Those skills are particularly needed in economic and financial reporting. To achieve and maintain a clear perspective on complex economic problems is difficult enough. To do so when these matters become major political issues—hence subject to the distortions of partisan debate—requires not only intelligence and judgment of a very mature order, but an extremely comprehensive background as well.

I am well aware how difficult it is to gather and understand economic facts—let alone interpret them—when the facts themselves are constantly changing. For, in the fluid and intricate economic picture, appearances can be deceiving—and foresight must rely heavily upon a hindsight that is itself often elusive and uncertain. As a result, sound and imaginative evaluation of national economic policy is extraordinarily difficult. With this in mind, let me examine briefly with you today some areas of economic policy in which I have direct responsibility.

The most urgent economic business before this Nation is the President's tax program. It has quite naturally dominated the public discussion of economic matters. That discussion has inevitably brought forth disagreements and misconceptions about the program. But it has also served to strengthen the widespread consensus among all segments of our society that the President's principal proposal—substantial tax reduction this year—is our best hope of accelerating the forward pace of our economy. Let me recall some of its main features:

The President has proposed a cut in the corporate tax rate from 52 to 47 percent to supplement last year's 7 percent tax credit for productive new investment and the liberalization of the rules and procedures governing tax treatment of depreciable equipment. Those two measures reduced business taxes by $2.5 billion a year. The proposed five-point corporate tax rate reduction would cut business taxes by another $2.5 billion by the time the program is fully in effect. This total of $5 billion would give business 40 percent of the overall tax reduction, provide a strong and continuing stimulus toward accelerated economic growth, and increase the profitability of new business investment by almost 30 percent.

The effectiveness of last year's tax changes on capital investment is impressive indeed. The latest McGraw-Hill survey of capital spending estimates that expenditures for plant and equipment in 1963 will rise to $40 billion from a level of just over $37 billion for 1962. Last year's tax reforms are responsible for at least 43 percent of the increase.

But the whole job cannot be done solely by stimulating business investment. No company will produce more goods without markets to absorb them. And the best way to assure those markets is to increase consumer purchasing power. The President's program would do that by reducing personal income tax rates from the present range of 20 to 91 percent to a much lower range of 14 to 65 percent. Such a cut in individual tax rates, combined with the proposed corporate rate reduction, would total $13.6 billion. When the various structural reforms that have been recommended are taken into account, the net reduction would amount to $10.3 billion.

The impact of that overall cut would be felt much quicker than most people realize. If the President's program were to receive final approval by October 1, over $10 billion would be released into the economy within the following 15 months—and some $8 billion of that amount would represent increased consumer purchasing power. The stimulus of a $10 billion tax cut would not stop there. For example, the Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress had estimated that it would eventually increase our annual gross national product by $40 billion.

Those, then, are some of the main features of the President's tax program. As an inevitable result of the legislative process, that program will be somewhat revised by the time the tax bill emerges from the House Ways and Means Committee some weeks hence. However, I am confident that the bill the committee reports out will be one that we can all support wholeheartedly.

Thus far, much of the discussion on tax reduction has centered, not on specific tax proposals, but on expenditure control. If the heat of that discussion has sometimes obscured the facts, I think they are now beginning to come through quite clearly—including the fact that an exceptionally large portion of the expenditure increases during this administration has occurred in the areas of defense and space.

One particularly enlightening comparison shows that, leaving aside only defense and space, all other governmental expenditures in the 3-year period 1958–1961 increased by $800 million more than they will in the first 3 years of the present administration. That comparison shows, cogently and unanswerably, that this administration has continually exercised a firm control over expenditures. And it offers the strongest possible endorsement of what is by far the most significant fact in the present discussion of tax reduction and expenditure control: the President's repeated commitment that, as the economy expands in response to tax reduction and Federal revenues increase, a substantial portion of those increased revenues will be used to reduce and eliminate the current deficit.

Last week, this issue of expenditure control was raised in an old and familiar context—when the House of Representatives debated the proposal to raise the temporary debt limit between now and the end of August, and once more brought a hardy perennial to the forefront of the news. As that debate made clear, there are few areas of fiscal policy as much in need of more, light and less heat as the debt limit. I should like to try to supply some needed light:

First, let no one labor under the delusion that the debt ceiling is either a sane or an effective instrument for the control of Federal expenditures. No one is more conscious than I of the need to keep Government spending under firm control. But this cannot be done by trying to exert controls at the tag end of the expenditure process, when the bills are coming due. The debt limit is not and can not be made a substitute for the control of expenditures at the decisive stage of the expenditure process—when the funds are being appropriated.

Second, since the executive branch cannot refuse to pay the bills incurred in carrying out the programs approved by the Congress, the only alternative is simply to delay paying them. That is exactly what happened in 1957, when an unrealistic debt ceiling forced the Executive to defer payment on its bills. No expenditures were cut back; they were simply postponed and Government contractors had to wait for their money. The unhappy economic effect of that unrealistic 1957 debt ceiling—in combination with other restrictive fiscal measures—needs no retelling here. But anyone who recalls the lesson of 1957—the year from which we date the pattern of slow economic growth which the President's tax program is designed to alter—is not likely to forget it.

Third, the temporary debt limit approved last week by the House, and currently before the Senate, would provide the absolute minimum levels needed by the Treasury for the proper management of the Federal debt and the Treasury's cash balance. These limits—$307 billion through June, and $309 billion throughout July and August—are tight, so tight that they provide little or no room for meeting unforeseen contingencies. The Treasury can attempt to operate within these limits only because it is likely that our expenditure estimates for so short a period will be reasonably accurate and our revenues are unlikely to fall below estimated levels. In addition, since Congress will be in session until some time in the fall, we could always obtain new debt limit legislation, should it be necessary, without having to call a special session of Congress.

And fourth, should we be required to operate between now and the end of August under the present debt ceiling of $305 billion, it would no longer be possible to handle the finances of the U.S. Government in a prudent and responsible manner. We would be forced to resort to an array of unusual financial procedures of the sort which had to be used in 1957–58—procedures which, in the end, would only add to the burdens of the taxpayers of this country. A $305 billion debt limit would also deprive us of one of our most important tools for keeping our short-term interest rates competitive with rates abroad: the ability to add to the market supply of short-term Government securities when the occasion demands. The timely use of this technique has undoubtedly helped reduce the outflow of short-term funds throughout the past 2 years by many hundreds of millions of dollars. It is no exaggeration to say that part of the price of an unrealistically restrictive debt limit would have to be paid in gold.

Those are but a few examples of the havoc that can be wrought in the name of fiscal responsibility. I think they make it obvious that the debt ceiling is not only the wrong instrument to use in attempting to control Federal expenditures, but that an unduly restrictive ceiling could place this country in an untenable fiscal situation. I suppose it would be unrealistic to expect that the seasonal storm over the debt limit through which we are now passing will not deluge us in future years. But I do hope, for the sake of fiscal sanity and prudence, that its intensity may clear the air and generate some fresh and lucid thinking about the whole question of the debt limit.

Another vital, if less incendiary, problem that is now receiving considerable attention is our balance of payments position. More specifically, some in this country have recently expressed concern over the adverse impact on our payments balance of foreign borrowing in the U.S. capital market, and have suggested that through one means or another, we make access to our market more difficult or more expensive.

Unquestionably, a large amount of money is being raised in our capital market by borrowers from countries which enjoy healthy surpluses in their own payments position. That is natural enough, since foreigners can find in our financial market what they often lack in their own: unmatched facilities and resources, and freedom from excessive government regulations. It is a market in which both borrower and lender can operate with maximum efficiency and minimum difficulty.

Although foreign borrowers undoubtedly contribute to our payments imbalance, it would be a shortsighted solution indeed if we were to make the facilities and resources of our capital market less available to them. The real solution—as I urged more than a year ago in Rome—is the development of capital markets in Europe and elsewhere that are better able to meet the needs of their own nationals, and that are more accessible to borrowers from other countries as well. That calls for removal of existing government restrictions, enlargement of capital resources, and improvement of facilities to increase the efficiency of doing business.

I am glad to say that some progress in this direction has been made and that more can be expected. But the development of markets more comparable to ours will take time. Meanwhile, there is every reason to maintain free access to our market, so that it can continue to function as an important part of the international payments system.

It is not enough, however, to encourage progress in improving markets abroad. We must equally encourage the participation of foreign capital in our own market. If we take full advantage of the possibilities of attracting foreign capital—as borrowers are now attracted—we can offset to a great extent the outflow of funds from the sale of foreign issues here.

We would, for example, like to see underwriters in this country seek actively and energetically to put the highest practicable proportion of their new foreign issues into the hands of foreign subscribers. Moreover, in order to give more foreign subscribers a greater opportunity to invest in these issues, we would like to see more of them publicly marketed, rather than privately placed.

When issues are privately placed—and private placements accounted for more than half of the new foreign issues in our market last year—they are offered almost exclusively to U.S. investors. Last year, for example, almost all of the Canadian and Latin American issues, which together accounted for a large part of the foreign use of our market, were private placements.

On the other hand the buyers of publicly placed new foreign issues are by no means all Americans. Last year foreigners purchased more than one-third of the publicly offered foreign issues. The willingness of foreigners to purchase new foreign issues in our market reflects the attractiveness of our facilities to both borrowers and lenders. Because of that fact, we have every reason to strive to develop and exploit our techniques for selling not only goods, but also securities, to foreign buyers. We have undertaken a great drive to expand our exports—a drive that is imperative if our receipts from exports are to meet the irreducible cost of our defense and aid commitments abroad and match the outflow of American long-term investment. We need an equally determined drive by the financial community to sell its very unique range of products.

This, then, has been a brief look at some aspects of the current economic scene. The outlook for the future no one can predict with certainty. But I think most of us will agree that the signs are generally favorable.

In the short run, our economic picture looks bright, but not perhaps so gloriously rosy as some would paint it. Our present economic upturn is heartening. A number of economists, after scrutinizing the latest pattern of the indicators, and paying particular attention to the rising level of capital investment, are hoping for a long run upswing to near boom-time levels. My feeling, while genuinely optimistic, is not quite so sanguine as this. Last January the President's Council of Economic Advisers estimated that 1963 gross national product would fall within a range of $5 billion either side of the $578 billion figure that was used as the basis of our revenue forecasts. It now looks like the high side of that range might be about right. That is what I had in mind when I suggested earlier this month that, if the present improvement continues, Federal revenues might perhaps exceed our estimates for fiscal 1964 by as much as $1 billion. But even such a result would not lead to any appreciable improvement in our employment situation. For that, we must look to tax reduction.

The first-quarter balance-of-payments picture is perhaps less rosy and I think it would be unrealistic to look for any sudden solution in this area. Because we are relying on the slower, but surer, solutions brought about by a market economy, it is entirely posible that this year's deficit will still be comparatively large. Obviously, the payments deficit is a stubborn problem, but with the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the Revenue Act of 1962, and particularly with the prospect of a meaningful tax program this year, we will certainly have the tools to work more effectively for a solution.

The answers to this and other vexing economic questions require close cooperation between the public and private sectors of our society. They also call for wider discussion of the major issues and broader understanding of their implications for the individual citizen and for the Nation—the sort of informed public understanding that the specialists in the business and financial press can help to generate. With your help—and, as President Kennedy said recently—"with the help of all of those in business, labor, and other professions who share your concern for the future, we shall build a future from which all Americans can take pride as well as sustenance."

Americans Urged a Jewish State Before the Zionist Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the April 25, 1963, edition of the American Examiner:

AMERICAN CHRISTIANS WHO URGED A JEWISH STATE

(By Rabbi Philip R. Alstat)

The nearest thing to unity in the multiplicity of rival Jewish organizations is their deep and common interest in advancing the welfare of the State of Israel (whose 15th anniversary occurs this year next Monday, April 29). The only discord in the harmonious chorus of felicitations will undoubtedly be the raucous voice of the American Council for Judaism.

The very name of that council is a misnomer and a gross misrepresentation. That hating Israel is against and not "for Judaism" should be obvious to anyone at all familiar with our religious heritage. The Bible, Talmud, Midrash, medieval Hebrew poetry and philosophy, as well as our traditional liturgy, establish beyond the least doubt the eternal and indissoluble relation among the Jewish religion, the Jewish people, and the Jewish land.

Even the reform wing of American Jewry, which originally had been militantly anti-Zionist, has revised its ideology on this issue and is now among Israel's warmest and most generous friends.

We now propose to show that the council is not even truly "American." Its psychopathological fear of the bogey or so-called dual loyalty merely reveals how far the council is from understanding the true spirit of America. American Christians, whose healthy psychology is free from both the complexes of assimilated Jews and the virus of anti-Semitism, come to recognize of their own accord the moral propriety and practical necessity of restoring the homeless, persecuted Jewish people to their ancestral land.

For illustration we cite, in reverse chronology, three examples of such Christian American Zionism, and all of them manifested spontaneously long before the rise of political Zionism among Jews.

A PETITION TO PRESIDENT HARRISON

On March 5, 1897—6 years before Dr. Herzl had convened the first Zionist Congress—a leading American Protestant clergyman, Rev. William Eugene Blackstone, presented to President Benjamin Harrison a petition, signed by some of the most eminent Americans of that time, which urged that, in view of the persecution of Jews in czarist Russia, steps be taken for their settlement in a reestablished Jewish state in the land from which they had once been exiled.

PRESIDENT LINCOLN'S SYMPATHETIC ATTITUDE

We have already recorded here in an earlier column (Feb. 8, 1962) that in a reply to a query by the Canadian idealist, Henry Wentworth Monk, President Lincoln expressed his sympathy for the dream of the restoration of the Jewish people to their national home in Palestine. He added, however, a reservation that his cooperation would have to wait till after the victorious end of the Civil War raging then. This utterance of Lincoln was made about 34 years before the World Zionist Organization came into being.

Finally we reproduce here a poem on Judea, which predicted the rebirth of the Jewish state and portrayed its future glories in ecstatic verses. It appeared in the New Hampshire Patriot and State Gazette, published at Concord, N.H., on June 11, 1827—70 years before the first Zionist Congress. The poet chose to remain anonymous, but since there is no record of a Jewish community in Concord at that time, its creator was most probably a Christian. For the discovery of this poem we are indebted to Henry M. Katz, a New York attorney by vocation and a collector of Jewish curiosa by avocation:

"JUDEA

"No more, Judea, on thy hills
The suppliant Hebrew bends;
No more along thy flowing rills
The voice of music wends;
Prostrate thy temples in the dust,
Thy palaces o'erthrown,
Carried like a sand-swept gust
To other land have flown.
No more to lute, or bard, or lyre
The dark-eyed maidens dance;
For dead is love and young desire,
Her whisper and her glance;
A cruel race profanes thy land,
Pollutes thy hallowed earth,
The Moslem with his blood-dyed hand
Now holds you for his mirth.
Yet ye shall sweep the Moslems' power
Like chaff before the wind,
Thy sons again shall hail the hour
When they their God shall find;
Amid the hills so desolate,
These walls deserted now,
And at Thy altar bow.
The valleys then shall ring to tones
Of heartfelt mirth and pleasure,
And music breathe her sweetest strains,
And wake her boldest measure.
With Tablet and sacred Ark
Will move your lightsome people,
While from the valleys joy shall rise
Above the mountain's steeple."

Remarks by Vice President at Luncheon Honoring Astronaut Cooper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I include the following in the Appendix under permission granted:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, LUNCHEON HONORING ASTRONAUT GORDON COOPER, BEN FRANKLIN ROOM, STATE DEPARTMENT, WASHINGTON, D.C., TUESDAY, MAY 21, 1963

In 1942, President Roosevelt called together our wartime leaders for the final decision on continuing or abandoning the Manhattan project which produced the atomic bomb. One of the most eminent leaders present heard presentation from all sides. Then, he solemnly gave President Roosevelt his verdict: "The bomb will never go off—I speak, of course, Mr. President, as an expert on explosives."

In that first, uncertain spring of the space age 5 years ago, some conscientious experts took the same attitude toward Project Mercury. History has proved them grossly wrong.

Today, same kind of doubts are expressed about further space explorations. History will prove those doubts wrong, also.

Project Mercury has established the capacity of free and open societies to come from behind—and forge ahead. We realize competition is intense. We expect further successes by the totalitarians. We expect continuing successes ourselves.

Americans do not intend that space shall be defaulted. Americans do not intend to live in a world which goes to bed at night by the light of a Communist moon.

Success has been achieved by teamwork—the teamwork of astronauts, scientists, engineers, plus teamwork of our political system. Responsible support of Members of Congress has been indispensable. The support will continue from responsible members of both parties. There will be no American default in space.

Hitler once predicted the Nazis would wring England's neck like a chicken. After the Battle of Britain, Winston Churchill said to Commons, "Some chicken. Some neck." We have heard some say recently that the civilian space program is only "leaf-raking." Considering Major Cooper—considering the vast technological cooperation which made his mission a success—I would say today, "Some leaf. Some rake."

The Income Tax Picture and What It Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following short essay by Henri de LaChappelle which appeared in a private publication concerns the income tax picture and contains highly pertinent statistics and conclusions:

THE INCOME TAX PICTURE AND WHAT IT MEANS

(By Henri de LaChappelle)

"Total tax take in late 1920's mounted to 15 percent of national income. In the 1940's it went up to 27 percent. Now 35 cents out of each national income dollar goes to pay cost of Government" (Nation's Business).

"All U.S. personal income tax rates above 50 percent (Newsweek, Nov. 9, 1962) yield less than $1 billion; i.e., less than 1 percent of total Federal revenues." (Incidentally, this amounts only to about one-tenth total annual interest service on Federal debt.)

"It has been said, people with incomes under $5,000 should not have to pay any tax at all. Let the rich man pay it. Unfortunately," says a Financial Chronicle article, May 1, 1962, "there are not enough rich men. Tax experts reveal if the Government seized all individual incomes over $25,000 a year, it would run the Government not quite 3 days. If it confiscated all incomes over $10,000 a year, it would carry the Government only 18½ days. All taxes paid by all persons in the million-dollar-income class would run the Government only 1 day. If they were taxed 100 percent, total revenue from that source would run the Government less than 15 hours longer."

From mid-April on, according to some statisticians, the average American stops working full time for his Government and is free to work the balance of the year for himself.

"The bulk of revenue from the Federal income tax is derived from the initial 20-percent rate. In 1960, 86 percent of receipts came from this first-bracket rate, to which all taxpayers are subject, while the entire progressive portion up to 91 percent produced only 14 percent of the yield. Collections were 23.3 percent of the total taxable income reported in 1960—which implies a flat tax rate of 23.3 percent would produce the same revenue as the present steeply graduated schedule," Newsweek of November 19, 1962, quoting First National City Bank.

"Per capita taxes (Federal, State, and local, but not social security) in 11 years, 1929–40, rose from $81 to $96, a rise of 17.2 percent. In the 13 years to 1953 taxes rose 446 percent to $524 per capita. In those years inflation just about doubled the price level. In the 9 years 1953–62, per capita taxes rose 27 percent to $666. Nearly two-thirds of that gain occurred in State and local taxes. In the past 5 years Federal taxes were up 17.6 percent to $82 billion. State up 41.5 percent to $20.6 billion, and local up 47.7 percent to $21 billion," U.S. News, September 1962.

"The bulk of taxes raised by Federal Government is levied against incomes and payrolls of its citizens and businesses, with a relatively minor share derived from taxes on consumption. In fiscal 1960 out of a total of $89 billion of Federal tax collections, $62 billion was derived from personal and corporation income taxes, while payroll taxes to support various social security programs took over $12 billion. Federal, estate and gift taxes, levied on transfers of capital built up by industrious individuals, brought in another $1.6 billion. All told, 85 percent of the vast tax revenues came from levies on income and capital, with the remaining 15 percent from a wide assortment of consumption taxes, including Federal excises, custom duties, etc. In only one other country—New Zealand—did taxes on income provide as much as two-thirds of Central Government tax receipts and it is generally conceded Russia would be in the lowest rank of all in such international comparison" (First National City Bank letter, October 1962.)

Social security taxes, up last January 1 to 3⅝ percent on employees and employers (a 16-percent boost for each) means $1 billion added to costs of doing business and reduces spending money of workers by another $1 billion. These taxes have risen over 78 percent in the past 6 years (M and M Association, November 1962) and benefits already promised require another 48-percent increase in payroll taxes between now and 1968.

Note: It might be well to view all of the above within the context of Karl Marx's Communist manifesto (1848) with special reference to No. 2 of its 10 commandments that reads as follows: "A heavy progressive or graduated income tax."

Obviously, tax reform is the crying need of the day, but the burning question is—What kind of reform? The right kind (from standpoint of good economics) could well launch an unparalleled wave of prosperity with possibly greatest impact on the heavy industries that for many years have been the "tail of the dog" in the body economic. Thus far the proposed scaling down in the tax brackets is a step in the right direction.

In reading the following item in the papers the other day the writer could not help but think about Karl Marx's No. 3 tenet in the manifesto that reads "Abolition of all right of inheritance":

"Mrs. William R. Timken (widow of the founder of Timken Roller Bearing Co.) died 4 years ago and last week Surrogate's Court in New York reported she left an estate worth nearly $44 million. But for all Mrs. Timken's zealous supervision of her finances, her heirs will get only about $13 million. Federal and New York State taxes amounted to more than $30 million." No comment.

Address by Hon. Daniel K. Inouye, May 5, 1963, Cornerstone Laying Ceremonies, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Yeshiva University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, our distingushed colleague in the other body, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], delivered the principal address on May 5, 1963, in connection with the cornerstone laying ceremonies for the new Ullmann Research Center for Health Sciences and for the Einstein College Hospital which includes the Horace W. Goldsmith Pavilion, the David and Irene Schwartz Pavilion, the Charles H. Revson Diagnostic Center, and the Evelyn and Joseph I. Lubin Rehabilitation Center. All of these buildings are presently under construction on the campus of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of the Yeshiva University of New York.

During the ceremonies at the site a "Letter to the Future" was placed in the cornerstone which reads as follows:

Letter to the Future—This Is Addressed to You—The Leaders and Builders of the Future

May the hope dreams, and aspirations which motivate and inspire us in this building program today become the living realities of your day. May our efforts and dedication to the programs and ideals of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University bear fruit in fuller, healthier lives for all mankind. May the dread diseases which cause man so much pain and cut so many down in the prime of life be consigned to medical history as scourges conquered by man's ingenuity. May the generations of doctors and scientists trained at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine and the scientific achievements emanating from its laboratories serve as an enduring testament to our faith in the future, an affirmation of Albert Einstein's belief that there is no higher purpose than service to one's fellow man.

Albert Einstein College of Medicine, of Yeshiva University, cornerstone ceremonies, May 5, 1963.

Mr. Speaker, at the dinner following this impressive ceremony Senator Inouye delivered an address of great importance advocating the establishment by the United States of a Health Corps like our Peace Corps.

His address follows:

Address by Senator Daniel K. Inouye

It is a privilege to share in your pride and joy at this exciting new stage in the life of your fine young medical school. Today, when so much strife and self-interest divides whole continents, it is gratifying to celebrate an occasion which brings together people dedicated to the health and happiness of humanity everywhere.

This afternoon, the cornerstone ceremonies heralded the near completion of magnificent new facilities for research and for the care of the sick and disabled. These new hospital and research buildings, as I understand, mark the completion of your college's grand design for a medical city which will rank among the world's truly great centers for human healing.

Eight years ago, John F. Kennedy greeted the opening of Einstein college with the expectation that it would become a monument of hope and pride to the future health and the happiness of all of its citizens. That prophecy has been fulfilled in a remarkably short time and the college is physical proof of the miracle that can be accomplished by men and women of all races and creeds united by a common concern for all.

Just a few hours ago, a "Letter to the Future" was enclosed in the new buildings, bearing the names of the visionary men and women who are determined that generations to come will inherit a world freer of disease and needless suffering than our own. This was a vote of confidence in man's potential to build a more joyous world—an affirmation that we can harness the positive forces of science for life rather than be helpless pawns in a tragic race for mutual annihilation.

It is only fitting that the school which bears Albert Einstein's name should epitomize the lifegiving aspects of science. The college has in its short existence already made an impact that reaches far beyond the confines of its metropolitan home. Conceived in the spirit of equality and freedom, it has become an international focus for the exchange of medical knowledge and training.

It is inspiring to read the list of far-flung states and nations of the world at which your graduate doctors and scientists are now practicing. Australia, Peru, Korea, Israel, Turkey, the Philippines, India, my own State, Hawaii—these are only a few of the scores of places across the length and breadth of the globe at which your faculty and student members are serving.

We of Hawaii have firsthand evidence of the skill and humanitarianism of your graduates—several of whom now serve with distinction in Queens Hospital of Honolulu.

During the past year alone, the college was home to more than 50 foreign scholars from 30 countries throughout the world. Soon they, too, will return to their native countries or move on to new posts in foreign lands which desperately need their skills. This is a new kind of international exchange—not of commodities, or capital—but of human resources which can be one of the major bridges of understanding between nations of differing beliefs.

We Americans have a long tradition of lending a helping hand to people less fortuate than ourselves. We have, for example, since the end of World War II, given billions of dollars to scores of nations. Such foreign aid is, of course, essential for these newly developed nations. But economic underdevelopment is not the only factor that separates the affluent nations from the poverty-stricken masses of the world.

Less apparent to Americans perhaps are the woeful medical inadequacies which are the daily lot of billions. So long as this terrible imbalance of health exists—so long as men, women and children are deprived of the most elementary health standards—so long will the smouldering flames of conflict remain to be fanned into active antagonism in a world divided.

Here, for example, are some of the appalling statistics of the gap in health standards that separates the more fortunate parts of the world from its less fortunate neighbors:

1. While the life expectancy of the average American is 67 years, a new born Asian can look forward to a life expectancy of less than 40.

2. While we in the United States have for the most part brought infectious diseases under control, millions in Asia and Africa suffer and die each year from dysentary, influenza, sleeping sickness, yellow fever, and typhoid.

3. Two-thirds of the world's 2.7 billion people are still without the most rudimentary health services such as clear water, plumbing, sewage, vaccination.

4. In the underdeveloped areas, virtually whole populations suffer from childhood endemic diseases like cholera, leprosy, and smallpox which in our land have been relegated to the status of "textbook cases."

5. We in America can boast or 1 bed for every 100 persons. Yet in India, there is a hospital ratio of 1 bed for every 3,500 people.

This gap, as we see is truly staggering. In this age of medical miracles millions die from diseases which long have been mastered in the laboratory.

At a time, when a revolution in the biological sciences offers unprecedented opportunities for longer life, millions of people still believe that sickness and early death are immutable fates. You here who have visited Africa, Asia, or the Middle East, have seen for yourself these appalling statistics translated into terms of human suffering. Paradoxically, however, this contrast between medical promise and the world's actualities suggests an area of agreement between opposing camps that could well show the way to peaceful solutions. Indeed unless and until our war driven world is able to find common ground for the positive use of the astonishing discoveries of science, we stand every chance of seeing science mobilized for the future extinction of life itself.

We know that the constitution of the World Health Organization of the U.N. guarantees "the health of all people as fundamental to the attainment of peace and security." Each of you here, through your association with Einstein College, has given evidence of your belief that every man has the inalienable right to freedom from disease, as he has to the other freedoms guaranteed in the charter of the U.N. and our own Constitution.

The example of medical institutions, such as yours—in acting as an international training ground for health practitioners—points to the way in which the advanced nations have begun to meet their responsibility to the entire world.

Many other medical schools, private institutions, Government agencies, and U.N. groups are currently engaged in serving the world's health needs on a relatively large scale. But we are still merely scratching the surface of the world's health problems. We can no longer afford the luxury of piecemeal efforts or mere guerrilla warfare against disease. The time is ripe for a massive retaliation of all nations against disease and needless suffering. Programs of such scope and significance are expensive—indeed running into millions or billions of dollars—and we understand full well the difficulties that stand in the way of organizing and administrating a global war against disease.

Nevertheless, our Nation can act as a catalyst in speeding such worldwide health efforts, much as our Peace Corps is doing its fine job of hastening the industrial progress of underdeveloped nations throughout the world.

I therefore want to put forward the following proposals by which our Nation can help to equalize the world's health imbalance:

1. I propose that our Nation's medical universities, along with our private philanthropic institutes—and in cooperation with the Government health agencies, should call a conference for the purpose of setting up a Health Corps along the lines of our existing Peace Corps.

2. The purpose of the Health Corps would be to send teams of scientists, physicians, nurses and medical administrators to those nations of the world which would request our help.

3. Once established in a specific area, these Health Teams in collaboration with that nation's own health authorities, would lay plans for short- and long-range programs, for the construction of vitally needed training and research and hospital resources.

4. These Health Teams would be drawn from private doctors and scientists in the United States and from undergraduate and graduate personnel of the Nation's medical schools, who would volunteer to spend their period of elective study, their internships, or residencies in the foreign nations involved.

5. The U.S. Health Corps would, of course, act in conjunction with the World Health Organization of the U.N. It might invite the participation of health teams from other nations, so that ultimately the Health Corps would become an international agency for promoting health throughout the world.

6. The Health Corps would be in a sense self-liquidating. That is, it would aim at eventually bringing the health standards of each of the member nations up to the point where they would be capable of meeting their own basic health needs.

7. The Health Corps would seek the advice, aid and experience of the World Health Organization so that the efforts of both would be pooled in solving the complex problems that exist.

This proposal is only one of the ways in which our Nation's unlimited potential for saving and prolonging life could be extended to other areas of the world. It would, in my opinion, also serve as a vital link in binding together the people of the world in a crusade that would transcend any and all dividing interests which now exist at the level of narrow nationalism.

Your presence here, as friends and founders of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, attests to the deep concern which you have for a better and happier physical life on this earth. Your "Letter to the Future" is written not merely in words but in your generous support of the splendid new halls of healing and research in which that letter is forever enclosed.

In the future, I am certain those of the forthcoming generations who will have benefited from your courage and concern will read in it a testament of man's humanity to all of the members of the human race.

"Unbiased" Information on Wheat Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on the day he was going to vote on the wheat referendum, a farmer constituent of mine at Watertown, Minn., sent me a copy of a speech by Charles S. Murphy, Under Secretary of Agriculture, which was included in the kit of unbiased information which the Department circulated to the farmers to educate them on the wheat program. My constituent, Ed F. Burns, suggested that I decide for myself "if it is in accord with Freeman's statement that USDA was only using money to give farmers unbiased information on the wheat issue."

Mr. Burns told me that he took the speech to the county ASC office, and was told that it had been mailed out "because his superior bureaucrats told him to."

I include, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Murphy's speech in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

WHEAT REFERENDUM--EXCERPT FROM TALK BY UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE CHARLES S. MURPHY BEFORE THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF GRAIN COOPERATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 3, 1963

Now I would like to speak to you briefly about another subject which is of primary interest to this group—the wheat referendum.

I have not said anything about this before. The Secretary has spoken about it and a good many other people in the Department have also been faithfully performing their duty of disseminating objective and unbiased information on the subject. I have not been gagged. It just happens that I have been attending to other matters. However, I have some thoughts on the subject that I would like to get off my chest, and I think this is the time and place to do it.

This group contains representatives of grain cooperatives through which a large proportion of the wheat crop is marketed every year. I have been told that the interest of these grain co-ops is the same as the interest of the farmers who are their members, and that these co-ops exist for the purpose of serving these farmer members. I have also been told that these co-ops are influential in molding opinion among wheat farmers—that it is around the country elevators that decisions are really made about what wheat farmers favor and what they oppose.

If both of these things are true, I suppose your top priority business from now until May 21 will be to inform wheat growers why they should vote yes in the referendum, and I suppose the wheat growers will follow your advice and everything will be hunky-dory. Surely, you will make every effort to see that wheat farmers do not lose $700 million by voting "no" in this referendum.

There are some high stakes in this referendum. It seems to me there may be some misunderstanding about just what is at stake. One thing that is not at stake is Orville Freeman's job as Secretary of Agriculture. He is just as solid in that job as the Rock of Gibralter. He will be right there if he is willing to stay no matter what the outcome is in this referendum—win, lose, or draw. Another thing that is not at stake is the position of the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture is 100 years old, and it, too, will continue to be right there no matter what the outcome of this referendum is. And, as a matter of fact, it probably will save several hundred million dollars in 1964 if this program is defeated in the referendum.

Also, I might add that the administration will probably be better off politically if this referendum fails. I have had some experience in presidential elections, and I think I know something about the subject. Throughout the country as a whole, farm programs are not popular. I am reminded of this every day when I come in contact with the outside world. This is unfortunate, but it is very true, and the farmers really have a rather thin line of leaders in the administration and in the Congress protecting their programs from onslaught from many directions. Only 8 or 9 percent of the people are farmers these days. If the administration approached this question on a coldly political basis, I shudder to think of the direction that might be taken. Farm programs are not generally popular, and, I repeat, politically the administration would probably be better off if the wheat referendum failed.

The principal thing at stake in this referendum is the farmers' income and welfare. The difference between $2 wheat and $1 wheat ought to be so plain as to require no elaboration. If wheat farmers vote to cut their gross income $700 million in 1964, they won't have much net income left.

Also at stake in this referendum may be the future of a particular farm organization. How anyone claiming to speak for the farmer could oppose a "yes" vote in this referendum I do not understand. It seems to me that any farm organization taking this position is bound to lose no matter what the outcome of the referendum. If the referendum carries, the loss of face and prestige is obvious. On the other hand, if the referendum loses, the result for the farm organization responsible could be much worse.

In North Carolina in 1932, farmers who were no longer able to buy gasoline and parts for their automobiles put shafts on them, hitched them up to horses and mules, and called them Hoover carts. They used to have Hoover cart parades. If this wheat referendum fails to carry, it may be that in Kansas in 1964 you will see farmers hauling $1 wheat to your elevators with signs on the side of their trucks saying "Shuman Wagons."

Also in 1932, I recall there was a magazine called Literary Digest that took a postcard poll as to how the election was to turn out. They found that Hoover was going to win by a large margin. Shortly after the election, the Literary Digest went out of business.

It's too bad we cannot learn better from the experience of others. Tobacco farmers in North Carolina voted against the price support program once in the late 1930's. Since then, the favorable percentage has ranged around 98. This is an awfully hard way to learn a lesson, and I hope the wheat farmers will spare themselves this.

Your president, Bill Thatcher, has a saying that farm prices are made in Washington, I expect he would agree with me that this is only partly true. In this case, Washington has already done its part. Now the rest of it is up to the farmers themselves.

Personally, I am optimistic about the outcome of the referendum. I simply don't see how farmers could be misled so badly as to vote no. However, I have been wrong about such things before and could be wrong this time.

Be that as it may, I will be watching very closely, and I am sure that all of you will be doing all you can.

Now, Mr. President, I hope that my remarks on this subject have not been too blunt, but the farmers have some vital issues at stake here, and I think the circumstances call for plain speaking.

Which Shall It Be: An Academy of Foreign Affairs, or a Freedom Academy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy in his fiscal 1964 budget requested establishment of a graduate-level National Academy of Foreign Affairs for employees of all Federal agencies involved in foreign affairs. On February 11 draft legislation was transmitted to the Congress and has been introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays] as H.R. 3668.

A separate bill has also been introduced calling for a Freedom Academy. The impact of each of these proposals should be thoughtfully considered. As a democracy we must thoroughly understand the direction in which each would tend.

The following editorial appearing in the May 8 Minneapolis Star gives one point of view on these two proposals:

Different Academies

Well-intentioned men such as Roscoe Drummond (writing in the adjoining columns; want the Government to set up a Freedom Academy to train Americans in cold war tactics. The idea has a certain amount of instant appeal.

One may, however, possess equally good intentions and an equally deep aversion for communism and still think this particular proposed academy is not really a good idea.

Do we really want to emulate the Russians in Cuba and train nationals of other nations in murder, sabotage and general subversion? The Communists are training these people to create chaos in vulnerable Latin American countries as a prelude to violent overthrow of their governments.

Where—other than perhaps in Cuba—do we think that we should or can at this time, or in the foreseeable future, try to ignite our own revolutions?

And what precise subjects does one teach to combat communism? None in particular, really, except such very specialized fields as antiespionage, counterinsurgency, etc., which are taught in our military schools.

The ideas which are our best day-to-day weapons against aggressive communism are the basic philosophical tenets of our free society. And these are taught in the history, economics, political science, and humanities courses of our universities and colleges. A special academy is not needed to isolate and present them.

A properly conceived National Academy of Foreign Affairs is something else, however. It can provide, for foreign service people and other Government personnel serving abroad, advanced training in special fields.

Such specialized training in a postgraduate level institution is needed. It would be a shame to dilute and confuse it through the diffuse and often ill-advised projects urged by too many partisans of the cold war academy.

Brickhouse at 2,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the other day, Chicago's most highly respected and admired baseball announcer, Jack Brickhouse, announced his 2,000th major league game from Chicago. This important observance brought an avalanche of congratulations from his many friends and admirers.

I am happy today to join in this tribute to a man who has helped to bring to millions of Americans the full spirit and excitement of baseball—our Nation's favorite pastime.

Jack Brickhouse has a unique facility through the use of words to bring to his listeners the very epitome of excitement and luster to each play. It is no accident that Jack Brickhouse has been announcing for WGN and WGN-TV in Chicago all of this time. He today towers as the Nation's outstanding sportscaster.

I take this privilege to join in congratulating Jack Brickhouse and his lovely wife, who shares in his rightfully earned glory.

I should also like to take this opportunity to call my colleagues' attention to a recent editorial which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on this momentous anniversary.

The editorial follows:

Brickhouse at 2,000

There were any number of places people might have sent telegrams on Sunday. They might have sent messages to the White House in praise of Major Cooper, back from his 22 spins in space. They might have dashed off telegrams to Members of Congress, asking why so little is being accomplished in Washington; or they might have put the same question to members of the general assembly in Springfield.

But we're certain that none of these received as many telegrams as were delivered to Jack Brickhouse, the old master of sports announcers, while he telecast his 2,000th major league game from Chicago. It was entirely fitting that the Cubs should join in the spirit of the occasion by winning, 3 to 2, from the Milwaukee Braves.

Jack Brickhouse didn't earn this tribute by solving any of the world's perplexing political or social problems. Neither did he earn it because he was the first to broadcast a baseball game across the Atlantic via Telstar, nor because of the many awards he has received. He earned it simply because he has spent 15 years doing his job and doing it well, and because the countless fans who listen to him and watch him over WGN and WGN-TV like the way he has done it.

This, perhaps, is the most meaningful tribute a man can receive. The Brickhouse example is a worthy one for us all, though our jobs may not land us in the headlines or on the TV screen. We congratulate him. We wish him many more thousands of successful telecasts. And we welcome him, by virtue of the column he has begun writing for Chicago's American, as a fellow journalist.

Cutting Taxes: An Alternative to the Kennedy Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, for the past several years I have consistently urged the repeal of the temporary 10-percent excise tax on automobiles which we are called upon annually to continue for 1 more year.

Because of the President's recommendations for tax reduction to stimulate economic growth, I sincerely feel that this year more than at any time in the recent past we should carefully review our excise tax structure. In this connection I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a column by Roscoe Drummond appearing in the Washington Post of May 22, wherein he discusses an alternative to the Kennedy tax plan which has been suggested by our distinguished colleague from Missouri, Representative Thomas Curtis. Mr. Drummond's comments are as follows:

Cutting Taxes: An Alternative to the Kennedy Plan

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The U.S. economy is picking up so well at this midyear point that some of the heat is seeping out of the campaign for a tax cut.

My own judgment is that while the brighter outlook reduces the pressure to lower the deterrent tax rates, it does not mean that early tax reduction is no longer desirable.

It was a mistake, I think, for President Kennedy so to oversimplify the case for a tax cut that he was left in the position of appearing to advocate it primarily as a means of averting a recession.

Now that any imminent recession recedes further into the background and the second half of 1963 and early 1964 hold promise of sustained recovery, Mr. Kennedy's argument appears greatly weakened.

I say "appears" because averting a possible recession is only one of several good reasons for taking the brake of very high taxes off the economy—and not the most important one.

The controlling purposes of a tax cut are:

To produce a higher level of economic recovery than we have had in the past 10 years, to promote a fuller use of our economic capacity, and to cut down the dangerously high percentage of unemployment which has continued through prosperous times.

This goal remains urgent even if the danger of any serious recession is vanishing.

Most Washington correspondents still figure that some kind of tax cut will be forthcoming this year. But it will be at least mid-June before the Ways and Means Committee will be able to report a bill to the floor of the House. Since all revenue bills must originate in the House, the Senate Finance Committee is disposed to hold back until it sees what the House is going to do.

This means that it will be late summer before Congress will narrow in on the tax decision. By that time the feeling may well be that, with the signs of prosperity so strong, the whole thing can be put off for another year.

If the Kennedy administration believes that a substantial tax cut soon is needed, not just to avert a nonexistent recession but to promote a more dynamic recovery which will really cut into unemployment, it should be ready to counter a late-summer disinclination to do anything with some practical alternative.

If the objective is a sizable tax cut, even if it doesn't take exactly the form the administration wants, then there is an alternative.

It has already been discussed by one of the ablest conservatives in the House, Representative Thomas Curtis of Missouri. It requires no action by Congress—only inaction. Mr. Curtis suggests that Congress simply allow all the special consumer and corporate taxes imposed during the Korean war to expire on June 30. They expire automatically unless Congress reenacts them.

These taxes were enacted for the very purpose of putting a brake on wartime consumption and on the use of scarce materials and services needed for the war. By the very logic on which they were imposed, removing them would release the economy and make $3 billion to $4 billion a year available to both consumer and capital investment.

This may or may not be the best substitute for the administration's tax program, which the President still hopes to get. But it would be a boon and a boost to the economy. What would be practical is for Congress to continue the Korean taxes for only three months. If by that time Congress is unable to agree on some acceptable version of the administration's proposed cut, then at least something constructive is still open; that is, the antieconomic growth Korean taxes could be allowed to expire with the greatest of ease.

Operation Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year I called our colleagues' attention to a remarkable youth achievement program sponsored by Junior Achievement of Union County, N.J., the congressional district I am privileged to represent.

At that time, I extended my remarks to include some of the background and details of this organization's special project called Operation Free Enterprise.

It is a special pleasure for me, therefore, to report to our colleagues on the results of this project in which the young winners spent several days last month in a visit to West Germany and Berlin. This report, prepared by Mr. J. Kenneth Roden, executive director of Junior Achievement, indicates very clearly the great value of the project to the young participants and illustrates the high degree of alertness and aptitude with which they approached this rare opportunity.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the report follows:

HIGHLIGHTS OF OPERATION FREE ENTERPRISE, APRIL 19–26, 1963

VISITS TO INDUSTRIES

Visits to the plant installations and offices of Fried. Krupp, Ford Motor Co., Esso A. G. and National Cash Register Co. were most impressive and demonstrated to the young people the tremendous economic success of the Federal Republic and the impact of the Common Market on world trade.

Personal meetings with executives of these firms, and the managing director of Bristol-Myers Overseas, resulted in very stimulating discussions of German affairs, economic, and political activities. These associations emphasized to the young people and the adults who accompanied them the values and benefits of free enterprise as contrasted to the despotic conditions in which people exist under the Communist regime.

THE WALL

The attached photographs vividly illustrate the revulsion and dismay of the Junior Achievers and their adult advisers when they looked over the infamous wall just prior to a visit into Communist controlled East Berlin. Their reaction became more emphatic as they witnessed the depressed, unsmiling faces of the East Berliners going about their daily activities amid war ruins and a superabundance of armed guards watching their every action through binoculars.

OFFICIAL RECEPTIONS AND BRIEFINGS

In contrast with the visit to East Berlin where they were greeted only by two members of the Peoples Police and a Communist guide, the Junior Achievers and adults were treated royally by their industrial hosts, representatives of the U.S. State Department, the U.S. Information Agency, the German Press and Information Office, and officials of the German government including Dr. Rainer Barzel, Federal Minister for All German Affairs, and Heinrich Albertz, Mayor of West Berlin.

The group had an interesting review of the postwar history of the city of Berlin by Dr. Semiens, pastor of the Protestant Church, at a luncheon meeting of the International Rotary Club, cosponsored by the West Berlin Rotary and Travelong, Inc., a member of the Elizabeth, N.J., Rotary Club. Dr. Semiens emphasized the importance of the American airlift in the salvation of the city.

WITNESS TO GERMAN HISTORY IN THE MAKING

During a luncheon meeting in Bonn, held at the American Embassy Club and sponsored by Bristol-Myers Co., the press attaché of the U.S. Information program in Germany announced that the young people had arrived in Bonn on the most historic day in recent history as at that very moment the successor to Chancellor Adenauer was being selected.

Because of the voting which took place that afternoon, Economics Minister Ludwig Erhard was unable to meet with the group as had been planned. Instead, the Junior Achievers were greeted by Ranier Barzel, Minister for All German Affairs, whose responsibilities include the city of Berlin. James Walsh (15 Beechwood Place, Hillside—member of Lee-Co. sponsored by Bristol-Myers Co.) and Patricia Koziol (418 Franklin Street, Elizabeth—member of Singster, sponsored by the Singer Manufacturing Co.) presented Minister Barzel with a friendship key which, in accepting for Professor Erhard, he termed "a symbol of good fortune and continued good will and understanding between our countries." He assured the Junior Achievers that the key would be the first gift presented to Minister Erhard after his selection to succeed Chancellor Adenauer.

WARM GREETING IN WEST BERLIN

Immediately upon their arrival in West Berlin, the Junior Achievers were transported to the Schoneberg City Hall for a meeting with Heinrich Albertz, mayor of West Berlin. (Transcript of the mayor's remarks attached.)

The mayor was presented with a motion picture film titled "This is New Jersey," a gift from New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. for use in schools, by television stations and by civic organizations.

The mayor was also presented with a plaque consisting of a reproduction of a cartoon "It Works in Other Lands Too" and editorial "Another Lesson in Free Enterprise" from The Daily Journal, Elizabeth, N.J., and relating to Operation Free Enterprise and the trip to West Germany. The plaque was inscribed with a message of good will and signed by Hon. Steven Bercick, mayor of Elizabeth, U.S. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, and by the president or chief executive of each corporation which sponsors Junior Achievement companies in the Union County-Carteret area.

The mayor emphasized the unique situation in Berlin and particularly the human problems of the divided city. He also emphasized the importance of the American aid and friendship and the role of the Americans in keeping West Berlin free.

STUDENT MEETINGS

In Bonn the group were guests of Internationes for afternoon coffee with about 25 German teenage students, who had studied in America. This resulted in a lively exchange of views, particularly about the American and German educational systems.

In West Berlin the Junior Achievers and adults were guests of the Senat and a group of about German students idealistically active in promoting a united states of Europe. This meeting resulted in active discussions of political points of view as well as a friendly exchange on matters of interest to teenagers everywhere.

RADIO FREE EUROPE BROADCAST

Mayor Steven Bercik, of Elizabeth, who accompanied the group, visited Radio Free Europe headquarters in Munich and did a 15-minute broadcast to the Iron Curtain countries in which he discussed Operation Free Enterprise and the interest and support American industries and civic leaders give to Junior Achievement, especially the Operation Free Enterprise project. A second 15-minute broadcast was taped by Radio Free Europe's Czechoslovakian Editor Zdnek Suda for broadcast behind the Iron Curtain. In this broadcast Mayor Bercik spoke in the Slovak tongue.

RIAS BROADCAST

Two Junior Achievers were interviewed on West Berlin's RIAS radio station (radio in the American sector). A tape of this broadcast has been sent to Junior Achievement by the U.S. Information Agency and is presently being used in high schools throughout the county. It will later be made available for use by local broadcasting stations and by interested American and German civic and community groups.

FREE ENTERPRISE ESSAYS

As part of the Operation Free Enterprise project, the Junior Achievers were requested to write an essay on "Why I Believe in the Free Enterprise System." The winner was John W. Martin, vice president, sales, DIWID Co., the Junior Achievement company sponsored by Weston Instruments & Electronics Division of Daystrom, Inc. In this essay he stated: "Someday free enterprise may stretch to all corners of the world and transform our chaotic and unpredictable world into a force to further peace, understanding, and good will among men * * *." Seeing the Wall dividing East and West Berlin confirmed this young man's conviction that the American system under which he lives must be preserved and that, furthermore, a way must be found to free the unwilling prisoners of the Communist way of life which these young people viewed in East Berlin.

JUNIOR ACHIEVERS WELL RECEIVED

Everywhere the Junior Achievers were complimented on their knowledge of German affairs, economic growth, and political and cultural activities. The appearance and conduct of the Junior Achievers throughout the trip reflected great credit upon Junior Achievement, the sponsoring industries, their high schools and the community as a whole.

ACHIEVERS HONORED BY STATE ASSEMBLY

Upon their return, the Operation Free Enterprise group was invited by the New Jersey State Senate and General Assembly to attend the assembly session at the statehouse in Trenton on Monday, May 13. At that time both houses will honor their outstanding achievements during the past year on behalf of the American Free Enterprise System and their home communities.

J. KENNETH RODEN.

U.S. Department of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, State Senator Harry Flood Byrd, Jr., of Winchester, Va., delivered a most interesting speech at an Armed Forces Day banquet at Fort Eustis, Va., on May 17, 1963, in the area sponsored jointly by the cities of Newport News, Hampton, Williamsburg, the county of York, and the town of Poquoson.

Mr. Byrd is a brilliant young Virginia senator who has served in the senate of Virginia for more than 15 years. He was an officer in the U.S. Navy during World War II. He is a businessman, including among his interests the publishing of the Winchester Evening Star, Winchester, Va., and the Harrisonburg News Record, Harrisonburg, Va. He is an able and dedicated American, and is not afraid to inveigh against evil when it appears. The country would be much better off if we had more men like him.

I read an account of Senator Byrd's speech in the Virginia papers and it excited my interest to such an extent that I applied for a full copy of the same which I have read with a great deal of appreciation. I am confident that it would be beneficial for every Member of Congress and every reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to read what the senator has to say in regard to certain of the recent actions of the Defense Department. The incidents referred to by Senator Byrd are to be deplored.

I am unable to understand why the Under Secretary of the Department should be allowed to remain in office after having made a surreptitious and underhanded attack upon two distinguished U.S. Senators. As reprehensible as it was to make such an anonomous attack upon these two Senators, the offense was compounded by Mr. Gilpatric who afterwards denied making the attack and then later, under oath, admitted he had done so.

Likewise, I am unable to understand why the Secretary of the Defense Department, acting contrary to the unanimous judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, awarded a $7 billion contract to the highest and not the lowest bidder. This is sound business judgment in reverse and the very antithesis of plain commonsense.

Mr. Speaker, George Mason, in his celebrated Bill of Rights, which has been incorporated into the Constitution of the United States, said that the great bulwarks of liberty are freedom of speech and freedom of the press, that these privileges can never be restrained but by despotic governments. Disregarding this fundamental principle of our liberty, the Secretary has undertaken to muzzle high military officials by firing those officials who, when called upon by responsible committees of the Congress, gave their honest views.

How long will the people of America and the Members of Congress tolerate such conduct on the part of the Defense Department without seeking redress?

Under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include State Senator Byrd's speech, which is as follows:

Secretary of Defense McNamara undoubtedly is a man of great ability.

My inclination is to support the civilian head of the Department of Defense in broad policy matters within the Military Establishment.

This was my inclination several months ago when the TFX airplane controversy became public. As you know, the contract for 1,700 all-purpose military planes was sought by both General Dynamics Aircraft Co. and Boeing Aircraft. Of the total, 1,500 are for the Air Force and 200 for the Navy.

But three recent events, taken together, have caused me to revise my thinking and to question the judgment of Secretary McNamara.

First, in giving the $7 billion contract to the highest bidder instead of the lowest bidder, Mr. McNamara overruled the judgment of his senior military advisers.

It was the unanimous view of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the lower priced Boeing plane is superior to the higher priced General Dynamics one. This was a technical military matter, not a broad policy question.

Second, the Under Secretary of Defense, Roswell Gilpatric, sought to destroy the effectiveness of a Senate investigation by anonymously attacking leading members of the committee, particularly Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, and Senator JACKSON, of Washington State.

I have no objection to Mr. Gilpatric's attacking any Member of the Senate, so long as he does it openly and is willing to stand behind his words.

But he did it anonymously, then denied to Senator MCCLELLAN that he was the source of the anonymous information, but subsequently, when under oath before the subcommittee, admitted that he was the source. Such hit and hide tactics are certainly beneath the dignity and stature of the high office he occupies.

What passes through my mind is why should Mr. Gilpatric use such methods if the Pentagon has nothing to fear from a thorough investigation of its handling of the multibillion-dollar contract?

Third, last week's firing of Adm. George W. Anderson as Chief of Naval Operations, and the unmistakable warning to Gen. Curtis LeMay, is obviously an effort to dry up individual thinking on the part of military officers and to bring about a conformity of thought, in line with the wishes of Secretary McNamara.

I have always felt that the most valuable ally is one who will present his frank and sincere judgment on matters in which he has an intimate and detailed knowledge.

Admiral Anderson thought Secretary McNamara was wrong and he said so within the confines of the Pentagon. He did not speak publicly except when officially asked to do so by the Congress.

General LeMay, the head of the Air Force, also gave his professional judgment to Congress, when asked to do so. As a result, his tenure of office was reduced.

No charge has been made that either was insubordinate or disloyal to his superior, Secretary McNamara. From a technical military standpoint they simply did not agree with Mr. McNamara's judgment.

Conformity of thought can be demanded and obtained by Secretary McNamara, if the President is willing to fire enough generals and admirals.

But whether this will result in a more capable and efficient Military Establishment is another question indeed.

On the contrary, it seems to me vitally important that military officials be encouraged to present frankly their views concerning matters where their experience is far more detailed and intimate than is that of the Secretary of Defense.

The Pentagon is too large, and the American military force is too farflung, for the Nation to rely solely on the judgment of one man, Mr. McNamara, as to what should be done in regard to military matters.

Yet the entire attitude of Mr. McNamara, as exhibited during the past few weeks, is that he prefers yes-men to those who speak their convictions. No Chief of Staff can become a mere yes-man without forfeiting his usefulness.

If, as president of the Ford Motor Co., Mr. McNamara made a wrong decision, that company probably could have lost several hundred million dollars of private capital—as that company did with the Edsel car.

But if, as Secretary of Defense, he makes wrong decisions, the Nation could lose not only billions of taxpayers' dollars, but conceivably, its freedom.

In Washington the other day a deadly serious former high public official told me this: "While the United States stresses scientific breakthrough, the Russians have only one aim in space—to control it. Don't be surprised if Moscow announces some day a military spaceship with tremendous implications, one that could stay in orbit with a crew fully supplied for months or years; one that could mount an attack on any spot on earth. One that could abort our own launchings. Such a weapon could enable the Soviets to tell us to turn in our guns by sundown."

The speaker was one who disagrees with current Pentagon policy. He may be wrong—but then again time may prove him right, in which case the Nation faces a terrible future.

So what I am suggesting is that in this complicated world we not rely on the judgment of one man; that we not exile our military leaders; that we not seek conformity of thought among those whose records prove them experts in the military field.

A production specialist like Mr. McNamara might run the Ford Motor Co. profitably without advice from anyone.

But I am frank to say that I very much doubt that he can successfully run the Pentagon in the Nation's interest if he shuts himself off from frank views of the military professionals who have spent their lives in the military field.

In ending, I reassert my desire to support the civilian Secretary of Defense in broad policy decisions.

But I reassert, too, my faith in the military judgment of our military professionals.

Mexican People Benefit Little by U.S. Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith an article by Henry Gotha which was printed in the May 12, 1963, issue of the San Jose, Calif., Mercury. This article shows that a very small amount of Alliance for Progress funds goes to the Mexican people, and, in fact, only $14 million goes to private Mexican borrowers.

It should be pointed out that Public Law 78 is responsible for the annual injection of at least $30 million directly into the hands of Mexican citizens.

I believe it is safe to say that this program does more to actually help the individual in Mexico than the vast Alliance for Progress program costing $700 million. Furthermore, it is not reflected in our tax bill nor is it added to the national debt.

The article follows.

MEXICAN PEOPLE BENEFIT LITTLE BY U.S. AID

(By Henry Gotha)

MEXICO CITY.—Mexico has received nearly $700 million in U.S. aid in the 2 years since President Kennedy announced the Alliance for Progress.

But the Mexican people have not benefited much for two reasons:

1. While approximately $700 million has been committed, or promised, to Mexico the best estimate is that less than 15 percent, or around $100 million, has actually been disbursed.

2. Only $14 million was in the form of loans to private Mexican firms. The rest is slated for the "public sector of the economy," that is for the Government. These funds often are used in long-range programs that have little immediate effect.

These figures can be misleading. Bankers, for example, point out that multimillion-dollar credits never are handed out in a lump sum.

But a consideration of the details of Alliance for Progress aid to Mexico can help one to understand why the average Mexican is not particularly impressed by astronomical figures and why he is not bubbling over with gratitude toward the United States.

Of the approximately $700 million committed, almost half—$345 million—is in the form of standby credits to bolster the Mexican peso. These are credits on which Mexico can be expected to draw only in a grave monetary crisis, an unlikely event.

If the $80 million in credits to U.S. exporters doing business with Mexico is deducted, the hard core of Alliance aid to Mexico is further reduced.

Almost all of what is left—$266 million—has been promised to the Mexican Government; only $14 million to private borrowers.

The bulk of the $14 million is made up of U.S. Export-Import Bank loans to individual Mexican firms. Among them are the Fundidora de Monterrey foundry, Aluminio S.A., and several milk pasteurization plans. There is also a $3 million "small industry fund" extended by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB).

The Government however, has received loan commitments from the World Bank in the amount of $175 million for irrigation, electrification and construction of toll roads. The Inter-American Development Bank has pledged $37 million for irrigation and land improvement in general and for water and sewage projects in the easternmost state of Yucatan.

While few Mexican or American businessmen question the worthiness of the majority of the projects being financed under the Alliance for Progress, they say that Mexico's private sector should receive a larger share of international loans.

Mexico does welcome foreign and private investment.

However, with a strong central government in Mexico and an economy based on more socialistic lines than in the United States, there is a tacit preference here for government-to-government financing.

Mario Beteta, manager of the Government's Bank of Mexico, appeared to sum up Government thinking when he said recently that international loans are designed to develop a nation rather than to show a profit like private investments.

Good Time To Cut Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I noticed an excellent editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 12, which quite effectively answers those who say that the predictions of a better economy than forecasted a year ago eliminates the need for any tax cut.

The Inquirer quite properly contends "that the case for an across-the-board cut in Federal income taxes this year is even stronger now than it was 6 months ago." They emphasize that there is no such prosperity for the employed in these glowing figures about a rising national product:

> A national economy that maintains a jobless total of 4 to 5 million persons, even when times are supposed to be good is unacceptable.

The article follows:

GOOD TIME TO CUT U.S. TAXES

Reports and forecasts by the Nation's fiscal experts and industrial leaders—presented at the spring meeting of the business council at Hot Springs, Va., the past 2 days—indicate that 1963 probably will be a better year, economically speaking, than was generally predicted 6 months ago.

We earnestly hope so—but it should be emphasized again and again that there is no such thing as prosperity for the unemployed. Glowing figures about a rising gross national product are meaningless to the man who is out of work and can't find a job.

The hard truth about the present day American economy is that unemployment continues at a high rate. There is no genuine prospect of alleviating the problem until individual and corporate income tax rates are adjusted downward to encourage increased investment in job-producing industrial expansion.

It seems to us that the case for an across-the-board cut in Federal income taxes this year is even stronger now than it was 6 months ago. The business upturn, accompanied by a persistently high level of unemployment, substantiates the point this newspaper has made repeatedly: An income tax cut is desperately needed, not as an emergency measure to prevent recessions but as a carefully calculated move to spur long-term economic gains and provide millions of additional jobs required by a fast-growing population.

President Kennedy has said from the outset, and events are proving him right, that a substantial across-the-board reduction in income taxes is necessary to stimulate economic growth no matter whether short-term movement of the business cycle in the immediate future is likely to be up or down. The economic upturn of the past 6 months has had no appreciable effect on unemployment. A national economy that maintains a jobless total of 4 to 5 million persons, even when times are supposed to be good, is unacceptable.

Cutting taxes is never easy, in face of constant demands for costly new governmental programs, but there may never be a more auspicious time to reduce both taxes and spending at the Federal level than now—when Congress is in a mood to eliminate wasteful and unnecessary expenditures, when business is better than was anticipated, when the Federal deficit may be less than was expected, and when States and cities, Pennsylvania and Philadelphia prominent among them, need more money for education and other purposes but will find it increasingly difficult to raise the funds as long as the Federal Government siphons off a disproportionately large share of available tax revenue.

President Kennedy has been both wise and realistic in urging Congress to give top priority to an across-the-board reduction in income taxes this year and postpone action on very important, but less urgent, tax reforms until next year. The question now is whether Congress, having dragged its feet for more than 4 months, will get around to enacting any kind of tax cut before adjournment.

The middle of May should mark the end of procrastination and the beginning of action on sound tax cut legislation accompanied by cuts in nonessential spending.

Based on Present Information, South Carolina Governor Russell Opposes Trotters Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have been sent the following editorial to be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the interest of those here having jurisdiction over the Trotter Shoals Dam, which has been proposed for building on the Savannah River between South Carolina and Georgia.

I have previously indicated my interest in seeing the dam built and I commend this editorial to those who have given so freely of their time and consideration of this proposal.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Anderson (S.C.) Independent, May 16, 1963]

BASED ON PRESENT INFORMATION, SOUTH CAROLINA GOVERNOR RUSSELL OPPOSES TROTTERS DAM

Gov. Donald Russell, of South Carolina, has informed the U.S. Corps of Engineers he cannot approve the Corps' present plan for the Trotters Shoals project on the Savannah River.

His action came after two public hearings and a report by Dr. Thomas F. Jones, president of the University of South Carolina, whom the Governor had designated as his engineering adviser on the controversial matter.

Governor Russell recognized the sharp differences of reliable opinion regarding the project and its impact on industrial growth.

In his report to Governor Russell, Dr. Jones expressed the view that "the hearing brought out no compelling or clear engineering reasons favoring either side of the Trotters Shoals issue," and stated "sufficiently comprehensive engineering data to permit decision on optimum use of the upper Savannah River are not available."

Dr. Jones concluded that any immediate decision by the Governor must be made on available data; but if there were no compelling reasons for immediate decision he would advise "a more thorough engineering basis be developed for a decision at an appropriate time in the future." Dr. Jones said such a study would take 2 years and cost about $35,000.

It is apparent Governor Russell felt he should make an immediate decision—a hearing on the project is being held by a congressional subcommittee—based on data before him, while acknowledging at the same time the need of more time for a "fresh review" of the potentials of the upper Savannah River.

Significantly, Governor Russell did not slam the door on future consideration of the merits of Trotters Shoals or similar public projects on the upper Savannah. His endorsement of a thorough State-sponsored engineering study to fill what he regards as gaps in information makes that clear.

Governor Russell's disapproval of Trotters Shoals as presently planned is disapointing, of course, to supporters of the project, including this newspaper.

We believe the Governor made a sincere effort, based on information available at the moment, to appraise fairly a difficult situation. His honesty of purpose is unquestioned.

As Governor, it is understandable and commendable that he should accord weight to the tax revenue prospects of plants proposed near the Trotters Shoals site by Duke Power Co. and the Mead Paper Co.

Gov. Carl Sanders, of Georgia is already on record as favoring Trotters Shoals for reasons similarly commendable and understandable. It is his conviction the project would enhance tremendously the economy of Georgia and South Carolina.

Potential benefits of Trotters Shoals include savings to power users on both sides of the river amounting to $4,500 000 annually, as estimated by E. V. Lewis of Central Electric Cooperative, and creation of a vast reservoir of untold industrial and recreational importance.

It is generally regarded as thoroughly feasible for this region to enjoy benefits of both Trotters Shoals and the proposed Duke Power plant, and further study would underscore this fact.

We favor the construction of both projects.

Importance of nailing down the compatability of the two projects becomes clear when it is realized that Duke requires U.S. Congress authorization for its proposed plant. Both Georgia's Senators RICHARD B. RUSSELL and HERMAN TALMADGE and the entire Georgia House delegation strongly favor the construction of the Trotters Shoals project.

The Georgians are not opposed to the Duke Power Co. plant, but they contend that both projects should be authorized since neither would interfere with the other; and, further, that they should be authorized at the same time.

Since the river belongs to both States, it is obvious that the wishes of Georgia must be considered. If the authorization of the Duke plant is held up by the Georgia delegation, the tax revenue anticipated by South Carolina would be out of the picture.

It would be ironical, indeed, should South Carolina lose such revenue because of failure to reach a basis of cooperation that would open the way for both Trotters Shoals and the Duke plant.

Insofar as Mead Paper Co. is concerned, the Governor's statement took note that it was "unwilling to commit itself definitely" and indicated any decision to build would be based on future demand for pulp products.

Further, it is abundantly evident that no paper mill could be operated in the Calhoun Falls area due to pollution problems intensified by lack of a constant flow of water.

In facing the whole weighty problem and confronted by a lack of time to delve as deeply into the matter as they would have liked, as shown by references to need for a more thorough study, Governor Russell and his adviser, Dr. Jones, are to be commended for a sincere effort to reach a decision on the data available to them and to leave the door open for further consideration.

Since the Trotters Shoals project is part of the overall plan for comprehensive development of the upper Savannah as contained in the Flood Control Act of 1944, proper place for initiation of further needed study is the U.S. Congress.

Meanwhile, proponents are confident that ultimately Trotters Shoals will be constructed and that Duke Power Co. can build its proposed plant if it really desires to do so.

No Concern?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, at yesterday's press conference, the President castigated Republicans because of their "politically inspired concern over Cuba." The President is acting like an ostrich with his head in the sand. In today's Baltimore Sun, an AP story tells of $300 million worth of Russian military equipment shipped to Cuba since last October's blockade. For the information of the President, the American people are quite concerned over this. A concern not politically inspired.

RUSS ARMS AID TO CUBA GROWS—SHIPMENTS SINCE NOVEMBER PUT AT $300 MILLION

WASHINGTON, May 22.—Information reaching U.S. intelligence indicates that Cuba's Fidel Castro has received some $300 million worth of Soviet arms since November and will get about $250 million in Communist economic help this year.

This is in addition to an estimated $500 million worth of Russian military equipment turned over to Cuban armed forces before last October's missile crisis and $300 million to $325 million in previous economic aid.

PRODUCTION DROPS

Despite the large-scale help from the Soviet bloc, Castro's Communist economy was reported in bad shape and getting worse. Cuban per capita production in 1962 was estimated down at least 30 percent from 1958, the year before Castro's takeover.

Industry was said to be faltering for lack of spare parts and maintenance. Even Castro's personal automobiles were reported in bad repair. Some of the bloc-made vehicles were described as unsuitable for tropical use.

Cuba's main money-earner, sugar, has spiraled downward from a 6,800,000-ton harvest in 1961 to a projected 4 million tons this year. But soaring world sugar prices could rescue Castro from part of his financial woes, if they stay high for the 1964 season.

Details on what arms the Russians are continuing to give Castro's forces were not immediately available.

A WIDE VARIETY

Past Soviet military assistance has included a wide variety of supplies, ranging from jet fighters to tanks, guns, rolling stock and other goods. The Soviets were said to have retained control over the long-range missiles and bombers which they shipped in and then pulled out of Cuba last fall.

Here is a current picture of Cuba's economy and financial relations with the Soviet bloc as presented in information reaching U.S. intelligence officials:

1. Cuba's industry is lagging on many fronts. Lack of spare parts for U.S.-made machinery has hurt severely. It has been further plagued by power failures, worker inefficiency, poor management, misallocation of resources and poor quality output.

PROGRESSIVE DECLINE

Thus although income may be more equitably distributed among the Cuban people now than before Castro took over, the progressive decline in output has markedly reduced the amount of economic benefits available.

2. Sugar production as of April 17 was down to an estimated 2,700,000 metric tons compared to nearly 3,500,000 last year at this time and 5 million in 1961. Final volume will probably be around 4 million tons, or 20 percent below the poor 1962 output of 4,800,000 tons.

The poor sugar record was attributed to bad management, labor shortages, unskilled workers, mechanical failures and a drought in 1962.

CROPS FARING BADLY

3. Other crops are faring badly, too. For instance, Cuba, normally a significant coffee exporter, must import coffee this year.

Castro, who is now visiting the Soviet Union, has been promised almost $470 million by the Soviet bloc in economic development and technical assistance credits, but apparently only $50 million to $75 million of this has been used so far.

Havana rejected some industrial projects proposed by the bloc countries. The Russians in turn have displayed an increasing tendency to "study" some Cuban plans for basic plants like the once much-advertised iron and steel plant proposal.

America Has a Job To Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, this Nation has always taken pride in being the home of the brave, and yet today there are many citizens so awed by the changes taking place in our world that their response is one, not of quiet courage but of fear and frustration. Allowed to continue unabated, this fear psychology which they are spreading could do great harm to us as a people and our Nation as the leader of the free world.

Last Sunday Mr. William R. Mathews, editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star in Tucson, Ariz., published an outstanding editorial entitled "America Has a Job To Do." It is a most compelling answer to those in our midst who seem to see enemies lurking around every corner. I commend Mr. Mathews' editorial to all of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

AMERICA HAS A JOB TO DO

(By William R. Mathews)

If the experience of our country with the Soviet Union has proven the value of one main policy, that policy is that at all times we should conduct ourselves fearlessly, but wisely. Our military power is strong enough to destroy the Soviet Union, even should we suffer a devastating sneak attack. But we should never try to match our manpower with either the Soviet Union or China.

In addition we have an industrial power that makes us the strongest Nation industrially as well as militarily, the world ever has known. That we have within the confines of our Nation one-half of the organized horsepower of the world should reassure us that we are not going to go broke in spite of what President Jack Kennedy spends.

Nor must we forget that after the softness that great wealth has developed within many of us, we are still a vigorous, strong, curiosity-seeking, adventurous people. As this is written, Astronaut Gordon Cooper has landed after whirling around the world every 88 minutes or so, more than 100 miles above the earth. Add to that the way our youth responds to military duty and the terrible zeal with which they can fight when it is necessary, and wherever necessary.

Our Navy polices the sealanes of the world. It is the most powerful Navy the world ever has known, and it is a modern airborne striking force as well as a surface one. From the South Pole to the Arctic Ocean, from the North Sea to the Mediterranean, and throughout the South Atlantic Ocean, the Indian Ocean, and the vast Pacific, the Navy is on duty day and night. Most of its personnel is young.

So it goes with our Army and Air Force stations. They are all over the world, and American youth responds devotedly to provide the personnel they require. Our youths are not getting soft.

Our country is not going to hell. Most Americans enjoy a prosperity and privileges that only kings and a small aristocracy enjoyed 100 years ago. Although we have only 6 percent of the population of the world, we have more than half of the telephones and automobiles. But we also have a freedom of choice, of speech and pen, and of religion that only a small part of the world enjoys. Every one of us has a right—and duty—to kibitz on the way our local and national governments are run, and choose the officials who govern us.

This brief discussion is made as an effort to reassure a growing number of Americans who are expressing fears—fears of the Soviet Union, fears of communism; fears of people who speak or write independently; fears of financial conditions; fears of taxation; fears of subversive activity. They express themselves too often in bitter personal terms, in denouncing those who do not agree with them. They do it because they harbor, perhaps unconsciously, fears of an impending calamity which doubtfully exists.

This fear was expressed Tuesday by Representative PAUL G. ROGERS, of Florida, when he made a speech on the floor of the House charging that two or three Soviet trawlers were sighted off the Florida coast, and that they were violating the 3-mile limit of territorial waters in the Cape Canaveral area. He demanded that the Government take all steps necessary to "protect our space-testing operations from any possible spying."

Why be afraid of three Soviet trawlers, even if they were coming within the 3-mile limit? We should bear in mind that we station our ships close to the Russian testing grounds of Novaya Zemlya in the Arctic Ocean.

But there is another vast difference that belittles the danger of these three small ships of the Soviets. All the Soviets have to do is to look at our own television, with its detailed pictures of our launchings. They can read our own free press, our technical magazines, and the proceedings of Congress itself, and thus compile extensive information.

They can do it because we are a free society. They deny such information to us, because they are a closed police society that fears to reveal how it does things. We are a free society, because we are willing to take the risks that must go with a free society. They are a police state, because their Government fears its own people. Ours does not. To those Englishmen who say that they would rather be Red than dead, the American answer is that we Americans would rather be dead than Red.

There is no reason for any American to be afraid of either the domestic or international situation in which his country is involved.

The disgraceful situation in Birmingham will pass, integration will gradually succeed there and elsewhere, if the extremists can be held in check.

The domestic Communist party is still a danger, but a trivial one as compared with the days of the New Deal and World War II. Then it had nationwide sympathy, and could place its party members or fellow travelers in high government positions, sometimes on the White House staff.

Bear in mind that it was Henry Stimson, onetime Republican Secretary of State, and Secretary of War during World War II, who said, "The way to win the trust of the Russians, is to trust them." When a distinguished international lawyer of unimpeachable integrity thought in such terms, is it any wonder that the Communists went as far as they did?

That is not possible any longer, because the American people, including most international lawyers, diplomats and politicians, have learned from experience—particularly after last October and Cuba—that the Soviet Union cannot be trusted.

The way the country responded to support President Kennedy last October revealed the basic character of the American people. The way Americans united behind him, and would have gone further than he chose to go, dispelled a bewildering gloom that was enveloping the country thoroughly. The way America responded revived universal confidence as our growing prosperity indicates. The native courage of the American people chased away the fears from most people, except those who are making fears a political profession.

America has a great destiny. What shape it will take, nobody knows. Yet it is pretty safe to predict that what we will do will express American character and that inspiring leadership will emerge to perform what will be a tremendous job with worldwide ramifications.

Americans love to adventure into the great unknowns, because they are both curious and courageous. Only such a people could have done what we have in the past 23 years. Americans still prefer to take the risk that a free society imposes, because they would rather be free than secure.

Salute to Israel's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the address of Mr. Abraham Schlacht, publisher of the East Side News, on the occasion of Israel's 15th birthday celebrated under the auspices of the New Era Club, Israel Cummings Forum, held Thursday night May 2, at the Educational Alliance, 197 East Broadway, New York City:

SALUTE TO ISRAEL'S INDEPENDENCE

Consul-General Katriel Katz, Congressman Leonard Farbstein, Rabbi Seymour Nulman, Mr. and Mrs. Israel Cummings, Miss Lee Blume, Mr. George Paley, Mr. Mannes Lipski, Mr. George Freedman and neighbors, it is with singular pleasure that I stand before you to express my feelings in regard to Israel's 15th birthday. Mention of this special day makes my heart and yours pulsate with great joy.

It brings to mind the struggles and tribulations of this young nation since it was founded in 1948, and the great progress it has achieved since then.

It is almost hard to believe how a nation, with all the odds against it, could have overcome most of its difficulties and won the respect and admiration of freedom-loving countries the world over.

Yes, Israel may be little in point of wealth, military power, population or material resources when compared with other nations.

But in gallantry and perserverance, in intellectuality and spiritual grandeur, she will match them anytime, if left alone to pursue the paths of peace and good-will.

To be sure, Israel is a comparatively young nation. She is only 15 years old. In point of history, such a measure of time is infinitely too short to determine in any way the growth, development, and the future of any nation. But in the case of Israel she has performed wonders which would have been considered impossible 15 years ago.

There were nations that predicted her early demise, but they were fooled, because they did not have the capacity to understand the undying dedication of the Israeli people.

The people of Israel love their land intensely. They are an unconquerable force. They have suffered the deepest sorrows and afflictions of any race. They have endured every conceivable torture in the catalog of atrocities. They have been hardened, toughened, chastened by their past experiences, and are alert to any imminent danger. They face the future grimly, confidently, prepared, because they know that they must not, dare not, experience the horrors of the past.

They love their Israel, the land of their salvation and their hope for the future.

Ironically, Israel is faced with a dilemma, with a paradox, with a contradiction.

She wants peace with her neighbors, but cannot have it. She extends the hand of friendship, but it is spurned.

Notwithstanding the fact that she was created by the United Nations, her neighbors proclaim to the world that she must be destroyed. They laugh at the U.N., even though they are members of it and are pledged under the Charter to settle their disputes by peaceful means.

Why does the United Nations stand by in the arms race between Israel and the Arab world? Is it afraid to antagonize the Arab nations at the expense of Israel?

The Arab world fears Israel—and with good reason. It cannot afford to expose its people with its rampant ignorance and poverty to the gaze of the Israelis, with their splendid culture, their throbbing cities, and their high standards of living. To do so would be to jeopardize the grasping power of the Arab chieftains.

To them, the word "democracy" is an evil term, which conjures up dire forebodings. For them to permit rule by the people would be the speedy death knell of their power and vast wealth.

We Americans, whatever our faith, believe in the diffusion of liberty everywhere. We must remember that our country was conceived in freedom, and ever since its birth has thrived on it. We who have been nurtured in it have faith in Israel's democratic processes of law, in her institutions, and her destiny.

To us, Israel shall always be a radiant light, shedding her rays of peace and understanding throughout the Middle East. For her power and greatness emanate from the people themselves—ruler of their own fate.

God willing, we shall continue to support the United Jewish Appeal and other vital endeavors so that Israel may live with dignity and self-respect among the family of nations.

Grave Constitutional Questions Raised by President's Threat To Use Troops in Birmingham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, as times goes on and as the tumult and the shouting die, people all round the country are becoming increasingly aware of the true facts of the Birmingham situation. Some, of course, have been cognizant all along of the true reasons for the trouble we have been plagued with this month in the magic city, Birmingham.

In any event, an extremely incisive editorial on the Birmingham story was published this week, on May 21, 1963, in the Richmond News Leader, Richmond, Va., of which Mr. James Jackson Kilpatrick is the illustrious editor. I invite the attention of the Members of Congress to this editorial which I insert herewith:

BIRMINGHAM

The Birmingham story, as yesterday's news columns made clear, is far from ended. In the city's punishment of more than 8,000 Negro schoolchildren, now suspended or expelled for disobedience and truancy, a cause for fresh bitterness has come into being.

Nevertheless, the violence has subsided. Some of the fog of emotionalism thins and rises. In this lull, it may be possible to point to certain fundamental constitutional issues, present in the Birmingham incident, that ought not to be obscured.

Paramount among these, in our view, is the ominous role played by the President of the United States. Other constitutional questions, dealing with free speech, peaceable assembly, the preservation of law and order, and the rights of private businessmen, have great importance but lack novelty. But the President's threatened use of troops to quell a wholly local disorder brings us to one of those great rivers by which constitutional boundaries are marked. Once bridged, under a smoky screen of civil rights, this boundary may never be restored.

In Little Rock and in Oxford, at least a tenuous case could be made to justify the intervention of Federal authority. Certain orders of Federal courts were involved; to some extent, a proper Federal interest had been judicially established. No such circumstances obtained in Birmingham. None at all.

When the President announced that he had shifted 3,000 troops to the Birmingham area, with a view toward putting them into riot service, he marched to the very brink of military dictatorship. The purported law that he quoted in support of his action never has been judicially tested under circumstances such as these; this law is flagrantly unconstitutional on its face, for it leaves to the uncontrolled discretion of a President the sole determination of local violence sufficient to justify the intervention of the Nation's Armed Forces.

At the time Mr. Kennedy made his stunning announcement, no judicial determination whatever had been made of anyone's rights in the Birmingham disorders. The courts, both State and Federal, were still functioning. The jailed rioters had not been denied habeas corpus. None of the knotty questions of free speech, peaceable assembly, or property rights had been submitted to orderly disposition. There was a riot, that was all, in which thousands of Negroes swarmed through the streets, fighting with police, stoning firemen, effectively denying law-abiding citizens the use of the area. The Birmingham police fought back; they used force, but in the midst of a riot, what else could they have used? Sweet reason is fine, but it is not much of a weapon in a razor fight.

The point is that these bloodied heads were the consequence of a wholly local brawl. This was domestic violence, in the constitutional phrase; and under the bedrock rules of constitutional government, this was simply beyond the President's reach. If a pro-Negro President may order out the troops in circumstances such as these, an antiunion President may send the Army to suppress a labor dispute. Any excuse could be seized upon in the name of someone's constitutional rights, and in the end all rights would be wiped out.

It is true that Mr. Kennedy stopped short. He kept his legions at Maxwell. As Gibbon remarked of the Emperor Domitian, who instituted a scheme of tribute from the Roman provinces, it may be that "he deserves the reproach of establishing pernicious precedents rather than of exercising actual oppression."

Alabama's Governor Wallace has demanded Supreme Court review of Mr. Kennedy's threat, but a mere threat offers nothing that a court, even if it were so disposed, can get its teeth into. Nothing of consequence will emerge from the Governor's suit. Meanwhile, the President's pernicious precedent cannot be left to go unchallenged. Members of the Congress, regardless of their views on race relations, in some fashion must be made to ponder the awful implications of Mr. Kennedy's action. The Birmingham story, in this regard, ranks as a "might have been." But what might have happened in Birmingham could be made to happen anywhere else.

Reins, Hames, and Britches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, quite a conflict seems to have taken place in the House of Representatives this week between liberalism and conservatism, between ADA and ACA, between leftwingers, and rightwingers.

While I am quite proud to be among that number of Congressmen who will receive special recognition by the ACA today for our willingness to stand upon and behind the U.S. Constitution, yet I feel that I am truly neither a liberal nor a conservative but am rather a constitutionalist, an American, a nationalist, a flag waver for our own great country 365 days out of the year. I do not owe allegiance to any group, whether political or civic, or ecclesiastical, above the allegiance I owe to the United States of America. No labor group owns me, no farm organization has bought my soul, no part of the fourth estate either to the far left or extreme right has ever fitted a collar for my neck.

I am an American. And if the ACA or any other establishment wishes to honor me for my own honor toward the American Constitution, then I am very grateful for such a gesture. William E. Gladstone said our Constitution was "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." And I truly wish that all 435 Members of the House would put themselves into such unanimous support for this modern yet ancient, rigid yet flexible, liberal yet conservative document we call the Constitution that all Americans everywhere could rise up to honor this kind of deep patriotism on the part of their elected representatives.

What is the Constitution? The word literally means "standing together." And certainly if we do not stand together on something, then we will surely fall apart on nothing.

One court of last resort here in our country said, "The Constitution is the embodied will of the people by which they govern their governors." Therefore, this great, living instrument, the Constitution, is the liaison, the connecting link, the umbilical cord between the operating machinery of the Government and the vibrant soul of the people.

The Constitution is moderate and temperate. It is concerned with the freedom and liberties and rights of the people. An official voice may sometimes wish to say you must pay $1,000; but the Constitution says you have a right to trial by jury on this very question. An official voice may sometimes wish to say you must stay in prison; but the Constitution says your body has a right to be brought forth for explanation as to why it is being held—habeas corpus. Some ecclesiastical authority may sometimes wish to say you must pay taxes to support this church or this church school; but the Constitution says no law shall be made to support—establish—any religion.

The Communists are on the far left. The Fascists are on the far right. The Constitutionalists are in the middle and they are the moderates of our Nation.

The Constitution tends to be a very considerate instrument. It provides no method of taking your tax money to distribute it in foreign aid; it provides no Peace Corps; it provides no back-door spending; it provides no absolute power for one official or one branch of Government but establishes three separate branches of Government having many officials in charge of them; it provides for no undeclared wars in faraway lands but only for wars declared by Congress and the swelling symphony of its many voices. The erroneous interpretations of officials have destroyed some of these constitutional benevolencies, I am sorry to say.

The Constitution is an instrument of great service. It provides for your defense and welfare; it provides for regulation of commerce between the different States of the Union; it provides for a monetary system and a standard of weights and measures; it provides for a postal system; it provides for an Army and a Navy.

The Constitution is a set of practical harness that controls the power of the people and yet is hitched to the carriage of your safe travel through this mortal life. And because it is a set of harness, the Constitution is the "reins, hames, and britches—or breeches" of your national life. You, the people, hold the reins, you cause the hames to work to pull the load of the Nation; you make the britches work to restrain the power that could destroy our country on the steep incline toward socialism.

I am proud to be a constitutionalist. I look neither to the right nor to the left, but to the Constitution.

Tribute to Henry C. Ulen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the entire State of Indiana has been saddened by the recent death of Henry C. Ulen, Boone County native who for 40 years was a world leader in the construction field.

His engineering and building feats are legendary, as are his other accomplishments during his 92-years.

Outstanding tributes from throughout the United States have been written about this great Hoosier, and two of the most descriptive and praiseworthy are requested to be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today.

They are by Mr. Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher of the Indianapolis Star and the Indianapolis News and former publisher of the Lebanon Reporter, and Mr. Al Wynkoop, the noted and often-quoted editor of the Lebanon Reporter.

The tributes to Mr. Ulen's memory were both published in the Lebanon Reporter and are as follows:

TRIBUTE TO HENRY ULEN PAID BY E. C. PULLIAM

(EDITOR'S NOTE: The following telephone message was received from Eugene C. Pulliam in Phoenix, Ariz. Mr. Pulliam, publisher of the Indianapolis Star and News, was formerly publisher of the Lebanon Reporter.)

Henry Ulen was one of God's noblest men.

I've never had a friend to whom I owed so much and who demanded so little.

His greatest joy came from giving happiness to his friends and especially to the people of his home community.

I traveled more than 20,000 miles with Henry on many trips. He also was the happy host and always a patient, perfect gentleman, no matter how far or often he travelled. He also was happiest when on his way home, and home was always Lebanon.

No community ever had a finer or more lovable citizen, his was the fibre of which America was built and became great.

There is a monument to his benefactions in Athens, Greece, but his real monument is in the minds and hearts of the people of Lebanon who knew and loved him as a dear friend.

HENRY CHARLES ULEN

These are not editorial comments. Rather, they are memories. Partly, they are evaluations based on conversations with those who knew him way-back-when, and personal observations spanning four decades. In life you never quite get around to telling a good friend what's in your heart. And that's too bad. Now, you think of little things * * * big things. But Henry Ulen wanted no laudation. To him, a yes-man was a nothing-man.

His was not a typical American rags-to-riches story, for he never knew dire want—only a series of challenges which he met head on and mastered. Thus, his life was lifted above the mundane as he wrote new chapters in what is known far and wide as the Ulen saga.

He was proud, but never boasted, that he attained hard-won eminence in international business affairs; that he was privileged to rub elbows with high officials in many foreign lands, and that he had the opportunity to help make living conditions better for millions of men, women, and children through public works all over the globe.

He was one of those rare individuals who wore the mantle of success with deep humility. He never lost the common touch. He never forgot a friend—and all he knew were glad to call him friend. The human equation meant more to him than slide rules and bulldozers and surveyor transits. Because he was a man with a purpose, he surrounded himself with the best administrative personnel and top engineers on the American scene.

When he inked contracts for such tremendous projects as the $11-million Marathon Dam near Athens, Greece, railroads in Persia and the Andes no other engineering firm would tackle, the Shandaken Tunnel through 18 miles of solid rock in New York State, to name only a few, he would tell his staff: "It's your baby—just do the kind of a job they expect from our organization. I'll be around—probably a few thousand miles away; but if you need me give me a buzz. I won't be able to help, but I'll give you my moral support." Which, of course, was always an understatement.

Uncle Henry, as he was affectionately called as the years fell away and the Ulen firm opened new world frontiers, never forgot that Lebanon was his true home, nor did he ever forget his Boone County friends. While his company was at its peak, he suddenly decided to move his administrative offices to Lebanon, and brought a score of families to the scene of his boyhood. He developed Country Club Park where he and some of the men he brought here from New York and Chicago, as well as several Lebanon citizens, built homes.

He bought acreage of near-swamp land north of town and built a golf course and clubhouse. He helped make Memorial Park a great recreational center.

He was known far and wide as the Hoosier Party-giver. He liked nothing better than to surround himself with convivial friends and play the gracious host for one simple reason—he liked people.

His benefactions were many, all performed quietly, without ostentation, for his memory encompassed the early years, sometimes a little lean and discouraging. But he had a goal, and he achieved it; not to count great wealth, but rather to share with others the fruits of a useful and successful life.

What did he mean to his beloved Lebanon and the county of his birth? Only a few know that for every dollar he spent for tangible things like the country club and residential area, he matched with dollars to individuals and organizations for their chosen careers and programs. Some, to this day, are unaware of the source of their windfalls.

Throughout this land there are scores of men and women who were recipients of his help in pursuing higher education, and it was always a source of intense pride that he never backed a loser—never picked a "lemon." He had an uncanny knack of singling out those who needed a lift, and his belief in his fellow men never wavered. Well might he have authored the phrase: "You can't take it with you." All he ever wanted was the chance to share with others the gains he had honestly made.

You never dared to call him a great man or a philanthropist. He was a self-styled common man whose luck was better than others.

Once he recalled a magazine writer had checked into his teen-age years and found evidence that "Young Hank Ulen was a sort of a Peck's bad boy. He never did anything vicious, but he'd run away from home at the drop of a hat, and bum a ride on any handy freight train." Uncle Henry laughed, and said: "I guess I grew up to be the kind of kid my mother didn't want me to play with, but when I got my fill of wanderlust, I did have enough sense to come back home."

He leaves many tangible and intangible monuments, but he had a credo. He believed to the end that in this hurrying mart of souls, there was room for friendship, and he tried his level best to keep neighboring from becoming a lost American tradition.

AL WYNKOOP.

Long Beach-Los Angeles Harbor Customhouse Decision Should Be Made Soon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, although funds and authority are available, and the need is urgent, a decision has yet to be made as to the location of the new Long Beach-Los Angeles Harbor Customhouse. Local circumstances necessarily delayed the decision pending the accumulation of certain factual data. That data is now in and it is suggested that the time for decision by the U.S. Customs Commissioner is near at hand, as indicated in the following editorial from the Long Beach Independent-Press Telegram of May 20:

CUSTOMS FACTS ARE ALL IN—IT'S TIME NOW FOR DECISION

The offer by the California Toll Bridge Authority to cut toll rates by 40 percent for customs vehicles using the Vincent Thomas Bridge should clear the way for an early decision on the location of the new customhouse.

U.S. Customs Commissioner Philip Nichols, Jr., had indicated he would approve Reeves Field on Terminal Island as the site for the customhouse if tolls could be waived for customs vehicles on the Thomas Bridge now nearing completion.

The 40-percent reduction offered by the toll bridge authority is, of course, quite a different offer than waiving the tolls completely. Customs, customs employees, and trucks operating under customs contracts would still have to pay 60 percent of the regular rate. Bond covenants forbid the waiving of tolls or the establishment of only token tolls.

Nichols may accept the toll reduction as adequate, or he may feel that even the reduced tolls are too stiff for customs and customs employees. In that case, he has an offer of a site in the Long Beach Harbor area. In any case, the facts are now in, and a Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor site can be speedily designated for the customhouse.

As usual, Los Angeles Mayor Sam Yorty attempted to throw extraneous issues into the decision of the toll bridge authority. He asked the authority to make its offer of reduced tolls contingent on the promise of the Federal Government to keep customs headquarters in uptown Los Angeles. The authority refused to make any such stipulation.

Actually, the Federal Government decided some time ago that in the interests of efficiency and economy customs headquarters will be located in the harbor area. Yorty would do well to start learning to live with that decision.

Integration Won't Help His Race, California Negro Lawyer Declares

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a rather strange phenomenon that many who demagog on behalf of the Negro race brandish a single weapon plan as if they felt all Negroes thought alike, acted alike, had the same ambitions, the same desires, and the same goals. Professional integration advocates would have the people of this country believe that they speak for every Negro in the land.

This is, of course, absurd on its face. While I would not challenge that some Negroes desire the elimination of segregation laws, there is more than a little evidence to indicate that many Negroes are simply anxious to have the opportunity to look out after their own needs, unhindered by professional racial demagogs. An example of this is highlighted in an Associated Press story by Mr. Don McKee, which was printed in the Birmingham News on Monday of this week.

I insert herewith a copy of that article which is most timely and which may well, if fully considered, upset a few mental applecarts here and about.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, May 20, 1963]

INTEGRATION WON'T HELP HIS RACE, CALIFORNIA NEGRO LAWYER DECLARES

(By Don McKee)

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., May 20.—A young Negro attorney said today racial integration is irrelevant to the progress of his race and that current civil rights campaigns "destroy rather than create pride and dignity in the Negro."

Desegregation drives such as the one here have done nothing to improve the Negro, said the attorney, 27-year-old Donald Warden, of Oakland, Calif.

Warden is president of the Afro-American Association, a new movement aimed at self-improvement of the Negro. He came to Birmingham to set up a chapter of his organization.

He issued a debate challenge to Martin Luther King, Jr., one of the integration leaders who have pushed the drive in Birmingham.

"And next time an integration campaign starts, I'm going to court for an injunction against the leaders to prevent them from collecting money from the masses of the people unless they admit it isn't going to benefit the people," he said.

Warden said desegregation benefits only the middle-class Negro who wants to disassociate himself from the lower-class Negro.

He said his plan was to create jobs, emphasize education, and vocational training.

"If the downtown lunch counters are desegregated,". Warden said, "the bulk of Birmingham's black community couldn't afford to buy a 50-cent hamburger.

"Why not put up a factory that would create a hundred jobs?

"In terms of financing, the money that has been spent on demonstrations—on bonding people out of jail—could have opened up factories with 200 to 300 jobs."

Warden proposes that Negroes forget about integration and, through pooling their resources, develop an economic structure of their own.

"We feel that if freedom means anything at all, the community is going to have to build itself up," he said.

"This is not being done in Birmingham, in the North or anywhere else. Of the unemployment in the United States, 40 to 50 percent is Negro. Opening up lunch counters isn't going to provide that many jobs."

He said the main objective should not be school desegregation but rather it should be learning.

"Even in desegregated schools, there are still the same number of dropouts (by Negroes) and poor grades," he said.

Warden said his group's efforts here would be directed at holding group discussions for several months; a radio program; a drive to encourage vocational training; pooling of money to build factories, and training a sales force.

"We probably will build a broom factory or clothing or shoe factory," he said. "This would raise economic standards of Negroes and give them a pride they don't have," he said.

"The reason we refer to ourselves as black people," he said, "is for identity purposes—it connects us with Africa—and we want to undermine color consciousness."

Negroes have been taught not to identify with their African heritage because of the paganism of their forbears, Warden said. This has resulted in a completely white orientated situation.

Pride in their cultural background and heritage would give Negroes a stability and motivation to improve, he said.

Warden started his movement in March, 1962, after graduation from the University of California Law School. He said there were about 1,000 members in the San Francisco area and chapters are being organized in Youngstown, Ohio; Philadelphia and Chicago.

Threat to Municipal Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, on the first of May, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma issued its decision in the Atlas Life Insurance Co. case holding that Congress had the power to tax indirectly interest from State and municipal securities and that it had properly exercised such power when it enacted the Life Insurance Company Tax Act of 1959, Public Law 86–69.

The complaint of Atlas, which was denied by the court, was that it was required to pay more tax on its other income from taxable sources solely because it received interest from State and municipal securities. While this decision involves an interpretation of the complex life insurance company tax provisions, it goes to the very heart of the constitutional tax immunity of State and local obligations from Federal tax.

Mr. Speaker, any threat to the historic exemption of interest on State and municipal securities from Federal income taxes is a threat to States rights and the ability of these levels of government to meet the needs of their people. We hear much these days of mounting Federal budgets and certainly we are all concerned over the need to hold down Federal spending. Our task will be made immeasurably more difficult if States and municipalities cannot borrow on reasonably favorable terms in the private market. These government units do not enjoy the massive financial strength and resources of the Federal Government and the loss of tax exemption would be a heavy blow to their efforts to help themselves. This is particularly true of smaller communities which are under special handicaps in the money market and to whom loss of tax exemption on their securities would virtually deny them any access to private financing on terms they could meet.

The Atlas Life decision and its far-reaching implications are aptly described in an editorial appearing in the May 6 issue of the Daily Bond Buyer, a financial journal, and in the lead article appearing in the May 8 issue of that publication. I recommend the Bond Buyer editorial and the article to my colleagues.

THE ATLAS CASE

The doctrine of reciprocal tax immunity received a legal jolt late last week when Federal District Judge Luther Bohanon upheld the validity of the Treasury's controversial pro rata taxing concept in the now famous Atlas case.

Judge Bohanon chose to agree with the Government attorneys that Congress, in enacting the Life Insurance Income Tax Act of 1959, expressed its intent to approving the complex taxing formula contained in the bill rather than by inserting the so-called exclusion clause.

The chronology of the bill's trip through Congress would seem to belie this interpretation. During the final stages of the bill's passage the legislators became uneasy over the belated opposition of State and local government officials to the bill's municipal bond provisions. Since the Treasury insisted that the bill did not tax municipal bond interest, and in order to avoid redrafting a most complex piece of legislation, the Senate Finance Committee resolved the controversy by inserting, at the last minute, a clause in the bill which provided that "* * * if it is established in any case that the application of the definition of taxable investment income under this subsection results in the imposition of tax on any wholly tax-exempt interest * * * adjustment shall be made to the extent necessary to prevent such imposition."

It is important to note that this clause leaves no doubt whatsoever about the intent of Congress with respect to the tax immunity of the interest on State and local government securities.

Ever since the enactment of this tax act, we have questioned the Treasury's intent in incorporating a pro rata concept which obliquely, but nonetheless effectively, imposed a tax on municipal bond interest earned by life insurance companies.

Our feeling was that the Treasury's objective was not so much safeguarding the $35 million or so of additional revenue involved, but the establishment of a precedent which could ultimately be applied to all classes of taxpayers. Almost two-thirds of the $80.1 billion of State and local government securities outstanding is held by individuals and commercial banks and we are convinced that it is these taxpayers that the Treasury is really concerned with.

From our point of view, the basic issue is really very simple:

Is interest on State and local government securities fully exempt from Federal income taxes? The answer is an unqualified yes, as even the Treasury will concede.

Does the imposition of the Treasury's prorata formula result in a greater tax or does a change in the amount of tax-exempt interest received affect the tax? Here again the answer is yes.

We are still confident that the Supreme Court will reaffirm the position it took some 30 years ago; namely, that one may not be subjected to a greater tax on his taxable income merely because he owns some that is tax free.

But we are quite disturbed about the chaotic market conditions that are bound to result when this litigation reaches the High Court. For this reason we humbly suggest that the time has come for all State and local government officials who are interested in preserving the integrity of their borrowing authority, to immediately communicate to their respective Congressmen the urgency of enacting a corrective amendment to the Life Insurance Tax Act of 1959 to spell out procedurally, for the benefit of the Treasury, congressional intent as evidenced by the exclusion clause.

Such legislation would obviate the threat of litigation and its disruptive effect on the market for State and local government securities. Should the Treasury achieve its historic objective to eliminate or cut back the tax exemption privilege of municipal securities, it would not be long before State and local governments will become mere administrative appendages of the Central Government.

Municipal Market Operations Unaffected by Adverse Decision in Atlas Life Case

(By Arthur R. Guastella)

With characteristic sophistication, the market for State and local government securities has remained calm in the aftermath of the Treasury's legal victory last week in obtaining the endorsement of the U.S. district court for its controversial treatment of tax-exempt municipal bond interest income of life insurance companies.

But, while Judge Luther Bohanon's decision had no effect on the day-to-day operations of the municipal bond market, it did stimulate considerable speculation about its possible implications. To anyone acquainted with the Treasury's historical aversion to the immunity from Federal taxation of the interest on State and local government securities, the implications are all too clear.

Should Judge Bohanon's ruling upholding the validity of the Treasury's pro rata concept be affirmed by the circuit court of appeals and the Supreme Court, it would be only an administrative formality to apply the concept to casualty companies, individuals, and commercial banks who collectively hold about 80 percent of the $50.1 billion municipal securities currently outstanding.

With municipal holdings of only $2.2 billion, life insurance companies are a comparatively minor market factor, but if the Treasury can get legal sanction for its handling of the tax-exempt interest income of life insurance companies, it can then logically apply the same concept to other investors.

EXTENSION THE WORRY

So the concern stems not from the possible effect on life insurance companies investments, but from the clearly adverse effect an extension of this taxing concept to commercial banks and individuals would have on the market for local government securities.

The pro-rata taxing formula is embodied in one of the most complex and involved pieces of legislation ever to clear Congress—the Life Insurance Income Tax Act of 1959. Stripped of technical terms this is how it works: Life insurance companies, because of their unique character, are required to set aside certain reserves to meet contractual obligations to policyholders. These reserves are reflected in policy contracts as cash values and other equities.

So, actually only a relatively small portion of a life insurance company's total investment income can be considered to be income in the corporate sense, since most of all interest income received must be added to reserves. Prior to enactment of the 1959 law, the portion of interest income needed to maintain these legal reserves had been deduced from investment income and only the free remainder was subjected to the income tax. The companies treated tax-exempt interest income just as any other taxpayer and subtracted it from gross income.

THE PRO-RATA ANGLE

The 1959 law, however, requires life insurance companies to divide tax-exempt interest income between the company and the policyholders and allows them to deduct only their share from net investment income. Thus, if the policyholders' share is determined to be 75 percent, then the company may exclude only 25 percent of its total tax-exempt interest income in arriving at its taxable base. This is a highly simplified version of the actual procedure but is basically accurate.

How could this concept be applied to commercial banks? The Treasury could say that some portion of the bank's tax-exempt interest income properly belongs to its savings depositors and thus require that the amount of tax-exempt interest income deductible from gross income be reduced in accordance with the same formula. Or, it could require that the interest paid to savings depositors be only partially deductible as an operating expense.

Similarly, individuals could be required to reduce their itemized deductions by the ratio which tax-exempt interest income bears to total income on the assumption that some portion of the deductions claimed was paid for with tax-exempt dollars. This is pure conjecture of course, but many feel it is entirely possible should the legality of proration with respect to tax-exempt interest be established for one class of taxpayers.

The beauty of the Treasury's approach in this respect is that it is entirely logical and effectively cuts back the tax exemption without, at least directly, involving the principle of reciprocal immunity.

OPINION OF THE JUDGE

This evidently was the view taken by Judge Bohanon, for, in his opinion, he states that the act simply classifies income for purposes of taxation and no tax is levied upon the tax-exempt interest.

In his opinion, Judge Bohanon further held that to adopt the formula urged by the plaintiff, namely to fully exclude tax-exempt interest income, would amount to a striking down of the formula adopted by Congress and at the same time set up a formula not provided by Congress.

It is quite clear then that the only hope of averting the risk of an adverse ruling from the U.S. Supreme Court on this important issue rests with Congress. The Treasury and now Judge Bohanon are of the opinion that the intent of Congress with respect to the taxation of State and local government securities was evidenced in the formula included in the law and not in the exclusion clause that stated that should any provision in the law result in a tax on tax-exempt interest, an adjustment shall be made to prevent such imposition.

POLL OF CONGRESS

A survey of key congressional leaders conducted by the Daily Bond Buyer's chief Washington correspondent, John Gerrity, indicates that they are overwhelmingly in favor of preserving the traditional immunity of State and local government securities from Federal taxation.

Minority leader of the Senate, Everett McKinley Dirksen, who reported that he has already begun to receive correspondence in respect to the Atlas case, says that if the issue reaches the point where Congress will have to take direct action to preserve the tax immunity, "I will naturally go along with tradition and precedent. The immunity must be preserved, since it goes to the heart of the individual States' sovereignty."

The senior Senator from Illinois, who this year took a seat on the Senate Finance Committee for the first time, added that he expected the issue to reach Congress for ultimate settlement, since the present disposition of the Federal courts is to rule against the States on questions such as this.

QUESTION OF STATES RIGHTS

Senator Strom Thurmond, Democrat, of South Carolina, said he "could not imagine any Member of Congress interested in preserving at least a semblance of States rights failing to support a definitive law, specifically spelling out the immunity of State and local securities."

He, too, indicated that the court's decision came as no surprise, and that he felt Congress would have to act sooner or later.

Senator Harry F. Byrd, whose Finance Committee added the exclusion clauses to the 1959 income tax law, is also known to hold the same views in respect to tax immunity that he held 4 years ago.

Next in line to be chairman of the Finance Committee—assuming the Democrats retain control of the Senate for the next 4 years—Senator Russell Long, of Louisiana, customarily refuses to declare his position on an issue before it actually comes before Congress. However, in the case of the tax-exempts, he describes himself as "a traditionalist" meaning he would favor legislation, if necessary, to preserve the tax-exempt status.

Others in the Senate who spoke out against further interference with the rights of States and localities to manage their own financial affairs included Senator John McClellan, Democrat, of Arkansas, and chairman of the Senate Government Operations Committee; Senator A. Willis Robertson, Democrat, of Virginia, and chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and Senator Clinton Anderson of New Mexico who heads the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

EFFECT ON MARKETABILITY

Senator Robertson stated he "would be greatly disturbed by any Supreme Court decision that would adversely affect the marketability of State and local bonds issued in the past, present or future."

He added he would support legislation to insure the tax immunity of such bonds, and further said "The Federal Government has cut off virtually every other avenue of financing and there is nothing left to the States or local communities except the right to issue their bonds. They should be allowed to retain it."

Congressman L. H. FOUNTAIN, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Arrangements, is also opposed to the idea of tampering with the existing tax-exempt status of State and local government bonds. Mr. FOUNTAIN said that "It is difficult to imagine or comment on the specific nature of a bill before it is placed before you, but I would say, as a matter of principle, I would strongly oppose any alteration to the long-standing tradition of tax immunity for State and local securities."

The Atlas case cannot reach the Supreme Court before the 1964–65 session, so there is ample time for Congress to enact legislation which would leave no doubt as to its intent in the tax treatment of State and local bond interest, and thus avoid a serious disruption of the market for these securities.

Man Has Only Started Reaching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Chalmers M. Roberts which appeared in the Washington Post of May 19, 1963.

If space is to be an area of peace instead of one of a threat of war, we must be No. 1 in space. The people of this country support this belief, I am sure, as recently in a poll I took within my congressional district, the citizens voted 3 to 1 in support of our present space program, which if continued, will make us No. 1 in space.

The article follows:

MAN HAS ONLY STARTED REACHING

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

CAPE CANAVERAL.—The hand of man reached a bit farther into space last week. And as surely as the nuclear genie will never be put back into the bottle, so man's efforts to explore the universe will go on and on.

Perhaps men of little faith will delay the efforts, hold them back a while, even set them back. Perhaps some of the money now scheduled for space exploration in one form or another will be switched to earthly activities or simply diverted back to the pockets of America's taxpayers in the form of tax cuts.

But just as King Canute once commanded the seas to abate in order to demonstrate to his sycophantic courtiers that the laws of nature are controlling, so astronaut L. Gordon Cooper's *Faith 7* capsule, circuling the globe 22 times last week, demonstrated that man's determination to learn and use those laws is unquenchable.

Soon America's attention will move from Project Mercury, which put Cooper and three of his fellow astronauts into orbit, to Project Gemini, which will do the same and a bit more for two men in a single capsule. And then will come Project Apollo, to break man free of the earth and send him to the moon. Beyond that lie the planets.

MACHINE STILL DWARFED

All of this is costing the United States billions. Quite naturally, many Americans figure that such colossal sums might be better spent at home to plug the gaps in our affluent society. Some argue that there is too much concentration on space spectaculars; that scientific brains are being too narrowly channeled; that machines set down on the moon, for example, could substitute for man at much less cost and with equal results.

The machines of man here at the Cape are indeed phenomenal. But the men here who direct them, and the man who conceived and built them, are far more phenomenal. It is hard to quarrel with a statement by Dr. William Helvey, chief of life sciences for the Republic Aviation Corp., one of the concerns involved in producing space age machines.

He commented that the human brain, no bigger than a grapefruit and operating on the equivalent of a tenth of a volt of electricity, has some 10 billion tiny, individual message relay centers linked together which can digest incoming data; analyze, compare and evaluate it, and initiate appropriate action in a fraction of a second. The brain, he said, has 10,000 times the memory storage capacity of the biggest computer.

Machines may be magnificent, but man himself, who created them, will not be satisfied until he stands on the moon, just as he was not satisfied until he stood on the peak at Darien and on the top of Everest.

But one cannot come here to Canaveral and dream only of science and exploration. For force and counterforce is not just a law of nature; it is also a law of man, sometimes expressed as challenge and response or offense and defense. Canaveral is not just the place from which Astronaut Cooper was boosted into orbit; it is also the Atlantic Missile Range.

Standing here at Cape Canaveral in last Wednesday morning's warm sunshine watching the Atlas missile propel Cooper's capsule into the heavens, the watcher was conscious of both power and prestige. The Atlas, of course, is not merely a booster for peaceful exploration of space; it is also a weapon that can carry death and destruction almost beyond human capacity to understand and do so some 5,000 miles away in 90 minutes or less.

The space capsule, both American and Soviet, may be widely regarded as a symbol of peaceful exploration of space. But the boosters that put the Soviet cosmonauts and American astronauts into orbit were developed as instruments of war. Prestige thus was built upon power.

As Cooper's *Faith 7* capsule settled into the Pacific, the Soviet Union was about to throw a new series of 5000-mile rockets into the same ocean. The Soviets, who work behind the shield of secrecy, may very well either beat the United States to the moon or introduce a new concept, perhaps a manned orbital space platform with nuclear weapons aboard.

There is no getting away from the fact that the race into space is a contest of utmost importance to both the United States and the Soviet Union, a political application of the physical law that every force has its counterforce. To avoid facing this fact is both naive and dangerous, akin to believing in unilateral disarmament.

Power, even power and prestige, alone are not enough, of course, to sustain a nation. Internal decay or external aggression have brought a nation's downfall many times in history. But in today's world, power and prestige are the foundation of both the United States and the Soviet Union.

Each must look to its internal defenses and each in its own way is doing that. Whatever the doomsayers may cry, each of these nations is in the ascendancy of its arc of life. The problem of each is to sustain and enlarge that arc.

THE INWARD LOOK

Here in the United States, Americans are wrestling today with a great domestic issue, the rights of a racial minority in a democratic society. Two years ago the Nation was in the midst of what amounted to religious controversy involving the office of the Presidency. The American population explosion presents us with myriad problems at every turn.

But we cannot concentrate alone on such problems, vast, complex and expensive as they are. An inward looking America was shaken as it seldom has been by the launching of the first Soviet sputnik in October 1957. An inward looking America today, either in terms of breaking away from its world responsibilities or in backing away from what are no less its responsibilities to reach into space, also would be disaster for freemen everywhere.

Force and counterforce are present today at every level of human life and human endeavor. With every breakthrough into a new realm, the scope of man's activities is inevitably and irreversibly increased. So it has been here at Cape Canaveral. So must it be as man now prepares for the next step farther into space.

Perhaps man will never learn all the secrets of the universe; he certainly will not unless he tries. But unless he tries, he will fail the very obligation of being man.

Howard Payne College Establishes Douglas MacArthur Academy of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, Howard Payne College, located in Brownwood, Tex., has recently established what is known as the Douglas MacArthur Academy of Freedom. This project, under the able direction of the college president, Dr. Guy D. Newman, is designed to establish an intellectual environment which will nurture understanding and reflective study of the spiritual, economic, social, and political problems of contemporary society. It will undoubtedly contribute significantly to the American concept of freedom and a deeper understanding and appreciation of the meaning of liberty under our Constitution.

Dr. Newman, who is one of America's leading educators, is entitled to commendation for this effort. He also conceived and initiated the national award-winning democracy-in-action program, now in its eighth year at Howard Payne. That highly successful project inspired the idea for the Academy of Freedom. The purpose of the program is to prepare younger people thoroughly to better understand the world in which they live, to appreciate the problems which they face, to recognize the place of Christian leadership, and to be better able to present the point of view of the free world.

This project inspired General MacArthur to observe:

> It is my earnest hope, as indeed it should be the earnest hope of all freedom-loving peoples, that the students who pass through the portals of this new Academy of Freedom will do so in the determined and relentless search for the means to shore up, fortify, and

revitalize that cherished heritage which they hold, not alone for themselves but in sacred trust for the generations which are to follow.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a concurrent resolution, adopted by the State Legislature of Texas, which eloquently describes and commends this program:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 47

Whereas in the 180 years of its existence, the United States of America has vindicated the faith of its Founding Fathers in the type of political, economic, and moral system they envisioned by becoming the strongest and most effective free nation in modern history; and

Whereas Americans are now engaged in a life and death struggle with forces both inside and outside the Nation which seek to destroy the basic freedoms and values which undergird the Nation's strength; and

Whereas the administration and faculty of Howard Payne College, a 4-year Baptist institution of higher education in Brownwood, Tex., believe that the American heritage, Judeo-Christian traditions and the free enterprise system have a special affinity of purpose which needs to be understood and preserved; and

Whereas believing that higher education has an indispensable role in the protection of the Nation and in the promotion of the ideas upon which it was founded, Howard Payne College has established the Douglas MacArthur Academy of Freedom which will become operative in September 1963 the first center of this kind ever established on a college or university campus; and

Whereas the idea for the academy is an outgrowth of the college's democracy in action program, which won an award from the Freedom's Foundation of Valley Forge, Pa., as the outstanding project of its kind in the Nation; and

Whereas unlike most freedom and anticommunism efforts now in operation, the program will be objective and nonpartisan, not seeking to impose the viewpoint of any group or organization; and

Where it should be a matter of pride to all Texans that a small, private liberal arts college in the Southwest is the first in the Nation to undertake such a program; and

Whereas named for the great American leader who said that the protection of this country "will only be possible if we regain some of the spirtuality and wisdom of our forefathers which caused them to ordain by constitutional precepts that government be servant rather than master of the people," the Academy of Freedom will have the following three stated obligations: (1) it will be maintained on a high professional and educational level; (2) it will be nonpartisan politically and seek to inspire all student members to search diligently for the truth without being inhibited in any area of life, thought and action; and (3) it will seek and maintain the highest type of professional leadership in the academic world and give these leaders freedom to inspire students to fuller understanding of the American heritage and the destructive processes in our cultural and help them prepare themselves for any and all areas of public life and civic responsibility: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 59th Legislature of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring), That Howard Payne College and its administration and faculty, particularly Dr. Guy D. Newman, president of the college, be commended and congratulated on the concept, planning, philosophy and goals of the Douglas MacArthur Academy of Freedom and wish them every success in this important undertaking.

Emancipation Proclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mrs. DWYER. Last week, Mr. Speaker, the 100th anniversary of President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation was observed in a series of special activities in Plainfield, N.J., sponsored by the Plainfield branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

As a part of this observance, Plainfield's daily newspaper, the Courier-News, published a particularly thoughtful editorial on the subject. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this editorial as a timely reminder to our colleagues that, in the words of the editorial, "There is still much to be done to give full meaning to the word, 'emancipation'."

The editorial follows:

EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION

Events in Birmingham, Ala., will set a background for meetings to be held this week in observance of the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation. It was not originally planned that way, but if the agreement in Birmingham holds, as reached by men of enlightenment in the white and Negro community, the present peace pact could go a long way toward a full recognition in Birmingham, the South and in the Nation for equal treatment and equal opportunity for all citizens as guaranteed by the Constitution. Those guarantees followed the Emancipation Proclamation.

It is of particular local interest that the man credited with much of the work in bringing together members of a biracial committee for a settlement in Birmingham is a native of Plainfield. He is Burke Marshall, Chief of the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division. While the tension still exists, and the peace is not certain, Marshall said that the white and Negro leaders of Birmingham had taken a tremendous step forward. We agree.

History tells us that the Emancipation Proclamation issued by President Abraham Lincoln became effective on January 1, 1863, putting an end to slavery in this Nation.

In following years, three amendmens—the 13th, 14th, and 15th—were added to the Constitution to give legal force to the proclamation.

The centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation will be observed here all this week, leading to a meeting at Plainfield High School on Sunday afternoon at 5 p.m. It is said that it will not be conducted as a celebration. It will be a solemn occasion. It will be a public meeting for all residents, sponsored by the Plainfield branch of the NAACP.

The progress in 100 years has been painfully slow. The efforts of freemen of all races and all nations are needed to reduce prejudice, to abolish discrimination, to bring about equal treatment and equal opportunity under law. There has been great progress, but much more is needed. The United States must correct the abuses within its own borders before it can ever set an example for the world. There is still much to be done to give full meaning to the word "emancipation."

Preparation for Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the congressional debate on Near East policy these past weeks, it was gratifying to hear the firm statement made by the President last week.

The President said then, and I quote:

> In the event of aggression or preparation for aggression, whether direct or indirect, we would support appropriate measures in the United Nations and adopt other courses of action on our own to prevent or put a stop to such aggression.

This should make it quite clear to President Nasser of Egypt that we are committed to defend the integrity of sovereign states in the Near East and that we will not acquiesce in a threat to Israel, to Jordan, or Saudi Arabia.

The President's words, "preparation for aggression," point specifically at the current activities of Egypt in relation to her neighbors.

The arms buildup in Egypt, accompanied as it is by forthright declarations of ruinous war, is preparation for aggression.

The fomentation of violence and rebellion, through endless propaganda from all the organs of mass communication, through skilled instigators disseminating hatred in the street, is preparation for aggression.

President Nasser has been employing both of these methods to undermine the entire Near East. I was glad to hear that our Department of State, during the pro-Nasser rioting which recently threatened the Hashemite throne of Jordan, urged radio propagandists in Baghdad, Damascus, and Cairo to desist in their war against King Hussein. It was about time that we acknowledged that in today's Arab world, words fly across frontiers with the accuracy of missiles and with the same intent to kill.

The President's policy, as always, depends on interpretation and evaluation of the threat in the Near East.

The threat to Israel was made explicit, as it has been innumerable times during the last 15 years, when Iraq, Syria, and Egypt signed their unity declaration in Cairo last month.

In their relations with Israel, the Arab States have continually violated the principles of the United Nations Charter. Thus, it may seem rhetorical to cite that this new Arab unity declaration flaunts the charter once more.

The new union has a provision in its declaration of formation which includes provision for the destruction of Israel. The United Nations should find it intolerable that the founding document of a new state, the United Arab Republic, which will undoubtedly become a member of the United Nations, should provide for the destruction of another state which is also a member of the United Nations.

It is dangerously incredible that the destruction of Israel should be a founding principle of the new United Arab Republic, as though it were a goal of the same status as economic union or cultural exchange.

We have watched with all possible good will and considerable assistance the economic development of Egypt, Iraq, and Syria. We should have been able to welcome their unity declaration. But the shocking paradox which betrays this declaration is all too clear. Instead of taking a positive step toward progress, Egypt, Syria, and Iraq have taken a negative step—toward war.

Those of us who contemplate with hope the struggle of oppressed peoples for freedom cannot but contemplate with fear a child of that struggle which is born deformed by hate.

The outstanding element in Nasser's pattern of international relations is his system of absolutes. "The friend of my enemy is my enemy," the Arabs say, and that is all there is to it. A Near East regime may be friendly, but if it is not abjectly pro-Nasser, then its friendship is unacceptable. This is the absolutism that denies Jordan a place in the Arab future, despite the extensive assurances of King Hussein and his Prime Ministers that Jordan wishes to participate with all her heart and energy in Arab development.

Even within the new union itself, it has become obvious that if Nasser is not inside the government, he is against it. Such is the nature of the conflict which has been aggravating Syria.

It seems clear by this time that the Egyptian President makes peace only with those who swear him allegiance. He is the most powerful man in the Arab East. He may fulfill his declarations and lead the Arab world into a war against Israel which would end in disaster for humanity.

The heart of the administration's statement is to do just this—to assure all our friends that the United States stands ready to preserve peace in the Near East, by whatever means it deems effective by the manifold channels of direct and indirect diplomacy and/or by the adjustment of written and unwritten agreements. We must feel free to be firm at all times with any state in the region that defies our defense of peace and threatens to involve itself or anyone else in a needless conflict.

Right now, there is an arms race in the Near East which has locked an economic and spiritual stranglehold on the inhabitants of that area. Israel is being forced to spend far beyond her means for defensive armaments. Her economic development since 1948 has been spectacular. The individual's income has risen from $294 to $750. But this same individual must carry one of the world's highest tax burdens to pay for a defense establishment which, if it will not bring him peace in the real sense it will bring him some peace of mind.

Egypt has been accumulating weapons over the years, to the great detriment of her impoverished people. Egypt has fed her children with American wheat—$576 million worth of American aid has gone to Egypt since 1955. At the same time she has been training for battle, she has made purchases of arms of over $700 million from the Soviet Union since 1955. And she has urged her farmers to maintain unnecessarily high cotton production in order to pay the Russians. Egypt is still suffering from the economic inertia that comes from a one-cash crop economy, not because she has lacked assistance in expanding it, but because her leader feels compelled to prepare for aggression.

I have said in the past and I still believe that the United States should see to it that economic assistance does not serve as a catalyst for the military aspirations of prospective aggressors.

If there has been stalemate and paralysis in our own Government's Near East policy, it has not been so grievous as the paralysis of the United Nations in dealing with the Arab war against Israel.

Any resolution in the United Nations which censured the Arab states has been obstructed by a foreseeable voting alinement.

The Soviet Union's veto insulates the Arab bloc in the Security Council. In the General Assembly, 13 Arab states can always gather at least one-third of the votes needed to prevent passage of any resolution they oppose.

At the recent Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference in Moshi, Tanganyika, we saw that Nasser has no trouble trading influence with the Russians and the Communist Chinese, just as he does in the United Nations. At that conference, we heard the United States and Israel condemned in the same breath. And we understood in which marketplace Nasser can meet most amicable with communism.

The United Nations has been incapable of condemning Arab provocations against Israel in the past. There is no reason to believe that it will have better luck condemning the current preparation for aggression which is taking place in Egypt.

For this reason, I am happy to hear the President assert that we will act on our own, even while acting within the U.N. framework, and even if action within that framework is unsuccessful.

In dealing with the tension in the Near East, our State Department has been plagued by a conflict of goals. We wish to bar the entry of communism in the area. But in our attempt to keep the Arabs out of Moscow's reach, we have hesitated to speak strongly in the defense of Israel. For many years, many of us in Congress have been arguing that these two goals are not mutually exclusive. That to guarantee the safety of Israel, our only democratic friend in the Middle East, is to tighten the containment of communism.

At last, there has been strong and public recognition of this identity in a statement reinforcing our intention to give a security guarantee to Israel, to watch over her continued growth. We can do no less. We have guaranteed by other means the safety of our other stanch allies throughout the world.

The most successful implementation of the President's policy will be nonimplementation. We declare our firm intention to defend peace in order that no action will have to be taken "to prevent or put a stop to" aggression.

If there is still some reasonable judgment left to the hate-ridden Arab world, then this brief, pointed statement by the American President should still be worth more in meaning than the tirades of Radio Cairo.

We Die a Little

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to personally join Dr. and Mrs. Reuter in expressing regret that Dr. and Mrs. Hintz are leaving Chicago and my congressional district. Dr. Hintz is to become pastor of the First Baptist Church in Seattle, Wash. Dr. and Mrs. Reuter have invited me to join them in honoring this dedicated couple on June 18. Whether or not my schedule will permit this, I include, under unanimous consent, the Reuter article, "We Die a Little," in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WE DIE A LITTLE

(By Dr. and Mrs. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

We are told by authorities that each of us starts to die at birth. The processes are short and simple for some but long and complicated for others. Events often cause us to "die a little." While the events are not necessarily good or bad per se, yet they are reflected in our image in society. Society is thus aided and damaged by the same event. Only history can measure the results after considering all the factors in the short-run and the long-run of events. Below are several examples:

First, Dr. August M. Hintz, pastor, North Shore Baptist Church, Chicago, resigned on April 28, 1963, after 10 outstanding years to become pastor, First Baptist Church, Seattle, Wash. His resignation places us in the state of mind of many Americans on April 12, 1945, with the death of President Roosevelt. At that time Quentin Reynolds said: "It was as though the Nation's heartbeat stopped for a moment and started again." We will honor Dr. and Mrs. Hintz on June 18, 1963.

Second, ex-Congressman Phil J. Welch, of Missouri, recently passed away. He joins history in Missouri along with ex-Mayor Roger T. Sermon, of Independence. Both made our Nation even greater.

Third, Queen Frederika of Greece is probably the greatest royal lady alive. We have been told by many citizens of Greece, in all economic areas, how much she is loved. The beautiful, charming, intelligent lady is the mother of three outstanding children: Crown Princess Sophia of Spain, Princess Irene and Crown Prince Constantine of Greece. Yet, the Government of England and the world were shocked to witness that even the great is insulted.

Fourth, U.S. Senator George Graham Vest, of Missouri, gave his famous "Eulogy to a Dog" many years ago in the old courthouse in Warrensburg, Mo. This famous dog speech is frequently quoted around the world, yet the voters of Johnson County, Mo., voted on April 23, 1963, against (1,873 to 652) a bond issue for $45,000 to purchase the old courthouse and repair it as a permanent monument. It would have cost so little to preserve this bit of history, yet thoughtless voters denied future generations a part of the common heritage. This is the second time that the people of Johnson County failed to recognize their obligations. The first was when the old home of U.S. Senator Francis M. Cockrell was destroyed.

Fifth, John Henry Faulk suffered a great ordeal for years before society corrected a major error. It took Look magazine to describe this event on May 7, 1963, under "The Ordeal of John Henry Faulk." The editors of this famous magazine wrote: "The John Henry Faulk story has a nightmarish quality. Yet it is sadly true, as related above, and there were dozens of other stories that never came to public attention in the ugly days of McCarthyism and its aftermath. No American who lived through those days has any right to feel superior to those actually involved in these cases. The guilt for John Henry Faulk's ordeal is shared by all—magazines, newspapers, radio and television, advertising agencies and just plain citizens. He who made no protest at the time has no license for smugness now. Let us hope that we have all learned our lesson well."

We are a nation of law and order and yet the Faulk case happened. The world only knows how much suffering is related to mankind. The recent situation of Arnold Maremont in Illinois who was removed from office by a civil type of ex post facto is now common knowledge in remote areas of the world.

Finally, Dr. John R. Rice is moving "The Sword of the Lord" from Wheaton, Ill., to Murfreesboro, Tenn., this summer. Dr. Rice, who is an internationally know preacher and Christian leader, has been referred to many times as the "preacher's preacher." He and his charming wife took time to be our dinner guests on May 1, 1963. Illinois is suffering a great loss in his departure, and Tennessee is the winner.

We "die a little" when such events as described above happen, yet as citizens of the greatest nation in the world, we must continue to work and pray for an even greater future for our country and our world.

Republicans Have the Best Candidates in Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune recently carried a very interesting letter to the editor written by Hon. William E. Miller, chairman of the Republican National Committee. The article was entitled "Republicans Have the Best Candidates in Years," and I wish to commend our distinguished colleague for taking the time and trouble to write this letter. I am delighted to see that the New York Herald Tribune is printing thoughtful letters of this type from notable Republicans and Democrats alike about important issues and personalities before our people.

The Republican Party has a great deal to offer, both in the way of issues and in the way of topnotch candidates, and my good friend, Bill Miller, has made a worthwhile contribution in his letter which follows below.

REPUBLICANS HAVE THE BEST CANDIDATES IN YEARS

To the HERALD TRIBUNE:

To inspire the loyalty and win the support of a majority of Americans in 1964 will require splendid candidates, constructive party principles and a proven record. The Republican Party approaches next year's election campaigns with these tangible assets. The Democratic Party does not.

We shall have the good fortune, for example, to select our presidential ticket from a crop of the most able, attractive and articulate personalities either party has put forward in years. The national spotlight is turning on at least a dozen Republican Governors, Senators, and Members of Congress who will provide us with magnificent presidential and vice presidential timber. The healthy competition set off by their followers will vibrate through the Nation, capturing attention and rallying strength to the Republican Party.

The chosen candidates will be able to point to a series of important Republican initiatives, contrasted with the Democratic Party's chronic lack of ability to govern, in spite of its occupancy of the White House and possession of heavy congressional majorities.

Last fall, for example, strong Republican pressure forced a reluctant administration to belated recognition of the peril in Cuba and impelled the President at long last to clamp down on Soviet shipping. On that day, October 22, the stock of the United States soared around the world, and at the polls in November the Democratic Party reaped the benefits of Republican firmness.

Since then, as we know, the initiative has melted away. The White House permitted the Soviets to welsh on inspection of Cuban military areas, now seems content to coexist with a Soviet bastion 90 miles off shore, and receives Castro's public praises for U.S. action in halting refugee raids on Cuba.

On the domestic front, the first constructive step toward solving unemployment under this administration, the Manpower Retraining Act, was essentially a Republican measure. Early this year Republicans introduced the first legislation on education and civil rights. The Democratic civil rights bill, incidentally, came along over 2 years after the passionate promises of 1960.

These are examples of Republican adherence to sound principle, as the deep antagonisms within the Democratic Party render it impotent. The Nation faces urgent domestic and international problems, but the haloed youngsters in the White House wage war with the gentlemen who rule the Democratic roost on Capitol Hill. Result: stalemate and threats of a Southern purge.

Members of Congress of both parties almost without exception report a "couldn't-careless" attitude toward the President's program among their constituents.

In the first 3 months of this year Gallup reported a 10-point drop in the Kennedy popularity. No candidate has promised more and delivered less. One by one, the glittering Kennedy pledges—over 500 of them—are being junked. The New Frontier as a political philosophy stands revealed, according to one eminent Washington journalist and Kennedy biographer, as a "dud."

Nevertheless, Republicans face an uphill climb in 1964, and the battle will be fought on three major fronts: the big cities, the suburbs, and the South. Reasonable gains in these areas, added to the steady advances we have scored in State and local elections since 1960, can put us over the top next year.

You will recall that in 1960, while we were losing the White House by a hair, we picked up 21 seats in Congress and 290 seats in State legislatures.

In 1962 we added 2 House seats, a governorship, and 159 additional seats in State legislatures. At the same time we increased our turnout for the House of Representatives by 4,500,000, over 4 times the Democratic vote increase. Meanwhile, our vote in the South was jumping 224 percent. It's still zooming.

The most significant test of public opinion on the New Frontier's policies which has occurred since 1962 was the special election held in the First Congressional District of California on January 22, 1963. This district, which went Democratic last November, was carried by Republican DON CLAUSEN in the special election.

In April we elected a State legislator in Corpus Christi, Tex., and two members of the city council in North Augusta, S.C. Both were notable firsts in the history of the South.

Earlier we sent a Republican to the Georgia Senate, 1 to the Mississippi House, and 12 to the Florida Legislature.

In Michigan, after ending a 14-year period of Democratic control by electing Gov. George Romney, we followed up by carrying the State for the new constitution, winning an extremely large percentage of the vote in Detroit.

In Chicago our candidate for mayor took 44 percent of the vote, a 15-percent jump over the previous showing in the Chicago mayoralty contest.

In Kansas City we lost city hall by a very slim margin, but our candidate carried 62.4 percent of the vote in three heavily Negro wards.

All of this shows that Republican organizational muscle is being built in the three major target areas mentioned. This effort will continue at an accelerated pace, and we shall continue to place emphasis on sound Republican principles.

A major challenge to Republicans lies in communicating our more responsible positions. Our mission is to teach that you do not get something for nothing from your Government. Any party which promises that—as the oppositon consistently has—undermines the foundations of America's strength and is unworthy of the support of the citizens of a great nation.

Republicans on the record have retained the stanch friendship and respect of our allies by a firm and wise foreign policy, have maintained a strong military posture, have kept the Nation at peace, and have created an economic climate at home which produced record levels of prosperity.

If we add to this constructive record, the magic ingredient of hard work in the precincts, the Nation can look forward to Republican victory in 1964.

WILLIAM E. MILLER,
Chairman, Republican National Committee.

WASHINGTON.

Subsidizing Brazil's Doublecross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it is clear to everybody, except possibly the New Frontier, that the United States has thrown good money after bad in Brazil and has become the "prize sucker" of the Western Hemisphere now that Brazil has already repudiated its commitments to the United States.

In March of this year, over my serious objections, the State Department loaned Brazil $400 million. The loan was made after our Attorney General, wearing the hat of an economic expert, explained that they must balance their budget in order to bring a skidding halt to their rampant inflation. Possibly the Attorney General should switch places with Mr. Heller—for a balanced budget is good advice for any nation.

It appears, however, that this out-of character advice and the AID agreements made for aid to Brazil, were merely the subterfuges needed by the State Department whose desire to give all leftist nations American dollars, is exceeded only by the eagerness of these nations to accept it.

Despite the fact that a portion of this money was going to—and subsequently has been used—to shore up Brazil's trade with Russia; despite the fact that Brazil is one of only five Latin nations still recognizing and doing business with Castro; and despite the fact that the U.S. Ambassador to Brazil Lincoln Gordon, in testimony before a House subcommittee, charged that Brazil's government, labor unions, and student organizations, are infiltrated with Communists—the loan was made.

But, as could be expected, we have been "taken again." Aside from using this money to boost their trade with Russia, Brazil is disregarding its AID commitments to the United States and is boosting Federal subsidies, a violation of agreement; and escalating by 60 percent the wages of government employees and the Army, a violation of agreements No. 4 and No. 10. The result? More inflation.

It will be interesting to watch what action the New Frontier will take when confronted with a leftist nation, Brazil, that has doublecrossed them.

In connection with this, I am inserting in the RECORD the complete text of the loan agreement made between the United States and Brazil as well as an article by Virginia Prewett discussing Brazil's violations of its agreements which appeared in the May 21, 1963, issue of the Washington News:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
March 25, 1963.

(Following is the text of a joint communique between AID Administrator David E. Bell and Dr. San Tiago Dantas, Minister of Finance of the United States of Brazil.)

The Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, Mr. David E. Prof. San Tiago Dantas, announced today the conclusion of the economic and financial discussions with the several U.S. departments and agencies concerned which were initiated on March 11. They are agreed that with the effective collaboration of the United States, other friendly countries, international financial institutions, and private enterprise, in support of the self-help efforts of the Brazilian people, Brazil will be able to accelerate its economic and social progress on a basis of financial stability and within the framework of the Alliance for Progress.

During his stay in Washington, Minister Dantas also held conversations with officials of the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the Inter-American Development Bank. Minister Dantas stated that these conversations had considerably encouraged him as to the prospects for the increased collaboration of those institutions in helping to support Brazil's program of stabilization and development.

The understandings reached between the two Governments are set forth in the exchange of letters attached:

MARCH 25, 1963.

HON. DAVID E. BELL,
Administrator, Agency for International Development, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: I have the pleasure of calling to your attention the essential elements in the program which the Brazilian Government has deemed it appropriate to adopt, in order to attack, with its own means and resources, the problem of economic and social development of the Brazilian people, while at the same time reestablishing monetary stability.

A number of major actions have already been taken by our Congress and by the Brazilian Government within the framework of the tax reform law of November 28, 1962, and of the 3-year plan for economic and social development. They include:

1. The adoption of tax reforms which are increasing revenues by about 25 percent, and which provide the foundation for important administrative improvements in tax collection.

2. The elimination of subsidies on wheat and petroleum products, so as to reduce the cash deficit of the Treasury and free resources for developmental purposes.

3. An increase in railroad freight and passenger rates, with a view to reducing operating deficits.

4. The issuance of Decree 51814 setting forth the plan of containment of budgetary expenditures for 1963.

5. The issuance of SUMOC Instruction 234 limiting the expansion of credit to the private sector from the Bank of Brazil.

6. The issuance of SUMOC Instruction 235 providing for priorities in the extension of credit by private banks, enforced through a penalty of increased reserve requirements.

7. Presentation to the Congress of a proposal to give SUMOC additional power to control the banking system and to reorganize its administrative structure so it may adequately carry out the basic functions of a central bank.

8. Conversion of the specific tax on electric power consumption into an ad valorem tax, and adoption for 10 years of a compulsory loan system related to power rates, in order to raise noninflationary resources for the expansion of power systems.

9. An appeal to the State governments, and their agreement, to cooperate with the national stabilization and development effort and to improve the efficiency of their governmental operations.

10. Presentation to Congress of a message proposing that wage increases for public employees be fixed at 40 percent effective in April.

11. An appeal to labor unions for the adoption of a wage policy based on the principle that wage readjustments this year should not exceed actual increases in the cost of living.

12. Agreement by business associations in the clothing, shoe, and automotive parts industries to the adoption of a policy of voluntary price restraint; similar agreements are being negotiated with other industries.

13. Presentation of a message to Congress proposing the adoption of an agrarian reform program, with a view to assuring an improved social distribution of land, creating conditions for increasing agricultural productivity, and reorganizing the Nation's agricultural system.

In addition, it is the intention of the Brazilian Government, during the course of the coming few months, to take other measures for the purpose of carrying forward the development and stabilization program, including the following:

1. Further elaboration of the plan for reducing the Treasury's cash deficit, so as to (a) identify in appropriate detail the main forms of government spending as among development, operating expenses, and subsidies to federal agencies, (b) establish a system of priorities to assure that development spending will be reduced as little as possible (or, if practicable, increased) within the limits of total expenditures prescribed in said plan, and (c) improve the control mechanism in order to assure compliance with expenditure ceilings.

2. Application of any excess of budgetary receipts over the amounts foreseen in the program mainly to a reduction in the forecast issuance of currency, and to some increase in expenditures for high priority investment sectors such as education and health, which have been especially affected by the economy program. In any event, the cash deficit of the Treasury will be held within the limits stated in the 3-year plan of Cr. $300 billion for the year 1963.

3. Adoption as soon as possible of further measures for the progressive elimination of the deficits of the railroads and the merchant marine, in accordance with the program already formulated by the Minister of Transportation and Public Works. This program includes rate increases, limits on number of employees, elimination of uneconomic railroad trackage, and other operational and administrative improvement.

4. The formulation, already under way, of a further tax reform measure to improve both the social equity and the economic efficiency of the incidence of taxation, to be submitted to Congress in time to permit legislative consideration this year. The corporate tax provisions will be designed to provide added stimulus to productive private enterprise. At the same time, further administrative measures will be taken to improve the collection of taxes and to reduce tax evasion and tax avoidance.

5. Maintenance of the coffee policy set forth in the 3-year plan, in order to yield a net surplus in the coffee account of at least Cr. $100 billion in 1963. A definite target will be established as soon as the size of the crop can be more precisely determined.

6. Securing additional noninflationary resources as offsets to the budget deficit, in accordance with the same plan, of at least Cr$100 billion during the year 1963, either related to the import system or through other means.

7. Direction of exchange policy, as provided in the 3-year plan, to reduce progressively the balance of playments disequilibrium and for that purpose the rate of exchange will not be dissociated from the trend of internal prices.

8. Adoption of specific measures to expand exports, particularly of iron ore, meat, and manufactured goods.

9. Adoption of measures to encourage the inflow of productive private investments in order to help attain the targets of the 3-year plan in relation to capital imports, creation of productive employment, and maintenance of a high rate of economic growth.

10. Liquidation of commercial arrears as rapidly as possible, in the light of exchange availabilities, with a view to their full liquidation by not later than May 1964, and the prompt institution of effective controls over importation on the basis of suppliers' credits so as to avoid undesirable levels of medium-term indebtedness.

11. Elaboration in greater detail, during the next several months, of the 3-year plan for economic and social development, and in accordance with the Charter of Punta del Este securing the collaboration of the Panel of Nine Experts, with a view to the subse-

quent organization of an international consortium of credit institutions and governments for the support of the Brazilian program within the framework of the Alliance for Progress. This program will contain specific developmental objectives for at least the years 1964 and 1965, and will take into account the measures being adopted during 1963 toward monetary stabilization and to strengthen our resources for development.

These are the actions taken and the measures intended by my government, in order, within the framework or our national effort, to carry out successfully our program of development and stabilization, so as to insure the economic and social progress of the Brazilian people.

The conditions for the successful execution of that program in a relatively brief time span can be favorably affected by the degree of external assistance which may be received from international financial institutions, Western European countries, Japan, and the United States, especially taking into account the estimated balance-of-payments deficits, this year and next, of Brazil vis-a-vis the United States and Western Europe, respectively. These deficits, whose magnitude has been estimated and reviewed by our respective technical advisers, can be absorbed or offset by means of credit operations which will at the same time serve the purposes of growth.

On the basis of the encouraging preliminary discussions which I have held in Washington with the managing director of the International Monetary Fund, we are asking the fund to negotiate a standby arrangement by June, and in order to achieve this purpose to send a mission to Brazil. In the meantime, the Fund has agreed to the deferral of the $26.5-million payment obligation which would otherwise have been due in March.

Continuing the discussions which I have already initiated with representatives of other countries which are creditors of Brazil, we will seek to obtain, during the same time period, new resources from Europe and Japan in an amount of approximately $100 million, including reactivation of the $77 million which were not used under the European standby credits negotiated in 1961.

It would be highly important for me to learn the viewpoint of your Government concerning the possibilities of your participation henceforth in support of Brazil's program for development and stabilization, so that this support may be included in the implementation of the 3-year plan already adopted by the Brazilian Government. I am sure that such collaboration, supplementing our own self-help efforts, together with the aforementioned cooperation of other governments and international institutions, would make a valuable contribution to the achievement of the objectives of social well-being and economic strength set forth in the Charter of Punta del Este.

Please accept, Mr. Administrator, the assurances of my highest esteem.

FRANCISCO CLEMENTINO
SAN TIAGO DANTAS,
Minister of Finance.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY
FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., March 25, 1963.

HON. FRANCISCO CLEMENTINO, SAN TIAGO DANTAS,
Minister of Finance,
The United States of Brazil.

DEAR MR. MINISTER: During our talks in Washington the last 2 weeks, we have greatly appreciated the opportunity to be informed by you and your associates of the program for economic stabilization and development of the Government of Brazil, and the actions and policy decisions already taken to implement that program as set forth in your letter of March 25, 1963. We have been deeply impressed by the way in which this program has been initiated and by the opportunities it appears to present for constructive international cooperation within the framework of the Alliance for Progress.

As you have indicated, the volume of resources required by the Brazilian program as well as your trade and investment connections with Western European countries and Japan render it desirable to enlist the support of those countries and also of international organizations such as the International Monetary Fund. We are accordingly glad to know that it is your intention to seek a standby agreement with the Fund during the next 2 months, to initiate conversations for long-term financing with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Development Association, and to obtain financial support from other international banking institutions such as the Inter-American Development Bank and from the principal Western European countries and Japan. In this connection, we have noted the encouraging results of your initial conversations with the International Monetary Fund and the other international financial organizations

As a result of these discussions, we can now foresee a combined supply of external resources from the United States, the other creditor countries, and international agencies in support of your program for development and stabilization adequate to cover fully Brazil's balance-of-payments deficit as now estimated for 1963 and to make a substantial contribution toward meeting the 1964 deficit. At the same time, a major portion of the credits from the United States will provide support for key elements in Brazil's program for economic development, such as roads, electric power supply, and the expansion of small and medium industrial enterprises.

Looking farther ahead, we warmly welcome your intention to detail further your 3-year plan as a basis for long-term economic and social development and to seek international collaboration in its support in accordance with the principles and procedures of the Charter of Punta del Este. The United States will be prepared to participate wholeheartedly in that effort. Thus international financial cooperation with Brazil can be freed from the pressures of intermittent balance-of-payments crises, and placed on the constructive basis of support for long-term economic and social progress.

For the period through May of next year, on the assumption that external financial assistance will successfully be negotiated by June 1963 from other sources, as foreseen in your letter, the U.S. Government will for its part be prepared to commit, subject to applicable legislation, the following financial resources, totaling approximately $400 million, in support of your program for stabilization and development:

	Million
Funds to be provided immediately:	
Export-Import Bank	$33.0
Treasury	25.5
Agency for International Development	25.5
Further funds:	
Agency for International Development:	
Program support	$100.0
Project loans	100.0
Export-Import Bank:	
Refunding of debt repayments falling due between June 1, 1963 and May 31, 1964	44.5
Public Law 480, title I commodity shipments (estimated)	70.0
Total	398.5

Disbursements of these funds are expected to be phased in time as required by the program and parallel with the successful implementation of the measures described by you. In order to meet the immediate needs of the program while negotiations are conducted with the International Monetary Fund and European countries, in addition to the postponement already agreed of the $26.5 million due this month to the Fund, the United States will provide immediately credits from the Export-Import Bank, the Agency for International Development (AID) and the Treasury in a total of $84 million.

The funds to be provided from AID resources would come in part from appropriations already made for the Alliance for Progress by the U.S. Congress for the fiscal year 1962–63; the remainder would be subject to the appropriation of funds by the Congress for the fiscal year 1963–64. It is expected that these AID funds will be made available in the form of loans repayable with a substantial period of grace and a long subsequent period of amortization, and at minimum rates of interest. The administration's total request for authorization and appropriation of funds makes sufficient allowance for these purposes, and also to provide resources for the Northeast development program and initial support for subsequent phases of your 3-year development program. The funds from the Export-Import Bank would consist of a release of $33 million from the commitment made in 1961 and on the terms then agreed, and $44.5 million in refunding of debt repayments over periods of 7 years. The Treasury funds will be applied immediately on an interim basis and would later become part of the longer term arrangements.

In addition the United States is now considering appropriate terms and conditions for the sale of wheat to Brazil under title I of Public Law 480 for the calendar year 1963 and would be prepared, subject to the requirements of existing legislation and established procedures, to extend this consideration to cover calendar year 1964 as requested by the Brazilian Government. The total estimated value of such an extended agreement would be approximately $140 million.

I look forward to the early completion by representatives of our two Governments of specific arrangements to implement the foregoing understandings, parallel with the progressive implementation of your own program.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. BELL.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, May 21, 1963]

SUBSIDIZING BRAZIL'S DOUBLECROSS

(By Virginia Prewett)

Brazil is a huge, beautiful and underdeveloped country whose rulers for over 2 years have bucked U.S. foreign policy for Cuba whenever we took a firm tone toward Castro. Today, Brazil's rulers have embarked also on an open course of bucking U.S. foreign policy for Brazil.

Within the past 2 months, Brazil's President Joao Goulart and his Foreign Minister Dr. Francisco San Tiago Dantas have quite spectacularly broken a vital agreement with the Kennedy administration.

THEY KNOW

The speed with which they have splintered solemn promises solemnly made to Washington is almost without parallel. Thick-skinned Norte-Americanos may not know that by this action Brazil has flung the United States a challenge. But Brazil's Latin American neighbors know.

The incident turns on the recent financial bailout granted Brazil by the United States. In March, President Goulart sent Dr. Dantas to Washington to plead that Brazil might soon have to default on official and commercial debts—the equivalent of national bankruptcy. To get a U.S. bailout of $398 million, the Goulart-Dantas team promised in writing to curb Brazil's rampant inflation.

Within short weeks, the two Brazilian leaders have done the opposite. They've restored Federal food and oil subsidies, and agreed to a 60-percent pay raise for Government employees and the army. A new round of inflation is assured.

President Goulart and Dr. Dantas solemnly tell U.S. newsmen that "political pressures" forced them to do this.

PAYOFF

The truth is that the Goulart-Dantas following is powerful in the government employees union that spearheaded the wage increase demand, so the two leaders in effect pressured themselves. The huge raise will pay off a political debt to the army—which sustains Sr. Goulart's power—and is insurance for Dr. Dantas' election as Sr. Goulart's successor in 1965.

President Goulart is often described as an opportunist. But his heir-apparent, Dr. Dantas, is wedded to his own set of principles. He remains viscerally anti-American, with a political philosophy little changed since he was a uniformed Brazilian Nazi before World War II.

President Goulart and Dr. Dantas have maneuvered the United States into subsidizing their political ambitions. Latin America is watching to see what President Kennedy's team does about it now.

George Todt's Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to include several articles by Mr. George Todt, a prominent columnist for the Los Angeles Herald Express, and are deserving of careful reading and thoughtful meditation.

George Todt's Opinion—A Fool's Paradise

"We of the United States are wallowing in so much wealth that we have become complacent as a people—and we are losing our inheritance of freedom by erosion." (Walter Knott, address to SAR.)

Recently the California Society of the Sons of the American Revolution held its annual meeting and election of officers at Knott's Berry Farm in Buena Park.

Carl Warn of Salinas, formerly northern California vice president of the old-line group, was elected president of the State body. He is a fine American patriot and it will be a privilege for all of our people to work with him.

I was honored with a vice presidency for southern California, which was more than I deserved. But nevertheless, I hope to be of as much service as possible to this dedicated organization. The SAR loves America.

As president of he local Los Angeles chapter, which was the host to the State's society this year, I presided at the prebusiness session.

KNOTT SPEAKS

It was a matter of great pride for us to present one of the most remarkable free enterprisers in in southern California as our guest speaker.

He was durable Walter Knott, who constructed a magnificent business out of a dream and a lot of hard work when he started out many years ago.

He is typical of the pioneer spirit and character which built America from a wilderness to the greatest nation on earth in a relatively short span of years.

He commenced his rise from a tiny family-type shop with nothing except faith in our way of life, a loving family and belief in our God.

CAPITALISM WORKS

Today he is a landmark in our "boomtown" area of these United States and we all ought to be inspired by his healthy example. He has proven, along with many other brave men and women, that free enterprise works.

We honored him with an SAR Good Citizenship Medal, our highest award, and he honored us in accepting it. Truly a wonderful American.

"The reason we have been so productive in our country," Knott said in the course of his address, "is because we have adhered to four basic and fundamental economic principles. These are (1) limited government, (2) individual freedom, (3) incentive, and (4) competition.

FOOL'S PARADISE

"But our generation has been mortgaging 150 years of thrift and we are now living in a fool's paradise of deficit financing—and we are passing along our debts to the forthcoming generation. It will ultimately drive us to socialism."

Knott said that our people originally immigrated here to seek religious freedom. They were poor at first and became largely ignored by Great Britain, the mother country. Left alone by "big government" they commenced to prosper.

Then the English sovereign laid on too hard with the taxes. Our American patriots and forefathers rebelled. And 66 of them came together one day to pledge their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to give us freedom from tyranny. They won us our liberty. What are we doing to keep it?

George Todt's Opinion—A Man From Phoenix

"Some are born great, some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrust upon 'em." (Shakespeare, Twelfth Night, act II, scene 5.)

The question whether Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona will run for the Presidency in 1964 is a speculative matter that has not been determined yet by the principal himself.

I discussed the subject with him when he was in Los Angeles 15 days ago. He has not closed the door on anything. His attitude is one of watchful waiting. At the appropriate time, he will make his decision.

Barry is not being coy. He is simply using his head.

He is not required to make any commitment at this time and has no intention of being stampeded into hasty action before he is ready.

NO TRICKS

Being a man of principle, he will keep faith with the people of Arizona—and will resort to no subterfuge or trick to get on the ballot again if he tries for the presidential nomination and is unsuccessful.

Therefore, he must weigh his future plans most carefully so that his decision will be the correct one. Which means he will wait until all the facts and factors are in to be counted. That time is not now.

Goldwater did not specify the exact time, or deadline, he has set for himself in this matter. He indicated that he intended merely to watch the future as it unfolded—and would be guided by his reason.

It could be by the end of this year or the early part of the next one. Who knows? Barry has the happy faculty of calling his own shots and does not allow well-meaning friends—or otherwise—to prod him into ill-considered action. I have great confidence in his judgment.

BARRY TOPS POLL

My point in revealing this conversation with the Senator is to place at rest some wishful thinking and inspired speculation from the portion of the mass communications media which has a superliberal tinge.

Some of these little people are doing their utmost to convince all who will buy their specious nonsense that Goldwater is, in effect, counting himself out of the race in 1964—which is simply not the case.

The man from Phoenix actually believes that it is much too early to declare himself either way as yet. To do so would be bad timing now.

NO PRODDING

I know he was very pleased to learn of the tremendous vote of confidence given him recently by the rank-and-file of the powerful Republican Associates of Los Angeles County. In a luncheon poll, 400 indicated him as their choice for party standard bearer in 1964. There were 425 present at the count.

These people represented the dominant Nixon wing of the GOP in past political wars. The great Republican center. Most significant.

Will he run in 1964? My own private guess is that he will do so. Might be the only practical way to save the United States from the folly of unilateral disarmament.

George Todt's Opinion—Cutting Down a Poll

"He should, as he list, be able to prove the moon is green cheese."—Sir Thomas More, English works.

A funny thing happened to me at the Republican Associates luncheon last week: I helped explode the myth created by the Gallup poll which claims Rockefeller leads Goldwater among the GOP faithful.

According to the controversial Dr. Gallup, the New York Governor is supposed to be three times more popular with Republicans everywhere—except in the South, where he says it is 4 to 1.

As the ancient philosopher, Alfred Hitchcock, is indicating these days: "This is for the birds."

AN EXPERIMENT

I received permission from Homer Preston, the RA boss man, to conduct an experiment with the 425 members of his exemplary organization following the lunch when CBS Telecaster Grant Holcomb and I were interrogating a "Paul Revere Panel" of three GOP Congressmen on the program.

They were Edward J. Derwinski of Illinois, William H. Ayres of Ohio, and Frank J. Horton of New York. Also in the audience were Congressman Glenard P. Lipscomb and former Congressmen Patrick J. Hillings and Edgar W. Hiestand, all of Los Angeles.

After some preliminary questions, in which Holcomb had brought up the matter of Goldwater versus Rockefeller in the GOP, I commenced my great experiment. First, I asked the Congressmen if they really took the Gallup poll seriously in their own private deliberations.

Speaking for Congress on the whole, Derwinski said the answer was negative. I suggested that I thought it was far off target where Barry and Rocky were concerned—and intended to prove it for them.

GOLDWATER WINS

Then I turned to the large audience and asked them to go along with us and to imagine that they were all Republican delegates at the 1964 Republican National Convention. How would they vote?

We stipulated that the Arizona Senator and the New York Governor had battled it down to the wire as the final choices. Now which one?

The Republican Associates present and voting spelled it out in this manner with their uplifted hands: 400 for Barry Goldwater and 25 for Nelson Rockefeller.

This is extremely significant for a variety of reasons. In the first place, this poll was not a rigged one. No other person—not even my friend, Homer Preston—knew what I was going to do. Those present represented a good cross section of the Republican Associates.

Most important, not even the most depraved fanatic could, by any stretch of the imagination, claim this notable tabulation to be the work of the John Birch Society, the Goldwater wing, et cetera.

WHERE ART THOU?

Actually, RA was the strong right arm of Richard Nixon in Los Angeles County in past political wars and performed yeoman service for the former Vice President in all his campaigns.

What the Nixon people voted here confirms what I have been reporting in these columns for many moons. Dr. Gallup, where art thou?

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION—KEEP THE UMBRELLA

"The only thing keeping peace in our world today is the Strategic Air Command of the U.S. Air Force. When we disarm SAC of the B–70 bomber, the Skybolt and other 'first strike' weapons—we are playing into the hands of the enemies of peace." (Congressman James B. Utt, address to Southern California Republican Women, Apr. 19, 1963.)

It is hard for this writer to conceive of sane and thoughtful Americans crying out to unilaterally disarm the United States in the modern world jungle we live in today. Rather, such ill-conceived action might well be the work of madmen.

Wars have always been fought over a little four-letter word spelled "l-o-o-t." And we are sitting on top of the biggest pile of it in history.

Can anyone in his right mind imagine that our people are not the target of envy and greed of all the have and have-not nations of the earth? Of friend and foe, alike? Who would really go to bat for us in any realistic showdown?

Let's be practical about this vital matter of national security. Out with thoughtless crackpots who would foolishly disarm us. We all will live longer that way.

INVITING BLACKMAIL

Here is a truly sane message from Col. Jack Warner as he made an exemplary address to the American Legion 44th Annual Convention at Las Vegas, Nev., last October. The astute president of Warner Bros. Pictures of Burbank had this to say in "The Ramparts We Must Watch":

"To be less than ready in a world where powerful aggression remains a threat," Warner told the Legionnaires, "is to invite disaster. To be less than strong is to invite national blackmail and global holdup—it could result in eventual loss of our freedoms.

"Those who may contend that a diminishment of our military strength will keep away war, are woefully unrealistic. This is like saying that the elimination of umbrellas will keep away rain.

KEEP THE UMBRELLAS

"Fortunately, this Nation has an umbrella. An umbrella of military power that represents a sane and safe persuasion for peace in a world of tumult."

Warner makes sense here and it is only sad that the "appeasement corps" in our Department of State and perhaps the civilian denizens of the Pentagon do not understand it.

They seem to be taking their ideological signals from Secretary Robert McNamara who made the Edsel auto, instead of Gen. Curtis LeMay who made SAC.

Those awakened and alert citizens in the Southland who are concerned about the drift of our Nation toward "unilateral disarmament" or other brands of same—would do well to journey to the Santa Monica Civic Auditorium tonight at 8 o'clock and hear former Congressman John Rousselot discuss the crucially important matter.

HEAR ROUSSELOT

In a document entitled "A Plan for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World," the Department of State has committed the United States to complete disarmament—and total internationalist control under a United Nations Peace Force." Remember Katanga?

Perhaps Rousselot will discuss the proposed Burleson-Curtis resolution now before Congress. It would give Congress some control over runaway disarming of our Republic by the diplomats. Let's look into this issue now.

Drew Pearson—Chuck Stone Dialogue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, there has recently been an interesting dialogue in the press between the internationally famous columnist Drew Pearson and the pungent editor of the Washington Afro-American Chuck Stone.

The articles in question follow:

[From the Washington Post, May 18, 1963]

"AFRO" HAS HAND IN UNREST HERE

(By Drew Pearson)

Behind Adam Clayton Powell's recent speech warning of race riots in Washington is a significant chain of circumstances. They add up to the fact that if Birmingham-type riots do come to the Nation's Capital, the leading Negro newspaper, Afro-American, will deserve much of the blame.

For more than a year the Afro-American has been publishing the type of news conducive to racial bitterness.

"No newspaper has done more to hurt better race relations in Washington than the Afro," says Commissioner John Duncan, the first Negro to serve on the Board of Commissioners which governs the Nation's Capital. "The Afro has been trying for a year to talk up a riot."

However, it has not succeeded. On the contrary, the Negro newspaper has aroused such antagonism in the Negro community that its advertising has been dropping off.

Washington has probably ironed out its racial problems with less friction than any other city along the edge of the Mason-Dixon Line. Even before the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision of April 1954, approximately 67 areas of the community had been integrated. But Negro readers would never know about this from reading the Afro-American.

Because of the paper's emphasis on racial bitterness, Negro leaders called a meeting with Chuck Stone, editor of the Afro, and asked him to tone down his blatant editorials and scare headlines. Stone refused.

"It's the only way to sell newspapers," he replied.

However, after the Afro began attacking such friends of the Negro as (Jiggs) Donohue, former District Commissioner and Aaron Goldman, president of the Human Relations Council, various firms began canceling ads.

It was at this point that editor Stone arranged to have Representative Adam Clayton Powell of Harlem and Representative Charles Diggs of Detroit attend a dinner in honor of editor Stone. Chief purpose of the dinner was to win back Negro support and especially advertising. It was here that Powell made his rabble-rousing speech warning of "one of the worst race riots in the history of America" unless racial tensions are removed in Washington.

The dinner honoring Stone had the partial effect of restoring some advertising to the Afro. Carl Shipley, D.C. Republican chairman, persuaded some advertisers to return. He considers the Afro-American a great asset for the GOP.

Meanwhile, the Afro-American is still playing up news of the Black Muslims almost as if Stone were a member, still excoriating the first Negro Commissioner in history and still fanning the flames of racial prejudice.

DREW PEARSON'S TIRADE SHOWS EFFECT OF TIME'S RAVAGES

(By Chuck Stone)

How about that Drew Pearson. Isn't he wonderful?

Here we are a small, struggling newspaper of 27,000 and what does he do?

He attacks us in his 422,000-circulated Washington Post and nationally syndicated column, and endows us with reams of publicity we couldn't have paid a publicist to get for us.

And most important of all, he "nationalized" Commissioner John Duncan's image because colored folks all over America know if the Washington Afro attacks the record of a colored public official, it must be vulnerable.

We never had it so good.

In his column last Saturday spanking the Washington Afro, Pearson demonstrated conclusively that the ravages of time have finally caught up with him.

It's a terrible thing for a reporter to grow old and inaccurate and silly—all at the same time.

Pearson has managed to do all three. Instead of an incisive, accurate, hard-hitting column about the shortcomings of the Washington Afro (and we have them), he typed out a pathetic compilation of inaccuracies, incredible falsehoods, racial hatred, and sheer fantasy.

After reading his bitter journalistic bowel movement titled "Afro Has Hand in Unrest Here," I could only feel pity for this poor man whose nervousness about race riots is actually a fear that his editorial plantation will be destroyed. (A swinging white gal who is a close friend of the family called me at the office Saturday and asked: "Say, where do I sign up for the race riot?")

However, let's take Pearson's nonsense, sentence by sentence, and see how it stands up in the face of truth.

"That if the Birmingham-type riots do come to the Nation's Capital, the leading Negro newspaper, the Afro-American, will deserve much of the blame."

Man, ain't we a hell?

I can't even get enough colored folks to read this newspaper, let alone get them to go out and start a riot.

There are 411,737 colored people in Washington, D.C.

The last Audit Bureau Circulation statement for the Washington Afro was 27,000—the second highest quarter during the last 4 years or 16 quarters—not bad, heh?

However, that also means that 384,737 colored people are not reading the Washington Afro. We've got a lot of power, Drew, baby, but we're not running the whole colored community.

"For more than a year, the Afro-American has been publishing the type of news conducive to racial bitterness."

We sure have.

And we're going to keep on publishing it.

Every time a policeman shoves his foot down a man's throat and beats him to a bloody, helpless pulp;

Every time the racists in Congress deny adequate funds to the District of Columbia simply because it has a colored majority; every time a colored mother on welfare is humiliated and insulted by an investigator; every time a colored family is rejected for an apartment or house merely because of the accident of their epidermal tissue; every time a colored father is turned down for a job just because he's black;

Every time the District officials throw more colored families into the street in hot pursuit of miles of highways; every time a family of seven almost starves and has nothing to eat for a month except tomatoes;

Every time the Washington Post places a two-column headline story on page 1 about a colored rapist, but places an identical story about a white rapist with a single-column headline on page C–2 in the same paper—then, we're going to headline these rotten injustices and you'd better believe it.

Our printing these stories doesn't precipitate any escalation of racial bitterness. Their occurrences do.

Unemployment, filthy slums, ghettoed housing, police brutality, persistent denials of equal opportunity in jobs and housing cause racial bitterness—not newspaper stories.

Quoting Commissioner John B. Duncan, Pearson writes this next bit of idiocy: "The Afro has been trying for a year to talk up a riot."

Au contraire. What we have been trying to do for a year is talk up the certainty that John Duncan—will not be reappointed as Commissioner.

Of course, this angers Drew Pearson because he loves John. They're very close. When a man like Pearson gets old as he has he needs somebody like John. Who really is.

WHO REALLY IS BOYCOTTING THE AFRO

"The Negro newspaper has aroused such antagonism in the Negro community that its advertising has been dropping off."

If Pearson were a more competent reporter and had done some extra digging instead of listening to John Duncan or "Jiggs" Donohue, he could have easily uncovered the real facts on this "boycott."

The truth of the matter is that our advertising has dropped, but only in the last 2 months.

This has been due to a boycott among a very few businessmen who have objected to the editorial policies of the paper.

Unfortunately, a small group took it upon themselves to try and persuade a number of our advertisers to stop advertising. Two men have been instrumental in this development.

One was able to influence two firms to stop advertising since these are his agency's accounts.

Another simply used his prestige and enormous influence against the Washington Afro. I can document this.

As a result of this campaign, we've either lost the following accounts or they have been very sharply reduced in lineage: Hecht's, Safeway Stores, Drug Fair, District Grocery Stores, Bruce Hunt, 975 Optical Co., and Springer Uniform.

This is no "Jewish boycott"—just like there has never been any "National Push Day" by colored folks. If anything, a majority of our advertisers who happen to be of the Jewish faith told their callers to go to the devil.

More than that, a number of our close friends within the Jewish community have been working assiduously to counteract this painful maneuver. I'm exceedingly optimistic about a solution despite Drew Pearson's gloomy prognostication.

"Because of the paper's emphasis on racial bitterness, Negro leaders called a meeting with Chuck Stone, editor of the Afro, and asked him to tone down his blatant editorials and scare headlines. Stone refused.

"'It's the only way to sell newspapers,' he replied."

Those are two outright lies with not a shred of truth, even in conception.

I've never met with any group of Negro leaders to discuss the editorial posture of the Washington Afro or any newspaper I have ever edited. And anybody who knows me knows I wouldn't.

As for the statement attributed to me about the "only way to sell newspapers," Pearson may have a chance to prove that.

"However, after the Afro began attacking such friends of the Negro as 'Jiggs' Donohue, former District Commissioner, and Aaron Goldman, president of the Human Relations Council, various firms began canceling ads."

True, after we began attacking "Jiggs" we did lose a couple of ads (more proof that the boycott was not solely of Jewish origin). "Jiggs" is legal counsel for one of the largest ad agencies in town.

But to call Jiggs a friend of the Negro is subject to some limitations. Any man who can be chairman of a testimonial dinner honoring Representative McMillan, is no top "friend of the Negro." John Duncan's friend, yes. But, no real friend of "the Negro."

As for Aaron Goldman, we've never "attacked" him. I consider him an invaluable friend and I think he regards me at least as a friend.

"It was at this point that Editor Stone arranged to have Representative Adam Powell of Harlem and Representative Charles Diggs of Detroit attend a dinner in honor of Stone. Chief purpose of the dinner was to win back Negro support and especially advertising. It was here that Powell made his rabble-rousing speech warning of 'one of the worst race riots in the history of America.'"

There never was any "dinner."

If Pearson had even read his own newspaper, the Washington Post on May 6, he could have read the front page story about the mass rally in my honor held at Shiloh Baptist Church.

The we salute committee arranged the mass meeting. And it grew out of an effort to keep me here as editor when I offered my resignation to become public affairs officer for USIA in Tanganyika.

"The dinner honoring Stone had the partial effect of restoring some advertising to the Afro. Carl Shipley, District of Columbia Republican chairman, persuaded some advertisers to return."

Untrue; what few advertisers left have not as yet come back. If Carl Shipley "persuaded" them to return, he sure never told me.

"Meanwhile, the Afro-American is still playing up news of the Black Muslims, almost as if Stone were a member."

Since I became editor of the Washington Afro, I have edited 248 editions. During that period, the Muslims have been on my front page a total of seven times (today's issue included which I did deliberately). That's a 2 percent news coverage of "playing up the Black Muslims."

Oh, I play up Malcolm X. Malcolm X is "good copy." The New York Times had him on page 1 last week. Playboy magazine has a long feature interview with him in this month's edition.

And though I disagree with the Black Muslims about any form of separatism between any race, country, or people and certainly cannot support or subscribe to the anti-Semitism in their posture (our daughter's godparents are Jewish), I'm nonetheless proud to be able to call Malcolm X my friend. He's a swinging dialectician and I respect and admire him deeply for that.

One truth in Drew Pearson's column managed to stand alone like the cheese in the "Farmer in the Dell"—the headline: "'Afro' Has Hand in Unrest Here."

We do, we do.

We push the colored leaders of this community to move faster, more aggressively. This in turn, stimulates more action against racial segregation.

The people become aroused (or as John Milton called it, "divine discontent") and things begin to happen.

I'm just sorry we can't create a whole lot more "unrest."

Behind Drew Pearson's column, though, is a more fundamental issue: an economic confrontation between the Washington Afro and the Washington Post.

For years, the Washington Post represented itself as the best, if not the only effective, media access to the "Negro market."

This is no longer true. The Post knows it. Many advertisers are beginning to know it. And we know it. The "new Negro" has begun to turn more and more to the Washington Afro—God bless you all.

So Drew Pearson's attack is not aimed at me. It's aimed at the Washington Afro in sneaky ploy to destroy this very effective and powerful voice among black people in the Nation's Capital. And Pearson is using a colored pal to spearhead it.

The success of their maneuver is up to you—the colored community with a full 55 percent of the population of this city.

Don't choose between me and John Duncan or even between Drew Pearson and me.

Choose between dignity and servility.

Choose between racial pride and racial shame.

Choose between power and weakness.

Choose between involvement and complacency. But you must choose.

The people in Birmingham chose—and they won.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

> Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)
>
> Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

Appendix

President Kennedy and Congress—An Article by George W. Oakes, Washington Star, May 12, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Record the text of a most interesting and thoughtful article by George W. Oakes, published in the Sunday Star, of Washington, D.C., on May 12, 1963.

Mr. Oakes has analyzed the relationship between President Kennedy and Congress with particular attention to the prospects for passage of the President's major legislative proposals.

The article follows:

Congressmen on How Kennedy Could Help Them

(By George W. Oakes)

As Congress moves into the summer when the fate of President Kennedy's major proposals will be decided, supporters of many of the administration's measures are privately expressing their views on how the President could be more successful in his battle with Congress.

Although the top Democratic leaders in the Senate and House are convinced that Mr. Kennedy is getting about all he can out of a conservative Congress dominated by a southern Democratic-Republican similarity of views, especially on the big domestic issues, more liberal Members in both parties are restive and believe he could do more to line up congressional backing.

A representative group of Senators and Congressmen who are strong advocates of major Kennedy bills were asked this question:

"If the President requested your advice on how he could be more effective in getting Congress to accept more of his program, what would you suggest?"

Here are the replies of some Democratic and Republican Senators:

"Granted that the Democratic Party is split and that Kennedy has a harder task than F.D.R. under quite different conditions, I think he should work harder on public opinion," said a veteran midwestern Democratic liberal.

"The President thinks more in terms of political deals to get votes than of appealing directly to the voters. Also, he compromises on his programs too soon, as in the tax legislation. He doesn't back up his friends in the Senate enough. If Kennedy's strategy is to hold over many controversial issues until the second term (which is increasingly discussed in administration circles), I think he will have lost much of his leverage. For example, most of the judicial appointments at his disposal have already been made."

TRADE BILL AS AN EXAMPLE

"President Kennedy should develop a more systematic effort to enact his program," commented a liberal Republican Senator from the East. "There's not enough organized push on specific issues. Last year the trade program was handled with care, because the President felt genuine concern over it, but on some of the major domestic issues like our broad transportation problems, there are speeches and reports, but no presidential followthrough. Sometimes one wonders how deeply committed he is to tackling these tough problems. The President seems to be more at home with organization politicians than among those who would take action to correct obvious inadequacies as education or transportation."

"The President should use more often his enormous talent to present the issues to the people on television," suggested a new Democratic Senator from the West. "It's possible to overexpose himself, but I think he errs on the side of caution."

"Many administration supporters on the Hill are wavering because of the barrage of opposition attacks. They would be stiffened if the President took his case directly to the people. Then perhaps more of us would speak up in defense of the administration proposals."

"I think that the President does give too much weight to the prerogatives of committee chairmen—perhaps because he is a former Senator."

"On foreign aid, he should have let the Members of the Congress who are under pressure from constituents get the credit for cutting the appropriation rather than slashing his original figure so much."

"Although there's much opposition to Kennedy's program throughout the country and in his own party," remarked a Republican moderate from the South, "the President doesn't fight hard enough for the measures he says he wants. He tends to give in too soon to congressional pressure and he could take a stronger line with his committee chairmen."

EXPLAINING MEDICARE

"If he explained medicare more understandably to the people, it would help those of us who are resisting great pressure. Press conferences aren't adequate, as they assume considerable background information."

"One of President Kennedy's weaknesses is that he is too close to the congressional system—he wants to stay a Member of the Senate team," said a Democratic liberal Senator for the Mountain States.

"A lot of us who support the President's program don't know when to stand firm because in the past he has often left us out on a limb and dealt us out. So we won't make a fight for an issue in which we believe but is unpopular in our home States."

Although Senator Morse, Democrat, of Oregon, would like President Kennedy to make more nationwide TV broadcasts on major domestic affairs, rather than depending on speeches before special groups, he doesn't think the President would improve his position in Congress by cracking down on his senatorial opponents. "He believes in reasoning with those who disagree with him rather than dictating to them and I think he's probably right," said this Senator. "I'm convinced that the President is determined to get his program through."

"There's one technique which is essential in my view—personal contact with key Members of Congress."

On the other hand, Senator Clark, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, believes that prospects for most of the Kennedy program depend far more on congressional reorganization than on Presidential action. However, Senator Clark argued that the President can help in reducing the power of the Senate establishment. "The critical time will come in January 1965, if Kennedy is reelected. Unless action is taken then, the second term will be a do-nothing period."

FLOOR FIGHT ADVISED

"I'd like to see the admiinstration not be so influenced by the judgment of committee chairmen and be prepared to fight it out more often on the floor. Too often the White House has been wrongly advised on how close a vote there would be and as in the recent case of the youth employment bill, when we have battled it out we have won."

In the House, where in general the Kennedy program faces more opposition than in the Senate mainly because of the Southern Democratic-Republican conservatism, these suggestions were offered:

"The morale of the Kennedy troops in the House isn't high," commented a Midwestern Democrat with considerable experience in planning strategy and lining up votes. "Too many of us have the feeling the President doesn't care enough about his program. Of course, Kennedy may be right in waiting for the big push until after the next election when we may have a gain of 15 or 20 liberal Members. Unless this gamble works out, this administration's record will be poor on domestic legislation. The present program seems to be mainly a series of political techniques to win reelection next year."

ALIENATION OF AFFECTION

"The President's strongest supporters in the House who campaigned for him around the country 2 years ago feel an alienation of affection—we seem to be expendable. If next year's presidential election is close, our lack of enthusiasm could affect the result; for many of us led Kennedy in our districts in 1960.

"The establishment which runs Congress won't be changed until the President fights it.

"One reason why the President cannot go more to the people is that, unlike F.D.R., he doesn't seem to have the same ability to communicate with them and produce an emotional response to what he is trying to accomplish, not just to him as a person."

"Vigorous leadership is the only way to get legislation," says Representative Hechler, Democrat, of West Virginia, a former professor of political science. "The President's strong statement urging Congress to restore the Appropriations Committee's cuts on the public works bill is an example of effective leadership. The President should speak out more, for he is the only one who represents all the people."

"There's too much of a feeling that the administration is thinking politically in preparation for next year," according to a liberal eastern Republican. "There's a terrible hostility to anyone who disagrees with them. They forget that today's enemies may be tomorrow's friends."

"The President should take to the airwaves more frequently to produce results in the House," in the opinion of an eastern Democratic liberal who was a key Kennedy leader in the 1960 campaign. "Main Street is what moves the House. The President's speech to the editors put the issues in simple terms but you have to talk to the mass of the people. Press conferences are too cut up when shown on TV."

FOR EDUCATION BILL

"There's more support in the House for a higher education bill than the President realizes," commented a young Midwest Republican. "If the White House would keep its hands off, the Republicans and Democrats would pass a college aid bill."

"Many Congressmen think the President goes out of his way to win over his enemies but ignores his friends who fought, bled, and died for his program," bitterly remarked a west coast Democratic liberal. "The only way you seem to get attention from the White House is to oppose them."

Representative BRADEMAS, Democrat, of Indiana, thinks that the administration could make use of its friends in Congress more effectively. "Frequently on controversial issues there are many House Members, sympathetic to the proposal but not on the committee involved, who would speak up in its defense if they were contacted and given more pertinent information. I think better advance planning of this kind would be a real help to the President's program."

Canyonlands National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it is with considerable satisfaction that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Deseret News entitled "Canyonlands Is in Sight." By its realistic appraisal of the situation, this highly respected Utah daily has put itself on the side of the Moss bill, and of the approach I have always taken toward the establishment of the Canyonlands National Park.

The editorial therefore becomes a fine argument for the type of bill I have presented from the very first—a measure establishing a single park of reasonable size, encompassing the most spectacular of the scientific, geologic, and scientific phenomenon in the rugged area around the confluence of the Green and the Colorado Rivers in southeastern Utah, with limited secondary use in keeping with national park standards. This is what the present Moss bill offers, and this is what I believe has the greatest hope of passage by the Congress.

Since I introduced the first Canyonlands bill in August of 1960, I have introduced two subsequent bills and a number of amendments, each of them an effort to temper my view to the conflicting points of view of others about Canyonlands in my State. As the News points out, no compromise is ever completely satisfactory to everyone, but I am hopeful that those who have steadfastly opposed the Moss bill will now agree to temper their views as much as I have mine so we can get on with the very important business of establishing a Canyonlands National Park in this session of Congress. My goal continues to be: Get Canyonlands National Park for Utah.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANYONLANDS IS IN SIGHT

With what appear to be the final amendments now in, the time has come when the unity we have been pleading for during the past months must at last be achieved or hope may be lost for any early creation of a Canyonlands National Park.

Bit by bit the park as originally proposed has been whittled away. Much of scenic value has been lost in the process--but a good deal of potential oil and mineral revenue has been saved. Only time will tell whether what has been gained is worth what has been lost.

In any event, now let's stop whittling and bend our energies toward getting congressional approval of the Canyonlands bill.

After the various proposals and counterproposals, here is how the park now shapes up:

The magnificent Island in the Sky with its breathtaking overlooks will be part of the park, approximately from the neck south. Grandview Point and Upheaval Dome are important features of that section.

The Maze and Land of Standing Rocks, the fantastically eroded country west of the confluence of the Green and Colorado Rivers, will be out of the park. As many people have pointed out and Senator Moss has agreed, its very inaccessibility protects it from exploitation. Only such rugged guides as Kent Frost of Monticello, are able to take parties in successfully, and then mainly on foot. The time may well come when this area will be added to the park, just as Zions was substantially enlarged several years ago.

Still under discussion is a one-mile strip along the southern boundary. This 20,000-acre area is good deer habitat, and the Utah congressional delegation has agreed to include it in the park only if hunting can be allowed in that strip. If this proposal runs afoul of park tradition, this section might be eliminated.

The great heart of the "lower park" area—The Needles, Chesler Park, Salt Creek with its Angel Arch, and Horse Canyon—and, of course, the river confluence itself—all will be included and fully protected.

The most controversial cutback has been in the area below Deadhorse Point. The bill now before Congress leaves that area out of the park, because of the proven oil and potash reserves there. One oil well is now in operation just below Deadhorse Point to the west and one is in operation and another being drilled to the east.

This omission may prove to be regrettable; again, time will tell. The well on the east is in a box canyon and completely hidden. The wells to the west are visible, but if the scars left by the drilling and seismograph work are carefully cleaned up and allowed to heal, the pumps themselves will be little evident.

The greater danger is that potash mining might be allowed to scar the area with extensive roads, and unsightly tailings. In this connection, the Bureau of Land Management can do a great public service in controlling any future digging in such a way as to minimize scenic damage.

In fact, the Bureau of Land Management is developing a fine sense of the public interest in use of land for recreational purposes. It is in the process of building overlook facilities and erecting signs at many strategically scenic spots outside the potential park, and in general catering to the tourist.

If this approach continues—as it certainly should—we may find that what we really have is a 253,000-acre park surrounded by a buffer zone of another 600,000 acres or so of land which is open for development of resources but under supervision of the Bureau of Land Management officials who are also concerned about scenic values.

This, of course, is an approach not entirely different from the concepts originally spelled out by both the National Park Service and, quite independently, by Governor Clyde's committee on canyonlands.

What all this means is that we are close enough together on both principle and detail that final agreement is in sight and attainable. No individual is going to be entirely satisfied; no one ever is in a compromise situation. But what has evolved after months of give-and-take is a potential Canyonlands National Park that will add greatly to the heritage of scenic grandeur we pass to our children, as well as add to the economic progress of Utah.

Now, let's get busy and get it nailed down.

Electric Power Prices in Tennessee Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is always music to my ears when I hear that the price of something is going down. And the music is all the sweeter when it is the price of electricity that is going down.

In many areas of the country, the price of this all-important commodity is going up. But in Chattanooga, Tenn., it is going down again; this reduction will mean a saving to consumers of more than a million dollars the first year the new rate schedule is in effect. Not only that, Mr. President, but the reduction is being made possible by a decision to the Chattanooga Electric Power Board to wipe out its bonded debt after this July 1—the first large electric system in the Nation to become debt-free. The Chattanooga Electric Power Board is one of the 150 or so municipal and cooperative distributors of electricity generated by the Tennessee Valley Authority, which this year is observing its 30th anniversary.

The decision to become debt-free and to lower rates was announced in the Chattanooga Times on May 4. This was followed by an editorial in the Times on May 5.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both of these items be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material referred to was ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Daily Times, May 4, 1963]

POWER BOARD TO BECOME FREE OF DEBT ON JULY 1: TO CUT RATES $1 MILLION—PRECEDENT IN UNITED STATES, FIRST LARGE PUBLICLY OWNED ELECTRIC UTILITY RID OF FINANCIAL DEBIT

(By Fred Schneider)

The Electric Power Board of Chattanooga plans to become debt-free July 1, and within

30 days after that will put into effect rate reductions that will save its customers more than $1 million a year.

Roy McKenzie, board chairman, announced Friday the mayor and board of commissioners of the city will be asked Tuesday to call for payment July 1 the $2,761,000 presently outstanding revenue bonds.

These bonds are due for retirement July 1 in 1964, 1965, 1966, and 1967. They are in addition to the bonds scheduled for retirement at their maturity July 1, 1963. They amount to $636,000.

With the paying off of all these bonds the power board will have no outstanding debt and will be the first large publicly owned electric system in the Nation to become debt-free, McKenzie said.

The new and reduced rate schedules to be put into effect will result in savings in electricity costs to board customers of about $1,064,000 on the basis of its 1962 revenues, the chairman stated.

CUT TO BE ABOUT 5 PERCENT

The board's revenues in 1962 were $20,141,963, which means the $1,064,000 reduction will amount to around 5 percent. McKenzie said this does not mean that all customers will get a reduction of this percentage. Some will receive less and some more, and so far the savings have not been computed on an individual customer basis.

"With the final details yet to be worked out, it is estimated that the proposed new and lower residential rate will effect annual savings of $460,000," McKenzie said. "The new and lower commercial and power rates will mean a saving of $569,000. Street lighting customers would save about $25,000 a year.

"At present, the board's residential customers already have available electricity costs among the lowest in the Nation and the new schedule will allow opportunities for still further increased usage.

"In 1962 the average residential cost of electricity in the homes served by the board was 8.8 mills per kilowatt-hour with the average annual usage of 14,795 kilowatt-hours, among the highest in the Nation.

SMALL USER TO PROFIT

"The proposed new and lower commercial and power rates will particularly benefit small and moderate users of the board's electricity service and provide an opportunity at a very low cost for further increase in their use of electricity. Lowered street lighting costs likewise will provide opportunity for improved and added street lighting.

"With many electric utilities throughout the Nation placing into effect increased rates for electric service, the board believes its scheduled reduction of electricity cost in the Chattanooga area will act as a stimulus toward location in this area of new industries and the expansion of already existing industries, thus creating additional opportunities for employment of Chattanooga area people.

"The new and lowered rates will give additional impetus to the present large sale of electrical appliances for which Chattanooga is one of the best-known markets in the Nation.

"The rate which the electric power board charges for service are a matter of agreement between itself and the Tennessee Valley Authority from which it purchased the entire electricity requirements of its 87,000 customers."

The $636,000 of bonds regularly maturing July 1, 1963, includes $570,000 of 2-percent electric power refunding bonds series AA, dated June 1, 1944, and $66,000 of 2½-percent electric power revenue bonds, series B, dated July 1, 1948.

The $2,761,000 of bonds which the board wants to call ahead of maturity includes $2.48 million of electric power refunding revenue bonds, series AA, dated June 1, 1944, and $281,000 of electric power revenue bonds, series B, dated July 1, 1948.

The $2.48 million of series AA bonds is composed of $250,000 of 2-percent bonds and $340,000 of 1¾-percent bonds due July 1 1964; $610,000 of 1¾-percent bonds due July 1, 1965; $630,000 of 1¾-percent bonds due July 1, 1966, and $650,000 of 1½-percent bonds due July 1, 1967.

$281,000 SERIES

The $281,000 of series B bonds is composed of $68,000 of 2½-percent bonds due July 1, 1964; $69,000 of 2½-percent bonds due July 1, 1965; $71,000 of 2½-percent bonds due July 1, 1966, and $73,000 of 2½-percent bonds due July 1, 1967. The calling of these 1964, 1965, 1966, and 1967 bonds ahead of maturity will be done with funds on hand, McKenzie said.

The bonding history of the Electric Power Board of Chattanooga, established in 1935 began with and has included the issuance of $100,000 of general obligation bonds in that year for the board's initial engineering and organizational expense. Then in 1939 $13.2 million of revenue bonds were issued when Tennessee Electric Power Co.'s local distribution system was purchased by the board.

In 1948 $1.2 million of revenue bonds was issued to provide for additional facilities made necessary by the upsurge in the use of electricity after World War II.

"All of these bonds will have been paid off entirely from the revenues of the board, which has rates among the lowest in the Nation," McKenzie said.

The Hamilton National Bank of Chattanooga and Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York have been paying agents in connection with the board's revenue bonds.

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times, May 5, 1963]

Milestone for Chattanooga

The Electric Power Board's decision to erase its remaining debt of nearly $3.5 million is a major milestone in Chattanooga history and a nationally significant tribute to the board's operation. As the Tennessee Valley Authority's 30th anniversary of May 18 approaches, mutual salutes are in order between this shining star of the TVA system and the organization that has revitalized the valley.

In becoming the first large electric system in the country that is debt free, Electric Power Board will lower rates that have already put us in annual contention for highest residential electricity use in the United States. The step will be taken, furthermore, by a system that began three decades with the lowest rates in the TVA net and has kept its charges near that mark.

This is an extraordinary commentary on the leadership of the board and the quarter-century direction of States Rights Gist Finley, superintendent.

The average 5 percent reduction in electric bills scheduled for around August will be considerably lower than the potential in the so-called Norris rates offered by TVA 22 months ago. These rates have been instituted by a relative few of the TVA distributors. Argument continues between the TVA and Electric Power Board on this score. The Authority contends that further debt obligations would enable the lower rate. Electric Power Board answers that it chooses the more conservative way.

Although the Board until now has held to a debt-retirement schedule ending in 1957, the step announced yesterday reflects discussion that predates the Norris rate announcement.

Another factor is the unfortunate sales tax increase voted by the State legislature. The tax will bring next month a 3-percent rise in bills to all residential customers and numerous others.

The fact that many industrial users will be entitled to a lower sales tax rate through exemptions, however, underscores the extremely important statement of Electric Power Board Chairman Roy McKenzie:

"With many electric utilities throughout the Nation placing into effect increased rates for electric service, the Board believes its scheduled reduction of electricity cost in the Chattanooga area will act as a stimulus toward location in this area of new industries and the expansion of already existing industries, thus creating additional opportunities for employment of Chattanooga-area people."

Advantages in the TVA area are obvious, with the average valley resident paying 0.96 cent per kilowatt-hour against the national rate of 2.43 cents. True, some private rates are rising. But TVA's presence has helped to keep them low over the years. And according to Time, the private companies' stock earnings now are twice the U.S. average.

The new Electric Power Board rates usher in still another remarkable era; an era in which still further reductions might become possible. The growth of the region has been materially assisted. Congratulations and appreciation for outstanding service are due to all concerned at this proud and promising moment.

Accomplishments of Top Students at a Typical Chicago High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, someday the seats that we now occupy in this historic Chamber will be filled by some, and likely many, who this year are being graduated from the high schools, public and private, of the Nation. I am extending my remarks to include an article from the Chicago Daily Calumet of May 21, 1963, listing the 14 top students at Bowen High School in the district I have the honor to represent. In doing so I may be putting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the first time the name of a future successor of mine as the Representative in Congress from the Second District of Illinois. In the second district we are proud of our schools, the members of the faculties, and the student bodies.

The article from the Chicago Daily Calumet follows:

Bowen Selects 14 Top Students

Lewis Leibovich, son of Mr. and Mrs. Harry Leibovich, 8818 Bennett, is valedictorian of the June graduating class of Bowen High School, 2710 East 89th.

Principal Vincent J. Conroy released the list of the 14 top students in the graduating class, headed by Leibovich.

Salutatorian will be Steve Zarit, son of Mr. and Mrs. Zarit, 2165 East 69th.

Bowen High School graduation exercises will be held at 8 p.m. Monday, June 17, in Calumet High School, 8131 May.

Valedictorian Leibovich is president of the National Honor Society, president of the Debate Club, Honor Club, tennis team, student council, advertising manager of the newspaper, Key Club, Drama Club.

Also, yearbook staff, Bausch & Lomb Science Award, honors group, Westinghouse talent search. Telluride Association scholarship candidate and finalist for national merit scholarship.

Salutatorian Zarit's activities include ROTC cadet major, vice president of National Honor Society, vice president of Chemistry Club, Honor Club, senior prom chairman, and copy editor of the yearbook.

Other top students ranking 3d through 14th in order and their activities are:

3. Judith Ginsburg, 8948 Chappel, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Benson Ginsburg. Orchestra, cellist; French Club, secretary; National Honor Society; Honor Club; Girls' Athletic Association.

4. Laurel Kohn, 8841 Clyde, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Morris Kohn. Honor Club; Chemistry Club; Girls' Athletic Association; student council; Illinois State scholarship.

5. Nancy L. Cerf, 8322 Bennett, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Eugene N. Cerf. National Honor Society; Honor Club; Library Club; French Club; newspaper, news editor; finalist, G. E. College Bowl national essay contest.

6. Thomas Sawicki, 9326 Ridgeland, son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Sawicki. Senior class, president; swimming team, cocaptain; Honor Club, treasurer; student council, representative; Chemistry Club; Boys' Bowling League; National Honor Society; Illinois State scholarship.

7. Lois Jane Wolf, 8359 Cregier, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Albert M. Wolf, Chemistry Club, president; yearbook, editor in chief; newspaper, assistant page editor; student council; Future Teachers of America; Honor Club; National Honor Society; Girls' Athletic Association; Voice of Youth winner in "Codes of Conduct" essay contest.

8. Myra J. Lazerwith, 9938 Calhoun, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Sam Lazerwith. Cheerleader; student council, secretary; Drama Club; newspaper, page editor.

9. Michael B. Fox, 9218 Constance, son of Dr. and Mrs. Max I. Fox. National Honor Society; Latin Club, president; Key Club; Chemistry club; Drama Club; band; student council; Honor Club scholarship; University of Illinois; winner in City Science Fair.

10. Stewart D. Fordham, 8610 Yates, son of Mr. and Mrs. Allen Fordham. National Honor Society; Honor Club; Latin Club, president; Chemistry Club; Key Club; newspaper; Winner City Science Fair; student council; Drama Club; Illinois State scholarship.

11. Richard Struber, 2119 East 98th Place, son of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Struber. Honor Club, treasurer; National Honor Society; newspaper, editor; Chemistry Club; student council; Quill and Scroll; hall guard; lunchroom monitor.

12. Philip Rush, 1652 East 87th Place, son of Mr. and Mrs. David Rush. Honor Club; yearbook staff; hall guard; French Club; Science and Math Club; Drama Club.

13. Judy Lesner, 9230 Bennett, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Sam Lesner. French Club, president; Drama Club, secretary; National Honor Society; Honor Club; newspaper, editor.

14. George Rutkowski, 8302 Phillips, son of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Rutkowski. Drama Club, vice president; Honor Club; mixed chorus; Chemistry Club; Pullman scholarship; Illinois State scholarship.

The Wheat Referendum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, a man by the name of George Alt of Faith, S. Dak., has written me a letter with suggestions that need to be passed on to Congress and considered by the Agriculture Committee and Congress in general. His letter with regard to agriculture is in part as follows:

Now that farmers have at last struck a blow for freedom from Government domination, I wonder if Congress will respond to the popular demand and gradually restore free enterprise to this industry.

It is now 34 years since Congress started to stimulate an artificial production of wheat by offering more than the market price, and later extending this stimulation to cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts, and at times to other branches of agriculture. These high price supports have thrown production completely out of balance with market demands. They have restricted our exports, encouraged many thousands of farmers to raise up to 15 acres of wheat, and due to acreage restrictions, have stimulated the use of large amounts of fertilizers to increase acreage production. When we consider the billions of dollars of taxpayers' money used to fill thousands of elevators and grain bins with unneeded grain, we marvel at the judgment used by our Congress.

Now that wheat farmers have expressed their disapproval of Government domination, I would suggest that a new program be adopted, that the old parity formula be discarded, and that supports be around 90 percent of the market price for the past 2 years. This would allow a gradual decline in the price level without the collapse that took place in 1921 and 1930. As the price declines, the high cost producers would gradually drop out and production would automatically decline to market needs without hurting anyone. At the same time exports would increase and make a larger market, until production would again balance with market demands. This is the only way that the problem can be solved and prosperity be restored to an industry that has suffered from Government interference for so many years.

Interior Secretary Udall Commissions "Albatross IV"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, on May 9, commissioned at Woods Hole, Mass., the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries' first 1,000-ton oceanographic research vessel—*Albatross IV*.

It is my hope, and one in which I am sure many of my colleagues share, that the commissioning of this fine ship will mark a new era in U.S. fisheries research, and that similar ships will be constructed for the North Pacific, Central Pacific, South Atlantic, and Gulf.

Other nations have larger fishery research ships than *Albatross IV*, among them Japan and the U.S.S.R., but I doubt that any of these foreign vessels is more expertly designed or better equipped for exploring and studying the living resources of the seas.

Prior to the commissioning of *Albatross IV* the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries had only three vessels of 500 tons or over, the largest 760 tons, but none of these ships was designed for research. Two were naval auxiliary craft left over from World War II, and the third was a pre-war vessel.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL AT THE COMMISSIONING OF THE OCEANOGRAPHIC RESEARCH VESSEL, THE "ALBATROSS IV," WOODS HOLE, MASS., MAY 9, 1963

We are commissioning a new vessel, the *Albatross*, the fourth in an illustrious line of this name since 1882. The first *Albatross* was unique and modern for its day—being the first oceanographic research vessel of any consequence constructed in the world. Its two successors were converted vessels. The ship before us, however, is one of the best equipped for this specific purpose by the Federal Government since the first *Albatross*.

We have a new *Albatross*—but we need a fleet of them. For despite our pioneering efforts over 80 years ago, our Nation still thinks of the oceans principally as highways. Today, we approach the sea with a new concept:

The ocean is the newest and last frontier of the world.

I would hazard a guess that we know more about the stars and the space above us than we do about the water—and the land beneath it—covering more than two-thirds of this planet.

The mysteries of the sea have always captivated the daring and imagination of Americans. Our history and our literature are replete with the rich traditions of our sea people. Herman Melville said "these sea hermits conquered the watery world like so many Alexanders."

Today, we need new sea adventurers to provide fresh volumes revealing man's relation to the ocean. We need new scientific Alexanders sailing to record these revelations.

President Kennedy made this quite clear in his historic message to Congress on natural resources.

He said, "The sea around us represents one of our most important but least understood and almost wholly undeveloped areas for extending our natural resource base."

And, he added, "This administration intends to give concerted attention to our whole national effort in the basic and applied research of oceanography."

Our national interest in oceanographic research has until recently been either sporadic or dormant. We are in many respects living in the Middle Ages in our knowledge of the world's sea spaces. We have made a start by identifying our problems—the important initial step—and we have made progress in charting a course of scientific investigation to obtain answers to these problems. We know, for example—

That the resources of the sea are almost illimitable, but some are in serious danger of depletion and require improved conservation programs.

That the shoreline of the United States is changing and becoming increasingly more polluted, thereby threatening many fish and other marine species which spawn or spend their early life close to shore.

That great expanses of ocean, and the floor beneath it, are unknown and uncharted.

That our research efforts are too concentrated on immediate problems, important as these are.

That we are woefully ignorant, in many respects, of the ecology of the oceans and their shorelines.

That our knowledge of the genetics of the creatures of the sea lags far behind similar knowledge of the animals and plants of the land.

That the full and imaginative uses of marine products, such as fish protein concentrate, are still largely to be discovered.

That the ocean contains many dissolved minerals which we do not know how to recover economically with few exceptions; further, only in the case of petroleum have we made any significant progress in utilizing the resources under the floor of the ocean.

That the technology of harnessing the energy of the oceans is in its infancy .

The Kennedy administration has started to work on some of these problems—and the *Albatross* will, as its predecessors, make important contributions. Other work is also in progress.

The Department of the Interior has constructed new laboratories; new research projects are underway to develop new oceanographic equipment; international probing of the sea frontiers are planned or underway; a fellowship program in marine science will help alleviate the severe shortage of young scientists.

A National Fisheries Center with oceanarium facilities—as recommended by the National Academy of Science—is being located in Washington; ecological studies of fish and shorelines are in progress; a cooperative program to study the geology and hydrology of the Atlantic Continental Shelf has been initiated with a similar Pacific study planned; and research has been expanded on fish protein concentrate, a product which not only can provide a rich protein diet for the hungry one-third of the world but also bring significant employment opportunities to the American fisheries industry.

We hear much of the peaceful uses of space and of the atom, but we should—I feel—place the peaceful uses of the sea on a similar parity in the scale of our national thinking. The secrets of the sea are another challenge in the understanding of ourselves. In the sea, man has an opportunity to reforge his links with the past and to plan his relationship with the future.

It is a mark of progress that we can dispatch questing ships such as the *Albatross* into new areas of exploration. As one of Britain's great physicians once observed:

"That man can interrogate as well as observe nature was a lesson slowly learned in his evolution."

May good fortune follow the *Albatross* as it probes and unravels the limits of man's current knowledge.

The Art of Living Without Working

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Walden Citizen Herald gives an interesting picture of some of the shenanigans that are going on all over our country at the present time. It is also a tribute to the sense of humor of the editor, Mr. Raymond J. Dulye:

THE ART OF LIVING WITHOUT WORKING

Clinton County in upstate New York is rated by the Federal Government as a depressed area, one in which Uncle Sam is spending pump priming money in an effort to pull it out of the economic doldrums.

Because Orange County has been listed similarly as a depressed area, the following commentary of current developments in Clinton's economy should prove of more than passing interest. This is an editorial in the North Countryman, a weekly newspaper of Rouses Point in that county, appraising the state of affairs mentioned above:

"Unemployment has been particularly heavy in the building trades since completion of most construction at Plattsburgh Air Base and the Adirondack Northway. Many building tradesmen were without work much of the winter, helped along by relief in the form of unemployment insurance and county welfare.

"Then things began to look better. The State stepped up building at State University Teachers College in Plattsburgh. Ayerst Laboratories, Inc., launched a $1 million expansion program in Rouses Point. Champlain is about to begin a new sewer system. And Rouses Point will begin a new water system. Both of the last two projects will receive Federal aid.

"So what happened? The 'unfortunates' we felt sorry for all winter didn't want to do common labor work for $2.67 an hour and called a strike.

"So who's crazy now? This business of living without working is getting to be an accomplished art."

Mrs. Rex Andrews of Burbank, Calif., Receives Woman of the Year Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to honor Mrs. Rex Andrews, of Burbank, Calif., who was given the Woman of the Year Award, being selected from nine outstanding nominees. This award is made annually by the Burbank Women's Council.

Grace Andrews is the wife of Rex Andrews, who happens to be Burbank's outstanding chief of police. The Andrews have two sons: Lee Lewis is attending junior college and the older son, Rex Elwyn, is in the U.S. Navy, serving aboard the U.S.S. *Buck*.

Mrs. Andrews was a registered nurse and her family and community have been the fortunate recipients of this skill and knowledge. Burbank, because of her service, is a better place to live and especially so for the handicapped and underprivileged as well as for her friends and associates.

The endless work of coordinating diverse community projects in Burbank is participated in by 39 women's organizations. Four categories in which the winner must be outstanding were established by the council in selecting their Woman of the Year: First, homemaking; second, civic achievements; third, religious activities; and fourth, social welfare.

Grace Andrews has given of her time and energy to the community in many, many more ways than those officially recognized in this award. She was cofounder and past president of Lelani chapter of the Childrens' Home Society and is now past president of the American Society of Community Visiting Nurses, after having served two terms as president. She also served as president of the Burbank Senior High School PTA and was State chairman of the PTA Founder's Day Committee. Two years were spent as finance chairman of the John Muir School PTA; chairman, Home Service Committee of the American Red Cross, Burbank chapter; recording secretary and Junior Women's Club sponsor for the Burbank Women's Club; member of the board of directors of the Burbank Symphony Association and in addition many, many of her hours have been given gladly to the Burbank police clinic.

It is because such women as Mrs. Rex Andrews have given unselfishly of their time and talents, throughout the Nation, that others are inspired with pride and security in our land and the American way of life. I believe that such noble and unselfish giving of one's self in service and leadership should be heralded throughout our land and it is for this reason that I cite Mrs. Andrews' accomplishments today. I consider it a privilege and honor that Mrs. Rex Andrews is one of my constituents.

We salute you, Mrs. Rex Andrews, and are grateful for your past achievements and extend you our best wishes for the achievements that will be yours in the future because of your unstinting efforts and determination to make Burbank a better place in which to rear one's family.

The Challenge of World Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the United States will be the official host nation to the World Food Congress being held here in Washington, June 4–18. This important international event will bring together representatives from 100 nations to discuss existing efforts to meet the problem of hunger which now affects two-thirds of mankind. The Congress will also examine ways to improve food production and use in the developing countries and to assist in economic development.

As the former Food for Peace Director, it was my privilege to help establish the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation and to assist in early plans for the World Food Congress.

The Freedom From Hunger Foundation, a group of private businesses, industrial, professional, labor, and farm citizens, represents U.S. citizens' involvement in the worldwide United Nations FAO Freedom From Hunger campaign—a campaign officially endorsed both by President Eisenhower and President Kennedy.

The World Food Congress is a highlight in the 5-year International Freedom From Hunger campaign. This international congress provides an opportunity for a major step forward in eliminating the malnutrition and antiquated production which afflicts men throughout the world. We in the United States are blessed with an agricultural abundance and knowhow which we have an obligation to make available to the developing countries.

The World Food Congress is an excellent forum for the exchange of ideas and information and to acquaint the visiting delegations with the marvelous technological advancements of American agriculture. It is an indication, too, of the concern all Americans share in ending the menace of hunger.

In an effort to generate interest in my home State, I sponsored an essay contest among South Dakota high school students. Several hundred of them responded with brief essays on the theme, "The Challenge of World Hunger."

Mr. Harry Edwards, executive director of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation, and his staff selected the prize-winning essay written by Miss Sue Grkovic, of Rapid City High School.

Miss Grkovic has been invited to come to Washington to attend the World Food Congress as my guest. I wish to acknowledge the assistance of Ozark Airlines and Grace Shipping Line in providing financial help to sponsor Miss Grkovic's visit.

I ask unanimous consent that Miss Grkovic's original well-written essay be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Challenge of World Hunger

(By Sue Grkovic)

The dream of a life of perfect fulfillment haunts man's days like a timeless mirage. Yet, for the most part, the world today is not congenial to life in the human form, for in many lands the primary mystery of life is not how it originated but how it is to be sustained.

From the gutters of Calcutta, to the Baluba country of the Congo, to the mountains of Bolivia, hunger is prevalent in all of its grotesque forms. Among the fugitives seeking escape are shrunken children, their little legs like withered twigs, carrying the huge burden of bellies swollen with the dropsy of starvation.

Yes, food is universally recognized as the most fundamental necessity of life; yet over two-thirds of mankind lacks the energy to do a full day's work because of undernourishment. It is well to note that a current FAO study shows that many underdeveloped lands have an agricultural production that increases at less than 2 percent a year. Yet an increase of less than 3 percent a year must be considered unsatisfactory, for in many of these countries the rate of population increase is 2.5 percent. Although, in many instances, these countries are not inherently poor; their growth has been retarded due to the underutilization of their physical and human resources and their inability to convert (due to lack of capital and training) traditional farming into modern scientific agriculture.

The average peasant in the underdeveloped country subsists on less than $120 a year. Therefore his soil is undernourished, his crops are undernourished, and he is undernourished. It becomes clear, then, that no other environmental factor acts upon man so despotically, or leaves so deep a mark as the factor of malnutrition.

The remedy to this situation, I believe, does not lie in the temporary relief that emergency food or task forces could bring. Underdeveloped countries are challenged to rid themselves of the status quo which has held them tightly in a vise. Their way of life and their villages must be transformed; they must be changed from places of squalor to healthy communities.

Hunger, the most degrading of adversities, breeds human misery, and is a seedbed of communism. Yet, democracy can also find opportunities in human misery, for we are challenged to help alleviate it, and in the process of doing so, to put meaning into individual lives. By conditioning our aid to specific plans of reform, we can further our progress of foreign aid. We can train our own people for oversea work, and they in turn can train the local people who will undertake the reform.

Specific reforms should be undertaken to help alleviate this problem of world starvation. First, I believe that the heretofore dormant soils should be exploited, and modern science should be made available to the farmers, including the secrets of seed selection, cross breeding of animals, proper irrigation and drainage of land, crop rotation, and the use of fertilizers. Second, a wise measure for the control of the population increase should be initiated. Third, surplus food from the United States must be given from the standpoint of mercy, not strategy; human providence, not power politics.

Although money is needed to bring about these reforms, people and ideas are needed even more. The Peace Corps is symbolic of what can be done, for the gentle stirring of life and hope is being reawakened, revived, and nourished by millions of solitary individuals whose deeds and work every day negate frontiers and the crudest implications of history—yes, we are sending well-trained, responsible men and women abroad to transmit simple skills and high ideals to the people of starving nations, who in time will also come to know how to make men free as well as to feed them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Common Sense About A Starving World," Rithshie Calder.

"Dr. Schweitzer of Lambarene," Norman Cousins.

"Must Men Starve," Jacob Oser.

"Science and New Nations," edited by Ruth Gruber.

"The Arc of Crises," Claude A. Buss.

"The Geography of Hunger," Josue De Castro.

"The Story of FAO," Vanostrand.

Weirton (W. Va.) Steel Co. Employees Publication Urges Public Consciousness of Freedom's Blessings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, despite the tensions of the cold war, in spite of the blandishments and threats of international communism, and regardless of the stern assessments of the challenges to our country which are daily issued in news media—all of these factors notwithstanding, most of us take freedom for granted.

It is perhaps a measure of the success of our democratic system that Americans accept their rights and liberties as a matter of course. We have become so accustomed to self-determination and its flexibilities that we forget that there are in the world today millions of human beings who are without the privileges we exercise at will.

People in Red China cannot vote for the national leader of their choice; East Berliners are prevented from leaving their country for a visit to the West; citizens of the Soviet Union do not feel free to criticize openly the government under which they live; Albanians, Poles, Slavs, and Cubans cannot refer to a radio or a newspaper for clear and accurate reporting of world events. Yet each of these acts is a common occurrence in the United States; we accept them without special notice.

May 30, Memorial Day, is drawing near—a day set aside to remind us of the sacrifice and devotion of thousands of American fighting men and women killed in action in order to safeguard this way of life. However, merely to honor our dead heroes on this significant holiday is not enough. We must use the occasion to remind ourselves that as a nation we are richly blessed; that millions are denied the fundamental considerations which we too often forget; that ours is the testing responsibility to maintain the integrity and strength of the United States of America as a citadel of justice and morality, and to sustain it as a spark of hope to the enslaved peoples of the earth.

Mr. President, the Weirton Steel Co., a division of National Steel Corp., is a respected member of the industrial community in Weirton, W. Va. The firm has made notable contributions to the economic resurgence of West Virginia, and has demonstrated a commendable level of citizen responsibility and civic awareness in support of local projects. Its president, Tom E. Millsop, is a trusted leader in business and public affairs.

The May issue of the Weirton Steel Employees Bulletin contains an editorial entitled "The Wall of Shame," which offers thought-provoking comment on the cold war, Communist rule, and the freedoms we enjoy. The content is especially appropriate as a Memorial Day reminder that Americans did not always live in freedom; that we too were threatened and oppressed. It effectively urges each of us to be thankful that we have the precious commodity of freedom, and charges us to insure that its blessings are carried forward to future generations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "The Wall of Shame," published in the May 1963 issue of the Weirton Steel Employees Bulletin, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Wall of Shame

Freedom is a sweet-sounding word. It must sound twice as sweet to those who know its meaning but are denied its expression.

In America we meet freedom on the street daily and, many times, fail to recognize it.

It is taken for granted, and rightly so, for it is one of the soundest building blocks of our society. It is a birthright of man, but this Nation had to tear it from the hands of tyrants. We have known freedom so long that it has become second nature.

Our freedom came dearly, we prize it greatly and display it proudly as a goal for the enslaved peoples of the world.

America is the shop window for the people of the Communist enslaved world, for the suppressed peoples of the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, East Germany, Red China, Cuba, and all the other dominated nations.

The commodity these people want to purchase at any price is freedom. And the price is high. For many it has been death. Thousands of Hungary's Freedom Fighters died in their attempt to purchase a piece of our most famous and prized commodity. Hundreds of East Germans have died just trying to reach the freedom offered in West Germany.

For years we have spoken of the walls around the enslaved countries, the Iron Curtin of the Soviet Union and its satellites, and the Bamboo Curtain of Communist China. These walls are imaginary, yet strong enough to enslave the minds of men, to strip them of their individuality and freedom to be whole human beings. Now we have a real wall, a barrier to freedom such as the world has never seen.

The cement and barbed wire wall around East Berlin is unique in the history of mankind. Walls have been built to protect cities and nations. Walled cities were common in Biblical times. The Great Wall of China was built to protect her people from other Asiatic raiders. Our own pioneers built walls around their villages and settlements to protect them from hostile Indians. The Maginot Line was built to protect France from her invaders.

Never before has a wall been built to confine an entire nation or part of a nation in slavery, as is the case with East Germany. But it cannot stand long enough to enslave the minds of men.

Man was born an individual, regardless of his nationality. The German, the Pole, the Russian desires individual freedom of expression as much as the American.

Russia's literary minds, the writers and poets, show great courage in their passive resistance to the Communist system through their writing. And they are punished by being segregated from the world literary community. Russia's greatest author, Boris Pasternak, was denied the right to accept the Nobel Prize for Literature, the greatest honor which can be given a writer. His book, which included criticism of the communistic system, was not even published in his own country.

The people of East Germany, though, once knew a type of freedom and their resistance to tyranny of communism takes a physical form. They break down the wall, they climb over it, they tunnel under it, and risk being shot in the back in a dash for freedom. In effect, they say, "I'd rather be dead than suppressed." To them, even death is a form of freedom.

In time, all the concrete walls of suppression will crumble as man expresses his individuality and wins the fight for his freedom.

Until that time, there will be millions of men looking to the window of America and hearing the voice of freedom over Radio Free Europe. We must maintain an attractive window, trimmed with freedom and displaying all its wares. We must present a goal for the world's enslaved millions. We must guard our freedom jealously from the tyrants of the world and yet be willing to share it with all mankind.

Most of all, we should be thankful that we have this precious commodity.

Report on Results of Fifth Connecticut District Questionnaire

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have completed the tabulation of the returns on my 1963 questionnaire and at this time I wish to make my report on this cross-section sampling of fifth district, Connecticut, opinion on important issues which currently are confronting the Congress and the administration.

In March 1963, I started the distribution by mail of the questionnaires in which I requested yes or no answers on 16 legislative and policy matters. The questionnaires were mailed to residents of my district who have at various times corresponded with me to express views on legislative and policy matters. Subsequently, I received requests for additional questionnaires from persons who learned of the survey through newspaper, radio, and television publicity. It is therefore not a scientifically calculated sampling.

From the approximately 12,000 questionnaires distributed, I have received 2,110 returns or about 18 percent. This is the third consecutive year in which I have gone to the electorate for advice and I am gratified that in each case the returns on questionnaires have approximated 18 percent. This constancy of returns is highly gratifying to me, but not surprising in view of the awareness and responsible interest in the problems of government which I know to exist in my district. In addition to the 2,110 questionnaires, I have also received many letters from constituents who supplemented the yes or no form with explanations and expanded expressions of opinion. I found these of particular interest for I realize that it is virtually impossible to express opinion on many of these issues with a simple yes or no.

I have prepared and distributed my questionnaire during the past 3 years as a means of obtaining a sample of opinion. This tabulation of returns and the many letters I have received will be of great value to me in the consideration of the problems before us. They do provide a very helpful guidance, but I want to make it clear, as I have in my report on the previous questionnaires, that I do not consider this a mandate in any sense and I shall continue to exercise my own best judgment on legislative questions as they arise.

We have often heard it said that the voters of America do not take a proper interest in their Government and in its problems and responsibilities. I can assure the House, on the basis of my experience, this cannot be said about Connecticut's fifth district.

The summary of returns shows that 50 percent or more of those participating in the poll would support—

First. A naval blockade of Cuba.

Second. Federal aid for public elementary school construction.

Third. A tax cut accompanied by budgetary reductions.

Fourth. Funds for the foreign aid program—economic.

Fifth. Establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps.

Sixth. Compulsory arbitration of national labor disputes, such as dock strikes.

Seventh. Standardized packaging and labeling of consumer products enforced by Federal regulations.

Eighth. Extra $1,200 income tax exemption for parents of students enrolled in schools of higher education.

Ninth. A one-time reopening of the national service life insurance program to eligible veterans.

Tenth. Establishment of a Domestic Service Corps.

Issues listed in my questionnaire and which would be opposed by 50 percent or more of those participating include the following:

First. Withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations.

Second, U.S. aid, under Presidential discretion, to Poland and Yugoslavia.

Third. Invasion of Cuba.

Fourth. Abolition of the Un-American Activities Committee.

Fifth. Reduction of the military budget for the next fiscal year.

Sixth. Federal aid for public teachers' salaries.

Seventh. Federal aid for parochial as well as public schools.

A less than 50 percent margin of support or opposition was demonstrated in the balloting on the following proposals:

First. Funds for the foreign aid program—military.

Second. A program of medical care for the aged, whether under social security exclusively; under social security with option for private health insurance; or under the existing Federal-State—Kerr-Mills—program.

Third. Establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs at Cabinet level.

I am convinced that the increasing interest in Government affairs is fully reflected in the increasing numbers participating each year in my questionnaire poll. In 1961, I distributed 7,350 and received 1,375 returns. In 1962, I distributed 10,000 questionnaires and received 1,795 in return. As I have stated, in 1963 the questionnaire went to 12,000 constituents and I received 2,110 returns.

I want to point out to you that the questionnaire forms were not printed at Government expense and that those who returned them provided their own postage. I was very pleased, too, with the large number of individual requests I received for questionnaire forms after initial mailing had been completed. In other instances there were requests from organizations and clubs for 50 to 100 questionnaires and I was pleased that the Women's Republican Club of Bridgewater, Conn.—population 1,000—requested 550 copies for distribution to every home in the town of Bridgewater. A number of Bridgewater residents had received the questionnaire in the initial mailing.

A tally chart showing the questions asked and the replies received, in numbers and percentages, follows:

Results of questionnaire, May 1963, John S. Monagan, 5th District, Connecticut

	Yes		No		Undecided	
	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
Do you favor—						
(1) Withdrawal of the United States from the U.N.?	332	16	1,619	76	159	8
(2) U.S. aid under Presidential direction to—						
(a) Poland?	757	36	1,135	54	218	10
(b) Yugoslavia?	678	32	1,182	56	250	12
(3) Funds for foreign aid program—						
(a) Military?	917	43	875	42	318	15
(b) Economic?	1,457	69	427	20	236	11
(4) Action against Cuba—						
(a) By naval blockade?	1,348	64	524	25	238	11
(b) By invasion?	370	17	1,278	61	462	22
(5) A Domestic Service Corps?	1,060	50	749	36	301	14
(6) A Youth Conservation Corps?	1,476	70	449	21	185	9
(7) Federal aid to education—						
(a) For public elementary school construction?	1,246	59	659	31	205	10
(b) For public teachers' salaries?	763	36	1,067	51	280	13
(c) For parochial as well as public schools?	864	41	1,086	51	160	8
(8) A $12,000,000,000 tax cut spread over 3 years—						
(a) Without regard to budget reduction?	393	19	1,090	51	627	30
(b) With budgetary reductions?	1,579	75	237	11	294	14
(9) Reduction of the military budget in the next fiscal year?	792	38	1,074	51	244	11
(10) A program of medical care for the aged—						
(a) Under social security exclusively?	604	28	1,025	49	481	23
(b) Under social security with option for private health insurance?	849	40	745	35	516	25
(c) Under a Federal-State (Kerr-Mills) program?	675	32	740	35	695	33
(11) Abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee?	556	26	1,341	63	213	11
(12) Establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs at Cabinet level?	905	43	1,016	48	189	9
(13) A 1-time reopening of the national service life insurance program to eligible veterans?	1,172	55	652	31	286	14
(14) Extra $1,200 income tax exemption for parents of students enrolled in schools of higher education?	1,616	76	369	18	125	6
(15) Compulsory arbitration of national labor disputes, such as dock strikes?	1,635	78	409	19	66	3
(16) Standardized packaging and labeling of consumer products enforced by Federal regulation?	1,655	78	329	16	126	6

Government Lotteries of Austria, Belgium, and Bulgaria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, out of the 77 foreign countries which operate government-run lotteries, Austria, Belgium, and Bulgaria are three nations which also appreciate the revenues derived from regulated and controlled gambling.

Austria profits not only from its lotteries but from football and horseracing pools as well. In 1962, the total gross receipts of the several gambling operations came to almost $14 million. The net income to the Austrian Government amounted to about $4½ million.

Belgium is a small but smart country which derives a tremendous benefit from its government operated lottery. Last year, it took in almost $17½ million in gross receipts—an increase of over $2 million from the previous year. The net income came to $6 million, also an increase over the 1961 profits. These profits were earmarked for the Brussels International Exhibition and the Belgian Social Welfare Fund.

Bulgaria, although a Communist country, recognizes and capitalizes on the normal human urge to gamble. Last year, the gross receipts from its lottery came to over $7,700,000 of which 50 percent was given in prizes and the other half was turned over to the government treasury.

Mr. Speaker, when will we profit from the example of Austria and these other nations which recognize that the urge to gamble is universal and should be regulated and controlled? A national lottery in the United States can easily pump over $10 billion a year in new income to our Treasury which can be used to cut our taxes and reduce our national debt. When are we going to be as smart as these foreign countries and face up to the fiscal facts of life? Why not follow the lead taken by New Hampshire? What are we waiting for?

Playing Hamlet to the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal, May 24, 1963:

PLAYING HAMLET TO THE COMMUNISTS

According to Adlai Stevenson, "the enslavement of the Cuban people and a Russian bridgehead in the Americas is intolerable to Americans. But we must not let the Russians use Cuba to divide" the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

Any action, the U.N. Ambassador went on, "without the willing assent of our friendly neighbors would only propel us toward the Communist objective."

Perhaps. But it is not at all clear that most of our hemispheric allies would violently object to the removal of the Russians and/or Castro from their midst. And if something is really intolerable to the United States, as the Soviet bridgehead is, then it seems odd to argue that nothing at all should be done about it unless 20 other nations agree.

Our concern here, though, is not to pick on Mr. Stevenson in particular. Rather, what he is indirectly expressing is a point of view that has become all too apparent in the government of late. While there is plenty of denunciation of the Communists, there is also a great reluctance to do anything they might not like no matter what provocations they throw at us. The ostensible fear is that any "confrontation" might set off a nuclear war.

That is an appropriate fear for policymakers to have, but it can be carried too far. Look at what it is getting us.

We have Presidential Advisor McGeorge Bundy implying that critics of the do-nothing Cuban policy just want to plunge the world into war, when in fact these critics have repeatedly outlined numerous steps, short of war, that might dislodge the unwelcome guests in our backyard.

We have Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman trotting off to Moscow to plead with Khrushchev to call off the Communist dogs in Laos—an ugly situation we helped create by agreeing to a government formed of a coalition with Communists.

We have the United States sanctioning a U.N. war against a Congo Province. This was to avoid, so it was said, a direct United States-Soviet "confrontation" in that unhappy land.

We have the United States engineering the handing over to Indonesia's pro-Red Sukarno territory to which he had no right, in violation of the interests of our Netherlands Ally and with no say-so by the natives of that territory.

All in all, it does not add up to a feeling of firmness. There are those who describe it in harsher terms. Some commentators call the present atmosphere in Washington one of peace at any price; others label it appeasement.

For our own part, we don't think it is that; we are sure this government would fight in a showdown. Part of the present impression, we imagine, comes from a sort of Hamlet complex; policy is analyzed so much it gets sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought. Not necessarily useful thought, it should be added; often the thinking seems to result in excuses for doing nothing. The question is not so much one of viewpoint about communism as it is one of temperament.

The trouble with a temperamental reluctance to run any risk of war is that it can embolden the enemy and even cause him to do things that might force us to war. The fact is that we can stand up to the Communists without plunging the world into war, as President Kennedy ably demonstrated last fall. It cannot be wholly unreasonable—or wildly belligerent—to suggest that a strong stand might also get the Red men and arms out of Cuba, and generally shore up our position for the edification of the Communist bloc.

Certainly if we refuse to defend our vital interests with our unmatched power, the Communists won't respect them. And they aren't showing much respect these days.

Education for What?—Do Our Schools Teach a Basic Understanding of Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced of the great importance of teaching the students of this Nation the immediate and ultimate objectives, the strategies and tactics of communism. Any effort that leads to a clearer understanding of how the Communist enemy works, is of value to all of us.

I would like to call the attention of the Members of this House to a new book which is replete with factual information vital to the citizen who is concerned about the increasing gains of communism.

The book, "Education for What?" by P. C. Beezley, was published by the Bookmailer, New York, N.Y.

The following is a brief commentary by Mr. Beezley on his new book:

> Education for What? includes the finding of a 50-State survey on the approach of American school systems to teaching about communism. The survey establishes that there is an appalling ignorance among most teachers regarding the facts of communism and their effect upon world affairs. This woeful lack of knowledge is not the fault of the teachers, but of the school systems and of three decades of denial, distortion, and omission of facts.
>
> Less than 10 percent of the schools make any use of the factual, documented reports of the congressional committees and their thousands of pages of sworn testimony. Most schools are unaware of their existence or how to obtain them. In the relatively few cases where these congressional reports are known, they are frequently derided or denigrated by education higher ups.

Mr. Beezley's book contains some specific suggestions for improving this situation. Advising an examination of original Communist sources, the author suggests:

> Before we dip into the early wellsprings, it may be advisable to assure ourselves that the current fad for believing that communism and Communists are mellowing is merely wishful thinking. Nikita Khrushchev made that clear in 1955, when he said: "If you think that our smiles mean that we have abandoned the principles of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, you are deceiving yourselves cruelly." September 28, 1959, speaking of anti-Communists, he said, "The people must straitjacket these madmen."

After substantial quotes from J. Edgar Hoover, the author quotes the Communist manifesto of 1960:

> In the opinion of Communists, the tasks which must be accomplished first of all if peace is to be safeguarded, are, to stop the arms race, ban nuclear weapons, their tests and production, dismantle foreign war bases and withdraw foreign troops from other countries, disband military blocs, conclude a peace treaty with Germany, turn West Berlin into a demilitarized free city, thwart the aggressive designs of the West German revanchists, and prevent the revival of Japanese militarism. * * * Peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems does not mean conciliation of the Socialist and bourgeois ideologies * * * it is indispensable to wage a resolute struggle against anticommunism."

Citizens' Views on Test Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, from the ivory tower of the Disarmament Agency a constant stream of test cessation semantics pours forth and ends up as fallout on the news and editorial pages of a lot of liberal newspapers. Occasionally, the ordinary citizens more directly spoken thoughts reach the light of print in letters to editors columns. Here are two samples of the opinions of ordinary, taxpaying, war-fighting American citizens about the issue, such as they, in the end, who are most vitally concerned with its outcome:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, May 20, 1963]

NUCLEAR TEST HALT

We Americans are undoubtedly dupes of the first order. According to a national news broadcast Tuesday, May 14, the Atomic Energy Commission canceled a nuclear test scheduled for that morning. Although no reason was given it was speculated that the reason might lie in Russia's announcement the day before that they might resume testing if the United States does.

It is hard to believe we can be so intimidated. We have already admitted we cannot detect Russian underground nuclear tests. If we could, why the requirement for on-site inspections? It is obvious that Russia could be testing twice a week—every Tuesday and Thursday on schedule if they pleased.

Since the Communists have broken 51 of the 52 treaties they have signed, we should be more amazed to hear that they are playing it straight than to hear otherwise. The whole question might be funny if anything but our national security were at stake.

I wonder when Americans will demand, not ask, but demand an end to this ridiculous tic, tac, toe game of appeasement and start playing as if we intend to win.

JIM DEWBERRY, Jr.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, May 22, 1963]

TEST BANS

SIR: I have been watching, with curious interest, the recent letterwriting assault in the "Letters to the Editor" column. Fuzzy-minded liberals, pleading pacifists and martyred mothers, all faithfully toeing the party line. Peace, says Pravda, and the Worker passes the word on to all the fellow travelers.

Meanwhile Tsarapkin stalls and procrastinates, Khrushchev alternately blusters and beams, and thousands of rock-throwing pacifists storm the barricades in England. All of this apparently designed to force a premature test ban on the United States.

What the "better Red than dead" crowd doesn't seem to realize is that one can easily be both Red and dead. A machinegun bullet kills an individual just as rapidly and efficiently as a 10-megaton bomb. Hungary learned this lesson in 1956. Communists haven't ceased being Communists. World revolution, be it by subterfuge or naked aggression, is still the order of the day.

The Soviets, given the chance, will continue to build weapons systems, and when ready to test, will manufacture an incident to justify their doing so. This must be understood. It must also be understood that the development of the neutron bomb, of improved delivery systems, of improved missile defense systems, and of tactical small-yield nuclear devices will shift the balance of power to the side possessing them.

Should the balance of power shift to the Soviet side, giving the Communists the hope that they can win a nuclear war, we can expect precisely what the pacifists fear most.

There are very few who don't yearn for peace. No one wants a nuclear holocaust. And yet, if we are to remain free and alive, we must never allow the Communists to think that they can win a nuclear war. Hopefully, faced with the inevitable massive destruction of their empire, the Soviets will be forced to turn from war as a means of conquest. At this point, and only at this point, and with thorough means of inspection can disarmament take place.

RANDALL GRINDLE,
Activities Director, Baltimore Area Council, Young Americans for Freedom.

BALTIMORE, *May 7.*

Those Soviet Fishing Boats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, appearing in a number of papers across the country is a syndicated article of Paul Scott which will make the blood of many Members of Congress and many Americans run a little cold.

If the facts set forth in the Allen-Scott report are correct and the Russians are using fishing boats operating out of Cuban bases to transport men and arms for subversive activities in the Latin American countries, then it is time for the President and the administration to take some fast and drastic action.

The article is as follows:

THOSE SOVIET FISHING BOATS

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—Russia is using a fleet of several hundred high-speed fishing boats to export Fidel Castro's Communist revolution to other Latin American countries.

These ocean-going trawlers, which can sail rings around the World War II naval vessels of neighboring Caribbean nations, are transporting arms and Red-trained guerrillas to Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Guatemala, and Brazil.

The fishing boats—constructed so they can be quickly converted for military use—have a carrying capacity of 150 to 250 passengers, or 300 to 550 gross tons of fish or arms. Their speed ranges up to 30 knots.

In the past 6 weeks, U.S. patrol vessels and aircraft have regularly sighted these Soviet trawlers making high-speed runs from Cuba to Mexico, concentrating on areas close to Guatemala and Venezuela.

Several of these powerful Russian "fishing boats" were spotted early this month unloading arms and men in an isolated cove of Margarita Island off the coast of Venezuela. The weapons and Communist-trained guerrillas were en route to camps near Caracas, only an hour and a half by air from Margarita.

The U.S. Consul in Veracruz, Mexico, has informed the State Department that 30 Russian fishing vessels are operating in the Gulf of Mexico, making regular trips to Cuba and using Veracruz as a base for supplies.

Many of these "fishing boats" have the latest electronic gear—far in excess of that normally deemed necessary for fishing operations. The ships are manned by Soviet crews, but usually carry Cuban and other Spanish-speaking passengers.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, led by Outgoing Chief of Naval Operations George Anderson, are so disturbed by this growing new Russian threat that they have quietly launched a drive inside the administration and Congress to induce President Kennedy and his policymakers to take prompt and forceful countermeasures.

The military commanders stress that despite the President's public pledge to Caribbean leaders at the recent Costa Rica conference to formulate plans to build a "wall of men" around Cuba, nothing has yet been done to make this a firm policy.

It is pointed out that the U.S. Navy, the only force powerful enough to halt this expanding arms and guerrilla traffic, has not been committed to do that. The Navy has neither directives nor orders to take such urgently needed action.

Navy operations in Cuban waters are now strictly limited to the surveillance of Russian shipping. Even that is far from effective because of the immense area to be covered and the small number of ships assigned to the job.

Impact of Bureau of Reclamation Program on State Economic Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, many times I have come before the House of Representatives to urge my colleagues to give their serious consideration and approval of a Federal reclamation project that has been studied and approved by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. On each of these occasions, we have endeavored to spell out for this body the pyramid of benefits that blossom out of each of these projects and justify their authorization as wise investments. Proof that these benefits are not just dreams, but hard facts, was detailed in a speech of May 21, 1963 given by William I. Palmer, Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, before the Association of State Planning Agencies here in Washington. I submit that speech to the attention of my colleagues:

IMPACT OF BUREAU OF RECLAMATION PROGRAM ON STATE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

(By William I. Palmer)

I welcome this opportunity to meet with you this morning because it provides an opportunity to further the national understanding of the importance of orderly natural resources planning and development in our total economy.

This will be something of an old story to those of you from the Western States, for we have worked together for more than 60 years in putting the available water to use in all its multipurpose applications. The results speak pretty much for themselves. I believe we who are aware of the reclamation program are agreed that it has been a major factor in our economic growth.

As a matter of fact, water resource development and economic growth have gone hand in hand throughout the history of our country. And we don't have to delve too far into world history to find out what happens when a nation and its people do not manage their natural resources properly. That must not happen here.

In the United States, to quote the historians, the course of empire has been ever westward. From the earliest pioneer days, the people of the United States have fed upon the Nation's vast store of natural resources, pushing ever westward until we now have the most populous State in the Union on the Pacific coast. Although the West is still the fastest growing area of the United States in economy and population, it is difficult to tell just how long this will continue.

The onset of industrialization, urbanization, and continued westward migration of people, industry, and commerce have put a severe strain on an existing irrigation economy in some areas which has been geared mostly to the production of food and fiber. This strain is evident on two fronts: water and land. And so, today, I want to examine our reclamation program not only in terms of its economic impact over past decades, but also to take a look into the future.

The economic impact of any reclamation project may be measured in three periods—construction, development, and operation. The construction period has its most noticeable effect on the local economy for it is here that you can see work in process. The purchase of construction equipment and supplies from faraway places and the placing of key orders for the generators, turbine gates, powerlines, and like items extends the beneficial effects to a widening State and National economy. The dollars invested in equipment, supplies, and construction wages reach every State in the Union. As a general rule of thumb, we estimate that for each million dollars of construction on a large earthfill dam, there are 49 man-years of contractor employment and 5 man-years of Government supervisory employment at the site.

From this same expenditure we estimate off-site employment will provide 8 man-years for the contractor, another 5 years for the Government, and 54 man-years for suppliers and transporters of equipment for every million dollars invested.

The grand total of on-site and off-site direct payroll impact per million dollars of investment in the particular project studied was 121 man-years. There is, of course, much variance between particular types of construction.

But we look upon all these immediate impacts of reclamation construction as secondary. Major construction projects of all kinds have a recognized beneficial effect in times of business slowdown, termed by many as pump priming. We think of reclamation construction in broader terms, recognizing the immediate benefits, but we are more concerned with building for the future. The long-term operational benefits far exceed those realized from immediate construction work.

We estimate that the development period on an average reclamation project lasts not more than 10 years after the project goes on an operational basis. We recently did a rather exhaustive study on one to determine what significant effects this period had produced in the local economy.

On the Columbia Basin project in Washington State, approximately 240,000 acres were developed for irrigation. What had been an almost exclusively wheat and grazing type farming operation was changed over to a diversified pattern where more than 50 different crops were grown, reaching a gross crop value of $25 million the 10th year.

It is a notable but usual experience with reclamation development that irrigation contributes very little to crops which are price-supported and in surplus. Diversified production made possible by irrigation permits the farmer to produce for the marketplace. It releases him from a dependence on a one-crop economy.

Total investments in the Columbia Basin project area, both rural and urban, reached $178 million during the 10-year development period. The major portion was in real estate and improvements. Farm property values alone rose $74 million, while a concurrent survey on adjoining dry land showed very little growth. There are some more statistics during this development period which will interest you. The population growth of this area, stimulated by expansion of employment and investment opportunities in farming and derivative commerce, amounted to 165 percent in the first decade of irrigation development. The population in cities and towns grew from 16,500 to 43,350, and in the rural areas from 8,500 to 25,000. It is a truism that irrigated agriculture, with the restrictions the Federal law places on acreage in order to bring the maximum benefits to the greatest number of people, slows the nationwide trend to larger and larger corporation-type farming. Population follows opportunity.

Nonfarm wages in the project area during this 10-year period showed a total increase, due to the project, of $141 million. This vast increase in purchasing power was also reflected in an 80-percent growth in business establishments. This amounted to 770 new businesses, most of them representing investment opportunities for small, independent, family-type operations. You can see from these payroll and business statistics how the construction benefits, while immediately important, are a relative drop in the bucket when compared to the long-range returns for which the project was authorized.

Of most significance, however, was the transformation of production and marketing patterns. During the pre-project era local commerce was associated with the output of dry-farm and ranching enterprises, and was confined largely to grain elevators and livestock loading pens. A decade of irrigation development brought mint oil extractors, starch and sugarbeet factories, food freezing plants, feed mills, storage warehouses and cellars, grading and cleaning plants, packaging sheds, dehydrators, seed-processing plants, feed yards, livestock auction rings, and slaughterhouses.

In all, 64 additional establishments were added for handling, processing, and shipping the newly diversified farm output. The investment amounted to $17 million, most of it locally subscribed.

Taxes are another barometer of trade. Real property collections in the Columbia Basin project area rose from $1.3 million to $4.3 million after a decade of development. Retail sales tax income also increased fourfold. At the end of the decade, Federal income tax payments had increased from $3.5 million to $13 million.

Now, what are the long-term impacts of reclamation development? First of all, the benefits accrued during the development period are retained and enhanced. But there are other returns as well.

Productive, economically balanced communities do not gain their vitality at the expense of other communities, but from their resource base. A number of such healthy communities complement each other and create an economically stable region.

We have found this to be a natural long-term benefit of reclamation. In the western United States, where reclamation has been in operation for more than 60 years, we can point to example after example of such well-balanced families of communities which have resulted from irrigated agriculture.

However, so attractive have these places proven for industries which are free to locate where they choose, that their agricultural bases have diminished and the full impact of irrigation is now partially obscured. It has been demonstrated that the comparatively small farms of irrigated agriculture as developed on reclamation projects, and small industry, complement each other. Also, the same pyramiding direct results from irrigation, which were shown during the development period, obtained in the long-range picture.

However, looking into the future, there is an area of competition for land and water which must be considered. This competition is particularly evident today in the Pacific Southwest, where explosive population increases and consequent rapid growth of the nonagricultural sector have created an intense demand for the available and limited water. The accompanying urban sprawl has made heavy inroads on good croplands. Is this really a good thing? Is agriculture a second-rate enterprise compared to industrial boomtown?

We do not hold, of course, that water and land for the farmer should take priority over water and land for people and industry when the course of economic and social events dictates otherwise. But we would give a wide berth to those who would draw blanket conclusions that we no longer need the farmer; that we no longer need to plan for irrigation of the desert, because industry, commerce, and subdivisions generate more money.

First, we must remember that irrigation has contributed much to the high level of farm productivity and diversification which we presently enjoy.

Second, we must remember that a large segment of our industry and commerce prospers only because of the farmer and will continue to thrive only as the farmer thrives. Thinking back 30 or 40 years, we should remember that the farmers were in a depression long before the stock market break and resultant general business disaster. The farm link was the first in the economic chain to break then. We must guard against it breaking again.

Third, and this is very important in my mind, we must remember that the supply of prime cropland is not unlimited. Some cropland is simply irreplaceable because of the specialty foodstuffs it will produce. This is true of citrus fruits, the entire commercial supply of which comes to us from narrowly confined geographic areas in Florida and the Southwest. This is true of certain winter vegetables such as lettuce, carrots, and celery which come to us almost entirely from irrigated lands in the Southwest.

It is unfortunately true that the same warm year around sun, which makes this production possible, also attracts people. These areas are subjected, more than any others in the Nation, to the pressures of urbanization and industrialization. To a large degree, the urban sprawl in these areas continues uncontrolled and in haphazard fashion.

No effective provision is made, and little planning takes place, to preserve those prime and fertile lands which alone are capable of producing our winter crops of citrus and vegetables.

Once this land is committed to such urban uses as subdivisions, highways, airports, warehouses, industrial parks, it will stay committed. No one will break up acres of concrete to turn it back to farmland. Apart from the physical difficulties, the development of the land for municipal and industrial uses will destroy the topsoil and furthermore it would be too costly. I doubt, too, that planners would entertain such thoughts in view of the tax revenues yielded by and required for the urban economy.

If we allow this urban takeover to continue uncontrolled, without an examination of possible and reasonable alternatives regarding climate, soil, and geography, we will soon be hard pressed to find the lands on which to grow certain high value crops to meet the rapid increase in our numbers.

This association may wish to consider sponsoring an effort to examine the feasibility of promoting a rural zoning procedure in the West that would protect for agriculture the fine productive lands that are rapidly being covered with concrete and asphalt. Where sound urban planning will not be damaged, the nonagricultural uses should be channeled into areas of nonagricultural land. Frequently, such areas have as great or greater value for residential and other urban activity. Once an acre of fertile farmland is dedicated to urban use, it not only is lost to agriculture, but it paves the way for continued nibbling into other acres.

We do not now push the panic button, because we hope a general alarm will serve the purpose. We simply make the point that you, as officials in charge of economic well-being of the future, carefully examine the whole range of alternative land uses with a view toward the requirements of future generations.

But even more important than the future use of our land resources is that of our water. We in the West have lived with water shortages all our lives. It is an old story to us to be constantly fighting to keep the supply ahead of the demand. Not only are we faced with a constantly increasing population, but also with increased per capita use of water. A combination of the two shoot our water needs up to almost unbelievable proportions.

Water shortages are no longer an exclusively western problem. Where most of the rest of the Nation has been concerned in the past primarily in flood protection, it is now finding that the best kind of flood protection is to so manage the watersheds and other water conservation measures as to retain as much water as possible, rather than to encourage its hurried sweep to the sea. There is not only a concern over municipal and industrial supplies, but more and more farmers in the East, Midwest, and Deep South are turning to irrigation to stabilize and insure crop production. Irrigation liberates the farmer from the straitjacket of single-crop economics and lets him plant for the market.

We endorse and encourage this philosophy and offer every assistance within our authorized ability. Our more than 60 years of experience in water conservation and management are being constantly called upon not only in this country but overseas. From the earliest days of the point 4 program, we have had teams of technicians in foreign countries and there have been thousands of trainees from these foreign lands work in our great engineering and research center in Denver and on our projects.

We also want you to be aware that we do not operate on the basis of Government doles or handouts. More than 90 percent of the total Bureau of Reclamation investment is reimbursable. It is nailed down by repayment contracts with the water users and arrangements whereby revenues from our numerous hydropower plants also pay a big share of the costs.

It is worthy to note also that an increasing share of our operations has to do with the development of municipal and industrial water supplies. I have explained how settlement and population expansion inevitably follow any pioneering irrigation development until, in some instances, the tail of urban expansion is now wagging the dog.

In our multiple-purpose approach to water development, we are also finding an increasing demand from established municipalities to incorporate their needs into our planning, construction, and operations from the beginning. The investment for any such purpose, along with the investment for power, is repaid with interest. We think it is one of the best investments the Government has or can make to insure our continued economic growth and prosperity.

Federal development of additional municipal water supplies may also be one way out of the dilemma I have mentioned of the need for zoning to protect our choicest farmlands. Urban and industrial expansion generally feeds in the best land because that is where the water supply has been provided or is the easiest to develop. One way we can protect this land is also to make a water supply available for municipal expansion to less desirable agricultural lands.

I am thinking of Salt Lake City, in my home State of Utah, as an example. The upper limits of the city, expanding onto the benchlands of the old Lake Bonneville shoreline, were pretty well fixed for many years by the inability to get water up to these lands. Since construction of the Deer Creek Federal Reclamation project, however, a high-line aqueduct has opened up new acreage which now boasts some of the choicest and most expensive residential sites in the whole metropolitan area. Yet this land would be almost totally valueless for crop production. Maybe we can save farmland elsewhere by a similar approach.

So, in summary, the struggle to keep our available water supply ahead of the demand is never ending. It is not the sole responsibility of the Bureau of Reclamation or of the Federal Government or of any single State or municipality.

It is everybody's responsibility and the only way we are going to win it is to keep everyone informed and working together.

How many people, for example, understand that the tremendous dams and reservoirs we have and are building in the West are another fulfillment of Joseph's wise planning in 7 years of plenty to meet the 7 years of lean back in the days of the Pharoahs?

The 7 years of plenty and 7 years of famine in those days were traceable to drouth cycles of high and low flood stages on the Nile. Primitive irrigation was practiced by letting the floodwater inundate lowlands where one annual crop was produced. When the floods failed to reach the usual crest, the land remained dry and the crops failed.

Joseph met this situation by filling the granaries during years of plentiful production for use when the crops failed. We are going him one better by filling reservoirs in time of plenty for use in years of drouth so there will be no crop failures.

The water situation in most of the Western States this year is critical. Where farmers and city people have to depend on ordinary stream flow, there is trouble ahead. But because of the tremendous reservoir capacity of reclamation projects, we do not anticipate any major crisis in areas served by our facilities.

We are thus creating an economic stability to replace the ups and downs of farm and urban pocketbooks and bank accounts which reflected the annual pattern of precipitation. I know of no area in the Western United States today that would willingly abandon any reclamation project undertaken by the Federal Government, even though they are paying cold, hard cash into the Federal Treasury as reimbursement for the Federal investment.

And that, to me, seems to be the ultimate in the way of a testimony to the successful economic impact of reclamation on the Western States in which we operate.

New Haven Symphony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, we all know that future generations will look back at us not so much through the eyes of politicians as through those of our artists. As a gifted writer has put it:

> In the last analysis, the realm of the mind and spirit is the dwelling place of man's enduring power.

When artists in all parts of our country—in small cities as well as in our great metropolises—contribute to this enduring power, it is a healthy sign. This was true when the New Haven Symphony Orchestra, of New Haven, Conn., gave a performance in Lincoln Center, New York City. According to the New York Times of April 26, 1963, the orchestra performed with "a feeling of excitement and vitality that is immediately transmitted to the audience," and the New York Herald Tribune described Frank Brieff as "a highly cultivated conductor, who knows not only the score, but all about it."

I want to congratulate the New Haven Symphony Orchestra. They have shown that a community of modest size has the talent to make good in the big city. These fine reviews before a critical audience in Lincoln Center should be a source of encouragement to communities throughout the country to seek out promising local talent and give increased opportunities to musicians and artists everywhere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the complete reviews from the Times and Tribune printed in the Appendix of the RECORD in order that all the Nation can share Connecticut's satisfaction in this achievement.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 26, 1963]

MUSIC: CONNECTICUT NIGHT—NEW HAVEN SYMPHONY AT PHILHARMONIC HALL

(By Harold C. Schonberg)

As one travels around the country and listens to local orchestras, the high level of accomplishment never ceases to astonish. Even in semiprofessional orchestras there generally are an assurance and a technical proficiency that make the results almost comparable to those achieved in the big cities.

Part of that is due to a tradition of orchestral playing in America. We traditionally have been an orchestral nation, as opposed to an operatic nation. But a good part also belongs to a group of well-trained conductors, predominantly Americans, who have succeeded beyond all expectations in taking raw material and whipping it into shape.

Wednesday night saw the arrival of the New Haven Symphony Orchestra in Philharmonic Hall. The occasion was named "Connecticut Night at Lincoln Center." We have, of course, had out-of-State orchestras in Lincoln Center; Boston and Philadelphia are regular visitors. But this was the first time that a sovereign State associated itself with a musical program in the hall.

A large audience from Connecticut came along to cheer its heroes and heroines on, and to cheer the conductor, Frank Brieff, who has been with the New Haven Symphony for 11 years. Mr. Brieff is not a stranger to New York. He is the conductor of the Bach Aria Group, and even before going to New Haven he had been active in concert and radio work in this city.

Mr. Brieff has made for himself a fine orchestra. It is well balanced, the quality of playing is excellent and the conductor has seen to it that the various choirs mesh beautifully. Like all orchestras a shade under the first rank, the New Haven Symphony lacks the ultimate in sheen. But, also like all equivalent orchestras, the New Haven players throw themselves into the music as though it were a matter of life or death. There is none of the blase attitude of their big city brothers, and they do communicate a feeling of excitement and vitality that is immediately transmitted to the audience.

The program selected by Mr. Brieff was of unusual interest, and it contained two New York premieres. Luigi Dallapiccola's "Three Questions With Two Answers," a 14-minute score composed this year, was commissioned by the New Haven Symphony. It represents Dallapiccola's serene serialism—a 12-tone technique that in his hands often comes close to consonance. There is no question, but that in his veins flows the blood of Verdi.

Dallapiccola's ear remains as delicate as ever, and his score is full of wispy sounds in unusual combinations. There is something curiously Ivesian about it. One thought of Ives' "Central Park in the Dark" and "The Unanswered Question." Like those two scores, the Dallapiccola has an enigmatic and a very personal quality. Even the title is Ivesian.

The other premiere was Ives' "Thanksgiving and Forefathers' Day," a typically wild, multitonal, jaggedly scored work floating over snatches of hymn tunes and patriotic songs. It is genuine Americana, as nearly all Ives is, and also genuine music—strong, original, and filled with creative impulse.

In the more conventional works on the program, the orchestra followed Mr. Brieff's secure, sturdy beat like veterans. The "Euryanthe" Overture received a spirited performance, highly rhythmic, never losing out in detail. Haydn's "Le Matin" Symphony was played by a reduced orchestra, and with harpsichord continuo. All was neat, fluent and musical. In the Ravel Left-Hand Concerto, John Browning sounded flustered at his entrance—who wouldn't? Ravel asks impossible things—but soon settled down to give an accurate, rather hard-sounding performance.

There was still another piece, "The Star-Spangled Banner," in which Helen Boatwright from New Haven was the soloist. This is worth mention because, for once, a conductor took a sensible tempo. Now if only those revolting snare-drum rolls can be stamped out for good.

THE PROGRAM

Connecticut Night at Lincoln Center, New Haven Symphony Orchestra conducted by Frank Brieff, with John Browning, pianist. At Philharmonic Hall.

"Euryanthe Overture," Weber.

"Symphony No. 6," Haydn.

"Three Questions With Two Answers" (first New York performance), Dallapiccola.

"Thanksgiving and Forefathers' Day from Holiday Symphony," Ives.

"Piano Concerto for the Left Hand," Ravel.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 26, 1963]

RIVALS DOWN THE LINE AND IN BIG LEAGUE

(By Paul Henry Lang)

There is a tendency among New York concertgoers to regard musical geography with a complacency that reminds one of the headline in a London paper: "Storm in Channel, Continent Isolated." Sitting in New York, we see between Philadelphia and Boston nothing but ourselves.

Wednesday night Philharmonic Hall was host to an orchestra from the way station of New Haven, which as you know is a small town in Connecticut named after a splendid railroad, and hence not really entitled to a full-fledged symphony orchestra. But small as it is compared to the mighty metropolis on the Hudson, New Haven does have one permanent resident orchestra, thus at least numerically equaling our sole proud possession, the New York Philharmonic. But then, New Haven does have a significance on the cultural map that transcends the fame of the great Winchester rifle and Colt revolver that are manufactured there.

This "provincial orchestra" turned out to be a thoroughly professional major ensemble. The strings are well drilled and unanimous, the woodwinds accurate and expressive, and the brass solid but mellow. The beginning of the "Euryanthe" overture was a trifle athletic, but the players took the sharp pace without flinching. The sound was a bit hard, but one cannot tell in Philharmonic Hall whether it was their fault or the hall's; used to the mellowness of New Haven's Woolsey Hall, the orchestra could not change its acoustic complexion overnight. But in the following Haydn symphony everything was shipshape.

Frank Brieff, the New Haven maestro, is a highly cultivated conductor who knows not only the scores but all about it. Haydn's Symphony No. 6 presents plenty of problems, for the budding high-classic composer flirts here with the old baroque concerto. Mr. Brieff had a nicely balanced orchestra and did full justice to the delectable solos and musical jokes which abound in the work.

Luigi Dallapiccola's "Three Questions, With Two Answers," is a difficult serial work, and while a little long and presenting some instances of overintellectualized music, this composer's mind is alertly awake and curious; it has not killed the faculty of surrender to the impulse of life. The work has a metaphysical "program" but it does not hurt the music too much. One scarcely expects an Italian composer to fall for this northern stuff, but I guess once you accept serialism the Germanic vapors go with it.

The many delicate blends of sonority were beautifully realized by conductor and orchestra; the New Haven Symphony does not have to take a back seat to any other.

The Late Honorable Jed Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *May 16, 1963.*

The Honorable VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR VICTOR: I appreciate your thoughtfulness in writing me with reference to our mutual good friend, the Honorable Jed Johnson. Your letter was the first information that I had about the passing of our friend. It came as a shocking surprise as I had so recently had a fine visit with him.

As you know, I served 10 years in the Congress with Jed. He was an able Congressman, a warmhearted friend, and a good and kindly man. If there were words that could carry a message that would comfort and sustain his fine family in their loss, I would want words to reach and surround them. But words are futile at times like these, and it is good to know that his dearly loved ones will be comforted and sustained by the warm remembrances of his faithful, kindly, and gentle life as husband, father, and friend.

I like to think as the poet once said, that "there is no death—the stars go down to rise upon some fairer shore."

Thanking you for your letter and personal regards,

Your friend,

LYLE BOREN,
Former Member of Congress,
Fourth District, Oklahoma.

The Constitution: Worth Having, Worth Defending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, many people these days feel it is fashionable to wink at the Constitution and to question the wisdom of the Founding Fathers. Too few of our citizens give serious thought to the real value of the Constitution and the need to constantly strive to preserve its integrity.

One of my young constituents, Jay B. Stephens, an 11th grade student at the Le Mars, Iowa, Community School, recently chose the Constitution as his subject for the American Legion Oratorical Contest in Iowa. Jay is a member of the National Honor Society and a delegate to Iowa Boy's State this year. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include his speech so that high school students in other parts of the Nation may have an opportunity to read his worthwhile comments.

THE CONSTITUTION: WORTH HAVING, WORTH DEFENDING

In the rapidly changing world of today, a flexible, yet concrete foundation for government is needed. The Constitution of the United States of America meets both of these needs.

When the designers of the Constitution met in 1787, they desired to establish a form of government that would derive its power from the consent of the governed. These men sincerely desired to write a document that would last throughout the ages as the foundation of our democratic government.

Never before had such a document been written, and never since has a document been so profoundly established.

Our forefathers, in bringing forth this new institution of government, recognized the need of a government which was fair to all concerned. They took great pains to meet this need. These constitutional architects guaranteed the American citizens certain freedoms. They provided for a division of power between a Federal and State governments. They designed the principle of separation of powers. The granted to the citizens of this land the right to free elections. The effort and meditation used in framing this institution of government has had its effect: No institution of government has withstood the trials of the world as has this 176 year old masterpiece of freedom and democracy.

In the words of Longfellow in his "Building of the Ship.":

"We know what Master laid thy keel,
What Workmen wrought thy ribs of steel,
Who made each mast, and sail, and rope,
What anvils rang, what hammers beat
In what a forge and in what a heat
Were shaped the anchors of thy hope."

A document that has withstood the ravages of time, as has the Constitution, is surely worth the support of the American citizens.

The Constitution is a foundation of government worth supporting and worth fighting for. In this document, as instituted by the "Bill of Rights," are the freedoms of the American citizen. Surely the American citizen enjoys more individualism, more freedoms, and more dignity than any other person in the world. I support this document because I enjoy my freedoms and only through the Constitution have they been made available unto me. Without these inherent freedoms, Americans would soon find themselves under a despotic system of government. As guaranteed by the first amendment, we enjoy freedom of religion, speech, assembly, and petition. The religious activities of the individual are left entirely to his own discretion. We are free to assemble when we wish. We are granted the right to speak when we desire, and the accompanied right of freedom of the press. However, certain limitations are placed upon these rights as in advocating government overthrow. Certainly if the government controlled the communications media, we would soon find ourselves under a system of government in which our rights and liberties would become nil.

In our democratic government the Constitution divides governmental authority between a central and state governments. In contrast to the Unitary system, the Federal Government can not designate or remove powers to or from the State governments. In our system the Constitution is the source of both central and state authority and each unit has a core of power independent of the desires of those who control the other level of government. Because of this principle, the Constitution is a document worth having and worth defending. To the national government are granted certain legislative, executive, and judicial powers. These powers are enumerated and are vested in national authority. However, the important principle is the fact that subdivisional governments do exist. These state governments are granted powers by the Constitution which are independent of those vested in the national government. There are also powers concurrent with both the Federal and State governments and those powers denied both.

SEPARATION OF POWERS

The Constitution protects our right through the system of separation of powers. These three departments: legislative, judicial, and executive are constitutionally and politically independent of each other. The personnel of these branches are chosen by different procedure and hold office independently of the other branches. It is this political independence and the distribution of functions that maintain our freedoms and liberties. Whether you or I be in the majority or the minority we are represented in our Government. The framers of the Constitution recognized that the separation of powers is an important principle to prevent any single segment of our country from gaining complete control of our Government.

The checks governing these powers are of great significance. The President can veto an act of Congress; however, Congress can override this veto with a two-thirds majority vote. Congress also has the power of impeachment. The President appoints the Supreme Court Justices, but the approval of the Senate is necessary. The Supreme Court has the power of the judicial review by which they can declare an act of Congress unconstitutional. Thus, we see that the independence of these branches is perhaps more important than the distribution of functions. The method of choosing these officials is important in maintaining the independence of each branch. The President is elected by popular vote and the electoral college. This is in contrast to many systems where the majority party in the legislature chooses the Chief Executive. The legislative body is chosen by the people. Congress is established on the bicameral system. When the fathers of the Constitution gave birth to this great document, they wished to give life to a branch that had political security and independence. In doing this, they felt that a branch with its personnel in politically secure positions would not be subjected to the passing whims of the Nation. To meet this need, out of the womb of the Constitutional Convention the Supreme Court was conceived. A justice is a member of the Supreme Court until death or retirement. Because of his security, a justice will concern himself with the welfare of the country for the future. Thus this branch was established politically independent of the President and Congress. Because of the independence of these three branches and the distribution of functions among them, as set down in the Constitution, I believe the Constitution is a document worth having and worth supporting.

The system used in electing our governmental officials is perhaps the most significant part of our Constitution. Only through the will of the people can our Nation remain free. The basis for all our freedoms comes from the theory that governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. The President is elected by the vote of the people and the electoral college. He is elected because he possesses the qualities the people of the United States desire in their Chief Executive.

The legislative department is divided in such a way that one group of people cannot gain a complete monopoly of this branch. The House of Representatives is based on population. Because it is felt that the House of Representatives is closer to the people, all bills concerning revenue must originate in the House. However, to remove the possibility of virtually eliminating a small State from any legislative power, the Senate was established in such a manner as to insure equal representation for small and large States alike. The Senate represents the people, but perhaps it represents more minorities and upper class groups. However, the basic principle of democracy is followed in selection of Members for Congress. That is: The individual citizen has the right to elect his representatives. Because of the principle of free elections, the people of the United States have been able to remain free and independent. This principle, established under the Constitution, is a concrete reason for having the Constitution and defending it to the utmost degree. For without this governmental idea, the liberties we prize and the rights we strive to maintain would soon fade from our great land. Yes, the Constitution is an institution of government worth having and worth defending. It vests authority in both the Federal and State Governments. It protects us from despotism through separation of powers. It guarantees its citizens rights and liberties. It derives its authority from the consent of the governed. It has withstood the perils of time. It has passed through the ages as a lighthouse of freedom and security.

Yes, this is truly a great institution of government. In defense of the Constitution we must concur with two of the greatest statesmen of our time. Winston Churchill: "I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears, and sweat." But these I gladly give, so that, as Abraham Lincoln stated, "the Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Ethan Shepley for Governor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as one who believes that educators have a great role to play in public life, and especially in the Republican Party, I was very interested to have brought to my attention by Iowa educators the front page editorial in the St. Louis Globe Democrat, May 6, which urges the distinguished retired chancellor of Washington University, the Honorable Ethan Shepley, to be considered as the Republican candidate for Governor of Missouri.

In Iowa, we know what a distinguished and amazingly outstanding lawyer, civic leader and educator he has been. The publisher and editors of the Globe Democrat are to be commended for bringing out so early the fact that there are competent educators in the Republican Party who should be considered for elective offices.

The full text of the editorial follows:

ETHAN SHEPLEY FOR GOVERNOR

For many years, Missourians of both political parties and of every philosophical persuasion have been saying that Ethan Shepley is the ideal man to be Governor of Missouri.

His whole life has been one of dedication to the public service. A graduate of Yale, and a volunteer in World War I who was commissioned as an Army second lieutenant, he was graduated from Washington University Law School. From the very beginning, he has interested himself in every aspect of the public welfare.

Ethan Shepley might have contented himself with a distinguished career in a prominent law firm, but he kept returning time and again to serve the people—often at great expense to himself and to his legal practice.

In 1930, at the bottom of the depression, he became the city's youngest Community Chest president, and an eminently successful one. He has served on many important citizens committees, from selecting the first St. Louis County Police Board to shaping the new State constitution in 1945.

He was president of the United Charities in 1940, and president of the Community Chest in 1947 and 1948.

Between assignments for the people, he became one of Missouri's and America's most outstanding lawyers.

Ethan Shepley was elected a director of Washington University in 1940, became president of the corporation in 1951, and in 1954—at the urgent insistence of his fellow trustees—became chancellor, an office in which he served with distinction through 1961.

Though not an educator, he won and maintained the admiration and respect of the academic as well as the civic community.

A churchman, he has been senior warden of Christ Church Cathedral, and lay delegate to three diocesan conventions. He was the Globe-Democrat Man of the Year in 1957, and has been accorded many honorary degrees and awards.

Ethan Shepley has been interested in Republican political affairs throughout his lifetime and has worked vigorously behind the scenes for Republican candidates, though he has been chiefly interested in politics in the higher sense.

Most of all, Ethan Shepley has a compassion for mankind and a devotion to the public service that is rarely found. Everything that he has ever done has been documentary to this central concept.

His enormous ability, his towering prestige, his quick and facile grasp of the science of government, his abounding energy, his proven abilities as an administrator, ideally equip him to be Governor of this State.

Ethan Shepley, as a candidate, would raise the sights of government in Missouri.

Better men and women would be encouraged to become candidates for statewide and congressional offices, for the general assembly, and for local offices in the cities and townships.

His candidacy would restore two-party government, which is indispensable to good government, to Missouri.

It is very rarely that any State has the opportunity to avail itself of the services of so dedicated and outstanding a man as Ethan Shepley. The descendant of patriots, Cabinet members, Ambassadors and distinguished jurists, he is, in his own right, one of the truly great men of Missouri and of America.

In the interests of good government for all the people, we most sincerely hope that Ethan Shepley will be persuaded to become the Republican nominee for Governor of Missouri in 1964.

If he does, we predict his election by all of the people in next year's general election, and 4 years of unprecedented achievement in Jefferson City, which will further advance the cause of good government and the welfare of all Missourians.

Small Business and the Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I have long been interested in the special problems of small business in this country. As a strong believer in competition and free enterprise, I have felt that our independent business firms represent a stronghold of American enterprise. While a member of the House of Representatives, I introduced the resolution that would have provided legislative authority for a permanent House Small Business Committee. I am again sponsoring similar legislation in the Senate.

In connection with my support of small business activity, I have come to know Mr. George J. Burger, founder of the National Federation of Independent Business, who is a man of unusual attainments, perseverance, and dedication to his work. A few weeks ago, Mr. Burger made an important statement on tax reduction and revision before the Senate Small Business Committee. Because it contains sound and intelligent comment on the current tax debate, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with a letter sent to me by Mr. Burger on May 14.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., May 14, 1963.

HON. GEORGE MCGOVERN,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: Due to your consistent interest as it relates to small business during your tenure in Congress beginning as a Member of the House—your action at that time was confirmed when you introduced the resolution that would provide legislative authority for the House Small Business Committee. In this you are to be congratulated again.

With very high regards and thanking you for your consideration,

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

TAX REDUCTION AND REVISION

(By George J. Burger)

I am George J. Burger, vice president, legislative activities, National Federation of Independent Business. We are a national organization composed solely of smaller, independent business and independent professional people. Our home office is San Mateo, Calif. I am in charge of the Washington, D.C., office.

Presently we have over 190,000 individual, directly supporting and participating members throughout all 50 States. This number is increasing every week. From the standpoint of number of directly supporting and participating members, we are the largest business-professional organization in the country.

Our main function is one of encouraging these independent enterprisers—who are the admitted backbone of our free enterprise system, and who are one of the strong pillars supporting our very liberties—to take a continuing, active, informed interest in Government affairs—State and national—and of providing them with programs to do so in an intelligent, effective manner.

I will not describe our method of operation. Most, if not all, the members of this committee have become familiar with the federation over the 20 years of our Washington activities. I will say only that in the federation, members speak directly for themselves—in their statements, officers voice only the opinion of the membership. Through The Mandate polls (regular reports on which have been furnished to you) we determine the majority position of the membership. This sets the federation's course. Through our special fact-finding surveys ("How's Business With You?" 1962—"Let's Take Care of Our Business-Government," 1963) we make it possible for members to tell us, and through us all in Government, the factual basis behind the many problems which are attacked by bills presented for vote in various issues of The Mandate. First of all, we want to congratulate your committee on these hearings. Small businesses of this country regard this as an area of prime importance in their operation. These facts are demonstrated clearly in our The Mandate polls and special surveys.

For instance, in our December 1962 mandate No. 280 (appendix A), 62 percent of our members insisted that Congress make consideration of tax reductions its first order of business in 1963. Further, in our special fact-finding 1962 "How's Business With You?" survey (sample copy and year-end tabular report on file with your committee), to which we received 56,486 signed responses, we questioned members on the desirability of tax reductions, action against unfair competition, imports, etc. By far the largest number of respondents—some 41,445—checked tax reduction as their most pressing need.

Interestingly, in the tax area we asked members what they thought was most needed: Lower tax rates, faster depreciation, plowback allowances, or self-employed retirement plans. We found the following:

1. 20,679 respondents checked self-employed retirement plans;
2. 18,208 respondents checked lower rates;
3. 16,216 respondents checked plowback allowances; and
4. 11,496 respondents checked faster depreciation.

As you know, Congress in 1962 moved a great distance to meet the No. 1 need expressed by our members by enactment of H.R. 10 and S. 59, the private retirement program bills. Furthermore, Congress and the administration moved a great distance toward meeting the Nos. 3 and 4 needs in the enactment of H.R. 10650 (which provides an additional 7-percent tax credit to assist in the replacement of equipment and machinery) and in announcement of a $1.5 billion increase in depreciation allowances.

This, of course, leaves the No. 2, lower rates, need still up in the air.

Now, how do our members—who are a bona fide cross section of all smaller, independent business and professional people in our country (incidentally, the largest such cross section in any single business organization in the land)—feel about action toward lower rates?

To put it bluntly, our members stand foursquare that tax rates must be reduced, with due consideration to the needs in small, independent business and independently operated professional vocations. They strongly prefer that these reductions be accompanied by matching reductions in Government spending. However, just how they would choose if they were faced with making the hard choice of accepting a tax reduction without matching spending cuts is a question that no one can answer.

Let's look at the record:

First, as to the administration's tax proposals, in our February 1963 mandate No. 281 (appendix B), we found that 66 percent of our members favored the proposal for a three-stage tax cut, 70 percent of our members favored the administration's proposals for reduction of personal income tax rates, and 53 percent of our members favored the administration's proposals to reduce corporate income tax rates.

While on this, we want to credit the committee and its staff for action taken last December, before the tax proposals had firmed up, for recommending that the administration give due consideration to smaller, independent corporations. We of the federation were happy to support this endeavor, in communications we sent to the White House. We share the pleasure expressed by your chairman, Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, and his colleague, Senator ALAN BIBLE, in your weekly staff report of April 6, over the fact that the President has seen fit to include—at least to some meaningful extent—the suggestion in his tax reduction proposals.

In any case, as to the question of tailoring these bills to those in smaller, independent business and the professions in the mandate No. 281, we also asked our members to express themselves on the Senate Small Business Committee's November-December recommendation on corporate tax reduction. We found that 59 percent favored this recommendation, against 53 percent who favored the administration's corporate tax revision plan.

We have made almost the same finding in our 1963 "Let's Take Care of Our Business—Government" special, factfinding survey (sample copy and first 2-month tabular report attached). In the first 2 months of this particular survey (which will require a full year for entire membership coverage), on the basis of 6,690 signed responses received from members throughout the entire 50 States, we have found a 5-1 preference (3,456 "yes" to 701 "no" expressed for the Senate Small Business Committee's November-December corporate tax reduction recommendation to the administration, against an approximate 1.7-1.4 rejection (1,429 "yes" to 1,652 "no") of an alternative proposition that corporation tax rates be reduced "by 5 percentage points all along the line, regardless of size of corporate income."

As to the preference expressed for the Senate Small Business Committee corporate tax reduction plan—as you know, few businessmen do not aspire to grow. This is part of the very nature of our freedom of opportunity and competitive economy system. Historically, the most severe growing pains are experienced in the transition between small and large business. A number of our members are in this stage. Our membership is limited to independently operated and owned firms which are not dominant in their lines. They are experiencing the difficulties in the early surtax area. Others hoping to grow behind them anticipate this difficulty. Therefore, clearly they would prefer a plan that would reverse the tax rates and extend the 22-percent levy to a $50,000 cutoff, to a plan that would reverse the normal tax rates, keep the present $25,000 cutoff, and effectively increase the present surtax by 3 percentage points.

Further, we are asking members in this same special survey whether they prefer to have individual income taxes reduced evenly all along the line regardless of size of income, or to have the larger reductions made in the lower income brackets. To date the margins are running 2-1 (2,909 "yes" to 1,434 "no") in favor of the former, but 3-1 in favor of the latter (2,987 "yes" to 1,123 "no"). These particular tax rates apply equally, of course, to unincorporated business and professional operations the same as to individuals.

We have told you that we do not know how our members would feel about the question of having taxes cut without offsetting Federal spending reductions.

We might have answered this question "Yes" during 1962. In a bluntly worded poll in our July 1962 Mandate No. 277 (appendix C, attached) we asked members: "Should Congress cut personal and corporate tax rates across-the-board this year? (Some business and labor groups suggest this to strengthen the economy, even if it results in an increased national debt.)" The result, a vote of 50 percent for, 47 percent against, and 3 percent no opinion. Additionally, in our 1962 special survey we asked: "Do you think Congress should make tax reductions now?" Our 56,486 responses broke down as follows: 73 percent (41,445) for, 18 percent (10,079) against, and 9 percent (4,962) no opinion.

Today, however, the mood seems one of much uncertainty, if not of opposition to tax cuts without matching spending cuts. In our February 1963 Mandate No. 281 we asked: "Do you believe that Congress should match tax cuts by Federal spending cuts on a dollar-for-dollar basis, before finally enacting tax reductions?" The result, a vote of 83 percent for, 14 percent against, and 3 percent no opinion. This would seem clear enough, except for one consideration—our findings to date in the 1963 special survey. One of our questions is: "Should Congress cut taxes this year?" Of the 6,690 replies to date, 46 percent (3,067) favor such cuts, 20 percent (1,336) oppose the cuts, and 34 percent (2,287) express no opinion.

Two things must be considered in connection with these 1963 poll and survey results. First, the poll was taken and the survey is being taken during a period of exceptionally intense, sometimes quite bitter, and widely publicized debate over the question whether taxes should be reduced if such contributes to a greater deficit. Second, to the extent such reductions would add to the deficit, this increased deficit would be of a different nature from any other increases, in that spending control of the moneys involved would be in the hands of individuals and private enterprise rather than in the hands of Uncle Sam at Washington.

In any case, as to the polls and surveys, two factors stand out. First, the change in vote between Mandate No. 277 and Mandate No. 281—from 47 percent opposition to tax cuts that might increase deficits, to 86 percent opposition to enacting tax cuts without offsetting tax reductions. Second, the change in response between the 1962 and 1963 special surveys, which is not appreciable in the category of opposition to tax cuts, but which is heavily in the "I don't know," or "I don't care to express an opinion" category.

For this reason, we do hope it will be possible for the administration and the Congress to effect the maximum reasonable economies in spending programs this year, because smaller independent business and professional people do need, and can very much use, tax reductions this year.

As to the question how such reductions would affect small firms there can be one answer only: The reductions—while perhaps the most desirable—would be helpful. For instance, Treasury estimates they would effect a tax savings of $233 million a year for corporations earning under $25,000. This saving, when added to savings made possible under the 1958 $260 million Small Business First Step Tax Revision Act, the 1962 depreciation revisions, and the 1962 7-percent tax incentive, can do nothing but further strengthen the financial position of smaller business units—proprietorships, partnerships, as well as corporations.

Second, as is well known, small business sales and profits tend to be much more volatile than those of their big business competitors. For instance, as Mr. John Horne, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, points out, earnings of small manufacturers increased by 44 percent as between the first three quarters of 1961 and the first three quarters of 1962, while the earnings of large manufacturers increased by 22 percent. Also, as the Treasury Department points out, under the 1963 proposals small corporations will achieve reductions of about 27 percent, compared with 4 percent reductions for their giant competitors. To the extent that smaller corporations are able to retain more of their earnings during periods of profit increases than are their larger competitors, it is clear that their position is nothing but strengthened.

While on this subject, we would like to point out that we have polled our members in various mandates, over a long period of years, on the question of income averaging such as is proposed in the administration's tax revision proposals. In each and every case we have received a favorable response.

Frankly, we are much intrigued by the thought that to the extent that these tax reductions might very well make it possible for the Small Business Administration to do a far more comprehensive job in its financial assistance operations. To the extent that reductions improve the financial position of small units, to that very extent this agency, which has been and is doing an excellent job, will be able to get more mileage, so to speak, out of each and every one of its lending assistance dollars. That can be nothing other than a further step in the right direction.

It is most important for Congress to act in this tax area. The more than 4.5 million small firms in the United States comprise about 95 percent of all businesses in the Nation. They employ 30 million persons—almost 50 percent of our entire work force—and account for 40 percent of all business activity. As a matter of fact, reports by your own committee some years ago indicated that in some lines of trade, particularly retailing, small firms account for as much as 80 percent of business activity, and employ as much as 70 percent of all the gainfully employed. All of this is in addition to the fact that basically small and growing businesses are the units which emphasize the competitive aspects of our economy, and by their very act of being and succeeding are concrete evidence that the basic freedom of opportunity in our country—which is so vital a part of the mix that goes into bulwarking our individual freedoms.

In short, small business is vital to our Nation, both from the standpoint of the part played economically and from the standpoint of social significance. The level of taxation is a most important factor influencing its chances for success. We appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and discuss this subject today, and hope that in the months ahead, you will continue the good work done in past years, in pressing for enactment of further needed and justified tax relief for this segment of our economy.

Appendix "A"—From Mandate No. 280; Membership Base: 185,445 Individual Independents

5. Should Congress make tax cuts for individuals and corporations its No. 1 order of business in 1963? ☐ For, ☐ against.

5. Argument for cutting taxes in 1963: Taxes must be cut as soon as possible after Congress meets in 1963. Individuals must be left with more money in their pockets for increased purchases, sales, profits, and employment. Corporations must be left with more money for expansions, modernization, and possible lower costs. Both things are needed for growth, which is the only type of economy in which small business can prosper. Expanded business activity could generate additional tax income, thereby reduce any deficit that might be caused.

5. Argument against cutting taxes in 1963: It's not reasonable to talk of cutting taxes at a time like this. First, little or no thought is being given to reduction of Federal spending. Second, any cut in individual and corporation rates might require offsetting increases in closing so-called "loopholes" which benefit various segments of our Nation. Third, our country is faced with a situation which could easily demand greater outlays for defense. Reduction of tax rates under these circumstances isn't the road to greater strength and prosperity.

Results of foregoing vote as published in mandate No. 281:

5. Congress make tax cuts No. 1 order of business for 1963: 62 percent; 33 percent; 5 percent.

Appendix "B"—From Mandate No. 281; Membership Base 187,576 Individual Independents

1. Are you in favor of the President's proposal to reduce personal and corporation income taxes in three stages (first part to come in 1963, second in 1964, and final in 1965)?

The President pledged to cut total spending except for defense, space, and interest. This would mean cuts in Government employment, welfare programs, other nondefense projects. ☐ For, ☐ against.

2. Are you in favor of the President's proposal to reduce personal income tax rates (this involves 28-percent cuts on taxable incomes to $5,000, 23- to 25-percent cuts on $10,000 to $50,000 incomes, and 15-percent cuts on all larger incomes)?

Personal income tax rates apply to all unincorporated business and professional operations. ☐ For, ☐ against.

3. Are you in favor of the President's proposal to reduce corporation tax rates to 22 percent on the first $25,000 taxable income, and to 47 percent on all above that figure?

Corporations now pay 30 percent on the first $25,000 taxable income, and 52 percent on all above that figure. ☐ For, ☐ against.

4. Are you in favor of the plan urged by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Small Business Committee to cut the corporate tax rate to 22 percent on the first $50,000 taxable income, leaving the rate at 52 percent on all above that figure? ☐ For, ☐ against.

5. Do you believe that Congress should match tax cuts by Federal spending cuts on a dollar-for-dollar basis, before finally enacting tax reductions? ☐ For, ☐ against.

1, 2, 3. Argument for: Our present tax system exerts too heavy a drag on private purchasing power, profits, and employment. Designed to check inflation, it now checks growth, flow of dollar purchasing power, invites recession, depresses Federal revenues, and causes chronic deficits. We must bring it up to date now, when the inflationary pressures of war and postwar years no longer threaten. The cuts proposed ($11 billion for individuals including unincorporated businesses, and $2.5 billion for corporations) will increase the purchasing power of American families and businesses in every tax bracket. They will also encourage the initiative and business risk on which free enterprise depends, induce more investment, production and industrial capacity use, and help provide the 2 million new jobs we need each year. The reductions follow the sound principle that each additional penny put into the channels of free enterprise revolves several times each year, picking up profits and producing jobs. The need for restraint in Government spending is recognized. Cuts in nondefense programs are promised. However, we are still in a dangerous world, and must spend the money needed for national defense. This means that the Federal deficit may increase temporarily—while the economy, absorbing the incentives of tax cuts, gears to greater production, profits, wages, and tax production. Thus, the program is spaced over 3 years, to assist in orderly adjustment of our finances.

4. Argument for SSBC plan: Most corporations, those with greatest growth promise, earn $50,000 taxable income or less. This plan is specifically for them. It would save $2,000 for firms earning $25,000, and $9,500 for those earning $50,000. No greater savings could be made by any firm. In the President's plan, savings would be $2,000 at $25,000, $3,250 at $50,000 and $5 million at $100 million. Firms earning over $25,000 wouldn't get full tax cut benefits until the third year. The SSBC plan would cause a smaller tax revenue loss.

5. Argument for dollar-for-dollar cuts: A soundly managed family or business must keep spending in line with income or go bankrupt. This principle is as old and sound as the world itself. It applies with equal force to Government. It cannot go constantly deeper into debt without a day of reckoning, if not for us then for our children. That day could involve complete financial ruin of all, and of the Nation itself. Now the administration wants to take a risk that tax cuts without equal spending cuts will accelerate business to the point where taxes once more will equal spending. Maybe it's right. But tax revision to date hasn't done this. The only safe course is to match tax cuts with spending cuts.

1, 2, 3. Argument against: The tax cut proposals are fine sounding and sincere. However, as matters stand there are areas subject to searching examination. Those in favor state that tax cuts will increase consumer spending which would stimulate production, make funds available for investment, and relieve unemployment. As to the need for doing something drastic to increase employment, we must remember that the statistics on which percentage figures show those out of work reflect in part workers in seasonal industries, housewives and students who are in and out of the labor force, and some people who, for one reason or another, do not want to work at any given time. There is question just how much tax cuts could do to increase employment in these areas. As to the need for funds for investment and purchasing, statistics show that today our reserve of savings and earnings is at an all-time high. Perhaps consumers are not spending their money because of a lack of desire for new or additional possessions, also possibly because of a feeling of insecurity as to what the future holds. Perhaps funds are not being used for plant investment and expansion because, in part at least, in many basic industries production is considerably below present capacity, and for one good reason: that demand is simply not there, even though as stated above, the consumer dollars are available. Therefore, tax reductions would not seem the answer.

4. Argument against SSBC plan: Small corporations are vital to our economy. But the President's plan is sound. It provides tax reductions for both small and large units, in relation to their needs. Let's face it. This is a country of big and little businesses. Each has its own part to play, its own contribution to make to production, distribution, and employment. Furthermore, there is a definite interdependency between them. The health of one affects the health of the other. Thus, when tax revisions are proposed, each must receive its needed and rightful share of benefits.

5. Argument against dollar-for-dollar cuts: Businessmen daily go into debt on programs aimed at bigger volume and profits. Risk-taking is part of their lives. But Government is the biggest "business" in our country. It too must take risks in building for the future. The facts are that our tax system is dangerously out of date, that changes must be made, that economy must be a watchword at Washington, but that we can't cut defense spending, and that dollar-for-dollar cuts on the civilian side would cut the heart out of vital services. The administration offers its program as a calculated risk in tax revision that will promote a sounder country. Many successful businessmen agree with its judgment. So, also, should we.

Results of foregoing vote as published in Mandate No. 282:

	Percent		
	For	Against	No vote
1. President's proposal for 3-stage tax cut	66	29	5
2. President's proposal to reduce personal income taxes	70	26	4
3. President's proposal to reduce corporate income taxes	53	40	7
4. Senate Small Business Committee plan to cut corporate taxes	59	34	7
5. Congress match tax cuts by spending cuts	83	14	3

Appendix "C"—From Mandate No. 277; Membership Base: 181,078 Individual Independents

Should Congress cut personal and corporate tax rates across the board this year? Some business and labor groups suggest this to strengthen the economy, even if it results in an increased national debt ☐ for, ☐ against.

1. Argument for the cuts: Tax cuts are vital to get our economy moving. Reduced personal income tax rates are needed to increase purchasing, sales, profits, and employment. Reduced corporate taxes are needed to promote business expansion. Both are needed for growth, which is the only type economy in which small business can prosper. By putting more money in the trade channels, the cuts should increase tax collections and balance off any loss to Government. Even if they don't, and even if they add another $5 to $7 billion to the national debt, this would still be a far lower cost than the price of another depression.

1. Argument against the cuts: Question isn't whether tax cuts are desirable, but whether the Government can afford them. The U.S. Government is now almost $300 billion in debt. Congress has just raised the debt limit to $308 billion. Government may end its fiscal year with an additional deficit of $4 to $8 billion. Sound business judgment dictates Government first reduce its spending (which it isn't doing) before cutting its income. Any other way is the road to bankruptcy, which isn't good for anyone, least of all small business. Argument the cuts will generate increased taxes is like an argument to prove perpetual motion. There's no such animal.

Results of foregoing vote was published in Mandate No. 278:

	Percent		
	For	Against	No vote
1. Congress cut taxes now	50	47	3

APPENDIX "D"—FROM MANDATE NO. 263—MEMBERSHIP BASE: 162,853 INDIVIDUAL INDEPENDENTS

4. H.R. 2–S. 2. Business reinvestment deductions—allow businessmen to deduct from taxes up to 20 percent of all earnings ($30,000 ceiling) which they reinvest in expansions of plant, inventories, and accounts receivable (Representative IKARD, Texas; Senator SPARKMAN, Alabama). ☐ For, ☐ against.

4. Argument for H.R. 2–S. 2: This bill would help independents who finish any year with increased funds tied up in accounts receivable, inventories, and new equipment. The 20-percent allowance ($30,000 ceiling) would apply to these increases. For instance, end a year with $5,000 additional inventory on shelves, $2,000 additional accounts receivable on the ledgers, an extra $3,000 tied up in a new truck, and the bill would give you a $2,000 tax deduction (apart from other deductions) to help you carry the load. The bill aims to help smaller businesses especially.

4. Argument against H.R. 2–S. 2: This doesn't do anything more than add another gimmick to our jerry-built tax laws, which are nothing more than the happy hunting grounds for lawyers and tax accountants. There's reason to believe it would be of more help to larger firms rather than small businesses. Instead of spending time on this type of legislation, Congress should make a thorough review of all tax laws, close loopholes which permit tax evasion, bring in more revenue, then act to hammer down rates along the line

Results of foregoing vote as published in mandate No. 264:

	Percent		
	For	Against	No vote
4. H.R. 2 and S. 2, business reinvestment deduction	80	18	2

Kennedy Plugs for Private Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, a large element of the Alice in Wonderland atmosphere created by the Kennedy administration results from the widespread practice of the President to say one thing while his chief lieutenants are doing the opposite. Such is frequently the case in the field of power. The following editorial from the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of May 26 hits the nail on the head in asking "if President Kennedy really means" to look first to private companies for the development of sites and the providing of services. The American public is not sufficiently conscious of the tremendous value to the Government of taxes paid by our investor-owned public utilities:

KENNEDY PLUGS FOR PRIVATE POWER

Following his speech at a recent meeting of the Committee for Economic Development in Washington, in which he urged faster economic growth, President Kennedy asked for questions from the audience.

John E. Corette, president of the Montana Power Co., said that the investor-owned utility industry would like to proceed with the construction of various major power projects, but was being prevented from doing so because of the administration's desire to build them as Federal projects with taxpayers' money. Corette specifically mentioned the High Mountain Sheep project on the Snake River in Idaho. President Kennedy then replied as follows:

"Let me just say that the standard which I have always followed was that if a private company—that the burden of proof should be on the Federal Government; that if a private company can develop a site and provide a service more satisfactorily than the Federal Government, then the private company should go ahead. Indeed, as I said, I would put the burden of proof upon the Federal Government to prove either that the site will not be adequately developed, that the service would not be satisfactory, and that only the Federal Government can do it before I would support the project."

If President Kennedy really means this, and will get such a policy promptly followed by Secretary of the Interior Udall and the Federal Power Commission, the air will be cleared, the economy will be stimulated, and the taxpayers will be benefited.

The investor-owned public utilities already not only make the largest annual new investment in plant and equipment of any industry in the United States but are, in the aggregate, the largest taxpayer.

While the establishment by the Federal Government of the original Tennessee Valley Authority was thoroughly justified during the depression of the 1930's, at a time when investor-owned utilities were unable or unwilling to proceed with that development themselves, there seems to be little reason for the Federal Government now to spend taxpayers' money to build additional power projects if the investor-owned utilities, which pay taxes and which are closely regulated, are able and willing to do the job.

Systems Management Has Not Been Evolutionary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, approximately a year ago it was my privilege to participate in an Air Force Systems Command Defense-Industry Conference in Monterey, Calif., convened by Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, commander, Air Force Systems Command.

Now that a year has passed I was interested in the evaluation of that conference and the results of it as presented by General Schriever.

Under permission to extend my remarks, therefore, I enclose an article from the May issue of Armed Forces Management entitled "Systems Management Has Not Been Evolutionary":

SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT HAS NOT BEEN EVOLUTIONARY

Except for a few gray hairs (barely noticeable at the temples), Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, Air Force Systems Command's 52-year-old commander, radiates an aura of restless youth—charged with energy, intent on accomplishment.

A very few hours around his headquarters makes it quite obvious he has imbued his staff and subordinates with much the same zeal.

A significant chunk of this attitude seems to stem directly from the General's personal philosophy: "I think it is fair to say that * * * management problems are more often the pacing items than are technical problems in reaching an operational capability." Moreover: "In the final analysis, people are still the most important ingredient in any system."

It's difficult to determine precisely when this management philosophy was born, but there seems to be little question that it currently guides most of his actions, and it's fair to assume it's not a late bloomer.

Born in Bremen, Germany, September 14, 1910, he came to this country in 1917 and settled in Texas with his parents. At 17, he entered Texas A. & M., graduating in 1931.

At this point in life, young Schriever was faced with a tough decision. At A. & M., he had developed into an excellent golfer. What career promised the best future—the links trail or the military?

In July 1932, he cast his lot with the service—entering flight training at Randoph Field, Tex. A year later, he was graduated, second lieutenant-pilot, and was assigned to March Field, Calif.

After a brief break in service a few years later, he returned to active duty in October 1938 and has risen rapidly since. Meanwhile, he found time to attain his master's degree in mechanical engineering (aeronautical) at Stanford (1942).

Since the war, his assignments have constantly reflected his growing value to U.S. Air Force—Chief, Scientific Liaison Section, DCS/Materiel; Assistant for Development Planning; commander, BMD; commander, ARDC.

When Systems Command was created (in April 1961), General Schriever became its first commander and, 3 months later, was rewarded with his fourth star. (Despite the fact he plays less today, Schriever, according to associates, still keeps his golf game "respectable," shoots consistently in the low 70's.)

In his current position, the tall, youthful general exercises management responsibility for Air Force contracts with more than 5,000 major contractors. This was an important factor in calling the Monterey Conference a year ago.

Was that meeting a success? Here's what General Schriever told Air Force Management about results at the first anniversary:

"Question. At the time that you planned the Monterey Conference, did you have specific objectives in mind?"

"Answer. We had a number of objectives. In the first place, it was shortly after we had established Systems Command and there was a great deal of emphasis on management from DOD. We had tried to initiate certain actions several months before but without much success. Creation of the command, where one organization in the Air Force had total responsibility for systems acquisition, along with the research and technology leading to acquisition, gave us an opportunity to get together with industry and the scientific fraternity.

"Our aim was to lay out our problems in the most candid way we possibly could. From that, I hoped everyone would get a better understanding and that they would see we were sincere in trying to find ways and means of doing the job better. Then, once that had been attained, we could use that understanding as a platform from which we could proceed to specifics.

"Question. Do you feel you succeeded in creating that candid atmosphere at the Conference?

"Answer. Well, I'm sure that we didn't suceed 100 percent, but I thought we had a very successful conference. This was something new. I don't think exactly this kind of conference had ever really been tried before. We were pioneering, plowing new ground, but we got a very, very fine response and I think the results will be felt for a long time to come.

"Question. In what way do you think post-conference work has contributed to this success?

"Answer. As you probably already know, we had the conference split up into certain major categories having to do with systems management. Each one of these groups came up with a list of specific action items which were agreed to by both the industry and Air Force sides. I told the conference in my closing talk that we intended to do everything we possibly could to follow up on the consolidated list of 40 recommendations.

"We identified each of these in terms of what could be done within the command and what needed action elsewhere. On those for AFSC, we set up an office of primary responsibility for each. Those that required action from the Pentagon, or even legislative action, we moved forward. In each instance, we have been able to point to something specific having been done—although, in some instances, because of circumstances, it hasn't always been exactly what the majority wanted.

"Question. Do you feel, then, that industry is satisfied with what has been accomplished in the last year?

"Answer. Again, I don't believe it would be true to say there is 100 percent satisfaction, but I feel everyone has been highly responsive to what we've tried to do. Certainly, this feeling of candor has prevailed. For example, I've had top management people, from the presidents of companies on down, come in and sit down and talk to me for an hour or more in terms of major management or organizational matters that had their roots in Monterey. These people have made many efforts to apply some of the suggested methods to their own management. And, of course, we've also tried to improve our way of doing business.

"Question. What has been the in-house reaction at levels above this command?

"Answer. People at the Air Force level have reacted very well. I have only talked to a few of the DOD people about the conference, but I think the reaction was quite favorable. When you read the final conference report, you'll note a number of instances of DOD and USAF cooperation in implementing conference recommendations. DOD has scheduled a conference for next month and it also closely follows the Monterey pattern.

"I think having such a conference at the DOD level is really better than having it at our level because they have a greater authority to accomplish the necessary actions. But, they're going to have to stress this attitude of candor to assure success.

"Question. General, a moment ago you spoke of improving your way of doing business also. What form has this taken?

"Answer. Well, first, I think, in the final analysis, people are still the most important ingredient or element in any system—be it weapons or management. We've come such a long way and technology is so dynamic. But, it's still necessary that we translate technology into systems in the most effective manner—in terms of dollars and the most effective system—and people are the only ones who can really do this.

"Systems management, or research and development including systems management, has not been evolutionary. When you look back on how we did business before the war and how we're doing it now, it's like night and day. We've learned a lot in the past few years—we had to learn—but we haven't always implemented all those techniques perfectly.

"Consequently, in specific areas where we have proven to be weak, we've introduced training courses—in cost analysis, quality control and similar phases. They are now conducted by the U.S. Air Force Institute of Technology and were developed in conjunction with Rand. They have been in force for about 2 years now.

"Question. I assume this provides you with a degree of uniformity when these people are assigned to Air Force systems command jobs?

"Answer. Yes, but not uniformity for uniformity's sake alone. We've attempted to bring more descipline into our management. For example, we've established a system of documentation which has provided us with the proper kind of management controls. This was the genesis of the 375-series of regulations.

"Next, we tried to establish some degree of uniformity of organization in our product divisions. Of course, each of these divisions has a slightly different problem because of product differences, but there are many basic factors that can create a uniform foundation.

"Then, we carried the same theory over into the offices of the program directors. For example, each had to have such things as an engineering element and a program shop, regardless of what their product was.

"Now, it's one thing to establish a policy or directive and quite another to have it wholeheartedly implemented. We've moved people around, but you can't cross-fertilize entirely. So, we have established some additional management courses. One is our systems program officers' course, which is 12 weeks long with the third class currently in session. In September, we'll start a new 15-month course which will be basically a management course.

"In short, I think the things we're doing now will help us to continue improving our management capabilities. Three, four, or five years from now, we're going to be even better because our people will be better trained and more capable of understanding procedures.

"Question. Then, do you feel that the Air Force has profited as greatly as industry as a result of the conference?

"Answer. Well, it's awfully hard to put your finger on tangible results this early in the game. I'm sure there are a lot of specifics you can assign tangible values to, but I wouldn't attempt to give you such a list yet. However, I do feel that, based on the manner in which we operate with industry, we have benefited to a degree at least equal with industry, if only because now we are being more candid with each other.

"Question. Feeling this way, do you contemplate another conference of this type in the near future?

"Answer. Before I make any further plans, I want to see what results from the DOD conference I referred to earlier. You can have too many conferences as well as too few. As a command, we spend about $8 billion annually and, on that basis, it pays for us to stay close to the people we're doing business with. But, if it can be done at the DOD level, I see no value in doing a repeat. So, I'd have to say we have no specific plans right now."

Pentagon Teams Prepare McNamara on TFX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, because of the growing concern in America about the TFX contract awards, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD an editorial and a related story from a recent edition of Aviation Week & Space Technology published April 29, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TXF

(By Robert Hatz)

The investigation by the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee headed by Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, into the processes by which Defense Secretary Robert McNamara awarded the TFX contract has reached a point where it is possible to consider the major issues it has raised before the final climactic testimony by Mr. McNamara and his henchmen, Air Force Secretary Eugene Zuckert and Navy Secretary Fred Korth.

We think Senator MCCLELLAN and his group deserve commendation for the objective way they have conducted these hearings, giving all interested parties an opportunity to present their segments of the stroy.

We also think Senator McClellan and his subcommittee are performing a valuable public service with their inquiry. We cannot subscribe to Mr. McNamara's view that these hearings could produce "nothing but harm," although we can understand this subjective viewpoint. They have in fact given the American taxpayers a great deal of information, which would otherwise have been cloaked under alleged "military security," about how their tax dollars slither around the Pentagon in the weapon system procurement process under the new civilian managers. The inquiry has also provided the first specific and detailed challenge to many of these managers' glib generalizations on the excellence of their own operations. It has required them to support their judgments with valid detail instead of well-polished slogans.

The basic issue raised by the McClellan subcommittee's investigation is whether the weapon system procurement process in the Pentagon is actually being run according to the processes and standards which Mr. McNamara says it is, or whether in fact it is being run quite differently by methods which cannot stand the light of public inquiry.

KEY QUESTIONS

This contrast between what was supposed to have been done and what actually was done in the TFX procurement process has been shown in several key areas of this process. They are—

Cost effectiveness: Mr. McNamara bases his TFX decision and his entire Pentagon management on the principle of cost-effectiveness. Yet so far there is no evidence, particularly from Mr. McNamara, that he did any cost-effectiveness studies of his own after he decided that figures presented by both contractors and U.S. Air Force were "not realistic," or that he actually has any hard figures to justify any of his statements about TFX costs or his claimed saving of "a billion dollars" by this decision.

Technical progress: Mr. McNamara rejected many of the advances proposed in the TFX technical evaluation process on the grounds that they were unfeasible. Yet the military and civilian experts who have testified to date have documented the technical feasibility of such advances as in-flight thrust reversers, use of titanium, etc. The record shows Mr. McNamara did not consult his own technical advisers in his directorate of research and engineering on any of these issues before making his decision. Where did he get his technical advice?

Commonality: Is this simply another glib generalization or does it have any validity in the TFX case? Mr. McNamara did not invent the concept of commonality. U.S. Air Force and Navy have used the same aircraft designs many times in the past where technical considerations indicated this was necessary. This concept goes back as far as the Boeing P-12 biplane fighter, which was the first-line fighter for both the Army Air Corps and Navy carrier forces in the 1930's. A recent example is the North American F-86, which served a similar function for both U.S. Air Force and Navy when it was the best-performing fighter of the Korean war era. Is it worth sacrificing the aircraft performance Mr. McNarama's concept of commonality apparently requires for whatever economy is involved? Does he have a valid concept or is it what naval air expert George Spangenberg identified as "poppycock"?

Program definition phase: Is the paper study effort of the program definition phase, which occupied a year during the TFX deliberations, more effective than building several experimental prototypes and wringing them out to get hard test data before full commitment to large-scale weapon system procurement? Is the cost difference between the paper studies of program definition phases and the price of flying prototypes a real savings, or does it prove more expensive in the long run?

PERFORMANCE VERSUS COST

One of the other major issues on which the TFX case hinges is to what degree it is wise to degrade weapon performance to achieve lower cost. Bitter combat experience in all air wars to date has proved that victory cannot be won with second-rate flying machines. In many phases of air warfare the significant margin of performance superiority over the enemy has proved to be remarkably small—perhaps too small for a cost accountant to measure.

As Gen. Carl "Tooey" Spaatz often remarks: "A second-best airplane is like a second-best poker hand. No damn good."

Since Mr. McNamara overruled all of the future combat users of the TFX in their judgments on aircraft performance and, according to the record, did not consult with any of his military service chiefs in making his decision, it is important for the committee to ask what, if anything, he substituted for their experience.

The final testimony of Mr. McNamara and his service secretaries before Senator McClellan's subcommittee will be of enormous significance to the citizens of this country and their elected legislators. For upon it will depend in large degree their final verdict as to whether Mr. McNamara is indeed an industrial management genius on whose rough judgments the country can depend for its defense, or whether he is just an extremely glib corporate pitchman whose judgments cannot stand the stress of inquiry or the test of time.

Pentagon Teams Prepare McNamara on TFX

(By George C. Wilson)

Washington.—Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, who soon will make his summation before the Senate subcommittee investigating his F-111 (TFX) contract award to General Dynamics-Grumman, has organized two task forces in an intensive but hush-hush effort to overwhelm his challengers.

Pentagon insiders say McNamara did not take his challengers too seriously until he received a telephone call from the White House which had this unmistakable theme: "Take the TFX hearings seriously. They are hurting the administration." This was like telling the former Ford Motor Co. boss that his $6.5-billion F-111 decision would look like another Edsel to the public unless he did something fast.

The White House phone call came March 8 after both civilian and military witnesses had told the investigating committee headed by Senator John L. McClellan, Democrat, of Arkansas, that the joint U.S. Air Force-Navy Source Selection Board thought the Boeing F-111 proposal was superior. The Board had recommended on four separate occasions that Boeing be awarded the contract (AW March 11, p. 22). But McNamara, despite these recommendations based on 270,000 hours of evaluating by others, reversed the Board.

Not until he heard from the White House did McNamara feel a massive effort was needed to justify his decision. But he wasted no time once he heard the administration's deep concern. He immediately set up two teams, one now known as the Red Team and the other as the Blue Team. The Red Team had the job of punching holes in McNamara's reasons for choosing the General Dynamics-Grumman design. This was to prepare him for challenges from the McClellan subcommittee.

Jack L. Stempler, assistant general counsel for logistics, headed the Red Team. Its job was much easier than that of the Blue Team, because it relied primarily on material already prepared by the evaluation group and source selection board. The Red Team's main job was completed in less than a week and it was disbanded.

But the Blue Team's is a continuing operation. Solis Horwitz, Director of the Office of Organizational and Management Planning within the Defense Secretary's Office, heads the team. It is going far beyond the Red Team's scope of operations by preparing new material to justify the award to General Dynamics-Grumman—material which was not considered when McNamara made the decision.

Officially, Defense Department spokesmen declare the function of the Blue Team is just to keep McNamara abreast of the F-111 hearings and supply material requested by the subcommittee. They say the team comprises about a dozen persons, including costs analysts and engineers, but decline to name the members on grounds the team is an internal operation. The team was established "during the week of March 4," these spokesmen say. Fred A. Payne, Jr., Deputy Director of Strategic and Defense Systems within the Office of Defense Research and Engineering, is one of the operating heads of the Blue Team.

What irks several subcommittee members is that the Blue Team is coming forth with material which was not used by McNamara in making his decision. Senator Henry M. Jackson, Democrat of Washington, second ranking Democrat on the subcommittee and champion of Boeing, complains that McNamara is conducting an evaluation after the fact. Senator Karl E. Mundt, Republican, of South Dakota, ranking subcommittee Republican, raises the some objection. Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Democrat, of Maine, is the chief administration defender on the subcommittee and has been asking most of the questions that are designed to support McNamara's decision.

Blue Team members have often worked nights and weekends in their intensive effort. The secretive atmosphere surrounding its operation was evidenced when a reporter visited Horwitz' office last week to find out where the Blue Team was located. Horwitz himself was not in, but a conversation with an aid in his office went like this:

"Reporter. Where is the TFX team, the Horwitz Blue Team, located?

"Aid. We have nothing to do with it. See Orville Splitt (news services director within the Office of the Secretary of Defense).

"Reporter. Who is one of the deputies on the TFX team since Horwitz isn't here and you can't talk about it?

"Aid. See Orville.

"Reporter. What's the room number of the team and I'll ask there?

"Aid. Please see Orville."

Next stop was the office of Roswell L. Gilpatric, Deputy Defense Secretary. There, a young receptionist, showing none of the reluctance displayed by Horwitz' aids, declared: "I've never heard of the Blue Team or TFX team, but the girl across the hall in the Secretary's office can probably help you." She could and did, leading the way to still another receptionist in McNamara's office who pointed to the door to the TFX headquarters, known variously in the Pentagon now as the Command Post, Beehive, and Blue Room.

The Command Post is in the old conference room is divided into eight cubicles third-floor office. Inside the Command Post was another secretary who said: "Oh, my!" when the reporter identified himself. Her desk formed a gateway where people could be signed in and out. The old conference room is divided into eight cubicles by portable, pale-green partitions. A sign hanging inside the Blue Room door reads: "Keep door closed at all times."

Again, no one in the Blue Room would say anything about what they were doing. The suggestion: See Orville. The reporter did. Next time he'll look for Wilbur.

Pioneer South Dakota Priest Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, a clergyman in rural America is more than a clergyman. He is a neighbor, a friend, a counselor, and an example for his community. His influence reaches far beyond the boundary of his parish. He is, indeed, a friend to man.

Such a clergyman was Msgr. J. M. Brady, one of the most remarkable men I have been privileged to know, who died on May 24. Monsignor Brady was my fellow townsman in Mitchell, S. Dak., for most of my life. He influenced everyone who came under the warmth of his personality. He knew and loved the young and old, and he was known and loved by them. He never passed by without a friendly greeting for those he met.

Because Monsignor Brady exemplifies the spiritual and civic role of our rural clergymen, and because he exemplified so well the meaning of brotherhood, I ask unamimous consent to have an article from my hometown paper, the Daily Republic, of May 24, 1963, about his lifetime of service to God and to man, printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

John McHugh Brady was born the son of Dennis Brady and Ann McHugh Brady on March 4, 1869 in Houston County near Caledonia, Minn. He was reared in the community of his birth along with his five brothers, Hugh, Patrick, Michael, James and Dennis. When he was 17 years old, his family moved to a homestead in South Dakota near Kimball.

His early ambition to some day study for the priesthood was finally realized when he passed entrance examinations to enter Creighton University in Omaha about 1898. After graduating from that institution in 1902, he spent 1 year in the seminary at St. John's University in Collegeville, Minn., and then transferred to St. Paul Seminary in St. Paul, for the remaining 3 years of his priestly preparations.

He was ordained by Bishop Thomas O'Gorman at the old cathedral of Sioux Falls on June 16, 1909. He celebrated his first mass at St. Margaret's Church in Kimball on June 27, 1909.

For the next 9 years, he was a member of the Diocesan Mission Band and gave week-long missions to both Catholics and non-Catholics in various parishes throughout South Dakosa, Minnesota, Nebraska, and North Dakota.

After serving in Europe during World War I, he was temporarily assigned to Plankinton for several weeks in 1919 and was then appointed pastor of Holy Family Parish at Mitchell—a post he was to hold for 43 years.

During his term as pastor he watched the Holy Family Parish grow from about 200 families to more than 1,000. He supervised the building of the rectory, two separate additions to the school and the parish auditorium.

Monsignor Brady took great pride in the school system of the parish. In conjunction with the grade school and high school, a junior college, which graduated more than 1,300 students, was operated for many years. In 1949, the junior college was closed when Presentation Junior College opened in Aberdeen.

During his 43 years as pastor of Holy Family Parish, Monsignor Brady provided leadership training and guidance for 16 assistants.

In May of 1958, Monsignor was honored as the first "Mr. Mitchell." In April of 1959, he was recognized for his work by Holy Father, John XXIII, who created him a Protonotary Apostolic. This is an honor above that of a Monsignor, which gives him certain privileges of a Bishop.

The spring of 1959 also marked Monsignor Brady's 50th year as a priest and his 34th year as a Monsignor. Formal recognition was given to him in a Golden Jubilee to the Priesthood on May 11 of that year.

The Brady Memorial Home, which was dedicated in 1961, was named in honor of Monsignor Brady and Bishop William O. Brady.

John McHugh Brady received the honorary title "Monsignor" in 1925 for his work as a Knights of Columbus chaplain; for his work as a missions priest, and for his work, to that time, in Holy Family parish.

American Shipping and the Expanded Trade Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress a very fine essay on "American Shipping and the Expanded Trade Program," written by Miss Mary Ann McClain of Harahan, La.—a Jefferson Parish city in my district. For her essay, Miss McClain, a student at Holy Name of Jesus Mercy Academy in New Orleans, has been awarded first prize in the 28th annual Harold Harding Memorial Essay Contest sponsored by the Propeller Club of New Orleans. Miss McClain will receive a Caribbean cruise and $150 for her prizewinning essay, in which she points up the great importance of the American Merchant Marine in effectively implementing the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Her essay is well written and makes a strong case for the need of expanding America's merchant fleet; under permission granted, I include Miss McClain's essay in the RECORD.

The essay follows:

AMERICAN SHIPPING AND THE EXPANDED TRADE PROGRAM

Despite its general appearance of financial prosperity, the United States today is faced with many economic problems. The country is in a deplorable situation in which only four-fifths of the industrial power is being utilized. According to statistics, American factories are operating on a level which is from 15 percent to 20 percent below their capacity. How can this situation be alleviated? President Kennedy, in his recent statement in connection with the trade expansion program, "Trade or Fade," has provided an answer. Today, only a fraction of our U.S. manufacturers are exporting goods, and much of America's foreign trade is handled either by foreign ships, or by American ships registered under foreign flags. America is in a position in which she must either increase her exporting power, thus giving herself a larger and better representation abroad, or lose her much-coveted title of world leader. The United States is in a situation in which it must gain better control of products exported from this country.

The importance of American participation in world trade cannot be overemphasized. Shipping is today, as it always has been, essential to the support of our national economy, for world trade is directly connected with employment and industry. People throughout the Nation depend on the shipping industry for everyday household goods. And in time of war or a national emergency, ships would be almost indispensable.

There should exist in the United States today a feeling of pride among its citizens in having American ships representing them in ports throughout the world. And, because of this, we should see to it that our ships carry their fair share of the world trade. Statistics obviously point to the fact that American trade must expand, for during 1959 American ships carried less than 11 percent of our total foreign commerce.

The Soviet Union is second only to the United States in military seapower. And while the American merchant marine fleet is shrinking in size and in power, the Russians are making plans for greatly increasing the size of their merchant fleet. America must not allow the Soviet Union to gain this ascendancy of seapower. The United States must have a merchant marine superior to that of any other nation, a fleet capable of carrying both domestic and foreign commerce, and able to defend the country in time of war or a national emergency. The United States cannot allow the efficiency of our merchant marine to fall behind, for, as Thomas E. Stakem, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, has stated, "The day we let ourselves slip short of an adequate merchant marine is the day we become a second-rate nation." Therefore, it is of greatest importance that the United States enlarge its exporting capacity in order to give itself a larger and better representation in today's world trade program.

Recently, in an effort to aid the trade expansion program, a special committee, composed of 15 member companies of steamship lines, began to take action. This committee, the Committee of American Steamship Lines, is at present conducting a nationwide program to expand foreign trade. The Committee of American Steamship Lines officials are convinced that by visiting inland cities such as Indianapolis, St. Louis, Atlanta, Cincinnati, and others, they can help to lay the groundwork for acceptance of the President's new program. Through this community visit program, by encouraging businessmen to take advantage of foreign markets, and by urging manufacturers to export more, the Committee of American Steamship Lines is also giving industry a boost. The Committee of American Steamship Lines is helping to strengthen the maritime industry and the U.S. Merchant Marine.

All types of ships, through the cargo which they carry, play a vital role in this new trade expansion program. Dry cargo vessels serve to carry any type of dry freight. Tankers are equipped and designed to transport cargo that is liquid or semifluid.

There are, however, many problems which, if not ameliorated, may literally price our merchant marine off the seas, and which may tend to limit the progress of the trade expansion program. Today's high labor costs have caused one of the big headaches of the shipping industry. Unreasonable voices of monopolistic labor unions make pressing demands upon ships registered under the American flag. Unions which go on strike for long periods of time are certainly not acting in the best interest of our Nation. Competition from foreign vessels does not improve the situation. America's cost of building and operating vessels is high. Wages, living conditions, and operational expenses aboard foreign vessels, on the other hand, are so far below those of our American ships that it is almost impossible to compete.

The new Trade Expansion Act will be of great assistance in expanding American trade throughout the world, for it gives the President the power to raise or lower tariffs on goods coming in and going out of American harbors. Under this act, the United States is able to combat unreasonably high foreign tariffs by raising American tariffs on goods coming in from the offending country. The program, in giving the President this power, is also making it easier to negotiate with the Common Market and affiliated countries to lower tariff rates when necessary.

Our modern world is a complex and ever-expanding one. American youth, as it looks to the future through the broad window of hope, sees many bright things ahead. The horizon is wide, the field is open to all who are willing to apply themselves. Yet the swaying voice of Communist propaganda sometimes closes in on youth, so that it sees not a clear picture, but a distorted one. Yes, the future is indeed promising if the upcoming generation can be assured, through the preservation of industries such as shipping, that it will remain so.

Every American should consider it his patriotic duty to support the merchant marine in its effort to expand trade and thus strengthen the maritime industry. In the words of Mr. W. J. McNeil, president of the Grace Lines, in his address at the annual meeting of the American Society of Naval Engineers, May 4, 1962, "Let's not sell short the American merchant marine—it can be a winner."

Dr. John P. Walsh, U.S. Department of Labor, Comments on Scope of the Manpower Development and Training Act at Annual Conference of the President's Committee for Employment of the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the annual conference of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped was held in Washington, D.C., May 9–10, 1963. As a member of the President's Committee it was my privilege to attend a portion of the conference, and to meet with responsible leaders in the rehabilitation field to discuss problems facing our handicapped citizens.

Among the important areas under consideration at this significant gathering were: the effect of automation on employment of the handicapped; the problems of workmen's compensation as they relate to the handicapped; the outlook for the mentally handicapped; and, progress made by government and private industry in employing persons with severe disabilities.

One portion of the meeting was devoted to a panel presentation on the subject of automation, manpower, and training, and the conservation of human resources. Giving worthwhile comment on this vital question was Dr. John P. Walsh, Deputy Director, Office of Manpower, Automation and Training, U.S. Department of Labor. Dr. Walsh spoke helpfully on the scope and aims of the Manpower Development and Training Act. He pointed out that since its inception in 1962, the total program of Manpower Development and Training Act has brought forth some 1,150 approved training projects under which 39,500 handicapped persons are scheduled to be trained. These projects also represent 160 different occupations, and are scattered through 49 States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

Dr. Walsh further said that:

> In the dynamic industrial economy of the future, when retraining will doubtless be considered a basic fact of everyday life, the retraining of the handicapped will assume its rightful place—as a well-integrated part of the whole nationwide retraining program, not the dominant part of it, but a very necessary one if we are ever to approach the ideal of full employment in the sense that each individual should become all that he is capable of becoming.

Mr. President, I request that the message of Dr. John P. Walsh at the annual conference of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, May 9, 1963, be printed in the appendix.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUTOMATION, MANPOWER AND TRAINING, AND THE CONSERVATION OF HUMAN RESOURCES

(Remarks by Dr. John P. Walsh, Deputy Director, Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training, May 9, 1963)

Widely quoted in the press was this trenchant sentence in the opening paragraphs of the Manpower Report of the President:

"The ideal of full employment, in the large sense that each individual shall become all that he is capable of becoming, and shall contribute fully to the well being of the Nation even as he fully shares in that well being, is at the heart of our democratic belief."

The goals of a free society in which the individual is paramount are to give that individual full employment and to enable him to be fully contributing and fully sharing. Unfortunately, we have been falling short of these goals.

During the past 5 years unemployment has averaged 5½ percent a year while at the same time the numbers at work are the highest in our history—over 68 million in April 1961. Long-term unemployment in particular has increased over the past several years.

Where does long-term unemployment, the most disheartening kind, hit the hardest? At those with the least skills, education and training; at minority groups, at those disadvantaged by age or physical or emotional handicaps. These are the ones who would seem to have greatest cause for fearing the technological revolution now taking place in our productive economy, the relentless march of automation and the resulting dislocation of people and the obsolescence of skills. Often handicapped persons have had to train themselves under difficulty to perform useful but highly specialized jobs which they can do despite their disabilities. Then they find themselves faced, because of technological unemployment, relocation of industry, merger, or a shift in military procurement to begin the search again for occupations they can perform. There is the prospect that this new occupation also will change or be eventually performed by a machine. There may be little prospect of becoming reemployed in their home communities. Too, the handicapped worker often finds it more difficult than the nonhandicapped to relocate in another area where jobs are available. Depending on the degree of independence he has, his family ties and responsibilities, and his age, he may be particularly affected by a lack of mobility.

Then there is the big hurdle of employer specifications. The employer tells his personnel office, and the local employment office, that he wants people who are sound in limb. This tends to limit training as well as job opportunities. It doesn't help the handicapped to know that these specifications usually become tighter in periods of labor surplus.

At the same time that basic changes in the economy are affecting the employment stability of the handicapped and the nonhandicapped workers, a flood of young people—some 26 million during this decade—are entering the labor market at a faster rate than they can be absorbed. Among them are handicapped youth who must compete with their nonhandicapped counterparts, as well as with adults displaced from their jobs.

Where are the answers to these perplexing problems? Economic growth which creates new jobs is part of the answer. Another response can be found in training programs that provide skills in demand. There are many job opportunities available if the individual has the right skill at the right place at the right time.

The Manpower Development and Training Act provides one more means of helping Americans become all that they are capable of becoming, one more training response to meet the evident need. There are many others; existing vocational education courses, public and private; on-the-job training opportunities, apprenticeship programs; technical training; and, especially for the handicapped, the Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program which provides training along with physical restoration and counseling services.

It is not intended that Manpower Development and Training Act replace any of these other activities. In fact, the act specifically prohibits the use of Manpower Development and Training Act training to reduce existing training activities. Manpower Development and Training Act is intended to, and does, offer some innovations and advantages not prevalent in existing training programs. Among others are these:

Relatively short-term, concentrated training of as much as 40 hours per week, but not more than 52 weeks.

2. Allowances while in training for as long as 52 weeks at approximately the average un-

employment compensation rate—without a means test.

3. Priority for adults with family responsibilities.

4. Reasonable prospect for employment after training—training programs are set up only where there is such a presumption.

5. Flexibility in the kind of training, with the chance of using classroom, on-the-job, refresher, upgrading, or new skill learning.

These innovations and flexibilities built into the Manpower Development and Training Act enable us, in its administration, to make a substantial effort to insure that handicapped workers have an even chance to compete with others in learning and doing the jobs they are suited for. That's all they ask for, really. That is the reason that policies under the act require that there be no discrimination against applicants because of physical handicaps, as well as age, color, and the like. The State employment security agencies and the State vocational rehabilitation agencies, cooperate very closely with each other in achieving this purpose. Actually they have been doing so for years. But early this year the Labor Department's Bureau of Employment Security and HEW's Office of Vocational Rehabilitation emphasized in instructions to their respective State counterparts the importance of cooperation under Manpower Development and Training Act to provide the very finest of service to handicapped job applicants, so that their "trainability" can be restored or improved. This cooperative arrangement, in essence, calls for first, dissemination of information on training opportunities; and second, consideration by the Employment Service, as the selection agency, of vocational rehabilitation clients referred.

It might be well at this stage to give you some idea of the present and future scope of the Manpower Development and Training Act total program, which has been operating since September 1962. Then I shall try to point up particularly the participation of handicapped persons in the program and our current efforts to improve this, as well as some of the problems.

To date, approximately 1,150 training projects have been approved; 39,500 trainees are scheduled to be trained in these projects; 160 different occupations are represented.

The projects are scattered throughout all the States except Louisiana, and in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam. Occupationally, these projects run the range from waiter and farmworker to highly skilled or technical specialties such as draftsman, aircraft sheetmetal worker, and bilingual stenographer.

Appropriations under the act total $70 million for this fiscal year, and are planned at $165 million for the next fiscal year and at $165 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, with the States matching funds during the last year. With this money, the Labor Department and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare hope that about 50,000 unemployed or underemployed persons will be trained and be placed with this year's funds, 140,000 with next year's and 280,000 with the funds the year after.

How many of these 470,000 will be handicapped persons? Perhaps we can make a projection on the basis of a sampling already made of 6,737 persons selected for training courses. Of these, 482 had definite handicaps under the terms of the definition used by the U.S. Employment Service. Essentially, these are persons who because of physical, mental or emotional impairments have more than usual difficulty in finding employment or changing jobs.

This amounts to 7.2 percent of the 6,737 trainees. Seven and two-tenths percent of 470,000 is 33,840, which represents the number of handicapped persons who can reasonably be expected to be trained or retrained during the life of the Manpower Development and Training Act in its present form.

Of course, very few people expect that June 30, 1965, will see the end of the Manpower Development and Training Act. It, or something like it, is a necessary accompaniment to the rapid industrial changes which will continue into the indefinite future. Automation, which reduces physical demands of work, is likely to increase the number of jobs which can be performed by handicapped persons. But the handicapped person will have the training and intellectual skills which are constantly moving upward. In this light, the figure of 33,840 appears to be a modest one indeed.

The 7.2 percentage quoted above can be placed in a perspective when we consider that 4.3 percent of the new employment applications with the public employment services in the calendar year 1962 were from handicapped persons.

In addition to those handicapped persons who enter regular courses, special training projects of an experimental and demonstration nature can be set up for workers with special problems. In this type of project we do not use our usual approach.

In planning a regular Manpower Development and Training Act training project we ordinarily work from the job to the people. That is, we determine what and where the job opportunities are, and then what are the sources of unemployed and underemployed people to be trained for those opportunities. In a special project, being planned for culturally or physically handicapped, we work from the people to the job. In other words, we determine first what are the needs and capabilities of the group being considered, and then what jobs can be trained for which offer a reasonable expectation of employment. That is what has happened in the preliminary planning for a project at the Institute of the Crippled and Disabled in New York. The project is designed to demonstrate effective means of counseling, testing, training and placing handicapped workers. The Institute, in cooperation with public agencies, will select, train, and place 100 handicapped workers in a dozen occupations like electronics assembler, machine operator, optical benchman, and clerk-typist. The results of this project should be of immense value in pointing to ways to better serve the handicapped.

In the maelstrom of today's restless, churning, and infinitely complex society, there are numerous handicaps which workers have which are just as real and just as disabling as physical, mental, and emotional handicaps. The lack of functional literacy, inability to speak or understand English well, and the simple fact of being over 40 years of age are examples of the kind of disadvantage which often represents a greater obstacle to the achievement of maximum utilization of the work force than difficulty in walking or seeing.

Under the Manpower Development and Training Act, something is being attempted in relation to all groups whose handicaps are recognized as special problems. There are more than 50 experimental, demonstration or regular projects in operation, being planned, or actively developed over the country for people of diverse physical, cultural or educational handicaps.

We don't want to bog ourselves down in a semantic morass. Actually, anything which prevents utilization of any individual to the best of his capabilities is a handicap. However, the dividing line between the kinds of handicaps which concern the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped and other handicaps is a fluid one. The Manpower Development and Training Act is concerned with them all.

As an example of Manpower Development and Training Act resources used to overcome a cultural handicap, there is a big project for training 500 school dropouts in Cincinnati. Educationally and culturally disadvantaged youth will be counseled and tested simultaneously with the development of job opportunities, so that the job opportunities uncovered and the results of the counseling can be meshed together into specific training courses.

In addition to demonstration projects, we have a number of regular Manpower Development and Training Act projects which are planned for the handicapped. For instance, Ohio has a project for training blind persons in the business management of vending stands and concessions, going beyond what the Randolph-Sheppard Act is doing in Ohio.

The potential of persons with distinct hadicaps, whether cultural, mental, or physical, cannot be evaluaed through the usual methods. The effect of the handicap and the degree of adjustment cannot be predicted as well as they can with persons without such limitations. In many of the special projects work tryout techniques of evaluation are planned. Sheltered workshops are being used for both evaluation and basic training. Prospective trainees will actually be tried in a variety of work situations to determine those for which they are best suited.

The results of these special or demonstration projects should be invaluable in assisting us in planning the future course of training the handicapped under the Manpower Development and Training Act. They should show us better how to plan and conduct training for handicaps which are compensable, such as deafness, and handicaps which are correctible, such as functional illiteracy.

We will make the findings of these projects available to the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped for dissemination through the network of Governors' and community committees on the employment of the handicapped.

We still expect, however, that the bulk of the handicapped members of our work force who are trained under the Manpower Development and Training Act will continue to be selected, trained, and placed under the regular processes of the act. There will be tens of thousands of these, some clearly identifiable under a statistic, some not identifiable as such.

In the dynamic industrial economy of the future, when retraining will doubtless be considered a basic fact of everyday life, the retraining of the handicapped will assume its rightful place—as a well-integrated part of the whole nationwide retraining program, not the dominant part of it, but a very necessary one if we are ever to approach the ideal of full employment in the sense that each individual should become all that he is capable of becoming.

An Excellent Community Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, problems of health and welfare are assuming a role of increasing importance in many of our communities. Both individuals and communities are faced with these problems, and very often they do not know where to turn for help or a solution.

I have just received a very interesting booklet which could serve as a guide for other communities to emulate. It is a comprehensive directory of health and welfare resources in a five-town area in my district of eastern Connecticut, which was prepared by the local chapter of League of Women Voters The five towns where these services are listed for the benefit of all who may need them are my hometown of Putnam and the neighboring towns Eastford, Pomfret, Thompson, and Woodstock.

The directory, which lists 87 different health and welfare agencies in the area, is the result of 2 years of research by the League of Women Voters of Putnam. Over 140 different groups, organizations and agencies were studied for possible inclusion in the directory. League workers conducted personal interviews, correspondence and contacts by telephone in an effort to obtain full information on these agencies, their functions, and their services.

Among those included, to list only a few, are agencies which help the blind, the mentally retarded, the alcoholics, the dependent children, the mentally and physically sick, the unmarried mothers, the aged, the unemployed, the disabled, the emotionally disturbed, and others. There are the agencies working in the field of adoption of children, the nursing homes for the elderly, the ambulance services, the cancer clinics, the children's centers, the hospitals, the juvenile courts and family relations courts, the schools for vocational rehabilitation, the family counselling services, the consumer protection services, the religious groups and veterans organizations which perform certain social functions in the community, the State and local welfare agencies, and others.

All in all, the 61-page directory renders a great public service and fills an important need. It is a guide for the whole community, but should prove to be of special significance to doctors, lawyers, ministers, priests, schools, libraries, social workers, community leaders, and others.

The directory was prepared by a committee of the league headed by Mrs. Eli Kogos and Mrs. John Gould as cochairmen, assisted by Mrs. George Child, and the following committee members: Mrs David Bates, Mrs. Peter Santos, Mrs. Carl Jacobson, Mrs. James Johnston, Mrs. Louis Edman, Mrs. Edward Bernier, Mrs. Richard Woodcock, Mrs. Benton Blair, Mrs. Oscar Richards, Mrs. Jerry Adams, Mrs. Eric Olander, and Mrs. Rodney Snedeker. Mrs. Benton Blair of East Woodstock is the president of the league.

The League of Women Voters of the Putnam area, and the ladies of the committee listed above, deserve special tribute for a job well done. They have rendered a great service to their community, and this should serve as an example to other communities. I congratulate them for their high public spirit and for their efforts to help their fellow men in these trying times.

What the Farmers' Vote Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the farm bureaucracy and some political leaders seem unable to read the lesson written by the Nation's wheat farmers by their votes in last week's referendum. Mr. Richard Wilson gives them a helping hand in the following article from the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of May 26.

WHAT THE FARMERS' VOTE MEANS

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—It will be 90 days or so before any one can say positively that wheat farmers are to be on their own next year without the controlling or guiding hand of the Washington farm bureaucracy.

As late as early October, Congress could enact a program of limited effectiveness on the 1964 wheat crop and thus cushion the sudden shift from a controlled to a nearly free wheat economy.

In any case, price supports will not be at the $2 level, controls will not be compulsory and a large area of freedom will be restored.

The opportunity is present to move into a rational program of acreage retirement, provided its cost is not too large, and in this way adjust more slowly to a virtually free wheat economy. It will not be done without hurting someone, and this is to be regretted.

But if it can be done it will be a stirring example for the rest of agriculture, and a contribution of immense long-range importance in reestablishing farming as an enterprise of private responsibility.

This is not to say that farmers should not organize and execute joint plans to protect themselves and their interests and win the income they deserve. They should and will do this with the help but without the control of Government.

This was the lesson of the wheat referendum, and it is one which neither the farm bureaucracy nor, I fear, the President, quite understands. They cling to the idea that the effects of lower prices will be so severe that wheat farmers will see the light next year and come hungrily back to the fold.

That, of course, could happen. But there is little in the results of the wheat referendum to suggest that this will be the case.

Farmers voted in this referendum knowing that they were taking a chance on lower prices, and on the enactment of new legislation to cushion the adjustment.

They decided in overwhelming numbers to take those risks in order to get rid of controls they had and tighter ones in prospect. To a farm bureaucrat, steeped in the doctrines of economic controls, such an attitude is incomprehensible: Why would anyone trade a sure thing on $2 wheat for such abstract ideas as freedom from Government controls?

Triumphs of the human spirit, it seems, are not confined to our spacemen; they find expression in the more mundane matter of growing wheat.

It seems quite clear that a majority of wheat farmers thought they had had enough of the mandatory system in effect since 1953 and wanted to go along an opener road even if it cost them something.

The wheat referendum was important in dramatically illustrating to the farm bureaucracy what it would not otherwise believe: that farmers do not like and would avoid, if possible, strict controls. The vote also gave the city dweller a little different image of the farmer, at least the wheatgrower. He was not, after all, willing to sacrifice anything for a Government handout.

Beyond all this, the wheat referendum has probably halted the movement to extend the system of compulsory control to other areas—feed grains, livestock, milk. This alone is a constructive result.

No one knows if the growers of wheat can maintain their high resolve under the pressure of lower prices. But then, too, no one knows that nature will not once again intervene in one of its dramatic downward adjustments of supply.

But if wheat farmers can stand the pressure, if it can be demonstrated that they can arrange their affairs without the control of Government, they will have made a tremendous contribution. For they will have pointed the way out of a dilemma that has burdened the Nation for three decades.

Congressional Stepchild

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, people in all parts of our country are interested in the happenings here in the District of Columbia. Certainly a clear indication of such interest is a recent editorial in the Harmony, Minnesota News. Because I believe that the concern voiced by this weekly newspaper in the First Congressional District of Minnesota is representatives of the thinking of much of the Midwest, I want to share the editorial with our colleagues:

CONGRESSIONAL STEPCHILD

Washington, D.C., the "city of magnificient distances," long regarded as one of the most beautiful in the world, the city that belongs to no State but to every State and to each of us, is in big trouble.

Many Americans believe, since the Capital City was established by the Federal Government "to create a residence for the Government where it should have absolute and unlimited control," that Uncle Sam takes care of the budget and local residents don't pay taxes. The truth is, of course, that the cost of running the city is born mainly by the taxes on its private citizens—as every where. Because it occupies about half of the city's area, there is an uncertain and inadequate payment from the Federal Government.

All cities have their fiscal troubles. But in Washington—

The Federal Government pays no taxes. In addition to occupying half the city's usable land, Federal requirements have set up hundreds of embassies, legations, ministries, military missions, purchasing missions and so on which also are exempted from all taxes.

The Federal Government is No. 1 employer—and most of its employees who work in Washington live in the suburbs and pay no income tax to the city.

Tremendous expansion in Federal hiring in recent years has skyrocketed the costs of providing municipal services to these nonresidents and tourists.

Because Americans want their capital to be beautiful, Congress—and the original plan of Major L'Enfant demand wide, treelined, costly streets and avenues. All municipal construction must conform to rigid (and costly) Federal esthetic standards. Even the height of private buildings (and their tax yield) is restricted so they will not overshadow monumental Federal structures.

In earlier years, Congress financed half of the city's budget. Today, the arrangement is a matter of annual debate. Since the change, lump sums have ranged from a high of 39.5 percent in 1924 to a low of 8.5 percent in 1964. In 1963 it is only 12.07 percent despite the dramatic increase in city housekeeping expenses all over the country.

Under the yearly hit-or-miss handling of dwindling income to meet increasing costs, the grandeur of a city that was once described as "Paris—with a Southern accent," can only crumble. Only congressional action can save it.

To stimulate such action while there is yet time, the Federal City Council, a private, nonprofit organization of local and national leaders, is appealing to Americans in all 50 States to urge their Congressmen and Senators to do the right thing by the beautiful but beleaguered city that belongs to all of us.

The New Haven Riddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, this morning's New York Times carries an editorial on the situation of the New Haven Railroad, which is coming perilously close to collapse. This is something that simply cannot be allowed to happen. The Times is absolutely right:

> It is unthinkable that this railroad should stop hauling commuters in New York. We cannot give up on this one.

Besides being of key economic importance to my district and to the Nation's greatest port and business center, the New Haven Railroad is an essential link in the Nation's defense transportation system. Its freight-hauling services, like its commuter operations, are indispensable to the economy of the Northeast. For this reason, Congress and the National Government are deeply concerned in its welfare. I submit the Times editorial for the RECORD as a means of calling the attention of Members once more to this increasingly critical problem:

THE NEW HAVEN RIDDLE

A few days ago the court-appointed trustees of the bankrupt New Haven Railroad announced that they planned within a month to petition for curtailment or abandonment of New York commuter service. This has an ominous but familiar sound. The public has heard the cry of "Wolf!" so many times from the railroads, and the New Haven especially, that it shrugs off alarm. But the wolf is not far from the door this time.

The railroad has now become so weak that it seems unable to take advantage of what nourishment is offered. It is the captive of the court, its stock removed from trading on the exchange, its freedom to maneuver restricted to a downhill slide. It wants to merge with a prospectively merged Pennsylvania-New York Central. Those roads shun it as an unhealthy partner.

It is easier to describe how bad things are than to prescribe remedies. Some experts challenge the view that commuter service is the major source of loss. But the mere fact that the New Haven's troubles seem thus far to defy solution does not excuse any retreat from trying. It is unthinkable that this railroad should stop hauling commuters into New York. We cannot give up on this one.

Will Clayton: Groundbreaker in Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Elmo Roper, the distinguished public opinion analyst, recently wrote an article in the Saturday Review, entitled "Will Clayton: Groundbreaker in Ideas."

Because Elmo Roper is one of our most dedicated citizens, who over the years has shown a great deal of interest in projects of international trade and civil rights, in which I have also been active, I wish to call attention to Mr. Roper's very fine article by having it appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article follows:

WILL CLAYTON: GROUNDBREAKER IN IDEAS

(By Elmo Roper)

Whatever the 87th Congress failed to do, it produced one outstanding bipartisan achievement: the passage of the Trade Expansion Act, the first fresh trade legislation in nearly 30 years. Behind this newest step toward lifting obsolescent trade barriers lie long years of unremitting effort by one man who has devoted himself, more than any other living American, to the cause of free international trade. The man is William L. Clayton. He has left his mark upon history—without, curiously enough, being fully appreciated by his contemporaries. America owes him more than it knows.

For the better part of a long lifetime (he is 83), Will Clayton has fought patiently, persistently, and with unshakable conviction for a dream. The dream is of a world living in peace and prosperity, linked by the ties of free trade. His devotion to that dream has led him far beyond the traditional free trade philosophy of his Southern origins to espouse radical innovations in America's relationships with the world. His story is one of old-fashioned American virtues, enlightened by the insights of a deeply inquiring mind, enriched by compassion, and lifted to the point of greatness.

His career began in a familiar American mold. Born of poor parents on a cotton farm near Tupelo, Miss., he left school at the seventh grade to help support his family, and ended up a multimillionaire in the cotton trade. Yet he was always something more than the hero of a Horatio Alger saga, and the "something more" was the quality of his mind and vision. His breadth of outlook led him inevitably to an involvement in the national scene. He early became convinced of the folly of economic nationalism, and in the late 1920's and early 1930's he became a champion of free trade. During World War II, as he served in a series of Government assignments, the second central idea in Clayton's thinking took firm hold: the interdependence of free nations. In the years just after the war, as the first Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, he had the opportunity to develop both strands of his thought, and to work for their expression in Government policy. In the spring of 1947 he lent his ideas and energies to the formation of the International Trade Organization, which he hoped would result in multilateral tariff reductions and free the currents of international trade. But the times were not ripe; in a world recovering from war, the tide of economic nationalism was running high.

The other stream in Clayton's thinking came to more fruitful expression. Convinced that Europe was on the brink of political and economic disaster, he wrote a memorandum to his friend, Secretary of State Marshall, in the spring of 1947, urging "prompt and substantial aid from the United States." He specified the amount of aid needed, insisted that America could well afford to provide it, and urged that both the Secretary of State and the President "make a strong spiritual appeal to the American people to sacrifice a little * * * to save Europe from starvation and chaos." The Secretary responded, made his historic Harvard speech, and the Marshall Plan—which might well have been called the Clayton Plan—was born. Men high in political life in Europe know of Clayton's role, but in the United States Clayton has never been given proper credit for this achievement—through no fault of General Marshall, who spoke many times of Clayton's enormous contribution to the European recovery program.

Clayton also felt that another step was needed for full European recovery: European economic federation. Quickly he expanded this concept to include the United States and joined the Atlantic Union movement to work for closer ties among the world's democracies. He became one of its stanchest supporters, and when I succeeded to the presidency of the Atlantic Union Committee following the death of Justice Owen Roberts, there wasn't a week when I didn't need, and get, the help of Will Clayton. One incident I shall never forget is a visit we paid together to persuade General Marshall to join our movement (which he did). General Marshall proved receptive to our philosophy but at one point he turned to Clayton and asked him this question: "If you unite only the NATO nations, you will have a white man's club—do you plan to stop there or will the gates be open to other democracies?" Knowing Clayton to be a lifelong southerner and at that time never having discussed the subject of race with him, I was anxious to take him off the hook and so answered Marshall myself. I said that the Atlantic Union Committee had no official position on this question but that I could speak for the 9 out of 10 members who felt it would be fatal as well as wrong to have just a white man's club and the doors would indeed be open to any experienced democracy that wanted to join. Marshall was satisfied with this and started to go on to another question, but Clayton at that point leaned forward and interrupted to say, in his quiet southern accent, "I just want to add that I think it is more like 10 out of 10 who feel as Elmo does, and that certainly includes me." Will Clayton needed no "northern liberal" to take him off the hook on the subject of race relations.

In recent years, Clayton has been commuting regularly from Houston, Tex., to meetings in Washington of the Atlantic Council, and in late 1960 he visited most of the NATO capitals in Europe, using his tremendous influence there to help set up the NATO Citizens Convention. With Christian Herter, he was co-chairman of the U.S. delegation to the convention, which recommended the outlines of supranational institutions for the Atlantic world; and he didn't miss a meeting. A year ago he spoke out again for his first love, free trade, urging the passage of the Trade Expansion Act, for which the 1961 Herter-Clayton Report on Foreign Economic Policy had served as background. The act has passed, and it only remains to translate its intentions into trading reality. What had, in 1947, seemed a nostalgic dream of the past was in fact a vision of the future.

It is impossible to pigeonhole Will Clayton; his life and thought are shot through with paradoxes. A hard-headed businessman, he has given great sums of money to liberal causes in which he believed. In many ways a conservative, he initiated and supported programs that broke new ground in business, government, and international relations. These are some of the paradoxes of a man, who drew great inner strength from his origins, and then went on to transcend them. He kept what he found good in the past, discarded what was irrelevant, and went on to become one of the outstanding economic thinkers and statesmen of our century. His vision has always been broader than that of those about him, and he has been true to that vision. Once convinced that a course of action was right, he has never wavered. Undiscouraged by misunderstanding or opposition, he has been prepared to spend years gently and courteously convincing others of its wisdom. Often he has stood alone—but not for long, because the vigor and vision of his ideas attracted followers, and one of Will Clayton's chief assets is his ability to get the best of these followers to become leaders. So it never seemed to be his ideas that won; for Will Clayton always keeps himself in the background, caring only that the right thing be done and not who gets the credit. He is the most modest man I have ever known, and, in my opinion, our greatest living American.

The Simplified Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, numerous Members of the other body today are introducing jointly a resolution urging that the complications of the nuclear test ban issue be swept away and that the U.S. effort be directed at a simple treaty banning testing in the atmosphere and under water. It is a pleasure to note that this concept was originated by one of our own colleagues in this body, Hon. CRAIG HOSMER of California. The following editorial carried in the Los Angeles Times on May 15, 1963, discuss the Hosmer proposal:

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 15, 1963]

HOSMER'S TEST BAN PROPOSAL

The continuing argument over the need for three, seven, or umpteen annual inspections to police any nuclear testing ban recalls the medieval dispute over the number of angels able to stand on a pin point.

And, apparently, it is just about as incapable of resolution.

The United States and Britain are pressing for the larger number of inspections. Russia insists the smaller number is adequate, in view of modern detection devices. Result: impasse.

The United States has just canceled a scheduled series of three underground nuclear tests in Nevada. An unpublished note from Premier Khrushchev apparently gave some hope of reaching a test ban accord if the tests were scrubbed. (Other sources said Russia threatened a whole new series of tests if the U.S. tests were resumed.)

There remains an uneasy feeling that Russia would evade any regulatory agreement, even if Khrushchev's offer of three annual inspections were accepted by the West.

In this unpromising atmosphere, Representative CRAIG HOSMER's suggestion has a forthright and practical appeal.

HOSMER proposes that Russia and the West agree on prohibition of undersea, surface, and atmospheric tests. This would eliminate fallout. Moreover, present monitoring techniques would quickly unmask any violations.

This would require no surrender of U.S. principles, and would halt the endless bickering at Geneva over the requisite number of onsite inspections. This one dispute has precluded any exploration of other avenues toward a workable world pact to curb nuclear weapons.

The Hosmer plan would leave Russia and the West free to conduct underground tests. The plan may not be perfect, but it would eliminate the fallout hazard, and it carries with it some possibility of agreement.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

TULANE UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF LAW,
New Orleans, May 20, 1963.

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: Enclosed is a copy of a letter which I wrote to the editor of the New York Times and which he refused to publish. It defends the report of the Civil Rights Commission relative to Mississippi and in effect it concerns the situation in Birmingham, Ala., relative to the rights of the Negro people. As it raises important constitutional matters I regret that the New York Times rejected it. My purpose in writing to you is to invoke your aid in making the content of the letter known, perhaps by insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or otherwise, at your discretion. My idea is that the Constitution of the United States, which requires the United States to guarantee republican form of government in the States largely justifies the report of the Civil Rights Commission and requires the presence of national troops in Alabama.

Sincerely,

MITCHELL FRANKLIN,
Professor.

(Details concerning my place in American life can be found in Who's Who in America and Who's Who in the South and Southwest. The constitutional idea stated above was formulated by me about a year ago in an essay "Interposition Interposed," published in Law in Transition, the journal of the National Lawyers Guild.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It is unfortunate that President Kennedy has said, in response to the suggestion of the Civil Rights Commission, that "he did not have and did not want the power" to deny national funds to the State of Mississippi (the New York Times, April 20, 1963, p. 1, col. 2). A reign of terror exists in parts of the South, directed against recognition of the constitutional rights of the Negro people. In effect, "cold" civil war is being waged against the United States. As parts of the South may be regarded as a political and cultural disaster area, the report and suggestions of the Civil Rights Commission relative to Mississippi should not be curtly dismissed.

In regard to the power of the United States to deny national funds to such cold war Southern States, it should be recalled that the Constitution (4.4) requires that "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of government * * *." In the Federalist No. 43, Madison indicated that this text could justify the "interposition of the general Government" against States. "But a right implies a remedy," he said, "and where else could the remedy be deposited, than where it is deposited by the Constitution?" By thus recognizing a national responsibility to maintain Republican form of government in the States, the federalism of the Montesquieuan conception of the Constitution of 1787 is subordinated to Democratic national or Rousseauan ideas. It is hardly necessary to suggest that qualities of constitutional republicanism may be derived from constitutional texts relating to civil rights. It is recognition of these constitutional rights which is aggressively denied in certain Southern States.

The constitutional guarantee of republican form of government states responsibility which the President says that he does not want. Certainly, this constitutional text states the responsibility of the Congress, which it, too, up to the present has not wanted. It also states the responsibility of the Supreme Court, which in the past it has also said that it does not want.

The Supreme Court has avoided its responsibility to guarantee republican form of government on the ground that the constitutional text may present political questions beyond its competence. However, if the Supreme Court deems itself incompetent because political questions are involved, both the President and the Congress may be reproached if they ignore or regret political problems presented to them by history.

However, the Supreme Court itself in the past has not been justified in refusing to exercise power, for the constitutional text requires the United States to guarantee republican form of government in the States. Although the recent decision of *Baker* v. *Carr*, regarding judicial power to compel reapportionment in the States, does not rest on this text, Mr. Justice Frankfurter, who dissented, said the majority of justices in effect were inspired to decide as they did by the constitutional text relating to republican form of government. It may develop that the Supreme Court would recognize the responsibility of the entire United States, including the Supreme Court, the President, and the Congress, to guarantee republican form of government within the States.

MITCHELL FRANKLIN.

Protecting Suspect's Rights, We Guard Our Own

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include excerpts from a Law Day address by Judge David L. Bazelon of the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C.

The speech is a fruitful evaluation of the much-discussed Mallory and Durham rules as well as the scope for protections we should accord suspects in criminal cases.

The address follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 5, 1963]

IN PROTECTING SUSPECT'S RIGHTS, WE GUARD OUR OWN

(By David L. Bazlelon)

Unlawful behavior in the District has been attributed to a variety of causes—the Mallory rule, the previously existing cussedness of the human race, the Durham rule, and soft sentencing policies—a charge which ignores statistics showing that District felons average a longer stay in prison than do felons in the States or in other Federal jurisdictions. The average length of time served by felons is 40.4 months; in the States it is 28.3 months; and the average of all Federal jurisdictions is 19.5 months.

Other alleged causes of District crime have included the inadequate number of juvenile court judges, the absence of corporal punishment and a consequent breakdown of discipline in the schools, and so on. Still other reasons have been reached for and found. Not yet sun-spots, however.

During August there was a phenomenal rise in the crime rate, something like 16 or 18 percent. I discussed the increase with a veteran police officer. "For such a marked rise," I said, "you must have some sort of explanation."

"Oh, yes, it's quite simple," he replied. "You see, August was a very wet month. These people wait on the street corner each morning for a truck to take them to a construction site. If it's raining, that truck doesn't come, and the men are going to be idle that day. If the bad weather keeps up for 3 days," he continued, "we know we are going to have trouble on our hands—and sure enough, there invariably follows a rash of purse-snatchings, housebreakings, and the like."

Then he added: "These people have to eat like the rest of us, you know."

Thus one gets a painfully sharp illustration of the direct relationship between unemployment, poverty, and crime—a theme to which James B. Conant has drawn attention in his significant study, "Slums and Suburbs." The mass of school dropouts who are without employment and without hope of employment constitute the combustible material which Conant fears will burst into a crime explosion on a scale we have never known.

Both crime and morality have their generative conditions. We need a probing awareness of the conditions of physical and mental life which are essential to the standards of law and morality we have adopted.

We must ask ourselves these questions: Does the citizen of a free, affluent society have a right to health and development, and to the adequate upbringing on which these depend? Do we want this included in our concept of modern democratic citizenship? If we do, then the illnesses and other failures of our citizens who have been denied such an upbringing must be recognized as failures of society as well.

An alternative view is that society need accept only limited responsibility for the sick and miseducated individuals it creates; need give only limited recognition, for example, to mental illness and mental retardation in criminal proceedings; need not recognize that such disabilities are a large part of the problem of crime and that social illness accounts for much of the remainder. By that alternative, "we," the more successful part of society, get off easy.

When rules are enforced against individuals who lack the training and capacity to follow them, the rules become instruments of oppression. It is not always the moral prescriptions that are wrong. What is always wrong is our failure to recognize the conditions that are essential for their observance.

Many people feel that a discussion of criminal law and morality which does not concentrate on the issue of free will evades the real question. I am neither a philosopher nor a theologian and have no desire to discuss free will in the usual abstract terms. I am satisfied that the concept of morality relates to choice—real choices, the grounds of which are never exclusively spiritual, because they also concern the multiform conditions of social life.

If belief in free will necessarily assumes that there is always a choice and that all choices are equally available to differently situated actors, then I heartily disagree. Intellectual, physical and emotional capacity, wealth, social status, all extend or limit the area of choice. To impose moral responsibility where there is no real choice is exactly what leads to Sunday morality, since it equates the illusion of choice with actual choice.

We would do well to return again and again to the irony of Anatole France who said: "The law, in its majestic equality, forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under the bridges, to beg in the streets, and to steal bread."

One evades all sorts of disturbing problems if one talks in terms of complete free will instead of examining the range of actually available choices; attributes antisocial conduct to inborn evil instead of questioning how the evil got there; adheres to the strict responsibility of criminals and ignores the other side of the coin, responsibility for criminals.

I suggest that most problems concerning the responsibility of society finally come down to a question of the allocation of resources—material and emotional; what we give and what we fail to give; finally, understanding and money. One might even say, love and money.

This assertion of society's responsibilities may smack of "welfareism." But is there really any other way of looking at the matter? The most violent opponent of the welfare state concept probably acts much like a welfare state toward his own family.

The balanced budget promises to take its place as the number one rationalization of social irresponsibility.

There is probably no area in the entire administration of the criminal law which is not affected by preoccupation with economy of money and economy of human feeling.

While we debate how and whether to attack the roots of the problem, what measures do we and should we take against those who endanger us by violent crimes? No one would deny that we need vigorous law enforcement. But should this entail, for example, the use of terror evoked by the threat of setting beasts against human beings?

I refer, of course, to the use of police dogs. Although I am not aware that this has reduced the crime rate, the police assert that it is effective. Assume for the moment that it is. A full-scale reign of terror might be effective, too. But could we respect ourselves if we instituted one? Can we pretend that resort to such tactics will foster respect for the law and not merely respect for brute force?

By measures such as these, perhaps you can force even the most unsocialized and antisocial people into a kind of submission—and not have to bother to look for the reasons for their plight.

Many people persist in thinking that withdrawal of legal rights and safeguards from those accused of crime would have a beneficial effect. We are told that crimes cannot adequately be solved if the police are not permitted to make arrests for investigation. And we hear that the rules established in the Mallory and Durham decisions increase our crime rate by enticing lawbreakers from outlying areas into the District.

I doubt that the perpetrators of crime calculate the length of time during which they may be interrogated by the police before deciding where to snatch a purse, or consider that, if caught, their chance of landing in a mental hospital instead of a prison may be greater here than it would be elsewhere.

I suspect that the causes of aberrant behavior run a good bit deeper than this, and that the factors which trigger it are less subject to rationalization. But suppose I am wrong. Suppose, for instance, it could be shown that the Durham rule increases the crime rate. Then we should have to weigh the morality of punishing mentally ill and mentally disordered people by putting them in prison or by putting them to death. Perhaps we could even go so far as to abolish the insanity defense.

But, as Justice Cardozo remarked: "If insanity is not to be a defense, let us say so frankly and even brutally, but let us not mock ourselves with a definition that palters with reality. Such a method is neither good morals nor good science nor good law."

Some of the measures which are advocated to deal with the problem of crime raise serious issues under our Bill of Rights. We have generally assumed that we are not subject to arrest unless the police have probable cause to think we have committed a crime. But the police tell us they need to make arrests without probable cause and solely for investigation in order to solve crimes. Such experience as we have had since the District Commissioners' courageous action to halt arrests for investigation does not bear out this contention.

But even if the position of the police should later prove to be factually correct, we should have to decide whether such arrests violate the fourth amendment, as the local bar is convinced that they do; and if so, then whether the fourth amendment must be abandoned in an attempt to stem the crime wave.

I urge that we face the constitutional issues which lurk in some of the proposed solutions to the crime problem. I do not mean that we should consider whether the words of the Constitution can be juggled so as to reach a desired end, but whether what is planned would in fact offend the letter and the spirit of the Constitution. I suspect that sub rosa infringements of constitutional guarantees are more dangerous than frontal attacks.

When we talk about arrests for investigation, lengthy police interrogation prior to arraignment, and the like, the subject under discussion is not you or me. We don't get arrested without probable cause because, to put it plainly, we don't look as if we would commit acts of violence and we do look as if it might not pay to trifle with our rights.

So the issue really comes down to whether we should further whittle away the protections of the very people who most need them—the people who are too ignorant, too poor, too ill-educated to defend themselves.

Though the direct effect of restricting constitutional guarantees would at first be limited to them, indirectly and eventually we should all be affected. Initially the tentacles of incipient totalitarianism seize only the scapegoats of society, but over time they may weaken the moral fiber of society to the point where none of us will remain secure.

Judge David L. Bazelon: "We must face the constitutional issues that lurk in some of the proposed solutions."

President Kennedy Applauded on Rights and Responsibilities Address in Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Banner praised President Kennedy for his recent address in Nashville, marking the 90th anniversary of Vanderbilt University and the 30th anniversary of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. Kennedy pointed out that rights and privileges go hand in hand with responsibilities and called for all people to assume and carry out their responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this editorial from the Nashville Banner, commending President Kennedy and his address, in the Appendix of the Record.

The editorial follows:

WELL SAID, MR. PRESIDENT—RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES GO HAND IN HAND

The Presidential speech delivered here Saturday was a credit to the principles it extolled; a challenge, at the individual level, for greater pursuit and fulfillment of the national ideals.

Its thoughts belonged to the occasion—for that related to the contribution of education as the refining process; with accent on the fact that it is the truth taught that holds within it the power to make men free.

The address was the climax of a highly satisfactory visit to Nashville for Mr. Kennedy, marred only by the absence of his old friend, Harold S. Vanderbilt, president of the Vanderbilt board of trust, who was scheduled to introduce the distinguished guest, when illness intervened. The Chief Executive expressed deep regret, both here and in a telegram to the great-grandson of the university's founder.

The speaker praised the role of the commodore's descendants as being one of the chief factors in bringing the institution to its present high stature, and had warm personal greetings for William H. Vanderbilt, great-great-grandson of the founder, and his son, William H. Vanderbilt, Jr., who represented the family on the notable occasion.

The theme of Mr. Kennedy's tribute to the university's 90 years, delivered in the stadium filled to near capacity, included a survey of precepts, never more needed, uniting rights with responsibilities as twin factors in full measurement to the function of citizenship. It cannot be overstressed, or safely neglected at any level of teaching—from primary grades to and through the graduate level—that the possession of one entails the other.

That is no dogmatic assertion, nor a cliche of theory and idealism. It is a principle without which free society would collapse, and the pattern of a government of law give way to anarchy.

President Kennedy treated it well, as he did the references to liberty and learning as the two touchstones of Vanderbilt University—"truly inseparable, if not indistinguishable. For liberty without learning is in peril—and learning without liberty is in vain."

Respect for law which is the foundation of free government, requires meticulous adherence to its orderly processes, not only on the citizen's part, but at the level of government, itself, where law is made and administered. As it is an instrument protective of rights, and for redress of injuries, even so does it bestow—in point of responsibility—a sacred trust on those executing it.

In truth, where liberty has no learning, it becomes license—as in a human jungle. And where learning has no liberty, it is enveloped in despotic chains—lending itself to tyranny.

It is in the free world that liberty and learning, both priceless, have gone hand in hand. It is in America that freemen have built with the one the institutions of the other, to elevate with knowledge and opportunities for all, the nations of mankind. Thus to bless the world.

It is in America that men, sensitive to that obligation, have invested their resources, time and energy, to build these institutions. Their impulse of philanthropy and leadership has been dictated by no central authority, commanding response, but by the desire of service measuring to their own responsibilities as a legacy of trust.

Such was the background of the institution where President Kennedy was speaking Saturday; and the very facts he recited were in acknowledgement of the spirit that founded, has perpetuated, and enhanced Vanderbilt University.

It was a ringing speech, as it was, in other particulars, the appeal to reason * * * for social order under law, by exercise of responsibility on all sides where interests seemingly are in conflict. Its conciliatory spirit, for evenhanded justice, needs accent in Washington * * * as the fountainhead of Federal exercise, as much as elsewhere in the country.

As a state paper of reasoned domestic policy, it ranks among the best.

Hon. Francis E. Walter

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues on the occasion of the 69th birthday of "Tad" Walter. I have come to regard him with great admiration and affection, as have all of us. He is truly a remarkable man, possessed of great intelligence and energy, and he has unstintingly given of himself for the benefit of this House and the people of the United States. I have learned much from him, and am truly sorry he cannot be here today to hear the deserved praise of his fellows.

Government Steel Mill in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to a letter which I recently received from an Ohio constitutent, Mr. Clifton A. Shinquin, who lived and worked in India from July 1920 until the end of 1938. In his letter, Mr. Shinquin expresses a deep concern over the proposal of the United States sending funds to India for the construction of a steel mill which will be owned and operated by the Indian Government. Mr. Shinquin's letter has many good thoughts which I believe would be of interest to the Members of Congress. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AKRON, OHIO,
May 15, 1963.

Re government steel mill in India.
Hon. FRANK LAUSCHE,
U.S. Senator from Ohio,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LAUSCHE: I read in the papers that the Kennedy administration is planning to give to the Government of India several hundred millions of U.S. taxpayers' dollars to build a steel mill in India and that it will not be a profitable concern for a number of years. I am 100 percent opposed to giving away my tax money for this purpose, particularly since we are running a deficit.

I lived and worked in British India from July 1920 until the end of 1938. That was during the bad old days when the British were in India with a balanced budget, famine fund, export surplus and at a time that did not cost the American taxpayer anything more than a few consulates in the major port cities. I am now retired, trying to live on a pension that will not increase as the dollar falls apart from big giveaway programs and wasteful spending.

In 1920 I first met Nehru at Amritsar. At that time he appeared to be playing both ends to the middle, but in any event, to the advantage of J. Nehru. Thus if he wants a steel mill, that is fine, but not at my expense. I used to call on the Tata Iron & Steel Co. (TISCO) at Jamshedpur and at the Indian Iron & Steel Co. At TISCO, the superintendent of blast furnaces (from Youngstown) always stated that the object of the TISCO mills was to make money but Nehru's gift mill will not break even for many years.

If a company in the United States gave away huge sums of money when the company was operating in the red, Bobby Kennedy would have all the directors in jail for stealing the stockholders' funds and causing grave weakness to the firm's finances. I agree with that procedure. But the same policy should be applied to the concern known as the United States of America and its stockholders known as taxpayers.

May I request that you vote to stop giving my money away in India—and a lot of other countries that should paddle their own canoe.

Very truly yours,
CLIFTON A. SHINQUIN.

Henrietta Means Joins Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the ranks of the congressional press corps recently have been thinned by the departure from them of one of the most capable and most diligent of the coterie of women correspondents assigned to the coverage of the activities of the U.S. Government.

The decision of Miss Henrietta Means to join the staff of the Voice of America is one which will without question be of great benefit to this important arm of our oversea information program, because it has been my observation that whatever Miss Means undertakes to do, she does well.

But her decision to leave the ranks of the men and women who cover this Congress will be regretted sincerely, not only by her colleagues in the profession, but by those of us in the House, and in the other body, whom she has covered for the past 13 years as a part of her daily duties.

Miss Means came to Washington from my hometown of Charleston, S.C., as one of the two correspondents for the two daily newspapers of that great port city of my State, the News and Courier and the Charleston Evening Post. But as a working partner in a small Washington news service, she has had occasion to be the Washington correspondent for a dozen or more newspapers and radio stations scattered between such far-apart places as Portland, Oreg., and Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

Through her work, she has gained an enviable reputation, for hard work, for accurate reporting, for fairness in her dealings with public officials, with her associates, and with her clients—and also for her success in retaining her modesty and other ladylike qualities in the highly competitive and aggressive field of Washington news coverage.

When the historic College of Charleston, of which I am alumnus, holds its annual commencement exercises, Miss Means, who was the salutatorian of the class of 1943 at this institution, will be honored as its woman alumnus of the year. This is indeed an appropriate recognition of a former distinguished student who has had a distinguished career in the field of journalism.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in my remarks a copy of a recent report in the News and Courier, concerning the selection of Miss Means and Mr. Robert Smalls as alumni of the year at the College of Charleston.

The report follows:

SMALL AND MEANS NAMED ALUMNI OF THE YEAR

A textile company executive and a career woman journalist have been named Alumni of the Year by the College of Charleston Alumni Newsletter.

Robert S. Small, class of 1933, and Miss Henrietta Means, class of 1943, were the subject of a feature article in the May issue of the Newsletter.

Mr. Small is president and treasurer of Woodside Mills, Greenville, S.C., and a director of Dan River Mills. He is a trustee of the college.

Miss Means recently was appointed to the headquarters staff of the Voice of America where she will work in the preparation of special English broadcasts aimed at persons who have a limited understanding of the English language. She majored in languages at the College of Charleston and was an honor student in six languages. Until joining the Voice of America, she was for 13 years an active working partner in Hamilton-Means Associates, a Washington, D.C., news service. She will retain her business connection with the company but will devote full time to her new work.

Mr. Small, who lives in Greenville, has been associated with Woodside Mills since 1951 and was named its president in 1958. He is a director of the South Carolina National Ban, Liberty Life Insurance Co., Piedmont Natural Gas Co., Featherknit Fabrics, Textile Hall Corp., and Carolinas Capital Corp. He is currently president of the South Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association, and a trustee of Greenville General Hospital. He also is on the advisory board of both Furman University and Converse College.

Mr. Small is married to the former Sallie Tyler of Charleston. They have five children.

Salute to the Vice President and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on May 24, 1963, pays a wonderful and deserved tribute to two great Americans, the Vice President of the United States and his charming and beautiful wife, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson:

SALUTE

It appears to be the fate of Vice Presidents to serve in relative obscurity. But this ought not to obscure the usefulness of what they do in quiet ways. In particular it ought not to obscure the warmth and unstinting compassion with which Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON has used his office for human and healing purposes—or the extraordinary degree in which he has been helped in this service by a lady of exceptional grace, his wife.

A week ago Vice President JOHNSON was given the Distinguished Service Award of the Capital Press Club and accepted this tribute to his efforts in the field of civil rights with an expression of faith that "the day will come when it is not necessary nor remarkable to give or receive human rights awards—not necessary or remarkable simply because justice will be colorblind and all men and women will be judged on their merits and not on irrelevant considerations of ancestry."

And last night at Cleveland, the Volunteers of America gave the Ballington and Maud Booth Award citation to Mrs. Lyndon Johnson "in grateful recognition of her devoted, untiring, and outstandingly successful efforts to marshal the forces for good in our land in behalf of the less fortunate, particularly those who suffer from economic and social disadvantage."

Both awards were richly earned. And we presume that the Vice President will take no offense if we salute with particular appreciation a lady who holds no public office but has nonetheless rendered unstinting and indefatigable public service. Her countrymen owe her the warmest gratitude.

Cotton-Subsidy Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, the action of the House Committee on Agriculture last Thursday, May 23, establishes a precedent, if Congress adopts it, of further supply management of cotton by Government bureau rather than helping the industry correct the problem gradually. The following editorial in the Washington Post of today points out the need for prompt reappraisal of suggestions discussed over the last 5 months in committee:

COTTON-SUBSIDY FOLLY

The House Committee on Agriculture voted to compound error with folly when it reported out an administration measure which heaps subsidy upon subsidy in a futile effort to protect both cotton growers and domestic textile manufacturers. The bill would add an additional $260 million to the taxpayers' burden.

In order to afford American cotton growers access to the competitive world markets, Congress granted them an 8½-cent export subsidy, thus establishing an incongruous two-price system. The two-price system in turn conferred a significant cost advantage upon foreign textile mills which Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina would offset by still another subsidy to the domestic cotton manufacturers.

But this proliferation of subsidies will not solve any problems Even if the price disparity is eliminated by a second subsidy, the domestic cotton mills will find it difficult to compete against their counterparts in Hong Kong and Japan, and they will clamor for additional tariff protection. And if protection is refused, Mr. COOLEY's next logical step would be to request subsidies for the wholesalers and retailers of high-priced domestic cottons.

The only effective means of resolving this manmade dilemma is to dismantle the two-price cotton system, and to replace it with direct cash payments that would be equivalent to the difference between the world price level and a price per pound that would provide growers with adequate incomes.

Fearful that this grotesque creature will not long survive, COOLEY declared that "unfortunately, this bill, of such vast importance, dealing with the livelihood of millions of workers—producers, the trade and workers in the mills—has become involved in partisan politics. Notice has already been served upon me that Republicans will not support the legislation. I am, therefore, not confident that the bill will be passed by the House."

We hope that Mr. Cooley's fears are thoroughly justified and that both Republicans and Democrats will join hands in rejecting this affront to economic rationality.

Justice to the Cardinal Mindszenty Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in the May 9 issue of the Wanderer, a national Catholic weekly, there appeared the following article, "Justice to the Cardinal Mindszenty Foundation," which I would like to recommend that my colleagues read:

Justice to the Cardinal Mindszenty Foundation

(By Rev. John E. Coogan, S.J.)

When Bishop Cuthbert M. O'Gara, C.P., emerged from 2 bitter years of imprisonment at the hands of the Chinese Reds, he expected, as he later said, that he "would find everywhere, among our American Catholics particularly, a seething indignation against the monsters who were torturing priests, sisters, and lay people in China and elsewhere in the world." "Instead," he confessed, "I found an appalling indifference to, and even ignorance of, the desperate fight going on." Evidently a widespread educational organization would have to be formed, even if such eyewitnesses of Communist atrocity had to form it.

The outcome was the Cardinal Mindszenty Foundation (CMF), established in 1958 and directed by 14 clerics (including 4 bishops headed by Bishop O'Gara), all with firsthand experience of the Communists. The organization was a success from the start. Today its 5,000 study groups are active in every State of the Union, in all Canadian Provinces, and in several Latin American countries. Its radio program, "Dangers of Apathy," is carried on more than 100 stations, coast to coast, and has featured such anti-Communist authorities as Cardinal Cushing, Herbert Philbrick, and Eugene Lyons. CMF has distributed over 100,000 copies of anti-Communist literature, undertaken many research projects, has a growing list for its monthly report, has put on many seminars, and has a Latin American educational program which includes translations of documents and tapes.

But the dominant liberal opinion in this country was and is—not anticommunism—but anti-anticommunism. And so opposition to CMF arose, even within the household of the faith. Surely the most unexpected opposition came from the Department of Social Action, NCWC. Its assistant director, Father John F. Cronin, S.S., with sensational press notices, launched a pamphlet called Communism: Threat to Freedom, that seemed to make anticommunism the chief danger. He avoided any mention of CMF in his pamphlet itself, but in his press release he implied that CMF was both a financial racket and an irresponsible source of division. When CMF replied that "the CMF has never solicited any money from anyone, and exists solely by virtue of the volunteer labors of the council and officers," Father Cronin withdrew his financial racket charge. But the liberal journals had been given their cue and thundered forth, "Catholics assail right extremists. Church opens drive against national disunity. NCWC prepares for million distribution." Advertisements for the pamphlet echoed that sensationalism, adding, "Here Is the Catholic Position on Communism and the Controversial 'Extreme Right.'" Thus the launching of this pamphlet written by a priest-assistant in a department of the NCWC sounded like an Orson Welles' radio version of the War From Outer Space. (A full commentary on that attack is given in Double Standard, Double Think, and Double Talk, Headlines, Post Office Box 333, Westport, Conn.

Shocked by Father Cronin's attack, Bishop O'Gara wrote him, asking an explanation. Father Cronin answered that his actual statement had been that the educational program of the CMF is good, but that often individual units get out of hand. These individual units, then, were the extremist, irresponsible operators.

"May I ask you to document your charges that 'often individual units get out of hand,'" Bishop O'Gara rejoined. "What units? How often?"

Father Cronin wrote CMF, asking for a complete set of the materials it had sent to members. The secretary replied, "Your 'request' for information is dated 1 month after the publication of your press release in which you made serious, false charges against the CMF. Under the circumstances, your interest in learning about the CMF comes too late. Your 'request' for information now is simply a confession that you made reckless charges in ignorance (we pray not in malice); after the damage of national publicity has been done, you start to look for something to clothe the careless calumny with an appearance of substance."

Father Cronin, however, continued his inquiry. Three weeks later he reported to Bishop O'Gara, "We did get reports from substantial sources that local groups were using extremist tactics. The enclosed copy of a letter by Mrs. Hartman is an example in point. Mrs. Hartman is a member of the CMF and CMF did send out an attack on the Foreign Policy Association. Not only are those attacks unfair and unjust to FPA, but the letter-writing technique, under these circumstances, is an example of what I call John Birch type of activity."

So the proof of the nationwide charge made by the social action department, NCWC, against a national Catholic anti-Communist organization operating under the guidance of 14 clerical eyewitnesses of Communist depravity, is one solitary letter, written by a lone woman, in criticism of the very controversial (to put it mildly) Foreign Policy Association. Moreover, that letter was written after Father Cronin's public criticism of the CMF, hence was no evidence of the misconduct he then charged. Finally, the letter made no reference to CMF.

The CMF was seriously injured by Father Cronin's still unsubstantiated attack. I know of no fairer use of this column than to try to right the wrong. Anyone interested in free materials on the nature of atheistic communism may address: Cardinal Mindszenty Foundation, Post Office Box 321, Clayton Branch, St. Louis 8, Mo. Remember, "In order that evil may triumph, all that is necessary is that the good do nothing."

Stop Red Cheating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following column by Mr. George Todt, which appeared in the May 22, 1963, edition of the Los Angeles Herald Examiner:

Stop Red Cheating

"Foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government"—George Washington.

The Nation owes a tremendous debt of gratitude to Congressman Craig Hosmer, Republican, of California (Long Beach), for his exemplary watchdog role as chairman of the Republican Party's Nuclear Testing Committee.

The field of nuclear disarmament is so vital to our national security that the GOP has set up a group to bulldog the striped pants set in Geneva now negotiating with the Soviet delegates there.

The Bolshevik idea of negotiating is summed up: "What's mine is mine; what's yours is negotiable."

THEY ALWAYS WIN

Their negotiators almost invariably have more guts than ours do. Result: They come away with our marbles. Our men usually prove quitters.

Already they have painted themselves into a corner at Geneva and we are very much on the spot. Let's go directly to the heart of the problem.

Simply put, if we have a nuclear test ban and/or nuclear disarmament, obviously we must have a cheat proof arrangement with the U.S.S.R.—or it is not worth the paper it is written on to us.

The Reds are notorious liars and have broken more than 95 percent of all agreements they have made with the West since Nicolai Lenin came to power in 1917—and frankly are not to be trusted.

Yet they are now insisting that their word must be trusted by us and our allies—or else. This is the old shell game and no diplomat worth his salt will buy it.

Great American defense experts the likes of Adm. Lewis Strauss, Dr. Edward Teller, and Congressman Hosmer can tell us truthfully that we need at least a minimum of 200 actual on-site inspections of the Reds annually if the nuclear test ban arrangement is to spell anything to the United States except eyewash.

FROM 200 TO 2

The generous Americans originally came down to a dangerous (for us) minimum figure of 20 or so—but the Soviet negotiators, hard boiled as they are, now have beaten our men down to a pitiful 2 or 3.

This is ridiculous on the face of it, but it is also tragic for the people of our Republic, because our unrealistic diplomats appear about ready to give in to their Red opponents. Are we to appease them again?

PUT UP OR—

If our so-called negotiators had any principle about them, they would say to our sworn enemies: "Put up, or shut up. You need this treaty worse than we do and you known it. Either give us adequate safeguards or we will walk out on you. We will give you nothing without an equal quid pro quo."

Our diplomats are derelict in their duty to the American people if they permit the Reds to foist an insane nuclear test ban on us which will automatically cause us to obey its terms—but allow the Reds to cheat.

Then they can go ahead and perfect nuclear weapons to use against us at a later date, while simultaneously our hands are tied. Cuckoo, what?

President's Failure in Foreign Affairs Creating Doublecross in Brazil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, recent news items from Brazil make it increasingly clear that the same failure to understand the situation on the part of the Kennedy administration which led to disaster in Cuba is now taking place with regard to Brazil.

The present Government of Brazil is brazenly doublecrossing the United States. Its rulers are openly apologists for far left principles akin to communism. They are pursuing a definite anti-American policy and they are using the money of American taxpayers to finance it.

Mr. Speaker, is it not time for Congress to demand that President Kennedy adopt a foreign policy in South America that is in the self-interest of the United States?

As to how we are subsidizing Brazil's doublecross, I refer you to the following column written by Virginia Prewett in the Washington Daily News of May 21:

SUBSIDIZING BRAZIL'S DOUBLECROSS

(By Virginia Prewett)

Brazil is a huge, beautiful, and underdeveloped country whose rulers for over 2 years have bucked U.S. foreign policy for Cuba whenever we took a firm tone toward Castro. Today, Brazil's rulers have embarked also on an open course of bucking U.S. foreign policy for Brazil.

Within the past 2 months, Brazil's President Joao Goulart and his Foreign Minister Dr. Francisco San Tiago Dantas have quite spectacularly broken a vital agreement with the Kennedy administration.

THEY KNOW

The speed with which they have splintered solemn promises solemnly made to Washington is almost without parallel. Thick-skinned Norte Americanos may not know that by this action Brazil has flung the United States a challenge. But Brazil's Latin American neighbors know.

The incident turns on the recent financial bail-out granted Brazil by the United States. In March, President Goulart sent Dr. Dantas to Washington to plead that Brazil might soon have to default on official and commercial debts—the equivalent of national bankruptcy. To get a U.S. bail-out of $398 million, the Goulart-Dantas team promised in writing to curb Brazil's rampant inflation.

Within short weeks, the two Brazilian leaders have done the opposite. They've restored Federal food and oil subsidies and agreed to a 60-percent pay raise for Government employees and the army. A new round of inflation is assured.

President Goulart and Dr. Dantas solemnly tell U.S. newsmen that political pressures forced them to do this.

PAYOFF

The truth is that the Goulart-Dantas following is powerful in the government employees' union that spearheaded the wage-increase demand, so the two leaders, in effect, pressured themselves. The huge raise will pay off a political debt to the Army, which sustains Senor Goulart's power, and is insurance for Dr. Dantas' election as Senor Goulart's successor in 1965.

President Goulart is often described as an opportunist. But his heir-apparent, Dr. Dantas, is wedded to his own set of principles. He remains viscerally anti-American, with a political philosophy little changed since he was a uniformed Brazilian Nazi before World War II.

President Goulart and Dr. Dantas have maneuvered the United States into subsidizing their political ambitions. Latin America is watching to see what President Kennedy's team does about it now.

Apathy to J.F.K. Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Wellington, Kans., Daily News, is reprinted in the RECORD without comment:

The New Frontier unleashed its broad domestic legislative program with not only vast enthusiasm, but total confidence. It was felt that the masses of the voters would rally to the cause and make recalcitrants in Congress bow to their wishes. Opposition was, of course, expected. But, the anticipations ran in the Kennedy echelons, this would be overcome by the Juggernaut. All the massive political resources and skills of the administration were organized with the utmost care and attention to detail—the same kind of care that made Mr. Kennedy's nomination and election an actuality—in order to get the machine moving.

What has happened, after months of debate, argument, controversy, wheeling, and dealing? As more and more informed commentators—including some who are personally favorable to the President and his ideas—are writing, the machine has blown a gasket. If it's moving at all, it is at a limping, one-cylinder pace.

The reason can be quickly explained in a single word, and that word is apathy. As Paul Duke of the Wall Street Journal puts it—and his view is typical—"New evidence of widespread public apathy toward President Kennedy's legislative proposals is darkening prospects for the 1963 New Frontier program. The evidence has been unearthed by lawmakers who communed with the folks back home during the 10-day Easter recess * * *. With remarkable repetitiveness, House and Senate Members report most voters in an aloof, couldn't-care-less frame of mind toward major measures pending in the 88th Congress." And he quotes a Democratic Congressman, who is solidly back of the President's program, as saying, "We seem to be at a plateau where people are satisfied with the status quo."

Oddly enough, the President's personal popularity, according to the polls and to what Members of Congress learned talking with their constituents, remains high—much, much higher than his domestic welfare program. This has happened before—Presidents Roosevelt and Truman found themselves, at times, in the same fix. In any event, at a rough estimate, here's how things look now:

Foreign aid—a heavy cut, of about a billion dollars.

The medicare plan for providing certain medical services to everyone within the Social Security System—hardly a chance of passing.

Extensive Federal aid to the public schools—no foreseeable chance.

Still tighter regulations on the pharmaceutical industry—extremely doubtful.

Further increases in the minimum wage—equally doubtful.

So the story goes. This leaves out of account the tax-cut, tax-revision program, the most ambitious of all the administration's domestic proposals. It, too, is in profound trouble. For one thing, the new rules recently adopted by the Internal Revenue Service, even though somewhat eased after waves of angry protest, make it tougher than ever on the individual taxpayer, and particularly on the man whose income comes totally from salary and who can claim no deductions other than the very limited standard ones. And there has been an important change in the rules covering other deductions. The burden of proof is now on the taxpayer, where it used to be on the Government. The keeping of records has been made more, not less, complicated. On top of all this, no one yet knows just how tough the IRS will ultimately prove to be in its audits, and this doubt and confusion hardly contribute to optimism and a go-ahead spirit on the part of the individual taxpayer.

Moreover, the proposed and possible tax cuts would mean little to the family in the average income bracket, hardly more than the increase in the social security tax that became effective on January 1 of this year.

Finally, there is a widespread fear that tax cuts without compensating reductions in spending would be exceedingly dangerous—and administration spokesmen see no chance at all for reduction of any substance.

Administration leaders press ahead, as they must, on behalf of the program. But, to repeat, the public response in general is just plain apathy.

Ratification of Holland Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Anti-Poll-Tax Act May Soon be Law." This article was published in the Washington Post on the 23d of this month. It indicates that the prospects are good for ratification, as a part of the U.S. Constitution, of the Holland amendment by next year. I sincerely hope the efforts put for the by the distinguished senior Senator from from Florida [MR. HOLLAND] will come to fruition, and that the fight he has waged for so long will be successful next year.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANTI-POLL-TAX ACT MAY SOON BE LAW

Chances are that the anti-poll-tax amendment will be part of the Constitution by the time of the 1964 political conventions. The proposed 24th amendment still needs the approval of four State legislatures to become part of the basic law of the land. Its success depends on 11 States whose attitude could change overnight. Four of the 11 appear likely to wind up in the ratification column. Thirty-four States already have approved the amendment which would outlaw payment of poll taxes as a condition for voting in Federal elections. Ratification requires approval by three-fourths of the State legislatures, or 38 States. In three States—Arizona, South Dakota, and North Carolina—the amendment either died or was smothered in legislative committees. Four States which have poll taxes—Virginia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Arkansas—still were alined against the proposal. A fifth, Texas, has moved a State law that would end it, but has taken no action on the amendment: Five other States—Kentucky, South Carolin, Wyoming, Louisiana, and Georgia—remained classified as "status unknown." Favorable responses, however, were expected from Maine, Oklahoma and New Hampshire. These, when combined with Texas, would yield the required 38.

Nothing Free From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, individuals, local communities, and States are slowly going broke accepting Federal handouts. Every time a public works project is approved with Federal aid it means that more money has been sent to Washington than will be returned.

If we would just stop and think of how much freight we are paying by sending our money to Washington to be worked over by the bureaucrats before dribbling it back to us, we would soon realize the States and local communities just can not afford Federal aid.

There is just no such thing as Federal aid. The Federal Government has no money. It can pay for projects only out of the money they take away from the people and the people always lose. For a slight indication of just how much it costs to get Federal aid I refer you to the following copy from an advertisement by the Warner & Swasey Co. in the June 3 issue of U.S. News & World Report:

WHAT'S THE POINT OF GETTING $1 THAT COSTS YOU $1.34?—PROOF THAT THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS FEDERAL AID

To get $3 billion in "Federal aid," 14 of the largest States in the country paid into Washington $4 billion, plus nobody knows how much "handling cost" which simply evaporated.

So, when some bureaucrat "offers" you a new road, a fancy public building, an extra airport, hadn't you better say, "No, thanks. Since I'll pay for it anyway, I'll buy it myself, and pocket the billion-plus dollars I'll save."

When, oh, when are we going to learn that obvious lesson in simple arithmetic?

Figures for the 14 States are for fiscal 1961, latest available: $3,218,900,000 "Federal aid" distributed to the 14 States, $4,313,500,000 estimated amount taxpayers in those States paid to finance total Federal aid.

Lowell Post Office Supervisor Builds Unique Fallout Shelter on Ocean's Edge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the criticisms of our civil defense program has been a lack of initiative on the part of many of our citizens. One man who has clearly exerted initiative and made a real contribution to our efforts in this field is Daniel Quill, of Lawrence, Mass.

Mr. Quill has designed and built a concrete shelter at his vacation home in Seabrook, N.H. For only $2,500 Mr. Quill's shelter and summer house combined more than meets the civil defense specifications of the Department of defense. This plan could and should encourage other Americans to undertake similar projects.

Under unanimous consent I am inserting an article by Frank E. Makarewicz, in the Lowell (Mass.) Sun describing the shelter, and the comments of Assistant Secretary of Defense Steuart L. Pittman in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

LOWELL POST OFFICE SUPERVISOR BUILDS UNIQUE FALLOUT SHELTER ON OCEAN'S EDGE

(By Frank E. Makarewicz)

LOWELL.—A postal supervisor in the Lowell office may be instrumental in revitalizing the fallout shelter program urged by Civil Defense authorities because he built a homey, attractive bunker that doesn't make people feel they're burrowing into a hole.

Daniel B. Quill designed and built the 15- by 18-foot concrete shelter this summer at his vacation home on Lowell Street in Seabrook, N.H. His shelter could be used as an apartment for a start for people wanting to build their own homes.

"I personally felt that the fallout shelter program had lost a lot of supporters and interest because people associate shelters with crawling into a dark hole to sit and wait in suspense and discomfort," Quill said, "so I made my own design."

Quill's shelter, which more than meets the specifications of the Civil Defense Agency, is lined with steel in the floor and walls. Even the roof, which is actually two roofs with a total thickness of about 17 inches, is reinforced with steel and has a steel beam supporting the 30 tons of concrete.

The shelter is built partly above ground and has a window that can easily be blocked up with solid cement and reinforced with standbags. A steel plate door is at the entrance that is gained by going through baffles that would greatly reduce fallout driven by wind.

In fact, Quill has arranged his shelter so the door could be opened if necessary, even during an alert period because the entrance faces eastward, meaning he would get clean winds from the ocean.

Inside the shelter, the designer who subcontracted the construction for an estimated $2,500, has painted the walls a bright yellow color. He has a stove and small pantry area, besides sleeping quarters, and toilet facilities.

He presently has commercial electricity, but hopes to put a generator outside in the future. Water he gets from his own well a few feet below surface. He has a hand pump for emergency.

The shelter can house five persons with its two permanent beds and three folding cots. Baggage rack-type shelves suspended from the ceiling around the walls can hold provisions which he intends to stock.

While being duly concerned with the specifications inside the concrete "apartment," Quill decorated the outside area to take the edge off its deadly serious appearance. His 30-ton roof becomes a pleasant sundeck that can be reached by stairs with ship's rope railings. He has placed a statuary fountain and potted plants to make it look like a summer patio.

Around the whole area, he has set up a sapling fence, giving his compound an appearance from the street of a fine summer home with a swimming pool.

So successful has been Quill's personal attempt to participate in the Government's fallout shelter program that it has attracted the attention of New Hampshire's civil defense director, Maj. Gen. Francis B. McSwiney who has sent representatives to look it over.

Although it could be the start of something big, the Lowell postal supervisor says he has no intention of going into the shelter-building business. "I built this shelter for family use," Quill said. "If it encourages many others to make livable shelters, my building will have accomplished a lot more than it was originally intended for."

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1963.

Hon. F. BRADFORD MORSE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Thank you for your letter of May 1, 1963, in which you requested comments on the fallout shelter design submitted by Mr. Daniel B. Quill, of New Hampshire.

Our engineers have carefully studied the newspaper clipping and attached plant and it appears it well fills the dual role of a utility apartment and shelter.

We are, of course, very pleased with the initiative shown by Mr. Quill in completing this project which apparently meets official Office of Civil Defense standards for family shelters, as outlined in the enclosure.

As you have requested we are returning Mr. Quill's material.

If we can be of further assistance please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely,

STEUART L. PITTMAN.

Word Versus Deed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Truman, Minn., Tribune has put together some editorial comments in which he finds vast differences between word and deed. Believing that my colleagues in Congress will find the words of D. R. Peterson of interest, I include the editorial in the RECORD:

WORD VERSUS DEED

Back about 80 B.C., the brother of Marcus Tullius Cicero advised the great orator that men prefer false promise to a flat refusal and that Marcus should remember this in all of his political affairs. Twenty centuries later, politicians haven't varied the formula for campaigning one iota—and we, the people, still swallow this swill.

In 1960 John F. Kennedy made Cicero look like a piker when it came to false promise. What did Kennedy say, and what has Kennedy done?

He said our country would move ahead "fastah" under his direction. Since Kennedy took office industry and business has been stifled and abused by the President. Kennedy has demonstrated more dictator traits than Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower combined.

In 1960 Kennedy promised America he could and would solve the unemployment problem. After 3 years of Kennedy administration, unemployment has increased to about 6 percent.

The farmer—remember all of those goodies he promised for the farmer? Well now, in 1963, the farmer is getting less for his pork and less for his beef than he has in many, many years.

In 1960, Kennedy (referring to Little Rock) said, "There is more power in the Presidency than to let things drift and then suddenly to call out the troops." The State rights Kennedy trampled on in Ole Miss are common knowledge, and he is repeating his blunder in Alabama this week.

In 1960, Kennedy said: "Let me say that I think it is extremely important that the United States maintain to the extent possible a sound fiscal policy and a balanced budget." Kennedy's budget is a record of $98.8 billion, topping expenditures in the peak World War II years, and he has built up a $27 billion deficit since he came into office.

In 1960 Kennedy said: "A greater use of the Small Business Administration and a more positive approach to the policies of management so lacking under Republican administration will do much to relieve the current problems of small business in this country." Since Kennedy has taken office small business bankruptcies have increased steadily, set an all-time high each year of the administration under the "positive approach" exercised. Altogether some 33,000 small business firms went bankrupt since Kennedy came into office, the largest 2-year total since the great depression.

In 1960 Kennedy said: "I am not promising action in the first 100 days alone—I am promising you 1,000 days of exacting Presidential leadership. I want to be a President who believes in working full time." In his first 2 years, Kennedy has been away from the White House 215 days, almost one-third of the time, vacationing, yachting, etc., at such places at Hyannis Port, Palm Beach, Newport, Glen Ora and elsewhere.

In 1960 Kennedy said: "Nepotism (political patronage to relatives) is dangerous to the public interest and to our national morality." Ranging from brothers to brother-in-law, Kennedy has brought his relatives into high administrative posts from the very beginning. Like Bob Hope says: "In America, we have two classes—the people and the Kennedys. And there are more Kennedys than people."

In 1960 Kennedy said: "I am not going to promise a Cabinet post or any other post to any race or ethnic group. That is racism in reverse at its worst." After he was elected Kennedy based his fight for a new Department of Urban Affairs on the promised appointment of a Negro to head it, tried to imply that opponents of the plan were anti-Negro rather than antiwaste.

In 1960, Kennedy said: "The dairy farmers of the country * * * the income has steadily dropped. The reason has been, of course, that this administration (Eisenhower's) has been manned by people with little imagination." Since Kennedy became President, his Secretary of Agriculture, the imaginative Orville Freeman, came up with the idea of throwing dairy farmers in Federal prison if they did not conform to his idea of how their industry should be run. Dairy income has dropped from 80 to 75 percent of parity under Kennedy's appointees.

The Upper Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a progress report has recently been released on the upper Colorado River storage project and centers attention on the accomplishments of this major water project which represents one of the most progressive steps in wise use of natural resources ever taken by this Nation. Although the project is confined to one area of the Nation, it has significance beyond the boundaries of the Upper Colorado Basin.

I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article on this subject which appeared in the Farmington (N. Mex.) Daily Times on May 23 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE YEAR OF THE FIRST HARVEST

The Upper Colorado River Commission has just released a progress report of the upper Colorado River storage project which focuses attention on the tremendous accomplishments of this gigantic undertaking.

As the commission, an interstate administrative agency created under the terms of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, pointed out, the year 1963 is a significant one for the storage project.

"The first crops grown on new project lands go to market. The first project power goes on the line. And the first recreational benefits on project lakes and reservoirs await an outdoor-minded America."

The Colorado River storage project is a phenomenal undertaking, as water-conscious people of the Four Corners well know. It culminates more than a half century of engineering research, planning, and interstate negotiations. The gigantic dams being built in the upper basin will stand as dynamic, functioning monuments to the ingenuity and hard work of surveyors, designers, engineers and laborers of our age, the commission is correct in emphasizing.

The first 7 years of the project have indeed seen remarkable progress. Our own Navajo Dam on the San Juan River was completed in 1962, the first of four great water storage units in the project to impound water. And as the seventh construction season rolled around, Flaming Gorge Dam on the Green River in Wyoming had been topped out and nears completion.

Glen Canyon Dam on the Colorado River also moved into the final stages of completion. Work was going ahead rapidly in Blue Mesa Dam on the Gunnison River in Colorado, a principal feature of the Curecanti unit, the latest storage unit to go under construction, the progress report noted.

Four multipurpose participating projects were completed in New Mexico, Utah, and Colorado, making much needed agriculture, industrial and municipal water available to the people in these States. Construction or preliminary work also was proceeding on other participating projects in the four Upper Colorado River Basin States.

Under authorizing legislation, the storage units will regulate streamflows and assure downstream users the delivery of their share of water. They will produce hydroelectric power and make development of water resources possible in the upper basin States. In addition, flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife development have been integrated into project plans.

This year water will back up behind the huge storage reservoirs at Navajo, Glen Canyon, and Flaming Gorge units, creating manmade lakes on lands once deemed trackless wasteland, the commission vividly has emphasized. And even as water collects, crews will be in the field erecting powerlines to carry the power that will be generated by the massive turbines in the dams' power plants. The storage project transmission system will be operated interconnected with other transmission systems under joint agreements between the Federal Government and public and private utilities operating in the areas.

The project will mean a great deal to this country. It will give birth to new markets, will stimulate trade, broaden the tax base, bolster national economy and also aid national defense, the commission is confident.

Because of these great advancements, we can truly agree with the Upper Colorado River Commission's statement that 1963 is "the year of the first harvest" in the upper Colorado River storage project.

Short Memories in the State Department?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, while I believe we recognize that it is neither practical nor appropriate for the Congress to undertake the day-to-day formulation and implementation of foreign policy, and that these functions must rest with the Executive, we cannot serve responsibly if we do not respond to conscience and object to moves, or projected moves, in the area of foreign policy which we view as inconsistent with national principles and the national interest.

In this spirit, I was impelled recently to address the Secretary of State in objection to strong indications that the United States is considering seriously establishing full diplomatic relations with the Communist regime of Hungary.

While I was not favored with such a communication, responsible press reports have stated that Members of the Congress assigned to committees having a special concern for international relations received a memorandum suggesting that the Kadar government in Hungary had moderated its repressive policies to such an extent as to warrant active study of resuming normal diplomatic communication.

I cannot accept the implication that the presence of our Embassy personnel in Budapest, making contacts with Communist Hungarian officialdom and the Hungarian population, carries informational advantages which outweigh the new doubts such an arrangement would generate in the minds of anti-Communist resistance leaders throughout the world.

Has the United States forgotten, they will ask, that the blood-stained Kadar regime came to power behind the naked force of Soviet tanks which crushed the valiant uprising of freedom-loving Hungarian patriots?

Can we contend, in reply, that these brigands have cleansed themselves by refraining from killing many Hungarians lately?

If we are looking for additional governments to recognize, does not the national interest, and considerations of national character, dictate a priority for the recognition of a free Cuban government in exile?

By moving at this time for restoration of full diplomatic relations with the Kadar regime, the Department seems to be saying that it is time to forget the Budapest massacre, and after all, the Kadar crew represents a government in being.

By failure, to date, to encourage the efforts of free Cubans to form a government in exile, the Department leaves itself open to the question of whether it is suggesting that the Bay of Pigs, likewise, should be forgotten, for after all, the Castro crew represents a government in being.

Wheat Plan Smashed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial was written by Rolla A. Clymer and appeared in the May 23 issue of the El Dorado, Kans., Times. It reflects the opinion a majority of the Kansas editors expressed following the defeat of the wheat referendum:

WHEAT PLAN SMASHED

The American farmer is an independent cuss, and won't be shoved around. He asserted that independence in rousing fashion Tuesday by voting a loud "No" against the Kennedy administration's farm plan which would have enmeshed him a lot tighter in Government controls.

It was a hot fight, with both sides unleashing a mass of propaganda. Even the President's last-minute ringing appeal fell of deaf ears. The national vote stood at 547,161, yes; against 596,942, no—a favoring vote of only 47.4 percent which was far short of the required two-thirds majority. Those favoring the plan did not score even a simple majority. The whole deal was a smashing defeat for the Government.

In Kansas, the vote was 38,369, yes; to 53,210, no; for a total of 91,479 votes, with 14,464 challenged. The large number of challenge votes came because many farmers voted outside their home precincts. Their votes are legal but were challenged as a check on double voting.

Butler County voted about 3½ to 1 against the Federal plan.

The dominant influence of the American Farm Bureau, which fought the proposal sternly, was readily apparent in the Kansas vote.

Now the Kennedy administration, which spends most of its time dealing with foreign problems and gives as little attention as possible to those at home, still has the stubborn farm problem on its hands. Whether the Democrat-controlled Congress will try to pass some suitable, and more acceptable, farm legislation at the present session is a question. This newspaper believes that it won't. The disposition there will be to let the farmer stew in his own juice. This may be a human reaction to such a defeat, but it won't help much in the Presidential election next year.

Kennedy and his fair-haired Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, are counting on the big city vote next year to reelect the present administration. Even so, disaffection in half a dozen farm States might prove highly embarrassing. So the administration had better attend to its knitting. And if, by some change, the New Frontiersmen would come up with a program to give the American farmer some real help in his present plight, they had better not try again the rejected plan of trying to trade $2 wheat for a mess of restrictions that would tie the farmer hand and foot.

Soviet Will Not Pay for Participation in U.N. Yet Maintains Full Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, if the Soviet Union is successful in its announced purpose to "bury" us, they will have received much aid and comfort for many who have helped to make it easy for them. The Soviet Union refuses to pay its legal share of the cost of the U.N. Do we demand they pay up or get out? Not at all. The policy of the United States under the Kennedy administration is to find ways to increase the cost of maintaining the U.N. for the American taxpayers and to allow Russia to keep its full privileges in the club. These privileges include using the U.N. to assist the Soviet Union in its goal of the destruction of the United States.

For a serious study of what is happening in the United Nations and how the American people are being pressured to help ease the financial burden for the Communists and impose it upon our own taxpayers, I ask you to read the following article by Ken Thompson, editorial writer for the Dallas Morning News:

UNITED NATIONS DEEP IN DEBT

(By Ken Thompson)

By the end of June, the United Nations is expected to be approximately $120 million in debt. This in spite of the fact that only last September the United States generously underwrote half of a $200-million issue of worthless bonds which were supposed to put the U.N. back on its feet.

Over the years, the United States has contributed about half of the total cost of financing the U.N. and its many specialized agencies. In 1952, Congress passed an act prohibiting the United States from being committed to paying more than one-third of the U.N. costs. The act has been completely ignored.

Until 1957, we were paying more than 39 percent of the U.N.'s regular budget. At various times we have paid far in excess of one-third of the cost of the specialized agencies such as the World Health Organization, UNESCO and the Food and Agriculture Organization. We have contributed in excess of 53 percent of the money spent by the voluntary agencies such as UNICEF. We have also paid 49 percent of the total cost of the U.N.'s latest big projects for "peacekeeping"—or warmaking, depending on your point of view—in the Congo and the Middle East.

At the same time, the Soviet Union has set a record as the biggest single defaulter on U.N. assessments. Although a larger country than the United States, Russia has been given much lower assessments. It has been unwilling to pay even these. As of March 1, the Soviet Union owed $16.5 million on its regular assessments, $16.5 million on its share of the cost of the Middle East operation and $37.5 million on the cost of the Congo peace mission—for a total of $70.5 million.

Every other nation in the Communist bloc is also in arrears on its U.N. assessments. Last July, the World Court ruled in a 9-to-5 decision that all member nations are required to pay their assessments or face the loss of votes in the General Assembly. This decision, however, is not likely to be enforced. It was not a decision at all but merely an "advisory opinion."

If the Communists paid their share of the U.N.'s costs, the world organization wouldn't have to worry about a deficit. But as long as they refuse to pay their share, it is hardly just to expect the United States to make up the difference. When we do, we are indirectly subsidizing the Red bloc.

Why not just forget about the U.N.'s debt? After all, that seems to be the attitude of many of the U.N.'s strongest supporters in this country, as far as the U.S. debt is concerned. It does not see ironic that the same people who wring their hands in despair and fretfully predict that the world organization will collapse unless its deficit of $120 million is paid can take a completely indifferent attitude toward the U.S. deficit of $300-plus billion, 2,500 times as large.

Those who applaud President Kennedy's planned deficit of $12 billion this year as a boost to the economy ought to be gleeful at the prospect that the U.N. is going further into the red. But they aren't.

A typical attitude was expressed by the League of Women Voters in its official Washington newsletter recently. "Without a sound fiscal base," the newsletter warned, "the United Nations cannot survive." How can the U.N. be put on a sound fiscal base? Several methods were suggested as worthy of serious consideration by the league—including the preposterous idea that the U.N. be given the power to levy taxes. One such tax suggested was a flat levy of 2 percent on the world's gross product.

This would provide the U.N. with annual revenue estimated at $52 billion. The league forgot, of course, to mention that about one third of those dollars would come out of the pockets of U.S. taxpayers. Haven't we got enough tax collectors at local, county, State and Federal Government levels today without adding international revenuers?

Do We Now Have a Duplicate System of Government?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, with the broad expansion of Federal power we are now experiencing, the role of the States in our system is rapidly changing. In widening areas of governmental activity, the States are finding their own choices of action restricted by Federal law.

The doctrine of supremacy of Federal law was not destructive of our States so long as the area of Federal activity was limited to those powers enumerated in the Constitution. Recent constitutional interpretations have so broadened the scope of Federal power as to raise this question: Has our dual system of government become a duplicate system?

On May 23, I addressed a radio audience broadcast from Detroit on that question as follows:

> In this country, we have a dual system of government. There are two governments serving each of us. On the one hand, the government of our State—on the other hand, the Government of the United States of America.
>
> In the beginning, these Governments were not intended to duplicate each other. The great residue of governmental power was intended to remain with the State.
>
> The Government of the United States was intended to exercise jurisdiction over relations with foreign governments and to control domestic affairs in a very limited list of activities which were enumerated in the Constitution of the United States.
>
> During the first century and a half of our national history, the Government of the United States was a government far away. Most of the law which affected the ordinary citizen was enacted by his State, and it was the State government, rather than the Federal Government, with which he dealt, so there was no duplication of governmental service.
>
> Today, however, all that seems to have changed. Phrases in the Constitution of the United States which originally were intended to restrict the Federal power have, in this generation, been reinterpreted in ways which appear to vest power in the Federal Government, rather than deny that power. The result is that the Congress of the United States is enacting laws covering every facet of social, political and economic life.
>
> In the assumption that it has a complete legislative authority, the Congress of the United States is acting like a State legislature—and the role of the States in our system is being rapidly reduced.
>
> If the people of the States desire to retain and preserve an effective role for the States in our system, they must without delay reassert the power of State government in its proper function.
>
> If the present trend continues, the States will soon find themselves without power to make final decision in any issue.
>
> When the Congress enacts a law, that law takes precedence over the law of the State if the two laws conflict. As the scope of Federal control broadens and extends over matters traditionally left to the States, the States find their own areas of activity narrowed and restricted. More frequently a State finds that it cannot solve a problem as it would choose, but must conform with Federal law.
>
> Relatively few people are aware of the extent to which this Federal control is reaching into every decision of State government. The State cannot exercise its own will. More and more, its activity is being directed from the Federal Government.
>
> Certainly, this is not what was originally intended in our governmental system. If the people of this generation want to reduce the States to practical nonetities, that is, of course, their privilege. But they should be aware that these basic changes in the fabric of our system are being made and the basic question should be debated so that they will know what they are losing.
>
> This revolutionary change in the place of the States in our governmental system results not only from the intrusion of superior Federal power into those matters of concern traditionally supposed to be vested in the States, but there is also an attack to undermine the control which the State has always had over its own political subdivisions.
>
> Since World War II, Federal programs have been devised which deal directly between the Federal Government and the cities and villages within a State. The State government is bypassed in the program so that the cities deal directly with Federal agencies—and a certain uniformity of urban activity throughout the country is achieved, with the States which created those municipalities simply standing by on the sidelines.
>
> The device of Federal grants-in-aid to one State or municipal activity after another has proved a very effective weapon in the hands of those who are engaged in centralizing our governmental system.
>
> When Federal money is used in a program, then, of course, that program must conform to Federal standards. And Federal control always follows Federal grants-in-aid.
>
> Sometimes these controls are not unreasonable or objectionable in any way—except that they do, in every case, transfer the power of decision out of the local or State level of government into the Federal system.
>
> Before coming to Congress I was for many years a member of our State legislature. As a State legislator, I was concerned with problems of education, labor, the regulation of trades and business, conservation, agriculture, law enforcement, public health, mental health, social welfare, civil rights, and the problem of financing those activities.
>
> As a Member of Congress, I find I am engaged in dealing with the same problems, in the same fields of activity. I say truthfully that the Congress is occupying its time on matters which used to be left to the States. In fact, the Congress is making decisions in some instances which used to be left to city councils. In addition, we are here also attempting to handle problems of traditional and undoubted national concern as well as problems worldwide in scope.
>
> The Congress has not only taken power of decisionmaking from the States and vested it in the Federal departments—it has likewise surrendered over to the executive some of its own constitutional powers.
>
> This process of delegation of congressional powers, proliferated throughout the governmental system, together with the onrush of power from the States to the central government, is greatly changing the governmental system which was our national heritage.

Arthur Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker , in compliance with popular demand, so to speak, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD several of Art Hoppe's columns which appeared recently in the San Francisco Chronicle:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, May 10, 1963]

DEAR SCIENTISTS, GO DIG A HOLE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Our dedicated scientists, having throughly loused up the Van Allen belt, are busily turning their attention to other things. Like trying once again to orbit a band of needles around our earth in order to muck up outer space. And digging a $100 million hole in the ground in order to satisfy their curiosity.

It's high time, I say, that we laymen take a stand. And I've taken mine. I'm for the hole in the ground.

This, as you know, is called Project Mohole. And its goal is to drill through the earth's crust to see what's inside. As a layman, I wish to say this project meets all my highest aspirations.

Firstly, it will keep numerous Scientists occupied for years. And, "busy hands are happy hands," as we used to say in nursery school. Secondly, it doesn't sound as though anything will blow up. Which is certainly a blessing these days. And, most important of all, it's fantastically expensive. So we'll all be rich.

This last is a matter of economics. Which I don't understand either. But the prevailing theory among our Government economists is the Government must spend more money. In order to stimulate our economy. In order to make us all rich. Which certainly does make sense. To Government economists.

But the grave problem these economists haven't faced squarely is: Where can the Government spend more money without making somebody mad?

If the Government decides to spend more on public welfare, the Conservatives get mad. If it's for more missiles, the Liberals get mad. If it's a pork barrel project in South Dakota, North Dakota gets mad. And if it's more foreign aid, everybody will get violent. In fact, it's kind of a rule that whatever the Government does, somebody gets mad.

Not that the Government cares. But Congress does. And Congress has to approve all this spending. In fact, it's getting so our honorable Congressmen can't find a nice, safe, noncontroversial place to spend more money. Hard as they try.

So it's plain as day that what we desperately need to meet our current scientific and economic aspirations is a good, big, deep hole in the ground.

The only concievable objection, then, to Project Mohole is: "Are we sure the hole is big enough?" After all, $100 million is a mere drop in the budget. And fears are being expressed the costs won't even run that high.

Could we, perhaps, double the width of the hole? Or challenge Russia to a race to the center of the earth? Or even go through to the other side? Or, best of all, drill similar holes in each of the 50 States? Plus several in every undeveloped country? Thus spreading wealth and full employment throughout the entire globe.

In one fell swoop, we could knock off public welfare, missiles, pork barrels, and foreign aid. Our Congressmen could sit around safely appropriating zillions for nothing but more and more holes, thus assuring their incumbency forever. And all of us would be rich and happy. Everybody's aspirations achieved. Except we'd have to be a little careful where we stepped.

So the Hole Solution is the only answer. Speaking as a confused layman, I say it's inevitable. Yes sir, I confidently forsee the day when the human race, led blindly onward by an ever-more-bewildering technology, will no longer be able to distinguish its aspirations from a hole in the ground.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, May 13, 1963]

WE SHALL ENDURE—IN TRIPLICATE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

The trouble with newspapers, as everybody says, is they're always printing sensational, scary stories. Like: "War Imminent!" And in these troubled times I think we ace newsmen should try harder to ferret out happy, reassuring stories. Such as what we're going to do when the bombs fall. Because if we know our leaders have got plans, I'm sure we'll all feel more secure.

Nor are our leaders sitting on their hands. Typical of their planning ahead, I feel, is the new "Administrative Manual LOEOM 0799." Drawn up by our State Department of Employment for use by its local offices in the event of an "All-Out War With Attack on the United States."

The manual lists the step-by-step procedures local offices should employ when disaster strikes in order to cut through bureaucratic red tape. The manual is 48 pages long.

For example, you are a survivor of the all-out war. You crawl from the wreckage of your office or factory. What do you think of first? Unemployment insurance. You stumble down to the nearest State Employment office. The local administrator checks Administrative Manual LOEOM 0799. On page 2, it tells him precisely the drastic emergency procedure to follow:

"1. New claims: Use the DE 1101 set and in addition an affidavit on DE 455 showing base period employers and earnings by quarter. Compute the MBA and WBA using the benefit computer DE 3000. The 1101A will be stapled to the original 455 and batch filed by date. No attempt will be made to keep these documents in alphabetical or SSA number order."

And so forth.

But note that in the event of a war destroying our civilization, our DE 1101 sets, our DE 455s and our MBA and WBA data will not have to be filed in alphabetical order. It shows our leaders are facing reality with a steady gaze.

The manual goes on, page after page, with the most meticulously detailed planning for disaster imaginable. "Observe endorsement stamp control procedures in 117.515," it cautions grimly. "Prepare a letter, in triplicate, explaining all signature card changes," it warns forbodingly. And it takes up policy matters, too: "Veterans preference (should) be resumed as soon as possible." Or: "Refer older qualified workers where radiological contamination is present or suspected."

But most of all, of course, the manual is concerned about the supply of forms. "Local offices," it says, should have "a minimum of 1 month's supply of normal operating forms in their stock rooms at all times." But should the stock room suffer a direct hit, Heaven forbid, the manual contains sample emergency forms which can be duplicated by hand in the local office. Moreover, with each manual comes a package ominously labeled: "Open Only Under Extreme Emergency Conditions."

Inside are more forms.

So war may incinerate our homes, destroy our factories, flatten our very cities. But in the unearthly stillness that follows, we now know that beneath the radiated rubble will sound the heartening ruffle of papers, the staccato drumbeat of the stapler, the comforting whir of the mimeograph machine.

What could be more reassuring? For it proves, as our leaders keep telling us, that nothing, absolutely nothing, can destroy our system of government.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, May 14, 1963]

A PRACTICE THAT NEVER MAKES PERFECT

(By Arthur Hoppe)

You will be grieved to know I've had to abandon the red eyeball system of birth control. It was based, as you may recall, on a new pill which is perfect in all respects. Except it turns the gentleman's eyeballs bright red. And while I felt tattle-tale eyeballs would actually be an asset in human relations, there was always the specter of natural disaster.

One epidemic of chronic conjunctivitis, for example, and the human race would treble overnight.

Yet what then is the perfect solution? The Planned Parenthood League keeps telling us: "Practice birth control." And people everywhere with heartwarming dedication keep practicing and practicing. But the population keeps growing and growing. There is clearly a fallacy here somewhere.

What we need, I say, is not practice, but perfection. Such a breakthrough, however, will require all-new thinking. Perhaps we should turn our energies from methods to incentives.

Look how the incentives are stacked today. You produce a child and what do you get? The lady gets love, sympathy, a new wardrobe and a whole roomful of new furniture to rearrange. The gentleman gets a $600 tax exemption, hearty congratulations and perhaps even a small raise.

But what of the couple who, at no little self-sacrifice, give their all to save the world from the population explosion. What do they get if they produce nothing? Nothing.

Is this fair? No. Is it even rational? Absolutely no. What we must do, before it's too late, is emulate those nations of the past which have rewarded proud parents with baby bonuses. Except, of course, we'll do it the other way around.

Our new nonbaby bonus will be administered, naturally, by the Department of Agriculture. Which has vast experience in the field of rewarding nonproduction.

We might start with a child allotment program similar to the soil bank now enjoyed by wheat farmers. Husbands will be paid a cash bonus for each child they diligently don't produce. Indeed, the problems being identical, there's no reason the husband shouldn't benefit from all the aid programs the farmer now receives. Except perhaps for the help the farmer now gets in converting his fallow acreage into a recreational area.

A stiff tax penalty for each new dependent would be a boon. And we could work on the present dangerous image of parenthood: Black armbands on Mother's Day, homes for unwed nonmothers and the annual selection of the childless American mom of the year. With a good hard sell, I'm sure we could make kids unfashionable.

Eventually, the incentives of cash and conformity being what they are, I have faith in my heart that mankind will one day enter The golden age of perfection. Wherein no young lady will come within 10 feet of a young man and * * * Great Scott. What am I saying?

Well, it all goes to show that the Planned Parenthood League is dead right in a way: It isn't perfection that counts in life. It's practice.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, May 17, 1963]

A-OK IS NOT C-SATISFACTORY

(By Arthur Hoppe)

"Mr. Cooper (at liftoff). Fuel is go. Oxygen is go. *Faith 7* is go. She feels pretty.

"Mr. Schirra (in Mercury control). You look real go, Gordo. * * * You're smack dab in the middle of the go block.

"Mr. Cooper. Boy-oh-boy.

"Mr. Schirra. Have a good drive, Bub.

"Mr. Cooper. Thank you, Buddy."

And with these historic words, mankind's latest epic voyage into the vast regions of uncharted space began. It's a crying shame.

Don't misunderstand. No one is prouder of our space explorers than I. True heroes all. And I'm all for our space program. Couldn't be more so. But I can't help hoping I shall live long enough to see that golden day when America successfully launches the first English-speaking astronaut.

Perhaps this technological glossolalia has some purpose. Such as confounding enemy spies. But the problem is that it's already insidiously distorting our mother tongue.

In Washington, New Frontiersmen speak of "the present thrust of my opinion is toward * * *." Agency chiefs testify glowingly in behalf of their "ongoing programs." And "A-OK," as you know, is now common usage. Which is "D-barely passing," as far as I'm concerned.

True, the English language is ever changing. And I find purists a stuffy lot. But in this space age are we not perhaps being forced to absorb a new vernacular too rapidly? Take the minutes of our local PTA meeting last night.

"Madam Chairlady. Four, three, two, one, blastoff. Old business?

"Mrs. Hoskins (an elderly lady). As secretary of your committee to inspect and assess our mimeograph machine it is my tragic duty to report that it is, at the present time, inoperable.

"Mrs. Merkwiler (a young modern). No-go, eh? We have to get this bird off the ground. My thrust's toward an appropriation so she'll feel real pretty.

Mrs. Hoskins (huffily). I happen to feel reasonably pretty as it is. And as for some flibbertygibbets——

"Mrs. Merkwiler. Your tracking tapes are no-go, Bub.

"Mrs. Hoskins. And furthermore, when it comes to which one of us more resembles a bird——

"Madam Chairlady. Buddies, please. Let us all try to join together smack dab in the middle of the go block, as we say. Remember our PTA motto: 'All systems go (except progressive education).' A-OK, buddies?

"Mrs. Hoskins. Block? Go? Systems? Are you implying * * *? My word, it's driving me out of my mind.

"Mrs. Merkwiler (sarcastically). Have a good drive, Bub."

(There followed, the minutes show, a brief fist fight before adjournment for coffee and cookies.)

So you see what I mean. Communication's breaking down. And I'm against our heroes using a special language. The trouble is each of us wants to be a hero. So we emulate them.

And consequently I have the uneasy feeling that in one sense it doesn't much matter whether we or the Russians win the race to the moon. Either way, it's going to be grave defeat for us English-speaking peoples.

Disabled American Veterans Rehabilitation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, my attention has recently been attracted to the unusual record of effective rehabilitation services extended to America's disabled defenders and their dependents, without any charge to them, by the Disabled American Veterans.

I am very pleased to note that at its national convention in Atlantic City the Disabled American Veterans elected one of my constituents, Peter L. Dye, as national commander. Mr. Dye is an assistant attorney general for the State of Colorado and is a member of the Murphy-Barelli chapter in Denver. He has served as department commander of the State and as chapter commander. He has been a junior vice commander of the national organization and has served on its national finance committee prior to becoming national commander.

The Disabled American Veterans was formed in 1920 and chartered by a special act of Congress in 1932 under the name Disabled American Veterans. The DAV extends freely much needed personalized services of innumerable types to thousands of distressed disabled veterans and their dependents each year. This service is performed by the organization through its nationwide setup of fulltime national service officers.

During the last 10 years the staff of national service officers have reviewed 2,407,720 claims folders, have made 1,025,090 appearances before Veterans' Administration adjudication bodies, have obtained 670,172 favorable decisions which included 30,066 service connections, 164,250 compensation increases and 180,040 pension awards. In addition, as pointed out in the Congressional Record for April 3, 1958, by the Honorable Lee Metcalf, of Montana, now in the U.S. Senate:

> Thousands of claimants have been given pertinent, helpful advice, not measurable or recorded in the monthly reports submitted by each national service officer to the national director.

Veterans benefits are not automatically granted but the veteran must file his claim for consideration by Veterans' Administration Rating Boards. As stated in the Congressional Record of February 21, 1958 by the Honorable Charles E. Potter, of Michigan:

> Governmental benefits for handicapped war veterans are not automatically awarded. More claims have been denied than granted by the U.S. Veterans' Administration. Expert advice from an experienced service officer, who knows what is required, under many complicated laws, to justify favorable decisions by the Veterans' Administration, is sorely needed by the average disabled veteran as to his claims for service connection, disability compensation, hospitalization, medical treatment, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, etc. Scores of thousands of disillusioned disabled veterans are thus assisted each year in the proper preparation and presentation of their worthy claims for various governmental benefits legally available under only certain circumstances. Because it must act as judge and jury, in effect, in deciding whether evidence submitted is sufficient proof of entitlement, the U.S. Veterans' Administration recognizes that the accredited service officers of service organizations can and do thus perform a very valuable service and therefore furnishes office space to them and the authority to look through official claims folders.

According to a statement in the Congressional Record for January 1, 1961, by the gentleman from Texas, Olin E. Teague, chairman of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs:

> Each day thousands of veterans with tens of thousands of questions each a possible claim for veterans benefits turn to the Disabled American Veterans service officers for advice and assistance. If it were not for these capable and experienced men, who are themselves all disabled veterans, the Veterans Administration would be forced to provide a great number of additional personnel to deal with this added influx of daily visitors and, of course, at great additional cost to the U.S. taxpayer.

Moreover as stated in the official Record for April 27, 1959, by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Silvio O. Conte:

> Most of these service disabled veterans have probably assumed that the Disabled American Veterans has been getting some kind of financial help from the Government although no Federal money has ever been appropriated to the DAV.

The vital importance of such personalized service is reflected in a remark that appears in the Congressional Record back on July 17, 1941, by the Honorable Homer T. Bone, of Washington who said:

> Americans who help to provide security for America's disabled defenders thereby help to provide security for America.

Former Congressman Lawrence Curtis, of Massachusetts, who himself lost a leg during World War I, declared that:

> Americans who are grateful for the sacrifice of America's disabled defenders of parts of their bodies or their health, will generously support the vitally important service program so effectively operated by the Disabled American Veterans.

With all the statements above quoted I heartily agree. It is very interesting to learn that since its formation 43 years ago DAV, notwithstanding its restrictive membership requirements, has nevertheless maintained the largest staff of fulltime national service officers of any of the congressionally chartered organizations. Following World War II the field staff of the Disabled American Veterans was greatly expanded. With the cooperation of the Veterans' Administration which assisted in providing a 2-year course of vocational training, some 400 physically disabled veterans of World War II became full-time DAV National Service Officers. This expansion was financed primarily out of the net income derived from the very unique idento-tag, or miniature license tag project, owned and operated by the DAV without any promotional fees of any kind being paid to anyone.

I was astounded to learn that since 1942 nearly 2 million sets of lost keys have been returned to their owners because of the attached idento-tags. This was without regard as to whether the Disabled American Veterans had ever received any donations from these owners. However, there have been an increasing number of States which validate their license plates for more than 1 year. This has resulted in diminishing returns and has unfortunately resulted in diminished financial reserves. Nevertheless the DAV has continued its determination to provide its invaluable service in all of our Nation's 50 States.

Other sources of income have been developed although by no means sufficiently fast. Among these sources are bequests in wills, special trust agreements, direct donations from benefited veterans and their dependents, which incidentally comprise only a small percentage, and from contributions by socially minded Americans as to which, incidentally, income tax deductions are applicable up to 20 percent of each individual doner's annual net income.

An increasing number of corporations have also been making property donations to the Disabled American Veterans, as to which they are entitled to claim income tax deductions up to 5 percent of their respective annual adjusted gross incomes, with a 2-year carryover. Such property donations have included outmoded or unused furniture, equipment, machinery, materials, buildings and land—based on their market value, according to authentic appraisals furnished through the DAV without cost or obligation for the cooperating corporations—and including diverse types of surplus inventories at their currently listed prices. Such disposable property donations frequently turn out to be financially advantageous for the Disabled American Veterans. Sometimes increased employment opportunities for disabled employables result.

Income tax deductions for the donating corporations are frequently preferable as compared with the continued payment of personal and/or real estate taxes, insurance premiums, guard fees, and so forth, in continuing to hold such unused properties. Also taken into consideration is the valuable space otherwise rentable and the time and talent of busy officers required to sell his disposable properties as well as the additional income tax that might thereby be entailed. Such corporations, thus cooperating with the Disabled American Veterans as well as other charitable and educational institutions by their varied property donations deserve the gratitude of all concerned.

By supporting the Disabled American Veterans these individuals and corporations support one of the great benefits of a free Nation and that is to insure its

Nation's defenders a life of security and dignity notwithstanding disablement that may have been incurred during the mortal battles fought in the course of preservation of our free institutions.

Why Litton Buys From Small Businesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago Litton Industries convened a small business symposium as a result of encouragement by the U.S. Navy Office of Materiel, as will as the Small Business Administration. The senior vice president of Litton Industries, George T. Scharffenberger, presented at that time the excellent record of Litton in awarding procurement contracts to small concerns. The practical reasons behind such awards, and the success of Litton's practice was amply demonstrated in Mr. Scharffenberger's address, which I believe will be of interest to my colleagues:

WHY LITTON BUYS FROM SMALL BUSINESSES

(By George T. Scharffenberger)

Litton is now among the 100 largest companies in the United States and is delivering products at a current annual rate of more than half a billion dollars per year, but Litton Industries itself was small only 10 years ago. But we have some reasons that are more practical than our past relationships for giving more than 62 percent of our procurement dollars to small businesses.

I think it is appropriate at this time to state our record in this regard. Of the 3,500 vendors on our approved list, more than 75 percent are classified as small businesses. We made a recent survey and found that 65 percent of our procurements in excess of $10,000 were awarded to small concerns.

These figures are especially significant in view of the growth of Litton Industries, because its continued loyalty to small businesses is contrary to the normal practices of companies when they grow from small businesses to major industries. For example, 5 years ago the two Litton Systems divisions in the San Fernando Valley were subcontracting a little more than $4 million, of which 68 percent went to small business. As the dollar value of our subcontracting climbed steadily, the share given small businesses rose in proportion. Last year we awarded $41,475,000 in contracts, of which 62 percent went to small businesses.

Even without the incentives of sentimentality, the social implications of helping small business, or the encouragement given us by the Small Business Administration, we would continue to be leaders in this practice for some very basic economic reasons.

With our design engineers specifying ever tighter tolerances and smaller sizes, and our customers expecting ever greater reliability and lower prices, we need to get each purchased part and service from that organization that can supply it at the optimum combination of low cost, quality, and delivery time. More than 75 percent of the time the best source falls into the category of small business, and for that very practical reason these small businesses constitute 75 percent of the vendors on our list.

There are several reasons that small businessmen are best adapted to provide the products and services we need to complement the ever advancing technology of our time. Some of the most important are:

1. Many of the new technological developments are originating with small business concerns.

2. Small firms have greater flexibility in delivery schedules than large firms offering comparable products.

3. The small businessman is frequently more competitive on smaller quantities than is the larger company.

4. Engineering liaison and communication between our research and development people and the man who will actually do the job are easier when we are dealing with small businesses.

5. It is easier for us to evaluate the capabilities of a small supplier.

6. Small businessmen are more cooperative in participating in our value engineering and quality assurance programs.

7. There are some unsophisticated materials that only the small businessman will supply.

We know that our small business program is an important contribution to the national economy, and we acknowledge the intangibles I mentioned before. But we wish to emphasize that the reason we have remained loyal to you small businessmen through the years is that you have earned it.

Battle Over Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the editors of the New York Times made their recommendation on farm policy on May 26, 1963. Their editorial is closely in line with a number of proposals which were introduced in the House of Representatives immediately after the defeat of the wheat program and particularly with H.R. 6545, a farm bill, which I have introduced. The area of agreement is sufficiently broad to be the basis of a national consensus and I append the editorial for the information of the Members of Congress:

BATTLE OVER FARM POLICY

Now that the administration has lost its fight for rigid controls over wheat production, the battle over far policy enters a new and crucial stage. Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman is tempted to let the farmers stew in their own juice and discover for themselves the harsh realities of an abrupt return to the free market. The Republicans want to make political hay out of the wheat vote by continuing to offer protection to the farmers. Either course would be a mistake.

The administration has to face up to the fact that wheat is too important to be left to the wheatgrowers. President Kennedy, who won the White House in 1960 without the aid of the farm States, may stick to his position, taken before the referendum, that the administration will resist any attempt to bail out the farmer. Like the old gray mare, the farm vote isn't what it used to be. Moreover, the Department of Agriculture can cite the precedent of 1939, when the tobacco growers rejected controls only to restore them the following year after suffering a severe drop in income.

But the price of doing nothing on wheat, the Nation's largest field crop and third largest cash crop is enormous. It will mean a vast addition to our already swollen granaries and poverty for many marginal farmers. It is unfair to punish farmers for their decision when the Government's past policies are at least partly responsible for the present situation.

Even the American Farm Bureau Federation, champion of the free market in agriculture and leader of the fight against controls, does not favor complete abandonment of the farmer. But its proposals, and those sponsored by Republicans in Congress, amount to a reward for defeating the administration. Their plan of a handout, of greatest benefit to the big and efficient farm units, would be an even bigger mistake, because it would do nothing to eliminate either poverty or the surpluses.

With farmers turning thumbs down on high price supports and tight controls, the only permanent solution lies in a return to a free market, while the Government takes steps to spare farms unnecessary hardship in making the transition. This means the gradual elimination of all price supports on crops, which will restore a single price system in both the domestic and world markets. Direct payments should be made to marginal farmers, who should be encouraged to leave agriculture by being given retraining. Direct payments also should be made to all farmers who agree to curb or divert production.

The road back to a free market will not be short or easy. Nor will it be inexpensive. But the problem of plenty amid poverty will grow worse if the Administration and its opponents remain attached to the old and unworkable solutions. The only hope is in a brandnew approach that will end the overproduction of crops and substandard farm incomes.

A Factual Report on Birmingham, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I continue to be anxious that the full and true facts of the Birmingham situation, which was in the news a couple of weeks ago, be made known to my colleagues and to all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In that regard, I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point a factual report as to how the disturbances came about.

This report was prepared by responsible citizens of Birmingham who have been thoroughly familiar with details of the situation and it was sent to me by Mr. John Steger, executive vice president of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce. The report is self-explanatory and I invite the attention of my colleagues to it:

A FACTUAL REPORT ON BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

Arrests have been made in Birmingham, Ala., under a city ordinance which requires official parade permits from the city government. Such ordinance was enacted by the city commission here many years ago when the hooded groups in the Deep South were militant and aggressive in public parades and demonstrations fomenting prejudice and incitement of hatred of the Jewish people, Catholics, and Negroes.

The city's enforcement of requiring parade permits to all races and groups is necessary, particularly in heavy traffic areas where constant traffic safety and control must be maintained. The city officials of Birmingham fully realize that such parades and demonstrations on the public streets can easily and quickly get entirely out of hand and become riotous with serious results.

In the arrests of the present demonstrators following a State court injunction, issued by Circuit Court Judge W. A. Jenkins, the demonstrators were in all cases forewarned that they would be in open violation of the law, both of a city ordinance and a circuit court order. This was ignored by the demonstrators.

Those arrested were taken to the city and county jail and treated the same as all prisoners are treated with a moderate amount of bond being set.

After these initial demonstrations were staged by adults, the children in the city and county public schools were then brought into the demonstrations, running rampant on city streets downtown, throwing bottles, brickbats, and other missiles at police who attempted to control them without use of force. The fire department was then called upon to use fire hoses to curtail the demonstrations and prevent race riots. Several firemen and policemen were hit by missiles and injured.

The children taken into custody, ranging in age from 6 years to 16 years old, were placed in the custody of the juvenile court. Since the court facilities were insufficient most of the children were sent to the State fairgrounds modern dormitories, with the girls being placed on one floor and the boys on another. These are the same dormitories containing bunk beds, numerous showers, adequate heating and cooling facilities in a modern fireproof building normally used by the boys and girls of the Future Farmers of America, the 4-H Clubs, high school athletes, college bands, and numerous other large groups for special events here in Birmingham where housing for large groups of this nature are needed.

The use of highly trained police dogs by Birmingham Police to discourage the more aggressive demonstrators has been purely a defensive measure with several incidents where the dogs have been attacked and in turn knocked the aggressors to the ground until the police could take them into custody.

These measures are similar to those used in many cities over the Nation where large groups of demonstrators in so called "peaceful" demonstrations have become unmanageable and become a direct threat to the security of the peace of the community.

There has been so much publicity as to these demonstrations in Birmingham, we felt that you would like to have factual, accurate information as to what has actually happened.

As of now the situation is improving, the children are being released to the custody of their parents and the major offenders in the demonstrations are being given court hearings to determine their guilt or innocence.

GOP Reports Success in Enlisting Professors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, professors in Iowa and Missouri recently held meetings to help contribute their talents to constructive work involving the Republican Party and the men and women elected as Republicans on the National, State, and local levels. These meetings were directed and organized by Dr. Robert J. Huckshorn, director of the Arts and Science Division of the Republican National Committee.

I have heard several very fine reports from educators in Iowa and Missouri about the forward-looking, positive way Dr. Huckshorn is conducting this type of meeting. It is important for the Republican Party to enlist scholars and students of government so that we may have programs and platforms which actually solve people's needs as opposed to the type of foolish approach which is so often peddled by the executive branch of the Government at this time.

The following are several articles which tell about professors in Iowa and Missouri meeting with Dr. Huckshorn:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, May 10, 1963]

GOP Reports Success in Enlisting Professors

The Republican Party has been successful in tapping professors for help in the political arena and expects the program to gain new importance, a national GOP spokesman said here Thursday.

Dr. Robert J. Huckshorn, director of the Arts and Science Division of the Republican National Committee, came to Missouri to help in teaming GOP politics and the academic world.

At Jefferson City Wednesday night, Dr. Huckshorn helped set up an Arts and Science Division of the Missouri Republican State Committee. Missouri became the 14th State to form such an organization since the program started nationally.

Stopping Thursday in St. Louis for a visit with Francis C. Corley, Republican national committeeman for Missouri, Dr. Huckshorn said the aim is to establish similar organizations in all the States.

"This is the first time in American history that a political party has made a formal effort to organize professors," Dr. Huckshorn said.

He said the defeated Conservative Party in Britain in 1945 had a similar program in its efforts to rebuild.

Dr. Huckshorn said that last July he started organizing arts and science groups in various States, always working in conjunction with the Republican State committee and the national committeeman and committeewoman of the respective States. He said the response was tremendous.

By the time of the November 1962 election there were organizations of GOP professors in 11 States.

"Nine were successful—five highly successful—and two didn't get off the ground," Dr. Huckshorn said in appraising the initial results.

He said the fields in which the professors are most helpful are in research, speech writing, briefing of candidates on particular topics and aiding in preparing policy stands.

"I think this is the area where professors should work," Dr. Huckshorn said. "Anybody can ring doorbells."

Letters received by him from all over the country tell how the program aided individual candidates, and in some cases the professors' efforts were "the key to victory," he said.

An example was Utah, where the efforts of a group of professors at Brigham Young University were instrumental in helping the Republicans win control of the State legislature by a narrow markin in the November election, he said.

Dr. Huckshorn said a roster of Republican-leaning professors started 3 years ago has grown to 12,500 and it is hoped the list will reach 25,000 by next spring.

National Committeeman Corley reported that a St. Louis area GOP group of professors, to be affiliated with the State organization, is being formed and its officers will be announced soon.

Dr. Huckshorn, 34, a native Missourian, is professor of political science at the University of Idaho and has been on leave the last year to work with the Republican National Committee. His home town is Willow Springs, Mo. He is a nephew of Charles Ferguson, who was chairman of the Missouri Republican State Committee about 20 years ago.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, May 9, 1963]

GOP Seeks Help of Professors

Republican college professors will play an increasingly important role in political campaigns, the director of the arts and sciences division of the Republican National Committee predicated today.

Robert J. Huckshorn, professor of political science at the University of Idaho, said that Republican professors contributed speech-writing talents and research efforts to good effect in 9 of 11 States where the division was active in time for elections last November.

Huckshorn was in St. Louis to publicize the party's effort to enlist the aid of academicians and to discuss with Francis Corley, Republican National Committemen from Missouri, the pending formation of a professor's committee here.

He helped form a State committee for Missouri in Jefferson City last night with a group of professors from central Missouri colleges and universities. It is the 14th to be organized since last June.

Huckshorn said this was the first time in American history that a party had sought to encourage cooperation between professors and candidates on a formal basis. He is 34 years old and was reared at Willow Springs, Mo.

The party's roster lists 12,500 Republican professors, including 50 from the St. Louis areas, he said, and about 25,000 are expected to be signed up by next spring.

Even if only 40 percent actually engage in campaign work their "reservoir or brainpower" will be invaluable, he said. The others will make substantial contributions by merely declaring themselves in the Republican camp, he said.

Special efforts are being concentrated in the field of social sciences, he said, because even though 50 percent of the Nation's 315,000 professors are Republicans, about 80 percent of those teaching social sciences are Democrats.

State GOP To Form Arts, Science Unit

A dinner meeting to organize an Arts and Science Division of the Missouri Republican State Committee will be held next Wednesday night in Jefferson City.

A reception at 6 p.m., followed by dinner at 6:45 p.m. will be at the Missouri Hotel. Dr. Robert J. Huckshorn, director of the Arts and Science Division of the Republican National Committee, will explain the purpose of the program.

Republican faculty members of universities and colleges in Missouri are invited to the meeting. Senator James P. Kelly, chairman of the GOP State committee, said the purpose of the new division will be to help the State committee in shaping policy and "to take advantage of the capabilities of the academic world in politics."

Reservations are $2 and may be made not later than Tuesday at the State Republican Headquarters at 204 Adams Street, Jefferson City.

[From the Post-Tribune, Jefferson City, Mo.]

TEACHERS URGED TO TAKE PART IN GOP ACTIVITY

Teachers in Missouri colleges and universities have been urged to take an active part in Republican political activity.

Dr. Robert J. Huckshorn, director of the Arts and Science Division of the Republican National Committee, met with a score of college teachers, legislators and party leaders Wednesday night at the Missouri Hotel in Jefferson City to discuss the work done by arts and science divisions of State committees. County chairman suggests names of teachers invited to attend the discussion.

"This is the first time a positive organized effort to enlist intellectuals in political activity ever has been made in the United States," said Huckshorn in an interview before the Jefferson City meeting.

SUCCESS ASTOUNDING

"I've visited 14 other States since August to discuss this program and to help organize arts and science divisions. Our success has been astounding."

Huckshorn is on leave from the University of Idaho where he is an associate professor of political science and director of the Bureau of Public Affairs Research. He joined the national committee a year ago.

"The decision by the national committee to take advantage of this great reservoir of brainpower actually began with a resolution in 1959 urging that college teachers be made to feel wanted and welcome in the Republican party."

Some 2 years were spent collecting a list of 12,500 Republican teachers. Of this number, some 4,000 have said they are willing to work.

In States which have arts and science units professors have helped with everything from ringing doorbells to writing speeches, researching political and social problems and helping draft position papers.

"The unusual thing about the Missouri interest in such a unit is the enthusiasm shown by the county chairmen. Some have thought that the party was unfortunately regarded as being indifferent or even hostile to intellectuals after the 1956 presidential campaign, I think this attitude resulted largely from a lack of communication at the county level, I don't believe it ever existed at the upper levels of the party."

NATIVE OF STATE

But the unusual interest shown by the county chairmen is not the only reason Huckshorn was eager to discuss the possibility of organizing an arts and science unit in the State. He is a native Missourian, was graduated from Southwest Missouri State College, and, he says, "an uncle of mine was Republican State chairman for 8 years."

The first and probably the most active State arts and science unit is the Ohio division under the leadership of State Chairman Ray C. Bliss and Arthur I. Peterson, director of the Institute of Practical Politics at Ohio Wesleyan University and new chairman of the State Civil Rights Commission.

Huckshorn is optimistic about the success the program is having and expects to have a roster of 25,000 professors willing to aid the party by 1964. "It is good for the party and it is good for the professors," he said.

United States-Yugoslav Relations—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star recently published several articles by Mr. Crosby Noyes on the extremely complex and emotion-ridden subject of Yugoslavia. As one long and intimately acquainted with the Yugoslav political and economic scene, I can say with confidence that Mr. Noyes has presented an accurate, precise, and comprehensive review of United States-Yugoslav relations.

I feel that these articles make a valuable contribution to our knowledge of this troubled Balkan State by enabling us to form a clearer picture of the contemporary Yugoslav scene.

Following is the first of the two articles on this subject. I heartily commend this well-balanced study to the attention of my colleagues in the House:

U.S. POLICY COULD FORCE YUGOSLAVS BACK TO SOVIET BLOC—PART I

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

BELGRADE.—Since the May Day celebrations Yugoslavia has been in something of a flutter.

The spring visiting season is in full swing. Workmen are working overtime—or whatever the Socialist equivalent is—lining the streets with flags in honor of arriving dignitaries and then takng them down again and replacing them with new ones.

As the huge Stars and Stripes flying over the Federal Council Chamber during Secretary Rusk's visit came down, up went the blue and white of Finland for President Kekkonen. The same delegation that saw Mr. Kekkonen off waited at the airport to greet U Thant of the United Nations. Egypt's President Nasser, who turned out the largest crowds, will soon yield the spotlight to President Tubman of Liberia.

CORDIAL EXCHANGES

On all these occasions the formula is pretty much the same: A warm and cordial exchange of public civilities, equally warm though sometimes less cordial private exchanges on current world problems. In Mr. Rusk's case there was also "mutual agreement on the need of strengthening relations between the United States and Yugoslavia * * * particularly in the field of trade."

For all the festive atmosphere and heartiness, however, the performance is not entirely convincing. One cannot talk with many Yugoslavs without coming away with the impression that the confidence of their leaders is largely assumed. In fact, Yugoslavia this spring may be facing the most critical threat to its political and economic future since the break with the Soviet bloc 15 years ago.

It is not a very dramatic threat. No sabers are being rattled, no breasts are being beaten. The man in the street, for the most part, is not aware that it exists. Even the leaders find it difficult to believe that the United States which has encouraged Yugoslav independence to the tune of almost $2 billion should now be threatening to adopt a policy calculated to undermine this independence and throw the country back into the Soviet bloc.

KENNAN QUITTING

It is the more difficult to understand when the American Government itself firmly opposes any such move as contrary to security interests of the United States. President Kennedy has argued against it. Ambassador George Kennan, who rates as one of the ablest American diplomats, is resigning from his post in Belgrade because of it.

Ambassador Kennan's resignation is not in empty protest, but in simple recognition of the fact that no American diplomat will have any useful work to do in Yugoslavia for a long time to come.

The threat which is so much on everyone's mind here is the result of one of those curious aberrations that sometimes finds its way into the conduct of American foreign policy.

Specifically, it results from an act of Congress last summer. In passing the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the House tacked on an amendment instructing the President to deny as soon as practicable what is known as the most favored nation treatment in trading with any country "dominated or controlled by communism." The effect would be to deny normal trade benefits accorded in the past to Yugaslavia and Poland.

To denounce the present trade arrangements with Poland and Yugoslavia requires first that a year's notice be given. Before doing this, however, the administration has asked Congress to reconsider its decision. As a part of the current foreign aid bill sent to Congress last month, President Kennedy has asked for broad discretionary powers in granting or withholding trade benefits.

MOTIVES UNCLEAR

Whether or not this request is granted, it is by no means clear what prompted this particular piece of congressional toughness at this particular time.

Our political relations with Yugoslavia and Poland have had a number of ups and downs. In the case of Yugoslavia, the neutralist conference in 1961 and the trip of President Tito to the Soviet Union last winter have marked the most recent low points. It may well be, however, that it was a feeling of frustration over Cuba, rather than anything in our relations with the countries concerned, that did the damage.

At any rate in the eyes of the State Department, the action of Congress makes curious logic. "Most-favored-nation treatment" is, of course, a most unfortunate phrase. What it implies is that Yugoslavia is favored above all other nations. What it really means is that Yugoslavia is not arbitrarily discriminated against in trade agreements. And that the tariff on any particular item of trade is no higher than that which applies to our most-favored-trading partner.

The most-favored-nation treatment is granted by the United States to all trading nations except for those of the Soviet bloc and China. It is not a piece of peculiar American generosity but the universal rule of world trade.

DATES TO 1881 TREATY

In the case of trade between Yugoslavia and the United States, it dates back to a treaty signed in 1881. At our own insistence it was never withdrawn even between 1945 and 1948 when Yugoslavia was considered one of the most committed nations of the Russian bloc.

Here again the granting of most-favored-nation status was not generosity but an act of considered policy.

Since the end of the war, two possible courses have been open to the United States with regard to the countries of Eastern Europe. They could be treated as part of a monolithic Soviet bloc, cut off from all access to the West and abandoned to their fate. Or they could be encouraged by all reasonable means to develop along the lines of their own national aspirations and interests in the hope that their subjection to militant Communist dogma would change with the passage of time.

In practice, American policy toward these nations has been a compromise between the two ideas. In the case of Russia, China, and the other bloc countries except Yugoslavia, most-favored-nation treatment was cut off in 1951. In the case of Poland, it was restored in 1960 by President Eisenhower as a matter of determined policy to increase that country's ties with the West.

NOT IN SOVIET BLOC

As the only Communist country which has received most-favored-nation treatment since the war, Yugoslavia provides the most convincing proof of the validity of the more liberal approach. The simple fact is that today Yugoslavia is not a member of the Soviet bloc and has no intention of returning to it. The nature of the regime and the brand of communism which have developed here are different from those of any other Communist country. And it is a difference which it is very much to the interests of the United States to encourage.

These differences and the American interests involved will be examined in more detail in another article. It is important, however, to understand the extent to which Yugoslavia's economic interests are involved. And how the political liberalization of the country has gone hand in hand with the development of its trade with the free world.

Starting after the war with heavy dependence on the East, Yugoslavia's trade with the Soviet bloc fell to practically zero after the break in 1948. The refusal of Marshal Tito to submit to the Moscow-dominated international Communist movement was maintained in spite of enormous cost and even greater risk. This was the bleak and nervous period when Stalin was fond of saying: "I will lift my little finger, and there will be no more Tito."

TURNED TOWARD WEST

After 1950, when the United States weighed in with a hefty program of economic and military aid, Yugoslavia's trade turned decisively toward the West. Though this orientation was again somewhat modified by Khrushchev's "reconciliation" with Tito 5 years later, this in no way implied a return to a dependence on the Soviet bloc in either the economic or political field.

Today, between 75 and 80 percent of Yugoslavia's trade is with non-Communist nations. About 60 percent is with Western Europe and the United States, the rest divided among the "uncommitted countries" of Asia and Africa.

In the meantime, Yugoslavia has been making strenuous efforts to adjust its foreign trade system to mesh with trade practices of the Western world, including a drastic currency reform and the virtual scrapping of the state monopoly system common to most Communist countries. Beyond this, it participates in several committees of the OECD and has provisional status in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Yugoslavia's hope of becoming a contractual member of the latter organization by 1965 implies a further important liberalization of its entire economic system.

In fact, as an "uncommitted nation" itself, Yugoslavia's trade with the Eastern bloc is considered by most experts to be abnormally low. It is increasing slowly and can be expected to continue to do so as industrial goods replace agricultural products as staple exports. From the American point of view, an increasing trade and contact with the East is no bad thing, since it increases the political influence and attraction which Yugoslavia is able to exert on the Communist bloc as a whole.

SUCCESS STORY

This attraction and influence are already considerable. On the political side the Yugoslav experience—including the break and reconciliation with Russia—has already had a profound effect on the organization of the satellite system and even on the development of the Soviet Union itself. On the economic plane it represents a success story that inevitably makes all other Communist nations sit up and take notice.

In brief, the story is that starting from a wretched base in 1950, Yugoslavia's rate of economic development has been among the highest in the world, matched only in terms of absolute growth by Japan. During the late fifties this rate reached the phenomenal figure of 14 percent annual increase of gross national product. In the last 2 years, partly owing to the severe economic reforms imposed, this rate has dropped considerably. But by any standard Yugoslavia is still the most economically promising of any of the Communist nations.

American aid played an important part in this dramatic recovery. In the early postwar years it was perhaps decisive. But it is important to emphasize how little American aid is involved in the picture today. And what a negligible part it plays in the controversy between the administration and Congress on the issue of trade relations with Yugoslavia.

The American aid program first reached significant proportions in the early 1950's with large-scale shipments of food and raw materials. In the same period from 1950 to 1957 there was a military aid program amounting to almost $800 million before it was terminated at Yougslavia's request 5 years ago. Since then the country has been buying its own military equipment.

MOSTLY LOANS AND CREDIT

In later years, American aid has consisted largely of industrial loans, extension of credit—along with a number of other Western countries—to finance the currency reform, and a technical assistance and training program.

Today all of these programs are in the process of being terminated. The American aid mission in Yugoslavia is winding up projects for which funds were appropriated in earler years or putting existing programs, such as technical training on a paying basis. The only exception is the sale of surplus wheat, cotton and oils which is continuing under the food-for-peace program. And even this the Yugoslav Government hopes will be unnecessary after another year or so.

As outside aid has diminished in importance, Yugoslavia's foreign trade has become increasingly vital to the continuing growth and development of the country. As a large-scale importer of industrial raw materials the most strenuous efforts have been called for to keep foreign exchange-earning exports in reasonable balance. The effort has not been easy or always successful and the margin between success and failure remains small.

In this respect, Yugoslavia's trade with the United States is of prime importance. Though representing less than 10 percent of the country's overall trade, the United States in 1962 was the leading exporter to Yugoslavia and the third largest market for Yugoslav goods. This trade, furthermore, has been expanding rapidly, rising from $39 million in 1961 to $52 million last year, with a goal of $60 million in 1963. These sums, though negligible in terms of American trade, could mean the difference between life and death to Yugoslavia.

EFFECT SEEN AS DISASTROUS

It could well mean just exactly this difference if the American Congress insists that Yugoslavia be written off as a hopeless country with whom the United States should no longer maintain normal trade relations. The effect of withdrawing most-favored nation treatment, in the opinion of every competent observer here, would be disastrous both from an economic and political point of view.

From the economic standpoint it would increase tariffs on 94 percent of all exports from Yugoslavia to the United States effectively pricing them out of the American market. In some cases present duties would be increased more than 400 percent.

This in turn would drastically cut imports from the United States, amounting in 1962 to some $154 million. The inability to earn dollars would also make it practically impossible for Yugoslavia to continue payments on its past debts to the United States which this year will total some $10 million.

Nor would the effects stop here. In the next few years, Yugoslavia is expecting the most difficult negotiations with its trading partners of the European Common Market, particularly in the touchy field of agricultural exports. A punitive policy by the United States, imposed for political reasons, can hardly fail to have an effect on our allies. Given the probable consequences, the economic future of Yugoslavia would look very bleak indeed.

GLASS EXPORT CASE CITED

In fact, the consequences are already being felt, even before the action of the Congress becomes effective. The experience of the Rogaska Slatina glass factory is an interesting case in point.

Since 1927, Rogaska Slatina has been exporting glassware to the United States, including among its important customers such firms as Macy's, Gimbels, W. T. Grant Co. and Pittman Dreitzer, a New York glass importer. Exports last year amounted to $300,000 or about 32 percent of the factory's total exports.

This year, when most of these firms failed to renew their orders, the general manager called on them in the course of a recent visit to New York, Gimbels and W. T. Grant refused to receive him; Pittman Dreitzer cut its order by 50 percent. Only Macy's reordered in the usual amounts and the manager estimates that his total exports to the United States this year will not exceed $75,000. Such cases of "patriotic" private boycotts of Yugoslav products since the action of Congress have not been rare.

ALLOWS NO LEEWAY

The net effect of this in the opinion of our top diplomats here is simply to destroy the effectiveness of a policy whose success has been conclusively proved over 15 years. From the American point of view the decision of Congress, if it stands, amounts to an irrevocable decision which allows the President no leeway whatever in dealing with a complex and changing political and economic problem. From the Yugoslav standpoint, it is a gratuitous injury which can never be successfully explained.

Above all it will discourge all those Yugoslavs who want better relations with the United States and give comfort to those in Yugoslavia and elsewhere who are opposed to the independent development and political orientation of the country. It will give the impression that although Yugoslavia may want to remain independent, the price of doing so might well be economic ruin.

It will not, in all probability, force Yugoslavia back into the Soviet orbit.

"We do not leave because of you in 1948" a Yugoslav official told me, "And nothing that you may do will make us go back. But it is hard to understand why you should want to push us in this direction."

Congress Tight on Military Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House an editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., regarding the military pay increase bill which the House passed recently. The Washington correspondent for this newspaper, Mr. Lucian C. Warren, attended many of the hearings on this legislation and made a thorough study of the facts involved in this issue.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include this editorial dated May 21, 1963:

CONGRESS TIGHT ON MILITARY PAY

At a time when democracy is engaged in a cold war with the forces of communism on many fronts throughout the world, Congress may be looked upon as one of the keystones in our national defense. It is this legislative branch of Government that digs into subversion, exposes foreign propaganda and most importantly appropriates the money needed to make our Armed Forces the strongest, best-equipped military in the world.

So anxious are our Representatives and Senators to insure against any possible weakening of U.S. striking power that they frequently vote funds for military hardware that the Defense Department doesn't request and in some instances deems unneeded. Production of the B-70 superbomber is one illustration of such insistence.

But despite this display of eternal vigilance, Congress appears to have developed a blind spot in the overall defense picture. That spot is the matter of salaries paid members of the Armed Forces. Billions of dollars are appropriated each year for complicated electronic weapons yet Congress exhibits a puzzling degree of parsimony when it comes to fixing the salaries of the intelligent, highly-skilled men needed to direct and operate them.

Salaries paid by private industries to men of comparable skills have soared far beyond military pay scales and as a result thousands of vitally needed technicians are leaving the Armed Forces each year to accept civilian jobs. And not infrequently they find themselves assigned as civilian technicians doing the same or similar work they did while in service, but at perhaps two or three times the salaries, plus regular hours, overtime pay, and complete freedom from former military restrictions.

Further, the side benefits that once made military careers attractive—free medical and dental care, hospitalization, free insurance and pensions—pale by comparison to many of the fringe benefits offered by private industries. Few companies today which seek trained, technical employees do not offer medical, surgical, and hospital benefits, plus substantial pensions and not infrequently bonuses. Military personnel already has lost the free $10,000 life insurance, which was replaced by a dependency indemnity compensation, claimed by many to be inadequate.

In a recent column on Washington affairs Lucian C. Warren, Courier-Express Washington correspondent, cited the difference between the indemnity pensions paid military and civilian dependents of the men lost in the recent tragic sinking of the nuclear submarine *Thresher*. Dependents of Navy men lost on the sub get pensions ranging from $174 to $280 a month while dependents of the lost civilians aboard the ship will get pensions ranging from $234 to $525 a month. Thus, through the cold comparison of figures, a naval career loses much of its appeal.

Mr. Warren also pointed out that while Congress raised the pay of civilian Government employees 39.8 percent over the past several years, military pay—including a recent increase in basic allowance for quarters—has been boosted only 16.6 percent. And certainly $55 extra a month for those who are exposed to hostile fire seems to be pretty poor compensation in view of steadily rising casualties in strife-torn areas. Fifty dollars would hardly cover the daily expenses of some of our junketing Congressmen who are only subject to the occasional verbal fire of a critic; that type of fire seldom proves physically fatal.

Congress is aware of the truism: "You get what you pay for." It is cold logic that if we want the best in equipment we must pay for it. If we want the Nation's best men to defend our liberties the same rule applies. We suggest Congressmen reexamine the military pay scale and then ask themselves: "Would we do the same work and accept the same heavy responsibility for that kind of wages?"

An honest answer will bring additional merited pay increases for our Armed Forces.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 25, 1963:

IT'S YOUR CHOICE

The individual citizen's rights and responsibilities are being overlooked or forgotten by our Federal Government leaders at this time. The radical-liberals including the President, his advisers, and his congressional leaders are chiefly responsible for the cataclysmic results in the destruction of our free society. Perhaps it is necessary to remember or restate these rights and responsibilities.

The individual's right is self-determination, through free choice, free will, accountable to his Maker, for his life and what he does with it. Government of, by, and for people is for the purpose of making secure this right of self-determination, and it follows that the Bill of Rights recognizes human rights and the Declaration of Independence proclaims these as God-given.

Individual responsibilities are quite simply stated, too. The individual is responsible for providing himself and his family. Beyond this, he is not responsible for others by manmade law. It is worth remembering, however, that man is charged by his spiritual concepts—whether he be Protestant, Catholic, or Jew to care for his fellow man, but as an individual. Charity is not the enforced distribution of money and property by Government tax backed up by jail and punishment.

The Federal Government is not a charitable institution, nor is society through Government, responsible for people's welfare. Here as I see it is the basic fallacy of many who inject Government into charity. Charity, caring for others, is voluntary and an individual responsibility, and is not the area for Government. Nor is there any right of the individual to be cared for by Government, as today's liberal-radicals declare.

That is why Government cannot constitutionally feed, clothe, house, provide jobs, medical care, or the basic necessities. That is why our people suffer so in burdensome tax and regimentation when Government tries to provide security against life's hazards. Government, in assuming as its role the need for providing life's necessities through tax and redistribution, is destroying capitalism and the republican form of Government at the same time it undermines and weakens the moral fiber of our people. Natural incentives are being replaced by Government assurances and mandates, but the Government has nothing until it takes away from people—and it taxes always with punishment to force people to perform. The President's "Democratic socialism" as spelled out by chief architect and adviser Schlesinger and exemplified by J.F.K. legislation, is clear now for all to see. So before they are gone and forgotten I wanted to remember once again the individuals' rights and responsibilities as our forefathers and their Constitution saw them.

Communism, socialism, fascism, or other government-enforced "isms" can never beat capitalism with its private and free society for the simple reason that every person will work harder for self and loved ones than for government—quite elementary, and quite disregarded by both President Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev, interestingly enough. Both communism and the New Frontier's big Government philosophy are based on disbelief and lack of trust in people; that people cannot be trusted to run their own lives; that people are not responsible if left alone; that self-determination is wrong and must be replaced by Government order backed up by force.

Today in the United States we see the President ready to use Federal troops to enforce Federal law as he interprets it. In Dallas today if there is an example of segregation in housing, FHA, use of facilities, public or private, or any other violation of Federal law or Constitution as determined to be a violation by the President, he then could send Federal troops to enforce the law as he construes it. This is the Birmingham story in its larger implication. This concept bypasses the courts, Federal marshals, State sovereignty and law, local law enforcement and individual property and moral rights.

This Nation is entering a new era, but is a logical progression from the New Deal and Fair Deal, the full flowering of the liberals' free hand in Congress and Government since the 1930's. Having transferred the power from Congress to the Chief Executive, via the Supreme Court, we now have a President assuming the dictatorial power that is his. The people now can see it, if they will, and agree or disagree as they must. America could still save herself.

FARMERS MADE A CHOICE

In spite of 30 years of Federal domination and subsidy, the wheat farmers have voted to remain free. After one of the most massive propaganda campaigns (paid for by taxes) ever conducted to sell the farmers on giving up a free agriculture in favor of tight Federal controls and handouts, the Kennedy administration was soundly beaten in the referendum. This action is a direct repudiation of the Kennedy-Freeman planned economy theories. It is an encouraging sign that American farmers are ready and willing to lead the way back to the sound American principles of private enterprise upon which the strength of this Nation is founded.

ALGER REMARKS IN THE HOUSE THIS WEEK ON PERTINENT ISSUES

The proposed "hot line" between the White House and the Kremlin poses serious dangers. There is grave concern among many in this country who fear the Kennedy administration may be coming to secret understanding with the Soviets. There have been many developments in these first years of the Kennedy administration to lead us to believe that if outright promises were not made, at least some understandings were reached which have cost the United States loss of prestige and have strengthened the Soviet position in the world. Starting with the Berlin wall—it went up shortly after the first Kennedy-Khrushchev summit meeting without objection by the President. We witnessed the buildup of Soviet military strength in Cuba and after token removal of missiles and troops, none of which have actually been proved, the administration announced removal of our bases in Greece and Turkey. The President had previously denied that any such move was contemplated just as he is now denying any intention to give up Guantanamo. When the President announced our intention to prevent Cuban exiles from freeing their homeland, he was lauded by Castro for accepting the first of the Communist demands. Just this week, in Moscow, Khrushchev reminds the world of the other Communist demands upon the United States, warning that we must accept them, including the removal of our base at Guantanamo. With the apparent understandings which have been reached as a part of the program of accommodation without the easy access of communication, I dread to think what could happen and what agreements could be reached in confidential conversations over a direct line between the President and the Soviet dictator. Because of these facts I believe we should prevent any hot line communications between Washington and Moscow.

It now appears the administration is softening up the country for an agreement with the Kadar government of Hungary. Congress and the American people should prevent the President from taking this move to further accommodate the Soviet Union. Peace can never be bought at the expense of honor. To recognize the Kadar government now would be an act of extreme dishonor.

Resolution of the Democratic Organization of Queens County, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a news release and resolution of the Democratic organization of Queens County, N.Y.

As are all decent Americans, we in New York are shamed by the happenings in Birmingham and other southern cities, and we hope and pray that these problems involving the basic human rights of the Negroes in those areas will be solved peacefully and equitably in the near future.

I am setting forth herewith the release and the resolution, issued and adopted on May 22, 1963:

The Queens County Democratic Executive Committee under the chairmanship of Assemblyman Moses M. Weinstein, today (May 22) adopted unamimously a resolution proposed by the organization supporting the people of Birmingham in their struggle for recognition of the basic human rights guaranteed to all by the U.S. Constitution. The resolution further urges complete support of the Democratic Clubs of Queens County and all men of good will to the march of the Negro community in its quest for a place of dignity and equality.

The full text of the Weinstein resolution passed by the group at Democratic County Headquarters, 72–50 Austin Street is as follows:

"*Resolved,* That the Queens County Democratic Executive Committee representing the Democratic community of Queens supports the program of the people of Birmingham, Ala., under the dedicated leadership of Dr. Martin Luther King and the Southern Leadership Conference in their struggle for recognition of the basic human rights guaranteed to all by the Constitution of the United States; and

"In furtherance of this position we urge the Democratic Clubs of Queens County and all men of good will to lend their complete support to the march of the Negro community in its quest for a place of dignity and equality."

If we are to continue to preach democracy to the rest of the world, we must first set our own house in order and ensure that the guarantees of our Constitution apply to each and every citizen of the United States, regardless of his race, creed, color or national origin.

Freeman Rebuked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the recent wheat referendum proved that the thinking of American farmers is strikingly opposed to that of Secretary Freeman.

The Macomb, Ill., Journal of May 23 suggests that Freeman resign.

The editorial is as follows:

FREEMAN REBUKED

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman should resign. The wheat vote establishes that his thinking is so radically at odds with the thinking of farmers that he cannot serve them satisfactory in any program they would approve. If President Kennedy heeds the message he will halt all efforts to regiment the farmer.

The wheat vote was a vote for freedom on the farm, and, equally important, it served notice that farmers cannot be stampeded by scare tactics by bureaucrats.

It is all the more impressive because of the pressure that was applied to get a favorable vote. The President warned that wheat might sink to $1 a bushel. Freeman said defeat of the proposal might mean chaos.

Kennedy and Freeman were not the only public officials who plugged the program. The Department of Agriculture made a major project of preaching that wheat growers had a choice between ruin and prosperity.

Also, the administration reserved a tremendous advantage for itself in setting up the rules for the referendum. Small growers could not simply vote as the larger growers could. They had to register in advance of the referendum to be eligible. Such a requirement is of course a minor obstacle, but it is sufficient to keep millions at home. Few people will go to the trouble of qualifying to vote when such an obstacle is thrown up.

Rejection of the wheat program leaves only a small percentage of farmers completely owned and controlled by Washington. One such group is the growers of tobacco. A number of years ago they accepted a control system comparable to the system sought for wheat. Today a quota to grow tobacco is worth more than the land on which the tobacco is grown.

Rejection of the wheat program sought by the Kennedy administration does not mean that there will be no wheat program. Congress may vote such a program. If it does, it is a certaintly that it will be a program more satisfactory to wheat growers.

A program of some sort may be advisable. While farm sentiment to get the Government out of farming is strong, an abrupt discontinuance of aid programs could carry heavy penalty. A gradual shift away from Government aid and control, giving time for adjustments to be made by the farming industry, would be preferable.

Soil and Water Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to insert in the RECORD a prize-winning essay on "Soil and Water Conservation," written by Miss Sharon Kuehn, of South Coffeyville, Kans. This essay won a first prize of a $25 Government bond in a recent soil conservation district contest. I commend the essay to all Members who may believe our young people are not mindful of the importance of soil and water conservation.

Miss Kuehn is a seventh grade student:

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

(By Sharon Kuehn)

Conservation of our soil and water means to use it wisely to the betterment of our home and Nation. Much progress has been made in the past few decades to improve and maintain the conservation program.

Since most of our food and clothing comes from the soil, either directly or indirectly, it is of vital importance that we get as high a production as possible for each acre. As crops are grown, minerals and natural resources are taken from the soil; therefore, we must, in order to keep the soil in top production, return these minerals by applying fertilizers or limestone, according to the soil and crop needs. The amount of food a nation can produce does not depend upon square miles, but upon the amount an acre can produce.

Ground can become weakened by continuously planting of the same crop. It then becomes neccessary to add fertilizer in the form of vegetation, animal, or commercial fertilizer. This organic matter also makes it possible for the soil to absorb or hold more water. When soil is planted to crops, minerals are removed. The soil gradually becomes poorer and it becomes necessary to return it to the soil by planting leguminous crops such as clovers, cowpeas, aand soybeans which are rich in nitrogen.

Erosion, or the washing away of soil, does more damage than raising crops. There are various ways of checking or preventing soil erosion.

Crop rotation is practiced in many countries. Cover crops are also good methods to prevent erosion. Gullies are caused by erosion when water flows washing the soil away. Many farmers do contour farming, terracing, and strip cropping to prevent this.

If land is badly eroded and is wasteland, it is well to encourage growth of native grasses, vines, shrubs, and trees. These will in time check erosion and allow the soil to be rebuilt and again become productive.

The best way to prevent soil blowing is not to overgraze and to keep good cover crops during the time when the wind is most likely to blow the soil. The proper use of soil conservation will in turn conserve our water supply and give us better use of it.

Water must be conserved for human and animal consumption, industry, household use, homes for fish and aquatic life, recreational purposes, plant life, a means of transportation, disposal, removal of waste, generation of electricity, refrigeration, air conditioning, and fire protection.

Water may be conserved in much the same way as our soil: by building terraces to prevent fast run of water, build more and larger ponds and mainly to teach our people more economical use of water that we now have available.

Most of our methods would not only save water, but prevent floods. By the proper use of soil and water conservation we will get the highest quality of production from the least amount of land; thereby saving more lives and guarantee a better future.

United States-Yugoslav Relations—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, an accurate understanding of United States-Yugoslav relations is important both for the Congress and for the people of this country.

Following is the second of two comprehensive and well-informed articles on this subject which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Monday, May 20, 1963. I recommend this fine commentary to my distinguished colleagues in the House:

TITO IS ANCHORMAN—AID HELPS YUGOSLAVIA STEADY UNSTABLE AREA—PART II

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

BELGRADE.—In Yugoslavia, it may be communism with a difference, but it is still communism.

No one can walk around this city, draped with red flags marked by the hammer and sickle and plastered with "Socialist" slogans, without being very much aware of the fact. No one can listen to a speech by any Yugoslav leader without being persuaded of his devotion to Marx and Lenin.

No one can talk about the possibility of improving relations between Yugoslavia and the United States without taking the Communist factor fully into account.

For a nominally "nonalined" neutralist country, Yugoslav leaders talk with distressing regularity out of the eastern side of their mouths. However cordial they may be in their dealings with American diplomats, their outlook on world affairs in general is radically different from ours. In the United Nations Yugoslavia's vote is cast at least 60 percent of the time with the Leftist group of neutralist nations with the Soviet Union and against the United States.

In this respect, President Tito himself is something of a special problem.

His speech to the neutral nations conference in Belgrade in 1961, defending Russia's renewal of nuclear testing and containing kindly references to the East German Communist regime, raised hackles throughout the West. His triumphal visit to Moscow last winter where he was lionized by Premier Khrushchev did nothing to endear him or his country to Washington.

As one of the very few remaining Yugoslav leaders who got his training in Leninist Russia, Tito clings to the traditional Communist verbiage more strongly than his younger colleagues. There is no doubt whatever that his standing in Moscow is infinitely more important to him from an emotional standpoint than his standing in the West. His reception by Khrushchev amounted for him to a final rehabilitation and, in effect, an official admission that it was the Russians and not he that had been responsible for the break in 1948.

All this, inevitably, has had a disturbing effect on relations between Yugoslavia and the United States in the past. Beyond any doubt there will be more problems in the future. In Washington and elsewhere honest men may ask themselves what the West has accomplished here after 13 years of effort and nearly $2 billion of aid. Some, in exasperation, may decide that Yugoslavia deserves to be written off and treated like a full-fledged member of the Communist bloc.

And yet so far as most qualified observers are concerned this would be a huge and inexcusable mistake.

SEEN AS NET ASSET

In his book on "Socialism and War," Edvard Kardelj, senior vice president of the Yugoslav Federal Executive, and one of Tito's certain successors, suggests that "when making an objective analysis, one should not allow slogans or political declarations to conceal insight into the real substance of things." Or, as American Ambassador George Kennan puts it more simply, "What's important is not what these people say, but what they are."

If this rule is observed, Yugoslavia, by any standard of measurement, emerges as a net asset to the West. And what has been achieved here with Western help is far too valuable to be thrown away in a fit of political pique.

To state the obvious, what the West has received for its support and effort is the conduct of an independent country over a 13-year period. It has achieved political stability in an area whose traditional instability has been a breeding ground of war for many generations.

It has encouraged in Yugoslavia a wise policy of calm, quiet and orderly relations with all of its neighbors to the West. The borders with Austria, Italy, and Greece are are wide open for a free exchange of persons, goods and ideas.

BIG INFORMATION PROGRAM

Radio broadcasts to Yugoslavia from the West are unjammed. Newspapers and magazines circulate freely. The United States operates an information program here on a scale that is unthinkable in any other country of the Soviet bloc. Ironically enough, the only iron curtain that exists here is between Yugoslavia and its fellow Communist neighbor, Albania.

At the same time, the country's military posture remains completely independent. Yugoslavia is a member neither of the Warsaw Pact nor the Comicom—Eastern Europe's version of the Common Market. Its independent behavior and successful development set an instructive example for other members of the Soviet bloc. Above all, Yugoslavia is a living manifestation of the fact that a country may be Marxist without being a satellite of the Soviet Union or serving its political purposes.

And beyond this, Yugoslavia is something more.

If one looks at this country for what it is, and resists the temptation to lump all Communists together for mass condemnation, it is clear enough that common slogans and quotations from Marx cover a very large spectrum of political and social attitudes within the Communist world. The simple fact is that the contradictions which separate the Yugoslavs from say the Communist Chinese are a good deal more fundamental than the contradictions which divide Yugoslavia from the West.

EXERT GREATER INFLUENCE

It would be an exaggeration perhaps to describe the system in Yugoslavia as liberal. The Yugoslavs themselves prefer the word "progressive" in contrast to the reactionary outlook of their Chinese comrades. Yet it is no exaggeration at all to say that communism as it exists here is unique. And that in the historical development of communism throughout the world Yugoslavia may well exert the greater influence in the long run.

When it comes to the internal system a certain degree of caution is advisable. For an outsider—or for that matter for the average Yugoslav—it is hard to say exactly how the system works. What one can say with reasonable assurance is that Yugoslavia has gone further in the process of decentralization both in political control and in the control of the means of production than any other Communist country in the world.

This principle of decentralization is firmly written into the new Yugoslav Constitution adopted this spring. Though it assures Tito's position as President of the country for the rest of his life (he is now 70) it also assures that no one in the future will exercise the same amount of personal leadership. Presidential terms are fixed by law as in the United States to two 4-year terms. Less important positions are fixed except in special circumstances to single 4-year terms.

ALLOWS FOR DEBATE

Though, as in all Communist systems there is only one party, there is room in the Yugoslav political setup for very considerable dissention and debate. The process, as one observer describes it, operates more like that of a board of directors who agree on objectives but argue over ways and means of achieving them.

The new Constitution provides, among other things, for four separate Houses of

Parliament which, together with a Federal Chamber, legislate in specific fields of economics, education and culture, social welfare and health, and political organization. Some American political theorists see in this system a possible improvement on our own system of congressional committees.

Apart from its central political organization, the all pervading authority of the normal Communist state is notably subdued in Yugoslavia. Police activity is restricted and political prisoners are few. Within limits, freedom of expression is tolerated and legal protections for the individual are being increased. Religious freedom is guaranteed by the Constitution and, after a brief experiment in collectivization of farms, 84 percent of agricultural property is now privately owned.

In the economic organization of the country, the principle of decentralization, in theory at least, goes even further. Under the general blueprint of successive 5-year plans, control and development of industrial enterprises—from beer factories to hotels to iron mines and railroads—lie in the hands of separate workers' collectives. Workers councils name their own directors, raise their own money and, again in theory at least, decide on the distribution of profits.

ENCOURAGES MERGERS

Once again, a degree of caution is necessary. Most certainly the central government through its control of central banks and other mechanisms exerts a very real degree of control over a system which otherwise might come close to anarchy. It encourages mergers between competing enterprises, discourages foreign competition and generally sees to it that the economic development of the country conforms with the overall plan.

Even so, however, in a country approximately the size of North Dakota there are some 29 separate railroad systems. If it continues in its present tendencies the economic organization of the country will inevitably lead to what one observer describes wryly as the "restoration of many features of a capitalist economy" with the single proviso of collective ownership.

It is not, however, simply the nature of its internal development or the fact that Yugoslavia has managed to dispense with some of the more disagreeable aspects of communism that sets it at the other end of the spectrum from a country like Communist China. For more fundamental in this regard is Yugoslavia's attitude toward the non-Communist world. And most specifically, the attitude of its leaders on the issue of peace and war.

This is, of course, the great issue that divides the Communist world today. It lies at the heart of the Chinese charge that the Yugoslav leaders are "revisionist," while they, the Chinese, are the true disciples of Marx and Lenin. It is the basis for the growing dispute between China and the Soviet Union upon which the whole future of the Communist movement depends. And in this dispute Yugoslavia plays in its own right a singularly important and prophetic role.

In its approach to the non-Communist world, as in its internal development, Yugoslavia has been on the side of pragmatism as opposed to dogma since Stalin's day.

"You must understand," a Yugoslav intellectual explained to me, "that when we speak of 'capitalist' we are speaking of the system as we knew it—as it existed here and in eastern Europe before the war. In many ways it was almost like the capitalist system that Marx wrote about in the 19th century. We realize, of course, that it does not much resemble the system in western Europe or in the United States today."

CHAMPIONED COEXISTENCE

Thus, when a leader like Mr. Kardelj speaks of the "disintegration of capitalism," he is speaking of the dissolution of a system which, for all practical purposes, has long since ceased to exist. His own revisionism consists of the bold assertion that "since the time of Marx and Lenin the world has continued to change, that capitalism has changed in many features, and that socialism, too, has changed in many features—these changes, of course, taking place in two different directions."

Thus, also, since the days of Stalin, the Yugoslavs have championed the idea of "active coexistence" with the West, rejecting the idea of the forcible imposition of the Communist system on other countries and the Chinese theories about the inevitability of war between the Socialist and capitalist worlds. Peace, in the Yugoslav book, is in the elementary interest of socialism as it is in the elementary interest of humanity as a whole.

All this, of course, is quite incompatible with the whole basis for Chinese doctrine and policy. From their point of view it represents a fatal heresy and a very real threat to their own position of power and influence within the Communist world. With Soviet Russia edging cautiously in the direction of a similar "revisionism" of its own, the stakes are enormous. And the interest of the West in the outcome of the struggle is no less than that of the countries directly involved.

A United Fight Needed To Obtain Protection for American Fishermen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the newly formed organization called National Fishermen and Wives, Inc., might well take up as their first major project the problem of the Ecuadorian Navy's unlawful interference with American fishing boats 7 miles offshore.

The Ecuadorians, of course, claim jurisdiction 200 miles offshore and have forced U.S. fishing boats to pay tribute for the privilege of fishing in international waters. I am glad to hear the American fishermen concerned have rebelled at this form of piracy on the high seas.

The U.S. Government at one time paid the fines of American fishermen. I do not know if they still do or not, but I would hope our State Department has abandoned ransoming our fish boats. Our Government should never have paid blackmail.

Mr. Speaker, the fishing industry of America should adopt a policy that an attack on one fisherman by anyone, anywhere, is an attack on all, and the National Fishermen and Wives, Inc. is the ideal organization to take up this fight involving southern California fishermen. It may be an Alaska or a Florida fisherman who needs protection next. So let those whose livelihood comes from the sea whether it be New England, the Gulf of Mexico, or in the Pacific Ocean—wherever it is—band together and demand protection for each segment of their industry.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the Representatives in Congress of coastal States to join in requesting our State Department to do something other than cooperate in some craven scheme to buy off another Nation's illegal actions against our fishing fleet.

On April 9, 1963, the Association of Wives of Commercial Fishermen in Seattle was formed. When their husbands are away at sea, the women will fight discrimination and unjustified actions detrimental to the industry.

I hope these wives and their new organization will take immediate steps to help their California brothers. A united fight to obtain State Department protection for America's fishermen is certainly needed.

Mr. Speaker, I am today writing to Assistant Secretary of State Alexis Johnson expressing my views and asking to be kept fully advised as to this international blackmail scheme against American citizens.

The following is the text of this letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1963.

Hon. ALEXIS JOHNSON,
Assistant Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: With great concern I read the May 26 news dispatch describing an incident of two San Diego tuna fishing boats being held at gunpoint by the Ecuadorian Navy for operating 7 miles off its coast.

Kindly keep me fully informed as to what action the U.S. Department of State takes with regard to this situation.

Meanwhile, I wish to strongly protest any policy acquiescence by our Government in regard to Ecuadorian claims of a 200-mile territorial sea. It is absolutely essential to stand on our rights unless the 3 mile limit is changed by international convention.

Our fishing industry is entitled to protection and every man who earns his livelihood from the sea has a constitutional right to call on his Government to punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas and offenses against the law of nations.

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Representative in Congress.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—Congressional Record, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the Record:

Roselle Park, N.J., *May 6, 1963.*

Dear Mr. Smith: I strongly urge action on House Resolution 14, to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Passage of this resolution would give our Representatives an opportunity to bring to the attention of all of us, the plight of the enslaved peoples, and I believe their efforts should be supported.

Yours truly,

Miss Ruth Higgins.

Dear Mr. Flood: I wish you success in your commendable efforts, and will ask my friends to write, also.

R. Higgins.

Ukrainian Congress Committee
of America, Inc.,
Denver, Colo., April 28, 1963.

The Honorable Donald G. Brotzman,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Brotzman: Congressman Daniel J. Flood submitted a resolution to the House Rules Committee calling for creation of a special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives, known as House Resolution 14.

The establishment of a special Committee on Captive Nations is an urgent need in the present cold war of communism against the Free World. Such an official parliamentary body will be capable of collecting true information concerning the countries and nations forcefully incorporated into the Communist bloc.

The non-Russian nations and their struggle for independence presents the perpetual difficulties for the Kremlin rulers. The problem of the captive nations is in fact the weakest spot of Communist Russian imperialism. It is in the best interest of the United States to know the facts concerning this weak spot of our mutual enemy. Creation of a special Committee on Captive Nations will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying its foreign policy.

We sincerely believe, Sir, that you fully understand the urgent need for creation of such a special Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives, and therefore we ask you: to introduce the similar resolution calling for the creation of a special Committee on Captive Nations in the House, or to write a letter to Congressman Howard W. Smith, Chairman of the House Rules Committee, expressing your full support for the Flood resolution, House Resolution 14. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

Ross Kuzmych,
President, Denver Branch of U.C.C.A.

American Counsel for an
Independent Cossackia, Inc.,
New York, N.Y., May 4, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: On behalf of our organization we urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration. Such a Committee on Captive Nations is vitally important both for our Government and the American people at large. While Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of "national liberation" in Africa and Asia, we as a nation, are not doing enough to help the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations which constitute a veritable weakness of the Soviet totalitarian empire.

A special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a reservoire of true and unbiased knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, which knowledge will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We strongly urge you, Congressman Smith, to give your full and qualified support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

Ignat Bilyj, *President.*

cc: Hon. Daniel J. Flood.

West Roxbury, Mass., *May 7, 1963.*

Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Martin: We can start to exploit the weaknesses in the Communist colonial empire by developing an effective policy toward the captive nations.

Last January, Congressmen Flood and Derwinski introduced House Resolutions 14 and 15 respectively which would implement the Captive Nations Week Resolution of 1959 and establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations. This committee would conduct inquiries into, study, and prepare concrete recommendations for an effective U.S. policy toward the captive nations. Many other Congressmen introduced similar resolutions.

On behalf of the Boston branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee, I am asking you—

1. To introduce a resolution of your own to establish a Committee on Captive Nations;

2. To support House Resolution 14 introduced by Congressman Daniel J. Flood;

3. To use your influence in the House Rules Committee, to which House Resolution 14 was assigned, and especially with the chairman of House Rules Committee, Howard W. Smith, to initiate action on the proposed legislation by opening public hearings.

Although this request does not come to you from your district, we believe that our fight with communism and our support for the captive nations is of a national concern and must have support of all Americans.

Your action and support in this matter will do much for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Sincerely yours,

Ukrainian Congress Committee of
America, Inc., Boston Branch,
Orest, Szcedluk, *Public Relations.*

Organization for Defense
of Lemkiwschyna,
Brooklyn, N.Y., May 1, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: We the officers of our organization urge earnestly to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it favorable support. We believe that such special Committee on Captive Nations is very important to our Government and the American people.

A Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a center of true knowledge and information on all the captive nations which information will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We strongly urge you, sir, to give your full support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee. Thank you.

For Organization for Defense of Lemkiwschyna.

Respectfully yours,

John Skwirtniansky,
Chairman.
Wasyl Skomsky,
Secretary.

Nondefense Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I reprint a recent editorial clipped from the Wellington Kansas Daily News. This editorial reveals once again that those who have been attributing our enormous budget to the cost of national defense have been barking up the wrong tree:

What's the cause of the present national debt, the further increase in that debt that is certain to occur this year, and the present level of taxation?

This is not so simple-minded a question as it may seem. A common answer is to attribute it to the cost of national defense, in an era when weapons are almost unbelievably expensive. And it is true that national defense accounts for roughly half of the total Federal budget, and is still on the upswing.

But proportionately, as Nation's Business points out in its April issue, defense has not been the principal villain of the play. Since 1952 defense spending has risen 26 percent, or $11 billion a year. But nondefense spending, in the same period, has risen 104 percent, or $22 billion a year, precisely twice as much in dollar terms.

Moreover, Nation's Business goes on to show Federal spending for nondefense purposes, which are in prospect, will rise on a wide variety of fronts. A partial list includes land, water and power projects; recreational facilities; fish and wildlife programs; urban renewal; public housing; rural electrification and telephone loans. And this is by no means the end. The magazine reports that public assistance will run to $3 billion next year, as against $2 billion in 1960—a jump of precisely 50 percent. It will cost more, so far as one can see now, to support Congress, the judiciary, the Internal Revenue Service, veteran's services—in sum, just about everything the Government does, plans to do, and wants to do. Areas where cost reductions are planned are almost as scarce as hen's teeth, and that is the basic problem that surrounds Mr. Kennedy's mired-down plan for tax reductions.

It is the most obvious of truisms to say that all of us would like to pay less in taxes. Yet the administration program has not found the response that was anticipated, either within or without Congress.

The "why" of that is not difficult to discover. For one thing, some of the changes in tax policy—the alleged "reforms"—that are part of the package have met with the stiffest kind of opposition. There has been determined objection to the proposal that tax reductions for such costs as mortgage interest and contributions to charity be strictly limited.

On a broader base than this, tabulations show that the proposed cuts in individual income taxes would amount to relatively little for the average family. There is a feeling, in major business circles that a tax program which would substantially spur the economy must be more favorable in its attitude toward the investment community.

On a still broader base, there is a fear the tax cuts without reductions in Government spending would be dangerous and unsound. And there is the real rub.

Nation's Business quotes various people's views on this aspect of the problem. Typical examples: A Kansas City man said, "A tax cut alone would only be like taking an aspirin: relief, but no cure. But a tax cut plus a cut in spending would give the country a boost like we haven't had in a long time." A New York woman said, "I can't afford for our household all the idealistic programs that would be nice for us as a family. And Mr. Kennedy can't afford for my country all the idealistic programs he proposes."

Finally, the influential Senator McCLELLAN has said that "continued excessive spending can only result in chaos and fiscal disaster." He is not alone, by any means, in that view.

What the United States Has Done and Is Doing for Refugees—Address by Hon. Francis E. Walter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address prepared by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. WALTER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the Committee on Judiciary, on which I have the honor to serve. The address was delivered for Mr. WALTER at the annual dinner of the Philanthropic Fund, American Council of Judaism, by one of Mr. WALTER's closest friends, Judge J. Cullen Ganey of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, Philadelphia, Pa.

The text of Mr. WALTER's address is as follows:

WHAT THE UNITED STATES HAS DONE AND IS DOING FOR REFUGEES

(By Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER)

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it is most gratifying for me to be able to respond to the invitation of your distinguished president, my dear friend, Mr. Henry S. Moyer, and present to this gathering not a speech, in fact, but a report on what the United States has done for refugees since that problem in all its magnitude and perplexity appeared before us in the aftermath of World War II.

It is particularly gratifying for me to speak on this subject as it was my voluntarily assumed task to undertake in the Congress of the United States to sponsor and pilot through the tortuous legislative route practically all of the legislation under which the United States accepted leadership in finding the solution of this problem.

When Mr. Moyer requested that I speak to you and outlined to me the scope and the framework of my address, I realized the very important and unique approach which your organization takes to the refugee problem and to the whole field of humanitarian endeavors.

It has been my experience that, for too long now, the critics of America's immigration policy have stressed the inadequacy of our effort rather than our unprecedented achievements. Never in history has a nation done more than the United States for victims of war and oppression. However, I feel obliged to say, the American Council for Judaism Philanthropic Fund is not among those who stress criticism, or who improperly suggest a lack of interest by the United States in assisting the refugees.

Mr. Moyer, in his wisdom, asked me for a balance sheet of our great achievements and I shall submit it to you tonight. It is a record of which all Americans may be proud. It is the product of their own sacrifices to bring it into being.

THE AFTERMATH OF WORLD WAR II

When the victorious armies of the Allies in World War II broke the back of the Nazi beast and occupied the heartland of Hitler's domain, they stepped into the appalling, overwhelmingly complex situation created by the uprooting of over 11 million human beings by Hitler's war machine and the Communist conquests in Eastern Europe.

It was my painful duty and unforgettably tragic experience to enter with our soldiers the gates of the most infamous concentration camps just liberated by our military might. I saw the ghastly looking inmates of the camps. I saw the people who miraculously escaped the gas chambers, and I saw the emaciated and hungry slave laborers. It was at that particular moment that I decided to do all that was in my power in order to assist these people on their return voyage to life.

Fortunately, there were people in the United States who had shown foresight by establishing, long before the invasion of Germany, an organization designed to provide immediate assistance—the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA), later succeeded by another agency planned well ahead of time, the International Refugee Organization (IRO).

The monumental task of assisting the mass of humanity to be fed, clothed, repatriated, or integrated in the economies of the countries of asylum, or to be resettled in countries which offered them opportunities to start a new life, fell first upon the Allied armies, then upon UNRRA and then upon the IRO.

THE UNITED STATES LED THE EFFORT

The United States assumed leadership in all of those areas of activity without the slightest delay.

In 1945 and 1946, for direct feeding of displaced persons by the U.S. Army in Europe, prior to the establishment of IRO, the United States spent $200 million. In the same period of time for assistance through UNRRA we spent $29 million. In addition to that, for resettlement activity prior to the establishment of IRO, the United States spent an additional $2 million. Thus, even before the international assistance machinery got started, the United States outlay amounted to $231 million.

The great effort undertaken by the International Refugee Organization (IRO) cost the U.S. taxpayers an additional sum of $237 million expended in the years 1947 to 1952.

THE UNITED STATES OPENS ITS DOORS

The United States was similarly in the lead with its initiative to offer hospitality to the refugees. The guns were hardly silent when, on December 22, 1945, President Truman, awaiting the enactment of special legislation, issued a directive which gave preference to displaced persons and refugees within the framework of the then existing immigration laws. The result was that 42,000 refugees entered the United States under this directive before the Congress finished its work on the Displaced Persons Act enacted in June of 1948.

When we succeeded in amending and extending the original act, in 1950, the doors of the United States were indeed thrown wide open and 405,000 displaced persons, refugees and expellees found new homes and a new life in our country. The administration of that law cost the United States $19 million between 1948 and 1952, when the principal parts of both special laws expired.

ICEM TAKES OVER FROM IRO

By the end of 1951, the great task had, however, been only partially completed. We realized then that with the expiration of IRO, which was scheduled for the end of that year, the problem of refugees required an additional effort in order to successfully resolve their resettlement, rehabilitation, and integration.

At our initiative 16 nations convened in Brussels and created the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM), an organization which is still active, continuing IRO's work of moving refugees overseas from Europe and providing resettlement and employment opportunities for Europe's unemployed work force.

Since the erection of ICEM, which by now has moved over 1,200,000 people, who otherwise would not have been moved, the United States has contributed $48 million to that part of the operational and administration funds which financed the resettlement of over half a million refugees.

FEEDING THE HUNGRY

The moving of refugees to new places of abode was not the only field of refugee assistance in which this country engaged. In the years 1950 to 1962, under the refugee feeding program authorized by the Congress, the U.S. unilateral action cost $120 million. Two simultaneously operated programs, assistance to Korean refugees and assistance to refugees from Palestine, cost the United States $332 million, of which $290 million went for U.S. contribution to the assistance of the Palestine refugees.

CONGRESS OPENS THE DOORS AGAIN

The Congress was not inactive while the last of the statutorily determined number of displaced persons were still landing on our shores.

The Refugee Relief Act of 1953 was the third of the series of legislative enactments under which the doors to the United States were kept open. As a result, an additional 190,000 refugees entered the United States while the number of war orphans entering this country passed the 6,000 mark.

The advent of the emergency caused by the mass exodus of Hungarian refugees streaming into Austria and Yugoslavia after the brutal crushing of the Hungarian uprising in 1956 by the Soviet panzer fist did not catch the United States unprepared.

The Immigration and Nationality Act, enacted in 1952, has a provision stemming from our past experiences. The law provides the chief law enforcement officer of our country, the Attorney General of the United States, with a permanent instrumentality permitting him to cope with emergencies that might arise in these troubled times. The "parole" provision of the so-called Walter-McCarran Act opened the door to 38,000 Hungarian refugees. The financing of the program necessitated the expenditure of $33 million.

This was in addition to expenditures exceeding $57 million incurred by the United States in operating still another unilateral program of assistance to refugees known as the U.S. Escapee Program (USEP). Further, in addition to that, we spent $11 million between 1959 and 1962 for support of activities of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and $90 million were spent between 1954 and 1958, for assistance to refugees from North Vietnam.

At the present time, the "parole" provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act serves to admit a number of Chinese refugees from Hong Kong who have close relatives in the United States. In May of 1962, when the influx of Chinese refugees into the British Crown Colony of Hong Kong suddenly increased, President Kennedy instructed the Attorney General of the United States to resort again to this provision of the law and to admit for emergency reasons a then undetermined number of Chinese refugees. We know now that approximately 12,000 Chinese refugees will be admitted to the United States by the end of the current year under the program administered jointly by consular officers in Hong Kong and the Immigration and Naturalization Service. This proves again that a permanent instrumentality for taking care of unforeseen refugee situations is available to the executive branch of this Government.

REFUGEES ENTERING UNDER QUOTAS

In reviewing the numbers illustrating the size of the U.S. special immigration programs for refugees, one must bear in mind the fact that refugees also entered this country under the permanent, general immigration law, although this class of immigrants does not necessarily bear the label of displaced persons and refugees. The most reliable figures relative to this category indicate that close to 150,000 quota immigrants would be classifiable as displaced persons or refugees.

ONE MILLION REFUGEES ADMITTED—$1.3 BILLION SPENT

By mid-1957, the last beneficiaries of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 found safe haven and new opportunities amongst us.

The Congress decided then that the expiration of the 1953 law ought not to foreclose the opportunities of an additional number of refugees to enter this country so as to fill the entire allocation provided by the 1953 act. A new law, which I had the privilege of sponsoring jointly with the then Senator from Massachusetts, John F. Kennedy, passed in September of 1957. It authorized the continuation of the movement of refugees to this country and made it possible for approximately 19,000 persons to enter the United States, not only from Europe but also from the general area of the Middle East, where persecution on religious grounds began to rear its ugly head after the emergence of certain new states and nations.

It is estimated by the statisticians of the Immigration and Naturalization Service that the total number of refugees who entered the United States under permanent and special legislation since the end of World War II is very near the 1 million mark, possibly exceeding it slightly. With additional expenditures for the assistance to the Algerian refugees, the refugees from Cuba now in this country, and assistance to refugees in Laos, the total amount of direct U.S. financial contributions to refugee assistance programs amounts to—in precise figures—$1,344,465,131.

It is important to keep in mind that this staggering amount of money represents only and exclusively the governmental contributions, contributions coming directly from the American taxpayers via the U.S. Treasury. It does not include 1 cent of moneys contributed through private voluntary organizations or private citizens. The latter amount defies evaluation, of course.

THE PRESENT SITUATION

What is the present situation?

The number of bona fide refugees entering Western Europe has been reduced to a mere trickle. Joint efforts undertaken by the community of nations banded together under U.S. leadership in ICEM and supporting the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, stimulated by the World Refugee Year, have contributed to a rapid liquidation of the last remaining refugee camps.

The improvement of the economic situation in Western Europe was an important factor further contributing to the integration of those refugees who could be employed in the countries of first asylum.

Joint efforts of several nations, including the United States, have provided for the establishment of welfare institutions giving care, maintenance, and recreation to the unresettlable hard core of refugees, to the aged, sick, blind, or crippled.

For the refugees who succeeded in leaving behind them the misery and oppression of the lands under Communist rule, the United States has provided legal means of entering this country by the enactment of Public Law 86-648, the so-called Fair Share Act, under which an average of 6,000 people enter the United States annually since June 1960. Under the same law victims of religious persecution prevalent in certain countries of the Middle East are also admitted in the United States as refugees.

Last year, in June 1962, with the support of my colleagues in the Congress, I succeeded in obtaining an indefinite extension of the Fair Share Act, administered humanely and diligently by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, acting through its officers stationed in Western Europe as well as in countries bordering elsewhere on the Middle East and the Iron Curtain.

With this law on our statute books and with the permanent authority of granting parole, the Attorney General of the United States is equipped to handle the present refugee situation and to face any unforeseen emergency. It is my firm belief that no large-scale refugee immigration programs are necessary at this time and it is rather fortunate that this finding can be made at a time when the domestic unemployment situation in the United States does not warrant any enlargement of the scope of the programs now in operation.

This is precisely why I, for one, do not believe that anyone advocating the admission of 50,000 refugees annually, as envisaged in certain legislative proposals, is acting realistically, sincerely, and in good faith. We simply could not find refugees in that number even if we were to institute a special search for them by beating the bushes in an internationally organized battue.

As long as the generous American people are satisfied that the deserving refugee is now adequately assisted in finding his way to freedom, safety, and new opportunities in this and other countries, I do not believe that our constituents would authorize us to enact that type of a legislation which, in all frankness, would be nothing but an exercise in futility.

It is good to know that we may have your wholehearted support when—never closing our eyes and hearts to human misery—we continue on the road of sound humanitarianism, keeping the best interest of our beloved country first and foremost in our minds.

The Richmond News Leader Comments on Birmingham Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most incisive appraisals of the Birmingham situation, and, simultaneously, one of the most thought-provoking commentaries on the current racial situation nationally, was recently published in the form of an editorial in the Richmond News Leader for May 22, 1963.

Mr. James Jackson Kilpatrick is the editor of this outstanding American newspaper and I very much hope this editorial will be read by the Members of Congress, and will be called to the attention of the people at large, for it deserves special attention:

BIRMINGHAM

If some homely advice could be offered to countless southerners who are sick, dismayed and despairing at the course of recent events, it would boil down to this: Have patience; stand fast. A point of national revulsion against the excesses of the militant Negro cannot be far in the distance.

In Birmingham, we believe, the Negro leaders may have pushed their luck too far. Little by little, as responsible voices rise above the stage-managed sound effects, a picture emerges that rational Americans will view with cold disdain. It is a picture of cynical manipulation by Negro leaders whose arrogance cannot be concealed much longer; it is a picture of hard infighting among the Negro groups for money and for power.

The picture emerges. Charles Bartlett, nationally syndicated columnist and close friend to the President, has put some of the facts on record. The Right Reverend George M. Murray, bishop coadjutor of the Episcopal diocese of Alabama, has provided in last Sunday's "The Living Church" a view of the Birmingham riots that will appeal to the good judgment of fairminded men. Relman "Pat" Morin, of the Associated Press, made it clear in some of his dispatches from Alabama that tales of police brutality were vastly overblown.

Bishop Murray does not mince words in his account of the affair. It is true, he says, that over the years, "race relations have been bad in Birmingham, and Negroes have been denied many rights." In the past 2 years, however, responsible citizens, both white and Negro, had begun to work effectively, on a local level, toward a better situation. Gains that once would have been regarded as "unbelievable" already had been made: "A new day was just ahead." A moderate city administration had been elected; only a few more weeks of patience were required.

The Negro leaders could not afford to wait. Bishop Murray is convinced that the demonstrations began as "a rather desperate gamble for power" on the part of one of the groups. "Too much was about to be accomplished without their help or their tactics." They wanted to be identified as the official bargaining agents for Birmingham's Negroes, and they were hungry for national financial support.

So the cynical manipulation of public opinion began. The staged hymn singing. The well-photographed kneelings. The children's march. The deliberate invasion of private property in order to provoke mass arrests. The calculated inflaming of an emotional and impulsive people. Criminal investigation eventually may disclose whether Negroes themselves were responsible for the acts of bombing and arson that set off the riots of May 11. Precisely such a pattern of criminal incitation was fixed a few years back in Louisville.

In the end, it will not escape public recognition that this violence was Negro violence. It was the Negroes themselves who stoned firemen attempting to put out fires in Negro property. White persons were not involved—except as the victims of broken bottles, brickbats, and knives. How much national admiration will be commanded by Negro athletes and entertainers who sought publicity by injecting themselves into a spark and tinder situation?

In predicting that the American people will soon tire of playing boob and patsy to the Negro leadership, we acknowledge the enormous forces of propaganda, falsehood, and sentimentality still marshaled in the Negroes' behalf. Our mail brings a lurid account by a Negro writer for the United Auto Workers. Monday's New York Times carries a full-page ad from the NAACP's Legal Defense Fund, asking half a million dollars in contributions to aid the Birmingham Negro who, "through nonviolent action, asserts his rights as an American citizen." The Liberal Party of New York takes a quarter page in the Times to address an inflammatory letter to the Governor of Alabama. A CBS television report on Birmingham, blandly presenting an appearance of impartiality, makes time available for two outside commentators, one white, the other Negro, to present contrasting views; for the white spokesman, 8 seconds; for the Negro, 94 seconds. In strident tones, such magazines as Life, Look, and Time cry out for "law" and support disorder.

Against these powerful organs of wealth and influence, it may seem impossible for reason to make headway. We do not despair. Unless we are wholly mistaken, a nationwide reaction already is setting in against the unbridled arrogance of Negro hoodlums, trespassers, invaders who demand special privileges in the name of equal rights.

The Negro organizations may reap a million dollars out of the Birmingham affair. They will gloat over it. But when the dust settles, they may find the accounts almost balanced by a million dollars' worth of ill will.

A Nuclear Submarine in Honor of Haym Salomon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which provides that a nuclear-powered submarine to be constructed at Groton, Conn., shall be named the U.S.S. *Haym Salomon*. This name shall be given to the first such submarine to be commissioned in the U.S. Navy after enactment of my bill.

Haym Salomon, in whose honor I propose the submarine be named, was the well-known financier of the Revolutionary War period who was imprisoned by the British and sentenced to death for his support of the American cause for independence. He succeeded in escaping and, despite his gravely impaired health, he continued to support the Revolutionary cause by his devoted service and the sacrifice of his personal fortune.

We have had a number of our nuclear-powered submarines named after heroes of the Revolutionary and post-Revolutionary period in our history. Among them are: George Washington, Ethan Allen, Patrick Henry, Nathan Hale, Alexander Hamilton, John Adams, James Monroe, Lafayette, and possibly others. I believe that Haym Salomon, a great American patriot, should be similarly honored. This suggestion came to me from the Jewish War Veterans at Groton, Conn., and I am in full accord with it.

The story of Haym Salomon is a very interesting one. There is a whole literature about him, but it will suffice to relate a few brief facts about this man taken from the Dictionary of American Biography, volume XVI, and other sources.

Haym Salomon is described as a merchant, a banker, and a Revolutionary financier. He was born in 1740 in Lissa, Poland, of Portuguese Jewish ancestry. He traveled widely and was proficient in several foreign languages. At the age of 32 he had come to England, and from there proceeded to New York where he established himself as a broker and shippers' agent. Shortly thereafter he threw in his lot with those fighting for the cause of American independence.

After the British had occupied New York, they arrested Salomon on September 22, 1776, and incarcerated him as a spy for the Revolutionary Forces. They later assigned him as an interpreter for the Hessian General Heister, but in this capacity Salomon sought to induce some of the Hessian soldiers to desert. He was later paroled and resumed his business activities. On January 2, 1777, he married Rachel Franks, the daughter of a prominent Jewish merchant Moses B. Franks.

In August 1778, Salomon was again arrested by the British and charged with being an accomplice in a plot to destroy British ships and warehouses in New York. He was found guilty and sentenced to death, but succeeded in escaping. Two weeks later he arrived in Philadelphia where he addressed a memorial to the Continental Congress setting forth his services to the American cause. He then established himself in Philadelphia as a dealer in securities. In time the business prospered and Salomon became the leading broker in the city and one of the largest depositors in the Bank of North America.

Among those who sought and obtained financial assistance from him were Robert Morris, the Superintendent of Finance; General Washington; James Madison; General Miflin; General Steuben; James Monroe, and many others. Upon the urgent request of General Washington, Salomon helped stave off a mutiny in the Colonial Army by raising a timely loan. He similarly helped finance Lafayette's army. He served as paymaster-general for the French forces in America, and also was named as sole broker for the Office of Finance and was successful in negotiating loans for the Colonies from France and Holland.

Original checks and vouchers presented later to Congress showed that at the time of his death on January 8, 1785, at the age of 45, he was owed nearly $700,000 by the U.S. Government which he advanced over the years for various purposes. The Dictionary of American Biography states as follows about Haym Salomon's financial assistance to the Government:

> These liberal advances in specie and equally liberal investments in Revolutionary paper furnish a singularly outstanding example of unselfish devotion to the American cause, particularly when it is remembered that the family was left practically penniless at his death.

Salomon suffered heavy financial reverses after the Revolutionary War. His sudden death in 1785 was attributed to worries over his financial losses and to the impairment of his health resulting from his imprisonment by the British during the war. He left a wife and four young children. Despite several attempts to obtain a settlement of the family claim against the Government, his heirs were never repaid any of the funds he advanced. One of his sons, Haym M. Salomon, served as captain of the 1st Infantry Brigade, U.S. Army, during the War of 1812.

Mr. Speaker, how different would have been the fate and destiny of this Nation if there had been no Haym Salomon to help raise the necessary funds for Washington to fight the war for our independence? Today, in the perspective of time, it is all history; but it is history which we should not forget. One way of remembering it to keep the memory of these patriots of yesterday alive in our own generation. Naming a nuclear submarine in honor of Haym Salomon would be a tribute to a great patriot who helped forge the destiny of our Nation nearly two centuries ago. I urge all my colleagues in the Congress to support my bill.

Transit Study Headed by Richardson Dilworth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times on May 26 published an article on the appointment announced by Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges of former Philadelphia mayor Richardson Dilworth as chairman of the Washington-Boston transportation study. I am offering the New York Times item for the information of the many Members who are interested in this important subject.

An editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer today describes Mr. Dilworth as the Nation's foremost authority on urban transit problems and their solutions. I have included this editorial also, as of vital interest to all Members from our cities, and especially those from the great metropolitan area extending from Washington to Boston.

This outstanding appointment affords one more instance of the many experts provided by Philadelphia on nationwide problems:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 26, 1963]

Dilworth Heads Transport Study

Washington, May 25.—The appointment of Richardson Dilworth, former mayor of Philadelphia, as chairman of a Washington-Boston transportation study was announced today by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges.

The purpose of the study is to evaluate transportation requirements in the Washington-Boston corridor and to recommend a coordinated program of development of road, air and rail facilities.

A Commerce Department spokesman said Mr. Dilworth would serve without compensation.

The Washington-Boston corridor, called a megalopolis by city planners, now contains about 40 million people. By 1980, it has been estimated, the population will total 50 million.

Mr. Dilworth was the Democratic candidate for Governor of Pennsylvania last year.

Mr. Hodges said he intended to announce appointments to an advisory committee soon.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, May 27, 1963]

Transit Study by Dilworth

Richardson Dilworth, the Nation's foremost practical authority on urban transit problems and solutions, is an excellent choice to direct a comprehensive transportation study embracing the almost continuous string of metropolitan areas stretching from Boston to Washington.

Appointment of Mr. Dilworth as chairman of the project, announced over the weekend by Commerce Secretary Hodges, assures all communities in the survey area that the study will be conducted in an expert manner by one who understands the complexities of urban transit development and coordination.

The former mayor of Philadelphia pioneered in the public-private partnership approach to mass transportation. Creation of the nonprofit Passenger Service Improvement Corp., and success of the famous low-fare operation commuter routes in conjunction with the Pennsylvania and Reading railroads, are impressive testimony to the wisdom of the Dilworth philosophy that expanded rail service is essential to the solution of transit difficulties in heavily populated areas.

Now a new dimension of the urban transportation picture is to be explored. The study under the chairmanship of Mr. Dilworth will concentrate on the interrelation of transit requirements affecting Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, and dozens of smaller cities interspersed among those major metropolises. More than 40 million people live in this metropolitan corridor—nearly one-fourth of the country's population. Not only rail but highway facilities are to come within the scope of the survey, which is the outgrowth of a proposal last fall by Senator Pell, of Rhode Island for an interstate transportation compact embracing the Middle Atlantic and New England seaboard cities.

Whatever long-range developments result from the Dilworth study will not interfere with immediate rail transit improvements being planned for Philadelphia and suburban counties in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. These projects should be expedited. Continuing leadership in mass transit development by Delaware Valley communities will establish this area more firmly as the logical hub and focal point for regional intercity networks created later.

Malaise on the Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, in a recent "Letter to the Editor," one of our colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Mosher], has expressed some cogent and well-reasoned opinions on the general subject of the present "Congressional Slowdown." I commend his thoughtful observations to, I hope, an even wider audience.

His basic premise, if I understand it correctly, is that Congress ought to recapture its initiative to legislate. Tailor-made bills which flow in never-ending profusion from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue are often consigned to unmarked graves in the legislative graveyard. This is true in part, I believe, because the technicians in the executive branch are insulated to a considerable degree from the flood of mail and visitors from "back home" that constitute a basic part of every legislator's daily routine.

Members of Congress who have been sent here to legislate ought to take the lead in reasserting their constitutional prerogative to do just that very thing. The executive branch has certainly not suddenly become the sole repository of creativity. Congress ought to give top priority to the task of originating laws rather than merely reviewing the proposals of the executive. I agree with Congressman Mosher that the results could be quite dramatic.

The article follows:

Malaise on the Hill

This letter is prompted by your May 19 feature, by Richard L. Lyons, concerning suggested reforms which might make the U.S. House of Representatives a more effective legislative body.

Most critics of the Congress today seem to measure its faults only by the extent to which the House fails to approve President Kennedy's legislative proposals. I doubt that is the most significant measure, but let's accept it momentarily—for the sake of argument.

Would the administration's program move much faster if the usually suggested reforms—cut the Rules Committee power; modify the seniority system; limit the tenure and power of committee chairman—were now in effect? I doubt it.

I suspect a major reason why the House hesitates to approve the President's bills is the simple fact that most of the Democratic representatives—who now hold control of the House by a large margin—simply don't much care.

Does their apathy toward the New Frontier legislation merely reflect public apathy? Or does it stem in part from the deep division within their own ranks, between North and South? Those, and other factors are part of the equation.

But I suspect a more fundamental cause of apathy is a lack of feeling among Democratic members that the Administration's program is also their program. They lack a sense of authorship, of proprietary interest, and therefore they show no enthusiastic allegiance to it—no sense of pride, enthusiasm and push.

Is that not because it is the executive branch which firmly holds the initiative in legislative matters? Practically all the important proposals given serious consideration are written in or near the White House, and then are handed over (handed down?) to the Congress. Congressional sponsorship is only nominal.

That is a perverted relationship, it seems to me.

Perhaps the "reform" most needed is some sort of dramatic act of independence by the House (and especially by the majority Members), some rebellious, inventive, positive act by which the House would rekindle its self-respect and self-assurance—its virility.

That act would require majority party leadership with the courage and imagination to ignore or reject the White House programs and say, "No, we've got some ideas of our own."

If the House could develop fresh approaches to the Nation's problems—in contrast to the Administration's warmed over New Deal—then there might quickly develop enthusiastic, prideful support, sense of initiative and participation, and legislative drive. In the face of such drive, the organizational hurdles usually blamed for congressional inaction would quickly be surmounted.

Is not action the best cure for inaction? Nothing succeeds like success, and all that sort of thing. I suggest an immediate and important opportunity for healthy revolution, an act of independence, is in the Ways and Means Committee—the possibility of some original tax-cut legislation quite unlike the Administration's proposals.

Genuine "Made on Capitol Hill" programs, rather than those stamped all over with the "J.F.K." brand, might be voted in the House with a whoop and holler—in sharp contrast with today's malaise of moans and sighs.

Charles A. Mosher,
Representative, 13th District, Ohio.

Washington.

Bob Considine: Military Pay Raise Is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the difficulties encountered by our military personnel in stretching their pay to meet today's high living costs was vividly described by Bob Considine, noted newspaper columnist, in an Armed Forces Day address.

Speaking at the 14th Annual National Armed Forces Day Dinner, Mr. Considine warned that America is guilty of making military careers unattractive.

Mr. Speaker, his remarks bear a grave warning to America—if, as he says, many good men are being forced to leave the service simply because they cannot afford to wear the uniform.

Mr. Speaker, his remarks speak for themselves. Due to the great importance of keeping our military strong and well staffed, under unanimous consent I insert the body of his speech for the information of the Congress:

Bob Considine: Military Pay Raise Is Needed

I am sure we all share a feeling of pride tonight as we pause—at this dinner—to pay our respects to the Armed Forces. But can we who are civilians be proud of our support of the people in uniform? I am afraid the answer is "No"—on those terms, we cannot be proud.

Let's face it. We are giving the military man far less support than he deserves. We are short-changing him—and I say "we" because our taxes pay the national bills, and our votes run the country.

As citizens we stand guilty, I am afraid, of making the military career so unattractive that we are daily forcing good men—top men—to leave their military careers simply because they cannot afford to wear the uniform.

I meant that quite literally. You're all familiar, I suppose, with some of the shocking examples:

Petty officers in New York State qualify, by virtue of their low income status, to be on the State's relief rolls.

The junior officers in the Pentagon draw less pay than the messenger boys who run around the five-sided building on those three-wheeled bicycles.

The general in command of a large Air Force installation is paid less than that of his civilian technical director.

The dependents of military personnel lost on the *Thresher*, will receive smaller Government pensions than will dependents of the civilians who were aboard the submarine in its last dive, and that is not to begrudge those dependents their legal benefit.

And, with all this, the military man suffers in silence. It is not his nature to petition his Congressman or his Commander in Chief. He is not—and we can thank God for it—a political animal. And now he's paying the price.

Congressmen will tell you they have heard little "noise," as they put it, on the military pay bill now before the Congress.

But there's plenty of noise out among the troops. The low retention rate in critical job categories proves the point. And the high cost of training replacements proves how daffy we are to think we are saving money by not paying a fair price for military service.

Yet, the military pay bill that has just passed the House, for consideration by the Senate, offers a pay structure that is far from comparable—allowing for all the so-called fringe benefits—with civil service salaries, much less industry salaries.

Do we really give a damn?

Do we? In the year that produced the Cuban crisis—with an enemy's nuclear missiles at our backdoor?

Robert Devereaux, the Earl of Essex, in the year 1600, said of military men: "If we may have peace, they have purchased it; and if we must have war, they must manage it."

Those words are as true today as they were 363 years ago. And we should add that military men must be fairly compensated for what they have purchased, and for what they must manage.

I'm happy to note that the sponsors of this event—the Army Association, Navy League, and Air Force Association—have joined hands on the military pay issue—and henceforth will present a united front to Congress and the public in behalf of our men in uniform.

Maybe they will make some of the noise that is needed.

But all of us have cause to make some noise on this subject—first, in fairness to the men who serve us—and second, in our own interests. For let's face it. The inadequate military pay structure—even with passage of the bill now in Congress—jeopardizes our military security.

If we really want to salute the man in uniform, we must make some noise to get more money in his pockets. Amen.

Internationally Known Historian Dies Following Brain Surgery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, a standard of quality in academic life seems to be the goal on the contemporary American campus. The desire for excellence is recognized throughout the Nation as the primary objective of our entire educational system.

One of America's scholars whose professional career exemplified the high standards of scholarship which she felt essential in the academic world was Dr. Dorothy Mackay Quynn. Mrs. Quynn died on Tuesday, May 21, 1963. Her life added to America's knowledge of history and enhanced the reputation of American scholarship abroad. Through her residence in France and her wide acquaintance among people of the French community throughout the world Mrs. Quynn became a true American ambassador. I have personally been able to observe the results of her interest in Franco-American relations and have witnessed the heart-warming response that she always achieved. Her contribution to the enhancement of good will between the French and the American people was significant. A brief account of her life is as follows:

Internationally Known Historian Dies Following Brain Surgery

Dr. Dorothy Mackay Quynn, internationally recognized historian, particularly in the field of medieval history, died early Tuesday morning at Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore.

Death was attributed to a brain tumor. Mrs. Quynn entered the Baltimore hospital several days ago and underwent brain surgery on Monday morning.

Mrs. Quynn, wife of Prof. William R. Quynn, resided at historic Amelung House, near Urbana. Her husband is a professor of French at the University of Maryland.

Mrs. Quynn was a native of San Francisco, Calif. She was educated at Lowell High School, San Francisco, the University of California at Berkeley and held a doctorate in medieval history from the University of Paris.

She taught, mainly history, in the leading colleges in the Nation being a member of the faculties at Mills College, near San Francisco, the University of West Virginia, Duke University, Durham, N.C., and Goucher College, Towson.

She was a member of many learned societies including the Medieval Academy, The American Historical Association and the Maryland Historical Society. She was accepted into membership of the Local Historical Society of the Department of the Loiret in France of which she and Benjamin Franklin were the only American members.

Locally she was a former president and member of the American Association of University Women, and the Frederick County Historical Society.

NEARLY COMPLETED BOOK

She was awarded a fellowship by the national organization of the American Association of University Women to trace the travels of Betsy Patterson. She was nearing completion of a book "The Biography of Betsy Patterson," at the time of her death.

She was the author of many articles on the history of medieval France, and on the history of the United States, Maryland and this county.

With her husband, she collaborated on several articles of Maryland history and together they wrote and published a book on "Barbara Frietschie."

Internationally sought as an authority on history, she contributed to several works on history. Ironically one person with whom she had worked, Sir Maurice Pewicke, famous medieval historian, died Sunday. He held honorary doctorates from many universities including Harvard.

INVITED TO FRANCE

One of her most outstanding honors came in the spring of 1961 when she was invited to participate in the annual Joan of Arc commemorative ceremonies by the City of Orleans, France. It marked the reopening of the medieval university noted for its law school. She delivered the main address of the opeining, speaking on the nonlegal studies at Orleans as shown in Chaucer and other medieval writers. During this stay in France—one of several trips abroad for study and research—she did visit several archives to continue her work on her AAUW Fellow project.

Mrs. Quynn was a daughter of the late William James Brisbane Mackay, a native of Scotland and of Illa Fales of New England.

United States-Yugoslav Relations—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, 1963, the Washington Evening Star published a perceptive editorial on the current economic and political developments in Yugoslavia.

I wish to call the attention of my colleagues in the House to this editorial, as well as to the two enlightening articles on Yugoslavia by the Star's European correspondent, Crosby S. Noyes. I have attempted to point out the significance of Mr. Noyes' excellent analysis of United States-Yugoslav relations in two previous inserts appearing in this issue of the Congressional Record.

The editorial follows:

Marshal Tito's Blast

If words mean anything in the wonderful world of communism, Yugoslavia's Marshal Tito has come to a final parting of the ways with Red China.

The Yugoslav leader, according to an Associated Press dispatch from Belgrade, has said he will continue to seek good relations with the West and will fully support Premier Khrushchev's policy of peaceful coexistence. This must have sounded like the rankest sort of heresy in Peiping. But Marshal Tito added insult to injury when he denounced the Communist Chinese as "war-seeking Trotskyites"—a very dirty phrase in the Red vocabulary. The reaction in Peiping must have been akin to what one would expect should he walk up to Harry Truman and—to his face—accuse him of being soft on communism.

The occasion for all of this is the scheduled meeting on July 7 between the Chinese and the Russians; ostensibly for the purpose of ironing out their ideological differences. It seems unlikely that much will come of this effort. But Marshal Tito, who has been condemned as a traitor and such by the Chinese, evidently was taking no chances. At any rate, he warned that a compromise at the expense of Yugoslavia could have serious consequences for the Communist movement.

There may be some meaning in this which has special significance for the United States. Winston Churchill once said that Russia "is a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma." Doubtless there still is much truth in this observation. But nevertheless what John Foster Dulles called the "yeast of change" seems to be at work in Khrushchev's Russia as distinguished from Stalin's Russia. The fact appears to be that the doctrinaire Chinese Communists hold fast to their belief that war is the essential instrument of world domination by communism. Mr. Khrushchev, however, seems to want to avoid war, or at least a major war, in the belief that time will work for the Communists and against the West.

No worthwhile judgment on these things can be handed down today. But if Mr. Khrushchev is edging away from the militant Chinese brand of communism and is leaning toward the proclaimed objectives of Marshal Tito's own special variety it would not seem to be in the interests of the United States to weaken or undermine the Tito position at this uncertain juncture in the evolvement of the Communist community.

This is the burden of the message contained in two dispatches from Belgrade in recent days by the Star's European correspondent, Crosby S. Noyes. He warned that relations between the United States and Yugoslavia will suffer, and the latter's economy may be seriously injured, if it becomes necessary to apply the legislation, passed last summer, which would exclude Yugoslavia from her most-favored-nation status—a term which means that Yugoslavia can trade with us under tariff conditions applying to our best customers.

President Kennedy and our returning Ambassador to Yugoslavia, George F. Kennan, have said much the same thing. Last June, we expressed the belief that Senator Proxmire had the better of the argument in opposing a particular development loan to Yugoslavia on the essential ground that Marshal Tito seemed to be moving closer to the Kremlin. The Senator, however, did not advocate cutting of the most-favored-nation treatment.

In light of our correspondent's on-the-scene reports and because of the ferment which obviously is at work in the Communist world, the wisdom of tying the President's hands at this particular moment is dubious to say the least. He ought to be given freedom to maneuver in our best interests.

No Reason To Fear U.S. National Debt if Country Has Sound Debt Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Paul A. Samuelson, of the economics department of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in Cambridge, Mass., points out that there is some analogy between public finance and private finance in his very interesting, stimulating, and amusing article published in the Washington Sunday Post and Times Herald yesterday. He reasons that there is no need for fear because of the size of the public debt, and that the United States can have a sound debt policy as long as the economy grows "at as large an average rate, or at the 4-percent rate which prudent judgment shows to be feasible."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks I wish to insert Professor Samuelson's article in the Appendix:

No Reason for Fear—We Can Have Sound Debt Policy

(By Paul A. Samuelson)

To become an expert on economics, one used to have to study for years, bone up on history, master statistics, learn German and French and cut down on dancing and playing golf during those years when dancing and golf are most enjoyable.

But World War II changed all that. The test as to whether a man was a good economist came to be boiled down to the simple question: "Have you ever met a payroll?" This created what Pareto would call a "circulation among the elite."

The self-employed were instantly disenfranchised. Down from the walls came the pictures of Adam Smith and Alexander Hamilton; up went the portraits of John J. Raskob and Ivar Krueger. Emerson's man, who built a better mousetrap, found the world beating a path to his door—not for mousetraps but for advice on the sensational problem of the Indian rupee and the notorious law of diminishing returns.

Since economic wisdom is the rarest good in the gross national product, this payroll criterion had a great virtue of increasing—over Friday afternoon, so to speak—the country's inventory of economic brains one thousand-fold. But that was only the beginning. An even better doctrine has finally been evolved.

Today, to understand the intricacies of the national debt or the capital-output ratio it is no longer enough for an economist to meet a payroll; he, I mean she, must also be able to bake an angelfood cake or at least thaw out frozen mashed potatoes. The prophet of this new doctrine is Senator Barry Goldwater, who said in a recent speech that he would rather have any housewife in his audience on the Council of Economic Advisers than Chairman Walter W. Heller. The applause was deafening.

But this is not a mere opening from the right. Leon Keyserling, whom few will accuse of being against the little man, independently opined aloud that his cook knew more economics than President Kennedy's coterie of advisers. Here we have the making of a united front, a new national consensus.

Despite the natural tendency for the victim of technological progress to resent his own Darwinian demise, I embrace the new Sylvias, who shall not only sing our country's songs but also write its laws. The League of Women Voters has always done its homework better than have the Lions and the Elks. Out of the mouths of grown-up babes comes wisdom. The invisible hand of Adam Smith is the hand that rocks the cradle and trumps the ace.

I propose, therefore, to discuss, in one brief lesson, what every woman should know about the public debt. This is a lesson never out of season.

There is some analogy between public finance and private finance. A mother can spend her money wastefully; so can a government. A bride can spend too much; so can a government. The absence of financial discipline can result in trouble and even in disaster.

There is also some lack of analogy between private finance and public finance—just as there is some lack of analogy between running a business for profit and a family for welfare. General Mills recently said: We have lopped off this year N million dollars of sales, because they cost more than they were worth; there is no sense in spinning the wheels just for motion's sake. This is a proper statement for a socially productive business firm to make.

But a housewife cannot say she will eliminate a twin this quarter or shut down temporarily on the business of education any more than the president of Harvard feels he must throw in the sponge because the university has never paid its way in the last 300 years and has never been able to claim the clean profit-and-loss statement of Arthur Murray's dancing school.

Women, perhaps better than men, know that life is a going concern. There is no rational reason to fear a public debt that grows indefinitely—say at an annual rate of 2 percent per year averaged over a decade—provided the economy grows at as large an average rate, or at the 4 percent rate which prudent judgment shows to be feasible.

To believe that disaster lies in this direction is to believe in old-husbands' tales. But the poor dears cannot seem to understand. So we must put it in the form of an analogy—the only analogy with private finance that brings fast relief to those troubled in their viscera by pseudoanxieties connected with the public debt.

American Telephone & Telegraph is a great stock; even poor widowers can trust it. A.T. & T. has been accumulating bond debt for the last half century. Forty years from now its bond indebtedness and interest charges can, with condfidence, be estimated to be up by 300 percent. Is this unsound? No. Even if the telephone poles and switchboards that were bought out of A.T. & T.'s deficit financing were incapable of being sold to other industry, so long as the phone receipts of A.T. & T. can be confidently expected to rise faster over the decades than its debt service charges, there is no debt problem.

So it is with the American Nation. The true problems of fiscal policy are twofold:

Discipline to insure we get the proper scope, and what is not the same thing, the proper efficiency in Government.

Dosage, to insure that surpluses and deficits strike the needed balance between sluggish growth with unemployment and feverish inflation with catastrophic gold drain.

So long as the taxable base of the American people keeps the needed balance of the public debt—and it will most assuredly continue to do so in these tormented cold war years—the burden of the debt on the backs of President Eisenhower's grandchildren will remain a problem of urgency lower than that of DDT or of the unemployment all youth faces.

If this is not precisely what they're saying down at the office, it's time the poor dears checked back with headquarters for proper briefing.

Resolution Passed by the Oklahoma Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, resolution, and roster:

THE GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED,
Oklahoma City, Okla., May 23, 1963.

Representative VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WICKERSHAM: Enclosed find a resolution passed by the Oklahoma Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped at its annual meeting, April 23, 1963. Also enclosed is a membership roster of the Governor's committee.

With the increased unemployment, due to disability, certainly an effort should be made to assist the handicapped person, who has received rehabilitation through the State and Federal program, in obtaining employment. Additional staff in the Employment Service, assigned to this specific responsibility, would certainly result in increased placement of the qualified, disabled worker.

We appreciate your support in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

WALDO E. STEPHENS,
Chairman.

Whereas the Oklahoma Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, at its annual meeting on April 23, 1963, discussed the ever-increasing number of unemployed handicapped persons and their abilities to become productive, taxpaying citizens if provided with the opportunity; and

Whereas the State and the Federal agencies are spending millions of tax dollars to train and rehabilitate handicapped persons for productive employment; and

Whereas the President's, the Governor's, and the Mayors' Committees on Employment of the Handicapped, with each membership comprised of private citizens serving without copensation, are striving to develop programs whereby the employers, through selective placement, will provide the trained, qualified, handicapped worker an opportunity to be productive; and

Whereas the U.S. Employment Service, through its 1,800 field offices, has the physical plant to complete the rehabilitation process of the handicaped person if adequately financed; and

Whereas with sufficient funds, each local office could provide increased counseling, job development, and selective placement for the severely disabled: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oklahoma Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, at its annual meeting in the Blue Room of the State Capitol on April 23, 1963, by unanimous vote, does hereby petition the Congress of the United States, through its Oklahoma Senators and Congressmen, to provide sufficient funds to the U.S. Department of Labor, U.S. Employment Service Division, to adequately staff each and every local employment office in the Nation so that sufficient personnel shall be available to provide increased counseling, testing, job development, and placement of the trained, qualified, handicapped worker; and be it further

Resolved, That the committee endorses the programs administered by the U.S. Employment Service through its agencies and vigorously opposes any reductions of these services or the curtailment of its functions.

Adopted and approved by the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped the 23d day of April 1963.

WALDO E. STEPHENS,
Chairman of the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED OFFICIAL MEMBERSHIP AS OF DECEMBER 10, 1961

Rev. Charles Arnold, pastor, Mohawk Park Christian Church, Tulsa, Okla.

John Arville, director, operation-programs, KWTV, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Don Atkinson, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Travis Austin (left the State), Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Okla.

W. J. Bacon, editor, Sayre Daily Headlight, Sayre, Okla.

Victor Barnett, Tulsa Tribune, Tulsa, Okla.

Harlan Bell, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Ben Blackstock, executive secretaray, Oklahoma Press Association, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Mrs. Moraul Bosonetto, attorney, Sapulpa, Okla.

Mrs. Margaret Brooks, director, Jane Brooks School for the Deaf, Oklahoma College for Women, Chickasha, Okla.

Jess J. Caldwell, secretary-treasurer, Oklahoma State AFL–CIO, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Howard Cowan, director of public affairs, Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, Tulsa, Okla.

Rev. Finis A. Crutchfield, pastor, Boston Avenue Methodist Church, Tulsa, Okla.

Kieffer Davis, M.D., medical director, Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

Roy Deal, district accounting manager, Oklahoma Natural Gas Co., Oklahoma City, Okla.

James DeVore, M.D., Oklahoma City, Okla.

J. Landis Fleming, editor, Moore Monitor, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Howard J. Fox, general purchasing agent, American Airlines, Tulsa, Okla.

David Fowler, president, district No. 21, United Mine Workers of America, Muskogee, Okla.

Shelby G. Gamble (left the State), Medical Rehabilitation Center, Okmulgee, Okla.

Mrs. C. H. Gibbons, Oklahoma Federation of Women's Clubs, Coweta, Okla.

Ted B. Halter, Oklahoma City, Okla.

John Harris, area manager, Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, Chickasha, Okla.

William N. Harsha, M.D., Oklahoma City, Okla.

A. J. "Bud" Haswell, vice president, Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., Oklahoma City, Okla.

R. W. Hendrickson, works comptroller, Western Electric Co., Inc., Oklahoma City Works, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Wilbur Henline, director, War Veterans Commission, Oklahoma City, Okla.

F. E. Hixon, manager, Sears, Roebuck & Co., Oklahoma City, Okla.

Rose Hohenshelt, assistant vice president, First National Bank, Clinton, Okla.

W. J. "Bill" Holloway, First National Bank Building, Oklahoma City, Okla.

John M. Hollimon, attorney, Oklahoma Bar Association, Bartlesville, Okla.

Fred Holmes, district manager, Oklahoma Natural Gas Co., Enid, Okla.

Homer Hurt, counsel, Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc., Tulsa, Okla.

Wm. K. Ishmael, M.D., Oklahoma City, Okla.

William M. Jackson, assistant manager, Federal Aviation Agency, Oklahoma City, Okla.

C. W. Jenkins, secretary-treasurer and business manager, Chauffeurs, Teamsters & Helpers Local Union 516, Muskogee, Okla.

George Jenkins, chief, education and training, Veterans' Administration, Muskogee, Okla.

Earl F. Johnson, General Insurance Agency, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Otey Johnson, M.D., Ardmore Sanitarium and Hospital, Ardmore, Okla.

John H. Koch, vice president, Burtek, Inc., 15th Street at 73d Avenue East, Tulsa, Okla.

Roy Krogstad, OCACUP, Tinker Air Force Base, Okla.

Milton Lundquist, director, Goodwill Industries, 130 South Second Street, Muskogee, Okla.

Earl R. Mahoney, vice president, Reynolds Oilfield Sales Co., 1540 Southeast 29 Street, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Emil Marcus, manager, Centra Leather Goods of Oklahoma, Inc., Frederick, Okla.

Britt Mayfield, chief, Technical Services, Employment Security Commission, Oklahoma City 2, Okla.

Dr. Tom Mitchell, medical director, Humble Oil & Refining Co., Tulsa, Okla.

J. M. "Skip" Montgomery, Halliburton Oil Well Cementing Co., Tulsa, Okla.

F. D. Moon, Oklahoma City 4, Okla.

Earl C. McCutcheon, president, Oklahoma City Chapter of American Society of Safety Engineers, Oklahoma City 9, Okla.

Floyd R. Nicholson, director, Oklahoma Goodwill Industries, Inc., Oklahoma City, Okla.

E. J. "Chuck" O'Connor, executive vice president, Associated Industries of Oklahoma, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Lloyd F. Palmer, regional director, Insurance Information Institute, 901 Colcord Building, Oklahoma City 2, Okla.

Ed Polk (resigned), Oklahoma City, Okla.

Wayne Quinlan, attorney, 724 NW. Britton, Oklahoma City 14, Okla.

Mrs. Esther Robinson, executive secretary, Oklahoma Council of Teachers of English, Oklahoma City 6, Okla.

Rev. Joseph Shackford, associate minister, St. Luke's Methodist Church, Oklahoma City 3, Okla.

Oren T. Skouge, M.D., manager, Veterans' Administration Hospital, Oklahoma City 4, Okla.

V. C. Sole, Superior Oil Co., Ponca City, Okla.

J. R. Stacy, M.D., Oklahoma City, Okla.

Steve Stahl, executive vice president, Oklahoma Public Expenditure Council, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Dr. Waldo Stephens, Stephens Oil Co., Oklahoma City, Okla.

Alfred R. Sugg, M.D. (deceased: December 16, 1961), Ada, Okla.

Carroll Swickey, executive secretary, Oklahoma Association of Insurance Agents, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Howard C. Walkingstick, Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Anadarko, Okla.

Joseph West (left the State), Western Electric Co., Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Mrs. Almon G. White, Shidler, Okla.

Leonard Williams, director of personnel, Seamprufe, Inc., 400 West Chickashaw, McAlester, Okla.

Seth Wilson, 1212 North Hudson, Oklahoma City, Okla.

John W. Wolfe, industrial relations, Cities Service Oil Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

Robert N. Woodard, 600 Northeast 13th Street, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Len Yarborough, executive vice president, Oklahoma State AFL–CIO, 531 Commerce Exchange Building, Oklahoma City, Okla.

TECHNICAL ADVISERS TO GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE, DECEMBER 10, 1961

Judge William A. Berry, Justice of the Supreme Court, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Dick Clarke, executive secretary, Oklahoma Society for Crippled Children, Oklahoma City, Okla.

L. K. Covelle, director, Oklahoma State Tech, Okmulgee, Okla.

Dr. Hayden Donahue, superintendent, Central State Hospital, Norman, Okla.

Mildred Fitch, attorney, Tulsa, Okla.

Neal Golden, county superintendent of schools, El Reno, Okla.

Lester Hall, executive secretary, Mental Health Association, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Dr. Oliver Hodge, superintendent of public instruction, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Ralph Hudson, State librarian, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Jim Hughes, State labor commissioner, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Joe B. Hunt, State insurance commissioner, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Wallace L. Keating, State personnel director, Oklahoma City, Okla.

J. C. Kennedy, Lawton, Okla.

Morris Leonhard, chief employment service, Oklahoma Employment Security Commission, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Frank Malone, principal, Northwest Classen High School, Oklahoma City, Okla.

K. T. Mosley, M.D., commissioner, State department of health, 3400 North Eastern, Oklahoma City, Okla.

James Overfelt, administrative assistant, department of public welfare, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Hon. Mildred Patterson, county judge, Logan County Courthouse, Guthrie, Okla.

Jack Sampson, manager, radio station KOMA, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Voyle Scurlock, director vocational rehabilitation, 1212 North Hudson, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Dr. T. Glyne Williams, director, Department of Mental Health, Post Office Box 3095, State Capitol station, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Hon. Dorothy Young, juvenile court judge, courthouse, Tulsa, Okla.

Virgil Young Insurance Agency, 225 East Main Street, Norman, Okla.

Has It Become 'Pipe Down' Era?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the betrayal by the U.S. Government of the principles of the Hungarian revolt of 1956 have completely come to light in recent weeks. This tragic development in our foreign policy, evidently the brainchild of the coexistence group in the State Department, ably abetted by Ambassador Stevenson and his policy of subordinating U.S. interests to U.N. authority, is the subject of a penetrating criticism by Columnist Edgar Ansel Mowrer in an article carried by the Newark Star-Ledger on May 22. Despite the fact that foreign policy decisions are made irrespective of congressional views or, for that matter, of general public interest, the article calls for a public stand against the defeatist foreign policy now being pursued under the New Frontier, and certainly merits our attention. The article follows:

[From the Newark Star Ledger, May 22, 1963]

HAS IT BECOME 'PIPE DOWN' ERA?

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

There may be no connection between an end of the U.N.'s insistence on keeping the Soviet rape of Hungary on the annual agenda and the news from Budapest that Cardinal Mindszenty is now free to leave his asylum in the American embassy there and proceed to Rome as the result of a deal between the Hungarian Communist Government, the Vatican and the United States.

But a lot of Hungarian Americans believe that there is a connection and are sore at the American administration because of it.

The U.S. State Department denies that it has in any respect changed policy. It explains that whereas in former years, the United States had the votes in the U.N. Assembly to keep the Hungarian outrage on the agenda and the credentials of the Kadar government unrecognized, this year it no longer had enough support. Therefore it simply allowed the matter to be dropped.

This may be exact, technically, but a lot of people all over the world are going to consider it in the same category as the administration's insistence that there was no connection between the withdrawal of Soviet missiles from Cuba and of American missiles bases from Turkey and Italy. The coincidence is too neat.

Moreover there has been too much advance talk about the possibilities of a deal for people to think that the Kadar-Mindszenty agreement just happened. A year ago, on May 10, 1962, the usually reliable London Economist announced that something of the sort was "expected to happen."

The East Europeans, like the Cubans, the Vietnamese, half the Laotians, the Chinese, and the Russians themselves will have to wait for liberation until, by our conquest over poverty, hunger, and disease elsewhere, we have "won the cold war." For God's sake, no more premature revolts like those of East Germany, Poland, and Hungary in the past.

And above all, let there be no attempt by the free Chinese on Formosa to liberate their sorely oppressed countrymen on the mainland. For that too might involve the United States.

This explains why the talk about piping down the east European refugees finds believers. For since it managed the news concerning the Bay of Pigs and the removal of Soviet missiles at the expense of Cuban liberation, this administration has acquired a reputation for doubletalk.

Concerning Hungary, the doubletalk now takes the form of insistence on the liberalization of the Communist regime there. To some extent this is true. While most of the talk about amnesty is sheer rubbish, the Kadar government has had to allow a lot more freedom of speech and even of movement than the hated Raksio tyranny. But all this is beside the real point.

Easing the situation for the poor Hungarians is one thing. Liberating them from their Communist masters is quite another. The former can very well result merely in binding the Communist chains more tightly on the victims.

Nothing less than freedom should be the goal of American policy. Not only because we of this country are committed to aid freedom everywhere by all that is deepest in our national being, but because so long as communism continues to rule a billion human beings, there will none of that peace which the Kennedy administration is so frantically pursuing.

Resolution of the Detroit Common Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the Congressional Record a resolution of the Detroit Common Council, together with a letter of enclosure of the Honorable Thomas D. Leadbetter, city clerk.

In this, our city council states on behalf of the 1,900,000 citizens of our city that they enthusiastically support the immediate passage of the administration's Health Insurance Act of 1963, H.R. 3920, which would provide prepaid hospital, nursing care, and out-patient diagnostic services for all those over 65 within the framework of the social security law.

The resolution follows:

City of Detroit,
Office of the City Clerk,
May 16, 1963.

Hon. John D. Dingell,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Pursuant to action of the common council, the following resolution was adopted by that body on May 14, 1963, and is herewith forwarded to you for your favorable consideration:

"RESOLUTION—FEDERAL LEGISLATION FOR HEALTH INSURANCE FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

"By Council President Carey:

"Whereas there are now more than 17 million people 65 years of age and over in the United States, and there is a net increase of 1,000 retired perons each day; and

"Whereas the median income for older couples is $2,530 and for older persons living alone it is $1,050; and

"Whereas persons 65 and over average 2½ to 3 times as many days of hospital care per 1,000 in the population as compared to younger persons; and the cost of hospital care has risen from a national average totaling $9.39 per day in 1946 to $32.23 per day in 1960; and the total medical bill for persons over 65 exceeds $500 per stay in the hospital for more than half of those hospitalized; and

"Whereas the old-age assistance and Kerr-Mills programs are reaching only a small proportion of those who need such help because of indignity of the means test and the inhumanity of lien and relatives' responsibility provisions; and

"Whereas only about half the people over 65 have any form of voluntary health insurance and such insurance usually pays for less than half the costs of their hospital care: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Common Council of the City of Detroit strongly support the immediate passage of the Kennedy administration's Health Insurance Act of 1963—H.R. 3920—which would provide prepaid hospital, nursing care, and out-patient diagnostic services for all people now over age 65, even those not covered by social security and railroad retirement. The additional moneys needed would come from the general Treasury; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution shall be sent to the President of the United States, the Governor of the State of Michigan, Michigan's two Senators, all members of Michigan's congressional delegation, and to Congressman WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives.

"Adopted as follows:

" 'Yeas,' Councilmen Connor, Patrick, Ravitz, Rogell, Van Antwerp, Wierzbicki, and President Carey—7.

" 'Nays,' Councilman Brickley—1."

Appreciating your efforts for the accomplishment of its purposes, we remain

Respectfully yours,
THOMAS D. LEADBETTER,
City Clerk.

Adm. John McCain, Jr.: New Four-Ocean Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Adm. John McCain, Jr., one of the world's leading authorities on naval warfare, reminds us of our Navy's challenge if indeed we are to be prepared to defend our freedom.

Admiral McCain demonstrated his knowledge of this tremendous challenge in an address to the Kiwanis Club at Charleston, S.C., on May 23.

His remarks are important reading to those charged with the defense of our Nation. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby insert his address for the information of the Congress:

THE NEW FOUR-OCEAN CHALLENGE

(By Rear Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., U.S. Navy)

Never has the free use of the sea been more important to our security and economic vitality than it is today, as we stand on the threshold of so-called age of space. A few months, this statement may have seemed unfounded to many people. However, as the course of history reveals more and more the suddenness with which grave crises can develop to threaten even the insecure truce which today we call peace, the fact is being driven home that seapower is taking on new dimensions as an essential factor in our national security. In fact, in this age of missiles and satellites, the first major showdown between the Soviets and this Nation took place on the seas during the Cuban crisis.

There is one inescapable factor exerting pressure on every instrument of our seapower. That is the relatively unnoticed, continuous "wet war" which we must wage concurrently with the highly publicized cold war and our competition with the Soviet Union in missiles, orbiting astronauts, and the race to the moon. This "wet war" is being waged with the same determination and thoroughness that characterizes the program of the Communist leadership in developing rocketry and penetration of outer space.

The "wet war" is no fiction, no myth. It goes deep into all aspects of the use of the seas—scientific, economic, political, and military.

Today, the United States is faced with a new four-ocean challenge. This is in contravention to the traditional two oceans, the North Atlantic and the Pacific Ocean, with which we have been concerned for many years. I will discuss the two additional oceans in detail as I proceed.

Coincidentally, the new four-ocean challenge rests on four major factors in current history. First is the uncertain course of history in which it is practically impossible to predict with any accuracy where the next trouble spot is going to occur. Second is the geographic pattern which Communist aggression has now assumed. Third, the impact of modern science and technology has had its effect across the entire spectrum of modern warfare. Fourth is the recently enunciated policy of the Secretary of Defense at various times referred to as graduated deterrence, controlled effective response, flexible response, or practical alternatives.

The seaborne striking forces of this Nation, as a part of our great national defense team, are peculiarly and uniquely adapted to the execution of a policy of graduated deterrence.

Important as is outer space, we still must live on earth. There are 3 billion people in the world today. The population is growing rapidly and there is grave question as to whether any portion can ever be moved to some other planet.

Almost three-fourths of the earth's surface is water, nearly 400 million cubic miles of it. The rise and fall of nations throughout history have been determined in large measure by the control of the oceans. At the turn of the century, man for the first time entered a shallow 200 foot depth of ocean with the submarine, and by virtue of this single action, it nearly changed the course of two wars.

Science and technology are moving seaward. They are looking for food, fresh water, raw materials, and ultimately, even power.

The ocean depths are the least explored, least understood of any factor on the world today, including outer space. There are vast uncharted areas of valleys, peaks, chasms, and plateaus. We have only scratched the surface of these oceans through oceanographic research. This has been done by skindivers, submarines, and oceanographic research ships taking oceanographic data worldwide. Recently, Lieutenant Walsh and Jacques Picard went down into the ocean depths approximately 7 miles in the Marianas Trench in the bathyscaph *Trieste*. This was a significant breakthrough in the exploration of this vast unknown area.

Pictures taken at the bottom of the ocean depths indicate nodules of raw materials which range across the entire spectrum of manganese, silver, uranium, iron, and gold. All that remains now is for science to unlock this vast storehouse.

For centuries, the world has derived food from the ocean in the form of fish. Science is now looking seaward for other forms of food. The Japanese have done extensive research in this area. They have prepared various types of food from such things as algae and seaweed. Even a minute sea growth called the diatom may have high food value.

This entire picture is complicated by the population explosion. Today, we have about 3 billion people on the face of this earth and by the year 2000 it is expected to have exploded into about 5 billion. And even today, 70 percent of the earth's population is undernourished.

What this is going to mean in future years no one can guess. But it brings into focus again the importance of the oceans in all aspects and the Soviet Union is aware of this fact. They have over 100 oceanographic survey vessels working throughout the world continuing to take data in the largest oceanographic program in the world today.

With this in mind, let's take a look at the world situation.

Up until a few years ago, the areas of cold war crises included the Korean war; Formosan crisis; South Vietnam evacuation; Tibet; the northern borders of India; the Suez, Lebanon, and Syrian crises; and the Berlin crisis, just to mention a few. You will note that these areas tend to conform with or are in the proximity of the borders of the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Today, shooting crises are spread halfway across the world. They extend 12,000 miles east and west and 5,000 miles north and south.

As a result of the many trouble spots throughout the world, today's Navy has more jobs to do of more kinds in more places than ever before in its 188-year history. Let's take a look at four prime jobs which our Navy must perform.

Hitler began World War II with 57 submarines; today the Communist bloc has over 400 and this imposes a tremendous threat which we must be able to counter with antisubmarine warfare. We must be ever alert to new tactics and techniques as we advance in this highly important area because the control of the oceans and the passage of shipping is fundamental to the future security of this Nation and the oceanic confederation of the nations of the free world.

As Adm. George W. Anderson, U.S. Navy Chief of Naval Operations, stated recently, "The presence of Russian submarines in Caribbean and Atlantic waters (during the Cuban crisis) provided perhaps the finest opportunity since World War II for the U.S. naval antisubmarine warfare forces to exercise at their trade, to perfect their skills, and manifest their capability to detect and follow submarines of another nation." Some of these submarines came to the surface and were photographed after the persistent surveillance of U.S. ships and aircraft.

Another prime function is the projection of the combat-ready marine ashore at any place throughout the earth where circumstances may dictate. This involves the Navy-Marine Corps team which is unique in history because of its mobility and the fact that it engages in all forms of warfare—land, sea, and air.

Another function is the delivery of air strikes deep inland. With high-speed jet aircraft flying from the highly mobile airfields, the carriers, we have a capacity of delivering strikes as deep inland as Chicago is from the Atlantic coast, in a matter of about an hour.

The U.S. Navy has also moved into the arean of space with the Polaris submarine which carries an awesome missile. It's here today, on patrol, and ready to be launched if the United States is attacked. This launching is done from the submarine in a submerged condition. The submarine submerges when it departs its home port and does not surface again until many days later after having completed its patrol. And in a matter of a half hour or less, it can deliver its entire lethal cargo.

These, plus many other functions performed by seaborne striking forces, add up to the most profound change in the history of warfare—in the event of hostilities, virtually no spot on earth will be beyond range of attack from the seas. In the past, the effective radius of action of a ship had been limited to the high water mark plus any additional range conferred by the gun. Today, this range must be increased to hundreds of miles inland with the advent of high-speed jet aircraft from carriers, ballistic and guided missiles from surface ships and submarines, and the improved amphibious capability of the Navy-Marine Corps team. Again, I repeat, this is the most profound change in all the history of warfare because three-fourths of the earth's surface is free real estate to use in our own defense.

After World War I we had to expand from a one-ocean Navy to a two-ocean Navy. World War I was a one-ocean war and it rotated around the North Atlantic. World War II was a two-ocean war and it involved both the North Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and after an interlude in history the Mediterranean came back again into its own as a strategic sea.

Today these two oceans are still our primary responsibility and this includes the eastern and western arcs to the approaches to the Eurasian Continent. The western approaches to Europe involve the NATO sphere of responsibility. In the Far East we have that responsibility which extends all the way from the Bering Straits to the Straits of Malacca.

Today, due to the advance of modern science and technology, we have a third new ocean, the Arctic Ocean to the north. This is the direct result of nuclear power both in our conventional submarines and of course in our Polaris submarines. For the first time we have developed a vast battleground at the top of the earth, which in previous history has been inaccessible to man.

The fourth ocean which is equally important is the broad Afro-Asian ocean which includes this new strategic area of the South Atlantic and the Indian Oceans. It extends all the way from New Guinea right across the southern shore of Asia to Africa.

On VJ Day, five nations held political control over most of this vast colonial area. These were Great Britain, France, Holland, Belgium, and Portugal. Most of the problems that arose were settled in five capitals. Today we have over 40 new nations in this area and this complicates any dispute which arises as it always does when you increase the number of people involved in a problem. Some 30 of these new nations are in Africa.

Africa like the ocean depths is a vast storehouse of raw materials. For example, a large percentage of the free world's cobalt and copper come from this continent. At the border between northern Rhodesia and Katanga is the richest copper vein in the world. The transportation facilities in the interior of this continent are meager in comparison with those in industrialized areas of the world and there are very few airstrips that can accommodate modern jet aircraft. As a result, transportation is often confined to available rivers, other inland waterways, and the coastal waterways of the continent itself.

Two-thirds of the capitals of all the nations and dependencies in Africa are located along or within 100 miles of the 10,000-mile stretch of coastline that extends from the Straits of Gibraltar around the Cape of Good Hope and up to the Gulf of Aden. One must conclude that the political and economic destinines of this great continent are tied to the oceans.

In the first few years after World War II, the Communists expanded rapidly. They absorbed the satellite countries in eastern Europe and at one time, many of these nations were our friends. This absorption was done by the simple process of marching in. In the Far East the Communists seized control of mainland China and its 715 million inhabitants.

As a result of these outward thrusts, pressures, and probes, the free world has drawn a line beyond which any Communist aggression gives a high probability of war.

The Communists are blocked to the west by our fixed base structure in Europe, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the 6th Fleet, and the possible deployment of the 2d Fleet and other forces from the east coast of the United States.

Moving all the way across the Eurasian continent, they are blocked as far as any expansion to the east is concerned, by our fixed base structure in that section of the world, the 7th Fleet, and the possible deployment of the 1st Fleet and other forces from the west coast of the United States.

In any expansion northward, they immediately encounter the climatic and geographic conditions which are inherent in the polar ice cap.

In addition to the military blocks which I have mentioned in Europe and the Far East, the determination of the peoples of those areas to preserve their independence in the face of Communist aggression is also worthy of note.

With only a southerly direction to move in, they have in fact leapfrogged far beyond their borders; for example, into Africa to take advantage of the turmoil and confusion which now exists as new nations there seek to adjust to self-rule and also into our own hemisphere into Cuba.

They have planted a foot on our doorstep. The grave danger is the marriage of Castroism and communism on this small island—a fact that has been pointed out so clearly in recent events.

There are certain strategic aspects about Cuba which are little recognized. First it is within reach of the trade routes between North and South America. Second, it sits athwart the entrance to the Gulf of Mexico. And third, if it ever falls into the hands of a truly predominant military power, it can control a vital artery of commerce, the Panama Canal.

If, on the other hand, the Communist bloc continues trying to acquire territory immediately adjacent to their borders, they run into another inescapable fact of geography. Any Communist drive to the south or southeast can be outflanked from the seas. We did it in Korea by the Inchon landing. The same principle applies to any thrust through the Southeast Asian peninsula, down through India, or down the isthmus which connects Africa with Asia. In other words, the Communists are faced with the disadvantages of peninsula warfare without control of the seas.

Take this one step further; look at Europe. Europe is a peninsula since it is surrounded on three sides by water. As the military man in Moscow looks to the west, he knows that with any further expansion in this section of the world, he is faced with having his flanks exposed to attack from the seas.

As a result of the concentration of the free world nations, both to the east and west, there is one great strategic area which one might say has been overlooked—the Afro-Asian Ocean. In this area we have few forces, few formal alliances, and few if any bases.

Throughout this entire section, the terrain is unfriendly, geographically as well as politically, for establishing fixed bases. It is extremely difficult to establish a base in deserts, jungles, or mountainous areas.

Only a string of U.S. islands off the shores of the Afro-Asian area could solve the base problems. Any establishment of a base on land is open to doubt. At the rapid rate which international events transpire today, we might not have time to construct such facilities.

Our only alternative is to look seaward for the answer to the base problem. There we find our "Islands of Seapower" which by their very mobility fulfill the requirement for a certain number of fixed bases. These seaborne striking forces have all of the components characteristic of a fixed base on land. The big advantage of this complex is that it is in a constant state of motion because ships at sea are never still.

There is no type of military power known to man today that cannot be projected from these mobile bases at sea. This projection of military power extends across the entire spectrum of modern warfare from putting the combat-ready marine or soldier ashore to any type of air strike.

Seapower can apply any degree of military power required—a show of force without firing a shot, putting men ashore to prevent trouble as well as handle it, and heavy air strikes even with nuclear weapons. The recent Cuban crisis pointed out so clearly that seapower can apply just sufficient pressure to achieve our national objectives at the moment. The highly effective naval quarantine which was imposed is just another example of the versatility and flexibility of our naval forces at sea.

Another factor of seapower which is little discussed is the "show of the flag." The Navy bluejackets and marines are outstanding ambassadors of good will. Their exemplary conduct and appearance when they go ashore in a foreign land gives to our friends and allies a confidence in us to support them in time of trouble.

An important characteristic of seaborne striking forces is long, sustained, mobile, staying power. This is a result of underway replenishment, a technique developed in World War II which provides all essential supplies while a task force is underway, at sea.

The ships of a task force run a wide range of capability. At one end of the spectrum is a mobile airfield, the carrier. It is a most versatile instrument of modern warfare. From its decks come the aircraft for air strikes, air defense, antisubmarine warfare, and reconnaissance.

Cruisers and destroyers are still very important members of our modern Navy. They provide air defense, antisubmarine protection, and gunfire support for amphibious operations. And don't underestimate the value of the gun. Guns still have a very important role in our defense today and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future.

One important type of ship in our Navy, which is sometimes overlooked, is the minesweeper. Mine warfare is little discussed today but it is estimated that the Communist bloc has a sizable stockpile of mines. Mines were used in the Korean conflict and will very probably be used in any future war.

Our amphibious forces are now receiving a few new ships which greatly increase their capabilities. The amphibious assault ship (LPH) and the amphibious transport dock (LPD) are particularly important since they provide new flexibility in vertical envelopment.

At the other end of the spectrum is the Polaris submarine. In addition to its atomic missile capability, this submarine has the latest sonar equipment, torpedo tubes, and fire control equipment. Most important is the fact that this submarine, since it is not visible, has a special deterrent effect.

Seapower can be deployed over three-fourths of the earth's surface unhampered and unhindered by international boundaries or the need for negotiations as far as base rights are concerned. Our amphibious forces are deployed in the western Pacific, the Mediterranean, and in the Caribbean. I have taken amphibious as an example because they have a prime responsibility in this age of possible limited war or brush fires. It was no accident of history that the 7th Fleet was off Formosa at its crucial time; that the 6th Fleet was off Lebanon at the time this trouble spot developed, and that the 2d Fleet was off the Dominican Republic at the time of that crisis. You will notice from this chart that there is a big vacuum all throughout the Afro-Asian Ocean.

Today's headlines are still signalling trouble and for the future we can foresee a continuation of the situation that exists internationally today. We are involved in the defense of some 60 nations either by direct treaty or military assistance agreements. With rare exceptions they border on the oceans and the oceans are the sinews by which we tie this oceanic confederation together. The lifelines of the free world are a network of more than 70,000 miles of vital ocean routes and these lanes must be kept open.

All four bottlenecks of world commerce lie in areas of unrest and uncertainty. I have previously pointed out the strategic relationship of Cuba to the Panama Canal. As you move to the east the next bottleneck is the Straits of Gibraltar which Great Britain has controlled for 2½ centuries by its possession of the Rock.

As you move farther east, we next have the Suez Canal and the Red Sea. We know the dislocation that occurs in world commerce when the Suez Canal is closed off because, among other things, through that canal passes oil from the Middle East to Europe. Europe cannot survive without that oil and we cannot survive without Europe. At the junction of the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden, the Soviet Union has completed the construction of a large seaport for Yemen. And Yemen at the present time is in a state of political uncertainty.

Moving to southeast Asia, we are all aware of the battle going on in South Vietnam. Moving a little to the west on the map, that nation which controls the Malayan Peninsula controls the Straits of Malacca which is the great highway between the Indian Ocean, the South China, and the Pacific.

The man in the Kremlin has studied Mahan. He has studied the history of British sea power and he is well aware that the channels of commerce throughout this world are absolutely necessary to our own survival.

Every day there are more than 2,000 merchant ships steaming the North Atlantic sealanes. There are 1,700 in the Mediterranean and a comparable number in the western Pacific. The lowly freighter has to get through otherwise we are not going to have a B-58, a nuclear-powered submarine, or the very coffee which is so necessary to our own creature comforts.

The Soviet Union knows all this too and they are building a sizable fleet of men-of-war and merchant ships. Speaking to merchant ships just for a moment, they have almost 900 today and they intend to double this carrying capacity by 1965 and multiply it by 3 or 4 by 1970. Furthermore, the Communist Bloc as a whole has 1,200 merchant ships and some of these ships carried the missiles, bombers, and technicians into Cuba.

The aspects of sea power are basic. We must control these seas for many reasons; scientific, political, economic, and military. Our sea power must have sufficient strength to give us the capability of applying just sufficient pressure to defeat any particular move at the moment that the Communsits commit.

The Soviet Union has not allowed the glamor of space to obscure the importance of the oceans. It is of particular interest that this nation which with its satellites occupies the world's greatest single land mass, should give so much attention to the present and future importance of the oceans. The "wet war" is real. Recent world events have announced its presence so emphatically. It is a war we cannot afford to lose.

Save Excelsior Springs

SPEECH
OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, one day last week our office received an announcement by General Gleason, now Administrator of the Veterans' Administration that it was their plan to close the tuberculosis hospital at Excelsior Springs, Mo., on July 31 of this year.

This announcement came to some of us who represent areas in western Missouri as quite a surprise and certainly as a considerable shock. Before going on, I think I should point out that Excelsior Springs is located in the Sixth Missouri Congressional District very ably represented by the Honorable WILLIAM R. HULL. Our own interest in this announcement comes about because of service during the 86th and 87th Congresses as a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, and as a member of the Hospital Subcommittee which had direct legislative oversight of all VA hospitals in the United States. As a member of the subcommittee, we were commissioned just about a year ago by the chairman to make a field inspection of this facility and report our findings. Our report in part was as follows:

First. The Excelsior Springs Hospital facility was well managed and the operation seemed to be running smoothly. Patient morale was high. The veteran organizations in the surrounding areas were found to be doing an excellent job of assisting through their visiting program.

Second. The buildings were found to be in a good state of preservation. The manager estimated exterior resurfacing might cost $25,000 but the interior could be handled out of operating funds.

Third. An elevator needed to be rehabilitated which could be done for an amount not to exceed $25,000.

Fourth. X-ray equipment was in good condition and only a small amount of additional laboratory equipment was needed.

Fifth. Personnel were well trained. They were kind to the patients and courteous to the public. We were impressed with the high quality of help found throughout the facility. They demonstrated themselves to be efficient, faithful, and dedicated employees.

Sixth. The only adverse circumstances were the cost per patient because of the declining average daily patient load—ADPL—and this was solely and only because of the fewer patients that had to be spread against a base of accumulated fixed costs. This simply meant that you get a larger quotient when you divide a smaller divisor into a stationary dividend.

At that time we strongly recommended the facility remain open for the treatment of TB as it was presently operated. Now, the Administrator in a very kind and considerate letter assures us that he is most interested in the welfare of the patients at this facility and the employees of the present staff will be given priority for employment elsewhere, but the cold hard fact remains that this well-operated facility is just another to be added to the list of those VA hospitals to be closed.

The letter of announcement assures everyone that upon the closing of the Excelsior Springs Hospital the VA facilities at Kansas City, Mo., and Wadsworth, Kans., are capable of absorbing the patient load and that there will be improvement in patient care. We have no doubt that General Gleason is correct when he says that the two nearby hospitals can absorb the patient load, but after visiting Excelsior Springs Hospital on several occasions, I would have to challenge the statement that there will be improvement in patient care. That might be rather hard to accomplish. There, we know from our own observation, the patients were cared for by well-trained personnel in pleasant surroundings, and it is very difficult to believe the move can result in any improvement in patient care.

As a former member of the Hospital subcommittee, we had been indoctrinated for years with the belief that the treatment of TB patients required some degree of isolation and that there was a danger of infection when such patients were intermingled with other patients. We are now advised there has developed a new concept and that because the danger of infection is now minimal, TB patients can be associated with other patients.

After all the good assurances and reassurances in the nature of window dressing contained in the letter of announcement about the closing of this hospital has been trimmed out and removed, we seem to be left with the statement that the reason for closing the hospital—which opened in 1924—is that it is "obsolete and uneconomical to maintain." This statement we challenge because less than 1 year ago the building was in a good state of preservation with the exception of ordinary maintenance and was not obsolete for the purpose for which it was then used. The truth of the matter is it has been a very economical facility to maintain over the years as can be demonstrated or established by the relatively small amount of funds that has been spent on its maintenance.

The letter announcing the closing goes on to cite as one of the principal reasons that the patient per diem cost is much higher than the cost for other hospitals. Such a statement gives only part of the true situation. As we suggested earlier, the real reason it is true costs were higher per patient is that there were not enough patients housed at this facility to offset the accumulated fixed annual cost of the facility. Had the VA management seen fit to give the hospital a greater use the cost per patient would have declined into the bracket of other hospital costs. The argument that the hospital is being closed as an economy move, because the hospital cannot compete in efficiency with other hospitals, does not measure up to good logic because enough patients to fill the hospital were never assigned to Excelsior Springs to reduce the patient cost per day.

Now let us take a look at this closing as a move for economy on the part of the VA. I am sure every Member of the House hopes that this first session of the 88th Congress will be long remembered for its efforts toward reducing Federal expenditures. We all hope that this Congress can earn a reputation for economy in Government by the elimination of all nonessential expenditures. I suppose there would not be a single Member without a keen interest in holding the line on Federal expenditures. But why, Mr. Speaker, does it always seem that it is in the area of veterans' compensation or pensions and in the area of adequate hospitalization for veterans that must be the first to feel the ax. Why is it that curtailment of expenditures must seem to start with the veterans' program? If it can be established that this same striving for economy is being exercised by the other independent agencies of our executive branch with equal vigor then curtailing VA programs would be in step with the trend of the times. Unfortunately the veterans' program seems to get sliced first and cut the most.

We are mindful that it is most unlikely that the Administrator can be prevailed upon to reverse his decision and let the hospital go on as a TB unit. Good things like that just do not happen very often. But after our inspection of this facility just 1 year ago, we would be hopeful that if there cannot be a reversal of this order to close Excelsior Springs as a TB hospital, there will be a very careful study by the Administrator leading to some other possible use for this facility. In our report to the Hospital subcommittee last year, we recommended that this hospital should be more fully utilized. We did not stop there. We further recommended that it become an annex to the large G.M. & S. facility at Kansas City where those patients who are in a recovery process after surgery or after extensive treatment could be transferred to Excelsior Springs to make room for more serious cases. As an alternative proposal we then suggested this facility could be more completely utilized by being put into a domiciliary-care unit. Those recommendations which were made to the chairman of the Hospital subcommittee have equal application today. Now we are at the crossroads where there must be a decision as to whether this facility should be completely abandoned or converted to some alternate use. That it will not be a TB hospital after July 31 seems likely but with all the nationwide need for hospital beds for veterans in the several other classifications of patient care this facility can surely be put to a good and valuable alternative use.

We cannot be expected to have at the tip of our tongue all of the statistics about the VA domiciliaries that house those who do not require nursing care and who may be able to take care of themselves but have no home. We understand there are 17 in the United States with obtu 16,000 members. We suggest Excelsior Springs is well suited for conversion to one of the domiciliary-care hospitals. We hope the Administrator will carefully survey the possible future use of Excelsior Springs for such a purpose.

Two years ago as a member of a special hospital committee I visited Coronado, Calif., to see why a former naval hospital should not become through conversion, a unit of the VA hospital system. There at that time we were confronted by the oft heard arguments that the hospital was too far away from the bright lights of Los Angeles to be able to enlist sufficient personnel including doctors and nurses. It was argued then the time had come that all VA hospitals would have to be located close to the big metropolitan centers or it would be impossible to have them adequately staffed. Well, that argument cannot apply to Excelsior Springs, Mo. Here, we have a large capital investment located in a beautiful setting close in to Metropolitan Kansas City. It is a facility which is in an excellent state of preservation, but more important, it is within just a few minutes driving time of the great teaching hospital of the University of Kansas. It is located only a matter of minutes from downtown Kansas City via a recently completed freeway. Excelsior Springs can be said to be a part of Metropolitan Kansas City.

It is our sincere hope that the VA, before it gives any consideration to asking for an order that this property be declared to be surplus to its uses, should give long study and thorough consideration to the fact that the Government has a fine capital investment in this property. The buildings were built during the days when costs were one-half what they are today. As we have pointed out above, not from hearsay, but from the word of those in charge of this facility, the building can be restored to top condition for a relatively small amount of money. We do not profess to know what may be the future plans of the VA as to the metropolitan area of Kansas City, Mo., but we respectfully point out that they will not find another chance soon to provide for what those who are armed with statistics tell us will be an ever-increasing future load for our veterans' hospitals, because of aging processes of the great segment of our veteran population. It is just good business sense to keep this property as a unit in the VA hospital system.

Assuming the figures on the cost of operation per patient computed by the Veterans Administrator are accurate and correct, I would respectfully point out that the figures which have been furnished to justify the closing of this facility are at variance with and higher than those given me by personnel at the hospital about 1 year ago.

If the Administrator, in his executive capacity as the head of this independent agency, cannot find it possible to rescind the order and keep this hospital as a TB facility, then it would take only a short visit to the facility for anyone to see that it can be economically adapted to a use as a sort of nursing home concept for care for this kind of patient by the VA. But the Administrator need not stop there. This beautiful facility could be easily adapted as a domiciliary-care unit for veterans that do not require nursing care. The point is, this valuable, useful, beautiful, and well-located Federal property should not be lost as a VA hospital of some type. Mr. Administrator, it is our earnest entreaty that you weigh carefully these suggestions we have offered with all the sincerity we can generate. Save Excelsior Springs for some continuing use as a unit in the VA hospital system.

More Kennedy Double Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include, without comment, the following editorial from today's issue of the Chicago Tribune:

WHERE CIVIL RIGHTS DON'T COUNT

Federal troops were recently alerted in the widely publicized battle for civil rights in Alabama, while far out in the Northwest the Kennedy administration has quietly sacrificed civil rights in order to further its own public power program.

Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, a Republican member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has accused the administration of violating the President's own civil rights order of March 6, 1961, in contracts signed last month for the construction of a $122 million generating plant at Hanford, Wash., to be powered by steam from the Atomic Energy Commission's nearby plutonium reactor.

The Hanford plant is to have a capacity of 800,000 kilowatts and will be the biggest atomic power plant in the world. More to the point, it is regarded as the keystone of a nationwide public power transmission system envisioned by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, and the public power lobby.

Private power interests oppose this bureaucratic scheme and managed, through Congress, to prevent the use of public money for construction of the Hanford plant. But last fall Congress authorized its construction by a group of Washington State public utility districts organized as the Washington Public Power Supply System. The plant is to be financed by revenue bonds.

Congress gave its approval after studying the proposed contracts, which contained the usual clauses providing for cancellation of the contract if contractors did not comply with Mr. Kennedy's order against racial discrimination in employment.

Then, according to Mr. SAYLOR, bankers told the power supply system that it would have trouble selling its bonds if the contracts contained these clauses. So an added clause found it way mysteriously into the contracts before they were signed last month. This clause, now a matter of public record, says that in case of "noncompliance with the nondiscrimination clauses of this agreement or with any [Federal] rules, regulations, or orders, this agreement may not be canceled in whole or in part so long as such cancellation would impair the security of the revenue bonds issued by the supply system."

In short, the Government is more interested in getting the money for its powerplant, and getting it at favorable rates, than in carrying out its own civil rights program.

"There must have been a lot of soul searching and midnight oil burned," according to Mr. SAYLOR, before the administration decided to sacrifice civil rights "on the altar of a greedy centralized government."

Soul searching may not be the right word. It doesn't require either a soul or any searching to figure out that in the Northwest there are many opportunities for the Government to invade the field of electric power, and few Negro votes.

The Reds "Zero in" on Pope John

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the following is an article from the Wanderer, a national Catholic weekly, which is published by the Wanderer Printing Co., established in 1867, which I would like to commend to the reading of the Members of this House:

THE REDS "ZERO IN" ON POPE JOHN

When William Buckley wrote, in the Chicago Daily News a few weeks ago, about Pope John's latest encyclical "Pacem in Terris," he predicted that, although the pontiff had put forward, from the bottom of his compassionate heart, a series of proposals which would commend themselves to all right-thinking men, nevertheless, it would not be long until "the Communists, the fellow travelers, the pacifists, the unilateralists, will zero in like vultures" on this great encyclical and would try to exploit it to their own advantage.

Buckley made that prediction on April 20. The very next day the New York Communist publication, the Worker, zeroed in. In that issue of the Worker, the U.S. Commie leader, Gus Hall, greeted the Pope's message as "a direct rebuff to the ultraright and other warmongers." Further, he said that the Pope had made it obvious that he was asking Catholics throughout the world to cooperate with the peace efforts put forth by "the Socialist world headed by the Soviet Union and with Communists and Socialists everywhere." Also, Hall said, the encyclical gave evidence of "a forthright, if belated, recognition of the Roman Catholic Church that the worldwide Communist movement sincerely represented and fought for the (lawful) aspirations of mankind." Hall said "it would be nice if the Kennedy administration, Congress, union leaders, and others now engaged in Red baiting would at long last come to a similar recognition of the sincerity of Communists" as had Pope John.

In any case, Hall promised, American Communists will do everything in their power to create the conditions for forging a national front to bring about some of the objectives which, according to Communist interpretations and interpolations, Pope John has urged upon the world. American Communists will do their best, Comrade Hall pledged his readers to give the encyclical life—that is, to propagate its message the way the Communists read that message. They will do this, Hall warned, despite what he predicted would be massive attempts both within the Catholic Church and outside it to water down, distort or nullify the meaning of the encyclical. Or, if we understand Comrade Hall correctly, the Communists will henceforth insist, in their propaganda barrage about the encyclical, that the Pope and the church are no longer really opposed to communism but that, in point of fact, the Pope and the church are now only opposed to the ultraright and other warmongers both within and outside the church.

Indeed the Worker itself (April 21) set the theme of the coming party line on the matter when it declared the Pope had not only plumped for peaceful coexistence between the capitalist and socialist sectors of the world, but he had at long last rejected the church's ancient alliance with the reactionary forces" and had broken with the ultraright, the warmongers, imperialists, etc. The Pope, according to the Worker, has urged the recognition of communism as a legitimate political movement, and hence every American should write to President Kennedy and to the Congressmen and Senators urging action on the principles enunciated in the Pope's encylclical.

Truly, as Bill Buckley put it, the vultures have zeroed in on the Holy Father's encyclical! They lie in their teeth, of course. Even as Satan himself slyly quotes Scripture, the Reds are presently quoting Pope John. Already they are telling American Catholics that those of our cardinals, bishops and priests who persist in opposing communism are sad to say, ultrarightists, reactionaries, and what not, and that such poorly informed leaders are in reality heretics whom all good and true Catholics and Communists, faithful to the principles enunciated by Pope John will gladly help excommunicate, one way or another, in the interests of peace and progress.

And meanwhile the Communists are being encouraged to thus confuse and divide the Catholic faithful. For when a responsible official like Father John Cronin advises American Catholics that the Pope's encyclical is indeed representative to some extent of an opening to the left, he is in effect affirming what the Communists themselves are saying and, objectively speaking, he is as guilty as they are of disseminating outright falsehood, distortion, and shocking misrepresentation. In such circumstances, it would be high time not only for American Catholic leadership to set the record straight on the church's unchanged and unchanging opposition of communism but also for rank-and-file Catholics not to permit themselves to be misled or caught off balance by a brazen and lying propaganda—managed news—set in motion by Communists and assorted fellow travelers in the liberal, secular press. The truth is that Pope John's encyclical is none of the things the Communists claim it to be. The truth is, as Pope John himself admonished us as recently as 1959, that the peace the church pleads for must never be mistaken for a yielding or relaxation of its firmness in opposition to the faith and ideologies and systems of life which are in open and irreconcilable opposition to Catholic teaching. If the masters of deceit and the gulliberals tell you otherwise, don't be suckers; don't believe them.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Space Technology—Today's Tool for Controlled Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, my attention was recently called to an article by William Leavitt, associate editor of Air Force magazine, concerning the potential of spaceborne surveillance as a device to help control conflict.

Mr. Leavitt has long studied and followed the development of space observation satellites and has, in particular, analyzed the prospect and promise of such satellites in arms control. He feels that we must make more effective use of the new tools of space technology.

His views deserve the serious consideration of the Members of the House, and I offer them for the RECORD:

[From Air Force/Space Digest, April 1963]

SPACE TECHNOLOGY—TODAY'S TOOL FOR CONTROLLED PEACE

(By William Leavitt)

When the history of our era is written, our successors may well read that the application of space technology to the control of conflict on earth was far more significant to mankind's well-being than such monumental achievements as the landing of manned expeditions on the moon and planets with all their highly touted "spin-offs" to the civilian economy. Whether or not such a chapter in future history is written will depend in large part on the imagination and daring of American leadership today and tomorrow.

Yet it is a major irony that in our cold-war-weary world the high potential of space technology as a tool for the maintenance of controlled peace with safety not only for the free world but also for our opponents—who live in the same nuclear shadow—receives so little of the attention it deserves. We hear only that space must be preserved for peaceful purposes and that the arms race on earth must be slowed, or better still, stopped.

Indeed, almost overnight there has grown up a vast literature of arms control and disarmament, with the great weight of the talk and writing on the Western side of the Iron Curtain. The burden of this vast and important discussion is that something must be done about the arms race, and that if something isn't done, an accident or other military-political event will inevitably set off a world-destructive nuclear holocaust in which there can, we are told, be no victor. War is obsolescent, we are warned, and Clausewitz's famous definition of war as a continuation of politics by other means is defined as an anachronism in the latter half of the 20th century.

In this context, great efforts are under way, political and military, to create a "safer" world environment. On the political side, reported daily and excitedly in the public prints, there is a vigorous effort to reach an agreement with the Soviet Union on the cessation of nuclear testing. On the military side, our top civilian defense planners are rushing headlong toward a stable-deterrence situation, an era of strategic nuclear parity, the rationale of which seems to be the firm administration conviction that within a few years both we and the Soviet Union will have mutual retaliatory strength sufficient to destroy each other and that the deadly logic of this situation will prevent nuclear attack by either side on the other.

Of course, the main criticism of this approach—as rational as it may seem on the surface—is the question: Will the Soviets agree with the administration's view that for all practical purposes military technology ought to be "frozen" at approximately its present level? The administration apparently believes strongly that the Soviets can be convinced, and that once they are, both sides can press on toward other agreements based on a "mutual interest" in the avoidance of world destruction. Yet history militates against such administration confidence. The Soviet Union, whether under Stalin or his successors, has given no indication of abandoning its messianic desire to communize the world. To be sure, there have been important changes in the Communist world—in Russia a lessening of terror as a domestic political tool—and in the larger Communist world a public and violent argument between Russia and Communist China over the best means to achieve world domination. It is true, too, that Nikita Khrushchev is far more understanding of the nuclear age which was well underway when he seized power than was his predecessor Stalin. He is doubtless appreciative of the "nuclear teeth," as he puts it, of the United States. Indeed, some argue that it is this very appreciation of the nuclear facts of life that will induce the Soviets to go along with nuclear test bans and successor arms-control plans, since Khrushchev must see that to press forward with new military technology will only encourage the U.S. to do the same and exacerbate an already tense arms race.

No matter how it is expressed, this philosophy has its roots in the conviction that technology, itself, particularly nuclear technology, has run amok, that it has come to threaten the very survival of the human race, and that therefore its march must be slowed or even ended by mutual agreement of its two foremost practitioners—the United States and the Soviet Union. Once nuclear technology is legislated against, according to this credo, other kinds of technology, notably space, and rocket technology—which provides the delivery means for nuclear warheads—can be regulated too. The particular and understandable nightmare of many strategic thinkers is the extension of rocket-borne nuclear weaponry into orbital space itself, that is, the orbital bombing system, which is often pooh-poohed as an expensive way to do something that can be done cheaper with conventional intercontinental missiles, yet continues to be recognized as worth worrying about by recognized strategic experts. As Donald J. Brennan, a leading defense scientist and arms-control expert who now heads the Hudson Institute at Harmon-on-Hudson, N.Y., has written:

"The potential characteristics and utilizations of orbital weapons cover a considerable range of possibilities. They could be used as a purely retaliatory system aimed chiefly or entirely at cities, in which case they could have relatively modest yields (in the region of one megaton). The problems of effecting reentry of these devices from orbit with sufficient accuracy for this purpose can probably be solved without the necessity for some form of terminal guidance.

"Another possibility of a purely countervalue (use against populations rather than military targets per se) system that has been discussed; and which appears much more disturbing, would involve placing in orbit a limited number of devices of very large yield (a few hundred megatons or more) which would be detonated at orbital altitudes, say 150 miles, rather than being brought down to earth before detonation. The thermal effects from such a high-yield device could set fire to a large fraction of a continent, the extent of which would probably be limited only to that which could be seen from the point at which the device was detonated, except that areas protected by cloud cover at the time of detonation probably would not be ignited.

"In addition to purely countervalue possibilities, it may prove possible to deploy orbital-bomb systems that are effective for attacking the strategic forces on an opponent. This would probably require devices of moderately large yield that could be brought down out of orbit with considerable precision, possibly using some form of active guidance (such as television) in the terminal phase of delivering the weapon to its target. Systems of this type would probably need to incorporate, or be supplemented by, reconnaissance systems for gathering suitable target information. Also, if a system of this type were to be used for initiating a coordinated surprise attack, it would probably be necessary to bunch the weapons in orbit in order to effect the delivery on their targets within a relatively brief interval of time. Retaliatory weapons, on the other hand, could be spread out in separated orbits since it would not be necessary to deliver them all at the same time."

As if to add to the horror, Dr. Brennan adds in a later passage in his essay, which appears in "Outer Space, Projects for Man and Society," a Prentice-Hall Spectrum book, published in 1962 by the American Assembly, Columbia University: "The further development of booster-rocket technology by the major powers may make possible the deployment of relatively invulnerable orbital weapon systems by some of the secondary industrial powers." Shall we be faced, Dr. Brennan asks, implicitly, with an *n*th-country-in-space problem? Will some future General de Gaulle insist that France must have the means of defending herself from space with a spaceborne deterrent, a force de frappe en l'espace?

Bombs in orbit, as Dr. Brennan and many other specialists in strategy and arms control suggest, obviously offer little toward solution of the arms dilemma. They can scarcely be identified as space-oriented contributions to conflict control. They are mentioned here primarily to make two basic points:

That no matter how hopefully we approach negotiations on arms control on earth or in space with the Soviets and no matter how logically we may expect the Soviets to act in the face of what we expect to be a stalemated strategic situation, we must take into account the Soviet temptation to make technological end runs. Orbital weapon systems are but one of a series of possibilities. They range from calculated disruption of our command-and-control facilities to the covert destruction, one by one, of our Polaris submarines.

That, unfortunately, most of the discussion of arms control, whether in terms of conventionally delivered nuclear weaponry as represented by intercontinental missiles, or of spaceborne weaponry, has been in terms of finding rationales on which to base reduction or outlawing agreements that will be acceptable to us and to the Soviets at the same time. This approach hangs tenuously on the hope that we can persuade the Soviets to be logical in our terms, a process that leads only to interminable hair-splitting negotiations.

Instead of emphasizing the unlikely abolition of technology by mutual agreement, what ought to be stressed positively is the use of technology, particularly space technology—married to the observation and computing arts of today—as a really viable instrument for conflict control, an instrument that ideally might eventually be used by an international authority, but that in any case ought to be used publicly and unilaterally now by the United States as a peace-preserving technique.

For a time, there was such an effort—albeit timid—underway. The United States openly discussed its Air Force Samos-Midas spaceborne-observation and missile-warning satellite programs and even sent up trial balloons on the possibility of turning over surveillance data to the United Nations. Then suddenly and absurdly in the early days of the current administration almost a total clamp was put on any information about such surveillance programs, except for recent official announcements that the Midas program suffered from serious technical problems. As to Samos, it is not only a dirty word in Moscow, where the Communists periodically howl about American spying from space, but it is also unmentionable in Washington, where the administration view is that to discuss it is to admit its existence, suggest its efficacy, and to acknowledge Soviet charges of provocation. This policy is not only inconsistent with the fact that everyone knows Samos exists, but it also makes no sense when measured against the fact that during the Cuban crisis last year, the one item that really had impact at the United Nations was the display at the U.N., to all who would look, of the photos of Soviet missile sites in Cuba. Somehow this point has been lost on the administration, yet it is crucially important to demonstrate that technology can crack the traditional Soviet secrecy screen. This fact should be used as a vital political conflict-control tool by the United States.

One of the most succinct statements in this connection is contained in a recent article, "Information and Arms Control," in the Journal of Arms Control, January 1963, by John B. Phelps of the Institute of Defense Analysis. Dr. Phelps writes:

"A further prospect, resulting from technology is that observation satellites will make it either impossible or extermely difficult to maintain certain kinds of secrecy in the 1960's. The development of these satellites seems inevitable. * * * The point to emphasize is that, in several days, the weapons and space technology of the 1960's holds the promise of both lessening the need for military secrecy and making certain kinds impractical anyway. Our task is to aline our arms-control thinking to take advantage of this state of affairs."

Dr. Phelps adds later in his article:

"It seems likely that as yet we do not fully understand the implications of these satellites for arms control or for a number of peaceful purposes. As before, it seems doubtful that either side will forego their use; they are in the technological cards. We may be able to move further toward acceptance of the principle that observation from space is a normal and not particularly threatening activity, more or less equivalent legally to observation from the high seas. Perhaps, eventually, satellite observation can be conducted on an international basis or made part of an arms-control agreement. As an agreed inspection technique, it could be notably free of irritation hazards. But as unagreed unilateral instruments, observation satellites can probably still contribute substantially to the totality of information on which a nation bases its arms-control possibilities. One is intrigued by the possibility that, if the Soviets can be gotten used to the idea of being looked at from above, over the years some fundamental and highly desirable changes in the present information asymmetry, and indeed in the whole politico-military climate, might be brought about."

Dr. Phelps' latter suggestion that the Soviets might get used to and accept observation from space is probably too much to hope for. But his main argument is cogent—that observation satellite systems are essentially positive contributions to the problem of conflict control in a cold-war world. This is true even with some political and technical caveats.

From a political point of view, American unilateral and open use of spaceborne observation will, of course, carry risks, not only of loud Soviet protests about spying, but even of Soviet appeals to international law. But all this has already happened. The shouts of spy are legion, and the Soviet Union has already complained at the U.N. that "no analogy exists (in terms of observation satellites) with principles applying to the open seas. Such United States gathering of reconnaissance intelligence data through the use of space vehicles is in violation of the sovereign rights of states, and if outer space is to be used in peaceful cooperation, such operations cannot be regarded as legal or in conformity with international law." The United States should welcome the chance to debate this point in the U.N. because of the opportunity to hammer away at the obsession with secrecy of the Soviet Union and its consequent untoward influence on the arms competition.

As to technical problems of observation satellites, they are numerous and range from the problems of penetrating cloud cover and camouflage to methods of data retrieval, and include vulnerability and the ever-present questions of cost effectiveness—which is to say, observation satellites are by no means a conflict-control panacea. (The interested reader will find what is virtually a "bible" on the problems and potential of observation satellites by following the work of the Rand Corp.'s Amrom Katz, who has written clearly and provocatively on the subject for this and many other publications.) Yet spaceborne observation is bound to be an important technological means toward the end of conflict control, a distinctively positive means.

The argument has been made that the primary purpose of observation satellites is really target selection, making such satellites offensive and aggressive. But in the U.S. context the purpose of such satellites has undoubtedly been to ascertain Soviet military capabilities so as to have solid data on which to base our own military planning. The arms-control enthusiast should logically accept such satellites as a vital contribution to nonformalized arms control, since the better the data the United States has on the true ratio of reality to bluff in Soviet weapon claims, the less the need for the United States to invest in unneeded weapon systems.

Ironically, instead of recognizing this positive present and future beneficial arms-control influence of unilateral U.S. spaceborne observation, too many arms-control thinkers tend to concentrate their energies on the "mutual interest" concept and worry about how the United States and Soviet Russia can find ways to agree on what not to test and what not to build. This obsession leads to projection of United States attitudes over to the Soviets, on the ground that they, too, are human and interested in survival. What is to often forgotten is that to recognize that the Soviets think differently from us is not to deny their humanness. It is rather to recognize that they will abandon their world-domination intent only when it is finally demonstrated as unworkable.

Robert S. Rochin of the General Electric Co., in his monograph, "Observation Satellites for Arms Control Inspection," GE General Engineering Laboratory Report 62GL78, sums up the case for observation satellites in the arms-control context this way:

"In a relatively short period of time, a satellite can survey the entire area of any country, or even the entire surface of the earth, in order to locate suspicious areas or activities. Such areas can then be examined more closely by higher resolution observation from a satellite or an aircraft, or by sending ground-based inspectors to inspect the area. Among the facilities which may be detected and identified from high-altitude rapid-scan observation are missile-launching pads, major airfields, factories which could be used for producing large weapons or weapon-delivery vehicles, such as missiles or airplanes, and storage facilities for such delivery vehicles. It is also possible to locate roads, shipyards, large roving ships at sea (due to their conspicuous wakes), and major logistic activities, particularly in areas where there had previously been no comparable activity.

"Satellites can also be used to photograph, with a higher resolution, specific areas which are pinpointed by the surveillance techniques described above. It is possible with these higher resolution systems to identify weapon systems and weapon production facilities for the larger types of weapons. Airfields can be analyzed to distinguish civilian from military fields. It should be possible to inspect ground force installations to analyze troop and weapon dispositions, vehicles, storage of munitions, etc.; to study seaports and their facilities to identify naval ships; and to determine the deployment of warships, naval airplane carriers, surfaced submarines, etc."

In short, with enough vehicles, enough film, enough time, enough patience, spaceborne observation can shatter the secrecy that envelops the most notably closed society in history, the Soviet Union. Such an attainment, unilaterally achieved by the United States and announced to the world and to the citizens of the Soviet Union and Communist bloc, could have an enormous and salutory effect on the cold war, a far more important effect than will be obtained by interminable musings on how to reach agreements with the Soviets on banning weapons on the ground or in space.

Another significant potential capability of spaceborne observation is in the field of limited war, which has attained so much significance in Mr. Khrushchev's era of "wars of liberation." As the Raytheon Co's Clark C. Abt (see "Space Denial: Costs and Consequences," Space Digest, March 1963) has suggested in his article "The Problems and Possibilities of Space Arms Control," in the Journal of Arms Control, January 1963:

"The effect of such a capability on limited-war operations would be a substantial aid to defending powers against Communist ambiguous threats and limited aggressions. Since the Western democracies have a sufficiently open society so that major moves of weapons and forces can be concealed only for a short period of time and with the greatest difficulty, while the relatively rigid internal security of the Soviet Union and Communist China make the concealment of such movements comparatively easier, the global surveillance systems would upset this advantage of an aggressor. Furthermore, the very availability of continuous global surveillance, presumably with the at least threatened intention of the United States to make public any indication of Communist buildup for aggression, might in itself help to deter such buildups of forces for peripheral aggression."

Mr. Abt's thesis makes good sense. The West's problem in dealing with the Communist bloc is essentially the problem of making impractical those aggressions, overt and covert, which feed Communist messianism. The West, led by the U.S., must take a world view based on its own image of what constitutes a peaceful planet, and it can take great steps in that direction by openly using the new tools of space technology. Global surveillance is but one of those tools. A U.S. anti-bomb-in-orbit capability—anounced to the world and especially to the Communists—is another and probably the best and cheapest way in the long run to convince the Soviets that whatever they put up we can knock down if it is considered dangerous. To base our hopes on tacit or even formalized agreements with them is an idle wish in an era of exponential technological development.

In the nuclear-space age, marred by a cold war we didn't start and have bent over backward for nearly two decades to try to end, there is more danger to us if we fear technology itself than if we intelligently plan to use it to our own and the world's advantage.

James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to call to the attention of the Senate a splendid article, in the Columbus (Ga.) Enquirer, concerning the early life and the political and the business career of the Honorable James A. Farley.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HONORS, FAME HAVE NOT CHANGED FARLEY

(By Larry Agee)

If you don't know Jim Farley you have a rare pleasure to contemplate.

Jim Farley, despite all the honors accorded him, his many political appointments, and his fiction-like success, is not a stilted, supercilious individual. He's as plain as corn bread, friendly, and possesses a unique, pleasing personality.

"Uncle Jim" knows politics so meticulously, thoroughly, and fluently you'd think he invented it and has all the patent rights on it. If he makes you a promise, consider it done. Perhaps that's a contributing factor to his success—the story of which reads like a fairy tale.

James Aloysius (a saint) Farley was born in Grassy Point, Rockland County, N.Y., May 30, 1888, son of James and Ellen (Goldrick) Farley. He married Elizabeth A. Finnegan April 28, 1920, in Haverstraw, N.Y. (She died Jan. 14, 1955.)

Nearing 75, he is chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Not too far back, Farley was a guest in the home of Mr. and Mrs. D. Abbott Turner, 3218 Hilton Avenue, and he graciously extended me the courtesy of an interview.

"I got my share of whippings in school and always with a good stiff ruler by my teacher but was mostly punished in school by being kept in by the principal and writing the word 'careless'," he said. "Sometimes he would force me to miss recess and I think I had to write the word 'careless' after school more than any boy in my class. I later learned that the principal did not keep me in writing the word 'careless' to punish me so much as to teach me to be more careful with my school work."

As a boy, he had a dog, mongrel or cur, but he forgets its name. He went on picnics, "all the church and local ones held during the summer around the neighborhood." He did not play hooky but spun tops and flew kites.

PLAYED MARBLES

"I played marbles but we used to refer to them as megels and I was pretty good playing them," he said. "I had my own assortment of alleys and like every other boy, wore out my knuckles when I played too often.

"I went barefoot all summer and—like every other boy—had my share of stone bruises and cut feet. None of the boys wore shoes in my community in the summer vacation.

"I did not have to go to a swimming hole because I was born and raised within a hundred yards from the Hudson River. I squished mud between my toes in the clay banks where they had blue clay for the manufacture of common bricks. I watched tadpoles but don't remember catching any lightling or june bugs."

Farley's mother and brothers called him Jimmy but as he grew up and played ball, his associates called him Stretch.

"When I attended grade school I walked about a hundred yards. However, when I went to high school, I walked about a mile and a quarter each way to the high school at Stoney Point," Jim said. "My most difficult study was English and the easiest were mathematics and history which I liked best. I liked English the least.

"My first job was as a bookkeeper for Merlin Kienholz Paper Co., located at 192 West Broadway, New York City. I was paid $8 a week for a year, after which I was raised to $10 a week."

His political activities include being appointed Postmaster General of the United States in President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Cabinet in March 1933 and reappointed in President Roosevelt's Cabinet January 22, 1937. He resigned as Postmaster General August 31, 1940, after having served 7½ years.

He was elected town clerk, Stony Point, N.Y., 1912–19; supervisor, Rockland County, 1920–23; appointed port warden in New York City by Gov. Alfred E. Smith, 1918–19; elected member of the New York State Assembly from Rockland County for the 1923 session.

He was appointed member of New York State Athletic Commission by Governor Smith in 1924; reappointed 1926, 1928; reappointed by Secretary of State Edward J. Flynn in 1930 and 1932; made chairman of the commission in 1925 and remained chairman until he resigned February 28, 1933.

He was appointed a member of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of Government by President Eisenhower July 24, 1953; appointed member of New York State Banking Board by Governor Harriman February 22, 1955.

Farley was elected secretary of the New York Democratic State Committee in August 1928, to fill the vacancy and was reelected in October 1928, for 2 years; elected chairman of the New York Democratic State Committee in October 1930; reelected to serve for 2 years in April 1932; reelected in September 1934; April 1936; September 1938; April 1940; August 1942; April 1944. Resigned as chairman July 11, 1944.

Elected chairman, Democratic National Committee, in Chicago, July 2, 1932; reelected June 27, 1936, in Philadelphia. Resigned as chairman of Democratic National Committee August 17, 1940.

He has been second vice president of the National Democratic Club of New York since 1930. He is a member of 25 social and political clubs and fraternal organizations.

Farley was elected chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp. September 1, 1940; director of the Coca-Cola Co.; president and director of Coca-Cola International Corp.; director of Coca-Cola Co. of Canada, Ltd., and Coca-Cola Inter-American Corp.

He is a director of the National Foreign Trade Council; director of Boys' Club of America; Andrew Freedman Home, New York City; Far East America Council of Industry and Commerce, Inc.; Empire State Foundation of Independent Arts Colleges; Catholic Youth Organization of New York; New York Convention and Visitors Bureau; Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge; the American Heritage Foundation; trustee of Cordell Hull Foundation; and Committee for Economic Development; Little League Foundation.

Farley has 27 honorary degrees, citations, and decorations. He is the author of "Behind the Ballots," 1938, and "Jim Farley's Story," 1949.

Ex-Senator Piersall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Jim Piersall, the celebrated centerfielder who won many new friends and admirers while performing with the Washington Senators in 1962 and 1963, has been sold to the New York Mets. While I regret this transfer because I have enjoyed watching Jimmie perform in the new District of Columbia Stadium, when I have had the opportunity to attend a game locally, I also recognize that in New York he will be that much closer to his hometown of Waterbury, Conn., which is in my district, and that both the Mets and Piersall will welcome the large number of fans who will support their hometown hero. The trenchant and distinctive pen of Dan Parker, who also is a native of Waterbury, Conn., has captured the image of Jim Piersall in an article that appeared in the Waterbury American on Saturday, May 25, shortly after Jimmie's transfer to the National League Mets.

With permission to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues to Dan Parker's article as it appeared in the Waterbury American, the New York Mirror, and other newspapers throughout the Nation:

Piersall Should Thrive Under Stengel Direction

(By Dan Parker)

New York.—There is a disposition on the part of some baseball people to regard Jimmy Piersall as a zany with an amazing proclivity for becoming involved in headline-making scrapes on the baseball field. High-strung, fiercely competitive Jimmy does manage to be in the storm center quite often when the punches start flying and hasn't been noted particularly for backing away from a good spot of knuckle-dusting whenever the opportunity or provocation arises. But anyone who dismisses the Mets' new centerfielder as a headline-hunting freak is displaying an amazing lack of perception.

Back in 1953, when Jimmy's new boss was managing the Yankees, he termed Piersall the best outfielder in baseball, and that took in Willie Mays and a few others of comparable skill. More recently shrewd Casey, whose azure orbs have gazed upon hundreds of ballplayers during his half century in the majors, stopped a Piersall detractor cold when he said: "Crazy? I've never seen him do anything crazy in the outfield or at bat. He's a big leaguer and won't hurt us." In the supercharged atmosphere in which Stengel's strivers move, Piersall could bounce back into his 1961 form with Cleveland when he hit .322, and, under the Stengel treatment, regain the fierce urge for victory that moves him when he is handled with a due regard for his temperament. The fact that he will be facing a brand new set of pitchers who don't have his batting weaknesses cataloged should help, too.

Ever since he was an all-around athlete at Leavenworth High School in Waterbury (Connecticut's Brass City, which one writer, telling of Jimmy's background Thursday, located in Massachusetts), Piersall has taken his sports campaigns as seriously as a professional soldier. Long before he became a favorite in Boston as a member of the Red Sox, Jimmy had established himself as an outstanding athlete there while leading his team to victory in the New England high school basketball championship tournament, with a 29-point solo performance embellished with some last-minute heroics that turned back Durfee High of Fall River in the final round.

The intensity Piersall puts into his athletic activity brought about a nervous breakdown in 1952, not long after he became a Red Sox regular. The fatherly interest Joe Cronin, now the American League's president, but then general manager of the Red Sox, took in his case brought Jimmy back to the Boston club the following year, better than ever. His recovery inspired a book, "Fear Strikes Out," which later was adapted by Hollywood for a movie. After seven seasons with the Red Sox, Piersall was traded to Cleveland in 1959 and spent 3 years there. The deal that sent him to Washington before the 1962 season started came as a surprise. Jimmy didn't react to the change as expected. He dropped to .244 with Mickey Vernon's Senators last year. This season he hadn't been playing regularly. In 28 games he had an average of .250. But even that will add punch to the Mets' attack.

Piersall's speed, superb fielding and fine competitive spirit are his chief assets. He ranges all over the outfield, as he learned to do while playing alongside slow-moving Ted Williams. He and Ted hit it off nicely as teammates. Piersall's batting improved under the master's tutelage.

Ten years ago with the Red Sox, he made six successive hits in the first game of a doubleheader one day, thus tying an American League record. The same year he not only led the league in sacrifice hits with 19 but also topped all the other outfielders in the loop in making double plays, with seven. Not a power hitter, although he has amassed as many as 19 homers in a season with the Red Sox, Jimmy specializes in two-baggers. His speed enables him often to stretch a single another base if he catches the outfielder blinking. He can drive a pitcher crazy in the manner of Jackie Robinson, when he gets on first, and starts acting like a jumping jack.

Jimmy's scrappiness asserted itself first in these parts when he and Billy the Kid Martin engaged in a fist fight at Yankee Stadium in the early 1950's. Piersall was outmatched in this one although the fact that at the time he was on the verge of the breakdown which institutionalized him may have had some bearing on the outcome. When Martin learned of the circumstances later, he expressed regret and became Jimmy's friend.

Down through the decade since his breakdown, Jimmy has been the target of grandstand ghouls who feel their admission ticket is a license to abuse players, and considered Piersall's misfortune a fair subject for their diatribes. One such creep in Baltimore so enraged Jimmy during a game there last season that he invaded the grandstand and beat him up. Then the foulmouthed bum had Piersall arrested on a charge of assault. The Baltimore judge who heard the case dismissed the charge after excoriating Jimmy's tormentor.

Piersall's arrival in Washington last season touched off a minor club rebellion. Some of the players thought Jimmy, who had a $37,000 contract, was receiving special privileges and they sent their representative, Gene Woodling, to the front office with a protest. Although Piersall didn't hold this against Woodling, whom he called a good friend, he wasn't happy in Washington.

"Mickey Vernon is a great guy but this isn't a good ball club," he said on a visit to St. Pete last March for a game with the club he now has joined. Stengel has had his eyes on Jimmy for some time. Although the fleet fly hawk is going from one last place club to another, he seems to be happy about it because he feels that, in Stengel, he has a friend who long ago not only recognized his talent but proclaimed it from the housetops.

There's another angle to the Piersall deal that makes it a shrewd one. Connecticut, which, with all the express highways now connecting it with New York City, has become practically a huge suburb of the metropolis, has a tremendous number of Jimmy's fans who General Manager George Weiss, himself a Nutmegger, hopes will visit the Polo Grounds often. George may even have had in mind the fact that there are enough young Piersalls running around Jimmy's domicile to fill a box—eight in all. And if those two silly goons who jumped out onto the field at Yankee Stadium a few years ago and made the horrible mistake of sailing into Jimmy, would like to come out some night and sample a few more of Piersall's punches, it might pay Tom Meany, the Mets' publicity director, to arrange a boxing match prior to a game as an added attraction, with Jimmy taking on both of them in the same ring.

Address of Hon. Theodore R. McKeldin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on May 9, 1963, the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin, mayor of Baltimore, Md., delivered an address at the Wesley Theological Seminary decade development program.

Mayor McKeldin's remarks reflect a keen insight into the nature of the first amendment to the Constitution, as well as the character of our church-state relationship. In order that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read this thought-provoking address, I ask unanimous consent that Mayor McKeldin's speech may be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address of Hon. Theodore R. McKeldin

Nothing is more common than for political theorists, especially those trained in European secularism, to misinterpret the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States. It is usually an error of omission; accustomed as they are to regard clericalism as a recognized and organized political force, they are impressed by the fact that no established church is permitted here; but they often miss completely the significance of the accompanying admonition—that Congress shall make no law prohibiting the free exercise of religion.

Yet, that is the very core and heart of the amendment. The Founding Fathers' objection to an establishment was precisely that it does in some measure restrict the free exercise of religion. That, at least, had been their experience; and that, it seemed to them, was bound to be the result of any combination of secular and religious authority. Far from being an assault upon religion, the first amendment is actually an attempt to embody in the organic law the injunction of Jesus of Nazareth, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." Congress had inherited the authority of Caesar, and the amendment is a formal acknowledgment that there are boundaries beyond which the authority of Caesar does not extend; and the souls of men are beyond that boundary.

It is, therefore, perfectly consistent with the oldest American doctrine that we should undertake to create a great theological seminary in the Capital, the seat of the secular power. For in any phase of life ignorance is bondage. Even religion, exercised ignorantly, is not exercised freely; and ignorance in the ministers and interpreters of religion inevitably fastens upon it chains of error.

An educated clergy is one of our strongest bulwarks against superstition, the mother of bigotry and prejudice. "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization," said Thomas Jefferson, "it expects what never was and never will be." Jefferson was thinking, to be sure, of political ignorance; but his words apply to a nation's spiritual leaders with even more force than to its political leaders. When the blind lead the blind, both will fall into the ditch; and I, for one, am persuaded that the keenest political vision cannnot keep out of the ditch a nation that is spiritually blind.

As a layman, therefore, I urge other laymen—business leaders, political leaders, professional leaders—to give careful consideration to the way in which support of this project is to their secular, as well as their religious interest, to their advantage as laymen as well as churchmen.

I leave it to others, better qualified, to discuss the significance of this institution as it affects matters of faith and dogma. I restrict my argument to its effect upon this world, in which we are living here and now; for I am satisfied that that effect amply justifies laymen in supplying the physical facilities it requires; for a really great theological seminary is a bulwark of the state as well as of the church.

I appeal with special urgency to laymen living in the city of Washington, by which I refer to the whole concentration of population, not merely that segment enclosed within the District line. This city has a relation that is unique to the rest of the country. Political leadership of the whole Nation is concentrated here, and political leadership cannot be wholly separated from economic, professional, and cultural leadership. It follows that if Washington fails in any aspect of leadership, the failure is more conspicuous than it would be in any other city.

It follows that responsibility for spiritual leadership rests upon you with especial weight. Through the secular power, Washington has become physically one of the most magnificent of the great capitals. The beauty that exists in the eye of the beholder has been developed lavishly. But that is the limit of the secular power; it can create physical beauty, but it has neither the right nor the power to attempt to cultivate the beauty of holiness. That is among the things that are God's, and if they are to be rendered unto Him, it must be by you, and you cannot transfer the obligation to Caesar.

Nevertheless, if you by your efforts play a worthy part in creating here a center of spiritual power comparable to Washington's centers of political power, you will strengthen Caesar in rendering His due unto God.

As a matter of strict fact, the entire decade of development program of Wesley Theological Seminary is no more than a first step toward the goal for which we should strive. But there is acid truth in the maxim that "it is the first step that counts." It is a truth that must be accepted, though, because it is also the first step that makes possible the long journey.

I am, I hope, a patriotic American, but I know that I am an optimistic one. I believe profoundly in the words of Shakespeare that they have carved on the Archives Building: "What's past is prologue," and I would even dare to add to them the next line: "What's to come is yours and my discharge."

That is to say, I believe that the first 200 years of American history can be made merely the introduction to a destiny greater than is within our power to imagine. But I admit that the limit of my belief is that it can be so; I dare not say that it must be so, for that destiny, to a large extent, hangs upon the decisions made and the action begun by our generation. If we should fail to discharge our responsibility, our children and grandchildren will be hard put to it to recover the lost ground; perhaps they cannot recover it.

We understand well enough that the present is critical. National security is our preoccupation to an extent almost, if not quite, without precedent in the generations before us.

It is reasonable that we should be uneasy, for the threats are only too plain; but I am not satisfied that the precautions we are taking are altogether reasonable. Physically, no doubt, they are the best we can do; but the best will not be good enough if we forget the first principle of all national security, once given us in these words: "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it; except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

Unless the spiritual power of this Nation rises in measure with its physical power, our military might will be a delusion and a snare. Unless we can build arsenals in which God's armorers can forge the sword of the spirit, our stockpiles of fission bombs and fusion bombs will be as useless as heaps of straw. For, though we slaughter our fellow men in uncounted millions, and ravage the earth so completely that no life can exist upon it, what profit is there if it be said of us, "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision"?

The effort to build Wesley Theological Seminary into the great institution it ought to be is an effort to create in Washington a spiritual arsenal in which men skilled in the use of intellectual tools may hammer into shape Paul's "armor of light," and put into our hands "the shield of faith, the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the spirit which is the word of God."

So armed, we shall be armed indeed; but without that armament we shall fail of our high destiny no matter how powerfully we are girt about with fire and steel.

It is both your duty and your high privilege to assist in the building of the arsenal. It is your religious duty, but let others speak to you of that; my assertion is that it is also your civic duty, your political duty; for when, after having posted your alert sentinels on every hand, you call on the Lord to keep the city, you may rest in peace. For under His hand, the city's watchmen will stand fast, its weapons will not fail, and "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

Need for Ratification of Genocide Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this month when much of the free world is commemorating the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising, we are reminded of the need for the United States to ratify the Genocide Convention. Recently the Jewish community of Pittsburgh reminded the U.S. Senate that this occasion could "be converted from an act of heartbreaking recollection into a positive and meaningful basis for defining and protecting the basic human right of survival."

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION FOR RATIFICATION OF THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION BY THE UNITED STATES

On the occasion of the observance of the Warsaw ghetto uprising against the slaughterers of millions of defenseless human beings, we call on President Kennedy to urge the Senate of the United States to ratify the Genocide Convention, at the current session, thus joining the 64 nations of the world, the 58 organizations in the United States, and the millions of decent citizens of this country who endorse its aims of preventing repetition of mass murder of a people. This subject has been languishing so long in the consideration of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate that it has become a blot on the reputation of the United States.

Passage of the Genocide Convention by the Senate of the United States would associate this country with an international pledge that horror of the kind perpetrated by the Nazis may never again be permitted. We urge that this occasion be converted from an act of heartbreaking recollection into a positive and meaningful basis for defining and protecting the basic human right of survival.

The Real Reasons for Classroom Cheating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, an extremely worthwhile project initiated by the Richmond (Va.) Junior Chamber of Commerce in my congressional district was the subject this past Sunday of an article in This Week magazine, entitled "The Real Reasons for Classroom Cheating." Written by Virginius Dabney, the Pulitzer Prize winning editor of the Richmond Times-Dispatch, the article reports vividly and accurately the scope of the problem. Under permission to extend my remarks I would like to extend the distribution of this important study by including the article at this point in the RECORD:

THE REAL REASONS FOR CLASSROOM CHEATING

(By Virginius Dabney)

RICHMOND, VA.—Why do teenagers cheat in high school? A particularly flagrant example of wholesale cheating came to the attention of the Richmond, Va., Junior Chamber of Commerce last year. The group of young businessmen decided to launch a study of high school cheating and to seek solutions. Their program has just been adopted by the national board of directors of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, and the 250,000 Jaycees are atacking the problem on a nationwide scale.

The suggestion to study high school cribbing was first made by Henry R. Miller III, president of the Richmond chapter of the junior chamber. To work up a constructive plan and carry it out, he appointed David R. White, 34-year-old investment banker, Virginia Military Institute graduate, and former Marine Corps officer.

ONE-MAN STRUGGLE

White knew that to find a cure for cheating, he first had to discover the reasons for it. Singlehandedly he began interviewing teachers and pupils. He sent out questionnaires to principals of 26 representative Virginia high schools. His interviews and questionnaires brought some surprising explanations for cheating:

1. Pressure from home for good grades. "All the kids are afraid of what their families will say if they don't get good marks," one student told him.

2. Emphasis on memory tests. Instead of questions framed in such a way as to develop analytical powers, the prevailing type of test puts a premium on facts which can be scribbled on a sheet of paper tucked into a sock or blouse.

3. Natural desire to excel. Students want to win prizes for scholarship and to get into college.

4. Lax proctoring. Many teachers fail to make it clear that they regard cheating as dishonorable. The importance of this last is seen in the finding of the Gallup Poll that most teenagers do not consider classroom cheating dishonest.

5. Bad example by parents. Fathers and mothers should make their disapproval of cheating strong and subject to no misinterpretation. However, if they chisel on their own income tax returns, they can hardly expect to have much influence in pointing the right way to their children.

TEMPTATION IS GREATER

"The tempation to cheat is greater now than ever before," reports Dr. Robert F. Williams, executive secretary of the Virginia Education Association. In an article for the Virginia Journal of Education, which he edits, Dr. Williams writes: "College doors are becoming increasingly difficult to enter. * * * Where does the parent stand? Does he say to his child, 'I would rather have you fail honestly than cheat your way into college'?"

The problem of cheating came prominently to the fore last year when "TED" KENNEDY, brother of President Kennedy, admitted publicly that, as a freshman at Harvard, he had arranged for another student to take an exam for him. Despite this admission, he ran up huge majorities in his race for the U.S. Senate. Accordingly, a question arose in many minds as to whether most people in this country regard cheating in school or college as a serious offense.

Youngsters try to rationalize peeping into textbooks to get the answer on a quiz, holding up answers scribbled on a sheet for a baffled fellow student to see, sitting in for other pupils on tests and handing in papers for them.

"Everybody cheats a little," said one teenager.

"I don't think it's cheating if you help someone who knows the subject but just can't think of an answer," declared another.

"You give a little and take a little; it's friendship," said a third.

"Cheating is justified if the test isn't fair," opined a fourth.

ASHAMED IF I CHEATED

But students who do not cheat look down on those who do, according to statements some of them made to White.

"It is not fair to those who don't do it and who work hard," said one.

"My father said he would be disappointed if I flunked, but ashamed if I cheated; I would, too," said another.

Finally White's study revealed what seems to be the key to the amount of cribbing in a given class: the teacher's attitude. "It all depends on the teacher," said numerous teenagers interviewed. "If the teacher is strict, no one cheats."

Examples of success on the part of instructors in breaking up dishonesty in the classroom are readily available. A teacher of English made it clear at the beginning of the year that he would give a zero to anyone caught cheating, and he would also call in the parents and put it on the student's record. There was no cheating in his class.

A Spanish teacher said that anybody caught cheating would have to stay in for Saturday detention. When the pupils found he meant business, the cheating stopped.

One teacher said recently:

"Students will not cheat if the teacher makes it difficult. I mean, for example, having the pupils take tests with the top of their desks completely clean except for the exam and their answer sheet, and having them place a clean sheet of paper over the top of their work as they complete it."

COMMUNITY SUPPORTED AND ACTION

However, teachers can't fight dishonesty singlehanded. They frankly told White that they needed the support of the honest majority of students, of parents and of the community. To mobilize the support teachers need White came up with an honesty program—not just a negative program to stop cheating, but a plan to promote honorable conduct in a school. He prepared these three leaflets, based on his research:

"Classroom Cheating: Who's To Blame?" which analyzes the factors, from parental pressure to lax proctoring, which encourage cheating.

"Honesty Ideas," based on the various honor programs that White found being used in leading Virginia high schools.

"Recommended Courses of Action," suggesting how a community can get moving toward an honesty program in its schools.

White's honesty program scored a success in Richmond, soon spread to other cities. Newspapers, radio, and TV stations publicized the plan. Student forums discussed the best way to apply the idea to their own situation. And junior chamber members who promoted the program found they had a special advantage: their ages run from 21 to 35, and this turned out to be just the right bracket to exert the maximum influence on high school students.

Now, since the honesty program's adoption by the national directors, the three leaflets—probably combined in a booklet with details on implementation—will be distributed nationwide by the Jaycees to interested persons, youngsters, and schools. It is sure to have a major impact on American ethics. The long-range significance was underlined by a Virginia school principal, Frank A. Solari, Jr.:

"Cheating is bad, not only because of the moral implications involved, but because this habit easily carries over to all the student's relationships with his fellow men."

But Not Yet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by Gordon Conklin appeared in the last issue of American Agriculturist, June 1963.

It would be well if we all took this editorial to ourselves and asked the question with sincerity: Do we want to do the right and best thing for our country? Why, of course, we all do. But is our final word that of St. Augustine: "But not yet."

BUT NOT YET

(By Gordon Conklin)

Ever hear of a man named St. Augustine? He was the fellow who lived many centuries ago and who, after he became a Christian and saw living in a new light, wrote a book about the transformation that had taken place in his thinking. In it he revealed a great deal about human nature.

Augustine had a lot of wild oats to sow in his younger days and he pursued this task with great diligence. After all, "everyone was doing it" in his society and he couldn't see bucking the trend and missing all the fun. Once in a while, though, an uneasiness gnawed at his mind, so he would attempt to pray, "O Lord, make me pure."

But then a vision of his latest heartthrob (clad in a Roman bikini) would flash before his eyes and he'd hastily add the words * * * "but not yet."

I have heard several speakers lately whose words remind me just a bit of St. Augustine. In essence, here's what they said, "Sure, we may disagree with the direction our society is going, particularly with the fact that more and more people are turning over their responsibilities to government. Whether it's tagged socialism, the welfare state, or any other label, is beside the point. If that's the direction the majority wants to go, why should we butt our heads against a stone wall? Shouldn't we get aboard the bandwagon and take advantage of the situation instead of slipping behind the parade?"

Make me pure and stalwart, O Lord, but not yet. Not until I have gotten mine and am too old to give a damn any more. Help me preserve the freedoms for which my ancestors shed their blood, but not if it means accepting a weekly wage below that of the electrical workers' union.

Help me see the values of the incentives of a competitive society where each person's income is determined by ability and willingness to work, but for goodness sake not until I have achieved parity, and legislation has been passed that guarantees equal incomes for all.

Thou knowest, O Lord, that I long to bequeath my children a land of opportunity without the necessity to purchase the right to produce, or obtain permission to enter an occupation, but these things are certainly essential for the present emergency if my own cup is to overflow.

Guard me from the temptation in the future to cut open the golden goose of our free enterprise system for a few golden eggs, but trouble me not about my present carving activities. I pray for the inner stamina whereby I may stand firm for what is right, regardless of its popularity at the moment, but not until my net worth is adequate for financial independence, and especially not until I have qualified for benefits from programs financed at public expense. Thou art so remote, and sometimes heedless to my pleas, but my Great White Uncle in Washington is ever eager to return, to all those who cooperate, a portion of that which he has taxed from them.

The record of humanity, including the book especially inspired by Thee, tells us that the upward thrust of mankind has been led by men often unpopular with the crowd. Thy prophets and Thy Son called upon us to seek truth rather than what is merely expedient—called us to dig deep beneath the surface of living, seeking to understand and to make a part of ourselves those things of lasting value. Grant me the courage to risk the derision of my neighbors in the fight for what is of lasting value, even if it costs me to do so, but not yet.

Court of the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Times and Democrat of Orangeburg, S.C., has published an editorial in its May 26, 1963, edition, supporting the plan for establishment of a Court of the Union. I have introduced, in the Senate, a proposal that the Constitution be amended to provide for the establishment of such a court, composed of the State supreme court chief justices and empowered to review certain decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

In recent weeks, we have witnessed increasing evidence of the need for establishing such a court. I appreciate the support which this outstanding newspaper is giving to this plan and I commend its editorial comments to the attention of this body. I therefore ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "Court of the Union," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COURT OF THE UNION

One of the constitutional amendments now being pushed by advocates of States rights is one which would set up a Court of the Union, empowered to review Supreme Court decisions.

Arkansas, Florida, and Wyoming have already approved legislation petitioning Congress to call a constitutional convention to enact such a constitutional amendment and others, as this is written.

This device—the constitutional convention—has never before been used. But it is provided for in the Constitution. Two-thirds of the States can petition for such a convention and Congress must call it. The convention can then decide upon amendments to the Constitution.

The Court of the Union proposed would consist of the Supreme Court Chief Justices of the 50 States. Beyond any doubt these would be well qualified judges since they would represent the ablest jurists in each State, experienced and well versed in the rights of States and those of the Federal Government.

The Supreme Court of the United States today has no check or limitation and is composed of political appointees. Many of its justices had no proper legal and judicial training, but were given their jobs as a reward for political services.

Obviously these men are not properly qualified to pass finally on the most vital matters of State and Federal rights, law and the Constitution. If there were a review court, such as the Court of the Union, which contained only experienced justices, the Nation's future would be far better safeguarded.

There is such great merit in the Court of the Union amendment it is difficult to see how it can fail to be adopted sooner or later. This review court would consider only a few of the most vital cases it decided to accept. It would not replace the Supreme Court. It would act as a senior, reviewing body, as the only check on a hitherto unchecked judicial unit of our democratic government.

New Hampshire Industrial Expansion Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, across the country we witness heartening signs of an economic recovery that will enable Congress to reduce taxes without lasting adverse budgetary effects. In the Concord (N.H.) Daily Monitor of May 25, 1963, appears the results of a survey of 63 manufacturing industries in the area of Concord, N.H. The expansion plans of these industries indicate not only the favorable national outlook for corporate investment, but also the progressiveness and imagination of the industries of the central Merrimack Valley. The Concord Regional Development Corporation and the Chamber of Commerce are to be congratulated for their leadership in focusing attention on the needs to be met for future industrial growth and development.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION

A very interesting feature of the survey, Mr. President, was the fact that 19 of the 32 industries reporting expansion plans indicated difficulties in recruiting skilled workers and technicians, in some 29 different categories. This lends special urgency to the State's plans to build a technical institute and shows the importance of the President's proposal for aid to technical education. The development of college-level programs of technician training will help to meet one of the most critical manpower needs of the United States. In my view, the $20 million allotted to this purpose in the President's budget request might well be increased. The survey of the Concord Regional Development Corp. and the Chamber of Commerce showed that expanded technical education opportunity is the second most pressing need of local industry. This is a finding that could be extended throughout my own State of New Hampshire and the rest of the manufacturing areas of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thirty-two of the sixty-three manufacturing industries in the Greater Concord Area, participating in the joint Concord Regional Development Corp.-Chamber of Commerce survey to determine potential growth, have reported widely varying plans for expansion.

This fact was reported to the newly elected board of directors at an organization meeting held at the Snow Shoe Club last night by Albert S. Baker, executive director.

In a preliminary summary of significant comments contained in the industrial survey questionnaires, Baker and the majority of those reporting expansion plans intend to use present sites but that several would consider new plant sites.

Of the 32 industries indicating they have hopes for expansion, 19 said they now have difficulty in recruiting the type of workers they require. They list 29 categories in which they said labor shortages exist.

Charles H. Toll, Jr., member of the law firm of Orr and Reno, for many years the clerk of the board of directors, was elected president of the corporation, succeeding Alexander Rennie, Jr., president of Page Belting Co., who continues as a director.

VICE PRESIDENTS NAMED

Other officers elected were vice presidents, Robert J. Hill, president of New Hampshire Savings Bank; Francis N. Southworth, vice president of Concord National Bank; and Richard G. Williamson, vice president of Mechanicks National Bank. Southworth and Williamson succeed Philip H. Butterfield, president of Concord National Bank, and James S. Barker, president of Mechanicks National Bank, both of whom completed 5-year terms as directors.

Clerk of the board is Morton M. George, president of Evans Printing Co., succeeding Toll.

Treasurer and assistant treasurer, Wilbert F. Cameron, president of Concord Savings Bank, and Harry A. Bartlett, president of Merrimack County Savings Bank, were reelected.

Newly elected directors who participated in the board meeting for the first time were vice presidents Southworth and Williamson; Louis G. K. Clarner, vice president and treasurer of Morrill & Everett, Inc.; and E. D. Swett, Pembroke contractor and director of the Suncook Bank.

In his annual report the executive director recommended that, in view of the facts developed in the survey of existing industries, the Regional Development Corp. should reappraise its activities to permit an aggressive program of assistance, where desired, to industries desiring to expand, without sacrificing its effort to attract new ones to the community; to define specific goals; and to determine ways and means required to carry out a revitalized plan.

ASKS LABOR POOL STUDY

Noting that unemployment levels in the area which includes Concord and 28 other communities, as reported by the State department of employment security, have been slightly higher in the last few months than for the comparable period a year ago, Baker suggested that such a review include consideration of a labor survey similar to that conducted when the CRDC was organized.

Other items he said he felt should be covered included an analysis of manufacturers' needs not now served by existing area industries, as reported in the study, to discover whether new industries to meet the problem could expect a sustaining volume of work.

The executive director also suggested that the board consider whether it should take a direct interest in the problem of downtown improvements in Concord and what official position it should take in the controversial question of State tax reform.

In the survey, manufacturers were asked to list any barriers to expansion which could be removed or diminished by individual or cooperative action on the part of the Development Corp., the chamber or the community. The largest number of specific suggestions related to the high and rising property taxes in Concord, which now has the highest dollar level of any of New Hampshire's 13 cities.

WANT TECHNICAL SCHOOL

Ranking second in needs was increased technical education for workers, both as an aid to industry and an upgrading of individual earning capacity.

Third and fourth factors respectively were improved business climate and better housing for workers.

Financial assistance to aid expansion was not shown to be a major need, according to the survey answers, with minor exceptions where increased capital was listed as a need.

General suggestions included recommendations for establishment of some sort of employment service for skilled persons and development of better ways of publicizing, in appropriate markets, the products of local industries, particularly for those unable to engage in "expensive" advertising programs.

Tele-Braille—Opportunities for the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on Thursday, May 23, a most important ceremony was held in Aberdeen, S. Dak., dedicating the Tele-Braille system in the Municipal Building of Aberdeen.

The Tele-Braille system makes it possible for a blind person to operate a telephone switchboard. The ceremonies in Aberdeen marked the installation of the first Tele-Braille device in the world. This is an important step in opening the door to another field of job opportunities for the blind. Vernon Williams, an Aberdeen, S. Dak., attorney, deserves a great credit for bringing to South Dakota the first Tele-Braille device. Mr. Williams, himself a blind man, has worked untiringly through the years in finding ways to open up additional job opportunities for the blind. He is to be commended for this successful effort which will mean much to blind people everywhere. It is most fitting that it took place in Aberdeen, S. Dak., since the South Dakota School for the Blind is located there.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the Record the news story appearing in the Aberdeen American-News for May 25, reporting on the ceremonies which took place.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Large Crowd Inaugurates Tele-Braille Switchboard

Ceremonies for the inauguration of the Tele-Braille switchboard system in Aberdeen Thursday attracted a large group of dignitaries and interested Aberdeenians.

They were present in the Municipal Building Thursday afternoon to commemorate the Tele-Braille system—the first of its kind in the world.

The Tele-Braille system makes it possible for a blind person to operate a switchboard and the device, officials said, would open the door to another field of job opportunities for the blind.

The system was opened in the Municipal Building as the central switchboard system for city offices with a phone call Thursday morning from Atty. Gen. Robert Kennedy in Washington to Mayor Cliff Hurlbert.

Mayor Hurlbert, who presided at the brief inaugural ceremonies Thursday afternoon, called the installation of the device "one of the most important things that has happened in our community. It gives us a chance to help the handicapped."

R. A. Devereaux, vice president and general manager of Northwestern Bell Telephone Co., Sioux Falls, expressed the company's "appreciation for the opportunity to be of service."

Gov. Archie Gubbrud called the installation of the Tele-Braille equipment a "tremendous thing," and said it "marks a milestone of progress for the State and the city."

Vernon Williams, Aberdeen attorney, was introduced as the "man who made this possible." Williams was instrumental in getting the equipment installed in Aberdeen.

Also introduced were Charles Nickerson, Portland, Oreg., co-inventor of the device; Velma Schultz, the operator who will work the board; Chris Merkel of the State Public Utilities Commission; Howard Hanson, of the State Service to the Blind; Mr. and Mrs. Walter Hack, of the State school for the blind in Aberdeen; Duke Benton, president of the South Dakota Association for the Blind; and Jack Vostad and Frank Pazlar of Northwestern Bell Telephone Co. from Aberdeen.

The dignitaries attended a banquet Thursday night.

Let's Get Off McNamara's Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article by Malcolm S. Forbes which appeared in the May 1 issue of Forbes magazine.

The article deals with our able and energetic Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara. It deals with the deliberate and premeditated attacks which certain individuals and groups are attempting to level against him. While some of these individuals and groups may be sincere or even sincerely misinformed, others obviously are self-seeking and vindictive.

Robert S. McNamara is undoubtedly the ablest and best Secretary of Defense we have had. It is encouraging to observe that all the petty attacks have not dimmed his reputation in the public eye. It is encouraging to observe that the thoughtful elements in the American press, surfeited and weary with the proliferation of petty criticism, are calling for an end to the futile flutters of his self-styled antagonists.

A good man, a big man, and an able man is being nibbled at by minnows. Thoughtful Americans in increasing numbers are beginning to echo the title of this understanding article. They are saying, "Let's get off McNamara's back and let him get on with the job of building America's defenses."

The article follows:

Let's Get Off McNamara's Back

(By Malcolm S. Forbes)

I certainly hope Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara isn't as impervious to criticism or as oblivious to suggestion as his critics imply. With equal fervor I hope his innards are not as sensitive as the computing machines to which he is often likened. In recent weeks he must be wondering what's hit him. From every side and from some of the most unlikely sources he has been attacked and assaulted not merely for his conclusions and actions; his motives in addition to his methods have been keelhauled.

I hope he can take it because I share what I feel is still a widely held opinion that he is the ablest defense secretary we've had and the ablest man on the Kennedy team.

Nobody making decisions that involve both the placing and canceling of billions of dollars in contracts affecting tens of thousands of people's jobs and income can expect to win popularity contests. But such decisions have to be made and that's the Defense Secretary's job. It's heartening to find out that the Defense Secretary doesn't view his task as one of trying to keep the Army, Navy, and Air Force happy in equal parts regardless of technical development and changing defense needs.

I don't know whether he made a mistake on the TFX contract. I don't know if getting one plane for the Army and the Navy at a savings of hundreds of millions of dollars is worth the saving. I always thought planes were built in relation to missions as well as costs; that perhaps carrier-based planes might have different requirements than land based, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

But if I, who ain't in the business, have these thoughts; and if some Congressmen have them; and if some Army, Navy, and Air Force people have them; and if you have them—isn't it perhaps reasonable to suppose that they might have occurred to Mr. McNamara also? That he may even have taken them into account while feeding data into his little computer? I certainly think Congress is entitled to ask him if he did, to ask him to justify his decision. But on the record I think it is just a little naive to suggest that Mr. McNamara made his decision for some quaint whim unrelated to facts. Of course, if he placed this possibly $6.5 billion contract in Boston, I might have joined the ranks of the suspicious.

As for the criticism repeatedly emanating from generals and admirals that he doesn't always follow their recommendations—good lord. I'd hate to see the Army headed by men who didn't believe, and who know blamed well for the security of this country, that we need more highly trained, ready soldiers. I'd hate to see the Navy in the hands of men who didn't believe, and know blamed well, we need more Polaris submarines, et al., to insure our defense. I'd hate to see the Air Force headed by generals who thought they had all they needed to discharge their incredible responsibilities.

But, "wouldn't it be lovely" if they had a boss who agreed with them all and in "fair shares" for all. I am sure the Soviets would be happy to place that Secretary of Defense in the mausoleum next to Lenin in appreciation of his contribution to the collapse of the free world.

Mr. McNamara isn't God. He has no claim to infallibility. I'm sure he has made and will make mistakes. I hope and believe he listens to criticism—as for instance, C. L. Sulzberger's comments in the New York Times on what McNamara's reneging on the air defense ground environment plans for NATO would do to that De Gaulle-buffeted alliance. Such an act would have consequences far outweighing its short-term savings in dollars.

I repeat, however, the fervent hope that he is not getting unduly rocked inside by the pummeling he has been undergoing. He is doing a well-nigh undoable job and doing it ably. After undergoing so many weeks of nonadulation I think it's time some of us in McNamara's band strike up for him an encouraging tune.

Louisiana State University's Contributions to the Space Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the recent remarkable and fantastic accomplishment of L. Gordon Cooper orbiting the earth 22 times, brings to mind the thousands of individuals who shared in the preparation and operation of this feat.

Louisiana State University, a great university which is located in Baton Rouge, La., can certainly take its justifiable place in its contribution to the development in this space age.

Following is an editorial which appeared in the Baton Rouge State Times and Morning Advocate. The editorial is as follows:

Louisiana State University is fortunate in being able to call upon three of its own distinguished graduates to teach a new advanced course in an important new science, that of manned space craft technology.

The three are Walter C. Williams, deputy director for mission requirements and flight operations at the manned spacecraft center now being built at Houston; Maxime A. Faget, assistant director for engineering and development at the Center; and Paul E. Purser, special assistant to the director of the Center. They will commute to Louisiana State University this fall to conduct a 15-week course presented by the Louisiana State University Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering.

All three have had distinguished careers in work with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and other agencies. Faget is credited with a major role in design of the Mercury spacecraft which carries American astronauts in orbit.

Louisiana State University can be proud of these three graduates, as of the many others who have achieved distinction in their different fields. One of the best measures of any university is the success in life of its former students. Louisiana State University can be especially proud of the contributions that its graduates have made to the new, spectacular, and vitally important science of manned space flight.

What's Wrong With Civil-Military Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, many of us here in the Congress have been deeply disturbed by the deterioration of relations between the Secretary of Defense and those in the Armed Forces.

There is no doubt in the minds of us who come in contact with the situation every day here in Washington that there is a serious lack of confidence in a great number of those in the higher echelon of the Armed Services with the Secretary of Defense. There have been many occasions in the past 2 years when I have had serious doubts as to whether or not the military have fully expressed their position on the occasions of their appearances before congressional committees. The rule entered by the Secretary of Defense that those having conversations with people outside the Pentagon in the journalistic field must make a report of their conversations to their superiors has further undermined this confidence. From all of this, there seems to be a definite trend by the present Secretary to see that people on the outside are not fully informed of the real feelings of those in the military. Never before in my time in Washington has any such thing ever been attempted. The result has been to quiet the voice of the military in decisions that vitally affect America and are properly military in scope.

Gen. Thomas D. White, one of the most respected men to hold a high military position in Washington has written an excellent article for Newsweek, in the May 27 issue, which I herewith include for the benefit of my colleagues:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS

(By Gen. Thomas D. White, USAF, retired)

The relationship between military and civil authority is becoming a matter of public controversy and needs prospective.

A reporter once asked me to state something unique about my job as Chief of Staff of the Air Force. I reflected and said: "The post of Chief of Staff is where military authority leaves off and civil authority takes over. The Chief of Staff is a catalyst between civil and military responsibility." Part of my job at that time, as it is intended to be now, was to interpret each side to the other.

Today controversy stems from the fact that a hardhitting Secretary of Defense has centralized authority in his office as never before. He is advised by a vast array of professors, scientist, financial and computer experts together with hundreds of civil-service employees scattered throughout all echelons of the Pentagon and elsewhere. Thus the role of the military at the top levels of government has become derogated.

The Department of Defense has been recognized, national strategy altered, the budget structure overhauled, and cherished service programs have been canceled. Most recently key military personnel changes have made the headlines. Because vital political, diplomatic, economic, and budgetary considerations are involved controversy is inevitable.

DISCONTENT

Fundamental in the civil-military relationship, recognized and accepted without question by the military, is the fact that civil authority is supreme. Every man in uniform is under oath to fight for this principle and I have never known an officer or man to want it otherwise. However, adherence to this basic tenet does not prevent contrary beliefs nor guarantee satisfaction among men in uniform. Although soldiers, sailors, and airmen chronically gripe, today there is deep-seated discontent.

There are many in high places who view with alarm the direction of our national strategy; some oppose organizational changes, and there is unhappiness over some weapon systems. The common denominator of it all is the belief that dependence on temporary civilian experts and even computer tapes has overshadowed military advice.

Salt is added to this lesion by resentment over attempts in some quarters to discredit the military. It is alleged that there is no experience of modern war and that military art has now become a mathematical science. Also there have been references to battleship admirals, bomber, and cavalry generals together with recitations of military sins in developing wasteful and outmoded weapon systems. Errors by the military (shared by their civilian superiors) have, indeed, been made and dollars could have been saved if hindsight could alter past budgets. The payoff has come in the cold clear fact that this Nation has been militarily safe throughout some of the most critical years in history. A case could be made that at least as great errors have been made in diplomacy, in economic forecasts, and in business decisions.

It could be proved from the records that had civilians followed military advice, America could have had a man in space before the Russians; the Atlas missile almost died during its early days because of civilian reluctance to spend the money; moreover the famous duplication between the Army's Jupiter and the Air Force's Thor IBBM was the result of a flat civilian order to produce both.

Today national defense is an exceptionally serious affair. In no other field is teamwork so essential. A divided house cannot be as efficient as a happy one, and it seems to me that this is a good time to take stock of what can be done in the public interest. I have the temerity, prompted by long observation, to offer some suggestions all around:

1. There should be critical examination of the fitness for defense work of some civilians—including an evaluation of their qualities of humility and tact in dealing with men in uniform. The latter are usually seniors in age and experience. Likewise military men who are not adaptable to teamwork with civilians should be transferred forthwith. Each side must recognize that the other fulfills an essential role.

2. Those high in defense authority should insure that the military voice has been taken into account at all levels of policymaking; and when the military's recommendations are not accepted the reasons should be made known to the officers concerned.

3. The military man must accept fully considered contrary decisions with grace and silence except before the Congress; else resign, retire, or speak out at risk of career.

4. May the Congress jealously guard its right to hear full and complete answers to questions put to military witnesses before committees, and let it be alert to the possibility of inhibited witnesses.

The Tablet: Louis Budenz' Final Column

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as a regular reader of the well-known diocesan newspaper of Brooklyn, N.Y., the Tablet, it was with regret that I noted in its May 23, 1963, issue, the final column by Louis Budenz, who for many years has had a weekly article in that paper under the title of "The Reds—What Now?"

Accompanied by an appreciative editorial by Patrick F. Scanlon, managing editor of the Tablet, this final column of Louis Budenz is a fitting end to the newspaper career of one who has done much to alert our people as to the operations of the conspiratorial force that has enveloped so much of the world.

The indicated appreciation and column follow:

[From the Brooklyn (N.Y.) Tablet, May 23, 1963]

LOUIS BUDENZ' FINAL COLUMN

(By Patrick F. Scanlan, K.S.G.)

We deeply regret the departure from our columns of Louis Budenz. Like Father James M. Gillis, who was compelled to withdraw because of illness, Mr. Budenz is prevented from continuing his weekly columns after many years of excellent writing.

Certainly every reader of "The Reds—What Now?" has been informed on the great Communist menace to our civilization. Mr. Budenz, a former editor of the "Daily Worker," a leader and lecturer of the party for many years, was fully informed on the ideology, its program, propaganda, methods, and objectives. Once out of the party, and enjoying the fulgent light of a great faith as well as the heat obtained from our sacramental Lord, he pledged himself to undo any harm he might previously have done while on the side of the enemy. A man of fine ability, a competent writer and a scholar who kept abreast of the information as well as the tactics outlined in current Red literature, printed in Moscow and elsewhere, he rendered a unique and effective service. This was particularly remarkable because of his very serious illness of the last few years—an illness which has become more difficult to combat as years rolled on.

His penitential spirit as well as his courage, patriotism and religion were manifested in his tremendous service to our Government in exposing subversive individuals and party secrets, enabling action to be taken against spies. For many years he was a frequent witness before congressional committees, before the Federal Bureau of Investigation and law courts. During this time he was wantonly abused, threatened and misrepresented by spies from within and their stooges. He acquitted himself with the courage of the bravest of soldiers fighting for our country's cause, and often against tremendous odds.

As a writer Mr. Budenz has revealed many fine qualities. One of them is his ability to face discomfiture, trouble and adverse criticism. He has been so dedicated to his apostolate that neither sickness nor the jibes of critics—many of them vicious or ignorant anti-anti-Communists—distracted him from his work, for both pain and sharp attacks were brushed aside. He has manifested deep faith in God and His justice, and rode on the road to accomplishment without detours and without paying attention to any bumps. That is a lesson for all genuine Catholic actionists.

Our friend had outstanding Catholic parents—his father was among the first promoters of and subscribers to the "Catholic Encyclopedia." He was educated in both Catholic high school and college. Later his faith was undermined, he joined the Communist Party, and for 30 years was recognized as a leader in that movement. Then, in 1945, he became a "sinner doing penance," as he put it. Bishop Fulton Sheen led him back to the faith of his fathers.

Mr. Budenz and his wife Margaret, of Unitarian background and an unusual convert to the church, have four daughters.

The eldest, Julia, is now Mother Miriam Budenz, O.S.U., a member of the faculty of the College of New Rochelle. Graduating with highest honors from the Ursuline School in 1952, she also graduated 4 years later, summa cum laude, from the College of New Rochelle. Thereafter, she immediately entered the Order of St. Ursula. She has received her master's degree from the Catholic University of America and is now teaching Greek and Latin.

The second daughter, Josephine, was formerly assistant head nurse in the psychiatric department (Reiss Pavilion) of St. Vincent's Hospital, Manhattan. She is a graduate of the Ursuline School of New Rochelle and St. Vincent's School of Nursing. Last year she was married and now lives in Menlo Park, Calif.

Justine is finishing her junior year at Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, after graduating from the Convent of the Sacred Heart at 91st Street, Manhattan. She won a scholarship and is majoring in English.

Joanna, the youngest is now in her third year at Elmhurst Convent of the Sacred Heart, Portsmouth, R.I. Recently she won a high secular honor for an essay in French.

The three oldest girls and Mrs. Budenz were baptized in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Manhattan, at the time that Mr. Budenz returned to the church October 11, 1945. They, together with Joanna, who was born after this event, were all baptized by Bishop Sheen. Mrs. Budenz formerly taught at the Convent of the Sacred Heart, 91st Street, and is now on the faculty of Elmhurst Academy in Portsmouth, near Newport, where the family resides.

The farewell article of our friend begins on page 1 this week. Calmly and humbly he outlines the work still to be done, and then graphically describes the great threat to our country today. His reference to C. L. Sulzberger of the New York Times pinpoints the character of the threat to our country. At the same time Mr. Budenz refers to his last great effort still to come, and he constructively refers to the educational effort Catholics must make to protect freedom, liberty, and justice. His work, as well as his health, should be in our prayers—prayers which during the past 17 years have enriched his life.

THE REDS—WHAT NOW?—FOR THE GREATER GLORY OF GOD

(By Louis F. Budenz)

In painfully writing finis, I am dutybound to point out that the comrades are keenly conscious of the new historic day which is ahead. This is brought to them by the first words of the "Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union," their mother party: "The Great October Socialist Revolution ushered in a new era in the history of mankind, the era of the downfall of capitalism and the establishment of communism."

But the issue is not that simple. The conundrum before mankind really is: Shall the world Socialist dictatorship prevail, or shall there come about a wider distribution of wealth, such as Pope John XXIII envisages?

In the first case, there will be obliteration of all belief in God; in the second, there should be increase to the honor and glory of God. For the wider distribution of wealth entails more ability to follow out St. Thomas Aquinas' conditions for a holy and whole life.

HEALTHY SKEPTICISM

We can be sure we Americans shall never be able to obtain the second goal unless we have a much better knowledge of living communism and its techniques. This requires not only the study of Cardinal Cushing's "Questions and Answers on communism" and my own techniques of communism. It also requires healthy sketpicism regarding our own general press.

Of late, much of this press has preached appeasement in many forms—including the suppression of the truth about individuals who have carelessly injured our national security.

We cannot forget that the New York Herald Tribune has just praised Owen Lattimore. Nowhere was it emphasized that the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee had declared that Mr. Lattimore had been a conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy.

Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer has been treated likewise, notably in the New York Times. As with Lattimore, it is stated repeatedly that he was under a cloud during the McCarthy era. Nowhere is it stressed that in a hearing before the Personnel Security Board of the Atomic Energy Commission, the board found him to be a loyal citizen but recommended against his continued access to restricted material. On appeal to the AEC, that body by a 4-to-1 vote, denied him further access to restricted material.

The press silences on these gentlemen are all the more conspicuous because the findings in each case could have been freely used by the press.

NEW WORD?

It must also in all charity be said that many of our general press commentators know little of the Marxist classics, which guide the Communist leaders. So it was that 2 years ago, C. L. Sulzberger, of the New York Times, uttered the astounding theory that revisionism was a new word in the Marxist lexicon.

Not knowing that it went back to the nineties and that "war on revisionism" had been particularly commended by Lenin as a spur to the Soviet Revolution, Sulzberger presupposed that it meant the liquidation of Zhukov. Whereas, it means the liquidation of us, the imperialists.

At that time I wrote the New York Times, citing the many Red documents which had mentioned revisionism. But the Times did not publish the letter. Mr. Sulzberger, whom I knew well, did write me most graciously, acknowledging that he was wrong and saying that he would file my letter for further use. But he has never used it so far as I know.

We shall also have to turn our skepticism of the general press to a knowledge of the Communist line. The consolidation of Soviet control over the captive nations now looms up as a result in part of America's fumbling in Hungary, and of our aid to Red Poland and Red Yugoslavia.

These countries are all played up in the current new times and international affairs as contributing to Soviet power in Europe. We must know, too, that Cuba, as the March international affairs shows, is now used as a showcase of successful resistance to imperialim among all colonial peoples.

Crowning all of this is the pushing forward of anticommunism as a poison, which again is revealed by the astute William Weinstone in the young people's paper Communist Viewpoint for January, to forbid all opposition to communism as immoral. This thought constantly intimidates our general non-Communist press.

There is encouragement, however, in that the Catholic high school superintendents are now resolved to introduce analytical studies of communism in their schools. There have also been moves for academies for freedom in general and for foreign affairs in Washington itself. It is my hope and prayer that these institutions will become fully awake to the necessity for a study of actual living communism.

Birds of a Feather

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I read in the May 23, 1963, edition of the National Guardian, well-known Marxist organ in America, about a party which was recently held in Ohio. One can readily imagine what was discussed. The article appeared on page 3 and is as follows:

RECEPTION AT EATON'S HOME FOR THE GUARDIAN'S EDITOR

Guardian Editor James Aronson was guest of honor at an afternoon reception May 18 at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Cyrus S. Eaton, Acadia Farms, Northfield, Ohio.

The reception was attended by Guardian readers and many persons involved in civil rights and community activities in the Cleveland area.

The previous evening Aronson spoke at a meeting of Guardian readers in Chicago and at a similar meeting the following evening in Cleveland. An interview with him appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer May 19.

The New Anarchists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very impressed with the column by Mr. Thurman Sensing of the Southern States Industrial Council, entitled, "The New Anarchists." This column, which was published in a number of daily newspapers this week, makes some very important points about individuals and groups who take the law into their own hands and try to impose mob rule on law abiding citizens. I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The New Anarchists

(By Thurman Sensing)

In surveying the riot in Birmingham, Ala., earlier this month and the wave of protests and riotous outbreaks from Nashville, Tenn., to Chicago, Ill., Americans will have to wake up to a new peril in our national life—the peril of anarchism.

Ever since the end of World War II and the beginning of the cold war, Americans have educated themselves as to the menace of communism. But they have forgotten that there are such persons as anarchists. According to Webster, an anarchist is one who rebels against any authority or established order. This definition fits those who fomented and carried out strife in Birmingham.

Good citizens in many parts of the country—in many parts of the South, for that matter—may be of different opinions as to the integration question or the advisability of various changes in social custom. But all good citizens can agree on the absolute necessity of preserving the public order and preventing the spread of chaos, lawlessness and law-defiance in communities.

Yet the events in Birmingham must bring home to thoughtful citizens the fact that elements in this country's population have embarked on a course of creating disorder and breaking the law whenever the law stands in the way of their desires. Even the New York metropolitan press, which has fanned emotionalism on issues involving the South, admits to concern over what has taken place. The New York Herald Tribune has spoken of "anarchical fringes" and columnist Joseph Alsop, a personal friend of President Kennedy, has written that "The King intervention (in Birmingham) was clearly, in some degree, the result of extremist pressure."

In Washington, D.C., the respected Washington Star, condemning an inflamatory address by Harlem's Adam Clayton Powell, said that "many of Mr. Powell's hearers and readers doubtless interpreted his prediction of impending mass violence in Washington as an invitation, even an urging, to violence."

The demonstrations which have taken place in Birmingham, Nashville, and elsewhere have gone far beyond any dispute as to segregation. What needs to be understood is that law and order are being defied in the United States. The defiance is being offered by those who masquerade as social reformers and helpers of a minority group. Contrary to what they say, the law-breaking that is being encouraged is doing more to harm the minority in question than anything that has been done in decades.

Americans need to look at the Birmingham strife-fomenters in terms of an anarchist threat. They should bear in mind that once before at the turn of the century, the United States faced peril from anarchism. Anarchism spread through the labor movement and bitter national strife resulted. The climax of the anarchist unrest came when anarchist Leon Czolgosz assassinated President William McKinley when he visited the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo on September 6, 1901. This terrible deed so alarmed the American people that the anarchist movement soon was brought under control.

Those with a sense of history can see a similar movement growing in this country in connection with the various so-called "nonviolent" organizations that make a business of inciting violence.

The United States cannot tolerate mob law. It cannot tolerate riots fomented by those who give lipservice to nonviolence but carefully plan conditions that will lead to rampaging mobs.

Today's citizens well know that the masters of the crime syndicates do not go about with guns in vest holsters. The vice lords and narcotics bosses are smooth operators who attempt to appear respectable. Yet such types are the masterminds of organized, syndicate crime in the United States. So it is with the organizers of violence and the leaders of the new anarchism. They cultivate a public image of dignity and even piety. While the mob runs wild, they deplore it all. But all the while they are setting up the conditions for more strife throughout the Nation.

Respect for public order is the foundation of civilized life. It is the keystone which holds up normal commercial activity of every form of business enterprise, from the small shop to the giant corporation. If substantial and sound-thinking Americans do not use their influence to guard and protect law enforcement authorities, chaos will rapidly spread across the land. Anarchy will rule where policemen, city officials and local courts are defied. The new anarchism of the "non-violent" groups must be nipped in the bud.

Ernie Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. WEAVER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, as a former student at Syracuse University, I look with pride upon the life and the example of one of its outstanding graduates, Ernie Davis. It is with sadness that we all note the passing of this fine young man through the untimely effects of leukemia. His life is an example and encouragment to young men and women of mental ability in combination with physical proficiency. He was a model for all young people to follow.

The ravages of leukemia can be conquered through considerate research and application of knowledge of the disease. It is our hope that the newly established Ernie Davis Foundation to study leukemia will aid in that respect. His life and death may then become the focal point for studies and discoveries that may prevent the unnecessary death of future generations of Americans.

As part of my remarks I should like to include the following editorials from newspapers in the 24th Pennsylvania Congressional District which so well pay tribute to this fine American.

The editorials follow:

[From the Meadville (Pa.) Tribune]

Ernie Davis: All-American

The body of Ernie Davis was interred yesterday but his spirit long will continue to be an influence on all who knew of his feats as one of the Nation's outstanding athletes and as a man.

Fearless on the football field, he made an impact on the National Football League, in which he was destined for stardom, even though he never donned the uniform of the Cleveland Browns. But the indomitable courage of this gentle, quiet, well-bred man was never displayed so well as it was after he learned that he was a victim of leukemia. Only he knew what was deep in his heart, but he never displayed a loss of faith that he would resume his career.

The tragic death of this great athlete will not be in vain if it spurs stepped-up research into the causes and cures of leukemia and other forms of cancer.

[From the Corry (Pa.) Journal]

Ernie Davis: Modern Merriwell

The worshippers of sports heroes have been put through the wringer lately, what with Paul Hornung revealed as a chronic bettor in violation of his football league's moral code and Big Daddy Lipscomb bowing out of this world on the wings of heroin.

And the perennial basketball and boxing scandals don't help much.

But, before we get to moralizing over these cases we have to consider the fact that they are not typical of the conduct of the vast bulk of the members of the athletic world, but are exceptions.

We have only to look back upon the all-too-brief career of Ernie Davis, the modest and brilliant young athlete who succumbed last week to leukemia. Probably for every Lipscomb and Hornung in sports there are dozens of men like Ernie Davis.

Hornung has been eliminated by the commissioner of his league and Lipscomb, of course, eliminated himself via the drug route.

No one ever wanted to see Ernie Davis eliminated in any way, shape, or form. Davis was the antithesis of the other pair and more nearly the embodiment of that popular image all boys hold dear in their hero-worshipping careers. Davis was the Frank Merriwell of his time.

Ernie apparently knew his days were numbered, yet he never succumbed to the temptation to let his guard down and never conducted himself as anything but a gentleman, and if ever a man had a right to go off his rocker, Ernie Davis had it.

So, when we think of sports, we like to think of the Ernie Davises and ignore the Big Daddies and the Paul Hornungs.

Of Hornung and Lipscomb, the less said the better.

Of Ernie Davis, it has been said by everyone who knew him, "There was a man."

And so he was.

Support for Elimination of the ASC Loyalty Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the Republican Congressmen who introduced legislation to eliminate the loyalty oath now required of ASC committeemen. I am pleased to note that this legislation has support in the State of Iowa. I call attention to a letter which I have received from Mr. Leon Werner, of Van Horne, Iowa, the ASCS committee chairman for Benton County, Iowa. Although Mr. Werner does not reside in one of the counties I represent, I appreciate having his comments and I feel that this is indicative of how many of the committeemen across the country feel about this requirement.

I also wish to call attention to an editorial from the May 22 issue of the Marengo (Iowa) Pioneer-Republican, which backs our position on this oath.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the letter from Mr. Werner and the editorial from the Marengo Pioneer-Republican appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

MAY 20, 1963.

Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I just finished reading an article in today's Cedar Rapids Gazette stating your views concerning the ASCS Committee loyalty pledge. I am presently chairman of the Benton County ASCS Committee and have been on the committee continuously since 1956. I want to thank you for the action you are taking in this matter as I am in complete agreement with your thinking. If this regulation is not rescinded and the Department insists on its enforcement, I for one will not be on the committee after this year's election because I will not sign this pledge and have so stated publicly.

It is my opinion that many more of those who are on county committees at the present time feel the same as I do and will refuse to sign this pledge. Anyone who does sign this pledge is in my opinion, a weak individual who by this very act proves that he can't think for himself and signifies that he is willing to become a mere puppet to spread USDA propaganda.

I sincerely hope you are successful in getting this regulation rescinded.

Very truly yours,

LEON WERNER.

ASC LOYALTY OATH

We agree with the resolution introduced in Congress to exempt members of the county Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation (ASC) committeemen from taking the loyalty oath which binds them to support administration farm programs. One of the supporters of the resolution is Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL of this district.

ASC committeemen are elected by their own neighbors (sometimes it is difficult to get people to serve from each township and members hold over from year to year). They are not employed by anyone in the Department of Agriculture. It was never intended by Congress that they do anything in these positions but exercise their own best judgment, free of coercion by the Department and the Secretary of Agriculture.

By taking a loyalty oath they swear to support the programs of the Agriculture Department, even though the programs may be vastly different than the ones announced when they were elected. The Secretary apparently wants to make sure all the committeemen become members of his propaganda team to put over supply-management programs, many of which may not be in the farmer's best interest, or the country's best interest.

Charges have been leveled against the Secretary in connection with the wheat vote Tuesday; that he was pushing for a yes vote and using Government funds and manpower to stage an all-out campaign for approval of the measure. Requiring committeemen in every township to be a part of his team, sworn to loyalty, would greatly increase his manpower.

To pledge fair and honest performance of duty is one thing, SCHWENGEL says, but to take an oath to support questionable programs is something else. We agree.

The So-Called Bundy-Rostow Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, 1963, I inserted in the RECORD an article by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott which quoted from the so-called Bundy-Rostow policy.

Following that, I wrote to Secretary Rusk of the State Department requesting a copy of the agreement known as the Bundy-Rostow policy referred to in the Allen-Scott report. In response, I received the following reply from Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 1, 1963.

Hon. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN YOUNGER: I am writing in reply to your letter of April 11, 1963, to the Secretary of State, in which you enclosed a copy of an article by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott that appeared in the Northern Virginia Sun on April 10. You draw attention to an alleged paper referred to in the article, purporting to be an agreement made by Mr. Bundy and Mr. Rostow, and you request a copy of this supposed agreement.

There is no Bundy-Rostow agreement or policy such as the article under reference suggests. The allegations contained in the article are inaccurate and highly misleading. They do not reflect U.S. Government policy. You can be assured that no one is advocating, or has advocated, a deal with Russia whereby the United States would reduce its forces in West Berlin and/or West Germany in return for a withdrawal of Soviet troops from Cuba. It is, of course, settled U.S. policy to get Soviet troops out of Cuba, but no one has suggested that we trade off a U.S. interest in Germany or in any other part of the world to effect this end.

As for the four paragraphs that the Allen-Scott article purports to quote from what it calls "the Bundy-Rostow policy," I should like to make clear that no such policy paper exists. As representatives of the Department have reported to the Congress, some months back a draft policy paper was circulated within the Department and to other interested agencies for comments and suggestions. A distorted version of some of the contents of this unofficial draft paper was leaked to the press. Apparently, sentences from this distorted version constituted the source of the purported quotations in the Allen-Scott article. The sentences were placed by the article in a completely false context and failed to include far more important paragraphs that had to do with certain positive proposals.

If I can be of further assistance to you in this matter, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

Subsequent to receipt of this letter, I again addressed myself to the State Department, but this time to Mr. Dutton, asking for a copy of the draft policy paper which was circulated within the Department and which was quoted by Mr. Allen and Mr. Scott. The following response was received:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 17, 1963.

Hon. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER,
House of Representatives

DEAR CONGRESSMAN YOUNGER: I refer to your letter to me of May 11, 1963, and mine of May 1, concerning a draft policy paper which was circulated within the Department and to other interested agencies.

This paper is a basic policy document, classified "Top Secret," which is being prepared for the National Security Council. It has been the position of all the postwar U.S. administrations that papers in preparation for the NSC and NSC papers, which are advisory to the President, are not made available outside the Executive branch. This is not done in order to conceal fundamental facts or policies from the Congress or public, but rather to permit the President to receive advice and to make decisions in reasonable privacy on matters concerning the basic national security.

I am sure that you will understand why, therefore, I am unable to provide you with the material you requested.

Please do not hesitate to call on me if I can be helpful in some other way in the future.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

It seems to me the interesting results in this case are the leaks which occur in the Department of State and the inability of the Congress to get information as to what is actually being done in the way of molding policy and what recommendations are made to the President.

Plea for Safer Automotive Design

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a communication from Ralph Nader, Esq., of Winsted, Conn., in support of the efforts of our colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, the Honorable KENNETH A. ROBERTS, to provide for the establishment and enforcement of safety specifications for motor vehicles.

The State of Connecticut, under the direction of the former Governor and now Senator **Abraham Ribicoff** and his successor, Gov. John Dempsey, has taken the leadership nationally in an effective program of highway safety, but despite these notable endeavors the death toll continues to mount and the problem continues to deserve constant attention and vigilance.

I applaud and support every action in the interest of highway safety and I, therefore, welcome the comments of Attorney Nader and the resolution regarding automotive industry and safer design which was adopted by the Connecticut Committee for Safer Designed Automobiles, which he has forwarded to me.

Mr. Nader has written to me in part as follows:

> I am enclosing a copy of a resolution passed recently by the Connecticut Committee for Safer Designed Automobiles which I hope you will read into the Congressional Record. The list of associations and experts that have condemned the manufacturers' laxness in building safer cars would fill pages. A few of them will be noted: American Medical Association, American College of Surgeons, American Association for Automotive Medicine, junior chamber of commerce chapters, American Automobile Association divisions. The Roberts' subcommittee hearings contain most of their statements along with many other expert witnesses.
>
> I have been concerned with this problem for many years, beginning while a student at the Harvard Law School. The lifesaving role which safer cars can play in our traffic situation has long been underplayed and unpublicized. Holding back on known technology that would minimize injuries and deaths has been going on too long to be tolerated by humane and intelligent people. Principles known since the time of Archimedes are not being applied in the interior of our cars to prevent the horrible spectacles of people being impaled on projections from the dashboard, instrument panel, and steering wheel and shaft mechanism to name a few of over 100 unsafe design features worked out by nonindustry engineers.

With permission to extend my remarks at this point, I include a copy of the resolution adopted by the Connecticut Committee for Safer Designed Automobiles:

RESOLUTION REGARDING AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY AND SAFER DESIGN

Whereas the principles to be applied for the reduction of deceleration injuries in motorcars have been known for over 30 years, have been in use in military aviation for 15 years, and were explicitly presented in professional engineering and medical journals many years ago; and

Whereas the principles are a part of basic engineering knowledge, and have been drawn to the attention of executive personnel in the motorcar industry by medical and other groups many times; and

Whereas the motorcar industry gave only token recognition to these principles and designs in its products for the 1956 model year, and, despite promises of definite progress in succeeding years, has produced no significant improvements in the years since and has even regressed in some areas; and

Whereas the area of known technology for safer motorcar designs in the fields of accident prevention and injury prevention has been expanded in recent years chiefly by private university experimental and crash studies, by military (Air Force) research and by one insurance company's work on a survival car; and

Whereas said findings and technologies have been ignored for the most part by the motorcar industry and have been almost totally unimplemented in production despite the rending and tragic toll of 40,000 dead and nearly 5 million injured each year on our highways: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Connecticut Committee for Safer Designed Automobiles requests the U.S. Congress to support the 7-year efforts of Congressman **Kenneth A. Roberts** and his Subcommittee on Health and Safety to frame and pass legislation that will provide for the establishment and enforcement of safety specifications of design and construction to which all vehicles manufactured in and imported into the United States must conform, so as to insure the incorporation of all devices and structures, known to be capable of reducing very substantially the deaths and injuries on our highways, in all motor vehicles.

Trouble in the Pentagon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the June 1963 issue of the American Legion magazine contains an important column by the able national commander of the American Legion, Mr. James E. Powers. It is entitled "For Your Information, Trouble in the Pentagon."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mr. Powers' article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TROUBLE IN THE PENTAGON

(By National Commander James E. Powers)

Two informed and respected Members of the U.S. Congress recently spoke up about changes made and proposed in the structure and administration of our Armed Forces under Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara. One said that Mr. McNamara's changes guarantee more efficiency, greater economy, and more effective civilian control of the military.

The other said they will lead to inefficiency, extravagance, and oppressive civilian control of the military.

These contradictory views rightly rated headlines. They reflect a deep division of public opinion regarding current policies and planning in the Pentagon.

The American people are concerned, and rightly so. American Legionnaires have a particular responsibility to find out what the argument is about and to help resolve it in the interest of the Nation's future preparedness program.

Unfortunately, the public press tends to play down the issues and play up personalities. To many people the key question is whether Mr. McNamara succeeds or fails in "knocking heads together" at the Pentagon. We see it differently. The real question is whether Mr. McNamara's innovations will help or hurt the combat effectiveness of America's fighting forces.

On this point, too, there is conflicting testimony. It ought to be noted, however, that criticism of the Defense Department's new look has come from sources whose motives and objectivity are not in doubt.

A subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee reported recently that "there has been a vastly increased centralization of decisionmaking, directly or indirectly, in the Office of the Secretary of Defense and a resultant diminution of the responsibilities of the military departments and the separate services. * * * As time goes on, with all the decisions being made at the Secretary of Defense level," this bipartisan committee warned, "lower echelons will develop a 'no decision' or indecisive philosophy."

It may well be that shortcuts in Defense Department administrative and operating procedures will save dollars and time. But is this the ultimate purpose of the Department? Is it even a desirable purpose if it affects the leadership and morale of the men who have to call the shots if the real shooting starts?

In recent months a number of Defense Department civilian agencies have been established to take over intelligence, supply, weapons selection, and other functions formerly handled by the separate services. Some observers have hailed the move as an answer to bickering and duplication of effort among the services. Others condemn it as a ban on healthy and productive interservice competition.

"The service Secretaries as well as the uniformed chiefs of the services are submerged in an immense Pentagon hierarchy," writes Military Analyst Hanson W. Baldwin. "Perhaps the greatest military danger in this centralization and unification is that it overrides the voice of professional experience and substitutes a military party line, a single strategic concept."

The decision of the Defense Department to curtail production of manned bombers means that by 1970 the Nation will be almost entirely dependent upon missiles for long-range nuclear strikes. Is it wise or necessary to rely on a single nuclear weapons system? Or would a choice of systems give us added muscle and added insurance against enemy attack? Can we meet all situations with a single system? Does not a single system simplify the problems of an enemy?

The American Legion remains convinced that the RS–70 bomber would contribute vitally to the strengthening of our strategic deterrent force over the next decade. Four committees of the Congress repeatedly urged the development of the RS–70 as a complete weapons system. The uniformed leaders of the Air Force, who are charged with direct responsibility for maintaining U.S. superiority in the air, made the same plea. The Defense Department said no.

Congressional investigation has disclosed that the decision to produce the all-purpose TFX interceptor, rather than two types of aircraft to meet differing requirements of the Air Force and Navy, involved reversal of the recommendations of four military evaluation boards.

Moreover, the Skybolt missile was abandoned over the objection of the military service which would have employed it.

These developments raise serious questions for defense-minded Americans. I'm sure that all Legionnaires would agree that Defense Department housekeeping can be improved to the benefit of our defense posture. Secretary McNamara has demonstrated rare courage and proficiency in undertaking the task.

What concerns me is that too many reforms may be attempted too soon and with little regard for the judgment and advice of military commanders who know their job and what it takes to do it.

The Armed Services are not business concerns. They don't have to make a profit or pay dividends. They are organized to protect us. The ideal of running a smooth peacetime military organization must never override its usefulness as a deterrent or as a striking force.

In the Matter of Colonialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut, and my associate on the Committee of Foreign Affairs, the Honorable John S. Monagan, has proved himself to be an arduous and able student of developments in Europe and throughout the world which continue to have important bearing on our economic and military security. His work in these fields and particularly in the study of the problems of the captive nations of Europe has attracted widespread support and attention.

Mr. Monagan's recent statement on the floor of the House in which he criticized the decision of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to abstain on the issue of approving the credentials of the Hungarian delegation was in keeping with the principle he has often expressed that we must be consistent in our approach to these problems if we are to be practical in resolving them.

His point that there is a strange double standard extant in the matter of colonialism is one which we must recognize and be concerned with. Colonialism, to my mind, too, is colonialism, whether white or black—or red. I was very favorably impressed with his comments and I endorse them wholeheartedly; and I note with appreciation that endorsement of Representative Monagan's remarks has also come from the editor of the Waterbury (Conn.) American.

With leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial comment on Mr. Monagan's statement as it appeared in the Waterbury American on May 17, 1963:

You Said It, John

Representative John S. Monagan, Democrat, of Connecticut, who represents our home, fifth district in the national legislature, said something on the floor of the House the other day that long needed to be said.

His comments were touched off by the recent decision of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to abstain on the issue of approving the credentials of the Hungarian delegation.

"There is," said Representative Monagan, "a strange double standard extant in the matter of colonialism * * *. Some of our officials seem to die a thousand deaths whenever the Communists talk critically of our association with allies, such as Portugal, which still maintain colonies. They are quick to disclaim any intention on our part of contributing to the maintenance of colonialism. Prominent in this attack on colonialism are African countries."

But, he adds, "it is indeed strange that these same countries are the very ones which now apparently refuse to support the firmness of the United States on the question of Communist colonialism which is now being practiced with the white countries of Europe."

We are in entire agreement with Mr. Monagan, and we believe that what he said has long needed to be said.

Why must we cringe before Communist charges in the United Nations, with respect to colonialism, when the Communists themselves are the greatest exploiters of colonialism in the world's history. Is sauce for the goose no longer sauce for the gander?

What we need in the United Nations is a constant and positive reaffirmation of our stand on such matters. In other words, a little more intestinal fortitude.

Smith College Honors Esther Peterson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, 1963, Smith College honored Mrs. Esther Eggertsen Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Labor, by conferring upon her the honorary degree of doctor of laws. The citation to Esther Eggertsen Peterson sums up the distinct contributions this outstanding woman has made to the causes she has dedicated herself.

The citation reads as follows:

In your own life you have superbly demonstrated that complementary roles of education and work in the emancipation of women. Educated at Brigham Young University and Columbia, you soon transferred your interests from traditional schools and colleges to pioneering programs of education for the woman worker. Marriage to a foreign service officer brought in time a family of four children but no significant interruption in your career of useful public service. The locale shifted to Washington, where you represented various sections of organized labor before Congress and since 1961 have served as Assistant Secretary of Labor. Throughout you have recognized that if their work was to furnish women with a room of their own, education was needed to provide the resources of mind and spirit for the true enjoyment of this independence. Exactly a century ago a 64-year-old Hatfield spinster whose lot had probably never required a day's work in her life was concluding that 'higher education for women would result in the redressing of their wrongs, the adjusting of their wages, and an increase in ther influence on reforming the evils of society.' It is most fitting that one who has labored so successfully in the cause for which Sophia Smith founded this college should join its ranks.

Mr. Speaker, the address given by Mrs. Peterson should be read by all. It is a compelling document and I feel privileged to place it in the Record:

Address by Mrs. Esther Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Labor, Smith College, Northampton, Mass., February 23, 1963

I am honored indeed to be here, commemorating the birth date of George Washington, and I consider it a pleasure and a privilege.

I would guess that the life and times of the man we call the Father of Our Country has provided the theme for most of the speeches given on this occasion. Today, with your permission, I would like to vary this theme, and talk about the mothers and wives of all the other fathers of our country—or, in other words, about the modern American woman.

In the era of Martha Washington, the notion that intellectual training might be made available to women through institutions of higher learning such as Smith College was, in a single word, unthinkable. Indeed, the opening of this college almost a century ago was a courageous step in a society that still dismissed all such efforts as radical or ridiculous.

Today, we take for granted that women have the right and the opportunity to seek higher education.

Today, this is one of the few assumptions about women that enjoys universal acceptance in this country.

We cannot forget, however, that woman's admittance into the academic world was not easily achieved. Nor can we forget that the transformation from chattel to partner was rough and painful, and has only begun to be recognized, and although the diploma, the ballot, and the machine have helped to give the women of our country a life unparalleled in its possibilities for richness and variety, they have also profoundly complicated it.

The modern American woman, along with the rest of the world, is in trouble.

This sober judgment, however, is in sharp contrast with many of the prevailing images of her. Casual observation reveals that she is educated and informed, that she is respected and rewarded, that she has leisure and love. Billions of words per day suggest that she controls the vote, the wealth, and the men. It would certainly seem that she has become the scrubbed goddess of the mass media—and indeed of the Western World.

Despite the enormous gains in status and opportunity that these images reflect, many American women today are in the wings, so to speak—rehearsed, and in many cases ready to go on—but waiting for the proper cue.

The fact is that economically, politically, and legally American women are, to extend the analogy, understudies. They are also mightily confused. And it's likely they will remain so until facts dispel fantasies, and judgments based on reality replace the charming myths about them.

Major revisions must be made of the female image, and the myths must be consigned to history, if we are to build a world in which the well-being of the individual is to be our primary concern.

Now let us look at some of the myths which in one way or another affect the employment of women. You will recognize them all because, I think it is safe to say, you have been conditioned by them all.

Current American myths about women are misconceptions sustained by bias, prejudice, outmoded convention and untidy thinking.

Let us first examine the notion that a woman's place is in the home. This is a difficult myth to deal with because much that we hold unassailable is implicit in it. We do not question here woman's basic responsibilities, but we do ask to what extent she might actually be unable to fulfill them if she remains exclusively at the hearth.

Stubbornly at the bottom of this attitude, I think, is the nostalgic image of the old-fashioned home. When we meet it today as a rationalization for keeping women from outside employment, we realize that it means a woman's place is in her great-grandmother's home.

In great-grandmother's day, home was clearly where a woman was most needed. Her roles of wife, child bearer, child rearer, and homemaker consumed her time entirely. All of her skills, her inventiveness, her physical and mental energies, were directed to the tasks of housekeeping, which included much more than it does today. She made a maximum economic contribution to her society, which was then totally home-centered for the majority of women. She was a producing housewife with time for little else but her chores and children—and I think she rarely paused to wonder whether or not she was content.

The sense of usefulness and completeness which has become so strongly associated with the homemaker of yesteryear accounts, I think, for the remarkable durability of this myth. Grandma made a great go of things, so why can't the woman of today follow her example? Women haven't changed that much, so the reasoning goes—and certainly there is as much to keep a woman in the home as there ever was. But the fact is that women do change. They were changing during the lifetime of our 19th century ancestors, and they are changing now. What has changed most, of course, are the conditions in which women live, and I continue to be astonished that so many of us refuse to recognize the shattering consequences of this fact.

The character of modern life which makes a woman's role as a homemaker a part-time task as soon as her children are in school are familiar enough. There is more money. Children are healthier we are told, and women live longer. Women now average 26 years of age at the birth of their last child. This means there are several decades of active participation ahead of them after family responsibilities diminish. Instead of being mainly producers, women are consumers. When a mother sews or bakes bread today it is more for fun, or out of nostalgia, or perhaps just the desire for a tasty loaf of bread, than it is a matter of necessity. Rapid technological change has in large measure displaced her in her traditional occupation; in a very real sense she is structurally unemployed. Automation came early to her kitchen, and she has been democratized, suburbanized, and mesmerized by the merciless barrage of the mass media and her own felt dilemma. She is a part-time mom who all too often has turned to momism for lack of finding anything better to do.

Her tasks have not only been greatly eased, but they are also being shared by her husband. Motherhood and fatherhood are not nearly such separate functions as they were in great-grandmother's day. It is no shock in modern suburbia to see Dad in the supermarket, in the laundromat, or pushing the buggy in the park. It is not even surprising to find him well-informed and experienced in the care and feeding of infants. Nor is it considered unusual to find him being supported by a "breadwinner bride" as he studies in graduate schools across the country. I was told of one report which showed 90 percent of the wives of married couples in undergraduate and graduate schools were breadwinners—only 10 percent of the wives attended school with their husbands. The wives say they are earning their PHT degree—putting husbands through. This reversal of traditional modes of married life is the consequence of a great many things, only one of which is early marriage.

Dramatic changes in the nature of housekeeping along with the lingering acceptability of the myth that a woman's place is in the home, tend to keep many a woman trapped in confusion in her own picture-windowed living room.

Yet for 24½ million women today, home is no longer the only domain.

Let me introduce here a few appropriate statistics. At the present time, women constitute one-third of the total work force. Over one-half of working women are married and about one-twelfth have college degrees. Studies indicate, furthermore, that 8 or 9 out of every 10 women of today will spend part of their lives in paid employment.

Many of you will make a start in a professional field. In some instances, however, you will not be greeted with any great enthusiasm. But I hope you will not let this deter you. In certain professions there are high concentrations of women; in these women continue to be eagerly sought. These are, of course, professions such as teaching, nursing, social work, music, and library work. There are not nearly enough teachers, nurses, or social workers to go around. Yet, even so, many women hesitate to step forward, approved as these professions are, because of insecurities aggravated in part by the myth of woman as homemaker.

There is a pressing national need for practitioners in many other professions, such as law and medicine, but in these it is still extremely difficult for a woman to get ahead because of the barriers of other myths at which we will have to take a hard look.

Paid employment is, of course, not the only avenue to fulfillment for the intelligent, trained woman. Many women prefer to, and do, perform immensely important tasks in a volunteer capacity. Although volunteer activity is still looked upon by many as doorbell ringing, envelope stuffing, and making cookies for the PTA, it can be and is now an area of genuine service to the community and the Nation.

In my opinion, any woman who neither needs nor chooses to seek paid employment has a compelling responsibility to find creative and meaningful volunteer work—or to continue to develop her own intellectual and artistic abilities. This judgment is basic, I think, to the principles for which the Peace Corps was established, and is the basis of President Kennedy's proposal to build the National Service Corps.

It is important to mention here, I think, that volunteer power is neither fully recognized nor adequately utilized, and it is not being properly related to female employment.

This is because what could be called the Helen Hokinson myth persists. The woman volunteer is still identified with the committeewoman, caricatured by the late cartoonist in the New Yorker magazines of a decade or more ago. Today's volunteer bears little resemblance to the lovable ample-bosomed, scatterbrained, teacake-oriented Hokinson matron, yet she is often classed with her when she attempts to enter or reenter the ranks of the employed. Too often that which is done on a volunteer basis is dismissed as having little significance. Even the more enlightened personnel people, both in public and private enterprise, say that volunteer activity must be discounted as work experience because it has not been tested in the crucible of competition. Implicit in this attitude is the view that volunteerism is an idle pursuit devoid of standards and a kind of dumping ground for women of limited capacity.

This is simply not true. Today's volunteer has a first-class mind. She is younger than her predecessor and is alert and well educated. The direction of her volunteer work is frequently determined by the skills and aptitudes she acquired in school or during a period of employment. There are today women on the New Frontier whose important jobs were a direct result of their earlier volunteer activity. Two whose names you will recognize are Evelyn Lincoln, the President's secretary and Marietta Tree, on the U.S. delegation to the U.N. Human Rights Commission.

Today's volunteer is a solid community asset, in education and health services, in social work, in recreation work, in politics and local government as well as in cultural and charitable activities. Her work is of exceptionally high quality, comparable to similar work of a professional nature.

In other words, volunteer work is authentic work experience in most cases, work which helps to retain and develop, rather than dissipate skills, work for which one deserves to get experience credits.

But a woman, to make the most of her abilities outside the home—in a job for which she is paid or in volunteer work, will have to find a way out of her conflicts and confusions about being a woman and come to regard herself as a person. She must make the most of the choices she has—on the basis of facts, not myths—in this matter of her dual commitment. She must come to real terms with the knowledge that she belongs both to the home and to the world, and she must prepare herself accordingly. And those who influence her development from the nursery to the altar must do precisely the same thing.

Consider, if you will, a few of the ways she has become bewildered. Throughout her high school and college years, the average girl is accustomed to compete intellectually with boys and men as if she were no different from them, and as if the nature of her life, her possibilities, were not to be considered separately in any academic sense. At the same time, along directly contradictory lines, she acquires the belief that her real fulfillment will come only as a homemaker, only in a kitchen with a wall oven, only with three or four children, and only in the married state. She comes to believe that despite the stimulating challenges of education she will be measured and rewarded according to the success of her social and emotional relationships with men. Sometimes she is even led to the absurd belief that only by being docile and demurely deferential to them—a posture which many men actually dislike—can she be truly feminine and thus make the grade.

These contradictions, I think you will agree, are not particularly conducive to the kind of growing up that we need in the world today, nor do they provide a very sturdy foundation for taking an adult part in it.

I would like to see all young women become aware of the confusions and contradictions in their beliefs and experiences, and aware that marriage, a home, and children are but a portion of, not the outer limits of, their possibilities as women, as persons. If young women understood this early enough in life, they might avoid a good deal of trouble.

Having considered the myths about the role of women in the home and as volunteers, we now come to one just as tightly woven into the fabric of our thinking. I am sure you have heard it said that women are not worth as much as men in the working world—or heard the argument that if they wish to participate outside their proper sphere, the home, they should expect second best and be paid accordingly.

This is pretty much what happens. With few exceptions, the pay envelopes of women are thinner than those of men even when they perform equal work equally well. Women are valued as members of our society but in too many instances are devalued as members of our working force.

Many businesses, industries, and professions today operate on a double-standard wage scale, some consciously and some without thinking.

Competition between men and women employed at this level often turns on factors having little if anything to do with their ability or training. In other words, competition based on merit exists among women and among men; but, in competition between the sexes, considerations that have nothing to do with merit often predominate. You are familiar, I am sure, with the merit system in your academic lives. Well, I am talking about the nonmerit system, which you can expect to become acquainted with, and handicapped by, when you take a job.

The peddlers of this myth about a woman's lesser worth generally know better. They rarely deny that the production, attendance, and learning rates of women are every bit as good as those of men. Yet for employers to discard the practice of the double-standard wage would be to give up an accepted and easy means of cheaper labor.

Equal pay for equal work is an old battle cry too often heard during political wars but not thereafter. We have an administration today that means what it says about equal pay, and that is urging Congress to give early approval to a bill which embodies this principle that the rate paid for a job should not depend on who performs the job, that nonmerit factors like age, sex, race have no place.

Our efforts, after all, to take the sex factor off the payroll, is a far different thing from wanting to take the sex factor out of everything. To disregard the sex factor altogether would surely contribute to a new, turned about, asexual world—a world nobody wants—and a world that could not be.

The point is simply that it should be possible for women to have careers that traditionally favor men if they want to and if they qualify. And if they qualify their pathways should not be blocked by barriers based on myth. I agree with Eric Fromm as he cautions us to guard against equality in the sense of "sameness." I agree with him as he warns us of the trend in contemporary society toward eliminating essential differences between men and women, and reminds us that men and women should be equal as opposite poles are equal. Women want an equality that is just, dignified, and reasonable; not ridiculous.

I turn now to a myth that is sheer nonsense. This one blandly proclaims that women work only for "pin money" and luxuries. No judgment could be more superficial. The fact is that 4½ million women in this country are the primary support of their families. Half of this group of women are working as a matter of economic necessity, not for "pin money."

Another 7½ million women in this country are working to supplement the substandard wages of their husbands, who earn less than $3,000 a year. Pin money? Nonsense. A recent study shows that working wives contribute about 30 to 40 percent of the family's total income when they work full time and about 15 to 20 percent when they work part time.

Because economic necessity accounts for most of the women who work, we cannot assume that the others are working just for luxuries. Many women whose husbands are in higher salary brackets work in order to provide for aging parents, to pay medical bills, or to build a cushion against the rocketing costs of higher education for their children, not frivolous reasons.

Still other women in comfortable economic circumstances are prompted to take jobs because, as I pointed out earlier, being homemakers no longer interests or fully occupies them.

I speak here of those women who choose to combine domestic commitments with a career—as a way of life rather than a means to accumulate extra money. They wish to be useful on their own terms.

As far as most working women are concerned, their investment of time, energy, and training brings more than a weekly salary. It brings regular dividends in emotional security and gives them an opportunity to become a part of the world beyond the immediate environment of their homes.

It is said over and over again that women are temporary workers. This is too easy a generalization. Unfortunately it is the one that commonly prevents women from being advanced to positions of higher responsibility.

It is difficult to refute this attitude in view of the changing pattern of marriage today. Women do have the habit of quitting in favor of marriage and children. Though the pattern applies mainly to newly married women, all women are "punished" by this myth.

The fact is, however, that young men do not stay put either. There is a similar pattern among them too—from law firm to law firm, from ad agency to ad agency, as they commence their climb to fame and fortune. And, there is tremendous mobility of all labor today. About 10 percent of all workers change jobs in a year. I frankly find it inconsistent to have two standards, one for the employee who moves out to have a baby and another for the one who moves on to greener pastures.

The myth that all women employees are just casual workers seriously handicaps the mature woman who has raised her family and wants another chance; it even more seriously handicaps the faithful woman who has never left the job. Despite her good record, steadfast performance and in many cases untapped talents, she is often denied a higher paying and more rewarding job because of this myth.

All along the line, women are considered greater employment risks than men. Many who do the hiring and promoting consider women to be less dependable. A myth. Many accuse women of greater absenteeism. A myth. Yet both these misconceptions are widespread enough to be major obstacles to women's access to positions of responsibility and authority.

In today's technological world, raw physical strength is no longer a significant employment factor. Thus, another myth maintains that women are mentally and emotionally weaker than men. We need only recall the record of women in World War II in the factories, at home, and in the undergrounds of Europe, to neutralize this myth. The war generated a distaff effort of enormous proportion—a demonstration of character, will, stamina, and indomitable spirit unique in all time, but these are human traits, common to men and women.

There is yet another myth which acts as a deterrent to the placement of women as executives and supervisors. I refer to the widely held notion that men will not work for a "lady boss."

From the dawn of civilization, men have dominated the positions of power and decision. Leadership, good judgment, wisdom and an ability to relate to others are all individual qualities. Women are endowed with them as liberally as men are, and can bring them equally well into play in high-level, demanding jobs.

Some men claim, however, to feel uncomfortable in language and action if they are supervised by a woman. This is a matter of form and taste and is perhaps a reflection of the confusion that exists between men and women.

It is also commonly believed that women, by going to work, cause unemployment among men. Again a myth. At the present time men neither seek nor train for the large majority of jobs held by women. Those who embrace this myth apparently never stop to consider the chaos that would follow a sudden retreat of women from the labor market. Picture, if you will, the magnitude of the disarray in communication, education, and health if just the private secretaries, the teachers, and the nurses stayed home. Think of the dishevelment if just the laundry workers quit.

Women do not stimulate unemployment. Quite the reverse. Women contribute significantly to employment. What would happen if all women workers were suddenly to withdraw from paid employment? Production would lag, and the economy would suffer. And few unemployed contractors or steelworkers or agriculture workers or miners could or would fill their places—teaching our children, punching our typewriters, assembling our radios, nursing our sick.

There is one other major myth that I want to bring to your attention, and one which will be of special interest to you, since it states that education is wasted on young women. Why is it wasted? Because, says the myth, you will marry and tuck it away among your souvenirs.

Several things need sorting here. In the first place, a college graduate does not move into a state of intellectual eclipse just because she marries. Her years of academic experience in a first-quality institution like Smith have had a profound effect on her very being—her perceptions, attitudes, interests, methodology, her curiosity—in a word, her maturity of intellect and her growth as a comprehending and sensitive human being.

The intellectual potential of a woman is no different from that of a man. Her response to knowledge and learning is no less vigorous. If testimony of this is needed, I can offer my son. When asked what he thought of coeducation, he said, ask any Harvard man what he thinks of coeducation, and he'll say that he's against it. Why? Because "the girls drag up the standards."

An education is always useful. However, it may be wasted if the opportunities it offers are not usefully evaluated. It may be often wasted if it is not conscientiously maintained and conserved. Student and teacher alike, it seems to me, have failed to give the necessary attention to the new economic fact that the woman of today will be spending more years in the labor market than the women did in the past.

Yet while the proportion of women who are employed has increased rapidly in the past two decades, their rate of entry into schools of higher learning has not been so impressive. Women earn, at the present time, about 35 percent of the B.A.'s granted, slightly fewer of the master's degrees, and only about 10 percent of the Ph. D.'s This is wasteful. Far too many young women with ability and special aptitudes dismiss the idea of graduate school for lack of proper incentives, proper direction, and, in some cases, for fear of missing out on marriage. When it is too late, they find that they are stuck in an educational halfway house.

It is becoming clear that the rigid must yield to the flexible in our educational system. Traditional methods and techniques must not be honored so much that they control us. I think that we have been bending to them. But in the future they must serve us, and they must be specifically modified to meet the new and emerging needs of women. They must be modified to permit women to continue their education either part time or after an interruption, without penalty and without a sacrifice of standards.

On several fronts, notably in colleges throughout the country, aggressive, forward-looking action is helping to mold new educational patterns for the people who need them. On the other hand, the undergraduate is being helped to furnish her ivory tower with some realistic equipment related to the multiform life ahead of her, and the graduate whose degree is a decade or two old is being trained and guided for a second chance. You are familiar with efforts of your own and those of other colleges and universities.

Radcliffe's recently established institute for advanced study has a rust-proofing plan for mature scholars; Sarah Lawrence, Minnesota, and other universities are operating services to help women continue their educations no matter what their age or what the stage of their formal education.

I was pleased to note that Smith has taken an important step in this direction as one of seven women's colleges making a community oriented attack on this problem. In Washington, Smith alumnae have arranged for Prof. Esther Cloudman Dunn, whom many of you know and love, to give an 8-week seminar in English literature designed to prepare Smith graduates and others to teach in secondary education. In New York, career seminars are offered by professionals in publishing, public relations, and similar fields.

There are, of course, many other examples of new and practical responses to the dilemma of the educated woman. Two come to my mind which I understand were initiated by Smith graduates.

The nationwide agency known as Catalyst is one of these. It is perhaps not as new to you as it is to me, since your distinguished President Mendenhall is chairman of its board of directors, and, I am sure, one of its guiding spirits. Catalyst is an exciting attempt to help the educated woman maximize her effectiveness. One of the major objectives of this agency is to open up part-time teaching jobs in the public school system. If it can overcome the long-term resistance of administrators to part-time teachers—and thus pave the way for doing the same thing in other fields—it would be a great step in implementing the goals for American women so often enunciated by President Kennedy.

The other Smith alumnae plan, to help women make full use of their special talents, is a project which WMCA, an independent radio station is just getting underway in New York City. "Call for Action" deals specifically with the city's housing problems. It is an effort to get fast results for all complaints, because the wheels of 22 agencies dealing with housing problems in New York move very slowly. WMCA's millions of listeners are told to call the station if a child has been bitten by a rat or if the plumbing goes on the blink. If action through normal channels is sluggish, the corps of women welded together by Ellen Sulzburger Straus brings pressure to bear on recalcitrant landlords or bureaucrats. Although this fast, trouble-shooting kind of plan is presently being tested in the single area of housing, it could certainly develop into something much bigger and ever more useful.

I applaud them both.

No comment on the status of American women would be complete without mention of the President's Commission on the Status of Women, established on December 14, 1961. This is the first commission of its kind. It is very important, because it gives firm official notice that the needs of women as individuals and as citizens are a matter of major concern and not marginal interest to this Nation.

The report of the Commission, due in October of this year, will be a comprehensive document on employment policies and practices, insurance and tax laws, political and legal rights, and education and family relations—as these things pertain to women. It will provide a much needed overall view of these subjects on a national level.

The Commission has seven committees investigating specific aspects and submitting recommendations for the report. Many new and creative ideas are emerging which will, hopefully, be implemented and eventually affect you and your world—or at least raise to greater public awareness myths we have identified and explored today.

Exciting ideas are sure to emerge as recommendations. For example, one is that of community resources and counseling centers for the care, rehabilitation and placement of, so to speak, becalmed mothers. In these centers, training and information about job opportunities might be matched for maximum effectiveness. I would also like to see more summer campus courses in which women with families would be able to catch up with current developments and knowledge in the company of their families and in an academic atmosphere.

There are too many "lacks"—lack of opportunities, of facilities, of information, and of household help. These "lacks" retard the total development of the modern wife and mother just as surely as they hurt the economically and organically disadvantaged child for whom we build centers and for whom we open summer camps.

I can assure you that it is the intention of the present administration to work toward adopting the best of the solutions proposed by the Commission for meeting the problems of American women. And I can hope that the best of the experiments being conducted outside of Government will be favorably considered by students and educators alike and become widely accepted as their effectiveness is realized. And I can predict that the myths discussed today will be gradually dispelled.

Now what does all this mean to you who are entering the period of your life when choices must be made? The present college generation is said to be strongly influenced by what Betty Friedan—a Smith alumna, incidentally—has labeled the feminine mystique, the idea that a woman's fulfillment comes only properly from husband, home, and children, that young women today don't want to enter the fray, are apathetic about participating in a man's world. I don't know; maybe you could tell me whether this is a fair assessment. But I do know that this is no time for apathy—nor is it a time to be restricted by either/or choices. To think in terms of the old extreme, of the aggressive career woman or the woman bogged down in snug domesticity, is to deny the reality that modern life has made possible a more productive, imaginative ordering of one's life. Only you can discover, each of you individually, that which will bring your own personal fulfillment. But let us hope that we can continue to widen the range of choice.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was know as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—Congressional Record, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the Record:

May 7, 1963.

Congressman Daniel J. Flood,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

The Honorable Daniel J. Flood: Your House Resolution 14, which advocated formation of a special House Committee on Captive Nations has created considerable interest among the Armenians and other minority groups in Metropolitan Detroit.

In order to help assure your bill reaching the House floor for debate and subsequent acceptance, several of my colleagues and I have written a letter to Chairman Howard W. Smith, of the House Rules Committee, asking him to use every legal maneuver possible to establish the aforementioned committee.

We congratulate you, Congressman Flood, for your apparent insight relative to the need for establishing such a committee, and we wish you to know that we shall support your proposition in every way we can.

Enclosed you will find a copy of the letter sent to Congressman Smith. A copy of this letter and one to Congressman Smith will also be sent to Congressman Derwinski, enabling the three of you to compare notes with others who are in support of your resolution.

Should there be other areas in which we can lend our support do not hesitate to so inform us.

We shall be extremely curious citizens when said resolutions are discussed, Congressman Flood. We wish you the best of luck in your worthy endeavor.

Respectfully yours,
Percy Sarkisian,
Dearborn, Mich.

Los Angeles, Calif., *May 14, 1963.*

Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
House of Representatives, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Flood: No one has heard an Estonian voice raised in protest at the United Nations. No one will. There is no Estonia. There is a freezing peninsula sticking north into the Gulf of Finland peopled by slaves who are permitted to work themselves to death to help the despots they despise.

Few people know anything at all about Estonia. Fewer still are aware of the aspirations of these people to be their own masters. The history of this little country is a blueprint of what will happen all over the world if the Soviet system prevails.

Please, if you be so kind, send me House Resolution 14, which earlier this year you reintroduced.

I never took much stock in asking people to write to Congressmen, not only because people don't bother writing, but because I figured Congressmen didn't pay much attention to letters anyway, even this when the Congressmen mail is postage free.

Meanwhile, the legislature prepared for a time that could include action on another explosive issue to fight for communism.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours sincerely,

Roman Laes,
Ex-Senator From Estonia.

New York, N.Y., *May 8, 1963.*

Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Flood: I have read your letter in the Tablet of April 25, 1963, re House Resolution 14. I would be willing to react favorably to your requests contained in your letter if I could get a copy of the bill. If you have a few extra copies, I would attempt to circulate it among my friends. I feel I cannot write an intelligent letter to Chairman H. W. Smith unless I know the bill. Therefore, I would appreciate it if you could send me a copy of it, or any amount you may be able to have at your disposal.

Respectfully yours,

George Erdesz.

Organization for the Defense of
Four Freedoms for Ukraine,
Inc.,
New York, May 7, 1963.

The Honorable Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: I have the honor to express on behalf of our organization which encompasses over 5,000 dues-paying members the petition appealing to you to submit the House Resolution 14 (the Flood resolution) for vote in the House Rules Committee.

Our petition is motivated by a great need to have a special House Committee on the Captive Nations which would constantly expose before the American public Russian colonialism over scores of nations by means of highly authoritative investigations, would assist the President in formulating best policies in respect to liberation of nations from Russian colonialism, and would contribute to liberation efforts of the said enslaved nations.

Creation of such a committee will be hailed by all the subjugated peoples as a significant move by the freedom-loving Americans.

Very sincerely yours,

Eugene Lozynskyj,
President.

P.S.—As a typical dramatic case of Russian colonialist methods may serve the murder perpetrated by the Soviet-Russian government against the head of the Ukrainian national liberation movement, Stepan Bandera, and the prominent Ukrainian scholar, Dr. Lev Rebet, mentioned in the enclosed communication of the government of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Brooklyn, N.Y., *May 3, 1963.*

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: Please let me urge that quick action be taken on House Resolution 14 to establish a speecial Committee on the Captive Nations, which would expose the status of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

To my mind, it is criminal negligence on the part of the United States not to pound away at this subject day and night. Russia makes screaming headlines about "colonialism," and not one word is ever tossed back in her teeth. What in the world is wrong with us? Are we no longer worthy of the name of Americans? Do we no longer champion freedom?

Sincerely yours,

Mary Fitzgerald
Mrs. E. G. Fitzgerald.
(For the Fitzgerald family).

The Good Guys and the Bad Guys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on May 23, 1963, Miss Miriam Ottenberg, the outstanding investigative reporter for the Washington Evening Star, made a talk before the Washington Kiwanis Club on crime and law enforcement in the District of Columbia. Miss Ottenberg is a Pulitzer Prize winner and one of the Nation's finest objective reporters.

In her address to the Washington Kiwanis Club she gave a sound analysis of the problems with which law enforcement officers in the District of Columbia are confronted. Miss Ottenberg is convinced that unless the so-called Mallory rule is reversed or modified and Washington's very fine police force is permitted to do its duty, crime will continue to flourish in the Nation's Capital.

Under the able leadership of Chief Robert V. Murray, Washington has one of the most efficient police departments in the Nation. Chief Murray has an outstanding record of service and is recognized as being one of the Nation's leading law enforcement officers. Chief Murray's department, however, has been hampered in law enforcement through the ban on investigative arrests, the so-called Mallory rule, and unrealistic court decisions.

These factors are very ably presented in Miss Ottenberg's fine speech before the Washington Kiwanis Club on May 23. As her talk concerns the most pressing problem in the Nation's Capital, I included it in the Appendix of the Record.

THE GOOD GUYS AND THE BAD GUYS

When I gave Tony Pritchard the title of my talk today—"The Good Guys and the Bad Guys"—I had in mind talking about the heroes and villains of my book—the Federal investigators versus the mobsters, traitors, spies, and dope traffickers, among others.

I wanted to tell you that as a Nation we're the best protected people in the world—that from the time we wake up in the morning and take our vitamin pills until we catch the late news broadcasts, Federal agents somewhere in the background are making our lives safer, more comfortable, and more secure.

I wanted to tell you, too, that thanks to support from you and the other good guys, we've gotten the local laws to run out of town a fancy collection of fraud artists, swindlers, and white collar cheats.

But the more I thought about it, the more I realized that, while what I said might be comforting, this is no time for complacency. I thought some more about my title and I realized that sometimes you can't tell the good guys from the bad guys without a scorecard.

For instance, a learned judge recently attacked what he called the terror evoked by the threat of setting beasts against human beings. He was talking about the police department's canine corps. He did not mention that a policeman with his dog was knocked down and beaten during the stadium riots but did not unleash his dog to defend him. Nor did this learned judge mention that the dogs are trained to hold, not to bite. And the judge did not say that in some parts of this town, where it's not safe for a man on the beat to patrol alone, a policeman's dog is the only protection he has against being attacked himself.

So you might ask yourself, when a judge attempts to rouse public sentiment against the canine corps, is he a good guy or a bad guy?

I'll have more to say about the same judge later.

Another example: A lawyer who also happens to be a local politician of some standing testified recently that Police Chief Murray's earnest efforts to ease the impact of the Mallory rule is an obsession that does the city no good. The politician said that he and the political organization he represents are violently opposed to any change in the Mallory rule. From where I sit, that politician can hardly be classed among the good guys.

Now, Tony Pritchard wanted me to talk about District crime all along. As you can see, I'm playing right into his hands. I had demurred at first because I thought you were tired of hearing about it. But I've changed my mind since reading some recent statements and misstatements on the subject. I think there's an urgent need to get away from theories and back to facts for awhile.

First of all, we've got this fact to face: Regardless of what anybody here says about the extent of crime, the word has gotten around the country that it's not safe to visit Washington. A friend of mine in Chicago sent me a syndicated column about crime in Washington, which also quoted stories running in Tampa, Fla., and Raleigh, N.C. There have been other widely distributed words about the situation here. United Press International sent a series on Washington crime over the wires and we didn't look good. The Saturday Evening Post devoted considerable space to the stadium riot and Washington's other crime problems. There's another story on our crime in the current Look magazine. We'll no doubt get more of the same on a TV special tonight with the provocative title: "Washington: A City in Trouble."

So, fact No. 1 is that no matter how we gloss over the statistics, no matter how much the apologists point to crime in other cities, Washington has accumulated a national reputation for being crime riddled.

For fact No. 2, let's take a look at the rest of the country. There's no question that crime is on the increase throughout the country. It has been for over a decade. But from 1950 to 1960, when nationwide crime increased by 98 percent, it only increased hereby 10.7 percent. In other words, we don't have to parallel the national increase and in the past, we didn't.

There is also no doubt, however, that Washington is viewed in a special light because it is the Nation's Capital. As a columnist wrote:

"The administration and District of Columbia law enforcers should make Washington a safe and habitable community before telling other cities how to deal with their own crime and delinquency problems."

So the fact that Washington is not alone in its present crime increase is hardly a comfort. Nor is it much comfort that we are 7th among 16 cities with populations ranging from 500,000 to a million.

The FBI, in issuing its Uniform Crime Reports, has always cautioned against comparing one city with another—believing that a more accurate gauge of how well a city copes with crime lies in a comparison of that city's offenses from year to year.

So, for fact No. 3, let's look at how we as a city did in the past and how we're doing now. Three different fiscal years are important—1953, 1957, and 1963.

In fiscal 1953, the rate of serious offenses reached the highest point of any period since the city adopted a more accurate count of crime in 1947. But in 1953, nobody was talking about social problems as the root of the crime problem. The experts had a pretty good idea why crime hit a peak. The police annual report of that year put it this way: The adverse publicity received by some members of the force as a result of the congressional crime hearings lowered public esteem for the entire force and might have been a factor in the increase in juvenile crime.

The police force was undermanned and demoralized, but Robert Murray had now become chief. Before the end of 1953, he had started crime on its downward trend. His cleanup job was thorough. He won the confidence not only of the community but of his own men. And he got more men.

As a result, Washington's crime trend was reversed. While crime continued to climb across the Nation, it plummeted downward here. So in fiscal 1957 police were able to report that crime in Washington had reached its lowest point in a decade. So, in the 10 years of the revised crime reporting system, we had hit both a crime high and a crime low.

But, at the end of June 1957—the beginning of the 1958 fiscal year—the picture suddenly began to change. You can see it dramatically on a chart. It's like a V. You can see the line of crime sliding steadily downward and then you can see the line starting upward again.

It has been climbing ever since. Thus, at the end of April 1963 serious offenses totaled 48 percent more than they did at the end of June 1957. At this point, we are only 3 percent below the alltime high of fiscal 1953.

What caused the increase? Some have blamed it on the influx of Negroes from the South. But the influx has been fairly steady for a long time. For instance, let's look at the school statistics, which I think are something of a population gage. In 1953, our alltime crime peak, there were 54,716 Negro children, or 54.27 percent of our school population. In 1957, our alltime crime low, there were 73,723 Negro children, or 68 percent, in our schools. So the percentage of Negro children in the school population increased by 14 percent during the period of our greatest crime decrease. The Negro school population, of course, has continued to rise but, as I've tried to show, this is not a controlling factor.

Besides, many of the criminals are natives—both white and Negro.

Some theorists have blamed the crime rise on the lack of job opportunities for Negroes. But Negroes now have many, many more job opportunities than they had in 1957. Don't misunderstand me. There's still a lot of job discrimination both by employers and unions. We need the maximum cooperation of the entire community to give Negro youths, particularly, the training and opportunities they need to become an integral part of the city's responsible working force. I think every move in that direction contributes to a healthier and safer city. The point I've been making, however, is that the need to end job discrimination is recognized now much more fully than it was in 1957 when crime was at its lowest point.

Some have blamed the crime increase on slum living and housing discrimination. There are still a few slums but not like there were in 1957. Southwest, a one-time high crime area, was leveled and those slums are gone. They're gone, too, in Foggy Bottom and in the mid-Northwest area where people lived in a maze of alleys. As for housing discrimination, can you compare the city now with the way it was in 1957? People who talk in those terms just haven't ridden around the city in recent years. In fact, it was the leveling of the slums that distributed crime into previously safe areas.

A crime rise can frequently be blamed on a corrupt police force, an undermanned police force, a poorly equipped or incompetently administered police force. Now, let's measure what's happened since 1957 in those terms.

We've got an honest police chief and the men under his command either hew to the line or get out. As for manpower, we've got 336 more police on the force than we did in 1957. We still need more and I'll have something to say about that later.

My point now is that we have more police than we had in 1957 but crime has gone up.

We also have a canine corps, which we didn't have in 1957. By July, we'll have 75 well-trained dogs on the street to patrol with the men, to chase felons, to track down prowlers, and to make their presence felt as a deterrent force where unruly groups gather.

As for equipment, we have 20 two-way radios for patrolman to use on the three shifts so now 60 policemen are equipped with walkie-talkies. We didn't have them in 1957.

As for administration, a number of major improvements have been made. For instance, virtually all plainclothesmen in the precincts are now under the centralized control of the chief of detectives. Five detective districts have been established under the command of crack detectives. In this way, the men in charge of the detective districts can deploy detectives wherever they're needed over two or three precincts to follow a pattern of cases or to focus on a particular heinous crime.

So, the crime increase since June of 1957 can't be blamed on a corrupt or incompetent force, either.

I keep getting back to June 1957. That, as you recall, was the month the crime trend was reversed. In case any of you don't know what else happened that month, I'll tell you now. It was in June of 1957 that the Supreme Court reversed the rape conviction of Andrew Mallory on the ground that his confession should not have been admitted in evidence against him because he was held too long between arrest and appearance before a committing magistrate.

I know this is an oft-told story to you but I have approached it in this way in an effort to deal with facts rather than theory. Now, I'm going to express an opinion shared by some learned Senators, professors, and constitutional lawyers.

I don't believe that the Supreme Court ever intended its decision in the Mallory case to be interpreted as it has been by our Court of Appeals. I don't think the Supreme Court even visualized that a judge of our Court of Appeals would ever suggest that the coroner could not testify to his examination of a dead body because the coroner would not have known where the body was if the killer had not confessed to burying his wife in a dump. Yet that is literally what one of our appellate judges wrote in the Killough case.

Despite all the loose talk about Mallory being a Constitutional issue, the Supreme Court did not base its decision on the Constitution but on the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. Congress approved those rules and Congress can pass a law affecting those rules. In other words, it's not a constitutional question and the Supreme Court never said it was.

It's a Federal rule affecting all Federal courts, but none of them have interpreted the Mallory decision like our Federal Court of Appeals. Federal agents tell me the only place they worry about the Mallory decision is in Washington.

The Killough case is a perfect example of justice, Washington style. I'll review a few of the details. Killough's wife turned up missing. After she had been gone for days, her relatives insisted that Killough report her disappearance to police. He did and then left town. While he was gone, police found Mrs. Killough's car with blood spots on it. They told Killough's girl friend to call police if Killough showed up. He did and she notified police.

Killough was questioned for about a day, maybe more. At that point, police were convinced Mrs. Killough was dead but they couldn't proceed until they found the body.

Knowing the courts, they could assume that if Killough confessed, the confession would not be given to the jury because of the Mallory rule. But at that point, their interest was in finding the wife. Well, Killough finally said he had killed his wife and buried her on the dump. They dug her up and charged Killough with murder. Killough then went before a committing magistrate who duly warned him of his rights.

A day or two later, a detective went to the jail to see Killough. His purpose was to find out what arrangements Killough wanted made for his wife's funeral and the detective also had some of Killough's clothes he wanted to return to him. While the detective was at the jail, a lawyer friend of Killough's showed up and offered his services. Killough said he had made other arrangements. Then, Killough became a compulsive talker. He wanted to unburden himself and he did so at length. This, incidentally, is not unusual. Police across the world have told me that once a killer is caught, he frequently develops a great desire to talk, to rationalize, to justify and somehow to purge himself through confession. Killough was like that.

At Killough's trial, the judge threw out the prearraignment confession as expected under the Mallory rule. The judge allowed the jury to hear about the confession Killough made at the jail because by that time Killough had been arraigned and warned and offered counsel.

The court of appeals reversed the conviction on the ground that the jail confession was prompted by the earlier confession—what the court calls "the fruit of the poisonous tree." As I said, one judge went further and wanted to throw out the coroner's testimony because he considered that, too, was the fruit of the poisonous tree.

The Government is now attempting to try Killough again, without the confessions, of course. It's touch and go whether enough evidence will get to the jury for a conviction and if he is convicted, whether the court of appeals will let it stand.

In other words, a confessed killer stands a better than even chance of walking out of jail. That's justice, Washington style.

We don't have to worry about Mallory himself any more. He made the mistake of shifting his scene of operation to Philadelphia when he walked out of death row. In Philadelphia, he was arrested for a similar crime and was sentenced to serve 11 to 23 years.

But we do have to worry about criminals from other parts of the country who have heard about Washington's reputation for letting confessed criminals escape justice.

If you think that's an exaggeration, consider the case of the kidnap rapist who abducted two young women at 10th and G Streets, forced them on a nightmare ride through town and raped one of them. When he was caught later in Philadelphia, during another crime, he made a phony confession to a murder in Washington. He explained after he was brought back that he thought his chances of getting off were better in Washington than in Philadelphia.

The learned judge I mentioned earlier—the one who wants to get rid of the canine corps—said recently: "I doubt that the perpetrators of crime calculate the length of time during which they may be interrogated by the police before deciding where to snatch a purse."

Well, he may doubt it, but I've got a case to illustrate that the criminals are well aware of the benefits to them of the Mallory rule as our courts interpret it.

Recently a Congressman was attacked in an alley. Police arrested a girl accomplice who proceeded to identify her male confederates. When one of them was brought in to confront her, the first thing he asked her was whether she had made a statement. She said she had. Then, he asked her whether she'd made the statement before or after arraignment.

When she said she hadn't been arraigned yet, he shrugged and said, "Oh well, the statement don't count." He may have been illiterate but he sure knew about Mallory.

It's because Chief Murray has seen the effects of the Mallory decision at first hand that he gives top priority to getting the Mallory rule eased for the sake of District law enforcement. The politician who said Chief Murray has an obsession about the Mallory rule did not mention that both U.S. Attorney Acheson—a Democrat—and his Republican predecessor, Oliver Gasch, both have argued strongly to get the law changed. Are they obsessed, too?

There is now legislation before Congress to clarify the Mallory decision so police will no longer be handcuffed in trying to solve crimes. The Star agrees with the police, the prosecutors, and a number of legislators that this is must legislation.

When the rate of offenses goes up, the only consolation is that the crimes are solved. Here again we are in trouble. Between the Mallory rule and 2 years of official criticism of investigative arrests—winding up in an outright ban—police have been unable to solve near as many crimes as they have in the past. Until 2 years ago, Washington had the highest rate of solving crimes in the country. In 2 years, the clearance rate dropped from 59 percent of the serious crimes to 45 percent. That's still far above the national average of 27 percent but it means a lot more crimes are going unsolved and a lot more criminals are remaining at large to commit further crimes.

If arrests for investigation are unconstitutional as the lawyers say, then, of course, they shouldn't be allowed. But police have to have some alternative.

At this point, police face this dilemma. Either they let a suspect remain at large—free to run, free to dispose of his loot—until they have enough probable cause to believe they've definitely got the right man. Or they pick him up and charge him with a crime he may not have committed. They will release him, of course, as soon as they've checked out his alibi but there's a charge of murder or robbery or rape on his record. That record cannot be expunged under present law.

What's the solution? Under the Mallory rule, you can't hold onto a man once he's charged long enough to bring in witnesses for identification, long enough to question him, long enough for a reenactment of the crime, long enough for him to reveal where he hid the loot. Under the ban on investigative arrests, police must charge a man first and check his alibi later. Police may then let him go, but they can't let go of the record.

In this quandry, Chief Murray has proposed a uniform arrest act under which police would be able to hold a man up to 6 hours without charging him. Unless the Mallory rule is substantially changed, Congress will have to consider some such alternative to investigate arrests.

In the immediate future, there are several measures that warrant the support of you and all other Washingtonians who are concerned not only with the kind of reputation we're getting across the Nation but also with the kind of dangers we're running at home.

First on the list is a change in the Mallory rule.

Second, as I mentioned before, we do need more police on the street. We are authorized to have a 3,000-man force but Congress has never appropriated enough money. We're still 100 men short. So, the second measure deserving support is for an appropriation large enough to bring the force to 3,000 men as authorized by Congress.

A third measure deserving support in the interest of more police protection is a pending bill authorizing the Police Department to handle special details such as the Major Cooper parade and Presidential appearances with off-duty policemen who would be paid at straight time for their work. This would keep the police on duty at their regular posts while providing enough manpower for the special details which are an integral part of policing in the Nation's Capital.

I've talked about the causes and some of the possible cures from the point of view of a reporter. I'd like to close with the words of a former criminal court judge, now a Member of Congress, who had her purse snatched outside her apartment just two blocks from her Capitol office.

Said Congresswoman GRIFFITHS: "The courts in this town are just too lenient. When a police officer goes to a lot of trouble to find a thief and take him down to court, then nothing is done, the police officer is demoralized."

Congresswoman GRIFFITHS decided to give up her convenient apartment in the Capitol Hill area and move to Virginia. Perhaps if an aroused community of good guys gets behind some of the measures we've been discussing and the police have a chance to get rid of the bad guys, maybe then we can bring the Congresswoman back into the District. At the same time, we'll bring back some of the visitors who have been warned to stay out of Washington—the city in trouble.

Foreign Aid—Inflation—Fiscal Crises—Economic Chaos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the unrestrained Federal Government's spending, the abandonment of any intent to balance the national budget, the expressed objective of the administration to artificially stimulate the economy by massive deficits, the deliberate adoption of policies to create inflationary higher prices by cheapening the dollar, are all contributing to an inevitable series of fiscal crises and economic chaos.

The Cheektowaga Times is a most responsible newspaper, published at Cheektowaga, N.Y. It is circulated in the Buffalo, N.Y., suburban area.

This newspaper recently published a concise editorial pointing out the dangerous consequences of this Nation's fiscal policies and programs.

This is a most appropriate time for this Congress, our executive department, and the people of the Nation to give sober thought to the fiscal, economic, and political truths contained in this editorial.

I congratulate the Cheektowaga Times upon the publication of this article with which I am in complete accord.

The article follows:

FOREIGN AID THREATENS OUR DOLLAR

The U.S. foreign aid program is threatening the American dollar. It is subsidizing foreign competition with our own manufacturers and industries. It is draining our gold supply and creating a highly unfavorable balance of payments.

In short, the foreign aid program is endangering our entire economy. These facts are obvious and easily substantiated.

Why do the budget planners overlook this situation when offering theories and strategems for curing our ailing economy?

Why do they omit mention of one sure step toward national solvency: a drastic cut in our foreign aid and military assistance programs?

At little or no interest, the United States is regularly extending 50-year loans to foreigners. Our Government must raise money for these loans by borrowing on short term at high interest rates. This has contributed to the raising of the Federal debt limit repeatedly.

The "temporary" authorization is now $308 billion, and the groundwork is being laid to raise it again.

Serious suggestions have been offered to have the ceiling on the national debt removed entirely. Efforts also have been made to remove the legal requirement for a gold reserve.

These changes could lead to unbridled spending and a nonstop trip to bankruptcy.

Leaders of the Soviet Union frequently define the primary goal of world communism as the collapse of the capitalistic system. Most of the free world economy is tied to the U.S. dollar, so a foremost goal of every mistaken leader is to wreck the economy of the United States.

If they succeed, they will have won their struggle without dropping a bomb or firing a single gun. When a nation's economy collapses, concentration of power is inevitable.

Before the people become aware of what is happening, they find themselves saddled with artificial fixing of prices for goods and services. Wages are set by the central authority and government takes over ownership and management of industries, business, and farms.

The emergence of an all-powerful dictator is but a simple step from this point.

If the United States were to succumb to totalitarianism, it would mean the end of freedom everywhere on earth. It is not an exaggeration to say that mankind's destiny upon this earth depends upon the preservation of a free economy in the United States.

Despite the danger signals, despite the low level of our gold reserves, the unwarranted foreign aid appropriations continue. Some of these appropriations are granted to nations we hope are our allies and friends. But they also go in great abundance to neutrals, to so-called neutrals who are really antagonistic to us, and to our outspoken Communist enemies.

Including the interest on the money we have borrowed in order to give it away, the total foreign aid account is more than $110 billion. This is one-third of the national debt.

To relate foreign aid more closely to our personal pocketbooks, remember that foreign aid programs consume the equivalent of 22 cents out of every dollar we pay in personal income taxes each year.

This flight of money has seriously weakened our economy. It has swollen the size of the national debt to grotesque proportions. Now our solicitous friends overseas are beginning to worry about a collapse of the dollar and are preparing for such a calamity.

It is time to call a halt to this squandering of our own lifeblood.

American Checks and Balances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening, May 27, 1963, the Masons of the District of Columbia and nearby Lodges presented the Grand Master of Masons Award to the Honorable HARRY FLOOD BYRD, U.S. Senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

In the program for the dinner there was an article by Charles Bruce Gilley, Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Masons of the District of Columbia, entitled "American Checks and Balances," which in my mind presents an excellent explanation of the workings of our government and worthy of the study of all of those interested in the perpetuation of our form of government.

AMERICAN CHECKS AND BALANCES

The world seems filled with sombre folk whose mission appears to trouble the gullible with thoughts that our cherished civilization is on the edge of oblivion. Before one succumbs to this destructive idea, your Grand Master urges all Americans, yes, even those of non-American affiliation, to hold before them, in plain view, the fabric into which has been twined and intertwined the history of this great Nation. Look at it, study it, revere it.

Personalities assume their immortal places in this masterpiece of government—George Washington, Patrick Henry, Paul Revere, Daniel Boone, Daniel Webster, Benjamin Franklin, Henry Clay, Thomas Jefferson, Marquis de Lafayette, Andrew Jackson, Robert E. Lee, Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, all of history, while in life looms the indomitable Harry S. Truman, Harry Flood Byrd, our distinguished guest and his long line of patriotic forebears, together with other patriotic leaders now showing the world that the true spirit of America still shines and glows in the darkness of the doubt and despair raised by the unbelieving.

The pessimist, or the destructionist, sees the fabric losing its fiber, sapping its own strength. He views world happenings as inclusive of all peoples. He cringes before the military might of communism—but history is devoid of any lowering of the standards of the American people because of the offensive power of any nation. He fears the pressure of this false ideology as creating in our people the all-motivating desire for material things. How false, as we contemplate the blessings and privileges accorded every man, woman, and child under the broad concepts of the American Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the Declaration of Independence.

The pessimist blindly, yet erroneously, sees his fellow Americans, even his Nation, denying the existence of Almighty God, in line with the apparent boast of those who cling to beliefs without faith.

America, with its checks and balances, holds the fabric of its existence in veneration, and proudly displays to all mankind the sources and foundations of its greatness, its power, and its position in the world of men and nations.

First, the spiritual quality by which the dignity of man becomes the watchword. This means reliance upon the basic qualities of our forefathers, those qualities which have held together so tightly whenever the evils attendant upon destruction, either by self or foreign design, have imperiled our national or individual status.

Second, the power of strength—military or economic—which enables the Nation to withstand attempts of those not of our family group to take unfair and unannounced advantage of a people whose aims are peace and tranquillity in the hearts of men and among nations.

Third, the certainty of faith in the goodness and the divine might of the Supreme Being, the one great source of power to overcome doubts and fears, and to establish and maintain, in the souls of men, determination, ability, wisdom, and desire to carry on the true principles of democracy and brotherhood.

These sources and foundations of the dignity of man, the need for military and economic power, and the reliance upon the unwavering strength and guidance of God, we find reposed in (1) the people of America, as they perpetuate the principles of government bequeathed by their forebears, (2) the home, where such principles are taught generation after generation, (3) the church, where faith in man and God is made a part of our daily lives, (4) the public schools, where democracy and decency are the fundamentals leading to good citizenship, and (5) the craft of freemasonry, where all of these qualities are taught and woven into the tapestry of men's souls.

America's checks and balances are secure, sound and imperishable. Her people listen not to the pessimist of thought and action, but place their faith and trust in those indestructible affiliates of man's dignity among his brethren, the American system of home life, the church of the living God, the public educational system, and the fraternal ties which bind man to man, and nation to nation.

CHARLES BRUCE GILLEY.

Television and Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on May 21, 1963, Mr. Robert W. Sarnoff, chairman of the board, National Broadcasting Co., Inc., gave a talk before the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, meeting at Miami, Fla., on the subject of "Television and Children." The subject is of great interest to the American people and what Mr. Sarnoff had to say on this subject is timely.

Part of his remarks are addressed to the role of educational television as distinguished from commercial broadcasting. There is quite a public debate going on at the present time as to what the proper roles are of educational and commercial television respectively. Mr. Sarnoff's views on this particular subject ought to be noted as a part of this public debate.

Mr. Sarnoff's remarks are as follows:

TELEVISION AND CHILDREN

My credentials for appearing before you today are now at the ages of 4, 6, and 19. They are three girls and they are all in the process of acquiring a formal education. In common with most other youngsters in the United States, they enjoy watching television and they are not bashful about it. When a program their father wants to view on NBC happens to conflict with one of their favorites on another channel, the audience of the National Broadcasting Co. sometimes declines by one.

Nevertheless, I share with my children, as many other parents share with theirs, an interest in their television viewing as well as in their education. Not that I equate the two. I could not, and I would not, suggest that commercial television has the same altruistic goals, for example, as the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. The schoolroom, the living room, and the marketplace are obviously different milieus, with differing disciplines and motivations.

Yet, I believe there is much common ground that the parent, the teacher and the broadcaster can occupy, and it is my hope to convince you that a joint exploration of this territory can produce tangible rewards for the children with whom we are concerned.

Like the process of learning, television is literally everywhere. Fifty million American families, the occupants of 91 percent of all the homes in this Nation, possess television sets which, in the course of a week, are watched with varying degrees of interest and consistency by one or more members of the household.

Children form an avid and substantial segment of this vast audience. Today, the child of 15 does not know a world without television. It was there, in bulky small-screen size, when he was in his cradle. As he progressed from the nursery, television progressed to the larger screen, the slimmed-down portable set, and even to color.

In the modern era, television has become as entrenched in the house as the bath or the telephone. The 15-year-old watches with aplomb a program sent in color to an orbiting satellite in outer space and retransmitted to his home receiver. He sees, at the same time as Sir Winston Churchill in London, the first honorary citizenship ever bestowed by an American President in ceremonies conducted at the White House.

Tomorrow, today's adolescent will watch television transmitted in full color to and from any areas of the civilized world. Singapore, Sydney, Suez and Stockholm will be as easily available technically as San Francisco is today; and quite possibly they will be seen on wall-size mural television, the successor to the present receiver.

Nor is it fanciful conjecture to speculate that today's 15-year-old will one day know and possess other forms of television that now are only scientific laboratory conceptions. For example, through advances in the miniaturization and integration of components, we may have sometime in the decade of the 70's color television sets no larger than the transitorized radio you now carry in your pocket.

Dramatic advances are also being achieved in the utilization of the outer reaches of the radio spectrum. There are billions of unused communications channels in the ultrahigh frequency range which science will some day unlock for the use of man. My children and yours may well have their own private broadcast frequency, just as we now have our own telephone number.

The prospect of personal communications, sight and sound, between any two individuals any place in the world is not beyond our children's grasp. Indeed, before the current crop of teenagers become octogenarian, it may be in television and voice communication with individuals on other planets.

This is a sepeculative glimpse of the television of our children's tomorrow, but what of television today?

Is it, as some allege, an electronic Pied Piper beguiling children from their parents, their studies and outdoor sports and piping them off to armchair hibernation?

The television industry would be the last to deny that television holds enormous magnetism for children. Some 90 percent of all youngsters in the United States under the age of 12—nearly 40 million children—watch television during the course of a typical week. Between the ages of 13 and 17, it rises to 97 percent, or more than 15 million teenagers.

Before we attempt to evaluate television's influence on children, we should be clear about who is being influenced. As every parent and teacher knows, a child is quicksilver—not today what he was yesterday, nor again what he will be tomorrow. There are light years of differences in the interests and responses of 6-year-old boys and 3-year-old girls. To the kindergarten child, high school possesses the remoteness of the planet Venus.

These differences, I think, make it important for all of us—parents, teachers and broadcasters alike—to tread softly when it comes to originating or endorsing broad generalities about the influence of television on children. The audience of children is not monolithic—it is a complex of different and disparate age groups, each bringing something different to television, each seeking something different from it.

There are, however, certain specific conclusions we can reach with reasonable assurance, based on extensive research conducted both within and without the industry. Primarily, children actively seek something when they watch television. A recent study stated that nothing could be farther from the truth than the notion that children are sitting victims, and television bites them.

While much remains to be done in developing information in this area, some realistic yardsticks for measuring television's effects on children have emerged from such carefully researched books as "Television in the Lives of Our Children," by Wilbur Schramm, and "Television and the Child," by Hilde Himmelweit.

These studies show that children who watch television carry certain advantages with them when they enter school. They have larger vocabularies than the children who seldom or never watch television. They take more interest in hobbies; and they have a broader and more detailed knowledge of the world around them. Television-viewing children move increasingly toward good quality magazines. They read more of both general magazines and news magazines. Significantly, they also read books on a wider range of subjects. In the television decade, publication of juvenile books is up 200 percent, and library circulation is up more than 50 percent. One study of the subject has concluded that "book reading comes into its own not despite television but because of it."

I believe it is a reasonable assumption that television has helped the younger child in adapting to society. It has demonstrably improved his performance in the world of reality. It has also allowed him to peer through the window that opens on a world of fantasy, beginning with those simple hot-pursuit animal cartoons and ranging upward to more sophisticated entertainments, such as "The Wizard of Oz," Mary Martin's "Peter Pan," and "Walt Disney's Wonderful World of Color"—experiences enjoyed by millions of adults as well as children.

Because differing attitudes and purposes enter into viewing, different children seek different things from television. It constitutes a kind of vast living library to them, and they make their selections in the same way that they take books from a library shelf. The selections may please, bore or absorb, but the child generally is successful in finding what he is seeking.

Of course, some problems and conflicts are unavoidable. In attempting to satisfy many different appetites, television must also provide abundant and varied selections for grown-ups. This accounts in major part for the broad range of offerings on television—from westerns to situation comedies, from mysteries to dramas, from cartoons to news and public affairs programs.

Not every program can suit every taste. While most youngsters derive constructive pleasure or amiable diversion from television entertainment offerings, some children are impressionable to the slightest nuances or suggestions. An unfortunate few are neurotic or disturbed.

Let me give you an example of how entangled the best intentioned efforts can become. Experimental studies have been conducted to determine the effects of television on disturbed and delinquent youngsters. The findings are interesting. Certain situation comedies that showed children in a pleasant home with well-adjusted parental relationships were highly upsetting. The disturbed child never knew such homelife could exist, and it was a deeply frustrating experience to see what he had not known. Yet it would be unreasonable to conclude that television should therefore eliminate family situation comedies. Were we to construct program schedules solely on the basis of suitability to all children, or to specified children with specific problems, we would penalize vast segments of the total audience.

As a father of three, I know what audacity it takes to propose an added child-rearing activity to a parent. But as a broadcaster, I suggest that television's role for children should be more than that of an auxiliary babysitter or pacifier.

Since time immemorial, parents have assumed responsibility for their children's food, dress, sleep, study, and play. Is it because television is relatively new, or so much taken for granted, that many parents have not realized their responsibility for their children's viewing? Is this why many teachers have not become more active in guiding their students in the use of television as a tool for learning, as well as an instrument for entertainment? A recent study indicated, for example, that only one child in five had been asked by his teacher to watch any television program.

Yet informative and stimulating programing is provided by commercial broadcasters in far greater quantity and variety than many parents or teachers seem to recognize. This includes programs in the entertainment field, such as "Mr. Novak," depicting the life and times of a high school teacher, or a series based on the work of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, both of which NBC will launch this fall. It includes a wide range of documentaries such as "Encyclopedia of Communism," "The River Nile," and "American Landmark: Lexington-Concord," as well as regular and special news programs on current events and their significance.

Beyond these, broadcasters offer certain programs designed specifically as information vehicles for children. The NBC series "Exploring" represents an enlightening case history. In planning it to meet the requirements of children between the ages of 5 and 11, we did a good deal of careful preliminary research on structure and content—including the most suitable time period, the information and interest levels of the different age groups, and their use of television.

We also supplied professionally prepared study guides to 260,000 teachers, outlining the subjects treated in each program in the series—mathematics, science, social studies, music appreciation, and language—so they could be coordinated with classroom work.

Recently, "Exploring" won a Peabody Award as "an outstanding television series for youth and children." It also received the Thomas Alva Edison Award for "Best Children's Program."

Yet it is a sad fact that "Exploring" reaches only a fraction of its potential audience. One reason is that, although it is the most viewed of all comparable educational programs, it has difficulty matching the magnetic pull of competitive entertainment shows. Another reason would appear to be that teachers have not, through the use of study guides or other means available to them, done enough to encourage the viewing of "Exploring."

Little purpose would be gained if this meeting were to be used as just one more platform for the cataloging of shortcomings, yours or ours. But I do urge you, both parents and teachers, to acquaint yourself more thoroughly with the affirmative values television has to offer young people, and to guide your children and students in its use.

Only you, as parents, know your child as an individual and know what is best for him; only you can gage his sensitivities, his emotional range, his changing desires. You do not surrender to him the right to eat nothing but jellybeans every day, and by the same token, you can help balance his television diet as his needs dictate.

An affirmative role also falls to the teacher, who is perhaps the most important external influence in stimulating youthful viewing. You can encourage your students to watch programs of an informative nature. You can assign televised documentaries and news programs on the same basis that you now make assignments from the daily press.

As parents and teachers respond to this responsibility, and as more and more children watch the programs that you consider educationally and informatively appropriate, you will provide the broadcaster with a powerful stimulant for an intensified effort in this direction.

I have been dealing with commercial broadcasting, and with the ways in which you can guide your children and students into constructive viewing patterns. Beyond commercial broadcasting, television offers another resource for enlightenment, much smaller in its current dimensions, but with infinite promise if properly developed. This is the field of educational television, whose role has been under continuing discussion—a discussion which has become more spirited in recent weeks. I would like to outline my conception of its role.

The function and potential of educational television vis-a-vis commercial broadcasting should not be confused by invoking such catchwords as "competitive" versus "supplementary" service, or "broad" versus "narrow" programing, or "cultural" versus "commercial" presentations. What is truly needed is an examination in precise and realistic terms of the contributions educational television can make, and the basis on which it can be supported.

A fundamental distinction between educational television and commercial broadcasting is the fact that the former is precluded by law from obtaining its financial support from the advertising of products or services. This imposes limitations on the scope of its operations, yet opens opportunities for it which are not feasible for commercial broadcasting.

Educational television, unlike commercial broadcasting, does not have the revenues to support a wide range of costly entertainment and information programs, including a comprehensive worldwide news service—all directed to a total public.

However, since educational television is not dependent on wide popular acceptance, it has unique opportunities. It has the opportunity to present in detail subjects which are of special interest to some members of the total audience. It has the opportunity for program experimentation which may initially attract a small number of viewers. And it has the all-important opportunity for formal instruction, as a major contribution to meeting the critical problems of an overburdened educational system from elementary school through college.

It is semantic futility to argue whether fulfillment of these opportunities results in a "broad" or "narrow" service. Educational television is by its very nature a specialized service, as compared with commercial broadcasting. But within its own framework and purpose, educational television can be as broad as the needs it fulfills.

Again, generalizations do not clarify the question of whether educational and commercial television are properly competitive. Both forms of television compete with each other, each in its own way, in seeking to engage viewer interest.

Viewed in this light, commercial and educational television are interacting, and by enriching each other, can enlarge the total contribution of television to the Nation. Commercial television is structured to attract vast audiences of all ages and educational levels; to bring significant aspects of our world to millions, through drama and music, through documentaries on art and science, history, geography and current affairs; and by doing so, to acquaint viewers with new cultural and intellectual experiences to which they may never have been exposed before. Educational television, on the other hand, has the capacity to explore areas in greater detail and to provide more intense involvement for viewers who have well-developed interests or professional needs; and to carry forward interests already awakened, in some cases, by commercial television.

Let me be specific. Within NBC's "Today" show viewed daily by nearly 8 million people, the noted art critic Aline Saarinen has spoken challengingly and interestingly on various milestones in the history of art. Her recent illustrated discussion with Marcel Duchamps about the sensation his paintings created at the New York Armory show—a half-century ago—prompted, I am sure, a real sense of curiosity among some viewers to know more about the art of this significant period. What more logical an area for educational television than to respond to such awakened interest with a series dealing in detail with the artistic explosion of the early part of this century?

This capacity of educational television to probe deeply and to develop in sophisticated detail subjects of special interest does not diminish commercial television's function of serving and stimulating mass audiences with cultural and informational programs. On the contrary, commercial broadcasting itself can benefit from those experiments which educational television has unlimited freedom to conduct.

Another vital area of educational television's potential is its enormous value as a teaching resource. At a time when all education is burdened by shortages of teachers and facilities, when educational requirements are outstripping conventional methods of instruction, the use of educational television as an integrated part of the educational system is not only indicated but is imperative. It can bring an added dimension to the classroom through a variety of effective audio-visual techniques; it can shoulder a part of the teaching burden itself through in-home courses, and it can give the most gifted instructors exposure in thousands of classrooms instead of one.

In order for educational stations to realize their full potential in these areas of specialized need, they must establish a base of financial stability. No broadcasting enterprise can plan its future soundly if compelled to divert its creative resources into a search for miscellaneous and uncertain benefactions. The high enthusiasm quotient propelling educational television is not in itself enough to assure the future; it must be accompanied by sound fiscal planning on a long-range and continuing basis.

This financial support, it seems to me, must come essentially from two sources: viewers who value the specialized service of an educational station and are willing to contribute to its continuance; and educational foundations and institutions—including elementary schools, high schools, and colleges—that join with it as a teaching resource. It is particularly through the latter group that a financial base can be established for educational television, in addition to the important resources furnished by viewer contributions.

In my judgment, those who discount the teaching aspect of educational television would undermine one of its basic functions; and those who discount the educational community as a source for permanent financing of educational television are unrealistic in failing to recognize its need for stability and continuity of income. It is incredible to me that programs designed for the specific purpose of teaching should be regarded as unworthy of educational television's mission, or as doing violence to its cultural potential.

As parents and teachers, you can contribute profoundly to the maximum development of both the commercial and educational forms of television. You can do so by seeking out and selecting the best of all that commercial television has to offer you, your families and your pupils. As thoughtful citizens and as members of a respected and responsible organization, you can encourage the establishment and development of educational television in your communities and help with its financial support, individually and through your school systems.

Over 2,200 years ago, the Greek playwright Menander wrote: "Children should not be led into the right paths by severity but by persuasion." Together we can guide our children to the right paths of television viewing, not by severity and denial, but by the mutual persuasion of proper program development by broadcasters, proper program selection by parents and proper program assignment by teachers.

Hon. Fritz Lanham

SPEECH

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute, along with my Texas colleagues, to the Honorable Fritz Lanham, of Fort Worth, Tex., who served in this body with distinction from 1919 to 1947. Unfortunately, I was not as privileged as some of the Texas delegation to serve along with this illustrious gentleman; but on the fortunate side got to know him quite well during his 16 years with Trinity River Improvement Association which he so ably represented here in Washington.

I think it is entirely fitting that Fritz receive his floral tributes from this great body which he served so well. Fritz was always ready and willing to lend a helping hand, and I know he was of great help to me during my freshman years in the House of Representatives. His advice and wise counsel on matters in which he was well versed were graciously accepted. Mr. Speaker, I know that all in this Congress who were privileged to know Fritz wish he and his lovely wife well in his coming years of a well-earned retirement.

Falls City Missionary's Faith Paramount in Battle With Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the story of a courageous individual is always an interesting story. We are intrigued by the question, "What would I do in that situation?" But to those of us who merely read about such individuals, there is always a bit of unreality involved. To those who live the stories, there is nothing but reality.

To those of us who are fortunate enough to be healthy, there is too often a sense of unreality attached to the battle currently being waged against killing and crippling disease. To those who are stricken, there is only reality.

The stories of the courageous ones who are daily fighting this battle should serve as reminders that the battle is not one to be left to the afflicted.

A young Nebraskan, Rev. Ingram Yoder, and his wife, Delpha, had decided to dedicate their lives to the missionary work of the Methodist Church. They had spent some years in Chile and had been blessed with two fine children while serving in that post. Last year, while on leave for further study, they discovered that the young man had cancer.

With the hope that it will inspire all of us to do our part in the fight against this dread disease, I ask unanimous consent that the moving account which recently appeared in the Falls City (Nebr.) Journal concerning the courageous activity of this fine family after their heartbreaking discovery, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FALLS CITY MISSIONARY'S FAITH IN BATTLE WITH CANCER

(By Bill Schock)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Sunday night, music lovers who attended the Better Music week program here were thrilled by the violin solo played by Rev. Ingram Yoder. Many asked themselves: How can a man who is fighting a life or death battle with cancer continue to give so freely of himself? The answer is his determination to "live each day to the fullest." Feeling that his story might serve a purpose in the current Cancer Crusade, Mr. Yoder agreed to the following interview).

Just about a year ago at this time, Rev. Ingram Yoder, Methodist missionary to Chile, was playing tennis on the campus at the University of Kansas, where he was a graduate student.

He had been bothered a little with a minor muscular ache and during the game he noticed he was limping. He wrote it off as nothing and then in the summer when it persisted, he supposed it stemmed from foot trouble and got some arch supports. They did little to alleviate the situation, but it still was of not much concern to the Falls City clergyman who was working on a master's degree in Spanish at Kansas University while on furlough from Chile.

The steep hills of Mt. Oread suddenly became a problem once the fall term commenced and when his left leg began to swell after the treks to class, Delpha Yoder, a registered nurse, was alerted by the inflammation.

A trip to St. Luke's hospital in Kansas City followed and after X-rays the Yoders heard the shocking diagnosis: "You have a large bone tumor."

That was on October 4, and 4 days later the leg was amputated. The surgery healed quickly and in 3 weeks Ingram was back in class at Kansas University, cheerfully getting around on crutches. Just before Christmas he received his artificial leg and the Yoders were eagerly making plans for their return to Iquique and their beloved English college.

He had served there from 1950 to 1954 in short-term missionary work which he describes as the predecessor to the Peace Corps, except that it was church-motivated. After graduation from the Drew Seminary at Madison, N.J., and his ordination in 1957, he returned to Chile with his wife and they remained there until November of 1961. Their two children, Kimberly, 5, and Stevie, 4, were born in Iquique.

However, a physical check ordered by the Methodist board of missions soon after the surgery resulted in a series of events which shelved the Yoders' return to Chile for the immediate future.

The examination revealed a spot on a lung and the probability of surgery after a month's observation. The 34-year-old missionary decided to take his trouble to Mayo's.

The diagnosis at the famed Rochester clinic was even more heartbreaking than the earlier shock in Kansas City.

He had cancer, it had spread to both lungs and it was inoperable. His one chance for a remission lay in experimental drugs.

Chatting at his home at 307 East 18th Street, relaxed and talking freely about his battle with cancer, Mr. Yoder recalled that his first impulsive reaction was to return to Falls City and get his family settled, then return to Mayo's to see what could be done.

But then came a poignant husband and wife conference and the monumental decision to cast their lot with cancer research. In so doing, Ingram would be making a contribution in medicine's crash program to find a cure for cancer.

The effort was to be made with a drug called Fudr. It is so prohibitively expensive that it is not for sale, but because it is strictly an experimental thing it is provided free, along with other tests, to persons offering themselves in the cancer research program. The research projects are financed through the American Cancer Society and Government funds.

Since his original trip to Mayo's, Ingram has returned once to receive his second series of FUDR. He is on maximum dosages of the drug, whose function is to attack every fast-growing cell. As it attacks the cancer, it also attacks other fast-growing cells and possible uncomfortable side effects [diarrhea, vomiting, anemia and loss of hair being a few] result. The administering of the FUDR series lasts a week and a half.

The Falls Cityan will return to Mayo's May 20 and it is possible that by this time X-rays will determine whether the treatment is paying off. If not, the medical men may decide to switch him to another drug. He will do as they see fit.

Meanwhile, how does one in this situation meet the future?

Ingram's answer lies in his faith that God does not always promise a cure but does give a very real spiritual power to transfer what ever test may come into a victory.

"Live every day to the fullest" is his standby.

And he is doing just that. While he was at Mayo's last month, he filled eight speaking engagements in 12 days in the surrounding area, telling his audiences about mission work in Iquique and his approach to the cancer issue.

Sunday, he spoke at the Greenwood, Nebr., Methodist Church and then hurried home to play a beautiful violin solo in last night's Better Music Week program. He intends to continue his speaking schedule as conditions permit. His violin figures prominently in his summer's plans, as does his fishing pole. Not to mention that babysitting while Delpha works part time is a full-time job in itself.

While cancer is a frightening word to many persons, it is not so to Ingram, although he has found that when he is speaking to people, in the beginning it is easiest if cancer is mentioned casually.

The writer recalled that in Mr. Yoder's recent talk to a Methodist Church audience, the sanctuary became all but motionless and few eyes left the pulpit as the Chilean missionary related a few details of his personal fight with cancer. Did you notice it, he was asked.

Ingram nodded.

"It happens every time," he said.

He continued that he feels he is speaking for many others who experienced or are experiencing cancer's creeping onslaught. "(The late) Mrs. John Wiltse and Wayne Ramer have been a real inspiration to me."

"A cancer patient is giving a witness to a community—in this case Falls City—people are watching you sympathetically and you are giving your testimony," he declared. "When we stand outside of suffering and sickness, we sometimes wonder how we would react if we were put in a like situation. But with Christian faith there comes a strength of peace and mind that is simply amazing. There is no question but that this is the richest spiritual experience of my life.

"Death just doesn't become real until you are facing it," he remarked, "but whatever lies ahead, we are going to fight it to the end."

Ingram and Delpha are not giving up, by a long shot.

"There is a very fine line between reality and hope," he pointed out, "and that is what we are treading so delicately. One always is hoping for a small miracle to turn up and medically, of course, that is possible."

Their thoughts continually are on their work in Chile. "One place our hearts, desires, and dreams all are wrapped up in is our school in Iquique during these months of suspense," he said. "Whatever turns up we will take advantage of opportunities as they are."

How have friends reacted to this crisis in the Yoder home?

"You suddenly discover how many friends you have and how wonderful people can be," he explained. However, he realizes that because of the nature of his illness many friends have found it extremely difficult to write or talk with him about it.

Ingram is vitally concerned about the general public's apathy for cancer education and would like nothing better than to go from house to house in Falls City to urge people to learn the seven danger signals for cancer.

He has no physical pain whatsoever except for the discomfort connected with the dosages of FUDR. Persons expecting him to look and act like an ill man have to be surprised. For he certainly does not.

What about other patients in the cancer research program—do they meet this crisis with an equal courage and faith?

The affable missionary answered with a quotation from one of the specialists in the cancer program at Mayo's:

"The Curie Pavilion is not a depressed area. Cancer patients know what they are fighting and most accept it and face up to it. On the contrary, those who think they are ill and are perfectly well—those are the truly tragic cases."

Resolution of the Polish American Congress, Connecticut District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the Connecticut District of the Polish American Congress, at its quarterly meeting at Hartford on Sunday, May 26, 1963, adopted a resolution which appeals to the United States to take certain steps in regard to Poland. I have the highest respect for this organization and for the patriotism of its members to America and American democracy. I am therefore pleased to insert this resolution into the RECORD and commend it to my colleagues for the logic of the proposals contained therein.

The resolution reads as follows:

The delegates and officers of the Polish American Congress, District of Connecticut, being assembled at Hartford, Conn., at its quarterly meeting on May 26, 1963, did adopt the following resolution:

"We resolve: To reassert our determination of steadfastness in continuous struggle for a completely free and independent Poland within the framework of European stability, world peace and American security.

"We urge the U.S. Government to safeguard multilateral control of nuclear weapons within the NATO in such a way which would prevent the Federal Republic of Germany from gaining mastery of atomic weapons on the European Continent.

"To appeal to the United States and to all free nations of the world for prompt and final recognition of Poland's western boundary along the Oder and Niesse Rivers. It is our deep conviction that such a recognition would lessen the dependency of Poland and other East European nations on Russia, as the supposedly sole protector against renewed German revisionism.

"To appeal to the governments of the free world not to foresake Poland's right to territories lawlessly annexed by Russia.

"To ask our Government for further extension of economic, technical and cultural assistance to the Polish people.

"To appeal to the Congress of the United States that it rescind the amendment to the Foreign Trade Act, which deprives Poland of its most-favored-nation status. To the United States, trade with Poland is an insignificant position in statistics; to Poland it means the difference between a relative prosperity and lower standard of living.

"To send copies of this resolution to the two Connecticut Senators and six congressional Representatives."

Dated at Hartford, Conn., this 26th day of May 1963.

THADDEUS MALISZEWSKI,
President, Polish American Congress, District of Connecticut.

Cooperatives and the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont, Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, before the National Conference on Cooperatives and the Future, held in Washington, D.C., on April 29, 1963.

Senator AIKEN is the ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. In his committee and on the floor of the Senate, Senator AIKEN has demonstrated again and again his leadership in support of the cooperative movement.

Senator AIKEN is a great farm leader in the Senate, as he is with every subject to which he addresses his experience, wisdom, and rare judgment. I am sure that his address will be of great interest to many persons in our country.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOPERATIVES AND THE FUTURE

(By Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, National Conference on Cooperatives and the Future, Washington, D.C., April 29, 1963)

The three principal functions of cooperatives are buying, selling, and servicing.

These functions are performed for our farm, rural nonfarm, and urban populations.

Cooperation represents the efforts of large numbers of individuals—each of whom by himself would be considered too small to do business and perform services in a manner usually ascribed to big business.

Since coordination of efforts between urban and farm people still leaves much to be desired and since my own experience has been largely with the farm, I shall speak primarily about farm cooperatives tonight.

Ordinarily, a decrease in the number of organizations or in memberships would give little cause for rejoicing or even satisfaction.

Last year—1962—the number of farm cooperatives in the United States dropped off by 2 percent while the total number of memberships decreased 1 percent.

That these losses simply represent the trend toward larger, stronger, and more efficient farms and farm marketing units is indicated by the fact that while the number of memberships and cooperatives both declined the amount of business done showed a gross increase of 3.5 percent over the previous year.

What has happened to farm cooperatives has happened to nearly all segments of industry and commerce and indicates clearly the trend which we must ride and direct if we are to do our part in promoting the growth of the national economy and see to it that farm people share equitably in such growth.

You will note that I did not say we must follow the trend.

To follow is to lag behind and lose both profit and prestige.

The farm cooperative has many times in the past demonstrated its ability to lead and direct.

Proper direction of our economy, particularly our agricultural economy, is now more important than ever.

We have already demonstrated our ability to keep up in front.

The time has come when we have to show determination as well as ability.

To grow strong, cooperatives must be willing to branch out—to merge with other cooperatives in order to become more efficient, and even to go out of business when it strengthens the system as a whole.

Farmers cannot afford to be sentimental about their cooperatives.

They cannot plead for the right to exist on an emotional basis, or ask for special favors just because they are cooperatives.

Cooperatives have grown strong for one great and overriding reason: They have proved their right to exist by competing effectively in the marketplace.

They have provided services to their members where such services would not otherwise have been available.

Great strides have been made in increasing efficiency but, while there have been many cooperative consolidations in the last few years, not enough has been done in this area of development

Is it because we have become too much slaves to commercial habit and established marketing practices or is it just plain sentiment?

Have cooperative members fallen victim to pride of membership, assessing the value of their own cooperative on an emotional basis rather than facing the fact that 2 or 10 or 20 cooperatives, when merged into one strong association, gain important selling and purchasing equality?

The lone cooperative increasingly finds itself in the same position of competitive disadvantage as an independent grocer who is trying to compete against the supermarket.

No great supermarket chain would dream of trying to stand still.

They are always on the watch for new areas that may be developed and new merchandising techniques which promise to extend their business.

However, no supermarket organization would go into a new area without first conducting thorough market research studies of the area under consideration.

So, too, must our cooperatives spend more time and effort on market research and business management.

As never before, they must justify their right to exist by improving their competitive position—not only in local areas but in entire regions.

This means more cooperatives must be willing to go out of business as independent units, for there are still more organizations in the old established fields than are needed—too many for the farmers' own good.

Before the advent of the modern highway and electric lines it was necessary to have cooperative creameries every few miles.

These crossroads plants have now served their purpose and many can be continued only on a luxury basis.

While pride of membership is frequently the very backbone of the cooperative movement, this pride cannot be allowed to interfere with sound business judgment.

Farmers, as a rule, are people of good commonsense who will readily accept a merger proposition that is advanced on the basis that the overall strength of those cooperating will be increased and the prospects for greater dollar income will be improved.

A study conducted by the State of Wisconsin not long ago analyzed the entire cooperative structure in the State and came up with the conclusion that the 319 existing cooperatives could effectively be reduced to only 54 associations.

Larger and stronger cooperatives—with more service branches—can serve the members at lower operating costs.

This is both a challenge and an exceptional opportunity.

In this day of rapid centralization, many small independent cooperatives will necessarily expire while strong cooperative associations will grow and perform additional services to their members.

While the field for marketing, purchasing, and servicing cooperatives has been quite well covered, we should not conclude from this that there can be no broadening of co-op opportunities.

I doubt if we ever reach the point where further development of new cooperatives or new type organizations will be undesirable or unprofitable.

We have as yet scarcely touched the area of production and utilization co-ops.

A new field that is opening up rapidly now is that of harvesting and marketing forest products.

It is a rather sad story that for every dollar a farmer gets for timber stumpage, $17.60 is added before the ultimate user gets the finished product.

This wide spread is due to harvesting, transportation, processing, and marketing costs.

What farmer, however, owning 50 to 100 acres of woodland, can afford $10,000 machines for roadbuilding or harvesting equipment?

What rural community can afford a manufacturing plant on an individual basis?

Fortunately, many rural communities do have small manufacturing plants but many more have not.

The transient purchaser of timber cannot be expected to drag out his harvesting procedure in order to keep the population of a rural community from drying up.

With more cooperative effort modern forestry and less costly processing methods could be practiced—sustained yield and sustained income be anticipated, maximum market prices be enjoyed, byproducts be salvaged and best of all a healthy rural community be perpetuated.

The road lies wide open for an expansion of cooperative farm forestry.

Closely allied with the opportunity for cooperative farm forestry and also capable of being extended to areas where trees are not so plentiful is the great new field of cooperative commercial recreation.

I am not speaking of nonprofit recreation but of programs whereby farmers may unite to not only make a real addition to their income but in many cases to make it possible to continue to operate farms which for the production of crops alone might be uneconomic.

Included in this category we find trail building for riding and hiking, fishing and hunting, wildlife sanctuaries, winter sports development and just plain vacation areas.

With the urban population expanding at a rapid pace and feeling a more proprietary interest in the natural resources of the Nation—with 90 percent of our people desiring and insisting upon outdoor recreation—we should not ignore what is perhaps our most rapidly growing industry.

While this growth is attracting great numbers of individual and corporate promoters the fact remains that in many areas the cooperative method could prove to be the best method of dealing with the situation.

One of the fallacies receiving rather wide distribution these days relates to special privileges which co-ops are supposed to receive under the law.

According to these fallacies all co-ops receive tax benefits not available to others engaged in the same line of business—and low-cost interest rates give rural electric co-ops special advantages over utility corporations.

You and I know that the charge that co-ops receive special tax benefits is a piece of pure fiction.

We know that co-ops pay normal property taxes and if earnings exceed the amount allowable for safe reserves and are not refunded to the members that these earnings are required to pay income taxes.

You and I know, too, that the benefits from the interest rate on loans to REA co-ops are scarcely a drop in the bucket compared with the tax benefits allowed the petroleum interests, the pipeline interests and the electric industry.

You and I know these things but the majority of the people do not.

We know that much of the enormous development of the U.S. economy during the last 20 years has resulted from the extension of REA lines throughout the Nation.

The public at large does not realize that.

The REA is under severe attack today.

Its enemies are making unprecedented profits themselves.

They leave no stone unturned in their continuing quest for monopoly.

They are not willing to live and let live.

Their strength in the Congress is greater than at any time within the last 25 years.

Why am I putting emphasis on the danger to rural electric cooperatives at this time?

Why should a dairy co-op or grain co-op or cotton co-op be disturbed?

It is because if REA co-ops can be weakened, crippled, or destroyed then other kinds of cooperatives will come next.

It is not the REA alone that is under attack.

It is the cooperative system of doing business.

How do we combat the type of attack which REA co-ops are undergoing today?

Mainly by getting the true story before the people at every opportunity.

By operating the co-op organizations so efficiently that all members will be fully aware of the benefits they receive from this means of doing business.

By recognizing that the primary purposes of cooperatives lie in filling unmet needs or in exercising regulatory powers in the economy at large.

By refusing to let co-op organizations be used for purposes only remotely connected with the business for which they are established.

By guarding against discriminatory legislation and keeping Members of Congress fully informed.

Cooperatives cannot expect exemption from antimonopoly laws or any other laws applicable to business in general.

We can expect and should insist upon such legislation as will insure equality of opportunity with other segments of commerce and industry.

We must insist upon nondiscriminatory administration of the law and a handsoff policy on the part of Government officials when farmer cooperatives undertake to strengthen their position by every legal means.

Happily there have been recent indications that the Department of Justice may be modifying what in past years has appeared to be a policy of harassment of farm cooperatives.

What should be the role of the Federal Government in the field of cooperation?

I will say again now as I have said many times in the past that it is the function of Government to furnish the tools with which to operate.

It should not be the function of Government itself to use those tools or to exert management responsibilities over farm cooperatives.

Government can and should carry on research work helpful to cooperatives just as it does for all factors of our economy—and just as it is doing today under the leadership of Dr. Joseph Knapp and his able staff.

It is, of course, the function of Government to enforce laws and regulations on an impartial basis.

The future well-being of agriculture, may I say, does not depend on Government except as government is a servant of the people.

It depends upon farmers themselves, their organizations, their leadership and their mangement.

The gravest danger to cooperatives will not be found today in the efforts of others to put us out of business or in the desire of any Government officials to control or direct our operations.

It is to be found in the complacency and inertia which has developed within our own organizations.

These culprits, while byproducts of success, can also prove to be our worst enemies.

The agricultural production of the United States is the envy of the world today.

It has been a most potent weapon in the cold war.

There are those who think agriculture is expendable.

We face competition or loss of markets particularly on the international front if these people have their way.

We will need all our power to protect our well-being.

Farm cooperatives are the backbone of our agricultural strength.

We don't need to waste time complaining—we need to plan, to work, and to fight.

We can fight successfully only with a united front—let's fight.

Government Interference Is Wrecking the Cotton Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in the current issue of the Reader's Digest, there is an excellent article, by Robert S. Strother, on the Nation's coton problems and its effects on both growers and textile manufacturers.

Mr. Strother correctly notes that if American cotton is to survive, if the cotton farmer and the cotton textile manufacturer are to remain vital parts of our economy, there must be remedial legislation without further delay.

I commend this article to Members of the Senate who are as concerned as I am about the future of cotton; and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Costly Chaos in Cotton—Time To End It: Ill-Conceived Government Interference Is Wreaking Havoc in an Industry That Was Formerly One of the Leading U.S. Dollar Earners Abroad

(By Robert S. Strother)

With the very best of intentions, the U.S. Government is bringing ruin to the American cotton-growing and cotton-textile industries—and losing nearly a half billion dollars a year in the process.

Only a dozen years ago cotton was among the most valuable of all our exports. Our cottongrowers supplied 47 percent of the cotton fiber in world trade, and our mills 558 billion square yards of cotton piece goods. Today our growers supply only 33 percent of the cotton fiber traded, and our mills only 417 billion square yards of cotton piece goods. In the last decade 3,711,000 cotton-system spindles have been shut down, and 282,000 textile-mill jobs—15 percent of the total—have disappeared.

In the last decade, too, our imports of cotton textiles have multiplied tenfold. In 1960, for the first time since recordkeeping began, imports exceeded exports, and they are still rising. As every customer of a U.S. department store or supermarket can see, our display counters are loaded with blankets, lace curtains, tablecloths, underwear, shirts, dressing gowns—cotton textiles in almost every form known—bought abroad and offered here at low prices.

On top of this, we have 8,500,000 bales of surplus cotton—$1.7 billion worth—in storage, in spite of the fact that we spent approximately 392 million tax dollars last year alone in efforts to dump, barter, or in effect, give the fiber away.

In short, cotton growers and processors are losing markets rapidly, both to foreign-grown cotton and to manmade fibers, and they will go on losing them until we have no cotton growers and mills left, or until our ill-conceived farm and trade policies are radically revised.

The trouble in cotton began in the 1930's. At that time, the United States supplied nearly half of the world's requirements, selling an average of 6,300,000 500-pound bales of cotton overseas annually, at a profit. Then, to help the small, depression-ridden farmer survive, the U.S. Government started propping up the price of cotton with public money, as it has done with wheat, corn, soybeans, and other farm commodities. This kept poor marginal farmers in business. But it also raised U.S. cotton prices so high that our cotton began to lose buyers in the world market.

After World War II, tropical nations around the globe saw a chance to profit by undercutting the U.S. high price for raw cotton. In addition, American point 4 advisers in countries such as India, Pakistan, Egypt, Sudan, Mexico, and Brazil helped local growers with improved seed, machinery, and instruction in advanced methods of cultivation. Production abroad soon soared to record heights, and the world price of cotton fell. U.S. cotton, with its price pegged at around 35.5 cents, could not compete. By 1956 we were selling only 2,200,000 bales abroad, instead of the 6,300,000 we had been selling 20 years earlier. Our stockpiled surplus rose to 14,500,000 bales.

Something had to be done.

Congress might have cut the subsidy being paid to cotton farmers, thus letting the price of U.S. cotton fall to a competitive level. The growers of about 85 percent of our cotton could have withstood this and been healthier for it, because it would have preserved their market, and because they don't need a subsidy to compete with growers anywhere anyway. But the small, inefficient growers of the remaining 15 percent would have been squeezed out, some into other crops, some into other businesses. So, instead of cutting the subsidy, Congress piled a new subsidy on top of the old one, setting in motion a scheme which became notorious as "two-price cotton."

This new scheme directed the Secretary of Agriculture to subsidize the sale of cotton abroad to any extent required to get rid of it. That meant, in effect, that he would buy up the surplus of U.S. cotton at the pegged price of, say, 33.5 cents a pound, and then dump it somewhere overseas at, say, 25.8 cents. He was empowered to take the difference out of the U.S. taxpayer.

At the same time, U.S. cotton mills were obliged to buy domestic cotton at the pegged price because there is a virtual embargo on raw-cotton imports. Thus, adoption of the two-price system meant that U.S. mill owners had to pay $167 a bale for the same cotton that the United States was glad to sell to a foreign mill for $129.

Spokesmen for the U.S. textile industry bitterly denounced two-price cotton as unfair Government discrimination against U.S. mills—and predicted a flood of textile imports. Their forecast was quickly confirmed. As the import tide rose month by month, many U.S. plants closed down, and others went on reduced work weeks. For the people who gained their living in the U.S. textile business, there was irony in the swirling tide of imports: their own income-tax payments had helped finance it.

Meanwhile, the United States had embarked on a second course which hastened the wrecking started by the two-price scheme. In a humanitarian move to provide cheap textiles to clothe the ragged masses of Asia and the Middle East, U.S. foreign-aid administrators built a number of new textile plants abroad and modernized others. The new mills were equipped with the most advanced machinery. American engineers, designers, and merchandising men with vaunted know-how were sent abroad to help.

These plants, too, moved in on the American market. With wage rates as low as one-fourth to one-tenth of those enforced by law in U.S. mills, with U.S. cotton available at a discount (and even in some cases bought with U.S. aid funds), and with efficient new plants financed in part by the American people, how could they lose?

Thus, the ruin of the cotton-growing industry was spread to the cotton-textile industry. Hundreds of thousands of Americans lost their jobs.

There have been periodic—and inept—attempts to doctor the situation. U.S. textile exporters could not stay in business under a 25-percent handicap in raw-material costs; so an "equalization fee" was introduced. Under it, exports may recover, again from the U.S. Treasury, 8.5 cents a pound for the cotton content of the goods they sell abroad.

Most of the new would-be remedies were designed, however, to regulate the flow of imports. These, too, have proved fruitless. Japan, which buys large quantities of U.S. cotton (1,103,000 bales, or 39 percent of her requirements, in 1961-62), adopted a "voluntary" quota on her shipments of cotton textiles to the United States. But then Hong Kong rushed to supply what Japan relinquished, followed by the Republic of Korea, Taiwan, Pakistan, India, the Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Italy, and France.

Seeing little progress in resolving cotton's dilemma, some administration spokesmen seem inclined to wash their hands of the mess that the Government has done so much to create. The Washington Post said outright what Under Secretary of State George Ball seems to have hinted: perhaps the U.S. textile industry should consider itself a "terminal case," and arrange to expire quietly while the Government undertakes to train its remaining 881,000 workers for other, unspecified jobs. "Sustained protection of uneconomic mills," the newspaper said, "would close our markets to struggling nations in whose advancement we have invested millions in foreign aid."

Textile people flare at the idea that the welfare of "struggling nations" should be of more concern to the U.S. Government than that of the two million Americans engaged in the domestic textile and garment industries. They attack the idea that their industry is obsolete. "Foreign producers are not underselling us because they produce a prettier, more serviceable or more durable product," says Robert C. Jackson, executive vice president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, "but solely because they have access to cotton—including American cotton—at one third less than we must pay, and because they pay a wage that could not be tolerated in this country."

"I recognize that foreign trade policy is an integral part of overall foreign policy," Robert T. Stevens, president of the J. P. Stevens Co. mills, has said. "Textiles, however, have been called upon to carry too much of the load—unless our Government desires to consider the textile industry expendable."

What lies ahead for this sick industry?

With President Kennedy's approval, the Department of Agriculture proposed in November 1961 that an equalization fee of 8.5 cents a pound be levied on the cotton content of textile imports, thus exactly offsetting the export subsidy. "A tariff to offset a subsidy that compensates for a price support," snorted the New York Times.

Fortunately, the Tariff Commission rejected the proposal, and the President tossed the problem back to the Department of Agriculture for referral to Congress, where one of the new ideas is to let handlers other than the producers buy U.S. cotton at the 32.5-cent support price, sell it to U.S. mills at the 24-cent world price, and then collect the difference of hundreds of millions of dollars annually from the ever-loving U.S. Treasury. The favored remedy, in short, is still another huge subsidy—an attempt, in the words of the Baltimore Sun, to "balance by new interference the unbalance wrought by earlier interference in previous efforts to balance still earlier interference."

We don't need any more remedies of this sort. We need, basically, to get rid of the subsidy paid to U.S. cotton growers, so that the price of our cotton can move toward the free-market level. This can be done gradually, over several crop seasons, and it must be done. The Committee for Economic Development and the American Farm Bureau Federation agree on this. The growers of 85 percent of U.S. cotton are by a wide margin the most efficient producers in the world, and can compete globally without leaning on a subsidy. It makes no sense to kill off both them and the cotton-textile industry in an attempt to keep the growers of the remaining 15 percent down on the farm.

"The little cotton farmer is fighting a losing battle, and knows it," a Department of Agriculture official in Georgia said to me recently. "The Government, instead of trying to keep these guys in business, ought to be helping them to get out and into something useful. It ought to give those who want it training and transition loans. A plan like that could save us a lot of money in the long run. It could also save the industry.

World consumption of cotton is increasing steadily. Despite its present troubles, U.S. cotton at the right price has a tremendous opportunity to recapture and expand its markets. It was U.S. research that doubled the cotton yield per acre in 30 years, and that opened vast new markets by developing cotton textiles that resist wrinkling, scorching, and mildew. Still greater discoveries may lie just ahead—but only if price supports, reduced gradually over several seasons, are used as a temporary bridge to carry the entire industry to solid economic ground, and no longer as a barrier to change.

The people of the United States, in the hope of promoting prosperity and peace, have assumed enormous burdens, both economic and military, around the globe. Our commitments have been based on confidence in the Nation's unprecedented economic strength. To allow that strength to be undermined by carelessness or lack of foresight—as it has been in dealing with the cotton problem—is to invite disaster. We cannot improve the world's economy by weakening our own.

How Patriotism Came to Our Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in the May 1963 issue of the South Dakota Education Association Journal there is an excellent article by Mrs. Donna L. Henseler entitled "How Patriotism Came To Our Family."

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mrs. Donna L. Henseler calls herself a "misplaced Minnesotan." Her parental home was at Worthington, Minn., but she came to Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and earned a degree in English in 1948. For the first 3 years after graduation she taught at Lyons, S. Dak., and then in 1951 married Kenneth J. Henseler, present senior high principal at Yankton, S. Dak.

When she was first married both she and her husband taught at Brandon, S. Dak., and both did graduate work at Montana University. While her husband continued in the Brandon system and became principal, Mrs. Henseler says she "retired" to rear a family. They have three boys—ages 9, 7, and 4.

Mrs. Henseler will receive her M.A. degree in English from the University of South Dakota this coming June. She is also a part-time English instructor at the university.

With all of her duties involved in studies, teaching, and raising three fine boys she has also authored an outstanding article on the meaning of the Fourth of July—our Independence Day—and how she explained its importance to her young sons. I commend this article to the reading of all my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW PATRIOTISM CAME TO OUR FAMILY

("I did not write this story for publication originally, but only as a story for my boys to have when they grew up.

Then, after listening to comments made about the need for "teaching" patriotism, I have thought that perhaps our experience might be of value to other parents and teachers."—Donna L. Henseler)

NOTE.—Mrs. Donna L. Henseler calls herself a misplaced Minnesotan. Her parental home was at Worthington but she came to Augustana College, Sioux Falls, and earned a degree in English in 1948. For the first 3 years after graduation she taught at Lyons and then, in 1951, married Kenneth J. Henseler, present senior high principal at Yankton. When she was first married, both she and her husband taught at Brandon, and both did graduate work at Montana University. While her husband continued in the Brandon system and became principal, Mrs. Henseler says she "retired" to rear a family. They have three boys—ages 9, 7, and 4. Mrs.

Henseler will receive her M.A. degree in English from SUSD, Vermillion, this June. This year she has also been a half-time English instructor there.)

May is many things. May is little boys who leap from the school room into brilliant vacation sunlight. May is small girls who hippity-hop home with best friends, planning a playhouse for their dolls. May is a teacher's sigh, half-relieved that the long year is over again, half-worried that the most given might not have been quite enough. And May, for many teachers, is the prelude to lengthy hours of summer school split in half by an all too short July Fourth vacation. May is many things.

As this May brings school to its close, I find myself recalling again a very special summer experience, a very special Fourth of July experience, which enriched our whole family. Oh, I am grateful beyond measure to the patient teachers who have endured my children through the long winter. They have taught so much, knowingly—the three R's; unknowingly—the gentle are of living. But summers our children are ours again. And some things parents must teach. That Fourth of July, long since past and put into mothballs, is one such lesson I recall yearly when May forecasts a lazy, golden summer. I recall it in a kind of humble pride—pride and gratitude, too, because I may never know another experience just like it. For on that Fourth of July quite suddenly—and without a certificate—I became a teacher.

July 3 had been a hot day and a trying one. My three small sons seemed bent on running me ragged with constant requests for firecrackers, cherry bombs, or at least a supply of "snakes." By the time I had finally got the last one, our eldest, into his bed, I could not resist the urge to lie down beside him for a few moments of sleepy conversation.

The job of mother involves much. There is the everyday work to be done, the makeshift psychology one uses in dealing with three very individual personalities, the patience, frayed nerves, discipline, and—redeeming it all—the storytelling. Thus when my son begged, "Tell me a story, Mom," I tried to gather my thoughts, all wandering with plodding feet, to make a new story for him.

BILLY BADGER'S FOURTH OF JULY

"Did I ever tell you about Billy Badger's Fourth of July?" I asked. Billy Badger, our homemade hero, had been invented when I first began storytelling. He had suffered some sadly boring adventures, especially when my mind sagged, imagination dulled. Billy had remained, somehow in spite of this, a star-studded adventurer whose cunning and valor were without parallel.

"No," my son breathed in wonder. "Did Billy Badger have firecrackers too? Or"—This in an exasperated tone—"wouldn't his mother let him have any either?"

"Oh yes. Billy had firecrackers, but of course not until the day of the Fourth. When Billy asked his mother for firecrackers, she said, 'Yes Billy, you may have some. But first, do you know why we have a Fourth of July?' Billy shook his head and his mother went on. 'The Fourth of July is really called Independence Day.'

Billy frowned. 'What does that mean, mother?'

"Well," said his mother, "to be independent means to be free. You see, many years ago when our country was very young, the people of America didn't own their land. A king who lived far across the great ocean claimed it as his. One day a group of men—and they were great men—decided they wanted to be free from the king. They decided they loved their new little country enough that they would fight to be free if they had to. They knew they might die in fighting to free their country, but they loved it so much that this wasn't important.' "

"They loved their country enough to die for it?" This from my son, surprised and not understanding wholly.

"That was just what Billy Badger said to his mother. And she answered, 'Yes, for if a person isn't free to live the way he wishes, then life isn't really worth living.

" 'Well, the people of the tiny country, America, sent a letter to the king telling him they would belong to him no longer. We call this letter the Declaration of Independence. When the king received the letter, he was very angry. He sent many ships full of soldiers to punish the people for daring to be free. But the people were ready, or as ready as they could be. Farmers and shopkeepers, doctors and fishermen, all banded together and fought a long, cruel war. It wasn't an easy fight, and many people did die during the weary months of battle.

" 'Finally, with Gen. George Washington as their leader, the people of the new United States won their freedom. The soldiers of the king went back to their ships and sailed home. From that day on, we have celebrated the birthday of the United States on the Fourth of July. Every time we pop a firecracker we are reminded of the war for freedom. Every time we see a rocket blaze into the sky we think of the happiness of the people when at last they won independence.'

" 'Billy Badger sat very still for a long time. Then he said, 'Mother, I'm going to tell that story to all my friends at the village. The Fourth of July will be lots more fun knowing it is the birthday party of our country.' "

The story was ended. My son lay so quietly I thought he had gone to sleep. Then he said, "I liked that story, Mom. Tell me another."

"One's enough," I laughed and creaked my aching frame up and into action again. "Tomorrow I'll tell you how Billy outwitted Old Mr. Hawk at the village picnic."

TRIP TO THE LAKE

The Fourth was, as it usually is in the Midwest, a sunny day with a crackling blue sky and a lazy breeze which meandered through the apple trees in our back yard. We spent the day quietly at home, listening to the spit and snort of firecrackers as they flung echoes back and forth across town.

Then in the evening we drove to the lake near our town, stopping on the way at a fireworks stand where the boys, in a frenzy of delight, picked out the long-awaited treasures. Once at the lake, we took a lazy swim while our youngest dabbled in the sand on the beach, building miniature castles complete with moat and driftwood drawbridge.

The sun set, flinging crimson fires into the western sky and touching the quiet ripples of the lake with lavender. Fireflies danced through the trees, lighting their own tiny fireworks as if in tribute to the day. And at last it was time for the supreme magic: the fireworks. With "ooh's" and "aaah's" we appropriately greeted each new piece as my husband, the official lighter, sent it soaring out over the lake in brilliant, solitary splendor. We all laughed uproariously at the one dud in the lot that fizzled, fuzzled, and spit vaingloriously into oblivion. Last were the sparklers. We lined them up in rows, like soldiers, in the sand and watched them shower their delicate spray over the beach. Some we saved to wave as they burned, and the boys wrote their names in huge misshapen letters on the fresh evening air.

Then it was time to go. Leave-taking at the lake is always slow, for we hate to give up that lazy tranquility which one wraps about himself like an old, comfortable robe. But eventually we piled beach ball, blanket, lunch basket, water toys, and ourselves into the car and slowly started home. We were quiet, each of us savoring the still bliss of simple existence. Then it happened.

THE LESSON COMING HOME

"Do you know," said my eldest son, then 7, "why we celebrate the Fourth of July?"

"To shoot off firecrackers," answered my middle son who, at 5, had a remarkably flat-footed logic.

"No, silly. The Fourth of July is the birthday of our country. Its real name is Independence Day."

"Inde— Independence? What's that?" puzzled my 5 year old, and our smallest son, 3, turned to listen.

"That means to be free," explained the oldest with great pride in his exclusive knowledge. And then it came, the whole story from start to finish. Just as I had mumbled it to him, half asleep, the night before. The tears, the anguish, the joy of freedom won—everything was there in place, precise and wonderful. The great love of country, the struggle—yes, even unto death—he had remembered every word. And somehow in the clear, uncluttered wisdom of children he had understood it, believed it for its enduring truth.

Our 5 year old sat quietly for a second or two when the story was over. Then he started to sing—loudly, happily, and off-tune—the most logical and appropriate song that was ever sung on the Fourth of July: "Happy birthday to you, happy birthday to you * * *."

There were tears in my eyes, a tumultuous lump in my throat that would not be swallowed. But I joined him as did all of the family in singing, "* * * Happy birthday, dear America, happy birthday to you."

Then when I thought my heart could stand no more of this surfeit of joy and love, my oldest son began to sing again, for we are a singing family:

"Oh, beautiful for spacious skies,
For amber waves of grain;
For purple mountain's majesties
Above the fruited plain;

"America, America,
God shed His grace on thee;
And crown thy good with brotherhood
From sea to shining sea."

The rest of the ride back to town is vague in my mind. I know there were many screams of joy as countless rockets flared into the darkening sky. For me, the miracle had happened. Nothing could overshadow it. Stumbling, fumbling my way through parenthood I had accidentally spilled water on ready ground; and with that unplanned draught had burst through the clean earth of young minds a slim and tender plant that would be named Patriotism.

Somewhere, lurking in the gloom of my deeper self, I heard a voice whispering to me that there is more my sons must learn. Someday they must learn that a free country does not stay free without sacrifice. They must learn that within their beloved country there is much that is ugly—men with too much power and greed to give unselfishly; people who have lost pride of independence, who quake at the thought of speaking for whatever is right; pseudosophisticates who scoff at love of country as passé. They will learn much, my sons. But that night a seed had sprouted with green, curling, young leaves, a seed that could grow into a strong vine of patriotism for their native land.

Then I chuckled to myself, with my tears trickling unseen in the darkness. I grinned at the star-spangled night and formulated a pompous, dignified speech to the great leaders of our country:

Oh wise and worthy ones, you may preach and pray at us. You may plan a moral equivalent for war in order to spur patriotism. You may enlist young Americans to give the word to the world about democracy's worth. You may shake a finger under our noses and thunder that we have forgotten how to love our country with a fierce, unyielding love. But for all your sound and fury, you cannot weld the future any stronger or promise a safe tomorrow with more assurance than a 5-year-old boy who sings in sturdy exuberance from the pure, undiminished spring of his soul, "Happy birthday, dear America, happy birthday to you."

Staten Island Chapter, American Institute of Architects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my address before the Staten Island chapter of the American Institute of Architects on May 20, 1963 at the Meurot Club on Staten Island:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. MURPHY

My first exposure to the architectural and engineering profession was as a student in engineering in the military topography and graphics classrooms at the U.S. Military Academy wherein I spent many hours at a drawing board, laboring with a T-square and a chisel-pointed pencil, learning the mechanics of the trade.

It equipped me with some insight into the problems and the severe mental training to which this great profession dedicates itself. I further learned that the architectural calling requires great personal integrity and complete dedication to the problems of its industry which are staggering in scope, variety, and complexity. In fact, I feel for this very reason that the future national problems which are growing increasingly more complex will require that the political representatives of the country be enlisted more and more from the professional ranks.

There are many reasons for this, including tremendous additions to the body of human knowledge every year, international and ideological competition, and the magnification of age-old problems by sheer force of numbers as populations explode and concentrate in urban areas. The Federal Government is, to a significant extent, aware of this need for greater intellectual development among the Nation's citizenry as is evidenced by the various aid-to-education programs for the contracting of research and training services of educational institutions in the interest of national welfare and defense, for support of individuals for whom there is special Federal responsibility, for support of schools in areas where Federal activity would result in undue burdens on school services without such support, for support of education in special areas such as vocational education.

In the field of engineering, funds for undergraduates are primarily in the form of payments to veterans enrolled in educational institutions. At the postdoctoral level, the National Institutes of Health, and the National Science Foundation provide fellowships and training grants, and the Department of State provides research grants and grants for university teaching through its Educational Exchange Program. At the graduate level, research fellowships are made available by NIH as well as under the National Defense Education Act. Also the National Science Foundation awards grants for teacher training, research participation, and fellowships at the graduate, as well as the undergraduate level. The Atomic Energy Commission grants awards for special schools and courses, and the Department of Defense, the Treasury, and NASA pay expenses for training military and civilian personnel in educational institutions.

The National Science Foundation also provides funds for summer science training for secondary students. The Department of the Interior conducts mining safety training as an adult education program for mine workmen.

In 1960, $62.4 million of Federal funds were provided for education in the field of engineering for a total of 90,253 students, trainees, both professional and nonacademic, and teachers. These and similar programs by all prospects should remain available for some time to come. Among the forces creating the need for such programs is the vast proliferation of space and missile projects at the Federal level, the many urban renewal and expansion projects at the State and local levels, and the cooperation of Federal and State Governments in public works projects such as the new interstate highway programs. Examples of these right here in Staten Island are the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge and the Gowanus and Clove Lakes Expressways on either side of it which are currently under construction. These as well as the network of Federal-State aided roads that will also lead to and from the bridge will be part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. The new bridge and its links will probably result in a tripling of Staten Island's present population by 1975 and thus give considerable impetus to urban renewal and area redevelopment projects.

Because of the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge, Staten Island may well have a new deepwater channel extending along its southern and western waterways through to the Arthur Kill, thereby greatly increasing its economic attraction for industry.

The trend to a more populous and dynamic Staten Island is also evidenced by the projected post office building to be constructed on the east side of Manor Road 200 feet north of Victor Boulevard which will be of rectangular design with a modern brick-and-glass facade and have an estimated interior area of over 39,000 square feet.

The shortage of engineers is aggravated by the fact that, while rate of growth in graduate engineering increases (the rate of growth in doctorates of engineering has been triple that in other fields and in master degrees double), there has been a 5-year decline in the number of undergraduate engineering students. In 1962 about 36,000 engineers were graduated from 209 colleges and universities in the United States. This total was 6 percent less than the number of 1961 engineering graduates. The decline apparently will continue unless something is done about it, for the number of freshmen enrolling dropped 2.3 percent last year.

I point out the shortage of engineers and illustrate it by the fact that in the House of Representatives at the present time, the special subcommittee on Federal aid to highways program, in which I am participating, is holding an investigation of the Arizona highway development. The hearings reveal that because of the inadequacy in the staffing of the State Public Works Department, many malpractices existed in construction. This problem does not confine itself to Arizona, but at the present time there are only 10 States which are recognized by the Bureau of Roads as meeting their requirements for properly overseeing the Federal interstate highway program.

The President, in a special message on education sent to Congress on January 29 of this year, proposed "a comprehensive, balanced program to enlarge the Federal Government's investment in the education of its citizens," which was embodied in the proposed National Education Improvement Act of 1963.

The act would provide a program of grants to aid public and private nonprofit institutions in the training of scientific, engineering, and medical technicians in 2-year college-level programs; and a program covering up to 50 percent of costs of constructing, equipping, and operating the necessary academic facilities.

The President also recommends expanding the National Science Foundation program for training institutes for teachers in the natural and social sciences, engineering, and mathematics to provide for upgrading the knowledge and skills of 46,000 teachers. This program is especially important to engineers who have been out of school for many years whose knowledge in this era of rapid scientific advancement has a tendency toward obsolescence. In a recent conference in Chicago on reducing obsolescence of engineering skills, participants said that the gap between engineering generations is most glaring in mathematics. No longer merely a tool for engineering, mathematics is a peculiar and indispensable language of its own. Difficulty with newer mathematics itself often prevents an engineer from keeping up with newly presented papers in his field.

As I have said, in the face of crucial national needs, the Federal Government has a vested interest in the number and quality of engineers in all specialized areas. In 1960, the Federal Government employed 61,000 engineers. NASA, which alone employed some 4,100 in 1960, currently employs about 5,600 and will probably need additional scientists and engineers at a rate of about 1,000 per year for the next 3 or 4 years. In the field of public works various governmental activities draw heavily on the services of both government engineers and private engineering consulting firms. In the past 25 years we have witnessed great progress in the field of highway design and construction in developing plans for the Interstate Highway System.

During the past 13 years since the comprehensive program of slum clearance resulting from the enactment of the Housing Act of 1949, hundreds of Federal agencies have been working with the Federal agencies on urban renewal projects. According to the annual report of the Urban Renewal Administration, which administers the urban planning assistance program authorized by the Housing Act of 1954, as of the end of 1960, 475 communities in 43 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands had taken advantage of urban renewal aids.

Of special interest to the Nation's architects is, of course, our tremendous urban growth in recent years. Four-fifths of our population increase in the past decade has been in our metropolitan centers: 70 percent of our people now live in urban areas, and even the smaller towns are feeling the impact of growth in their communities. Rapid urbanization will continue in the decades ahead not only in our metropolitan centers but in our small towns as well. It is this need which offers so much challenge and opportunity to architects and city planners. Part of the impetus to solving urban planning and development problems has been and will continue to be provided by the urban planning assistance program. Under the Housing Act of 1961, the Federal share of the total cost of any planning project can be as much as two-thirds rather than the previous one-half. In some localities falling under the provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, grants may amount to as much as three-fourths of the planning project cost.

In a recent keynote address, G. Holmes Perkins, dean of the School of Fine Arts at the University of Pennsylvania, said:

"Tomorrow's architect will obviously be involved in urban design. His interest and his acts will impinge upon the landscape, on art, on city planning, on engineering; in fact, upon the total urban environment."

In the same address Dean Perkins went on to describe a new role confronting the architect as he will have to work in ever-closer cooperation with engineers, economists, and sociologists because Government participation and new methods of financing have made possible an enormously enlarged scale of community development. Whereas before the war nine-tenths of our housing was built by operators who built less than 10 houses a year, today the big operator is dominant. Because of these changes it has become vital that the architect understand and guide the financier, the realtor, and the Government official by participating in the decision making at the programing stage. The problems of modern urban planning pose enormous challenges to the talent, education, wisdom, and patience of this and coming generations of architects. The role of the architect will be of critical importance, for his success, influence, and creative imagination will determine largely whether we build and inhabit a nightmarish or a beautiful environment.

Philadelphia's Playgrounds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, Recreation Commissioner Robert W. Crawford of the city of Philadelphia, who lives in my neighborhood, has long been considered one of the leading experts on recreation in the country. Now the New York Times and the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin commend the recreation facilities in our great city and the unusual equipment which is used for the benefit of our people.

I include the two editorial comments because they are not only a tribute to the city of Philadelphia but to our distinguished commissioner. He is now serving under the third of our great mayors who moved our city to a leading position in the Nation. Mayor James H. J. Tate and his predecessors Mayors Clark and Dilworth have supported men and women in their efforts to make Philadelphia an outstanding city in all of its facilities.

The editorials follow:

[From the New York Times, May 20, 1963]

PHILADELPHIA'S PLAYGROUNDS

Several years ago two 350-pound gorillas were used to test playground equipment in Central Park. The large thought was that if the swings held up under their weight, they would be fit for 50-pound children. The heavyhanded approach to New York's playgrounds continues to this day: get strong material that will stand up, without too much regard to the child's sense of adventure or his parent's sense of danger.

Our department of parks is understandably concerned about the operation and replacement costs of its extensive and important facilities. But there is nothing in the city rule book or budget saying that imagination and the latest in design and safety are forbidden. Visitors to Philadelphia the other day, members of the private New York Council for Parks and Playgrounds, had an eye opener there. They saw equipment in a rainbow of colors instead of drab antirust paints. In addition to swings, slides, and seesaws, they observed such playthings as spaceships and leather-strip seats. More importantly, instead of concrete and asphalt there were sand and tanbark below. Any parent who has watched his child hanging in hesitation at the top of a slide can appreciate what a soft base means in terms of safety and reassurance.

Thanks to voluntary parental funds and neighborhood goading, a few playgrounds in the city already have more imaginative playthings than they used to have, admittedly with the full cooperation of the department of parks. But these are only the merest beginnings. New York ought to be able to—and it can—afford the type of equipment Philadelphia has already. There is nothing sacred about drabness or concrete.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, May 21, 1963]

CITY PLAYGROUNDS IMPRESS NEW YORKERS

Once again, out-of-town experts have come here to look at Philadelphia's recreation facilities and have liked what they have seen.

Some 65 representatives of New York civic groups toured the city's facilities and took back home many ideas for betterment of their own playgrounds and parks.

They noticed that Philadelphia's recreation centers, in the main, were not all drab paint and concrete or packed clay. They saw children slide, fall, or jump into tanbark and sand, not cinders. They saw them crawl through, climb over, or investigate strange looking equipment, space ships, bizarre animals, concrete clowns with wide grins, simulated fire engines to be ridden.

But most of all, they found the equipment imaginative, not stereotyped, bright and clean and instructive. The equipment is to intrigue, to test, to develop physical fitness, yet be safe and entertaining. That's what recreation is all about and the New York group, the latest of dozens of other such groups from major cities, was impressed.

Armenian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, independence day celebrations always evoke a great variety of memories and thoughts, some of which are inevitably saddening while others are inspiring. On such occasions we are apt to reminisce and retrace the steps taken and the sacrifices made in the attainment of national independence. It is particularly fitting that such stocktaking and accounting be undertaken in the case of a people who have worked hard and sacrificed much for the realization of their cherished dream. This applies especially to the celebration of Armenian Independence Day.

The history of the Armenian people in its centuries-old struggle is rather uneven throughout its long course, and today the 45th anniversary of their independence day may well evoke in the minds of many the truly tragic days of World War I, when the Turks almost succeeded in exterminating the entire Armenian nation. These sturdy and steadfast defenders of their freedom and their faith had, for centuries, succeeded in salvaging part of their independence from the endless Asiatic hordes that overran and ravaged their country. Early in modern times, however, they were too weak to withstand the Persian and Turkish onslaughts. So in 1514 their homeland was overrun and divided between these two rivals, the Turks obtaining most of the country and with it most of the Armenians as their subjects. From that year on the modern history of the Armenian people took a new turn, a sad and decisive turn which led exactly 400 years later to the massacre of some 1 million Armenians in 1915.

Fortunately not all Armenians were massacred; many hundreds of thousands escaped to Persia and to Russia. And toward the end of the First World War, when the Russian autocratic regime was overthrown by the Bolsheviks in 1917, Armenians in the Caucasus, uniting with the survivors of the Turkish massacres, asserted their freedom, proclaimed their national independence on May 28, 1918, and founded the Armenian Republic. It is the 45th anniversary of that day which is being celebrated in all Armenian communities throughout the world today, wherever they are permitted to do so.

The new state thus born after the lapse of many centuries, and after the sacrifice of more than 1 million Armenians in one massacre alone, was a weak and very unstable entity, in need of urgent aid from abroad for its survival, and surrounded by many powerful foes. The situation was rendered almost hopeless by the fact that the Armenian state was isolated and cut off from the outside world where its friends, supporters, and sympathizers lived.

Under these circumstances the days of the Armenian Republic were numbered, and only a major miracle on the part of European governments could have saved it from its deadly foes. The hoped-for miracle did not take place, and, after a little more than 2 years' precarious but gallant existence, it went down under the powerful attack of the Turks in the fall of 1920. In this they were aided by the treachery of the Soviet Union. Finally, early in December most of the territory of the Armenian Republic was retained by Turkey while the part that fell to the Soviet Union became today's Soviet Socialist Republic of Armenia. In brief that is the story of the rise of the Armenian Republic in 1918 and its destruction by the combination of Turkish-Soviet forces late in 1920.

But the brief 2-year term of that Republic has left a profound impression in the minds and hearts of the Armenian people. Most important of all, it serves them as a lesson that regardless of the sacrifices made and suffering endured for the attainment of national freedom, the attainment of that supreme goal is worth all these and more. That is why the Armenian people attach particular importance to the anniversary celebration of their Independence Day; it reminds them that there is no easy road to freedom and independence.

Report From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN, VICTOR WICKERSHAM, REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

REPUBLICAN SENATOR SPEAKS OUT

It is a rare occasion when I agree 100 percent with anything that a Republican has to say. This month, however, Republican Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, made a remarkable speech on the Senate floor.

The Senator's remarks were made to point up the danger of the fright peddlers, groups of individuals that spread slander and abuse, generated by fear and heaped indiscriminately upon many great Americans. Senator KUCHEL referred to these individuals as a "handful of zealots, in the ranks or clutches of self-styled 'I am a better American than you are' organizations." The Senator reported that he received a deluge of mail every day, which he described as fright mail.

I too, receive this kind of mail. It is disgusting to see relatively intelligent Americans being duped into believing such junk. The fright peddlers are spreading out-and-out lies. Among these are allegations that the United States is training thousands of foreign troops, including barefoot cannibals with rings in their noses, in Georgia, as a step toward takeover of the United States by the United Nations; that the United States no longer has any armed forces because creation of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has turned over its military to a Russian general or colonel in the U.N.; and that thousands of Chinese Communists troops are poised on the Mexican border for an attack on California.

Senator KUCHEL said, "These fright peddlers are doing the devil's work far better than Communists themselves could do." The Senator is right. No good American, whether Republican or Democrat, can stand by and see these Red dupes do their dirty work in the disguise of an anti-Communist uniform.

If any of my constituents would like a copy of the Senator's speech, they may write to me and I will be glad to send them a copy.

PAY RAISE FOR MILITARY APPROVED IN HOUSE

I was pleased to vote for passage of the military pay raise this month, along with an amendment to recompute the retired pay for those that retired prior to the 1958 pay act. I also supported recomputation in committee. Our military personnel have needed a pay raise for a long time and I am pleased that the bill passed the House.

FOREIGN AID COMES HOME

Avowed opponents of all foreign aid never seem to consider one item worthy of note: Aid given to other countries comes back to the United States in the form of purchases that benefit local contractors, companies, industry, and employment. During January through April of this year, $89,756,577 worth of aid-financed orders went to 43 States in the United States. Oklahoma got $265,454 in orders. More than two-thirds of foreign aid procurement dollars now are spent with American suppliers, as a result of purchase source restrictions in loan and grant agreements. My previous stand on foreign aid remains unchanged: Cut out all foreign aid to Communist countries and eliminate all unnecessary foreign aid as outlined in the recent Clay report.

THREE LARGE LOANS APPROVED

Big news for the economy of Anadarko was made this month with the announcement of approval of a $390,000 Area Redevelopment Administration loan for Sequoyah Mills, Inc., a carpet plant. The plant will manufacture carpet for a five-State area and will employ 180 persons when in full production. Improved telephone service is due at Cheyenne, with the approval this month of a $610,000 REA loan to the Dobson Telephone Co., Cheyenne. A new dial office will also be built at Crawford. A $1 million loan was approved for Southwestern State College by the Community Facilities Administration. It will provide for housing for 286 students.

THE WAR THAT IS NOT A WAR

Amongst my mail this month was a letter from a woman in my district asking why we are fighting in Vietnam and not in Cuba. Much confusion seems to exist on this question and I feel some comment is necessary.

The war in Vietnam is not a war in the sense that we know it, but a special war of overt political action, with American casualties. The aim of our 12,000 troops in Vietnam is not to fight, but to teach others to fight. They have the goal of organizing local native forces to prevent a Communist takeover. This is done, using the concept of the strategic hamlet system. Here is how this works:

Scattered native groups living in the bush country are brought into central locations, where they construct hamlets, or small villages. The villagers are taught to build barbed wire fences around their hamlet and are given instruction in defending themselves against Communist attack. These natives seem to have learned well—of 20 hamlets recently attacked, only one was overrun by the Communists. The idea of protection and consolidation also permits other things to happen. The villagers are taught government; four elections have been held, the first elections in 2,000 years. Education is taught the villagers; the number of school teachers and students has tripled in the past 6 years. Hamlets which were formerly isolated from one another now have communication with each other.

This "war that is not a war" is difficult for the average American to understand. It is most regrettable that 73 Americans have been killed, even though we are acting only as advisers. Most of these casualties were helicopter pilots ferrying Vietnam troops, of which more than 100,000 have been killed. Both military and government leaders say there are signs of progress in Vietnam, in the actual fighting and in the intangibles that go with our actions.

This is the difference between Vietnam and Cuba, according to our military leaders: In Vietnam we are advising the natives how to fight communism, at the request of the local military government. In Cuba, we are on the outside, looking in. Militarily, we can do little in Castro's Cuba without getting into a full-scale war with Russia. What we are doing in Vietnam is closing the door on the Communists before they can get in, not after they have already gained a foothold.

OKLAHOMA ASTRONAUT MAKES GOOD

Astronaut L. Gordon Cooper, a native of Shawnee, certainly put Oklahoma on the map with his successful 22-orbit space flight. The mission proved beyond a doubt that man is the necessary element in space exploration, not a computer. I am looking forward to the day that Astronaut Thomas Stafford of Weatherford makes his trip to the moon. Then I can claim an astronaut from my district, as my good friend from the fourth District, TOM STEED, now can.

WEST POINT AHEAD FOR YOUTHS

Four young men from my district will be attending the U.S. Military Academy at West Point soon. Two of them, Sterling McColgin, of Reydon, and Virgil Stone, of Duncan, won my appointments. George Viney, of Lawton, was appointed by Senator MIKE MONRONEY, and William Brigadier, of Lawton, was appointed by Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT of California.

Remember, I am in Congress to represent and serve you. Anytime I may be of service, just phone, wire, or write.

Cordially your friend,

VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Member of Congress.

Commentary by Joseph McCaffrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, there is, unfortunately, too little knowledge of the organization and operation of the U.S. Department of State. This is responsible in large measure, I feel, for the many criticisms leveled at the Department. The State Department recently published a very informative booklet, entitled "Department of State 1963." Mr. Joseph McCaffrey, a Washington, D.C., radio commentator, on May 15 included in his broadcast a comment on this splendid publication and suggested a means whereby it might deserve the kind of distribution it deserves. His comments follow:

COMMENTARY BY JOSEPH MCCAFFREY ON WMAL-TV EVENING NEWS PROGRAM, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 15, 1963

I want to talk about a book, tonight. A book I think everyone should read. It isn't, unfortunately, on the best-seller list. It is a Government document.

This is it—"Department of State 1963," subtitled "A Report to the Citizens." This is an explanation of what the State Department is, who makes up the Department, how the Department operates.

The State Department is, perhaps, the most abused of all the executive departments. When anything happens in the world which isn't to the advantage of the United States, the State Department gets the blame.

As if wiping out the Department and starting all over again would also wipe out the major international problems confronting us in this atomic age.

The fact is that the State Department and its vital role in the compact world of today are not generally understood by the American people. This book contributes to a better understanding.

But as matters now stand few people will ever see this book. Ten thousand have been printed by the Government Printing Office to sell at $1.50 each.

What is really needed is for groups interested in international affairs or American Government to get together and buy copies of this report to the citizen for junior high school and high school libraries in their communities.

This book deserves a wide circulation. Wider, I am sure, than it would normally get, unless, as I mentioned, organizations take it upon themselves to help distribute this book to schools and classrooms.

Address of Bishop Herbert Welch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Bishop Herbert Welch, senior bishop of the Methodist Church, at a testimonial dinner held at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City, on Tuesday, November 6, 1962.

Bishop Welch is an American of great distinction. Highly educated, he has won academic recognition which literally is worldwide. While a student at my own alma mater, Wesleyan University in Middletown, Conn., he received more prizes than has ever been awarded to one person and his record has never been equaled. Dedicating his life to the church and to education, his responsibilities have extended from those of bishop to college president. The public recognition he has received exceeds that normally afforded any 10 men of merit and accomplishment. One indication of the esteem in which he is held is the fact that there have been named after him a dormitory at Drew University, an altar in the chapel at Wesleyan University, the chapel at the Theological Seminary in Seoul, Korea, the auditorium at Ewha University in Seoul, and innumerable babies.

The remarks of Bishop Welch at the time of this testimonial dinner warrant careful reading by the American public. They are noteworthy as a statement of personal philosophy, on the part of one who has been privileged to view this earthly scene for a number of years. In fact, these very human reflections were made by Bishop Welch on the occasion of his 100th birthday, as he entered his second century of vital contribution to the welfare of man.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY HERBERT WELCH, NOVEMBER 6, 1962

When I was a boy, we used to have albums for our friends to write in, answering such questions as "What is your favorite book?" or color? or flower? "If not yourself, who would you rather be?" or even "If you could choose a place and time to live in, what would you ask?"

Some might reply to this last question, "Italy, during the age of the Renaissance," or "Germany, in the day of Luther," or "England, in the reign of Elizabeth I." I, myself, in the light of all the facts, would answer now, "The United States of America, and in the present time." * * *

I would not choose to have been born later than I was, for perhaps, from all indications, it will call for a superman to master the coming age; and it's hard enough to deal with our own times. Certainly not to have been born earlier—for no century has been so fascinating and so significant as this last. If I had been born 100 years earlier, think what I would have missed. I would have had no electric light or telegram or telephone or television set. I could not have ridden anywhere except on a horse or behind a mule. The polar regions were hidden; Asia was a mystery, and Africa a Dark Continent. I would have known practically nothing about the moon except that it made the night less dark; and nobody knew anything to amount to much about the stars or what lay between them.

In a word, most of our knowledge of this earth planet and the universe around it, and the human beings who seek to control it all, has come to light in the last 100 years. In matters of travel, exploration, and discovery, in matters of research and invention, we have taken a longer step forward than all the centuries behind us. We live now in a new world, a wider world, yet a smaller world; a world with new problems, new temptations, new opportunities; a world no longer guided by the wisdom and the weakness of old men but by the energy and the rashness of the forties. New dangers confront us, new visions have come; new possibilities of freedom, justice, world order and good will.

"To be alive in such an age.
With every year a lightning page
Turned in the world's great wonder-book
When men speak strong for brotherhood,
For peace and universal good,
When miracles are everywhere.
And every inch of common air
Throbs a tremendous prophecy
Of greater marvels yet to be,
O, thrilling age."

And now, in this marvelous day of challenge, the lot of an increasing number of us is old age and comparative inactivity. Not many are as far along as I. The statisticians tell me that in our country at this time only 4 out of every 100,000 of the population reach the century mark, but those who do, need comfort. We hear with some pleasure an idealist declare that life begins at 70, that only the aged are really alive in the large sense, and long lists are made up of distinguished worthies in art, government, business, and church who have fully flowered only in the ripe eighties or the mellow nineties.

Whether longevity is to be regarded as a reward of unusual virtue seems to call out a difference of opinion. The Hebrew certainly believed that righteousness and long life went together. It was to the good man that the psalmist held out the promise, "With long life will I satisfy Him and show Him my salvation." On the other hand, our realists have been so impressed with the frailties and vices of age that in discouragement they have framed a proverb: "The good die young." Perhaps neither is wholly right. If you listen to the confessions of old men as to how they have lasted so long, you will wonder whether good habits have anything to do with it.

But whatever the why and the wherefore, old age has certainly its compensations. For one thing, it commands a certain charity in judgment. Of course only those who have died are sure of full recognition: "of the dead, nothing but good." My father used to say, "There's nothing like a sod poultice to bring out the virtues"; and the famous speaker of the House of Representatives, Tom Reed, somewhat cynically defined a "statesman" as "a successful politician—who is dead."

Nevertheless, seniority has its own recognition. Witness the chairmen of congressional committees. I have sometimes said to my young friends: "All you have to do is to stay around long enough and you will make the front page." I might have added, "If you reach a hundred, you may receive far more attention than you deserve." Witness, me.

Old age, in my own case, has meant an extension of the opportunity for happiness in the comradeship of my incomparable wife, in the loyal affection and care of two lovely daughters, and in the welcome appearance of two more generations of which I can be proud.

Old age gives you a chance to change your mind; and woe betide him who does not seize the opportunity. I am not sure that even in the case of my eminent Father in God, good John Wesley, it is wholly a matter for congratulation to claim that one has not changed his theology from youth on. The open mind, of course, should not be open at both ends so that nothing sticks; but even if nothing is to be dropped, there should be room for something to be added. There's a place for the second wind, mentally as well as physically.

Old age gives time to reap something of what you have sown. We commonly defer to the future life the rewards for whatever good we may have accomplished. But I have discovered a most praiseworthy trait in many people even now to forget my shortcomings and to encourage my increasing years by calling up some word or deed which proved helpful to them and which I had entirely forgotten. Indeed, in some cases I am compelled to believe that my forgettory was better than their memory, and that out of the kindness of their hearts they have made up or dreamed a story to fit my need. It is easy, and not unpleasant, to become a legend.

Old age has another compensation in enabling you to look back upon your ills with some pleasure, instead of looking forward to them with some fear. Dr. Dudley White of Boston tells a story about a client of his who was 106 years old, but came to him every 6 months for a checkup. One of the doctor's colleagues became interested in the case and asked the privilege of meeting the patient on his next visit. When the time came, he propounded this question: "May I ask you, sir, if you have ever had a really serious illness?" "H'm," was the answer, "Yes, I had a severe case of pneumonia just a hundred years ago.' "

In a mild way, I know how he felt. Whooping cough at 9, major operation at 50; sent home from Korea and China with gloomy forebodings, shipwreck in Alaska, fighting the Yangtze rapids, and traveling in Chinese bandit country under soldier guards; revolution in Korea and typhoon in Japan; winter midnight escape from our blazing home, and night journey through the shambles and holocaust of Tokyo, desolated by the earthquake—and they're all behind me. Nothing to boast of, but a certain gratification to think what I've met and come through. Also it has qualified me for that exchange of anecdotes ("speaking of operations, etc."), justifies the definition of travel as "that experience which is supposed to broaden the knowledge but really only lengthens the conversation."

I can understand the mood of that dear old lady who wrote, on reaching a certain age: "The house I am living in is 82 years old. Considering its age, the house is in fairly good repair, though I don't think it looks quite as well as it did 50 years ago. I have neglected to keep it painted, as so many women of this modern generation do. To tell the truth, I have been spending my time on interior decorating. The windows are fairly clear, and I am glad to tell you I have a reliable tenant in the upper story."

At least all such experiences broaden one's view of human goodness and divine love and plan. One is bound to look at people and events in a new perspective, and to learn some tolerance and patience. The world of sense grows smaller as the years roll on. One can't cover as much ground, can't hear as many sounds, can't read the fine print. But the inner world expands; there is a new opportunity for wonder, awe, simplicity; and, as other things fade, the stars shine on.

Naturally, as one comes to such a milestone and looks back, he begins to recall the comrades of the way. It is difficult to tell whether one has been more influenced by men, by women, or by books. Certainly books have an important place, but "the proper study of mankind is man." Association with great personalities is among the highest privileges of life. If those associations be intimate and prolonged, happy is the pilgrim. And even to touch the hem of the garmet of greatness, may bring a lifelong uplift. Souls which radiate some indefinable yet precious influence do something to you—you cannot be quite the same again.

As I speak, there comes to my mind, for example, a few men with whom I had (in most cases) scarcely more than causual contact, yet in whom I felt the greatness which is a challenge to lofty living—Gandhi, the Buddhist-Christian saint; Kagawa, the slum-dweller, who had all that Gandhi had, and more; Chiang Kai-shek, philosophical author, dedicated statesman, and inspiring leader; John R. Mott, the Christian internationalist, who touched and influenced the life of many nations; Theodore Roosevelt, man of vision and action superior. Surely a mixed group, but each man a summons to live life on the high plane of the Kingdom of God.

And what do I not owe also to the many friends in many countries who have no claim upon popular applause, yet whose integrity and devotion make their lives into poems which may not be recorded on disks or sung in Tin-pan Alley, but are chanted by angelic choirs. Ah, that "rejoicing in heaven" not only over the birth of a Saviour for the repentance of a sinner, but over the loyalty of a friend and the silent heroism of any soldier of the light. Thank God for friends; thank God for those who watch us, and pray.

Well, pilgrim, you have come a long journey; have you picked up anything on the road? Yes, to speak frankly, a curious assortment of curios: some worthless pebbles, only to be thrown away; some jewels, to keep; some oddities which experts might think out of place in any permanent collection.

For instance, I have fallen in love with little things: little books, trifling events, small triumphs, humble people. Others may deal with the large, the spectacular; I feel more at home among the lesser lights.

I like books, books which do not amplify and ramify and terrify; but which condense and simplify. Wise men tell me I must not forget to deal with the big definitive tome in order to sharpen my wits and toughen my mental muscles. But I like my learning in clear thought and understandable words and directed to some practical end. I have John Wesley on my side. He declared that a "great book was a great evil," and that if the angels wrote books we would have few folios.

I rejoice in little changes and advances, following the pattern of God in nature and in history: We want too much and we want it too fast. We cry, "Make haste, O Lord, to help us," but He doesn't make haste; He moves with maddening slowness. We want sweeping victories, He gives us narrow escapes. The benevolent and sagacious Pope who presides at the Vatican Council has recently urged his clergy to beware of the haste which often leads to failure, while success crowns the efforts of the slow and thoughtful. I stand amazed by the outcome of the little events—the seeming trifles of a day—which are later found to be the turning points of history. When I see a good cause moving with exasperating slowness, I can now be almost content, provided it is moving in the right direction.

I like ordinary people. There is a place for Moses, no doubt, but Aaron and Hur who hold up his hands, are the unsung heroes. If God is not in the littles, then He is shut out from most of His universe, where He puts more fish than whales, more blades of grass than oak trees, more of the common people for whom Lincoln spoke than of the giants of intellect and force. I value to the utmost the little, nameless, unremembered acts of kindness and of love that are the better portion of a good man's life. Not always to the swift is the race, nor the battle to the strong. It is David's sling against Goliath's spear. The voice of the people may not always be the voice of God, but how often the sure wholesome instinct of the mass is wiser than the cleverness of leaders. The old block may be more impressive, but the chips may serve better to kindle a fire. The little, the despised, the forgotten, in the providence of God, may in the last day wear the brightest crown.

As I have come along the way, it has dawned upon me that I must not take myself too seriously; that after all, I am only a speck in a boundless universe, and that my opinions and my ways may not furnish a pattern for all mankind. I must live, yes, I must have a way of life of my own, but I must also let live. Others have the same right to differ with me as I have to differ with them. I must learn tolerance, but that is not quite enough; tolerance carries a touch of condescension. My fellow man needs not merely my toleration, but my respect. Even among Christians of differing views, the essential spirit of unity must be based on full mutual recognition and respect and good will. It seems to me that we class too many of our credos and our codes as non-negotiable; there are only a few great basic truths that are not open for further consideration. One of the beautiful possibilities of old age is a return to the teachableness and the unselfconsciousness and the sanity of childhood.

Well, I am an optimist. That does not mean a rosy-spectacled idealist who will refuse to admit the existence of evil. The present age, like all previous eras, is a mixture of good and bad. The optimist is simply the man who recognizes the good, and believes in the better. The pessimist is the man who seeks out the bad, and believes the worst.

There are many reasons why I am an optimist, and one of the most cogent is the visible and undeniable growth all over our little earth of a sense of social responsibility, the responsibility of man for man, and class for class and nation for nation. An unparalelled acceptance of human beings as such is everywhere. The craving not only for food and shelter but for freedom and a place in the sun has brought astounding results even within my lifetime. Awareness of the needs of childhood and of age, the rights of races, the dignity of labor, has led to a worldwide revolt, often expressing itself in foolish political and economic forms. It's a new world, my masters. Little countries take their place beside the great powers. Colonialism fades out, and democracy slowly and painfully expresses itself in varied and sometimes fantastic forms. World domination is now resisted and world cooperation grows.

This sense of social responsibility spreads to all areas. Science, art, philosophy are newly conscious of their obligation not merely for their own development but for the common good. None can now lightly ask, "Am I my brother's keeper?" Opinions may differ on the length to which the welfare state may wisely go; but all agree that in some form and through some agency the demand for social justice must be met; that health, education, and opportunity must become the common possessions; and that the truly Christian standard of human relations should be our ideal—the strong for the weak, the wise for the ignorant, the good for the bad.

Who that looks at world history in its length and in its breadth can question that there is an unseen agency at work in individual and in national life—"a power not ourselves that makes for righteousness?" As I see it, this world is not a wreck, but a workshop, busily confused, but a workshop where the purpose of God is being worked out.

Among the many virtues and graces, the operation of which ministers to the divine purpose, my mind has come to be fixed especially on two: humility and compassion.

How transforming is humility. It is tied up with charity, with respect for the opinions of others, with unselfishness and geniality. It is the foe of dogmatism and downright ornery stubborness; it paves the way to repentance and willingness to share the common lot. Humility before God, and even before men—how wonderful, how beautiful.

And then compassion. Not pity—that means stooping to help, that may go with a superiority complex; but compassion, which involves deep understanding and fellowship.

These come from above, from Him who stood at the point where our search for life's secret finds ultimate reality in the Son of Man and Son of God—final, unchangeable, utterly trustworthy. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself." And the story did not end at the "green hill far away" or at the empty tomb in Joseph's garden. I believe in the Holy Ghost, God present with us here, now, everywhere, always, for guidance, for comfort, and for strength. The Golden Age is still before us.

"So life shall on and upward go;
Th' eternal step of progress beats
To that great anthem, calm and slow,
Which God repeats.

"God works in all things; all obey
His first propulsion from the night;
Wake thou and watch!—the world is gray
With morning light!"

The 45th Anniversary of Armenian Republic Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, Americans of all faiths and national origins again pause this year to celebrate the anniversary of the independence of the Armenian Republic. May 28 marks the 45th anniversary of that declaration, which in turn was a culmination of the legitimate national desires and political aspirations of the Armenian people. Despite initial diplomatic recognition, the Soviet Union, as is its frequent rule, violated the sovereignty of the Armenian state and brought it under the physical control of Moscow.

The continued spirit of the Armenians is such, however, that they have never accepted Soviet domination, and political independence still continues to burn in their hearts.

Freedom-loving Americans everywhere join with Armenians, and with Americans of Armenian origin and parentage, in marking their continued protest against Soviet imperialism.

Italy Pays at Polls for Russian Bargain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two columns by Eliot Janeway, an outstanding newspaperman who writes for the Chicago Tribune press service.

The first, "Italy Pays at Polls for Russian Bargain," analyzes the increased vote the Communists received in the recent Italian elections. Mr. Janeway feels that in part this is a reflection of the Soviet economic offensive toward Italy under which the Soviets provide essential commodities to the Italians at cut rates and permit the Italians to pay for them with exports.

The second, "Act To Checkmate Soviet Oil Bartering," deals with the Soviet oil offensive all around the world. The Soviets are exporting oil to independent countries at bargain prices and are permitting these countries to pay for this oil, not with money, but with products. The column describes how the Soviets are using oil exports to penetrate nation after nation in the free world. Both of these columns offer thoughtful analyses of a serious problem facing the free world and it is for this reason that I have asked unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the columns were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 13, 1963]

ITALY PAYS AT POLLS FOR RUSSIAN BARGAIN

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, May 12.—Thirty years ago, the Communist threat was often distorted and oversimplified. Whenever labor troubles and political violence broke out, there was talk of "Moscow gold" being smuggled in by bearded conspirators. And no doubt in certain cases—notably Germany and China in the 1930's—this was true.

Today, the Communists have perfected an altogether different technique for suborning independent regimes. Moscow is making stepped-up political mileage, and it has learned how to do it while saving its own money. The Italian election, with its surprise jump in Communist votes, shows how effective this new technique can be; not just in backward, underdeveloped areas but also in expanding relatively advanced industrial nations.

The Communist breakthrough at the polls represents, at least in part, a political dividend on several years of Soviet investment in the Italian economy. For Italy was the first of the Western allies whose economy Russia penetrated on a significant scale. Here's how Russia's first 5-year plan for Italy has worked on the economic front.

OIL IS BIGGEST NEED

Italy's No. 1 import requirement is for oil. Until Russia turned up with her "bargain" offer, Italy's oil bill was her biggest cash drain. Russia's "bargain" offer to Italy was irresistible—not only a deep price cut, but no need to pay the cut price in money.

Instead, the "bargain" on the import side of the Italian trade ledger worked out as an incentive scheme on the export side. For Russia was ready to take payment for her cut-price oil in Italian goods—tankers, steel mill products, machinery, and whatever else Italian industry was able and anxious to pay with.

On the face of it, this arrangement seems to have worked well for both sides—so far. Italy is the free world economy where Soviet penetration has reached deepest (with the possible exception of Japan). And, at the same time, Italy is the free world economy which has been enjoying the most dynamic rate of growth in the world (again, with the possible exception of Japan.)

It looks as if Soviet trade bargains have been financing Italian prosperity. But it also looks as if a bill has been accruing on the political side as the price for this business bargain. Here's how Russia's first 5-year plan for Italy has worked on the political front.

It has made Moscow gold out of date as an instrument of Communist subversion. Italy's business bargain has established Russia as her most powerful customer. This has given the Soviet trade representatives in Italy a decided in on Italian labor and political and press relationships.

With the Soviet orders which have been making jobs for Italian labor and filling capacity in Italian plants have gone checkoff distributions to Red unions, Red candidates, and Red publications.

BARGAIN PAYS OFF

Russia's business bargain with Italy has mobilized Italy's employers into paymasters for the financing of Italian communism. No need for Moscow to smuggle its gold to an Italian underground now that its deal with Italian capitalism has put the stamp of respectability on a political payoff for Italian communism. The Italian election results suggest that the Italian Communists have made the most of the political advantage which Russia's business bargain arrangement with Italian industry has given them.

The West, which expected the middle-of-the-road candidates to keep a firm hold on power in Italy, has been shocked by the Communist gains at the polls, despite her unprecedented prosperity. Let us hope that the Italian exeprience will bring home the lesson: The Communists play for a political bonus on every good bargain they offer in a business deal. In the Italian elections, they have just collected an installment payment.

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 6, 1963]

ACT TO CHECKMATE SOVIET OIL BARTERING

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, May 5.—The Soviet economic offensive has at last provoked a competitive counter offer from the West. The Soviet trade operation like most campaigns which work, is based on a simple, standard formula: Oil bartered at bargain prices to independent countries and paid for not with money but in the products of those countries.

There have been two good reasons why the Soviet formula has worked so well in so many countries. In the first place, the big money drain in all countries except those which live by exporting oil is the cost of importing it; oil bargains, especially oil bargains which need not be paid for with money, have been understandably welcome. The second reason is that the countries which need money to pay for oil imports also need export customers.

In country after country, the Soviet trade operation has solved both problems at once. It has sent oil and it has taken back anything the oil importing country has to give.

USES COFFEE FOR OIL

In Brazil for example, according to the terms of last month's deal, payment for Soviet oil will be accepted not only in coffee the obvious export, but in musical instrument. And note that this latest Soviet coup was completed within weeks after Washington's latest emergency loan (of nearly $400 million) which was made on the stale old slogan: "Keep the Russians out."

But Italy was the first of the NATO allies—and, thus, the first of the Common Market powers—to enter into long-term reciprocal trade arrangements with the Soviets. She has geared her oil-refining capacity well in excess of her domestic requirements. Thus, she has taken advantage of the Soviet "bargain-and-barter" formula not only to save cash on standard imports but to earn cash on new exports.

Italy has until recently been enjoying the most dynamic growth rate in the Western World and it is axiomatic that growth economies, like growth businesses, always stand in need of money. The Soviet formula has been directed toward meeting this need of Italy for cash. In the process Italy has become dependent—for employment and for industrial customers—on Soviet barter.

ACTS TO MEET THREAT

Or just on barter? At any rate, the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) is making a serious effort to find out. For after months of rumor and negotiation, it is apparently meeting the Soviet offer. It, too, is arranging to ship oil into Italy, pricing its product at 20 percent under world market list, and accepting payment in Italian industrial production.

This is an important change. Our great international oil companies have now recognized the need to meet the Soviet challenge head-on—by matching the Soviet offer in the major markets in which they cannot afford to lose position and where they must compete aggressively in order to be able to grow.

This means that the major oil companies will have to do more than merely sell their own product—they will also have to sell their customers' products, as the Russians have learned to sell Brazillian coffee and Cuban sugar.

NO MATCH FOR RUSSIANS

Will our international oil companies get help from our Government as they move to meet the Soviet challenge on the economic front? This daring and imaginative countermeasure is being taken by one of the biggest and richest companies in the world. But even Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) is no match for Soviet imperialism; only the U.S. Government has the resources to match marketing operations with Moscow. Increasingly, the cold war is taking the form of economic warfare, including an effort to penetrate and tie up the resources and requirements of independent and uncommitted countries.

War—whether military or political or economic—is the responsibility of government. The best that any company (or any individual) can do on the economic front is set up a guerilla operation in the hope of holding a beachhead until the marines can land. Will our Government send the marines—that is, their economic equivalent—into action against the Soviet dumping and bartering offensive in Italy and elsewhere?

Oregon's Wild Wallowa Wonderland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, while every State has its own claims to beauty, the great State of Oregon is especially fortunate in possessing a grand spectrum of spectacular scenery. In the Sunday edition of the New York Times recently there appeared a feature story on the "Wallowa Wonderland" in the northeastern part of the State, which eloquently describes one of the finest scenic areas in America. Under unanimous consent, I ask that it be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

OREGON'S WILD WALLOWA WONDERLAND

(By Ralph Friedman)

JOSEPH, OREG.—High in the northeastern section of this State is an alpine setting so Swiss-like in its towering mountains and frosted lakes that it has been aptly named "Oregon's Switzerland." Some visitors to the area are more ecstatic. They call this region "America's Switzerland."

This pristine, rugged wilderness has still another name, the "Wallowa Wonderland," for the protected heart of this expanse is Oregon's Wallowa Mountain Range.

For most people, the gateway to this wonderland is skyblue Wallowa Lake, a captivating body of water in an area famous for beautiful lakes. Many people do not go beyond this point, for the lake and just the sight of the blazing white peaks nearby are compensation enough for the long journey.

Wallowa Lake, which is 5 miles south of Joseph, can be reached from La Grande by taking State Route 82 north, east, and then south. Or the lake can be reached from Lewiston, Idaho, on State Route 3.

A third way, from Walla Walla, Wash., is to drive south to Weston, Oreg., and then east to Elgin, Enterprise, and Joseph. From whichever point—La Grande, Lewiston, or Walla Walla—the drive to the lake should take no more than 2 hours.

GLACIAL LAKE

The lake, considered by many geologists as the finest example of a glacially formed lake in the West, is the largest of 60 mountain-fringed lakes filled with trout. At an elevation of 4,000 feet, Wallowa Lake is dwarfed by snowcapped mountains brooding over it. The two largest, and grandest, are Sacajawea Peak, named for the Indian woman who guided the Lewis and Clark expedition through the Shoshone country, and the mighty Matterhorn. The latter is a picture copy of the famous Swiss mountain.

From the lake, foot trails lead to swift white water, razorsharp gorges, icy lakes and multicolored canyon walls. Pack-train trips, from an overnight jaunt to a 2-week outing, explore the heights and pits of the basaltic alps. One of the most popular pack trips goes to Ice Lake, a glittering pool washed by the tumbling snow of the Matterhorn.

Pack trip rates vary, according to duration, distance, number of persons and time of season. For the most current information, write to the Chamber of Commerce, Joseph, Oreg. In recent years, a few dude ranches have been developed in the Wallowa country, and current information about these also can be obtained from the chamber.

HUNTING AND FISHING

The Wallowas have numerous fishing and hunting grounds. The well-stocked mountain lakes and swift-flowing rivers abound in trout, salmon, and land-locked bluebacks. In the forests and hills roam deer, elk, and bear. Chinese pheasants, grouse, duck, and other game birds also are numerous.

A substantial section of the Wallowa wonderland, including most of the Wallowa Mountains, has been set aside by Federal law as a protected area. This means that firearms, save in the hands of rangers, are forbidden. As a wilderness region, this area is without roads or buildings.

The State of Oregon has spent a tidy sum of money to make Wallowa Lake an outdoor resort. It has installed 20 stalls for trailers, and provided them with electricity, sewers and water. Facilities within the lake park include a large comfort station, a utilities building providing showers for men and women, a clothes washing room, a kitchen, fireplaces and tables. Overnight campers are assured of grassy ground upon which to erect a tent or put down a sleeping bag.

The park also has a baseball diamond, a fine beach for swimmers, stretches of shore available for fishing and rowboats for rent.

A monument at the lake, erected in memory of the father of Chief Joseph, links the pure beauty of the Wallowa wonderland to a memorable chapter in the history of the West.

It was from the beautiful Wallowas, which means land of the winding waters, that Chief Joseph, the proud leader of the Nez Perce Indians, led an unsuccessful retreat to escape pursuing Federal troops. Several historians consider the retreat one of the most brilliant in military annals.

When land-hungry settlers rode into the Wallowa Valley, the ancestral home of the Nez Perce, and launched a program of ruthless expropriation, the Indians fought back. Then, as always, U.S. troops were called in.

Trailed and hounded by Federal forces, the Indians retreated with their women and children. They almost reached their destination, the plains of Canada, the Nez Perce idea of a safe and unmolested haven.

For long and weary days, some of the finest cavalrymen and many of the most battle-experienced officers in the Army sought to corner and destroy the Indians. But, time after time the Nez Perce, seemingly hopelessly trapped, slipped through the net. When there was no possible escape, the retreating Indians turned upon their more numerous adversaries and drove them off, even capturing artillery pieces.

But the Federal troops were soon augmented by fresh battalions who joined the pursuit. At last, with his people hungry, emaciated, sick, weary, and with little more than their bare hands to defend themselves, Chief Joseph strode from the embattled camp and surrendered.

CHIEF SPEAKS

With pride and deep anger, the chief is said to have told the commander of the Federal troops: "From where the sun now stands, I shall fight no more."

There still are many pioneer homesteads in the sweet, unspoiled Wallowa Valley. The Indians, of course, are no longer a "menace." Indeed, the grandsons and great-grandsons of the men who forced the Indians out, and then relentlessly pursued them, now regard the bloody struggle of eight decades ago as a tourist attraction.

But there is one consolation. If Chief Joseph and his tribesmen were to return to life, and ride their Appaloosa ponies along the old trails to the far edge of the lake, they would see the shimmering peaks as breathlessly lovely today as they were on that last agonizing morning of surrender.

Only the Strong May Fly the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit for publishing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a Memorial Day editorial from the Granville Sentinel, of Granville, N.Y. It was written by MacArthur H. Manchester, well and favorably known to so many of us for his many years of service here to the ROA. The editorial carries a very fine message, indeed.

The editorial follows:

ONLY THE STRONG MAY FLY THE FLAG

"Breathes there the man with soul so dead" was a part of a poem known and revered by every schoolboy within the memory of most of us. This concept is part of the verile heritage we Americans cherish.

When most senior citizens were in grammar school, Memorial Day was a real national holiday. Besides the band and the speeches in Fairmont Park, it meant a patriotic type of school program in the late morning or early afternoon, with flags and red, white, and blue bunting and almost invariably (if there were not too many schools and the community was lucky) grand old men, revered citizen-soldier-sailor veterans, usually of the blue or the gray, or both, on the school platform. Sometimes they said a few words—sometimes they were just there to be viewed, with respect and awe at their venerable dignity. This was the waning period, the eventide denouement of the grand old warriors of the War Between the States, but it was a period of American growth. It was the foundation period of America's World War I, World War II, and Korean conflict ability to assume even greater responsibility and leadership.

Of course, the cornerstone had been laid long before, but the foundation was not really reinforced until the cauldron of misunderstanding boiled over and the Civil War proved that all sections of America were gallant at their best, formidable soldiers under stress, and willing to sacrifice for the right as they saw the right.

Whether this concept explains the presence of the old soldiers of domestic and foreign wars on Memorial Day or not, the plain truth is that the citizen before World War I, and for some years after the armistice, recognized the value of the panoply of patriotism as a thing in itself.

The Memorial Day of our fathers was not witch hunting, hating, or pseudopatriotism for effect; rather it was a day to fly the flag from your own rooftop, display your colors, let all know that all Americans were proud of being in "The land of the free and the home of the brave." It was a day to stand up and be counted—yes, counted for something, not counted against something. It was a positive approach. Flag waving was not irresponsible in its concept. It was responsible and it moreover was a worthy display of where you stood, with plenty of room for divergent opinions on the issues of the day. It was not un-American to disagree—it was the essence of Americans to record honest differences. The only really common concern of all was agreed. Were you a loyal, good American? Were you decent, God fearing—or just plainly not, were you honest, were you respectful to those to whom respect was due, and generally proud of your American citizenship? There was abundant room for the idea of "my side of the street against your side of the street," my house against your house, in the details. But overall was our street, our town, our State, our country—our flag. Yes, our flag, because it stood for—still does—all that is America. It is our national symbol of united purposeful belief in freedom of thought, of life, of movement, of conviction on any self-respecting American kind of idea.

Today, too few value the panoply of symbolism on guard. Though grown up and mature as a people and a nation, we still need the spiritual uplift of belonging. We need a resurgence of pride in our common heritage and our common destiny. The tangible manifestation is tied in with symbols, honors, rewards—achievements all. The flag, in America, ties all these together.

Most nations have many holidays to provide the means of resurgent national pride. Today, Americans have Memorial Day which serves not only to remind us of the contributions of those who have served their Nation well in former years, but the men and women of our Armed Forces who today are manning our frontiers on a global basis. They serve to remind you, "Only the strong may fly the flag unafraid."

Mississippian Receives High Scout Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, no man can lay claim to true greatness unless among his virtues there is within him a deep and sincere love of youth, and he is genuinely interested in their future as well as present welfare.

One of the evidences of such a virtue is the time and the effort unselfishly rendered in the National Boy Scout and Girl Scout movements.

Undoubtedly, these splendid organizations are exceeded by possibly only one other organization, the church, in the proper training of the youth of the world for useful and dedicated service to their fellow men after reaching adulthood. The many hours that are so unselfishly given by many of the good citizens of the country are indeed a tribute to those adult leaders of this Scout movement.

L. O. CROSBY

Mr. Speaker, one of these unselfish and dedicated citizens who has rendered yeoman service to the youth of the land is my fellow citizen and good friend, Mr. L. Osmond Crosby, of Picayune, Miss. For many years, Mr. Crosby has given substantially of his time, effort, and means to this most worthy cause. As a result of this outstanding service, the National Council of Boy Scouts of America, at its annual dinner held Friday night, May 24, at the Americana Hotel in New York, awarded him the highest honor of its organization, the Silver Buffalo.

Other recipients honored for distinguished service to boyhood were General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, Edwon D. Canham, of Boston, editor of the Christian Science Monitor; Dr. Herold C. Hunt, Cambridge, Mass., professor of education in the Harvard University graduate school; Dr. Walter H. Judd, Washington, D.C., statesman, missionary, and civic leader; John T. Kimball, New York City, executive vice president of the American & Foreign Power Co.; Harold B. Lee, Salt Lake City, civic leader, railroad officer, church leader, and educator; Jack C. Vowell, El Paso, Tex., president of the Vowell Construction Co. and Vowell Material Co.; and Frederick M. Warburg, New York City, partner in Kuhn, Loeb & Co., investment concern.

The citation accompanying Crosby's award said:

> L. Osmond Crosby, Picayune, Miss., president, Crosby Forest Products Co. and Pearl River Valley Railroad Co.; industralist; railroad executive; community leader.
>
> Service to youth on an extensive scale and to the Boy Scout program in particular has characterized the life of this distinguished Scouter.
>
> Mr. Crosby's Scouting service dates back to 1920 and had included the presidency of the Pine Burr Area Council at Hattiesburg, Miss., 1955–56; membership on the region 5 executive committee since 1955; and, 1958 to 1962, the chairmanship of region 5, which comprises Arkansas, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Tennessee, and parts of Florida, Georgia, and Virginia.
>
> Mr. Crosby has been a member of the national executive board since 1958 and has been chairman of the national committee on exploring since 1961. He also serves on the national committee on finance service, the national personnel division committee, and the national program division committee.
>
> In addition to his numerous Scouting responsibilities, he serves as a trustee of the New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary and as a member of the Mississippi Legislative Educational Study Committee and of the chancellor's advisory committee on continuing education for the University of Mississippi. He is a past director of the Mississippi Young Men's Christian Association. He was mayor of Picayune, Miss., and has recently presented a new, modern library to his home community.
>
> He was awarded the Silver Beaver in 1956 and the Silver Antelope in 1957 for distinguished service to boyhood.

Armenian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, many nations have been deprived of their freedom and independence within the past half century. Under such conditions one cannot hope for a real or durable peace. By espousing and championing the cause of self-determination for these nations the United States has become a beacon of hope for these enslaved peoples.

Among nations deprived of their independence are the people of Armenia. Armenia's political independence was lost late in the 14th century, and from then until 1918 Armenians had not known freedom. For more than 500 years their historic homeland was conquered and parceled out among its conquerors—Persians, Russians and Turks. During all that time they suffered much and lost heavily in worldly goods. Often they were subjected to wholesale massacres by the Ottoman Turks. Early in World War I their very existence as a people was threatened in a massacre unprecedented in modern history. One million Armenians lost their lives in that atrocious butchery. But the survivors of these horrors did not lose heart. Early in 1918 in the northeastern part of their homeland, within view of historic Mount Ararat, they proclaimed their national independence on May 28 of that year.

It is the 45th anniversary of that day which is being celebrated today in all Armenian communities where there is freedom to do so. Armenia's independence was supported by the United States, and the Government of this country gave moral and financial assistance to the struggling government of that country at the time. Despite the fact that we tried to help it in every way possible, the course of international events proved fatal to Armenian independence. Late in 1920 most of the country was overrun by the Turks, and the remainder became part of the Soviet Union.

Since then Armenian independence has vanished, but the Armenian people and their sympathetic friends continue to celebrate that independence day in the hope that someday, and perhaps soon, they may regain their independence. I personally and heartily join in the celebration of the Armenian Independence Day.

Resolution Adopted by the Polish American Congress, District of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the House the following resolution passed by the Polish American Congress, District of Connecticut, at its quarterly meeting on May 26, 1963:

> The delegates and officers of the Polish American Congress, District of Connecticut, being assembled at Hartford, Conn. at its quarterly meeting on May 26, 1963, did adopt the following resolution:
>
> "We resolve to reassert our determination of steadfastness in continuous struggle for a completely free and independent Poland within the framework of European stability, world peace, and American security.
>
> "We urge the U.S. Government to safeguard multilateral control of nuclear weapons within the NATO in such a way, which would prevent the Federal Republic of Germany from gaining mastery of atomic weapons on European continent.
>
> "To appeal to the United States and to all free nations of the world for prompt and final recognition of Poland's western boundary along the Oder and Niesse Rivers. It is our deep conviction that such a recognition would lessen the dependency of Poland and

other East European nations on Russia, as the supposedly sole protector against renewed German revisionism.

"To appeal to the governments of the free world not to forsake Poland's right to territories lawlessly annexed by Russia.

"To ask our Government for further extension of economic, technical, and cultural assistance to the Polish people.

"To appeal to the Congress of the United States that it rescind the amendment to the Foreign Trade Act, which deprives Poland of its most favored nation status. To the United States, trade with Poland is an insignificant position in statistics, to Poland it means the difference between a relative prosperity and lower standard of living.

"To send copies of this resolution to the two Connecticut Senators and six Congressional Representatives."

Dated at Hartford, Conn., this 26th day of May 1963.

THADDEUS MALISZEWSKI,
President, Polish American Congress, District of Connecticut.

Liberals Do Believe in Devils

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate a very interesting article in the June 4, 1963, issue of National Review, entitled "Liberals Do Believe in Devils," and written by Mr. M. Stanton Evans. This article points out that those who invented the term "McCarthyism," which is supposed to represent character assassination because of one's personal beliefs, are, in most cases, the very ones who engage in character assassination against individuals who are critical of communism or Communist activities in this country. The article goes on to review an outstanding book, entitled, "Martin Dies' Story," which I likewise commend to the Members of the House and the Senate, because of the important story which it unfolds on the life of a great American who had the courage to stand and fight in the face of vilification and abuse because of his stanch stand against communism. This book is an autobiography of former Congressman Martin Dies, of Texas, and copies can be obtained for $5 each by writing to the Bookmailer, New York, N.Y.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mr. Evans' article, "Liberals Do Believe in Devils," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBERALS DO BELIEVE IN DEVILS

(By M. Stanton Evans)

It is an odd circumstance that men who have devoted themselves most adamantly to the principal issue of our times have very bad reputations. In the annals of Congress, for example, what legislators have been more vilified than Joe McCarthy, William Jenner, Pat McCarran, Francis Walter, or Harold Velde? Each of these men has been preeminently identified with the cause of anticommunism, and one by one they have been attacked by the massed voices of liberaldom as mountbanks, fools and cads. Nor is the case much different in the world of journalism, where the names Hearst, McCormick, and Patterson, staunch anti-Communists all, have been made synonymous with bad practice.

This surely is a strange coincidence. The laws of probability would indicate that sooner or later there would emerge, e.g., a chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities who went decently about his business, innocent of secret designs to rule by knout and truncheon; or that somewhere there would be a newspaperman who is an astringent anti-Communist without being simultaneously a maligner of respectable characters. But, on the liberal presentation, such things have never been and never can be.

So striking an aggregation of knaves on the side of anti-Communist militancy could hardly be fortuitous; it suggests that whoever takes up the cause of unyielding anticommunism is by virtue of that act defiled, so that however blameless his previous career he necessarily becomes a desperado in his new capacity. The liberal mind recoils from sleuthing down Communists as such; the central evil is implicit in the enterprise, and charges of megalomania (Lewis Strauss), tax evasion (McCarthy), kickbacks (Parnell Thomas), "paranoia" (Edward Teller), and irresponsibility (all), are merely details which, true or untrue (usually the latter), serve to amplify the original indictment.

Many of these defamed anti-Communists will in time receive historical restitution; for in any judgment of character which has ideological bias as its chief component, we may suspect errors both in detail and in general perspective. In the coming revaluation, there could be no better starting place than two men who, by virtue of the duration and the intensity of their public torment, qualify as Lucifer and Beelzebub in the liberal demonology. These are Martin Dies, who presided over the infant House Un-American Activities Committee, and Westbrook Pegler, the former Scripps-Howard and Hearst newspaperman. Each began his public career as a liberal, friendly to the New Deal and bemused by the charms of F.D.R.; in the latter 1930's, each suffered a gradual disillusionment with Roosevelt and his works. (The withdrawal phases did not always coincide; on more than one occasion, Pegler lampooned the Dies Committee's investigations.) As their political positions altered, so did their standing in received society. By the end of World War II, each had become a symbol of what nice people ought to be against.

In Martin Dies' case, the revaluation is primarily a matter of detail. Correcting misinformation about congressional probes of communism is a discipline unto itself. There is no deception too paltry or too absurd for the purposes of liberal warfare against these investigations, and Dies has been subjected to a long train of episodic misrepresentations about what his committee did or did not do. The former congressman has undertaken to set some of these matters straight in "Martin Dies' Story," an autobiographical essay which should be read both as a case study of the inverse ratio of anticommunism to respectability, and as a corrective for much entrenched falsehood.

Dies begins by recalling his early eclat in Washington when he was a New Deal favorite; then recounts the obloquies which were his when it was discovered he intended to take seriously the HUAC chairmanship F.D.R. had thrust upon him. The decline of his reputation can be very precisely dated from his declaration to Roosevelt that communism was as great a danger to America as was nazism. From that day forward, accusations, threats, open hostility from the President, and—as a matter of course—a full-scale political purge, were to be his lot. Most characteristically, Dies was to suffer the insistent frustration of seeing the actions and utterances of anti-Communists garbled and obscured by emotional slogans and shouted irrelevancies. In this book he picks his way through some of these, including the crucifixion of anti-Communist Educator William Wirt, the famous Shirley Temple incident, faked letters purportedly linking Dies to Silver Shirt Leader William Dudley Pelley, the Eleanor Roosevelt-Joe Lash encounter, and other episodes.

Dies' book is a valuable source. (It offers a particularly useful synopsis of the excellent work the committee did, contrary to present allegations, in cracking down on German and Japanese agents immediately prior to and during the Second World War.) It does not, however, constitute the restitution to which Dies is entitled; it is a memoir, fugitive and fragmentary, and as such is a datum which should be incorporated into a complete history of Dies' career and of the committee he headed.

Westbrook Pegler's vindication is not, like Dies', a matter of detail, but of general assessment. The episodes in which Pegler was depressingly wrong or exhilaratingly right are all fairly well known. The problem is to add these up, to mix in the other things that matter, and to determine Pegler's place in journalistic history. This is the job undertaken by New York Post Reporter Oliver Pilat in "Pegler: Angry Man of the Press." Needless to say, the judgment is not favorable. Pilat's assessment of the great controversialist follows almost exactly the trajectory from approval to disapproval described above. When "Peg" was a New Dealer, his rhetoric was perhaps excessive but generally amusing; it was only as he veered rightward that his manner became unforgivable.

To appreciate Pilat's judgment of the later Pegler, certain assumptions are necessary. One must believe that Krishna Menon is a statesman of mark; that J. Robert Oppenheimer is a great American; that fascism is today a greater threat to America than communism; and that expressions of opinion contra any of these axioms are manifestations of "hate." These are the coordinates of Oliver Pilat's universe, and it is in terms of them that Pegler is judged. Pilat charges the columnist with vituperation, cruelty to adversaries, the ruin of careers. Yet it becomes apparent that these allegations are not at the root of the Liberals' antipathy to Pegler. They in fact would celebrate his invective if he had remained one of them, and there is no Peglerian locution they have not accepted when it was used in their behalf.

If Drew Pearson is the embodiment of journalistic virtue, and if Eleanor Roosevelt was a wise and wonderful lady, then Pilat's judgment of Pegler is comprehensible. But these judgments are the measure of a disordered cosmos in which all standards have been turned upside down, where friends of liberty are "authoritarians" and worshipers of the state are lovable Democrats. It is a cosmos in which an Oliver Pilat can survey the policy which has yielded half the globe to communism, find it good, and come up with the conclusion that people objecting to it are incipient fascists, more dangerous than the Communists themselves.

In an age when such flights of hallucination are the regular order of business, the services of a Westbrook Pegler are not merely useful—they are a prerequisite of survival. Against the forces of delusion and folly, Pegler has hurled the stentorian force of a loud and unintimated honesty. He has made his mistakes. But he has never wavered in his commitment to American institutions, or lost touch with the striking virtues of his native idiom.

When so much political and social commentary is devoted to missing the point, or to annihilating and silencing those who happen to see it, Pegler has provided us with something we could not very well have done without. It is therefore likely that, despite Mr. Pilat, his reputation will survive. He has been our Savonarola, our Swift, and our Mencken all in one—the angry voice of sanity and honor in a world which is essentially absurd.

On Preserving Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the distinguished and respected columnist, Mr. David Lawrence, has been producing some outstanding columns on the subject of Presidential use of troops or preparation to use troops to force integration of the races. Mr. Lawrence has made it crystal clear that he is concerned about the lack of legal authority which the President had in dispatching troops to Alabama recently, and the potential for exercising dictatorial power to intimidate or force local officials and individuals to conform to the whims and orders of any President.

I only wish, Mr. President, that more of our national writers were as objective and courageous as Mr. Lawrence, in his determination to point out to the American people the dangers involved in using Federal troops for such a purpose. Evidently, to the Supreme Court, which has been indicating its lack of objectivity in decision after decision concerning the South, is so determined to force integration of the races that it will not even consider a challenge by the Governor of a sovereign State to the dispatching of troops by the President into a State for purposes of intervention and possible later use of these troops as an instrument of force against fellow American citizens.

It is therefore refreshing, Mr. President, to find in the Washington press corps, one, among at least several other newsmen, who is willing to sound the call of danger to the American public to make certain that both sides of this conflict are brought to the attention of the people, even though the Supreme Court will not even entertain an argument on the subject.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this column by Mr. David Lawrence, entitled, "Power a Dictator Would Usurp: U.S. Brief on Using Troops in Alabama Would Open Up Vast Area of Coercion," and printed in the May 27, 1963, issue of the Evening Star be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that a newsletter that I distributed on May 20, 1963, on a similar subject, and entitled, "On Preserving Order," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column and newsletter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 27, 1963]

POWER A DICTATOR WOULD USURP—U.S. BRIEF ON USING TROOPS IN ALABAMA WOULD OPEN UP VAST AREA OF COERCION

(By David Lawrence)

A remarkable brief has just been filed in the Supreme Court of the United States by direction of Attorney General Robert Kennedy. If the argument in it is ever sustained by the high court, the way is opened to a military dictatorship in the United States at any time and for any reason that suits the whim of a President. The provisions of the Constitution which limit a President's power would be swept aside and, for all practical purposes, the Constitution hereafter would be what the President says it is.

The brief was in answer to a petition of Governor Wallace of Alabama asking the Supreme Court to issue an order against the use of Federal troops in Alabama unless requested by the Governor or the legislature, as required by the Constitution.

The Supreme Court today, however, declined to pass on the merits of the argument in the brief and rejected the complaint on the ground that the President had merely taken "purely preparatory measures." But the brief of the Department of Justice will remain in the records as a statement of the basis for future use of Federal troops inside a sovereign State.

The Department of Justice replies that the provision of the Constitution which explicitly says that Federal troops may be used within a State only with the permission of the Governor or the State Legislature is "irrelevant" and that somehow the 14th amendment conferred broad new powers on the President to enforce any law on any subject or to use troops whenever, on the basis of his own judgment of the circumstances, he wishes to use them. The brief, moreover, makes this sweeping claim:

"There is no room for judicial review of a presidential determination that the conditions stated in section 333 have arisen and require him to take 'such measures as he considers necessary.'"

Section 333 is part of a law originally passed in 1871. It specifically relates only to a failure or refusal by State authorities to permit the "execution of the laws of the United States." President Kennedy has himself publicly stated that, in the recent disturbances in Birmingham, Ala., no Federal law was being violated—nor any court order, either.

The brief brushes aside as secondary the public statements of Alabama officials that they intend to maintain law and order, and adds:

"But the allegations of intent cannot relieve the President of the right and duty to prepare for all contingencies and to make the independent determination required by section 333."

Yet a President's intent, on the other hand—whether it be political or capricious—to prepare to deal with local disturbances whenever he pleases is held by the Department of Justice not even to be subject to judicial review. It is further argued in the brief that section 333 is a blanket authorization to a President to send troops into any State at any time that he himself thinks there may in the future be some intention to violate any law or court order. Section 333, however, doesn't deal with intent at all, but only with actual evidence of law violation or a refusal to enforce a law.

The constitutionality of section 333 itself has never been passed upon by the Supreme Court of the United States. Congress cannot assume the right to proclaim by statute what it wishes to be considered constitutional. Nor can Congress enlarge a President's constitutional powers by means of a law.

The most surprising statement in the brief—and one which would seem to pave the way for a military dictatorship by a President of the United States at any time he wishes to set it up—is as follows:

"We cannot know whether the occasion for invoking the statute (sec. 333) will actually arise. Nor need we examine the precise circumstances which might justify the contemplated intervention. It is sufficiently clear, however, that the prevailing situation in Birmingham may deteriorate in such a way as to require action under section 333."

Yet the law itself doesn't say a President may threaten to use Federal troops or even use them until the circumstances stated in the law have actually arisen.

But what difference would it make what the law says if the Department of Justice is right in claiming that there can be no judicial review of a President's acts?

There is no limit to the powers of coercion that could be applied by a President, whether a liberal or not, by ordering out troops. If the Supreme Court of the United States accepts the reasoning of the Department of Justice, then, even when no Federal law or court order has been violated, a President can mobilize Federal troops and deploy them as he pleases. He could intimidate local authorities and cause certain citizens to make concessions in favor of one group of voters rather than another. Also, a President, under his own concept of Executive power, could apparently choose to enforce that concept by military action irrespective of what is actually specified to the contrary in either the laws of the United States or the Constitution.

ON PRESERVING ORDER

In recent years many of the rights and powers of the States have been usurped altogether or in part by the National Government, through Supreme Court edicts, Executive orders, and by actions of the Congress. This is particularly true in the congressional authorization of grant-in-aid programs which permit the Federal dollar to bring about the desired element of control. Two major powers are still in large part retained by the States, these being in the fields of education and law enforcement. However, those who would centralize all power in Washington have been constantly chipping away at these two vital powers in the past decade.

The major accomplishment forged by the centralizers in the field of education was the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision of 1954. Another major effort to take over the field of education has been the proposed program of general Federal aid to education. However, this drive has been blunted and shows no sign of being revived during the 88th Congress.

In the field of law enforcement, the National Government would have usurped more power had it not been for the strong views expressed by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover against establishment of a national police force. Within the past few years, however, the centralizers have discovered another tool which can be utilized not only to gain more control over education but also to intrude on the law enforcement prerogatives of State and local governments. This is the tactic of using Federal troops to force compliance with Federal court orders. Last week this tactic was extended one step further by using it as a club to intimidate State and local officers under the threat of the use of Federal troops in Birmingham, Ala.

The idea of using Federal troops in the various States is highly questionable from a legal standpoint, except as provided in article IV, section 4 of the U.S. Constitution, to wit: "on application of the (State) legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened)." * * * The argument against the use of troops to force integration has been made by many eminent legal scholars from both within and without the South. The Congress certainly indicated it had no intention of forcing integration by use of troops when in 1957 it repealed an old reconstruction statute which provided for the use of troops in equal rights cases. The vote in the Senate was 90 to 0.

In the Birmingham difficulties troops were dispatched to the State by the President, without any Federal laws or court orders having been violated. In fact, the President made this clear at a news conference before the troops were sent to Alabama. In addition, the local law enforcement officials have been demonstrating their willingness and capability to maintain law and order in Birmingham in the face of rioting which was initiated by Negro mobs, encouraged by Federal officials and liberal elements outside the South, and then aggravated by the unfortunate bombings.

Clearly, the President has no authority to intervene or threaten to intervene in preserving law and order where no Federal laws or court orders have been violated. The preservation of local law and order is the responsibility of local and State officials. In fact, the dispatching of troops to Alabama only served to further aggravate a tense atmosphere charged with deep-seated feelings.

One Alabama editor, after lunching with the President, sought to excuse the President's action in part by stating that he felt the President was sincere in sending the troops to Alabama. Columnist David Lawrence has asked the appropriate question, however, why troops weren't sent when the rioting was initiated by the mobs. Why, instead, has Martin Luther King been made a court favorite at the White House, even to the exent of receiving presidential phone calls while in jail in Atlanta and Birmingham for creating domestic troubles? The question can likewise be raised as to why troops haven't been ordered to quell recent domestic racial violence in Chicago, Ill., and Englewood, N.J.

Sincere or not, the President's action in sending troops into Alabama for the purposes stated was both illegal and unwise. The voice of public protest should be heard on this action all across this land, for such an action merely plants the seeds for additional dictatorial actions in all sections of the country.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND.

Questionnaire—1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the session I sent out to my constituents over 100,000 questionnaires in an attempt to learn the opinions of those I represent here in Congress. I was heartened by the fact that almost 20,000 people took the time and the trouble to respond.

I released the recapitulation of the results of my questionnaire in February. At that time I noted that of those responding, 63 percent were listed as registered Republicans, 5 percent Democrats, and 32 percent were independents. I now have the breakdown of the responses by party.

The following is the final tabulation with respect to party affiliation and the totals for each question:

Questionnaire, 1963

	Percent			
	Independent	Republican	Democrat	Total
Do you favor—				
(1) Reducing Federal income taxes—				
(*a*) Geared to reduction in Federal expenditures	77	88	58	83
(*b*) Without a reduction in Federal expenditures	16	7	35	11
(*c*) No response (presumably against a tax cut)	7	5	7	6

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you favor—			
(2) Increasing your social security taxes to finance hospital and nursing home costs for those over 65?			
Independent	42	52	6
Republican	29	63	8
Democrat	67	26	7
Total	35	58	7
(3) Federal aid for construction of—			
(a) Public primary and secondary school facilities?			
Independent	55	37	8
Republican	44	49	7
Democrat	70	21	9
Total	49	43	8
(b) Private primary and secondary school facilities?			
Independent	16	70	14
Republican	9	79	12
Democrat	26	57	17
Total	17	69	14
(c) College academic facilities?			
Independent	48	40	12
Republican	38	50	12
Democrat	56	29	15
Total	42	46	12
(4) Federal aid for public school teachers' salaries?			
Independent	28	66	6
Republican	18	76	6
Democrat	38	54	8
Total	22	72	6
(5) Federal scholarships for higher education?			
Independent	60	34	6
Republican	50	42	8
Democrat	72	23	5
Total	55	38	7
(6) Legislation providing tax credits for parents paying college tuition?			
Independent	69	26	5
Republican	70	25	5
Democrat	70	23	7
Total	70	25	5
(7) Legislation requiring secret ballot of union members before strike can be called?			
Independent	90	4	6
Republican	94	2	4
Democrat	88	6	6
Total	93	3	4
(8) Federal aid for commuter railroads?			
Independent	35	50	15
Republican	41	46	13
Democrat	40	45	15
Total	39	47	14
(9) Creation of a Department of Urban Affairs?			
Independent	27	52	21
Republican	18	62	20
Democrat	43	34	23
Total	22	58	20
(10) Establishment of Domestic Peace Corps?			
Independent	40	45	15
Republican	30	55	15
Democrat	54	31	15
Total	35	50	15

Questionnaire 1963—Continued

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you favor—Continued			
(11) Increased pay for military personnel?			
Independent	43	37	20
Republican	41	38	21
Democrat	48	33	19
Total	42	37	21
(12) Increased pay for Members of Congress?			
Independent	16	64	20
Republican	18	60	22
Democrat	19	62	19
Total	17	62	21
13. Optional nondenominational religious activities (prayers, Bible reading, etc.) in public schools?			
Independent	75	17	8
Republican	83	11	6
Democrat	68	21	11
Total	79	14	7
14. A strong United Nations fully supported by all member nations?			
Independent	86	8	6
Republican	84	9	7
Democrat	90	6	4
Total	85	9	6
15. Aid to underdeveloped countries that are—			
(a) Pro-Western?			
Independent	72	16	12
Republican	72	16	12
Democrat	71	15	14
Total	72	16	12
(b) Nonalined (neutral)?			
Independent	35	44	21
Republican	32	45	23
Democrat	41	38	21
Total	34	44	22

	Percent			
	Independent	Republican	Democrat	Total
16(a) Do you prefer the services provided by the Federal Government to—				
Be increased?	15	6	26	10
Be decreased?	44	59	25	53
Remain at present level?	34	28	38	31
No response	7	7	11	6

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
16(b) If your previous answer favors increased services, are you willing to pay increased Federal taxes to obtain then?			
Independent	71	22	7
Republican	69	23	8
Democrat	20	74	6
Total	63	30	7

	Percent			
	Good	Fair	Poor	No response
17. What is your opinion of the President's record on—				
(a) Domestic matters?				
Independent	27	44	26	3
Republican	11	45	40	4
Democratic	52	35	10	3
Total	18	44	34	4
(b) Foreign affairs?				
Independent	34	38	25	3
Republican	17	43	36	4
Democrat	57	30	9	4
Total	24	41	31	4

NASA Medals and Decorations Awarded by the President May 21, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following list of medals and decorations awarded by the President in the rose garden, Tuesday, May 21, 1963:

NASA MEDALS AND DECORATIONS AWARDED BY THE PRESIDENT, MAY 21, 1963

NASA DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL

Maj. Leroy Gordon Cooper, Jr. His outstanding flight demonstrated man's ability to conduct engineering and scientific investigations in orbital space flight and added significantly to man's knowledge of space technology.

NASA MEDALS FOR OUTSTANDING LEADERSHIP

G. Merritt Preston, Manager, Project Mercury Operations at Launch Operations Center, Cocoa Beach, Fla. "The National Aeronautics and Space Administration awards the NASA Medal for Outstanding Leadership to G. Merritt Preston for his outstanding leadership in the preparation and checkout of the spacecraft for space flight missions of the United States in Project Mercury."

Floyd L. Thompson, Director, Langley Research Center, NASA, Hampton, Va. "The National Aeronautics and Space Administration awards the NASA Medal for Outstanding Leadership to Floyd L. Thompson for his outstanding leadership of the scientists and engineers who were responsible for the original technical concepts and who comprised the nucleus of the development team for the space flight missions of the United States in Project Mercury."

Kenneth S. Kleinknecht, Manager, Project Mercury Office, Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Tex. "The National Aeronautics and Space Administration awards the NASA Medal for Outstanding Leadership to Kenneth S. Kleinknecht for his outstanding leadership in managing the development of the spacecraft for the extended space flight missions of the United States in Project Mercury."

Christopher C. Kraft, Director, Flight Operations Division, Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Tex. "The National Aeronautics and Space Administration awards the NASA Medal for Outstanding Leadership to Christopher C. Kraft for his outstanding leadership in the planning and operational control of the space flight missions of the United States in Project Mercury."

Maj. Gen. Leighton I. Davis, commander, Air Force Missile Test Center, Cape Canaveral, Fla. "The National Aeronautics and Space Administration awards the NASA Medal for Outstanding Leadership to Maj. Gen. Leighton I. Davis for his outstanding leadership in planning and implementing the support of the Department of Defense to the space flight missions of the United States in Project Mercury."

NASA GROUP ACHIEVEMENT AWARDS

"The National Aeronautics and Space Administration presents the Group Achievement Award to the Department of Defense Recovery Forces for outstanding achievement of the planning, direction, and execution of recovery operations throughout the world in support of the space flight missions of the United States in Project Mercury."

(Accepting on behalf of the Department of Defense Recovery Forces: Rear Adm. Harold G. Bowen, Jr., chief, cruiser-destroyer flotilla No. 4, Norfolk, Va.)

"The National Aeronautics and Space Administration presents the Group Achievement Award to the Air Force Space Systems Division for outstanding achievement in managing the development and launching of the Atlas booster used in the space flight missions of the United States in Project Mercury."

(Accepting on behalf of the Air Force Space Systems Division for managing development and launching of Atlas booster: Maj. Gen. Ben I. Funk, commanding officer, Air Force Space Systems Division, Inglewood, Calif.)

J.F.K. Campaign Promises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the editorial which follows is reprinted from the Wellington, Kans., Daily News. In reading it one is constrained to wonder if the man who ran for President in 1960 is the same man who now occupies the White House:

J.F.K. Campaign Promises

President Kennedy's claim last week before the American Society of Newspaper Editors that an unbalanced Federal budget for the coming fiscal year is necessary to get the country moving again is a far cry from his 1960 campaign promises about Government spending and about the need for fiscal responsibility. For example:

"I believe in the balanced budget, and the only conditions under which I would unbalance the budget would be if there was a grave national emergency or a serious recession."—Candidate Kennedy, September 26, 1960.

"I cannot believe that there is not some money that can be saved in the Pentagon. I was chairman of Subcommittee on Reorganization that passed 30 bills dealing with purchasing. There is not any doubt in my mind at all that you are spending $32 billion and not getting as much of a bang for your buck as you could by control over effective expenditures."—Candidate Kennedy, September 29, 1960.

"I said last week I believed in a balanced budget, unless there was a severe recession * * *. So that I believe that on this subject we can balance the budget unless we have a national emergency or unless we have a severe recession."—Candidate Kennedy, October 7, 1960.

"I have stated in both debates and state again that I believe in a balanced budget and have supported that concept during my 14 years in the Congress * * *. I believe that the next administration should work for a balanced budget and that would be my intention. Mr. Nixon misstates my figures constantly, which is of course his right, but the fact of the matter is here is where I stand and I just want to have it on the public record."—Candidate Kennedy, October 13, 1960.

"There have been statements made that the Democratic platform would cost a good deal of money and that I am in favor of unbalancing the budget. That is wholly wrong, wholly in error * * *. That is not my view and I think it ought to be stated very clearly in the record. My view is that you can do these programs, and they should be carefully drawn, within a balanced budget, if we are moving ahead."—Candidate Kennedy, October 27, 1960.

"To hold down the cost of living, we must rely on a variety of constructive policies which will strike at inflation on all fronts. To do this, we should * * * balance the budget. Only in times of high unemployment or national emergency are deficits justified. Wage a constant war on waste—eliminate inefficiencies in Government activities and cut back Federal expenditures in less-essential areas."—Candidate Kennedy, November 2, 1962.

"We spend about $6 billion a year in the Department of Agriculture. My judgment is a sound program can bring supply and demand into balance and save at least a billion dollars or a billion and a half."—Candidate Kennedy, November 7, 1960.

"I believe in a balanced budget."—Candidate Kennedy, November 7, 1960.

A 6-Day, Eight-Port Trip to the 49th

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, all Senators know the Retired Officer magazine. This magazine keeps us informed on matters of direct interest to retired military personnel. It is both a useful and interesting publication.

In the May–June issue there is an excellent article written by Col. Robert Joseph which describes the newest and most exciting vacation opportunity in the United States. This is, of course, the trip offered by the Alaska Ferry System which now makes a regularly scheduled 6-day, eight-port trip from Prince Rupert to Skagway and return. Along the way the ferry stops at Haines, Juneau, Wrangell, Ketchikan, Sitka, and Petersburg. Each of these Alaska cities is fascinating; each one different. The scenery along the way is unequalled in the lower 48. Because I know that this article will be of interest to any family planning a vacation, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our Fabulous 49th State—Alaska

(Note.—At the invitation of the Honorable William A. Egan, Governor of Alaska, the Retired Officers Association was invited to participate in the inaugural voyage of the State's first vessel of the new marine highway—The M/V *Malaspina*. The voyage covered the period of April 27 through May 2, 1963, and the association was represented by its director of public relations.)

The ferry system in Alaska—now a reality—is the culmination of years of planning by Alaskans who recognized the importance of providing a connecting link between the communities of southeast Alaska and the highway and rail connections at each end of the panhandle.

The voyage, covering 6 days, included the eight ports along the historic inland passage route regularly served by the marine highway system, as follows:

Skagway: During the gold rush of 1898, Skagway was the gateway through which thousands of hopeful men passed on their way to the Klondike. Gambler Soapy Smith and his gang of thieves and con men reigned supreme—until Soapy was shot by a vigilante. Today Skagway has 750 residents, wooden sidewalks, no traffic lights, and some of the same false-front buildings that served its peak population of 20,000. Throughout the summer, the townsfolk put on a "Days of '98" show for visitors that's a lulu.

Haines: The 159-mile highway that links the ferry system with highways to the rest of Alaska is at Haines. Located on the shore of beautiful Lynn Canal, the city is also noted for its huge, delicious strawberries. Close-by Port Chilkoot is famous for reviving Indian arts and crafts. Here you can see authentic Chikat dances, the performers wearing colorful masks and costumes they've made themselves. And at the Indian Tribal House you can purchase carved totems, masks, paddles, and other unique Alaska Indian art.

Juneau: The capital of Alaska is located in an area so beautiful that it is undoubtedly one of the most scenic capitals in the Nation. Nearby is Mendenhall Glacier, the most photographed ice river in the world. Visitors can tour a large gold mine * * * see an outstanding Indian and Eskimo collection at the museum * * * visit the capitol buildings * * * and take a flight over the Juneau icecap that stretches for miles behind the city—a flat, snow-covered region dotted with pinnacles that look like peaks in a bowl of whipped cream.

Wrangell: Wrangell is one of Alaska's oldest towns, founded in 1834 by Baron Wrangell as a fur trading post. Today its economy is based on lumbering and fishing. On nearby Shakes Island, reached easily by footbridge, is a colorful collection of Tlingit totems. Wrangell is the takeoff point for the 4-day Stikine River trip, a thrill for those who like to get off the beaten path. A sturdy steamer takes you through the deep canyons in the Coast Mountains, over riffles and rapids and past a hundred glaciers, to the old mining town of Telegraph Creek, B.C.

Sitka: Sitka was the capital when Russia owned Alaska—a center of world fur trade, and so gay it was known as "The Paris of the Pacific." A reminder of the city's glittering past is the ornate Cathedral of St. Michael, with its exquisite religious art. The Indian totem poles outside town are reminders of even earlier residents. Gold Rush days are recalled by the Pioneers Home, a haven for old-timers. A $60 million pulp mill adds a modern touch to this historic town. Across the sound rises Mount Edgecumbe, almost a twin of Japan's Mount Fujiyama.

Ketchikan: Ketchikan lives up to its claim of "The Salmon Capital of the World" by conducting a season-long salmon derby in which visitors are invited to compete for weekly prizes. Charter boats are available for salt water fishermen, and charter planes take anglers to upland lakes and trout streams in 20 minutes or less. Alaska's first pulp mill is located at Ketchikan. And the city boasts the world's largest collection of Indian totem poles, clustered in the city park and at Saxman village on the outskirts of town.

Petersburg: Founded by hardy Scandinavians, Petersburg is known as "Little Norway." Its well-protected harbor is home port for 160 fishing vessels. Five fish a year. The restaurants feature Scandinavian cooking—and the tiny, famed Petersburg shrimp. The world's record King salmon (126½ pounds), which processing plants handle 16 to 20 million pounds of halibut, salmon, cod, and shellfishermen caught in nearby waters, is on display. Deer hunting in the surrounding area is among the best in southeastern Alaska.

Prince Rupert: The southern terminal of the Alaska ferry system is at the Canadian town of Prince Rupert. Named for the governor of the Hudson Bay Co., it's a bustling deep sea port of 11,000 people, and a halibut fishing center. It has the largest fish cold storage plant in the world. Grain from the Peace River country and pulp from nearby sawmills is shipped from its port, as well as fish. Visitors may want to stop at the Museum of Northern British Columbia to view the excellent collection of Haida argillite carvings.

The M/V *Malaspina* and her sister ships, the M/V *Taku* and the M/V *Matanuska*, are the largest motor ferries registered under the American flag, with more than 8,000 horsepower in the main diesels in each vessel. The speedy rudder, propeller, and engine control systems, together with heavy steel hull plating and deep hull, make these ferries the finest, safest, and swiftest ferries ever built in North America.

As was shown on the stiff trial tests in Puget Sound, the *Malaspina* could come to a dead stop from full speed in less than three ship-lengths, and make a complete circle in two ship-lengths at 18-knot speed. Normal speed at full load is 17 knots, and top speed—for emergencies—is 20 knots. The vessels are 352 feet long, 73 feet 7 inches beam, draw 15 feet of water fully loaded, and displace 3,585 tons.

Each vessel is certified to carry 500 passengers. In addition to comfortale reclining seats on the promenade and boat decks, each has 14 passenger cabins. In the winter of 1963, the private sleeping facilities will be expanded to accommodate about 100 persons.

The huge eight-lane auto decks are built so they can take vehicles legally allowed on any highway. The deck will handle 109 conventional automobiles or fifty-one 27-foot trailer vans.

Each vessel is manned by a complement of 31 people.

The vessels were purchased out of an $18 million bond issue asked by the first session of the first Alaskan Legislature, and approved by the voters of the State. They were designed by Philip F. Spaulding & Associates, of Seattle, and were built by the Puget Sound Bridge & Drydock Co., of Seattle.

On the regular schedule the three ships (MV *Malaspina*, MV *Taku*, and MV *Matanuska*) will make the one-way trip in 30 hours, with an additional 14 hours by way of Sitka. Although overnight stops in each community are not a feature of the regular schedule, each of the communities have adequate accommodations for substantial numbers of visitors.

The scenery is breathtaking and continuous. Bear, caribou, moose, reindeer, and wild goat meats are often readily available at mealtime, as is fresh salmon, oysters, and shrimp. The prices are reasonable, and every consideration has been given to further the comfort and enjoyment of the visitor passenger.

Alaska—America's last frontier—is beginning to move and its unbelievable beauties and vast resources discovered.

The new ferry system in Alaska, operated by the State, makes available, at reasonable cost, a tour that will stand out unexcelled in the mind of the traveler forever. Don't miss the opportunity to see this fairyland—soon.

For further information and rates, write to Department of Public Works, Division of Marine Transportation, Post Office Box 1361, Juneau, Alaska.

Revolution in Defense Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the editorial "Revolution in Defense Thinking," which follows from the Sydney Morning Herald of May 23, 1963, apparently indicates lack of faith from an unexpected quarter in our resolution to honor our world commitments:

REVOLUTION IN DEFENSE THINKING

The most important and most heartening feature of the Prime Minister's statement on defense yesterday was not the announcement of modest, though welcome, increases in expenditure and service strengths but the acknowledgment by the Government for the first time of the need for Australia to have the capacity for independent military action. The forces envisaged, said Sir Robert Menzies, would "provide a capacity for independent action to meet the initial shock of any emergency with which we may in future find ourselves faced." The need for that capacity has never before been admitted by the Government; earlier defense s tatements have not referred to it.

Previously the Government has repeatedly emphasized that Australia would never have to act alone, and that its defense programs were postulated on cooperation with allies in all foreseeable circumstances. The key to the new thinking is undoubtedly given by another novel reference by the Prime Minister. "We have noted," he said, "events in and concerning West New Guinea." Again, this is the first time the Government has publicly admitted the dangers created for Australia by the Indonesian arms buildup and occupation of West New Guinea. Sir Robert Menzies went on to give a very thinly veiled warning to Djarkata with the declaration that we would defend Papua and New Guinea "as if they were part of our mainland—there must be no mistaken ideas about that."

This new realism will be thankfully welcomed by all Australians concerned for their country's safety. But while the Government has acknowledged the needs of a new and dangerous situation it has not yet accepted their full implications for defense planning. The increase in defense preparedness must be very much greater than is provided for in the revised program. The Prime Minister's claim that the planned forces will "provide a capacity for independent action" is not sustained by the facts and cannot be accepted.

The minimum requirements of such a capacity are the raising of an all-Regular division of five battle groups (which, with the Regular Army's other commitments, would involve increasing its strength to 45,000), the purchase of an attack aircraft carrier and the replacement of the out-of-date Canberra bombers with an effective air strike reconnaissance force. None of these requirements is met by the Government's plans.

These plans provide for the enlistment of an additional 3,500 men in the Regular Army which, Sir Robert Menzies says, will enable the formation of a third Regular battle group. But in fact these additional men are needed to make the existing two battle groups logistically self-supporting. At present the Regular Field Force would have to borrow from Home Command units if it went into action, and this very unsatisfactory situation is apparently to be perpetuated. It is, moreover, quite unreal to speak of having a "fully equipped, fully modern, fully supported pentropic division" when two of its five battle groups are C.M.F. Quite apart from probable constitutional difficulties in sending the C.M.F. overseas, C.M.F. units cannot be brought to the same standard of readiness as Regulars.

Mrs. Jeffrey—First a Patriot, Second a Partisan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the State Journal, of Lansing, Mich., on Sunday, January 20, 1963, about a distinguished friend of mine and an outstanding Democrat of our city and State, Mrs. Newman Jeffrey, our national committeewoman, a faithful Democrat and a real patriot and dedicated liberal American.

The article explains better than I the multitudinous virtues and labors of this distinguished American:

MRS. JEFFREY—FIRST A PATRIOT, SECOND A PARTISAN

(By Patricia Tubbs)

Mrs. Newman Jeffrey, of Detroit, Democratic National Committeewoman, and a familiar person in mid-Michigan, has a full schedule in connection with her many activities.

She was in Washington, D.C., for the recent opening of Congress; traveled some 1,500 miles in snowstorms last weekend in the Upper Peninsula in connection with her party's membership drive; visited Lansing Tuesday evening to discuss ConCon with the Ingham County Democratic Women; flew to Chicago Wednesday for a day-long session on the employment of youth.

Mildred Jeffrey was elected national committeewoman in January 1961, after serving as alternate since 1957. She assumed the duties on a regular basis in 1960 when her predecessor, Mrs. Margaret Price, of Ann Arbor, was named national party vice chairman.

The diminutive blonde attributes her interest in social and economic problems and in youth work, all of which have led to interest in politics, to the Christian teachings which have been a part of her life since she was a child. One of the greatest influences on her life and career, she believes, has been the YWCA.

"We should practice * * * and try to live * * * Christian teachings, as well as preach them," is her motto.

She lives it in supporting her activities, in that while promoting her interest or cause, she does not deride her opposition. An extremely dynamic woman, Mrs. Jeffrey builds up her viewpoint and works hard for a cause, but feels that individuals are entitled to their own views.

A member of Evergreen Presbyterian Church in Detroit, Mrs. Jeffrey is on the Advisory Council of the National Council of United Church Women.

She represented the national organization of the United Presbyterian Church, USA, as a delegate to the recent conference on the "Ethical Implications of Rapid Economical Changes" in Philadelphia, Pa.

HONORED BY COUNCIL

She is also a member of the public affairs committee of the Detroit Council of Churches. In 1960 the council awarded Mrs. Jeffrey its Layman of the Year Award in recognition of her work in bringing religious and labor leaders together. She was the second woman to ever receive the annual honor.

In addition to her many voluntary duties, Mrs. Jeffrey is director of community relations for the United Auto Workers.

Her job here, she explains, is twofold. She works with community organizations to bring the story of the unions, its goals and program to the communities and conversely, keeps the union informed as to community views. In this respect she is engaged in programs of mutual concern to UAW and community.

Mrs. Jeffrey's duties as national committeewoman are also twofold. She and State committeeman Neil Staebler represent Michigan's interests and concerns in the national committee. They work with congressmen and Senators in securing Federal programs in Michigan.

On the other hand, they bring and implement the programs of the national committee in Michigan. An example is "Operation Support," organized last year to mobilize individual support by Michigan Dems for President John F. Kennedy's legislative program.

Her work as committeewoman takes Mrs. Jeffrey to Washington on the average of twice a month.

INTEREST IN YOUTH

Mrs. Jeffrey's interest in youth, especially the noncollege bound, is of long standing. She is a member of President Kennedy's Committee on the Problems of Youth, and is currently engaged in work in support of youth employment opportunities legislation.

Lost in committee during the last session of Congress, the youth employment legislation has been introduced as bill No. 1 in both the House and Senate this session.

The bills would provide job training and work experience for young people in the 16 to 21 age bracket.

Mrs. Jeffrey feels very strongly in favor of the bills, pointing out that the unemployment rate is highest in this age group. Often, she states, a high school diploma is not enough to secure the young person a job. In addition to training, Mrs. Jeffrey feels the proposed program would give the young people involved greater confidence in seeking employment.

Her Wednesday conference in Chicago was a planning and strategy meeting with youth leaders serving public and voluntary agencies throughout the Midwest.

The Chicago meeting, Mrs. Jeffrey said, is one example of what she feels to be the essence of democracy.

"People who are aware of a problem," she continued, "work together for what they sincerely believe will best solve the problem. This is democracy."

ANOTHER PROJECT

Now Mrs. Jeffrey is beginning another campaign—against Con-Con. More important even, she feels, than a definite "yes" or "no" stand is that citizens study the issues and be aware of the changes the proposed document would make.

"The document will have a profound effect on Michigan citizens for generations," she said, pointing out that she feels that everyone should be aware of the consequences of their vote.

Mrs. Jeffrey has been a member of the Democratic State Central Committee since 1954. In addition to her church and political affiliations, she is a member of Detroit's International Institute, a life member of the NAACP, member of the American Library Association, and is on the Detroit Library Commission.

The Jeffreys have two children. Daughter Sharon, who will graduate from the University of Michigan in June, seems to be following in her mother's footsteps if her many activities at the University of Michigan are indicative. The Jeffreys' son, Balfour, is a freshman at the University of Michigan.

Doing Business With a Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by John T. Connor, president of Merck & Co., Inc., at the dinner session, New England's 10th Annual World Trade Day, April 24, 1963, Sheraton-Plaza Hotel, Boston, Mass.:

DOING BUSINESS WITH A REVOLUTION

(Address by John T. Connor)

An audience of New Englanders should have no trouble understanding why it is difficult to do business with a revolution. You merely have to remember what Sam Adams and his Boston friends did a few years ago to the British East India Co. when it tried to sell three shiploads of tea in this neighborhood.

Today, of course, the shoe is on the other foot. It is now the Americans who are finding it difficult to do business with other people's revolutions. Our problems are not the same as those of George III or his Prime Minister, Lord North, who were blinded by the extraordinary theory that their adversaries would vanish as soon as the underdeveloped yokels hereabout were confronted with a regiment of redcoats. Two centuries later, faced with underdevolped areas in our own world, I do not believe we suffer from blindness. I think we assess quite clearly the nature of the revolution of rising expectations that is stirring up two-thirds of the globe. We are just not organized to cope with it.

It is my thesis tonight that our inadequacies are due, at least in part, to the failure of the two major forces in our society—business and Government—to work together. The game of cops and robbers they have been playing with each other for so long has become a too-costly luxury. It is not only hampering the expansion of our trade but it is defeating the objectives of our foreign aid program and opening the developing nations to infiltration, subversion, and possible conquest by Communist imperialism. We could reverse this tide, in my opinion, with a healthy dose of peaceful coexistence at home.

Government and business have been making faces at each other now for about a century. For much of this period, it was the businessmen who took the initiative.

During the years when we were flinging railroads across the continent and building the foundations of our industrial might, politicians were considered to be a nuisance and Government service was treated, by and large, with contempt. The rules of the game began to change shortly after the turn of the century when Teddy Roosevelt decided to play the role of cop. And ever since the 1932 debacle, business has been continuously on the run.

This mutual suspicion has led business and the state to pursue independent goals both at home and abroad. At home, except for the excesses of hostility, the benefits of a pluralistic society have probably been worth the price paid. Even abroad, at least during the period when America was coming of age, it was not a serious liability. In fact, I think we can be rather proud that in the second half of the last century we built global respect for the flag with the industrial corporation rather than the sword. It was not our Navy that made us a first-class economic power, but the size and wealth of our exploding domestic market, our accumulating capital, our skill with tools, men and ships, the hunger of our factories for raw materials and our ambitions as a people to provide more of this world's goods for ourselves and our families. The corporation was not an arm of the state as much as the state was the beneficiary of the corporation.

But today we face a different world and need a different approach. It is a world in which a speech by a governor of a Brazilian State has a simultaneous impact on Detroit and Washington; a decision in Pittsburgh can weaken or strengthen our Ambassador's hand in New Delhi, and a Government-to-Government conference in Bogotá can change the whole course of American industry's trade and investments in Latin America.

To protect the national interest under these circumstances requires the close cooperation between business and government that has characterized British, French and German overseas affairs for at least a century. There is nothing inherent in our political institutions to preclude this type of partnership, as the British have so amply demonstrated. The Tories and Labor may quarrel about both foreign and domestic policies, but, no matter which one is in power, they are together about promoting the United Kingdom's interest abroad. After Sir Francis Drake chased the Spanish around the Atlantic, British trade and the British flag became indistinguishable. In London a close bond of interest, knowledge and objectives unites the civil servant in Whitehall with his counterpart in the city. At a GATT conference in Geneva or a negotiation in Buenos Aires, they work as a team.

Ever since Andrew Jackson took out after the Bank of the United States, our cultural heritage has been just the reverse. The immature squabbling it encourages is getting in the way of our future. This puts us at a unique disadvantage, in my opinion, when faced with the enormously complex and dynamic forces that are now shaping the political, social and economic destiny of the developing nations of the non-Communist world.

For purposes of illustration, I shall confine my remarks to Latin America with which my own industry has had more experience than with any other area outside the Atlantic community. Treating Latin America as a single entity is full of dangers, I know, for it easily leads to oversimplification. But it is an area united by a common religion, a common European cultural and institutional heritage, and—with the exception of Brazil and some of the Caribbean island—a common language. Many observers believe it has a common future.

As U.S. industry looks at Latin America, it sees, on the one hand, opportunities inherent in markets that, until recently, have been expanding faster than our own. But, on the other hand, it sees so much economic and political chaos that private capital is literally fleeing the area. This chaos is the direct result of the revolution of runaway expectations which has hit Latin America particularly hard. Few of the national economies, no matter how fast they are moving ahead, seem to be able to match the speed of progress their people have been led to believe they are entitled to. Political leaders—when they are out of power—therefore have an easy time stirring discontent and an irresistible temptation to do so.

This, of course, plays right into the hands of the Communists, whose drive is not to improve the lot of the people but to create the kind of disorder, confusion and hopelessness on which they can ride into power. The politician who succeeds to office in this atmosphere is quite unable to deliver on his promises. To stay in office, he has to resort to desperation tactics. As a result, uncontrolled inflation, nationalization of industry, Yankee-baiting, novel forms of taxation and strangulating Government controls are becoming all too common. Those who try to be responsible, like Betancourt in Venezuela, find themselves ridiculed as American lackeys or targets for assassination by Castro's thugs.

In the midst of the current chaos in Latin America the U.S. corporation is about as much at home as a bishop in a poker game. It is not equipped to do business with a revolution. It requires order and a minimum of certainty, since risks cannot be calculated unless the rules are known in advance and there is some assurance they will not be changed the day after tomorrow. Disorder drives capital out of an area, not because it is timid but because it is scarce. It is the product of work and savings and it abhors irresponsibility, wastage and misuse.

Let us now take a look at a few samples of the kinds of conditions the U.S. corporation faces south of the Rio Grande.

* * * * *

In Venezuela the Castro mobs have been particularly vicious, dynamiting or setting fire to a number of American-owned installations. One of the victims was Sears Roebuck, which has had admirable success throughout Latin America in making consumer products readily available to the public at reasonable prices. It lost a $5 million warehouse. Another target was United States Rubber's Maracaibo sales office, which was invaded by four terrorists, who held the staff at gun point while they poured gasoline over $200,000 worth of property and set it afire.

* * * * *

At the beginning of 1963 the Peruvian Government issued an extraordinary tax decree which levied new undistributed profits and withholding taxes retroactively for 3 years. This was done without warning, hearing or debate.

In Argentina the balance of payments deficit in 1961 ran 50 percent above income from exports. The 1962 budget was 35 percent in the red, in large measure because of losses incurred by the inefficient operation of the railways and other State-owned enterprises. Partly as a result of this and partly because of political upheavals, the peso was devaluated 36 percent last year. Bankruptcies last November equaled the total for the whole preceding calendar year. Unemployment is serious and, for the first time in years beggars have turned up on the streets of Buenos Aires.

Brazil, the other giant of South America, is in equally serious trouble. The cruzeiro went from 65 to the dollar in January 1957 to a high of 825 last September. In 1962 the rate of currency devaluation was about 50 percent. During the last 2 years an estimated billion dolars in capital fled the country.

The New York Times summed up Brazil's predicament the other day in these words: "There is widespread recognition in government and business that only a successful monetary-stabilization program, coupled with development investment, can avert a political crisis of revolutionary proportions."

* * * * *

The Robin Hood attitude toward private property, the product of yesteryear, is about as useful today as the bow and arrow. It is not only the cause of much of the trouble in Latin America but of a great deal of the squabble betwen business and government in the United States. Its origins here lie in the ancient struggle for power between numbers and wealth. This was probably a useful battle for a democracy to fight its way through. But the point is that it is over. The result has been the kind of compromise for which democracy has a peculiar genius. Under the terms of the truce—which unfortunately is still a noisy one—we have been able to build the most productive society on earth and to distribute its fruits more widely than even the most optimistic had believed possible.

The misfortune is that the old battle cries are still ringing in the ears of too many people who take them seriously. What is really serious is that these ancient substitutes for thought are getting in our way. They crowd the rhetoric of business meetings and the policy discussions in Washington. They prevent us from building the kind of institutions that would enable business and government to work together effectively for the common good both at home and abroad.

The Alliance for Progress is a case in point. Launched with high hopes a year and a half ago, it is still stuck in the mud, spinning its wheels. There are many reasons for this, of course, primary among them being the chaotic, revolutionary atmosphere within which it has to work, the concerted attack from the Communists and their allies and the active opposition in many Latin countries to the kind of self-sacrifice, fiscal, taxation, and social reform that are the prudent requirements of both stable progress and outside financial help.

But there is another major reason for the difficulties of the Alliance, which is just beginning to be recognized. This is its almost exclusive emphasis to date on the public sector, an emphasis which, if continued, is bound to lead to failure. Admittedly, much must be done in the public sector because a large part of what the economists call the "infrastructure" is lacking: roads, bridges, schools, and other public services. But the Alliance for Progress, up to the present, has given insufficient emphasis to the basic fact that most employment opportunities and a large part of the tax revenues of governments still depend upon the success and growth of private business, large and small.

The figures are pretty clear. According to the recent Grace report to Secretary Hodges, about 70 percent of Latin America's economic activity is in private hands, some 90 percent of which is owned locally and only 10 percent by foreigners. It is therefore the private sector, not governments, that will have to carry the main burden of economic growth.

Let us look for a minute at what has been happening to U.S. private capital, which plays a larger role in these countries than the figures would indicate. It has been estimated that American companies produce about 10 percent of Latin America's gross national product, one-third of its exports, and about a fifth of its taxes. Up until the economic slowdown in Latin America, which began about 1958, these companies had been earning about 12.5 percent on the average on invested capital, one-half of which was remitted to this country while the rest was plowed back into the expansion of local enterprises. This means that Latin America, even at the height of its progress, was paying out only a little over 6 percent for the sizable contribution U.S. business was making to its economic growth.

For this reason, the plans for the Alliance called for an increase in American capital of $300 million a year, which is almost exactly what we put into the area in net new direct investment in 1958. But the conditions since then have been deteriorating at such a rapid pace that the figure had dropped to less than half this amount by 1961. And during the first half of last year, we took out an estimated $29 million more than we put into Latin America.

At a time when outside private capital is needed the most, it evaporates. Why? Would you invest in an atmosphere of rising anti-Americanism, unpredictable new taxes, threats that your property would be nationalized, revolutions that occur at the rate of two or three every few months, falling profits and runaway inflation? Or would you be more inclined to postpone the start of that new plant or addition to the old one?

My own company, Merck, has been doing business in Latin America for several decades. We now have manufacturing plants in Argentina, Brazil, Peru, Colombia, Venezuela and Mexico. We intend to stay, and hopefully, to expand. But we have been having our troubles, the most serious of which have been with inflation. When monetary inflation runs as high as 50 percent in a single year, every American business loses on currency conversion and working capital. Only those that can raise prices fast can keep in the black on sales, an area where we in the pharmaceutical industry are particularly badly squeezed, because we are subject to price control on most of our products made and sold in Latin America.

The effect of the present environment on local Latin American capital, which owns 90 percent of the businesses in the private sector, has been even more disastrous to the economy of the area. It is fleeing out of these countries at the rate of an estimated three-quarters of a billion dollars a year. And far too much of the rest of it is not going into productive enterprise but into such inflation sanctuaries as land speculation and money lending, for which rates of interest are running in some places as high as 50 percent a year.

What can be done about the situation? One thing seems to me certain: it will get worse and employment opportunities will continue to decline if the trend toward state intervention is not halted. I am convinced the emphasis in the Alliance for Progress programs should shift as quickly as possible toward the encouragement of the private investment climate on as broad a front as possible. The prospective local investor in Latin America will need some strong assurances from his own Government that his profits will not be dissipated through unexpected taxes, his business jeopardized by politicians, or his property values rendered worthless by inflationary policies,

There have recently been several substantial signs that an understanding is growing in this country of the need to promote the private sector. Last month's report of the foreign aid study group headed by Gen. Lucius Clay was particularly forthright. It stated quite flatly that the United States should not aid a foreign government in projects establishing government-owned industrial and commercial enterprises which compete with existing private endeavors. I agree, but we should keep in mind that public and private sectors are not the same all over the world and often we have to take them as we find them.

Similar sentiments were expressed a few weeks later in the so-called Grace Report by a committee of businessmen appointed by Secretary of Commerce Hodges. And a most welcome statement was made in early April by President Kennedy in a message to Congress on foreign aid. He not only stressed the importance of an increased role for private investment, making it one of the six formal objectives of his program, but he followed this with a promise of specific legislative recommendations. The President's promise was followed by announcement of a concrete proposal for a tax credit amounting to 30 percent of new investment in developing countries.

It is my contention that the situation would not have deteriorated to this point had our Government, from the beginning, taken American business into more active partnership in this vital venture. Advisory committees are not enough. Their advice can be, and too often is, ignored. What is needed is an institutional framework that will encourage business and government to work closely together. To ask American firms to do business alone with the kind of revolution now going on in Latin America is to ask it to retire from the scene. To ask government to do it alone is to ask for failure, followed by socialism or worse.

* * * * *

Industry, in my opinion, is ready to respond to a call by the President for a mobilization of its power, skills, and immense knowledge of the area and get behind a drive to make the Alliance for Progress a success. The first step would be the creation of joint Government-industry task forces for those countries ready and willing to set up counterpart teams of their own. Their job would not be to create a master plan for economic and industrial development of that country; the Alliance is already badly bogged down trying to do this. The task forces would have the following three objectives:

1. To recommend measures in each country that would help halt the flight of local and U.S. capital and encourage private investment in productive enterprise.
2. To recommend to the U.S. Government the kind of legal and administrative changes needed to enlist American enterprise in the development of that country on a major scale.
3. To search out specific profitable and employment-creating opportunities that are needed for economic growth and that would attract both local and American investment.

These task forces would have to have policy guidance, administrative direction, and support and immediate access to high enough levels of government so that their recommendations would lead to action instead of talk. The program director should be of top caliber and should report to either an Under Secretary of State or the Administrator of AID. To advise him he should have a board composed of representatives of the government departments concerned with Latin American affairs and an equal number of business and financial leaders experienced in the area.

In each Latin country there is a large nucleus of skilled and patriotic businessmen who are awaiting just this kind of leadership and joint purpose from their giant and successful neighbor to the north. Here at home such a venture would tap a huge reservoir of expert knowledge about the area and sophisticated responsibility toward its development among U.S. corporate and financial institutions. The response is ready, in my opinion, for the challenge.

* * * * *

I would not want to tell you that support of the private sector is all we need to bring Latin America into the modern world. Stable governments are probably more important, since they have an enormous effect on both the public and private sectors—witness the way Brazil was slowed to a halt for months last year while the question of President Goulart's authority was being settled. Social, fiscal, and tax reform are needed, though the forced draft under which this is being tried pursuant to the terms of the Alliance seems unwise. These reforms will take time. If they are pushed too hard, the result will be both economic and political chaos, not progress.

And the population problem is throttling the rise in per capita income. The Alliance planned for a 5-percent annual increase in gross national product. With an expected 2½-percent rise in population every year, this was supposed to produce a 2½-percent increase in per capita income. But economic growth has, in fact, slowed way down and the rate of the population rise, now the fastest in the world, is turning out to be nearly one-fifth higher than estimated. This has left the average person poorer than ever.

* * * * *

In summing up what I have said tonight, I would like to make the following points:

1. Neither Government nor industry can afford the peril of having on its southern doorstep a population the size of Russia's with comparable natural resources united under the Red flag and dedicated to the proposition that the United States must perish.
2. American business must cooperate with the U.S. Government's objective of raising living standards and keeping communism out of Latin America or else face the possibility that new and more powerful Castros will push all private business out of one of our largest and most promising markets.
3. Our Government must cooperate with industry far more closely than it has in the past, if it wishes to carry out its own objectives. Technical aid and government-to-government programs cannot begin to accomplish the task. What is needed is the active, large-scale assistance of U.S. corporations, the greatest providers of jobs and wealth that man has yet invented.
4. Both Government and industry must bury their ancient myths about each other and unite in the common cause. This will not be easy, for these myths appear to be as durable as those of Karl Marx and Adam Smith about capitalism. They have survived close collaboration during two world wars and innumerable joint projects since. But they are about as useful in running the complex machinery of the modern world as a sledge hammer.
5. We shall have to create imaginative new institutions, such as the country-by-country task forces I have suggested, that will harness the economic power of industry with the political power of government. As equal partners working toward the same goal, we have a reasonable chance of coping with the explosive forces south of the border.

In conclusion let me say that if someone had asked me 3 or 4 years ago whether industry could do business with a revolution, I would have thought even the question ridiculous. Now I am not so sure that the answer is going to be negative. Faced with reality, a national task of sizable dimensions and the known consequences of failure, the American people have always been remarkably resourceful and the American corporation has been ingenious.

No Buildup in Cuba—Or No Intelligence?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there is still great concern over the extent of Soviet strength in Cuba. Part of this concern is due to the questionable reputation which our intelligence operations in Cuba have acquired.

I have introduced legislation to establish a joint House-Senate watchdog committee to give regular scrutiny and review to these operations. Strong arguments for such a committee were put forward recently by John S. Knight, publisher of the Miami Herald, one of the Nation's leading newspapers.

I include Mr. Knight's lucid article at this point in the Record in order that it may receive the largest possible audience:

No Buildup in Cuba—Or No Intelligence?

VIEWS ON THE NEWS

Last week, I stated here that Soviet military strength in Cuba "is still very formidable."

Mentioned were 42 high performance jet fighters, heavy and medium tanks, anti-tank guns, field artillery pieces, rocket launchers and a minimum of 17,500 military personnel.

But, at the President's news conference on Wednesday last, this colloquy took place:

Question. Mr. President, there's still a lot of discussion in the Congress—Senator Lausche among others—on the increasing buildup militarily of Cuba. Is there anything you can say that would be in any way encouraging about the removal of Russian troops or of the military situation in Cuba?

"Answer. We do not have any evidence of increasing military buildup by the Soviet Union. I think at previous press conferences I've given an answer to the question of how many Russians were there, and the comment in regard to the withdrawal of Soviet troops. There has not been a satisfactory withdrawal as yet. But we have no evidence that there is a number coming in larger than going out.

"Question. Pardon me, sir, I was thinking more in terms of military equipment going into Cuba.

"Answer. Yes, I understand that. We have no evidence that there is an increasing military buildup in Cuba. The intelligence community has not found that."

THEY LOST BECAUSE

In the preceding dialog, the important words to remember are: "The intelligence community has not found that."

This is the same intelligence community which last summer mistook Soviet troops for civilian technicians and estimated Soviet personnel in Cuba at 5,000.

This is the same intelligence community which, notwithstanding human source reports, could not identify the presence in Cuba of Russian-organized ground combat forces until October 25, although some of them had been there since last July.

The preparedness investigating subcommittee of the Senate exonerates the intelligence community of the charge that a gap existed in our photographic reconnaissance over Cuba from September 5 to October 14.

But the committee does say "the deficiency in the performance of the intelligence community appears to have been in the evaluation and assessment of the accumulated data. Moreover, there seems to have been a disinclination on the part of the intelligence community to accept and believe the ominous portent of the information which had been gathered.

"In addition," says the committee, "the intelligence people invariably adopted the most optimistic estimate possible with respect to the information available. This is in sharp contrast to the customary military practice of emphasizing the worst situation which might have been established by the accumulation of evidence."

PHILOSOPHICAL?

The Senate subcommittee, on testimony taken from top officials of the CIA and the Pentagon, makes the startling statement that intelligence community analysts "were strongly influenced by their philosophical judgment that it would be contrary to Soviet policy to introduce strategic missiles into Cuba."

The committee says further that the intelligence chiefs acknowledge that they were misled and deceived. The intelligence people now say that all strategic missiles and offensive-weapon systems have been removed. The committee cannot reach a conclusion on this because "of lack of conclusive evidence."

Actually, it will never be known how many weapons are hidden in Cuba without on-site inspection, an early Kennedy objective now forgotten.

So when the President tells the Nation that our intelligence community "has found no evidence of a military buildup in Cuba," we can well ask on the basis of the past record, "How reliable is the information?"

AND NONPARTISAN

I believe the Senate subcommittee, with Senator JOHN STENNIS as chairman, has performed an invaluable service for the country by revealing that—as in the days before Castro—our intelligence evaluations are too often influenced by the philosophical leanings of the evaluators.

It is significant, too, that the full report was unanimously approved by Chairman STENNIS and the full subcommittee, consisting of Democratic Senators STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri; HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington; and STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina; and Republican Senators LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts; MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, and BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona.

Railroads Need Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an interesting statement published by the Association of American Railroads. It is an excellent defense of H.R. 4700, the bill to give railroads the same freedom of competition as to minimum rates now enjoyed by truckers and bargelines. The statement—"Support Fair Competition—Support Low Prices in Transportation," in the form of questions and answers, follows:

S. 1061, H.R. 4700, THE FAIR COMPETITION BILLS

These two identical bills are now pending before the 88th Congress. They will put old-fashioned fair competition to work in transportation.

They are a tiny numerical fraction of our lawmakers' legislative workload, but a major part of their 1963 legislative responsibility to the public.

Why? Let the President answer. "If action is not taken to establish a transportation policy consistent with the new demands upon the economy, we face serious problems of dislocation and deterioration in both the transportation industry and the economic life of the nation which it affects. I urge that action be taken to establish such a policy." (President John F. Kennedy, in his letter of March 5, 1963, to Senate and House leaders enclosing draft legislation on S. 1061 and H.R. 4700.)

Question. What would this legislation do?

Answer. I would give all carriers the right to lower freight rates without Government approval when they carry agricultural products and bulk commodities. Truckers now have this right when hauling agricultural products and bargelines have this right when carrying bulk commodities such as grain or petroleum—but not the railroads.

S. 1061 and H.R. 4700 would simply extend to railroads some of the competitive freedom already enjoyed by trucks and bargelines. It is no misnomer to call them the fair competition bills for American transportation.

Question. What would these fair competition bills mean to the public?

Answer. It is estimated that nearly $50 billion of the $554 billion gross national product in the United States today represents outlays for the transportation of things we produce and consume. Thus, when transportation costs are lowered through increased competition, the person devoting approximately 10 cents of each dollar to freight transportation will enjoy direct benefit.

The bills are a strong weapon against inflation. While virtually all industries are under pressure to raise prices, the railroads want the freedom to reduce them.

Question. What would railroads do if the bills are passed?

Answer. They would reduce more freight rates and pass on to the public more of the savings from technological improvements. A classic case is that of a progressive railroad which developed huge new hopper cars for carrying grain at greatly reduced costs. It has since sought to pass on to the public the benefits from this greater efficiency in the form of 60-percent cuts in freight rates on multiple-car shipments.

Question. How did unequal competition ever get started?

Answer. Basically from the failure of our transportation laws to keep pace with the development of transportation. The Interstate Commerce Commission was created in 1887, so the first Federal controls over railroad freight rates date back into the 19th century. Meanwhile, vast growth occurred in road, water, and air transportation, but different regulatory standards were applied to these new competitors. President Kennedy has stated the problem clearly:

"A chaotic patchwork of inconsistent and often obsolete legislation and regulation has evolved from a history of specific actions addressed to specific problems of specific industries at specific times. This patchwork does not fully reflect either the dramatic changes in technology of the past half-century or the parallel changes in the structure of competition."

Question. Why all the stew about lowering rates?

Answer. This is the weirdest part of all about outdated rate regulation. The public—and Washington, too—clamors for the lowest possible prices. Yet in transportation, lopsided laws have made competition a one-way street. Exempt trucks and bargelines can wheel and deal for traffic at will; when the railroads try to retain or recapture freight shipments by reducing rates in return, however, the public regulator all too often blows the whistle.

Question. Who is in favor of fair competition legislation?

Answer. Only the President of the United States, shippers, farmers, and food processors, consumers, railroads, and practically all fairminded Americans from every walk of life.

Question. Who opposes the fair competition bills * * * and why?

Answer. Truckers and bargelines who don't relish fair competition with the railroads. These competitors have thrived behind the regulatory barriers which allow them freedom to lower rates while denying the railroads the same freedom. In the vital struggle for the freight-shipment dollar, the postwar market has seen freight volume moving over rivers and canals increase nearly four times, and intercity truck traffic increase nearly three times.

Question. What about regulating everybody—exempting none?

Answer. Few will be misled by the truckers and barge operators' call to extend regulation when too much regulation now is the disease. This is like prescribing wet feet and a strong draft for a man who has caught pneumonia. This industry already suffers from too much regulation. The cure is less—not more. The plain fact is that in a dynamic, diversified economy, there is no workable alternative to less regulation.

Question. But what about opposition warnings of a "monopoly?"

Answer. This is a bogeyman whose horror mask long since disappeared. Railroading's 19th century dominance of American transportation has vanished forever in a top-to-bottom change in traffic positions: Railroads which once stood virtually alone in inland transportation now must fight for business with solidly established highway and waterway carriers, pipelines and airlines and "do-it-yourself" carriers. In 1962, ICC regulated intercity truckers took in more in gross freight revenues than all the Nation's Class I railroads. All intercity trucks put together, including nonregulated and private haulers, accounted for over twice as much freight business as the railroads. Where monoply once had been possible, monopoly now is impossible.

Question. What protection will be provided against unfair pricing?

Answer. President Kennedy has asked for "the protection of the antitrust laws against any destructive competition." The railroad industry concurs with this objective. Moreover, existing ICC controls against discrimination in railroad ratemaking would be continued, as would those over railroad freight rate increases.

Speech of Hon. Robert Moses, President, New York World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD, the following excellent speech of the Honorable Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair, at the Boy Scout Lunch-O-Ree, in New York City on April 17, 1963:

We recently sent a message to the New York Mirror Annual Youth Forum. Some of what we said about the Fair applies also to the Boy Scouts of America.

The Fair is dedicated to man's achievements on a shrinking globe in an expanding universe, his inventions, discoveries, arts, skills, and aspirations. We aim at an Olympics of progress open to all on equal terms at which friendships will be formed and peace promoted through mutual understanding.

You may say that these are mere words, clichés, exercises in semantics, gestures, slogans, echoing the obvious. Every college shield prays for truth and light, and youth is constantly being told to burn with a cold and gemlike flame. Nevertheless we must have purposes and they must be clothed in words, however inadequate. It is only the implementation that counts.

What then are we doing to translate words into deeds; to build above the deep intent, to strike the blow? Let me tell you briefly: Our New York World's Fair will be a genuine international exposition, bringing to the very heart of New York City not only the finest products of our domestic arts and industries, but those of other nations which are designing and building pavilions where they will present the image they wish to impress upon a shrinking globe. We promise an Olympic atmosphere. We offer honest competition in the best traditions of sportsmanship. Here you will find more friendliness than protocol and more track suits than striped trousers.

Why should we of my generation appeal to you? It is because, as the Great Apostle said, you are strong. We may become wise, durable, and stubborn, but strength is only for the young. It is one of the curses of my contemporaries never to have examined thoroughly the alternatives of war, of which healthy competition involving all the world's talents in an Olympic competition of industry, science, and arts is surely the most promising.

It is most fitting that the Boy Scouts of America should have a post of prominence in the World's Fair representing the youth of the Nation. As in the New York World's Fair of 1939 and 1940, the Boy Scouts of America will operate a Scout Service Corps of boys and leaders. This will be a valuable training experience for more than 2,000 topflight young men from every part of the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

In the New York World's Fair 1964–65 the Boy Scouts of America will be unofficial ambassadors for the youth of the world—greeting international visitors, and becoming a part of the various ceremonies welcoming young and old alike—arriving from the hinterlands and abroad to see the wonders of our great city and the fair.

We have made available for the use of the Boy Scouts of America under the leadership of Charles B. McCabe, chairman of scouting's World's Fair committee, a half-acre tract of exhibit space for the purpose of presenting their program to the fair's millions. Special Scout days for region two, New York and New Jersey, have been set for June 13, 1964, and June 12, 1965.

July 13 through July 16, 1964, and July 24 through July 26, 1964, have been declared to be jamboree Boy Scout Week by the fair. This is the period immediately in advance of and following the great national jamboree gatherings of 50,000 boys at Valley Forge. Your Scout officials expect that a high proportion of those coming for the jamboree will include a visit to the fair and New York City.

We have statistics on the Seattle Fair—not only the number of visitors by hours and days, but all sorts of interesting stuff as to their origin, by what means they came, what exhibits they patronized, individually and in families and groups, how much and where they ate, etc., all of which we shall translate into the terminology of Flushing Meadows, N.Y., 1964 and 1965. We have a similar report on the New York Fair of 1939 and 1940. Brussels tells us less because European conditions are so different.

We expect more than 70 million visitors in two seasons and they must be attracted, accommodated in town and nearby, moved in and out, parked, circulated, magnetized, separated and classified in a dozen ways. But in the end the exhibits, shows, concessions, foreign, domestic, industrial, entertainment, cultural, the welcome we give, the atmosphere of friendship we create, the reputation, gossip, and mystery we establish in the public mind through every medium of communication, are the things that count. Meanwhile the working days left for construction and installation become fewer and the opening day looms up more and more menacingly.

We already have enough exhibits to justify circus superlatives. A few foreign nations, States, and industries whose absence will be conspicuous will not affect the total attendance or financial success of the fair. Perhaps these initial absentees will be asking for space for the second season, but by then the vacant sites will have been sown to grass and planted with shrubs and trees as greenery, shade and rest for tired eyes and sagging arches, and pleasant spots for relaxation. We now need landscaping more than additional pavilions.

We had a world's fair at Flushing Meadows in 1939 and 1940, and at the end the beginning of a great park. That park will be completed after 1965 and will remain as a living memento of the exposition. And so the 1964–65 fair will not, to paraphrase the tempest, fade like an insubstantial pageant, leaving not a rack behind it, but will rise again with trees, shrubs, and water courses and a few permanent buildings to serve a growing community. Visitors to the fair will contribute more than their presence and dollars, and receive more than education and amusement. They will have the satisfaction of promoting world friendship and peace.

New York Steps Forward in Real Property Acquisition Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, on October 24, 1961, the Public Works Committee of the House by resolution established a Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition to study land acquisition in Federal and federally assisted programs. The subcommittee, of which I am a member, is now engaged in the research and analysis of pertinent Federal and State laws and practices and procedures of acquiring agencies to determine the adequacy of compensation in Government programs. We expect to complete the study in about a year and submit to the full committee a report with recommendations which we hope will provide a solid basis for achieving substantial improvements in all land acquisition programs.

It is encouraging to note that a number of States have been conducting studies to improve their own laws and procedures in acquiring lands for public improvements. In this connection, I wish to include in the RECORD an article appearing in the New York Times, of May 13, 1963, that offers a candid description of past New York procedures and relates the efforts being made in New York to eliminate or mitigate hardships to owners and tenants in its acquisition programs:

STATE REVISES LAND SEIZURES: OFFERS ONLY HONEST PRICES—AGENTS NOW QUOTE FIRM FIGURE FIRST IN DRIVE TO CUT COURT SUITS OVER SITES TAKEN FOR IMPROVEMENTS

(By Peter Kihss)

The State has begun trying to offer a firm but honest price for the homes and properties it is taking in increasing quantities for highways and other public works.

The State public works department in Albany hopes such honesty may even help save money for the State. For judges of the court of claims—who must render a decision whenever dissatisfied property owners sue instead of making agreements—have in past years tended to view the State's appraisals as too low. The result, some officials contend, is that court awards have climbed too high.

In the meantime, the court has been trying to speed its work. Fred A. Young, who resigned April 30 as presiding judge after having put through a series of administrative changes, figures the State can start saving $5 million a year in interest charges by reducing its backlog.

RATE OF $50 MILLION A YEAR

Seizures of property now cost the State about $50 million a year, and public works officials expect that rate to continue for 10 years or more.

As to public reaction, Judge Young, who recently became Republican State chairman, says frankly, "we have improved the attitude 500 percent—but we still have 10,000 percent to go." He has urged a study of the entire field.

J. Burch McMorran, superintendent of public works, said the administrative and legislative efforts last year and this year had caused "the most extensive changes and improvements in right-of-way procedures in the history of the State."

ACQUISITIONS DECLINE

Last year, the public works department took over 7,816 properties it appraised at $67,100,000. This was a decrease from 8,193 acquisitions the year before, even though the total for 1962 included 1,207 properties appraised at $20 million for the South Mall complex of State offices in Albany.

The number of claims that went to court rose from 773 to 1,037, including 125 for the South Mall. Claims can be filed any time within 2 years from the date the State takes title.

The court of claims reduced its pending cases to 2,971 at the start of this year, down from 3,375 a year ago. More than two-thirds of the cases on the calendar involve property acquisitions. The rest are mainly negligence and contract disputes.

TERMINATIONS INCREASE

For the first time since 1954, the court disposed of more cases than it had received. It terminated 2,134 and received 1,650. These were records in both categories, and the terminations nearly doubled the 1,145 of 1961.

In the first 4 months this year, 602 claims were filed, including 422 for land acquisitions. In the same period in the preceding 3 years, all claims ranged from 415 to 453. The court decided 442 cases through April, including 225 awards and 217 dismissals.

When the State seizes property under its sovereign right of eminent domain, it employs the administrative procedure "appropriation," an action against an individual property.

The State simply files a specific map with a county clerk, and the title then is vested in the State. The property owner is offered payment, and an agreement is reached in the overwhelming majority of cases without court action.

CITY USES CONDEMNATION

In a different procedure, New York City takes property by "condemnation." This process outlines the entire area of a project, and the prices paid are eventually set forth in a court decree even though individual owners may have reached agreement with city agents.

When the State takes land for highways in New York City, the corporation counsel's office employs its usual condemnation process. First Assistant Corporation Counsel Morris Handel says supreme court awards on State-Federal highway acquisitions here varied from $11,500,358 in 1959 to $19,644,916 in 1960, were $10,001,681 in 1961 and only $812,710 last year.

Upstate, the public works department generally acquires property for State agencies. The land takings have risen sharply since 1956 when the Interstate Highway program got underway. In that year, the department took 6,076 properties, appraised at $30,900,000.

The size and value of properties taken have increased. New highways may be four lanes wide, with intermediate strips and they are charted straight ahead for increased speeds. Urban areas are increasingly affected.

In the past, the State made its appraisal, and then sent out an adjuster. The adjuster might offer: "$2,000." A farmer might rejoin: "$5,000." Later the adjuster would return to his office and report with pride: "You authorized $6,000, I got him down to $3,750."

Some adjusters refused to make permissive partial payments if a property owner wanted to put the determination of the full amount to court. The owner thus faced delay as well as legal and other expenses.

Protests about State tactics began so arise, particularly when major highways were routed through the Binghamton and Syracuse areas.

BARGAINING IS OPPOSED

As one official put it: "We don't believe the State ought to bargain or cheat. Ninety percent of the time, the property owner would be happier if we left him alone. If the State is exercising the power of eminent domain—so severe a power that all we have to do is say it's for a public purpose and the court approves unless we have been arbitrary and unreasonable—we shouldn't chisel."

The belief was that judges were beginning to regard the State's appraisal only as a bottom figure. Public works department samplings indicated court awards averaged 79 percent more than the State offered in 100 cases in 1961 and 47 percent more in nearly 150 cases in the first half of 1962.

The situation was studied by a special interagency committee on land appropriations headed by Dr. William J. Ronan, secretary to the Governor. On March 13, 1962, Governor Rockefeller announced a new policy.

SINGLE OFFER SYSTEM

Under this, Superintendent McMorran directed public works representatives to offer the full amount of the State's appraisal in a single offer system.

Adjusters were directed to explain fully to an owner just how the value had been determined. The law requires that the State pay the amount that the property would have yielded under market conditions as of the date the State took over.

The department insists the new policy is not a take-it-or-leave-it proposition, for the adjuster is supposed to listen, and in exceptional cases there might even be a change. But the amount is said to be based on appraisals by the State's staff or hired experts, reviewed in districts and then in Albany, and used in allocating funds for projects.

The hope is that property owners will believe this—and that judges will, too, if a suit arises.

OTHER CHANGES IN EFFECT

Following are other changes put into effect, many emanating from the Ronan committee:

The State is now required under a 1962 law to offer a property owner a preliminary payment of 60 percent of its appraisal, even if he wishes to go to court.

Interest at 4 percent a year is to be paid from the time the State takes the property until the claims are paid. This is subject to limits to protect the State from undue delays by owners. Previously, interest was provided only on cases tried in the court of claims.

The payment of "reasonable and necessary moving expenses" up to $300 is provided for resident owners or tenants and up to $3,000 for commercial owners and tenants. Relocation advisory assistance units have been set up in each of the 10 public works district offices.

Owners can be repaid for prorated portions of real estate taxes, sewer rents and other charges for periods after the appropriation, under another act approved last month.

Payments have been expedited. Out of 6,020 agreements reached last year, the public Works Department reports that 1,395, or 23 percent, were paid in 90 days after the signing. This has been in part because since 1959, Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz has assigned senior attorneys to district offices to aid title clearances. Previously it was rare for payments to be made within 6 months.

The number of public works adjusters and appraisers has been increased to 262, up from 221 in 1959.

What the department calls "the Nation's first school concerned exclusively with land acquisition for public purposes" has been operating at Saratoga Springs since January. Three 2-week sessions are provided, totaling 200 hours of instruction during a year. A 2-day seminar for judges of the court of claims was held last month.

COURT 3 YEARS BEHIND

The court had been 3 to 5 years behind in its cases, according to Mr. Young, who was designated presiding judge as of January 1, 1962.

Two new judges were added, bringing the total to 12. In addition, the State judicial conference has arranged to assign a supreme court justice to help during 1963.

In his annual report to Governor Rockefeller this year, Judge Young reported a number of pilot projects that have helped to cut the court's backlog. They include an expansion of pretrial terms, the grouping together of claims for a given highway project to be heard by a single judge, and the scheduling of special terms in areas where substantial delays exist.

"In an appropriation claim," Judge Young said in his report, "the trial should not become a battle of opposing sides, it should rather be an orderly, rational search for the truth of the controversy."

Trackless Void: The U.S. Space Program Had Better Come Down to Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the Record an article entitled, "Trackless Void: The U.S. Space Program Had Better Come Down to Earth," which appeared in the May 13, 1963, issue of Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly.

While there can be general agreement that the United States must progress satisfactorily in our space effort in the interest of our national security and welfare, because of the tremendous expense in men and materials involved certainly we must weigh carefully our future space activities and plans. There is no justification for nonessential or wasteful spending of public funds.

The article I am including in the Record, which follows, is an example of some of the reappraisals that are being made of the program and the comments that are being offered by interested and concerned segments of our citizenry:

Trackless Void: The U.S. Space Program Had Better Come Down to Earth

Like the exploration of space itself, any criticism of the national effort in this sphere is filled with extra hazard. A writer approaches the task uneasily aware that on some launching pad, either in the United States or the U.S.S.R., the countdown may have started on the next towering feat of scientific prowess and personal bravery, one that will overshadow such mundane considerations as priorities or costs. In coming months, so President Kennedy confidently forecast last week, "spectacular" achievements by Soviet astronauts will silence all partisan objections to the soaring U.S. space budget. Even between moon shots the critic's lot is not an easy one. For willy-nilly he must challenge the most persuasive appeal to emotion since the Pharaohs of Egypt—perhaps to overawe the surly Assyrians, or to create jobs along the lower Nile—decided to build the pyramids. Like Columbus, we have been told time and again, the United States today lives in an age of discovery. Like Columbus, the United States must not fail to seize its moment of greatness.

While popular and plausible, the comparison strikes Barron's as unfortunate. To begin with, in contrast to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Columbus raised the funds for his epoch-making voyage at least partly from private sources. Far from setting out to discover America, moreover, the admiral and his financial backers merely sought to find a shorter—hence more profitable—route to the Indies; their primary aim was to make money, not history. Finally, though Washington has chosen to ignore the inconvenient fact, the conquest of the new world yielded Spain, after a short-lived fling at glory, four centuries of economic and political decay.

The parallel to Columbus can be pushed too far, not only by friends of the space program but also by its foes. Nonetheless, the lessons of the past, coupled with some contemporary wisdom on the subject, underscore the need for a sweeping reappraisal of the current U.S. space program. For example, lawmakers now suspect that NASA's skyrocketing budget (from which, according to the administration, not 1 cent can be cut without courting disaster) is designed to serve political as well as scientific ends. In turn, scientists, who know how to weigh alternatives, have grown increasingly skeptical of the overwhelming emphasis which Washington has placed upon landing a man on the moon. Thereby, they claim, the United States has ignored far less costly and more fruitful avenues of lunar exploration, while neglecting other promising ventures in space. The time has come, we submit, to ask "Is this trip necessary?"

Washington to date has replied with a ringing affirmative and the greatest burst of Federal appropriations in U.S. peacetime history. From modest beginnings in 1958-59, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has ballooned to the point where today only the Departments of Agriculture, Treasury, and Defense deploy more of the taxpayer's money. In the fiscal year which ends on June 30, NASA expects to spend $2.4 billion, nearly twice as much as in fiscal year 1962. For fiscal year 1964, its projected outlays will nearly double again, to $4.2 billion, and, to judge by the even steeper climb in new obligational authority, the end is nowhere in sight. The figures are vastly more impressive than the arguments which have been advanced to justify them. In a speech in Houston last September, President Kennedy offered this explanation: "The exploration of space will go ahead whether we join in it or not, and it is one of the great adventures of all time, and no nation which expects to be the leader of other nations can expect to stay behind in this race for space."

Scarcely illuminating at the time, official policy has grown no clearer since. What has changed abruptly is the Nation's supine acceptance of its burdens. Part of the change—especially on Capitol Hill—undoubtedly springs from a sudden awareness, especially among Republicans, of the massive political leverage which spending of such magnitude commands. The party in power, of course, knew it all the time. As the President told his whooping audience in Houston, "During the next 5 years NASA expects to double the number of scientists and engineers in this area; to increase its outlays for salaries and expenses to $60 million a year; to invest some $200 million in plants and laboratory facilities and to direct or contract for new space efforts over $1 billion from this Center in this city." Openhanded NASA also has blueprinted a $50 million Electronics Research Center "in the Greater Boston Area," which critics aver is unnecessary, as well as $77 million worth of construction which the Air Force, in a formal memorandum, claims will duplicate existing facilities. "What we are witnessing," a noted physical chemist and the editor of Science Magazine has concluded, "is the expansion of a new sophisticated form of the prewar Public Works Administration. Science is being used increasingly as a 'front' for technological leafraking."

From the same source has also come a trenchant critique of Project Apollo, the first lunar expedition in which, he charges, science is running a poor second to propaganda. Noting the total absence of scientists among the scheduled crew, he argues that "the alternative of exploration by electronic gear becomes exceedingly attractive. The cost of unmanned lunar vehicles is on the order of 1 percent of the cost of the manned variety . . . Most of the interesting questions concerning the moon can be studied by electronic devices . . ." His views have been echoed by a growing number of colleagues, including Dr. Vannevar Bush of M.I.T., scores of Nobel Prize winners, and by a caustic observer in the New Scientist, who recently remarked: "The widespread and growing belief that the first visit to the moon will bring back some kind of scientific Holy Grail is probably the biggest popular delusion of all time, the South Sea bubble notwithstanding."

The benefits of Apollo thus threaten to be largely illusory; the costs, however, are painfully real. As noted, the project already has sent NASA's budget into orbit. What is more unfortunate, by commandeering so much of the available time, money and talent, it has led to an unwise—and possibly dangerous—neglect of other areas of space development. Thus, in its haste to get off the ground, NASA has depended largely on obsolescent liquid-fueled vehicles which were ready to go; only last month the Air Force, with NASA's cooperation, placed the first orders for huge new solid-fuel rockets which, technologically, represent a great leap forward. Again, little has been done with the weather satellite, Tiros, which, back in 1960, was performing such scientific wonders as photographing cloud formations half a world away. With the help of Congress, finally, NASA has succeeded in dimming the once-brilliant future of satellite telecommunications. In the knowledgeable hands of the Bell System, Telstar made history nearly a year ago. Since then nothing of consequence has been done by the new publicly owned corporation which is supposed to take over from Mother Bell. And despite the great success of Telstar, NASA is tinkering with a different system known as Syncom, the first unit of which promptly got lost in the trackless void.

Whatever its other defects, Syncom thereby qualifies as the perfect symbol of the Nation's space program. For unless NASA's chaotic growth is slowed and controlled, the Federal budget—and U.S. solvency—someday may go the same way. Reaching for the moon, as President Kennedy has buoyantly said, may be the "greatest adventure on which man has ever embarked." Before it's too late, however, Washington would do well to come down to earth.

How Long, Oh Lord? Forever?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, a most significant editorial appeared in the May 14 edition of the New York Herald Tribune. It is on a most timely issue and its points are extremely relevant. I commend the editorial to my colleagues and under unanimous consent, include it at this point in the Record:

HOW LONG, OH LORD? FOREVER?

Under the czars, the Jews of Russia were persecuted, but many were able to emigrate or escape to the outside world, notably the United States. Now, under the Bolsheviks, the estimated 2,345,000 surviving Jews in the Soviet Union continue to be oppressed, but their escape route has been cut off.

Silently, searching their souls, they sit, suffer, wait, and wonder.

Into this highly charged atmosphere walked one of the great opera tenors of our time and raised his voice in Moscow's Tchaikovsky concert hall. It was not so much the power of the voice as the power of the words he sang which overwhelmed the Jews in the audience—words which are now certain to spread to all the corners of the vast Soviet empire.

The words, sung in Hebrew, came from the 13th Psalm:

"How long wilt Thou forget me, oh Lord? Forever? How long wilt Thou hide Thy face from me?"

These questions have been weighing for decades on the hearts of Russian Jews. But none would dare voice his complaints to the Lord in public for fear of punishment by the lords of the Kremlin.

It was the son of a Jewish emigrant from Russia who was able to do it for them—Jacob Pincus Perelmuth, better known as Jan Peerce. And the reason he could raise the question without fear of reprisal by the Kremlin is that his father left Russia so that he might be born on Orchard Street.

Success Story: U.S. Aid to Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, too often critics of our foreign aid program, basing their case on isolated incidents where our U.S. dollars have been misspent, go on to characterize the entire program as "throwing money down a rathole."

They overlook the many achievements which have been made possible in many countries around the globe because of the judicious use of our aid funds in helping people to help themselves. One of the countries which best demonstrates the effect which our assistance can have is the Republic of China on Formosa.

This Government, our brave ally during World War II and our cofighter against Communist world expansion, has used our U.S. assistance to better the material lot of its people and build a viable, self-supporting economy. Today, as a result, we are able to look forward to the day when we can cease giving the Republic of China economic aid.

In that regard, I recommend to my colleagues an article which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal which concerns the economic progress which has been made on Formosa. Written by Mr. James P. Cattey of the journal staff, it provides a reminder of the good which our aid dollars have done, and are doing, around the world:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, May 5, 1963]

UNITED STATES SIGNALS END OF PUMP PRIMING FOR FORMOSA'S EXPANDING ECONOMY—ISLAND'S INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION RISES 245 PERCENT IN DECADE, ANNUAL GNP GROWTH IS 7 PERCENT—NO END HINTED FOR AMERICAN MILITARY HELP

(By James P. Cattey)

Uncle Sam has announced that he is cutting the allowance of one of his favorite stepchildren—the Republic of China on Formosa. Uncle's spokesman, David E. Bell, Director of the Agency for International Development, said the United States would soon be able to end economic aid to the island—aid which has pumped some $2 billion into Formosa's economy since the Nationalist Chinese regime retreated there in late 1949.

The 90- by 250-mile island has learned its lessons well, Bell said on a recent "Meet the Press" interview, and has reached a point of economic self-sufficiency like that attained by Japan and Europe in postwar years. He cited an 8-percent growth rate in economic output and an annual increase of 12 percent in exports.

He might have mentioned that in the 1951-61 decade Formosa's real national income rose by 113 percent; industrial production rose a phenomenal 245 percent; exports rose 130 percent; and that agricultural output increased by 73 percent. Last year Formosa's gross national product rose by 7 to 8 percent. Real capita income was up 3.3 percent, despite some stiff inflationary pressures.

It is likely that Bell's complimentary remarks were an administration signal to the Nationalists. He gave no timetable, and the process will involve years of careful weaning. Neither was Bell talking about military aid, which in the early 1950's reached upward of 90 percent of total aid to Formosa but, which since has diminished to about half.

HANDICAPS STAGGERING

The fact of the matter is that Formosa has done remarkably well, given some staggering handicaps. Cutting all U.S. aid tomorrow would undoubtedly be a fatal blow. But Formosa's economy is far different, and offers a better chance of becoming viable, than when the Nationalists arrived in 1949.

Then they found a peculiar type of economy, a remnant of 50 years of Japanese occupation (1895–1945). Formosa (the Chinese call it Taiwan) had been closely integrated to Japan and supplied much needed food. In sugar Formosa became the prime supplier of the Japanese islands.

Diversification of industry became the No. 1 priority of the Nationalists. Ten years ago exports of industrial products accounted for a meager 5 percent of total volume. Last year, that figure had reached 47.2 percent—just about equal to export earnings from processed and unprocessed agricultural products.

There has been significant expansion in textiles, plywood, fertilizer, cement, glass, plastics, shipbuilding, food processing, pharmaceuticals, and electric appliances. The development has taken place in spite of fierce competition from Japan and Hong Kong.

One effective approach to finding investment funds has been joint Chinese-American ventures. Cyanamid International Corp. contributed 55 percent of the total capital of $1,100,000 for establishing the Cyanamid Taiwan Corp. in joint ownership with the Taiwan Sugar Corp.

TAX CLIMATE IMPROVED

Mobil China Allied Chemical Industries, Ltd., a joint enterprise of the Socony Mobil Oil Co., Allied Chemical Corp. and the Chinese Petroleum Corp., is building a $22,500,000 plant to manufacture urea fertilizer and ammonia with natural gas discovered on the island.

Revision of tax laws has created a more favorable climate for investors. Certain types of enterprises enjoy a 5-year business income tax holiday, and 25 percent of reinvested money is deductible from taxable income. Within certain limits, a deduction of 2 percent of annual export proceeds is allowed as an incentive to export. Certain machinery and equipment is exempted from property taxes.

With the help of the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction (JCRR), some of the most lasting accomplishments have been attained in the agricultural sector, still the dominant one.

A land reform program has about 85 percent of the farmers owning all or part of their land. In 1949 the figure was 30 percent.

DAM YIELDS POWER

The Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction has been active in crop and livestock production, pest control, fisheries, rural organization, forestry and soil conservation, rural health and economic studies.

Another big development is in hydroelectric power. Shihmen Dam, 32 miles south of the capital, Taipei, was surveyed in the thirties by the Japanese, laid out after the war by American engineers and built in 1958 by the Chinese with American aid. Its 37,500 kilowatts irrigated enough new land to increase rice production by 74,000 tons a year.

One American traveler reported last year that "2 million people live in a dream of returning to China, and the other 9 million wish they would hurry up and go."

While this is an exaggeration, it is true that the 2 million Chinese who came to the island in 1949 practically ruined the economy.

At the present growth of 3.5 percent annually—one of the highest in the world—the nearly 12 million population of the island will double in the next 20 years. Until very recently the Chinese have shown little inclination to conduct a massive birth control program.

Another problem is the military establishment—now about 650,000 army, navy, and air force personnel. It represents the heaviest military and administrative burden in relation to national income in the whole free world.

The size of the force is wrapped in the promise to return to the mainland, and the Nationalist Chinese say their troops hold down some 2 million Communist Chinese forces who might otherwise be used in southeast Asia.

While this may have an element of truth, it also rubs the other way. For the cost of a few thousand rounds lobbed on the offshore islands, Mao Tse-tung can taunt Taipei into diverting badly needed investment funds to the military.

WASTE IS CRITICIZED

Just before Wesley C. Haraldson, then director of American aid, left Formosa last August, he said:

"All Government enterprises in Taiwan are in varying degrees inefficiently operated * * * frequently burdened by seriously excessive personnel, by antiquated plant and machinery and are under pressures and influences to buy and sell at special prices and extend special terms and favors. * * * As a consequence, production in a large segment of the economy is inefficient, total production is less than it should be and * * * the standard of living of the people is accordingly lower than it should be."

The Government has been the logical entity for pushing large-scale economic activity. But because of its peculiar kind of paternalism, work is spread around, and many laborers are paid a wage for not doing anything productive.

It has been a long haul to come this far so soon, and the road ahead is not paved with gold.

Formosa must find more to export and hold down imports of consumer goods. It must act to halt population increases which would diminish or wipe out economic gains.

If the record of the last 13 years is an indication of the future, however, Formosa stands ready for the challenge.

Recent Studies of Our Banking and Financial System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address delivered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], before the Third National Mortgage Conference of the American Bankers Association, at Washington, D.C., on May 28, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Recent Studies of Our Banking and Financial System

(Remarks of Senator A. Willis Robertson, Democrat, of Virginia, before the Third National Mortgage Conference of the American Bankers Association, Washington, D.C., May 28, 1963)

It is a great pleasure to be with the 1963 meeting of the Mortgage Bankers Conference here in Washington. As you know, 1963 is a particularly significant anniversary year in banking. This year marks the 100th anniversary of the National Currency Act, now known as the National Bank Act; it is also the 50th anniversary of the Federal Reserve Act and the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. This is, therefore, a good year for taking stock of our financial system. In doing so, we have available the results of a considerable amount of study and discussion that has been going on over the past few years.

BACKGROUND OF RECENT FINANCIAL STUDIES

The reasons for the interest in our financial institutions do not lie in any concern about their security or soundness during the current prosperity and relative stability in the economy. In fact, the recent and current study of our financial system has taken place under conditions that contrast with the beginnings both of the National Bank Act and the Federal Reserve System.

As you know, the National Bank Act was passed after an era marked by banking excesses and speculation, as the State banks grew rapidly in response to the legislative principle of free banking first adopted by New York State in 1836. It was the need for a sound currency and for means to finance the Civil War which led to the passage of the National Currency Act in 1863. Likewise, the recurrent money panics that marked the last half of the 19th century, culminating in the panic of 1907, gave great urgency to the formation of the National Monetary Commission in 1908. And the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, sponsored by my distinguished predecessor in the House and Senate, Carter Glass, was the outcome of recognition stemming from the Commission's study of the need for an adequate system of providing bank reserves and a payments system for a national economy that had become continental in its geopraphic extent and that was entering the arena of world leadership among industrial nations.

It is the great changes in our economy, rather than any present concern over the soundness and stability of our institutions or our currency, that have stimulated recent studies. In the half-century since 1913, we have experienced two world wars and a great depression, and we have seen a gradual equalizing of wealth as we have put the consumer in the driver's seat of the economy in this present automobile age.

During this period the Government has entered many areas of finance, expanding the range and increasing the level of its activities. By the end of fiscal 1961, outstanding direct and guaranteed loans, excluding Government-sponsored, quasi-public programs and excluding the direct and guaranteed loans of the Commodity Credit Corporation, had risen to a total of $94 billion. Moreover, the Government debt has expanded to carry the total to a level that in 1960 was 237 times as great as in 1908, and that gives promise of expanding still more with the $12-billion deficit officially forecast for this fiscal year, if the Congress does not reduce taxes or appropriations.

There have been other significant changes since 1913. One is the growing public recognition of the need for the Government to moderate both inflationary booms and deflationary busts. Another is the rapid rise of financial intermediaries—investment trusts, pension funds, savings and loan associations, and credit unions; and, correspondingly, the relatively slower growth of the commercial banks, which along with investment banks in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries had been the predominant supplier of capital and credit to our private enterprise economy. Vigorous competition with the commercial banks by other financial intermediaries has stemmed partly from tax advantages of the specialized institutions, partly from the changing financial practices in the consumer-oriented economy, and partly from the aggressive merchandising of services by the specialized institutions.

There is ample precedent for the recent study of our financial machinery and policy, not only in the work of the National Monetary Commission and in the study preceding the Banking Act of 1935, but also in the work in Britain of the Macmillan Committee in the early 1930's and the Radcliffe Committee in 1958–59, both of which carried out exhaustive studies of the British financial system. The first suggestion during the postwar period for a comprehensive review of the U.S. monetary and financial system came in 1948 from the Committee for Economic Development, a private group of 150 leading businessmen and educators.

Other suggestions for studies of money and banking, particularly central banking, were made during the early 1950's. My financial institutions bill of 1957 was intended primarily to bring technical provisions of the Federal banking law into consistency, and although it did not pass the House, it had considerable influence on specific legislative proposals since passed by the Congress.

Beginning with that careful and time-consuming analysis of banking laws in 1956–57, many groups have conducted their reviews of our financial institutions and the functions they should perform. After the study by the Senate Finance Committee in 1957, conducted by my distinguished colleague, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, the private CED in May 1958, appointed its 25-man Commission on Money and Credit—the so-called CMC—made up of leaders from business, finance, labor, agriculture, and education. Some 110 professors worked on the commission's research projects and produced 11,000 pages before the commission submitted its 285-page report, costing $1.3 million, to President Kennedy on June 19, 1961.

In response to the report, President Kennedy in March 1962, appointed three committees composed of heads of Government departments and agencies. The Financial Institutions Committee, chaired by Walter Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and the Federal Credit Programs Committee, chaired by Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, have now made their reports, in April and February 1963, respectively. The third committee appointed by the President, on Government welfare and pension programs, need not concern us. In 1962, the Comptroller of the Currency appointed a 24-man committee of bankers to examine the national banking system, and that report is also now published.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STUDIES

The main conclusion emerging from all these studies is that there is no need, to use the CED's words, for "wholesale overhaul of our financial structure." And, as the President's Financial Institutions Committee report goes on, "many of the needed revisions in law and policy identified by the committee are not so urgent as to command the highest priority." In other words, national leaders in private business and education and top officials of the Government's departments having primary responsibility for financial matters see no pressing cause for urgency in enacting drastic legislative proposals to change significantly the financial structure under which our economy is now operating. Indeed, the report of the Committee on Financial Institutions, prepared with the benefit of a review by top Government officials of the earlier study by the Commission on Money and Credit of the CED, had this to say:

"Although numerous improvements are suggested, the report as a whole offers reassurance that our financial system, for the most part, functions soundly and efficiently to promote the growth and stability of our economy and effective employment of our Nation's savings; and that Federal supervision and regulation advances these ends. The Nation is therefore in a position to proceed with improvements after due deliberation rather than, as so often has been true in the past, under the pressure of financial crisis."

I share the view of these private and public groups that there is no urgent need for wholesale legislative changes, and I assure you that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee will give careful consideration to any proposals that come before it on this subject.

A second general conclusion that these studies reflect is that the country has now got a satisfactory set of Government economic objectives and that monetary and debt management tools are adequate to achieve those objectives. In other words, these studies endorse the general principle that the Government should confine its role in the economy to trying to create general conditions that foster economic growth, general monetary stability, and high levels of employment, and that the Government should rely on the forces of corporate and individual initiative and enterprise to assure the continued economic development of the country and the increase in real incomes of its people. I certainly can agree strongly with that conclusion. Even the CMC report, which in general reflects a tone of increasing emphasis and reliance on the Federal Government which I do not agree with, rejects a variety of proposed new devices to regulate credit.

A third general conclusion, so taken for granted by the studies that it is not directly stated, is that the Nation's dual banking system is effective and on balance satisfactory. Carter Glass supported the dual banking system as it had developed from 1863, and the Federal Reserve Act was superimposed upon the dual banking system with no intention to weaken or alter it. Throughout my 30 years in the Congress I have supported the dual banking system, and I am glad to state my support of it today.

Support of the dual banking system also means to me support of the principle of competition in banking. I, of course, recognize that banking is of necessity a regulated industry, because of its vital role in creating the Nation's supply of money, in operating its payments system, and in safeguarding its savings and credit needs. However, I also believe that competition among banks, in a climate of sound monetary and fiscal policy, is valuable to the economy in increased loans and investments, in better service to the public, and in better and more efficient bank manageemnt. The key principle that we can never lose sight of is to maintain a proper balance between sound monetary and fiscal policy and effective regulatory practices, on the one hand, and sufficient emphasis on private enterprise and competition in banking and finance on the other. The cautionary tone of the President's Committee on Financial Institutions seems to me to reflect an underlying concern for balance between regulation and enterprise in finance which I can endorse.

SUPERVISORY STRUCTURE AND RELATIONSHIPS

It is primarily in the area of supervisory structure and relationships that most of the recent studies of our financial system have had the most to say and have aroused the most discussion and controversy. The CMC report of the CED, for example, put forward a number of suggestions that would alter the way in which the Federal Reserve System carries out monetary policy. It proposes to deemphasize the voluntary and regional character of the Federal Reserve and would centralize more power in the Federal Reserve Board and make the terms of its Chairman and Vice Chairman coincide with that of the President.

I would vigorously oppose those legislative proposals, as I take it the administration itself has concluded, since its financial institutions committee report makes no reference to the subject. I believe deeply in the soundness of a Federal Reserve System independent of the Treasury. And I believe it would undermine the morale of the Federal Reserve System and make its problem of staffing acute to remove the policymaking function entirely from the regional Federal Reserve banks. I agree with Chairman Martin's position that the genius of the framers of the Federal Reserve Act lies in the creation of regional banks, knit together by a national governing body in Washington rather than in the establishment of a central institution with authoritarian powers.

The President's Financial Institutions Committee—the Heller Committee—was considerably more cautious in its approach to changing the banking system than the CMC report, and I think properly so, considering the fundamental judgment of both committees that our financial institutions require no wholesale restructuring. Its conclusions were not even stated as legislative recommendations but instead as principles to guide legislation.

Positive proposals included a graduated system of reserve requirements for demand deposits for all commercial banks, with Federal Reserve membership remaining voluntary, a reserve requirement for deposits of mutual savings banks and shares of savings and loan associations; a cash liquidity requirement for such institutions; flexible standby authority rather than continuous regulation of interest rate ceilings on time and savings deposits; and an increase in the coverage of deposit and share insurance coupled with additional powers by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to regulate savings and loan associations. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee will be glad to give any specific legislative proposals on these matters careful consideration at the appropriate time.

Aside from positive proposals, the Financial Institutions Committee's report reflected concern about branching authority, and it called for a comprehensive study of the geographic banking structure as a factual base for constructing sound administrative policy guidelines on new charters, branches, and mergers. The Committee was concerned about preserving competition and avoiding undue concentration of banking resources, yet it asserted that branching limitations in some States may impede competition and provision of banking services. The Committee was concerned about broadening the portfolio investment authority of some of the specialized institutions, but it cautioned against abandoning the concept of asset specialization. And the Committee was concerned about better coordination among supervisory agencies, but it did not recommend any fundamental changes in supervisory relationships within the Federal Government. The Committee, in other words, left us on the fence in setting legislative policy in these areas.

The Committee on Federal Credit Programs—the Dillon Committee—likewise was cautious in recommending changes. It did, however, lay down some principles for Government financial aid. It held that Government credit was justified only to remove credit "gaps" in the private sector, to shift resources into socially desirable areas, and to increase total resource use—assuming other means were not available. It also held that the Government should use guarantees or insurance to private lenders, Government aid to new private institutions, or creation of a Government secondary market, in that order, before it should resort to direct loan programs.

The Committee did urge regular appraisal by the President, perhaps along with the budget review, of Federal credit programs, to see whether they continue to be needed. It emphasized that such programs should supplement, not substitute for, private lending. It recommended coinsurance by the lender for some part of all guaranteed or insured loans. It rejected further tax-exempt loan or guarantee programs. It urged promotion of uniform State law on mortgages to promote a private secondary mortgage market. It urged that direct Government loans should generally be self-supporting. And it called for more reporting by Government so that loan programs could be effectively reviewed. Finally, the Committee set the principle that interest rates charged on Government loan programs should be equal to the rate the Treasury has to pay for its debt. All these judgments by the Dillon Committee seem to me to be generally sound and in our tradition of keeping the Government's role in business supplementary and not competitive.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Indeed, considering the usefulness of the studies by the President's Committees, I think it is fair to say that they will serve as valuable expressions of principle to guide the Banking and Currency Committees of both sides of the Congress. It does seem, also, that the general tenor of these studies supports the position—which I endorse—that our financial institutions are in good health, and that we should move slowly to accept any sweeping legislative proposals that would disregard the wisdom of many diligent and dedicated men who have come before us and have bequeathed to us a unique and successful competitive financial environment.

Taking a long look at our financial system in this anniversary year of 1963, it seems to me that, whatever the shortcomings and extremes of position the recent studies may reflect, our method of continual questioning and free inquiry is the best protection that we could have to assure the future strength of our financial system. In one sense the entire history of finance in this country has represented a continuous experiment in adapting these institutions bit by bit to the needs of dramatically changing times—from the simple life of the new nation, to the age of enterprise and industrial revolution of the 19th century, onto the 20th century stage of world leadership, and now into the beginning of the age of automation, space exploration, and the struggle for world freedom against Communist tyranny. The recent studies and the legislative proposals stemming from those studies are in the pragmatic tradition of that great American and fellow Virginian, Woodrow Wilson, when he said in the first inaugural address about the new Federal Reserve System:

"We shall deal with our economic system as it is and as it may be modified; not as it might be if we had a clean sheet of paper to write upon; and step by step we shall make it what it should be."

More Effective Discipline in Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives passed on May 13, 1963, by a vote of 277 to 53, legislation to bring about more effective discipline in the public school system of the District of Columbia.

The intention and practical application of the legislation has been misunderstood by many people. Three very fine North Carolina newspapers have recently carried editorials, however, which placed the matter in proper perspective.

Under order previously granted I request that editorials appearing in the Gastonia Gazette of March 29, the Shelby Star of May 24, and the Charlotte Observer of May 27 be inserted in the Appendix of the Record.

The editorials follow:

[From the Gastonia (N.C.) Gazette, Mar. 29, 1963]

Return the Spanking Privilege

What's all this fuss over spanking in school?

You'd think Washington never heard of it the way they make such a to-do over efforts to get the spanking privilege back in the District of Columbia school system.

The only thing that would cause any more attention than the spanking privilege would be an attempt to jerk away the franking privilege.

What is surprising about this whole affair is that it takes a congressional investigation to make it possible for a teacher to tan the hide of a culprit who needs it.

Dr. Woodrow Sugg, Gastonia's school superintendent, went to Washington at Congressman Basil Whitener's request. Dr. Sugg told the committee that he is in favor of North Carolina's paddling law.

What he said, in effect, was that the spanking privilege is akin to compressed air in a tank. If you need it, you need it and it's there. If you don't need it, so what?

Everyone realizes the necessity of putting the strings on that type of teacher or principal who would do a child lasting physical harm. No person should be allowed to get away with such as this.

However, the District of Columbia allows its teachers and principals little disciplinary measures at the time.

They not only cannot spank a child, but they cannot suspend nor expel him.

So, what can school officials do when a child gets out of line?

Smile at him.

Say, "Now you know you have been a bad boy. Try being a little better in the future."

This is hogwash.

Authority to use discipline not only would bring back the respect that is due these school people, but it would cut down on the tremendous amount of defacing of property—vandalism—which students now do and get away with scot free.

The Congress should act immediately in returning the spanking privilege.

[From the Shelby (N.C.) Star, May 24, 1963]

Idealistic but Impractical

President Kennedy's views on the use of corporal punishment in District of Columbia schools, while commendable from an idealistic standpoint, are totally impractical.

The President said Wednesday he is against corporal punishment in schools, "But I would be for very strong discipline at home so we don't place an unfair burden on our teachers." Who isn't?

We're sure District of Columbia schoolteachers, Supt. Carl F. Hansen and North Carolina Congressman Basil Whitener, who introduced a bill to authorize the use of reasonable force to keep order in classrooms, are for the same thing.

Their experiences, however, have prepared them to cope with the realization that excessive faith cannot be placed upon home discipline in an area beseiged from all sides by a frightening crime wave and a social situation unparralled in the District's history.

District of Columbia schools were rocked last year by the fact that 265 girls were forced to leave school because of pregnancy, dozens of teachers were assaulted, vandalism ran into fantastic figures, bodily assaults on students in classrooms and corridors continued to increase and school officials were forced to appeal for revamped police assignments to keep officers near the schools.

Dr. Hansen told U.S. News & World Report in March that, "if the children merely act the way they do in their homes, they're undisciplined in the classrooms * * * Some of them will be violent, will not respond to authority."

The proposal to lift the District's longstanding ban on corporal punishment—it dates back to March 20, 1918—is one of a series made as the indirect result of a riot after a high school football game last Thanksgiving Day. This same riot sparked a congressional investigation which established that the Washington school system has degenerated into a "blackboard jungle."

There have been relatively few cases in this country of excessive punishment practices among schoolteachers. A study made for the National Education Association in 1959, as a matter of fact, showed that only 60 cases of assault and battery had been brought against American teachers in the preceding 125 years.

Representative Whitener's bill is patterned after North Carolina law and was passed in the House May 13 by a vote of 277 to 53. The bill is now pending in the Senate.

President Kennedy's Wednesday remarks lead one to believe he might veto the measure should it win Senate approval. Before he takes pen in hand, the President had better inspect a few of those homes he expects to produce adequately disciplined boys and girls.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, May 27, 1963]

Discipline Can't Be Dreamed Up

It's unfortunate that our laws are so constituted that Members of Congress have to concern themselves with discipline problems in the public schools of Washington, but we still side with North Carolina Representative Basil L. Whitener against President Kennedy in the debate on the "corporal punishment" bill.

Whitener, after a series of congressional hearings on the discipline problem, introduced a bill patterned after North Carolina legislation. It would permit Washington's teachers to use "reasonable force" to restore order in the classroom. The House passed the bill on a 277 to 53 vote. It is now being considered by the Senate.

The President stated at a news conference that he is opposed to corporal punishment in the schools. His remedy for a chaotic problem in the classrooms of the Nation's Capital is "strong discipline at home so we don't place an unfair burden on our teachers."

If Supt. Carl F. Hansen had any hope at all that there was going to be this kind of home remedy in Washington. he would not have requested the District school board to approve sterner measures. The refusal of a majority of the board to act has prompted the so-called "spanking bill."

WHITENER has explained that his bill is simply an effort to restore the teacher's authority. An anticorporal punishment regulation now governing teachers does not even permit them to require a child to leave the room. The Congressman says that New Jersey and the District of Columbia are alone in the Nation in this approach to the behavior problem.

The cry against Dr. Hansen's administration was loud and angry last fall when a riot erupted after a high school football game in Washington. He later admitted that teachers in the system faced discipline problems every day that were intolerable. But he protested that school officials could not be held responsible unless they were given the authority to impose discipline on the students.

The President's statement seems slanted more to please Washington's Negro community than to get at the meat of the matter, although his observation that home discipline is the ideal answer cannot be disputed.

WHITENER's bill is recognition of the fact that this has not been and is not likely to be forthcoming in Washington's existing social situation. He should not, therefore, be made the whipping boy for a failure that is embarrassing to a racial minority group, the administration and the country as a whole.

The Right of Private Ownership and the Use of Firearms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend William Hudspeth, minister of the Old Bedford Christian Church, Blandinsville, Ill., recently wrote to me defending the right of private ownership and use of firearms.

His letter is a careful statement of faith in individual responsibility. Portions of it are included here:

OLD BEDFORD CHRISTIAN CHURCH,
Blandinsville, Ill., May 22, 1963.
Representative PAUL FINDLEY,
Washington.

DEAR SIR: It is likely that a matter I am concerned about is more the concern of the general assembly in Springfield, but it is never amiss that our national legislators know the feeling of the people. It is perhaps a little strange that an ordained, college trained minister should write about this matter, especially on church stationery. But this is America.

You see, the matter I am so concerned about is the feeling among some * * * that the private ownership and use of firearms should be prohibited * * *. One of the most sacred and meaningful liberties of the individual American is that of owning and bearing weapons. * * *

I could say something about the foolish cries that firearms are dangerous, and should be prohibited, although the same thing is true about woodworking shops and power lawnmowers, and they shouldn't be prohibited, but that has all been said before. All any firearms fancier asks is that the sound reasoning common to all human beings be used in this matter.

In fact, the House of Representatives, I think, owes it to the Nation to use sound reasoning in the formulation of all the Nation's laws. A real weakness among Americans is to say, "That's different," when it is not different. By reckless use of your newspaper, you could harm someone. By reckless use of my tape recorder, I could harm someone. In between, reckless use of an automobile would have harmed many—and the real culprit would not be the newspaper, the recorder, or the auto, but recklessness. This, I am afraid, is a fact that is seldom discerned.

I endeavor to impress upon my people that God created us; that we are, each of us, individual souls, not just a part of a homogenous mass. With this view of creation, we must protect and preserve human worth, dignity, and individual rights.

The church can but teach people that they are of such intrinsic eternal value as to deserve individual liberty; it is up to the lawmakers to take it from there. You will do it, won't you?

Sincerely,

WILLIAM HUDSPETH.

Message From the Chief of Naval Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress and as a citizen of the United States, it will always be my policy to support the Secretary of Defense in broad policy matters within the scope of our national security.

Nevertheless, I still believe that Adm. George W. Anderson's removal as Chief of Naval Operations was obviously an effort to dry up individual thinking on the part of the military officers and to bring about a conformity of thought in line with the wishes of the Secretary of Defense. In the matter concerning the TFX airplane controversy, Admiral Anderson thought the Secretary of Defense was wrong from a technical military standpoint and he did not hesitate to say so. In my opinion, the most valuable aid or ally is one who will present his frank, honest, and sincere judgment on matters in which he has an intimate and detailed knowledge. After 40 years of outstanding, dedicated service with the most powerful Navy in the world, Admiral Anderson has exemplified the finest qualities of a naval officer and has been an exceptional military leader.

This country is indeed fortunate to have officers like Admiral Anderson and others who can be relied upon in key positions throughout the world. Their experience, knowledge, and dedication contribute the kind of strength we need in these trying times, and I believe the President could not select a finer individual than Admiral Anderson as his Ambassador to Portugal.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a message from the Chief of Naval Operations to all Naval personnel, which I believe reflects on the ability and integrity of a great military leader. May this Nation continue to inspire military men who will humbly accept the responsibility for today in maintaining the peace and freedom of the free world.

MAY 8, 1963.

From: Chief of Naval Operations.
To: NAVOP.

1. The appointive term for the Chiefs of our military services is but 2 years, and mine expires on August 1, 1963. The President of the United States, our Commander in Chief, has announced, as you now know, that he will appoint Adm. David McDonald as my relief. I know of no finer professional fighting man, statesman, and gentleman, and I will be proud to turn over to him the helm of this, the most powerful and magnificent Navy ever to sail the seven seas. The President has, today, announced that I will continue to serve our country in another position of great responsibility and importance, therefore, I look forward with pride to the privilege of adding to my 40 years of service.

2. In regard to these forthcoming changes, I note with considerable concern the speculation as to possible reasons for the decision to limit my term to 2 years. I would, therefore, implore you to avoid any remarks, comments, or assumptions relating thereto. Let me assure each and every man in the naval service that our Commander in Chief has made clear to me not only his confidence in our naval leadership but his pride in our service. It would, therefore, be unbecoming of the naval profession to engage in any actions or reactions which could do damage to our service reputations—collectively and individual—as well as to the prestige of the Armed Forces of these United States and of our civilian leadership.

3. I have accepted the President's appointment to this new post as an affirmation of his confidence in, and recognition and appreciation of those values which form the foundation of our Navy. These principles are universal in their application. Abide by them always and use them well.

GEORGE ANDERSON.

Cooperatives and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, on May 8, one of our distinguished colleagues, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, addressed the Conference on Cooperatives and the Future on the subject "Cooperatives and Freedom." The speech deals with the contributions made to our society and our economy by cooperatives in an authoritative and interesting manner. It is truly an outstanding address that deserves a wide audience. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Cooperatives and Freedom: Transcript of Address by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota, Before the Conference on Cooperatives and the Future

Thank you very much Mr. Hendrickson, Mr. Secretary, and my esteemed colleague from Vermont, Senator George Aiken.

I can honestly say that of the many men that I have known in public life, I have never known one who was a more stanch defender, and a more sincere and effective advocate of the cooperative movement—of the farm cooperative—than the Senator from Vermont, Mr. Aiken. I want to compliment him.

Many things have happened here this evening that are intriguing. Roy Hendrickson introduced Clyde Ellis as the dean of the co-ops in Washington. My gracious. When I came here they were talking about that rambunctious young fellow from Arkansas, Clyde Ellis. Now he's a dean. It's a great honor to be known as "the dean of the co-ops," Clyde. You preside well over your unruly students. I want to compliment you, too.

I am pleased to be on this platform with the Secretary of Agriculture who was Governor of our State of Minnesota. Orville Freeman as Governor of Minnesota didn't take a passive interest in cooperatives. He took an active interest. He promoted them. He urged people to join. He was by word and deed and practice a true cooperator. You have in the Secretary of Agriculture one who pleads your case and cause well and one who lives by the principles that he espouses.

I want to talk to you now about my views on cooperatives and the cooperative movement in the United States—and elsewhere—and what we can do to improve it. If nothing else happened in this meeting than that six of the national federations are meeting together, working together, planning together, and thinking together, this would be a significant accomplishment in its own right.

One of the weaknesses in the past of organizations of cooperatives is that all too often the federations would have their own meetings, and the federations would pursue their own course. They were effective, but not often enough would the federations come together to find a common meeting ground—to find ways and means of cooperating between cooperative federations for the common good and the programs and objectives agreed upon.

The fact that you are here—300 to 400 of you—dedicated by life and by conviction, idealism and practice, to your cooperative organizations and the cooperative principles in itself is a significant accomplishment.

The charges against cooperatives—unfair charges, half truths—gain considerable acceptance by an unknowing public because they get the headlines and because they are cloaked in sensationalism. But like most good things, meetings of this sort, while meaningful to those who are the participants and having long-range good, just simply are not broadcast across the land.

You did not get where you are just by meetings like this. There were days when some of you in this audience met in less lavish surroundings. There were times when you wondered whether you could carry on, if you could find the means, yes, even the courage to carry on. Many a cooperative was started in a country store around a potbellied stove. Many a cooperative was started out of sheer desperation—it had to be started. There was no way to market the product without being exploited, no way to meet the rising costs of production unless you could band together.

Cooperatives as we know them are the result of both idealism and ideals, plus conviction and necessity.

One way that we can measure how well we have been doing is to look at the statistical evidence. Since 1913 cooperatives have marketed, or purchased or been involved in, economic transactions that have gone far beyond the $200 billion mark. That's big business. The net volume of cooperative economic enterprise in fiscal year 1961 was approximately $12½ billion. That's rather big business. I can think of some cooperatives out in our State of Minnesota that started with just a few thousand dollars 25 years ago, and today have assets that run into the millions of dollars.

In Minnesota, we have grain cooperatives. We have our great dairy cooperatives. We have the great Central Exchange. We have the Midland Cooperative. We have the Superior Cooperative in the Duluth-Superior area. We have the Farmers Union GTA. We have many hundreds of elevator cooperatives.

All of these had little beginnings—every one of them. Some of them perished along the way. In a free society this is inevitable and the admonition that has been given here tonight, of strengthening these cooperatives by wiser management, indeed at times, even by closer association, is a good and sound admonition.

But we didn't get where we are because somebody established an edict or because the Government of the United States said, "This is the way it ought to be."

About two-thirds of the dairymen of this country belong to cooperatives. Without cooperatives, America's dairy industry today would be a dead industry. It couldn't possibly survive. We are privileged today to have this great industry because wise men, now and in the past, brought farm producers of this highly skilled, expensive, costly operation known as dairying into the great cooperatives. Today, three-fifths of the fluid milk, 60 percent of the butter, and 75 percent of the nonfat dried milk is handled by dairy cooperatives.

A better measurement is to see what services these cooperatives offer. We ought to tell more people about them, because the cooperative movement needs acceptance as well as just toleration. It needs advocacy as well as an assumption that it will remain.

Consider marketing first. The picture for marketing farm products shows some disarray in spite of the cooperatives, in spite of government and other actions. But if it were not for the cooperatives the marketing of farm products today would be in an unbelievably bad situation.

One of the great needs of the farmers of today is to strengthen their bargaining position. This is something we have to drive home. While we do recognize the spiritual and political importance of individuality, we recognize that a farmer is helpless against some economic forces that affect agriculture and the entire Nation unless he can increase his bargaining position. The only alternative to bargaining is dictation—or destruction. I would hope that farmers would look upon their cooperative as not merely an association but also as a tool to bargain with and a means to improve their strength.

By pooling both the volume of their products and their bargaining power through cooperatives, farmers have proven again and again that they can exert great influence in the marketplace. And besides that, cooperatives help to build new markets and find new outlets for farm products.

The combined resources of many farmers often makes it possible to process and to package, and to sell under nationally known brand names—thereby creating a new demand.

Cooperatives help farmers to establish a high quality and a good reputation for products. There is no susbtitute for this. Competition today demands a better product, demands better packaging, demands better distribution, demands better merchandising. If cooperatives have one weakness, it is that they refuse to come to grips all too often with the marketing practices which this society requires. That means modern advertising, packaging, selling, and marketing practices.

Cooperatives have also become a potent factor in agricultural export trade. This whole meeting could be devoted to export trade. And no one has done a better job to point out the importance of our exports—for our national economy, for our balance of payments, for our national leadership, for our international position—than the Secretary of Agriculture. If this meeting didn't do anything else but to support the hand of those who are attempting to support America's position of leadership and export markets of agricultural products, it would perform a great service in this city. Let me warn you now: There are powerful forces in Government and outside of Government who are willing to make all sorts of adjustment, politically, diplomatically, and every other way, but are unwilling to take up the cudgel and to fight for a fair and decent opportunity to compete in open markets throughout the world. And if anyone fought this good fight, it was the Secretary of Agriculture when he was at Paris last fall, meeting with ministers of agriculture and finance and others, when he fought the good fight for American farmers and agricultural markets overseas—in the Common Market area.

What is happening to poultry is only a forerunner of what can happen to grains, and what can happen to one product after another. Unless we can do something to declare a halt to this protectionism before it is accepted because we have to have allies, American agriculture is going to suffer. Cooperatives now need to exert their influence before it is too late, not only to build export markets, but to influence the political climate in the Capital, in the Congress, in the State Department.

The American exporter, the American producer, has never faced the kind of competition which he faces today in the Common Market. He has never faced the kind of protectionism which can be established unless we insist that poultry and grains and dairy products, and vegetable oils, and cotton and a host of other products are all a part of NATO, of our expenditures for defense, of our 400,000 troops in Western Europe and of a common policy for the Atlantic Community. We'd better make up our mind to that.

Now we have some new export cooperatives. Right now, for example, the Producers Export Co. has sold millions of bushels of co-op grain abroad since it organized a few years ago. And there is a group of soybean and cottonseed processing cooperatives which is starting a new cooperative to sell abroad as well as at home. Its name is Soy-Cot Sales with headquarters in Houston, Tex. This is good. This is meeting modern needs.

Purchasing cooperatives are well represented here, and also exert a great force for the good of the farmer in supply and distribution. Farmers obtain through these purchasing cooperatives supplies at reduced costs. And they are supplies that are phased-in to the farm operation.

Although cooperatives supply only about one-fifth of the farm market, for the major supplies they handle, their influence on daily prices and quality result in savings to every farmer. This is in an amount to several times the dollar savings shown in their annual audits.

Another contribution of our cooperatives is to help farmers operate their farming enterprises more efficiently—through your journals, through your fieldmen, through the many services which are offered. I might add that these services could well be expanded.

Cooperatives often too prove to be the gadfly that stimulates other businesses to do a better job for farmers. This is no small contribution. Just recently a major company in the United States (a grain company) has offered a firm marketing agreement to growers in its area that guarantees paying growers a cash price above that given by a cooperative in the region. Well, that cooperative has done a service far greater than it will ever show on its books.

Cooperative spokesmen often refer to the yardstick or pace-setting influence on their businesses. You all know instances where the price of a product has show an immediate increase when farmers first formed a cooperative to market it or the price of farm supplies has dropped when farmers started manufacturing their own through a cooperative—and dropped as much as 30 or 40 percent. This is a common picture.

We often hear about change these days. The acceleration of change in farming and in outside environments in which farmers operate is throwing out a great challenge to our cooperative movement. This is what we have been talking about. And the cooperatives have to face up to that challenge.

All mergers are not bad, not when they modernize and streamline administrative operations, farm services, such as bulk delivery, when farmers need them, or when they are enough to adjust to serving the larger farms with increased specializations.

These are just a few of the changes. I want to emphasize in particular the changes that are required in marketing practices and in administrative organization. What is one of the greatest contributions of the cooperative movement? In our time, as we see it now, it is a contribution to freedom. I don't think there is any doubt about this. The cooperative movement has been an essential factor in the success of the family farm sysem. It has contributed to community life and agricultural progress. Cooperatives are the chief means of preserving this pattern that is so essential to a sound and progressive democracy.

The family farm today must operate, however, in an economic environment that is characterized by bigness. The only way that you can stand up to bigness, unless you want to "corporatize" American agriculture, is through the cooperative. The cooperative is the answer to the bigness that surrounds this entire agriculture operation. The cooperative may be the only answer in many cases if family farming is to continue to exist.

Family farmers, through their cooperatives, represent the true free enterprise system. We ought to make this point manifestly clear. Who is more closely and clearly identified with free enterprise than a landowner, a farm operator, the family farmer, the American farmer? The U.S. Department of Agriculture shows he has about $4 billion of his own money invested in these cooperatives—with no Government money invested.

Cooperatives are, in essence, doing things for themselves. This embodies the basic spirit of our freedom. Cooperatives help preserve our American heritage of a man with an independent spirit who is yet sensible enough to work together with others for his own common good.

I fail to understand why some people today seek to deny farmers and cooperatives the same rights to do what others do without any criticism at all. Other businesses join together to do many things—small grocers and drugstores form buying cooperatives and say it's great. And that they do this to meet the competition of the chain store on a more equal basis.

Newspapers, who are very often critical of cooperatives, get together to hire reporters and collect news on a mutual basis—the Associated Press is an example. Many businesses carry ownership of their product all the way from its raw state, to the finished product on the shelf to the customer. This is looked upon as efficiency.

When farmers do this in their cooperatives they are often charged with interference in what they call capitalist free enterprise system. Often the very people who shout the loudest about free enterprise are the ones who seek to deny the farmer the right to try to preserve his own private ownership by using cooperatives to help handle simply another stage, or extension, of his farming business. Who has a better right to market his own product than the farmer? Who has a better right and reason to get his supplies and services as economically and efficiently as possible than a farmer? He has every competitive disadvantage in the bigness of our system. He ought to be able at least to design for his own use some of the advantages that he sees are possible through his cooperative. This is good business.

Cooperatives, as I have said, help build good citizens. They help build leadership. Any country that is going to be a great country and be a continuing democracy must build leadership. Leadership isn't something you get out of a university, or something that you inherit. Leadership essentially comes through experience. In our cooperative movement today we have at least 100,000 farmers who are directors of cooperatives. Among the rural electric cooperatives of this country we have produced hundreds of outstanding leaders, and this is true of every one of your national federations. You have produced men and women who are political leaders, economic leaders, civic leaders, and who can stand up and speak their minds and do it well and cogently. There is no substitute in a free nation for leadership and dignity that comes through experience and conviction.

The recent encyclical issued by Pope John XXIII said:

"The right to private property even of productive goods, also derives from the nature of man. This right, as we have elsewhere declared, is suitable means for safeguarding the dignity of the human person and for the exercise of responsibility in all fields; it strengthens and gives serenity to family life, thereby increasing the peace and prosperity of the state."

Cooperatives are helping safeguard that human dignity and safeguarding the dignity of our world communities by helping farmers retain their independent farming enterprise, or as the encyclical said, "their right to private property even of productive goods."

Cooperatives thus help to build citizens under our system of government by providing them the means of gaining a better standard of living, by increasing knowledge, by encouraging initiative and by making people feel more assurance of being recognized as an active element of our society. For these reasons, a government of the people, a government by the people and for the people for over half a century has seen fit to give encouragement and assistance to cooperatives, through research and educational programs. Moreover, Government has assisted by providing loans to help improve and expand these operations—as early as the days of the farm credit system, the rural electric cooperatives with the REA, and the bank for cooperatives.

I want to warn this audience that every time we seek to hold these programs we have entrenched opposition, new attacks, new means of trying to distract us from the central objective of building a more equitable and a more just society.

The bank for cooperatives did a great job in this country. My own view is that the bank could well have greater capital because the cost of any kind of cooperative endeavor today is far greater than it was when that bank was established. Our friends here from REA know the importance today of adequate capital.

America ought to see to it that through the means of the private cooperative every farmer in America who wants a telephone, for example, can have one if he can pay for it through his cooperative or through whatever other system there may be available.

I'm happy to say that in many other parts of the world this is the case. In the Scandinavian countries, in Britain and Western Europe, in Italy, in Japan and many other countries the cooperative movement has a healthy public support and, of course, has great strength. Behind the Iron Curtain the situation is exactly the opposite.

The Communist state's collective farms are about as far as you can get from our free and independent associations of farmers. If there was ever any kind of a comparison that we could make between two systems, it is not the comparison between steel companies alone, not the comparison between a merchandising system alone. I think the real comparison that makes an indelible impression upon people throughout the world today is the comparison of the farmer and his cooperative in a free country such as ours and the farmer behind the Iron Curtain.

I talked with Mr. Khrushchev a few years ago. We talked a little bit about cooperatives. When he asked me to explain our capitalism, telling me I knew nothing of, as he called it, his socialism, I used our own State of Minnesota as an example. He told me quite frankly that I was ignorant, as he put it, of socialism and I said I didn't mean to be impertinent or impolite because that was not the purpose of my visit, but that I would return the compliment—that he was ignorant of our so-called private enterprise or free enterprise system. He said, "You take 20 minutes on your capitalism and I'll take 20 minutes on my socialism." So he took his time on his socialism and I took our time on what he called "our capitalism" and I explained my own State of Minnesota as best I could.

I pointed out that we had corporations, partnerships, big corporations, little family corporations, stock ownership. We had municipal ownership, we had public ownership, we had private ownership. But I said that above all, we have the greatest system of cooperatives in America, representing thousands of people who have learned how to work together without state dictation and have preserved their dignity, their freedom, their individuality, their private investments, their private property and yet, have pooled their resources—human, financial, and physical, for common purposes and common objectives. I don't know if we convinced him of anything, but I had the better of the argument and I knew it and I found this to be the case in country after country. When I spoke on Radio Moscow I didn't talk with them about their cities, but I talked to them about our cooperatives. I talked to them that way because the radio program went into many collective farms in Russia. I said, "What America is proudest of is the fact that we have been able to bring electricity to the homes of our farmers and to the farms and to the workshops, that we have been able to light up the land, so to speak, with people who own their own REA rural electric facilities, who are their own bosses, who set their own rates, who built their own plants and their own lines and own them. We are proud today that America's agriculture is out of the dark and into the light of modern living."

It seems to me that we had the better of the argument. Unfortunately, however, there are too many people in our own country who lump together cooperatives and collectives, who lump together the cooperator and the Communist.

No greater disservice can be done than to abuse the meaning or to misinterpret or misrepresent the meaning of what we call a cooperative. Our cooperatives are instruments of their owners and users, of the farmers. The collectives are the tools of the state. Where true cooperatives exist freedom is strong and communism is weak. We found this to be the case after World War II in Japan where cooperatives were organized for agricultural services and for fisheries. Today Japan's rural people are true friends of freedom and of the United States.

In many of the emerging countries that you've seen and I've seen, and your representatives are here tonight, people cry out for cooperatives. I returned from Caracas, Venezuela just last Friday, from a meeting of the Inter-American Development Bank. I'm happy to report to this audience that businessmen in Latin America (they were there by the hundreds—farm leaders and bankers) freely and openly said that the only hope in Latin America today to save the campesino from destruction and from infiltration of communism and ultimate collectivization and from Castroism is the cooperative. This is one of the reasons that this Senator, and thank goodness, others, insist that this Government not take a passive attitude on cooperative development.

If our Government in its foreign aid program would be as excited about cooperative development as it is about basic, big, economic development, of big industries where there are too few managers to run them, too few skilled workers to operate them, if we would become as excited about the possibilities of training cooperative leadership, of nourishing the cooperative movement, of helping to establish the Bank for Cooperatives in country after country and an International Bank for Cooperative Financing in Latin America, then we may be able to succeed with freedom in Latin America and prevent it from being destroyed and gobbled up by what seems to be a terrible disease that infiltrates this area. The disease is called Castroism, violence, terrorism and communism. If foreign aid is continued to be poured into these countries without the underpinning of a free trade union movement, of farmers' cooperatives, rural electric cooperatives, credit unions, supply cooperatives, supervised farm credit—if we continue to pour money in without these additional supports we will have wasted our substance. We will fail and freedom will be lost.

You've got to excite yourself about this. Cooperation cannot live as an island unto itself. We need to expand this whole philosophy and to extend it. Let me say to each of the six national federations—you are not fulfilling your responsibilities to this country or to the things in which you believe unless you are willing to dedicate part of your manpower, part of your resources, part of your technical know-how to help other people help themselves as you have been able to help yourselves.

You must share your knowledge and share your experiences and train and educate and organize.

I appeal to you then to make our American cooperative movement the vanguard of Operation Freedom, not only in Latin America, but in Asia, in Africa, and in every other country, to spread the good news around the globe, to spread it to the people behind the Iron Curtain.

We must make this message of cooperation which has enriched our lives a source of enrichment and of inspiration to people who today hunger for inspiration. If we do this, then we can honestly say that cooperation has fulfilled it real destiny.

Cooperatives, while they preserve individuality, are essentially international and are essentially universal. They are related to people everywhere, not just people here.

Thank you very much.

Automation, Manpower and Training, and the Conservation of Human Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address of Mr. A. J. Hayes, international president of the International Association of Machinists, which he delivered before the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped on May 9.

I feel that Mr. Hayes has given an excellent résumé of the employment situation and has stated clearly the need for full cooperation of representatives of management, labor, industry, and government if we hope to find the proper solution.

I am certain my colleagues will be impressed by this presentation by Mr. Hayes and will benefit from his suggestions:

AUTOMATION, MANPOWER AND TRAINING, AND THE CONSERVATION OF HUMAN RESOURCES

(By A, J. Hayes)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: I think we should make it clear at the outset that whenever we use the word "Automation" we are using it in its broad sense; that is, when we talk about automation we are talking about all forms of technological, scientific, and transitional progress.

Much has been said and written about the general effects of this type of automation upon our society. First we know, for example, that automation has caused substantial unemployment. Second, current indications are that unemployment, caused by automation, will continue to increase.

In fact, there are many economists who predict that unless we do much more than is now being proposed in the halls of Congress that technological unemployment will continue to grow to at least 10 percent by the year of 1970. If this comes to pass, more than 8 million American citizens will be without employment or employment opportunities. Such a large proportion of our work force—without jobs or job opportunities—creates a politically dangerous situation. The reaction of this substantial number of our working population could lead to very radical and dire consequences.

To determine whether or not such fears are justified we need only take a look at the official unemployment figures of the past 10 years. In 1953, 3 percent of our work force was unemployed, and notwithstanding our efforts to provide more and more job opportunities, ever since that year unemployment has gradually increased until today the official figures of the Department of Labor show that 5.7 percent of our work force is unemployed. But the 5.7 percent really doesn't tell the whole story. This figure does not include the full-time equivalent of part-time unemployment nor does it include the unemployment of those who are coming into the employment market and are not recorded as having sought jobs, only because they are convinced there are no jobs available. The statistics in these latter two areas should give us some idea of the problems here.

In March 1963, 2½ million people were employed on a part-time basis. In the official statistics these part-time unemployed are considered to be employed, and yet the full-time equivalent of their part-time unemployment would add nearly 50 percent to the unemployment figure. In addition to this, the number of young people between the ages of 18 and 25 who are coming into our employment market is increasing at a tremendous pace. The Secretary of Labor estimates that while 4½ million youths between the ages of 18 and 25 came into our employment market from schools and colleges between 1950 and 1960, that in the next 7 years (1963–70) this number will increase to 6 million. But actually our problems are even greater than those reflected by all of these figures. These statistics do not include temporary and transitional unemployment. In 1961, 15,096,000 (or 18.4 percent of our labor force suffered some unemployment during the year. This means that approximately 1 person out of every 10 of the entire population; 1 out of 5½ persons out of our total labor force and 1 out of 3 families were affected by temporary unemployment.

These figures, of course, reveal in a direct manner the economic consequences of unemployment but they still do not tell the whole story. In addition to the loss of purchasing power, the resulting reduction in the standard of life for all of the family members who are affected by this loss of purchasing power also has an adverse social and cultural impact upon our society. But even beyond this, even the most optimistic agree that at a certain stage unemployment begets more unemployment, and this, of course, would mean an even greater adverse impact upon the economic, social and cultural lives of our people.

Since we are here considering the problems of our handicapped, let us explore for a moment in a general way the effect that automation and unemployment have upon our handicapped and upon our efforts to find solutions to their problems.

One of the great unmet needs of our society is the unmet needs of the handicapped. While automation itself holds out great hope for better solutions to these problems, the adverse byproducts of automation actually make this task much more difficult.

Under normal circumstances, with a growing national economy, the pace of automated progress would be substantially increased. Moreover, automated machinery and equipment has reduced the physical qualifications for the performance of millions of millions of jobs and would thus provide far greater opportunity to those with physical handicaps. However, since we have not as yet found adequate solutions to the adverse by products of our own progress the tendencies of automation are in the opposite direction. Growing unemployment and the resulting loss in purchasing power, with its social and cultural impacts, is slowing up the pace of automation and technological unemployment is making it far more difficult to provide job opportunities for the physically handicapped.

Even though solutions have been discussed and some actions have been taken by our Congress and others, the results thus far have not justified optimism. Even our training and retraining programs are falling far short of accomplishing what could be accomplished through these programs if we had a full employment economy. In this connection, we are faced with a very practical problem; that is, that we accomplish very little in training, retraining or educating people to perform jobs which are not available to them, after they are trained, retrained or educated.

Thus, we are faced with a very difficult, a very complex problem that requires the cooperation and ingenuity of many segments of our society—particularly government, industry, business, and labor. We can only hope that a practical application of the vast know-how in these important segments of our society will develop practical solutions to a very practical and immediate problem.

Out on the Limb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a column which appears in the Temple City, Calif., Times. The column, "Out on the Limb," is written by Mr. George Vierhus, who is also editor of the paper.

On May 9 Mr. Vierhus took issue with a letter-writer who apparently advocates the impeachment of our eminent Chief Justice. Mr. Vierhus' comments follow:

Another anonymous letter writer came out of the woodwork to take exception to an item in this column last week. We reported that a TV station had found that a cesspool company was picking up the tab for the maintenance of a billboard advocating the impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren.

"That sorta figures," we had added as an afterthought.

The writer of the unsigned note claimed we need more cesspool companies to fight Warren's rotten record. Enclosed was some sort of a tally sheet based on remarks made by Senator James O. Eastland of Mississippi.

If we start using Senators as a source of information, we prefer to use those remarks made by U.S. Senator Thomas Kuchel of California last week in Congress asking "cruelly swindled Americans" to reappraise the "peddlers of fright for paranoia and profit" and "rejoin the ranks of responsible anti-Communist, pro-Americans."

That seems to make more sense to us.

We would be willing to stack California's Tom Kuchel's record against Mississippi's Eastland any time.

On May 16 this fearless editor, who refuses to be intimidated by extremists, again took pen in hand and brought his readers up-to-date on his latest correspondence with the radical right. His remarks follow:

In a recent column we mentioned that we were willing to stack Senator Tom Kuchel's record against Senator Eastland of Mississippi any time.

What had brought it up was that we had received an anonymous letter which enclosed some sort of tabulation made of decisions of the Supreme Court, according to Senator Eastland. The record purported to show that Chief Justice Warren and most of the other members of the Court have been pro-Red in their decisions.

The unknown letterwriter had disliked our comment in a previous column that it sort of figured that a cesspool company was picking up the tab for the maintenance of the billboard advocating the impeachment of Chief Justice Warren.

Coincidentally, Kuchel had just made his speech in Congress blasting "peddlers of fright."

This week we received another letter. This one had a signature and address which we assume are correct:

We quote:

"George Vierhus: Regarding your half-witted remarks concerning Senators Eastland and Kuchel.

"Compare their records. You will find that Senator Kuchel's record smells of 'leftwing' New Frontierism which many people, myself in particular detest.

"As for your love of Earl Warren; you deserve each other.

"Phil Bullington,
"Temple City."

Gee whiz, Phil, we didn't know you knew.

In this same edition of the Temple City Times is an editorial which reflects the same journalistic integrity displayed by Mr. Vierhus in his column. It is an editorial which, I am sure, reflects the hopes of all Members of Congress. The editorial follows:

The World Cries for Tolerance

We are living through a time in which, with depressing regularity, the world suffers anguished periods as it cries out for tolerance. They are moments of history in which we reflect what a happier world it would be if only everyone minded his own business and allowed others to travel in peace and freedom, minding their own business.

We are now in an agonizing phase of these cycles, although they are so common that it is difficult to separate them, to determine where one ends and another begins. They seem to be, unhappily, a continuing pattern.

At the moment, in what could have developed into a national emergency, the United States faces the sad Birmingham problem, a symbol of a problem which originated when the first slaves were brought to Virginia in 1619 and which has plagued us since the Emancipation.

We have sympathy for the feelings of the Southern whites, but the sympathy cannot condone the use of police dogs and high pressure hose against demonstrators for civil rights, nor riots, burnings and bombs.

There must be a compromise and it cannot be too long delayed. It may have been reached in Birmingham, but there is still Nashville and many other trouble spots with a crying need for tolerance. They are not confined to the United States. They exist, among other areas of the world:

In the Middle East, where the Arab States threaten the little Israeli Republic.

In the Caribbean, where the Haitians and the Dominican Republicans wave bayonets at each other.

Throughout the world, we witness man's inhumanity to man. The Biblical injunction "Love thy neighbor" may be impossible of attainment, but surely we should be able to tolerate our neighbor. It is not necessary to hate him.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

"Veterans Retreat" Honors Veterans on Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as Memorial Day is dedicated to the memory and honor of those who defended our freedom during the perilous times of war, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues, fellow Legionnaires, veterans, and all Americans; a poem entitled "Veterans Retreat" which has been written in honor of our defenders of freedom. It has been dedicated by its author to the memory of those gallant Americans who served our beloved land during time of war.

The poem was written by one of my constituents, Mr. Robert J. Murrin, and has been officially adopted as the Veterans Poem of the American Legion, Department of Virginia. I understand that it is to be presented to the National American Legion for adoption at its next next national convention. Beautiful in memoriam certificates are being presented to the survivors of those who served, at the time of burial. The certificates includes the verse honoring the deceased veteran. Many widows and other survivors have expressed deep feelings of appreciation for this recognition and final tribute to their loved ones at such a sorrowful time.

The poem has been used extensively on Veterans Day in editorials, radio broadcasts, and related memorial services. It has received outstanding commendation from national leaders together with the present national commander of the American Legion and his three predecessors.

Under unanimous consent of this body, I therefore insert Mr. Murrins' poem and join with him in calling to mind on this Memorial Day, the honor, courage, dignity, and devotion with which our veterans have served in order to protect our freedom, our Republic, and our democratic way of life.

VETERAN'S RETREAT

(By Robert J. Murrin)

His casket was draped with the red, white and blue,
The symbol—a flag—for a hero so true.

The legionnaires gathered all dressed in their best,
To carry their comrade to his place of rest.

They folded his memory with care in Old Glory,
And to his kin presented this story:
That he was a veteran of honor renown
For he served his country, his city and town;
That he was called in a time of great need
To protect us all from tyrants of greed;
That when the battle was over and finally won
He returned to his loved ones as his country's son;
That though others might forget over the years ahead
His comrades would remember to the day he was dead.

May we always remember his courageous deeds
In the time of our country's urgent need.

And so to his memory, a three gun salute
As taps softly play for this one-time recruit.

May he enter the gates of his final reward
And be received with honor at the house of his Lord.

Broadcast Ratings and Measurements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the Pennsylvania Association of Broadcasters at its recent annual meeting adopted a resolution concerning broadcast ratings and measurements, which subject has long been a matter of deep concern to the broadcasters. This group supports the objectives of the hearings of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which aims to improve survey procedures and is working diligently to assure that the entire system of audience measurement is changed to meet the highest possible standards.

Following is the resolution adopted by the Pennsylvania Association of Broadcasters on May 21 at State College, Pa.:

Whereas recent investigations of existing broadcast research have shown current methods to be improperly conceived, superficial, inadequate, inconclusive, and virtually unmindful of the need for reporting total circulation; and

Whereas there has been little change over many years in methodology or approach to measurement of either total circulation or specific audience quality; and

Whereas existing surveys developed without proper regard for needs and without sufficient preresearch and with little regard for providing information of maximum value to broadcasters, advertisers, and their agents: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Pennsylvania Association of Broadcasters in annual convention assembled support as a body and unanimously—

1. The Radio Advertising Bureau study of the comparison of methodologies to the end that proper measurement of radio's audience can be accomplished;

2. The Television Bureau of Advertising in its effort to establish sufficient and satisfactory methods for total measurement of television's audience and reach;

3. The National Association of Broadcasters in its efforts on behalf of all broadcasters to assure adequate research that will present the broadcast media in the most accurate favorable light;

4. And, in general, the development of new systems of measurement of radio's and television's total circulation and audience development which—having satisfied the requirements and specifications of broadcasters, advertisers, and their agents—will secure the approval and endorsement of those groups as the accepted manner of measuring these preeminent communications media;

5. And further, that this be accomplished with consummate care in the most expeditious manner.

Let's Not Sell Ourselves Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my remarks to the Henry and Stanley Cichon Post, the American Legion; the Cespino-Russo Post, the American Legion; and the Staten Island Memorial Day Service sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Richmond County, at Hero Park, Staten Island, N.Y.:

LET'S NOT SELL OURSELVES SHORT

Gentlemen and ladies, to those of us who have seen service in our country's wars this day holds a particular and cherished significance. It is a day the years roll away, a day when we see ourselves once again in Korea, on the beaches of Normandy or Okinawa, or perhaps in the Meuse-Argonne, or to a few in the fast-thining ranks of 1898, on San Juan Hill. Whatever our war—and wars haven't changed basically since Caesar's time—our remembrances are much the same. We recall the comradeship, the mounting tenseness and excitement as our ships or planes neared a foreign shore, and the satisfaction of meeting hardship and hazard steadfastly and proudly. Most of the bitterness, the fear and the grief has been washed away by the healing process of time. In your reminiscences with old comrades, you dwell largely on the humorous aspects of service life—or those that seem humorous now but might have been grim indeed at the time. Such as the conversation overheard by one of my friends, whose squad was under fire from a Japanese machinegun on the island of Saipan. One of the riflemen, apropos of nothing at all, remarked to his buddy: "I wish I was a civilian." Whereupon the other, with a wondering look, replied: "Where? Here?"

Those are the bits and pieces of war that remain green and fresh in the memory. But there are other, more important memories that must be kept green and fresh if we are to be worthy of those who shared the experience of war with us but who did not live to share our reminiscenses. Each of us who saw combat can recall the sudden, crushing finality of a friend's death in action.

Let us call a muster roll of those who gave their lives in order that we might be free—and bear in mind that these few figures I give you are only those who were killed in action—in the Revolution, 4,435; in the War of 1812, 2,260; in the Mexican War, 1,733; in the Civil War, 140,414 of the Blue and 74,524 of the Gray; in the Spanish-American War, 385; in World War I, 53,402; in World War II, 291,557; and, in the Korean War, 33,629. Those totals are the cost of freedom. It is a somber balance sheet and, to those of us who were spared to carry on, it must remain a debt of honor that can be paid only if we maintain the resolute faith in ourselves and in our cause that we once so stoutly shared with those who, in Lincoln's immortal words, gave the last full measure of devotion.

We are in a period of unsurpassed material prosperity. Our standard of living has risen beyond the wildest dreams of even the most optimistic economist of two decades ago. Our industry turns out a seemingly inexhaustible array of goods that is the marvel and the envy of the world. Our political system, though it has its imperfections, is generally conceded to be the most equitable thus far devised by man. We are, on balance, the preeminent power in the world.

Yet with all this we, as a nation, seem to be in a period of self-doubt, irresolution, timidity, and even fearfulness. It is very likely that our development of the atomic bomb and our subsequent decision to end the Pacific war with it sowed the seed of guilt in some who today argue that we should strip ourselves of such weapons and entrust ourselves to the dubious mercies of the Kremlin. That the bomb saved hundreds of thousands of lives—Japanese as well as our own—by making an invasion of Japan unnecessary is seldom pointed out.

On every side we see ban-the-bomb groups, composed, I am sure, mainly of sincere, well-meaning people, advocating unilateral disarmament—on our part, of course—if that is the only means of banning the bomb. Their cry is the familiar, "Better Red than dead," and they imply that those who wish to keep our atomic defensive arsenal—on the ground of commonsense—are in some way advocating a nuclear holocaust. To me, this is akin to disarming a policeman on the ground that a hoodlum might be provoked into violence by the sight of the officer's weapon. Unfortunately, these groups create an impression out of all proportion to their numbers and through emotionalism attract many who do not take the time to think the matter out. No one in his right mind advocates a nuclear war; but neither does anyone in his right mind advocate laying down his weapons in the face of an armed enemy.

There are those, too, who are quick to seize upon any internal difficulty in the United States and, with much hand wringing, see in it the signs of decay in our democracy. The civil rights crisis in Birmingham is a case in point. Naturally, the Kremlin has wrung every ounce of anti-American propaganda out of this distressing situation. But our own Cassandras are almost as bad. Conveniently overlooking the great strides the Negro has made in the past decades, they wail that Southern opposition to integration is destroying our "democratic image" and giving aid and comfort to our enemies. To hear them talk, you would think prejudice and bigotry were American inventions. Yet how many of them do you hear condemning anti-Semitism in Russia, a country whose record of Jewish oppression is second only to that of Germany under Hitler? Examined objectively, the claims of these doomsayers that the American way is decaying are, of course, utter nonsense.

Integration is becoming a fact in the South, and peacefully for the most part. But those who take alarm at this struggle, and in the other conflicts that are part and parcel of a dynamic democracy, are persuasive, they have access to the press and the airwaves, and they succeed in sowing a certain amount of doubt in ourselves. The other side of the story is told so seldom that we tend to forget there is another side. And so we wonder * * * are we slipping as a nation? Are we becoming decadent?

When our faith in ourselves begins to weaken, we tend to endow our enemies with far more strength than they possess. It is historically true that we, as a nation, either underestimate or overestimate our foes. In the 1930's, we dismissed the Japanese threat quite airily; our Navy could sink theirs in a day; their Army was primitive; they had no industrial capacity, and so on. Then came Pearl Harbor. Overnight, the Japanese became supermen. When a lone Japanese submarine lobbed a few ineffective shells at an oil refinery on the California coast, the fainthearts spoke wildly of retiring behind the Rocky Mountains to carry on the war from there. Ultimately, of course, we realized what had been true along—though tenacious fighters, the Japanese had no chance from the start in a war with a highly developed industrial nation like the United States. But I detect signs that this lesson is being forgotten, that the doom-sayers and the propagandists have created in us a feeling that the Russians are supermen and their leader, Khrushchev, is a man of consummate cunning whose thought processes are as infallible as the reckoning of a computer. Think back to the day a few years ago when the Reds launched their Sputnik.

From the ensuing uproar you could have been led to believe that the United States had no space program. We became intently self-critical—not that I am against self-criticism, which, in moderate doses can be constructive—and began to question our educational system, our industrial know-how, and the skills of our scientists. Of course, there was nothing seriouly wrong in any of those areas. Yet, today, with the cheers for Gordon Cooper still ringing in our ears, there are those who will tell you—on scanty evidence—that the Russians are far, far ahead of us slightly. But a good deal of what the Russians claim must be accepted on faith. I want to remind you that nobody, but nobody, in the free world has ever witnessed a Russian space shot. Contrast this strange secretiveness with our launchings—conducted openly with the whole world invited to watch. Yet too many of us feel, in a vague sort of way, that we are behind the Russians in the space race.

This tendency to overestimate the Russians is encroaching into another area, also—the field of history. As World War II recedes down the corridor of time, you hear and read more and more that "Russia won the war in Europe." And you hear it from those who should know better. This, of course, is what Russia wants the world to believe—the Russians also teach that they won the Pacific war singlehanded—and more and more people have been lulled into believing it. But here the Russians cannot hide behind their curtain of secrecy; there are facts and figures, long since swept under the rug, that paint an entirely different picture. Before we buy this myth of the super-Russians, let's, as Al Smith used to say, look at the record.

First, let's examine the Russians' vaunted political acumen and their so-called unrivaled intelligence system. The late tyrant, Stalin, as we know, had a reputation for perceptiveness and guile in his dealings with foreign nations. Yet how many of you know that this same, all-wise Stalin actually believed that Adolf Hitler would honor his nonaggression pact with Russia? And that despite their boasted spy network, the Russians had no inkling of the German attack until one of their division commanders noticed a cloud of dust mounting over the Polish frontier one morning in 1941? Under that cloud of dust were the Nazi armored columns.

It is known now that the Germans were vastly outnumbered in Russia; so much so that most of the general staff corps felt they were courting disaster in challenging the overwhelming and—theoretically—highly skilled Soviet army. We know what happened. The Russian troops disintegrated before the advancing Germans; thousands upon thousands of Russian soldiers simply threw down their arms and surrendered. Others joined the Germans against their own country. The Russians fell back almost to the gates of Moscow. And then, surprisingly, the tide began to turn. The Russians gave it out that their heroic troops and their mighty industry, single-handedly threw back the foe. But what actually happened? Well, we were in the war by that time, and the answer is provided in an official Army history—widely unread, I am unhappy to say—that was published some 10 years ago. It has to do with a dry subject—lend-lease aid—but in this book are facts and figures that every American should know. They will enable us to refute those who would distort history and undermine our faith in ourselves.

This history, written by T. H. Vail Motter, tells us that American deliveries through the Persian corridor to the U.S.S.R. were sufficient, by the standards of our own Army, to maintain 60—and I emphasize that figure, 60—Russian combat divisions in the line. Now, remember that the Persian Gulf corridor was only one of five routes by which we supplied the Soviets. And this corridor carried only 28.8 percent of the grand total of 17,499,861 tons of cargo shipped to Russia from the Western Hemisphere between June 22, 1941, and September 20, 1945.

Mr. Motter points out that almost half of these Russian-aid supplies reached the Soviet Union via a sealane which extended from American Pacific ports around to the north of Honshu. Because of the peculiar situation by which Japan winked at the traffic to her ally's enemy, only supplies classified as nonmilitary were carried. But the rest of these supplies were military. More than 8,500,000 tons of strictly military materiel—enough to maintain from 150 to 200 Russian divisions—were sent to the Soviet from the United States, in addition to the hundreds of thousands of tons contributed by our Allies. Now, consider this item: we shipped to Russia 14,834 military aircraft, a total that was very likely larger than the entire Soviet World War II air force. And consider this item: we shipped to Russia 409,526 trucks—a truly staggering number and a total that represented 7½ months of our output at peak war production and was the equivalent of 2 years and 7 months of the prewar capacity of the vaunted Soviet industrial machine. What this effort cost in money will be forever unknown; we wrote off the military supplies as a part of the war effort and have been negotiating, unsuccessfully, of course, with the Soviets for the balance ever since the end of World War II.

In effect, we underwrote the Russian Army—not only in tanks, planes, arms, and ammunition, but even to the point of preparing a special Red army ration in this country to be canned and shipped to the Soviets. Out of some 250 to 350 Russian divisions in the line against the Germans, we maintained at least half of them. Now the historians say that our aid was a major contribution to the Russian victory. I will go a great deal further than that. I say that the Russian victory over the Germans was "made in the U.S.A." I say further that not only did the Russians not defeat the Germans singlehandedly, as they boast, that they would have damned well lost their war if it had not been for our help. And there is something else we should remember. We accomplished this stupendous feat while raising and magnificently equipping an armed force of 10 million men; while building the greatest Air Force and Navy the world had even seen; while simultaneously fighting two wars in two hemispheres, and while maintaining an adequate if not luxurious civilian economy at home. If the label of "supermen" is to be handed out, it should be handed out to ourselves, not to the Russians. Remember this when the subtle propagandists and the doubters and the handwringers contrive to weaken your faith in yourself and in your country. Tell them of the long muster roll of the dead—those men whom we honor today—whose willingness to sacrifice their lives has proved again and again down the years that our moral fiber is as strong now as it was at Bunker Hill and at Gettysburg. When you are told that Americans are too preoccupied with material gain to fight for a cause, too lacking in stamina and spirit to fight gallantly against hopeless odds, remind them of the Alamo, of the Little Big Horn, where Custer and his troopers died to the last man, of Wake Island, and of Bastogne.

And above all, let us remind ourselves of our obligation to those to whom we do honor today. That obligation is to keep brightly burning the faith in ourselves and in our institutions that is the United States. Perhaps we are too prone to measure the caliber of our Nation in terms of its gross national product, its image abroad, and currently its posture in the space race. The greatness of a people lies in their faith, not in their production. No armed enemy will conquer this country. It can only succumb through default, and where there is faith there can be no default.

In closing, I should like to leave you with what, to me, is one of the most inspiring credos I have ever heard. It was written by Mr. Dean Alfange, who calls it, and I quote, "My Creed." It is also mine, and I hope it will be yours. I quote.

"I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon, if I can. I seek opportunity, not security. I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the state look after me. I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build, to fail and succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole. I prefer the challenges of life to the guaranteed existence; the thrill of fulfillment to the state calm of utopia. I will not trade freedom for beneficence, nor my dignity for a handout. I will never cower before any master, nor bend to any threat. It is my heritage to stand erect, proud and unafraid; to think and act for myself, enjoy the benefit of my creations, and to face the world boldly and to say, this I have done. All this is what it means to be an American."

Thank you.

The Fort Michilimackinac Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to call attention to an historic observance which will take place beginning Thursday, May 30, 1963, for 4 days, at Mackinaw City, Cheboygan, Petoskey, and Harbor Springs.

I refer to the Lacrosse-Fort Michilimackinac bicentennial celebration to commemorate the massacre of June 3, 1763, at the Straits of Mackinac.

The people of the richly historic Mackinac Straits area, where Michigan's two beautiful peninsulas are tied together by the magnificent Mackinac Bridge, have arranged these activities to mark this event in the history of the settlement of the Northwest.

A dramatic reenactment of the massacre professionally produced with a cast of hundreds will take place at Fort Michilimackinac on the actual spot where the original massacre occurred. During the 4-day commemorative, beginning on Memorial Day, there will be additional activities characteristic of the period in which the original events took place. This will include tomahawk and knife throwing, muzzle-loader shoots, archery, and canoe handling. There also will be three modern games of lacrosse between two of the Nation's foremost lacrosse teams. This one concession to modernity arises out of the fact that the game from which lacrosse has been developed—the Indian game of bagataway—was the ruse by means of which the Indians were successful in achieving their goal of eliminating the garrison.

Let me tell you the story of this American Trojan horse in the very words of Capt. George Etherington, commandant of Fort Michilimackinac on that fateful day written 9 days later on June 12, 1763, to Major Gladwin, commandant of the British fort at Detroit, which itself was besieged by the Indian nations under the great Chief Pontiac. This is a direct transcript from Captain Etherington's letter:

MICHILIMACKINAC,
June 12, 1763.

SIR: Notwithstanding what I wrot you in my last that all the Savages were amical and that everything seem'd in perfect tranquility—yet on the second instant the Chipaways who live in aplain near this Fort apointed to play ball, as they had done almost every day since their arrival. They play'd from morning till noon then throwing their ball close to the Gate and observing Lieut. Lesley and me afew paces out of it, they came behind us, seiz'd and carried us in to the Woods.

In the mean time the rest rush'd into the Fort, where they found their squas whom they had previously planted there with their hachets hid under Blankets which they took and in an instant kild Lieut. James and fifteen rank & file and a Trader named Tracy, they wounded two and took the rest of the Garrison prisoners five of which they have since kild.

The massacre was part of the conspiracy of Chief Pontiac and developed in the backwash of the Seven Years' War between the French and British. At the conclusion of the Seven Years' War the British and French signed a peace treaty but the British either forgot to sign a treaty with the Algonquins or chose to simply ignore them.

This meant that as far as the Indians were concerned they were still at war with the British. To them the "French Father," was merely asleep and would one day awaken and regain his former eminence in the New World.

Chief Pontiac, who was shrewd and intelligent and who would have been a great general in any army, was, for the moment, however, ready to concede that the British were dominant and he is reported to have approached them with a request for a commission—the rank of general—in the British army. He was turned down. It was, in part, this slight as well as the Algonquin conviction that they were still at war with the redcoats that led Pontiac to plot a campaign which he believed would drive the British out of the Northwest forever.

His plot was simplicity itself. The British had a number of outposts around the Great Lakes which they had either won from the French or had founded themselves. Among these outposts and forts were Fort Michilimackinac, St. Joseph, Green Bay, Fort Pitt, Niagara, Sandusky. Pontiac's plan was to mount Indian attacks against all these posts simultaneously. And his plan worked, and all up and down the frontier the British outposts were falling to the Algonquins. Nine posts in all were captured at about the same time. And though Pontiac had won the day, he eventually lost his war as the British juggernaut continued to roll through the wilderness, reclaiming the outposts from the Indians.

There is much for the student, tourist, and sightseer to enjoy at the Straits of Mackinac. The old fort has been restored to its original 18th century condition through the combined efforts of Michigan State University and the Mackinac Island State Park Commission. The fort looks now just as it did on the eve of that fateful lacrosse game.

On behalf of the bicentennial committee, may I extend to all of you a cordial invitation to visit the straits area, particularly the restored forts at Mackinaw City and Mackinac Island.

Debt Discipline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, today's Wall Street Journal contains an editorial entitled "Battered Ceilings and Bruised Heads" and an article entitled "Debt Discipline." These two articles relate to the recent congressional action on the national debt ceiling.

Since I have on previous occasions expressed the opinion that the debt ceiling should be adhered to and reduced in times when we are not in a national emergency, I found the Wall Street Journal articles most interesting. If Congress is not going to be guided in its spending by the existence of a debt ceiling, I believe we should seriously consider removing the ceiling entirely.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the two articles with my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 29, 1963]

DEBT DISCIPLINE: AN EFFECTIVE CEILING REQUIRES CONTROL OF SPENDING

(By Harley L. Lutz)

(NOTE.—Dr. Lutz is professor emeritus of public finance, Princeton University.)

Congress, once again, has pushed the Federal debt limit a little higher. The latest hassle, which ended yesterday with a temporary boost, was a rearguard tactic. Everyone knew that some increase was inevitable, as it has been time after time over the past decade. The reason is clear, Federal spending will have risen by more than 50 percent from 1955 through fiscal year 1964—from $64.4 billion to an estimated $98.8 billion. In the same period revenues were so far outrun as to cause an aggregate estimated net deficit of $46 billion.

The principal issue to be discussed here is whether there should be a debt limit. The history of the overall limit since its introduction in 1938 does not make a very good case for it, even aside from the immense debt increase during World War II. In February 1946 the debt dropped to its postwar minimum of some $252 billion and in June of that year the limit was lowered from $300 to $275 billion. As Congress debated action yesterday, the limit was $305 billion and Treasury operations were bumping against this ceiling.

In approaching the issue posed here, the first and most important question is: Do we really mean business or are we to continue the hypocrisy of this kind of sham battle against uncontrolled spending? If the administration, the Congress, and the people are not willing to accept the discipline of a firm debt limit, then the policy of debt limitation should be discarded as a bit of fiscal flummery. The position taken here is that there should be a debt limit and a firm policy of its strict enforcement.

NO MAGIC FIGURE

There is no magical, absolutely definite figure for this limit. The deficit for fiscal year 1963 is by this time fairly well set and provision must be made to cover the expenses, whatever they may be. The case is different for the fiscal year 1964, especially in view of the slow pace of congressional action on the appropriations for this year. Various well considered recommendations for reduced spending in 1964 have been advanced by responsible persons and organizations, and other sound proposals could no doubt be developed if such guidance and support were needed to stiffen the backbone of the Congress in a firm stand against further borrowing.

From the operational standpoint there can be no question that the 1964 budget can be reduced enough to involve no additional increase in the debt limit, beyond whatever may be necessary to cover the 1963 deficit. The political hazard of a bold stand for financial sanity has probably been exaggerated by such myths as spending and electing, but a firm national policy of debt control would provide timid candidates with a reasonable excuse for getting less Federal spending in the home district where success in such endeavors is the chief argument for reelection.

It must be emphasized that a debt limit, by itself, would not restrict Federal spending although, as indicated below, it would tend in that direction. The primary purpose of a firm debt limit is to prevent unrestrained debt-financed spending.

Among the reasons for a firm debt limit policy are the following:

1. The absence of a debt limit would tend toward even less compunction regarding debt financing and an even greater readiness to resort to it than now exists. The abuses of authorizations to spend from public debt recepits as a means of bypassing the scrutiny of the Appropriations Committees have been frequently exposed.

EVIDENCE OF INTEGRITY

2. Debt limitation is widely regarded as visible evidence of fiscal integrity, that is, the honesty and sincerity of the Government's intention regarding the value of the currency and of all fixed investments. The rigmarole of a debt limit which always moves upward just one step ahead of spending is a kind of lip service to the concept of fiscal integrity but it is of no avail as a protection against the perils of unlimited debt increase.

3. A firm debt limit would be a powerful source of a confidence among investors with regard to the stability of the public debt as a long-range investment. While there are other factors involved, the shift of investor preference from long-term to short-term Federal debt paper invites speculation as to the degree of confidence in the future value of long-term Treasury bonds. In 1946, for example, the average maturity of the Federal debt was 9 years and 1 month, and the debt under 5 years maturity was 45.7 percent of the total. As of December 1962 the average maturity had dropped to 4 years and 11 months, and the portion under 5 years maturity had risen to 73.3 percent.

The high proportion of short-term and floating debt is a handicap to efficient debt management. A lengthening of maturities requires the cooperation of investors who are naturally concerned with the ultimate as well as the present value of long-term Treasury bonds. The increased resort to debt financing that would be encouraged by absence of a limit would present definite prospect of inflation and continued erosion of the dollar in which, at maturity, the bonds are to be redeemed.

4. As noted above, while a firm debt limit would not necessarily prevent increased spending, it would indirectly operate in this direction. The limit would involve the obligation to pay cash on the barrelhead and this would tend toward a more careful public appraisal of the utility of spending programs as against the disutility of the additional taxes required to support them.

Certain practical aspects of a firm debt limit should be considered. The first is the effective date. Since the purpose is to prevent an increase of the debt, the end of the fiscal year is the logical time to apply the test. This means that Treasury operations during the fiscal year would be disregarded. The inflow of revenue over the year is variable, a situation which is exaggerated by the various actions of recent years to speed up tax payments. Three of the four instalments of individual income tax are due in the second half of the fiscal year. The outflow of expenditures is, by contrast, quite uniform through the year and, as a result, the Treasury must have temporary access to funds in the first half. Short-term borrowing to equalize income and outgo over the year is necessary and logical. The debt limit would prevent carrying such temporary advances into the next fiscal year as a permanent addition to the debt.

A second practical consideration relates to the debt to be subject to the limit. The present statutory rule includes everything except some minor items of no importance in the total. It is suggested here that the limit be applicable to the debt in the hands of the public, including the Federal Reserve Banks. A very important segment of the debt that would be excluded under this proposal consists of the Treasury obligations held in the trust fund accounts. These obligations represent the accumulated excess of collections over disbursements for Social Security unemployment compensation, railroad retirement, civil service retirement, veterans insurance, and others. The objective at which the present discussion is directed is the limitation and control of debt arising out of the operations of the administrative budget. The trust funds are not part of this budget, nor are they in any way controllable under it.

IMPACT ON JOBS

Two collateral matters should have brief notice. One is the contention, regularly used to support a huge budget and whatever deficit is involved, to the effect that any curtailment of Federal spending will increase unemployment. Hence a strict debt limit would increase unemployment.

Federal spending, as such, does not increase employment except as it adds more persons to the public payroll. A large airplane or missile contract may increase the demand for scientists or skilled workers in the plants designated to execute the contract, or in those of subcontractors. It will do nothing to provide jobs for those ultramarginal members of the labor force whose productivity is less than employers must pay under union rules or Federal law.

The other collateral matter is the argument that an expanding economy needs more debt because it will need more money. Hence, a strict debt limit will impede economic progress because it will restrict the capacity of the banking system to provide more money as the economy grows.

There is no question that the economy will need a larger money supply and a larger base for credit operations as its productive activities expand. Ninety percent or more of this increased money supply will be in the form of bank deposit credits. The question involved here is whether or not there must be an increase of the public debt beyond its present level in order to provide an asset base for the support of the larger volume of bank credits that will be needed. More specifically, must we allow the public debt to increase, not only for budget reasons, but also to maintain a supply of marketable debt paper sufficient to accommodate the Federal Reserve banks in the exercise of their money and credit control operations?

PERMANENT INFLATION

A deliberate increase in the public debt merely to permit, or assure, an expansion of the money supply would be permanently inflationary. It would be one of the weakest possible reasons for eliminating the debt ceiling, or for pandering to the spending urge by conceding every trick before the cards are played. Economic growth depends on increase of debt. This is as simple and as inevitable as the balancing of every credit by a debit. It does not follow, however, that the achievement of a higher rate of economic growth involves or requires a continuous increase of the public debt. Privately generated debt paper, arising out of the growth needs of the economy, can serve fully as well as Treasury debt paper as the basis of Federal Reserve operations.

A final point: It is not generally realized that the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives is, in a real and important sense, the key to our problem. This committee has original jurisdiction over revenue measures and the debt limit. It thus occupies a unique position in the area of fiscal policy determination. While its recommendations on taxes and other matters have not been accepted by the Congress in every case, its influence is great.

In the past this committee has initiated many of the tax policies which are now so generally under attack, and its complaisant attitude on the debt limit has, to say the least, not discouraged deficit spending. This financial course has not contributed to satisfactory economic growth. The committee now has the opportunity—and the challenge—to change direction, to exert its influence toward reducing and limiting the drag of Government on the economy, and to exercise its powerful leadership for the growth of the economy rather than the growth of Government. Sound tax reform and a firm position on the debt limit are essential steps to this end.

Results of the 1963 Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, listed below are the results of the questionnaire I mailed out to my district in Nebraska during the last week in March. Approximately 45,000 were mailed out and returns totaled almost 20 percent.

It is interesting to note that the people of the Third District in Nebraska want less Federal Government rather than more; that they still believe strongly in the principles of free enterprise and getting ahead through the efforts of individual initiative.

Replies, as you will note, are overwhelmingly in opposition to some of the major proposals before the 88th Congress.

There has been absolutely no demand, according to my mail, for programs such as the National Youth Opportunities Act or the Domestic Peace Corps. There is strong opposition to both of these proposals. The demand seems to come from the minds of a few social do-gooders here in Washington who would like to experiment along these lines at the taxpayers' expense to the tune of a good many millions of dollars.

One of the two most significant results of this questionnaire is question ten, which asks, "Do you favor the bill which I introduced to bring labor unions under the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act and other laws to eliminate monopolies in the field of labor?" Ninety-one percent replied favorably, with only 4.5 percent in the negative. Polls by other members on this question have brought overwhelming "yes" votes.

Another answer which is particularly significant is question 13(c), which asks if they favor "taking whatever steps are necessary, including military action, to overthrow the Castro regime in Cuba." Sixty-eight and two-tenths percent, or over two-thirds, replied favorably and only 14 percent voted "no," with 17.8 percent "not sure."

I trust that the Members will study the results of this poll, as I believe that it is indicative of a majority of our citizens' thinking throughout the country. The recent wheat referendum was a manifesto that our citizens want less, rather than more, Government control and want a cutback in our spending program.

The questionnaire follows:

Results of the 1963 questionnaire

	Yes	No	Not sure
1. The President has proposed cuts in income taxes, but at the same time has submitted a $12,000,000,000 deficit budget. Should Congress—			
a. cut taxes regardless of deficit?	10.2	86.7	3.6
b. cut taxes only if spending is reduced?	72.8	22.1	5.1
c. reduce spending, balance the budget, and then consider a tax cut?	92.7	4.3	3.0
2. Do you favor the present feed grain program for agriculture?	14.7	56.5	28.8
3. Do you favor the present wheat program for agriculture?	13.0	60.6	26.4
4. Should the Federal Government provide funds for—			
a. public school construction?	13.6	81.3	5.1
b. public school teachers' salaries?	4.8	93.3	1.9
c. loans and scholarships for college students?	34.1	55.1	10.8
d. grants for outstanding elementary and secondary school level teachers to attend universities for further study on subjects they teach?	23.9	67.3	8.8
e. should the full responsibility for primary and secondary education be left to State and local communities?	89.6	7.2	3.2
5. Do you favor establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps similar to the CCC of the thirties at a cost of $100,000,000 the 1st year?	10.6	78.6	10.8
6. Do you favor establishment of a "domestic" Peace Corps?	14.4	68.9	16.7
7. Should Congress pass my bill to increase the duties on both live animals and dressed meat imported into the United States?	86.3	6.7	7.7
8. Do you feel that the United Nations is an effective force for world peace?	26.3	52.8	20.9
9. Do you favor—			
a. The King-Anderson medicare bill which provides for a compulsory health program for the aged under social security?	8.4	85.4	6.2
b. Federal legislation which would allow an income-tax deduction for senior citizens to reimburse them for the cost of a health and hospitalization insurance policy taken out with a private insurance company?	57.5	27.7	14.8
10. Do you favor the bill which I introduced to bring labor unions under the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act and other laws to eliminate monopolies in the field of labor?	91.0	4.5	4.5
11. Do you think that Congress should appropriate $460,000,000 in Federal funds for the construction of public fallout shelters?	7.1	79.6	13.3
12. We are spending $4,200,000,000 on foreign aid this year. Do you feel that this program should be—			
a. continued at present levels?	3.7	93.2	3.1
b. continued, but cut?	63.0	30.8	6.2
c. gradually reduced until terminated?	80.3	15.2	4.5
d. immediately terminated?	35.8	53.2	11.0
13. In view of the continuing Cuban crisis, do you believe the United States should—			
a. continue its present policies?	14.1	71.1	14.8
b. impose a strict embargo to prevent any additional war materials from reaching Cuba until all Communist arms and men are withdrawn?	85.7	7.2	7.1
c. Take whatever steps are necessary, including military action, to overthrow the Castro regime?	68.2	14.0	17.8

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 29, 1963]

NATIONAL DEBT—BATTERED CEILINGS AND BRUISED HEADS

Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, who must be one of the most frustrated men in Washington's wonderland, had some sharp words the other day for those who would hold down Federal spending merely by putting a lid on Federal borrowing.

Said the Secretary: "Let no one labor under the delusion that the debt ceiling is either a sane or an effective instrument for the control of Federal expenditure * * *.

"This cannot be done by trying to exert controls on the tag end of the expenditure process, when the bills are coming due. The debt limit is not and cannot be a substitute for the control of expenditures at the decisive stage of the expenditure process—when funds are being appropriated."

Mr. Dillon is absolutely right. Unless we are willing to see the Government of the United States in the posture of a dead-beat, refusing to pay its bills, it is plain silly to go on happily appropriating billions more than the Government's income and then sternly forbidding the Secretary of the Treasury to beg, borrow, or otherwise scrounge the money to pay for it all. That's about on a par with gorging on filet mignon every day and then, in a burst of remorseful economy, deciding to balance the household accounts by telling your wife not to pay the butcher.

So Mr. Dillon's frustration is understandable. The President and Congress between them are planning to cut the Government's revenue while increasing its spending, leaving the Treasury Secretary with the problem of finding somewhere at least $12 billion in the next fiscal year alone. But with the Government's debt already bumping against the legal ceiling, Congress has been soberly debating whether to allow the Treasury to borrow the wherewithal; yesterday it once again agreed to lift the lid temporarily.

The simple truth of the matter, as Professor Lutz says in his cogent remarks on the debt which we publish this morning is that a debt limit will not prevent increased spending. The reasons for having one lie elsewhere. So too does the cure for the constantly increasing spending, deficits, debt, and their concomitant inflation.

The function served by a fixed debt limit is, first of all, that it does force the Government to sweat. Once bumped up against, it faces an administration seeking more money with two political battles, one for the appropriation and one to change the debt law. Congress is forced to at least take open cognizance of what its appropriations are doing to the national debt. Finally, as Dr. Lutz notes a ceiling puts at least some technical discipline on the Treasury's handling of the Government's finances.

Thus Congress has wisely retained the device even though, as the record shows, the battered ceiling always has been—and will be—raised when the spending grows unchecked. If the spending itself is to be checked that must be done not as Mr. Dillon says, "at the tag end" of the process but at the other end.

The appropriation process begins at the White House, where the Treasury Secretary sits in council. It is here that new programs originate. It is here that the budget for old programs is enlarged. It is here that proposals for raising or lowering Government revenue are begun; it was President Kennedy and Mr. Dillon who sought out higher spending and lower taxes.

So if Mr. Dillon is understandably frustrated it is here that his frustration begins. He might perhaps gain more sympathy if he himself were not urging both the bigger spending and the lower taxes that alone make the present debt ceiling chafe.

Still, it's true enough you can't put all the blame on the administration of the moment. Congressmen complain about the encroachments of the Executive, love speeches about the responsibilities of Congress. But unlike some areas such as foreign affairs, Congress is the undisputed master of the purse. A President may propose; Congress alone votes the appropriations and the taxes. Congress, in Mr. Dillon's phrase, is "the decisive stage of the expenditure process."

It is, therefore, the decisive place to clamp that lid on the Federal debt. The Congress ought to apply some of its much talked-about fiscal discipline to itself, putting a ceiling not only on the level of the debt but on the spending which alone creates that debt. In short, a limit on appropriations established at the beginning of the session which would restrain not just the Treasury Secretary but its own Appropriations Committees.

Any other kind of lid is bound to be not only frustrating but fragile. For as Alice discovered in her own wonderland, a ceiling is only a place to bruise your head if you keep drinking the stuff that makes a body grow and grow and grow.

Agricultural Chemicals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and spoken recently on the subject of agricultural chemicals, even to the point where in some instances expressions were used that would instill doubt in anyone's mind as to whether consumption of vegetables and fruits were not injurious.

In the following address, Dr. Daniel G. Aldrich, Jr., dean of agriculture at the University of California, sets forth some very well-founded and authentic statements on this subject:

AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS—WELLSPRING OF HUMAN PROGRESS

(Address by Dr. Daniel G. Aldrich, Jr., university dean of agriculture, University of California, Los Angeles, Feb. 12, 1963)

If this well-fed continent were called on to support its people with the tools of a century ago, we could very well rival India and China in poverty and human misery.

That is an unlikely sort of "if" of course. But there are around us the partisans of a chemical-free world. They would have us give up some of the principal tools of modern agriculture.

It is a good deal more likely—since our world is acquiring about 100,000 new mouths to feed every day—that this continent will be called on to support a great many more millions of people than today's agricultural tools and methods can feed.

And this can be soon. The year 2000, only 37 years away, and within the life expectancy of a fair share of us here, will see very nearly 400 million people in the United States alone. Counting new lands, not now touched by the plow, and today's lands that we still hope to save for agriculture, we will have in the year 2000 just 1⅙ acres of American farmland per person.

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the U.N. is still more dramatic in its estimates of our future footroom on this planet. The FAO calculates that we have today 12.5 acres per person. Also that no more than three of these acres could be cultivated. By the year 2000, the 12.5 acres will be reduced by the worldwide population explosion to 1.5 acres gross per man, woman, or child, counting Antarctica, the Sahara, and Mount Everest. Tillable land per person will be less than one-half acre.

We can almost say we'll be fighting for standing room. We can very surely say that the battle for food, less than 40 years from now, is going to enlist all of the science, all of the skill, all of the land we can save, all of the fertilizers and weedkillers we can create to make that land grow its maximum, and all the biological and chemical means we can devise to save the produce of the land for people to eat.

In this country, in the affluent 1960's, talking about a struggle for food doesn't seem to make much sense. We can almost say that Americans have no food needs at all any more. We just have wants.

But our wants are considerable. We want and we get convenience and quality. Most people who are 35 or younger have never seen a wormy apple in a store.

We want our foods free from insects, and free from skin markings or dirt, free of any suggestion that insects have been around. We want our apples or our lettuce as fresh as if they had just been picked. We tolerate no deterioration between the field or orchard and the table. And we want our foods safe.

The farmer's job was surely a simpler one a generation ago, when he was filling needs.

We have another want, too. We want our foods at bargain prices. And our foods are bargains. In the United States we are spending barely 23 percent of our incomes, on the average, for the most varied and abundant, the cleanest and most attractive, most nutritious, and safest foods the world has ever known. In Italy, for example, the average is closer to 46 percent of income. In Russia it is 50 percent, Japan 51 percent, in Ceylon 57 percent, in Nigeria 71 percent. In much of the world what we consider essential foods can't be bought at any price.

We'd like to hope no one seriously thinks that our rich soils and sunshine, our fortunes of geography, brought us all our abundance. These same lands, the continental United States, once fed a scant million people. They feed nearly 200 times as many today, and provide them with more material goods, more hardware, more gadgetry, and more leisure than any people have ever seen, because the sciences of agriculture have brought forth yields beyond our needs.

The sciences of agriculture today are truly all the disciplines we know as science. We owe much of our farm yields to engineering, with its roots in physics, which has given us today's tools of land preparation and harvest, and has brought water to the land. We owe much of our good living to genetics, which has brought us high-yielding new varieties, high quality, and resistance to pests and disease. Probably above all, especially in the years since the World War II, we owe our abundance of inexpensive and nutritious food to chemistry.

Chemistry has brought us knowledge of the soil itself, and of the growing plant. Through scientific application of plant nutrients, chemistry has brought yields of foods and fiber toward the genetic maximum. Chemistry has given us plant protection—the soil fumigation to kill nematodes and fungi, and sprays to control the insects and mites that can make fruits and vegetables unsaleable and can totally destroy a crop. Chemistry has led us to understanding of the ripening processes, so our pears and melons can be brought to perfection when the market is ready for them. Chemistry has helped us bar spoilage organisms, so we can store foods until they are needed, and bring them from the field to the market and to the home attractive, nutritious, and safe.

I'm sure you are all aware, however, that the public has been reading some indictments of chemicals, and of the people who make and use them. The most articulate of these indictments has been Miss Rachel Carson's "Silent Spring." The book has now been sufficiently reviewed by both its praisers and detractors, so I see no need to pour more oil on this fire of controversy. But I think there is room for some temperate remarks about chemicals as a basic tool of living today, about nature—and the birds and beasts and insects that are nature—and about the balance of man and his food supply, which someday could be a prime concern even in our own, food-surfeited United States.

With a very little imagination anyone who has spent some years in agriculture can conjure up a pretty vivid picture of a chemical-free world. It's not hard to picture the manpower, and womanpower, and childpower this country alone would need, if we went back to picking off the bugs by hand. And vivid is just the word for the apples that would come to our tables untouched by pest controls. We could go back to grandad's jokes: "What's worse than finding a worm in an apple? Half a worm." We could go back, too, to that theme of farming in the good old days: "One for the mole, one for the crow, two for blight, and one to grow."

Of course an untreated orchard will in time find a measure of natural pest control. Scientists working with the natural parasites and predators of the insects and mites have brought biological control to a point of acceptable efficiency—with some crops and in some climates and locations. Chemicals are expensive, and farmers have been happy to use natural controls any time they can. And scientists in the University of California are constantly studying new possibilities of extending biological control.

But experience tells us people will not wait for the parasites to take over the worms. And they won't sit still and watch the worms take over the apples. We have the means, the chemical tools, of producing perfect apples, in abundance. I think the public is realistic enough to keep on using these tools—and to use them more, and more efficiently, than we do now.

By a recent estimate, in spite of today's pest control know-how, this country has been giving up to the pests every year the production of 88 million acres of land. We could also add postharvest losses equal to the production from 32 million acres. This is wasted acreage, more than the entire area of California. Insects alone nullify the work of a million men, 10 percent of the country's agricultural labor force.

Perhaps we can afford this kind of waste. We are somehow paying for it, and building surpluses. But simple mathematics, the adding of millions upon millions of mouths to feed, point to a swift end for our surpluses. When they are gone, we will not be able to live with such waste.

When today we are losing the production of 100 million acres of land, what of the future? When population has doubled and the area of good farmland has proportionately—and actually—shrunk, agriculture will obviously have to be more concentrated and more intensive than now. We will see more specialized fields and orchards, more plants and more trees to the acre, more heavily applied fertilizer, more chemical control of weed competition, and all-out pest control, during growth and after harvest.

The call for still faster increase in food production only points up the seriousness of anything less than maximum yield and maximum delivery from the field to the table. The rôles of chemicals in bringing food to our tables are almost beyond count.

What are some of these roles? Sometimes we must start with land preparation, fumigating the soil to control nematodes or fungi. Fertilizers may be drilled into the soil before seeding. Preemergence weed killers may be sprayed on the soil to lessen competition for the young plants and seeds may be treated with protecting chemicals before planting.

Before plants are harvested, chemicals may have been used as selective herbicides, to kill weeds but not the crop plant. Sprays or dusts may have been applied to halt diseases or control insects. Other chemicals may be used to kill rodents. Hormones may be applied to regulate growth and defoliants or desicants to remove leaves, so machines can harvest the crop.

After harvest, chemistry still has important roles. The product may receive a nutrient supplement, such as the vitamin D added to milk. An antispoilant may protect the food from microbial action. A flavoring agent may be added. (Monosodium glutamate, in spite of its name, has been completely accepted by the public and sells as a consumer product.) Moisture controls may be added, such as the calcium silicate that keeps our table salt from caking.

These are all chemicals. What do they do to human health?

All chemicals affect human health, because all foods are chemicals. I might just quote Emil Mrak, one of the world's leading food scientists, who is chancellor of our Davis campus. He put it this way:

"Many people have forgotten that foods are chemicals. I think it also important to point out that we have forgotten some of the chemicals we use in foods are actually present in foods: for example, ethylene and sodium chloride.

"The confusions and delusions concerning the safety of natural foods with all their natural chemicals are extraordinary."

Not only are foods chemicals; the chemicals naturally in the soil, the chemicals in compost or barnyard manure, and the chemical fertilizers a farmer puts on the soil are the same things. Scientists can't identify the source of nitrogen, phosphorus, or potassium in the plant, whether from chemical fertilizer, manure, or decayed crop residue. And neither can the plant. The nutrient it takes up from the soil, whatever the source, is the same chemical element.

We might note too that during the last 19 years, which have been years of expanding use of chemicals of all types, life expectancy in the United States has increased by 7 years. In the Netherlands, where chemical fertilizers are applied in vastly greater quantities than here—20 times as much as our farmers average—public health standards and life expectancy are higher still.

I think most well-informed scientists would agree that our food in this country has never been better or safer, our health and lifespan never more favorable, and never before has science done so much to improve standards of living.

The American Medical Association, in its most recent issue of Today's Health, declared chemical pesticides have helped prevent famines and credited them with the complete elimination or stringent control of many of the diseases spread by insects and other pests. The AMA credited DDT with saving at least 5 million lives during World War II and preventing many more illnesses from insect and rodent-borne diseases.

Science is always on the job to make agricultural chemicals both more effective and safer. The chemical industry, which is built upon scientists, works closely with Government agencies to screen every new chemical product for all of its potential effects. Seven years or more may elapse from the synthesis of a new pesticide before all of the precautionary studies have been made and the product is on the market.

In our university laboratories at Riverside and Davis we have a rigid program to check new commercial pesticides. It extends from testing of effectiveness to elaborate studies of any residues the product may leave on or in treated plants, livestock, or the soil. This effort may take as long as 5 years. Our scientists constantly refine their methods and laboratory tools to identify complex compounds in amounts smaller than 1 part in 100 million.

Scientists of the Food and Drug Administration determine a chemical residue level safe for human consumption. Frequently they divide this safe level by 100. That 100th then becomes the tolerance level and the basis for accepted rates of application on crops. A residue tolerance may be as small as one-tenth of a part per million.

But if small amounts of these chemicals will control insects and mites, won't these same materials affect birds, mammals, fish, and other life? And won't the balance of nature be affected?

It may, of course, because almost any action by man or animal does something to his surroundings. Most surely an invasion of insects with no natural enemies upsets any balance nature may have.

We can say that any human society beyond the simplest of nomadic tribes has developed through its assault on its environment, its shifting of the balance of nature. Perhaps more basically, it is the distinction of the human animal that he can modify his environment.

When man discovered fire he changed his environment. When he began using fire to cook his food, he went off his natural foods diet. Probably 15,000 years ago man began saving and planting seeds and domesticating animals. He reduced the amount of land supporting wild animals.

Just raising a question about the balance of nature implies that people at some time lived in static balance with the other fauna of the world. The very measure of man's progress has been his ability to unbalance nature—to man's advantage. Even modern civilization, based on scientific agriculture and public health measures, exists only by unrelenting war against return to the balance of nature.

If we count people as a part of nature, we must give some credit to other organisms, too, for upsetting the balance at times. There are areas of Africa where man and his agriculture are stopped cold by the tsetse fly. Until the Second World War and DDT, malaria-carrying mosquitoes made some parts of the world extremely inhospitable to man. If chemicals have upset the balance of nature, some millions of people have reason to be grateful.

Some people tell us we haven't even done a very effective job in changing the balance of nature. We are surely well outnumbered still by the other organisms we share the world with. Our entomologists count some 82,000 insect species and 2,600 tick and mite species that flourish in the United States. In spite of all our efforts and techniques and chemical weapons, we have not eradicated a single insect species from the earth. If it weren't for some interfering factors, a single pair of flies in a few months could blanket the earth 3 feet deep with their descendants. With all of our modern tools, we are simply a part of the complex of natural enemies that keep the flies from doing that.

We have surely known times in the United States when our enemies the insects have very badly upset the balance of nature. As recently as 1874 grasshoppers caused so great a food shortage in the Midwest that Congress declared it a national disaster.

Inadvertently we have made some contributions to nature's imbalance. When we came from the Old World we brought our flies, ants, rats, and roaches with us. They came in our grain and seeds, and attached to our livestock. There was also a tendency for our imports to come without the natural parasites and predators that gave some kind of control at home.

Man has met some resounding defeats by the insect world. The first British colony in America, at Jamestown, Va., was once reduced by malaria to six able-bodied men. The French were unable to complete the Panama Canal because of mosquitoes. When we completed the canal in 1914, we had put 10 percent of the cost into mosquito control.

Science's job now is largely a battle with our insect and rodent enemies, the diseases they carry, and the weeds, to attain a balance of nature we can live with.

There is always some danger in the weapons man uses to hold his own in nature. Fire and the spear could also kill man. Any agricultural chemical today, like the automobile, or almost any device of modern life can be hazardous when used carelessly.

But the hazard to men who apply chemicals has grown steadily smaller. And so has damage to wildlife. Recent eradication campaigns against the screw-worm fly and medfly in Florida have been successful with little or no effect on wildlife.

By far the greatest part of this continent has been rarely or never touched by manmade chemicals. In a typical year more than 95 percent of the entire U.S. land and water area receives no pesticides at all. For our wildlands the figure is 97 percent.

In the past there has been carelessness and there has been some damage. But the harm man has done to wildlife in felling forests, tilling fields, draining swamps, polluting waters, and building cities has been of much greater consequence than the losses traced to pesticides. They have been relatively small and temporary.

The land then that is touched by our pesticides, herbicides, and chemical fertilizers is small. But that land yields history's highest living standard.

For just a minute then let's think a little about a chemical-free world. It might be the surest way to meet an unemployment problem. We would see an out-of-the-factory and back-to-the-land movement of millions. Handpicking the potato bugs and handchopping the weeds would give employment almost beyond conception. Those were the methods when this country had a fourth of today's population, and one farmer's labor could feed only two or three beyond his own family.

Now one farmer and his technology can provide for 26 people, and still contribute toward a food and fiber surplus. But it has been estimated that 40 percent of our crop production could be credited to fertilizers alone.

The first item of the chemical-free United States, then, might be disposing of 100 million people.

Getting rid of today's surplus foods would present no problems. George Gergstrom, of Michigan State University, has remarked that if all the food in the world were distributed equally, all the world would be undernourished. If all the people were fed at the U.S. level, all the available food would feed less than half the world's population now. We could exhaust the surpluses ourselves in 7 months.

We have long passed the point where anyone can seriously think of going back to a chemical-free, technology-free agriculture. It is simply a matter of people to feed and clothe. Without pleading the case for the late Thomas Malthus, I could cite the estimates that we are headed toward a U.S. population of 400 million by the end of this century. Some more adventurous statisticians have worked out a mathematical equation from population estimates since history began. They tell us that in the year 2026 this world could have 50 billion people.

Our answer can only be a food explosion. And this is possible. In the Western World we have the technology, equipment, and capital to increase world production of grains, legumes, meats, vegetables, fruits, dairy products, and fish tenfold in the next 10 years. But among the tools of our technology are the fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides, growth regulators, defoliators, and rodenticides. These are tools as indispensable to food production today as tractors, hybrid seeds, and improved crop varieties.

The high-density agriculture ahead of us will mean more plants, more fertilizer, more irrigation, more feedlots, and more production—all creating more favorable environment for pests. We will need more sophisticated, more selective, and more effective chemicals.

New lands, the tropics, must come into production and be made fit for human life.

More foods must be preserved, stored, and moved long distances. And this means more and better antispoilage chemicals.

Our chemical world has really been with us a long time, about as long as there have been people. When the caveman dried meat over his fire, he preserved it with a food additive, smoke. When he learned about salt, he had another chemical additive. When our Pilgrims learned from the Indians to plant a fish with the corn, they used the chemicals of the decomposing fish. When the first honey robbers learned they could smoke out a bee tree, they had an insecticide at their command.

Today we recognize that our insecticides, herbicides, and fertilizers are chemicals. We should recognize that all of our foods are too, and that they have not become inherently hazardous because we know their chemical composition.

We must learn still more about all chemicals, the natural ones of our foods and the ones we put together, because we must make still greater use of them. We are going to have a more crowded world, whether we like it or not. We can, if we understand the chemistry of all things around us, have a more populous world and still a safer and better nourished one than we have today.

Government Lotteries of Burma, Nationalist China, Hong Kong, and Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the normal, human urge to gamble can be found in almost every country around the world—in Europe, in Africa, in Latin America, in the Middle East, and in the Far East. In 77 countries, the gambling spirit of its people is legally recognized and capitalized on by its governments.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the Members of this House to the Far East and talk about the government-run lotteries in Burma, in Nationalist China, in Hong Kong, and in Indonesia.

Burma began its lottery operations in 1938 when the British ruled and has continued ever since. The total gross receipts for 1962 were almost $7 million. The net income to the Government came to over $2½ million. While there is no actual earmarking of the profits, lottery proceeds have been used for social welfare, housing, and similar governmental activities.

Nationalist China has only one state-operated lottery which is called the liberty lottery. In 1962, the gross annual receipts came to $3,689,000. The total income to the Government was $1,916,000 which was used for general fiscal purposes.

Hong Kong has only recently gone into the lottery business. Its first lottery was held July 7, 1962. Yet, the results of the two lotteries held in 1962 showed gross receipts of over $1 million. The total net income to the Hong Kong government was almost one-half million dollars which was allocated to expenditures for the purpose of social welfare. The fascinating part is that there was considerable interest in the lottery, and the ticket sales and profit to the government went well above its expectations—so much so that the Hong Kong lottery is firmly established as the new form of painless taxation.

Indonesia is another Far East country which sensibly and realistically recognizes that the urge to gamble is a universal, instinctive human trait which should be controlled and regulated with a national lottery. The total gross annual receipts for 1962 came to $8 million. After payment of prizes, the total net revenue to the Government came to $2 million. This revenue is paid into a special fund which finances various social welfare projects.

Mr. Speaker, why can we not be as smart as these governments? Why can we not be as logical and as sensible in our treatment of our own people? Yes, why can we not follow the example of New Hampshire? A national lottery in the United States can easily produce over $10 billion a year in additional revenue which can help cut our taxes and reduce our national debt.

Wheat Farmers Say "No"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of May 23, 1963:

WHEAT FARMERS SAY "NO"

The Kennedy administration's wheat control program went down to crushing defeat in the national referendum. It needed a 66.7 percent vote to carry and reecived less than 48 percent. The voting was a showdown of the administration's "supply management" policy for American agriculture. The wheat farmers have spoken. They don't want it.

If two-thirds of them had voted "yes," the wheatgrowers would have been assured of high price guaranties on the 1964 wheat crop, along with controls over production and marketing of unprecedented severity—penalties for violation ranging up to fines of $10,000 and jail sentences of 10 years.

But the majority of growers voted "no" on this. Their decision means they will have low price guaranties and virtually unrestricted production, unless Congress intervenes and enacts new legislation.

But the real significance of the vote extends far beyond the price of wheat. The fear of the plan's opponents was that if producers accepted the supply-management plan for wheat, they would have taken a long step toward accepting mandatory controls for other crops, for livestock, for dairying and poultry farming—for all of agriculture.

As the opponents saw it, a "yes" vote would be interpreted by Congress and the leaders of both political parties that farmers, with the enticement of high price guaranties, were willing to have their farms managed from Washington. The wheat farmers voted no. And the big majority of these wheat growers are diversified farmers. They grow other crops; they feed beef cattle or dairy cattle, or they raise poultry. They were not thinking merely of one crop; they were thinking of their right to manage their own business.

So the resounding "no" vote they gave on wheat surely is a resounding "no" on the Kennedy administration's supply-management theories. It was a farm vote of independence. It is notice to Congress to cut out the nonsense and to enact legislation designed to ease the Governemnt out of farming.

The vote actually is a belated but nonetheless resounding endorsement of the farm policy of the Eisenhower administration. Ezra Taft Benson, agriculture secretary in that administration, was plugging for a gradual return of farm management to the farmers and letting prices be determined in the marketplace. A wise administration in Washington will realize this and act accordingly.

The Value of Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to be able to present four of the winning essays in an annual Nebraska Rural Electric Association essay contest on the value of electricity to the rural community.

My colleagues from Nebraska will also include the other winning essays, and we are pleased to serve as hosts for a visit by the young people who are the authors of the winning essays during their trip to Washington and the Capitol next week.

My best personal wishes to each of the winners and by congratulations on the novelty of their approach and the messages which their essays contain.

The essays follow:

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Shirley Brown, 17, junior at Palisade High School, Palisade, Nebr.; father: Clark Brown)

Ever since the beginning of man there has been a source of light. In the beginning man was afraid of lightning, and the harm it could do. As the years passed, man began to gain more knowledge through experiments, trial and error, and by chance.

Man experimented many years and went through many trying times to achieve this tremendous asset of electricity we have today. Even many who have worked to bring about this astonishingly swift social revolution failed to realize how important and far reaching it is. Twenty-five years ago hardly 10 percent of the farmers of this country had electric power. Today more than 90 percent of all farms have electricity and many of the labor-saving devices that go with it. The way of life of the average farm family has been completely changed and the process of change is still only in the initial phase.

There were many trying times in the organizing of the REA cooperative and many experiments were tried to prove to the people how electricity could become a necessity instead of a luxury. For example, in 1923, 10 farmhouses were equipped with practically every electric appliance then existing. Electricity was installed in the farmers' barns, chickenhouses, and milk sheds. Electric motors were installed for dehydrating hay. An electric saw for cutting wood replaced the two-man handsaw. An electric pump brought running water into the houses. Separate meters recorded the amount of electricity used by these devices. And at the same time the farmer kept a careful check of his operating costs. As the experiment progressed, electric bills rose sharply. But at the same time the individual farmer found operating costs decreasing. Electricity was saving months of labor each year and thus the farmer was able to use his energy profitably at other jobs. Quite apart from these statistics, it was abundantly clear that life on the experimental farms was happier and healthier. The whole level of farm living had been raised by abolishing some of the backbreaking tasks of farm life.

The people at the top have been the first to say that the success of REA is in large measure due to the devotion and zeal that run through the rank and file. Lawyers, engineers, and cooperative organizers have worked long and hard through the years to make REA a success. They have taken the cooperative system off the drawing boards, translating the plants into reality and bringing the benefits of electricity to millions of people. Many of the ideas and philosophies within REA have been violent. These were arguments not on the goal to be reached, but on how to reach the goal.

Along with the whole far-reaching programs of subsidies, parity prices, and soil conservation, electricity now has come to the farm. It has come in typically American fashion, through a working relationship between Government, farm leaders, cooperatives, and commercial business. Sometimes private enterprise has cooperated willingly and sometimes reluctantly. But whatever the attitude, it is nevertheless clearly seen that the power load of the private utilities and the profits of private utilities have been greatly increased by the transformation worked on the farm. Private enterprise has built the refrigerator, the dairy equipment, the lighting systems, the heating systems, the food freezers, the toasters, and washing machines that are found on farms across the land; and this is to say nothing of the generators and other facilities necessary to produce the increased power for distribution to America's farm families.

There were never truer words uttered when you say, "live better electrically."

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By William A. Carter, 17, junior at Palisade High School, Palisade, Nebr.; father: Joe Carter)

"Let there be light."

This was God's own command in the beginning. Since then it has echoed and reechoed down the halls of time, picking up new meaning and importance with each reverberation until finally man can look back at the development of light and in its images see his own progress.

Man's existence in his early days on this planet was not a pleasant one. It was racked by fear, doubt and superstitution, the height of which was reached each day when the sun went down and left him alone in the dark. The next step in his progress came with his accidental discovery of fire. Perhaps it was a bolt of lightning or the lava from a volcano that revealed this secret to man, but at any rate he now controlled light for the first time. With it he could see at night and cook his food. As time passed and man experimented with fire, he used it to cure hides, form weapons, sterilize wounds, and to use it in many ways to improve his life on earth.

It was not until after the Renaissance (16th century) that the first form of electricity was noted, namely static electricity. Then man discovered that lightning was a form of static electricity and saw the tremendous potential energy in it. Following years of experimentation and theorizing, electricity was harnassed and the reins were in man's hands. A mountain of applied uses appeared for this mysterious "white coal." Among them were the light bulb and electric motor. These two inventions alone rejuvenated life—in the cities, that is.

While urban people were enjoying lighted streets and household appliances powered by electric energy, the inhabitants of the rural sections of America saw no change in their standard of living. Did not anyone care about the rural population whose task it was to feed the entire Nation? Were they to advance no further than their ancestors before them while town dwellers lived in comparative luxury and ease?

There were men who cared. In Washington, D.C. Sam Rayburn and Senator GEORGE NORRIS realized that the effect of electricity on the farm would be widespread and beneficial not only to the farmers whose lot it would improve but the entire Nation as well. The work that they put into passing the bill for rural electricity was finally rewarded on May 11, 1935, when the Rural Electrification Administration was created by a Presidential order. The long sought dream was a reality. The farms of the Nation were going to receive electricity.

"Let there be light."

The Southwest Public Power District was created in 1945. In addition to energizing and modernizing the farmsteads and bringing comfort and convenience heretofore unknown to rural dwellers of this area, over 150 deep wells have poked their noses into our vast supply of underground water and brought up enough liquid to irrigate between 9 and 10 thousand acres of some of the best land in the Nation. The results of this change in our community are far reaching and not confined solely to this district or its residents.

The demand for the goods a farm produces will rise in a few years directly following the steady rise in world population. It is apparent that soon much more food will be needed. The farmer will need all the helpers he can get to meet an ever-increasing demand. The REA will supply their helpers (over 400 are available) cheaply, quickly, and willingly for the farmer to use to meet the increasing demands for his products.

There is light, and it is good.

PUBLIC POWER IN NEBRASKA

(By Roald E. Psota, 17, North Loup, Nebr., senior at Ord High School; father: Edward Psota)

The year is 1893. A scorching south wind is turning the Nebraksa prairie and cornfields a dull, dead brown. Bits of dust, debris, and dry corn leaves fill the air. Money is a scarce commodity.

It isn't a pretty sight, but these conditions are to give birth to an idea—that of public power in Nebraska. Men of vision knew that Nebraska had to have irrigation to stabilize the State's economy. A period of plenty when the rains came and then nothing when they didn't was not enough.

These men of vision were also realists—they realized that a source of revenue, other than that received from irrigation, was necessary to compensate for the huge investment on dams, equipment, and land. That source was to be electrical power—public power for Nebraska.

Dynamic men, like Senator George W. Norris, Charles W. McConaughy, and the Kingsley brothers, worked with both Government and private investors to secure the needed capital. Their pleas were turned down, but their dreams and ideas were to live on.

The stage was set. The need was at hand when drought and depression swept the Nation in the 1930's. The people were interested; the plans and studies had been made. The last ingredient, money, was soon to be offered.

During the 1930's, public power and irrigation districts were formed and with the help of U.S. Senator George W. Norris, applications for grants and loans were sent to the Public Works Administration. Soon, dams and canals were being built on and near the Platte and Loup Rivers. The dream was becoming a reality.

More millions were given by the PWA for the development of REA districts. Over 60,000 miles of line were built. Nebraska was fast becoming an electrified State.

However, even with Government help the districts had many problems. Private electric companies, apathy and fast maturing bonds stood in the district's way. Almost all of the districts were deeply in debt the first 5 years.

Yet, by 1945 the Nebraska Public Power Districts had progressed immensely, and they were able to buy the last privately owned electric company. Nebraska became the first and only State served by an electric power system owned and operated by its own citizens.

It is hard to estimate the benefits that Nebraska has received after 20 years of public power. The work and money brought into the State during the depression years greatly benefited the economy. The districts also took an interest in the farmer. Now, REA lines can be seen everywhere. Nebraska's power rates are among the lowest in the Nation.

Many of the benefits of public power cannot even be evaluated. The districts provide irrigation that has stabilized the economy and attracted industry. Boating, fishing, swimming, picnicking, hunting, and camping are carried out on the artificial lakes and their grounds.

As for the future, it will be written in increased expansion, better service and mergers. Nebraskans will feel the impact of public power even more.

Problems will have to be worked out, but the districts have met and overcome many before. The future looks bright, and Nebraska and public power will share in it.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Pat Hageman, 16, Ogallala, Nebr., junior at Brule High School; father: Lester Hageman)

Anyone living on a farm knows that it is not an easy life. There is always plenty of hard work for everyone.

We live in a community of fine farmers. They are a challenge to us to try to keep making our farm better, and to try to live up to our heritage. This cannot be done by pushing electric buttons, but the things that electricity has brought makes it much easier.

Besides each of us having specific summer jobs, our family works together on one big project, yard beautification. We maintain an acre of bluegrass, a small orchard, a vegetable and flower garden, and many trees and shrubs. An electric submergible pump makes this possible.

At the bottom of our well is an electric motor that will pump all the water we can use. This water is stored in an automatic pressure tank, and we know that every time we turn a hydrant or faucet the water supply will be there. We don't worry about the hot weather drying up our grass or garden. This pump also supplies the water for our livestock.

The last 10 of the 15 years that we had a dairy herd, REA supplied the electricity for our milkers, the can hoist, and the can cooler. We remember milking by hand only once in those 10 years. I think that REA's fine service has been very valuable to my family.

We irrigate 20 acres with an electric submergible irrigation pump. It is a comfortable feeling to know that our livestock will have plenty of good hay and feed, regardless of dry weather.

Electric tank heaters and heat bulbs keep our tanks and waterers from freezing in winter.

An electric brooder makes brooding chickens easier.

We have yard lights everywhere. One of them has an electric eye. It turns on at sundown, and turns off at sunrise. Sometimes I think the main purpose of these lights might be to make our workday longer. There are lights in all our corrals, the shop, and most of the other buildings.

Many times during a busy day, the electric gadgets in the shop keep the machinery moving and in good repair.

Our hedges are trimmed with electric trimmers, and the electric appliances in our home are so handy that we take them for granted. Refrigerator, mixer, dishwasher, iron, washer, dryer, television, etc.—goodness, how could I ever get along without electricity.

I have often heard my father say, "Electricity costs us money, but considering what it does for us, it is cheap." I am glad he feels that way. I'd hate to have to eliminate any of our household appliances.

As I look out over our community in the evening, and see all the lights twinkling in the darkness, I feel very grateful that Mr. Norris worked so hard to realize a dream that has given us and our neighbors the opportunity to live better electrically.

Michigan in Nuclear Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News of May 23, 1963:

MICHIGAN IN NUCLEAR AGE

Dedication of Consumers Power Co.'s Big Rock Point nuclear power plant in northern Michigan came appropriately during Michigan week, for it points to another field in which this State has been a leader.

The high power density nuclear reactor plant, on the shore of Lake Michigan between Charlevoix and Petoskey, is Michigan's first nuclear electric powerplant to go into operation. Only four other large-scale nuclear electric powerplants have been completed in the United States.

James H. Campbell, president of Consumers, told newsmen gathered for the dedication this week that Michigan was the only State in the Union to have two nuclear powerplants ready for operation. The other, of course, is the Enrico Fermi plant near Monroe, built by the Power Reactor Development Co., with the Detroit Edison Co. as the prime mover. The Enrico Fermi plant, embodying different principles than are involved in the Big Rock Point plant, is almost ready to operate.

Both Detroit Edison and Consumers, with the cooperation of General Electric Co. and the Atomic Energy Commission, have shown their faith in the future of Michigan and the steady growth of this country by using substantial amounts of research and development funds in these two projects. Through them the electric industry is learning how to use the energy of the atom most effectively in electric power production. Consumers have made the Charlevoix plant available for a research program to be conducted for the AEC by the General Electric Co. with Consumers cooperating. The program will continue until 1966.

One goal is extension of the life of nuclear fuel, and the researchers seek to cut the cost of fuel fabrication, as well as to step up the initial generating capacity of the plant to improve the ratio between generating capacity and the dollars invested. These objectives are necessary if nuclear energy is to become fully practicable as a heat source for the generating of electric power.

Conventional fuels for generating power have not been outmoded, the utilities officials are quick to point out. But if American industry is to keep pace with technological developments and compete successfully in world markets, it must have the benefits of the lowest power costs possible. Government and private enterprise are cooperating in these two great Michigan research projects to prepare the way for full utilization of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The men who had the foresight and courage to launch these experimental programs are to be congratulated. They are doing their share to keep Michigan ahead.

Cuba: Khrushchev's Rising Star

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, unlike the ostrich-like New Frontier which is merely hoping and waiting for the day Castro's communism will wither away, I am of the opinion that regardless of the cost and difficulty involved, Russia will continue to nourish its stepchild in this hemisphere and Castroism will continue to spread unless the United States takes firm leadership of a meaningful program to implement the Monroe Doctrine.

My position has become further substantiated with the recent visit to Moscow by Castro where he was officially proclaimed a hero of the Soviet Union and where he received even further pledges of support and mutual defense from Khrushchev.

Moscow places a great deal of importance to Castro and his triumph in this hemisphere and nothing less than a determined effort by this country will thwart the spread of communism throughout the Americas.

I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the May 25, 1963, issue of the Tampa Tribune which discusses this topic:

SOVIET HERO, MADE IN UNITED STATES

Fidel Castro has been officially proclaimed a hero of the Soviet Union and no man deserves the title more.

He represents the only solid triumph of Soviet communism in foreign expansion in recent years.

He is the instrument by which Russia expects to complete the destruction of the Monroe Doctrine and spread its power throughout Latin America.

He has inflicted upon the United States the worst humiliation since the British burned Washington.

It was entirely fitting that Premier Khrushchev should weight the Cuban dictator with medals and roll out for him the plush red carpet reserved for very important comrades.

Castro's Moscow reception serves to emphasize the importance the Kremlin attaches to him. It discredits the hope of the Kennedy administration that some day Russia will get tired of the cost of propping up the Cuban economy, pack up its soldiers and weapons and go home.

Khrushchev is more publicly committed to Castro now than ever before. Besides, where else could he spend the Cuban aid money with greater profit? He advertises to the world that the United States is unable to get rid of communism 90 miles from its shore; he maintains a bridgehead from which to subvert and ultimately gain control of such strategic countries as Venezuela and Brazil; he holds the potential of a submarine and missile base which can threaten the entire Caribbean area and a large part of the United States.

No, Cuba appears now to be as much a part of the Soviet Empire as Poland or Hungary. The Russians are not going home, we think, until the island becomes too hot for them to hold.

What is the United States doing to burn the Soviet fingers?

Nothing that's known to the American public. Our ships continue the seemingly interminable job of delivering the $63 million payoff in medicines and other supplies with which the Kennedy administration ransomed the Bay of Pigs captives. (Castro, incidentally, sells these drugs to his people at 50 to 200 percent above the American retail price).

President Kennedy periodically expresses concern over the continuing presence of Russian troops in Cuba and he, or some administration spokesman, periodically denies reports of refugees that the Soviets are increasing their troop strength or have established a submarine base or have hidden nuclear missiles in the island's caves.

But nothing is done. No government-in-exile is established, to serve as a legal agency for waging a campaign against Castro. No aid, apparently, is being sent to the brave Cubans who fight in the underground. No ultimatum is given Khrushchev on pulling out the troops he apparently has privately promised to withdraw—sometime.

Fidel Castro is, indeed, a hero of the Soviet Union. But he's not self-made. He was made in America, by policies of blunder, timidity and complacency. And those policies, unhappily for the Nation, do not seem to change.

Bokaro Steel Mill: Political Symbol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, an interesting article in a recent issue of the

Washington Post contains an excellent analysis of the proposal to aid the Bokaro Steel Mill in India. The article follows:

BOKARO STEEL MILL: POLITICAL SYMBOL

(By Selig S. Harrison)

NEW DELHI.—On a visit to Moscow in late January 1961 I spent a morning at the Institute of Oriental Studies on Kirov Street in a guarded but rewarding exchange with two ranking Soviet specialists on India and Pakistan. It was not surprising to find a sophisticated and intimate knowledge of U.S. foreign aid policy on the part of academician A. M. Dyakov and his younger colleague, V. V. Balabushevich.

What induced the Soviet functionaries to submit to 3 hours of searching cross-examination was their frankly expressed desire to know whether the new Kennedy administration could be counted on to continue the agriculture-oriented aid policy of the Eisenhower years. The comfortable assumption of Soviet aid planners has been that the United States would confine itself primarily to good works in the villages and would steer clear of aid to heavy industry. Professor Dyakov explained with a proprietary air that the United States would not change its spots under Kennedy because aid to heavy industry means in most developing countries aid to state corporations. This is our territory, he said in effect, and a government in search of industrial power must turn as a matter of course to the U.S.S.R.

There are two principal reasons why the Indian Government has given unequivocal priority to hopes for an American-aided Bokaro steel mill and has held off Soviet feelers throughout the initial 2 years of the Kennedy administration. The first is the acknowledged superiority of the United States in the technology associated with the flat rolled steel products. Beyond this lies a fear of one-sided dependence for machinery and expertise in the politically strategic area of steel. As the process of decision in the United States has been prolonged and as Bokaro has seemed in danger of becoming a political football in Congress, the atmosphere surrounding Bokaro has nevertheless begun to undergo a subtle change and this has been sensed by the Russians. The Soviet Ambassador stepped in briskly and uninvited this week with a formal Bokaro offer in writing.

The United States Steel Corp. team appointed by the Agency for International Development to survey the technical problems in building Bokaro has contended that the plant cannot reach its full projected capacity of 4 million tons per year until 1977. This is regarded as an unnecessarily relaxed timetable by Indian steelmen who argue that 1971 is a realistic target in the light of experience in the three already constructed mills. An additional point of controversy in the continuing exchanges on Bokaro between New Delhi and Washington is the question of the extent of American management control.

India has agreed to set up a separate government corporation independent of the existing Hindustan Steel Limited to provide a bureaucratic clean slate and this is viewed here as a fundamental concession. But resistance has developed to the proposal that an American management team be given top-to-bottom control of the plant for 10 years. Steel Minister C. D. Subramaniam sought to quiet a growing uproar over reports that he had agreed to this in a press conference on Wednesday. He left the door open for a possible compromise "after a commitment has been made to us." But there appears to be little doubt that India will hold out for an Indian general manager and an Indian administrative structure into which American operating-level executives and skilled technicians would be integrated.

Subramaniam politely but flatly ruled out suggestions emanating from Washington that the character of Bokaro as a wholly state-owned corporation be altered to permit partial shareholdings by employees and Indian investors. His argument that the idea is unworkable because it will take too long for Bokaro to be a paying proposition sidestepped the basic issue at stake. This is that the symbolic importance of Bokaro in Indian public opinion resides precisely in the fact that it is to be publicly controlled. The expanding power of a few family-held monopolies in India is a powerful political factor and the so-called "public sector" is a rallying-cry connoting shared national progress comparable in effectiveness to "state socialism" as a political war whoop in the United States.

Until now, the Russians have had this rallying-cry to themselves and almost all of their $812 million aid program has been channeled to state-owned heavy industry. To the extent that the United States appears to accept public ownership as a fact of life in the developing countries, Bokaro and similar projects will thus undercut Soviet strategy and reap incalculable long-term political dividends for the West. But the political payoff has already been vitiated by the appearance of anguish and uncertainty in the Bokaro aid debate.

Essay Winner: Rural Electric Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, each year rural electric cooperatives in Nebraska hold an essay contest for children of their patrons. The essay winners were give a trip to Washington as a prize and in preparation for the arrival of these youngsters next week, I would like to introduce four winning essays into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that they may be read by my colleagues.

The following essay was written by Katrena Ann Murray, daughter of James Murray, Tilden, Nebr. She is a sophomore attending the Meadow Grove Public High School in Meadow Grove, Nebr.:

DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN MY AREA

Have you ever stopped to think of the many services and pleasures that have been brought into your home and on your farm with electricity. The modern genie of miracles brings to you things which were inconceivable only a few years ago.

Twenty-eight years ago, President Franklin Roosevelt signed the Executive order creating the Rural Electrification Administration as a general program of unemployment relief.

First Administrator of REA was Morris Cooke, of Pennsylvania. Cooke doubted that REA could be run as an unemployment relief agency. He was able to alter the character of REA so that it could make loans and get out from under relief regulations. The first REA electrification loan in Nebraska was approved in September of 1935.

The leaders had a choice to organize as a cooperative or as a public power district. The Nebraska Legislature enacted a bill which permitted the organiaztion of a public power district as a political subdivision of the State government without power to levy a tax.

A typical rural electric system had its beginning when a group of farmers met with their county extension agent, who told them about REA loans. They invited all interested persons and an REA representative to a meeting. One winternight, the 10 men gathered around a kitchen table, spread out road maps and began to plot in the homes of the people who had already signed up.

Once the electric system was organized, its troubles had just begun. But the factor that made the difference between success and failure was the spirit of cooperation on the part of the members or customers.

When rural electrification started coming to Nebraska farms in the mid-1930's, it was not enough for a farmer to agree to take electric service and grant right-of-way easements for the lines to pass through his farm. He was also faced with wiring his house and other buildings as well as providing distribution wires to each building from the yard pole where the power system line terminated.

Growth and progress were the natural results of the availability of low-cost power from the rural electric systems.

Nebraska schoolchildren are now spending part of their school day watching television. In 34 Nebraska communities ETV, educational television, is being used. ETV got its start in Nebraska about 10 years ago when commercial stations in Omaha experimented with educational programs. The first and only Nebraska educational station, KUON-TV, began broadcasting in 1954. When a network of ETV stations is completed, all Nebraska students and adults will be able to share the benefits of educational television.

A child touches a switch and produces the miracle of light, his mother takes food from the coolness of a refrigerator and prepares breakfast on an electric range. Throughout the day, electricity works for this family, silently, cheaply. At night, there is hot water for a shower, TV for entertainment.

This is the modern rural America. This is life in the same homes which a few years ago were filled with darkness and drudgery. That was before rural people joined together to form their own electric distribution systems, borrowed funds from REA, and built their own powerlines.

The following essay was written by Nancy Kluck, daughter of Cyril Kluck, Schuyler, Nebr. She is a sophomore attending the Schuyler Public High School:

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

With the swish of a pen the farmer was reborn to a better way of life. One that was unknown until May 11, 1935, when Franklin Delano Roosevelt put his pen to Executive Order 7037. This was a well-deserved climax to a long drawn out struggle for recognition to light the world of the forgotten man—the farmer.

With low-cost, accessible electricity the American farmer has become a person equal in prestige to cityfolks with equal opportunities to survive. For before rural electrification not many boys remained on the farm or ranch. What was there to look forward to—beside solitary darkness? One couldn't read, write, listen to the radio, or even get all the day's work done—such as ironing. Rural electrification gives the farmer a chance to take pride in his home and place of business. With the use of electricity he finds his work more convenient—for example: A cattleman may now use a feedwagon to feed his cattle for he has yard lights set up and is able to steer accurately through a narrow gate which otherwise, in the darkness, is impassi; a dairyman takes considerably less time to milk—he just hooks up and lets electricity make life easier.

Electricity has greatly improved health and cleanliness. The tired, terribly dirty farmer returning from a long, hard day's work refreshes before supper. With him in a better mood his wife is free from the grumpiness that used to plague the preelectrification wife, whose husband returned to a dimly lit home and had to eat supper while still covered with field grime because there was a lack of stove-top space—already covered with skillets and pans in preparation for the evening meal—on which to heat bathwater.

Electricity gives the farmer a fighting chance against nature through the aid of radio and television weather reports. He also is informed of worldwide happenings.

Food—a luxury and necessity—is now eaten in a variety of ways. Electricity has seen to that through refrigeration, freezing, and electric ranges. This leads right into our next convenience, "running" hot and cold water, to be used for—among various things—dishwashing, and by those who can afford one, the automatic dishwasher.

With electricity came clothes washers and dryers, entertainments (hi-fi, TV, etc.), electric steam irons, electrically powered drills, hair clippers, corn-dryers, and grindstones, sterilizing of medical equipment used on the farm, time for pleasures and pleasures for time. Perhaps one of the greatest things it has done is to bring irrigation to dry fields. Before—no matter how diligently a farmer worked—without water to supply his thrsty crops and without a tractor to run the pulley to start the pump it was almost a hopeless battle from the start.

"Nothing ventured, nothing gained." Something was ventured and something very indispensable was gained and is still being gained.

Electricity second only to water as the lifeblood of a farm or a ranch.

The following essay was written by Judith Marie Kadavy, daughter of Jos. J. Kadavy, Dwight, Nebr. She is a sophomore attending the East Butler Public Schools, Brainard, Nebr.:

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

The Rural Electric Association is one of the proudest achievements of our time. Accomplished by sacrifice and work, it stands as a monument to men such as George Norris and Clyde Ellis. Advancement goes on in electrification even when wars, floods, drought, and other disasters are prevalent in the country. Electricity has been one of the greatest contributors of modern communication and has done away with isolation in our rural and suburban areas. Hallum, Nebr., is a great example of the progress electricity has made in recent years. Here two of man's greatest powers combine to further improve the lives of Americans.

Today the Rural Electric Association is valued as one of the greatest assets of our community. Started as small cooperatives, it is both a heritage and present day concern. Men must continue to work if rural power is to grow and prosper in the face of private industry.

Electricity in today's home means that the people of today will never know some of the hardships encountered by past generations, such as, the drudgery of washing clothes by hand or the frustrations of stumbling around in darkness doing farm chores at night. Not only does electricity provide light and power, but its time saving devices provide extra time for recreation activities and relaxation.

During past years, farmers had little to show for after a year's work. No fresh foods could be stored by the housewife, no hot water for a hot bath at a moment's notice, nor were there any machines to perform the great task of milking cows twice a day, clothes always had to be dried outdoors, meals had to be prepared over hot uncomfortable stoves, and many other numerous advantages such as radios, televisions, toasters, electric mixers, irons, and fans were unknown. Yet most people of today take the advantages of electricity for granted.

Farmers no longer need to rise at sunrise and work till sunset to accomplish a task, because with the aid of electricity he can often do the same chore in a matter of hours. A farmer is more relaxed and enjoys life. As a farmer's wife once said, "I never saw my husband after dark before electricity. Now we find time to relax and just enjoying the growing up of our family."

Electricity to Nebraska is what oil is to the Southwest or coal to the East. Electricity in the community means as much to farmers as the farm itself. Without the power of electricity, the farm itself would never be what it is.

Today's automation demands more and greater electric power. Meeting this need is one of the greatest challenges facing the Rural Electric Association of America where the equality of opportunity in our cultural, social, and economic setting must be pursued.

To me, electricity means a better, more healthful way of living and more time for recreation activities in my home, my school, my community, and my country.

The following essay was written by Edward R. Hruska, son of Edward R. Hruska, R.F.D. No. 2, Schuyler, Nebr. He is a sophomore attending the St. Bonaventure High School, Columbus, Nebr.:

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

When I was a small child, the kerosene lamp and the icebox were used in our home. I can still remember mother dumping the pan from under the icebox. Sometimes she forgot it and had a mess. Even with an icebox we had to be careful of food spoilage. That was why mother had to do so much canning on our old range, which burned coal and cobs. In hot weather she canned on the smelly kerosene stove.

Thanks to the Rural Electrification Administration, mother now pushes a button, turn the dial to the proper heat, and cooks and bakes in a cool kitchen. She cans only the things we think are better canned than frozen, because REA has made our big freezer possible. Mother no longer works for days taking care of meat after we butcher. Now we put it in the big freezer and thaw it and use it fresh as we want it.

Electricity is not a luxury but a necessity to my family, not only in our living, but especially in the way we make our living—farming.

Electricity does the work of many men on the farm. The milking machine, the milk cooler, and the water pump are all electric and are all of vital importance to a dairy farmer like dad. Other farmers who are not principally dairymen benefit through other electrically-powered machines and inventions too numerous to mention here. These machines, run by electricity, decrease the time needed for various tasks. This time can be used to expand operations on the farm so that some profit can be shown. In this day and age every inch of a farm must be operated efficiently at the lowest cost possible. Eelctricity is the answer.

Electric power today is one of the most important considerations in any farming area. Anyone giving extended study to electrical developments in America will come to no other conclusion as a matter of equity, justice and progress than that the benefit of cheap, low-cost electricity is available to the farmer in the same extent and the same way that villages, towns, and big cities possess it.

There are also many other advantages other than light and power which a community gains from electricity. Electrical power and dams built for this alleviate floods. The reservoirs formed by the dams store water to be used for irrigation. Many lakes and reservoirs are used as game preserves.

Any rural area or community surrounded by a rural area which is served by the Rural Electrification Administration profits financially from the increased income in the area from the use of electricity.

Because of the REA farmers and farm families in my neighborhood have much more comfortable living than they had when I was a little child. Even more important, these farmers and my father are able to engage in an entirely different kind of farming and stockraising than they did then. The Rural Electrification has made this possible. An entire area and its urban communities profit when farmers can progress and raise their incomes. The Cornhusker Public Power District is directly responsible for this progress in the area where my father farms.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to

House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MAY 6, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Today I sent the following to Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman, Committee on Rules: "Please take action on approving resolution on captive nations, House Resolution 14, as soon as possible. Many thanks."

Respectfully,

JOSEPH KIRCHER.

WEST ROXBURY, MASS., *May 7, 1963.*

Hon. JAMES A. BURKE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURKE: We can start to exploit the weaknesses in the Communist colonial empire by developing an effective policy toward the captive nations.

Last January, Congressmen FLOOD and DERWINSKI introduced House Resolution 14 and 15, respectively, which would implement the Captive Nations Week resolution of 1959 and establish a special committee on captive nations. This committee would conduct inquiries into, study, and prepare concrete recommendations for an effective U.S. policy toward the captive nations. Many other Congressmen introduced similar resolutions.

On behalf of the Boston branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee, I am asking you to:

1. Introduce a resolution of your own to establish a committee on captive nations.

2. Support House Resolution 14 introduced by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD.

3. Use your influence in the House Rules Committee, to which House Resolution 14 was assigned, and especially with the chairman of the House Rules Committee, HOWARD W. SMITH, to initiate action on the proposed legislation by opening public hearings.

Although this request does not come to you from your district, we believe that our fight with communism and our support for the captive nations is of a national concern and must have support of all Americans.

Your action and support in this matter will do much for the establishment of a special committee on captive nations.

Sincerely yours,

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC., BOSTON
BRANCH,
OREST SZCZUDLUK,
Public Relations.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS
COMMITTEE OF AMERICA,
METROPOLITAN DETROIT BRANCH,
May 8, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Ukrainian Congress Committee of Metropolitan Detroit would appreciate whatever you can do to promote the Flood resolution.

We feel that a Captive Nations Committee would be able to keep us and our Government informed about the captive nations and that this would result in a better foreign policy for our United States.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. EMILY ZAPOROZETZ,
Public Relations.
MICHAEL WICHOREK,
Secretary.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
May 3, 1963.

Hon. JOHN M. MURPHY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are very much in favor of quick action on House Resolution 14 to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Please let us urge you to submit a similar resolution.

To my mind, it is criminal negligence on the part of the United States not to hammer away at this subject day and night. Russia makes screaming headlines about colonialism and not one word is ever tossed back in her teeth. What in the world is wrong with us? Are we no longer worthy of the name of Americans? Do we no longer champion freedom?

Sincerely yours,

MARY FITZGERALD
(For the Fitzgerald family).

MAY 6, 1963.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I would like to take this opportunity to commend you on your proposed resolution for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

As each captive nation is freed from the Soviet bloc the position of communism is weakened and the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness can be available to more human beings. Each person deserves the right to exercise all of his capabilities as an individual.

I urge you once again to press for the release of your House Resolutions 14 and 15 to the floor of the House. I am also writing to Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, and my local Congressman.

Once again I commend you for your fine work in this effort.

Sincerely,

ALICE AGHABABIAN.

Jim Farley Will Be 75 on May 30

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, May 30, 1963, a good friend of mine and yours, James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Cocoa-Cola Export Corp., will celebrate his 75th birthday. As a tribute to his years of service to his community and his country, I would like to bring to your attention the following article from the Long Island Sunday Press by Irish Donnelly:

JIM FARLEY WILL BE 75 THURSDAY

(By Irish Donnelly)

Big Jim Farley's 75th birthday rolls around next Thursday, but he's still going at a hectic pace, conceding nothing to the years.

The former Democratic National Chairman and President Roosevelt's Postmaster General traveled more than 53,000 miles last year, 46,000 of them by air.

"I spent nearly 106 hours in the air, attended 98 dinners and 78 business luncheons," said the affable Farley who keeps a record of everything.

He's still involved in politics, too. As late as last year, he considered seeking the New York Democratic gubernatorial nomination. And he has definite views on the national and international situation.

"I keep going all the time," said Farley in a prebirthday interview in the 18th floor Madison Avenue office where he operates as board chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp.

"I rise no later than 7 a.m., then go to a barber shop for a shave—my skin is very tender—and then to the offce by 8:30 or 9."

When he's in the office and not traveling, he keeps three or four secretaries busy. One is Mrs. Stephen (Jane) Duffy, who has been with him 37 years.

The years have dealt lightly with the master politician, successful businessman and sportsman, doing no more obvious damage than erasing his hair except for a white fringe. He's in radiant good health—his pink skin fairly glows—and he works at staying that way, watching his diet, walking a lot and getting adequate rest.

He weighs 205 pounds and has for a number of years, and stands 6 feet 2½ inches. He neither drinks liquor nor smokes.

"When I was confirmed at 12, I took a pledge to abstain from alcoholic liquors until I was 21," he once said. "When I reached that age, I was in politics and my mother suggested that I shouldn't drink or smoke. I've never done either."

"I don't think I could have carried on when the pace was hard if I had," Farley added. "I could always get under the shower in the morning and feel in great shape."

Nightly, he said, "I listen to the 11 p.m. news, say my prayers and go to bed. I'm able to throw my troubles aside and get a good night's sleep."

He said one of the factors in his ability to sleep and arise refreshed probably was that he has always told the truth.

He added that he doesn't understand why more men don't adopt the policy since it's much more simple than telling first one story and then another and then having to remember what was said so as not to cross up one's self.

How does he view the political situation today?

"I don't see anything in the distance that's going to prevent the reelection of President Kennedy. I think he has handled the situation well. I can visualize him going down as one of our greatest Presidents."

As for the Republican Party, there's no doubt in Farley's mind that Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller wants the GOP presidential nomination. "And at present writing I think he'll be nominated," Farley added.

Fifty-four years in politics—Farley began as district committeeman in Grassy Point, N.Y., in the town of Stony Point when he was 21—have left him with scars but no regrets, he says.

Standing in his well appointed office among countless memontoes of his long and momentous career, he looked down the years and became reflective.

One of the most difficult decisions of his life was that of breaking with President Roosevelt over the third term in 1940, he says.

"He was the biggest man of his day," Farley said of the four-term President he helped into the 1932 nomination. "I was leaving two of the most powerful posts (Democratic National Chairman and Postmaster General) * * * it's not easy to relinquish power."

Farley said he was against the third term because "I don't believe in breaking tradition. I had very definite views on the third term."

Farley said "If he (Roosevelt) hadn't run for the third term he would have gone down in history as America's greatest President," adding:

"The accomplishments of his first two terms were the greatest ever made by an American President."

Farley blames the third and fourth terms of the late President for "many of the ills which beset the world today."

He has said those terms "brought a great mind, but one worn by the weight of years and cares of state, to the all important conferences at Teheran and Yalta.

"We had a worn leader dividing the world in a series of concessions embodied in secret agreements which, having arisen from the Pandora box of secret diplomacy, are plaguing the world's children with blood, death, and fears."

Five Presidents, including the incumbent, have called him Jim. Except for Roosevelt, whom he called "boss" or "Governor," he calls all the others "Mr. President."

He intends to spend his 75th birthday as he has every birthday since his wife died on January 14, 1955. He will attend mass, visit Mrs. Farley's grave at Gate of Heaven Cemetery in Valhalla, N.Y., and those of his parents in St. Peter's at Haverstraw, and dine with his two daughters and their husbands and his son and his wife and 10 grandchildren at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel where he lives.

Resolution by Atlantic Amvets Post No. 1, Atlantic, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution passed by the Atlantic AMVETS Post No. 1, Atlantic, Iowa, on April 24, 1963:

THE ATLANTIC AMVETS POST NO. 1,
(GENERAL GEORGE S. PATTON, JR. POST),
Atlantic, Iowa, April 24, 1963.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
The House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: Enclosed please find copy of the latest resolution as passed by the Atlantic AMVETS Post. No. 1, in case it may be of interest to you.

Due to the urgency of the dangers facing our Nation today as recognized by the members of the American Legion Department of California, and by many of the Iowa members of the AMVETS, we are especially anxious to have this resolution printed, for the record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order that many other patriotic organizations may take up the work of saving our Nation from an early death and destruction.

Thank you for any help you may be able to offer in this matter, and with our best wishes to you in your heavy battles in Washington,

Yours very respectfully,
JAMES L. SMALLEY,
Post Commander.
CLYDE M. LONGSTRETH, M.D.,
Past National Second Vice Commander, AMVETS.

RESOLUTION

Whereas with reference to the Resolution No. 62–631–28, adopted by the American Legion Department of California, in regular convention assembled in Fresno, Calif., June 28, 29, 30; July 1, 1962, stating that, "the council on foreign relations has been exposed by extensive research and much testimony as being actively engaged in destroying the Constitution and sovereignty of the United States of America"; and

Whereas further reference is made to reports in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under dates of January 30, 1962 (p. A659), March 6, 1962, and May 6, 1962 (p. 7384), in each of which there have been strong protests against the council on foreign relations by returned war veterans' groups, to the effect that the council on foreign relations has managed to force many of its members into positions of power in both political parties; and

Whereas the U.S. flag committee, Post Office Box 269, Jackson Heights, N.Y., now has pertinent documented material on this matter, which sells in the "Packet 'Who runs the Country,'" for only $1.50, on order; and it is further suggested that each one contact their veterans' post, or State committee and help to get every State to pass such a resolution; and

Whereas the power of these council on foreign relations members in the United States constitutes an immediate and major danger to the continued existence of the United States of America and to the freedom we have enjoyed; and

Whereas American returned war veterans have fought for our country, and hundreds of thousands of Americans have died for liberty, and this liberty is being swiftly destroyed by the members and programs of the Council on Foreign Relations, who, in the name of One-Worldism and United Nationism, is surrendering our country to the enemy, proposing that our country be disarmed unilaterally or bilaterally, that all individuals in the United States be disarmed to make enemy conquest easier, that our armed forces be turned over to the Communist-dominated United Nations; and

Whereas it is noted that the definition of subversive (adj.) and to subvert (verb.) is, "To overthrow from the very foundation; to destroy as of moral or political force; to undermine faith or morals. The synonym-destroy; overthrow; abolish." And, in comment we note that, this definition most definitely applies, in that our Nation is being destroyed "from the very foundation—the Constitution—which is being undermined and circumvented." The moral, political, and spiritual fiber of our Nation, is being tampered with, and our people are being misled down the path to national suicide. This most certainly does appear to be subversive: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the General George S. Patton, AMVETS Post No. 1, assembled in a regular session, in Atlantic, Iowa, this date 24 April, 1963, do strongly urge every patriotic American to inform himself of the ways the Council on Foreign Relations is attacking the sovereignty of the United States of America, and take all possible action to save our country from destruction at its hands.

JAMES L. SMALLEY,
Post Commander.
CARROLL HAYES,
Post Adjutant.

Gen. James A. Farley—On His 75th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, Thursday, May 30, is the 75th birthday of a great American, Hon. James A. Farley. It is fitting that on a day set aside to honor those who served their country so well, we also pay tribute to a man who served his fellow citizens from his early post as Stony Point, N.Y., town clerk to Postmaster General of the United States. General Farley has always been ready to serve his country and every position he has held was marked with his standard of excellence.

Many say Mr. Farley's political trademark is his straw hat. I say, Mr. Speaker, a more outstanding characteristic is his friendship with so many. Mr. Farley is best described by that word for he is a friend of all he meets. His kindly smile, his firm handshake, his manly bearing, and his sincerity reveal his strong character and leave no doubt that he is a man among men—an outstanding citizen.

I am sure every Member of this House extends a warm birthday greeting to General Farley, 75 years young, and wishes him continued good health and many years of vigorous activity.

Mr. Farley's thoughts on this occasion are summed up in an article in the New York World-Telegram and Sun by Frank Lynn on May 24 and I am pleased to include it in the RECORD:

James A. Farley declared today in a 75th birthday interview that he would be the strongest Democratic candidate for the Senate next year.

Farley added that he "could be more helpful to the national ticket in 1964 than any of those who have been mentioned for the Senate nomination."

Among those who have been mentioned as possible Democratic opponents of Senator Kenneth B. Keating are Mayor Robert F. Wagner, Manhattan District Attorney Frank S. Hogan, Commerce Under Secretary Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., and Representative Samuel Stratton.

FAR TOO EARLY

However, Farley, who will be 75 Thursday, emphasized that he does not know whether he would seek or accept the Senate designation. "It's far too early," he said.

In a far-ranging interview with the World-Telegram, Farley the personification of the political pro, also made these points:

Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller is still the leading contender for the Republican presidential nomination next year. "I don't see anyone on the horizon now who could stop him."

President Kennedy was "better equipped for the Presidency than any other nominee in this century." Farley cited the President's political background, education and service in war, the House and the Senate.

ONE OF GREATEST

The President will be reelected, he predicted. "There is a great possibility he will go down in history as one of the greatest Presidents."

Richard M. Nixon is finished as a national candidate. His move to New York is purely financial.

On a more personal level, Farley, alert and still the possessor of a phenomenal memory, said he was not bitter that he did not win the senatorial nomination in 1958 and the gubernatorial designation last year.

"There's no sense getting bitter in politics; when you get bitter, you destroy yourself."

HE'D BE BOSS

Why haven't New York Democratic leaders chosen for elective public office "Mr. Democrat" who began his career 54 years ago in Rockland County?

"They know that I'd be the boss. They didn't want someone who won't take their orders."

Asked why he didn't run for public office in the 30's when he was at the height of his political power, Farley said simply: "I couldn't afford it; I had to raise a family."

As for his love affair with politics and the Democratic Party, Farley declared: "I never regretted my years in politics; politics brought me to the position I have now."

THIRD TERM ISSUE

Farley assumed his present post, chairman of the board of Coca Cola Export Corp., in January 1941, after his split with President Franklin D. Roosevelt over the third term issue.

Farley's piloting of Roosevelt to the Presidency is a political classic. It was the climax of a career which started in 1909 when Farley, then 21, was elected simultaneously chairman, treasurer, and secretary of the Democratic town committee in Grassy Point, Rockland County.

He rose through party ranks to become Democratic State and National chairman in 1932. Farley also has held various public offices including Postmaster General in President Roosevelt's Cabinet.

His office walls at 515 Madison Avenue are lined with autographed photos of the world's great, including 5 Presidents, two Popes, Sir Winston Churchill, and Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru.

NO SLOWDOWN

Farley's desk is piled high with papers—testimony to his 8:30 a.m. to 6 p.m. workday. A constantly ringing telephone and somewhat battered luggage are added witnesses to the fact that "Big Jim" has not slowed down.

Farley's 6-foot, 2-inch, 205-pound frame is still ramrod straight. He walks the 4 blocks between his office and Waldorf Towers apartments daily. His health? I feel very good.

Farley will celebrate his birthday by attending Mass, visiting the graves of his parents and wife, renewing acquaintances with old friends in Grassy Point and winding up with a Waldorf-Astoria birthday party with his son, James A. Jr., a member of the State athletic commission, 2 daughters and 10 grandchildren.

From Ancient Greece to World Government: The Ageless Problem of Equitable Representation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, Maryland, along with other States, is wrestling with the problem of congressional redistricting. In this regard, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress an interesting article by Dr. Elbert M. Byrd, Jr., assistant professor of government and politics at the University of Maryland, that appeared in the Maryland magazine.

From Ancient Greece to World Government: The Ageless Problem of Equitable Representation

(By Elbert M. Byrd, Jr.)

Gerrymandering and redistricting, rotten boroughs and reapportionment, overrepresentation and underrepresentation these are terms often encountered in the annals of politics, ancient and modern. Wherever representative government exists or is proposed, the problem of equitable representation inevitably appears upon the scene.

Districting and redistricting are neutral terms, signifying neither praise nor condemnation, but merely involving the drawing of district lines to designate areas from which officials will be chosen. But when the lines are drawn in a manner deliberately designed to favor one party (or tribe or race or area or ideology) against another, the actions has come to be known as gerrymandering.

Although the partisan drawing of boundary lines is as old as history, the new term came into existence when Gov. Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts, redrew the districts of his State, producing one which had the appearance of a salamander. A news reporter called it a Gerry-mander, creating a new and meaningful word for the English language.

The word "gerrymander" was soon used by historians to describe acts of rulers as ancient as the sixth century B.C. James R. Joy in his "Grecian History" of 1900 thusly describes the changes made by a new ruler, Clisthenes, in an attempt to retain recently won power:

"In order to prevent any single tribe from becoming the stronghold of one of the old parties, he gerrymandered the State, assigning plaindemes, mountain-demes, and shoredemes to the same tribe. Thus Athens itself, the only large city, was split into numerous districts allotted among different tribes, and it must be remembered that the municipality had no separate municipal government."

Here was an act of gerrymandering devised to change power balances by the actual redrawing of the boundary lines. With an increased population in certain areas combined with static or decreasing population in neighboring areas, the controlling faction may obtain a relative increase in power by refusing to redraw boundary lines. This inaction is sometimes called the "silent gerrymander." Although long since corrected, the extremes to which refusal to act can lead was illustrated by England's "rotten borough" system under which existed the absurdity of a town with a population of 14 having two members in Parliament while very large cities had none.

Redistricting in the United States sometimes refers to the drawing of boundary lines for the purpose of representation in State legislatures or even on city councils, but the problem most often referred to by the term is that of the drawing of congressional boundary lines.

There is, of course, no probleem if a State is entitled to one Congressman only. He runs statewide. But if the State has more than one Congressman, a decision must be made as to whether a district shall be established for each Congressman. Congress has thus far left these functions to the State legislatures. They have not evidenced any great concern that districts should be composed of approximately equal population, and the juggling of areas from district to district for the purpose of reaping partisan advantage has produced districts appearing even more weird than Governor Gerry's salamander. The present variation is between districts of approximately 200,000 population to those of about 1 million. Maryland's First Congressional District has a population of about 240,000 while the Fifth District has about 725,000.

In early American history the gerrymandered congressional districts were sometimes related to the selection of Presidential electors. Since the U.S. Constitution provided that Presidential electors would be selected in whatever manner the State legislature should provide, there was no necessary uniformity from State to State. The right still exists, of course, but there is uniform custom today that electors are chosen by the people in the general election statewide. This came to be known as the general ticket method. In the early days, however, some legislatures chose the electors while in other States the electors were chosen by the people on a district basis, usually the same as congressional districts. Maryland used the district system until 1836, the electoral vote usually being split between the political parties.

An incident involving the Presidential elector problem occurred in New York in 1800. New York's practice was that the legislature chose the electors, but anti-Federalist strength was shown in the spring election of new State legislators, causing Alexander Hamilton to fear that New York's vote would go in its entirety to Thomas Jefferson. He thereupon wrote to Gov. John Jay and proposed that a special session of the lameduck legislature be called for the purpose of passing a districting act for the choosing of electors. Such a law would insure a split vote, with some going to Adams. Hamilton told Jay that the "anti-Federal majority in the ensuing Legislature * * * will bring Jefferson into the chief magistracy, unless it is prevented by the measure" proposed by Hamilton. Recognizing moral objections to the proposal, Hamilton said "in times like these in which we live, it will not do to be overscrupulous. Scruples of delicacy and propriety * * * ought not to hinder the taking of a legal and constitutional step to prevent an atheist in religion, and a fanatic in politics, from getting possession of the helm of state." Governor Jay rejected Hamilton's proposal, noting on the letter that it proposed "a measure for party purposes, which I think would not become me to adopt."

There were later attempts to manipulate the presidential electoral votes for party purposes, but expectations eventually caused the State legislatures to act uniformly in adopting the general ticket system or statewide election of presidential electors.

The principal reason for presidential elector manipulation and for unequal populations among congressional districts continues to exist. That reason is the unrepresentative character, in terms of population, of the State legislatures themselves—often referred to as malapportionment.

Whereas gerrymandering or maldistricting refers to the inequitable drawing of district boundary lines, malapportionment refers to the inequitable distribution of legislative seats among the districts. In other words, districts can be drawn so as to be virtually perfect on a population basis, but the fairness of the arrangement may be completely nullified if one district is given 10 representatives in the State legislature while another district of similar population is given 1 representative.

Of course, maldistricting and malapportionment are often used in combination to effect desired ends. In his "Outline of History," H. G. Wells writes of the use of these techniques during the days of the Roman Republic:

"Whenever there was a new enfranchisement of citizens in Italy, there would be the most elaborate trickery and countertrickery to enroll the new voters into as few or as many of the 30 old "tribes" as possible, or to put them into as few as possible new tribes. * * * Here was the sort of work to fascinate every smart knave in politics. The comita tributa could be worked at times so as to vote right counter to the general feeling of the people."

It was this kind of manipulation which frustrated the representation of the people in the popular assembly, and contributed to the fall of republicanism in Rome and to the rise of Caesarism or dictatorial rule. Historically there are trends which appear to make it a reasonable conclusion that the reaction to a nonrepresentative assembly is either strike and insurrection or demand for a stronger executive, and often a combination of both. There was apparently feelings tending in this direction in Maryland in 1850, particularly observable in Baltimore where resentment to underrepresentation was strong, and from which came demands for a Constitutional Convention. The convention was called only after Gov. Philip Thomas warned that unless it was done "the sanction of the legislature would not much longer be invoked."

In post World War II America the problem of apportionment has become more and more accentuated as a result of the increase in population and the mobility thereof. The population of many suburban counties has doubled and doubled again while the representation of those areas in the State legislatures remained unchanged. In some States a change could be made only by constitutional amendment while in others the State constitutions provided that the legislatures should reapportion themselves every 10 years. The distinction made little difference. Minority-dominated legislatures refused to reapportion.

Having been continually rebuffed by the legislatures, those who agitated for more equitable representation turned to the courts. They scored a landmark victory in the spring of 1962 when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in the case of *Baker* v. *Carr* that the Federal courts have jurisdiction to determine whether or not malapportioned legislatures deprive citizens of the State the "equal protection of the law" required by the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Since that time the status of apportionment has been in flux. Some legislatures have been ordered reapportioned by Federal courts, others by State courts, and in some no action has yet occurred.

In Maryland, a State court determined that the house of delegates must be reapportioned but that representation in the senate need not necessarily be changed. The Court of Appeals of Maryland upheld the decision on the Senate by a vote of four to three. That decision has been appealed and is now pending in the U.S. Supreme Court.

After the judiciary ordered the house of delegates reapportioned, the general assembly was called into special session and passed an emergency reapportionment measure to be effective for the session of the general assembly beginning in January 1963. The legislation provided 19 new seats for the suburban area, bringing about some amelioration of the situation for the time being. There is grave doubt that this change meets the standard of equitable representation, but in any event the change is temporary only. Apportionment will revert to the old status in 1966 unless new action is taken prior to that time.

Before the temporary change, salient factors about representation in Maryland were as follows. In the house of delegates, representatives of 24 percent of the population had control. Conversely, representatives of 76 percent of the population found themselves in the minority. In the senate, representatives of 14 percent of the population can still control. Conversely, senators representing 86 percent of the population find themselves in the minority. This situation derives from the fact that the counties had a minimum of two up to a maximum of six delegates; and each county has one senator regardless of the population of the county. Baltimore City was in a special category, having 36 delegates and 6 senators.

Thus, according to 1960 census figures, Kent County with a population of 15,481 has two members in the house of delegates, and Baltimore County with a population of 492,428 had six. Each county had one senator. A resident of Kent County had 12 times as much representation in the house of delegates as a resident of Baltimore County, and had 33 times as much representation in the Senate. Although not quite so great, the disparities of representation between a small county and other large counties, such as Prince George's and Montgomery, were similar.

The disparities are not confined to counties of suburban and nonsuburban differences. The representation formula is so outmoded that it has produced such anomalies as follows: Frederick County (population 71,930) has six members in the house of delegates while Harford County (population 76,720) has four. St. Mary's County (population 38,915) has two delegates while Dorchester County (population 29,666) has four. Cecil County (population 48,408) has three delegates; Garrett County (population 20,420) has three.

Whether representation in both houses should be based principally on population, or whether one house should represent population and the other geographical area is a question now much debated. Those in favor of the latter system refer to it as the Federal plan, comparing State government to Federal Government.

The arrangement to provide equal representation in the U.S. Senate without regard to the population of the States, and basing representation in the House of Representatives on population, was a compromise necessary to gain the approval of sovereign States. The counties or other election districts within the States were, however, never sovereign, and this analogy is thus without foundation. In addition, Baltimore City was long ago given additional seats in the senate of Maryland on the basis of population.

The States had bicameral legislatures before the Federal Government was created, and this arrangement derived not from any Federal ideas but as a transplant of custom from Great Britain. There the growth derived from the belief that the upper house represented the nobility while the lower house should represent the common people—thus the house of commons. If this history should be the guide, there would be a retrogression to an understanding that representation shall be based on class rather than on population or geography. Besides, in early Maryland history, the upper house or council was appointed by the proprietary Governor of the colony.

Another argument against representation in both Houses on the basis of population is the objection that this would result essentially in a single house or unicameral legislature. As to form, this is, of course, not so. There would still be two Houses and two different sets of representatives. As to substance, or end-product legislation, there is some merit to the point—particularly if the legislators come from the same election districts and if the citizens allow bossism or machine rule to thrive. It is not necessary, however, for delegates and Senators to be elected from identical areas. Delegates could be elected from counties, while Senators could be elected from districts within populous counties and from districts comprising more than one county in areas of sparse population. Population would be the principal basis of representation but the geographical area represented would be different from that represented in the house of delegates.

Given these considerations, those who urge a change in representation in the Senate do not insist that the Senate should be reapportioned on the basis of population to the same degree that the house of delegates should reflect population. They do insist that there should be some reasonable relation in the Senate between population and representation. It is felt particularly that there should not be a status under which representatives of a minority of the population can control in the Senate, and they particularly reject the present situation under which 14 percent of the population can thwart the will of representatives of 86 percent of the population.

In an open society in which change occurs every day, in which population expands and contracts in various areas from year to year and census to census, there can be no perfect solution. The desired formula is one in which a genuine effort is made to adjust to changing population patterns as reflected by official census returns. What is not desired is the past practice of refusal to reapportion in the face of all objective evidence and even in the face of constitutional requirements in some States that reapportionment be accomplished.

Whatever is done in the American States, there is reason to believe that the problem of representation shall be with us for ages to come. Representation has been a problem in international organizations from ancient Greece to the present time. The League of Nations provided preferred status for some nations on the basis of power. The United Nations does the same in the Security Council, especially as reflected in the institution of permanent membership and the "veto." In the general assembly there is equal representation without regard to population. In some functional agencies, such as the International Monetary Fund, there is voting strength based neither on equality nor population but rather on the amount of monetary contribution made to the fund.

The problem of representation in international organizations is not, however, essentially of the same character as the classic problem because international organizations are not governments in the traditional sense. Those who urge the establishment of regional or world government have found the representational problem to be one of the most difficult obstacles. Especially during the period immediately after World War II a great deal of thought was given to the problem. It was felt, for example, that the United States or the Soviet Union would not agree to enter a world government in which either would have only one-third as much representation as China if population were to be the standard of representation. Theoretical plans were then proposed which include elements other than mere population. Some plans were tied to per capita income, others to per capita financial support of the world government. Still another detailed proposal combined population and national educational achievement. An individual with 1 year of formal education would receive one point, a college graduate would receive 16 points. By computation each country would have a total number of "educational years of national accomplishment," and the representation would be based on the "educational years." As of 1945 the United States would have 88 world assembly representatives, Russia 59, China 20. Although the plan was said to have a built-in "self corrective," in that it would provide an incentive for all countries to fight illiteracy and emphasize education, there was no discernible rush to adopt the proposal.

It is not yet claimed that a world government exists—of a representative nature or otherwise. But throughout most of the world, even in countries within the Communist orbit, it is claimed that representative government exists and that its existence is the principal moral claim to obedience. At least for a concerned and intelligent public, it is perhaps not too much to conclude that respect for government depends on the degree to which reality matches claim.

More Than a Tree Grows in Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, a rather interesting editorial appeared in a recent issue of the Wall Street Journal.

It is submitted for your information without comment.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 24, 1963]

Realism Grows in Brooklyn

If a group of employers get together to eliminate all competition, they're soon in a lot of hot water with Washington. It's a bit different with unions, which are able to control the supply of labor to many employers.

A recent example is the big Brooklyn local of the International Longshoremen's Association. The union has been worried about unemployment on the borough's docks—in other words, "excessive" competition for jobs. But Anthony Scotto, head of the local, now thinks he has the solution.

First off, he has pushed through new rules which will, by and large, keep non-Brooklyn longshoremen out of Brooklyn. And since a card in the Brooklyn local is a prerequisite for work, he has tightened up on his own membership. "These changes," declares Mr. Scotto, "are an approach to realism. Years ago, a man accepted for membership faced periodic unemployment * * *. We think we have eliminated this risk. In effect, we have closed the books on new members."

Tough on prospective new members, of course, and hardly in line with official lipservice to competition in general. But for purposes of running a monopoly, it's realistic all right.

Cuba a Persistent Threat So Long as New Frontier Philosophy Remains Unchanged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the formidable Soviet military strength in Cuba can no longer be hidden from the American people and the New Frontier's cries of "politics" as an answer to its critics no longer holds water with the release of the bipartisan Stennis committee report.

What is most alarming about the Stennis committee report is the "philosophical judgment" of the New Frontier's advisers which was 100-percent wrong about Russia's intentions both before, during, and after the Cuban crisis of last October. It clearly evidences what many of us have been saying all along—that the Kennedy administration does not understand the Communist menace, its devious ways, its double talking, and does not know how to cope with it, even when confronted with credible information of a monumental doublecross.

In line with the Stennis committee report and recognizing the presistent Soviet threat in this hemisphere, I am inserting in the Record at his point an article which appeared in the May 26, 1963, issue of the Miami Herald:

Views on the News

Last week, I stated here that Soviet military strength in Cuba "is still very formidable."

Mentioned were 42 high performance jet fighters, heavy and medium tanks, antitank guns, field artillery pieces, rocket launchers and a minimum of 17,500 military personnel.

But, at the President's news conference on Wednesday last, this colloquy took place:

Question: Mr. President, there's still a lot of discussion in the Congress—Senator Lausche among others—on the increasing buildup militarily of Cuba. Is there anything ou can say that would be in any way encouraging about the removal of Russian troops, or of the military situation in Cuba?

Answer: We do not have any evidence of increasing military build-up by the Soviet Union. I think at previous press conferences I've given an answer to the question of how many Russians were there, and the comment in regard to the withdrawal of Soviet troops. There has not been a satisfactory withdrawal as yet. But we have no evidence that there is a number coming in larger than going out.

Question: Pardon me, sir, I was thinking more in terms of military equipment going into Cuba.

Answer: Yes, I understand that. We have no evidence that there is an increasing military build-up in Cuba. The intelligence community has not found that.

THEY LOST BECAUSE

In the preceding dialogue, the important words to remember are: "The intelligence community has not found that."

This is the same "intelligence community" which last summer mistook Soviet troops for "civilian technicians," and estimated Soivet "personnel" in Cuba at 5,000.

This is the same "intelligence community" which, notwithstanding human-source reports, could not identify the presence in Cuba of Russian-organized ground combat forces until October 25 although some of them had been there since last July.

The preparedness investigating subcommittee of the Senate exonerates the "intelligence community" of the charge that a gap existed in our photographic reconnaissance over Cuba from September 5 to October 14.

But the committee does say "the deficiency in the performance of the intelligence community appears to have been in the evaluation and assessment of the accumulated data. Moreover, there seems to have been a disinclination on the part of the intelligence community to accept and believe the ominous portent of the information which had been gathered.

"In addition," says the committee, "the intelligence people invariably adopted the most optimistic estimate possible with respect to the information available. This is in sharp contrast to the customary military practice of emphasizing the worst situation which might have been established by the accumulation of evidence."

PHILOSOPHICAL?

The Senate subcommittee, on testimony taken from top officials of the CIA and the Pentagon, makes the startling statement that intelligence community analysts "were strongly influenced by their philosophical judgment that it would be contrary to Soviet policy to introduce strategic missiles into Cuba."

The committee says further that the intelligence chiefs acknowledge that they were misled and deceived. The intelligence people now say that all strategic missiles and offensive-weapon systems have been removed. The committee cannot reach a conclusion on this because "of lack of conclusive evidence."

Actually, it will never be known how many weapons are hidden in Cuba without on-site inspection, an early Kennedy objective now forgotten.

So when the President tells the Nation that our intelligence community "has found no evidence of a military buildup in Cuba," we can well ask on the basis of the past record, "How reliable is the information?"

AND NONPARTISAN

I believe the Senate subcommittee, with Senator John Stennis as chairman, has performed an invaluable service for the country by revealing that—as in the days before Castro—our intelligence evaluations are too often influenced by the philosophical leanings of the evaluators.

It is significant, too, that the full report was unanimously approved by Chairman Stennis and the full subcommittee, consisting of Democratic Senators Stuart Symington, of Missouri; Henry M. Jackson, of Washington; and Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina; and Republican Senators Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts; Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine, and Barry Goldwater, of Arizona.

Time for Freeman To Resign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of May 23, 1963:

Time for Freeman To Resign

Rejection by the Nation's wheat farmers of mandatory controls over their 1964 crop was more or less expected by experienced observers. However, the margin of the defeat in the referendum held Tuesday was astonishing, even to the most dedicated opponents of the marketing quota system.

All of which means that Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman and President Kennedy, who went all out to sell the program, have been slapped down, but hard, by the Nation's wheat farmers.

So severe was the defeat and the blow to Secretary Freeman's prestige that his resignation is in order. Certainly he does not have the confidence of the farm families of America. His position is untenable.

However, we really don't expect Mr. Freeman to resign. He isn't that kind. He won't give up gracefully. A man who can make himself appear as ridiculous as he did in the campaign preceding the election is the kind who will stay on even after he has been repudiated.

And Mr. Kennedy defended him in his Wednesday press conference.

So much for that. The big question is, What happens now? Will Congress write a wheat program more acceptable to the Nation's farmers, or will the administration make good on its promise to force the farmers to live with their decision under the present law?

Either way it goes things are going to be tough on the Nation's wheat farms, at least for a time. The price support level will drop drastically and those who choose to plant above the allotments granted them by the Government will have to take their chances in the open market.

But all these things the farmers knew before they trooped to the polls Tuesday to reject the marketing quotas. Then why did they do it? Why did they take the chance?

The answer seems to be that the farmers are fed up with interference in their business and honestly believe they had better take a chance on getting new legislation, or competing in a free market.

They saw the marketing quotas (which limit the amount of grain the farmer can grow and sell) as opening the door to even more interference in their business. Nothing Secretary Freeman said served to dispel that fear.

Make no mistake about it, the wheat situation is serious. With millions of bushels of the grain in Government hands, there is no easy way out. If all stored wheat, plus what the farmer can produce, should be dumped on the open market, the grain would go for about 10 cents a bushel, if that much.

Yet, under years of mandatory production control programs, the problem has gone from bad to worse.

It is significant, perhaps, that the farm commodities which are doing the best in production and in the marketplace, are those which have been freed from controls or in which Uncle Sam never has been a partner of the producer. It is when the Government moves in that trouble develops.

It is doubtful, at this point, whether wheat farmers can operate in a free market. But it also is obvious that the producers have told the Government, in the only way that counts, that they want to move toward greater freedom their operations, even at the risk of lower prices.

And certainly the wheat-producing system needs a good shaking out. The farmers in the vast Wheat Belt, who can operate most efficiently, find their allotments cut down and down. Even producers of specialty wheats, such as those in Michigan, sometimes find themselves in trouble. It seems impossible to write a control program which is flexible enough to meet all the needs.

In any event the farmers have spoken and have told Mr. Freeman and Mr. Kennedy they want less, not more, control of their operations. They showed a brilliant spark of independence.

Civil Defense Officials Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, in the day-to-day rush of our duties, seldom do we in the Congress have occasion to take note of the quiet, dedicated work being carried on by our civil defense officials.

Though their numbers are few, these men and women constitute a devoted and conscientious group of public servants. Their work seldom hits the headlines, but they daily do battle with public apathy in an effort to build our preparedness against a day we pray will never come.

The work of these people was brought home to me a few weeks ago when I was privileged to take part in a ceremony marking a fallout shelter in the Fort Worth National Bank Building.

It was the first fallout shelter officially marked in Office of Civil Defense Region 5, which is under the direction of William C. Parker in Denton, Tex.

Since that time I have been informed that Noble Shepherd and the staff of the Fort Worth civil defense office have carried out a 3-day shelter stocking program called "Operation Big Lift." A total of 478,194 pounds of survival items for 47,084 shelter spaces were placed in 33 Fort Worth buildings licensed as public fallout shelters.

Forty-one truck lines, coordinated by the Fort Worth chapter of the NDTA, donated an estimated $10,000 in equipment and personnel to handle the movement. In addition, 89 volunteers assisted in the loading and unloading operations at the depot and shelter points throughout the city.

To Mr. Parker, Mr. Shepherd and the staff and volunteers devoting themselves to these efforts, I would like to extend my personal thanks and congratulations.

The Tortoise Is Winning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am certain all of you recall the childhood story about the race between the tortoise and the hare. As the story goes, the tortoise won the race by sheer determination and persistence. My fight for the concept of true competitive bidding in military procurement reminds me of that story, for my "persistent" efforts are bearing fruit.

One giant step forward in this long "race" toward the goal to achieve more competition in the manufacture of defense equipment occurred today when the Army canceled a proposed no-competition purchase of 240 test sets used to check operation of a gyromagnetic compass. The action came after my charge in my speech on the House floor yesterday that a false certification of "no drawings available" for the production of the equipment was being used to shut out competition and channel a contract to a past producer.

These charges were substantiated in a matter of hours yesterday after I conferred with Brigadier General Stanwix-Hay, Chief of the Army's Electronics Materiel Command in Philadelphia, on the telephone. General Stanwix-Hay checked into the matter immediately, found that I was right and took direct action by ordering the procurement for the AN/ASM 61 test set—for which $220 was paid the last time a no-competition purchase was arranged—"pulled off the street" immediately and requesting a full and unbiased investigation by the Army's Inspector General of the obviously false certification. Further, he assured me that the procurement will be carried out under full competitive conditions when it is reissued soon, and he warmly thanked me for bringing the case to light.

I wish I could get the same cooperation from other officials when I pinpoint waste and worse in defense purchasing elsewhere. I congratulate General Stanwix-Hay, but at the same time, I would suggest the civil or military servant who set up the false certification should be disciplined severely. If this case had gone undetected, the contract would have gone to a favored producer at an unchallenged price. Now, I predict a bid considerably below $220 per unit will result when the 240 test sets are bought competitively. I must take sharp issue with a system which allows such obvious flouting of purchasing regulations and the law. There is something wrong when a U.S. Congressman must investigate and turn up the facts that hide behind redtape and fine print.

To briefly relate the story as it happened, upon learning of the false certification by the Army, I scrutinized the Army's own files and private business sources to prove that the test set had been purchased twice before from Winslow Electronics, Asbury Park, N.J., as a part of a June 1961 contract, and the Government paid $1,000 for and received a complete set of manufacturing drawings for the equipment. Further, this equipment is almost exactly the same as an earlier test set called the TS–1086. Made as a commercial "off the shelf" item as early as 1958 by Sorenson & Co., Stamford, Conn., this set, too, was accompanied by complete drawings. Hence, the Army has drawings for both sets.

I hope the Inspector General turns up some bodies in his investigation. Such people should be severely disciplined as an example to others. Once we see a few middle-grade paper shufflers pay for their mistakes and worse, we will see a real clean-up come about in procurement. The comparatively few bad apples in the procurement barrel make all the rest look bad.

A week ago, I lauded two Navy officers for stopping a procurement under similar conditions. The Navy swept the case under the rug. Americans should thank General Stanwix-Hay for his action which will save tax dollars and improve procurement efficiency while exposing those who misuse their positions of trust and authority. Those who rig purchases either through inefficiency or by design should not escape punishment while those who bring the facts to light and cause corrections to be made are being praised.

The Need for Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, there is much talk these days of the shortcomings of our Nation's agricultural programs. The recent demise of the new wheat plan, and other late disclosures, point to the need of thorough and sensible reform. An excellent editorial to this effect appears in the May 27 issue of the Atlanta Journal, which I insert in the RECORD:

THE NEED FOR REFORM

The reform of this country's agricultural program long has seemed a basic thing for our economic and social health.

It is a system under which the rich get richer and the poor move to town to offer their skills in a market which does not need them.

Senator Herman Talmadge has been an advocate of agricultural reform all his years in Washington.

Where has he gotten? Well, he is making haste slowly. It takes a long time before Washington learns to listen to a junior Senator.

This year the Senator created quite a splash with his proposal to reform the two-price system (one price for domestic buyers, a cheaper price for foreign buyers) for cotton.

His contention is that the system is destroying the textile industry. This thesis needs no arguing in this part of the world.

An analysis last Sunday by Journal Washington correspondent Margaret Shannon also showed how spectacularly the big farm operator was helped and how little the little man matters.

The big subsidy money goes West, though Mississippi still has some operators of formidable proportions, and South Carolina and Alabama a few.

But the cotton picture is gloomy. The textile industry faces ruin through an artificially created hazard.

The small cotton farmer who has survived so far also faces ruin for the same reasons.

Senator Talmadge offers some commonsense aid to grower and processor. The whole country stands in the need of a dose of commonsense, but our agricultural setup needs it most of all.

Winning REA Essays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the attached winning REA essays in the Appendix of the Record.

These essays, written by Sherrill Shadbolt, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. George W. Shadbolt of Merriman, Nebr.; Sheri Lou Schou, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John H. Schou of Sidney, Nebr.; Donna Kay Dent, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Earl Dent of Burwell, Nebr.; and Judy Montross, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. J. R. Montross of North Platte, Nebr., are written from their experiences and observations of life in our State of Nebraska on the subject, "The Value of Rural Electrification in our Home and Community."

I join the families and friends of these young people in a feeling of pride over their accomplishments. Their essays are well worth reading, and I want to share these messages with my friends and colleagues in the Congress:

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Sherrill Shadbolt, senior, Gordon High School, Merriman, Nebr.)

(Sponsored by the Panhandle Rural Electric Membership Association, Alliance, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

We live on a large, modern ranch where cheap, convenient power is in demand. The REA, as our electrical servant, has provided us with this power, saving us time, labor, and money.

Electricity is more convenient than any other kind of power. It is clean, available at the flick of a switch, and it requires no storage space. There are no unsightly tanks, dangerous gas lines, or failing pilot lights. And, in relation to other prices, electricity is one of the cheapest things we can buy.

Even before the stately electric poles had come marching up to our doorstep, we had recognized the value of electricity in a modern society. We, and ranchers like us, obtained a measure of electricity from either windchargers or diesel plants.

Ranches have enormous amounts of machinery, and machinery needs servicing. Today, the rancher can service his machinery at home. Welders, sickle grinders, drills, compressors, and a multitude of other electrical tools are found in the ranch shop. The available electrical power required to run these tools has saved the rancher money and has speeded up his ranching operations.

If REA has aided the rancher, it has saved his wife. Slaving over a hot wood stove and hand-washing stacks of dishes and tons of clothes, the ranch wife aged quickly.

REA has emancipated rural women from drudges to modern housewives. The mother has been freed from her drudgery, giving her more time to devote to her home and children. Electric pumps bring fresh, pure water into the house; electric water heaters heat it piping hot. The wife often cannot find help, but she can buy dishwashers, toasters, stoves, and vacuum cleaners.

Electricity has brightened the home and has made it a better place in which to live. The flickering kerosene lamps, once found in every rural home, are gone now. Rooms, bright and cheerful, dispel the gloom of long winter months.

Very rarely does the ranch family have time to travel. Entertainment was once considered a luxury, but not any more. A turn of a knob and the TV screen lights up to bring the outside world to them. News, religious programs, entertainment, and culture are available now to these previously isolated families.

REA has changed the country school as radically as it has the homes. Pupils now have better facilities surrounding them. They have electric lighting, indoor plumbing, hot water, and in the future—a chance to study via television.

We have come to take electricity for granted. It is only when the power goes off that we realize how our lives are centered around it. It is hard to visualize how our grandparents managed without the service of the kilowatt.

The REA has brought a look of progress to a previously isolated section of the country. The lives and homes of countless rural families have been benefited. Rural electric power has given us the same opportunities and conveniences that the rest of today's society is enjoying. Comparing the way we lived even 10 years ago with today, we can truly say that electricity and civilization go hand in hand.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Sheri Lou Schou, junior, Sidney High School, Sidney, Nebr.)

(Sponsored by the Wheatbelt Public Power District, Sidney, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

"Let there be light" is a Biblical injunction that should be applied before anything else, to the farm home, farmyard, and outbuildings. Correctly applied fixture lighting can provide proper balance of the room necessary to keep various decorating elements in their proper perspective. A well-lighted farmyard helps get chores done easier and faster, reduces accidents, and discourages prowlers. In the outbuildings good lighting is conducive to efficient sanitary operations.

Rural electric power is the one service you buy that costs less today than ever before. Lower rates in eastern Nebraska in the past few months will result in savings averaging more than three-quarter million dollars through 1965 to distributing power customers of the rural system.

Electricity is the farmer's hired man. Automation enables the farmer of today to feed twice as much livestock as before. The electrical feed handling setup is rather simple, but it does a topnotch job. The time saved is invaluable to the farmer.

The electric motor allows the farmer to apply a small amount of power to a task for a longer period of time instead of using a large amount of power for a shorter period. Thereby helping to reduce the peak of farm labor.

Electric heat makes winter work easier. Whether it's a cold born, an icy sidewalk, or a nonstarting tractor, electricity can do the job. Agriculture is, of course, the great power-consuming industry of modern society. The farmer uses more power to do his work than any other industry, except transportation. In his search for cheaper forms of power, the farmer has utilized the wind, animals, falling water, gasoline motors, and the human body. In the past 20 years the American farmer has had the miracle of electric power. This fluid energy is cheaper, more efficient, and more pliable than any other form of energy.

The valiant struggle of American farmers to secure light and power is one of the heartening chapters in the history of our national development.

The age of electrical agriculture lies ahead. The farmer himself, an innate conservative, has only begun to comprehend what electric power means in his work. Electricity is now enabling him to process much of his produce right on the farm. With the help of electric power he can perform some of the basic processing jobs, get higher prices for his crops, reduce spoilage en route to market, and is able to reduce the high toll taken by rodents, weevils, mold, and fire that proper handling by new methods largely eliminates.

A year from now, it's possible we may be lights our homes, milking our cows, or cooking our meals with electricity made by atomic energy. By mid-1963 a nuclear powerplant will be feeding electricity into a high-voltage grid system that covers part of Nebraska.

Truly, rural electricity does so much—costs so little—serving you in the home—on the job.

PUBLIC POWER IN NEBRASKA

(By Donna Kay Dent, senior, Burwell High School, Burwell, Nebr.)

(Sponsored by the Loup Valleys Rural Public Power District, Ord, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

Reaching out my hand through the darkness I felt my fingers touch power. I grasped power and held it in my hand. Yes, power was there, there at my fingertips waiting to do my work, however, I realized if I wanted power to work for me I must work for her first.

I looked into time and saw many things. I could see before me troubles, hardships and hard work. Many believed I would be the last to begin an experiment in socialism, but I knew I could do it. Had I not been called the great desert? Now I was dressed in a beautiful coat of green. I am a part of America. I have the chance to improve. I realized this when I was the desertland. I was poor, but I had the chance to turn into a land of many riches. Again it was time to turn toward better things. The upheaval of the 1930's was giving me this chance.

My people worked hard to pass the Enabling Act. After the third reading the House passed it 71 to 24. The Loup River Public Power District was the first to be organized under the new law, but the Sutherland project, known to many of you as the Platte Valley Public Power and Irrigation District, was first when it came to receiving a grant and loan from the Public Works Administration which enabled it to be the first one to finish her project. The tricounty project did cost me a lot of money, but it was also the largest. What a success has come out of that one.

The power was there. It was coming to life, but I could not have done all this if it had not been for my managers. Donald D. Price, I shall never forget him for he was the first chief engineer. George E. Johnson has worked in Nebraska power development longer than any man still living. A man with unusual abilities to organize and promote, was Harold Kramer.

Many people wonder if they are getting this power and good service at the lowest price. I am proud that I can say to my people they pay only $6.04 per 250 kilowatts while the national average is $7.10. I can also say to my neighbors, Kansas and Colorado, my rates are from 72 to 40 cents less than yours.

Power development is really an effort of the farm people to better their land; however, public power has also added to my recreational facilities such as hunting, swimming, and camping. Home utilities are available.

Changes may be needed in the future to meet the demands of the time. Some are talking now of new legislation defining the relationships between the districts, others want some form of control by a public commission. Whatever these changes are, I know they will be for the good of my people for I hold in my hand public power.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Judy Montross, junior, North Platte High School, North Platte, Nebr.)

(Sponsored by the Dawson Public Power District, Lexington, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

Before daybreak yard lights are blinking like tiny jewels up and down the Platte Valley as the dairy farmers prepare for milking. Where in days gone by six or seven cows milked by hand were considered quite a chore, now the same farmer with the use of electric milking machines can easily milk 30 or 40 cows, putting the milk through a spotlessly clean milk parlor in the same length of time. Electricity heats the water to clean and sterilize the milking utensils, augers the feed mechanically, and cools the milk immediately.

After his chores are done, he returns to his house for a hot breakfast cooked by electricity. No longer is the typical farm kitchen an outdated cousin of the city kitchen. Mealtime is no longer a hot, time-consuming job for the farm wife. Her electric stove, refrigerator, toaster, skillets, coffeepot, and many other electrical appliances have changed all of this. Long hours spent in canning foods over a hot wood stove are forever gone. Now fruits, vegetables, meats and baked goods can be prepared at leisure and put into her freezer for later use. At the same time she can be running a load of washing through her new automatic washing machine. No longer need she carry heavy baskets of clothes to the clothesline for it is just a few steps to her matching clothes dryer. In many cases, the homes, themselves, are heated by electricity.

With the use of electric heat lamps more and more baby chickens and pigs can be saved during cold weather. This same electricity will keep their drinking water from freezing. No longer is it necessary to carry heavy buckets of water, for it is piped from electric pumps directly to the stock.

When the day is over and the farmer comes home from a hard day's work, he is ready to sit down and read the newspaper by electric lamplight instead of a dim kerosene light. He is able to take a relaxing shower because of the hot water heated by his electric water heater.

The farmer uses his radio to find out if the grain market is going up or down, and if the weather is going to be favorable for fieldwork. He turns to television for information and entertainment.

In the summertime, our valley is a beautiful green patchwork of corn and alfalfa fields. During the hot dry days, it is a wonderful sight to see all the sprinklers going on the alfalfa fields and irrigation water running down the corn rows. A few short years back the farmer watched the sky with anxious eyes as his fields burned; he now can start his electric water pumps and watch the parched earth soak up the needed water.

These are a few of the many ways in which rural electrification is of value to my community.

The Potential of Private Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, H. Lewis Rietz, executive vice president of the Great Southern Life Insurance Co. of Houston, Tex., addressed the chamber of commerce's workshop on meeting the health needs of the aged as a part of the chamber's 51st annual meeting. Mr. Rietz gave an excellent picture of the progress that has been made by our private health insurance industry and forecast future progress for the industry. The success which the health insurance mechanism has achieved deserves the fullest attention of our people, for in it we have the basic answer to assuring that everyone, young and old, will be able to finance the costs of our increasingly expensive, and increasingly effective, medical care. Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Rietz' address in the RECORD at this point:

THE POTENTIAL OF PRIVATE HEALTH INSURANCE

(By H. Lewis Rietz)

In opening these remarks I should make it clear that I have great confidence in the potential and capacity of voluntary health insurance to meet in full the prepayment need of the vast majority of Americans irrespective of their age. My confidence is based on participating in and observing the development of the voluntary prepayment system, substantially all of which has occurred during my own insurance career. Hence, I take exception to the ever recurring depreciation of the accomplishments and the potential of voluntary prepayment plans by the advocates of compulsory governmental action in this area.

The real origin of voluntary prepayment mechanisms for health care costs goes back only about 30 years and the advocates of governmental intervention in this area have always depreciated its potential. Their early predictions and conclusions as to the potential of the voluntary system have been entirely wrong, as I believe the present predictions and conclusions of such advocates will prove to be over the years to come. For example, in 1938, when only 8 percent of our population had any form of voluntary coverage against health care costs, the National Health Conference concluded that, "Voluntary sickness insurance without subsidy or other encouragement through official action has nowhere shown the possibility of reaching more than a small fraction of those who need its protection." Ten years later when 42 percent of our population had some such protection, the then Federal Social Security Administrator, in a report to the President said, "At a maximum only about half the families in the United States can afford even a moderately comprehensive health insurance plan on a voluntary basis." Today, 76 percent of our civilian population enjoy the benefits of voluntary health insurance. Equally or more significant is the fact that substantially over half of our population aged 65 and over now have such insurance protection. The substantial protection now in effect for this segment of our population has evolved almost entirely during the last 15 years with very rapid growth in both numbers covered and scope of benefits provided in the last 5 years.

Without going into detail the report submitted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the House Ways and Means Committee in July of 1961 entitled "Health Insurance for the Aged" contains numerous statements and conclusions depreciating both the accomplishments and potential of voluntary health insurance which are contrary to the record and which I am convinced will be proven wrong over a very short period of years.

The remarkable accomplishment in the marketplace has been the development of coverages over a period of about 30 years which provide protection to 140 million Americans, constituting 76 percent of our civilian population. It is substantial evidence that the prepayment concept for medical costs which had to be sold vigorously and laboriously during its years has achieved a remarkable degree of public acceptance. The whole structure of the voluntary prepayment system has been subject for at least half of its history to serious challenges by the liberals and welfare advocates in our society. Some 6 years ago, faced with these continuing challenges, the health insurance business undertook serious studies by highly capable and responsible people to delineate its responsibilities and pinpoint its obligations in our social-economic system. Highly important principles and definite and specific recommendations for their achievement were set forth. In part the statement of principles provided:

"The Health Insurance Association of America recognizes the social responsibility and the economic necessity of providing adequate health insurance to all of the people of the United States who can be reached through established insurance institutions operating in a free and competitive market.

"It is reasonable to believe that the problem of financing health care costs of future older persons will be substantially eliminated through proved and time-tested voluntary mechanisms presently in operation. Meanwhile, the health insurance business recognizes the vital need for still more intensified efforts promptly to provide adequate opportunity and encouragement for the aged to insure themselves against the cost of medical care.

"Through the following of established insurance approaches and techniques, the health insurance business is now and will in the future effectively provide the aged with adequate health insurance."

I am happy to report that these were not high-sounding words adopted solely for press release purposes, but became serious challenges to all responsible segments of our voluntary prepayment system. During the very few years since the industry meeting at which these principles were adopted, we have seen the rapid development of (1) mass enrollment programs whereby insurance is offered to persons aged 65 and older regardless of condition of health; (2) the rapid entry of many companies into the field of hospital, surgical, and medical expense policies which are guaranteed renewable for life; (3) the extension of group insurance coverages to retired employees either through continuation under the group plan or by conversion to an individual policy; and (4) a real breakthrough in the coverages afforded by the development of the Connecticut 65 plan, and later the New York and Massachusetts 65 plans, which offer both basic hospital and surgical and optional major medical coverages with limits as high as $10,000 to the present aged without evidence of insurability.

In July 1961 when the insurance industry presented its testimony in opposition to the King-Anderson bills, our studies indicated that 53 percent of our population aged 65 and over had some form of voluntary health insurance coverage. An earlier Government study, in 1959, showed that 53 percent of the aged 65 to 74 had coverage and 33 percent of those aged 75 and over had such protection. Taking these figures into account, and recognizing the difficulty of projections, we presented testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee which included coverage projections for the year 1969. Our median estimate was that by 1969 about 57 percent of our population then aged 75 and over would have such coverage with the prospect that the actual coverage ratio could very possibly exceed 60 percent. For the age group 65 to 74 we estimated that about 75 percent would have such coverage and that the coverage ratio might well approach 85 percent, the level now prevailing for the total population in the Northeastern and North Central States. Weighing these figures together for the projected age distribution of our population over age 65 in 1969, we concluded that we could expect on a conservative basis to have 68 percent of all persons over age 65 insured and that the ratio might well reach 75 percent.

When we deal with a business providing coverage to 140 million people, of which possibly as many as 11 million are over age 65, the problem of maintaining continuous statistical information for all categories where it would be nice to know the facts and details assumes the magnitude of the problem confronting the Census Bureau. For reasons of expense which, of course, must ultimately be borne by our insureds, the statistical studies have of necessity been done periodically and directed to the broader areas of factual information. Hence, coverage and benefit payment data by age group is not available.

However, those of us who are active in this business on a day-to-day basis know that growth is continuing at a rapid rate and the extension of coverage among our senior citizens is progressing more rapidly than among the population as a whole. From the data available for use in preparation of our testimony in opposition to the King-Anderson bills before the House Ways and Means Committee, we know that the percentage of persons aged 75 and over having voluntary coverage was 15 percent in March of 1952, reached 24 percent in September 1956, and grew to 33 percent by mid-1959. In both the September 1956 and the mid-1959 studies the coverage level for persons aged 75 and over was almost exactly 75 percent of the coverage level for persons 65 to 74 years of age in the March 1952 and September 1956 studies, respectively. Using this 75-percent factor I would now estimate that the present coverage level in the 75 and over age group is at least 40 percent. Similarly, by extrapolation from data pertaining to the age 65 to 74 group, I believe current coverage levels on people aged 65 to 74 exceeds 60 percent. Combining these estimates our coverage level is probably close to 60 percent for ages 65 and over with almost 11 million persons having some protection. This would indicate an increase in numbers covered of 2 million in a little over 2 years.

These estimates take into account the impact that State 65 Plans in Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New York have had on high age coverages, as well as the rapid extension and revision of group plans to provide continuation of benefits into retirement years. A study reported recently by the Health Insurance Institute indicates that for new group insurance cases installed in 1959, 55 percent of the employees insured were covered under plans which provided for continuation after retirement. Only 3 years later, in 1962, over 80 percent of the employees insured under new group plans provided for continuation of coverage after retirement. While these figures relate to newly installed group insurance plans, the rate at which older plans are being amended to provide continuation of coverage into retirement years and, in many cases, to extend coverages to previously retired employees is certain to have an important impact on both our present and future senior citizens.

Important also in these considerations is the question of level or adequacy of coverage. Once the advantages of a prepayment mechanism for medical costs were appreciated by the American people, willingness to purchase broader coverages at higher premium costs has produced phenomenal growth in benefit payments due to rapid upgrading of adequacy of benefits. Several surveys have been made which reveal the public demand and appreciation for prepayment programs. One survey among women readers of the Good Housekeeping magazine, as reported in their August 1961 issue, revealed that 85 percent of these families had hospitalization insurance and liked it; 78 percent described their protection as adequate; 34 percent voiced a willingness to pay higher premiums for increased protection. Similar findings, but with slightly lower percentages, were reported with respect to surgical and medical expense insurance coverages. The rapid broadening of the scope of coverage is fully revealed by the fact that from 1951 to 1961 the number of people covered under the voluntary system increased by 60 percent, while the benefit payments increased by almost exactly 300 percent.

Within the pattern of hospital and surgical coverages, higher limits, longer benefit periods under policies issued at the higher ages and guaranteed renewable for life have come rapidly. Major medical expense insurance has won rapid acceptance with the number of people enjoying its broad benefits, growing from 108,000 in 1951 to over 34 million in 1961. Many group policies extending benefits into retirement years are major medical plans and we can confidently expect continued rapid growth in high age coverage under such plans.

While major medical per se constituted a breakthrough in breadth and adequacy of benefits available, a significant breakthrough in breadth and adequacy occurred with the implementation of the Connecticut 65 plan offering $5,000 and $10,000 maximum limit major medical benefits to all Connecticut citizens over age 65. Under the Connecticut 65 plan individuals could enroll for a $5,000 or $10,000 maximum benefit major medical plan either with or without a basic hospital and surgical plan. Eighty-five percent enrolled for the major medical only with the $10,000 maximum plan favored by almost 3 to 1. Interestingly, the average age of the enrollees was 75 and I understand about the same average age evolved in the other two States where similar plans have been implemented; namely, Massachusetts and New York. About 200,000 aged people have now been afforded broad coverages under statewide "65" plans in these three States—all accomplished in less than 2 years since the first enrollment in Connecticut in September 1961. Moreover, several other important States populationwise are now considering similar plans, including my own State of Texas, also California and Ohio.

Benefit adequacy is available under the voluntary system for all age groups and under several different marketing approaches. Real and substantial progress is evident in upgrading the scope of benefits our people enjoy.

By 1961 the voluntary system had extended coverage to over 80 percent of the civilian population in 10 States, including such heavy populated States as New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan, and in 5 of these States the percentage of the civilian population covered exceeded 85 percent. Recognizing that in a dynamic economy we will always have some element who through improvidence, misfortune or otherwise are unable to care for themselves and these are the persons for whom present governmental programs provide. There is another element of smaller magnitude and numbers, but still important, whose economic situation is such that they do not need or want prepayment protection for medical-care costs. With these groups in mind we may well be reaching the saturation point in some of these population areas.

As businessmen interested in the voluntary system, our effort will naturally turn to continued rapid upgrading of coverages in force and to more concentrated efforts to increase the percentage covered in areas which have lagged somewhat behind the States indicated. The unique accomplishments over a short period of 30 years gives reason for confidence in the ability of the American people to voluntarily provide for their health care needs with only a limited area of indigent and medically indigent which our society has and should continue to provide for through a combination of private and governmental means.

Stop the Moon-Doggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 26, 1963.

This letter is written by a former distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Hamilton Fish.

We can well consider Mr. Fish's suggestion and I believe that many Members of both the House and Senate will agree with his conclusions.

STOP THE MOON-DOGGLE

To the HERALD TRIBUNE:

I want to congratulate Senator FULBRIGHT for denouncing the $20 billion moon-doggle. The crash effort to reach the moon first is a shameful waste. Who cares who gets there first? There is probably nothing on the moon anyhow. And if it developed there were moon people, I am afraid we would soon be sending a billion dollars of foreign aid to them.

Instead we should spend more money on our schools, particularly our technical and engineering schools. Engineering is the only field Soviet Russia excels us in. They concentrate on engineering training, producing 100,000 engineers annually to our 25,000. Why not place Admiral Rickover in charge of a Government nuclear and scientific academy?

HAMILTON FISH.

"Thresher" Postscript

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Navy Times of May 29, 1963, carries a poignant letter from a Navy wife about the submarine *Thresher*, and the personnel aboard her. I agree with Navy Times that this is an inspiring letter which should be seen by as many people as possible.

The letter follows:

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The *Thresher's* loss on April 10 with 129 Navy men profoundly moved, not only the Navy, but the Nation as a whole. The following letter is from a Navy wife, Mrs. Cynthia N. Scales. She is the wife of Lt. Richard H. Scales ("Dick" in the letter), of *Thresher's* sister ship, *Tinosa*. She is writing to her husband's parents, Mr. and Mrs. John G. Scales, of Grosse Pointe, Mich.)

PORTSMOUTH, N.H.,
April 22, 1963.

DEAREST EVY AND JACK: The last of the memorial services are over, and numbness is slowly giving way to an acceptance of what has seemed more like a nightmare to be resigned and lived with. We lost five friends when *Thresher* went down, not our closest and dearest, but that has made it no less dazing.

Perhaps now I can say what I wanted to tell you over the phone and couldn't. It would be better, I suppose, coming from Dick, but it's unlikely that power range testing aboard *Tinosa* will afford him the opportunity to sit down and write for another week.

And the time for this letter is now.

I can't presume to guess the depth of your anxiety just now, nor have I hopes of saying anything to appreciably lessen it. I've only to be reminded of a few things you said over dinner at Lamie's Tavern last spring, Evy, to have a pretty good idea of what you've been going through these past 12 heartbreaking days.

I've even shared your feelings to some degree, of late. Guess I wouldn't be a normal wife if I didn't. In many ways of course, a Navy wife doesn't fit the standards of normalcy that measure her civilian counterpart.

Fear for my husband's safety in the line of duty is no greater than yours for Jack, for instance, at the wheel of his car in heavy traffic.

An awareness of the risks involved is always present in both of us, but fears are kept in check by our confidence in them and in their equipment—in Dick's case, a submarine.

It would be a hopeless task to try sharing my feelings with you on this point, for they can be acquired only gradually, in the course of living this life. You don't, and because of this, I can appreciate how much harder it is to be a submariner's mother than his wife.

The Navy of daddy's day and the Navy of today are so dissimilar that my indoctrination into the life in general, and submarining in particular, has been as unique an experience for me as for any other civilian-born Navy wife. And I've learned to love it. Perhaps I have little choice—Dick loves it, and I love him, and my pride in him defies expression.

It's not an easy life, Heaven knows. There are days (roughly 3 a week since Thanksgiving) when I'd like to scuttle the whole U.S. fleet and escape to a cave on the side of an isolated mountain, just to retaste the joys of that grand old institution of togetherness known as The Family.

But let a civilian aim one word of criticism at the Navy, and I fly to its defense like a lioness protecting her newborn cubs. Even now. More now, in fact, than ever before.

For at its core, the Navy is people—a strangely wonderful breed of people, liberally endowed with the same faults and foibles that characterize human beings in every walk of life, but still undefinably special.

And tragedy has an odd way of bringing out the best in those most directly touched by it. Weakness suddenly turns to strength, loyalties sharpen, thoughts of self are forgotten in an instinctive awareness of the needs of others, and strangers unite, bound only by the grief they share and by an impassioned willingness to help wherever and however they can.

You, Evy, with all your experience in club work, know what it is to chairman a committee and to recruit the workers to fill it—sometimes no easy task. I headed up a committee of sorts last week, on the suggestion of Capt. Feder's wife, to organize a nursery in one of the buildings in the yard, offering free baby sitting to all *Thresher* wives for the long day of Protestant and Catholic memorial services, Wednesday.

I hadn't a long list of names from which to recruit my helpers. Portsmouth is a Navy yard, not a base, and at present, there are only three ward rooms of wives plus a handful of girls married to officers attached to the yard.

And it wasn't a small favor I was asking. There could be 96 children over there, divided between two groups, the majority of them under school age.

In effect, it would mean asking a Protestant, for example, to hire a sitter for her own children from 11:00 in the morning, sit with the first group of children during the Catholic service and the cardinal's private audience for *Thresher* wives following, dash home to change and return to the yard for Protestant services.

It would be a long day, not an easy one, sure, and expensive, to boot. I figured I could get by with a total of five girls, in addition to myself, or three per service.

After 15 minutes on the phone, I had a total of nine. Three of them, having heard about the idea via the grapevine, phoned me to volunteer their services.

Almost as deepseated as everyone's grief, it seemed, was a sense of frustration in being unable to do enough to help. So is it still, and will it continue to be, for it's now, in the quiet aftermath of disaster, with the initial shock subsiding, that the wives will feel the full impact of their terrible loss.

In a matter of days, the real loneliness will set in. Their needs will be greatest then, and they'll not be left to face them alone simply because the worst is over for the rest of us.

You see, this is our Navy, and *Thresher's* loss was our common loss. This is the feeling that I would share with you. The sub service has always come into its share of ribbing as "one big, happy family."

Well, we're not happy right now, but a family, all the same, drawn more closely than ever before by ties as strong as those of blood. Dick and I are proud and grateful to be a part of it.

Tragedy then, has strangely strengthened, rather than shaken, our allegiance to this way of life and underscored our determination to remain a part of it. I don't imagine your hearts will be gladdened at the news, but the decision is irreversible, and it's only right that you should know of it.

Oh, I still hang on to that "ivy covered cottage" that's a part of every woman's dream. Someday, if a relaxation of world tension and partial disarmament lighten the burden of the military services, Dick will reevaluate his worth to the Navy. But not now; not even soon, and more because of *Thresher* than in spite of her.

A hundred and twenty-nine men carried an ideal to their common grave, and for Dick to leave submarines now would be to turn his back on them and the ideal for which they gave their lives.

The safeguarding of this Nation against the terrible threats that face it is all-important, and the honor of shouldering even a small part of that burden is its own reward.

Putting it in simpler terms, someone has to do this. And in this sophisticated age of ours, when patriotism is corny to some, and you hear others expounding that it is smarter to be a healthy coward than a dead hero, it should be comforting to know that out of a thousand Americans who ask:

"Why me?" there are still one or two who will answer, "Why not me?"

There will be resignations from the submarine fleet as a direct result of Thresher's tragic end. If there are men of special training and talents, such as Dick's, who can be lured back into civilian life just for the promise of personal gains in private industry, surely there are as many who will leave in a greater hurry when they feel that their very skins are at stake.

And without malice, I think that perhaps the Navy will be a stronger, stabler force for their having left it. I should not have to tell you that it is not for any lack of love for Dick that I haven't even brought up the subject.

For one thing, it would do absolutely no good. In truth, if I thought there were the slightest chance that a wife's selfish whining could move Dick an inch from his chosen course, I'd lose much of my respect for him. Deep inside, I think you would too.

Nor is it likely that his judgment could be influenced markedly by the old standby of all pleas for resignation * * * "for the good of the children." A man has obligations to his family, certainly, but by what reasoning can these be better served outside of the Navy? It's for us, for you, for our children and their contemporaries, for the country that our generation will one day put into their hands, that he must stay. Be proud of him.

Tinosa will go to sea soon, probably next month, for her initial sea trials. I thought that *Thresher's* loss would delay the first underway for a month or so, but it appears now that it will not. I'm not afraid, for I know this ship's complement of officers and men for the stubborn, immovable, hatchet-swinging perfectionists they are.

When the time comes, if they say that the ship and they themselves are ready, they'll be ready. Just what happened aboard *Thresher* is not yet known. There are probably as many opinions as there are men involved in the task of unravelling the mystery, and they're not helped of course by that fact that most of the tangible evidence continues to elude the ships searching for it in 8,400 feet of water.

That a flaw exists in the original design of *Thresher* class subs is still a possibility, although *Permit* and *Plunger* have operated successfully at test depth, as had Thresher herself prior to overhaul.

Rest assured that until they've ruled out the chance of a design flaw altogether, *Thresher*-class submarines, and this of course includes *Tinosa*, will be limited to a depth known safe even for *Thresher* herself on her last day of operations.

The Navy isn't ready to take chances with human life. From the greenest recruit in San Diego to the top brass in Washington, *Thresher's* loss has dealt the death blow to whatever cockiness and complacency had arisen out of the nuclear fleet's spotless record of 11 years' standing.

None of us will ever be quite the same. Even Portsmouth has changed. It's nothing you can put your finger on, just a feeling that pervades the military and civilians alike, and one that seems destined to remain long after the board of inquiry proceedings have left the front pages.

Part I. "The Elite and the Electorate," the True New Frontier Philosophy, Expressed by Senators Fulbright and Clark, as More Power for the President, Less for Congress and the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I read with grave concern the articles submitted for the symposium on the subject "The Elite and the Electorate" or "Is Government by the People Possible?" sponsored by the Fund for the Republic's Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions by Senators J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, discussing the former herein.

Senator FULBRIGHT spoke on the subject "Is Government by the People Possible?" and answers the question in the first sentence of his article, thus:

> The question before us can be answered simply: Government by the people is possible but highly improbable.

This statement and conclusion in itself is alarming enough, but when coupled with other observations, gives cause for real concern as to the outspoken critics of the traditional American concept of "Government of the people, by the people and for the people."

Senator FULBRIGHT, who is chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee concluded that "we must contemplate the further enhancement of Presidential authority in foreign affairs" and surprisingly reaches that conclusion on the basis of two premises which he feels dictates the downgrading of congressional constitutional functions in foreign policy. The premises he uses are, first, that the foreign policy difficulties of the Kennedy administration are to be blamed on "diffusion of authority between and within the executive and legislative branches" and second, that "the foreign policy powers of Congress under the Constitution enable it to implement, modify, or thwart the President's policy, but not itself to initiate or shape policy."

Senator FULBRIGHT suggests that the President become endowed with greater power and authority, resulting obviously in the diminution of congressional powers by acquiescence, because "the Presidential Office is the only one under our constitutional system that constitutes a forum for moral and political leadership on a national scale." In support of this he quotes Walter Lippmann who makes an amazing and almost unbelievably broad indictment of representative government in stating "a functional derangement of the relationship between the mass of the people and the government" has developed and that "the people have acquired power which they are incapable of exercising and the governments they elect have lost powers which they must recover if they are to govern." He follows this with a general downgrading of the Congressman's will or ability to make basic decisions in the interests of the Nation.

The article follows verbatim, with an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of May 28, 1963, commenting thereon entitled: "A Proposal To Junk the Republic."

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 28, 1963]

A PROPOSAL TO JUNK THE REPUBLIC

Never before in our history would a politician in the position of Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, have dared suggest, as the Senator has, that we scrap our constitutional system of checks and balances and make it impossible for Congress to "thwart" the President's plans. He would have been instantly, almost universally, and justifiably denounced as a traitor to the principles upon which this Republic was founded.

Yet such is precisely the proposal now made by Mr. FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and another Democrat, Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, in a pamphlet issued by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions under the suggestive title, "The Elite and the Electorate."

"The foreign policy powers of Congress under the Constitution," Mr. FULBRIGHT complains, "enable it to implement, modify, or thwart the President's proposals. * * * The defects of Congress as an institution reflect the defects of classical democratic thought."

Defects? Maybe there are defects in Congress, but where have the most dangerous mistakes been made? Who fumbled the Bay of Pigs invasion by pulling off air cover? Who tells us that we must allow the Government to manage our news? Certainly not Congress; these mistakes can be blamed solely on the executive branch of the Government, whose powers Mr. FULBRIGHT would increase.

Indeed Mr. FULBRIGHT himself is for managed news. "Public opinion," he says, "must be educated and led * * *. This is preeminently a task for Presidential leadership."

The Constitution, in Mr. FULBRIGHT's opinion, is hopelessly outdated. "Government by the people is possible, but highly improbable." Which means, we suppose, that the Revolutionary and Civil Wars were fought in vain, and that the Gettysburg Address can be relegated to the file of historical trivia. The electorate are incapable, through their Representatives in Congress, of running the country; their duties must be handed over to the elite, who, we suppose, inhabit the west wing of the White House and the executive departments.

Congressmen are too susceptible to pressure groups, according to Mr. FULBRIGHT. "Too often, decisions of principle are postponed or neglected, and opportunities lost * * *. The source of this malady is the diffusion of authority between the executive and legislative branches."

Does Mr. FULBRIGHT suggest that employees of the executive departments are immune to pressure? Does he prefer the risk of bad decisions made by executive fiat to the chance that good programs may occasionally be delayed by Congress? Does he forget that Congress is there as much to prevent mad programs as to enact good ones?

In the past, we repeat, Mr. FULBRIGHT would not have dared make such suggestions. But now we're on a New Frontier, where the President can casually dismiss the Constitution as something "written under entirely different conditions," and where Ambassador Stevenson can deplore old-fashioned patriotism as an obstacle to the hegemony of the United Nations.

And a leading member of the Kennedy team asks us to junk our heritage and substitute the volatile sort of autocracy which General de Gaulle has imposed in France. We're asked to submit to the sort of one-man rule which exists under Mayor Daley in Chicago, where crooked elections are the order of the day.

Let us not forget that this is the same Mr. FULBRIGHT who accused President Eisenhower of muzzling the generals, inhibiting free speech, and usurping the powers of Congress. What better evidence is there that his latest proposal is designed not simply to subordinate Congress to the President, but to subordinate all opposition, and indeed the whole electorate, to the will of a clique which presumptuously regards itself as the elite?

THE ELITE AND THE ELECTORATE

(By Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT)

The question before us can be answered simply: government by the people is possible but highly improbable. The difficulties of self-government are manifest throughout the world.

The history of political thought in the last century and a half is largely one of qualification, modification, and outright repudiation of the heady democratic optimism of the 18th century. "The play is still on," writes Carl Becker, "and we are still betting on freedom of the mind, but the outcome seems now somewhat more dubious than it did in Jefferson's time, because a century and a half of experience makes it clear that men do not in fact always use their freedom of speech and of the press in quite the rational and disinterested way they are supposed to."

The major preoccupation of democratic thought in our time has been its continuing and troubled effort to reconcile the irrefutable evidences of human weakness and irrationality, which modern history has so abundantly provided, with a political philosophy whose very foundation is the assumption of human goodness and reason. The dilemma has troubled all of the free societies of the West, none more so than the United States, whose national experience until a generation ago seemed to represent the realization of classical democratic theory.

In addition to defects of concept and content, classical democratic thought is marked by a strikingly unhistoric spirit. It grandly and inexplicably conceived of democratic society as an organ created by a single act of human will and reason, ignoring the empirical lessons of the centuries of English history through which representative government had been tortuously evolving in the face of numberless obstacles and diversions. If Englishmen could fall prey to such delusions, it was far easier for Americans, whose revolution lent some credence to the abstractions of rationalist philosophy.

The revolutionaries of 1776 inherited a society that was already the freest in the world. Its freedom was built on solid foundations of English traditions and constitutional principles, which formed the bedrock of future stability. The revolution was not directed against a feudal ancien regime but against the most liberal and progressive monarchy of Europe, whose oppression of the colonists had consisted in recent and limited infringements on long-established rights. The great advantage of America, said Alexis de Tocqueville in a profound insight, lay in not having had to endure a democratic revolution.

The American experience has thus had the appearance but not the reality of a society built by fiat to the specifications of rationalist philosophy. We have been permitted the romance of imagining ourselves revolutionaries when in fact our democracy is the product of long tradition and evolution. The mischief of our rationalist illusion is that it leads to erroneous inferences about our own free society and about the prospects of government by the people elsewhere in the world. Most notably, it blinds us to the powerful limitations on human action imposed by history, to the incalculable difficulties of building a free society, and to the basic incapacity of man to create viable institutions out of the abstractions of pure reason. Society, said Edmund Burke, is indeed a contract, but as the ends of such a partnership cannot be obtained in many generations, it becomes a partnership not only between those who are living, but between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are to be born.

The descent from democratic optimism in Western political thought has been more than borne out by events. As a result of the great conflicts of the 20th century the worldwide dominance of the Western democracies has been lost. These conflicts and upheavals have thrown the domocracies on the defensive and generated powerful strains within the free Western societies themselves. There has developed, writes Walter Lippmann, "a functional derangement of the relationship between the mass of the people and the Government." "The people," he writes, "have acquired power which they are incapable of exercising, and the governments they elect have lost powers which they must recover if they are to govern."

The impact of mass opinion on vital issues of war and peace, in Lippmann's analysis, is to impose a massive negative at critical junctures when new courses of policy are needed. Lagging disastrously behind the movement of events, Lippmann contends, public opinion forced a vindictive peace in 1919, then refused to act against a resurgent Germany in the interwar years, and finally was aroused to paroxysms of hatred and unattainable hopes in a Second World War that need never have occurred. The impact of public opinion, says Lippmann, has been nothing less than a compulsion to make mistakes.

For a politican who serves at the pleasure of his constituency, the course of prudence is to adhere to prevailing views. To be prematurely right is to court what, to the politicians at least, is a premature retirement. We come at last to the ironic inversion of the classical democratic faith in the will of the people: not only does public opinion fail to hold the politician to the course of wisdom and responsibility but, on the contrary, to take the right course requires a singular act of courage on the part of the politician. A few might share the Wilsonian view that "There is nothing more honorable than to be driven from power because one was right." Far more prevalent is the outlook of Lloyd George, who on more than one occasion quite candidly rejected proposals whose merit he conceded on the grounds that he did not wish to be "crucified" at home. In the Lloyd George view, which is a prototype—and not without some merit in my opinion—there is little glory and still less constructive purpose in being defeated for failing to do the impossible.

Can we reconstruct the excessively optimistic democratic thought of the 18th century into a chastened but more realistic philosophy of government by the people? I believe we can, and this belief, I think, is prevalent among the wisest of statesmen and scholars.

The philosophers of the Age of Reason emphasized the hopes and possibilities of a free society, but the strength and viability of democracy rest not only on its aspirations but also on its accommodations to the limitations of human wisdom, to man's inability to perceive the infinite. Democracy, Winston Churchill once said, is the worst form of government men have ever devised—except for every other form. Or in Jefferson's words: "Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him?"

If men are often irrational in their political behavior, it does not follow that they are always irrational and, what is more important, it does not follow that they are incapable of reason. Whether in fact a people's capacity for self-government can be realized depends on the character and quality of education. It seems to me an astonishing distortion of priorities that the American people and their Government gladly spend billions of dollars for space exploration while denying desperately needed funds to their public schools. I do not believe that a society that has shamefully starved and neglected its public education can claim to have exploited its fullest possibilities and found them wanting.

The case for government by elites is irrefutable insofar as it rests on the need for expert and specialized knowledge. The average citizen is no more qualified for the detailed administration of government than the average politician is qualified to practice medicine or to split an atom. But in the choice of basic goals, the fundamental moral judgments that shape the life of a society, the judgment of trained elites is no more valid than the judgment of an educated people. The knowledge of the navigator is essential to the conduct of a voyage, but his special skills have no relevance to the choice of whether to take the voyage and where we wish to go.

The distinction of course is between means and ends. The experience of modern times shows us that when the passengers take over the navigation of the ship it is likely to go on the rocks. This does not mean that their chosen destination is the wrong one or that an expert would have made a better choice, but only that they are unlikely to get there without the navigator's guidance.

The demonstrated superiority of democracy over dictatorship derives precisely from its refusal to let ruling elites make the basic moral decisions and value judgments of society. The core of classical democratic thought is the concept of free individuality as the ultimate moral value of human society. Stripped of its excessive optimism about human nature, the core of classical liberalism remains valid and intact. The value and strength of this concept are its promise of fulfillment for man's basic aspirations. The philosopher and the psychoanalyst agree that, whether it issues from reason or instinct, man's basic aspiration is to be a free individual.

A reconstructed philosophy of self-government, accepting the weaknesses as well as the strengths of human nature, must place heavy emphasis on the development of the human capacity for rational moral choice. The challenge to public education is nothing less than to prepare the individual for self-government, to cultivate his capacity for free inquiry and his more humane instincts, to teach him how rather than what to think, in short, to sustain democracy by what Ralph Barton Perry called "an express insistence upon quality and distinction."

A reconstructed philosophy of self-government must replace an ingenuous faith in human nature with a realistic faith in human capacity, recognizing that self-government, though the best form of political organization that men have devised, is also the most difficult. Democracy, in short, must come to terms with man's weaknesses and irrationalities while reaching for the best that is in him.

Such a revised approach to democracy has certain implications for the way in which we organize our Government and conduct its affairs. As Americans with our deeply rooted and fundamentally healthy distrust of government power, we might start by at least reexamining certain long-held convictions based on this distrust of power. We might at least consider the proposition, as expressed by Lord Radcliffe, that "liberty looked upon as the right to find and to try to realize the best that is in oneself is not something to which power is necessarily hostile," that, indeed, "such liberty may even need the atcive intervention of authority to make it possible."

To return to my metaphor, we must guard against allowing the navigator to determine our destination, but we must allow him to steer the ship without amateur supervision of every turn of the wheel. A political leader is chosen because of his supposed qualifications for his job. If he is qualified, he should be allowed to carry it out according to his own best judgment. If his judgment is found defective by his electors, he can and should be removed. His constituents, however, must recognize that he has a duty to his office as well as to them and that their duty in turn is to fill the office but not to run it. We must distinguish between the functions of representation and of government, requiring our elected leaders to represent us while allowing them to govern.

It may well be questioned whether the enormously complex and slow-moving procedures of the American Government are adequate to meet both the dangers and the opportunities of our foreign relations. Too often, decisions of principle are postponed or neglected and opportunities lost because of the obstacles to decision imposed by our policy processes. The source of this malady is the diffusion of authority between and within the executive and legislative branches and the accessibility of all of these centers of power to a wide variety of pressures and interests. The problem is compounded by the durable myth of Jacksonian democracy, the view that any literate citizen can do almost any job and that a democracy can do without a highly trained administrative elite.

"Foreign politics," wrote Tocqueville, "demand scarcely any of those qualities which a democracy possesses; and they require, on the contrary, the perfect use of almost all those faculties in which it is deficient * * * a democracy is unable to regulate the details of an important undertaking, to persevere in a design, and to work out its execution in the presence of serious obstacles. It cannot combine its measures with secrecy, and it will not await their consequences with patience. These are qualities which more especially belong to an individual, or to an aristocracy."

My question is not whether we might wish to alter our traditional foreign policy making procedures but whether in fact we have any choice but to do so in a world that obstinately refuses to conduct its affairs under Anglo-Saxon rules of procedure.

The source of an effective foreign policy under our system is Presidential power. There are major areas of foreign policy—those relating more to long-term problems than to immediate crises—wherein Presidential authority is incommensurate with Presidential responsibility as a result of the diffusion of power between executive and legislative branches and within the latter. The foreign policy powers of Congress under the Constitution enable it to implement, modify, or thwart the President's proposals but not itself to initiate or shape policy. These powers, moreover, are widely dispersed within Congress among autonomous committees, each under a chairman who owes little if anything in the way of political obligation to the President.

The defects of Congress as an institution reflect the defects of classical democratic thought. These pertain primarily to foreign policy. In domestic matters, it seems to me, the Congress is as well qualified to shape policy as the executive, and in some respects more so because of the freedom of at least some members from the particular electoral pressures that operate on the President. The frequency of elections and the local orientation of party organizations, however, do not encourage serious and sustained study of international relations. Congressmen are acutely susceptible to local and regional pressures and to the waves of fear and emotion that sometimes sweep over public opinion. The legislator, in short, is under constant and intense pressure to adhere to the prevailing tendencies of public opinion, however temporary and unstable.

Public opinion must be educated and led if it is to bolster a wise and effective foreign policy. This is pre-eminently a task for Presidential leadership because the Presidential office is the only one under our constitutional system that constitutes a forum for moral and political leadership on a national scale. Accordingly, I think that we must contemplate the further enhancement of Presidential authority in foreign affairs. The prospect is a disagreeable and perhaps a dangerous one, but the alternative is immobility and the paralysis of national policy in a revolutionary world, which can only lead to consequences immeasurably more disagreeable and dangerous.

The preeminence of Presidential responsibility is in no way an implied license for the legislator to evade national and international responsibility and to surrender to the pressures of local and parochial interest. I can find no better words to define this responsibility than those of Edmund Burke in his classic statement to his constituents at Bristol in 1774:

"Certainly, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative, to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinion high respect; their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfactions, to theirs; and, above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interest to his own. But, his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you; to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure; no, nor from the law and the constitution. They are a trust from Providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

As a freshman Senator in 1946 I attempted in a speech at the University of Chicago to define the proper role of the legislator in relation to his constituents, to the Nation, and to his own conscience. After 17 years I see no reason to alter the views I then expressed in these words:

"The average legislator early in his career discovers that there are certain interests, or prejudices, of his constituents which are dangerous to trifle with. Some of these prejudices may not be of fundamental importance to the welfare of the Nation, in which case he is justified in humoring them, even though he may disapprove. The difficult case is where the prejudice concerns fundamental policy affecting the national welfare. A sound sense of values, the ability to discriminate between that which is of fundamental importance and that which is only superficial, is an indispensable qualification of a good legislator. As an example of what I mean, let us take the poll-tax issue and isolationism. Regardless of how persuasive my colleagues or the national press may be about the evils of the poll tax, I do not see its fundamental importance, and I shall follow the views of the people of my State. Although it may be symbolic of conditions which many deplore, it is exceedingly doubtful that its abolition will cure any of our major problems. On the other hand, regardless of how strongly opposed my constituents may prove to be to the creation of, and participation in, an ever stronger United Nations Organization, I could not follow such a policy in that field unless it becomes clearly hopeless. * * *"

In conclusion, I should like to reiterate the theme of these remarks: government by the people, despite its failures and shortcomings, remains the one form of political organization that offers the promise of fulfillment for our highest aspirations. Although we have been compelled to qualify the unlimited optimism of classical democratic thought, we remain convinced that the core of that thought—the belief in the moral sanctity of the free mind and the free individual—remains the most valid of human philosophies. In Carl Becker's words: "* * * although we no longer have the unlimited and solvent backing of God or nature, we are still betting that freedom of the mind will never disprove the proposition that only through freedom of the mind can a reasonably just society ever be created."

Comprehensive Transportation and Land Use Planning Program for Northeastern Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 15, there was a regional meeting in Cleveland to consider a comprehensive transportation and land use program for northeastern Ohio. This conference was held at the Engineering and Scientific Center of Cleveland and included representatives of all of the urban planning agencies in the northeastern Ohio community.

The following brilliant and challenging address was given by the Honorable Robert C. Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency:

ADDRESS BY ROBERT C. WEAVER, ADMINISTRATOR, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY, AT A LUNCHEON ANNOUNCING A COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE PLANNING PROGRAM FOR NORTHEASTERN OHIO ENGINEERING AND SCIENTIFIC CENTER, CLEVELAND, OHIO, MAY 15, 1963

Recently I have had occasion to speak to two other groups—one in Pittsburgh, and the other in Detroit—that are involved, as you are, in planning for the future of their region.

The frequency of meetings of this sort is a clear indication of the increase, throughout this country, of interest in and action toward regional planning. And they are a symptom of the determination of Americans to meet the challenge of the urban frontier.

Urbanization—the growth of urban areas—has been going on in this country for a long time. But for many years it was possible to ignore urban growth, or at least to take a laissez faire attitude toward it. There was then very little realization that this growth represented the emergence in this country of a new frontier—a frontier of intensive development comparable in its challenges and opportunities to the old frontier of extensive development.

President Kennedy saw this, however, and made it an important issue during his campaign. Since his election he has made it a focal point for the domestic programs of his administration.

Most of you here are familiar with the long catalog of problems which have emerged as a result of urbanization: The migration of low-income families to the centers of cities; the migration of moderate and higher income families to the suburbs; racial discrimination in housing, schools, and public facilities; unemployment, aggravated by the spread of automation; the skyrocketing cost of replacing and expanding schools and other essential physical facilities; the impossible tangle of traffic and transportation needs.

Every one of these involves a host of immediate needs for those who live and work in urban areas. City and county budgets—even with the help available from the Federal Government—are strained to the utmost in attempting to meet the needs that exist now.

The very thought of the needs that will exist tomorrow sometimes seems overwhelming. Yet it is essential that we do look to the needs of tomorrow if we are to succeed in meeting them better than we have those of today.

This is why the metropolitan and regional planning activities that are going on throughout the Nation are so vitally important to the future of our country.

To the layman city planning still seems to be a very esoteric study—although there have been city planners at work since the time of the ancient Romans, and probably before that.

The surveyors who laid out the streets of the frontier towns of this country were city planners—without benefit of theoretical knowledge, perhaps, but planners all the same.

So are those who lay out the plans for the enormous subdivisions that are now being built on the outskirts of nearly every city in the country. Some of them are not much better versed in the theory of what they are doing than were the frontier surveyors. But they are exercising a powerful influence on our future.

While the man in the street is still struggling to understand what city planning is all about, the world has moved on to yet another stage—the stage of planning on the scale of the metropolis, the region, and even the State.

So far in this country we don't talk about national planning. The Soviet Union has made that a very unpopular phrase.

But we do talk about "national goals" and "national policies." So the time may not be far off when some of the academic fraternity may start thinking about national planning, whether they have the courage to call it that or not.

The proposed transportation and land use planning program for the seven-county area in northeastern Ohio, which you have made public today, is an impressive achievement. And I say that without even having had an opportunity to examine its details.

The very fact that 7 counties, comprising a region where more than 2 million persons live and 140 municipal and township governments exercise authority, can conceive of getting together and come up with any plan at all is an achievement.

And it is an achievement that holds out the promise to dozens of similar regions throughout the country that they, too, can surmount their local rivalries and join in planning for their future.

Mayor Locher has told me that this study is the largest to be conceived of under the new provisions of the Highway Act of 1962, which was one of the major achievements of the Kennedy administration. And I am sure that Mr. Lowell Bridwell, who is Special Assistant to the Under Secretary for Transportation in the Department of Commerce, has told you of some of the accomplishments under that act.

From the very beginning of his administration President Kennedy recognized the need for greater coordination between highway and redevelopment activities in our cities.

There have been places where the juxtaposition of highway construction and slum clearance have demolished great swaths through the centers of some of our cities. Very often many of the hardships caused by such a massive dislocation of people and of commerce could have been avoided by more intelligent planning and coordination between construction activities.

Shortly after his inauguration the President directed the Secretary of Commerce and me to take steps to bring this coordination about. Mr. Bridwell has outlined the nature of this cooperation.

In his transportation message in April last year the President made clear that in the future highway plans should be an integral part of comprehensive community development plans. The implications of this too have been set forth by Mr. Bridwell.

In the Housing and Home Finance Agency we have given, during the Kennedy administration, the strongest possible emphasis to the importance of comprehensive planning.

In his special message to Congress on Housing and Community Development, early in 1961, the President said: "The city and its suburbs are interdependent parts of a single community, bound together by the web of transportation and other public facilities and by common economic interests. Bold programs in individual jurisdictions are no longer enough. Increasingly, community development must be a cooperative venture toward the common goals of the metropolitan region as a whole."

The President called for the establishment of an effective and comprehensive planning process in each metropolitan area, embracing all major activities, both public and private, which shape the community. And he emphasized that such a process must be democratic—for only when the citizens of a community have participated in selecting the goals which will shape their environment can they be expected to support the actions necessary to accomplish those goals.

To carry out these policy directions, the Housing Act of 1961, which the President signed in June of that year, included a number of provisions strengthening the Federal assistance given to communities that undertake comprehensive planning.

That act increased the Federal share of the cost of urban planning from half to two-thirds—to the same proportion as that for urban renewal assistance. It increased the total authorization for planning grants from $20 million to $75 million. And it authorized the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide technical assistance to agencies undertaking planning.

For the first time, the act made comprehensive planning for mass transportation expressly eligible. And—in a new program—it authorized $50 million in loans to public bodies to finance the acquisition, construction and improvement of transportation facilities and equipment where these were part of the development of a comprehensive transportation system.

The Housing Act of 1961 also established a new program to assist local public bodies in the acquisition of land to be used as permanent open space. This program authorized grants of $50 million for such aid. These grants could be made for up to 20 percent of the cost of acquiring such land. Or—if the grants were made to a public body with regional responsibilities—they could be for as much as 30 percent. In either case the land would have to be acquired in accordance with a comprehensive plan for the area.

To coordinate and implement better the program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency related to planning and community development, I established a new Office of Metropolitan Development. As the Assistant Administrator to head that Office I was able to get a man with extensive experience in this field—Victor Fischer.

In carrying out his responsibilities he works closely with John Kohl, the Assistant Administrator who heads a new Office of Transportation. This office is responsible for administering the program of loans and demonstration grants for mass transportation that was authorized in the Housing Act of 1961. Both of these officials are in constant communication with the Urban Renewal Administration, a constituent of the Housing and Home Finance Agency responsible for our major urban planning programs.

We believe strongly that planning for urban regions cannot be left exclusively to the technicians—be they city planners, highway engineers, economists or other specialists. The development of metropolitan areas must be guided by responsible local leaders—elected officials and others. At the same time the technical planning needs to be tied closely to comprehensive planning carried out under local and regional auspices.

Through the end of March the grants that have been made for urban planning under the Kennedy administration have amounted to $32.1 million for 697 projects—compared with $13.4 million for 493 projects in the 6 previous years.

These included 78 grants to metropolitan or regional planning bodies and 36 grants where transportation planning was involved.

Early in his administration the President instructed Secretary Hodges and me to undertake an immediate and extensive study of urban transportation problems and the role of the Federal Government in their solution.

The study was made for us by the Institute of Public Administration, a nonprofit educational and research organization headed by Luther Gulick. It carefully examined the transportation needs of some 40 communities, large and small, in all parts of the country. And the findings clearly showed the need for vigorous Federal support of State and local action in this field.

On the basis of this study the President proposed to Congress a long-range program of financial aid and technical assistance to help plan and develop a comprehensive and balanced urban transportation network.

But he recommended that this Federal assistance be limited to cases where there is a continuing program of comprehensive planning on an areawide basis, and where the assisted project will be administered through a public agency as part of an officially coordinated areawide transportation system.

The Senate has already passed this legislation, authorizing grants on a one-third matching basis up to $350 million. The Banking and Currency Committee in the House of Representatives has cleared the legislation by a bipartisan vote of 22 to 7, and it is now awaiting action by the House Rules Committee.

In the event this legislation is passed, the plan which you have announced today can be an important step toward qualifying for participation under this new program.

Although I have limited my remarks today to the physical side of community development, no one could read the daily newspapers without realizing that all of this would be meaningless unless we think in terms of people and the way they will live.

The problems of physical relationships within the community are important, of course. But they are not nearly so important as the problems of human relationships. Before any community can intelligently plan for its physical growth it must give thought to creating the understanding between people that is essential to building for the future.

Former Mayor Celebrezze understood that during the years of his leadership here in Cleveland. He understood the needs and the aspirations of the many groups who live in Cleveland, and he worked with all of them so they would all work together.

Now that he has come to Washington to head the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare he is doing the same thing on a national scale.

The same cooperation that exists between the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Department of Commerce in regard to physical planning exists between the HHFA and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in regard to the human relationships within cities.

None of these are problems and needs that can be compartmentalized and segmented and assigned to one particular administrative category or another. All of them are complex, interwoven and overlapping problems that demand the closest kind of cooperation between all of us.

Your luncheon today is a symbol of that cooperation. And I am glad that Mayor Locher invited me here to take part in it.

Hudson VFW Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include remarks I made in part on May 4, 1963 at the 40th anniversary banquet of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Hudson, Mass., in my district:

This occasion has great significance for the town of Hudson, and indeed for all of us, since from the very time of its inception, and before, the members of this organization have always exemplified the most inspiring kind of patriotism and the best kind of citizenship.

In war, its members have been a tower of strength in every generation in defending our country against its enemies.

In peace, they have unselfishly furnished the leadership and example that has been so meaningful and constructive for community, State and Nation, for our spiritual ideals, and for the promotion of the public good and well-being.

It is, therefore, with great pride that I join in this outstanding celebration, and extend to you all, as your Congressman and as your friend, my warm congratulations, commendation, and the faith and prayer that your great work will long continue.

Through your members and other gallant Americans and allies have fought a succession of bloody wars to preserve our blessed heritage, and for the liberation of the oppressed, we have by no means, as yet, realized our goals of freedom and world peace.

The Communist conspiracy is still with us, vigorously pressing its aims to dominate the world and to stifle the lamps of freedom. It has been responsible for much bloodshed, turmoil, strife, and injustice in the world. It is continuing its bitter struggle to capture, not only the territories, but the political independence and minds of men and women in the many nations where it continues its incessant warfare against human freedom.

But it is now increasingly evident that the Communists are losing the cold war. The might, power, and strength of our country and the free world is now becoming clear to all, even the leaders of the Kremlin.

If we but continue with firmness and strength to stand resolutely against the Communist conspiracy, its aggressions, its design, its infiltrations of free nations, we may yet even sooner than we think, achieve that peace and brotherhood which the whole world seeks and yearns for.

We must not allow the establishment of a Communist beachhead in this hemisphere, spreading subversion and violence, to threaten our safety and security and that of our neighbors.

We must stand by our commitments for ordered liberty and for justice, decency and collective encouragement and assistance for those who stand with us in the fateful struggle that could well determine the course of history for the next thousand years or more.

These tasks will require continued courage and firm, sagacious leadership, but I am sure that the American people will never abandon our historic resolve to protect our free institutions and the rights of man.

In this critical period, as we face one crisis after another, let us continue to show that indomitable spirit, allegiance and loyalty to the free way that has so gloriously marked the members of this organization, and others like you, who have stood and will continue to stand for God and country, for the dignity of man and for the cherished freedoms we so dearly cherish.

Let us hopefully look forward to the day, which we pray may soon come to afflicted mankind, when subversive conspiracies will cease and when judicial institutions will replace armed might as the effective instrument for implementing a just world peace and establishing in the world the blessings and fruits of human brotherhood.

Until that day comes, let us courageously face up to every task, keep our great Nation united, vigorous and strong, and wisely and patiently use our great power, spiritual and material, and our resources to secure a just, enduring peace and to guard our territorial integrity, political independence and free democratic institutions.

Economic Forecasting: A Risky Guide to Policymaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, policymakers in Government as well as in the private sector are relying upon economic forecasting to a larger and larger extent. Although the business of forecasting has made giant strides in recent decades, it is useful to be reminded that the forecasters and their forecasts often are mistaken. Their predictions of things to come—while useful—must not be relied upon exclusively for guidance in the area of economic policy.

In an excellent article in the New York Times of May 27, 1963, Mr. M. J. Rossant draws our attention to some of the weaknesses of economic forecasting and stresses the need for continuous improvement and refinement in the statistical tools available to forecasters.

Another observation made by Mr. Rossant is that many forecasters tend to stick together when doubts arise about the economic future. The belief that there is "safety in numbers" is not confined to forecasters, of course, but the article does point up that many economists are not doing their homework. Instead, they are consulting each other about what the indicators are saying and arriving at a fuzzy consensus.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Rossant's article from the May 27 New York Times in the Record at this point:

Forecasters in Slump

(By M. J. Rossant)

Something continues to be seriously wrong with the state of business forecasting. The sharp rise in economic activity comes as a shock to most economists, who had expected a decline during the first half of 1963.

Last year, business economists were gloating over the position of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, which had been overly optimistic concerning the 1962 outlook. The CEA's 1963 projections, however, look a lot better than most private forecasts. Its original prediction was for an average of $578 billion in gross national product, give or take $5 billion, depending on whether or not tax reductions were enacted.

This now appears to be on the low side, even without tax cuts. With GNP, the total value of all goods and services performed, running at an annual rate of $572 billion in the first quarter, the prospect is for a rise well above $583 billion, which was the upper limit of the council's forecast, when the actual results for 1963 are in.

Even so, the CEA will be much closer to the mark than the so-called "standard" forecast that represents the consensus of business analysts.

ONE UNABASHED BULL

At this stage, Sanford S. Parker of Fortune magazine, who was an unabashed bull about 1963's prospects when his fellow economists were bearish, appears the most prescient. He also made the fewest hedges, which is an occupational disease among forecasters anxious to guard against any glaring errors.

Economists have been rushing to raise their sights, bringing them more into line with reality. Their revisions, though, are not much help to businessmen who may have been guided by their initial predictions. Forecasts are supposed to be an aid to policy making, but their usefulness is minimal if, like the permanent floating crap game, they are subject to constant and abrupt change.

Whether businessmen act on the basis of economic forecasts is dabatable. Forecasters have attained a good deal of status, and no self-respecting executive suite is complete without one. This may not mean too much, but even when they are hired mainly for prestige purposes, they usually have some influence on policy. So their misgivings about the first half, which confirmed what a lot of businessmen were feeling, may have had an effect on economic activity, holding down the extent of the rise.

LUKEWARM OPTIMISM

Their new found optimism is still pretty lukewarm. The economists who serve as technical advisers to the Business Council, for example, reportedly predicted a GNP of $578 billion, which implies that the economy would be at a standstill during the second half. This belated catching up is hardly a forecast. Businessmen can do as well by consulting a gypsy fortune teller.

With one or two notable exceptions, forecasters have been in a slump ever since last summer. That was when many of the leading indicators turned down, suggesting that a decline was around the corner. According to Beryl L. Spinkel of Chicago's Harris Savings & Trust Co., "those analysts who mechanically applied the indicators last summer and fall, concluded that a near-term recession was inevitable."

The economic indicators measuring activity gave off some false alarms, but the real fault was that too much reliance was placed on them. The statistical tools available to forecasters have been continuously improved and refined, but they are still not foolproof.

One explanation may be in the tendency for forecasters to stick together when doubts arise. This belief that there is safety in numbers is not confined to forecasters. But though the economy rarely conforms to the majority view, expecially at turning points, many economists prefer to run with the pack than take an exposed position.

This act of togetherness points up another failing, which is that many economists are not doing their homework. Instead, they are consulting each other about what the indicators are saying and arriving at a fuzzy consensus.

The cure for forecasters is not in the stars but in reappraising both tools and methods. Unless they do, they may have to share their space with tea leaves, crystal balls or divining rods. Meanwhile, the most promising augury for better business is that the standard forecast continues to call for a sluggish expansion.

Georgia-Florida Lawmakers Build Strong "Navy States"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for reprinting in the Congressional Record an article from the pen of Pope Haley which appeared in the Florida Times-Union, May 26, 1963.

The article follows:

In Helping Build a Strong Navy, Georgia-Florida Lawmakers Have Also Built Strong "Navy States"

(By Pope Haley)

Georgia has racked up another credit to its claim as a "Navy State" with the appointment of Georgia-born Adm. David L. McDonald to the Navy's highest post.

Admiral McDonald, 56, a native of Maysville, Ga., and son of a Georgia preacher, was picked by President Kennedy for the job of Chief of Naval Operations, succeeding Adm. George W. Anderson when his term expires August 1.

Admiral McDonald graduated from the Naval Academy in 1928, and became a naval aviator in 1931. He has served in a wide variety of assignments during his career, in the United States, Europe, and the Pacific, including a 2-year tour as flight training officer for the Naval Air Operational Training Command in Jacksonville from 1942 to 1944.

He had just reported to London as commander of naval forces in Europe when he was tapped by the President for the Navy's top uniformed assignment.

Although a coastal State with some 100 miles of ocean front, Georgia had little early tradition as a home of seagoing people. In contrast, from Florida's earliest history, the sea has been an important element in the life of its people. With the longest coastline of any Eastern State, Florida has always enjoyed a familiarity with the open water as an invitation, a challenge, and a source of livelihood.

Florida, whose earliest history is closely associated with seafaring adventures exploring the unknown, was recognized as a "Navy State," a century ago when Jefferson Davis, President of the Confederate States of America, chose a Floridian, Stephen Mallory, as Secretary of the Navy in his Cabinet.

Mallory, a resident of Pensacola, was elected by the State legislature to the U.S. Senate in 1851, and was serving his second term when he resigned in 1861 to enter the Confederate cabinet. After the war, he was held in Fort Lafayette, in New York harbor, until March 1866, when he was released on parole and returned to Pensacola to resume the practice of law. He died March 9, 1873, and is buried in Pensacola. His son, Stephen Mallory, Jr., entered the Confederate Army at the age of 16, but soon transferred to the Navy as a midshipman. After the war, he returned to Pensacola to practice law. He subsequently won election to the State legislature, the State senate, and the U.S. House of Representatives, and in 1897 he, too, was named to the U.S. Senate by the legislature.

The elder Mallory and John H. Reagan, a Texas lawyer who served the Confederacy as Postmaster General, were the only two members of Davis' Cabinet to serve in the same post for the duration. Judah P. Benjamin served successively in 3 posts, and altogether, 14 men held the 6 Confederate cabinet posts during the life of the Confederacy.

The 20th century, two World Wars and the demands of preparedness and national defense have wrought great changes, both in intensifying Florida's role as a "Navy State" and in increasing Georgia's active participation in the development of the Nation's seapower.

Coincident with the development of the Navy's air arm, Pensacola, the home of the Confederate Secretary of the Navy, became the primary training ground for fledgling Navy fliers, which it remains. Key West became a major operational base for the submarine fleet, and major installations in Jacksonville serve the Navy's operational air arm and its carriers.

Similarly, numerous defense installations in Georgia have made the Navy uniform a common and welcome sight, and turned the thoughts of countless Georgia boys, born and bred far from the smell of salt water, to careers in the seagoing service.

Many factors, including geography, climate, and the availability of desirable sites for the development of facilities, have contributed to the mounting importance of the Georgia-Florida area in the tremendous expansion, during recent decades, of Navy training and operational activities.

By no means the least of these have been the positions of high responsibility occupied by Members of the States' congressional delegations. Georgia is unique in having its Senator, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, and the dean of its House delegation, Representative CARL VINSON, of Milledgeville, serving respectively as chairmen of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees. Representative CHARLES BENNETT, of Jacksonville, ranks high on the House committee, and the Navy had no stancher supporter than the late Senator Park Trammell, who as a committee member contributed much to the pre-World War II development of naval power.

Representative VINSON, now the dean of the House, having served continuously since November 8, 1914, was for many years prior to unification of the armed services, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee. With unification, the naval affairs and military affairs committees were consolidated, and as senior member, VINSON became chairman of the Armed Services Committee, but he has never lost his close attachment to the seagoing service. He is often affectionately referred to as "the unofficial Secretary of Defense."

Georgia and Florida have profited from the interest of their elected Representatives in the Navy, but even more, the Nation has profited from having, when it was needed, the strong Navy which Georgia and Florida lawmakers, with vision, have helped create.

Albert Rains Speech Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, each year my alma mater, Snead College, at Boaz, Ala., conducts the Albert Rains speech contest in which contestants address themselves to a major issue of the day. This year the orations dealt with the Monroe Doctrine and I believe they merit the attention of my colleagues.

First award in the contest went to Barton Lewis, of Birmingham, while Mrs. Annette Black, of Arab, took second place and Miss Brenda Mosley, of Pontiac, Mich., received third prize.

I have been proud of this contest and of the winners every year. I believe their views on this very timely topic should be of interest to all of us and I am submitting the three winning speeches for the RECORD:

THE PRESENT ATTITUDE TOWARD THE MONROE DOCTRINE

(By Barton Lewis)

It is apparent that we all know the basic facets of the Monroe Doctrine. But what exactly is the opinion of this great paper that has gone through many trials and attacks. The most recent attack was that of the Cuban crisis. But were people actually concerned? To an extent—yes—but during interviews, I found that people were not as concerned as one might believe. To give more thought on this I found in talking to one man that the problem could be solved by dropping three bombs. One on Cuba, one in Russia, and one in Germany. But just as he had finished his statement, he retracted it and said that we couldn't do that because he had a son stationed in Germany and that the explosion could affect him. The main idea that came to my mind was that each person I interviewed was concerned mainly with how it would affect his family and himself.

But we cannot say that the Communists have not had a lot to say about the matter—they have. Mr. Khrushchev says that the Monroe Doctrine will one day become the "Bolshevik Doctrine." He also went so far as to say that "The Monroe Doctrine has been dead for 137 years."

These are harsh statements and statements that make Americans mad. The latest trend is now aimed toward our bearded friend in Cuba. A resident of Boaz said that Castro should be tarred and feathered and given to the poor, common people to do as they wished with him.

President Kennedy and his brother Bobby, share the same opinion about the matter. That the United States of America will not be pushed and kicked around like a ball.

A nice lady in Birmingham tells of the Bible story in which a giant red bear came down on the brave eagle. The symbol of the Communists is the red bear. The eagle refers to the United States.

What have we stated thus far? That people have classed themselves into one of three classes:

Second. The "don't care group" who are concerned for themselves only.

Third. The group that would want to blow up everything except their homes, their property—and if he lived in Birmingham—tell them not to blow up the city jail.

Khrushchev has recently made a statement saying: "We will have the United States during my reign."

Have you been reading the newspapers? The Russians are thinking about a new premier to replace Mr. Khrushchev, and he is making wild statements. The man doesn't know how long he has left to go, but he is scaring some people plenty. The old lady I was speaking of got it in her mind she needed something sound and strong to lean on. The most true and positive answer I got was from here in Boaz by a man who is quite a person to my way of thinking. The person said, "The United States has let the Russians take over Cuba. Almost every time a weapon leaves Cuba by our orders a new missile comes in by Russia's order. Only patience and hard thinking can ever correct the fault of the United States and Russia." Russia, according to reports, is not going to make any harsh movements. We should not be afraid of ourselves, and be on guard to remember what this Monroe Doctrine has been through. The doctrine worked because it had people who believed in it; who were standing behind it. This is the present attitude—it is as near as the person you are sitting by.

What is his attitude?

HISTORY OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE

(By Annette Black)

Today the United States is facing more critical problems than she has faced in many a decade. We are facing a foe who is advancing; sometimes quietly, sometimes violently, but always swiftly.

The Communists now control a major portion of the world and it is their goal to conquer it all. It is up to us, as a freedom loving people to stop this deadly advance. We have seen communism advance through Western Europe and we have watched them silently while they have slowly gathered most of Asia to their vast territorial gains.

When and where are we going to put a stop to this mass enslavement?

While we have watched, the Communists have sneaked right into our own backdoor. Cuba, only 90 miles off the Florida coast, has become a full-fledged Communist satellite. Are we going to watch while the Communists take over all of Central and South America? If not, what must we do?

Many people believe that this problem can be met by enforcing the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine was presented to the world December 2, 1823, in President James Monroe's end of the year address to Congress.

In essence, the Monroe Doctrine stated that the Americas and Europe were two separate spheres of political activity and should have as little to do with one another as possible. This had been the accepted theory since the time of George Washington.

The doctrine had a dual mesage. It was aimed at both Russia and the continental European powers. In 1822, Alexander I, Czar of Russia, had issued a decree claiming the entire Pacific Coast of North America and the surrounding seas down to the 51st parallel. President Monroe immediately had Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, draft a protest which stated that the American continents were no longer subject to European colonization. At this time, the holy alliance, Russia, Prusia, and Austria, had decided to crush the Spanish Revolution and put the despotic Ferdinand back on the throne. Monroe was afraid that Ferdinand, when restored to power, would try to reclaim his former colonies in Central and South America who had proclaimed their independence.

In August of 1823, George Canning, the British foreign secretary, and the U.S. envoy, Richard Rush, were discussing the dangers of intervention in Central and South America. Canning proposed a joint declaration warning the European powers against any attempt at reconquering Spanish America. President Monroe, however, decided that it was time for our country to stand on its own. The United States was, at this time, a young democracy, while most of the world's great powers were still ruled by kings or emperors.

The Monroe Doctrine stated that "The American continents * * * are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power * * *. We could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

European reaction was hostile. The United States was not a recognized power. The Revolutionary War had been over for only 40 years. We had no military power, no Army, and only five warships. The Monroe Doctrine may have been presumptous, but it worked.

This document has always held the world's respect because we have always had the determination to enforce it. Since it has been in effect, not one Latin American state has lost its independence as a result of outright aggression from outside this hemisphere.

We today, must not be afraid to move ahead. If we stand still, we surrender our chance of survival. Our Nation has more advantages, wealth, educational facilities, and more freedom than any nation on earth. If we fail as a nation, it is because we fail as individuals.

The United States is the only power that can remove Castro and release Cuba from communistic domination.

We must remember what President Monroe said as he proclaimed the Monroe Doctrine 140 years ago, "There was danger in standing still or moving ahead, and I thought it was the wisest policy to risk the latter course."

THE MONROE DOCTRINE AS A LOGICAL INSTRUMENT

(By Brenda Mosley)

In the past few months we have heard more about the Monroe Doctrine than ever before. Since last September its principle has been set before us in practically all forms of communication. Until then most of us had a knowledge of the doctrine only through our history books.

Let us take a brief look at the doctrine. In the second decade of the 19th century the world powers were in an uproar. Spain, France, and England were involved with the United States in Latin American affairs. President Monroe decided to settle the matter of foreign policy once and for all. His program can be broken into three principles: noncolonization, abstention, and the "hands off the New World" policy. Since this first speech by President Monroe, in 1823, the doctrine has grown to higher ranks and encompassed almost all the basic ideas of the U.S. foreign policy.

What does "logical instrument" mean? "Logical" means in accordance with the inference reasonably to be drawn from preceding events. "Instrument" is that by means of which any work is performed or result is effected. Therefore "logical instrument" is a reasonable means through which something is accomplished. How then can we say the doctrine is a logical instrument? I base my opinion on past experiences. Time and again the doctrine was tested and each time the potential aggressor met the stern reminder by the U.S. Government to keep out of the Western Hemisphere or meet the consequences.

In 1845 the doctrine again came into focus. It was applied to the extension of our settlements over our territories that were not before occupied.

In 1846 a former president of Ecuador organized forces in Europe to try to recapture his position by force. It failed, but Secretary of State James Buchanan sent reassurance of U.S. help.

In Yucatan in 1848 an Indian revolt prompted the Government to offer to transfer its powers to Great Britain or Spain. President Polk immediately sent a reply stating that such an idea was absurd. He also said under the Monroe Doctrine such a transfer could not be considered.

In 1864 with the United States still engaged in Civil War, Napoleon sent Maximilian to take over in Mexico. After the war ended the following year, Secretary of State Seward reminded Napoleon of our foreign policy and demanded immediate withdrawal of the French Army from Mexico.

In 1870 Italy offered to buy the Island of Saint-Barthelemy which belonged to Sweden. President Grant objected and negotiations were stopped.

In 1895 Great Britain tried to take over the contested area around the boundaries of British Guiana and Venezuela. President Cleveland sent a message to Queen Victoria stating that "the traditional and established policy of this Government is firmly opposed to a forcible increase by any European power of its territorial possessions on this continent." Britain submitted the dispute to arbitration.

In 1904 President Roosevelt initiated the Roosevelt corollary. It is the principle that inasmuch as we permit no European nation to intervene in the affairs of Latin American countries, we must ourselves assume the responsibility of preserving order and protecting life and property in those countries. The doctrine had given us powers and obligations we had not fully been aware of. The United States has the right, however reluctantly to intervene in Latin American affairs.

In 1911 an American syndicate proposed to sell a 400,000-acre tract of land in lower California to a Japanese syndicate. A resolution against such action was passed by Congress. This resolution was the first extension of the Monroe Doctrine to an Asiatic power, and the first extension of the Doctrine to cover control of American soil.

On October 27, 1913, in a speech to the Southern Commercial Congress at Mobile, Ala., President Wilson anounced the Wilson interpretation of the Doctrine. He promoted friendly relations with Latin American states.

President Wilson's policy was abandoned by the Hoover administration in the late 1920's. The abandonment was formalized in a statement by Secretary Stimson. He said the United States would recognize new governments not upon the question of constitutional legitimacy of new government—but upon its capacity to fulfill its obligations as a member of the family of nations.

The hemisphere foreign ministers warned the European powers at Panama in 1939 not to bring their conflict into American waters.

The act of Havana in 1940 dealt with the transfer of rights or interests in Latin American countries.

In 1962 we were again faced with the doctrine in the Cuban situation. In 1960 Mr. Khrushchev asserted that the Monroe Doctrine is dead. He also said, Now the remains of this doctrine should best be buried, as every dead body is, so that it does not poison the air by its decay.

The principles of the Monroe Doctrine are as valid today as they were in 1823. The principles the United States enunciated in the face of attempts of old imperialism to intervene in the affairs of this hemisphere are as valid today for the attempts of the new imperialism.

Before President Kennedy's speech on October 22 of last year, he received a lot of criticism for his inactivity toward Cuba. The American people were frustrated, angry, and deeply upset by the sudden appearance of Russians in Cuba. So in a sober speech the President added what has been called the Kennedy corollary to the Doctrine. He said, it shall be the policy of this Nation to regard any nuclear missile launched from Cuba against any nation in the Western Hemisphere as an attack by the Soviet Union on the United States requiring a full retaliatory response upon the Soviet Union. Later he warned Russia that any hostile move would be met by whatever action is needed.

The people were behind the statements of the President. We can be pushed just so far until we begin to fight back. The New York Times printed that so long as the United States has the power to enforce it, the Monroe Doctrine will be alive and kicking.

We believe in the Monroe Doctrine as a basic principle of our foreign policy. It is our golden rule in that we are not unduly aggressive of any other nation and expect other nations to treat us with the same respect.

We, as a world leader, must have principles. We must stand firmly on these principles or lose our leadership. The doctrine has served us in times past—and served us well. It is reasonable to assume it will continue to serve us.

Our Managed Cabinet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Tablet of May 3, 1963, there appeared an article on a quote attributed to former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare RIBICOFF, when asked by a reporter why he had not favored aid to children of nonpublic schools while a Cabinet officer. His response is shocking and indicates to me that our Cabinet officers, apparently, are not free to say what they think. Had I been former Secretary RIBICOFF, I would have resigned if all of my thoughts were being so censored. But everyone has his own brand of politics to play.

The article follows:

Suppression of Views on Fair Federal Aid

Senator Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut, in an address in Congress Monday, unveiled a program for recognition of the children of nonpublic schools. He was later asked by a reporter why he did not favor such a program when he was President Kennedy's Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. He replied: "I was not free to say what I thought when I was Secretary; now I am free to talk on my own as a Senator."

The present Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Hon. Anthony J. Celebrezze, is like Mr. Ribicoff when he was Secretary. He is, publicly anyhow, strongly opposed to treating all children alike when Federal funds are appropriated for education. But then, maybe, he is not free to take the position he would like to. Perhaps when he goes to another post, he will be a free man and able to stand up for fair play.

Isn't it a sad anomaly that public men must take a position contrary to their own views as well as to the justice of a cause, just because of the job they hold? The land of the free and the brave is entitled to something better.

Inconsistency, Thy Name Is Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the May 27 issue of the Dallas Morning News clearly shows why U.S. prestige and leadership is sinking to an all-time low. There is no way for our friends, our enemies, or our own people to tell what policy President Kennedy follows. The only way he has been consistent during his term of office has been in his complete inconsistency on all important problems.

Glaring Inconsistency

It is hardly news to report that American foreign policy is inconsistent. For nearly 20 years, our dealings with dozens of nations have reflected more schizophrenia than logic. But a recent example of glaring conflict in official U.S. policy with respect to two nations—Indonesia and Haiti—cannot be ignored.

For months Washington has been bearing down hard on the Duvalier regime in Haiti. American aid to this regime was cut off long ago. For the past month we have been redoubling our diplomatic pressure to force the regime to collapse. Recently the State Department announced that U.S. diplomatic relations with Haiti had been suspended—at least temporarily.

What caused all this toughness by Washington? Primarily the fact that Haiti is a dictatorship. It is corrupt.

President Duvalier has milked all the money he can out of the country and any nation that would come along with aid, but he has done nothing to relieve the poverty of his people.

The straw that broke the camel's back—resulting in our suspension of diplomatic relations last week—was the fact that President Duvalier, who was elected to a 6-year term in 1957 and constitutionally prohibited from succeeding himself in office, has extended his term for another 6 years. Significantly, diplomatic relations were suspended on the first day of Duvalier's new term.

If these were good reasons for meting out such harsh treatment—and we're not questioning the fact that they were—why has Washington failed to act with comparable toughness against Indonesia?

There can be no challenging the fact that Indonesia's President Sukarno has been at least as dictatorial as Duvalier. He certainly has been as corrupt. His people are as poverty-stricken as the people of Haiti, and under Sukarno's regime their lot has grown increasingly worse.

Sukarno recently pulled almost the same stunt that Duvalier performed to keep himself in power. If anything, Sukarno's was worse. The People's Consultative Congress in Indonesia—whose members have all been appointed by Sukarno—"elected" him President of Indonesia for life. The Indonesian constitution of 1945 required election of a new President every 5 years. Sukarno has already served in the office for 18 years—and now he is in for life.

To date there hasn't even been a peep of protest out of Washington concerning this matter. The same officials who have screamed their heads off about undemocratic procedures in Haiti have remained strangely silent about this exactly parallel, if slightly more outrageous, move by Sukarno.

What is the difference between Haiti and Indonesia? Both have undemocratic, corrupt, dictatorial regimes. Both have ignored their constitutions and robbed their people. The only real difference we can see is that Sukarno, if anything, is worse.

While Duvalier is a nuisance, he certainly constitutes no threat to the security of this or any other nation, while Sukarno has been a constant threat to peace in Southeast Asia.

In spite of these facts, Washington has taken an openly hostile attitude toward Haiti but has courted Indonesia, treating Sukarno as if he were a genuine friend and statesman. While U.S. aid and diplomatic relations have been suspended in Haiti, we maintain cordial relations with Sukarno and continue to send him aid. Last year alone, the United States sent $83 million worth of foreign aid to Indonesia.

One might argue that the basis for Washington's conflicting policy is the fact that Haiti is in our hemisphere, while Indonesia is not—and that obviously we ought to be tougher with dictators in our own backyard.

If that were the explanation, it would be impossible to reconcile the fact that we are coexisting with Castro—who is only 90 miles away—while we are fighting a war against his Red cousins in Vietnam, thousands of miles away in Sukarno's neighborhood.

Freedom From Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court decision and opinions in Engel against Vitale, popularly known as the School Prayer Case has caused much discussion within and without the Congress. I have recently read a most interesting article by Frank A. Cashman, editor of the Cornell Law Forum, published in the April 30, 1963 issue of that newspaper, and I wish to share it with my colleagues:

On Appeal: Freedom From Religion

(By Frank A. Cashman)

(Editor's Note.—This is the second in a series of discussions on personalities, decisions and issues which have helped to shape our modern legal philosophy.)

"We are a religious people, whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being." *Zorach* v. *Clauson* 343 U.S. 306, 313 (1951); cited in *Engel* v. *Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421, 442 (1962).

The recent landmark decision of *Engel* v. *Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421 (1962), is an example of the type of case which the U.S. Supreme Court had no business deciding. A simple reading of the majority opinion by Justice Black will reveal that the Court could find no adequate legal basis for its much-criticized holding, and in lieu of sound reasoning, Justice Black substituted a review of ancient and barely relevant English history dealing with the establishment of a national religion.

It is signficant that the majority opinion fails to cite a single case either as representative of a line of authority which the Supreme Court is extending, or which the Court feels constrained to overrule.

A great deal has been written both pro and con about the decision, but there appears to be more confusion among the general public as to the implications of the case than the opinion itself would justify. The case involves the validity of a prayer authorized by the New York State Board of Regents to be read at the beginning of each school day throughout the State. Petitioners, the parents of some schoolchildren, attacked the prayer as a violation of the guarantees of the first amendment of the Federal Constitution respecting the establishment of a religion and freedom of religion. Respondents claimed that because the prayer was nondenominational, and because any student could be excused from reciting the prayer or from attending class while the prayer was being recited, the ruling authorizing the prayer was valid.

Before the present term has ended, the Supreme Court will be given two more opportunities to discuss the issues presented in *Engel* v. *Vitale*, but these opportunities threaten to be wasted on rhetoric rather than reason. See *Murray* v. *Curlett*, 278 Md. 239, 179 A. 2d 698 (1962), cert. granted, 371 U.S. 809 (1962); and *Schempp* v. *School Dist. of Abington*, 201 F. Supp. 815 (E.D. Pa. 1962), leave to appeal, 371 U.S. 807 (1962).

WHAT ARE THE ISSUES?

In spite of the scholarly dissertation written by the Court, the issues which were on appeal in *Engel* v. *Vitale* do not appear to have a great deal to do either with the innocuous regents prayer or with the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Just as the process of growing up is the process of testing the limits to which a child may go before parental authority is invoked, so the Supreme Court appears to be testing the limits of public opinion on the issue of governmental support to religion.

It is no surprise that these first amendment cases arise during the current debate on Federal aid to parochial schools. As clearly as the lines were drawn between petitioner and respondent in the principal case, so the lines have been drawn between the proponents of aid to parochial schools and the opponents thereof. This is not to say that the Supreme Court was vicariously adding its voice to the controversy within the Government, but the implications of the Court decision are unmistakable in the realm of this kind of Government subsidy.

The complete failure of the majority opinion to deal with the questions raised by the respondents as to the validity of federally sanctioned references to a divine being on our coins, in our national anthem and in the pledge of allegiance to the flag reflects not so much contempt on the part of the Court for these arguments, but instead it seems to indicate the unwillingness of the Court to come to grips with the problems as actually presented in the case.

WHAT THE ISSUES ARE NOT

Any discussion of what the issues of *Engel* v. *Vitale* are is perhaps best approached by some indications as to what they are not. Given its widest possible interpretation, the board of regents' ruling has nothing whatever to do with freedom of religion. At best, the case lays down a dictum that the first amendment is to be interpreted as guaranteeing freedom from religion. Stated more simply, the Supreme Court has inferred that the best way to promote freedom of religion is to protect the people from any government influence in religions. By asserting that the right not to believe is as important as the right freely to believe, the Court has attempted to remove all governments from the support of any religious preference. Almost as clearly, the holding of the case has little or nothing to do with the establishment clause of the first amendment. Absent coercion of any kind, there can be no real attempt to establish a religion. Allowing students to choose whether or not to participate in the prayer reading is the same thing as allowing them to choose whether or not to participate in any organized religion.

If Engel against Vitale was decided neither on establishment nor on freedom of religion grounds, then the only other basis for the decision comes from Justice Douglas' concurring opinion. Justice Douglas preferred to reach the same conclusion as the majority (unconstitutionality of the ruling) on the ground that tax money was being spent to support a religious activity. However, Justice Douglas recognized that this method of attack would be unavailable at the Federal level because of *Frothingham* v. *Mellon*, 262 U.S. 447 (1923), in which the Court denied a Federal taxpayer standing to sue. (See 370 U.S. note 6 at 441.) To say that the first amendment of the Federal Constitution applies to the States, but not to the Federal Government is not only inequitable but irrational. Of course, to say that a State may not recognize the existence of a Supreme Being, but that the Federal Government may is equally irrational.

It need not be only briefly noted that the possible implications of a strict adherence to the holding of Engel against Vitale would necessitate the withdrawal of all governments from active support of religious holidays (Christmas decorations as well as any incidental religious observances in schools) and religious activities of all kinds.

A FRUSTRATING PRECEDENT

From all of the foregoing, it appears amply evident that in attempting to frame a broad principle, the Supreme Court has created a monster which only it is capable of destroying. Hopefully the Court's decisions in the two pending cases will clear the air for judicial reasoning based on enforceable legal logic. There can be nothing more frustrating to the practicing lawyer than a precedent which is impossible to apply, and there can be nothing more frustrating to the general public than a Supreme Court unwilling or unable to assume the responsibility of fashioning practical answers to constitutional dilemmas.

No National Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat commented editorially in its weekend issue of May 18–19 on the demise of the President's proposed aid to education bill. This editorial cuts away the side issues—racial and religious problems that would have to be faced if much aid were voted—and puts a spotlight on the real point, the fact that such aid is not needed, that we do not have the crisis which he had asserted was the basis of his legislative suggestion. It not only negates the need, but goes on to point out the excellent progress which has been made by our local communities in dealing with the job of giving an education to our expanding population. We have not yet solved all of the problems; we still have to finish the job of educational quantity, that is assuring every child an education, and we must begin to concentrate more on educational quality. The President misses these points, but I am sure the men and women in our local communities, on our school boards, in our PTA's and before the blackboards teaching our children will turn themselves to the remaining tasks with the same degree of interest and effectiveness that they displayed in avoiding the educational crisis upon which the President's aid to education bill was predicated.

WHILE J.F.K. WAS CRYING "WOLF"

Last week, a House Education Subcommittee quietly shelved President Kennedy's proposal to have the Federal Government grant $1,500 million over the next 4 years to public schools for building classrooms and raising teachers' salaries.

Why, in view of earlier lamentations in Washington—from the President on down—that American schools were faced with a crisis, if not disaster, was there no loud public outcry against the subcommittee's action?

The U.S. News & World Report, checking into the matter, has come up with a statistical answer which is simply amazing in the light of all the propaganda to the contrary.

While Mr. Kennedy has been calling for Federal aid to education as an imperative need of the Nation, American schools have weathered the postwar population boom through State and local efforts, and are now in better shape than they have ever been before in their history.

A shortage of classrooms had been cited as one of the major needs for Federal help, even before Mr. Kennedy became President. As far back as the mid-1950's, it was estimated that the shortage would reach 400,000 or more rooms by 1960.

What's happened?

Instead of increasing, the shortage—which is merely an estimate based on the optimum number of rooms required if every class was of the ideal size—has gone down every year but one since 1956.

Instead of increasing, the classroom shortage has declined by 24 percent over the 7-year period for which such records have been kept.

A shortage of teachers, caused in part by inadequate pay, was cited as another major need for Federal help.

What's happened?

Again, except for 1 year when the ratio did not change and 1 year when the ratio went up by a bare 0.2 percent, there has been a constant improvement in the overall ratio of teachers to pupils. In high schools, the change has been negligible, but in grade school the average teacher load has dropped from 30.8 to 28.5 pupils.

Teachers' pay has advanced by 164 percent since 1946 to an average of $5,940, which as far as women are concerned is a higher average than other women college graduates earn.

As for total spending for schools, that has increased by 166 percent in the last 15 years, from $5,700 million, or $273 per pupil, in 1947–48 to $19,500 million, or $547 per pupil, in 1962–63.

On the basis of these figures—which give such a different picture of the school situation in the United States than Frontier news managers have been reporting—there is a new reason for rejecting Mr. Kennedy's proposal for multibillion Federal subsidy to schools.

Much reluctance heretofore has been attributed to Congress unwillingness to tackle the religious and racial issues involved and to its deep-seated fear that Federal aid will lead inevitably to Federal control.

Now, however, the strongest reason is said to be that Congressmen no longer believe that Federal aid to public schools is needed—that while the Kennedy administration has been shouting to high heaven about the national school crisis, the States and localities have largely resolved it.

Our Cute Attorney General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, a very revealing story of a very secret backroom meeting between the Attorney General and others appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 26.

It indicates one thing to me—President Kennedy and his brother, Bobby, thus far have been afraid to honor their campaign promises of 1960 by insisting on meaningful civil rights legislation. They prefer to make grandstand plays, giving the appearance they are doing much for the individual rights of the citizen, enough to tide them over fairly touchy situations. It is no wonder, therefore, that the "secret meeting" did not turn out as well as Bobby thought:

N.Y. NEGROES AND BOBBY—BOTH SHOCKED

(By Sue Solet)

"We were a little shocked at the extent of his naivete," said James Baldwin of Robert F. Kennedy yesterday.

The Attorney General "has a full appreciation of the problem and the depths of the Negroes' feelings," countered a Justice Department spokesman. Mr. Baldwin, who gathered a dozen Negroes and whites—none of them spokesmen for organized civil rights groups—to meet in secret with the Attorney General Friday, said Mr. Kennedy was "shocked at the passion displayed by many disparate Negroes" in both the North and South.

The meeting, which was not a secret for very long, was held at the request of Mr. Kennedy, and took place in the Attorney General's New York apartment at 24 Central Park South. Mr. Baldwin, author of the bestseller, "The Fire Next Time," suggested the names of the participants at a breakfast meeting with Mr. Kennedy in Washington Thursday.

Dr. Kenneth Clark, the psychologist whose research was one of the main bases for the 1954 Supreme Court decision on school segregation, said the meeting was "tragic."

"There was no communication," he said. "I think we might as well have been talking different languages."

Dr. Clark said Mr. Kennedy "was in an extremely difficult position. This in no way tempered the sense of urgency and desperation which everyone was communicating to him."

Mr. Kennedy "is by no means a devil," Dr. Clark said. "The Attorney General is clearly among the best that America has to offer on this issue."

During the meeting he said, "there were times when we just broke out into hysterical laughter. Even the laughter wasn't laughter. It was the laughter of desperation."

"I didn't know whether to laugh or cry or both," Dr. Clark said. "We were unable to communicate clearly and skillfully that this was not a group of Negroes begging the white power structure to be nice to Negroes. We were trying to say that this was an emergency for our country, as Americans. This never got over."

Among the Negroes present were Singers Lena Horne and Harry Belafonte, Lorraine Hansberry, the playwright; Mr. Baldwin's brother, David, an actor; Dr. Edwin C. Berry, director of the Chicago Urban League; Dr. Clark, professor of psychology at City College, and Clarence B. Jones, counsel to the Gandhi Society, headed by the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King.

Mr. Kennedy, Burke Marshall, head of the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division, and Actor Rip Torn were the only whites present.

Earlier, Mr. Baldwin had been quoted by Life magazine as saying:

"The spinelessness of the administration has had a terrible effect (on racial matters).

"It's incumbent on Washington now to take a moral position and stop playing politics."

There was some speculation that Mr. Baldwin's statements in lectures along those lines led the Attorney General to call the meeting.

In a post mortem press conference at his apartment yesterday, Mr. Baldwin said the meeting "never got around" to specific proposals, "partly because of the mutual shock."

But, he said, Mr. Kennedy "now knows more about the Negro situation than he did before."

"He feels, in part justifiably," said Mr. Baldwin, "that his administration has made some steps in civil rights that no previous administration made.

"But as one of the students said to him: 'If this is the best you can do, the best is not enough.' The record of the Justice Department is totally inadequate."

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss racial segregation and the possibility of racial strife in the North, Mr. Baldwin said. But it concentrated instead on what the Attorney General and his brother, President Kennedy, could do to make their position clear on civil rights.

HE JUST LAUGHED

Mr. Baldwin said that when a Freedom Rider, Jerome Smith, 25, proposed that President Kennedy personally escort Negro students into the University of Alabama, the Attorney General "just laughed."

"He said it would be just the same as making a speech," Mr. Baldwin said. "He didn't get the point at all."

He said he "got through" to Mr. Kennedy when he expressed doubt that many Negroes "would be willing to fight to free Cubans for a government that can't free Negroes." Mr. Kennedy "was surprised at that," Mr. Baldwin said.

It was understood that the meeting became a "shambles" at this point.

The discussion was "heated" with the Attorney General arguing a little defending the administration, and asking questions, the novelist said.

"I am not prepared to say it was a failure," Mr. Baldwin said. "No one can afford to look on it as a failure. It has got to be looked at as the beginning of a dialog."

Dr. Clark said that one issue raised was the role of the FBI in southern civil rights cases. The Attorney General was told that since "the FBI uses Southern agents in investigations of civil rights abuses, the role of the FBI is coercive rather than protective."

"This issue was not dealt with by Mr. Kennedy," Dr. Clark said. "At one point Lena Horne asked him straight out: 'Are you not the boss of the FBI?' "

The psychologist himself raised the question of appointing a Negro to advise the President and the Attorney General of Negroes' feelings on civil rights.

"There ought to be someone," Dr. Clark said, "who has the intelligence, the training, and the courage to make this kind of knowledge available to the Attorney General and the President continually—as his job."

"This wasn't dealt with, either," he said. "Certainly the meeting convinced me that this is a very great lack in the present administration. I don't think people realize what a technical, difficult problem civil rights is. It's not a problem you play by ear."

Dr. Clark said a "recurrent theme" of the session was the belief among Negroes that the Kennedy administration's actions on civil rights are based on politics rather than morals.

HOUSING A TOPIC

Among the other topics discussed were segregated housing, particularly in Chicago, and the effect that the Government can have on residential and school segregation through its urban renewal program. Mr. Baldwin also suggested that the President use a fireside-chat format to make an unequivocal, absolutely clear statement on civil rights.

Mr. Baldwin said all the participants warned Mr. Kennedy about the possibility of "a major clash between Negroes and whites in the North."

"There's a tremendous gap between the bulk of the Negro people and his office," Mr. Baldwin said. "And something he doesn't realize—there's an increasing gap between the bulk of the Negro people and me."

"Like most Americans," he said, "Bobby Kennedy would really have no way of knowing what the extremity of the Negro's situation is."

"It was imperative that he be made to feel what every Negro feels."

Mr. Baldwin said the impetus for the meeting might have come from a telegram he sent to the Attorney General recently, expressing dissatisfaction with the Kennedy administration's handling of the Birmingham situation.

On Wednesday, Mr. Baldwin said, he got a call from Mr. Marshall proposing a meeting. The participants were deliberately chosen from outside civil rights groups so "we wouldn't have to worry about putting any organization on the spot" in the discussion, Mr. Baldwin said.

Part II. "The Elite and the Electorate," the True New Frontier Philosophy, Expressed by Senators Fulbright and Clark, as More Power for the President, Less for Congress and the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, commenting further on my concern over the articles submitted for the symposium on the subject, "The Elite and the Electorate" or "Is Government by the People Possible?" sponsored by the Fund for the Republic's Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, by Senators J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, discussing the latter herein.

Senator CLARK discusses the "Increasing Role of Government," and suggests that the executive branch be strengthened "at the expense of the legislature" and he makes it clear that the legislature includes State and local legislative bodies as well as Congress.

The seeds of distrust of the legislative process is sown by the statements such as "whether we look at any one of these, we react to what we see with scarcely concealed contempt."

The Senator misjudges my views because I look with pride at our constitutionally founded legislative process in general as being superior to any form of government yet devised by man.

Senator CLARK points derision at Thomas Jefferson's statement "that government is best which governs least" by saying, "Surely we have reached the point where we can say, for our time at least, that Jefferson was wrong: that government is not best which governs least."

He adds, sweeping all criticism of Government control over our everyday lives which is ever-expanding by saying "that nightmare of Federal control which haunts the dreams of our conservative friends is an hallucination."

His program for decreasing the legislative function include the drastic steps of: wiping out the "advise and consent" functions of the Senate in enabling the executive "to select his own agents without the need to satisfy legislative parochialism"; amending "the Constitution to increase the terms of Representatives from 2 to 4 years, decreasing the terms of Senators from 6 years to 4, and holding all congressional elections in Presidential years." This has the objective of providing the President with a "me too" Congress answerable to every whim of the President because after all they were elected at the same time and therefore the program of the President presented in the campaign is a mandate.

He adds a disturbing finishing thought intended as the coup de grace for all legislative bodies when he says:

> I have no hesitation in stating my deep conviction that the legislatures of America, local, State, and National, are presently the greatest menace to the successful operation of the democratic process.

This is must reading for anyone who has any doubts as to what the true objectives of the New Frontier and the radical liberals that are running our Government today are; or, as to the distrust of the people to govern themselves under our Constitution with balanced legislative, executive, and judicial powers on the Federal level and with the reserved powers of the States and local communities:

THE ELITE AND THE ELECTORATE—THE INCREASING ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

(By Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK)

The expansion of government in the 20th century has been the inevitable result of

revolutionary economic, social, and political forces which so threaten civilization that their control becomes essential to human survival. The size, range, and complexity of government increases—and will likely continue to do so. There seems no other feasible approach if civilization is to survive.

It can be argued, of course, that the increasing role of government is undesirable. But even though the argument may be moot, I would defend the proposition that this expansion is good—not bad. Surely we have reached the point where we can say, for our time at least, that Jefferson was wrong: that government is not best which governs least. The 18th century's aversion to tyranny has become the 20th century's antitotalitarianism. In fact they are much alike; but our democratic reaction is different. We now know—as Britain and Germany know, and France has just discovered—that to be effective in today's world a national government must be capable of strong action, and have strong leadership.

Otherwise democracy cannot survive. The fallacy in Jefferson's argument is the assumption that the expansion of government leads to the curtailment of individual freedoms. This is just not true. Despite the moans of those who thought Lincoln a tyrant, Franklin Roosevelt a dictator, and now the Kennedy's a dynasty, the history of personal freedom in this country is one of which we can be proud.

Where the civil liberties of our people have not been adequately protected, as in the case of Negro Americans, the failure is one of government inaction, not government action. There are, to be sure, blots on our escutcheon from the days of the Alien and Sedition Acts to the reign of Joe McCarthy. But on the whole the force of government has been on the side of the Bill of Rights and of a free individualistic society.

That nightmare of Federal control which haunts the dreams of our conservative friends is a hallucination. I cannot think of one example of the "heavy hand of the Federal Government reaching out into our private lives" that has actually been restrictive of our personal freedoms or detrimental to our economy—if, that is, one accepts the concept of the police power (always to be distinguished from the "police state"), the income tax, and the need for organized society.

The Federal Government has been subsidizing education in this country ever since the Northwest Ordinance of 1784. No harm and much good has resulted. The same is true of social security, housing, urban renewal, and Government plans for health care for the aged.

The real question, of course, is not the power of the Government itself, but how that power is used to promote justice and national well-being. The influence in our essentially free economy of the corporation and the big labor unions with their potential concentrations of economic power requires the countervailing pressures of a forceful, democratic government as a watchdog. It is this sense of government as a third force, representing the public interest at home and abroad, which in my view is required to protect both freedom and democracy. It is accordingly as salutary as it is inevitable.

The need for further cooperative international action to prevent political, social, and economic chaos is so great and sensible, and intelligent men from all countries are becoming so used to working together for international advancement, that creative control over world problems will be substituted for the essentially amoral international doctrines of the past. And, alas, the recent past.

Thus, I would hope to see the role of government increase in five major international areas in the next 10 years:

1. General and complete disarmament, verified by an international disarmament organization, enforced by an internationally recruited and commanded peace force. International controversy will be settled by international judicial peace-keeping agencies with adequate budgets and power under world law to enforce their decrees.

2. An international agency, perhaps an outgrowth of the present United Nations, adequately financed with funds saved from the armament race, will direct its activities toward assisting underdeveloped nations to that economic breakthrough which is necessary to enable them to raise living conditions within their borders to standards acceptable in the modern world.

3. An expansion of the powers and activities of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund will result in the establishment of a world currency as the medium of exchange for international transactions.

4. An extensive development of interlocking regional agreements for the orderly conduct of world trade, including stabilization of raw commodity prices and reduction of impediments to trade such as tariffs and quotas.

5. An international attack on the population problem.

If even some small part of these developments should occur, the role of government in the world economy will surely increase substantially.

The foregoing discussion may well seem to some unrealistic because the words communism, Russia, and China have nowhere been mentioned. It is obvious that the difficulties placed in the way of achievement of these five goals by the present policies of the Communist nations are substantial. But these difficulties are not insuperable. There can be no lasting progress on a worldwide scale unless and until we can either come to terms with, or overcome, the Communist menace to democracy and freedom. But this major problem, with all its intricacies, requires an even greater intervention of free governments than would otherwise be the case.

On the national scene fiscal policy is being taken out of the realm of morals, where it had languished ever since Ben Franklin's lay sermons on thrift two centuries ago. We treat it today as an economic matter. This is a revolutionary change in policy. Only 3 years ago the budget was still treated as a moral document. A balanced budget was prudent, honorable, sound, and good; a surplus was even more so; a deficit was imprudent, profligate, spendthrift, and bad. The terms were those of moral judgment. Today, with a remarkable bipartisan consensus, fiscal policy is couched in the language of economic consequence.

The next question is: Are our democratic governmental institutions adequate for the responsibilities that these extraordinary social, political, and economic forces are thrusting upon us?

We have inherited from our forefathers a governmental structure which so divides power that effective dealing with economic problems is cumbersome. Local, State, and national governments each have their responsibility in housing and urban renewal, in the appropriate uses of water, in transportation, labor-management relations, and education.

At each level, responsibility for appropriate action is divided between the executive and the legislature, with the judiciary prepared to step in at a moment's notice to declare unconstitutional whatever action the other two may decide upon. Under the circumstances, it is extraordinary how much we accomplish under forms of government heavily weighted against any kind of action, especially any that might alter significantly the status quo.

Of course, inaction is what the Founding Fathers intended—inaction until such time as an overwhelming consensus was prepared for action of some sort, inevitably a compromise. They were right in their day.

But they are wrong in ours.

How, in fact, do our many different governments, with power split three ways both horizontally and vertically, manage in the modern world?

On the whole, better than we have any right to expect. Local and municipal government has revived since the war. State government is the weakest link in the chain, but our Governors, many of them struggling under obsolete State constitutions which hamstring the executive at every turn, are for the most part increasingly aware of the need for their States to play a more effective part in the growth of the regional economy of which they are a part. Respect for the Office of President of the United States, whatever one's politics, has been justifiably high among serious students of government in the years since the depression. The courts, State and Federal, have played, on the whole, a wide and statesmanlike role in adjusting ancient jurisprudence to modern needs while protecting essential civil liberties.

It is the third branch of government, the legislative, where things have gone awry. Whether we look at city councils, the State legislatures, or the Congress of the United States, we react to what we see with scarcely concealed contempt. This is the area where democratic government tends to break down. This is where the vested interest lobbies run riot, where conflict of interest rides unchecked, where demagoguery knows few bounds, where political lag keeps needed action a generation behind the times, where the 19th century still reigns supreme in committees, where ignorance is often at a premium and wisdom at a discount, where the evil influence of arrogant and corrupt political machines ignores most successfully the public interest, where the lust for patronage and favors for the faithful do the greatest damage to the public interest.

As a former chief executive of a large American city, as a Member of the U.S. Senate, as a public servant who, in both capacities, has been obliged to know a good deal about the workings of State government, I have no hesitation in stating my deep conviction that the legislatures of America, local, State, and National are presently the greatest menace to the successful operation of the democratic process.

There is another almost equally serious defect in our democratic system, which may well result in government's failing in the role required of it in the next 10 years. We are not enticing into government at all levels the high caliber of individual we must have. The rewards of government service are inadequate, the punishments too severe. We leave the choice of careers far too much to the haggling of the marketplace. We make far too little effort to induce our able young people to fill the places where they are needed to advance American and, indeed, world civilization. In short, we are not adequately staffing that part of the army which must fight for freedom through governmental action.

Finally, the effective conduct of the regulatory agencies, local, State, and Federal, is quite definitely unfinished business. This, too, is closely tied to the problem of recruiting adequate personnel. Without adequate regulatory agencies the economy can on the one hand be strangled through redtape and foolish administration or, on the other, come under the domination of powerful special interests whose unchecked greed can destroy competition and, with it, free enterprise.

Thus I postulate that whether government will play its proper role in the next decade is part of a larger problem: Can we equip democratic government with the framework, the tools, and the men necessary to enable us to perform adequately the whole role of government?

What is necessary to staff freedom more effectively? A few suggestions may be offered:

1. The Executive should be strengthened at the expense of the legislature. Perhaps De Gaulle has shown the way. A constitutional amendment increasing the term of Representatives from 2 years to 4, decreasing the terms of Senators from 6 years to 4, and holding all congressional elections in presidential years would help to give greater authority to presidential policy and increase his ability to get it enacted. It is usually 5 years between elections in England, yet democracy is not in jeopardy. We need not fear Executive tyranny in this country merely because the legislature is more responsive to Executive recommendations.

Far too many Executive appointments require legislative confirmation. Under the Philadelphia city charter, the mayor makes all appointments without councilmanic approval, except the city solicitor, who is also the lawyer for council. This precedent might well be extended to State and National Governments to permit the Executive to select his own agents without the need to satisfy legislative parochialism.

Governors and mayors should be entitled to succeed themselves and should serve for 4-year terms. They should have executive authority over the whole range of government instead of having wide areas of executive action controlled by boards and commissions whose members are not directly responsible to the elected executive. New State constitutions and city charters are badly needed in most States and many of the medium-sized and smaller cities.

Executive pay should be adequate to enable the executive to live in comfort and to send his children to college.

2. Legislative customs, manners, traditions, rules, and procedures should be reformed in the interest of expediting action. Among the practices which render legislatures nonresponsive to democratic pressures, as distinguished from plutocratic or political-machine pressures, are:

Selection of committee chairmen by seniority rather than on ability as determined by secret ballot.

Outmoded procedures productive of delay, such as the filibuster in the Senate, the requirement that committees can meet while the Legislature is in session only by unanimous consent, and the "pickling" in committee of bills strongly recommended by the Executive.

A provision requiring legislation recommended by the Executive to be brought to a vote on its merits would be helpful, as would rules requiring proposed legislation to be reported out of committee favorably or unfavorably on motion of a specified number of committee members.

Sensible budgetary procedure similar to that presently existing in many well-governed cities would be a big help at the national level. For example, there should be a sharp distinction between capital and operating budgets and adequate advance budgetary planning.

3. Reapportionment of legislative districts, now well underway, should help.

4. Living conditions, pay, expense accounts, and working schedules of public servants should be reviewed, with a view to creating the perquisites that will attract talent.

5. The sinister influence of political machines, whose power derives from patronage and the ability to get legislation enacted or defeated, or administrative action taken or denied, at the behest of party contributors, must be destroyed. This can best be done by rigorously enforced modern, merit system legislation, by carefully devised and rigorously enforced laws dealing with political contributions, and by tax inducements to small contributors in the hope that the frightening cost of modern political campaigns can be met without reliance on "fat cats."

6. We must somehow create a climate of public opinion that stops deriding politicians as second-class citizens. To be sure, this is to some extent the problem of which comes first, the chicken or the egg. Politicians must have thick skins. They want, on occasion, to "dish it out" so they must be prepared to "take it." But they are entitled to a presumption of integrity to the same extent as the doctor, the lawyer, the banker. Fear of smear is still a deterrent to the entry into politics of many good citizens.

These are not drastic reforms. They merely modernize our existing governmental structure. Nor, if enacted, will they usher in the millennium. But they should help to make it possible for government to play adequately that role which a continuation of democracy as the most just form of government would seem to require.

Farrell Policy Lifts Immigration Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Plain Dealer carried a very interesting story on May 26, about one of our country's outstanding public servants, the Honorable Raymond F. Farrell, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. I have had the opportunity to observe his work in positions of trust and responsibility for many years. He brought to his present position in Washington a wealth of experience, an abundance of commonsense and the confidence of the many Members of Congress who have worked with him in past years. The report on his work in the Cleveland Plain Dealer brings additional credit to this fine public servant.

Under leave granted, I insert in the RECORD the article which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

FARRELL POLICY LIFTS IMMIGRATION SERVICE

(By Edward Kernan)

WASHINGTON.—Muscle with a heart.

That sums up the new spirit around the Immigration and Naturalization Service since personable and popular Raymond F. Farrell took over as Commissioner about a year ago.

"Our work can be pretty tough at times," said Farrell, referring to the various tasks of some 8,000 employees he supervises.

"But it's a job that has to be done and we do it. We have to be firm, sometimes even a little rough. We must uphold the law.

"We're tough when we have to be. But, for the most part, we try to be as pleasant as possible in our work."

The Immigration and Naturalization Service, which operates under the Department of Justice, has tremendous and widespread responsibilities. Every foreigner in the country is more or less its ward.

It must check on visitors from overseas, immigrants permitted under the quota system, Cuban and Chinese refugees and students here under the foreign exchange program.

In 1962, alien tourists or visitors for pleasure totaled more than 860,000, a banner year. At the same time, Farrell reported, it was "a bad year" for foreign-born racketeers, subversives and other aliens in illegal status.

More than 60,000 aliens conceded deportability and were permitted to depart without formal proceedings last year. Deported under formal proceedings were 7,400 aliens. Of these, 669 were deported under criminal, immoral, or narcotic charges.

The Immigration Service Border Patrol apprehended 35,700 deportable aliens last year, Farrell said. It was an increase of 23 percent over 1961.

Prior to joining the Immigration and Naturalization Service in 1941, Farrell saw service with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Interior Department, and the Public Works Administration. In 1938 and 1939 he was special counsel for a congressional committee investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority.

World War II interrupted his career with the Immigration Service. He entered the Army in May 1942, and was separated in November 1945, with the rank of lieutenant colonel and wearing the Bronze Star Medal for outstanding service in Italy.

Returning to the Immigration and Naturalization Service he was first named chief of investigations for New York City. Later, he came to Washington to operate as information specialist in the central office. Step-by-step promotions followed until 1958 when he was named assistant commissioner in charge of operations.

President Kennedy named him commissioner to succeed Lt. Gen. J. M. Swing (retired) on February 5, 1962.

In keeping with his muscle with a heart policy, Farrell is pushing the expansion of a new program to give foreign visitors a good first impression of Uncle Sam.

It's the port receptionist. Already there are some 40 young women at work at 12 U.S. international airports. The receptionists are bilingual. They also know words of greetings and key phrases in immigration procedures in a number of other languages.

"Our aim," says Retta Ann Kirchmier, an attractive brunet who is supervisory port receptionist, "is to welcome visitors, to let them know that America is glad to see them and that our giant Nation has a heart equal to its size."

Secretary of the Interior Supports Moss-Engle Bill To Regulate High Voltage Electric Transmission Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, in his speech at the 20th annual convention of the American Public Power Association in Cleveland, Ohio, made some significant comments about the application of new technology in the electric power industry. He said in part:

> While the emphasis of our time is so heavily concentrated on the dramatic advances in technology, we must not lose sight of the fact that we will fail in our responsibilities if we do not apply our knowledge and use the tools available to bring lower cost power to consumers.

The Secretary's statement points up key questions about the magnitude and character of this Nation's future electric power supply. A national power survey is presently underway in the Federal Power Commission concerning the Nation's power requirements and supply arrangements, and is expected to set forth broad technical and economic guidelines for the future. FPC Chairman Joseph C. Swidler has said:

> Our goal is the development of a pattern of power supply in 1980 that will meet the Nation's electricity requirements at the lowest possible cost.

By 1980 it is estimated that the Nation will require about three times the amount of electricity used today. A 1-mill reduction in the cost of power could mean a $3 billion annual saving to consumers in 1980.

Prospects for new giant generating units and extra-high voltage, long-distance transmission pose new problems of concentration of economic power in the electric power industry. Technology may well speed up the historical trend toward increased power supply furnished by a decreasing number of power suppliers.

Private power companies now control 75 percent of the country's generating capacity and serve nearly 80 percent of the Nation's electric power consumers. In 1917 there were 4,224 major private utility generating utilities. As recently as 1945 there were 1,060 such private power companies. By 1957 there were 465, and last year there were only 362. Thus, the number of such companies has declined in but 2 generations from 4,224 to 362.

Last year three private power companies—including the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. in the State of California—received from their customers nearly $2 billion. Fortune magazine recently listed 36 private power companies, representing about 10 percent of all privately owned utilities, whose 1961 income was about $8.5 billion or two-thirds of all the income received by the Nation's private power companies in that year.

The merger of these companies by consolidation or by acquisition has not prevented rate increases by the private power companies. FPC studies of typical monthly electric bills for the period 1952–62 show that the average price of electricity to residential, commercial and industrial customers has increased, not decreased. FPC statistics show that residential customers, on the average, paid more in 1962 for 250 kilowatt-hours of electric service than they did in 1940.

A research study released this year by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association shows rate overcharges of $1.25 billion by 38 of the Nation's commercial electric utilities between 1956 and 1960. Arnold Hirsch, public utility consultant, reported last year in Public Power magazine that on the basis of Federal income taxes actually paid, the largest electric utility company in each of 46 out of 48 States, excluding Alaska and Hawaii, received a rate of return in 1958–60 in excess of the generally accepted reasonable figure of 6 percent.

The latest FPC figures indicate that in 1961 the net profits of the private power industry equaled 14.9 percent of revenues, while the profits of all industries in the United States equaled only 3 percent of sales. While private power companies had a 5.1-percent increase in net profits in 1961, all industries in the United States had only a 1.4 percent increase in net profits, and manufacturing industries had a decrease of 4 percent in net profits.

The trade publication Electrical World reported on April 8, 1963:

> Last year was the best ever for utility net incomes. Based on a sampling of 142 companies, representing roughly 95 percent of the total electric revenues for the utility industry, net incomes posted a 10.2-percent gain over 1961, as compared with a 5.4-percent gain in 1961 over 1960. The increase in 1962 got a boost from the new 3-percent investment tax credit, and the Internal Revenue Service's liberalized depreciation guidelines.

The concentration of control in the electric power industry is revealed in the pattern of ownership of private power companies. A study of the top stockholders of 143 operating power companies and 10 holding companies shows that 5 firms—4 stockbrokers or dealers and 1 insurance company—are among the top 10 holders of 22 or more power companies each. Together these 5 financial groups are listed a total of 171 times among the top 10 holders of power company stocks.

Seventeen other firms appear among the top 10 security holders of 10 or more power companies. Together they total 234 listings among the top 10. Thus, these 22 financial firms total 405 listings among the top 10 holders of power company stocks with total holdings of 48,574,153 shares. With two exceptions, they are headquartered in the eastern United States.

While a listing among the top 10 security holders of a private power company does not necessarily mean that the financial firm itself is the actual owner of the stock, it does mean that the top holder has the voting rights in the company—a key factor in corporation control.

These facts support several conclusions: First, there is increasing concentration of economic power in the electric industry; second, the reduction in the number of privately owned utilities may reduce costs to the companies but does not guarantee lower rates to consumers; and, third, new technology, to achieve large units and power pooling, can enhance monopoly by large combines without attendant benefits to power company customers.

We need new tools to insure that consumers obtain the advantages of technical advancement in the electric power industry. Secretary Udall named one of these new tools—that the FPC should have jurisdiction over construction and operation of interstate transmission lines, 230 kilovolts and above. Bills were introduced by Senator ENGLE and by me, to require that private power companies constructing such lines must obtain a certificate of public convenience and necessity from the FPC, agree to make excess capacity available on a common-carrier basis, and obtain FPC approval prior to abandonment or curtailment of service over the certified lines. Secretary Udall declared, in his recent speech at Cleveland:

> The Department of the Interior favors a strong Moss-Engle bill. We support a bill that would place mandatory requirements upon the FPC to make certain that those 230-kilovolt lines and over are constructed which are needed in the national interest—and are utilized to their fullest capacity.

Extra-high-voltage transmission lines represent superhighways for the movement of electricity. Their location and use is a matter of national interest, just as is our interstate Federal road program. The Nation cannot afford to let the special interests have unrestricted control over either the road highways or the electric transmission highway.

Electric power is a necessity of life in any modern industrial nation. It is not in the public interest to allow a private monopoly to have the sole power to decide the Nation's flow of electricity. State utility regulatory commissions cannot effectively or adequately deal with this question. The problem cuts across State borders. Only with a national approach can we expect to protect the public interest efficiently and fairly.

One of the most perceptive experts in this country, FPC Commissioner Howard Morgan, declared earlier this year:

> We now have a minimum of 50 years of abundantly documented history to show (1) that the electric industry is reasonably prompt in putting technological advances to use as soon as they have proved practical, feasible, and profitable, and is doing so now with respect to extra-high-voltage interconnections regardless of our national power survey; and (2) that in the absence of adequate public controls, some elements of the electric industry customarily employ technological advances to protect and maintain monopoly positions while isolating, restricting or strangling municipal or rural electric systems and publicly owned transmission lines.

I commend Secretary Udall for his forthright support of my bill, H.R. 2101. His speech at the Cleveland convention of the American Public Power Association contains much useful information for the Congress and the people of this country, and under unanimous consent, I include the complete text:

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL TO A LUNCHEON OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION'S 20TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, CLEVELAND, OHIO, APRIL 30, 1963

For two very good reasons I am pleased to be here in Cleveland. First, I value highly this opportunity to address the annual meeting of the American Public Power Association; and secondly, this is the home town of one of my colleagues for whom I have great respect, Anthony Celebrezze, former distinguished mayor of this city and now Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Cleveland's municipal electric system had its beginning some 60 years ago when the nearby villages of Collingwood and Brooklyn, in the years 1902 and 1906 respectively, decided to establish municipally owned electric systems. Just as the rural electric cooperatives throughout the Nation later on, these systems were born to fill a need that the local company refused to serve. Although considered too isolated for service at the time, a few years later they were annexed to Cleveland and the local municipal system began to grow.

The years 1902 and 1906 are significant for other reasons as well. They happen to be historical milestone of significant note in conservation history and the development of the West. In 1902 the Reclamation Act was passed and signed by President Theodore Roosevelt, the first great conservation President, thereby protecting the settlers against exploitation from unscrupulous land manipulators.

In 1906 Congress passed the Power Development Act which gave the Federal Government the right to develop and market hydropower in the public interest and established the all-important preference principle on the sale of this power. This also established the bedrock upon which many rural electric cooperatives, municipal systems, and other consumer utilities have built their existence.

The thousands of customers of the city of Cleveland's municipal system have benefited considerably from "Muny's" low-cost power. As other progressive municipal systems elsewhere, I am confident it will continue to meet the needs of these consumers.

Our modern electric age had its beginning in the 1800's with development of the first power system and incandescent lamp. Its status in man's life for a long time was mostly as a luxury. Now it is a vital necessity to each of us personally and to the future of this Nation. To keep pace with requirements presently, the industry is doubling every 10 years. But these needs are growing in accordance with our population demands and our international responsibilities.

The concern of your Federal Government is that the need for abundant low-cost power will be met in the seventies, the eighties, and the tomorrows beyond as well as today. Every municipal system, every public utilities district, every cooperative, every private utility bears an important responsibility in meeting these future needs.

The sustained demand for power, coupled with recent technologic developments, is creating a revolution in the making and marketing of electricity. Most spectacular have been the developments in extra-high-voltage movement of electricity over long distances with conventional alternating current and the interest in the potentialities of direct current; the much larger and more economical generating units of 500,000 to 1 million kilowatts, and more; mine-mouth generating plants; coal-slurry pipelines; hydroelectric pumped-back storage; and the advancements in the use of nuclear heat for civilian power production.

These advancements make possible potentially lower costs to consumers through accelerated interconnections of systems and regions, the tapping of low-cost fossil fuels, the use of nuclear fuels, and the naturally associated economies of large-scale operations.

In terms of history, we have moved almost overnight into a new era of technology and sustained demands for electricity, bringing new questions and new opportunity for the operations of the power industry. Along with this must come a reexamination and reorientation of the Nation's industry and power policy.

If America's economy is to expand as it must to provide new jobs and a rising standard of living, adequate power at reasonable rates for the benefit of consumers must be a basic and solemn responsibility of every utility. Many departments and agencies of the Federal Government have firmly established roles in the marketing, transmission, and regulation of electric power. All such programs are designed to provide the Nation with low-cost energy. Accordingly, we must not sidestep crucial issues.

One fundamental issue emerges from the fact that the industry setup, existing legislation, regulatory methods, and many of our pertinent Federal policies came about in an earlier period of our Nation's power development. Changing times demand a reexamination of the situation.

Many fundamental issues affecting the continuing development and long-range welfare of our Nation are involved and must be corrected and improved before we can begin to achieve national goals and aims. In all our considerations we must be concerned with the role of our Government in such fields as regulation, research and development, plans and programs, and legislation. We must properly consider the role of Government simultaneously with that of the industry as a whole, bearing in mind the needs and absolute dependence of the Nation's economy on an abundant of low-cost power.

We can properly consider the overall power problems of our Nation in four major categories: technological development, systems and facilities planning, organization and administration, and utilization and marketing.

Basically, assuring a continuing and ample supply of low-cost power depends first upon improvements in technology and proper planning, such as determining those fuels and other sources of energy which should be utilized, the kinds and locations of plants that should be built, the inter-connection of power regions, and major transmission facilities to be built. This should be accompanied by proper organization and management to plan proper designs, construction, and operation of the necessary facilities. As they come into existence we must have optimum arrangements for pooling and interconnecting to achieve the lowest practicable cost for all consumers.

To apply our developing technology to the Nation's energy and power needs, Congress and the executive branch constantly appraise and study our requirements for energy and manpower, particularly as they relate to the things which must be undertaken by the Government.

We in Interior have felt that far too little research and development effort has gone into the field of direct-current transmission, where the Swedes, the Russians, and the English have outstripped us. But we are trying to catch up. With significant consumer benefits at stake, Interior agencies are providing important leadership to the power industry. Our Bonneville Power Administration has well underway an intensive program of research in direct-current transmission. It has now reached the point where we will soon be testing a million-volt experimental line. New valves, new insulators, and new switchgear will be tested. We expect the result of this research to provide design and operating data to enable all utilities to deliver power at lower costs over far greater distances.

Interior's Bureau of Reclamation is also experimenting with new lightweight transmission towers, some of aluminum, some of latticed tubular steel. Cost of installation, durability, response to temperature variations and many other factors which will ultimately result in lower costs transmission of electric energy are entering into these studies. We are even considering the installation of lightweight towers by use of helicopters in places now inaccessible to conventional equipment.

Simultaneously, of course, continued development of nuclear power is under way by the Atomic Energy Commission, cooperating with American industry and our public and private utilities. Our energy study, sponsored by the President's Science Advisor, should enable us to balance better our energy research and development program. The important point is that we will go forward with a balanced and constantly expanding program.

At this point, let me remind you that Alex Radin plans on Thursday to show you a film depicting some of the advancements the Russians are making in the development and transmission of electric power. This film was given me on our inspection trip to Russia last fall. We recognize the propaganda element in this film but we saw enough of these installations and facilities to know that the Russians are in dead earnest about surpassing us in this field.

One of the important responsibilities of government is to lead where leadership is needed. We believe the public interest demands the coordination and integration of our Federal power system for which Interior has the marketing responsibility. In the early months of this administration we began directing our attention to this problem. A task force study was made, demonstrating to the world the desirability of building an extra-high-voltage direct-current transmission line or lines between the Columbia River power system in the Northwest, the Central Valley project in California, and extending to Los Angeles and perhaps even farther to our great Hoover Dam on the Colorado River and President Kennedy has sent to Congress a budget item that will enable us to begin construction.

We have already received approval of a 161,000-volt line connecting the Bureau of Reclamation's Missouri River Basin system with the Southwestern Power Administration's system, working with the local cooperative in northern Missouri.

These efforts on the part of the Government have helped to encourage such recent developments as the Keystone project in Pennsylvania and the Virginia Electric Power Co.'s extra-high-voltage transmission to the eastern seaboard. Simultaneously, the TVA has entered into an arrangement with a number of power companies in the southwest power pool to achieve the benefits of the 1½ million kilowatts of diversity between these great power systems. In the Midwest, 345-kilovolt lines have been proposed to interconnect Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Louis, Minneapolis, and other leading centers.

The Federal Power Commission's national power survey is a constructive effort to assess certain vital national needs and encourage necessary action. This should be a permanent and continuous activity to make the Nation aware of its needs.

Conserving and developing our natural resources is a task that not only requires long-range planning but across-the-board cooperation. I believe we are making great headway in our Government. Of considerable importance to the entire Nation is the works which the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers are doing in comprehensive river basin development. This group will be interested to know that power planning is receiving the fullest consideration, as of course it should.

It is no secret that these agencies have differed in the past on the means and methods by which we make our plans and operate our projects. Happily these differences are being resolved to the benefit of the people. Clear-cut agreements have been worked out for water resource development in Alaska, the Columbia River Basin, and the Missouri River Basin.

We are also working more closely in our planning. Of particular interest to those in this area of the Nation are the studies we are making on installing low-head turbines of the axial flow type on the Ohio River where the Corps' locks are being rebuilt to improve navigation. It appears entirely feasible and highly desirable to modify these existing structures and make additions so that run-of-the-river power can be developed. This would be possible through turbines which operate economically and produce power at low-heads ranging from 26 feet or higher to as low as 6 feet. In addition to the Ohio, this offers possibilities for power development on such streams as the Mississippi, the Illinois, and the Arkansas Rivers, to mention a few. It offers America a greater opportunity to develop her precious water resources to meet the needs of future generations.

Our power marketing agencies have greatly intensified their work to realize the economies offered by applying the technique of pumped storage where the generator doubles as a pump, using off peak power to refill reservoirs and then releasing that water during peak periods to generate power.

Many other pumped-storage installations are being planned at existing and future Federal projects.

Pumped-back storage is another new frontier of technology. Taum Sauk, of the Union Electric Co. in Missouri, is rapidly being completed to develop about 400,000 kilowatts. Consolidated Edison has announced plans and has purchased equipment to construct over a million kilowatts of pumped storage on the Hudson River. The Niagara Mohawk Co. also plans another such million-kilowatt installation.

We commend these efforts, pointing out at the same time that the Federal Government must also put to use the pumped-storage technique if we are to properly conserve our power energy potential. We must improve power pooling methods as well, strengthening those that are inadequate and reflecting the technological advances of EHV transmission and large efficient turbines.

Organization and management techniques must be modernized—to plan, to build, to operate the major generating and transmission projects of the future. Your Government must continue to exercise leadership and influence to achieve these worthy objectives. We must bring our marketing and utilization of power into balance with other goals to achieve proper exchange agreements between systems and effect low rates for consumers.

But the best organization and management techniques and all our developing technology will be limited in benefits to American consumers, unless some segments of the power industry begin placing greater emphasis upon ultimate service to their consumers and less on defiling Government programs and consumer-owned systems of the power industry.

Conservation—the ideal, the principle, the practice—is the legitimate business of Government. Recently in carrying out our responsibilities to promote the conservation of resources, the Departments of Interior and Agriculture issued joint regulations governing applications for right-of-way over public lands by non-Federal utilities. We believe they will result in greater economies and efficiencies and at the same time minimize damage resulting from transmission lines crossing public lands and national forests. Briefly stated the policy requires that new lines crossing such lands must be available to carry Federal hydropower under certain circumstances as well as non-Federal power. In carrying out these regulations the Government would pay the cost of using the capacity and of building heavier towers or lines. Irrespective of the conservation aspects, it just makes good management sense to eliminate the possibility of parallel lines if one can do the job.

Congress has before it now a bill sponsored by Senator Clair Engle and Congressman John E. Moss, both of California. This legislation proposes an amendment to the Federal Power Act, which would require Federal Power Commission jurisdiction over the construction and operation of all transmission lines of 230 kilovolts and above. Further, the bill would require that these lines be made common carrier, and the FPC would have to issue a certificate of public convenience and necessity.

The Department of the Interior favors a strong Moss-Engle bill. We support a bill that would place mandatory requirements upon the FPC to make certain that those 230-kilovolt lines and over are constructed which are needed in the national interest—and are utilized to their fullest capacity.

While the emphasis of our time is so heavily concentrated on the dramatic advances in technology, we must not lose sight of the fact that we will fail in our responsibilities if we do not apply our knowledge and use the tools available to bring lower cost power to consumers. We in the Department are keenly aware of these responsibilities.

I believe the Kennedy power program is an exciting and vital program helping to pump new life into the economic mainstream of our Nation. A few days ago I participated in a ground breaking ceremony at a new steam plant at Hayden, Colo., to be built by the Colorado-Ute Electric Association and the Salt River Reclamation Project of Arizona. This is more than just a 150,000-kilowatt station. It is a new link in a chain that has been forged piece by piece. This small publicly owned station will tap Colorado coal reserves, increase employment and add $100 million to the Colorado Basin development funds because it will be tied in with a Federal transmission system, giving firm power when needed and sharing the use of Federal lines to serve its 42,000 rural customers.

We have spoken of the importance of power transmission. It is therefore timely to announce our intention to build new lines, more than 500 miles long, linking the Federal transmission systems of the eastern and western divisions of the Missouri River Basin project with the Colorado River storage project and the Parker-Davis project on the lower Colorado. This line will interconnect Federal power facilities covering a 15-State area of the Western United States—in Montana, North Dakota, Kansas, Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona, and portions of the States of California, Nevada, Iowa, Minnesota, and Missouri. From the northernmost powerplant in the Federal system at Fort Peck, Mont., and Garrison in North Dakota, the interconnections will stretch 1,250 miles southward to Phoenix and Yuma in Arizona.

We are carrying out the directions President Kennedy gave to me shortly after taking office, to develop plans for the early interconnection of areas served by the Department's marketing agencies.

We believe there is a place in the sun for all elements in the power program—Federal, cooperative, municipal, private—each has a legitimate role to play. Interties, properly planned and executed, are an absolute essential if we are to have an efficient electric power system in this country.

This is sound conservation doctrine—and sound commonsense.

Hon. Francis E. Walter

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join the other Members of this House in extending warmest birthday greetings to our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable Francis Eugene Walter, who will celebrate his 69th birthday this Sunday, May 26. We are all very sorry that "Tad" cannot be here with us on this occasion so that we might be able to extend our felicitations in person.

When I first came to Congress in 1944 "Tad" had already served many years in this House and from the start I have been privileged to count him among my friends. I have a deep sense of gratitude for the advice and help he has extended to me over these many years. "Tad" is one of our ablest Members, a modest man and above all fair and impartial in his dealings with his colleagues.

I am sure there are thousands of people all over the world who would like to extend "Tad" a most happy birthday for it was through his humanitarian efforts that many hundreds of refugees found it possible to start a new life at a time when they had lost all hope. Also through his help on private immigration bills many more thousands of people have been permitted to join their kin here in America. There is probably no one who has accomplished so much for the unfortunate, homeless, and displaced persons.

My hopes and prayers are that "Tad" will have a speedy recovery and will soon be back with his many friends here in the House of Representatives to continue his dedicated work for his district, the State of Pennsylvania, and his beloved country.

James Reston Eulogy of Orvil E. Dryfoos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the world of the printed word has been weakened by the loss of one of its best representatives. Everyone was saddened by the untimely passing of Orvil E. Dryfoos, president and publisher of the New York Times. This tireless servant of public information dedicated to his paper's tradition of "All the news that is fit to print," labored unstintingly to fulfill his commitment to an informed national community. At the request of his family to whom we extend our deepest sympathy, Mr. James Reston, the redoubtable chief of the Times Washington bureau delivered the following eulogy which so characteristically captures the measure of Orvil Dryfoos:

EULOGY BY JAMES RESTON

The death of Orvil Dryfoos was blamed on heart failure but that, obviously, could not have been the reason. Orv Dryfoos' heart never failed him or anybody else. Ask the reporters on the Times. It was steady as the stars. Ask anybody in this company of friends. It was faithful and kind. Ask his beloved wife and family. No matter what the doctors say, they cannot blame his heart.

In the spiritual sense, his heart was not a failure but his greatest success. He had room in it for every joy and everybody else's joy. This was the thing that set him apart—this warmness and purity of spirit, this considerateness of his mother, whom he telephoned every day; of his wife and children, of his colleagues and competitors. And this uncorrupted heart, broken or no, is what is likely to be remembered of him in this great city and at Dartmouth, his other home.

The obit writers had a hard weekend with Orv because they kept hunting for him in the files, and of course he wasn't there. He didn't make speeches, he made friends. The last time I saw him, he was breathing hard but still worrying about everybody else's worries and insisting that everybody get a good rest after the long strike.

SPECIAL QUALITY

Most of the time, it is the heart that governs understanding, and understanding was his special quality. He not only understood human frailty and almost preferred it. He understood the sensitive pride and combative instincts of reporters and editors, which is not easy. He even understood the anxieties of the printers during the time of our troubles.

Throughout the whole ghastly period, when he wore his life away, he was again worrying about other people, this time about those who were on the street and with no work and those who were in the office with too much work. He was running the office by day and often negotiating far into the night. Even when his heart began to rebel and the doctors put him on digitalis to regulate it, nobody knew what was going on but his family.

When the strike was over he finally slipped away to the hospital and never came back.

This quality of concern for others is vital to the tradition of the times. A newspaper is a very special kind of partnership. The main ingredients are not newsprint, ink, and advertising, but the more volatile human ingredients of blood, brains, pride ,and courage. This is why understanding is so important at the top, and why Adolph Ochs, Arthur Sulzberger, and Orvil Dryfoos, having understanding, were so good at it. For they saw a newspaper, as Edmund Burke saw a nation, not only as a partner of the living, but as a partnership "between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are to be born."

SENSE OF TRUSTEESHIP

There should be some consolation for us all, believer and unbeliever alike, in this thought. Orvil Dryfoos had this special sense of trusteeship to a marked degree. He thought of himself, as his father-in-law did before him, as one of a team working for an ideal larger than himself, of carrying on for a time something he devoutly believed to be important. And he not only carried it higher up the hill, but expanded its influence across the continent and planted a new edition of the Times beyond the Rockies. Thus, he achieved his ideal much more than most men are able to do, and remains a part of an institution that will go on as long as men are faithful to its ideals.

I never thought much of the family joke that Arthur Sulzberger and Orvil Dryfoos "married the New York Times." The women they married were so much better than any newspaper. Beside, it was the women who married them, and what is important now, bore them the children who must carry on.

Their fathers have given them a good lead. It is summed up for me in a quote from Robert Burns. He said: "Whatever mitigates the woes or increases the happiness of others—this is my criterion of goodness. And whatever injures society at large, or any individual in it—this is my measure of iniquity."

HIS IDEAL

Orvil Dryfoos lived by this noble ideal, but knew that ideals, and traditions, are not self-enforcing. Somebody must decide in the newspaper business. In no other institution are so many choices offered every day of the year. In no other craft are there so many men with so many diverse ideas on so many subjects, about which so much can be said. But the tyranny of the deadline is always present, and while most of these decisions are made on the desk, the big ones have to be made at the top.

Here, Orvil Dryfoos was equal to his duty. I will always remember him in the city room on election night of 1960 when he was the first to sense that we had gone out on a limb for Kennedy too early and insisted that we reconsider. And again, in 1961, when we were on the point of reporting a premature invasion of Cuba, his courteous questions and wise judgment held us back.

He had his weaknesses, like all of us, but usually they sprang from the more amiable qualities of the human spirit. To hurt a colleague was an agony for him, and in this savage generation, when men decide, other men often get hurt. But he could make up his mind. He suffered, but he acted.

INSPIRED RESPECT

Perhaps the simplest thing to say about him—and I believe I speak for my colleagues in this—is that the more we knew him, the more we respected him. He was a gentleman. He was faithful to a noble tradition, to the family from which he came, and to the great family be joined and loved.

Martin Buber once said: "If we could hang all our sorrows on pegs, and were allowed to choose those we liked best, every one of us would take back his own, for all the rest would seem more difficult to bear."

Let us then honor Orvil Dryfoos with remembrance rather than with tears. For his children will never be able to cry as much as he has made them laugh.

Why a Debt Ceiling?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Dillon, President Kennedy, and all of his economic advisers think the debt ceiling is just an exercise in semantics. They think this way because they want a blank check so that the President can reelect himself with the taxpayers' money.

A very erudite article on reasons for debt discipline appeared in today's Wall Street Journal, in an article by Harley L. Lutz. It is "must" reading for everyone:

DEBT DISCIPLINE

(By Harley L. Lutz)

Congress, once again, has pushed the Federal debt limit a little higher. The latest hassle, which ended yesterday with a temporary boost, was a rearguard tactic. Every one knew that some increase was inevitable, as it has been time after time over the past decade. The reason is clear. Federal spending will have risen by more than 50 percent from 1955 through fiscal 1964—from $64.4 billion to an estimated $98.8 billion. In the same period revenues were so far outrun as to cause an aggregate estimated net deficit of $46 billion.

The principal issue to be discussed here is whether there should be such a limit. The history of the overall limit since its introduction in 1938 does not make a very good case for it, even aside from the immense debt increase during World War II. In February 1946, the debt dropped to its postwar minimum of some $252 billion and in June of that year the limit was lowered from $300 billion to $275 billion. As Congress debated action yesterday, the limit was $305 billion and Treasury operations were bumping againt this ceiling.

In approaching the issue posed here, the first and most important question is: Do we really mean business or are we to continue the hypocrisy of this kind of sham battle against uncontrolled spending? If the administration, the Congress and the people are not willing to accept the discipline of a firm debt limit, then the policy of debt limitation should be discarded as a bit of fiscal flummery. The position taken here is that there should be a debt limit and a firm policy of its strict enforcement.

NO MAGIC FIGURE

There is no magical, absolutely definite figure for this limit. The deficit for fiscal year 1963 is by this time fairly well set and provision must be made to cover the expenses, whatever they may be. The case is different for the fiscal year 1964, especially in view of the slow pace of congressional action on the appropriations for this year. Various well-considered recommendations for reduced spending in 1964 have been advanced by responsible persons and organizations, and other sound proposals could no doubt be developed if such guidance and support were needed to stiffen the backbone of the Congress in a firm stand against further borrowing.

From the operational standpoint there can be no question that the 1964 budget can be reduced enough to involve no additional increase in the debt limit, beyond whatever may be necessary to cover the 1963 deficit. The political hazard of a bold stand for financial sanity has probably been exaggerated by such myths as "spending and electing," but a firm national policy of debt control would provide timid candidates with a reasonable excuse for getting less Federal spending in the home district where success in such endeavors is the chief argument for reelection.

It must be emphasized that a debt limit, by itself, would not restrict Federal spending although, as indicated below, it would tend in that direction. The primary purpose of a firm debt limit is to prevent unrestrained debt-financed spending.

Among the reasons for a firm debt limit policy are the following:

1. The absence of a debt limit would tend toward even less compunction regarding debt financing and an even greater readiness to resort to it than now exists. The abuses of authorizations to spend from public debt receipts as a means of bypassing the scrutiny of the appropriations committees have been frequently exposed.

EVIDENCE OF INTEGRITY

2. Debt limitation is widely regarded as visible evidence of fiscal integrity, that is, the honesty and sincerity of the Government's intention regarding the value of the currency and of all fixed investments. The rigmarole of a debt limit which always moves upward just one step ahead of the spending is a kind of lip service to the concept of fiscal integrity but it is of no avail as a protection against the perils of unlimited debt increase.

3. A firm debt limit would be a powerful source of confidence among investors with regard to the stability of the public debt as a long-range investment. While there are other factors involved, the shift of investor preference from long-term to short-term Federal debt paper invites speculation as to the degree of confidence in the future value of long-term Treasury bonds. In 1946, for example, the average maturity of the Federal debt was 9 years and 1 month, and the debt under 5 years maturity was 45.7 percent of the total. As of December, 1962, the average maturity had dropped to 4 years

and 11 months, and the portion under 5 years maturity had risen to 73 percent.

The high proportion of short-term and floating debt is a handicap to efficient debt management. A lengthening of maturities requires the cooperation of investors who are naturally concerned with the ultimate as well as the present value of long-term Treasury bonds. The increased resort to debt financing that would be encouraged by absence of a limit would present a definite prospect of inflation and continued erosion of the dollar in which, at maturity, the bonds are to be redeemed.

4. As noted above, while a firm debt limit would not necessarily prevent increased spending, it would indirectly operate in this direction. The limit would involve the obligation to pay cash on the barrel head and this would tend toward a more careful public appraisal of the utility of spending programs as against the disutility of the additional taxes required to support them.

Certain practical aspects of a firm debt limit should be considered. The first is the effective date. Since the purpose is to prevent an increase of the debt, the end of the fiscal year is the logical time to apply the test. This means that Treasury operations during the fiscal year would be disregarded. The inflow of revenue over the year is variable, a situation which is exaggerated by the various actions of recent years to speed up tax payments. Three of the four installments of individual income tax are due in the second half of the fiscal year. The outflow of expenditures is, by contrast, quite uniform through the year and, as a result, the Treasury must have temporary access to funds in the first half. Short-term borrowing to equalize income and outgo over the year is necessary and logical. The debt limit would prevent carrying such temporary advances into the next fiscal year as a permanent addition to the debt.

A second practical consideration relates to the debt to be subject to the limit. The present statutory rule includes everything except some minor items of no importance in the total. It is suggested here that the limit be applicable to the debt in the hands of the public, including the Federal Reserve banks. A very important segment of the debt that would be excluded under this proposal consists of the Treasury obligations held in the trust fund accounts. These obligations represent the accumulated excess of collections over disbursements for social security, unemployment compensation, railroad retirement, civil service retirement, veterans insurance, and others. The objective at which the present discussion is directed is the limitation and control of debt arising out of the operations of the administrative budget. The trust funds are not part of this budget, nor are they in any way controllable under it.

IMPACT ON JOBS

Two collateral matters should have brief notice. One is the contention, regularly used to support a huge budget and whatever deficit is involved, to the effect that any curtailment of Federal spending will increase unemployment. Hence a strict debt limit would increase unemployment.

Federal spending, as such, does not increase employment except as it adds more persons to the public payroll. A large airplane or missile contract may increase the demand for scientists or skilled workers in the plants designated to execute the contract, or in those of subcontractors. It will do nothing to provide jobs for those ultramarginal members of the labor force whose productivity is less than employers must pay under union rules or Federal law.

The other collateral matter is the argument that an expanding economy needs more debt because it will need more money. Hence, a strict debt limit will impede economic progress because it will restrict the capacity of the banking system to provide more money as the economy grows.

There is no question that the economy will need a larger money supply and a larger base for credit operations as its productive activities expand. Ninety percent or more of this increased money supply will be in the form of bank deposit credits. The question involved here is whether or not there must be an increase of the public debt beyond its present level in order to provide an asset base for the support of the larger volume of bank credits that will be needed. More specifically, must we allow the public debt to increase, not only for budget reasons, but also to maintain a supply of marketable debt paper sufficient to accommodate the Federal Reserve Banks in the exercise of their money and credit control operations?

PERMANENT INFLATION

A deliberate increase in the public debt merely to permit, or assure, an expansion of the money supply would be permanently inflationary. It would be one of the weakest possible reasons for eliminating the debt ceiling, or for pandering to the spending urge by conceding every trick before the cards are played. Economic growth depends on increase of debt. This is as simple and as inevitable as the balancing of every credit by a debit. It does not follow, however, that the achievement of a higher rate of economic growth involves or requires a continuous increase of the public debt. Privately generated debt paper, arising out of the growth needs of the economy, can serve fully as well as Treasury debt paper as the basis of Federal Reserve operations.

A final point: It is not generally realized that the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives is, in a real and important sense, the key to our problem. This committee has original jurisdiction over revenue measures and the debt limit. It thus occupies a unique position in the area of fiscal policy determination. While its recommendations on taxes and other matters have not been accepted by the Congress in every case, its influence is great.

In the past this committee has initiated many of the tax policies which are now so generally under attack, and its complaisant attitude on the debt limit has, to say the least, not discouraged deficit spending. This financial course has not contributed to satisfactory economic growth. The committee now has the opportunity—and the challenge—to change direction, to exert its influence toward reducing and limiting the drag of Government on the economy, and to exercise its powerful leadership for the growth of the economy rather than the growth of Government. Sound tax reform and a firm position on the debt limit are essential steps to this end.

Have We Become Neutral?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the questions that are being raised as to the direction of our foreign policy, the question posed in an editorial in the Lansing Journal, Lansing, Ill., of May 23, is especially appropriate. Not only is the question appropriate, but an answer from the administration would certainly be in order. I submit the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD at this point.

HAVE WE BECOME NEUTRAL?

What has happened to the United States of America?

This is the Nation that was conceived in freedom and dedicated to human dignity and equal opportunity. This is the Nation that gave its youth and its treasure in two World Wars to preserve and restore these "unalienable rights" to others.

This is the Nation that sets a pattern of valor and morality and progress for the world—only to embrace defeat and dishonor in Korea by Executive order; to turn its back on the Hungarian patriots; to betray the Cuban freedom fighters at the Bay of Pigs, and now, after ringing words of encouragement from our President to the prisoners we ransomed from Castro, to reject their cause—which we had presumed was equally our own.

Has the United States of America become a "neutral" nation? We might ask our Congressman.

President's Use of Troops Bypasses Constitutional Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the President's move to send troops to Alabama and the subsequent justification by the Office of the Attorney General paves the way for a military dictatorship in the United States.

Once we have accepted the principle that the President need not act within the framework of the Constitution, or that he alone may be the interpreter of the Constitution, we are well on the way to ending freedom in America. We have maintained this Republic within a democracy only because we have adhered to the constitutional restrictions upon the Chief Executive and have operated within the boundaries of the separation of powers set forth in the basic law of our land.

Now we find the Kennedy administration asking that all power to make decisions be delegated to the President and that he alone may order the use of Federal troops to violate States' rights, or local law enforcement at his discretion whether or not Federal law has been violated.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans should be alert to the danger posed by the power President Kennedy is demanding and which Congress has seemed to be willing to give to him. Once we have agreed to allow President Kennedy to bypass the Constitution, we may indeed have a military dictatorship.

Columnist David Lawrence, in the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star, ably cites the inherent danger to our liberties in the action of the Kennedy administration.

POWER A DICTATOR WOULD USURP

(By David Lawrence)

A remarkable brief has just been filed in the Supreme Court of the United States by direction of Attorney General Robert Kennedy. If the argument in it is sustained by the High Court, the way is opened to a military dictatorship in the United States at any time and for any reason that suits the whim of a President. The provisions of the Constitution which limit a President's power would be swept aside and, for all practical purposes, the Constitution hereafter would be what the President says it is.

The brief is in answer to a petition of Governor Wallace of Alabama asking the Supreme Court to issue an order against the use of Federal troops in Alabama unless requested by the Governor or the legislature, as required by the Constitution. The Department of Justice replies that the provision of the Constitution which explicitly says that Federal troops may be used within a State only with the permission of the Governor or the State legislature is "irrelevant" and that somehow the 14th amendment conferred broad new powers on the President to enforce any law on any subject or to use troops whenever, on the basis of his own judgment of the circumstances, he wishes to use them. The brief, moreover, makes this sweeping claim:

"There is no room for judicial review of a Presidential determination that the conditions stated in section 333 have arisen and require him to take 'such measures as he considers necessary.' "

Section 333 is part of a law originally passed in 1871. It specifically relates only to a failure or refusal by State authorities to permit the "execution of the laws of the United States." President Kennedy has himself publicly stated that, in the recent disturbances in Birmingham, Ala., no Federal law was being violated—nor any court order, either.

The brief brushes aside as secondary the public statements of Alabama officials that they intend to maintain law and order, and adds:

"But the allegations of intent cannot relieve the President of the right and duty to prepare for all contingencies and to make the independent determination required by section 333."

Yet a President's "intent," on the other hand—whether it be political or capricious—to prepare to deal with local disturbances whenever he pleases is held by the Department of Justice not even to be subject to judicial review. It is further argued in the brief that section 333 is a blanket authorization to a President to send troops into any State at any time that he himself thinks there may in the future be some intention to violate any law or court order. Section 333, however, doesn't deal with intent at all, but only with actual evidence of law violation or a refusal to enforce a law.

The constitutionality of section 333 itself has never been passed upon by the Supreme Court of the United States. Congress cannot assume the right to proclaim by statute what it wishes to be considered constitutional. Nor can Congress enlarge a President's constitutional powers by means of a law.

The most surprising statement in the brief—and one which would seem to pave the way for a military dictatorship by a President of the United States at any time he wishes to set it up—is as follows:

"We cannot know whether the occasion for invoking the statute (section 333) will actually arise. Nor need we examine the precise circumstances which might justify the contemplated intervention. It is sufficiently clear, however, that the prevailing situation in Birmingham may deteriorate in such a way as to require action under section 333."

Yet the law itself doesn't say a President may threaten to use Federal troops or even use them until the circumstances stated in the law have actually arisen.

But what difference would it make what the law says if the Department of Justice is right in claiming that there can be no judicial review of a President's acts?

A military dictator could use the same reasoning as is contained in the brief of Attorney General Kennedy. If disturbances were threatened at election booths or if a President wanted to postpone a national election, he could order the troops to suspend balloting on the ground that there had been disorders and that he felt the time was inopportune for balloting.

There is no limit to the powers of coercion that could be applied by a President, whether a "liberal" or not, by ordering out troops. If the Supreme Court of the United States accepts the reasoning of the Department of Justice, then, even when no Federal law or court order has been violated, a President can mobilize Federal troops and deploy them as he pleases. He could intimidate local authorities and cause certain citizens to make concessions in favor of one group of voters rather than another. Also, a President, under his own concept of executive power, could apparently choose to "enforce" that concept by military action irrespective of what is actually specified to the contrary in either the laws of the United States or the Constitution.

David Hall Awarded Handicapped American of the Year Trophy in Washington Ceremony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have previously called the attention of the House to a most remarkable and outstanding young man from my district, Mr. David Hall, of Green Bay, Wis., who was named Handicapped American of the Year by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

On May 9, I had the pleasure of attending an inspiring ceremony here in Washington during which Mr. Hall was presented with this award. From a tape recording of the ceremony, I have had written transcripts made of Mr. Larry Le Sueur's tribute to David Hall, President Kennedy's speech, and Mr. Hall's acceptance remarks and I would like to include these as part of my remarks:

A TRIBUTE TO COURAGE OF DAVID HALL

(By Larry Le Sueur)

Mr. President, David, Mr. Freeman, members of the committee, distinguished guests. It's an honor and a privilege to address the members of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. It's a very great honor to talk to people who are devoting themselves to benefiting those who are less fortunate than themselves. And it is a very great privilege for one who has been a war correspondent and then a peace correspondent, and now a member of the U.S. Information Agency to address such people as General Maas, who has done so much in the defense of this country.

There are still things confronting this country which make us look to our defenses, of course. But I think there are other things that our opposition may not try again, and I am reminded of a man I heard about this very week, who presented himself, of all things, to a theatrical agent and said, "Sir, I have a great act. I wish you'd put me on." The theatrical agent said, "Well, what is it?" He said, "Well, I can go to the top of the Washington Monument and I can jump off and land in a small bucket of sand." The theatrical agent said, "If you can do that just once, I'll hire you." So the man went down to the Washington Monument, left his bucket of sand at the bottom and he leaped off and he landed right in the bucket, got out, dusted himself off, and the theatrical agent was dancing with joy and he said, "Do you know what I'm going to do for you? I'm going to hire you at $100 a week for 10 weeks." Well the man shook his head and said, "Gee, I don't think so." He said, "Well, I'll tell you what I'm going to do. I'm going to double that. I'll make it $200 a week for 20 weeks." The man said, "I * * * I don't think so." He said, "Listen, I'll tell you what I'm going to do for you. I'm going to give you $1,000 a week and year's contract." The fellow still shook his head and said, "No, I don't think so." The agent said, "I don't understand you. What do you want? I have never given anybody a year's contract before." So, the man looked at him and said, "Well, to tell you the truth, I just don't think I want to try that again."

Well, I hope that's the way our potential enemies may feel. I know I would if I were in their situation.

But you know that it's sometimes the way in life that things that we wish to avoid most just happen to us, unfortunately. Now, what happened to David Hall could happen to any of us, or to any of our children. David was a robust, carefree, 19-year-old. He crammed every moment of his life into a whirlwind of activity. He played tennis, he skiied, he worked summers on the railroad. He was a typical teenager.

Then one beautiful morning in July 1955, he got up early in his home in Green Bay, Wis., to join a friend on a vacation trip to northern Michigan. They were young men—so of course they traveled fast. And then it happened. Their car brushed another vehicle, and David Hall hurtled from the open convertible, and came to rest by the roadside—his neck broken; his body, of course, paralyzed. David's whole way of life had come to an end.

What would you have done in that situation? What would I have done? Given up, perhaps? Submerged ourselves in a life of endless self-pity?

Or would we have managed to find within ourselves some of the spirit—some of the heart—that has brought David Hall back to this rough, touch work.a-day-world, to become a man and a self-supporting citizen, dedicated to the task of helping others.

David Hall's story is a story of challenge and response, a story of courage that matches those of more famous men—of Franklin D. Roosevelt, who fought his way back from crippling polio—or that of our own John F. Kennedy, who overcame a crippling back injury to rise to the presidency of this great Nation. It is the story of the Helen Kellers and the Beethovens and the blind Miltons—of all those men and women throughout the ages—the famous and the less well known—who, by rising above severe physical handicaps, achieved true greatness.

At first David was totaly paralyzed from his neck down, so he began that long tough battle to regain some use of his body, and after more than 2 years—and after some 800 pain-racked days—of physical therapy treatments, and four operations on his hands, he came home to Green Bay a winner. But it was only a partial victory, of course. He could move his arms, his hands, and his shoulders—but of course David would never walk again.

It was easy for him to feel sorry for himself. But David Hall quietly assessed his remaining abilities. He had lost the use of his legs—but his mind was as keen as ever. His hands had lost much of their power—but his voice was strong and clear, and he may have lost the boundless energy of a teenager—but he had gained the mature understanding of a man. He realized that he had everything he needed to work for a living—and to do his bit for humanity.

I'll tell you the story of how David Hall found his new mission in life.

During his long months in hospitals, one thought had obsessed this young man. He had become profoundly aware of a statistic. "Every 22 seconds," he remembered reading, "someone like me smashes up on the highway."

And as he watched the seconds tick by on his bedside clock, David imagined first one and then another tragedy—three a minute—180 in an hour. Whenever he heard the sound of ambulance sirens, he thought, "What wouldn't those people give for the chance to relive the moment that changed their lives? If they only had another chance."

And then the idea came to him. And after all most of the great things in life start as an idea, don't they? "What if I were to tell the story of my experience to others—not for sympathy but as a warning—as a reminder. Perhaps it would slow the ticking of that clock—perhaps it would still the angry wail of some of those sirens."

And, thus was born what we call "The David Hall Story"—the dramatic recounting of his accident. Now David really had something to live for—a mission in life to help save other lives.

As a carefree, able-bodied teenager—David had not been interested very much in acting or orating. But just 2 years ago David took the stage for the first time—to tell his friends his story in Green Bay, Wis., and since then, he's done 80 repeat performances—making his simple plea to men, woman, and teenagers throughout Wisconsin and Michigan. More than 50,000 people have heard him relate his story in person—and many more have heard him of course over radio and television—and sometimes they've heard of David Hall's experience in a most important place—behind the wheels of their cars—perhaps it has slowed the ticking of that clock.

But David Hall's dedication to the cause of his fellowmen is not limited to his story. David works. He is a supervisor in what is called a sheltered workshop—where men and women with physical handicaps or mental impairments learn some kind of a useful trade. His own achievements in overcoming his severe disability—and his cheerful manner—are an inspiration to those he is leading back to self-sufficiency, and that is the greatest boon we all realize that a person can enjoy. The enthusiasm of this disabled young man is a daily reminder to Wisconsin and Michigan employers that in General Maas' own words "it's a man's ability—not his disability—that counts on the job."

Because David Hall refused to give up, because he refused to wall in self-pity, he has helped to save some lives and he has helped make a better life for others. The task which he has undertaken is a very important one—with effects that may be felt far in the future.

We will never know, of course, how many accidents David Hall has prevented or how many lives David Hall has saved. But his community and his State have already felt the impact of his one-man war against the Nation's No. 1 disabler, maining on the highway. And David Hall has just begun to fight for others. And that's why we today pay tribute to a young man of courage—to David L. Hall of Green Bay, Wisc., the "Handicapped American of the Year."

Remarks of President Kennedy Before Annual Meeting of President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped

Mr. Gleason, General Maas, Mr. Hall, Mr. Fay, Mr. Macy, Mr. Freeman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I want to express my very great appreciation to all of you who work in this most important and deserving field, the employers, the members of the Federal Government who have concerned themselves with this problem, Mr. Gleason, Mr. Macy, the Armed Forces, the AFL–CIO, Mr. Freeman, who has worked very tirelessly in this matter, members of the President's Committee who devoted a good deal of their time, and also to all those across the country.

One of the impressive things that I have seen as I have traveled across the country—I remember going into the MacDonald Aviation Co. in St. Louis, Mo., which has been one of our most progressive employers in hiring those who are mentally handicapped and who have been among the most useful employees of the company; others in Long Island; others stretching across this country; employers who have gone to great pains to bring into their establishments disabled men and women who then are able to make a living not because of the support of others, but by their own efforts which have contributed to their rehabilitation, and to organized labor in this country, the AFL–CIO, who have worked with the unions, encouraging the unions to bring men and women in to make it easy for them to be hired.

This is the kind of work which comes not from the top down, but from the inside out. We are hiring today at the White House a young man who is handicapped to work on the grounds at the White House, and I am hopeful that people all across the country in the next year will make a special effort to bring into their lives in one way or another, by assisting, by hiring, by working with men and women who are handicapped, either physically handicapped or mentally handicapped. This is an area in which in recent months and years we have made a particular effort. We are making a particular effort in the National Government this year to bring up to date and really move ahead in the whole treatment of those who are mentally retarded and mentally disabled, as well as our efforts among those who are physically disabled.

As I said before, I see no reason why this very rich country of ours should have 3 out of 100 of our children mentally retarded, mentally disabled, while Sweden, which is not any more prosperous than we are, but is more concerned, perhaps, than we have been, has only 1 out of 100.

So this effort which we are all making in the Government, in the cities, in the States, in the employers, in the unions, this great cooperative effort to make a part of our community, a part of our country, a part of our lives for those who have been less fortunate, is deserving of the best you have.

I want to congratulate all of you for doing something about it, not merely talking about it. All the problems that this country has could be solved in a whole variety of ways if all of our citizens would just pick one project and give their time to it, whether it is helping those who are mentally or physically retarded, whether it is helping young boys and girls who are in difficulty with the law, whether it is entertaining foreign students, whether it is holding out a hand to one group or another. This can be done much better by our citizens than by the National Government.

I want to express my commendation to one group of our society here today who are doing something about it and who deserve the appreciation not of the country, because they deserve that, but I think that most of all they get the satisfaction themselves of recognizing that the obligations of citizenship, pride in their country, makes them want to look out beyond their own lives.

So I am delighted to be here today. I congratulate you all. We pay a special tribute to David Hall. I can imagine nothing more worthwhile than what he is doing. I have some personal knowledge of what has happened to people in automobile accidents. If they would have some recognition of how long is the difficulty, the time they saved, they would realize, is very unimportant. So that we are glad to honor him and we admire him. There are a lot of acts of courage which are done in the flash of the moment, but the most commendable and admirable acts of courage are those which go on day in, day out, month in, month out, year in, and year out. He has shown it, many of you have shown it, the general has shown it, and I am glad to be among those who live it.

Thank you very much.

Remarks of David Hall, of Green Bay, Wis., the Handicapped American of the Year

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

Chairman Maas, Vice Chairman Freeman, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen: First, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the President's Committee for this award, which I understand was made by the Sheltered Workshop of the Curative Workshop of Green Bay, Wis., by our own handicapped people. I would also like to thank the President's Committee Department of Rehabilitation, and the Green Bay Workshop in its rehabilitation program for providing the basic facilities and the opportunities. I think when talking about the handicapped, we can use a well-known expression which is, the handicapped do not ask what the community can do for them, but what, if given the opportunity, the handicapped can do for the community.

I sincerely believe that if given the opportunity, the handicapped will go far and succeed.

I would like to extend to my parents my grateful appreciation. Believe, me, I would not be here today if it were not for their understanding and their help. I would like to simply say to all of you a simple thank you. I know these are small words, but I hope you understand my feeling behind them.

I again thank you very much, and God bless all of you.

Why Not Take the Offensive?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it would be most revealing to the American people if for once we told the Communists what to do and where to go. The New York Daily News editorial in today's issue says exactly this in language that even the State Department ought to be able to understand:

So Take the Offensive

Unnamed high State Department officials are saying that things are looking up for our side in the cold war.

Their story is that Khrushchev's dispute with Mao Tze-tung and the unrest in his captive nations are slowing the Red drive for world overlordship, and the West can stop that drive in its tracks if the West doesn't weaken.

Fine. So how about our side—or at any rate the United States—going on the offensive?

Why not take the shackles off the Cuban exiles? How about giving Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek the go-ahead for his long-planned attack on Red China? What's the matter with some U.S. 7th Fleet bombing of Red supply points on the Ho Chi Minh Trail through Laos into South Vietnam? It might even be a dynamic idea to reassign Gen. Lucius Clay to West Berlin, to revive the fear of God in Walter Ulbricht.

If the enemy is staggering, let's punch harder.

Stimulating Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD correspondence from Mr. Felix A. Hertzka of 141 East 55th Street, New York, N.Y., regarding the possibility of a device for stimulating exports by the individual manufacturer without any assistance from the Government. This can be done under present laws and if used by enough of our businessmen and manufacturers would result in a significant change in the dollar outflow and loss of gold by the United States:

MAY 15, 1963.

Congressman JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have recently read your bill H.R. 4776 which is extremely interesting and an excellent idea.

I thought it might interest you to read an idea that I put to paper some time back in October of last year. I am enclosing herewith a photostatic copy of it which, I am sure, will interest you since it basically leads up to the same thoughts that you have had.

Yours sincerely,

FELIX A. HERTZKA.

EXPORT STIMULATION

To offset our decreasing gold reserves it is imperative that exports be increased, so as to return dollars to the United States.

The following is an idea that would increase our exports at a low cost to industry and Government. Generally our export prices are too high and therefore we cannot compete on world markets. To give an example: A manufacturer produces 1,000 units of his product per day and sells this product at $100 per unit in the United States. His plant works, say, 350 days during the year. Thus he produces and sells 1,000 times 100 times 350 equals $35 million.

If this manufacturer puts aside 1 percent of this sales figure to apply to his export sales 1 percent equals $350,000.

If the manufacturer can export an additional 5 percent over and above his U.S. sales, this would mean 50 units per day or 17,500 units per year.

If the $350,000 is applied to these 17,500 units, it would give the manufacturer a margin of $20 per unit; in other words, he could then sell the 50 units per day at $80 per unit and not suffer any loss. This reduction should make him competitive and bring about export sales.

The $350,000 would, of course, be applied to gross profit and, therefore, the Government would eventually lose the tax income on this amount, so that the Government would actually pay 52 percent (or $182,000) of the $350,000.

If the 50 units per day are exported, the amount of dollars returning would be 80 times 17,500 equals $1,400,000.

For the Government's loss in taxes of $182,000, the return of dollars would be $1,400,000—or a ratio of 7.7 to 1.

The above can, of course, be done by any manufacturer without any help from the Government; if the manufacturer wants to stimulate his export sales, the manufacturer only has to think of it in the above way. There is, however, one method which the Government could use to induce the manufacturer to increase his export sales.

The manufacturer who has exported his additional 17,500 units per year has made his regular profit on this amount. Let us assume that his gross is 10 percent (this gross of 10 percent has to be taken on the unit price of $100), therefore $10 per unit or a total of $175,000 per year.

This amount of $175,000 should be free of tax if the manufacturer can prove that he has worked on the above basis.

Of the above $175,000 the 52-percent tax would amount to $91,000. The Government therefore has lost $182,000 plus $91,000, which equals $273,000.

These $273,000 have brought back $1,400,000—or a ratio of 5 to 1. However, since the manufacturer can do step 1 without any help from the Government, it might be more realistic to consider that the $91,000 tax loss to the Government would bring in $1,400,000, and then the ratio would be 15 to 1.

It is certain that our exports can be increased if we are able to meet world market prices. Each industry will have to be studied to find out what percentage they must allow to enable export sales.

In many cases the additional export will also take up the slack of present production capacities and will, therefore, also stimulate the overall U.S. economy.

From the manufacturer's side, the picture will look as follows:

His loss will be 48 percent of $350,000, i.e.	$178,000
However, his income on the additional 17,500 units exported will be	175,000
His loss, therefore, is only	3,000

A Tribute to Leon Davis and Local 1199

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on May 21 workers at Mount Sinai Hospital, second largest voluntary hospital in New York City, voted 20 to 1 to be represented by local 1199 of the Drug and Hospital Employees Union. This represented an overwhelming victory for Leon Davis, president of local 1199, who is one of the most dynamic and progressive union leaders in the country. On May 26, the New York Herald Tribune published a fine article by Joel Seldin concerning Mr. Davis and his union. I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the following article:

LEON DAVIS AND HIS UNION: TWO REMARKABLE RECOVERIES

(By Joel Seldin)

"During the 1959 strike I didn't really believe that I'd ever see this day. But I knew that it had to happen, and that eventually the hospital workers had to benefit. They were at the very bottom of the scale. They couldn't be defeated because there was no place for them to go but up."

This was the recollection last Tuesday night of Leon J. Davis, president of local 1199, Drug and Hospital Employees Union, as workers at Mount Sinai Hospital, second largest voluntary hospital in the city, were voting 20 to 1 for the union.

It was the end of a long road that Mr. Davis started down in 1959, when he called local 1199 members out on strike against six New York voluntary hospitals, the chief among them Mount Sinai, to demand union recognition.

And it was also a beginning—on the task of building the first big union since the 1930's.

Among those who watch labor, the vote was a monument to Mr. Davis' unflagging conviction, against all odds and precedents, that the underpaid, unskilled, often alien and frequently illiterate hospital workers could be forged into an effective economically feasible union. Others had tried before but they had failed.

SIDELINED BY DOCTOR

From the start, Mr. Davis' attempt did not go unnoticed. In May 1959, at the height of the strike, when the union leader was holed up in a Manhattan hotel to dodge service of writs against the strike, the Herald Tribune found him and printed an interview.

On Tuesday, Mr. Davis was holed up again, but for a different reason. He was confined to his home in Queens, missing the excitement of the election and the gratification of the victory celebration because of doctor's orders. In February he suffered a heart attack. It will be months before he can go back to work, then only part time.

But there was no indication that the 52-year-old labor leader is letting up in his drive for full unionization of all the city's hospital workers, or that his illness has diminished his interest, even temporarily.

Through the evening, as the ballots were counted, his telephone brought reports of preliminary estimates. Each time, he jumped up to take the call, and to offer words of encouragement to the men in the field.

His wife, Julia, sounding resigned, commented: "This is probably better for him than his medicine."

Mr. Davis' recollections of the 1959 days were brief. Typically, his mind and his comments were on the future and the problems in store for the hospital workers and local 1199.

THE FIRST PROBLEM

The immediate problem will be in organizing hospitals, now that the State law has been amended and hospitals are no longer exempt from unionization. Local 144 Hotel and Allied Service Employees, is competing with local 1199 for the hospital workers.

"We will want to see that the hospitals are not fragmentized by 20 different unions. That would be bad both for the workers and the hospital.

"Fragmentation would be disastrous in a hospital. If they have a lot of different unions they will be in constant turmoil over labor problems, even if they don't have strikes.

"We think many hospital managements recognize this, and we expect less resistance from now on. We have demonstrated that we take a responsible position by our no-strike pledge, and we have shown that we are experienced with both professional and unskilled workers.

"We can do a good job for the hospital as well as for the workers. We were in the drug field for 25 years, and we know how to handle technical and nontechnical workers. We understand their problems.

"The forgotten people now are in the laboratories of the hospitals. There are some Ph. D.'s doing research who are terribly underpaid. We think there can be a place for them in our union."

RESISTANCE EXPECTED

Particular resistance to the union is expected from some of the largest hospitals, which are fighting organization by providing exemplary wages and working conditions. Another forecast sees resistance among the Catholic hospitals.

"Some hospitals will hold out, but higher wages won't stop workers from organizing. They want their rights—they want to be able to sit down with management and discuss their grievances. We will be able to organize in all the hospitals.

"We could win majorities in some of the Catholic hospitals now, and we will get more of them. We won't treat them differently than any other hospital."

The new law, backed by Governor Rockefeller as part of a hospital strike settlement last year, has opened the largest field for organizing in recent years.

There are 30,000 nonprofessional workers in the voluntary hospitals and nursing homes, where local 1199 is concentrating its effort. There are another 12,000 office and technical workers.

"We have 10,000 members now, and we should have 20,000 by the end of this year. In another 2 or 3 years, we should have perhaps 10,000 more hospital workers."

FIRST SINCE 1930'S

If that comes true, local 1199, which also has some 6,000 members in its drug division, bids fair to become the second or third largest union local in the city. The largest are now local 3, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and District 65 of the Retail, Wholesale & Department Store Union.

"This is the first big union to be built since the 1930's, but even more important than that is the fact that it involves so many Negro and Puerto Rican low-wage workers. This is more than just another union, this is part of the freedom struggle."

Mr. Davis is already thinking hard about the problems that come after the organizing, the problems of what to do with the "first big union to be built since the 1930's."

"In our kind of union, we are not interested in just wages and working conditions. We want to give our members a sense of understanding of their role in the community—their political rôle. Most of these people have not been voters. They are the slum dwellers.

"We cannot stop with the job and wages. We have to consider housing. These people are taken advantage of by phony merchants. The union must help in every way.

"We also have to bring out leadership in their own ranks. This will be good for the whole city. It will improve their buying power, and the city's political picture.

"The union is not obligated to either the Democrats or the Republicans. We are not like other unions—we have no political attachments. But it was Governor Rockefeller who gave these people the right to vote for the union."

At the longest range, Mr. Davis sees the union's job as organizing community centers, patterned after the young men's and women's Christian and Hebrew association centers.

"New York is not like a small town, where the worker goes to his union hall after work. After the office or factory closes, he has no contact with the union. He even pays his dues through checkoff.

The community center ought to be a union center, a place where the members of the community can gather to discuss their problems, get their recreation, fill their political needs. It ought to be a place that workers could look forward to coming to."

Of all the things that Mr. Davis is proud of, he is proudest of the hospital workers themselves.

THEY BELIEVED

"These people are terrific. All kinds of plans were set up that were supposed to be substitutes for the union, but the workers maintained the union for 4 years. Two thousand people paid dues out of their miserable salaries—$3 a month—and we couldn't go into the hospital to collect it.

"They did it because they believed in the union."

Statement of Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman Before the Subcommittee on Poultry of the House Committee on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this morning, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman appeared before the Poultry Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture.

As chairman of that subcommittee, I felt that Secretary Freeman's remarks were so important that they should be brought to the attention of every member of this body:

STATEMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON POULTRY, OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, MAY 29, 1963

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to meet with this subcommittee and discuss developments in export markets for U.S. poultry, particularly in the European Common Market. I think this group knows that poultry probably represents our outstanding success story in developing a new market abroad. I can say without hesitation that I have spent as much time, as much energy, in trying to maintain and improve the channels of commerce for poultry as I have on any other product in the foreign trade field.

The history of U.S. poultry shipments to the Common Market—primarily to West Germany—is relatively recent. By this time it is fairly well known history. But it adds up to an outstanding market development effort and will bear repeating.

The export program got underway in 1956, when members of the poultry industry and officials of the Department of Agriculture concluded that West Germany could be an excellent market for U.S. frozen poultry. This feeling persisted despite the skepticism of most German food importers, who seriously doubted that they could sell frozen, yellow-skinned, ready-to-cook birds. Germans preferred, so the argument went, fresh-killed, white-skinned, unfrozen poultry. The United States nevertheless went ahead with plans to give German consumers a chance to try our product. In 1956 the Department of Agriculture provided financial assistance for the first shipment of 4 million pounds of poultry to West Germany so as to keep the price of those first samples at a reasonable level.

The German poultry trade was astounded at the reception U.S. frozen birds got. I rather suspect that the German enthusiasm surprised even the most optimistic American suppliers. At any rate, German consumers turned out to be eager buyers. Poultry stocks were soon exhausted. (At about the same time, a comparably successful sales effort was made in Switzerland, but without any Government assistance.) Exports of poultry continued to increase. From virtually nothing in 1955, poultry sales to West Germany in 1962 reached the high total of 152 million pounds.

But let me make one point right here. German consumers were enthusiastic about U.S. poultry, but the West German Government was not. Despite the fact that their duty was bound under the GATT as 15 percent they were most reluctant to remove quantitative restrictions against poultry imports. As the result of strong pressure by our Government, these restrictions were relaxed in a piecemeal fashion and finally were ended only 2 years ago. When these were removed our exports shot up dramatically. For the first 12 months after liberalization our poultry exports doubled to West Germany.

While this is an outstanding example of market development, there have been many other remarkable achievements by our agricultural groups cooperating with the Department in our market development effort. I was heartened the other day to note that our agricultural exports during the first 10 months of the present fiscal year—through April—were $4,175 million, practically as large as the $4,197 million exported through April of last year. And you will recall that last year's exports of $5.1 billion were at record high. I consider this year's performance, in the face of record competitive crops abroad, particularly of cotton and grains, and our shipping strike last December, a tribute to the merchandising efforts of our agricultural exporters and the ingenuity of our cooperators in developing and maintaining new foreign outlets for their products.

Last year we were confronted with a new situation, far more complex and difficult than the German import restrictions. I refer to the poultry regulation of the EEC Commission in Brussels—which was and is the series of rules regulating both internal and external trade of the Community.

The Common Market's protective system is not a single levy. It is a complex of levies and charges.

First of all, the EEC has established what it calls a gate price, which is simply a minimum import price. We had been told on more than one occasion that this gate price was being established to prevent dumping by state-trading countries, such as those in Eastern Europe. By the time the regulation appeared, however, the intent and purpose of the gate price had been altered drastically. The purpose of the gate price came to be a protective wall. It presumably was based upon production costs in third countries, such as Denmark and the United States, but we found no relationship between the gate price and our own costs. The gate price was established at a landed price of about 33 cents a pound for ready-to-cook broilers, and it has been a long time since our domestic prices for broilers have reflected a landed price as high as this figure.

In addition to the gate price, the EEC Commission established what they called the poultry levy. For outside countries, such as the United States, this levy consists of three parts: (1) the old ad valorem tariff existing prior to the issuance of the poultry regulation, but with a slight downward adjustment; (2) the difference in value of feed grains need to produce a pound of broilers inside and outside of the Community; and (3) a 2-percent ad valorem duty, to give a preference to producers within the Community.

I realize that these are complex details. I'll try to clarify them. They mean simply this: A few years ago German consumers were able to buy U.S. poultry by paying a 5-cent-a-pound import duty. At that rate, U.S. producers could compete with other suppliers. Today, the total import fees have been jumped to 13 cents a pound. Because our exporters can land broiler chickens at Hamburg for roughly 30 to 31 cents a pound, these levies figure out at about 43 percent ad valorem, a most highly restrictive—in fact, I should say—highly excessive rate.

I might say at this point that many months before the new poultry regulation became effective we had stressed to EEC officials that a marked, sudden increase in the 5-cent-a-pound duty could severely damage our export trade. Despite our representations, the change in duties became effective overnight. On July 29 the duty was 5 cents per pound. The next day it jumped to about 10 cents a pound, and shortly thereafter to 13 cents a pound on broilers. And of course this group knows of the harmful effects that this high protective rate had on our exports.

Only part of the problem is with broilers. West Germany used to buy millions of pounds of backs and necks from our broiler industry because of the great popularity of soups and stew in West Germany. Before EEC, these backs and necks used to be landed in Germany for about one-third of the price of whole broilers—or about 10 cents a pound. However, because backs and necks were competing with European-produced stewing hens, the EEC decided to step up the tariff on these parts to extremely high rates. And how they stepped them up. EEC set the gate price and poultry levy for backs and necks at 125 percent of that imposed on whole birds—the same percentage adopted for other poultry parts, such as breasts.

What have been the effects of this complicated system on trade?

First of all, this system has really worked to limit imports from "outside countries" to the markets of the Community, particularly West Germany. Our trade has suffered the most. For the first 9 months of the new system, West German imports of poultry from all sources have dropped to 70 percent of the previous year's comparable 9-month period.

Sharp gains have been achieved by Belgium and France, and the Netherlands has about held its own. So the drop in trade has been at the expense of outside countries—particularly the United States. Imports of U.S. poultry were only about 40 percent of the 1961–62 level and only about 75 percent of the 1960–61 level. U.S. shipments of broilers and stewing hens have been hit especially hard—in contrast to turkeys where, despite the higher levies, we have almost held our own.

But there are problems within the Community as well. The poultry regulation permits heavy subsidies—which they term "restitution"—to be made. This has permitted one Common Market country to cut its export price on shipments to West Germany over 10 cents a pound as compared with its internal prices. The use of these subsidies is being contested strongly by other member countries. As a result, the poultry market in West Germany has suffered considerable disruption. This internal squabble over conditions of fair competition is being hotly debated in Brussels, and is a matter which must be resolved by the member countries. But it certainly is adding complications to our problem.

Nor are problems created by the poultry import system of the Community ending at its borders. Spillover effects have been created. Another "outside" exporting country, whose market in the Community has been curtailed, has responded by aggressively expanding its exports to Switzerland, our second most important export outlet. It has done so, by selling poultry in the Swiss market—as best we can tell—at a price about 15 cents per pound lower than in its home market. As a result, our share of the Swiss market has been cut in half.

These in brief are the problems. What has been done about them?

We have taken vigorous steps to protect our rights. The President has taken a strong personal hand in this matter, and has urged Common Market officials to modify the protective elements of the system to improve access for our poultry. U.S. Ambassadors, our agricultural attachés, have joined in this process. I can state unequivocally that we have had the wholehearted cooperation, at both the technical and policy level, of the whole machinery of our Government in trying to achieve a reasonable solution to this problem. On all my trips to Europe, and in my conversations with Common Market officials visiting here in Washington, I have hammered away at this issue. Nor should we forget that we have had the full cooperation of the U.S. poultry industry in this effort. In this connection, I particularly want to compliment the American Institute of Poultry Industries, which has done so much to help build this market.

We've kept the poultry problem alive on the negotiating table. We haven't let it be swept under the rug.

In a sense, we feel that as poultry goes, so go our overall trade prospects. We believe we must meet the challenge to our poultry trade, not only because of the merits of the product itself, but because of the symbolic importance it has to all our agricultural trade.

What we are seeking, and what we think it is reasonable for us to obtain, according to any reasonable interpretation of international trade rules and policies, is fair access to the European market for our poultry. And we would define fair access to mean modifications in the EEC poultry system to permit us to maintain the same share of the market that we had attained prior to the start of the common agricultural policy. After all, we are providing access, in our own market, to a wide range of EEC products, including many agricultural products. I could mention a few—wines, ham, cheese, fruit and vegetable products, and even a certain amount of poultry products.

In our efforts to obtain relief, we have urged modifications of the existing system. This does not mean that we have accepted in principle the equity of the various elements of the system.

For example, we have insisted that it is unfair to impose the gate price against products received from countries—such as our own—which do not subsidize poultry exports. We have argued the inequity of applying, arbitrarily, high levies on poultry parts—such as backs and necks. We have urged reductions in the grain component of the poultry levy, because we believe that it over compensates for the costs added to poultry by the higher grain prices in the Common Market system.

Despite all our efforts, I can only list two instances where the poultry system has been liberalized. The first of these occurred late last fall when the EEC Commission decided to impose a uniform supplemental levy to replace the individual invoice method of enforcing the gate price. For a while, it appeared that the West German Government was trying to collect two gate price charges—the one under the old as well as the one in the new system. At that time I was in Europe, and protested this case of apparent double jeopardy to Commissioner Mansholt. He assured me that this threat of dual charges was a mistake, and would be corrected. It was.

Also, we had been seeking a more equitable application of the gate price and levy on poultry parts—particularly backs and necks. As I mentioned earlier, these charges originally were set at 125 percent of those imposed on whole birds. Here again, strong representations were made to Community officials. And about a month ago, the Commission lowered the protective level to 60 percent. So now the total charges collected for backs and necks are around 18 cents per pound—7 cents less than before. We still think that this level is overly protective, but it should give some measure of relief to this area of our trade.

One of the things that we have been pounding away at is the feed conversion factor used in the gate price-levy system. From the start, we have been convinced that it was set too high. In order to convince the Commission that this element of the system should be modified, we sent a team of competent poultry experts to the Community last January. I think they did an outstanding job. As a result of their efforts, and, I am sure, independent studies by Commission experts, the EEC Commission proposed in late March, a lowering of the gate price and levy—based on reduced feed conversion factors. The total amount of the reduction proposed was 1.83 cents per pound. This would mean a reduction in the total charge against imports of U.S. broilers into West Germany from just under 13 to a little over 11 cents per pound. Although we believe that the feed conversion factors are still higher than they should be, the Commission proposal is a step in the right direction.

This proposal has not yet been acted upon by the EEC Council of Ministers. It must be approved unanimously by them before it can become effective. We have, of course, lent our strongest support to the Commission proposal in representations made at the capitols of the six countries. We have made it clear that in our view we cannot wait for a resolution of this matter beyond the meeting of this Council which will take place on May 30 or 31.

We are, of course, hopeful that the decision will be favorable. But if the meeting does not bring results, I think that we will have to take an entirely different approach.

We have been patient, perhaps overly patient, in seeking a solution within the existing system. We have demonstrated to Community officials that our trade has been damaged by the new system. And the Commission has acknowledged that remedial action is called for.

The next step in the process would be to invoke our negotiating rights under the so-called standstill agreement concluded as part of the settlement in the last round of tariff negotiations with the Community. Under this agreement, the Community is committed to negotiate with us regarding access to its market for our poultry products. You remember that before the close of the Dillon round of tariff negotiations there was a great urgency to complete the tariff bargain, but we were loathe to close the book on a system such as this which could seriously hurt our trade. Finally, at our insistence, this agreement was concluded with the Community.

We would, of course, carry to the negotiating table the rights we held with respect to poultry as of September 1, 1960. We regard these as extremely valuable rights. They encompassed a large and growing volume of trade at a fixed, reasonable rate of duty.

I would hasten to explain that although the Community is required to negotiate with us, we must come to a mutual agreement as to what constitutes reasonable access for our poultry products based on our negotiating rights.

Should we fail to agree—and, of course, our aim first and foremost is to protect our poultry trade—our only recourse would be to redress the tariff bargain—which is what the

Community did when we raised our duties last year on imports of carpets and glass.

Finally, let me say a few words about the implications of the recently concluded GATT ministerial meeting. At that session, the U.S. delegate, Gov. Christian Herter, said that agriculture must be included in the negotiations. He said that the United States could not agree to the closing of negotiations until satisfactory terms of access were developed for agricultural products. The Ministers accepted the recommendation of the United States that agriculture be included in the negotiations. I am greatly encouraged by this decision. Despite all the problems that remain to be worked out, the Ministers have accepted the principle that agricultural negotiations must be worked out side by side with industry.

For the first time, agriculture no longer will be sitting in the corner at these negotiations. Under this administration, agriculture will be sitting as an equal partner at the bargaining table. We're no longer Peck's bad boy. In this negotiation we will be examining, jointly with other countries, the fundamentals of our production and price policies—in other words, the elements of our different systems which affect trade. We welcome this kind of examination on a truly reciprocal basis, since for many commodities there is such widespread governmental influence on both the level of trade and the prices at which commodities are traded. I am convinced that this examination will indicate the relatively liberal access that foreign suppliers enjoy in the U.S. market for a wide range of agricultural products. On the basis of true reciprocity, I think we can expect and demand more liberal access for our exports to foreign countries.

The road ahead will be difficult, but there can be no misunderstanding of the firm intention of our Government to resolve trade problems of the kind we've been talking about today in a fair and equitable manner. Without such solutions, trade negotiations will not be concluded.

Address of Gov. Charles Edison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of May 2, 1963, a testimonial dinner in honor of Charles Edison was held in New York City. Some 500 guests gathered in the grand ballroom of the Plaza Hotel to honor this great American. Messages were received from distinguished American leaders throughout the country and from anti-Communist leaders elsewhere in the world.

It was my great privilege to have a small part in honoring Governor Edison and to share in the most memorable part of the evening, Charles Edison's response.

As a part of my remarks, I would like to include Governor Edison's message as follows:

AN AMERICAN LOOKS AT THE NATION

(By Charles Edison)

I would like to speak about America—about how it was and how it is. America—our country—the culmination of the dreams of the Founding Fathers and the centuries-old aspirations of men throughout the world for liberty.

"Liberty"—a word that seems almost archaic in these days—sort of old fashioned and fondly remembered, but belonging to an old frontier somewhere back in the pleasant dead days when the United States was a power to be reckoned with.

"Liberty"—a word and an ideal for which men pledged to each other their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor—for which farmers and merchants and artisan and iron-mongers and cobblers and writers and preachers—all of them together—withstood the bitter winter of Valley Forge to carve out a new nation and a new idea. The spark set by these men ignited a fire which swept the word and still—even in these days of cynical hypocricy—still has the power to inflame men to action—in Hungary, in China, in East Berlin and—yes—even in Cuba.

What did this word mean? What caused men to leave their shops and their farms prepared to give their lives fighting against what must have seemed tremendous odds—against the mightiest colonial power of the day—against the might of England. Certainly, at that time, England must have seemed at least as powerful as Russia does today. Yet, the thirst for freedom banished fear. These were men and women as you and I—with basically the same problems of bringing up children, of paying the bills, of trying to live their lives peacefully and well. What was it, then, that moved them so and brought forth every resource of courage and strength known to man? The word "Liberty"? Yes. And the meaning behind the word.

Liberty meant the right to control one's own destiny and, above all, the God-given right of each individual man to pursue his life as he saw fit—without interference or control except as he was responsible to his neighbors and his community. This, above all, was the essence of the word and the dream—the rights of the individual above any right which may be seized from him by government, whether it be from a foreign shore or from within his own country.

As so the Nation was founded—given strength by its individual citizens and given form by the Constitution drafted by the Founding Fathers.

And the Nation flourished. Through the years, it became the new promised land to peoples from every section of the earth. And, for the most part, the promises were fulfilled. From every nation and every area they came—the immigrants, the new Americans—giving of their talents and the sweat of their brows to build America into a proud and free and fearless nation. From the famine-stricken farms of Ireland, from the peasant villages of Italy, from the snow-swept hills of Sweden, from the coal mines of Wales, from the ghettos of Russia—from the tyranny that was Europe they came. And, yes—many came involuntarily—from the jungles of Africa and from the villages of China. And they, too, eventually found freedom and added their strength to America.

The American people marched on and settled the continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The true frontier moved forward. Our strength came from liberty and from the guaranteed right of each American to control his own destiny. The treasure of our country was brought forth from the earth and from the mountains to make the Nation rich and to give our people more of the good things of life than any other people on earth in any era of recorded history.

And as we grew, we learned that liberty could not be held exclusively. With technological advances, the fate of other people's freedom became intertwined with our own. And our young men once again laid down their lives—in Cuba and the Philippines in the war with Spain, in World War I and World War II, in Korea—and today in Vietnam—for liberty. For liberty and—the way things are going—perhaps for nothing.

This was our country and these were the American people—nurtured in the spirit of individual liberty and in their obligations to the Nation through patriotic understanding of what America meant. Through those years, our Nation produced heroes and villians—strong men and weak men. But all in all we produced a great and proud people. Unhappily, I speak in the past tense.

What has happened?

The spirit of the old frontier has been whittled away and eroded in the past 30 years until the American people now find themselves in the never, never land of the New Frontier. The eternal values of the Nation have been labeled "old fashioned" and not fit to survive along this New Frontier. The strength of the American people has been sapped.

From a people who proudly held honor as among the basic tenets of individual and national life, we have become a people where more and more honesty and honor are looked on as being old fashioned. A country where self-reliance, pride, hard work, and thrift are being replaced by ideas of dependency on Government, pleasure before duty, higher pay for less work, and the right to Government handouts.

And the honor of the Nation—what has happened to that? An administration which permits a policy of news distortion or blackout of truth in apprising the American people of the state of affairs and excuses this by citing national security. A nation which has propagandized peoples throughout the world living in Communist slavery on the principles of liberation and on America's courageous dedication to freedom—this same nation cowers in fear when they are called upon to help the struggle for freedom carried out in other nations of the world. A bit of our Nation's honor was lost along with the Hungarian revolution. Still more of our Nation's honor has been lost in the waters of the Caribbean along with the brave men who seek to liberate their Cuban island from slavery.

And what has happened to individual liberty—to the right of the American citizen to pursue his life and his destiny as he sees fit and within the limits of his capabilities? No longer can an American farmer grow what he wants. No longer can an American businessman produce what he wants or employ whom he wants. No longer can an American exercise his full talents and his initiative in order to profit himself and his family. More and more everything is controlled or else it is just not worth it to see the fruits of his labor be taxed away into the enormous Federal bureaucracy.

The American citizen is today controlled by a bureaucratic Frankenstein which he created himself. More and more, individualism is lost to the State. More and more, the State does all—feeds, houses, clothes, cares for the aged, cares for the youth, cares for the lower income group, the middle income group—takes care of everyone and everything. Thus, the empty philosophy of socialism is replacing the rich and free traditions of America.

There is a community of men today in the United States who live under this system. All their human needs are taken care of. They are fed reasonably well, they are housed in decent and air-conditioned quarters. When they are ill, there is medical care available. They are given work training and taught various trades and skills and they have job security. Their recreation is assured. There are books and study programs available. They have no problems other than that of living. This is the perfect example of socialism. The place I speak of is in Leavenworth, Kans. And this Leavenworth system—under different names and different slogans—is slowly being imposed on the American people. If this system is every finally implemented throughout the United States, it wil be truly escapeproof.

We have already lost much of our individual liberty. Our people's initiative is being destroyed. The eternal values which have made us great have been relegated to the scrap heap. The New Frontier offers us culture and entertainment and security and welfare—and emptiness. The courage of our people—proved again and again from Valley Forge, through Gettysburg, through the trenches in France, through the islands of the Pacific, through the mud of Korea—has been squandered in fear and appeasement of tyranny and in international cowardice. Our leaders rush forward to embrace our enemies—knowing that each time this is done freedom is lost in some place in the world. They seem unable to face up to the fact that the enemy is our enemy and meet it squarely.

The world has seen many dark times. One period of history was even called the Dark Ages. But even in those times, men carried on. In those years, there were monks who went from town to town—from country to country. Under their robes, they carried with them the manuscripts, the learning of the centuries gone before. They were hunted from place to place, and yet they carried with them the light of knowledge and the light of truth. Without them, all would have been lost.

Perhaps that is the function of Americans today—to keep on fighting and to carry with them the eternal truths laid down by our Founding Fathers. These truths are eternal and they will survive.

I have lived a good many years. No one knows all the answers, but I do know this: in the time that is left me, I will continue fighting for America—for what it really is and what it really means. And so must we all—no matter what the obstacles and no matter how discouraged we may become. To give up would indeed be a sin against the memory of all those heroes of the past who have given us a nation.

Urban Renewal Must Serve the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the 20th Congressional District on Manhattan's West Side an ambitious urban renewal program is underway. At the time the West Side urban renewal project was before the city planning commission and the board of estimate I fought for an increase in the number of units of public housing to be incorporated in the plan. The purpose of the title 1 housing program is to serve people, not profits or prestige. And the purpose should not be to increase local revenue from real estate taxes. The purpose should be to provide better housing for all people, particularly minority groups who suffer from the evils of discrimination. Urban renewal should be carried out to achieve integrated housing.

Mr. Speaker, the Reporter magazine's issue of May 23 has an article by Elinor Richey which describes the results of the Hyde Park urban renewal project in Chicago. This article should serve as a warning to those responsible for carrying out the West Side urban renewal project in New York City. I hope that the following article will be read by all who are concerned with housing:

SPLITSVILLE, U.S.A.: AN IRONIC TALE OF URBAN RENEWAL AND RACIAL SEGREGATION

(By Elinor Richey)

CHICAGO.—James Baldwin has observed that whenever trouble breaks out in Harlem, the city installs a new playground. In Chicago's Negro ghetto, they conduct a study.

Characteristically, official studies on the Negro in Chicago pretend to discover and register indignation about the condition that prompted them. Two recent studies, however—private ones financed by the Ford Foundation and the Urban League—have probed their special problems of housing and school segregation deeply enough for measurement. The surveys revealed that these two forms of racial segregation have increased in Chicago since the Supreme Court desegregation directives of 1948 and 1954. The school study, covering the years 1958 to 1962, found that segregation had increased from 88 to 92 percent over that period. The housing study shows that residential segregation rose from 92.1 to 93 percent in the decade between 1950 and 1960. Not only did the trend offset the Supreme Court decisions but it paralleled Chicago's mammoth nondiscriminatory housing program—a fact that puts into question the effectiveness of President Kennedy's order banning discrimination in federally assisted housing.

These discouraging statistics surprised many. Not that anyone believed much progress was being made toward integration in Chicago, but the Nation's largest racial ghetto has seemed sealed off from change of any kind. Federal Housing Administrator Robert C. Weaver has called the huge Negro sector extending from the Loop to the Indiana line the most segregated area in the industrial North. The U.S. Civil Rights Commission has termed Chicago the most segregated city of more than 500,000 population. Negroes call it simply Splitsville. Boundary lines expand but never crack. Chicago's Negro ghetto has been as carefully preserved as the Chicago water tower, and every Chicago real estate man knows how.

THE COOPERATIVE SPIRIT

Splitsville is a product of the Chicago Real Estate Board's rule of segregation, as strictly enforced today as when laid down in 1917. The rule decreed: "Each block shall be filled solidly [with Negroes] and further expansion shall be confined to contiguous blocks," and this shall be done just as slowly as possible. When it drafted the rule, the board called for active cooperation from all civic bodies, and in the 46 years since, Chicago's cooperation has never wavered. Cooperation has flowed abundantly from the city council, the police, lending institutions, newspapers, churches, and from white citizens. The latter have cooperated by bombing or burning the homes of nonconformists. In the early years of the rule a house was wrecked on an average of every 20 days; nowadays, thanks to mellowed tradition, this measure is necessary only two or three times a year.

Citizens formerly cooperated, also, by inserting clauses into their property deeds forbidding resale or lease to Negroes. By the Second World War, restrictive covenants protected 80 percent of white residential property, virtually walling up the Negro sector. Consequently a huge wartime immigration into the sector piled up a population density several times that of white residential areas. When the Supreme Court, in 1948, declared racially restrictive covenants unenforcible, Chicago Negroes hailed their liberation from the ghetto. But they underestimated the rule. The Court decision's sole effect was to set the ghetto expanding again, moving contiguously, moving slowly.

Today what little residential integration there is in Chicago—now 25.6 percent Negro—exists almost exclusively along the ghetto border, and most of it in blocks undergoing transition from white to Negro. Two remarkable exceptions are the fringe neighborhoods of central Kenwood, a district of older homes, and Lake Meadows, a new private apartment development, both of which are stabilized in an almost even racial balance. Elsewhere along the ghetto border, residential integration has declined markedly. Whereas in 1950 89 percent of Chicago Negroes lived in predominantly Negro districts, in 1960 the figure had risen to 95 percent. Since a third of the privileged 5 percent live in central Kenwood and Lake Meadows, integration along the ghetto borders must have been subjected to some powerful deterrent.

This deterrent is no mystery to those who have perceived the effect of urban renewal on the Chicago Negro—the actual effect, as opposed to the official publicized effect. Chicago currently has 33 urban renewal projects going, but only 1 is far enough along to evaluate. It is located in the University of Chicago neighborhood of Hyde Park. The official Hyde Park success story is a Chicago legend. Through citizen planning and participation, the publicity goes, Hyde Park was cleared of slums and rebuilt into a model community of gleaming town houses, apartments, and shopping centers, in whose wall-to-wall efficiency Negroes and whites share equally and amicably. The Chicago American hails it as a "monument to planning."

Part of the legend is true. Hyde Park began to run down in the 1940's, and by 1950 the Negro ghetto extended over about a third of the neighborhood, with a mixed area separating white and Negro sectors. Housing clearance got under way in the early 1950's, and grew into a communitywide urban renewal program after a 1954 Federal act extended renewal assistance to commercial districts and to housing rehabilitation. One requirement for obtaining Federal urban renewal funds is that plans have "full-fledged communitywide citizens participation and support." The Hyde Park renewal plan was drawn up by a professional planner hired by the University of Chicago with a grant from the Field Foundation. The plan was underwritten with public clearance funds totaling $37.7 million ($28.5 million Federal, the rest city). Before the plan was submitted to the Chicago city council for approval, community representatives were called in to inspect it. Though the planner refused to make any basic changes or reduce the amount of clearance, he was able to talk many critics into seeing things his way.

But not all were persuaded. Monsignor John Egan, representing the Roman Catholic archdiocese, and spokesmen for the Hyde Park Tenant and Homeowners Association flatly condemned the plan. The priority task, as the association saw it, was to relieve the pressing housing needs of low-income families, especially Negroes, thousands of whom had been pushed into the Hyde Park area after being evicted by a large private development. It would be unjust, many felt, to evict 20,000 low-income citizens and replace their homes with one-third as much housing designed for upper-middle-income tenancy. Ninety percent of the housing marked for clearance was of brick construction, Monsignor Egan pointed out—better than the tenants could find elsewhere.

Defenders of the plan retorted that 80 percent of existing housing would be left intact, that only deteriorated structures would be razed, and that this step was imperative if the white exodus from the neighborhood was to be halted. With blight banished, middle-class citizens would be attracted back from suburbia. Julian Levi of the University of Chicago-sponsored South East Chicago Commission argued: "The University needs a compatible neighborhood, one that will permit it to do its basic job in scholarship and research * * * You must view the project in terms of land use. Urban redevelopment is not an exercise in sociology."

The plan was approved. The city council did recommend, however, as a concession, that 120 units of public housing be included in the project, and directed that all housing constructed on clearance sites be offered on a racially nondiscriminatory basis. Since Hyde Park was the first urban renewal program professing to be interracial, it got national publicity as a "pilot project."

While Negro approval of the project was not required, the nondiscriminatory claim won it. James Baldwin has written of the Negro's "wise desire not to be betrayed by too much hoping." But Chicago Negroes, disappointed by the lack of results of the covenant decision, did turn hopefully toward the promises of urban renewal and believed that in time the trials of relocation would bring better housing opportunities.

NO BRONZE PHOENIX

No sooner had rubble dust begun flying that the Negro community grew alarmed. While 80 percent of the housing in all Hyde Park was indeed untouched, approximately 20,000 of Hyde Park's population of 70,000 were evicted in the clearance of entire blocks in West Hyde Park, and 14,000 of those moved were Negroes. Negroes were being evicted wholesale, cried the Negro press; forced-sale properties were undervaluated; relocation assistance was inadequate; available housing was less good and more expensive. Moreover, color seemed to be the prime target of the wrecking balls. Solid Negro blocks were getting a clean sweep, while integrated blocks underwent spot clearance of property that nearly always was Negro-occupied. The Urban League charged that 8 out of 10 of those relocated were Negro, and that the pile-up in the already overcrowded ghetto was "breeding more slums and worse slums" and causing "further concentration, enlargement, and institutionalization of segregation." Negroes began to say that urban renewal was really Negro removal and a process of chasing slums around.

Such discontent deserved study. A University of Chicago sociology team investigated Chicago rental opportunities and found that twice as many Negroes as whites lived in substandard housing, but because of acute demand Negroes paid $15 more a month for theirs—in effect, a color tax. This economic hardship (Negro income averages 30 percent lower than white) caused families to double up, overburdening facilities and services and thereby generating slum conditions.

One ghetto neighborhood where relocated Negroes were being concentrated was Woodlawn, which borders Hyde Park on the south. Built to accommodate 25,000 residents, Woodlawn by 1960 bulged with 82,000, many disgruntled at having been evicted by clearance several times. When the white press began calling Woodlawn blight ridden and vice infected, and delegations began prying around with note pads, Negroes smelled another Negro removal project brewing. Convinced that population squeezing had reached the limit, Woodlawn's Protestant and Catholic clergy pooled a fund and, in 1960, hired a professional organizer, Saul Alinsky, to organize Woodlawn to withstand wholesale clearance. The University of Chicago's announcement of its south campus plan wasn't long in coming. Having applied for Federal funds under a new act designed to help colleges improve their environment, the university hoped to clear a mile-long slice of Woodlawn for an expansion program.

More than 40,000 Woodlawners rallied to Alinsky's Temporary Woodlawners Organization, and at a community congress voted overwhelmingly to oppose any renewal program that was not approved and directed by Woodlawn citizens. Alinsky warned, "There will be people lying in front of the bulldozers if the university doesn't listen to us." Up to the moment of writing, the bulldozers haven't breached Woodlawn's borders.

When pricing on Hyde Park's rising apartments and town houses was announced, Negro tempers flared. Apartment rentals ranged from $125 for efficiences to $235 for bedroom apartments; town houses were priced from $20,000 to $42,000. Negroes cried, "We've been priced out!" Then, Hyde Park business interests succeeded in postponing indefinitely the construction of the 120 units of public housing the city council had recommended. By this time, the Negroes were sure they had been duped. "Urban renewal was a false promise," declared the Urban League. The Negro daily Chicago Defender summed it up ruefully: "Nothing has been more difficult to contend with than the newest strategy and racial discrimination—the device called urban renewal."

This disenchantment was dramatized last spring by two dissimilar events. Negro sculptor Richard Hunt, who had been commissioned to execute a bronze phoenix for a monument to Hyde Park urban renewal, stunned Hyde Park by announcing that he had decided not to complete his work. To a plea that he reconsider, Hunt replied that he would deliver his sculpture only on condition that he be permitted to destroy it as soon as it was unveiled. (The monument was not recommissioned.) The other event was the trouncing at the polls of Mayor Richard J. Daley's $22.5-million urban renewal bond issue. Analysis of the vote showed the Negro electorate contributed strongly to the defeat.

The mayor's response was to release a study, a survey of real-estate speculator operations that revealed new exploitation methods such as installment plan contracts. The buyer who was late in making his payment was charged a sizable fine; if he defaulted, his property was repossessed without refund. One buyer who had paid $800 down and $222 a month plus fines for 2 years lost all by defaulting. Since the study prompted no corrective regulations, presumably its only effect was to advertise the lucrative possibilities of "turning a neighborhood."

IF THEY CAN PAY

Negro repudiation of urban renewal has prodded the conscience of Hyde Park, which is proud of its reputation for liberalism. There has been some checking to determine if Negro accusations are valid. Checking is remarkably easy. The amount of new housing constructed on urban renewal sites is well known to be 250 town houses and 2 apartment buildings. Twenty-seven town houses are occupied by Negro families (the majority interracial couples); an FHA survey found 14 percent Negro tenancy in the apartments. It is difficult to determine to what degree this low Negro occupancy is due to pricing, how much to screening. All other construction on urban renewal land to date has been for institutional and retail commercial use; other cleared sites have been assigned for parks and playlots; much cleared land remains unpurchased. To be sure, a great deal of new housing has gone up in the project area on sites unaffected by the nondiscriminatory clause, and a great deal of the older housing has been rehabilitated. Property values have soared; so have rents. None of the promised 120 units of public housing have been constructed, nor have sites been assigned. Eighty-four units of housing for the elderly, which had been projected prior to urban renewal, were relegated to a remote corner of Hyde Park. Formerly separated by blocks undergoing racial transition, white and Negro sectors now are cleaved by an economic line of demarcation through which Negroes pass, if they are lucky, for the small quantity of housing for which they are eligible—if they can pay.

Thus, the admission of 100 professional-class Negro families to Hyde Park's urban renewal housing appears to be the replacement for the 14,000 Negroes who were evicted.

Initially touted as a national model for racially integrated urban renewal, the federally assisted nondiscriminatory pilot project has served to roll back the ghetto border, generating pressures that deliver displaced residents into the hands of greedy landlords and ruthless speculators. More than 150,000 Negro Chicagoans have been displaced by clearance since 1948, according to the Urban League. The Chicago experience stands as a dire warning of how the President's new nondiscriminatory housing order can be circumvented by planners whose goal is upgrading real estate values instead of human lives. Urban renewal has even failed in its goal of attracting suburbanites back to the city; the exodus of Chicagoans to the suburbs has increased.

If clearance has promoted residential segregation, school segregation has been assisted by new construction—that is, by the construction of additional all-Negro schools. Since the 1930's, the Chicago Board of Education has generally used residential segregation as its guide for school-attendance zoning (except during the 1947–53 superintendency of Harold Hunt), redrafting school districts as the color line shifted. But school segregation lagged behind housing segregation for a time because of a lack of seating space in Negro schools. When Negro schools reached the load limit of 45 students to a classroom, the overflow was channeled across ghetto lines until additional schools could be built.

A large school-construction appropriation has had the effect of enforcing a segregation policy for which the board recently was taken to task by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. The board justifies its policy on the basis that it is operating a "neighborhood school system," but the Commission charged that "In many areas it has not been operating a neighborhood school system, but has acted as if it were." Superintendent Benjamin Willis recently asked for more building funds. Negro groups oppose the request, saying that construction will be used for further racial separation, and that under integration the 22,000 surplus seats in white schools would take up the seat shortages of Negro schools. They say—and the Civil Rights Commission concurs—that Chicago Negro schools are inferior to white schools and that Negro schools are poorly supervised because of the lack of experienced teachers. Awaiting more building funds, the board is maintaining segregation by assigning Negro classes to mobile classrooms (dubbed "Willis wagons"), cafeterias, auditoriums, corridors, gymnasiums, basements, warehouses, vacant stores, and apartment space in public housing.

Educated by a school system that seems to be striving toward the separate but equal Supreme Court directive of 1896, housed according to the Chicago rule of 1917, and disillusioned by a decade of nondiscriminatory housing, Chicago Negroes cheered neither President Kennedy's latest housing order nor Mayor Daley's latest study which explored Chicago in the year 2013 and found all races completely integrated and absorbed.

Appeasement At Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is tragic for the United States that we have a policy of hopping whenever the Kremlin snaps its fingers. Two articles by Roscoe Drummond and David Lawrence, in the New York Herald Tribune of May 3, aptly describe our disgracefully weak-kneed policy:

WHAT WILL MAKE KENNEDY ACT?—CUBA, WHERE REDS STAY ON, AND HAITI, A NEW APPLICANT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—What will it take to persuade the Kennedy administration that the removal of Soviet troops from Cuba is the U.S. Government's first order of business?

If the Kremlin acquires another satellite in Latin America from which to operate, will this convince the President that the Soviet forces in the Western Hemisphere constitute a clear and present danger which must be soon removed?

I raise this question because a second Latin American country is evidently just yearning to be embraced. This is the little Batista-type dictatorship of François Duvalier in Haiti which is showing every sign of reaching out to Khrushchev and Castro in the hope that they can save it from the disillusion and discontent of his own people.

Trying to perpetuate his regime beyond its constitutional end this month, Mr. Duvalier is apparently desperate enough to take the risk of inviting in the Soviet-Castro Communists.

If this should happen, what would be the response of those who view the Soviet presence in Cuba as a secondary concern? No doubt some would argue that the danger is not increased, but divides between two countries, that the more the Soviets take over, the more Castro's image will be impaired elsewhere, and that if we will only keep quiet the Soviet troops will go away.

I suspect that most Americans are not so wishful or so timid.

Furthermore, the prospect that the desparate Duvalier will throw his country into the embrace of Soviet-dominated Cuba is no imaginary nightmare.

The Foreign Minister of the Dominican Republic, Andres Freites, has informed a peace mission of the Organization of America States that he has information showing that the Haitian President has already offered military bases to Castro.

Such a disclosure is not surprising, since there is already evidence that Duvalier has been maintaining secret contacts with the Haitian Communists and simultaneously making public overtures to Czechoslovakian and other Soviet bloc Communists abroad.

No doubt the Haitian dictator, who has tried to rewrite his nation's constitution in order to perpetuate his regime with a semblance of legality, believes that he can "borrow" enough Communist force from Castro to keep him in power but not enough to allow the Soviet-Castro forces to take over his government.

It doesn't work that way. Communists don't help keep non-Communists in office, as the events in Laos grimly prove. This is why the revelation that Duvalier hopes to save himself by offering a base for the Khrushchev-Castro forces can hardly fail to send a chill down the spine of every official in Washington.

It seems to me the premise of the administration is that because of other cold war issues (such as Berlin and Laos) we dare not make the removal of Soviet troops a top priority or accept the risks of action. I believe the opposite is nearer the truth, that if we don't deal decisively with the Soviet presence in Cuba, we will thereby be set back everywhere else in thec old war.

How often and how rightly it has been said that unless the United States stands resolutely against the encroachment of the Soviet Union on West Berlin, the whole Atlantic Alliance will decay and crumble. I believe it is equally true that unless we soon turn back the Soviet military encroachment in the Western Hemisphere, we will be undermining the Western position elsewhere as well as in Latin America.

We can't separate Cuba from the rest of our world position and leave the Soviet presence there unresolved. Once the Kennedy administration makes this decision, it will find the means to implement it. And it will have the massive support of the American people.

THE "PEACE AT ANY PRICE" ATMOSPHERE IN CAPITAL

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—The administration has decided to take a new line against the critics of its Cuban policy. It is to accuse them of wanting to plunge the United States into a nuclear war.

McGeorge Bundy, Presidential adviser on foreign policy, said in a panel discussion at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce convention here this week that the only alternatives to the present policy toward Cuba are a naval quarantine or military invasion. He added:

"Honest critics should say whether they prefer these acts of war to the Kennedy policy."

Judging by speeches in a similar vein by Democrats in Congress, it begins to look as if the administration is preparing to apply a "kept us out of war" slogan in the next political campaign if Cuba persists as a major issue—as seems likely, based on the widespread discussion of it among members of both political parties.

But the "kept us out of war" concept is the most dangerous of all political gimmicks, as it can bring on the very war that nobody wants. Back in 1916, the Democrats won a presential election with the cry that President Wilson had "kept us out of war." Mr. Wilson never used the slogan himself in his campaign speeches or claimed it as an accomplishment of his administration. But within 6 months after his election, the United States was forced into World War I.

Historians can attest that the miscalculation by the Kaiser's government was based on the assumption that American public opinion would restrain the American Government from going to war under any circumstances. The German Government had for more than a year refrained from torpedoing any merchant ships carrying American citizens. America's strong protest over the sinking of the *Lusitania* had brought about this forbearance on the part of Germany. But after the American presidential campaign had taken on virtually a "peace at any price" complexion, the militarists in Berlin decided to take a chance. They torpedoed unarmed ships on which Americans were traveling, and it did lead to war.

AGAIN IN THE THIRTIES

The same kind of situation arose in the 1930's in Europe. Prime Minister Chamberlain had given the impression that he feared any war. Hitler, in starting his war against Poland in September, 1939, took it for granted that Britain wouldn't fight.

President Kennedy made it very clear last October that he wouldn't hesitate to use military force to get rid of the Soviet missiles in Cuba. His firm attitude brought about the withdrawal of many of the missiles. This country experienced a war scare and breathed a sigh of relief when the Soviet Government apparently backed down.

But, as is characteristic of the Communists, the maneuver was merely a test. There is no evidence now that the Soviets intend to give up Cuba as a military base where they can maintain many thousands of troops and technicians and keep a measure of control over a government in this hemisphere, only 90 miles away from the territory of the United States.

Naturally, this has caused much anxiety. Some Democratic Senators have been as vehement in their criticism as Republicans. But the administration has not been able to clear up the situation and gives no indication that military measures will be applied to drive the Soviet military apparatus out of Cuba. The President's advisers take the position that any such drastic steps would bring on a big war.

Will this, however, encourage the Soviets to continue their aggressive position? Will they miscalculate and compel a showdown that really could bring on a war? These are the serious questions that are arising now, and it is in this context that comments from Mr. Kennedy's advisers about the awfulness of war can have a meaning in Moscow which is certainly not intended by anyone in a position of responsibility in the Washington Government.

On top of it all—as Castro is received with enthusiasm in Moscow by Khrushchev—a speech is delivered by the Soviet Minister of Defense accusing the United States of carrying on "a policy of aggressions and provocations toward Cuba, supporting and encouraging the piratical activities of enemies of the Cuban people."

Strangely enough, the American Government's spokesmen have failed to make strong speeches denouncing the aggressive acts and purposes of the Soviet Union, which were revealed when the United States by aerial surveillance discovered missiles planted in Cuba and aimed at this country. Instead, the comments emanating from the administration are concerned wholly with a fear that the use of force to assure American rights would be displeasing to the Soviets and could bring war.

The atmosphere today seems to be one of peace at any price. Though strong words were used several months ago, the tendency now is to accept the situation with respect to the continued presence in Cuba of Soviet troops and to bear with it indefinitely. The big question now is whether the current complacency here will stimulate the Moscow Government to become more aggressive in Cuba and elsewhere by reason of its confidence that the United States is either afraid to retaliate or will not wish to do so at least until after the next presidential election when the campaign on a policy of peace at any price has run its course.

Taxpayers Pay for Administration Lobbyists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, no administration has been so blatant in the use of taxpayers' money to pay for lobbyists in behalf of its pet projects than has the present one. Using the peoples' money to sell them on the grandios schemes of the social planners is bad enough, but what is worse the administration lobbyists are not even honest in their presentations. The least the people should be able to expect is an honest presentation of the facts, but this does not seem to be part of the administration thinking. A good example recently was the Federal lobbying of the farmer prior to the wheat referendum to secure a favorable vote.

How unfair lobbying works is told in the following editorial from the May 27 issue of the AMA News showing how the public is being hoodwinked on the Kennedy program for medical aid:

UNFAIR LOBBYING

The administration's use of Federal employees as itinerant lobbyists for Government medicine is open to serious criticism. The practice is unfair to the citizen—an insult to his intelligence and an attack upon his pocketbook.

Last year at this time there were Federal workers all over the country making the pitch for the King-Anderson bill, offering something like health care for the elderly at a cost of almost nothing per week. Few people took the bait. With the coming of spring they are out again, traveling far and wide at the taxpayers' expense, and more of them can be expected.

Perhaps this is a good sign. The fact that the administration's lobbyists are still making their weary rounds is solid evidence that the people are still rejecting Government medicine. If the majority—or even a near majority—of the people wanted compulsory medicine, there would be no need for a corps of cross-country orators. They could stay in Washington and do the work for which they were hired, work which does not include propagandizing a bill which most taxpayers oppose.

The speeches and interviews of these travelers follow a set and unsuccessful pattern. The King-Anderson bill is inaccurately labeled "hospitalization insurance" and briefly sketched to avoid the cost and the medical and social consequences. The elderly population is described as destitute. Voluntary health insurance and the Kerr-Mills law are then termed inadequate and the medical profession is defamed. These tactics have generated enthusiasm only from picked audiences.

Most people, as they listen to this sort of thing, remain unconvinced. Many turn against the speaker. They know that most of the elderly are not impoverished or lacking care and that voluntary methods are doing an increasingly good job. They do not recognize their local physicians as blackhearted villians and they do not believe that their doctors would belong to a disreputable organization.

A great number of these people do recognize that the real issue is whether Government compulsion shall replace voluntary enterprise in this country. They wonder why the speaker from Washington did not mention that, and why he did not mention the tax burden upon young people. The results of such speeches were singularly bad last year.

So far they have been bad again this year. Not long ago a woman smoking a cigar, an employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dropped into Chicago as a King-Anderson speaker and stated, "I am really just a lobbyist." Representative DURWARD G. HALL of Missouri, citing this confession, told his fellow Congressmen:

"It amounts to a disregard for the laws passed by the Congress and the Secretary of HEW should consider her dismissal under the provisions of title 18, U.S.C., section 1913. * * * She is a lobbyist for passage of the King-Anderson bill 1963 version, and if these are her duties, then she should not be drawing her salary from the taxpayers, but rather from one of the organizations supporting that measure such as the Forand Senior Citizens Council."

Leading the peripatetic pack this year is Ivan Nestingen, Under Secretary of HEW. Last year the undersecretary was hooted at a nonpartisan banquet in Wilmington, Del., when he gave a partisan speech on the King-Anderson bill disguised under the title of "My Career as a Public Official." The audience saw through the deception and resented it. This year Nestingen's itinerary included Concord, N.H., where he and a U.S. Senator addressed the State legislature on an equal time basis following an 11-minute speech by the president-elect of the AMA. The equal time stretched out to 34 minutes and included the usual tirade against the medical profession. A columnist for the Concord Monitor summed up the Nestingen performance:

"It was awful."

The public desires and deserves information. But the fact that the administration believes there is a need to use misrepresentation, half-truths and untruths, and villification to sell its program is disturbing. For although it indicates that the plan is not selling, it also indicates a paternalistic contempt for the ability of free people to choose for themselves. It should lead to a thought about Government goals. For it has never been necessary for a government to push a people toward greater freedom; a government's push is always toward more government.

Salute to Maj. L. Gordon Cooper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, we in New York City were honored on May 22 to have with us Maj. L. Gordon Cooper. At a luncheon in his honor the mayor of New York delivered an address which, I believe, not only sums up the feelings of New Yorkers but expresses the sentiments of all Americans. The address of Mayor Robert F. Wagner follows:

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT LUNCHEON IN HONOR OF ASTRONAUT GORDON COOPER

During those tense hours of May 15 and 16 when New Yorkers, along with millions everywhere, listened, read, and prayed about and for Gordon Cooper, they learned some new words like "T-time," "retrorocket" and "G force," and some new uses for old words like "go."

"Oxygen is go." "All systems go." "You are smack-dab in the middle of the go plot." These phrases, relayed and heard from Mercury Control shortly after the blastoff, thrilled New Yorkers to the core. And they have caught on in the streets and playgrounds of this city.

Today New York wants to say to you, Gordon Cooper, in your vocabulary, but with a New York twist, that as far as we are concerned, you are go, go, go. In our phraseology, New York goes for you, in a very big way * * * and also for those in all ranks, stations and capacities who made your trip possible, and who were, in fact, part of your effort and for whom you were the human extension and spearhead.

In the past, we have had the opportunity to express our feelings about your fellow astronauts who blazed the trail into space * * * the five who have preceded you. I hope that we will have a chance to greet and welcome, in a manner similar to this, each of those who will follow you, including the first ones to get to the moon and back.

We who are earthbound warmly salute you, and each of your fellow astronauts, and Administrator Jim Webb, and all of your colleagues and associates in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

America owes very much to you, to each and all of you. But in a larger and truer sense, it is the world and all humanity who are in your debt for adding to the sum of knowledge about the cosmos, for bringing the day of the moon-shot closer, but above all, for enriching the world's treasury of heroism—an international treasury which belongs to all humankind. Only 2 years have passed since that Russian major first made it out through and beyond the atmosphere and the control of earth gravity, out into space; less than a month later, he was followed by our own Commander Shepard. After that, before Major Cooper's flight, there were seven other manned space flights of record. Four of these were by Americans, three by Russians. It is not for me to compare one flight with another, but there were aspects of Major Cooper's flight which could not help but fill and thrill us with pride in our country and our countrymen.

It is remarkable how such a feat not only unities our own country in prideful pleasure, but also gives satisfaction to the rest of the world—to friend and foe alike. This is not man against man, but man against the elements, man against the forces of nature, man armed with the power of knowledge.

As Gordon Cooper sped around the globe 22 times in 34 hours, girdling and regirdling the earth, the boundaries between nations must have seemed to him increasingly indistinct. From his vantage point, the earth must have almost seemed like the one world Wendell Willkie wrote about 20 years ago * * * as perhaps one day it really will be.

Major Cooper believes that even from the incredible height of a hundred miles, he saw villages and cities and the evidences of human movement, activity and habitation. He didn't pass over New York; otherwise, he might even have heard as well as seen us. We can make a lot of noise in this great city of ours, as he must know by now, after his ride through town.

Let me assure Major Cooper and his fellow astronauts, however, that as noisy as we have been today, we were relatively quiet last Wednesday and Thursday. The people looked and listened. And there was a massive amount of silent praying and hoping.

Who will ever forget how Gordon Cooper had to match the excellence of his equipment, the thoroughness of his training, the cold steel of his nerve, and the great power of all his gathered skills against the unfeeling forces of the cosmos * * * at the point when the famous green light came on, telling him that his automatic system had failed. In that incredible crisis, Gordon Cooper, in every respect I have mentioned, tested A-OK. So, in that crisis, did all the other members of the Mercury team.

Major Cooper, New York bursts with pride to have you here in our midst, following Honolulu, Cape Canaveral and Washington, D.C.

We salute you Maj. L. Gordon Cooper, Jr.; and we salute you, Administrator James E. Webb, and each of your colleagues and associates who are here today. We are glad to have each one of you with us.

We are happy to sound off with our praise and our pride in all of you.

I am greatly privileged now, as mayor of this city, to confer upon you the honors of the city of New York.

Spending Into Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the Appendix of the Record an article by former President Eisenhower, which appeared in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

It is aptly entitled "Spending Into Trouble," and points out clearly the dangers of deliberately planned deficits.

I know the Kennedy administration and its socialistically inclined economists will disregard the article but the American people will not:

Spending Into Trouble

(By Dwight D. Eisenhower)

I have no desire to be an alarmist. However, the time has come when my sense of duty as a citizen demands that I speak out bluntly regarding what I believe to be a clear danger which could threaten our free way of life and our security as a nation. That threat is the determined effort of our current political leaders to commit the United States to a risky, highly experimental fiscal adventure, based on a questionable theory which I call spending for spending's sake. That policy, which fails to heed the plain lessons of history, now has been unveiled in what I consider a vast, reckless scope, calling for a larger-than-wartime budget, a deep tax cut and a deliberate plunge into a massive deficit. Let us review the principal figures briefly: a budget of $98.8 billion, which actually calls for new obligational authority of about $108 billion; a tax cut estimated to reach over $10 billion a year by 1965; and an estimated deficit of $11.9 billion for fiscal 1964—on top of a current one of $8.8 billion—with further planned deficits extending into 1967, if not longer. The administration's theory, based on the so-called new economics it professes, is that in the long run the tax cuts would stimulate our economy enough to offset the immediate losses in revenue. My first reaction to these proposals was one of amazement—and no doubt many other Americans reacted the same way. What can those people in Washington be thinking about? Why would they deliberately do this to our country? I asked myself.

My concern is not merely with the vast amounts involved but what I firmly believe to be a foolhardy disproportion between income and outgo, plus the willingness of the policymakers to gamble on a grand scale with our economic lifeblood. Such a fiscal policy is bound to transfer more and more of the economic decisions of the country into the hands of the Federal Government: A greater share of our national endeavor will be directed by politicians and bureaucrats instead of by the millions of businessmen, shopkeepers, farmers, bankers and workers whose composite daily judgments traditionally have determined the bread-and-butter activity of our country. To my way of thinking, it is obvious that the new economics out of which the administration has drawn its plans is not new at all; in the end it can be nothing more than the age-old shot in the arm, inflation, dressed up in fancy modern terms. It is the irresponsible, easy road of debt, a road which through history has lured nations to financial misery and economic disaster.

Of course, there is far more to our national life than dollar signs, debits and credits, but at the same time the fiscal policies of the Government reflect its basic philosophy in the exercise of power—and few Federal powers have more direct daily impact on the citizen than the Government's authority to tax and spend. Nowhere is there greater need for restraint and careful balance if we are to maintain sound self-government. As usual, the would-be spenders have prefaced their requests for more money, more borrowing with noble-sounding statements that they have only the welfare of the country in mind. Well, I am not questioning their motives or their sincerity, but I have serious doubts as to their judgment and their sense of proportion. We might well ponder a quotation from the late Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis: "Experience should teach us to be more on our guard to protect liberty when the Government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning but without understanding."

Let me emphasize that I am not writing as a partisan. Responsible government is not a partisan issue and I would be just as alarmed if a Republican instead of a Democrat leadership were attempting to embark on such a fiscal program as the one now before Congress. No party doctrine is necessary to tell us that if the present generation keeps passing its bills to the next one, our children and grandchildren will inherit not a free country, bright with opportunity, but a vast wasteland of debt and financial chaos. Republicans and Democrats alike—even our smattering of Socialists—will suffer if our present trend takes the country into debt beyond the point-of-no-return and plunges us into a spiral of increasing Federal powers over our purses, our jobs, and our lives.

The Federal Government's financial affairs are immense and complex, but their sound management is not a mysterious art; in fact, they are subject to the same time-tested rules as those followed by any farsighted householder or businessman. A wise family or a well-run enterprise makes a practice of spending less than it takes in; in good years the family builds up savings for its future needs, for sending the youngsters to college, for meeting possible emergencies such as ill health or unemployment; a business builds up reserves for carrying itself safely over poor years and for expansion and investment in new opportunities. This is simply commonsense. As Abraham Lincoln once wrote: "An individual who undertakes to live by borrowing soon finds his original means devoured by interest and next, no one left to borrow from—so must it be with a government."

Now I know that the economic theorists who advocate Federal overspending deride this analogy, having convinced themselves that normal financial laws don't apply to a nation. They tell us that a $300 billion national debt and interest costs of $10 billion a year are nothing to worry about. They imply that we can go on indefinitely mortgaging ourselves without impairing the Nation's credit. What counts, they claim, is the relationship between the debt and the gross national product—the total value of goods and services our country generates, a figure that ran $554 billion last year. As long as the debt doesn't grow out of proportion to the gross national product, they believe, the country will remain in sound financial condition. But what they don't point out is that nobody really knows where this theoretical peril point might be—how much leeway a nation actually can count on. Also they trot out the old cliche that the national debt can never become a problem, because, "After all, we owe it to ourselves." They speak of planned national deficits as "an investment in the future."

Such justifications have a way of sounding plausible—just as does the spiel of the high-pressure salesman who wants you to buy something you really can't afford. But so did the theories of certain self-appointed investment experts who told us back in 1928 and 1929 that the country had entered a new era, a new plateau, that the old rules no longer applied to stock prices and the warning signals were meaningless.

I say that the time-tested rules of financial policy still apply. Spending for spending's sake is patently a false theory. No family, no business, no nation can spend itself into prosperity. Any way you look at it, a nation is nothing more than a collection of families—about 47 million of them make up the United States—and it is their money that the Government is spending. They are going to have to carry the increased debt. It is their future that is being mortgaged. And they certainly are not going to be excused from paying in taxes the pyramiding interest charges on that debt. They and their children will pay and pay and pay. In effect, we are stealing from our grandchildren in order to satisfy our desires of today.

Some of the things the spenders fail to tell us are more significant than the doubtful premise on which they base their sales talk. For example, they have neglected to outline any plans for preparing the Nation financially to meet costly national or international emergencies which have a way of popping up without regard to theoretical timetables. Any thoughtful person knows that a household, an enterprise or a nation which has built up a substantial reserve of savings and has kept its credit good has a much greater ability to weather depression or disaster than one which is mortgaged to the hilt. If the United States embarks on a grand spree of debt, how can we ever know that it can safely meet the extraordinary financial demands of a depression or war?

From experience I know the serious burdens imposed on the Federal Government by even a fairly modest recession. For the fiscal year 1959 we had planned a budget of $73.9 billion and were counting on a small surplus. Then came a sudden unforeseen slump in business, causing Federal income to fall more than $6 billion short of estimates; at the same time Government spending was stepped up to $80.3 billion, much of the increase going to pick up additional payments for unemployment compensation. It is right and just for the Government to use its borrowing powers to meet this kind of emergency. But I want to emphasize that this deficit was not planned, and once the crisis was under control we worked as hard as we could to get the budget back into balance as quickly as possible.

The strain of a recession is but a minor headache as compared to the imperative financial demands of war—not an all-out nuclear war, which would be destructive and costly beyond comprehension, but a more likely conventional defense against a probing enemy. Distasteful as such a prospect may be, we know from recent history in the Congo, Korea, Vietnam, and Cuba that we must accept such threats as part of the times in which we live. And we know any sign of weakness could bring a Communist thrust at any time. Even a fairly small test of our strength and will to resist could require us to increase spending quickly and substantially. The question now is: Are we then going to find ourselves in the position of a spendthrift family which has little or no leeway in time of trouble? I am not saying that the Nation would or should fail to meet its obligations. But all of us would feel more comfortable and secure if our national leadership exercised the foresight and self-discipline to balance its budget and to begin paying back something on the national debt.

And just to dream a bit, imagine how much better the country would feel if it had no debt at all, but a healthy surplus.

The proponents of the new economics don't tell us, either, that if history has any validity their policies are almost certain to lead us into an eventual cheapening of the dollar and a corresponding rise in the cost of living. If we keep headed in this direction, we may soon have to find a new term, perhaps "dollarette," to describe accurately the buying power of our monetary unit. This doesn't mean that even financial conservatives such as myself believe that the buying power of our money can be held rigidly unchanged, regardless of any consideration. The three wars we have had in this century have had a strong inflationary effect. Not all of this could have been avoided by better governmental management. When I was a boy living on the outskirts of Abilene, Kans., I helped supplement the family income by selling eggs for 10 cents a dozen and milk—good Jersey milk—for 5 cents a quart, and in those years a dollar and "found" was a day's pay for a farmworker.

ROBBERY BY THE GOVERNMENT

We have come a long way in living standards and prices since those days, but the well-being and stability of the country still depend on maintaining our dollar as a fair, reasonably stable unit of buying power. We have the unfortunate example of the post-World War II period when the cost of living virtually doubled and the value of our dollar wasted away. During my administration we faced up to the situation and did our best to fight inflation with historically tested, conservative fiscal policies, realizing that no country, not even one as rich as the United States, can always afford everything it might want. I suppose the new theorists would scornfully call those policies "reactionary." But the results speak for themselves. In the 7 years of the Truman administration the cost of living index went up 47 percent. During my terms in office the rise of this cost curve was slowed to only a little over 10 percent in 8 years. I might add that we didn't accomplish all that we hoped—the free-spending philosophy has been so deeply seeded into the country's political life that it is a slow process at best to weed it out.

Statistics on the cost of living don't tell the whole story, of course. It is the people, not the figures, which cause me to be so distressed by the fiscal policies that now seem to be espoused by the Federal Government. Were I a younger man, planning for the best possible future for my family and looking forward to eventual retirement, I would bitterly resent the effrontery of the politicians who so blithely plan to experiment with the future value of my savings, my insurance, and my pension. I would call it downright robbery for my Government to decide on policies that are nearly certain to shorten progressively the monetary yardstick so that when I received my annuity or savings I would get dollarettes—worth only half or a fourth as much as today's dollars.

In these times the impact of inflation could be even greater than in the past, because we now have something of a pension economy. More and more people employed in industry build their future around pensions, insurance annuities and social security, rather than on investments in land and other property. If the Government is to keep faith with these people, it will not set out on a course which could make these future fixed incomes virtually meaningless. It is easy to say, "Oh, that can't conceivably happen here. We're going to build a greater prosperity." Well, it has happened time and again in other countries as the aftermath of inflationary policies. You have only to talk to a Frenchman, a Japanese, a Greek, or a German who lived through the toboggan ride of devaluation to appreciate its toll on the lives of the people.

During the mild recession of 1954 I had a conversation with Dr. Ludwig Erhard, Minister of Economic Affairs of West Germany, and we were discussing what the Government might do about the situation. Dr. Erhard said, "I beg of you, don't worry about a slight depression. Just worry about inflation. We have lived through both, and we know there is no misery like that of inflation." While I am not prepared to agree that a recession is not serious, we should remember, too, that inflation often destroys more than the financial structure. In Germany it so weakened the moral fiber of the people and so demolished their faith in democratic government that they welcomed the dictatorship of an Adolf Hitler.

Advocates of spending for spending's sake also gloss over the fact that their policies would place increasing power over our lives and our institutions in the hands of a few politicians in Washington. They don't point out that, as a rule of thumb, the people must abdicate their direct responsibilities almost in direct ratio as they let Washington pick up the check. This doesn't mean that there aren't many functions, especially defense, which are rightful responsibilities of the National Government; rather, it emphasizes the need for us to understand what is right and proper for the Federal Government to do, and what isn't. On my desk I keep a handy reminder of this principle, a saying by Abraham Lincoln, who put it this way: "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

Of course, Government now engages in many activities not considered essential a few years ago. Not long ago, while visiting with the presidents of several privately supported universities and colleges, I became curious as to the extent to which Federal financial power had invaded the campus, and I asked, "What would you do if the Government suddenly ended its research contracts with your schools?"

One president threw up his hands and exclaimed, "Why, we'd have to close our doors. We'd be virtually broke."

Another, heading an old, conservative university, said, "We would be badly hurt, but we've tried to look ahead, realizing that some breakthrough in disarmament might cause the cancellation of many defense research contracts. So we have paid all our key professors and scientists out of our own revenue."

This is one small sample. But it makes clear that at some point we should call a halt to the proliferating use of Federal money—which, after all, is our money—to control a larger and larger segment of our activities, including the very institutions on which our human dignity and freedom are based.

Another aspect of spending for spending's sake which the theorists fail to explore with candor is its possible effect on the value of the dollar in the eyes of the world. We long have been accustomed to unquestioned acceptance of the dollar as the dominant medium of commerce in the free world, but there are troublesome signs, such as the persistent deficit in our balance of international payments and the outflow of gold, which should warn us to be cautious. Many countries carry dollars or short-term dollar obligations as a part of their reserves, and as long as they believe that our fiscal policies are sound and we can and will meet our obligations, they see little reason to ship their dollars back to Washington and ask for gold. However, should this country get into large-scale deficit financing, if we get into an inflationary spiral with increasing production costs so as to shake the confidence of the rest of the free world in our currency, there could be a "run on the bank"—that is, on our depleted gold reserves. Then there would be great pressure on the apostles of the easy way to say, "Well, we don't need a gold standard. We will now repeal the law requiring our currency to be backed by 25 percent of its value in gold; we can't let an old-fashioned idea like that hobble our progress." And all the brakes on inflation would be off.

Let me emphasize that I don't for a minute believe that we are, as yet, in a precarious position. The dollar still is strong, and I'm sure the world has respect for our immense wealth and financial integrity. However, what bothers me is that we are heading in the wrong direction, and not enough of our people are viewing the matter with the care it deserves. Certainly one of the things not to do is to enlarge our deficit recklessly. What is required is the foresight and moral courage to use our national checkbook with restraint.

I believe in progress; I believe that government has a duty to create and maintain an economic atmosphere in which balanced and constant progress can be realized by the nation. Indeed, how could any man who has lived through the marvelous development of the United States in this century not believe in the genius of the American people for progress? But I oppose visionary and costly programs placed in operation in the name of progress by the Government.

Many times recently I have wished our schools and our informational media were doing a better job of dramatizing for the American people, especially the younger generation, the vital story of the way in which this country has become strong, rich, and powerful in world affairs under the rare climate of freedom and responsible self-government. These are more than pleasant phrases. They represent the unique fulfillment here of an ancient dream of mankind. For us, happily, the dream largely came true. It did so because our forefathers had the opportunity to build their own futures, starting with a great continent of tremendous, unmortgaged resources of land, water, minerals, timber, which an energetic people could shape to their needs without bowing to the restrictive hands of kings, dictators, or oligarchs.

This American system, we must remember, is still an experiment and even today is being tested on many fronts. Of this we may be sure: That system's continued success depends on our ability to preserve the values which made it great, on continued freedom to work hard and to exercise our ingenuity—not in impulsively distorting that pattern. That is why I would hope that all of our young people, no matter how well-off their families, might have the experience of earning a living for themselves by their hands and their brains. The science of what I call "constructive economics" is more easily absorbed by people who have earned their own way than by those who recognize a dollar only as something provided by an indulgent parent.

Let us get specific about the several parts of the administration's tax-budget-debt package. First of all, every well-informed citizen must know by now that Federal taxes are too high, and the whole patchwork system of income taxes is unfair and inefficient. In our free society the primary function of taxes should be the production of enough revenue to meet legitimate government expenses, not to rig the economy or to support unnecessary governmental programs. Necessary taxes should be collected in a manner that will be fair and just to every individual and will do the least damage to the economy.

By such a definition, we are much in need of a tax cut. I urgently favor one. Present income-tax rates, ranging from a low of 20 percent to a high of 91 percent, seriously impair opportunities in our economy, becoming virtually confiscatory in the upper brackets. The men who originally set up our income-tax system would be shocked by the rates today and the effect of the system. Recently I read an account of some of the debates prior to the adoption of the graduated income tax in 1913. The opponents argued that if the Government had the right to take 1 percent of an individual's income in taxes, it might in the future have the right to take as much as 5 percent or even 10 percent. The advocates of the tax replied that this was a foolish contention, because any government which attempted to take in taxes that large a share of the people's earnings would face revolution.

We haven't had a revolution, but the longer the delay in cleaning up the tax mess the longer the unfair rates will hold us back and the more difficult reform will become. Personally, I believe that we should lower the rates to the neighborhood or 65 to 70 percent in the top brackets and to 17 or 18 percent in the lowest ones. But that is only one man's opinion. More important than the exact range of the rates is a system which distributes the load fairly. And as a precondition to any reduction in taxes we must have the courage to cut spending. I still insist that the proposed budget is extravagant and can be cut by billions of dollars without harming a single essential Federal function.

The way to get basic tax reform, in my view, is to enlist a group of our ablest citizens to take a long, hard look at our whole tax system and to blueprint a complete overhaul that would get us back to solid ground. Such a group would be something like the Hoover Commission—which was notable for nonpartisan operation—with its attention devoted wholly to reforming our tax structure. It should include people from various walks of life—businessmen, union labor officials, farmers, lawyers, doctors, teachers and economists—even a few of what I call the wild-eyed kind, although they shouldn't dominate. These men would need to be highly public spirited, because theirs would be a grueling, brain-fagging job. The present tax laws are not a system but a patchwork quilt of laws and amendments, many of them enacted to meet certain emergencies long since passed.

The swollen budget for fiscal 1964 has been defended as "the mst powerful single tool the Nation possesees" to promote economic activity. However, this confidently stated proposition does not square with our economic history and our traditional free-enterprise philosophy on several counts. For one thing, sheer weight of Government spending by itself never has been, nor do we want it to be, the principal force in our long-range growth. Certainly it does not produce the self-supporting kind of expansion that has been typical of private investment and development. Government spending does produce activity, of course, and if all we want is feverish activity, we could carry that proposition to its absurd conclusion and let the Government take over all spending. Then everybody would be working for the Government, and we no longer would have a democracy.

The Government formula now given us is: Spend more, collect less, go more in debt. Does not this whole proposition put the cart before the horse? If we reduce public spending and taxes at the same time, then our economy will have its best opportunity for showing new growth. When we reach that happy stage where, with lower tax rates, the budget shows a surplus, then we can see our way clear to pay off a bit of our debt and devote more money to Government services for an expanding population.

Of course, the country must have economic growth, but when so-called experts say that it must be a certain number of percentage points per year, I just think they do not know what they are talking about. It is like saying that each and every child should grow the same number of inches a year. And when they say that Government spending should be the controlling factor in expansion, I regard this as a pernicious myth.

Where do you start measuring this growth? It would be a blessing if such poor, underdeveloped countries as India or Egypt could increase their productivity by 10 percent or more a year, giving them the opportunity steadily to raise their standards of living. For some time countries of the Common Market area have been expanding faster than the United States, as is to be expected, because they started from a lower level, had to rebuild from war damage, and had accumulated needs and desires. Now they are breaking down trade barriers between states, as we did in the beginning and are moving into the mass-marketing, automotive, mass-production age. In other words, many other countries, including Soviet Russia, are striving to catch up with our mature, highly developed society which has fulfilled far more of the material needs of its citizens than any other system on the face of the earth. The United States should not try to match some arbitrary percentage formula; rather its goal should be the maintenance of a climate in which our society can develop continually greater opportunities—both economic and cultural—for new generations.

For a moment let's think of national security and its costs. A key point to keep in mind is this: No matter how much we spend for arms, there is no safety in arms alone. Our security is the total product of our economic, intellectual, moral, and military strengths.

AN EASY WAY TO BANKRUPTCY

Let me elaborate on this great truth. It happens that defense is a field in which I have had varied experience over a lifetime, and if I have learned anything, it is that there is no way in which a country can satisfy the craving for abosolute security—but it easily can bankrupt itself, morally and economically, in attempting to reach that illusory goal through arms alone. The Military Establishment, not productive of itself, necessarily must feed on the energy, productivity and brainpower of the country, and if it takes too much, our total strength declines.

So how does one judge the limits of defense needs? That is the task of the statesman: to apply the rule of reason in judging what is clearly adequate but not excessive. The foibles and specialized viewpoints of human nature must be balanced off. For example, when I was President, it was not unusual for the Joint Chiefs of Staff to agree that the total defense budget was adequate—but later individual members would come to me to argue that the share of their respective service should be increased at the expense of the others.

The defense budget I left behind provided amply for our security at that time. Even though there have been costly developments in weapons since then, it does not seem that the spectacular increase of $10 billion in new obligational authority in 2 years, as is now requested, has been proved necessary. We already have the nuclear deterrent, the most valuable single element in our defense posture and one which, of course, must be kept up to date. One truth we should keep in mind at all times is that the other fellow, your potential enemy, doesn't want to be killed any more than you do. As long as he knows we are maintaining the power to destroy him if he dares attack us, as long as we keep our Nation fiercely proud, not only of its military strength but of its way of life, then we have the best possible defense in this imperfect world. Patriotism is as important as all the guns we can build.

Let us turn to the space exploration program, which I publicly have called "downright spongy." Now clearly the strong competitive spirit of the American people has been aroused by the so-called space race. But let us step back for a moment from emotion and be objective. This is what my scientific advisers and I tried to do when we started space work back in 1955 and thereafter enlarged it into a comprehensive program. We didn't and don't want to be a second-best Nation, not in any important field, and certainly not in total accomplishment. But can we best maintain our overall leadership by launching wildly into crash programs on many fronts? This is where we seem to have got out of focus.

Let me make it perfectly clear that we should have an aggressive program of research and exploration, so broadly based that in the long run there will be no question of our space leadership; but we should pursue it in an orderly, step-by-step way to enlarge systematically our knowledge of the scientific, military, and industrial potentials in space. This sort of a program would be a strong, steady push from the known into the unknowns of space science, accumulating along the way the techniques and skills to put our astronauts on the moon, among other developments. The annual cost would not include money for stunts and unnecessary contests.

Most of the scientists who advised me on space matters—all men of great knowledge and integrity—believed in this step-by-step program as most effective for the long pull, pointing out that the things we need to learn in space are almost as endless as space itself. Proud as we may be of our astronauts and our Venus probe and other accomplishments in space, this racing to the moon, unavoidably wasting vast sums and deepening our debt, is the wrong way to go about it, as I see it. Because it has been stated that the country's prestige is at stake in this race, the average citizen may be loath to question the huge sums now being requested. But he should.

Many items in the budget have become distended beyond reason; several should be mentioned for the pattern they make. The $5.7 billion allotted for agriculture—and the actual spending could easily exceed the estimate—to a large degree represents subsidies, originally intended as wartime incentives for increased production, which now have become imbedded in our farm economy. Moreover, these subsidies are a prime instance of the way in which Federal controls usually go along with Federal money. Ask any farmer about his cropping system these days, and he will answer not in terms of his plans but in terms of the acres permitted for this crop and that under his Government allotment.

Or take the way in which the Federal Government seems to have decided that it must do much of the medical research, despite the multitude of State and private medical schools, hospitals, and research foundations. The item for medical research in the budget left to me by the outgoing administration in 1953 was $96 million. The same item is now around $900 million. In this, as in so many other fields, the Congress seems to believe that money will buy anything and everything.

This poses the question: Are private hands being pushed away from this kind of research? I'm afraid they are. Often in recent years I have talked with people who have been giving generously to worthy causes, such as the American Cancer Society, the Heart Association, crippled children's organizations, and so on, but who are beginning to feel they no longer should do so because they already are supporting such work through the taxes they pay. Again it seems the Government insists on taking over.

Finally, a few words about the most misunderstood and controversial of all Federal expenditures—foreign aid. Never has there been any question in my mind as to the necessity of a program of economic and military aid to keep the free nations of the world from being overrun by the Communists. It is that simple. Such a program, if well-run and kept within the limits we can afford, offers the United States one of its best bargains in national security.

Unfortunately, foreign aid has suffered through its history from political maneuvering and lack of stability. Congressmen seeking reelection have found it a handy issue to kick around. They go back home and stir up voters with speeches saying, "You can be sure I'm not going to vote to give your money to Timbuktu when you good people so badly need more schools and hospitals." Because of this and other political factors, foreign aid never has been planned or administered on a long-range basis, although we know the Communist threat is going to be with us for a long time to come. Back in 1953 we inherited a foreign-aid budget of $7.6 billion and we cut expenditures to a more reasonable $4.8 billion, hoping to build a steady-going program. But we never were able to get Congress to assure the program the continuity in funds and personnel that are absolutely necessary if this important work is to attract and hold experienced, dedicated people.

That is why I agree with the recommendations of the Committee to Strengthen the Security of the Free World, headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay. The Clay report follows the guidelines of rule of reason that I have been talking about. It recognizes that we should not increase the burden of foreign aid at this time but should strengthen the program in areas where our purposes are best served while phasing it out in areas where it is not effective. I applaud the administration for accepting the terms of the report and hope that Congress will act favorably on it.

People who talk with me about the threat of spending for spending's sake often wind up by asking, "But what can I, an ordinary citizen, do about it?"

The answer is: plenty. One of the first things you can and should do is to inform yourself on this critical situation. Just how much are you paying in taxes? What is your share of the national debt? How much is the interest on that debt costing you? You can join with your neighbors or like-minded people in probing into these things, in discussing the whole problem. Determining what taxes you pay isn't an easy job, because so much of the load is hidden or indirect. A development which has my hearty approval is the little sign which now often appears on the gasoline pump showing the customer just how much of the price goes for taxes. Business should do that with other products—with such things as cigarettes, liquor, luggage, and other items on which excise taxes are collected. Employers should make sure—and so should labor unions—that workers realize just how much of their wage is being withheld for income taxes. All too often the worker thinks of his take-home pay as his real wage and doesn't stop to think how much larger his earnings would be if the taxes were more reasonable. I wish that employers would—if permissible—adopt a system used some years ago by a company to dramatize the tax bite: At one window workers were given their full pay envelopes and then, at an adjoining "tax window" the amount to be withheld was collected from them. Every earner would soon begin to ask, I'm sure, "Why do we need to spend all this money?"

If you believe in self-government, it is your right and your duty to make your wishes known to Washington on an issue as vital as spending for spending's sake. Actually, the solution to the problem could be this simple: If enough citizens write to their Representatives and Senators asking why they have been voting so much money for racing to the moon, farm subsidies, and even for defense, Congress will get the message. Your Congressman will get it particularly well if you demand not just a polite, noncommittal form reply, but a detailed, reasoned answer.

All of us will share the blame if continued spending and debt lead us not into lasting prosperity but into decadence and peril. This includes those who are seeking to lead us down this risky road. It includes the empire-building bureaucrats, too few of whom seem able to follow the wise doctrine of self-restraint. It includes Congress, holder of the purse strings, but all too often willing to give in to subsidy-seeking pressure groups or too eager to seek votes with "pork barrel" appropriations. But most of all it applies to us—private citizens—who allow our votes to be swayed by the carrots held out by the public spenders, who fail to look beyond an immediate Government check to ask ourselves, "How does this affect our children's future?"

Administration Exaggerates To Sell Its Economic Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the administration's penchant for exaggeration and distortion designed to force action on its program has been clearly evident in the strategy which it has employed to push its tax proposals. A March 16, 1963, editorial from the New York Times entitled "Playing With the Facts," point out that President Kennedy has made a scary prediction about how rejection of his economic proposals by Congress would mean downturn and disaster for the American economy.

The Times, quite correctly, calls the President's prophecy "buckpassing in advance, aimed at pinning the blame on Congress for any possible recession." Interestingly enough, events since the editorial was written on March 16 have proved the President wrong in prophesying disaster if his program was rejected. To the surprise of almost everyone, the economy has begun a new economic advance without the aid of a tax cut. This is not to say that the economy would not benefit further from well-conceived tax reduction and reform. But it does point up the fallacious and deplorable scare tactics which the administration has used to sell its program.

Under unanimous consent, I include this editorial from the March 16 New York Times in the Record.

Playing With the Facts

President Kennedy is continuing his dubious strategy of prophesying doom if his economic policies are not approved. In a speech prepared for delivery before the Advertising Council, he warned that rejection of his proposals by Congress might mean a "downturn and disaster for the American economy as a whole." He omitted "disaster" in his actual address, but this modification does not really dilute his scary prediction.

We have several times expressed our agreement with the administration that deficit spending is unavoidable, and that a planned deficit now will avert even bigger deficits in the future. We also agree that the administration's plan of combining tax reductions with reforms will stimulate longterm growth. But Mr. Kennedy is exaggerating the situation in his eagerness to force action.

It is his view that the policies pursued by the Eisenhower administration were largely responsible for our present slow rate of growth; but neither the Eisenhower administration nor the Democratic Congress favored a tax cut in 1957 or 1960. President Kennedy himself took the same position, refusing to demand reductions either in 1961 or again in the summer of 1962, when the economy seemed more sluggish and when confidence was certainly more shaky than it is now.

No one knows with any certainty what the future will hold; but Mr. Kennedy's prophecy amounts to buckpassing in advance, aimed at pinning the blame on Congress for any possible recession.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. **BYRNES** of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, two excellent editorials appeared recently in two newspapers in my district and I would like to call them to the attention of the Congress. They are well worth reading.

The editorial from the Appleton Post-Crescent effectively points out the fallaciousness of the argument that we can have any kind of Federal aid without controls and the Green Bay Press-Gazette editorial uses the State of Wisconsin as an example to disprove the implied claim of those who advocate across-the-board Federal financing of schools, that none of the States are willing or able to take care of their own educational needs.

[From the Appleton (Wis.) Post-Crescent]

Power of the Purse

In the recurring controversey over Federal aid to education, again brought up because of the President's bill, a strong argument is made that such aid would not mean control. The argument is fallacious and should be; we would not want to see the Federal Government handing out the taxpayer's money willy-nilly without applying standards and controls.

McGeorge Bundy, special assistant to President Kennedy and formerly dean of the faculty at Harvard, has argued persuasively in favor of more Federal aid, particularly to colleges and universities, on the grounds that money is money and there probably isn't as stringent control from the Federal Government as there is from alumni, State governments, or other sources of funds. But an editorial in the Wall Street Journal points out the stranglehold which the Federal Government is gaining on higher education through its control of funds. More than two-thirds of the entire Nation's scientific research and development spending, a lot of it in universities, comes from the Federal Government. This obviously has a strong effect upon the type of research and development.

As the Post-Crescent has pointed out in the past, the National Defense Education Act is in effect a Federal control of elementary and secondary education. Grants are given in the fields of science, mathematics, and foreign languages, as these were construed by Congress to be of national importance. But the effect is far reaching. Teachers in these fields can get grants for study which are denied to teachers in English, history, or geography, subjects of equal importance to youngsters in school.

Congressman John Ashbrook, in opposing the extension of NDEA 2 years ago, pointed to a report from the Office of Education which emphasizes the vast responsibilities that office would have. "Not only is it the responsibility of the Federal Government to conduct the foreign affairs of the Nation; it is almost equally evident that national observers are especially well qualified to assess the international deficiencies of our domestic educational system. The modern foreign language development program authorized by the NDEA is an instance of Federal identification of an international need imperfectly acknowledged by local and State educational agencies. It seems to the committee axiomatic that intimate involvement of the United States in international affairs will lead to the identification of other educational needs that could hardly be so readily seen by local, State, and institutional authorities."

This is a remarkable statement both in its arrogance and its fallacious conclusion. It is quite true that the availability of funds for language laboratories from the NDEA has probably meant that more schools have them. But the pressure for improved foreign language teaching originated primarily from parents and some teachers, not in the Federal Government. It may be quite true that Americans, once they get to Washington, lose touch with the rest of the country, but they hardly can be said to see more clearly than anyone else the needs of either the Nation or education.

There is another serious problem here that must not be overlooked. The purpose of American education is not merely to advance the fortunes of the State. The purpose is to help to develop the potentials of every American youngster, whatever his abilities, interests, or talents. Only in this way can the Government actually represent and serve the people. But the attitude from the Office of Education would reject the American conception of the Government as existing for the people rather than the people for the Government. It can be seen by the NDEA grants that the immediate needs of the Nation, as seen in Washington, would become the educational needs of the country.

The Wall Street Journel editorial, in pointing to the great amount of Federal funds now spent on higher education, says that the Federal Government is well on the way to "monopolizing the campus through the sheer power of money. We never heard of a monopoly that did not control what it monopolizes."

The financing of education is no simple matter. We have never agreed with those who righteously turn down Federal funds. The place to fight against their availability is when these proposals come up in Congress not on local school boards. But unless the financing is done primarily on the local and State level, our traditional education system existing for the student rather than for the Nation is over the hill.

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Press-Gazette]

MANAGING THE SCHOOLS

Superintendent Angus Rothwell, of the State department of public instruction, is reported as saying that Wisconsin is capable of financing the operation and construction of the public schools it needs, which is perhaps noteworthy only because Mr. Rothwell appears to be divorcing himself from the national educationist lobby which insists that the school system can be saved only with the intervention of the Federal-aid dollar.

From the Wisconsin perspective, however, there was nothing remarkable about the Rothwell testimony, especially for those who have observed what has been going on here lately.

During the last 10 years this State built more than 16,000 elementary and high school classrooms, as new space for expanding enrollments, or as replacement space for obsolescent schools.

During that period Wisconsin spent about $650 million in tax cash and borrowed funds to pay for the biggest school construction effort in its history. Expert projections indicate that the State as a whole will spend at least that much during the next 10 years for new construction and replacement that will equal or exceed the 16,000 classrooms built since 1954.

The Wisconsin will and enterprise and acceptance of local liability for local service financing are not necessarily relevant to Mississippi or Nevada, as we will doubtless be reminded by some readers.

We have no doubt that the need of some underprivileged sections of the country for financial assistance from the Nation can be documented, even as here in Wisconsin we have accepted the fact that the districts of higher taxing valuations must be called upon to assist others less fortunate for the maintenance of a fair level of equality of opportunity for children without regard to the geographical happenstance of their residence.

But the Wisconsin experience does show, we would submit, that across-the-board Federal financing of such intrinsically local services as schools is not required, and probably won't be required in the discernible future. What is wanted is a will to face local problems through local responsibility and tax liability. What is betrayed by the school lobby in the fierce demand for Federal aid legislation in Washington is the fatalistic assumption that local citizens and local governments cannot do what they ought to do, or that it will be easier to tax and borrow in Washington than it is to defend such commitments at home.

J.F.K. on Spanking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the Raleigh, N.C., News and Observer carried a very fine editorial on May 26, 1963, with reference to the bill passed by the House of Representatives recently to provide for more effective discipline in the public school system of the District of Columbia. Under order previously granted, I insert the editorial in the Appendix of the Record.

J.F.K. ON SPANKING

Almost everybody would agree with President Kennedy that the best place for spanking is in the home, not the school. But even the President must realize that those who most need discipline in the schools are those who come from homes where it is lacking.

Apparently it is proper at his news conferences to ask the President any kind of question from Cuban difficulties to cakemaking and child raising. And as parent of two children as well as President of 180 million people, maybe Kennedy qualified as expert in guiding the child in the way it should go. Still the President seems to make a pretty unrealistic assumption in suggesting that all homes can be substitutes for all schools in this matter.

The sad truth is that too many parents under too many Presidents got too little discipline in home, school or anywhere else and the results are appearing not only in the schools but also in the gangs, in the courts, and in the prisons. President Kennedy cannot be expected to rectify this situation but in any discussion of spanking in response to questioning he would do well if he indicated he was aware of it.

1963 Armed Forces Day Celebration at Fort Devens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record I include therein a speech that I recently made on the occasion of Armed Forces Day at Fort Devens, Mass., in my district:

REMARKS IN PART OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN ON ARMED FORCES DAY, FORT DEVENS, MASS.

It is a very happy privilege and honor for me to join with you today at Fort Devens in your inspiring Armed Forces Day celebration.

I am very thankful to General Verbeck for his considerate invitation, and for the fine, outstanding record which he, his able staff, and all the officers and enlisted men of this great command have made for the Army and the national defense.

In community and district, we have always been most fortunate in having notable, splendid commanding officers and other officers and enlisted personnel at Fort Devens. Let me assure you that we have been very proud of the magnificent services this command has rendered to the Nation and the country throughout the years.

Fort Devens is one of our great Army posts and we have every reason always to be proud of its marked contributions to the security of the Nation.

If I may strike a personal note today, I don't suppose that Fort Devens or any other military post has ever had a finer, more capable, efficient, dedicated commanding officer than Gen. William J. Verbeck.

I know he is a man of great modesty and humility but I think it must be said here today that we consider General Verbeck as one of the outstanding commanders of our Armed Forces. A general officer of great ability and humane spirit, considerate of all the personnel of his command and most gracious and helpful in his public and community relations. I am very happy to hail and salute him as a truly great military leader and great American, and I wish for him and Mrs. Verbeck and their lovely family, continued success, good health and all choicest blessings in the future. We will long remember his fine work at Fort Devens and I will ever be grateful for his cooperation and help in behalf of our people.

Fortunately for us, for our Nation and the world, on this Armed Forces Day, we are in a position to make a high and confident appraisal of the state of readiness, efficiency and power of our armed services.

We are faced with an insidious Communist conspiracy which seeks to dominate the world and suppress the liberties of freemen and women. The one great deterrent that is effectively preventing world communism from spreading its influence and control and imposing the evils of tyranny and oppression upon the world has been, is and will continue to be, the strength, power and readiness of our armed services, our great free enterprise system which backs them up, and the will and determination of the American people to preserve our blessed heritage, come what may.

Let us ever be mindful of the great debt we owe to those in every generation who have protected our great land, and those who will continue in the years to come, as long as it may be necessary, to deter the potential enemies of this Nation and the free world, whoever they may be.

Let us today take example from the struggles and sacrifices that so many have made, and are making, to keep this Nation free and safe and inspired by our spiritual ideals, political truths and the promise and faith of our great free destiny.

On this Armed Forces Day and always, let us continue to strive harder than ever through strength, wisdom and justice for lasting freedom and enduring peace in the world.

The International Game of Russian Roulette Must Be Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Sudeten German Day will be observed in Stuttgart, Germany, on June 1 through 3, 1963. This is an annual observance which attracts between 300,000 and 500,000 German people. This year sessions of the assembly will be addressed by the President of the German Republic, Federal Minister Dr. Ing. Hans-Christoph Seebohm, the Prime Minister of Baden-Wurttenberg and leading members of the Bundestag.

The motto of this year's assembly is "Free Homeland—United Europe."

Under leave previously obtained, I insert in the Record the message which I sent to this important European meeting:

The International Game of Russian Roulette Must Be Stopped

I am pleased to send warm greetings and best wishes to all taking part in the annual Sudeten German Day. The theme you have selected for your annual meeting "Free Homeland—United Europe" is most fitting. It expresses the basic political principles which bind together in common cause civilized people on all the continents. But it has special application to Europe, the historic seat of Western civilization, and the wellspring of the great moral and political values which undergird the foundations of free institutions in the new world.

For centuries imperial Russia, the historic seat of despotism and reactionary thought, has reaped a rich harvest from a divided Europe. It was the practice of the autocratic czars to spread the seeds of discord among the civilized European nations and to drive their leaders into conflict with one another. Every conflict between the advanced European nations increased the imperial power of Moscow. This is a fact of history we must face with reality.

The present Russian dictators are carrying on the predatory traditions of the czars. They have split Europe by the force of arms and they maintain that unnatural and dangerous partition by military occupation and government by terror. An iron curtain has been erected by imperial Russia to mark this dangerous division of civilized Europe. Behind that iron curtain are many once free and independent nations such as Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Armenia, Georgia, among others. The peoples of all those captive nations have strong, historic attachments to the culture and ideals of free Europe. All of them are non-Russians who, in this century, have enjoyed the blessings of self-government. The continuing demand of these captive peoples for governments of their own free choice and their aspirations for freedom and national independence have served as a powerful brake on the aggressive and imperial ambitions of Moscow. Continued Russian resistance against the legitimate aspirations of these highly civilized peoples has made Central-East Europe into a volatile, political tinder box. The growing aspirations of these captive peoples for freedom and national independence and the continuing efforts of imperial Russia to impose upon them a feudal and primitive way of life has created a serious threat of bloody revolutions and war.

That threat must be removed. Peaceful arbitration of that conflict is imperative. Universal application of the principle of national self-determination, under United Nations supervision, must be applied to that vast area of conflict without delay. The self-evident alternative is bloody revolutions and wars of liberation into freedom which could escalate into a thermonuclear holocaust. To delay action on the peaceful resolution of this volatile political conflict is to court disaster.

Part of this explosive political problem is the partition of Germany by imperial Russia. The people of now free Germany have established a government of their own choice, are masters of their destiny and enjoy the blessings of self-government. In fulfilling their aspirations the people of Germany have had the full support and encouragement of the Western nations. But the Russians have pursued a contrary course with respect to the German territories they occupied at the close of World War II. There a rump government of Moscow stooges has been imposed upon the people. All basic liberties and freedoms are denied the people. The feudal and primitive system of imperial Russia is being forced upon the people. Eighteen years after the close of hostilities the Russians continue a full-scale occupation of a large part of Germany. To emphasize the intention of imperial Russia to make this unnatural partition of Germany a permanent feature of European life, the Russians undertook the highly provocative action of erecting the Berlin wall. That wall stands as a testament to Russian inhumanity—an admission that only the exercise of brute force can prevent the German people from fulfillling their aspirations for a free and united Germany, under a government of their own free choice and through a system which guarantees popular consent by the governed.

President Kennedy has warned the Russian leaders that a continuation of their false partition of Germany is fraught with dangerous consequences. In his memorable reply to the most recent Russian ultimatum on Berlin and Germany, President Kennedy underscored that danger and proposed a peaceful settlement based upon the freely expressed wishes of the people directly concerned. I quote the most pertinent part of his peaceful proposal:

"The U.S. Government continues to believe that there will be no real solution of the German problem, nor any real tranquillity in central Europe, until the German people are reunified in peace and freedom on the basis of the universally recognized principle of self-determination."

President Kennedy made that proposal in July 1961, now almost 2 years ago. The Russians refused to consider it and have continued along their dangerous path of provocations and wholesale denials of basic human rights. Thus, the Muscovites are playing a game of Russian roulette with the pent up and explosive aspirations of all the non-Russian peoples imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain. We must stop that game of Russian roulette before the human explosion which is sure to result plunges the world into another war.

I know you join with me in looking forward to the early and universal application of the principle of national self-determination as the only practical means of preventing war. All people who sincerely want peace will call out for this remedy. All who believe in human freedom and justice are working toward this peaceful settlement. All of Europe must be reunited in peace and freedom. Attainment of that objective binds all civilized people in a common cause.

Our Frustrated Secretary of the Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, today's Wall Street Journal has some thoughts on the debt ceiling, the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Congress. It squarely places the responsibility for disastrous debt ceiling where it belongs:

Battered Ceilings and Bruised Heads

Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, who must be one of the most frustrated men in Washington's wonderland, had some sharp words the other day for those who would hold down Federal spending merely by putting a lid on Federal borrowing.

Said the Secretary: "Let no one labor under the delusion that the debt ceiling is either a sane or an effective instrument for the control of Federal expenditure * * *.

"This cannot be done by trying to exert controls on the tag end of the expenditure process, when the bills are coming due. The debt limit is not and cannot be a substitute for the control of expenditures at the decisive stage of the expenditure process—when the funds are being appropriated."

Mr. Dillon is absolutely right. Unless we are willing to see the Government of the United States in the posture of a deadbeat, refusing to pay its bills, it is plain silly to go on happily appropriating billions more than the Government's income and then sternly forbidding the Secretary of the Treasury to beg, borrow, or otherwise scrounge the money to pay for it all. That's about on a par with gorging on filet mignon every day and then in a burst of remorseful economy, deciding to balance the household accounts by telling your wife not to pay the butcher.

So Mr. Dillon's frustration is understandable. The President and Congress between them are planning to cut the Government's revenue while increasing its spending, leaving the Treasury Secretary with the problem of finding somewhere at least $12 billion in the next fiscal year alone. But with the Government's debt already bumping against the legal ceiling, Congress has been soberly debating whether to allow the Treasury to borrow the wherewithal; yesterday it once again agreed to lift the lid temporarily.

The simple truth of the matter, as Professor Lutz says in his cogent remarks on the debt which we publish this morning, is that a debt limit will not prevent increased spending. The reasons for having one lie elsewhere. So too does the cure for the constantly increasing spending, deficits, debt, and their concomitant inflation.

The function served by a fixed debt limit is, first of all, that it does force the Government to sweat. Once bumped up against, it faces an administration seeking more money with two political battles, one for the appropriation and one to change the debt law. Congress is forced to at least take open cognizance of what its appropriations are doing to the national debt. Finally, as Dr. Lutz notes, a ceiling puts at least some technical discipline on the Treasury's handling of the Government's finances.

Thus Congress has wisely retained the device even though, as the record shows, the battered ceiling always has been—and will be—raised when the spending grows unchecked. If the spending itself is to be checked that must be done not, as Mr. Dillon says, "at the tag end" of the process but at the other end.

The appropriation process begins at the White House, where the Treasury Secretary sits in council. It is here that new programs originate. It is here that the budget for old programs is enlarged. It is here that proposals for raising or lowering Government revenue are begun; it was President Kennedy and Mr. Dillon who sought out higher spending and lower taxes.

So if Mr. Dillon is understandably frustrated, it is here that his frustration begins. He might perhaps gain more sympathy if he himself were not urging both the bigger spending and the lower taxes that alone make the present debt ceiling chafe.

Still, it's true enough you can't put all the blame on the administration of the moment. Congressmen complain about the encroachments of the Executive, love speeches about the responsibilities of Congress. But unlike some areas such as foreign affairs, Congress is the undisputed master of the purse. A President may propose; Congress alone votes the appropriations and the taxes. Congress, in Mr. Dillon's phrase, is "the decisive stage of the expenditure process."

It is, therefore, the decisive place to clamp that lid on the Federal debt. The Congress ought to apply some of its much talked-about fiscal discipline to itself, putting a ceiling not only on the level of the debt but on the spending which alone creates that debt. In short, a limit on appropriations established at the beginning of the session which would restrain not just the Treasury Secretary but its own appropriations committees.

Any other kind of lid is bound to be not only frustrating but fragile. For as Alice discovered in her own wonderland, a ceiling is only a place to bruise your head if you keep drinking the stuff that makes a body grow and grow and grow.

Gunboats on the Raritan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the New Republic of June 1, 1963 entitled "Gunboats on the Raritan," chronicling one of the most frightful examples of failure of the State agencies and indeed of the Public Health Service bureaucrats to adequately abate pollution on interstate waters as required by Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress.

This excellent article well points out the most classical example of failure of these agencies to clean up and abate pollution to the detriment not just to the people in the area but to all Americans everywhere whose water supplies for home use, fishing, recreation, commercial, and industrial purposes and increasingly fouled with every imaginable form of pollutant, industrial and municipal.

GUNBOATS ON THE RARITAN

(By James Ridgeway)

Passing out of New York City to the south the traveler proceeds through an area of stinking bogs, not unlike the environs of the River Styx. Flames and putrid smoke belch into the sky from chimneys of oil and chemical companies. At the feet of these industrial engines, running amidst a clutter of towns and small cities, flows a foul smelling sewer, the Arthur Kill, into which industries have long heaved all manner of refuse. The Kill lies between the New Jersey shore and Staten Island, terminating on the north in Newark Bay. At its southern outlet, it feeds the accumulated filth into the Raritan-Bay, a body of water 30 square miles in area, located beneath the sprawl of New York harbor and designated since 1937 by New York and New Jersey as a playground for the 15 million people living in and around the city. Beneath this huge cesspool, close to where the Arthur Kill spills out its contents, other sewer pipes converge beneath the water's surface, spewing out 50 million gallons of human and industrial wastes each day. In all, the sewage from 1.2 million people is pumped into this bay every 24 hours. Large amounts of inorganic industrial wastes also are deposited. This mass of putrefaction oozes about the New Jersey and Staten Island shores for several days, washing the beaches with quantities of fecal bacteria, closing out the light and consuming the oxygen required by fish and other forms of marine animal and plant life, before sluggishly moving seaward on the outgoing tide.

Raritan Bay was designated class A waters by the Interstate Sanitation Commission, an organization formed by the states of New York and New Jersey to regulate interstate water pollution. Class A means that the waters are to be used primarily for bathing, boating, fishing, and other recreational purposes, as well as for the maintenance of a shell fish industry. (Pollution has forced the closing of all but a small portion of the once prosperous shell fish beds on the Raritan.) State health commissioners are members of the Interstate Sanitation Commission; they work through it and independently to enforce water standards.

The numerous tributaries, twisting tidal currents, and the great increase of population and multiplicity of industry have combined to make the abatement of pollution on the Raritan difficult. Even so, efforts by the States and the commission have been so belated and so feeble that the Bay is one of the worst sewers in the Nation. Two years ago an outbreak of infectious hepatitis was traced to clams taken from the Raritan Bay, bacteria standards for which had not been enforced by the States. At this point the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, acting under the authority granted it by the Water Pollution Control Act of 1956, intruded against strong opposition by the States to seek improvement in the abatement program.

This law is the crux of the Federal program. It permits the Government to spend $90 million each year to aid cities and towns in the building of sewage disposal plants. It also permits the Government to initiate a series of actions to abate pollution of interstate waters when health or welfare is endangered. The enforcement machinery is cumbersome. It involves first calling a conference of interested parties (usually State and Federal health officials) to give the States an opportunity to take remedial action on their own. If they do not lay out and implement specific plans for abatement usually requiring the construction of new or improved treatment plants, a hearing is held; if this fails to produce results the Government may finally bring suit. In many instances States are not eager to enforce pollution abatement programs because sewage plants mean higher taxes for municipalities, or because they are trying to lure industry to build new plants and do not want to hinder these prospects by requiring them to build expensive waste treatment facilities.

In the case of the Raritan, the first conference in August, 1961, resulted in the U.S. Public Health Service, under whose authority the pollution act is administered, establishing a research laboratory at Metuchen, N.J. Three ships began a study of the bay waters to see whether they met the standards set by the commission.

At this first session, State health officials as well as the commission protested that their pollution abatement programs were effective, that 73 cases of hepatitis "hardly presents the 'National' interest that would justify enforcement action by the Public Health Service," and finally suggested that one of the major purposes of the waters in question was for the disposal of waste. William C. Cope, then commission chairman, declared, "Surveys by State and city agencies indicate that they—the Raritan Bay waters—are now, and for some time past have been, in very good condition for virtually every use that can be made of them, including those requiring a high degree of purity such as fishing and bathing."

At that time, one of the more scenic spots on the Raritan Bay was the Perth Amboy, N.J., public bathing beach. The water was particularly warm because 200 feet off the beach front, rising in a boil, spouted the city's sewage outflow, bathing swimmers and beach with fresh, inadequately treated human feces. A few miles away, the town of Tottenville, Staten Island, N.Y., dumped its raw sewage from 4,000 people into the bay waters, and several miles east up the Staten Island coast, the public bathing beaches were washed in the sewage flows coming through the narrows from New York Harbor. At one of these, South Beach, the city of New York each year enacts a little drama: The city health department warns the people not to swim there because it is polluted; the city parks department then comes along, opens up the beach, and staffs it with lifeguards.

There are some indications that the policies followed by both the Interstate Sanitation Commission and the State health departments have tended to increase the complexity of the pollution problem. Since 1958, for instance, the Middlesex County Sewerage Authority, one of the largest contributors of waste to the bay, has been permitted to pump its effluent into 7 feet of water in a dead spot in the bay, adjacent to heavily populated areas and numerous bathing beaches. As a result, the sewage lies in this dead spot for several days before moving out to sea. To make up for the shallow water, the authority dug a hole 35 feet deep in the sand beneath the end of the pipe. Like many other sewage treatment plants in the Raritan Bay area, the authority provides primary treatment; that is, it settles out solids, which contain the bulk of harmful bacteria, and then chlorinates the liquid effluent to kill bacteria before expelling it into the water. The Government claims that the chlorine has not been administered in sufficient quantities to kill bacteria, and that the great volume of the effluvia has reduced the oxygen content of the water below commission standards.

The inabilities of the States to compel industry to clean up its wastes are well known. But the States of New York and New Jersey seem to have run up against particularly bad luck in attempting to persuade hundreds of industries along the Arthur Kill, to install treatment plants for their organic and inorganic wastes. Since 1955, the Interstate Sanitation Commission has been making certain studies of the kill. Each one has shown that definite progress was in sight; the industries, never named, were being consulted.

In effect, this appears to have been nothing but a delaying tactic, since the Federal Government says that pollution can be pinpointed through sampling outflow pipes, and that treatment is technically feasible in all instances. Moreover, Chairman Cope and his successors have consistently maintained that the Arthur Kill really has no effect on the Raritan Bay at all, but rather, expels its heavy pollution load into the Newark Bay. However, this view is contradicted by the commission's own research which reported that dye floated at any point in the water to show current direction, rapidly began to leave the Kill through both northern and southern extremities. A Public Health Service dye study of the kill showed, that under the most adverse conditions, anything placed at the Raritan Bay end of the kill would float all the way up on one tide and come back down in short order.

When the Public Health Service published the results of this study, the interstate commission fell silent on its claims to the current direction of the Arthur Kill. Orders were issued through the State health departments, directing several municipalities and industries, most of them on the New Jersey side of the kill, to improve markedly their sewage treatment facilities within 1 year's time. In announcing these orders as proof of its effective and progressive plans for water pollution abatement, the commission and the States at the second session of the conference held this month again urged the Federal Government to quit the bay. The Government studies, they said, were a scant contribution to the knowledge of the area. This the Government declined to do, since its studies are not yet complete.

New Jersey now says, however, that 1 year is too little time; it will take at least 2 years of work before plans can be laid out. There are three large industries which contribute the bulk of pollution to the Arthur Kill: Humble Oil, American Cyanamid, and General Aniline & Film. They have been dragging their feet on this problem for 8½ years already. Now New Jersey will give them at least two more.

Not only have the people of New York and New Jersey been spending money for delaying tactics, bad planning, and apparently bogus research on the Raritan Bay, but, so too has the Federal Government which each year doles out about $500,000 to the State health departments and the commission for their water pollution programs. These funds are part of a total $5 million annual expenditure by the Government to all States for similar purposes, and they are administered by the Public Health Service, which claims that it is prevented under the act from exercising any real control over their use. In the Raritan Bay, the Government is spending an additional $200,000 annually for its special study.

Even if they could exercise control over these funds, there is some question as to whether many in the Public Health Service would want to do much in way of supervising the State programs, partly because the funds are relatively small, but more importantly, because the Public Health Service—with the exception of a 24-man enforcement branch sandwiched into it—appears to take a fairly relaxed view of its duties under the pollution act. The enforcement branch depends on the Public Health Service for research to support its activities, but it also must fight its way through the bureaucracy of the Service to get any compliance.

Traditionally, Public Health Service officers have acted in the capacity of advisers to the States. Moreover, the primary concerns of the Service are those directly related to health, and when this narrow concern is applied to water pollution, it results in the closing down of beaches or shutting up the clam beds, not in the improvement of the water. The Public Health Service seems to feel that pollution abatement can best be achieved through gentlemanly meetings behind closed doors. In New York City regional officials of the Health Service went out of their way to make things easy for the States and the Interstate Sanitation Commission at the second Raritan conference. First, the Public Health Service regional office felt the Federal courthouse, the scene of the first conference, was unduly oppressive from the States' point of view. So they had the second conference removed to the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Then they attempted to suppress an innocuous press release announcing the conference and prepared by the enforcement branch. Because of "sensitive" Federal-State relations, the regional office felt the release was unnecessary. "They'd like to do it all behind closed doors if they could. It's all one big happy family," said one official referring to the relations between the State and Federal regional health officers.

Thomas R. Glenn, Jr., executive secretary of the Interstate Sanitation Commission, feels that the commission is best able to make progress when it "ends up in the back of the newspaper. The commission has a reputation of being reasonable," he added.

ONE BIG HAPPY FAMILY

Some Members of Congress have felt for a long time that the Public Health Service is inadequately equipped to administer the water pollution program. Representatives Dingell and Blatnik are sponsoring legislation in the House, and Mr. Muskie in the Senate, which would wrest the enforcement of the act from the Surgeon General, and place it in a separate administration directly under Secretary Celebrezze; but leave the research functions with the Public Health Service. The Surgeon General, on the other hand, wants the water pollution program as the single largest part of a new Bureau of Environmental Health.

The administration's attitudes toward this pending legislation appears somewhat confused. The President in his health message endorsed a Bureau of Environmental Health. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare says it has not yet decided what position to take. Secretary Celebrezze's interest in the matter seems slight. Since taking office he has not initiated a single abatement action. Twenty were begun under Mr. Ribicoff.

On the face of it, nothing would be gained by requiring the Public Health Service to become a regulatory agency, a function which it has shown itself ill equipped to handle. Surely nothing is gained by pretending that the pollution of interstate waters will be abated through a series of pleasant little meetings between Federal and State health officials, when in many instances the State officials represent governments anxious to attract industry and avoid raising tax rates. Water pollution is a straightforward Federal-State issue, waged on the one hand by a vigorous but tiny Federal enforcement unit which wants not only to stop pollution but to restore the quality of the waters, and on the other hand by States who resist every inch of the way. At the very least, the enforcement section should be removed from its administrative entanglements within the Health Service and made into an administration directly beneath the Secretary. But if this is to work, Mr. Celebrezze will have to show more enthusiasm for enforcement than he has to date. And, therefore, Mr. Dingell's latest solution, the transfer of the enforcement section to the Interior Department, may well be the best answer.

Needed: A Great Lakes Basin Compact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, for many years there has been an evident need for some organ to foster cooperation and coordination between the States bordering on the Great Lakes, as well as with the Canadian Provinces bordering on that great inland waterway.

To that end, I have introduced a bill into this Congress, H.R. 971, which would grant consent of Congress to the establishment of a Great Lakes Basin Compact. The purposes of this compact are, through means of joint or cooperative action:

First, to promote the orderly, integrated, and comprehensive development use and conservation of the water resources of the Great Lakes Basin.

Second, to plan for the welfare and development of the water resources of the basin as a whole, as well as for those portions with particular problems.

Third, to make it possible for the States in the basin area and their citizens to derive maximum benefit from utilization of public works, in the form of navigational and other maritime aids, which may exist or which may be constructed.

Fourth, to advise in securing and mantaining a proper balance among industrial, commercial, agricultural, water supply, residential, recreational and other legitimate uses of the water resources of the basin.

Fifth, to establish and maintain an intergovernmental agency to the end that the purposes of the compact may be accomplished more effectively.

The need for the Great Lakes Basin Compact was underscored recently in press reports about meetings between members of the quasi-official Great Lakes Commission and the Canadian provinces of Ontario and Quebec on the Great Lakes water problem. I am including an article from the Christian Science Monitor of May 24 which explains the extent and seriousness of the problem.

At the same time, a labor war on the Great Lakes continues to be an irritant to United States-Canadian relations, and poses a threat to seaway shipping. On that subject, I am including an article from the May 26 issue of the New York Times.

Both these problem areas point up the need for a Great Lakes Basin Compact, where difficulties could be discussed and worked out on a continuing rather than ad hoc basis. I urge my colleagues, and all who are interested in the future economic growth of the Great Lakes region, to support this needed legislation.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, May 26, 1963]

LAKES LABOR WAR UPSETS U.S. AIDS—OFFICIALS PRESSED BY CANADA TO BLOCK SHIP TIEUPS

(By Homer Bigart)

OTTAWA, May 25.—The Great Lakes labor war continues to disturb Canadian-United States relations.

Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson has made renewed representations to the Kennedy administration on the harassment of Canadian ships in U.S. ports on the Great Lakes by members of the Seafarers International Union.

Mr. Pearson raised the issue at a special meeting Thursday night with Secretary of State Dean Rusk, who is in Ottawa attending the spring session of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Mr. Rusk gave assurances that the United States would act immediately to prevent any further deterioration in the dispute.

The meeting was held against the background of worsening relations between the Canadian Labor Congress and the Seafarers International Union, which has headquarters in Washington.

Mr. Pearson had just been warned by Claude Jodoin, president of the C.L.C., that the Canadian labor organization might take retaliatory action, a boycott of U.S. ships in Canadian ports on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway, unless the situation eased.

JODOIN ANGERED

Mr. Jodoin was enraged by statements made in Washington Thursday by Paul Hall, president of the S.I.U., and an executive vice president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations. Mr. Hall was quoted in an interview with the Canadian press as promising support to the hilt for Harold C. Banks, head of the Canadian S.I.U.

Mr. Jodoin expelled Mr. Banks' union in 1960 for raiding the membership of another group. A year later, with strong backing from the Labor congress, the Canadian Maritime Union was formed for the sole purpose of running Mr. Banks' union off the lakes.

Canadian ships manned by members of the new union were picketed by the S.I.U. whenever they turned up at a U.S. port. Last summer there was considerable violence. C.M.U. sailors were beaten up in a dozen ports, some in Canada, some in the United States.

A special target of the S.I.U. was the Upper Lakes Shipping Co. of Toronto. Days lost because of picketing and harassment in American ports cost the company over $1,500,000. One of its ships, the *Howard L. Shaw*, has been floating empty at Chicago since April 22.

Both the United States and now alert to the real threat—that the dispute might paralyze the St. Lawrence Seaway and all the Great Lakes. Last summer lockworkers supporting the CMU refused to handle vessels manned by SIU crews and tied up the Welland Canal and the seaway for 8 days.

The dispute was discussed at the Hyannis Port meeting between Mr. Pearson and President Kennedy. The leaders declared that ships of both nations should be free to move without hindrance.

SECRET MEETING HELD

The communique was followed by top level efforts to settle the dispute. Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz and Canadian Labor Minister Allan MacEachen met in Washington last Tuesday with Mr. Jodoin and George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO. They announced that the discussion was "both constructive and helpful." Then Mr. Jodoin and Mr. Meany held a secret meeting with Mr. Hall.

Hopes of an early settlement were shattered by the publication of the Hall interview. Mr. Hall said he would not sacrifice Mr. Banks, the tough, burly Iowa-born leader of the Canadian SIU in any deal to restore peace on the lakes. Mr. Hall was quoted as saying that the Canadian Labor Congress executive group was composed mostly of "scabs."

Prime Minister Pearson, after his hastily arranged talk with Secretary Rusk, said that the statements attributed to Mr. Hall did not reflect a desire to work out a solution. It was the kind of statement that could do "nothing but harm."

Mr. Pearson's protest brought an immediate reaction in Washington. Secretary Wirtz sent a telegram to Labor Minister MacEachen suggesting they hold another conference with Mr. Meany and Mr. Jodoin. Mr. Wirtz agreed that Mr. Hall's comments seemed to indicate "failure to recognize the gravity of the present situation and an unwillingness to cooperate in meeting it."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 24, 1963]

GREAT LAKES DRAIN EYED

(By Nobuo Abiko)

CHICAGO.—The world's largest body of fresh water, the Great Lakes, is slowly coming to need more water.

As water uses increase on both the American and Canadian sides of the lakes, officials are searching for new sources of water with which to replenish the lakes' supply.

Several possibilities are currently under study, according to Albert J. Meserow, recently elected chairman of the Great Lakes Commission.

On the U.S. side, they include the Fox River, the Kankakee River, and the Des Plaines River, Mr. Meserow says.

Although none of these rivers, located in the Wisconsin-Illinois-Indiana arc around Chicago, flows directly into Lake Michigan, he explains, it may be feasible to construct huge reservoirs on them to store water during heavy rains. This supply could then be pumped into the lake.

EYES TURN NORTH

Probably the prime sources of additional water for the Great Lakes, however, Mr. Meserow says, are located in Canada.

He cites particularly the Albany River watershed just north of Lake Superior in the Canadian Province of Ontario. In this region, he says, are thousands of small lakes and rivers the waters of which might be channeled into the lake.

An even better source, perhaps, is a region in the Province of Quebec centered around the Harricanaw River, which flows into James Bay and Hudson Bay.

Most of this water, Mr. Meserow says, is wasted. He cites an engineering estimate that this region could supply some 100,000 cubic feet of water a second to the Great Lakes.

TALKS CROSS BORDER

The Great Lakes Commission—which is composed of representatives from Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, New York, and Pennsylvania—is currently conducting talks with the Canadian Provinces of Ontario and Quebec on the entire Great Lakes water problem.

Root of the problem is the mounting consumption of water for domestic and industrial uses on both sides of the Great Lakes.

When too much water from the lakes is used, Mr. Meserow explains, lowered lake levels hinder navigation (loading of ships at lake ports) and power facilities.

Diversion of Lake Michigan water by Illinois for sewage disposal and other uses has long been opposed by neighboring States, particularly Wisconsin and Michigan. Litigation on this point has dragged on for many years and has cost the taxpayers some $1 million, according to Mr. Meserow.

RISING NEEDS SEEN

Now, he says, a number of Great Lakes States are finding that they, too, may need more water from the lakes.

Ohio, for example, is planning to build a canal from Lake Erie to the Ohio River.

Cloquet, Minn., near Duluth, is eyeing more water from Lake Superior for domestic and industrial use.

Syracuse, N.Y., 30 miles from Lake Ontario, wants more drinking water.

Montreal needs sufficient water for its harbor facilities.

These mounting demands on Great Lakes water, Mr. Meserow says, have impelled the Great Lakes Commission to prepare a wide-ranging water-resources plan for the entire lakes region. The plan, when completed, will cover navigation, power, pollution, irrigation, diversion, and domestic and industrial uses, he says.

Lincoln in Western Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, known as a Lincoln scholar, the Reverend Landry Genosky, O.F.M., professor of American history at Quincy College, recently gave a talk on Lincoln's part in the history of Quincy and Jacksonville, Ill. Father Genosky has done extensive research on western Illinois history.

"Jacksonville and Quincy have much Lincolniana in common," said Father Genosky, secretary of the Tri-State Civil War Roundtable.

Text of the address given before the Jacksonville Kiwanis Club is given here:

BROWNING, WILLIAMS AND JONAS AIDED EMANCIPATOR, FATHER LANDRY SAYS

Jacksonville and Quincy have much Lincolniana in common. Jacksonville propelled Lincoln's most formidable opponent, Stephen A. Douglas, onto the political stage. Quincy, in turn, "benched" him—but honorably. From 1841 to 1843, Stephen A. Douglas sat on the circuit court bench in the old Quincy courthouse. Jacksonville, through its son, the later war-Governor Yates, in the summer of 1854, launched Lincoln on his political reentry. Quincy gave Jacksonville's Douglas the vote over Lincoln in the critical 1860 election.

As early as September 1, 1842, Lincoln, fearing arrest in Springfield, because of his pending duel with Alton's James Shields, sought refuge among Jacksonville friends. Quincy, 7 years earlier (Nov. 12, 1835), in its court, fined Abraham Lincoln $10 for inciting a riot in Carthage (Nov. 14, 1834).

Of course, it was the "wrong" Lincoln, but this trial for riot is the first documentary proof we have in Quincy of an Abraham Lincoln. Strange as is the coincidence, a Mudd, but a Raymond Mudd, is also one of the nine "evil disposed persons, who with force and arms unlawfully, riotously, routously and with violence did beat, bruise and maltreat * * * Jabey A. Beebe."

In Quincy, if not in the Nation, the "right" Lincoln's best friends were Mr. and Mrs. O. H. Browning. Well known is Browning's friendship with Lincoln. Less well known is Lincoln's friendship with Mrs. Browning. At Vandalia, during the winters of 1836–37 and 1837–38, Lincoln often visited the young married couple. Mrs. Browning, the former Eliza Caldwell, whose father was a kinsman of John Calhoun, had given up at least for a while her Kentucky "mint slings" and pipe for Browning, that February 15, 1836, when they were tied in wedlock.

To Eliza, Lincoln wrote of a love affair, at first, in 1833, so bright and young and gay, and then the young lady revisited years later, changed * * * "a fair match for Falstaff," Lincoln described her. "Nothing could have reached her present bulk (1838) in less than 35 or 40 years." Was he bound to marry her?

Also to Eliza, came a comical petition endorsed by Lincoln from the young legislators in the new capital, to "lighten bachelor society in Springfield, bringing in your train all the ladies, in general, who may be at your command and all Mr. Browning's sisters in particular."

The friendship continued through the years. When Lincoln visited Quincy in 1854, he had tea with the Brownings. When Lincoln visited Quincy for the Lincoln-Douglas debate in 1858, in the absence of her husband, Mrs. Browning held a reception for Lincoln in the Browning home.

Browning had his spats with Lincoln but, he writes in his diary: "At the time of his little Willie's (William Wallace Lincoln) death (Feb. 20, 1862), Mrs. Browning and I were out of the city but returned to Washington on the evening of the same day of his death. The President and Mrs. Lincoln sent their carriage for us immediately upon learning we were in the city and we remained with them about a week." In the funeral procession, the Brownings rode with Lincoln.

Lane Newberry, the Nauvoo artist, in an interview for the Herald-Whig, June 29, 1837 stated that Lincoln spent a weekend during the Fraim murder trial with the Brownings at Quincy. Possibly he did. Fraim, you recall, had murdered a man in a saloon at Frederick, Schulyer County. Lincoln, in his first murder case, defended Fraim—unsuccessfully. Fraim was hanged in Carthage, May 18, 1839.

All the assemblymen at the famous Vandalia session of 1837 agreed that Browning had the honor of being the handsomest member. Likewise, they all agreed that the two ugliest men at the same session were Lincoln and Archibald Williams of Quincy. Clad in buckskin, Williams' appearance drew laughs until he spoke. For three successive terms, he was returned to the assembly. One of the "seven young Indians" with Lincoln, he advocated Zachary Taylor, for which service Taylor appointed him U.S. district attorney for Illinois. Twice defeated as candidate for the U.S. Senate, the Whigs of the State acknowledged him their elder statesman. Offered a seat on the U.S. Supreme Court bench, he declined and received instead from his friend now President Lincoln, the first appointment after Lincoln's selection of his Cabinet.

During his campaign for the Congress in 1854, as a free soiler, Lincoln spoke in Quincy "to give Williams a little life." This anti-Kansas-Nebraska speech of Lincoln for his friend in Quincy (Oct. 31, 1854) would cause Lincoln headaches in 1860. This is the speech, made in Kendall hall, in Quincy, which the Herald reported to "addressed (to) abolitionists, Whigs, and Know-Nothings."

At the opening session of the State legislature in the new capital at Springfield (Dec. 10, 1839), Lincoln cast his vote for Andrew Johnston as clerk of the assembly. Andrew Johnston. Such an intimate friend of Lincoln that Lincoln entrusted him the only poetry, I believe, Lincoln ever wrote. This same Andrew Johnston, would write from Richmond, 4 days before Lincoln's assassination, "I made several attempts to see you" (while Lincoln visited the fallen Richmond) but "had no acquaintance to introduce me."

A lawyer from Richmond, Va., Johnston came to Quincy in 1837. He founded the Quincy Whig, was a Whig stalwart and encouraged Lincoln to publish his poem, "The Return" in the Whig (May 5, 1847) as well as the account of that strange "murder" of Archibald Fischer, which involved a week's search for a body, a clandestine affair in a thicket, a brother's testimony of another brother's act of murder, with a climax reached when the "corpse" walked into the courtroom. Lincoln defended the Trailor brothers and upset the town of Springfield's plans. As Hart, the drayman, put it after the corpse, so much alive, was produced: "It was too damned bad to have so much trouble and no hanging after all."

This Andrew Johnston would obtain from John Stuart, Lincoln's law partner, the appointment from Quincy to West Point of Johnston's nephew, George E. Pickett of Gettysburg fame. Two letters of Andrew Johnston, one to Archibald Williams, December 19, 1860, and the other to Lincoln, April 11, 1865, uncannily foreboded a crisis-fraught future.

To Archibald Williams (Dec. 19, 1860) on the eve of South Carolina's secession: "The discontents of the south are so widely and seriously felt, that new assurance must be given in the north or the south must dissolve the Union. If the endeavor to enforce the laws of the Union within the geographical limits of the Southern States (is made) South Carolina, will be supported by her States. I have long awaited and longed for some declaration of Lincoln that might tend to tranquilize and reassure the south."

To Abraham Lincoln (Apr. 11, 1865): "As you in part know, I have spared no effort to avert the struggle. (I want to express) gratitude at the moderation and humanity, nay, I will add kindness, with which the authorities of the United States have acted since the occupation of this city (Richmond)—it has done much to soften the bitterness of feeling and to reconcile the people to their fate. If continued, it will be far more efficacious toward preserving the public tranquility than any measure of severity."

Lincoln had laid down this policy. When General Weitzel, commander of the occupied forces at Richmond, had asked him what to do with conquered people, Lincoln responded: "I let 'em up easy, let 'em up easy."

No wonder, to Browning, Lincoln's assassination was "the heaviest calamity that could befall the country." Already June 12, 1861, the shrewd Browning could foresee that "the radicals are more dangerous than the rebels."

In 1860, to pin a Know-Nothing label on a presidential candidate could mean political disaster with a heavy Irish and German vote. E. M. Davis, a Quincy merchant, informed Lincoln of such an attempt. Writing from Quincy, June 13, 1860, E. M. Davis says:

"Hon. A. LINCOLN: Please permit me to contradict the assertion made Wednesday by our opponent (Richardson?) that you are or ever have been identified with the Know-Nothings. We have a very large foreign vote and large numbers of Republicans among the German votes.

"Very Resp'fully Yours,
"Your Able Servant,
E. M. DAVIS.

"P.S.—You may remember, I called upon you at your rooms last Tuesday morning."

This E. M. Davis wrote a series of articles on the Quincy Thespians, a local theatrical group, in whose company George E. Pickett played female roles.

This letter written June 13, 1860, antedates by 1 month and 1 week the famous confidential letter of Lincoln to Abraham Jonas, another Quincyan.

Abraham Jonas, an English Jew, the first grand master of the grand lodge of Illinois, came to Quincy in 1838. He first met Lincoln at the famous Washington birthday dinner in Springfield (Feb. 22, 1842). As a Whig, he won the State legislature election in 1842. Later he served as postmaster of Quincy.

By 1854, when Lincoln visited Quincy on Jonas' request, he was such good friend, that Lincoln, on July 21, 1860, wrote: "You were with me that day and both nights. * * *"

It was to Jonas, that Lincoln entrusted the job of quelching the rumor of Lincoln's visit to a Quincy Know-Nothing lodge in 1854. Lincoln had enough confidence in Jonas to add: "And now a word of caution. Our adversaries think they can gain a point if they force me to openly deny that charge, by which some degree of offense should be given the Americans. For this reason, it must not publicly appear that I am paying attention to the charge."

When Horace Greeley came to Quincy, the leading Republicans closeted themselves with him to discuss the 1860 election. Henry Asbury proposed Lincoln for President. None agreed until Jonas said: "Gentlemen, there may be more to Asbury's suggestion than any of us now think." Here the whole subject was dropped.

In 1862, Lincoln, who had appointed Jonas postmaster of Quincy, asked a favor—the release of a secessionist who was held in prison in Quincy.

The last favor Lincoln did for Jonas: "Allow Charles H. Jonas, now a prisoner of war at Johnson's island, a parole of 3 weeks to visit his dying father, Abraham Jonas, at Quincy, Ill. (June 2, 1864). A. Lincoln."

Charles reached Quincy the day Abraham Jonas died "in time to be recognized and welcomed by him." As a final tribute, Lincoln allowed Mrs. Jonas to fill out her husband's term as postmaster.

Quincyans continued their friendship with Lincoln to his death. After his assassination, Henry Asbury, then in Washington, D.C., was able to procure—how it is not known—but he did obtain—the hood the assassin Paine wore during his confinement, the key to Mary Surratt's cell, two keys to the old Capital prison and the manacles worn by Atzerodt. These were given to Distin, the first Governor of Alaska, whose daughter donated them to the Quincy Historical Society.

Idaho's Fine Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, throughout the remainder of this month and the first of next, we will witness the graduation from high school of a new generation of young men and women. Their future in the space age will pose problems with which we are but vaguely familiar. It is, however, our responsibility to see that they are given every advantage to better prepare themselves to meet these challenges headon and within the framework of our American way of life.

In these days where there is so much editorial and vocal comment about the reckless irresponsibility of our youth, my faith in our young people was confirmed by an editorial in the Idaho Free Press, printed in Nampa, Idaho, on May 20, 1963, which calls attention to the immediate response of students to projects which provide for a better community. It also points out a problem which is facing many of our Nation's small towns and cities today: the exodus of young people to centers of greater opportunities.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial entitled "Our Fine Youth":

The emphasis during these late May days is on accomplishments of our young people.

Our young men and women are getting diplomas, winning scholarships, receiving fellowships, accepting awards and chalking up honors of many kinds. And it's at such times that we realize the fine qualities of today's youth.

Not all win special recognition of course. Honors and awards would be meaningless if they went to everyone. But the quality of the entire group may be indicated by the significant number who rate high.

Two recent developments tell us something about our young people.

The first is Nampa High School student's reaction to the Dollars for Nampa Scholars program. When the community started a fund to give deserving students a boost, high school students staged their own car show and raised more than $600 for the project. They weren't waiting for a handout; they were contributing their own efforts to make project work.

The second development is in the area of senior projects. Again this year, seniors at Nampa High School saw the need for a campus improvement—and provided the money and effort to get the job done. They didn't wait for someone else to provide the cash or get the project started.

These are just a couple of examples. But they tell us something about the young men and women who are growing up in our midst.

But there's something disturbing in this picture too.

Far too many of these future citizens will leave our communities—giving their talents and energies elsewhere. The exodus of young people to centers of greater opportunity is a matter of high concern in smaller cities across the Nation. We know it disturbs many people here.

To hold our best young men and women and to attract others, our communities must provide employment opportunities, cultural climate and an intellectual atmosphere that can challenge, support and satisfy them. This subject deserves serious, realistic community study—in which our young people have a chance to express their ideas.

Yes, we're seeing the high caliber of our youth in these spring days. We also must see ways in which they can become partners in developing the places where they made early achievement.

Address by Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, there is a trend in the United States today to criticize the actions of public officials. These reports are usually of a negative characteristic. The positive good a person in public life contributes is rarely, if ever, reported. This is definitely a blow to democracy. One is hesitant to run for public office.

One of those who was vastly criticized is our great Jim Farley. He, too, was a controversial figure at one time, but no one could question his honesty, his integrity, and his willingness to face what he believed was the truth. It is one of my pleasures in life to know him as a friend and a public official. I am delighted to insert in the Record the following address given by him at a recent communion breakfast of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America and Ladies Auxiliary, which highlights the contributions of those of Irish ancestry to the church, education, and Government of the United States:

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, THE COCA-COLA EXPORT CORP., AT THE CORPORATE COMMUNION BREAKFAST OF THE NEW YORK COUNTY BOARD, ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS IN AMERICA AND LADIES AUXILIARY, HOTEL COMMODORE, NEW YORK CITY, MAY 26, 1963

Any American of Irish ancestry would feel, as I do this morning, humble and yet proud of the privilege of participating in this gathering. Over 120 years have passed since my grandfather left County Meath for a strange but at that time happier land, and the crowns and crosses of Ireland's past are all as personal with me as they are with you. I am not a native Irishman and yet I can claim as great a part in all the events of Irish history, prior to 1840, as any Irishman born and bred.

We of Irish blood are especially proud of the fact that Americans of Irish extraction have played so prominent a part in the strength and growth of the Catholic Church in America and in the establishment of Catholic universities and colleges. I am sure it is known to many in this assembly that the Catholic University of America was conceived at the Second Council in Baltimore in 1866, only 20 years after the start of the great migration. At that time, our grandfathers were still hewers of wood and drawers of water. They were carrying the hod and building the Erie railroad, but they were struggling for an education and filling the ranks of the priesthood and the hierarchy. So it was that they were well represented when all the American bishops met in Baltimore at the close of the Civil War. Moreover, the plan to establish a pontifical university in the United States reflected in great measure an Irish enthusiasm for learning.

It was enlightening to me when I learned of the role played by the Irish in convincing the Catholics of the United States that the first amendment to the Bill of Rights was a wise amendment. It was just a small group of Englishmen with a scattering of Germans and Frenchmen that constituted the Catholic body in our land before the coming of the Irish in the middle of the 19th century, and I have always thought that they were delighted with the disestablishment of the Church of England in the United States and the promise that no other would be established in its place. And that, after all, was the sense of the first amendment. This wall of separation between church and state we hear so much about today was a later invention.

The relationship that exists in this country between the clergy and laity should be a source of pride to all of us. While anticlericalism is unfortunately on the increase now here, as well as in Europe, due largely to the effects of secularism in our daily lives, there are few groups in the church as close to their priests as the American laymen. Our school system from kindergarten to the graduate school builds up a spirit of respectful familiarity which makes working together a mutual inspiration. And who gave us the school system? All the hierarchy, all the priests and all the faithful but we must admit privately that most of them were Irish, like the great John Hughes, first archbishop of New York and the father of the parochial schools.

For over 200 years our ancestors had been starved in body and in mind, if not in soul, by a cruel invader. Their teachers were hedgemasters, their classrooms the open field, and their leaders fugitive priests who offered the Holy Sacrifice in a cave. Any wonder then that when newer and freer worlds were opened to them their hunger for education had to be satisfied with schools that reflected their holy faith. Next to the churches in America, the Catholic schools of America are the greatest monument ever erected to a generation of downtrodden laboring immigrants.

And, because of all this background, an Irish attitude still persists in this country toward vocations of the priesthood and the religious life. We realize that the moral atmosphere of the whole world has been changing for the worse and the United States has not been spared. The nuns' vocations are almost stationary, while the Catholic population increases by leaps and bounds. Still, compared with most parts of the world, our situation is a matter of envy. Most of our families are still praying as their Irish fathers and mothers and grandparents prayed, that God will bless them with a priest, a brother, or a nun.

I trust you will not object if at this time, I refer to the recognition that has been given, and justly so, to American Catholics of Irish ancestry in their advancement in political activity and in public life.

It has been stated and repeated over and over that no group of immigrants conformed more wholeheartedly than the sons of Erin to the basic institutions of democratic government they found in the New World. By hundreds of thousands they flocked to the polls on election days and by their special genius for political organization they helped to direct the course of the Democratic Party which had shown them a far more friendly countenance than was true of its traditional rival. But they never wavered in their loyalty to the fundamental tenets of the American political creed.

Catholic men and women of Irish extraction have filled and do fill public posts of great importance efficiently and faithfully. The first Irishman to hold the office of mayor of New York was William R. Grace, elected in 1880, and today, 83 years later, the mayor of New York, Robert F. Wagner, lays claim to Irish ancestry through his late mother. And that is the pattern throughout the country. There are at present in the Senate of the United States, Catholic men of Irish extraction representing their States and in the House of Representatives there are a large number of men and some women, Catholic and of Irish blood representing their congressional districts in a most commendable manner.

We have now and have had down through the years many outstanding men of Irish blood serving as Governors of our great States. In my judgment the most illustrious of them was the late Alfred E. Smith, whose record as Governor of the State of New York will live forever in our State and throughout our country. It can be said without fear of contradiction that he was responsible for the enactment into law of more beneficial legislation than any other Governor of any State in the entire country, and laws now on the statute books of New York State have set a pattern which has been followed in numerous other States throughout the Nation.

It is indeed remarkable that shortly after the great migration President Franklin Pierce, a Democrat, appointed as his Postmaster General, James Campbell of Pennsylvania, an Irish Catholic and the first to be named to a President's Cabinet. Since then other Catholics of Irish extraction have served in Presidents' Cabinets, and they have served as members of the Supreme Court of the United States and in various judicial posts throughout the country.

The election of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, whose forebears were born in Ireland, as the 35th President of the United States—the first Catholic President—was a great tribute to the intelligence and tolerance of millions of non-Catholics in our country. We can be proud of him. He is a man of fine intellect, great integrity, and courage that is boundless. His problems from the day he took office have greatly exceeded the norm. No President in American history has borne greater burdens than he is bearing at this moment. Diplomatic disasters of first magnitude confront us on every side. Pressure of the enemy and doubts among our allies, the groans of the enslaved nations and peoples, and the whimpers of the appeasers assail the President from every angle. The press indicates almost daily the creation of one crisis after another. But, it can be truly stated, that in the American tradition, if the crisis is great the crisis will produce the man, and I feel that no man in our history is better qualified to make decisions than President Kennedy. He knows the horrors of war because he has suffered them. But he also knows that freedom is priceless because he offered his own life to save it. It is my conviction that he will meet the challenge on every side and that he will give the leadership we must have in these crucial days. I sincerely believe that historians of another day will cite this Catholic American President of Irish ancestry as one of our greatest Chief Executives.

I do not want to conclude my remarks this morning without paying a tribute to the priests and the religious for the position the Catholic Church in America holds today. Since the formation of the Republic, nearly 187 years ago, most of the priests were of Irish blood, and they were followed by hundreds of others down through the years, who with the members of religious orders helping them, built our churches, our schools, our colleges, our universities, hospitals and other institutions. We shall never be able to repay them for not only their spiritual leadership, but for their great contribution through accomplishment to the American way of life. I am sure that everyone present this morning, is fully cognizant of their tireless efforts. There are in this room, members of families whose relatives preceded them to this country who were part of that great contingent of priests and religious—to whom I sincerely pay tribute. And, let us all ever be proud of and grateful for the contribution of the Irish to the church, education and government in the United States.

Law Observance Exhibit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members will read with interest the remarks of Harry D. Shargel, Esq., and the program of the dedication ceremonies in connection with the third law observance exhibit, "Law Enforcement Serves the Community," which took place under the sponsorship of the Philadelphia Chapter of the Federal Bar Association on May 27, 1963:

LAW OBSERVANCE EXHIBIT

(By Harry D. Shargel)

The Federal Bar Association (Philadelphia chapter) through its law observance committee is engaged in a year-round program to promote respect for law and those who enforce it.

Our activities are designed to educate the public in the functions of the Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies; to urge the public to respect and uphold the law; and to improve the morale of law enforcement personnel, broaden their training, enhance the prestige of law enforcement as a career, and help attract the highest caliber of personnel to this field. We have promoted coordination among law enforcement agencies, prosecuting attorneys, the judiciary, penologists, and welfare organizations.

As part of our endeavors we have caused posters to be displayed bearing the slogan, "The Law Protects You, Respect It, Uphold It, Obey It," published a directory of law enforcement agencies; sponsored television programs designed to educate the public concerning the fine work of law enforcement agencies; organized coordination conferences among those concerned with crime and delinquency; arranged the distribution to teachers, parents, and students of relevant literature; established a speakers bureau which furnishes speakers in furtherance of our program; arranged for the establishment of a degree course in police science and administration at Temple University and organized exhibits. We are currently sponsoring a weekly radio program on station WIBG of interviews of persons connected with the law enforcement process, a series of spot messages urging respect for law by outstanding citizens on radio station WIBG and a similar series on WRCV–TV. We are also sponsoring a youth accomplishment program designed to direct youthful drives into constructive channels, provide a sense of accomplishment and appropriate recognition to young people regardless of their relative capabilities. We have already had dramatic evidence of the importance of this youth program.

Today, under the theme, "Law Enforcement Serves the Community," we inaugurate our third law observance exhibit to be held at the Philadelphia National Bank. We hope that this exhibit will help us all to realize the important part our law enforcement personnel play in making our American way of life possible. All of us should become familiar with the fine work of each law enforcement agency and realize that the law enforcement agent, whether a local policeman, State official, or Federal agent, is a friend dedicated to public service and the protection of each of us.

We in Philadelphia can take special pride in the fact that the work of the Philadelphia chapter law observance committee is serving as a model for Federal Bar Association Chapters around the country. As a matter of fact, as a result of the inspiration afforded by past exhibits in this bank, a national exhibit will be opened in the RCA Exhibit Hall in Radio City, N.Y., on June 17, 1963.

We are especially thankful to the Philadelphia National Bank for making this exhibit possible.

DEDICATION OF THE LAW OBSERVANCE EXHIBIT

Host: Philadelphia National Bank—Frederic A. Potts, president; Robert H. Schong; director of public information.

Exhibitors: Civil Service Commission—William T. Kesselring, recruiting representative.

Food and Drug Administration: Fred L. Lofsvold, district director.

Justice Department: Federal Bureau of Investigation—Fred A. Frohbose, special agent in charge.

Immigration and Naturalization: Lorraine W. Hurney, district director.

U.S. attorney: Drew J. T. O'Keefe.

Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board: Walter R. Wilson, supervisor in charge of enforcement district No. 1.

Philadelphia Police Department: Howard R. Leary, acting commissioner.

Post Office Department: A. J. Harkins, postal inspector in charge.

Treasury Department: Coast Guard—F. M. McCabe, captain of the port of Philadelphia customs; Charles Beiswinger, customs agent.

Internal Revenue Service: Dean J. Barron, regional commissioner, alcohol and tobacco tax; Louis DeCarlo, assistant regional commissioner, automatic data processing; Edward J. Manning, assistant regional commissioner, Intelligence; J. Walter Pearson, acting assistant regional commissioner, Secret Service; Joseph P. Jordan, special agent in charge.

Exhibit coordinator: Martin J. Dempsey, public information officer, Internal Revenue Service.

Sponsor: Federal Bar Association (Philadelphia chapter); president, Congressman Herman Toll; first vice president, Harry D. Shargel; second vice president, Judge Earl Chudoff; third vice president, Russell J. Borden; treasurer, Herman R. Testan; secretary and national vice president, A. S. Harzenstein.

Law observance committee: chairman, Harry D. Shargel; special assistant to counsel, Defense Clothing and Textile Supply Center; cochairman, Norris S. Harzenstein, field supervisor, FBI; members, Hon. Earl Chudoff, judge, court of common pleas; Louis DeCarlo, district coordinator of Treasury enforcement agencies; Ephraim Gomberg, executive vice president, Philadelphia Crime Commission; Mrs. Lorraine W. Hurney, District Director, Immigration and Naturalization Service; Hon. Drew J. T. O'Keefe, U.S. attorney; Hon. Joseph S. Lord III, judge, U.S. district court; Hon. Herman Toll, House of Representatives; Hon. Harold K. Wood, judge, U.S. district court; Morris Wolf, Robert V. Faragher, counsel, Radio Corp. of America; Hon. Francis L. VanDusen, judge, U.S. district court; adviser on radio and television, Martha A. Gable; adviser on municipal police problems, Howard R. Leary.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE LAW OBSERVANCE EXHIBIT

Civil Service Commission: Exhibit indicates careers in Federal service and type of work that can be done, contains a message from the President and an inspirational centerpiece representing the Federal Government as an employer.

Food and Drug Administration: Food and Drug Administration enforces the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act and thereby protects the community by insuring that foods are safe, pure, and wholesome and made under sanitary conditions; drugs and therapeutic devices are safe and effective for their intended uses; cosmetics are safe and prepared with appropriate ingredients, and that all of these products are honestly and informatively labeled and packaged. In the display are devices seized by the Food and Drug Administration which indicate various forms of therapeutic quackery including an electreat; a radioactive pillow; an Admiral See Saw; healt-aire, slender belt; spectro chrome device, etc.

Federal Bureau of Investigation: Two dramatic exhibits: one provides a brief look at some of the many responsibilities and functions of the FBI; the other demonstrates graphically the continuing struggle between the oppressive world communism and the ideals of personal freedom which motivates the United States and her people. There is also a variety of explanatory literature available for further study.

Immigration and Naturalization: Display pertains to Immigration and Naturalization activities; for example entrance of aliens into this country, and the laws regarding citizenship.

U.S. attorney: Exhibit contains a picture and message from the Attorney General of the United States in relation to law enforcement; a replica of the Department of Justice seal; a picture and message from the U.S. Attorney in relation to law enforcement; illustrations of seven stages in a criminal trial; and several symbols of justice.

The display includes a small still and the use of sample packaged illicit liquor and posters used to encourage enforcement of liquor statutes.

Philadelphia Police Department: Exhibit includes confiscated guns and police weapons. Also the excellent training of police dogs (referred to as the canine corps) is portrayed in a number of photographs.

Post Office Department: An exhibit furnished by the Bureau of the Chief Inspector, Post Office Department, portrays the history of the postal inspection service beginning with its inception in 1737 when Benjamin Franklin was first appointed by the British Colonial Postmaster General as postmaster of Philadelphia and given the additional duties of regulating the several post offices and bringing the postmasters to account. The display shows an outline of functions and the general areas of investigation: Post office burglaries, holdups of mail custodians, poisons and bombs sent through the mail, extensive direct mail selling of pornography, and fraudulent schemes by unscrupulous promoters.

Coast Guard; U.S. Coast Guard has a very unique display consisting of a complete navigational light assembly now used on lighthouses and buoys composed of light, flash timer, and automatic lampchanger. This navigational aid is the newest type and is in actual use throughout U.S. waters.

Customs: This exhibit indicates some of the many ways by which narcotics are smuggled from place to place. There is also a panel describing many of the functions of the Bureau of Customs.

Alcohol and tobacco tax (IRS): Display sets forth laws enforced concerning use of firearms, weapons classified as firearms coming within the purview of the national and Federal firearms acts, and pictures demonstrating the results of not practicing safety in the use of firearms.

Automatic data processing (IRS): Under the integrated automatic data-processing system, graphic charts illustrate the flow of returns, documents, and magnetic tape between internal revenue district offices, the Philadelphia Regional Service Center, and the National Computer Center at Martinsburg, W. Va.

Intelligence Division (IRS): The Intelligence Division serves the community by enforcing the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which pertain to wagering and gambling and income tax fraud. In so doing, it brings to justice many racketeers and gamblers. This is exemplified in the display which contains actual equipment seized during raids on illegal operations and data relating to the scientific detection of income tax fraud. Some of the items in the display are a slot machine which was seized for failure to purchase the occupational stamp for its operation; a Bolita board, a Chinese lottery drum, and a policy drum, a tabulation of lottery play on flash paper, an exhibit relating to a bookie operation using transcievers, a card and picture display of notorious income tax evaders, and newspaper headlines of income tax cases and other tax articles.

Secret Service: Exhibit shows seized contraband items such as $10, $20, and $100 counterfeit notes made by professional counterfeiters; copper and zinc plates used in making counterfeit notes; and one set of obverse and reverse lead molds for a $10 denomination coin. Also displayed are the products by which the violators are identified.

The United States on the Defensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the President is such an expert when he writes about courage, but he does not display it when he faces the Communist tyrant. The following report of the farewell meeting between Castro and Khrushchev, in the May 23 issue of the Washington Evening Star, is most revealing.

The Communists are arrogant and have every reason to be. President Kennedy is on the defensive and acts it. Is this the way the Commander in Chief of the most powerful military force in the world should behave?

The report follows:

READY TO RESIST ANY ATTEMPT TO INVADE CUBA—DEPARTING CASTRO HEARS PROMISE OF STRONG BACKING

MOSCOW, May 23.—Premier Khrushchev, addressing a huge farewell meeting for Fidel Castro, warned today that the situation in the Caribbean carries possibilities of becoming worse than last October.

In a speech of more than an hour, the Soviet Premier, in shirt sleeves and bareheaded in a broiling sun, declared:

"If the U.S. Government does not show necessary commonsense and understanding of the situation and permits itself to be drawn into a dangerous path, a situation even more formidable than that of last October might arise in the world.

"If such a situation is created by the aggressive forces of imperialism, clearly it would be much more difficult to emerge from the crisis than it was in 1962."

Later, at a Kremlin reception for the bearded Cuban, Mr. Khrushchev appeared to be in a more peaceful mood when he said he will not capitulate to "delirious talk" about going to war to promote communism. His statement seemed aimed at the Chinese.

PLEDGES DEFENSE

Stopping only occasionally for small bursts of applause, while the Cuban Prime Minister looked on at the outdoor mass meeting, Mr. Khrushchev said:

"A breach of obligations assumed by the United States would not be regarded otherwise than perfidy. This would radically undermine trust and make coming to terms more difficult."

He pledged that the Soviet Union would defend Cuba if the United States should attack that island of communism.

Responding, Mr. Castro thanked the Soviet people for their cordial hospitality during his visit.

"An avalanche of love fell upon us," he declared.

He was unable to begin speaking for several moments after he stood up because of the roaring applause.

SEES CAPITALISM DEAD

"The Cuban revolution has again borne out the Marxist-Leninist teaching that in the modern world the balance of forces is in favor of the Socialist (Communist) camp," Mr. Castro declared.

"Cuba has buried the old capitalist society forever as a corpse which will never come to life again."

The victory of the revolution in Cuba, which he said lies only 90 miles from the biggest center of imperialism, also proved another Marxist-Leninist principle: That the imperialists themselves inevitably dig a grave for themselves, he added.

Later, Tass announced that the Government had conferred upon Mr. Castro the title of Hero of the Soviet Union, the Order of Lenin and the Gold Star Medal. The decree says the hero title was granted to Mr. Castro "for his outstanding services in organizing the triumphant struggle for freedom and independence of the heroic Cuban people, for a worthy contribution to the great cause of peace and socialism."

In pledging again to come to the aid of Cuba, Mr. Khrushchev said:

"If the U.S. Government does not strictly observe the agreement that has been reached and aggravates the situation, we shall have to discharge our international duty, our obligations to the fraternal Cuban people and come to their assistance."

DON'T PLAY WITH FIRE

"We must say with all seriousness: Do not play with fire gentlemen, and do not play with the destinies of the people."

He proposed that the situation in the Caribbean could be "normalized" on the basis of principles put forward by Mr. Castro, including American surrender of Guantánamo Naval Base.

He did not clearly outline what he felt made the situation now possibly more dangerous than last October, when President Kennedy declared a blockade of Cuba to force the Soviet leader to pull nuclear rockets off the island.

Mr. Khrushchev recalled that the United States, during settlement of the Cuban crisis, had promised not to invade Cuba.

He maintained it was the policy of the United States which nearly brought the world to the "brink of thermonuclear war" last October.

TRANSLATED FOR CASTRO

Mr. Khrushchev's charges were made in a long, prepared speech which he read through his steel-rimmed spectacles. An interpreter whispered a translation into the ear of Mr. Castro, who wore his customary green fatigue uniform and beret.

Mr. Khrushchev also claimed it is the imperialists themselves who are creating revolutions in Latin America—but the "mythical hand of Moscow." The imperialists, he said, are exploiting the people and thus causing them to demand something better.

Mr. Khrushchev approvingly quoted those phrases from the American Declaration of Independence which say that people have the right to choose a government of their liking. These words, he said, have a very current ring 200 years later.

He hailed Mr. Castro as "Dear comrade."

HUGE CROWD ON HAND

More than 125,000 persons jammed the stadium to cheer the two leaders. Overhead, planes trailed Soviet and Cuban flags. Swarms of Russians wore paper hats bearing Cuban emblems.

Mr. Castro, who arrived in late April, has had one of the greatest welcomes the Soviet Union has ever given a foreigner during his stay here.

Today's crowd gave Mr. Khrushchev a roaring reception.

The Soviet Premier accused American monopolists of exploiting Cuba until they were thrown out by the Castro revolution. But, he added, the revolution and seizure of the property of the landlords is the easiest part. The harder part, he said, is to "rid the people of bourgeois tendencies and construct socialism."

"The peoples of the Soviet Union have always been, are, and will be with the people of Cuba.

"The Cuban revolution marks the dawn of a new life on the American continent. The eyes of millions in Latin America are now turned to heroic Cuba because it is on that island that a road to a better, happy life is being blazed."

SEEKS CHINA ACCORD

Mr. Khrushchev also declared the Soviet Union would make every effort to make ideological peace with China. He mentioned China by name.

"We will spare no efforts to unite our forces and remove differences between us," the Premier said.

He scoffed at what he described as Western efforts to develop a split within the Communist camp.

He said he looked to Chinese-Soviet negotiations to slay old myths.

"Not a few fabrications appear in the bourgeois press concerning the relations between the Communist Parties of the Soviet Union and China," he said. "As you know, a meeting of delegations of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China will be held shortly. We shall do everything to have this meeting lead to the rallying of our forces, eliminating the differences in our understanding of certain questions."

PREDICTS RED TRIUMPH

"We express the hope that this meeting will bring our parties, the entire international Communist and working class movement, even closer together. The great cause of communism will overcome all obstacles in its onward advance and will triumph throughout the world."

Planes flew overhead and big balloons surrounded the stadium for one of the biggest rallies ever staged in the Soviet capital for a visiting foreign leader.

Vladimir Promyslov, Mayor of Moscow, presided at the ceremony from a big stand mounted on the football field.

Mr. Promyslov said Cuba had chosen the slogan "Homeland or Death" for its slogan, and added: "This slogan will win."

"You cannot bring to their knees the courageous Cuban people," he cried.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Foreign Transport Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1963

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, approximately 100 business leaders of the Huntington, W. Va., area assembled on May 17, 1963, to hear an address by James N. Sites, assistant to the vice president, Association of American Railroads. The address by Mr. Sites was presented before the Railroad Community Service Committee of Huntington.

I believe these remarks are very significant and closely related to current discussions of the transport policies which our Nation should adopt. Mr. Sites reveals the results of his findings in some 25 countries where he examined government transport policies. His conclusions deserve the attention of every Member of Congress and all in the Nation interested in better transport service for the United States:

TRAIL TO SUPERTRANSPORT SERVICE

(By James N. Sites)

One of the most baffling and enduring ironies on the American scene is symbolized by our cities' traffic jams, overcrowded airlanes, train discontinuances, and other transport tangles. We've never had so many gleaming highways, jet-age airports, towboats, pipelines—or spent so many billions for such facilities.

Yet the irony remains that millions of people have never had a tougher time getting from one place to another. And it appears we're in for an even tougher time in the future.

There is a way out of this vicious circle in transport, however. Taking off from reports of the many authorities—the latest being President Kennedy himself—who have long labored to come up with answers to this riddle, my wife and I searched around the world and found a route that we believe can lead to a new streamlined shape for our transport network, with strength and stability built into the shaky industry, and an entire new era of better transport service.

Propelled by an Eisenhower exchange fellowship, we left the United States in late 1961 on our year-long quest for clues to the transport future. Our trek took us through 25 countries from Ireland through Europe and the Middle East to India and Russia. We rode trains, buses, planes, ships, talked with ticket clerks, carrier officials, transport ministers, industrial shippers, travelers, and ordinary citizens.

The results were striking, exciting in their implications. In fact, we were hardly prepared to find such a widespread groping for answers to transport questions or such diversity of remedial actions. Public policy changes are taking place in countries with as different an environment and political approach as Britain and Russia, Switzerland and Yugoslavia, Norway, and Israel. The lessons to be learned from others' hard experience were everywhere.

This had been precisely the hope of the top businessmen and educators behind the Eisenhower exchange fellowships, a limited nonpartisan program for nonacademic study set up a decade ago in honor of Ike. E.E.F. leaders had felt the United States might profit from a practical, case-history look at what kind of government transport policies are working out abroad, and which are not. It was also hoped we could learn a little by looking back and seeing ourselves as others see us.

We soon discovered that transport systems are in trouble everywhere. And because modern transportation grew up on the foundation of railroading, present troubles have hit the railroads with particular impact.

Transport upheavals can be traced to a booming growth of motor vehicles around the world which, along with air travel expansion, has up-ended the old patterns of rail and water service. Like Americans before them, Europeans today display a fierce hunger for owning an automobile. And they're getting their way. Motor vehicle totals in West Europe multiplied 4 times in the 1950's, and there's no slowdown in sight.

On the freight front, everywhere except behind the Iron Curtain the truck is eating lustily away at the railroad's highest profit traffic, sidetracking forever the lines' onetime near-monopoly on goods transport.

Thus, the question inevitably arises: Can railroads adjust to or even survive this tough new competitive era?

The answer from overseas is an emphatic "yes,"—and then some. In fact, we've hardly begun to realize the full potential in the rail form of transportation. This lies in an unmatched ability to concentrate enormous movements in a limited space and to cut hauling costs deeply when loaded with heavy traffic volume.

Herein lies the key to the streamlined service of our future. And this key, oddly, lies in recognizing that (1) there are many areas where railroads whave no business trying to operate and (2) transport is a team made up of many players, which works well only when each is allowed to do the job it can do best.

The limitations on a nation's use of railroads showed up most clearly during our trip in Northern Ireland. We found that trains hardly get rolling out of Belfast before they come to the end of the line. With short hauls and light loads, it's a matter of time before the iron horse is moved out to pasture permanently.

In Holland and Switzerland, on the other hand, railroad service is not only excellent but the lines also make money (if you disregard the fact they pay no taxes). And this on a continent where railroading swims in a sea of red ink.

In India, where railroads carry the overwhelming load of economic expansion, they are strangely among the most profitable anywhere.

And in the Soviet Union, a super-railroad of awesome proportions and performance is in the making.

Behind these varying fortunes lie vast differences in the ways governments regulate, tax and aid railroads and competing trucks, buses, airplanes, and inland shipping. These show up vividly in comparing the United States and others. For example, taking West Europe, we found that—

European cities place first emphasis on rail transit in meeting urban traffic problems, while roads and autos come first in the United States.

There are almost no taxes on European railroads. If U.S. lines were on the same basis, they would not be paying Government some $650 million a year.

There is far less regulation of railroad rates and fares abroad. Paradoxically, the government-owned railroads of Europe have more freedom to compete than the privately owned railroads of America.

Truck freight charges are rarely controlled by governments abroad.

Europe is much more restrictive than the United States on truck capacity, however, regulating truck numbers as well as the companies in the field.

European railroads have been shaped into integrated national networks—as if each region of the United States had a single system. There is little or no competition between railroads, though strong competition with other forms of transportation.

European lines have greater freedom to use trucks and buses to supplement rail service and as substitutes when rail lines are abandoned.

European governments are more conscious of the interrelationship—the unity—of all forms of transport; unlike the United States, most weigh the impact on all carriers of investment programs for each.

These general differences are backed up by some fascinating specifics that hold further clues to sound transport policies for America. In Great Britain, for instance, we found a full-blown storm raging around the nation's carriers. Some $380 million was poured out by Parliament in 1961 alone to cover the railroad's deficit, meaning $1.20 was paid for every $1 taken in.

Public howls over these drains finally forced government to change from policies of rigidly controlling prices to turning British railways loose to raise and lower their charges in line with market and demand conditions, like other businesses. Key conservatives wanted to go the rest of the way and restore the carriers to private ownership (they were nationalized under the labor government in 1948). But investors wanted no part of the deficit-hounded white elephant.

"The trouble with British railways," one of their most knowledgeable executives told us in London, "is that they're a Victorian age relic—a system built for the 1800's trying to do business in the 1960's."

To Dr. Richard Beeching, who came from Imperial Chemical Industries in June of 1961 to head up the British Transport Commission, has fallen this awesome updating job. His ideas have just been unveiled. Drastic cutbacks will have to be made in little-used trackage; 50 percent of the mileage is handling but 10 percent of the traffic. As much as one-third of the halfway prehistoric freight car fleet will have to do. Commensurate cuts must also be made in manpower. Clearly, a new political storm is in the making.

Crossing the Irish Sea to Dublin, we found another transport uproar, as well as a striking example of the concept of diversification in transportation—ownership under a single management of a rail system, trucks, buses, and barges. With the growth of highway hauling, rail deficits in Eire had so worsened that proposals were aired to bury the railroad completely. Then, in 1958, the Irish Transport Co. got an almost free hand to reshape the transport structure and offer services by rail, road, or water, whichever best suits specific needs.

The result: The railroad is now being sharply pared down in light traffic rural areas and modernized on the high-volume main lines between major cities. Trucks and buses, in turn, are picking up the business where rails are torn up, and service has never been better or overall costs so low.

The record in these two nations points up how governments everywhere attempt to relate the supply and price of transport facilities to the service demands of shippers and travelers by various control measures, including these:

1. Influencing the buildup of capacity by coordinating the capital investment going into basic facilities (the simple, effective instrument favored by Communist states), and by regulating right of entry of companies into the field, the number of vehicles they use or the range and type of vehicle operations.

2. Controlling the end product prices charged by carriers (the major control instrument wielded by U.S. agencies).

3. Subsidizing selected operators, thus reducing their costs and prices in relation to competitors and promoting their expansion.

4. Taxing selected operators, thus raising their relative prices and retarding their expansion.

Because these approaches are seldom rationally planned for the transport industry as an entity, their application is generally accompanied by a loud grinding and clashing of gears.

Holland proved an exception. There, controls over truck numbers are exercised as a fine art. Each year a study group takes a look at the economy, decides how much extra transport capacity is needed to handle shipping demands, then gives out permits for higher truck numbers (or restricts these in slack times). In America, by contrast, once a trucker gets permission to carry certain goods over certain routes, he can use anywhere from 1 to 1,000 vehicles.

West Germany has had a law for 10 years tightly limiting to 26,000 the number of for-hire trucks operating beyond 50 kilometers (30 miles) from home base. Truckers denounce this policy as designed to protect the giant Government railroad. Railroaders say it has protected truckers themselves against destructive competition from each other.

Experts in India are discussing similar limitations on truck operations as a way to divide transport spheres between rail and road. The most challenging thinking of all we encountered, however, held that such a division could come about best not by rigid rules but by natural economic pressures and user choices, once all carriers are put on an equal cost and regulatory basis and allowed maximum freedom to compete for the shipper's and traveler's business.

Norway stands out in this regard. In mid-1961, Oslo levied a kilometer tax on all large trucks and buses, thereby relating their tax payments more precisely to actual use of roads. Vehicle owners pay for each kilometer driven, with the tax rate rising with vehicle size and weight. Because trucks offering for-hire services to the general public meet obligations not borne by do-it-yourself truckers, a higher tax schedule is applied to industry-owned trucks.

French policymakers in Paris outlined an unusual method they use to equalize cost conditions between trucks using publicly provided highways and railroads which build and repair track out of their own revenues. Official studies disclosed that despite gasoline prices of around 75 cents per gallon, trucks still pay only about 60 percent of their share of road repair costs. Unwilling (or politically unable) to boost truck taxation, the Government decided instead to grant the railroad an annual sum covering 40 percent of railway maintenance costs.

Government spending for transport purposes is the big booster that can push favored carriers out in front of others not so aided. Railroads have been favored in this area abroad. Public development of roads and domestic air facilities overseas has lagged far behind America, while governments pay out $2½ billion in West Europe alone to cover just the nationalized rail systems' annual operating deficits. In the United States, by contrast, Government outlays for road, air, and water facilities have more than doubled in the past decade to a present total of $14 billion annually; nothing comparable is spent on railroads.

In Russia, as a result of hard-headed Kremlin decisions that railroading yields the most transport for the least investment, the railroad gets the lion's share of expansion funds. It handles 75 percent of passenger travel between cities and a massive 90 percent of the intercity freight volume (compared to 3 and 43 percent, respectively, in the United States). Trucks and buses are used in local services and to supplement long rail hauls.

In an effort to avoid waste of resources, Communist planners painstakingly draw up overall transport investment programs. In the United States, myriad Washington agencies plow tax dollars into highways, airports, and river-and-harbor works with scarcely a glance at the impact on other forms of transport. Looking at our lack of coordination, a Tito official served us this chilling thought in Belgrade: "Communists consider the deterioration of transportation in the capitalist countries as a sure sign of the coming collapse of the West."

Not all transport problems are in hand at the Kremlin by any means. Deputy Railroad Minister Vladimir Gavrilov revealed in Moscow that there have been rising disputes over transport plans among bureaucrats representing the different carriers. Such arguments went for settlement directly to the top-level Presidium. But this system got so cumbersome that a special Cabinet-level Transport Coordinating Commission was set up in early 1962 to bump heads together and come up with common policies. An idea for Washington?

While America and other motorized nations worry about coping with railway contraction, railroad expansion is the keynote both behind the Iron Curtain and in the newly developing nations of the free world. India, for example, laid down 2,000 miles of track in the 1950's, and hopes to build thousands more. The new nations are still at the stage of creating mainline networks. West Europe and the United States, conversely, overbuilt their rail system and now must cut back—because tracks were laid before the auto was born and in many places where roads can handle the transport job more effectively than rails.

"If we were going to build railroads for the first time today, we would do it far differently," stated P. Le Vert, director of the Inland Transport Committee of the U.N. Economic Commission for Europe, in Geneva.

How? Mr. Le Vert and other experts around the world express a remarkable unanimity of opinion on the answer.

The great, undeveloped art as far as government policies are concerned, they point out, is to allow the truck and train, as well as the barge and airplane, to function as parts of a smooth-working team. Trains should be used to bring out their basic advantages as a heavy-volume or mass-production means of transportation. This would result in extremely low costs per unit moved—and low prices to the public; and the lower these prices, the more freight volume would be attracted to rails. The truck and bus, on the other hand, are unit vehicles that can most naturally handle smaller movements or assemble over short hauls the big loads for through transportation by train—or by ship and barges where natural or low-cost waterways exist.

"Almost all governments have badly fumbled the ball on this one," a transport leader told us in Paris. Louis Armand, secretary general of the International Railway Union (UIC), declared that "by allowing the truck to escape many basic roadway costs and thus overextend its operations onto long-haul routes, present government policies have made bitter commercial and political rivals out of two carriers that naturally supplement each other and should be friends."

If any one word could be used to capsulize inland transport problems around the world, that word is change. Railroads have had to make drastic internal changes to adapt plant and services to the snowballing external changes brought by the 20th century. And governments must allow carriers to go on making even greater changes. The grim alternatives are either collapse into bankruptcy where railroads remain privately owned—or even greater deficits for taxpayers to shoulder where railroads are publicly owned.

This points up one of the most unusual results of our studies: Railroad problems are much the same regardless of the system of ownership. Government nationalization of once-private railroads did nothing to solve the problems that led to take-over. The major effect, in fact, was to delay solutions for 10 to 20 years while the public picked up a mounting bill for operating deficits. A start toward genuine solutions in Europe was finally forced in recent years only when this burden became unbearable.

The towering operating deficits of West European rail systems, which average about 20 percent over and above revenues, are due to these four principal causes:

1. Government-enforced obligations to provide a host of "social" services at below-cost charges.

2. Bans against elimination of uneconomic lines and consolidations of unused stations and other facilities.

3. Political reluctance to allow reductions of personnel even when positions are rendered unnecessary by mechanization.

4. Failure to require competing carriers to pay realistic tax charges for using public roads and air and water facilities, thus spurring traffic diversion from low-cost railroads to basically higher-cost competitors.

Such a listing of causes suggests solutions. One key moves lies in Europe's drastic loosening of restrictions over railroad ratemaking, thus permitting the lines to make the most of their volume-pricing capabilities. But greater freedom to compete is insufficient in itself to remedy over-all competitive imbalances: This measure must be accompanied by other moves placing all carriers on an equal cost and tax basis and granting railroads the necessary flexibility to adapt plant, operations and services to changes in technology, competitive conditions and customer demands.

Experience around the world indicates that if a nation is to get the most out of railroading in this space age, railroads must be allowed to carry out a sweeping reorganization program in these major areas:

1. Eliminate light-traffic, high-cost lines and unneeded parallel routes and duplicate stations, yards and shops, stripping railroading down to the trunk and main limbs of the transport tree.

2. Create a smoothly interconnecting transfer system to assemble traffic by road for long-haul volume movement by rail, and to deliver rail shipments door to door—meaning more piggybacking of truck trailers on flat cars or greater use of transferable freight containers.

3. Undertake bold railroad research programs to develop new pricing methods and new equipment to attract travelers and shippers and build more efficiency into operations.

4. Invest heavily to automate and mechanize mainline services and step up worker productivity.

5. Reduce rates and fares in line with the new railroad's rising economies.

There is nothing mysterious about what Government itself can do to bring about essential changes in transportation. A dozen expert study groups set up over the past three decades have called insistently for Washington action to clean out the musty backlog of 75 years of inequities in our transportation law. President Kennedy in a special message to Congress has roundly indicted our "chaotic patchwork of inconsistent and often obsolete legislation and regulation." The truth is that kindly old Uncle Sam, sometimes innocently, sometimes ignorantly, is killing the goose that lays golden transport eggs.

Europeans are bewildered by Government's treatment of U.S. railroads. A distinguished professor of transportation in London summed up much of this perplexed opinion when he declared: "It is tragic. You Americans appear not only to be undermining a great industry but to be throwing away a great national asset."

As viewed against the backdrop of case histories abroad, the formula for sanity lies in no brand of political alchemy but in a surprisingly simple idea—that of equal treatment of all competitors. Government actions that discriminate in taking taxes from the various carriers, in granting aid to them, and in controlling their prices or development not only warp the physical shape of transport but prevent people from getting the best service at the least cost.

Our survey showed that where governments abroad came closest to treating all carriers alike, the least costly and most stable transport systems and services resulted. Conversely, where government policies were the most uncoordinated and unequal in their impact, transport was in the worst shape.

The choice of solutions before America and others is to control or not to control—to achieve equality of treatment of competing carriers by extending Government regulation and subsidies to those carriers now free of these, or by withdrawing regulation and subsidies from those carriers already covered.

In a highly dynamic, sophisticated economy like America's, only the latter choice is a practical proposition. The same is true in West Europe, in the opinion of experts now hammering out common transport policies for the Common Market. Otherwise, transportation and ultimately the economy as a whole will strangle in redtape and an overblown regulatory bureaucracy.

This approach, by coincidence, is squarely in line with Mr. Kennedy's call for new Washington legislation. His message appeals for (1) "equality of opportunity for all forms of transportation and their users and undue preference to none" and (2) "greater reliance on the forces of competition and less reliance on the restraints of regulation."

In simplest terms, America's transport problem is characterized by too much of a good thing—too many trucks, cars, airplanes, barges, tracks. Sadly, our Government is doing little to deal with this central issue. In fact, its bloated spending programs only add to the surplus and make matters worse.

Washington can achieve a sound transport structure through these specific actions:

Stop building up excesive transport capacity by stopping subsidies and promotion programs for favored carriers—and require commercial beneficiaries to pay realistic charges for using tax-built facilities.

Coordinate administration transportation programs and all further Government investment in transport facilities by setting up a high-level centralizing office. This office (possibly a Federal Department of Transportation) should also have the responsibility for formulating and collecting fair user charges in order to make all transport development programs as self-supporting as possible.

Remove inequalities in the transport tax structure.

Drastically scale down regulation over transportation pricing, and allow carriers to negotiate reduced-rate long-term contracts for freight traffic.

Give an official green light to an accelerated railroad merger movement to clear the way toward reorganization of the national rail network.

Allow any form of transportation to provide services by any other form to promote combination services of the best features of each mode.

In these steps lie almost unimaginable potentials for better, lower cost transport service for America. We can choose now to reach out toward these goals or to plod along our present course, running the risk of seeing our transport networks collapse in political chaos and wasted tax billions.

Right of Private Property and Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in our zeal to protect the rights of minorities there is a grave danger that we may be riding roughshod over the inherent right of a citizen to his own private property. While all of us abhor injustice and are truly determined that all American citizens enjoy the full privileges guaranteed by the Constitution, are we not duty bound to protect the freedom of association, the right to privacy, the right to own property and enjoy it in freedom without Federal dictation?

These questions are raised in the following column by Richard Wilson in the Washington Evening Star of May 29:

New Aspect of Integration Issue: Question of a Person's Own Choice of Action Reached in the Debate

(By Richard Wilson)

After about 20 years of turbulent step-by-step progress toward race equality, the point has now been reached where the morality of personal choice comes stronger into question.

Many people, particularly in the Northern States, have philosophically supported racial integration as a principle of American government while conducting their own lives so as to minimize racial contacts. Or, these philosophical supporters of integration have indulged in token contacts which give the semblance of avoiding hypocrisy.

For more than 25 years, beginning in 1938, the courts have been ordering the elimination of segregation in public facilities, most notably in the public schools, but also in transportation, and to a lesser degree in housing and on public golf courses, beaches, swimming pools, libraries and amusement parks.

The major emphasis—in fact, it may be said the only legal emphasis—in this field has been on the equal use and benefits of public facilities.

We find now, as a result of the Supreme Court's rulings in the sit-in demonstration cases, the introduction of a newer element which has been implicitly present all the time but not so strongly brought forward.

This is the question of private segregation.

A great many individuals claim the right to conduct their lives in their own way and in the tradition of the English common law. They claim this right in their homes, their churches, their means of making a livelihood and other phases of their lives which need not be directly involved with the State.

They claim the right to make fools of themselves, to choose weak or transient friends, to drink too much or eat too much, to be rude to their neighbors and to be surly and intolerant with their fellow man because they do not like his looks or the way he scratches himself.

There are some, probably millions, who wish to practice private segregation by belonging to clubs, and going to or operating restaurants, stores, churches, theaters and social assemblies where there are not any Negroes. This may be a misguided and reprehensible way of life, but it is not one which is prohibited by the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, as currently interpreted.

Whether or not this will continue to be wholly the case is the question.

In the rulings freeing some 40 sit-in demonstrators, the Supreme Court came to the fringes of the question. These rulings were based on the illegality of attempting to enforce segregation laws which are unconstitutional.

Left open was the question of whether a storekeeper or restaurant operator can of his free choice conduct his own private segregation unaffected by law. If he cannot, then there will have been a moral breakthrough which in due time would undoubtedly have a wider ranging effect. The Court will have an opportunity in the near future to rule more narrowly on this question in a Maryland case which has been assigned for reargument.

It may well be that the very nature of operating a business which caters to the general public will be found to be so affected by the interests of the State that it must be open to all, white and colored. The fact that such a business abuts a public street or must get public licenses of one form or another may be found to invest it with the character of a public facility.

The morality of personal choice, while not yet judged legally by the Supreme Court, has always been in question in the Kennedy administration. This was first seen in the advocacy by the Kennedys of the admission of Negroes to all-white private clubs, and more recently in the President's proposals that more Negroes and whites visit each others homes and share each others eating habits. In the District of Columbia the question is rising as to whether a person offering a home for public sale can legally refuse to sell to a Negro for the sole reason of the prospective buyer's color.

In view of these trends of thought, the observations of the Court's lone dissenter, Justice Harlan, are worthy of long consideration. He said:

"An individual's right to restrict the use of his property, however unregenerate a particular exercise of that right may be thought, lies beyond the reach of the 14th amendment.

"Freedom of the individual to choose his associates or his neighbors; to use and dispose of his property as he sees fit; to be irrational, arbitrary, capricious, even unjust in his personal relations are things all entitled to a large measure of protection from Government interference."

Test-Ban Roundup—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Bill Sumner has written an excellent four-part series capsulizing the test ban issue as it has developed over the years, and particularly as it has become more sharply defined by debate and discussion over the past few months. The first of the summer articles, as printed in the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram follows:

United States, Russia View Risks of Test Ban

(By Bill Sumner)

Washington.—The most serious obstacles facing the earnest men of the U.S. disarmament agency in their quest for a nuclear test ban are located in two widely separated areas of geography and philosophy—the Kremlin and the Congress of the United States.

To begin, there remains a doubt that either wants to risk a ban on testing or regards the much larger subject of disarmament itself as much more than something one talks about because it is better than not talking about it at all. But the focus of the extremely bitter controversy here has been summed up in reservations expressed by Representative Chet Holifield, Democrat, of California.

Holifield, vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, said, "superiority in nuclear weapons is the best insurance of world peace. Our enlightened self-interest demands that we continue with the further refinement of a reasonably foolproof test-ban agreement."

And therein lies the nub of the controversy, what is a reasonably foolproof test-ban agreement? There are, of course, many answers. And it seems to be only incidental that the disarmament agency is not discussing, not negotiating, not even contemplating anything resembling a foolproof test ban.

William C. Foster, agency administrator, speaks instead of a "balance of risks."

Foster believes the risks inherent in a test-ban agreement—through clandestine underground testing or abrogation of the treaty—are not as formidable as those involved in continued testing and weapons development.

"A test ban," he said, "is in the interest of both sides. This curve of nuclear development is flattening. We both know a lot about the art. The real worry will be the conditions 10 to 15 years from now if 20 to 25 nations have nuclear weapons."

It is this concern—the spread of nuclear weapons—along with the concern of other nations with radioactive fallout, that seems to supply the administration's drive for a treaty of some kind. But Foster sees another advantage, "a beginning, to reduce tensions somewhat, to be used as the basis for future agreement."

He argues that the Soviet Union and the United States have enough weapons in their nuclear arsenals to blow each other and civilization from the face of the earth. He argues further that the clandestine underground testing which would be possible would do nothing to change the strategic balance of power.

This last was affirmed by Dr. Harold Brown, Defense Department Director of Research and Engineering. He feels the gains would outweigh the risks.

The atomic bombs which destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki were at the 20-kiloton range, a kiloton being the explosive equivalent of 1,000 tons of TNT.

Brown stated however, that the advances in strategic weapons would not be large with the kind of testing that could be done below the 20-kiloton level.

"This is not to deny that some interesting things could be learned," he said, "but no really substantial improvements could be expected, much less any unbalancing change in strategic military strength."

He agrees that the situation with respect to tactical weapons is different, that "tests of a few kilotons will allow development of the whole spectrum of tactical weapons."

If one side uses tactical nuclear weapons and the other cannot, the side with tactical nuclear weapons obviously has a substantial advantage. However, when both sides have them, differences in quality appear to make very much less difference, particularly since either side can so easily escalate the size of tactical nuclear weapon used."

The position here is based on many military considerations, the prime one—again—being that both Russia and the United States have the nuclear capability of destroying one another many times over, and that it is the delivery systems, not that which is to be delivered, that have yet to be perfected to a foolproof capability.

In addition, it is argued that if one country had superiority in tactical weapons, if one nation had a neutron bomb and the other did not, the have-not country would simply use the dirty old big blast weapons at its disposal in any nuclear showdown.

Brown, too, views a test ban as a minor step. But he thinks it would be important "as an example of agreeing on something which, by itself, would be useful."

He said there would be a definite risk to such a treaty. "But," he said, "it's a risky world. It's not a large risk as risks go in the world these days."

Test-Ban Roundup—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the second of a four-part series analyzing the test ban issue written by Columnist Bill Sumner as it appeared recently in the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram:

Sudden A-Pact Repeal Poses Risk

(By Bill Sumner)

Washington.—One of the major risks the Nation would face in the event of a nuclear test ban agreement lies not in the area of clandestine testing underground, but in a sudden abrogation of such a treaty after preparation of a series of tests.

This is a risk recognized by the Defense agency, and it has a related risk in what could amount to a relaxed state in our own readiness to test. But it is one the administration seems willing to accept.

Franklin A. Long, Assistant Director of the agency's Science and Technology Bureau, thinks this would be the more likely Russian choice as apposed to attempts at cheating.

"The question follows," he said, "could this if it happened really upset the power balance? Clearly, it would give the Soviet Union an advantage, but would it be catastrophic?"

Long didn't think so.

"The very worst it would be is significant," he said. "You can't have tested all the devices we have without amassing a body of knowledge to the point that it is no longer a breakthrough area.

"The rather obvious thing you can get under control is your own ability and readiness for tests. So that to a considerable extent you can keep that one in bounds."

He said, however, that a substantial threat might develop "in a relaxed state" with our readiness to test.

"It is reasonable to conclude," he said, "that the zeal and the energy of the people in the laboratories would diminish. It's very hard to assess how serious it is, but the areas of greatest concern no longer show up in the weapons laboratories anymore. The more significant area now is in weapons effect."

He said two problems were apparent to him in the current great debate. The first concerned the balance of power and the Nation's interest.

"First, you ask if a test ban were obeyed by everybody would it be a good thing?" he said. "There are people who think it would be a bad thing. Dr. Teller quite honestly feels a test ban is 'no good.' A number who feel this way are not quite as forthright. If you really don't think it is any good, it is not quite as forthright just to say, 'I'm in favor of a perfect test ban.' "

Long noted that the area of most controversy at present was in the area of clandestine testing.

"That's the particular area where the criticism has been so intemperate," he said. "No matter what kind of a monitoring system you have, no one can say it is foolproof. You have to admit that cheating is a risk. You try to make the alternatives to cheating as unattractive as you can."

It is here that some vagueness enters the picture as to what the unattractive alternatives might be, but Long holds to the line that the gains outweigh the risks.

He conceded that with clandestine underground tests, below the threshold of seismic identification, practical devices for pure fusion could be tested, offering a more simple and inexpensive trigger to a thermonuclear blast along with the neutron bomb and tactical weapons.

The neutron bomb is an atomic bomb set up to put a large content of its energy into radiation, where the present emphasis is on blast and fire effects. Often called a death-ray bomb, it could kill troops without too much destructive blast.

But Long insists "you can't do the honest-to-God big weapons studies, not even the modest big weapons studies. You can't study radar blackout successfully and you know there comes a time when the improvements you make have clearly leveled off.

"I think it adds up to the fact there are some risks. So the final job, the final assessment would be, are there gains that balance the risks? If you say there are not any gains than you don't want to take any risks. If you don't see any gains, then you'd better forget it, because there are risks."

What are the gains according to Long. They are those cited by agency chief, William C. Foster, and others of the agency.

"Most important to me," he said, "is the role in proliferation, but I'm inclined to give it a substantial role in getting something started."

These gains, of course, are disputed by many in the Congress, and in the Senate, where any such treaty would need the consent of two-thirds of the membership. The chances of such aproval will be dealt with in the next article.

Test-Ban Roundup—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the third of the very informative four-part series analyzing the test ban issue written by Columnist Bill Sumner as it appeared recently in the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram:

CRITICS DECRY NUCLEAR TEST BAN

(By Bill Sumner)

WASHINGTON.—The acrimonious debate here on a nuclear test ban has become caught up in a somewhat incomprehensive numbers game that strays from the principal concern. Would the gains under such a treaty be worth the risks involved? And would we really be risking our necks?

The administration and its disarmament agency hold that it is worth the risk, and that our necks would not be in danger. But there is a great doubt at this point if the necessary two-thirds of the Senate could be convinced.

Any test ban treaty—presuming our negotiators could persuade Russia to agree to one—would require ratification in the Senate. And in spite of the blandishments of Secretary of State Dean Rusk (who believes a ban now would be to our military advantage) and William C. Foster, disarmament administrator, there is a growing feeling of antagonism toward their proposals.

Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, whose Foreign Relations Committee would conduct hearings on any such treaty, seems to be disenchanted if not antagonistic.

In one confrontation of Rusk, he told the Secretary:

"I am not sure whether it is the weapons involved that contribute to war. I wonder if we are not really preoccupied with the symptoms rather than the cause of our troubles."

He said he had a suspicion that the disarmament negotiations were "diverting your attention and the attention of the whole Government from those areas which might lend themselves to improving our relations with our present enemies. I doubt if this contributes very much. You have created a whole agency for this particular activity. Nobody is very optimistic about getting anywhere. A lot doubt that you would achieve very much even if you made an agreement."

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, a member of the Joint Atomic Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee, is more militant in his disapproval. He discards as myths the notions that arms races have always led to war.

"Some people," he says, "go so far as to hold that any test ban agreement is better than none. The logic of this position is to go on making one concession after another, regardless of whether * * * the end result is an enforceable agreement."

Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, who has railed against the State negotiations repeatedly since the start of the year, takes issues with the assertion that clandestine testing would not significantly alter the military balance of power.

"This," he said, "reveals a defeatist train of thought which is perhaps the most dangerous element of the administration proposal. This is a philosophy that rests its hope upon scientific stagnation and thus runs against the grain of human experience. This is a Maginot Line philosophy."

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, the majority whip and author of the bill creating the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, feels that a treaty could be ratified but says that it would take an all-out effort by the President to do it.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, including Gen. Maxwell Taylor, their Chairman, remain to be heard from, but reportedly have filed statements with the Defense Secretary which hold that a test ban would endanger our security.

Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, vice chairman of the Joint Atomic Committee, no doubt would be heard from. He feels that we have reduced our demands in regard to the number of on-site inspections for underground tests (we are asking for seven per year) to too low a figure, and feels that it may go lower "because of the Disarmament Agency's vested interest in success." He feels that "success" here is the drafting of a treaty, and treaty.

And by far the most indefatigable of the test ban critics, Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California, who is responsible for bringing the current controversy to a head, remains unstilled. As ranking House minority member of the Joint Atomic Committee, his is another important voice of dissent. He claims the administration has developed a "monomania" on the subject to the point where "we've neglected other avenues in seeking peace in the world."

Early this year, HOSMER assembled a panel of formidable witnesses to make up a body of testimony for a Republican conference on nuclear testing. Their papers amounted to broadsides against administration test ban policies, and among the contributors was a scientist who undoubtedly would be listened to by any Senate panel contemplating such a treaty—Dr. Edward Teller, who overcame the opposition of Dr. Robert Oppenheimer and Dr. Hans Bethe in persuading then President Harry Truman to plunge ahead with development of the hydrogen bomb.

Test-Ban Roundup—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the fourth and final informative article analyzing the test-ban issue written by Correspondent Bill Sumner as it appeared recently in the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram:

PHYSICAL TECHNICALITIES CONFUSE TEST-BAN DEBATE, OBSERVER SAYS

(By Bill Sumner)

WASHINGTON.—The debate over a nuclear test ban seems to demand a summing up of sorts, a seemingly difficult task for those who found high school physics a trial and view seismology as a sort of sophisticated black magic.

But that is because the proponents of a treaty—and its opponents—have turned the debate into a great numbers game that may, in the end, prove extraneous to the issue.

The numbers game is complicated and can't be popularized. It involves considerations of geology, the magnitudes of earth shocks, the numbers of suspicious shocks and the yields of explosives. It also involves detection and identification of the latter, and the number of on-site inspections we would like to write into the treaty.

Currently, the United States is demanding seven inspections per year, while the Soviet Union is standing pat on three. All of this is concerned with underground testing which, with testing in outer space, remains the only problem area of detection.

Without attempting to join this numbers contest, our basic position is this, as outlined by William C. Foster, Administrator of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency:

U.S. scientists say that with evidence from our stations they can locate the center of a suspicious disturbance within a 12-mile radius. For inspection, we have proposed that each nation pick the event and set aside an area of 500 square miles for a 6-week examination by a 14-man team of scientists.

The team would have access to helicopters for picture taking at 500 feet, and additional flights for pictures at higher altitudes. There would be ground-level inspections. If certain evidence were found, the team would have the right to drill. There are other considerations, too, based on the establishment and periodic inspection of seven unmanned seismic stations (black boxes) on the soil of each nation.

"Based on this set of specifications," Foster said, "it is our belief that it would be a very strong deterrent to clandestine testing. The chance of any meaningful series is considered very very minor indeed."

The number of annual inspections demanded—reduced from 20 to 7—has been under attack, but scientists say they have been able to reduce the field of suspicion from around 400 earthquakes a year in the Soviet Union down to about 30 or 40 they would consider eligible for inspection. On this basis, Foster denies there has been any weakening in our position and cites it instead as a much better ratio than we had demanded.

"Actually," he said, "the real damage would be in the abrogation of the treaty. So the real problem is how we maintain our capacity if they are going to cheat."

It is this rather underplayed consideration, rather than arguments over our abilities in seismic detection and identification, that brings us back to a listing of the real issues.

1. Would a nation, which has never been known to honor a treaty, and which violated the test moratorium of September 1958 3 years later with a series of well-planned and spectacular nuclear displays (climaxing with the explosion of a 58-megaton bomb), be inclined to honor such a treaty as this?

2. What would the United States risk if Russia violated the treaty by cheating or by abrogation? All agreed that a cheater could conduct undetected series of tests at the 3-kiloton range and probably get away with blasts up to 20 kilotons, which is about the size of the bombs which destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The difference of opinion—in Congress, in the scientific community, and in the Pentagon—is in the value of such tests.

3. Given such examples as our inability to "handle" France and Russia's inability to "handle" China, would a test-ban treaty leave uncurbed the fearsome problem of the spread of nuclear weapons?

4. Does nuclear fallout from testing constitute "a hazard to present and future generations" as claimed by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota? Or is this the nonscientific testimony of socially minded scientists who have strayed from their own fields? Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, who as chairman (87th Congress) of the Joint Atomic Committee conducted hearings on this subject holds to this last view and asserts that "there is no hard evidence that injury has resulted from nuclear weapons testing."

He adds, "Even if we accept the working premise that all radiation is harmful, is there any real doubt about our willingness to accept the minimal radioactivity from testing, if testing strengthens the national defense and thereby helps to avert nuclear war?"

Eye on Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include the following article entitled "Eye on Puerto Rico," by Donald I. Rogers:

EYE ON PUERTO RICO

(By Donald I. Rogers)

While attention in the Caribbean has been focused on Castro and Duvalier, another area strongman has been running into difficulties of a different type that may, in the long run, be as important to the interests of the United States as the ultimate fate of the Cuban Communist or the voodoo-practicing doctor.

Luis Munoz Marin, Governor of Puerto Rico, has seen his hopes wrecked for a plebiscite this year that would permit Puerto Rico's voters to choose between three forms of government—continuation of its Commonwealth status, independence or statehood.

Because of the enormous U.S. investment of both public and private funds in the island, investment bankers and other Wall Street officials have been watching Puerto Rican developments with more than normal interest.

Munoz has been pressing for the plebescite since late last year when, with White House blessings, he unveiled the idea. With President Kennedy's support he had hoped to see the plebescite bill through Congress quickly. But the Governor's plans for "perfecting the Commonwealth," as he described them, were received coldly. In numerous lobbying trips he found many Members of Congress unimpressed by his arguments for a "culminated Commonwealth" as opposed to statehood.

What upset the lawmakers was the vagueness of his proposals. Not clear, for example, is whether Munoz's so-called "culminated commonwealth" would forclose statehood forever. Some Congressmen blanched when it was suggested that a culminated commonwealth would mean Puerto Rico had the right to make its own trade treaties—in effect, the right to conduct it own foreign policy.

Even liberal Congressman JIMMY ROOSEVELT had to tell Munoz that Congress could not go along with that. Nor, said ROOSEVELT, did he think Congress would pass any law that would permit Puerto Rico to decide whether it would or would not be bound by Federal laws. Such is not a matter of choice for either State or possession.

Munoz's argument for the right of self-determination has a difference. Under the present Commonwealth status, Puerto Rico receives all of the benefits of association with the United States—mail service, social security and old-age benefits and just about everything a U.S. citizen receives. There is however, a lovely exception.

For the Puerto Rican it is all free. He does not pay a U.S. income tax.

Munoz would like to maintain this best of all possible relationships, but he wants to make it permanent in a "culminated Commonwealth." Munoz also would like Puerto Rico to have the right to vote in presidential elections. This, of course, would be representation without taxation, a switch on a sacred U.S. slogan which had to do with taxation without representation.

The Governor will not go home without a bone. A bill has been introduced to create a study commission to decide whether changes would be made in the relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States. With this, Munoz has returned to San Juan where, according to his local press, he is sorely needed.

Puerto Rico's "Operation Bootstrap," which had been so ably administered by Teodoro Moscoso, is foundering. The economy has grown but there is high unemployment. Moscoso, who now heads the Alliance for Progress, is no longer available to run the economic development administration (Fomento). Moscoso permitted no politics. Now big labor has entered the picture and demands are frequent and, according to local businessmen, excessive.

Examples: The House and Senate Labor Committees of the island's legislature are headed by union leaders. The island is witness to investigation of alleged unfair labor practices by labor leaders themselves. Recently the sugar industry, mainstay of the economy and, since Castro's foolishness, now on the verge of bringing new wealth to the island, found itself at the negotiating table with mediators appointed by the president of the union representing the sugar industry's workers. Munoz remained mute about this.

Fomento openly fears, and has so stated, that the Governor's labor policy may well wreck its chances of continuing to attract much-needed industry to the island.

Whatever the future holds, it is plain that Munoz Marin doesn't want statehood with its responsibilities and its loss of tax privileges. He prefers a status on which he can exercise a sort of benign—and he is a benign man—"one-man democracy." It is not an unusual idea for a Latin leader. But it won't work in Puerto Rico, and it shouldn't be considered for a U.S. possession.

Nevertheless, Munoz is powerful enough and popular enough to have Wall Street and the State Department and some Members of Congress thoroughly worried.

New Wheat Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that President Kennedy, Secretary Freeman, and legislative leaders of the Democratic Party in the Congress, have said there would be no new wheat legislation after the wheat referendum, I am convinced that a new wheat bill will be enacted into law before Congress adjourns. In this connection, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of Thursday, May 30, 1963. This editorial seems to support my contentions in the matter.

THE FARMERS' LESSON

Income of American wheat growers in 1964 simply cannot be allowed to decline $700 million below 1962. The Congress knows it. The administration knows it. The wheat farmers know it. No matter how irritated the Government may be with the farmers for voting against a system of compulsory acreage and marketing controls that probably would have produced an income of $2.3 billion, the country will not be willing to stand by and allow to go into effect the only existing alternative plan under which income might be nearly a billion dollars less.

Several proposals for an alternative plan have emerged in Congress and it is plain that there is recognition on the Hill that the country is not ready for such an economic disaster. It is not just a matter of rural prosperity that is involved. Seventy-five percent of wheat acreage allotments are in the five northern States of Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota and the southern plains States of Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah, and Wyoming. Economic disaster cannot be inflicted upon this whole broad region without producing nationwide economic dislocation.

The hardship imposed upon the wheat farmers would carry over to the growers of feed grains and livestock, all of whom ultimately would share in the certain distress. It is not possible to confine such a dislocation to one segment of agriculture.

Nor is it possible to keep this sort of reverse confined to one segment of the national economy. All the 7 million workers engaged directly on farms will be hurt. And in addition, there will be effects on 6 million workers in the farm supply business and on 10 million persons employed in transporting, processing, and distributing farm products. Farmers in 1960 spent $4.8 billion for feeds, $1.5 billion for fertilizer, and $3.4 billion for machines and vehicles. It is idle to suppose that their hardships will not be transferred to their customers and suppliers.

The U.S. Census calls only that part of the population living on farms or in cities of less than 2,500 rural, but a far better definition of rural is that of Prof. Andrew Hacker who points out that 90 million Americans or nearly half the population still live on farms or in town with fewer than 25,000 population. You cannot punish the wheat farmer without punishing rural America and you cannot punish rural America without punishing the whole national economy, urban and rural alike. Disaster in the wheat belt would spread throughout rural America, make itself felt in unemployment in agricultural suppliers and processors and then translate itself into rising unemployment in urban centers far from the farm regions. Farm income rose in 1962 nearly $750 million over 1961 and the Department of Agriculture estimated that this rise created 200,000 new jobs in the whole country. These workers and no one knows how many thousands more would be idled by the sort of farm depression that is going to happen unless the Government intervenes.

It is too bad the farmers turned down Secretary Freeman's compulsory control plan. It may have been a good one. Apparently a lot of farmers would not have described it as Gladstone described the Constitution and probably it wasn't the greatest work ever struck off by the hand of man. Anyway, it was voted down. A workable and acceptable alternative is needed. Farmworkers who get less than half the pay of urban workers are not overpaid and they deserve better of the country. They don't need to be "taught a lesson" and if they did, the lesson would be more costly than the country could afford.

While Men Slept

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, not that Americans intentionally want to give up their freedom for communism, but because we many times are far too complacent about our freedom and our liberty and our country, we are unconsciously allowing freedom's greatest enemy to advance. We have freedom, sometimes which we tend to take for granted, because having had it so long, we are not really conscious of what it is. The real key is in the dignity of the individual and our right to choose.

WHAT IS FREEDOM?

Freedom is like a man standing at night opening the gate latch, and then sitting for awhile on the porch smoking his pipe before he goes to bed. It is a righteous anger of the pulpits. It is the violence of an argument outside of an election poll. It is the unafraid faces of people looking out of the windows of a train as it speeds across the continent. It is the shoulders of a mountain supporting the sky; and the seas breaking over the wide sands somewhere; it is the air you breathe and the dirt that is in your garden. It is the lack of apprehension at the sound of approaching footsteps outside your door. It is all the things you feel and cannot help feeling. Freedom—it is you, and just as freedom is you, just so do you determine whether you are going to continue to enjoy it.

IT CAN BE LOST

We must remember freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction, usually even closer. We did not get it passed to us in the blood stream or handed down like the grandfather clock—but through the blood, sweat, and tears of those before us. It must be fought for, protected, and handed on for them to do the same, or one day we will spend our sunset years telling our children, and our children's children, what it was once like in the United States when men were free.

In accordance with this, I would like to include a very thought-provoking editorial, "While Men Slept":

While Men Slept

"But while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way."

When I was a boy, three little ones in our neighborhood—a 4-year-old boy and his two baby sisters—were burned to death because the boy played with matches. The tragedy was caused not so much by the fact that this boy played with matches but his father was in the next room fast sleep when he should have been wide awake. The mother had gone shopping and would be back within the hour. But instead of watching the children, the father fell asleep and the horrible tragedy took place.

That father was never the same since—neither was the mother. At night he often was haunted by vivid memories of that fatal fire and the mother seldom smiled after that dreadful day.

This is also the story of the tragic advance of godless communism. "While men slept" can be written over the gravestones of nations that have succumbed to the total tyranny of communism.

While parents are sleeping, communism is sowing poisonous seeds to destroy their children's faith in the family, in morality, in parental respect and obedience.

While ministers are sleeping, saying that all that is necessary to defeat communism is to preach the gospel, the enemy is sowing the tares of unbelief, of evolution, of atheism, of attacks on the Bible, the virgin birth, and the deity of Christ.

While men sleep on their beds of tolerance, the enemy scatters the seeds of Red propaganda, of slanted articles, of half-truths and distortions, of smear-articles against American patriots.

While men elected to high offices sleep, the mistaken are boring from within, ignoring the Constitution or changing it by means of misinterpretation and by destroying our free-enterprise system by outworn Socialist schemes.

While some government department heads sleep, enemies infiltrate various offices, help each other into positions of power, protect each other and cover up for each other, and form and carry out policies that are in the interest of the enemy.

While some boards of education sleep, educators in many schools, colleges and universities are allowed to teach evolution, atheism, un-Americanism, Freudianism, and theories that help bring about a totalitarian society.

While millions of Americans sleep every week before their one-eyed idol, the enemy is hard at work organizing groups, teaching Communist doctrine, carrying out the will of the Kremlin, making every sacrifice to destroy our Nation.

While still other millions sleep before the silver screen, the enemy often is sowing his seed before their very eyes, without them realizing it, by means of films depicting shameless immorality, extolling vice and crime, mocking at chastity, patriotism, and old-fashioned Americanism.

"While men slept. While men slept."

Will this be the epitaph on the tombstone of this the once greatest, most powerful, most envied, and most cherished nation in the history of the world?

And what of you?

Are you sleeping the sleep of death? (Editorial, "Through to Victory," February 1963.)

Mr. Speaker, some Americans are not asleep. Some of those who have been, are awakening. One rugged and resourceful American who never has been, or never will be, Mr. A. L. Borden, of Tularosa, N. Mex., today sent me the following poem that he has written and I include it for your reading and reflection:

Just an Old Hillbilly

I'm just an old hillbilly
  With the soil right in my bones;
But I am also very patriotic
  Of which I make no bones.

It looks to me I think I'm right
  We farmers have been asleep
While asleep we've sown a seed
  We sure won't like to reap.

We have let the Government take control
  And they will tell us what to do;
With milk, potatoes, cotton, grain
  To mention just a few.

They set the price, tell us when
  We can sell, sow or reap;
We are all following the leader
  Like a bunch of crazy sheep.

When a man accepts assistance
  When he is able to earn his way;
Has lost his pride and manhood
  And is on the downward way.

The farmers built this Nation
  Till about 50 years ago
With orders from Washington;
  On when to reap, sell or sow.

It's about time we got in the furrow
  And plowed it straight and true;
Tell the boneheads in Washington
  With their programs we are through.

Who does your land belong to
  You or your Uncle Sam?
If it's yours, you'll work to keep it
  Or you're not worth a tinker's dam.

—A. L. Borden, Tularosa, N. Mex.

Eye on Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK MINOR MARTIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues the following article by Donald I. Rogers, New York Herald Tribune, May 19, 1963:

Eye on Puerto Rico

While attention in the Caribbean has been focused on Castro and Duvalier, another area strongman has been running into difficulties of a different type that may, in the long run, be as important to the interests of the United States as the ultimate fate of the Cuban Communist or the voodoo-practicing doctor.

Luis Muñoz Marín, Governor of Puerto Rico, has seen his hopes wrecked for a plebiscite this year that would permit Puerto Rico's voters to choose between three forms of government—continuation of its commonwealth status, independence or statehood.

Because of the enormous U.S. investment of both public and private funds in the island, investment bankers and other Wall Street officials have been watching Puerto Rican developments with more than normal interest.

Muñoz has been pressing for the plebiscite since late last year when, with White House blessings, he unveiled the idea. With President Kennedy's support he had hoped to see the plebiscite bill through Congress quickly. But the Governor's plans for "perfecting the commonwealth," as he described them, were received coldly. In numerous lobbying trips he found many Members of Congress unimpressed by his arguments for a "culminated commonwealth" as opposed to statehood.

What upset the lawmakers was the vagueness of his proposals. Not clear, for example, is whether Muñoz's so-called "culminated commonwealth" would foreclose statehood forever. Come Congressmen blanched when it was suggested that a culminated commonwealth would mean Puerto Rico had the right to make its own trade treaties—in effect, the right to conduct its own foreign policy.

Even liberal Congressman JIMMY ROOSEVELT had to tell Muñoz that Congress couldn't go along with that. Nor, said ROOSEVELT, did he think Congress would pass any law that would permit Puerto Rico to decide whether it would or would not be bound by Federal laws. Such is not a matter of choice for either State or possession.

Muñoz's argument for the right of self-determination has a difference. Under the present commonwealth status, Puerto Rico receives all of the benefits of association with the United States—mail service, social security and old-age benefits and just about everything a U.S. citizen receives. There is however, a lovely exception.

For the Puerto Rican it's all free. He does not pay a U.S. income tax.

Muñoz would like to maintain this best of all possible relationships, but he wants to make it permanent in a "culminated commonwealth." Muñoz also would like Puerto Rico to have the right to vote in presidential elections. This, of course, would be representation without taxation, a switch on a sacred U.S. slogan which had to do with taxation without representation.

The Governor won't go home without a bone. A bill has been introduced to create a study commission to decide whether changes should be made in the relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States. With this, Muñoz has returned to San Juan where, according to his local press, he is sorely needed.

Puerto Rico's "Operation Bootstrap," which had been so ably administered by Teodoro Moscoso, is foundering. The economy has grown but there is high unemployment. Moscoso, who now heads the Alliance for Progress, is no longer available to run the economic development administration (Fomento). Moscoso permitted no politics. Now big labor has entered the picture and demands are frequent and, according to local businessmen, excessive.

Examples: The house and senate labor committees of the island's legislature are headed by union leaders. The island is witness to investigation of alleged unfair labor practices by labor leaders themselves. Recently the sugar industry, mainstay of the economy and, since Castro's foolishness, now on the verge of bringing new wealth to the island, found itself at the negotiating table with mediators appointed by the president of the union representing the sugar industry's workers. Muñoz remained mute about this.

Fomento openly fears, and has so stated, that the Governor's labor policy may well wreck its chances of continuing to attract much-needed industry to the island.

Whatever the future holds, it is plain that Muñoz Marín doesn't want statehood with its responsibilities and its loss of tax privileges. He prefers a status on which he can exercise a sort of benign—and he is a benign man—"one-man democracy." It is not an unusual idea for a Latin leader. But it won't work in Puerto Rico, and it should not be considered for a U.S. possession.

Nevertheless, Muñoz is powerful enough and popular enough to have Wall Street and the State Department and some Members of Congress thoroughly worried.

We Can Have Sound Debt Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in his very thoughtful article on the Federal debt and budget, which appeared recently in the Washington Post, the distinguished economist, Paul Samuelson, has injected humor into a subject for which we usually reserve the greatest gravity.

Professor Samuelson has used his humor wisely, however, to make the very important point that there is no rational reason to fear a public debt that grows indefinitely, provided that the economy grows at a rate which is at least as large.

As Professor Samuelson states and supports:

> So long as the taxable base of the American people keeps the needed balance of the public debt—and it will most certainly continue to do so in these tormented cold-war years—the burden of the debt on President Eisenhower's grandchildren will remain a problem of urgency lower than that of DDT or of the unemployment all youth faces.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important contribution to an important public issue. Not only that, I think our colleagues will find the approach refreshing.

WE CAN HAVE SOUND DEBT POLICY

(By Paul A. Samuelson)

To become an expert on economics, one used to have to study for years, bone up on history, master statistics, learn German and French, and cut down on dancing and playing golf during those years when dancing and golf are most enjoyable.

But World War II changed all that. The test as to whether a man was a good economist came to be boiled down to the simple question: "Have you ever met a payroll?" This created what Pareto would call a "circulation among the elite."

The self-employed were instantly disenfranchised. Down from the walls came the pictures of Adam Smith and Alexander Hamilton; up went the portraits of John J. Raskob and Ivar Krueger. Emerson's man, who built a better mousetrap, found the world beating a path to his door—not for mousetraps but for advice on the sensational problem of the Indian rupee and the notorious law of diminishing returns.

Since economic wisdom is the rarest good in the gross national product, this payroll criterion had a great virtue of increasing—over Friday afternoon, so to speak—the country's inventory of economic brains one thousandfold. But that was only the beginning. An even better doctrine has finally been evolved.

Today, to understand the intricacies of the national debt or the capital-output ratio it is no longer enough for an economist to meet a payroll; he, I mean she, must also be able to bake an angelfood cake or at least thaw out frozen mashed potatoes. The prophet of this new doctrine is Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, who said in a recent speech that he would rather have any housewife in his audience on the Council of Economic Advisers than Chairman Walter W. Heller. The applause was deafening.

But this is not a mere opening from the right. Leon Keyserling, whom few will accuse of being against the little man, independently opined aloud that his cook knew more economics than President Kennedy's coterie of advisers. Here we have the making of a united front, a new national consensus.

Despite the natural tendency for the victim of technological progress to resent his own Darwinian demise, I embrace the new Sylvias, who shall not only sing our country's songs but also write its laws. The League of Women Voters has always done its homework better than have the Lions and the Elks. Out of the mouths of grown-up babies comes wisdom. The invisible hand of Adam Smith is the hand that rocks the cradle and trumps the ace.

I propose therefore to discuss, in one brief lesson, what every woman should know about the public debt. This is a lesson never out of season.

There is some analogy between public finance and private finance. A mother can spend her money wastfully; so can a government. A bride can spend too much; so can a government. The absence of financial discipline can result in trouble and even in disaster.

There is also some lack of analogy between private finance and public finance—just as there is some lack of analogy between running a business for profit and a family for welfare. General Mills recently said "We have lopped off this year N million dollars of sales, because they cost more than they were worth; there is no sense in spinning the wheels just for motions' sake. This is a proper statement for a socially-productive business firm to make.

But a housewife cannot say she will eliminate a twin this quarter or shut down temporarily on the business of education any more than the president of Harvard feels he must throw in the sponge because the university has never paid its way in the last 300 years and has never been able to claim the clean profit-and-loss statement of Arthur Murray's dancing school.

Women, perhaps better than men, know that life is a going concern. There is no rational reason to fear a public debt that grows indefinitely—say at an annual rate of 2 percent per year averaged over a decade—provided the economy grows at as large an average rate, or at the 4-percent rate which prudent judgment shows to be feasible.

To believe that disaster lies in this direction is to believe in old-husbands' tales. But the poor dears cannot seem to understand. So we must put it in the form of an anology—the only analogy with private finance that brings fast relief to those troubled in their viscera by pseudoanxieties connected with the public debt.

American Telephone & Telegraph is a great stock; even poor widowers can trust it. A.T. & T. has been accumulating bond debt for the last half century. Forty years from now its bonded indebtedness and interest charges can, with confidence, be estimated to be up by 300 percent. Is this unsound? No. Even if the telephone poles and switchboards that were bought out of A.T. & T.'s deficit financing were incapable of being sold to other industry, so long as the phone receipts of A.T. & T. can be confidently expected to rise faster over the decades than its debt service charges, there is no debt problem.

So it is with the American Nation. The true problems of fiscal policy are twofold:

Discipline to insure we get the proper scope, and what is not the same thing, the proper efficiency in Government.

Dosage, to insure that surpluses and deficits strike the needed balance between sluggish growth with unemployment and feverish inflation with catastrophic gold drain.

So long as the taxable base of the American people keeps the needed balance of the public debt—and it will most assuredly continue to do so in these tormented cold-war years—the burden of the debt on the backs of President Eisenhower's grandchildren will remain a problem of urgency lower than that of DDT or of the unemployment all youth faces.

If this is not precisely what they are saying down at the office, it is time the poor dears checked back with headquarters for proper briefing.

Armed Services Day Address by Rear Adm. Robert J. White, U.S. Navy, Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks, I include an eloquent ringing sermon on God and country delivered on Armed Services Day on May 19, 1963, to members of the U.S. Marine Corps at Albany, Ga., by Rear Adm.—Rt. Rev. Msgr.—Robert J. White, C.H.C., U.S. Navy, retired, former dean of Catholic University Law School and a veteran of World War I and World War II.

Without regard to race, color or creed, the sermon of Rear Admiral Msgr. White is one that appeals to all Americans from the angle of both religion and patriotism.

Armed Services Day Address by Rear Adm. Robert J. White, U.S. Navy, Retired

It is fitting that we observe Armed Services Day in this solemn religious service. The majestic music, the rich vestments, the ancient ceremonies, the national colors, and the gallant standards of your Marine Corps combine together to lift the heart and revive long memories of your glorious tradition "Semper Fidelis." As brothers, we meet to worship God the Father of us all. As comrades in arms, we pledge anew our devotion to our beloved Nation.

Now, religion and military service are natural allies. For religion renders faith, obedience, and love to God. While military service renders loyalty, obedience, and willing sacrifice to our native land. Truly there is an identity of disciplines in religion and in military service. When either one fails, the other is weakened. But combining together effectively they bring an invincible power to religion and to military service.

Both religion and military service require an assent of the mind in a motivating belief, a daily development in discipline and obedience to authority, a constant consciousness of duty, and an unfailing spirit of brotherhood which in the highest sense is the virtue of charity.

Moreover the Marine Corps and the Christian religion share significant symbols. For as the globe in your symbol depicts the worldwide mission of the Marines; so the globe in religion depicts the worldwide sovereignty of God, creator and judge. Likewise the anchor common to both was used by the adventurous St. Paul to describe religion as "This hope we have as a sure and firm anchor of the soul." Again your eagle symbolic of daring and lofty consecration finds its counterpart in many cathedrals throughout the world as the symbol of the young, generous, and loyal St. John who bravely remained by Christ on the cross when other apostles had fled in cowardice. Finally the inscription "Semper Fidelis"—from the centuries-old Latin—bids both the young marine and soldier of Christ to be valiant and forever loyal in the hardships, temptations, and dangers which test the young man in the ordeal through which he must need struggle as a true marine and a true soldier of Christ to hold fast to his ideals and become worthy of the accolade "Semper Fidelis."

As you know, the Marine Corps manual demands unswerving loyalty to the Nation, alert attention to duty, maintenance of discipline by personal example in behavior and performance, and the preservation of the traditional spirit of comradeship and brotherhood in arms—all these constitute a credo similar to the demands of religious belief.

No monument to our honored dead is as enduring as our prayers that their souls may rest in peace with God together with our solemn pledge to maintain the patriotic ideals for which they fought and died.

Thus this morning, as sons of God we humbly acknowledge our human faults and weaknesses and pray for forgiveness and for fortitude for the future. As military men we pray for greater strength and firmer resolution to render willing sacrifice—so necessary now and in the future for the survival and progress of the American nation under God. It is well for all of us to remember that proud traditions cannot live on the memories of the past alone. Such traditions wither and die unless they are kept alive and nourished. Only our geenrous sacrifices in the present can assure the supremacy of freedom in the future.

Unfortunately, too many are inclined to take the American heritage for granted and as a spendthrift heir squander the precious heritage. They are loud in their demands for rights. They are silent and neglectful in the matter of their duties. They forget that more precious than gold or silver or accumulated wealth is our heritage of faith in God and our tradition of American self-sacrifice to protect our homes and our Nation. We live in a time when contemporary historians are complaining that too many young men have grown soft in the pleasures of prosperity. Far from being satisfied—they are sliding into a series of discontents with a doubtful view of the power of ideals and sacrifice and a cynical disregard of the duties of patriotism. This erosion of American character can bode ill for the future of our country. In dramatic contrast to such wordly selfishness stands the long record of the Marine Corps of young men eager to serve, disciplined and brave, consecrated in a comradeship even unto death "No greater love hath any man than to lay down his life for his friend." Now my service in the military has taken me at times into the office of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Commandant of the Marines. The headquartres of your Commandmant of Marines is unique. For in addition to the many bemedaled battle standards, the room is enriched with lifesize murals which line the walls depicting the coloroful history of your Marine Corps. This is indeed a historic shrine. One feels that he is standing in a sacred sanctuary hallowed by the patriotic sacrifices of young men who willingly braved the danger, suffered hardships and met death "Semper Fidelis." Valiantly they stood determined to preserve this Nation founded in freedom and dedicated to Almighty God.

We have been living now for several years and will continue to live in the foreseeable future in a period described by the unthinking as a cold war. Temperature labels of hot or cold are dangerous self-deception. The fact is that we are at war—in a struggle of ideologies which will determine whether freedom in our time can survive. The memories of Korea, Berlin, Hungary, Indochina, Cuba, Vietnam, and Laos must be kept alive as constant reminders of the avowed purposes of those hostile forces which are determined to destroy liberty and rule the world in tyranny. To be sure they sometimes mask their evil purposes with pious professions of peaceful purposes in coexistence. History in our own day gives the lie to such a fraud. The millions of conquered peoples remind us of the grim choices which we and all other freemen must make—tyranny or liberty—government by decree or by due process of law—slavery or freedom—atheism enforced by the state or divine faith in the sacred liberty of conscience in the individual. Unhappily in our day, too many have grown weary because the promised goals of world war victories have too often proved to be only mirages in our quest for the springs of security and peace. Moreover, they resent rightly the ingratitude for our mammoth help to poor peoples in the world. America has indeed been an apostle of charity. However, any surrender to such disappointment and weariness can only produce a dangerous weakening of the Nation's will to preserve freedom at all costs—with sacrifices however heavy—in these and all the days to come. We need then to review our past, to recall the sacrifices that were necessary to make this Government strong, and to analyze the true meaning of American freedom in the light of religion and military service.

What then is the sanction of your American citizenship in the light of reason and religion? Now it is elementary that Almighty God ordained in the creation of the natural order that the individual be dependent upon cooperation with others in his family, in his community, in his business, and in his relations with state and nation. Indeed it is self-evident that an individual who attempts to live and work alone could never even survive. He needs and must have cooperation with others to earn his living, to advance in education and skills and to become able to satisfy his wants and the needs of his family. It is patently clear that government is necessary for order, peace, and safety. Thus those who serve in the military to preserve this basic order, against would-be aggressor enemies, are defending and preserving in a very real sense the order and authority ordained by God in His plan of life for men. In the long span of human history the American nation is relatively young. Yet—in addition to the permanent dedication of a government under God and the law this Nation has risen to power, and wealth, and social justice by peaceful steps through the force of law. But our material greatness is not the true measure of our stability and strength. Our true greatness lies in enshrining the Christian concept of the individual as free, equal, and made in the image of God—a true personality endowed with inalienable rights. The American Constitution's protection of the individual's right to worship as he wishes, to be free in the enjoyment of his faculties—to live and to work where he wills; freedom of speech and freedom of the press, the guarantee against unreasonable search and seizure and the sweeping protection of one's life, liberty, and property by the requirements of due process of law—all enshrine the Christion concept of man as an individual endowed by God with inalienable rights—of which he cannot be deprived either by a majority or an omnipotent state. This constitutes the priceless American heritage.

Now if discipline, routines and hardship tempt a young man to complain, let him read and understand these rights again and compare his American life with millions of youths whom godless tyranny has deprived of the strength and consolation of religion; has condemned to the occupation and to the living place decided by the state; has sealed his lips of any freedom of discussion; made a mockery of any claim to privacy in family life; has turned brother against brother; and boldly repudiated any pretense of equal protection in due process of law. In the light of the historical situation which we face, let all Americans come to realize again the worth of American citizenship, understand the proper balance of rights and duties, and recognize the necessity, obligation, and worth of military service—the only guarantee for the survival of freedom in our time. God's sanction is upon your military service to preserve human dignity and freedom.

Thus in our dedication to the preservation of constitutional freedom under God—we vindicate our debts to those who have left us this rich American heritage. Moreover we justify the hopes of our new generations. For ourselves we can, in good conscience, face the future confident and unafraid because we have obeyed the prophet's command "Not to be dismayed but to take courage and be valiant." Truly then today and in all the days to come—God Himself, promises His strength and His benediction to those who walk in His law and in His love "semper fidelis."

Wheat Plan Crushed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Abilene, Kans., Reflector-Chronicle which voices several sound reasons for the defeat of the administration's wheat program by the Nation's wheat farmers and at the same time emphasizes the importance of united action in seeking a responsible solution to a problem which just will not go away by wishing it so.

WHEAT PLAN CRUSHED

Reaction to the smashing defeat dealt the Kennedy administration's attempt to solve the wheat problem is varied and speculative. Wheat farmers who apparently put their independence above all gave a clearcut answer. The proposed new wheat program for 1964 didn't get even a simple majority, while a two-thirds favorable vote nationally was required to put it into effect.

Dickinson County wheat farmers voted approximately 2½ to 1 against the Government plan. This was a higher percentage than many counties of the State. It carried at only one voting place (Hope and Ridge townships) in the county and there it was virtually a stand-off at 89–83.

What happens now is the big question.

It's not only what the old time "Free" markets might do, but what the Congress will do. First reaction by the administration, from President Kennedy on down, was one of stunned hurt. The administration threatened that if the program conceived by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman failed, no other action would be taken—or in blunter terms, let the farmers stem in their own juice.

Political realities may dictate otherwise, however. If the Democrats block Republican proposals for a reasonable substitute wheat plan more acceptable to the farmers it could throw the 1964 election into doubt. The Kennedy administration already is in trouble in the South and could not afford to lose much ground in the agriculture Midwest.

Senator CARLSON of Kansas has said he will cosponsor a proposal to continue the present wheat program for another year to give Congress time to work out a compromise plan.

Many apparently voted against the Freeman plan because they felt it went too far down the road to complete Federal control, a road they would not be able to retrace to freedom. Many others no doubt voted "no" because they had confidence that Congress would enact new legislation in their interests.

One result can be told for sure: The farm population has stood up and voiced opposition to growing Federal controls. Wheat farmers would like to see the "farm problem" solved, but not at the obvious expense of their own freedom of action.

One experienced farm observer said the resounding defeat given the wheat proposal represents long pentup emotions against Government controls of agriculture. It should not be interpreted, however, as a demand to throw the Government out entirely, but a warning that this is the time for a halt toward greater regimentation.

This was the first time a nationwide campaign ever was waged over a wheat referendum. It was the first time the Department of Agriculture ever mobilized all the forces at its command to pressure farmers to vote the way it directed—for the wheat proposal.

It should also be a signal that all the farm organizations would do better to get together and help Congress write the right kind of farm legislation, instead of opposing each other like in a political campaign. It is difficult for Congress to solve the wheat or any other problem when the farmers themselves can't agree on what they want.

On Eminent Men and Political Slogans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Barrett McGurn which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, of Sunday, May 26, 1963, with reference to Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp.:

ON EMINENT MEN AND POLITICAL SLOGANS

(By Barrett McGurn)

Who have been the greatest men of a lifetime passed hobnobbing with the world's most eminent?

What is a man to make of the political slogans for which he fought with tenacious partisanship?

How does one of the master American politicians of all time sum up a life from the vantage point of his 75th birthday?

James A. "Jim" Farley, the man whose straw hat has become a political trademark, took the questions one at a time in his handsome skyscraper office at 515 Madison Avenue, where he is board chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp. The interview was a few days premature. Mr. Farley will be 75 on Thursday.

The greatest?

Well, let's see. Herbert Hoover (whose ouster from the White House was Jim's achievement in 1932, at least in good part). Franklin Delano Roosevelt (with whom Mr. Farley broke clamorously in 1940). Franco ("the courage of a bank burglar"). Kennedy ("better qualified beforehand than any other President in American history and, I believe, with his greatest accomplishments still ahead).

Mr. Farley named 11. The others:

Charles de Gaulle.

Former President Eisenhower.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Pope John XXIII.

The late Pius XII.

ON A BOOST—FROM A REPUBLICAN

Political slogans? The man who did so much to put at least one of them into the pages of American history books was skeptical.

"The New Deal? The Old Deal. The New Frontier. The Republicans. I think those are just names given to the activities of a period."

His meaning, he indicated, was that each generation of American administrators tackles the same problems. One emphasis may be needed one term and another the next, but certain issues dictate more or less the same handling. ("Which foot should we use, the left or the right? We need both. Both feet must be planted firmly.")

The great secret of these years? Friendship. And for that the former Postmaster General had a story he has always kept off the record through the years, the tale of how a Republican broke party loyalty to give Jim his start. For a half century Mr. Farley has kept that Republican's secret, but now five decades later there is no harm in telling it if the revered friend's anonymity is protected by a little vagueness. This is the story:

When Jim Farley was a high school student in Stony Point, Rockland County, a girl classmate died. The father of the teenager was a storekeeper, a local Republican boss. To Jim, who had been raised around his family shop and tavern as a fierce Democrat, any Republican Party officer was light years removed from him, but Jim felt sorry. He wrote a letter of condolence.

Three years later, at 21, Jim ran for the office of Stony Point town clerk. A friend astonished him on one of the final days of the campaign with this question:

"How come X (the bereaved boss) is out working for you?"

ON FRIENDSHIP AND GREEN INK

Nothing could have surprised the young Democrat more, but the night of his victory he went to the enemy store to thank his mysterious benefactor. The boss was shocked. He had campaigned for Jim only among his own relatives, people he had thought he could trust with his dangerous antiparty secret. At first the boss denied the charge. Certainly he had not helped any Democrat. Then he confessed.

"Yes, I did. You know, when my daughter died you were the only one who wrote to me. I will always help you whatever office you run for, as long as I live."

The town clerkship started young Farley on a road leading to the State and National chairmanships of the Democratic Party. The incident of the opposition boss taught him two things: "Friendship, and the fact that you need to be a friend to make a friend."

Letters? At 75 Mr. Farley sends 100 of them each day; congratulations, letters of sympathy, a word or two to an army of friends passing along the latest Farley article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, one or two lines followed by "Jim" in Irish-green ink.

"Curious thing about condolences," Mr. Farley never ceases to be surprised by the behavior of his fellows. "I send 500 or 600 a year, and less than half are acknowledged. I don't know why people neglect to do that."

As long as American history is studied, scholars will take note of the way Jim Farley, the son of the Stony Point Irish-American tavernkeeper, crossed the United States in 1931 making friends and building an organization for New York's Governor, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

"I contacted 17 States in 20 days. I slept 16 nights in pullmans. I did Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota * * * I saw some Kansas people too, I think.

Was it true he remembered all those men and women and everything about them, their children, their jobs, their hopes, their worries? Did he use memory aids?

"Memory aids, no. Remember all of them, no. But I did remember thousands."

One trick helped through the years. People have a strange way about them. If they hear there is a Jim Farley who has a filing cabinet memory, they try him on it: "I bet you don't know who I am." Well, to what would have been their disappointment, that has all too often been true. But Mr. Farley has long had a way of handling the situation. When he sees the eye gleam of the approaching test, he thrusts out his great Stony Brook ballplayer's hand and says, "My name's Jim Farley. What's yours?"

ON MR. HOOVER AND THE DEPRESSION

For those who do not mean to try him, Mr. Farley has a parallel approach. A subart in the field of friendship is, says Mr. Farley, "to make it easy for them."

"I will notice people in elevators nudging one another and looking. I turn to them, tell them my name and ask them where they're from. They may say, for example, Racine, Wis. Then I'll ask about someone I know there. It pleases people."

Is the day of nationwide acquaintanceships and friendships finished now that Government is so big and the country's population is soaring toward 200 million?

"No, it's easier than it was for me in 1931. With the airplane you can do now in a day or so what took me 20 days. You can have breakfast in Seattle, lunch in Portland, supper in San Francisco. It's easier."

To sum up the question of political friendships:

"You have to like people. You have to be willing to meet and talk with all kinds, with different personalities. And you have to know intuitively how to handle them and whom you can trust. You can tell that in a man's eyes, by the expression on his face—those who are lying to you, those in whom you can place implicit confidence. The big thing in politics is loyalty."

To go back to his list of greats, why Herbert Hoover? It was the campaign machine masterminded by Jim Farley which hounded Herbert Hoover out of the White House with the charge that he had falsely promised a "chicken in every pot" and that he had ludicrously predicted "grass would grow in [Democratic] streets."

"I have no apologies for 1931," said Mr. Farley, "but I think Mr. Hoover understands. I got to know him very well working with him on the Hoover Commission in 1952."

Mr. Farley's judgment now about the 88-year-old Mr. Hoover, 32 years after the depression campaign?

"In my opinion he is one of the most unselfishly patriotic Americans I have ever been privileged to meet. I have great admiration for him. My admiration grows with the passing of the years."

And "Mr. Roosevelt"? Each of his references to the President of 1932 to 1945 was with the correct, distant form of "Mr. Roosevelt." Books have been written about how Jim Farley felt socially snubbed by the elegant Roosevelts of Hyde Park, and about the manner in which the Postmaster General especially suffered affronts he felt were given to his beloved late wife who had been Elizabeth Finnegan. Why was "Mr. Roosevelt" on Jim's list of greats?

"I do think that the advances made during his first 8 great years were the most important in the history of American politics, the most important in the history of our country."

Jim Farley ran for the Democratic presidential nomination himself in 1940 in an unsuccessful effort to head off the third term.

ON FALLING OUT WITH F.D.R.

"I was against the third term in caucus and I was against it on the floor of the convention. I was not really a serious candidate, however. I put my name up only because John Garner wouldn't allow his name to go in unless I put mine too."

Yet with all that said, Mr. Roosevelt "gave great leadership to the country during the war period."

"I have always felt that if he hadn't served the third and fourth terms—naturally now he will be criticized in the years to follow about Yalta and Teheran; it's easy for people to criticize decisions in which they didn't have to take part—if he hadn't served the third and fourth terms he would have been remembered as the greatest President we have ever had, even greater than Washington and Lincoln."

A tall picture of a solemn-faced F.D.R. stared across from the opposite wall as Mr. Farley spoke. A sea of other photographs radiated out from either side and around the four walls, Farley and an aging Hoover, Farley and an amiable Truman, a grave Farley and a young President Kennedy, an early Roosevelt Cabinet meeting already looking ancient and inscribed: "To Jim Farley, F.D.R., 1933."

Farley's other wonder men?

MacArthur—"I always felt that General MacArthur was the greatest military man this country has ever produced. And one of the finest minds it has ever produced."

Truman—"He is certain to go down in history as one of the greatest Presidents. He made at least 8 or 10 important decisions taking great courage. He has the courage of a lion." (Which decisions? The Hiroshima bomb? The costly Marshall plan? The NATO involvement? The Korean war? The Greek war? The recall of General MacArthur? "I'd rather not list them.")

ON KENNEDY AND DYNASTY ISSUE

Kennedy—"I think he was better equipped to shoulder the responsibility of the Presidency than any of the others before him. Better than Mr. Roosevelt? Why sure. Kennedy's knowledge of history, his political experience, his war activities, his keen mind, his personality, all of these factors. I believe that he will go down as one of the great Presidents. And I sincerely believe that his greatest achievements lie in the years ahead." (The dynasty issue? "In my opinion it will have no effect on his reelection.")

That controversial Franco on the list of the best?

"I still believe General Franco has given to his country leadership it could not have been given by anybody else. He has helped peace in Europe. The nations there are very happy with the way Spain has acted and, in my opinion, justly so."

Eisenhower, another Republican President?

"He has been very friendly to me. I have for him the greatest admiration and affection. President Eisenhower's military leadership will always be remembered."

Is Mr. Farley at 75 an exponent of the big business he fought as a youth? The answer wound through many considerations, the two-party system, party loyalty, the differences between the Democratic and Republican parties and between Conservatives and Progressives. The gist of the reply was this:

The Democratic Party even under the New Deal was less an enemy of business than some people think. The Democratic Party by and large is the organization of the "down trodden." The Republican organization is or was under the control of big business. Mr. Farley would not think of opposing "business" any more than he would dream of abandoning an almost religious faith in the Democratic Party. He does not think there is any contradiction, and he does not even feel he should be denounced by liberal Democratic writers as a party conservative.

"I don't know why they call me a hidebound conservative," he said. "I never opposed any of the legislation in Mr. Roosevelt's first 100 days. In the years before and after that I supported every piece of legislation put up in New York State by Smith, Roosevelt and Lehman. For Mr. Roosevelt's first 8 years I supported everything, including even the court (packing) fight, which I didn't agree with. I never knew about the court bill until I read about it in the newspapers. I was not at the Cabinet meeting when he announced it.

ON THE USES OF PATRONAGE

"And when I say supported everything, I mean that I did more to get it through than anyone else except the President and Vice President Garner. I was the one who dealt with the Congressmen and Senators when there was a holdup on any of the legislation. I don't mind saying that I used the power of patronage to get the bills through. We withheld * * * until we got the program. We did it because we felt it was in the best interests of the country.

"And since I left Washington I haven't had any political position at all."

The Democrats as the foes of big business?

"No, no generation of American business was ever helped more than by Mr. Roosevelt in the years just after 1933, through his banking legislation, his bills during the 100 days, the way he saved the banks, the way he saved the insurance companies. No administration ever did more to save the capitalistic system. And of course I believe in business. I believe that this country's greatness is because of the free enterprise system. It is because of the work of sincere, honest, aggressive men."

The differences then between the parties? Do we have four parties: Dixiecrats, liberal northern Democrats, Barry Goldwater Republicans, Nelson Rockefeller Republicans? What is the key to the question of party loyalty?

"Four parties? No. We have two major parties and I hope we always will have only two. I firmly believe in two parties. I believe there is room for all shades of political opinion in both parties. Room for them and we do have them."

An experience one day with a lady in Paris summed up the complicated question for Mr. Farley.

The feminine inquisitor had one pointed question. Why did Mr. Farley support Mr. Roosevelt in his campaign for the third and fourth terms despite Mr. Farley's own personal vigorous disapproval of both ventures? ("I voted for Hull at the convention in 1940 and Senator BYRD even though he wasn't a candidate in 1944.")

"I explained that even though I didn't believe in the third and fourth terms, that I did believe in majority rule. But she kept pressing me. She said that I wasn't a good American, that I wasn't patriotic. It's difficult to explain party loyalty, party responsibility, why you always support the nominees of your party. Then I pulled something out that I had read sometime in a book somewhere, I said, 'I did it because of prejudice and ignorance.' That seemed to be satisfactory. It settled the argument. At least she stopped."

If Mr. Farley was always loyal to the party of his parents, the party of the immigrants of the last century, the party of the downtrodden, had it always been loyal to him? Had he ever thought of changing to the party of the Hoovers, the party of the Eisenhowers?

ON GRATITUDE AND GREATNESS

A shadow of certain sad memories flickered for an instant on the broad features of the tall ambassador of soft drinks.

"You know," he said, "there are some who achieve, who feel they have done it all alone. They forget that many others have sacrificed for them. I have seen it many times, how a few gather around a man and how those few become thousands and then how those thousands become hundreds of thousands."

Sometimes the leader of the hundreds of thousands forgets the selfless aid who rallied the first few and and the first few thousands.

"But I have never said that I have been shabbily treated by the leadership of my party. I did believe that I could have won the race for Senator in New York in 1956 if I had been nominated, and that I could have been elected Governor in 1960. I will never know why Bob Wagner and the others opposed me. Yet I will never complain for I feel that all I have I owe to my party. I would not be here, I never would have gone anywhere, if it had not been for my party starting back there in Stony Point."

Zionist Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include a resolution adopted unanimously by the Baltimore District of the Zionist Organization of America on May 15, 1963:

RESOLUTION

Whereas Arab leaders, now federating in military alliance, have formally renewed their threat to destroy Israel; and

Whéreas the Soviet Union is providing Arab States with bombers, fighters, submarines, tanks, torpedo boats, and missiles; and

Whereas German scientists are helping the United Arab Republic to produce guided ground-to-ground missiles; and

Whereas Western governments are providing unconditional economic assistance to Arab States, despite their war preparations and their refusal to meet Israel in direct peace negotiations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we appeal to the President and the Congress for these measures:

A firm security guarantee by the United States committing our Government to move swiftly to deter and prevent any aggression.

The grant of arms to Israel to insure an arms balance and to enable Israel to defend herself and deter attack. This is imperative until such time as the Arab States halt their arms acquisitions.

Continued economic assistance to help raise the living standards of the peoples of the area.

Careful administration of our aid program to insure that none of our assistance is diverted to finance preparations for aggression. Our aid program must not assist belligerent countries which threaten the peace of their neighbors.

Resistance to the Arab boycott and Arab belligerence and insistence that Arab leaders meet their United Nations Charter obligations to negotiate a peace settlement with Israel.

Action to hasten the rehabilitation and training of the Arab refugees and their resettlement in lands where there is room and opportunity for them.

We urge our Government to counteract incitement to hate and preparation for war. It is right to press for Arab-Israel cooperation and peace negotiations. It is wrong to be defeatist and to acquiesce in a continued state of belligerence. We must press for an Arab-Israel peace with a firm policy, clearly announced and vigorously pursued; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and to the Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mob Action Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, those who are not responsible, for whatever laudable goal, for encouraging mob action should pause to consider where disrespect of law and legal procedures will lead us. The following column by Max Freedman in the May 29 issue of the Washington Evening Star, reminds all Americans of the grave responsibilities we face:

MERCHANTS OF HATE IN THE UNITED STATES: RALLY OF NAZI-TYPE GROUP IN YORKVILLE IS BELIEVED RAISING LARGE ISSUES

(By Max Freedman)

The rally in Yorkville over the weekend raises larger issues than those posed by this challenge of the neo-Nazis in a local setting. The demonstration was intended to be the signal for similar incitements against Jews and Negroes in other parts of the country. Nothing was omitted by the National Renaissance Party to make its challenge flagrant and unmistakable.

It chose a district in New York that in the years before 1939 often saw organized violence and intimidation carried out by the Bundist movement which drew its inspiration from Nazi Germany. In dress and deportment the members of the new party plainly modeled themselves on the storm troopers. Their meeting was widely advertised amid circumstances of civic protest which heralded the fighting which later took place. The police were honorably loyal to their duty of protecting the speaker and giving the meeting at least an outside chance of proceeding without violence.

Apparently the meeting was organized on the principle upheld by George Bernard Shaw that anyone has the right to say what he wants and anyone else has the right to knock him down for it. Martyrdom is the test. Well, these ugly little merchants of hate in Yorkville are no martyrs. They packed up their prejudices, at least for 1 day, and were glad of police protection to escape the fury of a hostile crowd. The rally was an ignominious failure.

One recoils from the dangerous irresponsibility which could lead any group of Americans, no matter how fanatical or misguided, to preach race hatred at this particular time in our history. The Department of Justice has always been aware of a risk which has been hidden from general view by the somber events now taking place in the South. The Department knows that the sparks of hate flying about the South may stir northern bigots and fanatics, long dormant, into sudden activity that may make the disturbed racial situation even more explosive. Yorkville will soon be forgotten if it is no more than an aberration. It will take on a sinister significance if it is to become a precedent. Hence, the anxious study now being given to the little groups of extremists in the North which feed on doctrines of hate and are eager to snatch power by the exploitation of misery and ignorance.

The members of the Jewish War Veterans who broke up the meeting in Yorkville tried to justify their conduct by saying the rally was an abuse of free speech and free assembly. That is an issue to be decided by the courts and not by any group of private citizens brawling in the streets. The motives of those who challenged the National Renaissance Party may well be impregnable against all criticism. Their methods, however, are not beyond reproach. If this evil little band of fanatics can, in fact, claim the rights and privileges of a political party, there is little doubt that the courts will sanction its meetings in the streets and it will receive police protection. There are almost endless precedents to show that civil liberty in America includes freedom for those whose ideas we detest or fear.

From Birmingham to Yorkville is not so long a way after all. In both places there are prejudices ready to leap out from dark regions of the human spirit, and they do not stand alone in troubled America today. That is why the Department of Justice has embarked on its brave but so sadly misunderstood campaign to rally moderate and responsible opinion in both the North and South to a more vigilant defense of existing rights and to support new civil rights legislation in Congress. The law by itself cannot carry all the burden. It must work in communities whose leaders are ready to take risks for fairplay and equal treatment, and to use their influence to keep the extremists in constant check.

The southern Members of Congress, many of whom are among its best Members, will place the whole Nation in their debt if they rise to the height of this great opportunity and support the program in spirit that appeals to the conscience and judgment of the American people. Such an appeal will be answered with equity and magnanimity. But their responsibility will be grave and inescapable if they merely repeat ancient grievances and filibuster against freedom.

Address by Hon. Paul J. Kilday, Judge of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals, Upon Receipt of Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1963

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address of Hon. Paul J. Kilday, judge of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals, on Sunday, May 26, 1963, when he received an honorary degree of doctor of laws from St. Mary's University, San Antonio, Tex.

I think every Member of Congress will be very much interested in his humble acceptance of this honorary degree and also will be tremendously impressed, as I was, with the brilliant address he made on that occasion.

Judge Kilday is a man of vision, a man of great intellect, and a man of great wisdom. I commend his address at St. Mary's University to all who seek the answer to why we teach history in our universities and the value of a Christian education.

His remarks follow:

JUDGE KILDAY'S REMARKS UPON ACCEPTANCE OF THE HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS

It is with unconcealed pride that I accept this honor. I doubt that I can find words adequate to express my appreciation. No other institution could give me so great an honor because St. Mary's has known me longest. It is located in my hometown. San Antonio is the site of my many struggles. Here I struggled for the beginnings of education. Had my personal situation not been so stringent, I would likely have received an earned degree from St. Mary's as long as twoscore years ago. Here I struggled to become established in the practice of law. Here on 12 occasions I struggled for election to the U.S. Congress. Here will be my home always. It is particularly satisfying to be honored by my friends and neighbors; and to know that I am not without honor in my own country.

Father Neumann, I know of no words in the English language which can embellish the simple words "thank you," when they are spoken sincerely and with real gratitude. So, I say to you and to St. Mary's University, with real sincerity and from the bottom of a grateful heart—thank you.

Only last month the observance of the 100th anniversary of the founding of Boston College was deemed to be an occasion of such importance as to justify the presence of the President of the United States. When we realize that the State of Massachusetts was the home of the Pilgrim Fathers, we appreciate the significance of our observance of the 111 years of the labors of the Society of Mary in our community of San Antonio. Whereas, the Mayflower compact of 1620 marked the beginning of democratic government in the Western Hemisphere, the year 1852 was but 31 years after the severance of the ties of Spain with Mexico and but 16 years after the freedom of Texas from Mexico. Thus we know the good Brothers of Mary brought the blessings of Christian eudcation into a frontier land.

The hardships and tribulations of Brother Andred Edel, the founder of St. Mary's the 54 years of service of Brother Charles Francis and the contributions of the unbroken line of their successors, place us in their debt. We are quite inadequate to make payment of that debt. But we can provide an installment by expressing the gratitude and appreciation we have for those long years of toil and effort. This inadequate payment we make on this occasion by our presence here, our good wishes and pledge of support during the years to come.

We live in times of great stress. Due to the exigencies of the last great war which plagued the world, men of science brought forth an instrument of destruction. It was deemed necessary that we produce this instrument before it could be acquired by our adversaries. Necessary also that it be capable of such massive destruction of human life that its very existence in our hands would be the agency of preservation of even more lives than it was capable of destroying. Its use proved its effectiveness.

With frightening suddenness, we realized that in the production of the atomic bomb we had produced the instrument of destruction of, not only our enemies, but ourselves and all mankind. Then began feverish efforts to keep it for ourselves, lest it be used against us. We now know those efforts were juvenile and foredoomed to failure, for science, education, and learning can be universal. Our antagonists, long before we had anticipated, developed and possessed what we had visioned as our exclusive deterrent. A contest to excel ensued. At times our opponents seemed, to our dismay, to achieve preponderance while we sought parity and, then, overriding superiority. Developments of last fall indicate we have reached a stalemate.

Across this stalemate two competing political ideologies exist. One confirmed in its belief that it can hope to exist only by the elimination of the other. That other as equally determined that the contending economic system and godless form of government shall not spread to its neighbors and engulf the world. Thus we have stress and continuing tension, evidenced by a status of cold war. The issue resolves itself into which has the greater fortitude and perseverance; which will crack first.

To most of us our system of government seems quite simple and easy to understand. To many people of the world, our system is unfathomable. To them the idea of universal suffrage, a federation of sovereignties, division of powers of government, individual freedom and all our other rights and benefits constitute only confusion. To them, here lies the chink in our armament.

In our own lifetime two dictators, largely by reason of this misconception, have brought about two world encircling wars. There is very strong evidence that our present opposition may be similarly misorientated.

The fact is that our form of government is most complicated. It is most difficult of comprehension. Our system can be properly understood only by a knowledge of the events of history which produced it and an understanding of the political science and philosophy which have determined its form. Knowledge of this science, like knowledge of any other science, can be acquired only by study and application. Granted that self-education may be effective. Self-education requires self-discipline and lacks the organization and logical progression of formal education. This is the proper field of our educational system with emphasis upon the college and university.

We expect much from our institutions of higher education. They are indispensable to our well-being and progress. Viewing this importance from his present high position, the President said at Boston College: "From the office that I hold, * * * there can be no doubt today of the growing meaning of universities in America."

Our Nation has assumed a position of worldwide influence. Areas which were recently colonies have now become sovereign nations. They participate on a plane of equality with nations which have brought their influence to bear on international relationships for centuries. These new areas, until recently, we regarded as distant, strange, and mysterious lands. They created little or no impact upon world affairs. Now they participate on a basis of equality at the international conference table, in the United Nations, and in area compacts. They bring to those gatherings their own backgrounds of achievement and frustration. Frequently, their motivations for the future spring from some bitterness of the past. They bring with them their cultures, different from our own, which require our understanding.

No longer are there far off or distant places. Africa and Asia are now as close to us as Canada or Mexico. Our universities must study them and accumulate the knowledge of their histories and cultures, so necessary to an enlightened foreign policy to be adopted by our officials charged with that responsibility; and, equally necessary to a public which must support that policy.

There is a consciousness that knowledge has had a spectacular growth. This consciousness is evidenced by the fact that colleges and universities which formerly counted their student bodies in hundreds now count them in multiple thousands. There is contest and clamor for admission, and great strain is placed upon physical facilities and faculties to provide for the numbers. Deep thought and controversy go into plans for providing both of these essentials. Here, again, our appreciation must go to the dedicated men of the Society of Mary who provide the basic endowment of this institution.

Perhaps, as never before, the man in the street is aware of the progress of science. It is brought home to him by his own observation, on the marvel of television, that men encircle the globe and return to earth at a previously designated point. They realize that scientific vehicles circle the moon and planets and transmit visual and scientific information of their observations. Few men have any doubt but that men will soon land on the moon and return to tell us of its secrets. The only uncertainty is which nation will be the first.

Not only in space, but in medicine, national defense, agriculture, and industry, is this expansion of knowledge evident. We cannot be so unenlightened as to believe that all of the mysteries of science have been solved. Viewing what has been achieved in our own time leads to the inescapable conclusion that much more is to be accomplished. There remains too the practical application of all of this knowledge to the use and benefit of mankind.

The work of the universities has, in major part, produced the progress we have seen. That there be further development and application remains the work of the universities. The spectacular seizes our attention. Therefore, we are absorbed by what we have seen in the natural sciences. Not to be overlooked is the equal importance of the arts, letters, history, and the law; and the transcendent importance of religion.

A country in which knowledge of science existed to the exclusion of arts and letters would be a drab one indeed. Without arts and letters there would be no appreciation of the beauties of life and of nature, no facility of expression—no literature. With arts and letters there is the instrument of knowledge which leads to an appreciation of the finer things of life and, indeed, to the comprehension of religion. Here at St. Mary's it is possible to receive, as you graduates do today, your passport to the republic of letters.

History is the study of the character and significance of events. It is that branch of knowledge that records and explains past events as steps in human progress. "History is constantly repeating itself, making only such changes of program as the growth of nations and centuries requires." "Not to know what has been transacted in former times is to continue always a child. If no use is made of the labors of past ages, the world must remain always in the infancy of knowledge." For "history maketh a young man to be old without either wrinkles or grey hairs, privileging him with the experience of age, without either the infirmaties or inconveniences thereof."

"History is but the unrolled scroll of prophecy"; it "teaches everything, even the future."

In our time many of our people realize suddenly that stress confronts our country. They are appalled by the real dangers which surround us. In their terror they cannot believe that any comparable stress ever faced our people. Our country has constantly faced danger. This was true during the colonial period and was compounded during the critical period of 8 years intervening between the close of the Revolutionary War and the adoption of our Constitution, as the young republic sought to survive under the inadequate Articles of Confederation. In each succeeding era stress, in their time equal to our own, prevailed.

Each era has been faced with problems unique to its period. Whether that problem be Washington's struggle with a bankrupt new nation as he sought to make it 1 rather than 13 nations and faced the whisky rebellion; or the question of expansion as portrayed by Jefferson's purchase of the Louisiana Territory; or Madison's unwilling involvement in the War of 1812; or President Monroe meeting and overcoming European influence in the Western Hemisphere by the declaration of the doctrine which bears his name; Andrew Jackson's revival of liberalism, and his insistence that the Federal Union be preserved in the face of John C. Calhoun's fallacious doctrine of interposition; Vice President Tyler's accession to the Presidency upon the death of Harrison and his insistency that he had become, in fact, President; Polk and the explosive issue of the admission of the Republic of Texas as a State of the Union; the uncertainty of Buchanan during the excruciating advent of the Civil War, and the agonizing experience of a man of indecision; the anguish of Lincoln with a nation divided and engaged in the bloodiest war of all history, and that a fratricidal war; Andrew Johnson and his struggles with the radicals in his determination that the division of governmental powers established by our Constitution be maintained, thereby subjecting himself to trial for impeachment and that failing by only one vote; Rutherford Hayes abiding by the compromise as to whom had been elected President, and having the fortitude to end the military occupation of the Confederate States; McKinley and our entrance into war with Spain; or those of more modern times, such as, when Woodrow Wilson took us into the first Great World War and brought that conflagration to a conclusion; or Franklin Roosevelt's struggle with the great depression and the successful conclusion of the Second World War; or Harry Truman's penchant for creating controversy by his dedication to the philosophy that the manner in which to deal with the opposition is to "give them hell" and his abounding courage in stopping the march of communism in Korea; or Eisenhower's continuance of a foreign policy very akin to his predecessors; or John F. Kennedy's management of the cold war, his efforts toward the elimination of communism in Cuba, or his domestic program; each of these and many others, produced deep division and controversy.

The issues have varied and have had little relationship to each other. Each has given rise to debate. Debate is good and in accordance with our democratic concept of government. We would have it no other way.

But in debate the unscrupulous can soon resort to calumny and chauvinism. Untrue, baseless, and reckless questioning of the actions and motives of others follows and all the while the vainglorious patriotism of the calumniator is paraded. The uninformed fall easy victim to such conduct. Too frequently has this been true in our own history. Whether it be the War Hawks who plagued President Madison into the unpopular of 1812; the slanderers of Andrew Jackson who drove poor Rachel, brokenhearted, to her grave; the southern radicals and northern abolitionists who made the Civil War inevitable; the supporters of Thaddeus Stevens as he salted the wounds of the Southern States; or other instances of later times; all have worked against the national interest.

As examples of the impact upon the national welfare, we might consider but some of such concurrences. Charles Sumner, a Senator from Massachusetts, by vitriolic language, condemned the actions and questioned the patriotism of southerners. So violent was his attack that it impelled Preston Brooks, an inconspicuous Member of Congress from South Carolina, to invade the Chamber of the U.S. Senate and bludgeon Sumner into insensibility. By reason of the untoward actions of both, each became a symbol of the contending views in the explosive era between the Dred Scott decision and the secession of the Confederate States.

But, coming closer to home. Should I ask any audience in the United States if they could identify Sam Houston, almost unanimously, they would respond: "He was the father of Texas, both as a nation and as a State." However, if I should ask this well-informed audience of Texans: "Who was Louis T. Wigfall?" I would be met with silence. The truth is that Louis T. Wigfall was a U.S. Senator from Texas for 15½ months, from December 1859 to March 1861. There are no monuments to Wigfall in Texas nor in the hearts of Texans. Still, by reason of his violent temper, his bitter tongue, and calumnious denunciation of all who disagreed with him, he was a major instrument in creating the Civil War. His influence was such that he was able to overcome the influence of Sam Houston and lead Texas out of the Union and into the Confederacy.

Bitter divisions among our people have always operated to the detriment of our Nation. Almost inevitably such divisions grow and prosper among the uninformed. Other nations, and particularly those of unfriendly disposition toward us are led to believe our differences to be insoluable, thus promoting misconception of our position and power as a nation. That the people be informed of our past is essential. Not only that they be informed of our glorious past, but of our inglorious incidents as well, to the end that we not repeat those things which have been to our disadvantage. This knowledge must come from our educational system, with special emphasis upon the colleges and universities. Those men and women who come to their communities from the institutions of higher education are in a preferred position to gain and exercise leadership.

So, too, the science of our own form of government should be the forte of the college graduate. As I have indicated, our Government is complicated in its form. More than casual information is necessary to its understanding. The four basic doctrines of our National Government are understandable only if the origin of them is understood and the doctrines themselves properly analyzed and appreciated. Standing alone, some of the four doctrines of federalism, separation of powers, due process of law, and a government of laws and not of man, fall far short of their meaning and substance. The American concept that sovereignty resides in the people and not in a king or potentate is understood only when we understand the doctrine of divine right of kings and the action of Thomas Jefferson in incorporating in the Declaration of Independence the doctrine of John Locke that governments derive "their just powers from the consent of the governed." Our system is further complicated by its Federal nature with the Union of 50 autonomous or sovereign States and a division of legislative authority between the National Government and the State government.

All of our people take pride in the fact that the powers of Government are separated between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of our Government. However, that separation can really be understood only when the individual has a firm knowledge of what powers are actually committed to each branch of Government. Lack of accurate information leads to deep division of our people, conflict, and discord. These are evidenced by the recurring charges that the President is usurping the functions of Congress, the Congress is usurping the powers of the President, and the Supreme Court is usurping the powers of both. My nearly quarter of a century of intimate contact with the Federal Government forces me to confess that, on occasion, each type of usurpation has taken place, and I would bear responsibility for some thereof. However, it is an interesting fact, that I can recall no instance of actual usurpation which has attracted the interest of the public or resulted in uproar. Generally, such public protests result from lack of knowledge of our basic charter and confusion among our people. Such confusion and clashes can be minimized or eliminated if college educated people in positions of leadership are themselves informed and can adequately orient the people.

The majesty of the law is a glorious thing. With the charge always current that lawlessness is rampant, we should take great consolation and pride in the indisputable fact that at all times the overwhelming majority of the American people obey the law simply because it is the law. Within the walls of St. Mary's, as in courtrooms everywhere, including the one U.S. court with worldwide jurisdiction upon which I have the honor to sit, there is the frank admission that on earth perfect justice does not exist. We can hope for perfect justice only when we have achieved the beatific vision. Until that time we must suffice with rules of human conduct, ordained and enforced by competent authority. Admitting all of its imperfections, we seek good order and the protection of rights by observance of the prescribed rules of conduct. May I say, it is a source of real satisfaction to me to receive reports, constantly increasing in number, that law graduates of St. Mary's are well prepared.

I take advantage of this opportunity to say a few words about the court upon which I sit. The U.S. Court of Military Appeals was created by the Congress of the United States in 1950 as a part of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. That code came into existence as an aftermath of World War II. During that war perhaps as many as 15 million young Americans were called from their civilian pursuits to become members of the Military Establishment. They expected, and cheerfully accepted, many things to which they were not accustomed. Many of these were enjoyed and as time goes on the experiences will be recounted to children and grandchildren with ever increasing embellishment. However, an astounding number agreed upon one thing: they did not like the quality of justice administered in the military system. These young men had come from an era of history during which individual, personal, and constitutional rights had been emphasized. Intuitively, they knew what Blackstone had said: "* * * he puts not off the citizen when he enters the camp; but it is because he is a citizen, and would wish to continue so that he makes himself for a while a soldier."

Hence, the Uniform Code of Military Justice sought to establish a system which would conform the military as nearly as possible to the civilian concept of the administration of criminal law. The Congress deemed it essential that a court of three civilian judges, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, be superimposed upon the existing military courts and review procedures. This concept has not been readily acceptable to all military men. Their resistance came from a wide range of views. Some held the conviction that the administration of military justice was but an adjunct of the enforcement of discipline which required swift, if not summary punishment; others believed that persons in the military did not possess the constitutional rights enjoyed by civilians.

This latter group could not equate such constitutional rights as freedom of speech, assembly, petition and, perhaps our greatest right, to be let alone, with the restrictions imposed in these and many other areas upon the military. Such a restricted view overlooks the fact that all citizens may exercise their rights only to the extent that they do not thereby infringe on equal rights of other citizens. One example is sufficient to illustrate. We all have the right to freedom of speech. No one has the right to exercise it in a place of public worship in derogation of the right of the congregation to freedom of worship. So, too, no individual soldier can exercise his freedom of speech while in ranks or otherwise to infringe upon the right of all of the people to the common defense, the raising of armies, and the provision of the Constitution subjecting the soldier to the rules for the Government of the land and naval forces.

With the passage of time resistance has diminished and acceptance is increasingly evident. It is the purpose of the court to provide just and fair administration of the criminal laws within the military.

I leave my feeble remarks to such consideration as you deem them deserving. I extend my hearty congratulations to all of the graduates of this, my class. My best wishes go with you for success, recognition, and contentment in all of your future undertakings. You are fortunate that you emerge from a pioneer institution where Christian principles are always uppermost. There has never been kept before you the maxim that success for the purpose of success alone is secondary, while success achieved through service and accompanied by rectitude will bring the greatest reward of all—contentment.

Oregon Bombs Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, recently the city council of my home city of Portland, Oreg., by a 4-to-1 vote, decided to withdraw from the Federal shelter program. Subsequently, the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon reduced a proposed $410,000 budget item for a 20-member State Civil Defense Agency to $50,000 which would provide for a three-member staff.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I include two editorials—one from the Portland Oregonian of May 29, 1963, and one printed in the Wall Street Journal of May 28, 1963:

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, May 29, 1963]

OREGON BOMBS CIVIL DEFENSE

Oregon's grassroots revolt against civil defense, despite complaints from the Pentagon, may be just what the Federal program needs—a jolt to inspire a national civil defense program that makes sense to the people.

The evidence is clear. The people of Oregon—rightly or wrongly—are fed up with civil defense, as it has been administered on confused lines of authority and responsibility among Federal, State, and local governments. Legislators at Salem have reflected the sentiment of their constituents in reducing the State program to skeleton form. Even more emphatic is the rejection in the State's metropolitan center, where both the Portland City Council and the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners took the hint from last November's local rejection of a special, municipal civil defense levy and voted a halt to all civil defense programs. (The county had never had much of a program anyway.)

There has been some conflict in reports of the civil defense phaseout here. On the same day the city council was confirming its termination of the program, and an Assistant Secretary of Defense wired from the Pentagon that all Federal civil defense supplies and equipment would be withhheld from Portland, Federal officials were busy stocking five local Federal buildings with water drums for emergency shelter storage. It appears that the Federal Government may pursue its fallout shelter program here even though it does not have the cooperation of the city. Meanwhile 15 Portland public schools have already been stocked with 14-day emergency supplies, including water drums (to be filled at first sign of emergency), survival biscuits, medical supplies, sanitation kits and radiation monitoring instruments.

All supplies have been bought with Federal funds. Once placed in emergency shelters, they are the property of the city. Shelters in Oregon and Clark County, Wash., are supplied from Government warehouses in Troutdale. The Federal Government had earmarked approximately $1 million worth of supplies to provide emergency stocks for the 337,000 people that were to have been accommodated in shelters in 203 buildings in Portland.

Main thrust of the civil defense program since last fall's Cuba crisis has been in location and stocking of fallout shelters. Other States, some of which had little, if any, previous civil defense activity, have been speeding work on the shelter program. Oregon, whose civil defense programs, especially in Portland, were farther advanced than in many other areas, is thus an exception—and perhaps an exemplary one.

The fault cannot properly be laid at the door of the local civil defense organization, despite the questions raised by the October 12 storm. Portland's civil defense program has been among the leaders in the Nation. It is not generally understood that it provided much equipment (radio communications and standby generators) essential to local government services in an emergency, including the October 12 storm. But the local organization has had to perform under the broad lines of of the program emanating from Washington, D.C., and it has been the victim of the limitations and confusions of that program, which have been so apparent to the people as a whole.

We do not believe that Oregon's rejection of civil defense, as it has operated, is a rejection of the principle of sane national defense measures. Civil defense has never had the stature in the national defense program it deserves in the nuclear age; defense of the homefront cannot be left to the discretion of local communities. Perhaps the little bomb Oregon has exploded over the Pentagon will make that point. If so, it could be a great help, not a hindrance, to the Nation's home defense.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 28, 1963]

DEFENSE AGAINST DISASTER

Portland, Oreg., claims the distinction of being the first city in the United States to build an underground civil defense operations center. It also is credited with staging the Nation's largest population-evacuation exercise.

It has, besides, been getting ready to obtain Federal licensing of more than 300 buildings as fallout shelters, to be stocked with supplies already accumulated in warehouses. In a word, Portland hasn't exactly been dragging its feet on civil defense.

So when the city council voted the other day to eliminate the $109,000 civil defense budget and abolish the agency, there must have been some good reasons. One was the voters' refusal last winter to approve a special $75,000 civil defense fund, suggesting that there were doubts about the program's worth.

Certainly City Commissioner Stanley Earl is skeptical, for he now says that civil defense is useless since the H-bomb's development, and that if a bomb falls on Portland "there is nothing we can do to alleviate the effects." Plenty of people in other places would agree with that view.

In fact, Portland's action reflects a pretty general feeling that Federal defense officials, to whom localities must look for guidance, have been something less than specific and consistent about the direction civil defense should take.

One of the first plans for defense against nuclear attack involved mass evacuation of cities. This soon was abandoned as clearly impractical. Since then there have been many different proposals for shelter construction—by communities, by private individuals and by the Federal Government at staggering cost.

It may be true that, assuming advance warning of an attack, provisioned shelters could save a considerable number of lives. But until decisions are made about the urgency of defense and just what everybody is supposed to be defending against, it won't be surprising if more cities follow Portland's example.

Maybe, due to the inherent unpredictability of the course of any war, it's not possible to make those decisions. If not, it seems sensible to leave the responsibility with the police, fire and other agencies already trained for defense against disaster.

Commemoration of the Brave Japanese-American Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there will be a poignant moment in a commemorative program on June 2, 1963, at Arlington National Cemetery when every citizen of the United States should pause to remember with remorse that Americans of Japanese ancestry were misjudged and mistreated at the beginning of World War II, that their subsequent history shows brilliant military achievement, and that they are paying respect to all American war dead and to their own sons who made the supreme sacrifice. In the war hysteria after the attack on Pearl Harbor, these people, of whom there were about 110,000 residing on the Pacific coast, had their patriotism impugned, their property confiscated, and their liberties restrained. They were taken into custody and transported to inland internment camps and the young people denied entry into military service.

The occasion for the gesture of tribute will be at services on Sunday, sponsored by the Japanese American League during which a wreath will be laid at the Tomb of the Unknowns in tribute to all war dead. The services also include commemoration of the Nisei dead in Arlington National Cemetery of whom there are 21, 4 from Idaho.

After 2 years of internment, there was a change of heart on the part of the Government and President Roosevelt declared the Nisei were eligible for military service. More than 33,000 were inducted into the Army and formed into 2 special units, the 442d Regimental Combat Team and the 101st Battalion. Their achievements in the field of battle were spectacular, gallant, and courageous.

The 101st was named "The Purple Heart Battalion" because of the tremendous casualties. The 442d became the most decorated unit in American military history for its size and length of service. Seven unit citations were awarded and for seven major campaigns in Italy and France.

Among the 18,143 individual decorations for bravery were one Congressional Medal of Honor, 52 Distinguished Service Crosses, one Distinguished Service Medal 28 oak leaf clusters to the Silver Star, 560 Silver Stars, 22 Legions of Merit, 15 Soldiers Medals, approximately 1,200 oak leaf clusters to the Bronze Star Medals, approximately 4,000 Bronze Star medals, 12 French Croix de Guerre, 2 palms to the French Croix de Guerre, 2 Italian Medals for military service.

President Truman declared—

> The record is documented by episodes of highest valor. Yet the noblest evidence of their devotion to America is that in fighting for their own country, those assigned to the Pacific theater had to fight their own race.

This they did, knowing that in victory for the American cause was victory for all mankind.

Coming from Idaho to take part in the commemorative services are Mr. and Mrs. S. Nakashima of Pocatello, who have two sons in Arlington National Cemetery, and Mr. and Mrs. T. Murakama, of Pocatello, who have one son interred in the hallowed ground there. Another Idaho soldier interred there is the son of Mr. H. Nagano, Blackfoot.

As my tribute to the brave Nisei, I submit for inclusion in the Congressional Record a list of their names and their parents so that the roster may become a permanent part of the archives of Congress:

NISEI INTERRED AT ARLINGTON

1. Hada, Pfc. Victor K., parents, the Hada family, Nixon, Tex.
2. Ishida, Sgt. Haruo, mother, Mrs. A. Ishida, Milwaukee, Wis.
3. Kokubu, Cpl. Jimmie T., sister, Mrs. Charles Fujisaki, Brighton, Colo.
4. Kuge, Pfc. Tamotsu Thomas, parents, Mr. and Mrs. C. Kuge, Chicago, Ill.
5. Masaoka, Pvt. Ben Frank, mother, Mrs. H. Masaoka, Los Angeles, Calif.
6. Matsumoto T3g. Hisao, wife, Mrs. Tayeko Matsumoto, Springfield, Va.
7. Morihiro, Pfc. Roy T., parents, Mr. and Mrs. George Morihiro, Los Angeles, Calif.
8. Murakami, Pfc. Kiyoshi, parents, Mr. and Mrs. T. Murakami, Pocatello, Idaho.
9. Nagano, Pvt. Hiroshi, mother, Mrs. H. Nagano, Blackfoot, Idaho.
10. Nagato, Pfc. Fumitake, parents, Mr. and Mrs. B. Nagato, Los Angeles, Calif.
11. Nakamura, Pfc. John M., mother, Mrs. William Nakamura, Flint, Mich.
12. Nakashima, Pvt. Raito, parents, Mr. and Mrs. S. Nakashima, Pocatello, Idaho.
13. Nakashima, Sgt. Wataru, parents, Mr. and Mrs. S. Nakashima, Pocatello, Idaho.
14. Oba, Pvt. Stanley Takeshi, parents, Mr. and Mrs. Y. Oba, Portland, Oreg.
15. Onoye, Pfc. Lloyd Mitsuru, sister, Mrs. Ira Shimasaki, Bethesda, Md.
16. Shimizu, T. Sgt. Jimmy T., sister, Miss Mary Shimizu, Seattle, Wash.
17. Shiozawa, Pvt. Roy R., father, Heijiro Shiozawa, Clearfield, Utah.
18. Tanaka, Pfc. John, mother, Mrs. T. Tanaka, Denver, Colo.
19. Tanamachi, Pfc. Saburo, mother, Mrs. K. Tanamachi, San Benito, Tex.
20. Toyota, Pfc. Shichizo, parents, Mr. and Mrs. C. Toyota, Wickliffe, Ohio.
21. Yamaguchi, T4g. George T., mother, Mrs. Masaye Yamaguchi, Chicago, Ill.

And, as a tribute to the parents of all Nisei military dead and in appreciation of the living and their fine example of citizenship, I offer the closing paragraph of their touching creed:

> Because I believe in America, and I trust she believes in me, and because I have received innumerable benefits from her, I pledge myself to do honor to her at all times and in all places, to support her Constitution, to obey her laws, to respect her flag, to defend her against all enemies, foreign or domestic; to actively assume my duties and obligations as a citizen, cheerfully and without any reservations whatsoever, in the hope that I may become a better American in a greater America.

The creed was written by Mike Matsaoka.

Former President Aleman of Mexico, Friend of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert into the Record the fourth in a series of short articles on Mexico by Mr. Fred A. Orleans. Earlier articles in the series dealt with economic and political problems; this one pertains to tourism and the job being done in this field by former President Miguel Aleman of Mexico, who is a great friend of the United States and a strong anti-Communist.

The author of the series, Fred A. Orleans, is known as an attorney, economist, writer, and an authority on Latin American affairs. He is the first U.S. citizen to be elected a full member of the Mexican Academy of International Law. The fourth article in the series is entitled "Salute to a Great Former President" and reads as follows:

LET'S KNOW MORE ABOUT MEXICO

(By Fred A. Orleans)

PART IV. SALUTE TO A GREAT FORMER PRESIDENT

Mexico today is one of the three most stable nations, politically and economically, in the Western Hemiphere. Yearly the foreign trade deficits have become less and less and have been more than compensated for by net income from tourism which is one of Mexico's most important sources of dollar exchange. The overall balance-of-payments position of Mexico in 1962 including the revenues from tourism, indicated a favorable balance of approximately $92 million which is a great improvement over 1961 when Mexico had an overall unfavorable balance of trade of more than $22 million.

The recent growth in tourism as well as past industrial development can be to a degree attributed to the efforts of Miguel Aleman, President of Mexico from 1946–52, a period of unprecedented prosperity for Mexico and a time when many investors were encouraged to enter the country and lay the foundation for its present advanced industrial complex. President Aleman strictly adhered to the Constitution of Mexico at the same time was still able to provide a government sufficiently flexible to encourage foreign investments. He helped Mexico make significant strides during his term in office by promotion of industry, land reclamation, hydroelectric power development, and a vast program of school construction.

In November of 1961, former President Miguel Alemán presented his first public address since leaving office, before an audience at the National University near Mexico City. He issued a warning to the people of Mexico to beware of totalitarian systems that triumph over culture, technical knowledge, and over the civilization of democratic countries. Dr. Alemán, in his speech, was very critical of irresponsible leaders with ideas contrary to our type of thinking, to our interests, and to our Mexican integrity. He further stated that a nation must build upon its own culture and economy and is not able to adopt the plan of another and hope to keep moving forward. Dr. Alemán brought into sharp focus the question as to whether his country was desirous of transplanting in Mexico a system which would eliminate and replace the culture and civilization which has been achieved by Mexico over a period of many years. Thus, clearly rang out the voice of a great leader and outstanding anti-Communist.

This remarkable former President of Mexico, after 10 years absence from political office, returned to help his country when he accepted appointment to be President of the Mexican Tourist Commission. Former President Miguel Alemán's official responsibility is to aid and direct the growth of facilities to encourage tourism in Mexico. In a very short period of time he has already achieved remarkable results. Through his boundless energy, experience, and great ability, he actually personifies an Ambassador of good will for Mexico.

At the bar convention in Mexico City during July of 1962, I had the pleasure of again meeting and speaking with former President Alemán and I was amazed to find him unchanged despite the passage of many years. Miguel Alemán was a great President and today remains a great patriot dedicating his efforts to the good of his country and the realization of a dream that Mexico will one day assume its place among the leading nations of the world.

Philadelphia First in Fire Prevention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished mayor of the city of Philadelphia, the Honorable James H. J. Tate, has achieved for the city in the field of fire prevention the same recognition that was given to his predecessors. For the 7th consecutive year, the city of Philadelphia on May 9 was awarded first place honors in fire prevention by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. I include the article from the Philadelphia Inquirer which reports this great achievement:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, May 10, 1963]

PHILADELPHIA IS CITED FOR 7TH YEAR IN FIRE PREVENTION

For the 7th consecutive year, the city of Philadelphia on Thursday was awarded first place honors in fire prevention by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

The Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia was also honored by the national organization for "outstanding achievement in building year-round programs to reduce loss of life and property by fire."

PLAQUES ARE TENDERED

In ceremonies at city hall the Philadelphia chamber presented to city council and the city administration a plaque lauding their roles in the fire prevention campaigns that have brought credit to Philadelphia.

City council, in addition, presented a resolution to Fire Commissioner Frank L. Mc-

Namee for the fire department's accomplishments "in reducing fires and fire losses" in 1962.

COUNCIL LAUDS CHAMBER

The councilmanic resolution citing the chamber for "stimulating and supporting fire activities in our city" was presented to Chamber President Richard V. Bond by council's majority leader, Councilman George X. Schwartz.

The chamber's award to the city was accepted by Mayor James H. J. Tate and Council President Paul D'Ortona. It praised council and the administration for "their diligent applications to the city's fire safety program."

Lyndon Johnson Delivers 20th Century Sequel to Gettysburg Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Memorial Day, May 30, 1963, Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, delivered an oration in Gettysburg, Pa., which in my judgment shall stand for time immemorial as the 20th Century sequel to Abraham Lincoln's immortal Gettysburg Address.

In order for all Americans to see Mr. JOHNSON'S profound announcement in its entirety, I am talking the privilege today to include it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, Vice President JOHNSON'S Memorial Day address follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, MEMORIAL DAY, GETTYSBURG, PA.

On this hallowed ground, heroic deeds were performed and eloquent words were spoken a century ago.

We, the living, have not forgotten—and the world will never forget—the deeds or the words of Gettysburg. We honor them now as we join on this Memorial Day of 1963 in a prayer for permanent peace of the world and fulfillment of our hopes for universal freedom and justice.

We are called to honor our own words of reverent prayer with resolution in the deeds we must perform to preserve peace and the hope of freedom.

We keep a vigil of peace around the world.

Until the world knows no aggressors, until the arms of tyranny have been laid down, until freedom has risen up in every land, we shall maintain our vigil to make sure our sons who died on foreign fields shall not have died in vain.

As we maintain the vigil of peace, we must remember that justice is a vigil, too—a vigil we must keep in our own streets and schools and among the lives of all our people—so that those who died here on their native soil shall not have died in vain.

One hundred years ago, the slave was freed.

One hundred years later, the Negro remains in bondage to the color of his skin.

The Negro today asks justice.

We do not answer him—we do not answer those who lie beneath this soil—when we reply to the Negro by asking, "Patience."

It is empty to plead that the solution to the dilemmas of the present rests on the hands of the clock. The solution is in our hands. Unless we are willing to yield up our destiny of greatness among the civilizations of history, Americans—white and Negro together—must be about the business of resolving the challenge which confronts us now.

Our Nation found its soul in honor on these fields of Gettysburg 100 years ago. We must not lose that soul in dishonor now on the fields of hate.

To ask for patience from the Negro is to ask him to give more of what he has already given enough. But to fail to ask of him—and of all Americans—perseverance within the processes of a free and responsible society would be to fail to ask what the national interest requires of all its citizens.

The law cannot save those who deny it but neither can the law serve any who do not use it. The history of injustice and inequality is a history of disuse of the law. Law has not failed—and is not failing. We as a Nation have failed ourselves by not trusting the law and by not using the law to gain sooner the ends of justice which law alone serves.

If the white overestimates what he has done for the Negro without the law, the Negro may underestimate what he is doing and can do for himself with the law.

If it is empty to ask Negro or white for patience, it is not empty—it is merely honest—to ask perseverance. Men may build barricades—and others may hurl themselves against those barricades—but what would happen at the barricades would yield no answers. The answers will only be wrought by our perseverance together. It is deceit to promise more as it would be cowardice to demand less.

In this hour, it is not our respective races which are at stake—it is our Nation. Let those who care for their country come forward, North and South, white and Negro, to lead the way through this moment of challenge and decision.

The Negro says, "Now." Others say, "Never." The voice of responsible Americans—the voice of those who died here and the great man who spoke here—their voices say, "Together." There is no other way.

Until justice is blind to color, until education is unaware of race, until opportunity is unconcerned with the color of men's skins, emancipation will be a proclamation but not a fact. To the extent that the Proclamation of Emancipation is not fulfilled in fact, to that extent we shall have fallen short of assuring freedom to the free.

Communist Poland Blames United States for Increased Tension in Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the commonsense action taken by Congress last year to deny favored-nation treatment to Communist-occupied Poland and Yugoslavia has been more than vindicated by subsequent events.

The basic argument presented by the special pleaders for these two Communist dictatorships was that treating them as friends and favored recipients of our largess would cause them to loosen the chains of Moscow. Members of Congress have heard that fable repeated so often that it sounds like a broken record. But relief is in sight. The fable has been put to rest by the Warsaw regime.

The Washington Post, in a story from Warsaw dated May 28, 1963, reports that the Communist regime in Poland blames the United States for increased tension in Laos. The International Control Commission charged with maintaining peace in Laos was made inoperative by the refusal of the Polish member on it to recognize Communist aggression against that country as an act of war. He was recalled to Warsaw for consultations and the Polish regime then charged the United States with subversion and aggression in all the countries of old Indochina. In the upside-down language of Moscow this means resistance against Communist efforts to liberate Laos and Vietnam into communism. But it also means removal of any doubts about the real character of the Warsaw regime—it is a loyal stooge of Moscow. This calumny laid upon the United States puts to rest the overworked fables about the character of the Warsaw regime.

I insert at this point the Warsaw report carried in the Washington Post on May 29, 1963:

COMMUNIST POLAND BLAMES UNITED STATES FOR INCREASED TENSION IN LAOS

WARSAW, Poland, May 28.—Poland charged tonight that Laotian rightwing elements and the United States are to blame for increased tension in Laos.

A government statement denied Western charges that Poland was obstructing efforts of the International Control Commission (ICC) to maintain the peace in Laos.

The statement, circulated by the official Polish Press Agency, in effect defended the actions of Marek Thee, Polish armistice commissioner recalled from Laos to Warsaw last weekend for consultations.

Representatives of Poland, Canada, and India make up the ICC. It was set up by the 14-nation Geneva conference on Laos, which nominally guarantee Laos' independence and neutrality, to police the truce among the warring right-wing, neutralist and pro-Communist factions.

However, the West has blamed Poland for ICC's inability to take effective action in the recent fighting between neutralists and the pro-Communist Pathet Lao.

The Polish representatives were accused of blocking efforts to place an ICC team in the Pathet Lao-controlled areas, and have refused to accompany Canadian and Indian ICC members on inspections of the neutralist-held areas.

The Polish statement said, however, that "attempts of certain Western circles to blame the Polish representative for the existing situation are futile.

"The machinations of the rightist Laotian circles, supported by reactionary imperialist centers, have threatened recently to annihiliate the bases of the Geneva agreements."

It said that rightwing leader Phoumi Nosavan's staff, "with American help, has not ceased training and equipping subversive groups acting behind the Pathet Lao. Transfers of battalions of General Nosavan into the Plain of Jars are also taking place."

The Polish statement marks the first time the public has been told of Thee's split with the Indian and Canadian ICC members.

The United States, which reportedly has been exerting pressure on the Poles to cooperate in Laos, was mentioned several times in the statement.

It declared that "an increase of tension is caused by U.S. military displays in the area of Indochina and weapon supplies to the rightist groups."

Communist China has made similar charges in recent months.

The Polish statement charged that attempts to blame Poland for trouble in Laos stem from "a desire to hide from public opinion the factual causes of the situation in Laos, which are rooted in the actions of rightist Laotian groupings and their Western protectors."

To Shake a Bloody Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, indications that the State Department is considering the resumption of full diplomatic relations with Communist Hungary raise a serious moral question.

Are there, in fact, sufficient considerations of expediency to warrant more than an arm's-length diplomatic association with the Kadar regime?

That the United States should embrace Kadar seems incomprehensible to many.

In this connection, I include an editorial which appear in the Northern Virginia Daily, of Strasburg, Va., as follows:

TO SHAKE A BLOODY HAND

The year 1956 was not very long ago, and Americans can well remember, with a clarity that still makes one shudder, the savage butchery of the Hungarian freedom fighters by Soviet tanks

We can also remember the treachery and deception of the Soviets and Hungarian Communist leaders in luring the rightful Hungarian Premier Imre Nagy from his diplomatic haven with promises of safe conduct, only to put the hangman's noose around his neck. We remember, too, the ignominious shooting of Gen. Pat Maleter, resistance leader, while on a truce mission to the Russians.

Less than 6 short years ago we witnessed these and other Communist brutalities in Hungary which degraded the morality of man.

Now we are being told that Janos Kadar, who was the Communist leader responsible for calling in the Soviet tanks in the 1956 uprising, is leader of a different Hungary today. We are asked to believe that this same Kadar, who was installed as Premier by Soviet bayonets after condoning the hanging of his predecessor and the shooting of the Hungarian commander, has discarded this savagery of the repression and made life more acceptable to the hundreds of thousands of Hungarian patriots enslaved by communism.

In short, the U.S. State Deartment wants to normalize diplomatic relations with Kadar's regime.

One does not have to be a moralist to ask if it is necessary to now diplomatically embrace a government so recently guilty of a barbarity we condemned. Unfortunately, the answer seems to be that we must. These are the accepted ways of the modern world.

We who are shocked and affronted by the idea would be on firmer ground did we not remember that the United States not only befriended Germany and Japan after World War II, but helped to rehabilitate their economies. The needs of diplomacy cannot always be based on our ideas of international morality.

One more ideal will be destroyed by taking Kadar's bloody hand, no matter how much he may have done in the last few years to erase the memory of his deeds.

If, in the best interests of the United States, we must normalize relations with Kadar's government, let us be correct and formal in the process. We need not, we cannot forgive.

Pope John and Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Pope John's encyclical will go down in history as a great document in defense of human rights and individual liberty.

The following column by David Lawrence appeared in the Washington Evening Star, April 16, 1963:

POPE JOHN AND GOVERNMENT: ENCYCLICAL LIKENED TO A DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES FOR A FREE WORLD

There was almost universal applause from many people of all faiths for the document issued a few days ago by Pope John 23d entitled "Peace on Earth." This was primarily because it called for the establishment of a better world order and better moral standards than prevail today. Yet, due to the necessity of using abstract phrases, several parts of the papal encyclical did not receive as wide a reading as they deserved, nor was their significance fully appreciated.

What Pope John said about the organization of a political community has a very important bearing on the internal problems today by many countries which are striving to improve what is known as their political society.

The moral decay of government—the readiness of the politicians to practice deception, bribery, and distortion of the truth in order to gain their ends—is nowadays one of the most serious barriers to honest government. Pope John wrote:

"A political society is to be considered well-ordered, beneficial and in keeping with human dignity if it is grounded on truth.

"It is no less clear that today, in traditionally Christian nations, secular institutions, although demonstrating a high degree of scientific and technical perfection, and efficiency in achieving their respective ends, not infrequently are but slightly affected by Christian motivation or inspiration.

"It is beyond question that in the creation of those institutions many contributed and continue to contribute who were believed to be and who considered themselves Christians and without doubt, in part at least, they were and are.

"How does one explain this? It is our opinion that the explanation is to be found in an inconsistency in their minds between religious belief and their action in the temporal sphere. It is necessary, therefore, that their interior unity be reestablished, and that in their temporal activity faith should be present as a beacon to give light and charity as a force to give life.

"It is our opinion, too, that the abovementioned inconsistency between the religious faith, in those who believe, and their activities in the temporal sphere, results—in great part if not entirely—from the lack of a solid Christian education."

Pope John dealt with the very delicate subject of the relations of church and state, but emphasized that it was an individual judgment that has to be made as to the merits of governmental action or lawmaking. He wrote:

"Since the right to command is required by the moral order and has its source in God, it follows that, if civil authorities legislate for or allow anything that is contrary to that order and therefore contrary to the will of God, neither the laws made nor the authorizations granted can be binding on the consciences of the citizens, since God has more right to be obeyed than men. Otherwise, authority breaks down completely and results in shameful abuse. * * *

"It must not be concluded, however, because authority comes from God, that therefore men have no right to choose those who are to rule the state, to decide the form of government and to determine both the way in which authority is to be exercised and its limits. It is thus clear that the doctrine which we have set forth is fully consonant with any truly democratic regime."

The same encyclical dealt with human rights in a variety of circumstances, but the broad principles were stated in part as follows:

"Human beings have the natural right to free initiative in the economic field, and the right to work.

"Indissolubly linked with those rights is the right to working conditions in which physical health is not endangered, morals are safeguarded and young people's normal development is not impaired. * * *

"The right to private property, even of productive goods, also derives from the nature of man. This right, as we have elsewhere declared, is a suitable means for safeguarding the dignity of the human person and for the exercise of responsibility in all fields; it strengthens and gives serenity to family life, thereby increasing the peace and prosperity of the state."

Perhaps the most significant portion of the papal encyclical was the reference to totalitarianism, and yet the word "totalitarian" was not used anywhere in the document. The Pope wrote:

"Where the civil authority uses as its only or its chief means, either threats and fear of punishment or promises of rewards, it cannot effectively move men to promote the common good of all. Even if it did so move them, this would be altogether opposed to their dignity as men, endowed with reason and free will.

"As authority is chiefly concerned with moral force, it follows that civil authority must appeal primarily to the consciences of individual citizens, that is, to each one's duty to collaborate readily for the common good of all. Since by nature all men are equal in human dignity, it follows that no one may be coerced to perform interior acts."

This papal encyclical was utterly unlike most of the Vatican's pronouncements of the past in the sense that very little was devoted to a particular faith. In fact, it was more a declaration of constitutional principles that could govern a free world. It will take its place as one of the most outstanding encyclicals ever issued by the Pope at Rome.

Wheat and Feed Grain Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charlie Terpening, vice president of Anderson

Elevator & Feed Co., wrote the Anderson Independent a letter pointing out the threat to the livestock industry in the Southeast through Federal Government control of feed grains.

Mr. Speaker, I join Mr. Terpening in resenting the propaganda which was poured out over this country at taxpayers' expense in an attempt to bamboozle the farmers into more socialism and more controls.

On the other hand, I commend the farmer for his independence and courage in rejecting this Federal bid to further control and regiment our lives.

Mr. Speaker, the letter follows:

MAY 13, 1963.

The INDEPENDENT,
Anderson, S.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing in regard to your editorial Monday morning with reference to wheat referendum vote. In advising a "yes" vote I do not believe you realize what a continuation of the present farm programs is doing to the Southeast and Anderson County in particular.

The Southeast has been a deficit area, as far as farm feed grains are concerned. We did not raise enough to supply our needs before the feed grain program. Since it has gone into effect approximately 90 percent of grain fed in Anderson County must be shipped in from the Midwest.

This means a farmer who produces eggs, milk, beef, turkeys, and hogs must pay freight, commission and at least handling charges from both the shippers and local elevator or feed companies. In dollars and cents this represents at least 25 cents per bushel on corn alone.

I recall in your paper last November you had some difficulty finding a turkey flock in Anderson County for a picture for Thanksgiving. The reason for this was, since we no longer grow even a part of our feed here, the turkey man could no longer compete with the midwestern farmer, as both received the same price for his finished product. Feed cost enabled the farmer in the Midwest to make a profit where our local farmer just plain ran out of money. Hog farmers in the Midwest buy corn for $1.20 per bushel and sell their hogs for $15 per hundredweight. Anderson County farmers pay $1.45 per bushel for corn and sell their hogs for $15 per hundredweight; the same applies to beef, poultry and dairy farmers. Five years ago, before the feed grain program there were 15 farmers raising turkeys and making a profit. This year, to my knowledge, there are none. Hog farmers are like the Indians; they are becoming the vanishing race in Anderson County, and who will not agree that soon the dairy and beef farmers will join their ranks.

I am sure we will be able to continue to eat steak, eggs and milk but they will not be produced by Anderson County and revenue from these products will not be spent in Anderson County. This means also that farmers and all people connected with farm business will be forced to compete for jobs in other industries, which are now at full strength. Will they be able to absorb this influx, at this time or in the future?

In regard to wheat, which is to be related to the feed grain program, we have never had a surplus of soft Red Winter wheat, the variety that makes good southern biscuits, only Hard Winter wheat is in excess of our demand, so why make the Southeast pay a premium for something they did not create.

Government agencies and their employees are asking voters to vote "yes" and telling voters if the referendum fails, wheat will drop to $1 per bushel. The farmer today does not control the vote on a national level that he enjoyed 15 or 20 years ago, but he does use approximately one-third of all the rubber, steel, and petroleum products used in the United States today. I do not believe the administration or Congress could afford to let the farmers' purchasing power fall that low. I do not believe a Senator from a steel producing State would like the prospect of asking a steelworker, who was out of work, for his vote. I am quite sure that if a "no" vote is cast we can expect new legislation will be passed. I also believe they could enact legislation that would not force the southern farmer and consumer to import all farm products.

Ask any farmer who is now attempting to earn his entire income farming, if he believes the farm program, as it now stands, is helping him and then count the "no" votes.

Respectfully,

CHARLES TERPENING.

Why Not Follow Constitutional Procedures?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it may be well for those who claim to be acting in the best interest of the Negro citizens of this country to consider proper procedure under the Constitution as a substitute for the present appeal to mob action. David Lawrence, in the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star, points the way.

CONGRESS AND DESEGREGATION: LAW REQUIRING INTEGRATION OF SCHOOLS AND RESTAURANTS HELD NEVER ENACTED

(By David Lawrence)

There's worry about the "image" of America being created abroad nowadays, Secretary of State Dean Rusk attributes it to the controversy over racial discrimination.

But Mr. Rusk doesn't tell the whole story—that part which is conveniently overlooked by almost everybody because it's easier to do so than face the facts. The facts are that not a single law has ever been passed by Congress requiring desegregation or integration of public schools, restaurants or hotels, and not a single law has been adopted prohibiting discrimination in employment.

America's racial controversy today points up another omission in the field of law. The Supreme Court of the United States, consisting of nine men, is not a legislature. It cannot lawfully substitute its will for that of Congress. But it has done so. Also, two Presidents of the United States—in 1957 and 1962, respectively—have used Federal troops to secure the enforcement of Court orders relating to school integration, but no laws covering the subject have been passed by Congress. This creates abroad an "image" of dictatorship tactics.

The 14th amendment itself makes no mention of schools or private or public employment, but declares all citizens have a right to the "equal protection of the laws." This same amendment says explicitly that Congress is given the power to pass laws to enforce the provisions of the article. No laws dealing with desegregation in the schools have ever been passed by Congress.

This truth is beginning to be recognized at last by some leaders in Congress who, this very month, have introduced bills setting forth what racial discrimination covers and what shall be prohibited.

The United States has always been portrayed abroad as a free republic. America, it has been emphasized, has a government of laws—not of men. But foreign observers have noted that an oligarchy of nine men—who hold office for life—has attempted to write the laws. Thoughtful students of democratic government abroad have been amazed at this departure from the very words of the Constitution, and this tends to hurt the "image" of the United States as supposedly a free republic governed by a written constitution.

Commendable efforts have been made recently by local communities in different parts of the United States to try to settle the racial question by moral suasion. These efforts were making progress when "demonstrations" heralded as "nonviolent" stirred up racial violence. The episodes have not been confined to the South. They have spread to all parts of the United States. Riots and other disturbances are frequent. Every day the press dispatches tell the world that some Americans are relying on a form of mob rule to convince citizens who disagree with all this that they had better give in or their businesses will be ruined.

Has America learned anything in 100 years about how to deal with the race problem? In the 3 years after the War Between the States ended in 1865, a faction in Congress arbitrarily deprived several States of their seats in both Houses here, imposed military rule on the South, and sent in troops with bayonets to compel State legislatures to ratify the 14th amendment as the price of membership in the Federal Union. It was an example of lawlessness about which most Americans prefer not to read, though the facts are indelibly written in history books.

The way out of all this is to follow the procedure stipulated in the Constitution—to submit in a lawful manner a new 14th amendment which will specify school integration and anything else that two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and the majority of the people in three-fourths of the States of the Union want to declare as "the law of the land." Then there will be ample power for Congress to stipulate by statute just what shall be done about discrimination in public or private activities.

It is never too late to right a wrong—even one committed 100 years ago. If, as is widely assumed, an overwhelming majority of the American people would support such an amendment to the Constitution, this process need not take long. The 21st amendment repealing prohibition, for example, was adopted in only 9 months. The "image" of America abroad would then truly be portrayed as a government of laws—not of men.

Resolution Adopted by Slovenian Mutual Benefit Association, Lodge Soca No. 26 on Federal Health Insurance Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing concern on the part of millions of retired and aged Americans about the cost of health insurance. Many find the cost of health insurance beyond their means. They look to their Government to find a remedy for their needs under the time proven social security system.

The Slovenian Mutual Benefit Association, Lodge Soca No. 26, of Cleveland, Ohio, has adopted a resolution calling on the 88th Congress to give serious consideration to a Federal health insurance plan.

Under leave previously obtained, I insert in the RECORD the resolution which was sent to me by the Slovenian Mutual Benefit Association, Lodge Soca No. 26:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the costs of private health insurance are rapidly rising to a point where millions of our retired people cannot afford such insurance; and

Whereas the Federal Government each year expends billions of dollars for various domestic subsidies and foreign aid; and

Whereas the social security system now in existence in the United States does not provide adequate funds to enable these retired persons to carry adequate health insurance; and

Whereas these same retired people have given their productive years to building up our country to its present status: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the members of the Slovenian Mutual Benefit Association Lodge Soca No. 26 in due assembly, That the 88th Congress of the United States now in session, be petitioned to give serious consideration to the adoption of the Federal health insurance bill introduced by Representative FORAND at the last session of Congress or similar legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators STEPHEN YOUNG and FRANK LAUSCHE and Congressmen MICHAEL FEIGHAN and that they be asked to make a diligent search into the merits of such legislation.

MIKE BIZCJ,
President.
JOSEPH MIKLUS,
Secretary.
JOSEPH KLINEC,
Treasurer.
CHARLES, ZAKELY,
Recording Secretary.

Address by Comdr. Oliver Watkins, Department of Maryland, American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was my privilege to follow a tradition of long standing, handed down to me by my predecessors, in participating in the 96th annual Memorial Day exercises at Antietam National Cemetery in Sharpsburg, Md. The program for the day was organized by Antietam Post No. 236, American Legion, of which Mr. F. Leon Carnahan is post commander. Mrs. Carnahan once again efficiently and capably was chairman of all events during the day. Mr. Joseph B. Guiney was host and master of ceremonies.

One of the features of the services held at the Antietam National Cemetery was an address delivered by Oliver Watkins, commander, Department of Maryland, American Legion. Commander Watkins' words have such widespread application that I am appending them herewith for the benefit of the Members of Congress:

ADDRESS OF COMDR. OLIVER WATKINS, DEPARTMENT OF MARYLAND, AMERICAN LEGION

The observance of Memorial Day has become a sacred trust to members of the American Legion—Legionnaires know that any meaningful observance of the day must serve a dual purpose of remembrance of those who have made and kept America great—and a reminder to those who are about to assume the awesome responsibility of maintaining and furthering the cause for freedom.

Since the signing of the Declaration of Independence, more than 30 million Americans have borne arms in the defense of their country in time of actual war. Nearly 3 million have shed their blood in the cause of freedom and more than a million Americans have made the supreme sacrifice that liberty might live.

It is to these valiant men and women that we pause on Memorial Day to pay special tribute. It is from their memory and the knowledge of their fine deeds that we should draw new strength for the task that lies ahead.

The cost of winning and holding freedom in human life and suffering alone has been staggering enough, but it is only a part of the total cost. It is often said that that which is easily obtained is lightly regarded. Let this Memorial Day serve once again as a reminder to all Americans that the heritage which we cherish was not easily obtained, nor is it easily preserved.

Despite the terrible losses which mankind has inflicted upon itself through the ages, by attempting to settle differences through armed conflict, men still have not learned to live at peace with one another.

It is not inappropriate on an occasion such as this to call attention to the major threats to freedom as they exist in the world today, and which would destroy the very virtues for which those whom we honor this day gave their lives to defend.

Every American has a direct and personal challenge to measure up to the highest standards of citizenship and patriotism—if we are to meet and overcome the challenges of communism. Every citizen must respond with a personal devotion to the causes for which more than 1 million Americans have died.

The American Legion has every confidence in the ability of the American people, individually and as a nation, to measure up to whatever commitment is required of them to achieve that glory. For it is our firm belief that the wave of the future belongs to those who would seek to ennoble the spirit of man, and not to those who would degrade and enslave it.

Minnesota AAUN Makes Constructive Suggestions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on May 3 at the annual membership meeting of the Minnesota Division, American Association for the United Nations, Inc., thought-provoking resolutions on vital issues were adopted.

These worthwhile resolutions not only bring a tight focus on important problems now facing the United Nations but offer solid suggestions for constructive progress in international relations:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MINNESOTA DIVISION, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS, INC.

SECURITY PROBLEMS

The value of the United Nations in dealing with crises has been demonstrated repeatedly. The United Nations presence maintained in the Middle East by a few thousand men of the United Nations Emergency Force has eliminated open Arab-Israeli conflict. In the Congo, United Nations Forces have restored order, thus opening the way for a major effort to build economic stability and integration and to develop essential administrative and social services. Without the United Nations Force the only alternatives would have been tribal warfare inviting Communist penetration or a dangerous confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union in the Congo. In the Cuban crisis of 1962 the open debate in the Security Council made it possible for the United States to expose Soviet falsehoods and to prove its charges concerning Russian missile bases in a world forum. Mediation by the Secretary General persuaded Khrushchev to avoid a direct contact of Russian ships with the U.S. Navy. It is essential that so useful a security agency be systematically supported and strengthened so that resort to it will become feasible in an even wider range of cases.

FINANCING THE UNITED NATIONS

The crisis in financial support of the United Nations must be resolved quickly. Useful steps have been taken in clarifying the legal obligation of member states to pay their proportionate share of the expenses of United Nations military operations in the Middle East and the Congo, in authorizing an increase of the working capital fund, and in securing immediate funds to cover deficits by a United Nations bond issue. But it is necessary that member states now be led to pay their obligations promptly, that the balance of the bond issue be fully subscribed, that provision for the continuance of the Congo operation be at once assured, and that member states accept the principle of collective financial responsibility for all authorized expenditures.

The United States cannot properly continue to make large voluntary contributions beyond the quota assigned to it, which amounts to nearly one-third of the total. We hope the emergency session of the Assembly will face realistically the problem of securing discharge by member states of their financial obligations, and will also consider whether the United Nations might develop independent sources of supplementary income.

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT

The need for agreement upon cessation of nuclear testing and disarmament by progressive stages under adequate inspection continues to be urgent. In view of the deadlock in negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States upon what constitutes adequate inspection, we believe the time has come for a full-scale debate upon this subject by the Assembly, perhaps in a special session, so that the positions taken may be subjected to examination by the other states of the world and world opinion may be mustered in support of reasonable steps.

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

We again urge repeal of the Connally reservation to acceptance by the United States of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. We do so not because we suppose the reservation to be the major obstacle to wider use of the Court, but because it is wrong in principle and impairs the moral leadership of the United

States in urging full acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction by other states.

INTERNATIONAL—NOT FOREIGN AFFAIRS

We suggest that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs be renamed by substituting "International" for "Foreign." Although this change may not be a matter of primary importance, it would be a useful reminder of the proper focus of our external relations. If recent proposals for a "Department of Foreign Affairs" with several subordinate operating departments should be implemented, we believe the new agency should be named "Department of International Relations."

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Appendix

Urbanization and Its Sociological Impact: Challenges to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, one of our distinguished educators in Hudson County N.J., Dr. Frank M. Cordasco, associated with the West New York Board of Education and Seton Hall University, has been very much concerned with the problems presented by the large influx of Spanish-speaking imigrants into Hudson County and the population trends as they relate to education in general. He has made many contributions to the field of education. Recently, he delivered a speech at the 38th annual conference, Association for Field Services in Teacher Education, Montclair State College, Upper Montclair, N.J., entitled "Urbanization and Its Sociological Impact: Challenges to Education." Dr. Cordasco emphasizes the adequacy of our American schools to meet the profound changes in the population structure of our older cities and stresses the need of our teacher training institutions to take cognizance of the nature and needs of depressed area children and prepare teachers to face them skillfully.

Dr. Cordasco's comments are most enlightening and thought-provoking and I believe they will be of interest to all educators and certainly to the Members of the House of Representatives who share his interest and concern in the education and well-being of our children. As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I can appreciate the difficult problems which must be resolved by many communities in meeting the changing needs of the American educational system, particularly in the areas of segregation, language barriers, and the problems of student dropouts with the concomitant aggravation of unemployment due to technology and automation.

It is my pleasure to obtain permission to have his remarks inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

Demographers have established and discerned profound changes in the population structures of our older cities, and have been unanimous in noting the emergence of a megalopolis complex in our urban areas which is the spreading outward of the city; as the total population grows, the slum belt around the central business district of the old city becomes thicker with the concentration of lower class people in the areas of poorest housing; and this conglomerate at the center is a point of nucleus with successively higher socioeconomic groups at greater and greater distances, with a middle class and upper middle class population in the suburbs. The old city in our America has become the citadel of the migrant, the culturally deprived, and the immigrant.

As a result of the growth of low-income areas—the urban lower class school—has become a common phenomenon and has posed educational problems of the greatest magnitude and crisis. Such schools have a preponderance of pupils from working class homes; what the sociologist speaks of as a status ratio shows few or no pupils from middle class homes in these schools and is a matter of great alarm. Typically, the depressed area population tends to be a stratified group of predominantly unskilled and semiskilled workers (largely in-migrant) who have moved from the rural areas to the city. Ethnic and racial composition tends to be from so-called minority groups—southern Negro, Puerto Rican, Appalachian white, American Indian, Mexican, and lately Cuban. The high birth rate in these areas; the continuing influx of migrants with low levels of income, education, and vocational competence; and the inability of the schools to cope adequately with the economic, social, and cultural handicaps of the children are contributing to the accumulation of what Dr. James Conant has termed "social dynamite."

The New York Times (April 9, 1963) said, "Education of the culturally deprived child who may be found living in the slums of any of the country's large cities has emerged as one of the major problems of the schools today." The recognition of the problem is attested in two projects, both of which affirm the need for a direct confrontation of the educational challenges. "Project Beacon" for the preparation of preservice and inservice personnel to work in socially disadvantaged community schools has been initiated by the Graduate School of Education of Yeshiva University whose dean, Dr. Joshua Fishman, has said: "we ultimately hope that Project Beacon will accomplish more than prepare a few specialists for difficult schools—regardless of how well prepared these may be and how much good they may do; * * * some of our hopefulness that Project Beacon will help bring about a better understanding of teacher training is based upon the major involvement in Beacon of special education, guidance, educational psychology, therapeutic education and school psychology."[1] The Ford Foundation, in 1960, initiated in 10 large cities the "great cities school improvement program," which has been broadened to include a total approach (social, governmental, and educational) to the educational challenges of "the gray areas." And a quickening tempo in the response of American educators to the problems posed was heralded by the significant conference at Teachers College, Columbia University, in July 1962, in which educators from 24 cities discussed "Education in Depressed Urban Areas."[2]

The enormity of the educational problem is graphically underscored in some of the statistics. In 1945 there were 200,000 Puerto Ricans in New York City; the increase since then has been a third of a million per decade. From 1950 to 1960, the Negro population of the city rose from 750,000 to 1,100,000. In 1960, Negroes constituted 22 percent of all children in school, although they represented 14 percent of the population; in the same year, Puerto Rican children accounted for 16 percent of the school registry while they constituted 7 percent of the total population. Frank Reissman has stated—on the basis of in-migration and birth rates—that by 1970 one of every two children in large city schools will fall into the category of the culturally deprived. Prof. Miriam Goldberg, of Teachers College, has noted that despite many similarities, there are significant ways in which the present in-migrant populations differ from the great European migrations of the last century and early decades of the present.[3]

In the present groups, sociologists have discerned strong female dominance; unstable family patterns; the absence of a complete break with "the old country" (return is always possible); and of the Puerto Ricans, it has been plaintively noted: "He is at the same time American and foreign, white and colored, urban and colonial."[4] The present in-migrants are largely mobile and transient; reports of 100-percent student turnover exist, and 60–70 percent is not uncommon. A fifth grade in a typical lower class urban school presented this picture: All 42 students were Negroes or Puerto Ricans, of whom 15 percent received general welfare assistance; the majority was below grade—measured by standard tests—in reading or arithmetic, or both; 18 were overage (the average age for the grade is 10); eight were as old as 13; the majority of the overage students presented serious behavior problems; and this particular grade reflected the socioeconomic and racial composition and achievement level for the remainder of the classes in the school.[5] By the end of the 10th grade, two-thirds of pupils from the lower class school had dropped out of school or had failed and dropped behind a year. Low achievement was not due solely to attendance at a lower class school; other factors may have been lack of intellectual stimulus in the home, perhaps even inherited inferiority in intelligence; but sociologists and psychologists are in agreement in that a definite cause of low achievement is attendance at a lower class school. For American education, this fact and its impelling urgency impinges on the great educational and social issues of our time: de facto segregation in our cities; the problems of the language barrier student; the school dropouts, and the aggravation of the unemployment due to automation and new technology.

---

[1] Project Beacon, Graduate School of Education, Yeshiva University, January 1963, p. 4.

[2] See A. Harry Passow, editor, "Education in Depressed Areas," Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, New York, 1963. The NEA Journal for April 1963 addressed itself to the same problem. Other publications (a selected few) include: James Conant, "Slums and Suburbs" (1961); Patricia Sexton, "Education and Income" (1961); Kurt Back, "Slums, Projects and People" (1962); Frank Reissman, "The Culturally Deprived Child" (1962); Education Policies Commission, "Education and the Disadvantaged American" (1962); the NEA Educational Research Circular for February 1963 is entirely devoted to school programs for the disadvantaged.

[3] "Factors Affecting Educational Attainment in Depressed Urban Areas," in A. Harry Passow, Education in Depressed Areas, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963, pp. 68–99.

[4] Stuart A. Queen and David B. Carpenter, the American City, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1953.

[5] Robert J. Havighurst, "Urban Development and the Educational System," A. Harry Passow, editor, op. cit., pp. 29–30.

What are the American schools doing in the confrontation of these staggering problems? Many things, experimentally, hopefully, and in a sense historically addressing themselves again to problems in American society which only they can solve. The experimentation in American education has allowed a direct attack on the problems of the urban lower class school, and broad avenues have been carefully pursued: all have led to reform and to hope. And these main roads are easily discerned:

(1) Differentiation between preventive and remedial programs: A direct early attack (nursery, kindergarten, first grade) has been launched on cultural limitations; inarticulateness; short attention span; underdeveloped abstract-thinking abilities; lack of motivation for academic success. Programs in New York City; Dade County, Fla.; New Haven, Conn.; Quincy, Ill., have paid rich dividends.

(2) Building early readiness for school work: Provision has been made for experiences generally absent from homes and neighborhoods of disadvantaged students. Compare programs listed in No. 1.

(3) Speeding acculturation to urban life: Two questions pose themselves for answer. (a) How can the school contribute effectively to the urbanization of the new arrival?; (b) How can the school acculturate the lower class child—teach him middle-class skills so that he can live in (and earn a living in) a middle-class dominated city? Some answers have been provided in the Wilmington, Del., public schools project which has highlighted human relations; and in the 5-year Puerto Rican study (New York City, 1952–57), in many ways a blueprint for social and educational reform.

(4) Changing the school and neighborhood climate: The schools have attempted to upgrade the standards of areas; and in some instances have served as the catalyst for social urban renewal. Typical programs have included the Bannekar Group Schools in St. Louis under the leadership of Dr. Samuel Shepard which has turned its attention to the education of the community and its leaders; New Haven's opening opportunities program which has planned the rebuilding and relocation of 14 of the city's oldest schools; New York City's Commission on Integration which has experimented with the "open enrollment" plan wherein children in lower class schools are transported to middle-class schools.

(5) Curriculum modifications: The problems have demanded curriculum reappraisal in depth, and theoretic and administrative leaders have addressed themselves to a host of therapeutic experiments: (a) Preschool and early childhood programs (cognitive and verbal); (b) content modification; (c) curriculum enrichment (e.g., Higher Horizons in New York City); (d) school organization and classroom modifications (team teaching, ungraded primary); (e) diagnostic and remedial programs (New York City's early identification and prevention program); (f) additional and specialized staff (non-English-speaking coordinators; guidance and remedial specialists); (g) extension of the school day and the school year (New York City's mobilization for youth program); (h) parent education programs; (i) experimentation in new methods of instruction; (j) preservice and inservice teacher training (Project Beacon in New York City at Yeshiva University).

I feel confident that the American schools and their leaders are adequate to the herculean problems; and in many ways if the solutions appear not to be immediately at hand, still our continuing efforts affirm that these solutions are not impossible to achieve. Dean Joshua Fishman's observations are both hopeful and cautious: "There is no panacea to correct this condition any more than there is one to eliminate human misery and deprivation. Nor is it fair to pin the blame or responsibility on any one group in the vast world of education. Everyone shares in some way, be it the educational philosopher, practitioner, or researcher. All that can be asked of teacher training institutions is to take cognizance of the nature and needs of depressed area children so as to prepare teachers to face them skillfully."[6] The Association for Field Services in Teacher Education, whose contribution to American education is both dynamic and continuing, will, I am certain, heed Dean Fishman's words.

---

[6] Project Beacon, Graduate School of Education, Yeshiva University, January 1963, p. 30.

"Peace Where Men Live"—A Comment by George H. Shuster on Pope John's "Pacem in Terris"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, at a time when Pope John XXIII is gravely ill, our attention is drawn once again to his recent encyclical, "Pacem in Terris."

I wish to include in the RECORD a most thoughtful commentary on this encyclical by a distinguished citizen of my congressional district, Dr. George N. Shuster, assistant to the president of the University of Notre Dame and president emeritus of Hunter College.

Dr. Shuster is also a former U.S. representative on the Executive Board of UNESCO.

The article, "Peace Where Men Live," appears in the June 1, 1963, issue of Ave Maria, which is published at Notre Dame, Ind.

The article follows:

PEACE WHERE MEN LIVE

(By George N. Shuster)

Two things can be said about papal encyclicals. They are letters addressed to specified groups of people. They are supposed to be read and answered in terms of assent or dissent. Catholics are naturally expected to reply more promptly and with a deeper sense of personal commitment than are others, but in the case of "Pacem in Terris" the mailing list is as inclusive as all men of good will. To date some have responded whose good will is hardly as evident as could be desired. On the other hand, not a few sons and daughters of the church are frankly startled to find themselves being urged down a path they have not previously identified with the road to heaven.

Something more by way of prelude. This encyclical is not sophisticated in the sense that it reflects either the brilliant phrasing or the routine and drab vocabulary of contemporary writing about social and political problems. But accepted as a description of what the church sees when it looks about the world in which at present it must seek to educate and guide the faithful, it is remarkably subtle, comprehensive, worldly wise and outspoken. There is a refreshing lack of recipes for dealing with specific problems. Nothing is said about how to get the Communists out of Cuba, how to rewrite President Kennedy's medicare bill, or even how to engineer a nuclear stalemate. The Pope merely says to us all, this is the point of time in which we find ourselves. Of course, you and I wish it were different and we were somewhere else. I shall describe that "somewhere else" for you and hope and pray that all of us have enough sense to get there.

NOT A STUDY

The comment which follows has marked limitations. It is not a study of the encyclical. That would require among other things a careful analysis of the sources from which Pope John derives his thought as well as confrontation with other documents, not cited, which may at first sight seem very different in character from "Pacem in Terris." For example, one able columnist thinks it rash to dismiss this encyclical and "to ask instead for a repetition of Pius XI's anathemas." This is manifestly an oversimplification. Nor can my comment deal with specifically theological issues, for the simple reason that I am not a theologian. What is assumed here is a modest knowledge of the world situation and a willingness to discuss the part which religious-minded men and women might play in it. Since I have had some opportunity to deal with world problems, especially that of peace, within the framework of an international organization, I shall also take for granted that this experience will not seem either useless or bizarre.

We may begin by noting that Pope John is quite realistic about the radical changes which have taken place in human society. The times when the worker could be exploited are over. Woman is no longer content to be the beast of burden she once undoubtedly was. National independence has been achieved on a scale which quite staggers the imagination. The Pope writes "there will soon no longer exist a world divided into nations that rule others and nations that are subject to others." In short, the phenomena of mass evolution described in a spate of books from Ortega y Gasset to Paul Hoffman are accepted as the basis on which the Christian mission to mankind must henceforth rest. These phenomena have of course been observed by others, but the conclusions which the encyclical draws are, one must candidly aver, electrifying or shocking, depending on the reader.

Perhaps the most significant of these conclusions are those expressed in terms of the "rights" which the emancipated groups in question now consider self-evident and inalienable. Any list of rights drawn up at the dawn of the 20th century would have been very different and of course much briefer. Consider, for example, those which the Pope accepts as they are spelled out in the U.N. Bill of Rights and the UNESCO Constitution. It should be borne in mind that when he was papal nuncio in Paris he took an active and interested part in UNESCO discussions.

The encyclical reads, "every human being has the right to freedom in searching for truth and in expressing and communicating his opinions, and in pursuit of art, within the limits laid down by the moral order and the common good; and he has the right to be informed truthfully about public events." It is safe to say that never before in the history of the church could a sovereign pontiff have used language such as this, because the underlying concepts have been formulated only recently.

That these rights are interpreted as derivative from the natural law is of course due to a Catholic juridical tradition which the world generally does not accept. Hopes for a wider endorsement of the natural law concept in Germany, for example, which were entertained when the Second World War ended in 1945, have not been realized. It is therefore argued that it would have been more effective to suggest that the rights enumerated have been established by what is commonly called consensus. For my part, I rejoice in the fact that the framework of the natural law has been retained. It rivets the existential man of the present and the emerging future to Catholic tradition. Within that structure men of each era in turn have found safety and sustenance, despite everything which can be reported about Catholic failure, weakness and venality. Surely in our haste to change with a changing world we should not forget that concern for what Pope John terms "order" must abide.

Manifestly this bill of rights is the charter of Christian democracy, viewed not as a political movement but as first of all a confluence of Catholic public opinion the world round. Yet it is also more than that, being a set of dynamic principles the full realization of which will depend on the formation of a truly international order.

At this point one may of course wax skeptical and say that if Catholics, even in the United States where they seem readier than they are elsewhere to follow papal directives, have not yet caught up with Pope Leo XIII's "Rerum Novarum," what hope is there that "Pacem in Terris" will change the face of the earth?

HOSTILE MOOD GONE

I think that Father John Courtney Murray, writing in America, has made a highly pertinent observation at this point. From now on Catholics will no longer confront in a hostile mood the powerful liberal movement, which gained so much momentum during the 19th century, but can join forces with it not as a principle-teaching philosophy but as a form of social action which aided mightily in formulating the bill of rights which Pope John commends. Such a measure of cooperation would undoubtedly greatly strengthen the forces of freedom even as it might conceivably alter the outlook of the new nations. As the encyclical says, at the conclusion of a lengthy passage dealing with the question of authority, "It is thus clear that the doctrine which we have set forth is fully consonant with any truly democratic regime."

It is surely not an exaggeration to say that this doctrine tosses many older but still widely prevalent Catholic assumptions out the window. Indeed, at first sight it may seem that Pope Pius IX's "Syllabus of Errors," which caused such a stir in its time, is something we are now asked to forget. But I fancy that a closer look will make this seem doubtful, if not highly improbable.

"Pacem in Terris" restates the traditional view that the most suitable form of government cannot be determined once and for all. But then it goes on to advocate as desirable a form as much like that we have in the United States as one apple is to another. There must be freedom under the law, the law should be constitutional, and the constitution ought to recognize and preserve as distinct the three branches of government. But this form was not the product of the liberal movement. It took shape as men of the late 18th century reflected on the character of the common law known to England, and this common law comes as close to being natural law as anything in history ever has.

One would act most imprudently if one tried to read into the encyclical anything not fully spelled out in it. But I believe that what we are being told is that the Catholic tradition concerning the relationship between government and the rights of the person has always been valid, but that there have been times when others dealt with this relationship, in an existential sense, more fruitfully than did Catholics. We therefore must, for the sake of healing truth, frankly admit it.

Yet what has been cited up to this point pales into insignificance when compared with parts III and IV of the encyclical, which deal with relations between states and with the international community. Not a few among us will feel their blood curdling as they read on, and then proceed to take refuge in the undoubted fact that the reflections which Pope John has laid bare before all the world are not to be equated with dogma.

Ever since Pope Benedict XV's time, the Holy See has pleaded for the establishment of sound international relations and urged the mitigation of the nationalistic emotions which Carlton Hayes identified years ago as the enemy above all other enemies. Nevertheless the tenor of the argument in "Pacem in Terris" is very much more down to earth and suggests the intimate personal experience with international organizations which Pope John enjoyed prior to his ascension to the Holy See. None of his predecessors could have had any comparable opportunity to know the way of the world in this respect.

Let us see what he endorses and what he repudiates. Though he does not mention it by name, he endorses what the Genocide Convention sought to accomplish—a convention which strong groups in the United States disapproved of. He commends wholeheartedly the U.N. bill of rights. He expresses gratitude for what the world community has done to ease the plight of refugees and to insure respect for the rights of minorities. He knows about what the specialized agencies of the U.N. have undertaken and finds most of it good.

What does he deplore? On the one hand failure to have done once and for all with racial discrimination, and the tendency to link the giving of assistance to needy nations with political control. On the other hand, inability to halt the armament race. Here for the first time the encyclical deals with a specific problem, namely the cessation of tests, and this may perhaps be a minor blemish, not in the sense that what is advocated is wrong but that the ethical situation is not fully developed.

Here, then, is a dossier of opinions on basic issues which will be widely discussed. But much more significant, no doubt, is the unqualified expression of confidence in the United Nations. Adlai Stevenson might well include a copy of "Pacem in Terris" in every letter replying to critics. "It is Our earnest wish," says the Pope, "that the United Nations Organization—in its structure and in its means—may become ever more equal to the magnitude and nobility of its tasks, and that the day may come when every human being will find therein an effective safeguard for the rights which derive directly from his dignity as a person, and which are therefore universal, inviolable, and inalienable rights.

INTERNATIONAL ORDER

Perhaps (for who can venture to say what was in Pope John's mind?) the omission of any direct reference to communism or the Soviet Union can be understood best in the light of the major underlying purpose of the encyclical, which is to profess that the kind of world in which we live demands an international order the cornerstone of which must be a U.N. "equal to the magnitude and nobility of its tasks." If one believes that the only way to induce the Soviet Union to feel its way into a human society committed to truth, justice, charity, and freedom—which are the pillars on which the moral order rests—is to continue unflaggingly the kind of discussion between nations which now takes place within the U.N. and its subsidiary organizations, obviously one must admit that the conversation cannot begin with a denial that the Soviet Union has ceased to be the bloody and barbarous place it was under Stalin and which Pope Pius XI had to condemn even as he did nazism. And then one must be willing to concede that at present the discussion may conceivably lead us all a step nearer to a desired objective. Admittedly no one can prove that it actually will do so, but personally I believe, in the light of my own empirical experience, that this is a chance we must take because it is the only one we have.

Yes, in this respect the encyclical is of our time and also in advance of our time. Some will hold that it is much too far in advance, that Pope John has some notion that the "Holy See" can arbitrate between East and West, and that this notion is Catholic Christianity can always be accused utopian. But who must not agree that of utopianism? But for my part I should rather see the Pope be like St. Francis, who went to talk to the Sultan, rather than like somebody who preached the children's crusade.

On the other hand, "Pacem in Terris" is a stern challenge rather than anything remotely suggesting Pollyanna. The Pope says that very few people are prepared to undertake what he bids the faithful to do. "Admittedly," states the encyclical, "those who are endeavoring to restore the relations of social life according to the criteria mentioned above are not many." Indeed, in terms of the effort to create viable international institutions one can point to virtually no Catholics at all. To be active inside such an organization as UNESCO was as a matter of fact likely, until recently, to awaken suspicions that one was not in communion with the See of Rome. The present situation, therefore, is for a person like me well-nigh incredible. But then Pope John is well-nigh incredible.

It may be that this new encyclical, like "Mater et Magistra," is primarily directed to educators, among whom I include writers and publishers. At any rate, Pope John concludes with a lengthy exhortation to them. The peace which must be enkindled in men's minds before there can be any other kind is the peace of Christ. Yet this peace has nothing to do with nirvana. Its core is the love which embraces other men, all other men, in an ardent desire to make of this earth a fitting habitation for beings who should be and seldom are better than beasts.

Thank God for so radiant a plea from an old priest with a tiara on his head for giving young people a chance to find out that working for the good of humankind is the same thing as labor in behalf of the church and its Master.

Results of the Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, we submitted 10 questions to some 16,000 of our constituents who are on a monthly mailing list with the following results:

RESULTS OF THE OPINION POLL

Questions	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you favor a Domestic Peace Corps?	25.2	61.6	13.2
2. Do you favor a drastic cut in foreign aid?	79.2	15.3	5.5
3. Do you favor increase in social security tax to provide hospitalization for all?	21.3	69.8	8.9
4. Do you favor a tax cut without corresponding reduction in Federal appropriations?	12.1	82.0	5.9
5. Do you favor several hundred million dollars Federal aid for local rapid transit systems?	16.2	75.6	8.2
6. Do you favor an increase in Federal debt limit?	8.1	85.9	6.0
7. Should we trade with communist countries?	18.0	70.5	11.5
8. Should our payments to the United Nations be limited to our just share?	88.6	8.0	3.4
9. Are you satisfied with U.S. handling of Cuban affairs?	10.5	80.4	9.1
10. Should the State Department be investigated?	60.4	17.9	21.7

Also, the Advance-Star, of Burlingame, Calif., published the same questions requesting that their readers clip the poll and return it to the newspaper office. This was to be a poll separate and apart from our mailing list. This poll showed the following results as published in the Green Sheet of the Advance-Star:

Questions	Answer	Percent
1. Do you favor a Domestic Peace Corps?	No	50
2. Do you favor a drastic cut in foreign aid?	Yes	80
3. Do you favor increase in social security tax to provide hospitalization for all?	No	66
4. Do you favor a tax cut without corresponding reduction in Federal appropriations?	No	77
5. Do you favor several hundred million dollars' Federal aid for local rapid transit systems?	No	70
6. Do you favor an increase in Federal debt limit?	No	82
7. Should we trade with communist countries?	No	67
8. Should our payments to the United Nations be limited to our just share?	Yes	87
9. Are you satisfied with United States handling of Cuban affairs?	No	74
10 Should the State Department be investigated?	Yes	65

My Trip to Washington and What It Meant to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the permission granted me to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a few remarks, I am pleased to contain therein essays written by members of the eighth grade of the Frank Antonides Public School in West Long Branch, N.J., about their recent trip to Washington. It has been my privilege to offer prizes for such essays to young students who come to my office in an effort to rouse the young people's interest in their Government, and I am most gratified with the results. The winners are determined by their teachers in the school, and the first prize winner in this contest is Priscilla Wright, the second prize winner is Jo Ann Horn, and the third prize winner is Patricia Little. The essays they wrote follow:

MY TRIP TO WASHINGTON AND WHAT IT MEANT TO ME

(By Priscilla Wright)

From the day I was born, I had lived in the freest nation in the world, America. I had studied and learned of how our Government protects the rights of the individual. When I visited Washington, D.C., the things I had learned ceased being mere words, printed black on white in textbooks, and became real, alive, and meaningful. Before me was the birth and growth of a nation.

In order for America to be, it was necessary for many men to devote their lives to the cause of freedom, and for some to lose their lives fighting for this cause. In Washington and its surounding area, these heroes are honored with dignity and beauty. The memorials there range from the tall, stark Washington Monument, to a statue honoring the U.S. Marines who fought and died in World War II. The Lincoln Memorial left the most lasting impression on me. Standing before a giant among men, a feeling of deep humility overcame me that I shall not soon forget.

Washington is not only a city of history and heroes, it is also the very crux of present-day American Government. It houses all three main branches of our Government, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial, also the FBI, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and the National Archives. To me, the most fascinating of these Government buildings was the Capitol Building, for it is here that the Members of Congress meet to discuss and pass the laws of our Nation. Although time allowed me to see little of the sessions in the Senate and the House of Representatives, I was very grateful to have seen them at all. Only in a democracy are the people allowed such a closeup look at their Government.

Washington, D.C., being the Capital of the United States of America, is also the capital of democracy throughout the world. It is an important and beautiful city, visited by thousands of Americans each year. I was proud and happy to be one of them.

MY TRIP TO WASHINGTON AND WHAT IT MEANT TO ME

(By Jo Ann Horn)

As our bus entered Washington, D.C., the Capital of our United States, I felt a feeling of warmth, security, and devotion to my country. For here in this city lies the heart and the spirit of the freedom-loving people of the world.

The stone and cement monuments were now not just manmade buildings but were alive with American strength and vision. When I saw the Washington Monument, I pictured George Washington leading his men into battle and emerging victorious. The Jefferson Memorial brought to mind our third President writing the famous and everlasting Declaration of Independence which contributed to the democratic ideals that made this country great. The sight of the Lincoln Memorial envisioned for me the deep sorrow that Lincoln shared at the great loss of life in the Civil War. Seeing these three memorials, I realized how the efforts and inspirations of these men made this country the great democracy it is today.

This trip contributed immeasurably to my concept of democracy—actually demonstrating democracy or freedom in action. The idea that we were so near places of historic significance and decisionmaking areas made us feel that we were a real part of this democratic process.

Understanding can truly flourish when we see the real object, not a replica or duplication. Having studied about these places previously, and now seeing them, afforded the opportunity to observe minute details and analyze new information. Buildings such as the Capitol, various memorials and the like, created a feeling of awe and great sensitivity.

A lasting imprint of our visit will surely result in our minds and will definitely leave a strong record as a source of future reference in our thinking. These experiences can influence all American citizens to similar attitudes. The idea of being an American citizen is more deeply reflected in our National Capital.

MY TRIP TO WASHINGTON AND WHAT IT MEANT TO ME

(By Patricia Little)

Washington, our Capital City, is the symbol of freedom both here and abroad. Here in the many office buildings is done the necessary work to run our country and keep it strong. Here, too, foreign ambassadors meet to confer with our heads of state to try to solve some of the many problems in the world.

In our great Capitol Building our Senators and Representatives meet to make the many laws to keep us a free nation. In the Capitol visitors can see their representatives at work. All the Federal laws are made here and then they go to the White House to await the President's signature.

A trip to Washington is a real chance to visit, see, and learn all about our Government. It gives all of us an opportunity to see how laws are made, carried out, and interpreted. The different offices, headquarters, and departments give us a brief idea of what is being done throughout the United States.

The many statues and paintings in the rotunda, Statuary Hall, and throughout the building are a sample of the great esteem, honor, and respect that we, as Americans, give to fellow countrymen. The statues in Statuary Hall show each State's pride in a man or a woman famous in that State's history. Our own State's statues is that of Richard Stockton, a signer of the Declaration of Independence.

The museums of art and science throughout the city help preserve our knowledge in many fields. The Smithsonian Institution, for instance, has the space capsule used by John Glenn, and as a contrast has Lindberg's Spirit of St. Louis. This shows how much can be done in less than four decades. In the different branches you may see many wonders of man and nature, such as the Hope Diamond and raw materials.

I enjoyed Washington because it showed me the respect which all Americans have given their fellow countrymen, heroes, and famous foreigners who helped our country get started.

With the racial problems in the South, we should remember the man who freed the slaves in his belief that all men are equal.

The Lincoln Memorial, though simple in design, is fitting for this great man. On the walls are inscribed the ideals of total equality. Here, there is a feeling of solemnity and deep respect that is incomparable to any place in Washington or throughout the country.

This trip has shown me the responsibility of voting and getting good and capable men to represent us. When we are of voting age, we must remember this privileged duty and for the better qualified man the vote should be cast. Voting should not be on the candidate's popularity but on what he will do for the country and the people.

Washington, D.C., represents the glorious history of the past, the awareness of the present, and the hope for peace and security for the future of the democratic way of life.

Khrushchev's Cuban Toe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, my report to the people of the Second District of Washington State for the month of May concerns Cuba. This subject is perhaps more in the minds of the people I represent than any other issue outside Government spending. I base this observation on the many answers I have received from my annual questionnaire.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include my newsletter, "Khrushchev's Cuban Toe," in the RECORD:

KHRUSHCHEV'S CUBAN TOE

So much has been written, spoken, and debated about Cuba and the presence of Russian troops on that island in the last year that I thought my voice would only add to the confusion that seems to exist. Not that I haven't made my views known as far back as the summer of 1960 when I urged the Republican leadership to take military action to protect American lives and property, and last fall when I congratulated the President for taking positive action, action which I think all Americans applauded—and wondered why it had taken so long.

Since then, I have read many reports and I have talked to exiled Cubans, to people who were involved in the Bay of Pigs fiasco and heads of Latin-American countries. From these studies I have come to conclusions which, as your Representative, I think I should communicate to you.

1. The Monroe Doctrine, as we have known it for almost 200 years, is dead in the eyes of the world. We have failed through our inaction to keep it alive.

2. The report of the Stennis (Senator from Mississippi) committee confirms the belief of almost all Members of Congress that (a) there are still a substantial number of Russian troops in Cuba (from a minimum of 14,000 to as high as 60,000); (b) that Cuba is no longer run by Cubans, but by Russians; (c) that Cuba is the center of the Communist attempt at subversion and intrigue in the Western Hemisphere; (d) the fact that an acknowledged foreign power (Communist Russia and China) has established a base of operations in the Western Hemisphere despite our actions is a tremendous political disadvantage to us in all our dealings with the Soviets. Incidentally, this report was signed unanimously by Democrats and Republicans.

In September of 1960, President Kennedy said, "If communism should obtain a permanent foothold in Latin America * * * then the balance of power would move against us and peace would be even more insecure."

Tell me, are we helping or hinder establishment of a permanent Communist foothold? Why do we take a position of "let the dust settle" rather than take affirmative action?

Why don't we support those who want to attack the Communist government? We do it in Vietnam. We do it in Nationalist China. We did it in Korea, and we did it in Lebanon. Are we afraid to step on Khrushchev's Cuban toe?

Why did we dismantle our NATO weapons in Turkey and Italy? Was there a "deal"?

In my belief it is past the time for us to not only assert our views, but also to act. If we had the courage of our Central American friends we would support all activities taken to bring about the overthrow of Castro and communism. Don't ever forget we are the strongest Nation in the world. We are the leaders of the free world, or are we?

What do you think?

Sincerely yours,
Congressman JACK WESTLAND.

Government Lotteries of Ethiopia, Ghana, Morocco, and Nigeria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 weeks, I have brought to the attention of this House, several foreign countries which utilize government-run lotteries as a revenue-raising device. Today, I would like to take the Members of this House to Africa, and discuss the lotteries conducted in Ethiopia, in Ghana, in Morocco, and in Nigeria. These are 4 of 77 foreign countries that tie the gambling urge of their people together with the governments' need for additional revenue.

Ethiopia started its national lottery last year. Because of the newness of the project, inadequate distributions, and advertising methods, the gross receipts did not reach the anticipated level. However, the total gross annual receipts for 1962 were $800,000. The net income to the Government came to $138,000 which was used for support of charitable projects and the general treasury.

Ghana, a poor country, first established a lottery in 1958 as a means of raising badly needed revenues. The gross annual receipts for 1962 came to $756,000. The total annual net income to the Government was $311,000 which was applied to its general revenue.

Morocco does not operate its own lottery but is the recipient of benefits derived from the operation of a private lottery and the French national lottery both of which function there. The total gross annual receipts from the sale of lottery tickets in 1962 came to about $2 million. The Moroccan Government collected about 25 percent of the value of total lottery sales which came to one-half million dollars. These funds are earmarked for charitable purposes.

Nigeria has a premium bond lottery which was started last December 1962. This type of lottery is patterned after the British premium bond lottery and India's prize bond program. Nigeria realizes that a recognition of the normal gambling urge of its people can be a great help in handling the nation's finances. The proceeds of the sales of the bonds are intended to help finance Nigeria's economic development program.

Mr. Speaker, if we showed similar courage and wisdom in the United States and capitalized on our own people's gambling thirst we could raise over $10 billion a year which could be used to cut our heavy taxes and reduce our gigantic national debt. New Hampshire set the example, how about following it?

The Carney Hospital of Boston: 100th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on June 9, 1963, 100 years of progress in patient care will be celebrated by Carney Hospital in Boston, Mass.

Crumbling records from the hospital's archives show that on the morning of June 9, 1863, precisely a century ago, the first patient, a housemaid named Ann Mallon, was admitted to Boston's newest but most modest hospital, a converted framehouse equipped with 40 brass beds. Carney was the first Catholic hospital in New England.

Today, after serving over 300,000 patients and providing close to 3,500,000 treatments for outpatients and accident patients, Carney is a 318-bed general hospital, housed in a complex of new buildings in Dorchester, Mass.

The hospital's founder, Andrew Carney, came to America from Ireland in 1794 at the age of 22 and prospered as a tailor and merchant.

Following the Irish famines of the early 19th century when a great many impoverished Catholic immigrants arrived in Boston, creating a need for good medical care, Carney decided to build a Catholic hospital.

To help establish the hospital he sought the assistance of Sister Ann Alexis of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul who had been working in Boston since 1832.

Early in 1863, Mr. Carney purchased for $13,500 the J. Hall Howe estate on the southwestern slope of Dorchester Heights in South Boston close to the entrenchments erected by George Washington to compel the evacuation of the British during the Revolutionary War. Two years after the hospital opened, it was able to care for 175 wounded soldiers returning from the Civil War.

Before his death in 1864, Andrew Carney donated a total of $75,000 to his hospital. But because these funds were used for capital expenses, the task of maintaining the hospital was assumed by the Sisters of Charity. The history of the hospital has been filled with financial crises. During the early years the Sisters were often forced to beg in the streets of Boston to keep the hospital going.

In spite of the hospital's chronically poor financial position, high standards of patient care have always been maintained and there have been instances of true greatness in medicine and surgery.

It was at the hospital in 1882 that Dr. John Homans performed his early ovariectomies and thus opened up the field of abdominal surgery and gave the hospital and himself an international reputation.

Dr. Henry I. Bowditch was the pioneer of New England in treatment of diseases of the thorax and in pleurisy with effusion. It was Dr. Bowditch who introduced the practice of withdrawing the fluid from the thoracic cavity by the process of aspiration or thoracentesis.

Rubber gloves were used in the operating room at Carney for the first time in Boston by Dr. Frederick W. Johnson. For his eccentricity, Dr. Johnson was dubbed by his contemporaries as the "Dude from Back Bay."

The first cervical cesarean operation in New England was performed by Dr. Louis Phaneuf. Up to that time it was almost always fatal for a woman to have two or more cesarean sections.

Faithful to the Andrew Carney stipulation that the hospital, "be used by the Sisters of Charity where the sick without distinction of creed, color or nation shall be received and cared for," Carney has traditionally provided medical care for anyone who needed it, regardless of his race, religion or financial situation, and has responded to every demand of epidemic, war and disaster.

In 1898, casualties from the Spanish-American War arrived in Boston aboard the steamer *Lewiston* and were taken to Carney for treatment. Because the hospital was crowded at the time, tents were pitched on the hospital grounds and some of the Sisters gave up their own rooms to make provisions for the wounded soldiers and sailors.

In 1918, an influenza epidemic struck the city and Carney cared for over 600 victims. Later that year, the whole hospital was offered to the War Department for the care of wounded servicemen returning from World War I.

At the conclusion of the Second World War, the hospital was old and the facilities outmoded. The buildings were held together by the sheer determination of the Sisters of Charity and the hospital's inventive maintenance men. After an intensive investigation, it was decided to rebuild rather than renovate.

His Eminence, Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston, sounded the cry, "Save the Carney Hospital," and Bostonians of every race and creed responded to his appeal.

The new hospital became a reality in November of 1953. In its magnificent new buildings, the hospital has been able to sharply increase its services to the sick. Last year the hospital cared for over 12,000 inpatients and gave 33,000 treatments to outpatients and accident patients.

Since the new hospital was built, two wings have been added. The first wing constructed in 1956 and named for Richard Cardinal Cushing, contains quarters for house doctors and an auditorium. The second wing, housing the hospital's research program was built 2 years ago.

Carney is a teaching hospital of Tufts University Medical School, operates its own schools of anesthesia and medical technology and is a sponsoring hospital of the Catherine Laboure School of Nursing.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-three marks the 100th anniversary of the founding of the original Carney and the 10th anniversary of the new hospital.

The history—the trials and financial difficulties of Carney Hospital during the past 100 years—is a remarkable story in itself, as well as the story of the various Sister administrators, and other Sisters assigned to this hospital.

As was well said on the occasion of its golden anniversary on June 9, 1913, that "one can realize the enormity of this undertaking—with no endowment—and the struggle which it entailed."

It was due to the dedicated Sisters of Charity, who have served Carney Hospital during its first 100 years, that this hospital has been able to survive, prosper, and grow; and loyally supporting these good Sisters were countless of generous friends.

However, without the order of the Sisters of Charity and those sisters who served, Carney Hospital could not have survived.

As was well said again, 50 years ago, ters of Charity and those Sisters who worthy of repeating now, "Had the motive of this work been one of gain or otherwise, merely human failure would, without doubt, have been the outcome; but, because of devotion to the cause of suffering humanity was the underlying principle, it claimed the cooperation of generous-hearted people, and the blessing of God rested upon the hospital," and I might well include the Sisters of today and yesterday.

With the blessing of God, Carney Hospital and the Sisters of Charity can look forward with faith and confidence in serving God, mankind, country, and suffering humanity, for the next 100 years of the existence of Carney Hospital.

National Service Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask permission that a resolution drafted by the Hood College Cooperative Association and the town hall executive board urging the passage of legislation leading to the establishment of a National Service Corps by the 88th Congress, be printed in the Record:

Whereas numerous and complex social problems currently exist within the United States of America; and

Whereas serious shortages of both trained personnel and financial resources with which to meet and help diminish these problems, also still exist; and

Whereas we believe that the proposed National Service Corps now before the 88th Congress, would, if instituted, definitely help to alleviate many of these existing problems; and

Whereas we further believe that this Corps would contribute greatly toward the improvement of our country in that it would assist our citizens in areas of great need: be it therefore,

Resolved, That the executive board of the Town Hall Association of Hood College, the executive board of the Cooperative Government Association of Hood College (and the student body of this same college), urge the passage of legislation leading to the establishment of a National Service Corps by the 88th Congress of the United States.

Henry Ford II Expresses the Need for a Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to insert in the Record the remarks of Mr. Henry Ford II, chairman of the board of the Ford Motor Co., and cochairman of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963, to his stockholders regarding the necessity for tax cut, and the manner in which he thinks taxes should be cut.

The remarks follow:

Mr. Ford's Remarks to Stockholders—May 23, 1963

In the course of this review, you will hear in some detail the major economic factors affecting the automobile industry and Ford Motor Co.

First, I think it is no secret that the economy is strong generally and our industry is enjoying record sales for this time of the year, running neck and neck with 1955. Ford Motor Co. is sharing in this well-being, and is concentrating now on doing the things that will assure its increased participation in tomorrow's markets.

Despite the general prosperity we are enjoying, the economy continues to reveal certain weaknesses. There has been a persistent slack during the past 5 years in employment, in business investment and in business profits. At the same time, our international balance-of-payments position has been weak, posing a threat to the international value of the dollar. This combination of internal and international problems has created a dilemma for government policy, since many actions that might advance our domestic goals could harm our international economic interests.

In seeking some acceptable solution to this economic dilemma, the administration has made some gestures toward—but not really committed itself to—the one course that I believe has a good chance of success: taking full advantage of the potential for growth in the private economy.

The Government can best promote economic growth by giving the widest play possible to the forces of free market competition and by reducing the present high tax rates.

A broad tax cut will stimulate consumer spending, and thereby help to increase employment and put idle plant capacity to work. But a more lasting effect of a tax cut will be to increase the growth rate of the economy, once it is operating at full potential.

The real measure of economic growth is the rate at which living standards rise. We raise living standards faster only by making our working time and the resources we use more productive. To do this calls for more investment, more new products, better production methods and greater willingness to take business risks. We must, in other words, release the energies of our economy from the drag of high taxes.

The Government has proposed a tax cut, but it has obscured the basic purpose of this badly needed reduction and endangered its passage by combining with it so-called reform proposals that are highly controversial.

Cutting tax rates means accepting a larger deficit for a time. But if we do not control Government expenditures, we will not long be able to maintain tax rates low enough to stimulate growth. In a government, as in a private company, there is only one effective way to control expenditures: you have to set an absolute dollar limit.

It is my opinion, therefore, that there should be a combined effort by the administration and the Congress to limit fiscal 1964 budget expenditures so that they do not exceed the fiscal 1963 level, estimated at $94.3 billion. Some will argue that this limitation is too severe; others will say that it is not severe enough. It seems to me, however, to be both a reasonable and necessary measure to assure faster economic growth with fiscal responsibility. Expenditures have been rising rapidly in recent years. Fiscal 1963 expenditures, as presently estimated, will be $6.5 billion higher than in the previous year.

In controlling expenditures, the executive branch has a most direct responsibility to increase efficiency and reduce waste in government; it has a second, and more important responsibility—to refuse to sponsor legislation that may win votes but is not worth what it costs. The legislative branch also has a double responsibility to resist programs of unwarranted expenditure and to shun the temptations of pork-barrel spending.

These, of course, are general statements. To be more specific, it is my opinion that none of the items that make up the Federal budget, except for interest payments, is exempt from scrutiny.

In short, the way to get more growth is to reduce government actions that interfere with growth. We need lower tax rates that discriminate less against buying, investing and earning; less intervention in wage-price matters; fewer government spending programs designed to benefit local community and political interests; more reliance on open opportunity to compete. Given these conditions for vigorous, market-oriented growth, I have no doubt that the economy and the auto industry will enjoy good health for many years to come.

Look Homeward, America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, one of the men who founded the Tennessee Valley Authority—Mr. David E. Lilienthal—spoke recently at the 30th anniversary of the TVA at ceremonies in Decatur, Ala. There is no greater authority on the history of this fine institution than he. His remarks on that occasion are worthy of study by Members and I include them in the Appendix to share with my colleagues a historic speech which uses the experiences of the past to point to a finer future for our Nation:

LOOK HOMEWARD, AMERICA

(By David E. Lilienthal [1])

This valley is pausing for a moment to mark the 30th anniversary of the establishment of a new kind of American experiment in getting things done, the Tennessee Valley Authority.

For the first half of that 30-year span, I was in the middle of the headaches and the satisfactions and the controversies and the issues and decisions. So on this anniversary there is naturally a temptation to look backward, to reminisce and be nostalgic; but it is a temptation easily resisted because the Tennessee Valley and the TVA have had a habit, from the beginning, of looking forward, not backward. Why? Because it was, and it still is, a pioneering job. Looking ahead, not sitting back and glorying in the past, continues to be the prime characteristic of this valley and of the TVA.

So in joining with you in celebrating this anniversary, I should like to take a look at the present and at the future. Not that the past is irrelevant, for the past—as the saying goes—is truly prologue to the future. The past gives us some measure of where we are today and what the future can be.

My theme tonight can be introduced by asking this question:

What is it that the United States and indeed the world has learned from this valley, from this now world famous, practical achievement in the valley of the Tennessee? I think what we all have learned in this valley throws light upon the future not only of the Tennessee Valley but of our whole country, at a crucial point in our Nation's life.

What I think the TVA helps American to see more clearly is summarized in the topic I have chosen for these remarks: "Look Homeward, America."

In brief, I think the time has come for Americans to look to America—to give top priority in resources, both human and physical, in emotional energy, in heart and mind and hand to the further development of our own land, of these United States of America, as you have given top priority to the development of your valley.

All about us is evidence that with America's increasing preoccupation with the well-being of other parts of the globe, with our deep concern about our position, our prestige, our responsibilities abroad, we have, in characteristic American fashion, moved from the unworkable extreme of isolation to an equally, but even more dangerous, extreme.

We are in danger of putting our best efforts into being a kind of universal mother's helper for the troubles of the world, acting too much as if we were qualified to be Mr. know-it-all and Miss fix-it to the whole world.

American does have responsibility of leadership in the world, and shoulders that responsibility nobly. In a masterful and mature way under President Kennedy, I think, and his predecessors, Presidents Eisenhower, Truman, and Roosevelt, America has demonstrated our concern for the whole world, with full support of the American people. America has become indeed the trustee of some great basic principles of freedom.

But the time has come to get this into perspective. This world outlook can be carried to an extreme that is self-defeating. It is not only charity that begins at home; strength also begins at home, and humaneness as well.

I say to you in the utmost seriousness as one who once was responsible for our nuclear weapons that the security, not alone of the United States, but of the world depends first and foremost upon how well we demonstrate to other nations that the physical, cultural and spiritual foundations of this Republic have been strengthened, mellowed, developed. The future of people everywhere depends upon how well we in America show that the concept of a civilized people in one great area of the world, the United States of America, has not been diluted or eroded by a too great preoccupation with other parts of the world.

World leadership—yes. But what I say to you is that we, the American people, need to reexamine the way by which we seek to discharge our responsibilities of world leadership.

The record of participation by this country in world affairs—in the military area, in diplomacy, in education, in human concern for other people, in music and in the arts, in every area, since the end of World War II is a matchless one in the history of humanism, of idealism and of hard practical sense about the world.

But the effect of this trend of concern for others outside America, if it is continued, may cause us, indeed it already has, to overlook one basic proposition. That proposition needs to sink into our souls. It is this: The hopes of the world for the protection and the continuation of human culture, in short, of a civilized world, will not be determined by what happens in India or China or Russia or Africa, not indeed in Western Europe. It will be determined by what happens in our own country. The demonstration of what it means to be free and productive and tolerant of each other, of what equality of opportunity for every human being can mean, will take place here in America if it takes place at all.

The plea I make that America now look homeward is an appeal that we reexamine the trend of our worldwide commitments, not, I emphasize, not because this sense of obligation to the rest of the world is anything but desirable for itself. It is for another reason.

That reason is that there are to me deeply disturbing tendencies that in our exuberance at finding ourselves a world leader, we are beginning to neglect the needs of our own country. And by needs I do not mean we are spending too much money in our world leadership activities.

---

[1] Mr. Lilienthal was appointed by President Roosevelt in May 1933 as one of the founding directors of TVA, serving as a member and later as Chairman of the TVA Board, until his appointment in 1946 as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

These things we can afford as a purely fiscal matter. No, we are overspending our emotional energy on binges about Russia, India, Cuba, the moon—everything except what happens here where we live.

We are beginning a fatal practice of escaping from the challenges and opportunities and demands that are close at hand. The preoccupation of much of our intellectual leadership, of scientists, of military men, of public figures, is lured to other parts of the world or the universe because the problems close at home do not have quite the pull of the new and unfamiliar a long way away. Our President is able to arouse many by appeals to reach the moon before the Russians. But when he pleads for causes here at home, who listens?

Why have I chosen this TVA celebration in the highly vital and reinvigorated community of Decatur, Ala., in the Tennessee Valley to make this appeal to my fellow countrymen for a reexamination of what we are neglecting in our own country? Because your community's history and TVA's history, and its present activities are a reminder of the special genius of the American people. That special genius I would define as that rare capacity to get things done.

Other people have a genius for abstractions, for theories and ideologies and dogmas. To see the leaders of the vast Soviet Union arguing with their painters and poets about whether their paintings are disloyal to the tenets of Lenin, or to see the leaders of the world's most populous nation, China, ferociously splitting ideological hairs among themselves and with the Soviet Union—these are impulses that we do not have. The fact that the people of China are starving, the fact that the people of the Soviet Union, after 45 years of their revolution, still have scandalously inadequate housing for their people, that the raising of food and the organization of production is in what they themselves describe as a mess shows only how a people with a great talent for abstract argument, such as the Russians and the Chinese and the Indians, have the edge on us in the field of theorizing. But in this country we yield first place to others in that kind of thinking. We learn by doing.

When TVA was established in 1933, the people of this region knew there was a great deal to be done. A river was running unused, and in flood causing great damage. Many of the hillsides were eroding. A great many people were ill of malaria. The region needed more industry and electrical power and better transportation to serve its population. Debates there were about this and that, of course, but in a decade the valley was already largely transformed by the people themselves and their institutions, including the TVA, exercising this peculiar American genius for getting something done. By 1963 the physical side of this transformation of rivers, electricity, land, industry, has gone so far that many of you younger people probably think that this is the way the valley always looked. Many of us who are no longer young people prefer to forget what it once was because we are so filled with the next steps in the further and unceasing development of this region.

And what a vast task there is ahead in the Tennessee Valley.

This demonstration in one valley, of the American genius for doing has not been lost on the rest of the world.

The Russians take great pride in their achievements of shooting people into outer space. Some Americans seem to feel that beating the Russians in the space race to the Moon, or what have you, is what will most impress people in the rest of the world of Russian superiority if they accomplish it first, or of our own superiority, if we do. Frankly, I think this is questionable as a basic doctrine. Of course it is impressive and important—such spectacular achievements in outer space.

But I daresay that to the hungry and poorly housed billions of people in the world, the achievements of the United States in food production alone are more impressive because they are closer to the problem of getting something to eat three times a day. This half the people of the world don't manage to do.

The reason I think the Tennessee Valley has become a kind of mecca for visitors from all over the world is that what you have done here represents the kind of achievement that is most meaningful in the daily lives of the people of these countries. And remember that many of these countries are old, and their civilizations are old compared to the youth of the United States. And yet in all those centuries, they have not solved, nor do they appear to be on the way to solving in this century, the basic problem of getting things done whereby people can live without hunger, with less disease, in halfway decent shelters, and in peace among themselves.

Goodness knows we in America have many unsolved problems of our own. We are behind the goals we have set for ourselves, the potentials of our own development, here in this valley, and throughout the cities, towns, and countryside. In many ways we too are still an underdeveloped country, measured by our potentials and our goals. We, too, are behind in many ways. Which brings to my mind an episode during my days with the TVA.

The war was on; the Russians were our Allies. The Germans had destroyed some of Russia's power supply. The Lend Lease Administration in Washington asked the TVA Board if we could fulfill a request of the Russian Economic Mission that TVA's engineers design a hydroelectric dam the Russians wished to build behind the Urals. Yes, we said we would; they should send along the basic information and we would prepare a dam design. One day George Rich, then TVA's chief design engineer, was called on by a member of the Russian Economic Mission; let's say his name was Ivanovich. Mr. Ivanovich declined Mr. Rich's invitation to have a seat. "No, Mr. Rich, I do not wish to have a seat. I have come to complain. I have come to complain that you of TVA are behind." Mr. Ivanovich went on: "In the protocol between the Soviet Economic Mission and the Lend Lease Administration it is agreed that TVA will complete the design for our dam by October 1. Today is October 2, and the design is not yet ready. So you are behind." Mr. Rich, holding his temper said to Mr. Ivanovich. "Now look here. In the protocol agreement it is plainly provided that you would supply our engineers with the basic data for the design by January 1st. As you know, we didn't receive that data until May 1. So you are behind." Mr. Ivanovich drew himself up and said; "Mr. Rich, I am not here to speak about my behind; I came to complain about your behind."

We are behind in America in many of the areas of our life, judged by our own standards. And so I say: Look homeward America. Here in the United States our true strength lies. If we are diverted, and neglect our basic duty to develop to the fullest our own human and natural resources, we let down not only ourselves but the rest of the world.

It is unnecessary even to catalog the things that need doing in the United States in the next decade or two or three to develop and maintain our integrity of purpose, the distinctive culture which has evolved on these shores, and our continued leadership of the peoples of the world.

I think that all of us would put the education of our young people and the continued education of adults high on this list of things not to be neglected because of a preoccupation with things far away, whether it is on the moon or in India. Here in our own country, one that is founded on the idea of education, our teachers are too poorly trained, poorly paid, our schools and colleges and universities are too crowded, the curriculum and system of education in schools and colleges and universities quite out of phase with the utterly new problems young people must face. How do we dare take such a broad responsibility for education the world over when its needs here are so urgent and unfulfilled? Here alone—in education—is a venture in the development of our country that could occupy the most intensive interest and the talents of people in every community and State.

The role of science and technology is another area that provides a challenge right here at home. Science and technology have developed so fast since the end of the war that we really have not thought hard and critically about what is its proper function in our society. To hear some scientists and engineers talk, one would think that the problem is simply one of turning out—as if they were widgets in a factory—more and more scientists and engineers. If the future of our society and the well-being of our people will depend so largely upon our scientists and engineers, surely we can come up with a policy better than just multiplying the number of scientists and engineers or multiplying the amount of money we spend on laboratories.

Then there is another field, that of growing urbanization. In the past 10 years or so, millions of people have left the small towns and farming areas of America to become part of cities or their immediate satellites. This has had profound consequences on every institution, both in the country from which people have migrated, and in the cities and in the access to cities. The comfort of living, the problems of recreation and of taxation, of housing, of water supply, of the purity of the air we breathe—can there be more challenging issue than this in Pakistan or Uganda, granting, as I do, that we are also deeply and sincerely concerned about those and all the other countries who are struggling with the problems of development?

Then there are whole regions of America the potentials of which are neglected. National attention to these, in a pioneering spirit, could greatly strengthen the whole of the United States. Here again the anology of the valley of the Tennessee comes to mind. Making the Tennessee Valley better for the people who live here has, as everyone now recognizes, strengthened the whole of the United States. And so it would be if we devoted ourselves to the greatest possible development of the great Rocky Mountain area, or the Appalachian region or our great new State of Alaska—areas whose potentials have barely been touched, compared with their possibilities.

One could catalog many other great opportunities that lie ahead.

But whether things happen in these and other aspects of American life in the next decade or two depends upon a basic change in outlook. It depends upon a conservation and concentration of emotional energies and interest as well as resources upon the people of the United States as our first priority. It depends upon a conviction that the problems and opportunities in the regions of Denver and Newark and Anchorage and Salt Lake City—for examples—have priority over the problems of any other part of the world. It depends upon a conviction that the defense of the free world and the defense of the concepts of freedom and of culture that are deep in our hearts must be made first of all within our own country.

A passion for developing to its fullest this underdeveloped country of ours in every way—human, physical, cultural, spiritual—

is more rewarding, more exciting, more challenging, more important to the destiny of all men everywhere, than anything we shall find in space or in the remote and exotic parts of the world.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discusison which took place on the subject of the captive nations—Congressional Record, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the Record:

Staten Island Patriotic Council
Against Communism,
Staten Island, N.Y., May 4, 1963.

The Honorable Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Smith: The Staten Island Patriotic Council Against Communist respectfully requests you to take quick action on House Resolution 14 calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

The members of the council voted to support House Resolution 14 at their meeting of May 2, 1963, realizing that the aggressive world-domination of the international Communist conspiracy are holding in virtual slavery whole nations of peoples.

Our "sweet land of liberty" can no longer ignore the oppression to which the Soviet Union has subjected peoples of other lands.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. Lauretta Galasso,
Secretary.

Ukrainian Congress Committee
of America, Inc.,
Denver, Colo., April 28, 1963.

The Honorable Edgar J. Chenoweth,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Chenoweth: Congressman Daniel J. Flood submitted a resolution to the House Rules Committee calling for creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives, known as House Resolution 14.

The establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations is an urgent need in the present cold war of communism against the free world. Such an official parliamentary body will be capable of collecting true information concerning the countries and nations forcefully incorporated into the Communist bloc.

The non-Russian nations and their struggle for independence presents the perpetual difficulties for the Kremlin rulers. The problem of the captive nations is in fact the weakest spot of Communist Russian imperialism. It is in the best interest of the United States to know all facts concerning this weak spot of our mutual enemy. Creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations will be of vital importance to our government in carrying its foreign policy.

We sincerely believe, sir, that you fully understand the urgent need for creation of such a Special Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives, and therefore we ask you: to introduce the similar resolution calling for the creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House, or to write a letter to Congressman Howard W. Smith, chairman of the House Rules Committee, expressing your full support for the Flood resolution, House Resolution 14. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

Ross Kuzmych,
President.

College Point, N.Y.,
May 2, 1963.

Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Smith: I am fully convinced for the need of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. So, therefore, may I urge that quick action be taken on House Resolution 14 passage.

Sincerely,

Margaret M. Weltz.

Ukrainian Congress Committee
of America, Inc.,
West Roxbury, Mass., May 7, 1963.

The Honorable Harold D. Donohue,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Donohue: We can start to exploit the weaknesses in the Communist colonial empire by developing an effective policy toward the captive nations.

Last January, Congressmen Flood and Derwinski introduced House Resolutions 14 and 15 respectively which would implement the Captive Nations Week resolutions of 1959 and establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations. This committee would conduct inquiries into, study, and prepare concrete recommendations for an effective U.S. policy toward the captive nations. Many other Congressmen introduced similar resolutions.

On behalf of the Boston Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee, I am asking you—

1. To introduce a resolution of your own to establish a Committee on Captive Nations;
2. To support House Resolution 14 introduced by Congressman Daniel J. Flood;
3. To use your influence in the House Rules Committee, to which House Resolution 14 was assigned, and especially with the chairman of the House Rules Committee, Howard W. Smith, to initiate action on the proposed legislation by opening public hearings.

Although this request does not come to you from your district, we believe that our fight with communism and our support for the captive nations is of a national concern and must have support of all Americans.

Your action and support in this matter will do much for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Sincerely yours,

Orest Szczudluk.
Public Relations.

Ukrainian National Association, Inc.,
Utica, N.Y., May 4, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Howard W. Smith: On behalf of our society we urge you to submit the Daniel J. Flood resolution (H. Res. 14). Such a Committee on Captive Nations is vitally important both for our Government and the American people at large.

While Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of national liberation in Africa and Asia, we as a nation, are not doing much to help the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations which constitute a veritable weakness of the Soviet totalitarian empire.

A special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a reservoir of true and unbiased knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, which knowledge will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We the undersigned strongly urge you, Mr. Howard W. Smith, to give your full and qualified support to the Daniel J. Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) in your Rules Committee.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

Michael Dmytriw,
President.
Walter Zaparaniuk,
Secretary.

Peacetime Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Leonard R. Luce, of Everett, Wash., recently answered my annual questionnaire and included among his comments the following statement:

> If my taxes weren't so high, maybe I could afford one for my family.

Mr. Luc was referring to the following newspaper item, which I include in the Record, under leave to extend my remarks:

Peacetime Award

Syracuse, N.Y.—Lt. Marshall C. Smith has received the Air Force's Commendation

Medal, its third highest peacetime award, for designing a swimming pool for the officers' club at Hancock Field.

Smith, 26, of Carlton, Ga., was cited for "unselfish devotion of time and energy above and beyond the line of duty" for designing the $45,000 pool, the 26th Air Division newspaper, Command Post, said Tuesday.

The newspaper said the pool provided "so much for so little money" that the Air Defense Command adopted the plan for use at Air Force bases throughout the Nation.

Let's Ring the Bells Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 29, 1963, it was my pleasure to attend Memorial Day services at the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which was sponsored by USDA Post No. 36, the American Legion, and USDA Unit No. 36, the American Legion Auxiliary. The principal speaker on this occasion was Capt. Eugene H. Breitenberg, a native of Hot Springs, Ark., who is Troop Information Officer, Military District of Washington. He was introduced by Post Commander Robert M. Cox. The masterful Memorial Day address by Captain Breitenberg was well received by the large audience in attendance.

On March 31, 1963, Captain Breitenberg delivered the dedicatory address at the unveiling of the Fort Sumner marker, Sumner, Md. The event marked the 100th anniversary of the naming of the fort. Among those present at the dedicatory service was the gentleman from Iowa, Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL, who was lavish in his praise of the speech delivered by Captain Breitenberg and included the full text of it in his extension of remarks under date of April 22, 1963.

Captain Breitenberg received his bachelor of arts degree from Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo.; his master's degree from Henderson State Teachers College, Arkadelphia, Ark.; and he is now working on his Ph. D. degree at American University.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the full text of Captain Breitenberg's Department of Agriculture Memorial Day address, "Let's Ring the Bells Again."

The address follows:

LET'S RING THE BELLS AGAIN
(By Capt. Eugene H. Breitenberg)

I am greatly honored and privileged to have the opportunity to speak to you today. I think God, too, for the freedom and privilege to wear a military uniform of my country. I wear it on this occasion with added pride, for Memorial Day has a special meaning to members of the Armed Forces as well as to all of you. It it a day set aside in honor of all American servicemen who died that our Nation might live. It is also a day on which we pause to refresh our memories of the ideals and principles for which hundreds of thousands of Americans were willing to sacrifice their lives. It is an occasion on which we take stock of the price that has been paid for the ideals for which they fought and died, and our present ability to preserve those ideals.

Paying homage to the dead dates back to ancient times. The ancient Greeks honored their dead. A famous example of this occurred in 431 B.C. when Pericles, the great Athenian leader, gave his famous funeral oration to commemorate the fallen heroes after the 1st year of battle of the Peloponnesian War. Pericles reminded us, so died these men * * * for this offering of their lives made in common by them all, each of them individually received that renown which never grows old, and for a sepulchre, not so much that in which their bones have been deposited, but that the noblest of shrines wherein their glory is laid up to be eternally remembered upon every occasion on which deed or story fall for its commemoration. For heroes have the whole earth for their tomb; and in lands far from their own, where the column with its epitaph declares it, there is enshrined in every breast a record unwritten with no tablet to preserve it, except that of heart. These take as your model, and judging happiness to be the fruit of freedom, and freedom of valor, never decline the dangers of war.

The ancient Romans also honored their dead. Once a year, for 1 week, all Roman tombs were decorated with flowers and wreaths.

Memorial Day's inspiration also can be traced back to the Christian tradition of honoring the dead on All Souls Day. The first country to set aside one day each year on which to honor all men who died for peace and freedom was the United States. This action resulted from ceremonies that honored the fallen soldiers of the Union and Confederate Armies.

It would be in order, I believe, especially during the Civil War Centennial years, to take notice of the example set by a group of women, who, while making a pilgrimage to the graves near Corinth, Miss., to place spring flowers on the graves of Confederate soldiers who fell at the Battle of Shiloh, found Union markers. These American women, Mississippi women if you please, decorated both graves. This site, now known as "Friendship Cemetery" could well be the cradle of Memorial Day as observed in our country today.

A correspondent from the New York Tribune (who was an eyewitness) wrote the following: "These women have shown themselves impartial in their offerings made to the memory of the dead. They strewd flowers alike on the graves of the Confederate and of the Union soldiers."

The story of these American women became known throughout the land. Their heart-warming gesture was praised in sermons, speeches, poems, and songs.

Taking the cue from these women, we pay homage to men of character, North and South, who were willing to die for their sacredly held principles.

In 1868, Maj. Gen. John Logan, National Commander of the Grand Army of the Republic, ordered its member to observe May 30 as a special day. It would be a day, his order read, "for decorating the graves of the comrades who died in the defense of their country * * * and whose bodies now lie in almost every city, village, or hamlet churchyard in the land."

The original name of this day—Decoration Day—was changed to "Memorial Day" in 1882, and history has changed it from one of dedication to the dead of the Civil War, to one of tribute to all Americans of every generation who have met their obligations fully and freely, from the American Revolution to todays' sacrifices in strife-torn Republic of Vietnam.

The aspects of Memorial Day have broadened with the years. Today we not only mourn our dead, we honor them. In memory, we reverence and salute their spirit. One thing they held in common, each gave his life in defense of our cherished heritage—freedom.

Abraham Lincoln, at Gettysburg, reminded us of our obligation to alter our ways so that these dead shall not have died in vain.

There is in each ceremony taking place during this Memorial Day period throughout the Nation, a basis for renewed fervor, renewed loyalty, and abiding confidence in our great country. How may we extend these noble sentiments to future generations? Truly, our mourning of today leads us to an appreciation of the heritage of freedom that was left us by those brave souls who died along the way; who gave us cause for joy in celebrating the forthcoming hard-won day of independence, our Fourth of July.

On the first anniversary of our independence, bells were rung throughout our small Nation. Shall we not "ring those bells again?" This thought, originating from two gentlemen of Connecticut, is gaining support throughout the country.

Televised from in front of the Liberty Bell in Independence Hall, and relayed throughout the Nation, at a coordinated time, the bells should ring again on July 4, to be heard wherever freemen gather, at home, on the lakeshore, in the mountains, challenging all to remember what the Fourth of July really stands for. The thrilling reminder of those men whose lives, whose fortunes, and whose sacred honor, were pledged and forfeited to win our cherished freedom.

Loudly the bells will echo that we are heir to the same principles and spirit of freedom with which the writers of the Declaration of Independence were imbued. Their music will ring out that the freedom we cherish is a dynamic freedom to work out our destiny according to the patterns of our own minds. This is the principle for which those men, whom we honor today, gave their lives.

As the bells ring out their message of freedom, we should remember that the Declaration of Independence, did not proclaim the right to happiness, but only the right to "the pursuit of happiness," the right to roll up our sleeves and work, and fight, for happiness. The men we honor today rolled up their sleeves.

To often many permit others to assume the responsibilities of citizenship and dedication to service so long as they are not disturbed in their own business, family or pleasures. The men whose memories we cherish today also wanted to live, but they answered the call of duty, and in line of that duty, they perished.

Perhaps in no time in our history has there been a more imperative demand upon men who cherish freedom to pause for reflection upon what it means.

When we let freedom ring, we are rekindling an awareness of our heritage. We are again reminding the world of the statement by President Kennedy in his inaugural address, "Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world."

Memorial Day then, is more than a holiday, more than a day of relaxation. It is a day of reflection upon the past, of solemn memory, of resolution and determination for the future.

As we look forward to our day of joy, earned for us through this day of sorrow, let the bells ring out across the length and breadth of our land, to complete the memories of today. We are free. The ringing of the bells verifies that our dead have not made the sacrifice in vain.

We must strive, each of us, to measure up to the high bench marks of character, courage, and dedication to the tenets of our American faith which were established so long ago by our Founding Fathers.

In the final analysis, not only the very life of America and the perpetuation of our cherished, free, institutions, but also the liberty of all mankind, depends upon what we, individually, do or fail to do, day by day throughout our lives.

In the words of a poet, written during one of the world's dark periods of tribulation:

"Rejoice, whatever anguish rend your heart,
That God has given you for priceless dower,
To live in these great times and have your part,
In freedom's crowning hour."

Petroleum Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Automobile Trade Association of Maryland has unanimously adopted a resolution which favors the continuation of the existing tax treatment of petroleum and other extractive industries and opposes the proposed tax increases of those industries.

In connection with this, I wish to have printed in the RECORD this resolution adopted by the trade association at a meeting held May 14, 1963:

Whereas the present Federal tax laws governing the extractive industries have encouraged the development of the Nation's mineral resources and the discovery of new, abundant reserves; and

Whereas existing policies have resulted in an abundant supply of fuel for the use of the American motorist at prices which are far below the levels prevailing in most areas of the world; and

Whereas this availability of relatively low-cost fuel has been a major factor in the growth and prosperity of the American automotive industry; and

Whereas there are proposals currently be fore the Congress of the United States to increase the tax burdens of the extractive industries, at an estimated cost to the petroleum industry—and eventually to the motoring public, its principal customers—of some $300 million annually; and

Whereas such tax increases would discourage exploration and development of new petroleum reserves and, by restricting the available fuel supply, would inevitably lead to higher prices charged to the American motorist; and

Whereas the avowed purpose of the President's tax program is the stimulation of growth in the American economy and a tax increase which would be borne by the petroleum industry and, eventually, by our customers, the motoring public, would retard growth in our industry as well as in the petroleum industry, both of which constitute major segments of the Nation's economy; and

Whereas such a result is completely inconsistent with the general purpose of the President's tax program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Automobile Trade Association of Maryland favors the continuance of the existing tax treatment of petroleum and other extractive industries and opposes the proposed tax increases on those industries; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the U.S. Senators representing the State of Maryland and the Maryland Members of the House of Representatives.

An American Looks at the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that certain charges were made on the floor of the House against Charles Edison, former Governor of New Jersey and former Secretary of the Navy, I think it is well to give circulation to his ideas on government.

"An American Looks at the Nation" is the subject of the following address by Mr. Edison:

AN AMERICAN LOOKS AT THE NATION

(By Charles Edison)

I would like to speak about America—about how it was and how it is. America—our country—the culmination of the dreams of the Founding Fathers and the centuries-old aspirations of men throughout the world for liberty.

Liberty—a word that seems almost archaic in these days—sort of old fashioned and fondly remembered, but belonging to an old frontier somewhere back in the pleasant dead days when the United States was a power to be reckoned with.

Liberty—a word and an ideal for which men pledged to each other their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor—for which farmers and merchants and artisan and ironmongers and cobblers and writers and preachers—all of them together—withstood the bitter winter of Valley Forge to carve out a new Nation and a new idea. The spark set by these men ignited a fire which swept the world and still—even in these days of cynical hypocrisy—still has the power to inflame men to action—in Hungary, in China, in East Berlin, and—yes—even in Cuba.

What did this word mean? What caused men to leave their shops and their farms prepared to give their lives fighting against what must have seemed tremendous odds—against the mightiest colonial power of the day—against the might of England. Certainly, at that time, England must have seemed at least as powerful as Russia does today. Yet, the thirst for freedom banished fear. These were men and women as you and I—with basically the same problems of bringing up children, of paying the bills, of trying to live their lives peacefully and well. What was it, then, that moved them so and brought forth every resource of courage and strength known to man? The word "liberty"? Yes. And the meaning behind the word. Liberty meant the right to control one's own destiny and, above all, the God-given right of each individual man to pursue his life as he saw fit—without interference or control except as he was responsible to his neighbors and his community. This, above all, was the essence of the word and the dream—the rights of the individual above any right which may be seized from him by government, whether it be from a foreign shore or from within his own country.

And so the Nation was founded—given strength by its individual citizens and given form by the Constitution drafted by the Founding Fathers.

And the Nation flourished. Through the years it became the new promised land to peoples from every section of the earth. And, for the most part, the promises were fulfilled. From every nation and every area they came—the immigrants, the new Americans—giving of their talents and the sweat of their brows to build America into a proud and free and fearless Nation. From the famine stricken farms of Ireland, from the peasant villages of Italy, from the snow-swept hills of Sweden, from the coal mines of Wales, from the ghettos of Russia—from the tyranny that was Europe they came. And, yes, many came involuntarily—from the jungles of Africa and from the villages of China. And they, too, eventually found freedom and added their strength to America.

The American people marched on and settled the continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The true frontier moved forward. Our strength came from liberty and from the guaranteed right of each American to control his own destiny. The treasure of our country was brought forth from the earth and from the mountains to make the Nation rich and to give our people more of the good things of life than any other people on earth in any era of recorded history.

And as we grew, we learned that liberty could not be held exclusively. With technological advances, the fate of other people's became intertwined with our own. And our young men once again laid down their lives—in Cuba and the Philippine in the war with Spain, in World War I and World War II, in Korea—and today in Vietnam—for liberty. For liberty and—the way things are going—perhaps for nothing.

This was our country and these were the American people—nurtured in the spirit of individual liberty and in their obligations to the Nation through patriotic understanding of what America meant. Through these years, our Nation produced heroes and villians—strong men and weak men. But all in all we produced a great and proud people. Unhappily, I speak in the past tense.

What has happened?

The spirit of the old frontier has been whittled away and eroded in the past 30 years until the American people now find themselves in the never, never land of the New Frontier. The eternal values of the Nation have been labeled old fashioned and not fit to survive along this New Frontier. The strength of the American people has been sapped.

From a people who proudly held honor as among the basic tenets of individual and national life, we have become a people where more and more honesty and honor are looked on as being old fashioned. A country where self-reliance, pride, hard work, and thrift are being replaced by ideas of dependency on Government, pleasure before duty, higher pay for less work, and the right to Government handouts.

And the honor of the Nation—what has happened to that? An administration which permits a policy of news distortion or blackout of truth in apprising the American people of the state of affairs and excuses this by citing national security. A nation which has propagandized peoples throughout the world living in Communist slavery on the principles of liberation and on America's courageous dedication to freedom—this same nation cowers in fear when they are called upon to help the struggle for freedom carried out in other nations of the world. A bit of our Nation's honor was lost along with the Hungarian revolution. Still more of our Nation's honor has been lost in the waters of the Caribbean along with the brave men who seek to liberate their Cuban island from slavery.

And what has happened to individual liberty—to the right of the American citizen to pursue his life and his destiny as he sees fit and within the limits of his capabilities? No longer can an American farmer grow what he wants. No longer can an American businessman produce what he wants or employ whom he wants. No longer can an American exercise his full talents and his initiative in order to profit himself and his family. More and more everything is controlled or else it is just not worth it to see the fruits of his labor be taxed away into the enormous Federal bureaucracy.

The American citizen is today controlled by a bureaucratic Frankenstein which he created himself. More and more, individualism is lost to the state. More and more, the state does all—feeds, houses, clothes, cares for the aged, cares for the youth, cares for the lower income group, the middle income group—takes care of everyone and everything. Thus, the empty philosophy of socialism is replacing the rich and free traditions of America.

There is a community of men today in the United States who live under this system. All their human needs are taken care of. They are fed reasonably well, they are housed in decent and air-conditioned quarters. When they are ill, there is medical care available. They are given work training and taught various trades and skills and they have job security. Their recreation is assured. There are books and study programs available. They have no problems other than that of living. This is the perfect example of socialism. The place I speak of is in Leavenworth, Kans. And this Leavenworth system—under different names and different slogans—is slowly being imposed on the American people. If this system is ever finally implemented throughout the United States, it will be truly escapeproof.

We have already lost much of our individual liberty. Our people's initiative is being destroyed. The eternal values which have made us great have been relegated to the scrap heap. The New Frontier offers us culture and entertainment and security and welfare and emptiness. The courage of our people—proved again and again from Valley Forge, through Gettysburg, through the trenches in France, through the islands of the Pacific, through the mud of Korea—has been squandered in fear and appeasement of tryanny and in international cowardice. Our leaders rush forward to embrace our enemies—knowing that each time this is done freedom is lost in some place in the world. They seem unable to face up to the fact that the enemy is our enemy and meet it squarely.

The world has seen many dark times. One period of history was even called the Dark Ages. But even in those times, men carried on. In those years, there were monks who went from town to town—from country to country. Under their robes, they carried with them the manuscripts, the learning of the centuries gone before. They were hunted from place to place, and yet they carried with them the light of knowledge and the light of truth. Without them, all would have been lost.

Perhaps that is the function of Americans today—to keep on fighting and to carry with them the eternal truths laid down by our Founding Fathers. These truths are eternal and they will survive.

I have lived a good many years. No one knows all the answers, but I do know this: in the time that is left me, I will continue fighting for America—for what it really is and what it really means. And so must we all—no matter what the obstacles and no matter how discouraged we may become. To give up would indeed be a sin against the memory of all those heroes of the past who have given us a Nation.

Equal Rights for All Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, who can forget that stirring phrase, "To show the world that democracy really can compete?"

This is how America's latest astronaut, Maj. Gordon Cooper, emphasized the urgent need for success in our national space program.

And now Congress is finally beginning to realize how much more important is our success in the struggle to secure equal rights and equal opportunities for all Americans regardless of race, creed, or color.

ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM

President Kennedy has characterized this struggle as being "in the highest traditions of American freedom," and has called for faster congressional action on a series of wide-ranging legislative proposals in the civil rights field.

Prospects are now much brighter for favorable congressional action this year on the President's major proposals: First, to promote equal voting rights for all citizens in Federal elections; second, to provide technical and financial assistance to school districts in the process of desegregating their facilities; third, to extend the Civil Rights Commission another 4 years; fourth, to authorize the Government to initiate court action against discrimination in education; and fifth, to outlaw discrimination in public facilities and public accommodations.

INTERNATIONAL REPERCUSSIONS

No one will dispute that we are in a life and death competition with the forces of international communism. We must compete, and we must win, for the freedom-loving peoples of the world look to us for leadership, and for inspiration and guidance in the maintenance of human dignity and individual worth.

When we fail, as we have at Little Rock, at Oxford, and more recently at Birmingham, our voice in international affairs is muted, our friends are embarrassed, and our enemies take heart from our failure.

ONE HUNDRED YEARS

On this 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, it is only too apparent that we have a long way to go before every American is guaranteed equal rights and equal opportunities in education, in employment, in voting, in housing, in the administration of justice, in the use of public facilities, and in equal access to public accommodations.

As Vice President JOHNSON declared only last week:

> Until justice is blind to color, until education is unaware of race, until opportunity is unconcerned with the color of men's skins, emancipation will be a proclamation but not a fact.

THE SPIRIT OF FREEDOM

The mounting crescendo of sit-ins, stand-ins, kneel-ins, freedom walks, and other racial demonstrations occurring across the country is, in many respects, an extremely healthy sign.

To me, it indicates that the spirit of freedom is as much alive today as it was on that September day in 1787 when the framers of our Constitution joined together "to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, and secure the blessings of liberty" for themselves and for us, their posterity.

TRAGICALLY SLOW

If it is actually a self-evident truth, as the Declaration of Independence unmistakably asserts, that all men are created equal, and further, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, then the United States has been tragically slow in making this 187-year-old doctrine a reality for millions of American citizens.

Nearly 10 years after the Supreme Court unanimously ruled that public schools must be integrated with all deliberate speed, less than one-half of 1 percent of all Negro pupils in the Deep South attend desegregated classrooms. And the absence of segregation laws in the North, Midwest, and West does not produce school integration.

ALABAMA WISDOM

However, in a most encouraging development—in view of the recent Federal court order requiring admission of two Negro students to the University of Alabama—President Frank Rose pledged that the university "will maintain its dignity, its integrity, and our students will walk as honorable men and women."

Then he offered a quotation that citizens and community leaders throughout the United States might well ponder:

> Great economic and social forces flow like a tide over half-conscious people. The wise are those who foresee the coming events and seek to shape their institutions and mold the thinking of the people in accordance with the most constructive change.

A CONTINUING REVOLUTION

The founders of this country did not for a minute think they had fashioned a perfect instrument of government that would never require change. In fact, they specifically provided a multitude of constitutional means whereby the laws and customs of the country could be brought up to date.

They gave us a flexible instrument that would adapt itself to the times and not break under the stresses and strains that were bound to come.

THE AMERICAN DREAM

Now is the time for Americans in all walks of life to join in a noble crusade that will rid this country, once and for all, of the poison of racial and minority group discrimination.

We cannot rest our efforts until the phrase "second-class citizen" is banished from our vocabulary, and the revolutionary dream of freedom and equality is fulfilled for all Americans.

Ban on Braceros

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include this editorial from today's New York Times, entitled "Ban on Braceros."

BAN ON BRACEROS

America's most disadvantaged workers—the half-million migratory farm laborers and their families—will be the chief gainers from the decision of the House of Representatives to end the program under which hundreds of thousands of Mexican braceros have been brought into the United States to help harvest our crops.

The program was started during the Korean conflict to relieve an acute shortage of agricultural labor and to halt the illegal flow of "wetbacks" across the Mexican border. It has become a device for perpetuating the exploitation of domestic farmworkers by permitting growers to draw on a limitless pool of low-wage labor from south of the Rio Grande. With 4 million Americans jobless, the only difficulty farmowners still have in getting enough workers stems from the abysmal standards of pay, housing and health that attend agricultural employment.

The great bulk of the Mexican workers go to a relatively few large corporate farms. Numerically, these make up only 1 percent of the national total, and the availability of braceros has given them an extra advantage over the vanishing family farm. Unquestionably, the withdrawal of cheap labor will spur the huge "factories in the field" to more rapid mechanization. But no one will mourn the contraction of jobs that pay as little as 60 cents an hour for backbreaking toil. For all migratory workers average earnings remain less than $1,000 a year.

Since 1959 the number of Mexican farmhands brought here for seasonal work has dropped from 437,000 to 195,000. More decent wages and fuller use of the recruitment facilities provided by the U.S. Employment Service will overcome any adjustment problems in cutting off further importation. Since farm labor costs now account for only 5 cents of every dollar the consumer pays for food, retail prices should not be greatly inflated by more economic justice for the reapers of our crops. Any damage to the Mexican economy should be offset through direct foreign aid, not through an involuntary subsidy by the poorest of American workers.

The program's one real benefit has been in combating the influx of "wetbacks." Their total has shrunk from more than 1 million in 1954 to 30,000 last year. But the stability of the figure in recent years indicates that vigilance by the Immigration Service should be adequate to keep it from becoming a major problem again. The time has come for the clean cutoff the House has ordered when the present law expires December 31.

I am very happy to see that the eminent and highly respected New York Times has adopted an editorial stand in agreement with the position of the majority of the House of Representatives, which last week defeated the efforts to extend the Mexican farm labor program for another 2 years.

It has come to my attention that there is a possibility that an attempt might be made to have this program extended for 1 year. If such legislation is introduced I would specifically like to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that the arguments against this bill are still valid and significant, whether the extension be for a 2-year or a 1-year period. It is still a shameful and immoral practice, and should be terminated at the end of this year as recently recommended by the House.

Navy Ruling Is Unfair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, despite the language of the Missing Persons Act of 1942, some 500 Navy and Marine officers who were promoted while they were prisoners of war have not received the benefits of pay and allowances due them. The reason is a Navy administrative ruling, which in my opinion is unfair.

It seems even more unfair when you consider the fact that officers of the Army in similar circumstances did receive their pay and allowances retroactive to their dates of rank. Also, it seems incredible that a Navy employee should comment that such payments under the act might tempt officers in the future to go over to the enemy.

I have been concerned with this ruling since it was brought to my attention more than 4 years ago. Although I introduced legislation in the 86th, 87th, and the 88th Congresses, the Armed Services Committee has failed to hold hearings. My proposal, House Concurrent Resolution 88 would express the sense of the Congress by authorizing payments to Navy and Marine officers who were prisoners of war I believe due them.

Mr. Speaker, an article about one of my constituents, Mr. Fred L. Campbell, a retired Navy lieutenant commander, appeared in the Whidbey Island Record of Langley, Wash. This story points out both incredible and unfair aspects of the Navy's stand on this issue.

Also, the editor of this weekly newspaper, Mr. Ace Comstock, has written an editorial which helps bring the subject into focus. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include both the article and the editorial in the RECORD:

RETIRED NAVY VETERAN IRATE OVER POW RULING

A South Whidbey retired Navy officer came back from Washington, D.C. early this week, angry enough to chew nails and more mystified and upset over the workings of the government than he has ever been in a running 20 year battle with the Navy Department.

The retired Navy man is Fred Campbell, lieutenant commander, U.S. Navy, retired, of Sunlight Beach. His 20-year battle has been over pay and allowances he maintains he's entitled to for time spent in a Japanese prison camp during World War II.

While in Washington, D.C., Campbell took part in a conference arranged by Senator HENRY JACKSON's office and attended by representatives of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Jack Westland's office and the Navy Department.

At issue is an interpretation of Public Law 490, more commonly called "The Missing Persons Act." The act, passed in 1942, provides that men captured by the enemy shall be entitled to pay and allowances.

Campbell's anger stems from remarks made by a civil service employee who represented the Navy Department at the conference.

"The Navy representative said," Campbell explained, "that if my interpretation of Public Law 490 were correct, it might tempt officers in future engagements to go over to the enemy * * * in other words, to seek capture.

"I take this remark to be a damnable insult to every man who is in the service and every man who is liable to military service, in fact, to every American citizen."

Campbell declared, too, that previous rulings of the Navy Department concerning the one particular section of Public Law 490 which is at issue, are also an insult to Navy and Marine officers captured by the enemy during combat.

The Navy ruling which has incurred Campbell's wrath is on that section of Public Law 490 which declares that men captured by the enemy shall be entitled to pay in ranks which they held when captured and "to which they become entitled to thereafter."

In the Navy, officers are assigned a number and are many times promoted by ALNAV or "block" promotions. In other words, the Navy might send out an order declaring that "All warrant officers, Nos. 20 through 342, are herby promoted to chief warrant officers."

Such was the situation for Campbell and some 500 other Navy career officers who were imprisoned by the Japanese during the war * * * in other words, they came up for promotions during the time they were in the prisoner of war camps.

Campbell explained that when these Navy officers were freed from the Japanese camps they received the promotions to which they were entitled by ALNAV or block promotion lists, with the promotions predated to the time they should have been received.

The Navy, however, ruled that the war prisoners should be entitled only to pay in the ranks which they held when captured.

Campbell has fought that ruling for some 20 years, ever since October 1945, when he returned to the United States from the Japanese prisoner of war camps. In the process, he has filed volumes of correspondence, letters, testimony, court claims, and so forth.

At one time, he expained, the Navy ruled that he and his fellow officers were entitled to their back pay from the time of the promotions and paid him some $5,000 in such pay. Shortly thereafter, however, there was a "redetermination" and Campbell's retirement pay was shorted some $111 monthly for more than 40 months, in order to return to the Navy the money thus paid.

Twice, since that time, Representative JACK WESTLAND has introduced into Congress a resolution backing Campbell's position. At present such a resolution is under study by the Committee on Armed Services.

In 1960, when the resolution was first introduced, the Navy's reasoning for refusing to pay the claim was that officers who were prisoners were not present to shoulder the responsibilities of their promotions and that they were not available for physical examinations required by such promotions.

"WESTLAND, in February of this year, introduced House Resolution 88, which concerns this ruling," Campbell said. "At the conference I attended in Washington on this trip, the purpose was to discuss the resolution.

"It appears that the Navy is going to hold to its ruling and will fight the resolution."

Campbell said his imprisonment was probably typical of many of the 500 Navy officers in this particular situation.

"I was captured on Guam on December 10, 1941, and imprisoned at Zentsuji throughout the rest of the war," he said.

The prison camp held nearly 800 men for most of the time and was across the inland sea from Hiroshima. The prisoners worked unloading freight in the railroad yards, existing on minimum rations and suffering from the diseases and privations commonly associated with Japanese war prison camps.

When Campbell was captured, he weighed 175 pounds. When he was freed, his weight had dropped to 125.

"Among the 500 who are entitled to the back pay and allowances I am after, I am probably more interested than any because of my background in the Navy pay department," he explained.

Campbell said that priod to his capture, he had 20 years in the pay department and knows it thoroughly.

"I know that Public Law 490 entitles me to the pay I am seeking for me and my fellow officers," he declared. "The Secretary of Navy could see that we were paid tomorrow.

"As long as we aren't paid the money we're entitled to, I feel that it is a blot against the Navy Department and an insult to every man who wears a uniform.

"The Navy's ruling in this matter implies that every American officer is a potential traitor to his country.

"It's a damnable insult."

NIT PICKING

The news story we have written about the battle of Fred Campbell, Navy veteran, with the Navy Department, is not as clear and understandable as we would like it. Perhaps only those familiar with the Navy promotion method could understand the principles involved.

Understandable to all, however, is that the Navy Department ruling is based on nit picking.

The Department's ruling which states, in effect, that prisoners of war are not entitled to regular promotions because they are not available for physicals is nit picking.

The Department's ruling that states, in effect, that prisoners of war are not entitled to regular promotions because they are "not available to shoulder the additional responsibilities of their new office" is nit picking of the highest order. Good God, is there anything that requires more responsibility than to remain steadfast in the face of the enemy?

We are convinced, after studying all facets of this thing for some hours, that the Navy ruling is, indeed, as Mr. Campbell declared, "an insult to every man who wears a uniform."

Prisoners of war, for the most part, have as Mr. Truman's letter to Mr. Campbell declared: "shown courage in combat and remained steadfast in the face of the enemy."

The Navy Department's ruling that such courageous men are not entitled to all pay and allowances while prisoners in incredible and certainly not in keeping with the high standards of Navy service.

The President Cautious on Spending His Own Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat hopeful that President Kennedy is aware of the consequences of unlimited spending when it comes to using his own money. Perhaps we can hope, as expressed in the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune, that he may extend this concern to spending the taxpayers' money:

PRUDENCE ON HIGH

President Kennedy is reported to have ordered a crackdown on rising White House entertainment bills that are paid out of his own purse. The President gets a $50,000-a-year expense allowance, which is taxable, to assist in defraying expenses arising from his official duties. He also may spend a nontaxable sum of up to $40,000 a year for travel and official entertainment.

The social whirl at the White House has been fairly visible and Mr. Kennedy appears to be nearing the end of his nontaxable allowance. So it will be pork chops instead of pheasant under glass.

It is most touching to see that Mr. Kennedy's own wallet is a subject of his concern. Now, if he could only extend this concern to the rest of us taxpayers, who are saddled with a $100 billion budget, it would be very encouraging, indeed.

Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle: Tide in Vietnam Is Turning in Our Favor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished, courageous Marine Corps veteran has provided at my request a first-hand report of the bitter war in South Vietnam.

Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U. S. Marine Corps, retired, declares that the United States can beat the Communist if we do not falter in this desperate struggle for control of Vietnam—considered by many to be a key country in the control of southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby insert his report for the information of the Congress:

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 1, Armed Services Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request that I provide you with a few of my observations of the situation in South Vietnam. These observations, as you will recall, are based upon my recent visit to South Vietnam, in company with Mr. Joseph Lombardo, Senior Vice Commander-in-Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. On the basis of my observations both in Saigon and in the outer country area, and as a result of my conversations with United States and South Vietnamese military personnel and civilians, it is my firm impression that the tide has begun to turn in our favor in this bitter war in South Vietnam. If the United States does not falter in the stretch, we can win this struggle, and it is a struggle which we cannot, from the standpoint of sheer national security, afford to lose.

It is evident that the tremendous effort over the past couple of years by the United States and by the South Vietnamese Government of President Diem has reached the point where these forces are now producing favorable results.

The basic indicators as to the trend of events are favorable to our efforts. These indicators include the trend in total areas controlled by the Communists and the South Vietnamese forces; the trend in defections from the Communists to the South Vietnamese; the casualty ratios between the Communists and the South Vietnamese and the progress being so demonstrably achieved in President Diem's strategic hamlet strategy.

The strategic hamlet strategy is basic to the entire war in South Vietnam. It involves, as I know you are aware, the concentration of the populace in fortified and defended villages. This has a twofold effect:

First, the protection of the people from Communist terrorism; and second, the depriving of the Communists of sources of food supply, arms, and personnel for impressment into their military and supporting forces.

In the course of our visit in South Vietnam, Mr. Lombardo and I visited several strategic hamlets. These, I would like to point out, were not in the Saigon area where the most immediate results might be expected but rather in the forested high plateau country. The strategic hamlet program I was reliably informed, has progressed in a most satisfactory manner and in some areas is almost 90 percent completed. This represents a most significant achievement on the part of President Diem's government.

I might mention also that one of the most significant and potentially decisive developments in South Vietnam has been the relatively recent swing of the Montagnard tribes to the pro-U.S. government of President Diem. The Montagnard's are an aborigine—probably Malay—derivation people, totaling between probably 400,000 or 600,000, inhabiting the high plateau forest area, along the Laotian and Cambodian borders of South Vietnam.

These Montagnards have been wooed by the Reds with promises and inducements, because of their importance in the ultimate outcome of this struggle. However, the Montagnards are giving their support to the Diem government in increasingly large numbers. There are two reasons for this: The terrorist tactics of the Reds have boomeranged; and the farsighted sound policies of President Diem's government, with U.S. advice and assistance, are gaining the confidence and allegiance of the Montagnards.

These tribesmen are intimately acquainted with Red infiltration routes along the Laotian and Cambodian borders. They are natural guerrilla fighters. Although many of them have hunted only with a cross bow, they respond quickly, as was evident during our visit to a Montagnard training base, to modern weapons and military organization. Their support of the anti-Communist government of President Diem constitutes a genuinely serious setback for the Reds.

One of the most interesting but not surprising aspects of what is going on in South Vietnam is the truly magnificent service being performed by the U.S. Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force personnel in that area.

I was particularly impressed by the enthusiasm, tireless efforts, and high level of professional competence of the military advisory team No. 33 which we visited in Ban Me Thuot. This is an area of the primitive Montagnards tribes, and one in which the guerrilla warfare is bitter. To U.S. military personnel, who are living under austere standards, have gained the confidence of both the South Vietnamese regulars and the Montagnards. For instance, one of the U.S. Army advisers working with Montagnards has constructed a bamboo waterwheel at the small, but very important local agricultural school. As rudimentary as this bamboo waterwheel is, it is a completely new device to the Montagnards, who marvel at its ability to lift water a few feet from a small stream and irrigate the vegetable gardens and banana groves. Such ingenuity and sincere interest on the part of the U.S. personnel is typical of the contributions which our forces are making both in specific military matters as well as in economic and social endeavors.

In all of my conversations in Vietnam with personnel of various ranks, I did not hear any complaints or griping as to the duty being performed by them. If I judge our fighting men correctly, they have no respect for those who are urging "bring our boys home," from South Vietnam. Our military personnel there know the importance of what they are doing, the necessity, from the standpoint of U.S. security and that of the free world, of winning this war, and are effectively going about the job of gaining this objective.

It is only realistic, of course, to recognize that although the tide is beginning to turn in our favor in South Vietnam, the road to success is going to be a long, laborious, and bloody one. In 1962, for instance, the South Vietnam forces suffered 10,000 casualities. However, significantly, it is estimated that the Reds suffered 33,000 casualties.

In short, based upon my observations of the military buildup, the spirit, and effectiveness of the forces, the remarkable progress being made with the strategic hamlet strategy, and the trends of the conflict, I believe it justifiable to conclude that if we continue the determined effort in South Vietnam, the cruel Communist aggression in that vitally strategic area can be defeated.

Hoping this may be of some assistance to you, I remain

Respectfully,

J. D. Hittle.

President Lacks Total Understanding of Results of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in his public statements on the accomplishments of foreign aid, President Kennedy displays the same lack of understanding based on facts that he demonstrates in so many other fields of our national life.

The fact is that we have not stopped the spread of communism by pouring billions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money into the economies of other nations. The fact is that this great outpouring of our substance has not advanced the cause of freedom; it has not won friends for the United States; it has not served our national interest.

The following editorial from the Dallas Morning News of May 31 reminds us of how great has been the failure of our foreign aid program. It is to be hoped the President would face reality in making his public utterances on such important issues.

Foreign Aid

Since the Second World War, the United States has doled out roughly $100 billion in foreign aid to more than 100 nations. Much of this aid has been useful, perhaps, but much of it has not. In fact, a good portion of the money spent on foreign aid has done more harm than good.

While some critics of foreign aid have, perhaps, been too much inclined to believe that the whole program ought to be scrapped, defenders of the program have been entirely too reluctant to admit its failures. President Kennedy—who was a frequent critic of foreign aid when he served in Congress—is now so much of an apologist for the program that he has gone to ridiculous ends to justify not only continuing the program, but increasing it as well.

In a recent press conference, the President labeled critics of foreign aid the "noisy opposition" and implied that they really had nothing to say.

He expressed the opinion that, without U.S. aid, Western Europe would have been unable to rebuild its military strength and to contribute its share toward development of the underprivileged countries. He said, moreover, that "freedom is not on the run anywhere in the world * * * as it might have been without U.S. aid."

These remarks simply don't hold water. Whatever else U.S. aid to Europe may have done to rebuild the continental economy, it has not accomplished the specific results cited by the President.

Today the countries of Western Europe meet only a fraction of their defense obligation—with the United States still paying the lion's share.

Except for commercial loans, the European contribution toward development of the underprivileged nations of the world is almost negligible.

How the President can make the statement that "freedom is not on the run anywhere in the world" is something else again. It most certainly is on the run—and on a number of fronts. In spite of huge outlays of American dollars, many recipients of these dollars are in a poorer position today than they were before we stepped in to help.

Let's cite a few examples. Cuba has been the recipient of $52 million worth of foreign aid. Can anyone doubt that this went down the rathole?

Yugoslavia ($2.4 billion) and Poland ($522 million)—has our aid stopped the advance of communism or the retreat of freedom?

Other examples: Indonesia ($773 million); Laos ($460 million); Brazil ($1.9 billion); Argentina ($640 million); Haiti ($100 million); Cambodia ($336 million); Congo ($160 million); Ghana ($156 million); Ceylon ($79 million). We could go on.

In all of these countries, freedom seems to be at least more clearly on the run than it was just a few years ago. Most of them are ruled by despots, their economies are shaky and inflation is rampant.

The point is not that foreign aid by the United States has caused these conditions—though in some instances it has contributed to them—but that it certainly has not arrested them.

The Honorable Marie C. McGuire, Commissioner, Public Housing Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is not the least bit unusual for Texans to carve their names in the annals of American history. In fact, with daily regularity the accomplishments of Texans are chronicled by our news media. It is simply a habit for Texans to be exceptional.

Now, the only kind of person a Texan admires as much as another Texan is an outsider who thinks enough of Texas to ask us to adopt him. And Texans are charitable people.

And so it is, Mr. Speaker, that an adopted daughter of Texas has made a mark in a hitherto man's world, that of public housing. I refer to the Honorable Marie McGuire, Commissioner of Public Housing, the first woman in the 25 years of the program to be accorded that distinction with its tremendous responsibilities.

Recently, the American Institute of Architects honored Mrs. McGuire with a special resolution commending her to the Nation and the world as an expert in her field. I would like to incorporate that resolution in my remarks at this time:

Resolution Adopted by the Board of Directors of the American Institute of Architects at Its Preconvention Meeting in Miami, Fla., May 2, 3, and 4, 1963

Whereas the Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration, Mrs. Marie C. McGuire, has demonstrated her sincere desire to implement in the public housing programs the guiding principles for Federal architecture expressed by the President, and has sought the cooperation of the American Institute of Architects toward this objective; and

Whereas the institute's committee on Public Housing Administration liaison, in collaboration with the Commissioner and her staff, has accomplished constructive developments in proposed revisions of the architectural contract provisions; and

Whereas further collaboration is vital to establish the basic principles for advisory consultant services for the modification of development procedures and the determination of equitable fees for professional design services for public housing projects; and

Whereas, the institute's approach to such problems is based upon its standards of professional performance and its desire to cooperate with the Public Housing Administration for the attainment of desired objectives in the public interest: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Institute of Architects commends the Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration for her public statement of objectives in design and for her constructive work with the American Institute of Architects toward the realization of these objectives; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Institute of Architects hereby signifies its desire to continue this cooperation with the purpose of expediting solutions to mutual problems and implementation of procedures by the Public Housing Administration which will result in the optimum utilization of the architectural profession's talents in the building of public housing.

Although Mrs. McGuire was born here in Washington, she ultimately was attracted to Texas, and without a dissenting vote we adopted her. There, she began her record early, and in 1961 the President summoned her back to Washington, this time as Public Housing Commissioner. It is now her demanding task to supervise the administration of more than one half million federally assisted public housing units housing more than 2 million persons.

To this task she has brought the sensibilities of a great gentlewoman, together with the practical knowledge of a long career in Government and housing. I know all Texans and all Americans join me in saluting Marie McGuire.

Mrs. George Blackwell Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a number of years ago, a former rifle company platoon leader within my command during World War II called my attention to a letter written by a mother to her son who was killed in World War II. Each Memorial Day, this woman, Mrs. George Blackwell Smith of Chattanooga, Tenn., wrote a letter to her deceased son which was printed in the local paper.

This year, this exceptional lady wrote on Patriotism, a Code for Right Living, something which more of us in this country could use today. I am pleased to include Mrs. Smith's 1963 letter to her deceased son which appeared in the Chattanooga Times for May 30:

PATRIOTISM, A CODE FOR RIGHT LIVING

(The following traditional and moving piece by a valued Times contributor is in memory of a son who, next Memorial Day, will have been 20 years dead upon a battlefield in France:)

MEMORIAL DAY, 1963.

MY DEAR YOUNG SOLDIER: The years rush on, my son. This is May 1963. And once more, using this form of a letter to you, I pay Memorial Day tribute to our country's heroic war dead. Nearly 19 years have passed, my forever young son, since on a battlefield in France you gave your life in behalf of American belief and ideal. As an American I again offer proud and grateful homage to the thousands and thousands and thousands of my splendid young countrymen—of whom you were one—who have yielded up their mortal lives that this mighty Nation, the United States of America, might proceed on her destined way.

Probably always on Memorial Day a contemplation of patriotism is rife in the hearts of many, if not all, Americans. For patriotism has always been and must continue to be—lest the Nation perish—a very real part of American life. Patriotism, of course, encompasses many phases of purpose and practice; of duty, dedication and devotion both in peace and in war. On Memorial Day the Nation honors very particularly her war dead. Then we render most solemn thanks to God that our country has been blest with the legions she has needed in her hours of wartime peril.

On Memorial Day, too, we are wont to survey the long and glorious record of America's heroes. That record of unselfish and outstanding service stretches now from the colonial days long before Lexington and Concord on down into this uneasy truce called cold war in which the United States of America constantly fights the greatest battle of her history as she strives to avert the holocaust of nuclear Armageddon.

As we examine, for this May 30, 1963, our lengthy scroll of patriots, we pause before the stalwarts of the American Revolution who brought this Nation into being, and we pledge anew to keep the Republic worthy of them. We proudly hail the exploits of those who sallied forth to fight the War of 1812 and the Mexican War. With poignant sadness we remember that bitterest of national heartaches, the conflict of 1861–65. Yet even as we deplore the fact of that brother-against-brother strife, even as we reflect that a century ago right here in our own Chattanooga-Chickamauga area, the finest young Americans of their era were slaughtering each other in incredible numbers, inflicting terrible grief and loss upon their native land, we Americans take the deepest and most overwhelming pride in the boundless courage and the incomparable tenacity of those American boys who wore the gray and the blue. No finer troops ever marched, no more valiant soldiers ever battled upon this earth. Their page is the most stirring in American history.

Sometimes, unfortunately, patriotism is confused with a type of ancestor worship, and sometimes with thralldom to the past. Of course, it is neither. Yet patriotism is often difficult to define. For real love of country can mean so many wonderful things to so many different people. Certainly our beloved America deserves from every citizen the utmost effort in thought, and the utmost dedication and principle in action. And, just as certainly, every citizen is due every right of citizenship without regard to race, creed, or color. Patriotism is truly a code for right living in our great Republic, requiring unshakable loyalty to American ideals as embodied in the American system of government; respect for our forbearers, both the renowned and the humble, who had a part in establishing or building this greatest of nations; and steady advance everywhere toward the goals of individual liberty and responsibility, material betterment, justice and freedom and peace in all the world. The commitments as expressed in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution are sweeping us along more rapidly than ever before. The goals are always in sight but the road we tread is puzzling, startling, and often obscure. We pray that we travel aright.

On Memorial Day we think of the soldiers and sailors and fliers who carried us to victory in the First and Second World Wars, and of our gallant cohorts in the Korean war. Tenderly we remember those who did not return—more duty accepted and performed, more valor poured into the "Seven Red Stripes in the Flag."

It is useless to wring one's hands over the might-have-beens of life. But perhaps the First World War is the most tragic might-have-been of American history. For had the Nation backed fully the implementation of that victory lasting peace might have resulted. The Second World War would not have been, or the ghastly Korean one, which unveiled the full force of Russian perfidy before our then unbelieving eyes. We have been confronted with Russian perfidy ever since. Communist madness rebuffs us even in nearby Cuba, that island for which we dreamed democracy with our victory in the Spanish-American war.

The greatest patriots of all time may prove to be the young Americans who are now in the worldwide service of our country. Some of them, alas, have been called on to give the last full measure of devotion on land, in the air, bneath the sea. In outer space and on earth today, trained, alert Americans, armed with the latest products of tireless research, labor to hold off another world war until the time when even maniacs and authority will reject forever the horror and the finality such a war would bring to civilization.

It has been a long time now, my dear young soldier, since your dad and I, early in 1944, said goodby to you. How we cherish our memories of you as a baby, child and youth! How we miss having known the nature man you would have been! This Memorial Day our thoughts fly to the cross above your grave in France. And I lift my mind and heart to the full and consoling promise of the cross.

Every tribute to the war dead is a plea for peace. As usual I am sending this letter to a newspaper. If it can be of any small help in the continuing struggle for peace, I hope it will be published.

Devotedly,

MOTHER.

National Service Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States.

President Kennedy has stated:

> We need not only more professional personnel—more doctors, nurses, teachers, and social workers—but an even greater number of dedicated volunteers to support the professional in every area of service.

But where will we find the professionals and volunteers so badly needed to help solve our country's human problems? A National Service Corps program can help solve these problems by—

First. Providing opportunity for full-time dedicated service to men and women, young people just out of school, and older people retiring from regular employment or housework. The experience of serving others might well motivate many of the young people to choose lifelong careers in the helping professions.

Second. Adding manpower to local volunteer programs which carry on, for the most part, unsung though not unappreciated.

Third. Most important, focusing attention on the increased need for part-time volunteers to join the many volunteer service programs in their own communities.

The cost of this proposal is modest, Mr. Speaker, in comparison with the cost of most items of expenditure. It is minuscule in comparison with the need, and I predict that each dollar expended for a National Service Corps could return tenfold to the Treasury as human lives are rehabilitated, as clinic and hospital services are augmented, and as illiteracy and idleness are replaced by the self-supporting independence that comes with learning and skill.

The goals of a National Service Corps, Mr. Speaker, are fourfold:

First. To work with people in great need: The program would provide full-time opportunity for dedicated service. At the request of local public and private community groups, national service corpsmen will work with those Americans in greatest need in both urban and rural areas of the United States and its Territories and trusts.

Second. To motivate other citizens to give service: The corpsmen—men and women working full time in the program—could, by their example, motivate many more citizens to give part-time service in their own communities. This would build an even greater voluntary effort directed at the most critical needs of our people.

Third. To dramatize human needs: Many Americans in greatest need are far removed from our daily lives—many are unseen and forgotten. By dramatizing their human needs, a national service program—while not itself solving these problems—should spur action on many fronts in an attack on forces causing deprivation in America.

Fourth. To attract more Americans into helping professions: The experience of serving others could well inspire many people to choose careers in the service professions—social work, teaching, nursing—which suffer from critical shortages of trained personnel.

Accomplishment of these goals, in my judgment, would demonstrate to the Nation and to all its citizens the extent of human needs and the means of attacking them. The corps would thus act as a catalyst to greater effort by individual citizens for the elimination of deprivation.

Schools: What Do We Really Want From Schools?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, at a time when more money—Federal money—is championed as a cure-all to the problems of education, let us first examine what we really want from the schools. Values in education cannot be bought. Learning will not replace amusement unless citizens and school boards decide it deserves priority in the competition for the school dollar.

Mr. Sid Landfield, editor of the Mt. Sterling (Ill.) Democrat-Message, wrote this May 22 editorial:

UNHAPPY CONCLUSION

This editor has spent many years "covering" meetings of boards of education and if all the hours expended in just listening were laid end to end, they would extend many times around the eternity pole. Board meetings are always terribly long, running from a minimum of 4 hours to as much as 6½ hours.

From all this listening, this editor has arrived at but one firm conclusion: if it weren't for athletics, in all of its manifestations, boards of education would conduct their meetings in one-tenth of the time. In nontechnical language, we report, this means that "athletics" is the most common synonym for education.

How sad. How very sad, indeed.

We can recall vividly how we have often spent as much as 5 hours listening at a board meeting, with 15 minutes allotted to routines like approving bills and reading the minutes of the last debacle, and the balance of the time—4 hours and 45 minutes—spent in earnest discussion of some basketball coach's philosophy of the fast break in basketball versus the advisability of hiring such a man for the coming basketball season. What's more, all board members participate in the free wielding discussion with great enthusiasm—even fervor—while any mention, even, of curriculum puts at least five of the same seven members to dozing, yawning, or reading the sports pages of the evening gazette.

It's a most unhappy conclusion we have arrived at: American education at the public school level rotates on an athletic axis. By and large, school board candidates are elected or rejected by the citizenry on their feelings and drive for athletics; candidates are popular or hated by their stand on athletics; and the main business of the evening, invariably, centers on a crucial problem like: can we ever go to the "State"—or is our "line" big enough through the middle.

For example, it's been our experience that three times as much discussion, interview, and enthusiasm, is expended on the hiring of a coach over the hiring of a common teacher. Actually, it works out like hiring common labor and a foreman of the whole gang.

Another Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, those who may think that the social security system is a cure-all for all of the country's ills had better think twice. Today's New York Mirror contains an excellent editorial on its history and its future—the taxpayer will pay again.

The editorial follows:

UNCLE'S PAYROLL TAX

While President Kennedy talks of reducing the income tax, the key member of his party—Representative WILBUR D. MILLS, Democrat of Arkansas, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee—wants to increase the Federal payroll tax.

That is what the social security tax really is. It's not an insurance premium—merely a special tax to support a Government program. You can pay it for 40 or 50 years and still get no benefits in your old age if you don't happen to qualify under the rules.

This is a payroll tax that's getting steeper and steeper.

It began in the 1930's as 1 percent (with employers paying a matching amount) on the first $3,000 of a year's pay. The maximum payment was thus $30. Over the years, with inevitable election year tinkering by Congress, the percentage has risen to a current 3⅝ percent on a salary base now broadened to $4,800. The maximum payment now is $174. And, of course, that is duplicated by the employer.

Now along comes Representative MILLS with a proposal to extend the taxable salary base to $5,400. Employees making that much or more would thus pay an additional $21.75.

MILLS' main objective is to ward off the prospect of deficits in the program's trust funds, but part of the increase he proposes would also be translated into higher benefits in various categories.

And so it goes—up, up, up.

Some political dopesters think the MILLS gambit has a bearing on the Kennedy medicare program, which would operate under Social Security. But MILLS' suggestion could scarcely help in that direction. It only points up the fact that still another hefty increase in the social security tax would be necessary to handle medicare.

What the Mills proposal does, in any case, is to emphasize the staggering burden that social security is becoming. Even if Congress does no further tinkering (which is most unlikely), the rate schedule is now pegged for an increase to 4⅛ percent in 1966 and to 4⅝ percent in 1968.

Remembering that the employer pays a matching amount, this will mean a total social security tax of nearly 10 percent in 1968 on whatever salary base applies at the time. That kind of money could buy a pretty good retirement policy that would be genuine insurance—truly security.

This is a thought that is bound to occur to more and more people as social security approaches the overload point—the point at which it could crumble under its own weight.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of June 1, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS

ATTACKS ON AMERICANS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ACTION ANSWERED

Conservatism came under attack in the House of Representatives on May 20 when a group of liberals directed an attack upon the Americans for Constitutional Action and the Members of Congress who were given ACA awards. The attack accused the ACA and those honored by it of "doing the Devil's work in American politics," and lumped conservative constitutionalists into one group including ACA, John Birch, and others. The viciousness of the attack was based on inuendo, half-truths, and guilt by association which the so-called liberals have long deplored, but did not hesitate to use when it suited their own purposes in attempting to smear opponents of the Kennedy-liberal program of big government, big spending big welfare state.

This week it was my privilege to refute the charges and to defend the Americanism and patriotism of ACA as an organization as well as those who have been honored by it. In this task I was joined by a number of my colleagues, including Congress UTT of California, CURTIS of Missouri, HALEY of Florida, FOREMAN of Texas and TEAGUE of California. Our presentation did not deal in personalities, nor smears, nor character assassination. We based our arguments on the basic differences between the two philosophies of government which now confront the people of the United States—the liberal conception that a strong Federal Government, directing the lives of the people is better than individual liberty and State and local initiative—opposed to the conservative view that constitutional-limited government in which individual liberty is paramount.

The debate was marked by an attempt on the part of one member of the opposition to prevent my speaking. Although no member of the Republican side nor conservatives on the Democratic side who had been attacked the previous week made any move to prevent the speakers from stating their views, my effort was immediately challenged and the stalling procedure of asking for roll calls was used so that 1 hour and 20 minutes was consumed in calling the roll of the members twice before I was able to proceed.

It is not possible to present the entire debate, but I believe it is important that you know some of the facts brought out. I endeavored to present what the ACA stands for and started by reading what the Americans for Constitutional Action consider themselves to be.

"Americans for Constitutional Action is a nonpartisan, nonprofit, nationwide political action organization which is dedicated to these theses: (1) That the Constitution of the United States as originally conceived provides a sound foundation upon which the structure of our free social order has been erected, and (2) if we are to preserve that social order in America, it is imperative that we protect its foundation against erosion or destruction.

"To this end ACA has undertaken to help elect to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States individuals who, by their actions, have proved their allegiance to the original spirit and principles of the Constitution. Many important and vocal elements among our people have subscribed to the thesis enunciated by the prominent Swedish Socialist, Gunnar Myrdal, who was cited favorably by our Supreme Court, that 'The Constitution of the United States is impractical and unsuited to modern conditions.' They have supported measures designed to weaken and nullify many of the Constitution's provisions. Unfortunately, their efforts have been successful, in part at least. Their ends have been accomplished, first, by tortuous legislative, executive, and judicial interpretations of the 'general welfare' and 'commerce' clauses and the various amendments of the Constitution. Second, by an ill-advised constitutional amendment (the 16th—graduated income tax) which confers upon Congress the power to confiscate all of the income from private property and all of the fruits of the individual citizen's labor, without limitation. Third, by judicial decisions of questionable jurisdiction, rationalized by the so-called New Social Doctrine. Fourth, by abdication by Congress of its constitutional authorities and responsibilities in favor of an all-powerful Chief Executive, and fifth, by bribery of the sovereign States with 'handouts' from the Federal Government which are financed by tax extortions from the States' own citizens. Concurrently, the States are required to sanction an ever-increasing surrender of power to the Government centralized in Washington."

In alining myself with these fundamental beliefs as expressed by ACA and in evaluating the effectiveness of our Constitution as a political instrument designed to provide a "government of laws, not of men," I was pleased to recall the statement of the great British Prime Minister, William E. Gladstone, in 1878, that "the American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

The seven guidelines on which ACA bases its index in evaluating congressional votes, and to which I wholeheartedly subscribe are: For safeguarding the God-given dignity of the individual and promoting sound economic growth by strengthening constitutional government; for sound money and against inflation; for the private competitive market and against government interference; for local self-government and against central government intervention; for private ownership and against Government ownership; for individual liberty and against coercion; for National sovereignty.

My concern, as a Member of Congress and as a citizen of this land, rests in the fact that I unabashedly am seeking to preserve three things, the most constructive theses I know, in order to maintain the society which I inherited and which, God willing, we will preserve and pass on to our children. These three concepts are first, capitalism. I am for the profit motive, unapologetic, unashamedly, a capitalist. Second, preserving the sovereignty of the United States. Third, preserving the Republic as a form of government.

For these beliefs, the ACA and others of use subscribing to them, were accused of doing the "Devil's work." It seems almost unnecessary that we had to take the floor of the House to answer the charges as it is almost certain that the thinking American people would laugh them to scorn. I hope the debate this week was not merely a rebutal of baseless charges, but the beginning of a determined fight by conservatives to preserve the principles for which we stand, a fight which will be conducted in the Congress, in forums across the land, and at the polls.

LIBERAL PROGRAM SEEKS OPPOSITE GOALS

Recognized spokesman organization for the liberal point of view in America is the ADA. It is proper, therefore, to point out what the liberal organization believes. My research shows they believe that it is possible for a police state to be obedient to the popular will; that the apparatus of such a state can be so affected by benevolence that it can produce—through such coercive measures as compulsory union membership, enforce fraternization, a confiscatory share-the-wealth tax system and a strong centralized bureaucracy—a guaranteed annual wage for everybody, complete freedom from fear, want, and anxiety for all, and total economic welfare from the cradle to the grave for the entire populace. Before it is too late American citizens should compare these platforms, ADA, Socialist, Communist to each other and the ACA.

BRUCE ALGER,
Member of Congress.

Calendar of Events, National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following calendar of events, June 1963, of the Gallery of Art:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—CALENDAR OF EVENTS, JUNE 1963

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Permanent collection: Paintings and sculpture comprising the Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are located on the main floor. The Widener collection of decorative arts is on the ground floor.

New slide: 2 by 2 inch color slide. Gentileschi, "The Lute Player," 35 cents each, postpaid.

New reproductions: Color collotype reproductions: "The Castle of Nymphenburg," by Bellotto; 20½ by 36 inches, $18; "The Veil of Veronica" by Feti, 24 by 19¾ inches, $12; "The Small Crucifixion," by Grüewald, 24 by 18 inches, $15; "The Lackawanna Valley," by Inness, 24¼ by 35 inches, $15; "Gare Saint-Lazare," by Manet, 22⅝ by 27¾ inches, $15; all postpaid.

Concerts: Following the program on June 23, the gallery's concerts will be discontinued until the fall.

Sunday lectures: The series of lectures on "Great Artistic Innovations," which began in May, will continue through June 30.

LecTour: A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these LecTour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Monday through Saturday 11 a.m to 4 p.m. Sunday 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, MAY 27 THROUGH SUNDAY, JUNE 2

Painting of the week: Fra Filippo Lippi. "Madonna and Child" (Samuel H. Kress collection), gallery 4. Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Color and value, rotunda, Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Thursday 1; Sunday 5:00.

Sunday lecture: "Antonello da Messina." Guest speaker: Elio Gianturco, professor of art history, Hunter College, New York, lecture hall 4.

Sunday concert: Last concert of 20th American Music Festival: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, conductor; east garden court 8.

MONDAY, JUNE 3 THROUGH SUNDAY, JUNE 9

Painting of the week: Pissarro Boulevard des Italiens, Morning, Sunlight" (Chester Dale collection), gallery 88, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Composition, rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Innovation in Japanese Art." Guest speaker, Harold P. Stern, associate curator of Japanese art; the Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, lecture hall 4.

Sunday concert: Enid Dale, pianist, east garden court 8.

MONDAY, JUNE 10 THROUGH SUNDAY, JUNE 16

Painting of the week: Perugino. "The Crucifixation With the Virgin St. John, St. Jerome and St. Mary Magdalen" (Mellon collection), gallery 8, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Space and form, rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Films: "Art in Exhibition," produced by Yale University; "The Art Museum in American Life," produeed by the U.S. Information Agency, lecture hall 4.

Sunday concert: Marjorie Hayward Madey, soprano; Nathan Price, pianist; east garden court 8.

MONDAY, JUNE 17 THROUGH SUNDAY, JUNE 23

Painting of the week: Raphael. "The Alba Madonna" (Mellon collection), gallery 8, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Tactile Values, rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Kirchner and Expressionism." Guest speaker, Donald Gordon, professor of fine arts, Dickinson College, Carlisle, lecture hall 4.

Sunday concert: The Cantilena trio, east garden court 8.

MONDAY, JUNE 24 THROUGH SUNDAY, JUNE 30

Painting of the week: Turner. "Keelmen Heaving in Coals by Moonlight" (Widener collection), gallery 57, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour for the week: Line, rotunda; Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Mark Tobey and Oriental Influences in American Art." Guest speaker, Allen S. Weller, professor of fine arts, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, lecture hall, 4.

Happy Birthday, James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday marked the 75th birthday of James A. Farley. I am sure all Members of the House of both sides of the aisle join in extending best wishes to this great American. Peter Kihss, of the New York Times, captured the spirit of Jim Farley in an article published in the New York Times on May 29. I would like to bring the article to the attention of my colleagues.

FARLEY, 75 TOMORROW, WILLING TO RUN FOR OFFICE—DEMOCRATIC LEADER VIEWS HIMSELF AS A WINNER—STILL IN RUGGED HEALTH, HE PUTS IN A LONG DAY

(By Peter Kihss)

Jim Farley turns 75 years old tomorrow and the political craftsman of Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal era is as rugged and genial as ever. Also, he is ready for more political activity.

As to why his Democratic successors are having so much strife and so many problems in New York, the former State and National Democratic chairman says bluntly: "One difficulty is there isn't enough truth telling among the leaders.

"I never lied to anyone who came to me seeking a favor or assistance," he says. "I would tell him the reason why something couldn't be done if it was possible to do that. Truth saves a lot of embarrassing questions, if you don't remember what you said."

As to his own plans, this is not the time he wants to make a definite decision on whether to try for U.S. Senator in 1964, when KENNETH B. KEATING, a Republican, will be up for reelection.

"If I was interested and I was nominated," Mr. Farley says candidly, "I feel certain I could add more strength to the Democratic ticket than any of the men being mentioned for the post. I believe I could bring back to the Democratic Party many who have left the party."

Jim Farley—known that way to five Presidents, although formally he is James Aloysius Farley—is getting along in years only by the calendar. Last year his travels took him 53,000 miles; he attended 98 dinners and 78 business luncheons.

QUICK AND ANALYTICAL

His talk is quick, analytical, anecdotal. His face is healthily pink, between silver fringes of hair. Two operations overcame the detached retina in his right eye inflicted by a frenzied placard wielder at the 1960 Democratic Convention. He uses light hornrimmed glasses chiefly for reading.

He gets up in his Waldorf Towers apartment about 7 a.m., bathes and shaves, and breakfasts simply in the coffee shop.

He avoids heavy lunches; on his own he goes to a small restaurant for a bowl of soup, jello, and coffee. His one big meal is at night. His 6-foot-2 frame has carried 205 pounds for years; if he picks up poundage over a weekend, he tapers off at once.

He goes to Turkish baths as "the one place in the world where I relax." He neither drinks liquor nor smokes because of his mother's influence. He gets to bed by 11:30 six nights a week, after hearing the news and saying his prayers. He walks as much as he can, but does no formal exercising.

Mr. Farley gets to his 18th floor office at the Coca-Cola Export Corp., 515 Madison Avenue, at 53d Street—he has been chairman of the company since resigning as Postmaster General in 1940—about 8:45 a.m. He frequently stays until 6:30 p.m. He shows up Saturday mornings, too, to catch up on telephone messages, mail and reports. He takes some afternoons off for baseball or football.

Politically, he is "not very active because I'm not invited to be, but that's no complaint." He figured prominently as a planner in Mayor Wagner's successful primary fight in 1961 and in the mayor's subsequent reelection campaign.

Last year he would have been willing to take the Democratic nomination for Governor against Nelson A. Rockefeller, and "I feel I would have won." The Democratic Party's trouble in the city and State for years, he says, has been that "it has been leaderless because too many leaders have been competing for control."

The party, under Governors Alfred E. Smith, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Herbert H. Lehman and in President Roosevelt's first 8 years "passed more beneficent legislation in my judgment than ever was passed in the history of the country."

President Kennedy was a man whose nomination Mr. Farley urged long before the 1960 convention, and he predicts Mr. Kennedy "will go down into history as one of our greatest President's."

Mr. Farley's wife, the former Elizabeth A. Finnegan, died January 14, 1955. His daughter, Elizabeth is married to Glenn D. Montgomery, an engineer for the Long Lines Department of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. Another daughter, Ann, is married to Edward J. Hickey, 3d, who is in the men's furnishings business in Grosse Point, Mich. His son, James A., Jr., is a member of the State athletic commission, a post Mr. Farley, who is now a member of the State harness racing commission, also held.

For Budget Busters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, with our debt reaching monstrous proportions the following letter that appeared today in the New York Mirror's editorial page is an excellent reminder of what the Congress is doing to our future:

THANK YOU LETTER

(In case anyone is working up a time capsule, we nominate for inclusion the following piece by Jim Griffith, Jr., editor of the Lusk (Wyo.) Herald, under the title "A Letter to Future Americans.")

TO MY GREAT-GREAT-GRANDCHILDREN:

Inasmuch as we shall never meet, I want to leave you this note of appreciation. You see, it was during my lifetime that the leaders of the United States decided to spend some of the tax money that your great-grandparents, grandparents, parents and you, and most likely your descendants, would have to pay.

Thank you for your generosity.

Our practice of deficit financing was started during a financial depression and was necessary. It was necessary to continue the practice through a great war called World War II. Following World War II, the United States had a period of long prosperity, but we had grown accustomed to spending more tax money than we liked to pay. Rather than paying off what we had borrowed, we decided to let you do it.

I hope you won't hate the memory of my generation. Mostly, they were darn fine people. They would have liked to leave you the same rich, debt-free heritage that they received, but in the name of progress we had to get money from someone. We took it from you. Thanks.

With appreciation,

GREAT-GREAT-GRANDPA JIM.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Hon. R. Sargent Shriver, Peace Corps Director, Gives Significant Address at 75th Anniversary Commencement of Salem (W. Va.) College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, 1963 is a significant year for all West Virginians, particularly those who have been closely associated with the steady growth of my alma mater, Salem College.

Located in Salem, W. Va., this small, private, liberal arts college is observing the anniversaries of events important in its life as an institution which molds American youth. This is the 10th year in which the helpful programs of the American Humanics Foundation have been in existence on the campus. Likewise, this is Salem's diamond jubilee year, and the 75th anniversary of its first commencement exercises held in 1888.

Finally, this is "Centennial '63"—West Virginia's 100th year of Statehood and the time set aside for commemoration of our past, and rededication to challenges of the future.

It was my privilege to be present at a portion of the 75th anniversary commencement exercises, and related programs at Salem College, which lasted from Friday, May 24, through Thursday, May 30.

On Tuesday, May 28, Mrs. Randolph and I hosted a luncheon in honor of the Honorable R. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps. In attendance were members of the faculty and board of directors of Salem College. Distinguished guests included: Charles R. Van Horn, assistant to the president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad; Mayor and Mrs. Roger E. Garrett, of Clarksburg, W. Va.; T. Edward Davis, chairman of the Salem College board of directors; Byron Randolph, West Virginia counsel for the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation; Attorney Eugene Eason, of the Clarksburg committee; U.S. Attorney Robert Maxwell; Mrs. Samuel Kistler, chairman of the faculty committee; and Miss Alta Van Horn, academic consultant.

Also participating in the luncheon program was Dr. Alfred T. Hill, executive secretary of the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges. Dr. Hill expressed a meaningful tribute to Director Shriver and to Salem College, indicating that our West Virginia institution is contributing much to the advancement of quality education.

I request that the comments of Dr. Hill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, a second gathering of special note took place on Tuesday, May 28, at Salem College—the recognition convocation, at which the Honorable R. Sargent Shriver gave the inspiring message. It was my privilege to introduce the Peace Corps Director, and to comment on his commendable achievements as leader of this worldwide venture toward improved international understanding.

Director Shriver presented a dynamic address, discussing the qualifications of America as the leader of the free world. He pointed out that we have entered a grave period in which both our capabilities and our resolve will be sorely tested, and expressed the confidence that young Americans would respond with determination.

I request that my introductory greeting, and the address of Hon. Sargent Shriver at the recognition convocation of Salem College, May 28, 1963, be reprinted at the conclusion of these remarks.

The 75th Anniversary Commercement Exercises of Salem College were held on Thursday, May 30, and were attended by approximately 1,000 persons.

Focal point of the week's activities was reached when Dr. K. Duane Hurley, president of Salem College, conferred degrees on a graduating class of 133, one of the largest in Salem's history. However, an effective part of the program was carried forward by the students themselves.

John Griggs, student federation president for the coming year, thanked those organizations and private groups which have materially assisted in the expansion of Salem College. Larry Miller, student federation president for 1962–63, spoke of the support that Salem has received from individuals through the years. He especially singled out for praise the late Michael L. Benedum, Dr. and Mrs. A. S. Burdick, Mr. and Mrs. D. M. Davis, and Mr. and Mrs. Harper Ramsburg. The final student speaker was Jennings Randolph, Jr., great grandson of Jesse Randolph, first chairman of the board of Salem College. He pointed out ways in which the Federal Government can participate in education, in making possible long-range plans, student loans, and programs for housing, building and research.

President Hurley announced that in keeping with the commencement theme "Partners in Education," specific recognition would be given to organizations and persons whose interest in education has made academic excellence possible at Salem. Members of the Salem College Board of Directors presented citations and plaques to the recipients, as follows: Edwin Bond, of Salem, to William Wilson, C.I.T. Financial Corporation representative; Mrs. Oscar Nelson, of Charleston, to Attorney Byron Randolph, attorney for the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation; Board of Directors Chairman T. Edward Davis, of Salem, to James Hosey, representative of the United States Steel Foundation; Sanford Randolph of Clarksburg, W. Va., to Walter Koupal, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Foundation representative; and, Harley D. Bond of Plainfield, N.J., to H. K. Baer, secretary of the State Board of Education. As a member of the Board of Directors of Salem College it was my joy to present an award to Jay DeVon, director of the College Housing Branch of the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency. Almost $1 million in loans have been made for buildings on the campus.

Dr. William C. Sanborn, academic dean, presented to President Hurley the graduating class. Degrees were awarded and the ceremonies were concluded with the reading of the beautiful poem, "This Is Salem College," by the author, Dr. John Nelson, of Clarksburg.

I request that the poem "This Is Salem College" be printed in the Appendix at the conclusion of these remarks.

Also taking part in the commencement exercises were: Rev. W. S. Patterson, minister of the Salem Methodist Church, who gave the invocation; Rev. Edward W. Turns, pastor of the Salem Baptist Church, who read the scripture; Rev. C. W. P. Hansen, pastor of the Salem Seventh Day Baptist Church, who gave the opening prayer; and Rev. Mendell L. Gainer, pastor of the Salem Evangelical United Brethren Church, who offered the benediction.

At the baccalaureate service, held Sunday evening at the Nathan Goff Armory, Clarksburg, W. Va., an inspirational and meaningful message was brought by Dr. M. S. Harvey, minister of the First Methodist Church of Akron, Ohio. In his sermon "Six Weeks 'Til Frost," Dr. Harvey made reference to the life and worthwhile work of the famed West Virginia oil tycoon, Michael Late Benedum. Col. Paul G. Benedum, nephew of the late industrialist-philanthropist, received an honorary doctorate in humanities at the baccalaureate. Col. Benedum is now president of the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation, a group which has been instrumental in advancing many educational projects in the Mountain State.

During the observances of the 75th anniversary commencement a degree was also conferred on Hon. R. Sargent Shriver. The Peace Corps Director received the honorary degree of doctor of humanics at the recognition convocation, May 28.

to build their societies, they, in turn, help us to strengthen ours.

These are the American principles which have given shape and meaning to the Peace Corps. This is what the Peace Corps represents.

And because it is your Peace Corps, I envy you.

Other generations of West Virginians have had the chance to fight for these principles on the field of battle. And they responded with immense determination and courage.

You can now struggle for the same cause with the tools of peace and progress—your skills and thought and dedication.

A Peace Corps volunteer, David Crozier, was killed in a motor vehicle accident in Columbia. He had written his parents: "If it came to it, I had rather give my life helping these people rather than looking down a gun barrel at them."

Across the world are hundreds of millions of people struggling to break the bonds which chain them to lives of poverty and disease and hoplessness. You, the citizens of this historic State, have the chance—through the Peace Corps and in a dozen different ways to help them break those bonds.

By rising to this challenge—this unprecedented opportunity never before offered to any generation of Americans—you will carry forward, across the world, the same ideals which your ancestors labored for here in these hills and farms. You will be giving the answer to those who doubt whether America still has the toughness and dedication which made her great.

THIS IS SALEM COLLEGE (DIAMOND JUBILEE)

(By John F. Nelson)

"In the beginning, God,"
These hills, this lovely valley,
A colony, a yearning,
A valley of learning.
This is Salem College.

What depth of soil has settled here,
Whence waters run to the sea,
What eagerness of mind,
So sure to find,
With masters of life and logic,
What God designs to be.
This is Salem College.

Carefully nursed in infancy,
Its childhood gravely shaken
By fears and tears,
While across the years,
Battles were lost but campaigns won
With a generalship that cost
Bended knees and wee hours—
This is Salem College.

Not at the top does learning begin,
But somewhere farther down;
Minds, like skyscrapers, are deeply bound
To ancient rock, yet alive and free,
Building vigor, honor, and knowledge,
Not a "tower of Babel,"
But a temple of humility.
This is Salem College.

New times require new maps,
More space and quality;
Challenged by modernity and awe
With poundings at the door,
How can we meet the call?
"Go forward," said God, "and see."
So often, in the crucial hour,
Came decisive forces—and more.
This is Salem College.

From everywhere, they came
To this magnetic center,
They worked; they played;
Made friends and prayed;
Endeared to their alma mater,
Never rejecting,
Always respecting.
See them on the slopes of life;
Servants of man on every plateau;
With some at the very top,
The glory of God, reflecting.
This is Salem College.

So here we are in sixty-three
Our diamond jubilee.

These hills, this lovely valley,
But behold:
A wider community yearning;
A greater valley of learning.
This is Salem College.

Dedication of the School of the Holy Child, Potomac, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on May 23 the Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington, officiated at ceremonies formally dedicating the School of the Holy Child, at Potomac, Md., in the district I am privileged to represent in Congress. I am pleased to be able to join with Archbishop O'Boyle in extending to the Sisters of the Holy Child Jesus, who operate this excellent new college preparatory school for girls, a most cordial welcome to Maryland and to the Sixth District. I know that I speak for all of the people of my district in wishing the Sisters every success.

In connection with dedication of this school, which opened in Potomac in September of 1961, some facts concerning the history of the Society of the Holy Child Jesus should be of interest to all of us. The society was established in England in 1846, but its foundress, Mother Cornelia Connelly, was a native of Philadelphia and a convert to Catholicism.

Mother Connelly came to the United States in 1862 for the purpose of locating the first convent of the Holy Child in America in the Baltimore area on property which had been given to her order. The fortunes of the Civil War interfered, however, but before returning to England Mother Connelly did establish a convent in the Philadelphia area on other property which had been donated to the society.

The society's decision to locate a School of the Holy Child in Potomac marks a fulfillment, in a sense, of the plan envisioned a century ago by Mother Connelly. And in the intervening years the Society of the Holy Child Jesus has been most successful in this country. The Sisters have acquired an enviable national reputation as highly skilled and deeply devoted educators.

The prefect of the Potomac School of the Holy Child is Mother Mary Celestine, S.H.C.J., who served 15 years prior to 1961 as prefect of St. Leonard's Academy of the Holy Child, in Philadelphia, one of the society's oldest schools in this country. She heads a faculty all of the religious members of which have master's degrees in their respective fields. She carries on the educational traditions of her order in which emphasis is placed on small classes which are conducive to the establishment and maintenance of close personal contract between teacher and student.

The school has just completed its second year of operation with 40 girls enrolled in two classes, the first of which will graduate in June of 1965. In the fall another 25 girls will enter the school and ultimately enrollment will reach its present maximum limit of about 100 students. The Sisters hope to increase this capacity to some extent in later years.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that many of my colleagues are familiar with the work of this order and with Schools of the Holy Child in their respective districts. By way of summary, however, I would like to note that the society operates college preparatory schools, as well as parochial schools and convents, in California, the District of Columbia, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, and Pennsylvania. Rosemont College, in Rosemont, Pa., is the order's only college in the United States.

Founded by a native daughter of America, the Society of the Holy Child Jesus now is headed by its first American mother general since the days of Mother Connelly. She is Rev. Mother Mary Laurentia, S.H.C.J., former superior of the Holy Child Convent at New Sharon, Pa., whose headquarters now as mother general are located in Rome.

I believe it will be of particular interest to the Members, especially my colleagues from the Philadelphia area, that steps have been initiated in Rome toward beatification and ultimate canonization of Mother Connelly as a saint in the Roman Catholic Church. I am certain that all of us in the House, and all Americans, can share in the justifiable pride which the people of Philadelphia can and will display when in due course a native daughter is raised to sainthood.

The dedication address at the School of Holy Child on May 23 was delivered by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John S. Spence, S.T.L., director of education for the Archdiocese of Washington. He reviewed the educational concepts advanced by Mother Connelly and referred to her as a "probable saint." But Monsignor Spence, in his remarks, went beyond this review of the life of Mother Connelly and the work of her order to comment most appropriately on the subject of private education.

Mr. Speaker, Monsignor Spence's keen understanding of the role of private education in a democratic society is reflected in his remarks at the Holy Child School dedication. He sees in both private and public education the need for discipline and submission to authority, in the home as well as in the school, as the essential element in effective education of young men and women in modern America. His remarks in this respect have meaning for all of us.

Under unanimous consent I insert the text of Monsignor Spence's remarks at the dedication of the School of the Holy Child at this point in my remarks:

DEDICATION OF THE SCHOOL OF THE HOLY CHILD, POTOMAC, MD., MAY 23, 1963

(By Rt. Rev. John S. Spence)

Today's joyous occasion affords a timely opportunity of speaking briefly of the parents' and students' role in private education. Like the red spots that signalize the advent of measles or chicken pox, there are cropping out all over the educational body of America, disorders that are ascribed by some as symptoms of spring fever, fashionable fads of ivy league habitues, or other superficial adolescent maladies.

I believe these symptoms go deeper. I believe they are harbingers of a more virulent and fearful disease. I believe they are external evidences of a malignant misconception of the relationship between individual freedom and submission to authority. Rebellions against methods of teaching, marking, discipline, required standards of dress, demeanor, and deportment in private institutions of learning indicate quite clearly that many people, parents and pupils alike, are confusing the political freedom of individuals in a democracy with the disciplinary and academic conformity intrinsic to a private educational institution.

Private schools and colleges are not built by public funds, supported by public subsidies, directed by public representatives, do not offer curriculums of public, democratic choice, and are not subject to private or individual judgments of policy, so long as the institutions are licensed by the state as being in the interest of the common good and by the church as being contributory to common spiritual welfare.

They are built, owned, operated, and governed by private organizations, either religious or lay. No student is bound to attend them; but if the student is permitted to attend, he or she must submit to the authority responsible for them. If they object to that authority, they are free to leave; but as long as they remain, they must obey or else be forced to go. This principle is necessary for the maintenance or order and justice in and toward the institution; but it is also equally essential to the proper character formation of the students, to which the institution commits itself to develop in all their charges as law-abiding citizens of our America of tomorrow.

I might say parenthetically that this same principle of submission holds true, with adaptations of course, to public institutions of learning, for no society can achieve its and without the exercise of authority. What kind of a reversal of order would result if those to be educated governed the educators; if those who came to learn were allowed to teach the teachers and determine the courses of study for themselves?

Not only is this theme timely, it is most appropriate to this dedication, because the foundress of the Society of the Holy Child Jesus, Mother Cornelia Connelly, had such strong convictions on the necessity of respect for authority and the autonomy of authority as the basis of sound education that she fought for its preservation in her philosophy program, and techniques of education through opposition from her blood relatives and confreres at home, through local ecclesiastical personages, all the way to the top echelons of government in Rome itself. Finally, toward the end of her life she won her case against terrific odds, and since then her victory has proved its merit in the achievements of her spiritual daughters.

The life of Cornelia Connelly, wife, mother, nun, and probable saint, reads as grippingly as a first-class detective story, so compelling that only with great restraint can one put down her biography once it has been opened.

A profitable use of our time today might be spent on outlining for you some of the principles that guided the evolution of Mother Connelly's educational program. First of all, she started with the premise that her plan of operation could be most effective if it were limited in scope only to those children of homogeneous cultural background. She knew it would not do for a whole system of public education where schools were compelled to accept all children, regardless of home condition. Her program demanded that the respect for authority required in the school had to be supported by the same respect for authority in the home, where education really begins, where it most extensively developed freely, and where it reaches its flower and maturity.

Notice that she did not require sameness of intellectual ability, sameness of racial ancestry, sameness of social standing—but only sameness of cultural background in which the authority of home life followed the divine natural pattern of the father being the head, the mother his handmaid, and the children being the God-entrusted charges for the parents to guide, govern, and direct until the time when the youngsters were capable of functioning independently through the exercise of their fully developed faculties and powers. Only in such cases would the home complement the school in its efforts to educate the child.

Her technique of teaching employed St. Thomas Aquinas' axiom, "Nil in intelect, nisi prius in sensius," as its launching pad. "Nothing passes into the intellect, without first passing through the senses." Hence she insisted upon eye appeal as a premise to intellectual interest. Get the child interested with its senses and imagination, and then you can teach her to memorize and to understand.

Applied to the abstract subject of arithmetic, she urged that mathematics be started "partly with a box of bricks, a box of cards, weights, and a few plain figures capable of being taken to pieces, so that their eyes and imagination become involved in the observation of objects. They do not use numbers for their own sake but for the sake of the things numbered. They count by sight and are not able to abstract numbers from the things."

She believed that the lessons learned must be short and within the capacity of the child. Yet she was careful to discriminate and to protect any particular sparks of individuality and inspiration she divined in any of her pupils. Justice, she believed, did not lie in equality of treatment, and she felt firmly that "one yoke for the lion and the lamb is tyranny."

"Be accurate" was her favorite advice, but nonetheless she advised her nuns not to be to severe in the criticism and correction of compositions. "We are not to expect a perfect composition from a child. It is easy to correct redundancy, but a barren genius has no remedy."

Thus we see her recognition of individual differences of talent and ability, which can be encouraged and developed to the full, over and above the basic requirements exacted of all pupils.

There are other distinctive features of Mother Connelly's educational philosophy, of course; but these are sufficient to highlight their value as being worthy of your endorsement and justification for the investment you parents are making in this form of private but expensive type of education.

To the students here at Holy Child let me say a final word of admonition: "To whom much is given, of her much is expected." You are enjoying rare opportunities of education, purchased by those who love you and who are dedicated to your total development with all their souls. Your responsibility of profiting by these opportunities is great indeed. Do not be turned aside from the attainment of these goals by the temper of our times. Remember that you are here to learn and make your own a solid set of values that will equip you for outstanding citizenship and leadership in moral perfection. The key to your full response is humble and willing submission to authority in school and at home.

Let it never be said that you are weeds growing in a hot house of unreality. Orchids and flowers of rare delicacy require a warm climate of extraordinary protection until they are mature and strong. But there comes a day when these blossoms of beauty and fragrance can be admitted to the unstable elements of the world outside, where they will radiate their loveliness and charm without danger of wilt or blemish, because their inward stamina has been strengthened and readied to such a degree that they can withstand the perils of heat and cold without losing the vigor and loveliness of their inner life. May such be the fruits of every graduate of this new Academy of the Holy Child Jesus.

Labor Relations Board Makes People Wonder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Spartanburg Herald of Spartanburg, S.C., has posed a most important question in an editorial dated May 30, 1963, and entitled "Labor Relations Board Makes People Wonder." I ask unanimous consent that this outstanding editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR RELATIONS BOARD MAKES PEOPLE WONDER

What is the proper function of the National Labor Relations Board?

Is it to be a partisan, a promoter, a protector of labor union organization—with very little regard for the wishes of the people affected?

Or is it to be a fair and impartial arbiter of collective bargaining, with the principal aim of guaranteeing freedom of choice for the individual?

With almost every official act, the NLRB is expanding the image of itself as being a champion of the union organizer. And this is the agency which exerts the official U.S. Government policy on affairs of the workingman.

Its latest ruling concerning a Spartanburg firm intensifies concern about NLRB fairness.

Sixteen months ago, the NLRB called an election at P. Garvan Co. after the union showed to the Board's satisfaction that enough employees wanted a union to warrant an election.

They did vote for union representation.

But the union and the company never have reached a contract agreement.

A group of employees decided they did not want to be represented by the union any more. They circulated a petition asking the NLRB to call a new election—a legal and accepted procedure. Ninety-one out of 95 workers signed.

When this application went to the NLRB, its spokesman said that if an election were approved a hearing would be scheduled for the union to argue its case on appeal.

The opposite happened. The NLRB would not accept the petition. The union had filed a charge that the company was not bargaining in good faith. This, said the Board, would have to be settled first.

To stop an election, the union can churn out charges about as fast as a typewriter will go.

Attorneys for the workers who don't want a union asked for a hearing—which the NLRB already had assured the union it could have.

No soap. No hearing for employees. No election to determine how they feel on the matter.

Just whom is the NLRB supposed to represent? Surely its main interest should be for the workers. Not what the NLRB or the union thinks is good for the workers, but what the people themselves want.

An organizer can get an election any time he can present signatures of employees saying they want one. Why can't the employees get the same consideration?

Under our democratic system, government presumably represents the will of the governed. Excessive NLRB action is making a lot of alert citizens wonder about that.

Castro Reportedly Given Protection in Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, my attention has been called to an article titled "Castro Reportedly Given Protection in Florida," by Mr. Robert Jones, which appeared in the May 5, 1963, issue of the Indianapolis Star. The article states that the Castro forces in Cuba received important help from the United States before Fidel Castro came to power. The article was called to my attention by Mrs. Harold B. Chait, president of the Baltimore Woman's Committee for Cuban Freedom, 4546 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md., and at her request I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASTRO REPORTEDLY GIVEN PROTECTION IN FLORIDA

(By Robert Jones)

One of the great mysteries of the "Cuban problem" is also the least known. The mystery: Who were the Washington officials who spread a mantle of protection over flagrantly illegal Florida-based gunrunning to Fidel Castro and his guerrillas from 1956 to 1959?

There would be no Cuban problem today—and no elaborate U.S. security network to protect Red Cuba from similar operations—if Florida had not, during those years, been turned into a privileged sanctuary for Castro subversives.

Castro and his guerrillas were financed, armed, supplied, and reinforced from Florida. The Castro revolution could never have triumphed had officials enforced U.S. laws.

Few Americans outside Miami realize how wildly and flagrantly the law was violated by Castro agents in that city when Fidel was fighting in the Sierra Maestra.

Miami was virtually a Castro military base. Arms were trucked semiopenly through the city. An airlift shuttled tons of munitions to Castro's guerrillas from Miami airfields.

Ships packed with armed rebels—similar to the anti-Castro raiders now being feverishly suppressed—left south Florida for Cuba almost daily.

This was not mere bureaucratic negligence. Again and again, the Batista government and local law enforcement officers tried to persuade Washington to bring the situation under control.

Not only did the State Department resist the pressure, word was passed that Federal agencies in Florida were to keep hands off Castro operations.

Irritated, Miami law officers expressed oblique resentment at the Government's attitude in a report dated August 4, 1958, and released by the Dade County Department of Public Safety:

"Several weeks ago, at a request of Michael Fox, Chief of the Miami Beach Police Department, a meeting was held at the Miami Beach Police Department. This meeting was attended by Charles Zmuda and Sylvester Billbrough of the Public Safety Department. Chief Fox, Captain Webb, and Pat Purdue represented the Miami Beach Police Department.

"According to Mr. Zmuda, the meeting was also attended by Agent Davis of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The purpose of the meeting was for mutual aid and cooperation in dissolving the operations of the Cuban revolutionaries.

"As a result of the meeting, large amounts of guns, ammunition, and hand grenades were seized and confiscated by the joint efforts of the Public Safety Department and the Miami Beach Police Department. It was at this time that Agent Davis stated that the Federal Bureau of Investigation wanted nothing to do with the activity."

The limited resources of the local police were, however, quite inadequate to cope with what was an international conspiracy.

But once Castro triumphed, the hands-off policy was reversed. The FBI was ordered to crack down on anti-Castro activities. And today, the U.S. Government is forced to spend millions of tax dollars in deploying air, land, and sea security forces to prevent an anti-Communist duplication of Florida 1956–59.

Debt Discipline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Dr. Harley L. Lutz entitled "Debt Discipline" which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of Wednesday, May 29, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEBT DISCIPLINE: AN EFFECTIVE CEILING REQUIRES CONTROL OF SPENDING

(by Harley L. Lutz)

Congress, once again, has pushed the Federal debt limit a little higher. The latest hassle, which ended yesterday with a temporary boost, was a rear-guard tactic. Everyone knew that some increase was inevitable, as it has been time after time over the past decade. The reason is clear. Federal spending will have risen by more than 50 percent from 1955 through fiscal year 1964—from $64.4 billion to an estimated $98.8 billion. In the same period revenues were so far outrun as to cause an aggregate estimated net deficit of $46 billion.

The principal issue to be discussed here is whether there should be a debt limit. The history of the overall limit since its introduction in 1938 does not make a very good case for it, even aside from the immense debt increase during World War II. In February 1946 the debt dropped to its postwar minimum of some $252 billion and in June of that year the limit was lowered from $300 to $275 billion. As Congress debated action yesterday, the limit was $305 billion and Treasury operations were bumping against this ceiling.

In approaching the issue posed here, the first and most important question is: Do we really mean business or are we to continue the hypocrisy of this kind of sham battle against uncontrolled spending? If the administration, the Congress, and the people are not willing to accept the discipline of a firm debt limit, then the policy of debt limitation should be discarded as a bit of fiscal flummery. The position taken here is that there should be a debt limit and a firm policy of its strict enforcement.

NO MAGIC FIGURE

There is no magical, absolutely definite figure for this limit. The deficit for fiscal year 1963 is by this time fairly well set and provision must be made to cover the expenses, whatever they may be. The case is different for the fiscal year 1964, especially in view of the slow pace of congressional action on the appropriations for this year. Various well-considered recommendations for reduced spending in 1964 have been advanced by responsible persons and organizations, and other sound proposals could no doubt be developed if such guidance and support were needed to stiffen the backbone of the Congress in a firm stand against further borrowing.

From the operational standpoint there can be no question that the 1964 budget can be reduced enough to involve no additional increase in the debt limit, beyond whatever may be necessary to cover the 1963 deficit. The political hazard of a bold stand for financial sanity has probably been exaggerated by such myths as "spending and electing," but a firm national policy of debt control would provide timid candidates with a reasonable excuse for getting less Federal spending in the home district where success in such endeavors is the chief argument for reelection.

It must be emphasized that a debt limit, by itself, would not restrict Federal spending although, as indicated below, it would tend in that direction. The primary purpose of a firm debt limit is to prevent unrestrained debt-financed spending.

Among the reasons for a firm debt limit policy are the following:

1. The absence of a debt limit would tend toward even less compunction regarding debt financing and an even greater readiness to resort to it than now exists. The abuses of authorizations to spend from public debt receipts as a means of bypassing the scrutiny of the appropriations committees have been frequently exposed.

EVIDENCE OF INTEGRITY

2. Debt limitation is widely regarded as visible evidence of fiscal integrity, that is, the honesty and sincerity of the Government's intention regarding the value of the currency and of all fixed investments. The rigmarole of a debt limit which always moves upward just one step ahead of spending is a kind of lipservice to the concept of fiscal integrity but it is of no avail as a protection against the perils of unlimited debt increase.

3. A firm debt limit would be a powerful source of confidence among investors with regard to the stability of the public debt as a long-range investment. While there are other factors involved, the shift of investor preference from long-term to short-term Federal debt paper invites speculation as to the degree of confidence in the future value of long-term Treasury bonds. In 1946, for

example, the average maturity of the Federal debt was 9 years and 1 month, and the debt under 5 years maturity was 45.7 percent of the total. As of December 1962 the average maturity had dropped to 4 years and 11 months, and the portion under 5 years maturity had risen to 73.3 percent.

The high proportion of short-term and floating debt is a handicap to efficient debt management. A lengthening of maturities requires the cooperation of investors who are naturally concerned with the ultimate as well as the present value of long-term Treasury bonds. The increased resort to debt financing that would be encouraged by absence of a limit would present definite prospect of inflation and continued erosion of the dollar in which, at maturity, the bonds are to be redeemed.

4. As noted above, while a firm debt limit would not necessarily prevent increased spending, it would indirectly operate in this direction. The limit would involve the obligation to pay cash on the barrelhead and this would tend toward a more careful public appraisal of the utility of spending programs as against the disutility of the additional taxes required to support them.

Certain practical aspects of a firm debt limit should be considered. The first is the effective date. Since the purpose is to prevent an increase of the debt, the end of the fiscal year is the logical time to apply the test. This means that Treasury operations during the fiscal year would be disregarded. The inflow of revenue over the year is variable, a situation which is exaggerated by the various actions of recent years to speed up taxpayments. Three of the four instalments of individual income tax are due in the second half of the fiscal year. The outflow of expenditures is, by contrast, quite uniform through the year and, as a result, the Treasury must have temporary access to funds in the first half. Short-term borrowing to equalize income and outgo over the year is necessary and logical. The debt limit would prevent carrying such temporary advances into the next fiscal year as a permanent addition to the debt.

A second practical consideration relates to the debt to be subject to the limit. The present statutory rule includes everything except some minor items of no importance in the total. It is suggested here that the limit be applicable to the debt in the hands of the public, including the Federal Reserve banks. A very important segment of the debt that would be excluded under this proposal consists of the Treasury obligations held in the trust fund accounts. These obligations represent the accumulated excess of collections over disbursements for social security, unemployment compensation, railroad retirement, civil service retirement, veterans' insurance, and others. The objective at which the present discussion is directed is the limitation and control of debt arising out of the operations of the administrative budget. The trust funds are not part of this budget, nor are they in any way controllable under it.

IMPACT ON JOBS

Two collateral matters should have brief notice. One is the contention, regularly used to support a huge budget and whatever deficit is involved, to the effect that any curtailment of Federal spending will increase unemployment. Hence a strict debt limit would increase unemployment.

Federal spending, as such, does not increase employment except as it adds more persons to the public payroll. A large airplane or missile contract may increase the demand for scientists or skilled workers in the plants designated to execute the contract, or in those of subcontractors. It will do nothing to provide jobs for those ultramarginal members of the labor force whose productivity is less than employers must pay under union rules or Federal law.

The other collateral matter is the argument that an expanding economy needs more debt because it will need more money. Hence, a strict debt limit will impede economic progress because it will restrict the capacity of the banking system to provide more money as the economy grows.

There is no question that the economy will need a larger money supply and a larger base for credit operations as its productive activities expand. Ninety percent or more of this increased money supply will be in the form of bank deposit credits. The question involved here is whether or not there must be an increase of the public debt beyond its present level in order to provide an asset base for the support of the larger volume of bank credits that will be needed. More specifically, must we allow the public debt to increase, not only for budget reasons, but also to maintain a supply of marketable debt paper sufficient to accommodate the Federal Reserve banks in the exercise of their money and credit control operations?

PERMANENT INFLATION

A deliberate increase in the public debt merely to permit, or assure, an expansion of the money supply would be permanently inflationary. It would be one of the weakest possible reasons for eliminating the debt ceiling, or for pandering to the spending urge by conceding every trick before the cards are played. Economic growth depends on increase of debt. This is as simple and as inevitable as the balancing of every credit by a debit. It does not follow, however, that the achievement of a higher rate of economic growth involves or requires a continuous increase of the public debt. Privately generated debt paper, arising out of the growth needs of the economy, can serve fully as well as Treasury debt paper as the basis of Federal Reserve operations.

A final point: It is not generally realized that the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives is, in a real and important sense, the key to our problem. This committee has original jurisdiction over revenue measures and the debt limit. It thus occupies a unique position in the area of fiscal policy determination. While its recommendations on taxes and other matters have not been accepted by the Congress in every case, its influence is great.

In the past this committee has initiated many of the tax policies which are now so generally under attack, and its complaisant attitude on the debt limit has, to say the least, not discouraged deficit spending. This financial course has not contributed to satisfactory economic growth. The committee now has the opportunity—and the challenge—to change direction, to exert its influence toward reducing and limiting the drag of Government on the economy, and to exercise its powerful leadership for the growth of the economy rather than the growth of Government. Sound tax reform and a firm position on the debt limit are essential steps to this end.

The Late Francis E. Walter

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the sadness of this occasion, the sense of loss which we all feel in the death of our distinguished and able colleague, and the personal grief I feel in knowing that I can no longer seek the counsel of an old friend will make my tribute to FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, shorter than might be appropriate in any other such tragic case.

His brothers here know his unfailing courtesy, his intense energies, his devotion to his district, his State, and his country. His abilities were of the extraordinary kind that make the born legislative leader. But his leadership was tempered with the concern for common problems and ordinary people which shows that heart as well as mind are the motivating forces in a man's life.

The courage that he always showed in matters before the committee and subcommittee which he chaired, and on the floor of this House, that courage he showed to the fullest in his last days. He entered the hospital in February for what were described as tests; he returned to the hospital for the last time in April. In the face of death his spirits did not flag, his courage never ebbed. He died the fighter that he always was.

Others will detail here today his achievements and accomplishments in the years he served in this House. I wish merely to note that I knew him in his early days in Pennsylvania. I was proud to be able to say then that he was my friend. I am heartbroken to say today that my friend is gone.

Knowledge Production Grows Faster Than GNP—A Sign of Real Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most common assertions made in any discussion of the U.S. economy is that our growth rate has slowed down substantially in recent years and that extraordinary measures are called for to stimulate a faster rate of economic growth. The assumption that our growth rate has slowed down is based upon an analysis of the increase in the Nation's output as measured by the gross national product computations.

As I have frequently pointed out, the gross national product does not measure real growth, but rather the level of economic activity. We know, for example, that gross national product increases dramatically during a war period, but no one would assert that this is real economic growth.

The gross national product measures only imperfectly, if at all, many of the components of real growth, such as increased leisure time, new and improved goods and services on the market, more and better education, improved health and longevity, and so forth. If we could accurately measure some of these real growth factors, I am confident that a picture would emerge of a dynamic and rapidly growing economy.

Happily, an important start has been made in making these measurements. One of the Nation's most distinguished economists, Prof. Fritz Machlup, of Princeton University, has undertaken the pioneering task of trying to assess the growth in some 30 knowledge-producing activities involving research and development, communications media, information machines, information services, and education, including that in the home, on the job, in the churches, and in the Armed Forces. Professor Machlup estimates that in 1958, total knowledge production was almost 29 percent of the adjusted gross national product.

Compared to an average annual rate of increase in gross national product—at current prices—from 1954–58 of 5.1 percent and from 1947–58 of 5.9 percent, Professor Machlup estimates that the weighted average of the annual rate of increase in knowledge production was 8.8 percent from 1954–58 and 10.6 percent from 1947–58.

The differences in the rates of increase, Professor Machlup points out, appear even more impressive if knowledge production is compared with everything else included in gross national product. He says:

> If knowledge production, the sector comprising 28.7 percent of total GNP, increased by 8.8 percent (or 10.6 percent over the longer period) per year, an increase of total GNP by 5.1 percent (or 5.9 percent) implies that the production of other goods and services increased by only 3.7 percent (or 4.1 percent over the longer period).

These impressive gains in knowledge production are not fully reflected in the gross national product figures, which are commonly used as the measure of our Nation's economic growth. As Professor Machlup says, an economy such as ours, with a large service-producing sector, may not be able to show off with as large a physical growth rate as an economy which concentrates on the production of tangible goods. He points out:

> Increases in productivity in the performance of intangible services cannot be measured; indeed, most of them are in the form of improvements of quality, defying all attempts at quantification. No matter how real, how substantial, how important they are, they need not be reflected in any increased money values of input—their only measure. As we have seen in the discussion of research and development, an increase in the efficiency and productivity of these activities may eventually result in increased productivity in industries producing physical goods, but the production of knowledge does not exhibit an increase on that score. This failure of growth indexes to reflect improved efficiency in the production of intangible services has several implications. One of these relates to structural differences between economies: an economy with a large service-producing sector may not be able to show off with as large a physical growth rate as an economy that concentrates on the production of tangible goods, the increase of which is shown in the index of physical production and in GNP in constant dollars.

Another important service rendered by Professor Machlup is to draw a careful distinction between growth rates, which he says can be determined only by looking back over a span of 10 to 15 years, and rates of increase over a short period of time. Almost all economists, statisticians, publicists, and politicians mistakenly speak of growth rates with reference to a period of 3 or 4 years.

Professor Machlup emphasizes that an increase over 3 or 4 years may turn out to be only a short-lived upsurge, followed by a downturn around a trend line, showing no or only slow growth. Likewise, a decline may be a short-term movement around a sharply increasing trend line. This misuse of terms, he says, is especially serious when the growth policies of a national economy are debated.

Under unanimous consent I include an excerpt from Professor Machlup's book, "The Production and Distribution of Knowledge in the United States," published by the Princeton University Press in 1962, in the RECORD at this point. The excerpt which I am including covers Professor Machlup's discussion of the points which I have highlighted in these brief remarks:

THE GROWTH RATES OF KNOWLEDGE INDUSTRIES

After our speculative discussion of the possible and probable interrelations between rates of increase in certain branches of knowledge production and rates of increase in total national product we are even more curious about the actually observed rates of increase. This presupposes, of course, that the poor statistical data—to no small degree based on heroic estimates or guesses—can be regarded as empirical "observations." But we shall proceed as if the data reflected what actually happened, even if we must make many mental reservations concerning their reliability.

NOT EVERY INCREASE CONSTITUTES GROWTH

In talking about the increases in the estimated values of production in recent years we shall be guilty of not avoiding the semantic sin committed by almost all economists, statisticians, publicists, and politicians of our day—namely of speaking of "growth" rates although we know only rates of "increase" over a short interval of time. Only looking back over a span of 10 to 15 years would we be justified in speaking of growth. An increase over 3 or 4 years may turn out to be only a short-lived upsurge followed by a downturn around a trend line showing no or only very slow growth, or it may even prove to have been a temporary recovery in a longrun decline.

This misuse of terms, serious when the growth record, the growth objectives, and growth policies of a national economy are debated, is relatively harmless in our present survey; hence, we need not be so pure in our language. We shall bear in mind, of course, that a rate of increase observed over a short period does not warrant an assumption that this increase will be "sustained" over a longer period. When we fall into the bad habit of speaking of "growth" instead of an "increase" over a short period, this does not mean that we have forgotten our own warning.

INCREASED MONEY VALUES WITHOUT PRICE DEFLATORS

Another snare to guard against is the identification of increased dollar sales or increased dollar expenditures with increased production, without considering the price changes that have occurred. In order to measure increases or decreases in production, we must "deflate" dollar sales by changes in the prices of the products or, where there is no physical product and production is measured only by inputs, we must "deflate" dollar expenditures for input by the changes in the prices of the inputs used. To do this would be a formidable task. The work involved in finding the price deflators for each industry or branch of knowledge production would be enormous, and the results would not be worth the effort. Another way of interpreting changes in dollar figures must be found.

A crude but simple method is available: We shall not attempt to measure physical volumes of production, but shall simply use dollar values at current prices and compare the rates of change in dollar expenditures in the different branches of knowledge production with one another, with the rate of change in dollar expenditures for the total of all knowledge production, and with the rate of change of GNP at current prices.

For the latter comparison we shall not bother to adjust GNP for changes in the status of certain products as "final" or "intermediate." After all, what matters at this juncture is not the size of GNP in any one year but the rate of change of GNP over certain periods. For this purpose the official estimates at current prices will be used; we choose the period 1954–58 for the rate of increase "over the most recent period," and 1947–58 for the rate over a somewhat longer period. GNP at current prices was $234,289 million in 1947, $363,112 million in 1954, $442,224 million in 1958. This involves a "growth" of 21.8 percent over the 4-year period 1954–58, and a "growth" of 88.8 percent over the 11-year period 1947–58. Translated into annual rates, the short-period increase was 5.1 percent and the longer-period increase was 5.9 percent per year. These "growth rates" were the combined reflections of physical increases and price increases. The only use to be made of these annual rates of increase in GNP at current (rising) prices is to compare with them a number of other rates of increase, observed in the same or similar periods and likewise unadjusted for price changes.

GROWTH IN EXPENDITURES FOR KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION

In table IX–2 we undertake to show the rates of increase in expenditures for production in the various knowledge industries or branches of knowledge-production, as far as we have obtained data. The table is designed to present (1) the 1958 (or closest available) value of each item, as taken from table IX–1, to be used later as weight for the "growth rate" in order to arrive at average growth rates for knowledge-production as a whole; (2) growth rates for the most recent period, preferably 1954–58; and (3) growth rates for a longer period, preferably 1947–58. Unfortunately, in several instances different periods have to be used because data for the chosen years are not available; and for some items we must resign ourselves to showing blank spaces.

Blank spaces in the growth columns for the recent period are shown for education in the Armed Forces, conventions, wholesale agents, and three smaller items, because we have only a single recent estimate of each of these expenditures. The combined value of the six items for which no rates of increase are available is only $6,839 million, or 5 percent of total knowledge-production. Thus we have the short-period rates of increase for the other 46 items, making up 95 percent of the total. In the columns for longer period growth rates we have blank spaces in 16 lines, representing 1958 expenditures of $22,625 million, or 16.6 percent of total knowledge-production. The lack of comparable figures, in some instances due to changes in census classifications, explains several of these blanks. In one case—electronic computers—the industry did not exist in the early years of our longer period, and we do not wish to start with the very first year and have it as a part of a shortened period, because this would give astronomical growth rates. Incidentally, we do catch in our longer period the beginnings of television broadcasting, exhibiting a growth of 54,000 percent over the 11 years, but this is "only" an annual growth rate of 77 percent. By clipping off the first 2 years, 1947–48, and observing the growth only for 1949 to 1958, we would reduce the "growth rate" for TV broadcasting to 2,930 percent for the 9 years, and 46 percent per year. We should never forget that the early years of an industry regularly exhibit enormous rates of increase, impressive to those who do not understand the principle. Electronic computers and TV broadcasting are at least as impressive as some of the rates of growth of the output in new industries in Soviet Russia.

TABLE IX–2.—*Knowledge production: Rates of increase for all branches, 1954–58 and 1947–58, or similar periods*

Branch of knowledge production	Annual expenditures		Rates of increase (growth rates)					
			Most recent period			Longer period		
	Year	Millions of dollars	Years	Percent increase over period	Percent increase per year	Years	Percent increase per period	Percent increase per year
Education:								
In the home	1958	4,432	1956–58	2	1.0			
On the job	1958	3,054	1956–58	11	5.4			
In the church	1958	2,467	1954–58 [1]	39	8.5			
In the Armed Forces	1958	3,410						
Elementary and secondary schools:								
Monetary expenditures	1957–58	16,054	1954–58 [2]	44	9.5	1948–58 [2]	210	12.0
Implicit costs	1957–58	17,285	1950–56 [3]	64	8.6	1940–56 [3]	293	8.9
Colleges and universities:								
Monetary expenditures	1957–58	4,443	1954–58 [2]	64	13.2	1948–58 [2]	115	7.5
Implicit costs	1957–58	8,314	1950–56 [3]	54	7.5	1940–56 [3]	626	13.2
Commercial vocational and residential schools	1958	253						
Federal funds, not elsewhere classified	1957–58	342	1954–58	144	24.9			
Public libraries	1957–58	140	1954–58	37	8.2			
Research and development:								
Basic research	1958–59	1,016	1954–58	93	17.9	1949–58	292	16.4
Applied research and development	1958–59	9,974	1954–58	99	18.8			
Printing and publishing:								
Books and pamphlets	1958	1,595	1954–58	50	10.7	1947–58	119	7.4
Periodicals	1958	1,811	1954–58	12	2.9	1947–58	56	4.1
Newspapers	1958	3,956	1954–58	19	4.5	1947–58	95	6.3
Stationery and other office supplies	1958	1,852	1954–58	34	7.5	1947–58	94	6.2
Commercial printing and lithography	1958	2,870	1954–58	8	1.9	1947–58	70	4.9
Photography and phonography:								
Photography	1958	1,600	1954–58 [4]	32	7.1	1948–54 [5]	100	12.2
Phonography	1958	1,035	1954–58	105	19.6	1947–58 [6]	92	6.1
Stage, podium, and screen:								
Theaters and concerts	1958	313	1954–58	39	8.0	1947–58	67	4.7
Spectator sports	1958	255	1954–58	13	3.2	1947–58	15	1.3
Motion pictures	1958	1,172	1954–58	−3	−.8	1947–58	−26	−2.8
Radio and television:								
Radio stations revenue	1958	523	1954–58	16	3.8	1947–58	44	3.4
Television stations revenue	1958	1,030	1954–58	74	14.8	1947–58	54,110	77.2
Radio and TV sets and repairs	1958	1,982	1954–58	−16	−3.7	1947–58	81	5.5
Radio and TV stations investments	1957	806	1954–57	36	10.7	1947–57	437	18.3
Other advertising	1958	5,000	1954–58	26	5.9	1947–58	150	8.7
Telecommunications media:								
Telephone	1958	7,642	1954–58	43	9.3	1947–58	211	10.9
Telegraph	1958	318	1954–58	17	3.9	1947–58	30	2.4
Postal service	1958	3,000	1954–58 [7]	20	4.7	1947–58 [7]	83	5.6
Conventions	1957	1,600						
Information machines:								
Printing-trades machinery	1958	350	1954–58	25	5.7	1947–58	56	4.1
Musical instruments	1958	190	1954–58	42	9.1	1947–58	92	6.1
Motion-picture apparatus and equipment	1958	147						
Telephone and telegraph equipment	1958	1,200	1954–58 [8]	50	10.6	1947–58 [8]	94	6.2
Signaling devices	1958	200				1947–54	43	5.2
Measuring and controlling instruments	1958	4,968	1954–58	35	7.9	1947–58	155	13.5
Typewriters	1958	272	1953–58	31	5.6	1947–58 [9]	55	4.0
Electronic computers	1958	332	1954–58	1,647	104.4			
Other office machines	1958	937	1953–58	21	3.8		(10)	
Office-machine parts	1958	326	1953–58	275	30.2		(10)	
Professional services:								
Legal	1958	3,025	1953–58	50	8.4	1947–58	141	8.3
Engineering and architectural	1958	1,978	1953–58	48	8.2	1947–58	169	9.4
Accounting and auditing	1957	1,138	1953–58 [11]	56	11.8	1949–57	152	12.2
Medical	1958	2,083	1953–58	47	8.0	1947–58	106	6.8
Joint with financial services:								
Check-deposit banking	1958	(10)		(10)			(10)	
Securities brokers, etc	1958	647	[12] 1954–58	44	9.4	[12] 1947–58	390	15.5
Insurance agents	1958	2,173	1954–58	26	6.0	1947–58	155	8.9
Real estate agents	1958	(10)		(10)			(10)	
Wholesale agents	1954	1,229		(10)		1948–54	47	6.6
Miscellaneous business services	1958	1,714	[13] 1954–58	49	10.6		(10)	
Government:								
Federal	1958	1,555	1953–58	7	1.3	(14)		
State and local	1958	2,419	1954–58	36	8.0	(14)		
Total knowledge production	1958	136,436						
With data for recent period		129,597			8.8			
With data for longer period		113,811						10.6

---

[1] Includes only the congregational outlays of approximately 50 denominations.
[2] Does not include the item "transportation, supplies and clothing."
[3] Includes only items of earnings forgone (Schultz figures).
[4] Includes only receipts of photographic studios.
[5] Includes only receipts of photographic studios and photosupply stores.
[6] Includes only retail sales of phonograph records.
[7] Includes only 1st-class and airmail.
[8] Sales receipts of manufacturers of telephone and telegraph equipment.
[9] The data from the census of manufactures used here are not quite comparable with those of the current industrial reports used for the more recent period.
[10] Not available.
[11] Receipts of sole proprietorships only.
[12] Income originating in "Securities brokers, etc.," industry.
[13] Receipts of business-management consulting services are not included.
[14] Because of changes in reporting during the period, no comparable figures are obtainable.

Of all the anual "growth rates" tabulated for the various branches of knowledge production, the short-period rate for computers is the highest: 104 percent. The second highest is the longer period rate for TV broadcasting: 77 percent. The short-period rates for office machine parts (30 percent), Federal education programs (25 percent), phonography (20 percent), applied research and development (19 percent), and basic research (18 percent), and the longer period growth rate for broadcasting station investment (18 percent) are next in the list of top performers. A considerable number of annual rates above 10 percent appears in table IX-2. The most interesting are the short-term rate of over 13 percent for money expenditures for colleges and universities, the long-term rate of 12 percent for money expenditures for elementary and secondary schools, and the short-term rate of almost 11 percent for books and pamphlets.

All these individual annual growth rates should be viewed against the background of the average growth of knowledge production and the growth of GNP. The weighted average of the annual rates of increase over the most recent period of the 46 branches of knowledge production for which we have data is 8.8 percent. This compares with a 5.1-percent rate of increase of GNP (at current prices) per year over the same 4 years. The weighted average of the annual rates of increase of the 36 branches of knowledge production for which we have data covering the longer period is 10.6 percent, which compares with a 5.9-percent rate of increase of GNP (at current prices) over the same 11 years. The differences in the rates appear even more impressive if knowledge production is compared with the production of everything else that is included in GNP. If knowledge production, the sector comprising 28.7 percent of total GNP, increased by 8.8 percent (or 10.6 percent over the longer period) per year, an increase of total GNP by 5.1 percent (or 5.9 percent) implies that the production of other goods and services increased by only 3.7 percent (or 4.1 percent over the longer period).

RESERVATIONS AND SPECULATIONS

These comparisons must be taken with several grains of salt. The procedure by which the growth of knowledge production is held up for contrast with the growth of all other things, may be questioned because no account was taken of the missing data for 5 percent of knowledge production over the most recent period or 16.6 percent of knowledge-production over the longer period. If the missing branches happened to be slow growing, the use of the weighted average of "growth rates" of the branches represented in the tabulation as the rate applicable to the entire knowledge production would overstate its growth. But it is unlikely that an overstatement on this ground would be serious enough to vitiate the general conclusion. The contrast would remain impressive even if the rates of increase in knowledge production were not the full 2.4 times (or 2.6 times) the rates of increase in the production of other things.

There are, however, other grounds for objections or reservations. One may question the significance of the comparisons on the ground that the increases refer to amounts not corrected for possibly very different rates of price inflation. But the failure to correct for possible differences in price inflation may just as well involve an understatement as an overstatement of the differences in "real" growth rates. In any case, even if there should be less of a "price inflation effect" in other parts of GNP at current prices than in the expenditures for knowledge production, the relative money expenditures and relative rates of increase remain interesting. This is to say, it is important to note that the money expenditures for intangible knowledge services rose much faster than the money expenditures for physical goods and other services.

For a better understanding of the meaning of "growth" in areas of production in which output cannot be measured, and most of the increase is in terms of expenditures for input, it may be helpful to go through a bit of hypothetical reasoning. Imagine an economy divided in two sectors, one, A, producing physical goods, the other, B, intangible services, A employing three-fourths, B one-fourth of the total labor force. Assume now an increase in productivity in sector A due to technological progress and a consequent increase in the physical output of sector A by, say, 10 percent; assume further that all wages and salaries, in A and B, are increased by 10 percent and that product prices remain unchanged. If there is no change in the allocation of resources, money expenditures will have increased by the same 10 percent in both sectors. In sector A, where "growth" is measured in terms of sales of output, an increased quantity of goods is sold at unchanged prices; in sector B, where "growth" is measured in terms of payments for input, an unchanged quantity of labor is paid increased wages. Thus, the "real" increase in production in A, with no change in activity in B, results by way of adjustment in factor incomes in the same relative increase in expenditures for the intangible services of B. The "production" of intangible services by an unchanged quantity of labor with unchanged productivity will show the same percentage increase as the production of physical goods.

There is a reverse side to the coin. Increases in productivity in the performance of intangible services cannot be measured; indeed, most of them are in the form of improvements of quality, defying all attempts at quantification. No matter how "real," how substantial, how important they are, they need not be reflected in any increased money values of input—their only measure. As we have seen in the discussion of research and development, an increase in the efficiency and productivity of those activities may eventually result in increased productivity in industries producing physical goods, but the production of knowledge does not exhibit an increase on that score. This failure of "growth indices" to reflect improved efficiency in the production of intangible services has several implications. One of these relates to structural differences between economies: an economy with a large service-producing sector may not be able to "show off" with as large a physical growth rate as an economy that concentrates on the production of tangible goods, the increase of which is shown in the index of physical production and in GNP in constant dollars.

Achievement in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the rapid advance of American scientific achievement and our progress in space, as evidenced by the 22-orbit flight of Maj. L. Gordon Cooper and by the Gemini and Apollo projects, have gone a long way toward closing the gap created by U.S.S.R. achievements. So great has been the American effort that serious questions have been raised regarding the priorities involved in terms of scientific personel and budget. Still another consideration, which has not received enough public attention, is raised by an editorial in the publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. I ask unanimous consent to print in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial entitled "International Competition in Science," which appeared in the magazine Science, May 17, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL COMPETITION IN SCIENCE

The Soviet ability to launch large missiles has been misinterpreted as indicating superiority over the United States in scientific matters. Actually there are few areas of science in which the Russians excel. Despite their ability to place large pieces of hardware in orbit, their contributions to space research have been meager. They have nothing to match our Mariner II results, and their exploration of regions closer to the earth has been less intensive than ours. In high-energy nuclear physics our discoveries are unmatched, as is our progress in maser-laser studies and in semiconductors. In most areas of chemistry the Russians are behind us; plastics and petrochemicals are outstanding examples. In the exploitation of radioactive isotopes much of the Russian work is mere repetition of our research. In biochemistry, biophysics, and molecular biology we are superior. The Russians have achieved nothing like our progress in deciphering the genetic code or in determining amino acid sequences in proteins.

Innumerable examples could be given; we compete on countless frontiers of science which, in sum, are vastly more important than space. On many of these frontiers, such as solid-state physics, advances are crucial to future economic and military strength. Fundamental research is now often quickly followed by practical applications. A substantial fraction of today's commerce is based on discoveries of the last two decades. It is of interest to compare American and Russian competition in world markets in items involving science and technology. By this yardstick the Soviet Union is a third-class power. It is no match for Western Europe, the United Kingdom, or Japan.

The Japanese are competing in technological areas requiring first-class scientific competence. Their electronics products such as transistor radios and television sets are selling for less than ours on our own soil. To a degree this reflects cheaper labor, but only in part. The production of transistors and other solid-state electronic components involves sophisticated technology. Even the cheapest labor is no substitute for scientific ability in this field.

Western Europe is far stronger scientifically and technologically than the U.S.S.R., and the Western Europeans are rapidly closing in on us. If present trends continue, it will be only a matter of a few years before they achieve supremacy.

Western Europeans have long proved that they are, individually at least, as competent scientifically as we. They have made a remarkable recovery from the effects of World War II and are again in a position to challenge us. In the contest they have two advantages. Research costs them about one-fourth what it costs us, and proportionately less of their talent is occupied with military and space efforts. Leaders of industrial research in this country are increasingly concerned with the overpowering competition of Government-financed programs for first-class scientific talent. One research director told me recently, "We need good people, but my company can't compete with projects paid for by the U.S. Treasury."

We have chosen to stake our national prestige in a propaganda contest with the Russians in one of the few major areas of technology where they have an edge over us. In the meantime we fail to note that the Western Europeans are getting ready to walk away with the trophies which really count.

Domestic and Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the amazing anomalies of our times is the fact that so many of our young people seem to be so far ahead of our Government policy planners in the fields of both domestic and foreign policy. More and more of our young people are lining up against spendthrift Government policies which will end up leaving them holding the bag on the tremendous national debt which is being piled up today by irresponsible policies. I have also found great numbers of our young people who are concerned about our no-win foreign policy, particularly when they see the threat of world communism victoriously resting on the doorsteps in nearby Cuba, in direct violation of the Monroe Doctrine about which they have been taught so much in their schooling.

I am pleased to call to the attention of the Senate an excellent essay by Don Ubben, a student at Manning High School in Manning, S.C., entitled "What the Monroe Doctrine Means Today." This essay recently won first place in Manning High School in the annual essay contest sponsored by the Americanism Committee of the American Legion Auxiliary.

The essay has been called to my attention by being printed in the editorial columns of the Manning Times on May 30, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE MONROE DOCTRINE MEANS TODAY

(By Don Ubben)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following essay won first place in Manning High School in the annual contest sponsored by the Americanism Committee of the American Legion Auxiliary. Ann McFadin was second-place winner. This essay will be entered in a statewide contest, from which a winner will be picked for national competition.)

"We should consider any attempt (on the part of foreign governments) to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

Those words were spoken by President J. Monroe in 1823. The question is: Are they still valid in 1963?

Let us look into their background and see how they had their inception. Three leading European monarchies had pledged themselves to "put an end to * * * representative government, in whatever country it may exist." To protect the New World, the policy of President Monroe was introduced which was invoked several times in the 19th century. President Cleveland used it as a basis to declare war on Britain if Britain would not agree to arbitrate its dispute with Venezuela. The British Government (then our superior) promptly agreed, thus proving the effectiveness of this momentous doctrine.

President Theodore Roosevelt gave new life to the doctrine. He pointed out that weaknesses on the part of smaller American nations might tempt European countries to intervene. He also asserted that the Monroe Doctrine required this Nation to prevent such intervention by doing the intervening itself. Under this policy this Nation sent armed forces into several Latin American Republics and settled the disputes. Thus we see that the Monroe Doctrine has served us well.

Then the worm entered the apple. A serpent slithered into the heart of freedom on this planet. The name of the snake is communism. Poisoning the minds and hearts of many of our leaders, it is today coiled and nestled in the heart of our Government at Washington. Under its influence our State Department and our President killed the Monroe Doctrine in the Cuban crisis.

Khrushchev got what he wanted in Cuba without firing a shot. He was given a solemn pledge by the President of this Nation that Castro's Communist prison would be undisturbed and actually protected as a base for subversion, infiltration, sabotage, and conquest of Central and South America. Because of his unnecessary promise, President Kennedy knocked out with one blow the Monroe Doctrine which, for 140 years, has protected the sovereignty of Western Hemisphere nations.

"A great victory in Cuba," shouts the Liberal press. I say this: In Cuba we have lost to communism the most decisive battle of the cold war. We have been siphoned still deeper into the whirlpool of global Marxism. If this be victory, then may God help the human race.

What is the answer? The solution is that we must reinstate the Monroe Doctrine as basic plank of our foreign policy, and we must act. Perhaps the grave urgency of the situation is expressed in these words of Josiah Gilbert Holland:

"God, give us men. A time like this demands strong minds, great hearts, true faiths, and ready hands."

Hon. Francis E. Walter

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES D. WEAVER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER was a man whom I did not have the privilege of knowing personally. As an active citizen for many years and now as a Member of Congress, I have been aware of his fine record of accomplishments for his State and the Nation.

His qualities of leadership and knowledge of the intricacies of the workings of the Congress were remarkable. All Members held this man in high respect. Pennsylvania has lost a distinguished public servant. The Congress has lost an outstanding leader.

I add my personal expression of sympathy to Mr. WALTER's family and to his many friends. He will be remembered as a truly dedicated man to the America in which he firmly believed and for which he fought.

Resolution of the Guam Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, periodically the Guam Legislature passes resolutions memorializing Congress to consider legislation which concerns our westernmost Pacific territory. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has received Resolution 32, signed by the Honorable A. B. Won Pat, speaker, Seventh Guam Legislature, which memorializes the President, the Congress, and appropriate executive agencies to extend to those American vessels carrying goods to and from the territory of Guam the subsidy given such vessels carrying goods to foreign ports. The resolution points out that in the shipping field, and for other purposes, Guam is considered a foreign port in that no customs are collected on goods imported into the territory from foreign ports. Since Guam, a free port, is outside the U.S. tariff wall and is an obvious stopping point on voyages to foreign ports in the Pacific, it would appear that Congress should consider legislation to permit a subsidy on the Guam-Mainland U.S. run.

Mr. Speaker, I include a copy of Resolution 32 of the Guam Legislature as a part of my remarks:

RESOLUTION 32

Resolution relative to memorializing the President, the Congress, and the appropriate executive agencies of the United States to extend to those American vessels carrying goods to and from the territory of Guam the subsidy given such vessels in runs to foreign ports

Whereas as a result of the present Federal legislation affecting Guam as an American port, the legislature is advised that subsidized runs by American ships carrying cargoes to Guam are unauthorized, this not being a foreign port for the purpose; and

Whereas as a result, shipping costs to Guam are exorbitantly high, the tariff having been substantially increased twice in the last 18 months, which higher cost of freight increases not only the cost of living in the territory but makes difficult if not impossible the development of local industry and export trade; and

Whereas for other purposes Guam is considered a foreign port is that no customs are collected on goods imported into Guam from foreign countries, Guam being a free port and outside the United States tariff wall, and since Guam is an obvious stopping point on voyages to foreign ports in the Pacific, it would appear not improper to permit a subsidy on this run: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the appropriate executive agencies of the United States, particularly the Federal Maritime Board, be and they are hereby respectfully requested and memorialized to study the possibility of permitting a subsidy to

American vessels carrying cargoes to and from Guam; and be it further

Resolved, That the Speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the President of the United States, to the chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate and House, to the Chairman, Federal Maritime Board, to the president, American President Line, to the president, Pacific Far East Line, to the president, Guam Chamber of Commerce, and to the Governor of Guam.

Duly adopted on the 22d day of January, 1963.

A. B. WON PAT,
Speaker.
V. B. BAMBA,
Legislative Secretary.

Hit Back When Hit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, our worldwide stature as a nation is now under test by Ecuador which has seen fit to disregard international law by unfairly seizing at gunpoint two American-flag tuna clippers. Under the guise of neighborly diplomacy we have patiently suffered similar harassments on the high seas in the years past. As a result we now find our fishing fleet highly vulnerable to such flagrant seizures.

The May 29 Detroit Free Press clearly illustrates the feelings of our citizens, as well as world observers, in their editorial entitled "Hit Back When Hit" which is included as a portion of my remarks.

HIT BACK WHEN HIT

The United States will stand taller in the eyes of the world when it is quicker to show a militant firmness after its clear rights are deliberately and provocatively trespassed upon.

This week began with an example of a circumstance in which patience has no virtue.

With preposterous presumption, Ecuador claims the waters of the Pacific Ocean for 200 miles off its shores. Adhering to this absurdity an Ecuador gunboat seized two U.S. tuna clippers which were 7 miles out at sea—far beyond the 3-mile limit customary in defining territorial waters.

The tuna clippers' skippers refused to surrender their papers, refused to follow the gunboat into port and refused to hand over $12 a ton for the tuna catch they had aboard. Other U.S. tuna craft promptly hemmed in the Ecuadorian gunboat.

There should be, of course, diplomatic approaches to persuade Ecuador that it doesn't own the Pacific. But they take time. The immediate action should be dispatch of U.S. Navy craft to the disputed waters, with orders to take no nonsense from anyone molesting U.S. flag vessels.

Beyond question there would be howls of protest from all the usual quarters, some of them hyprocritical and others out on cloud 9.

But seeing how far you can go in heckling Uncle Sam would have received an answer. That is an answer which needs to be known, and early.

Otherwise the pushing and heckling goes on until it reaches a point where much more than a patrol craft or two is required to establish the fact that Uncle Sam won't be forever permissive about impositions.

Private Business and Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, there is something more to all the current agitation for integration than merely satisfying the demands of the Negro leaders for complete and total mixing of the races. There is the basic question, of whether citizens, other than Negroes, have any rights left under the Constitution, as provided in that charter of freedom, of an individual from oppression of an all-powerful Federal Government.

Again, Mr. Speaker, that courageous defender of the rights and freedom of all the people of this country, David Lawrence, has written a most timely column, which appeared in many newspapers throughout the country on Friday, May 31st last, entitled "Private Business and Integration." It is as follows:

PRIVATE BUSINESS AND INTEGRATION—POWER OF DICTATORSHIP SEEN IN PROPOSAL FOR LAW TO CLOSE ESTABLISHMENTS

Negro leaders are high-pressuring the Kennedy administration to coerce the dissenters on the segregation issue, even if it means the ruin of many private businesses which are caught in the emotional collision between rival groups in local communities.

President Kennedy apparently has decided to pass the buck to Congress. He has gone much further without law than any other Chief Executive to compel what is called "equal rights." But the Negro leaders—stimulated by the immunity granted by the Supreme Court recently to participants in street demonstrations which have provoked violence—say Mr. Kennedy hasn't done enough. So the President concedes, in effect, that he cannot proceed without a law, and now is about to ask Congress for more sweeping authority over business than has ever been given a Chief Executive in a Federal statute. If Congress balks, Mr. Kennedy can say he at least did his part.

The proposal is that the President be given the right to close down any business if it insists on choosing its own customers or if it refuses to serve those who may be disorderly or otherwise engage in provocative acts that offend other customers and cause them to abstain from patronizing the business.

Nothing in the Constitution, of course, authorizes any such use of power by the President. But Mr. Kennedy need worry little about this slight omission, for the chances are that no Congress will ever pass such legislation. It would mean, if enacted, the delegation to a President of the power of dictatorship over all private businesses throughout the country. Many a Member of the Senate or House who votes for such a statute would find an aroused and resentful electorate in 1964 imposing its only form of redress—the defeat of those who voted for such a bill.

The campaign issue would not be based on the racial controversy alone. It would reach into every kind of economic activity in the country. For the proposed law would declare, in substance, that the Federal Government can erase all State lines for business operations and decide that every business can be regulated from Washington. Controls can then be imposed as to the customers a business must serve and the employees it must hire.

The intention of those who now are drafting a bill on the subject is to rely on that provision of the Constitution which says Congress shall have power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States." Again and again throughout American history, the Supreme Court has decided dozens of cases involving Federal laws that endeavored at first to distinguish between businesses operating within a State and those whose operations extended outside a State. Gradually the Court has inclined to the view that all businesses can be affected by interstate commerce. The emphasis, however, has been on their interstate character and on commodities—their manufacture or production or transportation.

Only rarely has the Congress sought to deal with individuals in interstate commerce, and then only with the conditions of employment of those who are directly connected with businesses on either a local or national level. Never has the Congress nor the Supreme Court held that a business cannot choose its customers or cannot discontinue operations permanently or for a short time if it feels so inclined.

The Supreme Court nowadays, however, is a quasi-political body. Just a few days ago the Court ruled that those who provoked street demonstrations under cover of civil rights demands—often resulting in injury to other citizens—were guiltless and couldn't be disciplined as violators of local ordinances designed to preserve law and order.

So, if Congress should pass a law giving dictatorship powers to a President, a majority of the present Supreme Court justices could be expected to uphold it. They probably would disregard the article in the Constitution which says no person can be "deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

The only barrier which really remains is that which the voters themselves can erect in expressing their opposition to those individual Members of Congress who might be inclined to vote for a measure giving the President control of the operations of every business—not only as to customers chosen but as to employees hired. For the Federal Government would be able to compel the hiring of applicants who had been turned down. Irrespective of the protest of the employer that he was hiring on the basis of efficiency, Federal officials would be authorized to require acceptance of applicants in private business on whatever basis these officials chose to determine in each case.

The inspiration for this new move by the Kennedy administration is evidently the concurring opinion rendered recently by Justice Douglas of the Supreme Court. Although the explicit issue was not before the Court in that case, he wrote at length his view that every private business which today operates under a State, city or county license thereby becomes "State connected" and thus within the Federal concept under the 14th amendment, and that it can, therefore, be constitutionally restricted in accordance with specifications laid down by Congress.

No other issue in the 1964 campaign will affect the entire electorate so penetratingly as the one raised by the prospective legislation about to be sponsored by the Kennedy administration. The economic impact of this move might be such that the debate will no longer be confined to the racial problem but will raise the question of whether a free-enterprise system could long survive under such totalitarian controls.

Builder of Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, of all the statements made in sorrow over the death of Pope John XXIII, I would like to commend an article by Morris West. This Australian novelist has already written two books that relate to the Vatican, namely the "Devil's Advocate" and "The Shoes of the Fisherman." He writes with compassion and knowledge of the mission of Pope John XXIII. The article, written just prior to the Pope's death, is a stirring reminder of the man. It appeared in June 7, 1963, issue of Life magazine, and I am proud to enclose it in the RECORD.

BUILDER OF BRIDGES FOR US POOR DEVILS

(By Morris L. West)

I am very close to tears as I begin to set down these words. What can I say of a man so manifestly good, so manifestly the victim—or is it the victor—in a drama of divine irony whose poignant prayer as he lies stricken is not for the salvation of his own soul but for the salvation of a work begun in the name of God?

I have no dignity in the church. I have no personal merit to commend me for the task of writing a eulogy, save perhaps this—that I am, in the spirit, a stumbling son of Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli. And, as a son, I want to say what his living and the thought of his dying have meant to me and to other souls still vagrant on this puzzling planet.

I live 12,000 miles from Rome. I stand with 550 million other believers on the lowest level of the complex hierarchic order of the church. But I wander widely and I am troubled by the spectacle of misery and poverty, and injustice and oppression, and the million faces of despair. I wrestle daily with the mystery of how all this could have issued, as the deposit of faith affirms it does, from the single creative act of an all-good and all-knowing Divinity.

To me Angelo Roncalli presented himself always as a man who carried the burden of the same mystery, who shared the agony that it imposes on the human spirit, who knew the wild and risky leap demanded by the act of faith—and who knew, too, from how many millions the grace to make it has been withheld.

From the day of his election the makers of legends were busy about him. But even they could not obscure the true nature of this man—shrewd, pragmatic, kindly, too simple to be seduced by eminence, too gregarious to be happy in the baroque enclave of the Vatican, a man with a sense of fraternity and a gift of compassion which even the formalities of Vatican communication could not distort.

The Romans named him "un Papa simpatico." And everyone wished he were younger, so that the imprint of his personality might be deeper on the corporate life of the church and the common life of the world. We had had a surfeit of princes and politicans and theologians—even of conventional saints. We needed a man who spoke the language of the heart, who understood that the dialog of God with man is carried on in terms far different from the semantics of professional philosophers. We have had him too briefly.

Many of my generation felt that the traditional relationship between clergy and the people had become defective. We acknowledged without reservation the dignity of the priestly office, its divine function in the renewal of the sacrificial act and in the dispensation of sacramental grace. We respected the abnegation and dedication imposed by the celibate state. We supported our pastors according to their needs and our capacities. We built schools and monasteries and hospitals. We financed missions and works of charity. We carried double and triple burdens to educate our children in the faith.

But many of us felt, not without reason, that there was too much emphasis on the magisterium of the hierarchy—their authority as moral arbiters, interpreters of dogma and administrators of the temporal structure of the church. We felt that there was not enough understanding of their ministerium—the service of the Creator through and by spiritual and temporal service rendered to the people.

In half a generation the vista of the universe had exploded into galactic dimensions. The human spirit was being submitted to monstrous tensions—moral, political, economic. And while we clung desperately to the deposit of faith, we longed for a renewal of the intellectual and pastoral life of the church so that we might live—through the faith—hopefully and actively in the world into which we were born.

We were not cenobites. We were men of the 20th century and we could not opt out of it. We were not only members of a church, we were members of the diverse human family as well and we could not opt out of that either. It was like the breaking of a new day when we heard the call of John XXIII for an aggiornamento—for an updating of the church, her manners, her customs, and her interpretation of the deposit of faith into the language of this millenial century.

When John XXIII was elected pontiff, he abrogated nothing of the primacy of his office. Yet one of his first acts was to make himself more readily available to his brother bishops. Later he intervened in the debates of the Ecumenical Council and in the lobbyings of its members to affirm that the Roman Curia was not the Pope, and that the Pope was brother to every bishop in Christendom and servant of every human soul in the world.

Of all the recent Popes, it seems that John XXIII has been least afraid of schism, of heresy, or of the militancy of non-Christian religions. A man of simple faith, he believed in the indwelling of the Holy Spirit and in the promise of perpetuity made by Christ to the church. He put no store in interdicts or excommunication because he was also a man of simple charity who understood that, although human beings are limited by God's covenant with them, God himself is not so limited. He knew that all men must live with the burdens and confusions of their own history, and that salvation or damnation hangs, in the last resort, upon God's judgment of the final direction of a man's will—toward Him or away from Him. He claimed without reservation his right as the supreme pastor to preach truth and refute error, but he gave the impression of a man ready at all times to suspend judgment on human confusion and human delinquency. All other pontiffs knew these things—preached them, too. What has made John XXIII so different is his lively and intimate sense of their application to the commerce of life, immortally reflected in "Pacem in Terris," his encyclical on peace.

I am chary of miracles; but I think there has been a kind of miracle in the way Pope John managed to impress his charity upon the church and upon the world. Most people have seen him only in photographs. His own voice has not often been heard. Mainly his words filtered out to the faithful through newspaper reports and the variant voices of preachers, good and bad. But somehow we have all felt him, and felt that God was with him. In his hands the crosier of the bishop has meant what it was meant to mean—the crook of the kindly shepherd, to whom the wayworn and the stragglers meant more than those penned safely in the sheepfold.

When he was elected Pope, he became heir to a long list of titles: Bishop of Rome, Vicar of Jesus Christ, Successor of the Prince of the Apostles, Supreme Pontiff of the Universal Church, Patriarch of the West, Primate of Italy, Archbishop and Metropolitan of the Roman Province, Sovereign of the Vatican City State. Yet the title which has seemed to sit most comfortably on him is that of Pontifex: the builder of bridges. He goes too soon and he leaves his work unfinished, but the bridges he planned are already abuilding—bridges of understanding and tolerance between the separated families of Christendom and the nations of East and West.

The formula on which he based all his architecture was very simple: "I have tried to preserve my calm and balance while investigating and evaluating things and persons about me, ever concerned more with that which unites than with that which divides."

He was never a polemical man. He disliked contention and preferred to rely upon discussion and persuasive prompting rather than to invoke the authority of his office. He ordered that even the admonitions and censures of the holy office be couched in moderate language so that men of good will might have room to move through the most risky speculations to a fuller understanding of the truth. He was never a political man. He was a diplomat long enough to know that political action creates more problems than it solves.

There was a great boldness in his planning, a devastating directness. He encouraged the most daring speculations of modern theology, and he lent the weight of his influence to those ecumenical dialogs which aimed at breaking down semantic and historic barriers between Catholic and non-Catholic theologians.

There are some in the church who were disappointed because he did not take a more militant line against Russian communism. There are some who were shocked because he accepted birthday greetings from the Premier of Russia and then received his son-in-law in private audience. Yet the incident illuminated his whole attitude to the affairs of human souls. He knew that every society and every system survives by virtue of what is good in it, just as human beings are kept from the ultimate madness of despair by that in their nature which is good and conformable to a divine pattern.

John XXIII is to leave us—a great man, and a great Pope. For this very reason there is rare tragedy in his passing. The tragedy is that, having begun so much, he will not be permitted to see the fruits of his labor; he has seen only the first faint buds. Yet in this, as in all else, his life has been patterned on that of the Christ whose vicar he was. He was walked for all too short a time, scattering the seeds of truth and charity on good ground and stony soil, and has endured the painful crucifixion of illness and frustration. Now, at the end, he must abandon himself and all his unfinished work into the hands of God.

How has he felt during these last months, perched on his lonely eminence with the world spread beneath him like a campaign map and above him the monstrous mystery of the Godhead? There must have been times when his aged shoulders bent under the burden and even his stout peasant heart quailed at the thought of things undone. Even the mercy of death has been delayed for him—as it was for his Master.

History will be kind to him, I think, because he has been a kindly man who had compassion on the multitudes, "seeing them harried and abject, like sheep that have no shepherd." Princes and priests are mourned as rarely as they are thanked, but many will weep for this one because he has been, in truth, what he was named to be: a servant of the servants of God.

Will they canonize him and make him, officially, a saint in the calendar? In a way I hope not. For my part I do not want to see him idealized by a Vatican painter, lit by a thousand candles in St. Peters', reproduced in plaster and gilt and sold to pious pilgrims. I want to remember him for what he has been—a loving man, a simple priest, a good pastor, and a builder of bridges across which we poor devils may hope one day to scramble to salvation.

The Late Honorable Francis E. Walter: A Distinguished Legislator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, today many of us attended the funeral of our beloved colleague, the late Honorable Francis E. Walter, who was one of the most distinguished members of this body and also one of Pennsylvania's outstanding sons. The feeling of the people of Pennsylvania in reference to the passing of "Tad" Walter is very well expressed in an editorial which appeared on June 3 in the Morning Call, a leading newspaper in my district, which is published in Allentown, Pa. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I desire to include the aforesaid editorial, which is as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE OF ALL

Even a cursory glance at the record of Francis E. Walter makes it easy to understand why he was elected to 16 consecutive terms in the Congress of the United States.

He was, first of all, a Representative whose views of government and its responsibilities were broad, unlimited by geographical or partisan definitions. Service to his own district and region, and loyalty to his party, were important, but the welfare and security and progress of the Nation were the overriding considerations in determining his legislative efforts.

From his earliest days in Washington as a Member of Franklin D. Roosevelt's first Congress, he was regarded as one of the hardest workers on Capitol Hill. Being a Congressman was a full-time, year-round job. Whether Congress was in session or not, the lights in his office burned long into the night and he was readily available to all who sought him, regardless of whether they were constituents, residents of other areas with causes to plead, Presidents or fellow legislators.

He was frank and forthright, given to plain talk that was as easy to understand 1 day as the next. Although he generally took the view of Democratic administrations because he shared them, he could be just as vigorously opposed when he believed it was in the best interests of the country to disagree. The four American Presidents under whom he served valued his word because they knew once it had been given they could count on what he would do.

Few in public life have been as militant foes of Communists and their doubledealing fellow travelers. As chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, he sought out infiltrators and mercilessly focused the spotlight on them. They scorned and unbraided him, of course, but the Congress always sustained him. The last House vote supporting this effort was 412 to 6.

Those who sought to escape the oppression of Communist tyrants in other lands found him their champion. His efforts made it possible for something like 400,000 of them to enjoy liberty in this land of freedom.

There are many other important monuments to "Tad" Walter's more than 30 years as one district's representative in the Congress. Among them certainly is the Delaware River Compact and the developments that will be achieved under its terms during the next 50 or 100 years.

The greatest, however, is the evidence he consistently offered that a Congressman truly serves his constituents only as he faithfully devotes himself to the best interests of his country.

A Tribute to Francis Walter

SPEECH

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the news of the loss of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable Francis Walter, was a severe blow to many causes of importance to the country.

In his long career of able service to the House, Congressman Walter had won the wholehearted respect of all who knew him well and shared his continuing concern for the strength and security of the Nation.

As chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Francis Walter was a tireless and courageous fighter against the Communist Party and its insidious conspiracy.

He was particularly vigorous in his attacks upon loose and careless personnel security practices in Government, and hit hard against any official who appeared to take lightly the dangers of espionage and subversion in our Government.

While a few in this body have at times questioned the aggressive methods of our colleague in his constant battle to strengthen our Nation's internal security, I have never heard any Member question either his sincerity or his dedication to duty.

Francis Walter was a strong and fearless man who spoke out vigorously in support of his convictions, and he consistently and effectively supported efforts to build our Nation's defenses and improve its readiness to defeat its enemies.

It was a privilege and an honor to serve with this able American, who will be sorely missed in these Halls for a long time to come.

Roosevelt County, Mont., Program Produces Positive Results in Developing Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the February 15, 1963, issue of the Montana Farmer-Stockman includes an article by Belvina W. Bertino describing the excellent countywide improvement and planning done in Roosevelt County, Mont.

The progressive leaders of this county, white and Indian, town and country, have shown how to make government work for the benefit of their fellow citizens.

This county was the first in the Nation to utilize the Community Hospital Act, sponsored by the Montana congressional delegation in 1957 to provide better health facilities to serve both Indians and non-Indians. A fine new retirement home was dedicated last year. Nurses aids and firefighters have been trained. Technology has been applied to farming. Recreational development and new education programs are underway. New industries have come to the area.

In sum, these community leaders—from Wolf Point, Poplar, Brockton, Culbertson, Froid, McCabe and Bainville, and the farms—are planning the future instead of panning the present. They view the Federal Government as a partner, whose programs should be used selectively and fitted to local needs, rather than as a villain to be denounced.

I commend the good sense of the people of Roosevelt County and ask unanimous consent to have pointed in the Appendix of the Record the article referred to, entitled "Roosevelt County Program Produces Positive Results in Developing Resources."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ROOSEVELT COUNTY PROGRAM PRODUCES POSITIVE RESULTS IN DEVELOPING RESOURCES

(By Belvina W. Bertino)

The annual meeting of the Roosevelt Planning and Improvement Council of Culbertson in December presented a vital summation of the concentrated efforts of the people of the county in promoting the development of their native raw materials and human resources.

The accomplishments which have stemmed from the coordinated leadership of farm and nonfarm, Indian and non-Indian members of the council in countywide improvement and development are listed in the publication, "Teamwork=Progress, Roosevelt County," compiled by Ernest Ahrendes, Cooperative Extension Service, Bozeman, and soon to be released. It will be available to the public, both statewide and out of State, from the Montana Extension Service and through all county extension offices.

IMPRESSIVE LIST

Some of these accomplishments, according to the report, are:

Study of native resources and preparation of an overall economic development plan;

Organization of three development corporations covering all major communities to promote industrial growth;

Promotion of a program to place an additional 12,000 acres of Missouri River bottom land under irrigation in the near future;

Initiation of a training program in firefighting for Fort Peck Reservation Indians and a countywide nurses aid training program to increase employment opportunities;

Establishment of a strong adult educational program;

Promotion of local arts and crafts development from Montana products, including displays to attract tourists, creation of museums;

Initiation of a broad program of outdoor recreational development;

Development of an effective organized approach to planning for progress in Roosevelt County;

Reduction of cost of providing specialized education services for their youth by joint hiring of teachers among high schools;

Increase of agricultural income to the county by tripling hog production, expanding cattle feeding, promoting new crop production, getting some changes made in national farm legislation and making some adjustments in farm and ranch management.

BEGAN 5 YEARS AGO

This need for more specialized action was revealed about 5 years ago when a countywide functioning body was organized with the able assistance of Don Hunter, county extension agent, to study the economic status of the county and how to inaugurate improvements.

This body, known as the Roosevelt County Advisory Council, discovered a variety of situations contributing to curtailed development of the county resources. With little business expansion, many of the young people were leaving the county. Native products were also largely being shipped out for processing. Improvements were needed in sanitation, water supplies and sewage disposal systems. There was a keenly felt need for adult specialized training and education in arts, crafts and public affairs.

BIG TERRITORY

A great many more situations and conditions were literally crying for attention, but in such a large, 80-mile-long county the council realized it would take a great deal of cooperation and plain hard work to get much accomplished.

The towns of Wolf Point, Poplar, Brockton, Culbertson, Froid, McCabe, and Bainville are included in Roosevelt County, as well as much of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation (comprising roughly two-thirds of the county) with the agency at Poplar. The understanding and cooperation of both Indians and non-Indians were essential if progress in county improvement was to be made.

The establishment of the safflower processing plant at Culbertson in 1959 was an encouraging beginning toward the progress sought. In addition to the 20 to 25 local people employed at the plant, farmers throughout the county and surrounding area were benefited by being able to produce the new crop freely on diverted acres. Feed pellets and meal processed from byproducts at the mill were also available to livestock growers.

PILOT COUNTY

Another significant happening in 1959 occurred when Roosevelt County was selected as one of two pilot counties in public affairs education in Montana when a grant from the Fund for Adult Education had been extended to the Montana Extension Service. This gave a real boost to the work in adult education opportunities, public improvement and development which the advisory council had cut out for itself and for the county as a whole.

The grant also made possible the addition of Ernest Ahrendes, program consultant, to the county extension staff. He gave valued directive assistance to the council. Also, in 1959, Rupert Nelson joined the county extension staff to work closely with the Fort Peck Reservation Indians in regard to their needs and problems.

In order to make the most of their added opportunity as a pilot county in public responsibility and public affairs, the advisory council reorganized to take in as many groups as possible, such as farm groups, conservation, business, civic, church, women's and youth leaders' organizations, municipal and county officials, and tribal groups.

ACTION COMMITTEE

Renamed, the advisory council became the Roosevelt County Planning and Improvement Council. A 12-member executive action committee was elected to expedite the work which the larger council had recommended, with priorities given to projects demanding most immediate attention.

Subcommittees were formed to study and initiate action on priority rated programs which were carried on to completion, oftentimes in other channels. Council programs during the past 2 years have involved over 200 persons who have worked as members of committees or in similar essential capacities.

ECONOMIC PROGRESS

Economic progress in the county is reflected in new hospitals at Wolf Point and Poplar and a new retirement home at Wolf Point being completed and providing additional employment opportunities.

In 1961 a jet fuel refinery was built near Wolf Point and in 1962 a crafts store, featuring Indian art and craftwork for tourists, was started in the tribal office building in Poplar. The former agency building was razed and plans are under way for a combined museum and store. A housing development plan has been completed for Indians and development is expected to begin in 1963.

Planned for future development is chemical weed control in safflower, underground water survey, mineral resources survey, increased opportunities for adult education, labor availability survey, including number of workers and their skills, improved educational facilities for youth, youth organizations.

CONTINUED ACTION

Continued action in the multifaceted county improvement and development effort was clearly shown in the executive subcommittee reports at the December annual meeting.

The civil defense report showed that much work has been done in the county which was considered one of the better organized in a 10-county National Guard civil defense study. More will be done in regard to emergency shelters, rural warning systems.

Other committees reported on farm policy and marketing, recreation park survey and tourism development, agricultural and industrial development,, training program. Also reported was the Area Redevelopment Administration-approved $9,500 livestock feeding and marketing study to be made soon in the county.

While the efforts and accomplishments of the planning and improvement council under the pilot program and assistance of the extension service have been signally beneficial to the entire county, it is only the beginning of a broader, permanent program of progress made possible by continued organized leadership and teamwork.

Backstairs "Malevolence"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, enough of his fellow writers and former colleagues have adequately criticized "The Ordeal of Power" that I need add nothing on the subject of that self-seeking book. For the benefit of the entire House, however, I would like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following excellent column by the distinguished writer, Holmes Alexander, who provides a valuable service in exposing the character of the author:

BACKSTAIRS "MALEVOLENCE"

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—Certainly it is not a rule of life that benign persons are universally the victims of malevolence, but it happens often enough to make the angels weep. Many a gentle saint was crucified, and I have noticed that humble, harmless maiden aunts and household servants often are treated with Chinese cruelty by diabolical smart alecks under the same roof.

The only sure defense, it appears, is not innocence or loving kindness but a vial of retaliatory acid in the face of the offender.

It seems too much to expect that General Eisenhower's forthcoming memoirs will in any way dash the vitriol back at Lillian Rogers Parks for writing her "Backstairs at the White House" account of the Eisenhower years.

But nothing else would begin to visit due retribution upon Ike's trusted ghostwriter, Emmet John Hughes, and his book entitled "The Ordeal of Power."

Until reading it, I had supposed that Robert Welch, in "The Politician," had done the worst by Ike, except for Columnist Dixon, who liked to quote Ike's ad lib responses at press conferences, or Cartoonist Herblock, who usually depicted the then-President of the United States as a sick chicken.

But Welch held frankly to the thesis that Mr. Eisenhower couldn't have governed so badly without doing so intentionally, and the anti-Ike humorists were merely making fun of their betters. Emmet Hughes carves up this kingly figure, this unfailingly decent gentleman, with the treacherous knife of false friendship.

He leers in mock anguish at the deed. He sighs all the while with omniscience concerning the doomsday which Ike failed to avert, by trusting Dulles more than Khrushchev, tolerating Republicans instead of going all out for the opposition party, and not using political power the way F.D.R. did earlier and J.F.K. would try to do later.

Nobody need defend Mr. Eisenhower by contending his administration was a glorious reign. He inherited dismal legacies from both parties.

The Russians could not have recovered so fast from World War II, or have occupied East Europe and East Berlin, or have beaten us into space, or have opened the missile gap had the Roosevelt-Truman years been used to defeat the twin totalitarianisms of nazism and communism.

It was not Ike whose policies condoned the Red revolution in China, or bogged us down with a no-win strategy in Korea, or allowed the Russians to blockade the land routes to Berlin.

The country which President Eisenhower handed over to President Kennedy was far stronger, albeit much sadder, than the one which came down from President Truman. And it's hard to look to Cuba and Birmingham with any conviction that Ike's departure was a blessing.

Nor were the Republican deficits of 1953 any responsibility of the Supreme Commander whom the party insisted upon nominating ahead of Senator Taft. Dewey had presided over the incredible defeat of 1948. Nixon was Dewey's choice, not Ike's, for Vice President. McCarthy had been first elected in 1946.

Chief Justice Warren, who led the Court into the most troublesome decision of the century, was so big a Republican figure that the new President almost had to make the appointment as a political debt.

The terrible decline which set in during the Eisenhower second term might have been averted, but not by the qualities which Hughes seems to wish Eisenhower had.

Hughes wishes he had been more liberal—but he was too liberal. Hughes wishes he had welcomed Khrushchev sooner—but he should not have welcomed him at all. Hughes wishes he had dumped Nixon—but that would have been the kind of dirty trick that is out of the Eisenhower character.

And that brings us to Ike's fatal failing. He was too kind, too decent, too trusting.

Had Eisenhower been a ruthless and ornery man, Emmet Hughes would never have lasted long enough around the White House to write his kind of a book.

Hon. Francis E. Walter

SPEECH

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the passing of my good friend and our esteemed colleague, FRANCIS "TAD" WALTER, leaves me with a sad feeling of personal loss and removes from this body one of its most able and influential Members.

"TAD" WALTER was my friend and mentor when I first came to Congress and his expert guidance proved invaluable to me. Through the years he remained a loyal and true friend, always ready to extend a helping hand with any problem.

But aside from my personal feeling of loss, all of us here are going to miss his expert knowledge, his fearlessness, and his readiness to fight for what he considered was right and just. He was a man of strong beliefs and great sincerity and while many of us were not always in agreement with his views, we always admired his courage, his integrity, his ability, and his devotion to duty. We have lost a most able colleague and the Nation has lost a great American.

"TAD" WALTER was a devoted husband and father and to his widow and his daughter I extend my deepest sympathy.

The Harbor Gate Redevelopment Project in Richmond, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Richmond, Calif., has been deeply concerned about some serious inaccuracies pertaining to the Harbor Gate redevelopment project at Richmond, Calif., which were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 5, 1962, pages 21227 and 21228, by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER]. The same serious inaccuracies were also included in a speech made by the gentleman from Texas at the 51st annual meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce recently.

In order to set the record straight pertaining to the Harbor Gate redevelopment project, I am attaching hereto a letter dated May 3, 1963 written by Mr. Erwin Farley, executive director, the Redevelopment Agency of the city of Richmond, Calif., Post Office Box 1786, Richmond, Calif.

In addition, I am also attaching a supplementary letter dated May 22, 1963, sent by Mr. Farley to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce providing detailed answers to a series of 14 questions which the U.S. Chamber of Commerce asked about the Harbor Gate redevelopment project.

These letters make clear that the Harbor Gate redevelopment project was developed without the use of any Federal funds whatsoever. It is a real tribute to the city of Richmond and to the redevelopment agency that this project was carried out so successfully on a local level. As a matter of reality, the city of Richmond and the redevelopment agency of that city are entitled to commendation, rather than criticism, for the manner in which this project has been development.

THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND,
Richmond, Calif., May 3, 1963.

U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Some statements attributed by the press to Congressman BRUCE ALGER in his recent speech at the 51st annual meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce were completely erroneous regarding our Richmond redevelopment program. Knowing that the chamber would want to have the correct facts on this matter, I am writing to set the record straight. Should Congressman ALGER's statements be incorporated in any printed report on your recent meeting, I trust that appropriate space will also be provided for a summary of the true facts regarding our Harbor Gate redevelopment project in particular.

Enclosed are photocopies of front-page stories in the May 1 and 2 editions of the Daily Pacific Builder reporting the Congressman's remarks and our reactions to his statements. Also enclosed is a copy of a front-page story on this subject which appeared in the Richmond Independent on May 2.

Our Harbor Gate industrial redevelopment project has been an outstanding example of locally financed redevelopment. Absolutely no Federal funds were involved in this project. Therefore, I cannot understand the reasoning of the Congressman's criticism, unless he inaccurately assumed Federal participation in the project because it was praised in an urban renewal publication.

The city of Richmond was able to advance moneys from its general fund to underwrite the net cost of this project, which amounted to some $600,000. Through use of the tax increment provision of the California State law, the city was fully reimbursed for this expenditure within 4 years after the redeveloped land was sold. This reimbursement came from increased tax revenue accumulated from the net assessed value of the property attributable to redevelopment. Safeway Stores and United Mutual Grocers purchased the two large industrial sites in this 133-acre project for major food distribution centers.

Richmond, which has pioneered in redevelopment activities on the west coast, also used this same method of financing our Plaza residential project. This undertaking cost some $190,000 and was completed in 1958. One hundred attractive, moderately priced homes were built on this 11-acre parcel. Increased tax income from this area will pay off the city's investment in another 2 or 3 years.

Richmond still bears some scars from the impact of World War II shipbuilding activity. Urban renewal has been a valuable tool in our postwar transition. Funds accruing from increased tax revenue resulting from these first two redevelopment projects have been used to meet a portion of the cost of four other more extensive urban renewal undertakings. These later projects, because of their size and total cost, have been jointly financed by the Federal Government and the local community.

Congressman ALGER's accusation, as reported by the press, that the Harbor Gate project was a flagrant case of misuse of the urban renewal program is indeed surprising. His allegation that the Richmond City Council passed a false certification concerning this project is simply not based on fact. Furthermore, his criticism of the Federal Government in connection with this project is likewise uncalled for, since the Urban Renewal Administration was not involved. Therefore, any statement that hundreds of thousands of Federal taxpayers money was spent unnecessarily is completely erroneous.

Richmond has one of the most comprehensive urban renewal programs of any community of its size in the country, due in great part to the need to rehabilitate the remnants of extensive, federally developed, temporary war housing areas. Our local chamber of commerce is one of our many strong supporters. We have financed from local funds those portions of the program that we could pay for ourselves. However, in those cases where this was not possible, we have utilized the Federal assistance program. We are justly proud of our accomplishments and greatly disturbed by uninformed criticism. I trust this improves your understanding of our program and explains our shock at Congresman ALGER's statements.

If you wish any further information on this matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,

ERWIN FARLEY,
Executive Director.

RICHMOND, CALIF.,
May 22, 1963.

Mr. S. HOWARD EVANS,
Chamber of Commerce of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EVANS: Your letter of May 13, 1963, which was received on May 20, requests answers to a list of questions concerning our Harbor Gate redevelopment project. Answers to your questions are included in a supplement to this letter.

We trust that the additional information supplied will serve to clarify your understanding the redevelopment of this project, which was erroneously criticized by Congressman BRUCE ALGER in his recent talk to the 51st Annual Meeting of the Chamber of Commerce. We are anxious that any release of information concerning the Congressman's remarks be corrected to reflect the true facts in the Harbor Gate case.

This agency was not aware that similar inaccuracies were contained in the October 5, 1962, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in a recent issue of Human Events. Your advising us of this is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

ERWIN FARLEY,
Executive Director.

RE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES LETTER OF MAY 13, 1963, ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ASKED

1. When was the redevelopment agency established in Richmond? The redevelopment agency was created by the Council of the City of Richmond on October 24, 1949.

2. Where did it get the money with which to begin operations? On May 22, 1950, the Richmond City Council established the Richmond Redevelopment Agency administrative fund and appropriated $7,942 from its general fund for agency administrative and overhead expenses. On August 7, 1950, an additional $20,000 was appropriated. At various intervals thereafter additional city funds were made available for local redevelopment plans and studies.

3. When did it get its first Federal funds? On April 13, 1951, the agency received its first Federal advance of funds for "surveys and plans in preparation of a project or projects" in Richmond's redevelopment areas 1, 2, 5, and 7. Redevelopment area No. 6, which included the Harbor Gate project, was not included under that contract or any other contract for Federal funds.

4. Are Federal funds regularly used to pay staff salaries and office expenses? Federal funds are used to pay applicable portions of staff salaries and other expenses when redevelopment projects are federally assisted. No such funds are used or have been used when projects have been planned and executed solely under provisions of the California community redevelopment law, as in the case of Harbor Gate.

5. When was the Harbor Gate project undertaken? Harbor Gate was declared a redevelopment area by the Council of the City of Richmond in September 1950, along with several other south Richmond areas. Work on the project began in 1953 with preparation of a preliminary plan by the Richmond City Planning Commission. A final plan was approved in 1954. Land was sold the same year, and major public improvements were completed a year and a half later.

6. Was any of the land included in the Harbor Gate project ever used in any Federally subsidized project? and 7. If so, were Federal urban renewal funds ever used in any of the planning done for these predecessor projects? Like other undeveloped south Richmond land, Harbor Gate became a temporary World War II housing site sheltering shipyard workers and later veterans. The United States, which owned the major portion of the site, removed its war housing as required by law, and sold the land at fair market value to the Richmond Redevelopment Agency, which then disposed of it to the redevelopers. Harbor Gate was not included in or considered for any Federally assisted urban renewal, public low-rent housing or other similar project involving Federal funds.

8. When was the decision made to make the Harbor Gate project self-liquidating? The original redevelopment plan adopted in 1954 provided for financing of the project from the city's general fund without reimbursement. In 1956, the plan was amended to incorporate the tax increment (self-liquidating) provisions of the newly adopted State constitutional amendment. Richmond was the first city in California to use the State constitution's increment financing.

9. When did the city appropriate funds for this project? With adoption of the redevelopment plan for Harbor Gate on November 8, 1954, the Council of the City of Richmond declared its intention "Promptly to do or cause to be done the following": (a) To make available from the general funds of the city of Richmond and to authorize the expenditure thereof to do the site improvement work contemplated by the redevelopment plan; and (b) to make available from the general funds of the city of Richmond to the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Richmond such sums of money as may be necessary for the payment for such property within the project area that may be acquired by condemnation as provided by law." The funds were expended as the improvement work progressed.

10. How much was the total local financial contribution? The net cost of the Harbor Gate project (after land sales to Safeway Stores and Mutual-United Grocery Co.) was $592,153.71.

11. How much was the cost of planning this particular project? Planning of this project was a joint undertaking of the city and the agency. City planning and public works personnel expenses are included under an expenditure item entitled "Administrative and engineering overhead," costing $70,226. The agency's cost was $753.

12. Where did this planning money come from? and 13. When were the planning funds appropriated? No specific amount was appropriated for Harbor Gate planning. Planning was undertaken as part of the city staff's 1953–54 regular work schedule in accord with the approved city budget. The agency's funds were derived from its own general fund, composed of city council appropriations and other non-Federal moneys.

14. Were any Federal urban renewal funds used either directly or indirectly for planning this project? No.

Francis E. Walter

SPEECH
OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened at the death of FRANCIS WALTER. Over the years he has been so kind and helpful to me that I will miss him an awful lot.

His office was near mine and we saw each other frequently. Many of my problems I talked over with him. Knowing him and having him for a friend was a grand experience.

Power a Dictator Would Usurp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the actions of the President in sending troops into Alabama and the threat to use them in the Birmingham racial situation raises some very important questions, if not in fact sounding the warning signal to our system of government.

David Lawrence, one of the sound-thinking columnists of today, wrote a most thought-provoking editorial on this subject, which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., on May 27, 1963. It is as follows:

POWER A DICTATOR WOULD USURP: U.S. BRIEF ON USING TROOPS IN ALABAMA WOULD OPEN UP VAST AREA OF COERCION

A remarkable brief has just been filed in the Supreme Court of the United States by direction of Attorney General Robert Kennedy. If the argument in it is ever sustained by the High Court, the way is opened to a military dictator in the United States at any time and for any reason that suits the whim of a President. The provisions of the Constitution which limit a President's power would be swept aside and, for all practical purposes, the Constitution hereafter would be what the President says it is.

The brief was in answer to a petition of Governor Wallace of Alabama asking the Supreme Court to issue an order against the use of Federal troops in Alabama unless requested by the Governor or the legislature, as required by the Constitution.

The Supreme Court today, however, declined to pass on the merits of the argument in the brief and rejected the complaint on the ground that the President had merely taken "purely preparatory measures." But the brief of the Department of Justice will remain in the records as a statement of the basis for future use of Federal troops inside a sovereign State.

The Department of Justice replies that the provision of the Constitution which explicitly says that Federal troops may be used within a State only with the permission of the Governor or the State Legislature is "irrelevant" and that somehow the 14th amendment conferred broad new powers on the President to enforce any law on any subject or to use troops whenever, on the basis of his own judgment of the circumstances, he wishes to use them. The brief, moreover, makes this sweeping claim:

"There is no room for judicial review of a presidential determination that the conditions stated in section 333 have arisen and require him to take 'such measures as he considers necessary.'"

Section 333 is part of a law originally passed in 1871. It specifically relates only to a failure or refusal by State authorities to permit the "execution of the laws of the United States." President Kennedy has himself publicly stated that, in the recent disturbances in Birmingham, Ala., no Federal law was being violated—nor any court order, either.

The brief brushes aside as secondary the public statements of Alabama officials that they intend to maintain law and order, and adds:

"But the allegations of intent cannot relieve the President of the right and duty to prepare for all contingencies and to make the independent determination required by section 333."

Yet a President's intent, on the other hand—whether it be political or capricious—to prepare to deal with local disturbances whenever he pleases is held by the Department of Justice not even to be subject to judicial review. It is further argued in the brief that section 333 is a blanket authorization to a President to send troops into any State at any time that he himself thinks there may in the future be some intention to violate any law or court order. Section 333, however, doesn't deal with intent at all, but only with actual evidence of law violation or a refusal to enforce a law.

The constitutionality of section 333 itself has never been passed upon by the Supreme Court of the United States. Congress cannot assume the right to proclaim by statute what it wishes to be considered constitutional. Nor can Congress enlarge a President's constitutional powers by means of a law.

The most surprising statement in the brief—and one which would seem to pave the way for a military dictatorship by a President of the United States at any time he wishes to set it up—is as follows:

"We cannot know whether the occasion for invoking the statute (section 333) will actually arise. Nor need we examine the precise circumstances which might justify the contemplated intervention. It is sufficiently clear, however, that the prevailing situation in Birmingham may deteriorate in such a way as to require action under section 333."

Yet the law itself doesn't say a President may threaten to use Federal troops or even use them until the circumstances stated in the law have actually arisen.

But what difference would it make what the law says if the Department of Justice is right in claiming that there can be no judicial review of a President's acts?

There is no limit to the powers of coercion that could be applied by a President, whether a liberal or not, by ordering out troops. If the Supreme Court of the United States accepts the reasoning of the Department of Justice, then, even when no Federal law or court order has been violated, a President can mobilize Federal troops and deploy them as he pleases. He could intimidate local authorities and cause certain citizens to make concessions in favor of one group of voters rather than another. Also, a President, under his own concept of executive power, could apparently choose to enforce that concept by military action irrespective of what is actually specified to the contrary in either the laws of the United States or the Constitution.

Hon. Francis E. Walter

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my remarks to the many that have been made by Members in memory of our late colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter]. His death was sudden, and he leaves a bereft family and saddened colleagues in the House. I am one who often found himself in opposition to our late colleague on the floor of this body. But whatever the extent or depth of our disagreement we personally remained good friends and respected each other's point of view. If memory serves, following every exchange we ever had in committee or on the floor, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who was far senior to me, would extend to me a kind word, or a bit of humor. He had a fine sense of humor, and an ability to laugh at himself which few people have. I join our colleagues in extending to our late colleague's family and friends my deepest sympathy.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—Congressional Record, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the Record:

April 30, 1963.

Mr. Flood: We wrote to Mr. Smith requesting (respectfully) quick action on Res. 14, referring to the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Mr. Flood, we have always been so thankful to have a man like you in Congress—and as we receive the Congressional Record, we always read your remarks. We read your letter in the Tablet April 25, 1963.

Very sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. W. T. Carroll.

Costa Mesa, Calif.

Ukrainian Congress Committee
of America, Inc.
Denver, Colo., April 28, 1963.

Hon. Byron G. Rogers,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Rogers: Congressman Daniel J. Flood submitted a resolution to the House Rules Committee calling for creation of a special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives, known as House Resolution 14.

The establishment of a special Committee on Captive Nations is an urgent need in the present cold war of communism against the free world. Such an official parliamentary body will be capable of collecting true information concerning the countries and nations forcefully incorporated into the Communist block.

The non-Russian nations and their struggle for independence presents the perpetual difficulties for the Kremlin rulers. The problem of the captive nations is in fact the weakest spot of Communist Russian imperialism. It is in the best interest of the United States to know the facts concerning this weak spot of our mutual enemy. Creation of a special Committee on Captive Nations will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying its foreign policy.

We sincerely believe, sir, that you fully understand the urgent need for creation of such a special Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives, and therefore we ask you to introduce the similar resolution calling for creation of a special Committee on Captive Nations in the House, or to write a letter to Congressman Howard W. Smith, chairman of the House Rules Committee, expressing your full support for the Flood resolution, House Resolution 14. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

Ross Kuzmych,
President,
Denver Branch of U.C.C.A.

Armenian Youth Federation of
America, Lowell Ara Chapter,
Lowell, Mass., May 3, 1963.

Congressman Daniel J. Flood,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Congressman: The Lowell Ara Chapter, Armenian Youth Federation of America, has moved and passed with an overwhelming majority to support House Resolution 14–15, submitted by you, advocating the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

The formation of such a committee is vital to the security of the entire free world, and it will light a candle of hope for the enslaved and once free peoples of the Soviet Union.

We are contacting our Congressman as well as Congressman Howard W. Smith, head of the Rules Committee, urging him to release your resolution for quick passage.

We wish to commend you for your stand in this matter and assure you of our fullest support.

Sincerely,

Sandra Garabedian,
Corresponding Secretary.

College Point, N.Y., *May 2, 1963.*

House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Flood: Today I sent a letter to Howard W. Smith, chairman on the Committee of Rules urging that quick action be taken on the passage of House Resolution 14.

As requested, I am sending a copy of the letter and am also sending one to my Congressman here in New York.

Sincerely,

Margaret M. Weltz.

West Roxbury, Mass., *May 7, 1963.*

Hon. William H. Bates,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Bates: We can start to exploit the weaknesses in the Communist colonial empire by developing an effective policy toward the captive nations.

Last January, Congressmen Flood and Derwinski, introduced H.R. 14 and H.R. 15 respectively which would implement the Captive Nations Week Resolution of 1959 and establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations. This committee would conduct inquiries into, study, and prepare concrete recommendations for an effective U.S. policy toward the captive nations. Many other Congressmen introduced similar resolutions.

On behalf of the Boston Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee I am asking you:

(1) To introduce a resolution of your own to establish a Committee on Captive Nations;

(2) To support H.R. 14 introduced by Congressman Daniel J. Flood;

(3) To use your influence in the House Rules Committee, to which H.R. 14 was assigned, and especially with the chairman, Howard W. Smith, to initiate action on the proposed legislation by opening public hearings.

Although the request does not come from your district, we believe that our fight with communism and our support for the captive nations is of national concern and must have the support of all Americans.

Your action and support in this matter will do much for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Sincerely yours,
Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Boston Branch
Orest Szczudluk, *Public Relations.*

Diplomatic Relations With Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Tuesday, May 28, there appeared in the Columbia Record, a newspaper in South Carolina, an editorial entitled "Soviets Say We Will Leave Cuba." This editorial discusses reports which have appeared in press that the Communists are predicting that in 1963 the United States will evacuate Guantanamo Naval Base and establish diplomatic relations with Cuba. The editorial, incidentally, notes that the President has denied the validity of such Communist predictions. We need, however, to be repeatedly reminded that Cuba continues to constitute a threat to the free world and to the security of the United States and that any accommodation of the Communists will surely have dire consequences. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Soviets Say We'll Leave Cuba

An ominous report from Europe adds to the mounting evidence that the United States is following a line of appeasement in its confrontation with Communist aggressors.

The account came from Columnist Constantine Brown. Judging by his dispatches on subjects with which we are familiar at first hand, he is currently the most penetratingly accurate writer on the affairs of Western Europe.

Reporting from Rome, his home base for the last 2 years, the veteran Washington correspondent says that jubilant Communist bloc diplomats there predict that "this year will be a year of peace and good will." In the Soviet lexicon the beguiling words mean that the free world will make major concessions to Communist tyranny.

The Red spokesmen, particularly pleased by the restraining hand placed on freedom-loving Cuban refugees, see a new spirit in Washington. They note that "things are improving considerably."

Tied in with their optimism is a confident prediction that United States-Cuban relations will be resumed in 1963. This, they say, will be followed by American evacuation of Guantanamo naval base after the 1964 elections.

Here is the strategy the Soviets hint will be used to get American military forces off the island:

After the United States-Cuban rapport becomes effective, Castro will campaign intensively to send the Yanquis home. Anticolonial arguments which the United States employed to break up the empires of Western Europe will be used against the Cuban base. International pressure will be exerted to make the United States follow the example set by Britain and France in closing naval bases outside their sovereign domains. Domestic leaders will argue that because of the strong military installations in Florida and Puerto Rico, the naval base in Cuba is not needed.

At the same time, a line of reasoning that gained currency when Soviet missiles were first spotted in Cuba will be revived. The contention was that since we demanded withdrawal of Soviet arms from Cuba, we should recall our own. The Russians are furiously reinforcing the island and will be able to make a deal by nationalizing the armaments and removing all except "advisory" personnel, or "technicians."

The Constantine Brown report helps to validate the hellbent determination of our national policy planners to effect an accommodation with the Soviets, and to achieve disarmament and world government within the framework of the United Nations. A prerequisite to that idealistic accomplishment, they evidently believe, would be a parity of strength between the ideological foes. This would mean a slowdown in the West and a speedup in the Communist bloc.

The Soviets and their allies are doing their part. Russia has the world's largest submarine force; Red China, the fourth largest. The U.S.S.R. is vastly expanding its surface fleet. It has the biggest and best equipped army. It is continuously trying to close the missile gap. It has deployed an antimissile system. And it has begun surveillance of our aircraft carriers with long-range bombers.

On the other hand, the United States has discontinued bomber production. General LeMay, main advocate of strategic manned aircraft, will be dropped from the Joint Chiefs of Staff in 12 months. The Skybolt program for planes that could fire atomic rockets more than a thousand miles was scrapped. Development of an antimissile system was delayed at least another year. Land-based missiles were withdrawn from Turkey and Italy.

Our only sensational advance is in the Polaris submarine program. We now have 9 deployed and a target total of 41. But hear what one of the top naval officers in the submarine service had to say:

"Our Polaris system is good and great. We think it is the best. It is as accurate as any other missile we have. It is hidden and invulnerable. It can fire under water and underway. But we cannot put all our eggs in one basket. That would make it easy for the enemy. We believe in the use of bombers, land missiles, and all our other weapons on land and sea and in the air."

The Polaris is credited with being the sole deterrent against Soviet nuclear attack, but overreliance on a single method of defense could have disastrous results.

Premier Khrushchev has openly declared on an offensive against the free world in "wars of liberation" to upset independent governments. We cannot combat this menace to our sovereignty by vigorous retreat.

Most especially, we cannot withdraw from a frontier only 90 miles away without abandoning safeguards to our national security.

One Hundredth Anniversary of Felton, Sibley & Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to the outstanding firm of Felton, Sibley & Co., Inc., which has been manufacturing quality paints and chemical coatings since 1863. This year this great progressive firm is celebrating its 100th anniversary. Their main office is located in my congressional district and many of my constituents, I am happy to say, are employees of Felton, Sibley & Co.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include a historical capsule of Felton, Sibley & Co. in the Congressional Record for the benefit of my colleagues.

Historical Capsule

Business was established at the northwest corner of Fourth and Cherry Streets, Philadelphia, in 1863, where it has remained to this day.

The original members of the firm were Samuel K. Felton and Conrad F. Rau, who formed a copartnership under the name Felton & Rau. When Edward A. Sibley joined the firm shortly thereafter, the name became Felton, Rau & Sibley. In 1892, Mr. Rau withdrew from the firm and the name was changed to Felton, Sibley & Co. Following the death of Mr. Sibley in 1910, the concern was incorporated under the laws of Pennsylvania. Mr. Samuel K. Felton passed away in 1914 at the age of 82, having actively served in the paint industry for over 64 years; and with his passing a leading trade publication wrote, "We mourn the loss of one of the oldest and foremost figures in the paint industry; his fame as a pioneer in the trade is spread over the four corners of the country and his constructive and inventive ideas are just as well known." Mr. Felton was also known far and wide for his humanitarian, philanthropic and church work.

In 1913, the firm celebrated its 50th anniversary. Following are a few excerpts from the many tributes accorded by industry, press and citizenry:

"To be 50 years in the manufacture of paints and varnishes means something and there are but very few that can stand out in the clear sunlight and give an account of themselves. Mr. Felton, as the head of this grand old firm, you have done your work well and set the pace for the younger ones to follow. To be one of the oldest varnish houses in America, to be among the oldest paint manufacturers and still at the helm guiding the business, is a thing to be proud of."

"No paint house in the country has a higher standard for honorable business methods and uniform quality goods."

"This well-known house bears an enviable record of achievement and the history of such a remarkable growth indicates clearly what may be expected when a manufacturer endeavors to make a product that can be relied upon to accomplish exactly that for which it is made. Scrupulous care is exercised in the making of all their products and, as science finds new ways and better materials, Felton-Sibley is always ready to adopt what was proven after successful experimentation. They are progressive and show a steady increase of business each year because those dealing with them found the products made were as good as present knowledge and machinery can make them. We might further state that, while Philadelphia has concerns that were estabished many years ago, there is none that is more favorably known in the trade than Felton-Sibley."

"To Mr. Felton and his fortunate associates I beg to present congratulations coupled with the hope that generations yet unborn may look upon the name of Felton-Sibley & Co. with the same respect and admiration that today is accorded to it and to those who made it the synonym of mercantile integrity and human fair dealing."

In 1916, a new structure was dedicated at Fourth and Cherry Streets by members of the second and third generations. Officers were J. Sibley Felton, president; Walter G. Sibley, vice president; Horace S. Felton, second vice president; Howard B. Felton, treasurer; and J. Robinson Silver, secretary. At the dedication it was recalled when nearby farmers drove into Philadelphia with lineseed oil, which they sold to paint manufacturers. In those days the Merchants' Hotel, Fourth Street near Arch, was Philadelphia's leading hotel. Varnish at that time was sold mostly in drug stores, where it was carried in bulk; the customer brought in his own container and the varnish was measured out to him. The owner of a drugstore wanting some varnish would furnish the gum, oil, turpentine, and driers. The varnish maker would take this with his kettles and other equipment and to go to an open lot, along a stream if possible, so that he would have water to put out his fire when the kettle was through cooking.

Throughout the years, Felton-Sibley has pioneered and produced almost every type paint product and chemical coating—finishes for hairpins to Army tanks, traffic, bridge, and guard rail paints for bustling turnpikes and expressways—the multitude of interior and exterior household and industrial finishes so popular today.

When planetaria first came on the national scene, Felton-Sibley was commissioned to develop a unique dome finish, which has served as the standard to this day, for retention of acoustic fidelity on unusually high-type ceilings. The Fels Planetarium, Philadelphia; Hayden in New York and Boston; Adler in Chicago; Buhl in Pittsburgh; and the Moorehead in Chapel Hill, N.C., are among the more prominent planetariums using this special formulation.

The Betsy Ross House and other famous historical shrines have been protected and preserved by Felton-Sibley paints over the years. The finishes used in the restoration of Independence Hall were produced by Felton-Sibley after painstaking research. They match as closely as historical records indicate the original paint formulas used almost 200 years ago.

In 1960, Alsamite Paint Co., Inc., Carroll Ltd., Inc., and H. M. Wocher & Son, all Philadelphia based firms, were annexed as subsidiary divisions.

Present officers are: Horace S. Felton, chairman of the board; A. R. Steinberg, president; Herman J. Zimmerman, vice president; and David L. Steinberg, secretary-treasurer. Employees number over 150; 40 of which have served 25 years or longer and 6 over 40 years.

Through the trade sales division, a complete line of paints, varnishes, lacquers, shellacs, and paint sundries is marketed by over 1,000 independent retail dealers throughout the Middle Atlantic States. The industrial and painter maintenance divisions serve leading architects, painting contractors, interior decorators, city, State, and governmental agencies, plants, offices, and institutions in all phases of paint and chemical coating requirements.

Felton-Sibley is a charter member and exclusive eastern U.S. constituent of Spectromatic Associates, an international group specializing in the formulation and merchandising of custom tinted paints. Abreast of space-age paint technology, over 1 million colors can now be electronically projected and translated into precise paint formulas by Felton-Sibley through specially developed automated equipment. In addition to participation in local paint groups, active membership is maintained in the National Paint, Varnish & Lacquer Association and the Federation of Societies of Paint Technology.

After 100 years of continuous manufacturing at the same location, the Felton-Sibley parcel is being appropriated by the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Philadelphia as part of the program for the development of the Independence Mall Urban Renewal Area.

Plans are being consummated for a new ultramodern plant, consolidating all divisions under one roof with ample area for future expansion and embodying latest manufacturing, shipping, and administrative facilities.

Maryland Lions Tribute to U Thant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on May 4, 1963, the Lions of District 22 in Maryland honored U Thant, the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

I had the privilege of being present on this occasion and of listening to the remarks of Edgar M. Elbert, LL.D., past international president, 1952–53. In order that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read Mr. Elbert's impressive address, I have obtained a transcript which I ask to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I take this opportunity to commend the Lions of Maryland, as well as the Lions International, for the fine work they are doing.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My respects and commendations to you, International Director Bob. To our Past International Director Massey Roe, and in the interest of time, I shall omit all of the distinguished people at the two head tables with the exception of those who are representing here this evening our distinguished honored guest, the first of whom being Honorable Ambassador of Burma, Hon. Sein, and the second being the Honorable Phillip Dean, and I want to say to that gentleman that I am certainly happy that he changed his baptized name, because I couldn't have pronounced it anyhow. (Gerassimos Theodoros Christodoulou Svoronos-Gigantes.) Now you tell me, isn't this a mouthful? My respects also, to all of the members of the various committees and the governor's staff that have arranged this outstanding event; to all Lions here asembled and guests; and, finally to those of you of the weaker sex who have been born and raised on the gentle hillsides of Maryland and are now mellowing in the love and attention as only Lion's husbands and only Lion's sweethearts can give such attention; to you I say; "a very pleasant evening to you all." [Applause.]

I noticed a Lion to the left of the podium who looked a bit sour at this remark and I want to say to this fellow Lion that if I were to be [flash picture taken] (thank you sir, if they turn out I'll take a dozen) [laughter]. I want to say to this fellow Lion that if I wanted to be very truthful about my observation I might say this is the finest fathers and daughters banquet that I have ever attended. [Applause.]

All right, all right. We start timing now. Fellow Lions, ladies and guests. I would certainly be remiss in the matter of my innermost convictions should I fail to say to you at the outset how very, very happy I am to be back with you. It has been my privilege down through the past 20 years to appear at many, many meetings in district 22 and in particular district 22–C. It has always been a pleasure—I've learned to know you—I've learned to love you. I know that we have in common a great goal—the goal of Lions International, and, to see here tonight what you are doing and to note that you have raised your horizons on an international level—just tugs at my heart to think that I belong to an organization that has widened its horizon to this effect, especially about a man concerning whom we shall hear more. As a matter of fact, I was in your community on April 1, just about the time that the cherry blossoms were beginning to strike out. Three days later I left Vancouver for Tokyo, there on Lions business.

Fellow Lions and ladies, what happened in Tokyo and in the Orient during our Lions international board there would be a topic for a conversation which you and I could have for 2 hours. But, let us shorten the report and say this: it was there, in 1951–52 my pleasure to charter the first Lions Club of Japan. And it was my pleasure to charter three and four in Japan, in 1953. And imagine my amazement to speak there at a 10th anniversary of the Kobe and Tokyo Lions Clubs, and to find out that within 10 short years, 560 Lions Clubs are now constituted in the country of Japan with over 30,000 Lions members. But, before we go any further, I must say to you something that I have promised to do all my life, whenever I address an American audience, a promise that I intend to keep, viz: that from this point at which I stand and look over this audience up and down and right and left, I want to say to you that this is a beautiful sight from where I stand. Oh, not because your clothes are better than they would be somewhere else, not because perhaps that your savings accounts or your bank accounts are larger than somewhere else, no, that isn't the point. I say it because of something that was mentioned here a few moments ago by the man who received this accolation in the name of our honored guest, U. Thant. This is a beautiful sight because in this world tonight three-fifths of its people are not permitted to meet as we have met here tonight. No one asked me to give them a copy of what I was going to say to you. No one took your name and address at the door as you entered this great hall, and I promised myself from what I have seen around the world, that wherever I go, wherever I face an audience of free people—I am going to ask them to remember as I remember it because it's been seared into my soul—that freedom, that freedom is something that is in protective custody. Remember that phrase. Freedom is something that is in protective custody and the extent to which we protect this freedom decides whether we are to remain free or whether we are in slavery. [Applause.]

Now the very interpretation of Lions International L-I-O-N-S meaning—liberty, intelligence, our Nation's safety is the spark that has ignited the free thinking and the right thinking, gentlemen of this world, because of that little personal pronoun "our." Liberty and intelligence makes our Nation's safety, just as sweet to the man from Australia or from South America or the Orient or Europe or wherever he may be. And believe you me, my friends, there are in all corners and all crevasses of this world men who believe and who think as you and I think. This is the gift that men of North America, the founders of Lions International have given to the world, and I say to you—follow me very closely—I say it is not possible for a man to meet with his Lions Club week after week, month after month, year after year, and there salute Old Glory or the flag of whatever his nation might be, to sing his national anthem, and according to our religious conviction, ask a man of the cloth to give an invocation for our services and blessings of the food that we eat and the service that we are about to give, I say to you my friends, that it is impossible to do this year in and year out and not become a better citizen of whatever country you belong to.

Now, isn't this a simple little program that we have? And oh, how it is accepted by the peoples of the world, and, we know that the man we are honoring tonight, the Honorable U Thant, is a man who, on like level, espouses the same causes that we do, and that's why I say I am oh, so happy to have a small part in this program in which the Lions of district 22 are honoring this man—not because he is Secretary General of the United Nations, but because of the man he is, and the record that has brought him to this high level of service to humanity. You read it. We do not have the time to discuss it except there is one difference. The work of Mr. Thant, our honored guest, is on a nation-to-nation basis. The work of Lions International is on a person-to-person basis. We invoke in Lions International no sanctions. We use no force. Our membership is by invitation. There is no foreclosure on our part via a note of some super-body, ah no, every Lion in this world partakes in the management and the election and the policies and the procedures of Lions International.

"Now this is the gift of America to the world—Lions International. If there is any doubt in our minds as to Lions' worldwide acceptance, let us take a look at the records, as a certain American politician used to say. I have here in my hand the report of March 1963 which tells us that during March 109 new Lions Clubs were organized throughout the length and breadth of the world. Of these 109 clubs, 73 were organized outside the continental limits of the United States of America and 36 were organized within the United States of America. Within the past few days I have received, dated April 30, this letter which says that we now have Lions Clubs in 121 countries and geographical locations through the world because a Lions Club now has been organized in Mozambique, and another in Tanganyika. Mozambique, No. 1 and No. 2 in the Republic of Tanganyika. There are people in this audience that will never see Tanganyika or Mozambique, but my friends, let me tell you something, "Liberty, intelligence, our Nations' safety is the same thing to the Lions of Mozambique and to the Lions of Tanganyika. And they will pledge themselves and will work for humanities' betterment—district governors, deputies, zone chairmen, and presidents, they'll have their conventions; they'll have the same constitution you have and they'll have the same program activities in the interest of what? The same as our honored guest tonight, the Honorable U Thant, in the interest of humanitarian well-being. Is this bad? I don't think so. During the year 1962, this association together with a few men in every community of our country and every community of the world where they still believe in the Master's second great commandment, "Love thy neighbor as thyself," these men have pooled their interest and convictions and you know to what result. In 1962, in the United States alone, 140 millions of dollars raised—through various activities—by the Lions in the United States of America alone. Why? To build a big monument for somebody? To build a bigger building? To increase profits in some stocks in some corporation? I say to you, never. These funds were used to pay for some poor youngster's operation—someone that needed it and couldn't have afforded it. These funds were spent to send some deserving student to school, that couldn't afford it. These funds were spent for the blind and those of poor vision around every State of our Union; $400,000 worth were spent to train dogs that the blind may regain the dignity of human beings and not remain a charge on their fellow Americans. Why here in district 22-C alone, in your Lions eye bank and research foundation and other activities—it is told to me that your activities here alone last year amounted to over a quarter of a million of dollars. I haven't added it up and I haven't figured it out, but I believe you if you say so, and I know that you are capable of doing it. Your contribution on the local level to the great work that is being fostered and sponsored internationally, and led by our guest of honor tonight, the Honorable U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations.

Now all people haven't always believed that eternal vigilance is the price of freedom and liberty; some people do not believe it today. But, my friends, as a past president of Lions International, it has been my privilege, and oh, how I pray to God, that it might be the privilege of every Lion and his lady, somehow to sit upon a perch someplace and have a bird's-eye view of these activities as they are carried on far, far beyond our borders in the exact self-same program that you and I engage in them. In this capacity I have walked over the ruins of erstwhile civilizations who didn't believe that eternal vigilance was the price of freedom. I am thinking for instance at this moment, of the great ancient civilization of Carthage, I'm thinking of the civilization of Rome, and particularly of Greece at that great center of Balbec where in my mind's eye I can see, in the inhuman heat of the desert, men being whipped by bullwhips, dragging just monumental pieces of stone for a distance of over 800 miles, to build there a great monument, to living people who believed in no one but themselves. Here now, lie these ruins of great civilizations, and when we look at what's left of these civilizations we come to the conclusion, and this is a fact, that some of the architectural gems of the Carthagians, of the Romans, of the Greeks have not been duplicated not even in this enlightened year of our Lord in 1963 when you and I live, so they must have had an enlightenment, but they did not recognize the divine command "Love thy neighbor as thyself," because as they climbed higher and higher up the rungs of the economic ladder, interested only in materialistic things which helped them only and helped nobody else. Now it comes to me as a conclusion—and this is just an observation my friends—that finally, He who has made this earth, you and me, and everything else, finally says to himself, "These people are of no further use to Me in My great program," and result? Overnight He permitted some other nation which may be just as dastardly as they are, but stronger, to sweep down upon them and overnight another civilization has gone into the dead pages of history. And so we come to this great and glorious country of ours, this country that spawned the idea of Lions International and sent it out beyond all of our borders out to all of the people of the world and—they have accepted it—only because of this little personal pronoun of "ours"; "Liberty, intelligence, our Nation's safety," and, because the milk of human kindness still flows in their veins, and because there is a little bit of divinity that you can't get away from—the seed planted by the Creator down in the soul of every man or woman who has ever been born, determining that each perform his or her certain function on this earth before you are removed and this brings us to the very simple, simple program of what? Why are we here? I think we are here tonight, my friends and fellow Lions, to encourage—to encourage Mr. Thant in the work that he is doing with the United Nations. God knows there is enough criticism leveled against that organization. I think we as Lions say to ourselves, look—nothing is perfect, nothing ever will be perfect during our lives, so it certainly behooves us with our intelligence to try and make it a little bit better than it is. So we are here tonight to encourage Mr. Thant because his program on an international level is the same as ours is. Oh. Encouragement, what a word. Reduced to the purest least common denominator, it runs something like this. The president of a Lions Club, I don't care where it is, you've got lots of them here, he says to his secretary, "Joe, I want to tell you something. I've enjoyed being president of this club this year. You know why? Because of the help you've given me." "Boy. I tell you, if it weren't for you, this would have been a real honest-to-God job." And then he goes to the program chairman and he tells him the same thing. Now you know what he's done. He has encouraged these men. Does it cost him anything? Not a dime. You know what the secretary and the program chairman are going to do, they're going to break their backs to do an even better job. Isn't this right? That's the way it works. How do all of us react to a bit of encouragement? How did our soldiers in Valley Forge react to the encouragement of that great man, George Washington? I tell you there probably never was in this world—not even in Burma, Mr. Ambassador—an army that was as ill fed and as ill clad and ill at heart as our Army at Valley Forge. Never could have been. It is just impossible; and here is this great man Washington walking amongst them day and night, patting them on the shoulder, why? What was the result of this simple little act of encouragement, well you know it and I know it, we learned it in the fifth grade. With the coming of the thaws in the spring, these men, still ill clad and ill provisioned, with sacks around their feet, but encouraged. They marched forth, and one victory after another brought us our liberty here in this country. They made it possible for us to sit here tonight as we are doing.

I went to the AAU meet in Chicago some years ago, took my family there one night, and many things were going on in that great Chicago stadium. Many of you have been there at Lions conventions before. All of a sudden a voice came over the PA system and said "Ladies and gentlemen, would you please give your attention to an undergraduate who has had two chances to better a world's mark and now wishes to make a third and last attempt. Will all the rest of the events on the field, please cease so that this man may have our attention?" And everybody became quiet—23,000 people in that great hall became quiet and the other events stopped and there was one lone soul, a young man, a college senior. As he grabbed this pole, this was the pole vaulting event and as he ran down that lane, he felt with every element and sinew of his body and his muscles and his mind and his spirit the necessity to compensate these 23,000 people who were encouraging him in this valiant attempt to set a world's record—even as this crowd is now encouraging the speaker of the evening by your silent attention. This, too, is encouragement.

Well, I'll tell you something, my friends, when he ran down that line he knew, and you felt it—there was just no possibility of him missing—and it was on that night that Cornelius Warmerdam set the indoor pole vault record of the world—a record that has just been surpassed within the past few months, 12 years later. Take any incident you want, my friends, from your family relationships, in your history, in your activities as a student, any place you want to, you will find some little insignificant incident of encouragement that has brought great results. Must I tell you about one in the field of religion? May I? I shall, because no one has said no, and it is something that has made such a tremendous impact on my life. In 1953 I stood at a place called Golgotha, the place of the skull, it is sometimes called. And I recalled as I stood there, the history and the lesson that my grandmother and grandfather had taught me, and surely my father who was a minister of the Gospel for 59 years; and I remember that here was a man who was hung upon the cross, probably the most ignominous death of any man, living then or today. As a matter of fact, it is so ignominous, that in our present cycle we have eliminated it. Now, he hadn't done anything bad, matter of fact, he was double-crossed and he was there because of politics and a lot of other things—but primarily you and I know he was there because of the fulfillment of the Gospel. Anyway you judge this scene, legally it was a shameful procedure, besides everybody had turned against him. Darkness was upon humanity at this hour—all had forsaken him. There was no encouragement for this Man who had done nothing but good all His life. But suddenly—lo and behold, it was like a baseball game in your and my time, the score tied, 2 outs in the ninth inning, and a fellow with a batting average of 118 steps up to the plate and knocks a home run and wins the game. And so it was in this case when one of the malefactors, also being crucified and certainly there because of what was due him—this malefactor suddenly encourages this holy man in the middle by saying, "Lord, remember me when thou enterest thy kingdom." Unsolicited—encouragement—encouragement by adhering faith and oh, what an impact. I say to you no sweeter words have ever fallen upon the ears of a human being than the results of that encouragement. "This day, thou will be with me in paradise." Encouragement? productive? worthwhile? I'll say it is. Yes, fellow Lions and ladies—that's why we are here tonight—to encourage Mr. Thant as is our custom to encourage all worthwhile activities—sometimes difficult to do as an individual, but as a group—as Lions—our daily habit and now, may the fountain of all wisdom, knowledge, and well-being, grant to our honored guest this day, and for the rest of his life, blessings from on high to continue his life of service to his fellow man—so say we all. Thank you, and God bless you.

(Mr. Edgar M. Elbert's remarks in presenting picture:)

Ladies and gentlemen, another honor has been accorded me this evening, and that is a presentation on your behalf; I want the recipient of this gift to know, when I say on your behalf, it includes all Lions everywhere—a painting that is being presented to our honored guest, U Thant, in absentia, and I would ask at this time to step forward His Excellency U On Sein, Ambassador of Burma.

His Excellency, the Ambassador, tells me that this is a very fine likeness of Mr. Thant, and we want him to know and we want him to carry this message to the Honorable U Thant; that the likeness in the painting itself is not the only likeness that we wish to establish by this presentation. We want him to know, Your Excellency (and I wish I'd had you on my football team. We wouldn't have lost so many games.)—But we want the Honorable U Thant to know that the likeness is also in the philosophy and the program of our activities with all human kind. I present this to you, sir, on behalf of these wonderful people.

Rusk Phone Call to Ecuador: Oil on Tuna-Fishing Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will find the New York Herald Tribune editorial of May 30, 1963, entitled "Rusk Phone Call to Ecuador: Oil on Tuna-Fishing Sea," written by Marguerite Higgins, to be pertinent and indicative of the lack of success with which our State Department is meeting the flagrant treatment we have been subjected to by the Ecuadorian Government. It has become imperative for the Congress to take immediate steps to deny economic aid to this and any country continuing to harass our American flag tuna fleet when operating within the confines of international law.

Rusk Phone Call to Ecuador: Oil on Tuna-Fishing Sea

(By Marguerite Higgins)

Washington.—Secretary of State Dean Rusk yesterday telephoned Ecuador's Foreign Minister in an effort to avoid a flareup as the result of Ecuador's seizure of two boats in America's scrappy tuna-fishing fleet.

He requested immediate release of the *White Star* and *Ranger*, the two tuna boats "arrested" at sea last weekend by an Ecuadoran destroyer for allegedly fishing illegally in Ecuadoran waters. The 19 other American tuna-fishing boats in the vicinity are reported following angrily behind as the Ecuadoran Navy propels the "arrested" boats into port. (The Ecuadoran Navy said all 21 boats were "in custody.")

Mr. Rusk told Foreign Minister Benjamin Peralto that the incident could create reactions out of all proportion to the issues.

There was real fear in Washington last night of some kind of violent byproduct of the altercations between the Ecuadoran Navy and the tuna fleet. And while the violence might be on a small scale, it could have a poisonous effect in the hemisphere.

Mr. Rusk's extraordinary phone call marks the first time that a Secretary of State has personally contacted a Foreign Minister on a matter like this. He acted after reports reached Washington that the Ecuadoran destroyer had fired across the bow of at least one tuna boat to compel the captain to head for an Ecuadoran port.

The Ecuadorans justify their arrest of the American tuna boats by their contention that territorial waters extend 200 miles off shore. The United States takes the position that territorial waters extend only 3 miles and that therefore the Americans have a perfect right to fish in the area.

Mr. Rusk tried to shift the quarrel from the high seas to the heights of diplomacy by offering the Ecuadoran Foreign Minister immediate dispatch of top-level diplomats to Quito, the capital, to negotiate the issue.

Mr. Peralto, it is understood, promises to take the request for the release of the two tuna boats instantly to the Cabinet.

In Washington, representatives of the tuna-fishing fleet, which berths at San Diego, Calif., complained that what the fishermen wanted was protection by the U.S. Navy—not phone calls.

Report of the Foggy Bottom Mutual Admiration Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the New York Daily News of May 20, 1963:

Report of the Foggy Bottom Mutual Admiration Society

Some months or weeks ago, the U.S. State Department peered into a looking-glass and asked: "Mirror, mirror on the wall, who is the fairest of us all?" Then quick as a wink, State said: "Me."

What the mirror would have said if given time to answer is unknown.

But State's reply suited States right down to the ground, and very soon the Department headquartered in Foggy Bottom, Washington, D.C., was busy—furiously busy, my dears—at fleshing out that reply for all the world to ponder.

These labors produced a big, handsomely printed, lavishly illustrated 151-page book entitled, "Department of State 1963: A Report to the Citizen," which you can get, you lucky whatnot, by sending $1.50 to Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

Considering the taxes you pay to support Secretary of State Dean Rusk and all the other Federal bureaucrats, you might think yourself entitled to a copy free of charge, and to a reasonable fee for reading the thing. But if you talked that way, the liberals would call you a Fascist if not a John Bircher, so you'd better keep such dangerous thoughts to yourself.

Anyway, your reporter has read most of the book, and will now summarize it for you.

Essentially, "Department of State 1963" is a long song of love and praise for the "dedicated men and women" (President Kennedy's phrase) who work for that same Department of State. There are some 8,700 of these selfless saints now, as against 1,600 in 1929 and 5 clerks plus Thomas Jefferson in 1790.

YOU NAME IT—STATE'S GOT IT

They are engaged in an enormous number of activities, which are detailed in this book.

Walt W. ("Russia is Mellowing") Rostow chairs the Policy Planning Council, which dreams up U.S. policies (and what dreams and what policies) toward every foreign nation under the sun.

State is up to here in the Alliance for Progress—the President's plan to uplift and improve Latin America with some 20 billion U.S. dollars plus whatever pesos, cruzeiros, and bolivares the Latin Americans may deign to kick in.

The State Department runs a big intelligence operation, as if the Central Intelligence Agency weren't equal to its job. In this book, State takes no little credit for having advised the President on what to do when he became convinced last October that Khrushchev was parking missiles, missile launchers, and long-range bombers in Cuba.

State has fingers in virtually all of the United Nations special agencies, in foreign aid, in the Far and Middle East, in Africa, and in various Caribbean and Central and South American countries.

For all the wealth of information that this book contains, there are certain omissions. Most of these concern the reasons why U.S. foreign policy so often falls on its tin ear while tens of millions around the world roar with ungodly laughter.

The book talks as if the Cuban problem were all but solved, though it is obvious that Khrushchev has anchored a base in Cuba which it would take a major military operation to root out.

SKILLFUL WHITEWASH

We gather from the volume that virtually everything in Laos is coming up roses, which may or may not be so, but most likely isn't.

West Berlin? Well, sir; you read this book (p. 105) and you get the impression that West Berlin has sunk to the level of a minor problem which Secretary Rusk could solve singlehanded any afternoon before teatime.

The book, in short, is a skillfully done, expertly edited self-whitewash of the State Department and of the many hobbles, boners, and booboos it has committed since John F. Kennedy became President—or let's make it since John Foster Dulles died and was succeeded by Christian Herter as Secretary.

It would be funny in spots and unimportant throughout, if it were not for the fact that the U.S. State Department's operations affect the lives and destinies of all of us for better or for worse, and may eventually determine our survival or our finish as an independent Nation.

That fact makes "Department of State 1963" the most ominous and sinister book we've seen thus far in 1963.

Personal Message to the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of my constituents, Mr. E. H. Robertson, Jr., of Mount Pleasant, S.C., has asked that I present to the Congress a personal message from him. I call this message to the attention of the Members of this body, not only because Mr. Robertson has requested that I do so, but also because it reflects the sentiment of much of the mail I have been receiving from large numbers of South Carolinians and from others across this country who are concerned about the increasing tide of centralization of power in Washington. I ask unanimous consent that this message be printed in the Appendix to the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

This is to ask you to stop, look, and evaluate what your failure to vigorously guard your prerogatives has done.

Instead of being governed by the Constitution and by laws enacted by the Congress, we are being governed by Executive orders, decisions made by appointive agencies, wierd interpretations of the Constitution by the Supreme Court and by outright coercion, intimidation, and blackmail by the Attorney General's Office.

Each of you was elected to the legislative branch of the Government for the purpose of functioning as The Constitution stipulates. You, and you alone, are empowered to enact such legislation as is necessary to assure the rights of the States and/or the people Each of you on taking office swore to defend The Constitution against all enemies, foreign or domestic. You are expected to do your duty.

Your failure to act now to curb this mad usurpation of power will pave the way for a military dictatorship and a bloody revolution.

I emplore you, be men of courage, perform your duty as the Founding Fathers intended.

E. H. Robertson, Jr.
Mount Pleasant, S.C.

A Nut—Or Is He?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Odessa (Tex.) American and was reprinted by the New Oxford (Pa.) Item, of May 30.

It is submitted for the information of all with just one obseravtion—would that there were millions more identical "nuts":

What Kind of a Nut Is He?

He wants to run his own business.

He wants to select his own doctor.

He wants to make his own bargains.

He wants to buy his own insurance.

He wants to select his own reading matter.

He wants to provide for his own old age.

He wants to make his own contracts.

He wants to select his own charities.

He wants to educate his children as he wishes.

He wants to make his own investments.

He wants to select his own friends.

He wants to provide his own recreation.

He wants to compete freely in the market place.

He wants to grow by his own efforts.

He wants to profit from his own errors.

He wants to take part in the competition of ideas.

He wants to be a man of good will.

What kind of a nut is he? He's an American who understands and believes in the Declaration of Independence, that's what kind.

Aren't you glad you are too? And don't you wonder why so many of our fellow Americans are trying so hard to destroy the kind of life that has made us the aim and the envy of every other people on earth?

The question is: What kind of nuts are they?

Joint Baltic-American Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Leonard Simutis, one of the outstanding civic leaders in Chicago has been especially active in Lithuanian affairs. Mr. Simutis is editor of the Lithuanian Daily Draugas, which is one of the major Lithuanian newspapers in the United States. At the present time he is president of the Lithuanian American Council and member of the Joint Baltic-American Committee.

It was my privilege to be present at the presentation of the citation by the Joint Baltic-American Committee to the United States Information Agency in appreciation and recognition of the Voice of America broadcasts to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in the languages of these people, that was held in the Mayoflwer Hotel on May 28, 1963.

The thoughts and sentiments contained in Mr. Simutis' address are expressive and valuable, and under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include the full text of Mr. Simutis' address, as follows:

This is, indeed, a privilege for the Joint Baltic American Committee to welcome such a distinguished gathering. We are very grateful to each and everyone of you, ladies and gentlemen, who have given your valuable time to join us on this occasion of the presentation of a citation to the U.S. Information Agency.

The Joint Baltic American Committee has been established by the national organizations of Americans of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian descent to further the cause of freedom for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

We strongly believe that this goal is not a dream. It is based on many strong foundations, one of which is the firm stand of the people and the Government of the United States. On July 23, 1940, the U.S. Government, in an official statement, refused to recognize the forcible incorporation of the three Baltic States into the Soviet Union and since then the United States continues to recognize the Baltic diplomatic and consular officials as the legal representatives of their countries.

Since that memorable day, the U.S. Government is continuing to show its concern and interest in the fate of the three Baltic States. This concern has been constantly reflected in the official statements of the administration. It has been repeatedly demonstrated by both Houses of the Congress.

Today we are here to salute the U.S. Information Agency for its very effective broadcasts by the Voice of America to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania which bring the American message of hope, truth, peace and freedom to the Baltic peoples.

These Voice of America broadcasts are the main reliable channel for the Baltic peoples in retaining their contacts with the Western World to which they always belonged. They are a tangible proof of American respect for the national aspirations and cultural heritage of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians. They project the image of America. They bring to the audience a factual presentation of American objectives and policies.

As all the available evidence points out, the Voice of America broadcasts encourage the oppressed people to sustain their faith in the prevalence of human dignity and eventual victory of freedom over the forces of coercion and tyranny.

We wish to note the presence here of the competent professional staff, who translate the policies and objectives of the Government into radio programs in the vernacular of the audience, the broadcasts which are well received and appreciated.

Being aware of the fact that these broadcasts are most welcome to their audience, we are confident that they successfully promote the just aspirations of the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to rejoin in President Kennedy's words, "the peaceful world community of free and independent states, free to choose their own future and their own systems."

Dr. Herman M. Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to an eminent citizen of my congressional district, Dr. Herman M. Wilson, who has just retired from a long and fruitful career; a career which has added greatly to the creativity, the joy, and contentment of our senior citizens.

For 36 year Dr. Wilson was administrator of the Asbury Home for the Aging at Gaithersburg. He is a past president of the National Association of Methodist Hospitals and Homes, and is a charter member both of the National Council on Aging and of the National Gerontological Society. In addition, he also serves on the Montgomery County Commission on Aging.

A graduate of George Washington University, Dr. Wilson also earned a degree in law at the University of Maryland, as well as a master's degree from the Emory University. Upon completion of his theological studies at the Yale University Divinity School in 1927, Dr. Wilson became administrator of the Asbury Home. There he had his lifetime ministry.

From a one-building home in 1927, Dr. Wilson guided the institution until today it has 6 interconnecting buildings and 160 resident guests. Dr. Wilson pioneered in creative activity for senior citizens, seeking to dispel the notion that homes for the aging are places where people just sit and rock and wait to die. The name of the Asbury Home for the Aging underlines his philosophy that aging is a process to be enjoyed, and a time for creative work. According to Dr. Wilson, the word "aged" implies that a process has been completed and a person put on a shelf. More than 60 clubs, activities and interest groups keep the Asbury Home residents busy and informed. In honor of Dr. and Mrs. Wilson, the trustees of the home have renamed the main building "Wilson Hall."

I join their many friends in Maryland in wishing for Dr. and Mrs. Wilson a long and happy retirement, full of continued activity and creativity.

Drug Safety and Drug Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the question of the safety of drugs has occupied not only the attention of our Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee but of the House itself. It seems to me that the address of Dr. L. T. Coggeshall, Chairman of the Commission on Drug Safety, at the annual meeting of the Division of Medical Sciences, National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, April 9, 1963, is a worthy contribution to this overall subject.

DRUG SAFETY AND DRUG CONTROL

(NOTE.—An address by L. T. Coggeshall, M.D., Chairman of the Commission on Drug Safety, at the Annual Meeting of the Division of Medical Sciences, National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, April 9, 1963.)

We meet to discuss drug safety in its broadest aspects. Yet we come to it dominated by one event—thalidomide. That tragedy has been a catalyst in bringing the larger questions into focus. But nothing can obscure its being a tragedy. A single maimed individual, one unavoidable death—each is an event that strikes deeply into our hearts. If there is fault to be found in the thalidomide episode, no one individual, group or agency in our complex society can be singled out to bear it. If there is a lesson to be learned, it is a lesson for all of us. As we experiment with more potent compounds, we will inevitably run higher risks. This must be expected. The general public must know this truth and, indeed, share in the responsibility of carrying this burden.

The complexities of the subject of drug safety seem insurmountable. Our knowledge of basic life processes is scant and fragmentary. Applying what little we do know strains our abilities. Chemical information about drugs produces confidence to a certain point and then fades. The general practitioner has his weakness, the specialist his limitations, the researcher his frustrations. Economic considerations complicate the picture. And government activity increasingly disciplines various of its elements, as the legislative arm seems on the one hand to have unlimited confidence in the country's scientists, as demonstrated by the generous support of research, and on the other hand seems to have misgivings as it insists on more regulations.

DRUG PROGRESS INVOLVES RISK

The basic consideration is the search for chemicals to save life, to ease pain, to fight disease. The objective is the improvement of the human condition. We meet the problem of drug safety along the way. The encounter with the question might be put this way: How much of our cake can we have and eat? Can we get the new drugs humanity needs without taking risks, without facing dangers?

The answer is "No." But the reply should not be discouraging Quite the contrary. For it reminds us to focus our attention on the basic purposes of drug therapy. But, the problems of drug safety are more likely to be scientific problems than any other kind. And the kind of science they require is very likely to be more "scientific" than ever before: more sophisticated, more complex, more penetrating.

The Food and Drug Administration illustrates in its own development how the scientific aspects of the problem have become more and more important over the years. When it was established, in 1906, the agency was a policing operation. It was the country's first Mr. Clean, fighting dirt and grime, fraud and disease. Enforcement dominated its activities, and the courts were more important than laboratories. The testing function was primitive: A "poison squad" of 10 Agricultural Department employees volunteered to eat certain foods to determine whether the preservatives were harmful.

CHANGES IN MEDICINE

In the next 30 years, the FDA kept the directions set in the original law. But deep-seated changes were taking place in medicine and the biological sciences. Medical education was reformed with scientific and professional standards that have continued to rise. Research interests broadened, and investigatory techniques improved. Insulin and liver extract were added to the meager number of drugs available for the treatment of specific diseases by the practicing physician.

In 1935, with the discovery of sulfanilamide, a new era in drug research began. The FDA caught up with the backlog of changes in 1938 through the twist of fate that brought more than 108 deaths in the tragedy of the "Elixir of Sulfanilamide." New legislation installed a procedure for testing programs that would show that a new drug, at least, would not make the patient's condition any worse. With this emphasis on drug safety, the monitoring and enforcement activities of the agency expanded.

But the changes in medicine continued to gather speed. During World War II, the Federal Government entered the health field on a broad and substantial scale, and its expenditures rose to multi-million-dollar levels. After the war, it took on new responsibilities in public health, medical training, hospital construction, and biological research. Aware of the importance of research, the pharmaceutical industry kept pace and switched from a passive to an active participation in the progress of medicine. The leaders erected excellent laboratories and added basic research programs to their previous developmental emphases.

SCIENCE BECOMES BETTER

Powerful new drugs appeared—new antibiotics, new vaccines, artificial hormones. Tranquilizers tamed stubborn problems and created others. Drugs offered solutions to such personal and social problems as birth control. It is estimated that 90 percent of all prescriptions written today could not have been filled 15 years ago—that 45 percent were not available 5 years ago. To one writer, the advances of the last 30 years have been so spectacular that they exceed those of the preceding 500 years in medicine.

What was happening is simple: our science was improving. It became better both qualitatively and quantitatively. Science was given generous support from both public and private sources. This support, in turn, stimulated new advances. Economic incentives gave an additional thrust to the other forward forces at work. Progress came swiftly.

With it came public concern. The Congress in many ways expressed a close interest in the direction this progress was taking. Legislation was passed affecting the availability of medical and health services. Investigations were conducted into the long chain of events in drug research and distribution. But this was brought under control by marshalling authorities outside the government to set standards and policies, not by new legislation.

ASSESS LAW'S EFFECT ON SCIENCE

When the thalidomide tragedy occurred, the political response came quickly, almost within hours. Events paralleled the "Elixir of Sulfanilamide" experience of 25 years ago, and new regulations and new legislation were enacted. This time, the legislation sought not only to strengthen measures for drug safety; it also sought evidence that the new drug was efficacious. Not only must the new drug not make matters worse, said the new law, but is must help make them beter. The level of responsibility imposed on industry was heightened; but it also gave even more serious responsibility to the government agency which admits the new drug to the market place.

The high purpose of safety and efficacy are goals that must be achieved by scientific effort. The scientific resources of the government must now match those of the universities and industry outside government if the goal is to be achieved. Is this wishful thinking? I am uncertain at this point in time. Legislation, indeed, does have important contributions to make, but it is only scientific progress which can move us toward the objective. In fact, no more vital assessment can be made of legislation in this field than its effect on the adpance of science.

Whether the new legislation can stop another thalidomide disaster cannot now be assessed. Probably not. But it is too early to say. It must be remembered that thalidomide never became the tragedy in the United States that it was abroad. The thalidomide tragedy in this country was averted in time, not by new legislation, but by laws and regulations already a quarter of a century old and by the talents and integrity of a Dr. Frances Oldham Kelsey. If the thalidomide experience is to make a lasting contribution to drug safety, it will be through the recognition of the importance of the Dr. Kelseys to the Nation's health. These are the people we need more of: trained and responsible scientists in government, in industry and in the profession.

FREEDOM VITAL TO INNOVATION

The new law and its supporting regulations require a more elaborate procedure and a more detailed accounting at all steps in the testing procedure. When regulatory rules are changed, it is natural to be alarmed and to imagine the worst. But if intelligently and cooperatively enforced, they can be helpful. What can we expect from the new requirements? First, in my opinion, they will tend to upgrade minimal standards of testing, make for a more orderly presentation of new drugs, and provide more adequate material for evaluation. Second, they will permit a higher degree of control over, and selectivity among, drugs going into general use. The new requirements will give little difficulty to those firms which already have high standards. However, expectations that the new law will reduce drug prices will very likely be disappointing; there are strong possibilities that drug costs will rise, that smaller firms will be eliminated from the industry, and it will probably be very difficult for promising new ones to establish themselves.

The most critical test of the new legislation is its effect on the flow of new ideas. How will it affect basic research? What will it mean to scientific investigators? One outstanding medical scientist expresses deep concern. Having achieved one of the great advances of our time, he has given an opinion seriously doubting whether he would have been able to experiment with cortisone under the present stringent FDA regulations. His fears may not materialize. But his apprehensions are serious and contagious. They will, without doubt, divert some investigators to other pursuits. They also may have a profound adverse effect on young scientists making decisions about entry into a field where they are badly needed.

The scientific method demands records that can be validated, but the scientific inquiry cannot be initiated and directed by requirements for records. The end of a scientific experiment is not the production of records, but of knowledge. The only rule for innovation in science is freedom to inquire and explore, not constraint in following preordained paths. Such are the values that our laws must nurture and protect; certainly we must not discourage and inhibit.

REAL BARRIERS TO SAFETY

Legislation can take many steps to protect the public, but it can achieve absolute drug safety only by prohibiting the use of drugs. But this would be a reductio ad absurdum of a noble purpose. Safety is important in a factory, too, but it is not the purpose of the production line. In medicine, legislation can make the matter an essential part of the more important business of scientific discovery and applications. We must not make drug safety alone our goal, or else we will never find a way to cure cancer and prevent coronary disease, and I am sorry to observe the public attention diverted by legislative utterances and action from confidence to suspicion. The scientific barriers to drug safety, in themselves, are both real and extensive. The essence of drug safety comes in the ability to predict effects. The basis for prediction in man rests on tests in animals. Prediction from one species to another is difficult enough; prediction from animals to man must cross a gap of uncertainty that may be narrowed but never eliminated. Even when human experience with a drug is gained, the transfer of our general knowledge to one specific suffering individual involves grave risks. We must recognize these shortcomings and avoid a false sense of security about the safety of drugs. In the main, we must rely heavily on the judgment of those who are scientifically qualified and who bear professional responsibility in testing and administering drugs. There is no scientific institute or substitute for the well-trained physician who, in the final analysis, must balance risk with effectiveness in deciding the value of a new compound in man.

We can minimize the risk. The thalidomide episode revealed how urgently scientific resources must be marshaled to meet the problems. It highlighted the acute problem of side effects and complications of new drugs. It showed limitations in the current techniques of testing. It displayed an alarming difficulty within the scientific community to communicate quickly throughout the world.

COMMISSION COORDINATES INTERESTS

One of the results of the experience was the formation of the Commission on Drug Safety of which I have the honor to be Chairman. It was formed primarily because there was no organized way for the scientific community to react to the crisis. During the evaluation of the incident and the legislative process it set in motion, it became apparent that there was no one central active group ouside of Government to relate the attitudes and interests of the Govment, the pharmaceutical industry, scientific societies, the medical profession and its organizations, and the hospitals and universities. The Commission was established last August with a grant from the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association. The support was offered and accepted under the same conditions of an award to an academic institution which permits complete freedom and independence of the Commission in establishing its purposes and in carrying them out.

The Commission brought together 14 academic and scientific authorities from a wide variety of fields relating to drug safety. It first went to work to provide authoritative consultation on the new drug regulations which had been so rapidly proposed. Then, the Commission began to realize the importance of such services as it has to offer on a long range basis. It does not intend to administer or operate any programs. But as the larger questions of drug safety come under examination, it does believe there is a need for a coordinating agency. The mounting volume and diversity of effort in finding and testing new drugs will accentuate the chances for another thalidomide occurence. The Commission has established 17 subcommittees to investigate such specific areas as clinical pharmacology and communication of information, long-term chronic studies, teratology, basic research, and legislation. Individual subcommittees have been formed to consider the responsibilities of medicine, industry, government, the universities, and the public in drug safety. It has established close contacts with government agencies, pharmaceutical houses, medical, scientific and educational institutions, and outstanding investigators and authorities. It is working with professional societies and organizations such as the Association of American Medical Colleges, American Medical Association, American College of Physicians, and American Academy of Pediatrics. A conference of professional and scientific societies has been scheduled on the subject of the broad implications of drug safety for June of this year. The Commission expects to make its first general report before the end of the year.

FDA SHOULD REORIENT APPROACH

Without impairment of the public's dependence on the Food and Drug Administration's policing and enforcement responsibilities, the agency must itself become part of the scientific community if it is to meet the sophisticated demands of this era. The citizens advisory committees of 1955 and 1961 both put heavy emphasis on this point. The more recent report stresses the need for a reorientation of the FDA philosophy beyond its primary police duties. It specifically calls for scientists of broad experience in top policy positions. It also proposes stronger scientific programs and closer cooperation on the scientific level with industry. Although there are differences in the nature of their operations compared with the FDA, the National Institutes of Health, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration have benefited from a productive relationship with scientists in and out of the agencies.

There is an urgency in making the Food and Drug Administration an adequate scientific evaluating as well as enforcing agency. It does not derive from thalidomide alone. There are powerful new forces at work in biology that will have a vast impact on medicine soon. Some of the recent Nobel prizes give a clue to the significance of this widespread effort. From whatever approach biological investigations are undertaken, when they proceed to a deep enough level, they come together in molecular biology. At this fundamental level, we are gaining new insight into the basic unit of life: the cell. At present, we are using viruses for our investigations, and the gap to applications in human beings is too large. There is no timetable that will tell us when the breakthrough will come. What it means no one yet knows: the conquest of cancer, the regrowth of an amputated limb, the elimination of a genetic defect, the physical and psychic control over a new human life—all these are possibilities.

With these prospects, we must consider drug safety, not as an afterthought to tragedy, but as an integral element of our scientific advance. We must be carefully safe, but we can never be absolutely safe. There is some risk attendant on the acquisition of new knowledge and its application. To me, the future calls for a greater emphasis on the ways and means whereby the results of our enormous investment in health research can be applied for the betterment of mankind. The counterparts of insulin, pamaquine, digitalis, or even common salt in babies' formulas can be dangerous if improperly used. Could these get by the regulatory preliminaries today? The answer is "Yes" if we cooperate, but "No" if the action becomes punitive or retributive. I believe this problem is one of national importance. It will become more so, and there should be a national and objective Commission continued under independent sponsorship to serve as a reference body to all groups with pertinent interests, especially the Government, the universities, research institutions, and industry.

A One-Man Program in International Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, last week Washington was host to the 15th annual convention of the National Parking Association. Attending that meeting was one of my constituents, Kilian J. Schmitt, of Rochester, N.Y.

Mr. Schmitt is a man of whom my home community is most proud. He believes wholeheartedly in community betterment. To this end, he has made significant contributions to the development of attractive parking facilities in downtown Rochester.

Born in Germany, Mr. Schmitt has become one of the truly zealous promoters of the U.S. way of life. In fact, he sponsors a fellowship each year which permits a deserving German college student to study for 1 year at the University of Rochester.

I am personally aware of Mr. Schmitt's dedication and interest to our American institutions. As an example, it was during my tenure as president of Rochester Community Baseball, Inc.—Red Wings of the International League—that he founded Steuben Baseball Night at our Red Wing Stadium in Rochester. At this annual event, there is presented a most enjoyable pregame program of German music and folk dancing.

A director of the National Parking Association, Mr. Schmitt has been recognized in that organization's publication, Parking. The spring issue carries a story on Mr. Schmitt that I would like to share with my colleagues:

NO LONGER ANONYMOUS

For the last 10 years an anonymous donor has been sponsoring, through a University of Rochester fellowship, a one-man program in international understanding.

He visited Germany in 1950, 25 years after he had immigrated to the United States with nothing but the clothes on his back and a debt of $220 for his transportation.

"I was disappointed in the way the people talked about the United States. They just didn't understand. One farmer accused me—as a U.S. citizen—of burning down his barn in World War II. I tried to explain that when you start a war, as the Nazis had done, you paid the penalty for aggression. I tried to tell him how the American people felt.

"I discovered that they just don't understand what life is like in the United States. They think everyone is simply given washing machines, refrigerators, automobiles, and television sets. They don't realize how we have to work hard for these things. I began to think about some way to give people in Germany a little better understanding of the United States."

Thus was his fellowship idea born. This is the 11th year he will be giving $2,650 to bring to the University of Rochester for a year's study a student from the University of Wurzburg, Germany. He is convinced it is money well spent.

The project is particularly unusual because Kilian J. Schmitt is not a University of Rochester alumnus. The university is simply an instrument for the execution of Kilian's program.

He has preferred, over the last decade, to remain anonymous. He was prevailed upon to talk about the project not only because it dramatizes one man's concrete way of life, but because he hopes the exposure may prompt someone else to do something similar.

"I came to this country with absolutely nothing," Schmitt said. "It's been good to me. I'd like to preserve the things we have and help the people of Europe understand us. I don't try to be a do-gooder, but I'd like to think I help a little."

Schmitt owns or leases several parking lots in downtown Rochester and, as president of United Schmitt Corp., also is a real estate investor.

He was born in Hundsfeld, a town near Wurzburg, Germany, that no longer exists. The Nazis razed it and used the site for an airbase. Schmitt immigrated to Rochester in 1925, borrowing $220 for his transportation from school chums who were already here.

He found a job at Rochester Packing Co. as a sausagemaker. He enrolled at Washington Junior High School and learned English during the next 2 years. Then he worked his way through 6 years at Mechanics Institute (now Rochester Institute of Technology), studying mechanical engineering and management.

Meanwhile, he was a toolmaker at Todd Co., Bausch & Lomb, Liberty Tool and Die, and Kodak Park. The depression was moving across the land with its frightful stranglehold when Kilian decided: "I've monkeyed around long enough. I'd better make a job for myself.

"A real estate man said: 'I've got just the thing for you—a parking lot.' I said: 'What is a parking lot?' He said: 'Well, you know, people drive their automobiles downtown to shop or go to a movie, and they can't take them in with them, they have to park them somewhere. Where they park them, that is a parking lot.'"

On November 26, 1931, Schmitt, with $800 he had managed to save (he had no time to spend it, what with his work and schooling), bought a small lot in Clinton Avenue North opposite the Claridge Hotel.

"Times were hard, you remember. I paid $9 a week board. The landlord was kind to me. He let me run the bill up to $375. He said I'd eventually do all right, but that big bill worried me. I moved to a room in Franklin Square for $1.50 a week. Including breakfast. I cooked my other meals at the parking lot. It took me two years to pay back that $375."

Parking lot operation wasn't remunerative in those days. Schmitt charged 10 cents for all-day parking, 20 cents for a full 24 hours. And although he worked from 7 a.m. until midnight he couldn't make more than his rent.

Magazine sales crews stopped at the Claridge. Schmitt made a deal with them. "I gave them free parking if they'd buy their gas and oil from me. I remember one crew of 33 cars with the new V-8 engines. Every morning they took four gallons of gas and two quarts of oil. Two quarts every day. I made 50 or 60 cents a day from each car."

In 1939, when a bit of economic sunshine began to peek through the glowering clouds, he leased another lot in Chestnut Street. That was the same year he married the former Caroline Stock. She pitched in with a will, parking cars in the lot and handling business details. They made a great team.

When World War II came along, Schmitt had another lot at Church and Fitzhugh Streets. Gasoline rationing knocked the parking business into a cocked hat. Kilian went back to B. & L. as a toolmaker.

By 1948, however, he had leased another station at 57 Clinton Avenue South, and the next year he leased one at 110 South Clinton, now extinct as a result of the midtown project from the University of Rochester. That was his introduction to Hulbert W. Tripp, now financial vice president of the university. The fellowship program resulted from this association.

His trip to Germany in 1950 was to visit his mother, who was critically ill. A few days after he left, she called the neighbors to her bedside and said goodby to them. "I am going to die tonight," she said. She did.

Since then the Schmitts have twice returned to Wurzburg, in 1959 and 1961. The older Mr. Schmitt is now 86.

"In 1959, I told them at the University of Wurzburg about the fellowship, and that instead of selecting a student from Germany at large I would like to take a student from Wurzburg. They didn't believe me nor understand why I was doing it. One man said: 'Bah, this sounds to me like more of that American idealism. When the time comes I wonder if the money will be there?'

"In 1961, however, the university was so pleased with the results of the program that it decided to give one of the three government scholarships it receives from the German Government annually to the University of Rochester. Now we have an exchange of students each year."

The Schmitts have no children, but in this extremely practical approach to a problem of international education they have acquired, to date, 10 foster children who can't help but spread the gospel of democracy's tenets.

At the outset of the program, undergraduates were accepted. "But we learned that younger students are so impressionable they don't want to return to Germany. Now we take graduate students, law students if possible, with the idea they may go on to responsible positions in government and thus put into practical application their American findings."

Schmitt joined the National Parking Association soon after its founding and has been a director for 6 years.

In recent years he has also been very active in Steuben Society of America and is president of the local chapter for the fourth term. The Steuben Society is a national organization of men and women of German decent. It is semicultural and political in purpose mainly to remind its members of their duty to become interested and to help run this our adopted country and to help keep it free. The National Convention of the Steuben Society of America is going to be held in Rochester, N.Y., in September 1964. Mr. Schmitt has been elected chairman.

Kilian is the founder of the Steuben baseball night, which is an evening at the

Rochester Baseball Park, with pregame program of German folk dancing, singing of German songs by singing societies and a German band.

For some time the University of Rochester has realized that because of the present tax structure there won't be any more George Eastmans and other very wealthy people who can give millions to a university. Some friends of the university started the University Associates program. Mr. Schmitt and many others on the committee try to get men and women of the Rochester area to join in spreading the need for education.

Mr. Schmitt is also a member of Rochester Civic Music Association, chamber of commerce, Municipal Research Bureau, Planned Parenthood, Catholic Kopling Society, Rochester Convention and Publicity Bureau, vice president of the Federation of German American Societies.

These are only a few of the many things Schmitt is interested in and works on. When asked how he ever finds the time he said if he can help make this world just a little better place to live in than when he got here his life will not have been lived in vain. (The main portion of this article is reprinted from the Rochester Democrat & Chronicle, Jan. 14, 1963.)

San Diego Boats Harassed: United States Must Back Fishing Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it has become obvious that the Congress must take immediate steps to deny all pending and planned economic aid to foreign countries which continue to harass American-flag fishing vessels.

The following editorial from the San Diego Union dated May 29 entitled "San Diego Boats Harassed: United States Must Back Fishing Fleet" clearly presents the necessity of quick and decisive congressional action.

San Diego Boats Harassed: United States Must Back Fishing Fleet

Continued harassment of U.S. tuna clippers operating in South American waters calls for stern intervention on the part of this Government.

In the newest aggravation against U.S. fishermen, the Ecuadorian government held two San Diego tuna-boats under armed guard. The Ecuadorians sought fees from the Americans for allegedly fishing in their territorial waters, which they claim extend 200 miles offshore.

Chile, Peru, and Ecuador all insist upon the 200-mile boundary, although the United States tells its boat owners they can fish up to the traditional 3-mile boundary without obtaining special permits.

The issue is not new. Ecuador in 1954 began ignoring the recognized 3-mile limit and extended its sea mandate to 12 miles. The country later increased its territorial jurisdiction to 40 miles, and finally to 200 miles.

The nations that make unwarranted claims to control of the seas are motivated by fear of international competition. They obviously are not going to relent.

It thus becomes necessary for the U.S. Government to act. There are at least three ways in which this country could bring the offending South American countries in line.

The first logical move would be an embargo on tuna imports from nations interfering with U.S. fishermen. Also, foreign aid could be withheld from these countries.

Provisions of the Fishemen's Protective Act also could be extended to reimburse boat owners whose clippers are seized in what this country regards as international waters. The Government now pays fines imposed by foreign countries on U.S. fishermen. There is no provision, however, to repay owners for operation of their boats or crews for lost wages.

Strong Government action against countries refusing to recognize the 3-mile limit is particularly important to San Diego. An estimated $25 to $30 million payroll is brought into San Diego annually by tropical tuna fishing.

Since 1954, at least 43 American tuna clippers, most of them from San Diego, have been seized or harassed in international waters. Investigations by the United Nations and other probes have proved fruitless. As one tuna clipper operator said: "It appears we are paying the price for implementing the U.S. policy of freedom of the seas. It is quite a burden to carry."

The American tuna fleet, engaged in a hazardous and highly competitive international industry, deserves the staunch support of its Government. The fleet's continued harassment must not go unchallenged.

All the Centralists Need Is To Get Their Little Toe in the Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Record, I am pleased and proud to insert a genuine American speech by our highly esteemed colleague, the Honorable Walt Horan, of Wenatchee, Wash., a farmer-statesman. Walt is a top member of the House Appropriations Committee, of which I, too, have the honor of being a member. I know his heart beats like every deep-thinking American. Walt is deeply worried about the reckless, wasteful spending of our taxpayer dollars and our seemingly mad rush to a centralized state.

I, too, commend and admonish all our local and State officeholders to continue to be ever on guard at our portals of freedom, as does Mr. Horan in this speech which follows:

Speech of Hon. Walt Horan Before the Annual Convention of the Washington Association of County Commissioners, Wenatchee, Wash., May 22, 1963

The prodigal son was a liberal spender and the fatted calf was killed to make a feast when he returned to his father's house. But, he was not put in charge of the family purse. That was left in control of the elder son who continued to work in the field and create income.

Today I want to talk about spending. I hope we can all derive some semblance of what constitutes wise spending.

On my office wall is a quotation: "Nothing is easier than the expenditure of public money. It does not appear to belong to anybody. The temptation is overwhelming to bestow it on somebody."

I am especially happy to have this opportunity today to talk to you folks who are those closest to the people—the elected county officials of our great State of Washington. You are the men and women who, when corrutpion raises its ugly head at the county level, consider it to be a family sorrow. You know the facts as only a close association with the people can give them to you. Partisanship among you is the exception, and not the rule. Above all, you, by instinct, have some concept of what is a wise and moral test for the expenditure of public funds, whether they be Federal, State, or yours. You know what the impacts will be, or ought to be.

By now, I think you know, that I'm not going to talk about the man who drove to Las Vegas in a $10,000 automobile and returned home in a $100,000 bus. I am going to talk about a responsibility we jointly share in the protection and the future of those who labor in the vineyards and whose toil makes all else possible. You know these people personally.

Let me say that I am familiar with your home rule theme:

"Leave to private initiative all the functions that citizens can perform privately;

"Use the level of government closest to the community for all public functions it can handle;

"Utilize cooperative intergovernmental agreements where appropriate to attain economical performance and popular approval;

"Reserve national action for residual participation where State and local governments are not fully adequate;

"And for the continuing responsibilities that only National Government can undertake."

As your Federal Representative from this proud Fifth Congressional District, I am sure you can readily understand that I am greatly concerned with the last two items in this theme:

"Reserve national action for residual participation where State and local governments are not fully adequate; and for the continuing responsibilities that only the National Government can undertake."

I must note that this theme, upon which your entire national convention last year in New York City was based, follows closely the findings of the Joint Federal-State Action Committee, set up in 1957, after President Eisenhower made suggestions before the Conference of Governors.

I wholeheartedly favor these findings. And, I believe it is only fair to note that former President Eisenhower tried repeatedly, in budget messages and in many other ways, to retard and reverse the trend toward an eventual monolithic, completely authoritarian state. He recognized that there is no natural stopping place short of that—except the emergence of State and local governments that see clearly the effect of the drift toward centralism on their eventual status as regions and branch offices. Today there is a resistance to being called a depressed area or chronic disaster county or State. The reasons are obvious. Five months after the Area Redevelopment Administration program began, the Secretary of Commerce, who is finally responsible for the ARA program, said he wished more officially designated depressed areas would conduct their own economic development programs. "Psychologically, it's bad to be called a 'depressed area'," he said. The Secretary also voiced impatience with the slow pace of ARA approvals of redevelopment projects.

However, little more than a month after the Secretary's criticism, the ARA Administrator issued another complete list of areas eligible for assistance under the area redevelopment program. This list contained 823 areas, covering 1,035 counties which would be eligible for aid. This figure represents nearly one-third of all counties in the United States. I must here insert a word of warning—three times as many projects have been programed than there is money to carry them out. And new applications pour in.

Several reasons are stated for the failure of Eisenhower to check the trend toward centralism.

1. The very momentum of that trend. It had its start in the 1920's as the Nation grappled with the adjustments that followed World War I. It grew with the great depression when frameworks of centralism were built into our system. The "march to Washington, D.C.," really began. Who can forget the National Recovery Administration or the Works Progress Administration, to name but two.

Millions of voters now in their thirties have known centralism as a natural fact of government. Yet, I have witnessed a resistance upon the part of our present crop of new voters, who take the time to analyze the inhibitions that the rising tide of monolithic authority imposes. They want to be liberated so that in a new freedom they can exercise their abilities to get ahead unshackled by the rising flood of controls, regulations, limitations and tax burdens. Their future is indeed our hope.

The second reason poses even greater concern. The shift in population patterns. Many who were reared in the atmosphere of rural self-reliance, moved to urban dependencies, where they made the tragic surrender to welfare as a way of life—and they vote that way.

3. The lack of stronghearted support by bureaucrats, who have floated so long in the swift channels of centralism. They have just rested on their oars. There is a race to be won in which you are admittedly concerned—but, bureaucracy cares for its own.

4. The force of circumstances which gave the articulate centralists, in and out of public life, readily understandable rallying slogans. There was Sputnik which begat missile gap; and the 1957–58 recession which begat various forms of Federal shots-in-the-arm and pump priming.

5. A deluge of disclosures regarding Soviet education, not always factual, sometimes misleading. These added form and direction to great Federal programs in education in order to match the Russians.

6. For 6 years, Eisenhower did not control the Federal Congress and it is but natural that the frictions of politics reared its head to the final failure of any hope of the restoration of balance and the basic virtues of home rule.

7. The erosions of minority groups seeking dubious special privileges from the Federal Government.

It is like a breath of fresh air when I read the proceedings of your New York meeting. Here, I see you, a body of men, close to the people, witnessing the impacts of our changing world. You are diligently seeking the ways to meet the challenges of urbanization without losing the same principles of home rule. You are looking for wisdom in the expenditures of public money so that waste and squandering will not add momentum to the decline of the dollar. You resist the atmosphere of centralized despair so that our educated youth can see and seek the golden opportunities of the future. You know the problems your localities face—yet, you refuse to be overwhelmed by them. You see trees as just a part of the forest.

It is refreshing to me to see a group of men, orienting themselves so as to protect local government from improper excursions of their State governments, and from the invasion of the deadening uniformity of wasteful, costly, Federal programs with all their Federal Register ground rules, limits and stipulations. I do not attack the Federal Government—I merely applaud the logical courage of local government.

Yes, as I ponder your theme, I rejoice that you are the hope of the Nation, for you seek the restoration of the proper balance that will impede our mad rush toward the authoritarian state.

And, then I read this: "A Domestic Peace Corps—An Idea Worth Trying." It's the title of an editorial in the May issue of the County Officer by the executive director of your national organization.

Let me tell you—all the centralists need is their little toe in the door! Mighty oaks from little acorns grow; $120 billion worth of foreign aid grew out of a chance remark by General Marshall at Harvard shortly after World War II. The so-called "Volunteer," nonsalaried Peace Corps now spends over $60 million a year. That grew from a chance remark, too. The opening has to be mighty small that the centralist can't crawl through. Yet Congress is expected to pass a bill for such a program—and its eventual director has already been appointed.

Now, your executive director as an individual is entitled to his own opinion, but in his capacity as the executive director of your national organization, I suggest that he read the foreword that he, himself, wrote for your hearings at last year's convention, and particularly the speech by Gov. Terry Sanford, of North Carolina. Also, I suggest he read excerpts from the hearings of my Agriculture Appropriations Committee held early this year.

My good friend, Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio, allowed me to insert into our hearings two of his letters at the time we had the very able Dr. York of the Extension Service before us. We were discussing the subject so familiar to all of you—how can countries help themselves to permanent progress. The Domestic Peace Corps was mentioned. Senator LAUSCHE has been an outspoken opponent of it. In a letter to a young lady who agreed with him, he wrote, and I quote in part:

"What the members of this Peace Corps are to do has not yet been identified, nor has any description of it been sought to be given. If they are to do in the United States, the work which is now being done in foreign countries as the Peace Corps, they will be acting as teachers, social workers, and training an alleged underdeveloped people, to adopt advanced methods of fighting social, economic, and scientific confrontations.

"We have legions of Peace Corps workers already in our country. We have the ministers, priests, rabbis, the parents in the homes, teachers in our schools, the social workers in our governmental and private agencies, recreational workers in Federal, State, and local governments, the police and juvenile court officials, and the parole officers. We are reaching the point where we will have more guides working for the Government, than we have people to guide. In other words, the number of officers will exceed the number of soldiers who are to be commanded and directed."

Senator LAUSCHE pointed out that according to the 1960 census, we have 1,521,590 elementary and secondary school teachers; 96,686 social and welfare workers; 36,355 recreational welfare group leaders; 252,194 policemen and detectives; 23,930 sheriffs and bailiffs; 5,090 marshals and constables; 200,999 in the clergy.

He concludes: "This is a grand total of 2,147,663. The 1960 census shows that we have a population of 27,309,055 juveniles of the age bracket of 12 to 21 years. Without the parents, we have 1 worker to every 13 juveniles. This is another step in the direction of centralizing power in the present bureaus already existing in Washington."

You will note that the Senator does not mention boys' clubs, the YWCA or YMCA, the Boy Scouts, or Camp Fire groups, or any number of a whole legion of very worthwhile activities very much in this field. And, I might bring to your attention that an excellent article in Newsweek 2 years ago pointed out the encouraging fact that 97 percent of our juveniles are A-OK.

In Senator LAUSCHE's other letter to a gentleman who didn't agree with him, he commented: "For the Federal Government to supply workers to perform services in local and State communities will further deteriorate the Federal fiscal position and break down the integrity and independence of State and local governmental units."

Does it mean anything to you that we had to pass a bill allowing teachers to maintain discipline in Washington, D.C.'s schools by other than a stern look?

Just where are we? Our national debt exceeds the national debt of the nations of the entire world by an estimated $24 billion. For the free world, our presumed Allies, our debt exceeds theirs by nearly $102 billion. As of April 5, 1963, our national debt stood at $303,470,080,480 and rising in the present atmosphere. The combined national debt of the rest of the free world is, in round figures, $201,500 million. Against the credit of our Nation are obligations such as social security and others that exceed $1 trillion. "Certainly," as CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, said, in commenting on the current budget, "this is no time for us to spend money we don't have for things we can get along without."

Personally, I reject this "living dangerously" in fiscal matters. Our Federal finances have been written in red ink for 28 of the last 34 years—and now we are asked to accept a "planned deficit" and to pass some sort of tax reduction at the same time. That's what a southerner would call "sorry management." We ought to be bending our efforts to reduce the national debt. It's costing $10 billion a year in carrying charges.

The spectacle of Uncle Sam standing on two horses like a Roman rider, with one foot perched precariously on the gaudy colors of tax reduction, and the other resting on the back of the sad silks of "planned" deficit spending, is a disturbing sight. Obviously these horses are not going to run in the same direction. Uncle Sam is going to have his leg pulled plenty—in fact, both of them—and he might even lose his pants.

It looks suicidal.

I am somehow reminded of the effervescent man about town who was sitting in the barber's chair, eyeing the pretty blonde manicurist appreciatively. "How about a date tonight?" he asked. "I don't know how my husband would feel about that," said the blonde. "Ask him," said the playboy. "Ask him yourself," the blonde replied, "he's shaving you."

Let's not flirt with the idea that Federal money is "free" money. Behind it all lies the stark fact that a preponderance of your tax dollar goes for, what we call in terms used in appropriations justifications, "salaries and expenses." As an example, figures from my Agriculture appropriations for fiscal 1963, show: $219 million to administer Commodity Stabilization and related agencies; $37 million to administer the Farmers Home Administration (it cost $37 million, yet here is an agency that I subscribe to—it has saved productive men, has restored taxpayers); $10½ million to administer REA; and, the Department of Agriculture is asking for $51½ million to run the food stamp plan in fiscal 1964—and, it is still listed as a "pilot" program. It costs a lot of money just to give things away. I mention Agriculture because I have been on that Appropriations subcommittee for 18 years.

Administrative costs elsewhere are comparable.

Yes, it costs money to run these centralist programs—the big print too often tells you what you can do—and the small print tells you what you can't do.

As the farmer said about his insurance policy: "The big type gives it to you, and the small type takes it away."

It isn't quite as simple as the guide on the Washington, D.C., sightseeing bus described: "See all these fine big buildings—wonderful, aren't they. They don't cost the people a cent—the Government pays for it all."

The current issue of Nation's Business has a searching featured article: "Budget Cuts Would Boost Economy." The premise rests on: "An examination of the facts shows that dollars spent by taxpayers themselves contribute more to economic strength than Federal spending for two reasons: They create more jobs, and, they add more to productivity."

The article is fair and worth reading for those of us truly concerned with the wise expenditure of public money.

It's hard work, I know, for us to face up to some of these things, especially when the allurement of Federal money is so attractively waved at us. It looks like free money—one wants to embrace it to meet an immediate urgency. But, I like what Gov. Terry Sanford, of North Carolina, told you last July in New York:

"I know how hard it is to get tax money locally, but it will cost all of us less if we get it locally to spend locally rather than letting the Federal Government get it locally to spend locally. This is like pouring buttermilk from one glass to another. By the time it gets to the third glass, there is about 20 percent less to drink."

We have been busy at the national level. While the President insisted that his budget for fiscal 1964, the largest in peacetime by far, was a "tight" budget, your Representatives, both Democrats and Republicans, in the House, have so far reduced it by over a billion dollars. And, since we began to look over President Kennedy's shoulder, he, himself, has recommended further reductions of $674,078,000.

One can hope the Senate will help—but that remains to be seen. One reason they are sometimes called the "Upper" House is derived from their "upping" the appropriation bills we in the House send over there.

I have grown extremely suspicious of the glittering and platitudinous proposals that promise everything and produce such meager and such atrophying results.

I find myself voting "No" on so many proposals that lead away, in my honest opinion, from the encouragement of proud statehood and self-reliant local government.

Our vaunted Federal Government is not great within itself. Its power rests upon the greatness of the individual citizen whose sweat creates income and national credit, and whose freedom results in the glories of our cherished standards of morals and income.

Do you wonder that I am concerned about our ponderous debt, our sliding dollar, our bloated budgets that lead us headlong to the spurious pot-of-gold at the end of the rainbow?

I share with the President of the Union a desire to get this country going. Yet, after two years, unemployment remains virtually the same. The growth of centralism is the one thing that has really got going. The one promise that we politicians are usually careful not to make, is the promise that our election will assure the growth of bureaucracy. We would not run on a platform espousing the primrose path to the central, authoritarian state.

One of the most intriguing and disturbing programs before us is that of Federal participation in the business of rural and area economic improvement.

It began in 1955 with a proposal, the rural development program, to improve depressed rural counties. Some real gains have been recorded, surprisingly enough without the use of Federal money. The economic self-analysis that has honestly been faced by local people has been healthy in many ways. Secretary of Commerce Hodges apparently saw this when he said that he wished depressed areas would conduct their own economic development program.

Now we face a whole phalanx of alluring proposals, involving the injection of Federal moneys in a multitude of local communities. As I have said, far more than the money appropriated will allow. There is no doubt but that certain of these projects can be fully justified. If they lead to permanent progress, if they spell permanent jobs for taxpayers and are essential, they'll get all the support I can give or muster for them, for then local strength and initiative will follow.

But, I just can't bring myself to vote, as a palliative, for Federal money for swimming pools and golf courses. I can't bring myself to spend money we don't have for things we can get along without. The sad fact is, that so much in the accelerated public works proposal, sounds like the old Works Progress Administration, and one cannot resist the thought that the centralists are going back to 1933, when our debt was $16 billion, to solve the problems of 1963, when our debt is over $300 billion. It is my belief that the Government, of, by, and for a free people should so liberate its industry that its own economy will produce these advantages for us; that is, if Federal bureaucracy will let us.

I believe that there is still sense in Ben Franklin's admonition that we should not build two fireplaces when we have fuel but for one.

I hope, by now, I have convinced you that I would have every American at least 9 feet tall as far as creative purpose is concerned—no matter what his stature or physical handicaps may be. I would build, if I could, the desire to measure up to the glory of this flag, this land of freedom—as a land of love, self-reliance, and opportunity.

It can be done. I have seen it in my time. From the sod houses of the Midwest, the log cabins of all States, the row houses of Baltimore and Washington, D.C., the tenement slums, the mansions, the tents, the trailers—wherever there is love and purpose—there comes forth a useful life. It is the product of family and local influence. Heavens. This is where the Federal Government collects its taxes.

Our destiny in the history of civilization rests with our strength, and not in a fruitless recitation of our weaknesses no matter what the moment's political advantage.

When I sometimes meditate on the conditions that made this country great, I arrive at the inescapable conclusion that there are a lot of laws we could well do without.

I hope you, too, will give some time to such thoughts. Think of the frustrations, the limitations, prohibitions and inferiority complexes that are so often the byproduct of statutes that began with such musical titles and even noble intent. We need to liberate the men and women who labor and create—not fence them in. Government should exist for them, as well—to further their cause too—not just for the purpose of spending excessive amounts of time and money on the unproductive.

Your meeting here today is an evidence of your desire to work in that direction. Our need is interdependence of an honorable partnership of local, State, and Federal Government—a stop to this ever-growing rush toward centralism.

Thank you for inviting me to be with you today, and allowing me to participate in this most constructive meeting and to enjoy such a refreshing atmosphere where men join together to discuss the problems of the very foundation upon which our great Nation rests.

Hidden Scenic Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I have a great interest in the preservation of one of my State's most magnificent scenic areas, the Guadalupe Peak region, as part of the national parks system, and I have found my enthusiasm is shared by the people and the press of Texas.

Recently, Reporter Jim McVicar of the El Paso Times visited the Guadalupe area and told of his reactions in a full page picture story which appeared in the Times on Sunday, May 12. His response to the beauty of the area was typical of the delight which has been expressed by all of those who have visited the area behind the rugged peaks.

I believe all who are interested in the conservation of our beautiful land will be interested in Jim McVicar's report:

LUSH LAND SEEN AS PUBLIC PARK

(By Jim McVicar)

McKITTRICK CANYON, TEX.—Most people have never seen the lush greenery, the cool streams, and the steep rock slides of McKittrick Canyon.

Only a favored few have been allowed to venture into this romantic wilderness, which has some of the prettiest scenery in the Southwest.

But in the near future, if the Guadalupe Peak and El Capitan National Park is established, this all may be changed.

McKittrick Canyon is located roughly 100 miles east of El Paso, and about 8 miles west of U.S. Highway 62–180. A locked gate bars casual visitors from the sometimes-treacherous dirt road that zig-zags into the canyon.

If a national park is established in the Guadalupes, McKittrick Canyon would undoubtedly be a "favorite among visitors because of its extraordinary beauty. Its special scenery is not found even in the mountain resorts of southern New Mexico.

U.S. Representative JOE POOL, of Dallas, is extremely optimistic about the park prospects. POOL has introduced a bill into Congress directing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the advisability of establishing the Guadalupe Peak and El Capitan National Park to consist of approximately 50 square miles.

The specified area is located in the northeast corner of Hudspeth County and the northwest corner of Culberson County.

HIDDEN SCENERY

Although the raggy peaks of the Guadalupes, including El Capitan, are scenic wonders to travelers along the main highway, what is seen from the paved road offers only an idea of what is beyond.

After leaving the pavement, about 2 miles east of Nickel Creek Station, the traveler bounces over the unimproved road for a mile or two of scrubby desert growth before there are hints of the scenery to come.

The road dips down into a creek bed, and the shrubs and trees become denser. The stream, so clear that you can see its bottom all along its course, is the only place in Texas where rainbow trout will reproduce.

About 4 miles up the access road is a stone house. Its sides are rock and so is its roof, and it is solid today as its was many years ago when it was built by Wallace Pratt, an employee of J. C. Hunter, father of the present owner, J. C. Hunter, Jr., Abilene, Tex., oil man.

The visitor passes through several gates, the last one part of a high, wire "elk" fence, built in 1929 when 45 head of elk were shipped into the canyon from South Dakota.

By the time the elk gate is reached, the variety of natural growth has become great—there are more different kinds of trees and shrubs than in the high mountains in the area that are familiar to the tourists. The road, in places, is completely shaded by the thick greenery.

About 1 mile from the elk fence is the lodge, which provides complete facilities to guests in the canyon. There is a large dining room and kitchen, sleeping rooms and bathroom facilities. There is electricity and butane gas—but no telephone.

Adjoining the lodge is an outdoor dining area with rock tables and benches and a barbecue pit. The lodge was most recently used by the Texas Highway Patrol for its district meeting. The officers spent 2 days with classroom work and enjoyment of the scenery and facilities.

HIKER'S PARADISE

The road ends by the lodge, and from there on up the canyon it is a hiker's paradise. As the visitor follows the stream, the scenery becomes progressively more beautiful and awesome.

Noel Kincaid, justice of the peace at Pine Springs, Tex., listed a few of the tree varieties that flourish in McKittrick; walnut, maple, oak, wild cherry, manzanita, elm, aspen, Ponderosa pine, willow, and Douglas-fir. There is probably more manzanita than any other tree. The manzanita bears a red berry that ripens in the fall, and the bark peels off to reveal a pinkish, smooth wood.

Kincaid, who was born in the area, says the canyon is most beautiful in the fall when the leaves turn into a rainbow of colors.

Strawberries, grapes, and several varieties of cactus, also grow in abundance in the canyon.

The hiker travels in an "S," following the stream bed up to a spring at the head of the canyon. The path of the water is sometimes partially blocked by huge rocks, providing large, clear pools where trout reproduce and flourish. There are also perch in abundance.

Although the wildlife hides in the thick growth up the sides of the canyon, there are many signs visible along the trails. There are elk, which multiplied from the original herd, deer, wild turkey, mountain lions, bears, and antelope. Unfortunately, in parts of the canyon there are rattlesnakes.

The canyon walls, almost sheer in most places, are dotted with caves. Near the lodge, on the valley floor, is a small limestone cave with cavern-like stalagmites and stalactites. There are few very large caves. Kincaid said one goes 300 feet straight down.

STUDIED BY SCIENTISTS

The area is a geologist's paradise. Kincaid said that scientists from all over the world have visited the canyon and studied its formations.

McKittrick and most of the Guadalupe Range are is part of the Capitan Reef. Also a part of the reef is Carlsbad Caverns. "In McKittrick, the formations are open, whereas they are underground and somewhat transformed in the caverns," Kincaid explained.

A hundred legends are woven about the 1,000-foot limestone cliffs above the canyon.

The caves were once used by bandits hiding in wait for wagon trains. Rustlers and notorious outlaws also used the canyons and caves for hideouts in the 1870's and 1880's.

Long before the white man came to the Southwest, the Guadalupe caves were inhabited by Indians, and before that prehistoric man. Several basketmaker cave sites have been excavated in the Guadalupes, uncovering crude implements, vessels, woven goods, and charred wood. The basketmakers were a semi-Nomadic people.

An early tale of McKittrick Canyon concerned a detachment of cavalry. More than 100 years ago, a detachment of soldiers was sent up the mountains to drive out Indians who were harassing immigrant trains.

The soldiers managed to disperse the Indians, but when they started back for the train, they could not find a way back down the rocky slopes of McKittrick. Finally, a foot path, not suitable for horses, was found. The commander ordered the horses shot, but there was a shortage of ammunition, and the officer then had his men herd the animals over the cliffs.

In the late 1920's, El Pasoans hiking in the area found relics of the event—bones of horses, bridle bits and other parts of harness labeled "U.S."

A Vote for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the recent rejection by America's wheat farmers of the extremely rigid supply-management and price-fixing program advocated by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman and President Kennedy has brought forth many interesting editorial comments.

An editorial has been brought to my attention from the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune of May 23, 1963. This article puts in pretty clear perspective why farmers voted as they did.

My mail indicates that a great many voted "no" in the referendum because they felt Secretary Freeman's program was too mandatory. Many letters express the view that a more voluntary program, where the farmer would have a broader latitude in managing his farm, would be more desirable and more in keeping with a free market system which we have for most agricultural production. It is interesting to note that this administration ardently endorses the voluntary approach as incorporated in the feed grains program, recently passed by Congress and signed into law by the President. I, along with other House Members, have introduced wheat legislation incorporating the voluntary principle. It would seem that if this administration is sincerely interested in giving the farmer a simple, voluntary supply-management program where the farmer does the managing rather than the Secretary of Agriculture, Democrats should join with Republicans in an effort to put through Congress a sound wheat program.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the Oakland Tribune editorial I have referred to, with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

A VOTE FOR FREEDOM

With rare courage, the Nation's wheat farmers have placed principle above personal gain, and administered a resounding drubbing to the Kennedy administration's "dollars for controls" wheat plan.

Faced with the agonizing choice between remaining moderately subsidized freemen on the one hand, and on the other hand surrendering most of their economic autonomy for higher subsidies, the farmers overwhelmingly chose to remain free.

They made this choice in spite of massive efforts by the administration to impose more money—and controls—upon them. Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman repeatedly claimed that the choice was simply between $1 per bushel wheat and $2 per bushel wheat—which is as brazen an appeal to the pocketbook as was ever attempted by a vote-buying politician.

However the majority of the farmers couldn't stomach this sort of appeal, and turned the proposal down cold. The plan required a two-thirds majority to pass; it received less than 48 percent of the votes. As a result, the administration received one of the most severe domestic lickings of its life.

It was the administration's plan to impose not only crop controls on farmers, but to issue marketing controls as well. In short, the Government would have been empowered to dictate to farmers how many acres of wheat to plant, and how many bushels to sell.

Stiff prison sentences up to 10 years' duration, and severe fines, up to $10,000 awaited those husbandmen who broke some of the provisions of the proposed law.

The plan was frankly patterned along the lines of the corporative economics which found favor among European regimes in the 1930's and 1940's. In essence, it created a giant wheat cartel, with the Secretary of Agriculture at its head. Production was to be divided up by formula between the Nation's wheat producers. The price of wheat was to be determined not by the laws of supply and demand, but by the arbitrary decisions of the Secretary of Agriculture who was empowered to set prices at any point from 65 to 90 percent of parity.

The authoritarian nature of the law ought to serve as a stark reminder to American citizens that liberty is one of the most perishable institutions in this country. Fundamentally, the same lust for power and control lies behind each of the other Federal attempts to subsidize some segment of private life in America.

There are some who lack the moral strength of the wheat farmers, and who would willingly exchange their liberty for subsidies. It is for this reason that every American who seeks to enhance and preserve liberty in America should remain continually wary of gifts proffered by the power hungry in Washington.

His Holiness, Pope John XXIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the heart and voice of His Holiness, John XXIII, has been stilled by death but what he infused in the hearts of people everywhere and what he inspired their minds to work for will not be diminished by his death. The infusion was of paternal loving kindness; the inspiration was of a fraternal will for peace among all peoples in the world of here-and-now.

To Christians he was the embodiment of a vision of unity achievable with common charity and mutual forebearance from ancient antagonisms not rooted in faith or reason.

John XXIII truly was, and will be, in memory forever the Pope of the people though he be hailed as the Pope of peace. For peace for the sake of peace is not the concern; rather, peace for the sake of people. Peace is but a state of affairs or an abstraction of the intellect. His Holiness' dedication of self to peace was in essence, therefore, a dedication of himself to the people of the world as the beneficiaries of peace. He dedicated his whole life to them that he might leave them a legacy of peace and fraternity. What greater gift could he give? What greater legacy could he leave?

May he rest in peace even as he now prays that we shall live in peace—and may God so will it.

The Most Populous State's Future—Quantity or Quality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to enclose for the RECORD a speech that was given before the California Municipal Utilities Association on February 27, 1963, by the Under Secretary of Interior James K. Carr. It dealt with the conservation problems of the State of California under the rapidly growing pressure of population. The speech met with widespread support. The San Francisco Chronicle editorialized under the heading "State We Save May Be Our Own" and the Sacramento Bee editorialized under the heading "Preservation of State's Heritage Is Vital Need."

I bring this to the attention of my colleagues because the same problems exist in many States throughout the Union. Under Secretary Carr's call for a citizen conservation crusade applies particularly to the States on the eastern seaboard and subscribe fully to his comment:

> This cannot be done alone by greater State and Federal expenditures, although such expenditures may be necessary to acquire land and to accomplish certain specific objectives. But, success in such a drive depends on using all the latent human and financial resources that can be channeled into a conservation crusade if we provide the leadership. We cannot merely legislate conservation achievements. It is the result of a state of mind.

As former chairman of the State senate natural resources committee in California, I am intimately familiar with the critical problems mentioned in Mr. Carr's address. In addition, I believe the two editorials mentioned are valuable warnings to any populous areas in this day when we, too, need a citizen conservation crusade. Mr. Carr's address is as follows:

THE MOST POPULOUS STATE'S FUTURE—QUANTITY OR QUALITY

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is a distinct privilege to address this audience. This is a very timely opportunity. Many of the leaders of State government are here and we have the key officials of the cities and publicly owned districts in the California Municipal Utilities Association. The members of this association serve either water, electricity, gas, or a combination of these services to about 75 percent of the people of the most populous State in the United States.

Few audiences could be better qualified to ponder the subject of my remarks, "The Most Populous State's Future—Quantity or Quality." Actually, the subject must be, "The Most Populous State's Future—Quantity and Quality," because the quantity, the continued increase of population will occur whether we like it or not.

I speak to you as a former member of this association, a former member of the Governor Brown's administration, as the Under Secretary of the Interior, but primarily as a third generation Californian who shares with millions of others concern about the future of this State—occupied by the largest group of people in these 50 United States.

When my grandfather Carr migrated to California in the 1870's, Los Angeles was a relatively small, sleepy pueblo. In population and activity it couldn't match Shasta, the place where he settled—now a ghost town. Today, metropolitan Los Angeles, western America's leader in population, has 7 million people—southern California has 10 million people. Population estimates indicate southern California may have 30 million residents in less than four decades. The migration of the gold rush was insignificant compared to the western migration of today.

Today, I want to talk to you about California and conservation. When I speak of conservation, I mean development as well as preservation of natural resources. President Kennedy said it so well in his message to the Congress on March 1, 1962. He said:

"We must reaffirm our dedication to the sound practices of conservation which can be defined as the wise use of our natural environment; it is in the final analysis, the highest form of thrift—the prevention of waste and despoilment while preserving, improving, and renewing the quality and usefulness of all our resources."

A similar objective was in mind when Secretary of the Interior Udall said:

"It is the conviction of this administration that we should plan the use of our land resources so that material progress and the creation of a life-giving environment will go hand in hand."

Because of my past associations with you, some will expect me to talk about development of water and power and energy. These are the necessary foundations on which we build an expanding economy. I shall, however, leave those subjects to others. Suffice it to say that the State of California, local agencies represented here, and the Federal agencies, are making great strides forward in these fields.

Today, I want to discuss with you some broader conservation challenges which also relate to our life-giving environment. This is the "quiet crisis" as Secretary Udall terms it. These challenges refer to the task of renewing the quality and usefulness of the State's natural gifts.

When California was recently caught up in the holiday spirit, and celebrated achieving the title of the most populous State, many recalled the comment of Chief Justice Warren, a former great Governor of this State. He said:

"I would not celebrate with fireworks, or by dancing in the street. I would make it a day of contemplation as to how we might better provide for the happiness of these millions. * * *"

So I should like to speak even more to the point. You know as well as I do the ugly illustrations that make up the sad story of failure to maintain the quality of the Golden State. Smog too often hangs like a pall over all our cities, causing discomfort, damage, and even death. In a single generation we have almost ruined the superb, Mediterranean climate of southern California. Some shorelines foam with detergents, fish and wildlife are threatened, and scenic beauty is destroyed. Cities slobber over into the countryside, cluttered with billboards, spawning sleazy developments that have brought new, ugly words to our California lexicon—"slurbs" and "sluburbia."

Campground and recreation areas are overflowing with people. They are simply seeking living and breathing space.

California has one of the best highway systems in the United States, built to meet fantastic demands. But, in many places, our precious scenery falls under the tyranny of the automobile and the highway designer. There is need for more effort to build esthetically and to take advantage of the scenic approach as has been done so well on some of the parkways in the East. "Cracking up" 200 automobiles as a result of one accident on a southern California freeway, and 150 more in another accident within rifle shot of this room, is evidence enough that we have a lot to learn. More speed and straighter lanes of concrete are not the answer.

The shores of Lake Tahoe, the jewel of the Sierra, already bear the permanent scars of uncontrolled, unplanned commercialism unchecked; this kind of "slurbanization" can despoil forever our cherished, scenic, recreation areas. What a price to pay for so-called civilization.

And in the coastal mountains, California's special gift of the Creator, the redwoods, noble sentries of this "unique bright land," are increasingly victims of the chain saw, being logged in many places with no other control than the laws of the marketplace, as though these trees were just another species of timber. Should the economics of the lumber industry be the sole standard of value? In some instances, the logged-over hillsides bleed silt into the streams where fish no longer swim. As a result, the flood waters roar unchecked down the denuded hillsides and destroy giant trees in the glorious groves downstream where State and private effort has combined to save the redwoods. When these centuries-old trees are gone, they cannot be replaced for a thousand years.

One of the great commentators of our generation, Eric Sevareid, recently predicted that our last frontiers of serenity and space will "disappear unless we learn * * * that progress has to be defined to mean preserving and cherishing as well as changing and improving."

And there is another area where I think we should ask ourselves whether the sole consideration of the marketplace is leading us astray. Many of the rich bottom lands of this State are being filled with subdivisions. For a variety of reasons, primarily inadequate zoning, taxes go up, forcing the farmers to sell out. Losing forever valuable agricultural land is a reflection on all of us. We haven't given enough consideration to the future, nor to the problems of the farmers, or to the problems of the homebuilders. The result is that throughout California, agricultural lands which cannot be replaced are disappearing in this great "garden of Eden." It will take planning, courage, energy, and proper zoning laws to reverse the trend. One apparent need is to establish a tax policy to protect the individual who finds himself the victim of circumstances.

If nothing can be done to save the land from being overrun by subdivisions, we will have to establish Orange Grove State Park in southern California to show future generations a real orange grove. And, in the beautiful Santa Clara Valley, we will have to authorize an Orchards State Park so people can have some idea of how that famous, bountiful valley appeared before we overran it because of lack of planning.

There is and has been a longstanding controversy over the construction of a new powerplant on one of the most beautiful headlands along the California shoreline, Bodega Head. At one time this point was designated as a highly desirable location for a State park. It's not enough to blame the power company. The company makes the point that it is in the business of producing power as economically as it can for its customers. It does not have the full responsibility for planning land use for the entire State. But we must find a way for private enterprise and Government agencies to plan our future together and not on a single-purpose basis.

There are many who say the powerplant could be built elsewhere, saving this part of California's vanishing coastline for public recreation. If this shoreline is lost to the people of California and the Nation, it is your fault and mine for not insisting earlier that we have the kind of comprehensive land-use planning that is essential to protect the interests of all Californians and our children and grandchildren.

If the bleak picture I have just reviewed with you presents the entire story, there would be little reason for my speaking here today. Fortunately, the people of the State are beginning to be aroused. There is much being done. There is far more that we can and must do. With leadership from groups such as this, we can reverse the trend. We can keep California the "unique bright land."

Today I want to propose a California Conservation Crusade—a citizens' crusade—one that will permit people of every age to make their contribution toward improving the quality—the character—the livability of the State of California. This cannot be done alone by greater State and Federal expenditures, although such expenditures may be necessary to acquire land and to accomplish certain specific objectives. But, success in such a drive depends on using all the latent human and financial resources that can be channeled into a conservation crusade if we provide the leadership. We cannot merely legislate conservation achievements. It is the result of a state of mind.

Only last week the Commissioners of the District of Columbia were told that in this country a commercial building has a constitutional right to be an eyesore if that's the way the owner wants it. We must combat this interpretation of community responsibility or fall victim to crass commercialism.

As an example of an opposite viewpoint, let us focus for a moment on one of California's most beautiful cities, Santa Barbara, with its flowers, attractive buildings and tree-lined streets. It is uniquely situated on a shelf between the mountains and the sea. It just didn't happen that way. Thomas M. Storke, the distinguished Pulitzer prize-winning publisher of the Santa Barbara News-Press, has written warnings about the constant threat to the beauty of Santa Barbara. In his autobiography, California Editor Storke writes:

"Santa Barbara can remain a city of dreams if rigid zoning controls are maintained, if smokeless industry is encouraged, if building codes are not relaxed, and if fly-by-night subdividers with no stake in Santa Barbara's future are not permitted to despoil the natural beauty of our surroundings."

Has this emphasis on character, on quality, caused Santa Barbara to suffer economically? Hardly—it is the hub of one of the fastest growing counties in the State, and through vigilance the city is maintaining its charm.

If this same determination to build beautifully for the future—this leadership is multiplied in hundreds of other California communities, our job will already be half done. We will have reversed the trend. No longer will books be written entitled, "Dreadful California."

There are many things on the plus side. Governor Brown, Speaker of the Assembly Unruh, and many others are moving forward on a program to acquire land for parks and recreation. President Kennedy and Secretary Udall are joining with key congressional leaders to establish a land and water conservation fund. It will be used to assist States in planning for outdoor recreation and in acquiring the necessary land under both State and Federal programs.

Governor Brown, State Resources Administrator Hugo Fisher, and members of the legislature are taking action to establish more State park land such as the proposed interstate park at Lake Tahoe. And, there are excellent examples of cooperation between the Brown administration and the Kennedy administration. Just recently the Federal Government turned over to the State of California almost all the remaining land on Angel Island, the gem of San Francisco Bay, for enlargement of the State Park. The State of California is already at work. More facilities will be built there and reforestation will take place. By a brief boat ride over the waters of San Francisco Bay, visitors will be able to go from the congested city to this green sanctuary where, in a few years, much of the natural forest growth can be restored. Angel Island will be a living example of what this land was like before the coming of the white man—a magic island in the San Francisco Bay area for recreation and the renewal of the mind and the spirit.

There are many other hopeful developments in California. The Point Reyes National Seashore is a legislative reality, a major step toward saving some of this State's vanishing shoreline. And, up in the northern part of the State, an even larger new national recreation area may be opened up as a result of plans worked out between the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture. Legislation has been introduced in this session of Congress to establish there a national recreation area of more than a quarter of a million acres in the spectacular mountain region around the triangle of manmade lakes of the Central Valley project at Whiskeytown, Shasta, and Trinity.

Much of the land is already in Federal ownership. The area will be developed for intensive recreation use with water sports, fishing, hunting, hiking trails, riding trails. We are recommending to the Congress that the areas in the national forest be administered by the U.S. Forest Service, and the remaining areas by the National Park Service, but by national recreation standards rather than national park standards. This will permit intense, diversified land and water recreation use for tens of thousands of Californians.

In southern California the next step is to move forward to establish a national park on the Channel Islands off Santa Barbara. Also, we need to plan now for a scenic parkway down the coast range of mountains from Siskiyou to San Luis Obispo. Speaking of southern California, we must find ways to control fires, and prevent building in such a way that floods cause buildings to slide into canyons. Conservation means wise development of all of our resources. We suffer the consequences when we do things piecemeal.

Now a comment about conservation and local government. Without State or Federal help the citizens of the Big Sur country drew a master plan for zoning to protect the rugged coastline against those who would despoil its incomparable beauty. County and city governments have their responsibilities in the wise use of resources.

There are many other examples of individual and group effort in other States that can be a pattern for Californians. The record of troop 29 of Leland and Lake Leelanan, Mich., should be an inspiration to every Boy Scout troop in America. In the magazine of the National Wildlife Federation of December-January 1962–63, there is a highly deserved tribute to troop 29, the Boy Scout troop whose conservation good deed has lasted 13 years.

There are thousands of Boy Scouts, members of youth groups, conservation classes in schools, retired people, Californians in every walk of life who will join a California conservation crusade if we but show them the way. The job can never be done by Federal and State efforts alone.

We must establish ways through which people can implement their eagerness to contribute. Resources Administrator Hugo Fisher talked to me about this in Washington, D.C., 2 weeks ago.

Private groups must do their share and in many cases they are doing so. The Southern California Edison Co. has an excellent conservation record. It has done considerable work in reforestation and the development of fish and wildlife resources. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is stepping up its interest in recreation use of reservoirs. Many of the oil companies are assisting the conservation movement.

The real problem is to mobilize the willingness of individuals who want to help. Representatives of the Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co. are exploring the feasibility of my suggestion that we make conservation education as close as your telephone. All that would be necessary is to dial seven letters—C-O-N-S-E-R-V. State or Federal agency personnel would then give information by telephone as to how one can participate in conservation programs and particularly in their immediate area.

Your host utility, the Sacramento Municipal Utility District, has set examples of what many organizations in this association can do. The district has joined others in a drive to "Plant the right tree in the right place," a community beautification program that will have lasting benefits. The district is landscaping substations where they must be located in residential districts. Programs have been set in motion so homeowners and homebuilders can place unsightly power facilities underground. It is not an easy program to administer, but prudent conservation of our environment is seldom easy. The district also has established an excellent record in the protection and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources.

One thing above all should be made clear, and I would like to say this particularly to my fellow members of the engineering profession: Too many of us labor under the fallacy of thinking that the best way to get a job done is the short-term, cheapest way. Too often we ignore the fact that the facilities we build have a long-term impact on the community completely over and above the particular function they serve.

We engineers should never forget that our job is not merely to save money or to move traffic or to produce power, but to create better conditions of life for all of the people. We must have in mind every moment our higher obligations to our communities. Too often there isn't any chance for the people who pay the bill to have a voice in saying how roads should be built, utility systems established, a similar public works carried out, even when they would be willing to pay more to have the job done the right way. And by the right way I mean doing it so as to improve the beauty, the character, the livability of our communities.

So maybe all of us, particularly the engineers and tightfisted managers here today, should examine our consciences. We should ask ourselves whether it is worth saving a few dollars in the process if what we build is to remain throughout our lives and our children's lives—a monument to beauty or a monument to ugliness. Let's find a way for the people who pay the bill to have more voice in these decisions. Man needs these essential services, but he also needs food for the spirit.

Let's periodically ask ourselves, "What kind of a State do we want California to be 25 years from now—50 years from now?"

If we answer honestly we will answer the call to arms—a California Conservation Crusade to preserve and improve the beauty, the character, the quality of California. We will act to preserve this blessed land from blight, to keep it from becoming a neon wilderness and an asphalt jungle. We can do our part to prevent overlogging and oversmogging. We can have clear air to breathe, clean water to drink and to swim in—land to produce our crops and, at the same time, meet our recreational needs. We are stewards for a relatively short time. We cannot permit, in our day, the "slurbanization" and ruination of California's matchless resources.

So, it is my hope today that with the help of the members of this Association, and the assistance of the leaders in State and local Government, we can begin a conservation crusade as the Nation's most populous State—a model for other States—a crusade aimed at one goal—the preservation of California's great gifts and the creation of the highest quality of living possible. If we embark in this direction, with undefeatable determination, then we and our children and their children can live in a golden land which the California Indians a long, long time ago called the "terrestrial paradise."

Remarks of Erle Cocke, Sr., Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Before the Rio Grande Valley Bankers Association at Mercedes, Tex., May 25, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE M. KILGORE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Erle Cocke, Sr., Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, recently made a speech to the Rio Grande Valley Bankers Association of Texas which, I think, would interest the Members of the Congress because it contains a great deal of valuable information about the operation of the FDIC.

His remarks follow:

Next month, on June 16, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation will observe two important milestones. We will celebrate the 30th anniversary of the signing of the act which established the Corporation, and we will dedicate the new building which will house the Corporation.

We are proud of that building. It symbolizes the strength and durability of the Corporation and its great benefit to the banking industry since President Franklin Roosevelt signed such legislation 30 years ago, on June 16, 1933.

But the building symbolizes more than the growth of the Corporation. It stands for the Corporation's aid in building the strengths of the banking industry. We would like for the public, Government officials, and particularly bankers, to think of the building as their own, and come to see us when they are in Washington. We greatly appreciate banker visits to us in Washington on particular business or when in town on other matters.

The Corporation was designed to serve the public through service to and with bankers. Throughout the Corporation's almost 30 years of operation, it has devoted every effort to give the best possible service to the banking industry, and through banking, to the public.

One of those efforts to give the best possible service has led to continued study and analysis of the Corporation's insurance contract with insured banks. We believe that we are obligated to give the best possible protection at the lowest possible cost, consistent with safety, as any other insurer would.

For that reason we have continuously examined the insurance program, aiming at providing either reduced costs or greater coverage, commensurate with our duty to maintain the adequacy of the insurance fund.

As you all know, the adequacy of the fund must be our first consideration. That fund is not owned by the Government, and it is not owned by the bankers which pay assessments to the Corporation. It is, instead, a fiduciary trust for depositors of insured banks, and as such, we believe that those depositors should be given the greatest possible coverage consistent with sound operation of the banking system and of the Corporation itself.

During the history of the Corporation, the ceiling on deposit insurance protection has moved from $2,500 to $10,000, with an increase to $5,000 on July 1, 1934, and to the present level in 1950. During the same period the basic assessment rate for insured banks has remained unchanged at one-twelfth of 1 percent. However, upon recommendation of the Corporation, the effective assessment was reduced in 1950 by statutory provision of the Congress for credit of 60 percent of assessment income after deduction of insurance losses and expenses, and in 1960 this credit was increased to 66⅔ percent. With these credits, the rate of assessment on insured banks has been reduced to an effective rate of one twenty-seventh of 1 percent in 1950, and in 1962 to one thirty-second of 1 percent, after a refund to banks of 62.4 percent of total assessments for the year, or $126.9 million.

Given the experience of the Corporation, and the general trend of the economy, we recommended to the present Congress that the insurance level be increased to $25,000. Hearings were held before the House Banking and Currency Committee late in April, and that committee is now considering several identical bills to increase the limit.

The Corporation's recommendation came after long study and a complete analysis of the insurance fund. We considered the loss experience of the Corporation—which, parenthetically, I might say we feel is quite good—and the cost of any increase to the Corporation, with the paramount thought in mind that there would not be any increase in cost whatever to the banks insured by the Corporation.

Since its establishment the Corporation has made disbursements of $359.7 million in connection with 445 insured banks in financial difficulty. Estimated recoveries as of December 31, 1962, were at $329.2 million, resulting in an indicated loss of $30.5 million. Additionally, the Corporation has collected $9 million of interest and allowable return on the funds advanced in 159 of the 445 cases cited, reducing the potential loss to approximately $21.5 million.

In projecting the cost of an increase, we used the experience of the past decade. We felt the 1930's could not be used because that period reflected the excesses indulged in prior to the banking holiday, and the 1940's showed a history dominated by World War II and price controls. Throughout those years bank-loan portfolios were declining while security portfolios were enlarging, and the loss experience due to bank failures was subnormal.

The past decade, on the other hand, seemed to us to be much more likely to be akin to the period through 1971 than any other period of the Corporation's existence.

We worked out figures, based on projected deposit increase to $436,910 million as of December 31, 1971, and projected loss experience, expenses, and income from assessments and operations, for that period.

For example, the lessening of the accrual to the insurance fund through December 31, 1971, would be $244,000 with a $15,000 ceiling; $360,000 with a $20,000 ceiling; and $445,000 with a $25,000 ceiling. This is an average annual decrease in accrual ranging from $24,400 at $15,000 coverage to only $44,500 at $25,000 coverage.

Expressed as a ratio of the insurance fund to total deposits, the figures show even more dramatically. On December 31, 1961, the fund was $2,353,794,000, for a ratio to total deposits of 0.84 percent. Assuming no change in insurance coverage ($10,000), the projection to the end of 1971 gives a percentage of 0.96196 percent, and a dollar amount of $4,202,902,000.

Even with an increase in insurance coverage to $25,000, the ratio would be increased to 0.96185 percent, or only eleven one-thousandths of 1 percent less than would accrue at the $10,000 level. Expressed in dollar amounts, at the higher insurance level the fund would be at $4,202,457,000 by the end of 1971, or again, $44,500 less per annum than at the present level.

We wanted to be doubly sure, however, that our figures allowed for any contingency. So we went back and refigured the accruals to the fund through 1971, based on the $25,000 ceiling, if the Corporation's loss experience was four times as great as the 1952–1961 period, and we found that even that loss ratio would affect the fund only minutely. We found it would be reduced to 0.95782 percent, a reduction of a mere forty-seven one-thousandths of 1 percent.

Some bankers have asked why we cannot reduce assessments if we are able to increase the coverage without any added cost to the banks—and I want to stress that the proposed increase would not cost insured banks one penny.

Our major consideration, of course, must be to the adequacy of our fund. Efforts have been made to determine actuarially what size the fund should be. Discussions with out-of-government actuaries as well as the General Accounting Office of the Federal Government have been most helpful.

Our experience and studies at the Corporation, however, plus the data that the Corporation has been able to collect and analyze, lead to the conclusion that a deposit insurance fund of 1 percent of deposits of insured banks is the smallest that should be considered adequate. That ratio now stands at 0.84 percent, and, based on current assessment ratios and our projections of income and losses, should reach 0.96185 percent by the end of 1971, even with $25,000 coverage.

We do not believe that a further reduction in assessments is actuarially sound at the present time, though we continue to consider this possibility, and I would hope that in the future, when the fund is near or at 1 percent, reductions will be possible.

Let me add I never would be in favor of eliminating assessments entirely. No matter how large the fund gets, the banks should always contribute something, if only to maintain their interest in the Corporation and their present ties to the Corporation. Even a $1 assessement would still keep the banks partners in the fund.

I might point out also that our major concern in recommending an increase in coverage is to fulfill our duties to the general public, as custodians of a fiduciary trust. We should provide them the best possible coverage which is sound and feasible.

Our proposed increase would help do this. For example, under present coverage it is estimated that 98.2 percent of the accounts of all depositors are fully insured. At $25,000, this would be increased to 99.4 percent of the accounts of all depositors. This may seem a small percentage increase, but when it is broken down into numbers of accounts, it is not. It represents an estimated 1,921,000 additional accounts which would be covered completely, while increasing from 58.93 percent to 66.82 percent the amount of covered deposits in dollars.

Some bankers feel that an increase to $25,000 protection may benefit savings and loan associations more than banks because of the rate competition from savings and loan associations. There are two reasons why we at the Corporation would disagree with this feeling.

In the first place, the rate differentials have been shrinking over the past year or two. In 1962, when banks were authorized to pay up to 4 percent in interest, banks reported a time and savings gain of 18 percent while savings and loan share accounts went up only 14 percent, the first time in many years that commercial banks gained at a greater rate than the savings and loans, as well as mutual savings banks. It is notable that during the last 10 to 15 years, the spread ranged from ½ percent to as much as 1½ percent, but since January 1, 1962, it has been reduced to not more than 0.85 percent, and considerably less in certain large areas, in the case of 12-month time certificates, with other rates in proportion. The extreme top rates on the West Coast are more confusing than informative when the whole country is being evaluated.

In the second place, official announcements of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in recent days have urged immediate consideration to further reductions in dividends, and numerous associations all over the Nation have responded with announcements of lower dividend rates. This clearly suggests a continuing trend to a lesser spread in the rate structures of commercial banks and savings and loan associations.

Another suggestion advanced by some bankers is that an increase in deposit insurance levels will lead somehow to bad banking practices and laxity. This repeats a prophesy made in 1933, when opposing any insurance whatsoever, and repeated in 1950 when the insurance level went from $5,000 to $10,000. As you all know, it didn't happen either time. Nor do we think it will this time.

Actually, bank managements have materially improved over the 30 years during which the Corporation has been in existence. It is acknowledged that the Corporation restored and helps maintain the confidence of the public in the Nation's banking system.

We can, I think, go further, and say that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has made bankers confident in themselves. Bankers no longer need hoard cash in emergency conditions which prevailed before deposit insurance came into being. They no longer need to tighten up on new loans in order to maintain liquidity to meet possible runs. The public knows that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation stands behind the insured bank, and the public does not fear for its funds. As a result, bankers can continue with confidence to support their communities and allow loans to remain on the books. Further, they can continue, when the clouds darken in the economic skies, to make loans to worthy applicants and serve the credit needs of their areas. As a result, the old tendency to dry up funds in a period of crisis and thus accelerate the crisis has disappeared. This is one reason why leveling-off periods since 1951 have not deepened into deep recession or depression.

Another reason why we do not feel that an increase in coverage will lead to lax bank management is that insurance will not cover all deposits. There will remain in the insured bank system a large amount of uninsured funds, and prudent bank management must consider all funds in their operation.

Presently, of the approximately $300 billion in deposits in insured banks, some $125 billion is uninsured. With an increase in coverage to $25,000 and an estimated deposit total by the end of 1971 of $450 billion, some $150 billion, or one-third of all deposits, would be uninsured.

Without question this tremendous volume of uninsured deposits would act as one factor in requiring sound and prudent bank management.

Other factors also can be cited. The prudent bank manager must remember that he has stockholders, to whom he must account, and for whom he must earn an adequate income while preserving the safety and soundness of their investments. The prudent manager, if he is to attract the public's funds, must run an institution which maintains the public's respect and trust. The prudent manager, if he wishes to preserve for himself the benefits of his position in his industry and community, will want to maintain a sound institution. And finally, the prudent, sound manager must satisfy the supervisory authorities, including the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, other Federal agencies, and, when applicable, State authorities.

None of these factors can be ignored, and all of them require that a bank manager run a prudent, sound, community-oriented, profit-minded, and stable institution.

In outlining a few of the things that we feel an increase in insurance coverage will not do—such as give savings and loan associations an edge or the possibility that bank management might tend to become lax—I have in a sense outlined some of the reasons why we are for the increase and why we feel it can be justified.

More positively, we at the Corporation feel that the increase is justified because it will bring an added element of strength to the national economy by strengthening the monetary structure and encouraging the placement of more funds in insured institutions, creating greater pools of lendable capital.

This would be particularly effective in the manner in which it would help any community where a bank closed, by making a greater amount of funds available promptly through payment of insured funds up to $25,000. The additional liquidity of the monetary structure in such a town would cushion the shock and enable the town to recover from the blow of a closed bank all the more quickly. This would be especially true of the small- and medium-sized businessman, to whom the loss of even a portion of his working capital for any period of time can spell the difference between continued operation and failure.

I might add that it will be helpful to banking institutions as well, in that those institutions would be able to retain more local funds in most instances.

Too many people forget that there are, as of June 30, 1962, 7,745 one-bank-office towns in the United States, where the local institution must provide all the financial services that the community is to get. If these one-bank-office towns are to retain funds within the community, they must be placed with the bank in the community. With a $10,000 ceiling, many businessmen and depositors may place funds elsewhere when they have reached the ceiling, thus sending out of the community and its economic bloodstream much needed funds. The proposal to increase coverage to $25,000 would be of inestimable assistance to such institutions, and to the communities they serve, by allowing the retention of two and a half times as much in a single account on an insured basis.

In such communities as this it is not a question of consolidating accounts which may be partially located across the street, thus leading to interbank shifts with no positive advantage to the community. In such one-bank-office communities it is a matter of concentrating in the community as much of the funds as possible which are generated within the community, and which represent the community's financial well-being.

In arguing for the extension of insurance coverage, I might point to one final factor, the strengths that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation adds to the dual banking system.

It is no coincidence that the development of free banking in this country has been paralleled by the development of institutions redesigned to protect bank creditors from the errors and abuses of freedom. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is the culmination of this concern for depositors, and, as I outlined earlier, the capstone in assuring public confidence in our banking system.

So long as this confidence continues, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is there to assure it, the public will continue to hold its trust in the multiplicity of individual banking units and systems of banking control, including State-chartered systems and the national banking systems. It is no accident that such systems have continued to flourish.

We at the Corporation feel an increase in insurance coverage to $25,000 is both justified, and feasible. We feel that now is the time to strengthen, and extend, the "shield" which is the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

In short, we have four recommendations:

First, we support the results of our nearly 30 years' study on the feasibility of an increase in deposit insurance coverage.

Second, we support the 10 bills introduced to increase to $25,000 insurance coverage, bills introduced by chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee and others, plus identical bills before the Senate.

Third, we approve fully the conclusions of the Committee on Financial Institutions supporting a deposit insurance increase.

And fourth, we support the administration program, as outlined to us by the Bureau of the Budget. That program, as you may know, urges that legislation to increase coverage on deposits and savings share accounts should also include provisions for additional safeguards for the insuring institutions, including adequate requirements on reserves and liquidity, standby authority over maximum interest and dividend rates, and strengthened conflict-of-interest provisions.

Sick People Need Care, Not Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post a prominent physician of my congressional district, Dr. Louis J. Vorhaus, wrote a provocative piece about proper care for sick people. His point is that too much emphasis on research tends to downgrade the importance of day-to-day and night-to-night care of the ordinary medical case. For example, medical facilities and proper professional attention for stroke cases is almost out of the question for the average person. Research should be a matter of highest priority. But in the process there should not be a loosening of emphasis on the need for great emphasis on the treatment of the ordinary illness.

Dr. Vorhaus' article is worthy of note by all Members of Congress:

SICK PEOPLE NEED CARE, NOT RESEARCH

(By Louis J. Vorhaus)

The medical profession is being swept up into a crazy sort of research kick, and no one seems willing to stop and ask what the purposes of research are. It is high time that we reached a more sensible balance between medical research on one hand and medical care on the other. Our achievements in medical science must be utilized to alleviate the suffering and illnesses of people who are living out their lives, often unnecessarily short ones, without enjoying the benefits of the kind of medical care that should and could be available to them.

I do not suggest that medical research should cease. Basic research must continue if we are going to gain a full understanding of the processes of life and their disturbances and alterations in disease. We cannot predict in advance what will come of a research project, and some of the greatest discoveries have been achieved after years of seemingly fruitless endeavor. But a greater proportion of money and effort should be directed toward utilizing the available knowledge. The vast majority of people throughout the world are stricken with diseases which we already know how to prevent or cure. Malaria and tuberculosis, wound infections and parasitic diseases, beriberi and childbirth still claim untold victims each year. Most of the world is decades, if not centuries, behind the expanded medical frontiers.

Medically affluent America appropriates substantial sums and makes great efforts in research upon diseases that affect relatively few people. We seem unwilling to expend much of our resources to relieve the illnesses and sufferings of thousands of afflicted people. For every individual stricken with cystic fibrosis or multiple sclerosis, there are countless people throughout the world suffering from dysentery, hookworm, and trachoma. With the money spent studying muscular dystrophy, we could help thousands disabled by malnutrition, infectious diseases, and improperly treated wounds.

Even in the United States existing information, techniques, equipment and treatments needed to combat disease are not available to everyone. While traveling through the Midwest recently, I had occasion to stop at a small community hospital. That afternoon a 34-year-old mother of three young children died of acute kidney failure. In the previous few months at the same hospital a 51-year-old man had succumbed to hemorrhage due to cirrhosis of the liver, leaving his large family destitute. And a 65-year-old grandmother had died of a heart ailment. All three died not of incurable diseases but simply because the 1963 level of medical science had never reached this hospital located beyond the influence of the big-city, university-style hospital.

But even in the vast urban centers medical care of the highest quality sometimes is beyond the unfortunate patient. Not long ago an elderly patient of mine suffered a stroke. Knowing that she could not afford private or semiprivate care, I called a large hospital nearby to try to obtain a ward bed for her.

"A stroke?" inquired the resident. "Sorry, we're so crowded and our facilities so taxed that we must use our beds for patients we can do more for and who won't require long hospitalization. You'll have to send her elsewhere."

Because of a shortage of hospital beds, existing facilities are often, of necessity, reserved for "interesting" complex or difficult ailments only. Although we live in an age of potential medical abundance, too many people in this country literally want for adequate medical attention. The cause, we are told, is a shortage of doctors; but while we certainly need and could use more doctors, some of today's shortage is more apparent than real.

From 1931 to 1960 the number of physicians in the United States rose from 156,406 to 255,972. For 180 million people this should be nearly enough—a doctor for every 700 people. During this same time the percentage of doctors engaged in full-time practice of a specialty more than doubled, as did the percentage engaged in hospital service, teaching and administration. Meanwhile, the percentage of physicians in general practice dropped from 77.7 to 34.8 percent—an actual loss of over 32,000 general practitioners.

Even though some of the increase in the ranks of specialists is accounted for by an increase in the number of internists—specialists who often play the role of the general practitioner in big cities and wealthier suburbs—there can be no denying that emphasis in the medical profession has shifted away from treating the everyday illnesses of ordinary people to the glamorous field of specialization and, particularly, of medical research.

The responsibility for this shift in emphasis can, I believe, be traced directly to the Nation's medical schools and the university hospitals with which they are affiliated. Over the years the university medical centers have gradually abdicated their ancient, time-honored function as clinical centers for ministering to the sick and training medical students. Instead they have increasingly become medical scientific-research institutes, consequently deemphasizing the ordinary problems of medical care. More and more floor space is being given over to research laboratories, conference and seminar rooms, statisticians' offices and chambers housing elaborate scientific equipment. Less and less floor space is devoted to beds for the ill. Similarly, even the members of the full-time staff at medical centers spend more and more time on research projects, teaching rounds, scientific lectures and academic discussions—and less and less on the needs of the patients in their hospital beds.

A recent study monitored two interns at a university hospital and found they spent barely enough time with a patient to establish an acquaintanceship, much less a relationship. A much larger proportion of time was spent with the hospital staff. The situation in this hospital is in no way unique. Yet internship is supposed to be primarily a clinical experience: This is the period during which a young doctor gains his first real experience in dealing with sick people. Research is not a part of the internship program. Obviously hospital staff members, with their responsibilities in teaching, administration and research, spend even less time with their patients—if any—than do interns. And so, with decreasing contact between doctors and patients, a cry is heard: "We are understaffed."

Understaffed? Look for a moment at the typical large municipal hospital. In the past 15 years the number of beds was reduced from 3,100 to 2,700 and the number of patients cared for fell from 55,000 to 46,000. During this same period its staff of full-time physicians doubled. Yet 15 years ago there were enough doctors. Today there is a shortage.

As interest in scientific medicine grows, devotion to people, sick with ordinary and unexciting diseases, wanes. This lack of concern for the commonplace illnesses cuts two ways. First, it works on the patient who is not fortunate enough to be afflicted with an "interesting" rare or complex disorder. Second, it denies the doctor in training the opportunity of examining and treating patients with the kind of everyday diseases he will meet most frequently when—or if—he ever engages in the practice of medicine.

Furthermore, this interest in research at the expense of practice is self-perpetuating. With medical schools continuing to increase the emphasis on the scientific aspects of medicine, graduates tend increasingly to seek careers in academic medicine or else in the practice of some specialty or subspecialty, while fewer and fewer are stimulated to enter general family practice for the day-to-day care of the ill. Inside most university medical centers there is, in fact, a feeling of disdain, if not downright contempt, for anyone who conducts no research but merely practices medicine, particularly if that practice is general or unspecialized. Moreover, patients tend to become merely "cases" to study and to provide grist for the research mill.

It is natural enough, of course, and right that as more technical and scientific knowledge has become available, interest in this aspect of medicine has grown. It is also natural that medical students, exposed primarily to the cloistered academic atmosphere of the university medical center, should tend to worship at the altar of the medical scientist rather than that of the medical practitioner. But even these understandable trends do not completely explain the present-day overemphasis on research at the expense of healing. Why has the laboratory superseded the ward as the focal point of activity in the university medical center? Why is the medical practitioner increasingly discouraged from participation in the activities of the teaching institution, while the full-time staffs swell with each passing year?

The explanation, I think, lies largely in the skyrocketing costs of medical education. In 1936, for example, when it cost $597,677 to operate one leading medical school, tuition brought in 22 percent of the annual revenue. In 1961 expenses had risen to $7,502,354—but tuition, although tripled, accounted for only 6 percent of that amount. In the same 25 years this school's income from research grants rose from $139,078 to $4,359,656. Without these millions for research, the school simply could not have operated. The situation is similar at most medical schools.

The amount of money available in the form of grants for medical research is enormous, and inevitably a large proportion of this money spills over in to the functioning of the medical schools and university hospitals themselves. Thus a man on a research grant has his salary paid; his technician is also financed by the grant; and expensive equipment—which is often useful to the hospital for other purposes—is provided by the grant.

To make sure that it receives its share of this income, the teaching hospital obviously must increasingly emphasize its activities in the field of research. The result is predictable: more "scienctific medicine" and less patient care; more physicians working in the laboratory, fewer in the wards; more emphasis on biochemistry, less on practice.

Most of the money to pay the annual research bill comes from the taxpayer's pocket: Nearly a billion dollars in grants came from the Federal Government in fiscal 1963, and another $142 million from private sources, including the foundations and associations which conduct frequent public fundraising drives.

How well is this money being used? Are the results worth the time and effort so many highly trained physicians are devoting to these projects? How much of the research is really important and worthwhile—and how much merely keeps medical researchers busy and generates reports to justify further grants?

Not long ago I attended a medical staff conference at which an hour and a half was devoted to the new method for detecting the blood level of certain enzymes and their value in the diagnosis of certain types of disease in the pancreas. In the case used for illustration, samples of intestinal juices and blood from the patient had been subjected to elaborate and time-consuming chemical analysis by a team of physicians and technicians.

The younger men—interns and students—left the conference with a sense of high exhilaration: Here indeed was an example of medical science at work providing new methods for detection of disease. But the older doctors knew that the same information could have been obtained by a careful history, a thorough physical examination, an intelligent appraisal of the routine laboratory tests and close observation of the patient. The new diagnostic method was no more certain, took more time, was more expensive for the patient. And worst of all, large sums of money and effort went into the research to develop this superfluous test.

There are two justifiable reasons for engaging in medical research. The first is puristic—the scientist searching for the truth for its own sake, laboring to learn as an eager child explores his environment in order to better understand it, just for the sake of knowledge. Such a scientist should be given free reign, with no questions asked. But sadly, this sort of scientist is not common on the American scene. The second valid reason for research in the field of medical science is humanistic—that is, the concern with developing better ways of maintaining health, and diagnosing and treating the illnesses to which man falls heir.

THE MEDICAL-CARE GAP

Too many medical researchers, however, seem to be less interested in human welfare or the quest for truth than in personal aggrandizement. Ambitious and aggressive, they publish papers because it helps their careers to publish them, not because they want to disseminate information; they attend medical meetings not to listen and learn, but to talk and become known. Medical research is conducted by too few purists and too few humanists.

What needs to be done seems clear to me. We have fine research institutes in America—the Rockefeller Institute and the Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research in New York, for example, and the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md. Institutions of this kind should be expanded, should receive increased support and encouragement. Meanwhile, university medical centers should once again emphasize their clinical and teaching responsibilities, with research activities receiving proportionately less emphasis. More money and effort should be directed to closing the present gap between the medical care potentially available and the kind that people are actually receiving.

Instead of financing medical schools by the indirect, inefficient, and harmful method of giving them almost unlimited research grants, we should support them more directly with grants for the building of hospitals and medical schools and for the teaching of medical students. Young doctors would then be more adequately trained to care for the sick, and more would be stimulated to pursue careers in the practice of medicine—in the direct and present alleviation of human suffering. In achieving a better balance between research, teaching, and patient care, research need not suffer. Intelligent pruning and wise selection would only serve to eliminate the poorly conceived, uninspired and repetitious research projects.

Scientific research has penetrated far into the dim and misty horizons of biology and medicine in the past few decades, and the promise for the future is bright. This research deserves to be nurtured so that it may continue to flourish. Let us not forget that benefit to humanity remains medical research's principal raison d'être. If we fail to provide the wondrous fruits of this research to all mankind, then it has indeed been naught but a fool's errand.

Trouble Over Tuna

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, at a time when Congress is heavily bolstering Ecuador with U.S. economic aid we find ourselves confronted with the height of disrespect by that country. Ecuador has seized two American-flag tuna clippers and has shown a complete lack of willingness to diplomatically resolve the differences concerning fishing rights that exist between our two nations.

Realizing the full impact of Ecuador's actions, the Congress should take immediate steps to deny any economic aid to Ecuador, and to any other foreign country unfairly harassing or seizing our vessels.

The attention of my colleagues is directed to the June 1 editorial from the Baltimore Sun entitled "Trouble Over Tuna":

TROUBLE OVER TUNA

The detention of U.S. fishing boats on charges of operating within Ecuadorian territorial waters is one of those conflicts that makes a headline reader ask impatiently why the functionaries of a small and faraway nation have to raise difficulties when the channels of diplomacy are already overloaded with international rows. But, as one more flareup over fishing rights, it is also a recurrence of a historic friction point; and as an exacerbation of public opinion in the two countries concerned and possibly elsewhere along the west coast of South America, it can affect the success of the Alliance for Progress.

The question of what constitutes territorial waters has been argued for centuries, most notably in the North Atlantic Ocean. The 3-mile limit recognized by the United States and international law in general is not universally accepted; in the South Pacific, a 200-mile limit has been promulgated at one time or another by Ecuador, Peru, and Chile, which would like to encompass the Humboldt Current and its wealth of fish resources. The United States has dutifully suffered Soviet Russian "trawlers" loaded with detection devices to approach much closer than 200 miles, consistency as well as precedent support the case of the tuna fishermen seized when, their claim is, fully 13 miles off the Ecuadorian coast.

The populations of South American ports know and care little about international law, as the crew of the cruiser *Baltimore* discovered in a famous incident in Chile in 1899. In the current age, many a South American unfortunately enjoys any pretext for assailing the United States. And the tuna fish—the most important of the world's commercial fish, with virtually every fishing nation after it and U.S. canners prizing it second only to salmon—is likely to go on swimming where it pleases, in splendid disregard of the imaginary lines on paper maps.

Says Diversity Is the Key to Attracting and Keeping People Content in Hagerstown, the Hub City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to call your attention to the many advantages of one of the cities in my congressional district. The superior opportunities of Hagerstown, Md., are clearly set forth in the following article from the News of Frederick, Md., under date of May 23, 1963, written by George Rash of the Hagerstown Daily Mail:

SAYS DIVERSITY IS THE KEY TO ATTRACTING AND KEEPING PEOPLE CONTENT IN HAGERSTOWN, THE HUB CITY

(By George Rash)

HAGERSTOWN.—This is the Hub City—the town growing pains that most visitors like to come back to and most residents don't want to leave—after they have been here a while, that is. Diversity is the key.

Between the forested and protecting walls of the Hagerstown Valley, the city's economic, social, and cultural spokes extend into two States—West Virginia 6 miles to the south and Pennsylvania 6 miles to the north.

Four railroads, no longer carrying passengers, enter the city from the four points of the compass, and U.S. 40 and 11 cross in the center of town.

A glance at the license plates of autos parked on the city's streets and shopping center lots attests to the number of Pennsylvanians and West Virginians who come from nearby towns for work, business or pleasure.

The city is old—as old as the French and Indian War era when it was a trading post sitting astride what was to become the Old National Trail, the road to the West. But its citizens do not dwell in the dawn of its beginnings, although persons knowledgeable to the subject will bend your ear on matters historic by request.

In the Civil War its sympathies were on both sides, and opposing armies were in and out of town so much, the story goes, that most people had two sets of flags.

The city is new—as new as the interstate highways that are beginning to fork their way around its perimeter, and the $15 million Mack Truck engine plant employing 3,000 on a 200-acre site.

The city is expanding, reaching out to annex land within the metropolitan area where some 60,000 persons reside.

"The city must expand," says Winslow F. Burhans, Hagerstown's thrice elected mayor, "or be strangled."

For 2 years the city has been taking in chunks of contiguous territory, so that its once rectangular map is now one of ragged edges.

But the city's past and present are not alone the keys to the atmosphere that makes people want to stay (even when they may be furloughed from a job and there is employment elsewhere) and keeps 'conventioneers wanting to come back.

The word is diversity—not only in the industries and agriculture of the fertile valley watered by the Antietam and Conococheague Creeks, but in the resulting culture that make it a logical candidate for a portrait of "Small City-U.S.A."

The surrounding valley is filled with apple and peach orchards, wheat and corn fields and dairy farms.

The fact that over 20,000 persons are employed in industries in the area is meaningless unless the impact of diversity is considered.

They build everything from electronic parts to truck engines, make clothing from shoes to dresses, manufacturing from pipe organs to furniture, resulting in literally scores of occupations.

Hagerstown is not a satellite city—the evening home for those employed in other places, and is not influenced by such larger communities as Baltimore and Washington.

Its residents are happy that they have but to take a ride of an hour and half or less to obtain of the advantages of those places.

Hagerstown is a religious but not a prudish town. The number and variety of its churches constantly increases. Drives for additions and buildings are well subscribed and Sunday attendance fills the streets with traffic.

At the same time it is a club town, with large memberships in all fraternal and social organizations.

Wet throughout the week at over 200 licensed beverage places in the city and county, the legally dry Sundays are somewhat dampened by the 20 or so special "picnic" licenses that are issued each Sunday to clubs and organizations to permit the sale of beer.

Move to the city and it will not be long before a new acquaintance suggests a membership.

The nearby Potomac River is the summertime mecca of hundreds who spend the weekends at their clubhouses or on their boats, ranging from rowboats to cabin cruisers complete with bunks and toilet.

The city's government is involved in the growing pains of a community whose suburbia has seen so much home building that the health department had to clamp down on permits for septic tanks in some areas.

The city is trying annexation as a solution, while the county government has established the suburban santitary commission to solve the problem, with the result that a behind-the-scenes war is being waged by the two agencies.

The city has refused to sell water to the county group, and the county group is threatening to install its own system.

The economic development commission, with a record of success in landing some industries, is reaching for others and is trying to develop tourism, especially to the Antietam Battlefield, Harpers Ferry, Fort Frederick, Washington Monument Park and C. & O. Canal Park,

The city government is working through an urban renewal and planning commission to completely revamp parts of the city to rid it of substandard housing and decrepit, uneconomical buildings.

Thus the staid and box-like architecture of the German influence of the city's earlier days may give way to something new.

Hagerstown's citizens' interests are as diversified as their employment.

A symphony orchestra concert is likely to pack a 1,500-seat auditorium, while professional wrestling show may have a turnaway crowd.

They are not the same people, of course.

A county art museum show will bring entries and visitors from all over the valley, and an establishment featuring hardshell crabs on a Friday night can't supply enough seats.

The interest in country club life is such that the two clubs here are expanding their facilities.

A new junior college is being planned to handle the expanding demand for education.

This diversity of activity, of interests, of employment, occupation, and scenery allows something for everyone. It could be the cause of people hanging on to the town.

Hagerstown is not a timorous young girl, nor a woman enfeebled by age.

She is a healthy middle-aged gal, reaching out to the future, holding on to her past, and enjoying the present.

Rebuilding Slum Areas Without Dislocating Tenants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems in urban renewal and area redevelopment programs is the cost of relocating the residents of the area to be restored.

In New York City this cost averages at about $1,000 per family. Upon completion of the redevelopment and construction program, many of the residents who have been scattered to the four winds do not return to their former locations, causing a disruption in family life; in long and old associations with neighbors; complete changes in the complexion of a neighborhood adversely affecting churches and the makeup of their parishes; the balance and planning for proper schooling; and of course the economic impact upon the small businessman and shopowner is apparent.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I commend to you the idea submitted by the architectural firm of Wechsler and Schimenti with their system of rebuilding slum areas without dislocating tenants. Their idea has a patent pending and I commend the following thoughts to you:

Wechsler & Schimenti System of Rebuilding Slum Areas Without Dislocating Tenants

There has been a clamor recently to call a moratorium on new construction because of the hardships encountered in the relocation of tenants. We believe the method described herein will solve this problem.

Public officials have been looking for vacant land but apparently there is very little in the locale of slum areas upon which to build low-cost housing.

We have discovered, however, that there is much vacant area upon which to build, but it hasn't been noticed up to now. Surprisingly it is all over the city. It is our city streets and in many places the rear yards right adjacent to all our slum buildings—this is our vacant land.

Take a street in any slum area running from avenue to avenue. Such a street in Manhattan is approximately 700 feet long and 60 feet wide from building line to building line.

First, we construct a 17-story building in the street area from curb to curb. This portion of building will contain apartments on only one side of the corridor. When this section of the building is completed, the tenants from one side of the slum back move into the newly constructed portion of the building.

When tenants are out of the slum buildings, they will then be demolished. The second portion of new building will be attached directly to the corridor mentioned above. When this portion of building is completed the tenants from the opposite side of the slum block will be moved into this newly constructed portion of the building, demolition of the remaining slum buildings follows and lo and behold we now have a completely new building with corridor in the middle and apartments on both sides of the corridor. The street floor will have no apartments but will be completely open for parking of cars.

Having closed one city street we simply relocate a new street, if necessary, where the yards behind the demolished slum buildings were located.

As to existing sewers and other public utilities, these can remain in their existing locations as they will still be located under the open parking area, under the new buildings, of course there will be some minor alteration to these existing utilities.

The average slum block is about 700 feet long containing about 56 tenements 4 to 5 stories in height. The tenements are occupied by about 560 tenants. Therefore the new buildings would be approximately 700 feet long by 65 feet wide and 17 stories in height, large enough to receive all the tenants on the block plus an additional 76 apartments for tenants from other areas.

The simplicity of the method is self-apparent as the tenants can stay in the old buildings and watch their new homes being constructed before their very eyes and when the new buildings are completed they simply move from the old into the new without causing hardship to anyone.

This system could quite possibly be used in any city throughout the country.

Escape From Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune may give us the clue to the strange maneuvering on foreign policy in which the President indulges. It may be that because of his lack of understanding of the world situation and his inability to cope with the power politics on the world stage, he is in reality seeking an escape from foreign policy.

What Foreign Policy?

Senator J. William Fulbright's preposterous suggestion that Congress be deprived of the power to overrule the President, especially in regard to foreign policy, violates the principles of the Republic, as we have said. It also prompts an obvious question which the Republican leaders of Congress have now risen to ask: What foreign policy?

Ten other Republicans joined Senator Dirksen and Representative Halleck, minority leaders of the Senate and the House, in demanding that the administration explain what its foreign policy is—if it has one. Discovering what our foreign policy is, the Republicans said, is "one of the major problems in Washington today."

And well it might be. Wherever trouble arises, we seem to have two policies. One is to denounce in firm words any threat to freedom or to our own security; then, having thus shaken our fist, we sit down again to wait and see, while the administration tells us that there is really nothing to get excited about.

The Communist "military presence" in Cuba was long ago labeled "intolerable," yet it has been and still is being tolerated. What, the Republicans ask, became of the on-site inspection plans which, we thought, had been agreed upon by President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev? "No one seems to know."

In Laos the agreement on a neutralist regime was hailed as an end to the Communist threat in that country. "If the Communists were to dominate this country," Mr. Kennedy said of Laos in 1961, "it would endanger the security and peace of all southeast Asia." Yet today the neutralist leader, Prince Souvanna Phouma, concedes that he is all but powerless against the Communists.

The administration has made strong pronouncements about the importance of NATO and about free trade with an expanded European Common Market. Yet, as the Republicans point out, "President Kennedy's so-called grand design for Europe is now inoperative," and the NATO alliance, "despite a modest recovery attempt last week at Ottawa, is in a doubtful condition. * * * Most of its members have been aggrieved by one policy mishap or another sponsored by the Kennedy administration."

The White House seems to be so full of advisers that they never get around to agreeing, and the President is trying to accept all of their advice at once. When the coast seems clear, he can follow the advice of the "hawks," who want to talk tough to the Communists; when the tough talk brings forth scowls from Moscow, he can shift to the advice of the "doves," who preach peace at all costs; and our stern warnings are lost in a muddy stream of conversation at the United Nations or some such place.

This isn't a foreign policy; it is the attempt to escape from one. Yet this is the so-called policy which Mr. Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, would exempt from the will of Congress and of the people.

Let's Have the Truth About Krebiozen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the time is fast approaching when the Food and Drug Administration will ban the use of Krebiozen. That date is June 7. I wish again to urge that this action not be taken; that the continued use of Krebiozen be permitted until objective tests show that it is either a control for cancer or worthless. This is the only fair thing to do for the hundreds who now believe that they are living only because of Krebiozen.

Good sense has been continually urged in this situation by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Mr. Douglas, and by newspaper articles by Bob Farrell in the Brooklyn Eagle. Mr. Farrell's column of May 20, 1963, is commended to the attention of our colleagues and follows:

GOOD MORNING: BOB FARRELL—AND THE WHOLE TRUTH SHALL MAKE US FREE

I have no personal knowledge or any information that the use of Krebiozen can cure or control cancer. I only know that I attended a meeting at the Freedom House, where I heard documented cases of terminal and incurable cancers by the very people who were involved testify openly that their cancers were now controlled and in some cases completely gone. I have become interested in the problems of these people since on June 7 of this year the sale and use of this drug is going to be prohibited. A strong element in making this so is the American Medical Association which has advised its legion of members that the drug is dangerous when used. Because of their findings doctors refuse to use it or recommend it, and in fact frown upon it. Thus the Food and Drug Administration is banning it.

This disturbs me for many reasons.

First of all, having approved its use for some 12 years, the FDA should not be allowed to ban it just like that, not on its own decision nor on that of the AMA. The drug should be tested and if the facts check out then the drug should not only be allowed to continue being used, but doctors all over the Nation and world should be advised of this.

Three thousand doctors have used Krebiozen and there are 4,500 documented case histories to prove Dr. Durovic's and Dr. Ivy's findings.

Dr. Andrew Conway Ivy, one of the leaders in the fight for the recognition of Krebiozen, is one of America's leading men of science.

Dr. Ivy in 1947 was chosen as the representative of world medicine at the Nuremberg trials of doctors indicted for cruel and inhuman treatment of prisoners of war on the pretext that medical knowledge would be furthered.

Dr. Ivy was awarded in 1953 the Pope Pius XII citation for great services to humanity.

Dr. Ivy was presented with a Presidential Citation for contribution to the war effort at the close of World War II. Dr. Ivy has taught more than 5,000 students, had an active part in 1,300 medical projects, has written for scientific journals, discovered most of the body's hormones, crusaded against the quota system (limiting the number of medical students on the basis of race and religion).

Dr. Ivy is a life member of the American College of Physicians; held a membership in 10 research committees; a director of the Naval Medical Research Institute in Bethesda, Md.; former chairman of the Section on Pathology and Physiology of the American Medical Association; director at large of the American Cancer Society and the holder of dozens of other posts in medicine as important as those already listed.

It all adds up to a distinguished career of ability, dedication and service.

How can any government agency or any body of medical men cast any aspersions on one who has reached so high an attainment in the science of medicine?

Why it this man and his associates being subjected to the vilest treatment? Why is this scientist being called names which suggest he might be a quack? As I have said so many times over and over again, Why? why? why?

Are other learned men jealous of Dr. Durovic and Dr. Ivy? Have other men an ax to grind to prevent Drs. Ivy and Durovic being acknowledged as the first to break through in cancer chemotherapy?

Why should we the people, one of every six of whom will die from cancer, be in the middle of a quarrel, when all of the energy being exercised could be put to better use in acclaiming it or proving it a fraud if it is.

I want you to read the following letter that arrived in this morning's mail. I never met nor do I know these people:

"Thank you for your article 'Krebiozen's Fight So Others Might Live.' During the past 2 years I have watched a Krebiozen miracle. I am also heartsick to think that this wonderful medicine which has brought hope and relief to so many cancer patients is about to be banned on June 7. As a registered nurse, I heard of this Krebiozen medication for the first time about 15 years ago at the time of Dr. Ivy's initial statement in favor of Krebiozen.

"I was living in Chicago at the time and remember all of the controversy about it. I dismissed it all as 'quackery' along with many other professional men and women. I had not thought much about it until a few years ago when someone placed a copy of Bailey's book in my hands. I have been living in Brooklyn for the past 8 years. My husband is the pastor of the Dean Street Baptist Church. We have a church organist, Caryl Segerstrom. She is a music teacher at Erasmus Hall High School. She is a very wonderful and intelligent person. In April 1961 she was a patient at Grand Central Hospital in New York City. Her chest was filled with fluid and her report was metastasis of the mediastinum.

"Her own doctor stated that she was 'full of disease' and that he had done all that he could for her. She had had all the X-ray treatments they could safely give her.

"I thought of Krebiozen again and happened to read an article in the paper about it. I spoke to Caryl and asked her to pray about taking this medication.

"Someone telephoned her one day and told her about Dr. W——— in Brooklyn. Nothing in this conversation had anything to do with Krebiozen. She went to visit him and during the conversation she mentioned it.

"He stated that he would give it to her because she was 'full of disease' and had nothing to lose.

"When she first went to see Dr. W——— she was so weak she could hardly speak. She had almost reached the decision to give up her teaching position.

"I only wish you could see her now. She is like a new person. She has taken Krebiozen for 2 years. She has a full teaching schedule. Now, why should wonderfully intelligent, useful people as Caryl be deprived of this drug?

"Two wonderful years and she is feeling fine and no symptoms of any kind.

"What can I do to aid in this fight? My husband and I are deeply concerned as we have watched her progress carefully. Couldn't you go on television to plead this cause?

"The public should know the gross injustice that will be done if this drug is banned. I beg of you to do what you can and if Caryl and my husband or myself can help, call on us.

"Mrs. H. Kenneth Nelson."

Krebiozen has been in use for 12 years. The Food and Drug Administration has approved its use all that time. The only objectors to its use then and now has been the American Medical Association.

A few days ago the Medical News announced that the AMA praised a drug (nothing to do with cancer) and even recommended its use, knowing that the FDA had not as yet passed on it.

I can't figure that out. Perhaps Senator Paul Douglas' statement that the AMA is an agency with "dictatorial" powers could well be the understatement of the year.

The Senator's interest, together with that of many other Senators, might not only correct some of those powers, if the need be, but will also result in the happy conclusion that Krebiozen be given its day.

Wheat Vote Is More Than Just Disapproval

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column written by William V. Krause, editor of the Peabody (Kans.) Gazette-Herald, which is deserving of the attention of my colleagues in the House who are interested in a healthy and progressive agriculture for our Nation:

WHEAT VOTE MORE THAN JUST DISAPPROVAL

Last week's surprisingly onesided defeat of the proposed 1964 wheat program by the wheat growers of America has been analyzed and studied by everyone from street-corner philosophers to the top intellects in the Government. What everyone is wondering is just why the vote went as it did and what does it mean.

Of course, it obviously means that farmers were not happy with the proposed wheat program and that they were restless under more and more Government controls. It means that they are probably fed up with the frustrations of dealing with bureaucrats, large and small.

But it may well be that the vote was an indication of something even deeper. Something that we have felt for some time and mentioned before, and that is a general farmer dissatisfaction with his position in the Nation's economy and with his treatment at the hands of everyone else—Government, big business, and labor.

Farmers have felt for a long time they were not getting a fair shake all around. They buy at set prices (after dickering, of course) and they sell at prices set by someone else. For a long time they looked to the Government to even things up for them, but the Government has not done that. Government programs have been some help in some areas. They have kept prices on products the farmers sell fairly stable, but it still seems that the farmer is somewhere behind the majority of the economy, and it seems to him that that is the way the Government, big business, and big labor want it.

A good indication of genuine farmer unrest was shown in the past couple years by the growth of the controversial NFO organization. This organization operates in a manner entirely alien to what farmers are accustomed to, but it attracted a lot of support. It had rather limited success, but those outside of farming could well take a look and a listen, for the NFO gave some broad hints as to how far a farmer might go if they are pushed back too often.

Now, comes the resounding defeat of the wheat plan. If this does not indicate genuine farmer unrest, we are very much mistaken.

Farmers don't control many Senators and Representatives any more, but that doesn't mean they aren't important. Obviously, anyone who controls the production of food is vital in any nation. Less obviously, but almost as important, is the fact that farmers are among the Nation's biggest consumers, and farm prosperity is important not only to Peabody and Marion and Florence, but also to Kansas City, Chicago, and Detroit.

A farmer who uses $25,000 to $50,000 worth of machinery, three or four dozen rubber tires, metal buildings and fence, other building materials, a huge amount of gasoline and oil, to mention only the principal items, will consume many times more than a city laborer who uses only a car and a few appliances. A farm depression would quickly wreck the entire economy and any smart economist knows it.

Farmers are no longer a bunch of dumb hicks, if they ever were. Many of them are college educated, nearly all of them are self-educated to a surprising degree. They know what is going on around them and they can't be fooled very often. And they are restless with their lot.

In the lifetime of many of our readers, history has recorded the great move of labor for better conditions, then came the move of teachers and professional people for a better station in life. Farmers might well be next, and they have tremendous weapons to use in bettering their position.

Barbara Ward's Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to note a significant and provocative talk which was given at Williamsburg, Va., on June 2, by Barbara Ward, one of the most eloquent of the world's economists.

Miss Ward, who is probably best known for a number of important books, including her most recent book entitled "India and the West," chose historic Williamsburg as the scene from which to comment on the American initiative.

She makes a telling point that Americans have in their hands today an opportunity to make as significant a contribution to the progress of our society as our Founding Fathers had in the 1770's, two centuries ago. The text of her address follows:

BARBARA WARD'S SPEECH

If we look back on the men who framed the Virginia Declaration of Fights over the interval of nearly two tumultuous centuries, our first impression must surely be one of amazement at the universality and audacity of their political imagination. They were themselves heirs of one of the great pioneering ventures of humanity—the drive which took the cockleshell boats of Europe round the world and established for the first time, against fearful hazards, the concept of a single, terrestrial habitation for the human race. Then, within little more than a century of this first revolutionary expansion, here were the sober burghers of Williamsburg making quite as remarkable a set of affirmations about the political needs and aspirations of this one human family.

We must note that they did not speak for Virginians only, or even for Americans. The universal note is struck in the first great formulation of American liberties: "All men are equally free and independent," "all have certain inherent rights," "Government"—in other words all governments—"ought to be instituted for the common benefit, protection, and security of the people, nation, or community." There is nothing restricted or parochial here. These forefathers of ours, in their wigs and kneebreeches and flowered waistcoats, believed themselves to be acting beyond any local custom or tradition. They believed that they spoke for all mankind.

The aspiration is all the more remarkable when we remember the apparent narrowness of their political scope and the real inhibitions of their physical endowment. Here they were, 13 separate colonies, not yet certain whether neighbors would be ready to share sovereignty, even less certain whether the power of Britain could be successfully withstood. To seaward lay uncertainty and hostility; inland, a vast unknown where French pretensions and Indian enmity had still to be reckoned with. So, faced with odds which only seem favorable because we know the outcome, they spoke not as beleaguered citizens but as heirs and perpetuators of human freedom itself. We have to try with all our imaginative powers to recreate the magnificence of their audacity. Custom has staled it for us. We take for granted what should still leave us speechless with surprise.

EARLY OBSTACLES CITED

Their audacity stands in all the sharper contrast because of their physical insufficiencies. Communication and transport tended to separate them rather than draw them closer. Coming to share in these festivities, I could breakfast in London and take luncheon in New York. In Jefferson's day, one would not have reached half way to Baltimore. Farming still aimed at self-sufficiency. Industry was so little advanced that, while John Adams could exclaim that "many curious engines have been constructed to facilitate business," Jefferson wrote to Harvard complaining that the study of America's mineralogy "was still untouched." Education was widespread, true, and Yankee inventiveness had already made its mark.

But the colonies were still, as we should say now, in a very early stage of development, still 40 or 50 years away from takeoff, still a century away from a fully articulated industrial system. The dreams of these men were palpably ahead of their tools, their ends of their means, their visions of their workaday abilities. The disparity did not daunt them. They simply went ahead to create the first free continental society known to human history.

Such is the true perspective of 1776—unlimited vision, limited means. What, then, would the men of 1776 say of our present predicament?

Let us be clear about one thing at the outset. They would be staggered, overwhelmed by the ample quality of our means. Surpluses in wheat and meat which drown the market, threatened tropical surpluses which will do the same, steel mills working at 60 percent of capacity because of oversupply, oil markets threatened by Russian crude, European coal mines by Anglo-Saxon output, all fuel by future atomic energy, a 5-percent unemploymnet rate in America because of surplus labor—and although at least $100 billion a year is spent by all protagonists on arms and perhaps $12 billion on space, the surpluses persist while annual increases in Atlantic income are never les than 2 percent a year, with over a 5-percent rate of growth in Western Europe—and, incidentally, over 10 percent in Japan. Such a cornucopia of capacity has bestowed on mankind a freedom which the Founding Fathers could not even envisage—the freedom which springs from a physical ability to realize virtually any goal the community may choose to set.

GOALS CHANGED

And what are the goals? Here, surely, we find ourselves in exactly the opposite position from the men of 1776. Nothing was limited about them except their means. Everything is limited about us except our means. The world today is smaller than the continent they faced. The unity of human experience which they proclaimed has been demonstrated not only by the science that abolishes space and time but by the aspirations which unite whole communities in the desire for modernity and technological breakthrough. The Thirteen Colonies, underdeveloped States 180-odd years ago, are now the leaders of a human column all of whom, virtually without exception, march forward intent upon securing the same elbow room and sharing in the same abundance. Life—they want, too, to extend their human span from 20 to 70 years. Liberty—they want, and have nearly achieved, the self-respect of self-governing communities. The pursuit of happiness—at least they know happiness does not lie in sickness, in hunger, in racial subjection, in unremitting toil. The whole world is astir with the aspirations of 1776—except perhaps the Atlantic Community within which they first came to birth and where, now, they are in danger of degenerating to the level of Fourth of July rhetoric.

Have we confident economic goals? We may proclaim a Decade of Development—our hearts are not in it. The 1 percent of national income to be dedicated to development is reached by no more than one or two wealthy nations. In America, in spite of steady support by public opinion, political pressure is all to cut back the American contribution on the grounds that the effort is failing to give the expected return.

Yet the reasons given are hardly convincing. It is forgotten how much aid has simply sustained Western exports during the recent fallaway in primary prices. It is forgotten to what degree Western trade policies discriminate against the poorer nations. It is forgotten that the span of successful development in any society is not less than a couple of generations. Today, after only a decade, Western governments seem to expect results they could not have achieved themselves in a comparable period. It is forgotten in how many countries education, the foundation of all skills, has still to be built. It is forgotten how much, over the last decade, has in fact been learned, how many foundations laid, roads opened up, dams built, the habits of saving and investment introduced. And even if it is reasonable to concentrate resources on the more promising experiments, this is no reason for an absolute overall cut.

IMPATIENCE SCORED

If the men of 1776 had attempted the opening up of America with the testy impatience of so many politicians today, they would barely have crossed the Adirondacks. England at the time of the Luddites was about at the stage reached by many developing countries today. But to the light of flaring barns, to the sound of anger in the streets, with the fury of the urban mobs behind them, the men of that age did not stop investing. They passed the reform bill instead. Must we be less steady in our long-term perspectives?

Seen in the aspect not of a single decade but of the 50 or 60 years needed for full modernization, economic assistance to our crowded world could seem as challenging as our space ventures and far more rewarding. To set young minds afire, to create new opportunities for creative work, to break the millennial dependence on hatchet and hoe, to open up the streams of lifegiving water, to make the desert blossom, to give all mankind some share in the patrimony of 1776—this would seem a physical ideal not unworthy to stand beside space probes and infinitely more rewarding than the endless proliferation of the means of death.

And if our economic vision wholly fails to match our physical means, what are we to say of our political goals? Timidly, hesitantly we edge our way round the problems of supranational order in a world in which the largest nation state can give no more formal security than could Virginia in 1776. But the Virginians seized on the logic of their predicament. They opted first for the Continental Congress and when its cohesion proved insufficient, went on to full-blooded federalism.

Our task today may be more difficult. Or is it that our vision is less intense? After all, we shall never know the full force of the difficulties facing the men of 1776 in ridding themselves of British rule—which many citizens still supported—in transcending local State rights—which many profited by—and in preparing to open up a whole uncharted and potentially hostile continent. We cannot gage the obstacles because they were overcome. Today, while not decrying obstacles, we must remark a certain flaccidity of political will in which the positive vision of Atlantic interdependence hangs in the balance while lesser but sterner nationalisms seek to frustrate this grand design.

VISION CALLED FOR

Since then, an essential part of the political will is that citizens should give reason for the faith that is in them, let those who believe the principles of 1776 to be in a profound sense universal and the men of 1776—indeed to speak not only to the present in colonial America but to the whole future of the human experiment—let them apply those principles with the same vision and courage to the predicaments of today.

Let the United States, the first free Federal experiment on a continental scale, be the model. Let us match it now with the completion of the European experiment first by Britain's entry into Europe and then by Europe's dedication to free, Federal and supranational institutions. Let the two Atlantic sister federations establish those joint instiutions that are needed to serve their common life, including the trading and investment agencies which can transform the decade of development from rhetoric to fact.

Then let the legitimate influence of such economic policies be dedicated to encouraging in Africa and Latin America and, where appropriate, in Asia first common markets and then federal unions to which, as they advance toward mature industrialization, the common institutions of the Atlantic world may be extended, thus giving underpinning and substance to that concept of a "world authority" which, we all instinctively know, must be secured if postatomic man is to survive. A confederation of sister federations—may not this be the next institutional pattern of the human city? And is it not a more humane and flexible vision than the single sovereignty of totalitarian control?

Visionary—you will say—impracticable, idealist, utopian, ridiculous—but was it more visionary in 1776 to proclaim democracy in the age of monarchs, self-government in the age of empires, the rights of man in a colonial-feudal world, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness in a world still held in chains? If we do not dream today, tomorrow will belong to those who do. The visions of 1776 have proved to be harder and more realist than the fears and conservatisms of those who opposed them. What will be the visions of 1963? Who will dream them? And if freemen have no more visions, how soon will the whole great tradition of 1776 perish from the earth?

A Citizen Reports on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an editorial on foreign aid bungling from the first hand observation of a retired businessman who made it his business to inquire about how some of his money is being spent in foreign lands. The editorial-letter appeared in the Dallas Morning News, as follows:

WASTE IS FOUND IN FOREIGN AID

(By R. J. Ausfahl)

Among the objectives of our foreign aid programs is that to give assistance to the less-fortunate peoples of the world.

In his budget message to Congress, the President requested an appropriation of $4.8 billion for foreign aid, which represents a cost to every one of us of $25, or, for a family of five, $125.

Few of us would deny assistance to the sick, miserably housed and poverty-stricken in Asia and Africa. The sorry part is that, with all the billions of tax dollars that have been contributed to these areas, the less-fortunate have benefited only to the extent of wages received for work on some of our idiotic and ridiculous projects.

My criticism of foreign aid is based entirely on personal, on-the-spot observations of many of our projects in 14 countries of Asia and Africa, plus 8 years' residence in South America. No accusations are made of graft or thievery.

Space limits me to descriptions of a few projects. There were dozens more, equally as ridiculous as the following examples.

Illinois Route 74, a recently constructed highway I have watched progress, is a four-lane concrete artery that passes through high-priced farmland. Millions of yards of earth were moved in construction of overpasses. Average wages paid were roughly $3 per hour. The cost was $700,000 per mile.

Contrast this with the cost of a foreign-aid road in Saigon, South Vietnam. American contractors and engineers using identically the same equipment as was used on Illinois No. 74 were completing the first 18-mile leg of a proposed 250-mile road. This road was largely of 2-lane, concrete construction that originated in the city but terminated in the flat virgin jungle. There was one short piece of overpass over the railroad tracks. Wages paid were from 6 to 32 cents per hour with an average of 12 cents.

The cost was about $4 million per mile.

I questioned local people as to why such a road had been built and got this answer: "So the fat Chinaman with the automobile can take his wife out riding on Sunday afternoon."

Kosichang, Thailand, is a small town built on a mountainside. The cobblestone surface on a street in the outer edge of town had been replaced with a concrete street complete with gutters. The oddity of this project we supplied was that there wasn't a car, truck, or even a bicycle in the town. But they did have a street for an occasional two-wheel oxcart.

Djibouti, French Somaliland, had another example of American generosity. Fifty assorted sizes of trucks were stored on a vacant lot adjoining the dock. They had never been uncrated and had stood there so long that the red in the clasped-hands insignia of foreign aid had faded to pink.

A search through the city and surrounding area disclosed no construction projects.

Inquiry as to why the trucks were not being used brought the answer, "Nobody knows how to drive or service them."

Roughly 95 percent of the peoples of Asia and Africa are illiterate and have insufficient income for the bare necessities of life. Even in the cities many do not have electricity and cannot afford television or radio, but foreign-aid funds have been used to erect broadcasting stations.

Recently one of our more reliable magazines carried an article on our contribution of 400 color television sets to South Vietnam.

In my travels I found there was little evidence that foreign aid was being used for educational purposes. The general attitude of the 5 percent toward the 95 percent seemed to be that the latter are dumb and that it is better to keep them that way. Communism thrives on ignorance, yet giveaway ignores education and embarks on ridiculous grandiose projects to demonstrate how we do it in the U.S.A.

If you think we are being taken to the cleaners in Asia and Africa, I can only answer with the words of the late Al Jolson, "You ain't seen nothin' yet," when it comes to Latin America. Politicians seek office with but one purpose in many Latin American countries—to line their own pockets, and they aren't particular who furnishes the lining.

Ranchers To Seek State Help on Bracero Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the following news story which appeared in the Ventura County (Calif.) Star-Free Press, a paper that is considered to be somewhat liberal in its outlook. You will note particularly the interviews with the Mexican braceros themselves concerning the failure of the House to approve an extension of Public Law 78, Mexican farm labor bill. It shows the good feeling toward the United States of the average Mexican worker as a result of Public Law 78 and the ways in which he has been able to better himself and his family through the higher wages he has earned here. This, to be, is an irrefutable argument that Public Law 78 was the very best kind of "foreign aid" and should have been allowed to continue:

RANCHERS TO SEEK STATE HELP ON BRACERO LOSS

Ventura County farm labor leaders will go to Sacramento Monday to plan what steps California agriculture can take in view of the stunning defeat of the Mexican National labor import program.

Jessie Frye, Oxnard, manager of the Ventura County Farm Labor Association; Carl Samuelson, Ventura; and William Tolbert, Santa Paula, manager of the Ventura Citrus Growers Committee, will be among those taking the trip.

Farm leaders were still shaking their heads in disbelief and assessing the prospects for harvesting next year's crops, in view of the stunning setback.

Explanations for the defeat of the program—which most observers had expected to have comparatively easy sledding in the House—were lacking. Congressman CHARLES M. TEAGUE, Republican of California, offered this observation in a telegram to the Star-Free Press.

"I hope those who killed the bill, including a majority (but not all) California Democrats in the House, will have a plan for harvesting of our crops. The big farmers can make out, but I'm not so sure the small ones can."

The California delegation in Congress voted 19 to 13 in favor of the bracero program, with TEAGUE voting to continue it. All State Republican and some Democrats voted for it; the opposition vote was all from Democrats. Many Congressmen—four of them Californians—were vacationing when the vote was taken.

With the defeat of the Federal program, a number of State legislative bills in this field now are accorded a chance of passage. One such measure would provide American farm workers with many of the same benefits provided braceros under the Federal program.

The braceros themselves are the last to know.

The Star-Free Press today undertook to find out what the Mexican National worker—the bracero—thinks about having the program under which he came to the United States killed by Congress—that after December 31 he can no longer legally be in this country.

The interviews took place in a strawberry patch run by the Wakatsuki brothers, Ray and Woody, off Ditch Road in El Rio. Robin S. Cartwright, assistant manager of the Ventura County Farm Labor Association was interpreter.

But if the man in the row crop don't have direct information on congressional action, that doesn't mean he doesn't have opinions.

Alsibiades Sanchez is 20, serving his first hitch as a bracero, and in the United States only since March 30.

To him, the ending of the program would be "very bad." He came because as a farmworker in Mexico he could earn only 8 pesos a day (64 cents) while here he clears at least $7.50 a day.

LIKES MONEY

He would like to do what countless braceros have done before him, go back home and with the money he has earned in the United States, buy a little plot of land and plant a crop.

Pablo Salas, 42, was more of a philosophical turn of mind. His brown face took on a speculative look as he pondered the question, "What do you think of the ending of this program?"

At length, he began to speak, in Spanish. The translation, rendered by Cartwright, went like this:

"On one hand, it may be a good thing. Men will have to stay home now with their families, and see that the children are raised properly. On the other hand, we come up here to make some extra money, and losing it will be bad."

Salas has come to the United States eight times. He has seven children. His home is in San Geronimo De Juarez, Guerrero, Mexico.

Because living costs have gone up so much in his homeland, some of the money has gone to just feed his family. But he has been able to build a concrete house with his earnings—quite an improvement on the former adobe, he feels, and he has purchased his wife a new sewing machine.

Every bracero has a different story to tell.

Take Elovio Piza, 39. He is a laborer in the United States, but at home in Mexico, he is a businessman. He has come as a bracero seven times, and with the money, he bought up the crops of whole coconut plantations.

Then, with his own hired workers, he harvested the crops and sells them to copra dealers. So successful has been his business that Elovio was about ready to give up stoop labor in the United States. But he did sign on once more, because he wants to earn the money for four cows, "to insure the future of my children."

Daniel Carbajal, 44, of Coyuca De Benites, Guerrero, had heard "a rumor" that the program will end. But he hopes the Governments of his country and the United States will somehow get together and work something out. Carabajal is proud of the fact that he has always come to America legally, and he would not want to return as "a wet."

What Now for Wheat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the administration apparently needs to learn a lesson from the wheat referendum, the Minneapolis Star says editorially, and suggests some real leadership should be provided by the Department of Agriculture. I request that the editorial be printed in the RECORD:

WHAT NOW FOR WHEAT?

The administration takes the attitude that farmers last week voted for $1.25 wheat and unlimited production, so let them have those conditions. We think it more reasonable to suppose that the farmers voted against the stringent, across-the-board controls proposed by the administration.

The problem remains—too many resources devoted to wheat. If Agriculture Secretary Freeman and other officials wash their hands of the problem, even for only this session of Congress, they will have abdicated from an important responsibility.

What can Congress do? It could extend for another year the 1963 program, which provides for acreage allotments, payments for idled land and supports at about $2 a bushel. The program this year probably won't increase the wheat surplus.

Such an extension would give Congress time to study a long-term plan.. And that plan, surely, should provide for getting real adjustment in wheat production in return for Government payments. This inevitably means taking people and land out of wheat growing.

The plan which was voted down would have cut back on the planted acreage of all participating farms. But many farms already are too small to be economically sound units. It is better in our opinion to idle whole farms and to pay the farmers so they may retire from agriculture.

The retirement of land must be handled on a selective basis so that output is cut in those varieties for which the domestic and export markets have less use. In the past it has been the Government practice to lump all wheat together and thus the production of inferior kinds has been encouraged.

Instead of talking about chaos, let the Department of Agriculture provide some real leadership.

Address by Kenneth Mei, President, Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I was honored to be the host-chairman recently on the annual Congressional Weekend in New York where many of our colleagues and their families were entertained. On May 19 we were received by the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association in New York's Chinatown. After luncheon the group was addressed by the distinguished president of the benevolent association, Mr. Kenneth Mei. I commend his remarks to the attention of our colleagues:

ADDRESS BY KENNETH MEI

Distinguished Members of Congress, ladies and gentitmen, as president of the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association, representing over 85,000 Chinese in the New York area, may I extend to you on behalf of the association as well as for myself a most cordial welcome to Chinatown. We in Chinatown have looked forward to your annual visits to the city of New York and have been greatly flattered that you have included Chinatown as part of your tour.

In a sense, however, a visit to Chinatown by our Nation's most distinguished legislators is more than just a gracious compliment to our Chinese community, it is, in a larger sense, a vivid illustration of one of the unique factors in our form of government which makes the United States and the citizens who live here the envy of the world. Indispensable to a democratic government is the contact, rapport, and mutual understanding which exist between those who make the laws and those who have to obey them. No system of laws can successfully endure which is not based on public understanding and support. People who make the laws cannot make them effectively nor legislate wisely without direct contact with the people for a thorough understanding of their needs and problems. In this respect, this occasion for us to get together on this informal basis is not only a delightful social event, but fulfills a useful purpose in allowing us an opportunity for a mutual exchange of views.

I hope that I may be permitted this liberty of expressing to our esteemed Members of Congress some of the problems, desires, aims and aspirations of our people.

First, the Chinese people have long suffered under archaic and discriminatory immigration laws based on race. Thus, under our existing immigration statutes, all Chinese persons of one-half Chinese blood or more, regardless of their country of citizenship or country of birth, must immigrate to the United States under a pitifully meager and oversubscribed immigration quota of 105 persons per year. These rigid restrictions have caused grievous hardship to members of our community and have separated them from their wives, parents and children. Congress has been aware of the inequitable provisions of these immigration laws and there are at present, at least three bills which, in one way or another, would tend to eliminate or ameliorate them. There have been introduced in Congress the Hart bill, the Pell bill, and the Celler bill. Of these bills, we would prefer the Hart bill because of its simplicity, and because it would accomplish, in a large part, the needed reforms. However, the other two bills have many meritorious features which could well be incorporated into the Hart bill. We urge that Members of Congress give these bills their thoughtful consideration and support.

Secondly, while the aforementioned bills in Congress would tend to remove the racially restrictive provisions of the present immigration laws, these bills are deficient in that they fail to make any provision for adjusting the immigration status of many Chinese persons who came to the United States as seamen or crewmen. These persons have lived industrious, law abiding lives in the United States and many of them have been here for as long as 10 to 20 years. They are at the present time unable to obtain any type of permanent residence. Many of these persons are refugees from communism, many of them fled the mainland because of their opposition to the Communist domination of China, and the overwhelming majority of them have since their entry to the United States contributed much to this community by their industry and patriotism. They deserve some immigration legislation to permit them to obtain permanent residence and eventually citizenship. While under the Presidents refugee program, many worthwhile refugees have been paroled into the United States from Hong Kong, we think that it is somewhat inconsistent to allow refugees to immigrate to the United States and at the same time not permit equally deserving refugees who have been in the United States for several years to adjust their immigration status.

Finally, in conclusion, we wish to point out that the majority of the Chinese community here are citizens of the United States. We love this country and honor its traditions. However, like any other ethnic group in the United States, we have strong sentimental and cultural ties to the country of our origin. One of the great virtues of a country such as the United States is that it permits people of various racial strains to live together in peace and harmony and yet allows them to bring to this country from the land of their ancestors the many fine traits, virtues, and cultural customs, all of which tend to make this country one whose strength is founded on the best parts of different cultures. Naturally we are grieved over the misfortunes which have befallen the Chinese mainland and its subsequent occupation by Communist despots. We are totally in sympathy with the aims and objectives of the Chinese Republic on Formosa. We express the fervent hope that the United States will continue its support and friendship with the Chinese Republic on Formosa. We hope that the United States will continue to oppose the admission of Red China to the United Nations and will continue to withhold diplomatic recognition to that country because it has demonstrated over and over again, that it is unworthy of membership in a respectable community of nations and does not deserve diplomatic recognition.

The Chinese community welcomes you today and we assure you that we have been honored by your visit and we shall treasure the memory of this eventful day.

Thank you.

Skepticism—Or Else

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a statement I made before the class of 1963, Columbia College, New York, on Friday evening, May 30, 1963, at the annual senior dinner. The statement follows:

SKEPTICISM—OR ELSE

Do not fear. I have no intention of standing up here patronizingly to pat you on your collective head and play Polonius. Fifty-three years ago when I sat where you do now, I could not know that an era was ending, that I was to step forward into a world that was to be radically reshaped by the thinking of three men—Freud, Marx, and Einstein. Nor could I forsee the tragedy and degradation of man in wars and massacres—nor, for that matter, could I foresee the splitting of the atom, nor, for example, the release of man's energies in the overthrow of colonialism—nor his soaring into space, and so forth. In short, I could not foresee the admixture of good and evil, the bafflement and the wonder, the despair and the elation that was to mould the world as we know it today. Hence, how certain can I be that that which I say today will remain valid in a tomorrow which neither you nor I can really envision.

Nonetheless, I want to try.

In the over 40 years I have been in Congress, the most dismaying, even defeating, experience I have had is to see good minds rust in the illusion that the facts of their youth are the facts of today. They shun the pain of reexamination. Believe me, it is easier to hold on to a conviction than to release it. Because, once, a greater number of men dwelt on the land than in cities, Congress overrepresents the rural. Because so many, in Congress, are self-made men, they deny bitterly that there are those who need help. There are those who vehemently denounce Federal spending but see no contradiction in requesting another dam, another post office, another Federal building for their district. There are those who would make a canon of faith of the "balanced budget." As a matter of fact, only the very poor balance their budget.

The corporation is in debt to its bondholders because it must seek expansion, lest it petrify. The businessman borrows for the future. The family has a mortgage on its home. When the Federal Government spends for conservation, for slum clearances, for aid to education, it is not burdening the future generations; it is enriching them. The Federal Government has its assets to cover borrowing as do the others. The Government's assets are its natural resources, its harbors and ports, its rivers, its manpower, among others. In fact, the very man who relentlessly bedevil the "unbalanced budget" would fold up in horror were business and individuals to balance their budgets. The very wheels of commerce would stop. Yet, it can be political suicide for any politician to challenge the virtues of the "balanced budget." Politically, it would be safer for one to deny his own mother and embrace sin.

Let's turn to another much prated of concept. "A good Congressman is one who never retreats." At all costs, he must stand firm, unyielding, cloaked in self-righteousness, impervious to compromise. Nonsense. Imagine 435 Representatives and 100 Senators, each one of them standing on his own dime, muttering through his teeth "never." Were that so, we'd still be fighting over the Articles of Confederation. In 1957 and again in 1960, I was criticized because I had authored Civil Rights Acts that were not strong enough. Had I and others held on to the A-little-is-insufficient-but-nothing-is-enough-attitude, there would have been no Civil Rights Acts. As Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I am now conducting civil rights hearings on 104 bills. We will get a strong bill this session, but only because we now have the legal blocks upon which to build—the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960. This is not to deny the impetus given civil rights legislation by the occurrences in Birmingham, and in Oxford, and Jackson and in other parts of the North and South. But had the same conditions existed without the two former acts, we would have had to begin on a much lower key.

And so it has been with immigration legislation. Slowly, slowly, there has been liberalization—permanent legislation on the admission of orphans, the expansion of the use of the parole system which enabled the Hungarians and other such to enter, the more expeditious reuniting of families, the wiping out of 10-year waiting lists by declaring them nonquota. Verily, there is a time for sowing and a time for reaping.

I am not saying that one always compromises, nor am I saying one never compromises. What I am saying is that one has to understand the gap between illusion and reality. Rigidity is incompatible with political life.

The years of our life would be simple if we could indeed sink into the soft comfort of the cliché. Let's look for a moment at the criticism of the United States, both abroad and at home. In every country I have visited—India, Italy, Pakistan, Egypt, Germany, Spain, Brazil—I have found the opinionmakers in those countries of the same mind on one aspect of American life. With curious unanimity, they bewail the materialism of the United States—its gadgetry, its washing machines, the automatic automobile shift, and so forth. At home, in orgy of self-flagellation, we beat our own breast, as guilt ridden, our opinionmakers take the same line. I'll ask the same questions here I asked of the Indian intellectual when he scornfully referred to American materialism and gadgetry. "What is so noble about dragging a pail of water 2 miles and up four flights of stairs? What is so degrading about turning a tap and having the water flow? Does back-breaking labor render a person more sensitive to beauty? More sensitive to human relations? Is a woman per se nobler because she washes her linen in the river, pounding upon it with rocks?" On the contrary, I have found that comfort doesn't add fat to the soul—that instead, it releases man's energy so that he can turn his attention from self, alone, and look to what others in society need—that he can, in his time, cultivate the arts and the sciences. Is it a condition precedent to creative to starve in a garret? Could it not be that we have romanticized poverty too long? A materialistic America? When we have sent billions of our wealth to restore shattered nations abroad. Materialistic? When we have sent our Peace Corpsmen to all parts of the world to give help to the less privileged. Materialistic? When we embrace the system of compulsory public education for all, regardless of class or creed. Materialistic? When we have created the largest middle-class group in the world.

Thrown in for good measure is the criticism that we are addicted to cleanliness. Am I being told that we are boors because we don't scratch ourselves when we write or paint—or that it is easier to play the piano in a roomful of scuttling rats? I know that he who accepts the easy generalization, be he conservative or liberal, businessman or artist, farmer or city dweller, suffers from mental anemia.

Will you be capable of asking, "Is this really so?" Will you be capable of saying, "I never thought of that in this way before" when premises are set before you?

So many of our creative people today in the new writing, in art, and in the Theater of the Absurd, are given over to the dramatization of the sick, sick, sick, the lonely, the battered, the despairing. There is an irritating sameness. Imitation follows imitation follows imitation. We ridicule the conformity of fashion but we feel somehow ashamed to apply the same satire to the conformity of art. But, then, again, let me amend that. Perhaps, I, too, have been frozen into attitudes formed in my youth. Perhaps I've missed the impact of the search for new forms of expression. Because there is some conformity, let me not make the mistake of saying there is conformity everywhere.

Let not the mind be cast in stone, enduring but unendurable. Let it, rather, be like the running waters, forever refreshing itself and reflecting the lights and the shadows of living.

Well, I did turn into Polonius, after all.

The Only Guarantee of the Protection of the Rights of All Citizens Lies in the Operation of a Free Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of the current racial tensions and demonstrations is that we are witnessing a breakdown of law and order. A defiance of law enforcement agencies is the order of the day and we are being told by high Government officials that violence must be met by acceptance of all demands under the threat of greater violence.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that limited objectives may be obtained through mob action, but over a period of time the only guarantee that the rights of all citizens will be protected is a rigid adherence to a government of law. Those who would destroy legal procedures to gain immediate ends, may be the final losers in a complete breakdown of the law. The only hope for the survival of this free Nation with all it offers to all the people is in continuing our Republican form of government and not give in to those who would seize the power of dictatorship.

The truth of this hour is ably set forth in an editorial by David Lawrence in the June 10 issue of U.S. News & World Report. I commend to your attention the editorial "The Only Hope," which I include forthwith.

THE ONLY HOPE

(By David Lawrence)

It is easy to become discouraged nowadays. People are worrying about the bad news that covers the front page.

Inside our country, the American system after 174 years—a relatively brief moment in world history—is facing a severe crisis. The monarchial instinct—which motivates the totalitarianism of today—is revealed in the passionate quest for power by individuals and groups even in this free country. The word "democracy" is assumed to be a synonym for "republic," though one relies on a kind of mob rule at times and the other places its hope in the intelligence and restraint of a tolerant majority.

We once wrote fundamental principles into law. We prided ourselves on the concept of a majority will. But little by little we have torn to shreds the basic Constitution and have attempted to justify this as intellectual progress in our changing times.

Plainly, our heterogeneous origins were never intended to be an obstacle to progress. We restricted immigration only for economic reasons. We foresaw the assimilated American as an intelligent citizen who would retain the best of the ethnic qualities of our forebears.

But now a sociological quarrel divides us. The schisms are deep rooted. They are related to psychological differences—largely a residue of centuries of underdeveloped character among millions of individuals.

Fears of intermarriage are the source of our race conflicts of today. Apartheid exists in almost every community, in almost every home. It is imposed not always by law but by custom or by tradition. Britain, France, and Russia have their apartheids, too.

Deeper issues, to be sure, have confronted mankind. The struggles of history have not always led to satisfactory solutions, but in our own country we have usually been willing at least to listen to both sides. Exceptions there have been, and bloodshed has resulted.

In America today, however, we are witnessing an intolerance that would brush aside the processes of law and insist on mob-made rule. Impatience has led to demonstrations in city streets in the North and South which have provoked, and will continue to provoke, violence. It is a high price to pay for a lack of understanding of human relations and the necessity for a government of laws. It is comparable only to the intolerance of the lynch mobs who cried out: "The man is guilty—why wait for the law?"

The end should never justify the means. The Supreme Court was dead wrong in exonerating street demonstrators from responsibility for provoking violence. The administration is making a grave mistake in urging the enactment of Federal laws that will tell the owner of a private business the customers he must serve or the employees he must hire, irrespective of the antagonisms that may be created among other customers or other employees. Are we to use coercion to achieve conformity and thus destroy the constitutional concept of freedom of association?

All these questions will not be resolved at the point of a policeman's gun or by the bayonets of a federalized militia—nor by the threats of violence being expressed by those who are disappointed at the lack of progress on civil rights.

The arbitrary decrees of the courts cannot win victories that endure. Reason can triumph only when there is understanding of the function of the citizenry in a republic governed by a written constitution. The Supreme Court of the United States—whose members are appointed for life—was never designed as an oligarchy or a legislature that would pass laws or proclaim amendments to the Constitution. These powers are reserved to the elected representatives of a sovereign people.

Law imposed by fiat of the few can never solve fundamental differences imbedded in the hearts and minds of men and women who are as dedicated in their belief in individualism as the defenders of religious freedom are devoted to nonconformity.

"Equality" is a misnomer. There are many men of all races who do not equal others in intelligence or in the capacity to earn dollars or win fame in the arts and sciences. Certain individual Negroes can, by their intelligence, achieve in the world of letters or in the field of business or statesmanship or in the professions what many whites will never achieve. But we cannot allocate by blanket rule to any racial group as such the rewards that only individual efficiency, character, morality, and brainpower can earn.

There is only one hope—an informed electorate, an intelligent electorate, a community where in the majority of citizens endeavor to hear both sides. This majority can and will reaffirm in our free Republic that only by the votes of the majority in the National Legislature—not by the executive edicts of the few—shall laws be passed and only by a three-fourths vote of our States and a two-thirds vote of Congress shall the Constitution be considered to be properly amended.

Don't Drive Yourself to Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to serve as a member of the administrative board of the Safety First Club of Maryland. This fine organization has been crusading, since 1956, for safety on our streets and highways.

Among the honors accorded to the organization, the Safety First Club of Maryland received a National Safety Council trophy in 1959 "for outstanding contributions to traffic safety." This was a national award limited to the Safety First Club and 10 other organizations throughout the entire country. In addition, the club received a certificate of appreciation from the National Safety Council and the Advertising Council—

> In grateful appreciation for help given in the 1960 "stop accidents campaign" * * * A campaign designed in the public interest to save lives and thereby make America a safer place in which to live.

The organization believes that traffic supervision and control belong in the sphere of duly constituted experts and authorities; nevertheless, such groups as the Safety First Club of Maryland can render services through planned and consistent safety programs, campaigns and activities aimed at helping to reduce our tragic traffic toll.

Inspired by the action program launched by the President's Committee for Highway Safety, the Safety First Club of Maryland recently sponsored an essay contest revolving around the theme: "Don't Drive Yourself To Death." This project was directed by the organization's officers: Morris A. Kasoff, president; William Ryan, senior vice president; Maurice R. Shochatt, executive vice president; Paul Huddles, delegate; Maurice Cardin and Aaron B. Cohen, vice presidents; Samuel Matz, treasurer; Morton Levinstein, assistant treasurer; Eli Baer, counselor; J. O. Shuger, chairman of the board; and Bernard Potts, vice chairman of the board.

The winning essays carry fine messages worthy of perusal by everyone, whether adult or youth, pedestrian or driver. I deem all three worthy of consideration and request unnanimous consent to have them inserted at this point in the RECORD.

DON'T DRIVE YOURSELF TO DEATH

(By Mrs. John G. Breitenbach, Jr., 3105 Garden Avenue, Parkville, Md., winner of $25 first-place prize)

One of man's primary drives is survival.

If you are a normal, healthy individual, you will go to any length to keep your loved ones from harm.

Yet how often will you load the family into the car, take off on a nice drive and soon forget that your foot is on the trigger of a lethal weapon?

When you forget the common courtesies of the road, you are driving away from survival. You are driving yourself to death.

Laws are made for the good of all the populace. That means not only do driving regulations protect pedestrians and other drivers, they protect your loved ones; they protect you.

Crossing a solid white line to pass another car may get you to your destination a little sooner. It could even get you to your ultimate destination—6 feet under—years ahead of time.

A 25-miles-per-hour speed zone means exactly that—proceed at 25 miles per hour. Taxpayers dole out thousands of dollars each year to experts who study roads and road conditions. These experts know what speeds are safe. If you exceed the posted speed limit, you are going against that primary drive of survival again.

The ancient Egyptian Pharoahs took their entire households to the other world with them when they departed this life. Is this what you are planning?

Or maybe you are just hoping to leave your children with only one parent to guide them.

If someone came into your home and threatened bodily harm to you and your family, you would fight with every fiber of your body to protect your loved ones.

The next time you get into your car for a drive, think for one moment about that basic drive—survival. Maybe, then, you won't drive yourself to death.

DON'T DRIVE YOURSELF TO DEATH

(By Mary Catherine Marshall, Thurmont, Md., winner of $15 second place prize)

Death is of many places, many faces; a cheat, coward, lazy liar, Judas.

He is the hitchhiker going down the road just a little further when you want to pull off to rest. He turns the radio low, hums with the motor, keeps time with the tick of the dashboard clock. Suddenly, no more monotony of the superhighway, just a cold slab in the morgue.

He is the little voice that eggs you on to pass those pokes on a hill; call the guy's bluff who pulls out ahead; show that new driver how a pro does it. But even pros make mistakes, maybe your last.

He goads a kid into drag racing a regular road; a man into drinking that last one for the road. He proves that alcohol and gasoline do not mix; but blood, flesh, broken glass, and metal do. He passes the hat for bets on the best driving time and the same hat for flowers for your grave.

He keeps your mind on your problems and your foot on the gas, while he sees a child dart out in the streets or an old lady walk against the light. Too late, he holds your head while you're sick at the sight and consoles you with, "It wasn't your fault."

He is your proxy at your son's graduation, your daughter's wedding; sleeps in your room, sits in your chair; escorts your beloved to the grave or rides with you in the hearse.

Quarles wrote, "Death has no advantage except when he comes as a stranger." He waits ahead on a corner, around a bend. Don't pick up that stranger.

Don't drive yourself to death.

DON'T DRIVE YOURSELF TO DEATH

(By Kenneth H. Dashiell II, Baltimore, Md., winner of $10 third place prize)

Since the Pithecanthropus Erectus there has been a common denominator in accidents—carelessness.

Od, the caveman, had the habit of always being in a hurry. He quite frequently bumped into his fellow caveman.

Ode, a descendant of Od, invented the wheel. He had a habit of rolling around as fast as he could. He frequently bumped into his fellow caveman, too, but with no real serious accidents.

Amode-Tut, the Egyptian and descendant of Ode and Od, owned a fast, sleek chariot. He often was seen driving around Alexandria at breakneck speed—which, by the way is what happened to him one day as he raced past the temple and into another chariot.

Clodius, still another descendant of Od, the caveman, was an up and coming lawyer in Rome. But one day he was racing through the narrow streets in his four white horse drawn chariot trying to get to the Senate before the meeting when the wheel suddenly flew off and the chariot, with a bewildered Clodius, overturned. There was a fine funeral for the lawyer who was more concerned with business than in the upkeep and maintenance of his chariot.

And in another part of Rome, Clodia yet another descendant of Od and a cousin of Clodius, was happily leaving the Inn now that it was closing. Filled with much wine he hobbled into his chariot and blissfully drove off into the night. Unfortunately, before he reached his home he ran over two fellow countrymen because he could not control his horses.

Od, the caveman had many descendants. There was Odus Smith of the Massachusetts Colony who was driving his wagon when he fell asleep at the reigns. When his horse bolted after being frightened by a snake Odus Smith awoke in a ditch with a broken leg.

And only the other day George Odum smashed his convertible up when his brakes failed to hold at a red light.

As odd as it seems old Od still has plenty of descendants left, despite themselves and they all have one thing in common: quite normal in all other respects, when they get behind the wheel of a car they are careless. They are careless when they exceed the proper speed limit; they are careless if they do not have their vehicle in good operating condition; they are careless when they drink and drive.

And in this case being careless can mean, and often does, a funeral.

Salute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Post of May 24, 1963, saluting our distinguished Vice President for his outstanding work, and for the magnificent efforts by him and his lovely wife, Mrs. Ladybird Johnson, in areas of human compassion, and for their great interest in the well-being of their fellow men.

The article speaks well of this great pair.

SALUTE

It appears to be the fate of Vice Presidents to serve in relative obscurity. But this ought not to obscure the usefulness of what they do in quiet ways. In particular it ought not to obscure the warmth and unstinting compassion with which Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON has used his office for man and healing purposes—or the extraordinary degree in which he has been helped in this service by a lady of exceptional grace, his wife.

A week ago Vice President JOHNSON was given the Distinguished Service Award of the Capital Press Club and accepted this tribute to his efforts in the field of civil rights with an expression of faith that "the day will come when it is not necessary nor remarkable to give or receive human rights awards—not necessary or remarkable simply because justice will be color-blind and all men and women will be judged on their merits and not on irrelevant considerations of ancestry."

And last night at Cleveland, the Volunteers of America gave the Ballington and Maud Booth Award Citation to Mrs. Lyndon Johnson "in grateful recognition of her devoted, untiring and outstandingly successful efforts to marshal the forces for good in our land in behalf of the less fortunate, particularly those who suffer from economic and social disadvantage * * *"

Both awards were richly earned. And we presume that the Vice President will take no offense if we salute with particular appreciation a lady who holds no public office but has nonetheless rendered unstinting and indefatigable public service. Her countrymen owe her the warmest gratitude.

Union Pickets Enter U.S. Fishermen's Dispute With Ecuador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, each Member of Congress will find today's Wall Street Journal editorial, entitled "Union Pickets Enter U.S. Fishermen's Dispute With Ecuador," indicative of the growing national concern of our Government's inability to cope with the flagrant seizures by Ecuador of our American flag tuna clippers.

The Congress should take all immediate steps necessary to implement the denial of pending economic aid and at the same time conduct a reevaluation of our assistance to all foreign countries unfairly harassing the American fishing fleet.

The editorial follows:

UNION PICKETS ENTER U.S. FISHERMEN'S DISPUTE WITH ECUADOR

LOS ANGELES.—The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union entered the dispute between U.S. tuna fishermen and the Ecuadoran Government, and ordered a picket line to halt unloading of a ship laden with Ecuador bananas at Los Angeles.

Two tuna boats based in San Diego, the *White Star* and *Ranger*, were seized May 16 off the coast of Ecuador on a charge of intruding in that nation's territorial waters. Ecuador claims territorial rights 200 miles off its coasts; the United States recognizes a 3-mile limit.

An additional 17 San Diego tuna boats accompanied the *Ranger* and *White Star* to the Salinas, Ecuador, naval base in "voluntary detention." Ecuadoran officials are expected to reach an early decision in action against the two ships, but what may happen to the other 17 isn't clear.

The union, whose members man the tuna boats, said the picket line was established as retaliatory action for Ecuador's seizure of the two U.S. ships.

William Piercy, district director, said the union also plans to picket ships carrying coffee from Ecuador to west coast cities and will ask the International Longshoremen's Association in New York to halt shipments of Ecuadoran bananas along the east coast.

Mr. Piercy said a big shipment of 74,000 stems and 13,000 carbons of bananas is due in Newark, N.J., Thursday or Friday from Ecuador.

Picketed here is the German ship *Asseburg*, carrying a $300,000 cargo of bananas from Bolivar, Ecuador, under contract to Standard Fruit & Steamship Co., Los Angeles.

Charles Velson, manager of Standard Fruit, said 150 longshoremen normally would be needed to unload the bananas. The longshoremen, however, refused to cross picket lines established by Fishermen's Union Local 33 of the Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.

Mr. Velson said the bananas aren't in immediate danger of spoiling, but that "if the line is not removed soon we will invoke the mechanism of our contract. The union has the right to picket when an economic issue is involved, but we do not see such an issue here."

Mr. Piercy said he will request Standard Fruit & Steamship to halt importation of Ecuadoran bananas "until this problem is solved." The company normally brings in a shipload of bananas weekly.

An Eloquent Statement on Birmingham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following column was written by my good friend, Rabbi Dr. Harry Halpern, spiritual leader of the East Midwood Jewish Center in Brooklyn. It appeared in the May 17, 1963, edition of the center's bulletin and is an eloquent statement on what occurred in Birmingham last month. I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

FROM WHERE I STAND—THE RABBI'S PERSONAL COLUMN

I am an American and I am proud of it. I am a citizen of a great country which has harmonized the voices of people of many creeds, colors, and national origins, into a stirring chorus. I glory in the fact that here there is equal protection of the law for everyone, shielding me from the unjust seizure of my property and guarding my right to think, to speak, and above all, to worship God as I see fit. I point with pride to the contributions which my fellow-citizens have made to the happiness and welfare of the world. I rejoice in the realization that no secret police are trailing me or eavesdropping on my conversations. I am thankful that, for the most part, what I will become, is determined not by my birth into a certain group but by my own efforts. All of these things make me glad and proud.

But I am an American and therefore I am also conscience smitten and ashamed. I don't know what one answers when he is asked how Americans tolerate the creation of first and second class citizens, the former, white and the latter, black. I am ashamed because I cannot deny that Negroes have been persistently treated as outcasts and denied the opportunity to be educated, and to be gainfully employed as whites are.

As an American I hang my head in shame and I burn with anger when I learn that cities and States have the effrontery to defy the law of this country in their effort to bolster up a collapsing social order. I am ashamed to face the world after seeing large dogs set upon peaceful paraders in Alabama to prevent them from expressing their protest against segregation.

I am humiliated by seeing the spectacle of those who live in a so-called Bible Belt and who violate the basic principles of all religions. I am confused, as a religious person, in trying to explain how people who profess to believe in God can so maltreat those who are the children of God. I am proud of the fact that 20 of my rabbinical colleagues, at a moment's notice, left our convention to go to Birmingham as a gesture of our sympathy with those who are fighting the battle for freedom in our day as our ancestors fought for it in the past.

As an American and as a religious person, I am proud of America. I glory in its achievements and thrill to its avowed ideals, but I must confess that my joy is not complete. Birmingham has made me somewhat ashamed of being an American. Fire hoses are not baptismal fonts and police dogs are not symbols of peace. Perhaps the Lord distinguishes between saints and sinners, between the just and the unjust, but I am certain that He has no eye for differences in skin color.

Troubles Besetting the World Planners Emphasize the Strength of Capitalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to analyze the motives of the planners who seem to exert such a strong influence on the Kennedy administration. Under the capitalist system the United States is the unchallenged leader in the production of goods, services and opportunities for its people. On the other hand, the nations operating under planned economies, either socialist or Communist, are in deep trouble, the standard of living cannot even approach the meanest of that of American citizens, while scarcity and often hunger replace the abundance and the problems of plenty which confront us here in the United States. In spite of this glaring contrast, clearly visible and understood by the most illiterate of the world, the Kennedy advisers keep urging us to adopt the social system of the have-not nations and give up the private enterprise which is our strength.

One cannot help but be amazed at their plans and projects. Surely it cannot be stupidity for these men are highly educated and come from some of the most famous universities in the world. They are economists of wide reputations, even though their economic theories have never been put into practice. What, then, can be their motive? Could it be that their primary urge is to rule, not govern, to dictate, not be a part of a democratic system, to set themselves up as an elite bureaucracy with life and death power over a whole people?

Whatever the motives of the social planners in the White House, the American people should have no part of their schemes. Our capitalist system has been tried and has proven its worth. We know it can work. We know what it has given to the American people and the world the greater part of two centuries. It is time to tell the theorists and the schemers to go packing and sell their dreams of utopia to the less initiated. It is time for the American people to stop picking up the tab for every socialist and Communist experiment everywhere in the world.

The planners are in trouble all over the world and there is no reason for our taxpayers to bail out socialist India, Communist Russia or her stooges. Our greatest contribution to mankind is to set the example by strengthening our private enterprise system so that those who would be free and who would lift themselves would be able to do so with whatever technical know-how they could use. Our money does not help the poor people of the world. It only strengthens the gangster dictators and the poorly equipped leaders to further exploit their own and, at the same time, endangers the structure of our own society.

I would like ot include, as a part of my remarks, two articles from the June 10 issue of U.S. News & World Report. The first, under the heading "Worldgram from the Capitals of the World," explains how the planners are faring in many countries. The second deals exclusively with the problems of Russia. I commend these articles to you and then hope Congress may take action to stop trying to build socialism and communism and, instead, strengthen our own system of capitalism in the interest of our own people and all mankind:

WORLDGRAM FROM THE CAPITALS OF THE WORLD—NEW DELHI, PARIS, WASHINGTON, BONN

The planners are in deep trouble again. The world's best-known planned economies are floundering badly. Politicians keep messing up the blueprints.

Khrushchev's planned economy is in profound crisis. There's a showdown between Communist politicians and Russia's producers.

Gomulka's planned economy in Red Poland has stalled. Drastic changes are called for in Warsaw. You hear similar reports in other satellite capitals.

Nehru's planned economy is in a jam, his third 5-year plan a flop.

De Gaulle's planned economy, though relatively flexible, is running into inflation troubles. Group pressures are forcing unplanned changes in plans.

Wherever you look, top planners seem to be hung up on uncharted snags.

Nehru, in New Delhi, counts heavily on United States to bail India out of what is called "a quiet crisis" in the Indian economy. In this "quiet crisis"—

Shortage of raw materials has caused slump in industrial output. Capital needed for raw materials has been diverted to government steel mills. Farm output failed to rise for third year in a row. Population, increasing 2.3 percent a year, is outrunning national income, up only 2.1 percent.

India's planners are very much on the spot. Some high officials even have reached the conclusion India's planning agency ought to be abolished.

What alarms Nehru's friends still more is that in 2 weeks the Congress Party, run by Nehru, has lost three by-elections, all to bitter political foes of Nehru. From now on the critics will be heard from in India's Parliament.

Now, in New Delhi, you hear persistent rumors that Nehru, 73 years old, is in failing health and has lost his political touch.

So you can understand why Kennedy-De Gaulle relations are touchy.

De Gaulle, as things stand, has what amounts to a veto on key items in the Kennedy program. It used to be the Khrushchev veto that blocked the United States so often. It still is in the way, but as of now a De Gaulle veto looms larger.

De Gaulle showed his power when he blocked British entry into the Common Market. That was a potent De Gaulle veto, still resented in Washington.

Threat of De Gaulle veto hampers U.S. plans for European nuclear defense.

Another veto can, if De Gaulle wishes, stop the Kennedy round of tariff cuts in its tracks, with considerable damage to U.S. balance of payments.

A united Europe, urged by the United States, can be blocked by a De Gaulle veto. As it is, the De Gaulle and the Kennedy ideas for Europe are far apart.

Also still on the books is the Kennedy suggestion for a "declaration of interpendence" leading to "concrete Atlantic partnership" with united Europe. This can't very well come about if De Gaulle objects and uses his veto.

It's well known that De Gaulle's views conflict with Kennedy's on many basic issues. What's not known is how United States can get around a De Gaulle veto.

In Paris, De Gaulle has his own ideas on how to organize Europe. He is quietly going ahead with them, whatever Washington or London may think.

Key to De Gaulle's plan for Europe is Franco-German partnership. It's an idea he has hammered away at for years. Now the idea is getting a workout. It began, in fact, even before ratification of the Franco-German treaty.

Top defense officials of Paris and Bonn have begun meetings to see how France and West Germany can work more closely together on military matters.

Economic officials from both countries are holding periodic sessions to develop closer economic relations. Scientific - research chiefs are doing the same thing in their field. So are cultural and information experts.

De Gaulle's aides say all this is only the beginning of partnership. The Paris-Bonn get-togethers are to multiply. Already European diplomats are surprised at the degree of Franco-German intimacy.

Adenauer's retirement in favor of Erhard is to make no difference, French say. They don't see how Erhard can disrupt partnership even if he wants to.

To Germans nervous about losing U.S. military support, the French offer reassurance that Germans don't have to choose between United States and France.

To other Europeans fearing a powerful Paris-Bonn axis, the French answer: All you have to do is join the Franco-German pact. It's open to all Europe.

To De Gaulle, Franco-German unity is the grassroots foundation for a unified Europe. De Gaulle's aides say the foundation is well along.

People in Bonn have eyes to the East as well as the West. West German traders, with Bonn's blessing, are pushing into East Europe on a broad front.

Deal with Poland has gone into effect. It's set for 3 years.

Deal with Hungary is in the works. Secret talks are under way now.

Deal with Rumania is expected on the heels of agreement with Hungary.

Renewed deal with Russia is expected to be signed in Moscow late in 1963.

What are the Germans up to? Here's the explanation you get in Bonn:

It's a U.S. idea. The Kennedy administration, according to Bonn officials, thinks it wise for Bonn to improve relations with Soviet satellites. This is in line with the U.S. policy of strengthening independence of the satellites.

Bonn balks at cozy diplomatic relations with Russia's satellites, makes it clear increases in German exports, as result of deals, are to be minor.

Still, the new agreements open European doors wider to German trade. The machinery and equipment producers of the Ruhr are all for that.

In the Congo, this is what an American visiting Leopoldville was told by an African educated in France and known to be strongly anti-Communist:

"I have decided I want my son to accept that university scholarship he has been offered in Moscow. You ask why? After a year in Moscow my son is bound to come back as a confirmed capitalist. If I sent him to study in Paris, he probably would come back with Communist ideas."

WHAT'S REALLY GONE WRONG IN RUSSIA?

(Interview with a leading British Authority on Soviet Affairs)

(Has Russia outgrown Khrushchev? Inside the Soviet Union, nearly everything seems to be going wrong for Soviet rulers. Planning has gone awry. It has been one failure after another on the farms. The system is unable to fulfill people's wants. Carping and criticism have become commonplace. Why? Is communism losing its grip? Is a management class replacing the politicians? In this exclusive interview, one of Britain's top experts on Russia, Prof. Leonard Schapiro, tells what to expect. Mr. Schapiro was interviewed by Joseph Fromm of the international staff of U.S. News & World Report.)

(At London)

Question. Mr. Schapiro, there seems to be more and more evidence that the Communist system is in real trouble in Russia. What's the basic trouble?

Answer. It's because of the inherent inefficiency. The inefficiency caused by overcentralization. The inefficiency caused by the fact that no one and no institution ever knows the limits of its authority, whether it is a council of national economy, a ministry or, at a lower level, a local soviet or even a local party organ.

Everyone always feels that something is likely to interfere from the top. It's "government by telephone"—this business of using the mechanism of central authorities to intervene at any point where they wish. That's the basic principle on which ultimately the country is governed. And it cannot provide the efficiency which modern society needs.

Question. Is part of the trouble within the Communist Party system, itself?

Answer. The party leaders have a very vested interest in prserving it. They have a very strong vested interest in saying that the party must always guide, that the party is the best element.

But that is ceasing to be true. The party is not the best element. The best elements, I think, are beginning to go into rather more important work on the technical side. They are becoming the technicians.

Question. Is that bad for the Communists?

Answer. As I see the dilemma of the Soviet Government today it is this: If they want an efficient, modern society, they must let the technicians run it without constant interference from party officials. But if they do this, then the party will cease to have any reason for existence.

Question. In view of this dilemma, are the leaders who will exentually succeed Khrushchev likely to change things?

Answer. It may well be that those who are the new generation of Communists are much more in the nature of rather tough, practical operators who think that they must put an end to inefficiency in the country. They may think that they must make all branches of life in the Soviet Union match the very high degree of efficiency which has been achieved in parts of industry, in space travel, in science and in the development of weapons and the like.

It may well be that will be the mood and that the new leaders will turn away from the policy of advancing world Communism. They may well regard this as being an unnecessary obsession of their elders which might as well be forgotten.

It's not inevitable, but there is a reasonable chance that the next generation—Khrushchev's successors—might go in for rather radical change toward more rational policies for the simple reason that they are not revolutionaries.

The revolution is just a legend to them. The men of 40 played no part in the revolution or in the civil war. That's just something that grandfather told them about. Besides, they are, on the whole, people who have a lot to lose.

Question. These people you are talking of—the people coming up—are they more managers than they are politicians?

Answer. Yes. That's exactly what they are.

They probably have a considerable contempt for the bulk of the population as being a lot of selfish clods who only need proper managing.

I think they probably are less interested in dogma, less obsessed with what might be called the Lenin-Stalin style. Therefore, I should have thought they would be more likely to take a pragmatic and practical course. So it is conceivable that we might see a very considerable change in the Soviet Union when these younger men take over.

Question. You were talking earlier about the Soviet Union's troubles caused by central planning. Can you give us an example?

Answer. Well, consider for a moment the dilemma facing them in agriculture. One of the logical things to do with agriculture would be to allow a much greater degree of decision on the spot by the farmers on what they should grow.

That, of course, would soon involve a market economy for determining prices. And this in turn would involve abandonment of the whole idea that agriculture should be planned from the top by the party.

Now, the party is afraid that, if you do that, then peasants will be able to blackmail the machine by refusing to produce unless certain political demands are met. That's been the fear of the regime certainly since the time of Stalin, if not Lenin.

Question. So, are the politicians interfering increasingly with the managers, the technicians?

Answer. No. I think in some respects it is rather the reverse. I think the politicians are now sometimes being forced by circumstances to take a back seat.

Question. You mean yield more power to the technicians?

Answer. Yes, I think that's right.

But there is also another factor. You see, under Stalin, they had a fairly primitive economy. They were merely concerned with developing the more basic economic products, such as steel, at an enormous expense of the consumer side of life. To do that, they needed political direction. They had to force people to do something they didn't want to do.

But that isn't what the economy looks like today. Today there is, of course, still concentration on the means of production, but there is also a good deal more concession to consumer demand. That means that the economy becomes much more complex. It means that central planning becomes much more difficult. Indeed, according to quite a few economists—including some Soviet economists—central planning becomes impossible. Whether they like it or not, they have to make more concessions to local initiative to local interests. And that means less party interference.

Question. From the standpoint of efficiency, how different is the situation now from what it was in the time of the czars?

Answer. Well, the imperialist government was inefficient, heaven knows. But the difference that strikes me is that it was developing something in the nature of real institutions.

In the last years, it was developing something in the nature of real institutions of local government. It did develop something in the nature of a free parliament.

Now, apart from the war, the reason why the imperialist government collapsed was because it never really went with the stream. The logical and rational stream of development in Russia in the decade before the First World War was in the direction of a form of constitutional and democratic government. Now, the Emperor and some of his advisers were very reluctant to allow that to happen.

At the same time, society was dissatisfied and the revolutionary forces were growing. So the imperial government was faced by the dilemma that either it had to adapt—which meant yielding some of its authority—or resort to the kind of terrorism that Stalin employed in his time. But the autocracy was not prepared to do either. Therefore the collapse of the regime was written on the wall.

Question. Isn't that precisely the dilemma that faces the rulers of Soviet Russia now—the Communists?

Answer. There is a considerable parallel between the two situations.

Question. Will the result be the same—collapse of the regime?

Answer. We don't know yet. There may be a return periodically to terror which would keep the regime going for a bit longer. They have shown in the past that they don't hesitate to use forms of terror. On the other hand, I don't think we can say they are not going to adapt to the needs of a modern society. After all, at present the country is being run by people in their fifties and sixties. Khrushchev himself is 69. Now those are people for whom the style of government is in a sense the style of Stalin. When younger men come to the top after Khrushchev's death or retirement, it's conceivable that they might prove themselves a little more adaptable. They might be prepared to suffer the process of adaptation to a greater extent. Therefore, what happened in 1917 need not necessarily be repeated.

Question. If it doesn't collapse, is the Communist system in Russia going to be compelled to change more and more?

Answer. Well, it already has changed in character. Since the time of Stalin it has changed very considerably. It still is changing.

Khrushchev is, I suppose, the greatest squarer of the circle that has ever been known.

He is trying to retain essential control by the party and at the same time trying to do it without an all-around system of terror.

Now, the Soviet system is essentially an absurd system. But if you retain enough force you can keep a system like that going for a very long time. Stalin knew exactly how to do that.

Khrushchev, however, is trying to keep the system going without the enormous amount of terror and compulsion that Stalin employed. He is trying to get people to cooperate almost voluntarily. I, personally, have great doubts as to whether in the long run this is politically possible at all.

Question. Why do you call the Soviet system "absurd"?

Answer. It seems to me essentially absurd to expect that in the long run people will accept the dictatorship of a small, self-appointed group whose authority doec not rest on any visible legitimacy—does not rest, for example, on free elections.

Its authority rests on certain theoretical propositions which this group claims give them a superiority. It claims it has the historical right to be the dictatorial party. That is all very fine on paper.

But those are not ideas that evoke a natural response from the ordinary man. Therefore, you must have a very high degree of compulsion.

That is why I think there is an inherent absurdity—or an inherent contradiction—if you try to do the same thing without compulsion.

Of course, if you think that you can indoctrinate human beings over the years really to believe these ideas, that's another matter.

But I don't believe they can do that, and the evidence indicates that, in fact, it is not happening that way at all. I notice that the young people seem to be the most skeptical.

TROUBLE, TOO, IN KHRUSHCHEV'S EMPIRE

(Not only the Communists of Russia are in trouble. There is trouble for Communists, too, in the satellite countries of Eastern Europe. Nationalism, which Reds tried to crush, is rising fast.)

VIENNA.—A mood of independent nationalism is surging through the Eastern European countries at a time when Nikita Khrushchev has troubles of his own inside the Soviet Union.

Out of Czechoslovakia, normally the least troublesome of Russia's satellites, came admissions of activity by organized anti-Communists.

Seven youths drew jail sentences of up to 3 years for leading anti-Government May Day demonstrations in Prague. And 11 persons are charged with "creating unrest." Five workers in Budweis, south of Prague, got 4 to 10 years in prison for handing out "antistate" leaflets.

The mood behind these activities by the usually obedient Czechs is evident all over the Russian's satellite empire in Eastern Europe. Here is the report of a Westerner just returned from one of many business trips to the satellite capitals:

"In Warsaw, Budapest and Bucharest, even in Sofia and Prague, you get the impression that people are on the move into nationalism all over the Russian empire in Eastern Europe. And the only direction they can go is out—away from Soviet control.

"Don't look for anything drastic, like the Hungarian revolt of 1956. If such a revolt flared, it could be crushed again by Russian troops. What is happening now is far more subtle, perhaps more dangerous and certainly more difficult for the Communists to handle.

"Take Rumania: It has earned a lot of money from oil. Now the Rumanians are ready to spend it and they are feeling their oats. They are getting Western Europeans to build petrochemical factories, plastic and wood-product mills, quite an industrial complex.

"Rumanian missions are running around Western Europe and other areas looking for business for Rumania. They are ignoring COMECON, the Moscow office that is supposed to approve all such business deals made in the Communist empire. The Rumanians are getting cocky, talking like Rumanians rather than like Russian stooges. Poles, Hungarians—they are more nationalistic than ever, but you always expect that in Warsaw and Budapest.

"Even the Bulgarians, who always have liked the Russians as people, seem to be getting more nationalistic, more Bulgarian, now.

"Czechs and Slovaks in the recent past have been quiet, well-behaved as could be, toeing the Moscow line. Now they are somehow changing. The Czechs are hard workers, accustomed to doing business in the West. With Moscow's permission they are traveling all over the world as traders and technicians. Only now they seem to be more independent, confident, less subservient to Moscow.

"All these people of Eastern Europe have a fine sense of Moscow's hand on the leash. They sense, somehow, that Khrushchev has too much trouble at home to be tough with them. So they are stepping out, showing scorn for their own Reds, ignoring ideology. They are turning nationalist. And that means trouble for Russia."

Unfair Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, a trial examiner of the Civil Aeronautics Board recently rejected Northeast Airline's request for a permanent franchise to provide service from Boston to Florida. Northeast has been operating with a temporary franchise since 1957, and needs permanent certification on this route in order to stay in business. The opinion of the people of New England is best summed up by the following editorial which appeared in the Chelsea Record on May 31, 1963:

UNFAIR DISCRIMINATION

Northeast Airlines, one of the most popular flying out of nearby Logan Airport, is making a fight to keep its Florida runs in the face of stiff opposition of the competition and the unfair assessment of the situation by Government officials.

Six years ago the Civil Aeronautics Board said there should be three airlines operating the East Coast-Florida market, and Northeast was given a temporary 5-year permit.

Let's see what's happened since then. It is expected that nearly one-half million Florida passengers will be carried by Northeast in the current year. More than 400,000 were carried in 1963.

During the past 4 months Northeast has carried approximately 60 percent of all Miami-bound passengers from Boston; 40 percent of all Miami-bound passengers from Philadelphia; 25 percent of all Miami-bound passengers from New York.

The affairs of Northeast are looking up, very definitely. It has proved that its Florida flights are popular and profitable. In addition, approximately 60 percent of all passengers going from Boston to Washington and Boston to Philadelphia, fly Northeast.

In the face of all of this increased business and mounting revenue how, in the name of justice, reason and fairplay can the Civil Aeronautics Board deny a permanent license to Northeast to continue the east coast and Florida routes, when it has proved so conclusively that it can do so efficiently, satisfactorily, and profitably?

We mention the financial factor because the Government Board thinks the line is not sufficiently strong in the field. It is so much stronger and better off now than when this same agency granted the original temporary permit, that to deny it now is to admit they were wrong in the first place.

Northeast was given an opportunity to see what it could do. The service it gives proves it is necessary. It has proved that it can do the job and its qualifications speak for themselves.

Northeast deserves the right to continue. An adverse decision in the Florida route case would unquestionably bring about the demise of a carrier which has fought so hard to remain an entity in the airline business. This would be tragic for all of New England and especially the Boston area, Northeast's stockholders, and its hundreds of loyal employees.

Runaway Dads Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Hammond (Ind.) Times, in the following editorial, sets out reasons for Congressman DENTON's bill on wife and child desertion and why it should be enacted into law. "Bring them back."

RUNAWAY DADS

A man steals a car, drives it across a State line, and abandons it. The Federal Bureau of Investigation is empowered to track him down and bring him to trial.

Another man is responsible for the support of one or more children. He is under a State court order to pay so much per week or month in child support money, as part of a divorce or paternity suit settlement. He decides to cross a State line and abandon this responsibility. The FBI can't touch him.

So who takes care of the children involved? The taxpayer, through welfare payments.

This situation makes welfare people like Fred H. Steininger, director of the Lake County Department of Public Welfare, grind their teeth in frustration. That is why he is appealing for public support of a bill introduced in Congress by Representative WINFIELD K. DENTON, Democrat, of Indiana. This would make it a Federal offense for a man to run away to another State to avoid payment of court-ordered support to children.

This law has become known familiarly as the "runaway pappy" act. It was proposed in Congress 9 years ago, but met defeat on the ground that reciprocal agreements between States, to catch these runaways and force them to pay up, make a Federal law unnecessary.

Steininger does not agree with this at all.

The Lake County Department of Public Welfare has filed numerous actions in courts of other States to compel runaways to pay up, under reciprocal agreements. The results have been extremely disappointing.

In 1959, the Lake County department field 108 cases in 29 different States. In only 32 cases (30 percent) did the other States choose to act.

But even where the other States acted, results were poor. In the 32 cases on which action was taken, judges ordered $13,778 paid. The runaway fathers actually paid up only $1,713, or 12.4 percent, of this ordered amount.

Results were slightly better, but only slightly, in 1960 and 1961.

And during the period from January 1962, to May 10, 1963, according to a just-released welfare department study, results did not improve markedly. During the 16½-month period, Lake County filed 164 cases in courts of other States. In only 47 percent of the cases filed (78) did State courts order support payments.

In these 78 cases on which action was taken, $23,784 in support money was ordered paid. But of that amount, less than one-quarter was actually paid, the sum of $5,659.

Lake County is doing a good job of cooperating with other States in locating "skips" who settle here and forcing them to assume their responsibility of support.

Other States, however, are not reciprocating. Some officials just don't give a hang about the problem of supporting children in another State. Others are so busy they don't have the time to track down the runaways. The deserting fathers must be found by social agencies, through various detective techniques.

Unfortunately, only about half of them can be located by these methods.

Some object to the idea of a Federal law such as that sponsored by the Evansville Congressman, on the ground that it would further burden the FBI with responsibilities. To which Mr. Steininger has an apt answer—isn't the crime of deserting a family by running across a State line more serious than stealing a car and driving it across a State line?

Representative DENTON's "runaway pappy" bill now pending in the present Congress (H.R. 3968) is well worthy of support on several grounds, not the least of which is the idea of reducing the expenditures of public funds, to support children who should be the responsibility of the man who fathered them.

Manpower: A Serious National Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at the 50th anniversary dinner of the Indiana Vocational Association, Dr. M. D. Mobley, executive director of the American Vocational Association, Inc., made a speech which will be of interest to every Member of Congress.

His talk, concerning manpower, a vital American problem, was adapted for an article Dr. Mobley wrote for the May 1963 issue of the American Vocational Journal. The article will prove to be both interesting and informative, as it explains the needs for providing "present and oncoming generations" with more adequate and effective programs of vocational and technical education.

MANPOWER: A SERIOUS NATIONAL PROBLEM

(By Dr. M. D. Mobley, executive secretary, American Vocational Association)

Vocational and technical education will be emphasized more in the next 5 years than it has been for the past 30 years. This is a necessary development if the Nation is to meet its manpower requirements in the period ahead. The movement is already underway in many States. It will be interesting to watch the economic growth of those States.

To understand some of our manpower problems, we should take a look at certain existing facts and things that are expected to take place during the sixties. We are all aware of the fact that our Nation is presently experiencing a population explosion and that we are going through an industrial and agricultural revolution.

By 1970 our population will reach 200 million—an increase of 28 million during the sixties.

Advancing technology will continue at an accelerated rate which in the future will make many occupations of today obsolete. Never in the history of our Nation has there been a greater need for making training available to prepare people for available jobs—and may I hasten to add—there are jobs available.

The sixties will record an unprecedented growth in the American labor force. The 26 million new young workers entering the labor market during this decade represent a 46-percent increase over the fifties. This is not a time for regret, but rather a time for hope and planning. Those States that plan well and execute their plans will move forward in economic growth. Those States that fail to make and execute adequate plans will stagnate and cease to develop economically.

The great increase in young workers under 25 years of age has tremendous implications for occupational guidance and vocational education. If they are to find appropriate and satisfactory employment, and thus help maintain the high standard of living we enjoy today, they must have effective occupational guidance—and a large percent of them must receive vocational training of less than baccalaureate degree. This poses a serious challenge to all the States in our Nation.

ONE-THIRD MORE YOUTHS

By 1970 we will have each year approximately 3 million additional young workers entering the labor market. This is one-third more than the 2 million who started their work careers in 1960.

In the years ahead employers will require at least high school diplomas for more and more jobs. In addition, they also will require specialized vocational training for a higher percentage than was true in the past. As technology continues to advance, there will be fewer and fewer jobs available for unskilled and semiskilled workers and more and more jobs for highly skilled workers and technicians.

Today in the United States we have more than 4½ million unemployed people. This constitutes almost 6 percent of our work force of almost 68 million people.

At present we have in the United States a million youth out of school and out of work. The tragedy of this situation is that a large percentage of these youth are not only unemployed but are unemployable because they do not possess marketable skills. In other words, they don't know how to do anything efficiently.

Dr. James B. Conant, former president of Harvard University, in his book "Slums and Suburbs," refers to these unemployed youth as "social dynamite."

Of the 26 million new young jobseekers who will enter the labor market during the 1960's, 7½ million will not have graduated from high school, and 2½ million will not have completed the eighth grade. This means almost 40 percent of the 26 million new jobseekers will not have completed high school.

Approximately 30 percent of the school dropouts are destined for unemployment. Unemployment among young people, under 21 years of age, constitutes one of the most disturbing aspects of our entire unemployment picture.

Another disturbing feature of our manpower problem is the fact that though we have serious unemployment, especially among youth, there are hundreds of thousands of jobs going begging begging because people or not trained to hold and perform efficiently in these jobs.

This paradox of jobs going begging in a period of high unemployment was portrayed splendidly in an article that appeared in the January 1963 issue of the Reader's Digest under the title "Why Johnny Can't Get a Job." In this article the writer points out, "Furniture manufacturers, short of cabinetmakers, are importing them from Europe. New York Employment Service executives report that jobs go unfilled in 61 skilled trades." The article ends with this very striking statement, "The lopsided picture of jobs begging for men while men beg for jobs suggests that something must be done to bring the two together. That something must be a new kind of schooling for today's needs."

The article further pointed out, "that only 1 percent of all public school funds are spent on vocational training, less than 1 percent in some big cities."

The problem has become so serious that in late 1961 President Kennedy had appointed a Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education to study and make recommendations for improving and expanding vocational and technical education. The panel was composed of 25 outstanding Americans. With the assistance of a very capable staff, the panel carried on a nationwide study of vocational and technical education of less than baccalaureate degree. Dr. J. Chester Swanson, director of the panel staff, described the problem as "the greatest problem facing American education today."

Not too long ago, Dr. Kenneth E. Carl stated to a congressional committee, while explaining a survey on unemployment he had made in Pennsylvania, the following:

"I found that in Pennsylvania, with one-tenth of the unemployment in the United States, we had jobs available. I composed a list of 228 occupations for which there were jobs open, and 197 of these occupations were seeking people with less than college training but with very definite skills. All of these occupations were listed with the Pennsylvania State Employment Service. Jobs are going begging in the midst of serious unemployment. But, I emphasize, they are skilled jobs—jobs for which prior training is a must.

MACHINES REPLACE WORKERS

The January 1963 issue of the Kiplinger magazine, Changing Times, carried a very informative article under the heading "More Jobs Through Better Training." This article points out that automation wipes out around 35,000 jobs a week—that's 1,800,000 workers displaced each year by machines and new techniques.

The Kiplinger magazine article raises the question, "Will you be affected?" and answers the question by saying, "Yes," if you fall into one of the following groups:

1. If you are over 45 and have not kept up with technological changes.
2. If you are under 20 and dropped out of school.
3. If you don't have a modern skill.
4. If you live in a depressed area.

The article points out some of the things workers of today can do to prevent being among the unemployed. In general, it means more vocational-technical training to keep abreast of changing times.

Then, we should not overlook the implications of our manpower problems as they relate to our economic growth and our efforts to continue to lead the world in the production and distribution of goods and services.

Russia's Khrushchev already has made known in no uncretain terms Soviet economic plans. Not so long ago he said to an American newspaperman, and I quote:

"We declare a war we will win over the United States. The threat to the United States is not the intercontinental ballistic missile, but in the field of peaceful production. We are relentless in this, and it will prove the superiority of our system."

In his speech to the Economic Club in New York during his visit to this country in 1959, Khrushchev said:

"All of you are well aware of the fact that we are offering you economic competition. Some describe this as our challenge to the United States of America. But, it was the United States that first challenged the world; it is the United States that developed its economy above that of all countries. For a long time no one dared to challenge your supremacy. But now the time has come when there is such a state which accepts your challenge, which takes into account the level of development of the United States of America and, in turn, is challenging you. Do not doubt that the Soviet Union will stand on its own and in the economic competition, will overtake and outstrip you."

I do not believe Khrushchev's statements are true—that Russia will overtake and surpass us—but they do reveal Soviet goals—and we should not take them lightly.

While in Karachi, Pakistan, in late 1957, I saw positive evidence of Russia's attempt to battle us and other free nations for the markets of the world. While there I visited the exhibit of Soviet manufactured goods being offered for sale in that foreign country. The exhibit included tractors, grain drills, pumps for irrigation, automobiles, motorcycles, machine tools, sewing machines, bicycles, scales, meat grinders, microscopes, electric percolators, cameras, watches, porcelain, and many other items. Placed on each exhibit was the name of the local concern where it could be purchased, and in some cases the prices were displayed.

The products I saw were well made. In fact, many of them appeared to be carbon copies of American manufactured products and goods manufactured in other countries.

For example, the cameras were almost identical with the German Leica camera. The tractor for sale looked very much like the American made John Deere.

The thing that alarmed me was the fact that the prices were much lower than the prices of similar goods manufactured in this country. For example, the tractor on display was being offered for 5,000 rupees which at the rate of exchange was a little more than $1,000. The same tractor in the United States was then selling for well over $2,000.

As a part of Soviet economic plans, Russia is not reorganizing its entire system of education. The new reorganization law calls for a greatly expanded program of vocational and technical education—patterned somewhat after the programs we, in the United States, have been developing in vocational and technical education during the past 40 years. Soviet leaders are acting on the theory that success in winning an economic war is dependent in large measure upon the skill and productivity of their people—which must come through specialized training.

The President's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education has recommended a great expansion in all phases of vocational education. The panel report points out that 8 out of 10 Americans will never finish college—that the greatest educational need for our Nation is to provide adequate and effective programs of vocational and technical education for the 8 out of 10 Americans.

Last year the national Congress approved, by an overwhelming majority, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 which calls for the development of specialized vocational training to meet the needs of at least some of our unemployed. The most optimistic supporters of this measure were frank in stating that this measure is not a panacea for solving our Nation's unemployment problem; nor is it a panacea for meeting our vocational training needs. It will—we hope—result in helping many unemployed youth and adults acquire skills and knowledge they must have in order to find employment.

It is presently my privilege to serve as a member of the National Advisory Committee on Manpower which is composed of 10 people. So far I have been impressed greatly with the progress that has been made in the manpower development and training program. Of those who have thus far been trained under provisions of this program, approximately 90 percent have found satisfactory employment in occupations for which they were trained.

From knowledge I have gained from my experience on this National Advisory Committee, I am convinced that we will be faced for many years with unemployment problems. Advancing technology and new techniques combined with automation and other labor-saving devices will result in the dislocation of workers for many years to come. We must either be prepared to take care of these workers through doles or through training them for jobs where they can become self-supporting, tax-paying citizens rather than living on funds provided from the public till.

As the result of the efforts to deal with our manpower problems, the great American giant is beginning to stir. Throughout the Nation—in State after State—great strides are being made to develop new vocational facilities and to improve old ones—facilities that will help provide our present and oncoming generations with a more adequate and effective program of vocational and technical education.

I wish that time would permit me to tell you about what is taking place in all the States. Permit me to mention only a few.

Connecticut in the past few years has spent more than $40 million to expand and improve its physical facilities for vocational and technical education. Georgia is building more than 20 area vocational-technical schools—at a cost of nearly $30 million—that will serve the entire population of that State. These are new facilities.

California is making great strides in expanding and improving its program of vocational and technical education. Louisiana has 27 State-owned and operated area vocational-technical schools. Many other States are on the move to provide adequate vocational training opportunities for their people. Canada is in the process of spending more than $400 million for vocational and technical education facilities.

In closing, may I call to your attention something that is almost certain to occur. The States that do the most to develop and improve vocational and technical education programs in the 1960's will be the States that will lead the Nation in economic growth and in providing work opportunities for their people in the 1970's. If you want to determine the status of any State in the Nation during the 1970's, look at their activities in the field of vocational and technical education during the 1960's. The States that lag behind in vocational education in the 1960's will lag behind in economic growth in the 1970's.

Disappearing Wilderness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the heritage of our natural wonders—our wildlife, forests, and scenic wonders—are in danger of being lost to future generations as our civilization enlarges and spreads out into untouched areas. The destruction of the virgin wilderness would be irreparable.

Abraham Lincoln said:

> The legitimate object of Government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all or cannot do so well for themselves in their separate capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, the Government ought not to interfere.

Preservation of America's disappearing wilderness, lost forever if destroyed, is a legitimate activity of the American people's Federal Government.

The following editorial, from the May 23 issue of Macomb (Ill.) Daily Journal, relates how public works enthusiasts are ruining the beautiful Ozarks of the southern Middle West:

THE WILDERNESS BILL

> The so-called wilderness bill has been approved by an overwhelming majority in the Senate and is expected to win House approval if given committee clearance. Final enactment of this measure would mean one of the greatest forward steps in conservation in history.
>
> Under the wilderness bill a number of vast areas would be set aside to be preserved in their natural state. Generations of the future would be guaranteed the enjoyment of outdoor areas that would otherwise fall victim to one or another kind of commercial development.
>
> Heads of both parties favor the program because the need for it is so obvious, and there is realization that it may soon be too late. It also must be granted that the program is one the United States can well afford. It has more land than it can use.
>
> Another powerful argument for the bill is that the Government should as a matter of right make amends for some of the destruction of natural beauty that it has permitted or has, itself, engaged in. It would to some extent be making amends if it let nature rule in the selected areas.
>
> An excellent example of needless destruction and a spot marked for preservation are in the Missouri Ozarks, often visited by many Macomb area residents. There the Currant River is about the only mountain river remaining in its natural state.
>
> Many years ago a dam was built on the White River to form Taneycomo Lake. The lake has since become a giant mud hole that is heavily silted. When float trips on the White below Taneycomo were possible, the White was sparkling clear until midmorning. Then boats were overtaken by the tidewater released from the dam, and the river became clouded with the heavy load of silt.
>
> In more recent years and at heavy public expense Bull Shoals Dam was built. It has formed another huge lake and wiped out more miles of river. That is the pattern of operations everywhere: build a power dam for mismanagement by a group of socialistic bureaucrats. The load put on taxpayers and the destruction of natural beauty are meaningless.
>
> The wilderness bill provides for preservation of a large tract on the Currant River. It is an indescribably beautiful stream as every Ozark river was until the destroyers moved in. It is not enough that only the Currant can be saved, but that's about the best that can be done at this late date.

The Nonfarmer Asks for Parity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, since the defeat of the wheat referendum 2 weeks ago we have been hearing various interpretations of the significance of that vote. In particular, we have been hearing that the vote did not really mean that the farmers of this country want a free market but rather that they want more high price supports and unlimited production. If this is, in fact, the case, it is not at all evident to me, nor, I think, is it evident to a great many of my colleagues who have heretofore grudgingly supported costly price supports for the Nation's farmers.

Edward Higbee, professor of land utilization at the University of Rhode Island, has written an excellent summary of the current controversy over farm legislation which appeared in last Sunday's New York Times magazine. I commend it to my colleagues. The article follows:

NOW THE NONFARMER ASKS FOR PARITY—THE VOICE OF THE URBAN CITIZEN IS BEGINNING TO BE HEARD, ASKING WHY HE SHOULD DO WITHOUT NEEDED SERVICES IN ORDER TO PAY SUBSIDIES THAT MAKE BIG FARMERS BIGGER

(By Edward Higbee)

> American agriculture has rarely had it so good. New methods enable efficient farmers to grow more and more at less and less cost to them. The fast-growing population in cities and suburbs buys more than ever, and at higher prices. And much of what cannot be sold to urban consumers the Government has guaranteed to buy. Largely under the pressure of its surplus acquisition activities, the Department of Agriculture's budget last year reached $7.2 billion—a sum exceeded only by the costs of defense and interest on the national debt.
>
> Now organized agriculture—notably the American Farm Bureau Federation—is maneuvering to keep its grip on the taxpayer's wallet. On May 21, wheat growers voted to reject a Government program which would have given the quid pro quo of high price supports in return for farmers' acceptance of compulsory limits on production. Obstensibly, the farmers were choosing freedom for the rugged individualist to grow as much as he wishes—and to risk taking whatever the open market will pay him. There was talk that wheat prices might drop from $1.85 a bushel at present to $1.10 or less.

Actually, the Farm Bureau strategists had no desire to run the risks of a free market. They were counting on their political leverage to force Congress into setting new Federal floor prices for wheat. Then they would have the best of both possible worlds—unlimited production, and a guaranteed selling price. The taxpayer, of course, would get an even bigger bill next year than last.

The scheme may yet go through. But there is some new thinking on Capitol Hill. The voice of the urban citizen is beginning to be heard. It is he who goes without public services he needs in order to pay for the farm program. And after 30 years it is becoming clear that Federal subsidies are not solving the farm problem.

The irony of the Federal agriculture program is that the bulk of the taxpayers' money goes to the few biggest farmers, who are already enjoying bigger incomes than most taxpayers. Poor farmers hear only the whistle of the gravy train as it goes by.

To understand what is happening inside American agriculture it is necessary to recognize that the players at the top and the players at the bottom are not in the same league.

The years since 1935 have been the years of heaviest public spending to save the "small family farm," yet during these years the number of farm units dropped from 6,800,000 to 3,708,000. From 1930 to 1960 the number of big farms—more than 1,000 acres—upped their holdings from 23 to 49 percent of all the agricultural land in the country. It might be said that while the family farm survived America went a long way toward getting rid of the farm family.

Today, the top 9 percent of all the Nation's farm produce as much as the bottom 91 percent. Federal aid to farmers is distributed in about the same proportions. This is understandable since Government bonuses and subsidies are granted not according to need but according to capacity to produce. A farmer who gets a price support loan on one bale of cotton gets one one-thousandth as much as a farmer who puts 1,000 bales under Government seal. Because of mass-production methods, the big producer is almost invariably more efficient than the little producer. Thus, the kind of price support that barely sustains the little man becomes a prod to the big man to go all out to stuff Government warehouses.

The soil bank is no solution for this kind of overproduction. Under that voluntary scheme the poorest land under the poorest management is set aside for Government payments. Meanwhile, the best land under the best management is made to yield bigger surpluses than ever—also for the public to subsidize. Thus two payments may be extracted from the taxpayer where only one has been extracted before.

Under pressure to save the small family farm, Congress has rigged an incredible system of bonus handouts, retirement payments and price supports which has made high-speed, big-investment agriculture one of the most profitable enterprises in the country. This situation draws much outside money into agriculture. Large-scale operations are assembled while the little family farm that is short on cash but long on home-grown labor goes out of business. Thirty-four percent of all farms purchased in 1960 were bought by persons who were not farmers.

Capital gains on farm real estate for the decade of the 1950's averaged 8.5 percent per year. This was hardly a sympton of serious economic trouble. Farm mortgage debt increased only $6.5 billion between 1940 and 1961; in the same period, the value of all farm assets went up $119 billion. This was scarcely indicative of distress. In 1961, farm mortgage debt was only 10.4 percent of farm real estate values. Few city people are so solvent.

The financial plight of American agriculture, as it is usually presented for popular consumption, is largely a statistical fabrication derived by lumping the farm incomes of inefficient, part-time and semiretired operators with those of efficient, full-time professionals. If children's lemonade stands were included in a census of retail establishments in the same manner, even the A. & P. could be shown to qualify for Government aid. The true nature of farm operations is shown by the detailed data of the 1959 Census of Agriculture, the publication of which was just completed early this year. The Nation's 3,708,000 farms can be divided into three classes.

FIRST CLASS

At the top of the agricultural pyramid is a small but vigorous first class of only 312,000 farms which sell 50 percent of all agricultural commodities. None of these properties produces less than $20,000 worth annually. A third of them sell more than $40,000 worth each. There are 21,000 with sales exceeding $100,000, and these are surmounted by an elite of 1,200 which market more than $500,000 worth apiece.

The elite, of course, are freaks—but enormously productive ones. They are ranches or feedlots handling thousands of head of cattle. They are dairy farms on the edges of big cities that have so many cows they milk around the clock. They are cotton farms on irrigated land covering territory that stretches to the horizon, or sugar plantations just as large. They include spectacular wheat empires that measure their land in square-mile sections rather than in acres. They are enormous enterprises which grow, pack, and ship fruits and vegetables by carloads.

Even the average farm in first class is an impressive enterprise with real estate holdings valued at $135,000 and annual gross sales of $48,000. If there were just 600,000 farms of this kind in the United States instead of 312,000, the other 3,100,000 farms recorded in the census would be out of business.

Elmer Larson is the name we will give to one of these farmers in first class. After the last war he came back to his father's 300-acre place in the rich Corn Belt of western Ohio. He had been in motorized artillery and learned a lot about heavy equipment. He wanted to farm and his father wanted to retire; so they made a compact. Elmer took out a GI loan for a downpayment and the deed. The elder Larson took his son's mortgage and endorsed his note for a new heavy-duty tractor.

Everything young Larson saw around the place reminded him of how hard it has been to farm as a boy and how easy it was to make machinery do things in the Army. His father thought he was taking an awful risk to borrow more money to buy more and bigger mechanized equipment: a hay baler, a picker-sheller, a combine, a glass-lined silo with automatic unloader; then finally an automated feed mill and mixer with a panel of control switches as impressive as an astronaut's capsule.

As his equipment increased, Elmer Larson realized that he could handle more land and more livestock; so he bought out a neighbor who declared, "A man is crazy to stay in farming the way it costs to get this new equipment." Larson himself was scared, but he knew he could not stand still and survive. He hired a regular hand and let the man's family live in the house on the new farm he had bought.

As the years went by, and the value of farm property rose, Larson was making at least as much in real estate appreciation as he was at raising corn and hogs. Since his assets zoomed even faster than his debts, his collateral was good for more loans. He plunged into more land and more equipment. He installed a cement-paved feed lot that would accommodate 600 head of western steers. Corn was too cheap to sell. He could make more feeding it. Later Larson increased the capacity of his feed lot to 1,200 and began to buy corn from others. The deeper he got into this complicated operation, the deeper he realized he would have to go, because others were ahead of him and those who hesitated were obviously headed for the scrap heap.

MIDDLE CLASS

In contrast with the small but wonderfully productive first class is a very much larger, less productive middle class of 1,755,000 units. Farms in this category produce annually between $2,500 and $20,000 worth of commodities. Middle class properties constitute 47 percent of the Nation's official farms, and they sell nearly 45 percent of its crops and livestock. Statistically, at least, this seems like a fair balance, but there is a wide range of quality within the group.

To get a more precise picture, the middle class might be divided into a small upper-middle group of 483,000 farms, all of which produce more than $10,000 worth of commodities, and a larger lower-middle group of 1,272,000 farms, all of which sell less than $10,000 worth. The latter group has had a rough time, because their net farm incomes, as a rule, are only about one-third of gross sales.

William Ansel is a name we will give to one of the operators in the lower-middle class. He was a full-time farmer in southern Maryland before the war. He raised tobacco, kept laying hens and milked 12 dairy cows. He was a jack-of-all-trades who built his own coops and sheds and repaired his own machinery. He liked farm life, but made very little money. He would tell his town relatives, "I make a living because I don't spend much."

During the war, the Baltimore shipyards paid good wages, so Ansel took a full-time job there and worked his land weekends and evenings. His wife helped with the milking and other chores.

After the war, William Ansel continued to go to town to work. He did not enlarge his farm business. He preferred the weekly paycheck because he had four young children coming along. He bought a few pieces of secondhand farm machinery from time to time as old implements wore out. "The new stuff is over my head," he would say, "and I can get by with this."

Ansel is too conservative to expand. He is afraid of debt, for he looks upon his farm as a home, and the basis of personal security, rather than as a business. He does not want to jeopardize his slim assets. "I owe enough as it is," he declares.

In the last census year, the average net income by operators in the lower middle class was $1,740. Their average earnings off the farm were $1,816. As a group, they are already halfway out of agriculture, yet they most truly represent the old-style, self-sufficient countryman who tried to make ends meet by thrift and reliance upon family labor.

THIRD CLASS

At the very bottom of the agricultural pyramid is a large third class of 1,641,000 units which produce only 5.3 percent of all farm commodities. Actually their operators are not farmers and should not be called such officially. This entire group averaged only $217 net annual income from agriculture. They averaged $2,884—or 13 times more—from other sources. Within the third class are 1,300,000 properties run by semiretired or spare-time operators who averaged 93 percent of their incomes from outside sources and only 7 percent from farming.

However, this third class, which constitutes 44 percent of the official census farm family, includes 349,000 farms whose owners are truly one of the most distressed economic groups in America. Their net incomes from an attempt at agriculture averaged $438 and their net incomes from other sources averaged $525.

They just could not either employ themselves or find adequate employment elsewhere. Their poverty and degradation is equal to that found in urban slums. It is visibly apparent to anyone who travels widely in the country. They have been bypassed by a technological revolution beyond their means. Many of them are still engaged in horse-mule tillage while the real producers have moved into the space age.

The solution to their problem, like that of the urban unemployed, is more city jobs on the payrolls of others. A few more cents a bushel or a few more dollars a bale would not change their condition in the least. They just do not produce enough bushels or bales to make a living, no matter what the price.

Misunderstandings about the health of American agriculture could easily be corrected by a more realistic definition of the farm as it is enumerated in the Census of Agriculture. Under present rules, any operation qualifies if it is over 10 acres in size and sells $50 worth of produce. Units of less than 10 acres are also tabulated if they sell $250 worth of produce. Such definitions can make a "farmer" of a weekend hobbyist who grows raspberries for the gang at the office, but they do not come close to identifying the real agriculturist.

Of course, there is an understandable reluctance in certain quarters to count farms by more realistic criteria. The farm bloc in Congress would emerge with its wings clipped even shorter and the Department of Agriculture might have to put half of its 30 acres of prime Washington office space into the soil bank. Michigan's Representative Robert P. Griffin, Republican, may have forecast just such a calamity when—tongue in cheek—he proposed to Congress that "the total number of employees in the Department of Agriculture shall at no time exceed the number of farmers in America."

One of the strangest aspects of public policy at the present time is the highly articulate concern about the low incomes of undercapitalized entrepreneurs in agriculture while other more serious social and economic calamities have befallen the more numerous families of the urban unemployed who have less income and less equity in property. If, at a time when only 8 percent of American families live on the land and 92 percent live elsewhere, we continue to regard the family farm as a pillar of democracy, we may wake up later to find the roof has caved in.

A public program of aid and support which is designed to save the lower middle class farm can only increase the lead of the pace setters. Two Secretaries of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson under President Eisenhower and Orville L. Freeman under President Kennedy, have recognized that the most help from the Government goes to the few at the top in order that a little may trickle down to the many below.

Farmers did not like Benson because, while he would have removed controls on production, he also would have cut Government price supports. They do not like Freeman because, while he would raise Government price supports, he has proposed strict production controls. What they want are floor prices plus a wide-open market, and something of that sort is probably what they bank on getting from Congress this summer. There is a saying going the rounds in the Farm Belt: "Benson made a Democrat out of me and Freeman is turning me back into a Republican."

The urban taxpayer naturally gets aroused when he considers his own desperate needs for public services that he cannot have because the money is soaked up by agriculture's $7 billion sponge. If a few billions were transferred from spending on the farms to the congested metropolitan areas, quite a number of public hardships could be relieved without any increase in taxes.

It seems apparent that a significant part of congressional indifference to urban problems is due to a deliberate protest against Federal aid for the city on the part of certain rural spokesmen. Not long ago, representatives of the Iowa Farm Bureau visited Washington, as one Congressman put it, "to give us their views not only on farm legislation but on the other issues with which we are wrestling in Congress."

One of those voices from the grassroots advised the legislators: "We feel Government is attempting to solve too many problems which should be left to local governments. For example: Federal aid to education, Federal housing, urban renewal, etc."

Each year, the impact of such pronouncements loses a little more punch as the urban population rises and the farm exodus continues. The influence which agriculture still exerts on Capitol Hill rests largely on historical overrepresentation, seniority in strategic spots and the horsetrading wit of the farmer. While the last remains as sharp as ever, the intrinsic strength to back it up is ebbing.

The magazine, Wallace's Farmer, a voice to reckon with in the Corn Belt, sensed the wind of change in January, 1962. "We've had farm program fights practically every year," it editorialized. "But they were mostly family spats—differences of opinion among farmers themselves. Now a third party, the city consumer, armed with new voting power, is watching these goings on in Washington with increasing interest and suspicion. With this new 'partner' abroad, farm legislation must be drawn more carefully. To avoid a violent consumer revolt at the polls, political leaders know that future farm programs must be less costly and more effective."

It might be said, in the light of the wheat farmers' recent refusal to heed this advice, that they still think they can have their way. Yet President Kennedy himself cautioned them at his May 8 press conference not to hope for easier terms in new agricultural legislation. "I don't think you could get a majority," was his observation.

Perhaps the time has come when Congress will reorient its thinking, and agree with the Farm Bureau that the Federal Treasury has attempted "to solve too many problems which should be left to local governments"—notably, the farm problem.

Scourge of the Book Burners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I often wonder why the things we have in mind doing most get sidetracked while far lesser matters get attended to. Perhaps it is because we care so much more about the first that we want to do them right; not to be careless. That is an excuse, however, I cannot really approve of. It is best to say what ought to be said at the time it needs saying, and do what should be done when it needs doing.

On my desk there has been lying for several weeks the news clips of the death of Whitney Griswold. He comes to mind more frequently than a lot of other subjects that have come in and gone out with a note attached. It is difficult to put down a thought about him; he stood for so much. The news stories referred to him as Dr. A. Whitney Griswold. He was more affectionately known by thousands as Whit Griswold. He was president of Yale.

Whit Griswold was a most extraordinary man. He made a great university greater. He was an educator in the classical tradition. He was modern and advanced—he took little for granted—and yet his concept of education was founded on history and the traditions of the great free universities of the old and new worlds. He was a teacher who looked for excellence in each student, and was delighted when he found it. He sparkled with humor; he found a bit of the bizarre in every situation. He was vastly tolerant of the foibles of others and understandingly patient as long as there was room and respect for dissent and controversy. He loathed the book burners and the myopics who in various guises—usually "protecting" something or someone—smothered free ideas and the communication of ideas. "The only cure for bad ideas is better ideas," he said.

Of all the clips that I saw on Whitney Griswold the one that seemed to me to say the most with the fewest words was the report by Alistair Cooke in the Manchester Guardian. With the permission of the House I am including the article in the Appendix of the Congressional Record at the conclusion of my own remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the world should not be deprived of men like Whitney Griswold in their young age. I can't believe that Heaven needs them more than we do. But some men do not require a long span of years to accomplish the work of a century. Whitney Griswold was one such. His work as a teacher, scholar and president of a great university is carved in the building stones of history and the free system, and he takes his place among the great men who in the university tradition have sought truth, and in so doing have reached for the stars.

Scourge of the Book Burners

(By Alistair Cooke)

New York, April 21.—Dr. A. Whitney Griswold, one of the most civilized leaders and critics of contemporary education, died on Friday evening of cancer, on the campus of Yale University of which he had been president since 1950. He was 56.

The fitness of "Whit" Griswold to preside with conspicuous courage and humor over a great university in the McCarthy era was a very well-kept secret until the moment he was appointed. True, he was a direct descendant of three Governors of Connecticut, and a collateral descendant of Eli Whitney of the cotton gin, but these proofs that he was of the blood royal were known only to a handful of friends.

The university had known him, barely, as a nervous freshman, a stringy student, and a contributor of sassy verse to the university daily. Wall Street knew him briefly as a clerk in a brokerage firm. He moved from Yale into the financial world modestly in the summer of 1929 and deserted it, like thousands more, in the clatter of the following October. Like other bright and swiftly disillusioned boys it seemed he preferred to teach history rather than endure it.

He went back to Yale to get his Ph. D., and became an instructor in the history department. From then until his 44th year he was known to the campus as a modest expert on the Far Eastern policy of the United States and a lecturer with a sardonic strain.

His wildest admirers would have bet on a lifetime professorship agreeably relieved by a gift for dialect stories. The notion of a college presidency apparently never crossed his mind, for in this country a university president is above all a money raiser, and Whit Griswold was, on the contrary, a scholar and a teacher.

On a certain weekend he was lunching in New York with the president of a small college who was elaborating on the striking resemblance of his job to that of a community chest chairman. Griswold no sooner thanked the Lord he was "not in that racket" than, as in a Cary Grant film, he was called to the telephone and told that the Yale Corp. had just picked him unanimously to succeed Dr. Charles Seymour, the historian. The corporation included the then Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, and the late Senator Robert Taft. Their choice of Griswold, it emerged, was as inspired a bit of bipartisanship as they ever achieved.

He surprised everybody, possibly including himself, from the start. He began rapidly to change the university curriculum and quieted his critics with a slogan picked up from a bottle of mayonnaise: "Keep cool, but do not freeze." As a simple act of belated justice, he doubled the faculty pay scale. He developed a remarkable ability to raise money, and in his 12 years tripled the university's endowment fund. But this, he made clear to everyone around him, was a vulgar, if vital, necessity of survival in a teeming world of taxes and real estate.

A university president above all, he said, must speak for the best values he knows in the society he inhabits. This can guarantee a droning sort of fame in a quiet time, but Dr. Griswold was matched with the McCarthy hour, and for 5 or 6 years at least he was a thorn in the side of the book burners and the loyalty oath takers: "Books won't stay banned. They won't burn. Ideas won't go to jail. In the long run, the censor and the inquisitor have always lost. The only cure for bad ideas is better ideas."

When the university's financial position was still very shaky, he was urged to commit it to a Federal program that gave loans to poor students. But the Federal Government required a loyalty oath and an affidavit disclaiming membership in any subversive society. To Griswold "this negative affidavit" was like "the oppressive religious and political test oaths of history," and was too much to swallow. He took Yale out of the Federal program and sought money from similarly highminded men who were also millionaires and unafraid of McCarthyism. In the mid-fifties this was a fairly rare combination.

The freewheeling temperament is often acceptable in a scholar provided he does not indulge it in administration. But this thin, insistent, courteous man went cheerfully on the rampage against the whole committee approach to running a university and its departments. The normal faculty broodings in committee he called "endless, sterile, stultifying. Could Hamlet have been written by a committee or the Mona Lisa painted by a club? The divine spark leaps from the finger of God to the finger of Adam."

That sentence might well be his epitaph. In 1950 he looked like a springy rather earnest young idealist who would soon crack his skull on a congressional committee at worst, a board of trustees at best. When he died on Friday he was known throughout the Western World as a brilliant administrator, but also, and better, a man of salt who had good wounds to show for his defense of freedom in a high place in the early 1950's.

That's Where the Money Goes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy, in criticizing those who deplore our rising public debt and continued Federal spending, very cleverly challenges his critics to come up with specific recommendations for cuts. Of course, he ignores any suggestions that are made, but keeps on asking for recommendations to add to the image.

Our very able colleague from Kentucky, Congressman GENE SNYDER, has called attention to a number of areas of useless spending and his figures have been used for an excellent editorial in the Dallas Morning News. I commend it to the President. The editorial follows:

BABOONVILLE

Waste of the taxpayers' money by Government bureaucrats is an old story. And the most glaring examples usually involve the expenditure of a relatively small amount of money. For a Government which is spending $100 billion a year, what's another couple hundred thousand more or less?

What is often overlooked by those who take this attitude is that there are hundreds—perhaps thousands—of cases every year involving the wholesale squandering of funds on totally useless projects. Put together, they represent millions in waste.

A freshman Congressman, GENE SNYDER, Republican of Kentucky, was recently challenged to show how the budget might be cut. He replied by citing 66 examples of ridiculous expenditure over the past year or two, suggesting that many more similar cases might be found in the current budget. The list is long, but here are a few typical gems:

Purchase of 1,000 TV sets for $400,000 to be used in underdeveloped countries where there is no electric power.

Donation of a $3,100,000 yacht to the millionaire emperor of Ethiopia.

A grant of $1,250,000 for the study of relations between an infant monkey and its mother.

Some $10,000 for a tour of U.S. defense plants by officials of Communist Poland.

Some $18,000 to find out why patients break appointments at pediatric clinics.

A total of $61,895 to establish a colony of baboons and $13,816 for another monkey colony.

A total of $9,775 to produce a stereotatic atlas of the beagle brain.

A total of $11,500 to study blood group genetics of Southampton Island Eskimos.

A total of $20,092 to study diseases of a giant snail.

A total of $13,837 to find out what information is contained in echoes.

A total of $20,991 to study how synthetic detergents travel in percolating water.

A total of $8,205 to study the social role of aging wild horses.

Although the exact amount of money involved could not be determined in the following cases, they are of equal interest:

Government officials in Kinya have used our foreign-aid money to purchase extra wives.

We have bought suits for Greek undertakers.

Superhighways have been built in countries, with few, if any cars.

In Lebanon, we built a stockbreeding farm with nine stalls for every bull.

In Taiwan, we built a sawmill which couldn't handle the type of lumber produced there.

In Indonesia, millions of dollars in U.S. aid were used to buy U.S. gold.

In Liberia, millions we donated to reduce the level of poverty have been used to build a luxurious new palace for the president.

The $61,985 to set up a colony of baboons might be a good investment, come to think of it. Baboons, they say, can be trained to do just about anything a human being can do—or should do. Maybe a Bureau of Baboons on the Potomac, trained to check on useless expenditures such as setting up a colony of baboons, would save us some money now and then.

Stephen Foster: An American Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit an address, "Stephen Foster: An American Ambassador," by Gerald Marks as representative of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers—ASCAP—given at the Stephen Foster Memorial in White Springs, Fla., on February 16, 1963. Stephen Foster spoke to the peoples of the universe in a language understood by all—the language of music. It is fitting we ever keep in mind his immortal songs—songs for all occasions. The address follows:

STEPHEN FOSTER—AN AMERICAN AMBASSADOR

(By Gerald Marks)

The Encyclopedia Britannica defines the word "Ambassador" as, and I quote, "the highest rank of diplomatic representative sent by one government to another."

America has been fortunate in having had a goodly share of dedicated, talented, patriotic and brilliant ambassadors, all of whom served with great distinction.

Names enshrined in the annals of our history—Franklin, Adams, Jay, to name but a few, were Ambassadors from our Government who served in specific areas. To present the best possible picture of the United States was their mission in the countries to which they were assigned.

But no list of United States envoys can ever be complete without the name of a popular songwriter from Pittsburgh, Pa., Stephen Collins Foster.

A divinely endowed "ambassador" from America to no particular area, no specific country, no special people, he held a musicodiplomatic passport to all areas, all countries, all peoples.

His "Swanee River" alone has been known and sung for over a hundred years in remote corners of the earth by people who didn't have the remotest notion of where the Swanee River was located, except that it was American.

"Way Down Upon the Swanee River" is sung up the Volga, down the Danube.

A few years ago, while walking down a residential street in Rabat, Morocco, I, myself heard a class of school children singing "Way Down Upon the Swanee River." Only two words were distinguishable to me: "Swanee River," for the lyric the children sang was in French. I could not resist visiting the classroom and asking the teacher if her pupils knew where the Swanee River was located. She translated my question for the Moroccan children, whereupon all hands were raised.

Here before my eyes was proof of Foster's influence, his deep hold on the minds and hearts of children, as well as the old folks; for children living in Africa as well as in America.

The old folks at home—yes, the young folks away from home, too, whether they are folks in Walla Walla, Spring Lake, Concord, Christchurch, New Zealand, or Johannesburg—they sing the praises, of our Ambassador.

Our Ambassador's talent is a musical drawbridge that connects people everywhere. Epsom Downs in England and Longchamps in France, no less than Roosevelt Raceway in New York, and Hialeah in Florida, ring with the strains of "Camptown Races," while every Kentucky Derby is a memorial to his greatness, when at the opening of the meet, the band concertizes the haunting sentimental "My Old Kentucky Home." It is as much a part of the program as the race itself.

No, our Ambassador at large knows no borders or boundaries, no language barriers, no political differences. His ideology is one with which everyone everywhere agrees. There is no resisting it, neither, East, nor West, and there are no neutral or uncommitted nations.

Foster is accepted and welcomed everywhere.

We export automobiles and beans from Michigan, refrigerators from Ohio, steel from Pittsburgh, cotton from the South, corn from our Midwest, aircraft from the Coast, ships from the ways of Camden, New Jersey, and Norfolk, Virginia—countless cargoes of American goods are unloaded at numberless ports around the world.

And as these products are consumed, as they run down, become obsolete, they are replaced with the latest, the newest, the most modern that technology has to offer. And these in turn will be consumed, will wear out, run down, become dated.

Not so with Foster's exports. They have withstood use, time, change.

Every now and then a grumble is heard in the land proclaiming weaknesses in the "Star Spangled Banner," and some of our legislators have been known to propose legislation limiting the range of our national anthem.

There is no record of complaints about any of Foster's compositions from any quarter.

From our vantage point in time, it is easy to see that a large part of the cultural exchange idea we so heartily endorse today can be attributed to the impress of Foster's immortal works on the cultures of other lands.

Stanley Adams, the president of the American Society of Composers, Authors & Publishers, in fact, all of us in ASCAP, are well aware of the power and achievements of Stephen Foster's imperishable American folk songs in this land and throughout the world. We believe that he left his own best work as a general standard for the future. He holds his place at the top of the list of all popular composers.

In retrospect it is not news that the best songs of a fine songwriter were hits in their day, but the undeniable fact that the songs have not only remained hits but have grown more popular and have encompassed more of the world in the past century is amazing in the history of the music business. The number of performances of Foster's works through the years is unequalled by any other catalog of songs.

And we as writers cannot overlook the fact that the works and music were composed in the day of the horse and buggy, and the minstrel show, without benefit of the plugging techniques of radio, television, moving pictures and recordings.

And yet, here is the world—in 1963—still talking, whistling, dancing to and singing Foster: quiet, old "Uncle Ned," we love you still; "Nellie Bly," you were the first real Miss America; "Swanee River," you flow in every land; "Jeannie With the Light Brown Hair," the subject of Stephen's most sincere and tender love song, you always were lovely, just the way you are tonight; "Massa's in the Cold, Cold Ground," "My Old Kentucky Home," "Camptown Races," "Old Dog Tray," "Old Black Joe," infectious "Susanna," you with your delightful, absurd text, the No. 1 novelty song of all time—and all the rest from the 1940's on, we drink to your universal health.

And to the perennial U.S. musical "Ambassador plenipotentiary to the world," Stephen Collins Foster, the beautiful dreamer, we of ASCAP, as always, salute you.

Bracero Program in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, it will probably be some time before the Members of the House who voted against extension of Public Law 78 will fully realize the consequences of their action.

I submit herewith for the attention of my colleagues an interesting letter written by Mr. Alfred A. Morici, production manager of Contadina Foods, Inc., in San Jose, Calif. This firm is a major producer of tomato products and is responsible for the employment of hundreds of union laborers during the canning season. Mr. Morici's letter follows.

Contadina Foods, Inc.,
San Jose, Calif., May 31, 1963.

Hon. Charles S. Gubser,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Gubser: It is with great dismay that I learned from today's news that the bracero program for Mexican nationals has not been extended. I don't believe I have to tell you the effect this will have on California agriculture as this has been told to you before. I do think you should be aware and concerned as to what it will do to the cost of living.

There is no question in my mind that this will immediately curtail the production of fresh fruits and vegetables in the State of California. We went through this once before and found it just about impossible to contract for tomato tonnage. In fact, it got to a point where price was no object. All of our farmers wanted to be guaranteed that we would supply labor which is an impossibility on our part. Price means nothing if you can't harvest a crop. We all realize, in the canning industry, that the bracero program will eventually disappear but we need time and a gradual reduction in the cutoff. In the tomato industry we are gradually developing new varieties which we will be able to harvest mechanically. However, this against takes time. We are doing likewise in the cling peach business, but again we need time.

I'm sure that we have sufficient labor in California if we could get them to work. But our welfare program and unemployment insurance make this impossible. Likewise, our child labor laws are so ridiculous that even our young people cannot work on farms.

As you know, agriculture is the No. 1 industry in the State of California and I'm sure that you will do everything in your power to assist your home State's No. 1 industry.

Very truly yours,
Contadina Foods, Inc.,
Alfed A. Morici,
Production Manager.

Talmadge Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Senator Herman Talmadge of the great State of Georgia has offered a positive approach to the farm problem. Senator Talmadge has observed with alarm the exodus of the family-sized farmer to the great cities rampant with delinquency and public welfare.

The Talmadge farm bill deserves the urgent attention and earnest consideration of Congress. The following splendid editorial appeared in the May 22 edition of the Edgefield Advertiser, Edgefield, S.C. The Edgefield Advertiser is one of the South's oldest and most respected newspapers.

[From the Edgefield (S.C.) Advertiser, May 22, 1963]

SENATOR TALMADGE'S ABILITY NOW COMING TO THE FOREFRONT

It has been known for a long time Senator Talmadge, of Georgia, had a true insight into agricultural problems, especially in South; but because of his reasonableness it was expected that he would be recognized for both his understanding of agricultural problems and for his contribution to reason and truth in the total work of the Congress of the United States.

The federal agricultural program has been far too shamefully long an example of bureaucratic futility.

Ever since Senator Talmadge has been in the U.S. Senate he has been trying to get sense into the heads of his fellow Senators, his first love being the South's agricultural interests. Each year he has introduced legislation to put his ideas across—without success.

And now, amid cumulative failures of a farm program that was started nearly 30 years ago, and has destroyed the backbone of the South—the small farmer—the Talmadge plan is coming to the forefront.

The Talmadge farm bill would make an estimated savings to the taxpayers of the United States of $500 million. It would bring an end to the up-side-downess of 3 percent of farmers getting more than half of the law's benefits, wherein a single producer of cotton in California—Russel Giffen—is paid $2 million each year from the Federal Treasury. Five of the largest producers receive as much as the total combined payment of the 250,000 smallest producers.

The bill provides higher payments to the small producers, lower payments to the larger producers.

Primarily—and the Advertiser knows that this particular intent of the bill is closest to TALMADGE's heart—it attacks the long-standing subversion by the farm program for a generation, its destruction of the small farmer. It gives new hope to small cotton-growers who want to farm, and have been seeing their way of life going under since the 1930's.

Recognition of the Talmadge farm bill is late; for millions of farmers have given up their way of life; many farm communities have been completely subverted, have lost the qualities that made America the greatest and strongest nation in the world: the firm, the rugged and independent manhood that breathed spirit into every righteous cause, that recruited America's patriotism, upheld its will to enforce right, when questioned; venerated the finest and truest things in life, stood steadfast for the everlasting values of which their land, hallowed by its generosity and its total significance to man, was the crowning symbol.

There will be critics of any farm legislation. And certainly it would be best that the Federal Government had never entered the field of farming in any way. It would be best now that it get out entirely. But until the now confirmed addiction of Government to operating the lives of the people is somehow shaken off, until Government might restore the country to its former free enterprise status, toppling inflation, and enhancing again the advantages of farm life, there must be hedges established against the small farmer's being forever wiped out and even the memory of his way of life lost.

There are no better laws than those which forbid monopolies. They are now of long standing and are traditional. Protecting the small business from the ever-growing threat of bigness is the intent of Talmadge's attempt to rewrite farm control laws. The effort is an attack on those forces in Government which would continue to destroy the small operator—the small businessman everywhere.

Whether Senator TALMADGE succeeds or fails, to him goes the major credit, in these late years of trying to salvage something of the southern way of life, for attacking the basic southern problem, in which the small landowner has been made to feel that he has no right to farm any longer, that new ways belong to others. It is not surprising that the small landowners—in the millions—have quit under the burden of federally planned inflation that leaves them unable to pay the high prices of industrial goods, while their sources of income have been steadily diminished, also by Federal action.

There's significance in the fact that while everything has been attempted for labor, for the unemployed, for welfare and dole seekers, destruction has been the plan for the independent small operator.

When, in the years ahead, the ways of independence having been lost in the fabled southern country of the United States of America where men once stood on their land and defied the principalities to corrupt their way of life, where men and the land engaged in a partnership under such freedom with such faith and reverence for the great end of their being as to have provided the greatest culture, the greatest civilization, the world has ever known, it is hoped that a monument will be erected to HERMAN TALMADGE, the southern farm boy, son of a Governor who was once a farm boy, who, with a consummate care for what he loved, and for what he believed in—became Governor of Georgia and U.S. Senator and, still unwavering, drove ahead from month to month, and year after year in the fight for its salvation.

Noted European Economist Questions Kennedy Administration Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a recent article on basic problems in the American economy by Prof. Wilhelm Roepke, of the Graduate School of International Studies in Geneva, Switzerland, appeared in the Wall Street Journal of April 1, 1963.

Professor Roepke, who is a long-time student of the American economy, expressed his deep concern about the unusual degree to which the economic policies of the Kennedy administration are shaped by specific economic theories. It is these theories, he believes, which explain in part the clear defeats which the administration's economic program has so far suffered.

Professor Roepke says that the two major economic problems which confronted the Kennedy administration when it came to power—the balance-of-payments problem and high unemployment—have not been solved and tries to point to some of the reasons why.

He says the root cause of the balance-of-payments problem is internal wage and fiscal inflation. The administration's pursuit of ever higher levels of "effective demand," he fears, may renew severe inflationary pressures and make the balance-of-payments problem even more severe.

Professor Roepke believes that higher levels of employment in the American economy are impeded by the shrinkage in profits and by the deep uncertainties over the future which arise from the attitudes and policies of the Kennedy administration.

False economic theories, Professor Roepke says, can result in national and international policies which will not only end in bitter disappointment, but in increased peril for the half of humanity that is still free.

Under unanimous consent I include Professor Roepke's article from the April 1 issue of the Wall Street Journal in the RECORD at this point:

WASHINGTON'S ECONOMICS: A GERMAN SCHOLAR SEES NATION MOVING INTO FISCAL SOCIALISM

(By Wilhelm Roepke)

(NOTE.—This article, originally written in German, has been adapted by Prof. Patrick M. Boarman of Bucknell University. Professor Roepke, a long-time student of the American economy, left Germany when Hitler came to power. Since 1937, he has been on the faculty of the Graduate School of International Studies of the University of Geneva in Switzerland. He is the author of "Economics of the Free Society," translated by Professor Boarman and recently published in this country by Henry Regnery Co.)

Thirty years ago, I published an article severely criticizing the economic policies then being pursued by President Roosevelt in the name of a "New Deal." "The grave question arises," so my article concluded, "of what will become of us all when the economically most powerful country in the world allows itself to be led by anticapitalist slogans to certain ruin."

If, today, one were to subject the economic policies of the Kennedy administration to a similar analysis, the criticism would doubtless be less severe. It is hardly possible to equate what the "New Frontier" has thus far accomplished with the upheaval of the American economy engineered by Roosevelt. But enough has been done to warrant deep concern. Of particular interest to the economist is the fact that the overall policies of the Kennedy administration, including those pursued in the arena of world politics, are shaped to an unusual degree by specific economic theories. It is these theories which help explain, in particular, the clear defeats which the administration's economic program has thus far suffered.

It is worthy of note, to begin with, that the two principal problems which confronted the Kennedy administration at its inception are still unsolved. The deficit in the balance of payments and the associated gold loss still continue, nor is there any evidence that the ship of the American economy is any nearer than before to the open waters of full employment and full production. Both of these phenomena, however, are intimately interrelated.

SHIFTING THE BLAME

Where a country suffers from a balance-of-payments deficit, there is always a strong temptation—and the Kennedy administration has succumbed to it to a degree—to shift the burden of the blame, if not to unlucky juxtapositions of the stars, then to other countries. The weakness of the dollar is attributed not to discrepancies between cost and price levels in the United States and abroad, especially in respect to internationally traded goods, but to excessive capital exports. From this the conclusion is easily drawn that the dollar is less in need of an internal policy of strict monetary and fiscal discipline than of a reduction of the burden on the balance of payments stemming from capital exports. To help in the accomplishment of the latter objective, proposals are advanced which would restrain the outflow by exchange control discriminatory taxation of foreign earnings, and other drastic devices which have little in common with a free enterprise economy. Simultaneously, other countries are cordially (and sometimes not so cordially) invited to assume an increased share of the U.S. burden of defense and foreign aid.

The theory is seductive in its simplicity. A country suffering from a balance-of-payments deficit, no matter how rich (and the United States remains far and away the country with the richest endowment of capital) must curtail its export of capital. Corresponding to this is the view that a country enjoying a balance-of-payments surplus, however capital-poor it may be (West Germany, for example), must on this very account strive to achieve a net export of capital. The truth is that the one argument is as untenable as the other, for in both cases disturbances of external equilibrium are wrongly identified with changes in internal capital wealth. What is needful is that a country adjust its balance of payments (by means of appropriate internal policies) to its capital resources, not its capital resources to its balance of payments.

THE WAGE SPIRAL

The root cause of the balance-of-payments difficulties of the United States is the internal wage and fiscal inflation which has been allowed to develop in that country. The official assurances that these sources of inflation have been stepped up carry little conviction because both wage inflation and budget deficits financed by bank reserves rather than by genuine savings have increased uninterruptedly. It is not sufficient in the American case merely to hold wage increases within the limits which the Government has designated as politically feasible or socially desirable. What is necessary is that wage increases be held well below productivity increases; realistically, they should be suspended altogether. But in fact a number of the most powerful American unions have not even managed to hold their wage demands within the administration's guidelines.

It is the labor unions, in the final analysis, which must be accounted responsible for the fact that wages for the past 5 years have been pushed ever higher, in spite of persistently high levels of unemployment, placing the American monetary authorities in the perpetual dilemma either of accepting the unemployment caused by high wages or of overcoming it by inflation. The intemperance of the American unions, in turn, is bolstered both by the administration's policy of deliberately favoring labor and by its overall economic philosophy. The latter is based for the most part on monetary expansionism of an extreme type, distilled from a schematic and mechanical Keynesianism. Almost routinely, the managers of the New Frontier look upon any and all economic problems as ultimately soluble by an increase in the level of effective demand.

It is no accident that the principal architect of the administration's economic policy, Prof. Walter Heller, is the same person who in 1953 urgently advised the Bonn Government to cure the then substantial unemployment in West Germany—unemployment which was clearly due to a shortage of capital and hence definitely not of the "Keynesian" variety—with a bold program of monetary expansion. His advice, had it been followed, would have pushed the young German market economy ineluctably to its doom over the cliffs of inflation. The Heller philosophy, which the West Germans fortunately rejected, is one characterized by a perpetual impatience to give free rein to the money-creating mechanisms of society. Obsessed by fear of deflation, it is blind to the danger of inflation which persists undiminished in the almost ritually recurring rounds of wage increases. Nor is the danger of inflation any less serious because it emerges in the American case in conjunction with unemployment and business pessimism. Indeed, it is precisely in this combination that it is most to be feared.

It is not easy to restore the world's confidence in a currency which has suffered, as the dollar has, from protracted illness. Even the support for the dollar provided by the international community, as indubitable a sign as it is of the price which other countries are prepared to pay to underwrite the "key currency," cannot dispel the disturbing possibility which has been summed up in a famous phrase of Talleyrand's: "A ministry which needs support is a ministry which will fall." Of decisive importance, therefore, is the overcoming of the basic deficit itself.

EMBERS MAY FLAME UP

Doubtless the current inflationary tendencies in Europe will ease the task of the American in moving in an anti-inflationary direction. The probability is then that the balance-of-payments deficit will be reduced, providing other circumstances are favorable. But to the extent that his hoped for development does in fact take place, there arises the danger that under the double influence of labor union monopoly and the doctrinaire pursuit of ever higher levels of "effective demand," the embers of American inflation, now only glimmering under the ashes, will again flame up. In this case, international confidence in the dollar will again decline, possibly to a critical degree.

The danger of a too precipitate expansion of demand is the more serious where the belief persists that only in this way can the unsatisfactory domestic performance of the economy be improved. The forces involved in economic growth and prosperity are much more complex than is suggested in such a simple model. Thus, there can be little doubt that the functioning of the American economy has been slowed both by the relative shrinkage of profits, itself a result of increases in wages in a period of relative stagnation and underutilizatoin of capacity, and by uncertainties about the future engendered by the attitudes and practices of the Kennedy administration.

In particular, the ruthless use of Government power to roll back the price increases with which United States Steel had attempted to compensate for increased labor costs constituted a step in the direction of a controlled economy and repressed inflation. As such, it was a severe blow to public confidence. To the inevitable hazards of daily economic life, including those imposed by unbridled labor power, was added a vast and continuing uncertainty respecting the Government's readiness to accept the outcome of market processes. In short, the frustrations experienced under Roosevelt's New Deal, which failed in spite of years of effort to generate genuine economic expansion and prosperity, have reappeared on the New Frontier.

RISE OF FISCAL SOCIALISM

The similarity between the New Deal and New Frontier finds expression not only in the general decline in business confidence which the latter has provoked but in an openly defiant glorification of big government and in the fiscal megalomania which serves this questionable ideal.

We have to do here with an approach to economic problems which may be described as fiscal socialism. Increasingly, it has come to the fore as the key technique of the Socialist program in the developed countries as the classical goals of socialism—socialization of private property and planned economy—have diminished in attractiveness. In a recent session of the West German parliament, the budget expert of the Socialist Party was moved to remark that the continuous enlargement of the government budget is a fact which will shock only the naive members of the population. The observation itself, however, marks merely the continuance of a tradition which began with the Jacobins of the French Revolution.

The Kennedy administration stands clearly in this general tradition, as its pronouncements amply attest, and in this respect too it is continuing Roosevelt's New Deal. A prominent explorer on the New Frontier, John Kenneth Galbraith, has furnished in his widely read book, "The Affluent Society," a theory in behalf of fiscal giantism whose stylistic elegance, if not its logic, has seduced many. Seldom has the conviction that government expenditures ensure a wiser use of the people's income been put forward with such disarming candor. But Mr. Galbraith notwithstanding, the elephantiasis of contemporary government's expenditures in general, and those of the United States in particular, is verily a pathological process. In it is expressed the tendency for the increasingly centralized state of our times to surround like a parasitical vine both society and economy and, by sapping the strength of the latter, to deny itself the means of life.

Clearly, there are limits to the process of continuing growth of government, limits which may be exceeded only by eroding and ultimately destroying the spiritual, political democratic society.

ROSTOW'S THEORY

The role played by theories of this sort in the shaping of American policy is evident as well as in the esteem in which the administration holds the economist and economic historian, Walt W. Rostow. In his famed essay, "The Stages of Economic Growth," Rostow argues that the prime forces moving a country through the several stages of economic development are technology and capital formation. Carried forward by the engine of capital investment, the economy ultimately reaches a stage at which it takes off like an airplane from the ground. The developmental process is allegedly the same everywhere. Germany and the United States in the past, or Canada and the Soviet Union at present—all are subjected to precisely similar mechanisms of growth.

When the stage of take-off has been reached, a country will rise with increasing speed toward economic maturity and level off at the stage of high mass consumption. In turn, economic maturity and the transition to mass prosperity (and here the economic hypothesis subtly becomes a determinant of world policy) are accompanied by democratization and liberalization. This is a process, it is implied, which of itself will serve to brake the political expansionism of the Communist countries. The latter, that is to say, will grow directly from their teens into settled middle age—a development which is to be awaited with patience and forbearance. Time is on the side of reason and freedom; anticommunism which takes communism at its face value is mere hysteria.

If this theory is to be set in its proper framework, it must be remembered that the genuine progressive, believing mankind to be on the road to the millenium, finds in communism a most disturbing challenge to his Weltanschauung. His irresistible desire is to fit it somehow or other into his optimistic vision of the future. He is forever on a search for new theories calculated to demonstrate the innocuousness of communism's satanic drive to overturn and enslave the world. For communism then ceases to be an affront to progressivist optimism; on the contrary, it emerges as a comrade in arms in the march toward progress.

Such theories of Communist innocuousness, it is safe to say, have played a more important role in the advance of communism to its present power than has the whole panoply of Communist tanks, rockets, and divisions. Rostow's theory, in particular, constitutes little more than a new version of Rooseveltian illusionism in the dress of economic determinism (a determinism which is not nearly as far removed from that of Marx as Professor Rostow seems to think). But even as an economic hypothesis, it cannot stand. To see in an increase in the merely technical accoutrements of the economy the ultimate engine of economic development, is to confess to the crassest form of materialism in which everything spiritual, political, and moral is robbed of its decisive role in the life of society. But the most agregious and alarming defect of the Rostovian growth model is its total indifference to the kind of economic system within which growth occurs.

HOW THE "RICH" GOT RICH

Progress in science and technology and increases in physical capital are necessary but by no means sufficient conditions for improvement in the welfare of the peoples of the world. The "rich" countries of today are rich because to these necessary conditions is added the further condition of a specific economic system functioning within a specific legal and philosophical framework. But the economic system of which we speak is none other than the market economy; the framework we have in mind is none other than the assemblage of spiritual, moral, and political postulates upon which such an economic system depends. Only those unwilling to face facts can deny that prosperity for the masses in any real sense is found today only within that sharply defined area which is constituted of the fully developed industrial countries of the free world.

While the one-sided economism of current theory is remarkable enough, its political purblindness is downright menacing. Its unforgivable error is its disregard of the essence of communism as a cultural, social, and political system imbued with the apocalyptic messianism and expansionism of the pseudoreligion. Communism remains a highly active volcano. It is a mark of a dangerous naivete to regard it as extinct (and hence something to be turned into a sort of tourist attraction) merely because it occasionally stops spewing out ashes and lava. To reduce it to a mere technique of industrial growth is as absurd as to downgrade national socialism to a method by which Germany was provided with the network of autobahns.

So it is that false economic theories can terminate in national and in international policies which must end not only in bitter disappointment but in increased peril for the still free half of humanity. And this is excuse enough for an economist to step outside his accustomed pursuits to enter a protest and a warning.

Forfeit in Warsaw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House is continuing its public hearings on this year's foreign aid bill. One of the amendments which is receiving most vigorous attention by the administration is the restoration of favored nation status, under our Tariff Act, to Poland and Yugoslavia.

A most pertinent editorial in Friday's, May 31, Washington Post directs our attention to the contribution of the Polish Communist government to the International Control Commission in Laos, and directly directs attention to the effect that this might have on House deliberations on the question of restoring favored trade privileges to the Warsaw government. In view of impending deliberations on the subject, I place this editorial into the RECORD, realizing that its significance would be appreciated by the Members:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 31, 1963]

FORFEIT IN WARSAW

The Polish statement on Laos may well have cost it about $5 million. That is the approximate value of exports to the United States which stand to be lost if the Congress does not restore the trading privilege it removed from Poland last year. With Warsaw now in full Soviet voice on Laos, blaming the United States for the crumbling caused by the Communists, the Poles have probably forfeited the remaining support for their trade on Capitol Hill. They have also forfeited much of the good will which they have accumulated since 1956.

The obstructionism of the Polish member of the International Control Commission in Laos had been accepted in some quarters as the individual folly of a known sourpuss; with the recall of Maj. Mark Thee last week, the Poles had a good chance to slip into a discreet shadow. Instead they made a statement as gratuitous as it was provocative. Was it based on a Soviet instruction to keep the West off balance in the war of nerves in Laos? On Mr. Gomulka's inclination to nudge the Russians closer to the Chinese in order to dampen the Sino-Soviet crisis? On some hidden Khrushchev-Gomulka counterpoint?

Whatever the reason, American indignation is bound to be mixed with dismay over the Poles' apparent default in one of the few areas where they might be expected to exercise a slightly anti-Soviet initiative. Curiously, the United States has often seemed an even more ardent advocate of Polish nationalism than Poland itself and has come to understand why the Poles could not act forthrightly in international affairs. Now, however, Warsaw may have forfeited a good part of its claim to this forbearance. If this is the case, it can blame only itself.

A Salute to the New York Naval Shipyard on its 162d Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I point to the accomplishments of the New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N.Y., in its 162d year of shipbuilding and repair. The location of the "can-do" yard in Brooklyn is significant—another contribution to the Nation by the borough noted for its civic spirit, manifested so readily through its many fine schools, colleges, community centers, and civic organizations. The Navy yard has constructed historic vessels from the *Maine* to the *Franklin D. Roosevelt* and the *Constellation* and will continue its fine work under the leadership of Rear Adm. Ernest C. Holtzworth, directing the hard work of the many Brooklynites who are employed there.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, all Members of this distinguished House join with me in saluting this world-renown shipyard on its anniversary and will enjoy reading a brief history of the yard prepared as a community service by the Equitable Savings & Loan Association and its president, Andrew S. Roscoe in cooperation with the officials of the shipyard.

The history follows:

A SALUTE TO THE NEW YORK NAVAL SHIPYARD ON ITS 162D ANNIVERSARY

The New York Naval Shipyard in Brooklyn—known all over the world as the "can-do" construction and repair shipyard—this year is celebrating its 162d anniversary. The finest and largest warships required for the defense of our Nation have been built at the Brooklyn Naval Shipyard.

The shipyard had its beginning when the Government purchased a small piece of crescent-shaped land about a half-mile long and a half-mile wide on the muddy shores of Wallabout Bay. The property was purchased from John Jackson and his brothers for $40,000.

The Jackson brothers operated a small shipyard on the land. It consisted of a few ramshackle buildings which housed wooden sailing vessels under construction. On February 23, 1801, the Government bought the shipyard.

As the years rolled on and the Nation prospered, additional land was purchased to meet the need for an expanded Navy.

The New York Naval Shipyard in Brooklyn today embraces 290.92 acres and is recognized as the largest naval repair and construction yard in the world.

The Brooklyn yard represents an original cost investment to the Government of about $250 million. It is estimated that the yard today is worth in excess of $1 billion.

The New York Naval Shipyard is considered to be one of Brooklyn's largest industrial centers and vital to the borough's economy. The annual payroll for the present 12,000 employees is about $85 million.

There are 220 buildings of various sizes, 14 miles of paved roads, 7 miles of paved walks, 19 miles of standard-gage track and 4 miles of crane track in several sizes. Six huge drydocks, eight piers, two large building ways and eighteen major machine and metal working shops are equipped with the finest facilities for the construction of any type of ship—from small torpedo speedboats to super 75,000-ton aircraft carriers. In addition, the yard has the finest laboratories where scientists and engineers do research in many fields, including nucleonics and metallurgy.

The "can-do" yard—a name gained by the Brooklyn shipyard because of its fine record of repair and construction—has to its credit the production of many battleships which have added glory in the defense of American freedom and democracy throughout our Nation's history.

Ships that fought in the Spanish-American War and World Wars I and II were constructed or repaired in the Brooklyn yard. Famous ships, such as the battleship *Maine*, blown up while riding at anchor in Havana Harbor in 1898, were built in Brooklyn. The battleship *Missouri*, on which the Japanese surrender was signed also was built here.

In 1952 the Brooklyn Navy Yard began the biggest construction job up to that time when the keel of the 60,000-ton U.S.S. *Saratoga* was laid. This was the start of the construction of the largest supercarriers in naval history. The carriers *Franklin D. Roosevelt*, *Independence* and *Constellation* were built in the yard.

Yard workmen never flinched when called upon to work on some of the most difficult repair jobs. One of the yard's greatest engineering feats occurred in World War II when two destroyers, badly damaged by German torpedoes, limped into the yard. Engineers decided to make one good ship of the two.

The marriage of the two destroyers—the U.S.S. *Menges* and the U.S.S. *Holder*—is regarded as one of the most spectacular surgical repair jobs ever to be performed. The *Menges* was cruising along on convoy duty in the Mediterranean in May 1944. Two Nazi submarine torpedoes blasted the ship's stern to pieces. The crew made the vessel sufficiently watertight and brought it into the navy yard.

About the same time, the U.S.S. *Holder* was struck amidship by an aircraft torpedo. Two engine rooms were completely demolished and surrounding compartments wrecked. The damaged area was sealed off and the ship was towed to the navy yard.

Both ships were placed side by side in the yard. Since the *Menges* had more to be salvaged than her sister ship, it was decided to take the stern of the *Holder* and attach it to the forward section of the *Menges*. With the aid of powerful cranes and hydraulic jacks, the 94-foot section of the *Holder* was slipped into position astern the *Menges*.

The keels of the two ships were alined and welded together. The operation was a success and the new *Menges* once more went to sea to serve our country.

This dramatic repair job was one of many successfully accomplished by the workmen of the yard.

Rear Adm. Ernest C. Holtzworth, yard commander, is proud of his entire workforce. When he speaks of the yard's history he glows with the thought that the "can-do" yard is ever ready to serve our country in times of war and peace.

Middle East Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, my distinguished colleague, Congressman Ogden Reid, of New York, former Ambasador to Israel, addressed the ninth annual "Brotherhood in Action" dinner of the Lowell, Mass., chapter of the Children of Palestine. The Congressman, who has already focused the attention of the House on the rapidly developing and potentially critical situation in the Middle East, called for a strong, unified American policy in that area and pointed out the importance of stability in this area to world peace.

Mrs. Harry L. Kaplan, one of the founders of the Children of Palestine and now a national director, was singled out for her tireless efforts on behalf of the organization.

It was truly a memorable occasion, and I request unanimous consent to include an article from the Lowell Sun of May 27 describing the event in the Appendix of the Record.

Lowell.—The United States must speak with one voice in the Middle East—and it must be a voice for peace and against aggressors of all kinds—said Congressman Ogden R. Reid, of New York, former U.S. Ambassador to Israel, at the ninth annual Brotherhood-in-Action dinner of the Lowell chapter, Children of Palestine.

Representative Reid quoted from the dangerous propaganda emanating from United Arab Republic and from clandestine radios which are advocating war in the Middle East and the extermination of the State of Israel.

The emerging pattern in the Near East, he said was one of danger to the peace of the world. If we delay, said the former Ambassador, it may be too late. He pointed to the deliberate and all-out propaganda effort by the United Arab Republic, Syria, and Iraq to overthrow Saudi Arabia and Jordan.

Representative Reid implemented this statement with word-by-word quotations from the broadcast of the U.A.R. He said that he has introduced a resolution in Congress calling on the United States to speak with one clear voice on the Middle East, that it must see to it that there is peace and stability in the Middle East—that it notify all nations that aggressors will not be tolerated.

He called for freedom of transit through the Suez Canal—and emphasized the United Nations rulings must be observed.

In his opening remarks, Congressman Reid paid great tribute to the untiring efforts of Representative F. Bradford Morse for the country, to his steadfast dedication to his work in Congress, to his fine services to the people of the United States. Representative Morse had been selected to introduce Congressman Reid.

Representative Morse said that this was the first speaking appointment Representative Reid had outside his district and Washington, and a sterling tribute to the Lowell Chapter, Children of Palestine.

In his prefatory remarks, Congressman Reid told of his days as Ambassador to Israel and how he became acquainted with the work of the Children to Palestine Organization and the way it exemplifies brotherhood.

Mayor Joseph Downes brought the greetings of the city to the organization and presented Mrs. Harry L. Kaplan with a key to the city, a tribute to her untiring efforts on behalf of the Children to Palestine.

Mrs. Kaplan, coordinator for the organization, paid tribute to the late Jefferson R. Mansfield for his work on behalf of Children to Palestine. Mrs. Kaplan, a national director, and one of the founders, said that Mr. Mansfield, treasurer for the organization in Lowell since its inception, had given unstintingly of his time, money, and effort for the organization. The scholarship in Israel this year is dedicated to the memory of Mr. Mansfield.

Superior Court Judge Francis J. Lappin, a member of the organization's board of directors, served as toastmaster. The invocation was by Rev. Joseph Lyle McCorison, S.T.D., D.D., national chairman of Children to Palestine, Inc. Judge Lappin spoke of the efforts of the organization to promote brotherhood through Arab and Jewish scholarships to Technion-Isreal Institute of Technology and to the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and many scholarships to the Ben-Shemen Youth Village.

Rev. Fr. Armand Morissette, OMI, president of the Lowell chapter, Children to Palestine, presented $500 to Rev. Dr. McCorison on behalf of the Lowell chapter, said Fr. Morissette in part: "The spirit of the Lord is all-embracing. People are so different in so many ways among themselves that it is very had to find a real common denominator by which to unite them for any concerted action.

"Yet, in spite of the necessary, centrifugal movement of each individual, there is a great unifying, integrating force in mankind which is unavoidable as well.

"Life is the constant struggle between those two drives; the good life is their perfect balance.

"Every intelligent, stouthearted person in this world wants to influence others, but without impairing his or her own self. As a matter of fact, the stronger the image the wider and more penetrating its impact.

"A leader is catalytic.

"Difference in race, opinion, taste, and yes, even in the practice of religion will exist indefinitely.

"Organizations like the United Nations might be very helpful, but the definite answer to our problem is a united humanity. Such is the work of Children to Palestine."

Benediction was by Rabbi Joseph Warren.

An excellent program of musical selections was presented by "The Turnabouts"—John Salerno, accordionist and George Perrone, bass fiddler.

Honorary chairman of the dinner was Fr. Morissette, while Mrs. Kaplan was coordinator. In general charge of the program was Congressman Morse, while Mrs. Nicholas C. Contakos was in charge of the music. Miss Adelene M. Assaly and Patrick Mogan were in charge of the program. Reception committee members were Mrs. Jefferson R. Mansfield, Mrs. John F. O'Donoghue, Mrs. F. Hildreth Hardy and Albert Santerre. Albert Santerre was in charge of transportation while Mrs. Charles G. Sampas was publicity chairman.

Thomas F. Balfrey headed the ticket committee, with his cochairmen being Mrs. Conakos, Mrs. Hardy, Miss Marguerite Lyons, Mrs. Julius Neyman, Albert Santerre and Hermes Tsandikos. On the ticket committee were: Mrs. Arthur Antonopoulos, Mrs. Clarence Bartlett, Mrs. Philip Berman, Miss Frances Dillon, Mrs. George C. Eliades, Mrs. Wilbert Grew, Mrs. Carl Graun, Jr., Mrs. Francis Lappin, Mrs. William Moriarity, Mrs. Samuel Pollard, Mrs. Samuel Porton, Mrs. Calvin Robinson, Mrs. Lester C. Schwartz and Mrs. William Wolf.

Honorary president of the Lowell chapter, Children to Palestine, is Rev. Victor F. Scalise. Rev. Father Morissette is president. Vice presidents are Rev. John Sarantos, Mrs. F. Hildreth Hardy, Mrs. Jefferson R. Mansfield and Arthur Antonopoulos. Recording secretary is Mrs. Philip G. Berman, while Mrs. Carl Braun, Jr., is corresponding secretary. Mrs. Max Goldman is treasurer. Mrs. Contakos is music chairman and Mrs. George C. Eliades is music chairman. World Child's Day chairmen are Rep. Paul M. Husted and Albert Santerre. Mrs. Sampas is publicity chairman and Mrs. Harry L. Kaplan is national director.

Members of the board of directors are the following: Mrs. Henry Achin, Miss Norma Ackerson, Mrs. Arthur Antonopoulos, Miss Adelene M. Assaly, Thomas F. Balfrey, Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Bartlett, Mrs. Barnet Bernstein, Dr. Harry Black, Mr. and Mrs. Homer Bourgeois, Edwin Braverman, David F. Connors, Donald Cook, Attorney James Curtis, Miss Frances Dillon, Attorney Paul Fitzgerald, Norman Glassman, Attorney and Mrs. Frank Goldman, Attorney Robert H. Goldman, Mrs. Wilbert Grew, F. Hildredth Hardy, Judge Lappin, Wilfred Latour, Miss Marguerite Lyons, Dr. and Mrs. Martin Lydon, Mr. and Mrs. Jefferson Mansfield, Jr., Mrs. Charles McCarty, Jr., Mrs. Abraham Meister, Patrick Mogan, Congressman Morse, Mr. and Mrs. William Moriarty, Robert T. Morse, Mrs. Julius Neyman, Mrs. J. M. O'Donoghue, Joseph Pellegrino, Samuel Pollard, Mrs. Samuel Porton, Attorney Calvin Robinson, Charles G. Sampas, Albert Santerre, Mrs. Victor F. Scalise, Mrs. Lester Schwartz, Hermes Tsandikos, Richard Violette, Rabbi Joseph Warren and Mrs. William Wolf.

Brosnan Heads Huge Southern Railway System, but He Knows What It's Like To Swing a Pick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Bill Brosnan, president of the great Southern Railway System, is one of the most fearless, progressive, and dynamic free enterprise leaders of our time. Bill Brosnan has no fear of competition, and is dedicated to better service for the consumer. His rate reduction campaign has captivated the imagination and enthusiasm of the entire country. The following article appeared in the Sunday, June 2, edition of the Greenville (S.C.) News.

BROSNAN HEADS HUGE SOUTHERN RAILWAY SYSTEM, BUT HE KNOWS WHAT IT'S LIKE TO SWING A PICK

Washington.—D. W. "Bill" Brosnan is president of the Southern Railway System. But he knows what it's like to swing a spike maul or work with pick and shovel along a railroad track under a broiling summer sun.

The rangy railroad man's railroader once worked on a track gang.

"They called us 'student apprentices,'" Brosnan recalled with a grin, "but we found that a pick handle fit our hands as well as a pencil." That was in 1926 at Macon, Ga., his home State and Brosnan has been with Southern ever since.

Brosnan, now 60, has no regrets for his time in the pick and shovel academy. "If you don't have the guts to stand that," he said, "How are you going to take all the other pressures later?"

Today Brosnan thrives on the pressures of running the 8,200-mile railroad. His office is here in Washington, but he's far more likely to be found on the line somewhere, riding herd on Southern's service.

Brosnan turned to railroading after working for 3 years with the Georgia Highway Department following his graduation from Georgia Tech in 1923 with a degree in civil engineering.

Associates and opponents alike know him today as a tough-minded, tenacious fighter who never backs away from trouble once he is set on a course he believes to be morally and economically right.

He has tremendous zest for hard work, thinks nothing of working around the clock if necessary, and seems surprised if everybody else doesn't share his enthusiasm for long hours. He is sympathetic when subordinates fail after honest, intelligent effort and is quick to praise a job well done but impatient with excuses.

Turning his back on the past when railroads had a monopoly on transportation, Brosnan believes today's railroads face as many opportunities as problems.

Commenting on Southern's struggle to put drastically lower grain rates into effect against the opposition of unregulated barge and truck interests, Brosnan said: "Unregulated competition is the music we must dance to if we are going to dance at all. And we choose to dance. We're just trying to get the orchestra a little more in tune."

On railway mergers, he said: "There are too many railroad managements. Efficiency would be increased if there were 4 or 6 systems in the county, whereas now there are more than 105 class I railroads. With that many managements, I think mergers are a necessity."

Southern's president keeps a model railroad set in the basement of his home.

"That's just for the grandchildren, of course," he said with a smile.

State Department Indecisive on Haiti

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the security of the United States is the issue foremost in the minds of every American today.

These days in which Soviet-Communist forces are presenting to us a series of military thrusts, political demands and ultimatums for our retreat require the utmost in decisive action from every agency of Government.

Today, the Department of State is actively pursuing policies of tragic indecision, and irrational timidity.

I have pointed out to the Members of this House on a number of occasions the self-defeating nature of this Government's policies in confronting aggressive Soviet-Communist forces.

On May 14, 1963, I pointed out that the State Department is following in Haiti the same contradictory, timid, self-defeating pattern of errors which pushed Cuba into the grasping hands of the international Communist movement.

The State Department watches while Communists prepare to seize political power in one country after another.

The State Department waits until Communists seize power and begin to consolidate their control. Then, the State Department answers public cries for action with statements that the Communists already are in control so that our best policy is to negotiate and compromise with them.

This is the future we can expect in Haiti as the product of the State Department's policy of timidity.

Today's article by George Natanson, of the Los Angeles Times, documents how far the Department of State will go to prevent any positive action which might benefit the cause of freedom and the security of the United States while it watches and waits for Communists to turn Haiti into a second Soviet satellite in the Western Hemisphere.

The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, June 4, 1963]

U.S. ROLE IN HAITI INDICATES NO CLEAR POLICY ON DUVALIER

(By George Natanson)

Mexico City.—The U.S. role in Haiti over the past month has gone from one extreme to another, seeming at times to be on the verge of outright intervention, then seeming to take a standoff attitude.

Althought the United States restored normal diplomatic relations with Haiti on Monday, there has been no essential change in the internal Haitian situation since Washington declared a "limited diplomatic boycott" of President Francois Duvalier's regime 2½ weeks ago.

Haiti continues to be ruled by a tyrannical government whose battle cry, translated as "cut off their heads and burn their homes," still echoes through the dense jungles.

During the past 4 weeks, the U.S. attitude toward Duvalier showed no clear policy.

Throughout May, the U.S. aircraft carrier *Boxer* stood just of Haitian shores with battle-ready marines alert to invade if ordered.

On the other hand, there are strong indications that the United States intervened at least twice against positive steps to remove Duvalier from office with force of arms.

The first involved Dominican President Juan Bosch's threats to invade Haiti.

Had not a U.S. foreign correspondent checked with the American Ambassador in Santo Domingo following a midnight interview with Bosch, it is quite likely that the Dominican armed forces would be occupying Haiti today.

According to reports, Bosch intimated that his troops were ready to go over the frontier within a matter of hours.

Hearing the news, U.S. Ambassador John B. Martin made a hurried 2 a.m. phone call to Washington, followed by two predawn visits to Bosch's residence.

The promised invasion never occurred.

The second apparent U.S. move concerned a small, highly trained group of Haitian exiles.

On May 13 I was given confidential information that Haitian rebel troops were prepared to invade their country shortly after midnight on the 15th.

But on the morning of May 14, a U.S. newspaper carried a story quoting New York sources as saying that a rebel invasion of Haiti was planned for that night.

This news occasioned further urgent interviews with Bosch by Martin.

That night I interviewed the Haitian rebel leader in Santo Domingo. He said their arms had been taken from them by Dominican troops who had previously trained them for months.

Backing the rebel force was the Haitian Government-in-exile formed in Puerto Rico 2 days before.

There had been indications that the U.S. State Department had given its blessing to the rebel government.

According to rebel spokesmen, regular Haitian Army units would have gone over to the rebels and Duvalier's weakened government structure would have toppled with a minimum of bloodshed.

But this plan, too, was mysteriously shelved.

Sanity Has Its Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the May issue of Overture, the monthly magazine of local 47, American Federation of Musicians, contains an editorial by President John Tranchitella. Entitled "Sanity Has Its Day," the editorial supports the recent fine speech by the Honorable Thomas H. Kuchel, U.S. Senator from California, and says, in my opinion, exactly the right thing in a simple and yet powerful way. I believe my colleagues will find it of interest:

SANITY HAS ITS DAY

The other day our senior U.S. Senator, Thomas Kuchel, stepped onto the Senate floor to denounce the crackpots of the extreme rightwing in good, clear language.

His formal statement on the Birchers, racehaters and others of that stripe, was a masterpiece. His courage in delivering it deserves our commendation.

It must be a lonely feeling to sit in your Washington office and receive thousands of letters, as Kuchel did, that denounce you as a "Communist" because you have had guts enough to call rightwingers by their proper names.

Well, as for me, I'm with Kuchel and against the creeping Fascists, and I think it is time that we let Mr. Kuchel know where we stand.

The Birchers, and the other rug chewers, are trying to convince honest Americans that people like Dwight Eisenhower, Allen Dulles, and other responsible conservatives are "conscious Communist agents." Earl Warren * * * well, some of the nuts only want to impeach our former Republican Governor; others want to hang him.

THEY HATE US ALL

Among other things they hate the United Nations, all labor unions, and anyone who disagrees with them one iota.

I can't help but be fascinated by two articles that appeared in the press recently. One mentioned the fact that Fidel Castro was about to destroy every last vestige of the labor movement in Cuba. Another was a usual, hateful Communist diatribe against the United Nations.

Isn't it interesting that the Birchers and other rightest crackpots support these identical aims of the Communist Party? Like Communists, they hate legitimate labor unions. Like Communists they want to see the United States pull out of the United Nations so that the U.N. would become incompetent, and fail.

Like Communists they spread chaos, confusion and fear so that demoncracy can be discredited as a way of life. In short, to quote KUCHEL, they are "doing the devil's work far better than Communists could do." I would go the good Senator one step further; I believe that if the Birch society and the other rightist clans did not exist, the Communists would invent them. On the other hand, maybe they did.

A POTENT MINORITY

The rightwing extremists represent a small minority, but they are a very wealthy minority, having attracted some people with big pocketbooks and small, tight minds. And, like Communists, they are zealots who spend most of their waking lives tilting with the ghostly enemies they invent.

It doesn't take a large majority to create national chaos and hysteria. Hitler started out with a handful of "anticommunist" misfits and took over a supposedly cultured country.

Let the crackpots talk, sure. That's the way our Constitution is set up. But don't let them go unanswered. For every nut who screams that Eisenhower is a Red, there ought to be 10 good citizens to step forward and laugh the Bircher back into the woodwork.

What harm can these creeps do? They have already encouraged Nazi storm troopers to show their twisted faces on the streets of Los Angeles. They have already undermined reputations, placed careers in jeopardy, and worst of all, they have fooled some otherwise decent people into believing their madness. Such madness, unfortunately, is like a communicable disease.

What to do about it? I, for one, am sending this editorial to Senator KUCHEL, along with my personal letter, thanking him for fighting the good battle. I hope thousands of members of local 47 will follow suit. Let's start writing those letters right now.

Pope John XXIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of Pope John XXIII the world has lost one of the truly great men of our age.

No man was too humble to receive the Pope's attention, and no problem too great to benefit from his intelligence and counsel.

In addition to serving his church, Pope John XXIII was a true servant of world peace. He identified his church with the aspirations of men everywhere for freedom and dignity, for equality, for a decent standard of living, for scientific progress, and for mutual understanding among men and nations.

Probably no man in modern times has expressed the fundamental human desire for world peace more eloquently than the late Pope in his recent encyclical, "Pacem in Terris":

> Peace founded not on fear, suspicion and mutual diffidence; insured not by the threat of terrible destruction that would mark the complete ruin of the whole human race but established on a right ordering of human relations; order founded on truth, constructed according to justice, vivified and integrated by charity and put into effect in freedom. This is the peace that the race of man ardently desires as a most precious divine gift without which it is not possible to expect any constructive progress, lasting well-being and safe future for the young generations, for families and for nations.

Here is a beacon of counsel and guidance for all those who labor for peace in the worldly vineyard.

Intolerable Tolerance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, responsible editorial comment continues in regard to reports the State Department is inclined to favor resumption of full diplomatic relations with Communist Hungary.

The proposal is being noted with considerable distaste, as witness the following writing by W. D. Workman, respected associate editor of the State of Columbia, S.C.:

INTOLERABLE TOLERANCE

The State Department, in another display of its massive ignorance of grassroots American sentiment, is cautiously edging up to a recognition of the bloodstained Communist regime of Hungary.

As the State Department sees the situation through its rose-tinted glasses, the Hungarian rulers have shown encouraging signs of moderating their oppressive rule, and of admitting Western ideas, and westerners, to the country. Therefore, say our State Department officials, we might do well to recognize the Kadar regime.

Are our memories so short, and our indulgence so great, that we now should forgive and forget the Communists' brutality which crushed the Hungarian fight for freedom in 1956? Are we to disregard those Hungarian patriots who died in the streets of Budapest? Are we to ignore those Hungarian refugees who were forced to flee their homeland for safety and a breath of freedom?

A State Department memorandum circulating through Congress points out that the Kadar administration recently has granted amnesty to some 3,000 or more political prisoners. It is unfortunate that the same amnesty could not have been granted to the scores who have been backed to the wall and shot down by executioners since 1956.

What can we have in common with a Communist regime which deliberately held youngsters in prison until they reached the age of 21 and then called them up for execution when they attained the status of adults?

Will it be recognition of Red Hungary, then admittance of Red China to the United Nations, and then acceptance of Red Cuba?

Fortunately, there are voices in Congress which are trying out against any such perversion of the United States international morality. The outcry is coming from both sides of the aisle, with Democratic Senator THOMAS J. DODD joining with Republican Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER in the protest. And freshman Representative JOHN O. MARSH, Jr., of Virginia, is asking if the administration plans to forget the Bay of Pigs catastrophe as quickly as it seems to have forgotten the Budapest massacre.

We do not know how much influence the South Carolina congressional delegation has with the State Department, but such influence as it does command should be turned against any recognition of this Soviet satellite.

Keep the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune sets out a few of the many reasons why the U.N. should be expanded and financed for the future peace of the world.

RUSS SEEK NEW U.N. VETO

Many Americans have been critical of the United Nations at times, and critical of the Washington administration because it has been a consistent supporter of the U.N.

But today, when the United Nations is approaching a serious crisis in its life, we should be jarred to a recognition of how important it is that the U.N. be maintained.

The United Nations is under serious attack from the Soviet Union. It is a quiet attack, but none the less serious for that. The Soviet Union has and has frequently used a veto power in the Security Council. Now it seems to be after a financial veto over the General Assembly.

The U.N. is heavily in debt; the total deficit by the end of June will be anywhere from $110 million to $127 million. Russia and some other nations such as France have been refusing to pay their share of the bill for U.N. peacemaking activities in the Congo and the Middle East, and a crisis is at hand.

A special bond issue of $200 million has been authorized to meet the peacemaking bills. But even if all the bonds are sold (half of them to the United States on a matching basis), only 80 percent of the cash deficit would be covered.

Even this avenue toward fiscal stability is now threatened. When the bonds were authorized, it was provided that the issue would be serviced out of the regular U.N. budget. At the time, Russia agreed it would pay its regular assessments in full. The Soviet Union has now served notice to the contrary.

Instead of paying in full, the Soviets will deduct the amount that would go toward servicing the bond issue and also sums intended for four other programs which are in disfavor with the Kremlin.

These include the Korean Peace Commission, the U.N. Cemetery in South Korea, the Palestine Truce Organization, and the U.N. Field Service which supplies interpreters and other personnel for foreign activities. Together with money that would go to the bond program, these involve a deduction of about $2.5 million from the Soviet payment.

It's expected that Soviet satellites will make similar deductions, although the amounts won't be large. The French Government several months ago notified the

U.N. that it wouldn't pay its share to service the U.N. bond issue.

Altogether, the Soviet Union is more than $70 million in arrears on its various U.N. payments. It's by far the worst on the list of defaulters that also includes France, Belgium, and Nationalist China.

The answer to the U.N. problem is not one of bigger U.S. payments. We're now carrying nearly a third of the budget, even more of the Congo expenses.

But it is imperative that an answer be found. The Soviets lost a campaign to stifle the U.N. by naming a troika Secretary General. They must not be allowed to throw it into bankruptcy.

"Tad" Walter

SPEECH
OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, no coward soul was "Tad" Walter's.

He faced life squarely, defied criticism, resisted extremists who pressed in upon him, guarded the American heritage he treasured.

He was an outstanding legislator, faithful to his ideals, relentless to those who would destroy his government.

He was never unconcerned when it came to colleagues who needed guidance. He led, but always in a gentle manner.

His spirit will linger long in our hearts and will continue to influence the course of this Nation's destiny.

To his family and friends I extend my deepest sympathy.

We will all miss "Tad" Walter.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Military Sea Transportation Service and the American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, Vice Adm. Roy A. Gano, of the Military Sea Transportation Service, is in a unique position with respect to the American merchant marine. His organization is the largest customer of our privately owned fleet and his observations concerning its operations have great value and should be carefully read and heeded by all of us who are interested in the maintenance of a strong merchant marine.

The views set forth in his speech at the Tulane Institute on "Port Development and Foreign Trade," delivered March 18, 1963, are particularly arresting and stimulating, and should give pause not only to those lines whose very existence depends on Government business, but all private lines. His expression of the necessity for greater efforts to generate private business is most forceful, and should impel our carriers to redouble their efforts in this field. It is true that, as he says, such business requires more effort than that acquired through the solicitation of his agency, but it is far less subject to the vagaries of world politics and more dependable.

I think that everyone interested in the welfare of our merchant marine should read carefully his entire speech, which follows:

THE WORKING RELATIONS BETWEEN THE MILITARY SEA TRANSPORTATION SERVICE AND THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

(Speech by Vice Adm. Roy A. Gano)

It is indeed a pleasure for me once again to be a participant in the Tulane Institute on Port Development and Foreign Trade. I enjoy coming to New Orleans because of its traditional and well-demonstrated hospitality, and also because the Military Sea Transportation Service has its Gulf Sub-Area headquarters located here. Many of our ships call frequently at Gulf ports, and the wharves of the Crescent City are familiar berths to our cargo carriers. Practically all the Government-owned tankers operated by the Military Sea Transportation Service load in the Gulf and the nearby Caribbean, so we of MSTS have a deep interest in the efforts of this part of our Nation to develop port facilities and to improve the methods of foreign trade.

Last year, when I had the privilege of addressing the Tulane Institute, I discussed the concept of the single manager for ocean transportation, and explained that this is a device by which the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force requirements for surface transportation of personnel and cargo to overseas destinations are handled through one point of contact. This has worked quite well over the years, and both the military shippers and the commercial carriers have found that the single point of contact for transportation has increased efficiency of their operations.

Today, I want to talk to you about the related and timely subject of the working relations existing between the Military Sea Transportation Service and the American merchant marine. I believe you will understand the significance of this topic when I tell you that during fiscal year 1962 MSTS expended about $425 million for traffic operations, of which 78 percent went into commerical channels. Translated into other terms, about 12,500,000 measurement tons of dry cargo and 17 million long tons of petroleum were lifted under the aegis of MSTS. When I say that MSTS has become the largest single custom of the American merchant marine, you will understand why I consider it timely to talk about the working relations between MSTS and the steamship industry.

As the first step toward appreciation of the subject, it is necessary to have a clear understanding of the mission of the Military Sea Transportation Service, which has been stated quite concisely as—

1. To provide immediate transportation capability in an emergency;

2. To plan for and be capable of expansion in time of war, as directed; and

3. To provide sea transportation for personnel and cargoes of the Department of Defense and to provide support ships for scientific projects.

Worldwide, to accomplish this mission, MSTS has four main command headquarters in London, Brooklyn, San Francisco, and Yokohama, and 24 subordinate offices located in major seaports on our principal routes. The fleet controlled by MSTS consists of about 150 ships and craft, of which about 130 are Government-owned, and the balance are on medium to long-range charter to us.

In 1954, when hostilities in Korea were terminated and it became evident that serious problems of survival lay ahead of the American merchant marine, the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, and the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sinclair Weeks, signed a far-reaching agreement delineating the priority in which ships would be used for transportation of military-sponsored cargo. Before setting forth the terms of this agreement, it is appropriate to mention two laws which conditioned the Secretaries' thinking. These laws require that the Government utilize American shipping to transport certain cargoes in which the United States Government has a definable interest. The first of these is the 1904 Cargo Preference Act, the pertinent part of which I quote:

"Only vessels of the United States or belonging to the United States may be used for the transportation by sea of supplies bought for the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps. However, if the president finds that the freight charge by the vessels is excessive or otherwise unreasonable, contracts for transportation may be made as otherwise provided by law. Charges made for the transportation of those supplies by those vessels may not be higher than the charges made for transporting like goods for private persons."

You will note that, except for specific circumstances of unreasonably high freight rates, the military departments are compelled by this law to utilize the service of American-flag carriers. To this extent, it is true that MSTS, as executive director for ocean transportation for the Department of Defense, is the captive of the American merchant marine. I shall have occasion to return to this point later in this talk. At the moment, I want to impress upon you that the legal requirement that MSTS patronize American shipping is unequivocal.

The second law is the so-called 50–50 law, which requires that any equipment, materials, or commodities furnished to or for the account of any foreign nation without provision for reimbursement, or supplied with credits or guarantees as to the convertibility of currencies, shall be divided between American and foreign carriers in such a way as to assure "that at least 50 per centum of the gross tonnage of such equipment, materials, or commodities (computed separately for dry-bulk carriers, dry cargo liners, and tankers) shall be transported on privately owned U.S.-flag commercial vessels, to the extent such vessels are available at fair and reasonable rates for U.S.-flag commercial vessels." While this applies primarily to cargoes sponsored by the Agency for International Development, it also influences the routing of items shipped under the military assistance program to friendly nations around the world.

The specific terms of the 1904 law, as well as the concepts of the 50–50 law, were clearly in the minds of the Secretaries of Defense and Commerce when they signed their agreement in 1954. To eliminate the fear on the part of the industry that MSTS was intended to take over the American merchant marine, the Secretaries' paper provided a clear and precise directive for the appropriate utilization of the maritime resources of the Nation. After appropriate employment of the small numbers of transport and cargo ships directly operated by MSTS, all shipping requirements of the Department of Defense should be procured, consistent with military requirements and prudent management, in the following order of priority:

First. Maximum utilization of available U.S.-flag berth service;

Second. Time or voyage charter of suitable privately owned U.S.-flag merchant ships voluntarily made available by industry. Such charters will be kept to the minimum necessary to meet requirements which foresight indicates cannot be met by U.S.-flag berth operators;

Third. Shipping provided by the National Shipping Authority under General Agency Agreement;

Fourth. Where U.S.-flag shipping is not available, MSTS may employ foreign-flag shipping to meet urgent military requirements.

While there can be little doubt that the 1904 Cargo Preference Act and the 50–50 law, combined with the Wilson-Weeks Agreement, have been of major importance in accounting for the continued existence of the American merchant fleet, it is true that these decrees have restricted very sharply the flexibility of MSTS operations. I think it also is correct to say that some serious problems have been created for the American merchant marine by the existence of these requirements of law and policy.

To understand how the problems have arisen, it is necessary to explain the procedures by which MSTS is financed. In the simplest possible terms, our operations approximate those of any large American steamship company. We have a tariff which is distributed to our customers (the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force), and we charge them for transportation performed in accordance with the provisions of that tariff. The money we receive from our shippers is deposited in a revolving fund, known officially as an industrial fund, from which we pay our expenses. Annually, we compute the tariff in accordance with the forecasts received from our customers as to the cargoes and passengers to be carried, expenses to be incurred, and overhead to be paid. Annually, our customers provide a detailed estimate of what they expect to move in the form of passengers, dry cargo, and petroleum products. We take these data and develop the cost of transportation for the shipper services, who must request appropriations from the Congress. As part of our computation, we estimate how much of the total will be carried in MSTS-operated ships. Because they are Government-owned, these vessels are operated at a minimum cost per ton of cargo. Then we calculate how much of our buisness will be handled by berth-line operators. This is the most flexible, but at the same time the most expensive, form of sea carriage. Finally, we estimate the quantity of cargo to be lifted by ships chartered from private owners. These chartered ships are, next to our own ships, the least costly means of transportation.

When the preliminary figures are assembled, the MSTS ratemakers combine all the shipping costs, and produce a collection of rates known collectively as the billing tariff. Regardless of what type shipping may be employed in the actual lift of cargo, the charge to the shipper service will be that set forth in the tariff. This permits the different components of the armed services to forecast accurately their transportation expenses and to send their goods by the most expeditious method available during the entire fiscal year, without concern as to whether the cost of the carrying ship is high or low. It is really amazing to me to see how skillful our ratemakers are. They perform their magic year after year, and almost always arrange that we end up at the close of the fiscal year just exactly where we are supposed to be: we have made no profit and we have sustained no loss in our worldwide operation.

We buy about $135 million worth of commercial shipping space from the berth-line carriers each fiscal year. We have found this to be good business on our part. We can provide our customers with sailing schedules to meet their needs. We achieve tremendous flexibility in routing cargoes, because we can utilize many more ships than we ever could operate ourselves. To provide logistical support in wartime as well as in peace, we must have the assurance that these liner ships will be available to support military requirements. We appreciate that the only way this can be guaranteed is to give them our patronage to the maximum feasible extent. Finally, and after listing these other reasons it seems almost incidental, MSTS complies with the provisions of the Wilson-Weeks Agreement.

We are the largest charterers of American-flag tonnage. Most of our enormous petroleum lift is accomplished by means of commercially-owned tankers operating under consecutive-voyage or long-term charters. We also frequently go to the charter market in quest of American-flag dry-cargo carriers to handle shipload lots of many kinds of commodities.

Had it not been for the consistent employment by MSTS and other Government shipping agencies of the American tramp fleet, this segment of our merchant marine would have disappeared years ago. While it may be momentarily disconcerting to the berth-service operators for MSTS to use a chartered ship, there always is a good reason in addition to the fact that the tramps provide a service without which it would be more difficult to accomplish the MSTS mission.

Whereas the tramp owners deal with us individually, in the time-honored tradition of their branch of shipowning, the American-flag berth operators have found it advantageous to form two organizations, one representing the companies on the Atlantic and gulf coasts and the other, the shipowners on the Pacific coast, to negotiate rates and contracts with MSTS. Both these groups have filed their agreements with the Federal Maritime Commission pursuant to the terms of the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended, and function in all respects as standard steamship conferences, with the important difference that their only customer is MSTS. Within these two organizations, there are subdivisions of the carriers concerned with this trade route or that, but the value of having a single spokesman for each route has been demonstrated many times over. It is a convenience to MSTS to have a single point of contact; it is just as valuable to the operators to present a united front when an issue is discussed.

An interesting variation from standard business procedure is the rate structure developed by the commercial carriers under their shipping contracts with MSTS. Commercial practice provides for the steamship operator formulating rates which include all terminal costs associated with loading and discharging. The military cargo, on the other hand, usually is loaded or unloaded over military terminal facilities, using stevedore services provided by the military. Consequently, freight rates established for MSTS cargo are intended to cover the cost of ocean transportation only. This is what we have come to call the FIO rate—meaning free in and out. There are so many obvious differences arising from this change in the relationship between shipper and carrier that we have developed a new contract of carriage, as a substitute for the commercial bill of lading, which we call the shipping contract. Over the years, there have been many changes in the provisions of this agreement, but I think it is a tribute to the "can do" spirit of both sides that even when there is a dispute, the cargo continues to move.

Since the ocean carriers are commercial organizations, they are bound by the laws applicable to the merchant marine. Agreements made between the carriers to modify the basic organization of the companies must be filed with the Federal Maritime Commission for approval before they can become effective. The changes to tariffs which are hammered out in negotiating sessions must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Commission, and filed for approval. Since the passage of the amendments to the Shipping Act of 1916, the effective date of any rate increase must be at least 30 days after filing, unless the Commission finds that an exception is in the public interest. The only shipper concerned with these freight rates is MSTS, and therefore we have agreed with the secretaries of the carrier organizations that a waiver of the legal provisions is appropriate. I am happy to be able to say that the Maritime Commission always has concurred with us, and thus has made possible immediate increases in rates, once we finally have agreed to the changes.

To recapitulate briefly what I have said up to this point, let me remark that MSTS is required by law and executive agreement to utilize American commercial carriers to the maximum extent feasible, and it has developed a "billing tariff" which permits the armed services to obtain maximum flexibility in the delivery of goods around the world, with a predictable cost regardless of what mode of carriage is used: MSTS nucleus ships, chartered ships, or berth-service vessels. The value of MSTS business to the American marine industry is tremendous, aggregating about a million dollars a day.

It is true that the military is required to utilize American shipping whenever possible. It also is true that military business represents the largest source of cargo available to the American carriers from a single source. The earnings of some carriers reflect the transportation of a substantial tonnage of military-sponsored cargo. Some carriers, indeed, appear to derive a major portion of their total revenue from the Department of Defense. This, it seems to me, is a major problem area for the American operator, and I want to discuss this very frankly with you.

The military commitments of the United States during the years since World War II have been increasing steadily. The Government has provided a vast amount of materiel for the support of the hundreds of thousands of American fighting men on duty at bases all over the world. Our allies have been the recipient of millions of tons of equipment. To provide the shipping needed to support these activities has become a very big business indeed. It was to be expected that there should be companies organized for the sole purpose of supplying the steamship service needed by the Department of Defense. These companies have done a good job, and their operations have been appreciated by the military.. There is, however, a critical weakness in the foundation of such an enterprise. Since there is no commercial cargo transported, any considerable change in the military deployment of our Armed Forces may spell trouble for the shipowner. I believe it appropriate to add that our military and naval commitments must and will be made on the basis of strategic and tactical requirements of national policy. These changes may come about very suddenly, and may be very drastic. Undoubtedly many enterprises, which had grown up on the assumption that military installations would remain permanent fixtures in a community, will be hurt. It is conceivable that some small shipowner, who had built up a comfortable little business in transporting military supplies exclusively, would be forced into bankruptcy. This would be unfortunate, and there would be expressions of regret in the halls of MSTS headquarters, but there would be nothing that we could do to help the distressed shipowner.

An example of what I have in mind was announced recently by the Department of Defense. About 40,000 troops, sent to West Germany in 1961 during the Berlin buildup, will be returned to the United States and will not be replaced. There will be a reduction in the Army's requirements for vehicles, weapons, food, gasoline, heating fuel, medical supplies, and mail. There will be, of course, a corresponding cut in the demands for shipping service. The difference in what moved during 1962 and what will be moved in 1963 might be the margin of survival for a small carrier.

There is another factor which must be looked at dispassionately in our assessment of the relations between the Military Sea Transportation Service and the American merchant marine. This is the requirement imposed upon MSTS by the Department of Defense to operate a number of ships of specialized design. Some of these are experimental types, a few are prototypes of what might be built in the event of mobilization for a major emergency, and a few have become indispensable elements in planning for combat operations. The need to have a number of these ships in existence, and in full operating status, has to be recognized. There will be little time to construct new ships in the critical early days of a full-scale war, and what we have in being may be what we have to fight with for a considerable period. It takes time to reactivate a ship, and in sudden emergencies such as the Cuban crisis there is no time. Having ships ready and available for immediate support of the military plan proved to be invaluable.

The economics of ship operation are well known to the members of this group. It is no more feasible for MSTS to have a fleet of ships standing by in a ready status than it is for the commercial shipowner. We are compelled to find ways in which to operate our specialized ships economically, and to that end we use them to carry whatever cargo we can find that is appropriate for that type of craft. As the Defense budget permits construction of additional ships of a specialized type, it will be the obligation of MSTS to operate those ships as economically as possible. We have tried, and we shall continue to try, to reduce the impact of these operations upon the commercial carriers.

There is a temptation, I fear, for some American shipowners to look at the 1904 Cargo Preference Act, the "50–50" law, the Wilson-Weeks Agreement, and the worldwide distribution of our Military Establishment, and to assume that the Nation has an obligation to keep them in business. It is much easier to seek bookings of high-revenue commodities moving in large lots and handled by one office, than to go out and "beat the bushes" for 50- and 100-ton parcels. It is more economical for an owner to put his ship into a military terminal, and avoid the expense of leasing a berth. It is certainly a lot easier to send one big bill to the disbursing officer of MSTS and get a check almost by return mail than to try to collect dozens of due bills from shippers. It is also a dangerous frame of mind into which to slip, because the bubble might be burst at any time by highest level policy shifts.

The American merchant marine has been adding some magnificent new ships during the past 4 or 5 years. The superb performance of the new *American Challenger* class, the American Mail ships, the Lykes fleet, and the Moore-McCormack cargo carriers, to mention only a few, is something of which every American citizen can be proud. These ships represent tremendous technical advances over those they have replaced. They cost more to build and operate. They have much greater speed. In a given year they can carry—and will need, for profitable service—a great deal more cargo. They cannot be filled with military cargo alone. It is unlikely that the tonnage of Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force cargo will increase. If the planners who forecast the earnings, out of which these splendid new ships would be paid for, estimated that there would be any substantial improvement in the flow of military goods, they were grievously in error. I am compelled to say that it is unwise to depend upon military cargo as the principal source of revenue.

The Military Sea Transportation Service has had very happy relations with the American merchant marine industry throughout its history. I have been more than pleased with the willingness of the operators to divert their ships into many out-of-the-way ports, to pick up cargoes of unusual characteristics, and to delay departures to accommodate urgently needed but late arriving consignments. I have been assured, not only by words but by action, that the ships flying the American flag and operated by private American capital can be depended upon in time of emergency, and that they will take the cargo wherever it has to go. We have enjoyed dealing with the representatives who visit our offices in search of cargo or who present their ideas for improvements in contracts, services, schedules, or cargo routings. We consider that we have received fair return for the money we have expended.

I tell you these facts, because I want you to know, and I would like the record to show, that MSTS is established on the presumption that there will be available to it an American merchant marine to supplement the small nucleus fleet and provide the frequency and flexibility of service which our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force must have to accomplish their missions. At the same time, I want to have the same record show that there is very grave concern in the MSTS organization over the evidences of increasing dependence upon military cargoes which some of our shipping lines have shown. This we know to be true.

Every member of the MSTS staff lives in an official goldfish bowl, and is accustomed to having industry watch over his shoulder for every motion and every calculation of where and how to move a ton of cargo. We have no objection; we try to conduct our business so that there is no reason why every citizen should not know everything we do. We receive letters in Washington complaining about some decision we have made in the allocation of cargoes, the use of a foreign-flag ship, or a change of ship schedule which injures the local pride of a port authority. This more or less unending stream of correspondence is good for us; it keeps us from straying from the path of righteousness. But it is symptomatic of the idea that Government owes something to the American shipowner. It seems to me that if the same effort now directed to MSTS to assure that only American ships are used were devoted to commercial shippers, who in the aggregate, control a great deal more tonnage than MSTS ever will, it might procure a substantial quantity of desirable cargo. After all, there is a huge mountain of business into which to dig. Ninety percent of the American waterborne commerce in foreign trade is carried under foreign flag. Of the cargo which can be handled by the liner services, well over two-thirds moves under non-American flags. Only about 6 percent of our petroleum imports arrive in American-flag ships.

An intelligent, aggressive, persistent effort to sell American shipping to the American public is necessary. I shall venture to make some specific suggestions, because MSTS stands to gain by the existence of a strong and healthy American fleet which can be used by the military as required.

My first suggestion may not strike you initially as being very original, but I hope you will accept the premise that the American merchant marine needs better salesmanship and it needs a considerable improvement in what must be called, for lack of a better descriptive term, "commercial statesmanship." In the realm of salesmanship, I think much can be done, if the highest executives in the corporation will devote their personal attention to every complaint that American ships do not perform as well as their foreign-flag competitors. Since service is what is being sold, the customer must be pleased if he is to continue his patronage. Service can take many forms. For example, there still is a long way to go in packaging export cargoes. Customers can be helped by freight salesmen who know terminal operations, ship stowage techniques, and conditions in the delivery port. Each customer becomes an individual case, a challenge to the knowledge and ability of the salesman. It is axiomatic that improved packaging reduces claims. Fewer claims means greater profits, or reduced costs which can be passed along in lower freight rates. It will be expensive to train salesmen who are thoroughly competent to advise shippers in complex and technical matters. I am convinced, however, that the investment will pay dividends.

These are areas in which the American carrier can work. I would like to voice a plea that these activities be raised from the status of salesmanship to that of commercial salesmanship. Cooperatively, much can be done, and has been done over the years. The effort needs to be redoubled if the American merchant marine is to assume its proper place, and lift itself out of its present dependence upon military and Government-sponsored cargo. Just imagine what great potentialities there are in an industrywide program of market development, or elimination of Government restrictions which hamper international trade.

It may be a novel idea that the industry collectively can establish a training school for salesmen, but I believe you will agree with me that the average freight salesman today is not as well qualified for his work as he, his employer, and his clients would like him to be. An industry sponsored training program would be enormously valuable. Common problems could be discussed, where ethics and practices could be analyzed and standards adopted, and where new concepts of convincing the American citizen that support of American-flag shipping is good business. Company programs could supplement what the industry gives, and could mold the salesman into its own pattern.

I have ventured far afield in my comments upon the American shipping industry. My reason has been not only my personal concern, but also the deep official distress on the part of the military high command, over the plight of the American merchant fleet. There is no question on the part of the Military Sea Transportation Service that a vital, really strong American merchant fleet is essential to the welfare of the Nation. It has been a matter of real regret to MSTS to see some of the old names in American shipping disappear from the roster because of adverse economic tides. It is questionable if the American industry can survive on the basis of carrying only military or Government-sponsored cargoes. The only way back to a sound economic position is to get a larger share of the commercial cargo market. I know this means overcoming the hardest kind of competition, undertaking the roughest kind of work, engaging in the most determined kind of searching for opportunities. But I also know that it is the only way that the American merchant fleet can expect to survive.

It is easy to lay down the challenge. It is difficult to pick it up. I believe, however, that there is so much of the legendary American determination to win that the American merchant marine industry can and will pick up the challenge. Then and only then will the American merchant marine provide the ships that the military services need as an essential part of our national defense posture.

Hon. Francis E. Walter

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak as all the members of our Pennsylvania congressional delegation do when I express my profound sadness and sorrow on the passing of the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, our beloved dean.

"TAD," as we all called him, was our guiding light and our inspiration. He was our pillar of strength, our teacher, our confidant, and foremost—our friend.

When I first came to the Congress, I was, like all first termers, lost, but with the helping hand of "TAD" WALTER, I found my way very rapidly. For this I was grateful—and through the years that followed, his advice and his wisdom helped me immeasurably.

I will greatly miss Mr. WALTER and my family extends to his family our deepest sympathy in this—their hour of sorrow.

Cranesville Swamp, a Fossilized Relic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, in the June 2, 1963, edition of the New York Times there appeared a description of a quite curious area in my district of West Virginia which takes us back in time at least 10,000 years. I hope it may be of sufficient interest to many people to justify reprinting in the RECORD.

The article follows:

AGE-OLD SWAMP—BOG IN WEST VIRGINIA AND MARYLAND ATTRACTS SCIENTISTS AND STUDENTS

(By Heister G. Rhawn)

TERRA ALTA, W. VA.—While West Virginia celebrates its centennial as a State this year, this mountain community 2,600 feet above sea level—its name means "high land" in Latin—is offering a tourist attraction that scientists trace back to the immediate postglacial era.

It is the Cranesville Pine Swamp, a bog that straddles the State line between Garrett County, Md., and Preston County, W. Va. The swamp has been described as a northern island in a southern latitude, "an anachronistic fragment of a vast evergreen forest that followed in the wake of the retreating glaciers."

Romeo Mansuetti, of the Maryland Department of Research and Education, has said that a trip to the Cranesville bog leaves one with the impression "of a cool, wet, shrouded visit to a nether world." He also quotes Prof. G. Evelyn Hutchinson of Yale as saying that the fossil record of the area shows that this forest was established about 7500 B.C.

Also described as a "little bit of Canada transplanted in West Virginia," the swamp is the site of the Terra Alta Biological Station, which was set up by West Virginia University. Dr. Earl L. Core, chairman of the Department of Biology of West Virginia University has directed studies in this "frost pocket."

Dr. H. D. Bennett, director of the biological station at Terra Alta, and George Breiding, director of Oglebay Park in Wheeling, W. Va., will give prospective visitors data on field trips to the area. Gilbert E. Arnold, cashier of the Terra Alta bank, heads a tourist committee for the area and can also supply information concerning it.

ON THE B. & O.

Terra Alta is on the main line of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad and 10 miles from Oakland, Md., the county seat of Garrett County. At Oakland is Deep Creek Lake, where there are numerous motels and housing accommodations for summer visitors.

Plants that predominate in the bogs of the northern United States appear in the West Virginia-Maryland swamp. Students of the area have listed the royal fern, marsh fern, sedge, cotton grass, speckled alder, mountain holly, white azalea, cranberry, gentian and goldenrod as among the species in this swamp.

Birds in the sanctuary are the slate-colored snowbird, hermit thrush, northern water thrush, veery, Canadian warbler, Nashville warbler and great blue heron.

Fish found in the Cranesville bog include the longnose sucker, a Canadian species, as well as the northern chub, blacknosed dace and redfin sculpin.

The Nature Conservancy in Washington, D.C., owns about 50 percent of the swamp, which is roughly 2 miles long and one-quarter to one-half mile wide. The conservancy has designated the area as a sanctuary.

How did a spot so different from the familiar woods and hills of western Maryland and northern West Virginia come into existence?

Mr. Mansuetti explains that, during the Ice Age, the northern forest retreated southward in front of the advancing ice sheet. With the retreat of the ice and a general warming of the climate, the northern forest advanced northward again to where it exists today. Botanists term as a "relict colony" this small piece of a once vast northern forest.

With hiking boots, one can travel over quite a bit of the swamp area, according to Mr. Arnold. The Cranesville-Terra Alta road, which leads off State Route 7 at Terra Alta, makes the swamp area accessible to visitors. They also can reach it from U.S. 219 at a point near Deep Creek Lake, Md.

SMALL POPULATION

Terra Alta is a community of 1,500 people. It is situated in the foothills of the scenic Appalachian Mountains, with lovely vistas of rolling lands, tidy farms and distant blue mountains. The people are friendly, and there is a wealth of flowers and trees.

Oglebay institute operates an annual summer camp here along scenic Lake Terra Alta, an 18-acre body of water that contrasts with the ancient swamp area. Here, the Brethren Church maintains Camp Galilee with a lodge, swimming areas and cabins.

Nearby are a hunting and fishing camp and a game refuge of 2,050 acres. They have a total water area of 70 acres and 25 miles of brooks and streams, of which 15 contain trout. The town of Terra Alta has a city park of 15 acres, including an assembly hall and picnic facilities.

This is a typical mountain town. Once, coal, oil and gas operations offered employment, but they are now limited. This has caused leading citizens to make the bid for tourists and to point out the features of the Cranesville Swamp as an attraction for students and scientists. At the same time, they emphasize the inviting prospect of a visit to the cool and beautiful hills of West Virginia and Maryland.

Another Fisheries Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, this morning the news media brought word that the Canadian Government has made a decision to establish a 12-mile fishing zone off its coasts effective in mid-May 1964.

For many years, this proposal has confronted American fishermen, especially those from my district and the States of Washington and Alaska. Such a move would affect our fishermen who traditionally have fished along the coasts of British Columbia unless there are guarantees from the Canadians to protect our historic rights. I have requested the Secretary of State to begin consultations with the Canadian Government with the hope that an equitable solution can be reached.

The situation was reviewed in an editorial that appeared in the Seattle, Wash., Times on May 15, 1963. I believe this editorial presents a clear picture of what is happening and what is needed to meet the problems involved.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial in the RECORD.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, May 15, 1963]

ANOTHER FISHERIES PROBLEM

A single line in the communique issued by President Kennedy and Canadian Prime Minister Pearson at the end of their weekend talks revived a long-standing fear in the Puget Sound fishing community. It stated: "The Prime Minister informed the President that the Canadian Government would shortly be taking decisions to establish a 12-mile fishing zone."

For more than three decades, representatives of the Pacific Northwest and Alaska fishing industry have been urging the State Department to obtain a comprehensive agreement with Canada covering all American and Canadian fishing rights in the North Pacific.

Failure to conclude such an agreement led to serious controversy 3 years ago when a proposal to establish a 12-mile limit for coastal territorial waters, applicable to all nations, was considered by the Geneva Conference on Law of the Sea.

Fortunately for our fishermen, this conference went the way of so many other international conferences at Geneva. It ended in stalemate.

But now Canada is preparing to impose a 12-mile limit unilaterally on its coastal waters. If established without exception, such a move would bar U.S. fishermen from grounds they have fished for decades along the British Columbia coast.

It would prevent U.S. fishermen from harvesting many fish that spawn in U.S. waters.

Pearson's announcement comes at a time when both American and Canadian fishermen are undergoing an invasion of their traditional North Pacific grounds by steadily encroaching Russian and Japanese fleets.

Ken Campbell, secretary of the Fisheries Association of British Columbia, says it is concerned with the Russian and Japanese expansion—and not with Americans who traditionally have fished off British Columbia—that has prompted the new 12-mile proposal. Pearson assured Mr. Kennedy that historic U.S. fishing rights would be taken into account.

But leaders of Canada's leftist-dominated United Fishermen & Allied Workers have announced opposition to any concessions to Americans within the 12-mile zone.

If Canada does honor U.S. historic rights while imposing a 12-mile limit, the action might actually benefit American fishermen by discouraging southward Japanese and Russian moves down the coast from the Gulf of Alaska.

What is needed, obviously, is immediate and close consultation with the Canadians by U.S. Government representatives who are thoroughly conversant with American fishing interests.

Such consultations are necessary, not only to protect American rights in connection with the 12-mile issue, but to achieve a joint Canadian-American position in the forthcoming negotiations with Japan on the International North Pacific Fisheries Treaty.

Teague Blames Democrats for Bracero Bill's Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I inserted in the Appendix a news article commenting on the effects of the failure of the House to approve an extension of Public Law 78—Mexican farm labor bill. Today I call attention to another news story on the same subject. This time the item is taken from the Oxnard, Calif., Press-Courier of May 31, 1963.

[From the Press-Courier (Oxnard, Calif.), May 31, 1963]

CONGRESSMAN CITES PRESSURE OF LABOR

(By Donna Jenkins)

Congressman CHARLES TEAGUE, this morning, laid the blame for defeat of the bill to extend the Mexican National farm labor program, on California Democratic Congressmen

"Six Democrats from California voted for extension of the program, 13 voted against it. If only seven of them had switched, we would have carried the bill," the Congressman said. "Of the 14 Republicans from California, 13 voted for the bill—the 14th was not present.

"The responsibility for the defeat should be placed on the House Democrats," he said.

Contacted at his office in Washington, TEAGUE told the Press-Courier that he feels that Public Law 78 met its defeat Wednesday as a result of "terrific pressure by many segments of organized labor plus the well-intentioned but very misguided efforts of church groups—Catholic, Protestant and Jewish."

PRESSURE CITED

TEAGUE said, "Walter Reuther and the clergy are really rough when they put the pressure on Congress. Then throw in Norman Thomas, Rufus Von Kleinschmidt and Helen Gahagan Douglas and it is astounding the 158 Members of the House voted for the extension. In my opinion they qualified for a profile in courage medal.

"I hope those who killed the bill, including a majority, but not all, California Democrats in the House, will have a plan for the harvesting of our crops."

William Tolbert, executive secretary for the Ventura County Citrus Growers Committee, is presently in Washington meeting with TEAGUE. The Congressman said he will meet Tolbert this noon to discuss trying for a 1-year extension of the law instead of the 2 years called for in the defeated version. "I am not optimistic though. I think those who voted against the bill would do so again," TEAGUE said.

TEAGUE was to address Congress this noon on the labor situation.

GROWERS SEEK SOLUTION

In Ventura County, growers, already hard hit by a curtailment of bracero labor last year, are attempting to find some means to overcome the inevitable shortage that could change the whole agricultural program.

Congress, a year ago, passed a bill which allowed employment of Mexican nationals by any one employer for 210 days or 35 weeks in any year—whichever period was shorter. If a worker spent 15 minutes on the job during any week, the week was counted as one of the 35 allowable.

The curtailment forced over 20 growers to apply for hardship help and, according to Jesse Frye, manager of the Ventura County Farm Labor Association, will force more than double that amount to the hardship ruling this year.

SEES PRICE BOOSTS

"One result of the defeat that I can very definitely state," Frye said, "is that the price of food is going to increase. I also think that some of the smaller farmers will be forced out of business. One man and his son can handle many acres of strawberries all year until harvest. Then they need 150–180 braceros. They just can't compete in the labor market without the bracero program."

Hardest hit will be growers of strawberries, market and cannery tomatoes, celery, lettuce, spinach, and cabbage. According to Frye these vegetables are completely hand harvested.

"I predict," he said, "that this could change the eating habits of the entire United States. In the late fall and early spring we produce the only spinach, lettuce, and cabbage in the United States. Without labor it just won't be possible to grow it."

Growers from throughout the State will meet in Sacramento Monday and Tuesday to discuss the situation. Attending from Ventura County will be Frye, Tolbert, and Carl Samuelson of Ventura, president of the National Farm Labor Committee.

Walt Horan: Doctor of Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I know that all Members of the Washington congressional delegation join me in extending our congratulations to our colleague, WALT HORAN, upon whom has been conferred an honorary doctor of laws degree by one of the finest Catholic educational institutions in the Pacific Northwest.

This honor was conferred upon our colleague during the 76th commencement at Gonzaga University at Spokane, Wash., on May 26 by the Very Reverend John P. Leary, S.J., president of the university. President Leary's words were especially befitting the dean of our Washington State congressional delegation, and I would like to read them into the RECORD at this point:

> Inasmuch as WALT HORAN has for these several years given faithful service to us and to our Nation, concerning himself consistently and day by day with the national interest, epitomizing in his person all a good citizen should be: an example in affairs of state and in his family life, devoted humanely to the welfare of his constituents, loving man, and loving God; and
>
> Inasmuch as, like so many good public servants, he has gone largely unthanked, we today recognize our debt and his greatness, pointing him out to our students as a model for them to look to in a world of self-servers.
>
> For these so rich 25 years we adopt him as our son and make him doctor of laws.

You Figure It Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of this body a section which we are considering in H.R. 4955, a bill which would expand vocational education into every conceivable direction. We often mention bureaucratic jargon and I wish to point out a formula which literally requires a Univac computer to determine. Consider the formula which is set out in section 3 of H.R. 4955:

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $45,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $90,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $135,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each fiscal year thereafter, $180,000,000, for the purpose of making grants to States as provided in this Act.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 3. (a) Ninety-five per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the number of persons in the various age groups needing vocational education and the per capita income in the respective States as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year—

(1) an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged fifteen to nineteen, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

(2) an amount which bears the same ratio to 20 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged twenty to twenty-four, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

(3) an amount which bears the same ratio to 15 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged twenty-five to sixty-five, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

(4) an amount which bears the same ratio to 10 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the sum of the amounts allotted to the State under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) for such year bears to the sum of the amounts allotted to all the States under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) for such year.

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State's plan approved under section 5 shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use under the approved plan of such State for such year and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States not suffering such a reduction. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during such year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

(c) (1) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the per capita income for the State by the per capita income for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands), except that (i) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .25 or more than .75; (ii) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be .75, and (iii) the allotment ratio of any State shall be .50 for any fiscal year if the Commissioner finds that the cost of education in such State exceeds the median of such costs in all the States by a factor of 2 or more as determined by him on the basis of an index of the average per pupil cost of constructing minimum school facilities in the States as determined for such fiscal year under section 15(6) of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 645) (relating to Federal school construction assistance in federally affected areas), or, in the Commissioner's discretion, on the basis of such index and such other statistics and data as the Commissioner shall deem adequate and appropriate.

(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner for each fiscal year, between July 1 and September 30 of the preceding fiscal year, except that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, such allotment ratios shall be promulgated as soon as possible after the enactment of this Act. Allotment ratios shall be computed on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes for a State and for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for the three most recent consecutive fiscal years for which satisfactory data is available from the Department of Commerce.

(3) The term "per capita income" for a State or for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for any fiscal year, means the total personal income for such State, and for all such States, respectively, in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year, divided by the population of such State, and of all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

(4) The total population and the population of particular age groups of a State or of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the latest available estimates furnished by the Department of Commerce.

Ecuador's Long Arm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of June 2, 1963, which points out that our Government is not taking into account the help we have given Ecuador in negotiating for establishment of a sane and reasonable territorial waters limitation.

Two U.S. tuna boats are in detention by the Government of Ecuador. We are a major customer for Ecuadorian bananas, and have supplied $138 million in foreign aid that that nation to help develop and diversify its economy. This editorial points out that no country should have the right to unilaterally extend its territorial boundaries to the extent that freedom on the seas is destroyed.

Text of the editorial is as follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, June 2, 1963]

Ecuador's Long Arm

The preposterous contention of several South American countries that their territorial waters extend 200 miles to sea has been put to the test by Ecuador's seizure of two U.S. tuna boats from California. The Ecuadorean Navy says they were poaching in Ecuadorian waters, and the Quito government has rejected our request that they be released.

The purpose of these countries in asserting their 200-mile claim, which has not been recognized by the United States or by international law, is to exclude fishermen from the United States and other countries and to give monopoly rights to local fishermen.

Ecuador is trying to diversify its economy, which has been dangerously dependent upon the price of bananas. Expansion and improvement of its fishing fleet is part of this diversification. It has been accomplished to a considerable extent with aid from the United Nations and the United States.

This desire to diversify, however sensible, doesn't give Ecuador or any other country the unilateral right to extend its domain far out into the ocean and to evict American fishermen who have been working those waters for decades.

The United States, which adheres to the 3-mile limit, has consistently opposed the expanding claims of other countries as an encroachment on freedom of the seas. We have proposed compromises at several conferences, but in vain. Twelve-mile claims have become common, and in the case of Panama it would block off both entrances to the Panama Canal. Moreover, as countries expand their territorial waters, it becomes easier for enemy submarines to escape into protected waters from American ships or planes.

It is high time that this nibbling away at the freedom of the seas came to an end, and the first order of business should be the release of the American fishing boats.

Government-Operated Lotteries in Israel, Iran, Iraq, and Lebanon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I should like to take the Members of this House to the Middle East and acquaint them with the government-operated lotteries conducted in Israel, Iran, Iraq, and Lebanon.

These are 4 more countries out of the 77 foreign nations throughout the world which appreciate the additional revenues derived from properly regulated and controlled gambling.

Israel started its lottery program in 1951 and, during its 12 years of existence, has proven not only satisfactory but profitable as well. Last year, the gross receipts came to over $16 million. The Government received, after payment of prizes, almost $5 million which was applied for the building of hospitals and schools.

Iran operates a nationwide lottery under the auspices of the Imperial Social Services Organization which is associated with the Shah's family. Last year, the total gross receipts of the lottery amounted to $8 million. The organization withheld for the Central Government about $2 million which was used to establish dispensaries, hospitals, and schools.

Iraq has two national lotteries managed by Government agencies. One is the Public Health Lottery and the other is called the National Union Lottery. The gross annual receipts from both lotteries in 1962, was $1,700,000. After payment of prizes, the Ministry of Health received almost one-half million dollars for its hospital construction program and about $300,000 was contributed to benevolent societies and various other philanthropic purposes.

Lebanon established its national lottery in 1943. The gross receipts for 1962 were over $3 million. The net income to the Government amounted to about one-quarter million dollars which were earmarked and used for social development purposes, such as the Red Cross, scholarships, trade unions, Government employees' retirement fund and libraries.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat: Why can we not, like Israel, and all of these other foreign countries, overwhelm the hypocrites, bluenoses and moralists? Why can we not follow the recent example set by New Hampshire? If we can only wipe out hypocrisy in the United States, we could, with our own national lottery, pump into our Government Treasury over $10 billion a year in new revenue which could be used to cut our taxes and reduce our national debt.

That These Dead Shall Not Have Died in Vain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a remarkable sermon delivered by the Reverend Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, minister of the National Presbyterian Church, on the Sunday before Memorial Day, May 26, 1963:

That These Dead Shall Not Have Died in Vain

(By Dr. Edward L. R. Elson)

Hebrews 11: 39, 40 (Phillips): "All these won a glowing testimony to their faith, but they did not then and there receive the fulfillment of the promise. God had something better planned for our day, and it was not his plan that they should read perfection without us."

One hundred years ago next November 19 President Abraham Lincoln stood on a small platform in the town of Gettysburg, Pa., and, following a long and eloquent address by the great orator, Edward Everett, uttered in 2 minutes a speech which reverberated around the world then, has penetrated each generation since, has raised men's hopes in every generation and will be heard and heeded as long as man is man and human speech endures. Not a word or a syllable was wasted. Its single idea is stated logically, movingly, and in a beauty of style and structure unexcelled in classic English.

It sounds like scripture. No wonder, for it was from the knowledge and use of the King James translation that Lincoln learned his precisely polished English. It was learned from a translation of the Bible into English made at a time when the language was at its finest and best. And that book which reposes at the center of the church was for many years of Lincoln's life almost his only textbook.

Our Nation, he said, was "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. * * * We cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. * * * It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave their last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

It sounds like our text in Hebrews, chapter 11: 39, 40, "All these won a glowing testimony to their faith, but they did not then and there receive the fulfillment of the promise. God had something better planned for our day, and it was not his plan that they should reach perfection without us." This New Testament book, the "Letter to the Hebrews," binds ancient Israel to the new Israel, which is the church. It is the hall of heroes where we see honored the patriarchs, prophets, warriors, saints, and apostles of people who believe they gave testimony to a covenant-keeping God.

The ideas of Lincoln's address are found also in the "Epistle to the Hebrews," among which are—

1. A nation under God.
2. A new freedom won by Christ.
3. An unfinished work until all men in every generation are equally free under God to develop their own resources.

How do these great convictions fare 100 years after the Gettysburg dedication?

A foreign diplomat returning to his post in Washington after a tour of many other nations said to me one day, "America is unique among the nations. You see and you feel its uniqueness. America is different because it is a deeply religious nation." Allowing for the fact he was being diplomatic in speaking with a clergyman, the fact remains he had lived here a long time after living elsewhere and he knew and understood us. Sometimes we are better understood by others than by ourselves.

We pledge our allegiance to one Nation "under God"—we are under His creation, under His bounty, under His guidance, and under His judgment. But once established under God, how do you make certain that that truth is perpetuated, inculcated, and given witness? At the beginning at least, we were formed according to the divine covenant, in which concept we believe God blesses and guides that nation which obeys His laws and does His will. At the beginning at least, we put that explicitly, implicitly, and emphatically in our documents.

Now we seem to be unsure and are changing the patterns of conduct and direction of our national thinking. Even our own denomination sets forth as a guide (not an individually binding directive) a declaration saying Presbyterians prefer the basic concept of the secular state—which means a state organized apart from divine reference. A secular nation is not what we were at the beginning. Then we said it was God who gave us liberty, God who brought forth the Nation, God who hath preserved us a nation. Secularism is a way of ordering life apart from God and that is different from the philosophic deism of the Founders. If a church is a place where a way of life is expressed, then by omitting prayer as a symbolic act we make our public schools a secular church, and as we proceed to eliminate prayer and religious exercises we must be aware of three things:

1. God doesn't matter as much as we once thought.

2. These school exercises never were substitutes for denominational religious education. School exercises need richer content, and denominational education needs to be improved.

3. If we are to eliminate religious exercises in public schools and prayer in public ceremonies like Congress and civic celebrations, we must find, and soon find, ways of involving the whole people in public symbolic acts that we are a God-conscious people—a theistic people—even though not a theocratic state. It is as important for the secularist and atheist to know this as it is for the persons who believe it and do it.

Everywhere we seem to be in retreat from the use of the symbolic acts which attest the divine covenant. When a nation loses respect for its symbols, it is already on its way down. It ill behooves the clergy to complain that prayer in school or public assemblies is meaningless ritual. Rituals and symbolic acts always have deeper meaning than the acts themselves. And if symbolic acts do not presently have deep meaning, let us invest them with deeper meaning—not abolish the acts.

We are in the midst of crucial judgments with reference to church and state and we need to keep our equilibrium, respond to situations with our brains, our faith, and with a creative attitude and not simply with our emotions. But I must say I have rarely seen more emotion than that of the newer theologians contending for a secular view of the state and condemning the older view of the divine covenant. Emotional response must apply to people on both sides.

We are a theistic people, a God-conscious people—even though we do not have a theocratic government. This has been and, I trust, will continue to be a Nation under God. There is an unfinished task. No matter what general assemblies pronounce or courts adjudge, we must find new and better ways of increasing the depth of the God-conscious reality and creating symbolic actions whereby we teach this truth to our children and witness to the whole world the divine sovereignty over this Nation as well as over individual man and the corporate life of the church.

II

One hundred years ago, Lincoln talked about a new birth of freedom—for all men—and of the unfinished work to be done if we remain a government of all the people, by all the people, for all the people. Are we now paying the price for the sluggish response to the inclusive democracy the battle of Gettysburg and other battles were fought to bring to fulfillment? The unfinished task is all about us every day and hour and minute in this city.

As a matter of hard reality, Lincoln, as Jesus before him, knew that all men are not equal in ability, in talents, in physique, in personal endowments. But all men are equally free under God to develop the qualities God has given each.

And this equal freedom to develop what God has given each man as a person, and not as a member of a particular race, has not yet been fully achieved. And the races, white, Negro, and all other races suffer our present agony.

We suffer because we have deep-seated, inbred, historically conditioned barriers to finishing the work Lincoln talked about. And these attitudes and mental fixations are hard to budge or breed out of us. People have a right to choose their associates and organize their own groups. That is part of freedom, of course. But let us be honest. We white American Christians have not really opened our hearts and culture to people of every race on the same basis and with the same immediacy and naturalness of response we do to the people of our own race. I know this painfully from the unsigned letters I received many years ago when our church was host in the dining room to an interchurch group made up of many races. I know the other side, too, of how wise and statesmanlike our session was back in 1947 when it adopted a policy of welcoming to this church all persons who sincerely confess Christ and wish to serve Him. And for years we have numbered people of multiple races. Because this has been our attitude for years our session declined to put our church in the list published by the Council of Churches a few months ago—for that gave the impression that the churches were only then assuming a Christian attitude and the publicity only magnified the problem. Problems are not solved by spectacular demonstrations or flamboyant publications but by living together day by day as Christians.

Only a fully redeemed man, only one in whom the mind and spirit of Jesus is regnant, is fully qualified for the ultimate life that is required. For we are really asking for a quality of life which belongs to the kingdom of God, where love is the law and God is the ruler, and we have a long way to go in that journey. It has not been made in 100 years.

Surely it is clear that white American Christians must take the initiative in treating all persons as persons instead of treating some people as persons and others as problems. In some manner we are all "problems." One of our daughters taught us a Christian lesson for, after having herself been harassed by a culturally under-developed, over-age young thug, she surmounted the experience to regard him as simply a "bad" young teenager. So thoroughly did she emerge from the experience retaining a Christian attitude that Mrs. Elson and I never knew until we went to a PTA evening at the school which of the daughter's teachers were white and which were Negroes. By her attitude, revealed at home, they might all have been teachers from one race, whereas only half of them were from our race. A child sometimes still leads. We must take the initiative in treating all persons as persons.

And the corollary follows, American Christian Negroes can take the initiative in insisting on being treated as persons and not as problems or a separate group requiring special consideration and representation. The idea that we must put a person on a committee or a board or in a political office because he is a Negro must be repugnant to the qualified, cultured Negro who ought to be admitted to all of society and welcomed to serve any place in life because he is a qualified person, a person honored when he is honorable and respected when he is respectable.

And this means responsibility by men as men—persons as persons. It means responsibility for their own acts. When persons are bad persons they are bad persons—not bad whites, bad Negroes, bad yellow or red men. The last burglar apprehended in this Church was a white man who in court said he was hoping to get enough money to go to the Mardi Gras for a celebration before the Lenten disciplines were imposed. And the men who in broad daylight came into our fellow Church member's jewelry shop and unmercifully beat up one of your fellow Church members were nonwhites. If we are to get anywhere with improving our common life, people must accept responsibility for their own acts, no matter what race they represent.

If our beloved Capital City has become a jungle of crime and we are all swept by fear, let us begin to deal with persons who are bad persons as bad persons; and take the steps first to restrain them and protect the rest of the people; and then take the steps, costly as they may be, to remove the alleged causes and redeem the persons who are redeemable.

In his recent article in Look magazine, Fletcher Knebel says frankly: "That Washington's crime, school and welfare problems spring overwhelmingly from the Negro community is no longer a matter of dispute. Prominent Negroes and whites agree on that fact. They also agree on the underlying causes: poverty, unemployment, broken homes, ignorance and parental irresponsibility among thousand of Negroes who have flocked to the Capital from the rural South."

Correcting the basic sociological causes may take a long time. But let us not be self-righteous. People are not bad because they are Negroes but because they are bad people—for all the reasons which have made them bad people. On the other hand, persons ought to be treated as persons. Freedom and equality of opportunity bring responsibility, responsibility for one's own actions. You cannot blame everything on slums and poverty and ignorance, however great these contribute to low living and acting. Persons are persons and must be treated as persons.

Some of the greatest Saints have come out of the slums and what today we call depressed areas. And some of the worst thugs and criminals have come out of palaces of privilege. Persons must be regarded as persons. Neither the white man nor Negro man, neither yellow man nor red man has an exclusive monopoly on all the human virtues or all the human vices. There are enough vices to drive all of us to shame and enough virtues to lift all of us in proud human dignity. God is the God and Father of us all, and the great and good day will come and remain only when all of us live as responsible persons under the full sovereignty of the transcendent God.

On Memorial Day we hear the echo of marching men, "Tramp, Tramp, Tramp, the Boys Are Marching." As they come trooping up out of memory, carrying the national colors, toting their Bibles, suffering and dying, let us lock step with them and dedicate ourselves to the unfinished task of a nation under God about which Lincoln spoke, and the prophets and apostles of old heralded—for "our God keeps marching on."

Panama Canal Future Is Endangered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, among the most gravely serious questions that have been before the Congress for many years is that of the Panama Canal, the sovereign control of which by the United States has been under increasing attacks by world revolutionary forces. In an address to the House on April 9, 1963, under the subject of "Congress Must Save the Panama Canal," I dealt at length with the subject of sovereignty over the Canal Zone and its piece-meal liquidation, now being fostered by international socialist elements in the Department of State, and urged action by the Congress on House Concurrent Resolution 105, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON.]

Though the mass news media in the United States has generally failed to present the facts about the Panama Canal sovereignty matter, smaller publications have done so. The latest contribution on this subject is an illuminating and thoughtful editorial in the May-June 1963 issue of Pan American Headlines, published by the Committee on Pan-American Policy of New York, of which Harold Lord Varney is president.

The indicated editorial follows:

PANAMA CANAL FUTURE IS ENDANGERED

If Congress adjourns without passing the Cannon resolution, reasserting U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone, we may look for further dangerous erosion of the American position on the Panama Canal.

In line with its general weak-kneed policy in Latin America, the State Department is showing unmistakable signs of willingness to make further surrenders on the sovereignty issue. The goal of the Panama politicians is plain. It was voiced by Gilberto Arias, until recently Secretary of Finance in President Chiari's cabinet. As quoted in the Isthmian newspaper Critica (March 19, 1963), Arias said:

"In the future, with God's help, we will achieve our objective: that the Panama Canal be the property of Panamanians, under full and absolute jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama, maintained by Panamanians, operated by Panamanians, sanitated by Panamanians, and protected by Panamanians."

Since the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty with Panama of 1903, which guaranteed Panama its independence from Colombia, gave the United States "perpetual" sovereignty over the Canal Zone, the juridical basis for Mr. Arias' demand is puzzling.

In the face of the mounting crisis, the United States finds itself with its weakest representation in Panama in years. The Kennedy-appointed Governor of the Canal Zone, Robert J. Fleming, Jr., is proving himself a pitifully weak reed when events call for him to take a strong stand against the exactions of Republic of Panama officials. In a recent speech before the American Society of Civil Engineers in Panama, Fleming championed "the social revolution of today" and called for the slaughter of the "sacred cows of the 19th and early 20th centuries." He scoffed at "conservatism" and "silly resistance to change."

When Fleming weakly yielded to Republic of Panama politicians and displayed the Panama flag in the Zone on a par with the U.S. flag, Gerald Doyle, chief architect of the Panama Canal Company, filed a suit against Fleming and Secretary of the Army Vance to halt the flying of the Panama flag in the zone which, he claimed, was in direct violation of U.S. law.

Doyle, a man of high reputation, seems to have the moral support in his action of most of the 3,793 American citizens who are employed by the Canal Company and the Canal Government.

However, the pliant State Department policy on the sovereignty issue antedates Kennedy. In the Eisenhower administration, when the situation began to get ugly in Panama, the State Department took an equivocal stand on the Panama flag issue. To forestall a retreat, the House of Representatives, on February 2, 1960, adopted a resolution, by the overwhelming margin of 380 to 12, urging that the Panama flag should not be flown in Canal Zone. Disregarding this vote, the State Department waited until Congress adjourned on September 17, 1960. An Executive Order was then issued, and was proclaimed in Panama by U.S. Ambassador Joseph S. Farland, directing that the Panama flag be flown daily in the Zone with the Stars and Stripes.

This exhibition of American weakness, in the face of the demands of irresponsible Panama City mobs, has led to a sharp decline in American prestige. It was an open invitation to Panama Nationalist demagogues to make further unjustified demands.

Providing a gloomy background to the situation is the frank acceptance, by important figures in the Kennedy administration of the thesis that international control of the Canal is inevitable.

U.N. Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, on a 1961 visit to Panama, declared that "the logical future of the Canal may be some form of internationalization."

That influential State Department people would not be adverse to such a surrender is seen in the visit to Panama in January of Abdel Hamid Abubakr, secretary general of the Suez Canal Authority. Mr. Abubakr, who carried out the nationalization of the Suez Canal for Nasser, was invited to Panama under the State Department's "foreign leader" program and was the guest of the canal. While in Panama, Abubakr was photographed with Governor Fleming and lectured audiences on the Nasser snatch of the Suez Canal from its legal owners.

In the House, a determined group of Representatives spearheaded by Daniel J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, and H. R. GROSS, Republican, of Iowa, are mobilizing sentiment behind House Concurrent Resolution 105, introduced by Representative CLARENCE A. CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, urging that the United States "should not, in any wise, surrender to any other government or authority, its jurisdiction over, and control of the Canal Zone, and its ownership, control, management, maintenance, operation, and protection of the Panama Canal." If this resolution reaches the floor, chances for its passage, by another huge majority, are bright. Readers supporting this resolution should rush their letters to the President, and to their Congressmen and Senators.

The Sleepwalkers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of June 5, 1963:

THE SLEEPWALKERS

After a long sleep, the economic planners in the Western World are beginning to revive a bit.

At least, more is heard these days of France's loosely coordinated plan. Britain under the Conservative Party has established the National Economic Development Council (promptly nicknamed "Neddy" by an irreverent populace). In this country a good many people believe only real economic planning can bring the desired growth. There is even a lurking suspicion, doubtless without foundation, that some in our Government would push harder for economic planning here if they thought it politically feasible at the moment.

In the light of this modest revival, we found both wit and insight in an article by British economist A. A. Shenfield, currently a visiting professor at the University of Chicago. Writing in Modern Age magazine, Mr. Shenfield first notes that economic planning is somewhat difficult to define. Even antitrust legislation, usually championed by advocates of a free market, can be construed as economic planning because it is an intrusion in the marketplace. Between that and the totality of Russia's Gosplan are many gradations of planning.

Whatever the degree, Mr. Shenfield observes that planners do not actually plan. They aren't even necessarily committed to any particular plan, but just feel in their bones that only the state can produce economic order.

Thus Britain's Socialist Labor Party, he writes, "has for many years proclaimed itself to be the party of economic planning. In fact, not only has it never produced a blueprint for planning, but even when it was in power and believed itself to be planning the economy it never produced anything more than a succession of expedients which resembled each other only in that they all confined, hobbled, and undermined the processes of the market."

Even nationalization under that regime, odd as it may sound, did not reflect planning. The nationalized industries were allowed to operate as independent empires and hence couldn't be coordinated in any true national plan even if there had been one.

What Mr. Shenfield suggests is that it is, practically speaking, impossible to plan a whole economy, in Russia or anywhere else, down to the last ice cream cone. The results of trying, in Russia as in Britain under the labor party, are massive misinvestment and misallocation of resources, unplanned-for shortages, distribution bottlenecks and a whole array of blunders so ludicrous the planners become laughing stocks.

It's not only that people are basically unplannable even under compulsion. It's also that the vested interests of the planners play hob with any attempt at coherent planning; this despite the starry-eyed belief of some that once the state takes over, all the less desirable characteristics, like greed, vanish from officialdom and leave only an immaculate national interest.

Consider Neddy, which of course is far from a rigid or complete planning approach. The council's membership includes representatives of both management and unions. Every competent observer knows that the rigidities of unions in Britain, as elsewhere, are a major bar to increased economic activity; every realist knows the unions wouldn't dream of letting Neddy tamper with what they have taken as prerogatives. That being the case, how do you plan in the national interest?

Why then are the conservatives—who did dismantle labor's planning controls when they came to power more than a decade ago—now flirting with planning? Professor Shenfield thinks it's partly because they want to show political leadership, by doing something, especially with economic growth such a fad. How planing is supposed to bring growth that means anything remains a mystery; under labor it spelled stagnation.

So we hope people on this side of the Atlantic will be appropriately skeptical of the pleas for more planning. Every such effort is plainly an affront to political freedom; but more than that, it isn't even practical. With the best will in the world, the poor planners can only walk in their sleep.

U.N. Faces a Real Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. **FORD**. Mr. Speaker, many of us are concerned with developments in the United Nations especially in reference to the financial difficulties which the organization is experiencing.

Many of us supported the U.N. bond issue only after the World Court had ruled that a U.N. member could lose its voting rights in the General Assembly for the nonpayment of special assessments. However, the financial position of the organization has not improved materially.

I think, therefore, that the editorial in the Grand Rapids, Mich., Press for June 1, 1963, entitled "U.N. Faces a Real Crisis" presents the issue clearly and defines the responsibility of every member of the United Nations.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include this editorial:

U.N. FACES A REAL CRISIS

The most vexing problem before the United Nations at the moment is how to get its members to pay their assessments for peacekeeping operations in the Congo and the Middle East. Of the delinquent members, Russia is the most arrogant and defiant. It says that it won't pay because it doesn't approve of what the U.N. has been doing in those two areas. Our Ambassador to U.N., Adlai Stevenson, has correctly described this as a financial veto.

There is no provision in the U.N. Charter which permits a member nation to decide for itself which payments it will make and which it will not. When Russia joined the U.N. it pledged to abide by the rules. And so far as the rules in this case are concerned, they are strictly democratic. The majority in the General Assembly decides what action is to be taken. There is no veto power in the General Assembly, as there is on the Security Council. Russia, therefore, has no right to refuse to pay its assessments because it has no power under the charter to veto the decisions of the General Assembly.

It has been suggested that the right to vote in the United Nations, or even to sit there, be denied any country that fails to live up to its financial obligations to the world body. This would be a morally defensible action to take. But unfortunately Russia isn't the only country that has failed to pay up, though it is the only one to be so bold as to refuse outright. Around 65 percent of the 112 members of U.N. are in arrears. Many of them, including France and a number of Latin American countries, are our friends.

It probably would be impossible to get a majority of the members to agree to deny the right to vote to the delinquent members. And we may be reluctant to push the issue that far lest we put our friends in an embarrassing position. Nonetheless, it is perfectly obvious that U.N. cannot go on functioning as a peacekeeping organization unless some way can be found to collect the assessments it levies. Shorn of this function, it would become merely a debating society. Presumably the Soviets would prefer it this way. But better no United Nations at all than one devoted exclusively to argument. Sometime this year the real issue must be placed squarely before the 112 members. The decision they must make is whether to live up to the charter in all of its requirements or scrap it entirely.

Report on Foreign Aid in Colombia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. **BROOMFIELD**. Mr. Speaker, recently a group of five experts from Oakland County, Mich., returned from a 3-week survey of Cali and the Cauca Valley, Colombia.

This survey team was exploring a proposed new dimension within the Alliance for Progress in which many counties and local governments may become directly involved.

In essence, this team was trying to determine whether rapid, orderly growth and an increase in living standards can be brought about at the local level, in terms of specific, rather than through the broad generalities of central government country plans.

Within the next few weeks, this team will submit its report to the Agency for International Development, a number of private foundations interested in its work, and the local units of government in the Cauca Valley.

I would like to congratulate these five men who took part in this new approach to oversea assistance. They were not paid by the Federal Government for their considerable efforts. The only remuneration they received was for their transportation and lodgings.

The group included Mr. Delos Hamlin, chairman of the Oakland County Board of Supervisors, and expert on public administration and finance; Mr. D. V. Varner, chancellor of Oakland University, Rochester, Mich.; Mr. George Catlin, director of area development, Detroit Edison Co., and Mr. George Skrubb, director of planning, Oakland County.

The fifth member of the group, Mr. Mark Jaroszewicz, an associate in the architectural firm of Tarapata-McMahon & Associates, not only donated his considerable talents at no cost to the government, but his firm paid for his transportation and lodging as well.

It is this sort of oversea assistance which I feel has the best chance of success at a minimum of cot, and I hope we will see further cooperation between counties and communities of this sort in the future.

The Pontiac, Mich., Press and Reporter, Dick Hanson, published an article on the return of the group and I think the observations of the chairman, Mr. Hamlin, about the Alliance for Progress are important.

The article follows:

FOREIGN AID TO COLOMBIA IS NO GIVEAWAY PROGRAM

(By Dick Hanson)

U.S. foreign aid in Colombia, South America, "is no giveaway program of American money," Delos Hamlin, chairman of the Oakland County Board of Supervisors, declared today.

He and other members of a county delegation returned this morning from a 3-week reconnaissance of Colombia's booming Cali region.

They were visibly fatigued by what Hamlin described as a whirlwind mission that kept them moving 14 hours each day.

Their trip was sponsored by the U.S. State Department to determine if Oakland County officials might be able to assist Cali in future development.

Hamlin said it was too soon to say what specific assistance might be rendered.

Cali, a city of some 80,000 people, is undergoing a population boom that is raising problems in local government similar to those faced by Oakland County in recent years.

FUTURE POTENTIAL

The Cali region has a terrific future potential as a growing market for American products, said Hamlin.

"Most of our industries are down there, and others are looking into prospects," he added.

This economic activity is drawing many many people from the surrounding countryside; they must be provided with adequate housing and public utilities, Hamlin noted.

He thought Oakland County personnel might be able to offer some assistance in these fields by virtue of prior experience.

However, the Alliance for Progress, which is the U.S. foreign aid program in South America, already is giving great assistance to the Colombian Government, according to Hamlin.

Under the program, he said, Latin American countries are providing 50 percent of the money needed for development and are borrowing most of the rest from the World Bank.

U.S. aid is almost entirely in the form of technicians, said Hamlin.

ACCOMPANIED

He was accompanied from here by George Catlin, director of area development for Detroit Edison Co.; D. B. Varner, chancellor of Oakland University; George Skrubb, director of the county planning commission, and ex officio member, Mark T. Jaroszewicz, a Bloomfield Hills architect.

Hamlin said his group was split up most of the time. Each member was actively engaged within his own realm of experience.

Hamlin spent most of his time with members of the local government, while Catlin toured some 50 factories and Varner studied the educational system.

Skrubb met with local regional planners and Jaroszewicz with architects and engineers.

Hamlin said his group hasn't had an opportunity to compare notes yet to determine the overall situation in Cali.

Within the next few days they will be compiling a report for U.S. Representative WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, Republican, of Oakland County.

ORIGINATED IDEA

The idea of sending a team from here to study the application of U.S. foreign aid in Cali originated with BROOMFIELD.

The bedrock of Cali's economy is sugar cane. Cali is situated in the fertile Cauca Valley, which is able to produce two crops annually.

Other national products are coffee, wool, and emeralds. Colombia is the source of a third of the world's emeralds.

Hamlin described the Colombians as wonderful hosts.

He said his group wasn't present when a pro-Castroite ripped down the American flag placed over Cali's city hall in their honor.

"We experienced no resentment against Americans," said Hamlin.

Arriving by jet at Detroit Metropolitan Airport shortly after midnight, Oakland County's delegates were warmly greeted by members of their families.

The group left Bogotá, Colombia's capital city, at 2:40 p.m. yesterday.

Pope John XXIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in April of this year, Pope John XXIII, in the simplest of language which so characterized the greatness of this man, stated in his papal encyclical "Pacem in Terris," the rights and the duties of all men. He told us of the order in the universe as well as the order in human beings. His encyclical was a testimony of how simple life really is, but too, how difficult the application of these principles of life by the human being can be.

In the introduction to his encyclical, he outlines the order that should exist in human beings when he states:

> How strongly does the turmoil of individual men and people contrast with the perfect order of the universe. It is as if the relationships which bind them together could be controlled only by force. But the Creator of the world has imprinted in man's heart an order which his conscience reveals to him and enjoins him to obey: This shows that the obligations of the law are written in their hearts, their conscience utters its own testimony. And how could it be otherwise? For whatever God has made shows forth His infinite wisdom, and it is manifested more clearly in the things which have greater perfection.
>
> But fickleness of opinion often produces this error, that many think that the relationships between men and states can be governed by the same laws as the forces and irrational elements of the universe, whereas the laws governing them are of quite a different kind and are to be sought elsewhere; namely, where the Father of all things wrote them, that is, in the nature of man. By these laws men are most admirably taught, first of all how they should conduct their mutual dealings among themselves, then how the relationships between the citizens and the public authorities of each state should be regulated, then how states should deal with one another, and finally how, on the one hand, individual men and states, and on the other hand, the community of all people, should act toward each other, the establishment of such a world community of people being urgently demanded today by the requirements of universal common good.

Pope John was a man for all seasons and for all people. The entire world mourns his passing and it is evident that many who understand his efforts at bringing peace to the world will lose heart because he is not of this world.

However, we should draw added strength from the knowledge that John has left the blueprint for our future success. We mourn his passing, but we rejoice his legacy.

He did not describe the world in terms of the common man solely, nor the intellectual, in this age of scientific achievement. He steadfastly reminded us that this is not the world of the scientist but the world of man, and that the most difficult theorums that we must master today are not mathematical, but human.

At this particular time in our history we should realize these truths and draw the strength of character and of mind from his lesson. If we as a Nation do this, we will solve not only our problems of human rights, but be the example to all of mankind that will guarantee peace on earth.

We Are Not Ashamed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been a rash of articles dealing with crime and other problems in the District of Columbia. A recent editorial in the Washington Star has put the problems of the District of Columbia in proper perspective. The editorial follows:

WE ARE NOT ASHAMED

> We are just plain fed to the teeth with this stupidly monotonous chant going the rounds about the "shame," the "disgrace," the "sickness" of Washington. Until recently, the tune was strictly Dixieland in style. All we had to put up with was several hundred Southern editorials and speeches a year pointing out that the District had integrated its schools, and look where it got us. But suddenly now it seems just about impossible to read or listen to anything from around the country without finding this city of ours depicted as a criminal jungle redolent with savagery and decay.
>
> This thesis, not to put too fine a point on it, is a bunch of baloney.
>
> Washington has problems all right, and they are big ones. It is well aware of its problems. It has intelligent energetic citizens working hard to solve them. Perhaps the most encouraging sign at the moment is the emergent willingness of the Federal Government to recognize some of the needs of the Federal city. No one who cares about the place would dream of denying that there is much to do, and that we can use help.
>
> The pretense of these hand-wringing alien diagnosticians that Washington's body politic is afflicted with some rare disease is something else again. Any amount of crime is too much crime. But on the list of 16 American cities with populations between 500,000 and 1 million—in which we ranked fourth as to population in 1960—we ranked sixth in the incidence of crime. And we stood eighth, or right in the middle, as to crimes per 1,000 population. How long since you've read anything about the shame of St. Louis, which ranked first?
>
> Yes, we have violence in the streets and nobody is proud of it. But would anyone

like to take a walk, say, in lovely Morningside Park near New York's Columbia University? Don't try it. In New York, muggings and purse-snatchings are regarded as such a normal feature of metropolitan life that the newspapers don't bother to report them, which is one reason why there's very little talk about the sickness of New York.

In Washington we have slums, unemployment and serious racial tensions, and it's too bad such things exist in the Capital of our country. But take a good look some day at Chicago or Detroit—or Baltimore, for that matter. What in the world gives any other modern city the right to be smug in relation to us?

The truth is, of course, that the troubles of Washington, D.C., are the troubles afflicting urban centers today, some in greater degree, some lesser, but all typical. This does not mean that conditions must be accepted; among ourselves—within the civic family, so to speak—we are required to take them to heart and correct them as fast as we can. But it is possible to be concerned without losing perspective.

Cities are big, tough, dirty places. They also are exciting, busy, human, rewarding places.

This one happens to be a great city. If you haven't done so recently, try standing on that wide terrace under the Capitol's dome facing west. See what spreads before you—listen to the hum of it. Last year something like 8 million people, more than ever before, came here from all over just to experience the thrill of what we have around us every day. In spite of all the talk 600,000 visiting schoolchildren dared walk our streets. The number of them from outside the Metropolitan area victimized by our crime wave was precisely one. He was punched on the jaw by a local boy.

Washington has no incurable diseases. And it has no reason to be ashamed.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—Congressional Record, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel duty bound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the Record:

Somerville, Mass., *May 2, 1963.*

Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: As a member of the Armenian Youth Federation of America with an interest in the possible formation of a Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives, I wish to extend to you the backing of myself and the others of our organization.

We are writing letters to our Congressmen to support House Resolution 14 and House Resolution 15 when they are brought out on the floor for debate. Such a committee as proposed in these resolutions would be of great benefit to the people of the captive nations and of the people of the United States, who have an interest in their forefathers' homeland.

Thank you for your interest.

Fraternally,

Geraldine Hagopian.

Association for the
Liberation of Ukraine,
Brooklyn, N.Y., May 2, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: On behalf of our organization we ask you to give your favorable consideration for House Resolution 14, introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman Daniel J. Flood, of Pennsylvania, calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

At a time when Communist Russia poses as the liberator of nations in Africa and Asia, "oppressed" by the Western countries, the existence of such a committee on nations held captive by Communist Russia will serve the interests of the United States and the cause of freedom in the world.

We strongly urge you, Congressman Smith, to give your full support to the Flood resolution in the Rules Committee.

Respectfully yours,

Valentyn Koval,
Chairman of the Association for the Liberation of Ukraine.

Trenton, N.J., *May 4, 1963.*

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Congressman: I urge you to have quick action taken on House Resolution 14.

Very truly yours,

Charles Mantel.

Ukrainian Congress Committee
of America, Inc.,
New York, N.Y., April 28, 1963.

Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Aspinall: Congressman Daniel J. Flood submitted a resolution to the House Rules Committee calling for the creation of a special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives, known as House Resolution 14.

The establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations is an urgent need in the present cold war of communism against the free world. Such an official parliamentary body will be capable of collecting true information concerning the countries and nations forcefully incorporated into the Communist bloc.

The non-Russian nations and their struggle for independence presents the perpetual difficulties for the Kremlin rulers. The problem of the captive nations is in fact the weakest spot of Communist Russian imperialism. It is in the best interest of the United States to know the facts concerning this weak spot of our mutual enemy. Creation of a special Committee on Captive Nations will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying its foreign policy.

We sincerely believe, sir, that you fully understand the urgent need for creation of such a special Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives, and therefore we ask you to introduce the similar resolution calling for the creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House, or to write a letter to Congressman Howard W. Smith, chairman of the House Rules Committee, expressing your full support for the Flood resolution, House Resolution 14. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

Ross Kuźmych,
President, Denver Branch of U.C.C.A.

West Roxbury, Mass., *May 7, 1963.*

The Honorable Silvio O. Conte,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Conte: On behalf of the Boston branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., I am very pleased to express our appreciation for your excellent comments on Ukrainian Independence Day observances on January 24, 1963.

We also welcome your resolution to establish a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. The Boston branch of UCCA is fully supporting you, as well as Congressmen Flood, Derwinski, and others, in your endeavor to create a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

We are preparing plans to observe the Captive Nations Week in July. I am sure you will agree with me that this year's observances would be greatly enhanced by the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

I have written to all Congressmen from Massachusetts asking them to:

(1) Introduce similar resolutions, and

(2) To use their influence in the House Rules Committee and especially with Chairman Howard W. Smith to initiate action on the proposed legislation (H. Res. 14 and H. Res. 15) and start public hearings.

Members of our organization have also written letters to Congressman Howard W. Smith.

I trust that we can continue to count on your support in this matter, so important to all of us.

Sincerely yours,

Ukrainian Congress Committee of
America, Inc., Boston Branch.
Orest Szczudluk, *Public Relations.*

Ecuador's Seizure of Two of Our Tuna Clippers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that each of my colleagues learn the full impact of Ecuador's flagrant actions in seizing two of our tuna clippers. Among the voluminous protests received by my office was a particularly significant one written by John S. Robas, a commercial fisheries consultant, from Fernandina Beach, Fla., which I wish to include as a portion of my remarks:

Representative ROBERT WILSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. WILSON: Thank you for the support shown our American fishing industry in the Ecuadoran "fine" case now in progress. We wrote Senator GEORGE SMATHERS earlier this week urging legislation on this subject but our recommendation went beyond yours: we urged immediate and total suspension of foreign aid on the day our Embassy received notice of such a violation. Frankly, to a Latin, your bill is a slap on the wrist—they know they can handle our State Department.

The Ecuadoran shakedown is especially irritating to me because I and my children will be in debt all our lives because of deficit spending and these "fines" are reimbursed from State Department funds, thus adding to the load we must carry all our lives.

I wrote your Tuna Boat Association earlier this week and recommended that they adopt a new association flag: the American Colonial flag with the rattlesnake and motto "Don't tread on me." Ecuador, by my definition, is now treading on me and the tuna boats; the longer we wait to act the worse it will get. We are sending copies of the enclosed newspaper clipping to the rest of our Florida Congressmen plus some well known in the gulf and Oregon.

Please redouble your efforts on behalf of our fishermen while we still have an industry to preserve.

Very truly yours,

JOHN S. ROBAS.

TWO OR MORE: EXPECT FINING OF TUNA BOATS

GUAYAQUIL, ECUADOR.—Ecuadoran authorities are expected to levy fines today on at least 2 of 21 San Diego tuna boats held at the Salinas Naval Base despite a request from Secretary of State Dean Rusk for their release.

Official sources said Development Minister Jose Salazar Barragan will decide the penalties "in accordance with fisheries laws."

The tuna boats *White Star* and *Ranger* were seized Saturday by the U.S.-built landing ship *Jambeli* on charges of violating Ecuadoran territorial waters. Nineteen other boats of the San Diego tuna fleet gathered to protest the seizure and accompanied the two seized boats to Salinas in "voluntary detention."

It is not certain immediately whether any penalties would be imposed on the "voluntarily detained" boats.

Although it had been reported previously that the *White Star* and *Ranger* were 9 to 13 miles offshore when they were seized. Ecuadoran authorities now say they were within 3 miles off the coast.

Ecuador claims the right to monopolize fishing grounds within 200 miles of its coasts. The United States, however, regards Ecuadoran territorial waters as extending only to the customary 3-mile limit.

In Washington, Representative BOB WILSON, Republican, of California, has announced he will ask Congress for legislation requiring the Government to reduce U.S. aid to countries which interfere with U.S. fishermen on the high seas.

August Felando, executive director of the American Tuna Boat Association, said the Ecuadorans are cracking down on U.S. tuna fishermen because they have stopped paying "protection money" for fishing licenses.

Rusk told a news conference in Washington that he had telephoned Foreign Minister Benjamin Peralta Paez to request immediate release of the tuna boats.

The Secretary of State proposed negotiations to settle the territorial-waters dispute.

J. Edgar Hoover Begins His 40th Year of Dedicated Service to His Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, no man in the history of law enforcement had made a greater impact upon his profession than J. Edgar Hoover, the hard-working Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

In 1924, when Mr. Hoover took over its reins, the FBI was a little-known agency of the Justice Department—one characterized by lethargy, ineptness and corruption. Today—as a direct result of Mr. Hoover's brilliant leadership—it has gained an international reputation as the epitome of integrity and efficiency in law enforcement.

What is the FBI? In Government circles, we recognize it as the investigative arm of the U.S. Department of Justice. And year by year, we Members of the House and Senate pass laws which increase the FBI's already-heavy burden of responsibilities.

Thousands of our citizens—those who have had direct experience with the FBI and its special agents—look upon this remarkable agency in a different light. To them, the FBI is a group of men and women who work as diligently to establish the innocence of falsely accused persons as to identify and apprehend wrongdoers. To them, the FBI is truly a public service organization—one dedicated to the principles of justice and fair play, to the defense of civil rights, and to honesty and impartiality in law enforcement.

In the fight against crime, subversion and other enemies of our democracy, Mr. Hoover has continually pioneered the development of new investigative techniques. His foresight in founding the FBI Laboratory, the Identification Division, and a nationwide network of police training services has paid rich dividends to all authorized law enforcement agencies—particularly in terms of the scientific examinations of evidence, the comparisons and identifications of fingerprints, and the police school assistance which the FBI renders to local, county and State authorities each year.

During these past 39 years of great personal accomplishment, J. Edgar Hoover has remained a humble man. He has neither the time nor the inclination to bask in praise and adulation. That is why I was so delighted to hear Morgan Beatty's exceptionally fine tribute to him on the NBC radio network last May 17. I commend Mr. Beatty's comments to you:

THE GARDENER

This is Morgan Beatty, the ledger of life, dateline Washington.

The scene is a garden at dusk on the fringe of our Nation's Capital. A lone figure moves among the orderly fresh green mounds. Occasionally, he stoops to press deeper into the earth one of his precious plants that had been pushed upward by the ice of last winter. Carefully, he avoids disturbing the surface roots of his azaleas. Oh yes, he's a true gardener. He knows about rhododendron and mountain laurel and azalea. If you touch their roots near the surface, their hair roots, they are dead plants within 2 years. Azaleas are his favorites. He had become expert with them. As the dusk deepens into night, our friend the gardener stands erect, his arms swinging, his hands darkened by the good earth. In the distance the lights of busy downtown Washington make pulse beats against the sky.

The shaft of Washington Monument rises bright gray in its floodlight. The gardener seeks out his favorite chair for a few moments alone with his thoughts. The day had been a memorable one. Oh, the thoughts that might have crossed his mind. With every beat of his heart our friend the gardener could contemplate a perpetual benediction on the founders of our country and the men who carried it toward its destiny. Benjamin Franklin, who had said nothing is of more importance for the public weal than to train youth in wisdom and virtue. Certainly, our friend the gardener had lived that principle all his life. And he could look back on much more he had done to repair flaws in the American character. He could look back on the decades of his fight against the gangsters that erode the very foundations of our Government—Al Capone, Dillinger, "Pretty Boy" Floyd, Alvin Karpis. Karpis—our friend the gardener had walked alone into that bandit's lair, captured him singlehanded. Our friend could recall the temptations to become a politician, perhaps a statesman. These temptations he had resisted. He avoided creating a national police force in a democracy. He became the envy of the Stalins, and the Hitlers and the Mussolinis. Their police had to kill and maim and torture to get results. Our friend's disciplined men did not. Yes, he had spent 39 years keeping the faith. And only this morning he got a call from the White House. The President of the United States, a man whose political background might have created barriers, called in our friend the gardener and told him the Nation appreciated what he had done. And on that day, our friend might well have thought with the poet Wordsworth of our forefathers' years. Our friend the gardener had kept the faith with our forefathers and he could well pronounce a perpetual benediction that they had set his feet on the path of democratic discipline. Our friend the gardener, he is J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, who, this week enters his 40th year of service to the people of the United States.—Morgan Beatty, NBC News, May 17, 1963.

At 75, Jim Farley Sums Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of May 26, 1963:

AT 75, JIM FARLEY SUMS UP

(By Barrett McGurn)

Who have been the greatest men of a lifetime passed hobnobbing with the world's most eminent?

What is a man to make of the political slogans for which he fought with tenacious partisanship?

How does one of the master American politicians of all time sum up a life from the vantage point of his 75th birthday?

James A. (Jim) Farley, the man whose straw hat has become a political trademark, took the questions one at a time in his handsome skyscraper office at 515 Madison Avenue, where he is board chairman of the Coca Cola Export Corp. The interview was a few days premature. Mr. Farley will be 75 on Thursday.

The greatest?

Well let's see. Herbert Hoover (whose ouster from the White House was Jim's achievement in 1932, at least in good part). Franklin Delano Roosevelt (with whom Mr. Farley broke clamorously in 1940). Franco ("the world is just beginning to see"). Churchill, Truman ("the courage of a bank burglar"). Kennedy ("better qualified beforehand than any other President in American history, I believe, with his greatest accomplishments still ahead").

Mr. Farley named 11 in all. The others:

Charles de Gaulle.
Former President Dwight Eisenhower.
Gen. Douglas MacArthur.
Eamon DeValera.
Pope John XXIII.
The late Pius XII.

HE'S SKEPTICAL ABOUT SLOGANS

Political slogans? The man who did so much to put at least one of them into the pages of American history books was skeptical.

"The New Deal? The Old Deal, the New Frontier. The Republicans. I think those are just names given to the activities of a period."

His meaning, he indicated, was that each generation of American administrators tackles the same problems. One emphasis may be needed one term and another the next, but certain issues dictate more or less the same handling. ("Which foot should we use, the left or the right? We need both. Both feet must be planted firmly.")

The great secret of these years? Friendship. And for that the former Postmaster General had a story he has always kept off the record through the years, the tale of how a Republican broke party loyalty to give Jim his start. For a half century Mr. Farley has kept that Republican's secret, but now five decades later there is no harm in telling it if the revered friend's anonymity is protected by a little vagueness. This is the story:

When Jim Farley was a high school student in Stony Point, Rockland County, a girl classmate died. The father of the teenager was a storekeeper, a local Republican boss. To Jim, who had been raised around his family shop and tavern as a fierce Democrat, any Republican Party officer was light years removed from him, but Jim felt sorry. He wrote a letter of condolence.

Three years later, at 21, Jim ran for the office of Stony Point town clerk. A friend astonished him on one of the final days of the campaign with this question: "How come X (the bereaved boss) is out working for you?"

A SURPRISE FOR THE VICTOR

Nothing could have surprised the young Democrat more, but the night of his victory he went to the enemy store to thank his mysterious benefactor. The boss was shocked. He had campaigned for Jim only among his own relatives, people he had thought he could trust with his dangerous antiparty secret. At first the boss denied the charge. Certainly he had not helped any Democrat. Then he confessed.

"Yes, I did. You know, when my daughter died you were the only one who wrote to me. I will always help you whatever office you run for, as long as I live."

The town clerkship started young Farley on a road leading to the State and national chairmanships of the Democratic Party. The incident of the "opposition" boss taught him two things: "Friendship, and the fact that you need to be a friend to make a friend."

Letters? At 75 Mr. Farley sends 100 of them each day: Congratulations, letters of sympathy, a word or two to his army of friends passing along the latest Farley article in the Congressional Record. * * *

"Curious thing about conferences," Mr. Farley never ceases to be surprised by the behavior of his fellows. "I send 500 or 600 a year, and less than half are acknowledged. I don't know why people neglect to do that."

As long as American history is studied, scholars will take note of the way Jim Farley, the son of the Stony Point Irish-American tavern keeper, crossed the United States in 1931 making friends and building an organization for New York's Governor, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

"I contacted 17 States in 20 days. I slept 16 nights in pullmans. I did Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota. * * * I saw some Kansas people too, I think."

HE REMEMBERS THOUSANDS OF PEOPLE

Was it true he remembered all those men and women and everything about them, their children, their jobs, their hopes, their worries? Did he use memory aids?

"Memory aids, no. Remember all of them, no. But I did remember thousands."

One trick helped through the years. People have a strange way about them. If they hear there is a Jim Farley who has a filing cabinet memory, they try him on it: "I bet you don't know who I am." Well, to what would have been their disappointment, that has all too often been true. But Mr. Farley has long had a way of handling the situation. When he sees the eye gleam of the approaching test, he thrusts out his great Stony Brook ballplayer's hand and says, "My name's Jim Farley. What's yours?"

For those who do not mean to try him, Mr. Farley has a parallel approach. A subart in the field of friendship is, says Mr. Farley, "to make it easy for them."

"I will notice people in elevators nudging one another and looking. I turn to them, tell them my name and ask them where they're from. They may say, for example, Racine, Wis. Then I'll ask about someone I know there. It pleases people."

Is the day of nationwide acquaintanceships and friendships finished now that government is so big and the country's population is soaring toward 200 million?

"No, it's easier than it was for me in 1931. With the airplane you can do now in a day or so what took me 20 days. You can have breakfast in Seattle, lunch in Portland, supper in San Francisco. It's easier."

To sum up the question of political friendships:

"You have to like people. You have to be willing to meet and talk with all kinds, with different personalities. And you have to know intuitively how to handle them and whom you can trust. You can tell that in a man's eyes, by the expression on his face—those who are lying to you, those in whom you can place implicit confidence. The big thing in politics is loyalty."

HIS VIEWS ABOUT HOOVER AND ROOSEVELT

To go back to his list of greats, why Herbert Hoover? It was the campaign machine masterminded by Jim Farley which hounded Herbert Hoover out of the White House with the charge that he had falsely promised a "chicken in every pot" and that he had ludicrously predicted "grass would grow in (Democratic) streets."

"I have no apologies for 1931," said Mr. Farley, "but I think Mr. Hoover understands. I got to know him very well working with him on the Hoover Commission in 1952."

Mr. Farley's judgment now about the 88-year-old Mr. Hoover, 32 years after the depression campaign?

"In my opinion he is one of the most unselfishly patriotic Americans I have ever been privileged to meet. I have great admiration for him. My admiration grows with the passing of the years."

And "Mr. Roosevelt"? Each of his references to the President of 1932 to 1945 was with the correct, distant form of "Mr. Roosevelt." Books have been written about how Jim Farley felt socially snubbed by the elegant Roosevelts of Hyde Park, and about the manner in which the Postmaster General especially suffered affronts he felt were given to his beloved late wife who had been Elizabeth Finnegan. Why was "Mr. Roosevelt" on Jim's list of greats?

"I do think that the advances made during his first 8 great years were the most important in the history of American politics, the most important in the history of our country."

Jim Farley ran for the Democratic presidential nomination himself in 1940 in an unsuccessful effort to head off the third term.

"I was against the third term in caucus and I was against it on the floor of the convention. I was not really a serious candidate, however. I put my name up only because John Garner wouldn't allow his name to go in unless I put mine too."

Yet with all that said, Mr. Roosevelt "gave great leadership to the country during the war period."

"I have always felt that if he hadn't served the third and fourth terms—naturally now he will be criticized in the years to follow about Yalta and Teheran; it's easy for people to criticize decisions in which they didn't have to take part—if he hadn't served the third and fourth terms he would have been remembered as the greatest President we have ever had, even greater than Washington and Lincoln."

A tall picture of a solemn-faced F.D.R. stared across from the opposite wall as Mr. Farley spoke. A sea of other photographs radiated out from either side and around the four walls, Farley and an aging Hoover, Farley and an amiable Truman, a grave Farley and a young President Kennedy, an early Roosevelt Cabinet meeting already looking ancient and inscribed: "To Jim Farley, F.D.R., 1933."

OTHER MEN ON HIS LIST OF GREATS

Farley's other wonder men?

MacArthur—"I always felt that General MacArthur was the greatest military man this country has ever produced. And one of the finest minds it has ever produced."

Truman—"He is certain to go down in history as one of the greatest Presidents. He made at least 8 or 10 important decisions taking great courage. He has the courage of a lion." (Which decisions? The Hiroshima bomb? The costly Marshall plan? The NATO involvement? The Korean war? The Greek war? The recall of General MacArthur? "I'd rather not list them.")

Kennedy—"I think he was better equipped to shoulder the responsibility of the Presidency than any of the others before him. Better than Mr. Roosevelt? Why, sure. Kennedy's knowledge of history, his political experience, his war activities, his keen mind, his personality, all of these factors. I believe that he will go down as one of the great

Presidents. And I sincerely believe that his greatest achievements lie in the years ahead." (The dynasty issue? "In my opinion it will have no effect on his reelection.")

That controversial Franco on the list of the best?

"I still believe General Franco has given to his country leadership it could not have been given by anybody else. He has helped peace in Europe. The nations there are very happy with the way Spain has acted, and, in my opinion, justly so."

Eisenhower, another Republican President?

"He has been very friendly to me. I have for him the greatest admiration and affection. President Eisenhower's military leadership will always be remembered."

HIS ATTITUDE TOWARD BUSINESS

Is Mr. Farley at 75 an exponent of the big business he fought as a youth? The answer wound through many considerations, the two-party system, party loyalty, the differences between the Democratic and Republican parties and between conservatives and progressives. The gist of the reply was this:

The Democratic Party even under the New Deal was less an enemy of business than some people think. The Democratic Party by and large is the organization of the down trodden. The Republican organization is or was under the control of big business. Mr. Farley would not think of opposing business any more than he would dream of abandoning an almost religious faith in the Democratic Party. He does not think there is any contradiction, and he does not even feel he should be denounced by liberal Democratic writers as a party conservative.

"I don't know why they call me a hidebound conservative," he said. "I never opposed any of the legislation in Mr. Roosevelt's first 100 days. In the years before and after that I supported every piece of legislation put up in New York State by Smith, Roosevelt and Lehman. For Mr. Roosevelt's first 8 years I supported everything, including even the court (packing) fight, which I didn't agree with. I never knew about the court bill until I read about it in the newspapers. I was not at the Cabinet meeting when he announced it.

"And when I say supported everything, I mean that I did more to get it through than anyone else except the President and Vice President Garner. I was the one who dealt with the Congressmen and Senators when there was a holdup on any of the legislation. I don't mind saying that I used the power of patronage to get the bills through. We withheld * * * until we got the program. We did it because we felt it was in the best interests of the country.

"And since I left Washington I haven't had any political position at all."

The Democrats as the foes of big business?

"No, no generation of American business was ever helped more than by Mr. Roosevelt in the years just after 1933, through his banking legislation, his bills during the 100 days, the way he saved the banks, the way he saved the insurance companies. No administration ever did more to save the capitalistic system. And of course I believe in business. I believe that this country's greatness is because of the free enterprise system. It is because of the work of sincere, honest, aggressive men."

HOW THE MAJOR PARTIES DIFFER

The differences then between parties? Do we have four parties: Dixiecrats, liberal Northern Democrats, Barry Goldwater Republicans, Nelson Rockefeller Republicans? What is the key to the quetsion of "party loyalty"?

"Four parties? No. We have two major parties and I hope we always will have only two. I firmly believe in two parties. I believe there is room for all shades of political opinion in both parties. Room for them and we do have them."

An experience one day with "a lady in Paris" summed up the complicated question for Mr. Farley.

The feminine inquisitor had one pointed question. Why did Mr. Farley support Mr. Roosevelt in his campaign for the third and fourth terms despite Mr. Farley's own personal vigorous disapproval of both ventures? (I voted for Hull at the convention in 1940 and Senator BYRD even though he wasn't a candidate in 1944.)

"I explained that even though I did not believe in the third and fourth terms, that I did believe in majority rule. But she kept pressing me. She said that I was not a good American, that I was not patriotic. It is difficult to explain party loyalty, party responsibility, why you always support the nominees of your party. Then I pulled something out that I had read sometime in a book somewhere, I said, 'I did it because of prejudice and ignorance.' That seemed to be satisfactory. It settled the argument. At least she stopped."

If Mr. Farley was always loyal to the party of his parents, the party of the immigrants of the last century, the party of the downtrodden, had it always been loyal to him? Had he ever thought of changing to the party of the Hoovers, the party of the Eisenhowers?

A shadow of certain sad memories flickered for an instant on the broad features of the tall ambassador of soft drinks.

"You know," he said, "there are some who achieve, who feel they have done it all alone. They forget that many others have sacrificed for them. I have seen it many times, how a few gather around a man and how those few become thousands and then how those thousands become hundreds of thousands."

Sometimes the leader of the hundreds of thousands forgets the selfless aid who rallied the first few and the first few thousands.

"But I have never said that I have been shabbily treated by the leadership of my party. I did believe that I could have won the race for Senator in New York in 1956 if I had been nominated, and that I could have been elected Governor in 1960. I will never know why Bob Wagner and the others opposed me. Yet I will never complain for I feel that all I have I owe to my party. I would not be here, I never would have gone anywhere, if it had not been for my party starting back there in Stony Point."

American Tuna Vessels Under Seizure by the Ecuadoran Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a copy of a letter written to President Kennedy by Lester Balinger, secretary-treasurer of the Cannery Workers and Fishermen's Union of San Diego, Calif., which lucidly outlines the increasing sentiment for immediate Executive action on behalf of the two American tuna vessels still under seizure by the Ecuadoran Government.

The letter follows:

MAY 31, 1963.

President JOHN F. KENNEDY,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: American citizens, fishermen, and boatowners are being detained and harassed by Ecuador again. In recent years there have been numerous harassments of this nature, but this is by far the worst. From all we can find out, no top-ranking Government official has taken a firm stand in this Ecuadoran sovereignty water expansion program. Twenty-three vessels with approximately 14 crewmembers per vessel are involved. We suggest that it is time for the U.S. Government to act, to stop this piracy once and for all. We suggest the following steps be taken:

1. That a top naval attaché be dispatched to Ecuador to take charge of the situation (or a top Government official).
2. That naval vessels be dispatched to stand off the coast to show that we mean business.
3. That the topic of discussion be the immediate release by the Ecuadoran Government of the American tuna vessels and their crews, that Ecuador cease and desist claiming their 40-mile sovereignty waters.

We think that the time has come for this direct action, that if these steps are not pursued with forcefulness the American fishermen will be forced from the high seas.

Sincerely and respectfully,
CANNERY WORKERS & FISHERMEN'S UNION,
LESTER BALINGER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

What the Tobacco Ads Don't Tell You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, since I introduced H.R. 5973, a bill to make the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act applicable to smoking products, I have received letters of support from concerned people throughout the country.

I am convinced there is a huge reservoir of public opinion ready to make war on the techniques being employed by the tobacco industry. These people want the dangers of smoking highlighted. And they are becoming increasingly angry at the massive doses of advertising—most of it utterly absurb—being employed by the industry in its never-ceasing quest for new addicts. Parents, in particular, are highly critical of advertising directed toward youth.

One of the most moving and eloquent statements on the hazards of smoking comes from Dr. Charles F. Tate, Jr., associate professor of medicine, University of Miami School of Medicine. He wrote the following:

UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI,
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
JACKSON MEMORIAL HOSPITAL,
Miami, Fla., May 16, 1963.

Hon. MORRIS UDALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE UDALL: I am extremely interested in your plan to introduce legislation putting the entire question of smoking under the Food and Drug Administration. I think this would be one of the most important single steps that could be taken in order to prevent a problem that is becoming critical in the field of chest diseases today in this country. At present, severe pulmonary emphysema, a completely disabling disease physically of the lungs, which is the second most common cause of total physical disability in this country, according to social security statistics, is felt by chest disease specialists and all of the major chest organizations throughout the world to be due mostly to smoking. This stems from actual paralysis of the cilia, or hairs, that are supposed to clean the bronchial tubes constantly and this constant paralysis over the years leads to obstruction and infection with the trapping of air in the air sacs and subsequent rupture of these air sacs into one another and then overdistention of the lung, which is what the Greek work, "emphysema" actual means (overdistention). We see this emphysema in people who have asthma and allergy but not anywhere as significant as the severe, crippling problem that we see in our heavy smokers.

The trend toward smoking in age 10 to 15 years is increasing tremendously, we feel, due to the heavy advertizing that faces these children when they get home from school every afternoon. Some studies show anywhere from 20 percent to as high as 68 percent of some schools surveyed smoking from one-half to one pack a day. It takes roughly 25 to 30 years before real symptoms of cough, shortness of breath, and wheezing begin to occur in some people. Add the age 10 to 15 to 25 or 30 and this will give us a generation in the most productive period of life, becoming totally crippled physically. This trend is what led to the statement by Dr. Ochsner 2 years ago and which he has subsequently repeated many times, that unless something is done about the smoking problem in this country, that this Nation will be faced with one of the biggest medical catastrophes it has ever known within 25 to 30 years. This is strictly a preventative problem because once severe emphysema is developed, there is no cure and no reversing the process. These people are totally disabled the rest of their lives and have to be supported by welfare and social security and when it occurs at age 40, it takes relatively little imagination and intelligence to be able to figure out what the cost is going to be to this Nation in the way of support and loss of productivity of these people. There is no other solution to this except prevention, that is, not smoking.

The question of squamous cell cancer of the lung is the other one that concerns us markedly. Ninety-nine percent of the chest physicians in this country and all of the major chest organizations in this country are absolutely convinced of the direct relationship between smoking and lung cancer of the squamous cell variety. This is felt to be due to the constant contact of the irritating tobacco tars, particularly benzpyrene, and arsenic. Certainly I doubt that anyone can deny that this is the most intense smog that the human lung is exposed to day in and day out, that we have and that the material contained in this smog is definitely cancer producing, as shown by Dr. Rocky last year, who produced typical squamous cell cancer in the dog, an animal known definitely not to normally develop a squamous cell cancer on his own, so that the etiological relationship here is well proven. Again, this is preventable, but not curable since all our statistics show us that 95 out of every 100 people who come through our office door will be dead in 5 years, once the diagnosis of lung cancer is made, regardless of what we do, and the other 5 will be dead in the next 4 or 5 years. So, we are again faced with preventive medicine and no other course.

We know that we probably cannot stop smoking on the parts of adults who already have the habit but we feel very strongly that something should be done about this growing tendency on the part of children to start smoking, and here is where I feel a major contribution could be made if something could be done about advertising or if the FDA would take over. Since only 3 parts of arsenic per million are allowed in food that is sold by FDA, if they were forced to bring tobacco under their control, of course they would have to ban the sale of tobacco tomorrow because the average cigarette has anywhere from 40 to 50 parts of arsenic per million and approximately 3 to 5 parts per million is inhaled in the main stream smoke when a cigarette is smoked.

Please go ahead with your plans regarding legislation on this problem of smoking and if there is any way that any of us who are so concerned about this problem can do to help you, feel assured that we will. I certainly would be most happy to do anything possible along this line and feei free to call on me. I certainly wish you success in your plans.

Very respectfully yours,
CHARLES F. TATE, Jr., M.D.,
Associate Professor of Medicine, University of Miami School of Medicine.

Appeal of the Polish Peasant Party—Polish Peasant Day 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Executive Committee of the Polish Peasant Party, under Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, chairman, and Tadeusz Paul, secretary general, recently issued their appeal on the occasion of Polish Peasant Day, 1963, directed not only to their members but also to the people of the world. The appeal discusses the internal situation in Poland today, and related issues touch on all the controversial aspects of the Polish situation.

Since this appeal, made on free world soil, cannot be made in Poland itself, it certainly merits attention and I insert it into the RECORD, feeling that it contributes substantially to one of the continuing struggles of the peasants of Poland against Communist enslavement:

APPEAL OF THE POLISH PEASANT PARTY—POLISH PEASANT DAY 1963

Fellow countrymen, friends, Peasant Party members, the Peasant Day—a holiday of the Polish people—traditionally celebrated on Whitsunday in Poland prior to World War II—celebrated even in the underground, in the forests, during the Hitlerite occupation of Poland—celebrated en masse by the Polish Peasant Party in the first years after the war—cannot be celebrated under today's conditions in the homeland.

On all these celebrations held in the cited above circumstances, the Peasant Party members, while demonstrating their strength and will, demanded a free, democratic, and socially just Poland, protested always against the dictatorships—either of the Sanacja or of Hitler, or of the Communists.

With their blood they confirmed their allegiance to the peasant ideology, to the cause of freedom and independence of the fatherland, to the religion and Polish soil.

Twenty years ago, when the Communists in accordance with the German-Soviet Pact of 1939 still did cooperate with the Gestapo—the peasant battalions in Poland, the army organization of the peasant movement in the underground, openly with weapons in their hands did rise up against the Hitlerite policy of the partition of Poland, against the mass deportation of Polish children to concentration camps, against the mass deportations of Polish peoples from the Polish villages so that Germans from Bessarabia could be settled there.

The uprising of peasant battalions did interrupt the process of full implementation of the partition of Poland along the Soviet-Hitler Pact of 1939.

Today, those who always faithfully defended and cared for the Polish nation, do not have the right to celebrate in freedom the Peasant Day in Poland.

The place of the former Hitlerite occupation has been taken over by the Soviet occupation.

Our brothers in the homeland have only this right: To participate in especially organized Communist manifestations at which the Communist agents are praising the Soviet masters and at which they are told to accept voluntarily the increased norms of work and quotas of production.

Therefore, today on this Peasant Day—when the Polish nation continues to be enslaved by the Communist masters and cannot openly speak for itself, while the Warsaw agents of Moscow falsify its will and opinion—we together with the Polish nation do hereby appeal to all people of the free world:

The enslaved Polish nation—oppressed by the Soviets, deprived by them of its freedom and independence, religious and academic freedoms, as well as of the right of determining its political, economic, and social regimes, has never renounced and shall never renounce its natural right to a free life in a free, independent, democratic, and socially just Poland, and shall not rest until such a Poland will be won.

Together with the Polish nation we express our satisfaction due to the fact that the ever-growing number of peoples of Africa and Asia have been recovering their freedom and independent statehood. Simultaneously we hold appropriate to remind that the free nations of the world, while unanimously granting the right of national self-determination in the whole world—in their self-interest cannot indifferently watch the fate of the Polish nation—a nation with a millenium of statehood and a millenium of its attachment to Christendom and to Western civilization.

Therefore, the Polish nation has the right to expect active attitude and help from the free nations of the world with regard to Russian aggressive imperialism and communism directed from Moscow—the two ideologies which have enslaved Poland and other countries behind the Iron Curtain in Europe, and whose obvious goal is to impose a regime of Communist dictatorship on the rest of the world.

On the basis of the experiences of the Polish nation we are warning the free people of the world that the planned aim of the Communist dictatorship in the world—is dictatorship masked behind the Marxist and Leninist slogans of the "dictatorship of the proletariat" and the "dictatorship of workers and peasants," as well as behind the false peace slogans—and that—in case of inactivity of nations of the free world it is a threat against freedom and independence of their own nations and the peace of the whole world as well.

There is no peaceful coexistence when there is a matter of ideological struggle—says Khrushchev—communism must win—other ideologies must be destroyed and other regimes must be buried.

In order to achieve his aim, he recommends and practices revolutions, political diversion, racial, economic local wars he calls the holly wars. All these means he himself inspires and supplies weapons and ammunition for them.

Finally, the Kremlin is not hiding that, in case of free world's resistance, it is ready to start a nuclear war and destroy not only peace but also together with it tens of millions of human lives on both sides of the curtain.

For that reason, on this Peasant Day we appeal to the citizens of the free world:

Do not believe the falsehoods of Communist propaganda alleging that the Polish nations as well as other nations enslaved behind the Iron Curtain in Central and Eastern Europe are happy and do not wish any freedom or any change of the regime.

Do not believe the false propaganda about the Red Commissar Gomulka and the Red cardinal in Poland.

So as Khrushchev states that there can be no pardon in the ideological struggle—so there can be no fraternization between communism and Christianity—and about this very clearly spoke, in his public statements, the primate of Poland, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski. The problem has been similarly treated in Pope John XXIII's two socially progressive and peaceloving encyclicals: Master et Magistra and Pacem in Terris.

Any comparison of Gomulka, Khrushchev's agent in Poland, with the primate of Poland Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski is not only an insult for the primate, but also for the whole nation. For the nation supports the cardinal without any reservations due to his determined stand against Communist efforts to take away from Polish hearts religious beliefs and to demoralize the Polish youth by means of atheist propaganda.

We appeal to the free world:

You must be vigilant, active, and always ready. Vigilant about danger of the Soviet world aggression, active in the struggle against falsehood, diversion, and Communist aggression. You must be morally strong and ready for sacrifices. You have to be well armed, you must be always ready since you don't know the day or the hour when Moscow's dictator, threatened from inside, pressed by China and Soviet internal economic and political difficulties, out of despair in order to save his dictatorial regime and personal position, may set on the world war III conflagration.

In the service of Moscow, Warsaw Communists sell out the interests of the Polish nation.

On this Peasant Day—we do stigmatize and accuse Moscow's Warsaw agents, with Gomulka at their head, for their having sold out the very vital Polish national interests to Moscow's imperialism and Communist aggression against the free world.

Countless proofs to support this accusation cannot be contained in this appeal.

It is enough to analyze the roster of Gomulka's many trips to the U.S.S.R., Bialowieza Forest, or East Germany. Analyze his visit to the Berlin wall, these last years as a traveling salesman for Khrushchev in the United States and Yugoslavia. Look to what they were doing, Rapacki on Cuba, Cyrankiewicz in Mexico, Lange in India, Marek Thee in Laos, etc. Look at the pact concluded by the Communist with the Peronistas in Argentine. Should one need more proof?

As Khrushchev himself admitted, the initiative to create a more precise apparatus with which stricter controls and a more efficient exploitation of the enslaved countries could be carried out for the benefit of Moscow—the reorganization of the Comecon—has been no one else's but Gomulka's of Poland.

With great sums of money extracted from the Polish economy, the Polish Communists are helping out the Soviets to carry out their economic diversion and worldwide Communist aggression all over the world: in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

With hard-earned money of the Polish people, against their interest, with Polish coal, with food supplied by Poland—even using the imported wheat—Gomulka has been helping Ulbricht to overcome his shortages caused by the fast tempo of communization of Eastern Germany, and above all, caused by the speedy and violent collectivization of East German agriculture.

Sacrificing the most vital national interests, the Communists are investing huge sums of money into newly opened mines in the Soviet Byelorussia instead of using those investments for exploitation of potassium in Poland—a mineral already discovered whose location and potential are known.

The joint investments of Warsaw and Krupp both in Poland and the U.S.S.R. is a demonstration that Gomulka has found common language with the capital of Western Germany at a time when big West German industrial concerns have been continually refusing to indemnify the Polish victims of Hitler's concentration and forced labor camps—to pay indemnity to those who were forced to work for the benefit of the big industrial cartels.

General Spychalski, the chief "politruk" of Gomulka in the Polish Army, during his "visit" together with General Hofman from East Berlin with the Polish garrisons on the recovered territories in Poland has given the Polish regiments stationed there the names of German anti-Fascist fighters. One could forgive Spychalski visiting East Germany now and presenting to the German Communist regiments the busts not only of Swierczewski, but also of Marchlewski, Rosa Luxemburg and other international Communists, who though of Polish origin—lived and passed away as the members of the German Communist Party and as such they always faithfully served the interests of Moscow.

However, no one can forgive him the decorating of Germans for their services in the struggle for People's Poland when, after having joined the Communist cause, as former Hitler's executioners of Poles, later in the ranks of the PPR (Polish Communist Party) they were again murdering Poles in Silesia.

We accuse the Warsaw Communists for the wasting of hard-earned money of the Polish people with which to finance diversion and espionage among the exiles in the free world carried out by Gomulka's agents for the benefit of Moscow.

We accuse them for having stopped the repatriation of Poles from the U.S.S.R. and thus sacrificing the lives of about 2 million Poles to disappear in the Soviets.

We accuse them for the crime of polonocide—being committed in the form of legalized abortions under the guise of the so-called policy of birth control. This is the helping out of Moscow in the work of biological destruction of the Polish nation.

We accuse them for their destruction of the Polish nation through the antiworker and antipeasant legislation. This legislation only deepens the genuine misery and shortages caused by the unproductive Communist economy, as well as by the Communist exploitation for the benefit of Muscovite imperialism and financing of Communist world aggression.

We accuse the Polish Communists for their German-Kaisers-like extermination policy with regard to the peasants. Like during the Kaisers the Communists are expropriating peasant land and giving it to the sovkhozes. Like during the Kaisers the peasants are being deprived of their family homesteads.

They are doing this despite the fact that they know that all foreign trade transactions with the West do supply the Warsaw treasury with 60 percent of hard currency and this high percentage is earned by the export of agricultural products and food processed goods toward which the Polish peasant has contributed in fourfold ways:

1. In the form of cheap compulsory deliveries to the State;
2. In the form of high prices for coal which the peasant may get only after the delivery of compulsory quotas;
3. In the form of an especially high taxation of private farming; and
4. In the form of higher fees for use of tractor services, fertilizers, machinery, etc.

Assembled on this Peasant Day, we do request that the Governments of the United States and Great Britain—both coresponsible for the Teheran and Yalta decisions—to present the question of freedom of Poland and other countries behind the Iron Curtain on the agenda of the United Nations.

We request that the question of the Katyn murder be submitted to the U.N. for deliberation.

We request that the United States and Great Britain recognize the border on the Oder and Neisse.

Recognizing the eastern frontiers of Poland based on the Riga Treaty we request that freedom and independence be restored to Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Byelorussia and Ukraine so that a federation of these free and independent nations with Poland may be formed. Such a federation would enable these nations to establish better mutual relationships and cooperation and it would further create a basis for the formation of another federation including Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Albania, and Bulgaria.

Hereby we are voicing our opinion against the prevailing view that a restoration of freedom and independence to Ukraina would be upsetting the historical rights of Russia. Such a view is nothing more than the continuing recognition of imperialistic rights of old Tsarist Russia.

We request that the Soviets and the Warsaw regime fulfill the Potsdam decisions which did provide above all for the withdrawal of Soviet armed forces from Poland, for respect of religious and political freedoms, as well as of free, unfettered and democratic elections in Poland.

We request that the Red Army and all other Soviet functionaries be withdrawn from Poland.

We request respect for full religious freedoms in Poland, repatriation of Poles from the U.S.S.R., freeing of all political prisoners, restoration of freedom of speech, opinion, association and the right to a free and true self-government, the right to form free political parties, cooperative, professional youth, and cultural organizations.

We request that truly free and democratic election under the international control be carried out in Poland.

On this Peasant Day while sending our heartiest greetings to our brothers and sisters in Poland we do pledge that despite many obstacles and unfriendly winds on the international arena we shall always faithfully serve and fight for a free, democratic, and socially just Poland.

We deeply do believe that only the restoration of freedom, democracy, and social justice in Poland and other countries enslaved by the agrression of the Muscovite imperialism and world communism may give mankind the condition of life in peace, proper development, and progress.

SUPREME EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
OF THE POLISH PEASANT PARTY,
STANISLAW MIKOLAJCZYK, *Chairman.*
TADEUSZ PAUL, *Secretary General.*
Washington, June 1963.

Space Education: The St. Louis Planetarium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. S. McDonnell, president of the McDonnell Aircraft Co. of St. Louis, maker of the Mercury and Gemini spacecraft, recently dedicated a new planetarium in St. Louis. In his speech Mr. McDonnell outlined the important role which this planetarium will play in the future of space education. An important achievement in itself, this will be one of the great planetariums in the world. In addition, however, it will have an important educational role, as Mr. McDonnell's speech points out. To help give a fuller understanding of the objective of this new St. Louis Planetarium, I am placing the dedicatory remarks of Mr. McDonnell in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

ST. LOUIS PLANETARIUM DEDICATION

(Address by J. S. McDonnell)

Mrs. Brungard, Mayor Tucker, Mr. Gunn, Congressman CURTIS, Mr. Roos, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen of the St. Louis community, America is now a space-faring nation, and so I will talk to you tonight in space-faring terms.

And it came to pass in the early years of the age of aeronautics that there was an unusual city located deep in the heart of America, famous in history for the *Spirit of St. Louis*. Now, in the earlier age of aeronautics just 36 years ago, the tiny single-engine *Spirit of St. Louis*, piloted by Lone Eagle Lindbergh and backed by leaders of St. Louis, had—for the first time in the history of the planet called Earth—flown the great Atlantic Ocean alone and nonstop. In those early days of the age of aeronautics, Lindbergh's achievement was likened to the daring voyage of Columbus sailing westward in 1492 across the boundless waters of the Atlantic.

Now, in this evermore rapidly ascending spiral of science and engineering, America is a space-faring nation in the age of astronautics, and so it is most fitting that the creative people of St. Louis have designed and have built the first spacecraft, known as Mercury, in which the first free men have journeyed into space, although we were all with them in spirit, most recently to the extent of 600,000 miles including 22 days and 22 nights of 45 minutes each, nonstop in 34 hours from lift-off to down-splash.

It is also fitting that the free world's next improved 1964 model spacecraft, namely the 3.75-ton twin-astronaut Gemini, is right now being designed and built by St. Louisans to pioneer and practice rendezvous in space and perhaps to become the versatile workhorse of space.

And so it came to pass, in this *Spirit of St. Louis* town, that it was natural and typical to their style, that in 1955 A.D. the citizens wanted a planetarium and voted to tax themselves for same, and after a few trials and tribulations, here it is! It is significant that the good mayor of St. Louis gave only one directive to Gyo Obata, the brilliant architect: what was wanted was a planetarium unique to St. Louis and symbolic of the Space Age. And now here it stands before you in all of its pure mathematical beauty. The sweeping curves (created by rotating one straight line at an angle around a second vertical line with which it does not intersect) forming a hyperbola in silhouette, are indeed truly symbolic of the space age, and directly suggest the vast reaches of the celestial universe, because the largest comets sweeping through our solar system from outer space describe hyperbolic paths around our sun. Furthermore, if you attend a lecture in the planetarium's star chamber you may hear the sounds of rockets blasting off for the moon, the silence of deep space and the music of the spheres, the latter from 8 strereophonic high-fidelity speakers, truly symbolic of the space age.

What is the long-term significance, to St. Louis, of the planetarium and the space age? I believe that space science and exploration are here to stay and will continue at a high rate of activity because of four basic factors.

First factor: Whether we like it or not, there is a space race between the free world and the Communist world.

Second factor: From the military standpoint we can never tell when some new discovery in space science and exploration will have the potentiality of leading eventually to military control of the earth, so we have to do it whether we want to or not.

Third factor: Even without the first and second factors, the nature of the soul of man is such that man wants to discover and explore everything that he is able to discover and explore. Man's flight from earth to the moon and the planets will be the most prodigious adventure in his history. The hard work, the self-discipline, and the soaring spirit of man, which has brought him to the brink of this great achievement, will not stop now. I believe it will have no end as long as man exists on earth.

Fourth factor: Permeating all of this activity there will be a vast program of scientific research in almost all of the known sciences, and from both basic research and applied research there will in the end inevitably be many applications to everyday life on earth which will be stimulating to our business economy in many ways, and that means jobs, I am speaking not of months and years to come, but of decades and centuries to come.

Does the St. Louis region wish to be a vital part in the age of astronautics? Of course we do. St. Louis already has a good foundation in space age engineering and space age manufacturing; St. Louis already has this wonderful planetarium, and St. Louis already has many fine educational institutions.

What is needed next? It's inspiring for us to lift up our eyes to the stars, but then it does no good unless we do something about it. One obvious next step is to increase our educational efforts in the space sciences in order to have a real foundation for the future.

In this respect I have a specific $400,000 educational proposal to make for the consideration of the city of St. Louis and Washington University, defined in four programs:

First program: It is proposed that in addition to the planetarium's present excellent public lecture program, a new series of teaching programs be initiated at the planetarium from the first grade of grammar school through college. This would be the first time in the world that a planetarium would be used as a teaching laboratory directly to support the science curriculum of the community schools.

Second program: An additional educational program at Washington University with emphasis on high caliber graduate and research work under five professorships in the various space sciences, of which the first would be provided by McDonnell, in the hope that other leaders would thereby be inspired to provide the other four professorships such as astrophysics, radio astronomy, plasma/magnetohydronamics, planetary sciences, quantum electronics, or related fields bearing directly on space science.

Third program: It is proposed that adult education courses in astronomy, celestial navigation, space exploration and space sciences be made available through the planetarium. There ought also be provided courses in space sciences for specialized groups such as engineers, teachers, and others with a real and useful interest in the subject.

Fourth program: It is proposed that a lectureship program be established whereby distinguished authorities in the space sciences will be invited to come to St. Louis to participate in the activities of the planetarium and the community.

In order to get this entire program started on an excellent basis, I will pledge a gift of $400,000 which should be ample to pay the entire cost for the first 5 years.

Within the next several days, I will present this proposal in writing, and I wish to express deep appreciation for the fine and helpful collaboration of Mr. Charles A. Schweighauser, Michael Witunski, Prof. Robert N. Varney, and Provost George E. Pake, without which this preliminary proposal would not have been possible.

I invite you again to look at this beautiful utilitarian planetarium. Is it any wonder that this exciting design, equally brilliant in space age hyperbolic symbolism and also in its reinforced concrete materialization, and pointing from earth to outer space and the stars; is it any wonder that this combination has inspired this old Scotsman to try to help establish it also as both a symbol and an institution of space age education; and how fitting is its motto "Per aspera ad astra," which means "hard work to the stars"—a fitting part of the spirit of St. Louis—a fitting step on the way to one of St. Louis' new images: Leader in space science and exploration.

Youth Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, Jr., mayor of the city of New York, resquesting support for the President's youth employment bill, if and when it reaches the floor of the House of Representatives.

In view of the great record of the city of New York and its mayor on behalf of social programs, I think it singularly appropriate that his letter be inserted in the RECORD. I am particularly aware of this fact in view of the mobilization for youth project in my district on the lower east side of Manhattan wherein I attended a ceremony opening a gas station on Monday, June 3, 1963, which is being operated by youths who would otherwise have been on the streets of the neighborhood as unemployed.

This is only one of the numerous employment projects arranged for by the mobilization for youth to which the city has contributed $1.4 million annually for a few years.

Elsewhere in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of today I have included an article which appeared in the New York Times of May 23, 1963, particularizing in greater detail than I have mentioned herein the work of the mobilization for youth program.

The mayor's letter follows:

CITY OF NEW YORK,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
New York, N.Y., May 23, 1963.

Hon. LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FARBSTEIN: I am writing to ask your support for the President's youth employment bill when it reaches the floor of the House of Representatives shortly. As you know, the Senate has already passed this bill, and it now requires favorable action by the House.

New York's congressional representatives are in an enviable position to testify to the wisdom of public investment in youth training and employment programs. For you can point with pride to the many accomplishments of State and local governments in this field such as: the Youth Employment Service of the State Employment Service, and the special counseling and employment placement programs for school dropouts sponsored by the State and local departments of education. Here in New York City we are contributing $1.4 million annually to the Mobilization for Youth project on Manhattan's Lower East Side. A large part of that expenditure goes to support youth work, training, and placement programs.

The programs I have named are a few examples of the many and varied youth employment activities underway in our State. Total expenditures for all youth development activities now constitute a sizable proportion of State and city expenditures. For example, we are spending $1.1 billion of our $2.7 billion budget in New York City for educational, social, health, and recreational services for children and youth. Much of the good work we are doing may, however, be undone or wasted in cases where unemployed youth lose skills and motivation and fail to develop their potential because of enforced idleness.

Youth power is our most precious national and local asset. Since local government budgets are already badly strained, largely in order to provide youth development resources, it is both fair and just that the National Government contribute financial assistance and program leadership to this essential public undertaking.

I urge again your support of the President's total youth program and particularly your support of the youth employment bill.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Mayor.

Figures Refute Administration Rosy Picture of Balance of Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the optimistic statements from the President and other administration officials continue to assure the American people that we are not in trouble on our balance of payments and that there is no drain on our gold supply, the figures prove otherwise. It is time the President stop misleading the American people, tell them the truth, and take positive action to protect our gold supply and the value of our currency.

The following item from the Washington World of May 10 reports the drain on our gold reserves is up 50 percent:

U.S. GOLD DRAIN UP 50 PERCENT

Statistics for the first quarter of 1963 show an alarming increase in the balance-of-payments deficit. Based on the early 1963 figure, the annual rate of the deficit will rise to $3.3 billion, a jump of 50 percent over the actual figure for all of 1962.

According to Government economists the rise is largely due to the east coast dock strike and its impact on exports. An added factor is failure of foreign nations to repay debts.

As a result, the gold outflow continues and foreign confidence in the U.S. dollar wanes. Although the deficit is not quite in the neighborhood of the $4 billion of the years 1958–60, it still remains a serious challenge to the economy.

His Holiness Pope John XXIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the death of Pope John XXIII has deprived the Catholic world of a beloved father, the Christian world of a true shepherd, and the entire world of a good friend. For truly Pope John was a friend to all people of good will everywhere as his great encyclical "Pacem in Terris" reveals.

He did not live to see the completion of his great dream and undertaking in the Ecumenical Council but he did lay the ground work for the bridging of differences among religions. I pray that the spirit of ecumenism will be with us all through his successor for many years to come.

Though Pope John had a long list of titles, the one that seemed to fit him best was that of "Pontifex—Bridgebuilder." Morris West, the noted Australian author, expressed this so beautifully in a recent article in Life, as follows:

BUILDER OF BRIDGES FOR US POOR DEVILS

(By Morris L. West)

I am very close to tears as I begin to set down these words. What can I say of a man so manifestly good, so manifestly the victim—or is it the victor—in a drama of divine irony whose poignant prayer as he lies stricken is not for the salvation of his own soul but for the salvation of a work begun in the name of God?

I have no dignity in the church. I have no personal merit to commend me for the task of writing a eulogy, save perhaps this—that I am, in the spirit, a stumbling son of Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli. And, as a son, I want to say what his living and the thought of his dying have meant to me and to other souls still vagrant on this puzzling planet.

I live 12,000 miles from Rome. I stand with 550 million other believers on the lowest level of the complex hierarchic order of the church. But I wander widely and I am troubled by the spectacle of misery and poverty, and injustice and oppression, and the million faces of despair. I wrestle daily with the mystery of how all this could have issued, as the deposit of faith affirms it does, from the single creative act of an all-good and all-knowing divinity.

To me Angelo Roncalli presented himself always as a man who carried the burden of the same mystery, who shared the agony that it imposes on the human spirit, who knew the wild and risky leap demanded by the act of faith—and who knew, too, from how many millions the grace to make it has been withheld.

From the day of his election the makers of legends were busy about him. But even they could not obscure the true nature of this man—shrewd, pragmatic, kindly, too simple to be seduced by eminence, too gregarious to be happy in the baroque enclave of the Vatican, a man with a sense of fraternity and a gift of compassion which even the formalities of Vatican communication could not distort.

The Romans named him un Papa simpatico. And everyone wished he were younger, so that the imprint of his personality might be deeper on the corporate life of the church and the common life of the world. We had had a surfeit of princes and politicians and theologians—even of conventional saints. We needed a man who spoke the language of the heart, who understood that the dialog of God with man is carried on in terms far different from the semantics of professional philosophers. We have had him too briefly.

Many of my generation felt that the traditional relationship between clergy and the people had become defective. We acknowledged without reservation the dignity of the priestly office, its divine function in the renewal of the sacrificial act and in the dispensation of sacramental grace. We respected the abnegation and dedication imposed by the celibate state. We supported our pastors according to their needs and our capacities. We built schools and monasteries and hospitals. We financed missions and works of charity. We carried double and triple burdens to educate our children in the faith.

But many of us felt, not without reason, that there was too much emphasis on the magisterium of the hierarchy—their authority as moral arbiters, interpreters of dogma and administrators of the temporal structure of the church. We felt that there was not enough understanding of their ministerium—the service of the Creator through and by spiritual and temporal service rendered to the people.

In half a generation the vista of the universe had exploded into galactic dimensions. The human spirit was being submitted to monstrous tensions—moral, political, economic. And while we clung desperately to the deposit of faith, we longed for a renewal of the intellectual and pastoral life of the Church so that we might live—through the faith—hopefully and actively in the world into which we were born.

We were not cenobites. We were men of the 20th century and we could not opt out of it. We were not only members of a church, we were members of the diverse human family as well and we could not opt out of that either. It was like the breaking of a new day when we heard the call of John XXIII for an aggiornamento—for an updating of the church, her manners, her customs and her interpretation of the deposit of faith into the language of this millennial century.

When John XXIII was elected pontiff, he abrogated nothing of the primacy of his office. Yet one of his first acts was to make himself more readily available to his brother bishops. Later he intervened in the debates of the Ecumenical Council and in the lobbyings of its members to affirm that the Roman Curia was not the Pope, and that the Pope was brother to every bishop in

Christendom and servant of every human soul in the world.

Of all the recent Popes, it seems that John XXIII has been least afraid of schism, of heresy or of the militancy of non-Christian religions. A man of simple faith, he believed in the indwelling of the Holy Spirit and in the promise of perpetuity made by Christ to the church. He put no store in interdicts or excommunication because he was also a man of simple charity who understood that, although human beings are limited by God's covenant with them, God Himself is not so limited. He knew that all men must live with the burdens and confusions of their own history, and that salvation or damnation hangs, in the last resort, upon God's judgment of the final direction of a man's will—toward Him or away from Him. He claimed without reservation his right as the supreme pastor to preach truth and refute error, but he gave the impression of a man ready at all times to suspend judgment on human confusion and human delinquency. All other pontiffs knew these things—preached them, too. What has made John XXIII so different is his lively and intimate sense of their application to the commerce of life, immortally reflected in "Pacem in Terris," his encyclical on peace.

I am chary of miracles; but I think there has been a kind of miracle in the way Pope John managed to impress his charity upon the church and upon the world. Most people have seen him only in photographs. His own voice has not often been heard. Mainly his words filtered out to the faithful through newspaper reports and the variant voices of preachers, good and bad. But somehow we have all felt him, and felt that God was with him. In his hands the crosier of the bishop has meant what it was meant to mean—the crook of the kindly shepherd, to whom the wayworn and the stragglers meant more than those penned safely in the sheepfold.

When he was elected Pope, he became heir to a long list of titles: Bishop of Rome, Vicar of Jesus Christ, Successor of the Prince of the Apostles, Supreme Pontiff of the Universal Church, Patriarch of the West, Primate of Italy, Archbishop and Metropolitan of the Roman Province, Sovereign of the Vatican City State. Yet the title which has seemed to sit most comfortably on him is that of Pontifex: the builder of bridges. He goes too soon and he leaves his work unfinished, but the bridges he planned are already abuilding—bridges of understanding and tolerance between the separated families of Christendom and the nations of East and West.

The formula on which he based all his architecture was very simple: "I have tried to preserve my calm and balance while investigating and evaluating things and persons about me, ever concerned more with that which unites than with that which divides. * * *"

He was never a polemical man. He disliked contention and preferred to rely upon discussion and persuasive prompting rather than to invoke the authority of his office. He ordered that even the admonitions and of the holy office be couched in moderate language so that men of good will might have room to move through the most risky speculations to a fuller understanding of the truth. He was never a political man. He was a diplomat long enough to know that political action creates more problems than it solves.

There was a great boldness in his planning, a devastating directness. He encouraged the most daring speculations of modern theology, and he lent the weight of his influence to those ecumenical dialogues which aimed at breaking down semantic and historic barriers between Catholic and non-Catholic theologians.

There are some in the church who were disappointed because he did not take a more militant line against Russian communism. There are some who were shocked because he accepted birthday greetings from the Premier of Russia and then received his son-in-law in private audience. Yet the incident illuminated his whole attitude to the affairs of human souls. He knew that every society and every system survives by virtue of what is good in it, just as human beings are kept from the ultimate madness of despair by that in their nature which is good and conformable to a Divine pattern.

John XXIII is to leave us—a great man, and a great Pope. For this very reason there is rare tragedy in his passing. The tragedy is that, having begun so much, he will not be permitted to see the fruits of his labor; he has seen only the first faint buds. Yet in this, as in all else, his life has been patterned on that of the Christ whose vicar he was. He has walked for all too short a time, scattering the seeds of truth and charity on good ground and stony soil, and has endured the painful crucifixion of illness and frustration. Now, at the end, he must abandon himself and all his unfinished work into the hands of God.

How has he felt during these last months, perched on his lonely eminence with the world spread beneath him like a campaign map and above him the monstrous mystery of the Godhead? There must have been times when his aged shoulders bent under the burden and even his stout peasant heart quailed at the thought of things undone. Even the mercy of death has been delayed for him—as it was for his Master.

History will be kind to him, I think, because he has been a kindly man who had compassion on the multitudes, "seeing them harried and abject, like sheep that have no shepherd." Princes and priests are mourned as rarely as they are thanked, but many will weep for this one because he has been, in truth, what he was named to be: a servant of the servants of God.

Will they canonize him and make him, officially, a saint in the calendar? In a way I hope not. For my part I do not want to see him idealized by a Vatican painter, lit by a thousand candles in St. Peter's, reproduced in plaster and gilt and sold to pious pilgrims. I want to remember him for what he has been—a loving man, a simple priest, a good pastor, and a builder of bridges across which we poor devils may hope one day to scramble to salvation.

A Profile of Congresswoman Charlotte T. Reid in the Milwaukee Journal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include the interesting profile of our colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. Reid] by Ira Kapenstein, which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on May 23, 1963:

Representative Charlotte Thompson Reid, Republican, of Illinois, is serving her first tearm in Congress, but she is fast becoming a leading spokesman for the distaff side of the GOP.

Mrs. Reid, 49, was the only new woman Member of Congress elected last fall. An attractive mother of four, she was nominated to seek the 15th District congressional seat in Illinois, after the sudden death of her husband, Frank R. Reid, Jr.

Her late husband, an Aurora attorney, had been seeking his first term in Congress when he died.

Born in Kankakee, Ill., Mrs. Reid was graduated from East Aurora High School and attended Illinois College at Jacksonville for 2 years.

She studied voice for several years in Chicago and sang professionally for 3 years as a member of the National Broadcasting Co. staff. She was a featured vocalist on the "Don McNeill's Breakfast Club" program.

Mrs. Reid is no stranger to politics, having lived in a political atmosphere for many years. Her father-in-law, Frank R. Reid, was a Congressman for 12 years. She had campaigned actively with her husband before his death, and had worked with him, in other local political contests.

WOMEN'S ROLE IMPORTANT

Mrs. Reid attended the Republican National Convention in 1956 when her husband was a delegate.

She believes that women are the predominant force in politics today.

Much in demand as a speaker, Mrs. Reid is fond of telling her audiences: "The hand that once rocked the cradle is now out doing some powerful rocking in political and economic circles."

Mrs. Reid points to the statistics that show there are almost 4 million more women voters than men and that the majority of women vote Republican.

She told a recent audience:

"Women by their very nature are less inhibited than most men. Women have always had the responsibility of high standards of living for their families and moral codes of conduct for their children.

"They are alert to the needs of their communities and traditionally have given countless hours of service to worthwhile causes without thought of any remuneration.

"Women are typically crusaders for justice, for honor, and for peace."

Mrs. Reid contended that women are less apt to compromise their conscience and integrity.

NEW ERA HAS OPENED

"Women have always helped direct the course of men's destiny—usually behind the scenes in their roles as mother and wives," she said. "Today, however, a new era has opened the door to new opportunities. * * *"

Mrs. Reid hopes that more women will run for governmental office at the local, State and National levels and that women candidates will get the support from the tremendous resources of volunteer female campaign workers.

As a newcomer to Congress, Mrs. Reid says that the women Members want no special treatment or privileges. She says her goal is to represent her district and to legislate "as well as the men."

Women have some distinct advantages in politics, the Congresswoman believes.

"The particular value of a woman's participation in government, seems to me the fact that women tend to take things personally," she said. "This might be described as less willingness to accept prepackaged generalizations or prefabricated attitudes."

Mrs. Reid said that women must face such important national decisions as how much to spend for schools, hospitals, roads; how to avoid inflation; the problem of balancing the Nation's budget and other fiscal questions.

"Understanding these basic economics is essential if we are to be intelligent, responsible citizens," she said.

MUST KNOW ECONOMICS

The freshman legislator confessed that at times she has a hard time balancing her checkbook. She said that with women holding the balance of power in the United States, it is imperative that they have a better understanding of economics and politics.

Mrs. Reid suggested that more practical economics be taught at the high school level and that women's clubs and organizations take more interest in economic study.

Before entering Congress, Mrs. Reid's major interests were her home and her husband's career. She has four children. A daughter, Patricia (Mrs. George Lindner), lives in Boulder, Colo. A son, Frank, is in the Marine Corps at Lake Meade, Nev. Edward (Tom) and Susan are attending school in Aurora.

Mrs. Reid was active in the Aurora March of Dimes and the Child Welfare Society. She was on the Board of Directors of the Aurora Women's Republican club for 4 years. She has worked with local Girl Scouts, PTA groups and other civic and charitable organizations.

Mrs. Reid serves on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House and is on Subcommittees for National Parks, Territorial and Insular Affairs and Indian Affairs.

She was appointed to the Board of Trustees of the National Cultural Center and was elected secretary of the Illinois Republican delegation. She also is secretary of the 88th Club, which consists of new Republican Members in the 88th Congress.

A Celebration in the American Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, in San Francisco, the four sons of Mr. Lee Ling were hosts for a banquet which celebrated Mr. Lee Ling's 71st birthday. His friends attended with pride and devotion. They came from all parts of the United States, including the State of Hawaii, from the far reaches of Canada, and even from distant Formosa.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lee Ling well deserved this demonstration of respect and affection, as he has deserved through the years the admiration of his fellow citizens of San Francisco. Of humble origins, burdened with privation and debt in their early years, Lee Ling and his wife, his stanch helpmate, Yuk Kang, have weathered life's storms, have achieved independence and success, and have faithfully and enthusiastically served their fellow citizens in many civic, philanthropic, and humane endeavors.

Through their years of hard work together, Mr. Ling and his wife were the proprietors of the Eastern Bakery on Grant Avenue. For decades their efficiency and helpfulness were bywords in the community.

The business acumen which made a success of the bakery business is still actively at work in the enterprises of the Hawaii and San Francisco Investment Co., a busy and prosperous building and development firm which Mr. Ling now serves as vice president.

His civic participation deserves special praise. Each year for many years, and into the present, he has personally solicited donations for the Bay Area United Crusade, the San Francisco Bay area's community chest. He served his beloved Chinatown as chairman of the board of directors of its Chinese Hospital.

The members of his large family were especially proud of him on the occasion of his birthday banquet.

They have always held him in the highest esteem for the honor which his business success, his scrupulous honesty, and his performance of public duty have reflected upon them, but they were also glad to publicly express their gratitude for his service and devotion to them as a president and now an elder of the Lee Family Association.

He has worked and sacrificed for family and community, for city and country, for Chinese and Americans, for the United States and for China. He was a director of Young China, a San Francisco Chinese language newspaper founded by the distinguished Chinese leader, Sun Yat Sen, half a century ago. Mr. Lee has served on the executive committee of the local Kuo Min Tang, and is now on the executive committee of the Chinese Anti-Communist League.

He is currently chairman of the board of the Kin Kuo High School. In the great American tradition of preserving the culture of the country of origin while adapting to the democratic traditions of the country of adoption, this school, the only one of its kind in the United States, teaches its pupils the Chinese language after its public school hours. His devotion to his fellow Chinese Americans is shown in his directorship of the Young Wo District Association of Chinatown.

It is to Mr. Ling's credit and to the credit of the United States, the country which he loves and has served so well, that his industry, his aspiration, his insight, his honesty, his civic pride, and his patriotism have made of him a businessman, a leader, a patriot, and an American worthy of the emulation of his fellow Americans.

Debate on the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an article from the Washington World, "Is United Nations Effective Instrument To Assure Peace?" The article presents the pro views of Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, and the opposite views by our colleague, the gentleman from California, Congressman James Utt.

My own views coincide with Mr. Utt's because I canont see where the self-interest of my country is being served through the present makeup of the U.N.

In the interest of a full discussion of the issue, I include both the pro and con arguments as they appeared in the newspaper.

The article follows:

Is United Nations Effective?—Yes

(By Richard N. Gardner)

The peacekeeping functions of the United Nations help us in two principal ways:

In the first place, they help avoid global conflict and preserve the values of a free society during the dangerous ideological, political, and military confrontation in which we now find ourselves.

The U.N. serves as a forum for ventilating grievances and for mobilizing public opinion and political pressure against breaches of the peace and acts of aggression.

The U.N. serves as center of negotiation in which the settlement of disputes can be sought through quiet diplomacy, with the special advantage of a "third man" in the person of the Secretary General to get negotiations started where neither side is willing to take the first step.

ACTIONS ON BEHALF OF WORLD

The United Nations is an action agency able to mount economic, administrative, and policing operations in situations where action by one country or even a group of countries might prove politically inexpedient. The United Nations has special advantages of acceptability and noninflammability because its actions are taken in the name of the community of nations as a whole.

It is often said in criticism of the United Nations that it has not been able to keep the great powers together. The point is, however, that the U.N. has been able on numerous occasions to keep the great powers apart.

In disputes between small states, or in areas where the withdrawal of a colonial regime has left a power vacuum, the involvement of the United Nations through debate, negotiation, or a peacekeeping "presence" has helped insulate a potentially dangerous situation from the cold war.

And even in confrontations between the Soviet Union and the United States, the United Nations has demonstrated its value as a vehicle for great power disengagement.

U.N. VALUE PROVED

In the recent Cuban crisis, for example, the United Nations offered a valuable channel of negotiation which helped keep Soviet ships clear of our quarantine fleet. It also indicated future potential when both the Soviet Union and the United States agreed to U.N. inspection in Cuba to verify the withdrawal of Soviet missiles.

In the second place, and beyond these immediate benefits, the peacekeeping functions of the United Nations are an indispensable element in plans to escape from the balance of terror and to create a disarmed world under law.

If general and complete disarmament is ever to be achieved, there will have to be a major buildup in the U.N.'s peacekeeping role—its capacity for peaceful settlement and for controlling international violence by all means, including the employment of international peace forces.

ARMS SUBSTITUTE NEEDED

The fact is that nations never will be willing to eliminate their arms until they have some substitute means of protecting their territorial integrity and vital interests.

President Kennedy told the U.N. General Assembly in September 1961:

"To destroy arms * * * is not enough. We must create, even as we destroy—creating worldwide law and law enforcement as we outlaw worldwide war and weapons."

Communist obstruction alone will not destroy the U.N. as a peacekeeping agency. But the peacekeeping role of the U.N. could be jeopardized by a failure of support within the free world.

The fact is that the Soviet leaders are not the only ones who oppose the buildup of the U.N.'s capacity to keep the peace. There are even some Americans who proclaim that the development of the U.N.'s peacekeeping role, and particularly the peacekeeping provisions of our disarmament treaty, are a threat to our national security.

These American critics are prisoners of dangerous illusions which prevent them from understanding the thoroughgoing transformation in international relations wrought by the advent of modern weapons.

In an age when the Soviet Union and the United States have in their arsenals weapons each of which has the destructible power of all the bombs dropped in the Second World War—in an age when no matter how many weapons one side may build neither side can escape unimaginable destruction in a nuclear holocaust—in an age when the danger of war by accident or miscalculation grows with the increasing complexity of weapons systems—in such an age there is no rational alternative but to develop a civilized system of collective security under the aegis of the United Nations.

INSTRUMENT TO ASSURE PEACE—NO

(By Representative JAMES B. UTT)

There is no evidence of the Lord's work in the United Nations.

I know I may be accused of being irresponsible and fanatical, but I find myself in good company. The testimony of five of our greatest fightingmen—General Clark, General van Fleet, General Stratemeyer, Admiral Joy, and Lieutenant General Almond, before the Jenner committee in 1954—is summed up in the words of General Stratemeyer:

"We were required to lose the Korean war."

Lord Beaverbrook, noted British publisher, said: "Here in New York City, you Americans have the biggest fifth column in the world—the United Nations."

OPPOSITION QUOTED

After Alger Hiss recommended the first 500 employes for the U.N., the late Robert Taft said: "The U.N. has become a trap. Let's go it alone."

Herbert Hoover said: "Unless the U.N. is completely reorganized without the Communist nations in it, we should get out of it."

In my opinion, it is absolutely essential to the survival of this Republic that the United States withdraw from the U.N. The U.N. Charter infringes upon the constitutional authority of the United States and places the power to tax and the power to declare war within the U.N. and not in the Congress of the United States. Importantly, these are two of the basic attributes of national sovereignty.

U.N. FAILS TO KEEP PEACE

What about the so-called "peacekeeping" activities of the U.N.? The answer: the U.N. pays little heed to its own Charter and, instead of keeping peace, has promoted war. The organization has disregarded the prohibition against interfering with international domestic affairs. Witness the interference in the Congo. Nearly every issue has been resolved in favor of Communist governments—as in Laos, the Congo, Yemen, and in its resolutions condemning Portugal, Holland, and the Union of South Africa.

Our defeat in the abortive Cuban invasion can be laid on the doorstep of the United Nations, as the U.N. treaty prohibits us from engaging in any military operations without the consent of the U.N. Security Council in which Russia holds the veto power.

How silly can we get to relinquish the right to protect our Nation against Communist invasion in the Western Hemisphere? If we continue our membership in this organization, you can look to see this Nation condemned for having our naval base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. You can also look to see us condemned for owning the Panama Canal, and the same 66 votes which threw France out of its legal position in Bizerte can vote us out of Guantanamo and out of Panama.

You can see, and with reason, Mexico demanding through the U.N. all that territory taken from them under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo following the Mexican War in 1848. You can see Russia demanding the return of Alaska because we only paid them $17 million when it is really worth billions. And certainly the American Indians, if they had representation in the U.N., could demand the return of Manhattan Island together with the rest of the land that was legally theirs. You say this is fantastic? You would have said that the present situation in Cuba was a fantastic idea 10 years ago.

FEARS ONE-WORLD GOVERNMENT

You can expect to see a one-world government, Communist-controlled, under the U.N. You will see the U.N. run up astronomical debts which we, under the terms of the treaty, are bound to pay.

Just take a look at the U.N.'s management and you wonder just how it could possibly "keep the peace." After the death of Dag Hammarskjold, Russia demanded a "troika," or three-man board, to act as Secretary General, but acquiesced in the selection of U Thant, a Marxist school teacher from Burma, when Russia was given assurance that U Thant would appoint an advisory group. One of these was to be the under secretary for political and Security Council affairs. This office now has been held by eight consecutive Communists. U Thant announced the appointment of the latest, Vladmir Javiovich Suslov, only last month.

U Thant supports coexistence and states that we have nothing to fear from the international Communist conspiracy. U Thant made concessions and compromises with Castro which have not been revealed to the American public. The United States can make no move against the Communist conspiracy in the Western Hemisphere without the consent of the U.N.

Cannot our leaders recognize what this means? It means we have placed our foreign policy in the hands of a foreigner.

I believe the American public is becoming disillusioned with this world organization which is rapidly becoming an international military, political, and economic dictatorship instead of an organization to promote peace.

We were sold the U.N. on a promise of peace, but we failed to realize that this peace was to be on Communist terms; in fact, it was to be a total victory for the international Communist conspiracy. Russia has used the veto power nearly a hundred times. The U.N. has been completely unable to bring any degree of peace.

Textile Industry Needs Immediate Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a statement I am submitting to the Special Subcommittee To Study the Textile Industry, Senate Committee on Commerce, of which Senator JOHN O. PASTORE of Rhode Island is the chairman. The subcommittee recently conducted hearings on the subject. My statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE TO STUDY THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY, JUNE 4, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for having this opportunity to present to you a few brief thoughts in connection with your study of the textile situation. First, I desire to express my deep appreciation to your committee for undertaking this study. We can only hope that much good will come of it to benefit all those associated with this industry, which should also prove beneficial to the Nation's economy as a whole.

Those of us representing constituencies in the New England States are particularly perturbed over the very serious situation which the textile industry in this area is experiencing. In May 1961 President Kennedy announced a seven-point program to deal with the problem and emphasized at the time the need for action. Unfortunately, little has been done to implement the President's program of action during these past 2 years, while textile imports have risen sharply. The result has been that since then more textile mills were forced to close down and additional thousands of workers have been forced to join the ranks of the unemployed.

We have particularly felt the blow of these developments in Connecticut, which until recent years prided itself in having a very prosperous textile industry. Now, many of these mills and plants in Connecticut towns are the silent reminders of yesterday's prosperity and today's unemployment. Many people in our area, both in the ranks of industry and labor, are very much concerned over this situation. Many are worried that, unless specific action is taken in the near future, there will be tragic consequences for the remainder of the textile industry and for other communities.

Recent statistics of the Textile Workers Union of America show that the employment of production workers in the textile industry in January 1963 was 3 percent lower than in January 1962, and the number of unemployed textile workers had reached 60,700 in January of this year. The Northern Textile Association reported in March that imports of wool products in 1962 rose 78 percent over the level of 1961 and imports of manufactured textile products rose 39 percent. The same organization reported that 18 wool mills closed down in 1962.

These figures attest to the erosion of an entire industry. Steps must be taken to stop this, whether by restraining imports, or the development of certain controls or voluntary agreements on the part of textile exporting nations, or a combination of these steps.

While I am not prepared to say which of these steps should be taken first, it might perhaps be most wise to start out with immediate implementation of President Kennedy's seven-point program. I feel certain that your committee, in its wisdom and knowledge of the facts and in its desire to be helpful, will give this matter very earnest consideration and will recommend the proper action.

The Good Ship "Hope"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the Hartford Courant recently commented on the voyages which have been accomplished by the SS *Hope*, and told the story of its success on a visit to Peru. I offer it for the RECORD:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, May 22, 1963]

THE GOOD SHIP "HOPE"

When you speak of "the good ship *Hope*," you couldn't put it better. The hospital craft SS *Hope* is battling sickness, disease, and injury around the world. And the privately financed medical mission. Project Hope, that operates the ship, is at the same time building goodwill for this Nation. On Monday, May 27, a fundraising Hope ball is scheduled in Washington, with other similar events coming up subsequently throughout the country. The only obstacle to the expansion of the Hope project is lack of funds to outfit and maintain more vessels.

When the reconverted Navy hospital ship docked off Trujillo, Peru, in May 1962, Communists plastered the city with "Cuba Si, Yanqui No" signs. The signs came down in the next 10 months as the ship's medical staff performed 2,000 major operations, treated 46,000 disease sufferers, inoculated 80,000 persons against polio, and distributed milk, medicine, and supplies reaching a half million Peruvians. Some 20,000 grateful natives crowded into Trujillo Stadium for farewell ceremonies when the time came in March.

The permanent staff of the SS *Hope* includes 5 physicians, 36 nurses, and 26 auxiliary personnel. Volunteer teams of physicians are flown to the ship on a rotating basis for tours of 2 to 4 months. With the completion of her latest voyage, more than 300 American medical experts had served aboard the ship. Applications for the Peru tour came from 3,000 doctors. The *Hope* had previously spent a year in southeast Asia, and this year a third voyage is planned, possibly going to Ecuador—if $5 million can be raised. Ways to overcome the impersonality and low visibility of many U.S. foreign aid programs are being demonstrated most dramatically by Project Hope and the good ship *Hope*.

Dr. Flemming Endorses National Service Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from Dr. Arthur S. Flemming who was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Cabinet of General Eisenhower, endorsing the National Service Corps.

Quite coincidentally the day that this letter was delivered in my office was the same day that Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony Celebrezze, was testifying before my subcommittee in favor of this same corps.

As most of my colleagues who were here during Dr. Flemming's term as Secretary know, he is now the president of the University of Oregon.

Because those of my colleagues who knew him respected him as a sincere public servant, I include Dr. Flemming's splendid endorsement of H.R. 5625, and the 41 companion bills, as a part of my remarks.

The letter follows:

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
Eugene, May 27, 1963.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I regret very much that it will be impossible for me to come to Washington in order to testify in behalf of the bill which you now have under consideration to provide for a National Service Corps. We are in the closing days of the session of our legislature and under the circumstances it is necessary for me to remain in Oregon.

I wrote an editorial for the May issue of Good Housekeeping in which I endorsed the plans for a National Service Corps. I wrote this editorial because of a conviction that such a Corps could effectively supplement the work that is now being carried on in our communities by public and private groups. Theoretically, these groups should be able to take advantage of all of the opportunities for service which exist in our communities. Actually, this is not the case. Our failure to render this service in many of our communities is seriously impairing our ability to provide the Nation with the human resources which it needs.

I believe there are well-qualified persons in our Nation who would be willing to volunteer their services, under the conditions proposed in the National Service Corps bill, in order to help our communities deal in a more adequate manner with the problems which confront them in the health, education, and welfare areas.

For example, as a result of my experience as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I became convinced that it was imperative for us as a Nation to place renewed emphasis on rehabilitating families who are completely dependent on the help they receive from public and private welfare agencies. It is encouraging for me to note that some communities are beginning to move in this direction as contrasted with efforts in other communities to solve their welfare problems by getting tough with those who are in need. A community which has decided to adopt the positive approach could turn to the National Service Corps and ask for qualified manpower resources which could be utilized in a rehabilitation program. In response to such a request, the Corps might very well be able to provide volunteers qualified as teachers, professional welfare workers, doctors and nurses. If such a group of volunteers went to work in the community under local supervision, I am confident that after a period of 2 years they could point to very constructive results. This in turn would put the community in a far better position to set up an ongoing program.

Also, as a result of my experience in HEW, I was impressed by the fact, to take another example, that there are thousands of persons in our mental hospitals who do not need to be there. They are there simply because trained people are not available to help reintroduce them to their communities and to help make it possible for them to become productive members of these communities. Here again I believe that a group of persons recruited by the National Service Corps could, in response to a State or community request and under the supervision of State or local personnel, be of real help in dealing with this type of situation.

As I indicated in my editorial in Good Housekeeping, I believe that the Peace Corps represents the United States at its best. I also believe that the proposal for a National Service Corps could provide us with another example of the United States at its best.

If I can be of any help to the committee in its deliberations, I hope you will feel free to get in touch with me.

Very sincerely and cordially yours,
ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
President.

His Holiness, Pope John XXIII

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, all of humanity stands today with heads bowed in deep sorrow at the loss of one of the great spiritual leaders of all times, His Holiness, Pope John XXIII. He was known as the Pope of unity, the Pope of peace, but he will perhaps best be characterized in history as the Pope of the people, one who best understood the people and was most loved and revered by them.

To men of all faiths and all walks of life he represented compassion, patience, gentleness, good will, and love of humanity. He was possessed of a great ardor for hard work, he had boundless energy for a person of his advanced age, and conducted a vigorous reign which resulted in notable achievements in the few short years that he headed the Catholic Church.

In a world which often darkens perceptibly at noon because of the evil deeds of some men, Pope John XXIII shone forth as a beacon of light and hope. The guidance he gave to mankind was encouraging at all times. His work and his aims remain unfinished, but the greatest monument to the memory of a man who went forward so zealously for all mankind is the deep affection and boundless love for him by people everywhere on this earth.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to insert into the RECORD a very fine editorial which best expresses my sentiments and feelings in the loss we have just sustained in the death of Pope John XXIII. The editorial was published in the Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin, June 4, 1963, and reads as follows:

POPE JOHN XXIII

The world mourns today the loss of one of its most outstanding leaders and undoubtedly one of the greatest rulers of the Roman Catholic Church since the Reformation.

With the death of Pope John XXIII not only the church, which he loved and served so well, but others of every faith and creed will feel the sting which the naturalness of death always leaves in the loss of a beloved father and friend. He died as he lived with a tranquillity and submission to God's will which is the characteristic of one full of grace.

It has been part of the greatness of Pope John XXIII that no matter what anyone's past reaction to Rome, people of virtually all persuasions have liked him. No other Pope in modern history has been so popular.

Ascending the throne of Peter the Fisherman in 1958, Pope John immediately set a new pace in ecclesiastical circles. He defied tradition and while some, at first, thought to criticize his actions in leaving the Vatican for visits to neighboring places, they quickly agreed that this approach to human problems aided in forming a new opinion of the church.

Pope John went out of his way, it seems, to come down to the people. He was known to visit prisons, hospitals, homes for the aged. He entertained artists, actors, dignitaries, and others when his health permitted.

The beloved pontiff was known and will go down in history as the Pope of unity. This is a common and apt designation for this great spiritual leader.

As a result of his innovations, new ties have been formed with other churches, and they have entered into real conversations, not only through the second Vatican council but in cities and towns throughout the world.

Church leaders agree Christianity has witnessed developments that would have been considered impossible only a few years ago. Pope John, in one of his first official acts, provided the first liaison between Rome and Protestantism since the Reformation. He declared that both sides had been at fault in the past and should seek mutual ways back together.

He began sending Catholic observers to Protestant-Orthodox gatherings and also received a succession of Protestant, Orthodox leaders, sitting down in what was termed, warm and informal conversation. Noteworthy among his non-Roman visitors was Dr. Geoffrey Fisher, former Archbishop of Canterbury, the spiritual leader of the Anglican church. This, in itself, was unprecedented and was the first time in 400 years that such a visit had been staged.

His heart, however, went out in a special way to Orthodox Christians and he accomplished much to help heal the breach which occurred between the two branches of the church in the 11th century.

"There burns in my heart," he was heard to say not long ago, "the intention of working and suffering to hasten the hour when for all men the prayer of Jesus at the Last Supper will have reached its fulfillment."

That prayer was, "That they all may be one."

In his quest for peace Pope John explored new paths in relations of the Roman Catholic Church with Communist countries. His death leaves that papal initiative unfinished.

As the Pope lay dying Friday, Nikita Khrushchev sent a message for the Pope's recovery saying, "This news moved us deeply."

The extent of the good this Pope had done during his short reign on Peter's throne will be fully realized only in time. He enters now into the blessed company of God and His saints.

Let's Cease Hostilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a perceptive editorial written by Garland B. Porter which appeared in the April 15, 1963, issue of Southern Advertising & Publishing. It follows:

LET'S CEASE HOSTILITIES

There have been manifestations of total black-ins—that's failure to see any rights of white folks—in the Nation since the ill-founded May 17, 1954, decision by the Warren Court that Negroes can force themselves socially on white folks who prefer to be left alone. But none more biased than the recommendation the other day by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights that all Federal funds be withheld from Mississippi "until the State of Mississippi demonstrates its compliance with the Constitution * * *." These are supposed to be men of intelligence, leaders, not followers of a color line. The point is made that the Federal Government sends considerably more money into Mississippi than collected in taxes.

Has anyone ever admitted as pertinent the fact that white folks in the South, and outside the South, pay infinitely more taxes than Negroes? Has this so-called Civil Rights Commission considered that the Negroes who invade private places of business, troop uninvited into white's churches, which certainly disturbs public worship, are violating local laws? If Federal thinking is to take precedence on power that no local law can stand on its own, regardless of what its purpose is, then we might as well go back to the Reconstruction days when the five divisional areas in the South were ruled over by five Federal generals and the legislative bodies were composed of Negroes and members elected under military supervision * * *. After a hundred years, the South is coming back again. Help instead of harassing it.

To say that a Negro cannot worship God except in a white church is to slander God himself—does He not attend Negro churches? There is no worse hypocrisy in America today than that of the social-climbing Negroes who seek to force themselves into white churches under the guise that they wish to worship God. And there is no more shallow thinking than evidenced by such Commissions as that misnamed Civil Rights one; nor more blatant double standard than the one that disregards trouble with race mixing in the North and screams at it in the South * * *. Let's become an honest Nation, stop doubletalking and embracing phony issues—yes, stop trying to let the rest of the world tell our Nation how to live. And for the sake of that God who attends Negro churches as well as whites, take the Negro social problems out of politics.

G.B.P.

Edith Hamilton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, some Americans still venture to praise the humanities. Some even profess to believe them essential. Few of us have the ability to increase the depth or broaden the scope of our study of the humanities making them increasingly more meaningful. Edith Hamilton was one of the few who did so. The editorial which appeared in the Washington Post today is an appropriate tribute to her lasting contribution to American literature and scholarship. This editorial is appended:

EDITH HAMILTON

"Grow old along with me," sang Browning, "the best is yet to be." The lines have a hollow ring to many who retire to boredom—yet in the case of Edith Hamilton the last of life was indeed that for which the first was made. She "retired" in 1922 after a quarter century as headmistress at Byrn Mawr School in Baltimore; then she returned to the love of her student years and contributed as much as any American to the celebration of classic civilization in Greece and Rome.

Her books are her memorial: "The Greek Way," "The Roman Way," "Mythology" and an edition of Plato on which she was working at the time of her death at 95. She "makes one feel the intensity that once shook a narrow earth," Alfred Kazin wrote in tribute. Through the lucidity and grace of her pen she stripped the pejorative adjective "dead" from her evocations of a classic period when men gave life to the enduring ideals of Western civilization.

Washington was proud to have her as a resident though she shared her citizenship (honorary, at least) with Athens. Her presence was a tonic. "She is as uncorrupted by the vulgarities of the present," John Mason Brown once said, "as she is undowned by its pressures." Her zest for life recalls the parallel of Schliemann, the amateur archeologist who retired from business to rediscover Troy. She too acquired her love for the classics as a child and in age crowned her career by helping the past speak to the present. Schliemann found the gold of Troy; Miss Hamilton's literary legacy is no less precious.

Twenty-five Years for Bonneville

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Byron Brinton, editor and publisher of the Record-Courier in Baker, Oreg., is one of the most knowledged and respected authorities on the development of the West's river power. In a lead editorial in the Record-Courier on Thursday, May 30, Mr. Brinton feelingly details the present situation on development of the Columbia River Basin. I recommend it to all of my colleagues.

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS FOR BONNEVILLE

Bonneyville power system has just issued its 25th annual report. It recalls a bit of history and except for a relapse of memory on the part of all too many residents of the Pacific Northwest the Bonneville record might have been better.

Oldtimers will recall the Insull power trust scandals of the pre-Bonneville days, will recall the cost of electricity so high no one had more than a few drop lights to a dwelling, no stoves nor water heaters nor electric irons and few washing machines, will recall the exhorbitant prices for line extensions that prevented farm electricity, will recall the opposition private utilities had against Bonneville and Coulee Dams, calling them white elephants, will recall how private capital owned Oxbow for nearly 50 years and made no effort to produce adequate power until the high Hells Canyon Dam was proposed to flood out the dog in the manger.

Today no other river system in the world exceeds the hydroelectric development of the U.S. Columbia River power system. But even here this might also have been better.

To date the public has invested $2.4 billion in the system. As of last June the system has paid back $860 million into the Treasury. In spite of the raid the partnership power policy has made on this, the system was still $20 million ahead of payout schedule without raising Bonneville's original wholesale postage-stamp rates.

Chalk up a great era for freedom and American leadership in this system put together by the Roosevelt administration. Its 26 billion kilowatt-hours of power for war production turned the tide of war, without which who knows where freedom might have had to retreat.

We came out of the war with six more big dams authorized and Bonneville reserves ahead of schedule built up over the $70 million mark. Then people began to forget. They began to fall for "partnership" politics, they began to elect spokesmen of private utilities, to the presidency, to the governorship, and named them to the Cabinet. Private utilities began to build the cash registers on the big rivers. Bonneville under the policy of enemies began to drop behind in power development and power sales and its ability to pool hydroelectric resources.

Here's where we are now. No system water storage to squeeze the power market, no progress, no growth. The folks weren't fooling 10 years ago when they called this a "give-away." The record now proves that it was just that.

Bonneville could have had some of its system completely paid out by now, these units turning out virtually free electricity, since capital is the only major cost of hydroelectric power. But instead it is now going behind $17 million a year as $20 worth of waterpower is dumped annually unused in the Pacific Ocean under the "partnership" policy in which private utilities are replacing Bonneville power without, as cheap Bonneville power did, developing new firm-power customers and surplus power markets.

Last month Bonneville announced a policy it has been discussing with its advisory committee a long time, modificaton of its amortization policy to spread both old and new dam investments over the full life of the latest addition. This lessens annual charges and reduces the $17 million bookkeeping deficit. Hanford reactor was also authorized and will contribute to growth and production diversity. In the congressional mill is the California transmission intertie. Those will help but won't do the job without a new long look at keeping Bonneville in the resource development, storage and dam-building, and river and power coordination picture. Then of course, there is pending a possible Bonneville power rate increase, an indirect result of the old giveaways.

As we look back 25 years we can say that the Columbia River power system was a great boon to the region, a great stride for freedom, a great yardstick measure of resource utilization. Are we in the present era taking care of the heritage or are we continuing to fall for the same line that back in the twenties fought Grand Coulee Dam? We wonder if perhaps President Kennedy hasn't forgotten the things that need to be done.

Happy Birthday, "Big Jim"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 30 a distinguished elder statesman of the Democratic Party, Mr. James A. Farley, celebrated his 75th birthday.

As was only fitting, the event occasioned a number of laudatory articles and editorials in the Nation's press, as well as tributes to this former Postmaster General and master politician. One such editorial, entitled "Happy Birthday, Big Jim," appeared in the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press of May 27. Because of its rich and discerning praise of Mr. Farley, I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press, May 27, 1963]

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, "BIG JIM"

Thursday will be more than Memorial Day for one person who is one of the best-known citizens in the Nation today. That citizen is none other than "Big Jim" Farley, who will be observing his 75th birthday on that occasion.

While he was widely known as Postmaster General James A. Farley during the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, he probably was better known as "Jim" Farley, political salesman. It was he who "sold" Franklin Delano Roosevelt to the Democratic convention and to the Nation as a whole in 1932 and during subsequent Roosevelt campaigns.

He had a remarkable talent for remembering both names and faces, and his letters to coworkers, always signed in green ink, were masterpieces of salesmanship and inspiration for the recipients. In trying to explain his extraordinary ability to remember people and call them by their first name, Mr. Farley once wrote:

"A sincere conviction in your cause leads you to value each person you talk to, and that value helps identify him to you."

It's that simple?

A number of Sheboygan people, largely postal employees, had the pleasure of meeting "Big Jim" when he visited this city as Postmaster General on July 8, 1938. On that occasion he was the principal speaker at the convention of the Wisconsin chapter of the National Postmasters' Association. Those who met him will vouch for him as a hale fellow, well met, who has personality plus.

Besides his reputation as one of the most popular politicians in the history of the Nation, "Big Jim" also was famous as an election prognosticator. His prediction in 1936 that Alf Landon would carry only Maine and Vermont proved a historic classic along that line.

He is best described politically as a Democrat of Democrats. Himself a moderate conservative, he has been able to serve the New Deal without mental reservation, and to support the Fair Deal and the New Frontier. He is also a man of principle who joined reformers like former Senator Herbert H. Lehman and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt to fight New York political regulars for the nomination of Mayor Robert F. Wagner of New York City. He served on the Hoover Commission and strongly urged its governmental reforms.

In politics, he was never afraid to let people know where he stood.

If he ever came close to a break with his fellow Democrats, it was during the 1940 Democratic convention in Chicago when he was nominated for the Presidency by Senator Carter Glass, of Virginia. Mr. Farley's own account of his defeat ends with these proud words: "As I went through the hall there were cheers on every hand. The crowd knew they were cheering a loser, but they approved my courage to stand up for what I believed in."

He has always been a man of great courage. He is also a man of personal charm and magnetism whose legion of friends include Democrats and Republicans alike. So, at this time, we would like to join with countless others in wishing "Big Jim" a most happy birthday this coming Thursday.

Adult Education Program of Los Angeles Area Enters 76th Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the last few decades we have seen great accomplishments for the advancement of society. We have developed to the point where basic needs no longer trouble us. Credit for these advances is largely due to our educators, engineers, technicians and scientists who have opened whole new vistas in the realm of space exploration and seemingly endless possibilities for the constructive use of atomic power. To continue the rapid rate of progress in these and other new and challenging areas, we must continue to expand our educational facilities, constantly adapting ourselves to the nascent exigencies of modern society, of the society of the future. There are countless ways of meeting the demands made upon our educational facilities; our public primary and secondary schools, vocational training programs, universities. One of our increasingly important programs is that of adult education.

Generally adult education programs are providing training for unemployed, potential workers, fitting them for a widening field of vocational opportunities. Also these programs offer opportunities for more specialized training, adapting workers to more complex jobs or switching them to other fields where automation has not yet replaced the employee.

Such a program has enjoyed a successful history in the Los Angeles area. Today there are nearly 200,000 adults enrolled in over 2,000 classes in the city of Los Angeles alone. The program started 76 years ago through the efforts of a Los Angeles journalist, Walter Mellick, who began teaching other adults to finance his higher education. His school immediately interested the educators of the area who brought Mellick into the public school system in 1887. The program was given great impetus by the waves of immigrants who settled in the county. Not until 1933 did the adult education program receive an overall adviser expressly concerned with its unique needs. This man, E. Mansfield Evans, developed the program for 26 years into a position of strength. Since then the program has been constantly expanding in response to new needs.

Classes are available to meet a variety of requirements of the enrollees. There are classes in Americanization and citizenship for new arrivals to the United States; there are also classes of regular academic work open to people over 18 who have begun to feel the need to obtain a secondary degree; classes in vocational instruction in response to the changeover from newly automated industries to those which require technicians with special skills; classes in homemaking; classes in health, public affairs, business, and the fine arts.

Wide as the program is, it is just as flexible. English is offered to those of other nationalities and there are many courses of a sociological nature which attempt to adjust the individual to a society in a state of flux. At first the program was primarily a means of assimilating immigrants into the State; then later during the depression it offered instruction to alleviate the consequences of a depression economy; and later still, after World War II it placed veterans and people employed in wartime industries in a position to take advantage of new job opportunities. Today the program serves an increasing number of women and emphasis is gradually being placed upon improvement of intellectual understanding, rather than on purely vocational training.

This program is only part, but a vital part, of what has become an important nationwide project. Already counting all kinds of schooling for Americans over 18, one out of every two adults is enrolled in some kind of education. There are 50 million adults studying now, and it is estimated that by 1975 the number will reach the 70 million mark. Of all the many educational opportunities available to our population, such a program as is offered by the Los Angeles School District is one of the most basic and perhaps one of the most generally beneficial. It is to be hoped that similar projects on both the local and national levels will continue to operate in the future, adapting our citizens to the changing needs of modern society.

The Late Pope John XXIII

SPEECH

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the world mourns a true man of peace. Pope John came to the highest throne in the church just a short time ago, following the reign of a Pope, Pius XII, who had worked hard and brilliantly for a better world in his career. The new Pope was much less well known. He surprised the world in his choice of a name, which had not been used by a Pope for 624 years, and then swung vigorously into a program which sought to broaden the basis of agreement among mankind, to the greater glory of God.

He lived and served in a modern world, and he recognized the great scientific and technological progress with which the world is moving. He was to warn, in the great encyclical on "Master and Magistra," that in man's success in extending his knowledge of nature and in producing great works, he is in danger of forgetting and of destroying himself.

There were those who had thought him too advanced in his years to be very active, but they were surprised when he broke quickly with tradition. He began leaving the Vatican for visits to schools, hospitals, homes, and even jails in the city of Rome, or on one occasion, to the shrines of northern Italy more than 100 miles away.

His great leadership was evidenced by his decision to call an Ecumenical Council, to explore ways in which the church could affirm and demonstrate its pertinence to the modern world, and seek out the possibilities of greater understanding among all people. Christian unity was his strongest aim. His mind was serene, magnanimous, and optimistic, and in this he held out hope and justice to others. The full impact of the Council is yet to be measured, but it will be substantial.

We mourn a beloved citizen of the world. He has left his mark upon the globe, in his beseeching for tolerance, his quest for peace. The manner of his passing drew the prayers, the compassion of the entire world, but he can best be memorialized by heeding his guidance.

Credit Two Boys With Saving Life of Man, 76, Who Fell Into Concord River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is always a moving experience to hear of the heroism of our young people. I do not think I have been more proud of a group of young men than I was when I read that several boys from Lowell, Mass., had risked their lives to save a drowning man who fell into the fast-moving waters of the Concord, Mass., River. Five of the young men are students at St. Margaret's School in Lowell. They are Alphonse Varoski, who, by the way, has been recommended for a medal to commemorate his heroism, and Gene Gauthier, who was also intrumental in saving Mr. Shaughnessey Newman, and Charles Shaden, Leo Riley, and Dennis Riley, who assisted in the rescue.

These young men are a credit to St. Margaret's School and to their instructors, under the direction of Rev. Sr. Agnes Michael and St. Margaret's Parish whose pastor is the Rt. Rev. Raymond L. Hyder.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article which appeared in the Lowell Sun newspaper on May 23, 1963, in the appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

CREDIT TWO BOYS WITH SAVING LIFE OF MAN, 76, WHO FELL INTO CONCORD RIVER

LOWELL.—The quick action of two Lowell teenagers was credited today with saving the life of an elderly Lowell man who toppled into the Concord River yesterday afternoon.

The man, Shaughnessy Newman, 76, of 12 Watson Avenue, fell into the fast-moving river from a wall where he had been fishing. He is confined to St. Joseph's Hospital where his condition was listed as fair by hospital officials.

Alphonse Varoski, 14, of 131 Powell Street and Gene Gauthier, 15, of 14 Lawson Street, scaled a wire fence, jumped several feet to the river bank, and pulled Mr. Newman from the river to shore.

Andrew Souleotis, a parking meter repairman for the Lowell police department, was working in the nearby Smith parking lot and was among the first to arrive on the scene.

He applied artificial respiration to the elderly man until police, ambulance, and fire department crews arrived on the scene. Other officers who arrived on the scene within minutes were Mario Sepe and John Sousa.

The man fell into the water just below the Church Street dam.

Superintendent of Police Francis M. O'Laughlin said this morning that he has ordered an immediate investigation of the scene of the accident. He sent Capt. Peter C. Guduras there to get photographs of what he termed "a dangerous condition."

He said that a full report of the incident will be turned over to City Manager Cornelius F. Desmond in an effort to have the condition remedied.

Pope John XXIII

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I believe it appropriate that I say a word reflecting the anguish and deep sorrow caused the world and particularly the Jewish people over the death of Pope John XXIII.

In my city of New York the board of Rabbis called upon its members to offer prayers for Pope John XXIII during his illness. The call emphasized that he "has given heart and courage to all men of good will," and quickened the hope of people everywhere for world peace. Throughout Israel and Argentina as well as in this country, prayers for the Pope's recovery were held in synagogues.

As a Representative in the Congress, and as a member of the Jewish faith I desire to say on behalf of those of my faith whom I represent that we shall remember him in death as we appreciated him in life. He served as the good shepherd of his church and enriched and blessed mankind with the greatness an nobility of his spirit. His goodness and humbleness were recognized and appreciated by Christians and Jews throughout the entire world.

Several Popes had expressed in the Jewish people, but none matched Pope John XXIII in embodying that interest in specific acts. As Archbishop Angelo Roncalli, he was apostolic delegate to Greece and Turkey, based in Istanbul, during World War II. When told of the plight of several thousand Jews, including a number of children, slated for deportation to death at Auschwitz, he instantly made available thousands of baptismal certificates for use for the doomed Jews, without conditions, thus saving thousands from the Nazi furnaces.

Early in his papacy, he ordered the elimination from the Good Friday liturgy of the reference to "perfidious Jews," which he knew was offensive to Jews and which, it was understood, he considered not a doctrinal matter but a carryover from the polemical history of the past.

He had strong personal feelings about the need to remove the bases of animosity and hostility between religious communities, particularly in regard to Jews who, he was known to feel, had a special role in "salvation history." This was reflected again during the recent Good Friday when, according to press reports, the celebrant of the mass at the Vatican, either from habit or through use of a missal not brought up to date, again made a reference to "perfidious Jews." The Pope halted the service and had it repeated in its entirety with that reference omitted.

This attitude was exemplified again when, in January 1959, he appointed Cardinal Bea as president of the secretariat for promoting Christian unity for the Ecumenical Council. Cardinal Bea's commission has within it a smaller group with specific responsibilities to improve relationships between Catholics and Jews by removing inherited doctrinal sources of animosity through changes in Catholic teachings and liturgy. The Pope was known to have been kept acquainted with everything this commission was doing, and Cardinal Bea consistently had strong support from the Pope for the work of this commission.

His assistance to Jewish rescue missions earned him congratulations on his election as Pope from the then Chief Rabbi of Israel, Dr. Herzog. He received further praise in October 1960, when he gave an audience to 130 members of the United Jewish Appeal, who presented him with a scroll. He said to them in greeting, "I am Joseph, your brother," a reference to the Old Testament story of Joseph.

His dedicated efforts for a solution to the world's ills will serve as a beacon of guidance for all who labor for peace on earth and good will toward all men.

Civil Rights

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time in order that the failure of joinder on the part of the majority in the special order taken by the gentleman from New York on the question of civil rights not be interpreted that the majority is not at least as interested in the equal rights of all Americans irrespective of race, creed, or color as is the gentleman from New York.

This is not a matter only for words; it is a problem which requires active participation in order to prove one's position. While I do not condone violence and believe unequivocally in adherence to the laws of our country, I am proud to say that not only have I raised my voice in behalf of those of our citizens who are being deprived of their rights under law by appearing before the Committee on the Judiciary but I have picketed, along with other loyal but distressed citizens of New York City, in front of establishments in New York City, in protest to their policies of discrimination in their branches in other parts of the country. I have appeared at rallies sponsored by responsible, intelligent groups, advocating equal rights for all citizens of this country and shall continue to appear at such rallies and raise my voice in protest until such time as every individual in this country is permitted to vote, to attend the school of his choice, eat in the restaurant of his choice, live where he desires, receive medical attention by the physician and hospital of his own choosing so long as he has the wherewithal to cover the costs.

Mr. Speaker, many words have been spoken but where are the deeds which would openly and publicly support these protestations of liberalism?

Pope John XXIII

SPEECH

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the death of that great and good man, Pope John XXIII, has occasioned universal mourning. In country after country, around the world, bells are tolled, flags lowered to half-staff, and crowds gather for memorial services and prayers. These official tokens of mourning, and the others such as formal messages and resolutions, are to be expected upon the death of a man in his high public position. What especially marks the present occasion, however, is that this vast demonstration of public lamentation is deserved by Pope John, not as a public personage alone, but simply for his personal and human excellences; and that the official actions of heads of states and churches, and the demonstrations of crowds, grow out of a genuine individual grief and sense of loss felt by each of a vast number of individuals.

There are innumerable instances of Pope John's warm sympathy with, and insight into, the needs and desires of human beings in all sorts of different situations. Out of a clear mind and warm heart, he would take an immediate right action, or speak a simple and memorable word. Typical was his visit to inmates of a Roman prison, when he introduced himself simply, and explained his presence, by saying, "You could not come to me, so I came to you."

Brief as the pontificate of John XXIII was, it will probably be one of the most memorable and significant in all the long history of the papacy.

This was achieved by his unique personality—by his peasant simplicity and directness, by his imperturbable amiability, by his manifest goodness of soul, and by his determination to include every human being of every creed, race, or faith in his pastoral affection and solicitude.

I should like, at this point, to testify to my own experiences of Pope John's courtesy and consideration. In January 1960, when he was forced by illness to cancel an audience to which he had kindly granted Mrs. Halpern and me, he had extended in his name an invitation to attend a musical recital that night at the Vatican in honor of the College of Cardinals. He recovered sufficiently to attend and we were privileged to share that memorable evening. When we were in Rome again, in October of 1961, we did have the opportunity of a personal audience with Pope John, and, though we are non-Catholics, we count this among the greatest experiences of our lives. In our talk, I was deeply impressed by his clear and perceptive insight into world problems, his humility, and his quick sense of humor. He commented upon my own travels, and mused about his own immobility because of his role. During this talk, he stressed his hope for peace, and praised the efforts America has been making to achieve world peace.

May Pope John's memory long live, to inspire his church and the world with his admirable qualities of heart and soul, and to help us all toward the achievement of the ideals for which he labored.

America's Memory Is Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, nationwide indignation is being expressed against the State Department policy decision to embrace the Hungarian Communist regime and abandon the struggle on behalf of the Hungarian people.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat dramatized a recognizable reason for this policy change, pointing out that the lapse of time had permitted our apostles of peaceful coexistence to embrace another Red regime. The editorial I refer to appeared in the May 27 edition, and I place it into the RECORD at this point:

AMERICA'S MEMORY IS SHORT

The State Department is feeling out Congress on a possible exchange of full ambassadors with the Soviet-supported claque of Janos Kadar.

Not 7 years have passed since this odious traitor collaborated with Khrushchev and whistled the Soviet tanks back into Budapest to run down rebels, women and children, too, in one of the bloodiest national massacres ever staged. Can America's memory be that short?

Can America possibly believe Kadar now enjoys the support of the Hungarian people?

The State Department is circulating a memorandum among members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and House Foreign Affairs Committee, noting that developments that have taken place are encouraging."

Certainly. Now that much of the backbone, spirit, and youth of Hungary fell under Soviet tank treads or Soviet guns, the country enjoys the "peace and prosperity" that come to the exhausted and enslaved.

Under a "gracious" amnesty, Kadar has let some of the 1956 political prisoners out of their cages. The regime is now dealing with a more obedient and docile populace not anxious for another taste of the Russian whip.

Is this miserly scrap of liberty all that is required before America places an official stamp on the Kadar regime and sends a full ambassador to the court of the Russian toady?

We once told refugees and enslaved alike that it was our purpose to roll back the Iron Curtain; it was our goal that one day these people would see free elections, the end of Red tyranny and the absence of Russian troops.

Is it now sufficient that the satellites free a few prisoners, let the church hold a few more services and follow a "conciliatory policy toward the intellectual and cultural community"?

Mr. Thant, long an advocate of such "constructive" approaches to East-West conflicts, will certainly be pleased by this latest attitude of the United States.

Blind Father of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William D. Myers, of Wilmington, Mass., has been selected as the "Blind Father of the Year." Mr. Myers, a project engineer at the Avco Corp.'s research and advanced development division is the father of three. He has pursued graduate studies despite his handicap and is active in local civic and religious affairs in Wilmington.

This young man of 34 is an inspiration to all of us—both with and without handicaps. His example should encourage us to do the very best we possibly can for our families and our communities.

I ask unanimous consent to include a recent article from the Lowell, Mass., Sun describing Mr. Myers' achievements in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

WILMINGTON ENGINEER BLIND FATHER OF THE YEAR

WILMINGTON.—The national Fathers Day committee has named William D. Myers, a project engineer at Avco Corp. research and advanced development division, as the "Blind Father of the Year." Myers will be honored in a ceremony at the headquarters of the American Foundation for the Blind in New York, June 6, for the success he has achieved in his professional career, for his record of community service and as "a typical American father" who meets all his responsibilities despite a severe physical handicap.

Myers, 34, is a native of Grafton, W. Va., and a graduate of the University of West Virginia. He now lives in Wilmington with his wife, Rose Marie, and their three children, Wesley, 6, Russell, 5, and Teresa, 3. He is chairman of the finance committee of the Wilmington Methodist church and serves as a consultant to the Grafton development council.

Myers is a systems engineer at Avco-RAD's Lawrence facility. He works on reentry instruments for the U.S. Air Force Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile.

Although he has only 2½ percent of normal vision (less than 10 percent is considered blindness), Myers is able to read and evaluate the complex engineering specifications and systems diagrams used for the Avco Minuteman project. His job includes design engineering as well as engineering analysis of data transmitted to ground stations during missile flight tests from Cape Canaveral.

To further himself in his profession, he has pursued advanced studies at John Hopkins University, Baltimore, and is currently enrolled as an evening student in Northeastern University's graduate school.

He has been employed by Avco in Wilmington since February 1961. Prior to working for Avco, he held responsible engineering positions with several other companies including Ling-Temco-Vought Inc., Greenville, Tex., and the Allison division of General Motors, Indianapolis, Ind.

In selecting him as the Nation's "Blind Father of the Year" the Fathers Day committee paid tribute to the Avco engineer as a congenital, intelligent, warm-hearted person who has achieved an enviable professional record, demonstrated his sense of community responsibility, and fulfilled all of his duties as a father while overcoming his sight handicap.

Communists Still Enjoy All U.N. Privileges but Refuse To Pay Legal Dues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, how can any reasonable person justify allowing Russia and other nations to enjoy full privileges and voting rights in the United Nations while at the same time refusing to pay a fair share of the legitimate costs? How can any American citizen claim that the self-interest of the United States is served by picking up the tab to enable Communist nations to continue their membership in the U.N. in spite of their announced objective to destroy us?

Mr. Speaker, I can see nothing unreasonable in instructing our delegation to the United Nations to insist that Russia pay up or get out and if the Organization refuses to take such action, then certainly it can only serve our best interest to withdraw our own membership.

How bad the situation is can be seen from following article from the June 10 issue of U.S. News & World Report. I call special attention to the imbalance of payments and the imbalance of voting rights. On both counts the United States is taking a beating:

IS THE U.N. ON THE VERGE OF A CRACKUP? FOR THE THIRD TIME KHRUSHCHEV IS OUT TO WRECK OR RULE THE UNITED NATIONS. THIS TIME HIS TACTICS ARE TO HOLD OUT ON MONEY THE U.N. NEEDS FOR PEACE-KEEPING TROOPS. SHOWDOWN LIES AHEAD. KHRUSHCHEV MUST PAY UP BY YEAREND OR LOSE HIS U.N. VOTE. BEST GUESS: KHRUSHCHEV WILL PAY, THEN CLAIM HE "SAVED THE U.N. FOR HUMANITY."

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—By all standards normal to business and government, the United Nations is going broke, on the verge of a crackup.

The world organization today is more than $100 million "in the red." By the end of the present year the deficit may be up to $140 million. If funds are not found, it is said, the peace-keeping organization is likely to turn into a debating society.

All of this has been brought about mainly by the Soviet Union and its satellites. The Communists, including Castro's Cuba, refuse to pay bills for any U.N. activities not favored by them. The amount they owe the U.N. so far exceeds 62 million dollars. France, Nationalist China and Belgium also are in arrears on U.N. payments.

UNITED STATES TO THE RESCUE?

The result is that the U.N., once again, must be bailed out—probably by the United States.

There is concern, but little real alarm here at U.N. headquarters. Top officials believe a way will be found for the U.N. to maintain its police functions in the Gaza Strip between Egypt and Israel in the Mideast, and in the Congo in Africa.

In addition, the U.N. is sending a peace-keeping mission of 200 observers to Yemen. Cost of this force, however, is to be borne largely by Egypt and Saudi Arabia.

Communist attack on the U.N. this time is aimed at these peace-keeping forces. It is largely the bills, for these forces that Russia and its East European satellites, plus Cuba, refuse to pay. A senior U.N. official explained the Russian tactics.

"In trying to bend the U.N. to their own needs and desires, the Russians have found that the boycott is dangerous. They tried that at the time of Korea. It was the Russian absence which enabled the U.N. to approve military action in Korea.

"Just last year the Soviets tried to get control of U.N. machinery by dividing the Secretary-General's powers between three assistants—one a Communist, one a Westerner and one a 'neutral.' But the U.N. wouldn't accept the 'troika.'

"Now the Soviet Union is trying to sabotage the U.N. financial machinery. That won't work either, but it's causing us a lot of trouble."

TURNING POINT: THE CONGO

The Soviet Union approved the first move to send U.N. troops into the Congo. Khrushchev, at that time, thought the United Nations force would help his man in the Congo, Patrice Lumumba, to stay in power. But the U.N. force, instead, stood in the way of a Communist takeover. It was at this point that the Soviets changed their tactics.

Arguing that the U.N. force in the Congo had become merely a "front" for the United States and the European colonial powers, Russia and the other Communist members refused to pay their share of the cost of the troops. Nor were they alone in this attitude.

France, also opposing the Congo operation, refused to pay. So did Belgium.

At present, the Communist U.N. members owe $62.5 million to the U.N. while France owes $14 million and Belgium $3 million.

Chiang Kai-shek's government on Formosa is also in default, by $10 million, but this is largely a matter of money, not politics. The assessment for China's seat in the U.N. involves payment for all of mainland China, which Chiang claims as his own.

What worries the U.N. is that most of the money owed to it is owed for the U.N. peace-keeping units in the Congo and the Mideast.

Out of the $502 million needed for all U.N. activities last year, $102.5 million was for such social-welfare programs as the refugee and children's funds. These programs are voluntary and the Communists contribute little, while United States pays more than its share.

The regular U.N. budget, involving salaries of the permanent staff and the maintenance of U.N. headquarters, ran to $75 million last year.

LIMIT ON LAGGARDS

The founders of the U.N., knowing the ways of governments, set a rule under which any member nation in arrears for more than 2 years on its assessments to this regular budget will lose its vote in the Assembly. More than 40 U.N. members take advantage of this 2-year rule and are habitually in arrears. But, so far, all of them have paid up before they lost their Assembly votes.

The Communists—and France and Belgium, too—argue that members who disapprove of specific peace-keeping operations, as in the Congo, should not be assessed for their costs as part of regular dues. They refuse to pay. In 1962, U.N. costs in the Congo amounted to $120 million.

As a way around the financial problem of special peace-keeping assessments, Secretary-General Thant in 1961 came up with the idea of a U.N. bond issue, the returns from which would be used to pay the U.N.'s bills.

About $135 million worth of these bonds, out of $200 million worth in all, have been sold. Half were sold to the United States, the rest abroad. Interest and payment charges were to be added to regular charges to members.

To test the legality of this move, the U.N. went to the International Court of Justice at The Hague to get an opinion on the issue. In July 1962 the justices ruled that the charges for peacekeeping missions should be considered part of the obligations of U.N. members.

Last December, the U.N. General Assembly held, over the opposition of the Communists and the French, that the Congo and Mideast-force assessments were "legal and binding" on all members and that the 2-year rule applied to these charges just as it does to the rest of the regular U.N. budget.

FROM MOSCOW: ANOTHER "NYET"

Russia, on May 22, served notice on U Thant that it would not pay its share of the U.N. bond charges or of four other items on the regular budget. These included charges for the U.N. commission in Korea, the U.N.'s cemetery for its troops killed in the Korean war, the U.N. mission in the Mideast and the U.N. field service supplying personnel for oversea missions.

In addition, the Russians said they would pay their dues to the U.N. Technical Assistance Fund only in rubles. The Russian dues thus could be used only for the purchase of items from Russia or for the hiring of Russian personnel. Under U.N. rules it is up to the Secretary-General, not the members, to decide what currencies are acceptable.

SHOWDOWN AHEAD

Said a U.S. official after this Russian move: "The Russians are carrying this battle so far that in the next year or so we are going to be forced to throw them out or make them pay."

The fact is that the Congo operation—main target of the Soviet campaign—is almost at an end. U Thant hopes to get all U.N. military forces out of the Congo before the year's end. That would leave little more than a technical mission.

The U.N. Emergency Force in the Gaza Strip is a different matter. Many experts feel that, if this force were removed, Egypt and Israel would soon be at war again.

Most U.N. officials doubt that the Communist attack on these peace-keeping forces of the U.N. will make much difference for the future. Said one:

"If some real emergency arose I think we would put together a U.N. force and find the money later. Of course the United States and Britain would pay promptly, but the little fellows could put up token contributions to keep the operation international."

On the other side you hear opinions like this: "No nation is going to contribute troops unless it has some guarantee that these troops will be paid. If something serious broke out in [Portuguese] Angola or in South-West Africa [run by the Republic of South Africa], you'd get plenty of troops from African countries without any trouble. But Asians? Scandinavians? I doubt it."

RUSSIA'S NEXT MOVE

Deadline for the Communist bloc to pay up at least some of the money they owe the U.N. or lose their Assembly votes comes at the end of this year. What then? Here's the guess of a top U.N. official:

"They'll do just what they've done in the past. They'll fight this thing to the edge of the last ditch, but not into it. They'll pay enough to keep the vote—and when they do pay they'll make statements about how they want to save the U.N. for humanity."

The French already appear embarrassed by their stand with the Communists against payment of their share of the U.N. Congo force. They, like the Belgians, appear to be seeking a means of paying up gracefully before they lose their votes.

Much of the Communist campaign against the U.N. has boomeranged against Moscow, particularly in regard to the small and backward nations of Africa. Many of these countries look on the U.N. as their best protection and do not sympathize with efforts to weaken the world organization.

As for the U.N. itself, the betting here at U.N. headquarters is that the United States, with help from Britain and many smaller nations, will keep the U.N. going through this financial crisis, forcing Russia and its satellites to pay up what they owe, however slowly.

Commemorating Centenary of Battle of Gettysburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania adopted a resolution introduced by Senators James S. Berger and Charles R. Weiner, which was concurred in by the house on May 27, as follows:

Resolved (*the house of representatives concurring*), That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to mint a 50-cent coin with appropriate inscription in order to commemorate the centenary of the Battle of Gettysburg and Lincoln's Gettysburg Address; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

I hope that appropriate action pursuant to this resolution will be taken by the Congress.

The Late Hon. Francis E. Walter

SPEECH

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our senior colleague, Mr. WALTER, grieves us all. He was a legislator of stanch integrity and deep dedication to the Republic in which we live.

Some of the legislative areas in which I am deeply interested came within the province of Mr. WALTER's work. I found him willing to counsel and advise, but he was always a strict and fair adherent to the spirit and purpose of the law in which he had taken an active part as draftsman.

He had earned a burden of controversy, and was the target of many people who sought to change the laws with which he worked. He bore this burden equably and moved quietly and steadily on. In all instances, he had a clear and sharp understanding of the problems involved.

Those of us who serve in the House have known him as a stanch and loyal Member, one who believed in organization as the essence of orderly progress, and whose quiet methods could preserve parliamentary discipline and justice against the challenges of highly tense situations. He has left the stamp of his service on the House.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Inspiration of Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Thursday last I had the privilege of giving the Memorial Day address at Victor, W. Va.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the Record, as follows:

The Inspiration of Memorial Day

(An address by Senator Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia)

"There is a remembrance of the dead, to which we turn even for the charms of the living. This we would not exchange for the song of pleasure, or the burst of revelry."

These words of the American poet, Washington Irving, properly reflect the attitude of our entire Nation on Memorial Day, a day on which we honor our war dead. In the stillness of the spring morning we deliberately turn our thoughts back to our fallen heroes. We relive the anguish of their passing from us, and we know once more the pride of kinship with great men and women.

For al those we honor today were great, in spirit as well as in deed, and we draw close to them once again in order to remind ourselves of the greatness of spirit of our Nation. This is our Memorial Day, a tradition nearly a hundred years old in these United States.

To look back for the origin of Memorial Day is like seeking the source of a mighty river, fed by countless tributaries and rivulets. Many are the States and many are the towns which claim the honor of establishing the custom we are observing today. Of course, the practice of honoring the war dead annually has been carried out, in one form or another, throughout history. But our own custom is unique in that it had its inception in the aftermath of a bloody civil war that all but tore our Nation asunder.

Memorial Day had its beginning in a number of Southern towns where groups of women took it upon themselves to keep green the memory of their fallen loved ones by putting flowers on the Confederate soldiers' graves, once the cannons of war were stilled. The women of Columbus, Miss., displayed a generosity of heart by decorating the Union dead as well. This act is said to have inspired the New York State lawyer, Francis Miles Finch, to write his famous poem, "The Blue and the Gray."

Published in the Atlantic Monthly in September 1867, the poem was an immediate popular success, and the sentiment it stirred up across the Nation moved Gen. John A. Logan, first commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, to issue a general order providing for nationwide observance of Decoration Day, as it was originally called, on May 30, 1868. This date was chosen, not as a significant anniversary, but in order that, all over the country, there might be flowers in bloom that could be used in decorating the graves.

So, from this modest beginning, from this spontaneous gathering in a humble churchyard, on the part of a few neighborhood mothers and wives, began our Memorial Day. I wonder if those good folk could possibly have imagined how many times in the future their sons and their sons' sons would hear the roar of cannon again, and know the anguish of battle, the hot grip of pain, the cold hand of death.

Could they foresee San Juan Hill, or Manila Bay? Could they envision the savage battles on the Marne, the shell-rocked forests of Argonne? Could they comprehend Pearl Harbor, Guadalcanal, Iwo Jima, Okinawa? Did they, in their imagination, strew flowers on the frosty hillsides of Pusan and Inchon?

Or did they, like most people, imagine that their war would be the last great war, that they and their loved ones had earned peace on earth for all time, for all humanity?

Sadly enough, that is a dream that is still unrealized. For us the cannons have roared loud and often in our lifetime, and they are roaring still, in the jungles of Vietnam today. For us there is yet no peace, nor can there be peace, while the cause of freedom is still unwon.

Let not man say, because the war goes on, that these our heroes of the past died in vain, that theirs was a lost cause. For every flag that marks a soldier's grave is a signpost in the path that leads to human liberty. Let us not grieve that the final peace has not yet been won; let us rejoice, rather, for the opportunity that is ours to bring it about.

Our men in uniform stand at the ready at a hundred outposts halfway around the world; for them there is no peace. In the frozen wastes of the Arctic, in the depths of the sea, in the eerie loneliness of outer space, in foreign lands and in unfriendly climes, our men in uniform are never out of earshot of that final bugle call that may bring them to sacrifice.

However much we grieve for them, and regret the sacrifices they may be called upon to make in defense of their country and its cause, let us be of good cheer.

Happiness is not in length of years, nor in ease of days, but is best found in the service of one's fellowmen. In such service, these men and women we honor here today found their fulfillment.

Philosophers of all time tell us that the greatness of a man is measured, not by his wealth or lands or servants, but by the esteem of his countrymen. Surely we agree. A man who has given nothing of his life to his country, to his city or community, has not lived at all, in the meaningful sense of the word. A man who has perished in the service of his nation, whether in battle with armed foes, or while fighting crime, disease, poverty, ignorance, or any other social enemy, is to be admired and envied, rather than pitied: for such a man has truly lived, and lived well. Those who shrink from the performance of public duty are mere onlookers of life, pale spectators whose character has never been forged in the heat of noble endeavor.

Few of us are perfectly noble human beings. We have our little weaknesses, our self indulgences, our moments of fear and doubt. The virtue that is in us may never come to light, except in such moments when our Nation or our national ideals are challenged and we are called upon to give our all for the cause we believe in.

It has been said that great crises make great men. I do not know whether this is true, but I do believe that when we are absorbed by a cause greater than our own personal ambitions, when the good of others becomes paramount to our own desires, then pettiness and vanity are stripped away from our character and we live in the soul. Look at the honor roll of those who hold the Medal of Honor, our highest decoration. You will find that they were simple, ordinary men, undistinguished from their neighbors, until that momentous day when the crisis of battle caused them to soar to heroic heights of valor.

It is by surmounting crises that we have become a great people, invigorated by the struggle and buoyed by a common hope.

What is our common hope? There was a time when this Nation fought a war in the hope that it would make the world safe for democracy. I know there are some who might sneer at this sentiment, particularly in the light of subsequent events. But I hold that it is a noble thought, and one which animated the bravest hearts in our land: some of these we honor here today.

More recently we fought a war to preserve our freedom, to protect our land from invasion. Millions of brave hearts sprang to the defense of our Nation: and some of these we honor here today.

Still more recently we engaged in a war to protect freedom from being trampled underfoot thousands of miles from our shores, honoring our pledged word, our sacred bond. Some of the brave hearts who sleep today gave their lives in that struggle.

And some of us may ask, why? What have we to do with freedom in Asia, with the jungles of Vietnam, with the walled city of Berlin? The answer to that question is that, freedom being our common hope and desire, the loss of freedom anywhere in the world is our own, our personal loss. No man lives on an island in this day and age. For we have come to live in a shrinking world, where tyranny is no longer insulated by time and space. Fifty years ago, the Czar of Russia was nothing to us, for the crack of his whip and the whine of his bullets could not be heard across a continent and an ocean. But the modern czar of the Russians has his missiles of death trained on our shores, and his dogma of domination aimed at our banners. Every friendly nation that is swallowed up by the foe, every inch of land that it trampled under his iron heel diminishes our bastion of freedom; we have drawn the battle line and we must not retreat. At any moment we may be called upon once again to defend ourselves, our land, our ideals, our beliefs and our heritage of freedom, with all of our strength and courage. On this hallowed soil, remembering our dead, our glorious past, we pledge ourselves to the future.

In the frightening shadow of the atomic bomb; under the threat of a rain of death by inconceivably fiendish devices of war; amidst the hail of propaganda that menaces us daily, we the living are animated by the general hope that human reason will prevail over unreason, that love of our fellow men will prevail over hatred and envy, that free hearts will win over enslaved and soulless men.

This is our hope, and our challenge. We take our example from the men and women whose graves we decorate today. These flowers we strew over them are a symbol of that eternal hope in the human breast: that men can, and will, triumph over adversity.

Our presence here is a pledge that their efforts will not be forgotten, that their courage and determination live on, that their virtues will blossom again in us, in our sons and daughters, and that we will never abandon the fight for peace on earth and freedom among nations.

On this Memorial Day of 1963 we find our country faced with the seemingly impossible task of defending freedom on a cold war battlefront that encircles the globe. If we stop to ask ourselves, How can we do it? Where shall we find the strength, the vigor to maintain our farflung and beleagured outposts?—we have only to cast our eyes and our thoughts on those fallen heroes we honor with this ceremony. For our strength is not merely our own, but the collective and accumulated strength of every American soldier who lived and fought before us, and bequeathed us his unsullied standard.

If in time of peril each of us feels in his arms the strength of 10, that strength issues from the shadowy file of patriots who paraded into battle before us, 10, 20, 50—a hundred years ago and more. Time may dim the memory of their individual faces, but the glory of their deeds will ever brighten our lives and make resolute our purpose.

A thing of beauty, said the poet, is a joy forever. But where in nature or in art will you find a thing of beauty to compare with the act of supreme courage and self-sacrifice that laid these, our honored dead, in the dust at our feet? An act of duty is all they did, but who has ever done more?

Plans International Youth Symphony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years, increasing national attention has been given to the Interlochen National Music Camp and Arts Academy at Interlochen, Mich. For this reason I was fascinated to read in the Flint (Mich.) Journal of May 28, 1963, about the ambitious plans of Dr. Joseph E. Maddy, president of the academy, for an international youth symphony. I know this project will be of interest not only to musicians and sponsors of cultural programs but to all who are eager to find ways to promote good will throughout our world. Because I am certain many of my colleagues will be pleased to learn of this undertaking, I include in the RECORD the following news story about this tremendous effort of Dr. Maddy:

PLANS INTERNATIONAL YOUTH SYMPHONY

(By S. Gordon Gapper)

Dr. Joseph E. Maddy, president of Interlochen National Music Camp and Arts Academy, today announced in Flint plans for an international youth symphony orchestra.

Dr. Maddy said he proposes to bring to Interlochen, beginning next summer, about 50 talented young musicians from abroad for an 8-week course in their own instruments.

They would study and rehearse with selected American students and at the end of the period the group would play at the United Nations.

Dr. Maddy said he is enlisting financial support of foundations and also the cooperation of Rotary International, which has clubs throughout the world. He is a Rotarian.

The plan would be put into operation through a system of committees at Interlochen and overseas, Dr. Maddy indicated.

The foreign students would submit tapes of their music along with their credentials for consideration by the Interlochen authorities.

Dr. Maddy said the students chosen would come at least partly prepared because scores of the music to be played by the orchestra are available in their own countries.

He is proposing that next summer the first orchestra would play not only for the United Nations in New York, but also at the New York World's Fair.

Dr. Maddy said he already has arranged, by way of advance promotion, for the Interlochen Arts Academy Symphony Orchestra, which played here last Saturday, to play in New York's Philharmonic Hall next January 28. U.N. and foundation officials would in this way have a chance to hear some of the results of Interlochen training.

President Kennedy and Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, already have promised help in getting the project established, according to Dr. Maddy.

Dr. Maddy said:

"One of the objects is to create good will on the general idea that the talented children of all nations will be brought together in mutual appreciation of talents and creativity.

"They will learn to understand each other and the customs and creativity of other countries. It will help build the great dream of the world peace and brotherhood in years to come.

"This will be our way of using the international language of music to promote peace."

Dr. Maddy quoted a letter from Lucius D. Battle, an Assistant Secretary of State:

"I sincerely believe that the idea of bringing to the United States the most talented children from other nations of the world deserves serious consideration. I hope it will be realized one day.

"I believe the idea is such that it would exercise a strong appeal to the minds of our people. I assure you that the Department of State and the American embassies throughout the world would be happy to cooperate in any way that would assure success of the project."

Several foreign students already study at Interlochen each summer.

Sermonette of the Reverend Richard W. Buckingham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely sermonette delivered by the Reverend Richard W. Buckingham, Minister of the Grace Methodist Church of Parksley, Va.

There being no objection, the sermonette was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERMONETTE BY REV. RICHARD W. BUCKINGHAM, PASTOR, GRACE METHODIST CHURCH, PARKSLEY, VA.

Should we bear one another's burdens? Or should every man bear his own burdens? Sometimes the Scriptures are not quite clear to us. For in Paul's letter to the Galatians he says in one place that we should bear one another's burdens. And then he says in another place that every man should bear his own burden. This seeming confusion is in the King James, or what is sometimes called "the Authorized Version" of the Holy Bible.

If we read Dr. Moffatt's translation, or one of the other more recent translations, we find that the words translated "burden" in these two verses are actually two different words. In bearing one another's burdens, the original meaning seems to be just that—that we should help one another with burdens, problems or matters that are more than we can bear alone. On the other hand, each man must bear his own responsibilities. To put it in another way—our responsibility is in direct relation to our ability. And if we are given responsibilities or "problems" beyond our ability, we should seek and receive help from others.

Much of life's discord comes from one of two things: the failure of men to assume their own loads of responsibilities, or the failure of men to help those who have burdens beyond what they are able to bear.

And one reason why some men fail to bear their own burdens is that other men are doing too much for them. Some parents, for example, do too much for their children. When their children grow up they think the world owes them a living. Some governments do too much for their people, and they produce shiftless people who want to get everything free.

Even service clubs, which are noted for helping others, have been known to help those who didn't really need help, persons who needed, perhaps, only a chance to help themselves.

Sometimes this can be both tragic and amusing as in the case of a motorcycle accident reported to this writer: The story goes on that two men were riding a motocycle and the passenger felt too chilly from the wind. So they stopped and at the driver's suggestion the passenger put his coat on backward, to protect himself from the wind. Then they had an accident. The police report read like this: "The driver was dead when we arrived. The passenger died while we were trying to turn his head around the way it belonged." Doing what was not needed.

Have you ever been guilty of doing more than someone needed you to do for them? Every man must bear his own burdens.

But sometimes we fail just as much in not bearing the burdens of others. Parents order children to do tasks beyond their power to act. Teachers and managers give assignments beyond the abilities of their pupils and their employees. Those of us who have, fail to help those who have not—simply because we say they should bear their own burdens.

It is true that every man should bear his own burdens, up to his ability. But it is equally true that we should bear one another's burdens. And that's the joy of living. The happiness of finding someone who needs help, and helping him. Have you sinned recently in failing to help someone who needed the help you could give? Bear one another's burdens. This is God's way.

The problem of life is to know just when not to help, and when to offer help. It is not an easy decision to make. But those who work at it find that each time they stop and give the matter serious thought, their skill in deciding increases. They are truly God's children. They have found life's real joy.

Cannelton Dam Story Is Part of Nation's Commerce and History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, there recently appeared an editorial in the Cannelton, Ind., News entitled "Historically Speaking," which briefly tells the story of the part the Ohio River has played in the commerce of our great Nation.

The article also describes an important new improvement now being made on the river, the construction by the Corps of Engineers of the Cannelton locks and dam.

Because I believe this new project is historically significant, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial describing the event be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORICALLY SPEAKING

Even since we have had a Nation, and even before, the Ohio River and its tributaries have figured in the development of this country. Ever since the first pioneer ventured beyond the Allegheny Mountains, this great river, located at our feet, has been a terrific artery for the movement of traffic East and West.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has figured in river improvements ever since the first assignment on the Ohio River, by Congress in 1824. That was over 130 years ago. With navigation improvements provided by the Corps of Engineers, annual freight tonnages have increased on the Ohio River from 3 million tons in 1900 to over 80 million tons in the early 1960's. At the same time, tributary streams have been developed for commercial navigation.

Indeed, the Ohio Valley, once a wilderness highway, has become an industrial giant, serving the Nation.

It is significant that the Engineers are at this time engaged in building one of their great river assignments right here at Cannelton. This puts our city and its area on the map and makes it one of the important points of one of the greatest waterways in the world.

Winter cold, spring flooding and summer heat produce wide variations in the depth of a natural river. A series of dams in such a river helps to maintain a more constant depth to permit year around use by river traffic. Navigation dams, such as the one being built here, are the means by which river traffic is passed from one level to another. Thus the river is controlled and commerce moves on, unhampered by the seasons.

Since Cannelton is now a location for a new type locks and dam, that will keep the river up to levels needed for water transportation, the city again finds itself a center of importance to Ohio River traffic. It was once such a center, when it was a major refueling station for river packets. That was the day of big coal industry operations here. The packets have disappeared and so has the coal, but Cannelton returns to be an important river station in an era when controlled water stages is even more important to the Nation's commerce than it was in the days of yore, when packets moved up and down the route of the beautiful Ohio.

Crisis on California Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, sometimes big city newspapers seem to lack understanding of and empathy for the problems of rural people. Yet rural people are individuals, citizens of the United States, and an integral part of our social, economic, moral, and political society.

Oftentimes, as with the agricultural areas—one of the greatest of which I am proud to represent—because of remoteness of distance and appreciation, nonfarmers fail to appreciate how vital agriculture—or more basically, the food we eat—is to people in metropolitan areas.

I believe that if the metropolitan editors and city congressmen could live for only a short time in an agricultural area such as mine there would have been few "no" votes on the bracero bill last week.

To assist my colleagues, in better understanding the agricultural employment plight, I include the following thoughtful, well-considered editorial from the Salinas Californian by an editor who knows the problem, has lived with it, and who is genuinely concerned with all individuals involved—the farmer, the migrant, the bracero, the consumer, our Nation:

CONGRESS CREATES CRISIS IN BRACERO PROGRAM

Everybody concerned wants to extend the Bracero Act (Public Law 78) but Congress—it just doesn't make sense.

Besides the interested farmers, both Gov. Edmund G. Brown and Director of Employment Al Tieberg have urged extension of the act for 2 years, but the U.S. House of Representatives yesterday voted 174 to 158 not to extend the measure. Unless almost impossible new legislation is forthcoming, the bracero labor supply will end this year.

This lack of action could mean disaster for many Salinas Valley formers and others in California. Strawberries here will be the hardest hit; lettuce next. For, if not braceros, what? It may not be a problem in other areas of the United States but in Salinas Valley it's critical.

For instance, the bracero force harvesting the valley's vegetable crops here last year reached a peak of 12,700 on September 29. Right now today, there are 10,300 Mexican nationals working. If they were not here, what would we do? The total number of seasonal domestics (migrants) here now is only 2,090.

Where do we get sufficient domestic workers without Public Law 78? Is there a supply elsewhere? In the South, perhaps? And, if this labor could be found and was imported, what work could we offer these people in off-season? Nothing.

Such imported labor would be unemployed in off-season. This would create an impossible burden for the county welfare rolls. At this stage, the consequences are almost beyond comprehension as to impact on our community.

The socially minded people behind the defeat of the bill proved that far too many Congressmen could be misguided and be satisfied to remain misinformed as to the ramifications of their actions. Little did they care, and obviously little did they know as to what effect an inadequate labor force will have on many agricultural communities. In our own case, in addition to a probably unbearable welfare load, what about housing for imported workers and their families? Crowded schools already taking 63 percent of our county and city tax dollar? What about problems that will face the county hospital, law enforcement, city services and all the other family and personal welfare facilities when workers are idle for several months and unable to shift to other areas because of families? These are our worries, not those of the 174 Congressmen who created them for us yesterday. They are foisted on us for direct responsibility.

Salinas Valley needs a seasonal labor source, not an annual headache. As for "imports," look at the problem we have at the start of each produce season with the influx of undesirables who can not do stoop labor, who do not want steady work and those who know nothing about fieldwork in the first place.

There are so many facets to be probed and such an urgent need for a solution that the effect of the unexpected demise of the bracero program is almost unbelievable at this stage in agricultural production of perishable crops. In order to protect the valuable agricultural industry in Salinas Valley and the rest of California, we strongly urge renewed vigor in the Halls of Congress to save this most urgent program until the day when an equally acceptable solution is offered.

Air Force Nonstop Jet Flight to Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last week the Washington Daily News published a timely editorial calling attention to the fact that the Air Force jet which set a record of 8 hours, 38 minutes, and 42 seconds for the 5,004-mile nonstop flight to Moscow was in reality the taxpayers' jet and not the Kennedy jet, as announced by the White House.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAXPAYER JET

In taking a delegation of Government officials to Moscow for a sightseeing of Soviet atomic research points, an Air Force jet set a record time of 8 hours, 38 minutes and 42 seconds for the 5,004-mile flight.

In the headlines, the plane was called the Kennedy jet, a proper and concise identification, because the President is the principal user.

But somewhere, at least in a footnote, it should be mentioned that the jet is a taxpayer plane; just as Maj. Gordo Cooper's spacecraft was taxpayer property. It takes nothing away from all the others due applause for these achievements to remind ourselves of the fellow who, in the first instance, makes these things possible. He gets little enough credit.

The Longest Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, today marks the 19th anniversary of the Normandy invasion, when Allied forces stormed ashore on the beachheads to begin the final destruction of Nazi domination of Europe.

Last year there was presented to the American public a remarkable motion picture, "The Longest Day," which recreated most dramatically the first 24 hours of the invasion.

I believe it is of interest on this anniversary to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article about the movie from a fine service magazine, Our Navy, of November 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LONGEST DAY

We don't know what the second half of this century may offer but we do know that June 6, 1944, was one of the most significant days of the first half. In America history it will rank with such dates as November 11, 1918, and December 7, 1941.

For June 6 was D-day. In "The Longest Day" the events of that bloody time are relived through the eyes and words of the men who were there. The Darryl F. Zanuck film is as bold as it is unique. Besides being compelling entertainment it is a significant historical document.

It is probably the best war picture ever filmed. It is all there, the glimpses of humor, the moments of victory, the agony and the ugliness.

Taken from Cornelius Ryan's fine book of the same title the film depicts events in both the Allied and German military camps. This is the first time that D-day has been seen from the German side of the fence.

The film shows that the already narrow margin of Allied victory could have been even narrower had it not been for German bungling and—most important—for Hitler's peculiar stubborness in releasing the panzer divisions. Had these divisions been released immediately who knows what might have happened. One thing is certain—the number of Allied soldiers' graves that today dot the Normandy coast would have been a great deal larger.

Ironically it was Field Marshal Erwin Rommel, commander of the "Atlantic wall," who gave the book and the film its title. Standing with his officers on a windy bluff overlooking the beach, he pointed to the channel and declared prophetically: "The first 24 hours of the invasion will be decisive. For the Allies as well as for Germany, it will be the longest day."

"The Longest Day" tells the story of D-day from the moment the first paratrooper dropped out of a C-47 until the storming of **Point du Hoc late the next afternoon. The accent is on realism and authenticity in this dramatic account of the men who cracked the fortress of Europe.**

This movie is a must. It is all the things that are good. It may leave you a little thoughtful for it is not an experience you can dismiss as soon as you leave the theater.

A False Premise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the editors of the State, the largest daily newspaper in South Carolina, have directed some very pertinent remarks at the State Department in an editorial published in June 1, 1963, issue of this outstanding newspaper. The editorial is entitled "A False Premise," and it answers with eloquence and logic the recent comments by Secretary of State Dean Rusk that race relations practices in this country are serving to undermine our conduct of foreign policy.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FALSE PREMISE

The high-flown asininity of some of America's modern leaders is enough to bring tears to any adult—and enough to make the stalwart men of pioneer days weep loudly and bitterly.

In giving an account of a high-ranking State Department official's briefing of newsmen, the Associated Press reports that our State Department now believes the internal crisis in the Communist world "which we have been waiting for" is now rapidly building to a head.

But the same story says the State Department will do nothing to exploit this breach of Communist solidarity if it comes. The excuse for failure tomorrow, and the failures of the recent past, has already been manufactured.

The United States, says the State Department's apologist for failure, "is fettered in its international leadership by racial discrimination at home."

Now this would sound more plausible if separated from some of the many claims of this same administration. This same administration contends when campaigning for its favorites, that the United States has made almost unbelievable progress in eliminating racial and religious discrimination.

No administration can have it both ways; either there has been a deterioration in race relations in this country or the attribution of diplomatic failures to discrimination at home is hollow hogwash.

Conversely, if there has been progress in eliminating discrimination, then the leaders of today are operating under a far less burdensome handicap than were the men of 20, 50, 100 or 150 years ago.

Did Presidents Wilson, McKinley, Lincoln, Jackson, Jefferson, Washington—or even Franklin D. Roosevelt, for that matter—try to excuse their diplomatic failures because there was "discrimination" at home? The answer is "No."

Ben Bella is frightening all the Jews out of Algeria. Khrushchev is persecuting the people of this faith. African students have been treated so shabbily in some Communist countries that they left. India discriminates against Moslems. Some nations discriminate against religious minorities. "Europeans" are discriminated against in Africa. Yet none of the nations so discriminating excuse their failures in diplomacy because of this discrimination.

The contention is utterly fantastic when placed in the context of past history and present claims. Even more fantastic is the fact that our leaders have resigned themselves in advance to utter failure in the field of diplomacy.

Let's Govern Our Spending More Wisely

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time a letter I have received from one of my constituents, Mrs. C. E. Bennett, of Lakeland, Fla.

This lady is so deeply concerned about the need for fiscal responsibility in government today that she has given me permission to bring her letter to the attention of all of our colleagues. With her permission, I am placing her letter in the RECORD so that everyone will have the opportunity to read and heed her remarks. Her thinking is so similar to that of the many taxpayers who are convinced of the desperate need for fiscal responsibility and a reduction in government spending.

Her letter follows:

MAY 28, 1963.

Representative JAMES A. HALEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HALEY: If you feel that what I have to say here will help, you have my permission to share this letter with the entire House of Representatives.

We are not only angry, we are sick at heart over the way billions of our hard-earned dollars are being literally thrown away. If the money being spent so recklessly was really accomplishing some good, we probably wouldn't grumble. But we read about so many outrageous abuses committed that it makes us too sick to attempt reading new accounts, presented by faithful reporters and Representatives like yourself. Also in magazines like the Reader's Digest. If our economic program is not completely overhauled, renovated and fumigated, this country will be destroyed by reckless economy, not by communism.

It has been for years an American weakness to believe that we could buy friendship, security, prestige, etc. It is a human weakness to spend someone else's money recklessly. These two facts in combination are enough to send our country to suicide. I have often wished that the citizens of this country had the power to withhold their tax dollars until they knew how the money would be spent—in other words, refuse to pay another cent in taxes until a sane program of spending had been worked out and adopted.

The man in the street has been feeling the pinch more and more and it gets more painful every day. Florida is facing the prospect of a grocery tax, which I think is downright wicked. Gasoline taxes are exorbitant. People let their homes go unpainted because they can't afford to keep them in tip-top condition. I see signs of financial distress everywhere among the middle class of people.

Why do we continue to try to be Santa Claus to the whole world? When are we going to say: "No more—we need it here at home?" And we do. Let me illustrate:

In our own private family situation, we managed to get ourselves into a financial mess through poor management and lack of vision. It took us about 6 years to do it and just recently woke up to face the facts, and they are not pleasant. We can look back and see now what we could and should have done to be in a solvent condition today. We have two precious daughters in their teens whose needs increase daily. We cannot do things we'd love to do for them because we don't have the means. We were too concerned about material things when we should have planned wisely to invest in the girls.

Now the point I want to make is that our Government seems to be overlooking its most valuable asset in favor of scattering money all over the world, hoping to win friends and influence nations who couldn't care less. The asset is us, the people, who are being crushed by unbearable taxes, much of it unnecessary, because of sinful, irresponsible, lavish, wasteful spending of someone else's money—ours.

What about education? What about health? What about old people? What about scientific and medical research? Funds for these and other causes always seem to be inadequate.

Sometimes I wonder what would happen if our country were run entirely by women. The average woman manages the household economy and has to do it carefully to meet the needs of her family. Why should our administrators, handling vastly more, and therefore having a much greater responsibility, be any less careful to make every dollar count? What has to be done in a domestic unit surely needs to be done in a national unit, the Government of these United States.

Please, gentlemen, let's govern our spending more wisely. Take a good long look at the domestic situation, at the plight of our own people, and stop being so concerned about the rest of the world, until we get our own affairs in order.

Some of us do not approve of the space program. Most of us are not competent to judge. One thing I am concerned about is that man, who cannot conquer himself, should be allowed to invade outer space and take along with him all his ugly vices, contaminating more of the universe with his sins. Will God allow it? I pray not.

Sincerely,

EDNA D. BENNETT.

Pork Barrel Deluxe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include an editorial entitled "Pork Barrel Deluxe." I call this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, not only because the editorial is very timely but also because it expresses the thinking of my constituents at the grassroots.

[From the Fond du Lac (Wis.) Commonwealth Reporter, May 27, 1963]

PORK BARREL DELUXE

Soon the House of Representatives will have a chance to vote on a $455.5 million 2-year extension of the Area Redevelopment Administration. On its record, the House should vote "no."

Since ARA was authorized, unemployment trends have been inconclusive, but it is certain that ARA's expensive activities have had little effect for improvement. In all, far less than 1,000 new jobs per State have been created—and it's probable that in creating these jobs the program has destroyed many existing jobs.

Congress has learned details of many ARA projects, and they shouldn't cheer a taxpayer. The agency lent $1.8 million to help build a motel in one city where the rate of occupancy for rooms was 54 percent. It lent over $6 million to another city to build an auditorium, which might cheer up a depressed area somewhat, but which admittedly made no significant contribution to employment.

It has lent money for a papermill to take business from nearby papermills, and a soybean plant to take business from neighboring soybean plants. This was specifically enjoined in the bill which authorized the agency's existence.

This was expected by those who fought the legislation in the first place, and supporters of the ARA denied it could ever, ever happen. But now we know.

And Congress should turn down further funds for ARA, unless it wishes to affirm the political adage: "The reward for failure is a larger appropriation."

Failures of American Policy in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the widow of Dr. Chaim Weizmann, first President of Israel, has written to a newspaper a thoughtful and poignant letter that should be read by all Members of the U.S. Senate.

Mrs. Weizmann points out that American, British, and Soviet policies have created a situation in the Middle East that is not in the interest of either the Israelis or of world peace.

I am less concerned about British and Russian policies than I am about our own. I believe that the present administration in Washington is negligent in its obligations to peace in the Middle East and fails to distinguish between human rights and material concepts.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter, which appeared in the New York Times of June 6, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIDDLE EAST RIVALRIES—BELIEF EXPRESSED IN FUTURE OF ISRAEL AND TRIUMPH OF MORAL VALUES

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Current developments in the Middle East, coupled with the ambiguous American, British, and Soviet policies toward them, have created a confused and confusing situation not only for the Israelis, who feel their security gravely jeopardized, but also for people of goodwill everywhere who cannot fathom big power attitudes.

Indeed, one wonders whether the so-called guardians of world peace are actually interested in maintaining pacific relations among Middle East countries, as they solemnly profess at the U.N., or regard this region solely as a maneuvering area for power conflicts.

Fifteen years have passed since Israel was established and recognized by the U.N. Nearly one and one-half million refugees have settled in it, to be productive in agriculture, industry, science; develop its raw materials; establish its educational and welfare systems, and provide for the immigrants, the aged, feeble, and sick.

For 15 years we have reminded of the half million Arab refugees in neighboring countries, who left of their own free will. Yet more Jewish refugees left Arab countries than Arabs left Palestine. Nevertheless, the vicious assertion that there are a million—not half a million—Arab refugees is Egypt's greatest political asset, even greater than its Mig jet fighters.

THREAT FROM EGYPT

Today Egypt poses the State of Israel with the same threat that Hitler, 25 years ago, posed the House of Israel; intoxicated by successes with two rival great powers, Nasser fails to realize that even Rameses lost in the end and that inquisitions, pogroms and gas chambers could not annihilate the Jewish people. The valiant inmates of the Warsaw Ghetto did not fight in vain. Today is no longer yesterday. History will not repeat itself. If the Nassers of the world recognize this, it will be the first step toward peace.

As for myself, I believe, as my husband did, in the ultimate triumph of moral values—although people must get a little push now and then so as to see them more clearly. I believe in the spirit of George Washington, who fought for freedom over Boston's 5 o'clock tea; in the spirit of Lafayette, who left his own country to help another people fighting for their human rights; in the spirit of Cromwell, who invited Jews to settle in England, and of the authors of the Balfour Declaration and those who made the State of Israel a miraculous reality. Their spirit will prevail again.

And I believe that no power on earth can balance the oil and political rivalries of the Middle East against the fate of 2 million and more Israelis. For it is said in I Samuel, xv, 29—"And also the eternity of Israel will not lie nor repent: for he is not a man, that he should repent."

VERA WEIZMAN.

REHOVOTH, ISRAEL, May 24, 1963.

Why Can't We Get Rid of Castro?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Can't We Get Rid of Castro" published in the current edition of the Saturday Evening Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY CAN'T WE GET RID OF CASTRO?

"The Cuban revolution has failed," Post contributing editor, Edward Behr, reports in this week's issue. By that, he means that the Communists have proved once again their almost miraculous talent for making a bad situation worse, for wrecking an economy and enslaving a people. What has not failed, however, is the establishment of Communist power in the Caribbean. Although the Kennedy administration understandably enjoys taking credit for getting Nikita Khrushchev's missiles out of Cuba last October, it understandably prefers to gloss over the fact that Soviet power today is more firmly entrenched off our shores than it was a year ago. There are some 15,000 Soviet troops in Cuba—enough to "suppress any internal rebellion" or "to offer severe opposition to any attack."

That judgment comes from a recent report by the Senate Preparedness Investigation Subcommittee, which raises an even more sinister question: Did these missiles really leave? The Senators admit they don't know. They also acknowledge that top U.S. intelligence officials, "to a man," hold to "their opinion that all strategic missiles and bombers have been removed from Cuba." But the Senators add that the intelligence chiefs "readily admit that, in terms of absolutes, it is quite possible that offensive missiles remain on the island concealed in caves or otherwise. They also admitted that * * * based on skepticism, if nothing more, there is reason for grave concern about the matter."

The Senators, who cite several substantial errors by U.S. intelligence in the past, sound as though they are pretty skeptical and pretty concerned. So are we. We've talked to a lot of Cuban refugees, who have sometimes been more accurate than the intelligence chiefs, and one of them flatly insisted that he'd seen hidden missiles on the Communist island as recently as last November. "Russian missiles are in Cuba," he said. "I know so." Where? "Maybe if you look in the caves in Pinar del Río."

We can't look in the caves, but the Central Intelligence Agency can, and it's about time that its agents find out for certain what's going on in Cuba. To leave the Communists in a position to threaten us again with missiles from Cuba is clearly intolerable. But missiles are not the whole story. Even if the Soviets have no missiles in Cuba, they have troops and armor—and the political position that goes with military presence. The administration indicates that quiet diplomacy is getting the Soviets to reduce their troops. A reduction is not enough. We suspect the Soviets plan to keep troops in Cuba indefinitely, and we think that even one Soviet soldier in the Western Hemisphere is one too many. Instead of just quiet diplomacy, we think Mr. Kennedy should use his well-known skill at quiet armtwisting.

Getting rid of the Soviet troops isn't the whole story either. For as long as Castro rules Cuba, he will be maintaining a political beachhead for communism in Latin America—a beachhead that he's trying to expand by subversion, propaganda, and terrorism. That is why Nikita Khrushchev welcomed his bearded protege in Moscow recently with such a lugubrious display of kissing and hugging. The two of them had a high old time swapping toasts, shooting ducks, ogling ballerinas at the Bolshoi and inspecting the missiles rolling through Red Square. On a shoping tour, Castro considered buying a belt but then remembered that he had forgotten to bring money. Khrushchev, who supports Castro's regime with $500 million a year, soon settled that: "I can guarantee his credit."

But can he? President Kennedy repeatedly says that he is applying economic pressure on Castro, but it seems clear that he's not applying enough. As Behr's report makes clear, Cuba today is in disastrous shape, and yet it's still permitted to do business with unscrupulous businessmen in Canada and Western Europe. The oil that Castro needs keeps flowing in. Surely it's not impossible for the U.S. Government to find means of tightening its embargo, and keep tightening it.

And finally there are the refugees—a quarter of a million of them. We'll grant that a lot of them are wild-eyed and ineffectual, as Harold Martin reports on page 28, and that their hit-or-miss bombing raids don't do much damage to Castro's fortress. But Castro's fortress won't collapse all by itself either. The Cuban refugees remember one successful guerrilla who landed in Cuba with nothing more than one small boatload of seasick amateurs—and that was Castro himself. Organizing a rebellion against a dictator is a long, slow process, but it can and should be done. Why aren't we doing it?

Back in 1960 a prominent American political figure expressed very similar views. "We must attempt to strengthen the * * * democratic anti-Castro forces in exile, and in Cuba itself, who offer eventual hope of overthrowing Castro. Thus far, those fighters for freedom have had virtually no support from our Government." That was true when Senator John F. Kennedy said it. Isn't it true today?

An Address by Hon. James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am delighted to present an address by the Honorable James E. Webb, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This splendid address was delivered at the commencement exercise of my alma mater, the University of Florida, on May 4 of this year. The address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES E. WEBB, ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

No one can come to the university of this "first State in space" without emphasizing that what the men and women dedicated to a fulfillment of the exacting requirements of the space age have done here in Florida will live in the history of human affairs. Moreover, the way the men and women of this Nation, in making history in space, have followed the lessons of mankind's history and the traditions of democracy at its best is a tribute to the leadership of great, powerful, intellectually oriented centers of teaching and learning such as this, the university of a great State—Florida.

At the university we learn that all that we value most is a product of or intimately related to the human mind, and that most of the instruments and institutions of human progress are recent developments in the long history of mankind.

There is the art of writing, which we have enjoyed for some 6,000 years; agriculture, with us only a little longer; Christianity, less than 2,000 years; modern science, about 300 years old, and modern technology, as revolutionized by science, developed over only about 150 years.

In the explosive development of man's knowledge of the universe in which we live, through use of his mind, consider this series of events:

In 1632, or just 330 years ago, the Cardinals who passed sentence on Galileo asserted that "the proposition that the Earth is not the center of the world and immovable, but that it moves * * * is absurd and false."

But 200 years later man had learned, and had come to accept, that the Earth is not the center of the universe, and beyond that, that the Sun also is not the center of the universe. Instead it was recognized and accepted that the universe itself is in motion, and that we here on Earth are ourselves on a spacecraft traveling at 67,000 miles an hour in a path around the Sun, which will place us a year from now 180 million miles from where we are today—that is, with reference to the Sun, which also moves.

The marvelous capacity of the human mind for perception, analysis, and insight is illustrated by the fact that Edward Everett Hale, in his book "The Brick Moon," published in 1869, was able to write imaginatively of almost unimaginable events which were not to transpire for nearly 80 years. He wrote this:

"If from the surface of the earth, by a gigantic peashooter, you could shoot a pea upward from Greenwich, aimed northward as well as upward; if you drove it so fast and far that when its power of ascent was exhausted, and it began to fall, it should clear the earth, and pass outside the North Pole, if you had given it sufficient power to get it half round the earth without touching, that pea would clear the earth forever. It would continue to rotate above the North Pole, above the Feejee Island place, above the South Pole and Greenwich, forever, with the impulse with which it had first cleared our atmosphere and attraction."

Today, the human mind has made Hale's imaginary peashooter come true in the form of the modern space booster.

Twenty-five years after Hale's book, John Jacob Astor, who is best remembered for building the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel and going down with the *Titanic*, wrote a novel, "Journey to Other Worlds," in which men traveled to the planets. Although written almost three-quarters of a century ago, the book contains an artist's drawing of a spacecraft which might almost have been conceived by a designer of the Apollo spacecraft in which the first American astronauts will take off from Cape Canaveral and travel to the moon.

In the foreword to this book, Hale offered the comment that "there can be no question that there are many forces and influences in nature whose existence we as yet little more than suspect. How interesting it would be," he said, "if, instead of reciting past achievements, we would devote our consideration to what we do not know."

He continued, "It is only through investigation and research that inventions come; we may not find what we are in search of, but may discover something of perhaps even greater moment. It is probable that the principal glories of the future will be found in as yet untrodden paths."

Hale's pea has become a mancarrying satellite, the Mercury capsule, and the whole vista of space is opening up to man. Meanwhile, your generation has lived close enough to dramatic achievements in space to understand the profound truth of Astor "that the principal glories of the future will be found in as yet untrodden paths." Let me urge you now, as you complete one stage of your education, to turn eagerly to "consideration of what we, mankind, do not know."

How has all this come about? How does today's generation differ from those which, as recently as Jefferson's time, rejected the cast iron plow because it would cause weeds to grow, or the steam locomotive because at the incredible speed of 20 miles an hour the wind would blow the fire out? What has produced a preponderance of thoughful leadership in our country with vision greater even than that of a Thomas Edison, who said of the Wright Brothers airplane that it would never have any practical value, except perhaps as "the toy of wealthy sportsmen."

The other day I was reading the George Washington University Law Review, and I came across a quotation which I would like to read to you. Here it is:

"In very few ages of the world has the struggle for change been so widespread, so deliberate, or upon so great a scale as this which we are taking part in.

"The transition which we are witnessing is no equable transition of growth and normal alteration, no silent, unconscious unfolding of one age into another, its natural heir and successor.

"Society is looking itself over in our day from top to bottom, is making fresh and critical analysis of its very elements, is questioning its oldest practices as freely as its newest, scrutinizing every arrangement and motive of its life, and stands ready to attempt nothing less than a radical reconstruction."

This quotation, it seems to me, is so pertinent an assessment of this age in which we live that it may surprise some of you to learn that it was made by Woodrow Wilson in an address to the American Bar Association in 1910.

Wilson's main thesis, in addressing the leaders of the legal profession in his day, was that there are moments in history when slow and gradual adjustments in the law are not sufficient to meet the emerging needs of society. At such times, social habit is replaced by discussion, by political contest, and by political action.

Wilson was referring chiefly to the effects of the industrial revolution, and the changing relationships between labor and capital. Yet what he said half a century ago applies with equal force to the impact of a newer revolution—the influence which science and technology are having on our society.

The forces of change in the first half of this century were tremendous, as were the social and economic upheavals which they produced, and the legislative reforms which were enacted to deal with them.

But all of this has been transcended by the accelerating forces of change in the world in which we live today. We are dealing not only with profound changes in the social and economic structure of our country and the world; we are dealing as well with an even more profound change in man's own conception of the boundaries and limitations of his habitable environment and his understanding of the forces of the universe.

Throughout human history, as the great French thinker Henri Bergson pointed out, men have been accustomed to think of moving only in terms of the unmoving. But your generation will find it easier to think of itself as a part of a dynamic universe because John Glenn has, before the eyes of all men, demonstrated the emerging cosmology of Von Braun, Van Allen, Dryden, and Pickering.

It might be said that almost all that man knows about this vast universe that is his home he has learned from the examination of one material, that of Earth; one form of life, that of Earth; the characteristics of one body in space, those of Earth—its gravitation, magnetic fields, trapped radiation, atmosphere, and magnetosphere.

Now man is going out to get a second material to compare with that of Earth—that of the Moon, and perhaps a third, that of Mars.

And with Mariner's measurements of some of the characteristics of Venus, the mind of man, for the first time, can compare the magnetic fields of his Earth with those of another body in space. And as more Mariners travel to other planets, he will have their measurements to compare with those of Earth, much as lawyers sharpen up points at issue through studies in comparative law.

Finally, many believe man will achieve the most exciting prospect of all—that he will find extraterrestrial life to compare with his own.

In the world you enter today, man is no longer rooted to terra firma, to his native land, or even to his city block, either in the literal sense or in his understanding of the powerful forces of the universe, of which he is such a miniscule part. Increasingly man comprehends that the new understanding and knowledge that are being unleashed by science and technology will alter his existence in more ways and more rapidly than he can possible foresee.

The way you will come to feel about these impending changes will depend in large part on your estimate of man's ability to cope with them and adapt to them. You will find that many men anticipate them with basic optimism and some eagerness because they are already surrounded by evidence of the benefits received from the scientific and technological advances of the past.

Within your lifetime, science and technology have caused ancient economic, social, and political concepts to become obsolescent almost as rapidly as we have harvested the fruits of successful research and development.

The automobile and airplane have given us convenient transportation, but they have also altered our whole concept of the world in which we live, so far as our everyday lives are concerned. And so with radio, television, and countless other developments with which we are familiar.

Man has gained a new mobility. His horizons have broadened, not only in the geographic sense, but because he no longer feels bound by family, farm, or traditional village industry or nearby city factory.

Your generation will feel no constraint to farm or mine coal or work in a certain factory in a certain city and simply because that is what your father did, and perhaps his grandfather before him. But there is a constraint you will feel. It is to continue to look to your alma mater, your university with its familiar intellectual landmarks, for facts, and discussion of the great issues of the day. When government must reflect the will of the people, and large numbers of people are cut loose from familiar moorings, the university can still serve as a trusted source of information in which your confidence can be placed.

In one sense, this new mobility has been forced upon us, as employment opportunities in many of the age-old occupations of man shrink or disappear. Yet the very technology that has cut back the need for human labor in some fields of endeavor has opened new and more rewarding ones.

But as in the past, among the invisible products of man's scientific progress we can expect to find economic and sociopolitical upheaval. The theme of the message I have for you today is this: The civilization which can move to gear itself for travel to the moon and the planets, and appreciate the necessity for doing so, will not be content with outdated earthly concepts and institutions.

The threads of the fabric of our social, political, and economic institutions are being tested as we move rapidly into this new age of science and technology.

Our economic and political relations with other countries are being reevaluated. Old concepts of defense and military strategy are being challenged and revised.

Jealously guarded traditions of our educational institutions such as this university are being tested, altered, or, in some cases, discarded.

Our economic theories, and even the nature of our institutional structures, are undergoing reexamination as society seeks to adjust itself to the inevitability of change.

These changes are driving men from farm to city and have aroused deep and serious concern at both ends of the scale. While urban planners wonder how they will cope with too many people, agricultural regions wonder how they will survive with too few, and both seek ways to maintain and justify this generation's great hope of the future.

Bergson said, "For a conscious being, to exist is to change, to change is to mature, to mature is to go on creating one's self endlessly."

Durant, in his "Story of Philosophy" said of Bergson:

"After Bergson we come to see the world as the stage and the material of our own originative powers. Before him we were cogs and wheels in a vast and dead machine; now, if we wish it, we can help to write our own parts in the drama of creation."

That is your opportunity, if you grasp it, in this exciting age. You can help to write your own parts in the drama of creation.

Is Nuclear Dilemma at Roots of United States-Europe Split?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. **KEITH**. Mr. Speaker, all of us are aware of the difficulties which have divided the nations of the Atlantic community from time to time. Recently, they seem to have increased in number. All too often the United States has reacted instantly and perhaps instinctively. On too many occasions we have failed to think through the problem and to look for the source of discontent and disagreement.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a very penetrating and perceptive article, "Is Nuclear Dilemma at Roots of United States-Europe Split?" by Robert D. Papkin. This analysis, which appeared in the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., seeks to pinpoint the cause of friction among NATO members. It is worthy of thoughtful consideration by every Member of Congress.

The article follows:

THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY AND EUROPEAN SKEPTICISM—IS NUCLEAR DILEMMA AT ROOTS OF UNITED STATES-EUROPE SPLIT?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Robert D. Papkin, son of Attorney and Mrs. Barney Papkin, of 114 Palmer Street, is at present studying the laws and economy of the European Common Market at the College of Europe in Bruges, Belgium, under a Fulbright Act grant. A member of the Massachusetts Bar and the Federal Bar Association, Mr. Papkin is an honor graduate of the New Bedford High School, and a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Harvard College and Harvard Law School. Since his admission to the bar in 1957, with the exception of time spent in the military service, he has been on the legal staff of the National Labor Relations Board in Washington.)

(By Robert D. Papkin)

Eight months ago I came to Europe to study the movement toward the economic integration and the political unification of Western Europe. Like many Americans, I was convinced of the historic importance of this development and curious as to the effect it would have on future relations between Europe and the United States.

It has happened that my stay in Europe has coincided with a great crisis in the postwar movement toward European unity. In some ways this crisis revolves around the purely European question of the future shape of Europe, but in many ways the question of Europe's relationship to the United States lies at the root of the current problems.

ACTION SUGGESTED

I have undertaken to write this article not because I believe my brief experience in Europe has provided me with all the answers as to how Europe's dispute with America can be satisfactorily resolved, but simply in the hope that my observations may help to stimulate thinking about the kind of action that the United States must take if it is really serious in its announced desire to create an Atlantic Community.

There are many aspects of America's relations with Europe, each of which could serve as the basis of an article in itself. There is the initial problem of which Europe will confront America in the coming decades—the Europe of the Common Market, the Europe of NATO, or some combination of the two.

There is the very vital current question of whether the European Economic Community develops an outward-looking or an inward-looking posture with regard to the rest of the world, and the relation of the U.S. Trade Expansion Act to this development.

AID NEEDED

There is the important problem of the respective roles of Europe and the United States in aiding the developing countries of the world. This list could be expanded almost indefinitely, but in my opinion there is one question that is more important than all the rest and which must be resolved in some fashion if there is to be any meaningful relationship between Europe and America at all in the years to come.

This question is the "nuclear dilemma" and it lies at the base of the current division between Europe and America and of European skepticism toward the whole idea of an Atlantic partnership.

Last July 4 in an important speech in front of Independence Hall in Philadelphia, President Kennedy outlined his conception of an Atlantic partnership and spoke of a Declaration of Interdependence between the United States and a United Europe.

Several months later the first concrete step toward this partnership was taken when the Congress approved the Trade Expansion Act which gave the President unprecedented powers to negotiate for the reduction of trade barriers.

COLLAPSE POSSIBLE

Today less than a year after the President's ringing declaration at Philadelphia and only a few months after the passage of the Trade Expansion Act, the prospects for Atlantic partnership appear very dim, and indeed, the whole postwar structure of American-European relations seems in danger of collapse. Why did all this come about?

Have we arrived at the present situation simply because there is a strong man in Europe named Charles De Gaulle who is opposed to the American conception? Or, rather, do the objections of General De Gaulle find widespread popular support in a general European misunderstanding, and even skepticism, of the Kennedy vision of an Atlantic Community?

And if this misunderstanding and skepticism exists, how can the United States counteract it in a way that offers Europe a role in the world broader than the vision of De Gaulle and at the same time satisfies the European uneasiness about the American desire to retain the undivided leadership of the West?

These are the questions to which we must address ourselves if we are to understand what lies behind the current crisis in relations between Europe and America.

VITAL FACTOR

Any analysis of European-American relations at the present moment must begin with an appreciation of a vital factor: Europe's economic independence but continued military dependence on the United States.

At the end of World War II, Europe was entirely economically dependent on the United States. The rising tide of communism put a military threat beside that of economic chaos, and it quickly became evident that Europe was also completely dependent on America from a military point of view.

There is no need to relate again the story of how the economic problem was overcome. Through a mixture of American aid and European cooperation, the economic tide was turned and Europe was started on a road to recovery that has today made it an economic giant and a formidable competitor of the United States.

PROBLEMS FORESEEN

There were some Americans who were aware that the rebuilding of Europe might someday pose problems for us, but they believed that a strong, stable, and united Europe would provide a counterweight to Communist expansion and a formidable ally of the United States and that these factors would more than balance any economic conflict.

Europe, however, has continued to remain militarily dependent on the United States and the simple reason for this state is the role of nuclear weapons in modern war and modern diplomacy.

The simple fact is that the existence of nuclear weapons systems with their unprecedented destructive capacity and the enormous cost of developing and delivering nuclear weapons has changed the ways in which nations deal with one another.

NUCLEAR DETERRENT NEEDED

Or, to put it another way, it means that nations must possess a credible and reliable nuclear deterrent before they can deal with each other according to the traditional methods of diplomacy.

Europe, of course, has never had such a nuclear deterrent. This means that the security of every West European has been, and is, dependent in the last analysis on the decision of one man—the President of the United States.

Europe is composed of proud and dynamic people who have played a dominant role in the world up to the present. The state of military and political dependence in which they feel themselves to be with regard to the United States is psychologically and politically intolerable to them.

A comprehension of this continental complex that Europeans have about not controlling their own destiny helps us to understand what lies behind the current conflict between Europe and America.

Europe knows that it can't live without us. It needs the American nuclear deterrent and will continue to need it as long as there is a Soviet threat in Europe.

FEELING DESCRIBED

Even General de Gaulle is perfectly well aware of this, and he does not see his own small deterrent as a substitute for that of the United States. Yet, on the other hand, Europe doesn't like being led by America. It doesn't want to have the feeling that it is an American protectorate.

It doesn't want to have the feeling that it must go along with every suggestion of American policy or to bow to every sign of American displeasure. What it wants is a European Europe that can make European decisions about its own future.

Faced with this European desire for independence and self-assertion, the American reaction is usually one composed equally of puzzlement, resentment, and exasperation. Those Americans who favor the grand design of President Kennedy reply to these European views by saying: "America wants just what Europe wants."

America wants a union of equal partners, a strong Europe working with a strong America, together stemming the Communist tide, lowering world trade barriers, solving the global problems of commerce, commodities and currency and cooperating for the development of the emerging nations.

However, there is a very considerable influential group of people in Europe who say: "This is what America says, but not what it really wants."

U.S. CONTROL?

What the United States really wants from an Atlantic Community, according to many Europeans, is to preserve its control over Europe. Europeans make the following points: You Americans talk about equal partner, but how can there be partnership when one of the parties possesses all the real power in its sophisticated arsenal of nuclear weapons, and insists on keeping control of this power?

You ask us to increase our conventional forces but you know we can't do that and have nuclear weapons, so in fact you are simply asking us to become more dependent on your nuclear power and furnish the cannon fodder.

You say you will defend us against the Russians with your nuclear weapons, but are you really willing to risk the nuclear destruction of New York or Los Angeles to save Paris or Rome?

You fear the economic growth of Europe and by magnifying your investments, you hope to dominate the Common Market economically and keep Europe under American control. Before Europe has even had a chance to firmly unite, you try to seduce us with devices like your Trade Expansion Act which look to free trade and would give your powerful industries the ability to destroy our growing industries that cannot compete with them.

JUST A GIMMICK?

In short, your Atlantic Community is just a gimmick to prevent a European Europe and to continue American domination.

Taken together all these statement reflect a widespread feeling in Europe. This feeling is perhaps more evident in France because the Gaullists see the opportunity of exploiting these attitudes to achieve their own ends. Nevertheless these views can be found among all political groups from the Socialists on the left to the extreme right.

The most basic reason for European suspicion of the American grand design lies in the nuclear dilemma and resentment at the dependency that this dilemma has produced. However, there are numerous other factors that enter into European skepticism toward the Atlantic Community.

For one thing, there is the entirely legitimate argument that Europe has a face and a personality of its own to present to the world, especially to the developing countries, and that this must not disappear under a wave of Americanization. There is also the much less praiseworthy residue of distrust and contempt for the quality of American leadership and for things American in general.

There is the still considerable protectionist group that, despite their Common Market experience, genuinely doubt their ability to compete with American business. There is the Socialist view that an Atlantic Community will mean a huge free-trade area, and that this will inevitably lead to an end to national planning and prevent further political integration.

SINCERITY DOUBTED

And above all there is an unwillingness to recognize that the United States of the 1960's is different from the United States of 1917 or 1940, and that America is sincere when it talks of the inseparable interdependence of Europe and America in a nuclear world.

Finally, there is another aspect of the grand design that disturbs many Europeans. It is, essentially, a design for Western Europe and North America. It seems to Europeans to offer no solution for the problem of a divided Germany, and to abandon Eastern Europe to Soviet domination. This is considered intolerable, for the people of these countries are thought of as Europeans, too.

The American answer to this objection is that the successful completion of the grand design will undermine continued Soviet domination. For the Russians will realize that further expansion in Europe is impossible, and a strong, united and prosperous Western Europe will inevitably attract the satellites which are becoming increasingly intractable for the Soviets in any event.

HOW LONG?

When the Soviets realize this, the argument seems to run, they will be willing to seriously negotiate a settlement of the political problems remaining from the Second World War. But how long will this be, the Europeans wonder. How long will 17 million Germans remain subjected to communism, the West Germans ask.

Now all of these European attitudes regarding what the United States really means by its proposal of Atlantic partnership can be answered, some more easily and effectively than others.

But all too often the answers that come from Washington miss the point of European objections and even seem arrogant to Europeans. Brilliant and logical as the grand design may seem in the dining rooms of Georgetown or the conference rooms of Foggy Bottom, it creates in the minds of many Europeans the feeling of something they must accept, not something they can freely choose.

The problem of convincing Europe that the Atlantic Community concept is a valid one that they will want to choose freely is the current great problem of American policy toward Europe, and it requires patience, understanding and tact—bluntness and toughness are not enough.

If the picture of European opinion that has been sketched here is, in any way, an accurate one, then the problems that have come to a head in the past few months have been germinating for some time.

PATH SUGGESTED

General de Gaulle did not create these attitudes by what he said at his famous press conference of January 14, but he has cleverly and effectively exploited them to advance his own version of a grand design for Europe. For almost the first time since the end of World War II a European statesman has suggested a path for the rest of Europe that is not only different from the American way but is, in fact, opposed to the American way.

The Gaullist grand design envisions a continental, autarkic Europe composed of closely linked national states that can play a distinctive role in the world apart from the two great powers, the United States and the Soviet Union.

The problem for American policy is to convince Europeans that the American conception of an Atlantic Community is superior to the Gaullist vision. The task will not be an easy one.

In the first place, any American proposal will be suspect by the very fact of being American. Furthermore, anything which falls short of concrete action by the United States that indicates a willingness to share the leadership of the West will be belittled by Europeans and will result in a reinforcement of their skepticism.

PROOF NEEDED

American must show Europe by convincing acts rather than lofty rhetoric that we are ready to give up our complete freedom of action and put read meaning into the vague concept of partnership.

The place where partnership must begin is an effort to resolve the nuclear dilemma. Although the American proposals for the creation of a multilateral nuclear force represent a step in the right direction, they would appear, at least at the present, to pose more problems than they solve.

There is a genuine fear in Europe that these proposals may be nothing more than an American effort to give Europe the form of a say in the use of nuclear weapons while retaining the substance of control completely in American hands.

The trouble with much of the American thinking about creation of independent nuclear deterrents and their strategic use, which is often so sophisticated as to appear almost scholastic to the uninitiated, is that it completely misses the point of European objections.

The European desire to possess nuclear weapons is political and, above all, psychological. To tell Europe that expenditures for such weapons utilize resources that could be better employed for conventional defense and will not, in any event, result in creation of a credible deterrent only serves to reinforce the suspicion that America wants to keep a monopoly on nuclear control.

VALIDITY OUTWEIGHED

The validity of American arguments against the proliferation of nuclear deterrents is outweighed by the psychological need to feel responsible for one's own security. Of course, the same logic should indicate that although possession of a minimal nuclear force by Britain or France may make them feel better, there is no reason why Germany, Italy, or Benelux should thereby feel better off.

That is why only a European deterrent under European control could give to all of Europe the belief that it had a definite say in its own security, and restore to the Atlantic Alliance the kind of confidence that is necessary if it is to endure.

Furthermore, only a European deterrent fully coordinated with the American deterrent could prevent the independent national uses of separate deterrents. But the achievement of such an integrated European-American deterrent is opposed to the present policy of France, although it satisfies the psychological problem of giving Europe a say in its destiny.

Until such time as France is willing to submit its nuclear force to an integrated control and to turn its political aims away from a concept of a French-led Europe separate from America toward an Atlantic Community in which France is a leading partner, the alliance will be strained. And it would be unrealistic to expect such a change as long as France is led by General De Gaulle.

GROWING INTEREST

In recent months there has been a growing interest in Europe in the idea of a truly European deterrent as a way of reopening the idea of British membership in the Common Market and also making progress toward political unity.

Such a deterrent would be based on the British and French contributions but would include the financial aid of other members of the Common Market. Admittedly such an idea is still in the realm of speculation. Its acceptance would require a rather sharp change of policy on the part of the French Goverment, and there is little discernible enthusiasm for such a plan in Britain.

Furthermore, for Britain to share the nuclear information it has acquired from the United States with Europe would require changes in American law.

If the movement for a European deterrent gains political momentum in western Europe, the United States will be presented with a test and an opportunity.

The test will be to see if America is really willing to give up something, namely nuclear power monopoly, to achieve something, namely Atlantic partnership.

The opportunity will be one of really showing Europe that we have confidence in the ability of a united and outward-looking Europe to assume its rightful role in the world.

TRAGEDY SEEN

There is so much that America and Europe can do together in the world struggle against communism and in aid to developing countries that it would be one of the great tragedies of histroy if we drifted further apart.

It is unfortunate that the one thing that might be able to prevent this tragedy from accurring is the willingness to see Europe acquire the same enormous destructive capacity that we now possess. Yet, paradoxically, the future security of the world may depend on just this willingness.

Article Written by Ross Valentine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article written by Ross Valentine and published in the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFESSOR SAMUELSON VERSUS SENATOR BYRD

(By Ross Valentine)

Among the many mysteries of life, one has baffled me for years:

Do liberals, drawn by centripetal, psychic force, gravitate to Harvard—or is there something about the place that casts a Circean spell over faculty and students alike, and converts them into New Frontiersmen, passionately eager to spend other people's money, especially money other people haven't got?

Consider, if you will, the unique rationalizing of Prof. Paul A. Samuelson, distinguished Ph. D. of the Crimson, and a glittering star on the faculty of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

On the day before Virginia's HARRY BYRD, as chairman of the Finance Committee, warned the Senate to abjure planned deficit-spending, and deficit-financed tax cuts there appeared in the Sunday Washington Post and Times-Herald a piece by Dr. Samuelson, implicitly belittling the Virginian's thesis. It pointed out that a steadily increasing national debt was nothing to worry about * * * so long as the national economy grows at as large an average rate or at the 4-percent rate which prudent judgment shows to be feasible.

Professor Samuelson's piece was, as intended, amusingly caustic, vaguely reminiscent of Bernard Shaw's Mephistophelian mockery.

"Ridicule," wrote Horace away-back-then, "often decides matters of importance more effectually than severity."

Professor Samuelson started out by belittling all who believe in fiscal commonsense and hence distrust politico-economic quackery.

"To become an expert in economics," he wrote, "one used to have to study for years, bone up on history, master statistics, learn German and French.

"But World War II changed all that. The test as to whether a man was a good economist came to be boiled down to the simple question: 'Have you ever met a payroll?'

"Emerson's man, who built a better mousetrap, found the world beating a path to his door—not for mousetraps but for advice on the sensational problem of the Indian rupee and the notorious law of diminishing returns."

That, you see, set the stage—a politely sneering prelude, the condescending smile which the modern art initiate reserves for those who do not kowtow to the cult.

Samuelson mentions that Senator GOLDWATER reaped "a roar of applause" when he told an audience of housewives that he would rather have any one of them on the President's Council of Economic Advisers than Chairman Walter W. Heller. Hence, says Dr. Samuelson:

"To understand the intricacies of the national debt or the capital output ratio, it is no longer necessary for an economist to meet a payroll, he or she must also be able to bake an angelfood cake or at least thaw out frozen mashed potatoes."

Having thus separated the know-nothings from the sophisticates, he draws an analogy between the national debt and the indebtedness of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. I quote:

"American Telephone & Telegraph is a great stock; even poor widowers can trust it. A.T. & T. has been accumulating bond debt for the last half century. Forty years from now its bonded debt and interest charges can with confidence be estimated to be up by 300 percent * * * so long as the phone receipts of the A.T. & T. can be confidently expected to rise faster over the decades than its debt service charges, there is no debt problem.

"So it is with the United States * * * so long as the taxable base of the American people keeps the needed balance of the public debt * * * the burden of the debt on the backs of President Eisenhower's grandchildren will remain a problem of urgency lower than that of DDT or of the unemployment all youth faces."

Clever? Of course, and like so much of cleverness today, as shallow as ale on a plate. Let us examine this professional comparison.

Dr. Samuelson steps gingerly around the basic differences between a private corporation and government—and their respective "debts."

1. Unlike the Government, the company can sell stocks and bonds only to those who voluntarily buy them on demonstrated assurance that wise and thrifty management will pay dividends on their investment. If the company debt service charge eats up dividends, investors get out from under.

If the company debt service charge eats up dividends, investors management will pay dividends on their investment.

The Government, however, even when badly mismanaged, uses its police power to make you buy stock by enforced payment of taxes. It is not subject to the disciplines which keep business on the straight and narrow path of profitable efficiency.

2. Unlike the Government, a corporation does not and cannot create and issue money, so that even if it were mismanaged, the value of U.S. currency would not be impaired.

3. A company debt, unlike the Government's, cannot be "monetized" on a huge scale to create inflationary credit—and thereby depress the purchasing power of the U.S. dollar..

4. Unlike a company, Government fiscally operates on a gold base, as an earnest of its intention to maintain the integrity of its currency.

The Government's credit (money) is tied to gold. When international confidence in the dollar declines, our gold reserve declines. (Because of chronic deficit spending, all our gold is now in effect, foreign owned!)

Like other theoretical economists Dr. Samuelson (like the late Lord Keynes) is essentially a mathematician to whom economics is an ultrarefined game, taken very seriously, of course, but essentially an elegant gymnastic exercise, not a down-to-earth business, such as "meeting a payroll," or making ends meet in running a home on the purchasing power of a pay envelope.

While comprehension of economics presumes mathematical insight and reasoning, is essentially a human business; like Keynes and other brilliant theorists, Dr. Samuelson underestimates the human factor in the economic equation. Prior to deposit insurance and Federal Reserve cooperation, a bank could be sound as a $20 gold piece, yet a rumor, intimating lack of confidence, could cause loss of faith and a run on that bank.

Well, the Government is not only the biggest big business of all, but the biggest banker—and banker to the world as well (something not true of A.T. & T.).

Inflationary deficit spending, consequent flight of gold, impairment of international confidence, the creeping impoverishment of citizens (via taxes and inflation) and the concomitant corrosion of the dollar as debt rises—these are down-to-earth facts which Dr. Samuelson in his witty persiflage, for reasons best known to himself, carefully avoids mentioning.

Has he forgotten the crash of the topheavy credit pyramid in 1929? He must have—at least for the purpose of the Post article—or he could not have so gaily dismissed the day of reckoning, from which even the richest government is not immune.

He speaks of reading history as essential to an understanding of economics. History is cluttered with the gravestones of states that collapsed because its misrulers "clipped the currency," lessened the gold or silver contents, until its money had no value whatever.

By what devious intellectual process did Dr. Samuelson arrive at the conclusion that this country is immune from the penalty of gambling with a debt-inflated currency?

Even the angelfood cake-baking housewife and surely the employer whose employees depend on him to meet the payroll know better than that. They know that to make ends meet—with a thrift margin—is the measure of managerial competence and integrity.

The superbusiness of government, in that respect, is no different. If it is wasteful, if it squanders billions on faithless friends, if its operatives spend billions extracted from taxpayers to serve as campaign funds for reelection, if it gambles on the assumption that it can borrow its way to prosperity—then the likelihood of being buried by gold-hoarding Russia is alarmingly imminent.

As an honorable pedagogue, Dr. Samuelson and other liberals may be assumed to believe in such finger-snapping dismissal of debt as nothing to be feared—but because of their influence on the down-to-earth business of running the country, such men can be dangerous.

James Aloysius Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, no man in any cross section of the United States has more friends or has served the Nation more faithfully and successfully than Postmaster General James A. Farley, of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration.

Under leave to extend remarks, I am including a splendid tribute paid him this week by the St. Joseph News-Press, one of the great newspapers of Missouri and the Central West:

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS—A PERSONAL TRIBUTE

The Honorable James A. Farley will be 75 years old this Thursday, May 30, Memorial Day. No grander man ever lived. We first met Mr. Farley April 3, 1940, when he came to St. Joseph to dedicate the new post office building, across the street from the News-Press and Gazette. He came to our office to renew friendship of years standing with Henry D. Bradley, our new publisher. It was through Henry we met the handsome huge Postmaster General of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration.

We fell in love with that man that day and never have ceased to hold him in highest esteem. Mr. Roosevelt was nearing the end of his second term and his chief votegetter, the genial Jim, was against defying tradition. He did not want to see F.D.R. try for a third term. But even that early—the national political conventions were not to come until summer—most political observers knew that Mr. Roosevelt was itching for a third term.

While Mr. Farley opposed the nomination, once F.D.R. was nominated he had no more loyal supporter. But he declined to remain in the Cabinet after the election. Thus it came about we had two more Postmaster Generals before Roosevelt's own death: Frank Walker of Pennsylvania, Robert E. Hannegan of St. Louis, Mo. James Aloysius Farley retired from public life—that is, as much as a lifelong politician can retire. Anyway, Coca-Cola hired him and he has been that great worldwide organization's best asset ever since.

"A sincere conviction in your own cause (whether you are selling Coca-Cola, building materials, motor trucks, or a candidate)," Mr. Farley once wrote, "leads you to value each person you talk to, and that value helps identify him to you." Farley was explaining his peculiar and famous knack of remembering names and using them. He was also revealing more of himself than he may have realized.

For Jim Farley in politics was a salesman, and an enormously successful one. He knew his product and his market with almost encyclopedic thoroughness. His famous prediction in 1936 that Alf Landon would carry only Maine and Vermont was based on a sound network of political intelligence. He recalls, in "Jim Farley's Story": "When, at 3:36 a.m. (of the morning after the election), I got the information from John L. Sullivan of Manchester, N.H., that Roosevelt had pulled ahead in that city, I knew that my prediction would stand up."

Now observing his 75th birthday anniversary, Mr. Farley is a kind of Democratic right bower. He has no political organization as such, but his political influence is not inconsequential. He shuns the role of older statesman, preferring like that other Democratic septuagenarian, Harry S. Truman, the honest title of "politician."

Mr. Farley also is a Democrat of Democrats. As the political analyst Frank R. Kent, no Farley enthusiast, once put it: "His party regularity is without flaw." His reaction in 1960 was typical. A backer of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON at Los Angeles, Mr. Farley aimed most of his weaponry at Adlai E. Stevenson, saying, for example, that to send Stevenson to negotiate with Khrushchev would be like sending "the cabbage patch to the goat." And he also warned against a Kennedy stampede. But right after the election found him defending John F. Kennedy's victory, saying that anybody questioning the President-elect's mandate because of the narrow margin was "perilously close to irresponsible mischiefmaking."

Retirement from active politics brought fortune to F.D.R.'s Postmaster General and grand vizier as chairman of the board of Coca-Cola Export Co. and honorary degrees and decorations from foreign governments and all kinds of kudos. But one suspects that even at the age of 75, the old pro occasionally yearns to come back to the political arena for one last hurrah.

We can see Mr. Farley right now. It is in the coffee shop of the Waldorf-Astoria in New York. He is eating breakfast. He is alone. He is reading the New York Times, the obituary page. He once commented "These last few years I turn to this page first, so many of my friends have gone." Then he always asks—we see him every year—about several St. Joseph friends, maintaining that remarkable memory for names and faces. God keep you, Mr. Farley. Long may you live. We have so few so great as you.

Shrine for a Great Lady Needs Saving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I wish to direct the attention of my colleagues to an article which appeared in the May 26 issue of the Washington Post Potomac magazine. The article entitled, "Shrine for a Great Lady Needs Saving," refers to the home of Clara Barton, located at Glen Echo, Md. Efforts are now underway by the Friends of Clara Barton to preserve the home of the founder of the Red Cross. I am privileged to be a member of the committee which has been formed to preserve this wonderful shrine.

Mr. President, I hope that my colleagues will take note of this worthy project and I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHRINE FOR A GREAT LADY NEEDS SAVING

(By Hattie Leister)

Overlooking the amusement park at Glen Echo, Md., are the verandas and balconies of a monument to an American woman's idealism.

They beckon the passerby to the home of Clara Barton, humanitarian, battlefield angel of mercy, feminist, first president of the American Red Cross.

The hospitality dispensed within its paneled walls is not that of a musty historic shrine. Clara Barton House is today's steamboat gothic bridge to the self-assurance of a nation just beginning to flex its muscles.

Mark Twain would have felt at home there. Louisa May Alcott might have perused a slim volume there. Susan B. Anthony could have persuaded the timid in its hushed hallways. Civil War wounded would have received a cooling draught of water on the lawn, and a happy excursion party could have departed from its porch for the 1876 Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia.

That these things did not happen (the house was built in 1892) is no reflection on the building. The house evokes these images.

Its 36 rooms and 38 closets, its 3-story entrance hall recall a day of spacious living. The entrance hall, reaching upward to carved wooden balustrades, resembles a Mississippi steamboat. The settees, the gold leaf and onyx tables and the piano remind one that Victorian comfort could be tasteful.

Clara Barton was 71 when the house was built. Her great battles were over. Her innate shyness had been vanquished. She had trailblazed in the formation of public schools. She had worked in the Patent Office in a day when G-girls were considered unladylike eccentrics. She had aroused the Nation's conscience to the shocking medical conditions prevalent behind the Union lines in the Civil War. She had founded the Red Cross and mobilized its resources for disaster relief.

Her generosity was not unreciprocated. The culture-diffusing Chautauqua Assembly donated land for a house. Victims of the Johnstown flood even sent wood for construction. Her friend and adviser, Dr. Julian Hubbell, designed its unique floor plan.

Now Clara Barton could sit back and watch the sun set behind the beautiful hills that ran down to touch the Potomac River.

Born on Christmas Day, 1821, she died on Good Friday 1912. The institution she fostered thrives, and her house—the wonderful house of her later years—has been passed down in virtually perfect condition.

It may not continue that way.

The present occupants—four gentlewomen who admit to being over three score and ten—have placed the house on the auction block. Architecturally and historically, it has much to commend its preservation.

An organization called the Friends of Clara Barton has been formed to pursue that aim. It needs $45,000. The First National Bank of Poolesville, Md., will handle contributions for a committee that includes Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Judge Alfred Noyes, Representative JOEL T. BROYHILL and Representative CHARLES MATHIAS.

They wish to revere the memory of a woman with a great and good idea.

Gov. Donald S. Russell: "Our Economic System Is the Best in the World"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the system of free enterprise is the principal factor that has developed America into the greatest nation in the world.

We enjoy the highest standard of living known today. And if we are to continue to enjoy prosperity and cope with the multitude of challenges threatening us throughout the universe, America must retain its system of free enterprise.

The Honorable Donald S. Russell, Governor of South Carolina, a distinguished scholar, lawyer, and statesman, strongly espoused our economic system during a speech June 1 to the corps of cadets at the Citadel, the military college of South Carolina.

Addressing the graduating class of future American leaders, Governor Russell spoke out bold and clear. In an era when our capitalistic system is smeared and attacked viciously by the Communist element, his words are heartening for all patriotic Americans to hear.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert his speech for the information of the Congress:

REMARKS OF GOV. DONALD S. RUSSELL

As I return once again to the campus of the Citadel, I ame reminded anew of the strength of America and her heritage. Here before me I see strong and able young men from South Carolina and throughout the nation marking a milestone in their lives. Their families join them on this joyous occasion, and I deem it a privilege and an honor to be a part of this commencement exercise.

Under the able leadership of General Clark, South Carolina's military college has established a reputation throughout the Nation, a reputation which upholds in the finest fashion the historic traditions of the Citadel.

This college has from its inception displayed to both State and Nation the attributes of sound scholarship, character-building discipline, and moral leadership. Maj. Saint James Cummings, professor of English literature and history, described the college in 1889 in terms that are still appropriate today:

"The elevated moral tone of the academy is most manifest; and it is noteworthy in view of the fact that the growth of the religious spirit of the corps of cadets is in keeping with the growth of the institution in other particulars. There is a quiet earnestness of manly and noble purpose, which is felt to be the mark of student life at this place. This is in very great part due to the happy influences which have been set to work by the present superintendent, and it has already established a precedent of high-minded conduct from which it will be the ambition of the school never to retrograde."

It is such an institution, described movingly by Major Cummings in 1889 and led ably in that tradition today by General Clark, that has prepared these graduates for the age which they inherit, with its problems, opportunities and challenges.

And ours is, as everyone knows, an era of challenge, of challenge especially to our American way of life. What you who today move from the study hall into the responsibilities of life need to realize, in a very real way is that the challenge to our American system is a rising, not a receding tide. When our country came into being as a free Nation, the challenge to its position and ways of living was from the decaying institution of absolute monarchy. Now the challenge is from something new, something fired by ruthless zeal, something that has within a few years swept across half the face of the earth and has engulfed over 800 million people.

The conflict presented by this challenge is more than a political conflict. It is between two systems that cover the whole range of living—political, economic, social, and spiritual. Ours is the system of freedom. The challenge comes from a system which blights all freedoms, religious with the others, and which, as Sir Winston Churchill has phrased it, "rots the soul." It dominates even the family relationships, requiring that they be subordinated to the authoritarian state. It represents, if one may paraphrase the poet, the closed mind, the starved eye, the empty heart, and the brutal fist.

To us communism and all its ways strike fear into our hearts. We cannot praise even the professed high priorities it gives to teaching, to the professions and the sciences, because of the purpose of those professed priorities, which is not to make all men free, but to make a few men strong and dictatorial all over the world.

But the crusading Communist has a significant source of strength; he believes unquestioningly in his system. He is, alas, a dedicated man—dedicated to the destruction of our system, not merely because he hates it, but because he believes in his own. He thinks he is right. That's what makes him so dangerous. He talks his system. He expounds it without ceasing. He never has known freedom, but has been taught that it is his enemy. Despite what, to us, are loathsome qualities of communism—effacement of the individual, materialism, glorification of the lie as a means to its ends, scorn of spiritual values—the zealous Communist clothes his system in appealing words, presenting it confidently as tomorrow's way to satisfy the needs and desires of all men.

To those of us who have known freedom, to those of us who esteem spiritual values above the material, all of this is appalling. We know communism for the frightful delusion that it is. We detest it for its complete indifference to individuality and the soul of man. We are against communism and all its evil brood. About this we are clear.

But—and this is the burden of my remarks—we are not positive enough about our own convictions, about our own system of society, and about its superiority as a way of life. Certainly, we are not outspoken enough in our devotion to that system. And we will not successfully challenge communism, either among ourselves or with people in uncommitted countries, if we fail both to express and to practice our faith in our own system. That is fundamental. In short, we must be as much concerned with what we think and believe and do as we are about what we don't think and don't believe and don't do.

Generally throughout the 19th century and well into the 20th, we Americans were the zealous people of the world. All Americans, whether ministers, doctors, teachers, salesmen, sailormen, tourists or whoever, were missionaries, talking up the American story and supremely confident of its future. Humorists made many jokes about aggressively friendly Americans abroad, and I recall a characterization of America by an amused British visitor who said he found us epitomized by two words printed on all hotel and office doors. One of these words was "push." The other was "pull."

But our fathers and grandfathers got our story across; and they did it because they believed it. They drew millions of immigrants to our shores, people who thirsted for what they knew as American. Even to those who did not come, we gave new inspiration and new faith. Americans were the prophets of a new world of freedom.

We are as patriotic today as ever. The heroic fighting of our young men in three wars of this century proves that—if proof be needed. But with some degree of national maturity there has come also, some disposition to relax, to forget what has made our Nation great and what has given our people greater opportunities.

In an interview not too long ago, Charles Malik, the then Foreign Minister of Lebanon and a longtime visitor to America—one of the most discerning statesmen of the free world—phrased this point bluntly and with force. Speaking to Americans, he said:

"You have in your own traditions certain invaluable beliefs about man and society and history and human nature and the nature of God—beliefs that you should not be ashamed of, that you should feel free to export and to teach others. But first you must rediscover them yourselves and believe in them profoundly. My deepest fear—if you want it put bluntly to you—is that you don't know the infinite values that you have at the basis of your own civilization and you don't believe in them enough to put them strongly to the rest of the world."

Our hesitancy—and I am speaking in general terms—to declare our faith in our system is most evident in the economic field. In the political area, we declare our inflexible faith in democracy and freedom. We talk sententiously about liberty. We are a religious people, committed to the religious idea of the sanctity of the individual. But we hesitate to use—we stutter over—that word generally used to describe our economic life, "capitalism."

There have been false steps along the road of capitalism just as there have been along the road of political democracy or of religious liberty. But these temporary outcroppings must not obscure for us the inherent and transcendent virtues both of our political and our economic systems. No human creation is perfect, and that is so because we as individuals are not perfect. But we must not permit temporary faults to blind us to the overriding virtues of our political, religious, and economic virtues. Especially must we concern ourselves less with the confession of sin and far more with professions of faith and confidence in the paramount virtue of our system. We need to apologize less and to proclaim more.

It must be conceded that the word capitalism is an inapt term. We are engaged in selling something and something of infinite value to the freedom of the world and to our own future. We should not handicap our system with a descriptive word that lacks the power to attract and to proselyte. Especially is that true when the phrase that provokes the favorable reaction expresses better the philosophy of our economics. Free enterprise is an integral part of our society; it is the accurate expression of our economic life.

What does "free private enterprise" connote?

It means simply individual freedom expressed in the economic field. It means extending the liberty of the political area to the economic area. Stated somewhat differently but equally accurately, it may be truly said that one cannot have actual political freedom without economic freedom. The two freedoms are equally essential ingredients of a free society. Let us cease, therefore, to make some distinctions between political freedom and economic free enterprise. There can be no distinction; one is contingent upon the other. They are parts of a common tradition of individual liberty. They are cooperating architects of our culture and civilization.

We need especially to keep constantly in mind that free private enterprise is not the special possession of the so-called capitalist or entrepreneur. It serves the rights and promotes equally the opportunities of capital and labor, of rich and poor. Economic freedom is indivisible among all peoples and all classes. The economic freedom of the capitalist is the economic freedom of the worker.

Without free private enterprise, there cannot be free labor. Russia should be a disturbing example of what state capitalism means to the workingman and his rights. The Communist worker has no right to bargain freely. He cannot organize to promote his own welfare. His employer is the state. His right of organization is limited to doing what his employer tells him to do. As such, he will always be subordinate to state capitalism, or socialism, whichever name you prefer.

It needs, accordingly, to be repeated over and over again that free private enterprise is the true refuge of the working man and that, without it, labor can never be free. Also it needs to be repeated over and over again that our American system of free enterprise is today giving the worker more money, more leisure, more security, better health protection, pleasanter working conditions, and more generous retirement privileges than socialism ever dared to promise him.

Free enterprise proves its case by its fruits. It is no coincidence that the United States has the highest standard of living of any nation in the world. Ours has been described as the affluent society in which over-eating rather than poverty is the scourge of human life. As Professor Gailbraith, in his book. "The Affluent Society," puts it, "More die in the United States of too much food than of too little." Truly, ours is the abundant life, abundant in material comforts, abundant in culture and, above all, abundant in freedom. That is the inevitable product of free enterprise.

It is equally no coincidence that western civilization, with its human freedoms, has flourished under free private enterprise. For one thing, that is true, because, under free enterprise, production is ruled by the individual consumer, exercising his own freedom of selection, rather than by the ukase of a State bureaucracy. You and I, by our choice as the consumer, determine what will be produced profitably and what will not. No bureaucrat, however wise he may be in his own sufficiency, can make that determination. Accordingly, our society is responsive to what you and I want. We are the masters. We create our own society. Pitchfork Ben Tillman, a great character and colorful former U.S. Senator from this State, tried to give his audience some idea of the comprehensiveness of American freedom by declaring that "Every man in this country is free even to go to hell—if he wants to." We may add, parenthetically, that it would appear that many people are taking advantage of this freedom.

The economic rebirth of Western Germany and Japan attest the resiliency of free enterprise. This prompts the thought: If we expended a little more effort in selling free enterprise to India and Indonesia and other countries of the same grouping and a little less in giving them dollars to fritter away, we would probably contribute far more to their economic growth.

It may be suggested that Russia, under communism, has shown that statism can meet economically the West on equal terms. In support of this, many statistics may be marshaled. It should be remembered that all the mass of figures in support of the great industrial strides of the Soviets are issued by the Russian Government itself; they are self-serving and must be viewed with suspicion. Moreover, they deal with an economy at a much lower level than our own and thus one in which percentages of increase may often be most misleading, as Professor Nutter of the University of Virginia has so convincingly demonstrated in a number of recent studies. But even the Soviet figures, if taken at full value, demonstrate that Russian production increases are in areas of government interest and direction. They fit into a pattern of statism. In the field of consumer goods, in the area of providing a higher standard of living, in yielding to the individual demands of the people themselves, Russia offers a standard of living lower than that of even several of its satellites in Eastern Europe.

Our own high standard of living flows from this system of free enterprise, where the economy is controlled by the individual consumer and not by arrogant bureaucracy. It is the product of a society which is dependent upon individual initiative and judgment. The manufacturer cannot determine either himself or from governmental direction what he should produce. He must anticipate—and anticipate at his peril—what the individual consumer in our society will want.

Self-reliance, initiative, and innovation thus become an integral part of our economic society. All of this contributes to a progressive stream of growth and expansion and of an improving standard of living. It meets that test of good government as stated by Goethe, who, after asking, "What government is the best?" answered, "That which teaches us to govern ourselves." It produces a climate that can never exist under statism, when the government chooses what the manufacturer can produce and limits what the consumer can buy. There the choice is the government's and not the individual's. This assumption of supreme responsibility by government over the individual and his wants atrophies individual initiative. It creates blind and supine submissiveness that is hostile to progress.

Some modern economists criticize all this freedom and right of individual choice because they contend that "Madison Avenue" misleads and diverts our consumer demands. Perhaps there is some merit in this. But it overlooks that this is a small price to pay for the liberty that is ours. If we are to have freedom, it must include the right occasionally to be a fool. And especially is this true when our foolishness doesn't hurt anyone else.

This story—one of which I am sure, though I cannot vouchsafe it—illustrates the corrosive and degenerative effect of the failure of the individual to act on his own initiative—even if he act stupidly on occasions. An aged refugee sought asylum from communism among us. After a few years he asked to be sent back. His reason was unusual. He had been so habituated to the state making all choices for him that he could not adjust to a free society where he had not only the right, but also the responsibility, to make the choices.

No society can be truly great where its people do not have both the privilege and the responsibility of freedom—political and economic. From that common freedom will be woven the strength of a people. And only free private enterprise offers the opportunity for such freedom. Let us proclaim free enterprise as a basic part of our heritage and our faith, and let's be enthusiastic about it.

I trust that this may be your earnest conviction as you leave the beloved walls of this great institution.

Deplorable Incidents of Violence and Hate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OMAR BURLESON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, as a nation which came into being for the sake of freedom, liberty and justice, it is sad and deplorable that certain incidents of violence and hate must occur among our people.

These actions to which I refer are the very antithesis of the fundamentals and tenets of our society.

Our history has been marked by a few internal conflicts, the most notable, of course, being the War Between the States, but our modern country is not composed of a violent people. Guided by ideals and temperament, we are not a belligerent people, have never coveted anyone's territory or have attempted to impose our will upon other peoples. I think this is probably inherent in our character for the reason that we have been busy in developing our potentials. Our forefathers conquered a primeval forest, discovered our great natural resources and developed them. Actually, during our history we have been an impatient people which accounts for our high standard of living under a free enterprise system which is another way of saying under liberty and freedom of opportunity.

While our interest has lately been centered on the racial conflicts prevalent in several parts of our country less attention has been given to depredations by a few misled bigots who seemingly have little concept or respect for these principles which have made us the great people and the great nation we are.

In northern Virginia; in Huntington, Long Island, N.Y.; in Boonsboro, Md.; and in some other places, there have recently occurred acts of violence against Jewish synagogues by groups of hoodlums calling themselves Nazis, but who, from all accounts, probably could be better described as frustrated youths who have an overdose of egotism to the point of being psychopathic.

Just why this conduct by a comparatively few of this kind should assert itself at this particular time is difficult to analyze, but nevertheless, it is occurring. Evidently they love the publicity of their deplorable acts.

Our Nation in these times needs the moral strength which its people can muster to adequately lead free nations of the world against enemies who have vowed to destroy us. Nothing could please our adversaries more than to witness these actions and other tumultuous occurrences which they can exploit. All acts of violence among our people, wherever and whoever they may be, can prove to the world that we are not yet grown up and that we are incapable of keeping our own Nation in order, while at the same time, we occupy the position of world leadership which we did not seek, but which has been thrust upon us.

Mr. Speaker, as an example of some of the depredations to which I refer, I include with these remarks certain newspaper clippings describing several incidents which, I repeat, it is sad indeed they should occur any place in our country:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Mar. 1, 1963]

Swastika Hate Posters Appear in Arlington

Four swastika stickers bearing hate legends were found yesterday pasted to walls of the Arlington-Fairfax Jewish Community Center, 2920 Arlington Boulevard, Arlington police reported.

Joseph T. Kuney, president of the center, notified police about the stickers. Police said they were investigating.

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 1, 1963]

Boonsboro School Bars 11 for Nazi-Style Uniforms

Boonsboro, Md.—Eleven boys who wore clothing similar to Nazi uniforms to Boonsboro High School have been barred from classes until the fad ends.

The school principal, Dr. J. Willard Newton, said the 11 had worn the black shirts and trousers to school Tuesday. He said they wore the clothing again Wednesday despite his order not to do so, and he then barred them from class.

Yesterday he suspended one of the boys for 1 week. He said the others would be permitted back in class after their parents had talked with him and agreed to discontinuance of the practice.

He said the boys had used the Nazi salute but there had been no other Nazi-like action.

[From the Northern Virginia Sun, Jan. 10, 1963]

Nazi Authors Book Hailing Adolph Hitler

Arlington.—George Lincoln Rockwell, self-styled leader of the American Nazi Party, has written a book entitled, "This Time the World."

Dedicated to Adolph Hitler, Nazi Germany's World War II dictator, the book was published by Parliament House of New York.

The book, written by the Nazi leader who lives in Arlington, was not available at the county library or bookstores here today.

To Hitler, Rockwell opens his dedication by writing:

"Like spiritual giants before you—you were cursed and driven to death by spiritual pygmies for daring to stand up for a new and vital truth."

Rockwell also "gratefully acknowledges the inspiration" he received in his political career from Sen. Joseph McCarthy, Gen. Charles Lindbergh and Gen. Douglas MacArthur, pointing out that "no implication is here intended that these men are or were members of the American Nazi Party."

Long Island Youths Seized in Firing on Home With Machinegun

Huntington, Long Island., May 13.—Four teenagers were arrested here last night on charges of firing machinegun bullets at Huntington High School and into the home of a schoolteacher. No one was hurt in the shootings.

In the home of one of the youths, the police found a wide array of Nazi paraphernalia, including an 8-by-10-foot Nazi flag, a Gestapo uniform, and anti-Semitic literature. The police also found the machinegun, a bayonet, and ammunition.

The alleged leader of the group, John E. Collins, Jr., 18 years old, of 35 Thea Lane, told the police he was a member of George Lincoln Rockwell's American Nazi Party.

The other members of the group were identified as Richard Hohenrath, 18, of 23 Harriet Lane; Stephen Cook, 17, of 1206 Washington Drive; and Edmund Kennedy, 18, of 10 Bay Avenue, all of Huntington.

The police said the shootings occurred Friday night after the boys had been drinking. The first blast was fired at the home of Mrs. Elizabeth Cubley, of 74 Fairmount Street, Huntington Station. Mrs. Cubley had recently sent home notes about the classroom conduct of the boys.

From there, the police said, the youths drove to Huntington High School and fired at the vacant office of Robert Cushman, the principal.

The machinegun, of Italian make, was purchased several weeks ago by Collins at an antique gun sale. The muzzle of the gun, which had been sealed with lead, was cut off to make the weapon serviceable.

The youths were held without bail for a hearing on May 15.

Financial Plight of 4,000 School Districts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently Mr. Joe McCaffrey, a news analyst for WMAL-TV in Washington, pointed out the financial plight of 4,000 school districts across the Nation as a result of action taken by the House Education Subcommittee.

The subcommittee action cuts off all Federal aid to public schools which are still segregated as of a year from June, 1963.

Mr. McCaffrey is to be highly commended for calling this matter to the attention of all of us; and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that his commentary be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that all Members of Congress might also have the benefit of this journalist's keen analysis of the situation.

There being no objection, the commentary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTARY BY JOSEPH MCCAFFREY, WMAL-TV, MAY 15, 1963

Birmingham has spilled over, as it was bound to, onto Capitol Hill. The conflict in the Alabama city, which is now being mirrored in other cities around the country, North and South, can be seen under the surface in many of the issues facing Congress.

But it was well above the surface today when a House Education Subcommittee voted to cut off all Federal aid to public schools which are still segregated as of a year from next month.

This Federal aid to education, which is masked under the title of aid to impacted areas, is an important contribution to elementary and secondary education in this country.

Strangely enough although it is Federal aid to education, regardless of what it is called, it receives some of its strongest support from Members of Congress who claim Federal aid to education would prevent and destroy local control of education. Yet, under this program, $350 million is poured out to school districts in the 50 States, about 4,000 school districts in all.

There has never been any Federal control resulting from this Federal spending program. That is, there has never been any Federal control until now.

For the action of the subcommittee today is an effort to control the Federal expenditures so they will not be used in school districts which continue to defy the 1954 Supreme Court school ruling. It is expected this subcommittee action will be approved by the full committee with not more than 12 votes being cast against it.

The amendment agreed to today provides that all segregated school districts file a desegregation plan with the U.S. Office of Education by the 30th of next month in order to receive any funds for the school year beginning this September.

And the districts must have the plan in actual operation by June 1964 in order to continue in the program. This amendment will certainly face a Senate filibuster and, in the resulting fight over it, the impacted areas aid program may be killed.

What affect the death of this program would have on education can be seen by looking to nearby Maryland and Virginia where school districts receive a good share of their revenue from the Federal Government. An end to the program would mean a complete reevaluation of public school financing, not only here but in 4,000 school districts across the Nation.

Control of American Medical Association Over Organized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, some of us in Congress have complained for a long time about the authoritarian control the American Medical Association exercises over organized medicine. We have put forth the belief that the AMA through various coercive measures has effectively stifled the opinions of physicians who may disagree with official AMA policies. In so doing, the AMA has done a grave disservice to the profession it supposedly represents and the public it supposedly serves.

Happily there are distinguished physicians who have the courage and sense of responsibility to speak out against this undue regimentation. An excellent speech by a noted physician has recently come to my attention and I feel it would prove enlightening to my fellow Members of Congress.

The speaker is Dr. Russell V. Lee, founder and head of the famous Palo Alto Medical Clinic. At a meeting of the clinic March 30, Dr. Lee pointed up some of the responsibilities a physician has to the community he serves. It is refreshing to see this approach taken, because too often of late we have been hearing of what the community owes its doctors.

Dr. Lee has the courage to face a number of controversial issues squarely. He does not mince words stating his observation that a "preoccupation with political and with economic considerations seems to have replaced—the physician's—dedication to the good of all."

Nor does Dr. Lee mince words in calling on the medical profession to "accept what the rest of society accepts—the concept that access to medical services of high quality at a price he can pay is the right of every man in our modern society."

I am sure Dr. Lee's comments on the AMA will be of particular interest to many Senators and Representatives. He finds that "In the councils of the AMA one seldom if ever sees a great medical educator; medical researchers are very rare; even eminent practitioners are poorly represented."

Dr. Lee clearly feels the current composition of the AMA should be changed in the interest of the medical profession and the public. He calls for an urgent reorganization and he places responsibility for the job on the physicians of this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Lee's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PHYSICIAN'S RESPONSIBILITY TO THE COMMUNITY

(By Russell V. Lee, M.D.)

After salvation, and I suspect for many before salvation, the boon most desired by sane men is health. Health is that state which by providing freedom from pain, disability, and premature death makes possible the fullest expression of the physical, emotional, and mental functions of mankind. It is of prime importance to the strength of any nation. All should contribute to this desirable state, but the physician can and should contribute more than any other to the attainment and maintenance of health for all men. This, in essence, is his responsibility to the community.

He has done much in the past to discharge this responsibility, particularly in view of the limitations imposed by lack of knowledge. Instances of wholehearted devotion to the general welfare at great personal sacrifice are many in the annals of the medical profession. But sadly, and paradoxically, as his competence has increased his zeal seems to have diminished. Preoccupation with political and with economic considerations seems to have replaced dedication to the good of all.

The present situation is a challenge to us all, because now, for the first time in the long agonized history of the human race, the means exist, if we but have the wit to use them, to bring a medical utopia to mankind. And the chances of attaining this happy state are better in the United States than anywhere in the world. What is meant by a medical utopia? It means a situation wherein the active and planned promotion of health is an accepted policy of government, in which all methods for the prevention of disease are fully utilized; wherein there are enough physicians and paramedical personnel, properly trained, to give the sick all the care they need; wherein adequate facilities exist to make this care possible; and above all a state in which all these benefits are accessible to all the people. The physician, more than any other man, can bring this about. This truly is our responsibility. Let us examine, point by point, the ways in which we can discharge this responsibility.

In a complete health program to which the physician should contribute, there are seven elements. These are (1) promotion of health; (2) prevention of disease; (3) diagnosis and treatment of disease; (4) rehabilitation of the ill and disabled; (5) medical and health education; (6) research; (7) organization of health services.

I. PROMOTION OF HEALTH

There is much justification for the claim that the remarkable progress in health in the past century is due as much to the tremendous improvement in our conditions of living—housing, nutrition, education, etc.—as to the dramatic medical discoveries. It is certain that a trend for the better in many disease entities long preceded these great medical advances and can only be ascribed to improvement in our standard of living and our sophistication. All citizens and all officials share in responsibility for those measures which promote health. This is not always the case. There is widespread lack of comprehension among physicians themselves of even the meaning and the implication of the term "promotion of health." Understandably, there is a tendency to claim credit for medical advances as being due to advances in the art of medicine when they are due to improved conditions of living. And unfortunately, due largely to bad leadership, the physicians have been frequently jockeyed into a position of opposing measures designed to improve the general welfare, and hence the health of the people, on the grounds that these measures are socialistic. The Social Security System which has contributed immensely to the peace of mind and the standards of living of older people has not had the support of organized medicine. Quite the opposite. It does not even let its own members vote on their personal acceptance. Organized medicine is not conspicuous in other vital aspects of the promotion of health—cigarette smoking, alcoholism, air pollution, urban crowding, dietary deficiencies, eradication of venereal disease are areas in which we should play an active part in the promotion of health. And in the most important of all—the prevention of atomic war on which the health and even the survival of us all depend—we find more doctors conspicuously vocal supporters of the rightwing war whoopers and Birchers than in the ranks of the followers of the Prince of Peace. The promotion of health, to be sure, is everyone's business but the physician should be in the van and not in the rear.

II. PREVENTION OF DISEASE

The prevention of disease is the most creditable achievement of the human race in the past 200 years. One by one the great plagues which devastated and terrified mankind have been vanquished. It is a noble and exciting story. No one dissents from the aphorism that it is far better never to have acquired the disease than to be cured if the catastrophe occurs. While in terms of relief of human misery we get 100 times as much return from each dollar spent in public health as we do from each dollar spent in diagnosis and treatment, we still spend 100 times as much on medical services as we do on preventive medicine. We, the physicians, must bear great responsibility in this field. We have made the practice of medicine so attractive and so lucrative that only dedicated men go into public health. There are thousands of unfilled places in the preventive medical field. It is quite accepted that the primary responsibility for preventive measures is vested in Government (why are not water and food and drug control socialized medicine?), but it is the responsibility of the physician to give such measures full support. Physicians in general have done this even to their personal disadvantage. There is a heartening change in their attitude toward widespread immunization campaigns instituted by public health agencies. A few years ago there was pretty violent opposition to such procedures on the part of physicians. The KO of polio is an example of just the opposite—cordial and intelligent cooperation. But we as doctors should upgrade the field of public health and insist that physicians in this field be as well paid as we are. The U.S. Public Health Service loses many of its good, well-trained young men to higher paid positions.

We have a more direct responsibility in the field of personal preventive medicine—hygiene, immunization, dietary controls, etc. The pediatricians have done nobly in this field and have wiped out most of the epidemic diseases of childhood. In fact, most of our vaunted improvement in health statistics is due to the success of their efforts. And as a reward the pediatrician is the most poorly paid of all specialists. The rest of us, on an individual and on an organized basis, have failed to meet this responsibility in many, many ways. At all levels preventive medicine needs much more personal and financial support from the practicing physician.

III. DIAGNOSIS AND TREATMENT OF DISEASE.

This is the chief responsibility of the practicing physician. Furthermore, I affirm—and this may surprise some who have made judgments about me—that the Government should largely get out of this field and leave it almost exclusively to the private physician. There are some services, such as to the military, that must still be rendered by governmental agencies and personnel. But while the Government should and must see that such services can be made available and can be paid for, it should get out of the business of rendering the services directly. Yes, this means the Veterans' Administration medical services, the care of the mentally ill, and the care of the indigent. The financial means should be provided by government and the services by private physicians, particularly by groups of private individuals.

The acceptance of this principle—that the rendering of services be left to the private physician while their financing is guaranteed by Government—imposes great responsibility upon the physician in the community. The responsibility is to insure that the services are of high quality and that honesty and integrity prevail in the rendering of the bill. Chiseling—dirty word—chiseling has been widespread in systems laudably planned and launched, wherein padding of accounts and rendering of unnecessary services are possible. Human nature and physicians' human nature being what they are, such systems must be designed in which there is a built-in deterrent to abuse. Such systems, fought—alas—by organized medicine, are the closed-panel, capitation-prepaid plans. The acceptance by physicians of systems under which they guarantee to provide all needed medical services to the beneficiaries on a capitation basis can obviate abuse. This is the true way to avoid Federal medical care.

Medical services—diagnosis and treatment—are now worth having and the demand for them has increased enormously. It is the responsibility of the physician to meet this demand, not only quantitatively but with high-quality services. We should accept what the rest of society accepts—the concept that access to medical services of high quality at a price he can pay is the right of every man in our modern society. Let us accept the responsibility of providing the services; let the individual, the employer, and the Government cooperate in providing payment for these services.

In the light of the shortage of physicians and in the presence of the great demand, it is the responsibility of the practicing physician to so organize the delivery of medical services as to make the most of our limited supplies of personnel and facilities. Group practice is one such organizational device that makes possible the best utilization of physicians and the best assurance of quality care by insuring that those who do the special procedures are especially qualified for the task. Hospital staffs as presently organized can be utilized to carry out group practice procedures when by prepayment plan intrastaff economic rivalry is eliminated.

In general the quality of the diagnostic and therapeutic care in this country is high—for those who have access to it. It is the physician's responsibility, one of the most direct and urgent of his responsibilities, to see to it that the quality of this care is of the highest possible order. More self-examination and more self-discipline, as well as more self-education, are called for. And while we concern ourselves with the quality of the care we furnish, we must also concern ourselves with its accessibility to all men.

But fundamentally, if we are to escape governmental medicine, we must accept responsibility for four things: (1) To see that enough services exist to satisfy the need; (2) to see that such services are accessible to those who need them; (3) to see that all classes receive services of the same high quality; and (4) to see that the means for payment for these services are in the reach of all.

IV. REHABILITATION

We have the responsibility to recognize that rehabilitation is a necessary sequel to almost all illness and disability and in many cases is the primary need. While recognizing that by the very nature of the problem—long-term treatment of those who have no income—government and private philanthropy must carry the financial burden, the practicing physician has the responsibility of assisting in the staffing of the various institutions, of recognizing the need in his own practice of recruiting and training workers in this field, and of giving financial support when this is needed.

The modern concept of rehabilitation is not understood and accepted by enough physicians. They should become aware of the fact that practically every patient who has been through a serious illness or accident needs some rehabilitation, and for many illnesses (such as strokes) it is almost the whole of therapy. The enormous number of those afflicted by mental illness need rehabilitation desperately and as of now are almost totally neglected by physicians. This, too, is part of our responsibility.

V. MEDICAL AND HEALTH EDUCATION

In the Hippocratic oath is this pledge: "To consider dear to me as my parents him who taught me this art, to live in common with him and if necessary to share my goods with him; to look upon his children as my own brothers, to teach them this art if they so desire without fee or written promise; to impart to my sons and the sons of the master who taught me and the disciples who have enrolled themselves and have agreed to the rules of the profession, but to these alone, the precepts and the instruction." We have done well and we have done badly in discharging the responsibility for training future physicians. Well—in regard to the quality of the training. The Flexner report (headed by a layman) put the diploma mills out of business and the quality of medical education is good. Badly—insofar as numbers are concerned, and badly in the paramedical fields in which there are great shortages. The record of organized medicine is not altogether inspiring. For many years certain farsighted people like Dr. Lowell Reed, lately president of Johns Hopkins, have been pleading for increased production of medical personnel and for governmental aid to medical education. They have had scant help from the American Medical Association. When I was on the President's Commission for the Health Needs of the Nation, I urged a great increase in the numbers of physicians. I was blistered in an all-day hearing before the National Health Council and told in an authoritarian way by the big brass in the AMA, "There is no shortage." Today 17 percent of the doctors starting practice in America are trained in foreign medical schools. It is shameful that this country, the richest in the world, parasitizes other countries for doctors. We should export thousands. The present proposals of the Government are farsighted and vitally necessary. They should have AMA support not sabotage.

The hypocrisy of the attitude of the AMA lobby in regard to aid to medical education should be brought to the attention of all physicians. Hardly a physician who has graduated in the past 30 years but has had most of the costs of his education paid for by the State or by philanthropy. In the face of the demonstrated shortage of applicants of high ability, in the face of the overwhelming evidence that financial considerations play the most important part in this shortage, the opposition of the AMA to the scholarship proposals for students and subsidies of the schools is simply complete nonsense. It is the responsibility of the physician to correct this deplorable attitude.

In the education of the public in health matters we have also a great responsibility and an important one. The best assurance any individual has of the attainment of health comes primarily from being well-informed. The more sophisticated in medical matters will know how to get good health care. A greatly increased program of public education in health matters is greatly needed. And not the Whitaker and Baxter curriculum either. That silly sentimental picture of the old frock-coated doctor at the child's bedside is a sample of health education at its worst. The radio, TV and public and private instruction by physicians should all be used. Such programs as the one in Birmingham, Doctors News Conference here, etc. are good examples of what can be done. Health education in the best sense is a responsibility of the physician in the community.

VI. RESEARCH

Research has made us what we are today. We, as physicians, profit the most by the work of the research man in the laboratory. Almost all I do today has been taught me by the research workers who as a class have received far; far less than I have of the world's goods. Our responsibility to support research in every possible way is very great indeed for it is based on common gratitude for favors received, on proper regard for the welfare of mankind, on the broadest humanitarian considerations and on expectations for our future. Money—yes—support the Government and private agencies. People—much more so—let us attract more and more people into research; let us follow the example of our fathers and do research ourselves; let us keep on the lookout for bright young people and put them into this field.

We should not overlook the obligation and responsibility to do research ourselves. Most of the great early discoveries were made by the practicing physician, such as the circulation of the blood, aseptic surgery, anaesthesia, etc., and there is still great though all too often latent research genius in the active physician. Such institutions as the Palo Alto Medical Research Foundation, a facility at the disposal of the physicians in this area, should exist in every city and town of over 25,000 people. Let us have more "do-it-yourself" research. It is also a responsibility, and in the present avalanche of publications a very difficult one, to keep ourselves informed about the research going on. Much more adult education among physicians is needed.

Our responsibility in the research field is fourfold: (1) To encourage private and government support of medical research; (2) to help provide trained personnel capable of going into research; (3) to keep ourselves and the public informed as to the progress being made; (4) to do it ourselves.

VII. ORGANIZATION

The American genius for organization, so well demonstrated in industry, transportation, communication, and war, is conspicuously lacking in the field of health. The intense individualism of the physician and, indeed, the intensely personal nature of the practice of medicine mitigate against formal organized practice. But the immense complexity of modern medicine, the serious shortages of personnel, the increasing demands and the unmet needs require efficient organization if potential health benefits are to be achieved. It is time to take a more receptive attitude toward innovations in the methods of delivery of health services. The acceptance of the disciplines and restrictions of hospital staff practice indicate that the objective of a more rational health service organization can be achieved.

Group practice is one such innovation which, properly developed, can do much to improve the delivery of health services. The possibility of each man following his own specialty without economic penalty surely tends to higher quality of care. The delegation of all nonprofessional activity, such as business, taxes, etc., to others, leaves the physician free to see more patients and do more real medical work and helps the shortage problem. The utilization of paramedical personnel and the welding together of these with the doctor into a health team is a device that saves personnel. And the suitability of the group for comprehensive prepaid arrangements directly with its patients is not possible for the solo practitioner and is, after all, the best solution of the economic problem of payment for medical services. Hospital staffs, if they are willing to cooperate, can do many, indeed, almost all of these things. The organization of community health councils to which physicians and interested laymen belong, and which concern themselves with the health problems of the area, is another responsibility of the physician. Properly guided, these councils can solve many of the community problems and are fine buffers against State medicine. Most communities would welcome such health councils.

The organization of a regional approach to health problems can come out of such cooperation between physicians and health councils. Prepaid plans, on a regional basis, can follow and they would be far better than the "Blues" with their incentive to overutilization, and private insurance (for some strange reason the pet of organized medicine) which takes such a large bite from the premium.

In this company and before this audience, it requires considerable temerity to suggest that the reorganization of the American Medical Association is also a responsibility of the physician. But the facts are that this 100-year-old society, great and powerful as it is, has come far short of fulfilling its responsibility to the physicians and the people of this country. It is first in money spent in lobbying before the Congress of the United States; it is unequaled among professional and labor organizations in the control it exercises over its members (dissents are ridiculously few) but it seldom is on the side of the angels in fights for the betterment of conditions of living. A long list of good measures which it has opposed could be prepared. One thinks of the Alexander Brothers' song, "I heerd the crash on the highway but I never heerd nobody pray." It is certain that many physicians do not subscribe to the policies laid down in the board. But as the organization is presently set up they are never heard. In the councils of the AMA one seldom if ever sees a great medical educator; medical researchers are very rare; even eminent practitioners are poorly represented. The preponderance of representatives from small country towns on the board of trustees reminds one of the Georgia county court system. This is an urgent job of reorganization and a responsibility of the physician.

We have had the opportunity to see the medicine of Russia, the British Health Service, the semi-insurance plans of Scandanavia. We can do better, far better, than any of these. We can do this in the framework and under the unexcelled opportunities of free enterprise. There is no reason why we cannot evolve a system of medical services far better than any in the world today. This we must do or assuredly we will have state medicine thrust upon us as it has been on most of the world today.

SUMMARY

The profession of medicine is the most rewarding of any field of human activity. It imposes great responsibility to go with its great opportunities. Here in the United States we have the opportunity as no people ever had before to bring about something like a medical utopia. Let us look beyond our own selfish interests and particularly let us look beyond our sordid economic aspirations. The rewards of the physician are not expressed by yachts and expensive golf clubs. They are expressed in the hearts of men and in the heart of mankind. To know that some are happily alive that but for me might have been dead, to know that there is less pain and suffering, less anxiety and fear because of things I have done are rewards enough. We will meet our responsibilities only when we bring to all who need them all the benefits our predecessors and our brilliant research men have given us. It is no light responsibility.

Address of Hon. John J. Flynt, Jr., Law Day, University of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, when the senior students of the University of Georgia School of Law planned the annual Law Day exercises for this year, they selected for guest speaker one of the university's most distinguished graduates, Hon. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., a Member of the House of Representatives from the Fourth District of Georgia.

Outstanding Georgia lawyers, supreme court justices, judges of the court of appeals, trial court judges, political leaders, deans, faculty members, and honor students filled the 130-year-old historic and beautiful chapel to hear a profound address by our colleague. It is so noteworthy and significant that I set out its full text for the careful consideration by the House membership. I also wish to commend Law School Dean Alton Hosch and the student leaders of the school of law for affording this opportunity to the legal profession of Georgia.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., OF GEORGIA

Chairman Bloodworth, Senator Russell, Congressman Stephens, President Aderhold, Dean Hosch, ladies and gentlemen, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to participate in Law Day at the University of Georgia. For many years I have shared your interest and activity in developing Law Day into the outstanding annual event that it is.

This year you have honored me by asking me to speak on this occasion. It is particularly pleasant for me to return to this historic building, surrounded by many scenes which, for me, hold happy memories of more than a quarter century ago. This is the campus where I was first introduced to both the formal study of law and to formal college education. I owe a debt of gratitude to the University of Georgia and its environs which I can never adequately repay. I look forward to the enrollment of my older son and namesake in the student body of this university in the very near future.

Law Day is set aside as a day of national observance in the United States of America. It is the antithesis of the Communist May Day celebration which is celebrated throughout the Communist world. Law Day stands for a rule of right—not might and could accurately be described as a day dedicated to the dignity of man. May Day in the world behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains stands for tyranny, oppression and the elevation of the state over the individual.

The expressed purpose of Law Day is to impress upon the citizens of this country the great heritage of Anglo-American law, which protects our rights and freedoms. The solemn recognition and appreciation of our system of law is the perfect counterpart and antithesis of the Communist celebration of May Day, which is loudly celebrated throughout the Communist world with vast parades of troops and displays of armed might. A comparison of these two observances is the most vivid illustration of exactly why the theme for Law Day 1963, "Law: Rule of Right, Not Might," was selected.

In his proclamation designating Law Day 1963, President Kennedy recognizes the important part of our system of laws has played in the development of this country, when he quotes a former Justice of our Supreme Court as stating that: "The history of law is the history of the moral development of the races."

The word "law" has many meanings. We refer to laws of nature, laws of science, laws of economics, and laws of various other fields. In these instances we are confronted with certain facts so frequently or these facts are so inherent in human reasoning that we cannot conceive of any other alternatives, therefore, these facts are referred to as laws.

When we refer to the Golden Rule, we refer to a rule of morals or ethics that is the product of the development of civilization and we tend to regard it as a "law," but there is no compulsion behind the enforcement of ethical rules of conduct, except public opinion and our own conscience.

The word "law" as used in connection with Law Day has a meaning different from any of the aforementioned. When used in this sense we are referring to that set of rules of human conduct that are prescribed by a supreme governmental authority and enforced by the state through its courts. It can be said that "law" is the codified commonsense and good judgment of the ages. It must be that if a government under laws is to survive.

The theme of Law Day for 1963 is "Law; Rule of Right, Not Might." I think we find ourselves in accord that the United States of America would not have achieved its preeminent position of leadership among all nations of the world if this had not been the underlying principle of our system of jurisprudence in this country. We in America have been blessed by the principles of constitutional government and by the Anglo-American system of jurisprudence which has made this constitutional Government a reality.

It is probable that our Nation will survive for more than a millennium against all threats from external sources. Many historians, as well as many contemporary political scientists and philosophers, are of the firm belief that if America ever falls from its towering position of strength and leadership that it will be caused by weakness from within rather than from any external force.

Many believe that the greatest single threat toward the enduring strength and security of the United States of America is the noticeable trend toward absolutism.

As the main topic of my remarks today, I would like to discuss the theory of absolutism and the very real dangers which are inherent in it. Within the past year, the subject of absolutism has become a rather controversial one; and my purpose of discussing it today is not to add fuel to the controversy, but rather to warn of some of its dangers.

Let me emphasize that I do not question the motives, the patriotism, or the sincerity of those who advocate the principles of absolutism. They have a perfect right to those beliefs. I disagree with the theory of absolutism and with those who advocate it, but I believe that they are honest in their beliefs just as I assume that they attribute to me the honesty of my purpose.

The most dramatic way that I know to express this warning is by recalling your attention to the undisputed facts that the Caesars of Rome, the czars of Russia, Louis XIV and Bonaparte of France, and more recently Mussolini of Italy and Hitler of Germany were each, in their respective times, the foremost advocates of the theory of absolutism.

The devastation and destruction which each brought upon his respective country may not be attributable entirely to his adherence to absolutism, but it is at least a remarkable coincidence that each of these disciples of absolutism either totally or nearly destroyed his own country and his own people.

Several months ago, a colleague and I were discussing this very subject and we had slightly different ideas of the exact meaning. We turned to the lexicon to arbitrate our differences and while neither of us was exactly accurate, the dictionary defined absolutism as follows:

"The doctrine of that which is absolute, or without limitations; specifically, the doctrine or existence of unconditional power vested especially in an autocrat; despotism."

Secondary definitions were given, but I think that the foregoing expresses it best of all. Applied to the Government of the United States, the growing trend toward absolutism manifests itself in court decisions, in grants of power to the executive branch, and often times total disregard of prerogatives of State and local governments by administrative and executive officers of the Federal Government. With regard to the expressions of absolutism by the Court, you are aware that the decision in the school prayer case and its implication to all traces of religion in public activities is an example of what absolutism can lead to. I do not refer to this decision in an effort to be critical of the Court. I refer to it as an example of how far the trend toward absolutism has already gone.

In his first inaugural address, Thomas Jefferson invoked divine guidance for all our people describing them in his invocation as—

"Enlightened by a benign religion, professed, indeed, and practiced in various forms, yet all of the inculcating honesty, truth, temperance, gratitude, and the love of man; acknowledging and adoring an overruling providence, which by all its dispensations proves that it delights in the happiness of man here and his greater happiness hereafter—with all these blessings, what more is necessary to make us happy and a prosperous people?

"Still one thing more, fellow citizens—a wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities."

Following the theory of absolutism, the Court would strike down everything in the above quotation attributed to Thomas Jefferson.

Dean Erwin N. Griswold, of Harvard Law School, has forcefully expressed his concern about this trend. He, like myself, has been outspoken in his concern about the school prayer case and the application of the prohibitions contained in the first amendment against the States. To the best of my knowledge, prior to 1950, no one even claimed that the restraints laid down in the first five amendments restrained any echelon of government, except the Federal Government.

If the full circle of the trend of absolutism is completed, it will make hollow shells of every State capitol, county courthouse, and city hall in the United States. It will cause every subdivision of government to look to Washington for its solution to all problems. The solutions to most problems do not lie in Washington, but rather the solutions to most problems are close to the people—who are the only source of strength in this or any other country.

The Federal Government derives its strength from the strength of the 50 States and the people of the 50 States. It possesses no strength of its own—it can be no stronger than the source of its strength and power.

No President, however powerful and wise, can transmit his executive strength to the people over whom he presides. He can lead, yes. He can possess great wisdom and personal magnetism. But the strength of the government which he leads can only come from the broad base of the people.

Those who have authored every constitution of the State of Georgia surely had that in mind when, in their wisdom, they wrote article I, section I, paragraph I of our State's constitution which reads:

"ORIGIN AND FOUNDATION OF GOVERNMENT

"All government, of right, originates with the people, is founded upon their will only, and is instituted solely for the good of the whole. Public officers are the trustees and servants of the people, and, at all times, amenable to them."

Upon the belief that ultimate strength is derived from the people and that ultimate sovereignty resides there, our Government has grown from strength to greater strength. It would be tragic if we should deteriorate from strength to weakness because that belief should be changed.

Lest my views be misinterpreted, let me say forthrightly there are certain areas in which the power of the Federal Government must be absolute—among these are the conduct of foreign policy, maintenance of the Defense Establishment, regulations of interstate and foreign commerce, control of coinage and currency, and others clearly enumerated in our basic instrument of government.

When the Federal Government overreaches itself and extends its vast powers into subject matter which can best be done by the State, the counties, the cities, or by the people themselves, then the inevitable result is a deterioration of government in those areas which are exclusively Federal in their very nature.

Our Nation—its people—its Government may truly be the last great hope of earth. Surely the United States is the unquestioned leader of the nations of the free world. It could be that we are the main strength of Western civilization. I believe the best guarantee of a free world is a strong United States of America. An America, strong economically, militarily, industrially, and agriculturally, but most of all possessed of a people strong in purpose, character, and courage.

A strong America can be preserved by a proud and self-reliant people, with strong local governments at each level upon which a strong National Government and a strong Nation must surely rest.

If I have appeared overly critical of the theory of absolutism let me now make some positive and affirmative suggestions. Let me paint a confident and bright picture of the future.

Our people are both proud and self-reliant. Twice within 50 years ambitious rulers of foreign powers have started two world wars, in the belief that America had grown into lethargy and indifference and either could not or would not mobilize its resources in defense of America or America's allies. At a cost of millions of men and uncountable material resources each learned that the courage and strength of America is a very real thing.

The economic strength of the United States is still the strongest of any nation on earth. The private enterprise segment of the American economy is stronger than the private enterprise counterpart of any other country on earth. Research and development in the physical sciences, in the natural sciences, and in medicine bring more real progress in the United States each year than in the rest of the world combined. These advances we gladly share with all people on earth.

Based upon a belief in the accuracy of these statements, I think that the future of our Nation and our Government is brighter than it has ever been in its history. The horizons are unlimited—at least they are limited only by the willingness of the American people to make whatever effort and whatever sacrifice may be necessary to maintain the balance of power between the three coordinate branches of the Federal Government, and at the same time to maintain the balance of governmental powers between the Federal Government on the one hand and State and local governments on the other. Any problems of government capable of local determination including those of financing can best be handled at a local level by officials and administrators who know firsthand what the problem is and also know how to resolve it most quickly and most properly.

Most issues which concern us today are the same issues which have concerned all peoples of all nations since the beginning of recorded history. We have heretofore in this country found the right solutions in the hearts and minds of strong people.

A century ago our country faced some of the identical questions and I quote directly from a speech of the then President of the United States:

"You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting race and class hatreds.

"You cannot build character or courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence.

"You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."—A. Lincoln.

Each of these admonitions could well be followed by the leaders and the people of the United States today. To these I would add: both the hope and a prayer that this Nation will daily practice the theme of Law Day 1963: "Law: Rule of Right, Not Might." As we dedicate this Law Day 1963 to this theme, let us at the same time make it a day of thanksgiving to Almighty God for the blessings which he has given to this our land and our people. Let us make this a day of rededication to those things which have caused our Nation to grow to greatness and proudly reaffirm our faith in a supreme being—the Supreme Judge of the universe.

The "Truth in Lending" Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, in the June 4 issue of the American Banker, an editorial appearing stating the stand of the newspaper on the "Truth in Lending" bill. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGAINST THE DOUGLAS BILL

With increasing frequency, it has been called to our attention that an isolated observation, contained in a paragraph of one of our columnists' report of a lengthy interview with Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democratic, of Illinois, has been lifted out of context and offered as evidence that the American Banker has reversed its editorial stand against the "Truth in Lending" bill.

It has not.

We had not felt it necessary to comment on our opposition to the Douglas bill during the past few months, because we earlier had stated our opposition to it, and the reasons for that opposition, in full. But since the impression is being created that we have changed our position, it now becomes necessary to repeat our earlier statement.

We oppose the Douglas bill requiring the cost of credit to be expressed in terms of simple annual interest—as a percentage—as impractical, unworkable, and confusing. We note that the more than 40 States which have passed comparable "full disclosure" legislation have done so in terms of dollars and cents cost.

We also oppose the imposition of Federal standards in this field as an unnecessary encroachment of central government into the affairs of the States.

We are not in opposition to the principle of full disclosure. We are in opposition to the imposition of an awkward Federal scheme for it.

Brooklyn Navy Yard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle, of May 29, 1963:

BROOKLYN NAVY YARD

The Federal Government some years ago changed its name to the "New York Naval Shipyard in Brooklyn" but everybody, including those naval regulations say should "know better," continues calling it the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

Now the Yard is celebrating its 162d anniversary. The other day "Mr. Brooklyn" himself, Andrew S. Roscoe of the Equitable Savings and Loan Association, staged a luncheon and formal presentation in honor of that occasion.

For a time there was danger that the Federal Government might sharply curtail or even eliminate the Brooklyn Navy Yard. This would have been a disaster for Brooklyn, and we believe it would have been a terrible blow to shipping throughout this country. The Brooklyn Navy Yard is one of the most efficient, as well as the most famous, shipbuilding facilities in the world. Other governments throughout the free world realize this and are copying its methods with the permission of Government. The Yard, covering 291 acres, is worth about $1 billion. But more important, it is one of the most important industrial centers in the country, and by far the biggest in Brooklyn. Some 12,000 employees are on the payroll, which totals $85 million per year. Another 15,000 families make their living from companies which furnish supplies and materials to the shipyard. The Brooklyn Navy Yard, in fact, is one of the principal factors making up Brooklyn's vast seagoing industry, which provides 15 percent of the employment in this borough. The Brooklyn Navy Yard, like the Brooklyn Bridge, is so much a part of this borough that it was particularly fitting Monday to see "Mr. Brooklyn" in charge of the ceremonies honoring Rear Adm. Ernest C. Holtzworth, commander of the Yard, in the presence of our leading civic and political leaders.

But then, if we congratulated Andrew Roscoe every time he deserved it, there wouldn't be room for much else in this column.

If the Brooklyn Navy Yard is known all over the world as the "Can Do" construction and repair yard, the president of the Equitable Savings and Loan Association is certainly the "Can Do" civic leader.

Workmen still marvel over the Brooklyn Navy Yard's great engineering feat in World War II. Two destroyers, damaged by German torpedos, managed to reach the Yard. The Brooklyn Navy Yard engineers made one good ship of the two—"marrying" the U.S.S. *Menges* and the U.S.S. *Holder*. As Mr. Roscoe's brochure on the Navy Yard says, the merging of the two destroyers "is regarded as one of the most spectacular surgical repair jobs ever to be performed" on ships.

We greet the Brooklyn Navy Yard on its anniversary. Hail, too, to the famous ships built there—including the Battleship *Maine*, blown up while riding at anchor in Havana Harbor in 1898; the battleship *Missouri* on which the Japanese surrender was signed; the famous U.S.S. *Saratoga*, all 60,000 tons of it; the world's largest super-carrier in naval history—the *Franklin D. Roosevelt*, the *Independence*, and the *Constellation*.

These are proud chapters in the history of a proud borough Admiral Holtzworth and his 12,000 assistants deserve praise for a continuing good job in a climate of peace, patriotism, and understanding.

Cuba, All Over Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, an excellent analysis of our continued backing down and bungling of critical situations in our own hemisphere is spelled out in an editorial in the June 5 edition of Newsday. I am pleased to submit it for the RECORD:

CUBA, ALL OVER AGAIN

The United States has staged a humiliating backdown in Haiti. After suspension of contacts with the bloody Duvalier government—this in the hope that the dictator would be forced to flee—the administration has now ordered the resumption of "normal diplomatic business." Duvalier is thereby more firmly entrenched in office, and the hapless Haitians remain victims of his ruthless rule. It is another example of blundering on a par with our bipartisan handling of Cuba up to and including the abortive Bay of Pigs invasion. It makes us look ridiculous in the eyes of all Latin America, weakens the democratic neighboring government of

President Bosch in the Dominican Republic, and illustrates that we cannot keep our own hemispheric house in order.

The whole Haitian mess is thus compounded. From 1915 to 1934 we kept Marines in the country in an effort to restore order, encourage a viable economy, and lead the nation to an understanding of democracy. Successive U.S. administrations suffered then, as the present administration seems now to suffer, from the delusion that all was well. The minute the troops left, Haiti slumped back into chaos. This time our optimism was even less well founded. We dispatched a Navy-Marine task force to cruise off the coast as encouragement to Duvalier's enemies, secretly prepared for a landing of that force with the secret approval of three Latin American governments, exerted maximum diplomatic pressure, and then jumped to the conclusion that these acts would force Duvalier from office.

Properly enough we enlisted the Organization of American States in this project, but foolishly encouraged its members to believe that Duvalier would give up office and leave Haiti May 15, the end of his legal term of office. Since he did not, we have been made to look asinine to our Latin-American neighbors. No doubt the Russians, with their military forces still in Cuba, are chortling at this new ham-handedness.

The worst feature of that Haitian incident is the failure of our diplomatic and intelligence sources there to obtain accurate information or to assess correctly what information they gathered. It can be assumed that the CIA was active, as it was active in planning for the Bay of Pigs invasion. In both cases the conclusion was the same, and was false: that through pressure applied carefully, the peoples of Cuba and successively of Haiti would throw out their dictators.

This most recent series of blunders should alert the President to the crying need for more capable people to deal with Latin America, more sound sources of intelligence upon which to act, and advisers who know how to say "No" when the prospect is for failure. We would have done better to have stayed out of the Haitian imbroglio altogether.

The People Can End Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal. This short editorial explains exactly why it is so difficult to cut Federal spending and points to the way it can be done—if the people demand it and assume local responsibility instead of looking to Washington for handouts:

ON FEEDING AN OCTOPUS

In Doylestown, Pa., the other day, the borough council turned down the offer of a $500,000 Federal project to redevelop part of the community's business area. One resident, typifying the opposition, said that just because there were "one or two buildings that aren't pretty" it didn't mean that the "octopus of Federal aid" should be brought in.

At about the same time, in southern Indiana, farmers were giving a warm welcome to Agriculture Secretary Freeman, whose plan for stringent wheat controls they had helped bury under an avalanche of "no" votes. Greetings were friendly partly because Mr. Freeman has more than one string to his bow.

For instance, a farmer who said "just a little too much controls" were involved in the wheat plan is among those pressing for a substantial Agriculture Department grant for a dam project. Another who also voted against what he calls "regimented agriculture" heads his county's Rural Area Redevelopment Committee, one of Mr. Freeman's fast-growing projects.

So the octopus never gives up. And maybe it wouldn't be so fat if more people were like the Doylestowners who refused to feed it.

Pope John XXIII: Man of the Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the 6th of June is remembered in history as the day when thousands of Allied troops stormed the beaches of Normandy. Today, the 6th of June 1963, is a sad occasion for the world; John XXIII, the Pope of peace, will be laid to rest in the Basilica of St. Peter's. A day, remembered for an act of war, is now marked by the interment of a man of peace.

Guiseppe Angelo Roncalli was born in the small village of Sotte Il Monte in the midst of what he characterized as "serene poverty" and rose to become the "fisher of men," in the full significance of that ancient phrase.

On October 28, 1958, he appeared on the central balcony of St. Peter's Basilica, the new pope, assuming the leadership of the Roman Catholic Church under the name of John. The throng in the huge square of St. Peter's saluted the new pontiff, unaware that this kindly man, called John the good, would emerge as the "Man of the Century."

From the beginning of his reign, Pope John made innovations which energized the church in its mission of salvation. With the gentility of a benevolent prince and the loving heart of a kindly peasant, the Pope looked to other religious leaders of the world and extended a brotherly arm "Ut Unum Sint."

Pope John's greatness became apparent through three events—the calling of the Ecumenical Council and the Encyclicals "Mater et Magistra" and "Pacem in Terris." The spirit of brotherhood permeated his encyclicals, stressing the social nature of man and his dignity as an individual to be loved and saved regardless of station.

On another June 6th, in 1940, Pope John warned the world, "Everything serves to demonstrate that in the sense of true world peace there will be the gospel or we will return to bloodshed." Today, those words bear repeating as war continues to threaten mankind with annihilation.

As we recall the beaches of Normandy, long emptied to those infantrymen who gave their lives for freedom, we look to the chair of Peter, now emptied of that great heart which beat with love for all mankind. The holy father was truly, the spiritual father of all humanity. As his children, as he is laid to rest, it remains for us to work in his image and with his spirit—"Ut Unum Sint"—so we may be remembered as men of this century.

TVA After Three Decades

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, among the many tributes to the success of the Tennessee Valley Authority written and spoken in this 30th anniversary of its founding, the one in the Engineering News-Record is outstanding. It is the opinion of experts in engineering and long-range planning and is an objective report on what the TVA has accomplished for the people of 5 States and the Nation itself. To give my colleagues an opportunity to read this evaluation I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

TVA AFTER THREE DECADES

The Tennessee Valley Authority, created by act of Congress, May 18, 1933, received deserved praise on its 30th birthday from the President of the United States. Speaking at Muscle Shoals, Ala., near Wilson Dam and the nitrate-fertilizer plant of World War I vintage that were TVA's first physical assets, President Kennedy said TVA's accomplishments have given "the undecided and uncommitted peoples of the world an impression of growth and vitality and concern for human well-being which cannot be matched anywhere else in the world. In the minds of men the world over, the initials TVA stand for progress."

And the President was unquestionably right. This great river valley development is so widely known and revered abroad as to constitute one of our Nation's most useful assets. It enhances our reputation as planners, as engineers, builders, agricultural experts, and humanitarians. Even its public power aspect, which has had far from unanimous acclaim here at home, in nowise dims TVA's fame abroad where electric power development, distribution, and sale are more often than not in charge of some public agency.

TVA's reputation abroad, however, rests squarely on the fact that it transformed an entire river basin from a condition of mediocrity, well sprinkled with poverty, to a state of relative affluence based on industrialization and modernized agriculture. And this is just what so many of the "uncommitted and undecided" people in foreign lands are dreaming about and seeking means to achieve.

Here at home, and on its 30th birthday, TVA also deserves to be remembered and praised for its precedent-setting action in implementing for the first time the theory of comprehensive river development with multipurpose projects, and for carrying through this pioneer effort to so many notable results. Prior to TVA, only Hoover Dam could be pointed to as a multipurpose undertaking. But it was a single project on an otherwise undeveloped river. TVA, although stemming from what was aptly called in these pages "a confusion of diverging motives," nevertheless hewed to the line of multipurpose development of an entire river from its source to its mouth. This made it unique.

Navigation, water conservation, flood control, hydropower, were the initial TVA objectives, but with public health, agricultural improvement, industrialization and, in general, raised standards of living as the really ultimate goals. Such a pattern of objectives is now common practice in river valley planning, and TVA pointed the way.

In contrast it is not likely that TVA's organizational pattern will be repeated again in the United States; there are no more river basins in a comparable state of undevelopment and need to that of the Tennessee 30 years ago; there is no great economic depression (and hopefully will never be) to make available at one time the pool of high-order engineering talent that was recruited to man TVA; experience has shown that comprehensive river development can be carried out through cooperative actions by existing Government agencies and private enterprise; and there is no present incentive or public support for a "public power yardstick" to curb private power utilities as there was when TVA began operation. Nevertheless, TVA after three decades of planning and building and working for and with the people in its region is a fixture in the Tennessee Valley, and one with continually emerging plans for the decades ahead. It is deserving of the praise the President gave it, and more.

As a beacon to developing nations, as the instigator of comprehensive river development in the United States and as a monument to good engineering and construction executed with integrity, the TVA is indeed a national asset.

Private Industry in a Growing Colombia—Speech by John R. White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by John R. White, vice president and director, Standard Oil Co., New Jersey, to a meeting of the National Association of Industrialists of the country of Colombia. The speech was made in Cartagena, Colombia, and is entitled "Private Industry in a Growing Colombia."

I think it is a very important speech showing what American business is still trying to do, in cooperation with the Alliance for Progress, in trying to cut countries in South America free from the shackles of an antiquated economic life. I want to congratulate them for what they are doing.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATE INDUSTRY IN A GROWING COLOMBIA

(Address by John R. White)

The opportunity to be here this evening makes me doubly grateful. I never fail to find pleasure in visiting Colombia and renewing many old friendships here, and especially in coming to Cartagena with its historic beauty and its modern vitality. And I appreciate equally the privilege of meeting here with such distinguished leaders of the business and industrial community of Colombia.

Yesterday in this city we inaugurated a new plant, Amoniaco del Caribe—Amocar for short. Its products are ammonia and nitric acid—two chemical forms of nitrogen which are ingredients in the manufacture of nitrogen fertilizers. Not only for its operating company, International Petroleum (Colombia), Ltd., but also for the parent Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), which I represent, this plant is a significant new departure in the field of petrochemicals. We believe it will also be significant for Colombia's economic progress, and particularly for the growth of her agriculture, during this decade of her historic national effort as a member of the Alliance for Progress.

Let me now describe to you briefly the nature and purpose of this new venture.

One of the essential factors in a more productive agriculture is the efficient use of commercial fertilizers, including nitrogen fertilizers. For every peso spent on nitrogen fertilizer, a modern farmer often gains 5 pesos or more in the added value of his crops.

With the ever wider adoption of scientific farming methods, the annual consumption of nitrogen in commercial fertilizers in Colombia is increasing every year. It rose from 3,500 metric tons in 1950 to 20,000 metric tons in 1960. We estimate that it will continue to rise rapidly during the decade of the 1960's.

Hitherto all fertilizers have had to be imported into Colombia in finished or semifinished form. The annual cost in foreign exchange for this purpose is some US$15 million.

Therefore it is significant that in this year, 1963, Colombia can at last produce all her own nitrogen fertilizer requirements within the country, and from her own natural resources. The Jersey company is proud that its affiliate, Intercol, will play a key part in this new development in two ways—through its Amocar plant and through its one-third interest in Abonos Colombianos (Abocol), whose plant next door will turn Amocar's products into nitrogen fertilizers. The Amocar plant alone represents an investment of over US$13 million in new funds and equipment.

Let me add that we welcome our fellow pioneer in this field, the new ammonia plant of Industria Colombiana de Fertilizantes at Barrancabermeja. The market in the coming years will certainly afford enough room for both of us.

Amocar's products will serve first of all as the source of nitrogen feedstocks for the Abocol fertilizer plant, which will open very soon. I should like to pay a tribute to the Colombian investors and businessmen whose leadership has been essential to the formation of Abocol. This is an outstanding example of local private enterprise at work in Colombia.

We have purposely built Amocar bigger than necessary to meet the immediate needs of the Colombia market. (In fact, Amocar is as large and modern an ammonia plant as now exists anywhere in the world.) For the next 3 years if not longer, that part of Amocar's products not needed within Colombia will be exported to new fertilizer plants under construction in Central America and the Caribbean.

But the main reason for Amocar's size is the anticipated growth in the demand for nitrogen fertilizer here in Colombia. From 20,000 metric tons of commercial nitrogen used in Colombian agriculture in 1960, we estimate a sharp increase to about 75,000 tons by 1966 and possibly over 100,000 tons by 1968.

How can we sum up the advantage which Colombia's economy will derive from Amocar, and from the associated Abocol plant?

They will play a part in the growth of Colombian agriculture.

They also will help the foreign exchange picture. We estimate that Colombia's new, fertilizer industry, of which Amocar and Abocol will be a major part, will immediately improve Colombia's balance of payments by about US$9 million a year—and still more as the years go by.

The building of these plants has also stimulated the local economy. About 10 million pesos were spent in local procurement of materials. In the building of Amocar an average of 400 to 500 men were employed for 7 months.

Finally, these plants are backed by the full resources of Jersey's research affiliate in the United States, the Esso Research and Engineering Co., which is the largest research establishment anywhere in the petroleum industry. This means that both our manufacturing methods and our products here in Colombia will benefit from the continuous progress of Jersey's laboratories.

I believe it will interest you to know, in this connection, that the Amocar plant, and its neighbor, Abocol—as well as the related fertilizer plants in Costa Rica, El Salvador, and Aruba—constitute the first step in a major new program of fertilizer production on which Jersey and its affiliates are embarking at widely separated points around the world. Our affiliates already have definite plans to produce nitrogen fertilizers in Spain and the Philippines. We are also making studies for similar projects in several other areas.

The plants already built or planned in this program represent a total investment of about US$116 million. By our estimates, their combined capacity will move Jersey-affiliated companies from zero in 1962 to a capacity of 1,330,000 metric tons, with a value of more than US$100 million by the end of 1965.

Thus Jersey, which for many years has been a world leader in the petroleum industry, and whose existing products already have many uses in agriculture, will soon become one of the important producers of fertilizer in the world.

It is noteworthy that the plants I have mentioned are located not where agricultural productivity is already high, but in areas where more abundant food is required to meet the needs of expanding economies and fast-growing populations. In a decade when the American Republics, and the United Nations as well, have launched extraordinary efforts to raise living standards, we trust that our entrance into the fertilizer field on this considerable scale will not only be good business for us, but will take its place in the contribution of private industry to worldwide progress.

Now, it may occur to you to ask: Why did Jersey's first investment in the ammonia and fertilizer field come into being here in Colombia?

One could answer that question with another: Why have Jersey and its affiliates invested so heavily in Colombia over the past 40 years. For instance, beginning in 1951 we spent US$77 million and 11 disappointing years exploring for new oilfields in Colombia—until finally the new Provincia field began to produce last year. What caused us to take that long-term risk?

The answer to all these questions is the same. In Colombia we have found it possible to invest under conditions that meet the three basic tests of any sound international investment.

The first and most obvious test is that the investment should show a reasonable promise of yielding a profit to those who have risked their money as shareholders in our company. This need not in all cases be an immediate profit. Our company's financial resources enable us in some cases to make considerable investments in the expectation of future profit.

The second test is that our investment must benefit the country in which it is made. Through the payment of fair wages and of reasonable taxes, through the availability of our products on the local market, and in many other ways, we expect that our enterprises will serve the needs of the nation.

Finally, we insist that our investments should aid in the long-range development of the resources of the nation—not only its physical but its human resources.

Let me illustrate this last point from our experience in Colombia.

Consider first the teaching of new skills. In 1961, when Intercol turned over to Ecopetrol the operation of the refinery at Barrancabermeja, it was able to turn over at the same time a fully trained managerial, technical and labor force. Similarly, when Intercol built a refinery here in Çartagena, it also trained a technical and labor force from the bottom up to run that refinery. Virtually the entire Colombian staff of the Amocar plant received their training in that refinery.

As one result, today all but 51, or 2.5 percent, of the employees of our three affiliates in Columbia—Intercol, Esso Colombiana, and Andian—are Colombians. I emphasize this factor because the really creative element in an enterprise of this kind is not the visible part—the big and complex equipment—but rather the invisible part, the skills in the minds and hands of hundreds and thousands of people. More and more as the technical age advances, the human mind becomes our most precious resource, and development of human skills our most fruitful investment.

Further, we buy as much as possible of our supplies and equipment on the local market. In all their operations in Colombia our affiliates are purchasing each year in Colombia materials valued at about US$5 million.

Finally, we are aware that economic resources are not the only resources. We contribute to the education of young Colombians in fields unrelated to our business interests. We take a lively interest in the artistic and cultural life of Colombia. Esso Colombiana sponsors an annual literary prize which for the past 2 years has been offered for original Colombian novels. We made possible an exhibition of 3,000 years of Colombian art, from pre-Hispanic times to the present, which was shown last year in seven cities of Europe, with outstanding success.

Such is the philosophy underlying Jersey's many investments in Colombia. We do not consider ours to be a quixotic point of view. In fact it has been reciprocated by Colombia's historic policy of enlightened cooperation with progressive private enterprise. Our new investment here is proof of our belief that this Colombian policy will continue.

I have used the term "progressive private enterprise" advisedly. The search for profits—so long as it is combined with a sense of social responsibility—is one of the great progressive impulses of modern life. More than anything else it is the discipline of having to compete, and to return a profit to those who have risked their money in our business, that makes us efficient agents of economic progress.

I firmly believe that this same progressive private enterprise—both Colombian and international—will continue to provide an indispensable vital spark for the development of Colombia, a great and beautiful country, into a still greater and more prosperous future.

Building a Stairway to the Stars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on June 1 I had the pleasure of speaking before the Alumni of Concord College, at Athens, W. Va. In commenting on the important role the schoolteacher has come to play in our society, I pointed out that the success of our adventures in outer space depends on broadening our educational base.

Mr. President, I believe that in honoring the achievements of our astronauts, such as Major Cooper, we should reserve some additional praise for the colleges and teachers of our Nation who provide the basic academic training that makes our space flights possible.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

BUILDING A STAIRWAY TO THE STARS

(An Address by Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, of West Virginia)

It was the American poet-philosopher, Ralph Waldo Emerson, who said, "The true test of civilization is, not the census, nor the size of cities, nor the crops, but the kind of man that the country turns out."

If Emerson had lived in our day, perhaps he would have been moved to say, instead, the "kind of man that our colleges turn out." For our Nation is coming to depend more and more on the college graduate, not merely for leadership in our society, but also as a responsive citizen intelligently aware of the world we are living in and its myriad complicated problems.

There was a time when you young graduates here today would have been part of a small minority of college educated persons in our country. That is no longer true. The ranks of college graduates now number in the millions. This spring some 441,000 more will receive their sheepskins. By 1970 it is expected that some 7 million students will be attending college.

What do thees figures mean to you, to all of us? They mean that a college degree, by itself, is no longer a mark of special distinction. What counts now is what you have done with your 4 years of college, and what these 4 years have done for you, what kind of man or woman you have become, now that your long years of learning have come to an end—or at least to a pause.

The human being begins to learn something the moment he is born. His parents and his family are his first teachers, his nursery is his first classroom. But very soon these give way to the formal schoolroom, to the professional teacher. For 12 years he labors to master the basic knowledge of his society. In these 12 years he learns what it has taken the human race centuries upon centuries to learn.

Consider the enormous and confusing welter of facts that has accumulated in this time. Consider the task of a student trying to piece this information together for himself, without the aid of a teacher. A dozen lifetimes would not be sufficient for the task. That gives us some idea of the importance of the teacher and the college in our society. The more advanced and complicated our society becomes, the more important will be the role of the teacher in giving shape to the curricula of our colleges. We can see how truly creative the role of the teacher can be. Those who shape history are equally as important as those who make it.

In addition to the 12 years of basic learning, our educational system offers an additional 4 or more years to those students who are capable of going on. The college student has the opportunity to do more than absorb the knowledge of the past; he can equip himself to add to the store of human understanding; he can participate in the advancement of human society.

Ever since human beings found themselves on this earth, they have been faced with the necessity of learning or expiring. Animals adapt by growing heavy fur, long necks, sharp teeth, etc. It is a limited kind of adaptation. Human beings, on the other hand, adapt by extending, not our necks, but our intelligence. We have the power not only to alter our environment, but to change our conception of the world about us.

Education gives us the power to do both of these things. If it is our ambition to alter the face of the earth, to build bridges, erect skyscrapers, we can educate ourselves in that direction. If we want to divert rivers, fly over oceans, level mountains, we can educate ourselves to do that, too. We can learn to deal with things.

We can also learn to deal with ideas. We can learn to examine our beliefs, our concepts, our habits of thought, and we can realine them in such a way as to make for greater human happiness. That is one of the important roles of the teacher.

To survive in this world we need to be capable of earning a living. To be happy, we need to be able to deal successfully with thoughts, as well as things. We need to have healthy, sound, clear-cut beliefs about the world we live in, about our relations with other people, about our work, our community, our town, our Nation. Over the centuries of human history certain basic ideas have been found to be the building blocks of a healthy society. A sound education can build these ideas into our character, can provide us with a bulwark against adversity, a comfort for pain, an antidote for despair. An educated mind, to my way of thinking, is a cheerful mind, a mind that never loses sight of hope. No harm can come to a good man, in this world or the next, said the philosopher Socrates, who died in martyrdom as cheerfully as he had lived. A wealth of sturdy, sustaining ideas such as this is one of the bounties of a good education.

In this respect, it seems to me that the role of the teacher is an especially important one. We are continually improving our school buildings, our laboratories, our books, our technical facilities for teaching, but in the long run the crucial point in education is that point where student contacts teacher. Recent studies have shown us that such media as television, while they broaden the learning audience, are no match for the actual contact between teacher and student that is made in the classroom.

After all, the student is a human being, a living creature; he is not a mechanical robot into whom information is being fed automatically. His rate of learning, his grasp of new material, depends very largely on the kind of person who is presenting this material—on his teacher. If we are to have a better educated citizenry, we must first have teachers who are dedicated to, and inspired by, the historic task of enlarging human mentality.

This task has become especially important in our time, when our whole way of life is being affected by a technological revolution. The sum total of the technological revolution is that everything happens faster. We fly through the air with the speed of sound, we build automobiles in a mater of minutes, we solve incredibly complicated problems in fractions of a second.

To live, to survive in an environment where everything happens so fast requires a greater mental agility than ever before. Our world is becoming something like the instrument panel in the control cabin of a jet airplane. To anyone entering such a cabin for the first time, it seems incredible that the pilots can respond correctly and surely to so many different signals, involving such complicated mechanisms.

The answer, of course, is training—education. Our marvelous technological developments, our flights into outer space, have demonstrated that there is virtually no limit to the development of the human mind. Today the moon is within range, tomorrow the stars—after that, who knows? Human knowledge is a pyramid whose topmost point stretchest into infinity.

The moon will be reached in our time, although none of us here may make the flight. But I would be surprised if some of you here who are teachers had no share in making it possible. Scientists and engineers produce the rockets and the capsule that flies into space. But who develops the mind of the astronaut, and his co-workers? That is the job of the teacher, of education. That pyramid of knowledge I spoke of rests upon a base of solid, fundamental learning which makes all of our splendid achievements possible. Cut away that base, and the whole system will topple. The higher we are to soar, the broader that base must be. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the teacher is the Atlas on whose shoulder our world is carried.

There are some who worry about just how big a load this giant can bear, whether we are straining our capacities dangerously by setting our sights on the stars. I see no cause for alarm. There is a limit to how much a man can eat, how many cars he can drive, how many suits he can wear. But there is no limit to what a man can know, and there is no quenching man's thirst for knowledge. Whether or not we build a stairway to the stars depends simply on the kind of educated men and women our schools turn out. Let us not be content with ordinary men. Let us turn out giants.

Remarks of the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, in Presenting Lifesaving Awards During Ceremonies at the U.S. Coast Guard Receiving Center, Cape May, N.J., May 16, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I recently had an opportunity to visit the Cape May Coast Guard Receiving Station at Cape May, N.J., which is in my Second Congressional District, along with the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, Admiral Roland, the Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, and Hon. James A. Reed, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, for the purpose of awarding lifesaving medals to three coastguardsmen for a heoric rescue in the course of their duty.

After witnessing a very fine review of the graduating class, Secretary Dillon made a commendable address in connection with the awarding of the medals, and it is my privilege to insert his address, which points out the value of the U.S. Coast Guard Training Station, and acknowledges the great debt of gratitude which citizens of our Nation have to the U.S. Coast Guard for the performance of its duty during peace and war.

Secretary Dillon's remarks follow:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, IN PRESENTING LIFESAVING AWARDS DURING CEREMONIES AT THE U.S. COAST GUARD RECEIVING CENTER, CAPE MAY, N.J., MAY 16, 1963

Admiral Roland, Commander Waters, distinguished guests, and members of the Coast Guard recruit training class, I have been looking forward to this visit ever since I assumed office as Secretary of the Treasury more than 2 years ago. From this center comes a steady stream of highly trained men who have made the name U.S. Coast Guard known and respected the world over. It is fitting, therefore, that Cape May should be the setting for today's ceremony, in which we are proud to honor three very brave men who displayed the greatest valor in risking their lives to save others. For in recognizing their heroism, we also pay tribute to other grave men who received their training here.

One of the men we honor today, John C. Webb, boatswain's mate, first class, has distinguished himself in the past. Twice previously, in 1961, he was awarded the Coast Guard Commendation Medal for heroic action in the performance of duty. Today, he receives this third award, the Gold Lifesaving Medal, for outstanding heroism in making a most perilous rescue.

His companions, Anthony Duane Lloyd, engineman, third class, and Ray Dwayne Duerre, seaman, are to receive Silver Lifesaving Medals for their heroic parts in the same rescue. All three have brought great credit, not only to themselves and their families, but also to the historic service they so ably represent. They provide you graduates of the training class who are about to take your places in the Coast Guard with an inspiring example.

Today's ceremony is unusual. The Lifesaving Medal is rarely awarded to Coast Guardsmen, since exposure to great personal risk is considered part of a Coast Guardsman's assignment. The men who brave angry seas and screaming gales to aid distressed ships and persons expect no special recognition. They are dedicated men who think of themselves as professionals. Only action of the greatest personal daring, involving disregard for personal safety, justifies the award of the Lifesaving Medal to Coast Guardsmen. These conditions were amply met by the men we honor today.

I shall not attempt to go into the details of the rescue in which these men participated. The citations accompanying the medals will speak for themselves.

While this day has been set aside to honor three brave men, its significance goes far beyond that. In a very real sense, we are paying tribute to this small, but great service of some 30,000 officers and enlisted men in which they were trained to respond so magnificently to the challenge of danger. Courage and humanity lie at the very heart of the Coast Guard's mission. It has been that way from the very beginning, when the first small cutters sailed bravely off to fight Napoleon's numerically superior navy.

In risking their lives to save others, these men exemplify that humanitarian concern for life which motivates the Coast Guard. More than any other service, the Coast Guard gives active meaning to the high ideal of self sacrifice which is at the core of our religious beliefs. In times so given to developing means of mass destruction, the Coast Guard provides an inspiring example to all mankind as it goes about its task of preserving life.

Gentlemen, I congratulate each of you, your families and your officers on this happy occasion. I congratulate also the graduates of this recruit training company. The good wishes of all Americans go with you. May you all have long and fruitful careers in the service of your country.

Stan Lynde, Creator of Cartoon Strip "Rick O'Shay"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, a young Montanan currently is making a hit in one facet of journalism designed to please most people.

I am speaking of the comic strips and of one of the newest big time cartoon creators, Stan Lynde. With a deft and humorous touch, Mr. Lynde recounts the adventures of a tow-headed marshall in the mythical cow-town of "Conniption." I think some of my colleagues, who also may be western fans, might enjoy the change of pace offered by Mr. Lynde's droll view of the Old West.

Mr. Lynde knows his subject for he was born and raised on a ranch near Lodge Grass, Mont., and today lives in Billings, Mont. The road from that ranch to his present home was a long and circuitous one, involving a number of years working in New York City, perfecting his talents and looking for an outlet for his drawings.

His chance came in 1958 when "Rick O'Shay" and the other characters that inhabit "Conniption" caught the eye of a national syndicate. The success of Mr. Lynde and his comic strip makes a fascinating story. It has been well told in the winter edition of the Dude Rancher magazine. I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Rick O'Shay Is True West," written by Addison R. Bragg, and published in the Dude Rancher magazine, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICK O'SHAY IS BEST WEST

(By Addison R. Bragg)

The man who draws Dick Tracy never spent any time as a detective.

The man who draws Buck Rogers has yet to make his first trip into space and time.

But the person responsible for the life and times of a mythical cowtown called "Conniption" knows about horses because he grew up with them.

He knows about Indians because he lived with them. And he knows about cowboys and ranches and branding and six-guns because this was the kind of boy's world that Stan Lynde, creator of the cartoon strip "Rick O'Shay," lived in.

Lynde—who pronounces his name to rhyme with "mind"—doesn't mind admitting he's wanted to draw all his life.

He'll tell you, too, what his one ambition was. "I wanted to do a cartoon strip that was good enough that someday it would be syndicated."

Turning the dream into reality didn't take too long for the boy from Lodge Grass, Mont.

It was the island of Guam, back in 1953, that Lynde first got a chance to do what he calls "a funny strip."

"Most of my work," he said, "had been serious." Readers of the Navy paper, Mariner, were his first audience—and his first pen-and-ink creature was a character named "Ty Foon."

"I'd wanted to do an adventure strip of some kind," Lynde said, "but they wanted humor so I gave them humor."

It was his first real break into the world of the professional, deadline-fighting cartoon artist.

Out of the Navy, Lynde came back first to the V Bar H, the ranch owned by his father, Myron Lynde, near Lodge Grass, then went to Colorado Springs and, as was inevitable, on to New York City.

"I pounded pavement," he said, "and finally landed a job with the Wall Street Journal as a clerk-typist." In late 1957 he was made a reporter.

But the drawing board wasn't neglected.

And it was during his free-lance cartooning that the idea of the smiling tow-headed marshal began to jell.

The strip was sold to the Chicago Tribune-New York News syndicate in 1958 and Lynde's future, as well as the future of the citizens of Conniption, was assured.

Four years later, Lynde and his wife, Jane, realized a second ambition.

The cartoonist who wrote and drew about the old west from his home in Long Island finally came back.

"But," he adds with a quiet smile and in words which sound suspiciously like those which come from one of his own creations, "I had to go east to get here."

Lynde now draws the strip in a basement studio of his Billings home, keeping about 6 weeks ahead with plot and drawings.

And he has only one firm answer to the frequent question from Rick's many fans who want to know "What happens tomorrow?" or "How is this situation going to turn out?"

Wait, he says, and see.

Lynde, like some few others in his profession, is a perfectionist when it comes to reproducing the west.

"If I draw a gun wrong," he said, "I'm sure to hear about it. If I draw a stage coach, it has to be right—there are too many people who know me who not only saw stages but used to drive them."

The strip's authenticity doesn't stop there.

Every brand seen on a Lynde horse or steer is registered in the name of a Big Horn or Yellowstone county rancher.

And some of them remember saying once: "You know that Lynde kid—he draws purty good."

U.S. Justice for Puerto Rico—Clarification of Island's Status Is Called Imperative Also To Refute Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Max Freedman appearing in the Washington Evening Star, May 25, 1963. As a sponsor of legislation to clarify the status of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico I believe this analysis points the way to serve the common interest of the United States and its Caribbean citizens.

The article follows:

U.S. JUSTICE FOR PUERTO RICO—CLARIFICATION OF ISLAND'S STATUS IS CALLED IMPERATIVE ALSO TO REFUTE COMMUNISTS

(By Max Freedman)

In Congress and in Puerto Rico a determined minority is trying to cast doubt on a great constitutional project of our time. By every objective test, these men have small vision and large prejudices. But they have been able to spread enough mischief to bring President Kennedy into the controversy with a statement intended to clear away anger and error.

The status of Puerto Rico as a Commonwealth is unique. Its people are citizens of the United States, though the country is not a member of the Union. In recent years the economic progress of Puerto Rico, impressive in itself, has become a brave omen as Latin America has chafed under the currents of change. The enemies of freedom have made Puerto Rico their target. Fidel Castro derides Puerto Rico as a "perfumed colony." This charge is picked up and amplified by his Communist masters. Puerto Rico is said to have the fiction of freedom while lacking the substance of independence.

These venomous attacks are doing the United States no good in Latin America. There is just enough truth in these accusations to give wings to their essential falsehood. Public opinion in many countries is half persuaded that the system of government in Puerto Rico is less an experiment in freedom than it it a subtle new form of colonial rule. If there were no other reason for placing Puerto Rico's constitutional position on clear and unassailable foundations, this foreign criticism would be sufficient. For the American people would resent as an intolerable slur any suggestion that they had opposed colonialism all over the world while craftily seeking to maintain their own colonial domination over Puerto Rico.

Fortunately, the campaign by Mr. Castro and the accusations by the Communist world have left the people of Puerto Rico unmoved and unconverted. They know the value of their free association with the United States and are resolved to remain loyal to it. Their resistance to these Communist blandishments provides another compelling reason for looking with favor on their present effort to clarify their constitutional compact.

When Puerto Rico won its status as a commonwealth, the questions of statehood or independence were reserved for the future. The concept of a commonwealth is linked with the philosophy of Governor Munoz who has shown in the small arena of Puerto Rico a genius for political action that would do honor to a statesman holding sway over world affairs. In successive elections, a large majority has always indorsed the commonwealth principle. Every omen points to the same result in 1964. This fact has been ignored by some Members of Congress who have shown themselves strangely indifferent to the wishes and hopes of Puerto Rico.

In essence, Puerto Rico wishes to continue its present constitutional arrangement with the United States while removing it from the taint of obscurity and the threat of sudden change as a result of some unpredictable action by this country. Puerto Rico wants clarity, permanence, dignity. It wants to place the principle of self-determination above the swings and accidents of political life. To deny this principle will alienate our friends in Puerto Rico and comfort our critics in Latin America. What possible gain can there be to the United States in such a wretched philosophy? Acceptance of the full implications of self-determination, as President Kennedy has urged, would remove the uncertainty that is delaying the economic and social progress of Puerto Rico. Here is a rare occasion when self-interest unites with idealism to make an unanswerable case in Congress. Yet some Members still hesitate.

By an almost unanimous decision of its elected leaders, Puerto Rico has asked to join the United States in the establishment of a commission that would bring forward proposals to clarify and perfect the existing constitutional compact. These recommendations would have to be approved by both Governments. Governor Muñoz has been flexible and conciliatory. He wants the commission to consider all aspects of Puerto Rico's problems. Never has he tried to wrangle a special privilege for his own party. His concern has been with the acknowledged needs of Puerto Rico.

It is estimated that by 1980 or thereabouts, Puerto Rico will have an economic status equal to that of the poorest State in this country. Yet, Puerto Rico, next to Canada, is the best customer of the United States in this whole hemisphere. Surely such a people, with such a record of triumph over adversity, deserves to have its constitutional future defined with a clarity that will end all lingering suspicion of colonial status. When the facts are fully understood in Congress, there can be only one answer. Congress will agree to the commission. Any other answer would insult Puerto Rico and injure the United States.

English Journalist Reminds Us of Our Noble Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, so many of our people have become used to the propaganda of the social planners who for 30 years have been trying to convince the American people that security is better than freedom, that the strength of our national origin is being forgotten. It took an English journalist, Barbara Ward, to remind Americans of our noble heritage, the vision of our Founding Fathers backed by courage.

Mr. Speaker, if free men are to inherit the world of tomorrow, it is time we rededicate ourselves to the vision of the patriots of 1776 and once again make the United States the hope of all future generations.

An editorial from the Washington (D.C.) Daily News with Miss Ward's excellent remarks follows:

BARBARA WARD AND THE WORLD

Barbara Ward is an English journalist and economist, a woman of extraordinary intellect and perception.

Saturday she delivered the principal address at the annual Williamsburg, Va., observance of the 50 days in 1776 when the young American colonies asserted their demand for independence.

Speaking in the historic hall of the House of Burgesses in Virginia's colonial capital, Miss Ward paid a tribute to our national forefathers which few American orators could match—and administered a rebuke to the political and economic leadership of the world which would have done Patrick Henry proud.

As we reflect on the man who framed the Virginia Declaration of Rights, forerunner to the Bill of Rights in the Constitution, Miss Ward said: "We have to try with all our imaginative powers to recreate the magnificence of this audacity. Custom has staled it for us. We take for granted what should still leave us speechless with surprise."

In these beleaguered colonies, against overwhelming odds, these men yet spoke out for all mankind—all have inherent rights, all are equally free. Not just for themselves, or for local interests. Their dreams, as Miss Ward said, were palpably ahead of their means or their workaday abilities.

Today, said Miss Ward, "everything is limited about us except our means."

"The whole world," she said, "is astir with the aspirations of 1776—except perhaps the Atlantic community within which they first came to birth and where, now, they are in danger of degenerating to the level of Fourth of July rhetoric. * * * If the men of 1776 had attempted the opening up of America with the testy impatience of so many politicians of today, they would barely have crossed the Adirondacks."

Miss Ward asked for the same vision, to be applied to the world's predicament today as the men of 1776 applied to theirs.

"If we do not dream today, tomorrow will belong to those who do. The visions of 1776 have proved to be harder and more realistic than the fears and conservatisms of those who opposed them.

"What will be the visions of 1963? Who will dream them? And if free men have no more visions, how soon will the whole great tradition of 1776 perish from the earth?"

Clean Campaign Gifts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch recently published an editorial concerning the President's request that legislation be enacted to allow a tax credit or deduction for political contributions in presidential campaigns. The President's request is based on the report of the Presidential Commission on Campaign Costs which he appointed in 1961.

I have long supported the idea of a tax incentive to stimulate campaign contributions, because I believe it would stimulate increased interest in Government as well as helping to solve the problem of campaign financing. Our democracy would move another step toward perfection if campaigns could be financed on many small contributions rather than a few large ones. In January 1961 and in January 1963 I introduced an election bill which contained a provision for an income tax credit of 50 percent of a campaign contribution up to a maximum credit of $10. Recently, the junior Senator from Oregon introduced a bill to supplement the tax incentive proposal. This bill would authorize Federal matching funds up to $10 per contributor. This proposal would stimulate the political parties to conduct active fund-raising campaigns. The tax incentive proposal would contribute to the success to the success of such fund-raising campaigns. These two proposals working in conjunction would go a long way toward eliminating big money from election campaigns. I hope they will be enacted by the present Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FOR CLEAN CAMPAIGN GIFTS

President Kennedy again has asked Congress to do something about the high cost of running for public office and, especially, to allow less ground for the suspicions raised by big campaign contributions. Yet though its honor is involved, it is a question whether Congress is more inclined to accept his good advice than it was in the past—when it hardly could have shown less interest.

In addition to greater publicity for the financing of presidential and vice presidential candidates, the President urged that more widespread support of campaigns be encouraged by allowing a credit of 50 percent of a political gift—but not more than $10—on the donor's income tax. He also urged a tax deduction of the full amount of gifts up to $500. Thus the small donor could directly reduce his tax bill by as much as $10. The larger gifts would involve a relatively smaller tax saving.

Politicians, however, still seem reluctant to look to the average voter for support, even when this is encouraged by a tax concession. They seem to prefer to leave matters as they are and take their chances on being touched by scandal.

The President's special commission on campaign costs last year once again called attention to the immense amount of money involved in national campaigns, and the questions inevitably raised about the motivations of those ready to supply this big money. Yet even if all thought of favor and influence could be set aside, Congress ought to be concerned about the limitations of money on democracy. Participation in self-government ought to be not merely a legal right, but also an open opportunity for every citizen.

Commencement Address by Senator Kefauver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it seems to be customary with each older generation to criticize the younger generation as frivolous, irresponsible, and certain to come to no good. However, I have never been able to associate myself with such thinking.

Every year I try to attend at least one high school commencement in Tennessee. This year I was present when 46 graduates of Seymour High School in Sevier County, Tenn., received their diplomas.

This was one of the finest groups of graduates I have ever seen—eager, enthusiastic, anxious to move out into the world and do their part to make it a better place for themselves and the families they will one day bring up. I was privileged to be the commencement speaker, and I hope that what I said was of some inspiration to these fine young people.

In the further hope that these remarks may be of some benefit to others, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER TO THE SEYMOUR HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATING CLASS, SEYMOUR, TENN., MAY 31, 1963

If experience is a guide, chances are good that 15 years from tonight, most of you won't remember who gave your commencement address. But no matter whether you remember who spoke, you will never forget this evening. This is fitting. Nothing I or anyone else can say tonight can compare with the achievement each of you recorded in graduating from high school.

For one thing, it is impossible for any of us who have been adults much longer than you to fully appreciate your feelings and your thoughts upon graduating from this fine school. This is something many of us tend to forget. It's something you will probably tend to forget too: each oncoming generation arrives at adulthood with a totally different background of knowledge and experience.

Personally it seems incredible to me that you graduates never thrilled to the voice of Franklin D. Roosevelt summoning this country to responsibility, summoning it out of its agony of fear.

Or the voice of Winston Churchill summoning the democracies to greatness, summoning them out of the shambles of total demoralization and defeat.

Or saw and took part in the slow, painful, joyful transformation of this great State of ours during the thirties and forties, out of seeming defeat, depression and apathy to the vibrant, optimistic growing economy and society we have today.

Yet it is true. You did not experience these things.

These were the things your parents experienced. These were the things that molded their lives and their philosophies. We have something you cannot quite understand. At the same time, you have things which my generation cannot quite understand.

For one who remembers when there were more horses than horseless carriages, it is difficult to imagine that in your lifetime, daily trips to the moon may become commonplace. And fantastic though this may seem, we all know it is a very real possibility.

It has seemed sometimes that yours is one of the generations Roosevelt meant when he said: "To some generations, much is given." While the generation of your parents is obviously one he spoke of when he added: "From other generations, much is expected."

But this is not quite the case.

You know much is expected of you. Fear and defeat, and responsibility and greatness, are not the property of any generation or any year.

There will be times when you will fear. There will be times when you meet defeat. And there will be calls issued to you to leave fear and defeat behind.

My friends, you are being summoned to responsibility. You are being summoned to greatness. Now, tonight, and from now on through your entire lives.

When you file out of this auditorium, you will be leaving childhood behind. You are walking into the joys of responsibility and of citizenship and—let us hope—of greatness.

It is natural that you are privately worried about leaving this school and the society and friendships you have built within it. The future is dimly seen. The years seem to stretch endlessly ahead.

But those years will go fast. The 17 or 19 years you've so far passed seem a long time, perhaps. The next 10 years, 20 years, 30 years will find each year and each decade becoming shorter and shorter. You will have to seize your chance for greatness promptly.

There is no room nor time for worry. Nor is there any reason to worry. The joys of citizenship, of adulthood, of parenthood—in short, the joys of responsibility—are every bit as sweet as the pleasures of childhood, of youth, and of school. These are to be your joys, your responsibility, from now on.

Part of that responsibility is to prepare yourself for it. Preparation does not end here in high school. This is the age of specialization. I urge every one of you who possibly can to go on to college. If you cannot, try to attend a vocational or trade program which will better equip you to fulfill your responsibilities.

Recently I saw a Census Bureau report that gave a very good reason for going on to college. It showed that while the average annual income for families headed by a high school graduate is $6,300, it is much higher—$9,300—for those whose breadwinner is a college graduate.

Moreover, as we grow up and assume family responsibilities, we realize how much our children's education takes place right in the home. So we want to be as well equipped as we can to help them learn about the world in which they will live and bring up their own families someday.

Besides, education is the gateway to a fuller, richer life all around. It is the one thing that, coupled with experience, generates ideas of the most lasting significance.

A great, great responsibility is that of civic awareness and participation. It is up to you to inform yourselves about what is going on in your community, your State, Nation, and the world. It is up to you to speak out, to vote, and if possible, to offer yourself for community service. "Politics" is not a nasty word so long as good people, like you, are paying attention to it and helping to make it work.

So much for heavy philosophy on this wonderful evening.

It remains to remind you of something about which you surely know: Your parents are mighty proud of you all, both for having successfully reached this milestone and for the determination with which you will go forward to the milestones of the future.

I hope that you are proud of your parents. This community certainly is. It has not been easy, lending you the morale and material assistance to complete 12 years of school.

I hope that you are proud of the faculty of this school system—the teachers you have had. The community is proud of them. A teacher gives a part of himself or herself to his or her students, and acquires back a part of the student in return. This is one reason why teaching is a valued, honored profession. Wherever you may go now, you will take a part of this school and its teachers with you. No matter how far you go, a part of you will stay here.

Finally, I hope you are proud of this community—as proud of it as it is of you.

It has been at considerable expense that your community has provided this education for you—an expense which no one has stinted and which no one regrets. Yet it was an expense and it is up to you to repay it. You will repay it by unstintingly providing the education, or the cost of it, for those who are coming behind you.

Now then: This is your time. These times are your challenge. Responsibility is yours. Wear it well. Wear it proudly.

If you do, greatness will also be yours.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—Congressional Record, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the Record:

Armenian Revolutionary
Federation,
Oakland Committee,
May 24, 1963.

Congressman Daniel J. Flood,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Congressman: The Oakland Committee of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation informs you that a resolution has been passed by our unit supporting passage of House Resolution 14 submitted by you, which calls for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Recent developments worldwide and in Washington make the formation of such a committee imperative to the security and welfare of the United States, and will bring added hope to the tyrannized people of the once free nations today in Soviet bondage.

We are, in addition to this letter, contacting our Congressman as well as Congressman Howard W. Smith, head of the Rules Committee, urging him to release your resolution to the House floor for quick debate and passage.

May we take this opportunity to commend you for your stand in this regard, and to assure you of our every support of your measure.

Sincerely,
John Movsessian,
Secretary.

Oakland, Calif.

Alliance of the Friends of
Ukrainian Democratic Republic
in the U.S.A., Detroit Branch,
Detroit, Mich., May 12, 1963.

Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We, American citizens of Ukrainian descent, united in the Alliance of the Friends of Ukrainian Democratic Republic, would like to express our sincere appreciation for your introduction of the captive nations committee resolution in the U.S. Congress.

This resolution is of a great political importance. It assures the enslaved nations that they are not forgotten by the free world. It gives them hope for a better tomorrow.

The brutal Russian imperialism is not satisfied with the enslavement of hundreds of millions of freedom-loving people. Their aim is not just West Berlin, or Germany or even the whole of Europe. Their final goal is to rule the world.

America, in the eyes of the people behind the Iron Curtain, is a symbol of freedom.

Ukrainians will never forget the cruel and bloody history of the enslavement of Ukraine, which has claimed the lives of millions of Ukrainian victims in their desire for freedom.

More than 100 years ago a great Ukrainian poet and leader Taras Shevchenko hailed the first President of the United States of America, George Washington, and the democratic system of U.S. Government, hoping that the day will come when Ukraine will join the family of free nations.

Very truly yours,
Borys Ivahycky,
Secretary.

Organization for the Defense
of Lemkivshchyna, Western
Ukraine, Branch 3,
Passaic, N.J., May 17, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: We, the officers and members of our organizations, urge earnestly to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your support. Such a Special Committee on the Captive Nations is vitally important to our Government and the American people. While Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of "national liberation" in Africa and Asia, we as a Nation are not doing much to help the enslaved and captive nation which constitute a veritable weakness of the Soviet totalitarian system.

A Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a center of true knowledge and information on all the captive nations which information will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We strongly urge you, sir, to give your full and unqualified support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

Andre Shirka, President; John Chombo, Vice President; Julian Kotlor, Secretary; Andrew Borna; Stephen Onolrusiamey; Threslev Oleseburl; Gregory C. Zeeve; Harry Suarsha; Wazyl Chom-Ko; John Blycha; Arrobreu Gojola; Basil A. Bolocky; Dmytro Crornyj; Cmecpore Zeegropeewahsel; Woltte Chujul; Wosyl Moruszchol; Bouoguamy Birymand; Miroslos S. Hlysosly; Fopylego Jcrcie; Andrew Chyrol; John Chevinonsky; Frank Martyn; Pocimcrab Zorotypen; Johanna Kotlar; Metouly Shepski; Teodore Stec.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
MAY 22, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: May I add my name to the long list of citizens who have indicated their strong support of the Flood bill (H. Res. 14) which bill calls for the establishment of a special committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

I am certain you have noticed an increasing interest of Americans for reliable information concerning the captive nations now enslaved by Communist Russia. And these Americans are not necessarily those whose ethnic backgrounds associate them with the people of the captive nations.

In Forest Hills, N.Y., where I reside Our Lady Queen of Martyrs Church will hold "The Agape of the Captive Nations." The invitation to the Agape says concerning the Captive Nations—"They are captives of atheists; it may be called the Iron Curtain or the Bamboo Curtain, but it is always the curtain of anti-Christ. How many suffer behind it, only God knows. We know they can help themselves only by denying Christ."

If we are to regard and understand the U.S.S.R. as our enemy and not as our compatriot in coexistence then we must realize that our most powerful weapon against the U.S.S.R. must be the securing of the full and complete cooperation and help of our friends behind the red curtains—the captive nations. "Know thine enemy" is only part of the struggle—we must also know our friends. The special committee should help considerably in correcting the prevalent, deplorable lack of knowledge concerning the captive nations.

I look forward to and urge a speedy passage of House Resolution 14.

Respectfully,

JOHN H. ROBERTS.

MAY 17, 1963.

Hon. Congressman D. J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The following is a copy of my letter sent to Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH in regard to the establishment of a special Captive Nations Committee:

Very Honorable Congressman SMITH: I urge you to submit House Resolutions 14 and 15 (the Flood and Derwinski resolutions respectively) for a general discussion and a vote in your commitee.

I am very much interested in the establishment of a special Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives.

"I thank you in advance for your consideration, and past support toward this matter.

"Wishing you, and Congressman FLOOD the best luck."

Truly,

DR. V. CAZANJIAN.

Administration Foreign Policy Makes No Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, a Soviet military base in Cuba, with thousands of Russian troops at the ready and missiles pointed at the heart of our country poses no threat to the security of the United States and those who say it does are warmongers and a threat to the peace of the world. A threat by Dictator Sukarno, of Indonesia, to New Guinea, 10,000 miles away from the United States, is so serious we would be willing to go to war to protect Australian interests there. Mr. Speaker, these are not my statements. This is the stated position of the Kennedy administration. Sure it is confusing. It is downright ridiculous, but it is typical of the amazing, zigzagging, "no policy" of the President in meeting the Communist threat to world peace.

We are indebted to the President's highly placed adviser on foreign affairs, Averell Harriman, for the latest position regarding New Guinea. The following editorial from today's issue of the Chicago Tribune points out the utter irresponsibility of the Kennedy foreign policies:

NOW WE'LL FIGHT

There are a number of apparent ironies in Averell Harriman's announcement in Australia that the United States will fight to defend Australia's stake in New Guinea if an attack is made on the territory. The only aspiring imperialist in the southwest Pacific is Mr. Sukarno, of Indonesia, who recently grabbed the western half of the island from the Dutch.

Mr. Harriman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, mentions U.S. commitments to Australia and New Zealand under the Anzus Pact, stating that if trouble arose over New Guinea the three countries would be "in it together."

We can think of three peculiarities about this display of belligerent intent. First, if the United States is thinking of fighting to defend its own or the security interests of its allies, what about Cuba? It is an advanced Soviet military base 90 miles away from the United States, and, under various military agreements related to the Organization of American States, we have ample cause to resort to military action right in our own front yard any time we are in the mood to work up a fight.

But, no, Mr. Harriman and his Washington principals aren't interested. They think it more logical to shop for action about 10,000 miles away from Washington if they are obliged to do so at all.

The second oddity is that Mr. Harriman's threat is addressed to Sukarno and he would be in no position to threaten Australia in eastern New Guinea if the United States had not installed him in western New Guinea after easing out the Dutch. This was done with an assist from the United Nations after the details had been worked out by Ellsworth Bunker, a retired American diplomat.

The squeeze was put on the Dutch by refusing them transit rights for arms, troops, and transport at American bases and airports, repudiating agreements of the Eisenhower administration. Harriman now emphasizes America's duties under her Anzus treaty obligations, but Holland was an ally in NATO and no sentiment was wasted on its betrayal.

The third irony is that Harriman's reputation in the Far East, such as it is, is less that of being a stout defender against aggression than as a promoter of appeasement. It was he who worked out the formula which hitched the pro-Western, Communist, and neutralist camps in Laos to a coalition on the troika model. Instead of producing neutralism and peace, this arrangement has enabled the Communist Pathet Lao to grab ever larger chunks of the country. Here again, our friends, the troops of General Nosavan, were sold out to the enemy.

But in what's left of New Guinea Mr. Harriman is ready to take his stand. Why has principle suddenly become so all-fired important in this improbable spot when it is regarded as of no consequence any place else?

TFX Controversy Stirs Additional Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, recent expert witnesses before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations have helped focus national attention on the basic issue involved in this hearing: "Does the TFX award as directed from the Pentagon provide our country with the desired objective of getting the best available plane at the lowest cost to the American taxpayer?" Or, "Were factors other than low cost and top performance involved in this decision?"

New stories in the Wall Street Journal by Jerry Landauer, in the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star by Allen M. Smythe, and in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune by Clark Mollenhoff provide some interesting data on these questions. It is encouraging to note that many additional segments of our national press as well as our radio-TV news media are now reporting to their constituents the day-by-day accounts of the testimony before the so-called McClellan committee. Inasmuch as this matter involves the largest single contract which any Government in world history ever let to any company, I think it is well that more and more of our citizens are having all of the facts and factors made available to them. After all, this is the public's business—to the extent, in fact, of a probable $7 billion.

For the information of the Congress and the country, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the three news stories alluded to in these remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 24, 1963]

FORMER DEFENSE OFFICIAL SUSPECTS POLITICS HAD ROLE IN TFX AWARD; URGES INQUIRY

(By Jerry Landauer)

WASHINGTON.—Defense Secretary McNamara, undergoing increasingly rough treatment in the TFX hearings on Capitol Hill, is currently pictured there as a man willing to ignore hard facts when they fail to support what is being described as a politically inspired decision.

On top of earlier testimony by General Accounting Office officials that Mr. McNamara substituted undocumented "rough judgment" for the findings of subordinates supposedly schooled in the intricacies of buying multi-billion-dollar weapons systems, Senate investigators are being urged to find out whether portions of the $50 billion annual defense budget are "being used politically to insure the reelection of the (Kennedy) administration."

MR. TFX URGES INQUIRY

The source of the urging is a former Defense Department official, A. W. Blackburn, who was chairman of a Pentagon TFX task force group last year and was known in the department as "Mr. TFX." He joined the Pentagon in November 1959, after receiving a master's degree in aeronautical engineering from Massachusetts Institute of Technology and working as a test pilot for North American Aviation, Inc.

Senator McCLELLAN's investigators haven't yet found, and don't expect to find, documentation for Mr. Blackburn's suspicion of political motivation. Nor did the former Pentagon aide provide any documentation. But he said, "It was clear to all those involved that the decision could not in any way be associated with the merits of the two proposals for the TFX contract on either an operational, technical, management, or cost basis." Thus, by inference, high-level policy consideration played a role in the selection. By policy consideration, Mr. Blackburn made it clear he meant the distribution of jobs generated by the $7 billion TFX program.

Mr. Blackburn told the Senate Investigations subcommittee he quit the Pentagon earlier than intended because he believed that Mr. McNamara, in order to justify his selection of General Dynamics Corp. as development contractor for the TFX fighter-bomber, was ready to rely on data gathered only after the selection was already announced.

Mr. Blackburn testified that after Senate investigators began inquiring into the McNamara decision, which was announced last November, the Defense Secretary began planning his scheduled rebuttal testimony by means of a war game. Early in March he established a six-man "red" team, on which Mr. Blackburn served, to gather all the arguments for choosing Boeing Co. as TFX contractor, and a "blue" team to marshal the case for General Dynamics.

On hearing this, Senator CURTIS, Republican of Nebraska, snorted that Mr. McNamara seemed to think he was "in a kind of sporting contest with Congress."

Mr. Blackburn said, "The idea that a reevaluation of certain selected items in the design proposals could be realistically verified without several weeks' intensive review by a large team of unbiased experts, and without working with both contractors, was professionally repugnant to the members of the "red" team."

General Dynamics is developing and expects to assemble the planned production order of 1,700 TFX planes at its Fort Worth division; Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., which is associated with General Dynamics in the project, works out of Long Island in New York. Boeing would have performed the bulk of its work at Wichita. Many, if not most, of the subcontractors would be the same no matter which concern was prime contractor.

M'NAMARA DEFENDS CHOICE

Mr. McNamara has sworn to the subcommittee that no factor except probable cost and technical superiority prompted him to choose General Dynamics. Mr. McNamara kept President Kennedy advised of the design competition and checked with the President before announcing his choice last November 24.

Since the start of the McClellan hearings Mr. McNamara's men have kept close watch on the General Dynamics progress. Roger Lewis, president of General Dynamics, has been asked to brief Defense officials monthly; the first status briefing late in April was attended by Air Force Secretary Zuckert, Navy Secretary Korth, Admiral Anderson, soon to step down as Chief of Naval Operations, and General LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff. The two military men had recommended selection of Boeing because they were convinced its design promised distinct operational advantages.

The Pentagon hasn't responded yet to suggestions by subcommittee members to deter final selection of a contractor until Boeing has had a chance to match a prototype TFX in flight with that being developed by General Dynamics. The Pentagon hasn't indicated to Senator McCLELLAN whether it might consider test flight competition if the subcommittee insists; Mr. McNamara's spokesmen are saying, however, that the idea is impractical.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., May 24, 1963]

STATUS OF TFX BELIEVED GROWING DOUBTFUL: NEW FACTORS CITED

(By Allen M. Smythe)

Many budget-minded Members of Congress believe the controversial TFX fighter plane will never complete its development stage. They expect this weapon system to be placed in the doubtful completion status now occupied by Nike-Zeus, the RS-70 bomber, and the second atomic aircraft carrier.

Several new factors tend to confirm this viewpoint. Among these is a growing belief in Congress that this Nation possesses an "overkill" potential that is both unnecessary and expensive. Also, many believe that these new proposed tactical fighters will cost well beyond the present estimate of $6.5 billion.

ALTERNATIVES SEEN

The excellent performance of the present F4C tactical fighter and the possibility of further improvement that may extend its useful life several years beyond its planned active service has made its impression. Some new classified developments, now under intensive study, could become operative in the next 5 years and greatly reduce the need for the compromised TFX.

Defense Secretary McNamara recently said that many of our major weapons systems cost 300 percent above the original estimate and contract price. Some were canceled, but others were completed because the only alternate was no weapons and a bankrupt contractor.

Representative GEORGE MAHON, chairman of the powerful Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, supports Mr. McNamara by stating: "It is vital to have accurate costing before any firm contract is issued."

He points out the situation of the RS-70, 2,000-mile-per-hour, all-steel bomber whose belated estimates showed such heavy costs that it was reduced to a $1.3 billion contract for testing three prototypes by last December. It is now a year behind schedule, with the extra monthly development expenditures losing none of their momentum.

CALLS FOR BUDGET CUT

Senator BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia and chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, has asked the administration to reduce the defense budget.

Several Republican Senators have called attention to suggestions of a $10 billion defense budget cut by a retired general who has had considerable diplomatic experience. He thought that present defense spending should be around that of the previous administration. The general's name is Dwight Eisenhower.

A new report "A strategy for American Security," prepared by seven science professors, proposed to Congress and the Executive Department a $22 billion reduction in the 1964 military budget. It received some attention because their survey showed that two-thirds of the Nation's scientists and engineers were engaged in "wasteful war effort."

Many Navy and Air Force officials have expressed their disapproval of the final TFX design to Congress. General Dynamics was given a letter contract, considered the most tentative of contractual agreements. It contains a clause for a 6-month period in which to issue a formal development or production contract. Congress will have an annual review of the project.

[From Minneapolis Morning Tribune, May 27, 1963]

POLITICAL ROLE OF TFX FIRMS UNDER PROBE

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

MINNEAPOLIS TRIBUNE STAFF CORRESPONDENT

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The TFX investigation has turned to evidence of political activity of the General Dynamics-Grumman combine and indications of White House involvement in the multibillion-dollar fighter plane contract.

Chairman JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, of the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee has ordered a full investigation of the political activities of the Grumman Engineering Corp., which is associated with General Dynamics Corp. in the bidding on the $6.5 billion program. Republicans have said it appears the political activity of the defense contractors may violate the law.

While the investigation of political contributions and some questionable activity by General Dynamics and Grumman was receiving more attention, there were these other developments:

1. Albert W. Blackburn, an aeronautical engineer who was Mr. TFX in the office of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, testified that the award to General Dynamics could not be justified on the merits of operational, technical or cost basis.

He said it could only be justified on the basis of some "broad, high-level policy decision" by McNamara or the White House.

2. A newspaper correspondent, Seth Kantor, testified that high official sources told him prior to October 24 that the contract would be given to General Dynamics.

This was more than 2 weeks before the Pentagon Source Selection Board made its unanimous recommendation that the contract go to the Boeing Co.

3. Blackburn testified that early this year McNamara established a large Pentagon team to develop new, after-the-fact data to support the award of the contract to General Dynamics last November.

There is testimony in the record that at least one military officer was urged to change his story to support McNamara's decision.

In the sharpest criticism expressed yet in the 3 months of hearings, McCLELLAN said the testimony to this point carries implications that McNamara's decision represented a total disregard of exhaustive studies and evaluations that had resulted in the recommendations for Boeing.

McCLELLAN said the record shows that "someone is lying" in connection with circumstances surrounding the TFX decision.

Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, said testimony that the contract was "in the bag" for General Dynamics last October indicates "the Pentagon people have foisted on this committee and on this country * * * a $7 billion deception because this makes a fraud of the whole source selection process."

The McClellan subcommittee has established that the memorandum of justification McNamara signed last November 21 in connection with the contract was filled with errors. The Pentagon has admitted "a little slipup" on figures purported to be the performance ratings of the General Dynamics version of TFX.

MCCLELLAN also charges that McNamara's initial justifications included figures with errors of such magnitude as $77 million, $32 million, and $29 million.

The Source Selection Board was unanimous in its recommendations for Boeing on the basis of a superior performance rating, and a price that was lower by more than $100 million. Gen. Curtis LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, and Adm. George Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, concurred that Boeing's proposal represented a better plane at a better price.

McNamara took the position that he could disregard the Boeing low bid because Boeing had not submitted realistic cost figures. Boeing had submitted elaborate reports on its cost studies supported by a depth of "back up" material, but was never challenged by McNamara or others at the Pentagon.

When the General Accounting Office asked McNamara for cost studies to support his view, McNamara admitted he had none. He said he made a "rough judgment" on the decision, and had no figures except those in his head.

The comptroller general, Joseph Campbell, said this was not proper documentation for a decision on the largest contract let since World War II, and that it was impossible to conduct an audit on figures in someone's head.

McNamara has said the General Dynamics plane has "greater commonality" of parts in the Navy and Air Force versions, and he contends that Boeing has produced what is in essence two planes—one for the Air Force and one for the Navy.

On this point, the Navy's top aeronautical engineer said McNamara's view on "commonality" is "poppycock."

General Dynamics has over 83 percent identical parts in the Navy and Air Force version, and the basic Boeing proposal has 60 percent identical parts and about 20 percent similar parts.

Mount Rushmore Opens New Visitors Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the Nation's most impressive monuments is the Mount Rushmore "Shrine of Democracy" in the Black Hills of South Dakota.

This great mountain carving depicting the faces of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, was visited by some 1,209,364 persons last year. This placed it 22d out of 191 points of interest in the national park system in terms of the number of visitors.

Although I have viewed this magnificent shrine on numerous occasions, I never failed to be moved by the simple majesty of these great stone carvings. During these times of turbulence and tension, I believe that any American who has the opportunity to visit Mount Rushmore will find his faith and his spirit strengthened.

Mr. President, on June 9, 1963, a new visitors center will be opened at Mount Rushmore as a part of the National Park Service Mission 66 expansion program. Additional interpretive facilities and new conveniences will also be provided for visitors to the shrine.

I take this occasion to invite my colleagues of the Congress and their constituents to inspect this new development and to enjoy the inspiration of Mount Rushmore. I ask unanimous consent that a brochure sponsored by the National Park Service and the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society announcing the June 9 open house be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the brochure was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOUNT RUSHMORE NATIONAL MEMORIAL, S. DAK., VISITOR CENTER—OPEN HOUSE, JUNE 9, 1963

WELCOME

The National Park Service, which administers Mount Rushmore National Memorial, and the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society of Black Hills, welcome you to the memorial and invite you to inspect the new visitor center at open house, June 9, 1963.

MISSION 66

Mission 66 is a 10-year conservation, development, and improvement program of the National Park Service. It was launched in 1956 and is scheduled for completion in 1966, the golden anniversary year of the establishment of the National Park Service.

This program proposes to so develop, staff, and improve the areas managed by the National Park Service as to permit their wisest use, maximum enjoyment and understanding for those who use them, and maximum preservation of the scenic, scientific, and historic resources which give these areas their distinction.

DEVELOPMENT AT MOUNT RUSHMORE NATIONAL MEMORIAL

The memorial's central location and accessibility by several major roads, and because it lies near highly traveled highways serving Yellowstone, Grand Teton, and other heavily visited national parks, make it an outstanding attraction in the Black Hills. In 1962 total visits to Mount Rushmore National Memorial were 1,209,364, ranking the area 22d in yearly visits out of 191 in the National Park System.

Each year increasing numbers of visitors come to the memorial to stand and contemplate the greatness of our land and to leave refreshed and comforted—ready to face once more the challenges of this age.

This steady increase of visitors to areas of the national park system has created conditions which threaten the preservation and continued use of recreational and inspirational facilities. To provide better facilities and visitor services while avoiding the adverse effects of heavy use and to accomplish the aim of preservation—for the "use and enjoyment of future generations"—the National Park Service has initiated a long-range program at Mount Rushmore.

At Mount Rushmore National Memorial, Mission 66 will provide increased interpretive facilities and new physical facilities for visitors to the memorial. Development under this dynamic program began at Mount Rushmore in 1957 with the construction of concession buildings; a 350-car parking lot; a 750-seat amphitheater, and employee housing. Subsequent development has brought improvement in the Horse Thief Lake Road; an improved water and sanitation system; additional employee housing and the construction of the visitor center on Doane Mountain.

From the new visitor center the visitor can obtain an excellent view of the gigantic sculpture, and in this newly constructed facility he may also take advantage of the interpretative program, obtain information in the lobby, or find clean rest rooms.

As additional construction takes place within the memorial, a museum, memorial view terrace, additional parking facilities, and a utility building will round out the development program providing the visitor with greater administrative, interpretive, and protective facilities, thereby making his visit to Mount Rushmore National Memorial a more enjoyable experience.

The completion of Mission 66 at Mount Rushmore will assist the National Park Service in accomplishing the memorial's mission which is "to commemorate the achievements of the four Presidents represented in the sculptured memorial, thus stimulating a deeper regard for the principles of American democracy which they represented."

This open house is being sponsored by the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, and Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society of Black Hills.

Red Collapse a Catastrophe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Senate should find most interesting the studies which are being conducted under grants from the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. A very interesting article on this subject has been written by Miss Edith Kermit Roosevelt entitled "Red Collapse a Catastrophe." I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED COLLAPSE A "CATASTROPHE"

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—"The breakup of the Russian Communist empire today would doubtless be conducive to freedom, but would be a good deal more catastrophic for world order than was the breakup of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1918."

This astonishing conclusion, that it would not be in American interest for the Red bloc to collapse, was actually reached at the expense of the American taxpayer. They are the words of Walter Millis as part of a report for the government costing us $20,000.

Millis pictures what faces us in the future by saying: "In a completely policed world," the American Revolution of 1776 "would be suppressed, as was the Hungarian revolution, with all the global forces of law and order cooperating."

Heaven help any freedom fighters of the future with such a world army around.

The Millis study was paid for by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the controversial government bureau seeking to transfer American weaponry to the International Disarmament Organization. Millis' pompous title in his study on "The Political Control of an International Police Force" is "Director of the Study of War as an Institution, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Fund for the Republic." Defense Secretary Robert Strange McNamara is a founding member and annual contributor to this center.

This project, undertaken by the Peace Research Institute in Washington, is one of 18 contracts awarded by the Disarmament Agency as of April 10, totaling about $2 million. Millis' study appears in the second volume of this report entitled, "Quis Custodiet," which for the benefit of us nonelite, apparently means, "Who'll control what?" The loose translation given on the document is: "Controlling the Police in a Disarmed World."

Millis' thesis is that the existence of the Soviet slave empire is a necessity for the "world order." He writes: "One might say that if the Soviet empire did not exist, something would have to be created to fulfill its role in the world order."

The implication is that it should be American policy to join the United Nations in crushing any revolt in the Ukraine, Poland, Hungary, or any other captive nation, forcing it back under Moscow's heel.

"Whether we admit it to ourselves or not," Millis says, "we benefit enormously from the capability of the Soviet police system to keep law and order over the 200-million odd Russians and the many additional millions in the satellite states."

We are supposed to "benefit enormously" by the enslavement of these many millions of human beings.

This is the most dramatic confirmation yet of what Senator Strom Thurmond (Democrat, of South Carolina) calls Washington's no-win policy. It provides the ideological justification for an American policy of a strategic stalemate, and even assuring defeat of such freedom-loving forces as the brave band of young Cuban patriots who set sail April 17, 1961 for the Bay of Pigs.

The scandalous treatise by Millis admits: "It is in the first instance constitutional change which is proposed by the goal of general and complete disarmament."

"Constitutional change" means curbing Congress. It is no accident that the Center for Democratic Institutions—of which he is a staff member— published a pamphlet May 27 in which Senators Joseph S. Clark (Democrat, of Pennsylvania) and J. W. Fulbright (Democrat, of Arkansas) call for limiting the role of Congress.

"One cannot resist the conclusion," Millis goes on, "that there must be a supranational autonomous police power, with veto-free sources of revenue * * * solely responsible to a supranational political authority."

His paper meshes perfectly with policy statements by our highest Government officials. Included are:

"Agreements should explicitly prohibit the development" of an antimissile defense system. Stated by Jerome Weisner, top science aid to President Kennedy, at the Sixth Pugwash Conference, Moscow, November 29, 1960.

The United States should undertake "a series of unilateral (disarmament) actions designed to produce reciprocal action * * * on the part of our enemies." Paul Nitze, assistant secretary of defense for international security affairs, at Asilomar National Strategy Seminar, Monterey Peninsula, Calif., April 24–30, 1960.

"It is therefore, an American interest to see an end of nationhood as it has been historically defined." Walt Whitman Rostow, chairman of the State Department Policy Planning Board, at the Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, September 1959.

This approach, which goes beyond "appeasement" or "accommodation," to actually furnishing aid and comfort to the Soviet Union, only makes sense in the context of a world divided between two cooperating dictatorships. This nightmarish world, predicted by George Orwell in his novel "1984," would be ushered in by the so-called general "disarmament" treaty.

By aiding socialist consolidation elsewhere in the world, Washington's Federal planners see the road paved for absolutism at home. In their own hands, of course.

John Birchers in Livermore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 1963, a John Birch chapter was formed in Livermore, Calif., a city of 22,000 in the northeasterly portion of the Ninth Congressional District, which I am honored to represent.

The local newspaper is the Livermore Herald and News, and its managing editor, Mr. Arthur L. Henry, attended the formation meeting of the Livermore chapter of the Birch Society, at which the speaker was a Mr. Hugh Fine, full-time paid coordinator for the Society in the San Francisco Bay area.

Mr. Speaker, there has been so much discussion lately regarding this controversial organization that I am submitting herewith, for the pleasure of my colleagues, Mr. Henry's editorial describing fairly and objectively this thoughtful editor's conclusions of his first glimpse of the John Birch Society:

John Birchers in Livermore

If the John Birch Society were only what it says it is—an educational organization dedicated to preservation of the Nation's Constitution—few Americans would be as concerned as they are about its activities.

But about 50 Livermore residents heard with their own ears last Friday night from its paid coordinator that the John Birch Society, beyond being an educational organization, is a group of hero worshippers who profess to believe and promote a mish-mash of half truths, misinformation, evangelistic anticommunism, support of dictators, and character assassination.

Certainly no one should question the sincerity of many of the John Birch members. They simply have to be sincere, for there is little other explanation for some of their beliefs.

But even with its very best foot forward, at its own meeting trying to make the best possible impression on prospective members, and where there happened to be a minimum of critical questioning, the John Birch Society dismally failed to meet its description of itself as an educational organization.

The film which opened the meeting, an hour long outline of the growth of communism by Founder Robert Welch, was considered by many persons who saw it Friday night a relatively accurate but somewhat overstated history of communism.

Many educated observers will question, for example, whether Venezuela, all the nations bordering the southern edge of the Mediterranean, and our own State of Hawaii, are actually controlled by Communists, as Welch stated.

And his view that leaders of the United States are helping the Communist conspiracy all they can by "opposing dictatorships and calling for more liberal governments in Latin America" will hardly be supported by Americans, other than the John Birch style of American. It may be hard for persons who didn't hear it to believe, but Welch specifically criticized the United States for not supporting Trujillo in the Dominican Republic.

Here is an example of the Birch Society's selective view of history, taking facts that fit Welch's personal views to make his point while ignoring other facts. If Welch were as concerned about true American principles and ideals as he says he is, he would recall that there was a time when the United States itself was a more liberal government fighting to free itself from a government which approximated back in 1776 the dictatorships of today.

The pure American view can be nothing but support of people trying to free themselves from political dictatorship, but since the Communists weren't around in 1776 and since it is the Communists that Welch is fighting he invented a new kind of American ideal.

Certainly there are too many Communists involved in Latin American revolutions, and communism in Latin America surely is something to fear. But the alternative is not, as Welch states, support of dictators.

It was the discussion and comments that followed the Welch film which gave much stronger indication of the questionable views of the society.

Members proudly follow Welch's teaching, believing that his 13 years of study of the Communist conspiracy qualify him to tell them what the facts are and how the battle should be fought. And while members are permitted, a few times, not to take part in actions recommended by Welch, they believe the danger from communism is so critical there simply isn't time for members to debate which actions should be taken.

This hardly seems believable to most of us, but that is exactly what the man said here Friday night.

Again, if Welch really did understand and attempt to follow true American ideals he would know that the basic nature of American constitutional government requires a continual probing and questioning of existing government and possible courses of action.

The Birch Society members are entitled to follow Welch's views if they wish, but that doesn't make them right in our mind.

The society's drive to impeach Chief Justice Earl Warren is based on its belief that he has aided the Communist conspiracy in 63 out of 65 votes of the Supreme Court, and the action is directed against Warren even though, in the society's view, Justice Hugo Black has voted with the conspiracy a perfect 102 out of 102 times.

The explanation that Warren is being impeached as a symbol of the Court's "unconstitutional" decisions again is far short of what most Americans would consider the American determination to dispense justice equally and on the basis of a man's actions rather than his opinions.

The fact that three "Impeach Warren" billboards on Highway 40 were countered by 12 billboards supporting the Chief Justice is proof, the man said it, of the power and financial backing of the Communist conspiracy.

The case against President Dwight Eisenhower, would be ludicrous were it not that Birchers apparently believe Welch's "documentation."

Without going into a detailed refutation of the ridiculous collection of twisted half-truths and guilt by associations, it need only be pointed out that one plank in the case against Eisenhower is Welch's statement that he never was a Republican and was actually run for President in 1952 by the Democrats who knew that they couldn't win with any Democratic candidate. That's what the man said and what Birchers apparently believe.

Reasonable men might question whether the John Birch Society is even an educational organization. One knowledgable Livermorean said after leaving Friday night's meeting that what he had just experienced was the antithesis of education.

A film frankly designed to frighten its audience was followed by a speaker proclaiming the views of a hero whose flaming sword will strike down the enemy. It that education? It sounded much more like indoctrination in the views of a single man, which is a far cry from educating the people to the facts as they really are and an understanding of possible alternatives.

The views of the Birch society used to be more or less academic for Livermoreans. But as of right now the opinions and activities of these people are of specific and important local interest.

One chapter exists in Livermore now and the society is openly recruiting members and has even talked of as many as 400 members in Livermore Valley.

And while the society claims to be, and probably is, nonpolitical, its members are encouraged to be active in local politics and community affairs. In recent months Livermoreans have seen some evidence of this type of activity: the questioning of the patriotism of a school board candidate and some of the extreme attitudes proclaimed during the dispute over teaching of patriotism at high school.

The real fear that should be in the hearts of Livermoreans now is that the political activity of individual John Birch Society members will manifest itself here as it has in other communities. A growing community has problems enough without having to go through the type of thing that happened in Paradise, Calif., just to name one example.

Now, to be careful not to fall into the same kind of guilt by association attitude we accuse the Birchers of, it must be pointed out that not all challenging of attitudes or questioning of patriotism here will necessarily be prompted by the Birchers and because their membership is secret we will know of none but the leaders. But they are here and we must be wary of them.

To be especially fair to the John Birch Society, it must also be pointed out that these comments are being published in a newspaper—and you all know about newspapers.

Time and again we were told last Friday night that the press, magazines, and television of the Nation are controlled by the Communists. That is almost a refreshing change from the constant accusations of the Communists that we are the capitalist press.—A.L.H.

What Kind of a Nut Is He?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the New Frontier seems to be proceeding with great "vigah" to put into reverse practice President Kennedy's statement, "Ask not what your Government can do for you, but what you can do for your Government."

The Harvard-trained Frontiersmen are causing many to wonder if the time-tested virtues of thrift, self-determination and free enterprise may not soon be a thing of the past.

In this vein, an editorial from the Odessa (Tex.) American reprinted in the May 16, 1963, issue of the Clark County (Kans.) Clipper is most appropriate:

WHAT KIND OF A NUT IS HE?

He wants to run his own business.
He wants to select his own doctor.
He wants to make his own bargains.
He wants to buy his own insurance.
He wants to select his own reading matter.
He wants to provide for his own old age.
He wants to make his own contracts.
He wants to select his own charities.
He wants to educate his children as he wishes.
He wants to make his own investments.
He wants to select his own friends.
He wants to provide his own recreation.
He wants to compete freely in the marketplace.
He wants to grow by his own efforts.
He wants to profit from his own errors.
He wants to take part in the competition of ideas.
He wants to be a man of good will.

What kind of a nut is he? He's an American who understands and believes in the Declaration of Independence, that's what kind.

Aren't you glad you are too? And don't you wonder why so many of our fellow Americans are trying so hard to destroy the kind of life that has made us the aim and the envy of every other people on earth?

The question is: What kind of nuts are they?

Civil Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, my home city of Portland, Oreg., continues to be in the limelight as a result of the decision of its city council to abandon the civil defense program which perhaps was one of the outstanding ones among American cities. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to introduce in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD four editorials on the subject—one from the New York Post of May 31, 1963, one from the Washington Daily News of June 3, 1963, one from the June 1, 1963, edition of the Washington Post, and the fourth from the June 5, 1963, edition of the Evening Star of Washington, D.C.:

[From the New York Post of May 31 1963]

SUBJECT FOR DEBATE

Debate on the administration's request for $175 million to expand its shelter program is taking place against the backdrop of Oregon's wanting "out" from the program.

Oregonians, as Senator WAYNE MORSE interprets the action of their State legislature, considers the civil defense program senseless, wasteful, and unrealistic. Judging by New York's failure to tap the civil defense funds made available by Governor Rockefeller, such sentiments may be nationwide.

Sharp reservations about the shelter program are also reflected in the staff study of the House Armed Services Subcommittee which is holding hearings on the administration's request. It is absurd for civil defense officials to suggest that such questions spring from a reluctance to face up to the facts of the nuclear age.

As the staff study emphasizes, Congress as well as the American people need to be persuaded of the technical feasibility of a shelter program. It is the legitimate doubt on this score that leads to the further view that the program might constitute "a cruel and dangerous deception on the American people."

The issue is real; a national debate is in order.

[From the Washington Post, June 1, 1963]

NO HIDING PLACE

Civil Defense Chief Steuart L. Pittman has a thankless assignment in defending the administration's $175 million shelter program. The program had its genesis in the 1961 Berlin crisis, and even at that time there were grave doubts about the worth or wisdom of a vast shelter effort. Nothing has happened since to strengthen the case for the kind of blast shelter program Mr. Pittman is urging; much has happened to weaken it.

The central objections are summed up in an able staff study prepared by Philip W. Kelleher for the House Armed Services subcommittee headed by Representative HÉBERT, of Louisiana. The study suggests that the administration plan for constructing truly effective blast shelters is not feasible, that the program could become a wasteful boondoggle, and that there are serious moral issues raised by encouragement of private, every-man-for-himself shelters.

Mr. Pittman understandably rejects the feasibility argument, citing some scientific opinion to support the validity of private shelters and shelter areas in public buildings. But it will take considerable evidence to overcome the opinion to the contrary. Hanson W. Baldwin, military editor of the New York Times, sums up the opposing view:

"The 100-megaton weapon has invalidated the civil defense concepts of yesterday. Its explosion and the resulting fire storms would probably ignite anything flammable out to 35 to 60 miles from the center and incinerate or asphyxiate the occupants of shelters."

The administration response—that there are only six cities vulnerable to fire storms—is not exactly reassuring nor entirely persuasive. The fact is, as Mr. Baldwin stresses, that in an age of the offensive weapon, the enemy can nullify all except the most costly and elaborate attempts to provide protection.

Moreover, there is much weight to the staff study's point that a commitment to a shelter program would be irreversible and that potent economic interests would find reasons wholly unrelated to defense for favoring a permanently expanding effort. This has been the melancholy history of the strategic surplus stockpiles. Concerning the moral objections, much has been said, and time has given even more pertinence to the observation of Thomas E. Murray, former member of the Atomic Energy Commission. There is something sad, Mr. Murray asserted, "about the sight of a great nation falling back upon sheer survival as its all-consuming purpose in history. Such a morbid preoccupation reflects a bankruptcy of lucid, political thought."

In Oregon, the State legislature has voted to abolish the civil defense program. The city of Portland—long hailed as a model by civil defense officials—made the same decision earlier. This, it seems to us, reflects a growing awareness that the kind of civil defense plans Mr. Pittman is offering are obsolete. More and more Americans seem unwilling to invest millions to buy the illusion but not the reality of security. It will take some powerful, and plausible persuasion to demonstrate that a backyard shelter really offers a hiding place.

[From the Washington Daily News of June 3, 1963]

I Want Some Answers

(By Richard Starnes)

Every time the weight of accumulated evidence persuades me that mass insanity is the principal product of our society, along flickers a faint ray or hope that perhaps this gloomy conviction is still a mite premature.

Until recently, for example, old slack-jawed, bewildered, put-upon Boobus Americans would endure any indignity at the hands of his governing officials if only they took the precaution of first scaring him with a Bolshevik bogeyman.

Any taxpayer with mother wit enough to wonder just what we'll find on the moon that's worth the multibillion tab, was always coldly informed that if we didn't, the Russians would.

There are some heartening signs that this allpurpose nonanswer may have had it, however.

A notable straw in the wind was the action of the Portland (Oreg.) City Council, which abolished the city's civil defense organization. Heartened by this demonstration that the cries of a jobless bureaucrat were not necessarily fatal, the Oregon Legislature voted to perform the same humanitarian function with respect to the State civil defense machine.

Now, as if my cup wasn't slopping over already, a House committee has asked some searching and embarrassing questions about a $175 million fallout shelter program the Kennedy brothers are urging upon us. The questions, which were posed in a study by the staff of a House Armed Services subcommittee, seem sure to provoke mature debate on the feasibility of sheltering large numbers of Americans from radioactive fallout following nuclear war.

Simple arithmetic proves that any shelter program large enough to be meaningful will cost uncounted billions of borrowed dollars. Like the astronomical spenders in the space agency, the civil defense chaps follow the inexorable rule of keeping first estimates low enough to sucker Congress into authorizing some colossal lunacy, knowing they can always get more once a program is born and thus is automotically endowed with bureaucratic immortality.

Moreover, mass sheltering will mean mass management by a large number of persons, most of whom will turn out to be the sort of dolts and petty tyrants one would expect to enjoy prancing around in headgear of no earthly utility to anyone except a bedfast invalid. I think it can be accepted that anyonce who voluntarily wears a brassard does so in hope that whatever frail authority it confers will some day enable him to compel some superior mortal to do his bidding.

Given a choice of living under the orders of such a den mother for 2 weeks in a dungeon or of perishing decently in some rousing fireworks display, any person with character and intellectual stability would unhesitatingly choose the latter.

Before these warrens are authorized by Congress, I'd like to know if they are to be segregated or integrated? Co-ed or not? Will an unlucky prisoner be permitted to bring along a jug of old coffin varnish to wash down the pemican? Or will the WCTU, the NAACP and all the white supremacy councils trade away whatever rights I may still have? How about praying in these GI shelters—required or forbidden?

And, since the preservation of the species is the intent of the program, will the functionary with the armband and the white enameled fixture on his head permit, er, romance? Or will be ban it? Or possibly, insist on it?

Before they lock me up in one of their dratted sewers I want to have some answers.

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 5, 1963]

Shelters—A Cruel Deception?

An index to the kind of world we live in today can be found in the Hamburg firestorm of July 24, 1943.

On that date the British dropped a mere 2,400 tons of conventional explosives on the German port city. But the consequences for Hamburg were catastrophic.

These first bombs knocked out the water mains. On succeeding days tens of thousands of small fire bombs were dropped and these were followed by more blockbusters—8,000 tons in all. The chief intelligence officer in our London Embassy, James R. Newman, reported as follows:

"We got a phenomenon that man had never seen before, except perhaps in prehistory. Fires joined together in a radius of 3 miles. Hot gasses rose, while surrounding cool air was pulled in and acted as a bellows. Seventy thousand of Hamburg's 100,000 trees splintered to earth; 250,000 dwelling units out of 556,000 were completely destroyed. The fire lasted for 7 days. Temperatures flared to 1,400 and 1,800 degrees so that the bricks themselves actually burned. Thousands and thousands of people were in shelters at the time; all but a negligible fraction died anyway. Bodies were still being dug up 6 months later, most of them completely unmarked by fire. They had died of suffocation and carbon monoxide—70,000 in all."

Remember this disaster was visited upon Hamburg 20 years ago by a trifling 8,000 tons of conventional bombs. Has it a meaning for us today when, in an all-out thermonuclear attack, any major American city could expect to be hit, not with 8,000 tons, but with up to the equivalent of 100 million tons of explosives?

Surely it has. But very few people seem to care. We think the reason is not hard to discover.

A House Armed Services Subcommittee headed by Representative HÉBERT has been holding hearings on a Federal civil defense program, with particular reference to fallout shelters. And an Associated Press man reported the other day that the hearing was droning along before an average audience of 35 persons, some of whom were dozing. Obviously, nobody cares very much. And this view is reinforced by the recent decision in Portland, Oreg., to abolish its civil defense program and forget about it—fallout shelters and all.

Why is it that there is so little interest, so little concern? An excellent report to the Hébert subcommittee by its counsel, Philip W. Kelleher, furnishes at least some of the answers—especially with respect to fallout shelters. He quotes Dr. Alexander Langsdorf, Jr., a physicist at the Argonne Laboratories, as saying in a Chicago newspaper interview that the Russians, if they knew we had adequate fallout protection, would explode the bomb in the air rather than on the surface. Dr. Langsdorf added:

"From an airburst you get a massive firestorm which might set all Chicago on fire. Concrete fallout shelters would turn into ovens, cooking the people inside. If they don't burn they would probably suffocate, because all the oxygen would be consumed."

But let's suppose that some people hidden away in fallout shelters in some areas should survive. What of them? Mr. Kelleher quotes Dr. John N. Wolfe, chief, Environmental Sciences Branch of the Biology and Medicine Divisions of the Atomic Energy Commission, as follows: "Fallout shelters in many areas seem only a means of delaying death and represent only part of a survival plan. With an environment so completely modified, the question is, where does a man go after his sojourn in shelters? What does he do upon emergence?"

Mr. Kelleher elaborated on Dr. Wolfe's meaning in these words: "The survivor emerges from his shelter only to find that communications and distribution systems are damaged or destroyed. If there is food still undestroyed it may be contaminated, as will be the water supply. It is at least possible that the land which he must stand on is dangerously radioactive. Under these circumstances he may survive, but if so it will be through pure luck."

There is, of course, another side to this debate, and Mr. Kelleher presents it. But as we read his paper, he comes down squarely on the side of the argument which holds that "the currently planned fallout shelter program, or any extension of it, would work a cruel and dangerous deception on the American people."

For our part, we do not think the American people will want to spend up to $7 billion for fallout shelters, much less $100 to $200 billion for blast shelters. There is nothing in American nature that is compatible with the prospect of burrowing into the ground to hide for days and weeks, not knowing what has happened to wives, children or parents. George Kennan, speaking in a somewhat different context some time ago, just about said it all when he asked:

"Are we to flee like haunted creatures from one defensive device to another, each more costly and humiliating than the one before, cowering underground one day, breaking up our cities the next, attempting to surround ourselves with elaborate electric shields on the third, concerned only to prolong the length of our lives while sacrificing all the values for which it might be worth while to live?"

We think not. The only remedy, the only hope, is to prevent nuclear war. Meanwhile, again borrowing from a quotation used by Mr. Kennan: "Let us at least walk like men, with our heads up, so long as we are permitted to walk at all."

Pope John XXIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. Speaker, soon after the sun had set over St. Peter's Square while many thousands watched and the rest of the world waited, the word came that the beloved pontiff, Pope John XXIII had passed to his eternal reward. Many of those assembled—as did others in other parts of the world—unashamedly wept. Now the entire world kneels in abject sorrow to mark the passing of "the Pope of Peace and Good Will," and history will forever record his noble and untiring efforts to create world peace and good will among all men, regardless of race, creed or color.

Born Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli, in humble surroundings and of peasant parents who tilled the soil to eke out a bare living in the little known hamlet of Sotto il Monte, he too labored in the fields before he received the call to serve his Church. Despite all the splendor of the Papacy in Rome, he will always be remembered for his deep and sincere humility that touched all who were fortunate enough to be in his presence. He was a pastoral Pope—warm, humble, extremely contemporary and always optimistic with a bright outlook for the future. The 260th successor to St. Peter as the spiritual leader of a universal Church exceeding 550 million faithful, this great Vicar of Christ on Earth, was heard to exclaim on the first anniversary of his coronation, "One who is Pope at 78 years does not have a great future." Even then, his great impact on the world was beginning to take shape.

Pope John XXIII was the greatest moral force in modern history. He not only vitalized the Catholic Church, but created a tremendous measure of good will among non-Catholics throughout the world. His convening of the Ecumenical Council last fall in Rome had for one of its principal purposes the beginning of closer relations with the Protestant world. It was the most significant move in that direction taken for several centuries. Time and the continuation of the work of the Ecumenical Council will determine the strength of the foundation that was laid by the late beloved pontiff.

The diplomatic skill Pope John XXIII exhibited during his short reign of 5 years was not an accomplishment acquired in his latest years. Subsequent to his effective work with the Orthodox Church in the Balkans, he was to show skillful and masterful diplomatic and political acumen in those days when Paris was rising from the ashes of humiliation to a new liberation. His brilliant and bold encyclical "Pacem in Terris," or "Peace on Earth," was a historical document that had a forceful impact on the civilized world and endeared this Pope to peoples of all faiths. In this encyclical, Pope John XXIII reappraised the Communist world as a period of troubled transition—a movement in history based upon a false philosophy—that eventually will be subject to profound changes. This message addressed not only to Catholics but to men of good will all over the world gave renewed faith to the oppressed. This, together with his encyclical, "Mater et Magistra," or "Mother and Teacher," which was directed to the more prosperous to help the undeveloped, to share the abundant with those in poverty, hunger, misery, and despair. It was a forthright and historical document that enunciated an ancient philosophy of Jesus Christ that we are all our brothers' keepers, and one that focused attention on the vital social problems of the present day.

The deceased pontiff not only preached the brotherhood of man. He also practiced it throughout his life. Likened to Pope Leo XIII, his predecessor by almost a century who immediately upon his election as pontiff started working for the liberation of German Catholics who were suffering under Bismarck's repressive legislation, Pope John XXIII made history in his efforts to keep alive the spirit of human courage among the oppressed people of the world. As Angelo Cardinal Roncalli, he materially aided in the rescue and survival of thousands of Jews from the mad and sadistic oppression of Hitler and his Fascist cohorts during the World War II period. For these efforts, he earned the undying gratitude of the Jewish people in Israel and the rest of the world.

One of his crowning glories in the practice of brotherhood came when he named the Catholic Church's first African, Japanese, and Philippine cardinals as princes of the church. With the issuance of his two famous encyclicals and his unprecedented move to establish relations between the Catholic Church and the religion removed from the church, Pope John XXIII has left an indelible impression upon all the world—one that surpasses the achievements of any other modern pontiff.

Jim Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 31 the Hudson Dispatch published an editorial entitled "Jim Farley at 75 Still Rugged." I think my colleagues will find it of pleasant interest. I wish to commend the Hudson Dispatch for this fine editorial. Jim Farley is without doubt an outstanding humanitarian, a great American and one to whom the Democratic Party of today owes a great deal. He has rarely been wrong on his political evaluations and I am certain that history will prove him correct in his statement that President Kennedy "is likely to go down in history as one of our greatest Presidents." And in the days ahead I am sure my colleagues join me in wishing Jim Farley well.

The editorial follows:

JIM FARLEY AT 75 STILL RUGGED

One may or may not subscribe to the partisan views of James Aloysius Farley, a political craftsman who ranks among the best the Nation has ever produced and whose behind-the-scenes influence was indelibly stamped on the career of Franklin D. Roosevelt as both Governor and President, and on gubernatorial services of Alfred E. Smith and Herbert H. Lehman, but we doubt that even his foes in countless bouts in the arenas of politics would ever gainsay his stalwart dependability and his adherence to the principles he espoused.

Jim Farley, as he was known for decades to Presidents and Governors, as well as to the people of New York City and the Empire State, was 75 yesterday. At an age when most men have lost interest in what goes on around them, he is as full of zest as ever, and he is even contemplating a run against Republican Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, the New York State incumbent, next year. While not committing himself, the sage of Haverstraw declares that if nominated, he believes he could add more strength to the Democratic ticket than any others who have been mentioned for the race.

What we admire most about Jim Farley has always been his devotion to a principle. We have often felt that without his astute support, F.D.R. might not have gotten into the White House. He accepted the job of Postmaster General under President Roosevelt and ardently supported his chief during the 8 years of his first two terms in the White House. But, and if for no other reason, we came to admire Mr. Farley, he took a walk in 1940 when the squire of Hyde Park defied tradition and stood for a third term in the Presidency.

Mr. Roosevelt succeeded in his ambition and won that election as well as a fourth term in 1944, but the precedent he set will never be repeated, for Congress, fortunately, has enacted legislation limiting any occupant of the White House to two terms consecutively, thus stemming establishment of political dynasties that are almost inevitably bound to be of disservice to the country.

Mr. Farley's decision to no longer support FDR when the Chief Executive decided to defy tradition happened to parallel the thinking of our own father, who in all his life never voted any other than a straight Democratic ticket, taking his cue from his father. When FDR broke precedent and sought a third term, our dad for the only time after he became a voter refused to go to the polls. He felt he couldn't vote for Mr. Roosevelt and he wouldn't vote Republican.

Mr. Farley in a statement on the eve of his 75th birthday expressed the view that President John F. Kennedy "is likely to go down in history as one of our greatest Presidents." He added that he had never made a prediction that he didn't believe in. He supported his forecast of JFK's historical stature with the observation that Mr. Kennedy "came to the presidency better qualified than any other man in this century." He pointed to the present Chief Executive's education, his training in politics and government, his war service, his inquisitive mind, his memory and his courage as reasons to bolster his prognosis.

We would be the last one to sell Mr. Farley's analysis of Mr. Kennedy's place in U.S. history down the river, but personally feel constrained to withhold our own judgment on JFK's position in the ranks of American Chief Executives for at least a few years. If, as is more or less generally conceded, he is voted a second term in 1964, the ensuing 4 years will, in our mind, determine his rightful position in history's conclusions. We think he has done a very acceptable job despite his youth and could well rise to the heights of greatness Mr. Farley sees ahead for him.

Science and the Individual in a Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, June 5, at Mundelein College, Chicago, Ill., 218 graduates were presented with their degrees in the commencement exercises. The highlight of the ceremony was the commencement address by Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, entitled "Science and the Individual in a Changing World."

Because of legislative business here in Washington, I was unable to be present with Dr. Seaborg, Cardinal Meyer, and Sister Mary Ann Ida, president of Mundelein College, and those others participating in this proud event.

I did read with interest, however, Dr. Seaborg's address, and under leave to extend my remarks I would like to commend this speech to my colleagues and to the readership of the Congressional Record.

The speech follows:

Science and the Individual in a Changing World

Thank you, Sister Mary Ann Ida, for your kind words of introduction. I would like to say to Cardinal Meyer, to Sister Mary Ann Ida, as the president of Mundelein College, to the faculty, and to the students and their families and friends that I feel most honored to be here with you this afternoon.

Of course, I knew about Mundelein College and its recognized position in the educational community of the Midwest when I was working here in Chicago a number of years ago. This is one of the reasons why I am especially pleased to be able to come back, and to talk to all of you today. But I should like to talk most directly for a little while to the students who are graduating, since you are the reason we are all here. Surprisingly enough, I think that I may claim certain bonds of sympathy and understanding with you. In one way and another, you and I have all been heavily involved with the problems and processes of education for most of our lives—but of course this has been a somewhat longer and more complex period of involvement for me than for you students of the class of 1963.

For most of you, this day must seem to mark the completion of many years spent in grade schools, high schools, and then here in your college classrooms, studios, workrooms, and laboratories. For some of you today must seem the day when you can put all of this finally behind you and you can now sally forth into a new and waiting world.

But this is really not so much a day of completion for you as it is a day of beginning. That, of course, is why we say that this is your day of commencement. But I am also afraid that this will no longer be as rare an event in your life as it would have been in the days of your grandparents or even your parents. Our world is changing so rapidly today that for nearly every one of us here, almost every single day is a day of commencement in one way or another. Each day, most of us have new problems to face, new responsibilities, new anxieties, new burdens, and, if we are fortunate, new accomplishments and satisfactions as well.

It was not too long ago that a young person could graduate from college, or even from high school, almost completely equipped for a lifetime's career in the home, office, classroom, or laboratory. Today events are moving so rapidly that many of our textbooks are already obsolete and have to be supplemented by the daily newspapers and weekly news magazines.

For example, all our college textbooks in chemistry tell us that the noble gases such as helium, krypton, xenon, and radon are completely inert to chemical action. About a year ago, Prof. Neil Bartlett of the University of British Columbia announced that he had prepared a compound containing xenon. Investigators at the Argonne National Laboratory here in Chicago, including Howard H. Claasen, Henry Selig, and John G. Malm, have since discovered a number of additional compounds of some of these supposedly inert gases. This has been a notable scientific achievement, and one in which a Mundelein graduate, Geraldine Knapp, has also participated.

If we fall ill today, we may be cured by a drug that did not even exist 5 years ago. Our young people in the Peace Corps are going out to work and teach in distant places that were not even named on the maps they studied in school.

A man's lifetime of accumulated skills may become unneeded and unwanted because he has been replaced by a machine attached to a computer. Not too long ago, a man or a woman could be born, grow up, go to school, be married, live a full lifetime, and die and be buried in the same town. Today's graduating class comes from many parts of the world, many of you have already traveled extensively, and nearly all of you will still see many corners of this and other countries in your own lifetime. Perhaps some of your children will even see other corners of our solar system.

One of the results of rapidly changing conditions can be a sense of insecurity or anxiety. We see this in many forms: many people are afraid of what tomorrow may bring and wish they could return to the quiet and peaceful days of the past. Let us compare our situation with that of the people living in Europe during the days of the Renaissance. What was it like to live in those days? Life then was magnificent, cruel, glorious, uncertain, creative, and beset with problems. In brief, very much like life today. I think it of particular interest that most scholars today say that the period of the Renaissance started with a revolutionary advance in technology. About 1440, Johann Gutenberg invented the art of printing from movable type. The books that had once been the private treasures of institutions or a few wealthy persons thus became the common property of men and women of learning everywhere. The world has never been the same since

Today, science has become the dynamic factor in our society. There are a great many intelligent and dedicated men and women in the world using their highest talents and intelligence to try to solve complex problems about our universe. They are asking such questions as: What are the forces that hold the nucleus of an atom together? How does a tiny droplet of jelly develop and grow into a human baby—or a giant Sequoia tree? How old is the universe? Has our earth always had its oceans and continents? What were the conditions under which life developed on our earth? Is there life in other parts of the universe?

Answers to these questions will serve not only to satisfy our human curiosity, but, of course, will have enormous practical implications. Curiosity about our universe is part of our human inheritance, and the scientist is, after all, a person with a highly skilled and intelligently directed sense of curiosity. But he is not the only one driven by a sense of wonder and a sense of mission in the world—there are also those who are concerned with line and form and meter and rhythms and philosophical insight—those who devote their studies to the humanities.

Sometimes we hear that there is some sort of fundamental division or even antagonism between the sciences and the humanities or arts, but I cannot agree with this. If you look at the deeper motivations of the human spirit, you will find a need for knowledge, a need for understanding, and a very important need for creative expansion and expression. I think that these motivations really unite the scientist and the artist rather than divide them. Our world will be the richer for understanding this common bond.

There are some most remarkable developments taking place today in this area of cooperation between the fields of science and the fields of the arts. Many of these developments are not very well known or understood, but they are most exciting and challenging. Consider, for instance, how the invention of a simple mechanical device, the aqualung, by Jacques Cousteau has opened up an entire new field of historical investigation. The discoveries of the underwater archeologists in the Mediterranean alone are giving us new insight into the past. We are seeing not only the art treasures of ancient times, but are learning about the old trade routes, the techniques of engineering and science and much about what it must have been like to live in those days. M. Cousteau has recently described the discovery and exploration of a sunken wreck off Marseille. In addition to hand tools and pottery, part of its cargo also included some 7,000 wine jars or amphorae. I am sure that any of the great names of the romantic period of the last century would envy M. Cousteau's opportunity to sip wine over 2,000 years old and to discover that it tasted of pine rosin, just as does much of the wine of modern Greece.

There are many other examples today of remarkable advances being made as the result of close cooperation between the scientist and the artist or historian. I am sure you all know about how the accurate measurement of tiny amounts of the radioactive carbon-14 is used to estimate the age of the relics of ancient man. For this work, my friend Prof. Willard F. Libby was awarded the Nobel Prize in 1960. There are still other methods used to put a date on an ancient object.

One of the favorite materials used by ancient man for making tools was obsidian. This is actually a volcanic glass, and could be skillfully fashioned into very sharp arrowheads, knives, scrapers and the like. Obsidian does not rust when it gets wet, but it will slowly absorb water to form what we call in chemistry a hydrated layer on its surface. Scientists at the Smithsonian Institution have recently learned how to measure the thickness of this layer, and so can estimate the age of an object of obsidian. They can also use this method to detect modern-day forgeries of obsidian art objects.

The whole subject of detecting frauds in art is as fascinating a detective story as you could want, and an important one. Chemists can analyze the materials used in a painting, and, for example, if a painting attributed to Rembrandt contains a pigment which was not invented until 1922, then this is certainly a significant piece of circumstantial evidence.

Ancient coins and metal objects have always been valuable curios and there have always been those who would try to counterfeit them. Usually this was done by making a mold and casting a copy, say with molten silver. It used to be that an expert could detect such a fake with a microscope; the tiny bubbles which were formed during the casting were characteristic. But today counterfeiters are using the most modern techniques of vacuum casting to turn out Athenian drachmas and Persian shekels that are almost more real looking than the original, even under the microscope. Museums today are having to use X-ray diffraction to see how the atoms in the metal are arranged in order to detect fraud.

Genuine coins were made (and still are today) by hammering a piece of metal between an engraved die and an engraved anvil. This forces the design into the coin, but also changes the arrangement of the tiny crystals of the metal. A coin that is cast from a molten metal does not have the same X-ray diffraction pattern as does the hammered metal, and so can be detected as a fraud.

Still another way in which scientists are doing important work today is in helping to preserve the fine works of art which are part of our cultural heritage. Over 600 years ago, the early Italian artist Giotto painted a remarkable series of frescoes in the Scrovegni Chapel in Padua, Italy. They are among the finest paintings of their period, and, by and large, are in an excellent State of preservation. But there were a few areas where these paintings were damaged in the past, and various processes of deterioration were beginning to set in. In places, the hard plaster on which the frescoes were painted was beginning to crumble away to a fine powder. Some of this could have been a result of water seepage, but this was only part of the problem. In an interesting example of international cooperation, scientists in the United States determined that the hard plaster and the crumbling plaster were of different chemical composition. The hard plaster contained calcium carbonate, chemically equivalent to limestone or marble. The crumbled plaster contained large amounts of calcium sulfate, which is gypsum or plaster of paris. This was the clue they needed: what was happening was that small amounts of sulfuric acid in the atmosphere were slowly attacking the plaster. Today, Padua is a busy industrial city, and there is even a nearby factory manufacturing rayon upwind of the chapel.

Now that the cause of the decay is known, it should be possible to protect the painting by suitable air conditioning and air purification, combined with the use of appropriate colorless plastic resins to hold on the loosened areas of color. The discovery that the plaster is being attacked by industrial fumes will also be followed closely in other places in Italy and will undoubtedly help to protect still other works of art. The key part of this research was the use of X-ray diffraction, which can provide a chemical and crystal analysis of a tiny pinch of sample. I am proud to say that scientists at one of the laboratories of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Brookhaven National Laboratory, were among those who were able to contribute in this delicate work because of their special capabilities.

Another stimulating use of modern techniques to solve old problems is in the field of languages. The written language of the Mayas of Central America has long been a puzzle. There was no Rosetta stone to help, as there was for the Egyptian hieroglyphics. Interestingly enough, the key to the language of the Mayas seems to have been found. A group of Russian investigators has recently announced that by the help of modern electronic computers in studying patterns of distribution of symbols, and so on, a nearly complete solution has been worked out.

It may be of particular interest at this school to note that computers are also being used in theological studies. The complete works of St. Thomas Aquinas include approximately 13 million words. A complete concordance or index to the words in all his books would be of great use to those who would like to make a detailed study of the way he thought and wrote, or of how his thinking may have been influenced by others of his time and before. It has been estimated that such a complete concordance would take 50 scholars some 40 years to complete by hand in the old traditional way.

Through the use of the newer machine processing of such data, such a concordance could be completed with about one-fortieth of the time and effort, permitting the researchers to use more of their time for their specific scholarly abilities, such as interpreting and organizing the information obtained. Such a program is currently underway—a library in Italy has recently put all the words in the Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas on some 1,600,000 punched cards for machine processing.

A similar program is underway to study the words of the famous Dead Sea scrolls; it is interesting to note in this instance that a special card punch had to be devised to punch the cards from right-to-left, since this is the way the scrolls were written.

Perhaps a lesson to be gained from these accounts is the fact that there is a unity of knowledge and knowledge seeking. There is a continuum that extends from theories of the origin of the universe through the rise of life on earth to the evolution and history of man, and on to the completion of the cycle with such an abstruse field as high energy particle theory. There is no knowledge that is isolated from the total fabric.

René Descartes spoke directly to this point over 300 years ago, when he said: "Hence we must believe that all sciences are so interconnected, that it is much easier to study them all together than to isolate one from all the others. Therefore, if anyone wishes to search out the truth of things in earnest, he should not select any one special science; for all the sciences are conjoined with each other and interdependent." Today, I think he would have said the sciences and the arts are interdependent, as well. But then Descartes went on to say something more, which seems to me to represent much of what it is that your faculty here at Mundelein College wants for its students. If you will permit me the small liberty of changing the gender of a few pronouns, Descartes goes on to say: "Let her think only about how to increase the natural light of reason, not in order to solve this or that difficulty of a scholastic nature, but that her understanding may direct her will to its proper choice in every contingency of life."

I understand that Mundelein College is now in the process of making a very thorough study of its purposes, in order that the understanding of its students will let them make a proper choice in every contingency of life.

I look forward to seeing the results of these studies, because the kind of questions which are being asked are those which lie at the heart of most of the problems of the world. Your college is asking: What are we doing here? Where are we going? What is our purpose in life?

These are also the questions which we should ask ourselves as a nation from time to time. And they are certainly the questions which we should ask ourselves as individuals. Since our world and its circumstances and the pressures on us are constantly changing, like the headlines in each morning's newspaper, we have to ask ourselves if we are trying to get through tomorrow's examinations by turning in yesterday's set of answers.

One of the major problems of the woman, particularly the educated woman in our life today, is that of finding her true identity among all the external forces telling her to do this or to be that, or to fit into this prefabricated pattern. As many of you know, Mrs. Betty Frieden has made a thorough study of this situation in her recent book, "The Feminine Mystique." It seems to me characteristic of the spirit of your school here at Mundelein that this book is being actively discussed and evaluated not only by the students but by the faculty, who are also anxious to understand and to help. Mrs. Frieden's principal theme is one which is an old one, but which seems to b even more valid today than ever before. This is the necessity of creative and productive work for the continued growth of the whole individual. As she says, to do the work that you are capable of doing is the mark of maturity.

There are too many people, magazine editors, advertisers, and the like, trying to keep all women in the home, rather than finding out what it is that thy can really best do as individuals. Our country needs the talents of all its people. We need intelligence, mental and moral strength and courage, and the imagination to see byond the immediate needs of today. We should be grateful that these human abilities are not the exclusive possession of any limited group. Nature has seen to it that thy come to us in packages with a very wide range of shapes, size and color, and labeled both male and female. Biologists of course recognize that this diversity is one of the fundamental reasons for the success of the human race.

This graduating class can also make its contributions to our country, and I am sure will want to. You are here as the result of your own hard work and thought. You are here as the result of the loving help of your families. You are here because of the patience, devotion, and dedication of your teachers. You owe something to all of them, in the same way that we all are the cultural debtors of our ancestors. But you also owe it to yourselves and to your future husbands and children to do the very best you can with what you have. If you use your education and exercise your capabilities, you will continue to learn, and to grow in understanding and wisdom. The world is growing and we must grow with it as a nation and as indidividual men and women. I wish you all good luck in the years to come. Toil and responsibility will be heavy, but I think you will find that they can give you more rewarding satisfaction and accomplishment.

Welfare Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of criticism directed in the last year against the operation and administration of the public welfare programs of the District of Columbia government.

In my view, some of the criticism has been unfounded. And, in this regard, I include in the RECORD a letter printed in the Wall Street Journal on May 7, 1963, which points out the special circumstances in which the welfare and, for that matter, all operations of the District find themselves:

WELFARE STATISTICS

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

In your editorial "Investigators With Vested Interests" (March 20), you have expressed a point of view and taken a position without, it seems to me, investigating the facts.

In this editorial you draw some conclusions regarding the Washington, D.C., study of ineligible recipients of public assistance. In connection with this project several things should be kept in mind.

The District of Columbia has no form of self-government and is directly dependent on the Congress for all its policies, appropriations, and other legislation. In this respect it is completely different from all other jurisdictions where representative legislatures and active citizenry make policies, appropriate funds, and keep an eye on how they are administered. The vulnerability of any District of Columbia program to neglect, abuse, misinterpretation, and out-of-date policies is, therefore, extreme. Even when Members of Congress seek conscientiously to serve the District, the fact they are answerable to a different constituency creates a situation unlike that in any State.

The District of Columbia covers a very small geographical area and many of those who work for the Government, especially in the middle and upper income groups, actually live in suburbs located in Maryland and

Virginia, leaving a heavy concentration of lower income families in the city itself who are especially vulnerable to all the factors that make for dependency.

I think no fairminded person would say that the statistics gathered in the Washington study should be ignored but I think it is only fair to say that the results are far from characteristic of welfare administration in other jurisdictions.

HARRY T. SEALY.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Gov. William Scranton of Pennsylvania Creates Council for Human Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Gov. William Scranton, by executive order on May 29, 1963, has taken the constructive and progressive step in Pennsylvania of creating a council for human services. As I believe that Governor Scranton is to be highly complimented on this humane and farseeing action, I am enclosing the executive order in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to give broad coverage for the benefit of Congress and the American people.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Harrisburg, May 29, 1963.

EXECUTIVE ORDER

Governments exist among men because man is a social being and it is his nature to join with other men for the common good.

Western civilization sees each human being as a child of God, made in His image and likeness.

We hold that human life and human dignity are precious things. When misfortune strikes individuals or families within our society we feel an obligation to respond.

The concept of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God has led to providing care for the unfortunate members of society through governmental action.

Pennsylvania can be proud of the variety of welfare and health programs which operate under the auspices of the Commonwealth to meet the social needs and to fulfill the social responsibilities of Pennsylvanians.

But, the very variety of these programs creates its own problems. They are complex in policy, in operation, and in financing. Sometimes overlapping of effort saps the full potential of the effort.

We know that the social ills of our time are seldom isolated from each other. One family problem with social overtones breeds another. Chronic unemployment, delinquency, certain health needs—the list goes on at length in a chain of cause and effect.

It is not unusual for one family to be the subject of individual attention from a variety of State agencies and programs.

Frequently, this causes two difficulties:

One, because they are not coordinated, the services rendered by the Commonwealth sometimes are not as effective as they might be.

Two, the same lack of coordination results in duplication, overlapping and waste, resulting in turn in a heavier drain on State tax revenues.

Therefore, I am hereby establishing within the administration a council for human services.

This device, which we believe to be of a pioneer nature within the Nation, is designed to meet a twofold purpose. First, providing better welfare and health services for those in need; and, second, to accomplish these without wasting by inefficiency or duplication the tax dollars which pay for the many Commonwealth-sponsored programs.

The council for human services will consist of the secretary of public welfare, the secretary of health, the secretary of labor and industry, the superintendent of public instruction, commissioner of mental health, or secretary of mental health if departmental status is created, the secretary of administration, the attorney general, and the secretary of commerce. I hereby designate the secretary of public welfare as chairman of the council.

The council will advise the Governor on desirable changes in policy, program and structure for carrying out his responsibilities in providing human services. The council will develop and effectuate common policy with respect to related functions and responsibilities in the member departments.

In accordance with these purposes the council is hereby assigned the following continuing functions:

1. To conduct joint studies and develop programs in those areas of human services in which two or more of the departments represented on the council have responsibilities.

2. To decide on courses of action and to establish arrangements and mechanisms for interdepartmental coordination of human services programs common to more than one department represented on the council.

3. To consider new aspects of human services problems facing the Commonwealth and to recommend courses of action to the Governor.

In addition, the council's immediate functions will be:

1. To develop a Commonwealth policy for human services.

2. To formulate a human services program of action. Such program should be designed to mobilize all resources available under currently authorized programs in Pennsylvania. Particular attention should be given to the needs of our citizens who are suffering most under the twin burdens of economic stress and social strain. In this connection, the council is directed also to submit to the Governor recommendations for additional measures required for the more effective and efficient provision of human services.

The council may appoint such committees as may be indicated to consist of representatives of the departments concerned and professional and technical specialists. The council may request any department represented on the council to provide such resources, including personnel, information and materials, as will enable the council properly to carry out its functions.

The department of public welfare shall house such central staff as the council may require. For the purpose of retaining supplemental expert assistance for carrying out special studies, or for other expenses of the council, the council may utilize funds which are or may be made available to one or more of the departments involved, including such funds as may be made available from other public or private sources.

Whenever possible, special studies or pilot projects shall be carried out through the departments involved, rather than by the council itself.

The council shall meet regularly but not less than four times a year. The members shall be expected to attend meetings personally; however, when they are unable to attend, they shall designate a deputy or bureau chief responsible for the human services functions in their respective departments. The deputy secretary of public welfare, the commissioner of mental health, the deputy secretary of health, the commissioner of corrections, and one deputy or bureau chief from each of the departments of public instruction, labor and industry and commerce, and the office of administration, to be designated by the respective department heads, shall regularly attend meetings of the council and participate in discussions in addition to the head of the department.

Departmental units or programs which may be the concern of the council for human services include:

Department of public instruction: Special education, vocational education, adult education, State colleges—training for Commonwealth employment, Governor's committee on the handicapped, manpower development and training administration, area redevelopment administration and 2,508.3 courses.

Department of labor and industry: Vocation rehabilitation, workmen's insurance fund, Governor's committee on the physically handicapped, advisory board on problems of older workers, Pennsylvania apprenticeship and training councils, inspection bureau, bureau of employment security-employment service, unemployment compensation, manpower development and training administration and area redevelopment administration programs.

Department of justice: Adult prisons.

Department of health: Public health education, study, prevention and control of addictions, control of epidemics and venereal diseases, chronic disease programs, child health centers and special services to children with heart abnormalities, cleft palates who are crippled, nutritional improvement, public health nursing consultation and service, air pollution control, environmental safety, occupational disease control, sanitary engineering (inspection and control).

Department of public welfare: Income maintenance, supervsion of agencies and institutions for children, juvenile delinquency prevention and treatment, treatment of the mentally ill, care and treatment of the mentally retarded, mental health education and planning, licensing or supervision of institutions for the aged, convalescent and infirm program development for the noninstitutionalized aged, licensing or supervision of proprietary and voluntary general hospitals, administration of State-owned general hospitals, administration of Hill-Burton funds, vocational rehabilitation of the blind, remedial eye care, business enterprises, home teaching.

Department of commerce: Development of local housing, industrial and commercial facilities, community planning and renewal.

WILLIAM W. SCRANTON.

The Way of Our Schools: Dr. Hutchins Finds a Hole in the Wall, Child Sized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post, Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, an educator who never ceases to educate, points the way to aid our schoolchildren, fast and fairly. He indorses the aproach suggested by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, JAMES J. DELANEY, the GI bill for junior, H.R. 320. I am pleased to note as a sponsor of the bill with Mr. DELANEY that it now has more sponsors than any other education bill now before the House.

This article is not very long but it goes very far in the direction we should take if we would demonstrate to the Nation that we truly seek to prepare all our children to achieve the education they will need to live in the world we have made.

I do not hold with the author's observation that the President is perpetuating a masquerade in the presentation of his $5.3 billion educational program. The truth is that in 21 out of 24 parts adequate provision is made for aid to all educational systems. It is only in those titles governing general education that the formula is deficient. The Delaney bill in replacement of those titles would serve to conform all titles to the same high standard.

I commend to my colleagues Dr. Hutchins' contribution as follows:

A LIBERAL CALLS FOR AID TO CHURCH SCHOOLS

(By Robert M. Hutchins)

Federal aid to education is an absolute necessity. But a political argument over funds for parochial schools, marquerading as a constitutional issue, bars the way. Unfortunately President Kennedy, while calling for $5.3 billion in aid to education over a period of years, is himself guilty of jeopardizing aid to all schools by perpetuating the masquerade.

The President and many others, especially liberals, tell us aid to church-school pupils is a constitutional question. They say there is a wall of separation between church and state forbidding any kind of assistance, direct or indirect, to an educational institution operated under the auspices of a church.

In fact, the Constitution says nothing of separation and makes no mention of a wall. The words of the first amendment are: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The Supreme Court has held that the 14th amendment makes these words applicable to State legislatures as well as to Congress. Nothing in the words necessarily leads to the conclusion that every form of aid, direct or indirect, to educational institutions under religious auspices is unconstitutional.

We owe the wall not to the Constitution but to a letter from Thomas Jefferson to the Baptist Association of Danbury, Conn., in 1802, replying to a complimentary address. Jefferson wrote, "Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between man and his God, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legislative powers of government reach actions only, and not opinions, I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should 'make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,' thus building a wall of separation between church and state."

The letter shows that what Jefferson was interested in was freedom of religion. He did not want the Government telling people how or whom or whether they should worship—first, because of the nature of religion, and second, because of the nature of government. Religion was a matter between a man and his God; government should not, if only because it could not, attempt to control the thoughts of men.

The wall Jefferson erected in the name of the first amendment rose no higher than was necessary to wall off the religious opinions and practices of citizens from interference by government. His letter does not suggest that he would have opposed public expenditures that might benefit schools under religious management. And the record shows that he recommended procedures by which students at the University of Virginia, supported by the State and founded by Jefferson, might receive religious instruction.

Jefferson's wall disappeared into the mists of history for 77 years. Then it came back into view when the Supreme Court held that the first amendment did not protect polygamy among the Mormons. It came back, that is, with a hole in it, through which the Government marched against a practice defended in religion's name. In justifying legislative condemnation of a church's action, Chief Justice Morrison Waite, who wrote the opinion of the Court, used the Jefferson doctrine that legislative powers should be limited specifically to regulation of actions.

All was quiet along the wall for 62 years. Then, in 1941 it reappeared, but with another large hole in it, through which a school board in New Jersey drove buses carrying some children to parochial schools. The action was authorized by State law. In 1947 its constitutionality was upheld. The majority opinion said, "The first amendment has erected a wall between church and state. That wall must be kept high and impregnable. We could not approve the slightest breach. New Jersey has not breached it here."

For the last 15 years, whenever there has been a case involving church and state, almost every Supreme Court Justice has felt constrained to bow before the wall. The psalms sung in its behalf have grown more eloquent and more moving. It has become one of our more popular figures of speech. But the only effect of the wall on the decisions of the Court has been to confuse the opinions of the Justices.

The wall is used indiscriminately as a jumping-off point in all the cases in which the religion clauses of the first amendment are invoked. These cases are in general of three quite different kinds: those in which a public agency has used public money in a way benefiting private schools indirectly; those in which a public agency has authorized a program of "released time" for religious instruction in public schools or in connection with public schools; and those in which a public agency has instituted religious exercises in public schools.

Released time and religious exercises put the power of the state behind religion and raise the question of public pressure, direct or indirect, on the consciences of individuals and the consequent limitation of the exercise of their religious freedom. Indirect financial aid to schools under religious auspices does not raise this question. Such aid may actually help the aided pupils to exercise their religious freedom; it cannot be seriously argued that it restricts the religious freedom of those who are not assisted.

For all its talk of the wall, the fact is that the Supreme Court has never held aid to pupils in religious schools unconstitutional. As the Court sustained New Jersey in providing transportation for pupils in Catholic schools, so it sustained Louisiana in providing textbooks for children in all schools. The theory in both cases was the same: an overriding public purpose was to be served—the education of the children in the State. The fact that some benefit might incidentally accrue to a private school or to the religious organization that managed it was not significant.

The tax exemption of church schools has never been challenged. Neither have the numerous Government programs of grants, loans, scholarships, and tax benefits under such laws as the GI Bill of Rights, the College Housing Act, the School Lunch Act, and the Surplus Property Act, all of which have been available to church-supported institutions. The Kennedy Administration has sonorously opposed Federal aid to church schools. Yet it finds no logical difficulty in recommending in its present bill appropriations to facilitate the recruitment of teachers by parochial as well as by public schools.

My conclusion is that Federal aid to pupils in parochial schools is not a constitutional issue. It is a political issue, a real and important one. It may be stated this way: Will the general welfare be promoted by including parochial-school pupils in a national program of education, or will it be promoted by leaving them out?

In 1961 5½ million children received education in Catholic elementary and secondary schools. That is a little more than an eighth of all schoolchildren in these categories. If the Constitution does not require us to leave one-eighth of our children out of a national program of education, why should we do so?

In the New Jersey bus case, the court said, "It [the State of New Jersey] cannot exclude individual Catholics, Lutherans, Mohammedans, Baptists, Jews, Methodists, Nonbelievers, Presybterians, or the members of any other faith, because of their faith, or lack of it, from receiving the benefits of public-welfare legislation."

The children in schools supported by religious denominations should not be excluded because of their faith from the benefits of a national program of education. And we can hardly have a national program unless these children are involved in it.

Representative JAMES J. DELANEY, of New York, has reintroduced a bill to authorize a 2-year program of Federal aid to all elementary and secondary schoolchildren in all the States. The bill provides that $20 shall be allotted annually to each pupil to defray part of the cost of his education. Pupils who did not record their intention or desire to attend a private school would be presumed to be destined for a public school, in which case the allotment would be paid to the public educational authority in their community.

This is a GI Bill of Rights for children in elementary and secondary schools. Over a 2-year period it would add $1.7 billion to the resources of these schools. Something more than $100 million a year would go to church-related schools.

SCHOOL IS NOT CHURCH

Legislation of this sort would quiet the fears of those who are alarmed at the prospect of Federal control. It should calm those who believe that aid to church-related schools means the destruction of the public schools. It should satisfy everybody, except those who hold that a church-related school is the same thing as a church. They might say that legislation authorizing payment of $20 of taxes to a church school was the same as giving a citizen $20 of taxes to put in the plate on Sunday. They might argue that such payments were neither constitutionally possible nor politically wise.

But a school is not an assembly for worship. It does not perform ecclesiastical functions. Payments to a pupil for his education are not payments for the support of worship, of ecclesiastical functions or of the propagation of the faith. The object of education is the development of the mind. This may be conducted under religious auspices, but it is not the same as the development of religion or of the spiritual life. The Supreme Court would not have allowed New Jersey to pay for buses to carry worshipers to church.

A sensational shift in public opinion has been going on over the past 2 years on the subject of Federal aid to all schools. In March 1961, the Gallup Poll showed that 57 percent of those interviewed thought Federal aid should go only to public schools; in February 1963, only 44 percent of those polled were of this opinion. Apparently the commonsense of the American people is winning over the pedantry of their leaders.

Pakistan Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the terrible disaster which has swept Pakistan in the form of a cyclone and the resulting huge tidal waves, calls forth the deepest sympathy of our citizens, and all the aid we can possibly give them. The clipping from the Baltimore Sun gives detailed information:

CYCLONE TOLL PUT AT 16,000 IN PAKISTAN—TIDAL WAVE CALLED REAL KILLER AS AYUB KHAN FLIES OVER AREA

KARACHI, PAKISTAN, June 3.—Officials today set the death toll at 16,000 in the cyclone and tidal wave that swept the Bay of Bengal May 26. Unofficial estimates put it at from 25,000 to 50,000.

"It is a great national calamity," said President Ayub Khan after a flight over the disaster area.

The real killer, he told newsmen, was not the cyclone, but the tidal wave that swept the low lying islands in the Bay of Bengal afterward.

COUNTS 68 BODIES

He said the cyclone's path was narrower, but more devastating, than the one in 1960 that killed 10,000.

Fazalul Quader Chowdhry, central minister who also flew over the scene, said he saw bodies still floating in inaccessible areas. He said he counted 68 himself.

"What I saw was ghastly," he said, "what I heard was harrowing."

He described bodies caught in shrubs and trees and police searching for victims in rice fields.

THOUSANDS MAROONED

Deputy Commissioner K. Ahmed, of Chittagong, near the disaster area, said it would take officials 2 weeks to complete a survey of the ravaged areas and calculate the final death toll.

Officials told of the dangers of hunger, thirst, and disease among the survivors. Thousands were marooned and in danger of dying through lack of food and drinking water.

"You can't drop food on water," Ayub Khan told newsmen.

He said food could be dropped only after the waters had receded.

Five U.S. Peace Corps nurses stationed in Chittagong went into the interior to inoculate survivors. Their trip was sponsored by Lions International.

Ayub Khan approved a further $1,050,000 for relief, bringing the total to $1,470,000. The United States has made an initial grant of $10,000.

It was encouraging to note that in response to the appeal of the East Pakistan Government for aid, the Red Cross, CARE, several Peace Corps nurses stationed in the area, under the sponsorship of Lions International, and our own Government, have all responded to the need.

I am proud to report also that one of our local Baltimore bakeries, the Houswald Bakery, is donating 200 cases (24 loaves to the case) of canned bread to the victims. Efforts are being made to have Pan-American Airways transport the bread to East Pakistan. Baltimoreans are being urged to contribute to the cause by paying for additional loaves of the canned bread, and I am confident they will respond in their usual generous manner.

I strongly urge our Government to supplement its initial grant of $10,000 with whatever amount may be needed over and above private efforts, to help meet the terrific need of the estimated million persons left homeless by this disaster.

The Miracle of Pope John

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the column written by Mr. Walter Lippmann which was published in the June 6 New York Herald-Tribune, entitled "The Miracle of Pope John." The column needs no preface nor additional comment. It is a remarkable tribute to a remarkable man:

THE MIRACLE OF POPE JOHN

(By Walter Lippmann)

The reign of Pope John has been a wonder which grows more astounding the more we think how amidst the angry enmities of our time he became so greatly loved. It is a modern miracle that any one could reach across all the barriers of class, caste, color, and creed to touch the hearts of all kinds of people. There has been nothing like it, certainly not in the modern age. The miracle is a proof which we sorely needed that all the varieties of men do actually belong to one human family. Otherwise, so many could not have heard and understood and responded to Pope John.

That they have responded is proof that the enmities and divisions of mankind are not the whole reality of the human condition. There is in men a capacity, unplumbed and perhaps unmeasurable, to be reached by loving kindness. The miracle of Pope John is that he knew this and believed it and had faith to act upon it, and that he was proved to have been right. So, as he lies dead, he is revered and blessed by all sorts and conditions of men all around the globe.

We know that the miracle of Pope John will not transform the world. The condition of man is a hard one, and his struggle to survive and to prevail will not disappear with the appearance of a saint and the proclamation of a saving truth. We shall not suddenly become new men. But the universal response which Pope John evoked is witness to the truth that there is in the human person, however prone to evil, an aptitude for goodness. That is why we must never despair that the world can be better than the world we live in.

It is evident to any one who reads the two great encyclical letters, "Mater et Magistra" (Mother and Teacher) and "Pacem in Terris" (Peace on Earth), that Pope John, far from being naive and unworldly, had an encyclopaedic and acute knowledge of the complex and stubborn problems of the daylight world. The encyclical letters do not suppose that the world can be cured before the problems that harass it are brought to solution. The encyclical letters are, therefore, directed to the solution of human problems by ordinary men. They are cornerstones of an imposing construction which, as it is carried forward, will become acceptable and increasingly self-evident to men who deal toward each other with respect for the human person and for his reason.

The belief that there are such self-evident concepts and propositions has been denied by many in the modern age. Yet our own American institutions were founded by men who had been taught to think it self-evident that men are capable of reason and that this is a universe which can be lived in rationally. The Founding Fathers inherited this belief. For modern secular men, who have been taught to reject it, an act of faith is needed. When the belief exists, as it did so profoundly in Pope John, it can become the intellectual core of what can be a human doctrine which transcends conflicting diversity.

The movement to bring the teachings of the church to bear upon "the process of radical change" in the modern "economic and political situation" begins, says Pope John, with Pope Leo XIII. The first of the great modernizing social messages is the encyclical "Rerum Novarum" of May 15, 1891, on "the condition of the working classes." Pope John carried forward this movement not only in his two great encyclical letters but by calling together the Ecumenical Council.

What will now come of all this will be of critical importance not only to the Catholic Church but to all churches and to all governments. In any event, the modernizing movement can perhaps be arrested but it cannot for long be turned back. For what Pope John began will have very big consequences, and the history of our world will be different because he lived.

Armenian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, May 28, 1963, was the 45th anniversary of Armenian Independence Day. I rise to pay tribute to the heroic deeds of the Armenian people in becoming the first democratic nation in Asia Minor to be allied to the West, and I salute their bravery during World War I.

We are indeed indebted for their efforts in World War I, and for their substantial contribution to Allied victory.

Although an independent nation for only 2 years, the Armenian people were nevertheless able to create an effective government out of chaos. The Armenian nation was recognized by a number of countries and sent a delegation to participate in the Paris Peace Conference.

The history of the Armenian people since ancient times has been filled with amazing courage in their attempts to preserve their rights and freedom. Even in the face of Soviet conquest in 1920, the Armenian people fought valiantly to retain their independence.

In this year's celebration of Armenian Independence Day, we want Armenians in this country and all over the world to know our heartfelt gratitude for their past heroic deeds and our hope that someday they too will once again be a free democratic nation, and will be delivered from under the heel of the Communist conqueror.

The Pursuit of Excellence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on May 27 one of New Orleans' most distinguished citizens addressed the 1963 commissioning exercises of the Tulane University Air Force ROTC.

The speaker was Roy T. Sessums, vice president of the Freeport Sulphur Co., and who holds the rank of major general in the Air Force Reserve.

General Sessums' address to these young men exemplifies the personal character and qualities of the general himself. Besides being a respected business executive in Louisiana, General Sessums has served with distinction as an educator.

The rank General Sessums holds in the Air Force Reserve speaks for itself with regards to his dedication as a citizen soldier.

I feel sure that Tulane University's new Air Force second lieutenants were inspired by the sincerity and simple dignity of General Sessums' talk, the text of which follows:

I want you to know how much I appreciate the opportunity of participating in these commissioning exercises because I know how important and pleasant they are to all of you here. There is nothing more satisfying or heartwarming than the culmination of a long period of hard work that leads to a major accomplishment, and we are here today to pay tribute to the perseverance and determination of these young men who are to be commissioned.

More than this, I particularly appreciate this invitation because it is my firm conviction that our country has no commodity so precious, nor no prospect so promising, as the energy and brainpower of its young people.

I want to join you in acknowledging the help and support you have received during your training from the ROTC detachment personnel who are very proud of you today, I am sure.

In order to be where you are today, you have had to understand and put to use some time-tested virtues which make for success in any venture.

Most important of all, I think, you have recognized the need for an unrelenting pursuit of excellence. Perhaps that phrase, "the pursuit of excellence," could bear a bit of analyzing.

To me, pursuit means a seeking and a striving that never ends. Certainly it implies no guarantee of achieving excellence, any more than we are guaranteed happiness by the Declaration of Independence because of the right it gives us to pursue happiness.

And now "excellence." Does it mean genius, or being No. 1 in everything? Not the kind of excellence I am talking about. Excellence to me means winning the competition with yourself, doing your dead-level best, making the best use of the talents you have. It also means putting forth of that wonderful quality we call "extra effort."

The difference between a so-so company or an average military unit and a really successful company or topflight unit can be measured by the extra effort given by large numbers of individuals diffused throughout the organization.

Success in the pursuit of excellence is not beyond the reach of the average man.

It is often reflected in the uncommon performance of average men who put forth some extra effort.

In my opinion, many a lock would yield and many a door would open if more people understood and put to use these three keys to better performance:

1. The desire to be productive.
2. An unwillingness to settle for anything less than one's best effort.
3. A capacity for real, genuine, down-to-earth, honest hard work.

It seems to me you have already demonstrated, through your individual records here at Tulane and in ROTC, that you recognize and use those keys.

I caution you, however, to never assume that you can rest on laurels and successes already won. The pursuit of excellence is and should be a continuing thing that stays with a man, day in and day out, until the very last.

You will probably take exception to this statement, but most of the interests and experiences which will broaden and enrich your lives, and keep your minds growing, have not yet happened to you; they will come later in life.

An old professor of medicine, for example, summed up the need for additional mental growth and continuing self-education when he told his graduating seniors:

"I have given you the best information available. The text books we have used are the most widely accepted and reliable. The case histories we have used are the best I could find. But before we part company, I want to caution you that the science of medicine is developing so rapidly that in a a few years from now perhaps half of the things I have taught you won't be so. Unfortunately, I don't know which half that will be."

The same could be said about the business world and the arts of military science. Procedures, techniques and technology are changing every day. You must gear yourself to change with them if you intend to pursue excellence.

Remember the personal traits exhibited over and over by those who recognize the importance of being excellent and who work at it. I think that some of the most important of these are: An inquiring mind which is never satisfied with enough knowledge; A desire to do something that has never been done or a desire to do something better than it has ever been done; A constructive dissatisfaction with things as they are; and the ability to discipline yourself. None of these really need elaboration. You already know what I am talking about.

In closing, I should like to recommend to you the possibilities of the service as a career. Possibly some of you have already thought seriously about it, and I just want to add this to the pros and cons you may have been sifting:

From having served on both sides of the fence—the military and the business world—I can assure you that the future and the possibilities of making significant contributions to our country's needs have never been greater than they are now in the various areas of Air Force service. Certainly the financial remuneration is finally on a par with that of most industries and the better known segments of the business world. Over and above this, there is a chance to meet a new world of science face to face, to brush shoulders daily with history, to acquire experiences that broaden and deepen a man's vision and capabilities. I recommend it to you highly.

Thank you.

Now We'll Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the inconsistencies of the present foreign policy have never been more clearly visible than in one of the recent pronouncements concerning the Far East by one of the New Frontier's diplomatic light heavyweights, Averell Harriman. His statement to which I refer received effective analysis in an editorial appearing in this morning's Chicago Tribune which I submit for the RECORD at this point.

NOW WE'LL FIGHT

There are a number of apparent ironies in Averell Harriman's announcement in Australia that the United States will fight to defend Australia's stake in New Guinea if an attack is made on the territory. The only aspiring imperialist in the southwest Pacific is Mr. Sukarno of Indonesia, who recently grabbed the western half of the island from the Dutch.

Mr. Harriman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, mentions United States commitments to Australia and New Zealand under the Anzus pact, stating that if trouble arose over New Guinea the three countries would be "in it together."

We can think of three peculiarities about this display of belligerent intent. First, if the United States is thinking of fighting to defend its own or the security interests of its allies, what about Cuba? It is an advanced Soviet military base 90 miles away from the United States, and, under various military agreements related to the Organization of American States, we have ample cause to resort to military action right in our own front yard any time we are in the mood to work up a fight.

But, no, Mr. Harriman and his Washington principals aren't interested. They think it more logical to shop for action about 10,000 miles away from Washington if they are obliged to do so at all.

The second oddity is that Mr. Harriman's threat is addressed to Sukarno and he would be in no position to threaten Australia in eastern New Guinea if the United States had not installed him in western New Guinea after easing out the Dutch. This was done with an assist from the United Nations after the details had been worked out by Ellsworth Bunker, a retired American diplomat.

The squeeze was put on the Dutch by refusing them transit rights for arms, troops, and transport at American bases and airports, repudiating agreements of the Eisenhower administration. Harriman now emphasizes America's duties under her Anzus treaty obligations, but Holland was an ally in NATO and no sentiment was wasted on its betrayal.

The third irony is that Harriman's reputation in the Far East, such as it is, is less that of being a stout defender against aggression than as a promoter of appeasement. It was he who worked out the formula which hitched the pro-Western, Communist, and neutralist camps in Laos to a coalition on the troika model. Instead of producing neutralism and peace, this arrangement has enabled the Communist Pathet Lao to grab ever larger chunks of the country. Here again, our friends, the troops of Gen. Nosavan, were sold out to the enemy.

But, in what's left of New Guinea, Mr. Harriman is ready to take his stand. Why has principle suddenly become so all-fired important in this improbable spot when it is regarded as of no consequence any place else?

Nigeria—The Peace Corps Revisited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it has been 2 years since Peace Corps Volunteer Margery Michelmore wrote the famous post card that set off an international incident and threatened to blemish the Peace Corps program in its very beginning.

In the intervening months, the program has proven its value again and again, winning over many of its early critics, both domestic and foreign. There can be little doubt that the Peace Corps has faced no more difficult task than gaining acceptance in Nigeria. Therefore, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following Department of State cable. It reports what the Nigerian students are saying who 2 years ago were demonstrating against the volunteers:

MAY 23, 1963.

Subject: Departing Peace Corps volunteers get high praise from students' newspaper at the University of Nigeria in Nsukka.

The 23 members of the Peace Corps contingent who have been teaching at the University of Nigeria in Nsukka arrived on campus in the fall of 1961 in an atmosphere of deep suspicion and mistrust. They were subsequently accused by students of being "spies," of being unqualified for university teaching and of being "unemployable" in the United States (which presumably accounted for their having joined the Peace Corps in the first instance). They received, in short, a somewhat less than friendly reception. This same group of Peace Corps volunteers will be leaving the campus in a few weeks, having completed their tour of duty. During the intervening period of time, they appear to have completely overcome the earlier criticisms and suspicions.

The May 18 issue of the Nsukka Record, the students' newspaper of the University of Nigeria, devoted a full page to the Peace Corps group. Entitled "Goodbye, Good Luck, and Good Health to Our Peace Corps Friends," the article gave brief individual accounts of what each of the 23 volunteers has been doing since arriving on campus. Also included was a group photograph of the volunteers and news items concerning several farewell parties for the group, one of which was given by the campus branch of the Nigeria-America Friendship Society.

In the same issue of the Nsukka Record, an editorial entitled "Peace Corps Projects: Hope for World Peace" bestowed high praise on the Peace Corps in general and on the contingent at Nsukka in particular. The editorial writer, noting that he felt it timely and appropriate to offer a "dispassionate appraisal" of the Peace Corps program, first recalled the post card incident involving Miss Michelmore at the University of Ibadan and the atmosphere of suspicion which marked the arrival in Nsukka of the first Peace Corps group. The writer stated that the students subsequently learned that the Peace Corps volunteers "had come to help and not to subvert" and that their devotion to duty and other qualities: "combined effectively to erase ill feelings the students (previously) nursed against the Peace Corps volunteers on our campus. Now that these men and women have almost completed their tour and are preparing to leave, we feel that no amount of praise showered on them for their work is too much."

The text of the editorial is transmitted as enclosure 1 to this airgram.

ROBERT P. SMITH,
American Consul.

[Editorial, Nsukka Record, May 18, 1963]

PEACE CORPS PROJECTS—HOPE FOR WORLD PEACE

Elsewhere on these pages, we carry an article describing the activities of President Kennedy's Peace Corps volunteers on the Nsukka campus of the University of Nigeria. In addition to this, we feel it is both timely and appropriate to offer what we consider to be a dispassionate appraisal of the Peace Corps program.

President Kennedy's Peace Corps volunteers, mostly men and women still in their 20's, arrived on the campus of the University of Nigeria during the hectic week of the students' union election campaigns here. To this political situation were added the wounds still fresh in the minds of Nigerians following Miss Marjorie Michelmore's uncomplimentary remarks about life in Nigeria on a postcard she wrote to a friend in the United States. (Miss Michelmore was a Peace Corps volunteer staying at the University of Ibadan from where she made her remarks late in 1961.)

The students of the University of Nigeria, Nsukka, were therefore—like many other Nigerians—suspicious of the Peace Corps men and women when they arrived here on 28 November, 1961.

But as time went on, most of our students learned that the Peace Corps volunteers on our campus were men and women who had come with a mind to help and not to subvert. Their devotion to duty, their simplicity, their grace and ease, their complete lack of those "qualities" that are the exclusive preserve of master spies, and their demonstration that life is so short that men cannot afford to waste working hours taking siestas—all these combined effectively to erase ill feelings the students nursed against the Peace Corps volunteers on our campus.

Now that these men and women have almost completed their tour and are preparing to leave, we feel that no amount of praise showered on them for their work is too much.

Several Nigerian writers and speakers have from time to time written and spoken unfavorably about the presence of Peace Corps volunteers in the country. They have been called spies. Some people have even gone to the extent of saying that they (the PCV's) are "surplus hands" from the U.S. labor market, and that they have been sent to Nigeria not only to ease the congestion in their country but also to swell our unemployed population. What unfair comments.

We have to say at this point that these remarks are not only baseless and malicious, but they also betray the ignorance of the critics. When did the U.S. labor market become so congested that there are not jobs for genuine university graduates such as are here with us at Nsukka? Curious.

Human nature is prone to underestimate what it receives cheaply, but if hard cash had been squeezed out from Nigeria's pocket to pay these young men and women for what they are worth, as our Chancellor suggested it should be, perhaps people would have said less. But now that their services are free, we have found ourselves digging deep for all sorts of excuses to call them names. This is un-Nigerian, and the sooner these "new lovers" of Nigeria's security put an end to their glibness and inflated twaddlers, the better for the good name of their country.

We feel that President Kennedy, by launching his Peace Corps program, has taken a step in the right direction. And may we ask: Why can't other world leaders copy the President's example and launch similar programs in their own countries? Why can't the big powers of the world not only send out Peace Corps volunteers to developing countries but also have similar exchanges among their countries so that the youths of the world can move freely from one part of the globe to the other, exchanging candid views with their opposite numbers?

We call upon Premier Khrushchev, President de Gaulle, Mao Tse-tung, Chancellor Adenauer, Walter Ulbricht, Pandit Nehru, President Nasser, David Ben-Gurion, Abubakar Tafawa Dalewa, and Kwame Nkrumah to set up their own Peace Corps programs so as to make for a free movement of youths from one country to another.

Whatever propaganda such youths may carry with them into other lands, the truth still remains that consciously or unconsciously, the volunteers thus liberated are bound to assimilate and to appreciate the ways of life, problems and difficulties of the peoples of the lands they visit. And once the peoples of the world begin to understand the problems of their counterparts, the less shall be the dangers of war.

We call on the youths of the world to realize that theirs is the task of infusing order into a prejudiced and jaundiced world; that their contributions toward world peace can be a moral and material bulwark against all forces making for disorder.

We have found ourselves in an era when science has opened the secret gates of nature, making life worth living. We like it. We are grateful to the leaders both past and present under whose guidance scientific development has made the world what it is today. But we cannot afford to stand and see the same world of science plunged back into darkness as a result of ideological difference between world leaders many of whom may not regret it if they were to die today. We are tired of leaders paying lip-service to world peace while they control destructive weapons which need only a careless touch to wipe out all world population and even set the air, the land, and the seas ablaze.

While President Kennedy's men and women prepare to leave our campus, we ask for more volunteers from both Kennedy and Khrushchev to come and to live with us, work with us and appreciate our difficulties.

We also call on the Federal Government of Nigeria to launch her own Peace Corps program such as her finances can carry, and to send our youths not only to the developed countries of the world but also to other African states.

When this Peace Corps wheel has been set in full motion, then the world will be nearer bidding goodbye to that debating club in Geneva where the so-called disarmament talks achieve nothing but increased armament.

To our Peace Corps friends about to leave us, we say: We are indeed sorry to see you go. We shall miss you and your services. In the meantime we say "se wa tarana," which is the Hausa meaning for "goodby: we shall see you again."

The Great, Good Pope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the articles being written this week about Pope John XXIII recognize that he was a great man. History will no doubt measure that greatness far beyond our limited ability to forsee.

Two excellent statements were made in Minneapolis on Tuesday, an editorial in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune entitled "The Great, Good Pope," and a radio-TV editorial on WTCN. They both deserve the thoughtful attention of the Members of the House.

THE GREAT, GOOD POPE

Pope John XXIII has passed into history. Untold millions, not only Roman Catholics and other Christians but men of all faiths and no faith at all, will mourn him for he was one of the truly great and good men of all time.

When in the autumn of 1958 the then aging patriarch of Venice (he was nearly 77), Angelo Giuseppe Cardinal Roncalli, was elected Pope as successor to the late Pius XII, it was widely predicted that he would be an interim pontiff. The implications were that his reign would be a "do nothing" period in which certain realignments would be made in the Roman Catholic Church's inner circles.

The men who make such predictions could not have been wider of the mark. It is probably true that not since the Middle Ages has a Pope had a wider, more far-reaching influence on the world than John XXIII. One has to scratch at the roots of history to find a more universally beloved man.

There were so many human and lovable things about him. He immediately endeared himself to the world when, soon after his election, he sent word to Vatican editors to drop the elaborate, ceremonial verbiage that had previously surrounded papal statements. "Just say, 'The Pope said,'" he instructed them.

There were his visits to the Roman jails—"You couldn't come to see me, so I came to see you"—to hospitals, orphanages and schools. There was that twinkle in the eye that the world came to look for, and the friendliness toward "our separated brethren" and towards non-Christians who called on him.

This was John the human being, the kind man, the good man. But there was also the great man, the towering statesman who convened the church council known as Vatican II. There was the scholar Pope of the encyclicals, Mater et Magistra (Mother and Teacher) and Pacem in Terris (Peace on Earth). And there was the Pope who moved Christendom closer to unity than it has been at any time since the Reformation, even though admittedly there are still vast distances to go.

John XXIII has been another bright and startling example of the historic ability of the church and the papacy to renew itself. In a dark age, when the forces of destruction have been loose in so many parts of the world, this truly great Pope brought love and compassion, joy and serenity to countless men and women. He loved the world and it loved him. It is doubtful that this generation will look upon his like again.

THE DEATH OF POPE JOHN XXIII

The beloved church leader who told us a few days ago that his bags were packed and he was ready to go, has now departed on his long journey.

The Holy Father, Pope John 23d ruled over the 900 million members of his spiritual realm only 4 years. Yet no Pope in history, to our knowledge, has so endeared himself to those outside Roman Catholicism as did Pope John.

The Second Vatican Council, now in recess, which he convened, will forever bear the imprint of his influence. His stated objective was to renew the Church and to bring it into closer touch with the modern world.

The thing that set Pope John apart was his hand of friendship stretched out to non-Catholics. This gesture toward Christian unity triggered a deep yearning in the hearts of millions who have found no satisfactory explanation for the scores of denominations beneath the umbrella of Christianity.

Pope John could speak with powerful voice against what he considered the evils of the world. Few have worked harder for peace. He was a humble man, not above visiting with prisoners.

He treated each person who sought audience with him as an individual. His particular love was children.

These and other warm and simple qualities made him one of the most popular of all Popes.

We ask of our Catholic friends that we may mourn with them. For those outside the Roman Catholic Church are sad, too.

Pressure To Hire Negroes Undermines Merit System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I am most concerned and distressed about repeated reports I am receiving from Birmingham that the Justice Department and the Civil Service Commission are tampering with the merit system.

Within the last few days, I have received reports from workers at the Social Security Administration, the Birmingham Veterans' Administration Hospital, the post office and other Federal agencies in Birmingham that pressure is being put on local agency administrative officers, who are charged with the responsibility of hiring workers under the merit system, to hire Negroes for jobs coming open in their agencies.

Apparently, Mr. Speaker, the Justice Department has influenced the Civil Service Commission to order a step-up in the hiring of Negroes in Federal agencies in Birmingham. Although this has been denied by civil service officials, there has been no explanation of the secret meetings of Civil Service Commission officials and local hiring officers. This action to influence the hiring of a specific group or class of people is plain tampering. It is all the more alarming and distressing because civil service officials are actually participating in the efforts to show favortism to a specific group of applicants. This undermines the entire concept of the merit system.

I have very strongly and repeatedly protested this pressuring of agencies by the Civil Service Commission. I have asked for a complete investigation and explanation of the Birmingham meetings and the apparent pressures being exerted on Federal Government officials.

Mr. Speaker, it would be unconscionable, and a violation of all ethical standards as an infraction of civil service regulations, if, in the name of equal rights and opportunities, special privileges were granted Negro applicants for positions or promotions.

Results of 1963 National Issues Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, last month, I mailed my 1963 National Issues Poll to many of the residents of the 13th Congressional District of Illinois. The results have now been tabulated. In addition to sending a copy to the President of the United States, so that he will have the benefit of knowing the views of the residents of this great congressional district, I am placing the following tabulation in the RECORD for the interest of the Members of Congress:

RESULTS OF 1963 NATIONAL ISSUES POLL

To Residents of the 13th Congressional District of Illinois:

It is a pleasure to send you the results of the 1963 National Issues Poll. Your cooperation and that of the over 19,000 residents of the 13th Congressional District who gave the time and thought necessary to complete the questionnaire is deeply appreciated. I regret that it has not been possible to acknowledge each questionnaire and the many accompanying comments individually so that you might have my personal word of thanks.

To have effective representative government, I believe that those who are represented must be interested, informed, and vocal. Through the years this has been the trademark of the 13th district. Toward this end, a questionnaire is well worth the time, effort, and money, if it is informative, stimulates discussion and thought, and points up areas where a lack of information possibly exists, and, equally important, encourages comments and individual communications from residents of the district.

I feel strongly that a questionnaire of this type must be objective to accomplish its several purposes. Because of this conviction, I took great care in phrasing the questions in the hope of eliminating any tendency to slant or lead responses. From your comments, it would seem that I was, for the most part, successful.

The response to this questionnaire has indicated to me that it has accomplished its purpose. While the responsibility for my vote, in the final analysis must and should remain my own, I hope and trust that you will continue to write as the Congress proceeds through this session and that you will call upon me if I can be of assistance in my capacity as the link between you and your Federal Government in Washington, D.C. By so doing, you will assist me in providing the kind of representation that the 13th district wants and merits.

With my best regards.

Sincerely,

DONALD RUMSFELD,
Member of Congress.

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. The President has submitted a $99,000,000,000 budget for fiscal year 1964 providing for a planned deficit of $11,900,000,000. Should Congress—			
(a) Approve the budget as submitted, accepting the deficit?	6.8	84.2	9.0
(b) Cut the budget, leaving a smaller deficit?	42.8	49.5	7.7
(c) Balance the budget?	58.9	31.6	9.5
2. If the Federal budget is cut, it should be done in the area of—			
(a) Defense, military, and space expenditures?	28.5	41.4	30.1
(b) Foreign aid?	81.0	8.2	10.8
(c) Agriculture?	72.4	9.4	17.2
(d) All new domestic spending proposals such as mass transportation, medicare, Domestic Peace Corps, mental health, etc.?	66.6	18.3	15.1
3. Should Congress enact a tax cut this year—			
(q) Regardless of the size of the deficit it may create?	12.6	76.5	10.9
(b) Only if a relatively small deficit will result?	33.6	55.2	11.2
(c) Only if the budget is balanced?	52.8	37.1	10.1
4. With respect to tax reform, do you favor limiting deductions—			
(a) For the total of such items as State and local taxes, mortgage interest, and charitable contributions to the portion over 5 percent of adjusted gross income?	12.9	67.8	19.3
(b) To only that portion of medical and drug expenses over 4 percent of adjusted gross income?	19.7	52.1	28.2
(c) For medical expenses for persons over 65 and eliminating the 1 percent of adjusted gross income limitation for drug expense deductions?	23.9	49.0	27.1
5. Should the Federal Government continue present agricultural programs (1964 cost $6,400,000,000 against 1963 cost of$5,500,000,000)?	7.2	83.3	9.5
6. With respect to Federal aid to education, do you favor—			
(a) Scholarships for higher education?	50.5	37.7	11.8
(b) Aid for construction of public primary and secondary schools?	31.2	54.8	14.0
(c) Aid for construction of private primary and secondary schools?	11.0	73.2	15.8
(d) Aid for construction of college academic facilities?	30.7	53.2	16.1
(e) Income tax deductions for higher education expenses?	73.5	18.3	8.2
7. Should the Federal Government provide some type of medical expense aid to persons over 65? If "yes," should it be accomplished by—	48.7	25.3	26.0
(a) Expanding Kerr-Mills programs (based on need, administered by States with Federal-State funds—operative in Illinois and 28 States)?	35.9	28.8	35.3
(b) Enacting King-Anderson bill (financed by increased social-security taxes on employers and employees, given regardless of need)?	14.4	53.4	32.2
(c) Enacting Bow bill (permits tax reduction up to $150 per year for costs of purchasing private health insurance)?	42.0	21.5	36.5
8. Should the Civil Rights Commission be made permanent?	34.0	27.3	38.7
9. With respect to labor legislation, do you favor—			
(a) Applying the principle of the antitrust laws to labor unions?	85.6	5.2	9.2
(b) A 35-hour week with time and a half for overtime?	9.4	74.7	15.9
(c) Requiring secret ballot of members before union calls a strike?	88.6	3.1	8.3
10. With respect to commuter transportation, should—			
(a) The Federal Government provide tax concessions and bond guarantees for urban transit carriers (Lausche bill)?	26.0	49.7	24.3
(b) The Federal Government establish a program ($500,000,000 in grants) to improve urban mass transportation facilities?	14.0	64.0	22.0
(c) State and local governments and private enterprise develop and improve urban transportation without Federal aid?	71.9	11.7	16.4
11. Should foreign aid programs for developing nations be—			
(a) Approved as requested by the President (cost $4,500,000,000)?	10.4	80.7	8.9
(b) Continued but reduced substantially?	68.8	22.5	8.7
(c) Discontinued completely?	16.9	71.2	11.9
12. Do you favor U.S. diplomatic recognition of Communist China?	17.7	73.2	9.1
13. With respect to Cuba, do you favor—			
(a) Leaving Cuba communistic if it poses no military threat to the United States?	19.4	59.1	21.5
(b) Requesting multilateral economic restrictions on Cuba?	74.8	7.0	18.2
(c) Denying foreign aid to those nations trading with Cuba?	73.5	11.0	15.5
(d) A complete military blockade of Cuba?	43.2	30.0	26.8
(e) Military action against Cuba?	24.0	47.5	28.5
14. Do you support the use of force by the U.N. in world trouble spots?	64.8	20.3	14.9
15. With respect to the threat of nuclear war, should the United States—			
(a) Take steps unilaterally to discontinue nuclear testing?	21.0	57.7	21.3
(b) Continue to work toward a test ban treaty with Russia?	77.2	12.8	10.0
(c) Prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to additional nations?	67.3	10.8	21.9

16. Please rank by number these problems by order of importance to the United States:

(1) Maintaining strong military/nuclear deterrents.
(2) Balancing the budget.
(3) Communist subversion in Latin America.
(4) Unemployment.
(5) Stopping nuclear arms race.
(6) Education.
(7) Civil rights enforcement.
(8) Other—Population explosion.

Remarks of Hon. George A. Price Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George A. Price, a distinguished member of the General Assembly of Maryland, recently appeared before a subcommittee of the Agricultural Committee. It is my privilege to bring to the attention of my colleagues Mr. Price's remarks as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I'm George A. Price, of Phoenix, Baltimore County, Md. I'm 37 years old, married, have two children—a son, 12 and a daughter 9. I'm a livestock farmer, carrying a herd of 50 purebred Angus cattle, a flock of 30 grade sheep and some feeder pigs. The cattle and sheep are part of a breeding program in which I raise the offspring and fatten them for slaughter. The pigs are bought as weanlings and fattened for market. The farm comprises 380 acres, of which 130 acres are woodland, 100 acres are in permanent pasture and 150 acres are under cultivation. The crops grown are primarily used as feed for the livestock and marketed through them, any surplus is sold as a cash crop.

Before reading my prepared statement I would like to mention that I am a soil conservation district supervisor, a member of the Baltimore County Forest Conservation Board, the president of the Maryland Angus Association, and the past president of the Baltimore County Farm Bureau. I am now serving for the first time in the house of delegates in Annapolis. With the exception of the above I consider myself a fulltime farmer. farmer.

Gentlemen, I do not presume in less than 10 minutes to come up with a solution that learned leaders in agriculture and our Government have not been able to solve in 30 years, but I do hope to present a brief picture of family farms as I see it.

To define the term "family farms," seems a reasonably simple task until one tries to do it—since the phrase seems to mean different things to different people. However, for the purpose of this hearing, I will try to define family farms, so you listening will know what I mean when using the term. To me, family farm is a farm that is not only a place of business but the homestead of the family. Where the responsibilities and management are under the direct direction of the farmer. Where the entire family is aware of the workings of the farm, and where the bulk of the family income is derived from the farm operation. The size is irrelevant, as a 10,000-acre farm may be a family farm or a business corporation or at the other extreme, 10 acres may be a family farm or just a hobby.

The family farm is a vocation that should be respected and encouraged but not subsidized or perpetuated for sentimental reasons. It should be an efficient and economical unit that is capable of competing in today's markets.

Our Government, 30 years ago, probably took a very courageous and decisive step when it instituted temporary programs to save agriculture in general and our national economy in particular. At the time this was done, there was no doubt that the programs did help relieve the farm situation. But at the same time it was stimulating the country's economy, it was also encouraging the marginal farmer to stay in business. In some instances, inefficiency was condoned by the availability of these programs. Unfortunately some of these temporary programs have not only persisted, but have grown in scope—as evident the recent wheat referendum. The vote against the proposed wheat referendum, I think, clearly shows that the farmer does not want to become a puppet of the Government. Secretary Freeman, I hope, will use the power of his office to explain to the farmers through the various medians at his command, the 1964 wheat program. If the farmer is encouraged to stay within his wheat allotment, if the wheat surplus now on hand is not used at this time to flood the market, and if the Secretary and farmers will work together, I feel that we will be moving in the right direction in the wheat "field."

The family farm, like any other business, has to keep pace with the times. In order to do this, he must show growth in capital and improvement. If he fails to attain this growth, the only course the farm has is to regress.

The Department of Agriculture, the universities and the extension service have done a tremendous job in encouraging production through research and education, but little advance has been made in the field of marketing. How many farmers 30 years ago, knew about hybrid seeds, soil analysis, fungicides, herbicides, pesticides, and insecticides?; yet today's farmer knows but little more about marketing his products than did his father of 30 years ago. I do not wish to give the impression that marketing has been completely ignored, but rather that only the surface has been scratched. We in the State of Maryland are fortunate that marketing has been explored and has come up with various association sponsored sales, to mention a few: feeder calf sales, feeder pigs, wool pools and tobacco auctions. Associations are now being developed for marketing specific vegetable crops. In addition to these, the Department of Forest and Parks have encouraged good managerial practices through their family forest program which enables a farmer to integrate his small woodland lots into a longrange, but profitable part of his farming program through conservation and reforestation.

I would like to interject here that my brother and I were honored last year as the winners of the first Family Forest Award in the Nation.

Much has been said in recent months concerning the use of farmland for different types of recreation. It seems to me that this could be a wide-open market for many family farms.

I think the manufacturing industry has far outgained agriculture in its promotion of competitive products. I believe the most important part of marketing research, is the development and promotion of existing products as well as creating new ones for a dissenting public in these changing times. To explain what I mean—when homemade bread was the rule instead of the exception, more wheat was used in this than is now used in bakery bread,—soft drinks have become a standard, and I might add popular beverage, but nonetheless has usurped some of the milk drinking consumers; synthetic materials have taken a share of the cotton market and so forth. It is here that the farmer and marketing researcher has a challenge. With ingenuity, the farmer along with the Agricultural Department of Marketing and Research should be able to come up with new and desired products that will utilize these now "excess" farm commodities.

Cutting corners on expenses is not as appealing a way to increase net income as increased production seems to be. as an example, a man would rather put on three more dairy cows to increase production than to cull out a few poor producers in his herd, although the same net income might result.

I firmly believe it is morally wrong to encourage limited yield. If we are so blessed with the ability to produce copiously, we should not stifle this ability. At the same time I believe it is just as wrong to hoard these so-called surpluses, as we could market them through new products.

In conclusion, I do not feel our problems can be subsidized or controlled away. We should strive for the elimination of subsidies and exert our efforts and finances toward a program that would include (1) farmer-owned marketing associations; (2) research and development for increasing sale of existing and new products; (3) research and dissemination of information on efficiency of the farm operation and (4) encourage the marginal farmer to either become economically efficient on the open market or to look for off-the-farm employment.

Mobile Classrooms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, with basic education so necessary to the space age, it is alarming to note that some 2 million American children are being deprived of learning because of the lack of classroom facilities.

Recently Newton D. Glekel, a pioneer in the field of mobile classrooms presented a partial solution to this problem to Dr. Wayne O. Reed, Deputy Commissioner of Education. Dr. Reed called Mr. Glekel's concept "an exciting approach" to the existing problem. In addition, Mr. Glekel is expected to testify before the House Education Committee.

In the sincere belief that Mr. Glekel's report on the shortage of school facilities, and what can be done to alleviate it, is of vital concern to the Nation, I submit extract from this report:

MOBILE CLASSROOMS

THE EDUCATIONAL FACILITY SHORTAGE

For the past decade, Americans have grown increasingly conscious of the problems facing their educational systems. These are problems that include both shortages of teachers and educational facilities, as well as the need for reexamination of educational methods and plants, and, of course, budgetary considerations.

While it is obvious that all of these problems are interrelated, certain conditions stand out as requiring immediate solution. One is the classroom shortage.

HOW SERIOUS IS THE DEFICIT?

"Public school classroom shortages at the opening of the 1962–63 school year last year totaled 121,200. This figure is based upon reports from 50 States and compares with a shortage of 127,300 classrooms in the fall of 1961." (January 9, 1963, Report of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.)

Despite the completion of an average of 71,000 classrooms annually during the past 5 years (over 300,000 classrooms), little headway has been made in reducing the shortage.

Emergency measures such a multiple sessions or the use of libraries, auditoriums, and other specialized units for classrooms are obviously unsatisfactory. There is no solution to be found by depriving the student of required supporting educational facilities or by further limiting his time in school.

The classroom problem is one that must be solved immediately if we are to be fair to students presently in school. If they are deprived of facilities today, there is no possible way of making up this loss tomorrow. Educational opportunities denied once, are obviously lost forever.

There is, a need for long-range planning to solve the educational facilities shortage. At the same time, there is a more immediate need which must be met.

This report intends to examine the function of one educational facility—the mobile classroom—in both the long- and short-range planning.

There are four basic advantages unique to the mobile classroom—immediacy, flexibility, mobility, and relative cost.

THE MOBILE CLASSROOM—AN IMMEDIATE ANSWER

We have seen in a previous section that the need for additional classrooms is an immediate need. Today's students deserve a solution today. Tomorrow is too late for them. The mobile home industry is capable of delivering large numbers of mobile classrooms in very short periods of time. A recent order for 50 units from a major city called for deliveries within 30 days. This request was met.

In addition, the mobile classroom can be utilized to keep a balance between increasing student bodies and existing permanent facilities. As existing permanent facilities become overcrowded, mobile classrooms are an immediate answer avoiding the use of libraries, auditoriums, laboratories, and recreational areas as substitute teaching units. Both in terms of the educational effectiveness of the overall school and cost the mobile classroom meets an immediate need.

Frequently the need for an additional permanent school structure is not evident to the public until conditions become extreme, making it difficult to obtain the economic support needed for this major expenditure. Not only is the unit cost of a mobile classroom far lower in absolute terms, but its very presence in a school community represents tangible evidence of the need for added school facilities. It both meets today's needs and serves as a constant reminder that it is time to plan for tomorrow.

THE MOBILE CLASSROOM—A FLEXIBLE FACILITY

We have already indicated that the mobile classroom is an immediate answer to pressing requirements. We have seen that it can be used for additional classroom space before there is a need for a complete, new, permanent construction.

The responsible educator must, of course, be concerned with the continued utilization of the unit after the permanent facilities are increased to adequately accommodate the student body. It is important to emphasize that the mobile classroom does not become an economic liability at this point.

It is a highly flexible educational facility. Its use is not limited either by permanency of location or purpose. It can become a science laboratory, language laboratory, study room, recreation room, a self-contained summer school or night school unit, or one of many other supporting educational facilities.

In addition, it can be sent to another location within the same school district, sold to another district, to private business for emergency office space, or simply traded in for another type of unit.

Flexibility, then, is not only an asset at time of purchase, but remains equally important once the mobile classroom's original assignment is completed.

THE MOBILE CLASSROOM—A NEW CONCEPT

The mobile classroom is a new concept to educators as well as laymen. Educators, of course, are investigating the potential of the unit daily. However, its newness has led to a certain amount of confusion.

Some of the problems met in the employment of mobile classrooms stem from the already mentioned tendency to group them with all other "relocatable" units. Since they do not basically resemble other units they have been occasionally misused because they have been miscast.

We believe that there is therefore a need for a program to present the picture of the mobile classroom accurately and objectively. This program should reach the local school district level as well as the national educational leadership. It should also reach the people who ultimately have the financial responsibility for the entire educational establishment—the taxpayers.

The sponsorship and organization of such a program would have to be discussed. The industry that produces the mobile classroom should be involved. Educators who have used the units or who may require them should participate. Government agencies that have investigated them, foundations and other interested groups and individuals should also be invited to participate.

At the present time, however, confusion bred from a lack of knowledge has led to certain problems. Their solution is vital to the educational community if it is to have this facility available to it in the future.

METHOD OF BIDDING AND SPECIFICATION

Today when a local school district decides to utilize mobile classrooms, the educational authorities draw up their own list of specifications and put it out for bids.

While this is the conventional and certainly acceptable method for permanent school installations, it sometimes proves unsatisfactory in the case of mobile classrooms.

The mobile classroom is a singular and unique unit. The industry that produces it is new. The technology from which it sprung is new. Its proper employment is different from the permanent structure which it will supplement but never supplant.

If we accept the fact that many educational authorities on the local level are not experts in this new field and are, in fact, not very familiar with it, then we must question their ability to independently set up proper specifications for its manufacture.

Specifications for a 20- to 30-room, 3- or 4-story structure are not necessarily applicable to a single classroom. In the cases where inapplicable standards have been applied blindly the industry has been forced to produce units that are wasteful, inefficient, and overly expensive.

It is not unusual for a single manufacturer to be producing two different units for two different school boards at the same time. One will be more efficient, more complete and more creatively designed than the other, and yet be considerably less expensive, yet at this time, there is nothing the manufacturer can do about it.

At the other end of the spectrum are those local authorities who mistakenly regard mobile classrooms as temporary installations and who are determined to buy them as inexpensively as possible. This has led to some of the "chicken coop" type of structures that serve no valid purpose in the educational picture, and tend to demean the mobile classroom facility on a national basis.

While many manufacturers refuse to bid on such specifications, a certain amount of this type of construction still goes on and will, as long as purchasers demand it.

The program to make local authorities aware of the proper use of the mobile classroom, should start with a plan of cooperation between authorities, industry representatives and educators on the preparation of realistic specifications for particular needs.

It is certainly intolerable that a school district using mobile classroom units for the first time should be deprived of the experience and knowledge gained by other districts throughout the country as well as the industry's technological experience. A clearinghouse of such knowledge should be established.

Bill Introduced To Amend Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today a bill to further amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act. The amendments I propose, which are being introduced for the first time in this House, would close what is in my judgment a serious lag in Federal regulation of these products, many of which can be dangerous or even lethal to humans if they are not stored, handled, or used properly.

The regulatory gap to which I refer is this: Under present law, the Department of Agriculture may find a specific compound too hazardous to be marketed, but it cannot by reason of its scientific finding alone prevent manufacturers from selling the lethal product. As the statute now reads, the Government must await a tragedy—death or disease as a result of the specific bug or rodent killer. Only then may the Government intervene to prevent further sale and use of the dangerous chemical.

As the House is aware, this gap existed for many years in the case of drugs, chemicals added to foods, and certain other products. In recent years, however, we have wisely amended the legislation in this field to provide for pretesting and clearance by the Food and Drug Administration before a dangerous product is marketed and an otherwise avoidable tragedy occurs.

It is now time, in my opinion, for this sound regulatory principle to be applied to the economic poisons that are the subject of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act. Hearings on the hazards of improper use of economic poisons are underway or scheduled by some of the appropriate committees. I therefore recommend this bill to the consideration of my colleagues.

I am informed that the principles applied in this bill have the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, but that the administration has not yet submitted a bill because of the problem of reconciling views of the various administrative agencies. My bill follows the principles and procedures of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to pesticides. I believe the measure I propose will therefore serve at least as the basis for consideration by the appropriate committee, and I strongly urge early action.

More than a month ago, I proposed that the Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a member, hold hearings on the need for additional legislation in this field. However, no action was taken on my request for such an investigation.

Let us not delay, Mr. Speaker, until another thalidomide tragedy proves anew the wisdom of pretesting and regulatory approval prior to marketing.

Thoughts on the AMA News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I have received a request from Bradford H. Cole, cochairman of the Town Democratic Committee of North Carver, Mass., wherein he makes the following statement:

> DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURKE: Any attempt to unmask the American Medical Association, editorially or otherwise, may be almost as difficult and frustrating as shoveling sand against the tide, but the enclosed editorial, written by Edward B. Garside, comes as close to hitting the mark as any that this Democrat has seen.
>
> If you could see fit to have it entered into the Appendix section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD it would be appreciated.

The article reads as follows:

THOUGHTS ON THE AMA NEWS

Recently we were put on the AMA news mailing list, a biweekly tabloid publication financed and distributed by the American Medical Association. We find it has great laboratory interest.

A typical issue runs to 20 pages, beautifully printed in offset, with two colors effectively used on the front page. Subscription price is listed as $3. But apparently dailies and weeklies get it free.

The articles are very well written in a deadpan style calculated to promote bias while preserving an air of detachment. Members of the editorial staff noted on the masthead are not national names, with the exception of Ted Lewis, who writes an anti-administration column used by Republican newspapers.

In the current issue there is a list of the names and party affiliations of all Senators and Representatives. In the upper right-hand corner of the page this boxed notice appears: "How, where to write. The list of U.S. Senators and Representatives by States is printed on this page for your use in writing your elected Representatives in support of the Kerr-Mills law, and to express your opposition to Federal intervention in medicine as proposed by the King-Anderson bill."

The AMA organ makes no bones about its purpose. It is intended to arouse and maintain a national ferment of opposition to medicare, or "fedicare," as pejoratively known in AMA circles. To do this it has placed itself under publicist guidance, exactly like the AFL–CIO, the National Association of Manufacturers, the chamber of commerce, and countless other vested interests great or small.

Reportage in the AMA News is mainly devoted to keeping track of developments all over the country in publicly supported medicine and hospital care. There seems to be so many of these subsidy situations that it might be thought self-defeating to chronicle them and so advertise what is plainly a national trend. But, of course, this is a calculated promotion risk. A minor portion of the news content is given over to extolling private health insurance and to recording various philanthropies and scientific advances stemming, directly or indirectly, from the American Medical Association.

The lead story in the current issue tells about the proposed purchase, in the depressed soft coal region, of 10 United Mine Workers' hospitals by the Presbyterian Church. This is represented as bad for the reason that the church is seeking financial help from the State of Kentucky in buying the hospitals.

Meanwhile the leader on the editorial page warns against being lulled into a false sense of security by reported public apathy toward the King-Anderson, or medicare, bill. "A battle was won," the editorial notes, "but the war is still on." To which one can only say "Amen."

The net impression left by the AMA News is unsettling. The Aesculapian ideal is selflessness and objectivity. Here it suddenly blossoms out in prejudicial guise, speaking in absolutes through hireling word-manipulators. This gives rise to the suspicion that large sums of money are being spent to kill medicare not merely for ethical reasons, but for pecuniary ones as well. To get, you must spend. And this is being done.

Invasion of Normandy Beaches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, 19 years ago to the day Allied forces charged ashore on the beaches of Normandy to open the final, bloody act of World War II in Europe.

The decision to launch this massive assault upon Adolph Hitler's "Festung Europe" will go down in history as one of the keys to victory in Europe. The decision, of course, was made by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Supreme Commander of the Allied forces in Europe.

It was not an easy decision. It involved one of history's great risks. For if the invasion failed because of any one of a number of factors—weather, tides, supply difficulties—the war could have been indefinitely extended.

The risks were enormous. Even if success were guaranteed the loss of life and equipment would be staggering. All of these things were among those which had to be considered by General Eisenhower before he could make his decision whether or not to move on occupied France on June 6, 1944.

General Eisenhower faced his problem honestly and met it squarely, fully cognizant of the fact of what failure might mean to his Nation, his men, and to himself.

Mr. Speaker, I have often wondered how the war in Europe would have turned out if the decision to invade on June 6 had been left to the men who today comprise the advisers of the President of the United States. Would the same decisiveness displayed by General Eisenhower have obtained? Would the invasion have taken place at all?

Mr. Speaker, I have given this matter much thought. By applying the reasoning that seems current today in the development of our strategy in the cold war I believe I have found the answers to these questions.

First of all, had the Rostows and the Bundy's and the Schlesingers been responsible for the prosecution of the war in June 1944, the American people would undoubtedly have been told that the German occupation of France offered no threats to the security of the free world. It would have been pointed out that the German forces in occupied France were mainly technicians; that they were being gradually withdrawn—although not in numbers adequate to satisfy our "hopes"; and that they were armed only with "defensive weapons." We would hear that after all, the enemy was still over 30 miles away.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, our State Department officials would be speaking knowledgeably of the great victories the free world could anticipate as the result of the split or rift between Nazi Germany and Italy. This rift, we would have been told, offered our best long-range hope for victory, or rather, for reaching a lasting accommodation with the Axis Powers.

Another line which would be fed to us on the homefront would have been that an invasion of occupied France would only have served to exacerbate the tensions between the United States and the Nazis and could conceivably lead to an escalation into some horrible all-out war. We would have been told that every effort would be made to reach an accommodation through negotiation and that the administration would wait and see what happened, all the while hoping for the best. Finally, it would have been said that Hitler, having achieved so much of what he sought, was now mellowing.

Since all of this kind of talk coming from the officials of the United States would have caused grave doubts about the sincerity of our desire to win the war in Europe among our allies we could have expected General de Gaulle and his Free French forces to have taken matters into their own hands and to have launched surprise exile raids against the coast of occupied France. And I believe that it would not be too much of a stretch of imagination to speculate that the United States would then have imposed a quarantine against such exile raids.

As a result of all of this our allies would have been so disturbed that the alliance would have fallen into a state of disarray. This in turn would have caused us to seek to heal this disarray by offering our allies sort of a limited partnership in a joint military force which, of course, would have remained under our exclusive control lest some rightwing extremist like Winston Churchill among our allies take it into their heads to invade Europe.

At home, a campaign against those extremists who would have the United State invade Europe would have been launched and the administration would have branded the thinking which led to such opinions as unsophisticated.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, June 6 would have come and gone. As a matter of fact, I think it would be fair to say that World War II would still be going on today, except that the argument over the invasion of France would have by now become the argument over whether or not we should do anything to evict the Nazis from New York since it was a well-known fact that they were armed only with defensive weapons.

When I awake from this sort of nightmarish speculation, Mr. Speaker, I fervently thank God that it was Dwight D. Eisenhower who commanded our forces in June 1944 and not the faculty that today directs our destinies. And I whisper to myself in the most impassioned manner, "Oh, how I miss Ike."

International Competition in Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, for some years now it has been something of a pastime among certain groups in this Nation to attribute almost supernatural powers to the science and technology of the Soviet Union. In the days since the first sputnik was launched we have been subjected to a steady stream of handwringing statements that the Soviets were "ahead of us" in one field of endeavor after another.

Every Member of this body is familiar with the type of thing of which I speak. One of its results was the charge leveled during the 1960 presidential campaign that President Eisenhower had permitted a "missile gap" to exist in the favor of the Soviet Union—a charge that was quickly disavowed after the Kennedy administration took office.

On May 17, Science, the official publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, carried an editorial which I believe will do more to dispel all of the nonsense to which we have been subjected vis-a-vis Soviet accomplishments in science and technology than anything previously said on the subject. In the hopes that this editorial will help to stem the tide of the "America is always last" propaganda campaign, I commend this editorial to my colleagues:

INTERNATIONAL COMPETITION IN SCIENCE

The Soviet ability to launch large missiles has been misinterpreted as indicating superiority over the United States in scientific matters. Actually there are few areas of science in which the Russians excel. Despite their ability to place large pieces of hardware in orbit, their contributions to space research have been meager. They have nothing to match our Mariner II results, and their exploration of regions closer to the earth has been less intensive than ours. In high-energy nuclear physics our discoveries are unmatched, as is our progress in maser-laser studies and in semiconductors. In most areas of chemistry the Russians are behind us; plastics and petrochemicals are outstanding examples. In the exploitation of radioactive isotopes much of the Russian work is mere repetition of our research. In biochemistry, biophysics, and molecular biology we are superior. The Russians have achieved nothing like our progress in deciphering the genetic code or in determining amino acid sequences in proteins.

Innumerable examples could be given; we compete on countless frontiers of science which, in sum, are vastly more important than space. On many of these frontiers, such as solid-state physics, advances are crucial to future economic and military strength. Fundamental research is now often quickly followed by practical applications. A substantial fraction of today's commerce is based on discoveries of the last two decades. It is of interest to compare American and Russian competition in world markets in items involving science and technology. By this yardstick the Soviet Union is a third-class power. It is no match for Western Europe, the United Kingdom, or Japan.

The Japanese are competing in technological areas requiring first-class scientific competence. Their electronics products such as transistor radios and television sets are selling for less than ours on our own soil. To a degree this reflects cheaper labor, but only in part. The production of transistors and other solid-state electronic components involves sophisticated technology. Even the cheapest labor is no substitute for scientific ability in this field.

Western Europe is far stronger scientifically and technologically than the U.S.S.R., and the Western Europeans are rapidly closing in on us. If present trends continue, it will be only a matter of a few years before they achieve supremacy.

Western Europeans have long proved that they are, individually at least, as competent scientifically as we. They have made a remarkable recovery from the effects of World War II and are again in a position to challenge us. In the contest they have two advantages. Research costs them about one-fourth what it costs us, and proportionately less of their talent is occupied with military and space efforts. Leaders of industrial research in this country are increasingly concerned with the overpowering competition of Government-financed programs for first-class scientific talent. One research director told me recently, "We need good people, but my company can't compete with projects paid for by the U.S. Treasury."

We have chosen to stake our national prestige in a propaganda contest with the Russians in one of the few major areas of technology where they have an edge over us. In the meantime we fail to note that the Western Europeans are getting ready to walk away with the trophies which really count.

The Honorable Francis E. Walter

SPEECH

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow that I learned of the passing of my good friend and our esteemed colleague, the Honorable FRANCIS EUGENE WALTER. This great legislative body has lost a pillar of strength, our country has lost a leader, the district he so ably represented for 31 years has lost a devoted servant, and I have lost a valued friend.

"TAD" WALTER was in the Congress when I was first elected in 1936, and if there was anyone more willing to help, more anxious to assist, or more readily available to advise and counsel, it was not my privilege to meet him. "TAD" WALTER had an understanding of people that was unsurpassed, and time and again used this great understanding to unite and solidify divergent forces behind an issue that would surely have failed without such support. He was a skilled parliamentarian, and possessed such a brilliant legal mind, that he often was given the responsibility of the chair in securing passage of the most heated and controversial legislation. During his service in the House, he was honored by many high and responsible positions, which was a tribute to the quality of his service and dedication, and at the time of his death was chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee, chairman of the Democratic caucus, chairman of the Patronage Committee, and chairman of two subcommittees of the House Judiciary Committee. Truly a great record of accomplishment by a great American.

It has been a privilege for me to know and work with such an outstanding individual, and I would like to extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

A Letter From a High School Student

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OMAR BURLESON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, the following is an excerpt from a letter from a high school student in my town of Abilene, Tex.

In commenting on the statement by this young man, a friend of mine said it indicated a perception far beyond that expected of a high school student, and I fully agree.

In this excerpt from the letter by Lynn Taylor, 802 Graham Street, are fundamentals which impress me very much in light of present-day trends:

> Although I certainly do not consider myself an expert on political theory, however, I do have some very concrete ideas. I am saddened by the seeming deterioration of personal evaluation in this country. It seems that far too many of us are seeking to avoid our own responsibilities by hiding behind some very vocal group that keeps us amply supplied with literature so as to avoid our having to do a little thinking for ourselves. Today many people aren't Americans anymore; they're Democrats, Republicans, liberals, conservatives, Birchers, leftwingers, isolationists, internationalists, or pacifists. We don't ask a man his beliefs anymore; we ask to see his party card or try to determine whether he's leftist or rightist. Most of us find it easier to travel in the deep ruts to the left or right instead of attempting to move along the rough and lonely middle route.
>
> Far too many Americans today do not realize that it is not necessary to yell and cry in order to expedite our American way. A firm unyielding set of values, a code of beliefs, and an unfaltering faith in God and in ourselves seems to have been partially replaced by the committee. The only qualifications for entry into most of these leftwing and rightwing radical organizations seems to be a strong pair of lungs and almost complete immunity to fact.
>
> I hope I will not allow myself to become such a thoughtless person as I attempt to serve my country as a lawyer and possibly an active politician.
>
> Pardon my lengthy letter. Thank you again for being so kind and thoughtful.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> LYNN TAYLOR.

Profile of a Lion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, unless one is an active member, the significance of our international service clubs to our Nation and the world can easily be overlooked.

Lions International is one of these great movements. It binds together public spirited citizens throughout the world. There are today 677,000 Lions in 17,117 clubs located in 121 countries and geographical locations throughout the world. These men have joined together to help, encourage, and extend the personal hand of friendship, to those who for any reason cannot help themselves.

On May 18 it was my privilege to be present and speak briefly to the guests at a testimonial dinner given in honor of my long-time friend and former associate, Michael Orecchio, of Fairview, N.J., on the occasion of the completion of his term as a governor of District 16–A, New Jersey, Lions International.

Governor Orecchio is the owner of the Orecchio Agency, in Fairview, N.J., a well known and highly successful real estate and insurance business. During his entire life, Michael Orecchio has served his community with zeal and devotion. He sponsored and aided in the construction of his town's first playground. He equipped and set up a baseball league for youngsters. He was instrumental in organizing the town's first Boy Scout troop. He served for years on both the board of education and the planning board. For 26 years he was a volunteer fireman, serving also as fire chief. He served as president of the Fairview Chamber of Commerce. Every fund-raising drive has benefitted from his help and leadership. He has had a lifelong interest in crime detection and crime prevention, which led to his service as chief of detectives for Bergen County, N.J.

During his years as a member of Lions International, Michael Orecchio has seen a need for some brief credo which would identify a Lion to the community, to the world at large, and last but not least, to himself.

In words that are brief but full of meaning, he has written a "Profile of a Lion." Those who have heard this wonderful description of a Lion have been deeply moved by it.

Lions International was established 46 years ago. Its Lions Club objectives and Lions code of ethics set the standard for Lions conduct. In a sense, this "Profile of a Lion," taken together with the Lions Club objectives and the Lions code of ethics could well form a trinity of lionism.

Mr. Speaker, because the philosophy so well expressed in the "Profile of a Lion" could be followed by all of us, under unanimous consent I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

PROFILE OF A LION

He is a respected citizen of his community.

He is reverent to his God, loyal to his country and uncompromising in his devotion to both.

He raises his glass in the "Lions toast" and thereby acknowledges the concept of equality of all Lions the world over.

He recognizes authority, accepts responsibility and exercises self-discipline, realizing that only through proper organization can Lionism achieve its greatest goals.

He gives willingly of his time, energy, and substance to assist his community and the needy.

He meets regularly with his fellow Lions and through the common denominator of "friendship" confers, plans and carries out the objectives of his Lions Club.

He is an ordinary guy, enjoys fun and good fellowship, although not perfect he is ever mindful of human concern.

Partnership for Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, on May 31, 1963, I was privileged to attend the dedication of a new wing of the U.S. Plant, Soil, and Nutrition Laboratory at Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y. The principal speaker on that significant occasion was our colleague HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, of the 37th District of New York. His talk, entitled "Partnership for Research," was highly informative and very timely. His remarks are especially significant today as the House is considering the agriculture appropriation bill. He discussed the essential role of Government in certain aspects of research but correctly warned that the proper balance between Government and private research must be maintained if we are to avoid stunting our economic growth. The vast expansion of governmental research can siphon off too large a percentage of our scientific talent if we are not aware of this danger and fail to take appropriate corrective action. I trust we will consider carefully this problem and do all in our power to strengthen research in every field of production activity so that our national economy may be strengthened in all its vital phases.

Although the speech documents a lag in agricultural research it highlights the slowdown in research in many significant areas. I am confident our distinguished colleague's remarks will generate serious thinking and constructive action:

PARTNERSHIP FOR RESEARCH

(By Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG of New York)

It is a great honor and privilege for me to join with you today here at Cornell University on the occasion of the dedication of this important agricultural research facility. Cornell has developed a magnificent and enviable record for progress in agriculture over the years. And, too, Cornell has played a balance and leading role in science and technology as it applies to government, education, and the private sector of our whole national economy and culture. All of use who are familiar with its programs and services are confident that this new wing of the U.S. Plant-Soil and Nutrition Laboratory will produce achievements in keeping with the great traditions and standards developed here in the cooperative programs of Cornell University and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. It was a source of real satisfaction to me to join with Congressman John Taber, Congressman Alexander Pirnie, Congressman Howard Robison, and many other friends of this great institution in obtaining the approval in the Congress of the United States of the necessary funds for the construction and operation of this laboratory wing.

This laboratory is being dedicated today to unlock the many remaining secrets, the creative talents, applicable to our soil, plant, and animal resources. These are agriculture programs of a kind which all of us endorse and support, and it is to be regretted that a far greater share of the tremendous budget of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is not devoted to scientific progress of this nature. In the Department of Agriculture budget of $7 billion now before the Congress, only $185 million has been programed for the Agricultural Research Service. In fact, no funds have been requested in this budget for the establishment of any new agricultural research facilities anywhere in the country. As a member of the Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives, I am one who believes in economy in government, but I certainly find this to be false economy.

Throughout our history, the Department of Agriculture has been in the forefront of the Federal Government's efforts in support of research. The Department has carried out extensive research within its own facilities, and in support of research elsewhere. It has built up many fine working partnerships with our universities, such as the partnership that exists here at Cornell. The results of these efforts and these partnerships have been dramatic—they have played an important role in reshaping American agriculture—and in making the abundance of American agriculture the envy of the world. We take pride in the knowledge that each American farmer produces food and fiber for an average of 26 other persons, while the Soviet Union farmer's production capability is limited to 6 of his comrades.

I indicated a moment ago that I am not completely satisfied with the consideration given to agricultural research in the pending 1964 budget. In saying that, I should point out to you that in recent years the support for agriculture research has not kept pace with the tremendous surge of Government-sponsored science—research and development. During this period, the strong cooperative system of research developed many years ago as between the Department of Agriculture and that of our colleges and universities—this partnership has provided a sound foundation for expansion, and has measurably benefited the other areas of responsibility on the part of Government in the all-important fields of science and technology.

Although these other areas of governmental endeavor are something of a "Johnny-come-lately" in research pursuits, they have come into being with a tremendous rush. Many of these Federal programs have been increased 50 to 100 percent annually, in recent years. As a result, agriculture research, which was once the chief research interest of the Federal Government, is now in a distant fifth position in the financial tables for research supported on the part of the Federal Government. Topping the list of Federal patrons of research is the Department of Defense, with half of the overall total—followed by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Agriculture Department, in that order.

Yes, the Federal Government has entered into research with a tremendous surge. How big is that surge?

Well, in this present fiscal year, the Federal Government intends to spend more than $12 billion in the research and development category; and next year's budget calls for almost $15 billion. The Federal Government's expenditures for research are four times greater than they were 10 years ago, and they have doubled in the last 5 years. The Federal Government is now supporting more than two-thirds of all the research and development work performed in our great country. 10 years ago, the Government supported less than half the total expended for this purpose.

How has this happened?

What is its meaning and its impact?

Let me take a few moments to discuss these developments because I believe they are highly important for our Government, our educational institutions, our private enterprise, our economy, and for our national well being. And, they are now beginning to command reassessment as to application and balance.

The principal reasons for this tremendous growth have been the great expansion of Government responsibility, and the new importance of science and research to the public interests. For example, research in space has become almost totally a program of the Federal Government; health has become a major concern of the Federal Government; promotion of science, itself, has become a major Government responsibility; and, of course, national defense and security have become strongly dependent upon scientific research and technological development, in addition to dependence upon productive capacity and manpower, as in the past. In agriculture, in addition to the continuing goal of seeking to improve quality, and quantity, research has been stimulated also by such factors as rising costs, Government acreage controls, and by price supports. In these latter cases, I am afraid the results have not always been of benefit to agriculture.

Ten years ago the Federal Government accounted for less than 50 percent of the Nation's research and development—it spent about $3 billion in this area. Today, Federal expenditures are $12 billion and comprise more than two-thirds of the national total, both public and private. The Federal role has soared so swiftly and its impact has been so enormous, that we are just beginning to assess these new patterns and their effects.

One thing to be remembered, of course, is that federally supported research is not the same as federally performed research. More than 80 percent of federally sponsored research and development is performed by nongovernment organizations. In other words, $4 out of every $5 invested in research and development by the Federal Government is channeled through industry, colleges and universities, and other nonprofit institutions. Industry receives by far the largest allocation of this—mainly for defense and space projects. But our educational institutions this year will receive about $1.5 billion from the Federal Government in the pursuit of science, research, and technology. In most of the major universities, the Federal Government provides more than one-half of the funds of their research budget. As I understand it, right here at

Cornell University the Federal Government supports more than two-thirds of the research activity; and in keeping with the general pattern, the aeronautical laboratory receives by far the largest amount. Agriculture ranks second.

The chief area of research in our educational institutions has always been that of basic research, and I am glad that this has remained true in this period of domination by the Federal Government. While the colleges and universities receive only 12 percent of all Federal funds allotted for research and development, they receive almost one-half of the funds earmarked for basic research. To my mind, this is a very important consideration, because our educational institutions must continue to function as the chief training ground and producer of our new scientists and engineers; and they must continue to play their traditional role in the basic research efforts of the Nation.

May I say that the Congress has given enthusiastic support to the accelerated and varied plans and programs for research and development, and certainly the results have justified our enthusiasm. In space, in medicine, in agriculture, in military technology, in many, many fields progress and achievements have been dramatic and gratifying. Certainly the Nation has benefited greatly. But I must report to you today that there are signs of a second look developing. Why? Because there is a growing concern about the overall effects of the dominant role which the Federal Government has taken in the scientific and research and development effort of the Nation.

What is causing this growing concern? Well, let me discuss a few of the questions being asked.

We are being asked whether it is desirable in our form of democracy to give the Federal Government such a dominant voice in setting the course and the goals of American science and technology.

Is this dominance on the part of Government crowding out many research projects required by the private sector of our society? Is the traditional role of our colleges and universities in the research picture being altered, and is it for better or worse?

Is too much of the scientific manpower of the Nation being diverted to Government purposes? Is there adequate application or "spin off" of Government research to the civilian economy, or are we actually handicapping our economic development by stunting the growth of privately sponsored research?

And then, of course, as Government-sponsored research has mushroomed in all areas, the usual administrative question marks have appeared. For example, are Federal funds justified for research on such programs as religious cults in North Brazil, mother love of the monkey, or bargaining solutions for games?

There have been some difficulties, too, over the diversion of grant funds to other purposes.

I have brought these questions with me from Washington, but I cannot report to you today on the answers. I can tell you that Congress is looking with favor on a new Federal program to aid construction of college facilities, including laboratories. But many of the congressional committees are looking more carefully and critically at Federal research programs and budgets this year. The National Science Foundation is conducting a study of the impact which Federal research funds are having on the research programs of our colleges and universities. We are looking earnestly for the answers to these questions which have developed.

However, I do not consider agriculture research to be affected by this new second look. I believe our problem in that area is to change the uses being made of funds allocated to Agriculture. Research in agriculture requires a far greater share in the national effort: Its value—its merit—its need—are beyond question. These facilities here at Cornell give daily testimony to that. This is the type of Federally supported activity whose benefits permeate our entire society. As Dean Palm has said, agriculture research stretches beyond the production and marketing of the farm to our growing suburban and nonfarm population. It supplies answers to countless problems of homeowners, and yields innumerable results of direct benefit to all mankind.

Research in all fields of endeavor has played an important role in shaping our Nation and our society of today. It has been a strong, workable, realistic partnership with government, industry, our colleges and universities, and other organizations. Even more than in the past, research today will determine the character of tomorrow. It will have a decided bearing on our gross national product, our competitive position in the world, our standard of living, and our pursuit of happiness.

It is a challenge to all of us to see that America's partnership for research remains balanced, diverse, vital and strong, so that our Nation will continue to fulfill its traditional promise of a better tomorrow.

To the Graduates of 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the appendix of the RECORD, I include an article written by Tom Anderson, editor, which appeared in the Farm and Ranch magazine, May issue, which I commend to the attention of the House:

TO THE GRADUATES OF 1963

Once upon a time a mighty king condemned one of his lowly subjects to die. The wretch proposed and the king agreed to call off the execution if, within a year, the condemned could teach the king's horse to fly.

"Why postpone the inevitable?" a friend asked the wretch.

"It's not inevitable," he replied. "The odds are 4 to 1 in my favor: (1) the king might die; (2) I might die; (3) the horse might die; (4) I might teach the horse to fly."

Jesus said, "All things are possible to him that believeth."

A person who aims at nothing has a target he can't miss. Set an attainable goal. When you reach it, set another goal, higher. Many people flounder on the ship of life because they never chart a course. Make money the byproduct, not the goal. Drink at the fountain of knowledge, don't just gargle.

It's all right for you girls to be fortune hunters, if you marry a man who's a fortune in himself. Marry kindness, ambition, courage, determination, diligence, intelligence, honesty, good manners, sympathy, integrity, enthusiasm—and you have married a fortune. And remember, it takes two to make a marriage a success, but only one to make it a failure. "Kissin' don't last but good cookin' do."

Don't ever let anybody sell you the idea that chastity is out of date. Chastity will never be out of date. Your children will want their mother to be as pure as you want your mother to be. If we lose our morality we will be enslaved, and vice versa. Freedom and morality are one ball of wax. The great Thomas Jefferson said: "Yes, we did produce a near perfect Republic. But will they keep it? Or will they, in the enjoyment of plenty, lose the memory of freedom? Material abundance without character is the surest way to destruction."

Remember, freedom while God-given, does not perpetuate itself. There is only one great Giver—and that is God, not government. Government can give you nothing but what it takes from somebody else. A government big enough to give you everything you want is big enough to take everything you've got, including your freedom. Government is not a creator, but a parasite. Government can be a good friend, or your worst enemy. Government must be studied, understood, participated in, and controlled by the people, else it may become not the referee it is supposed to be, but a tyrant. Demand that your government leave you alone, as long as you are not harming your fellow man.

You should be rewarded according to your ability and your effort, not your needs. Prepare to pay your own debts, but not the debts of parasites. Go the extra mile to help him who would help himself, but give nothing to the leech who would live off the diligence of others. If you're determined to milk all possible pleasure out of life, buy your own cow, don't milk somebody else's through the fence.

Remember, you cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. America represents the last hope of mankind, during our time, to be free. The enslaved of the world look to America. We may yet have the morality and the courage to free them from Communist tyranny. But if we lose our freedom, who will free us? If the lamp of freedom is blown out in America, the world will be thrown into darkness.

Every person can excel in something. Develop your God-given talents to their highest pinnacle. Do not accept mediocrity. In the final analysis, neither your government nor your parents are responsible for you—you are responsible for yourself. Believe in your God, in your country, and in yourself and in that order. Repeat constantly to yourself: "It all depends on me."

There are two kinds of people: those who lift and those who lean. Some dedicate their lives to lifting their own character and fortunes and in making the world a better place because they are in it. The leaners, on the other hand, are parasites who live off the achievement of others. Be a driver, not a hitchhiker.

Recently a woman told me that my daughter, age 22, had more character than almost any person her age she had ever known. This brought a tear to my eye. This I had rather have heard than that she is the most beautiful, the best dancer, singer, writer, painter, athlete, or anything else. This is the supreme compliment. For character is the only thing we earn on earth which we can take with us when we die. Reputation is what you're supposed to be; character is what you are. Reputation is what your obituary says. Character is what your angels say.

You can't help it if you're ugly at 18. But if you're not beautiful at 80, it's your own fault. You can't help it if you were able neither to earn nor to inherit much in worldly goods. But character is a victory, not a gift. If you lack it, blame not your parents nor society, blame yourself.

Confucius said: "To know what is right and not do it is the worst of cowardice."

The morning after Charles Lindbergh flew the Atlantic nonstop from New York to Paris, an associate of Charles Kettering rushed into the research expert's laboratory in Dayton, Ohio, shouting: "He made it. Lindbergh landed safely in Paris." * * * "He did it all by himself." Kettering looked up from his work momentarily and remarked quietly:

"When he flies it with a committee let me know." The great accomplishments of history have been wrought by individuals, not by the mass. Learn to sing solo. Anybody can sing when everybody is singing.

Thomas Carlyle said: "The great law of culture is: Let each become all that he was created capable of being."

Society advances mainly through those who're unafraid to be different. "The strongest man on earth is the man who stands most alone." Dare to be a Daniel. Dare to be "square." Be a sovereign individual, not just a member of the mob. Be the "chicken" with the guts to say no to the crowd when the crowd's wrong.

The completely happy person who has no problems is either without sanity or conscience. Trouble is the common denominator of living. Clouds bring lifegiving rainstorms and are a necessary part of life. Learn to face life as it is, and as it can be.

One of your most precious possessions is time. It's criminal to waste it. You'll never live this moment again. Cato confessed that the fault which he felt the greatest need to repent was spending an hour unprofitably.

Life is an opportunity, a skill to be developed, a victory to be won. Every passing second is a grain of gold—won or lost. The poet said: "Of all sad words of tongue or pen, the saddest are these: 'It might have been.' " It might have been if we had so willed it.

TOM ANDERSON.

The Late Honorable Francis E. Walter: A Dedicated American

SPEECH
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I note the passing of a dedicated American, our distinguished colleague, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER. Representative WALTER, one of Pennsylvania's outstanding sons, served 16 terms on Capitol Hill, an outstanding Congressman, dedicated to his own District and region, his party, and above all, the United States of America. His concern with the welfare of his country was manifested in his chairmanship of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, where he sought out subversive elements and would grant no quarter to those who attempted to undermine his beloved country. His colleagues in Congress last supported the efforts of his committee by a vote of 412 to 6, silencing those who while opposing his work never doubted his sincerity.

The memory of FRANCIS E. WALTER will not fade in the minds of Americans who cherish freedom and deeply resent attempts to subvert the greatest Nation in the world. As long as we have men the caliber of FRANCIS E. WALTER, our Nation will be secure from within and we will be capable of defeating any enemy from without.

It was an honor and privilege to serve with this able legislator who must be remembered as a great American.

Biography of a Successful Director

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, a very high honor has come to a Bedford, Mass., doctor. Dr. S. P. Lacerva, who has served as director of the Veterans' Hospital in Bedford since 1961, was affiliated with the hospital for 13 years. He has just been named assistant director of psychiatry, neurology, and psychology here in Washington at the VA. Dr. Lacerva has rendered tremendous service to the Bedford institution. He will be missed there, but he goes with the profound good wishes of all his patients and associates there. Under unanimous consent I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tribute to Dr. Lacerva, which appeared in the monthly publication of local 32, National Association of Government Employees in Bedford:

BIOGRAPHY OF A SUCCESSFUL DIRECTOR

When it was announced that Dr. S. P. Lacerva, M.D., hospital director at the Veterans' Administration in Bedford since 1961, was going to leave this institution for a higher position of assistant director of psychiatry, neurology and psychology at Washington, D.C., a wave of profound regret and deep disappointment spread throughout the Bedford facility.

To the more than 1,600 veteran inmates at the hospital and the large professional staff and all other personnel there, Dr. Lacerva, elevated to the directorship in 1961, has been considered by all of us, as the heart, the soul, and the brains of our institutions. He dedicated his all to serve the ill, infirm, crippled and mentally sick here and other veteran facilities for the 13 years he has been on the medical staff.

His skill and experience, not only as a medical doctor but his additional training, experience and knowledge as a specialist in psychiatry, made an outstanding man in this profession. He is never satisfied to stand still. Interested in education and training, he has served as an instructor in clinical psychiatry at Tuft's medical college. This supplementary experience makes him invaluable in serving the veteran.

A man of modest, unassuming character, he serves the unfortunate veterans, whom he treats with patience and the paternal consideration of a father. It's no wonder that all who know him loved and respected him. To them, he is always and will continue to be a man among men.

All of us at Bedford will hate to see him leave and the place will not seem the same without him.

Now that he is recognized in Washington for his ability and his long faithful and unexcelled service, his legion of friends at Bedford will tender him a testimonial Wednesday, June 12, at the Paramount Lounge, North Chelmsford.

Here, will assemble several hundred of his close professional and admiring personnel to give him a farewell that we hope he will forever remember; that the folks at Bedford truly love him as a man, a doctor, and director or our hospital.

Although some of us have disagreed on a few or Dr. Lacerva's moves—which is normal, natural and our privelege as well—we must declare that he has done a superb job.

"May his shadow never grow less" wherever he goes, is the fervent wish and prayer for all his friends.

The 19th Anniversary of D-Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, today, June 6, represents the 19th anniversary of D-day, when the Allied forces on June 6, 1944, crossed the English channel and began the invasion of Nazi-held Europe.

It was a day destined to be indelibly written on the pages of history. We have come to know it by many names. Operation Overlord, it was known to the Allied Command. Military analysts speak of the Battle of Normandy. Author Cornelius Ryan, using a quote by German Field Marshal Erwin Rommel, has made it famous as "The Longest Day."

Certainly it is worthy of our looking back and remembering the events of that day.

The English channel was choppy and fog rolled. At 4 a.m. on June 5 at Southwick House near Portsmouth, England, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower had listened to weather briefings and, in the words of British Field Marshal Montgomery "decided to go on June 6. Eisenhower was in good form and made his decision quickly."

A few hours later the man responsible for the defense of Normandy, Rommel, wrote a situation report saying that "invasion is not imminent." The worse storm the English Channel had known in 20 years, plus the lack of Allied activity during 18 perfect-weather days in May, had lulled the Nazi "Desert Fox" into a false sense of security. His report finished, Rommel set off by car to Berchtesgaden to beg Adolph Hitler for more Panzer divisions. His Chief of staff, Gen. Hans Speidel, issued an order relaxing the month-long alert his forces had maintained along the coast of France. Officers moved inland for rest and relaxation.

Even as the Germans relaxed, the world's mightest armada slipped across the choppy channel toward Normandy's rugged coast: 4,000 ships and thousands of smaller craft, ready to dump onto the beaches the men, machines and equipment committed to freedom's cause. Shortly after midnight, June 6, the first paratroopers of history's largest airborne operation—18,000 men—tumbled through darkened skies. Within 6 hours the main assault forces would hit the beach and the world would for the first time hear the names of places rising to take a place in history: of Utah Beach and bloody Omaha Beach; of Cherbourg and Caen and Bayeux.

What of the giants of the times on this momentous day? And what of the men who then toiled in relative obscurity, but would within an amazingly short time rise to national prominence? What were they doing?

Winston Churchill spoke in the British House of Commons for 10 minutes on the fall of Rome and after, in his own words, "keeping them on tenterhooks for a little" dramatically told his people of "the liberating assault falling upon the coast of France."

Gen. Charles de Gaulle set foot upon his native soil for the first time in 4 years, leading the Free French into battle.

General Eisenhower paced the floor in anxious wonder, fretting as have commanders since the beginning of wars, over the slowness of progress reports.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt asked the Nation to join him in prayer:

> The darkness will be rent by noise and flame. Men's souls will be shaken by the violence of war.

Adolph Hitler slept on, not knowing of the assault until midafternoon of D-day. His now-infamous order to German commanders reveals his failure to grasp the magnitude of the invasion assault: "Clear the beaches by nightfall."

From Moscow, Premier Joseph Stalin wired Churchill:

> The invasion * * * gives joy to us all and hope of future success.

In the U.S. Senate, Chaplain Frederick Brown Harris also prayed:

> Grant that on this D-day of liberation weapons of freedom, forged in fires of faith, may pierce the shields of pagan steel.

Senators recited the 23d psalm together and a few rose to make stirring speeches about the long-awaited invasion.

One Senator who did not speak was a mild, bespectacled man from Missouri. He quietly voted against a proposed technical amendment to a price control bill and left the Senate Chamber. Within 45 days Harry S. Truman would be nominated for Vice President. Within 10 months he would be our Chief Executive. He had no way of knowing what fate held at the ready for him.

The House of Representatives recited the Lord's Prayer. Congressman LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas' 10th District, home from the wars with a Silver Star for gallantry in action, made no speeches but went quietly about his work.

At the Chelsea, Mass., Naval Hospital a 26-year-old lieutenant, junior grade, by the name of John Fitzgerald Kennedy recuperated from serious wounds received 10 months earlier when his P.T. boat had been cut in half by a Japanese destroyer. No one had the foresight to ask his reaction to this historic day.

On the beaches the Allies fought on. Soon they would sweep into France, capturing Paris on August 23. By September 1 they would reach Belgium and 9 days later fire the first shells into Germany itself.

The Third Reich that Hitler boasted would live "for a thousand years" felt the tremors that meant the beginning of the end.

Thus it has ever been, in the fullness of time, with every such regime founded upon tyranny and terror. And thus may it always be.

Indonesia—Stroke of Sanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, prior to, but most particularly since the release of the Clay report, foreign assistance to Indonesia has been considered a bad risk. The attitudes and actions of the Indonesian Government brought upon it the disapproval of informed persons in our country and abroad.

The Clay report expressed the belief that aid could not be granted to Indonesia until it put its internal house in order, provided fair treatment to foreign creditors and enterprises, and refrained from foreign adventure. If its shortcomings were overcome, the Clay report added, then Indonesia would deserve the support of free world aid sources.

This week, Mr. Speaker, the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific was privileged to receive a report from Lt. Gov. Wilson Wyatt, of Kentucky, on the recent oil negotiations with President Sukarno which took place in Japan. Governor Wyatt and his associates are to be highly commended for the part they played in successfully mediating this dispute.

On the basis of President Sukarno's willingness to negotiate a settlement in the oil controversy and in his conversations with Prime Minister Rahman on Malaysia, we can, with cautious optimism, look for future improvement. If Mr. Sukarno continues to demonstrate the statesmanlike qualities he displayed in these instances, and his government pursues a responsible course, we would be remiss in not reassessing current attitudes toward aid to the people of this developing country, the world's fifth largest in population.

An editorial entitled "Stroke of Sanity" which appeared in the Washington Post today succinctly sums up recent events and the hopes they raise for the future.

The editorial follows:

STROKE OF SANITY

President Sukarno's agreement to compensate American and British oil companies for facilities nationalized by his Government is to be welcomed in every way. The Indonesion President's stock had fallen, quite frankly, to an alarming low in recent months. While the oil settlement of itself does not resolve all misgivings about Indonesia, it does mark a new beginning in relations between this country and President Sukarno.

Much credit goes to Wilson Wyatt, President Kennedy's special representative, who participated in the negotiations with Mr. Sukarno. The agreement could well set a pattern for similar disputes elsewhere. Under its terms, Stanvac and Shell Oil will operate the facilities on a contract basis while the industry becomes a nationalized property. Adequate compensation is provided for the facilities, and provision is made for exploration of new areas during the next 30 years.

Perhaps the air in Tokyo was bracing, because during Mr. Sukarno's stopover there on his latest overseas hegira he also cooled off his feud with Malaya. The unexpected meeting between the President and Prime Minister Tunku Abdul Rahman was cordial. The two leaders have been matching acerb compliments for months over the creation of the Malaysian Federation. In August, if all goes well, Malaysia will be born, bringing five dependencies (Malaya, Singapore, North Borneo, Brunei, and Sarawak) into a single federal structure.

Malaysia could be a bastion of stability in Southeast Asia—and Indonesia will become a far stronger and more prosperous country if Mr. Sukarno really commits his undoubted talents to constructive ends.

Open Up the Gates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the death of Pope Pius XXIII has taken from this vale of tears a saintly man of uncommon concern for the problems of the common man the world over. His pontificate, coming at a time in the affairs of mankind when concern for "these the least of our brethren" seemed lost in the torrent of harsh and impersonal invective, was like the warmth of a spring breeze blowing over the handiwork of a long, cold winter. That pontificate has unleashed the forces of calm and compassionate reason, the healing forces of brotherly reconciliation, and, a call to all humanity to consider urgently the pressing problems and needs of the entire human family.

The Cleveland Press, in a lead editorial on June 4, catches the compassionate spirit of Pope John the man, a great man, a good man.

By leave obtained, I insert in the RECORD the editorial:

OPEN UP THE GATES

The life work of Angelo Guiseppe Roncalli was restoration of faith in the brotherhood of man.

When he was elevated to the papacy, in 1958, as John XXIII, he found a world full of bitterness and hate engendered by cataclysmic war, the brief Nazi reign of terror and the rise of insolent communism.

A reversal of that trend was beyond even his eloquently persuasive powers, but his saintly example at least compelled men to reflect on their ways.

An instrument to this end was an Ecumenical Council, the 21st in 20 centuries, called to promote unity of Christian faiths. A return to Roman catholicism was his ambition but he must have held that a far-off ideal. Meanwhile he worked for tolerance and understanding.

To this end he sent observers to the meeting of the "separated brothers" in the World Council of Churches, meeting in India. And he invited their observers to the Catholic World Council at the Vatican. His meetings with Protestant church leaders were the first in centuries.

His ideal of brotherhood went far beyond the Christian community. He revised the language of several church prayers considered offensive to Jews and seemed, correctly, to look upon Judaism as an early schism in common religious brotherhood which time yet may heal.

"You of the Old Testament and we of the New," he told a Jewish delegation, "must come closer and closer as brothers under God, to work for peace throughout the world."

Awesome responsibilities descended on the shoulders of this Italian farm boy, 262d Supreme Pontiff in descent from St. Peter. The traditional ceremony which surrounds this office was faithfully observed. But through it all, so warm was his personality, he could be comprehended as a fellow human being.

He was short and stout, bald with a fringe of white hair, smoked cigarettes—two a day—drank some wine but no spirits, was a moderate eater. And he had an irrepressible sense of humor.

In the First World War he was a medical sergeant. Going on half a century later, a bishop who was chief chaplain of the Italian Army with the rank of general attended a private audience at the Vatican. Pope John hoisted a snappy salute before the astonished bishop saying, "Sir, Sergeant Roncalli, at your command."

The story which seems best to illustrate his warm humanity concerns his visit to Rome's Regina Coeli Prison the day after Christmas in 1958, the first Pope in a century to make such a visit.

"You couldn't come to see me," he told the prisoners, "so I came to see you."

Prison officials, concerned for his safety among dangerous criminals, had urged him not to go inside.

"They are all children of the Lord," he reproved them. "Open up the gates."

Now that he is gone these words seem an appropriate epitaph for this great and good man. He is mourned by men and women of many creeds who have been warmed and given hope by his example.

For those of his rare kind, the words preserved by St. Matthew also are peculiarly apt: "Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God."

Pope John XXIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my profound sorrow on the death of Pope John XXIII. This simple, penetrating, human, and courageous man will surely go down in history, in spite of his brief reign of less than 5 years, as one of the greatest pontiffs in the long and impressive history of the Roman Catholic Church.

Few men in all history have ever captured the love and affection of so many millions of people, many of whom did not share his own religion, and most of whom never had the privilege of seeing or meeting him. This basic ability to communicate with other human beings was truly, as has been said, the miracle of Pope John.

He has breathed new life, new hope, indeed a healthy and youthful new vigor into mankind's age-long quest for peace on earth and good will and mutual understanding among all men.

As we bow in sorrow at the passing of this great man, we can only thank God for having given him and his leadership to the world in such a critical hour, and we can only hope that the great causes of peace and Christian unity for which he fought so tirelessly will be carried forward with equal fervor in the days ahead by all of us who were privileged to live in the age of John XXIII.

Pope John XXIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, Pope John XXIII was a leader of his church and of all mankind. Few people in modern times have contributed more deeply to world understanding and to a recognition of the significance of the common humanity which we share.

Regardless of religion, nation, or philosophic outlook, we pay tribute to him and his great and kindly works.

Death of Pope John XXIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the world has lost a great force for peace, unity, and good will in the death of Pope John XXIII.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Special Research Problems and Opportunities of the Electric Power Industry—Address by Joseph C. Swidler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent address on the subject, "The Special Research Problems and Opportunities of the Electric Power Industry," by Joseph C. Swidler, Chairman, Federal Power Commission, delivered before the Edison Electric Institute, Denver, Colo.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SPECIAL RESEARCH PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES OF THE ELECTRIC POWER INDUSTRY

(By Joseph C. Swidler)

It has been many years since a member of the Federal Power Commission has addressed a convention of the Edison Electric Institute. I am, therefore, especially honored by your invitation. It seems to me to be important from the point of view both of the Commission and the industry that the two should be on speaking terms. The Commission is handicapped in making positive contributions to the progress of the electric power industry and the welfare of power consumers without full knowledge of the plans and problems of all segments of the industry. The industry, in turn, will benefit from an understanding of the objectives and program of the Commission. If we are to continue to make progress together, it will require a better knowledge on the part of each of us as to what the other thinks and how it functions.

If I may say a personal word, let me confess that addressing an Edison Electric Institute convention seems a most unlikely thing for me to do after having spent most of my working life as an employee of the Tennessee Valley Authority. However, I understand your invitation was extended in full awareness of my background as well as of my present position, and I have accepted the invitation in the same spirit of adventure as it was tendered.

The revival of interest by the industry in the functioning of the FPC is, I believe, due not only to an invigoration of the Commission's traditional functions in hydro licensing and rate regulation, but also to its employment of the discretionary authority which Congress has granted to encourage joint action by the various segments of the industry to solve their own problems. The outstanding example is the National Power Survey in which the Commission in cooperation with all parts of the industry is attempting to help them to take full advantage of the technological possibilities in the generation and transmission of power to bring down power costs and power rates throughout the country in the years to come. Perhaps one of the most important benefits of the National Power Survey is that it has brought the various elements of the industry—the private companies, the Federal systems, the municipalities and the cooperatives—into closer relationship with the Commission and with each other. I believe for the first time the Commission has become a strong unifying force within the industry. Unfortunately, there are many centrifugal forces at work to separate the segments of the industry. They need to be offset by more of such unifying ventures as the National Power Survey.

I shall not speak any further today about the national power survey. I have discussed it on a number of occasions. In fact, my friends have said that if there is a lull in any conversation I am likely to seize the opportunity to bring up the national power survey. This is a gross exaggeration as well as being unfair to the natural gas industry, because frequently, instead of the national power survey, I bring up the subject of the Commission's area rate proceedings to fix producer prices for natural gas. As you can see, therefore, I am a man of broad conversational interests. I could try to prove my point by a discussion today of the Commission's program to regulate gas producers and of the many reductions the Commission has ordered in the prices charged by your natural gas competitors, but I shall forgo the temptation.

Those of you who follow the work of the national power survey closely enough to read the published minutes of the committee sessions will have noticed that the subject of power industry research is a recurrent theme at the meetings of the executive advisory committee. No other subject has proved to be as intriguing and provocative. I believe the reason is the general recognition within the industry that there is large room for improvement in the research effort applied to the problems of the power industry, coupled with an awareness that the structure of the industry makes it difficult to achieve that improvement.

The electric power industry was born as the result of an intensive research effort by Thomas Edison in one of the first industrial laboratories in the country; and technological pioneering has been the lifeblood of the industry throughout the eight decades of its existence. Research is likely to be even more important to the industry in the next 80 years if its phenomenal rate of growth and record of steadily decreasing costs is to be maintained. It is fair to say that the share of the Nation's energy market which the electric power industry will supply in future decades hinges largely on the success of its present research efforts.

The scale of research and development expenditures by the electric power industry and the allocation of these funds must be considered in the context of the enormous investments that the industry will make in the coming decades. The industry will be investing in the neighborhood of $140 billion in the next 20 years, and most of this money will go into equipment of more advanced design than anything that has yet been built. Steam powerplants already started have been planned for an ultimate capacity that will represent investments of over a half billion dollars at a single site. With such vast expenditures, and such concentration of resources in new equipment, ordinary prudence compels us to ask if we are learning as much as we possibly can about the probable performance of the equipment we are purchasing, and about the materials out of which the equipment is manufactured. Adequate research and development is the best means of insuring that the industry and its consumers will get their money's worth from the vast sums which the industry will invest in the next two decades.

It may seem incongruous to speak of the need for improvement in the research organization of the electric power industry in the light of the record of achievement of the industry. The United States with only 6 percent of the world's population has 34 percent of the world's power capacity; three times as much as any other country. This Nation's per capita use of electricity is exceeded only by three countries—Canada, Sweden, and Norway—which are all especially rich in loy-cost hydro resources. The EEI's recent report on current research and development in the electric utility industry points out its enormous technological progress, especially in developing the economies of scale in steam plant generation and transmission.

The maximum size of generating units in service has tripled since the end of World War II, and units of a million kilowatts are under construction. The average efficiency of heat utilization has improved by 30 percent during the same period. There is also mounting momentum in developing EHV transmission grids. Thousands of miles of 315-kilovolt lines are in service and several 500-kilovolt lines are now being built. More are under active consideration. A great deal of work is also underway to develop new methods for energy conversion.

The five principal equipment manufacturers for the electric industry recently estimated that their total research and development costs for the industry amount to approximately $76 million a year. To this must be added many millions more spent on research and development by other manufacturers and by the utility industry itself.

Both in achievement and in the scale of effort, the research and development activities of the industry are truly impressive. The question is not whether the industry's record is good or whether it is making rapid technological progress. To both these questions the answer is "Yes." The question I raise, rather, is whether we are doing as well as we should, that is, whether we are taking advantage of the research opportunities reasonably available to us and thus assuring the industry that it will continue and even accelerate the present pace of technological improvement.

Let us start by taking a look at the present research structure of the industry other than for research in nuclear generation, which is a story in itself. The principal industry reliance is upon the equipment manufacturers who carry on almost all their research as a part of product development and charge the cost to the purchasers of the equipment as a part of the purchase price. Most of the large utility companies, public and private, carry on comparatively modest research programs of their own, related primarily to everyday operating and construction problems. In addition, ad hoc groups of utilities, usually all in the same segment of the industry, sponsor particular research projects which are carried out in research institutions or by the manufacturers. The research in magnetohydrodynamics carried on by AVCO, the Apple Grove EHV test facility of Westinghouse, and the EHV cable project at Cornell, are a few examples of these industry efforts.

A source of research effort for the electric power industry which promises to be of large importance is the so-called fallout from the many research projects which are being carried on as a part of programs to achieve national supremacy in the missile and space fields. However, I know of no systematic effort by the industry to insure that it utilizes all of the fallout value for civilian power purposes.

To my knowledge there is little basic research conducted by the industry, and apparently it depends almost entirely on others to support research for the purpose of advancing general scientific knowledge, which is the foundation for improving the technology in every field of endeavor, including the electric power industry.

There is no direct Federal participation in research in conventional power technology other than amounts spent by various Federal power systems on a scale comparable with those of the private utility companies which have research programs.

On the nuclear side the situation is entirely different. The Atomic Energy Act was intended to provide a vehicle for capturing the peacetime values of the Nation's nuclear programs by massive Federal expenditures, direct and indirect, for research and development in nuclear reactors. The rapid improvement of nuclear technology springs from the organized Federal support amounting to approximately $1.1 billion for research and development in this field to date; and the expenditures continue at the rate of $200 million annually. The equipment manufacturers thus far have spent approximately $250 million on nuclear R. & D. and they are now spending about $100 million annually. The utility industry itself has spent approximately $300 million which can be attributed to nuclear R. & D. and it now spends perhaps $50 million a year. Incidentally, in 1962 the class A and B privately owned electric companies reported to FPC in the account for general research a total of $26 million for nuclear power research expenses, as contrasted to less than $4 million spent for all other experiments and general research. This is for the Nation's largest industry in terms of investment. Even if we assume that some research expenses were included in other accounts the showing is not impressive.

The total annual expenditures of approximately $150 million by the utility industry and its manufacturers for nuclear research and development alone exceeds substantially the amount they spend for all other research and development. If we consider the total of all research and development expenditures in the electric power field, over two-thirds of all the money spent is devoted to nuclear technology alone. Indeed, the enormous share of total research in power technology which is being devoted to the nuclear side poses the question whether the Nation and the industry are making a wise allocation of our scientific and research resources.

I do not question the desirability of nuclear research and development, but even on optimistic assumptions as to the growth in nuclear generating capacity in the years ahead, less than 10 percent of the industry's total generating capacity by 1980 will be in nuclear plants and the nuclear equipment and associated fuel will at most comprise only 2 or 3 percent of the industry's total investment in generation, transmission, and distribution. The 70 percent of industry research and development money now being devoted to nuclear technology stands out in provocative contrast.

While the emphasis on nuclear research and development is striking, I cannot say from my own competence that the present allocation of research effort in the electric power field necessarily represents a poor use of research resources. The point, rather, is that the allocation of research effort as between nuclear and nonnuclear activities does not represent a considered judgment as to the best way to invest research effort and money, but results largely from the fact that research in nuclear reactors is federally sponsored while other industry research is not. The research effort in both the nuclear and nonnuclear power fields are aimed at the same goal—to reduce the cost of power to the Nation's consumer's—but different scales are used in appraising research expenditures for nuclear and nonnuclear projects.

My position is not that the nuclear research program should be reduced. What I do believe is that both the industry and the Government should consider their expenditures in relation to the need for accelerated research and development in all phases of electric generation, transmission, and distribution, and that we need to take a fresh look both at the industry's scale of research activity, and at the possibility of Federal participation in some phases on nonnuclear research.

I am frank to say that I favor a stronger research effort in power technology. I hope for greater emphasis on research in conventional technology, and in unconventional areas other than nuclear, not at the expense of nuclear research, but as the result of a greater total research effort in the power field.

The President has recognized the importance to the future of our economy of the allocation of Federal research and development expenditures in the various areas of the energy field. On February 15 of this year he directed that an Interdepartmental Energy Study be carried out under the chairmanship of the Director of the Office of Science and Technology and with the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors as Vice Chairman. In his memorandum to the various participating agencies—including the Federal Power Commission—the President said: "The amount and allocation of Federal research and development in the energy field will affect the efficiency of various components of our energy system, and, consequently, the rate and pattern of our national economic growth." He directed "that a comprehensive study be undertaken of the development and utilization of our total energy resources to aid determining the most effective allocation of our research and development resources."

The study ordered by the President is currently underway. It has great potential importance for the future of the electric power industry. But improved government organization for research in the electric power and overall energy field is not enough. I believe the industry, too, needs some way to identify and appraise research opportunities and to organize and support research projects of potential long-term importance to the industry and its consumers.

The well-springs of research are incentive and freedom. The research function can easily be overcoordinated and there is great value, which must not be lost, in the freedom of the various organizations engaged in research to follow their own ways of approaching a research objective. Competition is one of the best of incentives, and in research it makes possible a diversity of approaches to the solution of research problems, and draws upon the talents and inspiration of many rather than a few. Moreover, sometimes it is impossible to separate research from design and application, and to separate applied research from product development might mean foregoing practical use for the solutions to research problems. The interrelated nature of R. & D. may make it difficult for one organization to use the results achieved by others without going through the process of making the results one's own.

Having said all this, however, it still remains that there is a consensus in the industry, and I include the manufacturers, that more is needed, certainly by way of increasing the level of nonnuclear research effort in the industry, and probably also by way of rationalizing the distribution of the available research resources. It is a commentary on the state of research in the electric power industry that the Edison Electric Institute is now for the first time conducting a comprehensive survey to inventory the research work which is being carried on. As lately as a month or two ago EEI reported that "no data are now available with respect to the amount of utility company expenditures on research and development."

A comparison of industry's R. & D. effort with those of other industries is instructive. The chemical industry spends 6 percent of its sales revenues on research. The oil and gas industry spends 3 percent, while the railroad industry spends only a 15th as much as oil and gas, or 0.2 percent. The electric power industry is near the lower end of this spectrum, with 1 percent of revenues expended for research and development—including nuclear.

The research problem of the industry is not all of a piece. Research with respect to equipment for which there is an existing market or which can be expected to develop an early market—what might be called research in contemporary hardware—is now being carried on, I believe very creditably, by the manufacturers. Where there is adequate commercial incentive I see no reason for intervention either by the industry as a whole or by the Federal Government. In fact, such intervention might well be mischievous. By relieving the manufacturers of their research responsibilities and complicating the problems of proprietary protection for product development, the industry's overall research effort might well be hampered.

The essence of the problem is that there is much that needs to be done in the interests of the industry and the Nation in nonnuclear research for which there is no adequate commercial incentive. Some of these opportunities are in the technology which will be required in periods yet too remote to warrant large expenditures by manufacturers. For example, 500 kilovolt and 750 kilovolt transmission would be much further off were it not for projects sponsored by individual utility companies or groups of companies. Little is being done on 1,000 kilovolts AC or on DC transmission although either could prove to be of great future importance.

Even more conspicuous examples of failure on an adequate scale to take advantage of important research opportunities are in the fields of energy conversion, such as magnetohydrodynamics, thermionics, and fuel cells. There is much good work being done in these fields, but the effort is hardly commensurate with the large improvements in efficiency which some day will undoubtedly be achieved by one or more these new methods of generation.

Metallurgy is another field in which the industry is far from having kept abreast of present-day requirements for containment of heat, pressure and corrosion, much less the requirements that we can already foresee in the decades ahead. Metal failures appear to be a basic cause for many of the unscheduled outages of the new high-pressure and high-temperature generating units. If such outages of generating equipment could be cut in half this would have a value of hundreds of millions of dollars to the electric power industry and its consumers. Neither the producers nor fabricators of the metal have the same financial stake as the industry itself in research which will enable the metal members to withstand the duties imposed upon them.

The industry has shown little interest in research for the purpose of broadening the potential market. From the industry's virtual neglect of reasearch in the battery field, for example, one would little suspect that improvements in the weight, life, and cost of batteries would open up a whole new vista of electric power growth. The potential of the market is suggested by the fact that supplying the automotive needs in this country with electricity would roughly double the industry's output. Battery operated automobiles have existed almost from the birth of the industry, but today batteries are basically the same as those which were made a half-century ago. Despite this fact battery operated vehicles are common today for specialty uses. These uses could be multiplied manifold by battery improvements which do not seem out of reach of the attainable by an intensive research program. The public interest in helping to free our cities from fumes which contribute to air pollution is another consideration which should be a large incentive for research efforts in this field.

Improvements in battery design and costs would make possible a tremendous multiplication of battery-operated appliances ranging from lawn mowers to snow plows and tractors. Batteries can be recharged in off-peak hours, and offer loads which are ideal for improving system load factors.

Space heating is another example. The power forecasts for 1980 assume more than a tripling of present power loads. A very large share of the increase is expected to come from space heating. Indeed, the industry is striving for a 15 or 20 fold increase in space-heating installations in this country by 1980. We know that in order to become a major factor in space heating the industry must overcome increasingly stiff competition from natural gas and oil. Yet the EEI Survey reveals no major research work being carried on to aid the industry's efforts to capture this market upon which it is counting so heavily. The scale of industry research as to how this market can best be served by electricity bears no relation to the stakes involved.

Many research and development opportunities which have vast potential but lack early commercial importance will readily come to mind. The revolution in urban transportation which is now beginning and which will accelerate with mounting urban populations provides a unique opportunity to the industry to help relieve traffic congestion and air pollution with newly engineered electrified rapid transit systems. Railroad electrification is by no means a lost cause if the industry brings to this problem the benefits of its own cost reductions coupled with intensive research in new equipment. We are beginning to find in this country as has already become apparent in England and elsewhere that we must give more consideration to esthetic and amenity considerations in designing and building powerplants, transmission lines, and substations. Undergroud transmission and distribution is only one application in which greater research efforts should be explored.

In mentioning these possible areas of research opportunity I do not mean to imply that they are necessarily the best or the most urgent. They are only illustrative of the scores and hundreds of opportunities for research and development which should be evaluated on their merits for their future promise to the progress of the industry and the welfare of the American people.

The lack of industry emphasis on research and development affects the quality of the professional employees attracted to the industry. The electric power industry is fortunate that its present top management were drawn into the industry at a time when it represented one of the most attractive fields for able, imaginative, and ambitious young men. Now it is the electronic, missiles, space, and atomic energy fields to which the top graduates of our technical schools are attracted. The heart of the appeal in these new fields is their research orientation and opportunity.

The electric power industry has as much to offer to the new generation of American scientists and engineers as it did to past generations. It is the greatest growth industry of all time and more than any other the foundation of a modern society. It will become more rather than less important with the passage of time. Today about 20 percent of the energy consumed by the American economy is in the form of electric energy. By the year 2000, if the industry can continue its technological progress, 40 percent of all energy is likely to be utilized as electricity. What is lacking to draw the best of our young people into this industry is the appeal of an active and strongly supported research and development program, the excitement of the discoveries and breakthroughs which no longer come almost unbidden but must now be purchased by highly organized and expensive research programs. One of the greatest hidden costs of the industry's present approach to research and development is that it deflects the best technical talent to other industries.

The fact that the electric power industry sells only one product fails to disclose the broad range of the industry's interest and concern in this Nation's economic growth and its general welfare, and conversely of the stake of the American economy in the progress of our industry. The electric power industry can grow only if the American standard of living and resulting demand for electricity grows; but the industry can stimulate that growth by reducing its own costs. Any investment which holds promise of reducing substantially the cost of electric power will pay large dividends to all Americans.

I am convinced, and many industry leaders to whom I have talked share the conviction, that the scale of research in the electric power field is too small and that the allocation of research effort is too haphazard. The electric power industry is too great and important, and its potentials are far too vast, for its research strength to depend either upon the initiative and the particular interests of individual electric industry executives who are harried with operating responsibilities, or upon the fallout from research programs directed at altogether different objectives. The Nation's No. 1 industry can afford a research program scaled to its needs and opportunities. It cannot afford the risk of lost opportunities and delayed progress which is inherent in the present lack of system or direction in research.

I have no prescription for curing the research problem of the industry but I should like to propose a small step which could lead to some improvement. As the agency with over-all national responsibility in the power supply field the FPC could appropriately call together a group of knowledgeable people representing the private, public, and cooperative sectors of the industry, the manufacturers, and the research community, to consider how the industry—acting as a whole—could best serve its own interests and the interests of the nation by stimulating more intensive research efforts in areas where such intensification is likely to be rewarding. Such a group would be fully aware of the risks of overcentralization and of the need, with respect to product research, for integrating the research effort with development and production.

Specifically, such a committee would be asked to make recommendations with respect to the establishment of a permanent industry-wide organization, including its composition, responsibilities and administrative structure. I suggest that such an interim committee should have in mind that the permanent organization could discharge a great variety of functions for the industry including the following:

Appraise research opportunities and determine areas in which research is lagging, measured by research expenditures in other areas and the pace that would be warranted by prospective benefits;

Serve as the instrument of the industry in sponsoring research projects of general importance;

Provide liaison with the Federal Government on problems of allocation of Federal research efforts and of interrelation of private and public research efforts;

Serve as a research clearinghouse for the entire industry, including scrutiny of defense and other research which might have application to the technology of the industry; and

Keep abreast of research developments in other countries and make arrangements to take advantage of technological improvements adaptable to American circumstances.

The FPC seeks no role in such an organization. Our only interest is that the industry itself—all of the elements of the industry—shall create and maintain an organization which will assure the utmost technological advancement which can be brought about by research and development activities on a scale commensurate with the opportunities and promise of rewards. Here, indeed, is a goal on which all of the forces of the industry can unite to advance.

The Connally Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently a prominent Arizonian, Mr. Denison Kitchel, who has served for a number of years on the American Bar Association subcommittee concerning the Connally amendment, wrote a book, which has been published, entitled "Too Grave a Risk." Recently, Mr. William Henry Chamberlin wrote a review of the book; and the review has been published in the Wall Street Journal. I ask unanimous consent that the review be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONNALLY AMENDMENT: A BRIEF FOR RETENTION

As an experienced lawyer, Mr. Denison Kitchel has prepared many briefs. But it is doubtful he ever presented such an excellent case as he does in "Too Grave a Risk," a little book in which he argues that the Connally amendment—restricting U.S. acceptance of the jurisdiction of the World Court—should be retained.

The World Court is composed of 15 special judges, elected for 9-year terms with a 3-year rotation system, so that one-third of the Court is reelected every 3 years. Its function is to render judgments and opinions on disputes between nations involving points of international law. Its jurisdiction does not extend to matters of internal concern. But who is to determine what is a matter of internal concern? This question was left ambiguously open when the Senate was debating U.S. acceptance of World Court jurisdiction in 1946.

Then Senator Tom Connally, of Texas, filled in this gap with an important specification in six words, "As determined by the United States." In recent years it has become a matter of the liberal faith to attack the Connally amendment as an obstruction to the realization of that mirage-like goal: "World peace through world law." Some well-meaning people have gained the impression that the United States, by maintaining the Connally amendment, is failing in its duty to give leadership for world peace and lagging behind the rest of the world.

THE U.S. COMMITMENT

Mr. Kitchel, with his full knowledge of the facts, has little difficulty in demonstrating that this is just not so. "The truth is," he writes, "that the United States is further committed to the World Court than any other major power."

Only about one-third of the members of the United Nations have followed the American lead in accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. And of the 35 which have accepted almost all have carved out much bigger escape hatches than the United States. France, Great Britain, and the Commonwealth countries are members of the Court's jurisdiction on the understanding that they can quit on 1 day's notice. America's time limit is 6 months.

No Communist-ruled nation has accepted the jurisdiction of the Court at all, although some of its judges have been Soviet and Polish nominees.

During the first 15 years of its existence the World Court decided only 11 cases, disposed of 5 others on technical grounds and rendered 12 advisory opinions to the United Nations. Of these 11 cases only 1, the mining of two British warships off the coast of Albania, was serious. The others varied from the trivial to the ridiculous, such as the case of a German in Guatemala who, for a handsome consideration, bought himself citizenship in the postage stamp size principality of Lichtenstein.

As the author observes, two things stand out in the Court's record during this period:

"The first is the relative unimportance of the disputes which have been submitted to the Court. The other is the small number of disputes submitted during a period when disputes between nations seem to have been almost constant. These things are mentioned at this point only to dispel any illusion which may exist that the nations of the world have accepted in large measure the principle of adjudication as a means of settling disputes involving their vital self-interests, or that the World Court has to date played any real part in international affairs."

COURT'S ROLE COULD GROW

The question may arise why, if the World Court has been so ineffectual, it is necessary to retain the Connally amendment. The answer is that the past is not necessarily a guide to the future. And the time has passed when the United States could reckon on an automatic majority for its viewpoint in the Assembly of the United Nations.

It is quite conceivable that a combination of the Soviet bloc and the "uncommitted nations" could produce anti-American votes on matters very vital to U.S. national interests: Tariffs, immigration, race relations, U.N. control of funds appropriated for foreign aid, the Panama Canal, the base at Guantánamo, to mention a few. Such a vote might be followed by an appeal to the World Court. In such a case the Connally amendment would be a very useful trump in Uncle Sam's hand. At the present moment the struggle over the Connally amendment is dormant. But the Democratic platform of 1960 calls for its repeal and the issue may flare up at any time.

It is a good thing to have such a convincing brief for the retention of the amendment, on the ground that its repeal would involve, in the words of the title, "too grave a risk."

WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN.

Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1964

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6754) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I contend this is legislation on an appropriation bill because it would prohibit the Secretary from carrying out the duties and the authority that he has under legislation that has not been changed. The author of this proposed amendment is attempting to come in here today and prohibit the payment of money to officials of the Government who are authorized, delegated, and responsible for the administration of a program. When you try to put a limitation on the price at which cotton may be supported you are amending the present law affecting the price-support program on cotton; for certainly the gentleman from Illinois does not expect employees in the USDA to work without pay.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. The effect of my amendment would be to provide a limitation on the use of funds in this act, and to require that the legislative intent of the 1958 act be carried out and to restrain officers of the Department of Agriculture from entering into price-support levels which were not anticipated nor intended in the legislative act of 1958.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is where I disagree with the gentleman, because it has been under the 1958 act, that the Secretary has acted properly and legally in supporting this price as he has done on all of the commodities. He has not violated the law. When you take away payment of salaries to the people who are enforcing the law, I say you are in effect repealing a law that is on the books.

For that reason, this amendment that the gentleman has offered is legislation on an appropriation bill any way you take it. I do not care what the ruling may be, it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The gentleman is trying to change basic law. You should go before the Committee on Agriculture. You are coming in here today to take a short circuit to try to use people who are trying to destroy a program without going through the regular legislative processes.

If the Chair should overrule the point of order, he can do so only by looking at the mere form, not the substance of the amendment. The effect of the proposed amendment is to reduce the level of price support on cotton from 32.47 cents per pound to 30 cents per pound. This is clearly a legislative act. To emphasize the point I am attempting to make, the author of the amendment might have set the figure at 10 cents a pound; he might have placed a limitation on the level of price support for corn at 75 cents a bushel; he could have provided that none of the funds provided in this bill could be used for the payment of salaries to officers or employees who administer a price-support program for dairy products at a level of price support in excess of 2 cents per pound. If this kind of amendment is admissible, then it is in order to repeal the whole farm price support program by a simple floor amendment to an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, while I am insisting, as I believe I have pointed out, that this amendment is clearly legislation which should not be admissible, I do not have at hand citations which I believe would conclusively convince you that the point of order should be sustained, I will, in my extension of remarks, include citations which will support my contentions.

Citations: Cannon's Procedures, House Document No. 610, 2d session, 87th Congress, page 64, quoting from Chairman Frederick C. Hicks, on January 8, 1923:

> Does the limitation curtail or extend, modify or alter existing powers or duties, or terminate old or confer new ones? If it does, then it must be conceded that legislation is involved, for without legislation these results could not be accomplished (Cannon's Precedents VII, 1606, 1608, 1628, and other similar citations).

Small Business Benefits From SBA—Local Bank Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, C. Jay Smith, president of the Manufacturers National Bank of Newnan, Newnan, Ga., and a member of the Small Business Regional Advisory Council was speaker at the Georgia Bankers Convention held in Atlanta on April 16–18, 1963.

As a banker who has long recognized the importance of small businesses in our economy, Mr. Smith devoted the subject of his address to the benefits derived from the cooperation between the Small Business Administration and small banks in assisting business firms in their early stages. He urged that these businesses, if in need of financial aid, take advantage of the opportunities afforded them by this agency.

Mr. Smith stated that, when small businesses utilize the benefits of the Small Business Administration along with the assistance of local banks, they will not only reap profits for themselves and their companies, but also will help maintain stability in the economy of their communities and contribute to the well-being of the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Smith's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"The Small Bank —SBA Participation," C. Jay Smith, member, Small Business Regional Advisory Council; president, the Manufacturers National Bank of Newnan, Newnan, Ga.

Over the past 30 years Georgia has undergone a tremendous change in its economy. Thirty years ago our economy was primarily one of agriculture, but today we have reached the point where a majority of the income of Georgians is realized from industrial rather than agricultural endeavors.

This change in the economy of Georgia has, of necessity, brought a new challenge to the bankers of our State. Where we once made crop loans to finance agricultural production, we are now called on to make term loans to industrial concerns.

Greater capital requirements in other type businesses, such as retailing, wholesaling, and service establishments, have meant that they, also, have term-loan requirements rather than the short-term seasonal credits that we used to extend to them.

This trend toward term lending; that is, from 5 to 10 years, has made it difficult for the small banks in Georgia to meet the credit needs of their customers. Not only have we had to learn new techniques in lending, but we have had to make more money available over longer periods. I suppose that to the larger city banks this has not caused a strain, for with their much larger resources and more diversified staff, they are usually able to meet any credit need of their customers, but I believe that most of the smaller banks in Georgia have met with difficulties in filling these new needs. I am sure that you have found that while most insurance companies will insure the lives of the people, they will not make commercial loans in small towns.

The Small Business Administration was established with this expanding need for term credits in mind. It was set up not to compete with banks nor to supplant them in their lending functions, but rather to complement and supplement them.

While our own correspondent bank has been very helpful in assisting us with short-term credits over our bank's limit, they have been understandably reluctant to enter into participations for the longer terms. This is the field where SBA has been so helpful to our bank.

If we get a request for a term loan that is beyond our limit and we do not think our correspondent banks would want to take the excess, then we call on SBA to purchase a participation in it. I will have to admit that in its early years of existence the agency had its share of redtape, and while we did not let this bother us, I am sure that many of you may have hesitated to participate with SBA up to a few years ago because of this.

SBA has been most anxious to improve and simplify their procedures, and over the years they have consulted with bankers and other businessmen from time to time through the State, regional, and national small business advisory councils, of which I am happy to be a member.

As a result of these efforts, SBA has greatly simplified their loan programs and have made them much more acceptable to the banks.

Less than 2 years ago, SBA came out with a program that they call the simplified bank loan participation plan, or SBLP. In this plan the bank itself, rather than the customer, applies to SBA for the participation on a one-sheet application form (form shown).

This is accompanied by a one-sheet statement from the applicant, a list of collateral and applicable financial statements.

To a great extent, SBA relies on the bank's judgment of the applicant's credit.

And, instead of sending several documents with which to close the loan, SBA permits you to close it on your own forms, with the exception that they do require that you use their note form.

This type of participation requires that the bank take 25 percent of the loan and SBA's participation may be up to $350,000 as in their other business loans. I'm happy to relate that our bank handled the first participation of this type in the country.

Of course, SBA prefers to take their participation on a deferred basis—rather than an immediate one, and this can quite often be advantageous to the bank, for the bank can go ahead and make all of the loan and earn interest on it, with SBA coming in to take up its deferred portion whenever the bank requests it to do so.

In the past few days John Horne, SBA Administrator made the following announcement:

"Arrangements have been completed with the Treasury Department for deferred participation certificates of the Small Business Administration to be eligible for pledging with Federal Reserve banks as collateral for Treasury tax and loan accounts of banks."

Just last year the SBA Administrator, John Horne, and the American Bankers Association president at that time, Sam Fleming, announced that these simplified procedures that I have been talking about, had now been applied to the agency's early maturity loan program; that is, where the bank gets paid its share of the principal first, before any repayment is applied to SBA's share. This requires a 50 percent participation on the part of the bank, and it gets its money back during the first half of the loan; that is, if it is a 10 year loan the bank gets its money during the first 5 years.

It is not a giveaway program. Perhaps some of you may be interested in SBA's loss experience. The agency's ratio of losses in fiscal year 1962, to the average amount of loans outstanding, was 0.53 percent. The similar ratio for all insured commercial banks for the year ending December 31, 1961, was 0.24 percent. When you consider the nature of the agency's lending—that is, term loans entirely, as against seasonal lending by banks, I believe you will agree that this ratio is very low.

Now to tell you something about our own bank's experience with SBA. At the present time we have 18 loans on our books in participation with SBA. Let me tell you that these 18 loans have made a difference in the economy of Newnan, Ga.

I wish I could take each of you through Newnan and show you the industries which have been strengthened or expanded with term loans made by our bank in conjunction with SBA. Besides these 18, we have made many more which have already been paid out. We do not consider the maker of any loan we have handled as being a substandard businessman, or his note a substandard loan.

Not one loan that we have had in participation with SBA has ever gone sour. Frankly, some bankers have sent marginal credits to SBA and then blamed the agency when they went sour. SBA didn't make them go sour. They were marginal credits and would have gone sour regardless of the lending agency involved.

The loans that we send to SBA are the loans that we would make in their entirety except for their size and maturity. I am proud of the job that our bank has done in conjunction with the SBA in Newnan, and there is not a banker here who could not do the same for his own community. Of course, some of you have.

Incidentally, SBA has a very fine staff in this State and Southeastern Region. Their men are young, capable and are very expert in term credit and accounting matters. They are diplomatic and tactful; although they have a very small staff, they try to give prompt—and in some cases, 1-day service. This region ranks at the top in all SBA activities, and I've never known one of their representatives to misrepresent anything or fail to do a most creditable job, and sometimes they can help out and assist even some of us oldest and most experienced bankers in counseling matters. Nationally, about 66 percent of all the agency's loans are made in participation with banks, but in Georgia and this region that ratio is much higher, about 79 percent, showing that they always strive to keep the banks in the forefront.

Using SBA's services to the fullest, our bank has really made an impact on Newnan's industrial and commercial progress, and I am very proud of these accomplishments. Let me just review a few of these typical loans our bank has made:

The breakdown on the 18 loans we are now carrying is as follows: 1 industrial development loan that brought employment to 200 people, 1 retail furniture store, 1 franchised truckline, 1 laundry, 2 retail groceries, 2 plumbing and electrical contractors, 1 furniture manufacturer, 1 retail auto parts, 1 thread manufacturer, 1 wholesale plumbing supplies, 1 cement mixing plant, 1 concrete block manufacturer, 1 independent packing plant, 1 aluminum extruding plant, 1 farm implement dealer, 1 gents furnishings store.

All payments on these loans are current. These 18 loans, when made, totaled $1,200,000, of which SBA furnished $1 million and the bank $200,000. The balance due at this time on the $1,200,000 total is $507,000. During the period from the time the loans were made the bank collected as servicing fee $9,803.88.

We have commitments for $1,100,000 at this time. These loans are in process of being closed. We have applications being processed for one loan of $70,000 for a local industrial development corporation for a new industry and now employing 100 and expects to increase to 400.

My purpose here is certainly not to sell you on SBA. However, I am trying to sell you on the idea of providing a source of term credit for the industries and businesses which are so necessary for your community, so as to maintain its economic stability and move forward with the times.

If you can handle these loans without SBA, then I don't think SBA wants a part in the loans. But if your bank is like ours and you have difficulty in meeting the demands for this type of credit—I am pleased to give them a warm personal endorsement for the fine job they have done in working with our bank.

One final point: On SBA participations, the participating bank receives one-half of 1 percent per annum as a service fee from SBA on SBA's share of the principal. If you sell SBA a 75-percent participation, keeping 25 percent for yourself, and charge 6-percent interest you will actually be realizing 7½ percent on your share of the loan if you include the servicing fee.

In addition, you will more than likely have increased your deposit balances by having added to the working capital of your customer. More importantly, you will be contributing substantially to the stability and well-being of the area you serve. If you think SBA can be of help to your bank, as it has been to ours, I know that Jim Hollingsworth, the Regional Director of SBA here in Atlanta, or some of his assistants, will be most happy to provide you with any information you need and also any assistance you might desire. John Horne the Administrator of the Small Business Administration is a native of Alabama and is dedicated to serving small business. Under his leadership, SBA continues to make rapid strides. His is the best operated of any Government agency I have ever dealt with, which is due to his ability and leadership.

Japanese Americans Pay Tribute to Francis E. Walter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the Japanese American Citizens League, consisting of 88 chapters in 32 States, recently adopted a resolution paying tribute to the memory of our distinguished departed colleague, the Honorable Francis E. Walter. The resolution expresses the feelings of all Americans of Japanese ancestry and their alien parents who benefited from the labors of the late Mr. Walter, and here offer it for inclusion in the RECORD:

Whereas the officers and members of the Japanese American Citizens League, with 88 chapters and members in 32 States, have learned with real sorrow of the untimely passing of Congressman Francis E. Walter, late of Pennsylvania; and

Whereas Congressman Walter, aware of the unfortunate wartime mistreatment and persecution of Americans of Japanese ancestry solely on account of race and cognizant of their legal, social, national, and international implications and proud of the unprecedented record of loyalty and gallantry achieved by Japanese American soldiers in World War II, as the ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee, assumed much of the leadership in the Congress to secure corrective and remedial legislation for those of Japanese ancestry in the post-World War II decade; and

Whereas Congressman Walter, as chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, accepted and insisted upon the inclusion of the so-called equality-in-naturalization provisions in the monumental Immigration and Nationality Act that bears his name, thereby extending for the first time in American history the privilege of naturalization to lawfully resident aliens of Japanese ancestry, most of whom were the parents of American soldiers of Japanese ancestry who had served in our Armed Forces during World War II and had resided in this country and contributed much to its development for more than half a century, and voiding and nullifying through that enactment more than 500 National, State, and local laws sanctioned against those of Japanese ancestry solely on account of their "racial ineligibility to citizenship," while eliminating race as qualification for naturalization; and

Whereas Congressman Walter, familiar with the Japanese Exclusion Act of 1924 and its significance in destroying the democratic forces in Japan while strengthening the military in the 1930's, also accepted and insisted upon the so-called Asian provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act that repealed the arbitrary and complete exclusionary prohibitions by extending token immigration quotas based on the national origins formula to Japan and other Asiastic countries; and

Whereas Congressman Walter, recognizing the necessity for allowing husband and wife to be admitted into the United States without discrimination, included in the Immigration and Nationality Act the section authorizing nonquota immigration privileges to all spouses of American citizens, without regard to sex, thereby permitting U.S. citizen couples to remain united in their entry into this country; and

Whereas Congressman Walter, understanding the years of administration of the law and of the many changes in the status of the Japanese and other Asian aliens in this country in the past quarter-century, added special provisions in the Immigration and Nationality Act that corrected inequities and injustices against those of Asian ancestry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Japanese American Citizens League, That expressions of condolence and sympathy be extended to the family of the late Congressman Francis E. Walter, and that the Speaker of the House of Representatives be informed of our high esteem and regard for this outstanding and courageous lawmaker who helped make democracy more meaningful to many thousands of Americans, including particularly those of Japanese ancestry.

K. PATRICK OKURA,
National President.

The Nation Salutes J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, recently one of America's most respected citizens, J. Edgar Hoover, began his 40th year of service to our country as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

On that occasion, the Atlanta Constitution published an editorial which I am sure all Members of Congress will want to read.

The editorial follows:

THE NATION SALUTES J. EDGAR HOOVER

Today one of America's most respected public officials begins his 40th year in a post which affects the safety and security of us all. He is J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, who entered the Justice Department as a clerk in 1917 and who on May 10, 1924, assumed his duties as chief of the FBI.

Describing the event, Mr. Hoover said recently: "In the preceding months, the FBI had been rocked by scandal. It had become a dumping ground for political favoritism. Morale was low. Investigative operations were inefficient. The Bureau was in need of a thorough reorganization and house cleaning."

Since that time, not only has the FBI become one of the most efficient and effective law enforcement agencies in the world, its scope of activities has been increased manifold to meet the increased needs of national security, to combat interstate crime, and to curb racketeering. The agency has met these increased duties creditably and within the bounds of the democratic system. Mr. Hoover has kept it free of politics and dedicated to enforcement of the law within the realm of law.

The book by Mr. Hoover, "Masters of Deceit," is perhaps one of the most definitive explanations of the Communist conspiracy yet written. It warns, too, of the dangers of too militant anticommunism by those who have no real understanding of the menace. For this book and for all his other great contributions to this Nation, we salute Mr. Hoover as he begins his 40th year with the FBI at the age of 68. We hope he will be around in the job for quite some time.

Alliance for Progress—New Hope for People of Central America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, bringing new hope to the lives of the peoples of rural Central America is the Alliance for Progress and its mobile rural health program. A Baltimore surgeon, Dr. Edgar F. Berman, has sparked the program's development.

Medical care at the grassroots for 4 million people has opened new vistas for community development. The Peace Corps, in cooperation with the Alliance for Progress, is assigning individuals to the local villages to help carry out sanitation and community projects.

Mr. President, a most interesting and rewarding article, "Jungle Medicine—U.S. Style," by Cherrill Anson, appeared in the May 12, 1963, issue of the Baltimore Sunday Sun. I recommend to my colleagues this article which shows what can be accomplished under determined and able leadership. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNGLE MEDICINE—U.S. STYLE

(By Cherrill Anson)

The dusty rural villages hacked out of the jungles of the five nations of Central America and Panama are depressingly similar. The crops change a bit, and the percentages of Negro, Spanish, and Indian blood in the veins of the inhabitants vary.

But there is always the main street, rain-swollen part of the year. There is perhaps an adobe church; and, if it is a lucky village, a school battling an illiteracy rate which nears 70 percent.

The adobe or thatch huts which straggle out for miles from this unprepossessing nucleus house anywhere from 200 to 1,500 persons sapped by malnutrition, malaria, anemia, and intestinal diseases. Pigs are the local garbage collectors. There are few toilets, little fresh water, little electricity, and no doctors. A child who fractures a leg is crippled for life.

Plagued by intestinal worms and ill-nourished on a diet of maize, bananas, and rice, the young children are grossly pot-bellied and retarded in growth. Their fathers go out by day to work for a patron and count themselves lucky to earn $100 a year. There is no sense of community organization; outside of their families, the inhabitants have never worked together.

IN CAUSE OF HEALTH

But 600 of these villages are breaking through a tradition of hopelessness, thanks to a mobile rural health program sponsored by the Alliance for Progress and sparked by the work of a Baltimore surgeon, Dr. Edgar F. Berman.

The Alliance for Progress is the major international framework for aid which will encourage Latin America's giant step forward of the sixties. It is a mammoth program which emphasizes self-help and embraces every social and economic factor which contributes to an improved standard of living.

A year ago the U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance, Teodoro Moscoso, was looking for a health program adviser. Dr. Berman was at the time president of Medico, the nongovernmental, nonprofit organization of U.S. physicians whose aim is to improve medical conditions in underdeveloped countries.

His Medico experience proved uniquely suitable for a shaper of grassroots Latin American health programs, and he became and has remained Moscoso's consultant.

Central America, it was decided, was good material for an ambitious medical experiment. The need there was as great as anywhere in Latin America; the land areas were relatively small and relatively close to the United States. Dr. Berman found himself a major architect of the project to bring modern medicine to the remote villages of six countries.

ROUNDS IN VILLAGES

Traveling by jeep, boat, and mule, three-member teams of Central American medical personnel have been making regular weekly rounds of villages since last December. By next fall, more than 60 units will be in operation, their activities aided by the U.S. Agency for International Development, 300 Peace Corps men, and supplies of high-protein American food for peace.

Althought the program means that 2 to 4 million people who have never seen a physician in their lives will be treated this year, Dr. Berman says that "the medical angle is the least fascinating to me." He frankly identifies the mobile rural health project as "bait," a technique for initiating community development and for coaxing out of disorganized groups of people living at a subsistence level "the human involvement and participation which are necessary for social and economic progress."

Curative medicine, Dr. Berman feels, especially the kind which shows quick and dramatic results, can shatter backlands apathy and promote a feeling of self-interest and a desire for self-help among the villagers. After 2 weeks or less of treatment, for example, the potbelly of a malnourished worm-infested child disappears. A dozen pills, 15 grams of protein, and 10 grains of iron a day are all that is needed to cure the child and save him from chronic illness.

"The traditional Latin American attitude toward social welfare has always been paternalistic," the surgeon says. In a sharp break with this viewpoint, the mobile rural health program requires that patients either pay the equivalent of 25 or 50 cents in local currency for treatment or work off the debt.

IN DOOLEY'S STEPS

In this unprecedented step, Dr. Berman has followed the example of the late Dr. Tom Dooley, cofounder of Medico. "He always charged, you know," Berman says, "even if it was just a chicken or a few eggs."

"Everyone told me," the surgeon continues, "that we wouldn't get 10 cents out of all Central America. We are averaging $25 per village per week. That will amount to more than $1,000 for each village annually, or more than $500,000 for all of Central America."

Where do the patients find the money? "If they're raising coffee or bananas or maize on a little patch of their own, they take some to market, barter a little, make a little money. It's 'mattress money.'" The payment is important, Dr. Berman says, not only because it maintains the patient's self-respect but because the money stays entirely in the village, to be used for whatever community project the villagers agree on in their first taste of the democratic process—access road, permanent health center—or ball field, if that's what they want.

SIX U.S. ADVISERS

The mobile program, which encompasses El Salvador, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama, has six American advisers—a physician, an administrator, a health educator, a nurse, a sanitarian and a community developer.

It is the community developer who takes the first step in drawing a village into the program. Consulting with the village priest and whatever leaders are available, he spells out the community's responsibilities: furnishing some sort of housing for a clinic, supplying volunteers, complying with all health measures prescribed, and assuming the burden of deciding how the funds which are accrued will be used.

By the fall there will be one Peace Corpsman assigned to every two villages, to help the local improvement committees to carry out sanitation measures and community projects.

Response from the villages has been heartening. Four communities in El Salvador have arranged to finance the cost of a permanent nurse aid. The residents of Santiago Nonualco have contributed $1,200 to purchase a dental chair, dental instruments and equipment for use in their villages and five others. The six have agreed to recruit a dentist to travel with the mobile health team, which ordinarily consists of a doctor, a nurse, and a sanitarian-driver. The dental service will be financed through low fees—40 cents for an extraction.

At San Luis Talpa, in El Salvador, a local landowner offered land for a permanent health center and $16,000 toward the cost of construction. Village women vie to make announcements, keep records, and help the doctors and nurses.

"We have had a bit of difficulty with the local witch doctors or curanderos," Berman says. "We try to enlist their aid. To replace their incantations, amulets, and quasi-religious ceremonies, we try to teach them to give medicine empirically and to treat certain simple illnesses."

Based in towns which have hospitals or established health centers, the medical teams drive half an hour to 2 hours to reach their patients. The drive may be a bone-wracking one along a road which is nothing more than a rock riverbed. Berman inspected villages in El Salvador and Honduras where the sky-blue jeep-ambulance with the silver cross and the green circle-and-arrowhead symbol of the Alianza had to be left by a stream and the journey completed for 2 miles on foot. Patients walk as far as 18 miles to get the medical help.

In one Honduras clinic, Berman saw a mother whose baby had been sick for 2 weeks. The day before she heard about the mobile unit, and she carried the infant 11 miles to reach it. "I had to tell her the child was dead. It must have died halfway through the trip. All I could offer her was the hope that her next baby would have a better chance."

LECTURES ON HEALTH

In a regular visit, an explanation of the workings of the Alianza and an illustrated lecture on village health are given while patients are registered by a volunteer and examined by the doctor. The very ill are set aside to be driven back to the central hospital. One of these was a little boy who had had laryngitis for a year and for 6 months had been unable to speak. He eventually underwent successful surgery.

Although the Central American nations pay the team members, the Agency for International Development is supplementing the salaries. "We are doing this," Berman says, "because there is no paucity of physicians—but they are all concentrated in urban areas. To tempt them in rural areas, they need something to work with, a decent salary, and some postgraduate association with medical schools."

The medical schools have been tied closely into the project, which strikes Berman as particularly important in light of the strength of Communist influence in universities.

The AID also buys the vehicles, which cost $2,900 fully equipped, and pays for the drugs used. The individual Central American governments supply free entrance for supplies, storage, internal transportation, supervision of their own personnel and all services to the vehicles.

CREDIT UNION PLAN

Looking to the future, Dr. Berman says that a 600-village credit union system is imminent. Credit unions will promote savings and take care of community funds. "With these savings the people can make loans for a hoe, or. seed, or 10 chickens. They can get interest on their money." After the credit unions are on their feet, he conjectures, agricultural cooperatives can be established.

Now in the process of giving up his private practice, Dr. Berman plans to spend all his time in international medicine. Three months of the year will be spent in Central America and Panama "ironing out the bugs and extending the program." And most of this time in the six countries, he hopes will be spent in the field with the Alianza teams.

"Of course, it's a purely experimental field," he says of the program. "If it works there is the possibility of extending it throughout Latin America."

CHANCE AND CHALLENGE

Not surprisingly, the elements of chance and challenge involved appeal to a surgeon who performed the first operation in which an artificial gullet was implanted in a human patient, who was one of the first researchers to complete a successful heart transplant in a dog, who led a Medico expedition which rejuvenated the Republic of Haiti's medical system.

His globetrotting as Medico president took him to southeast Asia and Africa. For a month he worked with Dr. Albert Schweitzer in French Equatorial Africa, performing some 60 operations.

The mobile rural project, which is scheduled to last 7 years, will be turned over to the Central American governments in the 8th year. "In 7 years we will reach 15 to 20 million people," Dr. Berman says.

"For AID it will involve a total expenditure of $12,400,000. For what we're going to gain in political stability, I think that's reasonable."

Hon. Francis E. Walter

SPEECH

OF

HON. ARTHUR WINSTEAD

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of deep personal sadness that I join my distinguished colleagues in mourning the passing of a good friend and a great American, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER. Having been closely associated with "TAD" WALTER has inspired and enriched my own life and I am confident that the same can be said by many, many Members of the Congress. Although a man of undaunted courage, he was a kind man, a man who loved his friends and who was willing to go "the second mile" to be helpful to them. The loss of our beloved colleague has created a void in the House and in the Nation that will be difficult indeed to fill.

The name of FRANCIS WALTER was synonomous with Americanism. As chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, his contributions to the security of our country will stand as a monument to him throughout the years. To be sure, he left many other testimonials of a great career and even though many of these have been enumerated, it would be impossible to evaluate them all. Suffice to say, FRANCIS WALTER died as he lived—in the service of his country—and those of us left here to carry on the work would do well to emulate his worthwhile life.

I extend deep and sincere sympathy to his family and to the devoted members of his staff.

Udall Blasted for Swipe at California Reactor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on June 3 the San Francisco Examiner placed Interior Secretary Stewart Udall's petulant criticism of the nuclear electric generating facilities planned for Bodega Bay in the following editorial perspective:

EARTHQUAKE BUGABOO

Intervention by Interior Secretary Stewart Udall in the Bodega Head nuclear reactor controversy on the grounds of possible earthquake perils seems to us a bit like throwing the overalls in Mrs. Murphy's chowder.

Certainly there are many areas of legitimate doubt about the Bodega project. Such doubts will be resolved by competent authorities at the proper time. We respect the misgivings of those who look askance at the proposed reactor for reasons of health, safety, and esthetics.

But we suggest that Secretary Udall has not offered a legitimate doubt on the issue of earthquakes.

Californians, and particularly San Franciscans, do not need to be told by Mr. Udall or anyone else what earthquakes can do. They learned that the hard way.

But who in San Francisco said, "What's the use?" after the 1906 shakedown? Everybody knew the city was sitting astride the San Andreas fault and always would, and the possibility of future shakes existed, probably forever. But nobody thought it was no good building anything bigger than a pig sty, simply because more shakes might come.

The city picked itself up out of the ruins and built again, better and bigger than ever.

And suppose it had not. Suppose it had followed the counsel of those who, like Udall, would let fear dictate the shape of the future. If San Francisco had ever stopped building because of fear of earthquakes, the city would have died in 1906 with nothing more needed to mark the spot than a few tombstones.

Most of California sits on San Andreas or similar faults. Any one of the faults can get out of line at any time. But the whole future has not been written off for that reason.

University of California's vast system of nuclear laboratories and experimentation was established without deterrence by fear of earthquakes. Stanford University's 2-mile-long linear accelerator, a nuclear giant, is not inhibited by the possibility, even the likelihood, of quakes. All these monumental institutions rest atop known and major earth faults.

Where would America now be in the world nuclear armament race, if Dr. Ernest Lawrence had let the possibility of future earthquakes stop him?

Californians go on living, building, growing—knowing earthquakes and what they can do all too well. Would Secretary Udall have it any other way?

James K. Carr Honored for 30 Years in Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I quite understand why Under Secretary of the Interior James K. Carr has performed well in his 30 years of public service. That is because I have known Jim Carr all of those 30 years and I knew his distinguished father, the late Judge Francis Carr.

Secretary Udall gave a luncheon the other day to honor Under Secretary Carr. The Sacramento Bee tells the story in a news article and editorial published on May 23, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON FETES CARR'S 30 YEARS IN PUBLIC LIFE

WASHINGTON.—Under Secretary of the Interior James K. Carr today observed 30 years of public service.

The Californian, who started his public career with the Geological Survey at a salary of $70 a month and was tapped by President John F. Kennedy after his election in 1960 to become the No. 2 man of the Interior Department, was honored at a luncheon given by Secretary Stewart L. Udall.

Udall called Carr his "strong right arm" and praised the work which Carr has done to project and develop the Nation's resources.

TROUBLESHOOTER

Carr has been the Department's top troubleshooter in straightening out complex problems involving water, power, recreation, and others.

Among those attending the luncheon were the chief aids of the Interior Department and Emmett Coon, Carr's first boss on a Geological Survey team which included J. Carl Jennings, presently assistant city engineer for the city of Sacramento.

Coon now is district manager of the Geological Survey in Denver, Colo.

During his 30 years of public service Carr has worked for Federal, city, county, and State governmental units.

He has been assistant city engineer of Redding, Shasta County, and later for Shasta County.

He worked briefly with the California Division of Highways. While with the Bureau of Reclamation, Carr set the essential engineering and political wheels into motion on such projects as the Sacramento Valley canals, the Trinity River project and the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project.

He was the chief of the survey party which staked out Shasta Dam and the Shasta powerplants.

For several years Carr was the engineering consultant of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. He left that post in Washington to become an assistant general manager of the Sacramento Municipal Utility District, where he was active in the preconstruction phases of the American River project.

Carr was chairman of the California State Water Commission by appointment of Gov. Edmund G. Brown when he was named Under Secretary.

A DEDICATED OFFICIAL

Friends of Under Secretary of the Interior James K. Carr have been congratulating him this week on completion of 30 years of public service and one can say unreservedly it could not happen to a more worthy public official.

It is not much of a trick to put in three decades working for the Government but what sets Carr's service apart is that it has been unfailingly dedicated to the high ideal Government is operated for the benefit of the people.

Carr lives by the often neglected philosophy that a public office is a public trust. This has guided him from the time he worked at summer jobs with Government survey crews while attending university through 2½ years as No. 2 man in the Department of the Interior.

A native of Redding, Shasta County, and a Sacramento homeowner, Carr has made the Central Valleys project one of his first loves. Apart from 7 plus years when he was assistant general manager of the Sacramento Municipal Utility District he devoted a large part of his working years to the CVP either with the reclamation bureau or as consultant to the House Interior Committee in Washington.

When appointed Under Secretary by President John F. Kennedy in 1961 he was chairman of the California Water Commission. Commenting on the appointment, U.S. Senator CLAIR ENGLE said:

"Carr knows his job and will serve the Nation with skill and dedication."

Those acquainted with Carr's background knew that was a sure-shot prophecy. It is not within his nature to do anything else but.

Military Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very forceful article entitled "It's Housing's Turn for the Ax," written by John F. Loosbrock, editor of the Air Force-Space Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S HOUSING'S TURN FOR THE AX

(By John F. Loosbrock)

These days a military man just has to learn to take the bitter with the sour.

This conclusion was reached after an examination of the military housing program which now seems about to suffer the same fate as military pay—an inadequate request based on fallacious criteria, which probably will be cut by the Congress. One big difference is that, at this writing, Secretary McNamara is about to fight for his housing bill on the Hill.

More than 3 years ago we wrote a piece about Air Force housing, or the lack thereof ("Housing—One of USAF's Unsolved Problems," Air Force, March 1959). A Pentagon veteran of many housing battles told us wryly the other day that we could run it again this year, almost word for word. "Just jack it up and run the new figures under it," he suggested.

The fiscal year 1964 arithmetic is pretty discouraging. The Air Force request originally was for 13,000 units. After DOD review this came out as 4,992 units. Of these, new authorization is being asked for 3,714 units. The other 1,278 units are those for which authorization had previously been voted but for which funds were never made available. Total Air Force money involved is $88.2 million; of this, $63.5 million requires new authorization while the balance of $24.7 million represents previously authorized construction.

The difference between authorization and funding has been used over the years to keep military housing in its place—which far too often is 40 miles and 60 minutes away from a man's place of duty, or at rentals far above his housing allowance, or in a slum. The Armed Services Committees can only authorize. The money comes from the Appropriations Committees, and this is where the deep cuts are usually made.

In this day and age, when professional military forces must stand on an alert and ready status for an indefinite number of years, housing becomes, in effect, a part of the weapon system. A man who chooses a military career has the same basic requirements as his civilian peers—he wants adequate pay, an opportunity to get ahead, satisfaction in his job, and decent living conditions for his family. All of these impinge sharply on his efficiency, and quality control and reliability are at least equally as important in the human components of a weapon system as they are in transistors, valves, and fuzes. The man needs a decent home, and it should be close to his job—just as a transistor needs to be in place in the missile, not on the shelf in a supply room. So the military man needs to live on base or near it—ideally no more than 5 or 10 minutes away.

But the housing program starts with a Department of Defense criterion that says DOD isn't in the homebuilding busines—that the rental-housing assets of the local community must be exhausted before on-base, government-built housing can be justified. Distance from the base is not considered a critical factor. So the on-base requirement is compromised in the beginning by unrealistic criteria, partly generated by local pressures from landlords. Added to this is the money squeeze, even though on-base housing for everyone who has a legitimate need for it would represent less than 2 percent of the total investment in an average base.

Then the Congress gets in its licks, and it is an inexplicable fact of political life that the same Representatives and Senators who will vote all that is asked for, and more, for weapons will cheesepare at the expense of the men who must make these weapons work—for the security of all of us. They will vote air-conditioned buildings to house computers and balk at air-conditioned houses for the men who run these machines. Money for housing is never increased on Capitol Hill; it is always cut.

This is all part of the pattern which assumes that the man in uniform can be counted on to suffer in silence. He does not write letters. Very often he does not vote. He is a convenient patsy.

Bob Considine, the news columnist and commentator, put it this way at the Armed Forces Day dinner in Washington:

"Thousands of military families have inadequate housing * * * are separated for reasons other than military necessity * * * lack adequate Government medical care * * * find that fringe benefits, like old soldiers, just fade away * * *.

"The low retention rate in critical job categories proves the point. And the high cost of training replacements proves how silly we are to think we are saving money by not paying a fair price for military service. * * *

"If we really want to salute the man in uniform, we must make some noise to get more money in his pockets."

We can only add, "And a roof over his head near his place of duty." Commuting distance may be a status symbol in Exurbia, but it is a symbol of waste and risk in military housing.

Treasury Survives Flagellation Rite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House and article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of June 6, 1963, by Sylvia Porter. It is a very clear discussion of what is involved in the recent action of the House and Senate in setting the ceiling on the Nation's public debt:

TREASURY SURVIVES FLAGELLATION RITE

(By Sylvia Porter)

Congress has completed the spring rite of "flagellation of the bookkeepers"; the Treasury now has permission to borrow money to pay the bills Congress itself has run up; an "unthinkable" national financial crisis has been averted at the last minute, and the mess won't become front-page news again until August.

To put it in financial terms: Congress has voted to raise the ceiling on the public debt from a strangling $305 billion to $307 billion until July and to $309 billion between July 1 and August 31.

Had Congress not done this a week ago, the public debt could have pierced the ceiling last Friday, and part of our Government's debt might have become illegal. Had this occurred, it is conceivable that the legality of some of the Nation's I O U's could have been successfully challenged in the courts and chaos might have resulted. Even "Mr. Debt Limit" himself—Virginia's Democratic Senator Byrd—admits this.

As a lid on Government spending, the debt ceiling has been a monumental failure since it was initially placed at $28 billion in 1918.

STILL GOING UP

With minor interruptions, it has gone up and up, and the all-time record of $309 billion won't stand long either. The ceiling must be raised by many billions more in late summer. As Treasury Secretary Dillon cried out when he was pleading with the lawmakers to raise the limit on time, "Let no one labor under the delusion that the debt ceiling is either a sane or effective instrument for control of Federal expenditure * * * Yes, and let no one hide from these realities:

It is the administration which proposes the budget, and it is in the White House that most spending programs originate.

It is Congress and Congress alone has the power to say "yes" or "no" to the spending programs.

It is the state of the economy which basicallyy determines whether taxes collected on our paychecks and profits will be sufficient to cover the spending programs Congress votes.

It is the Treasury which raises the money for the approved progams. If our paychecks and profits do not produce enough tax income to cover the outgo, the "bookkeepers" must borrow the funds and thereby increase the national debt.

The debt ceiling does compel the country to face up to the deficit, but it does not limit the spending. There isn't a Congressman who doesn't know that if he wants to curb the rise in the national debt, he can do so via his votes on spending programs and taxes. There isn't a Congressman who doesn't know that, if his votes create deficit in the budget the Treasury must borrow and boost the debt. There isn't a Congressman who doesn't know that when he votes against a boost in the debt limit made imperative by his own action, he is just indulging in "flagellation of the bookkeepers."

A Tribute to the Service of Japanese Americans in World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, 1963, the Japanese American Citizens League held a special 20th anniversary service in honor of all Japanese Americans, living and deceased, who served in World War II. There was a ceremony befitting this memorable occasion in the flagpole area adjacent to the Tomb of the Unknowns at Arlington Cemetery, sponsored by the Japanese American Citizens League.

This occasion offered all Americans, regardless of race or ancestry, an opportunity to recall with gratitude the unusual bravery and heroism displayed by Japanese Americans throughout the war.

There were over 20,000 Nisei in the U.S. Army and an extraordinary proportion of these were volunteers, since Nisei were not regularly drafted into the Army between March 1942 and January 1944. Thousands of these volunteers were from the relocation centers and Hawaii.

The famed 100th Battalion, called the Purple Heart Battalion because almost every member received at least one wound, participated in the landing at Salerno and in every major Italian action. It drove four times across the Volturno River, held the front lines in Cassino 40 days, led the breakthrough in the march on Rome, and spearheaded the U.S. attack on Livorno in the campaign to drive the Germans from the upper ranges of the Italian peninsula. The fortitude and intrepidity displayed by the officers and men of this 100th Battalion reflected the finest traditions of the U.S. Army. This battalion is said to have been the most decorated unit in the war. It wrote a brilliant chapter in the history of the fighting men of America.

Mr. Speaker, American citizens of Japanese ancestry performed some of the most valuable work of the war in the Pacific theater as well. They not only proved their deep loyalty to the United States, but they voluntarily risked their lives in order to perform important frontline services, in combat, in intelligence, in training U.S. troops shifted from the European theater to the Pacific, and in many other ways. Three thousand Nisei soldiers bought $100,000 in war bonds within 2 days after the announcement of the execution of American fliers. Important radio broadcasts of the Office of War Information beamed to Japan were made with the aid of Japanese Americans. Nine hours every day in San Francisco, the staff of 21 Nisei translators and announcers waged psychological warfare in World War II. All proved themselves efficient as language craftsmen and as fine human beings. Nisei were invaluable in teaching the Japanese language to Army and Navy personnel throughout the country.

The part played by American citizens of Japanese descent in preserving freedom and opportunity in America is as inspiring as it was heroic. Not only in the military, but also in the arts, sciences, and the professions, Japanese Americans have made outstanding contributions to American culture.

In commemorating the outstanding service of Japanese Americans the words of President Roosevelt spoken 20 years ago ring with special meaning. He said with special reference to Japanese Americans:

> The principle on which this country was founded and by which it has always been governed is that Americanism is a matter of the mind and heart. Americanism is not, and never was, a matter of race and ancestry.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer my congratulations to the Japanese American Citizens League for making arrangements for this notable event. Mr. Masao Satow, national director, and Mr. Mike Masoaka, chairman, 20th anniversary commemorative committee to honor Nisei in military service in World War II, are to be commended for their splendid efforts in this regard for they remind us again that these Japanese Americans served the United States with loyalty, courage, and honor and our Nation is the better for their having done so.

Text of the President's Address at the Air Force Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the graduation ceremonies of the Air Force Academy. It was an ideal day with a tremendous crowd and the President gave a forceful address. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

It has become trite to say in graduating addresses that commencement signifies a beginning instead of an end. Yet this thought applies with particular force to those of you graduating from your Nation's service academies.

For today you receive not only your degrees, but your commissions—and tomorrow you join with all those in the military service, the foreign service, the civil service and elsewhere who have chosen to serve the great Republic at a turning point in its history.

You will have an opportunity to help make that history—an opportunity for a service career more varied and more demanding than any that has ever been open to the officers of any nation on earth.

There are some who might be skeptical of that assertion. They claim that the future of the Air Force is mortgaged to an obsolete weapons system—the manned aircraft—or that the Air Force officers of the future will be nothing more than so-called "silent silo sitters." But nothing could be further from the truth.

It is this very onrush of technology which demands an expanding role for this Nation's Air Force and Air Force officers, and which guarantees that an Air Force career in the next 40 years will be even more changing and challenging than the Air Force careers of the last 40.

CHANCE TO EXPLORE

For some of you will travel where no man has ever traveled before. Some of you will fly the fastest planes, reach the highest altitudes and lift the heaviest payloads of any aviator in history. Some of you will hold in your hands the most awesome destructive power that man has ever conceived.

Some of you will work with the new leaders of new nations which were not even nations a few years ago. Some of you will support guerrilla and counterguerrilla operations that combine the newest techniques of warfare with the oldest techniques of the jungle.

And some of you will help to develop new planes that spread their wings in flight, detect other planes at unheard of distances, deliver new weapons with unprecedented accuracy, and survey the ground from incredible heights.

In short, the future of the Air Force is no more tied to any particular kind of weapons system than the future of the Navy was tied to the battleship several decades ago. The fact that the greatest value of these new weapons of massive retaliation lies in their ability to deter the very war which would require their use does not diminish their importance.

Nor will national security in the years ahead be achieved simply by piling up bigger stocks of bombs or buying our missiles under bigger piles of concrete. For in an imperfect world—where human failures and follies have too often been the rule instead of the exception—the surest way to bring on "the war that cannot happen" is to sit back and assure ourselves that it cannot happen.

NO MERE STALEMATE

The exisence of mutual nuclear deterrents cannot be shrugged off as a mere stalemate. For our national security, in a period of rapid change, will depend on constant reappraisal of accepted doctrine, on alertness to new developments, on imagination and resourcefulness, and new ideas.

"Stalemate" is a static term—and no one of you would be here today if you believed you were entering an outmoded service requiring only custodial duties in a period of nuclear stalemate.

I am impressed by the unusually fine scholastic achievements of the students and graduates of this Academy, as demonstrated in successful competition with the Nation's best colleges for Rhodes and other selected scholarships, and in the graduate record examination.

I am also impressed by the fact that more than one out of five of your all-military faculty members has a doctor's degree and all the rest have master's degrees. This is good.

For the Air Force officer of today and tomorrow requires this kind of scholarship. He requires a breadth of learning and outlook which was rarely required in earlier days.

NEED BROAD TALENT

You will need to know economics and history and international affairs. You will need an appreciation of other societies and an understanding of our own Nation's purposes and policy.

General Norstad's leadership in NATO—and General Smart's outstanding tour of duty as our senior military representative in Japan—are examples of Air Force officers whose broader talents enabled them to serve their Nation in key positions. Many of you will have similar opportunities—to represent the Government of the United States in some part of the world or some part of an international organization—or to negotiate with both military men and civilians from either Allied or adversary camps.

Your major responsibilities, of course, will relate to the obligations of military command. Yet, as last October's crisis in the Caribbean so aptly demonstrated, military policy and power cannot and must not be separated from political and diplomatic decisions.

Whatever the military motives and implications of that reckless attempt to place offensive missiles on the island of Cuba may have been, the political and psychological motives and implications were equally important.

We needed in October—and we shall need in the future—military commanders who are conscious of the enormous stakes involved in every move they make—who are aware of the fact that there is no point where a purely political problem becomes a purely military problem—who know the difference between vital interests and peripheral interests—who can maneuver military forces with judgment and precision as well as courage and determination—and who can foresee the effects of military moves on the whole fabric of international power.

POLITICAL CHALLENGES

We need men who can cope with the challenge of new political situations as well as new enemy weapons—who can keep their forces flexible as well as reliable, and alert without being trigger happy.

For we live in a world where the principal problems are not susceptible of military solutions alone. The role of our military power today, in essence, is to free ourselves and our allies to pursue the goals of freedom without fear of enemy attack.

But we do not have a separate disarmament policy, and a separate foreign aid policy, all unrelated to each other. They are all bound up together. Our goal is a coherent overall national security policy—one that truly serves the best interests of this country, and the interests of all freemen, and the interests of all who aspire to be free.

It is worth noting that among the two military problems most in the news today—the efforts of this country and its European allies to work out the difficult issues involved in a proper sharing of nuclear responsibilities and a proper balance between nuclear and nonnuclear forces—are both problems that cannot possibly be dealt with in narrow military terms alone.

Both require—on the part of military and civilian negotiators alike—great political wisdom and diplomatic skill as well as modern military knowledge.

Crime Trend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Crime Trend," which appeared in the June 4 issue of the Messenger of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

CRIME TREND

People who are disturbed about the onward march of crime in the United States have more reason than ever to knit their brows.

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has issued a January through March edition of the Agency's Uniform Crime Reports, showing that serious crime in our country was 7 percent greater in volume during the first 3 months of 1963 than in the corresponding period in 1962.

The nationwide increase is attributable to the continued upswing in crimes against property, the law enforcement agency said. Larceny over $50 in value registered the sharpest increase, with a 12-percent rise, followed by auto theft, up 9 percent, and burglary, up 6 percent. Robbery nationally increased 1 percent above the 1962 level.

It is noteworthy that all crimes against the person declined, with murder down 1 percent, aggravated assault down 3 percent, and forcible rape down 2 percent. But the total crime index trend ranged from a 3-percent increase in cities over 1 million population to 12 percent in metropolitan counties surrounding large cities.

Based on a more detailed offense analysis, it was noted that street robberies which make up about half of all robbery decreased 2 percent. This was offset by a similar increase in commercial house robberies and an 8-percent increase in residence robberies.

Seventy-eight percent of the burglaries occurred at nighttime, with residence burglaries after dark rising 9 percent and nonresidence nighttime burglaries 4 percent.

Larcenies $50 and over in value showed the most significant increase, ranging from 7 percent in cities of 500,000 to 1 million population to 24 percent in metropolitan counties.

Shoplifting with a 10-percent increase and thefts from autos with an 11-percent rise contributed greatly to the larceny upturn, the FBI figures showed. Rural counties showed a decrease in auto theft but an upward trend in the other property offenses of robbery, burglary, and larceny of $50 or over.

Oil Depletion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently I ran across a description of the depletion deduction for the production of oil. Since this is a technical subject and one not generally understood, I thought this explanation was in such form that the problem could be understood by a layman not knowledgeable in the oil and gas industry. For that reason, I think it is a valuable contribution to the information contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

DEPLETION DEDUCTION

When crude oil is produced and sold, the producer sells two things, a part of his capital and a part of his inventory of goods. Congress has provided, through the depletion provision that the sale of the producer's capital should not be taxed as income—that only that part of his income which represents recovery over and above his capital should be subjected to income tax.

Congress has also provided for depreciation of capital investments such as factories, service stations, or equipment you might use in your service station, so that the recovery of your investment as it wears out will not be subjected to income tax. Oil and gas reserves do not wear out—they are used up. Thus they are depleted—not depreciated.

Percentage depletion for specific resources was first established by Congress in 1926 to provide equitable application of income taxes. It now covers over 100 minerals. Here are some of the rates of depletion:

Sand and gravel, 5 percent; sulfur and uranium, 23 percent; oil and gas, 27.5 percent.

The above percentages vary in relation to the expense required to find and produce the natural resource. For example, it is much easier, and less expensive, to find and produce gravel than it is to find and produce sulfur or oil.

For anyone engaged in prospecting for and producing oil, the depletion provision applies only to the production of crude oil and natural gas and has nothing whatsoever to do with the transportation, refining, or marketing of petroleum products. All of these other activities in the oil industry are subject to depreciation, but not depletion.

Congress enacted percentage depletion in recognition of a basic rule—it allows for recovery of capital used up in operations. There is no depletion allowed when a well turns out to be a dry hole.

In the case of a factory, the owner can recover the capital it took to build that factory by use of the depreciation provision of the tax laws. But, drilling for oil is different from building a factory. The oil producer invests his capital in exploration and in drilling wells. In drilling wildcat wells he must drill on the average, nine wells before he finds one that produces oil or gas. No one has to build nine factories before he has one which will produce his products. The oil producer might be lucky and find oil with his first well, or he might drill 50—all dry.

Moreover, once the oilman has found oil and starts producing it, he immediately starts reducing his available crude supply. Each barrel of oil brought out of the ground brings him one barrel closer to the day when there will not be any oil left in that particular well. To provide for this depletion of the oilman's capital—the oil under the ground—and to permit its replenishment, Congress passed the percentage depletion provision.

The depletion provision has nothing to do with the construction costs of a service station, bulk plant, pipeline or refinery.

The following questions and answers will help you understand the depletion provision—what it is—how it operates.

Question. Why is the oil and gas depletion provision 27½ percent?

Answer. In 1926 a Senate committee recommended a depletion provision of 30 percent of gross income. A House of Representatives committee recommended a 25-percent depletion provision. A compromise figure of 27½ percent was finally established by the House and Senate committees in conference.

This percentage has been given careful scrutiny by both Democratic and Republican Congresses over the last 35 years. All have agreed that the rate is fair and equitable.

Actually, 27½ is a maximum figure. Because of the restrictions on its application, the average depletion provision is less, probably about 23 percent as a national average.

Question. It has been said that oil companies do not have to show a profit in their marketing operations because of the depletion provision. Is there any truth to this?

Answer. No. The depletion provision has nothing to do with the construction costs of a service station, bulk plant, pipeline, or refinery. Its application is restricted as a matter of law to the production of crude oil and natural gas.

Some misguided critics have stated that integrated oil companies are able to compete unfairly with the smaller transporter, refiner, and marketer, because they receive percentage depletion on their entire gross income. This is absolutely false. Percentage depletion does not apply to income from transportation, manufacturing, and marketing but only to the value of the crude oil and raw gas unenhanced by transportation or refining processes.

Question. Actually, what relation has the percentage depletion provision to marketing of refined products?

Answer. Percentage depletion is not related to marketing of refined products—whether or not you are in the oil business.

Question. Does the public pay for this depletion provision?

Answer. No. Informed authorities agree that the incentive features of percentage depletion have helped to provide plentiful supplies of petroleum at reasonable prices. If the incentive were removed, it is inevitable that exploration would suffer and lead to shortages and increases in prices. The millions of users of petroleum products—including the 57 million automobile owners, farmers, truck and bus operators, and every governmental body using motor equipment—would suffer.

Question. Why is the oil depletion provision higher than the other depletion provisions?

Answer. Because of the tremendous expense and the greater risk involved in prospecting for and obtaining crude oil in quantities to meet the demand of the most energy-hungry nation in the world.

Question. Have the oil companies received special consideration in the use of the depletion provision?

Answer. No. The depletion provision was established in 1926. Since that time taxes, labor, and material have all increased from 3 to 10 times, but the depletion provision has been continued at the same rate as when it was established. If special considerations were given to the oil companies, the depletion provision would be higher today in recognition of these factors.

Question. It has been said that—

1. An oil company can sell gasoline for nothing and still come out with a profit because of the depletion provision; and

2. An oil company can build a service station for nothing because of the depletion provision.

Answer. These statements are not true. Depletion applies only to production of crude oil and natural gas. It does not apply to refining, transporting, marketing, or anything else. There is no magic by which an oil company—or anyone else for that matter—can sell products for nothing and still come out with a profit.

As a matter of fact, the oil industry spends far more in the search for new deposits of oil and gas than it is allowed to retain from percentage depletion. Under these circumstances, it obviously cannot subsidize its marketing of products or anything else from the depletion provision.

Question. Is percentage depletion a subsidy to oil companies?

A. No. In the first place, the depletion provision is a capital value recovery method. Secondly, the percentage depletion provision, as was intended, has the effect of compensating only the successful producer. Thus, even though wells are constantly being physically depleted, no benefit is received from percentage depletion if the producer cannot operate at a profit. Nor does the explorer who searches for, but fails to find oil, receive percentage depletion deductions. In short, percentage depletion is an incentive—not a subsidy. A subsidy promotes laxity; whereas, an incentive is a stimulant to efficiency and successful accomplishment.

Question. Are oil companies only interested in selling the maximum volume through service stations they supply?

Answer. Volume is important, but only when it can be sold at a profit. Actually, an oil company can profit from its marketing activities only if the dealers selling its products can do so at a profit and remain in business. Therefore, the profit of each individual dealer is of primary importance.

Question. What would elimination of the depletion provision cost the public?

Answer. If the depletion provision was suddenly discontinued or substantially reduced, many producers could not continue their search for oil due to the tremendous financial risk involved. This brings in the old law of supply and demand. With less crude oil available and the smaller supply costing more to find, it could be expected that prices of raw materials would rise. These increased costs would have to be recovered from consumers of finished products through increases in product prices. This would directly affect the individual car owner, the trucker, taxi cab owners, farmers, and all other consumers of petroleum products. The pressure on prices created by decreased supplies of crude oil would most certainly have a serious effect on the service station business.

Question. Agreed that the depletion provision encourages oil prospecting. Why is this so important?

Answer. Today we are consuming petroleum at close to 10 million barrels per day. This means that we must find at least 100,000 barrels of new oil every 15 minutes, or putting it in more common terms, we must find 5,000 gallons of new oil every second of every minute to every hour of every day just to keep up with today's demand.

To meet the ever increasing demands of our national economy and to provide adequately for our national defense, we must do even better than this. Percentage depletion helps accomplish these objectives and the Congress has wisely held to its course adopted in 1926 in the national interest.

Pope John XXIII—1881-1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 4, 1963, the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader Evening News published an excellent editorial on the outstanding life and the death on Monday, June 3, of His Holiness, Pope John XXIII. As part of my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, I include this thoughtful editorial from that paper:

POPE JOHN XXIII

On October 28, 1958, there was a murmur of excitement in the news department of the Times-Leader Evening News, as an Associated Press dispatch revealed that a new Pope had been elected at the 78th conclave of the College of Cardinals in Rome to succeed the late Pius XII.

Between the time the white smoke signaled the election of the 262d supreme pontiff of the univesral church and his appearance on the balcony of the Basilica for the tradtional announcement, there was lively speculation about his identity.

When the pro-dean of the college announced the new Pope was the Most Reverend Lord Cardinal Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli, the disclosure drew blank expressions, as members of the staff scurried to the library to find out who he was. There was no file on him. The only thing available was his photo in a routine release of the Associated Press, revealing he was the Patriarch of Venice.

Nobody had heard of this churchman who suddenly emerged as John XXIII, the new spiritual leader of a half billion Roman Catholics, although it later developed he had been an intimate of three Popes, a noted diplomat and educator who started life as a farm boy in the North of Italy and, during the First World War, served as a private and later as a chaplain in the Italian Army.

So the talk started to make the rounds that he was to be an "interim" Pope because the college had been unable to agree on another candidate. The fact that he was 76 tended to lend a note of credence to this conclusion.

But time was to prove how wrong the speculation was about the new Bishop of Rome and Patriach of the West. The College of Cardinals, true to its vows, had selected one of its own thought best equipped to serve as the Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth. The general public, not familiar with his qualifications and background, had misinterpreted the significance of the choice completely. This warm, humble, and compassionate son of a village farmhand, one of 13 children, incidentally, turned out to be the right choice for the vacant post.

Perhaps it was because so little was expected of him that the world was taken by surprise at the pace he set from the outset. Due to his familiarity with the operations of the Vatican, there was no lost motion.

In the first month of his reign, the Vatican machinery was running smoothly. In the second month, he created 23 new Cardinals at his first Consistory. Ten days later, he spent his first Christmas as Pope, visiting inmates of Rome jails, offering them comfort and hope and providing the world with its first real insight into his character—a dedicated friend of the downtrodden who sought to invest the Papacy with a deep sense of humanity and a vigorous leader with the courage of his convictions as well as a zealous churchman who told the people of Venice when he assumed his duties there in 1953:

"Don't look at your Patriarch as a politician or diplomat; look at him as the servant of God."

There followed his announcement of his intention to summon an Ecumenical Council which opened in Rome last October and now is in a state of suspension because of his death. But it is reasonable to assume his successor will authorize the resumption of the sessions and carry out the program which has for its high purpose the paving of the way for a reunion of the forces of Christendom in one of the most crucial periods in history for religion as well as for freedom. This well may be his monument.

In three subsequent consistories, he created 25 additional cardinals, bringing the college to a record total of 87. He issued eight encyclicals which enhanced his reputation among peoples of all faiths. Between times, this tireless worker in the Lord's vineyard presided at canonization and beatification ceremonies, made contacts with the Communists, healed wounds that had caused distress for centuries, initiated a number of moves to modernize the ancient church he headed, and, above all, crusaded for peace with justice for all.

Pope John was stoutly orthodox in his Catholicism. But obviously he did not think it necessary to stress this by holding himself and his office austere and aloof. Nor did he hesitate to innovate or to break with tradition.

Not all his changes were liberalizing. Many reforms were, in fact, a return to older and largely forgotten ways. In this respect, he showed an abiding concern for the historical continuity of the exalted post he held.

This sincere man of God did not forget that his position gave him a rare opportunity to speak to the world as an advocate of order, of sound morality. His pronouncements were a powerful force for good in an age that desperately needed such counsel and influence.

Rarely has there been the activity in the Vatican as the past 4 years and 7 months witnessed. Pope John was a human dynamo, a tireless worker. Perhaps it was the knowledge he had so little time to do so many things that motivated him. Even on his deathbed, he worked and prayed until he had to bow to the inevitable. As the late Mayor Daniel L. Hart said about his own service, it wasn't the time Pope John spent on the job that mattered, but what he accomplished while there. The imprint of his spiritual life on the world was great, his pontificate fruitful.

Perhaps nothing became him or touched people of all faiths more than his serenity, piety, and patience in the throes of death when he dedicated his sufferings to humanity.

And when he realized his days were numbered, he resigned himself to the divine will. "My bags are packed," he told members of the Papal household. "I am ready to go."

One can almost hear the answer from the Master he served with such fidelity and distinction:

"Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

While the world mourns the passing of this Pope of good will, it will find a measure of comfort in his accomplishments which will live after him. He has left a lasting imprint, but it is too early for us to assign him a lasting imprint, but it is too early for us to assign him a place in history. Future generations will have the answer to that. It is most regrettable he did not have another 5 years.

Freedom of Radio–TV in Jeopardy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial written by Mr. C. L. Dancey for the Peoria Journal Star of June 5, 1963, entitled "Freedom of Radio–TV in Jeopardy?" Under unanimous consent, I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM OF RADIO–TV IN JEOPARDY?

Newton Minow, it was revealed yesterday, suggested in his letter of resignation that the FCC be abolished and replaced with a single Administrator.

The move to create a czar over television and radio is typical of the legacy that the retiring Federal Communications Commission Chairman left—increasing governmental control of radio and TV.

His legacy to American broadcasting includes the first instance whereby this Federal Government has taken away the license of a station on the basis of programing, and thus establishes decisively the new relationship between all broadcasters and the Federal administration. Admittedly this was a flagrant case.

It further includes, at the same session, an official act outlawing "option time" in the network relationship with its affiliates. This act makes it impossible to "pin down" local stations for blocks of time by a netwrk contract; it is a blow for freedom of local stations on the surface.

Unfortunately, what nobody seems to mention as they take such action is that this practice does not exist in a total vacuum, but is an integral part of the whole complex relationship between networks and local stations, and an integral part of the resulting financial structure of both.

When you knock option privileges out, that is not and cannot be an exclusive action. That act is bound to have a profound effect in other areas of the total system. However, it seems axiomatic in politics and government never to look at the consequences beyond the one simple result that sounds good.

The assurance of some plase to display a show, whether it is all-day coverage of an astronaut's flight, or a key documentary, or a new entertainment effort is obviously a part of the ability of a network to make the initial investment involved in creating such a show.

When a network must go into the costly staffing on a "will wait" basis for such a thing as Cooper's flight—or must make the investment in a new "pilot" program—without any idea how many stations will broadcast the result, it is bound to have an effect on the network's capabilities.

Imposing financial uncertainties and limitations of this sort is hardly calculated to improve network programing or potential—whereas any "boon" that may be involved to the local stations offers no significant opportunity to develop programing of the same level.

As for its total effect on programing, it simply makes program selection more cold-blooded and tends to eliminate any overall balancing effect, because the station is put in the position, in fact, now of "going for the buck"—that is, selling any available time to the highest bidder, regardless of the quality of programing.

It is hard to see how this is going to improve things—except for the station owners. The public? Not that we can see. Quite the opposite.

However, to weaken the networks and strengthen the station owner is to put more control into the hands of those persons who depend entirely on a Federal license to operate.

And this comes, simultaneously, with the first radio station owner being slapped down and his license taken away by the FCC on programing grounds.

We have all seen program practices where we have a tendency to say: "Somebody ought to stop them from doing that."

But when Uncle Sam starts juggling the license to exist on the basis of the program, and there are no longer any mechanical and measurable standards which protect the man who sticks to them—only the "judgment" of the FCC on his programing, what happens?

Whether encouraged or not, you automatically set up a situation in which owners are impelled to try to please the present political administration in Washington. You put such a club over their heads that they will shrink from programs that are free and critical, and will jump at broadcasting the political propaganda of the powers in Washington.

This is inescapable.

We had definite signs both of the fear and the fawning before the actual overt act with which Mr. Minow bowed out. Now we have had the act itself, and Minow replaced by a man described as "twice as tough."

Thus, American broadcasting has become a political captive.

The license system left a basic freedom as long as it did not apply to programing itself.

Now, the freedom of a major media for communication to the U.S. public is completely gone, except in form.

This is wrong. It is also deadly dangerous.

And what is most dangerous of all is the calm, quiet, unnoticed manner in which it has been accomplished, and the quiet way that freedom is dying without public attention or realization—without even a scream from the victims. Just an almost inaudible whimper.

C. L. DANCEY.

Proposed Increase in Taxes on the Domestic Petroleum Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, recommendations of the administration propose an increase in taxes on the domestic petroleum industry estimated by the Treasury at approximately $280 million annually, or $175 million annually. Both figures have officially been offered.

At the same time, the administration seeks to accelerate industrial activity to provide for an expanding economy.

It is difficult for me to see the rationale in these proposals. I can reach no conclusion other than that an increase in taxes paid by oil will retard that industry's growth.

Were taxes on oil and gas production to be increased on the order of $280 million annually, or $175 million, or even $75 million, it would appear evident that the industry's expenditures for a year would be decreased by a like amount. Translating the Treasury's first estimate into capital for drilling operations, it could mean 5,000 fewer well completions. In terms of additions to crude oil reserves, assuming the industry would follow the pattern of the past 5 years, we would fail to develop some half billion barrels of new oil in a single year of reduced drilling activity.

Of course, with a cutback of $280 million in capital realization by the oil industry, not all the reduction in activity would be in the area of oil well drilling. There would be fewer gas wells, service wells, secondary operations, and a general retraction in all phases of drilling-production activity. However, the illustration I have offered serves to bring into focus the magnitude of the proposal to increase oil production taxes.

There is another detrimental aspect to the proposed tax increase. I refer now to exploratory, or wildcat drilling.

In this department, also, there would be a retardation of activity. A large number of exploratory wells, in some indeterminate number, would not be drilled in the search for new oilfields. Yet it is these year-by-year discoveries which provide the industry with its development drilling programs.

In this area the adverse effect would be cumulative.

In my own State of New Mexico—although we are rich in mineral resources—over two-thirds of the total value of all minerals produced is represented by petroleum.

I would be most reluctant to witness a further decline in exploration or development of the petroleum resources of the State of New Mexico. Yet, I am forced to the conclusion that this would be inevitable under the proposed tax program.

Oil, as an industry, enjoys a history of progress since its founding in Pennsylvania in 1859. The unusual hazards it faces in exploration for new reserves has been recognized by realistic tax measures. Since 1926, the depletion factor has been a part of its tax structure. This has served as a needed stimulant to offset the hazards to capital expenditures.

Prior to 1926 discovery depletion was the method used to recognize the peculiar nature of the wasting asset high-risk oil and gas producing industry. However, due to the highly complex nature of this method—percentage depletion was adopted. Now through the back door, the Treasury is seeking to make basic changes in the industry's longstanding tax structure which would be tantamount to a cut in the oil and gas depletion rate of up to one-third. Under the guise of correcting "claimed" defects in the application of existing tax provisions in the natural resources area, the President and the Treasury Department has recommended four specific changes which would—

First. Require a carry forward of intangible deductions for the purpose of reducing the net income from a mineral property in succeeding years upon which the 50-percent limitation is based.

Second. Revoke the taxpayer's option to combine several mineral interests into one property.

Third. Tax gains on sales of mineral properties at ordinary income rates instead of capital-gain rates to the extent of drilling, and depletion deductions (up to cost basis) taken after 1963.

Fourth. Revise the tax treatment of foreign exploration and development costs.

While each of these recommendations would adversely affect oil and gas producers, I particularly wish to point out the harm that would be done to small independent producers if recommendation No. 3—the so-called recoupment provision were enacted. Under present law, any taxable gain realized upon the sale of mineral properties held for more than 6 months is taxed at capital-gains rates. The proposed change would require that gains realized after 1963 be taxed as ordinary income to the extent of deductions taken after 1963 for depletion (up to depletable basis) and drilling costs. In other words, any profit realized from the sale of a mineral property after 1963 would first be considered recovery of prior depletion and drilling deductions which would have to be restored to ordinary taxable income.

Since the vast majority of all sales of mineral properties are made by small independent producers, the full impact of this proposal, which Treasury states will pick up $50 million each year, would fall on those taxpayers least able to absorb this increased tax burden. These smaller companies which discover many, many new oilfields are concerned principally with growth and most always reinvest the bulk of their available cash from the sale of such properties in the further search for and development of new properties. Relatively few independent producers who sell part or all of their properties quit the business; but rather they use the proceeds of the sale to pay their taxes, retire their indebtedness and use what is left over to start in again. The adoption of this particular proposal would severely limit the encouragement of smaller companies and individual operators to remain a vital and effective part of the domestic petroleum industry.

This Nation can ill afford to force out of the oil business these small, yet vitally needed independent producers who find and develop new oilfields and take the money from the sale of such fields to keep on looking for additional new oil reserves.

This proposal as well as all of the other Treasury regulations which adversely affect oil and gas producers should be rejected.

It is my conviction that the industry requires the same tax framework today as it has throughout its history—and for the same reasons—that have provided for progress in the past.

Restraint of Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the May 27 issue of Barron's points out another inconsistency in the policy of this administration—in this instance, with regard to trade.

Despite the words of the President, as quoted in the editorial, that "the free market is a more efficient decisionmaker than even the wisest central planning body," our Government continues to practice controls and enter into international commodity agreements which seem to result in higher prices to the consumers of America. The unfortunate results of the sugar agreement is a case in point.

The editorial follows:

RESTRAINT OF TRADE: A NOTE ON THE VICES OF GOVERNMENT CARTELS

It is well to remind ourselves from time to time of the benefits we derive from the maintenance of a free market system. The system rests on freedom of consumer choice, the profit motive, and vigorous competition for the buyer's dollar. By relying on these spontaneous economic forces, we secure these benefits: (a) Our system tends automatically to produce the kinds of goods that consumers want in the relative quantities in which people want them; (b) the system tends automatically to mimimize waste. If one producer is making a product inefficiently, another will see an opportunity for profit by making the product at a lower cost; (c) the system encourages innovation and technological change * * *. I regard the preservation and strengthening of the free market as a cardinal objective of this or any administration's policies.

The passage would do credit to BARRY GOLDWATER, or, for that matter, Adam Smith. The speaker, however, happened to be President John F. Kennedy, who paid this handsome tribute to the virtues of free enterprise before a surprised and delighted group of business magazine editors and publishers last September. At the time the President's eloquent statement of principles failed to charm one member of the audience, who, during the press conference that followed, inquired as to how it squared with administration policies, notably in the area of farm price supports and international commodity agreements. The simple question elicited a long and complicated answer, the gist of which was that restraints on supply and demand are sometimes a painful necessity. "There are, of course, limitations on the free market."

In Washington last week the lawmakers and administrators were busily proving the point. Despite the stunning results of the wheat referendum, in which those who grow the grain voted to rid their land of Federal controls, the Department of Agriculture, aided and abetted by the White House, took steps to strip them of access to foreign markets. On Capitol Hill, meanwhile, the Senate ratified a treaty designed to restrict imports and thus to "stabilize" the price of coffee. Both moves, of course, were made in "the national interest," a convenient phrase which covers a multitude of sins. Here it was designed to cloak what is tantamount to blackmail of the Nation's farmers and extortion from consumers. Whether done at home or abroad, by one government or many, price fixing is a dirty business.

By rejecting the administration's carrot-and-stick proposals—high price supports coupled with strict marketing quotas—U.S. wheat farmers have sought to regain their economic freedom. However, in selling abroad, as the White House lost no time reminding them last week, they remain bound by the provisions of the International Wheat Agreement. Under its terms 10 exporting countries (including the United States) and 36 importers have pledged to buy and sell the grain only within a stipulated price range, which fixes a ceiling of roughly $1.90 and a floor of $1.50 per bushel of high-grade wheat in Kansas City. Within 48 hours after the referendum, President Kennedy signed an Executive order granting the Secretary of Agriculture broad authority "to prohibit or restrict the import or export of wheat or wheat flour and to issue such rules or regulations as he may deem necessary" in order to carry out the Wheat Agreement. Secretary Freeman, in turn, reportedly is mulling over several possible schemes, all of which, one way or another, would create a Government monopoly and slam the door to the world market on the domestic wheatgrower.

In view of the snail's pace at which bureaucracy customarily proceeds, such a burst of activity seems suspiciously hasty. The new deal in wheat, after all, will not take effect until next May, when the winter crop heads for market. What the price will be at that time, nobody can safely predict. (On Friday wheat for delivery in July 1964 sold in Kansas City at $1.62 per bushel, or roughly a dime above the IWA minimum.). Hence the official explanation of the high-level maneuvers—to prevent "dumping"—scarcely rings true. Other observers, notably the American Farm Bureau Federation, flatly label them "scare tactics," aimed at intimidating the wheat farmer and, well in advance of the next referendum a year hence, showing him the error of his ways.

In the case of wheat, then, price fixing has led all too easily to coercion. In coffee it smacks of undiluted highway robbery. For the new International Coffee Agreement commits the importing nations (of which the United States is first and foremost) to control the available supply, both by limiting imports from nonsignatory countries and by requiring that certificates of origin accompany shipments from members and nonmembers alike. Coupled with export quotas, these measures, say their advocates, will "stabilize" the price of coffee at around present levels. Its critics, contrariwise, argue that the pact inevitably will push prices up.

Either way, the consumer will suffer. For both sides ignore the fact that coffee today is historically high. According to global experts, a sensible price for the brew, at which supply and demand might balance, would be 25 cents per pound, or 25 percent below the current market. In an undiplomatic moment last winter, Lincoln Gordon, U.S. Ambassador to Brazil, lashed out at the mistaken belief that low coffee prices, somehow engineered by the damn Yanquis, lay at the root of Rio's woes. Specifically, he pointed out that in 1962 Brazil's terms of trade (i.e., the prices of what it sold compared to those of what it bought) were more favorable than in 3 out of every 4 years since 1920. Nonetheless, thanks to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. coffee drinker, as well as the U.S. taxpayer, henceforth must support Brazil in the style to which it has become accustomed.

To some lawmakers, of course, robbing Peter to pay Paul is no more than just. The United States, so Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY said recently, is a rich country which, "according to the principle of progressive taxation," must be prepared to shoulder the financial burdens of its poorer neighbors. The Senator's point is well-taken. However, one may fairly wonder whether he has made a case for the International Coffee Agreement, or against the graduated income tax. For wherever it has been tried, global price-fixing has had the most unfortunate results. Thus, previous efforts to "stabilize" the price of coffee have cost Brazil nearly half of its market, kept the country deeply in thrall to a single cash crop and occasionally driven it bankrupt. Moreover, global cartels have led everywhere to a breakdown of law and order. Brazilian and Colombian coffees long have been exported illegally. A large contraband trade in Ghanian cocoa has sprung up in the wake of export taxes. Even in law-abiding Europe, the smuggling of butter from Holland to Belgium is big business. If Mr. Freeman should pursue his plan to monopolize the export of American wheat, truckloads of bootleg grain will undoubtedly find their way to Canada and Mexico. In sum, government interference with the freedom to buy and sell is worse than immoral; it breeds crime.

"The free market is not only a more efficient decision maker than even the wisest central planning body, but even more important, the free market keeps economic power widely dispersed. It thus is a vital underpinning of our democratic system." President Kennedy's words were true last fall. They remain true today.

Jim Farley at 75

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as an old friend of Jim Farley's, it gives me great pleasure to include in today's RECORD an editorial from the Scranton (Pa.) Tribune of Wednesday, May 29, 1963, as well as a feature article from the Scranton Times of Friday, June 7, 1963, on the occasion of his 75th birthday anniversary. I am sure I express the sentiments of a multitude of longtime friends and associates when I wish Jim Farley many more birthdays. The articles follow:

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Tribune, May 29, 1963]

JIM FARLEY AT 75

James A. Farley will observe his 75th birthday anniversary on Thursday.

Jim Farley is something of a Democratic right bower. He has no political organization as such, but his political influence is far from inconsequential. He shuns the role of older statesman, preferring the honest title of politician.

A backer of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON at the 1960 Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles, Farley aimed most of his weaponry at Adlai Stevenson, saying, for example, that to send Stevenson to negotiate with Khrushchev would be like sending the cabbage patch to the goat." And he also warned against a Kennedy stampede.

Himself a moderate conservative, Farley has been able to serve the New Deal without mental reservations, and to support the Fair Deal and the New Frontier. This is not to say that the wily politician is not a man of principle and independence. He refused to go along with a third term for Franklin D. Roosevelt. He served on the Hoover Commission and strongly urged its governmental reforms.

Jim Farley's own account of the 1940 Democratic convention in Chicago, where he was nominated for the presidency, ends with these proud words: "As I went through the hall there were cheers on every hand. The crowd knew they were cheering a loser, but they approved my courage to stand up for what I believe in."

Retirement from active politics brought fortune to the former Postmaster General as chairman of the board of Coca-Cola Export Co. Honorary degrees and decorations from foreign governments and all kinds of kudos were showered upon him.

Jim Farley, throughout his long career, has been noted for his knack of remembering names and using them. Explaining this, he once wrote, "A sincere conviction in your own cause leads you to value each person you talk to, and that value helps identify him to you."

In so stating, Mr. Farley was revealing more of himself than he may have realized.

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Times, June 7, 1963]

JIM FARLEY

With the exception of the few occasions when he passed through the city on an automobile trip to some other point, James A. Farley, former Democratic national chairman and Postmaster General, has not spent any time in Scranton since he paid the city a flying visit in July 1936. As political writer on the news side of this newspaper, I interviewed Mr. Farley on that occasion. He was here only long enough to have dinner at Hotel Jermyn and then make a hurried departure for Sky Top in the Poconos for a reunion with Mrs. Farley and their daughter, Betty, then 13, who was at Camp Tegawitha, near Tobyhanna. Three years previously, on August 13, 1933, Mr. Farley had been the principal speaker at the annual Irish Day celebration held at Rocky Glen Park. Mr. Farley's two visits to this area are brought to mind by the fact that he has just turned 75. He celebrated his birthday on Memorial Day and Associated Press dispatches reported that he is as alert and active as ever, with his interest in politics undiminished. As board chairman of the Coca Cola Export Corp., Mr. Farley last year traveled more than 53,000 miles, 46,000 of them by air. "I spent nearly 106 hours in the air, attended 98 dinners, and 78 business luncheons," the noted political leader of the New Deal era told the Associated Press. Mr. Farley is meticulous about keeping records of almost everything. However, he has a card-index memory, especially for names and faces. For years Mr. Farley was the favorite whipping boy of enemies of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration. He lost that role when he broke with Roosevelt over the third term issue in 1940. Almost overnight Farley became the hero of the Roosevelt-haters.

Big Jim Farley, often described as a cartoonist's delight was a kingmaker in his day and earned the rating of one of this country's most successful politicians. And that leads to the question of how he views the political situation today: He says that nothing he can see at present would lead him to think that President Kennedy will not be elected to a second term. "I think he has handled the situation well. I can visualize him going down as one of our greatest Presidents," he declared when asked about President Kennedy's 1964 chances. Mr. Farley also believes that at the present time the nomination of New York Gov. Nelson Rockefeller by the Republicans is a sure thing. Of the man he did so much to put in the White House, Franklin Roosevelt, Mr. Farley says: "If he hadn't run for the third term he would have gone down in history as America's greatest President. The accomplishments of his first two terms were the greatest ever made by an American President," he stated. Mr. Farley unhesitatingly blamed Mr. Roosevelt's third and fourth terms for many of the ills plaguing the world today. "Those terms brought a great mind, but one worn by the weight of years and the cares of state, to the all-important conferences of Teheran and Yalta. We had a worn leader dividing the world in a series of concessions embodied in secret agreements which are plaguing the world's children with blood, death, and fears." It is plain to be seen that Mr. Farley has not forgiven his old boss. But by virtue of his break with Mr. Roosevelt and the fact that he has turned 75, the former Democratic national chairman has become an elder statesman. He may not be of the same stature as Herbert Hoover, Harry Truman, and Dwight Eisenhower, for they enjoy a special status as former Presidents, but 75-year-old Jim Farley's pronouncements still carry respect when they have to do with national affairs or politics.

Private Research Produces Pollution Aid and New Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the whole country has been looking to the soap and detergent industry for an answer to the problem of detergents which foam up in our water supply systems. The soap companies have been working for a number of years with their suppliers on a costly research project to solve this problem.

Members in both Houses of the Congress, concerned about the problem, have introduced bills hoping to expedite a solution. The House Government Operations Committee's Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power, chairmanned by our colleague the gentleman from Alabama, Representative ROBERT E. JONES, is conducting a carefully considered series of hearings aimed at gaining some perspective on this whole water pollution problem, of which detergents are a small but dramatic evidence.

As many of you may have read in this morning's papers, a breakthrough has been achieved. I am proud to call to your attention that an answer has been found in the petroleum industry.

A company in my district, Continental Oil Co., today announced two multimillion-dollar plants already fully contracted for and under construction which will by this time next year be ready to deliver a new soft detergent chemical.

For the last several years, annual production of the necessary base chemical for household detergents has totaled 450 million pounds. This has been selling for about 10 cents per pound.

Continental Oil's discovery will be available to the soap and detergent industry for about the same price. Continental's new process should make it possible for the household detergent manufacturers to provide the housewife with a superior product at little or no increase in price.

The total market for the new soft product should be something in the neighborhood of $50 million annually.

I know that the people of America will appreciate this latest contribution to better living from the oil industry.

I have here a copy of a letter to the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, advising him of Continental Oil Co.'s breakthrough. I should like to introduce at this point in the RECORD a copy of this letter.

CONTINENTAL OIL CO.,
Houston 1, Tex., June 3, 1963.

Hon. ANTHONY CELEBREZZE,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CELEBREZZE: We are taking the liberty of writing you with regard to plans which Continental Oil Co. has to produce raw materials for detergent manufacture which are biologically "soft."

On May 15, 1963, Continental's board of directors approved a capital expenditure of more than $7 million for the construction of new conversion of present facilities to produce "Nalkylene" detergent alkylate. This new material is a straight-chain product which, when converted into the finished detergent, is biodegradeable. It is expected that these facilities will be completed early in the summer of 1964 and that substantial quantities will be in the hands of the detergent manufacturers by September of 1964. These manufacturers then will have for the first time a commercial product for the formulation and process development necessary to provide satisfactory end-use materials.

In addition to the "Nalkylene" alkylate plant, Continental Oil has been producing "Alfol" detergent alcohols for over a year at a $10 million plant. "Alfol" alcohols derived from petroleum sources, provide a raw material which when sulfated, ethoxylated, or ethoxylated and sulfated produces blending components for liquid detergents which are also biodegradeable. This is in contrast to currently used alkyl phenol types.

I would like to take this occasion to respond to recently voiced accusations that the Soap and Detergent Association and several large detergent manufacturers have been delaying the introduction of new products designed to overcome the "detergent" problem. On the contrary, as a supplier we have been continuously encouraged to rush the development of our "Nalkylene" and "Alfol" materials. Continental Oil itself has expended upward of $6 million in research on the two types of products described and will have invested nearly $20 million in facilities designed specifically to produce new detergent raw materials which can alleviate the industry's share of the water-pollution problem. Due to the highly competitive nature of this industry both in the finished household product area as well as in the raw materials supplier area much of the very substantial progress made has not become known generally.

We appreciate the opportunity to assure you that both segments of the industry are indeed making major efforts to solve the water pollution problem in a voluntary fashion.

Very truly yours,

E. R. BAKER.

Tourism in Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, it was with great satisfaction that I read in the May issue of the Message Register, published by the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., of Maryland, an article entitled "Our State Government" concerning the role of the tourist division of the Maryland Department of Economic Development.

Gov. J. Millard Tawes created the department of economic development in 1959, and one of its primary objectives was to develop the Maryland tourist business. In these past 2½ years, Maryland has had considerable success in this endeavor. Visitors to the Maryland State House alone has jumped from 70,000 in 1959 to over 110,000 in 1962. These visitors came from every State in the Union and from 37 foreign countries.

I would like to compliment the editor of the Message Register, Joseph H. Cromwell, and members of the staff of that newspaper for printing this revealing article, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article in the RECORD:

OUR STATE GOVERNMENT: THE ROLE OF THE TOURIST DIVISION OF THE MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, ONE OF A SERIES OF NON-PARTISAN ARTICLES ON THE OPERATION OF OUR GOVERNMENT IN MARYLAND

Maryland is now in the tourist promotion business. But this is not a unique situation. So is the U.S. Government, virtually every State in the Union and most foreign countries.

In 1959, when Gov. J. Millard Tawes created the Department of Economic Development, one of the tasks he assigned the new agency was to develop Maryland's tourist business. A division of Tourist Development and Publicity was set up and a program of advertising, publicity and promotion was undertaken. In the past 2½ years, the Department of Economic Development, headed by George W. Hubley, Jr., has experienced considerable success in attracting tourists to Maryland. Mr. Hubley points out that the number of visitors to the Maryland State House alone has jumped from 70,000 in 1959 to over 110,000 in 1962. These visitors, he said, came from every State in the Union and from 37 foreign countries.

Gilbert A. Crandall, the head of the tourist promotion division of the department of economic development, says that Maryland has a sound economic reason for developing tourism. He points out that tourism is big business and that tourists bring new money to our State.

MANY TOURIST ATTRACTIONS

Mr. Crandall stresses the fact that Maryland has a great many tourist attractions, but that the general public, particularly outside of our borders, are not aware of them. For this reason, the department of economic development has been advertising and publicizing Maryland in newspapers and magazines, and through other media. Just recently, Redbook Magazine, in its May issue, carried a travel story on Maryland titled "The Delightsome Land." In April, Argosy Magazine carried an article, "Travel the Southern Highways," which recommended its readers to visit Maryland. Dodge Motors Magazine will devote the June issue to Annapolis.

Recently the department of economic development advertised Maryland in a teacher's magazine. As a result, nearly 2,000 inquiries were received from teachers from all parts of the United States.

The department of economic development produces several publications for travelers to answer the thousands of requests that are received each month for this type of information. One of these publications, "Maryland at a Glance," has this to say about Maryland:

"'Maryland, the Star-Spangled Banner State,' is a land of delightful contradictions. It is one of the oldest parts of the country (settled in 1634); yet it houses some of the most important developments of the space age. It still has huge areas that are wholly rural with only a few signs of human occupation; yet it is a center of great industrial development that includes the world's largest steel mill. It's one of the smallest States; yet it has one of the largest areas of water. This means all kinds, too—salt water of the Atlantic; from salt to brackish in its inland sea, the Chesapeake Bay to fresh water lakes.

It is a Southern State—but it has fine winter sports. It offers vacation resorts by the sea or in the mountains, the distance between being less than 200 miles."

TO BE REPRESENTED AT 1964 FAIR

When the New York World's Fair opens in April 1964, Maryland will be represented with a pavilion that will feature a fine restaurant serving crabs, oysters, fish, and chicken. A magnificent display of Maryland's attractions will include a dramatic presentation of the writing of the Star-Spangled Banner. Participation in the World's Fair is expected to attract thousands of visitors to this State.

The Future of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, when the United Nations was faced with a complex problem of financing its efforts, the American people, through their Representatives in this august body, voted to grant a reprieve to the organization. The financial assistance which was granted last year, however, served only to delay the inevitable and the showdown approaches once again.

It is accompanied by an even more complex problem—financing of all future United Nations operations. In the press, much is being said on what should be done. The views are as diverse as the writers and quite frequently, are but political exposés. I include an editorial which appeared this past week in the Catskill Daily Mail, of New York, and which approaches the matter objectively. In assessing the likely action of the nations currently in arrears on their payments, it has isolated the issue which will, I believe, determine the future effectiveness of the organization as a guardian of world peace, a question which bears the reflection of each of us: Will commonsense dictate that the voting rights of those nations who are remiss in their obligations be denied when they come due next year? The editorial reads as follows:

MONEY FOR THE U.N.

The United Nations is sometimes criticized as an expense to our country. This criticism has been sharpened by the fact that some members are free riders, behindhand on their dues. Both points deserve consideration.

As many as 83 nations have fallen behind in paying dues. That number defaulted on the special issue of the Congo peacekeeping operation, and 57 on the Middle East U.N. force. Russia heads the list of nonpayers.

There is a possible penalty. Any nation 2 years in arrears may lose its vote in the General Assembly. The suggestion that this rule might be enforced has made some recalcitrants hurry to pay up, just as the threat of repossession gets money out of a defaulting car buyer. Tunisia, Morocco, Lebanon, Hungary and (hold your hat!) Cuba are now all paid up. France, the great defaulter after Russia, hints that it will meet its obligations in 1964. Even chaotic Haiti is desperately raising the small sum required to keep its membership going.

If these continued defaults threaten the existence of the U.N., should we make up the difference to keep the organization going? The cost is less than might be supposed. Last year we paid out $235 million, only half the cost of a nuclear aircraft carrier, and less than one-half of 1 percent of the defense budget.

In return, we get a chance to sell our views to the rest of the free world. The U.N. forum is so valuable that if Russia really feared expulsion for nonpayment, it probably would decide to pay up. Its deadline is January 1, 1964. That date is one to watch.

Unspoiled by Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, Henry Wolff, Jr., a reporter-photographer for the Abilene (Tex.) Reporter-News, is a man with a keen interest in the Texas outdoors. Recently, he was with a group from the Texas Outdoor Writers Association when they visited Guadalupe Mountain Ranch in west Texas to see an area which I hope will someday soon take its place among the national parklands of the United States.

His story on the Guadalupe area appeared in the Abilene Reporter-News of May 19. I believe it has something of value for all of my colleagues who share his love for the out of doors.

GUADALUPE AREA UNSPOILED BY MAN

(By Henry Wolff, Jr.)

GUADALUPE MOUNTAIN RANCH.—Spanish conquistadores riding north from Mexico in the 1500's must have experienced many of the same inquisitive thoughts of modern day travelers as they approach the Guadalupe Mountain Range.

Traveling by the scenic range, one cannot help but wonder how El Capitan, the point of the wedge; Guadalupe Peak, the highest point in Texas; and numerous other peaks and interesting canyons would appear on closer inspection.

Today, the average tourist most often does not get a chance to inspect these impressive displays at close range. However, if a proposal of Congressman at Large JOE POOL becomes reality, many future tourists through this area of Texas will get an opportunity to share its beauty and outdoor recreation possibilities.

OVER 8,000 FEET

Rugged El Capitan rises to 8,200 feet above sea level. It has an impressive sheer face and is visible for over 50 miles. Guadalupe Peak, directly north of El Capitan, is 8,751 feet high. Near Guadalupe Peak is Pine Top Mountain, 8,362 feet.

Guadalupe Mountain and part of nearby McKittrick Canyon are on acreage of the 71,790-acre Guadalupe Mountain Ranch owned by J. C. Hunter, Jr., of Abilene. A portion of the canyon was owned by Wallace Pratt, a noted geologist, who gave approximately 6,000 acres to the National Park Service in March of 1961. The Park Service has explained that because the area is relatively small, it would not be feasible to do more than give protection at this time.

At the time Pratt made his gift to the Nation, he commented, "If the public is to enjoy anything like a full measure of the grandeur and scenic beauty of McKittrick Canyon and the surrounding Guadalupe Mountain, the limits of the new national park must be extended to include these privately owned lands."

At the present time the area is unspoiled by man. Population is scarce and those who live on the land take a great pride in its beauty. When hiking up McKittrick Canyon, Hunter will often stop to pick up a gum wrapper or other litter that some careless visitor has left behind. He is careful to leave behind only that which will return to the earth easily.

It is currently a good hike over rock and through stream to view much of the beauty of the canyon. It has a stream which lazily travels some 4 miles through the cut in the mountains before vanishing underground. Trout swim in the cool, clear water. On each side of the stream, mountains often rise to nearly 6,000 feet. The canyon itself is a rich museum of living plantlife, ranging from cacti and other desert vegetation to ponderosa and other pine, more often seen outside the State.

To get a highland view of Guadalupe Peak and El Capitan, one can ride a horse or mule up the rocky, twisting, and narrow trail that leads to the top of Pine Top Mountain, nearly 3,000 feet above Frijole, the ranch headquarters. The view is one not to be forgotten for those few who get an opportunity to venture this far into the mountain range. The State's only herd of wild elk roams this area. Though the elk and trout were not around when Mescalero Apaches inhabited the region, the rest has not changed. The beauty which they knew has been slightly marred only by man's fences and roads.

WANDER TO LEGENDS

With a strong mountain breeze rustling the pines, man can today stand on Pine Top viewing the two more noted peaks before him and quickly find himself leaving thoughts of today behind while letting his mind wander into legend and lore.

While Gen. Lew Wallace was Governor of New Mexico, he says he found a document in Santa Fe describing how a converted Indian conducted a party of Spaniards to a rich gold deposit on the eastern spurs of the Guadalupe Mountains. It is said that Geronimo leader of the Apaches, used to say that the richest gold mines in the world lay hidden in the Guadalupes. In the 1880's, Ben Sublett, a prospector from Odessa, used to venture into a cave somewhere on the mountain and return with nuggets.

Today, the mountains might not offer man what some of the legends say they did in years gone by, but they can still offer him a chance to get away from crowded civilization for a closer look at nature. They are located in what is already an area with considerable tourist interest. New Mexico's White City, located within a few miles of Carlsbad Caverns and 20 miles from Carlsbad, is only some 25 miles. El Paso with its gateway to Mexico is less than a 2-hour drive.

Though pleased to look at her beauty today, tourists with that desire to enjoy the outdoors must travel through on their way to other spots of interest feeling somewhat deprived of having a more intimate contact with the majestic mountain range.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was know as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

STANFORD, CALIF.,
May 14, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress,
331 House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Enclosed please find a copy of a resolution by the Stanford Area Young Republicans endorsing your resolution creating a House Committee on Captive Nations. We wish you the best of luck in securing approval of the resolution and hope that our action will be a help.

Sincerely,
F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr.,
(For Barbara A. Westerlund, President, Stanford Area Young Republicans.)

STANFORD, CALIF.,
May 14, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Member of Congress, Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, 1101 House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: Enclosed please find a copy of a resolution passed by the Stanford Area Young Republicans Executive

Board endorsing Congressman Flood's proposal for a House Committee on Captive Nations, which is currently pending before the Committee on Rules.

It is our hope that the Rules Committee will speedily consider and approve the resolution, giving the entire House a chance to act on the measure.

Sincerely,

Stanford Area Young Republicans,
F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.,
(For Barbara A. Westerlund, President.)

RESOLUTION

Whereas the U.S. Government has not given all the aid and comfort it could to the enslaved peoples of Eastern Europe and Asia; and

Whereas significant governmental attention to the problems of those enslaved by Russian domination will be regarded as a symbol that the greatest of democracies, the United States of America, still gives hope and encouragement to those peoples desiring democracy in their own land but are unable to achieve same because of the presence of Russian arms; and

Whereas Congressman Daniel J. Flood of Pennsylvania has introduced a resolution creating a Committee of the United States House of Representatives on Captive Nations; and

Whereas said resolution is currently pending before the House Rules Committee: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Stanford Area Young Republicans Executive Board in meeting assembled this 14th day of May, 1963, that we urge the House of Representatives to speedily adopt Congressman Flood's resolution creating a Committee on Captive Nations; be it further

Resolved, That we urge the House Rules Committee to quickly consider and approve said resolution for action by the full House; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Congressman Daniel J. Flood, Congressman Howard W. Smith, Chairman of the House Rules Committee, and Congressman J. Arthur Younger of San Mateo County, and that a copy be released to the Stanford Daily.

Barbara A. Westerlund,
President, Stanford Area Young Republicans.

May 21, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: On behalf of our organization (or a group of citizens undersigned below) we urge you to submit the Flood Resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration. Such a committee on captive nations is vitally important both for our Government and the American people at large. While Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of national liberation in Africa and Asia, we as a Nation, are not doing much to help the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations which constitute a veritable weakness of the Soviet totalitarian empire.

A special committee on captive nations in the House of Representatives would become a reservoir of true and unbiased knowledge and information on the plight of captive nations, which knowledge will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We strongly urge you, Congressman Smith, to give your full and qualified support to the Flood Resolution in your Rules Committee. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

J. Klysiah,
President.
Natalie Matz,
Secretary.

Ukrainian Congress Committee,
of America,
Passaic, N.J.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, New House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: On behalf of our organization (or a group of citizens undersigned below) we urge you to submit the Flood Resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration. Such a committee on captive nations is vitally important both for our Government and the American people at large. While Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of national liberation in Africa and Asia, we as a Nation, are not doing much to help the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations which constitute a veritable weakness of the Soviet totalitarian empire.

A special committee on captive nations in the House of Representatives would become a reservoir of true and unbiased knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, which knowledge will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We strongly urge you, Congressman Smith, to give your full and qualified support to the Flood Resolution in your Rules Committee.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

F. J. Klysiah,
President.
W. Maruzczol,
Secretary.

Chicago, Ill.,
May 21, 1963.

Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
Congressman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Flood: I wish to inform you that I have sent an identical letter about the Special House Committee for Captive Nations to the Honorable Congressman Zablocki on April 12, 1963, and to the Honorable Howard W. Smith, chairman, House Rules Committee, on May 20, 1963.

Also I sent letters to the State Department and President Kennedy on May 11, 1963. My letters express strong support for your House Resolution 14.

In this letter we can see many, many facts, which necessitate a better understanding and make urgent and essential a House Special Committee on Captive Nations.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

Milinko D. Aleksich.

North Shore Vramian
Chapter, Armenian Youth
Federation of America,
Danvers, Mass., May 10, 1963.

Congressman Daniel J. Flood,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Cengressman: The North Shore Vramian Chapter, Armenian Youth Federation of America informs you that a resolution has been passed by our unit supporting passage of House Resolution 14–15 submitted by you, which calls for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Recent developments of worldwide and in Washington make the formation of such a committee imperative to the security and welfare of the United States, and will bring added hope to the tyrannized peoples of the once free nations today in Soviet bondage.

We are, in addition to this letter, contacting our Congressman as well as Congressman Howard W. Smith, head of the Rules Committee, urging him to release your resolution to the House floor for quick debate and passage.

May we take this opportunity to commend you for your stand in this regard, and to assure you of our every support of your measure.

Ethel Boghosian, *Secretary.*
Michael Yagjian.
Alan Gardner.
Helen Psasianos.
Zora Margosian.
Margaret Mekalian.
Gregory K. Boghosian.

Antigo, Wis.,
— *April 26, 1963.*

Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: This is to state that I have written to Hon. Howard W. Smith for speedy passage of House Resolution 14.

If possible I would like a copy of the brochure published on the 45th anniversary of Ukraine's independence.

Yours truly,

Cyril Kabat.

Aerospace Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the tremendous increase in Government support of research and development, both direct or indirect, has resulted in numerous scientific advances which will be of lasting importance to this country and to the world. In addition, however, the expenditure of vast sums of money, far exceeding the sums being spent by private interests in the country, has given rise to a difficult and increasingly important question as to the political and economic relationship between private industry and the Federal Government.

For the interest of the Members of the House, I am inserting in the Record the following column by Mr. Edwin Darby in the Chicago Sun-Times of May 29, 1963, which, in quoting a report recently issued by the Stanford Research Institute, suggests that—

> A very large and important part of the American free enterprise establishment is not only under Washington's thumb but is also increasingly becoming a quasi-part of the Government.

The editorial follows:

Aerospace Study—Does Report Dim Hopes of Midwest?

(By Edwin Darby)

It would be hard to say that there's any comfort for Chicago and the Midwest in the brilliant detailed, 318-page report on the aerospace industry just turned out by the Stanford Research Institute.

Comfort? A Chicago businessman, hungering after a fine, fat defense contract, might be forgiven if he read Stanford's findings on the relationship between the aerospace industry and the Federal Government and concluded: "Who needs it?"

"Something new under the American sum," Stanford says, summing up the status of the Government-dominated aerospace contractor.

What's new? The apparent fact that a very large and important part of the American free enterprise establishment is not only under Washington's thumb but is also increasingly becoming a quasi-part of the Government. The aerospace contractor shares the credit and the blame for the success or the failure of Government programs and policies. He is accountable to the Government and to the public. He takes his orders from Washington and he has "no point of appeal." That is, he is not even as well off as the public utility. At least the public utility is operating under a commission which has formalized rules of procedure and a commission's decision can be appealed to the courts. The aerospace contractor is bossed by a man with a checkbook and a rule book.

MEMBERS TRANSFORMED

Here are a couple of comments from the Stanford report:

"A major portion of the industry is not free enterprise in the classic sense of the term, and does not operate as such. Because of its almost complete dependence on the government, it seldom takes firm positions in opposition to be government's desires, however justified. * * *

"As applied through contracts, regulations and procedures to some degree transform the members of the aerospace industry into closely controlled agents of the government for the operation of 'arsenals' for modern weaponary and space exploration. The anomaly is that aerospace firms are expected to act with the drive, efficiency and flexibility usually attributed to private enterprise."

As for results, the Stanford study holds that this "remarkable" blend of government and industry has achieved success of which the Nation may be proud. But the bulk of the report is devoted to means by which industry and government, jointly and separately, may take steps to preserve the "essential creative ability of the working relationship."

As noted, the discussion contains little that would encourage the Midwest in its hopes of nailing down contracts for either aerospace research or hardware production.

The industry, after surviving violent periods of ups and downs and change, is maturing, solidifying along already established lines.

Stanford acknowledges that pressure is mounting for "more general geographic distribution of contracts" and also for more emphasis on widely competitive awarding of contracts.

But it also finds that "nothing has really been accomplished in diffusing the geographical peaks of prime contract awards. A spot study of the subcontracting patterns of eight prime facilities revealed only an enhancement of prime contract concentrations."

USE WHAT'S THERE

Unfortunately it is becoming increasingly difficult to change the pattern. Once the concentration is established, political, social and economic reasons make it difficult to change the pattern. That is, the community is dependent on the contracts.

Then there's the question of who can do the best work at the least cost to the government. Rather naturally, the outfit that's already doing similar work. Or as the Stanford study puts it: "The highly specialized nature of (aerospace activities) tends to commit the government to continuing use of available company facilities or capabilities for economic reasons."

Another trend that certainly makes for concentration: "The complexity of systems and the lessening number under development is encouraging a new kind of specialist in industry—a few firms, some old-timers and some new, skilled as weapons systems integrators. Other contractors may find themselves more frequently as team members and subcontractors than as team leaders or prime contractors."

Stanford Research has turned out 318 pages of very valuable facts, opinions and thought-provoking questions. It is possible that improvements will flow from it, not only in such basics as the politico-economic relationship between the aerospace industry and the Federal Government, but also in such problem areas as the centralization contracts.

The report indicates that the Midwest is on the right track when it puts a priority on research capability. The means used to create the present aerospace industry, the report notes, has been the "tremendous increases in Government support of research and development."

Government Lotteries of Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, and Ecuador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to acquaint the Members of this House with additional Latin American countries where gambling is respected and treated as recreation and relaxation. Out of a total of 77 foreign countries where Government-run lotteries are legal and proper, none are as foolish as we are in refusing to recognize and capitalize on the human urge to gamble.

Chile operates two national lotteries. Last year, the gross annual receipts came to over $20¼ million of which the Government received over $3 million. Most of the moneys were earmarked and used for support of colleges, public health service, children's welfare program, hospital construction, Red Cross, and other charitable purposes.

Colombia is a small and poor country, yet it realizes the worth of lotteries. The total gross annual receipts in 1962, came to $33,360,000. The total net income to the National Government was almost $11½ million. These funds were earmarked for the blind and deafmutes, for hospitals, homes for the poor, and the aged, and other charitable institutions.

Costa Rica is another country that realizes that the natural gambling spirit of its people should be regulated and controlled for the benefit of its treasury. Last year, the gross annual receipts ran up to almost $10 million. The total net income to the Government was over $3¼ million. These funds were earmarked for the support of metal institutions and other charitable hospitals.

Ecuador, like a number of other Spanish-speaking nations, conducts a Government lottery not for the benefit of the general treasury but rather for the support of numerous charities. In 1962, the gross receipts of the national lottery of Ecuador came to $2,900,000 of which about $906,000 was turned over to various charitable groups and organizations.

Mr. Speaker, we in America could benefit immeasurably if moneys that now flow into the pockets of gangsters and professional gamblers could be diverted into a U.S. lottery and utilized for the benefit of our own people. Why can't we show the same intelligence and sound judgment as our Latin American friends? A national lottery in this country can not only strike a lethal blow at organized crime but pump into our Treasury over $10 billion a year in additional income which can be used to cut taxes and reduce our national debt.

Mr. Speaker, isn't it time that we stopped being reckless and careless with the tax and revenue advantages offered by a national lottery?

Police Sgt. Edwin Adolphson, of Hawaii, Winner of Medal of Merit for Valor, Sets Example for Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, our daily papers are full of stories of crimes and violence and the part played by the police. Today I would like to call your attention to one policeman out of the 400,000 men in blue who has been awarded the Medal of Merit for Valor by the National Police Officers Association of America in a different kind of a situation.

Hawaii is surrounded by beaches—some perfect for swimming and surfing while others are treacherous with undertow that is not easily discernible to the average surfer who is intrigued with the mountainous waves that look perfect for surfing.

During the past 7 years Police Sgt. Edwin Adolphson has saved 100 persons from a watery grave by his constant volunteer patrolling of the west side of the Island of Oahu. To carry on his one-man weekend patrol which he started in December 1958, Sergeant Adolphson has invested over $10,000 out of his own pocket to equip his black sedan with the latest in rescue equipment. He is especially busy during the winter months trying to keep foolhardy surfers out of the giant waves. The sergeant, who will be 47 in November remains in top physical condition, and dares to take his surfboard into the stormy seas whenever someone is in need of help.

Reporters often have trouble getting him to talk about his rescues, but always find him willing to praise the fire department, the Army Land Rescue Team, and the military and civilian pilots who have participated in rescue missions.

Last December more than 300 persons attended a dinner in Sergeant Adolphson's honor and presented him with gifts and awards from 22 civic and military organizations. Awards included the Merit Award, First Class, the police department's highest award, and the Military Order of Loyal Companions, the highest civilian award that can be made by the Army's Pacific Command. He was praised for his achievements, and the countless hours of overtime work he has contributed without any compensation.

Accounts of his experiences sound like an adventure book, according to "Valor", the association's magazine. A cash award of $250 from the Reader's Digest Foundation will be given to Sergeant Adolphson along with his Medal of Merit.

Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from Hawaii I am proud to add my words of congratulations to Sergeant Adolphson for his work in saving men's lives, and to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this account of his humane exploits, brief and inadequate as it may be.

Here Comes the U.S. Tax Collector

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, all have agreed that tax reform is important to progress in South American countries. Unless those who can afford to help pay the cost of government do pay their share, the governments cannot provide the services needed, the educational opportunity, and the cooperation with the Latin American programs.

A recent article is very revealing and worthy of the attention of all Members. It is as follows:

HERE COMES THE U.S. TAX COLLECTOR

(By Ed Kiester)

SANTIAGO, CHILE.—Latest export of the United States to this Latin American Republic are nine men with business suits, pleasant manners and sharp, unyielding minds.

They are tax collectors. These boys from the U.S. Internal Revenue Service have been operating here for the last 2 years. Their mission: to teach their Chilean counterparts the secret of how to part a taxpayer from his money. And so far, to the despair of shocked and reluctant Chileans, they have been wildly successful.

Since the Americans came, tax collections here have increased between $30 and $50 million a year. They are expected to jump twice that next year. But increased revenue is only part of the story. The Americans have helped close loopholes, modernize procedures and crack down on chiselers. And, to the wonder of all Chile, they have taken 2 persons to court, have 2 others awaiting trial and are investigating an additional 50.

THE GOOD OLD DAYS

All this is a far cry from the ways things used to be here. In the entire country—in fact, in all Latin America—no one, but no one, had ever been tried for tax fraud. In whole regions of Chile, not a single person ever had filed an income tax return.

In a classic case, a man purchased a valuable business property in Santiago, the capital, for $300,000 in cash. The transaction brought him to the attention of authorities, who found he never had paid taxes. Asked about it, the man protested, "Why, I've never earned enough money to pay taxes."

Furthermore, those who dodged the tax collectors usually managed to avoid paying a penalty. The law assessed penalties, fines and interest for overdue taxes—but every 2 years Chile's congress passed a law "forgiving" them.

To us, revolutionizing this taxless paradise may not sound very neighborly, but it is actually (according to the tax men) being done for our benefit. Under President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress program for Latin America, the United States agrees to give aid to those countries which show willingness to help themselves.

But Uncle Sam sees no reason to shell out U.S. taxpayers' money when Latin America's home-grown taxpayers go scot-free. Accordingly, to qualify for funds, a nation must first institute tax reforms. Chile is the first to do so.

Actually, Uncle Sam would like to see the Chileans go even further. Eighty percent of tax money here comes from sales taxes and import duties—levies which fall hardest on people least able to pay. The United States would like to see income tax rates changed to squeeze more out of upper-bracket incomes. Chile's congress is now debating such a step. Meanwhile, the problem is to collect the maximum under existing laws.

Says Norman D, Nowak, the thickest, energetic New Yorker who heads the nine-man advisory group in Santiago: "The present system would not seem so inequitable if it were being properly enforced. The income tax schedule is not really so much below ours. But collections have not been made, good administration has not been followed. It may be that sound administration is as important as new law."

When Nowak first came here in 1961—at the personal request of Eduardo Urzua Merino, the Chilean director of internal revenue, whom he had once shepherded around the Manhattan IRS office—administration of the tax laws was anything but good.

Taxes were being withheld from the wages of factory workers; other Chileans were filing regular returns, but few of the returns were being audited. Collectors, inspectors and clerks were untrained.

Underpaid agents held second jobs—sometimes for the very persons whose taxes they were supposed to check during the day. Most complicated of all, no one had ever written down all the Chilean tax rules, procedures and regulations in one place. Most agents carried them around in their heads.

Nowak started off with a drastic program. Aided by a revolving staff of American specialists plus 85 full-time Chilean instructors, he set up a training program, wangled a 50 percent pay boost, had the offices redecorated and refurbished, put a crash crew to work drawing up a Chilean tax code.

More important, he showed the average Chilean taxpayer that the agents meant business. He hand-picked 50 men for an intelligence division, trained them in such things as how to eavesdrop, shadow a suspect, use a hidden mike. Then—after passing the word that informers would be rewarded—he turned them loose on tax frauds.

BATHING SUIT FRAUD

Result: The golden age of Chilean tax-dodging came to an abrupt halt. The fraud team suddenly pounced on the office of a bathing suit manufacturer and confiscated its records. Then they charged that the firm had falsified invoices, made up phony purchase orders, and doctored accounts to make their profits look small. They also made certain that the case—first of its kind on the continent—got wide publicity when it went to court.

The chief of the division, Jorge Varela, then let the word out that his office was investigating 40 or 50 more cases. He also said auditing would be increased fivefold—and that, in the U.S. tradition, the agents would concentrate on returns from the higher income brackets.

As a result of all this, there is today a new attitude about taxpaying in Chile—and it's one that most Americans would recognize. Reluctantly, many taxpayers are beginning to file returns for the first time—and honest ones at that. Among the 2,800 agents, there is a new zeal and a new esprit de corps. Nowak's job isn't over, but he is looking forward to going home.

"All we wanted to do was make them independent," he says—"set up a professional service and enable them to get the absolute most they were entitled to. That's what we're getting in Chile. Soon it'll be just as tough on tax cheats as the States."

Operation Yorkville, a Major Force in the Battle Against Obscene Literature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it gives me special pleasure to be able to report on some of the activities of a vital group which is leading the way toward community action against obscene literature. Operation Yorkville, organized just a few months ago in the Yorkville section of New York, has sparked enthusiasm far beyond the borders of that area.

Together with the fine work of the citizens-for-decent-literature groups across the country, Operation Yorkville has been effective in mobilizing the local communities to work on their own problems in combating unsavory material on newsstands and other outlets. At the same time Operation Yorkville has encouraged an interest in the national problem and has been a leader in calling for more Federal action on this national problem.

I am pleased that this group has endorsed two bills which I have sponsored concerning obscene literature. These are H.R. 319, which is designed to allow postal patrons to protect their own mail boxes from unwanted and unsolicited obscene mail, and H.R. 470, which calls on the President to establish a Commission on Obscene and Noxious Material. A summary of these two bills will be found at the close of my remarks today.

I call to the attention of the House that hearings have been scheduled on H.R. 319 and related bills before the House Postal Operations Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI]. These hearings will be June 25, 26, and 27.

It is a pleasure for me, as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, to work with the chairman because he is also very interested in doing all possible to control the traffic in obscene literature. Other members of our subcommittee have also been very helpful in our consideration of this problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include some interesting articles which appeared in the recent Bulletin of Operation Yorkville, Bulletin 20, dated May

24, 1963. And I will conclude by including the summary of H.R. 319 and H.R. 470.

FRATERNAL ORGANIZATIONS IN 26 STATES JOIN HANDS WITH OPERATION YORKVILLE

In just 6 months Operation Yorkville has grown into Operation America. Fraternal organizations in 46 States have endorsed and pledged cooperation with Operation Yorkville in its attempts to keep obscene literature out of the hands of children by supporting community standards. Many have already wired and sent letters to the President of the United States, voicing their community standards, and urging him to action. Typical of communications received at Operation Yorkville headquarters: "The Massachusetts State Council does hereby endorse the action of Operation Yorkville * * * in requesting President John F. Kennedy (1) to send a message to Congress calling attention to the danger caused by the nationwide epidemic of obscene material flooding the country, urging a broad and continuous investigation and competent study of the problem and the adoption of appropriate legislation, including, but not limited to, bills now pending; (2) to issue a call to the nation for moral and mental fitness; (3) to alert the press to the evils of pornography and to ask cooperation of the entire Nation in establishing decent community standards as guidlines for elected representatives." "Riverton, Cheyenne, Sheridan, Rock Springs, Cody and Casper * * * Wyoming has been heard from and you can be assured of our continued support." From Virginia: "Operation Yorkville is a courageous and highly commendable campaign and merits active support * * *. We have an obvious obligation to do our utmost to prevent the corruption of an entire generation of American youth through the distribution of filth for the profit of irresponsible publishers." The entire Colorado congressional delegation has been contacted asking for their support of pending legislation.

OBSCENITY IS A NATIONAL PROBLEM

Wires and letters urging the President to action on the flow of obscene literature are converging on the White House from 46 States. As a voter you have a right and an obligation to request such action. The President has said that the problem of obscenity should be dealt with locally. The dealer around the corner is a matter of local concern, true. But when obscenity is sent through the U.S. mails, it is a matter of national import; when obscenity is brought in from abroad, it is a matter of national import; when the Supreme Court sees fit to review a cast (*Roth* v. *U.S.*, 1957) and define obscenity, it most certainly becomes a matter of national import. If the Nation is to be concerned with the physical fitness of our youth, it must first look to the mental and moral fiber of that youth. Mental fitness must precede physical fitness. A generation which is swallowing huge doses of obscene poison, and thus becoming obsessed with sex and perversion, cannot be mentally alert, able, and fit. Obscenity is, therefore, a national problem and must be dealt with nationally as well as locally. It must receive the attention of the most important elected official of the Nation, the President of the United States.

OPERATION YORKVILLE STORIES BRING DEALER PLAINT TO NATIONAL JOURNAL

Two Operation Yorkville articles (Mar. 23 and Apr. 13) in America, a national journal of opinion, brought letters to the editor from Arkansas, Colorado, and Chicago.

From a dealer in Chicago came these remarks: "I have been reading with interest your reports on Operation Yorkville. I should like to present the magazine vendor's side of the problem * * * I had a rule of thumb years ago that I followed. I would not put any magazine on my rack that I would not leave at home in my living room * * *. We had to return 10 to 15 percent of the material that was sent. Today, with the flood of pornographic stuff that we get, we have to return 50 to 60 percent * * *. The magazine business is strictly a push business. We have no control over what is sent to us. We must take it or leave it. We then have to go through every bundle and separate the good from the bad * * *. Why don't we buy from another distributor? Because there isn't any. In the city of Chicago, magazine distribution is a monopoly. So you can see what a problem it is to keep a clean magazine rack."

From a woman in Arkansas: "Cheers for Operation Yorkville and cheers for America for publishing an account of constructive action."

A man in Denver had this to say: "Splendid and considerate. Your wonderfully illuminating remarks about 'prurient interest.' New York is to be envied and Operation Yorkville parents sincerely admired on all three counts: For being rightly concerned about the danger of pornography, for their courage in taking public action, and especially * * * for their use of the Roth versus United States definition."

OPERATION HAWTHORNE GETS UNDERWAY

An Operation Yorkville team traveled to Hawthorne, N.Y., Thursday, May 9, to help Operation Hawthorne get underway. Among the civic, educational, and religious groups represented at the meeting were: The Hawthorne Police Department, the Hawthorne Fire Company, the Hawthorne Elementary School Parent-Teachers Association, the Columbus Avenue PTA, Westlake Junior High and High Schools, the Rotary Club, Lions Club, Board of the Town of Mount Pleasant, Mount Pleasant School District No. 1, leaders of the Boy Scouts, Cub Scouts, and Girl Scouts, American Legion and American Legion Auxiliary, Knights of Columbus, the Trinity Lutheran Church, the Hawthorne Reformed Church, Holy Rosary School, and the Catholic Youth Organization.

Operation Oceanside and Operation Larchmont are successfully at work: Operation Yorkville meetings were held last week in Staten Island, North Plainfield, N.J., and with the New York Rotary. Meetings are scheduled for coming weeks in Brooklyn, Queens Village, and the Bronx.

The Rotary Club of New York at their May 16 meeting at the Hotel Commodore sent the following telegram to the President:

"Letter going forward today expressing our concern about the pornography reaching our children. May we request you as our Chief Executive to protect our children from this grave danger. We promise our complete support."

EXCITING MEETING IN NUTLEY, N.J.

Mr. James P. Foley, chairman of the Nutley Decent Literature Campaign conducted an exciting meeting in the Nutley High School auditorium, May 16. This group was addressed by Dr. William P. Riley, of the New York Citizens for Decent Literature, and by Mrs. Doris Townsend and Mrs. Mildred Cronin of Operation Yorkville. Those attending signed a wire to the President and sent cards urging action.

TWENTY THOUSAND SIGNATURES ON PETITIONS TO COMMISSIONER

To date, 20,000 signatures have been received on "Petitions of Gratitude" to Police Commissioner Michael J. Murphy for the recent police raids on obscenity distributors in Queens and dealers in Times Square.

N.Y. LAW WILL BRING OBSCENITY PUBLISHERS INTO THE OPEN

Late in April, Governor Rockefeller signed into law a bill which the District Attorneys Association said will "help considerably in enforcing the laws on obscenity." The law, which goes into effect on September 1, will require the name and address of the publisher to appear in every publication "which is so composed or illustrated as a whole to be devoted to the description or the portrayal of bondage, sadism, masochism, or other sexual perversion, or to the exploitation of sex or nudity." Governor Rockefeller said the purpose of the law is to expose "all those responsible for the publication of materials which are obscene or offensive to public morals." Such exposure, he said, will make it possible for law-enforcement officials to "bring to justice the real culprits responsible for the dissemination of this unwholesome literature." How effective the law will be in stopping the flow of obscenity remains to be seen, but it is a beginning. It will be interesting to see whether publishers of lurid literature will stand up and take credit for their dirt, or will discontinue publication.

MAN OF THE WEEK—REV. ROBERT E. WILTENBURG

Reverend Wiltenburg, pastor of Immanuel Evangelical Lutheran Church, is a member—along with Dr. Julius G. Neumann, Rabbi Congregation Zichron Moshe and Rev. William T. Wood, S.J., pastor of St. Ignatius Loyola—of the sponsoring committee of Operation Yorkville. Appointed to the post by Dr. Dan M. Potter, executive director of the Protestant Council, Reverend Wiltenburg has been a member of the committee and a guiding spirit of Operation Yorkville since its inception.

The fact that Operation Yorkville has become such a tremendous force in the community is due, in no small part, to Reverend Wiltenburg's clear thinking and eloquence. Operation Yorkville has been told that its phenomenal success has been due to the fact that it has not made the major mistakes (extreme pressure, etc.) that have been made in similar campaigns. This is because one of the hands at the helm has been that of Reverend Wiltenburg. His calm, reasonable approach to the problem of obscenity has helped keep Operation Yorkville on the right path.

Reverend Wiltenburg is an active, energetic member of the New York Rotary. Among other important Operation Yorkville meetings he has arranged, was a New York Rotary luncheon gathering on May 16. The assemblage was addressed by Dr. Bernard Pacella, an eminent psychiatrist, James P. O'Donnell, assistant district attorney of Queens County, and by Rev. Morton A. Hill, S.J., secretary to Operation Yorkville. Operation Yorkville's Dr. Julius Neumann gave the invocation, and Reverend Wiltenburg was toastmaster.

Ministering to Lutherans in a wide Yorkville geographic area, Reverend Wiltenburg has become prominent for his interest in community affairs. He lives in Queens with his wife and four children. Operation Yorkville is proud to have him as one of its driving forces.

TEENAGERS PETITION PRESIDENT JOIN OPERATION YORKVILLE

The following communication was received this week at Operation Yorkville headquarters from the Teenagers' Decency Campaign, Post Office Box 637, Stamford, Conn.:

"We are joining Operation Yorkville, citizens for decent literature, and other organizations in sending letters and telegrams to President Kennedy asking him to take action on pornography which is undermining the moral character of this Nation, stunting its moral and spiritual growth.

"This is the kind of action which is necessary if we are to rid this Nation of the vile literature which can be found on almost every newsstand across our country. This is the kind of unity which we have been seeking and we urge you to join us in this effort by sending either a letter or telegram to President Kennedy as soon as you can. Please ask your friends to do the same."

SUMMARY-ANALYSIS OF H.R. 319 AND H.R. 470—BILLS TO CONTROL OBSCENE MATERIAL, INTRODUCED BY REPRESENTATIVE GLENN CUNNINGHAM, OF NEBRASKA

H.R. 319, INTRODUCED JANUARY 9, 1963; REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

A bill to protect postal patrons from obscene mail matter and Communist propaganda

This measure is based on the principle in old English law that a man's home is his castle. It assumes that a man has a right to protect his home against the delivery of obscene material and Communist propaganda by the Post Office. Such material is often sent to homes because they are on a list which is sold or rented to various firms by "list brokers" and which falls into the hands of a dealer in obscene material.

Specifically, any person is authorized to return any such matter to the Post Office Department if it is addressed to him or his minor child with a request that the Department notify the sender to remove the name and address of such person from each mailing list owned or used by the sender.

The Department will give appropriate notice to the sender.

Should the sender continue to send mail to the same addressee, the person would return it to the Department. The Postmaster General could immediately cancel or suspend any and all permits issued by the Department to the sender.

In the case of such matter from abroad, the Postmaster General notifies the postal authorities of the country of origin. Continued mailing of such matter from abroad to the person in this country can be followed by withholding of all mail from oversea sender to the person in the United States. In addition, the Postmaster General could refuse to deliver any and all matter within the United States sent by the foreign sender.

The bill also defines "minor child" to mean unmarried persons under 21 years, furnishes several definitions, and provides an exclusion for second-class publications mailed to bona fide subscribers and certain other mail.

H.R. 470, INTRODUCED JANUARY 9, 1963; REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

A bill creating a Commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matter and Materials

This measure provides for the establishment of a 17-member Commission appointed by the President and composed of representatives of Government, clergy, and mass media.

The Commission is charged with investigation of the relationship between noxious matter and antisocial behavior; recommending coordination between the levels of Government for control of obscene matter; informing the public in regard to traffic in obscene matter; enlisting cooperation of leaders in mass media; recommending addito confirmation or change by committee actions, and taking other steps which would be appropriate.

Authority is granted for advisory committees within States. Cooperation of Federal agencies is specified.

Recommendations are required by January 31, 1964, although this date is subject to confirmation or change by committee action dependent upon progress of the bill through Congress.

Agricultural Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the vote was close yesterday on the question of whether to reduce the agricultural conservation program. Here are some statistics about the accomplishments of the ACP in my district:

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM: OKLAHOMA—SIXTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

During the past few years, a high proportion of the farmers and ranchers in the Sixth District have received cost-sharing assistance through the agricultural conservation program for performing conservation practices. These practices have substantially contributed to erosion control, water conservation, soil improvement, crop adjustment through the diversion of cropland to grass and legume cover and trees, protection against wind and water erosion, improvement and establishment of wildlife habitat, and revitalizing small streams by reducing siltation and bank erosion, controlling runoff, and recharging underground water sources.

The 1961 ACP expenditure for the Sixth District was $2,650,000. This amount was paid to farmers as the Government's share of performing ACP practices. Farmers match this by their own contributions, therefore in the Sixth District about $5,300,000 was spent in 1961. This money is spent in towns and cities. Either directly or indirectly, every person in the district benefits from this expenditure.

A wide variety of conservation measures are performed under the ACP. Among the principal practices carried out in the Sixth District under the 1961 ACP are the following:

Conservation practice:	*Extent*
Permanent cover for erosion control or land-use adjustment, acres	33,000
Increased acreages of cover in crop rotations for erosion control, etc., acres	26,000
Improvement of established cover for erosion control, acres	6,000
Improvement of rangeland by deferred grazing to permit natural reseeding, acres	80,000
Control of competitive shrubs on range or pasture land, acres	31,000
Wells for livestock water to improve grassland management, number	300
Dams, pits, or ponds for livestock water to improve grassland management, number	800
Establishment of sod waterways to dispose of excess runoff, 1,000 square feet	104,000
Construction of terraces to control erosion or conserve moisture, acres terraced	54,000
Construction of diversion terraces or ditches, or dikes, to control erosion, miles	150
Lining irrigation ditches to prevent erosion and conserve water, rods	6,000
Temporary cover to protect soil from erosion, acres	240,000
Stubble mulching to control erosion and improve permeability, acres	52,000
Leaving high-cut stalks or stubble in designated wind erosion areas, acres treated	52,000
Weed control as a step in controlling erosion in designated wind erosion areas, acres treated	4,500
Surfacing clod-forming subsoil to control wind erosion, acres treated	5,000

Farmer and rancher participation in the Sixth District has been as follows for the past 3 years:

	1959	1960	1961
Farms and ranches	9,900	10,800	13,800
Persons receiving assistance	10,200	11,100	14,300

The total participation over a period of years materially exceeds the number shown for any 1 year since many farmers and ranchers carry out practices only intermittently.

The ACP gives particular attention to the establishment of conservation practices needed on the land on farms in organized watersheds. This helps farmers meet the requirements and schedules for conservation plans and treatment which are prerequisite to planned structural works of improvement.

Under the 1961 ACP in the sixth district, numerous conservation practices were performed in 4 such organized watersheds involving 14 counties and 4,300 participating farms. The ACP cost sharing for these practices was $750,000. The farmers themselves contributed about as much more.

Beginning in 1936, sixth district farmers have been carrying out, under the ACP, many conservation practices which conserve our soil, water, woodland, and wildlife resources. They have made good use of these public funds, and indicate a willingness to accelerate the rate of installation of conservation measures if their economic position permits it.

Support for Legislation To Control Obscene Literature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, the Knights of Columbus Councils of Massachusetts in their annual meeting last week took action which I wish to call to the attention of the Congress.

Supported unanimously by delegates from 204 lodges, comprising more than 67,000 members throughout the State, the convention pledged support for legislation to control obscene literature.

Specifically, the convention delegates endorsed H.R. 319 and H.R. 470, both introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]. These bills have two purposes: first, to give postal patrons a method to use in protecting their homes against unwanted obscene literature of any kind, and second, to create a Citizens Commission on

Obscene and Noxious Material established by the President in order to guide all citizens in their efforts to control obscene material in their own communities and nationally.

The announcement of this action reads in part:

> Delegates representing 204 councils comprising more than 67,000 members of the Knights of Columbus in Massachusetts, in annual meeting assembled in Boston, while having no intention either of advocating the abolishment of a free press or of advocating censorship of political or religious convictions, yet convinced that freedom of the press does not mean that 100 million adults must grant a handful of publishers, supported by their highly paid attorney, the power to corrupt 80 million American young people, unanimously endorsed H.R. 319 and H.R. 470.

Television and Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the influence of the television programs on the children's day is a subject of constant discussion among parents and those interested in television.

On May 21, 1963, Robert W. Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the National Broadcasting Co., delivered an address before the National Congress of Parents and Teachers in Miami, in which he gives the viewpoint of the broadcasters, both in connection with commercial programs and educational television.

I am sure this address will be of interest to all Members of Congress:

TELEVISION AND CHILDREN

(By Robert W. Sarnoff)

My credentials for appearing before you today are now at the ages of 4, 6, and 19. They are three girls and they are all in the process of acquiring a formal education. In common with most other youngsters in the United States, they enjoy watching television and they are not bashful about it. When a program their father wants to view on NBC happens to conflict with one of their favorites on another channel, the audience of the National Broadcasting Co. sometimes declines by one.

Nevertheless, I share with my children, as many other parents share with theirs, an interest in their television viewing as well as in their education. Not that I equate the two. I could not, and I would not, suggest that commercial television has the same altruistic goals, for example, as the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. The school room, the living room, and the market place are obviously different milieus, with differing disciplines and motivations.

Yet, I believe there is much common ground that the parent, the teacher, and the broadcaster can occupy, and it is my hope to convince you that a joint exploration of this territory can produce tangible rewards for the children with whom we are concerned.

Like the process of learning, television is literally everywhere. Fifty million American families, the occupants of 91 percent of all the homes in this Nation, possess television sets which, in the course of a week, are watched with varying degrees of interest and consistency by one or more members of the household.

Children form an avid and substantial segment of this vast audience. Today, the child of 15 does not know a world without television. It was there, in bulky small-screen size, when he was in his cradle. As he progressed from the nursery, television progressed to the larger screen, the slimmed-down portable set, and even to color.

In the modern era, television has become as entrenched in the house as the bath or the telephone. The 15-year-old watches with aplomb a program sent in color to an orbiting satellite in outer space and retransmitted to his home receiver. He sees, at the same time as Sir Winston Churchill in London, the first honorary citizenship ever bestowed by an American President in ceremonies conducted at the White House.

TOMORROW AND TODAY

Tomorrow, today's adolescent will watch television transmitted in full color to and from any area of the civilized world. Singapore, Sydney, Suez and Stockholm will be as easily available technically as San Francisco is today; and quite possibly they will be seen on wall-size mural television, the successor to the present receiver.

Nor is it fanciful conjecture to speculate that today's 15-year-old will one day know and possess other forms of television that now are only scientific laboratory conceptions. For example, through advances in the miniaturization and integration of components, we may have sometime in the decade of the seventies color television sets no larger than the transistorized radio you now carry in your pocket.

Dramatic advances are also being achieved in the utilization of the outer reaches of the radio spectrum. There are billions of unused communications channels in the ultra-high frequency range which science will some day unlock for the use of man. My children and yours may well have their own private broadcast frequency, just as we now have our own telephone number.

The prospect of personal communications, sight and sound, between any two individuals any place in the world is not beyond our children's grasp. Indeed, before the current crop of teenagers becomes octogenarian, it may be in television and voice communication with individuals on other planets.

This is a speculative glimpse of the television of our children's tomorrow, but what of television today?

Is it, as some allege, an electronic Pied Piper beguiling children from their parents, their studies and outdoor sports and piping them off to armchair hibernation?

The television industry would be the last to deny that television holds enormous magnetism for children. Some 90 percent of all youngsters in the United States under the age of 12—nearly 40 million children—watch television during the course of a typical week. Between the ages of 13 and 17, it rises to 97 percent, or more than 15 million teenagers.

Before we attempt to evaluate television's influence on children, we should be clear about who is being influenced. As every parent and teacher knows, a child is quicksilver—not today what he was yesterday, nor again what he will be tomorrow. There are light years of differences in the interests and responses of 6-year-old boys and 3-year-old girls. To the kindergarten child, high school possesses the remoteness of the planet Venus.

These differences, I think, make it important for all of us—parents, teachers and broadcasters alike—to tread softly when it comes to originating or endorsing broad generalities about the influence of television on children. The audience of children is not monolithic—it is a complex of different and disparate age groups, each bringing something different to television, each seeking something different from it.

There are, however, certain specific conclusions we can reach with reasonable assurance, based on extensive research conducted both within and without the industry. Primarily, children actively seek something when they watch television. A recent study stated that nothing could be further from the truth than the notion that children are sitting victims, and television bites them.

While much remains to be done in developing information in this area, some realistic yardsticks for measuring television's effect on children have emerged from such carefully researched books as "Television in the Lives of Our Children," by Wilbur Schramm, and "Television and the Child," by Hilde Himmelweit.

These studies show that children who watch television carry certain advantages with them when they enter school. They have larger vocabularies than the children who seldom or never watch television. They take more interest in hobbies; and they have a broader and more detailed knowledge of the world around them. Television-viewing children move increasingly toward good quality magazines. They read more of both general magazines and news magazines. Significantly, they also read books on a wider range of subjects. In the television decade, publication of juvenile books is up 200 percent, and library circulation is up more than 50 percent. One study of the subject has concluded that "book reading comes into its own not depsite television, but because of it."

I believe it is a reasonable assumption that television has helped the younger child in adapting to society. It has demonstrably improved his performance in the world of reality. It has also allowed him to peer through the window that opens on a world of fantasy, beginning with those simple hot-pursuit animal cartoons and ranging upward to more sophisticated entertainments, such as "The Wizard of Oz," Mary Martin's "Peter Pan," and "Walt Disney's Wonderful World of Color"—experiences enjoyed by millions of adults as well as children.

Because differing attitudes and purposes enter into viewing, different children seek different things from television. It constitutes a kind of vast living library to them, and they make their selections in the same way that they take books from a library shelf. The selections may please, bore or absorb, but the child generally is successful in finding what he is seeking.

Of course, some problems and conflicts are unavoidable. In attempting to satisfy many different appetites, television must also provide abundant and varied selections for grownups. This accounts in major part for the broad range of offerings on television—from westerns to situation comedies, from mysteries to dramas, from cartoons to news and public affairs programs.

Not every program can suit every taste. While most youngsters derive constructive pleasure or amiable diversion from television entertainment offerings, some children are impressionable to the slightest nuances or suggestions. An unfortunate few are neurotic or disturbed.

Let me give you an example of how entangled the best intentioned efforts can become. Experimental studies have been conducted to determine the effects of television on disturbed and delinquent youngsters. The findings are interesting. Certain situation comedies that showed children in a pleasant home with well-adjusted parental relationships were highly upsetting. The disturbed child never knew such home life could exist, and it was a deeply frustrating experience to see what he had not known. Yet it would be unreasonable to conclude that television should therefore eliminate family situation comedies. Were we to construct program schedules solely on the basis of suitability to all children, or to specified children with specific problems, we would penalize vast segments of the total audience.

As a father of three, I know what audacity it takes to propose an added child-rearing activity to a parent. But as a broadcaster, I suggest that television's role for children should be more than that of an auxiliary babysitter or pacifier.

PARENT AND TEACHER RESPONSIBILITY

Since time immemorial, parents have assumed responsibility for their children's food, dress, sleep, study and play. Is it because television is relatively new, or so much taken for granted, that many parents have not realized their responsibility for their children's viewing? Is this why many teachers have not become more active in guiding their students in the use of television as a tool for learning, as well as an instrument for entertainment? A recent study indicated, for example, that only one child in five had been asked by his teacher to watch any television program.

Yet informative and stimulating programing is provided by commercial broadcasters in far greater quantity and variety than many parents or teachers seem to recognize. This includes programs in the entertainment field, such as "Mr. Novak," depicting the life and times of a high school teacher, or a series based on the work of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, both of which NBC will launch this fall. It includes a wide range of documentaries such as "Encyclopedia of Communism," "The River Nile" and "American Landmark: Lexington-Concord," as well as regular and special news programs on current events and their significance.

Beyond these, broadcasters offer certain programs designed specifically as information vehicles for children. The NBC series "Exploring" represents an enlightening case history. In planning it to meet the requirements of children between the ages of 5 and 11, we did a good deal of careful preliminary research on structure and content—including the most suitable time period, the information, and interest levels of the different age groups, and their use of television.

We also supplied professionally prepared study guides to 260,000 teachers, outlining the subjects treated in each program in the series—mathematics, science, social studies, music appreciation, and language—so they could be coordinated with classroom work.

Recently, "Exploring" won a Peabody award as "an outstanding television series for youth and children." It also received the Thomas Alva Edison award for "Best Children's Program."

Yet it is a sad fact that "Exploring" reached only a fraction of its potential audience. One reason is that, although it is the most viewed of all comparable educational programs, it has difficulty matching the magnetic pull of competitive entertainment shows. Another reason would appear to be that teachers have not, through the use of study guides or other means available to them, done enough to encourage the viewing of "Exploring."

Little purpose would be gained if this meeting were to be used as just one more platform for the cataloging of shortcomings, yours and ours. But I do urge you, both parents and teachers, to acquaint yourself more thoroughly with the affirmative values television has to offer young people, and to guide your children and students in its use.

Only you, as parents, know your child as an individual and know what is best for him; only you can gage his sensitivities, his emotional range, his changing desires. You do not surrender to him the right to eat nothing but jellybeans every day, and by the same token, you can help balance his television diet as his needs dictate.

An affirmative role also falls to the teacher, who is perhaps the most important external influence in stimulating youthful viewing. You can encourage your students to watch programs of an informative nature. You can assign televised documentaries and news programs on the same basis that you now make assignments from the daily press.

As parents and teachers respond to this responsibility, and as more and more children watch the programs that you consider educationally and informatively appropriate, you will provide the broadcaster with a powerful stimulant for an intensified effort in this direction.

I have been dealing with commercial broadcasting, and with the ways in which you can guide your children and students into constructive viewing patterns. Beyond commercial broadcasting, television offers another resource for enlightenment, much smaller in its current dimensions, but with infinite promise if properly developed. This is the field of educational television, whose role has been under continuing discussion—a discussion which has become more spirited in recent weeks. I would like to outline my conception of its role.

UNIQUE OPPORTUNITIES FOR ETV

The function and potential of educational television vis-a-vis commercial broadcasting should not be confused by invoking such catchwords as "competitive" versus "supplementary" service, or "broad" versus "narrow" programing, or "cultural" versus "commercial" presentations. What is truly needed is an examination in precise and realistic terms of the contributions educational television can make, and the basis on which it can be supported.

A fundamental distinction between educational television and commercial broadcasting is the fact that the former is precluded by law from obtaining its financial support from the advertising of products or services. This imposes limitations on the scope of its operations, yet opens opportunities for it which are not feasible for commercial broadcasting.

Educational television, unlike commercial broadcasting, does not have the revenues to support a wide range of costly entertainment and information programs, including a comprehensive worldwide news service—all directed to a total public.

However, since educational television is not dependent on wide popular acceptance, it has unique opportunities. It has the opportunity to present in detail subjects which are of special interest to some members of the total audience. It has the opportunity for program experimentation which may initially attract a small number of viewers. And it has the all-important opportunity for formal instruction, as a major contribution to meeting the critical problems of an overburdened educational system from elementary school through college.

It is semantic futility to argue whether fulfillment of these opportunities results in a broad or narrow service. Educational television is by its very nature a specialized service, as compared with commercial broadcasting. But within its own framework and purpose, educational television can be as broad as the needs it fulfills.

Again, generalizations do not clarify the question of whether educational and commercial television are properly competitive. Both forms of television compete with each other, each in its own way, in seeking to engage viewer interest.

Viewed in this light, commercial and educational television are interacting, and by enriching each other, can enlarge the total contribution of television to the Nation. Commercial television is structured to attract vast audiences of all ages and educational levels; to bring significant aspects of our world to millions, through drama and music, through documentaries on art and science, history, geography and current affairs; and by doing so, to acquaint viewers with new cultural and intellectual experiences to which they may never have been exposed before. Educational television, on the other hand, has the capacity to explore areas in greater detail and to provide more intense involvement for viewers who have well-developed interests or professional needs; and to carry forward interests already awakened, in some cases, by commercial television.

Let me be specific. Within NBC's "Today" show, viewed daily by nearly 8 million people, the noted art critic Aline Saarinen has spoken challengingly and interestingly on various milestones in the history of art. Her recent illustrated discussion with Marcel Duchamps about the sensation his paintings created at the New York Armory show—a half century ago—prompted, I am sure, a real sense of curiosity among some viewers to know more about the art of this significant period. What more logical an area for educational television than to respond to such awakended interest with a series dealing in detail with the artistic explosion of the early part of this century?

This capacity of educational television to probe deeply and to develop in sophisticated detail subjects of special interest does not diminish commercial television's function of serving and stimulating mass audiences with cultural and informational programs. On the contrary, commercial broadcasting itself can benefit from those experiments which educational television has unlimited freedom to conduct.

Another vital area of educational television's potential is its enormous value as a teaching resource. At a time when all education is burdened by shortages of teachers and facilities, when educational requirements are outstripping conventional methods of instruction, the use of educational television as an integrated part of the educational system is not only indicated—but is imperative. It can bring an added dimension to the classroom through a variety of effective audiovisual techniques; it can shoulder a part of the teaching burden itself through inhome courses, and it can give the most gifted instructors exposure in thousands of classrooms instead of one.

A SOUND FINANCIAL BASE

In order for educational stations to realize their full potential in these areas of specialized need, they must establish a base of financial stability. No broadcasting enterprise can plan its future soundly if compelled to divert its creative resources into a search for miscellaneous and uncertain benefactions. The high enthusiasm quotient propelling educational television is not in itself enough to assure the future; it must be accompanied by sound fiscal planning on a long range and continuing basis.

This financial support, it seems to me, must come essentially from two sources: Viewers who value the specialized service of an educational station and are willing to contribute to its continuance; and educational foundations and institutions—including elementary schools, high schools, and colleges—that join with it as a teaching resource. It is particularly through the latter group that a financial base can be established for educational television, in addition to the important resources furnished by viewer contributions.

In my judgment, those who discount the teaching aspect of educational television would undermine one of its basic functions; and those who discount the educational community as a source for permanent financing of educational television are unrealistic in failing to recognize its need for stability and continuity of income. It is incredible to me that programs designed for the specific purpose of teaching should be regarded as unworthy of educational television's mission, or as doing violence to its cultural potential.

As parents and teachers, you can contribute profoundly to the maximum development of both the commercial and educational forms of television. You can do so by seeking out and selecting the best of all that commercial television has to offer you, your families and your pupils. As thoughtful citizens and as members of a respected and responsible organization, you can encourage the establishment and development of educational television in your communities and help with its financial support, individually and through your school systems.

Over 2,200 years ago, the Greek playwright Menander wrote: "Children should not be led into the right paths by severity but by persuasion." Together we can guide our children to the right paths of television viewing, not by severity and denial, but by the mutual persuasion of proper program development by broadcasters, proper program selection by parents and proper program assignment by teachers.

Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Detroit (Mich.) News of Sunday, June 2, chronicling the ineffective efforts of the Public Health Service and Federal agencies generally in the fight against water pollution, and indicating that 45 million fish were killed by water pollution in and near the United States in 1962 according to a Public Health Service report.

The two waters mentioned are interstate waters subject to pollution abatement under Public Law 660 which requires the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to go into and abate pollution of an interstate nature.

This is another example of failure of the Public Health Service to vigorously abate water pollution and is still further reason why an independent agency with sufficient vigor and ability to direct its own policies in the abatement of pollution is required.

The article follows:

FORTY-FIVE MILLION FISH KILLED BY POLLUTION

WASHINGTON, June 1.—About 45 million fish were killed by water pollution in and near the United States in 1962, the U.S. Public Health Service reported today.

The largest single kill noted in the report was 37.8 million fish destroyed in the Pacific outside the entrance to San Diego Harbor. This killing was blamed on a large amount of oil, known to be toxic to fish, which was dumped in coastal waters. The report did not say who did the dumping.

Within the States, the largest kill occurred in the Anacostia River near Washington last September when 3.18 million fish were killed by the dumping of about 40 million gallons of raw sewage during construction around the sewer system.

Of the 7 million fish deaths reported by 38 States and the District of Columbia, 3.3 million were blamed on domestic sewage, 1.1 million on industrial wastes, 700,000 on mining operations and 91,000 on agricultural poisons.

The report made no effort to evaluate the extent of sublethal pollution that destroys aquatic plant food or pollutants that taint fish flesh making it unacceptable for human consumption.

The 14th Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as one of the sponsors of civil rights legislation introduced by my party in January—the bill the New York Times International edition hailed as the strongest "rights bill ever introduced"—and the additional legislation last week, I continue to be greatly concerned with the potential inherently provided by the 14th amendment. I am absolutely fascinated, Mr. Speaker, that the present administration continues to talk about matters not germane to the real issues at hand. The serious rights struggle in this country, which is threatening to snowball in every direction, could be met head on with the proper application of this amendment. I am happy that the Washington, D.C., chapter of the NAACP has filed a suit seeking to compel Commerce Secretary Hodges and the Census Bureau to produce figures which will undoubtedly show that certain Southern States have not attempted to follow the provisions of the Constitution. It will be a case of "reviving a dead letter," as this excellent Boston (Mass.) Herald editorial of June 1, 1963, states.

I commend the editorial.

REVIVING A DEAD LETTER

The 14th amendment unequivocally provides that a State's normal quota of congressional Representatives (based on total population) be reduced in cases where the State denies or abridges the voting rights of male citizens over 21 except for participation in rebellion or other crime.

The reduction, according to section 2 of the 14th amendment is to be, "in proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State."

Thus, a State which disfranchised one in four males eligible to vote would lose one in four of its Congressmen.

The purpose of this post Civil War constitutional enactment, of course, was to discourage Southern States from denying the vote to otherwise qualified Negro men. (Women were not enfranchised until later.)

But the reduction-of-representation proviso has not worked. It has been a dead letter virtually since the time of its adoption in 1868, for Congress has not taken the initiative to implement it through explicit legislation.

And, to the present, civil rights groups have been unsuccessful in securing its implementation through the judicial process. In 1945, a Federal court dismissed a suit which sought judicial reduction of Virginia's representation in Congress, declaring the matter a "political question" beyond the power of the courts to adjudicate.

But the U.S. Supreme Court's recent requiring legislative reapportionment in Tennessee (*Baker* v. *Carr*) has—for better or worse, depending on one's point of view—propelled the high court into the very center of the political arena, thereby giving new hope to civil right supporters.

This hope is implicit in the suit filed by the NAACP the other day in the District of Columbia, seking to compel Commerce Secretary Hodges and Census Director Scammon to come up with figures reflecting appropriate reductions-in-representation for Southern States which continue to defy the Constitution in the matter of voting rights.

Whether or not this suit is successful, it will have served a healthy purpose. The NAACP is to be congratulated for calling attention to a major discrepancy between constitutional ideals and congressional practice.

Effective New Anticrime Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, because of the effective spadework that was done by our freshman colleague, the Honorable ROBERT MCCLORY, when he was a member of the Illinois General Assembly, it now appears certain that our State will have an effective new anticrime weapon.

It occurred to me that in view of the intense interest here in the Congress and at the national level in pursuing effective measures to curb crime and to control the criminal elements throughout our Nation that the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News would be timely and of particular interest to the entire membership.

It is indeed a tribute to Mr. MCCLORY's resolute determination to control the criminal element in our society and to make our neighborhoods safe for law-abiding citizens.

In any event, those who are interested in doing something about the mounting crime statistics will, I am confident, welcome this bit of news about this development in our own State of Illinois, and the prominent part played by our colleague, the Honorable ROBERT MCCLORY of the 12th Congressional District of Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial follows:

EFFECTIVE NEW ANTICRIME WEAPON

Victory now appears certain in the 10-year struggle to create an Illinois crime commission. Enabling legislation has passed both house of the legislature, and needs only minor reconciliation before going on to Governor Kerner for signature.

The 12-man commission, with its modest $100,000 appropriation, is not likely to blaze a dramatic trail at the outset. But it has the principal tools needed to wage effective war on organized crime and to make its impact increasingly felt.

The commission will be divided equally as to political parties. It will have a permanent director and staff. Armed with subpena power and the authority to cross county lines, it will be able to pursue its investigations statewide, in any field whatever. It can look into suspected encroachments of the crime syndicate into politics, labor unions, or business and industry. It can study and report on the efficiency of law-enforcement agencies.

As Representative Anthony Scariano, Democrat, of Park Forest, its house sponsor, declared, it will provide a tough new weapon to the people of Illinois who have been mainly "fighting organized crime with cornstalks."

The success of the measure is a triumph for Scariano and former Senator (now Congressman) ROBERT McCLORY, who vainly battered away at previous legislatures to bring such a commission into being.

The overwhelming votes given the project this year in both houses also betokens a new look in the legislature. We cannot infer that the traditional interceders for the hoodlum element have either disappeared or acquired religion; they're still around, representing the same viewpoint. But their voices have seemed somewhat muted in this session, and we take that to indicate an awareness that the public has grown a bit impatient with their heretofore brazen conduct.

Philippine War Damage Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, when the Senate amendment to last year's War Claims Act was briefly before the House on May 14, 1963, many Members felt that it should not be brought up as a rider to the supplemental appropriations bill, but should be considered in connection with legislation reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee. It will shortly come before the House in that manner as a result of the action of the Senate in adding it to the Foreign Service Buildings Act, H.R. 5207. It is now before a conference committee.

The Senate amendment changes last year's act—Public Law 87-616—by providing that any further payments shall go to the Philippine Government rather than to private claimants. It was adopted as a result of disclosures before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during its investigation of the Foreign Agents Registration Act—printed hearing of April 18, 1963.

Supporters of the Senate amendment believe that the disclosures in the Senate investigation compel such a change in the 1962 act. They contend that the Senate investigation disclosed that the activities of lobbyists and other having a personal interest in further payments to private claimants were largely responsible for nurturing and gradually building up an impression both in the Philippines and in the United States that the 1946 act resulted in a moral obligation to pay private claimants the full 75 percent of their approved claims; that there was no such moral obligation; that in this and other ways the lobbyists stirred up a demand for further payment of war damages to private claimants.

They contend that the above activities were much more than ordinary lobbying, and amounted to international blackmail. They contend that but for these and other activities and deceptions, the Congress would not have passed the 1962 act in the form in which it was passed, that is with provision for payments to private claimants; that the proper remedy is to adopt the Senate amendment; and that this amendment would be the most effective way of cutting off the payment of further fees to the lobbyists, would prevent windfalls to large private claimants, and would accomplish more nearly the purposes of the original act of 1946, which was to rehabilitate the Philippine economy.

The first question is as to what the activities of the lobblyists and their confederates actually were.

ACTIVITIES OF LOBBYISTS

Correspondence between Mr. O'Donnell in the United States and Mr. Delgado in the Philippines reveals the extent of their activities in stirring up a demand for further payments of war damages to private claimants. This correspondence was produced under subpena during investigation by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Foreign Agents Registration Act—hearing April 18, 1963.

Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Delgado had both been members of the Philippine War Damage Commission which adjudicated claims under the 1946 act. Mr. Delgado was the Filipino member. He was a man of large influence in the Philippines, and close to the Government. He had served as Resident Commissioner of the Philippines in Washington, as justice of the Philippine Court of Appeals, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Philippines Senate, as a Permanent Delegate for the Philippines to the General Assembly of the U.N.

I quote from this correspondence as follows:

January 13, 1952, letter to Francisco A. Delgado: "I am afraid that enthusiasm on the part of the interested parties and the Government here have cooled off. * * * I will discuss the subject in an effort to arouse enthusiasm and get the ball rolling."

February 9, 1952, letter to Delgado: "This is in response to your letter of January 22, requesting a copy of a list of about 120,000 claimants which matter you have referred to Mr. Charles. I regret that I have been unsuccessful in procuring these names. In connection with the war damage claimants, I discussed this matter thoroughly with Ambassador Romulo, who feels that if the final 22½ percent is to be realized, it can be accomplished, if at all, from this Congress. I know that the Ambassador will give us unqualified support in such an endeavor. It is regrettable that we did not make up this list before we left the Commission, but this is little solace now."

January 18, 1954, letter to Delgado: "Considering Magsaysay's popularity here, it would be my recommendation at this time that you work toward Magsaysay making a request upon our Government for this 22½ percent which has been promised as a matter of law. All of these actions, together with our work here, can keep this proposed legislation in the limelight and ready to move at the appropriate time."

October 31, 1955, letter to Delgado: "Insofar as Mr. Miller is concerned, you and I know that we used his services to keep the war damage legislation alive. He is one of the few who were left who were members of the Insular Affairs Committee that passed the original act and, perforce, he has great standing in the House * * *. I am at a loss to understand the action you report of others in endeavoring to interject other lobbyists into this picture * * *. I have worked for 4 years meeting with Members of the House and Senate on this proposed legislation * * *. Any deviation from this program I believe would be fatal."

May 7, 1957, letter to Delgado: "The climate here has been greatly improved insofar as the Philippines is concerned. Accordingly, I am having Congressman Miller reintroduce the war damage bill, which he will do within the next few days. A copy of his statement is enclosed herewith for your information."

March 10, 1958, letter to Delgado: "All in all, I believe that our next effort to obtain the actual passage of a law directing the payment of the balance of the war damage awards has a better chance than at any time during the period of our efforts to keep the subject alive by the introduction of bills in each Congress as it convenes * * *. What concerns me now is our position in the picture * * *. The only chance for legal counsel to be compensated for the efforts resulting in the legislation is through an advance arrangement with the major claimants * * *. I think we should get our ducks in a row at this time * * *. I [shall] proceed after you have made the arrangements aforesaid to adopt a definite plan of action in which I shall outline the part to be played by the claimants and possibly Government officials in promoting the legislation on a vigorous scale in the Congress."

May 10, 1958, letter to Delgado: "I am very much interested, indeed, in having the sugar companies which you enumerate as well as any other who might want to join, sign retainer contracts which will assure us of a position in the legislative picture as well as compensation if our efforts should meet with ultimate success."

January 27, 1959, to Jose Romero (Philippine Sugar Association): "As I advised you in my cable, unfortunately Congressman ZABLOCKI left Monday heading a congressional delegation to the funeral of the former chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Congressman Gordon, of Illinois. As you know, he is most friendly and as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Far East of the House Foreign Affairs Committee should be the natural one to introduce our bill. In this Mr. Miller and Majority Leader McCORMACK agreed. On the other hand, the Ambassador I know was very anxious to have this bill introduced while he was in the Philippines—thus my cable to you."

February 9, 1959, memorandum to Romero: "As I cabled you, ZABLOCKI wanted to wait until his subcommittee conferred with Bohlen in executive session next week before introducing our bill, but since Congress was adjourning for Lincoln's Birthday, I prevailed upon him to do it today. Miller introduced a bill simultaneously.

"The enclosed editorial from the New York Times of the 8th is very good and very timely. I hurriedly changed ZABLOCKI's introductory speech to accompany the bill, copies of which are enclosed, using the editorial to advantage."

February 10, 1959, letter to Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo: "Enclosed herewith please find a copy of H.R. 4311, introduced by Congressman ZABLOCKI, together with an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 9.

"The delay in the introduction of this bill was occasioned by the fact that the Congressman and I had to do much research with respect to the amount and other details of which you are only too familiar before embarking on this program."

February 9, 1960, cable to Don Manolo Elizalde, Philippine Sugar Association: "Interests of members the sugar association and all war damage claimants are greatly impaired by demands for direct payment of balance of $73 million to Philippine Government and reported insistence of Philippine Foreign Secretary on payment of 100 percent, amounting to more than $150 million plus expenses of administration. Members of Congress, who for years have favored appropriation for completing unpaid balances of war damages to claimants, are now vehement in refusal to participate in what appears to be political struggle among factions in your country and with United States * * *. Many Congressmen on the committee hearing our bills have publicly stated that irrespective of reported position of our State Department favoring same they will not vote for legislation to pay war damage funds in any amount to Philippine Government instead of claimants directly as originally intended. I strongly urge you and your association to advise your Government to take immediate realistic stand in support of Zablocki-Miller bills."

November 13, 1961, memorandum to Philippine Sugar Association: "The proponent of the bill (Zablocki) with whom the counsel for the Philippine Sugar Association has been and is in constant communication gave complete and conclusive answers to the arguments (before the House Rules Committee), but it was apparent that the congestion of the committee's calendar and the importance of some administration legislation, such as that providing for a Peace Corps, did not permit the members of the Rules Committee to give adequate consideration to these replies."

August 4, 1961, memorandum to Philippine Sugar Association: "It is anticipated that the war damage bill will be reported out favorably by the House Foreign Affairs Committee on Wednesday.

"In order to speed up its consideration I had today in the Senate introduced a similar bill by Senator Humphrey, of Minnesota, Democratic whip and a senior member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. As soon as this bill is printed copies will be forwarded to you. Attached herewith is Mr. Humphrey's statement as it appears in the Congressional Record of August 4, 1961."

It is clear from this correspondence that the activities of Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Delgado went far beyond ordinary lobbying. As a result of their experience on the Philippine War Damage Commission, they saw the possibilities of earning large legal fees if legislation were passed to provide further payments to private claimants. They embarked on a broad scheme with ramifications in the United States and in the Philippines to bring about such legislation.

It has even been charged that the cancellation by the President of the Philippines of his trip to the United States after the House defeated the Philippine claims bill on May 9, 1962, was part of a contrived scheme intended to point up the Philippine contention that the United States owed the money.

The correspondence quoted above justifies the charge that a powerful moving force behind the passage of the 1962 act was private gain rather than public welfare or national security.

MORAL OBLIGATION

The question whether there really was a moral obligation to make further payments to private claimants goes to the heart of the Senate amendment, as that amendment cuts off such further payments, and in adopting it the Senate denied any such moral obligation. The adoption by the Senate of that amendment implies that the evidence presented to show that the alleged obligation was a "promise," a "debt," a "legal obligation," was misleading, and based in part on reprehensible activities and undisclosed personal interests.

The question of moral obligation should be reexamined by the House in the light of the recent disclosures. In reexamining that question, the starting point must be the provisions of the 1946 act.

The Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 authorized the appropriation of $400 million, and authorized the Philippine War Damage Commission "to make compensation to the extent hereafter provided on account of physical loss or destruction of or damage to property in the Philippines occurring after December 7, 1941, and before October 1, 1945, as a result of various war activities, including enemy attack, action by the Armed Forces of the United States, and looting and pillage." It then provided—section 102:

> In case the aggregate amount of the claims which would be payable to any one claimant under the foregoing provisions exceeds $500, the aggregate amount of the claims approved in favor of such claimant shall be reduced by 25 per centum of the excess over $500.

The Commission was given discretion to make immediate payment of claims under $500, and the first $500 of larger claims, and a proportion of the remainder, due consideration have been given to total funds available for distribution. The act then provided:

> After the time for filing claims has expired, the Commission shall determine the amount of money available for the further payment of claims. Such funds shall be applied pro rata toward the payment of the unpaid balances of the amounts authorized to be paid pursuant to section 102 of this title.

What this somewhat complicated language amounts to was that $400 million was to be disbursed by first paying claims under $500 in full, and the first $500 of other claims, and the balance of the money was then to be used pro rata in payment of larger claims up to 75 percent. The money was sufficient to pay them only up to 52½ percent.

Any fair appraisal of the committee hearings and reports would indicate that the primary intent of the act was to provide for the disbursement of $400 million, and that there was no intention to create an obligation to pay up to 75 percent.

The whole emphasis of the 1946 act was on rehabilitation of the Philippine economy, and the report of the House Foreign Affairs Committee stated:

> The bill is not a private claims measure to reimburse individual or organizations for damage incurred in war. The primary function of the payments is to assist and encourage rehabilitation and rebuilding of the economy and social structure of the Nation.

Contemporaneous evidence indicates that the 1946 act did not create an obligation to make further payments beyond the original $400 million. The much-respected Bell mission to the Philippines of 1950 felt that the 1946 act imposed no such obligation, as it recommended:

> That further war damage payments to individuals would not contribute materially to economic development in the Philippines, and that continuing assistance by the United States should be for development projects in agriculture and industry related to the specific needs of the Philippine economy rather than as additional war damage payments to individuals.

Since then over $1.5 billion of U.S. aid has gone to the Philippines, and Philippine people are drawing $80 million a year in benefits from the Veterans' Administration for widows and other beneficiaries.

Other contemporaneous evidence is the failure of the Foreign Affairs Committee to report out a bill on which it conducted hearings in 1950 to authorize further funds in order to bring payment of Philippine war claims up to 75 percent. The committee must have felt that its action only 4 years before had not resulted in any obligation to make these further payments.

Other contemporaneous evidence indicated that there was general appreciation in the Philippines of the payments made under the 1946 act, and that there was little demand for further payments until that demand was stirred up by lobbyists.

Our Government in 1959 concluded that there was no obligation to make further payments to private claimants. Mr. Dillon, then Under Secretary of State, testified to this effect on February 25, 1960, before a Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Part of his testimony was quoted by the subcommittee chairman at page 7041 of the Congressional Record of April 30, 1963, but other parts are also material.

He said that President Garcia on his visit to the United States in June 1958 discussed with him the settlement of 19 Philippine claims against the United States, 1 of which was for "additional war damages." Mr. Dillon testified:

> We do not think that there is any legal obligation to do this. We think that the appropriation of the original $400 million at that time was a complete act.

He went on to explain, however, that the circumstances were such that there could have been misunderstanding about this, and that when the Philippine Government made a series of claims, "we felt this one had certain merits and that we should in all justice ask for appropriation of enough money to take care of it."

In August 1959 the administration agreed upon a settlement with the Philippine Government under which the United States would pay $73 million to the Philippine Government, subject, however, to a set off of a United States claim against the Philippines of about $20 million. This $20 million was in fact paid April 10, 1961. Foreign Relations Committee hearing June 12, 1962, page 20.

Mr. Dillon wrote to Speaker Rayburn on March 3, 1960, recommending legislation to carry out this settlement, submitting a draft bill, and saying:

> The executive branch believes that rebuilding, replacement, or repair of war-damaged private property in the Philippines is no longer practicable. Moreover, in view of the time which has elapsed since the original claims were approved, and since the U.S. Philippines War Damage Commission went out of existence on March 31, 1951, it is not considered practicable for the U.S. Government to assume any responsibility for the payment of the balance of approved individual private property claims.

The Foreign Affairs Committee, however, reported in June 1960 a bill—H.R. 12078—providing for further payments to private claimants. That bill was not reported out of the Rules Committee, and the Foreign Affairs Committee in August 1961 reported a similar bill—H.R. 8617. This was defeated in the House on May 9, 1962, but the House subsequently passed another similar bill—H.R. 11721—which became Public Law 87-616.

The above facts, and particularly the contemporaneous evidence, are persuasive in showing that there was no moral obligation to pay approved claims up to the full 75 percent.

The Senate investigation has shown that the claim that there was a moral obligation was largely promoted and contrived by lobbyists and others having a personal interest. These same people spearheaded the testimony before the committees of Congress in support of the alleged moral obligation, without disclosing their personal interest.

It is true that there were some members of the 1946 committee who wanted to provide for payment of the full 75 per cent, and much has been made of their statements. But the hearings, reports and debates of 1946 show that the majority of the committee did not go along with them.

The vote of the Senate on May 1, 1963, of 58-26 to pass the amendment to the 1962 act was in effect a vote that there was no moral obligation. Members should read what was said then, and what was said when the question came up again on May 23, 1963.

THE HOUSE SHOULD ADOPT THE SENATE AMENDMENT

From the facts stated above as to the activities of the lobbyists, and as to the nonexistence of a moral obligation to make further payments to private claimants, it is clear that if the recently disclosed facts had been known to the House in 1962, it would not have passed the 1962 act in the form in which it was passed, that is with provision for payments to private claimants.

If so, the proper remedy is to amend the act in the manner provided for in the Senate amendment. It will be asked why, in view of all of the above facts, the proper remedy would not be to rescind the 1962 appropriation and not pay the money even to the Philippine Government. A motion was made in the Senate on May 23, 1963, to bring about this result, but was defeated 45-22.

The reason why the $73 million should be paid to the Philippine Government is that our Government agreed with the Philippine Government in 1959 upon such a settlement. Mr. Dillon's testimony on this subject was discussed above in considering the question of moral obligations and the fact that this settlement denied any moral obligation to make further payments to private claimants.

It was there pointed out that Mr. Dillon testified that the Philippine claim for additional war damages was brought forward by President Garcia in 1958, that the administration then felt that the 1946 act might have given cause for misunderstanding, and that it was desirable to settle the issue.

It is not relevant to wonder whether, if the facts since disclosed had then been known, this settlement would have been made. However that may be, our relations with the Philippines on this subject have progressed to the point where it would be highly undesirable to rescind the 1962 appropriation entirely.

If the $73 million is paid in a lump sum to the Philippine Government, that Government will receive it without strings, and can use it either for payment to claimants, or for economic rehabilitation, or in such other manner as it deems fit. Such a result will fulfill more closely the purposes of the 1946 act than would the payment of huge windfalls to private claimants, which would result if the Senate amendment is not adopted. And our Government could properly take this $73 million into consideration in making further provision of economic or other aid to the Philippines.

Senator Sparkman has strongly confirmed the statement made above that Congress would not have passed the 1962 act in the form in which it was passed had the facts since disclosed been known at that time. He presided over the Foreign Relations Committee during practically all of its hearings on the 1962 act. The committee had before it bills for further payments to private claimants and for a payment directly to the Philippine Government. He stated that had he known the facts which have since been disclosed:

> I certainly would not have voted for that bill (the payment to private claimants). I would have voted for the bill which would have provided payment directly to the Philippine Government. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7161.)

The Senate acceded to this view and passed its amendment providing for payment directly to the Philippine Government on May 1, 1963 by a vote of 58-26. On May 23 it again passed the same amendment, attaching it to the Foreign Service Buildings Act, this time on a voice vote.

CONCLUSION

In view of the facts stated above as to the activities of the lobbyists and as to the nonexistence of any moral obligation to make further payments to private claimants, the House should certainly not approve further payment to private claimants which would confirm the results secured by the reprehensible activities which have been disclosed.

Those disclosures indicate that passage of the 1962 act was secured as a result of a broad scheme, international in scope, pursued by devious methods. There is still time to undo the results so achieved by passing the Senate amendment. Merely cutting off further fees to lobbyists is an insufficient remedy. House Members should not place themselves in the position of confirming the results secured by the lobbyists by the means which have now been disclosed.

The House should accept the Senate amendment.

Employment for Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to record the contribution made by private industry located here in the Nation's Capital in securing employment for the visually and mentally handicapped workers living in the District of Columbia.

One such firm, the Chloraseptic Co., has been a leader among private companies in providing employment for these workers.

For almost 3 years, the Chloraseptic Co. has contracted with the Columbia Lighthouse for the Blind and the occupational training center by having professional supplies of their product packaged and prepared for mailing by the workers of these two organizations.

For visually handicapped workers alone, this has meant that over 20,000 hours of gainful employment, during the past year, was provided by this single, relatively small pharmaceutical firm.

And it is a pleasure for me to report that this company's worthwhile effort has not gone unnoticed. On January 23, 1963, Secretary of Commerce Luther C. Hodges presented the first Columbia Lighthouse Citation of Merit to the Chloraseptic Co. and its officers, Dr. Robert I. Schattner and Samuel Schattner, "for recognizing the capabilities of the visually handicapped in their employment practices."

It is important to note, too, that the contracts made by the Chloraseptic Co. with the Columbia Lighthouse for the Blind and Occupational Training Center have alerted other private companies to the possibilities of employing visually or mentally handicapped workers for various jobs.

What is the history of this company and what has its experience been with employing the visually and mentally handicapped of the District of Columbia?

As reported, in part, in Pageant magazine in February 1962, one summer evening back in 1952, at a party on Long Island, a man complained to a dentist friend that he was in misery—he had had several teenth extracted that afternoon.

Later, the stocky, 27-year-old dentist—Dr. Robert I. Schattner by name—started thinking about his friend's complaint. And he decided to try to do something about it.

After years of doggedly persistent research on his own, Dr. Schattner succeeded in discovering an effective remedy for post-extraction pain.

But that was not all.

Ironically, Dr. Schattner discovered that his new painkiller had a far more important use, and one he had not dreamed of: as an antiseptic in killing germs.

Dr. Schattner's new discovery can bring relief to painful tissues in 15 seconds, and within hours it is reducing the bacteria count. This one-two punch, some scientists say, is not duplicated by any other medicine or germicide. By 1957, he finally achieved a preparation that was both nontoxic and nonsensitizing. In 1960, scientists at Tuskegee Institute in Alabama found that Chloraseptic—the trade-mark name its discoverer gave the drug—relieved throat pain in 200 cases of eight types of ailments, ranging from acute tonsillitis to inflamation of the mouth and tongue.

Dr. Schattner's discovery was not only proven to be a fast painkiller. The original clinical tests showed that it was also effective as a germkiller.

Early in 1960, the Chloraseptic office was moved to Washington, D.C. The little firm began to grow slowly.

During this time, the product was given to employees of several Government agencies, who found it relieved sore throats quickly. Several Congressmen tried to ease their throats after oratory. All reported excellent results.

Twice, the fledgling firm was rescued by loans from the Small Business Administration. The second loan came within hours of bankruptcy at a time when the company had substantial professional orders for the product, but no immediate funds for bottling. At the last moment, a bank vice president, Mr. Frank Gunther, had enough faith in the discovery to advance the funds before they were actually approved by the Small Business Administration. He is now the president of the bank.

The number of those endorsing the new preparation reads: "dentists, 21,905; physicians, 18,480; and industrial nurses, 390."

Bernard Posner wrote in Performance, the publication of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, September 1962 issue:

HANDICAPPED MAILERS TWICE AS FAST

Last year, a Washington, D.C., antiseptic manufacturer contracted with a commercial concern to mail samples to 170,000 doctors and dentists in the United States. The samples went out at the rate of 4,500 a day.

This year, the manufacturer turned to the handicapped for help. The output more than doubled, going to 10,000 a day.

According to Samuel Schattner, vice president of the Chloraseptic Co., there was need for speed. The samples had to go out in time for the "sore throat season" in hope that the product would be recommended for wintertime's sniffles and sneezes.

And so the company turned to the Sheltered Workshop for Mentally Retarded Adults and the Maryland Workshop for the Blind, both in Baltimore. The former prepared cardboard boxes for mailing: blind workers in the latter inserted sample bottles and literature, sealed the packages, put on labels, and sorted the boxes by State (using an ingenious system involving sense of touch).

"Our use of the handicapped was not based on sympathy, but rather on a sensible business decision as to how the job could best be done," said Mr. Schattner.

The Catholic Review on April 7, 1961, reported in part:

MERCY DOCTORS REPORT FINDINGS

The *Hope* ship, which is currently serving the underdeveloped countries of South America with a team of physicians and dentists, carries a supply of Chloraseptic sufficient for 1 year's needs.

Requests for supplies of Chloraseptic have also come from our Armed Forces in various parts of the world and the Supreme Court Clinic.

And so, without much fanfare, a new medical advance has come into being. With this product, the handicapped have been given new employment opportunities and recognition.

Let Freedom Really Ring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, Americans will soon be celebrating Independence Day, our greatest patriotic observance of the year.

July 4, 1963, will be unique in that a new national observance of bellringing throughout the United States is planned. Every city, town, village, and hamlet will ring bells at the exact time the Liberty Bell announced the signing of the Declaration of Independence in 1776.

A very fine editorial appearing June 5, 1963, in the Terre Haute Tribune amply explains why this symbolic bell ringing can and should be the basis for a new rebirth of patriotism and Americanism.

Under unanimous consent, I request this outstanding editorial be reprinted in full. The editorial is as follows:

LET FREEDOM REALLY RING

July 4, 1963 (at 1 p.m., c.d.s.t.) will mark the beginning of a new nationwide observance of the anniversary of American independence.

The bells of America in every village, town, and city across mountains and prairies will peal forth in a resounding chorus of the Nation's heartbeat of pride in freedom. It will mark the identical hour upon which the Liberty Bell announced the signing of the Declaration of Independence in 1776, to proclaim freedom throughout the land.

The Tribune believes that there has been perhaps, too much time and space devoted among platform, pulpit, and press, to both the rightwing and the leftwing, which terms are an obvious reference to our symbolic American eagle.

The Tribune believes that the strength of America lies neither in the right nor the left wing, but in the great body of the eagle that stands between and clutches in its talons both the unleashed arrows of war and the olive branch of peace, which in turn and justly used, have made and kept the freedoms for which our Founding Fathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. There, in the great body of old-fashioned, but never out of style, patriotism lies the glory of the heroic dead whose memory we so recently honored on Memorial Day.

Therefore, the Tribune commends the idea that the Nation as a whole salute the ideals of freedom for which our dead gave their lives. It praises the sponsors of the idea; it commends all who cooperate, and urges whole and complete participation in the program.

"Let's ring the bells again—let freedom really ring."

The Federal Budget and the National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of all my colleagues in the Congress the very informative speech on "The Federal Budget and the National Economy" by the Director of the Budget, the Honorable Kermit Gordon, to the 13th annual conference of the National Society for Business Budgeting on May 16 in San Francisco.

In his lucid and enlightening speech, Mr. Gordon discusses two major questions in any examination of our Federal budgetary policy.

Whether we are using the Federal budget wisely to attain our Nation's goals of continued prosperity and of a satisfactory economic growth rate, and whether the Federal Government is spending too much.

Mr. Gordon's speech was called to my attention by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Douglas Dillon, and I would like to insert his thoughtful letter into the RECORD as an introduction to the text of Mr. Gordon's speech. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to introduce both Secretary Dillon's letter to me and Mr. Gordon's address into the RECORD.

Mr. Dillon's letter follows:

JUNE 7, 1963.

The Honorable HALE BOGGS,
House of Representatives.
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HALE: As you requested, I am happy to send you a copy of the very excellent speech Director of the Budget Kermit Gordon made on May 16.

With logical analysis and a wealth of supporting detail he has cogently restated the two most significant facets of the President's overall financial plan. First, he has shown why tax reduction and revision in 1963 is the prime tool in the kit of measures to restore economic vitality and achieve an adequate rate of economic growth. Second, he has reiterated the hardheaded program of expenditure control that embodies the Government's determined commitment to prudent financial management.

I commend his speech to your careful study.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

The text of Mr. Gordon's speech follows:

THE FEDERAL BUDGET AND THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

(Address by Kermit Gordon, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, before the 13th annual conference of the National Society for Business Budgeting, San Francisco, Calif.)

When I took office as Budget Director last December, my predecessor handed over to me the combination to the safe, a $98.8 billion budget for the next fiscal year, and his commitment to address the National Society for Business Budgeting on May 16. In the intervening months we have made some changes both in the combination to the safe and to the 1964 budget, but I am pleased to say that the engagement with this society has remained inviolate.

I consider it a stroke of good fortune that my first speaking engagement outside of Washington should be with a distinguished organization of business budget officers. I have heard it said that only a man who has suffered the affliction himself can really understand the ordeal of a friend with a case of shingles. There must be a similar bond of compassionate understanding among budget officers. I can look at you and say to myself, "It's comforting to think that these people have probably lost as many friends as I have in the last 5 months." And you can look at me and say to yourselves, "No matter how many headaches are waiting for me when I get back to my desk, I'll still be lucky compared with this fellow."

With the reassuring knowledge that we are united in the bond of a common burden, let me turn to the subject of my talk. I want to examine the two major questions which people have in mind when they discuss and debate Federal budgetary policy. The first of these is the fiscal policy question: Are we using the Federal budget wisely to help achieve the broad economic goals of sustained prosperity and a satisfactory rate of economic growth? The second is the expenditure policy question: To put it in its bluntest form, is the Federal Government spending too much?

I. FISCAL POLICY

In the heat of public debate about spending, taxes, deficits, and debt, I think we sometimes lose sight of the fact that we have achieved in the United States a rather broad consensus in support of the idea that Federal budget policy should be designed to help compensate for inadequacies or excesses in private demand. Most of us, I think, will accept the idea that if total private and public demand for goods and services presses too hard on total supply, we will have inflation; that if demand falls considerably short of potential supply, we will have idle plants and idle workers; and that it makes sense to try to adjust the relationship between Government spending and taxes to help avoid both of these evils.

Those who doubt the existence of such a consensus should consider whether there would be much support today for the kind of policy we followed in 1932—given the same conditions. In 1932, you remember, the economy lay prostrate under the onslaught of the great depression. Real gross national product was 28 percent below the 1929 level, and nearly one worker in every four was unemployed. Because of the collapse in production and incomes, Federal revenues fell 50 percent from 1929 to 1932, and largely for this reason, the 1929 budget surplus turned into a 1932 deficit.

The Congress considered what it ought to do in the circumstances. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee said on the floor of the House:

"Now, my friends, I want you and the country to gird yourselves with stamina, with backbone, and with courage to meet this emergency. All must make tremendous sacrifices. The budget must be balanced. To do it, additional taxes must be levied."

So Congress proceeded, in 1932, to raise income taxes. This action was in accordance with the prevailing doctrine of the period, which held that the only sound rule of fiscal policy was to try to balance the budget each year. Indeed, the conviction of Congress that it was doing the right thing was reinforced when it received a communication bearing the signatures of 62 faculty members of a great university urging an immediate increase in taxes. But the result, almost certainly, was to aggravate and deepen the depression. The fact that few people today would urge the same policy in the same circumstances is evidence that we are not as deeply split on the issues of fiscal policy as the temperature of the debate might suggest.

In saying this, I have no desire to paper over the many major differences of emphasis, attitude, and prescription which do exist; but I think it is useful, as we turn to an examination of our present economic problems, to recognize that we start from the common premise that Federal budgetary decisions should be made in the light of the needs of the economy.

What is the present state of our economy? If we look back only to the beginning of the year, we find reassuring signs of a quickening pace of economic advance, which gives promise of bearing out the more optimistic forecasts of GNP in 1963. If we look back further—to January 1961—we find a 28-month record of uneven, but sustained, economic expansion from a recession trough.

But if we look back as far as 1958, we find a more revealing and sobering picture. We find an economy that has been operating considerably below its potential for 5½ years. Even now, with more than 2 years of expansion behind us, we are producing at a rate $30 to $35 billion a year below our comfortable capacity; the average operating rate in manufacturing is perhaps 10 percent below the preferred rate; and more than 5½ percent of the labor force is unemployed.

Whether we look at total output, employment, or investment, the evidence of slowdown since 1957 is clear. In the postwar decade 1947–57, our total output rose at the brisk rate of about 4 percent a year; since 1957, our progress has slowed to 3 percent. In the postwar decade, unemployment averaged 4.3 percent of the labor force; since 1957 it has averaged 6 percent, and has not in any month fallen below 5 percent. From 1947 to 1957, private fixed investment averaged 11 percent of GNP; since 1957, it has fallen to an average rate of 9 percent.

A persistent gap has opened up between our achievement and our potential, and in many subtle ways we have been paying a high price for our lagging performance. Our growth rate compares unfavorably with that of most other industrialized countries. The overhang of idle capacity has dampened domestic investment incentives and has encouraged the flow of American capital abroad, with consequent strain on our balance of payments. High unemployment rates among our youth have bred discontent and frustration. Our chronically depressed areas have been denied the rejuvenating effects of a strong demand for labor, which would tend both to attract new industry to areas of labor surplus and to draw idle labor into more prosperous regions. Because of the absence of good alternative employment opportunities, many of our agricultural workers continue to earn low incomes and our underlying farm problem persists. In a stubborn effort to save their jobs, workers seek to institute restrictive work rules and to shorten the workweek; and some industries, in a similar effort to insulate themselves from the general economic climate, seek to price their goods so as to earn normal profits on subnormal volume.

The immediate cause of our unsatisfactory economic performance these last 5½ years is, in my opinion, inadequate total demand. We have simply not been able to sustain a rate of climb in demand sufficient to absorb our unemployed and put our idle capacity back to work. The effort to diagnose this condition has led to a search for remedies, and this search has led directly to our Federal tax system.

We are weighed down by the burden of an income tax system which, though modified somewhat, is still essentially the system we adopted to restrain excessive demand in wartime. Its power to extract income from the bank accounts of individuals and corporations is so great that the Federal budget would have shown a string of handsome surpluses rather than deficits in the years since 1957 if the economy had been operating close to full employment. We have been witnessing the paradoxical truth that tax rates set so high as to absorb an excessive proportion of full employment GNP will block the road to the achievement of full employment and will yield disappointingly low revenues. In the six budget documents submitted from January 1957 through 1962, a cumulative budget surplus of $8½ billion was forecast; yet the actual budget outcome was a cumulative deficit of $33 billion. In each year of the past six, revenue estimates were based on an expected resumption or continuation of brisk economic expansion—and in each year the dampening effects of the tax system helped to keep the estimate from being realized.

This, very briefly, is why we believe that the needs of our economy require a substantial further revision of our income tax system in 1963. I stress the need for further revision to remind you that tax changes instituted last year—the liberalization of depreciation rules and the enactment of the 7-percent investment tax credit—had the effect of reducing business tax liabilities by about $2½ billion a year and started us on our way toward the adoption of a growth-inducing tax system. You will remember that these tax changes were greeted skeptically by the business community when they were instituted; but the skepticism has melted in the presence of hard evidence that business investment this year is responding to the stimulus of these tax reforms.

The President's tax program which is now before the Congress has the following main elements:

1. Taxes are to be reduced by $10½ billion, in three stages, during 1963, 1964, and 1965.
2. The $10½ billion net cut is made up of $13½ billion of gross tax reduction offset by $3 billion of revenue-producing reforms. In turn, the $13½ billion gross reduction consists of roughly $11 billion in personal and $2½ billion in corporate taxes.
3. The top braket rate of the individual income tax to be reduced from 91 to 65 percent and the lowest bracket rate from 20 to 14 percent.

The tax program has two major objectives: First, to provide a sizable increase in market demand by sharply reducing overall tax rates; and second, to provide a tax structure, through sharp cuts in top-bracket rates and reduction in corporate taxes, which will encourage increased risk-taking and a higher tempo of business investment. It is thus a program which will narrow the gap between performance and productive potential, while at the same time stimulating a more rapid growth in that potential itself. The President's tax proposals constitute the most important economic policy issue before the Congress this year, and I am glad to say that the prospects are bright for the enactment of a constructive and invigorating tax program.

But, many people ask, is this the right time to cut taxes? Rather than cutting taxes when we already have a big budget deficit, shouldn't we defer tax reduction until we have a surplus in the budget?

This is an important question, and it deserves a straight answer. The answer, in my opinion, has two parts:

First, I believe we are more likely to reach a balanced budget in the next few years if we cut taxes now than if we do nothing. If we fail to act, we risk a continuation of the experience of the last 5½ years—undercapacity operations and excessive unemployment. An economy operating at undercapacity is unlikely to generate the tax revenues needed to balance the budget. It is instructive to note that we have had budget surpluses six times since the war, and in every case save one the surplus has occurred in the setting of full employment. Our experience lends support to the view that it takes full employment to generate the revenues needed to balance the budget. If we cut taxes now, we will have a somewhat larger immediate deficit, but a better prospect for reducing and eliminating the deficit in the years ahead through the increase in tax revenues returned by an expanding economy.

Second, if we were by some chance to achieve a balanced budget without a tax cut, we would probably find that a tax cut in such circumstances would be badly timed. As we have seen, balanced budgets and full employment tend to go together. Unless a slump is in prospect, to cut taxes in a setting of full employment and high utilization of capacity is to court the danger of excessive demand and inflation.

Another main objection which is raised to tax reduction at this time stems from the fear that the immediate deficit associated with tax reduction will cause inflation. This is a legitimate concern; the American people fear inflation, and properly so. Moreover, there are times when a Government deficit will cause inflation: When demand is pressing against the limits of supply, a reduction in taxes or an increase in Government expenditures will tend to raise prices. But there is no alchemy by which deficits are automatically transmuted into price increases; it is the state of the economy which determines whether deficits will cause inflation. For example, we have deficits in five of the last six years, but our price level has been more stable than that of any other advanced industrial country with the exception of Canada. The reason, of course, is that at no time in this period have we had the pressure of excess demand. Although the President's tax program is designed to stimulate private demand, we do not believe that it will overstimulate demand and cause it to overtax capacity. Even if excess demand pressure should develop—though we think it most unlikely—the tools of monetary policy can be brought quickly into play to damp down the pressure.

Hence, whether one appeals to economic logic or to recent economic history, there is little basis for the fear that the President's tax program is inflationary. The opposite danger is greater—that failure to enact the tax program will leave us with the same set of economic ills which has troubled us for the last 5½ years and will increase our vulnerability to recession.

I do not mean to leave the implication that the President's tax program is the solution to all of our economic problems. I do believe, however, that the enactment of the program will help to create a climate of economic vitality and expansion in which many other problems—ranging from agriculture to automation—will be easier to solve.

II. EXPENDITURE POLICY

Now, I would like to turn to the expenditure policy question: Are we spending too much? Is fiscal responsibility dead in Washington? Is the budget out of control?

These are questions which trouble a good many thoughtful people, and they deserve a considered answer.

We can start by acknowledging the fact that Federal spending has been increasing steadily. As President Kennedy said last year:

"It is true that in recent history each new administration has spent much more money than its predecessor. Thus, President Roosevelt outspent President Hoover, and with allowances for the special case of the Second World War, President Truman outspent President Roosevelt. Just to prove that this was not a partisan matter, President Eisenhower outspent President Truman by the handsome figure of $182 billion. It is even possible something of this trend may continue."

But to ask whether we are spending too much implies a comparison with something. Simply to compare dollar expenditures in 1963 with expenditures in 1923, or 1953, or even 1962, overlooks the fact that we are today a different nation than we were in any of those years. Our needs are constantly changing, our resources are constantly changing, and even the unit of measurement has changed from earlier years.

In his 1960 budget message, President Eisenhower made the same point: "Inescapable demands resulting from new technology and the growth of our Nation, and new requirements resulting from the changing nature of our society, will generate Federal expenditures in future years * * *. We must not forget that a rapidly growing population creates virtually automatic increases in many Federal responsibilities."

Here are some examples: Between the fiscal years 1962 and 1964, the number of tax returns will rise 2.5 percent; the volume of mail will grow 6.4 percent; visitors to our national parks will increase by 7 percent; the number of veterans or survivors receiving pensions will rise by 10 percent; aircraft landings and take offs at airports with Federal towers will go up by 11 percent; beneficiaries under the old-age and survivors insurance program will increase by 16 percent; the number of patents granted will rise by 20 percent; and passports issued will increase by 25 percent.

Consider what has been happening to our population. By the end of fiscal 1964—the budget for which we are now debating—there will be 10 million more Americans than there were the day President Kennedy took office. This means that we will add to the United States in this short period a number of people which is more than half the population of Canada. And since 1939, we have added to our population a number of people substantially greater than the present population of France.

Consider, also, the growth in our output of goods and services—our gross national product. Measured in the same current dollars we use to count Federal expenditures, our GNP has increased more than fivefold since 1939. It has increased 57 percent in the last decade.

Finally, each Federal expenditure dollar buys less today than it did in earlier years. Though we have had relative price stability for the last 5 years, our price level has more than doubled since 1939 and is about 10 percent above its level a decade ago.

The single most important fact about the trend of Federal expenditures over recent decades is the vast expansion of our national defense program, which now takes 55 percent of our budget. Who in 1939 even dreamed of atomic energy, of missiles, of supersonic planes, of a cold war with 2,700,000 servicemen in uniform during peacetime and defense research budgets of $9 billion? Our defense budget in 1939 was 1 percent of gross national product, in 1949, 5 percent, and in 1963, 9 percent.

But apart from national defense, Federal budget expenditures have been tightly contained in recent years. As a proportion of gross national profit, they are substantially lower today (at 7 percent) than they were before the war in 1939 (at 9 percent) or after the war in 1949 (at 10 percent). Even including national defense, Federal budget expenditures in recent years have been remarkably stable as a proportion of GNP; during the latter 1950's, they averaged about 16½ percent of GNP, and that is where they are today.

Nor do the statistics give much comfort to the common view that the Federal Government is eclipsing and eroding the State and local governments. A quarter of a century ago, nondefense expenditures in the Federal budget were just about equal to total State and local expenditures; today, these Federal expenditures are about 60 percent of State and local expenditures. Of the more than 9 million civilian employees of governments in the United States today, about 7 million are employed by State and local governments, and 2,500,000 by the Federal Government. Since 1948, State and local employment has risen by 81 percent, while Federal civilian employment has risen by 22 percent—or by less than the rate of growth in the population as a whole.

In 1952, we had 1.6 Federal civilian Federal employees for each 100 people in the population. By 1957, the figure was down to 1.4. Today we have 1.3 Federal employees to serve every hundred people.

Let me add that, of these 2,500,000 Federal civilian employees, 1 million are employed by the Defense Department, about 600,000 by the Post Office Department, and about 200,000 by the Veterans' Administration. Everything else that the Federal Government does is accomplished by 650,000 employees, and this number is substantially smaller than total employment in the telephone industry.

But what about the trend of expenditures in the budgets of the Kennedy administration? The 1964 administrative budget calls for a $4.5 billion increase in expenditures over 1963. The whole of this increase, indeed, more than the whole of the increase, is accounted for by expenditures for national defense, space, and interest. All other expenditures, taken together, will actually decline from 1963 to 1964. In the process of putting together the 1964 budget, $19 billion was trimmed from agency requests.

If all three Kennedy budgets—1962 through 1964—are looked at together, they tell essentially the same story. The great bulk of the increase—actually 70 percent of it—has been in the defense, space, and interest category. Over the 3-year period from 1961 to 1964, budget expenditures for all other purposes taken together will increase by $4.5 billion. This compares with an increase of $5 billion in the same category over the preceding 3 fiscal years.

These figures lend little support to the assertion that the budget is "out of control." Just a week ago today, President Kennedy explicitly endorsed a statement of the Committee for Economic Development which said: "We believe that Federal expenditures should be made only when they are clearly more valuable than equal expenditures that could be made by individuals and business if equivalent income were left in their hands, or by State and local governments." And the President continued:

"I accept this standard and I am prepared to defend the expenditures proposed in my budget on this basis."

To sum up, I believe that this administration has proposed a fiscal policy which gives promise of restoring to the American economy the confidence and vitality which characterized our first postwar decade. And I believe that we have pursued a prudent expenditure policy which has responded to the urgent needs of national security and domestic well-being, but which has neither indulged in loose spending to give the economy a shot in the arm nor countenanced spending for the sake of spending. I am sure that we have erred in matters of detail, and I know that we can profit from informed and responsible criticism. But I believe that our budget policy is serving faithfully and constructively the interests of our national economy, our national security, and our national well-being.

Unemployment U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Howard K. Smith's TV program "News and Comment" is always a fine one, but I thought the program presented on Sunday, June 2, was particularly timely and of special interest to those of us now giving careful consideration to legislation designed to improve the unemployment situation existing today. I commend this script to my colleagues for their careful perusal in the event they missed the actual presentation:

UNEMPLOYMENT U.S.A.

The United States has the richest standard of living in the world—and it is still rising.

At the same time, the United States has the highest rate of unemployed, idle, unproductive humanity in the Western World—and that, too, may rise.

The eminent American economist, Robert Heilbroner:

Mr. HEILBRONER. If all forces stay more or less as they are, including this most important force of a rising number of kids seeking jobs, we could very well have around 10 million unemployed people by 1970.

The man in charge, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz:

SECRETARY WIRTZ. Unemployment is going to get worse and worse and worse. And the projection is quite clear, and what we have got to expect is it will go toward 6 percent and 7 percent within the next 2 or 3 years. That's if nothing is done.

The two biggest new categories of unemployed are young people and Negroes. Edward Washington, who belongs to both categories, admits boys like himself are ripe for trouble.

E. WASHINGTON. You would get into trouble with the police if you dropped out of school and can't find a job. These days boys around my age like to have clothes, and money and then that leads up to robbery.

DON DIXON. You mean if they can't get work?

E. WASHINGTON. Yes, sir.

DON DIXON. They'd get the money some other way?

E. WASHINGTON. Yes, sir.

Tonight, "News and Comment" on the causes—and the possible cures—of the spreading American cancer: unemployment.

Mr. SMITH. Good evening. It is notoriously difficult to get the U.S. Congress to act on our national problems until after catastrophe has struck. The great depression of the thirties might have been avoided or mitigated had Congress faced its responsibilities in time. World War II, which killed more humans than any war in history, might have been avoided had Congress acknowledged and faced the problem of stopping Hitler while he was weak.

Today in the face of growing new problems, Congress is almost asleep. As a result there is no doubt that a new catastrophe is abuilding. What form it will take this time is not certain; but very possibly it will be a series of violent social explosions in the midst of our cities. The current rise of crime five times as fast as population—robberies, muggings, rapes—is the merest harbinger of bigger troubles to come.

As suggested in this cartoon by Herbert Block of the Hall Syndicate:

The detonator or fuse will be unemployment, idleness, national neglect of strong young restless Americans entering the work force but finding no jobs.

The way of intelligent behavior is to study a problem before it becomes one. So Reporter Don Dixon went out and interviewed 16-year-old Edward Washington, a polite, well-read young Negro school dropout who cannot find a job. Washington had not fallen victim to the bitterness growing among increasing numbers of idle youth, both Negro and white, but with frustration it can come.

DON DIXON. When did you leave school, Edward?

E. WASHINGTON. I left school in February of this year.

DON DIXON. Why?

E. WASHINGTON. Because I didn't feel that I had the proper clothes to wear like other boys had, you know, and I thought I would get out—come out of school and get me a job and get the clothes I want to wear to school.

DON DIXON. So, have you been able to get any kind of job at all since you left school?

E. WASHINGTON. No sir.

DON DIXON. What sort of work were you looking for?

E. WASHINGTON. A busboy. Some kind of domestic work like that.

DON DIXON. Is that what you would like to do? Why did you decide to go look for a busboy's work?

E. WASHINGTON. I decided to go look for a busboy job because in looking through the papers that was the only thing I seen in looking in the ads.

DON DIXON. What would you like to do? What sort of job would you like to get?

E. WASHINGTON. I would like to be a printer or something like that.

DON DIXON. Is there a demand here for printers do you know?

E. WASHINGTON. No, sir.

DON DIXON. Well, if you did get a job as a busboy, what sort of money does it pay?

E. WASHINGTON. It pays 25 a week. $25 a week.

DON DIXON. You can't very well live on that.

E. WASHINGTON. No, sir.

Mr. SMITH. How big is the unemployment problem? Leading officials say when 2 percent are unemployed that, in fact, constitutes full employment and that should be our target.

Some economists say 3 percent is good enough, and we should aim at that less difficult figure of unemployed workers.

President Kennedy's economic advisers think we cannot quickly get down to that figure, and say getting it down to 4 percent unemployed is an interim goal.

In fact, unemployment today hovers around the figure just below 6 percent which everyone agrees is far too high.

And you heard experts predict that if things go on as at present, the figure will soon rise to 7 percent and more—a percentage that can grow to 10 million without work, nearly as many as in the great depression.

Why, in our increasingly rich Nation are increasing numbers condemned to the frustration of joblessness, a prospect that threatens us with social upheavals, with recessions and even with losing the competition with communism.

The simplest statement of why unemployment exists is our increasing productive industry does not distribute enough purchasing power for people to buy up all the inceasing output of industry.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, once a professor of economics, thinks artifically high prices keep the public from buying enough of industry's output.

Senator DOUGLAS. I think if we had a perfectly competitive economic system that prices would be reduced to the point where there would be a sufficient quantity of goods and services demanded to employ 6½ or 7 percent who really are unemployed now. But instead of that, we have a high degree of monopoly, price agreements between firms, imperfect competition and cartels. And as a result, prices are kept up on stilts and the sum total of price tags on goods which are produced, or which could be produced is in excess of the sum total of monetary purchasing power in the pockets of people. So I would favor, as an immediate step, building purchasing power up to the level of prices.

Mr. SMITH. William F. Butler is vice president of Chase Manhattan Bank. He puts the problem differently: lack of stimulation to the economy has caused growth to lag.

Mr. BUTLER. It seems to me that the basic cause has been the slowdown on our rate of overall economic growth after 1957. In this period our growth rate has been a little better than 2½ percent per annum and this is not a fast enough rate of growth to provide the number of jobs necessary to deal with the unemployment problem.

Mr. SMITH. Leon Keyserling, who was President Truman's chief economic adviser: productivity has risen by automation much faster than purchasing power.

Mr. KEYSERLING. You have an increase in your productive power and your social prosperity has to increase fast enough to take up that increase in your productive power. What we have had in the past 2 years is a rate of growth that looks good, but only about half as high as the rate of growth needed to absorb the growing size of the labor force in view of the increasing technology in automation.

Mr. SMITH. James Callaghan of the British Labor Party being groomed to run the British economy as Chancellor of the Exchequer sums up the causes of unemployment.

Mr. CALLAGHAN. First of all you get changes in traditional industries, where industries decline and leave areas semi-abandoned and derelict. Secondly, you get the failure on the part of the Government to pick up sufficient purchasing power to put it into the hands of the people. I think that's a very important reason. And, thirdly, of course, you can get external problems that can infect your own domestic economy.

Mr. SMITH. The cause of unemployment is lagging demand—not enough money to buy up goods at a time when automation is increasing the number of goods being turned out; this happening at a time when the number of people hunting jobs has suddenly leaped upward.

Economist Robert Heilbroner:

Mr. HEILBRONER. It's the fact that the big bunchy baby boom has moved up and now bunches and bunches on the labor market, upon the colleges also, by the way. That creates a very special problem, and they are very important problems. There's a real chance that if we do not rev up our growth rate very considerably, that in 5 or 10 years we may face a level of unemployment that can only be called darned serious.

Mr. SMITH. Unlike the foregoing speakers who are commentators on the problem, the man who has the problem is Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz. We asked him why unemployment currently is up.

Secretary WIRTZ. Because there are so many more of us. Every day. Every year. In the last 12 months we have added over a million jobs—about a million jobs to the economy. So employment goes up and unemployment goes up too. That's the center of the problem. The postwar baby crop which busted out the walls of the schools is now hitting the work force. That, plus the effect of machines on the economy, represents a short answer to your question.

Mr. SMITH. Now, why is it that we did so well from the war up to 1957 and relatively much less since 1957?

Secretary WIRTZ. Well, when you say so well that the economy is moving along right now at a good rate in terms of gross national product and so on and so forth. But something that people forget is that the impact of automation on the economy came during those fifties, when the work force growth was low because of the war and the postponed effect from it. Now we are getting the confluence of both automation and the increase in the economy, so even though the economy as a whole is doing well in terms of full employment, we are not doing well.

Mr. SMITH. How many jobs do we have to create each year?

Secretary WIRTZ. We have to create for the next 4 or 5 years a million and a half new jobs each year to take care of new people coming into the work force. It's growing that fast. In addition to that, we have to create jobs to replace every job which a machine takes away. Now, that's a hard figure to arrive at, but it's running right now between 25,000 and 30,000 a week. And in addition to that, we have got to create jobs which will bring our present unemployment down from—oh, about 5½ percent to the figure 4, 3, 2, hopefully. The combination to these means the answer to your question. Something in the neighborhood of 2 million jobs a year for the next 4 or 5 years. It's a big order.

Mr. SMITH. Now you have been quoted as saying that even though we don't have enough jobs to go around, the amount of work to be done in this Nation is tremendous and that we could use all the people we have if we would use them sensibly. What about that?

Secretary WIRTZ. If we would set out to do the things we want to do in this country—some things in the private sector: pulling up the low incomes to the level they ought to be; some things in the public schools we ought to meet; the hospitals; get rid of the slums; we could have a manpower shortage in this country very easily, if we set out to do the things we can do, want to do, and a good many of them we will do. That's where the answer will come.

Mr. SMITH. The problem of getting enough purchasing power to the people to stimulate industry to employ more people is crucial. In America in the depression thirties, unemployment remained high because with all the Government spending, not enough was spent.

In America after World War II the situation was the opposite. War put a stored up purchasing power equal to a hundred and fifty billion dollars in Americans' pockets, and they spent it. Also, rising expenditures of the Marshall plan and the cold war injected more purchasing power. The result was a period of full employment.

The year 1957 is the year the postwar boom is considered to have ended. Surplus purchasing power was used up. Defense spending continued to rise but it went no longer into industries turning out masses of weapons and employing millions of workers; it went into new weapons requiring fewer high-paid workers. Also, to reduce rising labor costs, industries automated at a furious rate, reducing the need for manpower. And now the postwar baby crop is coming of age, demanding more jobs faster.

To illustrate the problem: this is a schematic oversimplified design of how the economy works:

One, the consumer buys goods;

Two, the store then orders more goods from the factory; and

Three, the factory invests in increasing its plant in order to make more goods this employs more workers and puts money into hands of consumers.

But now, the new plant is automated and employs fewer people, distributing less money. Flow of dollars, once swift, from consumer to store, now slows down too.

The store orders less from the factory.

The plant cuts down on its production, causing unemployment.

The debate about what we should do involves dissension about where we should restimulate the flow. Robert Heilbroner thinks the flow should be stimulated at the investment point:

Mr. HEILBRONER. Today if you had to put your finger on the buyer in the economy who is not so much the consumer, it is business. Business buys for capital expansion. Business is buying new plants, new buildings, new machinery. That's the sector which is, in a sense buoyant enough, but disappointing. It could be higher.

Mr. BUTLER. The problem in our economy for 6 or 7 years has not been a lag in Government spending. Government spending has been going up 6 percent for a year on the average. The lag has been in business investment in new plants and equipment. The investment that provides new and better machinery and thus supports the creation of new jobs. Such investment if not increased in this 7-year period has been steady. Our problem is to provide the incentives, the encouragement to increase investment in new plants and equipment and thus achieve real and lasting prosperity.

Mr. SMITH. Economist Leon Keyserling disagrees. He thinks the stimulus should be aimed directly into the pockets of consumers.

Mr. KEYSERLING. The reason business isn't investing still more is that they do not foresee enough more demand for their products to invest even more rapidly than they are in the building of plants and equipment. Therefore, the whole concentration of stimulatory policy, in my view, should be on the expansion of consumption, demand for other products. That takes two forms: consumption among 180-odd million American people, privately, and consumption by Government—public spending—of the things that a nation needs and can't get privately.

Senator DOUGLAS. I would say that the remedy is to raise purchasing power to the level of prices. This does mean an increase in the national debt, because it would be effected either by cutting taxes without commensurately cutting expenditures or choking off private demand through curtailing credit, or by a public works program. In either case what you do is put an injection of monetary purchasing power into the economy to build up total demand.

Mr. SMITH. The President's plan is aimed to please both those who want him to stimulate investors, and those who want him to stimulate the consumers. His plan is a tax cut and a tax reform that will give both investors and consumers more money to spend. Like many plans aimed to please everybody, it may please none.

We asked the investor's man, William Butler, if the President's plan will solve our problems:

Mr. BUTLER. No; I do not believe it will. It seems to me that the President's tax program is spread out over too long a period—3 years or longer in the case of the corporate tax—and this dilutes its impact so that it will not do the necessary job.

Mr. SMITH. Keyserling, who prefers to stimulate the consumer:

Mr. KEYSERLING. I don't think the tax program itself will do very much to help this problem. First, because it is too small. Second, because I think it isn't distributed in a way that will maximize its effectiveness. And third, because I think many other things besides taxation are even more important than tax reduction to deal with this unemployment problem.

Mr. SMITH. We have never hesitated taking stands on this program and won't hesitate now. I think Mr. Keyserling is right. The economy is sluggish and doesn't provide enough employment for people because about one-fifth of Americans live in poverty and haven't enough purchasing power to give the economy the stimulation it needs. The logical thing to do would be not to have a feeble tax cut to benefit well-off people who don't need it. The logical thing would be more Government spending to get money to the bottom one-fifth of Americans, spending on their sadly neglected education, on replacing their slums with decent neighborhoods, and so on.

However, even the President's rather weak tax cut is getting nowhere in Congress. What is it that impedes action to cure what the President has called our No. 1 domestic problem—unemployment?

The tendency of unemployment to rise amid our great wealth can only be halted and reversed by vigorous action, especially by Government spending which will no doubt increase our deficit. There is a deep-rooted and wrong American prejudice against Government spending and deficits. Almost every modern American President has deferred to that prejudice with calamitous results.

In the early thirties, President Hoover thought that restricted Government spending would bring prosperity just around the corner. In fact, it deepened depression.

It is easy to forget that Franklin D. Roosevelt's winning campaign in 1932 was that he would balance the budget and restrict Government expenditure. He became famous for doing the opposite, but not enough to end the depression.

In the 1952 campaign, Eisenhower promised one thing—to balance the budget. In office he failed to do that 5 years out of 8, and created the biggest peacetime deficit in our history, but in trying to obey the myth presided over a series of recessions.

Kennedy's key campaign promise was to get the economy moving. He has not notably succeeded, and that is greatly due to not facing the need for much more Government expenditure.

British Politician James Callaghan offers an apt comment on deficit spending.

Mr. CALLAGHAN. We show a deficit you know. But by altering the way which we made up our accounts we could show a profit if we wanted to. And we do confuse, I think, capital items with revenue items. Where's the profit when you put in a sewage scheme or when you build a school? There isn't any but it shows a deficit. And yet these are capital items which are going to yield a return, although not a direct financial return.

We are altering our system of accounts in Britain because we want to make this more clear. We've been held up to the world as running very heavy deficits. By altering the accounts we needn't alter our policy. We will just look better. This is absurd you know, really, and I do think we've got to be very careful not to become the prisoners of words on this question of deficit financing.

Mr. SMITH. Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz.

Secretary WIRTZ. I think in connection with these programs we propose the Manpower Development Training Program, a better education program, a youth employment act, that kind of thing, we are told that the cost is such that we can't afford it. I wish I could someway get across the idea that it would cost us today—does cost today—just in round figures about a thousand dollars to retrain a man, to salvage a boy or girl who would otherwise go into the slag heap, about a thousand dollars. That boy or girl will represent a cost to this economy of this country of about a thousand dollars a year if we don't train him or her.

The economics someway get out of joint.

When I hear about the concern of passing debts on to the next generation, my reaction is that the worst possible debt we could pass on the next generation is a boy or girl who is untrained and who is going to cost the next generation a $1,000 or more a year. That is the debt we can't pass on. The thing that we can't get across, apparently, is that a good many of the things we do as a Government are the kind of things companies do as companies; they invest in the future. And the investment cost should not be charged against our present concept of expenditures.

If we could get across the idea that when we train a person, put $1,000 into the education of a person, it is an investment for the future. When we build a park, when we build a highway, when we build a school, when we build a hospital, those things are investments for the future and shouldn't be charged against the present. It's not just a matter of deficit spending. It's a drawing of the distinction between immediate out-of-pocket costs and the investment thing. I agree, in principle, with what is suggested. I think it would be better if it were put in terms which got away from the idea of deficit spending. That's an oversimplification.

Mr. Smith. We asked Secretary Wirtz, will we get full employment back.

Secretary Wirtz. That's a question the American public will have to answer. My answer to it is that we can get it down there. It takes the decision to do the things we want to do. But I'm talking, not—I'm talking hard business sense. If we do set out to do these things, if we develop a tax program, a manpower program and do these things we want to do, I think it can be moved down past the 4 percent, 3 percent, toward the 2 percent which is probably the ultimate limit because there are always people moving from one job to another and there are always a few who can't be employed. I think it is a practical target to shoot for 3 percent and a 2 percent.

Mr. Smith. Some friendly advice from British politician Callaghan.

Mr. Callaghan. I think yours is a tough problem. I think you have got to educate. Could I make one general plea: that we shouldn't, any of us, allow ourselves to become the prisoners of words and of old-fashioned ideas no matter what they are. The real test is how are we going to make human beings live and fulfill all their values and all of the qualities of which they are capable? And we ought, if we find our ideas are destroying human beings and their right to survive, then we ought to be willing to put those ideas on one side.

Mr. Smith. We have nothing to add that will improve on that. Good night.

Bokaro Steel Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of June 1, 1963:

BOKARO STEEL DECISION

The stage is being set for a clash between President Kennedy and Congress over the biggest foreign aid project we have ever undertaken. It is a proposal that the United States should spend $891 million of the taxpayers' money to finance the construction of a government-owned steel mill at Bokaro, India, 150 miles northwest of Calcutta.

President Kennedy is on record as favoring the project. At his May 8 press conference he noted that India needs steel and added: "I would think we could assist if it meets what the economy of India requires. I think we ought to do it."

There is oppoistion to the project in Congress, in part because of district of Prime Minister Nehru's neutralist policies, his seizure of Portuguese Goa by force and his refusal to agree to a plebiscite to determine the future of Kashmir.

The opposition has been reinforced by the report of the foreign aid investigating committee headed by Gen. Lucius Clay. That committee said the United States "should not aid a foreign government in projects establishing government owned industrial and commercial enterprises which compete with private endeavors." The committee reasoned that the way to get development is to keep government out, that otherwise the fear of political pressures and price and tax restrictions would discourage investment by private enterprise.

India already has five steel mills, three owned by the government and two privately owned. The three government-owned plants were built with foreign aid help, one by West Germany, one by Soviet Russia and one by Britain. But all five do not produce enough steel to meet India's needs.

For several years Congress has been spoiling for a fight over foreign aid. The Bokaro project could touch it off in the form of an amendment to the foreign aid bill specifically barring the Bokaro proposal, or prohibiting aid for government enterprises which compete with privately owned business.

U.N. Secretary Peddles Communist View to American Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, for those apologists for the pro-Communist official statements of the U.N., I refer them to the following editorial appraisal of a commencement address by the Secretary General, U Thant, to the graduating class of Mount Holyoke College. How far will the American people permit an organization based on our soil, largely financed by our taxpayers to go on giving lipservice to the cause of our enemies?

U THANT AGAIN

The Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, used the occasion of a commencement address at Mount Holyoke College to unload another of his patented apologies for communism. To hear him tell it, communism is a friendly and innocent system, content to live and let live, and the world environment is poisoned by unjust suspicions of its aims.

Mr. Thant did not have the effrontery to name the principal culprit as the United States, but that was most certainly the thought in his mind. It was, he said, a "psychological or emotional frame of mind" that produces wars.

"This state of mind, fed daily by mass media propagating sensationalism and suspicion," he said, "develops into a condition bordering on obsession, which renders peaceful settlement of disputes difficult if not impossible."

As Mr. Thant derives his large tax-free income by residing among us, it may be taken that this is his characterization of American media. It is not within his mental compass that all media in Communist countries are harnessed to the propaganda purposes of the state and give vent to a constant stream of vilification against those standing in the way of a Communist takeover.

Nor are the rocket rattling speeches of Khrushchev or the usual threatening orations of Red military leaders on such occasions as May day exactly in harmony with the Thant thesis that hostility and hatred are preached only in the West.

"History," said the Secretary General, "is full of examples of religious intolerance, but the ideological fanaticism that we see today seems to me sometimes to be even more implacable, and certainly more deadly and dangerous to the human race, than the religious fanaticism which marked the history of past centuries."

This might be taken as an adequate characterization of communism, but if you think that Thant meant it to be so, you will be obliged to guess again. For the Secretary General's remarks must be read in the context of an incredible speech which he delivered December 2, 1962, at John Hopkins University.

In that appearance he described the amelioration of communism from Stalin to Khrushchev, describing Khrushchev as committed to the thesis "not of the inevitability of war, but of the imperative of competitive coexistence." Thant embelished this appraisal with the suggestion that we settle such contrived controversies as that relating to Berlin by a process of give and take with the Communists.

As Prof. Hans J. Morgenthau of the University of Chicago has remarked, "How do you bargain with a nation which believes in the universal triumph of communism and regards itself as charged with the mission of bringing about your doom? What can you give a nation by way of compromise if that nation is bent on taking all?"

At Mount Holyoke, Thant wound up with the vision of a neutralist world governed by a world authority developing through the U.N. out of the needs of its largest and most powerful constituent members. This is fantasy, for how can the United States and the Soviet Union ever make common cause when their spirit and motives are irreconcilable?

Cuban Subversion in Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, for many months now, the world has been awakened to the tremendous degree of communist subversives who, trained in Cuba, are spreading destruction throughout this hemisphere. The most recent nation to feel the sting of Castro's marauders is Canada—a nation that continues to do business with Communist Cuba.

The recent bombings in Quebec, the subject of an excellent Miami Herald editorial of June 4, 1963, and which I insert in the Record following my brief remarks, should further awaken nations dealing with Castro to the insanity of their position. Trading opens the door to subversives. It makes their dirty work child's play.

Any nation doubting Castro's aims in this hemisphere should examine closely the Canadian episode. It offers the clearest proof possible that when trading with Castro, the bonus is subversion and sabotage.

The Miami Herald editorial herein referred to follows:

A CUBAN EXPORT—TO CANADA

One sentence stands out in a dispatch from Montreal reporting that police arrested eight suspects in the recent wave of bombings in Quebec:

"They said the leader was trained in Cuba."

A later account called him "a 33-year-old Belgian trained in terror tactics in Communist Cuba."

The others were said to be mostly between 19 and 22 years old. One was described as a mechanic who fabricated the bombs.

In making the arrests, police confiscated 50 sticks of dynamite, detonator caps, fuses, timing devices, and wires.

These details are meaningful. So is the gang's method of operating, even to its name, the Quebec Liberation Front (FLQ). The stated purpose of the FLQ was to force the secession of French-speaking Quebec from the other Canadian provinces.

The announced aim played on the longstanding desire of French Canadians for a larger voice in their nation's affairs. Any other grievance would have served as well. But the real aim of such terrorists always is the same—to foment hatred, strife, and disorders.

The FLQ boasted of its crimes. One of its bomb victims was a 65-year-old night watchman. Another was an army sergeant barely alive after losing his left hand and suffering severe brain damage while trying to defuse a bomb planted in a residential mailbox.

The gang also claimed credit for blowing up a section of railway track in the path of Canada's Prime Minister, and for a $35,000 army payroll robbery in which a soldier was shot six times by a masked bandit carrying a submachinegun.

If all this sounds familiar, it is. The liberators of Quebec were following the same pattern as their counterparts in Venezuela and elsewhere in Latin America. The difference is that good police work in Canada, by peace officers and soldiers, put the suspects behind bars and "broke the back" of the gang, in the words of a police official.

The formula is the kind that comes straight from Communist training camps in occupied Cuba: Send one trained terrorist anywhere in the Western Hemisphere. Give him an appropriate arsenal, or money to acquire it. Let him use any handy local issue to recruit young hotheads. Launch the reign of terror.

The sequel in Canada should be as instructive as the opening chapters. South of the border Americans will ask again: How long do we tolerate the three "C's" in our hemispheric alphabet: Castro's Communist Cuba?

Touch Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House should have an opportunity to read James Reston's column that appeared in the New York Times for Sunday, June 9, 1963. Mr. Reston is not a partisan critic of the President. He speaks of President Kennedy from a sympathetic and knowledgeable base.

I particularly call attention to this paragraph by Mr. Reston:

> The President's appeal, somehow, is to the mind of the Nation and not to its heart. He defines the problems of race, unemployment and education, but doesn't came to grips with them. He is a tactician but not a teacher. He plays touch government: he seems to touch everything and tackle nothing.

Under unanimous consent I include the entire column at this point:

TOUCH GOVERNMENT

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, June 8.—Almost every political crisis in the Nation is a time of opportunity as well as danger, and this is particularly true of the current racial crisis.

The country has been startled by the conflict in the streets. It is now paying attention. The opportunity, therefore, has come for leadership at every level—National, State, and local—to break through the barriers of prejudice and indifference and sweep away the intolerable injustices to the American Negro.

Here the leadership of the President is critical. He cannot do it alone. He needs the help of the Congress, the Governors, and the public and private leaders of every community, North and South. But the job of creating a working majority of the people for change, of bringing the feelings of the fairminded majority of the Nation to bear on public legislation, is undoubtedly his.

THE LEADERSHIP PROBLEM

There is something wrong with his leadership on the homefront. Something is missing in his speeches, his press conferences, his trips, and his timing. He is not communicating his convictions effectively, and it is important to try to analyze why.

The President's appeal, somehow, is to the mind of the Nation and not to its heart. He defines the problems of race, unemployment, and education, but doesn't come to grips with them. He is a tactician but not a teacher. He plays touch government: He seems to touch everything and tackle nothing.

There is something too cool about it all. He gives the country statistics about the Negro—17 percent Negro unemployed in Chicago and only 5 percent white, etc.—but he doesn't convey the humiliation or the ache in the heart.

This is a just and decent country. It may be confused about taxes and missiles, trade and budgets, Federal and local power, but on human questions like the right of a Negro to buy a sandwich at a drugstore counter or a spend a night without embarrassment at a hotel, the vast majority is obviously for equality.

President Kennedy has never seemed to believe much in appealing to the spirit of the whole Nation. He thinks in blocs. He concentrates on institutions, on the leaders of associations, and on the representatives of the people rather than on the people themselves.

He is, in short, political rather than philosophical, more given to manipulation than education. But the fact remains that manipulation has not succeeded. The people like him but do not quite believe in him enough to support him openly. The Congress admires his political skill but does not follow his policies.

DIFFUSING THE IMPACT

His trip into the West this weekend illustrates the point. The main thing on his mind when he left here was the racial crisis, in which he needs the support of the majority of the people and of the Republican Party. But he did not speak in a single forum where he could be heard by the whole Nation, and he did not concentrate on the race issue, but mixed it up with military policy and a Democratic fundraising political rally in Los Angeles.

The result of this is not to inspire disinterested concentration on the central race question, or direct the attention of the whole Nation to the race problem, but to disperse an enormous amount of personal energy over local audiences and different subjects, including the raising of funds to defeat Republicans whose support he desperately needs in Congress if he is to get any civil rights legislation at all.

The surprising thing about this is that the President knows how to concentrate on a single subject and focus the attention of the whole Nation on it. He has done so in the past on the Berlin crisis and the Cuban crisis. The national television audience is available to him almost any time he requests it. He can present his civil rights program to a joint session of Congress, and again arrest the attention of the whole Nation. All will listen if he carries his civil rights battle into the South or the racial jungles of northern cities. But he has done none of these things.

Something, then, is obviously wrong. When the Chinese write the word "crisis," they do so in two characters, one of which means "danger" and the other "opportunity." But the opportunity in the present racial danger is not being exploited and part of the reason is that the leadership is well meaning, but ineffective.

Reviewing Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, very soon the House will consider the foreign aid authorization bill, subject at this time to recent review by the Clay Committee.

The Philadelphia Bulletin on June 5, editorially commented on the need for review of foreign aid. I insert this timely editorial into the RECORD at this time:

REVIEWING FOREIGN AID

Sixteen years ago today, on June 5, 1947, General Marshall, then Secretary of State, delivered the commencement address at Harvard. It must have been the most influential speech ever given at a graduation exercise, for in it he launched the idea of foreign aid.

The war was over, and war measures like lend-lease had ended with the coming of peace. What Marshall now proposed was something new. Let the nations of Europe, laid waste by the conflict, agree on a European recovery program, and the United States would be prepared to finance it. The offer extended to the Communist nations (who quickly spurned it) and to former enemies like Germany and Italy, as well as to faithful allies.

Now, after 16 years, Europe no longer needs assistance, except for our participation in NATO, a strictly defense operation. But, in the meanwhile, the idea of foreign aid has been extended to cover (1) nations directly threatened by Communist aggression; (2) nations ostensibly undecided between East and West, who get help in the hope that it will keep them out of Moscow's orbit; (3) new nations struggling to get on their feet; (4) underdeveloped nations all over the world.

Congress is now reviewing foreign aid, and many close observers have said bluntly that we must reduce substantially the budget requests of the administration. It is undeniable that serious errors and miscalculations have marred the program's record. Some could not be avoided, but others grew out of theories that have failed to prove themselves. For example, 16 years of experimental foreign aid has not shown that a Tito, a Gomulka, or any other Communist can be converted by making his path smooth for oppression.

Nor can we congratulate ourselves on the career of a hostile neutralist like Sukarno. Perhaps the effort to win him over was worth a try. But now that the money is running out in this country, and we are faced with the necessity of establishing priorities, if something must go, experiments which have failed should be among the first programs to be terminated.

Another field under scrutiny is the advisability of financing adventures in public ownership, like a steel mill for India, just to show our good will.

There are critical areas in the world—one right at our doorstep, in the Caribbean—which can use foreign aid money expended in our own self-interest. There are others where actual fighting is going on, and where our interests are vitally engaged. After they have been taken care of, allocations for other purposes should be examined with cool objectivity. The fact is, that our continued loss of gold and hard foreign exchange has created an emergency which cannot be separated from the outgo of foreign aid money and goods from this country. The United States can no longer afford the pleasant role of rich uncle to all the world.

Education Dragging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on June 5, Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel delivered one of the finest statements on the problems of American education that I have ever seen. Delivering the commencement address at my alma mater, Boston University, Commissioner Keppel pointed out the need for constant attention to the improvement of the quality of our teachers and our educational product, as well as the quality of our classrooms and instructors. The significance of the search for quality and excellence can never be overemphasized.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article by John Chaffee, Jr., which appeared in the Boston Herald on June 6 discussing Commissioner Keppel's address:

"EDUCATION DRAGGING," WARNS KEPPEL: 2,482 AWARDED BOSTON UNIVERSITY DEGREES

(By John Chaffee, Jr.)

The Nation lacks a much-needed sense of urgency regarding the adequacy and quality of its schooling, U.S. Education Commissioner Francis Keppel said yesterday at Boston University's first outdoor commencement.

Only 6 months after assuming the task of directing the Nation's education effort, Keppel said he has found in Washington only vague agreement that something ought to be done about improving the quality of schooling in America.

WAITED TOO LONG

Federal aid to education must be raised from a "desirable domestic goal to a deadly serious necessity," the former dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education told a crowd of nearly 20,000 at Boston University field.

"A basic question is not whether our schools and colleges are better than those of the past—they are—but whether they are good enough for the future—they are not," Keppel said.

"Knowledge and technology are moving so rapidly that only progressively faster and better learning can succeed in keeping individuals a jump ahead of ignorance," Keppel warned.

"Much of what was true yesterday is already obsolete or old fashioned today; and much that seems important today must be reevaluated tomorrow."

The commissioner then told 2,482 degree candidates that they were already partly obsolete.

"We have waited too long," he insisted. "We are face to face with a problem that must be solved at once or our national future will be in jeopardy.

"We cannot be satisfied with yesterday's brand of education for tomorrow's world."

LARGEST IN TWELVE YEARS

Keppel was one of 10 honorary degree recipients at exercises for Boston University's largest graduating class in 12 years.

Director Sargent Shriver and the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, many words of praise have been heaped upon the Peace Corps since its inception 2½ years ago. They have come from world leaders and some of the original critics of the Peace Corps within this country. In every instance of praise, bouquets are also tossed to Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver for his faith, vigor, and persistence in organizing what many said could not be organized, training the young people who did want to serve humanity selflessly, and winning worldwide acclaim for the United States and the idealism of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I think that my colleagues will be interested in a recent article by the noted columnist, Holmes Alexander, printed in the Boston Herald on May 29, 1963, concerning the Peace Corps and Director Shriver.

The article follows:

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?—IS PEACE CORPS MERELY SHRIVER?

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—It's fair to say for Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, that he now carries the undeserved handicap of being a Kennedy in-law.

Any other Frontiersman who had proved his administrative ability as Shriver has in a minor post would have been promoted long before now. But the Cabinet is closed to him because a Kennedy is already there. The governorship of Illinois is presently blocked by local political complications. Shriver seems likely to keep his present post until after next years' elections.

Meanwhile, imitation being the sincerest form of flattery, Shriver is being internationally complimented in a manner that no administration figure can boast. Eight nations are in the process, or on the verge, of forming volunteer oversea agencies on the American Peace Corps model. West Germany has appropriated $1.4 million for the purpose, and is expected to hold some sort of inaugural ceremony when President Kennedy, accompanied by Shriver, visits there next month. Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, and New Zealand have made starts. Italy, Switzerland, and Belgium are discussing ways and means with Shriver. Honduras, El Salvador, and Jamaica are instituting domestic versions of the Corps. Argentina plans to send Spanish teachers to the United States in a gesture of reciprocity.

Shriver has showed rare signs of administrative talent. He recovered from a very rocky start when the Corps got some bad publicity at the outset. Although his outfit is growing faster than Congress and other critics would like (he is aiming for an enlistment of 13,000 by September 1964), Shriver has done the truly remarkable thing of cutting the administrative spending ratio. He began by spending 33 cents to the dollar on headquarters money, and now has it down to 19 cents. It costs $7,000 to keep a volunteer corpsman in the field and only $2,000 to keep an administrator behind him. By bureaucratic standards, these are economical operations.

But Shriver may have outgrown his job. He also may have made things very tough for his successor. Now that the novelty of the Peace Corps has worn off, it bears the burden of proving its worth. The first year's appropriation was $30 million, the second was $59 million, the present year's asking price is $108 million. Congress has already refused to underwrite $150,000, which Shriver asked to pay the first-year expenses of founding an international secretariat. The danger of overevangelism, which always besets do-gooder organizations, is beginning to show. The next Peace Corps Director will have to trim ship.

That will be the time, with Shriver gone and his fledgling out of the nest, to ask if this idealistic effort is worth pursuing. The test, I think, will not come on the elevated but unprovable thesis that the Peace Corps is, in William James' famous concept, a "moral equivalent of war." This kind of down-to-earth, secular missionary work does not remove the international causes of conflict for the plain reason that people do not make war. Their politicians do that for them. The causes of war are so complex that not even the greatest historians have ever devised a credible explanation for mankind's organizational pugnacity.

But the Peace Corps idea will prove its worth, if at all, on a much lower scale. It has already demonstrated the usefulness of what is known in Shriver shoptalk as "middle-level manpower." The scientist and the economist at the top, and the common laborer at the bottom, are not the full answer to community development at home or abroad.

Something else is needed. Call it the missing link. And it may be that Peace Corps idea of personal instructorship is it.

Assembly of Captive European Nations Deplores Approval of Hungarian Credentials in United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the recent approval of credentials of the Communist delegation of Hungary to the U.N. and the role in this approval that was played by the U.S. delegation is subject to critical comment throughout the country.

One of the organizations which rightfully, forcibly, and morally discusses this development—the Assembly of Captive European Nations—includes in its membership the legitimate leaders of the Hungarian people, and I ask leave to insert the statement of ACEN into the Record at this point:

Assembly of Captive European Nations Deplores Approval of Hungarian Credentials in United Nations

Regarding the unopposed decision the United Nations Credentials Committee took on June 5 to accept the credentials of the Kadar-delegation to the U.N. General Assembly, the Assembly of Captive European Nations issued today the following statement:

The approval of the credentials of the Kadar regime by the United Nations Credentials Committee will come as a great shock to the people of Hungary and other captive countries. The absence of any attempt to challenge the legitimacy of the representatives appointed by a regime the U.N. had branded as one established by Soviet military intervention will, we feel, be viewed as proof that to all practical purposes the question of Hungary has been dropped, as proof that sheer expediency and not principle determines the policies of the Western powers. The abstention of the U.S. delegation will be credibly represented to the captive peoples by Communist propaganda as evidence that the status quo in East Central Europe has come to be accepted as final. It will further demoralize the captive peoples and thus weaken an essential deterrent to Soviet aggressiveness in Europe.

The damage this action is bound to cause to the prestige and the vital interest of the Western powers can still be repaired, at least in part. The United States and other free nations can bring up the substance of the matter at the autumn session of the United Nations General Assembly. They can and should ask for the inscription of the real issue on the agenda of the next U.N. session. And the real issue is not whether some amelioration has occurred in Hungary, but whether the right of self-determination has or has not been restored to its people. The U.N. resolutions have called indeed for the restoration of political independence of Hungary by means of the withdrawal of Soviet troops, reestablishment of human rights and free elections. These are demands the passage of time cannot render obsolete. It is the hope of the Assembly of Captive European Nations that public opinion in the United States and other free nations will lend strong support to the plea that the real issue be raised as a matter of principle, regardless of the chances of securing a majority vote.

Cuba, Training School for Subversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, while the Kennedy administration urges further understanding of the Russians and prepares for new concessions in the spirit of accommodation, the Soviet Union, through its puppet Castro, continues to use Cuba as a training school for subversion in the Western Hemisphere designed to isolate and destroy the United States. Wouldn't it be a good idea, before the President makes any further accommodation to tell Khrushchev to get his troops and weapons out of Cuba, stop sending his saboteurs into other Latin American countries and pull his agents out of the United States? Or is it too much to ask the Russians to at least call a halt to their campaign against us while the peace talks are going on?

The following report from the Chicago Tribune of June 9 tells to what extent the Soviet Union is using Cuba to export subversion and make U.S. policies look ridiculous:

Report From Latin America: Calls Cuba School for Attack on Americas

(By Jules Dubois)

Lima, Peru, June 8.—Pedro G. Beltran, former Prime Minister, recently delivered an address to the Catholic Press Association of the United States and Canada in Miami Beach.

"Cuba has thus become a model campus of the modern college for subversion of the Americas," he said. "The Communists are mounting an attack on our countries from within."

No sooner had he returned home than a band of Communists who had been trained in Cuba fought a battle with police at an isolated river port in Peru.

Beltran, who has been exposing the Communist conspiracy in his newspaper La Prensa here, points out that his remarks in Miami Beach fit the facts so well that they now sound as if they had been prepared after the event.

"How can you expect to control this sort of indoctrination and infiltration?" Beltran asks with great concern. "The boys who are taken to Cuba—whether from Peru, Bolivia, Colombia, and Ecuador or any of these countries—need no passport in order to travel. Once they are over the border, Castro agents furnish them with money and transportation. They are welcomed to Havana without documents and when they leave they are provided with forged passports which do not mention their stay in Cuba. Certainly they will not return home through regular channels.

ACTIVITY BLAMED ON RUSSIANS IN CUBA

"The fact is," Beltran warns, "that as long as the Russians are in Cuba, it will continue to be, as I said in Miami, a model campus of the modern college for subversion of the Americas."

Beltran recalls that a distinguished Englishman reminded him recently that it took Europe centuries to halt the Moslem penetration and finally to drive them back from Europe. In South America, he points out, the Russian threat is seen in a different light.

"We see Cuba as an ideal center of operations for the subversion of Latin America," he says, "far handier and more effective in Khrushchev's plan for this part of the world than mother Russia. Russia is too far away. A different language is spoken there."

Premier Fidel Castro learned that during his trip to Russia, where he was rewarded by Khrushchev for having fallen in line as the Voice of Soviet Russia in Latin America. He was made a hero of the Soviet Union, another Communist accolade to add to the Lenin Peace Prize that he previously received. This time, though, Khrushchev personally pinned the medal on him at a Moscow ceremony.

While Beltran rightfully expresses his concern about the Communist encroachment, one must also ask what the Peruvian Government plans to do about it.

OAS CALLED ONLY AS GOOD AS MEMBERS

As yet there has been no sign that it might place the case before the Organization of American States. Critics of the OAS lash at that body and accuse it of inaction. But the OAS is no better than its member governments and it cannot act without being requested to do so by a government.

In this particular case, Peru is the affected party. Peru has collected the evidence and has in custody the fighters who confessed they were trained in Cuba.

Perhaps the military junta that is supervising tomorrow's presidential elections may feel that it is only an interim government and that the constitutional regime (if one should assume office July 28) is the one to pursue the matter before the OAS.

In the meantime, though, the junta has been warned through the exposes of La Prensa, which began more than a year ago, that guerrillas were active in the Andean mountains and were part of a plot to seize the government and deliver the country to Russia.

Beltran is now sparking another campaign; a law against Communist subversion. The junta might enact that before it leaves office, if it does leave as scheduled.

Cotton Problem—Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, the future of the food and fiber industry from the producer to the consumer, is in a very delicately balanced, precarious position. Congress can and should write legislation during the 1st session of the 88th Congress that will gradually move our country forward toward the day when our commodities will enjoy a free market regulated by the greatest law—supply and consumption.

The cotton problem is clearly illustrated in the following article in the June 1963 issue of the Reader's Digest:

Costly Chaos in Cotton—Time To End It: Ill-Conceived Government Interference Is Wreaking Havoc in an Industry That Was Formerly One of the Leading U.S. Dollar Earners Abroad

(By Robert S. Strother)

With the very best of intentions, the U.S. Government is bringing ruin to the American cotton growing and cotton textile industries—and losing nearly a half billion dollars a year in the process.

Only a dozen years ago cotton was among the most valuable of all our exports. Our cottongrowers supplied 47 percent of the cotton fiber in world trade, and our mills 558 billion square yards of cotton piece goods. Today our growers supply only 33 percent of the cotton fiber traded, and our mills only 417 billion square yards of cotton piece goods. In the last decade 3,711,000 cotton system spindles have been shut down, and 282,000 textile mill jobs—15 percent of the total—have disappeared.

In the last decade, too, our imports of cotton textiles have multiplied tenfold. In 1960, for the first time since recordkeeping began, imports exceeded exports, and they are still rising. As every customer of a U.S. department store or supermarket can see, our display counters are loaded with blankets, lace curtain, tablecloths, underwear, shirts, dressing gowns—cotton textiles in almost every form known—bought abroad and offered here at low prices.

On top of this, we have 8,500,000 bales of surplus cotton—$1.7 billion worth—in storage, in spite of the fact that we spent approximately 392 million tax dollars last year alone in efforts to dump, barter or, in effect, give the fiber away.

In short, cottongrowers and processors are losing markets rapidly, both to foreign-grown cotton and to man-made fibers, and they will go on losing them until we have no cotton growers and mills left, or until our ill-conceived farm and trade policies are radically revised.

The trouble in cotton began in the 1930's. At that time, the United States supplied nearly half of the world's requirements, selling an average of 6,300,000 500-pound bales of cotton overseas annually, at a profit. Then, to help the small, depression-ridden farmer survive, the U.S. Government started propping up the price of cotton with public money, as it has done with wheat, corn, soybeans, and other farm commodities. This kept poor marginal farmers in business. But it also raised U.S. cotton prices so high that our cotton began to lose buyers in the world market.

After World War II, tropical nations around the globe saw a chance to profit by undercutting the U.S. high price for raw cotton. In addition, American point 4 advisers in countries such as India, Pakistan, Egypt, Sudan, Mexico, and Brazil helped local growers with improved seed, machinery, and instruction in advanced methods of cultivation. Production abroad soon soared to record heights, and the world price of cotton fell. U.S. cotton, with its price pegged at around 35.5 cents, could not compete. By 1956 we were selling only 2,200,000 bales abroad, instead of the 6,300,000 we had been selling 20 years earlier. Our stockpiled surplus rose to 14,500,000 bales.

Something had to be done.

Congress might have cut the subsidy being paid to cotton farmers, thus letting the price of U.S. cotton fall to a competitive level. The growers of about 85 percent of our cotton could have withstood this and been healthier for it, because it would have preserved their market, and because they do not need a subsidy to compete with growers anywhere anyway. But the small, inefficient growers of the remaining 15 percent would have been squeezed out, some into other crops, some into other businesses. So, instead of cutting the subsidy, Congress piled a new subsidy on top of the old one, setting in motion a scheme which became notorious as "two-price cotton."

This new scheme directed the Secretary of Agriculture to subsidize the sale of cotton abroad to any extent required to get rid of it. That meant, in effect, that he would buy up the surplus of U.S. cotton at the pegged price of, say, 33.5 cents a pound, and then dump it somewhere overseas at, say, 25.8 cents. He was empowered to take the difference out of the U.S. taxpayer.

At the same time, U.S. cotton mills were obliged to buy domestic cotton at the pegged price because there is a virtual embargo on raw-cotton imports. Thus, adoption of the two-price system meant that U.S. mill owners had to pay $167 a bale for the same cotton that the United States was glad to sell to a foreign mill for $129.

Spokesmen for the U.S. textile industry bitterly denounced two-price cotton as unfair Government discrimination against U.S. mills—and predicted a flood of textile imports. Their forecast was quickly confirmed. As the import tide rose month by month, many U.S. plants closed down, and others went on reduced workweeks. For the people who gained their living in the U.S. textile business, there was irony in the swirling tide of imports; their own income-tax payments had helped financed it.

Meanwhile, the United States had embarked on a second course which hastened the wrecking started by the two-price scheme. In a humanitarian move to provide cheap textile to clothe the ragged masses of Asia and the Middle East, U.S. foreign-aid administrators built a number of new textile plants abroad and modernized others. The new mills were equipped with the most advanced machinery. American engineers, designers, and merchandising men with vaunted know-how were sent abroad to help.

These plants, too, moved in on the American market. With wage rates as low as one-fourth to one-tenth of those enforced by law in U.S. mills, with U.S. cotton available at a discount (and even in some cases bought with U.S. aid funds), and with efficient new plants financed in part by the American people, how could they lose?

Thus, the ruin of the cotton-growing industry was spread to the cotton-textile industry. Hundreds of thousands of Americans lost their jobs.

There have been periodic—and inept—attempts to doctor the situation. U.S. textile exporters could not stay in business under a 25-percent handicap in raw-material costs; so an equalization fee was introduced. Under it, exporters may recover, again from the U.S. Treasury, 8.5 cents a pound for the cotton content of the goods they sell abroad.

Most of the new would-be remedies were designed, however, to regulate the flow of imports. These, too, have proved fruitless. Japan, which buys large quantities of U.S. cotton (1,103,000 bales, or 39 percent of her requirements, in 1961–62), adopted a voluntary quota on her shipments of cotton textiles to the United States. But then Hong Kong rushed to supply what Japan relinquished, followed by the Republic of Korea, Taiwan, Pakistan, India, the Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Italy, and France.

Seeing little progress in resolving cotton's dilemma, some administration spokesmen seem inclined to wash their hands of the mess that the Government has done so much to create. The Washington Post said outright what Under Secretary of State George Ball seems to have hinted: perhaps the U.S. textile industry should consider itself a "terminal case," and arrange to expire quietly while the Government undertakes to train its remaining 881,000 workers for other, unspecified, jobs. "Sustained protection of uneconomic mills," the newspaper said, "would close our markets to struggling nations in whose advancement we have invested millions in foreign aid."

Textile people flare at the idea that the welfare of struggling nations should be of more concern to the U.S. Government than that of the 2 million Americans engaged in the domestic textile and garment industries. They attack the idea that their industry is obsolete. "Foreign producers are not underselling us because they produce a prettier, more serviceable, or more durable product," says Robert C. Jackson, executive vice president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, "but solely because they have access to cotton—including American cotton—at one-third less than we must pay, and because they pay a wage that could not be tolerated in this country."

"I recognize that foreign-trade policy is an integral part of overall foreign policy," Robert T. Stevens, president of the J. P. Stevens Co. mills has said. "Textiles, however, have been called upon to carry too much of the load—unless our Government desires to consider the textile industry expendable."

What lies ahead for this sick industry?

With President Kennedy's approval, the Department of Agriculture proposed in November 1961 that an equalization fee of 8.5 cents a pound be levied on the cotton content of textile imports, thus exactly offsetting the export subsidy. "A tariff to offset a subsidy that compensates for a price support," snorted the New York Times.

Fortunately the Tariff Commission rejected the proposal, and the President tossed the problem back to the Department of Agriculture for referral to Congress, where one of the new ideas is to let handlers other than the producers buy U.S. cotton at the 32.5-cent support price, sell it to U.S. mills at the 24-cent world price, and then collect the difference of hundreds of millions of dollars annually from the ever-loving U.S. Treasury. The favored remedy, in short, is still another huge subsidy—an attempt, in the words of the Baltimore Sun, to "balance by new interference the unbalance wrought by earlier interference in previous efforts to balance still earlier interference."

We don't need any more remedies of this sort. We need, basically, to get rid of the subsidy paid to U.S. cottongrowers, so that the price of our cotton can move toward the free-market level. This can be done gradually, over several crop seasons, and it must be done. The Committee for Economic Development and the American Farm Bureau Federation agree on this. The growers of 85 percent of U.S. cotton are by a wide margin the most efficient producers in the world, and can compete globally without leaning on a subsidy. It makes no sense to kill off both them and the cotton textile industry in an attempt to keep the growers of the remaining 15 percent down on the farm.

"The little cotton farmer is fighting a losing battle, and knows it," a Department of Agriculture official in Georgia said to me recently. "The Government, instead of trying to keep these guys in business, ought to be helping them to get out and into something useful. It ought to give those who want it training and transition loans. A plan like that could save us a lot of money in the long run. It could also save the industry."

World consumption of cotton is increasing steadily. Despite its present troubles, U.S. cotton at the right price has a tremendous opportunity to recapture and expand its markets. It was U.S. research that doubled the cotton yield per acre in 30 years, and that opened vast new markets by developing cotton textiles that resist wrinkling, scorching, and mildew. Still greater discoveries may lie just ahead, but only if price supports, reduced gradually over several seasons, are used as a temporary bridge to carry the entire industry to solid economic ground, and no longer as a barrier to change.

The people of the United States, in the hope of promoting prosperity and peace, have assumed enormous burdens, both economic and military, around the globe. Our commitments have been based on confidence in the Nation's unprecedented economic strength. To allow that strength to be undermined by carelessness or lack of foresight, as it has been in dealing with the cotton problem, is to invite disaster. We cannot improve the world's economy by weakening our own.

Clarke School for Deaf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, Clarke School for the Deaf, in Northampton, Mass., was chartered June 1, 1867, by an act of the Massachusetts General Court. Its early history is sprinkled with great and generous names and the area of Northampton where the school is located—Round Hill—is rich in the history of this country.

In 1871, Alexander Graham Bell taught the Clarke faculty his father's system of visible speech. Later, he was to marry Mabel Hubbard, who had been deafened at the age of 4.

One of the great unfolding dramas of the time was the eventual partnership between Alexander Graham Bell and "May" Hubbard Bell.

A recent article in the Northampton Daily Hampshire Gazette vividly recaptures this memorable event. I commend the article of May 28, 1963, to my colleagues:

CLARKE SCHOOL FOR DEAF CARRYING ON VITAL WORK

Mabel Hubbard, wife and inspiration to Alexander Graham Bell, early in life learned the meaning of the 23d Psalm.

Four-year-old May Hubbard walked through the valley of the shadow of death when she suffered a virulent attack of scarlet fever. The disease destroyed her hearing.

Coaxed by her mother, the bewildered little girl identified objects and even volunteerd a few words. But she could not hear. May tore at her parents' hearts when she said perplexedly, "Why don't the birdies sing? Why don't you talk to me?"

RECITES PSALM

The Hubbards never were sure that May understood them. They feared that the illness had affected her brain. Then one day as Mrs. Hubbard was reading the 23d Psalm to May, the winsome girl joined in as her mother read, "And goodness and mercy shall follow me." May did understand.

In her book, "Make a Joyful Sound," Helen E. Waite describes the steps—first faltering, then confident—that May took from the baffling world of silence and her subsequent life with the inventor of the telephone.

Mabel Hubbard was the daughter of Gardiner Green Hubbard, a Boston lawyer and philanthropist who was the first president of the National Geographic Society. Mr. Hubbard was determined that his daughter should not spend her life in silence and isolation.

Mr. Hubbard sought teachers who could help his daughter retain her speech. It was a pioneering quest in 1862, and experts offered him no encouragement. "You cannot retain her speech, Mr. Hubbard," they said. "She will be dumb in 3 months because she cannot hear. And if by some chance she did learn to produce words, her voice would be worse than the screech of a steam locomotive."

Unsatisfied, Mr. Hubbard turned to Samuel Howe, director of the Perkins Institution for the Blind. Dr. Howe, with Horace Mann, had written a classic report about the German schools where deaf children spoke and understood others by reading lips.

Dr. Howe said May could do the same. "Talk, talk, talk to her, just as you do to your other children," he advised. "Make sure she is watching your lips. And teach her by vibration. Have her feel your throat, the cat's purr, the piano, and make her talk."

TRYING TIMES

The task was not easy. Neither of May's parents cared later to speak of those difficult months. Mr. Hubbbard once said, "At first our little girl was very unwilling to talk," and Mrs. Hubbard wrote to a friend, "What an easy life you lead. How free from care compared to mine."

"But then, gradually, the tide had turned," Miss Waite writes. "Miraculously, May understood more and more of what was being said to her. She used words and even sentences more freely and voluntarily, even adding to her vocabulary words she hasn't known before her illness * * *. She was a happy and responsive member of the family once more."

Mary True, a devoted teacher, then took over May's education, drawing her firmly into the hearing world. "She was my teacher for 3 years," Mrs. Bell later recalled, "and my friend for all time."

In 1867, when she was 9 years old, May Hubbbard proved she had learned her lessons well. She was the star witness at a State legislative hearing.

A special committee of the Massachusetts Legislature was considering a proposal for a new school for the deaf. Witnesses doubted that deaf children could be taught to speak and read lips, and a strong faction wanted sign language taught at the new school.

The sign language advocates were carrying the day until Mr. Hubbard called on his daughter to speak to the members of the committee.

"They plied her with questions in history and geography, and gave her simple problems in arithmetic," Miss Waite writes. "May's answers were prompt, while her whole face lit with eagerness.

"Opening a book, May read a page or two easily and clearly. Something like awe seemed to drop over the room. Most of the committee had sudden difficulties with their spectacles. * * *"

The legislature granted a charter for Clarke School for the Deaf—still carrying on its vital work at Northampton. Another bill provided for teaching deaf children at Clarke and other schools how to speak and lipread. The victory was complete.

When she was 13, Mabel Hubbard visited Germany with her mother. Even the directors of the advanced German schools for the deaf were amazed. "I tell you no German child in any oral school can match her in any way—speech or speech reading, or everyday knowledge," one director said. "It is a true miracle."

When Mabel was 15, her mother took her to Alexander Graham Bell to improve her speech still further. Young Bell was teaching visible speech, invented by his father, Alexander Melville Bell. It was a system of graphic symbols representing the position of speech organs in making different sounds.

Professor and pupil fell in love. Mabel married Bell in 1877 when she was 19, a year after he had successfully demonstrated his telephone at the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia.

Though a great inventor, Dr. Bell always considered himself a teacher of the deaf. Until their deaths, he and Mrs. Bell together labored to help fulfill the Biblical prophecy that the "ears of the deaf shall be unstopped * * * and the tongue of the dumb sing."

So Goes the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as the House will soon consider the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1963 to extend again the discriminatory excise tax against the automobile, I take this opportunity to call the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial from the 1963 Automotive Yearbook, setting forth so effectively the importance of the automobile industry to our whole economy and the danger of serious repercussions if the industry does not continue to prosper.

The excise taxes designed to retard production during wartime have been lifted from almost every product on which they were levied, but not on the automobile. Now, when the President is calling on us to consider tax reduction as a force to stimulate the Nation's economy, I submit that it is certainly a time for deep reflection about the advisability of continuing these unfair excises.

The author of this editorial is Robert B. Powers, publisher of Ward's Automotive Reports, a well-known weekly digest covering all phases of automotive production. As we ponder about the various courses of action to promote economic growth, I feel that we should join in saying "Thank God for the auto industry." The editorial follows:

SO GOES THE ECONOMY

The automotive year of 1962 will be recorded as the year Washington discovered the old Detroit adage: "As the auto industry goes, so goes the economy.

Certainly the industry that produced over 8 million cars and trucks gained little encouragement from a Government seemingly more interested in hearings and investigations than in helping to create a favorable business climate.

In the year past, the attitude toward business was puzzling, unemployment kept mounting, the Nation's gold supply kept dwindling, a scarcity of silver bullion became evident and the props were pulled out from under a seesaw security market.

Yet the auto industry and all those dependent on it continued to thrive. The carmakers had attractive products and knew how to merchandise them to an increasingly selective public.

And Chrysler, as the star performer of the year, sharply increased its share of the automotive market and helped to stir a sluggish security market to life.

There is an omen in all this that should not be ignored. It is that a profitable and full-employment automotive year needs now to be close to a 8 million car and truck year. continually mounting costs demand it.

The break-even point among automakers gets yearly higher. It's the same for the parts makers, the dealers, the suppliers.

It took $1.06 billion in sales in 1962 for one automakers to turn in a net profit of $34 million on the year's output.

A manufacturer in another field netted $140 million on an identical volume of business. He could suffer a $100 million loss in sales and still net more than the car manufacturer. A similar $100 million drop in sales would put the automaker at the mercy of the Wall Street bankers, as Henry Ford used to call them.

The new automotive year is well on the way to another near record, perhaps an all-time record. With the population growth and the two-car family trend, it could become a habit and spell the end of automotive off years.

But the auto industry needs room to breathe to do its job with its widely acknowledged know-how. May the reported words of a White House official "Thank God for the auto industry"—become part of the permanent Washington language and not just a cry of salvation in a year of misery and mischief.

ROBERT B. POWERS,
Publisher.

Administration Indecision Strengthens Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Communist threat to the Western Hemisphere grows and is strengthened each day that the Castro dictatorship stays in power in Cuba supported by the armed might of the Soviet Union. The indecision of the Kennedy administration in either bringing about the removal of Russian troops and weapons and in taking steps to give the Cuban people a chance to regain their freedom adds to the strength of the Castro government and further threatens the security of the United States.

It is past time for President Kennedy to take firm and bold action to rid Cuba of Castro and the Western Hemisphere of Russian aggression. He should immediately reinstate the Monroe Doctrine, stop the shipment of strategic materials to Cuba, including oil, and demand the immediate withdrawal of all Russian troops and arms.

The following column by Virginia Prewett in the June 7 issue of the Washington Daily News exposes the problem created by the President's lack of policy:

ACTION NOW IS URGED TO OUST CASTRO

(By Virginia Prewett)

A capsule referendum of U.S. nongovernmental leadership has urged President Kennedy to publicize the full facts of the United States-Cuba position, and to remove both Fidel Castro and the Soviet presence from Cuba "without delays."

New York's Freedom House and other specialists recently disclosed that 25 seasoned U.S. military, inter-American agreed that—

Washington's withholding of information on Cuba "hinders the formation of American public opinion rather than obstructing the enemy." The meeting demanded publication of "the correspondence between Nikita Khrushchev and the President during and following the October confrontation."

On eliminating the Soviet occupation of Cuba, "what is needed is a commitment to urgent and immediate action, unambiguously expressed."

On the risk of nuclear war, "We are most in danger when our indecision suggests fear, weakness, or ineptness. The risks later will be more formidable than the risks now."

SPARK

Continued Red presence, in fact, "could provide the very spark that ignites a nuclear war," the report notes. "Any incident—a barroom brawl with Soviet soldiers in Havana, a flareup of tempers over a child run down by a Soviet jeep—could lead to Russian shooting."

Among those at the 3-day assembly, cosponsored by Freedom House and the Citizens' Committee for a Free Cuba, were Vision Magazine Publisher William E. Barlow, the Research Institute of America's Leo Cherne, Herald-Tribune Columnist Roscoe Drummond, the liberal Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom's Frances Grant, Daniel James of the Citizens' Committee, Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall, Columnist Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Columbia University Prof. Frank Tannenbaum, Vice Adm. Charles Wellborn, Jr., Florida University's Prof. A. Curtis Wilgus, and this writer.

The report asks: Is our policy geared to secret "accords" with Khrushchev? Why is there no tough ban on American goods to traders with Cuba? Did Bay of Pigs prisoner exchanges serve as cover for a Tito-style reconciliation with Castro? Don't "deals" with a Sovietized Cuba repudiate United States-Rio Pact obligations and "in effect the whole inter-American system?"

ACTION

The conference listed 14 possible direct Castro-toppling actions, from collective measures honoring the Rio and Bogotá Pacts and Punta del Este to invasion of Cuba by an OAS joint task force.

"Our leaders must keep us informed of the facts and their plans for the future; we must keep our leaders informed of the people's judgment and willingness to sacrifice," the conferees agreed.

United States-Yugoslavia Trade Relations—Senseless or Sensible?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks a number of articles opposing most-favored-nation tariff treatment to Poland and Yugolsavia have been inserted into the RECORD by various Members.

This subject is a controversial one and properly so. But I am sure that most of my colleagues are eager to examine both sides of the coin before reaching a final decision on this important trade matter. It is to aid them in formulating an objective judgment on the most-favored-nation issue that I call their attention to an article which appeared May 19, 1963, in the conservative-oriented Los Angeles Times.

The story was written by Mr. Jack Jones, an assistant city editor of the Times, who recently toured Yugoslavia on a visit to Europe.

The article follows:

YUGOSLAVIA GUESSING GAME—WHICH WAY WILL TITO TURN?

(By Jack Jones)

BELGRADE.—Raise a glass of slivowitz with a Yugoslav at a sidewalk cafe along the Bulevar Revolucije and, because you are an American, he will ask:

"Why does your Congress try to kill trade relations with Yugoslavia? Are they trying to force us to trade with the Russians?"

Confusion and hurt persist as to why the United States, for which a large number of Yugoslavs hold warm regard, should want to revoke this country's most-favored-nation tariff benefit status.

Combined with the conclusion that Western European buyers for about half of its products will fade with the acceleration of the Common Market, Yugoslavia's fear over possible U.S. trade discrimination is a chilling one indeed.

American economic observers here see two alternatives:

Yugoslavia will turn fulltilt back to the Soviet block, from which it broke in 1948, in the ideological uproar with Stalin.

Marshal Tito (who after all is Yugoslavia) will try the monstrous task of putting together an independent trade bloc of nonaligned nations.

These observers regard the second possibility as hopeless.

The recent visit to Belgrade of Secretary of State Dean Rusk made clear the Kennedy administration's concern over where Yugoslavia might wander if Congress doesn't repeal the act which would cancel the most-favored-nation clause.

Because they have heard that Rusk was "optimistic" in his private talk with Tito, many Yugoslavs will tell you now they don't think the United States is going to let them fall in with the Soviets again.

U.S. Embassy people in Belgrade are almost frantic in their desire to convince the American public—and Congress—that Yugoslavia is unique among Communist countries, that it is inaccurate to identify it with Moscow leadership.

They are openly disturbed by the threat of discriminatory tariffs, just as the Common Market specter is growing.

"The overall effect of the congressional action," said one American diplomatic figure here, "was to give the impression that Yugosalvia's future with the West isn't very bright * * * that their trade future lies in areas other than Western Europe and North America."

But even Yugoslavia's stanchest American friends here recognize that Tito and some of his underlings are directly responsible for anti-Yugoslav feeling in the United States through their penchants for pro-Soviet statements.

American resentment is natural, they realize, when one considers that Yugoslav economy has been bolstered by more than $2 billion in U.S. aid over the past few years.

But, Embassy people here point out, that aid is finished except for surplus wheat sales and the windup of some technical assistance programs.

And that aid, they maintain, helped keep Yugoslavia out of the Soviet bloc and make it a stable nation in what historically has been a short-fused region.

Yugoslav trade officials feel Americans don't realize that 75 percent of the country's post-1948 trade has been outside the Soviet bloc—almost half of it in Western Europe and about $30 million of it yearly with the United States.

The U.S. figure may drop to $20 million or less if most-favored-nation status is killed.

Any indication that Tito can forge a nonalined trade bloc which would flourish without Russia or the West draws doubtful headshakings because of the lack of heavy machinery in virtually all those countries.

Tito apparently sees his (or Yugoslavia's) future as leader of the Afro-Asian bloc, the nonalined, however, and there is a great deal of feeling here that he will chase that rainbow despite his ingrained Marxism which prompts him from time to time to babble Soviet-style recitations.

Here and there someone will complain that Tito, who is President for life, is living too luxuriously to be a good comrade, but not many seem to mind that.

He is helped, doubtlessly, by the fact that the economy is perking along obviously improving steadily. At least until the Common Market and most-favored-nation threats become actual body blows.

One thing seems certain. Yugoslavia is going to move in the direction Tito points.

There is of course, the question of what will happen when Tito, 71 on May 25, dies. His younger deputies are not quite as imbued with Soviet indoctrination as the stubby little Croat. Only history will answer that question.

America's Outdoors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a statement appearing in the American Federationist of June 1963, the publication of the AFL–CIO, entitled "America's Outdoors—Campers and Congestion" by Mr. Saul Miller.

This is a clear and concise statement why legislation like that sponsored by the administration for assistance to States in acquiring recreational lands and additional resources to handle this new trend in our American way of life is both urgent and immediate.

The statement follows:

AMERICA'S OUTDOORS—CAMPERS AND CONGESTION

(By Saul Miller)

(NOTE.—Saul Miller, Director of the AFL–CIO Department of Publication, last summer led the expedition described here.)

A station wagon topped with a tarpaulin-lashed carrier and loaded with children and gear picks its way down a two-lane forest road. It stops briefly before a small sign staked in the ground, turns into a rutted dirt road, and moves slowly past the clearings in the woods.

It pulls up before one of the clearings. The driver gets out, quickly inspects the area, turns and signals approval. In a moment children tumble out of the station wagon. The tarpaulin is loosened and gear is heaped in the clearing. The family has found its home for the night.

This scene will be repeated some 20 million times this year in every national forest, national park, and State camping facility as urban Americans continue their rediscovery of the land, its beauties and challenges, its grandeur—and its litter.

And they will find this year, as they have found in the past decade, that the National and State parks and forests are not prepared to cope with the hordes of campers—especially those who cling to their urban conveniences and are not inclined to live sans flush toilets, running hot water, television, and the rest.

Most Americans living in urban or suburban surroundings have at best a tenuous relationship with the woods, streams, and mountains of the Nation. This is a vast and wondrous land, richly endowed with a great variety of natural phenomena and geological formations. Neither the movies, television, nor plane trips can substitute for a drive on the new or old highways etched in the plains and the river beds and spiraling up through rugged mountains and down jagged canyons.

But driving the highways provides quickly passing views. For a closer and prolonged examination, to hunt, to fish, to investigate the terrain or to drink deeply of the beauty and gasp in exclamation at the majesty and sweep of the land, a campsite is necessary either for an overnight visit or as a base of operations for days or weeks.

In the past 10 years, fast, modern roads, increased leisure time, relatively inexpensive and simple-to-operate camping equipment, a rise in incomes and in the ownership of automobiles have coincided to bring an almost unbelievable pressure on all recreational facilities, especially the camping facilities of the National and State parks and forests.

Urban Americans are deeply involved with exploring their country. They are plumbing its resources for recreation, education, or just simply to get away from it all, to camp at 10,000 feet where there are no disturbances except Nature's own, where a clearing in the woods becomes a challenge to modern man to provide his shelter, food, light, and amusements.

The trade union movement has provided an important stimulus to the outdoor recreation boom of the postwar years. Collective bargaining resulting in improved living standards, longer paid vacations, and earlier retirement on decent pensions has increased automobile sales and the purchase of outdoor camping and recreation equipment. Labor's legislative campaigns have helped provide the new roads and the limited overhauling and expansion of facilities in the parks and forests.

A day on the road rolling through any section of the Nation provides the evidence that many American workers are finding it possible for the first time to pack gear and families into cars and take off for the woods, the river valleys, the mountains, or the seashore, not in search of new jobs or because they must move along to exist but as pure and simple recreation and education.

And every summer the recreational facilities creak and groan under the onslaught. The overall picture looks something like this:

Only 12 percent of the acreage of the United States, or about 283 million acres, is in public recreation areas. About 80 percent of this acreage is federally owned and managed.

But of the 25,000 estimated recreation areas located on the 283 million acres, 80 percent is State-operated although comprising a little over 12 percent of the total land and water involved.

These figures for 1960 come from a report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to the President and Congress. This report shows that about 3 million persons could be accommodated on 105,000 acres of the total set aside for picnicking; 757,000 persons could be handled on 10,699 acres for swimming in pools or beaches; 300,000 on 50,000 acres for winter sports; 82,000 on 42,000 acres of historic sites.

Overnight facilities in four categories were available for about 1 million persons in 1960, with 75 percent of the facilities in campgrounds, 12 percent in cabins, 7 percent in trailer camps, and 6 percent in hotels, motels, and lodges.

About 70 percent of the overnight facilities were on Federal lands, with 38 percent of all camping capacity in national forests. National parks accounted for 13 percent and State parks for 20 percent.

The ORRRC report disclosed that nearly 5,000 areas involved in its survey showed a day-use capacity of 4 million persons at one time and 1 million in overnight capacity for a total of 5 million.

Of daytime capacity, the report said, "the maximum potential capacity that could be made available under presently existing conditions could accommodate 10 million users and another 2.7 million could be accommodated if additional spaces were developed as a result of major changes in access, water supply, etc." This, plus planned additions in the 1960–64 period, could accommodate 14.5 million additional daytime users on existing areas—more than 3 times the 1960 capacity.

Of overnight use, using the same approach, the report said planned additions by 1964 would accommodate 658,000 persons, potential capacity use could add another 7 million persons and 1.7 million could be accommodated if major changes were made—a total of 9.4 million or 9 times the 1960 capacity.

This is a rough inventory of the present facilities and the possibilities in the future. What about use?

Total daytime visits in 1960 were 515 million—about one-third to Federal areas. The national forests received more than half of the visits to Federal areas.

Overnight use was about one-tenth of daytime use, or about 51 million visits, over half on Federal areas. The national forests accounted for two-thirds of all these visits.

That's the way it was in 1960. But look what's been happending in one decade.

In 1950 recreational visists to national parks totaled 32.8 million; in 1960 the figure hit 72.3 million.

The national forests saw the 1950 influx of 27.4 million jump to 92.6 million in 1960.

The recreational dams of the Corps of Engineers witnessed a fantastic rise from 16 million in 1950 to 106 million 10 years later.

A simple projection of the visits to federally-owned lands in the 1960s at the same rate of growth as during the past 10 years produces "some utterly fantastic figures," says one ORRRC report. Present tastes and perferences for outdoor recreation can be expected to continue, the population will increase as will life expectancy, leisure time, real income, urbanization and mobility.

There is little doubt that picnicking and camping are the two most popular recreational activities involving outdor use of land and that picnic areas and campgrounds are the least expensive recreation areas to build and maintain. This accounts for the concentration in developing and expanding these types of areas in the 1960–64 period.

The day-long drive into the country for sightseeing and picnicking is basic to the urban tradition. Less traditional and popular is the camping trip. But its appeal is manifold: it makes economically possible a cross-country auto trip from the populous urban east to the Pacific; it gives urbanites glorying vicariously in their vast country the opportunity to see it at first hand; it exchanges the clanging bustle of the cities for the softer sounds of the woods, the streams, the mountains; it furnishes the opportunity for a mold identification with the pioneering history of the Nation.

All of these and other factors—including the simple pleasure of camping—put this writer and his family on the road last summer for a memorable trip of the western United States.

The problem was simple enough—there was an unfulfilled desire to tour the country, especially the West, while the family was still intact. Enroute there would be stops at some of the great cities of the West—Denver, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Salt Lake City; a visit to Disneyland to assess manmade recreation; a few stops with long unvisited relatives. And of course there were the natural wonders—the mountains, the lakes, the canyons and the deserts and also the animal life ranging from Pacific Ocean seals to Yellowstone Park bears.

A trip of this scope normally entails a minimum of 6,000 miles of driving and, to take more than a passing lunge at the country, at the very least three to four weeks. This time and distance factor, if converted into motel and restaurant costs, would make the venture financially improbable. If the lodging costs are removed and campfire-cooked meals substituted, the cost of the trip can be reduced by two-thirds and brought within reach of a family of six—our family.

It is this simple economic exercise that brings most campers to the forests and parks. And during the exposure many become confirmed campers by choice rather than by financial calculation.

The Miller odyssey, as the trip was termed when it was being charted on a map after its completion, covered five weeks and 9,100 miles and cost some $800 or about $25 a day. It included a Disneyland spree, a full sightseeing and dining out day in San Francisco and other noncamping activities.

Only 5 days were spent in motels—mostly on the trip home when one of the drivers had to leave early. Three days were spent with relatives. The rest were spent in campgrounds, mostly National Forest sites, a few State parks and one city park in Wyoming.

Nearly 40 percent of the cost went for gas, oil, repairs and a new tire for the large station wagon, topped with a box carrier, that comfortably handled the passengers and gear. About 20 percent was spent on gifts, souvenirs, sightseeing, entertainment, refreshments, campsites and parking fees. About 25 percent went for food and ice and the remaining 15 percent went for restaurant meals and motels.

The family had been on shorter camping trips in previous years and had acquired some of the basic gear—a gasoline stove and lantern, sleeping bags and air mattresses, a large ice chest and water jug, a fly and some small tools and odds and ends. For the trip, two new tents were purchased, one to sleep four and one two-man tent. A few extra items were added, such as a battery-powered lantern to supplement the gasoline light and a lightweight folding table. A duffle bag and an old suitcase rounded out the equipment, plus some old pots and pans and silverware from the kitchen and a pair of folding chairs.

Assuming no camping gear at all, to oufit a family of six in the above fashion would take between $350 and $400. However, this is a one-time expenditure. Buying good equipment ensures use for many, many years. The savings from week-long camping trips in lieu of motels and restaurants will cover the cost of the equipment.

When the family is finally on the road there are a number of logistical problems, all rather easily met—food, water, ice, gasoline, and laundry. These usually are found in a cluster in almost every small town or crossroads and a one-stop-for-all experience is not uncommon and provides a break from the perpetual motion odometer and for car-weary youngsters.

In a typical national forest campsite there is a clearing in the woods, a flat area large enough to pitch a tent, a wooden or stone table and benches, a fireplace or cookstove, and usually close at hand a water pipe providing safe drinking water. Fifty or 100 yards away, accessible to a number of campsites, is a usually clean privy. There normally are no lights, no sinks or flush toilets, no showers, no hot water, no power outlets for electric blankets or television sets. There is privacy and simplicity and a challenge to put the simple camping gear to work to provide shelter, and light, and cooked food, and hot water for washing.

In other camps, mostly in the national parks and in some State parks, there are more conveniences but also less privacy as campsites are placed closer together so as to be nearer the facilities.

National park campsites usually are closer to the natural wonders that the parks were created to preserve. Development of campsites may be on the basis of eight sites to an acre or more. The national forests, covering vast expanses of acreage, usually develop campsites further removed from the points of interest but based on about four sites to the acre. State parks will vary greatly in facilities and accommodations, many intended only for brief overnight stays, others combining conveniences and privacy.

Campers usually fall into several groups—the touring camper who makes overnight or 2- to 3-day visits; those who stay in a site for 4 or 5 days or a week and move on to another site for a similar period; those who set up camp in a favored park or forest and spend several weeks, using the camp as a base of operations.

The Miller odyssey was of the touring variety, concentrated on the western United States. Its itinerary, perhaps, provides a clue to why the roads will be jammed, the camps bursting this summer.

Starting in Washington, D.C., in early July, the family moved in slow stages through the middle of the country to Denver. Enroute there were camping stops at a State park in Ohio, complete with a thunderstorm; a camp along the Mississippi River marking the site of Indian burial grounds and an uncommon amount of mosquitoes; a motel in Kansas in face of car radio warnings of tornadoes; and a windswept campsite alongside a newly built dam in far western Kansas, where electric outlets were located at the base of utility poles for the convenience of campers.

These were overnight stops, with the sightseeing limited mostly to what could be spotted from a moving car. But for the youngsters this was their first crossing of the fabled Mississippi (they were disappointed that it was not more heroic in proportions). It was also the first exposure to the limitless plains stretching to the horizon in all directions, the first sight of a Kansas town marked at great distances from the actual location by sky-soaring elevators.

From Denver the course moved southwest through the Pike National Forest and Colorado Springs over the Continental Divide at about 11,000 feet into a riverside canyon camp in the San Juan National Forest. Here the youngsters wandered up the side of a canyon just before dusk and were brought down by a rescue party, somewhat bruised but unhurt.

By this time the family was a smoothly working camping unit and could set up its tents and have a hot meal going in about 45 minutes. Light, efficient and not too much equipment, plus assigned chores and duties, made the difference.

Mesa Verde National Park, with its Indian cliff dwellings high atop a flattened mountain, was our first experience of the millions of vacationers, tourists and campers converging on the parks and their wondrous sights. The tour schedules and the guided walks were efficient and well planned, but the scene in some aspects was not unlike a visit to Radio City in New York.

From the Mesa Verde to Gallup, N. Mex., was a trip through the Navaho wastelands—an almost endless nothingness with hogans and shacks scattered here and there. The youngsters were overwhelmed and they began to identify all wasteland or barren areas on the rest of the trip as Indian reservations, with appropriate commentaries on the visible injustice.

At sunset the Painted Desert and the Petrified Forest in Arizona were at their most beautiful and eerie. There is a deep gratitude that these sites have been preserved by the Government, for this is a strange and unique part of our country.

The journey continued to Oak Creek Canyon south of Flagstaff, where a wooded campsite along a cool stream and a natural rockslide in a drop in the creek delighted the youngsters. The next stop was the Grand Canyon, again a bustling tourist attraction but one that can quiet chattering children by its awesome dimensions.

More desert mileage was eased by a water-rigged air cooler hanging from the right front window to bring a degree of humidity into the parched interior of the station wagon. At Page, Ariz., car trouble threw the schedule off a day and gave the family a taste of the intolerable heat of desert camping at the newly-developed Glen Canyon Recreation Area. It provided laso a look at a gigantic dam abuilding, with the huge earthmoving equipment grinding away through the night and a new bridge spanning an 800-foot drop into the depths of the canyon.

The odyssey continued through Zion National Park into the Lake Mead Recreation Area for swimming and a tour of Boulder Dam, an impressive demonstration of a wisely-spent tax dollar. Through the neon empire of Las Vegas into the Mojave Desert at night to Los Angeles and the first leg of the trip was climaxed by pitching a tent on a relative's lawn to house the male youngsters of both families.

Disneyland faded quickly as the journey resumed up the California coast. The savage beauty of the bare, jagged cliffs dropping precipitously to the ocean fitted in well with the late William Randolph Hearst's castle at San Simeon. A fog-shrouded campsite near the water's edge kept the campfire going late into the night and produced nightmarish shadows.

The Spanish mission at Carmel and a visit to Monterey brought a new understanding of this part of the country and its traditions and background. And moving up the coast to San Francisco, the family was certain its decision to pass up the interior mountains and lakes had been well taken.

A few miles north of the Golden Gate Bridge a California State park high over the ocean provided an excellent campsite base for a visit to San Francisco. Camping and touring clothes gave way to dresses and jackets and a fling at the city's fine restaurants and attractions.

We moved northward into the giant redwood country and a State park provided a memorable campsite in the midst of the towering trees. Slowly the trip moved to the very top of California and into the Rogue River National Forest in Oregon and Crater Lake where, on July 30, the children engaged in a vigorous snowball fight while breakfast was being prepared. The blue of the volcanic lake was almost an exaggeration as one gazed down at it from the heights above. Looking southward, the High Sierras spread out in stark beauty and beckoned the camper.

But the journey then turned eastward and moved across the barrenness of southern Oregon into Idaho and dipped down toward Utah. The sagebrush and tumbleweed, the hallmark of so much of the West, grew monotonous and then suddenly the lush rich valleys of eastern Utah appeared. A camp in the Wasatch National Forest provided an easy access for a visit to Salt Lake City and a swim in the Great Lake.

North and east again into Wyoming and the Jackson Hole country, with a campsite at Grand Teton National Park complete with hot showers, stores and a full quota of campers. The Grand Tetons are overpowering, craggy and snow-topped in August. The park abuts Yellowstone on the south and a day-long expedition was undertaken to visit the geysers, the lake, the bears. Here the jam became more evident, especially the traffic, with license plates reading like a roll of the States and the Canadian provinces. Old Faithful required a prelunch and postlunch viewing as the youngsters valiantly clicked away with their box cameras (and came home with some fine shots).

Through the park and heading east there was the hush of the copper-hued Shoshone canyon and the breathtaking switchbacks of the Big Horn Mountains. The schedule broke down somewhere along the line and camp turned out to be a rather dusty small city park. It did for the night.

The ride through the Black Hills brought a new feeling—the towering heights were replaced with a new ruggedness. The mass pilgrimage to Mount Rushmore brought almost larger crowds than elsewhere on the trip and, as the wagon headed toward Rapid City, a note of lurid commercialism crept in. This had been noted elsewhere—the "natural wonders," the animal farms and "zoos," the roadsigns starting hundreds of miles away and keyed to whetting the appetites of car-cooped youngsters.

From South Dakota, with one driver leaving, the family drove home in slow stages, stopping in motels until finally the wagon pulled up in front of the house in Washington bearing visible traces of its journey. The youngsters were physically in top condition, hardened by weeks of sleeping in tents or under the stars. They had learned they could exist reasonably well without television, dishwashers, refrigerators or electric lights. They were ready to tackle anything that came along and they had absorbed some of the splendor of the land and its people and understood a bit more what America is.

A few years ago, a Congressman made a cross-country camping trip with his family of five children and filed a report with a House committee. Most of his camping was done in the national forests. His report urged top priority for access roads to campsites and a plea for simple, spacious, private campgrounds without showers, laundry facilities and electrical outlets. The national parks and the State parks should be allowed to satisfy the demand for more conveniences he said.

To finance new campsites, which he urged be located on streams or lakes, he recommended a users' stamp fee similar to a hunting or fishing license, a proposal now before Congress in the administration's recreation program.

The Kennedy administration has introduced legislation in the 88th Congress setting forth the broad outlines of such a national recreation policy and coordinating the activities of the various National and State agencies all involved in or forced into the recreation business by the insatiable demand.

But the Government must move rapidily if enough land is to be set aside for conservation and recreation uses. The expanding population, coupled with advances in technology, has accelerated the exploitation of lands for suburban developments, highways, parking lots, industrial sites and other purposes. Drainage, navigation improvements and pollution may be reducing recreation water resources at an even more rapid rate.

As outdoor recreation resources are diminishing, the demand is rapidly increasing. All responsible predictions indicate a continued high growth in use of recreation resources. There is general agreement that the available supply of facilities is inadequate now. **Unless an overall national policy approach institutes remedial action, the present inadequacies in outdoor recreation will be compounded and multiplied.**

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of June 8, 1963.

"WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

CIVIL RIGHTS AND LAWFUL PROCEDURES

The week's events in the field of race relations indicate political motivation behind much of the agitation. The matter has been brought to a head for the people of Dallas by two events: (1) The ill-advised action of ignoring civil service procedures, and (2) the inclusion of Dallas on the Attorney General's list of cities having race problems. As to (1) the order to promote Negroes strictly on the basis of race and to bypass civil service procedures came from Washington. The local postmaster was forced to take action on instructions from his superiors. In bypassing civil service procedures all the postal workers have been downgraded which is bound to result in lowered morale. The merit system for promotions is the only way to insure justice and equity for all Federal workers. The evils of the spoils system became so bad it resulted in the establishment of the Civil Service Commission and the merit system for Federal employees in 1883. Promotions have been based on (a) ability and performance determined by examinations and rating: (b) seniority; (c) supervisory appraisal. All of these factors are ignored now in orders to make promotions on the basis of race. Also ignored with resulting grave injustice is veterans preference. A breakdown in the civil service system can only hurt all Federal employees including minority groups.

As to (2): Including Dallas on a list of cities having race problems was best appraised and dismissed by a Dallas business man present at the President's meeting who said: "I didn't know we had one." The tragedy of the attempts of the President and the Attorney General to force integration policies without regard to legal procedures is that these efforts are creating racial strife where heretofore it did not exist. The relationship between people must be solved locally by those of good will, and good relations cannot be established, nor justice maintained on any other basis. Every citizen must be guaranteed all the rights outlined in the Constitution which means that in the places where taxpayers money is used and in areas classed as parks and public utility in nature, of course, there can be no discrimination. However, for the President by government action (and force) to define public utility for the purpose of invading private property is to use the 14th amendment to destroy the 5th amendment which forbids the taking of private property without due process.

As in all our relationships these problems must be solved by the people and for the people. In the Post Office to establish justice for all the postal workers and the people they serve. In other areas to protect the rights of all citizens, the majority as well as the minority groups whatever their race or national origin. If discrimination against Negroes is wrong, and it is, then discrimination in reverse—for the Negro and against the whites—is equally bad. The best guarantee the Negro has to attain justice is within the framework of the Constitution. The fight for equality, the battle to eliminate the injustices that do exist cannot be fought on university campuses or the streets of our cities; it cannot be won through Supreme Court decisions or Executive orders altering the Constitution. It must be won on the floor of Congress through proper legislation, through proper respect for law enforcement, and finally through proper religious motivation in the human heart.

TAX LEGISLATION

A tax bill, the President's No. 1 legislation, is a long way off. There is still no bill, that is, no language. The drafting of language is now beginning. When drafted, the basic tax areas—rate reduction, individual and corporate; and the areas of structural reform—will be considered separately, then collectively, as a package. The economic impact of each, also Federal revenue effect as tax-take of each, must be separately, then collectively, computed. Meanwhile, the Korean taxes consisting of corporate rate reduction, 52 percent to 47 percent; and various excises, must be considered for extension. Othervise, these wartime, temporary taxes, expire. There is ample reason for letting these taxes, a package producing $4.1 billion revenue, to expire. However, some feel the Korean taxes should be continued and considered as a part of the larger tax reshuffling requested by the President's $10.3 billion package of recommended changes. I favor letting the Korean taxes expire and then reforming what remains. The Ways and Means Committee agreed not to consider further any change in the taxation of natural resources embracing coal, oil, and the approximately 100 extractive minerals.

COMMUNIST GOALS

The Communist Manifesto of November-December 1960 in Moscow laid down a blueprint for the completion of world domination, prime target being the United States.[1] Their goals of muzzling our military and squashing anti-Communists are continuing to meet with success. Greatest impetus in their drive, of course, is their successful open penetration of the Western Hemisphere and discard of the Monroe Doctrine. Cuba can now be called the beginning of the end for American and Western civilization unless something halts final accomplishment of the blueprint. The Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee accurately assesses the danger in a recent report and lists the 11 clear and present dangers, as follows:

1. Cuba is an advanced Soviet base for subversive, revolutionary, and agitational activities in the Western Hemisphere and affords the opportunity to export agents, funds, arms, ammunition, and propaganda throughout Latin America.
2. Assuming without deciding that all strategic weapons have been withdrawn, there is the ever-present possibility of the of the stealthy reintroduction of strategic missiles and other offensive weapons, using the Soviet forces still in Cuba as camouflage and security for the activity.
3. Cuba serves as an advance intelligence base for the U.S.S.R.
4. The potential exists to establish electronic warfare capabilities based on Cuba.
5. The vital Panama Canal could be the target for sneak raids originating from Cuba.
6. Potentially, Cuba is a base from which the Soviets could interdict our vital air and

---

[1] S. Doc. 47, 87th Cong.

sea lanes. It can now be used for the air, sea, and electronic surveillance of our military activities in the Southeast United States and the Caribbean.

7. Cuba's airfields could serve as recovery air bases for planes launched against the United States from the Soviet Union.

8. Advanced Soviet submarine bases could be established in Cuban ports with very little effort.

9. The continued presence of the Soviets in Cuba could require a further reorientation of the U.S. air defenses.

10. Cuba provides a base for the training of agents from other Latin American countries in subversive, revolutionary, agitational, and sabotage techniques.

11. The very presence of the Soviets in Cuba affects adversely our Nation's image and prestige. Our friends abroad will understandably doubt our ability to meet and defeat the forces of communism thousands of miles across the ocean if we prove unable to cope with the Communist threat at our very doorstep.

A consideration of all these matters serves to emphasize the gravity of the threat to our national security which Cuba now represents.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Appendix

Our National Reclamation-Irrigation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HAYDEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks by the Commissioner of Reclamation, Floyd E. Dominy, before the 50th convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, in Washington, D.C., on June 7. The title of his remarks is "Our National Reclamation-Irrigation Program."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NATIONAL RECLAMATION-IRRIGATION PROGRAM

(Remarks of Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy)

The pessimism of those who seek to show how uneconomic it is for man to reach for the moon has a familiar ring to those of us who have lived in the American West or participated in the development of its resources.

In the early part of the last century—only a few minutes on the clock of the universe—Americans were wondering what to do about the vast desert wasteland that lay beyond the Mississippi—relatively almost as far distant from Washington then as the moon is from the earth today.

Eloquent Daniel Webster didn't intend to do anything about the West, and he told the Senate so in some rhetorical questions that stand today in retrospect as something of a monument to unstatesmanlike utterances:

"What do we want with this vast, worthless area, this region of savages and wild beasts, of shifting sands and whirlpools of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs?" he asked.

"To what use could we ever hope to put these great deserts or those great mountain ranges, impenetrable and covered to their base with eternal snow?

"Mr. President, I will never vote 1 cent from the Public Treasury to place the Pacific coast 1 inch nearer Boston than it now is."

Even as late as a century ago—in 1859—the great Colorado River Basin of the West, which incidentally contains many square miles of moonlike landscape, was being similarly written off by an Army officer who headed the first navigation survey expedition up the river. This is what Army Lt. J. C. Ives wrote after the conclusion of that 1859 survey:

"The region last explored is, of course, altogether valueless. It can be approached only from the south and, after entering it, there is nothing to do but leave. Ours was the first, and will doubtless be the last, party of whites to visit this profitless locality. It seems intended by nature that the Colorado River, along the greater portion of its lonely and majestic way, shall be forever unvisited and undisturbed."

History, it seems, has come full circle from the debunking efforts of Daniel Webster and Lieutenant Ives. Their successors are now making similar predictions about the folly of trying to land men on the moon.

As an individual who has devoted the major part of his professional career to developing the land and water resources of the West, I feel strongly that it is man's destiny, and this generation's responsibility, to reach for the moon. And, in spite of the examples just cited of the vulnerability of predictions on the future, I subscribe to the forecasts that the results of lunar exploration will prove extremely valuable to mankind—just as the conquest of the once-forbidding western frontier proved valuable to America.

Thinking of Daniel Webster, however, one prudent qualification seems necessary—these favorable results can materialize if the early moon expeditions include scientists who can solve the problem of developing a supply of water, which, for man, is just as basic a resource on the moon as it is here on earth.

But to get back to earth, and to my assigned subject.

Since the Reclamation Act was signed by President Theodore Roosevelt six progress-filled decades ago, 135 reclamation projects have been authorized by the Congress.

Some $3.2 billion worth of project features now in service include 220 storage dams completed or under construction which will have a total of 130 million acre-feet in storage capacity; 119 diversion dams, 461 pumping plants, 6,400 miles of main supply canals, and 42 powerplants, and 11,000 miles of transmission lines.

The storage reservoirs of the Bureau of Reclamation provide irrigation water for 8 million irrigable acres, which, since 1910, have produced more than $17 billion worth of agricultural crops—currently at a level of $1 billion in gross crop value yearly. The reservoirs aso yield 483 billion gallons of municipal and industrial water annually, and approximately 27 million visitor-days' use is made of the 1.4 million acres of water-surface area of these man-made lakes and the adjoining shorelands.

Water released from the reservoirs for these and other purposes also turn turbines in project powerplants, which generate nearly 27 billion kilowatt-hours of energy annually.

In addition to these vast material benefits, these reclamation projects also provide major public benefits from flood control, navigation, water pollution control, fish and wildlife propagation, and other benefits.

Project operations now return revenues of more than $90 million a year and additional millions in Federal, State, and local taxes, without counting the jobs provided in project construction and operation, and in processing and service industries in the communities adjoining reclamation projects.

And, as a final economic note to this very brief statistical picture of the reclamation program, you, as taxpayers, will be pleased to learn that the water and power users on these projects are contracting to repay more than 90 percent of the Treasury costs of the investment.

Now let us look at some of these statistical accomplishments in human terms.

One of the first large storage dams built by the Bureau of Reclamation was the Theodore Roosevelt Dam on the Salt River in Arizona. This structure, and the related storage and diversion dams on the Salt, Gila, and Verde Rivers, made it possible to utilize water—literally liquid gold—which, for ages, has wasted into the Gulf of California. They made possible the tremendous agricultural, industrial, and population growth in Phoenix and vicinity.

The amazing growth of another burgeoning section of the West—southern California—was made possible to a large degree by the construction of Hoover, Parker, and Davis Dams on the lower Colorado River. Parker Dam is the start of the 242-mile Colorado River Aqueduct, built by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California to carry water for 8 million people over mountain and across desert from the Colorado River to the Pacific Coast.

After demonstrating at Hoover Dam that the mightiest rivers can be plugged with concrete, the Bureau of Reclamation designed and contracted to build the world's largest concrete structure in the Columbia River at Grand Coulee. Here the Bureau rivalled the work of the glaciers in the ice age, by blocking the mighty Columbia and pumping water to fill an abandoned river channel, or coulee. This formed a large man-made lake which already supplies water to 450,000 acres and ultimately will supply irrigation water to 1 million acres of desert lands in central Washington. Grand Coulee Dam is one of the world's most imposing dams, particularly at floodstage, with its broad spillway cascading water three times the height of Niagara Falls. Nevertheless, that spillway water is waste which we hope can ultimately be contained and put to use.

Also during the 1930's, the Bureau of Reclamation undertook construction of the 500-mile-long Central Valley project in California—the world's longest irrigation system. Our next Paul Bunyanesque assignment was to drill a 13-mile-long tunnel, nearly 10 feet in diameter, through the Colorado Rockies, to take water from the west slope to the east slope and dropping it to valley floor through stair-step reservoirs and powerplants. One of the most complex and spectacular projects ever undertaken by the Bureau, the Colorado-Big Thompson project, is composed of more than 100 separate engineering features integrated into a power and irrigation system existing for 250 miles of mountains and plains.

Since the mid-1940's, the Bureau of Reclamation has been engaged with the Corps of Engineers in building the 10-State Missouri River Basin project, the world's largest water resource development from the standpoint of planned investment. This great project has not yet reached the halfway mark in its total development. Its potential benefits, regionally and nationally, are almost incalculable.

Any of these major reclamation projects is worthy of inclusion in lists of engineering wonders of the modern world. Collectively, they represent a tremendous program of achievement, and we are entertaining literally hundreds of technicians, administrators, and other visitors from countries throughout the world who are coming here to inspect these great engineering works and to solicit our know-how.

Much has been accomplished but much remains to be done. Here are a few samples:

We are only part way along with the billion dollar, five-State Colorado River storage project. This project involves the construction of Glen Canyon Dam, a 710-foot-high rival of Hoover Dam now nearing completion, and many other storage and diversion dams and other structures. These facilities are required to develop irrigation, municipal and industrial water, hydropower, fabulous public recreation centers, and other benefits for a mountain-desert region larger than New England.

In spite of the extensive water development work in the Pacific Southwest, still-pyramiding population pressures are foretelling water shortages if something more isn't accomplished before the southern California area trebles its population to the projected year 2000 level of 30 million, and the Phoenix-Tucson area more than quadruples its present population to reach 2½ million in the same period. To meet this incipient water supply emergency, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall has launched a Department of the Interior study, announced several months ago, aimed at meeting the total future water needs of this region.

The study will consider the use of additional water storage, importations from other areas, plants—powered by both fossil and nuclear fuels—to convert saline and brackish water to fresh water, water savings by the use of canal linings and conservation through the elimination of useless, water-consuming plants and reduction of inefficient irrigation practices, and other potential remedies. The economic potentialities are enormous because the future industrial and population growth of a large and important geographic area is directly involved.

In the State of Texas, the Bureau of Reclamation is working with various Federal agencies and the State of Texas in a statewide development study of great significance. Texas seeks to find an adequate supply of water for its expected population increase from its present level of 9 million to 22 million residents by the year 2010. The major engineering feature of plans now nearing completion by the Bureau of Reclamation, after 12 years of study, is a river-sized canal which would extend for 450 miles in a great arc from the Sabine River in the northeast to the Rio Grande Basin in southwest Texas. This is big thinking in future water supply—even for Texas.

In California, the Bureau of Reclamation is cooperating in the development of the $1¾ billion California State water plan. This project will create another river-sized canal that will be made to run uphill in the San Joaquin Valley—eventually to be lifted over the Tehachapi Mountains into the Los Angeles-San Diego area. We are constructing the San Luis Reservoir as a joint facility of this State project and the Federal Central Valley project.

Concluding, I want to underscore three major points of emphasis in water resource development in this country if we are to keep ahead of water needs in the future.

1. More efficient use of water:

Because water has been so plentiful, we, as a people, have been notorious in our waste. We could fill the equivalent of several large reservoirs simply by elimination of this waste. It is one of our best possibilities for what would constitute a major addition to our water supply.

2. We must accelerate basic and applied research in hydrology:

We must not allow all of our best brains in engineering and allied technology and science to be diverted exclusively into the more glamorous pursuits of the space age. Let's reach for the moon, but not forget the earth—especially the semiarid and arid portions of it.

3. We must build water resource projects for all uses, and all users must be persuaded to help pay their proportionate costs of the investment.

This sound economic approach has paid off in six decades of Reclamation development, and it should be applied across the board as far as is practical.

The Reclamation program has amply demonstrated that water resource development is both essential to, and economical in, the most challenging areas of this country. We must continue to display the same vision, the same forward thinking, the same unity of action we have had in the past, if we are to keep pace with the needs of future generations.

NASA and the Boston Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, there are times when the awarding of Government contracts creates controversy and much speculation on the part of those sources that consider themselves well-informed on Washington affairs.

We have another such case before us at the present time. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, after considerable study and qualified discussion, wish to locate their new Electronics Research Center in the Greater Boston area.

I understand that questioning voices are already making themselves heard on this matter. The substance of the criticism appears to be that this is "a political payoff," or that this is "undoubted favoritism."

Mr. Speaker, I am shocked by this carping criticism. Because the Bay State is represented in the executive branch of our Government must it be excluded from every consideration? Can the State of Massachusetts not be given a simple research center? I trust that this is not the case.

My own State of California has qualified for many Government contracts. Primarily, this is due to the excellent academic and technical skill available there. In Massachusetts we have a similar situation. One of the greatest institutes of higher learning in the world—MIT—is located in the Greater Boston area. Several outstanding universities and colleges are also located there.

Mr. Speaker, when this country has been in great need it has always gone to the areas of competence. This is the reason the Nation has gone to California for aircraft manufacture, for missile manufacture, and now for spacecraft and other items related to the space program. It is totally logical, therefore, for NASA to go to the Greater Boston area to locate its new Electronics Research Center. Once again the Nation will be taking advantage of existing resources.

As I understand it, the Government does not presently have the broad-based skills in electronics and related sciences to meet the future requirements in the space field. Based on studies conducted by NASA, the officials there were led to the conclusion that they needed an increase in their scientific knowledge in order to provide the support required for future space efforts.

The establishment of a new NASA center, specifically planned for research in the field of electronics and related sciences, appeared to have clear advantages. Concentration of research talent, with the absence of any conflicting development missions in other fields, and the availability of comprehensive research facilities would contribute to the creation of a major capability in electronics research as quickly as possible.

While other areas in the country have electronic competence, it seems to me that the real heart of the electronics industry is in the Greater Boston area. This section has the University and Industrial strength that will provide the necessary stimulating environment for the proposed center.

Mr. Speaker, I think we would be the first to criticize NASA if it accepted less than the ablest contractor—less than the ablest method of providing preeminence in space for this country—or less than the best location in the Nation for the Electronics Research Center which is so vitally and rapidly needed.

Let us forget parochial and provincial arguments. Let us have an end to this unconstructive and petty criticism. Let us go forward and build the new research center and see that this Nation of ours assumes its rightful place—first in technical know-how, and first in the space race.

De Zavala Park Endorsed by Harris County, Tex., Historical Survey Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on May 27, the Senate passed Senate bill 261, my bill to clear the way for the establishment of a State or county park at the homestead of Lorenzo de Zavala, a signer of the Texas Declaration of Independence and a Vice President of the Republic of Texas.

The Harris County Historical Survey Committee has gone on record in support of enactment of this bill in the Texas Congress with a resolution adopted May 14, 1962.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE HARRIS COUNTY HISTORICAL SURVEY COMMITTEE, MAY 14, 1963

Whereas Lorenzo de Zavala was a signer of the Texas Declaration of Independence, first vice president of the Republic of Texas, and one of the New World's outstanding statesmen of his era; and

Whereas there exists no suitable monument or memorial to this extraordinary early Texas hero; and

Whereas there could be no more suitable memorial to Lorenzo de Zavala than a State shrine embracing the site of his home where the wounded in the Battle of San Jacinto were hospitalized and also the nearby cemetery where he lies buried, immediately across the Houston Ship Channel from the San Jacinto battleground (and where also is buried David Thomas, first attorney general and for a time acting secretary of war of the Republic of Texas); and

Whereas such a State historic monument in the form of a park adjacent to the battleground not only would be a fitting tribute to Zavala's memory but also would enhance the scenic and aesthetic value of the battleground itself; and

Whereas a Lorenzo de Zavala shrine would be a scource of particular pride to our large population of Mexican extraction, as well as to Texans generally; and

Whereas there is a bill in Congress to convey, out of the surplus Federal property which is the former San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, parcels A-23, A-25, A-26, A-27, and A-28, comprising 142 acres of the 177-acre Zavala homestead to the State of Texas as a historic monument; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Texas has enacted a bill to accept this property for a State shrine: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Harris County Historical Survey Committee, created by the Harris County Commissioners Court at the request of the Texas State Historical Survey Committee, an official agency of the State of Texas, does hereby urge the enactment of S. 261 by Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH of Texas and directs that copies of this resolution be sent to Texas Senators and Representatives in Congress and to the chairmen of the appropriate committees.

HAROLD G. PYLE,
Chairman.
FRANK E. TRITICO,
Secretary.

The Middle East Cauldron

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, last week the distinguished senior Senator from New York, Senator JAVITS, addressed the 11th Annual Convention of District 1, B'nai B'rith. Senator JAVITS spoke on the difficult situation which exists in the Middle East. As the Senator said in his remarks, the unrest and tension which exists in that area impedes peace not only in the Middle East but in the world. I ask unanimous consent that Senator JAVITS' remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that the benefit of his analysis may be available to all.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The present crisis in the Middle East is deepening and the danger of war with Israel's existence at stake will not disappear as if my magic just because certain words are said and certain statements pronounced.

U.S. policy in the Middle East continues to be one of "quiet diplomacy" and the Middle East is the only part of the world where U.S. policy treats friends of peace and foes of peace alike. This is an untenable and ill-advised posture for our Nation, and it is time we abandoned it.

With new fighting in Yemen; with Iraq teetering on the brink of civil war with the Kurds once more, and with Nasser's propaganda agitation and subversive activity going at full blast, it will take definite acts by the United States—not unilaterally but together with other nations—to halt the war threat in the Middle East and bring about a climate in which our objectives of peace and stability can be fully realized.

One action that we should take as soon as possible is to tighten up on our aid program to Egypt and make it clear to the President that he should suspend or withhold that assistance altogether if President Nasser continues his aggressive and warlike activities in violation of the express aims and objectives of the Foreign Assistance Act.

I have written to the Department of State to this effect and I shall introduce an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act which will emphasize the President's authority to cut off aid to Egypt.

The grave concern felt in the Congress over the rampant hostilities in this region found full expression in the series of speeches and colloquies which took place in the House and the Senate. On April 30, I was joined by 15 of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in an attack on the Soviet-Egyptian arms buildup and to call for a sharp change in our present policy of dealing even-handedly with friends and foes of peace alike in the Middle East. It is worth noticing that in 2 hours of discussion and debate on the Senate floor by Democrats and Republicans, not one voice was heard in defense of the State Department's policy in this respect.

We were heartened when President Kennedy, on May 8, issued the firmest and strongest statement on the Middle East he has made since he took office. At that time he told a press conference, and I quote:

"In the event of aggression or preparation for aggression, whether direct or indirect, we would support appropriate measures in the United Nations and adopt other courses of action on our own to prevent or put a stop to such aggression."

Now this should make it quite clear to President Nasser of Egypt where we stand. But President Nasser has a long memory; he knows that the Department of State does not think he is prepared to act the way he talks, and will react to his threats by giving him as before more economic assistance and more private and unpublicized appeals to be nice and not do anything rash.

That economic assistance which the United States is giving Nasser rescued him from the disastrous consequences of his own so-called Arab socialism—which was little more than an excuse to nationalize all private property. Egypt's cotton crop was being sold to the Soviets in return for modern guns, planes, and submarines, and the country was on the verge of starvation when we stepped in with a massive aid program that amounted to over $250 million last year alone, most of it in surplus foods.

We did it because it was said this was an opportunity to get Egypt away from its entanglement with the Soviet Union and back into the Western sphere of influence again. And for a time it seemed to work; President Nasser paid off Great Britain and France for his seizure of the Suez Canal; Egypt's trade with Europe began to pick up again; and some effort was begun to improve the miserable living standards of the Egyptian masses.

Once the panic over the fear of starvation and revolt was gone, President Nasser began his familiar tactics of agitation and subversion, boasting of his new jet bombers that could destroy the oil fields of Saudi Arabia, and his new missiles which could reach, as he put it, south of Syria; and everyone knew that he meant Israel.

That was the beginning of the present crisis, and the next steps followed quickly.

First, came the Nasser-engineered revolt in Yemen last year. He poured 30,000 Egyptian troops, tanks and planes into a war against the new imam, a Western-educated ruler who had just begun to take his nation out of its primitive condition. Nasser's planes, some of them allegedly piloted by Russians, and all of them serviced by Communist ground crews, bombed Saudi Arabian towns and dropped boobytrapped toys and trinkets.

For a time it looked as if the war might spread, and when proroyalist Yemen tribesmen began to beat back the so-called republican forces and their Egyption allies, the State Department abruptly stepped into the picture. In exchange for a vague promise from Nasser to withdraw his troops, the United States suddenly recognized the new Yemen regime, even though it had no popular support and no chance of survival without the protection of Egyptian troops. The British protested our action as premature and even our own diplomats in some Middle East countries were shocked by this appeasement of Nasser.

Today, 6 months later, Nasser is still in Yemen, vowing to keep his troops there until he wins, and Maj. Gen. Anwar Qadi, his commander in Yemen, is warning that "reactionaries" should not be misled into believing that "we shall pull out before realizing all the objectives of our mission." Meanwhile the Department of State has turned over the hot Yemen problem to the United Nations and is urging speedy implementation of the withdrawal agreement drafted by our special envoy, Ellsworth Bunker.

The second factor contributing to the present crisis was the disclosure that German scientists and technicians, many of them diehard Nazis, were working for Nasser to develop nuclear warhead missiles. Something like a shudder of horror went through the civilized world over the realization that Nazis could still be working for the destruction of Jews 18 years after Hitler Germany had been smashed to the ground. The present German Government of Chancellor Adenauer has ordered its scientists and technicians to return home, and the United States has flatly banned the introduction of nuclear weapons into the Middle East, but Egyptian rockets even with conventional warheads could cause horrible devastation in crowded Tel Aviv and Haifa.

The third action that triggered Israel's alarm was the open declaration in the Cairo charter of April 17 that the avowed object of the new Arab federation of Egypt, Syria, and Iraq was to destroy Israel. At the same time Egypt resumed her propaganda war and subversive agitation in order to stir up revolt in Jordan and possibly Saudi Arabia too. These were followed by riots in Jordan and Egyptian incitement to assassinate King Hussein—an action that could start Israeli armed forces moving toward the west bank of the Jordan. The Government of Israel has formally protested to the Security Council of the United Nations against this new threat to peace.

In a letter to me dated May 20, the Department of State expressed the view that Israel was in no immediate danger and said also that—and I quote—"the aid program in the UAR is tailored as carefully as possible so as not to free resources for arming." But the Department also admits—and again I quote—that "obviously the UAR in its military program absorbs resources which might otherwise contribute to development. But U.S. interests will not be served by ignoring or rejecting the legitimate needs of the people for economic progress or, for that matter, of food itself."

I must take issue, however, with the view that there is no immediate danger to Israel. I feel there is such danger and that it may be imminent.

The unrest and tension imperils not only peace in the Middle East but in the world. The Department of State should not allow of the criticism that our Government fails to act when there is still time and room to do so. I am convinced that we must take steps now to assure the security of Israel and the entire region not by works alone but by action. And one critical place to act is the massive U.S. aid program to the United Arab Republic.

The contention that we would be ignoring the legitimate needs of the Egyptian people if we conditioned our aid to President Nasser on a cessation of the arms race is not valid. On the contrary, we would be truly helping the people of Egypt by bringing them face to face with the consequences of President Nasser's policies so that they can be changed. As it is, their condition has not been materially improved.

Regarding the security of the Middle East, I am convinced that a mutual defense agreement, joined in by the United States, the United Kingdom, and France, with Israel and any other Middle East state willing to assume its obligations, is essential.

B'nai B'rith has a long and honorable history of association with the development of Palestine and the upbuilding of the State of Israel. In Israel, it participates directly and through its membership in a children's home, the Hillel Foundation at Hebrew University, and in other institutions of welfare, health, and education. Through its Israel Committee it contributes substantially by the purchase of Israel bonds and the support of the United Jewish Appeal. Thus, B'nai B'rith, like the United States, has an important stake in the security and independence of Israel, and I would urge you to defend that stake with all your rights as Americans. Congress will take a very searching look at our foreign aid program, especially that part of it which relates to Egypt, and I hope that you will not only let your Congressman know how you feel but also arouse sentiment in your areas about this program.

There is tremendous support in our country for the best relations between ourselves and Israel and for Israel's security so that her mission may be fulfilled. It is critically important, therefore, that this climate of support and Israel's prestige in the United States be kept vital and alive.

House Office Building Revealed as Most Expensive in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, today while the House was sitting in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, I made reference in my remarks to the newspaper article appearing in my hometown paper. I think that it is essential that Members of Congress know the image that they are projecting by such appropriation bills as H.R. 6868 today considered by the House.

For the information of Members of the House, the following news article appearing on page one of the Louisville Times, a daily newspaper with a circulation of 180,000:

House Office Building Revealed as Most Expensive in History

(By Richard Harwood)

Washington, June 6.—The cat jumped out of the bag today with an admission by the House of Representatives that its squat and unappealing new office building will cost the taxpayers $131,500,000.

It is expected to be completed sometime next year and will take its place in architectural history as the most expensive office building ever erected on earth.

The Pentagon, the biggest office building in the world, cost only $83 million. New York's newest and most luxurious skyscraper, the Seagram Building, a bronze and glass shaft that soars 38 stories above Park Avenue, cost only $41 million, including the site.

Since the building was begun in 1955, the cost has been effectively hidden from the public by complicated accounting procedures and by constantly shifting estimates.

The official estimate published in 1959 was $64 million. It has been going up ever since.

The new estimate was revealed today in the published hearings of the House Appropriations Committee.

The cost breakdown included: $14,200,000 for acquiring and clearing the site; $71,500,000 for construction; $7,500,000 for a subway system linking the building with the Capitol, which is across the street; $5,300,000 for architectural and engineering fees; $3,500,000 for administration and miscellaneous; $8 million for underground garages; $3,500,000 for furniture and furnishings; $18 million for remodeling the two existing House office buildings, necessitated by the abandonment of offices by Congressmen who will move into the new building.

SWIM POOL CONFIRMED

The committee hearings also confirmed what has long been suspected but always denied by project officials—that the new building will contain a swimming pool for House Members.

The hearings covered the proposed budget for the House in the coming year and contained some fresh facts on the somewhat mysterious fiscal operations of Congress.

Philip Roof, executive assistant to Capitol Architect George Stewart, revealed for the first time that Congressmen and their wives are the beneficiaries of a "socialized" floral operation.

They are supplied bouquets and potted plants free by the Botanic Garden at an annual cost to the Treasury of about $25,000. When it runs out of flowers, the Botanic Garden buys them for Congressmen from commercial florists at the taxpayers' expense.

Another witness, James L. Harrison, of the Government Printing Office, revealed that he is supplying specially designed wall calendars to Congressmen at a cost last year of $30,944.33. It's possible that this calendar operation is illegal.

Representative Tom Steed, Democrat, of Oklahoma, who heads the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations, asked Harrison what legal authority he had for printing and giving away calendars.

NO SPECIFIC AUTHORITY

Harrison replied that he didn't know. He said he produced the calendars at the request of the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate.

The Clerk's office, questioned by Steed on this point, replied that there was no specific legal authority for supplying calendars.

Both House and Senate Members eat in Capitol dining rooms that receive annual Treasury subsidies. This year, the committee was told, the congressional dining rooms will need a subsidy of nearly $250,000.

The committee's final recommendations on the budget for running Congress in the coming year haven't been published. But virtually every unit in Congress is seeking a budget increase. That includes the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-Essential Federal Expenditures, headed by the conservative and economy-minded Senator from Virginia, Harry F. Byrd.

Do Members Want the Food Stamp Plan for Their Own Districts?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Agriculture has been holding hearings this week on my bill, H.R. 5733, the administration measure to authorize the appropriation of sufficient funds for a nationwide food stamp program such as is now in effect in about three dozen areas of the country on a pilot plan basis.

I know that many of the Members want to have the food stamp plan adopted in their districts, too—or, if it is now in operation in parts of their district, then have it extended throughout the district. I would like to point out that the only way more Members can have the food stamp plan for their districts is to enact H.R. 5733. In my testimony today, I explained why that is true.

A number of the Members have joined me in testifying in favor of H.R. 5733. However, it is interesting to note that many of us who are testifying already have the plan in operation in our own districts—and can continue having it regardless of whether H.R. 5733 is passed. But we are reporting on our experiences under the program in order to persuade the committee to make it possible to have the program used nationally. I therefore urge those Members who sincerely want the food stamp plan substituted in their districts for the present system of direct distribution of surplus food to get in touch with the Committee on Agriculture and voice their support for this legislation. The hearings are scheduled to conclude tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion at this point, a release on my testimony this morning, as follows:

Food Stamp Sponsor Urges Use of Plan Nationally

Congresswoman Leonor K. Sullivan, Democrat, of Missouri, sponsor of the Kennedy administration's bill for expanding the pilot food stamp plans into a nationwide program, testified today that enactment of the bill would bring "good food and needy Americans together at the dinner table, where the rest of us can be found every day in the year."

Appearing before the House Committee on Agriculture as the first congressional witness on her bill, H.R. 5733, following testimony in favor of the legislation yesterday by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, Mrs. Sullivan said:

"The pilot food stamp programs now in operation in about three dozen areas of the country, including my own city of St. Louis, assure well-rounded diets for families unable to afford even a minimum standard of living at the dinner table. The enthusiasm of the public, of the food industry, and of the needy who are assisted, in areas which have had the plan in operation long enough to iron out administrative redtape, is indeed heartening to all of us who have supported this idea over the years."

The Congresswoman was the author of the first and only food stamp law ever passed by Congress—a bill enacted in 1959 but which was never put into effect by the Eisenhower administration and which subsequently expired. She said new legislation is now necessary to authorize the appropriation of sufficient funds if the pilot plans are to be expanded nationally.

The pilot plans, she explained, are financed by a special fund, consisting of one-third of all annual customs receipts, set aside under the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1935 to cover the cost of removal of surplus "nonbasic" agricultural commodities from the market, chiefly meat and dairy products, eggs, poultry, vegetables, fruits and other perishables, and processing them for use in the school lunch program and for donation to the needy.

Only $40 million of section 32 money, however, is earmarked specifically for the food stamp plans in the Agricultural Appropriation bill passed by the House last week, Mrs. SULLIVAN said, whereas about $360 million would be needed to expand the program nationally. She said much of this cost—about $260 million—could be saved through the elimination of the present program in 1,500 counties of direct donation of surplus food packages to the needy, in favor of the food stamp method.

"The question before you is whether the food stamp plan of distribution is preferable to the direct distribution system," she continued. "The experience in the pilot plan areas proves that it is preferable—without any doubt whatsoever.

"The food stamp plan is by no means utopia on a handout card. For those who qualify, and who receive any income at all, a monthly payment must be made to purchase stamps covering the full amount that such a family could reasonably be expected to spend for food. If anything, this regulation has been administered over strictly, and many families previously receiving surplus food donations in the pilot plan areas are not participating."

She said she had investigated numerous complaints in bureaucratic rigidity in setting up the stamp purchase requirements in St. Louis and had found some complaints justified, others not.

"There must be flexibility in administration of any complex program of Government," she added. But, as so many of our colleagues will tell you about the food stamp pilot plans now operating in parts of their districts, the plan does work, and works exceptionally well, to bring decent, American-standard, nutritious enjoyable diets to families long denied such a blessing—people who previously went hungry in a country where we have such abundances of food they cause us all kinds of agricultural woes. Let us use this method to improve the diets of those who cannot afford adequate meals—who are deprived of red meat and fresh eggs and fresh milk and fresh vegetables and who live instead on the cheapest and most filling foods regardless of caloric content and adequacy of nutrition. The food is here; all of us prefer to see it eaten rather than stored or powdered or dehydrated or destroyed."

Under the pilot food stamp plans, eligible participants, mostly families on public assistance receive for the money they normally would spend for food, a value of stamps intended to provide them with a well-rounded and adequate diet. The stamps are usable as money in grocery stores, but only for food items, and only for foods grown or processed in this country.

Law Day U.S.A., 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I take great pride in bringing to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress an excellent speech by Leif R. Langsjoen of Willmar, Minn. Mr. Langsjoen is president of the Kandiyohi County Bar Association. He delivered this speech before the association on the observance of Law Day U.S.A., 1963. Mr. Langsjoen reminds us that "freedom under law must be guarded and nurtured at home, improved and expanded at home, and promoted and applied abroad," and this is not just the responsibility of lawyers or government, but of every citizen in this country.

I ask unanimous consent that this thoughtful and sound message be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW DAY U.S.A., 1963

(Speech of Leif R. Langsjoen, Esq., at Law Day observance at the Kandiyohi County Court House, Willmar, Minn., April 26, 1963, the Honorable C. A. Rolloff, judge, presiding)

Official proclamations and resolutions, however well phrased, have a way of being devoid of impact. Thus when the 87th Congress of the United States adopted, in 1961, a joint resolution designating May 1, 1961, as the first Law Day U.S.A., it provided it "be set aside as a special day of celebration by the American people in appreciation of their liberties and the reaffirmance of their loyalty to the United States of America; of their rededication to the ideals of equality and justice under law in their relations with each other as well as with other nations; and for the cultivation of that respect for law that is so vital to the democratic way of life." What, specifically, does this mean? One thing it does not mean. Law Day is not a promotional device for lawyers or for the legal profession. It is not a "National Sausage Week." And it is not simply a day to commend or compliment ourselves on our superior legal system.

It is rather a sober observance of an almost uniquely Anglo-American circumstance—a government under law where the rights of every citizen, regardless of birth or race, social or financial position, are equal and protected. And it is more than an observance. It is a public rededication to a system of freedom under law. And it is more than this. It is the statement of an ideal, only imperfectly realized at home, unevenly available abroad, and in an embryonic state internationally.

Why is freedom under law unique? Considered in the span of human history it is an infrequent and short-lived phenomenon. Our democracy is less than 200 years old and is among the oldest in the world today. England's concept of freedom and equality under law is 700 years old and for a part of that time its future hung in the balance. Half the world is under Soviet tyranny, where rights are determined arbitrarily by those who govern. Africa is crawling out of the stone age. A modern, civilized nation, Germany, less than 20 years ago, practiced genocide and slavery on a scale that would have shamed the Visigoths; 250 years ago the most advanced nations in Europe subscribed to the "divine right of kings."

Why should we rededicate ourselves to this freedom under law? Because unless we do we have no assurance whatever that it will last. President Kennedy, in his Law Day Proclamation this year describes law as reason and morality displacing brutal force. Reason and morality come only to an enlightened citizenry. Morality in government is retained only through constant vigilance. It is quickly lost through indifference. In fact, freedom and equality under law and the respect for law have a hundred enemies; greed, dishonesty, willfulness, expediency, lust for power, ignorance, pride, envy. But once freedom under law is acquired, surely its greatest enemy is indifference.

Every indifferent juror weakens this system of freedom under law. Every forgetful or unavailable witness weakens it. Every expedient police act, illegal arrest, or forced confession offends it. Every punitive or confiscatory tax violates it. Every discriminatory act, by society or Government, against another by reason of his race or religion or economic position damages it. Every appeal to greed and envy, promise to provide by law the goods or wealth extracted from others, undermines it.

It is an ideal imperfectly realized at home. One hundred years ago we sold human beings like cattle or horses. Eighty years ago we exterminated the American Indians in about the same fashion as we reduced the coyote population. One year ago Federal troops were necessary to admit a Mississippi citizen to a university his taxes helped support.

It is imperative that, while we preserve and develop the concept of freedom under law at home, we sell it abroad and apply it internationally. John Foley of the Massachusetts bar, writing in the April 1963 issue of the American Bar Journal states: "Communism is a way of life which cannot be conquered by force. The only sure way to destroy communism is, if possible, to awaken in all people a desire for freedom and self-expression that can only come through law."

Dr. Walter Judd has said in substance, "The world will be either all Communist or all free—and in our lifetimes." President Kennedy had international application in mind when he said in January this year, "We have all the more need to work for a day when law may govern nations as it does men within nations."

No, it isn't for us to compliment ourselves today on what we consider the finest legal system in the world. Rather Law Day should remind us that freedom under law must be guarded and nurtured at home, improved and expanded at home, and promoted and applied abroad. This cannot be one by lawyers alone or even by lawyers and Government together. It requires the active help of every informed citizen the country possesses.

Tribute to the Late Francis E. Walter

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that very few people in the history of the House of Representatives have exercised a greater influence on the course of the Nation and composition of its laws than our late colleague, "TAD" WALTER. He possessed in very large measure the attributes of greatness as a legislator.

One of the marks of that greatness, I believe, was his willingness to advise and assist less senior Members of the House in the sometimes difficult problems that they faced. My own personal experience with "TAD" WALTER amply demonstrated this facet of his character. During my first term in the Congress I discovered that "TAD" WALTER, in spite of the many important projects in which he was engaged and the heavy demands on his time, was a person to whom I could turn for valuable help and counsel.

I believe that it was this feeling for his colleagues more than any other aspect of his character and career that made "TAD" WALTER a respected and beloved leader of the House of Representatives. We who were his colleagues shall miss him very much. More importantly, the country has lost a great leader whom it shall be very difficult to replace.

American Ships in the Expanded Trade Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many Members who are interested in the U.S. Merchant Marine and its relation to world trade will be interested in a winning essay in the 1962 Harold Harding Memorial Essay Contest for the Port of Portland, Maine Propeller Club, on the subject of the U.S. Merchant Marine and world trade. This essay was written by Mr. Charles Blumenthal, an 18-year-old student at Deering High School, Portland, Maine:

AMERICAN SHIPS IN THE EXPANDED TRADE PROGRAM

If the President's recently approved trade program ever gets off the ground, American ships should undoubtedly benefit from its tariff-cutting powers. Common Market complications, however, impede its progress. If Britain is not admitted to the European Economic Community (and De Gaulle of France is steadfastly opposed to her admission), "the main force of the Trade Expansion Act cannot come into play." [1]

Britain's alternative, then, "is a coordinated reduction of tariffs with her EFTA partners (Norway, Denmark, Switzerland, Austria, Sweden, and Portugal, a grouping of nations with which she has cut internal tariffs 50 percent in the last 2 years), the Commonwealth, and North America, that would, in effect, create a worldwide free trade area able to bargain and compete with De Gaulle's Europe." [2]

Whatever Britain's position in economic organizations, the fact still remains that the United States must inevitably face stiff competition for shipping lanes already heavily serviced by the British or the other nations of the world. Who is going to retire his fleet, even in the interest of international cooperation?

The very existence of the Trade Expansion Act is an indication of the merchant marine's poor state of health. Some $300 million flow from the U.S. Treasury each year in the form of subsidies to the domestic fleet. These subsidies are supposed to cover the difference between building and operating an American ship and a foreign ship. Every year the taxpayers' contribution increases, but the results diminish: "In just the last 10 years, the participation of U.S.-flag shipping lines in the Nation's foreign commerce has dropped from 53 to 10 percent.[3]

Perhaps the merchant marine should depend less on the elimination of tariffs under the President's program and adopt an aggressive program of expansion of its shipping area: "The United States ranks high only in commerce to and from home ports (in contrast to Britain and Norway which appear high on most routes, even on those not touching Europe)." [4]

It is too early to estimate the gains of the merchant marine's current program of efficiency, speed, and versatility. The domestic fleet manages to survive high construction-operation costs and cheap foreign competition by more efficient cargo handling, by faster and bigger ships which earn higher profits by permitting more trips per year, and by versatile vessels capable of carrying varied cargoes because of innovations in automation.

Automation, however, is a source of dissension between labor and management. Union leaders naturally want to preserve jobs for the men, trained and untrained, who can be replaced by mechanical cargo-handling equipment and virtually unmanned vessels: "A fully automated 300-foot freighter (crewed by only six men) that has just been blueprinted by Matson Navigation Co. won't be built without a union go-ahead. And Morris Weisberger, Pacific vice president of the Seafarers International Union, already hopping mad that the ship was planned without union consultation, threatens that negotiations will be long and tough." [5]

Still another possibility for increased cargoes is the internationally controversial 50–50 rule under which half of U.S. foreign-aid shipments must be carried in U.S.-flag vessels. In the interest of survival it makes sense for domestic shippers to transport all or most of such gift goods.

If, however, such measures as have been suggested should fail to bring about the desired results, perhaps the merchant marine should seriously weigh the truth of the "gloomy predictions that America's days as a great maritime power are ending." [6] The extraordinary post-World War II revival of Europe, the emergence of the African nations, the unrest of impoverished South America—all these factors augur the potential necessity for international cooperation beyond mere tariff cutting, perhaps even to the point of great international combines.

Although American economic superiority is threatend by the new prosperity of other nations, these same expanding powers must inevitably suffer problems similar to our own—the inflation spiral, technological unemployment, subsidization, etc. If this is so, then some measure of cooperation will be necessary for adjustment of maritime commerce. If the U.S. Merchant Marine actually is in its "twilight hours", then the President's trade expansion program is the first step toward preserving some share of the sea for our benefit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dun's Review, published by Dun & Bradstreet, the Shrinking World of Shipping, New York, June 1962.

Life, published by Time, Inc., the U.S. Merchant Fleet, New York, December 21, 1962.

Newsweek, published by Newsweek, Inc., Winds of Change—East and West, New York, February 4, 1963; the Periscope, February 25, 1963.

Senior Scholastic, published by Scholastic Magazines, Inc., Troubled Seas for the U.S., Merchant Fleet, New York, May 3, 1961.

---

[1] "Winds of Change—East and West." Newsweek, LXI (Feb. 4, 1963), 14.

[2] Ibid., p. 33.

[3] "The Shrinking World of Shipping." Dun's Review, LXXIX (June 1962), 108.

[4] "The U.S. Merchant Fleet." Life, LIII (Dec. 21, 1962), 130.

[5] "The Periscope." Newsweek, LXI (Feb. 25, 1963), 16.

[6] "The Shrinking World of Shipping," p. 108.

Manned Lunar Landing and International Competition in Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, recently there came to my attention two excellent editorials which were published in Science, the weekly magazine of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, of which Dr. Philip H. Abelson is editor. The first editorial deals with the subject of a manned lunar landing and the second with the international competition in science.

In my opinion, these two editorials are of such thought-provoking nature that their contents should be made available for reading by Members of the Congress and others.

I ask unanimous consent that both editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Science, Apr. 19, 1963]

MANNED LUNAR LANDING

The Nation is committed to the manned lunar landing program. Nevertheless, the project seems certain to be the center of continuing controversy. Each year Congress will vote on appropriations, and this guarantees a recurring reexamination of the basic rationale of the program.

Four principal justifications have been cited: The propaganda value of beating the Russians, possible military applications, technological fallout, and scientific values.

The Nation may sustain the continuing burden of the program principally because of man's spirit of adventure—his desire to conquer the inanimate. An earlier generation was excited about reaching the North Pole. Later, Lindbergh's flight was greeted with wild enthusiasm. However, the emotional peak was sharp and soon dissipated. The sequence of public reaction to the orbiting astronauts is instructive. Our first success was witnessed by a huge enthralled audience. A later episode was considered routine. The lasting propaganda value of placing a man on the moon has been vastly overestimated. The first lunar landing will be a great occasion; subsequent boredom is

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

inevitable. Interest in lunar exploration will be sustained only if there are important military implications, exciting scientific accomplishments, or technological fallout.

Military applications seem remote. The cost of a missile based on the moon would be about a hundred to a thousand times that of an earth-based device. The trajectory of a missile from the moon to the earth is complicated; a slight malfunction would be disastrous. Another proposed application is surveillance of other countries. The disadvantages of observing from a distance of 240,000 miles rather than from much nearer are obvious.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has sought examples of technological fallout from its program. To date, those cited have not been impressive. The problems of space are different from the problems of the earthly tax-paying economy. Not more than a small fraction of the cost of the moon program will be recovered through technological fallout.

The scientific exploration of the moon has been accorded a secondary priority in the lunar program. This has been indicated in the attitude surrounding presentation of the new budget to Congress and underlined by the decision not to have a scientist in the first lunar astronaut crew. If expert human observers are not to be employed, the alternative of exploration by electronic gear becomes exceedingly attractive. The cost of unmanned lunar vehicles is on the order of 1 percent of the cost of the manned variety; unmanned vehicles can be smaller and need not be returned. Most of the interesting questions concerning the moon can be studied by electronic devices. These include important puzzles concerning selenodesy (the analog of geodesy), topography, and the particle size, chemical composition, and mineralogy of the lunar surface. Investigations of the internal constitution and seismicity could also be conducted electronically. Observations of the sun and other stars could be made in which a far wider segment of the electromagnetic spectrum could be employed than is available through man's vision. Unmanned exploration could provide the basis for realistic design of manned landing craft, thus decreasing the total costs and increasing the chances of success. A reexamination of priorities is in order.

P.H.A.

[From Science, May 17, 1963]

INTERNATIONAL COMPETITION IN SCIENCE

The Soviety ability to launch large missiles has been misinterpreted as indicating superiority over the United States in scientific matters. Actually there are few areas of science in which the Russians excel. Despite their ability to place large pieces of hardware in orbit, their contributions to space research have been meager. They have nothing to match our Mariner II results, and their exploration of regions closer to the earth has been less intensive than ours. In high-energy nuclear physics our discoveries are unmatched, as is our progress in maser-laser studies and in semiconductors. In most areas of chemistry the Russians are behind us; plastics and petrochemicals are outstanding examples. In the exploitation of radioactive isotopes much of the Russian work is mere repetition of our research. In biochemistry, biophysics, and molecular biology we are superior. The Russians have achieved nothing like our progress in deciphering the genetic code or in determining amino acid sequences in proteins.

Innumerable examples could be given; we compete on countless frontiers of science which, in sum, are vastly more important than space. On many of these frontiers, such as solid-state physics, advances are crucial to future economic and military strength. Fundamental research is now often quickly followed by practical applications. A substantial fraction of today's commerce is based on discoveries of the last two decades. It is of interest to compare American and Russian competition in world markets in items involving science and technology. By this yardstick the Soviet Union is a third-class power. It is no match for Western Europe, the United Kingdom, or Japan.

The Japanese are competing in technological areas requiring first-class scientific competence. Their electronics products such as transistor radios and television sets are selling for less than ours on our own soil. To a degree this reflects cheaper labor, but only in part. The production of transistors and other solid-state electronic components involves sophisticated technology. Even the cheapest labor is no subsitute for scientific ability in this field.

Western Europe is far stronger scientifically and technologically than the U.S.S.R., and the Western Europeans are rapidly closing in on us. If present trends continue, it will be only a matter of a few years before they achieve supremacy.

Western Europeans have long proved that they are, individually at least, as competent scientifically as we. They have made a remarkable recovery from the effects of World War II and are again in a position to challenge us. In the contest they have two advantages. Research costs them about one-fourth what it costs us, and proportionately less of their talent is occupied with military and space efforts. Leaders of industrial research in this country are increasingly concerned with the overpowering competition of Government-financed programs for first-class scientific talent. One research director told me recently, “We need good people, but my company can't compete with projects paid for by the U.S. Treasury.”

We have chosen to stake our national prestige in a propaganda contest with the Russians in one of the few major areas of technology where they have an edge over us. In the meantime we fail to note that the Western Europeans are getting ready to walk away with the trophies which really count.

P.H.A.

The Wheat Referendum and Centralized Government in General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD, a letter that I have just received from a rancher and farmer of western South Dakota, which is food for thought not only for every Member of Congress, but for the people of the Nation as a whole. His letter refers first to the recent wheat referendum and to centralized government in general. The letter is as follows:

This is the first time I have voted on any of their referendums. Heretofore it had always seemed to me there was not much to vote on. It had always seemed to me the only thing for me to vote on was to try to make a choice between what might be the lesser of two evils. But this time it was different. Even if I would have had the information at hand that would have shown I was going broke tomorrow, the day I voted, I would have still have had to vote no. I do not belong to any of the so-called farm organizations; most of them really do not represent the best interests of the farmer. They, too, have absorbed much socialistic thought.

To me, farm programs are not the answer. In plain words, socialism is not the answer to any of our problems today, and that is what is boils down to, for no matter what terms and phrases they use to dress it up, planned economy, planned management, or whatever else they might think up for it, it is still socialism. And this does not apply to agriculture only, it applies to all areas of our economic system.

So far we have somehow survived 30 years of planning. How much longer we can survive I do not know, but I do know the tempo of the pace is quickening toward socialism, and it was reflected in the terms of the wheat referendum. It is also being reflected in our increasing soft attitude toward communism itself. Amazingly we have many forces, even strong forces, and from such unexpected places that favor this attitude, and I am thinking especially of the National Council of Churches, and the World Council of Churches. They have been and are becoming more so, powerful political forces not only in our own country, but all over the world. In fact, if it had not been for the National Council of Churches, Kennedy could never have been elected President of our country. In a measure, it is largely responsible for the situation we face in Cuba today, a really impossible situation, that could have been prevented had we not gone soft on communism.

The world, including our own country, is being brainwashed in preparation for world socialism in some form. There seems to be nothing we can do to stop its diabolical advance. It might help to recognize it for what it is, but so far apparently it has not been done. The inflationary measures that go with it, and upon which it thrives to give the illusion of prosperity, are a force in themselves that are hard to combat. Socialism is not noted for what it can do for a people, but rather what it does to them. Generally, it is not recognized for what it is until it is too late. And when it is, we are reminded of that phrase we hear so much in these times, “Too little and too late.” Too little and too late could bring to an end the way of life that we have known, and it could be sooner than we think.

Thirty years of farm programs, farm relief, have only made a bad situation worse. It has set operators up in farming wheat who would have never farmed wheat if it had not been for a farm program. It has kept land in wheat production that would have been taken out under normal conditions. It has encouraged the growing of inferior wheat that would not have been grown, again under normal conditions.

And worst of all, it has made farmers think they are dependent upon payments, regardless of how puny, in order to survive. For some it has already become a way of life. (We also find this true in our welfare programs, the thinking behind it is the same, and we also find it true in collective thinking.) No public enterprise can be considered without first determining how much can be gotten from the Government. When unrestricted deficit spending begins there can be no end to it, for there is always a new imagined need for Government spending, and when it is made available, there is at once an organized effort to obtain it. When it becomes a way of life we have already gone too far down the road to socialism.

It was encouraging to note the finality of the “no” vote, but in the States that actually produce the wheat, the good wheat, the vote was not so final. It would be interesting to know just how many voted yes and were thinking no. Personally, I know of many who voted under those circumstances.

I doubt if there were many who voted no and were thinking yes. Where we go from here depends entirely upon the interpretation that is given the no vote. My vote has little to do with the price of wheat. I was voting against more regimentation, more socialism. I had no alternative. The issue as I saw it was not the price of wheat, but a way of life.

Obituary Notice of Martin Stenehjem, Longtime GOP Political Figure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, one of the major reasons the United States of America became the great Nation it is, is the quality of its people. From the beginning this Nation benefited from the migration to this country of some of the finest people from all over the world.

North Dakota is one of the youngest States of our Union—its pioneers only having settled there 75 to 80 years ago. North Dakota is most proud of these pioneer settlers. Theirs was a tremendous contribution to the growth and development of North Dakota.

Among the finest pioneer settlers of our State is the Martin Stenehjem family—a large family, a proud family, and a good family. Martin Stenehjem, the head of this family, passed away just a few days ago. We in North Dakota salute him for all of his many, many contributions to his local community, his State, and the Nation. Martin and his good wife, Emma, exemplified all that was good in these pioneer families. They are always active and most influential in their church and community life. For many years both took a very active and most influential part in the Nonpartisan League, until it affiliated with the Democrat Party. They remained Republicans and continued their influence in the party. They were always among my best and most-appreciated friends.

Martin Stenehjem's passing was a tremendous loss to North Dakota and to me personally. I extend my heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Stenehjem and all of the Stenehjem family.

Mr. President, I think it would be very appropriate, and I ask unanimous consent, that Martin Stenehjem's obituary, which appeared in the Minot Daily News, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the obituary notice was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARTIN STENEHJEM, LONGTIME GOP POLITICAL FIGURE, DIES

Martin S. Stenehjem, 77, long active in North Dakota politics and widely known for many other public service activities, died Friday at his home in Minot. He was a member of a pioneer American family that had immigrated to the United States from Norway in 1849.

He and Mrs. Stenehjem, equally well known in political circles in North Dakota, celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary last January. The family residence for many years has been at 116 Ninth Avenue NW.

The funeral for Mr. Stenehjem will be at 2 p.m. Tuesday in First Lutheran Church at Minot, Rev. Dr. Harold B. Kildahl officiating. Burial will be in Rosehill Cemetery.

Six nephews will serve as pallbearers, Ove Stenehjem of Anamoose, Andy of Arnegard, Phillip and Gilman, both of Williston, and Leland and Vincent Stenehjem, both of Watford City. Thomas Funeral Home of Minot has charge of arrangements.

Friends may call at the funeral home, beginning this evening. There will be reviewal at the church before the service Tuesday.

A lifelong member of the Republican Party and alined with the Nonpartisan League when it was affiliated with the GOP, Mr. Stenehjem was endorsed in 1950 by the league as a candidate for U.S. Congress. He was defeated in his bid for nomination but he continued to be in the forefront of Republican politics.

In 1956, he was named chairman of the Citizens for Eisenhower Committee in North Dakota, and later that year attended the National Republican Convention in San Francisco as an official delegate.

Mr. Stenehjem was one of 11 children of Mr. and Mrs. A. A. Stenehjem. Four hundred to five hundred descendants of the first Stenehjems in America staged a giant reunion at Detroit Lakes, Minn., in 1949. Martin Stenehjem was banquet toastmaster at that reunion.

All 11 children once lived at Arnegard where they filed on land opened up to homesteading, beginning in 1905. Before settling in Arnegard, Mr. Stenehjem completed his formal education at Mayville State (Teachers) College. Born October 17, 1885, in Spring Grove, Minn., he came to Mayville in 1901.

He remained at Arnegard for 30 years, but when the hard, dray days of the 1930's hit North Dakota, he took a position as field representative with the land department of the Bank of North Dakota and moved his family and six children to Bottineau. In 1936, the family came to Minot.

In his capacity as field representative, Martin Stenehjem worked hard to persuade the people to stay on their farms. So successful was he that he was retained on the job until 1941, when he resigned the post to devote full time to his farming operations and selling native and southern growers on the virtues of certified seed potatoes. His success as a potatogrower was widely known. He said once, "The rains came and farm prices started back up again. I can't claim credit for a change in the weather."

In 1949, the Stenehjem potato warehouse, a large, modern concrete structure east of Mohall, was a casualty of heavy rains. The loss was estimated at $10,000. The structure was replaced with a new warehouse.

Martin Stenehjem's interest in farming and farm products extended into other areas of agriculture.

He sold the first combine bought in North Dakota in 1925. He was the first North Dakotan to terrace his farm to save moisture, in 1928. He had learned the practice on his trips south during the winter months to sell disease-resistant seed potatoes.

And he was first with a group which in the early 1920's persuaded a doubtful legislature to set up the State seed department.

Mr. Stenehjem was an active member of the First Lutheran Church in Minot and a member of the board of directors of the Lutheran Home for the Aged. He also was a member of the Masons and the Shrine, the Elks Lodge, and was a former member of Rotary Club in Minot.

He and Mrs. Stenehjem, the former Emma Bjornstad, were married Jan. 23, 1913, in Grand Forks. The couple had six children, Martin Jr., of Williston; Mrs. Patrick (Gwen) Bond, Martinsville, N. J.; Mrs. Lee (Dorothy) Wise of Long Beach, Calif.; Dr. Jerome of Redlands, Calif.; Mrs. R. W. (Geraldine) Wheeler of Bismarck, and Gerald of Williston.

Mr. Stenehjem also is survived by five brothers, Edwin of Winona, Minn.; Thomas and Gerhard of Williston; Odin of Watford City; and Styrk of Caledonia, Minn.; two sisters, Mrs. Chris Knatterud of Winona and Mrs. Dora Christenson of Santa Barbara, Calif., and 25 grandchildren.

The United States Should Be Doing More To Insure Peace in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, increasing numebrs of Americans are concerned about the welfare of the State of Israel, which is surrounded by hostile neighbors. I believe the U.S. Government should be taking a more active role in promoting peace in the Middle East and assuring the sovereignty of Israel.

Most recently I heard from Mr. Albert Liss, executive director of Brith Sholom. He sent me a statement adopted on behalf of that organization's national board of governors.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Liss' letter and the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITH SHOLOM,
Philadelphia, Pa., June 4, 1963.

Hon. HUGH SCOTT,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The membership of Brith Sholom, one of Pennsylvania's great fraternal and service organizations, is greatly disturbed about conditions in the Middle East. Their concern is forthrightly expressed in a statement adopted on their behalf by our organizations national board of governors meeting at the Adelphia Hotel in Philadelphia on May 23, a copy of which I am enclosing for your information.

Knowing of your consistent advocacy of strong measures to insure peace in the Middle East and to protect our Nation's interests, which can only be equated with social justice and the right of each sovereign state to security and protection from aggression, we take this opportunity to express our grateful thanks.

If it would assist our efforts, may we impose upon your good offices to insert our statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Again, expressing our deep appreciation.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT LISS,
Executive Director.

STATEMENT ON MIDDLE EAST CRISIS, ADOPTED BY NATIONAL BOARD OF GOVERNORS, BRITH SHOLOM

"Elimination of Israel, long advocated by the Arab nations and now confirmed as their basic policy in the Constitution of the Arab Federation now in the process of formation, poses a danger that requires immediate and resolute attention.

The most ardent admirers of the Egyptian dictator who mistakenly view him as a reformer can no longer ignore the war arsenal he is amassing that can transform his threat into an Armageddon for the Middle East.

Confident that her mounting accumulation of Russian bombers, tanks and submarines and her newly acquired ground-to-ground missiles, designed by German scientists, can win an easy lightning victory for his nation, Nasser may be tempted to unleash another war against Israel.

Outnumbered, vulnerable to lethal attack from the skies because of her small size, surrounded by hostile neighbors bent on its destruction, and without assurances from her friends that her security will be protected, Israel may feel impelled to take preventive action similar to the Sinai campaign.

To reverse the tide toward war in the Middle East the United States independently and in concert with other nations seeking peace must bring its enormous political, economic and moral power to bear upon the Arab nations to renounce their belligerency and to meet face to face with representatives of Israel to work out a peaceful solution to their differences.

Our Government should attempt to work out an agreement with the Soviet Union for control of armaments in the area as a model program for general disarmament. Such an experience can only enrich the nations in the world in their search for permanent peace.

Should the Arab nations reject our counsel of sanity it should be made clear that the U.S. Government and her allies are prepared to provide Israel with the military power required to equalize her position vis-a-vis the Arab nations. It is imperative that the people of Israel who have demonstrated indomitable will and tenacity be given the means to defend themselves. Otherwise the speed of modern warfare may confront the world with a fait accompli before aid can be furnished Israel in the event of attack.

Our Government should also advise the German Government whose prosperity was made possible by our generous aid and who now counts heavily upon our Government for defense, that we look with disfavor upon the work of German citizens engaged by the Egyptians in the development of ultra new weapons of destruction, aimed at completing the Nazi mission of extermination of the people of Israel.

In the United Nations, steps should immediately be taken to declare the Arab policy of belligerency against Israel a flagrant violation of the U.N. Charter.

We must announce to the nations of the Middle East that upon completion of a peace settlement, we are prepared with other nations to embark on a vast redevelopment scheme to aid them in rising from their poverty.

Nasser and his cohorts must not be permitted to continue to use the cold war as a weapon to blackmail us into unlimited aid. We must demand as our quid pro quo an understanding that Nasser will pursue peace.

An Unnecessary Expenditure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer an editorial from the Evening Independent of Massillon, Ohio, which contains a suggestion for our colleagues who are wrestling now with Defense Department appropriation hearings:

AN UNNECESSARY EXPENDITURE

This newspaper has always been an outspoken critic of the continual soaring cost of operating the Federal Government, the excessive tax burden Americans now shoulder and the steadily increasing national debt and has strongly advocated a reduction in wasteful spending, reduction of bureaucratic domination and less Government control over the lives of supposedly free Americans.

And there will be no change in this newspaper's attitude as long as billions of American taxpayers' dollars are tossed down rat roles all over the world in the guise of foreign aid and thousands upon thousands are being added to the public payroll to staff needless and wasteful Government operations.

The cry for less spending and more efficient Government is heard in all corners of the land but the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government are doing little about it. The emphasis is upon more and more spending, even though there are some Members of Congress who would like to slash spending but they are in the minority.

All of the above was inspired by something the mailman delivered to our desk a few days ago.

Inside the package was a news release from the public information office of Headquarters, Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet, U.S. Department of the Navy.

And what a news release it was.

First to attract our attention was a short news item about a Massillon boy who is a member of the amphibious assault landing ship U.S.S. *Valley Forge* which has just completed a 3-week training exercise with elements of the 1st Marine Brigade and Marine Air Group 12 and was steaming for Pearl Harbor and, as the public relations officer put it, "and some well earned liberty for all hands."

Now we were glad to receive the news item about the local boy who is a member of the crew. We are always glad to receive such items about local and area men and women serving their country.

Now had the public relations office turned his attention to some other duties after the local item all would have been well.

But he didn't.

Taking a closer look at the package we extracted this additional stuff: Five well developed glossy 6½- by 4½-inch prints of the *Valley Forge* in various formations during its Pacific test and two stories, covering 3 pages teach, double spaced, giving in detail all the nice things the captain had to say about his ship and the members of the crew.

Now to our way of thinking the glossy photos, which really do cost money as all photo fans will acknowledge, and the stories about the *Valley Forge* were an unnecesasry and wasteful expenditure of public funds—taxpayers' money.

We presume that newspapers in every city in the United States of America which had residents as members of the *Valley Forge* crew received the same amount of material which came to this newspaper.

Why was such a voluminous and expensive report on the recent training maneuvers of the *Valley Forge* necessary right now? We all presume that all branches of our military department are at all times engaged in building adequate defense for this Nation.

Had the *Valley Forge* information officer restrained himself to just sending us the news item about the local member of the crew, he might have saved enough money to make a substantial downpayment on a new warship.

But had that been the case what would the public information officer have done with his spare time?

Masonic Award to Senator Byrd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on the evening of May 27, the Grand Masonic Lodge in Virginia held a meeting. On that occasion the grand master presented to our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] the Grand Master's Award. At that time the Senator from Virginia made a speech accepting the award. He was presented to the grand lodge by Grand Master Charles B. Gilley. I ask unanimous consent that the presentation speech by the grand master, Mr. Gilley, and the speech by the Senator from Virginia be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY GRAND MASTER CHARLES B. GILLEY, MAY 27, 1963, GRAND MASTER'S AWARD DINNER, STATLER HOTEL

My brethren, this evening is an example of public devotion of masonry in action; your very presence here and at all other Masonic gatherings solidifies the fabric that makes our fraternity a strong and useful segment of this great society. Yes, all that we possess is but a token that our Founding Fathers bequeath us.

The most important heritage for us to remember is the many struggles and sacrifices they encountered while molding this great Government and country which we all love and pledge our lives to protect and upgrade. Franklin D. Roosevelt remarked during World War II, "So much to do and so little time to do it," and Thomas J. Watson stated, "The largest room in the world is room for improvement." No words could be more applicable to our present time. Don't break the ties that bind us together; no, don't even bend them because behind every weak or pessimistic American is a sneakthief trying to damage or sink the ship of American freedom and our religous way of life.

Thank God for freedom and the many who are doing their part to ward off the offenders.

This evening we are honored to have among us many outstanding Americans and Masons who have answered the call but we are particularly proud to pay tribtue to one who has displayed his love, devotion, and leadership to his community, State, and his country. A man we are proud to call brother, with family ties which are deep rooted and a strong supporter of our Constitution.

Honorable Brother HARRY FLOOD BYRD, as Grand Master of Masons of the District of Columbia, it is with pride and honor that I have the pleasure in presenting this plaque to such a distinguished Mason who has plowed his way into the hearts of every American by serving them in the high office which you occupy. You are the ideal and personification of an American statesman.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

I am greatly honored and deeply touched by the award bestowed upon me this evening by my brothers of the Masonic fraternity and I am deeply indebted to the grand master. I accept the grand master's award with humility and rededication to the fine teachings of Freemasonry.

Masonry has been good to me in so many ways. It has been good to me in tangible ways such as this occasion and this award—both of which I shall cherish forever, as I do the 33d degree conferred upon me in 1939 by the Supreme Council, Scottish Rite.

And beyond this, Masonry has been good to me in the intangible ways that we here know from its inspiration for exemplary character, good works, good deeds, and good will—and in general, all of the Masonic force for good in human society. It gives us a clear conception of our duty to God and man. It helps us to develop our spiritual faculties, and broaden our lives in fellowship and service—always with respect and appreciation of our brothers. It challenges us to strive for the nobler objectives in life. Its purpose is development of character and culture through fellowship and mutual helpfulness for all who will heed its teachings. It is charitable, benevolent, educational, and religious, and it encourages free association of men together for the achievement of these objectives. It is a fellowship philosophy that translates its principles into terms of daily living.

In my lifetime I have known many people in many walks of life, and in many places. And it has been my observation that Masons invariably are men of good will who merit both respect and confidence. It is the greatest organization of its kind in the world.

During my 30 years in Congress it has been my privilege to have become acquainted with a great many of its Members, in both Houses; and it is very pleasing to note the presence of so many Members of Congress in this great audience tonight.

It is understandable, of course, that my closest associations in Congress have been with Members of the Senate; and I think it is appropriate to say to my brothers here, that I have never known a Member of the U.S. Senate to commit a dishonorable act.

This is in the character of Masonry which—in its worldwide fraternity down through the centuries—has embraced millions of men who in their individual capacities—great and small—have contributed so much to advancement of our civilization and society.

Being from Virginia, passing the national memorial in Alexandria so frequently, and working in the Capitol of the United States, George Washington somehow always symbolizes Masonry in the United States to me; and I think Washington was one of the greatest Americans who ever lived.

Moving through the Capitol, and under its great dome, I find myself frequently pausing—mentally at least—in the recollection that Washington, in the company of his Masonic brothers from Maryland and Virginia, laid the cornerstone plate for the Capitol on September 18, 1793.

And Washington was not the only American President who has been active in Masonry. Others were Monroe, Jackson, Polk, Buchanan, Johnson, Garfield, McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Harding, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Truman.

It has been my great privilege to have been personally acquainted with President Franklin D. Roosevelt and President Truman, and I suspect many of you have had the same privilege during the past 30 years or so.

President Roosevelt and I took the oath of office, here in Washington, on the same snowy day in March 1933; and, as many of you will recall, the great depression was more turbulent than the weather.

Before his election as President, I had a very cordial friendship with him. We were Governors at the same time. I visited Albany and he visited Richmond. He and my brother Dick were intimate friends and remained so throughout their lives. They had served in the Navy together.

I had been enthusiastically for the 1932 National Democratic platform as a means of strengthening our system of government and bringing us out of the depression. That platform said:

"We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party when entrusted with power, and the people are entitled to know in plain words the terms of the contract to which they are asked to subscribe." And some of the plain words in that platform said:

"We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Government."

There we old New Dealers still stand; admittedly there is not much left to stand on; but then there are not many of us left standing. Just let me quote another passage from that 1932 platform:

"We favor maintenance of the national credit by a Federal budget annually balanced and sound currency to be preserved at all hazards." And to conclude these 1932 platform quotes, it said we stood for:

"The removal of Government from all fields of private enterprise except where necessary to develop public works and national resources in the common interest."

With that platform, the Virginia delegation at the 1932 convention gave me the privilege of casting its vote for Franklin D. Roosevelt on the promise that he would cut Federal expenditures by 25 percent when he took office.

In his campaign Mr. Roosevelt called President Hoover a spendthrift. Federal expenditures were then $4.6 billion. My first vote in the Senate was for a Roosevelt bill entitled "A bill to preserve the credit of the U.S. Government."

It provided for a 15-percent cut in all appropriations, including veterans pensions. Mr. Roosevelt had promised a 25-percent cut, and as campaign pledges go, I thought a 15-percent cut was pretty fair performance.

The President kept his campaign pledge for economy for 6 months, and then suddenly he abandoned his platform, and the Nation was started on an orgy of deficit spending which has lasted until this day. Mr. Roosevelt changed, but I did not.

I well recall an incident when he called me to the White House. He greeted me cordially. He said, "HARRY, your mother and my mother are two of the grandest persons who ever lived. We should have a reunion of the Byrds and the Roosevelts."

I replied, saying, "Mr. President, my mother and the Byrds would be delighted to attend whenever you name the day." Then he came to the business at hand.

I had been appointed chairman of a committee for reorganization of the Federal Government. The President said: "HARRY, here is a little bill I would like for you to introduce in the Senate."

I said, "Mr. President, I would like to look it over, and if I can sponsor it, I certainly will." He looked me right in the eyes and said, "HARRY, take it or leave it."

And I said, "Mr. President, on that basis, I will have to leave it;" and he took the bill back, I heard nothing more about the reunion.

The bill was introduced by someone else. It would have given him the power to control—among other departments—such quasi-judicial agencies as the Interstate Commerce Commission. The President could have fixed freight rates, passenger rates, etc. But the bill, as he proposed it, was defeated.

My first serious break with Roosevelt came when he proposed to pack the Supreme Court. We then had a Court that knew the law and stuck to it; and the laws he advocated had been declared unconstitutional. He wanted a Court which would give him his laws.

After I opposed his Court-packing proposal, he took away from me appointments usually given a Senator in the same party, and announced that Gov. (brother) Jim Price of Virginia would distribute this Federal patronage. Jim Price, let me say, was one of the outstanding Masons of Virginia.

But this did not hurt me. There were not as many jobs as there were unemployed. When applications were made to me, I simply referred them to the Governor, as the President had indicated.

Pretty soon so many people were calling on poor old Jim down at Richmond, he built a tunnel from the Governor's Mansion to the capitol to avoid the job hunters. The President urged him to oppose me in the next election, but he did not do it.

When President Roosevelt ran for his fourth term, to which I was opposed, the wheels of fortune had made me chairman of the Senate Rules Committee; and by long custom the Rules Committee chairman was chairman of the inaugural ceremonies.

As chairman of the ceremonies, I inquired as to the customary appropriation for defraying inauguration expenses in adequate fashion. I was told it was $25,000 for the stands and other expenses, and I promptly requested this amount.

President Roosevelt then announced that he would have the ceremonies at the White House, and show the economy-minded BYRD how to save this $25,000. And this was done.

I immediately canceled the plans at the Capitol, and withdrew the $25,000 appropriation request, except for an amount sufficient to pay for the invitations.

When the inauguration was over, the White House called and asked me to sign a voucher to pay for a chicken a la king luncheon. I told them to tell the President that, in accordance with his statement, I had canceled the appropriation.

The invitations to the inauguration carried my signature as chairman of the committee. And from some source that I cannot identify, an invitation was sent to Harry Bridges who then was under suspicion of being a Communist.

A San Francisco newspaper got hold of this invitation and published it with the notation that it had always thought well of me, but now that I had invited Bridges to the inauguration, it had changed its mind. Roosevelt made a great war leader and on this I think we can all agree.

President Truman and I were deskmates for 5 years. We were very cordial friends, and I had and still have a high respect and personal affection for him.

But we disagreed when he moved to take over the United States Steel Co., which was being struck, and said he would not only fix the wages but also the dividends, and would take full charge of the operations of the company.

Judge Dave Pine, a Federal District judge, here in Washington, knew and understood the Constitution and declared this action to be in violation of the Constitution.

After I opposed President Truman in this action, he said there were too many Byrds in the Senate. This too helped me in Virginia, and I never held it against the President too much.

I disagreed with President Truman again when he dismissed Genearl MacArthur. But on the other hand I will say that he was always frank and aboveboard in everything he did. He had great courage.

I still have a cordial regard for him. Recently I received a nice letter from him. He started out by saying "Dear Harry," and I replied "Deary Harry" to him.

I also had cordial relations with General Eisenhower. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I came in contact with him before he was President. I have great respect for him. He was one of our outstanding military leaders of all time.

I shall never forget meeting with him in Europe, in May 1945, 10 days after peace was declared with Germany. I was one of a delegation of Senators, headed by Senator RUSSELL, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

We had a 3-hour conference with General Eisenhower in Frankfurt, Germany. I was then deeply impressed with his sincerity and his desire for world peace.

President Eisenhower and I agreed on some things and disagreed on others. I was opposed to sending troops to Little Rock.

I deeply regretted the fact that the largest peacetime deficit in history to date occurred during his administration—in 1958-59. I think it could have been avoided; but it may be that he will not enjoy this dubious distinction much longer.

The withdrawal of our gold reserves following that deficit was significant of the effect that deficit spending in this country has on the confidence of other nations in the soundness of the dollar.

It was my privilege also to have very cordial relations with President Kennedy during the years he was a Member of the Senate. His father and I were friends too. We still are. And I hope the President, notwithstanding our differences, has the same cordial regards for me that I have for him.

I have had frequent conferences with President Kennedy and I have supported his proposals whenever I could; and I shall continue to do so on all measures which I think are wise and in the country's best interest.

President Kennedy has a remarkably attractive personality, and he has ability. Late last spring I was called to the White House for a conference of nearly an hour in an effort to resolve differences on the omnibus tax bill.

When I left, the President accompanied me out to the anteroom, and with a grin he said "Senator BYRD and I have agreed on everything." The facts were that he had not changed me, and I had not changed him. As our service together continues, I hope our relations will be cordial.

I have taken the liberty of telling you these anecdotes, because I think Masons appreciate the ability of people to differ sharply on issues without sacrifice of the amenities of civilized discourse, and within the bounds of mutual respect and courtesy.

This is one of the great experiences which are common to Masonry and the Congress of the United States. It has been my great privilege to be a member of both; and for it I am indebted to you and the people of Virginia.

No one could be more pleased than I have been with this meeting of brothers of Masonry—all of whom I am proud to call my friends. I thank you sincerely and very deeply.

New Bedford's "Moby Dick" Trail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, an article appeared in Sunday's New York Times regarding New Bedford, Mass., the former whaling capital of the world, which I think will be of interest to my colleagues.

As Boston has its "Heritage Trail," pointing out the spots of national and historical interest in the area, so New Bedford now has its "Moby Dick Trail," telling the story of whaling in New England. Visitors to New Bedford will be fascinated with the historic past of the fabulous whaling industry as it unfolds before them on their walk from Kelley's Boatyard to the Whaleman's Chapel and the Bourne Whaling Museum on Johnny Cake Hill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON NEW BEDFORD'S "MOBY DICK" TRAIL—FORMER WHALING CAPITAL OF THE WORLD PEGS ITS TOURS ON MELVILLE TALE

(By Arthur Davenport)

NEW BEDFORD, MASS.—This prosperous and bustling city was once the whaling capital of the world, and the residents still take real pleasure in recounting the glories of the past. Perhaps this is because of the affinity their present economy has with the whale oil business, or because so much of the history of the daring whaleboat era is associated with heroism and tragedy.

A fascinating picture of this historic past is presented to the visitor in the form of a take-it-yourself tour that is called, quite appropriately, the Moby Dick Trail. The visitor catches on quickly that New Bedford was the home port for Herman Melville and that it gave to him much of the background material for his internationally known whaling tale, "Moby Dick."

BUILDINGS ACTUALLY EXISTED

It was at Kelley's Boatyard that the whaling ship Acushnet, on which Melville shipped, was fitted out for the trip that provided the Moby Dick story. Merrill's Wharf, the Counting House, the Sail Loft, and the Candleworks, which are all so much a part of the classic story, actually existed in New Bedford's whaling days, and some of the buildings can still be seen.

The high point of the tour is the visit to Johnny Cake Hill. A cluster of historic buildings make this the center of the Moby Dick country. The Old Customs House is on the corner of William Street, and a short distance up the hill is the Seaman's Bethel, where Melville worshipped when he was ashore.

The Bethel is a picturesque old church, beautiful in its simplicity and seemingly filled with stirring memories. The walls are lined with tablets that tell the tales of the heroic tragedies of the whaling period, and the pulpit is built in the form of a ship's prow, complete with blunted bowsprit.

BY ROPE LADDER

In the early years, the minister ascended the pulpit by a rope ladder, but now he uses more conventional wooden steps to reach his perch of eminence. During the summer months, interdenominational services are held on Sundays at 11 a.m., and visitors are welcome.

The Bethel was built in 1828 and is the Whaleman's Chapel referred to in the Moby Dick story. Next to the Bethel is the Old Mariner's Home, which was built in 1787 and continues to be used as a haven for sailors who have retired from the sea.

Across the street from the Bethel is the unique Bourne Whaling Museum, in which the story of the whaling industry of the 19th century is said to be more completely told than anyplace else in the world. The museum's collection gives the visitor an understanding of the operation, as well as a first-hand look at the equipment that was used. The museum also contains exhibits of the many outfitting shops that were needed to prepare a ship for her whaling voyage.

The value of the whale long had been known to man, but his efforts to capture the dangerous prize had been restricted to the taking of the smaller right whales that frequented the shallower coastal waters. No serious industry developed because the whalers had to wait for the whales to come to them, and so at best the trade was a sort of coast-watching affair.

The early settlers of Nantucket, being forced to look to the sea for their livelihood, made more of the business of whaling than did the inhabitants of other colonial seaport towns. The shore variety of whales was plentiful enough in the New World, however, so that there was some whaling activity in many coastal communities, notably Sag Harbor, L.I., Salem, and New Bedford.

Two events in Nantucket changed the course of whaling history. In 1712, a Nantucket ship, having been blown off course, captured a large and unknown variety of whale. The oil from this new species proved so superior to the former product that it brought the ship great profit.

SPERM WHALES

Even so, it was some years before much fishing for this new variety, known as the sperm whale, took place. This was because of the need for larger boats and longer trips.

In 1761, a Nantucket whaler conceived the idea of fitting out a ship for a long voyage and equipping her so that she could render the oil while still at sea. The idea was an immediate success, but the deepwater work required boats too large for the Nantucket harbor to accommodate.

As a result, the more active whaling interests began to gravitate to New Bedford and its excellent harbor facilities. Thus, by 1850, the wharves of New Bedford saw the greatest concentration of whaling activity the world ever has known.

WHALING BARK MODEL

The Whaling Museum on Johnny Cake Hill seems to give the visitor a sense of the high degree of accomplishment of the whalemen. The central item is a scale model of the whaling bark *Lagoda*. The ship was owned by the Bourne family, and so great was her success that she was known as one of the greasiest whalers afloat.

Few ships ever enjoyed such constant success. From 1841 to 1860, the bark averaged a yearly profit of 98 percent from her voyages. The model is said to be the largest ship model in the world, and the visitor is allowed to go on deck and wander around at will.

It is possible to stand at the wheel, or go below decks to see the quarters of the captain and his crew. Furthermore, the ship's sailing equipment is complete, with all rigging intact and sails set for a trip "down East" before the wind. Here a restriction appears, as a sign politely asks the visitor not to climb the rigging.

Also on the main floor of the museum is a 30-foot fully equipped whaleboat, in which six men would put to sea from the larger whaler and from whose fragile platform the actual harpooning of the whale took place. These two central items are surrounded by exhibits that show the shops of the barrelmakers, sailmakers, merchants, blacksmiths and specialty artisans whose help was needed to make a whaler ready for a voyage that might last 4 years.

The walls are lined with harpoons and harpoon guns, and many examples of the equipment that was used to reduce the whale blubber to the sought-after oil. Near the door is an outstanding exhibit of "scrimshawing."

WHALEBONE ITEMS

This weird-sounding name was given to the artistic and intricate decoration of various items that the whalemen made from whalebone during the long hours spent at sea. It is a sort of elaborate form of doodling.

During July and August, the museum is open weekdays from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. and on Sundays from 2 to 5 p.m. In the other months of the year, it is closed on Mondays, and not open after 4 p.m. A modest admission charge is used by the Old Dartmouth Historical Society for the continuance and development of the museum and its collections.

In additin to the well presented story of the whaling days, New Bedford and its environs offer the visitor a chance to do some interesting sightseeing and to make some unusual side trips. The British burned the city during the War of 1812, so most of the older colonial homes are gone.

However, a few of the elaborate mansions of the rich sailing masters remain to give evidence of the fabulous era of the whaling fortunes.

The waterfront is still a bustle of sailing activity, but now the boats are power-driven fishing vessels that drag for scallops or fish the Grand Banks for catches that keep the markets and freezing plants supplied.

Today, the wives drive their sailor-husbands to their boats, as though to a commuter station. The voyage may last for 7 to 10 days, which might seem long in commuter communities, but the families take it as a matter of course. This is because it is so short an absence, as compared to the voyages of 100 years ago.

The town of Fairhaven, across the river from New Bedford, is included in the Moby Dick Trail, because it shared in the whaling activities. The British did not burn the smaller community, so many of its older colonial houses can be seen along the shady and narrow streets.

The visitor is not likely to notice the absence of stone walls in the New Bedford area until it is called to his attention. The story is told that, during the Civil War, many of the older whaling boats were loaded with stones from the nearby walls and then sailed south to be sunk in the mouth of some of the harbors of the Confederacy.

STATE PARK

A trip by car onto the peninsula takes one through the small villages of Dartmouth and Westport. At the tip of the peninsula, at Horseneck Beach, is a beautiful State park.

Another side trip, this one by boat, takes the tourist to Cuttyhunk Island. This was the landfall of Bartholomew Gosnold when he discovered the area in 1602. The island also was the site of the historic meeting at which some of Gosnold's followers bought the New Bedford area from the sons of the great Indian Chief, Massasoit.

The island is about 2 miles long and less than a mile wide. It has no roads, but is a delightful place to visit for a picnic or a lonely walk along the beach. It is a fishing village today, and serves as headquarters for the fine striped bass fishing in the area.

A small boat, the *Alert,* sails from the New Bedford wharf at 10:15 a.m. daily during the summer and returns to New Bedford at 4:30 p.m. This enables the visitor to spend about 3 hours on the island.

New Bedford's facilities to care for the tourist are excellent. A fine, modern hotel graces the center of the city, and many first-class motels are on the edge of town. The city also abounds in eating establishments, many of which specialize in seafood.

The whale steak that often adorns the menu no longer comes up the Acushnet River by boat, but the scallops, lobsters, swordfish and other varieties in season are the product of the hard work of the present-day variety of fisherfolk, many of whose forebears were the courageous and brave whaling men of New Bedford's colorful past.

Illegality Breeding More Illegality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, we are undergoing a constitutional crisis in our country today. Negroes are carrying on illegal boycotts of white merchants in many areas of the South. Negro demonstrators are flowing into the streets, rampaging as an unruly, unchecked mob.

Recent Supreme Court decisions which seem to sanction this behavior on the part of Negroes are breeding still more illegality and is causing a serious diminution of respect for constitutional processes.

The following article from the Washington Star, May 24, 1963, discusses this matter and I believe that all the Members will be interested in reading it:

Illegality Breeding More Illegality—Big U.S. Issue Is Called How To Achieve Respect for Constitutional Processes

(By David Lawrence)

Illegality is breeding more and more illegality. The biggest question confronting the country today is by what means a respect for law and constitutional processes can be achieved.

The disquieting facts are these:

1. The Supreme Court of the United States asserts the right to amend the Constitution by an order or decision. If the people don't like it, their only redress now apparently is to go through the long process of adopting constitutional amendments that would specifically nullify every decision which is not sanctioned by the written Constitution.

2. The President of the United States orders troops into Alabama in direct violation of the provisions of the Constitution which deny him that power in dealing with threatened disorder. Some of the best constitutional lawyers in the country—including members of the U.S. Senate—are pointing to this violation.

3. George Wallace, Governor of Alabama, has petitioned the Supreme Court of the United States to order that Federal troops not be used in Alabama unless there is formal application by the State for such use as required by the Constitution.

4. Meanwhile, the Alabama Governor announces that he will stand in the doorway and block the admission of two Negro students who have been accepted by the board of trustees of the University of Alabama.

5. The United Press International in two dispatches—one from the North and the other from the South—reports the defiance of official authority in connection with race problems.

From Englewood, N.J., comes the following:

"The parents of 34 Negro children today defied a board of education order to cease boycott and sit-in protests. They sent the unregistered youngsters to the predominantly white Cleveland school for the 12th consecutive school day.

"School Superintendent Dr. Mark R. Shedd sent telegrams to the parents last night directing them to cease immediately the boycott at the 98-percent Negro Lincoln School and the unauthorized entries at the Cleveland school."

From Greensboro, N.C., comes the following:

"Almost 700 Negroes jailed for racial demonstrations were released early today. The Negroes, some of them crying, marched out but later claimed they had been tricked into leaving.

"The Negroes, most of them college students, were ordered by Guilford County Sheriff Clayton Jones to leave a reopened polio hospital where they had been held. The hospital was ringed by police and sheriff's deputies as the Negroes left.

"A few of the male students sat on the floor and had to be carried down the halls by deputies to an outer lobby."

6. In a speech in the U.S. Senate on Tuesday, Senator John Stennis, Democrat, of Mississippi, who is one of the foremost lawyers in Congress, spoke as follows:

"The recent mobilization of the armed might of Federal military forces in the vicinity of Birmingham, Ala., raises a constitutional question of grave proportions. In addition, it provides another unhappy example of how the rights and privileges of the States of the Union are gradually being usurped as a result of continued encroachment by the Executive branch of the Federal Government.

"No Federal court order was involved.

"There was no violation of a Federal statute.

"There was no abandonment of their functions by the local police. To the contrary, local police officers and State troopers were in control and functioning fully and effectively.

"Thus the President apparently believes that there has been an unlimited and unrestrained delegation of authority to him to call forth Federal military forces to supersede and replace local law-enforcement agencies whenever he sees fit—even before there has been a violation of Federal law or a defiance of a Federal court decree. If we accept this belief or doctrine as valid, it simply means that we abandon our historic freedom and liberty under laws prescribed by the people through their elected Representatives. We thus open the doors for a future military dictatorship in this country.

"It begs the question, of course, to minimize the importance of the actions with respect to Birmingham by saying that the troops have not been used and may not be used. It is the threat of their use and the principle which is involved which is of importance. None of us should be content to sit idly by in the face of this direct assault upon and threat to historic constitutional principles. Whether the troops are actually used in Birmingham or not, we may be very sure that—with the precedent thus established—they will be ordered into action on some occasion in the future when the executive department should so desire.

"If the President has such unrestricted and dictatorial power as is claimed for him, then no State and no city in the country is safe from the threat of military rule at the whim of a Chief Executive. Indeed, one must wonder why Federal troops were not called into action following the racial disorders and rioting at the (Washington) D.C. Stadium last Thanksgiving."

Senator Stennis charged Martin Luther King, Jr., and other Negro leaders with deliberately inciting disorder. He said:

"The hard truth of the matter is that Martin Luther King and his co-workers went to Birmingham for the express purpose of stirring up conflict, strife and disorder. King wanted to be put in jail. He and his co-workers took children out of school and marched them into the business district of the city, seeking to have them arrested. In addition to violating local statutes and ordinances, he committed the common-law crime of inciting to riot."

The irony of the situation is that several Republican and Democratic Senators favoring integration are at last introducing bills to secure the enactment of laws—covering discrimination in schools, restaurants, employment—which the Supreme Court unconstitutionally has endeavored to write into law by judicial decision.

AMVETS Again Endorse GI Educational Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the national executive committee of AMVETS has reaffirmed continuing support of the cold war GI bill which is sponsored by 39 Members of this body. Hearings on the bill have recently been completed by the Veterans Affairs Subcommittee, and I am hopeful that this very badly needed legislation will advance to consideration by the Senate in this session.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Tar Heel AMVET captioned "AMVETS Back Cold War GI Education Bills as Matter of Simple Justice."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMVETS BACK COLD WAR GI EDUCATION BILLS AS MATTER OF SIMPLE JUSTICE

The National Executive Committee of AMVETS meeting in Washington, D.C., on April 7, reaffirmed its support of Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, cold war GI bill. The resolution also commended Senator YARBOROUGH for his hard work in behalf of the cold war veterans. The resolution was introduced by Wilbur Hobby, NEC man from the North Carolina Department of AMVETS.

Testimony in favor of providing cold war readjustment benefits was presented before the Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee on April 10, 1963, by AMVET national service director, Garrett J. Bowman. Below is the text of Bowman's testimony before this committee.

"Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: AMVETS sincerely appreciate the opportunity of appearing before this distinguished committee to present our views on proposed legislation to provide readjustment benefits for our so-called cold war veterans.

"Since 1955, AMVETS' national conventions have unanimously adopted resolutions supporting this type of legislation. We are grateful to this committee for scheduling hearings early in this session. In our judgment, no subject in the field of veterans' affairs is more deserving of consideration at this time than legislation to provide readjustment benefits to the post-Korean veteran.

"Prior to the end of World War II an ex-serviceman was either a wartime veteran or a peacetime veteran. It was not difficult to distinguish between the two types of service. This Nation was not committed to the defense of the free world and the men serving in other than wartime were not serving under the threat or compulsion of the draft. Normally, the peacetime veteran was following a career of his choice and as a result, different benefits were awarded to those who answered their country's call than to those who followed a chosen profession.

"Circumstances have changed since World War II and now this Nation's Armed Forces are committed to defend the right of all peoples to be free. At a time when their energies should be directed toward securing an education and preparing themselves to compete in this highly competitive society, our youth are again donning uniforms and serving this Nation on every front in the free world.

"Today we live in a technological age: Automation moving into business and industry; robot computers doing in hours the work of years for human brains; manmade moons; men in space; nuclear installations for power. These are all signs of America's growth.

"But as technology strengthens us for new responsibilities among nations, it makes its own demands for new human skills and, here again, 11 million veterans trained under the World War II and Korean GI bills have enriched beyond measure America's pool of technological and professional skills, 600,000 trained as engineers, 400,000 as electronic technicians, 250,000 in the field of health as doctors, dentists, nurses, lab technicians, 250,000 as school teachers, 150,000 as scientists, and millions more in skilled labor and farm training.

"This is the way our World War II and Korean veterans used the GI benefits which the American people provided for them."

Legion Award Goes to Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, in this era of managed news and suppression of facts, it is indeed enlightening and a privilege to find a newspaper that still exhibits the spirit of Americanism through its editorial and news reporting policies.

It is equally important in these trying times to find an arm of the news media so vitally interested in the accomplishments of our youth, because the youth of America hold our future in their hands.

Because of these policies exercised daily by the Greenfield Times, an independent newspaper in my congressional district, it was awarded the 1963 Americanism Award by Post 298 of the American Legion.

This award was well deserved, and I am proud to insert the resolution of the American Legion recognizing the contribution this newspaper has made to its community.

I commend the Greenfield Times and its editor, Mr. Pat Shrock, and include herein in my remarks the following news item:

LEGION AWARD GOES TO TIMES

Robert A. Smart, Post 298, American Legion, presented its 1963 Americanism Award to the Greenfield Times at Memorial Day service Thursday.

The presentation was authorized by formal post resolution as follows:

"Whereas a primary purpose of the American Legion is to foster and perpetuate a spirit of Americanism within the community, State and Nation; and

"Whereas the Greenfield Times has exhibited that spirit of Americanism through its editorials, editorial policy, and particularly through its constant news policy of recognizing and reporting in a prominent position in the paper the worthwhile accomplishments made by the youth of this community: Therefore be it

Resolved by Robert A. Smart, Post 298, the American Legion, Department of Ohio (in regular meeting assembled in Greenfield, Ohio, on May 2, 1963), That this post present an Americanism Award to the Greenfield Times, a publication of the Hartley Newspapers, in recognition of that spirit of Americanism; and be it further

Resolved, That this post express its sincere appreciation to Pat Shrock, editor of the Greenfield Times, for his efforts in furthering this spirit of Americansim."

President's Important Statement Creates Dull Thud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, all day Sunday the radio and TV stations across the land announced an important foreign policy statement would be made by President Kennedy on Monday morning. After the tremendous buildup and with the whole Nation waiting for some inspiring words from its Chief Executive, what did we hear—an announcement that we must be more understanding of the Russian Communists and that to prove our good intentions we would once again refrain from nuclear testing without any promises or guarantees from the Soviet Union.

The President's much touted speech fell with a dull thud. It contained nothing to inspire patriotic Americans, it lacked any ringing challenge in defense of our ideals. It was a tired rehash of the same apologetic policy of the Kennedy administration which has resulted in the Soviet beachhead in Cuba, in the Communist advances in Laos, in the war that is not a war but in which American boys are dying in Vietnam, in the building of the Berlin wall, and in the bolstering of Khrushchev's ego to the point where he has announced to the world that the Monroe Doctrine is dead, that he will permanently occupy the Western Hemisphere and that the United States dare do nothing about it.

Mr. Speaker, the American people do believe in peace, but the President has yet to prove that peace can be secured through accommodation of the Communists. What he is actually asking is clearly outlined in the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of June 11, which I include herewith:

THE OTHER CHEEK

On the theory that total war "makes no sense," President Kennedy announced yesterday that the United States will join Britain and the Soviet Union in "high level discussions in Moscow" looking toward the conclusion of a comprehensive treaty banning nuclear testing. Meanwhile, Mr. Kennedy said, the United States would conduct no tests in the atmosphere so long as other nations do not do so.

The haggling over a test ban has continued for almost 5 years and has been marked by one flagrant breach of faith on the part of the Communists. On September 1, 1961, Russia, after long and surreptitious preparations, broke the "voluntary moratorium" with the United States which had been in effect since 1958. It launched a series of atmospheric tests in a range extending to the equivalent of 58 million tons of TNT.

Mr. Kennedy at the time read the appropriate moral. The Soviet Union, he said, had indicated "the complete hypocrisy of its professions about general and complete disarmament." The following March Mr. Kennedy called upon Khrushchev to repent and reform, offering him until mid-April to enter another agreement to forswear testing. When there was no response, the United States initiated tests of its own.

Since then the administration has engaged in a series of retreats from its original requirements for international inspection to enforce a test ban. It has expressed willingness to agree to no more than seven inspections within Russia in a year. The Communists offer no more than two or three, under conditions which would offer the United States little assurance against cheating.

It is in the face of this record of deceit and chicanery that Mr. Kennedy expressed his willingness to turn the other cheek, even though he himself acknowledged in his address yesterday at American University in Washington that no treaty, however worded, can "provide absolute security against the risks of deception and evasion."

That, together with the known character of Soviet communism, is precisely the point. How can Mr. Kennedy have faith in a system which has demonstrated its duplicity and whose known objective is to bring the United States to its knees by fair means or foul?

Yet the President is willing to gamble on no better security than the strength of his illusions. He will, he says, seek by every means to avoid confrontations that might lead to war. He is willing to subscribe to Khrushchev's formula for peaceful competition—in other words, to the doctrine of coexistence, which is war without shooting.

All he asks is that the Communists permit other people to make the choice of their own future. If they choose communism, Mr. Kennedy will apparently humor them.

His slogan in the campaign for peace is to "help make the world safe for diversity." That is, Western free governments will accept the permanent fact of communism, not only in Russia, but in Cuba and wherever else it may spread. A world of Khrushchev, of Tito, of Mao, of Castro, of Sukarno, of Nehru, and of Kadar is quite acceptable to Mr. Kennedy, just as long as it permits a dash of diversity in the form of Mr. Kennedy himself, or De Gaulle, Macmillan, or Lester Pearson.

What a summons to American patriotism: "a world safe for diversity." Even Woodrow Wilson's slogan, to make the world "safe for democracy," spurious though it was, sounds downright compelling in comparison with Mr. Kennedy's, and Franklin Roosevelt's frauds, ranging from the Atlantic Charter to the four freedoms, at least had propaganda value.

But a world safe for diversity is a world safe for communism, for the Communists are what are to be diverse from us. As a tocsin to arouse his countrymen, Mr. Kennedy's call will be greeted with unexampled boredom.

Foreign Aid and the State of the U.S. Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in a letter dated May 11 to the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mark M. Jones, president of the National Economic Council, Inc., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., requested permission to testify before the committee on the foreign aid authorization bill, H.R. 5490.

He was advised that his request came too late and that he would be given only an opportunity to submit a statement for inclusion in the printed hearings. It is not my purpose to question this decision, since I am advised that a cutoff date of approximately April 24 was set for submission of requests from individuals who desired to appear.

However, it is interesting to note that the committee heard, and had an opportunity to question comparatively few witnesses who expressed opposition to foreign handouts during the lengthy hearings, which started on March 23. Most of the time was spent hearing administration spokesmen and public witnesses in support of foreign aid.

Following is Mr. Jones' statement which he has submitted for inclusion in the printed hearings and which he wanted to present in person:

The legislation pending before your committee involves much more than meets the eye. The effects and consequences of foreign aid on the people of the United States and on the national economy are subjects of far greater importance in an overall sense than foreign aid as a distinct and separate matter. It is time to face the fact that there are adverse effects of foreign aid on the U.S. economy which outweigh all other considerations with respect to it.

The National Economic Council is a nonpartisan and nonprofit organization, established in 1930, and is concerned with the preservation and improvement of our system of freedom, predicated as it is on a constitutional republic that is rooted in self-government, private enterprise, and individual responsibility. The council believes it a matter of life or death to reestablish a self-renewing economy. I mean the kind that built the Nation, but was frittered away by those who have been in control of the Federal Government during the past generation.

Gentlemen, we no longer have a going-concern economy; we have an economy in liquidation. The United States is not so big, so rich, and so strong that there is no limit to what it can do. That childish delusion must be dispelled.

After this committee has devoted days and weeks to the foreign-aid spenders, shouldn't someone ask: How about equal time for America? How much longer are we to ignore the impact of foreign aid on the home folks? What is the real effect on the scale of living of the American people? What about a sound economy? What about a strong national defense? It is questions such as these that concern the people. They wonder when they will concern enough of their Representatives in Washington to bring about results in the public interest. The country is fed up with the bureaucratic propaganda that pours out of the radio and fills most front pages, while the degenerative effects of excessive spending continue and are ignored.

THE PUBLIC INTEREST IN FOREIGN AID

If Western civilization is to go on, this orgy of colossal political spending, of which foreign aid is a conspicious feature, must end. There is nothing new or different about the way in which the U.S. economy is being degenerated. Many other civilizations have been destroyed in the same way. Gentlemen, are we just going to sit around, temporarily surfeited in comfort, and watch the fuse burn to the end?

Among the reasons which indicate that overspending by Government must be stopped are the following:

1. Continuance of foreign aid in the billions fosters continance of similar overspending throughout the rest of the Federal apparatus. These excesses have been carried on for so long that they are beginning to validate the prophecies of Lenin and Stalin who said all they had to do was "to cause capitalism to pay for its own funeral."

2. Large-scale spending by Government is not a panacea, a specific, a remedy, or even a good idea. There is a point of diminishing returns in it, just as in everything else that is subject to the laws of nature and mathematics. It is just forcing the country to spend itself into bankruptcy.

3. The economic atmosphere of the United States today and of recent years is not and has not been prosperity. It is an economic fever—a synthetic condition, artificially and mistakenly induced and maintained. We have a forced-draft economy, overstimulated and without balance, equilibrium, or a sense of proportion. There is nothing sound about it. The condition of the country is developing into something like that of an individual who guzzles alcohol continuously but without quite getting enough to establish a narcotic effect. It takes more and more to have the same effect. It is like running faster and faster just to stay in the same place.

4. There is no magic in government and law. Neither can set up and impose what might be called alcoholic economics nor keep a moonshine economy going for long. Both ultimately are subject to the same arithmetic and the same universal laws as everything else. This may not be clear to most people, of course, but if so, it is because of the defects of education.

5. There is one astounding fact about today's crisis that is more important than the cold war, nuclear energy, or the number of orbits of astronauts rolled together, so far as the public interest and the future of the American people are concerned. It is that in the past 30 years (one generation) Federal, State, and local governments in the United States combined have spent \$2,481 billion—\$2½ trillion of the people's money. And, gentlemen, this reckless spending has not led us into the promised land—only the promising land. The sole feature of novelty it has developed is a gigantic system of promising.

6. The excesses on the side of promising are as incredible as those on the side of spending. Persons who have added the public and private debt of the United States to the accrued liabilities which must be put on the books, because of promises legally made, confront us with a total that

now approximates $1¾ trillion. Notice, gentlemen, I said "trillion." How can anyone think of trillions in terms of such obligations postponed to the future without thinking of stealing from our children, our grandchildren, and even our great-grandchildren?

7. Government expenditures are nonproductive overhead expense from the standpoint of national accounting. That is one sense in which they are not like the expenditures of individuals, corporations, or other organizations. However, they are subject to the same laws, proportions, relations, and ratios as all other overhead expense. The fact that we have paid no attention to the arithmetic working in the background, that professors scorn it, and that spenders abhor it, makes no difference.

8. In the case of the United States, that part of the nonproductive overhead expense represented by governmental expenditures, as of recent estimates, was in excess of $174 billion at an annual rate. Whether this is 40, 50, or 65 percent of the national income depends on how you compute the national income. But in any event, it is much too much. In fact, it is at least twice what can be sustained and still have a going-concern economy.

9. The historian, Toynbee, in discussing 21 previous civilizations, points out that 19 disappeared on account of causes within. These, first and foremost, would include excessive overhead expenditures. But in each case, such causes were very much like those which we now confront.

10. The faith of the American people in education and their sacrifices for it are based principally on the expectation that it will provide them with leaders who will not repeat the mistakes of their predecessors. The record already made in this century by those who were products of education and who controlled the Government of the United States is leading more and more to believe that the universities and colleges have betrayed the people, are a failure, and perhaps should be closed.

11. Up to this point we have been treating principally of causes. We now come to effects. The consequences of the omissions and commissions of those in control of the Government of the United States for a generation are piling up and threatening us on every hand. However, there appears to be but one overall measure of them. It is provided by the Consumer Price Index of the U.S. Department of Commerce. This shows the purchasing power of the dollar at consumer prices. At the time they stopped printing the figure, about a year ago, it indicated that in comparison with a 1935–39 average base, the purchasing power of the dollar at retail prices was down to 44.6 cents. This meant that 55.4 percent of the value of the dollar, or more than half the value of the money of the people, had been destroyed up to that time. But even so, the 1935–39 base ought not to be taken as the starting point in measuring the degeneration. If we begin about 1933 and make a rough reckoning from the time just before the dollar was devalued in terms of gold, it leads to the belief that the aggregate consequences of the omissions and commissions of those in control have given us a dollar now worth less than 25 cents. In other words, we now face the stern fact that those in control of Government have destroyed 75 percent of the value of the money of the people of the United States in about 30 years.

Very important, in addition to the domestic impact of foreign aid, is the balance-of-payments crisis of which foreign aid is the principal cause. If anything more reckless and irresponsible has been perpetrated during the orgy of squandering over the past generation, it would be difficult to saw what it is.

In turning toward a conclusion, I call to your attention another significant historical aspect of the problem. It is that if $120 billion of the people's money or thereabouts has been spent on foreign aid so far, it, together with the domestic spending to which it has been related, might be described as a madness that dwarfs every madness reported in history. Roll all of the mass madnesses of history together and the result would be infinitesimal in comparison with this New Deal madness of the 20th century. I mean put together the South Sea bubble, the Mississippi bubble, the tulip bubble, and all the other mass madnesses, and then throw in Ponzi for good measure, and the result still will represent but a flyspeck in comparison with the political madness of the past generation, a part of which you are considering now. However, it is important to note one big difference in this New Deal-Fair Deal-New Frontier madness. This one is a madness of politicians, not of the masses. In contrast with mass madnesses of history, the people have been but a minor factor in this one. They are the victims this time.

Finally, I come back to the question with which I started. Are we to go on and put the American economy through the wringer by destroying the value of the money of the people of the United States entirely, and with the prospect of 25, 50, or 100 years of chaos? Or are we going to stamp out the burning fuse now?

Dignity Is Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the following editorial from the June 9, 1963, issue of the Peoria Journal Star:

DIGNITY IS SPIRIT, NOT RICH CLOTHES

Our society has become so materialistic, and its high-domed thinkers so remote from the mundane facts of life, that it has become a "moral" maxim that it is impossible to have any human dignity much less nobility "on an empty stomach."

We have reached a stage wherein we consider such earthly physical experiences as hunger, pain, sickness, etc., as undignified, degrading, and debasing.

Liberty doesn't mean anything when you are hungry we are told. Spiritual values do not exist when you are sick, we are told.

You can't expect "human dignity" from physical unpleasantness, and if something is unsanitary it is also undignified, indecent.

Dirt offends us. Work—especially hard work, sweat, degrades a human being.

Death also is something degrading and embarrassing to be hidden away, camouflaged, and, above all, thought about as little as possible.

These are the false values that go with "Money isn't everything, but I can't think of what comes first."

These are values being beamed at us by politicians, Government agencies, and even in many instances by commencement speakers in the past week.

Then came the last great contribution of Pope John, who in his death and the complete and detailed information which followed each development and word and action of the dying man, reminded us that dignity and nobility and the highest values are those of the spirit.

We had another example that human dignity and the nobility or man, in truth, finds its highest expression in pain and suffering and ultimately in death.

Christ died on a cross, stripped of his garments, ridiculed, whipped, nailed, and stabbed as an everlasting example to men of resurrection, yes, but also as the climax of a ministry which taught and repeatedly demonstrated that human dignity is a matter of divine spirit more than ragged versus rich clothes, more than sweat and pain versus ease and comfort.

In those days, it was considered to be degrading to wash a person's feet—a most menial task, it seems. Jesus performed this as a symbol of what is important and what is not in measuring the spirit of man.

It was the Pharisees who equated human values with fine clothes, full plates, and physical comforts and physical cleanliness, not Jesus.

Aside from the Christian story and beliefs, all historical experience demonstrates that our hoity-toity materialism, itself, is the thing that is degrading.

Was the spirit of man impractical, and freedom foolish and something secondary for the men at Valley Forge, where there was plenty of hunger, and sickness, and suffering and pain? Or do we mark that as an example of the highest human dignity and noblest of human spirits?

The early settlers of this Central Illinois area, habitually, survived their first winter largely on limited supplies of corn made into unappetizing square blocks of something much like hominy for purposes of preservation. This was a frontier standard for "getting through" the first winter of near starvation before more extensive preparations could be made.

It did not degrade, debase or soften the pioneers. It was part of their fight for individual independence. It toughened them. It was a triumph of the spirit.

Sympathy is a worthy human sentiment, but when it takes on the superiority and the lack of understanding and the presumption of "this guy hasn't a chance to be a decent human being" such as we too often direct these days against some of our own people and many in the world—it is this patronizing attitude that is debasing, degrading, and insulting—not hunger, not lack of sanitation, not the conditions against which those people are struggling.

Finally, the flight from death that has become so much a part of our social philosophy and habits is a denial of reality and truth.

Every one of us is suffering from an "incurable disease" called mortality.

Any philosophy or attitude which ignores that most basic fact of life, which tries to avoid facing the physical fact of physical death, but to hide from it, to push it into the shadows, to hold it back, back, back—is a false, weak, unreal, and degrading pretense.

Death must be one of three things. It is either the doorway to a new life; the end of a meaningful existence; or the end of a meaningless existence.

While mouthing all sorts of euphemisms, our society seems actually to pursue a pattern fitting to the God-kings of ancient Persia, in which we pretend that man is God, providing he can dress like a God, eat like a God, look like a God, live like a God, and camouflage his death, when it comes, as much as possible.

It won't work.

There is something deeper than these material things. Compassion is not enough to offer human beings who happen to be dirtier, hungrier, and more ragged than we. We are not Gods over them, but brothers to them, whether we admit it and recognize it or not.

Commencement Address by Boisfeuillet Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, without doubt the finest high school commencement address I have heard was delivered by Mr. Boisfeuillet Jones, special assistant to the Secretary of HEW, at the National Cathedral School commencement exercises on June 4. Students, faculty, parents, and friends were thrilled with it. The message it contained for the graduates will be equally enjoyed by Members of Congress, and I am therefore inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that they may read it:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY BOISFEUILLET JONES, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY (HEALTH AND MEDICAL AFFAIRS), U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Life is a balance, an equation—as between good and evil, joy and sorrow, beauty and ugliness, eagerness and satiation, service and selfishness, reasonableness and prejudice.

Two forces tip the balance, one way or the other—chance and choice. We tend to disavow responsibility for chance. Chance represents things that happen to us—inadvertently, by action of others, or according to some master plan we do not understand. We tend to accept responsibility for choice. Choice represents our own decisions, the consequences of which we must be prepared to bear.

Achievement of a balanced life—this is the reason for education. Education equips us to deal with the vagaries of chance in our lives, and guides us toward right decisions on matters of choice. The balance is a delicate one, requiring the best of education to deal effectively with the forces of chance and choice, to achieve a full and purposeful life.

An individual becomes educated only in a relative sense—education is a never-ending process. It has been rightly said that education begins in the cradle and ends in the grave. But we have formalized the process to a considerable extent, and you in the class of 1963 at National Cathedral School have now completed the basic stage—a secondary school education.

You should now have the five basic tools of life: an ability to communicate effectively with your fellow man, in speech and in writing; a knowledge of man and events through a wide range of history; an appreciation of the mysteries and laws of science; a responsiveness to aesthetics—art, drama, music, literature; a fundamental faith in the dignity of man as the child of God, a belief in the ethics of Western culture.

You are now graduating from this stage and commencing another, where you will sharpen and refine these basic tools of life in the higher phase of formal education.

The time of transition does not come easy. Perhaps you share the feeling of the little boy who received a pincushion from his grandmother for Christmas.

In his reluctantly written thank you note he said: "Dear Granny, thank you for my Christmas present. I have always wanted a pin cushion, but not very much." You have always wanted to graduate, but just now, perhaps not very much.

But your transition will be much easier than that of a majority of your contemporaries, those who have been lost to formal education. For each two of you who entered high school, there is one somewhere in the Nation who dropped out along the way. And for each two of you going on to college, there are three high school graduates elsewhere who are not. Also, most of you will have the comparatively rare privilege of going to the college of your choice.

In short, you are the advantaged few—a most fortunate few. There is a somewhat cynical saying that "all men are created equal, but some are a lot more equal than others." You, in this sense, are very equal indeed.

I point to your privilege simply as a fact—it is something neither to be ashamed of nor to be complacent about. But it does place a set of special obligations upon you. You are familiar with the French proverb noblesse oblige, which means simply "nobility obliges."

It was coined and widely quoted among the titled European nobility of a century and more ago, as a sort of self-justification for privilege, as, for example, when the wealthy distributed food baskets among the poor, or when a nobleman performed some service to the state.

The concept of a titled nobility, obliged or otherwise, has always been rejected in our Republic. But for you who, through a combination of happy accident and hard work, are among the educationally privileged, the nature of our society imposes some quite different kinds of obligations.

You have the obligation to deliver up to the level of your opportunity. You are receiving the best possible chance to develop your talents and abilities. You performance here at National Cathedral demonstrates that your talents are considerable. It will be up to you to produce, to contribute to society in a manner which fulfills this opportunity and this high potential.

The hard common denominator in the concept of equality is performance. Measured by any just standards, the less privileged person who produces despite obstacles, and the less talented person who realizes the whole of his limited potential, both rank above the privileged and talented person who delivers below expectation, even though his achievement might seem more outstanding.

Because of the depth and quality of preparation you have received and will continue to receive, you will have a special obligation to enter vigorously into the business of helping to shape democratic decisions, as well as personal ones.

If you were graduating half a century ago, you would have strong opinions on one burning issue in American life—whether or not women should be allowed to vote. A number of you would be strongly alined with the suffragettes—that valiant band of ladies who paraded up and down the principal avenues of the principal cities, bombarded their Congressmen with letters, and finally, in 1920, won their case.

You would also, of course, be immune to such scoffing comments as this definition, advanced by a carefully anonymous male: "A suffragette is one who has ceased to be a lady and not yet become a gentleman."

I doubt that it would have occurred to you that there was a time when the issue of women's suffrage was seriously debated, unless you had been specifically exposed to this fact in a history course. Would anyone suggest today that women are not justly entitled to vote?

And yet that debate, which was finally resolved by the adoption of the 19th amendment to the Constitution, was a very recent chapter in the agelong history of struggle toward equality. Today's chapter—no less urgent—has to do with assuring women of equal pay for equal work; and of assuring voting privileges and pay equality, among other rights, for all citizens. Fifty years from now, the graduating class at NCS may consider these issues as dim and dusty as women's suffrage seems today.

The struggle for equality goes on. And what is equality? In 1776, Thomas Jefferson and his colleagues in Philadelphia dared to assert: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal." At Gettysburg, a century ago this year, Lincoln described our country as "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

Clearly, neither Mr. Jefferson nor Mr. Lincoln was confusing "equal" with "identical." Each of them towered over most of his contemporaries—both literally, in terms of physical height, and figuratively, in terms of intellectual and creative statute. Each was thoroughly aware of the tremendous diversity of men's talents; each, in fact, recognized that the great strength of our Nation lay precisely in its diversity.

Did they mean "equal before the law"? This, obviously, is an important part of the true equality toward which we strive—and a part which, unhappily, has still not been universally achieved within our own highly favored land. But legal equality is not the whole story.

Perhaps the closest we can come in a single phrase is "equality of opportunity." Through our history we have been struggling to perfect a system whereby each individual has the opportunity to develop his own special talents and abilities to his maximum capability. This is, in fact, very close to a definition of the ideal of a democratic society.

Like most ideals, it is still remote. But we have come a very long way toward minimizing the prejudicial attitudes and folkways that limit equality of opportunity.

Never before in human history have these decisions of society been so difficult. Community life in the latter half of the 20th century, like personal life, is a delicate balance—as between benefit and hazard, between dazzling development and terrifying destruction. Striking and maintaining this balance—advancing the benefit and minimizing the risk—is everyone's business in a democracy.

And those who are best equipped by education are those to whom we shall be turning for leadership and guidance.

Countless examples of this delicate balance in our civilization can be cited. The most obvious, of course, is the constructive or destructive use of nuclear energy. There are many others; I cite a few.

Our economy and a large portion of our social structure depend upon the automobile—an instrument which brings great benefit and also causes more than 40,000 deaths each year.

New drugs are being produced at a fantastically rapid rate, saving lives and reducing suffering for millions of people—yet some of these drugs may produce side effects in a few people which result in unnecessary suffering or death.

Chemicals bring life to crops, supporting our farmers and feeding and clothing our people; but if they are not properly used, they can bring death to birds, wildlife, and sometimes human beings.

Advances in medicine permit us to keep many older persons alive for many years, often at great cost—but for a number of these, life has lost all contact with reality; they lead a kind of vegetable existence.

In short, we are increasingly dealing with problems on which judgments must be made, which resolve themselves into such profound questions as "What price human life?" Only an understanding society—a society that is not merely learned but also wise—can make such decisions. You who are graduating today, who are going on to broader and deeper courses of learning, shall bear a primary responsibility.

You of the class of 1963 have chosen to symbolize your happy memories of N.C.S. through your whimsical mascot, litle Pooh-bear. You have sung:

> "Our Pooh will be forever
> A cherished memory,
> Wherever life may lead us
> In our hearts dear Pooh will be."

Perhaps the postman will become accustomed to delivering alumnae mail to Wisconsin and Woodley, addressed simply "The House at Pooh Corner.'

Your teachers, your families, your friends would wish to join Pooh and me in saying to you, in words of the poet:

> "When all the stars have lost their glow,
> And evening follows day no more;
> When fragrant breezes cease to blow,
> And not a shell gems any shore;
> When limpid streams no longer flow,
> We may forget you—not before."

It is right that your commencement be in God's house. May His rich blessings go with you always.

Investigation of Veterans' Preference Violation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving repeated reports of violations of the Veterans' Preference Act in filling Federal Government jobs in Birmingham, Ala. I have, of course, protested to the Civil Service Commission, asking for an immediate investigation of these reports that 10- and 5-point veterans are being passed over in filling positions.

All of this arises from the fact that pressures from high public officials are being exerted on Federal agencies hiring personnel in Birmingham to hire Negro applicants for civil service jobs. I believe that these people who are violating the Civil Service laws and regulations should be punished. Apparently Justice Department officials have influenced the Civil Service Commission personnel to order a step-up in Negro hiring. After a series of secret meetings with Birmingham Federal agency hiring officials, the new drive to hire Negroes was begun. An effort is being made by Justice Department officials to place a Negro applicant in the position of deputy U.S. marshal for the Northern District of Alabama over a qualified 10-point veteran who has been recommended for the position.

Mr. Speaker, actions of this kind lessen the confidence of our people in the fairness in the administration of civil service procedures with their legally based and established veteran preference features. It is unconscionable and a violation of all ethical standards, as well as a reflection of civil service regulations, if, in the name of equal rights and opportunities, special privileges are granted Negro applicants for positions or promotions.

Mr. Speaker, I have brought this to the attention of Mr. James E. Powers, national commander of the American Legion; Mr. Byron B. Gentry, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; and Mr. Peter L. Dye, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans. I have asked that they conduct their own inquiry into the violations.

Philippine War Damage Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, in the next few days the House may once again consider the matter of Philippine war damage claims.

Recent articles appearing in the press suggest there is a growing feeling that this Government should make payment to the Philippine Government rather than the individual claimants.

In the interest of economy, I have excerpted five such articles and include them herewith:

[From the New York Times, May 16, 1963]

In the Nation: The Philippine War Claims Scandal

(By Arthur Krock)

Washington, May 15.—Don't cheer yet, but there seems to be a good chance of preventing a second "take" by lobbyists of money provided by U.S. taxpayers to cover damages in the Philippines during the Second World War. The money involved is $73 million, supplementing a prior appropriation of $400 million.

More than $1 million already has been the take, from the prior appropriation, of the lobbyists who, moreover, were two members and a high-level employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission. The chance to repeal this second foray became available when the Senate dropped, from a $1.5 billion supplementary appropriation measure that included money for public works projects designed to create more employment, a rider which would have prevented the repetition. After the House yesterday refused, on parliamentary procedural grounds, to put this rider on the $1.5 billion legislation, Senate leaders agreed to remove the item, and add it instead to a measure for the construction and improvement of U.S. service buildings abroad.

Chief credit goes to Senator Fulbright, of Arkansas, for the new legislative situation which restores at least a prospect that this taxpayers' $73 million will not again be tapped by the lobbyists. It was he, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who uncovered the unsavory facts. If they had been known on August 1, 1962, the efforts of Representatives Barry, of New York, and Curtis, of Massachusetts, to earmark the $73 million in a lump sum for the Philippine Government, would probably have been successful. In May 1962 the House had accepted the recommendation of the Eisenhower administration to make the appropriation in that form. But the action was overturned by the House on August 1, after assiduous activity by the lobbyists, in general ignorance of the facts concerning them, and by subsequent Senate approval of the private claimants distribution method.

[From the New York Daily News, May 10, 1963]

Capitol Stuff

(By Ted Lewis)

Washington, May 9.—The congressional hassle over the way lobbyists cut themselves in on the millions appropriated for Philippine war claims deserves to be exposed for what it is: A cheap exhibition of phony political morality.

That became transparently clear today as both House and Senate appeared near agreement on so-called remedial legislation—aimed at depriving lobbyists of any further cut in the spoils. It is admitted that the legislation is incapable of achieving that purpose, but in this case Congress is more interested in going on the record against graft, corruption, and the "5 percenters" than abolishing same.

The sorriest part of the spectacle is that Congress was only moved to action by the disclosure before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the top Philippine lobbyist, John A. O'Donnell, had contributed $9,300 to the 1960 campaigns of 24 Members of Congress.

As Representative Robert Barry, Republican, of New York, told the House in lawyer language yesterday:

"From a legal standpoint, an amendment to the present act permitting payments to Mr. O'Donnell would not be enforceable. Even if the claimant signed a letter saying he would not pay Mr. O'Donnell and associates, the claimants for the most part are Philippine nationals, and the claimant could be sued in Philippine courts for collection and could be forced under Philippine law to pay Mr. O'Donnell and associates."

BARRY RECOMMENDS PAYING PHILIPPINE ISLANDS GOVERNMENT

In this dilemma Barry said the best way out for Congress would be to amend the 1962 claims law and provide that all the $73 million be paid to the Philippine Government instead of individuals.

This obviously would be tough on the lobbyists who were trying to follow the letter of the 1962 law and not demanding more than 5 percent. But even in the debate on whether the Philippine Government or individuals should get the money from Uncle Sam, there has been a flood of disgusting doubletalk.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 21, 1963]

Manila Sugar Firm Tied to Political Gifts

(By Laurence Stern)

A Philippine sugar executive linked by Washington lobbyist John A. O'Donnell to an $18,000 campaign fund for friendly Congressman is president of a Manila firm that stands to get $621,564 in war damage claims.

The sugar official is Gerald Wilkinson, president of the Hawaiian-Philippine Co., which will collect the new claim under the 1962 Philippine War Damage Act that O'Donnell helped lobby through Congress.

It also came to light yesterday that the former chairman of the Philippine-American War Damage Commission, Frank Waring, testified in 1960 that the claims agency had never made any public commitment to the Philippines for the additional $73 million in damage payments voted by Congress last year.

He gave his testimony to the House Foreign Affairs Far East Subcommittee headed by Representative Clement J. Zablocki, Democrat, of Wisconsin, on March 17, 1960. On the following day O'Donnell and Schein, who were both associated with the war claims body, testified that the United States had committed itself to the payment.

The following year, when ZABLOCKI ordered the 1960 testimony reprinted in the transcript of a 1961 hearing on his new claims bill, Waring's testimony was omitted. Also dropped from the 1961 transcript was the previous year's testimony from State Department witnesses who opposed ZABLOCKI's bill making the payments to individuals rather than to the Philippine Government.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 22, 1963]

WASHINGTON SCENE: HOW TO SUCCEED

(By George Dixon)

At this point I would like to apologize to O'Donnell for underestimating him. I have seen him for a long time hanging around corridors in the Capitol but I thought he was just one of those guys who buttonholed Congressmen for a few bucks a buttonhole. Now I learn he has received about $265,000 for handling Philippine war damages claims before the Philippine War Claims Commission, of which he used to be a member.

Moreover, according to Chairman J. William Fulbright of the Foreign Relations Committee, he stands to make as much as $150,000 more from prospective clients.

For some reason, Senator Fulbright seems to disapprove of the operations of O'Donnell. The distinguished lawmaker is an Oxford and Rhodes man so he is not uncouth about O'Donnell the way you and I might be. He says restrainedly and eruditely that "the legislative process has been subverted and both Congress and the Executive were deceived" and that O'Donnell and a Filipino associate were "unduly enriched."

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 23, 1963]

PHILIPPINE WAR CLAIMS PROBLEM; VIEW IS THAT CONGRESS SHOULD CANCEL PAYMENTS, SEND FUNDS TO GOVERNMENT

(By Charles Bartlett)

The dominant official view, apparently shared by the President and Senator FULBRIGHT, is that Congress should quickly pass a bill which will cancel the payment of the claims but make the money available to the Philippine Government for distribution as it sees fit. This would be a test of the moral quality of the Macapagal government, but many are confident that it is equal to the test.

Fire Island National Seashore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today the Secretary of the Interior recommended enactment of legislation to create a Fire Island National Seashore. Secretary Udall proposed including additional portions of Long Island to encompass an area of about 8,000 acres stretching along 52 miles of relatively undeveloped seashore.

I have introduced today a new bill to carry out the Department's recommendation. In both this Congress and the 87th Congress, I previously introduced legislation to comprise the area "lying generally between the westerly limits of Fire Island and a line two miles east of Moriches Inlet." I think that the Secretary has shown foresight in seeking action to protect the additional area for public use.

Fire Island, 50 miles away from New York City, is the last remaining area of natural beauty and wilderness near the city. It has long been a refuge for for those who wish to escape to the quiet contemplation of nature. The island now faces two great dangers—development and erosion. The Federal Government should act now to preserve it.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times in an editorial on June 7, 1963, eloquently outlined the problem and urged prompt congressional action. I urge all of my colleagues to read the following editorial and to support this measure to protect this seashore area from the double threat of erosion by sea and by man:

FULL STEAM ON FIRE ISLAND SEASHORE

If Fire Island is not approved as a national seashore under Federal protection, it will remain an irresistible target for the roadbuilders, the hot dog and pizza entrepreneurs, and the other developers who would develop it to death—in fact, to a fate worse than death. Although the Fire Island bill has received bipartisan support from New York's legislators in both houses, endorsement from the Department of the Interior, and the blessings of Suffolk County and the island's residents, a report from Washington indicates that there isn't enough steam in the congressional boiler to get the big wheels moving.

Fire Island is one of the last remaining areas on the Atlantic coast suitable for a national seashore park. It is a 30-mile-long narrow sandspit of sea, beach, and dune only 50 miles from Manhattan—but worlds away in serenity and beauty. This great glacial relic is clothed with bayberry, eelgrass, beach plum and the vegetation found mainly along the Eastern littoral; and there are enough unbroken stretches between the settlements still to give the impression of wildness, if not wilderness. In its dunes and saltwater marshes, and land birds thrive. Here the legacy of nature is rich—but it won't be much longer without effective protection.

A victory is in the making at Breezy Point, Queens, thanks to efforts by Mayor Wagner and concerned citizens; this will be a much-desired recreational region only a milk-run away on a hot day. But Fire Island is more than a recreational area; it is a natural barrier reef of beauty along our shoreline. It needs a high congressional priority to be saved as a national seashore.

Socialistic Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in Mr. Jack Pickett's editorial column of the California Farmer, on June 1 the following editorial appeared which I think is worthy of consideration by every Member of Congress, in order that we may know what is actually transpiring in the agricultural field:

SOCIALISTIC CONSERVATION

(By Jack Pickett)

The National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts is tremendously proud of a new communal farm they have helped set up in southeastern Colorado. Forty farmers borrowed $375,000 from the Farmers Home Administration and bought a 15,000-acre ranch. They not only got the ranch but they also got a complete soil and water conservation plan under the Federal cost-sharing program.

On 1,440 acres of wheat land they seeded grass and they will get Great Plains Conservation Program cost-share help.

The loan from the Farmers Home Administration is the first under authorization in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 in which groups can borrow to finance shifts in land use to grazing, forestry, or recreation uses.

Forty years ago who would have thought that we would see the day in this country when we would set up a Federal bank that would make loans to people who were too poor a credit risk to get a loan from a commercial bank?

Who would have dreamed that the Government would sponsor the big ranches and what would your grandfather have said if the Government had offered him money to plant grass? In fact, we wonder what grandpappy would have said if the Government had come around and offered him money to convert from farming to recreation. We imagine that grandpappy's thoughts would probably be unprintable.

Employment of Handicapped Persons in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, having always been heartily in favor of the program in support of employment of the handicapped, I am particularly pleased that an Alaska employer, Alaska Coastal-Ellis Airlines, is winner of the American Legion's 1962 award as Alaska's "Employer of the Year" for excellent utilization of handicapped employees. It should be noted that this did not occur in the absence of competition, as witnessed by the fact that placements of the handicapped by the Alaska State Employment Service have gone up steadily in the past 3 years—175 in 1960, 201 in 1961, 281 in 1962. The story of the recognition of the handicapped by Alaska Coastal-Ellis Airlines which lead to its winning the award is told in the May–June 1963 issue of Performance published in Washington, D.C. by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped and republished on May 8, 1963, by the Daily Alaska Empire of Juneau. The story, with a message worthy of widespread attention, is as follows:

NO HANDICAPS ON OUR PAYROLL

As if shot from a bow, a supersonic jet liner arcs from Ketchikan, Alaska, to the State capital, Juneau, carrying passengers, mail, and freight on the last 45 minutes of a journey from Seattle.

Debarking at either Annette Island, which is Ketchikan's terminal, or at Juneau, anyone or anything destined for other southeast Alaska points will transfer to a plane bearing the markings of Alaska Coastal-Ellis Airlines—1962 winner of the American Legion Award as Alaska's "Employer of the Year," for excellent utilization of handicapped employees.

The plane itself is small and lacking in frills by ordinary airline standards. But Coastal-Ellis is no ordinary airline. Its aircraft are capable of landing and taking off on land or water. They are considered by the line to be the best ever devised to challenge the harsh flying conditions of southeast Alaska, where the wind comes from all directions at once, and the rain falls and falls and falls.

As soon as the windows clear from a watery takeoff, the passenger, fresh from jet flight, finds himself in a vast spectacular new element—the world of southeast Alaska, which earlier had passed unnoticed far below the rushing jet.

This world of Coastal-Ellis consists of hundreds of islands, large and small, and a long rugged mainland coastline, frequently broken by deep inlets. The lower slopes are covered with rain forest. Higher, much higher up are sheer rock mountain peaks floating in vast crumbled icefields.

The two-motored amphibian avoids the high country whenever possible, navigating through zigzag waterways. Only occasionally does it shortcut up and over a glaciered mountain pass, to reach yet another of the waterways which are the only highways connecting the region's towns and villages.

Inhabiting the 35,257-square-mile land area of southeast Alaska are some 35,000 fishermen, cannery workers, lumbermen, government employees, their families and the various tradesmen who serve them. Their communities are balanced along narrow shelves where the mountains meet the water. To these people who were once completely dependent on infrequent coastal freighters and small interisland vessels, the air service now provided by Alaska Coastal-Ellis has gradually become an integral part of existence.

The statistical fact is, the line has, over a period of years, served 463 different locations besides those regularly scheduled. In one peak month, August of 1962, there were 145 points served. Overall, in 1962 Coastal-Ellis carried 125,760 passengers, 2,822,022 pounds of cargo and 1,727,002 pounds of mail.

The 25-plane fleet has 65 scheduled stops, though there are only 5 airfields in the area. But that's only part of the story. It is well known locally that Coastal-Ellis will stop, if physically possible, at any signal, whether in response to an emergency, to pick up or drop off a hunter or sports fisherman, or to take a lumberjack into town for a spree.

It is no wonder that, in a day of general sophistication about the once awesome adventures of flying, the people of southeast Alaska consider the Coastal-Ellis pilot an amalgamation of Charles Lindberg, the U.S. Marines, and Leonard Seppala who mushed the serum to Nome.

The Alaska Coastal-Ellis team numbers 280 employees. Among these are many who have some physical disability. The definite number is not known because this firm does not record such information. The management is justly proud of the fact that it hires applicants for their abilities, not disabilities.

At an awards dinner September 28, 1962, in Juneau, K. Vernon Banta, Deputy Executive Secretary of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, was personally on hand to present the American Legion award. On this occasion Alaska Coastal-Ellis, represented by Vice President O. F. Benecke, was commended particularly for its job application form, which does not designate space to record that any applicant is handicapped.

The application itself reflects the company policy of hiring its employees on the basis of qualifications, with no nonperformance requirements which would tend to bar the handicapped.

Coastal-Ellis employees are, of course, involved in all the occupations associated with operation of an airline, from routine maintenance to detailed overhaul of airframes, engines, instruments, as well as the various passenger services.

A tour of the facilities reveals many workers who would be recorded as handicapped by most employers.

Commenting on the reason Coastal-Ellis has established its advanced outlook on employment of handicapped, Mr. Benecke says, "We used to have disability information on our applications, but experience showed us it had no bearing on an employee's performance. It was a waste of time to investigate so we deleted it. In short, such information is irrelevant. We maintain that, while some of our employees may have certain disabilities, we haven't a single handicapped worker on the payroll."

Common Market Commission Recommends External Tariff Cuts To Fight Inflation in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the European Economic Commission, the administrative agency of the Common Market, is now urging the governments of the Six to cut tariffs on imports from nonmember countries in order to dampen inflationary pressures on prices now being felt throughout the Common Market. An increased flow of imports, says the Commission, would provide needed price competition from abroad to hold down prices on locally produced commodities.

I urge the administration to take advantage of this initiative on the part of the Common Market Commission and to work with it to persuade the Common Market to take this most sensible and constructive step. Unilateral or more-than-reciprocal reductions in Common Market tariffs would not only help Europe to fight its inflation, they would also help the United States in a fundamental way to reduce its present payments imbalance with Europe.

I particularly welcome and commend the Commission's recommendation, since it is one which I have made repeatedly and which has been endorsed in numerous reports of the Joint Economic Committee.

In a floor speech on January 25, 1962, I said:

> By greatly increasing imports from the United States, Europe could go far to balance dollar inflows from tourist spending, United States military expenditures, capital investments, and other sources. This would require the abandonment of remaining quotas on dollar imports and substantial tariff reductions by the European countries without asking for compensatory reductions by the United States.

On May 7, 1962, I pointed out that a liberal European import policy would reduce our unemployment and our payments deficit and at the same time strengthen Western Europe.

> Such a policy—

I said—

> would enable European employers—with the blessing of their own governments and of the friendly United States—to grant wage increases without risking inflation, because it would make available the goods needed to sop up the extra purchasing power thus created. And, if the operation were really successful, it could go far toward wiping out the U.S. payments deficit and Western Europe's payments surplus, to the great advantage of the whole free world.

In an article in the May 1963 issue of Harper's magazine, I again called attention to the many advantages of increased imports by the Common Market from the United States:

> This would not merely spur the U.S. economy and create jobs for Americans. It would also help the European countries. At present, a wage increase in Europe can cause inflation because higher purchasing power will compete for roughly the same amount of consumer goods. If Europe were to let down her trade barriers, new imports could sop up this excess purchasing power. And these sales of our products abroad would help wipe out the U.S. international payments deficit and Western Europe's payments surplus. to the advantage of the whole free world. Only thus can the dollar—the international currency of Europe and the United States—become stable once again.

The August 1961 report of the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments of the Joint Economic Committee recommended that the United States encourage surplus payments countries to rely on liberalized imports and the elimination of payments restrictions for anti-inflationary action. Again, in December 1962, the subcommittee concluded:

> Many countries of Western Europe, and particularly those in the Common Market, need to import more because they face inflationary pressures. The tendency for countries like Germany, France, and Italy to continue accumulating gold and dollars rather than to spend more of their rising export income on imports, on capital investment in other countries, and on foreign aid, has been responsible for a larger part of the free world's payments imbalance. If such surplus payments countries would buy U.S. and other foreign goods more freely, their present fully employed resources of capital and manpower could be devoted to the most productive activities, including further domestic capital investment essential for their future growth.

The March 1963 annual report of the Joint Economic Committee recommended that:

> The United States should promptly and vigorously bargain for a reduction of the Common Market external tariffs, and the Common Market should be requested to make an immediate unilateral reduction in its tariffs on a most-favored-nation basis pending completion of the negotiations.

In arriving at this conclusion, the committee adopted the reasoning set forth in the December 1962 report of its Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments:

> Our best hope to developing a constructive solution to the persistent U.S. payments deficit is the development of policies to deal with the basic sources of the present deficit.

The first step in dealing with the basic sources of our payments deficit is the development of policies to expand our overall export surplus.

Fortunately, an expansion in our export surplus can be achieved by the further removal of barriers to international trade. The first step is the removal of the barriers to American exports into the Common Market in Western Europe. These countries are among the most rapidly expanding in the entire world. Over the years ahead these nations will need to import more both because of their rapid growth and because they face inflationary pressures. The tendency for countries like West Germany, France, and other countries to continue accumulating gold and dollars rather than to spend more of their rising export income on imports, on capital investments in other countries, and on foreign aid, has been responsible for a large part of the free world's payments imbalance. If such surplus payments countries would allow goods from the United States and other countries to be sold more freely in their markets, their present fully employed resources of capital and manpower could be devoted to the most productive activities, including further domestic capital investment essential for their future growth.

The text of the New York Times article of June 6, 1963, reporting the recommendation of the Common Market follows:

TRADE BLOC PANEL URGES TARIFF CUTS: COMMISSION ASKS COMMON MARKET TO MAKE MOVE TO SPUR PRICE COMPETITION

(By Edward T. O'Toole)

BRUSSELS, June 5.—The European Common Market Commission, obviously disturbed by increasing price pressures, is urging the six member states of the trade bloc to invite price competition with nonmember states by cutting tariffs wherever possible.

In its sixth annual report, published today, the commission said any Common Market regulatory measures to control prices "at this time would not be opportune."

But, the commission added, the six natons of the European Economic Community, or Common Market, could each take steps to help dampen price increases. The six members are Italy, Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg and France.

TRADE WOULD RISE

Tariff cuts with nonmembers, the report said, would increase trade with other countries. An increased flow of goods would mean an increase in price-dampening competition between locally produced goods and those imported from outside the community.

The commission made it plain that this would tend to offset the increasing upward pressures on prices being felt throughout the Common Market.

The commission is the operating management for the six countries of the European Economic Community. It has a responsibility that transcends national interests. Its function is to propose policies that are designed for integrating the six member states into one economic and political unit.

COUNCIL DECIDES

But, although the commission proposes policies, the member states, through their representatives on the Common Market Council of Ministers, actually decide which policies will be followed.

Thus, last week, although the commission proposed a reduction in the tariffs on U.S. poultry exports, the council instead voted to increase the duty.

After reviewing financial developments during the year, the commission urged the member countries to encourage the development of their own money markets. It indicated that this would ameliorate the shortage of investment capital that is being felt within the community.

The commission cautioned against competition with private needs for investment capital.

It also advised the Common Market to avoid undue repatriation of capital held in their countries. It said this could have adverse effects on the liquidity and balance-of-payments positions of nonmember states.

In discussing trade developments within the community, the commission reported that, since the Common Market's inception, imports by the member states from other member states had increased remarkably.

The commission gave these estimates for intracommunity import increases in the past 4 years:

France, a 130-percent increase; Germany and the Netherlands 80 to 90 percent; Italy, 60 percent, and Belgium-Luxembourg, 25 percent.

Change in Policy Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which recently appeared in the New York Times as written by Roscoe Drummond. This editorial clearly states the position that the Republican Party has urged the President to take. The article follows:

KENNEDY AND CUBA—CHANGE IN POLICY NEEDED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

President Kennedy, I feel sure, will not long condone a passive, timid policy of accepting the Soviet military presence in Cuba with the clear implication that little can be done about it except to try to keep it from spreading further into the Western Hemisphere.

There are two reasons why this policy needs to be changed and, I believe, will be changed.

One reason is that it isn't working; the wall isn't holding. Soviet-supported Castro subversion and sabotage of neighboring Caribbean countries is mounting. Its intensification dates from the Soviet takeover of the Castro regime last fall. Castro has explicitly and openly made Venezuela his first target. Last week Venezuelan Communists successfully raided and burned the U.S. military mission in Caracas.

The second reason why administration policy cannot long remain passive is that the American people will not, I think, accept it. Unless the do-little Cuba policy is changed in the course of the coming months, it will be a central issue in the presidential election and the country will have the opportunity to register its verdict—yes or no—at the polls.

New evidence that containment is not containing comes from the eight-nation investigating committee of the Council of the Organization of American States, whose officials are neither alarmist nor given to overstatement. Their latest findings are:

That Cuba-based subversion in Latin America has increased considerably during the past year.

That the Communist offensive, with the aid of training, money, and propaganda from the Cuba base, is being steadily intensified.

That there is no real awareness on the part of the American countries of the danger to their own security in taking a passive attitude toward the Communist activity.

This is straight talk—and welcome. It runs counter to the cozy and soporific attitude one encounters in many places in the administration; namely, that if we will only hold our breath—and our tongues—the Soviet forces in Cuba will go away and that, anyway, since they cannot attack the United States, there is nothing much that needs to be done.

It is a valid assumption that the Soviet presence in Cuba is only a negative force, a kind of umbrella against invasion, just a prop to Castro?

The OAS committee repudiates this comforting theory.

It declares that the Communist intervention in the Western Hemisphere "results mainly from the intensification of Soviet military power in Cuba.".

It reports that "the utilization of the island as a base for promoting subversion activities in other countries" stems largely from the fact that "Cuba has now been converted into a Soviet military base."

It deserves to be noted that President Kennedy himself has never said that he intended to acquiesce indefinitely in the presence of Soviet forces in Cuba. But I have listened to very high officials saying that we will have to "live with their presence a long time," that "they may never get out," that the American people have a kind of "neurotic preoccupation with Cuba."

I do not believe that President Kennedy can long live with such a policy. All the American people need to know is that he does not intend to do so. They are prepared to leave with the President the timing and the means of acting once they become certain he intends to act.

Birmingham Civil Service Violations Protested

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, in the Federal Government's efforts to show favoritism to Negro applicants for civil service jobs in Birmingham recently 76 people on a civil service register were passed over to reach a particular name. Although the applicant was No. 77 on the register, she was offered a position as secretary to the Regional Counsel of the Internal Revenue Service. This applicant was a Negro.

Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly protested these violations and uses of favoritism in Birmingham to Mr. John W. Macy, Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Although the job would represent a promotion for a number of women applicants already employed by the Internal Revenue Service in Birmingham, the Negro applicant from outside Government service was given the job.

Directions and pressures to hire Negroes for these civil service jobs are coming from high officials here in Washington. Their actions and pressures represent willful violations of civil service rules and procedures. These are not the only violations, Mr. Speaker, but there are others. The civil service merit system is being seriously jeopardized. The pressures being brought to bear on Birmingham Federal agency officials, charged with the responsibility of hiring personnel, to hire Negroes are making a mockery of civil service regulations and procedures.

Mr. Speaker, continuation of the present policies and pressures will result in the complete loss of confidence in the Federal Government merit system hiring.

Although I have been assured that the Civil Service Commission is investigating these complaints, I am not aware that remedial, corrective or punitive action is being taken. I cannot stand idly by, while these violations are being perpetrated in the name of so-called equal rights and opportunities while these actions are, in fact, efforts to show favoritism and preference to a specific group.

The Meaning of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in these times when the freedom of man is threatened from all sides by the advocates of big Government and rule by small selected groups, it is well to ponder on the freedom which was handed to this generation of American as a precious gift. We should rededicate ourselves to its preservation so that we may hand it, untarnished, to those who follow after.

The following editorial from the Dallas Times Herald of June 9, gives two refreshing views of freedom:

TWO VIEWS OF FREEDOM

A sobering look at freedom was taken by two speakers in Dallas recently.

Dr. Albert Burke, educational consultant of the National Broadcasting Co., called freedom the greatest danger to our future.

"You are free to be as ignorant, as intolerant and as indecent as you want to be," Dr. Burke said. "By the same token, you are free to be as informed, as honest and decent."

Rabbi Levi Olan, of Temple Emanuel, warned of another danger in freedom. "Man wants to be free," Rabbi Olan said, "but at the same time he dreads the responsibility for making his own decisions that freedom brings. Too often he eagerly hands over his gift of freedom to a Hitler, Mussolini, or Stalin who will tell him what to do. Or he turns to a churchman, politician, or psychiatrist to relieve him from the terrible burden of free choice."

Freedom is a precious gift. It is also, as these men indicate, a responsibility. Freedom, won by a hard struggle by one generation, must not be flitted away by following generations.

Both of these men made pleas for an intelligent understanding of freedom, a meeting of the demands of freedom. Both, in effect, were answering the growing cries of anti-intellectualism, the shouts of those who say the best way to keep our freedom is to place limits on it.

As Dr. Burke said, "The loudest is usually the least knowledgeable. Empty barrels make the most noise. It doesn't take loud noise to be patriotic and have concern and dedication. You can go about it in a quiet manner."

A Tribute to Hiroshi Miyamura

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, while New Mexico cannot boast of as many Japanese Americans who served in World War II as many of our neighboring States, we can, however, point with pride to the fact that the only living Japanese American Congressional Medal of Honor winner lives among us, in Gallup, N. Mex.

He is Hiroshi Miyamura, whom most of us call "Hershey," owner and operator of a service station in Gallup.

Although he won the Nation's highest decoration for valor in Korea, he received his baptism of fire with the famed 442d Japanese American regimental combat team. He was a replacement for that combat team, just as was Pvt. Sadao S. Munemori, who won the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously in Italy. Both participated in the final Po Valley campaign, which ended in the defeat of the German Armies in Italy.

Hershey was a sergeant in Korea with the 7th Infantry Regiment. He was captured as a wounded prisoner of war after his heroic actions near Taejon-Ni, late in April 1951. It was not until he was exchanged for Korean prisoners of war after the armistice was signed at Freedom Village in August 1953, after 29 months in enemy hands, that he learned that he had earned the Congressional Medal of Honor. His award had to be kept secret, for there is no telling what his Communist captors would have done to him had they known of his high honor.

Then President Eisenhower personally decorated him with the Medal of Honor at special White House ceremonies in the summer of 1954.

The citation for his Medal of Honor is a remarkable reminder of what patriotic Americans, regardless of their race, color, creed, and ancestry, can do when our Nation's honor is at stake.

The citation reads as follows:

(Sgt.) Cpl. Hiroshi H. Miyamura (service No. ER38584192) Infantry, Army of the United States, a member of Company H, 7th Infantry Regiment, 3d Infantry Division, distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy near Taejon-Ni, Korea, on April 24 and 25, 1951. On the night of April 24, Company H was occupying a defensive position when the enemy fanatically attacked, threatening to overrun the position.

Corporal Miyamura, a machinegun squad leader, aware of the imminent danger to his men, unhesitatingly jumped from his shelter wielding his bayonet in close, hand-to-hand combat, killing approximately 10 of the enemy. Returning to his position, he administered first aid to the wounded and directed their evacuation as another savage assault hit the line. He manned his machinegun and delivered withering fire until his ammunition was expanded. He ordered the squad to withdraw, while he remained behind to render the gun inoperative. He then bayoneted his way through infiltrated enemy soldiers to a second gun emplacement and assisted in its operation.

When the intensity of the attack necessitated the withdrawal of the company, Corporal Miyamura ordered his men to fall back while he remained to cover their movement. He killed more than 50 of the enemy before his ammunition was depleted and he was severely wounded. He maintained his magnificent stant despite his painful wounds, continuing to repel the attack until his position was overrun.

When last seen, he was fighting ferociously against an overwhelming number of enemy soldiers.

Corporal Miyamura's indomitable heroism and consummate devotion to duty reflect the utmost glory on himself and uphold the illustrious traditions of the military service.

Urgency of Reenactment of Public Laws 874 and 815

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to publish a statement concerning the extension of Public Laws 874 and 815, issued by Supt. G. Harold Holt, of Davis County schools, Utah.

Mr. Holt effectively outlines the urgent need for extension of this legislation to assist such Utah school districts as his own and adjoining districts such as Weber, Ogden, Toole, Salt Lake, Granite, Box Elder—to name a few.

I urge my colleagues to note Superintendent Holt's statement and to give consideration to extending these laws so important to so many school districts in Utah and the Nation:

STATEMENT OF SUPT. G. HAROLD HOLT, OF THE DAVIS COUNTY SCHOOLS IN UTAH, EMPHASIZING URGENCY OF A REENACTMENT OF PUBLIC LAWS 874 AND 815

In representing Davis County School District and referring to Utah school districts, I should like all to know that our districts are consolidated districts in Utah. They are city or county districts.

The original act providing financial assistance to school districts under Public Law 874 contained a declaration of policy. I should like to call your attention to section 1 and section 3 of the act which set forth that policy. In section 1 the Federal Government accepts responsibility to provide assistance to local educational agencies upon which the United States has placed financial burdens by reason of the fact that (1) the revenues available to such agencies from local sources have been reduced as the result of the acquisition of real property by the United States; or (2) such agencies provide education for children resiidng on Federal property; or (3) such agencies provide education for children whose parents are employed on Federal property; or (4) there has been a sudden and substantial increase in school attendance as the result of Federal activities.

Section 3 of the bill seeks to compensate school districts in reasonable amounts for the cost of educating children who, because they reside on tax-exempt Federal property or because their parents are employed on such property, do not in effect pay their own way.

I do not know what the situation is throughout the United States. I do know that there has been no significant change since 1950 in the Davis County School District or most of the other school districts in Utah to justify a change in policy. The impact is greater today in our school district than it was in 1950. The enrollment increase from 1950-51 to 1951-52 was 726 or 8.77 percent. Last year the growth was 1943 or 9.4 percent. The ratio of the 1951-52 federally connected pupils to the total membership was 37 percent. On October 19, 1962, it was 41 percent. A comparison of this ratio in other Utah school districts is as follows:

School district	Percent		
	1951-52	1956-57	1962-63
Tooele	56	53+	64
Ogden City	26	23	24
Weber County	40	36	36.69
Box Elder County	19	16	24
Logan City	None	4.05	4.114

The membership in Davis County School District was 4,220 in 1933-34. It was 4,210 in 1940-41. Beginning with World War II it gradually rose to 7,658 in 1950 and to 19,002 in 1960 and as of January 1963 it was 22,652. Since 1949 the district has spent $17 million and encumbered another $3 million. Of this amount, $4,932,821.54 will have been provided by the Federal Government under Public Law 815. At the present time the district is using 59 makeshift rooms. In addition, we have no winter kindergarten which would require an additional 45 classrooms. Considering the need to eliminate makeshift rooms and to reduce overloads in regular classrooms, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington, D.C., officially approved our district as having 3,184 unhoused students as of March 9, 1962. Since that time the number of federally connected students in the district is considerably greater than the number approved for the spring of 1963 in our last application under Public Law 815. Five hundred housing units are now being constructed at Hill Field under Armed Services housing project, fiscal year 1962.

Davis district is now bonded to the legal limit of 13⅓ percent of the assessed valuation. However, since our district has one of the lowest assessed valuations per child in the State of Utah our sources of local building funds are greatly limited. Therefore, Federal funds under Public Law 815 are vitally needed at one of the most critical times since the end of World War II.

The Davis County School District has qualified for a grant of $891,480 under Public Law 874 for the school year 1962-63. Without this money it would be impossible to carry on an educational program comparable to other areas of the State.

It seems urgent that Public Laws 874 and 815 be immediately extended so that our 1963-64 budget can be adopted with the assurance that the usual Federal funds will be forthcoming. An immediate 1-year extension would be most desirable if there are complications to be ironed out before an agreement can be reached on a longer extension period.

Since most of these districts are making the maximum financial effort to meet the demands to provide satisfactory facilities, good teachers and a good curriculum we shall appreciate your support for an immediate extension of the program.

Headless Foreign Aid Horsemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article written by John Chamberlain which appeared in the May 11, 1963, issue of the Galveston (Tex.) News:

HEADLESS FOREIGN AID HORSEMEN

(By John Chamberlain)

In the 19th century in England they used to speak of "St. George's Cavalry"—meaning money that was spent abroad to buy the allegiance of other nations or to stir up local rebellions that would benefit the British position in the world. The justification for using St. George's Cavalry was that it kept Britain from having to fight wars directly.

On the record the British used their monetary substitute for troops wisely. They defeated Napoleon with a very small commitment of British soldiers, and they kept out of large-scale wars for a century thereafter without visible loss of prestige, real estate, or power.

Since World War II there have been many attempts to justify the U.S. foreign aid program as a 20th century variant of the horsemen of St. George who used to ride for Britain. But the U.S. monetary horsemen seem to be headless. For instance, they have ridden in Cambodia since 1945 to the tune of $248.6 million in economic aid and $85.9 in military aid, making a total of $334.5 million. Surely that ought to be sufficient to earn a little gratitude, you might think.

But the news from Cambodia that this neutralist monarchy in southeast Asia has just signed a document pledging its support to the foreign policies, not of the United States and its Allies, but of Red China. Included in the specifics of the agreement is Cambodian endorsement of the Red Chinese claim to Formosa.

In other parts of the world the American versions of St. George's horsemen have been galloping off in all directions and getting nowhere. There is Brazil, to which $1.9 billion has been sent in hopes that the nation might get its skyrocketing inflation under control and somehow pull the teeth of the Communists who are trying to exploit the sufferings of landless peasants in the Brazilian northeast.

If the deployment of our own St. George's Cavalry serves to keep the largest nation in Latin America from going the way of Castro's Cuba, we can count our foreign aid to Brazil as being money well spent. But when Brazilian President Joao Goulart urges his own leftist supporters to keep their eyes on what he does, not on what he says, it is obvious that promises may not always match performances in Brazil.

The curious thing about our aid to Goulart's government is that it has been extended without any hint of real reciprocity. Brazil sells coffee and buys wheat, which would seem to set the stage for some sort of barter deal connected with our aid program.

But we go on paying money for Brazilian coffee while Brazil takes wheat from Soviet Russia. This does not mean that our own St. George's Cavalry has lost the Brazilian war, but it does indicate that it has been outflanked in a rather important battle.

Elsewhere in the world St. George's Cavalry has ridden into cul de sacs. We have provided Haiti with $100 million in aid—and as this column is being written the fantastic Haitian dictator has just announced that he has already been reelected president in an election that is schedule for next week.

Indonesia got $670 million—and thumbed its nose at the West by grabbing Dutch New Guinea. Cuba got $52 million, and then, in accordance with Castro's idea of gratitude, grabbed $1 billion in U.S. property. India has had $3.9 billion, and is currently angling for funds to build a state-owned steel mill at Bokaro.

The United States Steel Corp. has advised our Government that the proposed steel mill, which would be built near coal and iron sources, would be practical, but private steel companies in India operate at costs approximately 15 percent below the costs of existing Government mills, so why not lend the money to private Indian steel companies to expand?

Venezuela has had $274 millions in U.S. aid—and in view of this oil-rich nation's proximately to the Panama Canal few Americans would begrudge a penny of the money. Even so, it is a little disconcerting to hear from Cuban exile sources, that Khrushchev has promised Mao Tse-Tung that when Venezuela is subverted by the Communists its relatively unpopulated savannas will be turned over to China to help solve the problem of where to put all those extra Red Chinese.

The idea of letting St. George's Cavalry ride in place of flesh-and-blood U.S. troops was not inherently a poor idea. But we badly need a ouija board connection with certain departed British statesmen of the 19th century to learn how money should be deployed.

Relief Against Medical Expenses, No—Socialized Medicine, Yes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the proverb "actions speak louder than words" was aptly demonstrated yesterday in action by the House Committee on Ways and Means. I am pleased to include in my remarks herewith a release from the office of the Honorable JOHN W. BYRNES, ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. His statement speaks for itself:

The defeat by a solid bloc of Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee of the amendments which I offered to encourage voluntary insurance against medical expenses is a strange paradox for those who claim to be concerned over the health and medical needs of our Nation. Today's action means that the Democratic Party is not interested in the health of our citizens, but only in providing for a socialized system of Government medicine under the administration's program for medical care for the aged under the social security system. Any proposal which seeks to encourage private initiative in forestalling citizens from becoming "public charges" with respect to their medical needs is opposed by the Democrat majority.

Because the 3-percent floor applicable to the present deduction for medical expenses has the effect of nullifying any deduction for such premiums for health and accident insurance, I initially offered an amendment to permit the full deduction for premiums paid on health and accident insurance for the taxpayer and his dependents. Notwithstanding the professed concern of the administration over medical care, the amendment was rejected by the committee by a tie vote (12–12), with one member voting present. All 10 Republican members supported the amendment.

I then offered to limit the deduction to prepaid health and accident insurance which would provide medical coverage for the taxpayer, his spouse and their parents upon reaching age 65. This would enable taxpayers to provide in their working years for medical insurance to cover them and their parents in later life. This, likewise, failed by a tie vote.

Finally, I offered to limit the deduction to prepaid medical insurance purchased by the taxpayer for himself and spouse for coverage upon reaching age 65. This provision could have been adopted with a minimum revenue loss of less than $10 million. By a tie vote the committee failed even to adopt this amendment—thereby flatly refusing any relief to the taxpayer who might insure against future medical expenses.

Area Redevelopment Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the Area Redevelopment Administration bill is coming before this House tomorrow. I plan to oppose this legislation for several reasons. However, at this time, I would like to bring to the attention of my fellow colleagues one example of the poor administrative judgment used by the ARA. ARA has approved two new tissue plant applications in the last year. This has been done without the foreknowledge of the tissue industry which has warned its members repeatedly that the large number of new tissue machines and mills being planned spell over capacity in the industry. ARA officials still insist that this is a growing industry and that further expansion is desirable despite the Tissue Association's admonition. I wonder how these two new plants in Tomahawk, Wis., and Pickens, Miss., will fare in light of the following news article which states that major producers of household sanitary tissue are reducing their prices by 10 percent. And what is more important, I wonder how the employees of existing mills will be affected by the establishment of two new mills in their industry which is already over producing. In ARA's zeal to shovel out their money, it seems they have forgotten their main goal, that of encouraging new employment and creating new jobs.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 10, 1963]

TWO-PLY TOILET TISSUE WHOLESALE PRICE CUT; RETAIL TRIM EXPECTED

Major producers of two-ply toilet tissue have cut wholesale prices.

The cuts are expected to result in a retail price reduction of about 1 cent a roll, or of 2 cents on two-roll packages. These packages have been selling in supermarkets at 25 cents to 29 cents.

Scott Paper Co., Philadelphia, said it made a 9.1-percent price cut on its Soft-Weve tissue to wholesalers and chainstores, effective last Monday. Scott said it also reduced its price to industrial distributors to bring it into line with the quote to wholesalers who distribute to retail outlets.

Procter & Gamble Co., Cincinnati, said it reduced wholesale prices on its White Cloud tissue to $9.55 a case from $10.50, effective last Friday.

Crown Zellerbach Corp., San Francisco, cut its price on Chiffon tissue to about $9.63 a 96-roll case from about $10.50, effective last Monday, the company said.

Kimberly-Clark Corp., Neenah, Wis., said it reduced its tissue price 10 percent to $9.55 a case from $10.61, effective in about two-thirds of the company's marketing area. A spokesman added that prices in the remaining areas, chiefly in the East and South, would be cut June 1. No other products are involved in the price cuts, he noted.

In explaining Scott's price cut, Thomas B. McCabe, Jr., marketing vice president, said improved manufacturing efficiencies "contributed significantly to our ability" to take the action. He also indicated the cut reflects savings to Scott from not offering special coupon and cut-price merchandising. "It is part of the company's program announced in 1962 of dropping such promotional devices * * * in favor of our traditional approach" of offering products at the lowest possible across-the-board prices.

Scott's most recent price change on the product was an increase of about 2 percent in April 1957.

Scott has reduced the price to wholesalers of five other products in the last 14 months: Waldorf single-ply toilet tissue by 6.5 percent in March 1962, Scotties facial tissues by 5 percent to 8.5 percent in June, Confidets sanitary napkins by 9.5 percent in October and Cut-Rite sandwich bags by 10.3 percent in March 1963.

Peace Corps Called New Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, we continue to hear commendations of the fine work being done in foreign fields by members of the U.S. Peace Corps. There recently appeared in the Waterbury (Conn.), American a first person account of the experiences of a young man from Torrington, Conn., who volunteered for Peace Corps service and who recently completed 1 year of service in Brazil. The young man I refer to is Mr. Mark J. Ruwet, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph N. Ruwet of 1600 Torrington Street, Torrington, Conn., who operate a 250-acre dairy farm in Litchfield County.

Mark J. Ruwet is only one of several Connecticut volunteers currently serving with distinction in the Peace Corps.

I was very much interested in reading Mark Ruwet's report of his experiences in Brazil. I was particularly impressed with his statement that "After a year of Peace Corps work, I am even more 'sold' on the idea of working directly with the people, helping them to help themselves. Many Brazilians have told me that the Peace Corps is one of the best aid programs the United States could ever offer."

With permission to extend my remarks, and with a word of personal commendation to Mark J. Ruwet and to his Peace Corps associates, I include at this point the text of Mr. Ruwet's report on his experiences in Brazil:

PEACE CORPS WORK SEEN AS "NEW WAY OF LIFE"

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mark J. Ruwet of Torrington is currently spending 2 years in Brazil as a Peace Corpsman, helping local extension workers develop a 4–H type rural youth program. A freshman in the 2-year Ratcliffe Hicks School of Agriculture at the University of Connecticut, he is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph N. Ruwet of 1600 Torrington St., Torrington. The Ruwets, operators of a 250-acre dairy farm, have made available a letter from their son who tells of his work in this country.)

(By Mark J. Ruwet)

A year has passed since I arrived in Brazil to begin work on the first U.S. 4–H Peace Corps project. Throughout this time I have had many wonderful and exciting experiences, and have made many friends. There were encouraging moments when I had a chance to see improvement in my work through result demonstrations and careful evaluation.

Discouragements came too, particularly in the beginning part of my work. At first it was the language, then the customs, the food, and the work didn't seem to progress at all. But, with help and friendship of the Brazilian people, I gradually became accustomed to this new way of life. Within a few weeks I managed to speak Portuguese adequately. I finally began to accept the fact that I could not expect to see quick results that most Americans are accustomed to.

My first worksite was in Estrela, a town in the gaucho state of Rio Grande do Sul. It was a cozy, clean community with cobblestone streets and a nice park, which is typical of most Brazilian towns.

Its population of 7,000 persons is mostly of German descent. Many older citizens could not speak the common language, Portuguese. However, most of the children over 9 years of age could speak the language because it was a required course in school.

The town's main agricultural crops are corn and mandioca (a root used for making flour). Swine also are raised widely.

The land has been extensively worked and is now no longer fertile. Some farmers, though, through agricultural extension teachings, are starting to use fertilizers and to practice good soil conservation. The ox and cart are still used in Estrela as in all of Brazil, except on large "Fazendas" where mechanized farming has been introduced.

CALIFORNIA GIRL ASSISTS

I arrived in Estrela in June 1962. My job was to organize and develop new 4–S Clubs (similar to 4–H Clubs in the United States) and to strengthen the leadership of three existing clubs. Together with another Peace Corps student, Lorie Farinha of California, we assisted the youth in their home economics and agricultural projects. Fortunately, the Peace Corps provided us with a Jeep station wagon which proved invaluable, since most of our work is done in the country where road conditions are poor.

Estrela's 4–S Club program was weak in several respects. There were no active leaders and it was mostly the extension agents who guided the clubs. Those of you who know anything about 4–H realize that the success of the club program depends on local adult leaders. Too many projects and a weak recreation program were other areas that needed attention.

Consequently we stressed our work in these three areas; finding good dedicated leaders, having one project for boys and one for girls to lessen leader needs, and improving club recreational programs.

For 6 months both Lorie and I worked in Estrela, visiting families and explaining the 4–S program. We asked their cooperation, talked to probable leaders, made preparations to start new clubs, held meetings with the community and finally attended the first meetings of these clubs. In addition, we oriented and helped leaders of the already formed clubs, taught members more recreational games, and demonstrated and explained better methods of agriculture and home economics. These included planting corn, fertilizing, vaccinating, building chicken coops, sewing, cooking and home improvement.

TOLD TO LEAVE

In mid-December, however, we had to end our work in Estrela. The somewhat leftish and very nationalist Governor of this State had found a loophole in the contract that Peace Corps has with the Extension Service and demanded our removal. Although our time was cut short, I feel that we have left an impression in our work there as well as a favorable impression of the American people.

In 6 months of work we had organized three new clubs, set up a leader responsibility program for the older clubs, and introduced various recreational programs. Our most important accomplishment, though, was gaining the friendship, confidence and respect of the people. As a result we have been able to show the ways of the average American, how he lives and the way he thinks. We have given these people a better idea of what the U.S. is like, how our Government works as well as an understanding of our educational, agricultural, and industrial systems.

After our annual month's vacation, we received our reassignment to the small town of Orleaes in the State of Santa Catarina, bordering Rio Grande do Sul. Orleaes is situated near the coal mining center of Brazil, Criciuma.

This town is on a hillside and in a very mountainous zone. Its largest building is the Catholic Church (the predominant religion of Brazil). The main street, running 75 yards, is of cobblestone; the rest is dirt. There is a small movie house, the town's main attraction for "passing time."

The people in this region are mostly of Italian descent. Farming is mostly done on hillsides, with the main crops being mandioca and corn. Roads throughout the interior are narrow, steep, winding, and full of holes.

SOLD ON PEACE CORPS

Since there are no 4–S Clubs in this municipio (county), it will be our job to introduce the 4–S idea and to organize new clubs. I feel that our main problem will be to convince the skeptical farmers about the value and benefits of club work. We will be training adult leaders to assume the leadership and perpetuation of these clubs.

After a year of Peace Corps work, I am even more sold on the idea of working directly with the people, helping them to help themselves. Many Brazilians have told me that the Peace Corps is one of the best aid programs the United States could ever offer.

What better way is there to learn the language, the customs, the traditions, and to gain the confidence and the friendship of the people? These are truly the objectives that I feel represent the Peace Corps program.

The Mental Urges of the Mob

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I know that many of my colleagues will be interested in reading the following editorial which appears in the June 17, 1963, issue of U.S. News & World Report. It is written by the editor of that fine magazine, Mr. David Lawrence.

The Supreme Court's decisions, giving aid and comfort, and apparently sanctioning the inflammatory and illegal behavior of Negro demonstrators is very alarming to all who believe in the rule of law. Mr. Lawrence's article discusses the dangers inherent in these so-called demonstrations.

I insert the article herewith.

THE MENTAL URGES OF THE MOB

(By David Lawrence)

The Supreme Court of the United States in a group of six cases recently reversed the convictions of several Negroes arrested for breaches of the peace in restaurants, lunch counters in stores, and recreation grounds in parks in the South.

The laws of trespass have been imbedded in our system of government for many decades. The Louisiana Legislature, for example, passed a law which wiped out all segregation ordinances and defined disturbance of the peace as including "the commission of any act as would foreseeably disturb or alarm the public."

The Supreme Court now has held, in effect, however, that the ordinances covering disorders were too broad and that the "mental urges of the police were designed to maintain segregated service, while the mental urges of the demonstrators were merely motivated by the pursuance of a constitutional objective. The High Court declared:

"It is said that failure to obey the command of a police officer constitutes a traditional form of breach of the peace. Obviously, however, one cannot be punished for failing to obey the command of an officer if that command is itself violative of the Constitution. * * *

"And the possibility of disorder by others cannot justify exclusion of persons from a place if they otherwise have a constitutional right—founded upon the equal protection clause—to be present."

This is an invitation to mass violence in America and virtually blocks preventive action by the local police as mobs gather. The officers must wait until persons and property have been injured. They cannot thwart a riot or a foreseeable disorder because, conceivably, some constitutional objective is in the minds of the demonstrators.

It so happens that Robert F. Goheen, president of Princeton University, wrote a letter last month to all his students and to the alumni condemning a recent riot in the town of Princeton which had no provocation at all, except perhaps spring madness. His analysis of the passions and urges of the participants, even in a purposeless demonstration is worth study by the High Court. He wrote in part:

"If, then, a riot were simply the sum of the motives that go into it, or could be judged simply by such innocence of origin, there would be no problem, and the university would not have found it necessary over many years to have on its books General Regulation No. 12: 'Any undergraduate who is guilty of inciting to riot or of participating in a riot renders himself liable to dismissal.'

"The damage to property, which amounts to over $5,000, and the very considerable disturbances occasioned off campus seem generally to be recognized, after the event, as matters demanding apology and restitution. And I must admit that when trouble of this sort spills into the town, it does seem to me more serious than when it can be confined to the campus. There remains, however, beyond the external effects, something intrinsically ominous and reprehensible about rioting, which matches—if it does not transcend—in seriousness the outward results, just as those results so often cancel whatever innocence or righteousness there may have lain in a riot's origin.

"As I wrote in reply to the New York Times editorial of May 9, there is a common, frightening characteristic of rioting that makes it far too dangerous to accept as a form of play, and that should severely limit any general approbation of rioting as a mechanism for social action. This is the ease and rapidity with which mass play or mass protest swings into a condition of mass hysteria, wherein individuals not only throw off common restraints but surrender much of their identity. Otherwise responsible persons cease to be persons, and in the 'minds' of those so involved, the rights and persons of others likewise become obliterated. The collective force of brute impulses rules the moment, and other persons lose significance except as they may chance to stand in the way and so become either interferences to or playthings for the mob. And such are the strange ways of the psyche that even after the event many involved don't realize what happened to them or to what they have contributed."

Dr. Goheen said he could not complain of the emphasis given the riot by the national press and added that "the senseless frenzy and random violence" of the students "was of more than local significance." He noted that the riot became news alongside of what he termed "the deeply somber struggles in Birmingham."

But how can the advice of a university president even in the North be of avail now when the Supreme Court winks its eye at the mischievous antics of sit-in-demonstrators and, in effect, holds that incitement to violence must be tolerated by local police whenever a racial controversy is involved.

This is a sad turn of affairs for America. It makes the maintenance of law and order by local police a frustarting paradox in an era of supposed constitutionalism.

An Outstanding Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the family of Mrs. Dixie Gill of Vashti, Tex., represents the type of high ideals and accomplishment for which all Americans should strive.

The following article, which took the entire front page of the Bellevue News on April 18, tells of the accomplishments of Mrs. Gill's five sons. They are most certainly to be commended for the outstanding record of service and attainment.

The article follows:

THE GILLS FIVE SONS—FIVE GOLD STARS: SONS OF MRS. DIXIE GILL, OF VASHTI, HAVE THE HONOR OF BEING THE ONLY FIVE-STAR FAMILY IN TEXAS

Quick now. How many mothers do you know whose five sons are holders of the coveted 4-H Gold Star?

(The Gold Star is awarded annually and is the highest honor on the county level that can be earned by a boy and girl taking part in the 4-H Club program of the Agricultural Extension Service of Texas A. & M. College).

Chances are great that the reader doesn't know any such mother, because research indicates there quite likely is only one in all of Texas.

She is Mrs. Dixie Gill, who lives at Vashti, near Bellevue, in the southern part of Clay County. Mrs. Gill, a tall and erect farm woman, speaks with equal pride and pleasure of:

1. Oliver, who is 31, earned the Gold Star in 1947, is an excombat jet pilot planning to fly soon for a commercial airline.

2. William, who is 29, earned the Gold Star in 1948, is working for his doctorate in entomology at the University of California.

3. Leland, who is 24, earned the Gold Star in 1955, is a first lieutenant in the Air Force Finance School at Wichita Falls.

4. Kenneth, who is 20, earned the Gold Star in 1959, is a junior at Texas Technological College at Lubbock.

5. Charles, who is 17, earned the Gold Star in 1962, is a junior at Bellevue High School.

Here are other distinctions shared in common by the quintet of sons:

Born and reared in Clay County.

Honor students in high school and college. Oliver, William and Leland were valedictorians of their Bellevue High School graduating classes, a goal that Kenneth missed by only one-tenth point. Charles invariably makes honor roll.

Oldest four sons earned the Opportunity Award Scholarship ($200 to $500 annually for 4 years) given by Texas A. & M. College—and Charles is applying for the scholarship.

Faithful members of the Vashti Baptist Church. Charles has missed only one Sunday school class, and that on the day his father was buried in October 1958.

A great love for the land, animals, wildlife, work, and church.

The guidance, encouragement, discipline and love of a remarkable mother.

Since she was widowed by the death of her husband in a road construction accident, Mrs. Gill has managed a small herd of registered and grade Herefords—on the same 100 acres that she and her husband have rented for 30 years. She also raises some small grain.

To supplement her income, Mrs. Gill has been teaching full or part-time in Clay schools. She attended North Texas State University at Denton, has an insatiable reading appetite—and likes people.

An unusual group, the Gill family. Don't you agree?

There is an appreciable amount of paper work involved in securing an A&M Opportunity Award Scholarship. Most of that paper work for her oldest four sons was done by Mrs. Gill—and, she has done the work for many other Clay County boys and will do it for Charles.

Despite her undeniable influence on the successes of five sons, Mrs. Gill's unchanging reaction to questions concerning her role is: "Mine have had a harder time than I would have chosen for them. The times for us never were easy. I am grateful for what my five sons have accomplished in the face of disadvantages."

MANY OTHER HONORS WON BY THE GILL BOYS IN PAST YEARS

And, here is a brief listing of some successes enjoyed by the Gill boys, successes inspired in part by the discipline of 4-H membership:

Oliver: Won wildlife conservation award with 4-H project in district 4 of the Agricultural Extension Service, attended State 4-H Roundup, has 3,500 hours as jet pilot, was in top 10 of his flying class, flew in Korea in 1957-58.

William: Won district wildlife conservation award with 4-H project, attended State 4-H Roundup at A. & M., graduated with highest honors in School of Agriculture at Texas Tech in 1960, served with Air Force in Korea.

Leland: Showed grand champion pen of turkeys at State fair of Texas in 1955 (4-H project), was State public speaking champion during 1955 4-H Roundup at Texas A. & M., competed same year at National 4-H Congress in Chicago, graduated with highest honors of his class in School of Accounting at Texas A. & M., was a good-will ambassador to Korea in 1955 for the Christian rural overseas program.

Kenneth: Earned place on dean's honor roll at Texas Tech every month since he began studying there on an Anderson-Clayton Scholarship.

Charles: Served one term as page in Texas House of Representatives, wants to enter the ministry—he preaches in area churches today, is enrolled in a nondenominational memory course designed to help him remember Bible verses and references—he can quote hundreds from memory, has impressed several critics with his artistic ability, has composed numerous poems and short articles, won trip to 4-H Congress in Chicago in 1962 on basis of his achievements.

By the way, Mrs. Gill belonged to a Texas Corn Club, the forerunner of 4-H Clubs in Texas.

Agricultural agents in Clay County also have exercised much influence on the Gill boys. Present agent is Billy M. Collier, who has worked in the 4-H program with Leland, Kenneth, and Charles. The Clay home demonstration agent is Mrs. Lonella Roesch, who long has counted on Mrs. Gill for adult leadership.

Medical Care for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the availability of comprehensive medical care insurance for elderly people, without physical examination and without regard to prior medical history, is the basis of H.R. 21, the Bow bill for medical care for the elderly.

I was pleased to see in the New York Times for June 2 an excellent article by Mr. Sal R. Nuccio in which this subject is developed and it is explained that major insurance companies are making a highly successful effort to provide for the medical care insurance requirements of our older population. I will include the article with my remarks.

Unless one has kept abreast of progress in this field, he may be unaware of the tremendous strides made by the health insurance carriers, particularly with reference to coverage for our senior citizens. Comprehensive insurance plans are now available, on a guaranteed renewable basis without regard to physical condition, for everyone over 65.

My legislation would provide additional incentive and encouragement as well as outright assistance to men and women over 65, their relatives and their former employers, to avail themselves of the protection that is now offered by the carriers of this Nation. In this way, on a voluntary basis, in the best tradition of American individual initiative and free enterprise, we can solve once and for all the problem of the high cost of medical care for those who live on the reduced income of retirement years.

The editorials follow:

[From the New York Times, June 2, 1963]

ELDERLY COURTED BY HEALTH PLANS

(By Sal R. Nuccio)

Older persons who had little chance of buying health insurance at a relatively reasonable cost several years ago now can get it regardless of physical condition or age.

Intensive enrollment drives aimed at persons 65 years of age or older have been scheduled by at least four major insurance organizations in the next 2 months. Two campaigns started yesterday, one starts tomorrow. The companies will ask no medical questions and require no medical examination, and the applicant or a relative may buy a policy by mail.

Health insurers are eager to prove that a Federal medical-care program for the aged is not needed. The industry's coverage of the Nation's elderly citizens advanced from 26 to 55 percent since 1952, when about 3 million were insured. It now claims more than 9 million insured among the nearly 18 million persons over 64.

The prime beneficiaries of the industry's effort are the older people themselves, and those relatives who may have to support them. (Sponsors of over 65 health insurance plans say that from 25 to 30 percent of the policies are paid for by persons other than those insured.)

SUPPORTS KERR-MILLS

The insurance industry maintains that the Government cannot economically and efficiently provide broad medical care for the aged. It says government, on all levels, should provide such care only to the needy, and supports such legislation as the Kerr-Mills Act, which allows Federal grants to States for this purpose.

Industry executives also have asserted that a Federal program could cut deeply into the health insurance business, because "people can use just so much protection against medical expense, and won't be looking for supplemental coverage."

Conversely, social security has inspired the sale of a tremendous amount of life insurance, because it provides a substantial base on which an individual can build a financial program.

The question remains of how much an older person can afford to pay for medical insurance. In a report last month, the President's Council on Aging noted that half the older couples had incomes of less than $2,530 a year, and that older single persons, living alone, had averages of only $1,055.

Other surveys put the median incomes of older families at about $3,000, roughly half that of younger families. However, while many expenses are reduced, primarily because of reduced responsibility, medical costs are not.

A Bureau of Labor Statistics study revealed that medical care takes more than 10 percent of the aged person's budget, and that the actual dollars spent about equals that of younger families.

The programs offered to the aged on a nonmedical basis range in cost from $6.50 a month for a basic hospitalization and surgical policy to $21 a month for a package including broad major-medical, or catastrophe, coverage. The individual insurers' programs vary one to the other in price and coverage.

Basic policies generally allow $10 a day for 31 days of hospitalization and up to $200 in surgical payments. However, there are plans that allow up to $18 a day and a maximum of $250 or more in surgical payments. But the increased benefits are reflected in the premiums.

An employee of a New York company pays $5.24 monthly for individual benefits under a group Blue Cross-Blue Shield plan, which includes 21 full days and 180 half days of hospitalization payments and surgical payments to a maximum of $500. Extended into retirement, the plan would cost him $7.18 a month.

Comparable Blue Cross-Blue Shield benefits, with surgical payments to only $250, could be bought for $14.25 monthly by persons over 64, who must complete a medical questionnaire.

The mass enrollment of policyholders is sought within a limited time in geographic groups—state, regional or national. Since large numbers are insured through a central administration, money is saved in group underwriting.

Walter M. Foody, Jr., vice president of the Continental Casualty Co., and originator of the concept, said that a reasonable cross-section of insured persons could be obtained through the limited enrollment periods, which prevent procrastination. The general experience has been a rush near the deadline.

Continuous enrollment would attract a high percentage of applicants with an urgent need for insurance, said an industry spokesman.

The scheduled enrollment drives are as follows:

June 1 to 15: The New York 65 Health Insurance Association, a nonprofit group of 49 companies sharing the risk—and the public-relations advantage—of providing health insurance for the State's aged. The association was formed in October under State legislation passed last spring. It insures 107,000 of the State's 1,700,000 elderly residents.

June 1 to 30: The Fireman's Fund Insurance Companies of San Francisco, which introduced its fund-65 plans on February 1, 1959, and insures more than 50,000 persons over 64 in 11 Western States.

June 3 to 27—The Continental Casualty Co., credited with devising the geographic-group plan. It will spend $2 million in a natonal effort to add 200,000 over-64 policyholders to its present total of 1,300,000.

July 15 to September 15: The Mutual of Omaha Insurance Co., which also has about 1,300,000 elderly policyholders. It plans a national campaign to increase the number of "nonselected" insureds (those not asked medical questions) in its geographic-group program. "Selected" persons, those subject to medical questions on application, may apply for policies outside the specific enrollment periods.

EXTENSIONS OFFERED

Many older persons either have some form of health insurance in their jobs or have extended it into retirement. Extension of group health coverage into retirement is offered by at least 100 insurance companies, as well as other organizations, such as the 146 Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans, according to the Health Insurance Institute.

At least 215 insuring organizations provide the option of conversion to an individual policy on retirement. More than 80 insurance companies offer guaranteed-for-life health plans to persons in or near retirement.

Of the more than 9 million insured persons over 64, more than 5 million have Blue Cross hospitalization. Most of the 3,250,000 persons who have Blue Shield surgical plans are among those with Blue Cross. The Associated Hospital Service of New York accounts for about 10 percent of this group in its Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans.

The New York plan has 11,120 persons enrolled in its over-65 program, which was started in 1961 and involves medical questions. It is understood that a senior citizens plan comparable to the group programs of other organizations is under consideration by the local Blue Cross-Blue Shield.

The group concept was first applied to persons over 65 by Continental Casualty in 1955, when it insured members of the New York Retired Teachers Association. The next year it insured the National Retired Teachers Association, and the year after the National Association of Retired Civil Employees, who now are being insured by the Federal Government.

In late 1957 Continental applied the group concept on a geographic basis, limiting applicants to elderly residents of Iowa. By the spring of 1959, the company was represented in all States.

In 1961 Connecticut insurers applied essentially the same program in forming the first statewide underwriting syndicate to provide health insurance for aged residents. An insurance industry committee had shared in drafting enabling legislation.

The associated Connecticut health insurance companies provide health insurance for 26,000 of the State's 242,000 elderly persons. Thirty-two participating companies won a low-cost talking point in their battle against Federal insurance, and 26,000 persons have reasonably priced health insurance.

Statewide underwriting pools are gaining favor. Last year, they were set up in New York and Massachusetts. New York 65 has 49 patricipating companies and Massachusetts 65 has 46, which collectively insure nearly 50,000 of the Bay State's 572,000 residents who are 65 or older.

REGIONAL POOLS POSSIBLE

Legislation enabling the establishment of underwriting pools has been enacted in Mississippi, Nevada, New Mexico, and Washington. It has been introduced in about a dozen other States, and there are indications of interest in several more.

Because it is not feasible to operate underwriting pools in thinly populated States, there are reports that plans are being considered for the establishment of regional pools that would include them.

The main point is that the underwriting-pool plans and many of the individual ones can be bought regardless of age and without answering medical questions or submitting to a physical examination. The average age of persons insured in the State plans is about 74.

Teenagers Show Responsible Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, during these times when we hear so much about juvenile delinquency and other problems of our young people, it is important that we also recognize the many worthwhile and constructive endeavors in which they are engaged. If one takes the time to notice, it can be seen that teenagers throughout our country have shown responsible citizenship in many ways. Two such incidents which occurred recently in the 10th Congressional District of California are noteworthy because they denote a sincere desire on the part of our young people to help their own country as well as further international understanding.

The first project was initiated by the students of Homestead and Fremont High Schools in Sunnyvale, Calif., and involved a succesful effort to financially assist the hospital ship SS *Hope*. As most people know, the *Hope* is a fully equipped medical training vessel, which has recently had two successful voyages, one to southeast Asia and the other to Peru. On both occasions the *Hope* received a hearty welcome by the people of these countries. During a short, 3-year lifetime, this hospital ship has gained an excellent reputation throughout the world, and has certainly improved our relations with other countries. This American goodwill venture is supported wholly by private donations, and although the American people have been generous, there is always a need for funds.

The students at Homestead and Fremont launched a statewide high school program, inviting other California schools to participate in an effort to raise funds. Not only has this effort brought thousands of dollars to Hope's treasury, but in the words of many of the students, it has helped them learn more about international relations and has given them the satisfaction of actively helping their own country.

Homestead's students have carried out a second project through the American Field Service, and I understand that similar projects are planned by other schools in the district. The American Field Service is responsible for the well-known exchange student program which has done an extraordinary job in creating friendship and understanding between the students of the United States and those of other countries. Looking for an interesting way to raise funds for this program, Homestead students sponsored an International Week, which not only improved their knowledge of other nations, but resulted in raising the money necessary to sponsor a foreign exchange student in this country. Each of the school's language clubs was given 1 day to present a program—to include music, films, dances, customs and traditions of the particular countries—and the proceeds went into a general fund. An international dinner climaxed the week's activities, and over a thousand people attended this event. Food prepared from French, German, Spanish, Russian, and Italian recipes were served, and foreign students from nearby colleges provided interesting entertainment. The event was regarded as a great success, but most of all, both the students and their parents felt it did much to stimulate interest in the ideas and feelings of our neighbors abroad.

With the many national and international problems which face our country today, and will continue to face us in the future, it is very encouraging to see these high school students, and hundreds like them throughout the country, engage in worthwhile efforts which not only help them personally, but their community as well as the entire Nation.

Race Criterion Introduced on Postal Personnel Form

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the Post Office Department, at the behest of the Justice Department, has recently circularized to all employees in Birmingham, Ala., requesting certain personnel information. The forms were sent out on May 22, 1962, with an accompanying letter to all postal supervisors telling them to secure the information requested within 24 hours, and no excuses accepted.

The forms asked the postal employee to give his name, his payroll number, his age, his title, his level, his step, college attended—including vocational and business colleges—semester hours, quarter hours, type degree held—if any—and his race.

Mr. Speaker, I have protested this in the strongest possible terms to Post Office Department officials, yet I am unable to secure a reasonable or satisfactory explanation for this. It is my strong feeling that the introduction of this form, asking for the employee's race, is merely part of an effort to promote Negroes in Federal Government positions without regard to long-established promotional procedures.

For years, Mr. Speaker, seniority lists and personnel records of the Post Office Department have been kept without regard to race. I am fearful that the use of this form means the introduction of race as a hiring and promotional criterion.

Here is a copy of the form that was circulated:

U.S. POST OFFICE, BIRMINGHAM, ALA., MAY 22, 1963

Employee's name----------------------------
Payroll number-----------------------------
Age--
Title--------------------------------------
Level--------------------------------------
Step---------------------------------------
College attended, including vocational and business colleges: (Give length of time in attendance if vocational or business college and course of study. If none attended, state none.)--------------------
Semester hours-----------------------------
Quarter hours------------------------------
Type degree held, if any-------------------
Race --------------------------------------

Mr. Speaker, this confirms repeated reports I have received about violations of established civil service procedures and efforts to recruit and promote Negro applicants in Federal Government positions.

Sukarno Gives a Bit To Gain a Steel Mill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the pending foreign aid bill includes a substantial sum for the dictatorship of Indonesia, despite evidence of the complete misapplication of funds and the failure of our policy to produce any practical understanding from Mr. Sukarno.

Columnist Eliot Janeway, in his Chicago Tribune column of Monday, June 10, discusses in detail the Sukarno technique for requiring massive funds for the foreign aid program.

SUKARNO GIVES A BIT TO GAIN A STEEL MILL

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, June 9.—President Sukarno of Indonesia might well be described as a latter-day Huey Long. He has been able to make a pretty good thing of the workrule that what's good for Sukarno is good for Indonesia. But recently the career which has taken him so far ran into a roadblock—in fact, into the same roadblock which stopped Huey Long a full generation ago. This is the Congress of the United States. It has been, and it still is, a patient and ingenious builder of roadblocks against flamboyant politicians with a penchant for making their own rules.

Sukarno has been involved in a dispute with Washington. Like the leaders of many other "emergent nationalists", he is anxious to get as much as he can out of the international companies operating in his country. His targets are the oil companies. The issue has been whether he should take them over and, along with their properties, the burden of financing and maintaining them; or whether, under this threat, he would do better merely to squeeze, tax, and regulate.

By all previous calculations—that is, before Congress got into the act—harassment of the international oil companies figures to be winning politics for Sukarno. He played this game for 2 years, and it would still be winning politics for him if he didn't need something from us.

This something is a steel mill, capable of producing the simple sort of material which Indonesia needs for making wire, nails, hand tools, etc. The problem of poverty there, like the problem of progress, centers in agriculture. The people who work the land need simple materials and rudimentary tools in order to feed their expanding population and meet rising social demands.

To import rod and wire and nails drains off foreign exchange which Indonesia can't spare, and necessitates onerous import restrictions. A merchant mill to produce these general purpose necessities would not only give Sukarno a domestic political dividend but would also take pressure off his strained exchequer.

SUKARNO FACED ROADBLOCK

This mill is up for consideration in our next foreign aid budget. But here is where Sukarno found himself facing a new congressional roadblock, the Hickenlooper amendment. Under this appendage to the last foreign aid bill, countries expropriating property of U.S. nationals without due process and fair compensation are barred from receiving Government funds.

This cutoff is automatic. No appeal to Presidential discretion and no pressure on the State Department can set up compromise negotiations or produce emergency grants. And this automatic cut off on aid to expropriating countries is here to stay. In addition, there is considerable bipartisan sentiment for extending it to cover cases of discriminatory tax and exchange rates.

Sukarno has just recognized the effectiveness of this simple congressional device. Baiting Yankee imperialism and the imperialist oil companies is winning politics in neutralist countries; while contrariwise, going along with them invites risky political competition. Nonetheless, Sukarno has just settled for a continuing deal with the oil companies.

INCREASED ROYALTY TAKE

He has, it is true, regularized his earlier de facto increase in the royalty take from the old rate of 50 percent to the new norm of 60 percent. He is justifying this back home by claiming he is taking over the oil companies on the installment plan (which, indeed, he is; but, at least, he is paying for it). The Hickenlooper amendment has provided an automatic sanction, which neither Sukarno nor the Kennedy administration could ignore. Sukarno has recognized the line Congress has drawn, and he has not dared to step across it.

Heretofore, the Sukarnos of the world have been able to present their demands to our Government with a powerful "or else" as a persuader—"or else we'll stop playing it down the middle and head for the Communist side of the road." But now Congress has given the administration a balancing "or else"—"behave yourself or else you'll have no place to go but to the Communists." Sukarno doesn't want this, and he does want a steel mill. Maybe the United States will figure out ways and means to get back into business around the world.

Honorary Doctorate in Humane Letters Conferred on Peace Corps Director R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., by Springfield College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 9, Springfield College in my home city of Springfield, Mass., conferred upon R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., Director of the U.S. Peace Corps, the honorary degree of doctor of humane letters. In his commencement address at Springfield College, Director Shriver answered some of the objections to the Peace Corps voiced over a period of time by Peace Corps cynics. I include with my remarks in the Appendix the citation accompanying the honorary degree conferred on Dr. Shriver during the 77th commencement exercises of Springfield College, and excerpts from his speech as they appeared in the Springfield Union of June 10:

ROBERT SARGENT SHRIVER, JR.

Gifted and energetic leader of a magnificent venture in human relationships that now is manifest in 45 nations of the world, you have sparked a new awareness on an international scale of the value and validity of the role of the volunteer. In a hundred places on this uneasy earth, Americans now work and live to bring new understanding and mutual respect among all peoples. Through the growing volume of volunteers in the Peace Corps program—well trained, highly motivated, altruistic far above the shallow viewpoint of selfish cynics; realistic far beyond the fuzzy dreams of do-gooders—a missing component has been provided those cultures moving from the tribal communal concept to the liberating democratic ideal. Through the pragmatic idealism of the volunteer in a new type of partnership with need and neighbor, moving to meet and conquer formidable tasks with a new kind of motivation, facilitating self-help through new strategy, you are translating dreams into actions, hopes into happenings, as you help build men and nations.

It is fitting that a college founded to facilitate the services of volunteers through professionally trained leaders in 59 countries of the world, should honor this service, and you who have been its chief architect in new and fresh form.

The faculty and trustees of Springfield College, with deep appreciation of the central significance of the concept of the volunteer in the preparation and practice of peace recommend you for the degree, doctor of humane letters, honoris causa.

SHRIVER TOPIC AT SPRINGFIELD COLLEGE: PEACE CORPS 'INFECTION'

A concept of the U.S. Peace Corps as a "germ warfare" program capable of spreading the "disease" of democratic ideals was presented Sunday at Springfield College commencement exercises by R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., Peace Corps Director.

RECORD LARGE AUDIENCE

Commencement speaker and one of five honorary degree recipients, Shriver addressed 437 graduates and a record high audience of an estimated 3100 who crowded the Springfield College Memorial Fieldhouse.

He told a story of an Indonesian official who reported strong protests over a proposed visit to his nation by 21 physical education teachers and athletic coaches as part of the Peace Corps program.

As Shriver reconstructed the conversation, he expressed surprise to the Indonesian official, saying: "Why? Why is there such concern over 21 American coaches? You would think that we were starting germ warfare in Indonesia."

MAY INFECT THOUSANDS

This was the reply:

"In a certain sense, Mr. Shriver, you are. In Indonesia we have many more than 21 Americans, and if these Peace Corps volunteers were simply 21 more Americans, there would be no interest in them at all. But these volunteers come to Indonesia representing an idea, the Peace Corps idea.

"That's why there is opposition. Your volunteers may well infect thousands of Indonesians with the ideas of a free, democratic society. In that sense, you may be starting germ warfare."

Widespread doubt about the prospect for success greeted the announcement a little more than 2 years ago of the Peace Corps, Shriver said.

"The skeptics and the cynics were convinced that modern Americans were too flabby in body, too flaccid in spirit, to meet the rigorous challenges of life in the underdeveloped world," he said. "But today we know from experience that the skeptics and cynics and the doubters were wrong * * *.

WELCOMED EVERYWHERE

"No country anywhere has yet requested a Peace Corps volunteer to leave because of unsatisfactory performance on the job, or offensive conduct of a personal or social nature. No one in the Peace Corps has been declared persona non grata by any government anywhere."

Shriver said other objections to the Peace Corps program have been voiced: that the Corps volunteers are too few to make a lasting impression on the nations they visit; that this country cannot afford to support the Peace Corps, but should concentrate on balancing the budget.

In answer to the first objection, he cited the "germ warfare" incident. Answering the second, he said:

"The spirit in which our volunteers go forth is just as important as the skill they carry with them, for theirs is a profoundly moral challenge. They are being asked not only to help the people of these young nations achieve economic independence, they are being invited to reaffirm our own fundamental commitment to a just and free society for all peoples.

"They are being invited to reveal the revolutionary nature of our democratic society and to show that such a society offers the greatest meaning for the most people, because in it each and every man is of transcendent importance.

U.S. SOCIETY AT STAKE

"More is at stake in this effort than the defeat of communism, or the winning of new sources of wealth or even the affection of the world's peoples. The character of American society itself is at stake. * * * The Peace Corps is not foreign aid. We give away nothing. Ninety percent of our money is spent on American citizens—75 percent of it right here in the United States.

"I'm not arguing for a 'do good' purely humanitarian effort. I am proposing a new conception of citizenship in a democracy. I believe that all citizens, young and old, should give a significant part of their lives to the voluntary service of their country and their fellow man, especially those most in need. That's what the Peace Corps stands for * * *."

In a reference to last month's announcement that Springfield College is the first local college to be awarded a contract for the training of Peace Corps volunteers in physical education and community development Shriver said:

SAME IDEAL

"Like Springfield College, the Peace Corps is a preparation and an education. I believe Springfield College is devoted to the ideal of service to men, as is the Peace Corps. Working together voluntarily, I am sure the world you make will be a world you will be proud of."

Shriver, brother-in-law of President Kennedy, was awarded an honorary degree of doctor of humane letters. Also receiving that honorary degree: Eugenio Mendoza, of Caracas, Venezuela, an industrialist who heads 18 corporations, prominent in YMCA and youth service agencies in South America; Paul A. Schilpp, Northwestern University philosophy professor, president of the Library of Living Philosophers.

Other honorary degree recipients:

Doctor of laws: Dr. Ellen Winston, nationally known social economist who last January was named first head of the Welfare Administration in the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Doctor of humanics: Renato W. Jones, a Springfield College graduate, director of UNESCO Youth Institute in Gauting Munchen, Germany, world leader in amateur sports, cofounder of the International Amateur Basketball Federation and organizer of Olympic basketball tournaments for more than a half century.

Dr. Glenn A. Olds, Springfield College president, awarded degrees to 295 candidates for the bachelor of science degree, 102 for the master of education degree, 25 for the master of science degree, 12 for the professional certificate, and 3 for the doctorate in physical education.

Tying President's Hands on Aid to Indonesia May Be a Mistake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the decisions which will be faced by Congress soon is the desirability of writing into the foreign aid bill a provision which would cut off aid to Indonesia. This has been recommended by many critics of President Sukarno and his administration.

Recently Robert Hewett who is a Minneapolis Tribune Far East correspondent in Hong Kong wrote a series of articles on Indonesia. He detailed the relations between Indonesia and the East and West. In a separate article he has set forth his own conclusions with respect to this question of congressional action on aid to Indonesia.

Because this question is currently before the Congress, I believe it would be a useful contribution to have his article reproduced in the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

BOON SEEN FOR COMMUNISTS IF UNITED STATES BANS ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO INDONESIA

(By Robert Hewett)

HONG KONG.—It would be a great mistake if foreign aid critics succeed in their reported plan to write an outright ban on further economic assistance to Indonesia in legislation now before Congress.

Such a blunderbuss attack on President Sukarno's regime would tie the Kennedy administration's hands in dealing with a particularly delicate Indonesian political situation. It would foolishly hand the Communists a devastating propaganda weapon in their struggle to gain power.

Sukarno himself deserves every bit of criticism voiced in Washington circles recently about the economic and political mess which his policies have brought to a potentially prosperous nation. But what American legislators must keep in mind—if they are to act as mature statesmen rather than indignant budget cutters—is that much the same kind of criticism against Sukarno is being voiced more and more strongly by influential anti-Communist circles inside Indonesia.

The worst thing that could happen would be for the U.S. Congress to get publicly involved in this Indonesian family fight. Sukarno has stayed in power by balancing Indonesia's growing Communist Party, on the one hand, against anti-Communist elements in the army and Moslem religious circles on the other.

Now that the nationwide emotional binge over "recovery" of West Irian is over, Sukarno is finding pressure from both sides building up to the point where an outright clash is not unlikely if the Communists get too bold.

Washington's carefully considered policy in recent weeks has been to stay out of the limelight in this family fight. But American aid—and the quiet but firm threat to withhold it—is being used as behind-the-scenes pressure on Sukarno to straighten out his economic mess and keep the Communists out of key spots in his government.

No one can be certain whether this "velvet glove" policy will work. For one thing, American economic assistance is important to Indonesia but in itself cannot be the single decisive factor in the power struggle now going on. But what is certain is that any formal congressional action censuring the Sukarno regime at this stage by withholding U.S. aid or publicly laying down "conditions" would only defeat its purpose by cutting the ground out from under the feet of anti-Communist forces now critical of Sukarno.

In the nationalistic politics of newly independent neutralist Indonesia, any such congressional action would only give Sukarno more internal stature as champion against Western imperialism. Sukarno's present critics on legitimate economic and anti-Communist ground would be forced into silence for fear of being labeled "tools of imperialism"—a political kiss of death in Indonesia as unthinkable as a Mississippi Congressman espousing integration. So the crux of the American aid policy in Indonesia is not what to do (Sukarno has already gotten the Washington message: no reforms, no money) but how to do it.

Sukarno cannot be expected to change overnight and there is bound to be grounds for future mutual American-Indonesian exasperation and irritation. But in the last few days there have been signs that "quiet diplomacy" is yielding some results.

Sukarno, vacationing in Tokyo to dodge some of the mounting political pressures at home, took the initiative in holding friendly meetings with Malaya's Prime Minister, Tungku Abdel Rahman, with whom he had been feuding bitterly over the forthcoming creation of pro-western Malaysia.

In Toyko Sukarno also finally reached an agreement with Anglo-American oil companies after a 3-year deadlock on how Indonesia will take over (with compensation) oil refining and distribution facilities and get an increased share of oil production profits (60 percent to Indonesia, 40 percent to the oil companies).

And Indonesia is now applying for reinstatement to the international Olympics committee on the promise of good behavior after its expulsion following the barring of Nationalist China and Israel from the Asian games last year in Jakarta.

None of these developments merits an overdose of optimism about future developments in Indonesia. But as for now, Sukarno has shown no signs of turning into another Castro and Washington policymakers can best serve the cause of resisting communism in strategic Indonesia by quiet diplomacy instead of public castigation in Congress.

Lives Lived Without Purpose Produce Useless Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, throughout my district in recent weeks, the clergy and laypeople of the Episcopal Church have been meeting to hear the first of a series of area vestry and bishop's committees addresses by the Right Reverend Albert A. Chambers, the new Episcopal Bishop of Springfield. Because of the rather frank and constructive nature of this talk and the favorable notice which it has been attracting in Illinois, I would like to share with my colleagues and other thoughtful readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the text of an address by the Right Reverend Chambers. Below follows the full text of this address:

ADDRESS BY THE RIGHT REVEREND ALBERT A. CHAMBERS, BISHOP OF SPRINGFIELD

The purpose of these area vestry meetings is first of all to bring before all of us, the many needs and opportunities we face in the diocese. There will be many other results—of getting to know each other, deepening our sense of "family," bringing more unity to our church. For we operate under many handicaps—distances, different occupations, almost different cultures, within the boundaries of our diocesan lines. And in addition to this, we will learn more about ourselves and our church. All of this is important; but, we must keep in mind that our first purpose is to face up to our responsibilities, as a church.

Our blessed Lord says, "where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." We must think about this. Where is our treasure? What, by our actions, do we show to be our treasure? If we judge America by the evidence, we see an alarming picture. There is increasing secularism, increasing emphasis on the externals of life: its luxuries, pleasures, indulgences. And if we judge the church by the evidence, it is almost as disquieting. There is too much of what we call "cushioned pews," too comfortable a religion, failure to give adequate and necessary support to the church, not only by gifts of money, which could be afforded, but gifts of one's time and energy in the cause of the church, as well as in support of her worship and life.

All of these, combined, provided an index to our spiritual life. "Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." Or, we might reverse the order for emphasis—"where your heart is, there you will surely give of your treasure: your time, talents and gifts."

We are on solid scriptural ground. Our Lord tests and measures us by the manner in which we live—"Faith without works is dead." "By their fruits ye shall know them." "For inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." "Where your treasure is."

There are many sharp contrasts in life—hot and cold; black and white; the good life, the evil life; the kind life, the cruel life; the selfless life, the selfish life. Yet, for the majority of people, these sharp contrasts do not prevail—they are neither hot nor cold, black nor white, good nor evil—but rather lukewarm, gray, vascillating, indecisive—and failing to be either one or the other, their lives tend to fall into negative uselessness and indifference—so typical, by the way, of an age of anxiety and frustration. Lives lived without direction and purpose produce useless living, day by day.

Jesus had a lot to say about uselessness. He bore down on it with intensity and persistency. He regarded it and taught it as a deadly sin. Let me remind you of a few of His illustrations:

The pious travelers (the priest and the levite) in the parable of the good samaritan were condemned because they did nothing.

Dives, in the parable of Dives and Lazarus, was condemned because he left Lazarus uncared for at his gate, while he feasted sumptuously. The indictment came, because he did nothing.

In the great parable of the judgment, the indictment is a comprehensive charge of uselessness—"I was hungry and ye did not give me to eat; thirsty, and ye gave me no drink, a stranger and ye took me not in, naked and ye clothed me not." They did nothing.

In the parable of the talents, the man was accursed. He was called a "good for nothing" servant and cast into "outer darkness," because he hid his talent while the others traded theirs, and they multiplied. He did nothing.

When Jesus speaks of the future life, it is with useless people that His most fearful apprehensions are concerned—the useless chaff will be consumed, the useless weeds will be burned. Good for nothing.

Other sayings of our blessed Lord are equally clear—savorless salt is insipid and good for nothing. The candle hid under the bushel burns uselessly. The fig tree is accursed—"cut it down." He says, "why doth it cumber the ground?" It bears not fruit. It is useless—good for nothing.

We need not go on. The perils of uselessness are obvious. It is to be feared and avoided.

There are many ways of doing nothing, even as there are many reasons why we do nothing. Chief among them is ignorance. If we do not know that a need exists, its nature and its requirements, we may be partially excused. But, besides ignorance, there is such a thing as obstinate refusal to do anything because of prejudice or lack of concern. And of course, there is procrastination, and lack of interest, and indifference, and halfhearted response, and even token response.

These we all know; and at the same time, our unwillingness to commit ourselves to a way and a life is often camouflaged by our excuses and our rationalizations.

All of this has a very real bearing on our life in the diocese and the work that this diocese should be doing within its own life and area of concern. Canon Jacobs will speak directly to the needs and the challenges this diocese faces. And I am bold to assume that any failure on the part of the people to measure up to their responsibilities in the missionary work of this diocese, is chiefly because of ignorance, and not due to any of the other factors I have mentioned. But I mention them, "just in case."

What I am very anxious to emphasize, is that—all of our planning, all of our drives, all of our concern for the work of this diocese, must be against the background of the sin of uselessness. Of doing nothing. Of doing only a token, or an indifferent share of the responsibility we all face, together as God's family here in this diocese. We cannot, must not fail Him. And to consider our privilege, against the background of a positive loyalty, is my hope and dream. It is a fulfillment of the life of usefulness, in the service of our blessed Lord.

When I was elected your bishop a year ago, I received many letters, over 1,000. All of the bishops wrote me, welcoming me to their fellowship. Many friends wrote. Many people here in the diocese wrote. The mail was heavy. Some of the letters said wonderful things, which caused my heart to glow with joy. But some of them, frankly, annoyed me. Even as I struggled to seek the direction of the Holy Spirit whether this was a call of God, or whether my work in New York was not yet done—these letters came to confuse and disconcert.

I want to share some of the nasty ones with you, because they have a relevance. They represent the image this diocese has given the whole church—and an image which we must, and will change.

Here are some of the quotes:

"I can think of no one I know who can approach the great needs of this little diocese better than you." (Little diocese indeed.)

"The diocese of Springfield did much better than they deserved and I congratulate them on electing you. You are a brave and good man to go there for there is much that needs to be done in that diocese."

"As one of your oldest friends may I offer my sincere congratulations. Of course, it is a dinky little diocese, but with your organizing ability and your genius for making people love you, it will become a mighty diocese. * * *" Fui.

"The news of your unanimous election on the first ballot as bishop of Springfield, thrilled us tremendously. I do not recall of anyone ever being elected in this way in the American church. Of course there are other things to be considered. First, Springfield has the lowest ratio of communicants to population in the American church. Also its strength has shown a steady decline in the past decade or so. Second, the people are a difficult lot. As I recall, from a visit there 45 years ago, they are a suspicious, violent and prejudiced bunch. Religion (if any) is of the Bible belt variety. Episcopalians, on the other hand, are of the 'Biretta Belt' persuasion. Yet this may be God's will for you."

You can well imagine how annoying these letters were to me. And yet I could not disregard them. But against them, were many letters of confident joy and concern. They were realistic, and I wish that I had time to read them all to you—but I choose to read one:

"Dear Fr. Chambers: You have, by the time this reaches you, received the news of your election as the next bishop of the diocese of Springfield, I am writing as an individual to urge you to give this your prayerful consideration, and hope that you will accept, subject to the usual consents.

"You must be well aware that the synod in electing you has not conferred a signal honor in secular terms. Rather it is an appeal similar to that in Acts 16—'Come over to Macedonia and help us.' I trust however that you will not be subject to stoning and imprisoning, although other events may prove distressing in other ways.

"However, I am not pessimistic, even though my 20 years in this diocese has not seen much to cheer about. As a delegate to several synods, I was impressed with both the regular synod last fall and the abortive one earlier this year. There seems to have been an upsurge of charity and a determination to see that God's work continue and grow. I am convinced that we have many dedicated and able priests and laymen waiting for definite leadership.

"What the leadership will or should be, I do not presume to know or suggest. It might be quiet, it might be dynamic. Whatever manifestation it may take, I am again sure that you will find willing people by your side."

Leadership may be important. A bishop may have special gifts. But of one thing I am sure. That in all my ministry I have never done the job by myself, or by my talents or gifts, if any. I would have difficulty in listing them, if I were brazen enough to try. But the one thing I am sure of, is that people who love God and His church, are always ready—if they know the facts, to see the vision and realize their responsibility. It is for this purpose that these meetings are being held, and will continue to be held—that we may grow in knowledge, as well as in grace, and in favor with God and man.

God save us from the sin of uselessness, as He opens our mind and stirs our will to see His vocation for us, here in this part of His vineyard.

Salute to Crew of the "Thresher"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been just 2 months since the nuclear submarine *Thresher* disappeared to the bottom of the sea. This tragedy, entombing 129 brave, skilled, and irreplaceable men in a steel casket at the bottom of the sea, came as a numbing shock to the people of the United States and, as a nation united, our heartfelt sympathy went out to the parents and wives and young ones of these courageous men. It is always a great tragedy when men go down to the sea in ships and do not return. It is especially true of these men, who went out on this trial run, testing the diving capability of this atomic-powered submarine.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for the Record, a resolution recently adopted by the Amvets Solidarity Post No. 63 of Toledo, Ohio, saluting the crew of the *Thresher* and extending condolences to their survivors:

AMVETS Solidarity Post No. 63.
Toledo, Ohio, May 13, 1963.

Hon. Thomas Ludlow Ashley,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Let it be known that we, the officers and members of Solidarity Post No. 63, of the AMVETS, do hereby salute the gallant crew of the U.S.S. Submarine *Thresher*.

They, like our comrades of World War II, who made the supreme sacrifice are worthy of and hereby accorded our most profound gratitude.

We, who are veterans of World War II, are aware of the many sacrifices being made by the members of our Armed Forces in these perilous times.

To their survivors, may we express our heartfelt sympathy. The membership of Solidarity Post No. 63 are ever mindful of the contributions they have made toward making America the greatest country ever known to man.

May they rest in peace.

Yours respectfully,
Joseph Koraleuslu,
Commander.

Two Thousand Attend Black Watch Military Ball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I at this time call to the attention of the Members of Congress the outcome of the visit to the United States of the famous Black Watch—RHR—of Canada. The following is a news story by the well known news reporter Angus MacDonnell, of the Quincy Patriot Ledger:

Two Thousand Attend Black Watch Military Ball

(By Angus MacDonnell)

Quincy.—Five gifts based in strong goodwill between the United States and Canada were presented to 100 members of the Black Watch, Royal Highland Regiment of Canada, Wednesday night in the State Armory attended by 2,000 persons.

PLAQUES PRESENTED

The reception and military ball was sponsored by American and Canadian veterans and gifts were accepted by Col. William Redpath, of Montreal, commanding officer of the Black Watch's 3d Battalion.

Four were plaques and the fifth was a trophy given by the city of Quincy. It was of statuette design 48 inches high on a base of Canadian hardwood and was presented by Mayor Amelio Della Chiesa.

Plaques were presented by Comdr. James M. Fraser, in behalf of the Royal Canadian Legion; Eastern Seaboard Command; by Comdr. Francis S. MacKenzie for the Quincy Veterans Council; by J. Phillip Mitchell for John Donnelly & Sons, and by Lt. George A. Beerris, commanding officer in the Army recruiting area.

Lieutenant Beerris thanked Colonel Redpath for having cooperated with the two Quincy men who initiated the Black Watch visit here. They were M. Sgt. George J. Matta and Sfc. James Johnston, in charge of the South Shore Army recruiting area as aides to M. Sgt. Edward B. Keeney of Hanover. Mayor Della Chiesa gave the two men full credit for the successful visit. They were cochairmen.

OFFICIALS ATTEND

In attendance were officials of town, city, county, State and Federal Government. Congressman James A. Burke, of Milton, was unable to attend as speaker from Washington because inclement weather delayed his plane for 2 hours over New York. His place was taken by Edward J. Moore, his administrative aid.

David G. Alexander was chairman, Thomas F. Blasi opened the program and James D. Asher of WJDA was toastmaster.

A musical review preceded the formal program with John T. Yunits of Holbrook leading the 215th Army Band.

Presented as Black Watch soldiers who survived battles were Murdock D. McLeod of Quincy, Andrew Johnston of South Quincy; Ernest M. Morris of North Quincy; James M. Kidd of Wolaston; Charles Coutts of Braintree; Douglas Cumming of Holbrook, and Lt. Archibald C. MacKinnon of Dedham.

Scottish Highland dancers were Barbara MacNeil, Rhonda MacLeod, Sandy Shattuck and Lydia Smith. Piper was Alex MacLeod, chief of the Boston Caledonia Club.

PIPERS' EXHIBITION

The Black Watch's 16-member unit of pipers and drummers gave a marching exhibibition in full dress kilts of their clans.

Scottish songs were sung by Nancy Howard DeBruyn of Milton with Jessie Black, pianist, and included Angus MacDonald and Annie Laurie.

Eight couples of Black Watch officers and ladies in evening dress gave an exhibition of Scottish dances accompanied by the pipe band.

American committee aids included Mrs. Grace M. Blasi and H. J. McCaul. Canadian committee aids were Dave Boncher, Mrs. A. Gertrude Whitney, John Harding and Archibald MacKinnon.

The program for the reception and military ball was as follows:

Reception and Military Ball in Honor of the Black Watch (RHR) of Canada, Sponsored by American and Canadian Veterans, Wednesday Evening, May 29, 1963, Quincy National Guard Armory, 1000 Hancock Street, Quincy, Mass.

INVITED GUESTS

President of the United States John F. Kennedy.

Prime Minister of Canada Lester B. Pearson.

Governor: Hon. Endicott Peabody.

Lieutenant Governor: Hon. Francis X. Bellotti.

Secretary of state: Hon. Kevin H. White.

Attorney general: Hon. Edward W. Brooke.

Treasurer and receiver general: Hon. John T. Driscoll.

State auditor: Hon. Thomas J. Buckley.

President of senate: Hon. John E. Powers.

U.S. Senators: Hon. Leverett Saltonstall; Hon. Edward M. Kennedy.

Congressmen: Hon. JAMES A. BURKE; Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

State senator: Jamès S. McCormack.

Representative: Charles L. Shea.

Mayor of Quincy: Amelio Dellar Chiesa.

Councillors: Carl W. Anderson; Richard W. Barry; George G. Burke; Joseph J. LaRaia; George B. McDonald; David S. McIntosh; John J. Quinn.

Sheriff: Charles W. Hedges.

Deputy master: John A. Chmielinski.

John Donnelly & Sons, James Connolly, vice president.

Congressional secretaries: Edward Moore; Mrs. Mary Tuohy.

Military dignitaries: Maj. Gen. William J. Verbeck; Brig. Gen. William Y. Frentzel; Col. Philip S. Melody; Lt. Col. Raymond F. Aquilina; Capt. Blish C. Hills; Capt. Forest A. Pease; Maj. Gen. Charles H. Terhune; Col. Thaddeus T. Wojick; Adm. Chester L. Harding; Lt. George A. Berris; Maj. Gen. Richard J. Quigley; Col. William D. Gnau.

Canadian and British dignitaries: Eastern States Command state's commander: James M. Fraser.

Auxiliary to the Eastern States Command: Vivian Chagnon, president.

Canadian American Club: Jack Currie, president.

Commander: Edward C. Hussey.

Canadian Consulate General Stewart D. Hemsley.

Dominion president: Hon. C. C. Sparling.

Eastern State's Command. Colin Stard, Dominion republic.

British Consulate General John N. O. Curle.

British Consul James Stewart-Robinson.

British Ambassador Sir David Ormsby Gore.

Under Secretary of State N. A. Robertson.

American Ambassador, W. Walton Butterworth; James Hill; V.C.

Canadian Club of Boston: Frank Anthony, president.

Maj. Gen. George P. Vanier, D.S.O., M.C. LLD.

Spanish War Veterans: Rev. Charles Charlton, department commander.

Veterans of Foreign Wars: William R. Turnbull, department commander.

American Legion: William F. Hogan, department commander.

Disabled American Veterans: Louis Stamas, department commander.

Veterans of World War I: Henry W. Jackson, department commander.

Jewish War Veterans: Bernie Becker, department commander.

Marine Corps League: Floyd Barnett, State commandant.

American Veterans of World War II: Joseph Terrino, department commander.

Gold Star Mothers: Mrs. Eleanor Charron, department president.

Waves: A. G. Ellis, commander.

Religious: His Emm. Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston; Rev. Thomas J. Tierney; The Rev. Frank J. Bauer; Rabbi Jacob Mann.

Ken Fallon, WJDA; Herb Fontaine, WJDA; Alex Smith, city auditor; Henry W. Bosworth, Jr., Traveler; John R. Herbert, Ledger; Richard J. Koch, park board.

AMERICAN AND CANADIAN COLOR GUARD

Sergeant at Arms: Thomas F. Blasi, PC Quincy Post, American Legion No. 95.

Assistant Sergeant at Arms National Colors: H. J. McCaul, aid department commander D.A.V.

Color Guard: Albert Parker, commander, Caddy Detachment, MCL.

Canadian Colors: Dave McIssac, Senior Vice, Post No. 1.

Color Guard: John J. Gillis, PC Post No. 1.

AIDS TO INVITED GUESTS

American: John Wipfler, PC DAV Chapter No. 97.

Canadian: John Harding, PC Post 87.

HONOR GUARDS

American: Joseph Burke, VFW; Warren Stuart, VFW; James McManus, VFW; Paul Taylor, VFW; Leo A. Ekbom, VFW.

Canadian: Calkin B. Hicks; Earl Sprague, PC post No. 1; William Letson, post No. 112; John Ferguson, senior vice commander, Eastern States Command.

PROGRAM

8:00—Thomas F. Blasi, sergeant at arms: Introduction.

David G. Alexander, general chairman: Introduction.

8:05—Opening: James D. Asher, master of ceremonies.

8:15—Post colors.

8:30—National anthems.

8:40—Presentation: Presenting framed memento: J. Phillip Mitchell, public relations for John Donnelly & Sons; presenting plaque; Comdr. James M. Fraser, in behalf of the Royal Canadian Legion, Eastern States Command; presenting plaque: Comdr. Francis S. MacKenzie, in behalf of Qunicy Veterans Council; presenting trophy: Mayor Amelio Della Chiesa, in behalf of the city of Quincy; Accepting: the commanding officer for the 3d Battalion, the Black Watch (R.H.R.) of Canada.

9:00—Recognition of survivors.

9:05—Remarks: Congressman JAMES A. BURKE.

9:10—Pipes and drums: The Black Watch, 3d Battalion.

9:30—Five highland dancers: Barbara MacNeil, Rhonda MacLeod, Sandy Shattuck, Lydia Smith, Priscilla MacLeod.

Piper: Alex Sinclair, chief of the Boston Caledonia Club.

Dances: "Sword Dance," "Highland Fling," "Reel of Tulloch," and "Flora MacDonald Fancy."

9:45—Vocalist: Nancy Howard DeBruyn, soprano; accompanist, Jessie Black.

Songs: "Angus MacDonald," "Annie Laurie," "Maple Leaf Forever," "Come to Me, Bend to Me," from "Brigadoon."

10:00—Grand march: Led by pipers of the 3d Battalion.

THE BLACK WATCH COMMITTEE

David G. Alexander, general chairman.

American committee: Cochairman, M. Sgt. George J. Mata, Sfc. James Johnson, U.S. Army Recruiting; Mrs. Grace M. Blasi, executive secretary; Thomas F. Blasi, publicity chairman; H. J. McCaul, assistant publicity chairman.

Canadian committee: Dave Boucher, cochairman; Mrs. A. Gertrude Whitney, secretary; J. Kent Brydle, treasurer; John Harding, publicity chairman; Archibald MacKinnon, assistant publicity chairman.

Music director and advisor: Rev. Thomas J. Tierney.

Advisors: Douglas Cumming, Alfred Walker, Francis S. MacKenzie, John Thomson, Lawrence S. Butler, James M. Fraser, John A. Golden, John M. Gordon, John F. Wipfler, Henry J. Williams.

"AULD LANG SYNE"

(By Robert Burns)

"Should auld acquaintance be forgot,
And never brought to mind?
Should auld acquaintance be forgot,
And days o' lang syne?
For auld lang syne, my dear, for auld lang syne.
We'll tak' a cup o' kindness yet, for auld lang syne."

On Memorial Day a record turnout of more than 75,000 men, women, and children, many waving flags, viewed Quincy's biggest-ever parade. The citywide observance was under the auspices of the Quincy Veterans Council. Colorfully uniformed members of the Canadian Black Watch detachment performed in the ceremonies including pipers and drummers.

The Black Watch had been the guests of the Quincy Veterans Council, the Army recruiting office of Quincy and the city of Quincy, for 48 hours. The impact of their visit and the great contribution toward a greater and better understanding between the United States and Canada cannot be estimated. They were warmly received and they succeeded in capturing the hearts of all. The people of Massachusetts will always cherish this visit and we certainly hope they will return.

In the afternoon the Black Watch were the guests of Headquarters 56th Artillery Brigade—Air Defense—Office of the Commanding General, Fort Banks, Winthrop, Mass. Commenting on the visit of the Black Watch to Fort Banks, William Y. Frentzel, brigadier general, U.S. Army, commanding, said:

> The reaction to the appearance and performance of the Black Watch in the Winthrop area has been extremely favorable. All the military and civilian personnel who had the opportunity to see the Black Watch were very enthusiastic in their praise of this colorful unit.

LIST OF OFFICIAL GUESTS, MEMORIAL DAY, MAY 30, 1963, FORT BANKS, WINTHROP, MASS.

Mrs. Monte J. Hickok, 124 Babcock Street, Brookline, Mass.

Dr. and Mrs. Marshall R. Hickok, 51 Stone Road, Belmont, Mass.

Maj. K. Stuart Kunz, retired, 1754 Rocky Point Road, Pewaukee, Wis.

Miss Susanne S. Marshall, 2172 Linden Avenue, Highland Park, Ill.

Capt. William K. Snead, U.S. Army, ROTC detachment, St. John's University, Collegeville, Minn.

Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy, Palm Beach, Fla.

Miss Eileen O'Connor, 175 Main Street, Winthrop, Mass.

Mr. James O'Connor, 175 Main Street, Winthrop, Mass.

Mr. John O'Connor, 175 Main Street, Winthrop, Mass.

Mr. Archbold Van Beuren, Room 4938, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

Mr. Adrian Archbold, Room 5038, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

Mr. and Mrs. Pasquale Madonna, 248 Shirley Street, Winthrop, Mass.

Mr. Joseph Madonna, 248 Shirley Street, Winthrop, Mass.

Guests of Mrs. Hickok: Mrs. Irving Sindaly, 1454 Beacon Street, Brookline, Mass.; Mrs. Esther Ackerman, 1454 Beacon Street, Brookline, Mass.; Mr. and Mrs. Ralph W. Thomas, 1454 Beacon Street, Brookline, Mass.; Mrs. Whitney Green, 77 Park Street, Brookline, Mass.; Mr. and Mrs. T. M. Noyes, 32 Powell Street, Brookline, Mass.

LIST OF DISTINGUISHED GUESTS

Governor and Mrs. Endicott Peabody, State House, Boston, Mass.

Senator and Mrs. Harry DellaRusso, 407 Revere Street, Revere, Mass.

The Honorable and Mrs. Fred A. Baumeister, 12 Prospect Avenue, Winthrop, Mass.

Mr. and Mrs. Melvin T. Carver, selectman, 247 Winthrop Street, Winthrop, Mass.

Mr. and Mrs. Walter A. Van Dalinda, selectman, 117 Buchanan Street, Winthrop, Mass.

Mr. and Mrs. Henry F. O'Connell, selectman, 20 Belcher Street, Winthrop, Mass.

Mr. and Mrs. Peter W. Princi, 46 Bartlett Parkway, Winthrop, Mass.

Mr. and Mrs. Robert P. Fitzgerald, 162 Thornton Road, Chestnut Hill, Mass.

Mr. and Mrs. Albert Crane, chairman, Memorial Day committee, 19 Nahant Avenue, Winthrop, Mass.

Maj. Gen. and Mrs. William J. Verbeck, Fort Devens, Mass.

Capt. and Mrs. Arthur H. Damon, Jr., Office of the Commandant, 1st Naval District, 495 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

Dual Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include the statement of Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, given before the House Small Business Committee on the subject of "Dual Distribution."

I am George J. Burger, vice president, legislative activities, National Federation of Independent Business. We are a national organization composed solely of smaller, independent business and independent professional people. Our home office is San Mateo, Calif. I am in charge of the Washington, D.C., office.

Presently we have over 190,000 individual, directly supporting and participating members throughout all 50 States. This number is increasing every week. From the standpoint of number of directly supporting and participating members, we are the largest business-professional organization in the country.

Our main function is one of encouraging these independent enterprisers—who are the admitted backbone of our free enterprise system, and who are one of the strong pillars supporting our very liberties—to take a continuing, active, informed interest in Government affairs—State and National—and of providing them with programs to do so in an intelligent, effective manner.

I will not describe our method of operation. Most, if not all, the members of this committee have become familiar with the federation over the 20 years of our Washington activities. I will say only that in the federation, members speak directly for themselves—in their statements, officers voice only the opinion of the membership. Through our the Mandate polls (regular reports on which have been furnished to you) we determine the majority position of the membership. This sets the federation's course. Through our special fact-finding surveys ("How's Business With You?"—1962; "Let's Take Care of Our Business—Government"—1963) we make it possible for members to tell us, and through us all in Government, the factual basis behind the many problems which are attacked by bills presented for vote in various issues of the Mandate.

Naturally you are interested in what the members of this federation, independent enterprisers throughout all 50 States (many in your own district, and you have been hearing from them through various phases of the federation's programs), have had to say about the dual distribution problem and the various programs being offered to assist them in this particular field.

Mr. Chairman, I would prefer to make my statement brief but due to the seriousness of the problems facing small business in our Nation, both in the production and distribution field, I must talk about the facts as they exist. My views will be documented by reports we received from over 190,000 small business members in the 50 States.

First, we want to congratulate your committee and its staff for the interest being taken in dual distribution. It is a real problem area for smaller, independent business people. This is proven clearly by the mandate polls we have taken of our membership.

For instance, in Mandate No. 246 (mailed in March of 1959 to our then membership of 125,832 independents nationwide), we presented the following for vote:

"H.R. 2729. Equal pricing—a bill to require manufacturers who sell through factory-owned stores and independent dealers, to put their independents on the same buying price basis as their factory-owned stores (Representative Bentley, Michigan.)"

As reported in Mandate No. 247, our members voted as follows on this measure: 86 percent for, 11 percent against, 3 percent no opinion.

Again in Mandate No. 260 (mailed in September of 1960 to our then membership of 158,726 independents nationwide), we presented the following for vote:

"Equal price treatment—Should Congress compel manufacturers to sell at the same price to both their factory-owned stores and their independent outlets?"

As reported in Mandate No. 261, our members voted as follows on this issue: 79 percent for, 16 percent against, 5 percent no opinion.

Yet again, in Mandate No. 270 (mailed in October of 1961 to our then membership of 175,232 independents nationwide), we presented the following for vote:

"S. 2641. Bring factory-owned retail store chains under the antitrust laws the same as all other businesses (Senator Long of Louisiana)."

As reported in Mandate No. 271, our members voted as follows on this issue: 83 percent for, 14 percent against, 3 percent no opinion.

Again, in Mandate No. 278 (mailed in September of 1962 to our then membership of 184,227 independents nationwide), we presented the following for vote:

"Should Congress compel manufacturers to sell at the same price to both their company-owned stores and their independent outlets?"

As reported in Mandate No. 279, our members voted as follows on this issue: 73 percent for, 23 percent against, 4 percent no opinion.

Finally, we are currently polling our more than 190,000 members nationwide on the following, which ties directly in with the subject matter of your present hearings:

S. 1107 and 1108. Require manufacturers who sell through factory store chains and independents to sell their goods at the same prices to each (Senator Long of Louisiana).

These bills are identical with H.R. 3562 and H.R. 3559 sponsored in the House by Representative Roosevelt of California. They would also require manufacturers to keep accounting records in each of their stores showing individual costs and profits.

As usual, in all polls (background arguments for polls in mandates No. 247, 260, 270, and 278 are contained in copies of these Mandates in hands of your staff director) we supply our members with concise arguments for and against these bills, to help them reach their own conclusions. These arguments are as follows:

"3. Argument for S. 1107 and S. 1108: Just as well for an independent businessman to go into the ring with both hands tied behind his back, as to try competing successfully with factory-owned store chains and captive plants operated by his supplier, when the supplier is charging him higher prices than its factory-associated outlets. Yet, this is something that goes on every day in the year, in paint, tire, oil, aluminum, glass, shoe, and other fields. And nothing can be done about it because factory-owned outlets and plants are not subject to the laws of pricing fairness as are other businesses. This bill would correct this situation.,

"3. Argument against S. 1107 and S. 1108: No one should tell a manufacturer how to price his merchandise to various classes of customers. If he can sell for less through his factory stores or plants he should be permitted to do so, and consumers should get the benefits. If independents find this distasteful, they should find other suppliers. They should realize that competition, which is the life of our economy, isn't pleasant. They should be able to adjust to new situations. If they can't do so, then they should be prepared to close down. Our way of life doesn't guarantee success. All it can guarantee is the opportunity."

We will be happy to advise your committee of the outcome of this poll as soon as it is available.

We submit, however, that the overwhelmingly favorable response to each of the foregoing presentations, through a period of continuing federation growth, in and of itself is proof positive of presence of a problem in dual distribution, indication beyond question of the importance of your undertaking.

Further indications of the gravity and scope of this problem are found in the results of the federation's 1962 "How's Business With You?" special factfinding survey. As we have already advised your committee some 56,486 of our members on the rolls as of December 31, 1962, sent in signed responses to this survey. As your committee's staff director and general counsel have seen for themselves, on about half of these responses our members took the time and trouble to write in concrete information as to the problem areas they checked on the survey forms, and this half of the responses is on file, divided by States and color coded by problem area, at our Washington office. Members of your committee's staff have visited our offices to investigate responses covering dual distribution and have reported to you. The other half of the signed responses are on file at our home offices in San Mateo, Calif.

In any case, as we have reported to your committee already, 21,286 (38 percent) of our 1962 survey respondents claimed competitive injury due to unfair pricing by suppliers. Most significantly, 7,464 of these particular 21,286 respondents claimed competitive injury due to the operation of factory-owned stores—in other words place their difficulties right in the area of dual distribution. This, we submit, attests to the utmost gravity of the problem—for here are 35 percent of all who claim injury due to unfair pricing (and 13 percent of all respondents) pinpointing dual distribution. You can be certain beyond doubt that if even 10 percent of the population of Washington, D.C., were to come down with an illness, the health authorities would move in immediately with remedial measures, perhaps even to declare a state of emergency.

Furthermore, we have received the following information direct from our nationwide membership in the following States, as per the form attached. This information is taken from a sampling of the total individually signed reports on file in our Washington office, and the same situations will be found in all other States:

ALABAMA

Gulf Shores: "Mobile Paint Co. selling through their retail stores below thriving markup for us selling their product."

Montgomery: "Oil companies investing in LPG and petroleum companies in competition with other independents they supply."

ARIZONA

Tucson: "We are stocked with GE appliances by the distributor, but GE allows distributor to sell to building contractor at same or lower price than to a stocking dealer."

CALIFORNIA

Carlsbad: "GE sold GE steam irons at $9.98 that cost us $12.12."

Long Beach: "Factory-owned stores (paint) selling at or below dealer price."

Shafter: "Large shirt company owns men's shops in my area."

San Jose: "RCA owns their RCA Service Co. which competes with our dealers. RCA sells their service company at our cost."

Salinas: "John Deere and International Harvester operate factory stores—their unlimited funds make it impossible for independents to compete."

Yuba City: "Westinghouse and General Electric wholesale outlets competing with other wholesalers."

San Francisco: "American Optical and Bausch & Lomb through wide factory-owned outlets depressed prices in various areas to eliminate competition."

Redwood City: "Factory-owned service companies such as RCA Service, Packard Bell Service (called Sunset) General Electric Service. These companies are becoming giants and threaten to monopolize the service business, especially on new TV and appliances."

Abboyo Grande: "Paint companies load their dealers with paint for a promotional sale then offer it in their own stores below their dealers. Check with San Francisco."

Modesto: "Factory-owned stores (paint) selling retail customers at wholesale."

Pasadena: "I feel there should be a separation between manufacturer and retail."

Newport Beach: "Some factory-owned stores are selling to consumers, paint at less than my net cost such as Pittsburgh Plate Glass, National Lead and Dunn Edwards."

IDAHO

Lewiston: "GE and RCA have factory-owned stores."

Lewiston: "GE and Westinghouse sell direct to builders and motel owners."

ILLINOIS

Chicago Heights: "Company-operated stations cut price on gasoline constantly (Mobile) (Sun Oil)."

Lena: "Remington electric shavers—unfair promotional allowances. A growing number of companies are taking smaller- and medium-sized accounts off from direct shipments, while keeping large accounts on direct—giving the large accounts a distinct buying advantage. Revlon and Colgate-Palmolive have done this."

Ottawa: "Sale of Royal portable typewriters to Montgomery Ward is perfect example of price favoritism to competitors. Remington Rand sales of portables to Spiegel, so they can sell at $39.95 approximately $1.50 less than dealer cost."

Joliet: "Piano factories such as the Gulbransen piano company, Kimball Piano Co. have their own stores and can sell far less than any of their dealers can."

Pontiac: "Sherwin-Williams, the largest, own and operate factory branches or stores in towns all over the country. You cannot compete with them. A painting contractor can buy as cheap as a dealer."

Roseville: "Until a few months ago International Harvester operated a factory-owned operation in Roseville and still has a number of them in Illinois."

Centralia: "GE & Westinghouse factory-owned stores seem able or do sell below my cost on jobs regardless of size."

Freeport: "Factory-owned service shops—captive service—such as RCA-GE."

Dixon: "The Pure Oil Co., through its subsidiary, W. H. Barber Co., will sell gasoline at 1¼ cents to 2 cents less per gallon than we are charged."

Monticello: "My liquor supplier is in the retail liquor business."

NEW YORK

Waterloo: "Glass company stores which we must buy our wholesale from are selling retail cheaper than we can."

Oceanside: "The Sherwin-Williams factory-owned stores sell the painting contractors at dealer price."

Andover: "Corning Glass Works factory outlets."

Dryden: "International Harvester selling trucks from factory-owned outlets at close to dealer cost."

Medina: "Sherwin-Williams factory-owned store in town have been known to sell retail customers at 20-percent off and to painters at near my cost on Super Kem-Tone. So far I have been unable to get a sales slip in proof from anyone that made these claims."

Bronx: "Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., manufacturer, distributor and retailer/Ford Motor Co's carlite glass division (unable to complete with car dealer)."

North Syracuse: 'In this area GE has its store, sells to its employees at cost some sales make choice of merchandise other than GE."

Hornell: "Sherwin-Williams has factory-owned store in our town and allows discount as high as 25 percent to individual retail purchasers."

PENNSYLVANIA

McKeesport: "Chrysler Corp. factory stores take business from all retail independent auto stores to some extent."

North East: "International Harvester in Erie, Pa., is a factory branch. They can sell the same model as we sell for less money and have done it."

Warren: "Ford Motor Co. owns factory outlets in large cities which is unfair to other dealers in same area. They also give refunds of $100 to $250 per unit to leasing companies to bring the trade-in value of Ford up to Chevrolet but they expect the dealer to stand this out of pocket and still get the same share of market or they start talking of termination of franchise."

Indiana: "Paint stores owned and operated by Pittsburgh Plate Glass or Sherwin-Williams manufacturers selling to dealers at distributor prices, yet refusing to grant these prices to other dealers."

Holidaysburg: "Many factory-owned paint stores sell painters or contractors at dealer prices. This is possible because they have the manufacturers profit to operate on, which of course we do not."

Sharon: "Westinghouse Electric Corp. sells from within its plant appliances below our cost. Example, sweepers $5 below our cost."

Willow Street: "RCA factory stores always sell under our cost; employees buy for families and friends at factory stores. GE is bad for this too."

VERMONT

White River Junction: "GE and Westinghouse supply companies selling their own outlets below independent's cost."

Mr. Chairman, insofar as the rubber tire industry is concerned the problem is quite prevalent in that industry and I will have factual, detailed information to present to the committee as to that problem in that industry in my appearance on that section of the hearings.

Further, we have noted a variation in the intensity of complaints from different areas. For instance, about 50 percent of respondents claiming unfair pricing by suppliers from the States of Alabama, Indiana, and Ohio pointed to factory store competition as the source of their difficulties. The proportion ran about 33 percent in such States as Arizona, California, and Texas. It ran as low at 10 percent in Alaska. It may be of interest to members of this subcommittee to know that this ratio ran 40 percent in Oklahoma, 41 percent in Illinois, 32 percent in West Virginia, and 37 percent in Kansas. However, complaints were received from each of the 50 States of the Nation.

As always, we invite the members of this subcommittee to send representatives to our Washington office to check over the signed comment-bearing responses, many of which deal directly with dual distribution, for a better appreciation of trends in your own States.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope for the overall good of the Nation's independent business both at the production and distribution level that speedy action be taken by your committee and on the completion of the hearings on all segments of this problem that special attention be given for an early report and special recommendations. The committee's action on this could result in being a great stimulant to small business that at last their basic problems of unfair competition are receiving the due consideration of the Congress. Otherwise we might put the question: Our economy; where will it all end? The big fellow, the big fish, gobbling up the little fish—or smaller fish. Pyramiding his holdings for the sake of diversification of capital. Not so much for the good of the company he takes over, the people in it, or the product it creates, or the good of the consuming public. Back to the days of the big trust in a new guise. This pyramid is built in reverse, delicately poised on its point. What happens if we have a sharp decline. It is pushed off its focal point and the pyramid topples other pyramids and result—a great crash.

The Moon Can Wait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe the editor of the Rochelle Leader, Mr. Ken Smith, of Rochelle, Ill., speaks for a sizable segment of Americans who are in fact concerned over the expenditure of $20 to $40 billion for a scientific stunt of landing a man on the moon in the sixties.

Perhaps that catch-phrase may be a bit prophetic in view of the four requests to raise the statutory ceiling on the public debt over the past 2-year interval with the gloomy prospect of another lid-lifting request due later this year. With such a history of experience at escalating costs perhaps "sixties" has more reference to the monetary value of this experiment than to any decade.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to note that this editorial appeared in the Rochelle publication on June 7 and just 3 days later, Dr. Philip H. Abelson, editor of Science magazine, one of five prominent scientists who testified before the Senate Space Committee issued a broad indictment of the space program, cautioning that the race to the moon was detracting from national security and delaying the conquest of cancer and mental illness.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has an obligation to the taxpayer against any empire building in the space program and in this connection, the following editorial is typical of the kind of enlightened thinking in the interesting and informative editorializing of the Rochelle Leader. I commend it to the entire membership.

The article follows:

THE MOON CAN WAIT

We have been hearing for some time now that we must land men on the moon before the Russians do. Backers of the moon shot have made this statement with such positiveness that it seemed foolhardy to question it.

Fortunately there are now many people who are raising questions and taking a second look at the project.

In the first place the price tag that is being put on the man on the moon program—from $20 to $40 billion—is making many people a bit reluctant to buy it.

They are beginning to think what that amount of money would do if spent closer to home to improve the health and living standards of our world.

The expenditure of this huge sum just to be first to the moon becomes an important matter to taxpayers who are now being called upon to spend more on Government than on any single family expense.

The contention that the American people can afford it is not an especially convincing argument in view of the fact that 2 hours and 21 minutes of every American's 8-hour work day is spent in meeting the cost of Federal, State, and local government.

The Federal tax burden per person is expected to be $583.30 for 1964. This burden is expected to grow heavier even without a multibillion-dollar moon shot.

Taxpayers already are growing rebellious under this tax load and have expressed their resentment by voting down numerous local projects even when they were known to be worthy and even necessary.

The argument that man must reach the moon "just because it is there" doesn't have much appeal at a time when there are so many other demands on the wage earner's paycheck.

The moon may be there but he has a family here that must be fed, clothed, housed, and educated. He is expected to support the church, the Community Chest, the various fund drives and a multitude of Government activities.

The taxpayer has consistently shown a willingness to dig deeper to pay the cost of necessary Government services such as defense, health and welfare, farm and foreign aid, education, policing and a system of courts.

He could be counted on to pay his share to put men on the moon if our national security depended on it or even if it were a matter of national prestige.

But if the object is merely to make a moon landing as a scientific stunt or a propaganda feat then the cost seems to be far out of line with the returns.

We are committed to space explorations and Americans are proud of the men who have ridden the capsules into orbit and the engineers, scientists, and technicians who have made these accomplishments possible.

They want this country to protect its interests in space and prevent its use for purposes that would threaten our national safety. But they see the need of putting first things first. Our finances are not inexhaustible and our supply of scientists and engineers is not sufficient to proceed at full speed on every conceivable project.

Until we have met our closer and more important needs we should keep a curb on those who want to rush into a manned flight to the moon. It will probably come in time as an extension of space programs that are already progressing steadily and soundly.

But nobody has convinced us that it is imperative that we reach the moon by a certain date. It will be there for a long time.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

H.R. 6500 Military Construction Authorization Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6500) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, from what the chairman and other members of the Armed Services Committee have said here today the committee spent many days going over the military construction authorization bill, and in the final analysis reduced the requests for authorization by $242,983,000. This reduction made by the committee amounts to approximately 13 percent across the board. We are assured that these reductions will in no way impair the operational effectiveness of the armmed services nor will they in any way jeopardize our national security.

Despite this assurance I regret that the committee has seen fit to delete one item which is of considerable importance to the capabilities of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard in my district. This was a large crane which had been requested for use in connection with a large drydock located at this yard. It is the world's largest drydock and was completed over a year ago—except for additional increments such as the crane. In order for the drydock, which was constructed at considerable cost, to be fully utilized it should have a crane that can reach halfway across its width. Some members of the committee have told me that while they realize the eventual need of the crane the full committee felt that provision for it could be put off until a later date. They have given me assurance that it, together with many other deleted items, will be considered in the next authorization bill. I respectfully disagree with them and believe the crane ought to be authorized this year so that there will be no unnecessary delay in is construction should one of the supercarriers need repair or overhaul work done at the yard.

However, I recognize the futility at this point of offering an amendment to restore the item. As usual, the House would support the committee position and defeat the amendment. This would make it difficult for the House conferees to accept the item in conference should the Senate see fit to include it in their authorization bill. At this time, therefore, I desire only to register my views and to urge the House conferees to give favorable consideration to the crane item should it be brought up in conference.

It seems to me that having authorized and constructed the drydock at great expense we ought to complete the whole project as quickly as possible.

Salute to Crew of the "Thresher"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been just 2 months since the nuclear submarine *Thresher* disappeared to the bottom of the sea. This tragedy, entombing 129 brave, skilled, and irreplaceable men in a steel casket at the bottom of the sea, came as a numbing shock to the people of the United States and, as a nation united, our heartfelt sympathy went out to the parents and wives and young ones of these courageous men. It is always a great tragedy when men go down to the sea in ships and do not return. It is especially true of these men, who went out on this trial run, testing the diving capability of this atomic-powered submarine.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for the RECORD, a resolution recently adopted by the Amvets Solidarity Post No. 63 of Toledo, Ohio, saluting the crew of the *Thresher* and extending condolences to their survivors:

AMVETS SOLIDARITY POST NO. 63,
Toledo, Ohio, May 13, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS LUDLOW ASHLEY,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Let it be known that we, the officers and members of Solidarity Post No. 63, of the AMVETS, do hereby salute the gallant crew of the U.S.S. Submarine *Thresher*.

They, like our comrades of World War II, who made the supreme sacrifice are worthy of and hereby accorded our most profound gratitude.

We, who are veterans of World War II, are aware of the many sacrifices being made by the members of our Armed Forces in these perilous times.

To their survivors, may we express our heartfelt sympathy. The membership of Solidarity Post No. 63 are ever mindful of the contributions they have made toward making America the greatest country ever known to man.

May they rest in peace.

Yours respectfully,
JOSEPH KORALEWSKI,
Commander.

Legislative Branch Appropriation Bill, 1964

SPEECH

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6868) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, it seems appropriate to me at this time while we are on printing to direct attention to the earlier statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], who is here, relative to the "trash and trivia and tripe" as he described insertions in the RECORD of the Members of Congress. I personally take exception to that, and I say to my colleagues most respectfully that while I may disagree with many of the statements put in the RECORD because I do not share that particular philosophy or because I disagree with the gentleman who put in views with which I disagree, I certainly shall not foreclose any Member from expressing his views. When I see any Member of this House, knowing the expenditures we run up in the course of a year, saying that as an economy move we will hamstring or curtail the efforts of the Members of Congress themselves to be heard and speak for their districts, I must object. Indeed, if you want some type of rule, Mr. Chairman, I would say, well enough, let us all have the same number of lines, if that is what you want, if you want to limit the Members of Congress to be heard. However, limiting the freedom of speech on the floor of this House, or the freedom to use the RECORD and calling Member's views trash and trivia I think is wrong. I do a lot of my work at night in order to have my remarks ready. I can redo these and not use any extraneous material, but we have access to the best brains in the United States who are writing their views, with which we may agree or disagree. When we take that material, editorial or otherwise, and tie in our own thoughts I think we render a service. I say even to those with whom I have disagreed, I have had a tremendous benefit from each of you as I read your views and your extraneous material. I will not accuse any of you of putting trash and trivia in the RECORD when I may disagree with a commencement speech, or some other editorial or material that you use. Therefore I would like to direct a question to the gentleman from Missouri, who is with us now. Can the gentleman give us at this time examples of trash and trivia and tripe placed in the Congressional Record and the Members doing this?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I cannot give you any examples of what I would consider to be trash and tripe and trivia that is inserted in the Record. I have made speeches on the floor of the House calling attention to certain local eulogies and writeups of local problems, and recipes for cherry pies, and other remarks made by people who are not prominent, and editorials. The question is not that I disagree with their content, but that they are not of such a literary standard that the Congressional Record should be used to give some status to them. In that respect I think that the Member has an opportunity to use some selectivity in the type of material he puts into the Record. I think if he will exercise some choice we can elevate and improve the standard of the material that has been appearing in the Record. I have made detailed studies of this and I have on occasion printed in the Record some of the material I feel falls into this category. I am not trying to restrict anybody's freedom of speech.

What I have said on the floor here today is not intended to limit any Member in the future in expressing his views to any extent he wishes. But it is intended to cut out editorials and articles merely to fill up the Record and to leave the impression that somebody has made a great study and a great contribution when the contribution is not worth the paper it is printed on.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I merely asked the gentleman to make a statement of the Members who have inserted this material and examples of this material. He may have those. I renew that request. I had not intended for him to comment otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not set myself up as a censor of any other Member of the House, nor do I think any other Member has that privilege. Whatever we do, let us apply it equally to all Members. I happen to disagree with the gentleman, and I do so respectfully. I happen to think that a Member of Congress may put material in the Record with which I may disagree, but I do not call it trash or trivia. That is his view, not mine. I decry the efforts of the gentleman in trying to censor the rest of us.

A Tribute to the Brave 442d

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues of June 11 in paying tribute to the Japanese American community that country.

As a veteran of the European Theater in World War II I know we owe a great debt of gratitude to those members of the Japanese American community that served in the Armed Forces during the late war.

We have, of course, representatives of that gallant body of men here in the Congress. Hon. Daniel K. Inouye—a Member of this House in the 86th and 87th Congress and presently a distinguished Member of the U.S. Senate—served in Italy with the 442d Regimental Combat Team. Senator Inouye lost his right arm in the Italian campaign, and was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for bravery.

Our distinguished colleague from Hawaii in this Congress, Hon. Spark Matsunaga, served in the European Theater with the 299th Infantry. He was wounded twice, and was awarded the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have to look beyond the confines of Capitol Hill to see living testimony to the heroism of the Japanese American soldier.

It may be of interest to recall the period of World War II. Our treatment of the Nisei is a shameful chapter in our national history.

On June 17, 1942, the War Department advised the Selective Service System to discontinue Nisei inductions until further notice. Soon afterward all Nisei were reclassified 1V–C, not acceptable for service because of ancestry.

This lamentable period extended for several months, until January 1943 when the famous 442d Regimental Combat Team was organized. However, it was not until December 1943 that all barriers to the induction of the Nisei were lifted.

I think we can say with truth that it was the Japanese-American fighting men that proved to our Government of that day the loyalty and patriotism of the Nisei.

The 100th Battalion, a Japanese American unit, went overseas to Europe in August 1943. In the first 3 months of service in Italy this unit lost one-third of its members as casualties.

During the first 6 months of service in the Italian campaign this battalion was awarded 900 Purple Hearts, 4 Distinguished Service Crosses, 36 Silver Stars, and 21 Bronze Stars. The 100th became known as the Purple Heart Battalion.

This single battalion by March 1945 21 Distinguished Service Crosses, 7 Soldier's Medals, 6 Legions of Merit, 73 Silver Stars, 96 Bronze Stars, and 16 Divisional Citations.

Mr. Speaker, that record speaks for itself.

In April 1944 the 442d Regimental Combat Team arrived in Italy and the illustrious 100th Battalion became part of that larger unit. The motto of the 442d was "Go for Broke," and this was certainly destined to be the story of the Nisei soldier.

This gallant body of valiant men became the most decorated unit in U.S. military history. However, the price was high—the 442d suffered a total of 300 percent casualties by the end of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I think the words of Gen. Mark Clark, addressed to the 442d, say all that can be said to honor these fine men.

"You are always thinking of your country before yourselves. You have never complained through your long periods in the line. You have written a brilliant chapter in the history of the fighting men of America. You are always ready to close with the enemy, and you have always defeated him. The 34th Division is proud of you, the 5th Army is proud of you, and the whole United States is proud of you."

Tributes to Japanese American Military Service in World War II

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 2 at Arlington National Cemetery commemorative services were held marking the 20th anniversary of Japanese American military service in World War II. Previous commitments precluded me from attending this impressive ceremony but I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to all those Americans of Japanese descent both living and dead who served in World War II.

I am very proud to have a large number of Japanese Americans in my congressional district. When in 1942 our Government's policy was to move those Japanese American inland, many eventually settled in our great city of Chicago, the center metropolis of the Midwest. They made their new homes around the neighborhoods near the University of Chicago and along the north Lake Shore. In a short time their energetic and loyal natures and their pleasing personalities made them an integral part of the community. They have become very active in civic affairs mostly through the Japanese American Citizens League which does much to promote and foster a responsible and interested citizenry.

The chairman of the Midwest district council of the Japanese American Citizens League is Dr. Frank F. Sakamoto whom I know to be an able and conscientious worker in behalf of the league's interests. He is aided by such men as Mr. Mark Yoshizumi, chairman of the Chicago Chapter, JACL and Mr. Tomo Kosobayashi, chairman of the legislative committee.

Every 2 years coinciding with the congressional and many local elections the Japanese American Citizens League extends invitation to all candidates to appear before them and express their opinions and views. Each candidate is introduced by a different member of JACL, and after speaking for a few minutes then joins the audience to hear the remainder of the speakers. The league makes no recommendations to its members but lets them decide for themselves after having viewed and participated in the forum.

This is in the best American tradition and I am sure that all Nisei who fought for the American way of life under the American flag during World War II can well be proud of the heritage that Japanese Americans are continuing to contribute to our country truly making the United States the world's greatest democracy.

A Bill To Provide for Federal Payments to Counties Where National Forest Lands Are Located

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for Federal payments to counties where national forest lands are located. My bill provides for an annual payment in lieu of taxes to each such county at a rate of 10 cents for each acre of national forest lands in the county. This payment would be in addition to the revenue-sharing payments currently made to States for distribution to counties for roads and schools.

Under the act of May 23, 1908, and subsequent legislation, a payment amounting to 25 percent of gross receipts from each national forest, mostly from the sale of timber, is made at the end of the fiscal year to the State in which the forest is located. This money is spent as the Legislature may direct for the benefit of the public schools and public roads of the county or counties in which the national forest is located. The money may not be used by the county for any other public purpose.

In the 12th Congressional District, in which the Ottawa and Marquette National Forests are located, the funds annually made available from revenue-sharing payments are neither an adequate nor a dependable source of revenue upon which local governments may rely in budgeting for the needs of their communities.

The revenue-sharing payments in my district fall far short of making up for the tax losses on property added to the national forests in recent years. I am sure that this is true in other parts of the country. One of the inequities in the present payment system, however, results from the wide variance in the payments because some forests are more productive than others.

One of the greatest defects of the present system is the way the revenue-sharing payments fluctuate from year to year in accordance with the supply and demand situation in the wood-based industries. The Forest Service informs me that the reduced revenue-sharing payments from the Ottawa National Forest in recent years have resulted from lower demand for stumpage and reduced stumpage prices. During the period from 1953 through 1957 these payments averaged 10.7 cents an acre, declining to 7.9 cents in the years 1958 through 1962. The Forest Service estimates that the payment for the current fiscal year will approximate 6.5 cents an acre.

This decline in revenues under the present system has had a serious impact on the counties in my district at a time when expenses for schools, roads, and other public facilities and services have steadily increased. In Gogebic County, for example, 38 percent of the land is in the Ottawa National Forest. In some school districts the proportion of Forest Service land is much higher. One of the larger geographic units in Gogebic County is the Marenisco School District, comprising 200,000 acres, of which 122,000 acres, or 61 percent of the total, are owned by the Forest Service. The largest part of this acreage has been added to the Ottawa National Forest in the last 15 years. Before 1938, 50,800 acres in the Marenisco School District were part of the national forest. Since then, 71,200 acres have been added to the national forest by withdrawal from private ownership. Local authorities estimate that the tax revenues on the additional acreage that went off the local tax rolls since 1938 would now amount to $19,000 annually and perhaps as much as $29,000, depending on certain variable factors in the assessment procedure. At the estimated average of 6.5 cents an acre the revenue-sharing payment on these 71,200 acres will amount to $4,628 during the current fiscal year.

In 1948 the Congress approved a special payment arrangement for 500,000 acres of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area of the Superior National Forest in Minnesota. Timber cutting in this area had been drastically curtailed in order to preserve its scenic beauty, and the counties in that area were thus deprived of funds they otherwise would have received as their share of the forest revenues. To make up for this loss, Congress passed a law requiring an annual payment of an amount equal to three-fourths of 1 percent of the appraised value of the forest lands as determined at 10-year intervals by the Secretary of Agriculture. This payment is made to the State of Minnesota for distribution to the counties concerned.

Since this area lies across Lake Superior from the Ottawa National Forest in my district, I thought it would be interesting to know how the Minnesota counties have fared under the special arrangement. I learned that they are much better off than the counties in my district and will do even better when the next appraisal reflects the enhanced recreational value of the wilderness area. Even under the last appraisal made in 1958 the payments averaged 17.1 cents an acre in 1962, about 10 cents an acre more than revenue-sharing payments have been averaging in my district. It is also significant that revenue-sharing payments to counties in the Superior National Forest of Minnesota outside the canoe area averaged only 5.6 cents an acre in 1962.

It is obvious, therefore, that the present revenue-sharing system is an inequitable method of reimbursing counties for the loss of national forest lands from the local tax rolls.

Basing payments in lieu of taxes on the assessed value of the forest lands might be the fairest method of assuring the counties stable revenues of which they could rely in their long-range planning. I am mindful, however, of the great expense that would be incurred in making the regular appraisals that would be required for putting payments on a valuation basis. For this reason I believe that the simplest solution to the problem is to retain the present system, based on forest revenues, and make an additional payment at the flat rate of 10 cents an acre.

My bill provides for this payment to be made directly to each eligible county, which could then apportion the funds among its townships, school districts, and other units of local government.

It is also unwise, in my opinion, to restrict such funds, as those from the revenue-sharing payments are restricted, to educational and road construction purposes. The money that would be available under my bill could be used to build and maintain roads and schools, but also could be used for other essential purposes of local government.

This legislation is vitally needed by the counties in which our national forests are located and I urge its enactment.

Tribute to Japanese American Military Service in World War II

SPEECH
OF
HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, a most impressive ceremony took place on the 2d of June. It took place in the quiet surroundings of the hallowed grounds of Arlington National Cemetery. It was a tribute to the Nisei, who were in the military service in World War II on the 20th anniversary of their participation.

This ceremony had a special significance for me because I have the honor of representing many Americans of Japanese ancestry in my district. I have walked among them and I have talked to them in the fields and in their shops. Their love of their country is moving and it is an inspiration to talk to them. I had the great pleasure of campaigning with a distinguished citizen of Colorado who was elected to the Colorado House of Representatives last year. He is Seiji Horiuchi, a former national vice president of the junior chamber of commerce, and one of the most promising young legislators in Colorado.

The stories of bravery and courage displayed by the 33,000 American citizens of Japanese ancestry who saw service in World War II are legend. The "Purple Heart Battalion," in 11 months of combat, suffered 9,480 casualties. Six hundred of these valiant men were killed. Nearly 9,500 Purple Hearts were awarded the members of this "Go-for-Broke" group.

It was the late Gen. Joe Stilwell who described them best: "They bought an awfully big hunk of America with their blood," he said.

Over 20 years ago, in 1941, the Japanese American creed was read into the Congressional Record. The first few lines of that creed describe beautifully and succinctly their belief:

> I am proud that I am an American citizen of Japanese ancestry, for my very background makes me appreciate more fully the wonderful advantages of this Nation. I believe in her institutions, ideals and traditions; I glory in her heritage; I boast of her history; I trust in her future.
>
> Because I believe in America, and I trust she believes in me, and because I have received innumerable benefits from her, I pledge myself to do honor to her at all times and in all places.

Mr. Speaker, we are forever in the debt of these great Americans. It is an honor to pay tribute to them.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resoluiton 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—Congressional Record, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the Record:

Stanford, Calif., *May 16, 1963.*

Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Flood: In the thought that it might interest you, I am enclosing a clipping from page 1 of today's Stanford Daily regarding the Stanford Area Young Republicans' endorsement of your proposal for a House Committee on Captive Nations.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.,
Treasurer, San Mateo County Young Republicans.

SAYR Endorses Plan of Congressman Flood

The Executive Board of the Stanford Area Young Republicans last Tuesday unanimously endorsed the proposal of Congressman Daniel J. Flood, Democrat, of Pennsylvania that a special committee of the House of Representatives be established to investigate conditions in the Communist dominated nations of Eastern Europe and Asia.

The SAYR resolution stated that the enactment of Flood's measure, which is currently pending before the House Rules Committee, would give hope and encouragement to the people living under Russian domination by showing them that the U.S. Congress had an interest in their suffering.

Ivan Mazeppa Society,
Branch 303 of the
Ukrainian National Association,
May 18, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: On behalf of Branch 303 of the Ukrainian National Association, the Ivan Mazeppa Society, we ask you to submit the Flood resolution to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable support. We feel that it is of the greatest importance for Congress to have such a special committee by which it can uncover the true facts of Russian colonialism. We feel that such a committee would be of the greatest value both to our Government and to the American people.

We again ask you to give your support to the Flood resolution in the Rules Committee. Thank you very much.

Respectfully yours,

John Lewandowskyj,
President.

Joseph A. Maschak,
Secretary.

Chelmsford, Mass.,
May 17, 1963.

Congressman Daniel J. Flood,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Conrgessman Flood: I, an American citizen of Armenian descent, am writing to you in support of your Resolution 14–15 for the formation of a committee for investigating the enslaved and captive nations of the Soviet Union.

I am proud to say that there still are men as yourself who have not forgotten the Armenian people as well as all the captive nations who are enslaved by this Communist disease. For if we do not act now to help these people then they will give up all hope on looking toward America to becoming independent again.

The Armenians were the first to recognize the evils of the Bolshevik disease, besides being one of the first to be overtaken by them, and warned the world of what was to come about yet deaf ears were turned to us after the First World War.

Now that one-third of the world's population and land area has come under Soviet rule, it is time the world woke up from its deep slumber and take whatever action is necessary to free the people under their rule.

I sincerely know that you do your utmost to have this bill released to the floor and passed for the benefit of humanity.

Sincerely yours,

Stephen T. Dulgarian.

Detroit, Mich., *May 20, 1963.*

Congressman Daniel J. Flood,
House of Representatives Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Flood: As an interested American citizen and a member of the strongly anti-Communist organization. The American Revolutionary Federation, I strongly urge the release of House of Representatives' Resolutions 14 and 15 from the Rules Committee. It is essential that the American Government stand firm on the question of all captive nations and be well versed on the problems and aspirations of these nations. Here is hoping for favorable action and acceptance of these resolutions.

Jack R. Garbooshion.

May 12, 1963.

Congressman Daniel J. Flood,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Flood: I have expressed via letter that Representative B. F. Sisk from my district support House Resolutions 14 and 15 as well as his intercession with members of the House Rules Committee to release this legislation for House action.

Godspeed to you and your efforts and for the successful establishment of the Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Mercedes Margosian.

Fresno, Calif.

Equality of Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have asked to have inserted in the Record certain remarks and speeches of our Vice President, Lyndon B. Johnson. It occurs to me that it is particularly appropriate that this be done, for the Vice President has never limited himself to the customary or traditional functions of his office.

He has far exceeded these by endeavoring to use his office to help lead, instruct, and revitalize the thinking of Americans. He has acted in the conviction that as a leader of this Nation he must not be content to preside over his office but must also use his office to help lead the America people through troublesome situations and to help them aspire to their highest capacities as a people and as a nation.

The Vice President was doing this on Memorial Day when he made such a moving speech at Gettysburg. His remarks on that occasion were widely reprinted and commended.

However, a few days before the Gettysburg speech, Vice President JOHNSON spelled out his thoughts on "Equality of Opportunity" with even greater particularity.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this address as given at the Capital Press Club on May 18, 1963, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

(Remarks by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Prepared for Delivery Upon Acceptance of Distinguished Service Award, Capital Press Club, Washington, D.C., May 18, 1963)

I can respond to your generosity tonight in two ways—and two ways only. First, I can express my deep and heartfelt thanks; and, second, I can pray that I shall always conduct myself in such a way as to justify and merit your confidence.

It is only through the second response that I can—in any manner—approach levels of adequacy. Of this, I am deeply conscious. The purpose of this meeting tonight is not to touch off a round of mutual, back scratching, congratulations. It is, instead, to review what has been done by some people in the hope that we can inspire ourselves and others to do even more.

I am very proud—and I do not apologize for my pride—that you have included me in the company of those who are being honored tonight. At the same time, however, I am aware that this dinner does not represent the last chapter in a book or even the last page of a chapter. When we are involved in the field of human rights, we cannot consider the volume closed until those rights are so secure that no one even thinks of challenging them.

ROLL OF ACHIEVEMENT

At this moment in the history of our country, it is possible to call a roll of successful achievements in the struggle for equality of opportunity and human understanding. That roll can and should be called frequently, because it is essential in times of strife and turmoil to remind ourselves that progress is possible and our goals some day will be achieved if we have sufficient dedication.

But we would be doing ourselves and our country a disservice if we assumed that those successes meant that full and complete justice has been achieved. Quite the contrary. Justice is not a partial thing which can be measured in terms of percentages. Any degree of injustice is complete injustice. And until we achieve complete justice, we can regard progress only as a series of steps toward the goal. Each step should hearten us, but should not lull us into self-satisfaction that the job has been done.

Some months ago, the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, which I have the honor to head, released some statistics on minority group employment. They were good statistics in that they demonstrated a substantial improvement in the hiring practices of some of the firms that come under one of the Committee's programs. It was a report of solid, substantial progress.

A Negro editor wrote an editorial for his newspaper the following week. Commenting on the figures, he said something like this:

"When somebody points out how far I have come, I am the ungrateful kind of SOB who points out how far he has got to go."

Some people considered the comment to be ungracious—and perhaps it was. But that point did not bother me. The thought that loomed largest in my mind was that the comment was valid—and that the editor was absolutely right.

A SOBERING THOUGHT

A massive Federal effort, backed by all the prestige of the executive agencies of the Government, had succeeded only in bringing the editor (speaking figuratively) part way along the road to a goal where he had a right, as a human being, to be without any Federal effort at all.

This is a sobering thought which I commend to those of my fellow Americans who sometimes feel that efforts at progress should be abandoned because the presumed beneficiaries of these efforts do not express deep gratitude.

The truth of the matter is that there is nothing to be grateful for except, perhaps, the discovery that decades of inequality have not succeeded in quenching the flame of conscience in the breast of our fellow man.

We are not trying to do something for a group of people that will give them an extra edge in life. All we are trying to do is to eliminate deprivation so this group will have an opportunity to compete with their fellow Americans on terms of equality. And should we succeed, I am confident that they will take care of themselves—as they want to anyway.

But the sands of time are running out. The hours are short and we have no moral justification in asking for an extension or a continuance.

As a prudent—at least, I hope I am prudent—man, I know that frequently in life I have had to settle for progress short of perfection. I have done so because—despite cynics—I believe that half a loaf is better than none. But my acceptance has always been conditioned upon the premise that the half loaf is a step toward the full loaf, and that if I go on working, the day of the full loaf will come.

It seems to me that in the field of human rights, we are well past the stage where half a loaf will do. No one in this audience is so unrealistic as to expect to awake tomorrow morning in a perfect world. But, nevertheless, progress must come faster and I believe it will come faster as sensible men and women realize that they cannot afford—morally or economically—to abandon the field to the forces of unreason.

PROGRESS MUST BE FASTER

Progress must come faster because otherwise there are millions of individuals—human beings entitled to their rights—who will never receive justice even though some day justice may come to their group.

Progress must come faster because otherwise the tragic headlines which speak of the breakdown of law and order will increase rather than diminish. (And I hope we relearn the lesson that issues which are not settled by justice and fairplay will sooner or later be settled by force and violence.)

Progress must come faster because otherwise we will not achieve the unity which we must have if freedom—freedom for all of us—is to survive.

And, finally, progress must come faster simply because it is right, and has been too long delayed.

UNDERSTANDING EAR

I think that one of the greatest barriers to progress is the fact that we don't talk to each other enough or, rather, that we don't listen to each other enough with an understanding ear. We leap to conclusions too rapidly, we seize upon half truths without looking at the full picture; we accept slogans without looking behind those slogans to the essential reality.

For example, it is said repeatedly that no law can enforce human understanding or implant reasonable attitudes among human beings. With this statement, I agree. It is valid. It is also beside the point and totally irrelevant to the issues that divide our country today.

The law cannot bring reasonable men and women together to work out their differences. But it can restrain unreasonable men and women from imposing their will on a community; and then the reasonable people can, and will, get together and work out their problems themselves.

The law cannot inject goodness and brotherhood into those who are determined to reject both qualities. But it can prevent the extremists from trampling over the rights of others.

The law cannot make men equal and does not pretend to do so. But it can open the doors of equal opportunity which have been slammed shut by those who fear that when men and women can compete on an equal basis and are equal before the law, they will turn out to be rather equal after all.

And I want to make one point clear—very clear. This administration is determined to enforce the law.

TO FORCE THE LAW

We are fully aware of the fact that the ultimate solutions must spring from the people themselves. But that is not—and will not be—an excuse for sitting idly by while minorities obstruct the efforts of just and reasonable men and women to find solutions.

I am not here tonight to make a speech. I am here to share this evening with you—to say thanks for your courtesy and to extend in return my best wishes.

I only wish to leave you with one thought. These are difficult, emotion-ridden times. We face strife, and it is idle to pretend that it will go away. It is going to be difficult to maintain our perspective—at times virtually impossible. Yet, this we must do.

We must remember that we are all Americans—Americans with a difficult problem. We must work it out together. We must not be satisfied just with progress but neither can we afford to despair and reject progress.

I have faith that the day will come when it is not necessary nor remarkable to give or receive human rights awards—not necessary or remarkable simply because justice will be colorblind and all men and women will be judged on their merits and not on irrelevant considerations of ancestry.

Thank you.

Army Times Guide to Army Posts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, there are guidebooks on every State in the Union and every country in the world. But until now no one has had the patience to put together a much-needed guidebook on Army posts. Such a reference book has now been published and it is an excellent piece of work. I refer to the Army Times Guide to Army Posts, published by Army Times Publishing Co., and edited by Tom Scanlan, a veteran member of the Times staff.

This book will certainly prove of great value to our Army families throughout the world, families who must move from post to post while protecting the vital interests of the United States. There is a great deal of factual information on more than 300 Army installations in the book, including posts overseas; and the emphasis is on current housing, transportation, schools, and other facilities at or near the posts. This is the sort of information Army families need to know, that has never been conveniently collected in one volume before, and Members of Congress should find the book of great help in answering queries from constituents in the service.

But there is also a great deal of factual and fascinating historical data in the book about some of the older Army posts. In this regard, Editor Scanlan's comment in the preface seems worthy of attention:

> It is suggested that anyone interested in American history and how the United States came into being can discover something of value from a study of old Army posts. Even a passing knowledge of old Army posts will again prove that the United States was not created by a people intent upon playing it safe, waiting for a base on balls, and letting some other guy fight the wilderness, the prairie, pestilence, the original Americans we called savages, and the innumerable other fears and facts of the unknown that had to be met before this Nation could be united ocean to ocean.

Editor Scanlan, who has been writing about the Army for over 10 years, combines the concise, sharp writing of a good newspaperman with the accuracy of a historian. He has made a reference book interesting reading. I am sure the book will prove of value to all Members of the House.

President Kennedy's Grab for Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are in danger of losing their freedoms because of the unmatched grab for power by President Kennedy. Not even Franklin Roosevelt, in his bald attempt to pack the Supreme Court, could match the demands made by the present occupant of the White House. And the real danger is that the President's plans to downgrade Congress and seize additional power for the Executive are applauded by some Members of Congress.

The dangers inherent in Executive excesses were eloquently exposed by Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, who took the affirmative side of the question, "Is President Kennedy Attempting a Grab for Power?" in this week's issue of the Washington World. Senator MORTON's article follows:

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S GRAB FOR POWER

(By Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, of Kentucky)

Until right now there has been pretty general agreement that the success of our form of government rests on the balance of powers among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government.

But things have changed. We have some fellows in Washington who equate checks and balances with brakes—brakes on their vehicle of executive pride and power.

The Budget Director told Congress its Members couldn't consider the budget properly because they "fragment" it by dividing it into receipts and expenditures. Only the President, he says, can view the budget properly.

When Franklin Roosevelt tried to pack the Supreme Court with men who would bend to his executive will, there was an outcry that rocked the country.

There should be a similar outcry now against the attempts to pack the executive with so much excessive power that all the other branches of government are subordinated.

DANGEROUS EXCESSES

Perhaps we could be excused for shrugging off these executive excesses. One by one they seem relatively innocent. Together they are far from it. And nowhere is this more alarmingly apparent than in the life-or-death matters of our national security.

Key members of congressional committees recently awoke to read newspaper stories describing our negotiations to remove missile bases from Turkey and Italy—negotiations based upon Executive decisions.

Just a few weeks earlier Khrushchev's demands that we remove those missiles in return for his removal of missiles from Cuba had been hooted down as another Munich.

But suddenly, without constultation and without the opportunity to obtain congressional expressions, the Munich was underway, prettied up with a new set of clothes supposed to represent modernization of our weapons systems.

The Nassau agreement with Prime Minister Macmillan was another example of negotiation in sunny secrecy, of decisions which affect us all but which were arrived at quickly, perhaps precipitously, by the Executive alone.

Perhaps Congress should feel no pain at being left out of that one, however. The President's own Secretary of State, or at least the man who carries the title, wasn't even present.

When, if ever, a disarmament is finally reached, one wonders what razzle-dazzle of public relations will be used to break the news to the American people and their representatives in Congress.

Of course, there are excuses aplenty for the Executive excess. One is that our society has become so complex it can no longer rely on the cumbersome machinery of representative government to get its job done. There seems to be some magic mathematical limit on individual responsibility.

"Planning" is another magical excuse word. Our society is said to be so interdependent that it can't rely on individual responsibility to accomplish the integrated planning needed to get us moving.

DISTRUST OF PEOPLE

I think these excuses are nonsense. The root of the growing tree of executive power is simply distrust of the people.

The New Frontier is simply a frontier of fear—fear that people can no longer manage their own lives, fear that they might take some course other than that plotted and planned in the all-wise, all-knowing ivory tower.

Taxes are described in this new philosophy as not merely a means to raise revenues but as a way to distribute income. The free market doesn't do a good enough job. People spend their money on the wrong things. The solution? Simple, let the Government take the money and spend it for you.

It's really ironic. In this period of our history, since the turn of the century anyway, our average incomes have doubled and doubled again. Our individual education has grown from a grade school average to a high school average and is now approaching a full college average.

MUST GOVERNMENT DO ALL?

Nevertheless, we find that the prevailing theory is that we are not smart enough to handle our own affairs. We must be protected from ourselves.

We can't insure ourselves against sickness or old age. The Government must do it and do it all, without options, given its way.

We can't build our own schools in our own communities. The Federal Government must do it for us.

We can't settle our own affairs in business and industry; the Federal Government alone is wise enough.

We can't raise prices, we can't lower prices, we can't work short hours, we can't work long hours. We can't be trusted even to take someone to lunch for a business chat.

That's the nub of it—mistrust of the people.

Macdonald Praises Passamaquoddy Public Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, New England, which has long had the unenviable distinction of paying the highest electric rates in the continental United States, may soon be getting ready to do something about it.

I await the report of the Interior Department on its restudy of the Passamaquoddy project and St. John River. It is my understanding that the report will be completed by July 1 of this year. I certainly hope it will be a favorable report—a report which will mark the beginning of comprehensive development of New England's water resources.

I have in the past supported water resource development programs throughout the Nation. I sincerely hope those of you from other areas will view this proposal with favor when it is brought before the Congress for action.

I want to outline some of the recent developments which are putting the problem of power costs in New England—and the possible solutions—into clearer focus than ever before.

First, it is an unfortunate and distressing fact that power rates in New England are too high.

William D. Shipman documented this statement in his 1962 book, "An Inquiry Into the High Cost of Electricity in New England." He found that rates in New England were 12 to 15 percent higher than comparable rates of private utilities outside of our area. He found that on a cost per kilowatt-hour basis, the difference was even greater—46 percent higher in New England.

Federal Power Commission Chairman Joseph Swidler documented the fact that New England power rates are too high in a speech in Boston in October 1962. Mr. Swidler observed: "New England still has far to go in taking advantage of its opportunities to reduce the cost of producing and selling electric power."

In 1961, Mr. Swidler noted, the average residential consumer in New England used 3,113 kilowatt-hours of electricity. But, he added, that was 23 percent below the national average of 4,019 kilowatt-hours. These figures raise sharply the question whether consumers in New England are achieving the full benefits of electrical living.

The latest available figures from the Federal Power Commission—as of January 1, 1962—show that New England residential consumers are paying from 4.8 percent to 20.5 percent more—highest in the continental United States—for 250 kilowatt-hours of electricity than the average U.S. residential consumers.

Manufacturing industries in New England fare much worse. A recent study by the Electric Consumers Information Committee reveals, for example, that manufacturing industries in the United States paid an average of 0.882 cents per kilowatt-hour for purchased power in 1960. But New England manufacturing industries paid an average of 1.452 cents per kilowatt-hour for the power they purchased in 1960. That was highest in the Nation, 65 percent more than the national average age, and 181 percent more than in the east south-central region.

Consider this: If power purchased by the New England manufacturing industries had been just one-tenth of a cent cheaper—in 1960, our industries would have saved $11.4 million. And even a 1 million decrease in the cost of power would have still kept New England's cost of power highest in the Nation.

Now I want to point out that New England is beginning to speak out on this issue. We are concerned and we want to do something about it. The Boston Herald noted in an editorial on November 15, 1962:

> Here is another opportunity for useful leadership by the Governor of Massachusetts in 1963-64 * * *. It is to bring about a reduction in the cost of power.

I want to add that all of us from New England have an opportunity for useful leadership on this issue.

The same Boston Herald observed so accurately in another editorial on November 23, 1962:

> Electricity is not only costlier in New England than elsewhere in the country, but to make it cheaper would give tremendous impetus to the whole economy of New England.

Another Massachusetts newspaper added its voice to the call for action a few months ago. In an editorial February 26, 1963, the Haverhill Journal declared in sharp language:

> The cost of power in this region is outrageous. It is a definite factor deterring our future industrial growth and must be brought into line with reason if we are to achieve any genuine progress.

The Journal added:

> If we are being overcharged for electricity, let's find out why and put a stop to it. If we are not being overcharged by our electric utilities, let's find out why their rates have to be so much higher than private owned utility companies in other regions.

Our good friends and neighbors in nearby New York are also voicing their concern about high power rates. In words that apply so aptly to New England, a group of industrial leaders in New York City said recently that high power rates are "building an economic wall around our city that may halt any future plant expansion and keep vital new industry out."

There is the issue. There are some of the recent expressions of concern. Now, what can we do about it?

Mr. Swidler, the FPC Chairman, offered several concrete suggestions in his Boston speech. He urged greater integration of facilities and operations, and coordinated planning. He urged development of the region's hydroelectric potential. We in New England have 2.8 million kilowatts of undeveloped hydropower capacity, according to the latest conservative figures. That total does not include an estimated 1 million kilowatts of peaking capacity at the Passamaquoddy project.

Mr. Swidler also urged the construction of large, more economical generating plants, as well as greater use of power, with rate reductions to stimulate increased use.

Mr. Shipman, in his book on New England power rates, suggested that a regional power policy for New England would be desirable. He also suggested consolidation of many of the small power companies into two of three large integrated systems.

The distinguished junior Senator from the State of Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] observed in an address in Cleveland, Ohio, early this month that our New England "hydropower can, and should, be developed now." Unlike atomic energy, he said, "the technology is already perfected and feasible sites have been surveyed. The major cost of a hydro project is in building the dam to form the reservoir. This expense is subject to escalation as price levels rise; thus, the sooner these projects are constructed, the lower the anticipated price tag."

The point is clear: much can be done to make more power available to Massachusetts at lower rates. I hope our New England region will band together as never before to accomplish this goal. We need to modernize and improve our power system. We need multipurpose development of our water resources and integration of our now disjointed small power systems. Large steam generating units, conventional and atomic, should be constructed.

We might well consider creation of a Northeastern Power Administration to bring to New England and the entire Northeast the benefits which other regions have enjoyed under similar arrangements. Massachusetts can surge forward on a tide of low cost energy if proper vision and imagination are used in power resource development.

All of us in New England—local and State officials, business and labor and farm and civic groups, all consumers, and those of us who represent our great region in the Congress—all of us must work together, on our own and in cooperation with the appropriate Federal departments and agencies, to achieve the goal of abundant electricity at lower rates in our region. The people, businesses and industries of New England will benefit. So too will our entire Nation.

Statement Supporting H.R. 5625

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement I submitted to the Special Subcommittee on Labor on June 11, 1963, in support of a National Service Corps:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 5625, BEFORE THE HOUSE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, JUNE 11, 1963

Mr. Chairman, President Kennedy stated very explicitly in his Youth Message on February 14, 1963, that "the logic and value of a National Service Corps has been demonstrated by the work and success of our Peace Corps overseas. . . . While admiring the work of these volunteers in carrying their skills and ideals to assist the needy in other lands, it is equally clear that the opportunities for service are also large here at home. Although the United States is the wealthiest Nation the world has ever known, the poverty of millions of our people, and the need for training, assistance, and encouragement in numerous corners of our country, from teeming slum areas to those depressed rural areas virtually bypassed by technological and economic progress, provide fertile fields for those citizens with the desire and ability to be of assistance."

I agree with the President, I think, however, the justification for a domestic corps—aside from the tremendous need—should be sought so much in the success of its foreign predecessor as in the inherent rightness of the idea it represents. That is: it is time for the Federal Government to give a boost of a very particular kind to the American volunteer social work tradition.

Why boost the American volunteer social work movement? Because the only reasons for not doing so are either that no need exists or that there is a better alternative. I would challenge anyone to assert that no such need for more workers in the social work fields exists. The need is blatant, and the question of its existence is simply not the issue. The issue is: who is going to provide such workers? One small pamphlet recently published on the National Service Corps put it this way:

"Whether or not it is properly the business of the Federal Government to supply volunteers for local social service projects, few persons question the value of work of this kind or doubt that more volunteers for it are needed." ("Domestic Peace Corps," Editorial Research Reports, No. 13, April 3, 1963, p. 255.)

The figures from the Fact Sheet on Social Work Manpower and Social Work Education for 1962-63 describe just how severe this need is. In June 1962, 2,318 students in the United States completed their social work education and received their master's degree in social work. Yet, the most careful estimates available indicate that upward of 15,000 persons would have to be recruited annually to replace those leaving the field, to staff necessary expansion of existing services, and to man newly developing services. Moreover, this estimate does not take account of the full expansion of services that would be required by the recent rapid growth in population.

In addition, right now there are 10,000 current social work vacancies for which funds are available but for which qualified staff cannot be found.

There are no figures on how well volunteers are currently working to fill this gap. But when the President's Study Group for National Voluntary Service consulted State, county, and local officials and hundreds of organizations around the country, as well as the professional fields that would be most concerned with the use of volunteer workers, they not only got a response that expressed great interest but some organizations also submitted concrete proposals outlining projects where volunteers could be used.

For example, back in November, when the domestic Peace Corps idea was first gaining ground, the Mobilization for Youth project on the lower East Side of Manhattan was asked for recommendations on whether and how they could use such volunteers. The directors replied that they could easily use as many as 30 Peace Corps volunteers and said: "Almost any place you touch on our program you can find a use for peace corpsmen."

I think that it should be emphasized that the volunteers provided by the National Service Corps would be full-time volunteers. Most persons currently doing volunteer work are not full-time but part-time volunteers. This certainly is understandable in that for most volunteers, their volunteer work is only one item on a crowded schedule. But it also makes more attractive the idea of a corps that would supply volunteers who could do what they do in the spirit of total commitment.

A director of Mobilization for Youth, once again, showed how this kind of commitment could be valuable. It would mean that these full-time volunteer workers could live with the people they were helping. He added:

"This way they would establish their own contacts and attachments—each within a different pocket of the neighborhood. We would want them to root themselves in the community, to understand and become part of its culture and climate."

He even concluded that this advantage of a peace corpsman gives him a value in and of his own that is different from the professional worker who would not be willing to live in this manner.

I think another way to really appreciate the possible potential and value of a home corps to this country is to examine the alternatives. It has been generally admitted during the past few years by public welfare personnel that payments alone to the poorer part of our population are not enough. These people need rehabilitation to make a payment meaningful. We, as a nation, are coming to the point where our national conscience will not tolerate the mere transfer of money as an adequate method of improving the lot of the poor. We must provide the right social services to help people climb from the confusion and despair into which poverty has sunk them.

This could be done either by expanding our public welfare programs at a very high price to provide such services, or it can be done by enacting an idea like the National Service Corps, which would achieve many of the same goals, at a minimal cost. The special kind of commitment that characterizes such an effort is something that cannot be bought at any price, and yet, is a tremendously valuable factor in the makeup of a program that aims at rehabilitation.

A most important consideration, of course, is how the potential volunteers and how the social work profession, in general, feel about the establishment of such a corps. By now enough spokesmen have been heard from and enough surveys tabulated to make it possible to draw a fairly clear picture.

A recent publications of the President's Study Group, "Facts on the Proposed National Service Program," reports the following on a survey they conducted:

"More than 10,000 students at 65 colleges and universities replied to the questionnaires; 88 percent felt a national service program is desirable; 70 percent said they would join, or consider joining, such a program.

"Responses from over 4,000 senior citizens showed that 82 percent think the program desirable, and 57 percent said they would join or consider joining."

Not too long ago, the Social Welfare Assembly, speaking for the many groups that are its members, took a stand on the idea of a national peace corps. Cautious as they were in their statement, they explicitly and unquestionably endorsed the corps. Their published position statement reads:

"The National Social Welfare Assembly believes that a National Service Corps under certain conditions can make significant contributions to the welfare, health and education services of the Nation.

"We believe the National Service Corps should set forth sound goals which can be achieved. Under positive conditions the program will have significant value and merit."

Such support is valuable and should not be ignored.

I think we should be most encouraged and spurred to establishing such a corps by the words of one of our fellow representative's daughters, Barbara Boggs, when she said the following in trying to capture the current mood of youth, and especially of those individuals in the organization she was discussing—the National Student Association. She described: "a growing willingness to act on social issues." And mentioned: "The Good Joe idea, even the ivory tower idea, is disappearing rapidly. There is a desire on the part of many college students to channel their new awareness into some type of socially worthy activity after graduating."

This bill, H.R. 5625, would authorize $5 million for the coming fiscal year. Although it is not specified in the bill, I understand that the goal is to get 1,000 persons at work by the end of fiscal year 1964, and perhaps, 5,000 by the end of 3 years. I agree with those who would keep the corps small. It is highly desirable to use it as a catalytic agent rather than developing an army of workers upon which the whole Nation might ultimately depend. This latter development might also stunt the very kind of growth that it is trying to stimulate.

The provisions for the volunteers seem advisable, and the $75 per month allowance, which had initially been considered at a figure less than $75, seems fair. I understand that many have both speculated on and, then, argued about the contemplated length of the training period for these volunteers. In fact, the National Student Association representatives favored a 3-month training period like the foreign corps volunteers rather than the 1 month suggested by the President's Study Group. It seems to me that although the on-the-job difficulties of the foreign and domestic assignments will be equal, the preparation needed does not necessarily have to be. After all, this is America and the question of a new culture and a new language plus all the other general background information that can be helpful in this work will not need to be covered to the same degree as in a totally foreign land. Much that is known by any citizen will carry over although, naturally, particulars on different minority groups will have to be filled in.

I definitely favor also keeping the stipulation that no project be undertaken unless the local community has initiated the action and invited the Federal Government to come in. There is plenty of potential in this home corps and there is no point in stifling it by having it continually embroiled in disputes with localities claiming the Federal Government will try to impose its will on them. Also, to have the Federal Government force the issue is to deny the initial purpose of the legislation, which was to supplement, not coerce, local action.

I would like to conclude by saying that the time to pass this bill is now. The potential for social gains inherent in it is great, and the expenditure is small. I urge the early enactment of H.R. 5625.

Annual Lobster Dinner of the Maine State Society of Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, once again the Maine State Society of Washington, D.C., has scored a hit in the promotion of Maine products. Its annual lobster dinner was held this year on Friday, May 24, in the Department of the Interior Cafeteria. A record-breaking total of between 500 and 600 people were in attendance at the dinner which featured a menu of Maine food products, including apple juice, clam chowder, boiled fresh Maine lobster, potato chips, blueberry pie, and the fixings.

Mementos of the occasion included a 5-pound bag of Maine potatoes for each person and Maine-made products donated by their manufacturers were distributed as door prizes.

The Society's President, Federal Maritime Commissioner, James V. Day, presented certificates to leading seafood restaurants in Washington which have featured Maine lobster. Also, he presented on this occasion, on behalf of the Society, a prefabricated cabin to the Pineland Hospital and Training Center of Pownal, Maine, for use of retarded and emotionally disturbed children at the planned George Freedman Memorial Camp.

The mighty "homarus americanus" remained king of the evening, however, as the Maine lobster, unchallenged monarch of the seafood family, reigned supreme. Temporarily displaced Maine citizens and their guests paid homage to this delightful crustacean and the experienced, along with the uninitiated, dined amid words of praise.

On August 2, 3, 4, 1963, the Maine Seafoods Festival will be held in Rockland, Maine, where each year people from all over the country join in praise of this same succulent "King Lobster." It is a memorable annual occasion where good people enjoy Maine's beautiful coastal area and delight in the warm hospitality of Maine and its good food.

The Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews Honors Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., Dr. Jerome V. Wiesner, and Prof. Erwin N. Griswold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest organizations in the United States, dedicated to extending understanding and areas of agreement among our people, is the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. It is truly a great organization which for years has performed constructive and effective work in connection with unity of all Americans without regard to race, color, or creed.

The secretary of this committee since its inception, a dedicated man, is Ben G. Shapiro. Mr. Shapiro has devoted his entire life in this all-important field. Each year this committee, of which I am a member, selects three outstanding persons to be the recipients of an award for outstanding contributions to God, country, and mankind. The awards are conferred upon the recipients at a large banquet held in Boston each year, in which banquet the outstanding citizens of Massachusetts participate. This organization also commands the complete respect of the people of Massachusetts.

On May 9, 1963, the 26th annual Good Will Dinner of this committee was conducted in Boston, at which dinner the toastmaster was Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor. The recipients of the awards were: Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr.; Dr. Jerome V. Wiesner, and Prof. Erwin N. Griswold.

I herewith include remarks made by Oscar W. Haussermann, chairman of the committee; remarks made by Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor, and toastmaster; report made by Ben G. Shapiro, secretary of the committee; remarks made by Prof. Erwin N. Griswold, dean, Harvard Law School, member, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights; together with copy of the three citations presented to the recipients.

REMARKS BY OSCAR W. HAUSSERMANN, CHAIRMAN, MASSACHUSETTS COMMITTEE, CATHOLICS, PROTESTANTS, AND JEWS

Reverend clergy, Governor Peabody, Mayor Collins, honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, this meeting will please come to order. In behalf of our Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, I welcome each and every one of you to this, our 26th annual good will dinner.

My assignment tonight is to present to you our toastmaster. I do so under the handicap of wifely admonitions not to comment on my Indiana Hoosier background; not to wallow in "ers" and "ahs" as I fumble for words; and not to stray from my allotted task.

Those of you who attended Tech's midcentury convocation may recall that our fellow American, Sir Winston Churchill, before he was naturalized, hailed Boston as a community of noble institutions. Tonight I hail two of these institutions, the Christian Science Monitor and its editor, Erwin D. Canham, a past recipient of an award from this committee and our toastmaster tonight.

As most of you know, Erwin is a native of Maine and a graduate of Bates who came down to Boston and into the great world to observe and comment on the cosmic scene. A foreign correspondent, first in London and then in Switzerland, and later a traveling journalist, his thoughtful reports from abroad made even Indiana folk more worldly wise and less provincial. A few years ago he headed the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Today, in addition to being the editor of the Monitor, he's a moderating moderator—a traffic cop who gives the stop and go signals to a distinguished group of brilliant, but oftcontentious, gentlemen who man the TV panel entitled "Starring the Editors." A former Rhodes scholar, an author, the recipient of numerous honorary degrees, a member of our committee and a good companion, he's graciously agreed to preside over the proceedings tonight.

Ladies and gentlemen, Erwin D. Canham.

REMARKS BY ERWIN D. CANHAM, EDITOR OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

I am most happy to add my word of welcome to you who have come to the 26th annual dinner organized by the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews.

How grateful we can be that this activity has been going on in our community for over a quarter of a century. The headline news and the front page pictures from another great city in the United States gives us daily tragic proof that interracial problems must be solved. The worst thing that can happen in any community is for its reasonable and moderate leaders, its idealists, its men and women of good will, to be driven underground. To a considerable degree the moderate leaders of many areas in the great southland—our brother States and cities only a few hours away by jet aircraft—have been forced to take cover. The extremists tend to seize power and dominate. In Birmingham, Ala. a relatively moderate group has begun to reassert itself but is not yet by any means the decisive element in the community. Meantime grave dangers stalk the streets, hates and fears intensify within the unfortunate city, the American good name is tarnished throughout the world, and Federal intervention looms.

Here in Boston, this committee is a standing illustration of the triumph of decency and good judgment of that commonsense which is the best possible version of idealism. We are zealots and extremists in the cause of brotherhood and understanding. We are moderates in our broad and generous attitude toward those of different faiths and traditions. We have learned to live together. It has not happened by accident. It has been done by people grouped together in organizations such as this one. We have succeeded in establishing a climate in this city—and believe me, anybody who can improve the Boston climate is pretty good. The climate we have established is one of mutual respect. There is no better basis for a sound community than that.

This committee's work during the past year has followed its traditionally constructive pattern. Its very continuity is of great importance. Those institutions work best in a community which have most nearly come to be taken for granted—have become a normal way of life. But no dynamic institution can ever really be taken for granted in the sense of not working for its progress and strengthening. This committee takes a great deal of work, which rises to a community ceremony and act of faith in this annual dinner. It is better to have a demonstration of understanding and respect here in this familiar dining room than a mass of angry, frustrated people in the streets and squares, facing one another in anger and stark fear, or even in desperate martyrdom.

In short, dear fellow citizens, let us keep it this way. Tonight's meeting is a formal act of rededication.

A REPORT BY BEN G. SHAPIRO, SECRETARY

I am very proud of our Massachusetts Committee Catholics, Protestants, and Jews and the great contribution it has made in furthering the cause of human brotherhood.

During the past 26 years many outstanding citizens, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews have been gracious and kind in saying that it was the Massachusetts committee which motivated them to give of their time, effort, and means to help destroy bigotry, hatred, and the lack of respect for our fellow man—not only through our committee but by cooperating with other organizations dedicated to the same noble purpose.

Certainly no one can measure the good we have accomplished over the years—but I am sure you will agree that conditions in 1963 are very much better than they were in 1937.

Our committee is dedicated to a conviction that each person should have the right to grow, to achieve and to participate up to the limit of his or her natural abilities. It seeks to remove social barriers to the growth, achievement, and participation of people, particularly barriers which differentiate their rights according to their race, religion, or national origin.

From time to time many have asked—do the people who attend these dinners need to be reminded that bigotry and hatred and lack of respect for our fellow man are bad? There are many answers, but I shall attempt to give you only a few. Our records indicate that during these 26 years, more than 25,000 men and women of all faiths, who attend our annual dinners, have carried the message of brotherhood and good will to friends, neighbors, and others.

Through the wonderful cooperation of our fine newspapers, television and radio, to whom we owe a tremendous debt, our message has reached millions of our citizens.

We cooperate with the good citizenship program of the Boston Park Department.

We provide funds for the three chapels program at Brandeis University.

We make it possible for men and women from varied professions and academic backgrounds to acquire valuable training and experience in the field of human relations at Boston University.

We are proud of the aid which we gave to six graduate fellows in human relations at Boston University.

It is worthy of mention that one of these fellows—Prof. C. Eric Lincoln—is presently working with others to establish a human relations center at Atlanta University in Georgia.

We are proud of our contribution to the growth of the Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs at Tufts University—founded in 1948 by Dr. John J. Mahoney and the late Dr. Henry W. Holmes.

Under the able direction of Dr. Franklin Patterson, the Lincoln Filene Center has served as the clearinghouse and service arm for the commissioners of education of the 9 Northeastern States in carrying out the program of the Northeastern States youth citizenship project, which reaches the more than 4,000 secondary schools of the northeastern section of the United States.

The Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews has an enviable record of support for this valuable work extending back for nearly a quarter of a century for a total of more than $40,000. The committee can take great satisfaction in this record of support.

For 12 years now we have been holding an annual junior goodwill dinner for boys of the Boston public and parochial schools.

This has become very close and meaningful to all of us on the committee.

Picture, if you will, over the years a total of 1,800 schoolboys breaking bread with great affection for each other.

Many of these young men will be the leaders of tomorrow, and racial and religious prejudice will be abhorrent to them, I am quite sure.

We have at our annual dinner representative young men and women from colleges in the metropolitan area. We have had as our guests over the years some 1,300 students and we know that many of them are now actively participating in similar activities in many sections of the country.

I leave it to you to judge for yourselves whether these annual dinners, and some of our endeavors which I have just briefly described, are justified.

To you ladies and gentlemen who attend our dinners, and to the wonderful people who help us with their financial contributions, we are indeed grateful.

Yet, we cannot afford to be complacent. There is much that remains to be done for there still exists in our social fabric and in our institutions, too many obvious examples of second-class citizenship.

We need to renew our efforts to stamp out bigotry and subtle discrimination wherever we find it.

To accomplish this, we need more than lipservice. We need men and women who will give it the same faith and the same loyalty that we give a religious faith; and it must be a faith that comes out of love rather than fear—out of conviction rather than superstition—out of a true goodness.

REMARKS MADE BY ERWIN N. GRISWOLD

One who receives such a citation as this must realize that it comes to him in a representative capacity. I accept this honor, humbly and with gratitude, and in the full understanding that my part in the work for brotherhood and civil liberties has been a small one.

Thanks to the vision and efforts of Ben Shapiro, and those who have worked with him, these dinners have been held here in Boston over a period of more than 25 years. The committee is called the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants and Jews. The problem with which it was organized to deal was thought of as one arising essentially from religious differences. As I look about the Commonwealth in which we live, I like to think that we have made great progress with such problems, and that there is now a large measure of understanding and confidence among persons of different faiths in this State. If you would look for evidence, I would point to the last three persons elected by the people to the office of Attorney General of the Commonwealth—George Fingold, Edward J. McCormack, Jr., and Edward W. Brooke.

Of course, problems arising out of religious differences are not all behind us, and we will have to keep working at them. Thanks to the efforts of many people, the climate of such work here is, I think, rather good. But there are other, closely related, areas where problems are developing rather rapidly, in all parts of the country, including Massachusetts. I would like in broad strokes to summarize these problems, and to express the hope that we may find ways to focus the resources of community intelligence and good will on them as we have here in matters of religious difference.

The matter to which I refer is essentially economic, with its roots in racial rather than religious causes. The problem exists in Massachusetts, and in all other parts of the country. Many of us here are inclined to overlook it, but it exists just the same, and is growing in seriousness and importance. It is perhaps largely a problem with respect to Negroes. However, it also arises, here and elsewhere, with respect to Puerto Ricans and, in other parts of the country with respect to persons of Mexican, Oriental, or American Indian descent.

Though there is no legal segregation in housing in Massachusetts, there is almost complete practical segregation; and this leads to schools right here in the Boston area which are virtually as segregated as any of those in the South. There is no legal job discrimination in Massachusetts, but there is much practical discrimination. It is hard for a Negro to get a job in many fields, and he is likely to be the first one who is laid off in times of recession. This has its serious implications for every age group. It is hard to persuade a Negro boy to stay in school, or to take technical training for many trades, when he knows there is little opportunity for him in skilled employment, and no opportunity for him for permanent employment in many trades. This leads to frustration, disappointment, and disillusionment among teenagers. It leads to school dropouts and juvenile delinquency. We are likely to blame these things on the youth who are involved. With better understanding, we may come to see that the real blame is often on us, on society, and that the solution will come not from taking vigorous measures against the youth, but from opening up the channels for education, opportunity, and development. We must find ways to give these young citizens of our country a real and solid basis of hope and motivation for the future.

A figure which is often quoted is that 4 or 5 percent of our labor force in this country is unemployed. This is bad enough in itself. A country which is spending $20 billion to put a man on the moon should be able to find a way to provide employment for its able-bodied workers. It is perhaps not irrelevant to point out that the Russians provide employment for all their workers. We should be able to do as well as they do.

But the 4 or 5 percent unemployment figure is in some respects misleading. Behind it lies the fact that of the unskilled workers in this country, nearly 20 percent are unemployed. In most parts of the country, a high proportion of these unskilled workers are Negroes. What would you or I think, in this country, in 1963, if 20 percent of the people we knew were unemployed?

Many of these problems go back to prejudices not wholly unrelated to those which used to exist in the religious field. They go back to our failure to live up to the ideals on which this country was founded, and which are expressed so nobly in our Constitution. In some areas, as in some parts of the South, the resistance to our ideals is active. In other parts of the country, as in Massachusetts, the resistance is often only passive. We like to pat ourselves on the back, and say what a good job we are doing, when in fact we should be doing a very much better job than we are. As it has in the past, Massachusetts should be providing great leadership for the country. I hope very much that it will move more clearly in that direction.

A few weeks ago, as a member of the Civil Rights Commission, I joined in a report to the President and to Congress which was focused on Mississippi. Because most people have seen only newspaper accounts, and not the report itself, this report has been widely misunderstood. It has been said that we recommended that all Federal expenditures in Mississippi should be terminated. This would have been a bad recommendation, and we did not make it. One of our three recommendations was, in fact, that the question of Federal expenditures in Mississippi should be considered by the Congress and the President, and that the President should explore his power to withhold payments. We gave a specific example. Earlier this year, in 1963, the Federal Government through the Federal Aviation Agency granted $2,180,000 for the construction of a jet airport building in Jackson, Miss., the plans for which provide for separate eating and restroom facilities. We have been assured by the President that when this building is finished, it will not be operated on a segregated basis. But why should the Nation's taxpayers pay for separate facilities if they are not to be used? What kind of impression does this action make in Mississippi, and in the rest of the country? The Civil Rights Commission is convinced that careful investigation of other Federal expenditures in Mississippi will produce other instances like this, and that there will be cases in which Government action involving expenditures should clearly be modified.

In that same report, we also urged that the Federal Government exercise greater leadership in this area. But this recommendation got no publicity in the papers, and has not been generally understood. I applaud the action of the Attorney General in his recent visits to the Governors of several States in the South. This was a fine and courageous action, and is an example of the kind of leadership the Civil Rights Commission is seeking. We do not minimize the difficulties of the problems. But we are convinced that they require constructive and affirmative action, and that they will not solve themselves.

This is inevitably a problem which is on America's conscience. The easiest thing to do with such a problem is to push it sharply aside, or sweep it under the rug. A more thoughtful reaction, rather than denunciation of the Commission, would be to ask why it was that the Commission's recommendations were made. What is the problem with which the country is confronted, in all States, not merely in Mississippi, and what should be done about it?

And so I close, in grateful recognition of what has been accomplished here, but in the hope that we will also recognize that there are great problems still before us, and that these problems exist, and demand our best efforts for solution, right here in Massachusetts.

The Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, at its 26th annual dinner, presents this citation and testimonial to Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., a graduate of Yale College and the Yale Law School; a junior in a New York law firm; a Navy man starting as an apprentice seaman, promoted to the rank of ensign and for 4 years on continuous duty in the Atlantic and Pacific aboard battleships and submarines; recipient of the Navy Unit Citation, the Submarine Medal and various campaign medals with battle stars; one time assistant editor of Newsweek; assistant general manager of the Merchandise Mart of Chicago; and the executive director of the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation.

Appointed in 1961, Director of the U.S. Peace Corps, he has performed the sensitive duties of his high office in a manner that has warmed the hearts of all Americans regardless of race, color, or creed. From the highways and byways of our land he has drawn young men and women with a dedicated sense of service and sent them to far places to help peoples struggling toward a better day. Under his inspiring leadership, his Peace Corps workers have, through practice and example, brought home to natives of foreign lands and to the world at large a better understanding of America's concern for the welfare of man.

Proud of him and his Peace Corps, the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, presents to him this testimonial and award.

Dated at Boston, Mass., this 9th day of May, 1963.

The Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, at its 26th annual dinner, presents this citation and testimonial to Jerome B. Wiesner, distinguished leader in our modern world of science; now serving as President Kennedy's Special Assistant for Science and Technology and as Director of the recently created Office of Science and Technology; born in Michigan and graduated from the University of Michigan; former chief engineer of the Library of Congress; a professor of electrical engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and one time director of its research laboratory of electronics; recipient of a medal of honor from the Electronic Industries Association; and member of numerous learned societies including the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the National Academy of Sciences.

Dr. Wiesner has impressed the American public by his conviction that the march of science can be pro bono publico and that America's vast and varied activities in the scientific field not only make for strength in time of war but also assure a fuller and richer life in time of peace.

Grateful for his farsighted contribution to the proper channeling of scientific research in our challenged land, the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, presents to Jerome B. Wiesner this testimonial and award.

Dated at Boston, Mass., this 9th day of May, 1963.

The Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, at its 26th annual dinner, presents this citation and testimonial to Erwin N. Griswold, born in Ohio; a graduate of Oberlin College and the Harvard Law School; in his early years a lawyer in Cleveland; one time attorney in the office of the Solicitor General, Special Assistant to the U.S. Attorney General and consulting expert in the U.S. Treasury Department; able author of books and treatises on taxation, conflict of laws and the fifth amendment; called to the Harvard Law Faculty in 1934 and in 1950 appointed Langdell professor of law and dean of the Harvard Law School; former president of the Association of American Law Schools; member of the American Philosophical Society, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and other learned societies; holder of numerous honorary degrees from educational institutions in this country, Canada and Australia; profound and forceful exponent of the importance in a democratic society of respect for the civil rights of individuals regardless of race, color, or creed; and valued member of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission—Dean Griswold by his executive ability, his scholarship and his helpful civic service has won the respect and gratitude of lawyers and laymen alike, here and abroad.

In recognition of his constructive contribution to a better understanding of the role of law in a free society, we, his fellow members of the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, present to him this testimonial and award.

Dated at Boston, Mass., this 9th day of May, 1963.

Canyonlands National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, Utah is endowed with some of the most spectacular and exciting natural scenic attractions in the world. The area located in the southeast portion of the State is one of the most colorful in the world. It has long been the desire of those acquainted with this scenic wonderland to conserve and preserve the scenery, the natural and historic objects for the enjoyment of future generations.

Consistent with this desire, a Canyonlands bill was introduced in the House in the 87th Congress. Testimony was heard and recorded and the committee report was made with the recommendation that the measure be passed. Even the minority view of the report stated, "There can be no question but that much of this area is of a true national park stature, possessing outstanding scenic grandeur unsurpassed anywhere else in the Nation." Exception was taken to the bill, however, because of threats to private interests and unresolved questions of multiple use.

Since that time, the members of the Utah delegation, the Governor of the State of Utah and other persons and organizations involved have worked diligently to resolve these problems.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that these problems have now been quite largely resolved and we are ready to create the Canyonlands National Park. The bill I introduced yesterday is, I think, a reasonable compromise and I sincerely hope that we can now move forward with the creation of the park.

Dr. C. Willard Camalier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. C. Willard Camalier, D.D.S., assistant secretary of the American Dental Association and director of its Washington office, has announced that he will retire on June 30.

Both as a legislator and as a physician, I have long had the greatest respect for Dr. Camalier and the deepest admiration for his valuable contributions to this Nation's health. Since World War I, Dr. Camalier has been representing his profession to Congress and to other branches of the Federal Government. No profession, business, or Government could ask for a finer or more devoted representative. His achievements are many and have rightly brought him a long list of honors.

I am happy to say that Dr. Camalier is a good friend of mine, as he is of many other Members of Congress. I first met him during the days of World War II when he served on the Procurement and Assignment Board for Physicians and Dentists, and I served as personnel officer for the Surgeon General of the Army. Our friendship has been a rewarding one and I know I speak for all of his many friends in wishing Dr. Camalier well and congratulating him on his long and notable career of service to his profession, his country, and his personable and fine family.

An Enemy—Emphysema

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Tuberculosis Association of Alabama, in cooperation with the Medical College of Alabama, has recently developed a mobile unit for the purpose of detecting emphysema. It is my hope that it will be possible to display this unique machine to the Members of the House in the not too distant future.

Emphysema is an enemy that the average layman is not aware of, nor do they understand the cause of its symptoms.

Nate Haseltine recently wrote an article on this subject which appeared in the Washington (D.C.) Post on June 9, 1963, that I believe very adequately describes this illness and I would like to have this article inserted in the Record at this point:

Potent, Undramatic Disease Kills More Than Tuberculosis

(By Nate Haseltine)

The Greeks had a word for it, emphysema. British doctors prefer to call it chronic bronchitis. American doctors call the lung-disabling disease emphysema but admit that perhaps in as many as 9 of 10 cases cases it is preceded by what they call chronic bronchitis.

Call it what you will, out of 14 people eligible for social security benefits because of total disability, 1 is eligible because of the diagnosis of emphysema. Its total death rate exceeds that of tuberculosis.

Its incidence is much higher in areas that have a high degree of air pollution. It occurs chiefly in men over the age of 35 and who, generally, are heavy cigarette smokers.

Emphysema, chronic bronchitis, or obstructive airway disease, whatever it is called, is not a communicable disease like tuberculosis. Nor is it a dramatic one like lung cancer. These are the reasons you don't read much about it.

The condition begins insidiously. In what the American doctors call chronic bronchitis, the individual often doesn't realize how long he has been coughing. Coughs have become a part of living, and doctors themselves are hard put to say the coughing is normal or something to watch. Even doctors cough.

One definition of a chronic cough is that of the patient who coughs more than his doctor does. This leaves a lot of diagnostic room.

The cough of the victim of chronic bronchitis, or emphysema, is not the dry, hacking cough. It is the so-called productive cough, persistent coughing accompanied by an overproduction of sputum, throat-clearing (actually lung-clearing), and the necessity to swallow or spit out the secretions.

That is chronic bronchitis, as both the American and British physicians agree. At some point, however, the victim begins to show shortness of breath. The British continue to call this bronchitis; the Americans call it emphysema.

But shortness of breath is also a complicated business. It is associated with extra girth, and of aging. These two factors alone delay diagnosis of the more grave form of obstructive airways (lung) disease.

Usually, by the time the American doctors get around to diagnosising the condition as emphysema there is little they can do for it except to treat its symptoms. By then, obstructions of airways by excess secretions may be so severe that victims may die in the midst of an acute episode.

This is a relatively rare occasion. Much more commonly the condition hangs on and gradually increases in severity until there is no longer doubt that emphysema has set in.

X-rays, so valuable in lung cancer and tuberculosis, are of limited value in diagnosing emphysema or its precursor, bronchitis. Telltale shadowings on X-ray films may suggest the diagnosis, but usually the physician is most guided by the patient's symptoms and appearance.

In acute distresses, the victim of emphysema is literally gasping for breath. He appears to be strangling in his throes. His face is drawn by his efforts, and if you look closely enough you will observe it has taken on a bluish tinge.

He won't say more than a few words, because his shortness of breath won't permit it. He is trying desperately to breathe in, which is what the Greek word emphysema means.

Further signs for the physician's trained eyes show that the chest has assumed a barrel-like shape, a characteristic development to the end product of emphysema. And, most likely, his legs will be swollen.

Finally, the close observer will see a prominence of muscular structure in the neck, which normal individuals do not show. This means that the neck muscles have been overworked in taking over the job of helping to move the chest.

At this point, doctors can do a lot to relieve the symptoms of bronchial obstruction. They can administer oxygen to compensate for the defects in gas exchange within the lungs. They can artificially ventilate the patient, to rid his lungs of excess accumulations of carbon dioxide. And, should the patient be in a condition of heart failure, the doctors have a variety of means to overcome this.

But the basic defect of emphysema has by now become established, and so far as is now known is irreversible. From then on, the doctors can take care only of the acute episodes. Ultimately, in a matter of not many years, death ensues from the basic defect.

This basic defect is a loss of fine structures which normally exist between the major airways of the lungs. The tissues, under the inroads of chronic bronchitis, just disappear; the airways enlarge, and the lungs become more like balloons than the finely structured bellows that nature originally endowed.

Besides treating symptoms, about all the doctors can do to prevent or stave off emphysema is to convince their patients to stop smoking, or, where air pollution appears to be a factor, persuade them to move elsewhere.

All the above information was obtained from experts gathered at a seminar for science writers at Princeton Inn, Princeton, N.J., by the National Tuberculosis Association and the American Thoracic Society. The NTA and its local chapters have recently extended their efforts to encompass other major respiratory ailments as well as tuberculosis.

Negro Initiates Home Policy Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, as the present civil rights crisis reaches new levels of intensity, discrimination in housing continues to be one of the prime problems in this area as well as throughout the country. It is encouraging to note that residents of one of the largest suburban developments here in the Metropolitan Washington area have moved to supply the leadership necessary to bring about prompt and peaceful integration.

In the Sunday, June 9, 1963, issues of the New York Times and the Washington Star, news articles point out that a group of local residents representing the city council and various civic organizations have joined with Dr. Norris Mann, a young Negro pharmacologist on the staff of the Food and Drug Administration, in requesting that he be allowed to purchase a home in Belair, the large Levitt & Sons development near Annapolis.

While Dr. Mann's application was refused, perhaps the real point here is that the residents of Belair have demonstrated their willingness to accept integration, a concern for the rights of minority groups, and the initiative to help bring it about.

It is to be hoped that the Levitt organization will, in the near future, join its customers in exhibiting these traits. As the Nation's largest builder, Levitt & Sons has a great responsibility in this respect. It is likewise to be noted that, as the largest single development in the Metropolitan Washington area, Belair could prove to be a most helpful factor in alleviating the housing pressures presently being experienced within the District of Columbia and set an example for the country.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the two news articles in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, June 9, 1963]

NEGRO INITIATES HOME POLICY TEST—LEVITT BARS CAPITAL DOCTOR—KENNEDY ORDER AT ISSUE

(By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON, June 8.—A Negro physician tried unsuccessfully today to buy a house in a large suburban development here to determine whether the Kennedy administration's attitude toward housing discrimination had toughened in recent months.

Dr. Norris G. Mann, an employee of the Food and Drug Administration, was turned away from William J. Levitt's Belair development at Bowie, Md., by a salesman who said that the sole reason was Dr. Mann's race.

Dr. Mann's application to buy a $15,990 house was in no way legally different from an earlier application to buy in Belair by a Negro Government economist, Karl Gregory.

In the earlier case, the Federal Housing Administration, after attempting to persuade Mr. Levitt to open his project to Negroes, informed Mr. Gregory that it was powerless to take any legal action against the builder. That was in March.

Dr. Mann, and a group of white Belair homeowners who accompanied him to the Levitt sales office today, expressed the hope, however, that the administration might now invoke certain sanctions against Mr. Levitt that it had declined to use earlier.

They cited the outbreaks in Birmingham and elsewhere and the intensification of Negro demands for equality throughout the country.

Under the antidiscrimination order issued by Mr. Kennedy in November, the Government can deny financing assistance to builders who will not open their housing projects to all applicants, regardless of race.

Mr. Levitt is using Government financing at Belair, but he obtained the financing prior to the effective date of the antidiscrimination order.

As a result, the Federal Housing Administration has said that there was nothing it can do to help Negroes gain entrance at Belair.

Mr. Gregory argued that other steps were available, including denial of financing to Mr. Levitt on projects elsewhere.

The language of the antidiscrimination order does not make entirely clear whether it can be applied only on a project-by-project basis or whether a builder can be penalized for discrimination in one project by denial of financial assistance for others. Some of Mr. Levitt's projects elsewhere are now open to Negro occupancy under State antidiscrimination laws.

Dr. Mann's application at Belair was supported by a group of Belair homeowners, including a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, two members of the city council and the incoming president of the Belair Citizens Association. They said that the presence of Negroes in the development would be accepted by the community.

[From the Washington Post, June 9, 1963]

BELAIR REJECTS SALE TO NEGRO

A Negro pharmacologist with the Food and Drug Administration said he was turned down yesterday when he tried to buy a house at the Levitt & Sons, Inc., Belair project in Bowie, Md.

Eleven Belair property owners accompanied Dr. Norris Mann, of 823 Tewkesburg Place NW., when the project's sales manager refused to accept his application and $100 deposit for a house.

Dr. Mann said he asked the manager, Robert S. Langford, why he would not accept the deposit.

"His answer was that due to the local customs and traditions that Levitt & Sons would not like to be the first nor the last to desegregate," Dr. Mann said.

A spokesman for the Levitt firm later issued a policy statement saying: "We certainly don't expect to be last in complying when such a general solution (to discrimination) becomes available. But neither can we be the first now to set a new pattern in the area."

FEARS ECONOMIC SUICIDE

Levitt's policy to "obey the law and follow local custom. To do anything else would be, for us, economic suicide," the firm said.

Dr. Mann said this is the second time he has been refused a Belair home because of his race. He tried a year ago and was told that the segregation policy might change in the near future, he said.

Last March, the Federal Housing Administration received a complaint from Karl D. Gregory, a Negro economist with the Budget

Bureau, that the Levitt firm refused to sell to him.

The FHA said then that it could do nothing in the matter because Levitt had secured Federal financing before a Presidential antidiscriminatory housing order was issued.

PLANS TO FILE COMPLAINT

Among others who accompanied Dr. Mann yesterday were:

The Reverend Reinhart B. Gutmann, staff member of the Christian Social Relations Department of the National Council of the Episcopal Church; Robert L. Nelson, special assistant to the staff director of the Civil Rights Commission, and Ronald Natalie, staff attorney to the commission. All were acting as private citizens who are Belair property owners, they said.

Dr. Mann said later he wanted to move to Belair because the houses were good buys and it would be closer to his wife's job at the Glenn Dale Sanitorium.

He plans to file a complaint with the FHA and the Presidential Committee on Fair Housing.

The Freedom Academy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion has long been noted for its patriotism and devotion to country. Throughout its history, it has recognized that communism must be fought on many fronts with many weapons. East Atlanta Post No. 159 has recently adopted by unanimous vote, a significant resolution concerning the proposed "Freedom Academy." I am pleased to offer it for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

AMERICAN LEGION POST NO. 159 RESOLUTION

Whereas the Freedom Academy bill (S. 414; H.R. 1617, etc.) was passed by the U.S. Senate in year 1960, though failed to pass the House; and

Whereas this Freedom Academy bill is designed to combat the Soviet research and training program on nonmilitary conflict in political warfare; and

Whereas this being a different kind of conflict on nonmilitary struggle being promoted and sponsored by the Communist in every school and/or organization in all countries in and outside of Russia; and

Whereas the United States in Senate revised bill S. 414 proposes to set up a school, the Freedom Academy, which would act on the same basis as West Point or Annapolis in training combat forces, yet to be known as nonmilitary; therefore be it

Resolved, That members of East Atlanta Post 159, of the American Legion, ask the Georgia Department Executive Committee to memorialize the National Executive Committee to petition the U.S. Congress to adopt the S. 414 bill and the H.R. 1617 bill, as sponsored by the Orlando Committee, of Orlando, Fla.; further

Resolved, a copy of these resolutions be furnished our Representatives in Washington, D.C., and a copy also be sent to the Atlanta Newspapers, Inc., in Atlanta, Ga.

Unanimously adopted this 23d day of April 1963.

AMERICAN LEGION POST NO. 159.
CHESTER BADURSKI, *Commander.*
WALTER B. JONES, *Adjutant.*

Why Not Let Blue Cross Handle Aged Care?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, while we have been occupied of late with other issues of paramount concern, the national debate over methods to provide hospital insurance for the aged continues. I happen to believe that the best method is a program financed through and operated under social security. Those interested in the issue have advanced alternate methods. One such method was recently brought to my attention by a physician who resides and practices in Princeton, N.J. The method he suggests is set forth in a recent issue of Medical Economics. It is outlined in an article entitled "Why Not Let Blue Cross Handle Aged Care?" With your permission I should like to place before you this article and my reply thereto which was in the form of a letter. The article and my letter are as follows:

WHY NOT LET BLUE CROSS HANDLE AGED CARE?—THAT'S WHAT BLUE CROSS AND THE A.H.A. PROPOSE AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE ADMINISTRATION'S HEALTH CARE PLAN—HERE'S WHY THEY SAY THE GOVERNMENT MUST PAY FOR HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED, BUT BLUE CROSS SHOULD RUN THE PROGRAM

Practially all the aged need help in paying for hospital insurance policies. It's got to be Government help, and "the tax source of the funds is of secondary importance to us." The important thing is for the insurance to be purchased and administered through the voluntary nonprofit prepayment system.

That's the gist of two public statements made last year by Blue Cross and the American Hospital Association. They did not attract much attention then; President Kennedy's aged-care plan took the play away from them. But after the Kennedy plan was comprised and defeated in the Senate, some Congressmen took a second look at the Blue-Cross A.H.A. proposal. Its combination of Government money and private initiative may turn out to be a popular political mix in 1963.

Can you pocket the Government's money without winding up in the Government's pocket? A good many doctors have wondered if that's where the Blue Cross-A.H.A. proposal might lead. So Medical Economics Associate Editor Carlton Smith recently put some pointed questions to Walter J. McNerney, president of the Blue Cross Association. Here are the highlights that emerged from their discussion:

"Question. Mr. McNerney, doesn't your proposal call for a kind of Government subsidy of Blue Cross?

"Answer. No. What we've proposed is Government subsidy of the 65-and-over age group to help them buy the hospital care protection they need but can't afford.

"Question. Do you mean that assistance would be given directly to the aged to help them pay for Blue Cross coverage?

"Answer. We haven't specified Blue Cross. Our proposal was that the administrative machinery of the entire voluntary prepayment system be used. There's already a shortage of skills on the administrative side of health care. So to create a parallel organization as a Government agency would only heighten the shortage and make for unnecessary duplication.

"We propose to make use of the experience that the voluntary system has acquired in enrolling millions of subscribers. Blue Cross, for example, has developed a high degree of sophistication in working with doctors, hospitals, and subscribers. As a result, quality of care isn't subordinated to purely quantitative considerations. For quality hospital care, the U.S. public needs that kind of experience—and it can't be acquired overnight.

"Question. Why, then, have Blue Cross and the hospitals proposed using Government money to subsidize the over-65 group?

"Answer. Because Blue Cross can't provide the money, particularly for people reaching retirement age who never had Blue Cross during their working years. They never participated in creating the plan's reserves. Blue Cross can't undertake to subsidize a special group and at the same time continue to be competitive.

"Question. What about the hospitals? Couldn't they give aged patients a discount?

"Answer. That might have been possible back in the days when a hospital was a 'house of mercy' with mostly volunteer labor. Today's hospital doesn't have the financial cushion to absorb such a loss. So if you eliminate the prepayment system and the hospitals as a subsidy source, the only practicable alternative is Government money.

"Question. How much money? A good many doctors aren't convinced that the over-65 are in quite the dire straits that are publicized. How much assistance do you think is actually needed?

"Answer. Blue Cross has made a thorough study of that question. On the average, the aged's hospital expenses are roughly double those of people under 65. Their incomes, on average, are of course considerably less than those of the younger group. And our study tells us that there will always be an aged group in need of some help.

"Granted, not all the aged need help. Some of today's aged are fairly high on the scale in terms of assets and income. Yet what makes the aged unique as a group is the disproportionate number with low incomes and high health care expenses. And because of their fixed incomes, they're usually not protected against inflation.

"Question. If the need for assistance varies within the aged group, how will you determine who gets how much help?

"Answer. Blue Cross and the hospitals have suggested a scaled-income system—more help to those with low incomes, less help to those with higher incomes. An aged person at the bottom of the scale might be subsidized to the extent of 100 percent of the cost of his hospital insurance. Someone at the top of the scale might get a 25 percent assist. And there would be gradations in between.

"Question. Would every aged person get some help, whether he needed it or not?

"Answer. Yes. On the scaled-income system, everybody would receive some help. We feel that the relatively few aged with substantial resources have been overplayed as a reason for not simplifying the subsidy system.

"Question. How would you determine where an aged person belonged on the subsidy scale?

"Answer. Probably by a special report he'd make to the Internal Revenue Service or to some other Government agency.

"Question. Then each person receiving assistance would get his money directly from the Government—as a monthly check, for example?

"Answer. The amount could be added to a Government retirement check, or it could be a separate check. Each recipient would have to supply evidence that he was insured for hospital care—possibly through certification by the carrier.

"Question. Let's take a bank president who retires with a net worth of $1 million-plus and an income of around $75,000 a year. Would he be eligible for assistance?

"Answer. It's conceivable that he'd get a minimal subsidy if he carried health insurance. Whether he'd need it or not isn't really the issue, as far as Congress is concerned. There are strong forces in the country—including people in industry management itself—who feel that after all the taxes they've paid to the Government, they and their employees and dependents should get something in return. If such power groups developed enough weight, Congress would have to see that everybody got something. That's a matter of cold political reasoning.

"Question. Mr. McNerney, wouldn't your proposed system bring the Government into medicine on a large scale?

"Answer. The Government would certainly develop some standards—some controls. But the extent to which it would try to manipulate the controls—to take over—would be an indication of how well or poorly Blue Cross performed. We think our standards and performance are so good that, if we were involved, there'd be no need for excessive Government controls.

"Question. But if you opened the door to the Government this way, wouldn't it soon want to take over?

"Answer. I think not. Blue Cross is covering many retired Federal employes throughout the country, and our underwriting relationship with the Government is working well. The State of Texas is buying Blue Cross for its indigent aged patients, and our experience there is good.

"The administration and Congress might welcome our voluntary prepayment plan as a buffer against the many complex issues that arise in the course of covering a sizable part of the population. Besides, there's a growing bipartisan sentiment that the indigent in this country deserve to get good quality health care. This feeling isn't necessarily prompted by a desire to have the Government take over medicine.

"Question. Granting the good intentions, isn't there a danger that, once you started a plan such as you propose for the aged, pretty soon everybody would want the Government to pay for his hospital care?

"Answer. Some people may be aiming for that. But right now the bipartisan middle group in Congress doesn't seem to be. The essential question is this: Would acknowledging the need for more Government help to the aged strengthen the voluntary health insurance system or weaken it? I'm convinced that what Blue Cross and the hospitals are proposing would strengthen the voluntary system."

DEAR DOCTOR: I want to thank you for forwarding the article entitled "Why Not Let Blue Cross Handle Aged Care?" which appeared in the May 6 issue of Medical Economics. I read that article with great interest. As I promised in my letter of last week, my views respecting the article follow:

Blue Cross, it would appear, is again jockkeying for position as Congress heads toward renewed consideration of a hospital insurance program for the elderly.

The Blue Cross Association proposes that a Federal program for the elderly consist of subsidization of the cost of acceptable private hospitalization coverage (i.e., Blue Cross). The Government's contributions are to be made on a sliding scale based upon individual income.

I think the proposal is deficient on several counts:

1. Subsidization of Blue Cross contracts would involve considerably more cost to the program than if the underwriting function were assumed by a social security fund. Additional expenses involved would include: (a) risk charges; (b) unnecessary or unreasonable charges for overhead such as might be involved in the payment of salaries, advertising, promotion, and lobbying expenses; (c) payments to hospitals in excess of reasonable costs—a reimbursement practice of a number of Blue Cross Plans; (d) the cost of Blue Cross establishment and operation of a national apparatus. Blue Cross, as you know, is not really a functioning national entity, but is, essentially, a loose confederation of more than 70 different organizations. Coordinating all these local plans would represent a costly and complex operation and the national head quarters has not had any comparable task in the past, so that it cannot be demonstrated that the capacity exists. On the contrary, the Blue Cross Association has on several occasions been unable to obtain compliance among member plans with its announced national policy because the authority of local member plans has been dominant.

2. Blue Cross claims that it now has 5 million subscribers who are aged 65 and over. A large proportion of those enrolled pay premiums based upon community rating—that is, rates representing an average cost of all subscribers, both young and old. Blue Cross says that it pays out far more than it takes in from its older members. A program involving Government subsidy would encourage Blue Cross to raise its premium levels to a point covering the actual claims experience of these older persons, eliminating the community rating factor. A factor, incidentally, which had been included in the premiums charged these older people during their younger and more claims-free working years. The Government would thus conveniently relieve Blue Cross of a major obligation by its payment of substantially higher premiums for the same coverage previously provided by Blue Cross at lower cost. This would be a unique beneficial gesture toward Blue Cross and would not affect commercial insurance companies in the same fashion. The commercial carriers, as you know, have been making a substantial profit on the limited coverage offered to older people.

3. There is no question that a social security underwritten and administered program would hold the interests of those insured paramount. There are serious questions raised, however, as to whether many Blue Cross plans have an equal overriding commitment to their subscribers. I think it fair to state that Blue Cross boards of directors are, in the main, dominated by persons directly or indirectly connected with the providers of health services—hospitals, doctors, etc. State regulatory agencies have exhibited increasing concern over this imbalance in representation, and what even borders on conflict of interest. What we want is a program with an unqualified, unhedged, and unlimited dedication to the beneficiaries of that program. I know social security can make that commitment; Blue Cross, at least at present, cannot.

4. No one has, as yet, been able to devise an equitable and satisfactory income test—and Blue Cross is no exception. Such a test would greatly complicate any program and would result in inequities to many beneficiaries. The requirement that millions of people copay premium costs would mean that many might not be able to pay initially or maintain their share of the cost. Indeed, as premium costs went up the burden would become ever greater. But, my principal objection to this feature is that we are talking about a social insurance program, not a public assistance plan with a means test. All beneficiaries should be able to secure the protection on an equal basis; employment of an income test works against this vital principle.

I am not so sure that all of the Blue Cross plans want to participate in a social security financed program. The American Hospital Association statement of January 1962, quoted in the Medical Economics article, says, "The tax source of the funds is of secondary importance to us." The Blue Cross plans, meeting concurrently with the AHA omitted that phrase from their statement. I understand that this omission was deliberate and reflects the substantial opposition of a number of Blue Cross plans to the essential principle of social security financing. Related to this is the fact that the Blue Cross plans do not speak with "one voice." The 75 or 76 plans are, basically, locally and not nationally oriented. Their policies vary, reflecting local biases, prejudices, and methods of operation—many of which would be unacceptable in a national program.

Perhaps the most dramatic illustration of the degree of disorder and lack of agreement among the various plans occurred last fall. The Blue Cross Association, at that time, announced in full-page advertisements that all Blue Cross plans were prepared to offer new plans of hospital protection for the elderly during the fall of 1962. Millions of older Americans were tragically misled by that advertising campaign. Many Blue Cross plans—including the two largest ones—did not offer new programs. The Blue Cross Association could not force its reluctant or recalcitrant member plans to implement a national program. Blue Cross, definitely, does not speak with a single voice. It is, rather, an unled, dissonant chorus.

I realize that the position I have outlined above is somewhat strong. I should point out that I am familiar with a number of outstanding Blue Cross plans which do a fine job of serving the public interest. Unfortunately, too many other Blue Cross plans do not meet the high standards established and maintained by the best plans. I should also indicate that while I firmly oppose subsidies to Blue Cross, I have an open mind on the possibility of making use of Blue Cross in certain aspects of administration of a social security-financed program.

Power Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the officials and white people of Prince Edward County have been under the guns of the Federal judiciary for many years, particularly since the Supreme Court decision of 1954. All during this time there has not been a single incident of disorder, violence, or discourtesy charged to the white people even though during this time there have been some public assemblies that could well have brought on disorder had the white people of Prince Edward been other than sincere and honest in their efforts and attempts to seek legal adjudication in the principles involved in the school controversy.

The Federal Government is now throwing its financial weight against the people of Prince Edward County in that it is making available over $2 million for a so-called study of the needs for remedial training of some 500 Negro children who have been out of formal education for the past 4 years simply because their parents, at the urging of certain organizations, have refused to take advantage of the educational opportunities offered them, which education would be equal to that which the white children are now receiving at private institutions in the county.

On June 7, 1963, there appeared in the Farmville Herald an editorial which outlines the situation in Prince Edward County and calls upon the people of the county to remain calm, patient, and to continue their good behavior toward each other. It is a great pity that the present administration has not adopted the same attitude. Apparently they are welcoming strife, tumult, discord, and riot, rather than have peaceful solutions in the Court.

Mr. J. Barrye Wall, editor of the Farmville Herald, has done a magificient job in keeping the people of his county informed, encouraging them to abide by law and order, and urging upon them a nonviolence course. I commend him for the great leadership he has exerted and only wish that there were those in the National Government who would follow his example.

I commend the editorial to the membership of this body, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial which is as follows:

Power Strategy

In Mississippi, President Kennedy has spent $5 million to force one Negro student into the University of Mississippi. In Alabama, he has sent 50,000 riot-trained Air Force troops, to threaten the Governor of Alabama, at a cost still unknown. In both incidents, legal cases were pending in the Federal courts, which if finally adjudicated would not have required such action by the President or the Federal Government.

In Prince Edward County, the Health, Education and Welfare Department, at the incidence of the Justice Department and the blessing of the President, has granted $2 million to make a 5-year study of the need for remedial training of 500 Negro children who have been out of formal education for the past 4 years, despite refusal of the opportunity and the efforts of their fellow countrymen. Another bureau of the Federal Government has granted $75,000 to the education department of the University of Michigan, as liberal a department of education as can be found in any university, to survey the children of Prince Edward.

We may be thankful that the Army or Air Force was not called out in the case of Prince Edward, and we trust that those who will come to the county for purely educational studies will be of good will and professional interest, not here to agitate our people.

In this case as in the others, litigation is still before the Federal courts. If and when the litigation has been completed, and the "ground rules" of operating educational institutions have been determined, we believe the people in Prince Edward could and would take care of the educational needs of their people, as has been the case during the years.

In Prince Edward the question is one of control of the public schools. No law has been broken in Prince Edward, no court order defied, no bigotry or demagoguery used. The people want to know, and justly so, do they control the education of their children, or does the Federal courts. The answer to this question has not been forthcoming. The importance of a final adjudication of the Prince Edward case cannot be overestimated because fundamental constitutional issues are involved, the adjudication of which could affect the future of education in public schools throughout the Nation, and conceivably the fundamental structure of this constitutional Republic.

Not only are Federal-State relations and powers involved, but the fundamental issue of taxation. It has required 4 years of litigation to bring the Federal courts face to face with the issues. Much of the legal chaff has been blown away and the Federal courts are confronted now with principles of law—of constitutional law—which must be decided.

Prince Edward people have not been sidetracked by economic pressures exerted by the courts, nor threats to the State, in their search for a final determination of the principles for which they have stood since 1955. Nor have they broken a law, nor defied a court order. They have attempted to provide education for all of the children. The white parents have taken advantage of the opportunity, the Negro parents have refused. The Federal courts have added to the economic strain, but the determination of the people have not diminished.

The Federal Government could save $2,075,000 by seeking a court decision rather than adding endlessly to oppression of the people who have suffered enough already, to some extent needlessly.

We counsel our people, white and colored, to continue their patience, maintain their courtesy one to the other, discourage radical demagogs, treat with courtesy those officials of the Government or their agents, in the days ahead. Violence has no place in Prince Edward, nor in the problem we are attempting to solve. We must live here together, long after the would-be agitators have gone.

Prince Edward stand steady.

Organized Labor and the Negro Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, despite some uptrend in the economy recently, unemployment remains disturbingly high. The problem of joblessness, with all the acute human difficulties which can result, is particularly serious for certain groups in the economy. For example, the rate of unemployment is notably higher among those who feel the impact of racial discrimination.

I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an informative article on this subject, entitled "Organized Labor and the Negro Worker," which appeared in the National Review for June 4, 1963.

This article points out that "the average proportion of Negroes seeking jobs is 13.8 percent, while only 7 percent of the whites are out of work."

The article goes on to document a pattern of widespread discrimination against Negroes within the ranks of organized labor, pointing to the discouraging conclusion that, "for the Negro, increased unionization has in too many instances meant decreased job opportunity."

The text of the article follows:

Organized Labor and the Negro Worker

(By Myrna Bain)

At the 1959 AFL–CIO National Convention held in San Francisco, Negro unionist, A. Philip Randolph, presented a resolution calling for the expulsion of two railway unions unless they removed "white only" clauses from their constitutions by a specified date. The response was given by George Meany when he asked, "Who the hell appointed you guardian of all Negroes in America?" A little less than a year later, 10,000 Negro unionists answered Meany by forming the Negro American Labor Council.

The NALC has many stated goals for the future. But all its maneuverings within and without the labor movement in the last 2 years have centered around Randolph's belief that trade unions "are essentially urban organizations and since Negroes have been moving to the cities in ever-increasing numbers, it only follows then, that labor's future is tied up with the future of the Negro."

But labor's future is also tied up with the problems of union corruption, growing dissatisfaction with too many long and costly strikes, and a dwindling supply of new members. As far as the leadership of the AFL–CIO is concerned, more harm can be done to labor's sociopolitical stance by some of these problems than job discrimination or segregation of the Negro in any of the major unions of the country.

Since 1940 the Negro population of New York City has increased nearly 2½ times, to 1,100,000, or more than 14 percent of the city's population. In Philadelphia, Negroes have doubled in number since 1940 to 529,000, or 26 percent. The Negro population of Detroit has more than tripled to nearly 500,000, or 29 percent of the city's population. And the Negro population of Los Angeles County has jumped sixfold since 1940, from 75,000 to 464,000. This vast internal migration from the rural South to the industrial North has been taking place for many reasons, but the principal reason has been employment opportunity.

During the 1940–45 period the hope and the reality of this thinking were sustained. The "open recruitment" policy offered tens of thousands of Negroes employment in steel, automobile, rubber, and packinghouse plants.

But the war has been over 20 years now, and instead of more Negroes joining labor unions, fewer are doing so; for the Negro, increased unionization has in too many instances meant decreased job opportunity.

PATTERN OF SEGREGATION

When the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers became the collective bargaining agent at the Bauer Electric Co. in Hartford, Conn., in the late forties, the union demanded and got the removal of all Negro electricians from their jobs. The excuse was advanced that, since their union contract specified "whites only," they could not and would not change this to provide continued employment for the Negroes who were at the plant before the union was recognized. Similar cases can be found in the Boilermakers' Union and the International Association of Machinists at the Boeing Aircraft Co. plant in Seattle.

Occasionally (after pressure from the NAACP, the Urban League or the Federal Government), a major union will hire one or two Negroes for an apprenticeship program, or promote a Negro who is already "on hand" to a local chapter. But if the larger Negro organizations scream "tokenism" at southerners over school integration—the fact remains that there are still more children attending integrated schools in the South today than parents working and belonging to integrated unions.

The pattern of segregation pervades all quarters of the country and all areas of life, taking one form here and another there. Yet it is almost impossible for anyone not either a Negro union member or an avid newspaper reader, to find more than a slight hint of this new development in the house of labor. No Liberal journal protested any of the discriminatory practices seen by Herbert Hill, labor secretary for the NAACP, when he testified last summer against David Dubinsky's heavyhanded discrimination against Negroes and Puerto Ricans employed in the garment center.

As things are today, no Negro boy attending high school (integrated or segregated) need learn the printer's trade, plumbing, bricklaying, or electrical work, because after school he will have no chance of joining any major union. As a result, today, wherever there are unemployed people, the average proportion of Negroes seeking jobs is 13.8 percent, while only 7 percent of the whites are out of work.

Many proposals have been tendered lately to correct this abuse but the weapons at hand are all administered either by State or Federal bureaucracies which seem to have no intention of upsetting the very foundation (e.g., unions) of their power.

In fact, A. Philip Randolph has dropped the threat of decertification for any union, local or national, which permits discrimination, against the judgment of many members of the NALC. The effectiveness of executive pronouncements on a situation of this sort is practically nonexistent.

Any appropriate settlement of the question of job discrimination will, of necessity, have to be fought outside the established labor councils. Job discrimination and many another problem plaguing organized labor today result in many cases from a concentration of power in the hands of the small group of men at the top. Until the union rank-and-file wants to do something about this situation, and wants to do it enough to buck its own powerful leaders, Negroes will continue to find it impossible to break into the field in a number of trades. The growth of separatist labor groups such as the Negro American Labor Council is assured under the present ground rules.

What Rural Development Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on June 1 the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, the Honorable Howard Bertsch, spoke at a groundbreaking ceremony for a community water system at Esto in Holmes County in my district. We were highly honored to have this distinguished leader in Government in our midst. He has rendered outstanding service in one of the most important agencies in Government. I have watched with appreciation the contributions of the Farmers Home Administration to the farmers of northwest Florida and the Nation for many years. Few agencies have contributed more to the good of the people. Mr. Bertsch is carrying on the fine tradition of the Farmers Home Administration in an outstanding way. He has made significant improvements in the operation of the agency, and I am greatly impressed by his service.

His speech follows:

WHAT RURAL DEVELOPMENT MEANS

(By Howard Bertsch)

I am delighted to be here this afternoon. You folks have given me a unique opportunity, first of all to help honor a man whom I consider not only a personal friend but also a dedicated servant of American farm families, and secondly, to recognize publicly the kind of development project that is very near and dear to my heart. So, you see, this will be one of the most productive afternoons I have spent * * * and one filled with great satisfaction and pleasure for me.

You know, in the halls and corridors of the Capitol in Washington, there are statues of a great many statesmen who have served their nation long and well. It is one way a grateful people have chosen to honor their political leaders.

I wish there were some equally dramatic way in which the agricultural community of the Nation could honor men like Bob Sikes who have served American farm families so faithfully and so well.

Those who are fighting day in and day out to support and strengthen the concept of family farming in the United States would just literally be overrun if it were not for men in the Congress like Representative Sikes.

Let me give you a concrete example. It's no secret to many of you that in the period 1953–60, my own agency, the Farmers Home Administration, stood in real danger of being liquidated. An agency with the mission of helping small family farmers, Farmers Home found itself under the direction of an administration that wanted small and medium size family farmers eliminated from the American scene. It was one of their main solutions to the farm problem.

Year after year during that long and arid time, the requested budget for Farmers Home Administration was cut way below the needs of farm families. The policy very frankly was to phase out the agency and thus the farm families it was set up to help.

However, the folks in charge during those years overlooked one important factor. They overlooked the fact that there were men in key positions in the Congress, like Bob Sikes, who were willing, able and eager to stand up and be counted on the subject of helping farm families. These Congressmen simply would not permit the administration at the time to destroy Farmers Home and thereby wipe out the last chance many farm families had of saving their farms, their livelihood, and their self-respect.

So, whether you know it or not, Bob Sikes was one of that band of courageous Congressmen who saved the Farmers Home Administration. Without exaggeration, it was he and his colleagues who made possible the project and others like it that we are beginning here today. For he helped keep the agency alive until a new day could dawn for it, and a new spirit of service could motivate and propel the work it does.

Since 1961 the Farmers Home Administration has been overhauled, modernized, broadened in its operations and in its opportunity to be useful.

The agency's programs are now tailored to meet specific rural problems. They are now much more effective in strengthening family farming and providing supplementary credit for development of the farm family's community.

FHA can—and is—supplying capital to those owners and operators of family farms who face the alternative of growing—or going.

We now make ownership loans of up to $60,000; operating loans of up to $35,000. This means the agency can supply capital in large enough amounts to help eligible farmers position themselves for the technological race of the 1960's.

We're also concentrating on the problems of deserving young farmers who require large amounts of capital to get started in farming.

At the other end of the scale, FHA also has strengthened and expanded its loans to farmers on small units who draw most of their income from off-farm work.

Finally we are undertaking to be useful to a group of farm families who because of age or other limitations can make their best contribution to their communities and to our national life by continuing to farm in a limited way where they are, who can repay modest loans and who will live better by having the help we can provide.

Other significant steps were taken in both 1961 and 1962 to enable the Farmers Home Administration to do the job it was established for: Strengthening family-type farming and rural living through the unique combination of credit plus counseling.

Housing loans to rural residents including special programs for the elderly. Loans for recreation enterprises, for rural renewal, for broadened public facilities, to finance changes in land use—all these tools have been added to the FHA kit.

We have the opportunity now to assist farmers and other community leaders in improving the entire rural environment.

In 1962 FHA loaned rural families $754 million. This was the largest amount of loans during any 12-month period in the history of the Farmers Home Administration.

It was 50 percent more than in 1961, a new record at the time; 120 percent more than the amount loaned in 1960.

Approximately 214,000 families used Farmers Home Administration credit during the last year. This was 17 percent more than in the previous 12-month period, and 24 percent above 1960.

In the State of Florida, Farmers Home Administration loaned more than twice as much money to rural families in 1962 than in 1960. The agency's housing program virtually tripled here in Florida during that period.

These days, we cannot look at one segment of rural America, be it the farm segment, or business groups, or those needing jobs, or the growing number of older folks—we cannot look at any one of these segments and say, "This group is the key. If we meet the problems of this group, we will put countryside America back on the road to progress and prosperity."

Rural America is changing. With the change we are seeing a new interdependence among groups.

Healthy agriculture depends more and more on a high degree of managerial skill among farm operators and a high degree of labor skill among farmworkers. It also depends upon adequate sources of capital, in short, on enlightened lending practices.

Most rural areas, in turn require a mixture of farm and nonfarm jobs to support their population and keep their young folks at home.

As a matter of simple fact, the majority of the 54 million people living in what is classified as rural America today do not live on farms at all.

Even among farm families, about one-third of the income is earned in occupations other than farming or comes from some other nonfarm source.

We are developing a complex society out in the countryside and in the small towns and trading centers serving the countryside.

We need to recognize, however, that there are several major groups among these 54 or so million people who do have serious and unique problems. I believe that the people in these particular groups merit some special attention.

First of all, the older folks. The average age of farm operators in the United States now stands at nearly 51 years. Fifteen percent of all active farm operators are 65 or over. The burdens of poverty, of poor housing, low income, a life of poorly paid labor, fall with particularly cruel force upon the aged.

As I have said, my agency recently started several programs of loan assistance to stimulate housing for the elderly in rural areas. This is a step that has long been needed.

However, I do not think we should overlook some of the other needs of our citizens who are 60 and over. Like the rest of us, they desire a stable and happy life, productive and interesting work, opportunities to grow and learn, to stretch their minds with new and useful interests.

At the other end of the age scale, another group that has special needs in rural America are the youngsters. The education and training of rural youth is probably the single most serious educational issue facing the United States today. Take note, for a second, of these facts—Fact one: Boys raised on farms are receiving less education today compared with their city cousins than they did 25 years ago. Two decades ago, the difference in school years completed between the two groups was 1 year, today it is nearly 2.5.

Fact two: High school graduates from farm homes are much less likely to attend college than are urban high school graduates. Only one-third of the 1960 high school graduates from farm homes enrolled in college that fall, compared with nearly one-half of the urban graduates.

Fact three: There are still far too many inadequate schools in farming areas. According to some educational experts, the criteria for adequacy in a high school in terms of teaching personnel and facilities is a graduating class of 200.

If this is true, too many of the Nation's rural high schools still are too small to provide the kind of education in depth that young people must have to cope with an increasingly complex society.

A third group in rural America whose situation requires the particular attention of the Nation are the unemployed and underemployed.

It's a little known fact that nearly 4 million people living in the rural areas of the Nation are unemployed all or part of the time.

This figure includes the members of some 1 million families living on small farms who don't have, and can't get, the resources needed to be successful under modern agricultural conditions. They are underemployed. Their farm production is presently too limited for an adequate income. They can't find supplementary work in their areas. It's just not available or, if available, they cannot qualify for it.

To help farm and other rural leaders solve this deep-seated problem of unemployment on the farms and in the small towns that make up rural America, the Department of Agriculture has underway a national rural areas development program. This part of Florida is among the areas active in the program.

With the new authorities I spoke about earlier and the new spirit of service that permeates all of the Farmers Home Administration, we are moving rapidly into this broad community development field.

Let me give you three illustrations of what I mean. All three are familiar to many in this audience.

Ever since its founding this community has been without a dependable and decent supply of water. A few miles away, the Navy may be flying 1000-mile an hour airplanes, but here in Esto some 90 families still must use a source of water not much different from that in use 100 years ago.

Now, anyone can analyze the impact of this situation on the long-range development of a community. A young couple wanting to buy a home and settle down in such a community will think twice before they do. Why should they spend an extra $1,000 or so to drill a well, which then may—or may not—provide a dependable source of water. It is on just such individual family decisions that the life and future development of a community rests.

In the middle of the 20th century, Americans, particularly young Americans, will not force their families to live without the facilities they have learned to take for granted. The community that cannot provide these facilities will simply wither away.

Therefore, the project which is being started here today will stand as concrete evidence of what Farmers Home Administration can do to stimulate community development.

My second example is housing. After scarcely more than a year and one-half of experience with the new Farmers Home Administration rural housing loan program, I would say unequivocably that better housing is the number one need in rural America.

For the period, July 1962 through June of this year we had $182 million available for rural housing loans. Virtually all of these funds have been loaned. Yet, the demand everywhere remains strong.

The experience here in Holmes County has been repeated all over the Nation. Since July 1, we have made enough loans in this county to build 50 houses. Yet, I regret to say, Farmers Home Administration is not beginning to meet all of the needs here for housing credit to supplement that available from conventional lenders.

Decent housing, housing comparable to what you will find in a modest-income suburban community, is another key factor in rural development.

Housing has both direct and indirect effects. The 50 houses that will be built here in Holmes County through the Farmers Home Administration program make up the equivalent of a small industry, when measured by the jobs they'll create, the business they'll generate in stores and shops. They are directly contributing to the economic growth and progress of the area.

In addition, and even more important, this new housing will make your communities even more attractive and pleasant places in which to live. Like the water system here in Esto, they will encourage folks, particularly young folks, to make their homes in this area.

Two things are the key to rural development—environment and jobs.

The neighborhood environment must be attractive to families, and there must be jobs to provide a living for these families.

My first two examples centered on the environment part of the equation. My third has to do with jobs.

As some of you know, Holmes and Washington Counties are among the first six areas in the Nation to be selected as rural renewal areas.

Farmers Home Administration has assigned a young fellow, Bill Weathers, to these two counties. He is one of the best men the agency has, not only in Florida but anywhere. He has one job only while he's here—to help you folks make the best use of all the resources available, including those from the Federal Government—in developing your area.

I have discussed this program at some length with Bill. I am impressed by the cooperation he has received and the interest he reports among all groups and in all sections of the two-county area.

Bill is not a miracle worker. He cannot pull projects out of a hat. But his job is much more useful, not to say practical—to help you gain every possible benefit from the sources of technical assistance and financing that are available, including both Government and private sources.

Many Federal agencies now supply financial assistance for local projects that will develop an area. Farmers Home Administration is an outstanding example. Small Business Administration, the Area Redevelopment Administration, the U.S. Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare also are of great importance.

The problem facing any community is to use these and other programs as effectively as possible in a way that will meet the particular needs of that community.

By assigning a specialist like Bill Weathers here, Farmers Home Administration is trying to help solve this problem in the two-county area.

Area development is a long, slow, and painful process. Obtaining financial assistance from Government agencies usually involves knowledge and patience in about equal measure. (Some would say, patience is the main ingredient.)

Nonetheless, the development of new and better opportunities for employment is very nearly the key to survival for many farming communities and the small towns serving them. Whatever patience, whatever skill, whatever knowledge and stick-to-it-iveness is required—well, they must be forthcoming.

The expanded kit of tools made available to the FHA and other Government agencies can only support what must always be local plans for progress, locally made and locally directed.

Ultimately, the decision as to where rural America is headed must be the decision of thousands of rural communities here in north Florida and all across the land.

Local people—those who live on the land and use it—must make farm and rural development their own business and carry out their own programs. The Department has resources that will help them. What is even more important, the Department under Secretary Freeman is again responsive and sympathetic to the needs and aspirations of farm families and rural communities facing the challenges and problems of the 1960's.

The real challenge however is to the leadership of the people of this great countryside of ours.

What is needed in the decade of the 1960's, are effective programs for total development of rural areas. These include:

1. Encouraging by every means at our command a vigorous, growing family farm economy.

2. Getting land not needed for farm production into recreation uses, into conservation, and trees and wildlife preservation, instead of leaving it idle.

3. Creating more jobs out in the countryside.

4. Helping the fine young people growing up on farms and in rural communities to get the education and training they absolutely must have in the America of the space age, of the common market, of the 2-hour flight to Europe * * * in the American century of leadership and dynamism.

We must ask ourselves what kind of countryside do we want both now and for our children and their children? On the one hand, factory-type farms, decaying towns, vast expanses of unused land? On the other, progresive family-type farms, prosperity in the towns, expanding industries and service trades, all our resources, both human and physical, put to use—their best use?

George Santayana, a famous American philospher, has said those who forget the lessons of the past will be forced to repeat them. The history of nations is filled with examples of what trouble and woe can be spawned when rural decay is permitted, indeed encouraged, to destroy the fabric of a once bustling, vigorous society.

What my own agency, the Farmers Home Administration, has done in the last 2 years to retool for the future is an outstanding example of Secretary Freeman's determination to help get rural America moving ahead, to choose the right way. And it's our way of keeping faith with those in Congress who have given us their support, their vote of confidence, their endorsement—our way of demonstrating our appreciation for statesman like Bob Sikes.

Deficit Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the theme of this Congress concerns efforts to impose new economic theories and drastically revised concepts of financial management. There are many Americans in and out of Congress who are seriously concerned over this kind of experimentation and who do not wish to see the Nation's resources committed to such a course on the basis of the flimsy supporting evidence we have been given.

The theory of a planned deficit is rightly under fire, in my opinion. We are being told, in effect, that a deficit is fine if it is planned. Deficits which are unplanned are wrong. This is only a shade away from the "newthink" of George Orwell's "1984." It is stated with such all-pervading confidence that it allows no discussion of the disastrous consequences of an unplanned deficit piled on top of one that is planned.

Broad discussion of the new thinking in terms of past national experience is resulting in greater caution on Capitol Hill than at the White House. I wish to commend to the Congress the following editorial broadcast on June 5, 1963 by the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co.—WBT, WBT-FM, and WBTV—of Charlotte, N.C., which comments upon the debate:

Former President Eisenhower in an article in the Saturday Evening Post accused the Kennedy administration of adopting a philosophy of spending for the sake of spending. In general we agree with the former President's warning, because we have been critical of the Kennedy administration on the same ground. Deficit financing has been aptly designated as a shot in the arm, because it brings a little more than a temporary sense of well-being.

Mr. Eisenhower, however, should be careful about denouncing other administrations on this score, because his administration set the record for spending up to that time. It was responsible for the $5-billion upper Colorado project and for an interstate highway system the cost of which is yet to be calculated.

Nevertheless, a warning against deficit financing is welcome even when it comes from a source that is not itself without blemish. But Eisenhower did not make unsound financing an official policy. Mr. Kennedy did that, it seems to us, when in his speech before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in April he said "a cut of $5 billion now from the proposed Federal budget * * * would cause one million fewer jobs."

We believe this to be in error, because the Federal Government does not earn the money it puts into creating jobs; it merely collects it from business and individuals in the form of taxes. If that five billion were not collected as taxes, it would remain in the hands of business to be reinvested in capital equipment for new jobs. Hence, the jobs would be created anyway, and, when created by business, they would represent a permanent addition to the country's capital wealth, and an additional source of tax revenue.

Mr. Eisenhower's former chief economic advisor, Dr. Raymond Saulnier, refuted the administration theory that to cut the budget would decrease the number of jobs and bring on a recession. Dr. Saulnier showed that this recession occurred during a period of increasing Federal expenditures; hence, it must be accounted for otherwise. Mr. Kennedy told the editors the recession of 1957–58 was caused that way. One factor was the sudden switch of a large amount of automobile buying from domestic cars to foreign compacts. Business had overspent on new capital equipment and cutback in 1957. Housing starts, equaly overdone, made a sharp decline. These, Dr. Saulnier says, were the real causes of the recession.

This debate is with those who hold that wealth can be distributed by merely taking it away from one group and giving it or its benefits to another. That view is so oversimplified as to be impracticable. The superiority of free enterprise is that it does not try to make everybody equal, but it does make everybody better off. In that way its actual distribution of wealth is more fair than any theoretical distribution yet devised.

Jobs Go Begging as Automation Advances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, because of a high level of unemployment and rapidly advancing technology, many persons often lose sight of the large number of jobs now going begging in our economy. An excellent example of this is the situation at the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Washington.

According to a Washington Post article of June 5, in spite of the fact that the C. & P. "has been automating like mad for the past decade," it cannot find enough workers to fill new jobs opening up in the company. Within the past 3 years, the company has added 400 persons to its payroll and foresees a need for 775 additional operators and clerical employees by the end of 1963.

As I have stated before, the key to reaping the benefits of automation in the telephone industry, as well as any other, lies in effective training and retraining programs to fill the job vacancies being created. This article makes that point clear, and under unanimous consent, this article from the June 5 Washington Post in the Record at this point:

AUTOMATION FAILS TO CUT C. & P. JOBS

(By S. Oliver Goodman)

Automation cuts down jobs? Tisn't so, according to the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Washington, which has been automating like mad for the past decade or longer.

The Washington area phone firm yesterday announced a new long distance office at 725 13th Street NW., is nearing completion. To be named the Potomac office, it will serve the downtown area.

The new office, with 48 operating positions, represents a capital investment of $400,000.

What with automatic long-distance dialing and other robot devices, it seemed proper to ask a spokesman of C. & P.: "Well, how many girls and other employees will this new station displace?"

The answer was a revelation. Fred W. Langbein, C. & P. representative; pulled out some notes and asked some questions of his own.

"Do you know that we would like to hire immediately some 275 additional operators? And we'll need 325 more operators by the end of this year?

"In spite of automation, do you know that C. & P. badly needs 175 more clerical help and would hire them today, if available. And by the end of 1963, we could use 450 more clerical help."

Langbein also emphasized that the telephone company is an equal opportunity employer, which means it will hire qualified persons regardless of race, creed, or color.

C. & P. now has some 6,694 persons on the payroll in the Washington area, an increase of about 400 in the last 3 years.

Farley Reaches Hearty 75—Calls It "Respectable Age"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have known Mr. James A. Farley all the years I have been in politics. That encompasses 30-odd years that I have held elected public office. In all these years of my acquaintanceship and friendship with Mr. Farley he has always been the epitome of forthrightness and dependability in a very difficult profession.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the May 26 issue of the New York Journal-American on the occasion of Mr. Farley's 75th birthday. A man of prodigious capabilities and character, honored by both Republicans and Democrats, I feel it only fitting that the few encomia contained in the article be spread upon the Record.

The article follows:

CALLS IT "RESPECTABLE AGE"—FARLEY REACHES HEARTY 75

It will be happy 75th birthday for James A. Farley next Thursday.

"A respectable age," said the pink-cheeked former Democratic National Chairman and ex-Postmaster General, who defies time and calendars by adhering to a work schedule that would crush many a younger man.

He still dictates a minimum of 125 letters every day to a battery of 3 to 4 secretaries and letters go to people whose names he does not have to look up.

The affable chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp. still has the almost superhuman faculty for never forgetting the name of a person to whom he has been introduced.

NO SCREEN

And he is one of the very few tycoons in New York you can talk to by simply picking up a telephone and dialing his number.

Big Jim generally answers his phone himself instead of passing off this chore to a secretary. And he can be patient, affable, and honest, with the most boring caller.

"I always tell the truth," he smiles. "That's why I sleep good every night. I don't know why more people don't adopt the same policy.

"It's so much simpler than first telling one story and then trying to remember what you said so you won't cross yourself up."

HELPED FDR

He still unqualifiedly ranks the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt as the master politician of all times although Big Jim broke with F.D.R. on the third term issue—after opening F.D.R.'s path to the White House.

"He was the biggest man of his day," Mr. Farley said of the four-term President, whom he helped to the 1932 nomination. "I left two very powerful posts, the Democratic national chairmanship and the Postmastership.

"It's not easy to relinquish power. But I don't believe in breaking tradition. I had definite views on the third term."

Last year, he let it be known he would accept a nomination for Governor of New York. About the same time he got into a good donnybrook with the reform Democrats.

Today he would like to run for U.S. Senator.

How is Big Jim going to celebrate his birthday next Thursday?

It will be the same as every birthday since his wife died January 14, 1955.

He will attend Mass, visit Mrs. Farley's grave in Gate of Heaven Cemetery, Valhalla, and the graves of his parents in St. Peter's Cemetery, Haverstraw.

In the evening there will be dinner with his two daughters and their husbands, his son and daughter-in-law, and 10 grandchildren at the Waldorf-Astoria, where he lives.

Does he expect a vote of confidence at that dinner party?

"A landslide," he grinned.

San Francisco's St. Francis Square Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the first cooperative housing project sponsored by a labor union on the west coast is now a reality. This noteworthy step toward solving one of America's most vexing housing problems was taken recently by the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union and the Pacific Maritime Association. I am submitting for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the San Francisco Chronicle describing this unique venture in San Francisco's western addition in the hope that it will inspire others to undertake similar projects.

A combination of high building costs, the high costs of improving land, and a shortage of close-in land in many cities has led to a serious shortage of suitable new sales and rental housing within the financial means of most middle income families. These families are caught between the upper limits of public housing and the lower levels of the private construction market. The most promising solution to this problem is cooperative or limited profit housing. It was hoped that the new Federal Housing Administration program of mortgage insurance for rental and cooperative housing projects, which limit occupancy to low and moderate income families, authorized by the 1961 Housing Act would stimulate more activity in this field. However, the idea of cooperatives is a new one in many parts of the country and there has been a shortage of appropriate sponsors for such projects.

Mr. Speaker, the successful completion of such a project under union sponsorship sets the kind of example that was needed to start the ball rolling on the west coast. The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union and the Pacific Maritime Association deserve a vote of thanks for taking that all-important initial step in the right direction. They have proved that private developers under similar sponsorship can build moderate cost rental housing which reflects the needs and desires of middle income families using the cooperative system of management.

The article follows:

A UNION OFFERS SAN FRANCISCO'S BIGGEST HOUSING BARGAIN

(By Walter Blum)

It's a long way from 19th-century clipper ships to a three-story housing project in San Francisco's western addition, but the connection is there—and it's not as tenuous as you might think.

The ships, or rather their names, are being used for the streets, squares, and pedestrian malls of a cooperative housing development called St. Francis Square, which in turn is being sponsored jointly by those two labor giants of the shipping industry, the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union and the Pacific Maritime Association.

The ILWU-PMA project is unique on at least two counts: It is the first time on the west coast that a labor union has found itself in the housing business, selling apartments on the popular new cooperative principle. And it is the only project in the rapidly rebuilding western addition to be conceived along completely interracial lines.

"We believe a mixed population is a healthy one," says Hal Dunleavy, the development coordinator. "And that's the kind of community we're actively trying to build."

Dunleavy, a private developer, was at one time or another a tilesetter, a gold miner in Arizona, and a political pollster. He sees his project as an augury of the future.

"By 1970," he declares, "over half the city's population will consist of elderly, Spanish and nonwhite. We have to be prepared with an answer to that situation."

Dunleavy's answer is a project where every effort has been made to keep prices down. Estimated monthly charges range from $85 (1 bedroom) to $143 (3 bedrooms, 2 baths), and the down payments are a phenomenally low $410 to $610, depending on the size of the unit.

"That may not be exactly low-cost housing," admits ILWU Chief Harry Bridges. "But at least it's meant for the working stiff."

A top income of $6,400 to $9,750, according to family size, is stipulated. Householders don't have to be ILWU or PMA members, but preference is given to those displaced by redevelopment. Mortgages are long-term, 40-year Federal loans, and because of a special section in the 1961 Housing Act, the interest rate is a staggeringly low 3⅛ percent. The unions put up 10 percent of the construction money, thereby qualifying for low interest; Dunleavy financed the remainder from the Bank of California.

Purchasers get electric ranges and refrigerators, gas wall heaters (two to an apartment), reserved parking space, and laundry rooms. Each apartment boasts either a patio or a sundeck. Two streets, O'Farrell and Buchanan, have been blocked off, and almost two-thirds of the development will consist of malls, play yards, and landscaped walkways.

One of the project's most ticklish problems involved the neighborhood school, Raphael Weill, which is now over 90 percent Negro. The San Francisco School Board finally agreed to contract the district's borders so children from the new project could be accommodated; and Dunleavy believes that, because of the mixture in the project, the racial composition of the school will soon be radically altered. "This is the right way to achieve integration," he says.

St. Francis Square is part of a growing trend among developers to seek out atypical sponsors like churches and unions. "I call them the innocent sponsors," remarks Dunleavy, "because they don't know what they're getting into."

In one respect, though, the project definitely does practice discrimination—it won't sell to single people without families. What's more, adds Revels Cayton, project manager, "We haven't decided yet whether we'll admit dogs and cats. Of course, I really don't see how we can keep them out."

Soviet Trials: Jews Are Target of Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, taking advantage of recent events in the South, the Communist press and radio has been broadcasting to the world of racism within the United States. But on the other side of the coin, there is the racism manifested within the Soviet Union itself, directed not only against people of color, but antireligious as well, including a growing amount of anti-Semitism.

And, also on the other side of the coin is the fact that while there exists in the United States overt racism, this racism is vigorously opposed by our National Government; in the U.S.S.R. such racism is not only condoned but is encouraged.

The Soviets have sought to answer these charges, but their replies have been in the form of words and not deeds; printer's ink is not a fair exchange value for blood. It is incumbent upon the Soviets to show the world that their good faith lies in the work of their hands and not the labor of their tongues.

I am taking the liberty of inserting at this time an article by Roscoe Drummond, which appeared in the Washington Post of May 27, 1963, entitled "Soviet Trials: Jews Are Target of Campaign":

SOVIET TRIALS: JEWS ARE TARGET OF CAMPAIGN

(By Roscoe Drummond)

A vast and many-sided campaign against "economic parasites" is being carried out in the Soviet Union today—with ominous overtones.

Its declared objective is understandable. It is to eradicate widespread economic crime in which large numbers of Soviet citizens apparently engage in one degree or another.

Three powerful instruments of the state are being used in this concerted operation. They are: mass show trials, a mounting number of death sentences, and a nationwide propaganda drive in the Soviet press.

In dozens of Soviet cities people are being mobilized to witness the trials and to endorse the convictions (which always come out the same way: "Guilty"). The crimes are described as embezzlement of public funds and property, currency speculation and bribery. In groups of 3 to 60, the accused are tried and sentenced—without right of appeal and generally to long imprisonment.

Steadily the toll has mounted of those sentenced "to death by shooting." It has reached more than 140. This stark fact of meting out capital punishment for economic offenses is beginning to shock humane opinion and stir protests even from friends of the U.S.S.R.

While world attention has been riveted on the death sentences, there is another aspect of this campaign which is even more ominous. This most ominous fact is that in the show trials, in the death sentences, in the press propaganda, Soviet Jews are being uniquely singled out for attack, for calumny, and for death. Most of the mass trials have been anti-Jewish in character and of the more than 140 sentenced to death, at least 83 have been Jews.

Many thousands of spectators witness the trials, but it is the official Soviet press coverage which magnifies the audience to millions. This is the audience at which the anti-semitic campaign is directed. What is this audience being told?

I have examined full tranlations of many of these articles. They reveal an unmistakable pattern of hostility to Jews. In many of them the religious affiliation of the accused is explicit. But even the word "Jew" is not used, the Jewish names of the accused are prominently featured.

The campaign plays many variations on one central theme: The Jew is anti-hero in the Soviet Union. It pulls out all the stops on the traditional anti-Jewish stereotypes. The Jew is described as having "an insatiable thirst for money and skill at its acquisition." Jews are portrayed as "conniving," "lying," and "bribing." Again and again they are depicted as "the initiators and masterminds of criminal gains." The suggestion is repeatedly made that there would be no economic crime among non-Jews if the Jews didn't put them up to it.

It is a careful statement to say that this campaign conjures up a version of the traditional anti-Semitic fantasy of an international Jewish financial conspiracy. It does so in the most offensive and prejudicial terms. The tone of the Soviet press toward Jews is bitter, spiteful, contemptuous. It heaps upon Jewry blanket condemnation, ridicule, insult, and shame.

The result and, one cannot doubt, the purpose are to encourage and perpetuate the deep-rooted anti-Semitic prejudices that are widespread among large segments of the Soviet population—and to implant them where they do not already exist.

The significance of this campaign is clear, especially since so much of it appears in the same Soviet papers which feature false and degrading images of the Jewish religion. It informs the conditioned Soviet reader that his government believes that the tiny community of Soviet Jews—1 percent of the population—is responsible for 60 percent, in some cases 90 and even 100 percent, of the economic offenses warranting the death sentence.

It is, of course, quite reasonable that Soviet officials should be anxious to reduce the mounting economic crimes in Soviet society, but it evokes a painful memory of Nazi Germany to see Jews again used as the scapegoat.

Artificial Kidney Centers in VA Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article appearing in the New York Times of Monday, June 10, 1963, entitled "Veterans To Get Kidney Centers," in which is described a nationwide network of artificial kidney treatment centers recently established by the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration:

VETERANS TO GET KIDNEY CENTERS—ARTIFICIAL AID FOR CHRONIC SUFFERERS TO BE PROVIDED

(By Harold M. Schmeck, Jr.)

A nationwide network of artificial kidney treatment centers is being established by the Veterans' Administration to preserve the lives of patients who would otherwise die of chronic, incurable kidney disease.

Three pilot units have recently been set up at Veterans' Administration hospitals in Los Angeles, Hines, Ill., near Chicago, and in Washington, D.C.

During the next 2 or 3 years, the Veterans' Administration hopes to expand the network to comprise about 30 units throughout the Nation, according to an officer involved in the development program.

ONLY VETERANS ELIGIBLE

Today no comparable network exists anywhere in the world. Indeed, almost all patients who pass to the final stages of chronic kidney disease die in a matter of weeks or months. It is to save and even rehabilitate persons in this category that the units are being set up. Only persons eligible for treatment at Veterans' Administration hospitals will be accepted.

If the program proves successful it may increase by tenfold or even more the total number of lives being saved from chronic kidney disease. Several thousand die yearly from it.

The program appears to be the first entrance by the Federal Government into a rapidly developing field that has excited much interest and much soul searching within the medical profession during the past year. Federal money has previously been available for research on the use of artificial kidney apparatus for treating chronic patients, but the establishment and operation of nonresearch treatment units is another and a much more expensive matter.

One medical center at present doing this kind of work estimates the cost of treating one patient for a year to be more than $8,000. Since the periodic treatments must go on for the rest of the patient's life, the expense, on a private-patient basis, would be staggering. This fact, together with any artificial kidney center's substantial needs in trained manpower and equipment, has caused much of the soul searching in the medical profession.

By no means is there universal agreement that this much expense is worthwhile under the circumstances, even though lives are at stake. A special meeting sponsored by the National Kidney Disease Foundation and the American Medical Association will convene here June 20 to discuss the scientific, social and economic future of this kind of treatment for patients otherwise doomed.

The new Veterans' Administration program is under the direction of Dr. William B. Tucker, chief of medical services, and is being developed with the assistance of Dr. Harold W. Schnaper, chief of research in internal medicine. Because of the importance that the Veterans' Administration attaches to this program, it has been possible to set it up rapidly, Dr. Schnaper said during a recent interview by telephone. The decision to set up three pilot units was made about 6 months ago. It is hoped that 7 to 9 additional units will be "phased in" yearly until the planned total of 30 is reached.

Dr. Schnaper said it was difficult to predict the number of patients the program might be able to care for when thoroughly set up. He said roughly 300—about 10 patients per unit—would be a reasonable guess.

TREATMENT TO BE USED

The treatment procedure that will be emphasized was developed at the University of Washington School of Medicine in Seattle with support from the John A. Hartford Foundation and the National Institutes of Health. Most of the patients being treated at Seattle have not only been saved from death, but have actually been rehabilitated sufficiently to return to their normal occupations. Some have been totally without natural kidney function for more than 3 years. Similar programs elsewhere have been less successful.

The units in the Federal program will be integral parts of the Veterans' Administration hospitals in which they are located. Because of this, the cost of treatment may prove to be substantially less than has been the case in private institutions. Dr. Schnaper said they hoped to keep the cost down to roughly $5,000 to $7,000 for one patient a year.

Each patient being treated for chronic disease with artificial kidney apparatus visits a treatment center regularly—usually once or twice a week—to have his entire blood supply cleansed by the machine during an all-night or all-day treatment session. The process is called hemodialysis. Through it, the machine fulfills in one session the main function that a person's natural kidneys should be doing daily—that is, cleansing the bloodstream of impurities and maintaining the chemical balance of the blood.

Some specialists predict a large role, relatively soon, for however, except for transplantations between identical twins, these operations are considered.

Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News issue of June 7:

Post Office and Negroes

The promotion of three Negroes to supervisory positions in the Dallas postal system is typical of Washington's policies which try to please everybody—the reason for the pleasing, of course, being votes.

The Government for years has made much commotion about the need of efficiency and qualifications in civil service personnel. To assure those attributes, a grading system was set up.

Now comes another criterion—equality.

Obviously there can't be a merit list and an equality list. A man in the postal service who makes 65 on a test is not equal to one who makes 95. But from all indications, a good case can be made that the man who makes 65, if he has a dark skin, is superior to the 95.

Certainly the Negro should be hired in the system and be given every opportunity to advance. And if he makes the top nine in grading he should get equal consideration with the other eight.

But what is "equal" about jumping over 53 whites to pick a Negro who is No. 54? Isn't such a policy of "equality" really one of inequality for the 53?

Philippine Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, this is Philippine Independence Day, and, in recognition of this important national holiday of our firm friend and ally, the Republic of the Philippines, it is appropriate that the Voice of America has scheduled for today a broadcast of Ambassador Amelito R. Mutuc's Philippine Independence Day message to his homeland.

As a review of his country's recent progress, the message merits our interest, and I include it under leave to extend my remarks, as follows:

Message of the Honorable Amelito R. Mutuc, Ambassador of the Philippines to the United States, on the Occasion of Philippine Independence Day, June 12, 1963, Broadcast by the Voice of America to the Philippines

It is with a sense of profound gratification and a feeling of joy and hope that we observe Philippine Independence Day this year.

To those of us who are so far away from home, Filipinos living as far west as Guam, or as far north as Vancouver and Chicago, or as far south as New Orleans, and as far east as New York and Washington, an independence day celebration always has a deeper significance and a warmer meaning.

Those of us who are fortunate in being a part of the new administration in the Philippines are pleased that today there is recognition, at home and abroad, of the "dynamic year-and-a-half administration" of President Macapagal.

In his state-of-the-Nation address early this year, President Macapagal listed the concrete measures taken and enumerated the first tangible results of his program in regard to the moral regeneration of the people and the faster rate of economic growth of the country.

The performance of his administration matches the promise he made in January 1962 eliciting the evaluation by foreign observers, including the American press, that the Philippines has accomplished the first phase of the socioeconomic development program to make full use of Philippine material potentialities. There is now evident an atmosphere of confidence among Filipino and foreign business executives, industrial leaders, bankers, and investors—confidence in President Macapagal and his administration, confidence in the future, and above all, faith and confidence in themselves.

It is equally clear that many Filipinos, recognizing the intense reformist zeal of the new leadership in the Philippines, and aware of the implications of the 5-year integrated socioeconomic development program, look with high justifiable hopes for the good life, which is the rightful heritage of all mankind.

Gratified then by what has been accomplished, we are now hopeful that we can achieve a steady, self-sustaining growth, and at the same time safeguard the value of individual freedom and enhance human dignity.

The marginal, and sometimes submarginal, lives of Filipinos, as reflected in inadequate housing, food, and shelter, are compounded by a rapid growth in our population.

It is the recognition of this overriding fact—a fact prevailing in other countries of the world—that has made the 5-year socioeconomic development program a vital factor in our national life and economy. In this regard, in the comparatively short period of 1½ years, President Macapagal has accomplished the following:

1. The most disturbing elements deterring our paramount objectives have been removed. The foreign exchange control system, which was the main breeding ground of graft and corruption, has been abolished. This was followed by the prosecution of those who have "utilized organized political power to build business empires, and vice versa; misused public trust to amass wealth; perpetrated smuggling, committee overpricing"; and "labor leaders who have exploited their followers for selfish purposes."
2. Price levels have been stabilized. This is particularly true in the case of rice and corn which are the staple food of our people. According to an Associated Press survey late last year, prices in the Philippines are second to the lowest in the world.
3. These price levels have been accompanied by the rise in income in the public sector and the increase in wages in private enterprise.
4. Philippine export receipts increased by $103 million over the previous year, while the import bill decreased by $72 million.
5. Philippine international reserves grew from a level of $103 million at the beginning of 1962 to $140 million at year's end.
6. Agricultural production increased by 7.1 percent for all food crops.
7. Industrial production for the first 6 months in 1963 increased by 7.3 percent.

The stability of the exchange rate continues and together with the fiscal discipline exercised by the Government, public spending has been kept to the minimum and revenue collections have been increased.

The pattern of these figures—impersonal and dry as they may appear—reveals that the magnitude of the responsibilities, which a year and a half ago appeared insurmountable, has been lessened substantially.

As the Philippines moves with confidence into the decade of the sixties, it is now clear that it is engaged in a peaceful revolution of economic growth that compels greater productivity and savings; that it is in the midst of fulfilling the basic requirements of modernization: better farming, more production, the building of roads, the establishment of power utilities, transportation and public communication facilities.

Our people fully realize that in this movement there are prerequisites, which impel a sense of dedication and greater effort.

That is why under the emergency employment administration, the blueprint for a ₱15 million fishery development project is being planned; the program of agriculture extension intensified; and with the cooperation of the National Resettlement and Rehabilitation Administration, 12 projects for resettlement and the construction of feeder roads are now underway; intensive work in forest conservation and reforestation is being undertaken; and the training and recruitment of the necessary labor for handicraft industries being done with the collaboration of the national cottage industries administration.

The construction of multistory tenement projects has started in Manila's most impoverished district, which will be followed by the construction of similar projects in Philippine provinces.

At the same time, the Government and the Textile Mills Association have embarked on a program to produce and distribute the low cost, durable cotton material, the Pagasa cloth, for our people.

The department of education has formulated policies and implemented measures to improve the quality of instruction and strengthen the curriculum in all levels of instruction.

The department of health has contained the El Tor epidemic and controlled the threat of smallpox. As part of its public health program, it established additional rural health units and completed 31 hospitals.

Attention has been paid to the blind and other physically handicapped citizens by the social welfare administration when it constructed the regional vocational training center.

Industrial peace prevails in the country, the disputes between labor and management having been reduced by 17 percent in 1962, a figure twice less than that for 1961.

A drastic modification in the plans of the Philippine Armed Forces was effected so as to make its activities more responsive to actual conditions such as the modernization of equipment and weapons, the creation of task forces to carry out peace and order and wage campaigns against internal disturbances.

The most significant developments in Philippine foreign affairs include the maintenance of relentless vigilance in combating the infiltration of communism in vital sectors of the Government and Philippine society; the institution of administrative reforms, which have resulted in safeguarding and enhancing the career service; closer relations with other countries; the filing of the Philippine claim of sovereignty, jurisdiction, and proprietory ownership over North Borneo; and the continuance of close Philippine-American relations. Never has this relationship been closer than now, President Macapagal has said. The American Government has shown its willingness to assist the Philippines in every practical way: The U.S. Congress has just enacted laws extending hospitalization benefits and other privileges to Filipino veterans; the Philippine war damage bill appropriation of $73 million was approved last year and although there is some movement afoot to cure certain alleged misdeeds connected with its enactment, I am sure that the Congress will treat this matter with its usual sense of fairness and justice. The U.S. Agency for the International Development, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the International Finance Corporation, the Export-Import Bank, and even many private American banks are more than ready and willing to extend loans and investments to Philippine projects.

The interest in Philippine economic development is not confined to the United States. Other businessmen, bankers and investors in Europe and in Asia, are now exploring the investment opportunities in the Philippines.

This perfectly fits into the desire of our Republic to welcome foreign capital because domestic capital is inadequate to sustain the economic enterprises needed for expansion and for progress.

That these things have come to pass are due to the zeal, selflessness and dedication of the present leadership in our country; to the cooperation and energies of our people; and to the understanding engendered among the peoples of other nations, which share our political persuasion and our economic aspirations.

It is in line with this direction in Philippine affairs that recently as the representative of our Government in the United States, I convoked the First Philippine Foreign Service Regional Conference in North America.

That conference examined with care and admirable diligence the workings of the Philippine Foreign Service in a changing world, and laid particular emphasis on how best the service could help implement the 5-year socio economic development program.

Since assuming my post in the American Capital, I have been fortunate in having been able to project the image of the Philippines and detailed some of the most important characteristics of Philippine conditions. That many Americans, in the public sector and in private, have expressed a wish to go to the Philippines and assist us in giving hope and shape to our national economy, is, to me, a singular source of satisfaction.

I am one of those who deeply believe that there are certain special dislocations in our time, which give us neither security nor solace. The first rests on the discovery of the secret of the atom, which can lead into one of two directions: limitless energy harnessed in the interest of peace or searing energy, which if uncontrolled can reduce the world to cinders and mankind to dust. The second revolves around the conflict between two power systems: the Communist system with its relentless thrust toward world domination; the free, open society, which stands for a climate of freedom under which the liberties and the dignity of individuals, can flourish.

I believe that the Philippines, as a middle-sized state, can contribute to universal peace and progress because as has been aptly remarked, it believes in the "interdependence of nations and the integration of humanity."

This belief, which of course, is not new, was dramatized recently when Pope John XXIII died and the world, mourning his death, remembers with gratitude and admiration, his two great encyclicals, the Mater et Magistra and the Pacem in Terris. These pronouncements stressed the obligations of individual societies to their underprivileged members, the poor, the disinherited, the displaced; the responsibility of affluent nations to the less fortunate; and the urgency of close cooperation between rich and poor countries, such cooperation to be effected "with the greatest respect for the liberty of the countries being developed."

It is within this perspective, then, that as I deliver these remarks from Washington, D.C., for rebroadcast to the Philippines, I am hopeful that all our friends in this country and in other nations will extend to us their friendship, understanding and guidance for the importance of June 12, in the words of President Macapagal, "demands that it be observed with fitting ceremonies to the end that it will be cherished forever in the hearts of the Filipino people and inspire them and posterity to greater dedication and endeavor for the welfare of the country and well-being of mankind."

Civil Rights in Missouri and Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, of late we have witnessed, and are continuing to witness, a new and agonizing chapter written in the annals of U.S. civil rights. It is a chapter filled with suffering and pain visited upon a segment of our citizenry in their continuing struggle for community acceptance of their moral, as well as legal rights. It is a chapter which we as Americans cannot afford to forget, for if we do, the violence of Birmingham, Ala., Jackson, Miss., Lexington, N.C., and the rest will have been to no avail. If any good is to come from this unhappy and sanguinary chapter, it is to bring to the forefront a revitalized awareness of the evils of nationwide racial discrimination and the stark injustices which have, for too long now, plagued the lot of the American Negro. Being an atrophy of human energy and talent, racial discrimination must be eliminated; it serves only as a painful obstacle in man's endeavor to realize his best potential.

Attendant upon the current racial turmoil have been innumerable editorials on the arborescence of continued racial violence. An eloquent and inspiring example is the May 16, 1963, editorial in the Tablet, the official organ of the diocese of Brooklyn. In its thought-provoking presentation, the editorial seeks to apply the message and spirit of love as found in the late Pope John XXIII's great encyclical letter, "Pacem in Terris," to the recent racial disturbances. At this time I insert the Tablet editorial in the RECORD in order that Members of both Houses may be benefited from its import:

[From the Tablet, Brooklyn, N.Y., May 16, 1963]

CIVIL RIGHTS IN MISSOURI AND ALABAMA

Against the background of the civil rights demonstrations by Catholics in Missouri and by Negroes in Alabama, these words from Pope John's peace encyclical are worth recalling:

"If a man becomes conscious of his rights, he must become equally aware of his duties. Thus he who possesses certain rights has likewise the duty to claim those rights as marks of this dignity, while all others have the obligation to acknowledge those rights and respect them."

Thus the demonstrators in both instances, aware of their rights to equal treatment under the law, were not acting rashly or imprudently but were fulfilling a duty, to claim their rights as marks of their dignity.

If some of the methods used are questionable (as Archbishop Toolen has asserted in Alabama) they are to be condemned; but this fact can in no way condone the continuance of discrimination. Rather, the mildness of most of the protests, after so many years of injustice, is to be marveled at.

Much as we deplore the racial goings-on in Birmingham, as a nation we must bow our heads in shame for having tolerated so long the conditions which gave them rise. The rioting, bombing, stabbing, vilification and all the rest of the ugly mess are but the symptoms of a deep-seated social malignancy. Race supremacy—white or black—is the name of the deadly virus.

Sad to own, the outbreak in Birmingham is nothing new in our history. Incidents like it have happened elsewhere in our country, many times, in the North as well as in the South. And we will not see the end of them as long as the color of a man's skin is accepted as reason enough to keep him apart in public accommodations, and for depriving him of the free exercise of the rights guaranteed him by the law of the land.

Nine years ago this week, the U.S. Supreme Court, in a unanimous decision, banned enforced racial segregation in tax-supported schools as being unconstitutional. Desegregation has since proceeded at a snail's pace, and in some States it amounts to very little more than token compliance. Like Catholics and anyone else, Negroes can get tired of waiting. And they are well within their rights in demonstrating publicly for the removal of the indignities and the injustices they continue to suffer through practices of racial discrimination.

In his widely acclaimed encyclical letter "Pacem in Terris," the Holy Father condemned the very evil against which the Negro population of Birmingham has risen in organized protest:

"On the contrary, the conviction that all men are equal by reason of their natural dignity has been generally accepted. Hence racial discrimination can in no way be justified."

What cannot be justified ought not to be endlessly endured, in Alabama or Missouri. We feel that some good may yet come out of Birmingham, even though the price is a big one to have to pay. The cause of interracial justice has always been an uphill fight, but despite the radicals on both sides—white segregationists and Black Muslims—the cause does go forward. Birmingham is a bitter lesson, but it may yet have therapeutic virtue for those who are willing to take the cure.

That fact that the Alabama and Missouri civil rights demonstrations are in the news at the same time could be to mutual advantage.

May we hope that Catholics and Negroes, as well as Protestants and Jews—all of whom are quick to protest injustice against themselves—will be helped to understand the problems of all our fellow Americans.

What of those who loudly claim their own rights but in practice admit to no corresponding duty to acknowledge and respect the rights of others? "Pacem in Terris" is an encyclical of love, but it has strong words for these split personalities:

"Every fundamental human right draws its indestructible moral force from the natural law, which in granting it imposes a corresponding obligation. Those, therefore, who claim their own rights, yet altogether forget or neglect to carry out their respective duties, are people who build with one hand and destroy with the other."

Polar Explorer, Capt. Finn Ronne, U.S. Naval Reserve (Retired)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, Polar Explorer Capt. Finn Ronne, U.S.

Naval Reserve, retired, who has a remarkable record in geographic and scientific exploration of the Antarctic, was honored recently by the Explorers Club of New York at their annual banquet of the Washington group.

The certificate of merit, of which Captain Ronne is the second worldwide recipient, was presented him by Dr. Serge Korff, president of the Explorers Club of New York. In presenting the citation, Dr. Korff stated "that the board of directors of the Explorers Club awarded him this honor, recognizing his achievements in his geographic and scientific contribution to polar knowledge over 30 years of service in exploration."

Captain Ronne in accepting this honor expressed his appreciation with the hope that Dr. Korff would convey his heartfelt thanks for the club's recognition. "It was very thoughtful and gracious of them to remember me at this time," he concluded.

The record of my friend, Capt. Finn Ronne, upon which this citation of merit is based is unparalleled in the annals of arctic and antarctic exploration. To date, Captain Ronne's distinguished career encompasses six journeys to the Antarctic; four of at least 15 months' duration, including one he personally organized and led in 1946–48, as well as four summers to the arctic regions.

Norwegian born and the son of Martin Ronne, who was with Roald Amundsen for 20 years, Finn Ronne's enviable record of geographical exploration of the Antartic was accomplished as an American citizen. Trained as an engineer, he emigrated to the United States in 1923 and joined the engineering staff of Westinghouse Electric Corp., at Pittsburgh, Pa. He became a citizen in 1929. On leave, he served with Admiral Byrd's 1933–35 expedition as ski expert and dog driver and sledged for months in Antarctica's interior doing geographical exploration and survey.

Back with Westinghouse in 1935 he made plans for his own small expedition which suddenly snowballed into U.S. Antarctic Service Expedition when his plans were taken over and conducted by the Department of Interior. As second-in-command at East Base on Palmer Peninsula, he led the main southern sledge party that completed a 1,264-mile sledge trip in 84 days, exploring and delineating 450 miles of new coastline in the Pacific quadrant, and claimed newly discovered land for the United States. On the mountainous Palmer Peninsula he accurately surveyed more than 300 geographical features, photographed them from 12 main control centers and completed a survey map that forms the basis for control of trimetrogon photographs he took on his later exploratory flights over the same area 7 years later. Commissioned a lieutenant in the U.S. Navy in May, 1941, he served in World War II with the Navy's Bureau of Ships in charge of tenders and repair ships for which he received Navy's commendation. In summer of 1946 he was on Navy task force staff surveying Canadian Arctic and northwest Greenland to set up weather stations and construct airstrips at now famous Thule Air Force Base.

Without funds of his own and against great odds, his sheer determination launched the Ronne Antarctic Research Expedition 1946–48. With congressional approval for loan of a Navy ship, he solicited funds and equipment from universities and scientific organizations. The Air Force lent him airplanes for exploration and aerial photography and the Office of Naval Research outlined a scientific plan to follow. The 23 people, including his wife Edith Ronne, the 183-foot wooden ship *Port of Beaumont* was manned and sailed beyond Cape Horn, to Marguerite Bay, off Palmer Peninsula, Antarctica where his ship was frozen in. Based on shore, his party spent the long, dark and cold winter-night preparing to tackle geographical problems on the sun's return. His party of aviation people, himself the aerial navigator, made numerous flights and mapped known and previously unknown land to the south and southwest of the treacherous Weddell Sea. Here the last unknown coastline in the world was delineated; it stretches from Palmer Peninsula southernmost in the Weddell Sea to Coats Land, a distance of about 450 miles. Scientists at base and out in the field with dog teams conducted investigations in 11 branches of science. Mountain ranges with huge glaciers were discovered in the newly explored "Edith Ronne Land" which is more than twice the size of Texas—all of which he claimed in the name of the United States.

The 100 new features discovered includes Isaiah Bowman Peninsula, Gould Bay, Mount Merle Tuvé, LeMay Mountain Range, Sweeney and Lowell Thomas Mountains, and many others. The correlation and location of all of the newly discovered features he located on sketchmaps sent to the American Geographical Society from Valparaiso, Chile. Complete maps were made by the society even before the expedition ship reached New York. This also proved to be a "first" in the history of exploration. A full description of the geographical and scientific accomplishments of the expedition were published in the June 1948 issue of Geographic Review of the American Geographical Society of New York.

The results obtained by Captain Ronne's expedition are found in 15 scientific publications by the Office of Naval Research. Other publications as a result of his expedition were presented the Air Force, the Army, Scientific Monthly, Explorers Journal, et cetera, and the popular account of the expedition in "Antarctic Conquest," Captain Ronne's own story, by G. P. Putnam's, New York. The expedition which cost a total of only $50,000, was financed on a shoestring, but the accomplishments of its 23 members, as indicated in the foreword of "Antarctic Conquest" by Dr. Isaiah Bowman, were much greater than any much larger and costlier expedition of the time. Captain Ronne's work has been recognized in the scientific and geographical polar field. In 1946 he became the first American postmaster ever to set up a post office in the Antarctic and thus gave him official backing to an otherwise privately financed and operated polar expedition.

Promoted to captain in the Naval Reserve in 1953, he served as military commander and scientific leader of Ellsworth Station, southernmost in the Weddell Sea in Edith Ronne Land from 1956 to 1958 with 38 men in his expedition to collect scientific data under the International Geophysical Year program. In addition to a thorough scientific study made by the nine civilians in the party, Captain Ronne discovered new mountains and glaciers in the Edith Ronne Land sector on many airplane flights and these also were claimed for the United States.

During the 1958–59 season, Captain Ronne accepted an invitation from the Argentine Navy to accompany their expedition to their many bases on the Palmer Peninsula and their two bases, deep in the Weddell Sea. Again, in November-December 1961 he flew to McMurdo Sound in the Ross Sea from New Zealand and farther on to land at the South Pole. This visit was in connection with the 50th anniversary of Roald Amundsens sledge expedition when they first reached the South Pole on the 14th of December 1911. In the summer of 1962 Captain Ronne spent some time on Spitsbergen, north of Norway in a small 97-foot long sealing ship cruising along the western fiords of the archipelago studying this little known island group in the far north.

Thus through four yearlong winterings and seven summer-tours in the cause of science and geographical exploration, Captain Ronne has covered more terrain in the Antarctic by dog-team travel and airplane flights than any other Antarctic explorer. All of this newly discovered land he has claimed in favor of his adopted country, the United States of America, in the never ending direction of energies toward the accumulation of knowledge for the benefit of all mankind.

The President's Envoy to Moscow Disarmament Negotiations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, appalling as the President's announcement that we were suspending nuclear testing in the atmosphere and entering into top level disarmament negotiations in Moscow was to the American people, the naming of our top negotiator is simply beyond belief.

The man the President is sending to deal with the wily Khrushchev, to reach an agreement which could result in total disarmament of the United States, is Averell Harriman, the architect of failure in our policies of combating the Communist conspiracy. It was Harriman who arranged the coalition government of Laos at the Geneva Conference which resulted in the present Communist aggression and will probably mean a complete Communist victory in Laos. After the Communists had broken the agreement, it was Averell Harriman who went to Moscow and made the amazing discovery that Khrushchev agreed in principle on the need to keep the Laos fighting from getting out of hand. Of course, Mr. Harriman got no commitment from Khrushchev to stop the fighting instigated by the Communists, nor did he receive any pledge that the Communists would honor the solemn agreement they entered into last year.

In fact Mr. Harriman has been involved in many of the disastrous agreements in which the free world has lost to the Communists in central Europe and Asia, and was particularly involved in the loss of Rumania.

How can the American people now have confidence that the Harriman formula will save us from another disaster? Mr. Speaker, there can be no such assurance because of Mr. Harriman's consistent record of failure in dealing with the Communists. If the President insists on continuing to send the Nation on the suicidal course in international affairs, the least he can do is to put an engineer at the throttle who will recognize the danger signals when they are flashing.

An article from the Washington World follows:

DID HARRIMAN MEET CASTRO IN RUSSIA?—SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATES REPORT OF CLANDESTINE CONFRONTATION IN APRIL

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

The Senate Preparedness Subcommittee is investigating a sensational report that Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman and Cuban Dictator Castro conferred secretly in Russia

Both were there in late April, although this allegation is the first hint of a meeting between them.

According to detailed information from important Cuban refugee sources, the reputed parley took place around April 28, in either Moscow or Murmansk.

Harriman was in Moscow April 25–28, to talk to Premier Khrushchev on the deteriorating situation in Red-threatened Laos. On the basis of a Soviet announcement, Castro was in Moscow on the 28th. From a news photograph released by the Russians, Castro was in Murmansk on April 27. Harriman stopped off in that city on the 28th, on his way out of the Soviet.

NEWS TO HIS OFFICE

Inquiries by these writers at his State Department office, brought a blank reply. Assistants stated Harriman was in Australia, and claimed they knew nothing about a meeting between him and Castro. They didn't deny it, but asserted it was news to them.

The Cuban informants told the Preparedness Subcommittee, headed by Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, that Harriman and Castro discussed reestablishing diplomatic relations in exchange for a further reduction of Soviet troops in Cuba.

Also that Castro brought up the question of resuming trade between the United States and Cuba—which he makes no secret of ardently seeking.

Such a move by the United States would automatically destroy the extensive trade barriers built up against Castro's Communist regime by members of the Organization of American States. The whole diplomatic and trade battle against Castroism would collapse.

The reputed meeting between Harriman and Castro is taken with utmost seriousness by the Senate committee. The report is being very carefully looked into.

State Department and other administration officials are slated to be closely questioned. Meanwhile, the committee is making a thorough study of certain confidential details conveyed to it.

Reason for the committee's concern is the impressive source of its admittedly sensational information. One of the informants is a refugee who gave up an important government job in Havana. Other information obtained from these sources has proven valid.

From these refugee sources, the Senators also have learned that Soviet troops have been secretly moved from their encampments to areas that cannot be easily spotted by high-level (U-2) reconnaissance flights. These significant changes have taken place very recently.

BEARS ON RED TROOPS

They are particularly important as the Soviet Embassy has been assuring the State Department that Moscow is slowly withdrawing combat elements from Cuba.

Intelligence reports do not bear this out.

On the basis of intelligence data, Russia actually is rotating its forces and not withdrawing them. For every shipload that ostentatiously leaves the island, another ship surreptitiously disembarks as many or more troops.

Intelligence estimates Russian troop strength in Cuba at 17,500. President Kennedy has stated the number is 12,500. Cuban refugees claim at least 22,000.

A major reason for this lack of accurate data is that there have been no low-level reconnaissance flights over Cuba since early February. They were suspended on direct orders of President Kennedy.

High-level U-2 reconnaissance flights are limited and infrequent.

This has never been publicly disclosed either by the White House or the Pentagon.

On April 20, 1961, several months after taking office, President Kennedy stated, "Communism is not negotiable in this hemisphere."

William H. Grier—Rock Hill's First Citizen—Is Only Clemson Grad Getting Honorary Degree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose an article from the Rock Hill Herald, Rock Hill, S.C., of June 1, 1963, which salutes the magnificent civic and community leadership of Mr. William H. Grier, leading citizen of York County of South Carolina. I, too, join in this wonderful salute to Mr. Grier.

WILLIAM H. GRIER—ROCK HILL'S FIRST CITIZEN—IS ONLY CLEMSON GRAD GETTING HONORARY DEGREE

CLEMSON.—William H. Grier, president of the finishing division of M. Lowenstein & Sons, Inc., and Rock Hill's first citizen in the minds of most city fathers, will be the only Clemson graduate getting an honorary degree today at Clemson commencement exercises.

Grier, son of a Fort Mill grocer, graduated from Clemson in 1923 with a degree in textiles. Since graduation he has worked his way up through the ranks of the textile industry.

During the 40-year span he has spent in textiles, Grier has observed many changes in methods of production, employment, safety, and other facets of the industry.

Education, he said, is definitely the first requirement for a future in textiles, or any other industry.

"There is a very definite lack of chemical and textile graduates today," he said. "I was at a NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration) conference recently, and those officials are worried about the lack of trained chemists."

Grier said opportunities in textiles are wide open. "There is a terrific future in textiles if a young fellow is willing to work," he said. "Too many young fellows get out of school, though, and are too anxious to get to the top."

He noted that jobs are becoming scarcer for persons who do not bother with a formal education.

"In the future it's going to get harder and harder for young people without a high school education to get jobs in industry. A plant should try not to hire anybody but high school graduates," he added. "We've watched that over the years and it has paid off."

Grier should know. He was among the first in the industry to stress educational qualifications for hiring. "There has been an overall stress of education and a terrific upsurge of research in just the past few years," he noted.

Mills under his management won't hire workers without high school educations.

Required skills are becoming increasingly important in the textile industry, Grier said. "Consumers and their buyers demand quality in the products they buy. It's no longer a question of what will get by. It's got to be right, and skilled labor is a necessity for turning out quality products."

Grier pointed out that automation is "coming fast and everybody is going to have to accept it. I'm against it where it's going to be a hardship on anybody—but it's coming," he warned.

Another change in the textile industry that Grier has observed during the past 40 years was the big upgrading of quality.

"Styling didn't amount to anything then. Now we have to have the color, finishes, and a variety of materials," he said.

"Research has played a big part in the industry. It lends itself to the product and to use."

Grier said the greatest change in textiles was in blends and finishes. "When I started out, manmade fiber just wasn't accepted. But, it's here to stay now," he added.

"For example," he said, "wash-and-wear finishes are comparatively new. That is strictly a chemically controlled process. Frankly, more use of chemistry has been a big trend in the industry. It's a real science now."

Turning to another aspect of textiles, Grier noted that plant facilities and plant safety have become focal points in the industry.

"When I first started out, we paid very little attention to safety. Now I don't know of any plant that doesn't stress safety. Most plants have a man whose sole job it is to stop accidents. We provide our employees with safety shoes, and goggles, and we put up guards around the machines. We also promote safety in the plant."

Of the two-price cotton system Grier had only one comment:

"It is a great drawback and it would certainly help to get relief."

Grier got into textiles because he didn't like farming, or so he tells it.

When he was 17 he won a $240-a-year scholarship to Clemson.

"When I got there," he said, "I found that the scholarship provided for either agriculture or textiles. I chose textiles. I had had enough of farming."

When he graduated, he worked in a plant in Massachusetts for a year and a half. "I liked it from the start. I liked everything about it," he said.

He left the Massachusetts plant and returned to South Carolina to work in the Pacific Mills plant at Lyman, now the Lyman Printing & Finishing Co., sister plant of Rock Hill Printing & Finishing Co.

In 1929 he went to Thomaston, Ga., as superintendent, and, in 1930 he became superintendent at the Commander Mills in Sand Springs, Okla.

In 1933 he returned to Rock Hill Printing & Finishing Co. as bleachery superintendent. He later became assistant superintendent, sperintendent, general manager, and executive vice president. In 1959 he was named president of the finishing division.

At present Grier is a member of the Lowenstein board of directors, P. & N. Railroad board of directors, Winthrop College board of trustees, board of Rock Hill Chamber of Commerce, board of Carolinas United Community Services, board of the South Carolina Association of School Boards, Inc., and is a deputy chairman of the Federal Reserve Board of Richmond.

As president of the finishing division, his main office is in the new office building in Rock Hill, but he goes to Lyman about twice a week. He is in constant touch with both plants at all times and has straight line telephones to both plants as well as the New York office.

"My family is my one hobby," said Grier, "but every Saturday morning I shoot pool at the Elks Club. I almost never miss that pool game."

Grier chuckled: "I guess I'll have to miss it today to go to Clemson."

Seriously, he said, "The awarding of this degree is the greatest thing that has ever happened to me outside of my family. I am very proud and will accept it humbly."

Grier's acceptance of the honorary degree of doctor of laws today crowns a lifetime in which education has been almost as strong a factor as the textile mills he loves. His associates say he has never stopped learning himself.

He has provided his own children with complete educations, and through loans, gifts and occasional anonymous grants, he has seen to it that numbers of other youngsters have been afforded the opportunity to attend college.

And as much as his success in textiles has been the goal of his life, his love of South Carolina has proven even stronger. Little known among his friends and neighbors is the fact that Grier once refused the presidency of M. Lowenstein & Sons because he didn't want to move to New York and leave his beloved South Carolina behind.

Certificate From CAB To Permit Northeast Airlines To Continue Its New York-to-Florida Route Permanently

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to have it noted in the RECORD that on Tuesday afternoon, June 11, the entire Massachusetts delegation to the Congress of the United States, including Speaker of the House JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, and Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, met on the steps of the Capitol with more than 200 employees and citizens of Massachusetts. The purpose was our mutual interest in a certificate from the Civil Aeronautics Board which will permit Northeast Airlines to continue its New York-to-Florida route permanently.

Each member of the congressional delegation spoke at the meeting as well as Mr. Lindner and Mr. C. Sinclair, of the Transport Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO. For the information of my colleagues here in the House, who may not be aware of the importance of this matter to New England, I wish to include the remarks of Mr. Lindner and Mr. Sinclair:

Mr. LINDNER. Mr. Speaker, Senator SALTONSTALL, Senator KENNEDY, and Members of the House of Representatives, I should like to take a few moments of your time to express the profound appreciation of the Transport Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, for your kind attendance at this very brief ceremony, and for your past assistance in other Northeast Airlines' struggles wherein you have so generously participated.

But more importantly, I should like to say to the Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, how very much the Northeast employees appreciate your untiring and unselfish efforts in their behalf. You, Mr. Speaker, have been in the forefront of every situation Northeast has been involved in from its very inception in Boston and New England—later on New York and, finally in the New York-Florida market—even to the extent of appearing personally before the Civil Aeronautics Board testifying in our behalf.

Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the Northeast Airlines employees, Frank O'Connell, and myself, I want to extend to you our heartfelt thanks. And now, Mr. Sinclair, president, Local 515.

Mr. C. SINCLAIR. Mr. Speaker, Senator SALTONSTALL, Senator KENNEDY, and Members of the House of Representatives, speaking in my capacity as president of local 515 of the Transport Workers Union, and in behalf of the nearly 1,500 employees of Northeast Airlines my international union represents, I would like you to know how very much we appreciate you taking the time from your very busy schedules to come here and receive this TWU sponsored Northeast Airlines employee delegation, and our petition soliciting your assistance, by whatever means deemed legal and proper under the rules of practice of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The employees of Northeast Airlines, some 2,800 in number, have for the past year and a half suffered great anxiety—never knowing what new obstacle might terminate their employment. Our employer, Northeast, not too long ago, was on the verge of bankruptcy, mainly because of the short-term financing forced upon the company in the purchasing of new jet equipment due to its temporary New York to Florida route certificate—5-year terms as compared to the 9- to 11-year terms enjoyed by its competitors.

The Board, after due hearing and process, allowed Hughes Tool Co. to assume control of Northeast and bail the company out of its dire financial position. More jets were purchased or leased, creditors were either stayed or satisfied and, for the first time this past winter season, Northeast competed effectively with the other two carriers.

Since the award to Northeast of a temporary 5-year New York to Florida route, Northeast has fulfilled its commitment to the Board that such a route would allow Northeast to go off subsidy and to remain off. Northeast has lived up to that commitment.

We firmly believe that with this kind of determination; the leadership given to management by Mr. Austin, Northeast Airlines president; the financial backing of Hughes Tool Co. and with the faith in our company as shown by this employee representation here today, Northeast Airlines is "Fit, willing, and able."

Should the Board fail to recognize the seriousness of our situation, it will mean that in the very near future approximately 2,000 employees, mainly Massachusetts residents, would lose their jobs. This would mean a loss in wages alone of $10.5 million annually.

Mr. Speaker, I now present you with our petition on behalf of all Northeast Airlines employees, and sincerely thank you all for your kindest attention and courtesy extended us. Thank you.

National Lotteries of Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, all of the 77 foreign countries that operate Government lotteries have found that restraining rather than prohibitive measures are best not only in coping with the gambling problem but in raising additional revenue. Today I would like to go back to South America and point out four other countries that utilize Government-run lotteries as the best, painless revenue producers.

Mr. Speaker, all of these countries make the normal gambling urge of their people work for the benefit of health and social welfare.

Paraguay is a small and impoverished nation of about 2 million people. Revenue sources are few and far between, but public needs are great. Luckily, Paraguay is smart enough to take advantage of a national lottery. The total gross receipts for 1962 came to $900,000, of which almost $187,000 went to the government. The net revenues were used by the department of maternal and child care for the mother-child care program.

Peru is another country that takes advantage of and capitalizes on the gambling spirit of its people. The gross annual receipts for 1962 were $2,506,000. The net income was $406,000, which was used to increase the charity funds of the public benevolent organizations operating the lotteries. These funds were earmarked for hospital and medical services.

Uruguay is also a small country of some 3 million people, but it also has the sense to realize that great benefits may be derived from a national lottery. The gross receipts for the year 1962 came to over $18 million, an increase of $3 million over last year. The total net income to the Government came close to $5 million.

Venezuela is another country where the wheels of fortune spin on behalf of the public welfare. This small nation took in over $28 million in 1962. After payment of prizes, about $2¼ million went to the Government treasury. All of the income was set aside for the support of charities.

Mr. Speaker, with our taxes rapidly rising and with the need for new sources of revenue to meet our public demands becoming more pressing, is there a more painless or sensible way of raising Government revenue than a national lottery? None of these countries think so.

It is hard to understand our stubbornness and reluctance in not having our own Government-run lottery in the United States. If we took advantage of a national lottery in this country, we could raise over $10 billion a year in added income which could be used for tax relief and reduction of our national debt. What a lift this would be to Mr. and Mrs. American taxpayer.

Pope John XXIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, the world recently lost one of its great and vital leaders when death claimed Pope John the 23d.

By reading the extracts from his diary written some 20 years ago when Pope John did not realize what destiny held in store, one can easily understand why this son of peasant parents was later to make such a mark on all of humanity. It is also easy to understand from these excerpts why last week people of all religions, of all nationalities, and all classes were mourning his passing.

Proverbs so aptly states, "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." Pope John's diary reveals a man of great love and understanding who followed closely the teachings of Jesus Christ that we should love one another. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include the excerpts from Pope John's diary which were written between 1938 and 1940 and which were carried by United Press International since his death:

July 26, 1938: "One must make oneself loved in order to impose order, peace, and religious progress."

October 6, 1938: "The farewell to my loved ones, to my mother who perhaps I will never again see on the earth, is always something said, poignant. I know, though, how to be obedient and this tempers and sweetens everything."

October 23, 1938: "We must, in the case of souls, make the effort to approach, rather to penetrate, the spirit with which Jesus cares for them. And surely the spirit of Jesus is regard to them is more charitable than ours."

February 22, 1939: "It is well to let oneself be ground up by pain and by death so as to rise again."

May 10, 1939: "All know how to suggest and more than a few how to criticize, but to direct oneself to a useful and simple service: This is another thing."

September 4, 1939: "It is of great comfort to feel oneself understood, followed and loved. All that happens in a form superior to my merits."

October 1939: "In these days my spirit is filled up with discomfort. On the other hand why suffer? Isn't it enough to do the holy will of the Lord and to adore the profound mystery in the destiny of peoples?"

November 7, 1939: "What more can I wish for in life? Nothing: Beyond a greater effort of perfection in living and achieving my obligations as Bishop and as servant of the Holy Church. Sometimes I am stung also by poverty, that which renders me impotent to help my own who, so numerous in the house, suffer the lack of so many things. Beati pauperes (blessed pauperes)."

February 24, 1940: "To my poor fountain approach men of every type. My function is to give water to all. Leaving a good impression even on the heart of a scamp seems to me a good act of charity that in its own time will bring blessings."

April 13, 1940: "Human love without contact with God leads to every excess and ends in sadness."

June 10, 1940: "The war is a periculum enorme (enormous danger). For a Christian who believes in Jesus and in his gospel, an inquity and a contradiction. I think that from today my responsibility and my obligations of wisdom and of moderation and charity become even more serious. I must be the bishop of all, that is: Consul Dei (Consul of God), father, light, encouragement for all, nature makes me desire the success of my dear country: Grace inspires me from today more than ever to proposals and efforts for peace."

June 22, 1940: "Everything serves to demonstrate that in the sense of true peace in the world either there will be the gospel or we will return to blood."

I am proud to join with government leaders throughout the world and church leaders of every denomination in paying tribute to the life of this great and godly man.

Unworthy Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the May 29, 1963, edition of the Tuscola County Advertiser, Caro, Mich. The resounding defeat of the wheat referendum has been recorded, but tales of "fast plays," as described in this editorial, on the important vote continue to be reported. This particular incident, I believe, is important enough to call to the attention of every Member.

The editorial follows:

VICTIM OF FAST PLAY

An advertisement in last week's Advertiser, signed "Tuscola County Wheat Growers", which urged a "Yes" vote on the wheat referendum Tuesday of this week, has caused some little stir among some wheat growers.

A few have called this office, asking who was responsible for insertion of the ad, and saying they were mad because, while they grew wheat, they were not in favor of the proposition. These callers remarked also that they did not know of any organization called the Tuscola County Wheat Growers.

We believe that those who are kicking about the ad have a very distinct point.

The signature on the ad was a patent attempt to make people believe that there was some sort of a Tuscola County organization which was sponsoring the ad when in fact that was not the case.

The Advertiser feels itself somewhat at fault for accepting an advertisement with such a vague signature, and in the interest of fair play tells the following story:

The advertisement came to us in the mail, with a Caro postmark. Attached to the copy for the ad was a small slip reading as follows: "Duane Andreas, GTA North Snelling Drive, St. Paul, Minn." Under that were the instructions to "make bill out to him (Andreas), send bill to Mike Hatles, Owendale."

After receiving several telephone calls about the matter, we became curious ourselves and after some little effort we found that Duane Andreas is the assistant general manager of the Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association, which operates a big business in Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Montana, and others of the northern wheat-growing States. His address is Box 3597, St. Paul, Minn.

Mike Hatles of Owendale is an area field man for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation section of the U.S. Department of Agriculture or more familiarly the ASC. The area which he oversees is 10 counties in this section of Michigan.

For several weeks, perhaps even months, since this particular type of Government control of farmers has been proposed, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has been charged by the American Farm Bureau Federation and other farm organizations with using Federal funds to influence a favorable vote on the proposition with the taxpayers' money. This present situation in this one county, with an employee of the ASC helping to pass on our bill to the GTA would seem to give some idea that the charges are true.

Nobody who has called, or the Advertiser, questions the right of any group to promote in a legitimate way, such as open advertising, any proposition they favor.

But we, with the maddened wheat farmers here, feel that by a half-true signature on the ad we printed, we have been the victims of an attempted fast play.

We don't like it, and this little incident will make us much more careful in the future.

New Hope for Stability in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, events in southeast Asia during the past few weeks have been disturbing. There have been indications that Communist China has stepped up its efforts to overrun the independent nations to the south of it.

For that reason it is encouraging to note the actions taken by Indonesia, Malaya, and the Philippines during their meeting this week in Manila. These three nations have announced plans for a mutual defense pact against subversion "in any form or manifestation."

With cautious optimism, we can hail this alliance as a hopeful sign. These nations, even while battling illiteracy, poverty and underdeveloped economies, have had the foresight to realize that a common defense is needed against the Chinese Communist menace.

At the same time, there has been agreement on the formulation of the new nation of Malaysia, which will unite Malaya with the British dependencies of Singapore, North Borneo, Sarawak and Brunei. This too is a favorable development since the Malaysia question had been an irritant among the three countries.

It is also encouraging to note that the three nations have agreed to explore an even closer union through some form of pan-Malay confederation. Such a confederation could be a powerful bulwark against further Chinese Communist encoachments in southeast Asia.

The leaders of all three nations are to be congratulated for these efforts on behalf of peace and unity. It seems fitting, however, to single out Indonesia for particular attention.

Of late, this nation has exhibited a heartening maturity and responsibility in its dealings with other nations. Another recent example was the amicable settlement on oil negotiated between Western firms and President Sukarno in Tokyo.

Mr. Speaker, should these trends continue, the Congress would be acting prudently in extending a moderate amount of foreign assistance to Indonesia. By this action, we would demonstrate concretely our approval of these Indonesian policies, while at the same time aiding the people of that populous, strategic and resource-rich nation to develop a more stable economy and a fuller way of life.

I commend the attention of my colleagues to the article which appeared today in the New York Times regarding the three-power meeting in Manila and the possible significance of the plans drafted there:

ASIAN LANDS BACK ANTI-PEKING PACT—ALLIANCE TO LINK PHILIPPINES, MALAYA, AND INDONESIA

(By Robert Trumbull)

MANILA, June 11.—Indonesia, Malaya, and the Philippines announced plans today for a mutual defense pact against subversion "in any form or manifestation." By implication, the agreement is aimed at Communist China.

The accord is regarded as a significant shift in favor of the West in the power alinements of southeast Asia.

The leading foreign affairs officials of the three countries also announced agreement on their dispute over the proposed formation of Malaysia, a union of Malaya with the British dependencies of Singapore, North Borneo, Sarawak, and Brunei.

Under the formula worked out in a strenuous 4-day conference, U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations, will be asked to ascertain the wishes of the people in the British dependencies before Malaysia comes into being on August 31.

After Malaysia is formed, it is proposed that its Government consider a longstanding claim by the Philippines to part of North Borneo. Manila has claimed latent sovereignty over about a third of the British colony and part of Indonesian Borneo. The Philippines maintains that there is a fault in the British title to the territory, acquired in 1878 from a now-defunct Filipino sultanate.

The conference recommended that these agreements be made formal at a meeting between President Diosdado Macapagal of the Philippines, President Sukarno of Indonesia, and Prince Abdul Rahman, Prime Minister of Malaya. This conference is to be held in Manila some time in July.

The meeting also recommended that the heads of government take initial steps toward the formation of a confederation of nations of Malay origin.

The agreements were signed by Vice President Emmanuel Pelaez of the Philippines, Tun Abdul Razak, Deputy Premier of Malaya, and Foreign Minister Subandrio of Indonesia.

Diplomatic observers attached major significance to the accession of Indonesia, a country neutral in the cold war, to a mutual defense pact with two pro-Western countries. This development was considered especially important in view of the recent visit to Indonesia of Liu Shao-chi, the Chinese Communist head of state. The consensus of diplomats here was that Mr. Liu's overtures to Mr. Sukarno had somehow failed.

JAKARTA'S MOTIVES VIEWED

Indonesia's agreement to an alliance with Malaya and the Philippines was interpreted by some observers as a move by Jakarta to edge under the defense umbrella of the United States, which protects the Philippines, and Britain, which has a mutual security treaty with Malaya.

There were strong indications that Indonesia's next move would be to cement relations with her southern neighbors, Australia and New Zealand.

Observers wonder whether Indonesia will eventually readjust her position between East and West by making some move to conciliate Communist China. However, President Sukarno's meeting with Prince Abdul Rahman and President Macapagal in this pro-United States capital will presumably come first.

President Macapagal emerged as the architect of the new pan-Malay alliance embracing the 140 million people of the three nations of common ethnic stock. Both the meeting of foreign affairs chiefs and the subsequent conference of heads of government were suggested by him.

CONFEDERATION IS FAVORED

"The ministers examined the Philippine proposal embodying confederation of nations of Malay origin, and agreed on the acceptance of the idea as a means of bringing together their countries into the closest association," the communique said.

"Initial steps were agreed upon by the ministers in order to implement the proposal. For this purpose, they agreed to recommend to the forthcoming meeting of heads of government the establishment of machinery for regular consultations among their governments at all levels on problems of common concern, such as security, stability, and economic, social, and cultural development."

The communique continued:

"The ministers were of one mind that the three countries share a primacy responsibility for the maintenance of the stability and security of the area from subversion in any form or manifestation in order to preserve their respective national identities, and to insure the peaceful development of their respective countries and of their region, in accordance with the ideals and aspirations of their peoples."

The ministers "recommended that a meeting of their respective heads of government be held in Manila not later than the end of July 1963," it said.

Sources in the conference made it clear privately that the mentions of security alluded to what they termed the "Chinese threat." All three countries have large and economically powerful minorities of Chinese descent, and all have taken various repressive measures against them.

Mr. Subandrio gave the new alliance a title, "Mafilindo," from the first syllables of the names of the signatory states.

Micawber and Haiti

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I was tremendously impressed with the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star on June 9. It is one of the finest and most forthright discussions I have seen on the administration's handling of the situation involving Haiti.

I wholeheartedly agree with the conclusion drawn therein that "the result today is that in relation to Haiti our position is one of total inertia—waiting, like Mr. Micawber, for something to turn up. It is nowhere near good enough."

Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that we can ill afford more repetitions like Cuba and Haiti and it is high time that our ship of state was given proper direction lest it flounder on the rocks of complete loss of international prestige. It is indeed ironic that the present administration which seemed so concerned about our international prestige now so objectly accept one foreign policy defeat after another.

The article I refer to follows:

MICAWBER AND HAITI

The U.S. performance in the case of Haiti has been nothing short of ludicrous. First came an intensive propaganda buildup about the hatefulness of Francois Duvalier's regime. Then, taking our lead from the neighboring Dominican Republic, we shook our fist at the two-bit voodoo dictator, assembled an invasion force against him, evacuated American dependents from his capital city, sailed a fleet up and down off his coast, and put out the word that he was about to flee the country.

An absurd moment of truth ensued. Dr. Duvalier called a press conference: There must have been some mistake, he said. He was not planning to run away.

At which, if you please, the U.S. Government in effect now throws up its hands and says, "Oh well, if he wants to stay, of course, there is nothing more to be said about it."

One thing to say about it is that if the Eisenhower administration had ever marched up such a miserable little hill and then, at the first hint of resistance, scuttled back down again, the howls of the loyal Democratic opposition would have been heard round the world.

Dr. Duvalier, if he is capable of laughter, must be having a pretty good chuckle these days, as he contemplates the fumbling performance of the giant of the north. There is no doubt about his policy. He means to stay President of Haiti, certainly for 4 more illegal years, and to run the country as his private fief. The question is: What is our policy?

It seems painfully evident that the United States currently has no policy toward Haiti. It has sentiments, yes. Duvalier has violated the Haitian constitution to remain in office and he is a tyrant; therefore the United States opposes him. But it is not policy to wish someone to go away. Policy, in a case like this, means assisting someone out of office or assisting someone else in.

Obviously we take the position nowadays that armed intervention cannot be undertaken in this hemisphere, barring a spectacular threat to our security like the presence somewhere of Soviet rockets. There are ways, however, of accomplishing these things.

For one thing, as we pointed out the other day, there is economic pressure. Our purchases from Haiti are not extensive. But, for instance, could we not get along without Haitian coffee while Duvalier remains in power?

Duvalier could be toppled, as he should be, by the Haitians themselves—relatively few of them. The men to topple him are there and, sooner or later, one of them will organize the job. They need guns, grenades and explosives. If the United States remains a spectator, growling only when its nationals seem to be menaced, the next leader of Haiti will owe us even less than the present one.

If the State Department now virtuously argues that we cannot meddle in the affairs of neighboring countries, it has a short memory that any survivor of the Bay of Pigs or of the CIA-sponsored revolt against Jacobo Arbenz of Guatemala could refresh. It also should have heeded these promptings of reticence before our national prestige was conspicuously committed to the abortive effort last month.

Haiti, of course, is close to Cuba geographically, just as the two cases are closely parallel. If Duvalier were to invite the Russians in, or if Castro were to move against him, we would have no alternative but to take action, and fast. Should we permit so dangerous a vacuum to remain so inviting for so long?

The truth seems to be that this administration is quite cynically willing to put on the pressure where it thinks it may scare somebody, but also is quite cynically willing to forget the whole business when the opposition shows signs of life.

The result today is that in relation to Haiti our position is one of total inertia, waiting, like Mr. Micawber, for something to turn up. It is nowhere near good enough.

The 1963 Freedom Award to Congressman Derwinski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I know that many Members of the House will be interested in knowing that our colleague, Congressman EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, of the Fourth District of Illinois, has received the 1963 Freedom Award by the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia.

In making the award June 2, 1963, at Asbury Park, N.J., Dr. James H. Tashjian, of Boston, Mass., secretary of the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia, lauded Congressman DERWINSKI for his efforts in advocating a special House committee on the captive nations and said he is "a stalwart cordon of distinguished Americans who have made it their duty to remind America of its revolutionary past and its duty to mankind all over the world in the never-ending struggle to enfranchise peoples and nations. Congressman DERWINSKI is a man whose vision transcends the narrow bounds of continents."

Previous recipients of the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia Freedom Award include Allen Dulles, former head of the Central Intelligence Agency; J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; Senator Thomas Dodd, of Connecticut; former Congressman Charles Kersten, of Wisconsin; and a number of other distinguished Americans.

In connection with the presentation of this award, Mr. Setrak Benjamin Minas spoke in honor of Armenian Independence Day, and discussed the continuing aspirations of the Armenian people to be free from the bondage of communism.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a copy of the address by Mr. Minas:

SPEECH OF SETRAK BENJAMIN MINAS GIVEN ON OCCASION OF ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY (MAY 28, 1918), HOTEL BERKELEY-CARTERET, ASBURY PARK, N.J., JUNE 2, 1963

On May 28, 1918, the Armenian people under the leadership of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation proclaimed the free and democratic Republic of Armenia bringing to an end 600 years of enslavement. On May 28, 1918, the Armenian people proved that man cannot forever be kept in bondage, and that tyranny can never achieve final victory.

In 1921 the infant Armenian Republic became the first victim of Russian Communist imperialism. This attack on the Armenian people was in reality the opening attack on all the freedom-loving people of the world. It was Russia's declaration of war on democracy which has continued unabated until today.

The 1921 Russian attack was in reality a penetration of the outermost borders of democracy. * * * A penetration that has now reached within 90 miles of the United States and is threatening the whole Western Hemisphere. In 1921 some 2 million Armenians were separated from the free world; today some 800 million freedom-loving people have been drawn into the Communist orbit. The Armenian Republic of the 1920's was the Cuba tragedy of the 1960's. The war against the Armenian people in 1921 has now spread to all continents, and a local war has now become a global struggle. The Western democracies have been ineffectually on the defensive. The United States has spent countless billions of dollars and American lives in Korea but still the Communists advance relentlessly. The free world cannot long survive this Communist onslaught. The United States must reexamine and reassess its foreign policy if it is to continue to exist in the kind of world we wish. We cannot successfully overcome the Communist evil if the policy of our Government as revealed in the Secretary of State's letter to the House Committee on Rules continues in force. When our State Department takes the position that certain countries including the present Republic of Armenia are not nations but historically regions of Russia and that a captive nations resolution might endanger the Berlin situation, it is not only ignoring history, but it is endangering the entire world situation. We are losing the support of the enslaved peoples and the neutrals by this demonstration of principle bowing before expediency.

We can move from the defensive to a potent offensive if we can rediscover the true principles of democracy. Since 1921 democracy has not only been under attack from outside forces, but more tragically, it has been betrayed from within by those who have forgotten or abandoned the philosophy and character of our great American Revolution. Democracy has been drained of its moral content and has ceased to be revolutionary. The basic weakness of the western democracies is their willingness to defend democracy only when their own freedom is immediately affected. Only those nations are helped who are vital links in the chain of defense against Communist encroachment. Miilitary and economic self-interest supercedes human values and human rights. This is the disease that is sapping the strength of the western democracies in today's global struggle. Faced with this crass reality of international politics the smaller nations assume indecisive positions anxious to offend neither side because of the fear that the advance of military weapons may render them useless links in an abandoned chain of defenses. So long as the western democracies seek only to shield their own freedom, they cannot expect stanch allies. This selfish and defensive attitude renders the western democracies weaker than they should be, and makes the Communist world stronger than it really is.

The greatest danger to the concept of democracy is our failure to understand it and our lack of faith in its potency. When we rationalize our conduct by saying that certain peoples are not ready for democracy we admit that we see democracy as an institutionalized concept devoid of moral content. Basically democracy is the right to be free and the right of self-determination, free from outside interference. This concept of democracy all people can understand, even the most primitive, because the right to be a free man is a primitive concept and not an invention of advanced nations. The Founding Fathers of this country understood democracy in its basic and fullest meaning when they wrote the Declaration of Independence before they had determined the form of government to manage our affairs. They recognized the natural law as the source of democracy when they said, "All men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.". It was with the spirit of these words that Woodrow Wilson set on fire the hearts and minds of people everywhere. It was the spirit of these great words that led Woodrow Wilson to champion the Armenian cause in 1918. The United Sttaes as the leader of the free world and as the legatee of the Declaration of Independence, must rediscover the philosophy and character of the Founding Fathers, and rededicate itself to a universal democracy. When we do this our foreign policy will become positive, uncompromising and inspiring. The heroes of our early American history have achieved permanent greatness because they were inspired and lived by spiritual precepts. If we permit our industrial and military power to divest us of these spiritual precepts we will have thrown away the spirit of 1776 which has been the secret of our greatness.

May 28, 1963, we are here assembled to observe the independence of Armenia proclaimed in 1918. We are here to honor those Armenian men and women who died as apostles of freedom, and who are today resting in peace on the islands of the blessed.

But we assemble each year to do more than this. Each year on this day we publicly rededicate ourselves to the cause of Armenian freedom and of world freedom. This is the day when the Armenian Revolutionary Federation says in clear and uncompromising language to the entire world:

The Armenian people deny the right of Soviet Russia or any other foreign power to control the Armenian Republic. That the Armenian people have been endowed by their Creator with the inalienable right to be equal to all men, and have the right to determine their own destiny as a member of the family of free nations. The Armenian Revolutionary Federation says that any invasion of these rights is illegal and that neither the passage of time, treaty, or international decree can legalize a violation of these natural rights. That no nation or combination of nations can lawfully deny the Armenian his heritage and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the Armenian did not preserve his identity, his culture, and his rights for 600 years to surrender everything today.

The Armenian people in Armenia today cannot speak and fight for their rights, but they expect you and me in the free world to speak loudly and clearly what is in their hearts—a free Armenia.

And speak we must—so that Communist Russia and the whole world will hear that the Armenian cause is still alive—that the leader o fthe Armenian cause—the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia—still lives and will continue to live.

Address by Hon. James E. Webb, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, at the University of Pittsburgh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by James E. Webb, Administrator of National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and an article written by Kenneth Eskey:

ADDRESS BY JAMES E. WEBB, ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH COMMENCEMENT, PITTSBURGH, PA., JUNE 3, 1963

In years gone by for the graduates, the commencement ceremony marked the completion of the preparation phase in their lives—their formal education—and the beginning of the careers which they would pursue throughout their lives. Today, this can no longer be the case. Because of the explosion of human knowledge taking place in the world, and its influence on mankind, this event must be viewed as but one landmark in an educational process which most of you will find it desirable, indeed necessary, to continue throughout your lives.

Here at the University of Pittsburgh you have learned that all that we value most is a product of, or intimately related to the human mind, and that most of the instruments and institutions of human progress are quite recent developments in the long history of mankind.

There is the art of writing, which we have enjoyed for some 6,000 years; agriculture, a little longer; Christianity, less than 2,000 years; modern science, about 300 years old, and modern technology, as revolutionized by science, developed over only about 150 years.

In the explosive development of man's knowledge of the universe, through the use of his mind, consider this series of events:

In 1632, or just 330 years ago, the Cardinals who passed sentence on Galileo asserted that "the proposition that the earth is not the center of the world and immovable, but that it moves * * * is absurd and false."

But 200 years later and just 100 years ago man had learned, and many had come to accept, that the earth is not the center of the universe, and beyond that, that our sun, also, is not the center of the universe. Today it is everywhere recognized and accepted that the universe itself is in motion, and that we here on Earth are ourselves on a spacecraft traveling at 67,000 miles an hour in a path around the sun, which will place us a year from now 180 million miles from where we are today—that is, with reference to the sun, which also moves.

The marvelous capacity of the human mind for perception, analysis, and insight is illustrated by the fact that Edward Everett Hale, in his book "The Brick Moon," was able to write imaginatively of almost unimaginable events which were not to transpire for nearly 80 years. He wrote this in 1869.

"If from the surface of the earth, by a gigantic peashooter, you could shoot a pea upward from Greenwich, aimed northward as well as upward; if you drove it so fast and far that when its power of ascent was exhausted, and it began to fall, it should clear the earth, and pass outside the North Pole, if you had given it sufficient power to get it half round the earth without touching, that pea would clear the earth forever. It would continue to rotate above the North Pole, above the Feejee Island place, above the South Pole and Greenwich, forever, with the impulse with which it had first cleared our atmosphere and attraction."

Today, the human mind has made Hale's imaginary peashooter come true in the form of the modern space booster.

But before the end of the 18th century 25 years after Hale's book, John Jacob Aster, who is best remembered for building the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel and going down with the Titanic, wrote a novel, "Journey to Other Worlds," in which men traveled to the planets. Although written almost three-quarters of a century ago, the book contains an artist's drawing of a spacecraft which might almost have been conceived by a designer of the Apollo spacecraft in which the first American astronauts will take off from Cape Canaveral and travel to the moon.

In the foreward to his book, Hale offered the comment that "there can be no question that there are many forces and influences in nature whose existence we as yet little more than suspect. How * * * interesting it would be," he said, "if, instead of reciting past achievements * * * we would devote our consideration to what we do not know."

He continued, "it is only through investigation and research that inventions come; we may not find what we are in search of, but may discover something of perhaps even greater moment. It is probable that the principal glories of the future will be found in as yet untrodden paths."

Hale's "pea" has become a mancarrying satellite, the Mercury capsule, and the whole vista of space is opening up to man. Meanwhile, your generation has lived close enough to dramatic achievements in space to understand the profound truth of Astor "that the principle glories of the future will be found in as yet untrodden paths." Let me urge you now, as you complete one stage of your education, to turn eagerly to "consideration of what we, mankind do not know."

How has all this come about? How does today's generation differ from those which, as recently as Jefferson's time, rejected the cast iron plow because it would cause weeds to grow, or the steam locomotive because at the incredible speed of 20 miles an hour the wind would blow the fire out? What has produced a preponderance of thoughtful leadership in our country with vision greater even than that of a Thomas Edison, who said of the Wright brothers airplane that it would never have any practical value, except perhaps as "the toy of wealthy sportsmen."

The other day I was reading the George Washington University Law Review, and I came across a quotation which I would like to read to you. Here it is:

"In very few ages of the world has the struggle for change been so widespread, so deliberate, or upon so great a scale as this which we are taking part in.

"The transition which we are witnessing is no equable transition of growth and normal alteration, no silent, unconscious unfolding of one age into another, its natural heir and successor.

"Society is looking itself over in our day from top to bottom, is making fresh and critical analysis of its very elements, is questioning its oldest practices as freely as its newest, scrutinizing every arrangement and motive of its life, and stands ready to attempt nothing less than a radical reconstruction."

This quotation, it seems to me, is so pertinent an assessment of this age in which we live that it may surprise some of you to learn that it was made by Woodrow Wilson in an address to the American Bar Association in 1910.

Wilson's main thesis, in addressing the leaders of the legal profession in his day, was that there are moments in history when slow and gradual adjustments in the law are not sufficient to meet the emerging needs of society. At such times, social habit is replaced by discussion, by political contest, and by political action.

Wilson was referring chiefly to the effects of the industrial revolution, and the changing relationships between labor and capital. Yet what he said half a century ago applies with equal force to the impact of a newer revolution—the influence which science and technology are having on our society.

The forces of change in the first half of this century were tremendous, as were the social and economic upheavals which they produced, and the legislative reforms which were enacted to deal with them.

But all of this has been transcended by the accelerating forces of change in the world in which we live today. We are dealing not only with profound changes in the social and economic structure of our country and the world; we are dealing as well with an even more profound change in man's own conception of the boundaries and limitations of his habitable environment and his understanding of the forces of the universe.

Throughout human history, as the great French thinker Henri Bergson pointed out, men have been accustomed to think of moving only in terms of the unmoving. But your generation will find it easier to think of itself as a part of a dynamic universe because John Glenn has, before the eyes of all men, demonstrated the emerging cosmology of Von Braun, Van Allen, Dryden, and Pickering.

It might be said that almost all that man knows about this vast universe that is his home he has learned from the examination of one material, that of earth; one form of life, that of earth; the characteristics of one body in space, those of earth—its gravitation, magnetic fields, trapped radiation, atmosphere, and magnetosphere.

Now man is going out to get a second material to compare with that of Earth—that of the Moon, and perhaps a third, that of Mars.

And with mariner's measurements last December of some of the characteristics of Venus, the mind of man, for the first time, can compare the magnetic fields of his Earth with those of another body in space. And as more mariners travel to other planets, he will have their measurements to compare with those of earth, much as lawyers sharpen up points at issue through studies in comparative law.

Finally, many believe man will achieve the most exciting prospect of all—that he will find extra-terrestrial life to compare with his own.

In the world you enter today, man is no longer rooted to terra firma, to his native land, or even to his city block, either in the literal sense or in his understanding of the powerful forces of the universe, of which he is such a miniscule part. Increasingly man comprehends that the new understanding and knowledge that are being unleashed by science and technology will alter his existence in more ways and more rapidly than he can possibly foresee.

It has been said that man himself has doubled the body of knowledge in the last 20 years; that the contributions to knowledge in the natural sciences since World War II exceed those of all previous history. As a consequence, according to Ralph W. Tyler, director of the Center for Advanced Study and the Behavorial Sciences at Stanford University, more than half of the members of this graduating class, and others like it in the country, will be employed in occupations which did not exist in the year in which you were born.

Moreover, according to another authority, the forces of change during the years ahead will be so great that children now in their first year of school can expect to change occupations three times during their lives. And, as I have suggested, your generation cannot be satisfied with one shot of formal education. It must be a continuing process throughout your lives.

The way you will come to feel about these impending changes will depend in large part on your estimate of man's ability to cope with them and adapt to them. You will find that many men anticipate them with basic optimism and some eagerness because they are already surrounded by evidence of the benefits received from the scientific and technological advances of the past.

Within your lifetime, science and technology have caused ancient economic, social, and political concepts to become obsolescent almost as rapidly as we have harvested the fruits of successful research and development.

The automobile and airplane have given us convenient transportation, but they have also altered our whole concept of the world in which we live, so far as our everyday lives are concerned. And so with radio, television, and countless other developments with which we are familiar.

Man has gained a new mobility. His horizons have broadened, not only in the geographic sense, but because he no longer feels bound by family, farm, or traditional village industry or nearby city factory.

Your generation will feel no constraint to farm or mine coal or work in a certain factory in a certain city simply because that is what your father did, and perhaps his grandfather before him. But there is a constraint you will feel. It is to continue to look to your alma mater, your university with its familiar intellectual landmarks, for facts, and discussion of the great issues of the day. When government must reflect the will of the people, and large numbers of people are cut loose from familiar moorings, the university can still serve as a trusted source of information in which your confidence can be placed.

In one sense, this new mobility has been forced upon us, as employment opportunities in many of the age-old occupations of man shrink or disappear. Yet the very technology that has cut back the need for human labor in some fields of endeavor has opened new and more rewarding ones.

But as in the past, among the invisible products of man's scientific progress we can expect to find economic and sociopolitical upheaval. The theme of the message I have for you today is this: The civilization which can move to gear itself for travel to the moon and the planets, and appreciate the necessity for doing so, will not be content with outdated earthly concepts and institutions.

The threads of the fabric of our social, political, and economic institutions are being tested as we move rapidly into this new age of science and technology.

Our economic and political relations with other countries are being reevaluated. Old concepts of defense and military strategy are being challenged and revised.

Jealously guarded traditions of our educational institutions such as this university are being tested, altered, or, in some cases, discarded.

Our economic theories, and even the nature of our institutional structures, are undergoing reexamination as society seeks to adjust itself to the inevitability of change.

These changes are driving men from farm to city and have aroused deep and serious concern at both ends of the scale. While urban planners wonder how they will cope with too many people, agricultural regions wonder how they will survive with too few, and both seek ways to maintain and justify this generation's great hope of the future.

Bergson said, "For a conscious being, to exist is to change, to change is to mature, to mature is to go on creating one's self endlessly."

Durant, in his "Story of Philosophy" said of Bergson:

"After Bergson we come to see the world as the stage and the material of our own originative powers. Before him we were cogs and wheels in a vast and dead machine; now, if we wish it, we can help to write our own parts in the drama of creation."

That is your opportunity, if you grasp it, in this exciting age. You can help to write your own parts in the drama of creation.

And this great, good, and powerful Nation will not be left behind as men and nations map their courses and take off personally and vicariously from earth to seek new knowledge on the moon and planets, and through study of the stars and galaxies from observatories operating outside the opaque and obscure atmosphere of the earth.

Forty years elapsed between the Wright brothers and the first supersonic flight. Only 10 years were required to reach 4,000 miles per hour in the X-15. Applying this knowledge, we now see a shrunken and bipolarized world, within which we can travel anywhere in a few hours, but cannot solve without force and violence man's relation to man. And all of this was achieved using the atmosphere up to twice the height of mountains.

By the end of this decade, man will have stood on the moon and looked outward to the vast universe and beyond, and learned in the process vastly more about the earth itself.

I repeat, you can help to write your own parts in the drama of creation.

WEBB DEFENDS UNITED STATES IN SPACE—SYMBOL OF POWER, NASA CHIEF CLAIMS

(By Kenneth Eskey)

The U.S. space program is a "symbol of national power," James E. Webb, head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, said here today.

"It is regarded all around the world in that light," added Mr. Webb, who was here to address the University of Pittsburgh commencement ceremonies on the Cathedral of Learning lawn.

He said in an interview that our space ventures compare to the U.S. stand in Berlin as evidence of the power struggle.

He declared that the space effort has opened the door to a wide range of academic pursuits.

His views were somewhat at odds with those expressed yesterday by Dr. J. C. Warner, president of Carnegie Institute of Technology, who spoke at Duquesne University's commencement.

Dr. Warner asserted that we are involved in space not for the scientific or military values to be derived but for national prestige.

According to Dr. Warner, there is little evidence to support the theory that our massive space venture will result in future economic growth.

Mr. Webb said this country has "suffered more from unwillingness to do new things than from overexpansion." He cited the rejection of jet engine research in the 1920's as an example.

Touching on the cost of space projects, Mr. Webb said the budget for the program for 10 years runs to $35 billion. He pointed out that this amounts to two-thirds of the total U.S. defense budget for a single year.

He added that numerous space research programs are carried on at colleges and the work is unclassified. This means the results can be put to uses other than military.

He conceded that the technology from this research is brought under security controls.

In his talk to the graduates, Mr. Webb touched on the vast jump in fundamental knowledge over the past several centuries and urged his audience to "reach out to grasp new knowledge of the universe."

The NASA official said the pressing need of the future is wisdom in the use of our new knowledge.

"Your generation will find it easier to think of itself as a part of a dynamic universe because John Glenn has * * * demonstrated the emerging cosmology of Von Braun, Van Allen, Dryden, and Pickering," Mr. Webb said.

The "most exciting prospect of all," he told the graduates, is that man may find life on other planets.

He praised the new generation for its willingness to break with the past.

"Your generation will feel no constraint to farm or mine coal or work in a certain factory in a certain city simply because that is what your father did * * *," he said.

Furriers Joint Council Rallies for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on May 28, 1963, at 11 a.m. 15,000 fur workers stopped work in New York City to take part in a rally to protest the bombings, jailing and the use of dogs and firehoses against the courageous freedom demonstrators in Birmingham, Ala., and elsewhere in the South, and to show their support for immediate establishment of equal rights for all.

The rally was sponsored by the Furriers Joint Council of New York, the Joint Board Fur, Leather and Machine Worker's Unions, Fur Dressers Union, Local 2F; Fur Floor Workers, Local 3F; and the Fur Chauffeurs and Helpers Union, Local 122F. The chairman of the mass meeting was George Stofsky, manager of the Furriers Joint Council of New York.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the sponsors of the rally for their efforts in behalf of this urgent cause and want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following resolution adopted at the furriers' rally:

We, 15,000 fur workers, express our full solidarity with the heroic struggles being waged by the Negro people of Alabama, Mississippi, North Carolina, and throughout the South, for the end of segregation now. We recognize that so long as there is discrimination and second-class citizenship anywhere in this land no American is free. We call upon President Kennedy to use the full powers of his office and of the Federal Government in support of this great crusade for democratic rights. We pledge that we shall not rest until America is truly free and until every American enjoys the heritage of democratic liberties granted by our Constitution.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Equal Pay—Article From the Machinist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the newspaper, the Machinist, published by the Machinists Union, has an excellent article in its latest issue describing the new Equal Pay Act just signed by President Kennedy on June 10 and now Public Law 88-38. It was, indeed, a proud and happy moment for me to be present in the President's office on Monday when he affixed his signature to this measure for which some of us have been working for many years.

The article in the Machinist, prepared before the President signed the bill but on the assumption that he would sign it, tells what the legislation can and cannot do, and what it will mean to millions of women workers.

I join the Machinist in expressing my congratulations to Assistant Secretary of Labor Esther Peterson for her effective efforts in bringing the need for, and the merits of, this legislation so clearly into focus that by the time the bill came before us for action it was almost considered noncontroversial. Its support here this year was overwhelming.

Mr. Speaker, the article from the Machinist on the new Equal Pay Act follows:

WORKINGWOMEN WIN RIGHT TO EQUAL PAY BEGINNING NEXT YEAR

After 18 years of campaigning, the ladies have finally done it. They have won from Congress an important new Federal law under which women in industry are guaranteed equal pay with men when they do the same work.

The act, outlawing lower rates for women workers, will take effect a year from the date President Kennedy signs it—probably this week.

Every shop, every factory, every office now subject to the Federal wage and hour law is covered by this new act. Most retail and service firms will not be covered. Confidential newsletters are advising employers that this is the most important social legislation to be adopted since the wage and hour law of 1938.

Assistant Secretary of Labor Esther Peterson, chief of the U.S. Women's Bureau, led the drive for the new legislation. She had the support of most women's organizations and labor.

The AFL-CIO saw to it that the act, as finally adopted, contains an ironclad restriction against any chiseling attempts to equalize pay by reducing wage rates paid to men. The new law provides:

"No employer * * * shall discriminate * * * between employees on the basis of sex by paying wages to employees * * * at a rate less than the rate at which he pays wages to employees of the opposite sex * * * for equal work on jobs the performance of which requires equal skill, effort, and responsibility, and which are performed under similar working conditions."

Exceptions are permitted where wage rates are subject to seniority, a merit system, piece rates, or other recognized differential based on factors other than sex.

Then the new law provides: "That an employer who is paying a wage rate differential in violation of this (law) shall not, in order to comply with the provisions of this (law), reduce the wage rate of any employee." Employees have been allowed plenty of time to adjust to the equal pay law. The provisions become effective in June 1964 for nonunion employers. Those operating under union agreements are permitted to work out the term of their contract provided it doesn't run beyond June 1965.

Limited to those now protected by the wage-hour law, the measure will cover some 8 million of the 24,500,000 women in the U.S. work force. That's about a third, but it covers most of those in larger industrial establishments.

The U.S. Labor Department estimates that about 3,500,000 of the 8 million women are now working under union contracts.

Most union contracts have abolished pay differentials between men and women. Thus, the law mainly will help the 4,500,000 women not working under union-negotiated agreements.

Wage-hour inspectors will enforce the equal pay provision just as they now spot check employers for minimum wage and overtime violations. They can take employers to court for back pay if the companies fail to comply.

Pioneers of Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in this centennial year of West Virginia, my State is proud to recall the part it has played in the industrial development of our Nation. In a recent article, the Union Carbide Chemicals Co. describes how several of its important contributions to industry were pioneered by its workers in West Virginia.

One of the first commercial ferroalloy plants in the country was established at Glen Ferris, W. Va., in 1901. The new alloys developed in this plant helped to make possible the dynamic changes we have seen in the uses of stainless steel—in the food handling industry, in building construction, laboratory equipment, and so forth.

Another pioneering plant, in the field of petrochemicals, was started at Clendenin, W. Va., in 1920. Petrochemical development is responsible for such modern marvels as permanent antifreeze, liquified petroleum gas, vinyl resins, insecticides, and many others.

As a salute to the industrial pioneers of West Virginia, I ask unanimous consent to have the article on the history of industrial chemicals in West Virginia printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS THE WAY IT STARTED

For a while no one could figure out what the grayish lumpy substance was. Still hot from the furnace, it was quenched with water and a strange, pungent-smelling gas was given off.

The year was 1893, and the place was the little town of Spray in North Carolina. There, a small group of inventors had been using excess waterpower from a small cottonmill to run one of the remarkable new electric furnaces that had just been developed. The men were trying to make aluminum. Instead, they had stumbled upon a process for making calcium carbide and from it acetylene gas, which was soon to be in great demand for portable lighting.

In fact, as a result of this discovery, two companies were formed: Union Carbide Co. in 1898 to manufacture calcium carbide, and The Prest-O-Lite Co. in 1904 to produce dissolved acetylene.

French scientists, meanwhile, had discovered that acetylene when burned with oxygen produced an intensely hot flame, making a unique tool for welding and cutting metals. As this new oxy-acetylene process came into widespread use, a demand naturally was created for large quantities of oxygen. As a result, The Linde Air Products Co. was organized in 1907, for extracting oxygen from the air.

Associates of those who first made calcium carbide at Spray continued to experiment with the electric furnace—using it to smelt chromium and silicon ores. This led to the establishment of the country's first commercial ferroalloy plant at Holcomb Rock in Virginia, and shortly afterward other alloy-making facilities along the Kanawha River at Glen Ferris, W. Va. These pioneer alloy-making facilities were acquired by Electro Metallurgical Co. when it was formed in 1906 to produce alloys for steelmaking.

Two of these companies—Union Carbide Co. and Electro Metallurgical Co.—needed carbon electrodes to power their furnaces. This brought into the picture another company, whose history went back even earlier.

This part of our story, in fact, had its beginnings in 1876. In the summer of that year, a group of people had crowded into the public square in Cleveland to see the first commercial carbon arc street light, which was said to be tremendously brilliant. The demonstration was successful, and soon arc lamps were hanging on street corners in large cities throughout the country. Some 10 years later, in 1886, National Carbon Co. was founded primarily to produce carbons for these arc lamps. This same company also produced in 1890 the world's first commercial dry cell battery.

Although all these companies were producing widely different products, they were closely related in their business and research activities. One common interest was the electric furnace, which was used for either the manufacture or the application of their products. So, it was decided to band together these companies and form Union Carbide & Carbon Corp. in November 1917 (the name was later shortened to Union Carbide Corp.).

During the next few years, research in the treating of air and other gases—particularly acetylene—continued. Seeking a new source of acetylene, Union Carbide researchers discovered a vast new field of chemical products derived from hydrocarbon gases, which gave birth to one the the country's largest chemical enterprises. Production started early in 1920 in the mountain town of Clendenin, W. Va. Later that year, Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corp. was formed to market the unusual new chemicals.

Many of the chemicals were used in making plastics, and soon Union Carbide's researchers were working on the development of plastics as well. The first vinyl plastics were introduced commercially by Union Carbide over 25 years ago. And, in 1939, Bakelite Corp. joined the Union Carbide family. This company, one of the country's pioneer plastics manufacturers, had been founded in 1910 by a Belgian-born chemist, who developed the first modern plastic resin in 1907. This phenolic plastic is still produced today under its now famous trademark Bakelite.

Woven into Union Carbide's history, also, is much of the early development of nuclear energy in this country. The corporation pioneered in the mining and refining of uranium ores on the Colorado Plateau. It was also one of the first companies to become active in the Government's atomic energy program. To integrate the corporation's many diverse activities in this field, Union Carbide Nuclear Co. was formed in 1955.

Union Carbide also extended its interests into two additional fields with the formation of the Silicones Division in 1955 to produce silicone chemicals, and the entry of Visking Corp. into the Union Carbide family in 1956. Visking produces food casings and plastic films.

In 1959 the corporation formed Union Carbide Consumer Products Co.

Death of Medgar Evers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial which appeared in the Daily Clarion-Ledger of Jackson, Miss., of this date, on the death of Medgar Evers, together with a statement on the same subject by W. M. Mann, president of the Jackson (Miss.) Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Daily Clarion-Ledger, Jackson, Miss., June 13, 1963]

MEDGAR EVERS

The death of Medgar Evers is most regrettable. We join practically our entire community in this feeling.

During the past several weeks, Jackson has been thrown into an atmosphere of tension and strife by outside agitators. These tensions were easing and had all but disappeared in most recent days.

Evidence was available at the very hour of the shooting that outside agitators had abandoned further efforts to continue demonstrations here. This in itself should be ample evidence to all white citizens that these disturbing visitors who fomented demonstrations are no more representative of the colored citizens of Jackson than the shooting of Medgar Evers is representative of white citizens' feelings toward the colored citizens of Jackson.

Such lawlessness must not go unpunished. For this reason, the Clarion-Ledger and Jackson Daily News are offering $1,000 reward for information leading to the arrest and conviction of the guilty person or persons.

Continued demonstrations can lead only to more bloodshed. Therefore it is hoped that all our citizens, both white and colored, immediately will return to the work of building a law-abiding, progressive city.

STATEMENT BY JACKSON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PRESIDENT W. M. MANN

This community is shocked over the apparent murder of Medgar Evers. Jackson, Miss., out of a deep conviction of our public officials, business leaders, and citizens, has built a reputation during the troublesome and trying times of recent years, for preserving law and order. We have consistently and unitedly, both local white and local Negro, agreed on this and insisted on it.

Someone has taken the law in their own hands.

We know al law enforcement officials will cooperate in a thorough investigation and that the guilty party or parties, will be apprehended, brought to justice, and given the maximum penalty under the law.

We urge all citizens to cooperate in every way to bring the guilty party or parties to justice.

The Greatest Moment in U.S. History—Newsday Contest Winners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, what was the greatest moment in American history? In answering this question for a contest sponsored by Newsday, two high school students have contributed winning essays for the month of April. Writing with significant insight and ability, Miss Pamela Gould and Mr. Richard Allen Watson, have each cited the moment they believe to be the greatest in American history.

Miss Gould, a freshman at New Hyde Park Memorial High School, wrote that—

> Our country has a purpose: "All men are created equal"—and until the purpose is a reality, we cannot reach or even hope to reach our inherent greatness. But when the day comes when our purpose is a reality—

Then concluded Miss Gould—

> we shall see "America's greatest moment."

Mr. Watson, a senior at W. C. Mepham High School, in Bellmore, reviewed a series of singular events in the history of our country but wrote that—

> Mere moments of high passion have not, and should not have been, the high points in our history. The greatest moment in any nation's history comes when its governmental system reaches its fulfillment, when all the nation's philosophical precepts are crystallized in a single act. Thus, the crowning point of a democracy is the act that gives it substance—the pulling of a lever in a voting machine or the casting of a ballot into a box where all men's opinions are equally upheld.

Certainly we have cause to be proud of the excellence demonstrated by the fine work of these two students who will be among tomorrow's leaders.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, the text of the two winning essays be printed in the Appendix to the Record.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WINNING ESSAYS IN NEWSDAY CONTEST NAME "THE GREATEST MOMENT IN AMERICAN HISTORY"

(By Pamela Gould, freshman, New Hyde Park Memorial High School)

A tree, a man, a star—in everything there is the rhythm of birth, maturity and death. And it follows that if there is a rhythm in all things there must be a reason for all things. This is true of a tree, a man, a star—and it is also true of our Nation.

"All men are created equal * * * they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights * * * among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Thomas Jefferson stated the reason in language so simple and yet so perfect the words have lived to this day. Rather, the words not only have lived, but have grown more meaningful with each year, until the phrases written in 1776 seem almost prophetic in 1963.

From the earliest settlers to the immigrants of the 1800's to the refugees of the 20th century, our country has been a symbol of freedom, equality, and dignity of the individual. This is the reason and purpose of the United States of America but until the day this purpose is achieved and all people who are created equal are treated equal, our country cannot reach its destined greatness.

No man can walk with his head high if he must continually stoop to keep another in bondage. Multiply this man many times and we have an entire group of men, an entire town, a State—an entire section of our country so busy keeping a racial group in bondage, it has become a victim of its own hatred.

The students in Mississippi who rioted when James Meredith came to study among them—they might have created a great drama, uncovered an important piece of research, solved a mathematical equation with all that great energy that was used so destructively on James Meredith. The registrars in Alabama who beat and victimized Negroes who were trying to vote—with that force, they might have built a great road, erected a hospital or planted crops for food.

A WORLD OF COMPENSATION

Lincoln said, "This is a world of compensation. He who would be no slave must consent to have no slaves himself." When we realize that Louisiana has the highest illiteracy rate, Mississippi the lowest per capita income in our Nation, we see how effectively those who have tried to enslave the Negro have succeeded in enslaving themselves.

Racism, bigotry, prejudice, discrimination, segregation—call it what you will—there is another word to describe it: waste. For every Ralph Bunche or James Baldwin who has fought his way to accomplishment, how many others have been lost to us? Has another voice as glorious as Marion Anderson's been destroyed in the darkness of discrimination?

The Negro boy who does not attend school in Louisiana because his father cannot afford to buy him shoes is merely one child. But multiplied many times, how many doctors, lawyers, writers and statemen are lost to us? The white man by his discrimination deprives himself, enslaves himself and finally chains himself to the lowest and ugliest of deeds, rather than the noblest and most glorious.

A tree, a man, a nation, all things have a rhythm and a purpose. Our country has a purpose: "all men are created equal"—and until the purpose is a reality, we cannot reach or even hope to reach our inherent greatness.

But when the day comes when our purpose is a reality, until the day all men, regardless of the color of their skin, have equal opportunities in school, in jobs, in housing, until the day our country's own inner violence turns outward and becomes a force for truth, brotherhood and achievement—when that day comes, we shall see "America's Greatest Moment."

(By Richard Allen Watson, senior, W. C. Mepham High School, Bellmore)

When has America reached the greatest moment in her history? Down through 180 years of freedom there have been many great moments in our Nation's life:

With awesome implications, a Virginia patriot declares to the world that it must "Give me liberty or give me death."

Sobered by the awful spectacle of war, an unpopular President stirs his people with the hopeful mandate of the Gettsylburg address.

Sword in hand, a future President leads his "Rough Riders" up San Juan Hill to liberate a captive people.

America's heart swells with pride as a gallant colonel orbits the Earth on a mission of peace.

And a courageous President tells his people that we must go to the brink of war in Cuba, and the Nation girds itself in protective readiness.

These are but a few of America's thrilling moments, times when our entire Nation throbbed with resolution and a single purpose, when the vitalizing blood of nationalism welded our many peoples into one. But these are not the moments which have kept America a haven of justice and hope. Brave words would have no purpose if an aroused citizenry could not retain freedom. The liberation of an enslaved people would have been in vain had not our Democracy set a working example. All the struggles of the "cold war" have been fought to protect a system that only the American people themselves could maintain.

Although many incidents have served to arouse patriotism in the United States, mere moments of high passion have not, and should not have been, the high points in our history. In the blackest of tyrannies there are periods of national pride. There is petty nationalism in the Soviet Union, and fanatical love of country was found in Nazi Germany and Napoleonic France.

WHEN PRECEPTS CRYSTALLIZE

The greatest moment in any nation's history comes when its governmental system reaches its fulfillment, when all the nation's philosophical precepts are crystallized in a single act. Thus, the greatest moment in a monarchy comes with the coronation of a ruler, the high point of a socialistic state is the collectivization of the people's goods, and the zenith of a dictatorship is the death of democracy.

The greatest moment in a democracy, however, is a singular event, a moment unique and meaningful simply because it can occur only in a people's government. Under a government "of the people, and for the people," no one hero can perform the nation's most decisive act, for the ultimate hero of a democracy is the common man, indeed all the common men. Thus, the crowning point of a democracy is the act that gives it substance—the pulling of a lever in a voting machine or the casting of a ballot into a box where all men's opinions are equally upheld. America's greatest moment comes when the painter and the plumber, the housewife and the handyman, the artist and the intellectual, every prince and pauper of our society elevate themselves to equal brotherhood in the great instrument of justice, the ballot box.

America's greatest moment is not the Fourth of July, or the Presidential press conference, or even the wining of a war, America's greatest moment comes once a year—on election day. Then, in the sometimes unimpressive, but nevertheless glorious atmosphere of the local polls, the American hero, the common man, commits the vital act that nourishes democracy, making all our struggles worthwhile. This is America's greatest moment. Let us use it well.

Equality of Opportunity in Apprentice Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the New York State Commission for Human Rights George H. Fowler recently made a significant speech on equal opportunity in apprentice training programs to the 36th annual convention of the Union Label and Service Trades Department, AFL–CIO.

It is my understanding that the complete text of this speech was unanimously included in the minutes of the meeting.

I commend Chairman Fowler's remarks to the Members of the House, as they illustrate the need for legislation in apprentice training to assure equality of opportunity for qualified persons and as they relate to progress in the State of New York since the enactment on March 20, 1962 of the first such State statute:

Text of Remarks Delivered by Commissioner George H. Fowler, Chairman of the State Commission for Human Rights, Before a Meeting of the Union Label and Service Trades Department, AFL–CIO—36th Annual Convention Held in the Hotel Syracuse, Syracuse, N.Y., May 28, 1963

I am happy to be here today to address this 36th annual convention of the labor unit that works toward the promotion of union-made products and services through the use of labels assuring the consumer the products are made by organized workers in plants conforming to union standards of wages and hours, health and safety.

Aside from the garment we wear with its sewn-in label, all of us wear any number of labels in the community. We might be labeled as Democrats or Republicans; we might be labeled by race or religion; we might even be labeled by the neighborhood we live in.

There is nothing wrong with this except that when such labels are used to denigrate or demean us or deny us our rights, labels then become offensive.

I am reminded of the time when Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, the author of the Sherlock Holmes stories, took a trip to Paris. As he alighted from his cab at the hotel, the driver said, "Merci, Monsieur Conan Doyle."

"How did you know who I am?" asked Doyle curiously.

The taximan explained, "There was a notice in the paper that you were arriving in Paris from the south of France. I knew from your general appearance that you were an Englishman. It is evident that your hair was cast cut by a barber of the south of France. By these indications I knew you."

"This is extraordinary. You had no other evidence to go upon?" asked Doyle.

"Nothing except," said the driver, "the fact that you names is on your luggage."

So you see that labels are inescapable, and we of the commission look forward to the day when your label will say even more—that the product was made in plants staffed by union people who open their books freely to all men, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, and who learned their craft in apprenticeship programs where no man was denied admission on any extraneous grounds, but that all who wanted to learn and had the aptitude for the particular craft were made welcome.

The State Commission for Human Rights, on which I serve as chairman, has the responsibility to administer laws designed to assure to all people equal opportunity in many areas of life. I wish here to address myself particularly to those areas which are of labor interest.

As you no doubt know, the law provides that all people shall have equal opportunity to seek gainful employment, that they shall have the right to enter apprenticeship, on-the-job and job retraining programs and that this right may not be abrogated by an employer or a labor union.

The law covering apprenticeship programs became effective on March 20, 1962. It is significant to note that a survey of such programs conducted in June 1961, showed that there were 17,000 trainees in 2,100 programs. A similar survey made in December 1962, after the law became effective, showed 21,000 apprentices in 2,500 programs—an increase in 18 months of 400 programs and 4,000 apprentices.

In the pursuit of the Commission's legal mandate, it became necessary recently to hold a public hearing on the complaint of a man who alleged that he had been denied admission to one of your larger craft unions because of color. It is my personal conviction that the case itself need never have gone as far as it did if all parties—being men of goodwill—had faced up to the realities of the situation when the complainant first brought the case to the Commission.

It is not the primary goal of this Commission to punish or chastise or to demean any labor organization. Speaking for myself—and I am sure that the other commissioners would concur if they were here—I hold the labor movement in high regard and if anything that I say is critical of union organizations, I would like my remarks to be regarded as those of a friend.

In all truth, apprenticeship programs are not moving forward in embracing all Americans as well as they should. We must face up realistically to the fact that there are unions which exclude journeymen and apprentices who have the necessary qualifications. And I must say here, emphatically, that if any man comes before this Commission with a complaint against such a union, we shall process it most vigorously in the belief that such exclusion is undemocratic, is un-American, and is harmful to the

American community. I might add, it is also harmful to the labor movement.

The right to join a labor union to seek gainful employment is a part of our concept of American democracy and the denial of this right hurts the individual, the community and the image of America in foreign lands.

I know also that there are some labor leaders, men of great devotion, who have given their lives to the unions which they head. I applaud them for their courage and dedication. But I cannot applaud them when they regard the particular organization which they built as a satrapy; something that they own; something that they control; something in which they believe they shall have the final say.

I would remind such labor leaders that these were not the terms of dedication when they first met in cellers to organize their unions against the hostility of employers who would have denied them the right to earn a living had they known of these secret efforts.

I would remind them that in those early days they were willing to lay down their lives for their fellow workers. And I call upon them now to rekindle that spark of altruism in behalf of all workers, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

No man owns a job; no man owns an industry; no man owns a labor union. All are part of the system of free enterprise that has made this country great and continues to keep it as a worldwide model of what human beings, acting together, can do for their own good and for the good of each other.

You cannot divorce labor from the rest of the community concept. You are part of the warp and the woof of our democratic system, and I say to you—if you should deny these great ideals, then who will be left to propagate them?

I want your department, which is more concerned with the image of labor than any other in the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations—I want you to proclaim freedom throughout the land.

I want out of this conference to evolve a positive program, to make sure that all persons qualified to enter apprenticeship programs be accorded that right to earn their livings as they desire.

This is not just a matter of posture. It is a matter of good public relations for the labor movement so that it can face its critics openly and unashamedly. It is the job of your council to foster the purchase of union made goods and services through a meaningful label. But I tell you that label would be meaningless if it is soiled.

Last March 9 I was invited to speak before the Civil Rights Committee of the New York City Central Labor Council at its third annual convention on the theme of "Equal Opportunity for Youth." At that time I noted that the 1962 Trade Union Handbook of the council carried this message from the council's highly respected president, Harry Van Arsdale:

"The goals of the New York City Central Labor Council AFL-CIO are to achieve a better life for organized labor in our city, in our State, in our Nation, in all the countries of the world. Through its day-to-day activities, through the programs of its committees, special conferences and rallies, the New York City Central Labor Council brings to its million members and to the vast public the message that one of the chief goals of labor is to make a contribution in whatever way it best can for the ultimate good of the community."

I told that gathering that I endorsed this concept of truly union goals without reservation. I told them that the phrase, "a better life for organized labor" also meant a better way of life for those who head the ranks of organized labor.

I have said, and I will say it over and over again—no man is free if the shackles are removed from his hands but a leg iron pins him to a wall of prejudice. No man is one-third, one-half, or three-quarters free. He is altogether free or he is not. Freedom is absolute. It knows no quantity or quality, and those who deny freedom to others are as truly enslaved as those who they oppress by such denial.

The spiritual wealth of America is a testament to the greatness of people who make up this country. Civilizations have risen and fallen. Men have struggled and conquered and been conquered but the history of humanity is that no nation can long endure when it loses its spirituality and divides or segregates its people.

I don't have to tell you that more and more the idealism of the American people is becoming vested in the labor union. Labor has grown far above the simple bread-and-butter issues on which unions were organized originally. It has moved into the educational and cultural areas. It has done magnificent things for the emancipation of the souls of men. At this point in its history it must not falter.

You of an older generation were born and brought up in communities where prejudices did exist. As you grew older, you freed yourselves of those prejudices which were brought to these shores as alien concepts. You have learned that this great country is an amalgam of all kinds of people from all areas of the world with all kinds of backgrounds. You have learned that intellect, kindness, generosity, goodness of spirit were not the contribution of only one group and I ask you now as human beings, as true union members, as fathers and mothers, as community leaders, to purge yourselves of any last remaining vestiges of concepts that are alien to the American ideal.

I ask you to get behind our State law with all the goodness and spirituality that is in you so that the State commission for human rights may never again be the recipient of complaints that any man was denied by any union the right to earn a living.

Thank you.

Now the Nonfarmer Asks for Parity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, more and more the American people are questioning the logic of the Government's farm programs. Certainly every Senator is aware of the increasing numbers in his State who make inquiries for which reasoned answers are hard to find.

Those of us with vast urban populations are hard pressed to explain these programs, when only 7 percent of the civilian work force of this country is presently engaged in agriculture.

In the June 2, 1963 issue of the New York Times magazine, Mr. Edward Higbee, professor of land utilization at the University of Rhode Island and author of the book, "Farms and Farmers in an Urban Age," wrote to this point in an article entitled "Now the Nonfarmer Asks for Parity."

I ask unanimous consent that Professor Higbee's excellent article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOW THE NONFARMER ASKS FOR PARITY

(By Edward Higbee)

American agriculture has rarely had it so good. New methods enable efficient farmers to grow more and more at less and less cost to them. The fast-growing population in cities and suburbs buys more than ever, and at higher prices. And much of what cannot be sold to urban consumers the Government has guaranteed to buy. Largely under the pressure of its surplus acquisition activities, the Department of Agriculture's budget last year reached $7.2 billion—a sum exceeded only by the costs of defense and interest on the national debt.

Now organized agriculture—notably the American Farm Bureau Federation—is maneuvering to keep its grip on the taxpayer's wallet. On May 21, wheatgrowers voted to reject a Government program which would have given the quid pro quo of high price supports in return for farmers' acceptance of compulsory limits on production. Ostensibly, the farmers were choosing freedom for the rugged individualist to grow as much as he wishes—and to risk taking whatever the open market will pay him. There was talk that wheat prices might drop from $1.85 a bushel at present to $1.10 or less.

Actually, the Farm Bureau strategists had no desire to run the risks of a free market. They were counting on their political leverage to force Congress into setting new Federal floor prices for wheat. Then they would have the best of both possible worlds—unlimited production, and a guaranteed selling price. The taxpayer, of course, would get an even bigger bill next year than last.

The scheme may yet go through. But there is some new thinking on Capitol Hill. The voice of the urban citizen is beginning to be heard. It is he who goes without public services he needs in order to pay for the farm program. And after 30 years it is becoming clear that Federal subsidies are not solving the farm problem.

The irony of the Federal agriculture program is that the bulk of the taxpayers' money goes to the few biggest farmers, who are already enjoying bigger incomes than most taxpayers. Poor farmers hear only the whistle of the gravytrain as it goes by.

To understand what is happening inside American agriculture it is necessary to recognize that the players at the top and the players at the bottom are not in the same league.

The years since 1935 have been the years of heaviest public spending to save the small family farm, yet during these years the number of farm units dropped from 6,800,000 to 3,708,000. From 1930 to 1960 the number of big farms—more than 1,000 acres—upped their holdings from 28 percent to 49 percent of all the agricultural land in the country. It might be said that while the family farm survived America went a long way toward getting rid of the farm family.

Today, the top 9 percent of all the Nation's farms produce as much as the bottom 91 percent. Federal aid to farmers is distributed in about the same proportions. This is understandable since Government bonuses and subsidies are granted not according to need but according to capacity to produce. A farmer who gets a price support loan on one bale of cotton gets one one-thousandth as much as a farmer who puts 1,000 bales under Government seal. Because of mass-production methods, the big producer is almost invariably more efficient than the little producer. Thus, the kind of price support that barely sustains the little man becomes a prod to the big man to go all out to stuff Government warehouses.

The soil bank is no solution for this kind of overproduction. Under that voluntary scheme the poorest land under the poorest management is set aside for Government payments. Meanwhile, the best land under the best management is made to yield bigger surpluses than ever—also far the public to subsidize. Thus two payments may be extracted from the taxpayer where only one has been extracted before.

Under pressure to save the small family farm, Congress has rigged an incredible system of bonus handouts, retirement payments, and price supports which has made high-speed, big-investment agriculture one of the most profitable enterprises in the country. This situation draws much outside money into agriculture. Large-scale operations are assembled while the little family farm that is short on cash but long on home-grown labor goes out of business. Thirty-four percent of all farms purchased in 1960 were bought by persons who were not farmers.

Capital gains on farm real estate for the decade of the 1950's averaged 8.5 percent per year. This was hardly a symptom of serious economic trouble. Farm mortgage debt increased only $6.5 billion between 1940 and 1961; in the same period, the value of all farm assets went up $119 billion. This was scarcely indicative of distress. In 1961 farm mortgage debt was only 10.4 percent of farm real estate values. Few city people are so solvent.

The financial plight of American agriculture, as it is usually presented for popular consumption, is largely a statistical fabrication derived by lumping the farm incomes of inefficient, part-time and semiretired operators with those of efficient, full-time professionals. If children's lemonade stands were included in a census of retail establishments in the same manner, even the A. & P. could be shown to qualify for Government aid. The true nature of farm operations is shown by the detailed data of the 1959 Census of Agriculture, the publication of which was just completed early this year. The Nation's 3,708,000 farms can be divided into 3 classes.

FIRST CLASS

At the top of the agricultural pyramid is a small but vigorous first class of only 312,000 farms which sell 50 percent of all agricultural commodities. None of these properties produces less than $20,000 worth annually. A third of them sell more than $40,000 worth each. There are 21,000 with sales exceeding $100,000, and these are surmounted by an elite of 1,200 which market more than $500,000 worth apiece.

The elite, of course, are freaks—but enormously productive ones. They are ranches or feedlots handling thousands of head of cattle. They are dairy farms on the edges of big cities that have so many cows they milk around the clock. They are cotton farms on irrigated land covering territory that stretches to the horizon, or sugar plantations just as large. They include spectacular wheat empires that measure their land in square-mile sections rather than in acres. They are enormous enterprises which grow, pack and ship fruits and vegetables by carloads.

Even the average farm in first class is an impressive enterprise with real estate holdings valued at $135,000 and annual gross sales of $48,000. If there were just 600,000 farms of this kind in the United States instead of 312,000, the other 3,100,000 farms recorded in the census would be out of business.

Elmer Larson is the name we will give to one of these farmers in first class. After the last war he came back to his father's 300-acre place in the rich Corn Belt of western Ohio. He had been in motorized artillery and learned a lot about heavy equipment. He wanted to farm and his father wanted to retire; so they made a compact. Elmer took out a GI loan for a downpayment and the deed. The elder Larson took his son's mortgage and endorsed his note for a new heavy-duty tractor.

Everything young Larson saw around the place reminded him of how hard it had been to farm as a boy and how easy it was to make machinery do things in the Army. His father thought he was taking an awful risk to borrow more money to buy more and bigger mechanized equipment: a hay baler, a picker-sheller, a combine, a glass-lined silo with automatic unloader; then finally an automated feed mill and mixer with a panel of control switches as impressive as an astronaut's capsule.

As his equipment increased, Elmer Larson realized that he could handle more land and more livestock; so he bought out a neighbor who declared, "A man is crazy to stay in farming the way it costs to get this new equipment." Larson himself was scared, but he knew he could not stand still and survive. He hired a regular hand and let the man's family live in the house on the new farm he had bought.

As the years went by, and the value of farm property rose, Larson was making at least as much in real estate appreciation as he was at raising corn and hogs. Since his assets zoomed even faster than his debts, his collateral was good for more loans. He plunged into more land and more equipment. He installed a cement-paved feedlot that would accommodate 600 head of western steers. Corn was too cheap to sell. He could make more feeding it. Later Larson increased the capacity of his feedlot to 1,200 and began to buy corn from others. The deeper he got into this complicated operation, the deeper he realized he would have to go, because others were ahead of him and those who hesitated were obviously headed for the scrap heap.

MIDDLE CLASS

In contrast with the small but wonderfully productive first class is a very much larger, less productive middle class of 1,755,000 units. Farms in this category produce annually between $2,500 and $20,000 worth of commodities. Middle class properties constitute 47 percent of the Nation's official farms, and they sell nearly 45 percent of its crops and livestock. Statistically, at least, this seems like a fair balance, but there is a wide range of quality within the group.

To get a more precise picture, the middle class might be divided into a small upper middle group of 483,000 farms, all of which produce more than $10,000 worth of commodities, and a large lower middle group of 1,272,000 farms, all of which sell less than $10,000 worth. The latter group has had a rough time, because their net farm incomes, as a rule, are only about one-third of gross sales.

William Ansel is a name we will give to one of the operators in the lower middle class. He was a full-time farmer in southern Maryland before the war. He raised tobacco, kept laying hens and milked 12 dairy cows. He was a jack-of-all-trades who built his own coops and sheds and repaired his own machinery. He liked farm life, but made very little money. He would tell his town relatives, "I make a living because I don't spend much."

During the war, the Baltimore shipyards paid good wages, so Ansel took a full-time job there and worked his land weekends and evenings. His wife helped with the milking and other chores.

After the war, William Ansel continued to go to town to work. He did not enlarge his farm business. He preferred the weekly paycheck because he had four young children coming along. He bought a few pieces of secondhand farm machinery from time to time as old implements wore out. "The new stuff is over my head," he would say, "and I can get by with this."

Ansel is too conservative to expand. He is afraid of debt, for he looks upon his farm as a home, and the basis of personal security, rather than as a business. He does not want to jeopardize his slim assets. "I owe enough as it is," he declares.

In the last census year, the average net income by operators in the lower middle class was $1,740. Their average earnings off the farm were $1,816. As a group, they are already halfway out of agriculture, yet they most truly represent the old-style, self-sufficient countryman who tried to make ends meet by thrift and reliance upon family labor.

THIRD CLASS

At the very bottom of the agricultural pyramid is a large third class of 1,641,000 units which produce only 5.3 percent of all farm commodities. Actually their operators are not farmers and should not be called such officially. This entire group averaged only $217 net annual income from agriculture. They averaged $2,884—or 13 times more—from other sources. Within the third class are 1,300,000 properties run by semiretired or spare-time operators who averaged 93 percent of their incomes from outside sources and only 7 percent from farming.

However, this third class, which constitutes 44 percent of the official census farm family, includes 349,000 farms whose owners are truly one of the most distressed economic groups in America. Their net incomes from an attempt at agriculture averaged $438 and their net incomes from other sources averaged $525.

They just could not either employ themselves or find adequate employment elsewhere. Their poverty and degradation is equal to that found in urban slums. It is visibly apparent to anyone who travels widely in the country. They have been bypassed by a technological revolution beyond their means. Many of them are still engaged in horse-mule tillage while the real producers have moved into the space age.

The solution to their problem, like that of the urban unemployed, is more city jobs on the payrolls of others. A few more cents a bushel or a few more dollars a bale would not change their condition in the least. They just do not produce enough bushels or bales to make a living, no matter what the price.

Misunderstandings about the health of American agriculture could easily be corrected by a more realistic definition of the farm as it is enumerated in the Census of Agriculture. Under present rules, any operation qualifies if it is over 10 acres in size and sells $50 worth of produce. Units of less than 10 acres are also tabulated if they sell $250 worth of produce. Such definitions can make a farmer of a weekend hobbyist who grows raspberries for the gang at the office, but they do not come close to identifying the real agriculturist.

Of course, there is an understandable reluctance in certain quarters to count farms by more realistic criteria. The farm bloc in Congress would emerge with its wings clipped even shorter and the Department of Agriculture might have to put half of its 30 acres of prime Washington office space into the soil bank. Michigan's Representative ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Republican, may have forecast just such a calamity when—tongue in cheek—he proposed to Congress that "the total number of employes in the Department of Agriculture shall at no time exceed the number of farmers in America."

One of the strangest aspects of public policy at the present time is the highly articulate concern about the low incomes of undercapitalized entrepreneurs in agriculture while other more serious social and economic calamities have befallen the more numerous families of the urban unemployed who have less income and less equity in property. If, at a time when only 8 percent of American families live on the land and 92 percent live elsewhere, we continue to regard the family farm as a pillar of democracy, we may wake up later to find the roof has caved in.

A public program of aid and support which is designed to save the lower middle class farm can only increase the lead of the pacesetters. Two Secretaries of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson under President Eisenhower and Orville L. Freeman under President Kennedy, have recognized that the most help from the Government goes to the few at the top in order that a little may trickle down to the many below.

Farmers did not like Benson because, while he would have removed controls on production, he also would have cut Government price supports. They do not like Freeman because, while he would raise Government price supports, he has proposed strict production controls. What they want are floor prices plus a wide-open market, and something of that sort is probably what they bank on getting from Congress this summer. There is a saying going the rounds in the farm belt: "Benson made a Democrat out of me and Freeman is turning me back into a Republican."

The urban taxpayer naturally gets aroused when he considers his own desperate needs for public services that he cannot have because the money is soaked up by agriculture's $7 billion sponge. If a few billions were transferred from spending on the farms to the congested metropolitan areas, quite a number of public hardships could be relieved without any increase in taxes.

It seems apparent that a significant part of congressional indifference to urban problems is due to a deliberate protest against Federal aid for the city on the part of certain rural spokesmen. Not long ago, representatives of the Iowa Farm Bureau visited Washington, as one Congressman put it, "to give us their views not only on farm legislation but on the other issues with which we are wrestling in Congress."

One of those voices from the grassroots advised the legislators: "We feel Government is attempting to solve too many problems which should be left to local governments. For example: Federal aid to education, Federal housing, urban renewal, etc."

Each year, the impact of such pronouncements loses a little more punch as the urban population rises and the farm exodus continues. The influence which agriculture still exerts on Capitol Hill rests largely on historical overrepresentation, seniority in strategic spots and the horsetrading wit of the farmer. While the last remains as sharp as ever, the intrinsic strength to back it up is ebbing.

The magazine, Wallace's Farmer, a voice to reckon with in the Corn Belt, sensed the wind of change in January 1962. "We've had farm program fights practically every year," it editorialized. "But they were mostly family spats—differences of opinion among farmers themselves. Now a third party, the city consumer, armed with new voting power, is watching these goings-on in Washington with increasing interest and suspicion. With this new 'partner' abroad, farm legislation must be drawn more carefully. To avoid a violent consumer revolt at the polls, political leaders know that future farm programs must be less costly and more effective."

It might be said, in the light of the wheat farmers' recent refusal to heed this advice, that they still think they can have their way. Yet President Kennedy himself cautioned them at his May 8 press conference not to hope for easier terms in new agricultural legislation. "I don't think you could get a majority," was his observation.

Perhaps the time has come when Congress will reorient its thinking, and agree with the farm bureau that the Federal Treasury has attempted "to solve too many problems which should be left to local governments"—notably, the farm problem.

Reports to the United Nations Trusteeship Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, last week it was the pleasant duty of two of our colleagues, the gentleman from California, EDWARD R. ROYBAL, and the gentleman from Hawaii, THOMAS P. GILL, and myself to represent the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs at meetings of the United Nations Trusteeship Council on June 5 while discussions on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands were in progress. We were genuinely impressed with the manner in which the Honorable Sidney R. Yates, U.S. representative on the Trusteeship Council, and the Honorable M. Willfred Goding, High Commissioner of the Trust Territory, and their respective staff members described our procedures and explained our implementation of the Trusteeship Agreement under which the Micronesian Islands of the Pacific are administered.

Mr. Speaker, I offer the first of a series of five statements which were presented at the Trusteeship Council meetings. The first article includes an address by our former colleague in the House of Represenatives, Hon. Sidney R. Yates, in which he presents an overall account of our administration in the Trust Territory, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

It is a very great plesaure for my delegation to report to the Trusteeship Council on the administration by the United States of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. My own remarks will be introductory and fairly brief. The burden of the report will, with the approval of the Council, be presented by the able High Commissioner for the Trust Territory, Mr. M. Wilfred Goding, and I am sure that he will be pleased to answer any of the questions that representatives may have with respect to the administration of the affairs of the Trust Territory.

We are also honored to have with us our distinguished colleague from Saipan, the President of the Marianas District Legislature, Mr. Vicente Santos, who also, with the approval of the Council, will make a brief statement. Accompanying Mr. Santos are two other distinguished citizens of the Trust Territory, who are with us today as observers of our proceedings. They are Mr. Andrew J. Robomon, who is President of the Yap Island Council, and Mr. Francis Defngin, who is Assistant District Anthropologist and Adviser to the Yap District Administrator. We are very pleased to have them with us so they can see for themselves the seriousness and the diligence with which members of the Council undertake their responsibilities.

My Government believes that our visitors who are with us today are aware, as are all the people of the Trust Territory, of the sincere and sympathetic regard of the United States of America for the people of Micronesia. Ever since the United States voluntarily brought its administration of the Pacific Islands into the International Trusteeship System some 15 years ago, our efforts have been founded in friendship, and we have made a sustained effort to improve the welfare of the people. We have been devoted toward helping them approach the time of self-determination, which is the right of all nations under the United Nations Trusteeship System.

The United States is not a colonial power. The United States is not present in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands as a colonial power. We are in total agreement with article 76 of the charter, which declares the goal of the trusteeship system to be "the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence."

Moreover, we subscribe to the purposes of General Assembly Resolution 1514 (XV), the so-called anticolonial resolution, and we firmly support its second operative paragraph, which declares that: "All peoples have the right of self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development." It is our objective that the people of the trust territory shall be given a free and an informed choice of the type of government they wish for themselves. We shall do our best to make a worthy contribution to the shining record of the Trusteeship Council, a record which we believe constitutes one of the bright and stirring chapters in the history of international cooperation.

Our fundamental goals in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands are threefold: first, to raise the general level of health and education to equip the people to deal with the problems of the Micronesian community and the world beyond; second, to build a structure for a more productive economy which will enable the people to achieve an acceptable level of self-sufficiency and well-being; and finally, to foster the sense of political unity and responsibility which are necessary to enable the people to make an informed decision about their future.

The task of administering the affairs of the Trust Territory of the Pacific has not always been an easy one. This is understandable in view of the fact that the territory lies in a vast area of some 3 million square miles. Its 80,000 inhabitants live on 96 of the 2,100 islands, which are scattered throughout an area equivalent in size to the continental United States or the continent of Australia. Hundreds of the islands are only tiny spits of sand and coral which are uninhabitable.

It is understandable, therefore, that, if for no other reason than the geographical difficulties, a number of problems have not been attacked as rapidly as would be desired. My government is well aware of that fact and intends that the pace be speeded up. We believe that our current and future efforts will show such acceleration. President Kennedy has made clear that a determined effort will be made to increase the beneficial impact of our program, and he has followed through by requesting that the appropriation for the current fiscal year for the territory should be doubled. As visiting missions from time to time have pointed out, additional funds could be used to make necessary improvements in the islands. It was with this in mind that the President made his request. The Congress in turn has agreed to the President's request and has affirmed its interest in and concern for the people of the trust territory by approving two appropriations. The first is a supplemental appropriation which in effect doubled the amount available for the budget of the trust territory this year by increasing that amount to $15 million. In addition to that appropriation the sum of $15 million has been appropriated for the next fiscal year. What this means is that improvements already in progress, improvements that have been started, will be continued in an uninterrupted fashion and new work can start promptly. Almost the entire amount of the new money will be spent to build classrooms, to build houses for teachers, to build hospitals. The largest single expenditure for both 1963 and 1964 is earmarked for education.

Secondly, President Kennedy has appointed a special consultant with a distinguished record in the solution of economic development problems to lead a survey mission to the trust territory. The mission will visit Micronesia in July and will study critically the actions we are taking to deal with the political, economic, and social problems of the territory.

My delegation regrets that legislation to provide a means for judicial settlement of the land claims of certain citizens of Kwajalein and Dalap Islands was not, as we had expected, enacted by Congress at its session last fall. This was not attributable in any degree to a lack of understanding or sympathy on the part of Congress. The legislation was a victim of the logjam that occurs at the tail end of every congressional session. Similar bills have been introduced at the present session of Congress and have already been passed by the House of Representatives. I have received a letter from Senator Jackson, who is the head of the Senate Committee on the Interior, advising me that the Senate committee is scheduled to consider that bill on June 11. We hope for its early passage.

Legislation to provide for the settlement of the remaining claims of the people of Rongelap Island, who were affected by the 1954 nuclear tests, also failed of passage at the last session of Congress and for the same reason. Again this legislation has been acted on favorably this year. The Senate will consider that legislation on the same day as it considers the other claims I spoke about.

The Governments of the United States and Japan are continuing to discuss the problem of Micronesian claims which remain against the Government of Japan since the war, seeking to find an equitable solution. We regret the length of time it is taking to find such a solution. I am sure that all of us do, but I am sure as well that my colleagues who have had experience in negotiating claim questions recognize their complexities and their intricacies. The Japanese Government and the United States Government are giving the problem urgent attention. We hope that we can come to some agreement in the near future.

On this point I should like to assure the council that when a settlement has been reached with the Japanese Government, every effort will be made to adhere to the Council's recommendations for disbursing the funds.

With respect to political developments in the territory during the last year, I think that the most important one resulted from sessions of the Council of Micronesia which were held in late September and early October in 1962. At that time the council resolved that a true legislative body should be created as promptly as possible. To help bring this about, it established a legislative drafting committee to begin the preliminary work on drafting a constitution. In March of this year the council met in special session in Saipan to consider the preliminary report of the legislative drafting committee. This special session made preliminary recommendations about the organization of a future legislative body, and their recommendations are now being carefully studied both in Saipan and in Washington. They will be considered again in the near future by the Council of Micronesia.

While many steps to organize a true territorial legislature are still to be taken, it seems most probable that this political advance, which was recommended by the trusteeship council last year, will shortly become a reality.

While the political threads which knit a community together are becoming more numerous in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, new economic threads are also strengthening the community fabric.

A change in policy made last year will, we hope, have an important effect in improving living standards for the Micronesians and for improving the general level of economic activity. This was the decision to open the trust territory to private U.S. investment. This is beginning. You will hear more about this from Mr. Goding.

Moreover, additional funds have been placed in the Development Loan Fund which is administered by the High Commissioner for the purpose of stimulating locally owned businesses. Legislation is now pending in the Congress which will allow the Fund to be used more effectively, and in time it is expected that the Fund will reach a size where it will be able to make large-scale development loans and to enter the field of guaranteeing commercial bank loans.

I have already mentioned the progress which is being made in the field of classroom construction, and in this field of education another change in policy should be brought to the Council's attention. Previously, each of the six districts in the territory was given the responsibility for financing and maintaining its own elementary education system. This is the principle that is generally followed in the United States. Educational needs are met on a local level. The new policy provides central funds and guidance for elementary classroom construction, for teacher recruitment, for support, and for the provision of school equipment. We believe that this approach will be much more effective in meeting the educational needs of the islands, and we are confident that it will bring a rapid improvement in the school system.

Notable progress, too, has been made in the field of higher education. The College of Guam, which serves as the institution of higher learning for the majority of students from the Trust Territory, is now a fully accredited 4-year institution.

The coming year shows plans for an increase of 60 percent in the number of Trust Territory college scholarships for Micronesian students. This will raise from 65 to 104 the scholarships that are available, and the total from all sources will be raised from 86 to 125. As in the past, most of these new scholarship will provide for study at the College of Guam where a new dormitory is under construction for the accommodation of students from the Trust Territory. Students will also study, as they do at present, at colleges in the United States, in the Philippines, and elsewhere abroad.

This has been only a brief review of the noteworthy developments over the past year and of my government's plans for the future. We believe our administration shows substantial progress. We intend to continue our efforts with renewed vigor.

We welcome the recommendations of our fellow members of the Trusteeship Council, and we suggest that our record for the past year shows we have taken the Council's recommendations most seriously. We shall continue to do so.

It is clear that the U.S. Congress and the executive branch of the U.S. Government are as one in their determination to see that the obligations of the United States in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands are discharged with honor and in full partnership and friendship with the people of Micronesia.

May I now request the permission of the Council that our High Commissioner, Mr. Goding, be seated at the Council table in order that he may present his report to the Council.

Mr. Robert W. Smart Receives Reserve Officers Association Distinguished Service Citation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include an article appearing in the June 15, 1963, issue of the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal with reference to conferring the Reserve Officers Association distinguished service citation to the Chief Counsel of the House Armed Services Committee, Robert W. Smart.

Mr. Speaker, 16 years ago, when the House merged the Committees on Naval and Military Affairs into the Committee on Armed Services, not everyone was certain the consolidation would prove as successful as the succeeding years have demonstrated.

The outstanding reputation which the committee enjoys today is an amalgam of many elements, but it is no secret that one of the principal catalysts has been, and is, the committee's chief counsel, Mr. Robert W. Smart.

Mr. Smart came to the committee soon after it was organized and has served in his current position since 1951. He has earned the respect, trust, and friendship not only of those Members who have been privileged to work with him on the committee, but of every Member of this and the other body who has ever come in contact with him. His intelligence, objectivity, wit, and good common sense have provided me and the committee with an invaluable asset which has proved equally advantageous to the Congress and the Nation.

Today, in Miami, Mr. Smart is receiving the Reserve Officers Association distinguished service citation for his outstanding contributions to national defense.

The Army-Navy-Air Force Journal has highlighted the award with a profile on Mr. Smart which I believe all Members will want to read.

The article referred to is as follows:

A Profound Imprint on Service Lives

Anyone who has ever sat for a half hour or more in what might be called the reception room of the Committee on Armed Services, U.S. House of Representatives, cannot help but be impressed by the man who occupies an unimposing desk crowded into a corner of the room.

He is Robert W. Smart, the committee's chief counsel.

His name may mean little to rank-and-file members of the Armed Forces, but in countless, mostly unrecorded ways, he makes, and has made for the past dozen years or more, a profound imprint on their lives.

A daily stream of visitors moves to and from his desk. Some are distinguished leaders of Government and industry; some are "little" people. Most have problems or perplexing questions and, frequently, furrowed brows. Few depart without a noticeable air of "reprieve."

To Armed Forces leaders and senior Members of the House and Senate, "Bob" Smart is known as one of the most influential and gifted lawyers on Capitol Hill. Strangely, he has achieved his reputation through an ability which is almost anathema to the legal profession.

As one House leader has put it, he is "endowed with unlimited perspicacity." In simpler terms: he goes straight to the heart of a complex problem, pinpoints the main issues and cites in clear-cut language what can or should be done.

When Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat, of South Carolina, once took a difficult committee assignment, he agreed to accept the job only after he had obtained assurrance that Smart would be assigned as his counsel. He said, "I was going to travel first class or not leave home. I left with Bob."

In the military field, Smart is the senior staff member of the Congress, but House Members also go to him for advice and guidance on many matters unrelated to the Armed Forces.

He has served on the professional staff of the Armed Services Committee since 1947 when the committee was created.

The first chairman was a Republican. So is Smart. GOP Members had lured him to Washington from his native Missouri with the promise of a stimulating, but possibly temporary, job.

When House control passed to the Democrats 2 years later, he might have been dumped. But the new chairman, CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, had been impressed with Smart's abilities and his nonpartisan approach to committee activities. He kept him on the staff, and, in 1951, elevated him to chief counsel, a post he has held through 12 successive sessions of Congress.

Born in Missouri on May 20, 1907, Smart was graduated from the State university, earned his LL.B. at Cumberland University (Tenn.), and made a successful but brief swing into politics. He was elected prosecuting attorney of Lawrence County, Mo., but resigned 8 months after Pearl Harbor to enlist in the Army.

Following OCS at Fort Sill, Okla., he served as a field artillery platoon leader, battery executive, battery commander, and eventually as a military government legal officer, ending his active military service in Korea in 1946 in the rank of captain.

He remained a Reserve officer in the Army until 1949 when he shifted to the Air Force Reserve, received "eagle" insignia and subsequently was promoted (Mar. 7, 1961) to the rank of brigadier general.

This week he received the Reserve Officer Association's distinguished-service citation for his outstanding contributions to national defense." Chairman VINSON said General Smart "has been a tower of strength" to the Armed Services Committee and that by honoring him, the Reserve Officers Association paid the committee a great compliment.

As chief counsel of the committee, General Smart coordinates and directs the major activities of the committee staff, supervises the committee agenda, writes legislation and reports, presides as counsel at full committee meetings and frequently counsels special subcommittees appointed to examine some particularly thorny problem.

Even this busy schedule does not prevent him from helping the services smooth out many small, day-to-day problems which reach his desk. He is seldom too busy to come to the aid of a troubled service wife or a junior officer or enlisted man who is experiencing difficulties which merit assistance.

Anyone who wants to talk to him, including occasional tourists who stumble in by accident, is rarely turned away. But whether the supplicant is a Cabinet member, a flag officer, a lieutenant, or a sergeant, whether the problem is big or small, he listens with grave attention, reflects on what has been said, asks a few quick questions, and states his views in unmistakable terms.

When he is complimented on the dispatch with which he has resolved a question, he is apt to say, "Often in error, but never in doubt." Those who rely on his judgment know that his batting average is amazingly high.

Many of General Smart's qualities are not easy to assess because they stem from characteristics which generally are thought of as commonplace. Yet they stand out and are all the more remarkable because they are seldom encountered in official Washington.

A single example illustrates the point:

When his secretaries are busy and his telephone rings, he answers it himself, and always with the most direct greeting possible: "Armed Services Committee."

He is a bad influence on a city of status symbols, but in the words of an Appropriations Committee member, "one of the most capable men on Capitol Hill."

Problems of the ARA Program as I See Them

SPEECH

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4996) to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a number of varied comments on the merits and demerits of the ARA program. I think a significant revelation of fact has been made on the floor of this body during the verbal exchange. Very little reference was made to the basic intent of this legislation—the intent being to help areas help themselves. No one can find fault with this principle. However, the derogatory remarks made have been directed primarily to the administration of the program itself, the politics involved, and the tendency to replace or compete with existing business enterprises in given communities. I believe most of the blame for breakdown of this program lies with the politicians themselves.

In my district I have seen potential benefits of the program. I have seen good administration, but I have also seen complications arise as a result of the program. It appears to me the fundamental problem lies not in the principle involved, not with the dedicated public servants involved, but, more specifically, with the fact that duplications with other programs tend to conflict with one another, improper judgment in approving certain loans have resulted in unfair competition to existing businesses sometimes resulting in a shift of job opportunity and of tax base, rather than creation of new jobs and new tax base as was initially intended.

I supported Mr. Bolton's amendment because I believe it is designed to rectify existing discrepancies and strengthen the opportunity to help those areas actually in need of industrial and economic development.

I supported Mr. Taft's amendment for the same reason. If these amendments do not pass, the program will continue in jeopardy.

Liberty Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following is the testimony of Mr. Ralph Courtney, a constituent of mine, from Spring Valley, N.Y. Mr. Courtney testified on July 5 before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, for the Liberty Lobby, an organization of which he is a member and on whose policy board he serves.

While I may not agree with my constituent 100 percent, I certainly agree with his views on decentralization and equality under law.

The testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF RALPH COURTNEY

Liberty lobby is a national organization of over 25,000 patriotic Americans who are seriously concerned with the increasing trend toward Federal centralism. We view these bills as vividly representative of this dangerous trend and strongly oppose them and urge their defeat.

It is the conviction of those who share the decentralist point of view that whenever a proposed bill singles out a group of citizens and proposes to do something for, or against, this group, then this bill aims at something that is contrary to the spirit of the American Constitution.

For the United States was not to have second- or third-class citizens; nor was there any justification in the Constitution for classifying citizens as workingmen or employers, or as anything else such as blacks and whites. All were to be full citizens, entitled to common and equal rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Therefore when any bill to extend or add to the rights of groups of citizens, points to groups inferentially such a bill may be suspected of subverting the Constitution. The so-called rights which this bill proposes may actually deny common rights on which this country was founded by creating special "rights" or, better said, special privileges to be given to groups in seeking their political support or for other reasons.

Thus a politically centralized society, which in reality is a hangover from a former and more aristocratic view of social life, is still with us today. Instead of respecting common and equal rights, this type of society continues to hand out special favors. The corruption to which this method of handling public affairs has opened the door is bound to continue until social functions are decentralized and the powers of government can be limited to the safeguarding of equal rights.

Social decentralism draws a sharp distinction between the cultural, political, and economic functions of society. The cultural life of society will be the richer the more it is free from political direction. The political life of rights will be satisfactory to the extent that it maintains the principle of equal rights. The economy will be efficient and healthy when conducted on the basis of common rights especially equal rights in the pursuit of economic happiness.

The politically centralized social form which society has not been able to outgrow or shake off originated hundreds of years ago when the needs of men were very different from those today. The peoples of that time believed that the earth as well as the heavens was actually ruled by the Divinity Himself with the help of His Angels, Archangels, Archai, etc. Therefore the earthly rulership, with its governments and their ministers, was planned as a faithful reflection of this arrangement in the heavens. Such is the outmoded social form that we still follow today.

Certain members of this basically aristocratic setup were considered to be superior to others and there was presumed to exist within this complex a supreme authority to which everything could, if necessary, be referred back. Nowadays, it is clear to all citizens that there is nothing in the supreme political authority that by the greatest stretch of the imagination could be thought of as divine or even noble.

As long as political centralism permits victorious parties to create special privileges for themselves or their supporters, the racial element that is dominant in society becomes important. But as soon as the American doctrine is accepted, namely, that the creation and maintenance of rights is an equalitarian function, it will become unconstitutional to create special privileges and the racial problem will become a thing of the past.

The American alternative to political centralism is to be found in the Declaration of Independence where the task of safeguarding rights that are equal and held in common by all is intrusted to the Government of the newly conceived American society. If this concept had been followed it would have limited the governmental function to the field of common rights, leaving education and business to develop freely on the basis of general rights. This separation and independent operation of the cultural, political, and economic functions of social life is functional decentralism.

Hon. Francis E. Walter

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my expression of deep sorrow at the passing of my good friend and colleague, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER.

Like so many others who were privileged to associate with Mr. WALTER, I feel his absence as a keen personal loss. I did not have the opportunity, as did some, to serve closely with him over many years. However, I was privileged to have him as the dean of my delegation, and as such, he was of course one of the first persons I met when I came to Congress.

I shall never forget how kind and helpful he was to me in my earliest days here. Despite his heavy responsibilities he had the time to give me the benefit of his advice and counsel. Since that time he always continued to exhibit the same gracious interest at any time I had occasion to call upon him.

I was deeply impressed with the conscientiousness and sincerity of Mr. WALTER. He was obviously a man who was truly dedicated to public service. The author of much controversial legislation, he was often the target of bitter criticism, but no one could deny his good motives nor fail to admire his stanch conviction. I felt extremely fortunate to be the beneficiary of his long experience and good judgment.

As time went on I of course became more aware of the important role being played by Mr. WALTER in the House of Representatives. As one observed his unusual qualities of leadership and his brilliant understanding of the law, it was not difficult to see how he had attained his position. He was indeed an outstanding legislator.

It was because of his superior ability as a legislator that Mr. WALTER was so often called upon to preside when the House was considering very complex legislation. It was an inspiration to watch him on such occasions. His knowledge of the rules of the House and his precise understanding of the provisions of the law were remarkable. His skill as a parliamentarian was such as to often command words of praise on the floor of the House after he had presided over the consideration of a controversial bill.

It is not often that a single Member of Congress can make his presence felt as keenly as did "TAD" WALTER. He leaves behind a record of performance that will be long remembered. And he leaves behind many friends who have profited by knowing him.

Mrs. Moorhead and I extend our deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

Admiral Hart Will Be 86 Wednesday, Regrets Leaving U.S. Senate at 69

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 86th birthday of Thomas C. Hart, a great naval commander and a former U.S. Senator from Connecticut. Admiral Hart, as far as I know, is the only man in our history who resigned his commission as a four-star admiral and on the same morning went up to Capitol Hill to take his oath as a U.S. Senator.

The Bridgeport Telegram recently published an interview with the admiral who lives in Sharon, Conn. The article captures the flavor of this remarkable man very well and I am happy to offer it for the RECORD. I know every Member will join me in wishing this great American many happy returns.

ADMIRAL HART WILL BE 86 WEDNESDAY; REGRETS LEAVING U.S. SENATE AT 69

(By David Holmberg)

A sharp-tongued old salt who survived three wars and a stint in politics faces another milestone this week.

Thomas C. Hart, admiral, U.S. Navy, retired, and former U.S. Senator from Connecticut, celebrates his 86th birthday Wednesday.

From the helm of the good ship *King House*—Admiral Hart's 160-acre farm at Sharon—to which he retired in 1946—the former commander of the U.S. Pacific fleet confronted the new "crisis" with the same bold directness which made him a hero of World War II and one of the sharpest disciplinarians in the Navy.

"I don't have birthdays any more," he said.

The words came over the telephone wire with the crispness of a command and with the characteristic wit of one of Connecticut's most favored sons.

Admiral Hart, it was clear, hadn't changed a bit.

He hastened to make that even more obvious: "I only have birthdays every 5 years now," he said. "The next one will be my 90th."

So on the farm where he came to live permanently after leaving the Senate in 1946, there will be no family observance of the hurdling of the latest chronological obstacle.

"Celebration?" the admiral snorted. "I tell them (his family) that I won't be here if they do."

What will he do on his birthday then? The admiral snorted again. "I think I'll take a pill and sleep all day," he said. It is not very likely, for Admiral Hart is not the daytime sleeping kind.

He left his Flint, Mich., home in 1902 to become the youngest cadet at the U.S. Naval Academy, to command a destroyer before he was 30 years old, during the Spanish-American War, to be cited for distinguished service in World War I, to rise to admiral and then to commander of the U.S. Pacific fleet in World War II, to an interim appointment to the U.S. Senate in 1945.

In 1946 he announced he would not run for the Senate and retired to his wife's ancestral homestead where he had lived—and returned to only sporadically between Navy assignments—most of his married life.

REGRETS LEAVING SENATE

Now his humor subsides into seriousness when he is asked if he regrets leaving the Senate at the age of 69. (He said at the time that there were "already too many men of too advanced an age in the Senate now.")

"I sometimes regret having left the Senate," he says, "but, of course, at the time I didn't know what shape I'd be in in 6 years, and I wanted to return to the farm. But possibly I retired a little too soon. The Senate was one of the very interesting times of my life."

He occupies himself now with the farm, which is run by his son, Roswell. A second son, Thomas, Jr., was killed in World War II, serving with the Navy. Two daughters live near Sharon, and another lives in Washington.

"I don't do too much on the farm now, unless there are some engineering problems," he says. "This is a dairy farm, and I don't even know how many faucets the cows have."

HE FISHES AND GOLFS

And he fishes and golfs—"in the hundreds," and offers barbed replies to people who asked about his health.

"I get up long enough every day to have my bed made up," he says.

He is not active in local politics, and his last fling in the political arena was in 1956. Then he served as chairman of Citizens for Eisenhower in Litchfield County.

STILL STANCH REPUBLICAN

He is still "very much a Republican," but he will make "no partisan remarks" about the Kennedy administration, or politics in general.

He is still very much the man, the admiral, the Senator named Thomas C. Hart, for when asked how much he weighs, if he has kept his "fighting weight" (a trim 140 pounds on a 5-foot 6-inch frame) he answered with a question:

"How much do you weigh? I can get down to 134 now. How much do you weigh? I'll take you on."

And then he said "good night," very crisply.

U.S. Curb on Braceros Gives Mexico Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, the bracero problem remains unsolved in California due to the action of the body. I am including in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Washington Post. It simply corroborates and amplifies the problems created as initially presented in testimony before the Agriculture Committee and during debate on the floor of the House:

U.S. CURB ON BRACEROS GIVES MEXICO PROBLEMS

(By Bert Quint)

MEXICO CITY.—The recent decision by the U.S. House of Representatives to cut the flow of Mexican migrant laborers to the farms and ranches of the United States down to a trickle, threatens this country with an economic, and perhaps a political crisis.

Since 1951, when the two nations signed an agreement formalizing the hitherto illegal traffic in peasants back and forth across the border, hundreds of thousands of Mexican "braceros" have entered the United States each year, providing cheap farm labor throughout the country, but especially in Texas, California, New Mexico, Arizona, Arkansas, and Colorado.

Every 2 years, the agreement has been renewed, despite increasing opposition from the AFL–CIO, which claims U.S. farm wages have been kept low because of the willingness of the Mexicans to work for sums that are great by their standards, but small by American standards.

In 1961, when the last extension was accorded, the labor group charged that negotiations for it between the United States and Mexican Governments were held "in haste and secrecy."

UNIONS NOW WINNERS

When the issue came to a vote this time, on May 29, organized labor won. The House rejected a proposed 2-year extension by a vote of 174–158. Unless a new bill is submitted to the Senate and passed by that group and the House changes its mind when it gets a second crack at it, the braceros program will die on December 31.

Several thousand Mexican farm hands will continue to enter the United States each year as permanent immigrants, and others undoubtedly will slip across the border illegally. But the bulk of Mexico's migrant labor force will be kept at home.

Some Mexican politicians reacted to the news of the House's surprising rejection of the bill by following the popular custom of trying to make the Mexican people believe they are not dependent on the United States for anything. They hailed the decision as "an end to the cancer which has been consuming the country, the migration of its workers."

MEXICAN WELL-BEING AFFECTED

Nevertheless, even they realize that, for two reasons, it is a migration vital to Mexican well-being.

It is a source of badly needed foreign exchange. The braceros who goes to the United States to work saves most of his money, or sends it or brings it home with him. Many Mexican villages, especially in the perennially drought-stricken northwest, depend on the income of the few braceros who work for 3 or 4 months in the United States and return with a few hundred dollars. The entire village lives for the rest of the year on this money.

The Bank of Mexico conservatively puts the revenue earned by the country this way at something over $30 million per year.

Then there is the matter of Mexican unemployment. There simply is not enough land to provide work for the 52.8 percent of the Mexican population that depends on agricultural labor for its livelihood.

Until 1959, the braceros entered the United States at the rate of 400,000 per year. More recently, because of increased farm mechanization, the need for them has lessened. In 1960, 325,000 entered, followed by about 300,000 in 1961, and 250,000 in 1962. This year, between 150,000 and 200,000 are expected to cross the border before the pact expires.

FARMERS CITE "STOOP" LABOR

Farmers, especially in California and the Southwest, insist that the need for them still exists. Americans, they say, are unwilling to engage in "stoop" labor, like picking cotton and beets. The AFL–CIO counters with the argument that, "if they were paid enough, they would do it," and has sought unsuccessfully for establishment of a minimum farm wage.

Times are hard as it is in the Mexican countryside. With a curb on employment on the other side of the Rio Grande, they will become harder. Communist agitators, already active in rural areas, probably will become more active and, with the peasants more desperate than ever, likely will meet with more success than in the past.

The migrant labor pact, however, is not yet necessarily dead. The House vote was taken on May 29, when many farm State Representatives already had left Washington for the Memorial Day holidays. California's Gov. Edmund G. Brown has begun a campaign to put pressure on President Kenedy to have a new bill submitted for extension of the agreement, hoping that this time it would pass.

Mount Carmel, Center and Hospital for Alcoholics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, one of the fascinating things about big bureaucratic goverment is the terrible and unwarranted interference in the business affairs and the freedom of the American people, as well as injecting itself into charitable institutions.

A matter has come to my attention concerning the Department of Labor's attempts to make a test case of Mount Carmel, center and hospital for alcoholics at Paterson, N.J., which is under the direction of the Very Reverend Monsignor William N. Wall. I am taking the liberty of inserting herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, copies of correspondence with the U.S. Department of Labor, and statements and letters by the Very Reverend Monsignor William N. Wall. I believe it very important that the American people have an opportunity to understand just what is going on by the Government's attempts to interfere with the rehabilitation of alcoholics without Government funds or contributions from anyone.

I have personally discussed this subject with Monsignor Wall, and shall assist in every way possible to see that this institution and other institutions will be able to carry on the good works in the field of rehabilitation of human beings, that they be assisted and encouraged and not circumvented by petty regulations of bureaucratic officeholders. It would seem to me our great Department of Labor would have other important and serious problems to handle, rather than spending time and energy, at the taxpayers expense to harass institutions of this nature.

I await further word from Monsignor Wall as to the outcome of the meetings in which he is endeavoring to resolve this situation with the Department of Labor.

The correspondence follows:

MOUNT CARMEL,
CENTER AND HOSPITAL FOR ALCOHOLICS,
Paterson, N.J., June 5, 1963.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I feel it my moral duty to bring the attached correspondence to your attention.

This issue with the Federal Government is based on the bigness of Government that approaches human problems with massive, rather than intimate interpretations of laws.

Sincerely yours,
Very Rev. Msgr. WILLIAM N. WALL.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
WAGE AND HOUR AND
PUBLIC CONTRACTS DIVISIONS,
May 6, 1963.

MOUNT CARMEL GUILD,
Mount Carmel Hospital for Alcoholics,
Paterson, N.J.
(Attention of the Very Reverend Monsignor William N. Wall).

GENTLEMEN: This will reply to your April 17, 1963, letter addressed to our Investigator Victor Pellechia.

Mount Carmel Guild has been scheduled for an investigation to determine its coverage under and compliance with the Fair Labor Standards Act. Such investigations are made for a variety of reasons, all having to do with proper enforcement of the act.

Sections 9 and 11(a) of the act, copy of which is attached, provides the authority to conduct such investigation and describes the general procedure to be followed. Regulations part 516, subparts A and B, also enclosed, list the records that are required to be kept. You will note that section 516.7 of the latter regulations provides that all records shall be open at any time to inspection and transcription.

Also enclosed for your general information is regulations part 525 dealing with Employment of handicapped clients in sheltered workshops pursuant to section 14 of the act. These regulations spell out the procedure in applying for a certificate, the criteria considered in passing on the application and other related matters.

We would welcome your cooperation in making it possible for us to proceed with our investigation without further delay. Please advise me within 10 days whether the required records will be made available and if not, the reasons therefor.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK B. MERCURIO,
Regional Director.

MOUNT CARAMEL CENTER AND
HOSPITAL FOR ALCOHOLICS,
Paterson, N.J., May 14, 1963.

MR. FRANK B. MERCURIO,
Regional Director,
U.S. Department of Labor,
New York City.

DEAR MR. MERCURIO: Your letter was kind and fair. It was brief and legalistic—but it missed the point that I have earlier discussed and written to other agents of the Labor Department.

Mount Carmel is, and I am, beholden to the laws of the land. You will not find me uncooperative in any area of governmental quest if there is legal or moral justification for such questing.

In this instance, I feel no such justification is present. On the contrary, if I did not oppose your jurisdiction, I would offend my conscience.

The matter is very simple. We at Mount Carmel are dedicated to Christian principles of charity—charity exactly as we perceive it from the words of Christ, not government. This is not to say we are defiant to government order. More simply, we reject totally the idea that your agency has any jurisdiction in this matter.

Let me start at the beginning:

In the United States, there are between 5 and 8 million alcoholics. Each of these alcoholics has an average of five relatives around him or her. Thus, I am talking about 25 to 40 million people. My point of orientation differs from yours. You orient your thinking around sections and acts and paragraphs and authority and subparts—and I deal with souls—souls of Almighty God. I'm dealing with compassion, understanding, tolerance, forgiveness, and you deal with a staff of governmental experts who respond to the dictates of an inanimate act of Congress. The real question is, Which law prevails: Christian law or materialistic law?

In 8 years, we have, with our own efforts, developed a rehabilitation and recovery facility that has proved successful, by every standard, to the relatively few men and women whom we have been able to assist. In these years, we have served more than 1 million meals (none better served at the training table of any university). More than 300,000 man-days of sober shelter have been provided men who are earning their way back to sobriety—earning their way back to God with words and deeds, like prayer, humility, understanding—not wages and hours; not acts and articles; not sections, paragraphs and subparts.

Let me ask a simple question: How many hours, under the U.S. Labor Act, does it require for a homeless alcoholic to get sober? What is the fair rate of pay for the years of terror these men have experienced on the Bowery? Or in jail? Or away from their families? What is the rate of pay that you recomend for the wife who has, for years, supported children because the husband and father has been addicted to alcohol and lost all sense of reality and responsibility?

Let me ask the question in another way. Is there any paragraph, subsection, subpart or special provision—or procedural recommendation—for the 50-odd men who died in 10 days on the Bowery in New York from drinking wood alcohol? Or a more harsh question, who in government is assuming the moral responsibility for these deaths? Has anyone checked into the lives of these men to see how many children survive—how many wives' tears are involved? Is there any special provision in the act to ascertain that these men had any spiritual assistance at the time of their death?

Or, indeed, is there any provision in the labor laws of the United States to assist any helpless alcoholic back to gainful sobriety—assist them back to employment?

There is only one requirement for admission to Mount Carmel—a very simple one—all the applicant has to do is suggest by his actions or his words, that he wants to quit drinking. Most of the men here are homeless—tired, sick and with an employment record that even the hard pressed labor-short market would reject. The best that can be said about their physical condition is that they are ambulatory—they can actually stand on their feet for the length of time that requires their being admitted. If they have been in our place once, and return to drinking, we have another question—still simple—are you sincere. We have had men in and out frequently—but they get a fresh start any time they can convey the idea that they sincerely want to stop drinking.

We give these men an allowance—and we deliberately do not call it a wage because to call it a wage would be to encourage them to an institutional life. We do not want the men to stay here indefinitely—although there are many men here who have been in residence for 2, 3, 5, to 7 years. Our objective is to admit them, sober them, give them good meals, rest, and strength—and an awareness of God, the value of sobriety.

And yes, we do provide daily work for the men with two motivations. We think work is good for every man—and we need to support ourselves.

Our reason for supplying the men with allowances is very simple—we do not want the men to go back to the standard method of raising revenue that they used before coming in—panhandling.

We are justifiably proud that we have been able to support ourselves. We are justifiably proud that we have never called on any Government agency, welfare setup or what-not, to get one red cent for the work we are doing.

There are some alternates which I think you can help us select. Is it your intent that we close up this facility? Is it your intent that we apply to Government agencies for aid—certainly every Hottentot from remote, unheard of countries all over the world are on our back now—and we're probably eligible for all kinds of Government assistance funds. However, we prefer to do it ourselves—by ourselves, with God's aid.

We have another direction we can take. We can call in the city, county, and State relief people and enroll every last one of these people. This way, they can get relief, but no work; they can get money but no sobriety; they can get food and booze, but not God's grace.

It seems to me that you have to assist our making this judgment.

(It is unfortunate that this letter has to be directed to you personally. My remarks are primarily intended for the ectoplasmic system of massive government that finds individual men—good, and, I'm sure, charitable men like you—in a contest of charity versus governmental regulations.)

In closing, Mr. Mercurio, I do invite you to came and investigate this place. We want you to bring over your entire staff. But come, not with the authority of your governmental acts, but with the authority of charity that is your responsibility—as it is mine. You can see the men, eat with the men, sleep with the men, live with the men for as long as you want—and I encourage you to find one abuse, one minor area in which we are not doing our maximum best to provide these men with the one thing your act does not cover—sobriety.

I look forward to your visit.

Cordially,

Very Rev. Msgr. WILLIAM N. WALL.

MOUNT CARMEL CENTER AND
HOSPITAL FOR ALCOHOLICS,
Paterson, N.J., May 14, 1963.

W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The attached exchange of correspondence between the director of your New York regional office and me are as unwelcome to me as I'm sure they will be to you.

But neither of us can afford not to examine the issue involved.

Several years ago more than 50 percent of the American people were sufficiently impressed with the New Frontier to give it a vote of confidence by electing a government dedicating to pursuing these new ideals. But many did not believe that our Government would beget law and regulation that would attempt to legislate Christian charity.

In the areas of Christian charity, we do not need new frontiers—indeed there is little to be improved on the ancient teaching of Christ on our relationships to our fellow men. If this is retrogressive thinking, then I'm all for it. If this suggests a greater wisdom of His frontiers, then count me in.

Our Government is overregulated, overlegislated, and overtaxed.

Today, many Americans turn their backs to needed acts of charity because they feel the Government will take care of our less fortunate fellow citizens. If a neighbor becomes sick, falls on a barren period, we tend to feel we have cared for our Christian obligation when we drive him to the nearest welfare office and help him to get registered. All the talk about aid for senior citizens is in direct competition to the ideals we learned as children that we should "honor our mothers and fathers."

I'm for Government aid, when needed, of course, but I'm not for Federal aid when it erodes one of the basic principles that have guided men from early days—that Christ told us to love our neighbor.

In 1955 when we became aware of the tragic problem of alcoholism—and the broken families, the high divorce rates, the abandoned children, and most important, the distractions from God—all of which are caused by alcoholism, we started a rehabilitation center from which has grown—thus far—two licensed hospitals. In the early years we were plagued with legislative booby traps. The city set standards, the county set standards, the State set standards—and each as though the other didn't exist. But we've complied with them all.

There remains in America a hard core of people who do not need, don't want, government handouts, some of which actually do more harm than good.

Need I refer to any authority than your own judgment about the welfare abuses—the terrifying scandals that are being discussed in magazines and newspapers every day. I am for welfare—I think organized action against major calamity is the only expedient course of action—providing that this governmental action is not submitted as being better than, or a substitute for, the obligation of all to respond to Christian teachings on our charitable relationships to our fellow men.

Governments today use charity as a political weapon. We see our aid programs administered on the basis of power exchange rather than from the heart and soul of the American people.

Welfare in the United States runs into billions of dollars. And when individual efforts by interested citizens are directed to eradicating a basic cause of welfare, we find ourselves hamstrung, insulted, threatened and frustrated. It is estimated that between 35 and 60 percent of all welfare cases can be traced to the excessive alcoholic drinking of one or both the parents.

Rehabilitation of alcoholics should be encouraged, but isn't.

Thousands of Government workers are employed to administrate welfare funds—but one wonders how many are employed in the areas of minimizing or eliminating causes or need of welfare.

Let me try to describe the average man who seeks our assistance. If you'll accept a broad paint stroke, this is a composite of the 15,000 we have tried to assist.

They are homeless, tired, sick, weary. Most have histories of skid row living and have been in the revolving door of short term jail sentences for drunken offenses against society. Chances are they have been thrown out by their families.

Their drinking conduct even offended those who love them most, their wives, their children, their mothers and fathers. Most of our men are over 45—but they look to be over 60. They have an employment record that scares off anyone even the employer of the most menial and despised unskilled work. The mechanical dishwasher denies these men the old opportunity of getting a free meal and a few dollars for a bottle with a few hours work.

These men have been moving in a social environment that is almost guaranteed to keep them drinking. They are rejected by family, state, county, and city government—rejected by every human agency. But not by God, nor by His teachings.

They are destined to sleep in flophouses, or worse. Their only companionship is a constant inner despair of doom—they live with their failures and crave more of the poison that makes them sicker still.

Dante didn't write the full description of Hell because he was not on the Bowery—or the skid row of any town. You can't know this hell unless, God forbid, you suffer from acute alcoholism—a medical disease that paralyzes the body, paralyzes the mind, and paralyzes the soul.

In this drunken condition are these men welcome in your office—will you hire them iny any of your many departments? Will you provide the personnel to interview them, humor them, take their unintentional insults, their meaningless blasphemies? Will you provide them comfort, understanding, warmth? Indeed, where do they go to get a place to wash their dirty face—or a meal—or a place to sleep—or a quiet place to beg Almighty God for mercy?

Mount Carmel started out with an old house big enough for six men. Today we have 55,000 square feet of hospitable space devoted to the care and rehabilitation of the despised, the homeless alcoholic. Every day we serve about 400 meals—and have for 10 years—more than a million meals. Never does a week go by that we don't serve all the meat the men can eat—and at 10 or more meals a week. Always plenty of vegetables, desserts—the best we know how to provide. I challenge you, or anyone, to find any university dining room that serves meals more nutritious, more appetizing than we do.

What is it that we are trying to do? Hire men to make money. No. Help men to save their souls? Yes. How do we do it?

All the man need do is show up and indicate he wants to be sober. Then he gets a bath, a bunk, and breakfast—in that order. Then comes the job part. We think (with old fashioned ideas) work is good for men. These men have been nomadic, irresponsible and unreliable. They must first absorb the simple discipline of sleeping at night and being awake in the daytime. Their first job is usually one that they select—it could be anything—inside or outside, light work or heavy work. But any work selected by the man, or assigned to him, is designed to help him to stay sober that one day.

The men are free to come and go, free to reject a job, ask for a better one, easier one, or harder one. Gradually old talents come back, muscle tone returns. The years of boozing leave a dulled haze over men that does not clear up for months or years. Many men are too far gone, the disease has affected their brain. Other men are too old to leave—and stay here indefinitely.

Our purpose is not to shelter men—they can get that in jail, at taxpayers expense. Our purpose is not to keep men from drinking, they can get that in county institutions, at taxpayers expense. Our purpose is not to provide these men with incomes, they can get that from welfare agencies—and not work for it—again at taxpayers expense.

Our job is indefinitely more complex—we want to teach them to live sober lives, rehabilitate them so they can reenter industry, readapt to their professions. Our job is to rehabilitate them to their families. Our job is to adjust them to a sober society where—when they can think straight—hopefully they will find God.

Until we received this exchange of correspondence from your department, we thought we were doing a pretty good job. But we truly can't determine what your investigation is all about. Are you asking us to pack the men in trucks and drive them to the welfare office so they can be herded and regulated into nothingness again?

It has been reported to me that your Department has said it would like to make a test case of this matter. The test case relates to my declining an investigation by the Labor Department.

These reports—and their inference that we are doing something seriously wrong to our men, our Government, or our God—are totally offensive to me.

This is a simple contest: Christian charity versus the United States of America.

Believe me, I hope we can continue this discussion.

Cordially,
Very Rev. Msgr. WILLIAM N. WALL.

P.S.—Under no circumstance will I tolerate any further unwarranted, unwelcome and unfair remarks on the part of any employee of your Department in the trade suggesting that we are to be the subject of a test case. Because of the persistence of these rumors, I have no alternative but to bring this matter to the attention of the trade and the public so they can make individual appraisal of the entire matter. I'm sure you are as much interested in a public fully enlightened about governmental affairs and action as we are.

STATEMENT FROM THE VERY REVEREND MONSIGNOR WILLIAM N. WALL

It has come to my attention from various sources, that the U.S. Government, through its Department of Labor, seeks a test case suggesting that the Mount Carmel center for alcoholism is in violation of certain labor laws. This public statement is intended to provide all the facts so this matter can be exposed to the clear light of common public discussion.

Several weeks ago, a local agent from the Department of Labor visited our facilities and demanded to see our books and records. Such examination was denied. We are a charitable institution, totally self-supporting, operating with the permission of our bishop and by the grace of God—not the Labor Department of the Federal Government.

The matter was transferred to the New York office of the Department of Labor and correspondence was directed to me by Mr. Frank B. Mercurio, Director of the New York office of the Department of Labor.

His correspondence is attached, as is my reply. My reply is substantially more moderate than is my sense of rightious indignation.

From sources, ascertained to be reliable, I have learned that people representing themselves as agents of the Department of Labor have been seeking complaints of unfair labor practices so that they might make a test case of our alcoholic facilities. Because the agencies involved have seen fit to discuss their claims in business circles before getting any point of view, formally from me, I have no alternative but to make public this correspondence.

Inasmuch as this matter was taken out of the Paterson office and referred to a higher echelon of Government action, I feel justified in taking it one step higher still—to the office of the Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz.

My correspondence to him is attached.

I reject entirely the principle that Christian charity should be regulated by this or any branch of the Federal, State, county or local government. We support ourselves with no Federal aid or grants and request only that the Government let us alone—get off our back—in our difficult task of rehabilitating alcoholic men and women, alcoholic fathers and mothers. Ours is a relationship to sick men, their families and their God—not the U.S. Department of Labor.

I reject and resent the implications of wrongdoing. These slanders inhibit our work, are insulting to the men with whom I am working, and do not do justice to the ordinarily fine work that is being done by the Department of Labor in protecting men's rights in areas of their justified interest. They do not become the Federal Government.

This matter could have been settled in a more orderly manner except for the Government's action in soliciting tradesmen for complaints. Not facing up publicly to any activity in which I, or Mount Carmel center, am involved is contrary to my nature.

Baltic Freedom Day; Our Duty To Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we remember today the people of three small nations, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. They were cruelly overrun by Communist Russia 22 years ago, yet the people of these countries have not forgotten, even today, the joys of the freedom they once knew. They still work and hope for the day when they will know it again.

We can best understand the plight of these Baltic peoples by realizing the blessings that we in the United States of America often take too much for granted. Perhaps one of the greatest benefits which we have had was well over a hundred years of relative isolation from the rest of the world. In this position of isolation, after our Declaration of Independence, we were able to work out our destiny within the confines of our national interest and a national unity, with relatively few outside influences with which to contend. We also had vast unsettled lands into which our expanding population could move. In spite of a Civil War, we were able to maintain a detachment from the divisive influences of foreign involvements which allowed a great degree of our attention to be directed toward national problems during our most formative stages. Thus, when the full force of outside struggles for power was introduced into our country with the coming of the First World War, we were strong and united internally, with a dedication to self-preservation and great faith in the ideals upon which this Nation was founded and governed. By these unifying strengths we have been able to stand up and defeat those who would pull us down.

Not so with too many of those small nations on continental Europe, surrounding its large central land mass. Though the peoples of these areas are ethnically separate and have at various times in history been able to form themselves into self-governing States, a continuance of this state of existence was in direct relationship to the centralization of power in the land mass center controlled from Moscow, and Moscow's relationship within the European balance of power. The independence of smaller States surrounding Russia depended too much on the particular pressures of the moment within the stronger States bordering them. We have then, as with Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, brave, strong, and hardworking peoples of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds, formed into viable democracies of their own choosing, yet unable to stand up to more powerful outside influences, both of fascism and communism, that would do them ill. It is a sad mark of our times that many nations, from the Balkans to the Baltic, have found themselves in a like position, too close to a power-mad nation that would adopt any means to subvert adjoining nations to their particular brand of government and political control.

It is for us in the Western World, especially in this country of ours, continually to call attention to the plight of so many millions of people not so fortunate as to enjoy the fruits of political freedom and independence with which, due in many ways to our geographical position, we have been blessed.

Twenty-two years ago the Soviets, from Moscow, set about the consolidation of their conquest of the three free Baltic States through a policy of mass deportations to slave-labor camps in faraway Siberia of so-called antisocial elements within each nation. It was the Soviet intention to subject the remaining population to their own imperialistic control, and to allow them the most minimal degree of self-government and autonomy within the monolithic Soviet state.

But in following this course of action the Soviets forgot one extremely important factor: people have an inborn urge for freedom to live within societies of their own making, and to determine their own future under leadership of their own choosing. This spirit cannot be killed in slave-labor camps, by brainwashing, and by harsh political control through threat and use of force.

The peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, in spite of the persecutions of the Soviet Union, have not given up their thirst for freedom. Their spokesmen in the free world, and clandestinely from within the countries themselves, remind us constantly of the plight of their fellow citizens. They look to this country, the United States, as the absolute antithesis of what is represented by Soviet dictatorship, and to the action taken by us in bringing about a return of freedom to these unfortunate nations. On this 22d anniversary of the first cruel Soviet deportations of free peoples from the Baltic States, let us rededicate ourselves to the task and goal of seeing their freedom returned.

Dr. Edward D. Re Lauds President Kennedy's Civil Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, 1963, the Order Sons of Italy held its Grand Annual State Convention in New York City. The Honorable Edward D. Re, of New York, Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, delivered the principal address. I would like to bring to the attention of all Americans his timely and important message.

Dr. Re believes that the ultimate test of any civilization is the degree of effective liberty that it has made available to its people. To answer the question whether American has done its best to achieve this liberty for all its citizens, Chairman Re reviewed briefly the progress that has been made by our Government. Beginning with the civil rights cases decided by our Supreme Court in 1954, he proceeded to enumerate the concrete steps taken by the President and other officers of the executive branch to make the American ideal of equal opportunity a reality for all Americans.

> Under the leadership of President Kennedy—

States Dr. Re—

> the great resources of the Federal Government have been utilized as never before in the total war against prejudice, bigotry, and intolerance in all forms.

Our national goal, in Dr. Re's words, is to guard the rights of the individual, to insure his complete development, and to enlarge his opportunities.

Dr. Re noted, however, that much more needs to be done to achieve our American ideal.

> Although we are closer to its attainment today than ever before in our history—

He said—

> it remains for each one of us to strive toward its complete attainment by conquering all forms of prejudice, intolerance, and bigotry.

Finally, Dr. Re cited the advances that have been made in this important area of civil rights in New York City under Mayor Robert F. Wagner.

Mr. Speaker, in bringing this significant speech to the attention of all Americans, may I add that Chairman Re himself is eminently worthy of proclaiming these ideals. A professor of law at St. John's University School of Law in New York since 1947, in 1961 he was appointed Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission by President Kennedy. In fulfilling the trust of public office, he has exemplified the highest ideals of competence and devotion to duty. As lawyer, educator, and public servant, he has been an outstanding spokesman for the American ideal, and through his example has provided an inspiration to countless Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues Dr. Re's remarks which follow, "Equal Rights for All Americans: Here and Now":

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR ALL AMERICANS: HERE AND NOW

(Remarks of Hon. Edward D. Re, Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, at the Annual State Convention of the Order Sons of Italy in America, New York, N.Y., June 1, 1963)

Reverend clergy, distinguished members of the judiciary, public officials, officers and members of the Order Sons of Italy in America, my fellow Americans, it is an honor and a privilege for me to be given the opportunity to address this distinguished audience. I feel particularly privileged to be your principal speaker. This heightens my responsibility and imposes upon me the duty of conveying a message that is timely and worthy of this important function.

THE AMERICAN IDEAL

On many occasions in the past I have spoken about our American ideals, and what we as Americans have done and can do to make these ideals a reality for all Americans and indeed for all the peoples of the world.

Tonight, once again, I would like to speak to you on still another aspect of that American ideal. Specifically, I propose to discuss some of the concrete steps that have been taken—and are being taken—to achieve this ideal. At this convention I can think of no subject more fitting or appropriate. Surely this is so when one addresses men and women who have fought to preserve the American heritage and to hold it aloft as a goal to be achieved by all nations throughout the world.

Let us examine the principles and ideals on which this American heritage is founded.

In contrast to the admitted national goal of the Communist nations, the national goal of America is to guard the rights of the individual, to insure his complete development, and to enlarge his opportunities. These goals were proclaimed for the world and enshrined for all time in the American Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

This prophetic vision shattered the ancient and outmoded concepts of government that prevailed for centuries of human history. With it dawned a new era of faith in the human dignity of every individual.

The Constitution itself was fortified by the first 10 amendments, the Bill of Rights, wherein the Founding Fathers stressed once again that the dignity of the individual is the goal, and that government is merely the means of achieving that goal. Commenting on the American ideal in the Olmstead case, Mr. Justice Brandeis said:

"The makers of the Constitution * * * sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions, and their sensations. They conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone—the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men."

The American philosophy thus proclaims that the state exists for the benefit of the individual; that the citizen is free to develop his capacities to the fullest; and that he is entitled to equality of opportunity and, above all, equal justice under law.

OUR NATIONAL GOALS

As it has been since the days of the Declaration of Independence, the status of the individual remains our primary concern. The President's Commission on National Goals has restated this concept for all Americans:

"All our institutions—political, social, and economic—must further enhance the dignity of the citizen, promote the maximum development of his capabilities, stimulate their responsible exercise, and widen the range and effectiveness of opportunities for individual choice.

"Vestiges of religious prejudice * * * and, most important, discrimination on the basis of race must be recognized as morally wrong, economically wasteful, and in many aspects dangerous. In this decade we must sharply lower these last stubborn barriers."

How can there be any doubt that this concept requires respect for every individual? Each American must have equal rights before the law. This implies an equal opportunity to vote, hold office, be educated, obtain employment, be promoted, buy a home, and to participate fully in all community affairs. Clearly all Americans have the right to be part of the American community.

It has been said that the ultimate test for any civilization is the degree of effective liberty it has made available to its people. This is the test that America is presently facing. We are now met with the inescapable choice between the granting of full equality to all Americans or a violent struggle over rights which no group can any longer withhold from any other.

The time for sober reassessment is long overdue. Has America done its best to achieve equality for all of its citizens? What are the rights to which all Americans are entitled here and now? What steps have been taken—and what more needs to be done—to assure these rights for everyone here and now? Let us attempt to answer these crucial questions by looking first at the contributions of the Supreme Court to this area of human rights.

BROWN VERSUS BOARD OF EDUCATION

In 1954 there appeared the first of a series of historic Supreme Court decisions which was to shape the destiny of American civil rights for years to come. In Brown versus Board of Education, the first Brown case, the Court held that racial segregation in State public schools violates the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment, and outlawed public school segregation. In the second Brown case decided the following year, 1955, the Court applied the doctrine of the first Brown case to public recreational facilities, and permitted implementation—not at once, but "with all deliberate speed." Clearly, the Court did not say "with all deliberate delay."

The antidiscrimination holdings and equal rights for all Americans philosophy of the Brown cases were gradually expanded by the Court in subsequent decisions. Such cases as Dawson versus Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, Muir versus Louisville Park Theatrical Association, and Taylor versus Louisiana paved the way for the historic decisions of April 1963. In Cooper versus Aaron, the Court said: "Law and order are not * * * to be preserved by depriving the Negro children of their constitutional rights." And in Wright versus State of Georgia, together with accompanying cases decided only weeks ago, the Court overthrew convictions based on sit-in demonstrations, protest marches, and other cases of civil disobedience. The highest court of the land had spoken with authority, clarity, and firmness of purpose. An American commits no crime, when all that he does is peaceably to demand the rights and privileges enjoyed by all other Americans. With these historic decisions, the legal process had come much closer to closing the gap between legal rights and their actual enjoyment by all Americans. Equal justice under the law acquired a new luster and America advanced a giant step toward achieving the American ideal of equality for all.

WATSON VERSUS CITY OF MEMPHIS

In Watson versus City of Memphis, a historic decision rendered on May 27, 1963, the Supreme Court made it clear that it would not permit indefinite delay in the desegregation of public schools. The case centered around the interpretation of the deliberate speed mandate of the second Brown case. Mr. Justice Arthur J. Goldberg, writing the unanimous opinion for the Court said:

"The basic guarantees of our Constitution are warrants for the here and now and, unless there is an overwhelmingly compelling reason, they are to be promptly fulfilled."

The Court's opinion in this case dealt with segregated parks and playgrounds in Memphis, and the Court held, in an unusually emphatic decision, that Memphis must desegregate all these recreational facilities at once, without delay or gradualism. But the Court went far beyond the park problem and proceeded to deal specifically with segregation in the public schools. In so doing, the Supreme Court of the United States issued a pointed warning that the days of delay, evasion, and token integration have come to an end. Wisdom, logic, and morality joined forces in the words of the Court:

"The good will between the races * * * can best be preserved and extended by the observance and protection, not the denial of the basic constitutional rights here asserted. The best guarantee of civil peace is adherence to, and respect for, the law."

The Supreme Court thus made it clear that affirmative judicial action is required to enforce "the generally operative and * * * clearly controlling principle that constitutional rights are to be promptly vindicated:

"We cannot ignore the passage of a substantial period of time since the original declaration of the manifest unconstitutionality of racial practices * * * the repeated and numerous decisions giving notice of such illegality, and the many intervening opportunities heretofore available to attain the equality of treatment which the 14th amendment commands the States to achieve."

The second Brown decision, Mr. Justice Goldberg added, "never contemplated that the concept of 'deliberate speed' would countenance indefinite delay in elimination of racial barriers in schools." City officials had contended in the Memphis case that immediate desegregation might produce disorder or even violence. But the Court, citing its decision in the Little Rock, Ark., school case, said that "constitutional rights may not be denied simply because of hostility to their assertion."

The words of Mr. Justice Goldberg therefore sum up eloquently the current status of America's historic advance:

"Any deprivation of constitutional rights calls for prompt rectification. The rights here asserted are, like all such rights, present rights; they are not merely hopes to some future enjoyment of some formalistic constitutional promise."

THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

In light of the recent Supreme Court rulings, one may well ask what specific steps have been taken by the executive branch to assure equal rights and equality of opportunity to all Americans.

Under the leadership of President Kennedy, the great resources of the Federal Government have been utilized as never before in the total war against prejudice, bigotry, and intolerance in all forms. In this massive effort, the executive branch has worked unceasingly to effectuate the decisions of the Supreme Court. A broad comprehensive program designed to assure equal rights and equality of opportunity to all Americans without regard to race, color, or creed, keynoted the dramatic and busy months following the inauguration of the Kennedy administration.

THE PRESIDENT'S EXECUTIVE ORDER 10925

On March 6, 1961, the President issued Executive Order 10925, establishing a President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity—a committee which has more enforcement powers than any predecessor agency.

This Committee, under the leadership of Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, has taken important steps to end job discrimination in both the Federal service and in employment on Government contracts. Under this order, all department and agency heads were directed to appoint an employment policy officer to effectuate these policies.

Pursuant to the regulations of the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, any person who believes that he has been discriminated against because of his race, color, creed, or national origin, has the right to register a complaint with the Committee or with the employment policy officer of the particular agency. He initiates thereby a comprehensive investigation designed to resolve all complaints and to eliminate discrimination in Federal employment.

PLANS FOR PROGRESS

In addition to the function of the employment policy officer in each agency of the Government, the Department of Justice has made it clear that this Government means business on its pledge to assure first-class citizenship for all Americans. Most of the large Government contractors have already signed specific plans for progress with the Federal Government which call for their recruitment, training, hiring, and upgrading of employees without regard to color, creed, or previous national origin.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN CURRENT CRISES

In addition to these specific programs, the administration has also sought the aid of the courts during the current civil rights crises. Even as the Supreme Court was rendering its historic decision in Watson versus City of Memphis, the executive branch was taking concrete steps to enforce these constitutional rights. But the efforts of the executive branch did not end with President Kennedy's efforts as reported in the daily newspapers.

On May 27, 1963, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy personally met with representatives of about 80 percent of Southern movie theaters in an effort to persuade the owners to desegregate their theaters voluntarily. These representatives expressed their "appreciation that there would be a cooperate attitude on the part of the Government" toward attempts by the owners to solve these problems.

As part of the administration's policy to speed desegregation of public places, the Attorney General also met personally with hotel groups and has conducted meetings with other groups and organizations.

ASPIRATIONS OF MINORITIES

In this connection also it ought not to be forgotten that under the Kennedy administration, there has been an extensive recognition of minority aspirations by the appointment to high public office of numerous candidates from minority groups.

Always, in these instances, it was patently clear that the appointment was made because of the qualifications of the individual. In each case a qualified American was therefore appointed to high public office regardless of his race, color, creed, or "minority" status. Equality of opportunity was thereby recognized clearly to include the privilege of serving one's country in a position of trust and confidence.

In light of all these concrete efforts, President Kennedy's statement that the Federal Government is doing all that it can legally do to end discrimination once and for all is eminently accurate. Never before has the initiative been taken in so many areas. In this most sensitive area of civil rights, the Kennedy administration has concretely demonstrated that there is no substitute for alert, active, and responsible leadership.

PROGRESS IN NEW YORK CITY

Any statement of the current advances against discrimination would be incomplete without a reference to New York City.

As a New Yorker, I am proud to refer to the progress in New York City. The reference to our largest Northern city also highlights the fact that the combating of racial prejudice and bigotry of all kinds is a problem for all America and for each individual American—both north and south of the Mason-Dixon Line. Indeed, subtlety and furtiveness in the practice of discrimination compound the offense and aggravate the moral wrong.

Under the leadership of Mayor Robert F. Wagner, New York City has taken the initiative in this area and is setting the pace for other American cities.

Mayor Wagner has said that "whatever we have been doing along these lines until today is not enough for tomorrow." Accordingly, he has ordered all city departments to review their programs and practices pertaining to equal opportunities.

Every agency of the New York City government, Mayor Wagner emphasized, "was made to advance the cause of equal rights for all our citizens, and to wage an active battle against segregation, discrimination, prejudice and bigotry."

MAYOR WAGNER'S PROGRAM

As part of his extended campaign against discrimination, Mayor Wagner has directed all city agencies to review and reassess their present programs and activities. The agency heads are to report to the mayor the changes in law or administration that are needed in order to expand equal opportunities "for all our citizens." Further, the mayor has pledged a new program of action in addition to the ones currently in existence.

Among the concrete steps being taken in New York City are the strengthening of the city's contract compliance program, which provides for cancellation of contracts with any private firms doing business with the city if discrimination is found to exist. There also is provision for barring such firms from city contracts for 3 years. To assure compliance, some 10,000 firms are now submitting reports bearing on racial practices.

Plans will also include a closer scrutiny of employment and promotion practices within city departments. The mayor has ordered a racial census of city employees to begin on June 7, 1963, to determine by color and grade the composition of the city work force.

Provisions will also be made to grant larger powers to the city's Human Rights Commission, which is seeking to tighten fair housing practices and step up action in other areas, including employment and school integration.

All of these plans and procedures represent only a cross-section of the steps designed to end discrimination "once and for all," and to grant equal rights to all Americans "here and now."

OUR IDEAL AND OUR FOREIGN POLICY

It is only when we turn to the rest of the world that we can truly see the staggering importance of these steps to achieve our American ideal. If this ideal is to continue as a beacon for the whole world, we must place renewed emphasis upon its total realization here at home. What we do will be much more effective than what we say. Let our actions be the true voice of America.

Discussing the vitality of the American ideal in our foreign policy, Dean Rusk has stated its fundamental principles:

"The first is the notion of law—the law which does not enslave but liberates * * *. The second is the underlying and fundamental difference between a world of coercion and a world of freedom.

"What is American foreign policy? The simple notion that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Health, rather than sickness; knowledge, rather than ignorance; relief from the terror that strikes at midnight; ability to move with family and friends in confidence.

"These are the simple notions that move us forward, and these are the notions that are deeply rooted in the very nature of man * * * these are the notions which link us with people in all parts of the earth, and these are the notions which mean that the world of freemen is the world of tomorrow."

CONCLUSION

This, then, is the ideal that we are working to achieve. And although we are closer to its attainment today than ever before in our history, it remains for each one of us to strive toward its complete attainment by conquering all forms of prejudice, intolerance and bigotry. For that goal will fall short of universal achievement only to the extent that we as individuals do not put it into practice in our daily lives.

The law, as we have seen, has made gigantic strides. Yet the final gulf cannot be bridged by law alone; the law and right reason can only show the path and furnish a foundation upon which we must build. What is now required is the genuine support of all men and women.

Let us together crusade to rid America of the pestilence of racial discrimination. Each of us has it within his power to help build a better America and a better world. Only our truly best efforts are worthy of the moral greatness of our goal.

Seventh Russian in a Row Gets Critical U.N. Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Tucson Daily Citizen, Tucson, Ariz., May 23, 1963:

SEVENTH RUSSIAN IN A ROW GETS CRITICAL U.N. POSITION

A significant event occurred at United Nations headquarters in New York on Tuesday. On that date the Citizen carried this news item on its front page:

"SUCCEEDS KISELEV: THANT NAMES RUSSIAN SECURITY COUNCIL AID

"UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Secretary-General Thant today announced the appointment of a young Soviet diplomat, Vladimir Pavlovich Suslov, as United Nations under secretary for political and Security Council affairs to succeed the late Evgeny D. Kiselev.

"Suslov, who is 40, becomes the youngest of the U.N. under secretaries.

"Kiselev, also a Russian, died of a heart attack April 17.

"Suslov until recently was a senior assistant to the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He was graduated in 1948 from the Moscow State Institute of Foreign Relations."

This news item is significant for two reasons:

1. The under secretary for political and Security Council affairs is an important executive in a sensitive position in the U.N. Secretariat.

2. Vladimir Suslov is the seventh Russian Communist to hold that position. In fact, the position has never been filled by anyone other than a Communist.

Just how important is the job? The late Trygve Lie, first U.N. Secretary-General, called it the premier assistant secretaryship and said the man in that position directed the Secretariat department most concerned with the preservation of international peace and security.

An official U.N. document titled "Organization of the Secretariat" shows that this under secretary heads the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs, which has these functions:

1. To provide substantive services, secretariats and documentations for the Security Council and its subsidiary organs, the political committees of the General Assembly and their subcommittees, the Disarmament Commission, and subsidiary committees or commissions concerned with matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security.

2. To arrange for the provision to the Military Staff Committee of the services necessary for its due functioning.

3. To assist in the negotiation of military agreements and the application of enforcement measures.

The Military Staff Committee hasn't done anything in years, but the U.N. has conducted several military operations. No matter who served as field commander of these operations, they have been directed and coordinated from the Secretariat. Ultimate responsibility seems to rest on the Secretary-General as the chief administrator and only elected official in the Secretariat.

The under secretary for political and Security Council affairs is his right-hand man for military matters—and he would be his right-hand man in the implementation of any disarmament treaty worked out under U.N. auspices.

The Russians, understandably, asked to have a Soviet national in this sensitive position. The Americans, incredibly, agreed. According to Trygve Lie, this deal was made in 1946. Here are the Russians who have filled this post: 1946–49, Arkady Sobolev, U.S.S.R.; 1949–53, Constantin Zinchenko, U.S.S.R.; 1953–57, Ilya Tchernychev, U.S.S.R.; 1957–60, Anatoly Dobrynin, U.S.S.R.; 1960–62, Georgi Arkadev, U.S.S.R.; 1962–63, Evgeny Kiselev, U.S.S.R.; 1963—, Vladimir Suslov, U.S.S.R.

It seems fantastic—and it is. How in the name of commonsense can any Americans seriously propose disarming the United States and putting an invincible military force under U.N. command? But the Kennedy administration, through its Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, has proposed just that.

ARA Needs Streamlining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appeared in the May 31 edition of the Boulder Daily Camera that is particularly timely. It spells out accurately and incisively an important criticism of the operation of the Area Redevelopment Administration. I commend this excellent paper for calling attention to a situation wherein an agency of Government is competing directly with a segment of our free enterprise system.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert this editorial:

ARA NEEDS STREAMLINING

Originally the Area Redevelopment Administration was set up to help revitalize industries and create jobs in depressed areas with a long history of high unemployment.

The House Banking and Currency Committee's minority report reveals that not all ARA money has been used in keeping with that purpose. For example, in Detroit, where there is a long history of unemployment, a $1,894,525 ARA loan has been made to finance a motor hotel, which theoretically would create 450 jobs.

But, says the report, "Since the hotel occupancy rate for Detroit in 1962 was only 54 percent it is clear that the new motor hotel will not add even one hotel job on a net basis to the economy of Detroit. At best, employment at the new facility will result in a corresponding decrease in employment at existing hotel facilities."

Up to March 25 this year, 24 percent of all industrial and commercial loans approved by ARA for the fiscal year that began last July 1, went for hotel and motel construction.

The American Hotel and Motel Association does not believe such a large outlay is necessary. "While we are willing to concede that most of this money has been properly used," the association says, "we are, nevertheless, concerned by the dangers of overbuilding to our industry."

The association points out that last year 38 percent of the hotel rooms in the Nation were empty every night in the year. The organization doubts whether any new transient housing facilities are needed in most areas of the United States.

The association points out further, "The fact also exists that private capital is available to hotel and motel builders if these builders provide competent feasibility studies to prove that a new facility is needed in an area."

While the hotel and motel business is only one segment of the economy getting ARA aid, its situation also can be applied to other areas, raising some questions.

Are artificially created facilities of any kind justified if there is not enough demand for them? Private enterprise may take its chances in any venture it chooses. But can the use of public tax money and tax-supported agencies be justified in business gambles that even private enterprise would shun because of lack of demand?

Can ARA programs be justified if they do not create new jobs but merely shift the unemployment statistics from one part of town to another?

There is something to think about in the American Hotel and Motel Association statement about the availability of private capital where demand can be demonstrated. This is true for just about every type of business and industry.

Where demand doesn't exist, facilities artificially created with the aid of Government funds can hardly be expected to contribute to the economic health.

Congress should take a good look at the ARA program and do a job of streamlining.

Japan's Economy Undergoing Dynamic Structural Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post recently published a 24 page special report on "Japan in Today's World." As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I would like to commend this extremely helpful document to the widest attention.

This fascinating series of stories on the many remarkable changes taking place in Japan shows that almost in one generation, she is making the transition from a feudal to a democratic society and from widespread poverty to industrial affluence. In the process, many basic Japanese traditions are being set aside. For instance, eating habits are becoming Westernized as the average Japanese income grows. Today the Japanese are consuming far less rice but far more milk, eggs and meat.

I was particularly impressed by an article written by Mr. Saburo Okita, director of Japan's Economic Planning Agency, who gives a very frank appraisal of what has been achieved so far in the plan to double Japan's national income by 1970 and the problems that remain. Because his remarks show the sincerity and resolution with which the Government of Japan faces its economic problems, and greatly add to our understanding of one of America's key trading partners, I am extending my remarks to include Mr. Okita's article from The Washington Post of May 26, as follows:

JAPAN'S ECONOMY UNDERGOING DYNAMIC STRUCTURAL CHANGE

(By Saburo Okita, director of the Economic Planning Agency)

TOKYO.—Japan's economy is undergoing a phenomenal structure change. In 1949, per capita income was $100, lower than many of the Latin American countries and even lower than a few Asian countries. In 1962, it was $450, about half that of the highly industrialized European countries. The government hopes that by 1970 per capita income will be almost equal to that of the present European standard.

Economic output measured in terms of gross national product has been expanding and the GNP for 1963 is estimated at $58 billion, about equal to that of Britain, France or West Germany and about one-tenth that of United States.

The prewar image of Japan—a predominant paddy field rice cultivation relying heavily on human labor, and textiles and other light industries producing cheap industrial goods—still lingers among many foreigners who have not seen modern Japan.

However, one of the most important aspects of the structural change is the growth of industrial production, particularly in heavy and chemical industries, and the decline in relative importance of agriculture and light industry.

On the other hand, secondary industry, including mining, manufacturing, and construction, has expanded remarkably since the war. Its share in the national income rose from 27 percent in 1930 to 39 percent in 1961. This means that secondary industry earns four times as much income as agriculture and forestry.

The labor force in secondary industry in 1961 was 13.2 million, just about equal to that of agriculture and forestry. This means that average labor productivity in agriculture is still very much lower than in secondary industry. The absorption of low productivity labor in agriculture into high productivity industries is considered one of the major causes of Japan's rapid economic growth.

Another important aspect of structural changes is the relative decline of light industry, particularly textiles, and the remarkable expansion of heavy and chemical industry.

The heavy and chemical industry's share in the total output of the manufacturing industry rose from 39 percent in 1930 to 60 percent in 1960 whereas that of the textile industry declined from 38 percent to 11 percent. Production of steel ingot was 27.6 million tons in 1962, fourth highest in the world.

Output of the machinery industry has shown a remarkable expansion stimulated by a strong investment demand and the great demand for consumer goods. Thus the index of machinery production (1960–100) rose from 28.5 in 1955 to 145 in 1962.

The pattern of family expenditure, both urban and rural, has changed greatly in recent years. According to a 1962 survey by the Economic Planning Agency, the number of families in possession of various consumer durables as percentage of total families is shown as follows: Sewing machine (urban), 78 percent, (rural) 63 percent; cameras (urban), 55 percent, (rural) 21 percent; TV sets (urban), 84 percent, (rural) 49 percent; electric washing machines (urban), 63 percent, (rural) 23 percent; election refrigerators (urban), 38 percent, (rural) 5 percent; passenger cars (urban), 6 percent; motorcycles (rural), 28 percent.

The pattern of food consumption also is undergoing a far-reaching structural change. The average Japanese now eats 12 percent less rice, 8 times more milk, 3 times more meat and eggs.

In short, westernization of eating habits is proceeding with the increase in average income, and the changes in food consumption, together wtih the beginning signs of labor shortage, are the basic causes transforming traditional agriculture—largely dependent on rice cultivation—into the more diversified one of dairy farming and fruit and vegetable growing.

One of the peculiar characteristics of Japan's economy is the so-called dual structure which entails the existence, side by side, of modern efficient enterprises and premodern inefficient ones; highly mechanized industries and manual labor in agriculture and small-scale industries; a wide gap between the wage level of the employees of large- and small-scale enterprises.

Rapid economic growth and the growing demand for labor are gradually changing this picture. Ministry of Labor statistics disclose some very interesting and important facts. During the 4 years from 1958 through 1962, average wages in large factories with more than 500 employees rose 30 percent while wages in small factories rose 70 percent. In 1962 alone, average wages in large factories rose only 5 percent while those in small factories rose 23 percent.

This tendency to narrow the gap in wage levels of enterprises of different sizes is having a far-reaching impact upon the economic and social life of the Japanese. It is improving wage and working conditions in medium and small enterprises and has affected favorably the income level of the self-employed workers.

All this creates new problems for the small businesses. Wages of their employees are rising sharply whereas productivity is not rising proportionately. Some small enterprises have been forced to close.

Another negative aspect of the impact of the narrowing wage gap is the effect upon price level. Up to 1960, the price index has been remarkably stable. In 1961 and 1962, however, the consumer price index rose by 5.3 and 6.8 percent, respectively. One of the basic causes was the rise in the wage level.

Another important problem is the imbalance between the private and the public sectors of the economy. Because of the rapid expansion of industries, mostly belonging to the private sector, public facilities such as roads, ports, sewerage, water supply and commuter transportation are very much overloaded.

Inquest of Freedom: The Enslaved Peoples of the Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, 22 years ago this month saw the enforced deportation to Siberian slave labor camps of thousands of free and innocent peoples, being slowly crushed under the heel of Soviet Russian imperialism. We speak today in memory of this sad occasion, yet call attention to the heroism of the peoples and nations involved—Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

Here we have three small countries that grew into respectable and ably administered independence after the horrors of the First World War—an independence guaranteed by the Allied Powers and confirmed by treaty with a powerful neighbor, Soviet Russia.

These between-the-war years were well used by the governments and peoples of the Baltic States to develop economically and politically within the range of their domestic interests and within the confines of their own nationality. Yet at the same time the three countries made able and appreciated contributions to the world at large and fulfilled with all proper qualifications the obligations of nationhood. Liberal, advanced and economically able, the contributions made by each to the period between 1920 and 1940 were well conceived and well accepted.

Yet, as an immediate neighbor to these nations there grew in strength and power the Soviet imperialist military machine. To have a nation of political liberty hard against the borders of a state dedicated to political dictatorship was intolerable—that three such states existed hard against Soviet Russia could not be allowed to continue.

It was not difficult for the masters of Kremlin strategy to figure out a method of gaining control over those three small bastions of liberty in what was becoming a dark area as far as political and personal freedoms were concerned.

Though secretly negotiating with the Nazi Germans, the Russians used as an excuse that there were pro-German elements within the governments of the three States working against the interests of Soviet policy. In spite of a declaration of neutrality by each of the governments concerned, and a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union itself, the Russians marched against each nation in turn, using the excuse that the security of Russia herself was endangered by the continued presence of anti-social elements within the nations in question.

With the rest of Europe already plunged into Hitler's war, there was nowhere to turn or no way out for the unfortunate victims of the latest in Soviet expansion—and all three countries capitulated to the force of Communist armies. Liberty was at an end.

To insure that there would be nothing left of some of the social elements within each country possibly demanding or working toward freedom and against the interests of the Russians, a policy of mass deportations was instigated that saw a swelling of the populations in the Siberian slave labor camps; this was only halted with the German invasion of Russia and the Baltic, and the passing of control over these countries from Russian to German hands.

For a brief moment after the fall of Hitler, Germany hoped there might be a chance for a return of freedom to the Baltic States, but that hope was nipped quickly in the bud by an immediate return of Soviet troops to the Baltic area, and an immediate reinforcement of the Communist rule of terror to keep the people under.

Yet the people have not stayed under—they, if not in fact, in spirit and mind are fighting back. We must, on our part, continue to give fuel to that spirit burning so brightly for a return of the dignity of freedom and independence. We will keep that spirit high for peace will not come to this world until all conquered peoples are liberated, and it is the greatest desire of this Nation to know peace.

The Meaning of Flag Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, June 14, is Flag Day. I believe that this is a most important day and one that we should all be conscious of.

At this time in our Nation's history when we are beset, all around the world, by vicious and unscrupulous enemies it is not enough to simply commemorate Flag Day. I think we should be aware of the meaning and something of the history of our Grand Old Flag.

In this regard I wish to draw my colleagues attention to an article by John R. Lechner, Americanism chairman, Inglewood, Calif., Post 188, American Legion and director of the Americanism Educational League in Los Angeles. Mr. Lechner's words are appropriate at this time and merit our consideration.

The article is as follows:

THE MEANING OF FLAG DAY

On June 14, 1777, the Continental Congress passed a formal resolution adopting the Stars and Stripes as the official flag for the Armed Forces of the United States. This new flag received its baptism on August 3, 1777, at Fort Stanwix, where the British first cast eyes on the magnificent symbol of freedom.

Since then, Old Glory has seen many battles, and has inspired millions of our fighting youth in every corner of the globe to give their full measure of devotion to the cause of freedom and justice. It still flies unsullied in the breezes, a hope for all mankind that the individual might have dignity and that he might have the opportunity for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

To those who conceived Old Glory, and to millions of Americans over the years who lived and served and died under its protection, our flag is not just a fetish, nor is it a mere design, pleasing to the eye. Woven into every strand of that great flag we find the hope and the joy and the faith of freemen everywhere. Each part of Old Glory has a meaning, and it is that meaning which makes the American flag the proudest symbol in the firmament of Heaven.

The stripes stand for the Thirteen Original Colonies, led by remarkable men who were big enough to transcend provincial jealousies and personal interests in order to unite in a federation of States, welded together by a common ideal, that of creating a government "of the people, for the people, and by the people," a government in which the moral conscience of humanity could find articulation. These stripes will always remain as dramatic proof of the efficacy of mutual cooperation of states or nations when inspired by lofty concepts of freedom and justice.

The stars represent the individual States of this Union. Each of the 50 stars has a glorious history of its own. For example, star No. 31 represents the great State of California. It would take a small library to house the records of the thrilling drama about this Golden State, about the covered wagons, the undaunted courage of men, women and children who journeyed westward, about the Gold Rush, the opening up of vast agricultural areas, the waterways, the harnessing of nature's power and the building of industries and cities. Each State has its own history, its own saga of courage and vision, and together they comprise the 50 stars in the field of blue.

Each color of the red, white, and blue also has a profound meaning, and adds infinite significance to Old Glory. The red stands for the red blood of the countless patriots who fought and died for freedom, the men at Valley Forge, at Gettysburg, at St. Mihiel, and the Argonne, at Guadalcanal and in the Phillipines, and on Heartbreak Ridge in Korea, and more recently, in South Vietnam. The red in the flag is a challenge to all Americans to be willing to sacrifice their "lives and their fortunes and their sacred honor" to preserve the magnificent heritage handed down to us by our Founding Fathers.

The white stands for liberty, for the hope of men and women over the whole world, and represents the purity of this ideal, according to our own George Washington.

The blue stands for the loyalty of generations of people from all corners of the earth who adopted this great land, created the tradition of a dynamic republic, and remained loyal to its ideals. Loyalty is the most difficult of all attitudes under the pressures of alien political, social and economic theories. Today, more than ever, the American people are called upon to express their loyalty to basic American concepts, to the ideals of free economy, self-determination, personal initiative and endeavor, as well as to individual responsibilities as American citizens. Unless we have that loyalty to the principles upon which this great Republic was founded, Old Glory will lose its luster, its inspiration, and its purpose. In simple words, the meaning of our wonderful flag rests with all of us who project our hopes into it. If we, the American people, fail, the flag will fail.

May God help this Nation to revitalize the meaning of Old Glory with the renewed dedication of each generation of Americans, so that a thousand years from now it will have preserved its majesty in the affairs of mankind.

Education: Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker—

I stand but in awe of the teacher. He has an increased dimenson of responsibility. He has, if his mind be not lulled to sleep by the drone of his own sonorous tones, a widened area of curiosity. Man knows more today about more things than ever before. In the full floodtide of our printed revolution, the art of education is not so much knowing how to read as it is knowing what to read. The wise teacher must temper his curiosity with inquiry, and hope that its resolution will bring that rare man who can mingle his love of knowledge with his understanding of ignorance.

I quote the words of the able and distinguished Director of the U.S. Information Agency, Mr. Edward R. Murrow, who delivered the commencement address at East Carolina College in my district at Greenville, N.C., on Sunday, June 9, 1963.

I am deeply interested in East Carolina College, which is one of the outstanding educational institutions in my State. I am interested in the education given by this college to the young people of my area who will go forth to be the leaders and responsible citizens of our country.

I am deeply interested in the great work of the U.S. Information Agency and its Voice of America, which has the world's most powerful short wave radio transmitter facility near the city of Greenville. Through that great radio complex and various other media the USIA and its Voice of America are extending education to the world.

I was privileged to hear Mr. Murrow's address, and as I heard him speak I felt that his remarks should be made available to all the Members of this House. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave I insert in the RECORD at this point the introduction of Mr. Murrow by the distinguished president of East Carolina College, Dr. Leo W. Jenkins, and the text of Mr. Murrow's inspiring address:

PRESIDENT LEO W. JENKINS' INTRODUCTION OF EDWARD R. MURROW

I think it is of historic significance to us that the speaker on this occasion is a great champion of education; although in his case it may be called propaganda, it is, nevertheless, education. He and his associates are not trying to capture the minds of man, but to free them. This task is difficult, because the way of life he is trying to explain to the world is complicated and requires literacy and sophistication to understand.

Fifty-three years ago, our first commencement speaker, Gov. Charles B. Aycock, had a similar task to perform for his people. He knew that our way of life is dependent upon knowledge and understanding, not on the part of the few, but for everybody. On that occasion, Governor Aycock launched vigorously into his plea for education for everybody and everything. He declared that man was educating animals and vegetables, teaching a mule to obey and improving plants, and that if animals and plants should be educated, then surely every human being should be; he repeated, to an audience to whom his words had great meaning, for they were being educated to teach others:

"Universal education is necessary. You cannot get the best for your child without making it possible for me to get the best for my child. * * * If you want the best for your children, you must give the best to everybody else's children."

Our speaker today has a challenge similar to that, although his classroom is the world.

I have given you this background by way of an introduction of our speaker. The choice of a commencement speaker is a task a college president must perform with considerable care. He must seek a person who believes in education, who believes in young people, who understands the objectives of the college, and who has a sense of direction and a challenge for the graduates.

On some occasions, the President is able to find a person with all these qualifications. This is our good fortune today. Our speaker knows that the greatness of any nation depends upon an educated citizenry. He not only voices belief in this, but he is working untiringly and heroically to forward this noble objective. As Director of the U.S. Information Agency, it is his assignment to tell the world about America.

As radio and television's top news analyst and reporter, the man who brought world events and personalities ("This Is the News," "See It Now," "Person to Person") into the homes of millions of Americans, this man who covered much of the war and prewar events in Europe, from 1938 to 1945, is, without doubt, the best qualified to administer this country's information program abroad.

The U.S. Senate confirmed his appointment as Director of the U.S. Information Agency on March 15, 1961. He was sworn in by President Kennedy on March 21 of that year.

He was born near Greensboro, N.C.; when he was 4, the family moved to Washington, near Seattle. Even in college days, awards and prizes—now more than 100—some 13 honorary degrees—and titles from France, Great Britain, and Belgium—began coming his way.

I am pleased to tell you that he is a Reserve commander in the U.S. Navy, a trustee of the Institute of International Education, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, and Director of the National Institute of Foreign Affairs.

It is a great pleasure and a high honor for me to present to you Edward R. Murrow, Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

ADDRESS BY EDWARD R. MURROW, DIRECTOR, U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

To speak at a commencement is, to some degree, to accept the challenge of the obvious. Commencement means beginning. But how many times have commencement audiences heard ringing phrases like "Commencement is not an ending but a beginning." I first heard that comment in the sixth grade, and it impressed me. When I heard it again in the ninth grade I was reminded I had been impressed in the sixth grade. By the time it had been repeated at high school and college commencement, I had heard it and had it enough.

So Mr. President, leave us commence our commencement with a promise not to parse commencement into a beginning.

I have come here to the red clay soil of east Carolina in part to represent the interest my Agency and this State have in common. We have just completed in nearby Greenville the world's most powerful shortwave radio transmitter complex. We have an operating reserve and an executive reserve here, and your President is an active and enthusiastic member of this latter. In point of fact, my Agency has received splendid cooperation from this college and this faculty, and my colleagues and I in Washington are grateful for it.

The U.S. Information Agency is in the communications business. We seek to tell others something about the kind of men who inhabit America. We try to associate this people and this Government with the hopes and aspirations of other peoples. To do this we put to hopeful good effect every instrument of modern communication known to man.

We broadcast radio—the Voice of America—789 hours every week in 36 languages. For special events coverage, such as the orbiting of Gordon Cooper, we broadcast in up to 62 languages. Every week, for use on oversea domestic stations translated into their native languages, our posts place locally 14,000 hours of taped broadcasting.

We make moving pictures. Six hundred million people a month see USIA films produced in 52 languages.

We produce television, placing some 500 programs every year in 61 countries.

We are in the press business. We send a wireless news file transmitting 10,000 words daily to over 100 world posts. We print newspapers and magazines—66 magazines and 20 newspapers in 25 languages. We have a worldwide photo service, last year placing a million and a half pictures in newspapers around the world. We print pamphlets and cartoon strips—over 18 million pamphlets last year, and 5 cartoon strips published in 87 countries—including one that is the most widely read printed feature in the world with an audience of 100 million people.

We produce traveling exhibits, some 300 of them in continual use around the globe.

We publish books—8 million of them last year, many of them in foreign translations, but not near enough.

We run libraries and binational centers—182 libraries in 88 countries and 159 binational centers, with approximately 30 million people visiting them each year.

We teach English, having instructed over a million persons since 1953, and teaching every day, for one example, over 7,000 people in Mexico City.

In conjunction with the Department of State, we administer the education and cultural exchange program—helping some 5,000 students, leaders, and teachers every year to experience for themselves our country.

We work in private cooperation with U.S. business firms, with several hundred separate concerns sending material to their thousands of representatives working abroad.

And this is all done by some 1,300 Americans and 6,300 foreign nationals working overseas with our total Agency budget last year of $122.5 million.

So it is this instrument of national policy that some of the people located here are designed to complement. We appreciate your interest.

I have never been intrigued with the fascination of my own reminiscences. I remember well my own schooldays, but I am not about to burden you with homilies honed and humored over the past half century. As college graduates you are worthy of congratulations on the glorious magnitude of the infinite uncertainty confronting you. In the past those similarly garbed and graduated had at least the consolation that with modest diligence they would survive. But populations grow. Needs arise. Crises appear. And with the fearful possibility that the human equation might someday equal the nuclear nought, even that is no longer safe assurance for you.

Even more, perhaps, do I have a modicum of empathy with teachers. They work with the intangibility of ideas and often the ingratitude of students as well as the impatience of administrators. And yet if our future bears any relevance to dream and desire, who is a more instrumental instrumentality than the teacher.

I stand here today. Tomorrow one of you may stand in my stead. I am beyond the sway of your teachers. You are not. My prejudices and patterns, for ill or good, are set. Yours are just beginning. If one of you is to fall heir to my mantle of responsibilities, or to another in Washington or Raleigh, as invariably someone must, what you have just completed at this school may have done more to form you than any other single experience in your life. Reflect upon that as you regard those who for 4 years have borne the burden of exposing you to the pain of ideas.

I stand but in awe of the teacher. He has an increased dimension of responsibility. He has, if his mind be not lulled to sleep by the drone of his own sonorous tones, a widened area of curiosity. Man knows more today about more things than ever before. In the full floodtide of our printed revolution, the art of education is not so much knowing how to read as it is knowing what to read. The wise teacher must temper his curiosity with inquiry, and hope that its resolution will bring that rare man who can mingle his love of knowledge with his understanding of ignorance.

And the students' view of these rare men of the mind is epitomized best in William O. Douglas' canard about the first confrontation between Supreme Court Justice James Clark McReynolds and Robert Hutchins—McReynolds, then the elderly bastion of conservatism stanch in his devotion to the principles of the last century, and Hutchins, then the mercurially brilliant new young dean of the Yale University Law School. Justice McReynolds grumbled over the handshake, "Well, I suppose you tell them at that college that we are old fuddy duddies," and Hutchins replied softly, "Oh no, we simply let them find it out for themselves."

But there are other things you will find out of life as well. You will find that you advance into a world not quite overwhelmed at your coming. Days of leisure and pleasure now become weeks of work and worry. There is a living to earn—it must be garnered as it is not given. There are responsibilities to assume—they must be discharged as they will not dissolve. There are destinies to meet—though some of the meetings may be both unexpected and unpleasant.

I wonder if you realize how unusual you are. This country has a population of 188 million people. In a land where the pat phrase runs, "almost everyone goes to college," do you know how many college graduates this country had last year? Four hundred and twenty thousand. Math majors among you will quickly calculate that at about 0.002 percent of our population. In the entire country there are but 10 million college graduates—about 5¼ percent of the populace.

A lot of people in college? Yes, if you count them head by head; no, if you count them group by group. Ladies and gentlemen, you are an elite, an educated elite, and no elite in history has fared well unless they serve themselves and their society with distinction.

With diplomas in your hands, you have now had an education. We are all afloat on a vast sea of ignorance, but recalling the numbers I mentioned above, you have been better prepared than most to sail that sea. If you founder, your excuse will come with the poorest grace of all. This society has chosen to educate you. An educated man among the uneducated, like that one man with eyesight in the company of the blind, cannot help but be a leader.

Being educated, you now should have that most important faculty of all—criticism. You should have opinion and idea as to what is good and what is bad, what is meritorious and what is meaningless. You should be able to distinguish quality from quantity. You should have the beginnings of taste, because now your life becomes your judgment. Should you judge wisely and well, so will you live.

I am curious about this rare thing you now have that we call education. Have you, for example, heard the names of Stuart Mill and Rousseau, or of McCauley and Gibbon? You know the names Tom Jefferson and Karl Marx; have any of you read anything either has written? How many of you have read a play by Ibsen, a poem by Eliot, criticism by Mencken? Do you have a favorite painter or sculptor, a preferred composer or conductor? Or even more mundane, how many of you know any painters or composers?

Education should have made you more sensitive as well. The more you know, the more of complexity and difficulty you should appreciate. Education should remind you that when an apple falls on your head you think of gravity. But when you see a car driving down the road, how many of you think of Arab oil or Venezuelan gasoline that propels it, or of highway deaths near half-a-hundred thousand each year, or of fat Americans in poor condition who rarely walk, or of labor unions striking in behalf of worker benefits, or of design and fashion and built-in obsolescence changing each car each year for each buyer, or of traffic choking the downtown heart of big cities and leading to blighting the city core and urban renewal, or of massive highways cutting across the land and changing forest land to billboard freeways, as well as the ardent campaign of beautifiers to ban the billboard, or of dormitory suburbs with spreading conformity and eaten-up land and segregated living. It's all a part of the one word "automobile," and it comes from nothing more than elemental sensitivity and critique that education should have given you.

For you now do the things that for years you have complacently watched your parents do for you. Conservation and the Outer Banks, better newspapers and television, business ethics—they'er all alien concepts to the world from which you come. But they're all passionate concerns of the world to which you go.

As college graduates you go from lessons you have studied to lessons you must learn. There is much to learn in this machine age. The largest educational machine in the world is in Berlin. It is 27 miles long, it is strung with barbed wire, it teaches lessons in the meaning of democracy and communism, of freedom and tyranny, of humanity and inhumanity. Its name is the wall.

There are other educational machines here. One of them is a lunch counter. It is some 50 feet long, it is lined with almost deserted seats but it is ringed with a great crowd. Over the shoulders of that great crowd stand another whole host of onlookers. Through picture and print and film and text a veritable legion across this country and around this globe watches what lessons in democracy and freedom and humanity emerge from this teaching machine.

My contrast is somewhat invidious, and for that I offer apology. The wall is deadly repression and depressed strife. The lunch counter is, I suggest, lively progress and expressed life.

If education has made you sensitive and critical, then the one thing you cannot feel is indifference. In the pages you have thumbed these past 4 years, one hopes you have learned to discern and to temper rawness with rationale. Your hopes are probably no different from those who have gone before you. Most of your dreams have been dreamed before. But what will concern you? Of what shall you be afraid? What will stir you to righteous anger—to action?

If you have learned to discern then the issue becomes what it is about which you choose to feel. I know my own feelings and angers. They are not as important as yours, for you are my tomorrow. Through your feeling and your anger shall men know you, and me, and us, and all this country, and all that we in our world feel is noble and just and worth the price of sacrifice.

Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia: Their Freedom Must Be Returned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, 22 years ago the troops of Red Russia marched into three independent and self-governing nations with but one intent, to occupy and control. This invasion was made in spite of the fact that each country had a treaty of friendship and nonintervention with the Russian Government.

The rest of Europe, already embroiled with Hitler's grasping for political hegemony for Germany over the entire area could do little as those three brave nations went under—when their freedom was destroyed. Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, small nations along the Baltic Sea were absorbed by force into the Soviet Union.

Born out of the hopes and dreams at the end of the First World War, all three had obtained independence as a result of the Allied victory, and for 20 years enjoyed the fruits of this independence within the world community of nations. Twenty years is short in the average lifetime of any nation, yet it is a sad fact of recent years, though that such a life expectancy seems about average for those nations and peoples bordering the Soviet Union.

Stalin's Russia—nor for that matter Khrushchev's either—could not allow a nation representing a political doctrine of liberty and freedom for its citizenry to taint its border areas. Such a "revolutionary" philosophy spreads quickly, especially amongst people who know nothing but the extreme opposite. So, crying subversion against his state, the Communist master of the Kremlin gave the order to move forward. His troops marched in, and that was the end of freedom.

It took more than military control to defeat these people—their countries may have been small in size, but their peoples were not small in bravery or spirit. The Russians intended to establish puppet governments, but in order to do so all possible opposition had to be done away with. This really presented no problem, as the wasteland of Siberia had long been a Russian dumping ground for political elements not taking kindly to Moscow domination. This was again the policy followed. In the week subsequent to June 13, 1941, alone, some 60,000 men, women, and children were deported to Siberia and, for most, almost certain death.

This number represented but one period in the deportation schedules that were interrupted only by the arrival of another invader—Nazi Germany.

Yet not even the victory of the democracies after the Second World War could bring succor to the citizens of these countries. For included amongst the victors was imperialistic Russia, still determined upon her policies of domination and conquest. The Baltic States slipped easily back under Communist control, and there was a new series of deportations, with political control from Moscow ever stricter.

Today, 22 years after the first great deportations the situation remains the same. It is therefore our just and rightful duty to give recognition to the peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia in their dedication to overcome all opposition and to again see freedom in their respective homelands.

The Massive Youth Program of the Latter-day Saints Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of our entire country could profitably take note of an occasion soon to transpire during the lovely spring evenings in Salt Lake City, Utah. Some 50,000 spectators will gather in the stadium on the University of Utah campus to witness a dance festival unduplicated anywhere in the world. Six thousand young dancers assembled from all parts of the United States will apppear in costumed dances to climax a conference to which 25,000 youth leaders will be gathered. These leaders will return to give continued guidance, inspiration, and encouragement to more than 300,000 people enrolled in the Mutual Improvement Association, an auxiliary of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

It was 50 years ago that the Latter-day Saints Church became the first religious body in the United States to sponsor the Boy Scout program. It simultaneously established a corresponding Beehive program for the girls of comparable age, which has matched in success the wonderful results of the scouting program.

As the name of this auxiliary suggests, it is geared to personal improvement through mutual participation in activities designed to build character, develop each participant's talents, and provide wholesome entertainment for youthful energies. In a day when we are plagued with increasing juvenile delinquency, charges of a corrupted youth, and are urged to enact massive Federal programs to occupy the time and energies of our young people, it is indeed refreshing to note the great success of such a youth program in our Nation.

Its success is accomplished voluntarily as a service of love and appreciation, being carried out enthusiastically by those who have benefited from the program during their growing years. Hundreds of thousands of our youth have been reached by this activity, and at absolutely no cost to the Federal or State Governments.

I am sure my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in offering sincere congratulations to the dedicated leaders and teachers in the MIA program on the forthcoming annual conference, and in expressing the hope that their continued efforts will provide healthy and constructive achievement for many thousands more of our Nation's youth.

A Bill of Rights for Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I cannot begin to say how much I admire the thoughtful work being done by some of our country's senior citizen groups to improve the quality of our humanity. We who live in the San Jose, Calif. area are particularly privileged and proud to have been able to observe in action one of our country's outstanding senior citizens, that most dedicated humanitarian, Mr. Peter Zomer.

Mr. Zomer works full time without compensation in the furtherance of senior citizen activities, first and foremost of which is the rallying of support for the administration's hospitalization plan under social security, that badly needed, humane program which we hope will be passed during the 88th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the Santa Clara County Council of Senior Citizens, of which Mr. Zomer is the indefatigable chairman, seeks establishment of a bill of rights for senior citizens. I would like to respectfully commend to the attention of my colleagues the following, outstanding statement of worthwhile human goals and obligations.

BILL OF RIGHTS DRAFTED FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

Seeking establishment of a bill of rights for senior citizens, the Santa Clara County Council of Senior Citizens also backs a statement of obligations.

Peter Zomer, council chairman, lists them as follows:

RIGHTS

Each of our senior citizens, regardless of race, color or creed, is entitled to—

1. The right to be useful.
2. The right to obtain employment based on merit.
3. The right to freedom from want in old age.
4. The right to a fair share of the community's recreational, educational, and medical resources.
5. The right to obtain decent housing suited to needs of later years.
6. The rights to the moral and financial support of one's family so far as is consistent with the best interest of the family.
7. The right to live independently, as one chooses.
8. The right to live and die with dignity.
9. The right to access to all knowledge as available on how to improve the later years of life.

OBLIGATIONS

The aging, by availing themselves of educational opportunities, should endeavor to assume the following obligations to the best of their ability:

1. The obligation of each citizen to prepare himself to become and resolve to remain active, alert, capable, self-supporting, and useful so long as health and circumstances permit and to plan for ultimate retirement.
2. The obligation to learn and apply sound principles of physical and mental health.
3. The obligation to seek and develop potential avenues of service in the years after retirement.
4. The obligation to make available the benefits of his experience and knowledge.
5. The obligation to attempt to maintain such relationships with family, neighbors, and friends as will make him a respected and valued counselor throughout his later years.

A Peaceful, Prosperous Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, recent events in the Middle East have again given rise to fears of aggressive action in this extremely important and highly volatile area.

There are so many conflicting interests at work and so much internal instability evident that no one can predict with certainty what may happen next.

But it should be borne in mind by all leaders of the nations located in that cradle of civilization that the interest of all demands the maintenance of peace. Wars and threats of war disturb the tranquility of the area and prevent it from developing its resources for the benefit of all its inhabitants.

As one of the leaders of the free peoples of the world, the United States has a strong and vital interest in keeping the peace among all the countries of the Middle East.

This continuing interest was sharply emphasized in 1958, when President Eisenhower, at the request of the local government, sent American troops into Lebanon to assist the constituted authority in maintaining its democratic heritage and tradition in a stable atmosphere.

In view of this past history, it is well to note the statement made recently by President Kennedy in answer to a question at one of his press conferences. I believe Mr. Kennedy's statement should be taken at face value by those contemplating aggression in this area, now or at any time in the future—for it certainly has the support of all Americans, and it certainly will serve as the basis for any American action, should such action become necessary.

The President's statement follows:

> The United States supports social and economic and political progress in the Middle East. We support the security of both Israel and her neighbors. We seek to limit the Near East arms race which obviously takes resources from an area already poor, and puts them into an increasing race which does not really bring any great security.
>
> We strongly oppose the use of force or the threat of force in the Near East, and we also seek to limit the spread of communism in the Middle East which would, of course, destroy the independence of the people. This Government has been and remains as strongly opposed to the use of force or the threat of force in the Near East. In the event of aggression or preparation for aggression, whether direct or indirect, we would support appropriate measures in the United Nations, adopt other courses of action on our own to prevent or to put a stop to such aggression, which, of course, has been the policy which the United States has followed for some time."

In short, the President has expressed the traditional U.S. position favoring a peaceful and prosperous Middle East, but, at the same time, he has reiterated our firm determination to support with all our strength the forces of peace in that strategic region.

Wallace C. Large

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Newport Plain Talk and Tribune, Monday, June 10, 1963, in memory of Wallace C. Large.

Wallace C. Large left behind a glowing example of a life dedicated to others, and I would like to make this editorial available to Members so that they might know of his greatness and devotion. The good deeds he accomplished in Cocke County and especially in the Cosby area are a living monument to his devotion to his fellow man, his community, and his country.

WALLACE "WAL" LARGE LIVED AND SERVED WELL

"We believe * * * that service to humanity is the best work of life."

This part of the Jaycee creed readily sums up the life of Wallace C. Large, who passed away last week. And although the lifespan of "Wal", as he was known to his numerous friends, was short when compared with the life expectancy today, he left behind a glowing example of a life dedicated to others.

The store operated by him in the Cosby area was a favorite gathering place and his customers always found a warm greeting upon their arrival. There was hardly a person living in the Cosby area that Wal did not know. Too, he always knew information about former citizens of that community, which he shared with his friends, as well as newcomers to that community.

He was always ready and willing to help any family in any way that he could. At Christmas time, he made a special effort to see that every family in the area around Cosby had those extras that mean so much during the holidays. If he was unable to obtain the items himself, he would solicit help from others in bringing happiness to those less fortunate.

He loved people, especially children. He was never too busy to listen to the problems of people of any age. The thousands of citizens who visited the funeral home served as a testimony to the uncountable friends he had made.

As one of Cosby's leading citizens he was a charter member of the Ruritan Club and devoted numerous hours to the projects of this group. He was always ready to accept responsibilities during the annual Ramp Festival time—and much of the success of this festival could be credited to him.

There is hardly a family in the Cosby area that has not been helped in some way by Wal.

His death is a great loss, not only to Cosby, but to Cocke County. Our deepest sympathy is extended his family and friends.

"When the great scorer comes
  To mark against your name;
He'll not ask if you won or lost,
  But how you played the game."

Wal Large played the game of life well.

A Tribute to Japanese Americans

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it gives me much pleasure to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the accomplishments of the Americans of Japanese ancestry. Cleveland is fortunate in having among its citizens some unusually contributive and constructive Japanese Americans who have won our respect, admiration, and warm regard.

We all owe a debt of gratitude to the heroic Japanese Americans who fought so valiantly in Italy and other places in World War II—many of whom gave their lives for the country that we share. They contributed greatly to our final victory. I am very happy to join my colleagues in commending these Japanese Americans for the magnificent job they did then, and for the splendid role they are playing in America today.

Baltic Freedom Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, one of the ironies of modern times is the "progress" which mankind has made in developing weapons of mass terror and conquest. The barbaric practices of antiquity have given way to the more efficient methods of the gas chamber, slave labor camp, and cattlecar deportation. It is the last technique in particular which the observance of Baltic Freedom Days on June 14–16 brings to mind, for it was 22 years ago this week that the Soviets ruthlessly executed a mass deportation in the three conquered Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

The goal of these mass deportations, along with mass arrests and exterminations, was the complete physical and spiritual destruction of these three small nations. The figures are staggering. During one night alone—June 14—about 10,000 Estonian men, women, and children were arrested and shipped in cattle cars to Siberia and northern Russia. From Latvia, 15,600 were transported to Siberia on June 13–14. During the week of June 14–21, Lithuania lost 34,260 souls to the remote areas of Siberia and the Arctic. The week's total for the Baltic area was 59,860 deportees.

What happened to these ill-fated people. Most of them died or went insane as a result of Soviet brutalities and inhuman living conditions. There were few survivors, but the testimony of some of these has documented one of history's most heinous crimes.

It would be wrong to assume that these deportations are a thing of the past, to regard them as simply an excess of Stalinism. The mass deportation has continued throughout the postwar era to be an instrument of sovietization and coercion. The specific techniques have shifted from mass arrests and cattle-car shipments to the more subtle one of job and housing controls which force segments of the population to move from one area to another. These methods may be less offensive, but the hardship and disruption which they cause the Baltic peoples have not been lessened. Thus it is an illusion to believe that these peoples have any more freedom under Khrushchev's so-called liberalized regime. It is well to be reminded of these hard facts of the cold war, lest we forget the human misery and suffering caused by Soviet imperialism. It is our fervent hope that the Baltic peoples will again be able to observe an occasion such as Baltic Freedom Days in their native land.

Wausau High Gets National Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Wausau Senior High School, Wausau, Wis., in my congressional district, has been selected as the recipient of the 23d Annual Bellamy Flag Award to be presented on October 9, 1964. I wish at this time to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Wausau (Wis.) Daily Record-Herald on this high honor bestowed upon one of the outstanding high schools in the country. The editorial is as follows:

WAUSAU HIGH GETS NATIONAL RECOGNITION

A high honor, one of a number received in recent years, has been bestowed upon Wausau Senior High School. There is every indication that our public high school richly deserves the national Bellamy Flag Award, perhaps the highest tribute ever paid the local institution and one which is highly coveted among the secondary schools of the Nation.

Only one such award is made each year in the United States. While judging was limited to Wisconsin schools this year, our school won out over 73 others nominated for the honor. We join a select list of 22 past winners, including Central High School of Chattanooga, Tenn., the 1963 winner.

An indication of the importance of the award is that Principal Marshall Taylor has already received letters and telegrams of congratulations from 14 Governors, 18 Senators, 10 Congressmen, and a host of other noted educators, Cabinet members, widely known entertainers, and others.

There are three good reasons why the Bellamy Award will be presented at Wausau Senior High on October 9, 1964. They are administration, teachers and students.

From the top, the Wausau Board of Education has set down ground rules which have made possible the growth of an outstanding institution of learning. No small measure of the success is due Superintendent G. W. Bannerman, the energetic and widely recognized educator who has insisted upon one of the finest high school staffs anywhere.

Cited particularly for his leadership was Mr. Taylor, who, while comparatively new on the job as principal, has pushed for new and higher goals for our school. As the award citation states, he has "presented an image deserving of the Bellamy Award."

Teachers were specifically cited for "exceptionally high calibre" and for having "tireless devotion" and being "without jealousies."

Students have demonstrated "good citizenship and patriotism" which has made their school worthy of the award.

Other specific reasons are cited for granting the award to Wausau High including one that says that the "local press is thorough in promoting a good local educational system," according to Miss Margarette S. Miller, Portsmouth, Va., director of the award. We are particularly proud of that statement because a good educational system is a continuing objective of this newspaper.

But giving credit where credit is due, the award was won, as previously stated, by outstanding administration, teachers, and students. We salute you, educators, and students.

Problems of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the results of the wheat referendum continue to reverberate through the Nation. Certainly, the inescapable conclusion is that wheat farmers rejected further drastic Federal intervention in the affairs of agriculture. The alternative may be unsatisfactory and in view of the threats that no new legislation would be enacted, the choice of the wheat farmers is all the more decisive.

The following editorial by the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co.—WBT, WBT-FM, and WBTV—of Charlotte, N.C., on June 5 reviews the problems of agriculture and makes worthwhile comments upon the thinking which motivated the Nation's wheat farmers:

PROBLEMS OF AGRICULTURE

The main conclusion to be drawn from the defeat of the administration's wheat support plan by the farmers' referendum, is that the long-deferred showdown on our haphazard farm legislation has at last arrived and must be faced.

For a quarter of a century we have not had a free market in agriculture. Almost every piece of legislation passed during that time has been merely a makeshift to ward off a crisis in some branch of the industry, but at no time has a genuine effort been made to find an overall solution. The result of most of these measures has been to aggravate the very conditions they were intended to improve. By its very nature a price support system without controls tends to benefit the large producer who could make a profit in the free market and to keep the marginal farmer in business by subsidizing his comparative inefficiency.

This is true also of the other basic crops. In cotton only 3 percent of the farmers get 56 percent of the Federal payments, and one California producer, gets $2 million a year in price supports.

Much the same is true of wheat. The natural consequence is that we have unmanageable surpluses of all the basic crops. The storage costs alone amount to more than a million dollars a day.

The day of reckoning had to come. Either we went all out for the socialistic method of price supports plus controls, or we discarded both. Our experience of 25 years shows that one without the other simply does not work, and the two together would put the farmer under an unbearable regimentation. It was this regimentation that the farmers rejected, in spite of all the pressure Secretary Freeman could bring to bear. He mustered 27,000 Government employees, circulated 4 million pamphlets, and sent TV films and radio tapes to 300 broadcasters.

But the farmers apparently chose to risk a temporary financial reverse rather than jeopardize their freedom. Charles B. Shuman of the Farm Bureau Federation described the Freeman plan as "the false idea that a licensed and regimented agriculture run from Washington is preferable to a system in which farmers make their own decisions in response to the impersonal operation of a market system."

It may develop that we have been lucky. Instead of putting Government controls on all of our basic industries at once, as some incautious countries have done, we have experimented with them only in agriculture.

If we can profit by this example, we may be saved the agony of trying to lift our whole economy out of the quagmire of socialism. The American farmers, like the rest of us, must continue to separate "wheat from chaff" if we are to preserve private enterprise.

Population Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I call attention of Members of Congress to an important study planned on the global problem of overpopulation.

I include, herewith, Mr. Speaker the announcement made recently by Dr. John C. Snyder, dean of the faculty of public health at Harvard University which I believe is important to all House and Senate Members:

PLAN POPULATION STUDY

Plans to assemble a group of experts, already eminent in their respective fields, to concentrate on the global problem of overpopulation in a new Center for Population Studies at the Harvard University School of Public Health were announced today by Dr. John C. Snyder, dean of the faculty of public health.

The center will be concerned with developing new knowledge through research, with the practical application of knowledge among population groups, and with the teaching of graduate students to prepare them for careers in the population field.

Dr. Snyder said the Center would build upon and extend to universitywide scope the research and teaching which the school has been conducting in the population field since 1953. He said that funds are in hand for an endowed professorship and that a commitee is seeking an individual who will "lead the undertaking with skill and distinction." The sum of $2,400,000 is being sought for endowment and construction of facilities for the Center. The additional endowment will be used to bring experts from several different disciplines in the biological and social sciences into new faculty positions, thus complementing the knowledge and skills in the population field already represented in the various Harvard faculties.

"The implications of the rapidly increasing population of the world constitute a challenge to the best minds of the era," Dean Snyder said. "We hope that the new center will achieve the very important 'critical academic mass' which, to apply a term familiar in this nuclear age, implies that a wholly new kind of result may be expected when experts in the required number and of the appropriate backgrounds are brought together closely enough to permit sustained intellectual interaction." He attributed the expression, "critical academic mass," to Dean Harvey Brooks of the division of engineering and applied science at Harvard. "The achievement of critical academic mass is the function of a university, a function that Harvard itself traditionally has performed with excellence," Dean Snyder said.

"For ultimate success in mankind's effort to advance and improve civilization," Dean Snyder declared, "a relative balance must be maintained between numbers of people and the means to sustain them in health and well-being. Thus, social innovation must parallel scientific and technical advances. The situation calls for extraordinary measures, one of the foremost being to make it possible for men and women of unusual stature in professional fields bearing on the problem to put their minds together and to work concertedly in laboratories as well as communities. The concept of the new center for population studies at Harvard is that of collaboration by scholars whose professional excellence, originality and ability to contribute to joint undertakings have been outstanding in their respective fields, whether or not they have ever before addressed themselves to population studies. For some of the participants this will mean a radical change in midcareer, a fact which underscores the importance of adequate facilities and stable financing."

Dean Snyder, a physician and microbiologist, is leading a 3-year study of the school's teaching program for its international students, more than a third of whom are preparing for public health administration, research, or teaching abroad, particularly in the developing countries. Active in several international health organizations, Dr. Snyder was a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations "Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less-Developed Areas," held in Geneva last February. Pending the appointment of a professor to lead the new center, Dr. Synder is serving as acting head of the department of demography and human ecology created in the school last July.

Four years ago, in a lecture on "Ethics and Public Health" at the Riverside Church, New York, Dean Snyder called upon the profession of public health to "concern itself with rapidly increasing populations, particularly in those areas where health measures are being introduced with such profound effects * * *. I am convinced that the profession of public health must accept responsibility for introducing, with great vigor and ingenuity, the elements of effective education in matters of health, at the same time that it applies measures for prevention and control of disease. In the term, effective education in matters of health, I specifically include the information required for regulation of reproduction by the populations involved. In my opinion, to fail to accept this responsibility would be just as wrong as to fail to apply the necessary health measures in the first place."

Dean Snyder said that two considerations had given special impetus to the search for resources needed to develop the center for population studies in Harvard: The probable consequences to society of the continued rapid increase in the population of the world are such that institutions concerned with the health and welfare of mankind must now give vigorous support to study and action directed toward the biological and social issues involved. Furthermore, the compass of the social issues, although pointing directly to such matters as technics for regulation of family size and the physiology of human reproduction, does, in fact, range widely across several other areas of great concern to mankind. These include:

(a) The relations of family size to the immediate health of mothers and children;

(b) The effects of high population density and poverty on families and communities;

(c) The relation of rising population density to agriculture and nutrition;

(d) The economic consequences, especially for the newer nations, of an imbalance between population growth and resources;

(e) The problem of motivation of people, and the educational process itself; and

(f) The more subtle, but equally important problems associated with changes in population quality, for example, the ethics of social action aimed at changing population quality, or the genetic consequences to mankind arising from society's interference with the traditional selective processes of evolution.

Dean Snyder said the Harvard School of Public Health "has taken upon itself the development of a center dedicated to study and action on these issues for several reasons. First, the profession of public health now must embrace the consequences of its success in reducing infant mortality, and the death rates from communicable and infectious disease. From this, it is obvious that rising population density threatens to vitiate the gains made by civilization and, indeed, to block the efforts of the profession of public health itself to achieve a higher level of general health and welfare for mankind throughout the world. There are some observers who feel that the motivation of the individual parent to practice child spacing can best be accomplished under the auspices of health programs already accepted by the people of an area.

"But perhaps the most important reason why the school of public health has launched a drive toward a universitywide center for population studies is that in matters affecting the health of mankind the graduate schools of public health must take the leadership in bringing together the experts of several different disciplines. It is clearly their responsibility because the public health profession is made up of biological, physical, and social scientists through whose joint efforts the collaborative approach to public health problems is well established. The simple problems which can be solved by the individual scientist of a single discipline, using the traditional techniques of his own specialty, have long since been resolved. The faculty of public health at Harvard has accepted the responsibility for pursuing these complex studies which require the efforts of many different experts transcending the traditional role of any one faculty."

Memorial Day Speech

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me requested by my colleague from Illinois, the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA, I want to express my personal appreciation for the fine representation that my good friend is performing for the United States in Bermuda. I am referring, of course, to Bing Morris.

Bing Morris is very well known to many Members of the House, as he was manager of the Congressional Hotel for the Knott Corp. I question whether there is a citizen in the continental limits of the United States who has a greater love for their country and enjoys citizenship privileges as much as does Bing Morris.

Even though his profession presently requires him to be out of the country, his loyalties and thoughts are ever with the United States. It was my privilege to provide a flag that had flown over the U.S. Capitol to him for a special display in Bermuda on Memorial Day. Not only was this flag properly and prominently displayed, but at each table in the large dining room of the Carlton Beach Hotel a special memorandum was placed to note that the particular flag did fly over the Capitol Building of the United States.

His friendship has long been a source of great satisfaction to me, and his love and affection for the United States and her principles should be an inspiration for every American.

A Great Pope, a Great Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, this month Pope John XXIII, one of the greatest men of our century, died. His actual public life was very brief but measured in terms of what he accomplished in his 4½ years as supreme pontiff of the Roman Catholic Church, history will surely devote much to his achievements.

Men of all faiths and all nations are currently mourning his death. One of the many tributes to him is contained in an editorial published June 4, 1963, by the San Leandro, Calif., Morning News.

I am pleased to insert this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A GREAT POPE, A GREAT MAN

From the high pinnacle occupied by the supreme pontiff of the Roman Catholic Church, it is difficult to appear at once a great religious leader and a warm human being. Pope John XXIII achieved that distinction in his brief 4½ years as Pope.

Possessed of a winning friendliness, he sought from the outset to invest the papacy with a deep sense of humanity. That he succeeded is attested by the fact that millions of poor everywhere responded to him with great feeling.

Pope John was stoutly orthodox in his Catholicism. But evidently he did not think it necessary to stress this by holding himself and his office austere and aloof.

He did not fear to innovate. He called an Ecumenical Council, only the 21st ever to be summoned in some 20 centuries of Catholic history. He consecrated a bishop, using an ancient Greek rite which was novel to Rome. There were many other such touches.

The warmth of his spirit was felt when he visited prisoners in a Rome jail, when he raised the salaries of many in the Vatican, when he broke the old tradition that the Pope must eat alone.

Not all his changes were liberalizing. Many reforms were, in fact, a return to older largely forgotten ways of doing. In this respect he showed an abiding concern for the historical continuity of the exalted post he held.

Pope John did not forget either that his position gave him rare opportunity to speak to the world as an advocate of peace, of order, of sound morality. His various pronouncements were a powerful force for good in an age that desperately needs that influence.

At 60, Pope John was unknown to the world Sixteen years later he ascended to the Pope's chair. Many thought his advanced age would make of him a kind of "transition Pope" who would have slight affect on the course of Catholicism and religion generally.

Pope John confounded the doubters. He toiled with great vigor and full heart. His years at the pinnacle were few. But his imprint on the spiritual life of the world was great.

This brilliant and courageous but humble man will surely go down as one of the great Popes in history.

He was a genuine "Pope of the people" and truly a leader of the world.

We join with all humanity in mourning the death of Pope John XXIII.

Canal Zone May Use Panamanian Stamps?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, among the subjects now being discussed by a joint United States-Panama Commission concerning the operation of the Panama Canal is the use of Panamanian postage stamps in the Canal Zone as requested by the Government of Panama.

An informative summary of the historical background of the stamp question by Belmont Faries, stamp editor of the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., which was published in the philatelic news section of the June 9, 1963, issue of that paper, is quoted as part of these remarks in order that the Congress may know what is transpiring in the Canal Zone.

The indicated article follows:

CANAL ZONE MAY USE PANAMANIAN STAMPS

(By Belmont Faries)

Discussions are underway in Panama which are expected to result in the use of overprinted Panama stamps in the Canal Zone.

During President Roberto F. Chiari's visit to Washington in June 1962, he and President Kennedy agreed to appoint high level representatives to discuss points of dissatisfaction in United States-Panamanian relations in regard to the Canal Zone.

A Joint Commission made up of the Governor of the Canal Zone, the U.S. Ambassador to Panama, Panama's Foreign Minister, and an international lawyer has been meeting about twice a month since then to discuss adjustments which can be made within the terms of the treaty.

One of the topics under discussion is a Panamanian request that the Canal Zone Postal System make use exclusively of overprinted Panama stamps purchased at an agreed percentage of their face value, as was done for a 20-year period from 1904 to 1924.

TAFT AGREEMENT

When the United States assumed jurisdiction over the Canal Zone in 1904 Panama stamps overprinted "Canal Zone" were used for less than a month and were then replaced by overprinted United States stamps.

Because of complications over differences in currency and cheaper postage rates in the Canal Zone which led to extensive use of the Zone postal system by Panamanians with consequent loss of income to the Panama government, Secretary of War Taft, in an executive order since known as the "Taft Agreement," directed that Zone authorities purchase stamps from Panama at 40 percent of face value and use them with a "Canal Zone" overprint.

This agreement was in effect nearly 20 years, from December 12, 1904, until it was abrogated effective June 1, 1924. For the next 4 years overprinted United States stamps were again used. On October 1, 1928, the first distinctive Canal Zone stamps were issued. They were printed by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, as have been all issues since.

PURCHASE AUTHORIZED

American negotiators saw no possibility of making any such broad concession as that asked by the Panamanians, since it would be inconsistent with the authority granted the United States under the 1903 treaty.

However, on the basis of the Canal Zone code and United States law, the Governor of the Canal Zone has the legal authority to procure stamps from Panama for use in the Zone and he has been authorized to negotiate a purchase agreement with Panama.

The American proposal is for Panama to provide samples of stamps from which the Governor would order such amounts as were needed, paying production costs for them. After delivery they would be overprinted "For Exclusive Use in the Canal Zone," probably at the Canal Zone Printing Plant at Mount Hope.

Such an agreement would not exclude use of distinctive Canal Zone stamps as desired, and from a practical standpoint there are postal items such as stamped envelopes which Panama might not be able to provide.

There would be no change of any kind in the Canal Zone Postal System. Only the question of stamp procurement is involved.

No agreement has yet been reached on the United States offer, but the introduction of overprinted Panama stamps could come very quickly once the plan is approved.

The Most Glorious Flag in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, a Mr. Michael Stoner, has written a song honoring our flag. On the occasion of Flag Day, June 14, I am pleased to insert the words thereto:

THE MOST GLORIOUS FLAG IN THE WORLD

The most glorious flag in the world,
Is the flag of our own U.S.A.
The most beautiful flag in the world,
Is the flag my heart salutes each day.
It rhymes with heaven's blue;
Heaven's stars are in it too,
It's bars of red.
For heroes dead,
Forever in it's hue.
The most glorious flag in the world,
Has a star for every lovely State;
The most glorious flag in the world,
Tells tale of patriots so great.
A nation's right to be,
At land of liberty;
The story's there,
The glory's there,
In the most glorious flag in the world.

New Climate for Feighan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the new chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the Committee on the Judiciary is a well known and articulate authority in this important and highly specialized field of congressional work. He brings to his new responsibilities 20 years of intensive experience with the problems of people made homeless by war, tyranny, and revolution. His keen knowledge of law, world affairs, and the crisis of the cold war qualifies him as a natural for the chairmanship of this subcommittee.

A news story appearing in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on June 12 reflects the thoughtful views of our colleague, MICHEL A. FEIGHAN, as he assumes his new chairmanship. This report of a personal interview by Alvin Silverman is a warm and well deserved tribute to a distinguished American.

By unanimous consent, obtained June 12, I insert this item in the RECORD:

NEW CLIMATE FOR FEIGHAN

WASHINGTON.—MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of Cleveland, brand new chairman of the House group that handles immigration matters, leaned back in his chair and looked over the top of his rimless glasses at the ceiling.

The head man of a most important committee in the congressional scheme of things, FEIGHAN was pondering a question about his views on immigration.

It was an unusual experience for him.

For 20 of his 21 years as a House Member, he had served on the Judiciary Committee. Now, with the death of Congressman Francis E. Walter, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, he was its ranking Democratic Member. For 14 of those years he had been a member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality. Now, with Walter gone, he was its chairman.

It was an extraordinary occurrence because, even though FEIGHAN had been articulate and, at times, verbose about immigration policies, few persons had sought out his views or listened very attentively to his expressions.

People talk of "the leadership" and of "majorities" but the individuals who run the show in the Congress are the committee chairmen. They can block legislation or they can report it out. If you want to get national publicity, you make a speech on Capitol Hill. If you want to get a particular measure enacted into law, you make friends with the chairmen of the committees.

FEIGHAN may or may not have been reflecting on the turn of events. When he answered, though, it was apparent he had been reflecting on immigration laws.

The handsome Clevelander, whose rippling silver hair usually causes more gallery comment than many of his colleagues' declamations, leaned forward suddenly and said:

"Our immigration laws should be pointed at three major objectives."

The first of these, said FEIGHAN, was to reunite families, with citizens of the United States receiving priority.

Second, he went on, we should seek to acquire special skills and aptitudes needed by our national economy, cultural interests and, in fact, our security. This, he explained, could best be done through a selective immigration process geared to our established needs.

And third, said FEIGHAN, our immigration laws should provide the President of the United States with a reasonable flexibility of action so he may move quickly in international emergencies growing out of wars, tyranny, and human upsets.

"The world looks to the United States for leadership in these circumstances," FEIGHAN explained, referring especially to his third point. "A rapid response could spell the difference between peace and war."

Above all, in the Clevelander's opinion, our immigration policy, as all U.S. policy, must serve the common good of our people. It must reflect what is best for the interests of the United States, domestically and internationally.

"Our immigration laws, through which policy is put into practice, must be consistent with the traditions and history of our Nation," FEIGHAN asserted.

"We are a Nation made great by the toils, the hopes, the sacrifices, and the creative genius of people whose origins go back to many other countries of the world.

"We have been a safe haven for oppressed people, people who have suffered religious and political persecution, people made homeless by war, aggression, terror, and tyranny.

"In my opinion," FEIGHAN continued, "our immigration laws must be flexible, completely in tune with the changing times and consistent with our responsibilities as the leader of freedom's cause."

Cleveland, for many years, has been the great melting pot of the United States. Nearly two-thirds of its population is either foreign-born or second-generation American. Its Hungarian community, to pick out only 1 of the 14 principal nationalities, is said to be the largest in the world outside Budapest.

Now a Clevelander has much to say about American immigration policy.

America and Its Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, each year the Fort Lauderdale News conducts a citizenship essay contest among the high schools of their area. This year the theme was "America and Its Future."

The newspaper is to be highly commended for encouraging young people to give more thought to the future of our Nation and the true meaning of citizenship.

This year the contest was won by Michael Garretson of St. Thomas Aquinas High School in Fort Lauderdale. After reading his fine essay I feel encouraged about our future. Not only does Michael evidence a broad and understanding background in history and political theory, he states his case clearly and concisely.

In order for others to share this essay, I include it at this point in the RECORD. I want to commend Michael for his successful work, and extend best wishes for the years ahead. This essay indicates that his high school years were well spent, and bring credit to him and to his school:

AMERICA: ITS FUTURE

(By Michael Garretson, St. Thomas Aquinas High School, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.)

According to the historical Marxist, America has no future. She is dying—if she is not already dead. She is approaching the end of that great cycle developed and given to the world by Herr Marx and disseminated in the epistles of Communist thought. The United States and her allies are about to collapse in the final phase of that sociological cycle known as historical evolution.

Now it is an acknowledged fact that modern man has little time to think out sociological principles. This is especially true if the sociological principles are derived from that masterpiece of confusion and contradiction, the Communist Manifesto. Since the modern Marxist must take great pains to illustrate this theory of historical evolution, he draws flamboyant and inaccurate comparisons between American democracy and Greek democracy and the fall of Greece, between American morals and Roman morals and the fall of Rome, and between American capitalism and feudal capitalism and the collapse of the feudal states.

It is with great delight that the fall of other states and other institutions are equated by the Marxist with the fall of the United States and her institutions. No consideration is given to the fact that America is unique, and that the ideal of America, the idea of a free and democratic society, will always live in the hearts of men, or at least in the hearts of those men who refuse to submit to any indignity that would make them something less than men.

Right now, America is different. If she remains different, she will never succumb to the Marxian wheel of fortune. Admittedly, there may have been a pattern followed in the fall of the earth's 127 major civilizations, but America does not fit into that pattern.

Few people have not heard the expression, "All roads lead to Rome." One reason given for the collapse of previous states has actually been expressed in this hackneyed phrase. Excessive self-indulgence or alleged self-sufficiency can destroy nations as well as individuals. If the time comes when America feels that she has conquered the world and is free to step on the toes of smaller nations, or, just as bad and at the other extreme, to isolate herself from them, she will be taking the initial step down an ill-fated trail. All life was to revolve around Rome while the barbarian world could go to perdition but, if you remember, the outside world didn't go to perdition. It went to Rome.

America is different. She walks the earth in a true spirit of internationalism. Not only has she freely given her food, her machines, her resources, but now even her youth, in the battle for international peace and understanding. We are the first people in all of history to care whether our neighbors lived or died or could read and write. We struggle, perhaps in vain, that all people may belong to the United Nations. We fight a sometimes thankless war so that all people may not be forced into social and economic servitude. We negotiate so that the final test of the advancement of some may not be the annihilation of all. We would be the first to admit that all roads should not lead to Washington, D.C., and that every good thing does not bear the label, "Made in the U.S.A."

At the height of the Peloponnesian War in ancient Greece, an Athenian argued vehemently against the use of the catapult in naval warfare. He objected on the grounds that the weapon was not an Athenian invention. The same man objected to the formation of a legislature. He said that all the people should govern because that was the way things had always been done. Two years later, Athenian democracy was destroyed forever when Sparta won a series of sea battles in which, most historians seem to agree, the deciding factor was the use of flame-throwing catapults. Athens had grown to proud to change and reform.

The trouble with many older nations today is that, like Athens, they have become rigid, by rejecting change as a sign of weakness rather than as a sign of adaptability.

One of the most impressive features of the American scene is our ability to change and reform. Queen Victoria once quipped, "They even change princes every 4 years." America has been able to maintain her leadership in every major field because she realizes that no matter how good a thing is, it can always become better.

With Jerome Kerwin, I believe that, "An American must hold his philosophy as something not unamendable or fixed for all time. Philosophy is the product of man's reason which has limits in a general sense, but the limits are not definable. Man's reason may still apprehend further truths and these he must be ready to accept."

Democracy, as I undertsand it, is a goal yet to be reached. It is an Eden always around the corner or beyond the horizon. Even if we were to turn all the world into bountiful and productive democracies presided over by just and honorable men, there would still be a challenge, and a goal yet to be fulfilled.

I firmly believe that the ideal which we call America has a great future. It is also my opinion that because America has been integrated into the world, has learned to reform herself when necessity warrants, and has yet to fulfill an all-encompassing never-ending challenge, she will continue to grow and to serve mankind long after the spurious histories of Karl Marx have passed into oblivion.

Travel and Entertainment Section of the Internal Revenue Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of remarks delivered by Mortimer M. Caplin, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, before the National Restaurant Association in Chicago on May 21, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Mr. Caplin's remarks are a clear summary of the meaning of the new Internal Revenue Service rules with respect to travel and entertainment expenditures by businessmen.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Text of Remarks Delivered by Mortimer M. Caplin, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Before the National Restaurant Association, Chicago, Ill., May 21, 1963

I welcome the opportunity to join you in this nonlavish, nonextravagant business luncheon, in this quiet surrounding, conducive to the discussion of business.

My present assignment in Government requires me to travel all over the country. I have met a wide variety of restaurateurs and hotelmen, and continue to be impressed by the sort of persons they are. They are a friendly, hard-working group. They enjoy being with people and have a real desire to be of service. I have found them to be responsible individuals with a deep interest in their local communities and the affairs of their country.

During my 20 years as a business lawyer, I have represented restaurateurs and hotelmen. I understand their problems and views, and make every effort to see that these viewpoints are properly taken into account in the day-to-day decisionmaking of the Internal Revenue Service.

The important relationship of Internal Revenue to your industry is obvious. Your prosperity and growth are of direct concern to all elements of Government. They mean higher incomes and more jobs. They mean a larger tax return to our country to support our defense, space, and other vital governmental programs at home and abroad.

Internal Revenue administers the tax laws in the form they are passed by Congress. We don't make the law; this is within the province of the legislature. We don't recommend tax laws; this is the role of the Secretary of the Treasury. We can't ignore or repeal a tax law, nor can we alter or modify it. Rather, we try to follow congressional direction as closely as possible, and to see that the law is applied in a decent and even-handed manner.

NEW TRAVEL AND ENTERTAINMENT STATUTE

This pattern of administration applies to all provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, including the new travel and entertainment section which was enacted in October 1962.

The travel and entertainment problem is not a new one. It arose many years ago, in part due to an overlap in two provisions of the Code—one which allows a deduction for ordinary and necessary business expenses; and another which disallows any deduction for personal, living, or family expenses. Beginning with the high taxes of World War II this problem became particularly acute and many abuses were revealed.

Our tax administrators sought numerous solutions within the existing statutory framework, but the basic problem defied administrative solution.

Over a 10-year period, Congress has been giving travel and entertainment its special attention. In 1952, Congressman KING, of California, introduced legislation which would have barred business expense deductions unless substantiated in accordance with regulations. In 1959 and in 1960, Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, proposed corrective legislation, and in the latter year, the Senate passed a bill which would have denied travel and entertainment deductions except for the cost of food or beverage. It was after this Senate action that both Houses agreed that the Secretary of the Treasury and Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation should report back to the 87th Congress on the results of administrative efforts. This was the background.

After lengthy hearings in 1961 and 1962, Congress enacted the new travel and entertainment legislation—code section 274—which we are discussing today. The provision has two principal goals:

1. To abolish the "Cohan" rule, which permitted deductions based on estimations and uncorroborated statements of taxpayers. The statute effects this by requiring the taxpayer to substantiate by adequate records or by sufficient evidence corroborating his own statement the various elements of travel and entertainment expenditures.

2. To deny deductions for items which are essentially social or living expenses: This is accomplished by generally requiring a closer proximate relationship between most travel and entertainment expenses and the taxpayer's trade or business.

PROCEDURE IN DRAFTING REGULATIONS

In preparing regulations under the new statute, Internal Revenue did not work in an ivory tower.

In the first instance, we meticulously sought to follow the direction of Congress. This was emphasized to our staff members who were charged with the responsibility of drafting the various provisions of the regulations. In my recent appearance before the Senate Finance Committee, this philosophy and approach were discussed in full.

Next, our policy guideline was clearly fixed so as to apply a rule of reason and to attain a balanced set of regulations. We did not want the statute or regulations to interfere with legitimate business activity. Our aim was only to end the abuses identified by the Congress.

Both during and after the drafting stage, we conferred with many business and professional leaders to get their ideas and suggestions, and to work together with them in solving various practical problems. In addition, numerous business expense account forms and practices were carefully studied.

Tentative regulations were than reviewed by my advisory group of outstanding lawyers, accountants and businessmen. Finally, public comments were invited and public hearings were scheduled to obtain taxpayer reactions, all as part of the normal procedure Internal Revenue follows in preparing the regulations required by law.

Of further importance was our decision to provide a transitional period allowing time for the public to become familiar with the new statute and regulations and to make accommodations to them. While the new statute is technically effective on January 1, 1963, we are instructing agents that, until 30 days following final publication of the regulations, taxpayers acting in good faith are not expected to be in exact compliance with the law and regulations. On interpretative issues, all reasonable doubts will be resolved in the taxpayer's favor. This grace period which will not end before July 1, 1963, is also being allowed to enable taxpayers to conform their accounting procedures and systems to the new statute and regulations.

REGULATIONS FAIR AND REASONABLE

Almost every tax specialist who understands the new law, and who has carefully compared the statute and regulations, has concluded that the regulations are very fair and reasonable. They reflect a liberal approach, while remaining consistent with the statute passed by Congress. On recordkeeping, they approximate the requirements that well-run corporations have been using for years for internal purposes.

Your own association has publicly said: "The new expense account regulations, if they are understood, should not hurt restaurant sales."

You might properly be asking yourself: "If all this is so, what is all the shooting about? Why are certain restaurants feeling the pinch?"

In response, I think it clear that certain expense account abuses are being curtailed; and, to the extent this is so, any restaurant which had previously received income from these violations of the tax law would experience a reduction in operations. But, I quickly add, this is not the full story.

Part of the falloff in receipts is undoubtedly due to an overreaction to the new law; and part to the decisions of some employers to use this as an occasion to carefully monitor all travel and entertainment expenditures of their businesses.

Also, there is some misunderstanding and confusion over the operation of the new law. We have sought to explain the statute and regulations by various releases and speeches, and we plan to do more in the future. But the public has witnessed a series of charges and countercharges, with references to vagueness and complexity.

A good deal of energy has been expended on attacks on the new legislation and regulations. In fact, they are not any more difficult than numerous other items in our tax laws; nor is more discretion being given here to revenue agents than in many other provisions of the tax laws.

Some of the misunderstanding has resulted from the fact that, for the first time, numerous individuals are themselves reading new tax provisions instead of following their past practices of relying on their lawyers and accountants. This has led to certain public debates which to date have unfortunately created more heat than light.

Today, the need is apparent for clear communication and simply worded advice in interpreting the new provisions. Americans have a great record of compliance with our laws, and they should be given every possible assistance in meeting their tax obligations.

WHEN ARE TRAVEL AND ENTERTAINMENT EXPENDITURES DEDUCTIBLE?

The new law provides that—so long as expenditures meet the old ordinary and necessary business standard—travel and entertainment costs will be deductible if they fit into any one of the three basic provisions of the new code, section 274:

1. If there is an active, legitimate business discussion during the entertainment period; or

2. If goodwill entertainment is being provided directly before or after a substantial and bona fide business discussion; or

3. If food and beverage is being provided to a business associate for goodwill purposes in an atmosphere where there are no substantial distractions. This is the so-called quiet business meal exception which is of such importance to the restaurant and hotel industries.

Your representatives have asked me to state in plain language—to the extent tax laws allow room for this—the meaning of these rules from your standpoint. In reply to four of the questions that have been put to me, I offer the following:

1. The new law is virtually the same as the old wtih respect to entertaining business guests at a meal in a typical restaurant. This form of goodwill entertaining does not require that there be an actual business discussion.

2. Directly before or after a substantial and legitimate busines discussion—or a business session of a typical convention—nightclub entertainment of business guests is deductible in virtually the same manner as under prior law.

3. So long as the husband's entertainment expenses are deductible, there is no change in the law with respect to entertaining wives of the taxpayer and his business guests in restaurants or in nightclubs, whether at conventions or otherwise.

4. The cost of banquets at the typical business convention is deductible whether entertainment is provided or not. Similarly, the cost of a hospitality suite at a convention is deductible in the same manner as under prior law.

Another related question put to me was: "Under the new law, must a business guest at a restaurant luncheon actually be a customer?" The answer to this is "No." In referring to this type of business guest, I have sometimes described him as "the natural object of your business attention." Included here would be legitimate business prospects as well as customers, and the fact that repeated contacts might be needed in order to culminate the business transaction would not defeat the deduction. Nor is it necessary to show that the efforts were successful. It is a fact of busines life that "The best laid schemes o' mice an' men gang aft a-gley."

To summarize on restaurant business guests, I suggest that only one question needs be answered affirmatively: "Was your primary purpose to further your trade or busines?" Or, putting it another way, "Can you reasonably expect a business benefit from your relationship with this guest?"

A series of other questions was also submitted by your representatives late last week. These questions go into many specific situations, and we plan to publish detailed answers. Prior to publication we hope we will have the opportunity to confer with some of your leaders to consider their views on the form and substance of these answers.

NEW RECORDKEEPING RULES

The new statute states that no travel and entertainment deduction is allowed unless the taxpayer, by "adequate records" or by "sufficient evidence corroborating his own statement", substantiates the following: amount, time, place, business purpose, and business relationship to the taxpayer of the persons entertained. The statute also permits the regulations to waive some or all of the substantiation requirements for incidental items, up to a given dollar amount.

The committee reports indicate that Congress felt that the taxpayer's own contemporaneous records would normally be sufficient for such incidental items as cabs, telephone calls, tips, and the usual business luncheon. In response to this, the regulations provide that receipts or other outside documentation will not be required for meals or entertainment expenses under $25. We believe this is a reasonable figure in interpreting the so-called de minimis rule, and we try to liberalize it further by stating that tips need not be included in determining whether $25 or more had been spent. Initially, some people misunderstood this effort to liberalize and charged that we were being overmeticulous in suggesting separation of tips. But it is clear now that this separation is optional to the taxpayer, and is intended for his benefit.

Most people will rely on the "adequate records" requirement of the statute, for this is obviously the most practical way of substantiating expenditures. For the typical restaurant business meal all that is usually involved here is a notation of the amount, time, place, and identity of the person entertained. Typically the business purpose is evident from the surrounding circumstances, and only if this is not so is there any need to record this. I might add that the mere statement "business good will" would sufficiently identify the business purpose, and this would normally be presumed even in the absence of a written entry.

Where the good will entertainment is directly before or after a substantial and legitimate business discussion, additional information is required to be recorded. The regulations require a statement of business purpose as well as the time, nature, and extent of the business discussion.

In applying the "adequate records" rule of the statute, the regulations allow for a certain measure of flexibility. Four relief provisions are set forth:

1. Substantial compliance: If a taxpayer has made a good faith effort to comply with the regulations, he will not be penalized if his records do not satisfy every requirement. For example, he would not automatically be denied a deduction merely because he did not procure a receipt in a situation calling for one.

2. Accidental destruction: If receipts or records are lost through circumstances beyond his control, a taxpayer has a right to substantiate deductions by reasonable reconstruction of his expenditures.

3. Exceptional circumstances: If, by reason of the "inherent nature of the situation," a taxpayer is unable to satisfy in full the "adequate records" requirements, he has the right under the regulations to substantially comply by presenting the next best evidence.

4. Commissioner's discretion: The regulations grant to the Commissioner the discretion to waive the receipt requirements if he determines it is impracticable for such documentary evidence to be required.

TWENTY-FIVE DOLLAR RECEIPT RULE

Your officers asked me to discuss in particular the $25 receipt rule.

At the outset, let us first be clear that there is no $25 limit on expenditures. There seems to be some misunderstanding about this, and we have even heard reference to the "$24.95 special" in the context of an absolute ceiling price. There is no change in the law here, and, as before, the test of reasonableness applies. Legitimate business expenses, including legitimate travel and entertainment expenses, may certainly exceed $25. Questions on amounts of legitimate expenditures are not raised frequently, and when they are, the determination is based upon all the facts and circumstances surrounding the particular situation.

To the extent information is contained in a receipt it need not be duplicated in a diary or similar statement of expenses under the "adequate record" rule. Normally a recordation is called for whether the expense is above or below $25.

An exception from recordkeeping is made for per diem or reimbursement arrangements up to $25 a day when the taxpayer is traveling away from home, as well as for mileage arrangements up to 15 cents a mile. Here, reasonable internal controls by the employer are deemed to be sufficient, and there is no requirement for either recordation or receipts.

A deduction is not automatically lost if the taxpayer does not procure a receipt when it is normally called for by the regulations. The relief provisions were mentioned above—substantial compliance, accidental destruction, exceptional circumstances, etc. Further, the taxpayer is always free to supply "other evidence" even though he has not maintained "adequate records." A supporting memorandum from his files and a statement from the persons entertained are an example of an adequate substitute.

RESTAURANT INDUSTRY PROBLEMS

Needless to say, I am very much aware and concerned about the problems of the restaurant industry. Of great interest to me was the comprehensive analysis made in the May issue of one of the leading magazines in the food service industry—Institutions, a magazine of mass feeding—mass housing.

Institutions describes the many difficulties the restaurant industry has been facing over the years: long term decline, and a profit squeeze; continuously rising food and labor costs; economic inability to raise prices; profits dropping from 5.7 percent (1950) to 3.2 percent; for every 30,000 new restaurants each year, 27,000 going out of business.

Also referred to is the three-year study on public buying habits being completed by the U.S. Department of Commerce. The shift in purchasing patterns is said to be graphic. More is being spent on basics, durable goods, and savings. Less is being spent on such things as tobacco, alcohol, food, and dining out.

"Institutions" noted the "tremendous increase in eating out—necessary meals at lunch or dinner", but it also commented on the "obvious decline in dining out as a leisure-time activity". In analyzing the many causes of the decline in restaurant business, it said: "The revolt against the excesses of expense account living—high wining and dining—is a popular revolt." It also said: "Many potential quality customers * * * have been offended by the excesses of the expense account rich and prefer to do their entertaining elsewhere."

The writer of the piece, feature editor James Wood, posed a number of questions:

Whether the restaurant industry wants to become "identified in the public mind with lavish overspending"?

Whether it is doing anything to "divorce itself from this image"?

Whether Gresham's law is being applied: "the bad reputation" of some customers driving "out the good" customers?

Whether there is "any way for the restaurant industry as a whole to make a comeback, divorced from the abusive expense account freeloaders?"

This is the line of questioning suggested by Institutions, a magazine which has been serving your industry for some 25 years.

CONCLUSIONS

Most of the restaurateurs I've spoken to follow the view recently expressed by the Florida Motel Association:

"We want to see (our) industry prosper, but we want more to see it successful, based on income and practices from legitimate and honest sources."

These restaurateurs want everything they're legitimately entitled to, and nothing more. They're interested in giving their customers value: high quality and good service at decent prices. They're interested in their non-expense-account clientele as well as their non-expense-account customers.

The views of these responsible restaurateurs provide a firm basis for us to join forces:

To make sure that legitimate business activity is not hampered by the new law and regulations;

To communicate to the public on the proper deductions allowable under the new law and regulations; and

To communicate to Internal Revenue personnel on the need for fair, reasonable and commonsense administration of the new law and regulations.

The travel and entertainment statute recently passed by Congress is good legislation. It is not antibusiness, nor is it aimed at legitimate business activity. Rather, it strikes a fair balance between restricting abuses which were undermining confidence in our tax system, and not imposing undue restrictions on fair and reasonable business expenditures.

With cooperation and a reasonable approach on the part of both tax administrator and those affected by the new legislation, I believe the law will be administered fairly—to meet the legitimate needs of the restaurant industry and the business community, and to serve the best interests of our country during this challenging period of the Nation's history.

Tribute to Pope John

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. **RHODES** of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, rarely, if ever, in modern history has such a wide range of world opinion respected and praised a Pope of the Roman Catholic Church, as is evidenced by the public expression of sadness at the news of the recent death of Pope John the 23d. In the short space of 4½ years this kindly and peace-loving Catholic leader has gained the best wishes and the affections of Protestants, Catholics, Jews, and all men of good will. His contributions to religious unity, world peace and the well-being of enslaved peoples and suffering humanity everywhere will always be remembered.

Under unanimous consent, I include two editorials from newspapers in the Sixth Congressional District, which I represent, in the RECORD. These well-written editorials, one from the Shenandoah Evening Herald, and the other from the Pottsville Republican, admirably reflect the grief and sadness felt by us all:

> [From the Pottsville (Pa.) Republican]
>
> HIS IMPRINT WAS GREAT
>
> From the high pinnacle occupied by the supreme Pontiff of the Roman Catholic Church, it is difficult to appear at once a great religious leader and a warm human being. Pope John XXIII achieved that distinction in his brief 4½ years as Pope.
>
> Possessed of a winning friendliness, he sought from the outset to invest the papacy with a deep sense of humanity. That he succeeded is attested by the fact that millions of poor everywhere responded to him with great feeling.
>
> Pope John was stoutly orthodox in his Catholicism. But evidently he did not think it necessary to stress this by holding himself and his office austere and aloof.
>
> He did not fear to innovate. He called and Ecumenical Council, only the 21st ever to be summoned in some 20 centuries of Catholic history. He consecrated a bishop, using an ancient Greek rite which was novel to Rome. There were many other such touches.
>
> The warmth of his spirit was felt when he visited prisoners in a Rome jail, when he raised the salaries of many in the Vatican, when he broke the old tradition that the Pope must eat alone. Not all his changes were liberalizing. Many reforms were, in fact, a return to older largely forgotten ways of doing. In this respect he showed an abiding concern for the historical continuity of the exalted post he held.
>
> Pope John did not forget either that his position gave him rare opportunity to speak to the world as an advocate of peace, of order, of sound morality. His various pronouncements were a powerful force for good in an age that desperately needs that influence.
>
> At 60, Pope John was unknown to the world. Sixteen years later he ascended to the Pope's chair. Many thought his advanced age would make of him a kind of "transition Pope" who would have slight effect on the course of Catholicism and religion generally.
>
> Pope John confounded the doubters. He toiled with great vigor and full heart. His years at the pinnacle were few. But his imprint on the spiritual life of the world was great.

> [From the Shenandoah (Pa.) Evening Herald]
>
> REST IN PEACE
>
> Death of Pope John XXIII consumates the career of a man whose life was a modern version of a success story.
>
> Here was an Italian peasant's son who went on to become leader of half a billion Catholics around the world. He learned the hard side of life as he grew up on the land his father worked for another man as a sharecropper. This humble beginning provided a background of human kindness and great respect for the working classes.
>
> The Holy Father was a devoted disciple of world peace. It was in April of this year that he issued his famous Papal document "Pacem ad Terris" (Peace on Earth) which urged world leaders to work together for peace based on justice and liberty for everyone.
>
> Some unknowingly criticized Pope John when he received the son-in-law of Soviet Premier Khrushchev at an audience last March. It was later revealed that the Pope had initiated a program to free the many imprisoned clergymen behind the Iron Curtain and to obtain greater religious freedom in Communist countries.
>
> His campaign for world peace was recognized this year when he was selected for the Balzan International Foundations Peace Prize.
>
> Unlike many of his predecessors, Pope John was of the firm belief that religion should keep up with the times. His illustrious career has seen many incidents where he broke with tradition. In each case he was of the opinion that the change was for the good of the church as many practices became outdated in today's modern way of life.
>
> As death came upon him his prayers were not for himself but rather for his great ambition, "Peace throughout the world."
>
> May he rest in peace.

U.S. Flag Symbolizes National Heritage and Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Flag Day is June 14. No day is better for an American to pause and reflect on those matters of serious import to him as an individual and as a citizen-member of that great Nation, the United States of America.

With all our national traits of exuberance and enthusiasm, our acceptance of the need for struggle and hard work to accomplish our personal and national goals, we all too seldom take time out to recapitulate all the glories of American citizenship. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that Flag Day gives us all an opportunity to pay homage to our great tradition and to rededicate ourselves to the perpetuation of our highest aspirations and ideals.

No nation's flag is merely a handful of gaily colored bunting. It may seem to be that, but it is much more. As Henry Ward Beecher said:

> A thoughtful mind when it sees a nation's flag, sees not the flag but the nation itself. And whatever may be its symbols, its insignia, he reads chiefly in the flag, the government, the principles, the truth, the history that belong to the nation that sets it forth. The American flag has been a symbol of liberty and men rejoiced in it.

Mr. Speaker, it is not sufficient for all Americans to recognize and celebrate Flag Day with appropriate ceremony. True patriotism demands daily recognition of the continuing symbolic importance of our flag. Do we display the flag on all prescribed occasions? Do we conform to the regulations protecting it? Are we alert to failures to so do? These are some of the many questions we should ask ourselves.

It is one of the basic guarantees of citizenship that a citizen of the United States, acting solely as an individual, has the privilege and duty to exert a responsible role in demanding for the U.S. flag the honor and protection it deserves. That such individual initiative may win desirable community action is best illustrated by a recent incident in Dade County, Fla.

Due to the increasing number of polling places, some of them temporary, there has been somewhat of a problem in always procuring proper display of the flag. We realize, Mr. Speaker, that Public Law 829, 77th Congress, section (f) declares:

> The flag should be displayed daily, weather permitting, on or near every polling place on election day.

This legislation sets up criteria for the displaying and treatment of our flag and leaves it up to the proper local officials to voluntarily conform.

Many citizens probably made passing note of the absence of the flag, but failed to follow the matter further. It was left to a constituent of the Fourth District of Florida, which I have the honor to represent, to implement his deep feeling that the symbolism of the U.S. flag and the precious freedoms alined to it never can be too often brought to our attention and granted our support and respect.

I am speaking of Mr. Norman R. Kirk, of Miami, Fla. He made it his business to notify the authorities of Dade County and his Congressman of the oversight in displaying of the flag. As a result of his protest and further inquiry by me, I am proud to state that County Manager Irving C. McNayr, of Metropolitan Dade County, Fla., has authorized the purchase of flags for every polling place in Dade County, and our Nation's flag should be flying there at the next election.

The simple sincerity of Mr. Kirk's words expresses every citizen's feeling about the U.S. flag that I wish to share them with my colleagues. The following vital excerpts from his letter are his plea:

> I am a retired naval officer with 30 years' service. Our flag has been my inspiration for many years, and as my years diminish, I am proud to bask in its security, stature, strength, and prestige.
>
> My letter brings me to this point: when I voted last November the American flag was noticeably missing. I contacted the Miami Herald, a flag was procured for that polling place by midafternoon, through what channels I do not know.
>
> Last month (February 1963), at my voting precinct, again no flag. * * * Again on March 12, 1963, I went to vote, again no flag.
>
> So, I am requesting, if no law presently exists covering this act, that one be enacted making it compulsory to display an American flag at all polling places in Dade County.
>
> I have spent too many of my years assisting in the preservation of our flag to find it missing at the very initial basis of our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, we may well conclude our remarks with the reminder that the American flag was brought at the price of dedication by generations of citizens, by a lifetime of service by members of our Armed Forces, such as Norman R. Kirk, and by the supreme sacrifice of the lives of many true patriots. Let us then, on Flag Day and all other days, render to it the reverence and homage which it deserves.

Economic Illiteracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, amid the plaintive cries of "creeping socialism" and the "advent of the welfare state," it is indeed refreshing and heartening to come upon a man who eagerly accepts the challenges and risks inherent in the preservation of the free enterprise system. I commend to the attention of my fellow Members an article by the secretary of Kiwanis International, O. E. Peterson, which should serve both as a warning and as a call to reexamine the sometimes passive acceptance of our own economic principles.

KEEPING ENTERPRISE FREE

(By O. E. Peterson)

The phrase "free enterprise" is a very dangerous one. It sounds so simple, but the reality behind the phrase is not simple at all. It is so complicated that many people who live under the free enterprise system only vaguely understand it. Recently a stockbroker told about a woman who wanted to invest some money. "But be sure to get me only stocks that will go up," she said. "Don't get me any that might go down."

This incident points up an aspect of our free enterprise economy that needs emphasizing today as never before. Free enterprise, like freedom in any form, involves risk. Freedom and complete security are fundamentally incompatible. A cradle-to-the-grave welfare state may be possible, but it is not possible within a context of freedom.

This is not to say that it is unimportant to provide increased security for our fellow citizens. Unconcern for those who have been unable to succeed in a competitive free enterprise economy is wholly inconsistent with Kiwanis objects. It is one of our basic principles that help should be given to those who need it.

The big question is: From what source should this help come? On one side are those who insist that increased governmental intervention is the only answer, even at the price of a very substantial diminution of individual freedom. Opposed to this view are all of us who believe that our people's needs can be filled in a free society.

We must recognize, however, that the burden of proof is on us. That free enterprise offers both economic security and freedom is easy to say; it is far less easy to demonstrate. But demonstration, not utterance, is now required of all who have faith in free enterprise.

Let us consider some specific areas. A good deal of government interference in our economic system has followed exposure of indefensible business practices. The passage of the Pure Food and Drug Act in 1906 is one example. The philosophy of free enterprise to which we subscribe is not an "anything goes" philosophy. A dishonest business practice cannot be justified in the name of free enterprise, but it can do much to undermine the free enterprise system itself. We must, therefore, do all in our power to eliminate abuses before they provide the occasion for increased governmental intervention. A person who invests in a business is taking a risk. This is inherent in the free enterprise system. But a person who buys a product or service should not have to risk being cheated. This risk is not a proper free enterprise risk.

Even adherence to the highest ethical standards will not be enough to preserve both our economic system and our freedom. The system itself must be made to operate with ever-increasing efficiency. The demands that will be made on it are so great that inefficiency and waste can no more be tolerated than can unscrupulousness. We who support free enterprise are vociferous in our condemnation of governmental waste and inefficiency. We dare not turn a more tolerant eye on wasteful and inefficient practices in the private sector of our economy.

The more emotional we become about "free enterprise the more likely we are to forget to emphasize "enterprise" as much as we emphasize "free." Of all economic systems, free enterprise provides the least justification for complacency. The businessman who thinks and operates today as he did 30 years ago is asking for trouble—and is a trouble spot in our economy. So is the businessman who welcomes Government intervention when it happens to work to his advantage. On occasion, a group of business interests have actually asked for governmental restriction of their competitors. The company president who on Monday gives an impassioned talk on behalf of free enterprise and on Tuesday dictates an equally vigorous letter to his congressman demanding legislation to restrain his competitors is actually a hazard to the economic philosophy to which he pays lip service. He's against "governmental paternalism"—except for himself.

One positive measure all of us can take to help keep enterprise free is an unremitting effort to combat "economic illiteracy." Ironically, we who believe strongly in free enterprise must bear the responsibility for the appalling popular ignorance of its principles. The father who is dismayed by his teen-age children's attitude toward free enterprise should ask himself how much time he spent explaining the economic facts of life to them.

All of us, in fact, should ask ourselves how much individual effort we have put forth to help keep free enterprise a vital reality. It is not enough to say that we haven't the time, that we have all we can do to take care of our own businesses, our own professions, our own families. We have not become Kiwanians in order to do no more than we would have to do anyway. Our Administrative Theme for 1963 is "Responsibility—The Key to Freedom." It remains for us to accept that responsibility.

Who Are the Real Fright Peddlers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday evening, June 7, my colleague from California, JAMES B. UTT, delivered a speech at the Indiana War Memorial Auditorium under the sponsorship of "We the People."

The address was entitled "Who Are the Real Fright Peddlers?" and the text follows:

WHO ARE THE REAL FRIGHT PEDDLERS?

(By Hon. JAMES B. UTT, of California)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and my fellow Americans, it is a privilege and an honor to be invited to participate in this important and historic occasion. Meetings and discussions such as this can have an important bearing on the future of this Republic. I am, as you all know, a controversial figure. I have been called an "alarmist" by those who want America to sleep. To that I will plead guilty, even as Paul Revere was an alarmist in his day, and traveled the countryside to warn the sleeping villagers that the British were coming. I have been called "inflammatory" because I will not subscribe to the slogan of "Better Red Than Dead." More recently I have been referred to by a few of my colleagues in the House and the Senate as a "fright peddler." It is apparent that we who have a patriotic devotion to this Republic are supposed to lie down and play dead while the pseudo-liberals not only permit but assist in the extension of communism in every part of the globe; and those who wish to resist the appeasement in Laos, the surrender in Cuba, and the abandonment of freedom fighters throughout the world, as well as the suicidal unilateral disarmament program, are termed "fright peddlers." The truth is, I am frightened, and I would be a coward if I did not raise my voice in protest, and to tell the American people the truth about the International Communist Conspiracy and its interwoven relationship to the Communist Party, U.S.A.

As J. Edgar Hoover said in an address to law enforcement officials on March 1, 1960: "It is indeed appalling that some members of our society continue to deplore and criticize those who stress the Communist danger. What these misguided 'authorities' fail to realize is that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is an integral part of international communism * * * Public indifference to this threat is tantamount to national suicide. Lethargy leads only to disaster."

Our Founding Fathers were well aware that man's eternal enemy was government, whether that government was a dictatorship, a benevolent monarchy, a democracy, or a republic. Usurpation of power is the natural trend of every government. George Washington expressed it in these words: "Government is like a fire, which if it is properly controlled, will light your homes and cook your food and run your factories, but if it is not controlled, it will destroy you."

A hundred years ago, a great Civil War was being fought to test whether a nation conceived in liberty could long endure. Today, we are engaged in another civil war testing the same premise. It is not a hot war, but a cold war, which can be just as deadly. During tha hundred years, the poles of the compass have swung in a 180° arc. At that time it was a question of whether or not the sovereignty of a State or a group of States transcended the sovereignty of the Union. That conflict was resolved in favor of the Union. The conflict today is whether or not the sovereignty of the Union transcends the sovereignty of the States which created the Union. That conflict has yet to be resolved.

Free enterprise and capitalism have long been the American way of life. One hundred years ago, Karl Marx completed his blueprint for the destruction of the capitalistic society and his proposal to establish a universal Socialist-Communist society. We have been following this blueprint for many years, and the pseudoliberals embrace that doctrine 100 percent. It is well known that the seeds of death are implanted in every human being before he draws his first breath. So also are the seeds of destruction implanted in the body politic of every nation at birth. Just as the life of an individual can be extended beyond its three score years and ten, by proper care, attention and prudent living, so also can the life of a nation be prolonged beyond the normal cycle; but as wanton and careless living will cut down the span of a human life, so also may our national life be cut down. If this Republic, which was conceived in liberty, is to survive, the American people must demand that we return to the basic concepts of our forefathers and declare again that we are a nation under God.

It was not until dozens of patriotic organizations throughout this Nation began to alert the American people to the dangers of the Socialist-Communist ascendency to power in this country, that the hierarchy of the Communist international conspiracy decided that it was high time to destroy the anti-Communists. To this end, they called a meeting in Moscow, which was attended by 80 Communist organizations from all parts of the world. The delegates to this meeting were instructed to return to their respective countries and begin a massive program to destroy all anti-Communists. Gus Hall, president of the Communist Party, U.S.A., returned from Moscow and inaugurated that program of destruction. The first to feel the ax was General Walker, who was indoctrinating his troops so that they would recognize the dangers of communism as a conspiracy and so that they would not be brainwashed as they were in Korea. For this bit of patriotism he was dismissed, degraded, demoted, and deprived of his rights under the Constitution.

This served only to accelerate and intensify the work of patriotic anti-Communist organizations. The administration was frantic because the New Frontier was being equated with socialism and socialism with communism, and something had to be done. Who was to do it? None other than Walter and Victor Reuther, who came to Washington in the fall of 1961 and had a strategy conference. At this conference Walter Reuther promised to write a memorandum for Attorney General Robert Kennedy. That memo was a 24-page blueprint for the destruction of the anti-Communists. The memo was actually written by Victor Reuther, whom you remember as being the Soviet devotee, who in his earlier days spent some time in Russia writing glowing reports on the Soviet socialist program, and in a moment of reverie wrote a letter to his colleagues in America urging them to "keep up the fight for a Soviet America." This man, then became the chief adviser to the administration on how to deal with the anti-Communists. In his note, which accompanied the memo, he said, "We are hopeful that this memorandum may have some value to you in focusing attention upon possible administration policies and programs to combat the radical right."

Now it must be understood that the "radical right" refers to any and all patriotic organizations which stand opposed to the Socialist-Communist doctrine as set forth in the Communist manifesto of 1848 and restated by the Moscow Communist Convention in 1960. That, of course, means you as well as me.

"Liberty cannot exist where government takes care of the people, but it can only thrive where the people take care of the government." Woodrow Wilson said that many years ago. He might just as well have spelled it out more clearly by saying that liberty and socialism cannot coexist, that they are incompatible and only one can survive. In 1937, Pope Pius XI asked a searching question: "How is it possible that such a system long since rejected scientifically and now proved erroneous by experience, how is it, we ask, that such a system could spread so rapidly in all parts of the world?" If Pope Pius XI was shocked in 1937, what would he say today after seeing an additional 750 million human beings swept behind the Iron Curtain? Pope Pius XI also said in 1931 that the Socialist state cannot exist without an obviously excessive use of force. We are seeing that excessive use of force not only in the Communist countries, such as East Germany, Hungary, and Cuba, but also in our own country.

Now let us examine the recommendations of the Reuther brothers to be used for your own destruction. The first recommendation was that "The radical right inside the Armed Forces poses an immediate and special problem requiring immediate and special measures." Under this heading, he recommended that Secretary McNamara investigate the extent of the radical right in the military. The memorandum claimed that it was widespread pressure from rightwing generals and admirals in the Pentagon which brought about the recall of Gen. James Van Fleet to active duty. What was wrong with General Van Fleet? Simply this, he was a member of the board of For America, he endorsed the Florida Coalition of Patriotic Societies, and he was on the board of advisers of H. L. Hunt's Life Lines. The memorandum complained that all that Van Fleet accomplished was to embarrass Adlai Stevenson by saying that Stevenson was to blame for the U.S. failure to provide air support in the Bay of Pigs invasion and that General Van Fleet would have fired Stevenson. Had I been President, I would not have fired Adlai Stevenson for the simple reason that I would never have hired him in the first place.

The No. 2 complaint in the Reuther memorandum was that the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations is lending aid and comfort to the radical right. (That's you.) The memo goes on to state, "Although the radical right poses a far greater danger to the success of this country in its battle against international communism than does the domestic Communist movement, the latter has been branded subversive by the Government, and the former (radical right) has not." The memo goes on to state, "The list today is almost like a Good Housekeeping seal for the radical right and as long as it exists" (indicating it should be abolished) "it should not remain one sided and permitted to work in favor of the radical right." It is interesting to note that the adjective "radical" precedes any mention of "right." You see, radicalism has always been an offensive word to the American people, and, if the brothers Reuther can implant the word "radical" in connection with conservatism or rightwing movements, it would prove destructive.

The memo continues that "It might be advisable for the Attorney General to announce at this time that he is going to investigate one or more of these organizations with a view of determining whether charges will be filed and hearings held on the question of listing one or more of these organizations. The mere act of indicating that an investigation will be made will certainly bring home to many people something they have never considered—the subversive character of these organizations and the similarity to listed groups on the left."

Now that is really something. Many of these organizations to which Reuther refers have requested an investigation, and I can assure you that if one is held there will be no witness who will take the fifth amendment.

One specific proposal in the memo was that FBI agents infiltrate ultraconservative organizations to determine whether they should be classified as subversive or not. My dear friends, the FBI does not have to infiltrate these organizations. They have an open invitation to join with any of them.

The third suggestion was "The flow of big money to the radical right should be dammed to the extent possible." You should note that the word "dammed" is spelled with two m's although their direct intent was to spell it the other way. The proposal further stated "As funds are a source of power to the radical right, action to dam up these funds may be the quickest way to turn the tide now running in their favor." At least that is an admission never before heard, that the tide is running in our favor. The memo suggested that tax exemptions be carefully checked and that the list of major donors to the far right be made public and that the Federal Communications Commission check radio and television stations carrying far-right propaganda, but listing their programs as religious, news analysis, or public service, and that the program, "Know Your Enemy," emanating from Washington, would be a good place to start.

Incidentally, immediately after the memo was circulated, the income tax reports of Walter Knott of Knott's Berry Farm, one of the greatest exponents of free enterprise, and a true patriot, were examined and he was found liable for deductions which he had taken on contributions to support the California Free Enterprise Association. It is amazing how easy it is to deduct money for contributions to the Fund for the Republic and other leftwing organizations which support the socialistic Communist ideology, but when you attempt to educate people on the free enterprise capitalistic system, you are then dispensing political propaganda. When you consider the massive political propaganda spewed forth by the National Education Association, the Rural Electrification outfit, and even the National Council of Churches, the double standard becomes so apparent that a schoolchild would recognize it.

Skipping one recommendation, I go to the fifth, which was that "The domestic Communist problems should be put into proper perspective for the American people, thus exposing the basic fallacy of the radical right." What we are doing here tonight is putting the domestic Communist problem in its proper perspective for the American people, and in so doing we are not exposing any basic fallacy of the conservative right.

Now we come to the real "meat and potatoes" of what seems to be bothering the liberals, and that is that the Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover, "exaggerates the domestic Communist menace at every turn, and contributes to the public's frame of mind upon which the radical right feeds." The memo further charges that Assistant Attorney General J. Walter Yeagley, who continues in charge of internal security matters, has always maximized the domestic Communist menace. "There is no need," the memo continues, "of a further effort to dramatize the Communist issue, the need now is to rein in those who have created the unreasoned fear of the domestic Communist movement in the minds of American people and to slowly develop a more rational attitude toward the strength of this movement." In other words, the rational attitude which the pseudoliberals want is that we should appease and even embrace the international Communist menace. The memo suggests that it would not be well to forbid dissenting officials from expressing a contrary view for fear of the charge that the administration was attempting to muzzle J. Edgar Hoover, but that "any effort to take a more realistic view by the leaders of this administration would probably cause most of the administration officials to fall in line, and even some legislators might be affected thereby."

This, then, is the key to the recent attacks upon our patriotic conservatism by some Members of the U.S. Senate and some Members of the House, and, if you will read these attacks appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, you will be amazed to see how closely they have followed the substance and the language used in the 24-page memo of Victor Reuther.

The authors of the book, "The Far Right," Donald Janson and Bernard Eismann, state that, "No formal action was taken on the suggestions, although the document was read by key members of the administration and circulated to sympathetic Congressmen." With that statement I completely disagree, for sympathetic Congressmen and Senators have been following the directions of this memorandum, and many TV and radio station licenses are being withheld. These charges by sympathetic Congressmen are replete with the charge of guilt by association and similar techniques, and anyone who disagrees with these so-called sympathetic Congressmen becomes anti-Semitic, anti-Negro, and is charged with being a greater menace to American security than is the domestic Communist establishment.

I, as a dedicated conservative patriot, resent being charged with radicalism and as a member of the "lunatic fringe." However, these charges will not alter my course nor the course of you patriots, who intend to continue exposing communism wherever it rears its ugly head. As Daniel Webster said, "I was born an American, I expect to die as an American, and in between I intend to live as an American."

We have been in a steady retreat from Moscow, which is more humiliating to me than Napoleon's retreat from Moscow 150 years ago. The difference is that Napoleon was forced to retreat, while we retreat by reason of weakness, fear, and design. We have the greatest military force in the world, but its Commander in Chief does not know when to use it, where to use it, or how to use it. High military decisions, including the selection of armaments, are made by the "whiz kids" in the Pentagon over the objections of the Joint Military Chiefs of Staff.

Paul Nitze, one of the planners in the Pentagon, and now the leading candidate to be Under Secretary of Defense, stated years ago that our military power should be divided among the nations of the world, and we are proposing to do just that. How can we have a win policy with such men directing our defenses? Why should not the American people be frightened over our steady retreat because of a threatening bully in Moscow? Why should we not be concerned over the establishment of a Soviet military base in the Western Hemisphere? Why should we not be concerned over the suggestion that we give up Guantanamo Bay? In spite of the President's denial of this, it was the administration that asked for money to acquire land in Puerto Rico and money to build additions to the naval base at Roosevelt Roads. The only thing that stopped it was the Committee on Armed Services. There was ample opportunity to set up a representative government in Cuba when Batista offered to resign, warning our Ambassador in Havana of the Castro threat, but there were people in the State Department who were bound and determined to set up a Communist government in Cuba, with full knowledge that Castro was a dedicated Communist. The two men responsible for this were William Wieland and Roy Rubottom, and the Senate report is replete with their treachery. These two men were not even reprimanded by the administration, but were advanced to higher positions of security, just as Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White were moved upward into places of greater authority after their treachery was common knowledge.

It is only human that some mistakes should be made, but when none of them is in favor of America, I cannot help but recognize a design for surrender. The Bay of Pigs fiasco is a good example of this, along the route of our retreat. Following that, the Soviet military buildup was well known by the administration, but denied by them until a national election seemed certain to swamp the New Frontier. Then dramatic action was taken which lasted less than 48 hours during which time this administration made concessions to Khrushchev, all of which have not yet come to light. These concessions played into the hands of the Communists, for they actually accomplished exactly what they set out to accomplish, and that was a Communist satellite within the Western Hemisphere, protected by the force and might of the U.S. Navy.

In exchange for the removal of a few offensive missiles from Cuba, we would dismantle our foreign bases in the Mediterranean and other places. At this point, I would like to say that I have seen a lot of missiles, and I have yet to see one designated as offensive and another designated as defensive. It depends on which way the gun is pointed. Khrushchev promised to remove an undisclosed number of troops from Cuba, with March 15 of this year as a deadline. According to the count, nearly 3,000 troops were removed, but no count was made of the troops on the incoming ships. As of last month, the Senate Committee on Military Preparedness disclosed that there are now a minimum of 17,500 Russian troops in Cuba. But for the token removal of troops in March, our President hailed Mr. Khrushchev as a statesman for keeping his word. How silly can you get?

Castro is exporting communism by propaganda, as well as military equipment and men, to several Latin American countries. From this we will reap a whirlwind, and not in the too far distant future. What happened to our demand for on-site inspection of Russian military might in Cuba? The answer is, nothing. We even go so far as to summarily dismiss a marine captain who caught a Communist spy redhanded on our naval base at Guantanamo and had to shoot him in self-defense. This same captain has been told that he will be fined $10,000 and imprisoned if he even talks about the incident. What has happened to our first amendment of free speech? The same pattern by which we lost Cuba to the Communists is being followed with regard to the Republic of Haiti.

I would like to submit just two examples of misstatement of facts by the administration with reference to the Cuban situation, and compare them with the interim report of the Senate Military Preparedness Subcommittee. On February 6, 1963, on page 47 of the special Cuba briefing, R. S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, said, "I have no evidence that Cuba is being used as a base for subversion directed against other Latin American countries. It is a matter that is of constant interest to us and one we are monitoring continuously." Now this is what the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee said on page 7 of the interim report: "The evidence is overwhelming that Castro is supporting, spurring, aiding, and abetting Communist revolutionary and subversive movements throughout the Western Hemisphere and that such activities present a grave and ominous threat to the peace and security of the Americas."

At his press conference on August 29, 1962, President Kennedy said, "We have no evidence of troops * * * we do not have information that troops have come into Cuba." And this is what the Interim Report said on pages 10 and 11 (speaking of the July-August period, 1962): "Human source reports also alleged that the nature and character of the arriving Soviet personnel had changed significantly. It was reported that some of the arriving personnel during this period were primarily young, trim, physically fit, suntanned and disciplined, and that they formed in ranks of fours on the docks and moved out in truck convoys. Refugee, exile, and other human source reports suggested that, in contrast to the earlier arrivals, the new arrivals were Soviet combat troops. However, the intelligence community adhered to the view that they were military instructors, advisers, and trainers, plus a number of civilian technicians and advisers associated with improving the Cuban economy."

These are just two examples of the inconsistencies between statements of the administration and the actual facts.

Walt Rostow went to Moscow to ask Mr. Khrushchev what we could do to lessen tensions. Mr. Khrushchev's reply was that we should eliminate our first-strike capabilities, and Mr. Rostow returned to Washington to implement that suggestion. That is why the Skybolt was canceled and the RS-70 program is at a standstill. It is the Strategic Air Command, with its capabilities of striking first, that has prevented Khrushchev from attacking us, and, while we phase out our first-strike capabilities, the Soviets continue to build the counterpart of the RS-70, capable of carrying warheads on a 25,000-mile mission at speeds up to 2,000 miles an hour, at altitudes in excess of 70,000 feet.

The fuzzy-minded planners surrounding the President have the idea that if we disarm unilaterally the Russians will do so, as a gesture of good will. That is just like hoping that if you let a ball player steal second base, he will be a good boy and not try to steal third. It is just as foolish, but far more deadly. We can no more unilaterally disarm and have peace, than you can disarm the police force of a big city, in hopes that the underworld will respond by abandoning their criminal careers. There is nothing but force or the threat of force that will deter the Communists from destroying us.

There has recently been some discussion of a memorandum by Walt Rostow and McGeorge Bundy (political advisers to the President) which stated in part that it should be the policy of the administration to refuse aid to freedom fighters in any part of the world and that, if a Communist government took over, the United States should do all within its power, short of war, to see that such a government should survive. This is shocking, but when inquiry was made to the State Department regarding this memorandum, the State Department replied that there was such a memo, part of which was leaked to the press, but that it had been taken out of context and was misquoted. The only posible answer to that is, "Let's look at a copy of that memorandum to see what it really said." Upon requesting a copy of this memo from the State Department in order that the matter might be clarified, the reply came that the memorandum was prepared for the Security Council and was "classified and top secret." So the public will never know the truth. However, to give credence to the Rostow-Bundy memo, it should be noted that, when a resolution was introduced to provide for a Captive Nations Week and thereby hold out some hope to the enslaved peoples in the captive nations, the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, filed an objection with the Rules Committee against the passage of this resolution on the grounds that it would create tensions and displease Mr. Khrushchev. All I can say is that it is about time we began to offend Mr. Khrushchev.

Because your organization and others like it, as well as individuals, including me, are attempting to alert and warn the public of the serious consequences of these successive retreats, compromises, and accommodations, we are called "fright peddlers." Let's see who are really the fright peddlers. President Kennedy threatened this nation with a depression if Congress failed to pass his tax program "in toto." Nothing can be more frightening than a depression. Secretary Freeman threatened the farmers (and when I say threatened I mean threatened) with a farm depression if they refused to buy his farm program of rigid controls. He even indicated that he would go so far as to dump our grain surplus on the market and ruin the farmer. To many, that is fright peddling.

Why is it that those, who make eloquent outbursts on the floor of the House and Senate, ignore the fright peddlers such as Khrushchev who says that he will bury us? Recently, Khrushchev said he would pulverize us if we interfere with Castro's Cuba. Why do they ignore Castro's frightening demands and threats to our security?

Why, also, do they ignore the frightening requests of the State Department that American department stores should display in their show cases goods made by Communist countries?

Those who ignore these threats are the real fright peddlers by their very silence in this area. This is a sin of omission which is as great as the sin of commission.

President Kennedy continues to ignore the bilateral agreements with Latin American countries, calling for the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine; which, by the way, has recently been adopted by Mr. Khrushchev, in reverse, by demanding that America stay out of Western Hemisphere affairs, and, moreover, the President has promised Mr. Khrushchev that our Navy will protect the sovereignty of Fidel Castro. To me, that is truly frightening. The President agreed to remove our missile bases and to call home many of our Army personnel, now located in strategic points around the world, with the exception, of course, of Oxford, Miss.

It is high time that the American people stop looking for fallout shelters and begin looking for "sell out" shelters. If this administration, as suggested by the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Paul Nitze, turns over our Strategic Air Command to NATO and the United Nations, there must be an accounting by men in high places. The creation of an international "peace force," under the control and direction of an organization controlled by the Afro-Asian bloc in concert with the Russian satellites, would certainly be giving aid and comfort to the enemy and should be dealt with accordingly.

The administration's effort, to promote civil rights by riot, strife, and revolution, is doing much to implement the Communist manifesto of 1848, wherein Karl Marx declared that capitalism and all property rights must be abolished. No one can deny that people are entitled to their civil rights, but what they fail to comprehend is that with each civil right there is an equal and corresponding civil responsibility. And that responsibility is that the civil rights of others cannot be destroyed by illegal application of the civil right in point. Civil rights must be a two-way street. The recent decisions of the Supreme Court are leading us down the road to the complete destruction of property rights and the law of trespass held sacred since the Magna Carta.

The high emotional stress to place human rights above property rights is a false concept. Let me say here and now, and most emphatically, that the highest human right of man is the right of private property and its protection against trespass and confiscation as provided in the Fifth Amendment. In fact, all human rights are based on property rights, and, if you question this statement, I suggest that you examine the situation in all Communist countries which have destroyed property rights, and you will find that human rights followed them down the drain. In this emotional atmosphere, it is apparently easy to convince the people that we should carry out the Communist Manifesto tnd destroy the right of private property. Of course, much of this is being done under a highly graduated personal income tax and inheritance tax, as recommended so clearly by Karl Marx, as the main weapon in the arsenal of socialism.

People are good not because they are white or black or yellow or red. They are good because they accept the moral and spiritual laws, and apply them in their daily lives. They simply want to be good people. And people are bad not because of their race, creed or color, but because they refuse to accept and apply the moral and spiritual laws.

Men, as well as governments, do good things in order to entice others and to then perform their evil deeds. The child molester always entices a child with candy or some other gift before he performs his evil deed. Likewise, governments promise something for nothing in order to extend their control and dominion over the people whom they are supposed to govern by the consent of the governed. I have seen a lot of free cheese in a mouse trap, but I have never yet seen a happy mouse that ate the cheese. Likewise, our liberties are contracted with each extension of dominion and control. This is the short road to slavery.

Beyond the constant attacks of the anti-anti-Communists, there is a concurrent and massive attack against religion which is the foundation upon which this Nation was built. This attack comes not only from the atheists, but from other people and organizations, including the U.S. Supreme Court, under the guise of sophistication. We are attempting not only to maintain a separation of church and state, but a separation of state from God.

If this Nation ever turns its back on the God who created us and made us free, we will be destroyed as surely as God destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah. You will find these words in Second Chronicles, chapter 7, verse 14: "If my people who call me by my name, will humble themselves and pray, and forsake their wicked ways, then will I hear from heaven and forgive their sins and will heal their land."

Ladies and gentlemen, if there was ever a land that needed healing, it is this glorious America of ours. Let us then unite in that high purpose, that the design of liberty etched upon the fabric of our American life shall continue to shine brightly upon us, our children and our children's children for generations to come. "To Him all majesty ascribe and crown Him Lord of all."

Foreign Aid: The Essential Factors for Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, most of us would agree, I am sure, that the one major prerequisite to informed action by the Congress is factual, intelligent, and responsible information.

This is just as true in the field of foreign affairs as it is in the field of domestic affairs.

I am pleased, therefore, to bring to the attention of the Members of this body the following address by Chester Bowles, a former Member of this House:

FOREIGN AID: THE ESSENTIAL FACTORS FOR SUCCESS

(Address by the Honorable Chester Bowles, President's special representative and adviser on African, Asian, and Latin American affairs, at the National Conference on International Economic and Social Development at Washington, D.C., May 28, 1963)

This spring the foreign aid program is once again undergoing its annual drubbing on Capitol Hill and in certain elements of the Nation's press.

Yet the situation is paradoxical.

In spite of a nagging uncertainty about the nature of its objectives and policies, the program's public support—according to Gallup—is at an alltime high, with 58 percent of the American people in favor of it and 30 percent opposed. This is substantially greater than F.D.R.'s 1936 margin over Alf Landon in the greatest political landslide of our century.

Unless I am mistaken, however, this widespread statistical support reflects not so much knowledgeable public understanding of the program's objectives and accomplishments but rather a kind of public hunch that any national effort that has been supported by every President, every serious candidate for President, and every Secretary of State since the war must be better than its critics say it is.

This is a dangerously unstable base for such an essential instrument of U.S. foreign policy. Unless it can be greatly strengthened, the program will continue to be vulnerable to the axes of its political critics and to the often unpredictable swings of public opinion.

There is urgent need, therefore, for some thoughtful, down-to-earth stocktaking by those who recognize the critical importance of this effort; and this conference is an excellent place to start. As I leave for India where much the largest U.S. aid program is now operating, I should like to contribute my own analysis to this review of what may be missing.

Let me preface my remarks by saying that in my opinion the program now has the most experienced management since the days of Paul Hoffman. Dave Bell is an outstanding economist with deep respect for people as well as for the arithmetic of development. Equally important, he has had many years of experience in practical, down-to-earth administration in what we here in Washington refer to as "the field."

Under his leadership I believe we can expect to see the continuous, rapid improvement of administrative procedures, a lessening of flagrant errors of omission and commission, and greatly improved morale.

What, then, about the program itself? In my opinion, a large measure of our success or failure in the next few years will depend on public and congressional understanding of what the program can and cannot do, on the emphasis within the program itself, and on the extent to which we can relate our efforts abroad to our own traditions and to the essentials of our own society.

More specifically, there are six essential elements which will largely shape our capacity to do what we have set out do do:

1. We must clarify public and congressional thinking as to the basic objectives of the AID program.

Let us start by making it clear what the program won't do:

It won't enable us to control events in other countries.

It won't enable us to buy allies and votes in the U.N.

It won't insure us first place in a global popularity contest.

The reasons why our development effort won't do these three things, should be clear by now; but since it obviously isn't clear to many observers, let us briefly explore the point.

Most of the recipient nations are either recently emerged from colonial rule or striving, as in the case of Latin America, to establish their own proud, individualistic identity. Consequently, they are in no mood to jump through political hoops to please any other nation, however rich or right it may be.

We may therefore expect to see the emergent nations frequently going out of their way, noisily and sometimes irrelevantly, to assert and reassert their independence.

While this may be exasperating to many Americans, it should be recognized as a human reaction to a long and humilitating colonial experience—a reaction similar in many ways to that of our own young nationalistic country in the 19th century. When did the Founders and early Presidents of our Nation ever hesitate to tell the older nations of Europe where to get off?

Nor will our development program ever be fully understood by the Congress and public—nor will it be effective in its operations—if we continue to present it as a negative stopgap effort shrewdly designed to thwart the Communists.

This narrow view implies that if the Communist movement did not exist, there would be no valid reason for the United States to continue to help the less fortunate nations. For the developing countries this, in turn, ironically transforms a noisy Communist minority into an absolutely invaluable natural resource.

Indeed, the unearthing of a local Communist underground might be expected in such circumstances to produce more American dollars than the discovery of oil or uranium.

This poses the basic question: If our foreign aid program cannot be expected to buy friends or votes, and if its purpose is not simply to combat communism, what exactly is it good for? What will it do?

Although the answer to this question is well known to this audience, it is essential that it be understood in every community in America, as well as in every congressional committee.

Let me state it briefly: A wisely administered U.S. aid program can help create nations that are increasingly prepared to defend their independence against totalitarian enemies—external or internal, overt or covert—and increasingly willing to work with us as partners on common projects which may lead the world a little closer to peace.

Judged against this realistic yardstick, the program has rolled up an extraordinary record of achievement.

Consider Europe in 1945, dispirited, destitute, and totally vulnerable to organized Communist minorities. Today, thanks in large measure to a wisely conceived program of U.S. Marshall plan assistance, Europe is a roaring political and economic success with a total production second only to that of our own country.

Consider India in 1947, newly independent, fragmentized by deep-rooted internal differences, with a wobbly government, grossly inadequate food resources, a disrupted transport system, and the bare beginnings of industrial development.

In the last 16 years that same India, with a population greater than Africa and Latin America combined, has created a democratic constitution, run three democratic elections, placed three times as many children in school as before, nearly doubled her agricultural production and more than doubled her industrial production, tripled her electric power, vastly improved her transport system, and above all, has awakened its Indian people so that today they stand united in defense of their nation against the blatant aggression of their giant Chinese neighbor.

In India, as in Europe, American loans, grants and technical assistance played a major role. Yet here is the essential point: This aid was not given to force either Europe or India into a satellite relationship to the United States, or to purchase good will or votes in the United Nations. Naturally, no country—whether India, France, or any other country in Europe—is happy to feel it is in any way dependent on the United States. Rather the aid program's objective has been to help establish independent countries, able and willing to stand on their own feet and prepared to defend what they believe to be their interests—interests that by and large coincide with our own.

2. Now let us consider a second factor which grows inevitably from the first: The success or failure of an aid program in helping to create independent nations depends not only on the rate of economic growth, but at least equally much on what happens to people in the process of growth.

Many observers measure the success or failure of "development" by such purely economic criteria as increases in per capita income, in kilowatt-hours of electricity, in miles of railroad, numbers of irrigated acres, and so on. Yet such standards of judgment can lead to some harsh surprises.

Cuba, just before Castro took over, had the third highest per capita income in Latin America. Indeed, when we compare those Latin American countries with the highest per capita incomes—some of which are higher than several European countries—with those that are most politically stable, we find that there is almost no consistent relationship.

A feeling of national purpose and independence can only be created if the people are given a sense of involvement in their own development, a sense of belonging, and a growing sense of justice.

Without these social gains, a booming per capita income, if badly distributed, can actually widen the gulf between rich and poor and lead to a political explosion.

As a case in point, I recall two letters I received from friends of mine working in Iraq in the spring of 1958. The first was from a young American engineer in Baghdad, who reported with great excitement his contribution to the damming of the Tigris and the Euphrates. He listed the exciting industrial development that would soon grow from these power projects as an indication of Iraq's successful development.

That same week, by coincidence, I received a letter from a former associate of mine in India whose letter in effect was a reply to the engineer, although neither one knew the other.

"In the Iraqi village where I live," he wrote, "we often hear that things are going remarkably well in Baghdad, that the Tigris and the Eurphrates are being dammed, and that great industries will soon be coming into being. Undoubtedly, this is a grand accomplishment. But out here in the countryside where most of the people of Iraq make their living as farmers and herdsmen, everything remains much the same.

"Indeed," he continued, "the only evidence of chance here is in the fact that the landlords and the money lenders who formerly came riding out on horseback to collect their rent or interest now arrive in Buick cars."

Obviously something must have changed somewhere, but it hadn't affected many of the people of Iraq. I may add that this was shortly before the political explosion of 1958 when the Iraqi Government came apart at the seams.

In our presentations and our speeches, I believe that this second point deserves particular emphasis. Economic growth is critical to national development, but what happens to beople in the process is decisive.

3. Now let me turn to a third basic consideration: Orderly political growth in the developing nations is impossible unless it improves the living standards of the 80 percent of the people who live in the rural areas and simultaneously gives them a greater sense of personal involvement.

In November of 1917, when Lenin announced that the great feudal estates of czarist Russia would be divided among the peasants who tilled the land, he knew that the climax of his effort had been achieved. "Now," he said, "the revolution has become irrevocable."

In China, Mao Tse-tung's primary appeal was to the peasants. Aroused by Mao's false promises of land and freedom, it was they who provided the mass manpower of his Red army.

As long as the rural areas of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are oppressed with poverty, exploitation and injustice, they, too, will continue to be targets for Communist infiltration.

The need for greater emphasis on rural development, however, is economic as well as political. This is so because no developing nation can increase its industrial output rapidly if the four-fifths of its people who live in the rural areas lack the purchasing power to buy its factory-produced goods.

This means that our aid program should be increasingly related to the improvement of agriculture, the encouragement of land reform, the creation of rural extension services, and the building of rural schools, roads, and clinics.

As this sophisticated audience well knows, such things are easier to say than to do. Most of us Americans are now urban-oriented. Even our farmers, with their advanced soil technology and their thousands of dollars worth of investment in complex farm equipment, are now largely out of touch with the grassroots farming techniques that are most readily applicable to the rural development of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

In many countries I have seen our people make an earnest effort to develop effective rural programs, only to become bogged down in the face of the practical difficulties.

The heat becomes awfully tiresome, the local people appear more and more apathetic, and new ideas are hard to communicate. The most conscientious of AID administrators may thus find themselves wondering if country X is really ready for a rural program; is not the more immediate need for a cement factory? After all, every developing country needs more cement.

Yet the overriding, urgent challenge of rural development in Asia, Latin America, and Africa must be faced and mastered

The economic interdependence of urban and rural areas has always been basic to every country, including our own. Here in the United States one of the first signs of a national recession is usually decreasing sales of farm and household equipment in our great agricultural States—a decrease that is quickly reflected back into our industrial centers.

Moreover, in line with my previous point, it is essential that the rural majorities be given not only greater economic opportunity but also an increasingly personal stake in national development.

This takes us beyond the simple question of who owns the land. Although in many cases "land reform" may be no more than a political slogan, wisely planned and administered it can open the door to vast new opportunities for the human spirit and for economic, social, and political development.

Let us consider two cases in point: Country X, where the original land reform program ran into difficulties; and country Y, where from every standpoint it was a substantial success.

In country X millions of acres of land were distributed to the former tenant farmers. Although the enthusiasm of the peasants was great, agricultural production in many areas dropped sharply, and soon right-wing groups who opposed broader land distribution were pointing to the reform program as a failure.

That the program did not fulfill expectations was not a result of land distribution to those who till it, but rather an outgrowth of the fact that a coordinated rural development program to back up the land reform measures was missing.

What was needed was an extension service, adequate rural credit, rural marketing cooperatives, better transportation facilities, and a massive effort to educate the new landowners in the techniques of farming and community organization.

In country Y, in contrast, the land reform program was a comprehensive and, therefore, highly successful effort. As a result, the distribution of land to the farmers led to a sharp increase in production per acre, an increasing measure of political stability among the rural population, and also to a spectacular increase in the prosperity not only of the rural, but also of the urban areas where the added rural purchasing power created many additional jobs and large profits.

May I add that a successful, integrated rural development effort also calls for a high degree of local cooperation among the various government agencies involved—the Ministries of Health, Agriculture, Education, Welfare, Transportation, Labor, and all the rest.

When their lines of communication and administrative control each run straight down to the village, the result is often chaotic, with each ministry competing for the attention of the village leadership in behalf of its particular program.

In my own experience, the method which has been most successful in eliminating this confusion is a coordinated community development operation in which the Prime Minister or the President acts as the Chairman of a national rural development board which sets priorities as to resources and manpower.

The programs agreed to by this board are then assigned to a rural development administrator who sees to it that each ministry gets its full share of resources at the local level and supplies its services at the proper time and in the proper sequence.

Without an integrated administrative organization of this kind, the various ministries are rarely able to agree on anything. The result is waste of both resources and trained people.

Another critically important facet of rural development that has largely been ignored is the function of the provincial towns in relation to the surrounding countryside.

The development program for India, for example, which was originally proposed in 1952, called for groups of approximately 300 villages set around a central provincial town. Here it was planned to create a central market place with a high school, technical training school, agricultural training centers, and a sizable sprinkling of light industries.

Unfortunately, the initial cost of this program was far beyond the resources which were available. And because after 5 years of independence the 350 million Indian villagers could see little improvement in their lot, it was felt that highest priorities should be given to their welfare.

The result was a 10-year village community development program which now covers most of India's 550,000 villages. The next step, many Indian developers believe, is to tie in the provincial towns as centers of consumer industry, education and administration.

4. Let us now consider a fourth major factor which will help determine the success of our development effort: The need for clearly worded, realistic criteria for the distribution of economic aid which reflect the requirements of the first three factors.

The need for such criteria was recognized in the Act for International Development itself. Indeed, in this legislation Congress directed us to do previsely what experience has taught us must be done if our oversea assistance effort is to succeed. For instance, the act says:

"Assistance will be based upon sound plans and programs, be directed toward the social as well as economic aspects of economic development; be responsive to the efforts of the recipient countries to mobilize their own resources and help themselves; be cognizant of the external and internal pressures which hamper their growth and should emphasize long-range development assistance as the primary instrument of such growth."

In the spirit of this congressional mandate and direction, some searching questions are now being asked in regard to all requests for assistance from abroad.

These questions relate to the applicant's present per capita income and its distribution; the competence of the government, and its sensitivity to the needs of the population; the existence of a well-conceived, long-range national economic development plan; the adequate distribution and collection of the nation's tax burden; the priority given to the vast majority of citizens who live in the rural areas; the development of equitable land distribution and the creation of an integrated approach to community development; the existence of a favorable climate and adequate incentives for foreign and domestic private investment; and the maintenance of effective controls over the expenditure of foreign exchange for luxury imports.

Perhaps most important of all, we are asking ourselves whether a government which seeks our assistance is sufficiently rooted in public support to assure the broad backing of its people necessary for a bold program of economic and social development.

Although no nation on earth could respond affirmatively on all these counts, I believe that these are the objectives we must stress in developing priorities and standards for the distribution of our assistance.

Let us face the fact that in some instances, courageous adherence to these standards may lead us to refuse aid to friendly governments which have assumed that their unquestioning support of our political views in the United Nations would assure them, willy-nilly, a continuing flow of U.S. development dollars—even though their persistent failure to put their domestic houses in order means that we are in fact pouring U.S. funds down a rathole.

What is the better alternative? In my opinion, there is none. If the economic development effort in Asia, Africa and Latin America is to succeed, and if our aid program is to maintain the essential support of the American people and their Congess, we must insist as a general rule on the necessary domestic reforms as a precondition of continuing U.S. Government assistance.

There is nothing in what I have said, however, that requires us to be foolhardy. In our complicated and divided world, overriding strategic considerations in specific situations may occasionally cause us to throw away the book, to exercise our own ad hoc judgment, and temporarily to relax our pressures for reform.

The important point is that we keep the number of such exceptions to an absolute minimum consistent with our national interests, and that we do not allow temporary compromises to become permanent policy.

As for the inevitable charges of "Yankee interference in our domestic affairs," we should take them in our stride. Whatever we do in regard to giving or withholding economic aid constitutes interference of one kind or another.

For instance, when the United States Government provides capital and technicians to governments that are unwilling or unable to create the internal conditions necessary for their own economic development, it is in effect subsidizing the forces of the past.

This in itself is interference—but in this case interference on the wrong side of what history will surely judge to be a central issue of our times.

5. This brings us to a fifth consideration: the need for improvement in the planning and integration of each foreign aid program in which we are involved, not only in regard to the resources provided by our own Government, but in connection with the complex variety of international agencies and donor nations that also operate in this field.

The United States Government provides unilateral aid through the Export-Import Bank, which helps the underdeveloped nations finance the purchase of industrial goods in the United States; the Development Loan Fund, which provides long-term loans on easy terms payable in both dollars and soft currencies; U.S. technical assistance, which offers a wide range of specialists in planning and technology; the Peace Corps, which provides several thousand volunteers trained in teaching, nursing, rural development and the like; and food for peace, which distributes U.S. surplus farm products, including wheat, rice, powdered milk, and cotton.

These U.S. sources of development assistance should be more carefully integrated with the loans and technical assistance available from the international agencies. These include the World Bank, which provides loans payable in hard currencies; the International Development Association, which provides soft loans; the International Monetary Fund, which helps stabilize currencies; and the so-called specialized agencies of the U.N.—the World Health Organization, Food and Agricultural Organization, and UNESCO.

Finally, West Germany, France, Britain, Canada, Australia, Japan, Switzerland and Israel also provide unilateral economic assistance on a generally similar basis.

The staggering number of sources to which the developing nations can turn for assistance inevitably creates confusion and some overlapping of effort. This suggests the need for careful planning to make sure that the right kind of aid is made available, and that its use is effectively coordinated with the resources of the developing country itself.

Here the World Bank and the Special Fund of the United Nations can play an effective role.

6. The sixth and final factor upon which the success of the program depends is the greater involvement of the American people in the program, together with a bolder and more substantial effort to explain its objectives to an often critical public and to an increasingly antagonistic Congress.

First of all, it is essential that we speak frankly and clearly to the American people. At present very few of them have a clear idea of what the aid program can do, what it cannot do, and why it is an absolutely essential instrument in creating a more rational and peaceful world.

In the last 10 years, I have discussed this program in detail before audiences in 42 of our 50 States. As a result, I am convinced that once the people are given the basic facts, once they understand the principles which Congress has laid down and the ways in which the President and AID are carrying out Congress's wishes, they will give this effort the support that it deserves and must have if U.S. policy is to be effective in today's world.

Yet we face a serious roadblock: in this effort to explain the program on a mass basis the public information unit of the foreign aid agency has been refused the funds necessary for its task. As a result, it has been able to provide no more than a bare minimum of the information to which all of us citizens and taxpayers are entitled.

More than that, our congressional and public presentations throughout the 1950's were in large measure negative and in disregard of the factors which I have described. Too often false and expedient reasons were advanced by the administration in power in a desperate effort to gain the necessary votes—only to find themselves forced at a later date to defend the program when it failed to achieve what the public and Congress had been led to expect of it.

In this regard, our task will be made easier by a greatly expanded "people-to-people" effort by nongovernmental agencies to assure much greater involvement of individuals and organizations both in the recipent countries and in the U.S.

For instance, Rotary International, the League of Women Voters, Lions, Parent-Teachers Associations, Labor Unions, Chambers of Commerce, and similar organizations have even greater contributions to make in the process of overseas nation-building than they are now making. There are 1150 Rotary Clubs in Latin America alone.

United States business and labor groups have a particularly important role to play in helping to shape development plans on terms acceptable to the developing countries and profitable to the individual corporations.

In addition, the spectacularly successful Peace Corps can be an increasing factor in creating the necessary basis of understanding not only in the recipient countries, but in the United States itself as a steady stream of volunteers return.

The task of our foreign aid program is to help release the energies of the people of the developing nations so that they can work effectively towards economic progress, increased justice, and a sense of individual fulfillment and participation.

Its purpose, in other words, is to help them create prosperous societies which they are willing and able to defend. Only in such a world can we ourselves be safe, happy, and secure.

The constructive leadership of America is therefore challenged to understand the nature of the revolutionary forces that are reshaping our world and to put ourselves in touch with the aspirations of the vast majority of mankind who see this planet as something more than an arena for the Soviet-American conflict or the maintenance of an American way of life which is remote from ther own.

If civilizaton is to mean anythng, it must be bolstered as well as protected by democratc people with dynamic ideas and the skill and boldness to put those ideas into effect. The future of all mankind may depend on our willingness to accept this challenge which our hungry, chaotic but infilnitely promising world presents to us.

Mass Deportations From the Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the Baltic States Freedom Committee in commemorating the 22d anniversary of criminal deportations from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, which were conducted by the Soviet Union. The martyrdom of thousands of citizens of the Baltic States in 1941 remains on the consciences of all who believe in the ideals of freedom and independence. The anniversary of this event should be noted by every American who believes in the ultimate victory of the free world.

The Soviet Union has imposed the harsh rule of an alien dictatorship on the Baltic peoples since June 1940, when Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia were forcibly and cruelly incorporated into the Soviet Union. The peoples of the Baltic States have resisted the efforts of the Soviet Union to impose a foreign way of life and prevent the continued practice of traditional Baltic customs. Those who resisted these efforts were subjected to exile, deportation, imprisonment and even execution. When they found difficulty in imposing dictatorial rule on these ancient peoples, the Soviets made plans to transplant all the people of the Baltic States to Russia.

The fact that these plans were not carried out is surely due in part to the resistance of the Baltic peoples. The Russian answer to Baltic opposition was deportation. The outrages which I would like to commemorate today reached their peaks on June 14, 15, 16, and 17, 1941. During these few days thousands of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians were expelled from their homelands under the most primitive conditions.

As we join in commemorating the mass deportations from the Baltic States in June 1941, we reaffirm our dedication to the cause of freedom for the Baltic peoples.

San Francisco's Irving M. Kriegsfeld Sets Precedent for National Service Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, in many minds, a National Service Corps is associated exclusively with the young people who will be attracted to it. But a factor of the National Service program which deserves broader recognition is the role senior citizens will play.

Irving M. Kriegsfeld, executive director of the Mission Neighborhood Center in San Francisco has done much to show the vital role our senior citizens may well play in the National Service Corps. His experience in San Francisco makes it clear that senior citizens will respond to the call for National Service Corps volunteers in large numbers.

The President's Study Group on a National Service program polled over 4,000 senior citizens in order to gage their reactions to such a program. Eighty-two percent expressed approval of the proposal while 57 percent said they would join or consider joining. Such an enthusiastic response emphasizes the strong desire to serve of the senior citizens—a large and valuable segment of our population.

In his special message on aiding senior citizens, President Kennedy stated:

> Voluntary service by older persons can both demonstrate their continued skill and provide useful activity for those retired from gainful employment but anxious to make use of their talents. Enactment of the National Service Corps * * * is urged again as a constructive opportunity for senior citizens to serve their local communities. This program would provide an ideal outlet for those whose energy, idealism, and ability did not suddenly end in retirement.

I concur heartily in the President's views and believe that the contributions of senior citizens can be valuable and should be utilized.

It is significant to note that 15 organizations representing senior citizens have officially endorsed this project—national organizations as well as local and State groups, including 2 from the State of California; the Allied Senior Citizens Clubs, Inc., of California and the State of California Citizens Advisory Committee on the Aging.

I wish to insert in the RECORD an article from "Harvest Years" by William P. Dumont describing volunteer activities of senior citizens in two programs—one, the Mission Neighborhood Center of San Francisco; the other, New York's Henry Street Settlement House.

This heartening description of the many worthwhile activities of these senior citizens and their feeling that a national service corps could increase this sort of action should be of great interest to our colleagues.

The article follows:

MEET THE MISSIONAIRES

(By William P. Dumont)

East, West, and in between, our cities are discovering us. We retirees—with skills experience, mature judgment, pride, and time on our hands—are beginning to receive our share of the national spotlight. The big job is to smoke us out of retirement and into the light of community service.

Both sides benefit. The city gets important work done at little or no cost; the individual gains personal, tangible satisfaction from dedicated usefulness. But how can we get started? How can we find our niche? Just follow me to the Mission Neighborhood Center in San Francisco, similar in function to many such centers across the country.

Picture the mission district in the heart of the city—a 12-square-mile area packed with some 200,000 people—and more pouring in daily. It embraces a polyglot population, with natural problems of communication and assimilation due to language difficulties.

Irving M. Kriegsfeld, executive director of Mission Neighborhood Center, summarizes the problems in such cores of any city. "Scratch the surface in any city where this situation exists, and you'll find a pervasive loneliness. People don't know their neighbors, even in the same building. They have no sense of belonging. They keep hearing others talk about home—which is always someplace else. They feel uncertain about their future—unwelcome, unwanted. The great need is to get them out in the open—mingling, participating, communicating, learning the difference between neighborliness and just living in a neighborhood.

"To integrate these people, we need help. We receive financial help from the United Crusade funds, the San Francisco Foundation, and from other organizations. Newspapers, broadcasters, city officials, churches, schools, and the San Francisco Advertising Club publicize our need for volunteers—especially for senior citizens with their varied skills and experience. And we depend most on the desire of the retiree to be of service to himself and to others.

"We call our volunteers missionaires. Some help out at night; others in the daytime. Some contribute a lot of time; others less. The total is thousands of helpful man-and-woman hours.

"The center is something like a giant four-ring circus. There are hundreds of different kinds of jobs—jobs that call for all kinds of skills, talents, and interests.

"Some missionaries teach languages or serve as interpreters. Others sew or take charge of children while mothers learn English. We need the help of photographers, writers, drama and music teachers, nursery-school storytellers, young-adult group leaders, and, of course, a maintenance, clerical and receptionist staff.

"Community improvement is a living program. It takes everybody to help it succeed."

MISSIONARIES AT WORK

When I visited the Center one day, I spotted retired painter Frank Delaroche atop a ladder. He flashed a mischievous smile when I coaxed him down the ladder for a coffee break. He has become a one-man task force, brightening the weathered face and worn interiors of the old, shingled mission center buildings.

His eyes twinkled as he said, "After 45 years of painting, I decided to rest, but I found I was rusting, rather than resting. So, I picked up my brushes again and offered my services. Now I feel useful again. I see people. I get out of the house in this wonderful mission sun. I'm happier because I'm helping my city.

I met Alfred Baruch, former Navy supply inspector, who was always on the go. Naturally restless, he volunteered his help, asking only, "Keep me busy on the outside." As staff aid to the director, he roams the city on missions, earning the accolade of "an extraordinary ambassador-at-large."

And let me introduce you to the Kellogg Jones family. Mr. Jones, a retired market analyst for a large oil corporation, contributes accounting and auditing services which translate into considerable dollar value to the center. Mrs. Jones, who serves as a board member, adds that his work for the center is "an outgoing interest we can share at home."

Retired Schoolteacher Inez Dixson, former Minnesotan, and librarian J. Mae Bert, from Ohio, offer their time, talents, and experience to their adopted retirement city and thus stay in the mainstream of active life.

But not all the missionaries follow their former or present vocation. Director Kriegsfeld says, "We ask people what they like to do * * * what their hobbies are * * * what most interests them. Then we try to match our needs with these interests—sort of a reverse twist on usual employment procedure. A department store executive preferred library work—and later gave us valuable counsel as a board member. A real estate man teaches English to Spanish-speaking newcomers . A tax expert teaches Spanish to English-speaking adults. The hobby-interest approach affords change of pace from workaday routines and offers the volunteer relaxation so he keeps interested longer.

"If a person isn't sure what he wants to do, we give him 'exploratory placement' in a particular job. In this way he can test his interest in a field before settling in this work."

A missionaire chooses his hours of work and where he wants to work (at home, at the center, in the neighborhood). But once he decides upon a work plan, he must stick with it. "We look upon a missionaire as an unpaid staff members," explains Kriegsfeld. "We cover him with workman's compensation insurance and furnish him with all the tools he needs to do the job. All this lends status to the work."

Another status symbol is an honorary check paid to members who have worked a year or more. This check represents payment for work performed; it is credit-card size so a missionaire can carry it with him to show to friends.

Director Kriegsfeld adds that the center also helps some people get back into the mainstream of life following illness or assists them in finding payroll supplement to their pensions. He explains:

"Recently a retired railroader offered to help us if we would help him find a paying part-time job. We put him to work on the outside where he could make contacts. Eventually he found employment as a hotel night clerk. The mission lost a missionaire—but helped a man.

"Because of illness, a former secretary had been out of work so long she needed a reconditioning period to restore mechanical skill and to determine whether her nerves would stand work-a-day pressures. Soon she was back on a payroll. The Mission gave her therapy plus a recommendation to her employer that she was ready to return to work."

A lot of straws? Yes. But bundle them all together and you get a lot of strength.

VOLUNTEERS IN THE EAST

Clear across the country, in a similarly congested neighborhood, is the Henry Street Settlement House in New York. Executive Director Helen Hall, a much-honored social worker, points out that Henry House is located next to a community workshop and home-planning center for younger folks. She explains:

"We believe strongly in mingling the young and the old. Our young folks are impressed with the vitality and skills of their elders—are amused by the gaiety in the senior lounge—and they no longer think of 'old folks' as washed up. The elders get a lift from the enthusiasm of youth."

One hard-working group made up of 215 women and 126 men, ranging in age from 60 to 89, is called the Good Companions and Friendly Visitors. Here are some of their accomplishments:

Eight of the women average 15 hours a week packaging and labeling pills and potions for Gouverneur Clinic. Some of the men patiently impart lifetime-acquired trade tricks to eager youth. Others visit the sick, blind, and crippled, shop for them, run errands. Some interpret for neighbors not yet able to cope with conversational English. Skilled garment workers make layettes, baby blankets, flannel shrugs, soft slippers for those hospitalized * * * many visit the lonely, perhaps the most appreciated and rewarding service of all.

Mission Neighborhood Center Director Kriegsfeld sums up potentials for work, East or West. "This is a job bigger than anybody—a challenge to everybody. We're out to get everyone into the act—but in an orderly, organized way. Our focus is four-sided: youth, adult, family, and neighborhood development. You can see how much we need the maturity and skills of older citizens. Their participation and interest, even for a few hours a week, will help weld any city's 'melting pot' population into a solid community."

WHAT YOU CAN DO

There are over 800 Neighborhood Centers and Settlement Homes all over the United States. You can find the one nearest to you by looking in your telephone book, or by checking with the Community Chest or similar group. You can also write to the National Federation of Settlement Homes and Neighborhood Centers, 226 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.

Also, Congress is becoming increasingly interested in formalizing a National Service Corps that will enlist the skills, maturity, judgment, leadersihp, and personal and public pride of all senior citizens. Foremost in piloting such a corps are the State of Michigan Commission on Aging and the National Council of Jewish Women (see "Poking Around," Harvest Years, February 1963). The latter has published a booklet to guide community groups who want to get a National Service Corps established. For further information, write to the National Council of Jewish Women, 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.

If there isn't a service corps in your community, why not start prodding the mayor, councilmen, assemblymen, United Crusade or Community Chest leaders, churchmen, social welfare executives, and all others who are active in the community to start such an organization. A service corps can—

Help the community absorb and utilize everyone in its boundaries.

Create new jobs for both young and old.

Give volunteers the opportunity to be uesful—and consequently to be happy through constructive activity.

Alleviate traditional city loneliness.

Offer opportunity for everyone to contribute of himself and of his skills.

I'm already signed up. How about you?

Americans Repel Arab Boycott Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the May 1963 edition of the Anti-Defamation League Bulletin contains an exchange of correspondence between the League of Arab States' Commissioner General of the Central Office for the Boycott of Israel and Scherr-Tumico, Inc., of St. James, Minn. The American firm, which refused to be intimidated by the attempt of the Arab countries to boycott Israel, responded in words which should prove to be most heart warming to the millions of Americans who share the same convictions but will probably never have a similar occasion to so state. In addition, and perhaps most important, let us hope this letter will also serve as an inspiration and example to other American businesses in refusing to support discrimination—whether at home or abroad.

The letters follow:

EXCHANGE OF CORRESPONDENCE—A BOYCOTT EFFORT BY THE ARAB LEAGUE IS REPELLED BY AN UNINTIMIDATED AMERICAN FIRM

LEAGUE OF ARAB STATES, SECRETARIAT GENERAL, CENTRAL OFFICE FOR THE BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL,
Damascus, Syria, May 10, 1962.

SCHERR-TUMICO, INC.,
St. James, Minn., U.S.A.

GENTLEMEN: We wish to inform you that we have acquired reliable information to the effect that your company has subscribed in the establishment and the ownership of a plant in Israel for the production of mechanical, optical, and electronic precision measuring devices.

In this regard, we draw your attention to the fact that the Arab countries are still in a state of war with Israel. Therefore, as a measure of self-defense and with the view to safeguarding the rights and the vital interests of the Arabs of Palestine, the Arab countries stricly adhere to a set of boycott regulations directed at Israel. In brief, these regulations prohibit any Arab from having any dealings whatsoever with any Israeli person or business, or with foreign persons or firms maintaining such dealings with Israel. Violation of these regulations entail the blacklisting of violators in all Arab countries with the result that all commercial transactions with such violators are banned.

However, before any action is taken against your firm, we deem it necessary that we contact you directly in order to ascertain the nature of the dealings of your firm with Israel. This will have to be done in the form of a declaration duly signed before the competent governmental authorities and should also bear a final authentication to the signature of the authorized representative of your firm apended thereto by the closest consulate or diplomatic mission of any Arab country. The required declaration will have to contain complete answers to the following questions:

Detailed questions asked whether Scherr-Tumico had now, or had in the past, branch factories, assembly lines, general agencies, or head offices, in Israel; whether it had ever granted Israelis patent rights; whether it now, or ever, owned shares in, assisted, or represented any Israeli firm.

If, in the light of the answers to the said questions, it turns out that you have any dealings with Israel in the aforementioned forms, then under the Israel Boycott Regulations, now in force in all Arab countries, the name of your firm will be blacklisted in all these countries. Consequently you will be denied access to the extensive Arab markets and all transactions with your business will be banned.

We earnestly hope that you will choose to keep your commercial relations with the Arab countries in good standing, rather than to impair your free access to the Arab markets. If you decide to adopt this course, then you will have to repudiate any standing agreement between your firm and any Israeli firm or business within the aforementioned forms. You will also have to furnish us with documentary evidence to this effect.

In this connection, we draw your attention to the noteworthy fact that under the effective Israel Boycott Regulations, failure to submit the required documents within a period not to exceed August 20, 1962 will automatically lead to taking action against your firm, as provided for by the said regulations.

Finally, we do hope that you will extend sympathetic understanding of the compelling considerations which render these measures mandatory. It is also our sincere hope that you will find it appropriate to maintain your commercial relations with the Arab countries.

Very truly yours,
Dr. Abdul Karim El-A'Idi,
Commissioner General, Central Office for the Boycott of Israel.

May 22, 1962.

League of Arab States,
Secretariat General,
Damascus, Syria
(Attention of Dr. Abdul Karim el-A'idi, Commissioner General, Central Office for the Boycott of Israel).

Gentlemen: The information you have, to the effect that we are establishing a subsidiary manufacturing plant in Israel, is correct. The plant is now under construction there and we will produce measuring devices and do metal finishing when it is completed.

We were invited by the Government of Israel to come there for that purpose. After a thorough investigation by us of the market potentials, the capabilities of the people, and the generally favorable business climate there, we decided to avail ourselves of their many advantages.

We have found them to be a friendly, industrious, forthright, and intelligent people, interested only in making a modern, productive, and suitable homeland for a people, who until 1948, had been homeless. They have, through almost superhuman effort, made a desert "bloom." It is our opinion that they wish to live at peace with and trade with their Arab neighbors as well as the rest of the world. People of Jewish extraction have been and are now contributing more than their proportionate share to the artistic, scientific, industrial, and social achievements which the world now enjoys.

Scherr-Tumico, Inc., is a non-Jewish corporation, the majority owners and principals of which are of British extraction and are third-generation Americans. We have therefore not entered into the agreement with the Government of Israel for reasons of sentiment. Had the Arab states extended us the same invitation and the same ensuing cooperation, we would have given such an overture equal attention and consideration.

We are not impressed by your threats of intimidation and coercion through boycott and blacklist. If the Arab States had progressed industrially and scientifically to the point where your markets were lucrative for our products, we would still not be impressed.

The effort you are expending in fomenting hate and strife with your neighbors can better be used to bring something of substance for your people, that they may have the advantage of a better standard of living. Cease your war with the Israelis and you will find this corporation and most all of America ready and anxious to extend to you a welcome and helping hand.

Cordially yours,
Scherr-Tumico, Inc.,
Howard M. James,
President.

Baltic Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, June 14 marks the 22d anniversary of the mass deportations by the Communists from three Baltic States: Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

For 20 years these nations and their leadership knew the fruits of a hard-earned independence that came after the First World War. During this period each of these countries exhibited to the world at large the abilities of their leaders and peoples to assume with dignity and correctness the obligations of independent national status. These three Baltic States, giving to their peoples a democratic rule in cooperation with the Western World, knew economic, political, and social stability remarkable for the time and surrounding conditions.

Most unfortunately for the hopes of these nations, they had a powerful neighbor with urgent designs on the territory of each; not only could imperialist Soviet Russia not allow a nation knowing political freedom to contaminate her borders, but Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia controlled a major portion of the Baltic Sea, a vital trade and shipping route the Russians felt they must have.

How to gain control of these countries, each of which had a treaty of friendship and a guarantee of sovereignty with Russia, was an easy problem for the masters of the Kremlin. Quickly overpowering each weakened government, the Russians established Soviets in each country, and began a campaign of mass deportations of all antisocial elements that was halted only by the subsequent German invasion of Russia in 1941, with eventual conquest of the three Baltic States.

First the Russian conquest, then the Nazi conquest—still the spirit of freedom was not killed among these brave peoples. With the confusion following the breakup of the Nazi war machine in 1945, resistance leaders in the Baltic area sought to reestablish their national independence. They were in for a sorry disappointment. As victory against Germany was assured, the Russians quickly moved against Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, snuffing out any move toward independence, and reestablishing their strict prewar control.

Again the deportations began. All enemies of the State—that meant all who aspired after some sort of freedom from outside political control—were packed off to Siberia, and almost certain death. Thus during a 5-year period, through two mass deportation moves, untold thousands of free people were driven from their homelands. National independence was no more, it died through Russian power, that began with brute force 22 years ago this month, and is still going on today.

I would like to discuss in this connection a measure I have introduced in the House, House Concurrent Resolution 43, which calls on Congress to request the President to bring up the Baltic States question in the United Nations and ask the U.N. to request the Soviets to withdraw from Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia and return Baltic exiles, and that the U.N. conduct free elections in Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia under its supervision. In my view it is important not only to the Baltic people but to the free world to work diligently to bring about freedom for the Baltic people and I would urge that this resolution be approved by the Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the Record a memorandum prepared by an organization known as "Americans for Congressional Action To Free the Baltic States" discussing the struggle for freedom by Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and commenting on the resolutions introduced in the House and Senate designed to help bring this about.

The memorandum follows:

Washington, D.C.,
June 12, 1963.

LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA HAVE A RIGHT TO BE FREE AND INDEPENDENT

The period following World War II was notable for the emergence of certain newly independent nations. It also saw other free nations drawn behind the Iron Curtain by the cruelest colonialism of this modern day.

Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians have inhabited the lands along the shores of the Baltic Sea for many centuries. They had rejoiced in their freedom and independence.

In June of 1940 Soviet armed forces invaded and occupied Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The Moscow-appointed emissaries set up puppet governments; the parliaments were dissolved; heads and higher officers of governmental agencies were dismissed and replaced by Soviet agents; civil liberties were suspended. The Soviet puppet governments took over all newspapers, printing establishments, and broadcasting systems.

The desire for freedom has not been crushed

These are outright annexations of territories of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia whose people are as enamored of freedom and as fully entitled to their rights as are the people of Africa, Asia, and the Americas. Even more shocking was the series of deportations undertaken by the Soviets following their ruthless subjugation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. In June of 1941, more than 200,000 persons were deported from the Baltic States, and the total now approaches 1,500,000.

The people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are today a silenced people, unable to speak their mind, practice their religion. Despite their long enslavement, we know that their desire for freedom has not been crushed. They may be waiting silently and grimly, but also hopefully for the future.

We must help the Baltic people to get rid of the Communist regimes in their countries

The Government of the United States of America has refused to recognize the seizure and forced "incorporation" of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Communists into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Our Government maintains diplomatic relations with the former free Governments of the Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Since June of 1940, when the Communists took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, all the Presidents of the United States (Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and John F. Kennedy) have stated, restated and confirmed our country's nonrecognition policy of the occupation of the Baltic States by the Kremlin dictators. However, our country has done very little, if anything, to help the suffering Baltic peoples to get rid of the Communist regimes in their countries.

The case of the Baltic States is not a question about the rights of self-rule of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, since this is established beyond any reasonable doubt, but the question is how to stop the Soviet crime and restore the freedom and independence of these countries. The Select Committee of the House of Representatives To Investigate the Incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R., created by the 83d Congress, after having held 50 public hearings during which the testimony of 335 persons was taken, made a number of recommendations to our Government pertaining to the whole question of liberation of the Baltic States. According to the findings of this House committee, "no nation, including the Russian Federated Soviet Republic, has ever voluntarily adopted communism." All of them were enslaved by the use of infiltration, subversion, and force. American foreign policy toward the Communist enslaved nations, the committee stated, must be guided by "the moral and political principles of the American Declaration of Independence." The present generation of Americans, the committee suggested, should recognize that the bonds which many Americans have with enslaved lands of their ancestry are a great asset to the struggle against communism and that, furthermore, the Communist danger should be abolished during the present geration. The only hope of avoiding a new world war, according to the committee, is a "bold, positive political offensive by the United States and the entire free world." The committee included a declaration by the Congress which stated that the eventual liberation and self-determination of nations are "firm and unchanging parts of our policy."

Thirty-two Senate and House concurrent resolutions pending before Senate and House committees

Thirty-five Members of the U.S. Congress have taken concrete steps in seizing the offensive from the Soviet Union and the Communist world. These Senators and Congressmen have introduced 32 concurrent resolutions in the Senate and the House since January 9, 1963, when the 88th Congress convened for its 1st session, that call for freedom for the captive peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Following are the resolutions and their authors:

In the U.S. Senate

1. Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, introduced by Senator **Jack Miller**, Republican, of Iowa, and Senator **Bourke B. Hickenlooper**, Republican, of Iowa.
2. Senate Concurrent Resolution 15, introduced by Senator **Thomas H. Kuchel**, Republican, of California, Senator **Thomas J. McIntyre**, Democrat, of New Hampshire, and Senator **Hugh Scott**, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
3. Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, introduced by Senator **Harrison A. Williams, Jr.**, Democrat, of New Jersey.
4. Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, introduced by Senator **Kenneth B. Keating**, Republican, of New York.
5. Senate Concurrent Resolution 20, introduced by Senator **Roman L. Hruska**, Republican, of Nebraska.
6. Senate Concurrent Resolution 33, introduced by Senator **Frank J. Lausche**, Democrat, of Ohio.

In the House of Representatives

1. House Concurrent Resolution 15, introduced by Representative **Charles B. Hoeven**, Republican, of Iowa.
2. House Concurrent Resolution 38, introduced by Representative **Edward J. Derwinski**, Republican, of Illinois.
3. House Concurrent Resolution 43, introduced by Representative **Glenard P. Lipscomb**, Republican, of California.
4. House Concurrent Resolution 54, introduced by Representative **James Roosevelt**, Democrat, of California.
5. House Concurrent Resolution 55, introduced by Representative **Abner W. Sibal**, Republican, of Connecticut.
6. House Concurrent Resolution 59, introduced by Representative **Glenn Cunningham**, Republican, of Nebraska.
7. House Concurrent Resolution 62, introduced by Representative **William T. Murphy**, Democrat, of Illinois.
8. House Concurrent Resolution 63, introduced by Representative **John J. Rooney**, Democrat, of New York.
9. House Concurrent Resolution 66, introduced by Representative **John J. Rhodes**, Republican, of Arizona.
10. House Concurrent Resolution 80, introduced by Representative **Alphonzo E. Bell, Jr.**, Republican, of California.
11. House Concurrent Resolution 96, introduced by Representative **Peter W. Rodino, Jr.**, Democrat, of New Jersey.
12. House Concurrent Resolution 97, introduced by Representative **William L. St. Onge**, Democrat, of Connecticut.
13. House Concurrent Resolution 103, introduced by Representative **Robert Taft, Jr.**, Republican, of Ohio.
14. House Concurrent Resolution 106, introduced by Representative **Carleton J. King**, Republican, of New York.
15. House Concurrent Resolution 126, introduced by Representative **Edward A. Garmatz**, Democrat, of Maryland.
16. House Concurrent Resolution 127, introduced by Representative **F. Bradford Morse**, Republican, of Massachusetts.
17. House Concurrent Resolution 128, introduced by Representative **James A. Burke**, Democrat, of Massachusetts.
18. House Concurrent Resolution 130, introduced by Representative **Clarence D. Long**, Democrat, of Maryland.
19. House Concurrent Resolution 132, introduced by Representative **Stanley R. Tupper**, Republican, of Maine.
20. House Concurrent Resolution 133, introduced by Representative **Harold R. Collier**, Republican, of Illinois.
21. House Concurrent Resolution 135, introduced by Representative **Thaddeus J. Dulski**, Democrat, of New York.
22. House Concurrent Resolution 138, introduced by Representative **Richard E. Lankford**, Democrat, of Maryland.
23. House Concurrent Resolution 139, introduced by Representative **Silvio O. Conte**, Republican, of Massachusetts.
24. House Concurrent Resolution 140, introduced by Representative **Clifford G. McIntire**, Republican, of Maine.
25. House Concurrent Resolution 151, introduced by Representative **Augustus F. Hawkins**, Democrat, of California.
26. House Concurrent Resolution 153, introduced by Representative **Martha W. Griffiths**, Democrat, of Michigan.

The aforesaid resolutions request the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States' question before the United Nations and to ask that the United Nations should request the Soviets:

1. To withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists and controls from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia;
2. To return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons and slave labor camps; and
3. To conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia under the United Nations direct supervision.

All these resolutions have been referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs respectively.

Our Government must act now without a further delay

At a time when the Western nations have granted freedom and independence to many nations in Africa, Asia and other parts of the world, we must insist that the Communist colonial empire likewise extend freedom and independence to peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia whose lands have been unjustly occupied and whose rightful place among the nations of the world is being denied. Today and not tomorrow is the time to brand the Kremlin dictators as the largest colonial empire in the world. By timidity, we invite further Communist aggression.

A. This organization, the Americans for Congressional Action to Free the Baltic States, embracing thousands of freedom-loving Americans throughout our Nation, states:

(1) The liberation of the Baltic nations is no political gambit. It is a proposition that all Americans should embrace if they are to be true to the ideals upon which this Nation was founded.

(2) The Baltic question must not become an object of international compromise. The plight of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia must be brought to the attention of the world. The United Nations must act to restore the rights of the Baltic peoples, and it is an obligation of the United States to initiate such action.

B. This organization respectfully urges the Congress of the United States:

(1) To request the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to act favorably and

without any further delay on the aforesaid resolutions;

(2) To act on these resolutions, when reported out of the committees, promptly and overwhelmingly.

The sufferings and subjugation of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and other captive nations must, if we are to survive in liberty, spur free peoples to the preservation of man's inalienable rights. By maintaining the rights of others to be free, we confirm our own unyielding will to survive in freedom and in peace.

LEONARD VALIUKAS,
President, Americans for Congressional Action To Free the Baltic States.

Jesse Wolcott To Dedicate New FDIC Washington Headquarters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation which was founded by Congress for the protection of our bank depositors, will dedicate its new Washington headquarters building with an open house Sunday, June 16. I am sure that all Members of Congress have been invited to attend.

The occasion also will mark the 30th anniversary of the creation of FDIC, and it will be a notable event for a former Member of this body, the Honorable Jesse Paine Wolcott, who so ably represented the 7th District of Michigan in the House of Representatives, for 26 consecutive years, and is now one of FDIC's three directors.

The Washington correspondent for the Flint Journal and other Booth newspapers in Michigan, Mr. William F. Pyper, has written a splendid story reviewing our former colleague's present and past connection with Federal deposit insurance. I ask that this news story be included in the RECORD.

MICHIGAN'S WOLCOTT HAS FDIC DEDICATION ROLE

(By William F. Pyper)

WASHINGTON.—Although he has 6 months more before retirement, dedication of a new headquarters building for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation next Sunday, will climax a long Washington career for Michigan's Jesse P. Wolcott.

He will participate in the ceremony as one of three directors of FDIC, a position he has held since 1957, including 4 years as Board Chairman. The dedication also will mark the 30th anniversary of FDIC, and Wolcott, then a member of Congress, also had something to do with the founding in 1933.

Back in 1930, the people of the Seventh Michigan District elected Wolcott, then prosecuting attorney in St. Clair County, to Congress. In his first term he was a Republican in a Republican Congress. It was the great depression, when banks were failing like mad, and his support, even as a freshman, of a Federal deposit insurance law was popular.

His District reelected him in 1932, when Republicans were falling everywhere, including Michigan. In fact, his district elected him 26 straight years. But he recalls that, in the Congress which convened in 1933, it was a bit difficult to find any Republican. That may have been one reason why he was assigned to the Committee on Banking and Currency and was able to lead the minority in the enactment of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act which today is regarded as a necessary fixture of the Nation's banking system.

Of course, in 1933 he saw the February 14 bank closing in Michigan and the later national bank holiday. It sems strange now that two Michigan Republicans, Representative Wolcott and the late Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg of Grand Rapids, are given most of the credit for founding FDIC. But the Democratic sponsors of the act in that Democratic year are largely lost in history.

In 1931 there were 2,293 bank failures. In 1932, there were 1,453 more failures. In 1933, all banks closed down, at least temporarily. Wolcott had other committee assignments in those days, but he always remained a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Banking and currency is a complicated and somewhat uninteresting field, but the Nation's concern about its banking system was emphasized in the early 1930's. Even though he was a junior Member of the minority, Wolcott stood out to such an extent that Democrats couldn't line up their votes until they consulted him.

By the end of World War II, Democratic leaders were frank to say they couldn't bring up a monetary bill until Wolcott was ready. And he produced Democratic-Republican majorities in the House reliably when he was satisfied with a banking bill, a housing measure, or even a foreign-aid bill.

In two Republican Congresses—1947–48 and 1953–54—he was chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee. More than that, however, in the Democratic Congresses, he was the key figure until he retired from the House in 1956. A young Republican was elected to succeed him, and since 1959 a young Democrat has represented the Seventh District.

In the meantime, Wolcott had seen his FDIC grow to a powerful element in U.S. banking structure. After his retirement from Congress he was in business in Washington until 1957, when President Dwight D. Eisenhower appointed him Chairman of the Board of the Corporation.

He served in that capacity until the day after the 1960 election, when he issued a statement withdrawing as Chairman in favor of Erle Cocke, Sr., of Georgia, a Democrat, also appointed by Eisenhower. Cocke's term runs out in August, and President Kennedy will have to name another member and Chairman. Wolcott will go on through this year.

FDIC operates without appropriations of tax money. It started in 1933 with Federal funds which it has repaid with interest. Its income is from premiums paid by insured banks—last year one-thirty-second of the amount of deposits.

The law permits charging each bank up to one-twelfth of deposits, and requires that all expenses plus an investment in Government bonds paying 2 percent interest be taken out. Then the remainder is refunded to the insured banks. The Corporation now has for protection of depositors a reserve of $2,502 million plus a $3 billion standby fund in the U.S. Treasury.

At no cost, depositors are now insured up to $10,000, and it is possible to double, triple, or quadruple such protection by dividing deposits into separate accounts. And hardly any insured banks fail any more. There were no failures during 1962. There has been one small one this year, due to embezzlement. In fact, in 30 years FDIC has had to shell out only $359,700,000 to depositors, and all but $22 million has been recovered by liquidation of assets.

So FDIC has been a moneymaking proposition while strengthening the banking structure. It has paid all its own expenses and, by buying U.S. bonds, has contributed to financing of Government operations. All this time it has been headquartered in rented space, principally in the National Press Building.

In 1957, during Wolcott's chairmanship, the decision was made to build its own headquarters building. The Corporation bought a site for $1,500,000 in downtown Washington. The building itself—a beautiful edifice which adds to the attraction of the Nation's Capital—cost $6 million. But this was all with FDIC money, coming from small assessments against insured banks and from the return on investments. It didn't cost taxpayers a cent. Return on investments now produces more revenue annually than the insurance premiums.

It is this building which will be dedicated June 16 and it is this building in which Jesse Paine Wolcott, of Michigan, will sit as the chief Board member until he returns to a fishing cabin north of Port Huron in January.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Flag Day Address by Senator Morton, of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address given by my colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], at the national convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in Milwaukee on June 14, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLAG DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORTON, OF KENTUCKY

Do you agree that the legislative branch of Government is indispensable? Or do you prefer rule by Executive rather than rule by representative? The keystone of our representative form of government has recently been challenged, and to this new issue, which traverses all American tradition and crosses all party lines, may we address ourselves tonight.

In this country, Government like the flag, stands for the people.

The flag was a dear subject to an uncle of mine, R. C. Ballard Thruston, and he wrote a history of it which was adopted and printed by the 69th Congress in 1926. Reading his treatise, I noted that the flag evolved from the personal flags of the English and Scottish kings. Take note, not the flags of the English and Scottish peoples, but the kings. The flag was the king's.

This difference between a king's flag and a people's flag symbolizes the challenge to American representative government.

Not long ago, self-government, implemented by the representative system, would never have been questioned in this Nation. For by self government, and that alone, Americans have been free, are free, and shall be free. But there is a new doctrine. This scheme has sprung up inside this Nation. Its spokesmen are our fellow citizens—free men kept free by the institution their doctrine subverts.

The doctrine has no name, but it is the doctrine of the master planner. Its sponsors consider themselves the elite, the ruling class.

What precisely do they have in mind? I shall read you a statement of this doctrine. One of our richest and most prestigious scholarly foundations issued it. Its author, having raised the question of how are we doing with respect to the processes of democratic self-government, concludes this way:

"It is the third branch of government, the legislative, where things have gone awry. Whether we look at city councils, the State legislatures, or the Congress of the United States, we react to what we see with scarcely concealed contempt. This is the area where democratic government tends to break down—the greatest menace to the successful operation of the democratic process."

To rectify conditions as he sees them, the author would amend the Constitution to increase the terms of Representatives to 4 years, to decrease the terms of Senators to 4 years, and to hold all congressional elections in presidential election years.

The author of this is a Senator. Had he been from another branch of the Government, his opinion would not have been so shocking. It could have been written off as another typical example of the new party line.

And this line separates not Republicans from Democrats but rather the arrogant, self-appointed omniscients of rule by the few from us old-fashioned types who continue to believe in the virtues of limited government and balanced power, the twin bulwarks of free society. But, as I said, he is a Senator and the former mayor of a great eastern city. I have unwavering faith in JOE CLARK's sincerity. His reasoning I question.

He is correct in every count if:

(1) If the measure of our democratic representation is its speed in bowing unthinking to every decree from the Executive.

(2) If legislative productivity be judged by the amount of debt piled on the living as well as the unrepresented generations to come.

(3) If he would reduce the legislative, the powerful right arm of the people, to a spineless bunch of yes men who hear no evil, see no evil, and speak no evil.

Let's look more deeply into this doctrine. Let's put our fignger on its basic assumptions. Besides taking for granted that the people are not receiving true representation from those they elect and, in most cases, reelect, it says that a tiny handful of willful minor deities can do the job. Can they? I doubt it.

They have tried and failed. Irving Kristol, editor of "Basic Books," writing in the New Leader, has this to say about such a regime.

"The basic fault * * * is that it suffers from delusions of managerial omnicompetence. Its vaunted (philosophy of government) too often seems to amount to nothing more than a ruthless opportunism in small matters of politicking and administration, combined with a self-righteous and doctrinaire obstinacy on large matters of policy."

And what is the end result of rule by this elite? Mr. Kristol expresses it thus:

"In sum, that very sophistication and wide-ranging thoughtfulness which makes (the elite) so intellectually attractive also seems to make it so practically ineffectual. In politics intelligence and imagination are qualities to be desired, but it is a misfortune when they are not subordinated to a readiness to look reality in the face, to recognize its plain features, and to act with a simple decisiveness. It requires strength of character to act upon one's ideas; it requires no less strength of character to resist being seduced by them."

In other words, this ruling elite thinks it can make no mistake, but it does.

The doctrine of the ruling class would remove our only protection from the Executive's poor judgment. The legislative branch embodies that protection. But if every Member of Congress, was elected with the President, don't you see that the majority would be a pack of coattail riders, rubber stamping every proposal from the White House regardless of its value.

That is not the function of Congress, nor is it anything but the abdication of reason to vest so much power in the Executive. The United States has thrived on the system of checks and balances, the limitation of power.

Walter Lippmann, the columnist, once wrote:

"The genius of the American system is that it limits all power—including the power of the majority. Absolute power, whether in a king, a president, a legislative majority, a popular majority, is alien to the American idea.

"For a decision which has to be enforced against the determined opposition of large communities and regions of the country will, as Americans have long realized, almost never produce the results it is supposed to produce. It is necessary to postpone the decision, to respect the opposition, and then accept the burden of trying to persuade it."

We respect the opposition. That is important. We respect it because we recognize our own limitations. We are aware that we can be wrong, and we take that into account in our affairs.

The ruling class, however, would not allow for that. In essence, they are right. If you disagree with them, you are wrong, and they would bury you.

Delusions of managerial omnicompetence are part of the false underpinning of the ruling class doctrine. The other part, I said was disbelief that representatives truly represent.

If you take a quick look at the 88th Congress, you'll see that few bills have passed, that for a long time none were, and that the Senate almost as soon as it convened got tied up in a filibuster over one of its rules of procedure. I can understand how someone develops reservations about the legislative process.

But if you take a long look at Congress, you will see much more. It is, in fact, the meeting ground for the countless and contradictory needs and interests that arise from this gigantic and very complex Nation.

Its task, with respect to all sides, is to reconcile the contradictions, to determine priorities and find and reflect the national will. The difficulties become gargantuan because Congress is the voice of the people in a Nation of some 180-odd millions.

The national will; how can it emerge from the diversities and inner confines of this country? The considered judgment of the whole people can only come—never easily and never perfectly—from the sober deliberations of responsive and responsible legislative assemblies.

And each one of these assemblies is composed of thoughtful and hardworking men and women—responsive to the ballot box but, more basically, responsible to certain enduring standards of right and justice that tradition has deposited, experience has tempered, and time has tested .

I do not think I either exaggerate or glorify when I say that the Congress, at the apex of our representative system, has always been the national forum in which this painstaking process has gone forward.

"Process" is the key word. Senator CLARK uses this same word, but he seems not to understand its real meaning. The political process which produces the national will is, of necessity, disorderly and often disorganized; it is inherently slow and deliberate; it refuses to conform neatly to any textbook of rules and procedures; it defies perfectly logical analysis.

For one reason, no political process accurately mirroring the scope of our society and purporting to serve it could possibly be other than complex—filled with competition and conflict.

The second reason is more important still. The focus of all of America's institutions, their dependence and their ultimate strength is people: individual citizens, free men and women. In times of greatest crisis we are most acutely aware of this fact. Then, the slick flow charts and the scientific procedures go out the window and what we have left are dedicated citizens who discharge their duty not because the rules say they must but, quite simply, because it is the duty that they freely assumed.

The Congress, too, is preeminently a human institution. And as I have already noted, it is indispensably the deliberative forum which echoes the multitude of America's competing and conflicting interests—echoes and then refines them. Its purpose is not just to respond but to represent. Its typical mode of operation to weigh and to balance—and only then to decide, in about equal parts by acting, by not acting, or by acting in ways that could not possibly have been predicted at the outset of the process. The ballot box and its own best apprehension of the national good are, equally, its benchmarks.

The difficulties of Congress and other legislative bodies boil down to the fact that they represent the people. The legislative is the epitome of the democratic system. No President of the United States shall ever be as close to the citizens of Milwaukee as Representatives Zablocki and Reuss. Consequently, no President shall ever protect the interests peculiar to this city as will its elected representatives. If the incumbents don't, the people will trade them in on a new model. What holds for Milwaukee in this respect also holds for every other community of the Nation.

Yes, I think the legislative branch is indispensable. It is the single limb of American Government that is close enough to you to be called, in a real sense, yours—whether you live in Maine or California, Minnesota or Mississippi.

Earlier, I mentioned the flag. Do you know that whenever either House of Congress is in session the flag flies above its Chamber? This is appropriate because the flag stands for us.

But if you strip the powers of Congress and give them to the Executive you may as well haul down that remarkable standard and trample it in the dust.

For when Americans release their individual freedom and make a king, they will have desecrated the flag.

I hope such will never occur. I believe it never shall, because so long as we know from what our freedom comes, we shall see to it that that billowing, bright-colored cloth we unashamedly call Old Glory floats above the great Houses of self-government.

To Find a Better Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD V. LONG
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, virtually without exception, Americans are well aware of the ringing success of the Peace Corps.

Although they neither ask nor expect any special recognizition for their vital contributions to the Peace Corps' impressive record, many private organizations and educational institutions are playing a key role in this unfolding story by way of the training and conditioning programs that prepare the corpsmen for their assignments.

One such university, St. Louis University, has gone even a step further, and has not only trained the volunteers for their project, but is jointly responsible for the project in which 25 peace corpsmen are working with quiet, but with great effect in Honduras.

So that all readers of the Congressional Record may know how St. Louis University, one of the oldest and most respected centers of learning in the Midwest, is carrying out its part in the Honduran project, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record, an article by David Brown, which appeared April 14, 1963, in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat Sunday Magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe Democrat, Apr. 14, 1962]

To Find a Better Understanding

(By David Brown)

There were high hopes and low misgivings when the Peace Corps program was launched and the United States sent forth its young men and women to live with and give help to the peoples of strange lands.

The high hopes were that by intimate contact with these young Americans of good will the people of faraway lands would get a truer image of the United States, while, in turn, the people of this Nation would get a better understanding of the faraway strangers. This, it was hoped, would inhibit the march of communism in backward regions and advance world peace.

Those with low misgivings predicted that the program would turn out to be just another colossal boondoggle.

This grass roots experiment in spreading good will through good deeds in out-of-the-way places began about a year and a half ago. The returns so far look pretty good.

Here, for example, is a progress report on one segment of the Peace Corps program in which St. Louis has a special interest.

The demeanor of the Reverend Robert J. Henle, S.J., was radiant when he came back to St. Louis University recently after tramping around the sweltering coastal plain and the cooler mountainous interior of Honduras, a backward banana republic tucked away in the heartland of Central America. Washington has been so uneasy about Castroism finding root in this region that President Kennedy last month held a 3-day meeting with the five Central American nations in Costa Rica.

A little band of 25 Peace Corps volunteers trained at St. Louis University last summer has been living and working with the Honduran people in 10 cities, towns, and villages scattered from the humid banana coast on the Caribbean to the forested peaks and plateaus of the inland. The Honduran program is jointly administered by the Peace Corps and St. Louis University. This is unique; in all other regions of the world the programs are conducted solely by the Peace Corps.

Besides being dean of the graduate school, Father Henle is director of St. Louis University's Latin American program, and that is why he happened to be looking over the Honduran Peace Corps project with such interest. Backwater Honduras has skimpy railroad service, used mostly for hauling bananas. Its highway system is far from adequate and in much of the country transport is still in the oxcart stage. But paradoxically, Father Henle was able to hop about quite well by plane. He visited, talked to and went out on tasks with 13 of the volunteers located in Tegucigalpa, the capital and largest city, in hot coastal towns, in isolated mountain villages. He visited prisons, hospitals, health clinics, community centers and poor areas ridden by poverty and illiteracy.

He was delighted with the work this stalwart little band of Americans was doing in this land of overwhelming social and health problems and the fine impression they had made on the Honduran people in only 5 months.

St. Louis University became part of the Honduran Peace Corps project last summer when 29 volunteers arrived here from all parts of the country to undergo 10 weeks of training for a 2-year stint of service in the Central American country. The group was composed entirely of nurses and social workers, for they were what Honduras needed sorely. The number finally dwindled to 25, with 22 of them women and 4 of them, together with Thomas J. Walz, the director, graduates of St. Louis University. There were 14 nurses and 11 social workers.

The group, after more training in Puerto Rico, reached Honduras at the beginning of last October and found a republic about the size of Tennessee with a population of close to 2 million. Mostly the people were of mixed Spanish and Indian descent, called "mestizos"; dire poverty was commonplace, and 60 percent of the population was illiterate. Their language was Spanish, which the volunteers had been taught intensively at St. Louis University.

Five social workers were placed in Tegucigalpa, the capital and largest city with 100,000 population, and the rest were scattered thinly in 9 other localities.

As Father Henle hopped about the country on his inspection tour it was evident that St. Louis University had trained an exceptional bunch of volunteers. A husband and wife team in San Pedro Sula, 40 miles inland, found the indigent natives had a great surplus of oranges that were rotting on the trees, so they organized a cooperative of women to make and sell orange marmalade and candy.

In Tegucigalpa, a pleasant tree-lined city which contained both the extremes of wealth and poverty, Father Henle found social worker Ruby Ely, a St. Louis University graduate, handing out CARE food packages to the destitute with a new twist. At the same time they received their food packages she was teaching them how to prepare the food more palatably, nutritiously, and with better diet balance. The hungry, impoverished people became interested in the recipes and, since they couldn't read, memorized them. And while she gave them their food packages she also slipped in health and social welfare movies for their benefit.

Said Father Henle, "The point is, I think, that we're getting the people to seize the opportunity to improve themselves in many different ways."

In a village near Tela, Caribbean banana port, he found another fine job being done by Evangeline Harris, Negro girl graduate from Xavier University at New Orleans. She had got the people to building their own community center out of old wood, was the most popular person in the thatched, backward village. Meanwhile at nearby Tela social worker Kent Myrick got access to the prison—a bunkhouse and chickenwire cage—and was teaching many of the 50 prisoners to read and write. "It was a miserable hole of a place," said Father Henle, "but they were all excited about learning something."

And then there was Alice Buntin, the 63-year-old nurse from Anaheim, Calif.

The Peace Corps is for young persons who can live stringently and endure hardship, but Alice Buntin was holding the line at the village of La Esperanza in a jungle region of sawtoothed mountains and uplands in southwestern Honduras. She and a Honduran doctor were running a government health clinic there and were the only two medical persons administering to the sick in an extensive isolated area.

Alice lived in a single room in the village. In a sort of boarding inn, with fresh pine needles carpeting the floor like sawdust in an oldtime saloon. She demanded only one concession—a private shower bath in her room. The only place of ablution prior to her coming was a public bath at the edge of the mountain settlement. They built it for her.

"She is a good example of the Peace Corps," said Father Henle. "A whole area of people will get their image from this 63-year-old nurse. It is the image of a kindly, efficient person.

"She is really wonderful. They call her 'mamacita,' which means little mother. Parents will walk for 2 days to bring a sick child in from the mountains. She's marvelous."

Americans of Japanese Ancestry Who Served in World War II

SPEECH

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to join with my colleagues in honoring the Americans of Japanese ancestry who served so bravely and valiantly in World War II, particularly since there are more Americans of Japanese ancestry living within the confines of the city of Los Angeles than any other city in America with the exception of our sister city in the Pacific, Honolulu. Nearly one-third of all Americans of Japanese ancestry, known familiarily as Nisei, have their homes in Los Angeles County. It has been my pleasure to have worked with Comdr. Jun Ogimachi of the San Fernando Valley Nisei Memorial Council, District No. 7, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, which post is located in Sun Valley, Calif., part of the district which I represent.

The wonderful record that the members of the 442d Japanese American combat team is well known throughout our great Nation, but the use and exploits of these Americans of Japanese ancestry as linguists in the Pacific theater of the war against the Japanese has not been such a well-known fact. Through their actions and sacrifices in this theater of operation the end of the war was brought to an earlier close. In World War II there were more than 33,000 American citizens of Japanese ancestry that served their country valiantly; over half of this number had lived on the mainland of the United States.

The solemn and impressive ceremony that was held on June 2, 1963, in the environs of the hallowed and beautiful Arlington National Cemetery honoring these American men of Japanese ancestry was a sincere gesture from their country to commemorate the memories of those gallant Nisei that had made the supreme sacrifice to further the tenets of our country's long history of freedom and liberty for all mankind. May I add my humble salute to these American Japanese patriots.

Message by Congressman Ben F. Jensen, of Iowa, to the Delegates to the World Feed Conference From 100 Foreign Nations on This Side of the Iron Curtain Now Being Held in Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MESSAGE BY CONGRESSMAN BEN F. JENSEN, OF IOWA, TO THE DELEGATES TO THE WORLD FEED CONFERENCE FROM 100 FOREIGN NATIONS ON THIS SIDE OF THE IRON CURTAIN NOW BEING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, being a member of the congressional delegation to this conference to devise ways and means to help feed the hungry people of this troubled world, I am impelled to make the following remarks which I hope you will all take in the spirit in which this statement is made.

We welcome you here in the United States of America, land where God has been good to us, by giving us such a plentiful supply of sunshine and rain, and rich productive soil which our farmers keep productive by good soil and moisture conservation practices which was started here only 27 years ago, to the end that, we have a surplus of feed, food, and fiber and which we want to share with you folks across the seven seas, but we want to be sure it reaches the people we want to help, which we know it has not to a marked degree up to this time. So I say without fear or favor that unless you leaders, here representing your respective countries, see to it henceforth that, the right people do receive these commodities, then your time and money attending this conference has to a marked degree been wasted.

Your time and money will also have been wasted in coming here unless on your return home you do not start a crusade to establish a land reform program in your respective countries if such a program has not already been established in your homeland.

It has been my good fortune to visit some 40 foreign nations and to observe the problems of the people there, and it was crystal clear to me that most of those problems were found in the nations where most of the land was owned by the great powerful land barons, who had for past centuries permitted their once-productive soil to wash away, blow away, and erode away and thus become unproductive to the end that hunger strife and internal unrest is now and has been for centuries past, the order of the day as all of you well know who come from such countries as I have just described.

I will refrain from naming those countries, but I will name some of the countries abroad who have since World War II established a land reform program: Pakistan, India, Japan, Formosa, and Thailand just to name a few. We are all glad and relieved to know that, in all those nations, hunger and internal unrest and strife is gradually disappearing, and as a consequence, the Communist conspiracy to rule them and the entire world is being effectively blocked.

Land reform programs were established in all those nations by peaceful means. The government took little to great blocks of land paying a reasonable price to the owners, divided it up in small economic acreages which were sold at a reasonable price to the former peasant farmworkers on a long-term payment basis, at a low interest rate, and also made necessary farm machinery available to the new owners with irrigation where needed, along with technical farm advice by people experienced in the art of good farming, many of them former U.S. farm boy graduates of the State Agriculture College at Ames, Iowa.

It is noteworthy that the only ineffective land reform program that has recently been established is in Cuba, where Castro by armed force, and by rolling heads in typical Communist style, took complete control of every farm and every segment of the Cuban people, their industries, churches, and schools. All of which is doomed to failure, and must be eliminated from the Western Hemisphere and soon and by force if necessary as the last resort. Now even though that is another story, nonetheless if not soon brought to heel, the peace of the entire world will be in jeopardy.

Thus my friends I pray and plead and admonish every one of you to unite with us in cutting away this cancerous growth from our body politic before it engulfs all of us in another world war more destructive to life and property than all the wars that have been fought on this earth.

In closing I beg of all to remember always that, Uncle Sam covets nothing that does not belong to the people of the United States of America. We seek only peace and freedom for ourselves and for you. Our liberties we prize and our rights we will maintain.

Memorial Day at Gettysburg, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, this year, as always, the Gettysburg Memorial Day Committee conducted appropriate and impressive ceremonies at the National Cemetery in that historic Pennsylvania community. An outline of these ceremonies follows, as well as the principal address of the day which was delivered by the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States:

CHESTER S. SHRIVER. On behalf of the Gettysburg Memorial Day Committee, the citizens of this community and our Commonwealth, we extend to you a most cordial welcome to the 96th annual service as we commemorate Memorial Day here in the National Cemetery in Gettysburg.

We are highly honored to have present for this service today, one of our own citizens from Gettysburg and Adams County, a man who has served this community in a dedicated spirit, for many years in business, education, and public service to this State and our Nation and at present on an international level. It is my honor and pleasure to introduce to you, His Excellency, the Honorable John S. Rice, U.S. Ambassador to the Netherlands.

REMARKS BY HON. JOHN S. RICE, U.S. AMBASSADOR TO THE NETHERLANDS

Ambassador RICE. It is fitting that we have another illustrious personage address us at this national shrine. Our speaker is not only a distinguished citizen of the United States but one of the world's great statesmen.

During his career as leader of the U.S. Senate, he particularly distinguished himself as a great unifier. He has the canny ability to bring people together to work for responsible government. His great leadership was recognized by the people when they elected him to the second highest office of our country.

It is a privilege and honor to present the Vice President of the United States.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Vice President JOHNSON. On this hallowed ground, heroic deeds were performed and eloquent words were spoken a century ago.

We, the living, have not forgotten—and the world will never forget—the deeds or the words of Gettysburg. We honor them now as we join on this Memorial Day of 1963 in a prayer for permanent peace of the world and fulfillment of our hopes for universal freedom and justice.

We are called to honor our own words of reverent prayer with resolution in the deeds we must perform to preserve peace and the hope of freedom.

We keep a vigil of peace around the world.

Until the world knows no aggressors, until the arms of tyranny have been laid down, until freedom has risen up in every land, we shall maintain our vigil to make sure our sons who died on foreign fields shall not have died in vain.

As we maintain the vigil of peace, we must remember that justice is a vigil, too—a vigil we must keep in our own streets and schools and among the lives of all our people—so that those who died here on their native soil shall not have died in vain.

One hundred years ago, the slave was freed.

One hundred years later, the Negro remains in bondage to the color of his skin.

The Negro today asks justice.

We do not answer him—we do not answer those who lie beneath this soil—when we reply to the Negro by asking, "Patience."

It is empty to plead that the solution to the dilemmas of the present rests on the hands of the clock. The solution is in our hands. Unless we are willing to yield up our destiny of greatness among the civilizations of history, Americans—white and Negro together—must be about the business of resolving the challenge which confronts us now.

Our Nation found its soul in honor on these fields of Gettysburg 100 years ago. We must not lose that soul in dishonor now on the fields of hate.

To ask for patience from the Negro is to ask him to give more of what he has already given enough. But to fail to ask of him—and of all Americans—perseverance within the processes of a free and responsible society would be to fail to ask what the national interest requires of all its citizens.

The law cannot save those who deny it, but neither can the law serve any who do not use it. The history of injustice and inequality is a history of disuse of the law. Law has not failed—and is not failing. We as a nation have failed ourselves by not trusting the law and by not using the law to gain sooner the ends of justice which law alone serves.

If the white overestimates what he has done for the Negro without the law, the Negro may underestimate what he is doing and can do for himself with the law.

If it is empty to ask Negro or white for patience, it is not empty—it is merely honest—to ask perseverance. Men may build barricades—and others may hurl themselves against those barricades—but what would happen at the barricades would yield no answers. The answers will only be wrought by our perseverance together. It is deceit to promise more as it would be cowardice to demand less.

In this hour, it is not our respective races which are at stake—it is our Nation. Let those who care for their country come forward, North and South, white and Negro, to lead the way through this moment of challenge and decision.

The Negro says, "Now." Others say, "Never." The voice of responsible Americans—the voice of those who died here and the great man who spoke here—their voices say, "Together." There is no other way.

Until justice is blind to color, until education is unaware of race, until opportunity is unconcerned with the color of men's skins, emancipation will be a proclamation but not a fact. To the extent that the Proclamation of Emancipation is not fulfilled in fact, to that extent we shall have fallen short of assuring freedom to the free.

Mr. SCHRIVER. Thank you very much Mr. Vice President for this most inspiring message and tribute that you have rendered here upon this occasion. We deeply appreciate the fact that you have taken your time from your busy schedule, to lead our Nation and the world upon this observance of Memorial Day.

And as a special gesture of high esteem for your dedicated service to the peoples of the world, may I present you with this citation of merit from the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, the only organization, chartered by Congress, to represent the Grand Army of the Republic, and who by their General Order No. II in 1886, proclaimed May 30 annually as Memorial Day. As their commander in chief, may I present this special citation to you.

Address by Robert Moses at National Cartoonist Society Luncheon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair, 1964–65, at the National Cartoonist Society's Rube Goldberg 80th birthday luncheon, in New York City on June 6, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES AT THE NATIONAL CARTOONIST SOCIETY LUNCHEON

Here we are, my fine Gotham friends, celebrating the 80th anniversary of a great humorist, genial pictorial chronicler of our time and kindly caricaturist, an original artist in pen and ink, cast in the mold of the early Mark Twain.

Rube is as American as the Golden Gate, Iowa corn, New England maple syrup, the Lambs Club, rat cheese, and Paul Bunyan's blue-eyed ox, and as absurd as Josh Billings.

There is no need to rush to the word books for a definition of Rube's role in the America of the last half century. He is no satirical Daumier of the comics. He is whimsical, kindly, tolerant, never even in his more serious moments a fanatic, tosser of vitriol or etcher in acid.

He is the enemy of the sour, pompous, oppressive, conceited, and portentous. Like Scaramouche, he was born with the gift of laughter and the sense that the world is mad. For half a century this paragon has let the fresh air of sanity, fun and comedy into stuffy rooms, and the rippling river of laughter into arid places. He has made light of the foolish, unanswerable questions which plague the humorless. He has had no truck with nonobjective abstractions.

I incline to the belief that the engineer gone wrong makes the very best cartoonist. Only a renegade engineer could produce those monstrous mechanical devices, those mountains in labor, those prodigious wasted efforts of Rube's which end with a miniscule mouse. Rube slyly insinuates that our busiest bunnies are not really busy, but just confused.

God bless you, Rube. You have long since earned your A as a genuine American. May you never lay aside the comic mask. Just to show what we at the World's Fair think of you, we are framing in the bar at the top of the Helicopter Tower a hundred of your most famous cartoons to delight visitors from far and wide and to show laughter holding both his sides.

Micawber, President Kennedy and Haiti

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting and informative editorial as recently published in the Washington Sunday Star. It provides additional evidence of the growing indecision and ineptitude of our current foreign policy.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MICAWBER AND HAITI

The United States performance in the case of Haiti has been nothing short of ludicrous. First came an intensive propaganda buildup about the hatefulness of Francois Duvalier's regime. Then, taking our lead from the neighboring Dominican Republic, we shook our first at the two-bit voodoo dictator, assembled an invasion force against him, evacuated American dependents from his capital city, sailed a fleet up and down off his coast, and put out the word that he was about to flee the country.

An absurd moment of truth ensued. Dr. Duvalier called a press conference: There must have been some mistake, he said. He was not planning to run away.

At which, if you please, the U.S. Government in effect now throws up its hands and says, "Oh well, if he wants to stay, of course, there is nothing more to be said about it."

One thing to say about it is that if the Eisenhower administration had ever marched up such a miserable little hill and then, at the first hint of resistance, scuttled back down again, the howls of the loyal Democratic opposition would have been heard round the world.

Dr. Duvalier, if he is capable of laughter, must be having a pretty good chuckle these days, as he contemplates the fumbling performance of the giant of the north. There is no doubt about his policy. He means to stay President of Haiti, certainly for 4 more illegal years, and to run the country as his private fief. The question is: What is our policy?

It seems painfully evident that the United States currently has no policy toward Haiti. It has sentiments, yes. Duvalier has violated the Haitian constitution to remain in office and he is a tyrant; therefore the United States opposes him. But it is not policy to wish someone to go away. Policy, in a case like this, means assisting someone out of office or assisting someone else in.

Obviously we take the position nowadays that armed intervention cannot be undertaken in this hemisphere, barring a spectacular threat to our security like the presence somewhere of Soviet rockets. There are ways, however, of accomplishing these things.

For one thing, as we pointed out the other day, there is economic pressure. Our purchases from Haiti are not extensive. But, for instance, could we not get along without Haitian coffee while Duvalier remains in power?

Duvalier could be toppled, as he should be, by the Haitians themselves—relatively few of them. The men to topple him are there and, sooner or later, one of them will organize the job. They need guns, grenades and explosives. If the United States remains a spectator, growing only when its nationals seem to be menaced, the next leader of Haiti will owe us even less than the present one.

If the State Department now virtuously argues that we cannot meddle in the affairs of neighboring countries, it has a short memory that any survivor of the Bay of Pigs or of the CIA-sponsored revolt against Jacobo Arbenz of Guatemala could refresh. It also should have heeded these promptings of reticence before our national prestige was conspicuously committed to the abortive effort last month.

Haiti, of course, is close to Cuba geographically, just as the two cases are closely parallel. If Duvalier were to invite the Russians in—or if Castro were to move against him—we would have no alternative but to take action, and fast. Should we permit so dangerous a vacuum to remain so inviting for so long?

The truth seems to be that this administration is quite cynically willing to put on the pressure where it thinks it may scare somebody, but also is quite cynically willing to forget the whole business when the opposition shows signs of life.

The result today is that in relation to Haiti our position is one of total inertia—waiting, like Mr. Micawber, for something to turn up. It is nowhere near good enough.

American Mothers Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, the American Mothers Committee, Inc., on May 7, 1963, adopted five resolutions which express the position and goals of this fine organization. In this connection, I include the resolutions at this point in the RECORD.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE AMERICAN MOTHERS COMMITTEE, INC., PRESENTED AND APPROVED MAY 7, 1963

I

Whereas the home and family are the foundations of our American society and the strongest bulwark against the deterioration or degeneration of individual behavior: Be it

Resolved, That the American Mothers Committee go on record to endorse those programs and movements which have as their aims the strengthening of the American home and family; be it further

Resolved, That the American Mothers Committee reaffirm its basic objectives of emphasis on religion in the home; be it further

Resolved, That the American Mothers Committee concern itself with the problems of the American family: immature marriage, the increased divorce rate, discord within the family, juvenile delinquency, alcoholism, use of narcotics, premarital sex relations and all of those problems which results in the deterioration and degeneration of individual behavior; be it further

Resolved, That the American Mothers Committee support those programs which are concerned with the problems of the aging and which are working constructively toward the solution of these problems; be it further

Resolved, That the American Mothers Committee implement these concerns with the above named problems through the extension and expansion of its present mothers counseling program and through supporting those organizations and agencies that are working constructively toward the solution of these problems.

II

Whereas the problem of world peace is of concern to all peoples today, and the conduct of our international relations program bears directly on this goal: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the American Mothers Committee urge the President and the Congress to conduct our American foreign policy in a manner which will further international understanding, cooperation and good will, and that, in this effort, we will support measures to make the U.N. and its subsidiary agencies more effective and will oppose measures which would impair their strength; be it further

Resolved, That the American Mothers Committee call upon the U.S. Government to join the other 59 nations which have already outlawed genocide, by signing the Genocide Convention without delay; be it further

Resolved, That the American Mothers Committee support programs which are working in a manner consistent with national security, toward worldwide limitation of arms and control of the testing of nuclear weapons.

III

Whereas the constitutional rights of all citizens are basic to the preservation and continuation of our free American society: be it further

Resolved, That the American Mothers Committee urge the support of all those programs and activities which are based on respect for the importance and dignity of every living human being and that this organization strongly oppose any actions which would result in the denial of constitutional rights to any minority groups.

IV

Whereas universal and free education is necessary for the welfare and advancement of our society and for the full development of all individuals: be it therefore

Resolved, that the American Mothers Committee affirm its support of all those programs which are designed to expand, enrich, and extend educational opportunities at all levels; be it further

Resolved, that the American Mothers Committee support those efforts which contribute toward the enlightment of our society and preservation of its basic freedoms through channels of mass media; be it further

Resolved, that the American Mothers Committee, while rejecting censorship methods, abhorrent to and unconsonant with American ideals, support all efforts to prevent the circulation of pornographic literature directed toward the impairment of the morals of our youth.

V

Whereas many psychological surveys are being circulated through numerous junior and senior high schools throughout the country which through their content frequently tend to inject ideas and concepts heretofore unknown to the minds of youth and which can only result in moral and spiritual deterioration: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Mothers Committee, Inc., expresses its deep concern on this matter and further that it supports the bill, H.R. 10–10506, as presented to Congress by Ohio Representative JOHN ASHBROOK which requires that parental permission be granted before indiscriminate brainwashing questionnaires be circulated among students.

Individual Initiative in Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. PEARSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, in the Thursday, June 13, 1963, issue of the Drovers Telegram, an editorial appeared entitled "Historic Change in Making?"

This editorial comments upon a talk given by Mr. Don Paarlberg, a former USDA staff member in Washington and now an agricultural economist at Purdue University. Mr. Paarlberg offers the opinion that this country has passed the high tide in Government intervention in the production and pricing of farm products. The farm policy initiative, he declares, may have passed during the past year from this Government intervention to those who believe in individual decisionmaking.

A careful reading of this editorial will, however, define clearly the role of Government in American agriculture. This role, the editorial points out, is to improve the function of the enterprise system, to place a floor over the pit of disaster, to help the individual equip himself better for his task as a decisionmaker, and to see that the market functions as an enlightened institution. In brief, the proper objective of Government participation in economic life is seen as strentgthening the process of individual decisionmaking, not as substituting public for private action.

This is the sort of commonsense approach which is often required at a time of transition which is now occurring in the agriculture life of this Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial herein referred to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORIC CHANGE IN MAKING?

In a talk which impressed his listeners as particularly sound in its logic and is making quite an impact around the country, Don Paarlberg, a former USDA staff member in Washington and now an agricultural economist at Purdue University, offered the opinion that "we (in the United States) have passed the high tide of government intervention in the production and pricing of farm products." He refers, of course, to the area of production controls and price supports, not to that of government-assisted research, education, establishment of grades and standards and other similarly appropriate government activities in the field of farming.

Why does Paarlberg think the tide has turned? Much as a scientist would, he set up his belief as an hypothesis, then attacked and defended it with all of the factors which could be brought to bear on the situation. The result led him to this conclusion:

"In the farm policy format of this decade, it is the government programs and not the free markets that are on the defensive. The regulated portion of agriculture is in deep and costly trouble; the competitive part of agriculture is in better shape. It is time for those who believe in individual decisionmaking to get off the defensive. They have so long defended the market system that they continue from force of habit in a defensive frame of mind. Free institutions have been vindicated by their relative success, as compared with the rival system. Believers in the individual should take a new reading. They should shift from a defensive to a positive frame of mind, and carry this reappraisal to the general public. They need to act rather than react, to initiate rather than to defend. As I see it, the time is now."

Lining up the arguments in favor of and against the hypothesis, Paarlberg ventured a judgment that the probability is somewhat greater than 50 percent that it is valid and that we have passed the peak of government intervention in the pricing and production of farm products. The farm policy initiative, he declared, may have passed during this past year to those who believe in individual decisionmaking. If so, this is a momentous event, he added.

Discussing the possibility candidly, Paarlberg told his listeners that believers in individual decisionmaking weaken their case by talking about returning to the free market. The term free market, he pointed out, calls to mind economic institutions as they existed 50 years ago—and naturally there is no attraction in going back to that. "Wealth was too privileged and poverty too general," he noted.

"Many believers in individual decisionmaking contemplate an active but not a dominant role for Government," Paarlberg explained. "This role is to improve the function of the enterprise system, to place a floor over the pit of disaster, to help the individual equip himself better for his task as a decisionmaker, and to see that the market functions as an enlightened institution. In brief, the proper objective of Government participation in economic life is seen as strengthening the process of individual decisionmaking, not as substituting public for private action.

"We need to visualize a market that is free in a modern, rather than in an archaic sense," he continued. "This means a market free from manipulation, free from misrepresentation, free from gross ignorance and free from senseless gyrations as well as free from Government domination. It means the kind of market that intelligent people are capable of creating in this modern day."

Those who argue against returning to a free market for farm commodities usually contend that if all props were suddenly pulled out from under farm commodities and stocks were unloaded, the market would plunge to disaster levels, Paarlberg noted. And so it would. But this is not a test for the free market, which cannot be expected overnight to handle the current production of wheat, corn, cotton, and other commodities which terribly costly Government programs have failed to handle.

A return to the free market would take time, and would involve heavy cost. But it could be achieved with proper handling, education, and understanding. It would have to include all developments which lift the capacity for responsible private decisionmaking, such as market regulation like that done by the Commodity Exchange Authority, supervision of grades and standards, accurate price reporting and good outlook information. It would have to include marketing orders, wisely administered for appropriate commodities, and it would include price supports at levels which permit price to fluctuate freely most of the time.

Returning to the free market should be no means be interpreted to mean a return to license, the total absence of restraint. "A better concept of freedom is that it is closely tied to responsibility," added Paarlberg. "The more responsibility is self-imposed, the less restraint will have to be supplied from the outside."

These thoughts take on added significance in the light of the recent wheat referendum. Didn't the wheat vote indicate that Farmers want to make their own decisions? Doesn't it indicate a desire to progress toward a modern free market for wheat—not one which heads the wheatgrower toward disaster, but toward a sensible move in the direction of modern freedom?

The U.S. Merchant Marine Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, on June 14 it was my privilege—as a member of the Congressional Board of Visitors—to visit the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at King's Point, N.Y.

This was my second visit as a member of the Board of Visitors and, as before, I was greatly impressed with the high caliber of the cadets at this institution, with the "shipshape" appearance of the physical facilities, and the very obvious capability of the administrators and teaching staff.

Again it was very evident that the Superintendent of the King's Point Academy—Rear Adm. Gordon McLintook—continues to effect his efficient and capable leadership in developing the Academy into a truly outstanding institution, an academy that trains young men to become competent officers for our merchant fleet and for our naval reserve.

Admiral McLintock has served the Academy as superintendent for over 15 years, years studded with outstanding accomplishment and service. This was properly noted in the 1963 spring issue of Polaris, an academy publication, and the pertinent article follows:

Rear Adm. Gordon McLintock assumed the Superintendency of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy on April 1, 1948. With rather vague instructions to the effect that he was to get the academy accredited and to get a chapel built, he and his wife became the moving forces behind many of the institutions that we now know as fact—not simply proposals.

Today cadets tend to assume that the things we enjoy were inevitable facets of our growth; a bachelor of science degree; permanent status equal to the other academies; a chapel to worship in; an expanded curriculum; recreational facilities, in particular Land Hall; refresher programs for men already in the industry and foreign exchange programs that have increased our stature abroad. It must be remembered, however, that in 1948 not only our growth, but our permanency was in doubt; and, that for the first 8 years of his administration, Admiral McLintock was faced with an operating budget that was each year less than the preceding one. In spite of these obstacles, and perhaps because of them, Admiral and Mrs. McLintock's determination to aid the Cadet Corps has been manifested in the achievements which we are now able to take for granted.

Admiral McLintock, whose education and administrative experience leave him uniquely qualified for the leadership position he now holds, had this to say regarding the past 15 years: "Such success as I have as Superintendent, and have had, I owe in large measure to my helpmeet, Mrs. McLintock, who has always, and still does, labor at my side night and day, Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, for the Academy; to my splendid supporting staff; and the Corps of Cadets, also, superb, highly selected men, of whom we are all justly proud."

Mr. Speaker, the country is indeed indebted to the devoted and capable service of Admiral McLintock, as are the hundreds of cadets who deeply appreciate the admiral's deep interest in building a type of training school which has opened to them opportunities for a successful career in their chosen profession.

Due recognition was extended Admiral McLintock early this year by the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy Alumni Association, Inc., Kings Point, N.Y., and I sincerely hope this school will continue to have the services of this outstanding leader for many years to come.

As an appropriate conclusion to my comments, I insert into the RECORD the April 10, 1963, press release on Admiral McLintock issued by the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy Alumni Association, Inc.:

On the occasion of the 15th anniversary of the superintendency of Rear Adm. Gordon McLintock at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N.Y., the Alumni Association of the Academy in recognition of his outstanding performance and relationship with the sons of Kings Point, and

Whereas, during his tenure in office the Academy has been accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Universities; and

Whereas its graduates now receive a fully accredited bachelor of sciences degree; and

Whereas the Academy received recognition as a permanent Federal educational institution; and

Whereas his personal efforts have resulted in the construction and dedication of the only national memorial chapel to the merchant marine honored dead of World Wars I and II; and

Whereas his efforts have achieved much beneficial legislation for the Academy and the merchant marine; and

Whereas his leadership has inspired the continuing improvement in the Academy curriculums to meet the demands and technological advances for a modern and nuclear merchant marine; and

Whereas, under his able administration the Academy has undergone modernization of its training facilities to meet the current and future skills of a merchant marine officer in a changing technological profession; and

Whereas he has fostered a program of educational assistance to developing nations thus achieving international recognition for the Academy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Governors of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy Alumni Association and its chapters represented at its annual meeting—held on March 30, 1963, acknowledge and publish in gratitude and in full appreciation the superintendent's dedication and continuing services to the Academy, the merchant marine, and Nation.

The West's Water Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, we in the West have a keen interest in the recent decision of the Supreme Court concerning the distribution of the waters of the Colorado River Basin.

Gordon Eliot White, a newspaper man of Washington, D.C., prepared an article, published on June 9 in the New York Herald Tribune, which is a very good analysis of the problem; and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WEST'S WATER PROBLEMS

(By Gordon Eliot White)

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. Supreme Court Court ruled last week in favor of Arizona to wind up a bitter 40-year war between Arizona and California over the waters of the lower Colorado River. The decision ends a fight which has preoccupied the Southwestern United States with the division of the limited waters of the river which could not satisfy the needs of either State.

The decision turns attention now toward the yet untapped resources of water-rich northern California, and the limitless waters of the Pacific Ocean and the Gulf of California, through the magic of converting salt water to fresh by several new processes.

The Court decision held that California would have to give up to Arizona more than 195 billion gallons of water now being diverted each year to the rapidly growing Los Angeles metropolitan area.

In Arizona the new flow of life-giving water from the river will only begin to meet needs in the fast-growing Phoenix and Tucson areas. Last year this area drew 815 billion gallons more from underground wells than was replenished by rainfall and subterranean flows.

For both States, the waters of the Colorado will fail to keep pace with the rapid expansion of population.

Arizona today has no reservoirs or aqueducts to take the additional water from the Colorado. Before the floodgates to California are closed and the water delivered to Arizona, Congress must authorize and appropriate for the billion-dollar central Arizona reclamation project.

By the most optimistic Arizona estimates, it will be at least 1972 before substantial amounts of water will be taken from California. Faucets in southern California will not go dry then, for by that time a new flood of more than 490 billion gallons a year will flow into the Los Angeles metropolitan area from the Feather River project in northern California.

Feather River is the forerunner of a vast network of State projects now under discussion in California. These systems would bring water from the north, where more than 110 inches fall each year, to southern California, where desert areas get less than 2 inches a year.

California water officials say the State receives enough rainfall to supply the entire State in this century if enough north-to-south diversions are built. Many engineers believe, however, that the next 10 years will bring successful development of salt water conversion processes that can be less costly than 300-mile-long canal systems. For the future, beyond the year 2000, sea water appears almost certain to become a major source of irrigation and municipal fresh water in the State.

The Supreme Court case decided last Monday was brought by Arizona in 1952, after California congressional Representatives in the House Interior Committee had blocked construction of the comprehensive central Arizona project. Authorization bills had already passed the Senate twice, in 1950 and 1951. California opposed the Arizona project because it would take power and water which had been hers by default for 25 years.

The first major move to tame the Colorado came in 1919, when the Department of the Interior recommended construction of a dam and reservoir system below Boulder Canyon, and a canal to take irrigation water to the Imperial Valley of California.

Western water law, developed out of necessities of life in a desert climate, gives a vested right to the first user of a quantity of water. The other States along the Colorado feared that California would appropriate the entire flow of the river and deprive them of water when they came to need it.

The ensuing controversy was partially settled with the adoption of the Colorado River Compact by California, Arizona, Utah, New Mexico, Colorado, Nevada, and Wyoming in 1922. Division of the river into upper and lower basins at Lees Ferry, Ariz., was agreed upon in a compromise worked out by Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce. The California share remained unsettled.

Although the States were unable to agree upon a division of the lower basin share of 7.5 million acre-feet a year, Congress set up its own formula. (An acre-foot is the amount of water that would cover 1 acre to a depth of 1 foot.) In the 1928 act, which authorized construction of what is now Hoover Dam, Congress allotted Nevada 300,000, Arizona 2.8 million, and California 4.4 million acre-feet of water each year from the river. California and Arizona would split all water over 7.5 million acre-feet which came into the lower basin, aside from Mexico's 1.5-million-acre-foot share.

California has been taking about 5 million acre-feet of water from the river each year, 600,000 feet more than the portion allotted her in the 1928 act. Until Arizona sought to use its entire share in the central Arizona project, the California division had gone virtually unchallenged because the disputed water would otherwise have gone to waste in the Gulf of California.

Within California, the extra water from the Colorado basin has gone to Los Angeles. Under Western water law giving first priority to users within the basin, the Imperial and Coachella Valleys had first rights to California's undisputed share of the river. The effect was to give big, politically potent Los Angeles a powerful interest in holding on to the extra water from the river.

At the same time Los Angeles was eagerly absorbing billions of kilowatt-hours of cheap electric power generated at Hoover Dam and other lower Colorado powerplants by water to which other States held title, but did not use. California was determined to fight to keep both the low-cost power, the water, and her share in Hoover Dam power revenues.

When Arizona sued for its full share in 1952, the Supreme Court appointed a special master to hear the bulk of the evidence in what became a 27-month trial. Master Simon H. Rifkind reported to the Court in January 1961, and the Court twice heard arguments by the States. Most of Mr. Rifkind's recommendations were adopted last week by a 7 to 1 majority. Chief Justice Earl Warren, a former Governor of California, abstained from the case.

DIFFERENT OPINIONS

The opinion, written by Justice Hugo L. Black, upheld the division of the lower basin waters made by Congress in 1928. It rejected the California contention that the Western law of prior use should determine rights to the river.

Arizona also won Supreme Court approval for her contention that tributary waters need not be counted as part of the lower Colorado and shared in the division.

Since California was entitled to half of all lower Colorado waters in excess of 7.5 million feet, inclusion of the tributaries in the basin would have given California half of the waters of Arizona's Gila River.

The Court's ruling reserved the tributaries to the States in which they flow, a decision which was generally applauded by all of the river States except California, which has no side streams.

The Court overruled the master on the question of dividing the river in years of water shortage, and gave that key power to the Secretary of the Interior.

Dissenting from the decision to give the Secretary almost unlimited discretion to apportion the river in dry years were Justices Potter Stewart, John Marshall Harlan and William O. Douglas. All three said Congress intended to give no such power to the Secretary, and had created a formula by which a shortage would be borne by each State in proportion to its normal share of the river.

Justice Douglas also dissented from the majority tributary decision. He held that the side streams were part of the basin, and should be included in the division of the Colorado.

All told, Arizona now uses about 1.2 million acre-feet from the river, plans to take another 1.2 million for the central Arizona project, and probably will use most of its remaining 400,000 feet for the Indians.

DIFFERENT PROBLEMS

In California, the great State water plan of which the Feather River project was the first will have to be accelerated to keep up with the growth of the Los Angeles area. The Eel, Klamath, Calaveras, Russian and other rivers in the north will have to be dammed. Their chronic floods will have to be channeled away to the south.

Californians will have a breathing space of at least 10 years, engineers estimate, before they will lose heavily to Arizona under the Court decision. Not only will Arizona have to build its project, but upper Colorado States still have not taken all that they are entitled to draw from the river, and they probably will not fully develop their basin until the 1980's.

The conversion of salt water to fresh is the ultimate hope of water engineers for the future. A demonstration plant built by the Department of the Interior will start operating at Roswell, N. Mex., July 1, turning out fresh water at the rate of about 1,000 acre-feet a year. The Department has seven such plants built or building, and plans to ask Congress next year for money to help Key West, Fla., build a 10,000 acre-foot plant. Department engineers say that the next step is to a plant 10 times larger than the Key West facility, a size which begins to be attractive to medium-sized cities.

Salt water conversion would be possible today if costs could be reduced. Converted water would cost from $80 to $100 an acre-foot, about three times the cost of irrigation water in some parts of the West. Engineers will be able to trim costs, but the conversion of salt water need not compete with the cheap water of the 1960's. It must be compared for cost with future water that will have to be brought from hundreds of miles away, or pumped over mountain ranges.

The Supreme Court recognized, without saying it in words, that Arizona must depend upon the Colorado. The State has no other significant water source except the Colorado River and its tributary, the Gila. Someday in the future Arizona may have to absorb the entire flow of the river. At that time new water from northern California and salt water conversion will have to take the place of river water for the coast cities. Legally, Arizona will have to indemnify California through some financial arrangement of payment for alternative water supplies.

Can We Wave the Flag Too Much?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, June 14 marked the 186th anniversary of the adoption of our flag by resolution of the Continental Congress on June 14, 1777.

For 186 years, our flag has symbolized "our unity, our power, our thought and purpose as a nation," as expressed by President Woodrow Wilson in his Flag Day message of 1917. He further stated:

> It has no other character than that which we gave it from generation to generation. The choices are ours.

There are some today who may feel that the flag can be "waved too much." In response to such criticism, I would like to include the following words of Dr. S. L. DeLove, president of Independence Hall of Chicago, which is dedicated to America's heritage:

CAN WE WAVE THE FLAG TOO MUCH?

Is it possible to wave the flag too much? Provided, of course, that you wave it with integrity? Is it possible to study Lincoln or Shakespeare too much? Is it possible to read the Bible too much?

The great, the good, the true, are inexhaustible for inspiration, example, and strength. I believe that we are not waving our flag enough, not nearly enough.

It seems to me that we are developing a tendency to be timid or even apologetic about waving the Stars and Stripes. Walk up and down the streets on July 4 and count the flags. It is our Nation's birthday, a sacred day in world history, the most important day of America. Why isn't the flag flying on every rooftop and from every home and building? This complacent attitude is strong evidence of cancerous patriotic decay. The flag is a symbol of our national unity. It is the spirit of our undying devotion to our country. It stands for the best that is in us * * * for loyalty, character, and faith in democracy.

Isn't our flag a synonym of the United States of America? Does it not represent man's greatest, noblest, most sublime dream? Is it not the zenith of achievement, the goal to which generations have aspired? Ladies and gentlemen, I believe it is time for us—for the mad, rushing 20th century American—to stop for a moment and think. Let us arrest our near reverential admiration of material success and return to the spiritual and ethical values. Let us imbue and rekindle in ourselves and our children the so-called old-fashioned way of patriotism, a burning devotion to the principles and ideals upon which our country was founded.

Should not every home own and proudly display the colors on holidays and other such occasions? Isn't the flag Patrick Henry, Jefferson, Franklin, Washington, Nathan Hale, Gettysburg and Valley Forge, Paul Revere, Jackson, and other great men and women who have given us our heritage? When you look at the flag can't you see the Alamo, Corregidor, Pearl Harbor, the *Monitor*, the *Merrimac*, Wake Island, and Korea? Lest we forget, isn't the flag Flanders Field, Bataan, Iwo Jima, Normandy, Babe Ruth and Davy Crocket? The great events of our past and present are wrapped up in our flag.

It is a symbol of this blessed Nation, a giant in industry, education, and commerce. Millions of fertile square miles, wheatlands, coal mines, steel plants. Our great Republic, the chosen infant destined to be man's last and remaining hope for suffering humanity, a shining beacon of light, noble and glorious, the haven for the oppressed and persecuted and truly God's gift to mankind.

That is what the flag means to me. Can we wave it too much? I don't think so.

United States Curb on Braceros Gives Mexico Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of June 13, 1963:

UNITED STATES CURBS ON BRACEROS GIVES MEXICO PROBLEMS

(By Bart Quint)

MEXICO CITY.—The recent decision by the U.S. House of Representatives to cut the flow of Mexican migrant laborers to the farms and ranches of the United States down to a trickle, threatens this country with an economic, and perhaps a political, crisis.

Since 1951, when the two nations signed an agreement formalizing the hitherto illegal traffic in peasants back and forth across the border, hundreds of thousands of Mexican "braceros" have entered the United States each year, providing cheap farm labor throughout the country, but especially in Texas, California, New Mexico, Arizona, Arkahsas, and Colorado.

Every 2 years, the agreement had been renewed, despite increasing opposition from the AFL–CIO, which claims U.S. farm wages have been kept low because of the willingness of the Mexicans to work for sums that are great by their standards, but small by American standards.

In 1961, when the last extension was accorded, the labor group charged that negotiations for it between the United States and Mexican Government were held in haste and secrecy.

UNIONS NOW WINNERS

When the issue came to a vote this time, on May 29, organized labor won. The House rejected a proposed 2-year extension by a vote of 174–158. Unless a new bill is submitted to the Senate and passed by that group and the House changes its mind when it gets a second crack at it, the braceros program will die on December 31.

Several thousand Mexican farmhands will continue to enter the United States each year as permanent immigrants, and others undoubtedly will slip across the border illegally. But the bulk of Mexico's migrant labor force will be kept at home.

Some Mexican politicians reacted to the news of the House's surprising rejection of the bill by following the popular custom of trying to make the Mexican people believe they are not dependent on the United States for anything. They hailed the decision as "an end to the cancer which has been consuming the country, the migration of its workers."

MEXICAN WELL-BEING AFFECTED

Nevertheless, even they realize that, for two reasons it is a migration vital to Mexican well-being.

It is a source of badly needed foreign exchange. The braceros who goes to the United States to work saves most of his money, or sends it or brings it home with him. Many Mexican villages, especially in the perennially drought-stricken northwest, depend on the income of the few braceros who work for 3 or 4 months in the United Staets and return with a few hundred dollars. The entire village lives for the rest of the year on this money.

The Bank of Mexico conservatively puts the revenue earned by the country this way at something over $30 million per year.

Then there is the matter of Mexican unemployment. There simply is not enough land to provide work for the 52.8 percent of the Mexican population that depends on agricultural labor for its livelihood.

Until 1959, the braceros entered the United States at the rate of 400,000 per year. More recently, because of increased farm mechanization, the need for them has lessened. In 1960, 325,000 entered, followed by about 300,000 in 1961 and 250,000 in 1962. This year, between 150,000 and 200,000 are expected to cross the border before the pact expires.

FARMERS CITE "STOOP" LABOR

Farmers, especially in California and the Southwest, insist that the need for them still exists. Americans, they say, are unwilling to engage in "stoop" labor, like picking cotton and beets. The AFL–CIO counters with the argument that, "if they were paid enough, they would do it," and has sought unsuccessfully for establishment of a minimum farm wage.

Times are hard as it is in the Mexican countryside. With a curb on employment on the other side of the Rio Grande, they will become harder. Communist agitators, already active in rural areas, probably will become more active and, with the peasants more desperate than ever, likely will meet with more success than in the past.

The migrant labor pact, however, is not yet necessarily dead. The House vote was taken on May 29, when many farm State Representatives already had left Washington for the Memorial Day holidays. California's Gov. Edmund G. Brown has begun a campaign to put pressure on President Kennedy to have a new bill submitted for extension of the agreement, hoping that this time it would pass.

Fish Finale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, once again I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial by Byron Brinton, of Baker, Oreg., regarding the development of the Columbia River system. Many of us vividly remember the fight waged over Hells Canyon, and who should control the potential of the Middle Snake River. Byron Brinton was one of those with the wisdom to see then the issues which were actually at stake. His editorial of June 4 is well worth reading, and under unanimous consent, I include it at this point in my remarks:

FISH FINALE

Sportsmen may not know it but the hearing currently being held in Portland by the Federal Power Commission may spell the doom of migratory fish on the Snake River and even the Salmon River.

If it does, it goes back to the stand this writer has always held: that a private license on a big river is a one-way agreement—a monopoly privilege on the one hand but a scrap of paper on the other. As between a Federal power-licensed project and a congressionally authorized public development, only the latter can be relied upon to enforce the overall public resource interest.

It must be kept in mind that FPC is holding the hearing. FPC by the flourish of a pen can wipe out the Brownlee net barrier, Oxbow fish passage, Low Hells Canyon, and Mount. Sheep site migratory fish facilities requirements. Will FPC see justification for continued expenditures of millions of dollars—which private utilities have gladly spent of other people's money—for fish facilities that don't work even though the utilities have never intended that they work? This newspaper has warned time and again the purpose of the utility from the very start was to get out of the fish and multiple-use business and not keep in it.

The appearance in Portland Tuesday of its attorney, R. P. Parry, who argued fervently for fish all through the proceedings that resulted in the IPCO-FPC project license, was for the sole purpose of now arguing against fish. This is the completion of another of the now famous defaults of the low dams.

The press quotes Parry as now contending that since the dams have destroyed the fish that only below the lowest dam with hatcheries should the power utilities be required to provide facilities. He said $9,206,820 was spent, including $3.5 million at Brownlee net barrier, a failure.

But if this is the finale of fish in Snake River, Mr. Parry typifies the reason. It was he for IPCO who argued before a congressional committee that the project would respect all States rights, but within hours at the Pendleton session of the Oregon Supreme Court, argued that Federal supremacy superseded and Oregon rights could not control the IPCO project—and won his case.

This is the position Rollin Bowles, chairman of Oregon Game Commission, and other conservationists are in. The Federal Power Commission is the judge and jury, not Oregon, not Congress, not the people, not the game or fish and wildlife commissions.

Conservationists got themselves into this position by not standing up to principle in the Hells Canyon fight. They are getting themselves in this position by siding with the Mount Sheep and Low Hells Canyon private damsites even now, knowing full well that no conservation group anywhere can tell the FPC what to do. It's strictly power and it's strictly private.

Running from a public project at Nez Perce site, below the mouth of Salmon River, into a Mount Sheep-FPC private power damsite above the Salmon River but including an ultimate private dam at Lower Canyon to block the Salmon River, is like jumping from the frying pan into the fire. Congress and public development on the big rivers and not FPC is conservation minded. If conservationists haven't learned that lesson at Hells Canyon, nothing now can save either fish or full development on either the Snake or the Salmon Rivers.

Economic Development in Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, a recent news story appearing in the Evening Capital, the daily newspaper which so adequately serves my hometown of Annapolis, Md., provided further evidence of the outstanding job being done by the State's department of economic development to capitalize on and improve the economic resources of Maryland.

The department, started in 1959 during the first administration of Gov. J. Millard Tawes, is now the focal point for an expanding industrial complex in the State which is making significant contributions to the betterment of Maryland each year. The Evening Capital article points out, for instance, that an estimated 200 new and expanded plant projects were reported during 1962, adding more than 8,500 new jobs and more than $40 million a year to the State's industrial payrolls.

Sharing the honor for these advances along with the department of economic development, which is so ably headed by Mr. George W. Hubley, Jr., are the local economic development commissions which exist in every county, Baltimore City, and numerous other communities throughout the State. These local commissions, the article points out, have become the backbone for the successful organization and application of the State's resources.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the department of economic development has become the prime mover behind the concentration of the industrial community in Maryland on scientific and research matters. I am sure you know that the Baltimore-Washington area is the nucleus of scientific activity of the United States, and very likely the world. There are over 500 research-oriented firms in the area, with practically every type of research and development program represented. The area ranks third in the Nation in number of scientists, with 8,143.

These are remarkable achievements, and I am very proud that they are taking place in my home State.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the Evening Capital article at this point in the RECORD:

MARYLAND SEEN PREPARED TO ATTRACT NEW INDUSTRY

As recently as 1958, only a few well-established economic development organizations existed in Maryland.

Today, the State is 100 percent organized to develop its resources in areas extending from Pennsylvania to the Potomac and from the narrows to the shore of the Atlantic Ocean and the Chesapeake Bay.

Many new programs are underway on a county and/or city basis, as well as on regional and state-wide bases, in a concerted movement aimed at keeping the State's economy rolling.

Reactivation of the Caroline County Economic Development Commission completes a list of the development programs operating in 23 counties and the City of Baltimore. Agencies in several other cities are dedicated to the expansion and stabilization of Maryland's economy.

George W. Hubley, Jr., director of the Maryland Department of Economic Development, said here today that the effective operation of local organizations is an indispensable factor in helping out-of-State investors find profitable plant locations for doing business in Maryland.

Dr. Robert M. Sparks, chief of the department's division of banking and industrial development, attributes a lion's share of the credit for the success of the State's industrial expansion program to the cooperative efforts of the county and local agencies.

An estimated 200 new and expanded plant projects were reported in Maryland last year, adding more than 8,500 new jobs and more than $40 million a year to Maryland's mounting industrial payrolls.

Continued assistance is also rendered by two recently organized state-wide associations—the Maryland Industrial Development Association and the Maryland Association of Local Development Agencies.

The former has a membership comprising industrial specialists representing the railroads, public utilities and the development departments of the Metropolitan Board of Trade, the Baltimore Association of Commerce and the Maryland Port Authority. The Maryland Association of Local Development Agencies is made up of development specialists representing cities, counties, chambers of commerce and others.

The Economic Development Committee of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade and the Industry Location Department of the Baltimore Association of Commerce are both powerful allies of all programs of Maryland counties in the market areas.

Maryland's complete list of county development agencies follows:

Anne Arundel County Trade Council, Industrial Development Commission of Baltimore County, Calvert County Area Redevelopment Committee, Dorchester County Industrial Development Commission, Caroline County Economic Development Commission, Carroll County Industrial Development Committee, Cecil County Industrial Association, New Industry Committee of the Chestertown Chamber of Commerce (Kent County), Charles County Economic Development Commission.

Upper Potomac Industrial Development Co. (Allegany County), Frederick Chamber of Commerce, Garrett County Development Corporation, Economic Development Commission of Harford County, Howard County Department of Industrial Relations, Montgomery County Department of Information and Economic Development, Economic Development Committee of Prince Georges County, Queen Anne's County Economic Development Committee, St. Mary's County Development Committee.

Salisbury Chamber of Commerce (Wicomico County), Somerset County Redevelopment Corporation, Economic Development Committee of Talbot County, Washington County Economic Development Commission, and Worcester County Economic Development Committee.

Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday was the anniversary of the admission of Arkansas into the Union. This great State was admitted on June 13, 1836. I welcome the opportunity this commemoration affords to congratulate the people of Arkansas for having the good judgment and foresight to send its present delegation to the Congress. National leadership is fast becoming a tradition in Arkansas.

Mr. Speaker, my most vivid recollection as a boy of my hometown county fair in October 1928 is the red, white, and blue bunting of the Democratic Party booth and the pictures of Alfred E. Smith, of New York, the Democratic nominee, and his running mate, Senator Joe T. Robinson, of Arkansas. Joe Robinson blazed a trail of brilliant leadership reaching a climax today in one of the most outstanding State congressional delegations in the history of the United States. No State in the modern history of our Nation has sent to this Congress a more distinguished delegation than that presently serving from the great State of Arkansas. This fact is all the more remarkable when we consider that the Arkansas delegation is comparatively speaking a small delegation composed of only six men. No State delegation wields more influence over the future destiny of this country and upon the free world than our colleagues from Arkansas.

It is fitting and proper that we pay tribute to the people of Arkansas, and I congratulate them for sending to this Congress such an outstanding delegation—each a national leader of renown—men of integrity dedicated to the preservation of this Republic. Much could be written about the ingredients which molded this character and superb leadership. Mr. Speaker, I believe it was the independent spirit, self-reliance, intense patriotism, and Bible-belt philosophy of a great people moving forward in an agrarian environment.

Mr. Speaker, every American can point with pride to: JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, senior Senator and chairman of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, who has conducted a relentless combat against organized crime and racketeering; Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, who is day and night involved in the great struggle to protect the free world against the onslaughts of ruthless communism; WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and one of the world's most influential men today molding American tax and trade policy; E. C. GATHINGS, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Cotton, who aids in the formation of the cotton policy affecting millions of cotton growers and millions of textile employees as well as the taxpayers of the country; OREN HARRIS, chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, scrutinizing and influencing the activities of television, radio, publications, interstate commerce, and foreign commerce; JAMES W. TRIMBLE, member of the powerful Rules Committee supervising the flow of all legislation; and Mr. Speaker, I remind the House of our beloved colleague of many years, Brooks Hays, who is now Special Assistant to the President of the United States.

The Menace in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the recent recommendations for action against Cuba which were submitted to the Organization of American States have brought attention and praise from many corners of this hemisphere. The result of careful investigation and analysis, the special eight-nation committee which made these recommendations has provided the OAS, and the entire hemisphere, with a specific, concrete plan for action to combat the spread of communism from the Kremlin's Caribbean foothold.

The Washington Evening Star, in its editorial of June 10, 1963, states the case for adoption of these recommendations very clearly. I heartily concur with the Star, and include the editorial in the RECORD in order that it may have an even broader audience:

THE MENACE IN CUBA

The special eight-nation investigating committee of the Organization of American States now has somberly confirmed the obvious: Fidel Castro's Cuba, which might more accurately be called the Kremlin's Cuba, is a growing threat to all its neighbors in the Western Hemisphere.

Here are some of the committee's key findings: (1) The continuing presence of Soviet military power on the island—a presence made up of many thousands of troops and technicians—means that the betrayed and captive Cuban nation is being used "as a base for promoting subversive activities in other countries." (2) There is no exaggeration in saying that the place has been converted into a heavily armed beachhead from which Moscow plans to launch ever-increasing violence and disorder throughout the Americas. (3) This holds true for all our neighbors to the south, with special emphasis at the moment on Venezuela, where the Communists openly espouse and practice sabotage and terrorism of the worst kind—as exemplified by their vicious attack a few days ago on the U.S. Army Mission in Caracas.

In sum, as the committee has reported, "Undoubtedly Cuba now constitutes the regional center for subversive action by international communism in America. This is true not only with regard to the spread of Communist ideology but also, and what is more dangerous, because it constitutes a nearby center for training agents of every kind whose function it is to carry on subversion in the countries of the hemisphere." That is why the committee, noting that Dictator Castro has become ominously more militant and pro-violence since his long visit in the Soviet Union, has urged that the OAS, when it meets next month, take positive collective counter-action in such fields as security, intelligence, customs, communications and the control of "the constant and heavy stream of travelers to and from Cuba."

Some of the Americas—notably Mexico and Brazil are a bit skittish and squeamish about all this. They feel, it seems, that any firm effort to check the Kremlin-directed drive to stir up as much trouble as possible in the Western Hemipshere would interfere with certain constitutional liberties. Here again we have a good and altogether depressing example of the soft-headed kind of thinking that persuades certain governments to tolerate, in the name of freedom, the very forces that would destroy them.

Well, regardless of how some of our neighbors may react to it, the new OAS report adds up to an altogether impressive warning about the menace in Cuba. The Kremlin is doing an ugly and supremely provocative job there. And one of these days, whether or not certain OAS members object, or whether or not Nikita Khrushchev is conscious of the possibility, we may find it imperative to move in on the situation with all-out force to clean it up before it gets worse than it is already.

Equal Employment Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, James B. Carey, president of International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, has furnished me a copy of his June 14 letter to the President in which he urged that equal employment opportunities be included in the President's civil rights legislative proposals, and illustrated the necessity for legislative action in this field to give effect to that in others:

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF
ELECTRICAL, RADIO, & MACHINE WORKERS,
Washington, D.C., June 14, 1963.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your speech to the people of the United States and your call for Federal civil rights legislation places you in the forefront of the greatest moral crusade in America today. In 1948, President Truman asked Congress to implement the report of his Committee on Civil Rights, on which I was privileged to serve. Since then and until your speech to the Nation on June 11, 1963, no President has spoken out so forthrightly and boldly. The temper of the times commands a legislative response and new laws. The brave and selfless action of Negroes and whites, particularly the youngsters, has written indelibly on the pages of history that second-class citizenship will no longer be tolerated in the United States. The struggle for civil rights has moved from the courts to the streets.

There is a desperate urgency that there be a legislative approach devised and enacted to provide for stable and rapid progress. Moreover, the legislative response must be as broad as justice and decency demand.

Most of us in the ranks of organized labor have long fought against employment discrimination without regard to the identity of the enemy. We have fought employers, employment agencies, and even those small segments in the ranks of the unions that deny equal employment opportunities. Our success has been limited and the failure to move further is more important than the gains we have made.

We support broad-gage effective legislation in the field of public accommodations. However, it would be a tantalizing fraud to tell a Negro that the color of his skin will no longer be used to prevent him from buying a meal or renting a hotel room if we do not guarantee to him the opportunity to earn money so that he may use these facilities. We believe that it is as urgent that you include equal employment opportunities in your civil rights legislative proposals as that you include other elements of a program adequate to meet the needs of the Nation.

We commend you for your Administration's enforcement of the Constitution in accordance with the interpretation handed down by the Supreme Court. However, as you, yourself pointed out, legislation is necessary. We believe that the U.S. Attorney General should have both the responsibility and the authority to undertake lawsuits whenever any of the civil rights of an American citizen is jeopardized or denied. We believe that the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court, finding that segregated schools violate the Constitution, should be implemented and that legislation be enacted that will guarantee prompt and certain integration. The right to vote is an indispensable need of any free society. Limitation on this right has been demonstrated. We support legislation to protect that right including displacement of local registration officials by Federal registrars where it is demonstrated that the local officials are embarked on a policy of obstructing the right to vote.

We are proud that we have participated in every arena in which has been fought the fight for the equality of man. We earnestly hope that the struggle may be diverted from the streets to the halls of Congress. We will be in either place or both places as the needs may arise. We hope and pray that under your leadership a free and decent society will be achieved now.

Respectfully yours,

James B. Carey,
President.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following newsletter of June 15, 1963:

Washington Report

(By Congressman Bruce Alger, 5th District, Texas)

HOUSE KILLS NEW AREA REDEVELOPMENT FUNDS

A major victory in the fight to slow down Federal spending was achieved by the House of Representatives this week with the defeat of President Kennedy's request for an additional $455 million to continue the Area Redevelopment Act, 209 to 204; 152 Republicans and 57 Democrats voted against the spending bill; 189 Democrats and 15 Republicans were in favor of it. The bill would have provided additional authorization for loans and grants to carry the area redevelopment program for the next 2 years. The House vote will not end the program, but will slow it down and should result in additional savings of the taxpayers money. Chief arguments against appropriation of new funds were based on the minority report of the Banking and Currency Committee which pointed out the lack of accomplishment of the program in its first 2 years of operation and the record of using Federal funds to transplant unemployment and to create new businesses and jobs at the expense of those already existing.

Some examples from the minority report: (1) The Area Redevelopment Agency approved a loan to the Ponchartrain Hotel Co., Detroit, Mich., in the amount of $1,894,525 to assist financing a 432-unit motor hotel with the claim it would add 450 jobs. Since the hotel occupancy rate for Detroit in 1962 was only 54 percent, it is clear the new motor hotel will not add even one hotel job on a net basis to the economy of Detroit. At best, employment at the new facility will result in a corresponding decrease in employment at existing hotel facilities. As a matter of fact, a net decrease in hotel employment for Detroit might easily be the result if the new facility forces existing hotel facilities, already suffering from excessive capacity, into bankruptcy. (2) The Agency approved a $418,000 loan to the Tomahawk Paper Co., of Tomahawk, Wis., to establish a papermill to make household tissues. Present capacity of that industry, without addition of this new plant, as of January 1, 1963, is in excess of current consumption in the United States by more than 400,000 tons. The 73 new jobs claimed for this new facility simply means that corresponding unemployment will be transplanted to existing plants which are only operating at 84 percent of capacity. (3) In Dorchester County, Md., an application has been made for a loan to build a $2 million plant to process soybeans into poultry feed. The plant would be in the heart of the Delmarva Peninsula, made up of parts of Delaware, Maryland and Virginia, which accounted for nearly 30 percent of U.S. poultry production just after World War II, but now represents less than 10 percent. Since Delmarva's share of the poultry business has shown little inclination toward growth, other feed companies in the area claim a new plant would cost more jobs than it would create. Typical of the reaction of the citizens: "This ARA is supposed to be creating new jobs, but they're just about ready to take mine away"—"We could hardly complain if this were a privately financed operation, but it just isn't fair to use our tax money to build a plant to drive us out of business."

In my remarks during debate I pointed out: The ARA on April 15, 1963, approved a $68,250 loan to the Farm Ranch Cooperative Association of Wetumka, Okla., to establish a feed and grain mill. I have introduced a bill to place co-ops on an equal taxation basis along with the rest of business. But my question is this: Is not this using taxpayers' money to set up a tax-exempt business in competition with a tax-paying business? In answering my question, Congressman Harvey, of Michigan, said in part: "In our hearings and the press there have been cited instance after instance of the ARA being used for the purpose of promoting more competition in a particular field where competition was not needed."

My principal objection to the area redevelopment program is the use of it to establish Federal criteria for designating distressed areas and this is just not possible. More than one-third of all the counties of the country have been declared eligible areas—depressed areas. Common sense tells us that in this period of reasonably good prosperity, that just is not true. With the House action this week we have taken at least a short step toward the return to the encouragement of private business, the only real way to increased economic growth and the creation of new jobs.

MUZZLING CONGRESS

A subtle move seems to be underway to muzzle Congress. For the past week one Member has objected to all special orders, that is requests of Members for time to speak on the floor on subjects not directly related to the legislation of the day. Later in the week a second Member decided that the other Members would be limited to only one insertion in the Appendix of the Congressional Record and would not be permitted to use extraneous material in connection with floor speeches. He effectively used this form of censorship by objecting when unanimous consent was required to put such remarks in the Record. I strongly objected to this abridgement of the rights of all Members of Congress, those with whom I disagree as well as those whose views I find compatible. The House as a forum for debate and the expression of views must not be subject to the censorship of an individual Member or group of Members. If the President is making mistakes, one of the best ways to cover up is to stop criticism by Members of Congress and this is the real danger in the actions now taking place in the House. As I stated on the floor, "I shall not set myself up as a censor of any other Member of the House, nor do I think any other Member has that privilege." I will certainly not be silenced in presenting views I think are important to the people of my district and the Nation, or in criticizing the President when, in my opinion, his actions threaten the freedoms of our people and the security of the Nation.

KOREAN TAXES AGAIN EXTENDED

The Tax Rate Extension Act of 1963 extended for another year excise taxes and Korean war taxes. I opposed the extension and joined in the minority report to point out: (1) This is a tax increase bill. Expiration of tax rate increases imposed temporarily for 2 years to meet a specific crisis cannot be properly referred to as tax reduction. On the contrary any bill to continue these temporary rate increases can only be regarded as bills to increase taxes. (2) There is a moral obligation to remove tax rates which were sold to the people as temporary taxes. (3) A basic solution to removing these taxes and enacting an overall tax cut in all brackets is to cut Federal spending. (4) Excise taxes hit those of lowest income hardest of all.

ARCHITECT OF FAILURE TO HEAD DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS

The man the President is sending to deal with Khrushchev, to reach an agreement which could result in total disarmament of the United States, is Averell Harriman, the architect of failure in our policies of combating the Communist conspiracy. Appalling as the President's announcement that we were suspending nuclear testing in the atmosphere and were entering into top level negotiations with the Soviets in Moscow, was to the American people, the naming of Harriman as the top negotiator is simply beyond belief.

It was Harriman who arranged the coalition government of Laos at the Geneva Conference which is now resulting in the complete takeover of Laos by the Communists. In fact, Mr. Harriman has been involved in many of the disastrous agreements, particularly regarding Rumania. If the President insists on continuing to send the Nation on a suicidal course in international affairs, the least he can do is to put an engineer at the throttle who will recognize danger signals when they are flashing.

Business and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., at the luncheon and annual meeting of the Effective Citizens Organization, Washington, D.C., on June 12, 1963:

BUSINESS AND POLITICS

I am delighted to share in this occasion, where there is such graphic proof that business and politics can coexist. You will, I hope, forgive my obvious pleasure at this sight but I have spent a good many years of active participation in these two worlds. Occasionally I feel like the man who was asked, "Which is more affectionate—blondes or redheads?" He replied, "I can't say. My wife has been both."

There were days when my friends in the business community classed me as "one of those dirty politicians" and other days when the politicians put me in the "business czar" niche. Of course, the truth of the matter is that I just happened to be a man in business who enjoyed political activity and liked to have a part in determining the future government of my State and my country.

The virtual bill of divorcement between business and the political-governmental area is the most incongruous situation of our era. The average businessman complains to his circle of friends and associates that Government is a headache—a nuisance infringing on his prerogatives in running his affairs. In the next breath, he proclaims that old saw, "Politics is dirty" and he simply will not be contaminated. I might say this is a rather unsophisticated comment for one who in any way is identified with our current society. From the politician's point of view, the businessman represents one of dozens of special interests which are not always willing to defer to the politician's judgment of what is the larger national interest. A politician has to be reelected if he's going to do anybody, including himself, any good and he often feels that the businessman fails to recognize the essential need for compromise in political matters.

I cannot deny, much as I would like to, that a breach exists between business and Government. I do believe this breach is rooted in a lack of understanding and mutual respect on both sides. The differences between these two essential elements of our modern society rest on a kind of peculiar competitive fear that has developed within the two power structures of this Nation. Differences are not resolved when both sides withdraw into their shells and snipe away at each other. Wishing won't make it so when one says "Government, go away" any more than when politicians say, "Let me legislate in peace without considering the interests of business." Until permanent lines of communication are established between business and Government and kept in good repair, a serious threat to the American system will remain.

Both sides can help to establish this rapport but the bulk of the responsibility rests with the business community. Government can try to bring business representation into a political administration through appointments but the businessman must accept the job. And business has the same obligation as labor or any other segment of our society and, for that matter, any individual citizen; namely, to take an interest in political affairs and then do something about it.

This brings up some practical problems. I am genuinely amazed by the attitude of many business people who are sincerely interested in politics. Take the man who is running a successful factory operation. He has demonstrated his leadership ability and now has developed an interest in politics. He didn't step into the top spot in the factory his first day on the job; yet he will present himself at his local party headquarters fully expecting to be named county chairman on the spot—or nominated for public office. While many of the qualities required for business success are the same factors necessary for political achievement, you can't transfer in grade. You must start at the bottom of the political ladder and prove your right to advancement, just as you do in business.

Of course, as we all realize, there is always an exception to the rule which has never been better illustrated than the appearance on this platform of General Eisenhower, our honoree who is to be the recipient of Effective Citizens Organization's first award.

I know General Eisenhower remembers my conversation with him in SHAPE, in his headquarters in Paris the day before he was relieved of his command by General Ridgeway. On that occasion I told him that I was possibly one of the few men he had met or would meet who would advise him that in my judgment he was going to be nominated at the Republican Convention and subsequently elected in November.

In that same conversation I very frankly advised him that I wouldn't vote for him because I am a lifelong regular organization Democrat, and that I was going to be a delegate in the convention in Chicago and would, of course, support the Democratic nominee who would oppose him. We had a very friendly discussion which was too long to recite here. I am sure the general also recalls that conversation.

A second, and in the long run, more important practical consideration is your attitude as a businessman toward a politician. You have every right, and, in a very real sense, an obligation to represent your legitimate interests to any elected official. Your welfare is of vital concern to the ultimate health and soundness of the country, financially and socially. But you must remember that the politician is bound by an oath to assume responsibility for the public interest. Occasionally, he may possess facts and information not available to you which influence his decision. At other times, he may be trying to reconcile the divergent interests of many groups, molding a policy which will result in the greatest benefit to all. If an officeholder disagrees with your views once in a while, you have no right to condemn him—out-of-hand—as opposed to business.

Certainly, the protection of your own interests gives you a good practical reason to be concerned with politics, but I would point out another more fundamental justification if you need it. As Americans, we have so many blessings that we tend to be complacent. But have you stopped to think that your personal political freedoms are basic to everything else you enjoy? Without our political system and its foundation of principles, there would be no freedom of speech or press or assembly. There would be no protection from search and seizure. There would be no guarantee of the freedom to worship—or not to worship, as you choose. True, these principles can exist, even in a dictatorship, but they exist as privileges, not as basic natural rights. Their existence rests on the whim of a despot and not as the fundamental assumption underlying the law of the land. Without politics, force is our only recourse in defense of these principles. But politics provides an orderly mechanism through which any citizen can participate in their protection and implementation.

Today we face a challenge to these principles such as we have never known. Traditionally, our peace-loving Nation has been willing to take up arms in defense of our beliefs and rights. Since World War II, we have developed a military potential which makes an all-out war unprofitable for an aggressor. Thus the battleground has become men's minds and the weapons of war are ideas. If the house of democracy is to withstand the storm of communism, we must strengthen it from the inside as well as out. How can we hope to maintain that strength if the able, competent men and women of the American business community choose to sit on the sidelines, denying our political system the benefit of their support and leadership?

Our Nation is in one of its most difficult eras, and it requires the very best in leadership if we are to preserve the freedom of this Republic in an increasingly hostile world. Inevitably lasting effective leadership must come in part from our responsible business leaders. Let me exhort all business leaders to reexamine your understanding of the processes of government in this Republic, and its need for your contribution.

The last decade has seen great strides in this area. Ten years ago no major company in the United States had what we now call a public affairs program. Today more than 300 companies maintain such activities. Some of you here today were the pioneers of corporate public affairs; some of you are neophytes; and some of you are still our "heathen brethren," open, we hope, to conversion.

The merits of public affairs have been widely recognized and many national groups have entered the field. Literally thousands of industrial employees have benefited from company-sponsored political and economic education courses. Communications programs and "Get out the vote" campaigns have resulted in a better informed, more responsive electorate. Bipartisan, inplant political fundraising drives are a valuable potential answer to the problem of broadening the base of political contributions. These public affairs activities are reaching and affecting hundreds of thousands of men and women and returning the investment of business and industry in them many times over.

I am pleased to appear in conjunction with this award presentation today, both as a personal admirer of the honoree and as a lifetime Democrat representing a bipartisan organization in the presentation of an award to a former Republican President.

It is particularly fitting that the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower be the recipient of the Effective Citizens Organization's first award for outstanding contributions to the public affairs field. The Effective Citizens Organization itself—and thus, in large measure, the public affairs movement—was born as the result of a casual conversation between two men present at this table today—H. Bruce Palmer and Dwight D. Eisenhower. Great credit goes to the men who struggled with the implementation of the general's suggestion, organizing and maintaining the Effective Citizens Organization.

To Dwight Eisenhower go the thanks of the American people, not only for the formation of organizations like the Effective Citizens Organization, but for his continued interest and support of all efforts to expand citizen interest and participation in the affairs of our Nation. He is an example of the citizen-turned-politician and he has lent his prestige to the cause of better government and increased acceptance of political responsibility by every American citizen.

Good government is not a partisan issue. Wherever we may disagree as party members, we share the concern for our Nation's future and the preservation of our system.

I have here the resolution adopted by the Effective Citizens Organization board of directors, June 12, 1963, which reads as follows:

"Whereas Dwight D. Eisenhower has maintained a consistent interest in furthering the cause of increased citizen participation in political and governmental affairs; and

"Whereas he has willingly given of his time and effort in support of those activities designed to increase citizenship responsibility; and

"Whereas he has offered leadership, inspiration, and encouragement to the public affairs movement and the Effective Citizens Organization; and

"Whereas he has personally exemplified through a life of devoted public service those qualities of good citizenship which have earned for him the respect and admiration of the American people and which are the characteristics that the public affairs movement strives to promote in every citizen; and be it therefore

"*Resolved,* That the board of directors of the Effective Citizens Organization expresses gratitude and appreciation to Dwight D. Eisenhower for his contribution to the cause of good citizenship and to the public affairs movement; and further

"That the board of directors of the Effective Citizens Organization directs the creation of an award in recognition of his personal contributions to be presented at the annual meeting of the Effective Citizens Organization."

In accordance with this directive, it is my privilege to present this award to you, Dwight D. Eisenhower, inscribed with your words which are a fitting motto for the public affairs field: "Politics ought to be the part-time profession of every citizen who would protect the rights and privileges of free people."

The Man and the Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate a very excellent commencement address made by one of South Carolina's most outstanding doctors, Austin T. Moore, to the graduating class of Wofford College at Spartanburg, S.C., on June 2, 1963.

Dr. Moore is an internationally recognized bone surgeon and specialist in this field, and has been a leader in civic and social activities in South Carolina as well as in the medical profession nationally.

Dr. Moore's address entitled "The Man and the Challenge" is unique in its message, and I wish that everyone could read it.

Mr. President, I have been informed by the Public Printer that the printing of the address will require 2⅔ pages of the Congressional Record, at an estimated cost of $240. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that this important address be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Man and the Challenge

(Address by Austin T. Moore, A.B., M.D., F.A.C.S., F.I.C.S., LL.D. (Hon.), Sc.D. (Hon.), Orthopedic Surgeon, Columbia, S.C.)

President Marsh, distinguished faculty, members of the graduating class, visitors and friends, at the outset may I exceed to this 109th graduating class of Wofford College my heartiest congratulations. First, I wish to commend you on your resolve to obtain a college education. Next, I compliment you on having the pertinacity to pursue a long, hard course to its completion. Finally, I congratulate you on having the uncommon wisdom to select this fine old institution, Wofford College, as the place to receive your instruction. The little success I have achieved is in a large measure due to basic precepts implanted in my undergraduate mind while a student on this time-honored campus.

"You have fought the fight, you have finished the course, you have kept the faith."[1]

That is the subject of my address to you. You have met the challenge. You have responded to it. The measure of a man is the way he meets the challenge.

This is a commencement exercise. You are getting your degrees. Some of you may think you have completed your education. Your education has actually just begun. You are commencing your voyage of life. You are about to set sail. There will be pleasant days, stormy days and perilous days. You will have great experiences. You will learn something every day. You will continue to become educated.

My purpose today is to talk to you in a simple, impersonal way. I am neither an orator nor an educator. I shall make no pretense of talking in that vein. I love this old campus. I honor and revere its distinguished faculty who were my preceptors and mentors many years ago when I was here. Their teachings have meant much to me. I hope I may be able to say something to you that you will remember and that may help you in the years to come.

In 1920 I stood here to receive my diploma. A great many changes have taken place in the intervening 43 years. I have changed, Wofford has changed, our State and our country has changed. The world has changed. Marcus Aurelius has said, "There is nothing so constant as change."

Several days ago I looked at the old Bible I was given at the time of my graduation here. It was autographed by the 11 members of the faculty who were my professors. The name of Henry Nelson Snyder, immortal in Wofford history, stands first on the list. The other distinguished faculty members were D. A. DuPre, J. A. Gamewell, A. G. Rembert, J. E. Clinkscales, D. D. Wallace, C. B. Waller, W. L. Pugh, J. A. Childs, A. Mason DePre and E. H. Shuler. At that time the faculty of 11 taught a student body of approximately 300. Today instead of 11 faculty members there are 53. In contrast to 300, there is now a student body of 800 and there are many magnificent new buildings. Wofford has grown in cultural and physical stature—and is justly proud.

I could address you on the changes that have been made in my lifetime. I could outline some of the thrills, some of the disappointments, some of the joys, and some of the sorrows I have had in adjusting myself to these changes. Possibly these experiences could be of help to you. I could recite some spectacular opportunities that have arisen in my lifetime and how some men have seized these opportunities and others have defaulted. I could possibly point out to you some opportunities that will surely come your way. Rather than do this I prefer to refer you to the magnificent address your great president, Dr. Charles Marsh, delivered to the Clemson College graduating class in January of this year, 1963, the title of which was "Opportunities Unlimited."

I wonder if you fully realize the marvelous age in which you are living, the opportunities you have and what a glorious privilege it is to live at this time.

Most of you could not imagine some conditions that existed as recently as the turn of the current century. Those were the days before radio, television, air conditioning or airplanes. There were buggy-wheeled and steam-propelled automobiles, wood-burning locomotives, carbide gas lights, no screens on doors or windows, no modern sanitary facilities, and no wonder drugs. There has been more change and more progress in the last 60 years than in all the prior years of recorded civilization. Almost without question more progress will be made in the remaining years of this century than has occurred up to the present time. It has been my good fortune to be a witness to this unprecedented period of development. You will see the incomprehensible developments of the atomic and space age. Let us pray that these revelations to come will insure "peace and good will" for the universe.

Now what about man's response to challenge. You have accepted the challenge of obtaining a college education. The more arduous and difficult has been the task the more has been the stimulus to you to overcome it. Some who started with you have been of fainter heart and have "fallen by the wayside." Has it occurred to you that statistics show that few of you will go on to outstanding success? Most of you will be successful. Some of you will fail. Have you soberly reflected that some of you will be decimated by accident or disease? How many of you, do you think will be able to return to this campus 43 years from now? How many of you have fully determined precisely what will be your life's work? Do you know that only 15 percent of college students know what they want to do when they graduate? The time allotted to complete your life's work is much shorter than you think. Soon you will be facing difficulties and making important decisions. The measure of a man is the way he meets the challenge.

That famous philosopher of history, Arnold Toynbee, has written a masterpiece of erudition, "A Study of History." He holds that the course of history is ruled by psychic influences and not by deterministic philosophy or materialistic forces. He maintains that the well being of a civilization lies in its ability to respond successfully to human and environmental challenges. In other words, a civilization may be measured by the way its people respond to a great challenge. He makes many comparisons of people and races such as Spartans, Nomads, Polynesians, and Eskimos. He compares lightskin- and darkskin-people. He compares environment of high, cold countries with that in low, hot countries. For example, the cold, hard, rugged hills of Scotland have produced a people much more rugged than their English neighbors. It is interesting that nearly one-half of the Prime Ministers of the United Kingdom have been purebred Scots.

Footnotes at end of speech.

He compares the virtues of adversity with the stimulus of blows, pressures and penalizations. It is interesting that different peoples respond to challenges differently under similar conditions. In similar climates Egyptians have responded and developed differently from African Negroes. The Norsemen have developed differently from the Eskimos.

In a Christian democratic civilization I am in complete agreement that all men should have equal opportunity but I am convinced there are different breeds of men just as there are different breeds of animals. Society follows a natural evolutionary process and certain basic changes cannot be enforced by regimentation or legislation.

You men are the leaders of tomorrow. Never before have the opportunities been greater and never before have there been greater challenges. You will have the responsibility of determining the course of future history.

Education is the key to world progress and you are most fortunate to have received your collegiate training in an institution of the type that is represented by your alma mater. There are advantages of great universities where specialized courses are available but there will always be a place for smaller colleges where the arts and humanities are taught in a cultured atmosphere. With a broad, cultural understanding that may be obtained in this type of college a man may prepare himself to fit into any position. Special knowledge will come later with special study and experience.

There are a few broad challenges I will mention before I discuss the individual challenge as it relates to you.

Education and religion go hand in hand. The great outstanding challenge is to enlighten the world. It has been estimated that a college education is one of the finest bargains one can buy. For a comparatively small outlay a college education has a value of over $150,000 in increasing one's earning capacity. All of you are familiar with the recent surveys that show, shamefully, that our State of South Carolina stands near the bottom in illiteracy and earned annual income. The survey shows that the counties which have the greatest percentage of nonwhite illiterate population have the lowest rate of earned annual income. Education will find a way to remedy this problem in our State and only through education can world problems be solved.

The next great challenge is communism that has spread its insidious tentacles to many places throughout the world. It is feeding and thriving on the ignorance of underprivileged people, but, being a dictatorship and teaching godlessness, it will never survive. Righteousness shall prevail. A basic urge of all men is to be free and to be allowed to worship something good. Education and spiritual enlightment are spreading all over the world and in time all men will realize that democracy is the only way of life, with freedom of worship and all the other freedoms it assures.

Over 100 years ago in Locksley Hall Tennyson wrote:

"For I dipt into the future, far as human
eye could see,
Saw the vision of the world and all the
wonder that would be,
Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down
with costly bales;
Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and
there rain'd a ghastly dew,
From the nations airy navies grappling in
the central blue.

* * * * *

Till the war drums throbbed no longer and
the battle flags were furled
In the Parliament of man, the federation
of the world."

Such a time can only come with universal education and morality as expressed in the practical democratic way of life.

The great fear and danger of a democracy is that evil demagogs may finally achieve so much power and exercise such control that democracy will be converted into a dictatorship. This is the great challenge before the American people at the present time. A centralized form of government precedes dictatorship and our Government is seeking more and more power in Washington.

Lord Akton said, "Power leads to corruption and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

This has been demonstrated many times in many places throughout the world. America, through democracy, has become the greatest Nation on earth and it makes no sense that we should return to the type of government from which our forebears fled.

We must accept this challenge and discard the handout, socialistic philosophy that is being preached. This kind of government is demoralizing and builds so great a national debt that it may not be retired by your and future generations. A budget that becomes increasingly out of balance will ruin this or any other country. Stalin once said he would make us drown ourselves in our own red ink. We must return to conservatism to avoid disaster and dictation.

No government can give you anything. It can only return to you what it takes away—minus the cost of operation. Any government that is big enough to give you all you want is big enough to take away from you all you've got.

We must return to individual freedom and to States rights.

In Honolulu I listened to a powerful address by Adm. Chester Ward. He quoted Benjamin Franklin who said "Those who would exchange freedom for security deserve neither freedom nor security." From George Washington he quoted "If we are to secure the peace it must be known that at all times we are ready for war." To the statement we would rather be red than dead, Admiral Ward said, "We don't have to be either red or dead. We need leaders in this country who are supremely unafraid and dedicated to the cause of freedom." We must be willing to stand up and be counted. We must accept and we must meet the challenge.

Now let us discuss the response you must develop to the challenges of everyday life. Your attitude will either be positive or negative. If negative you will try to escape. If positive you will face the challenge joyously—"as a strong man about to run a race."[2]

Happy is the man who makes adjustments and happy is he who finds himself in his work. He develops self confidence and the will to win. A winner never quits and a quitter never wins.

Some men have the capacity to adjust and react positively, others do not. Most men, through training and self discipline, can greatly enhance their possibilities. A mediocre runner can develop into a good track man, but to be a champion he has to have a cerain built-in reserve. The champion runner is born with these potentials. When apparently exhausted, he is able to get his "second wind." This has been proven scientifically. If one's chromosomes are arranged correctly he may, with training, be eminently successful. If the chromosome pattern is asymmetric he may become a chromosome catastrophy. Man has to take stock. He should be his own severest critic and he should honestly evaluate himself. He must do his best. Over 30 years ago I arrived at my philosophy at daybreak one morning driving on my way to Charleston to teach at the medical college. I found myself, among other things, worrying that the cases I had operated on the previous week might be in trouble. I then began to rationalize and consider that I had only certain potentials and I had certain limitations. I reasoned that if I was honestly doing my very best then I could not possibly do more. With this thought I achieved peace of mind. It can bring sleep on many troubled nights. "Do your best, your very best and do it every day." We must honestly evaluate our potentials and we must candidly admit our limitations. We must also realize we have an obligation to society to employ our talents wisely. With these basic understandings we cannot possibly do more than what we know is our best—then comes peace of mind.

To do one's best requires constant use of "The Master Word." Were I gifted with a silver tongue I might try to address you as did Sir William Osler when he delivered his memorable valedictory oration "Equinimitas" to the graduating class and faculty of medicine at the University of Pennsylvania in 1889. He said equinimity and imperturbability are two most desirable attitudes. Later, in another address, he spoke on the master word—"And the master word is work. Though a little one, the master word (work) looms large in meaning. It is the open sesame to every portal, the great equalizer in the world, the true philosophers' stone which transmutes all the base metal of humanity into gold."

Thomas Carlyle said "Blessed is he who has found his work. Let him ask no other blessedness."

A successful businessman was once asked to name his ideas of the necessary qualifications for success. He said there were three:

First, An honest attitude; second, reasonable intelligence; third, willingness to work.

Another equally successful businessman gave his three qualifications as: First, work; second, work; third, work.

On the walls of Dr. Abdul Rahim's orthopedic department in Karachi, Pakistan, I saw a portrait of Sir Robert Jones, the father of orthopedic surgery. Underneath were inscribed Longfellow's words from "The Ladder":

"The heights by great men reached and kept
Were not obtained by sudden flight.
But they, while their companions slept,
Were toiling upward in the night."

Work. Work. Work.

The only place you find success without work is in the dictionary.

We have spoken of success and the challenge one meets on his way to success but first of all we should understand what is meant by the world success. Surely it is not in gaining material things in life. Ill-gotten gains do not bring happiness. The life of an individual who has acquired possessions in this way cannot be considered a success. Likewise spiritual values alone, without proper correlation and use cannot bring success. Briefly, success may be defined as having pride and happiness in the accomplishment of one's endeavors.

Enthusiasm is another prerequisite for success. Emerson states—"Nothing great was ever achieved without enthusiasm." You should be enthusiastic when applying for work and you should be happy and enthusiastic in carrying out your work. As an employer you should hire with enthusiasm and, when necessary, fire with enthusiasm, but remember you cannot fire your way to success.

Life may be compared to a long voyage and the measure of a man is the way he meets his challenge. In good weather all hands cry "sail on." In foul and turbulent weather the weakhearted falter, some flounder, some may be washed overboard but the stronghearted sail on. The successful skipper eventually completes his voyage, he comes into harbor, he makes fast his moorings and calmly he gets off the boat.

The intrepid courage of Columbus has been depicted in that inspiring poem written by

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

Joaquin Miller after he had read the words the admiral wrote in his logbook day after day on his first long voyage across the uncharted Atlantic. Storms had ravaged the ships, the *Pinta* had lost her rudder and the men were threatening mutiny. Columbus was on the verge of despair. He had set his course and neither danger, darkness, hunger, panic, nor despair could turn him from it. Day after day he wrote "This day we sailed on."

When men of lesser courage faltered in their faith the poet Miller had Columbus answer every question with "Sail on! Sail on! and on!"

"They sailed. They sailed. Then spake the mate
This mad sea shows his teeth tonight
He curls his lip, he lies in wait,
With lifted teeth as if to bite!
Brave Admiral say but one good word
What shall we do when hope is gone?
The words leapt like a leaping sword—
Sail on! Sail on! Sail on! and on.

* * * * *

He gained a world, he
Gave that world
Its grandest lesson:
On, Sail on!"

One of the most powerful and inspirational poems ever written was found after the death of a young man, who in "Invictus" thanked God for his "unconquerable soul".

William Ernest Henley was only 25 years of age but since childhood he had suffered from severe tuberculosis of the bones. One foot has been amputated and for 2 years he had been lying on a cot in the Edinburg Infirmary. He had undergone more than 20 operations and was being treated with new methods by the famous Dr. Lister in the hopes that the remaining limb and his life could be saved. The challenge was extreme, his response was magnificent—"I won't give up", he said:

"Out of the night that covers me
Black as a pit from pole to pole
I thank whatever Gods may be
For my unconquerable soul.

In the fell clutch of circumstance
I have not winced or cried aloud
Under the bludgeonings of chance
My head is bloody, but unbowed.

Beyond this place of wrath and tears
Looms but the horror of the shade
And yet the menace of the years
Finds and shall find me unafraid.

It matters not how strait the gate or
How charged with punishments and scroll.
I am the master of my fate,
I am the captain of my soul."

Invictus is known throughout the English speaking world. It has brought courage to countless thousands to accept the blows of fate, to triumph over physical handicaps and carry on with head unbowed.

In all walks of life there are times when conditions must be evaluated, calm decisions must be made and deliberate actions taken. Precipitant actions may bring uncalculated or disastrous results. In surgery, when conditions are difficult or critical, there is no place for the man who flinches or quails. Those are the times that try mens souls and the measure of the man is the way he meets the challenge. The confident, competent and experienced surgeon, in times of great stress, takes pride in the knowledge of his skill. He doesn't become excited. He calmly, surely and swiftly goes about his work. That is no time for indecision. That is the time to operate.

It is recorded that Sir Winston Churchill, early in 1942, was on the verge of desperation. America had not yet come into the war. He was deserted by France and the indications were it was hopeless to try to resist the crushing forces of the evil German dictator. He called Petain but could get no support. He was haggard, worn, tired, and suffering from loss of sleep, but before retiring, he thought of the phrase "We can fight them on the beaches and in the streets."

The next morning he made his ever-to-be remembered, powerful address that inspired his fellow countrymen and saved the Western World—"We shall defend our island, whatever the cost may be. We shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets. We shall fight in the hills, we shall never surrender."

One of the greatest qualities for success is to be supremely unafraid. "When you walk all alone, hold your head up high—and don't be afraid of the dark."[3] Self-confidence and the will to win is represented by: I am what I think I am. Believe you are a winner and you will be a winner. In Proverbs it is stated: "As a man thinketh in his heart so is he."

There is also a quality of toughness that is necessary to be a winner. It has been my privilege to work with athletes at our great university in Columbia for 36 years. We have a saying, "When the going gets tough the tough get going." Toughness comes as a result of rigorous training. The greater the adversity the greater the stimulus. The greater the pride in physical strength the greater the satisfaction of achievement.

Those in sports who are conditioned by training respond immediately and eagerly to the challenge of the contest. Also it is an established fact that they have the fewest injuries. Among our athletes it is known that in order to win you must have the will to win. This we call desire.

Chuck Noe, our head coach of basketball, tells a wonderful story to illustrate desire. The setting of the story was the last football game of the season when Columbia University played Brown University. One of the better players had just lost his father but insisted on coming out in uniform. He pressed earnestly to start the game but Coach Lou Little held him on the bench. The game was not going well and the benched player could no longer be denied. On his first play he took the ball and by terrific, driving slashes he tore his way through for a very substantial gain. From then on his playing was spectacular. He ran, he passed, he blocked, he tackled, he was all over the field. Lou Little had never seen anything like it. His efforts were by far the greatest contribution in winning the ball game. Previously he had been considered a good ballplayer but today he was superb and sensational. Coach Little found him at the end of the game sitting with his face in his hands. He put his arm around his shoulders and said, "You were magnificent. You were terrific. I'm proud of you. How could you do it?" "Coach," he asked, "You have seen me leading my Dad around the campus?" "Yes," said Coach Little, "I knew he was blind." "Well, my Daddy wanted me to play football. He was proud of my playing football. This was my last game and this was the first time my Daddy could ever see me play football." Desire.

In addition to desire, the will to win, and proper conditioning we need faith.

Buddy, the son of my good friend, Dr. Theo DuBose, was a fighter pilot in World War II. His plane, "Sweet Eloise," was named for the lovely young wife he had left in America. One dark night, well after midnight he left his base in England, all alone. He was bound for the African coast to take part in the invasion of Europe. The trip was long and his tanks held barely enough gas. On the way he ran into headwinds and he was fearful he might not make his destination. There were no lights, no communications, no contacts. He was far from home, all alone, and over a dark, angry sea. He wrote back home, "There was nobody out there but me and God and Sweet Eloise." It is well to have God for a copilot.

If I may be allowed to become personal there is one final story—years ago when my son was a little boy about 10 years of age we were caught in a fearful storm on Lake Murray. We were trying to get back home but the storm broke when we were several miles away. I had hauled down the sails and was running for refuge behind a chain of small islands. It was cold, rain was descending in sheets and I could scarcely see. As I looked forward I realized I was headed for a rocky reef. I came about but the small auxiliary engine was not sufficiently strong to make headway against the wind. The only recourse to prevent being dashed to pieces on the rocks was to throw out the anchor. Fortunately the anchor caught hold before we reached the rocks. By this time is was black dark. We hurriedly secured the rigging and went down below into the small cabin where were our supplies. We were wet to the skin and chilled to the bone. We stripped off our wet clothing and snuggled down in our sleeping bags to get warm. The wind was howling the shrouds were slapping and the boat was pitching in the storm. My little son didn't whimper or cry aloud. I knew any minute anything might happen but to comfort him I said "Everything is ship shape, don't worry. Even if the storm continue tomorrow I am sure Mr. Oliver will come up in his big boat to tow us back home." He looked up at me and said, "Daddy, I hope no one comes to get us." That was one of the finest and one of the proudest experiences of my life. I hope no one comes to get us. We'll go it alone—and love it. The measure of a man is the way he meets the challenge.

In conclusion I wish to remind you again that life is a challenge and you succeed or fail in direct proportion to your own desires and responses. There will be times when the way is uncertain. Remember, that which cannot be avoided must be endured; the happy man is the one who makes adjustments; and don't forget the master word is work.

"Full many a fighter is whipped before the fight is begun.
Full many a race is lost ere even the course is run.
Think big and you'll strive ahead; think small and you'll lag behind;
Think that you can and you will, it's all in the state of mind."[4]

Prepare yourself mind, body, and spirit. The healthy body makes a healthy mind. The mind is prepared through education, the body through conditioning, the spirit through desire and divine assistance.

I am happy and proud to be here to take part in this commencement of your voyage of life. I hope you may remember some of the things I have said. Do your best, work hard, hold your heads up high and don't be afraid of the dark. The measure of a man is the way he meets the challenge.

Sail on with light hearts, sail on with self confidence, sail on with desire and enthusiasm. Sail on, sail on, sail on and on.

Good luck and good sailing.

---

[1] Bible—Timothy 4: 1.

[2] Bible—Psalms 19: 2.

[3] "You'll never Walk Alone"—Rogers and Hammerstein—"Carousel."

[4] Anonymous.

Pope John's Legacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the entire world suffered a profound loss upon the recent death of His Holiness Pope John XXIII. His words and deeds were filled with compassion and affection for all mankind. Indeed, his passing has brought a sense of deep grief to us all. Archbishop Patrick O'Boyle of Washington, delivered the sermon at the pontifical requiem Mass for Pope John held last Friday, June 14, 1963, at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception. In his remarks the Archbishop paid eloquent and lasting tribute to the memory of Pope John XXIII. Feeling that the Archbishop's fervent and heartfelt comments will be of interest to my colleagues I am including his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD at this time:

[From the Catholic Standard, June 14, 1963]

POPE JOHN'S LEGACY

(By Archbishop O'Boyle)

"The livery you wear must be tender compassion, kindness, humility, gentleness, and patience. * * * And to crown all this, charity; that is the bond that makes us perfect."
—Colossians, chapter III, 12, 13.

The death of Pope John XXIII came as a severe shock to all of us. It has left a void in our hearts which only the healing passage of time will be able to fill. Meanwhile let us ask ourselves, for our own instruction and edification, what manner of man was this great Pope that the entire human family should have been so profoundly influenced by his life and should now be so grievously saddened by his death. What was it about him that spontaneously caught the imagination of men and women everywhere in the world and won for him their abiding admiration and respect and, more than that, their filial affection?

Part of the answer to this question can be found in the writings of the Holy Father himself. He was the least complicated and the least self-conscious of men. Fortunately, he has left us a few scattered paragraphs, written at 25-year intervals, which tell us more about his basic priestly character than a self-centered and introspective individual could have told us about himself in a full-length autobiography.

In 1932, in a letter to a personal friend, Pope John wrote in part as follows: "My approach to life is still the same as it has always been, namely, to believe my own eyes, to interpret everything in the best possible light, to take comfort in the good which I see around me rather than to be distraught by the vision of overwhelming evil, and then to look ahead confidently to the future."

The 51-year old Papal Nuncio to Bulgaria who penned this revealing self-portrait in 1932 was a quarter of a century older, when, in 1958, he favored us with another fleeting, but equally revealing insight into his priestly character.

JOSEPH YOUR BROTHER

The "new Pope," he stated on the occasion of his coronation, "by the vicissitudes of his life, can be compared to that son of Jacob the Patriarch, who, meeting his brothers, afflicted with grievous trials, shows himself tender and compassionate toward them, saying: 'I am * * * Joseph your brother.'"

"The new Pope * * *," he continued, "is especially and above all the one who realizes in himself that magnificent picture of the Good Shepherd of the Gospel described by John the Evangelist in the very words which came from the Saviour's lips. * * *

"We wish particularly to insist," His Holiness continued, "that what we have above all at heart is to be the pastor of the entire flock. Every other adornment of the human mind—learning, skill, diplomacy, executive ability—can indeed complete and enrich the pastoral office, but it can in no way substitute for it."

MEEKNESS AND HUMILITY

After describing in detail the essential qualities of the Good Shepherd, as they are defined by the Evangelist, Pope John again referred to himself, this time in even more intimately personal terms. If it is important to know, he said, what the new Pope intends to do, it is even more important to know "with what spirit and intention" he plans to carry out the responsibilities of his exalted office. The chief characteristics of his own pontificate, he solemnly affirmed, would be meekness and humility. This, he said, is the "great law" of the Gospel. It is "the very core of the divine teaching and the precept which contains all the rest and sums them up * * *. 'Learn of me that I am meek and humble of heart.'"

The motif of Pope John's pontificate was to be the charity of Christ which St. Paul has described in his Epistle to the Colossians as the "bond that makes us perfect." The livery that His Holiness intended to wear in the papacy was to be "tender compassion, kindness, humility, gentleness, and patience." The Lord's generosity to him would be the model of his own generosity in carrying out the crushing responsibilities of the highest office that can be entrusted to any human being.

PAPAL LEGEND

Although he reigned as the Vicar of Christ for less than 5 years, Pope John XXIII will undoubtedly be remembered as an extraordinarily great Pope—perhaps one of the greatest in the history of the church. Indeed he has already become a legend in the annals of the Papacy. His richly deserved reputation for true greatness will rest, to some extent, on his many phenomenal achievements in the public order, not the least of which was the Second Vatican Council. And yet I venture to predict that long after the council and the other public acts of his pontificate have ceased to be of overriding interest, the memory of his Christlike personality will still be honored and revered and will be as much of an inspiration to the people of that distant day as it was to his own contemporaries.

Pope John made such a profound impression on his own contemporaries—and will, I think, make an equally profound impression on countless generations to come—because he so faithfully and so joyfully and goodnaturedly practiced what he preached. And what was it that he preached?

He preached and consistently practiced humility and meekness which, to him, was the great law of the gospel.

LOVER OF MANKIND

He preached and, in practice, was the living exemplar of selfless service of his fellow man in the manner of the Good Shepherd who, as he pointed out in his coronation address, "must always be ready to undertake the most arduous tasks * * * may not draw back before the supreme sacrifice * * * and does not fear to engage in combat with the ravening wolf."

He preached and unfailingly exercised tender compassion toward those who, like the brothers of Joseph the Patriarch, were "afflicted with grevious trials." His Easter message of 1963 was the classical expression of his compassionate concern for suffering humanity.

"We feel ourselves," he said, "to be at the side of the workers laboring in the workshops and in the mines, in the fields and in the factories to whom in every hour of the day our affectionate thought and care goes out. But it is natural that our heart beats with a more vivid sympathy for those suffering, for those lacking secure work and to whom the needs of their families bring burning anxiety tempered only by trust in Providence; for all those struggling heroically in adverse situations, exposed to pain known only to the Lord; for all those who are suffering in body and in spirit in the wards of hospitals and in their own homes. Oh, how we would wish to come to the side of each of them, to exhort them to serene confidence or to offer them—God willing—both strength and joy."

Pope John also preached and, in practice, never deviated from the policy of straightforward honesty and simplicity, unalloyed by the corrupting taint of cynicism or suspicion. He believed his own eyes and interpreted everything in the best possible light.

CHRISTIAN OPTIMIST

He preached and joyfully exemplified a rare degree of Christian optimism and resolutely turned his back on the enervating vice of pessimism and despair. "I take comfort," he said, "in the good that I see around me and do not permit myself to be distraught by the overwhelming vision of evil."

And finally—to complete this admittedly partial listing of his characteristic virtues—he preached and, to the very moment of his peaceful and serenely happy death, dramatically showed us how to practice the virtue of unqualified and unlimited confidence in the providence of God. "Having done all that I am capable of doing," he wrote, "I look forward confidently to the future," trusting in the infinite goodness of Almighty God.

These latter words were written in 1932. Thirty years later, in addressing a pilgrimage from his former see of Venice, Pope John reaffirmed, even more solemnly, his childlike confidence in the providence of God. "The pontiff," he said, "whom you have come to visit in order to express your homage is still the same humble man, a priest, and pastor who presented and qualified himself as such at St. Mark's Church on the evening of March 15, 6 years ago, when he began his ministry in the midst of you. I can say, too, with the psalmist: 'Your right hand has sustained me and your solicitude has made me great.'

THE PEOPLE'S POPE

"This," His Holiness concluded, "is the mystery of my life. Do not look for other explanations. The saying of St. Gregory of Nazianzen was always familiar to me: 'Not our will but the will of God is our peace'."

My dear friends in Christ, this should likewise be our fervent prayer this morning as we bid a fond farewell to our beloved father in God—good Pope John, the people's Pope. As we pay our filial respects to this supremely great man—a greater man by far than most generations are privileged to see—let us turn our sorrow into joy by resigning ourselves, in all simplicity, to the holy will of Almighty God who has taken Pope John unto himself just when we felt that we needed him most.

We are going to miss the holy father very much, but our sadness and our sorrow should be mingled with sentiments of profound gratitude for the 4½ years of his magnificently successful pontificate. When we look back upon those 4½ years, we cannot help but say to ourselves that Pope John was truly a providential gift of God, not only to his church but to all mankind. By human reckoning, he was too old, when he was elevated to the primatial see of Rome, to have been expected to leave his own distinctive mark upon the church—too old to have been expected to alter the course of human history. How fallible, though, is human reckoning, and how infallible the promptings and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit who, in season and out of season, guides the church of Christ along the particular paths that Almighty God in His infinite wisdom has determined that she should follow.

In less than 5 years, Pope John, in spite of his advanced age, accomplished veritable wonders that most of us, I suspect, never even dreamed of witnessing in our own lifetime. I am not referring here to his great encyclicals on social justice and international peace—"Mater et Magistra" and "Pacem in Terris." These are admittedly two of the most important papal documents of modern times, but, for all of that, they are not the most significant of Pope John's many contributions to the welfare of the church and the welfare of human society.

Even the Vatican council, as such, was not his greatest accomplishment. In other words, the fact that the second Vatican council was convened by Pope John is less important than the fact that he stamped it at every turn with the indelible seal of his own exquisitely Christian personality. He thereby prepared the way, under God, for what promises to be an extraordinarily important epoch in the history of human society—an epoch which, hopefully, will be characterized by truth, unity, and peace.

The promotion of these three very precious values—truth, unity, and peace—through the inspiration of love was the theme of Pope John's first encyclical, "Ad Petri Cathedram." The council was to be the principal means of implementing the far-reaching agenda outlined in this great encyclical. But it was to be a particular kind of council—one that would faithfully reflect the spirit of meekness and humility which Pope John had told us was to be the distinctive hallmark of his pontificate.

His holiness returned to this theme last October in his opening address to the council—an address which was surely one of the most important statements ever made by any Pope in the history of the church. A concluding quotation from this very moving allocution will tell us better than I have been able to do in my own inadequate words what manner of man Pope John really was and what kind of future he envisioned for the church over which he was privileged to preside for 4½ years as the vicar of its Divine Founder, our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ:

> Nowadays * * * (His Holiness said in the course of this address) the spouse of Christ prefers to make use of the medicine of mercy rather than that of severity. She considers that she meets the needs of the present day by demonstrating the validity of her teaching rather than by condemnations.
>
> That being so, he said, the Catholic Church, raising the torch of religious truth by means of this ecumenical council, desires to show herself to be the loving mother of all, benign, patient, full of mercy and goodness toward the children separated from her. To the human race, oppressed by so many difficulties, she says like Peter of old to the poor man who begged alms from him: "Silver and gold I have none; but what I have, that I give thee. In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, arise and walk." In other words, the church does not offer to men of today riches that pass, nor does she promise them a merely earthly happiness. But she distributes to them the goods of divine grace which, raising men to the dignity of sons of God, are the most efficacious safeguards and aids toward a more human life. She opens the fountain of her lifegiving doctrine which allows men, enlightened by the light of Christ, to understand well what they really are, what their lofty dignity and their purpose are, and, finally, through her children, she spreads everywhere the fullness of Christian charity, than which nothing is more effective in eradicating the seeds of discord, nothing more efficacious in promoting concord, just peace and the brotherly unity of all.

We have gathered here this morning around the altar of sacrifice to honor and to pray for the author of these noble words—the draftsman of what history will undoubtedly identify as the charter of a new age. We have prayed for him in the best of all possible ways—by offering for the repose of his soul the sacramental renewal of Christ's passion and death on the hill of Calvary. But when it comes to honoring him, no words of ours will adequately express the enormous debt of gratitude we owe to him for the wisdom, compassion, and farsighted vision which he brought to the administration of his high office and, more than that, for the inspiring example of his holy life.

Let us turn to the Scriptures, then, for assistance and pay our sad but deeply grateful respects to our beloved Holy Father in the beautiful words which are found in the concluding verse of the 78th Psalm: "We Thy people and the sheep of Thy pasture, will give thanks to Thee forever. We will show forth Thy praise unto generation and generation."

May his great soul and the souls of all the faithful departed through the mercy of God rest in peace. Amen.

Support for the Test Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the President's foreign policy speech on Monday announcing a high-level meeting in Moscow to break the nuclear test ban deadlock was an encouraging tension reduction initiative. The speech in its entirety was published in Izvestia on June 12.

It is my sincere hope that the Nation and the Congress will strongly back the President in his efforts to achieve a nuclear test ban treaty. As part of the effort to encourage support, professors from the major universities in the United States signed an ad urging that a test ban treaty be concluded as soon as possible. The advertisement appeared in the New York Times on June 9. I urge my colleagues to read their statement which follows and consider it carefully:

> "MANKIND MUST PUT AN END TO WAR OR WAR WILL PUT AN END TO MANKIND"—PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY
>
> We have built a weapons system capable of delivering the equivalent of 7 tons of TNT for every person on this planet. Is it to our advantage to further increase our destructive power? The tactical striking power of both sides exceeds any strategic requirements, with an overkill of several hundred percent.
>
> The real danger to the security of the United States does not lie in the inadequacy of our military force. Our arsenals and stockpiles may deter any major act of aggression against our allies or our shores, but they cannot prevent the eruption of a nuclear holocaust.
>
> There is no system of defense capable of fully protecting the United States from an all-out attack. Our "hard-line" strategists believe that our defense system should be augmented limitlessly. They fail to say that nuclear war can only be offensive. They fail to add, that the spread of nuclear arms can only impair the future security of the United States.
>
> A BETTER STRATEGY FOR PEACE
>
> A better strategy for peace must focus upon the opportunities for skilled negotiations. In retrospect, it seems it might have been possible to have obtained a test-ban treaty in 1958 or 1959, the President has admitted. Now we must look to our leaders as diplomats determined to negotiate with honor and to resist the rigid doctrines of the military fatalists.
>
> The argument over the number of onsite inspections must not deflect us; it is of a political and not of a military nature. A treaty aims to deter a nation from cheating and perpetrating underground tests. Such tests, as Congress has been advised, are only of minor military value to even a skillful cheater.
>
> Our primary concern is the defense of the Nation and the maintenance of the values it stands for.
>
> But security must be considered today in a new light * * * without the delusions of maximum military preparedness * * * without the fatalism of the missile-minded strategists in both Moscow and Washington.
>
> As academic faculty members and as private citizens we urge that President Kennedy and Congress make every effort to obtain a test-ban treaty.
>
> The time for such a treaty is "fast running out," the President has warned. If a test-ban treaty is not signed this year, "the genie may never get back into the bottle" and we may never have it. The President considers the resumption of nuclear tests "personally, a great disaster for all concerned." We share his assessment, and this has moved us to action.
>
> We believe that security alone must guide us, and that the goals of U.S. policy must now be firmly restated:
>
> The ability of more and more nations to test nuclear weapons must be immediately curbed.
>
> A brake must be applied to the fast-growing possibilities of accidental war, to the accumulation of radioactive fallout, and to the heightening tensions of the arms race.
>
> For the love of our country and of our fellow men we pledge our support to those American leaders who will help construct a disarmed and peaceful future.
>
> We do not confuse purposeful negotiation with appeasement. We anticipate a future without the threat of nuclear war.
>
> The first step toward this goal is a test-ban treaty.
>
> We will use our best resources to support those who can help mankind to achieve it.
>
> A test-ban treaty is needed—now.
>
> Please write President Kennedy and your Senators today urging support for a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

Tribute to Japanese American Military Service in World War II

SPEECH

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] and would like to associate myself with his very thoughtful remarks commending the Japanese Americans who served so valiantly in our country's service during World War II.

These brave men fought a double battle—one against this country's wartime enemies and another against racial prejudice. Though they were placed in relocation camps and otherwise discriminated against, these men chose to fight this discrimination by proving themselves true Americans on the battlefields of the war.

Many Japanese Americans had to fight an uphill battle just to enlist in our Armed Forces. Once they were permitted to join, however, they proved that this trust was not misplaced.

By serving America bravely and valiantly the Japanese Americans showed patriotism and citizenship to be matters of the heart and mind, rather than race or religion. I am happy to join with my distinguished colleagues in saluting the Japanese American Citizens League on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of Japanese American military service in World War II.

Awarding of Honorary Degree to Robert Davidson Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, Belmont Abbey College, located at Belmont, N.C., is one of the outstanding colleges in the South. For almost 100 years the institution has been operated by the members of the Order of St. Benedict in such a manner as to render great public service to the Nation.

It has been a characteristic of the institution that it recognizes outstanding leadership by citizens of the area. One of those honored at the commencement ceremonies this year was Mr. Robert Davidson Hall, an outstanding citizen of Belmont, N.C.

The citation prepared by the faculty of Belmont Abbey College in a brief way sets forth some of his very worthy activities which brought about the awarding of the honorary degree of doctor of laws to Mr. Hall. I happily call this citation to the attention of my colleagues by inserting it in the Appendix of the RECORD today.

It is as follows:

ROBERT DAVIDSON HALL, ESQ.

By an intense commitment to the activities of his community, a man unfailingly makes important contributions to his fellowmen. It is fitting that a Benedictine institution, fostered itself by a long tradition of stability, should publicly single out such a person for recognition, since in our modern mobile society long duration in a particular locale is increasingly rare. More than fitting, it is perhaps urgent that acclaim be made to counteract the growing notion that significant service to the world demands a geographical setting larger than the small American town.

The man we honor on this occasion is sufficient evidence that this notion is false.

A lifelong resident of Belmont he has, since boyhood, been associated with an industry indigenous to this area. From minor position in the textile mills of Belmont he has steadily progressed to chairmanships and presidencies numerous enough to persuade one that he himself is not a single individual but an entire corporation.

His competency in this community has commanded the attention and the admiration of more than those who work with him personally. The Governor of this State asked him in 1941 to serve on the Employment Security Commission of North Carolina, a post he has continued to hold. A past president of the North Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association, he is the immediate past president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute. In addition he somehow finds time to be president of Belmont Hosiery Mills and president of Belmont Knitting Co.

Industrial obligations have not kept him from other interests, particularly education: he is a member of the advisory council of the North Carolina Vocational Textile School, a member of the board of Saint Andrews Presbyterian College, and a member of the board of advisors of Belmont Abbey College.

In recognition of his positive contributions to the economic development of this State, as a tribute to his ceaseless concern for community betterment, and as an appreciation of his wise counsel and support generously offered to educational institutions, Belmont Abbey College confers the degree doctor of laws, with all its rights and privileges, upon Robert Davidson Hall, Esq.

(Given at Belmont Abbey College this 4th day of June, 1963, and of the founding of this college, the 87th.)

American Liberalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on May 28 some of my colleagues attacked American liberalism by way of equating the platform of Americans for Democratic Action with that of the Socialist Party and the publicly stated position of the Communist Party. This linkage is frankly false because it attempts to directly associate liberalism with socialism and socialism with communism. This tortured logic, if extended, as was done on the floor, allows no difference in principle, philosophy, and methodology between liberalism and communism and democratic socialism and communism.

Mr. Speaker, such reckless charges violate the American tradition because they neither deal with the merits of any issue nor bear any resemblance to the truth. These allegations attempt to relegate to the ash heap those practices which are traditional, appropriate, and proper in American political life. I would hope that my conservative colleagues would call liberals to task if they ever link conservatism with reaction and reaction with fascism.

A cursory knowledge of American politics should clearly demonstrate that liberals are not Socialists and Socialists are not liberals and both are antitotalitarian and therefore anti-Communist. By the same token, conservatives are not reactionaries and reactionaries are not conservatives and both are antitotalitarian and therefore anti-Fascist. The test we must apply is how well do the liberals and conservatives meet today's challenge through use of democratic processes.

In this time of continual crisis, which we have faced since the beginning of the cold war, we need liberals and conservatives who participate fully, vigorously, and effectively in the dialogue on the great issues affecting Americans today—how to enhance the freedom of all Americans, abolish poverty and regain full employment, protect our security by encouraging independent nations elsewhere, and maintain peace.

Ours is an open, strong society. Its strength rests on a vigorous clash of ideas competing in the open. It is in this context that liberals and conservatives must battle. The subverters of our Constitution—the Communist Party, the White Citizens Councils, the John Birch Society and their fellow travelers—shun the marketplace of ideas and instead pursue conspiratorial avenues of political influence that inject fear and falsehood into American politics.

I propose to discuss only two items: the meaning of the ADA platform and the application of the liberal and conservative ideologies.

The ADA platform covers many items. This is so because ADA is a multiinterest national political organization. Its members are interested in domestic and foreign policy and so ADA takes a stand on a whole host of issues from the problems our aging face through making the United Nations a better instrument for freedom and peace. The ADA stand is not always correct. As a member of its national board, I do not agree with every policy ADA supports. And I dare say no member in ADA agrees with each and every ADA position. That is always the case in a democratic organization which arrives at its positions after discussion and debate, where ideas clash and one policy prevails over another.

Liberalism and ADA will be judged by their purposes and goals, their past achievements and future accomplishments. ADA has stood the test of time, for as President Kennedy told the 16th annual ADA convention, held in May of this year—a convention I had the honor to address and, yes, even criticize ADA in a serious but friendly vein—"you have contributed an indispensable ferment to American politics and looking back you can take satisfaction that on the whole, time has confirmed the rightness of your judgments."

Mr. Speaker, I request that President Kennedy's message to ADA's 16th annual convention be inserted in the RECORD immediately after my remarks.

Liberalism and ADA stand for affirmative goals. The fulfillment of the individual in a just and responsible world is our goal. ADA believes that its goals can be achieved in only one way: through the democratic process. ADA practices democracy by participating in election campaigns, generating ideas, stimulating thought. Its performance is always in public for all to judge, evaluate, accept or reject.

ADA welcomes to its ranks only those whose devotion to political freedom is unqualified. Those who apologize for segregation have no place in ADA. Those who apologize for Russia, China, Yugoslavia, Cuba, Spain, the Dominican Republic under Trujillo, Venezuela under Jiminez have no place in ADA.

But let us examine what the conclusions of two recognized scholars are about ADA. Prof. David Shannon of Columbia University in his book, "The Decline of American Communism," concludes that ADA was one of the most important factors after World War II, in converting the non-Communist left into the anti-Communist left at home and abroad. ADA fought the Communist issue on preservation of principle without violating democratic procedure. We did not engage in the recklessness of false accusation and scare tactics as so many who use the issue of communism solely for political profit.

Prof. Max Lerner of Brandeis University in his preface to "Americans for Democratic Action"—a book incidentally sympathetic with ADA's philosophy but not uncritical of ADA—says:

> There can be no doubt that without the ADA American political thought and action would have become more extremist at both ends, left and right.

The ADA record in support of expanding democracy is clear. We believe in more freedom at home—a vigorous defense of the Bill of Rights and immediate implementation of the 14th and 15th amendments.

Today as in past years we oppose imperial expansion and internal dictatorship. To those who resist dictatorship, Communist or otherwise, and support democracy, we lend our support. We look toward a world where all people may share our freedom—a world without aggression, a disarmed world subject to effective inspection and control.

We are disappointed, however, that too many conservatives too often have not upheld their acknowledged belief in constitutional process and the rule of law. For the greatest contribution of conservatives to American democracy would be to rid their organizations, such as Americans for Constitutional Action, of undemocratic John Birch Society members and its equally undemocratic fellow travelers and at the same time join American liberals in supporting comprehensive civil rights legislation, that is real and not a sham, to fulfill the constitutional mandate of the 14th and 15th amendments. The conservatives' failure to meet this responsibility will mean that the American people are the losers, for it is the American ideal that will remain unfulfilled.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have not gone into the subject which fascinates ADA and administration critics: namely, that ADA'ers run this country. Judging by ADA's criticisms of the administration, one could never imagine that ADA is running the country. Furthermore, glaring inaccuracies in statements made by my conservative colleagues lead me, for one, to wonder how much credence can be given to their arguments on substantive issues. I refer specifically to Mr. HALL's remarks appearing on page 10137 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. HALL said that "the 35 ADA'ers in key administrative positions include" ABRAHAM RIBICOFF as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Arthur Goldberg as Secretary of Labor. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, I believe, has been elected to the U.S. Senate from Connecticut, and Arthur Goldberg, of course, is the newest member of the Supreme Court. This is but one example of how out of date are many of the thoughts of my conservative friends.

J.F.K. TO ADA

I am happy to send my greetings to the 16th annual convention of ADA. During these years, you have striven valiantly for social progress and civil freedom at home and for liberty and peace in the world. You have done this in the face of clamor and criticism, and you have seen the causes for which you have fought move steadily ahead toward fulfillment. You have contributed an indispensable ferment to American politics. Looking back, you can take satisfaction that time has on the whole confirmed the rightness of your judgments.

Now again we look to the future. This strong country of ours faces all of the problems that come with a complex and changing economy in a revolutionary world. This administration—in the field of economic and monetary policy, in education, in the care for the sick, retarded and the aged—has put forward programs to provide a greater participation in the American life for all of our citizens. This country cannot turn its back on the urgent problems of the day: four and a half million unemployed, an inadequate educational system, a growing tangle of urban blight, pockets of poverty that reproach our affluence, a large segment of our citizens still denied their civil rights, the massive problems of the developing nations and, above all, the overwhelming need to turn the world's momentum toward destruction into an equivalent momentum for production and peace.

I may not always agree with ADA on how these goals should be pursued, or they with me; but I salute the role you have played—and will continue to play—in supporting new initiatives and new ideas, in freshening our political dialog, and in countering those who reject the future, doubt the present and labor to keep us mired forever in the past.

What Is Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the entire United States is being threatened with mob violence. Scores of self-anointed Negro leaders in all sections of the country constantly threaten mass demonstrations and civil disobedience unless their demands are met.

These anarchists obviously do not believe in the law of the land.

Yesterday the Memphis Commercial Appeal carried a thought-provoking editorial on the current racial crises. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial and commend it to the attention of my colleagues. It follows:

WHAT IS RIGHT

A Deputy Assistant Attorney General of the United States of America was forced to stand before an anarchistic mob in Jackson, Miss., yesterday and plead for law and order.

"It is not right with bricks and bottles in the street," said John Doar of the Justice Department.

What else could have been expected?

Jackson law enforcement authorities bent over backward yesterday to preserve the peace of the city. During the "mourning march" for slain NAACP leader Medgar Evers police provided the ultimate in protection. They halted traffic at intersections. They removed their hats as the cortege passed.

But preceding the march leaders of the Negro community and spokesmen for national Negro organizations had used the occasion of the tragic slaying to whip up racial antagonism. Their speeches were not peaceful.

The ultimate march of hundreds of aroused Negroes into the downtown Jackson area was inevitable. So were the thrown bricks and bottles.

All blame for this blatant violation of law must rest squarely on irresponsible leadership.

We deplore the racial hatred which apparently led to the murder of Medgar Evers. It was a shameful and dastardly act.

We equally deplore those who are turning it into a means of generating deeper racial strife by whipping up Negro emotions.

Extremists among Negro leadership are inviting more terrorism from white extremists. Tension is high in Jackson, and it can spread like wildfire.

When we say that the postfuneral demonstration in Jackson yesterday was unlawful, we refer to the Friday action of the U.S. Supreme Court. Without qualification it upheld a court injunction against these Jackson demonstrations. Every arrest made by the Jackson police has the blessing of the Supreme Court.

Perhaps the Negro leaders cannot understand this. They have become accustomed to blanket endorsements of their demonstrations by the High Court.

But it happens that in past Supreme Court actions on such incidents—where convictions for demonstrations have been reversed—the Court has maintained that the marches and picketing did not constitute actual breach of peace. The Justices have felt that if a community was not likely to explode in retaliation, the demonstrations were warranted under the constitutional guarantee of free speech, free assembly and freedom to petition for redress of grievances.

Those who demonstrate should be informed that the same Court does not condone demonstrations which threaten the peace. Justice Tom Clark has written: "The priceless character of first amendment freedoms cannot be gainsaid, but it does not follow that they are absolutes immune from necessary State action reasonably designed for the protection of society."

Justice Clark also has said: "To say that the police may not intervene until the riot has occurred is like keeping out the doctor until the patient dies."

Let there be no more murders of Negro leaders. Neither let there be mob marches in the streets and hurled bottles and bricks.

The peace of society is as sacred a right as life itself.

It is guaranteed by the Constitution.

Deputy Assistant Attorney General John Doar, standing before the Jackson mob yesterday, cried out: "I stand for what is right.

It is not right with bricks and bottles in the streets."

President Kennedy said last Tuesday, "We have a right to expect that the Negro community will be responsible, will uphold the law."

That is a right in Jackson. It is a right in Maryland, North Carolina, Alabama, New York, Illinois, California—wherever the mob fever may be high.

Right is not a matter for mob action. It is a matter for court adjudication. That applies to any group, white or dark.

Those who have built the fires under the cauldron of strife in Jackson, or any other American city, must weigh that in their hearts.

Commencement Address at Ohio University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the able Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Mrs. Katie Louchheim, who is one of the highest ranking women in Government, made an eloquent commencement address at Ohio University on June 9, that I wish to share with my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the commencement address at Ohio University on June 9, by Mrs. Katie Louchheim, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS AN EDUCATION FOR?

(Address by Mrs. Katie Louchheim, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, at the commencement exercises of Ohio University, Athens, Ohio, June 9, 1963)

This is the time of year when young people all over the land are being exhorted by speakers who urge them to go out and conquer the world. The difficulty with this approach is that today's graduate has enough to worry about just to find his place in the world. Though I do believe some of this spring's speakers will fare better than usual because—in my opinion—there's a good deal more of the light of idealism, the spark of adventure, abroad than there has been for many a day.

We live in a world in which change and challenge have become household words. Whether it be change of abode or a challenge to our freedom, we are surrounded by indefinable and often unpredictable instabilities which we must be prepared to meet.

You are old enough and wise enough to understand the challenges we face; to know that President Kennedy was talking to you when he said: "In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger."

Words are wonderful magical messengers. The words on your parchments are the sign posts on your road to the future. The words of the wise, of the great, of the prophet, the poet, and the philosopher have become yours. You have inherited them by means of a fortunate legacy, the legacy of an education.

What are you going to do with them? How can you use them to defend freedom "in its hour of maximum danger"? Why are you here? What is an education for?

Commencement, which is after all a beginning, is an appropriate time for asking and answering questions.

The answer in the simplest terms is: education is the single most important adjunct to a fuller life. Your legacy can be spent in realizing your best self. "Knowledge," a political economist once said, "is the only instrument of production that is not subject to diminishing returns." An education is the means by which understanding and fulfillment, the greatest riches this human experience proffers, are yours to use as you deem best.

In the world struggle between the free self-determined societies and the closed authoritarian society of Communism, the contribution of each individual becomes the strongest positive force we can exert.

Whether we be physicists or lawyers, doctors or architects, homemakers or horticulturists, we must be involved in what goes on about us. The prerequisite for understanding is involvement. The essential ingredient in the achievement of fullfillment is participation.

As Secretary Rusk has said, "Understanding requires knowledge. We need more than passing amiability if we are to understand other peoples and other countries. The university was invented to understand."

The same concept linking education with good government was expressed by one of the founding fathers of Ohio University, the Reverend Manasseh Cutler, who said: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

It was this philosophy that led to the founding of this distinguished university, the very first institution of higher learning in the then burgeoning Northwest Territory. And it is this still burgeoning campus that is today contributing its sons and daughters, committed to the doctrine that "knowledge is necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind." Probably General Putnam and Reverend Cutler did not envisage that their plans for Ohio University would some day extend from the Northwest Territory to the far reaches of Nigeria, but in their hearts they knew that the American dream must grow and that the thirst for knowledge knows no limitations. And with it grew the understanding for which, in Secretary Rusk's words, "the university was invented."

We must participate in this democratic process handed down to us if the spirit of democracy is to flourish and grow. We cannot withdraw into our professions, we cannot seclude ourselves in our specializations, if our kind of world is to survive and succeed.

Most Americans would agree that an education is important as a means of enriching one's private life. The wondrous thing about a free society is that it permits its citizens to pursue their own personal goals.

But this kind of enrichment can become sterile because it is inward directed. One runs this risk if talents and intelligence are concentrated too much on personal goals.

There is also the social responsibility of education. You have inherited a great many obligations by the very fact that you are now college graduates. You are still relatively a chosen few, even though the numbers of graduates have increased, and for that reason you have these special obligations.

A contemporary philospher, Scott Buchanan, has eloquently stated our case: "the human individual is responsible for injustice anywhere in the universe." If we needed proof of this thesis we have but to read the headlines. Crisis is served with the morning coffee; concern is our shadow; change and challenge are our birthright.

Mr. Buchanan's remarks should not be taken to mean that each of us is responsible for injustice anywhere, but that every one of us has the responsibility for dealing with these injustices.

To set the universe as the limits of our responsibility may seem to you to be exaggerating the case. But if we were to ask that each individual assume responsibility for dealing with injustice in his own community there would undoubtedly be acceptance of our proposition.

We cannot alter, perhaps, what is going on at the other limits of the globe. But the world is now the kind of place where events in our own community affect our standing at the other ends of the earth. Through the mediating mechanism of TV, films, radio, and press, the ripples in our own community can now reach the farthest ends of the globe.

And so, for the informed, involved, participating citizen, the educated man and woman, the community expands. It is not only his or her town or city, it is also Birmingham, it is also New Delhi, it is the universe.

In a recent speech in Nashville, Tenn., President Kennedy was giving eloquent expression to this proposition when he said that "a special burden rests on the educated man or woman if our country is to reject the temptations of prejudice and violence and to reaffirm the values of freedom and law on which our society depends." Defining the obligations of the educated citizen, he listed three: "Your obligation to the pursuits of learning. Your obligation to serve the public. Your obligation to uphold the law."

To keep alive our belief in the individual, in his rights, in his responsibility to uphold the law, we as individuals must in our daily lives prove that this right and responsibility is alive.

This sense of our personal responsibility for what goes on around us has been implicit in the American way of life ever since the earliest days of our country. In a very real sense the entire world has become our personal responsibility.

I see evidence of this at the State Department. Every day we receive some 1,000 cables from our missions around the world; we maintain diplomatic relations with more than 100 countries. In any given week we are taking part in about two dozen international meetings and conferences on different subjects in different parts of the globe.

We are doing all these things because our country is trying, in President Kennedy's words, to build "a peaceful world community of free and independent states."

Fifty years ago, even 30 years ago, it did not much matter if the ordinary American concerned himself with the tropical belt of the world. He got his cocoa and coffee, his tin and rubber, his spices from hot mysterious countries he had never seen, whose people were not only unknown to him but beyond his sphere of influence. Americans were related to the vast continents of Asia, Africa, and Latin America by trade—only by trade—so we thought.

How different the world is today. New nations, new governments, political and economic turmoil, the aspirations of nationalism, the ambitions of new leaders, each new crisis touches us because it is not so long ago that we too were a young country, a small ill-assorted band of revolutionary States struggling to make a nation. The anguish of the hot continents was always there and the very fact that it was possible for us to remain unaware of it for so long makes it all the more clamorous and insistent today.

We are often reminded that America has taken on the mantle of leadership and that today we are the greatest state and power in the world. If this is true—and I doubt many of us would contest the fact—then we must ask ourselves: Are power and material advantage all we have to offer the uncommitted or enslaved people of the world?

Of course not. First of all, we have knowledge—a commodity for which the demand always outruns the supply. In many parts of the world it is not nearly as important to split the atom as to dig a well.

Happily, we are doing something about exporting knowledge through the Peace Corps. And our aid programs provide a variety of essential tools to translate knowledge into accomplishment—the steel plough, the water pump, the bulldozer, the concrete mixer, insecticides, vaccines, and above all, pencils, paper, and books.

Second, as an equally important adjunct, we have an exportable philosophy of national life. It is the philosophy of government by law which President Kennedy spoke of in Nashville—self-imposed law that liberates and regulates but does not enslave. It is a simple philosophy, but not an easy one. We are not perfect practitioners.

Because of our imperfections we cannot expect to export our democracy packaged only in our documents, even such historic and noble ones as the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. In a day when astronauts girdle the earth, television images flit across oceans, and anyone can pick up the telephone and talk to London or Bangkok, we are judged not only by our Constitution but by our ability to provide equal rights and opportunities for all citizens in our land.

It is this image that you as adults will help to create. For your acts to come under world scrutiny, you do not need to be a policymaker in Washington. You can do honor to your country, or bring it shame, as a school board member in a small community.

You do not need to be a delegate to the United Nations to commit a diplomatic fauxy pas or pull off a diplomatic coup. You can do either by the way you function on a civic committee dealing with urban conditions that breed crime and poverty.

What I have been saying is that to use your education you must become involved in the life of your Nation and community and that when you become involved you acquire a moral responsibility of staggering dimensions.

In fulfilling these responsibilities, I want to urge you to carry with you the same curiosity to know the truth, the same objectivity that has served you so well in your academic training. I want to plead with you that no matter what your private pursuits, your professions, your postgraduate preferences, you consider the unfinished business of democracy your business.

These unfinished tasks, these unresolved problems, these unrealized goals * * * these too are your legacy. For an education enables you to undertake a greater involvement, to participate more intelligently, to uphold the law with greater judicious restraint and with deeper conviction, in the world around you.

It is for you to interpret our historic documents, our Constitution, and our Bill of Rights, and translate them into deeds. It is for you to mold these honorable and historical words into equal opportunities for all, into new ways in which all citizens can make constructive use of their capacities, into an end to the conditions that breed slums, despoil our countryside, and pollute our rivers. It is for you to increase the participation of all individuals in our common search for the good life with freedom and justice for all.

The Irish writer, Frank O'Conner, describes an episode in his youth which appears most applicable to this occasion: "When as kids we came to an orchard wall that seemed too high to climb, we took off our caps and tossed them over the wall and then we had no choice but to follow them. I had tossed my cap over the wall of life and knew I must follow it, wherever it had fallen."

I have a very bright vision of all of you throwing your metaphorical caps over the wall of life, and I wish you the joy of fulfillment that must come to you in following after them.

Dr. Rosemary Park's Inaugural Address at Barnard College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on April 22, 1963, Dr. Rosemary Park was inaugurated as the new president of Barnard College. In her inaugural address she spoke with great wisdom of the value and meaning of a liberal arts education in our highly specialized society. I commend her address to my colleagues:

THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT ROSEMARY PARK AT BARNARD COLLEGE

There is an old precept of the law which forbids double jeopardy. Two inaugurations in one lifetime might seem to imply wanton disregard of this legal principle. To such a suspicion I can only reply that the problems of liberal arts undergraduate education are intricate enough to encourage examination from a variety of points of view. Such a new vantage point is offered me by the presidency of Barnard College. For this magnificent opportunity I am deeply and humbly grateful.

It was Friedrich Nietzsche who dared to define life as an experiment of the knower, ein experiment des erkennenden. This is perhaps too subjective a definition of life as we experience it, but it might well be considered as a definition of education: an experiment of the knower. I like it because it implies creative activity in relation to some principles or functions but with no assurance as to result. The principles are set forth by the various disciplines of learning; the functions by society; and the experiment consists in varying methods of inculcating these principles or functions. The task of education is clear enough as long as its principles are ascertainable, the social functions defined and accepted. I shall maintain that in regard neither to principle nor function is there clarity today, and that, therefore, the whole structure of liberal education, no matter what methods it may practice, falters in its pronouncements and programs.

Ours is a society which depends for its existence on the specialist. This is nothing new—all societies have, whether the specialists were priests, kings, bureaucrats, or scientists. Our specialists today, the high priests of our civilization, are primarily scientists. We tax ourselves to support them, pay homage to their probity and courage, their knowledge and power. They are the sine qua non of our social structure. But they are also our danger.

History teaches, I think, that the specialist must be continually challenged by the lay person or the specialist atrophies in his power structure and with him the society he controls. Some part of this necessary challenge today is furnished by recruitment from all walks of life into the ranks of the specialized knower. Our specialists are not an hereditary caste, but continually renew themselves from outside.

The expanding quantity of knowledge, however, obliges these men and women to be narrow in scope if they are to work with complete integrity. Ironically, all their investigations point to the interrelatedness of our universe, to what Whitehead calls "the connexity of the world." The very specialization of knowledge leads to the revelation of "a connexity" far beyond the power of one human mind to apprehend. Frustration, therefore, must be the fruits of specialization today. But this personal, this existential sacrifice required of our specialists is not the reason for regarding them as a potential danger.

The danger they represent is at a more fundamental level. As scientists, as our high priests, their definition of truth is accepted as the only possible formulation of truth. Truth, for the scientist, is the discovery, the uncovering, the apprehending of existing facts, relationships, or if you will, laws. Indeed, excitement in learning today is almost entirely the excitement incident to discovery, not creation. I do not wish to deny that this truth of discovery, this method of science, is not fundamental. I only wish to question whether to accept it as the only form of truth is not to negate possibilities of human activity which desperately need strengthening in our Western society. I refer to the fostering of a lay point of view, a nonspecialized and concerned understanding.

The function of the university is to produce and nurture the specialists on whom our society depends for its existence and to some extent, for its freedom. As the stage of education before the university, the liberal arts college must begin this training, must indoctrinate a younger generation of discoverers with the ideals of truth which science represents. I do not believe, however, that this exhausts the college's function. Today the college has chosen to interpret its responsibilities too exclusively in terms of a preparation for specialization: its programs and policies are not, therefore, enunciated with the conviction of a genuine, definable, and particular mission. No liberal arts college, for instance, has had the temerity to assert a claim on the whole of a student's time, nor to require 12 months in the year for the completion of its assignments. The world expands, multiplies in complexities, but we do not present in the claims of the liberal arts any greater urgency than we felt two, three, four generations ago.

This faltering, which I believe any honest observer must sense, the pleasant atmosphere but lack of dynamism in our good liberal arts colleges, arises not from a lack of their significance for modern life, but rather from the bad conscience of the institution which assumes, as does the rest of society, that only the truth of the scientific investigator is valid truth. Now I believe that the whole history of the liberal arts as arts, the practice of which makes men free, is derived from a different assumption. It is the confusion between their antecedent history and their present ideals of truth which causes these colleges to seem agreeable but less than essential.

Plato speaks in one of his descriptions of education about the love of the beautiful as the love of generation, of birth in beauty. This creative aspect of truth, which plays only a secondary role in scientific investigation, lies at the heart of the liberal arts tradition. It is this tradition which has nourished the great lay movements of modern history—the Reformation, Renaissance, the Enlightenment—in all of which laymen opposed the specialists of their time, whether in church, in university, or in state. These revolutionaries had some knowledge of the classics, of theology and literature, of science and mathematics—the liberal arts of their day—from which arose their confidence that as freemen they could make the world other than it was.

Gibbon speaks about that public courage which is nourished by love of independence. This love arises, I believe, from the assurance that truth not only is to be uncovered but also may be created. My concern is that the college has almost totally negated this aspect of education in its attempt to begin the training of the modern specialist. In annulling, to some extent, its tradition of liberal arts the college has deprived society of the informed lay person, and this vacuum has been filled by pressure groups of specialists, who make no attempt to speak for the whole.

It is possible that an opportunity is now presenting itself which may enable the college to reconsider its role and to speak with more authority out of renewed conviction. The best colleges today are receiving boys and girls who, thanks to the imagination of some college and secondary school instructors, are prepared to anticipate a good portion of the first year of college work. The question arises as to whether the college should offer these students an opportunity to acquire a master of arts degree in their field of specialization, or whether the work anticipated should be used to strengthen the fundamental liberal arts curriculum so that the bachelor of arts shall be more significant and not less so.

Too often today the liberal arts, at the college level, consist of a perfunctory required course in English, in a foreign language, in history and science—usually of an elementary sort. Suppose for a moment that the liberal arts meant not this relatively simple acquisition of facts, but rather experience in the creative arts, advanced mathematics, political and economic theory, classical philosophy, and history. This kind of instruction would enable a younger generation to be thoroughly aware of the concept of truth as creation as well as of the concept in its more usual scientific meaning, the discovery of a law. If the liberal arts could be returned to this level of sophistication, then the liberal arts college could begin to fulfill its basic, fundamental, and historic function, the nurture of freemen. And in addition such education would make easier the study of other civilizations impinging on us today, whose ideals of truth are far removed from our concept of scientific law. In time, their instruction in these civilizations in liberal arts programs will serve the purpose not just of reducing our Western provincialism but of enriching and deepening our students' sense of reality and truth.

If the college can use the improvement of secondary school programs for increasing its own offering in liberal learning, then, in addition to providing an introduction to specialized, professional work, the college could expect to see questions of ultimate concern raised in its classrooms, questions of meaning, standards, commitment. Where else today can this be done? In less secular societies than ours the church and the home were responsible for these discussions. Today both have abdicated; the first unwillingly, the other willingly. If the liberal arts college were to recognize these questions as properly its own, it would become less a way station to specialization and more the indoctrination center for a generation. There would be inevitable and bitter battles of interpretation, genuine revolts of youth, not just the ineffectual squeaks of the beatniks whose lack of opportunity for protest seems to end in masochistic disintegration.

To accomplish the larger aim the college would have to be hospitable to many kinds of teachers: to great research scholars opening the avenues to specialization, to critics who could help establish standards in the arts, to men and women from many areas of learning who would seek to penetrate the meaning of our knowledge. I fear that unless the liberal arts college can provide such educational symbiosis in its faculties, it is fated to become the nursery school to the university, with custodial and elementary responsibilities only. Then I do not see where the lay people of the future will be formed, nor who will challenge the specialist for the public good.

It is essential that we should determine a source of such people, because we are now in conflict with a great social system which does not permit the individual autonomy the liberal arts have fostered, nor seek the fruitful criticism of a lay public. In our own society, too, we are fast approaching an era where the needs of machines may dictate the form of life to man. If these threats are real, and I think they are, then we must bethink ourselves in time to find the strength in our own tradition sufficient to meet and hold these dangers off. I do not believe need look further than the tradition of liberal learning if we will but return it to a decent level of sophistication and seriousness.

In spite of what I have called the faltering of the liberal arts college there is, nevertheless, abroad, sometimes in strange places, a sense that these liberal arts colleges are necessary to our society. In this regard the support which corporate business has given to liberal education is significant. I believe that this interest of business in education programs which provide no obvious quid pro quo is the most extraordinary development I have observed in my professional life. I should like to thank the imaginative men who first urged on the business community the social importance of the liberal arts college, even before the educators themselves had formulated this importance properly.

In Government, too, there is increasing concern for such colleges, although the larger part of Government interest is understandably in the training of specialists. And, of course, Government must properly concern itself with the whole structure of American education, not just the college and university. The form of increased Government support which is inevitable will depend upon our citizen laymen's understanding of education and its functions. In this context, I believe, all college and university faculties have been negligent in failing to assist citizen groups as they try to elaborate methods for the improvement of American education as a whole.

More active has been the vast network of women's organizations, so characteristic of American society. For this reason, if no other, women must understand the function education can perform in a free society. The preprofessional training of women is well provided by the woman's college. But even more than the man's college, the woman's college must accept the liberal arts education which can nurture an informed lay public. The lay person par excellence, of course, is the mother, and it is for her education as well as for the liberal arts education of the rest of us that I am pleading. The woman's college therefore has an especially urgent need to seek out and cultivate the enlarged concept of truth our society requires. Barnard College has been fortunate in having in its first president, Millicent McIntosh, a woman who so admirably combines the professional and lay responsibilities of modern, democratic society. I can only rejoice that in the difficult task of following her in Barnard's presidency I can always point to a living example in her of what the woman's college can achieve. She would join me I am sure in paying tribute, too, to our mutual predecessor, Virginia Gildersleeve, whose long reign at Barnard provided for us both the rich inheritance of achievement and regard which the college enjoys today.

I enter then upon this great experiment in education, Barnard College, with respect and gratitude for those who have formed its past—so generously and courageously. I am conscious, too, of the grandeur of the liberal tradition to which the college is pledged and of Barnard's particular responsibility within its sheltering university, to represent a symbiosis of both approaches to truth—the one which assumes the rationality of the world and discovers answers to its questions framed on this assumption, and the other which is free to question even this principle of rationality, because it teaches that disciplined men have the power within them to create a new world in imagination and in hope.

Although my task is a great one, it is not a lonely one. Barnard College has grown in stature over many years, through the devotion and enthusiasm of succeeding faculty and student groups. To have some part, together with the alumnae, faculty, and students, in this experiment in knowing is a privilege which I cannot deserve but which I may humbly hope to earn.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Italian Contribution to American Culture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include, for the information of my colleagues, an address by the Reverend Father Theodore E. McCarrick, Ph. D., entitled, "The Italian Contribution to American Culture." Father McCarrick delivered this address before the American Committee on Italian Migration which held its third national symposium on June 10, 1963, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

Father McCarrick has been a student of migration problems for many years. He is thoroughly familiar with the contributions made by immigrants who have come to the United States throughout the years. Father McCarrick is an outstanding scholar and educator. He has traveled widely throughout the country and Puerto Rico giving many lectures on sociological problems. Father McCarrick's address is both informative and encouraging:

THE ITALIAN CONTRIBUTION TO AMERICAN CULTURE

(By the Reverend Theodore E. McCarrick, Ph. D., sociologist, assistant vice rector, and dean of students, Catholic University)

May I begin by thanking our chairman for his most gracious introduction. Indeed it is I who am honored by the invitation to speak to so distinguished a group as this. I have read your program with a certain amount of awe, and am more than humbled to find myself listed with so eminent a group of speakers. I share your concern for the grave problems of immigration to the United States, and both as a priest and a sociologist, I am proud to subscribe to the principles of the American Committee on Italian Migration.

I am looking forward to meeting many of you personally and to chatting with you in the days ahead, for I am sure that sharing the same ideals and the same concerns we shall be good friends. Conscious as I am that, according to some historians, St. Patrick himself may have been an Italian, I feel at home very much.

I do not know Italy well. The extent of my knowledge comes from a 2-week visit made during the Holy Year of 1950 when I made my pilgrimage from Switzerland where I had been studying. But no man visits Italy without awakening in himself the desire to go back and to stay longer, and I look forward to the time when I shall be a reverse migrant and find myself in Italy once again.

It is customary for a speaker, no matter how academic his background, to offer one or two funny stories at the beginning of his talk, and I am not bold enough to fight against this laudable custom. When you hear my stories, however, you may think that my boldness is in the other direction.

What I hope to do this morning is to point out some of the real contributions that the Italian immigrant has made to the United States. You might call this a sociological justification for the program of the American Committee for Italian migration, for I hope to point out clearly that this Nation has gained in many ways from the coming of the Italian migrant group and that this gain can be multiplied by an increase of this migration.

The title of this talk may have been somewhat misleading. I do not hope in a short half-hour even to scratch the surface of the many contributions that Italy has made to the United States. To do this one would have to span the centuries and seek the very foundations of our civilization whose noble pillars were laid in Rome, or trace back the golden history of art and letters and speak of Florence and its genius, or page the books of history and commerce and read the entries dated Florence and Genoa, Milano, and Napoli. It will be enough—perhaps even here I am too bold—to consider the contribution made by the Italian immigrant of the past hundred years to this country which he chose as his own. This is the tale I have to tell, and if it is somehow an ordinary tale, it is in reality very wonderful indeed, because it is the story of your parents and grandparents, and of you, yourselves.

I shall not speak of it as a historian, although it would make an interesting recital of facts and events which have made their way into the historical record of this country. I should like to speak of it as a sociologist, as one whose task it is to study society as a system of interacting agents, of groups that influence each other, dynamically in the process of social life.

Thus our spotlight is on the migration of several million people of a different culture and the influence this migration had, on the land to which they came, and on the culture of those who were there before them. The mingling of cultures is something like the blending of coffees. Each type of coffee grain has its own specific flavor, its own consistency, its own particular richness and aroma. Some blendings can be made easily. They seem, as the coffee advertisements say, to be made for each other. Others must be ground still more finely until a proper tasteful blending is complete. So it is with peoples. Some cultures blend well, others require an immense amount of give and take, of adjustment and accommodation before they can be made into a harmonious society.

But perhaps I am getting ahead of my story. I should be a good teacher and define my terms first. What is culture? And what is different in one culture or another? We can call culture the sum total of all the though and action patterns of a group or of a people as a whole. It takes in everything from our table manners to our deepest value system, from the way we dress to the way we talk, to the way we think about important things. It is enforced by pressures from those around us and builds up inside us, giving us patterns of acting and patterns of thinking. A popular New York radio program used to insist that "We are what we eat" and in a certain sense this is true. It is also true in a very real way, that we are what our cultures pressure us into being. Not that culture ever takes away free will, but that it can make it easier for us to do certain things than to do others.

May I give you an example. It is not original with me, and so you may be already familiar with it. If a young Irish lad—red hair, dimples and that winsome Irish smile—were adopted by a Chinese family when he was just a few days old, what would he be like as a young man of 21. Let me confuse the story a little more. How would he compare with a Chinese young man of 21, who had been raised since infancy in Ireland. The cultural influence working on each of these lads would have made the red-headed Irishman a perfect Chinese and the yellow-skinned youngster a 100-percent Irishman. Not only would they speak their adopted language with the accent or brogue of a native, but the redhead would think as a Chinese, would react as a Chinese, and would find a typically Irish pattern of concepts absolutely foreign to him. This is what I mean by culture, and it enters into our own lives in a million little conditioned cultural reflexes that mark us as belonging to a certain group of people.

Now if this culture is never challenged by having to come into contact with new ideas and new ways of looking at life, it can become stagnant and lose its vitality. Imagine how boring it would be to live in a land where every single person looked exactly alike, and acted exactly alike. There is a parallel, and it is found in a land where everybody thinks the same way as if they were turned out by the same limited machine. Now you appreciate that I am making these examples rather extreme to make my point more clearly. What I want to illustrate is that a nation needs the challenge of new cultures and new ideas in order to stay alive and vital in the world. This is still true today; it was even more the case at the beginning of this century when the Italians came to the United States while it was still in the wraps of its initial isolationism.

The migration was such an intercultural contact. To an Anglo-Saxon, Protestant-oriented America, there came this wonderfully different Mediterranean people. The Catholic Irish were hard enough for the native American to understand, but they still spoke the same tongue. The Germans, even though their language was different, were at least a cousin civilization, but the Italian was something else again, and this newcomer presented a different outlook on the world.

What brought this new group to the United States? What were the causes of their migration? John Foster Carr, writing in 1906, described it this way: "The poor in Italy are everywhere crushed by heavy taxes * * *. But more serious than the exactions of the tax gatherers is the long-continued agricultural depression that has reduced a large part of the south to poverty." Carr notes that the excess of births over deaths in one year amounted to 350,000 people, the population of a whole Province. "Through whole districts in this overcrowded land," he goes on, "Italians have to choose between emigration and starvation." They are driven "by a definite economic cause and not at all by any vague migratory instinct."

Oscar Handlin in his excellent study of immigration as a factor in American history notes that by 1950, more than 4,776,000 Italians had come to the United States, the peak year of the migration being 1907. The latest census information released by the Department of Commerce shows that the young of Italian stock is the largest among all the foreign stock populations in the

United States, counting for more than 13 percent of the total, and being a full half percentage point above the Germans, who rank second. More than one out of every eight persons of foreign birth or parentage in this country is of Italian stock.

What kind of people were they, these millions who crossed the great Atlantic—these immigrants who braved the ocean crossing to come in such multitudes at the turn of this century? Oh, surely, many were unlettered and unlearned, poor in their education, and poor in their possession of material goods, without schooling and often without skills; they were indeed little people who sought to find a meager place in this great but strange new land; this, all this, is true, yet culturally they were giants.

Not one but knew by heart the lilting melodies of the world's great music, not one but carried a memory of time-honored proverbs and snatches of overwhelming verse. They were the heirs of a culture whose noble traditions had become part of the air around them and they brought to the new world the sunshine and the newness of this ancient heritage.

I do not say they all were heroes, far from this. But let us merely let it be said that there are good and bad in every race and nation, and look at the vast majority who are numbered among the good. These are the folk who gave themselves to build up this Nation; because in giving it diversity, they gave it greatness.

The Italians who came to the United States in the 1890's and afterwards were not a drain on the resources or the wealth of the new world. They enriched it and they bestowed great gifts on it. Before I talk at some length of their cultural contribution—lest we forget that there were many others—let us consider the economic blessings they brought to America, their influence on the historical institutions of their adopted country, and their impressive role in the development of social and welfare thinking.

Economically they filled an important gap in the needs of the labor market of the United States. Listen to Carr writing in 1906 once again: "The Italian comes because this country has the greatest need of unskilled labor. They come by the hundred thousand yet their great numbers are quickly absorbed without disturbing either the public peace or the labor market. In spite of the enormous immigration of Italians in 1903 and 1904, the U.S. Labor Bulletin shows that the average daily wage of the laborer in the North Atlantic States—the congested area at the very gates of Ellis Island—had increased by about 4 percent. And 1904 was not a particularly prosperous year. Equally significant, in view of the unprecedented Italian immigration of the first 6 months of this year (he is talking of 1906), is the announcement in the last number of the Bulletin of the New York State Department of Labor that the improvement in the conditions of employment has been so marked, and the proportion of idle wage earners has diminished so rapidly, that the second quarter of 1905 surpasses that of 1902, which was the record year up to that time.

And the Italian was willing to work. "We who have no education," one of them used to say, "must have good sense in our hands."

And little by little, a bit more slowly than might have been expected, they have begun to take their proper place in American history, they have begun to enter the key posts in the institutions of this Nation. Now they are numbered among the Senators and the Governors of great States, their names appear in the high tribunals of justice and in the high ranks of the military, they have entered the hierarchy of the American church, and in our day even to the Cabinet of the President of the United States—and this is but the beginning.

More than this, no history of social welfare in the United States can be written without the story of one little Italian woman, who found that she really could do all things in the power of the Lord, and who made her work for the poor and needy Italian immigrant the model and pattern of much of the social charity of our time. With so much fittingness did Pius XII call her the mother of the immigrant and their celestial patron: Frances Cabrini of whom Theodore Maynard truly wrote that for her this was too small a world.

In the area of cultural contributions, let me name five of the greatest of these and then say a word about each in turn. The very presence of the Italian immigrants—as we have mentioned before and as is, of course, true of every newcomer group—their very presence focused attention on the pluralistic base of our American society. It gave the older American the chance to reflect on himself and his way of life, an opportunity to adjust outmoded patterns of social activity in line with values now seen more clearly. The Italian brought also a spirit of independence that renewed the democratic fervor of revolutionary America. Besides this, he brought with him a sense of values that was more spiritual and more open than the dry materialism that threatened to hold so grave an influence in this country's past. Fourthly, there was a certain richness to his life, a certain fullness and joy. He enjoyed life and the bittersweet ache of living, enjoyed it and embraced it with an ardor that was both attractive and catching. Finally, he brought as corollary to this depth of feeling, a tendency to the habitual practice of that most rare of gifts, the virtue of magnificence.

Every newcoming group, inasmuch as it forces the old inhabitants to reflect upon themselves thereby performs a great service to society. This is true of the Spanish-speaking in the United States today, and it was true of the Italians at the beginning of the 1900's. They prevented America from becoming the kind of nation in which everybody is slave to a single hard and fast rule of culture. They brought variety—in thinking, in acting, in the values of social life.

Next, their spirit of independence was a refreshing change on the American scene. They wanted to go into business for themselves as soon as they could. If they had a specialty—some of the finest stonecutters were Italians, and some of the best florists—they would not be satisfied unless they were doing what they liked to do and what they could do best.

Unlike the Irish, they did not enter the occupations where the individual must form part of an organized team. It is only recently that we find a good number of Italians on the police force, for example. They were independent, anxious to take care of themselves. Insurance appealed to them because the commission system gave them the chance to work for themselves. This emphasis is an important one in their outlook on life, and it has been important in American society.

Third, the Italian culture was steeped in a long tradition of Catholicism. All of them did not practice their religion, indeed many of the immigrants were strongly anticlerical with all the ugly points of view that accompany such an attitude. But whatever he thought of God and the church, he thought of it deeply, and he was never unaffected by the profoundly spiritual part of his nature. Angelo Pellegrini in his book of biographical sketches "American by Choice" describes his own mother in a sentence that subtly reveals this side of the Italian character. He writes, "She had a peasant's love for early autumn, and she was wise enough to see in the yellow leaf a reminder of her own mortality." The Italian may not be by nature a poet, but he becomes a poet more easily than the citizen of a less passionate people.

There was a joy in living that the Italian brought with him wherever he went. No matter how hard the labor of the week might be, no matter how many the troubles or how grave, he was always ready to put them aside for a fiesta or a party or a few hours of song. Psychologists today have many a name for this indispensable aid to mental health, but to the Italian it came naturally, and he brought it with him to the businesslike hurly-burly of newly industrial America.

I have referred above to the virtue of magnificence and I should like to treat this as the final one of the great characteristics of the Italian contribution. It is a hard virtue to define; perhaps I may oversimplify it by saying that it is the virtue by which we are enabled to do things in a big way. I have found—and this is a very personal experience—that God has given this gift to many Italians. It does not make any difference if they are rich or poor, learned or without education, they have a knack for seeing things in a large light and doing them in a big way. May I illustrate with one story. Last month in New York, one of the greatest and most beloved of the Italian pastors came to the end of an amazingly full and zealous life. Death came to Msgr. Bonaventure Fillitti just as he, one of the great builders of the archdiocese, was planning to erect a great new church in the Bronx.

The story of this church goes back several years to a pilgrimage that Monsignor Filitti made to Lourdes. It was a time of great grace and one in which the inspiration comes to make great resolves and great promises. Monsignor Filitti loved this central shrine of Our Lady, and at this pilgrimage he made her a promise. He promised to build a fine new church at Our Lady of Grace, his parish. So far the story is inspiring but not necessarily unusual. What adds the touch of magnificence is this. That Our Lady might know that he was not just speaking lightly, he added a sanction to his promise: He told her that he would not come back to Lourdes until the church was completed. He will never go back to Lourdes now, and other hands will finish the work he began, but the mother of God will surely smile on him with a gesture of her own magnificence when this wonderful Italian-American priest stands with his great heart before her throne.

The Italian personality, fused into the melting pot that is the American way of life, can only enrich it and make it more appealing. There is no mystery to the fact—and yet it is still an astounding fact—that the world's two most beloved and revered men of this generation have both been Italian: One of them the tall Roman nobleman who shook the modern world with the depth of his vision of the mystical body of Christ, and the other, the great old man of Sotto il Monte, whose passing still leaves us with a catch in our throats, and whose unforgettable name, we may pray, may even in our own time be raised to the honors of the altar.

The Italians in the United States have made their contribution to the greatness of this Nation. They have nothing to apologize for, for their contribution has been a substantial one. To work the hardship of separation of families on this group, as our present legislation provides, offends against the gratitude of this Nation and the laws of Christian charity.

Pope John XXIII in his very first encyclical turned his attention to this and commenting on measures recently taken to ease the migration of peoples he wrote: "We trust that these measures will make it possible for emigrants to enter those lands in greater numbers and with greater ease, but we are even more concerned that they provide for the happy reunion of parents and children as a family unit." Thus your goals are approved and promoted in the words of the man who so well deserved to be called the common father of all.

His Eminence Cardinal Confalonieri, when he spoke to you in May of 1961, in a few sentences summed up the whole message of this long talk on the cultural contribution of the immigrant, when he said, "Just as you are a vital and integral part of your wonderful nation * * * so now the new emigrants integrating little by little within the new structure, will also bring good elements of civilization, goodness, history, faith, technology, dedication—toward the mutual perfection and the concrete realization of the true universal brotherhood of the people."

This task the migrants of the past have begun, may God grant that the migrants of tomorrow—in fitting numbers and with families joined together—may continue to write the bright page of this history.

Mr. Darden's Timely Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Richmond Times Dispatch of Saturday, June 8, 1963, entitled, "Mr. Darden's Timely Warning."

The warning was contained in the John Randolph Tucker Lectures delivered by the Honorable Colgate W. Darden, Jr., at the Law School of the Washington and Lee University a few weeks ago, to which lectures reference is especially made for those who are interested in studying the subject beyond the statements contained in this editorial.

Mr. Darden is one of our most distinguished and outstanding Virginians and Americans. He served for a number of years as a Member of Congress from the Second District of Virginia. He was elected Governor of Virginia in 1941 and served the term beginning January 1942 and ending January 1946. He was one of Virginia's outstanding Governors and shortly after his term was concluded, he was elected president of the University of Virginia where he served with distinction until his retirement not long ago. I have high admiration for Mr. Darden and I am in full accord with the views which he has expressed in the lectures delivered by him at Washington and Lee University. The editorial hereinabove referred to is as follows:

MR. DARDEN'S TIMELY WARNING

Colgate W. Darden, Jr., is to be thanked for the timely warning he sounded recently against the growing role and excessive spending of the Federal Government, with the resultant steady eclipse of the State. Such a warning cannot be sounded too often, and when it comes from a man of forward-looking views with a distinguished record as Governor, Congressman, and president of the University of Virginia, it has special weight.

One cannot do justice in a limited space to Mr. Darden's analysis, as contained in his John Randolph Tucker lectures at Washington and Lee University. An extract is published below.

He points out that whereas it was inevitable in the early days of the republic that "the balance of power would shift toward the National Government," no one "ever dreamed of the dominant position now occupied by the central establishment."

"Time is running out for the States," he says, "and they must act if they are to survive." He goes on to declare that if the present trend continues, "the States will sink beneath these Federal programs."

Quoting from the late Per Jacobsson, managing director of the International Monetary Fund, he notes that this eminent Swedish expert in the field of finance said last year:

"It seems to be a lesson of history that without stable money neither justice nor progress can be assured and that the human spirit cannot give of its best if it is harrassed by all the uncertainties to which rapidly changing money values give rise."

Mr. Darden is alarmed not only by the degree of spending, but also by the fact that the Federal Government is "entering upon and financing undertakings which can be better organized and better managed by the several States."

The ultimate result, of course, is bound to be the progressive weakening of the States, unless a halt somehow is called. Mr. Darden suggests that the States should undertake the administration of all joint programs, and that there should always be "a substantial contribution by the State."

He also makes the point that if the States are to flourish, "they must be prepared and willing, to the extent of their ability, to shoulder the heavy obligations that industrialization, and the urbanization incident to it, forces upon government."

Mr. Darden urges the Council of State Governments to push a program of this nature, with the aid and collaboration of Members of Congress. Something of the sort will have to be done, if we are to salvage what is left of States' rights and local responsibility.

Tennessee Mud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what I consider to be a masterpiece in poetry by a little fourth grade girl who lives in the district I represent. She is Adele Davidson, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. J. B. Davidson, 117 Orange Lane, Oak Ridge, Tenn.

The poem follows:

TENNESSEE MUD

With pride I put it on my hand
Or wipe it on my shirt,
For this is good old Tennessee mud,
And sometimes Tennessee dirt.

Some people will swim for pastime
Others will go to sea,
But for me it's just the plain old dirt,
Or mud in Tennessee.

You may have fine playthings
Or oceans in which to play,
But for me it's the old Clinch River
And the good old Tennessee clay.

I'm glad for Melton Hill Dam
That was started by TVA
It holds up the water and what I like,
The good old Tennessee clay.

Erosion is something I hate;
It's usually caused by a flood
It washes away that Tennessee dirt
And good old Tennessee mud.

We must do something about this
And we must do our best,
So when our mud is mentioned
We can still puff out our chest.

Arkansas Delegation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday was the anniversary of the admission of Arkansas into the Union. This great State was admitted on June 15, 1836. I welcome the opportunity this commemoration affords to congratulate the people of Arkansas for having the good judgment and foresight to send its present delegation to the Congress. National leadership is fast becoming a tradition in Arkansas.

Mr. Speaker, one of my most vivid recollections as a boy is that of my hometown county fair in October 1928. I remember so well the red, white, and blue bunting of the Democratic Party booth and the pictures of Alfred E. Smith, of New York, the Democratic nominee, and his running mate, Senator Joe T. Robinson, of Arkansas. Joe Robinson blazed a trail of brilliant national leadership for Arkansas, reaching a climax today in one of the most outstanding State congressional delegations in the history of the United States. No State in the modern history of our Nation has sent to this Congress a more distinguished delegation than that presently serving from the great State of Arkansas. This fact is all the more remarkable when we consider that the Arkansas delegation is comparatively speaking a small delegation composed of only six men. No State delegation wields more influence over the future destiny of this country and upon the free world than our colleagues from Arkansas.

It is fitting and proper that we pay tribute to the people of Arkansas, and I congratulate them for sending to this Congress such an outstanding delegation, each a national leader or renown, men of integrity dedidated to the preservation of this Republic. Much could be written about the ingredients which molded this character and superb leadership. Mr. Speaker, I believe it was the independent spirit, self-reliance, intense patriotism, and a Bible-belt philosophy of a great people moving forward in an agrarian environment.

Mr. Speaker, every American can point with pride to JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, senior Senator and chairman of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, who has conducted a relentless campaign against organized crime and racketeering; Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, who is day and night involved in the great struggle to protect the free world against the onslaughts of ruthless communism; WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, is one of the world's most influential men molding U.S. tax and foreign trade policy; E. C. GATHINGS, member of the House Agriculture Committee and chairman of the Subcommittee on Cotton, who aids in the formation of the cotton policy affecting millions of cotton growers and millions of textile employees as well as the taxpayers of the country; OREN HARRIS, chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, scrutinizing and influencing the activities of television, radio, publications, interstate commerce, and foreign commerce; JAMES W. TRIMBLE, member of the powerful Rules Committee which supervises the flow of all legislation; and Mr. Speaker, I remind the House of our beloved former colleague of many years, Brooks Hays, who is now Special Assistant to the President of the United States.

Social Security Is Not Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, attempts to expand social security and to enlarge the benefits to cover health expenses remind one of the old "chain letter" schemes whereby the promoter frantically tried to perpetuate a pipedream just long enough to reap his profit before the whole financial house of cards toppled.

To call social security old age, survivors, and disability insurance is "false advertising" according to Donald Forsythe's Hancock County Journal, Carthage, Ill.

With Ben Johnson as managing editor, the June 13 issue had the following editorial:

FALSE ADVERTISING

Remember that other name for social security—"old age, survivors' and disabiilty insurance?"

Anyone who thinks this is insurance has been gravely deceived. And since the institution of insurance is highly regarded by the American people, it seems obvious that the intent was to deceive.

Our contributions to social security are not insurance premiums. They are simply taxes. The money an individual (and his employer) pays in during his working years is not set aside for him, but goes to pay those now on the OASDI benefit rolls. And, obviously, this system of "robbing Peter to pay Paul" has not worked as planned, since the tax has crept up from the original 1 percent of the first $3,000 earned to 3⅝ percent of the first $4,800. This is already more than the 3 percent ceiling originally planned and the tax will keep on going up—with further increases of nearly 50 percent now scheduled during the next 5 years.

Early beneficiaries, who had paid in very little, had a good thing in social security. But, today, the chances of many workers getting back even what they have paid in are growing pretty slim. Thus, the fear is well-founded that in time, it must be a losing venture for all.

But now, this system which has been misrepresented to the people as insurance, which is not self-liquidating and never will be, is to be extended—if the administration has its way—to include hospitalization and medical care for the aged. This, of course, will mean further tax boosts.

In 1935, when FDR was urging the "old age survivors' and disability insurance" (social security) program on Congress, he warned at the same time against extravagant action and said that too ambitious a program would be disastrous. That their action has been extravagant and far too ambitious is now painfully clear. Social security obligations to present beneficiaries and those now paying for it are estimated at over $600 billion, while total contribtuions to be made by those now working and their employers, together with the funds on hand, are estimated at just over $300 billion.

Whatever the Government may feel must be done to provide hospitalization and medical care to those over 65, it should not be hung on the shaky structure of social security. We would hope, since most of our oldsters are ready, willing and able to provide for themselves, that medicare legislation will be designed solely for those in need of it—and not masquerade as compulsory insurance for all.

First Woman Oklahoma State Legislator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Oklahoma State Legislature has adjourned and its first woman member to be elected in 15 years will have completed her first session. We are proud of the fact that that woman, Representative Pauline Tabor, is one of the representatives from Bryan County which is in the congressional district I represent. The Oklahoma House of Representatives last Friday adopted a resolution commending Representative Tabor. It reads as follows:

The presence of Mrs. Tabor has helped make the arduous job of legislation more enjoyable, and all the members feel that this lovely woman should be commended for the fine manner in which she has represented the people of Bryan County and the State of Oklahoma.

In a recent article in the Tulsa Tribune, Mr. Nolen Bulloch wrote that house members liked Representative Tabor because "she asked no quarters and gave none in committee meetings and discussions." He added, "They respect her as a woman, but they treat her as another member in the legislative work."

She is a member of committees on education, social welfare, business, and industry, public health, and industrial development. She had a perfect attendance record at committee meetings until recently when she was called home because of an emergency.

"Mrs. Tabor has won respect of her colleagues by not trying to take advantage of her femininity," Mr. Bulloch wrote. "And like the well-coached freshman member she has taken the floor only on occasion. When she does the members listen attentively. She makes strong points and in strong tones."

I have known Representatives Tabor for many years and am proud of the record she has made in her first session as a Bryan County representative in the State legislature.

The Old Pro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials commemorating the 75th birthday of James A. Farley:

[From the Trenton (N.J.) Times, May 29, 1963]

THE OLD PRO

"A sincere conviction in your own cause (whether you are selling building materials, motor trucks or a candidate)," James A. Farley once wrote, "leads you to value each person you talk to, and that value helps identify him to you."

Farley was explaining his peculiar and famous knack of remembering names and using them. He was also revealing more of himself than he may have realized.

For Jim Farley in politics was a salesman, and an enormously successful one. He knew his product and his market with almost encyclopedic thoroughness. His famous prediction in 1936 that Alf Landon would carry only Maine and Vermont was based on a sound network of political intelligence.

Today observing his 75th birthday anniversary, Jim Farley is a kind of Democratic right bower. He has no political organization as such, but his political influence is not inconsequential. He shuns the role of older statesman, preferring like that other Democratic septuagenarian, Harry S. Truman, the honest title of "politician."

Retirement from active politics brought fortune to FDR's Postmaster General and grand vizier as chairman of the board of Coca Cola Export Co., and honorary degrees and decorations from foreign governments and all kinds of kudos. But one suspects that even at the age of 75, the old pro occasionally yearns to come back to the political arena for one last hurrah.

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Home News, May 28, 1963]

A GREAT DEMOCRAT AFTER 75 FULL YEARS

James A. Farley will be 75 years old on Thursday, and the veteran politician still probably wields a great deal of power, though he is less well known to today's generation of Americans than he was to immediately preceding generations.

A Democrat of Democrats, he was a wheelhorse of the New Deal and he went on to support the Fair Deal and the New Frontier, although his Democratic salesmanship concealed a moderate conservative at heart. From active politics he went into active business and became a mainstay of the Coca-Cola empire. But soft drinks did not make him soft and he was back in the fight, shoulder-to-shoulder with former Senator

Herbert H. Lehman and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, to win the renomination of Mayor Robert F. Wagner of New York in 1961.

Farley never made it big for political office on his own, though he was put in nomination for the Presidency by Senator Carter Glass at the 1940 Democratic convention in New York.

Few followers of American Presidential campaigns will ever forget Farley's prediction in 1936 that Governor Alf Landon would carry only Maine and Vermont. And few Democrats doubt that, given the right kind of emergency and excitement, the old pro might even yet come back into the political arena for one last hurrah.

Government Lotteries of Cambodia, Japan, Malaya, the Philippines, and Thailand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to take the Members of this House to the Far East where the human urge to gamble is also recognized and capitalized on by the governments in that area of the world. Cambodia, Japan, Malaya, Philippines, and Thailand are 5 more of the 77 foreign countries that utilize government-run lotteries as revenue producers.

Cambodia operates a national lottery which, considering its size and wealth, does very well. In 1962, the gross receipts came to almost $14 million. The annual net income to the government in 1962 was over $4 million. The profits to the government were consigned to a special account and devoted to financing projects of social and economic importance.

Japan has seen the merit in government control and regulation of the inextinguishable human urge to gamble. In 1962, the gross receipts came to over $12 million. The revenue derived from the operation of this lottery—almost $4½ million—was earmarked for public works, such as construction of schools, hospitals, roads, and bridges.

Malaya started its government lottery operation in 1950 and has proven a success. The gross receipts for 1962 were over $11 million. The net income to the government was almost $4 million used for social welfare purposes.

Philippines is another country that has the wisdom to see that gambling revenues can be used for beneficial purposes. Last year, the gross receipts of its lottery amounted to over $12 million. The net profit came to over $4¼ million. The funds were used for hospitals and health centers.

Thailand has also found a national lottery very productive. Last year, the total gross receipts from running a lottery amounted to over $34¼ million. After payment of expenses and prizes, the net income to the government came to over $9¼ million which was used for public charity, public housing, and social welfare.

Mr. Speaker, the governments of these Far East countries are not the only ones which have had the wisdom to see that gambling revenues can be used to further charitable and other beneficial endeavors. The United States is one of the few Western nations that has yet to come to its senses.

A national lottery in this country can easily raise over $10 billion a year in new income which can be used to cut taxes and reduce our national debt. Why can we not even follow the example of New Hampshire? What are we afraid of? Are not the American taxpayers entitled to a break?

Panama Canal: Diplomatic Uncertainty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the cumulating arguments over increased transit capacity for the Panama Canal, there has been entirely too much loose talk on this gravely important subject, which has been featured by noisy demands upon the United States with respect to its sovereign control of the Canal Zone. Coupled with the avoidance by responsible agencies of our Government of adequate clarification of the key issues and failure on the part of the mass news media to enlighten our people, this clamor has served to compound the confusion surrounding the entire canal question.

Recent agitations for a second Isthmian Canal of so-called sea-level design through the mountainous Darien region to replace or supplement the existing waterway, have generated a considerable degree of uncertainty among the people of Panama as to the continued operation by the United States of the Panama Canal. This fact is shown by an objective editorial in La Estrella de Panama, as translated and republished in the May 29, 1963, issue of the Star & Herald, the English language companion of the other paper.

It is interesting to note that the editorial recognizes the grant in perpetuity by Panama of the Canal Zone to the United States for the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal. In addition, it makes these points: that while Panama cannot unilaterally abrogate the 1903 treaty neither can the United States; that Panama is bound by the terms of this treaty, which includes the grant of sovereignty over the Canal Zone; and that the United States cannot cease to maintain and operate the Panama Canal in perpetuity. These views accord with the provisions of the Spooner Act of June 28, 1902, which authorized the President to acquire perpetual control of the Canal Zone on behalf of the United States for the construction and perpetual operation of the Panama Canal by the United States. Thus, the editorial indicates an excellent grasp of the Isthmian Canal subject and, at this conjuncture, is a valuable contribution to the discussions now being conducted.

The foregoing causes me to suggest that there would be no need to go to the Darien region to build a new canal for the reason that the potential capacity of the existing high-level lake and lock type canal at Panama, if properly utilized through needed major operational improvement and increase of capacity of present canal facilities, would meet the needs of traffic for another hundred years. Especially do I have in mind the enlargement of the existing waterway according to the principles of the well-known and tested Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan, which other Members of the Congress and I have often explained. The cost of such major improvement would be immeasurably less than that of a new canal of sea-level design, either in Darien or at the present canal site. Nor would the Terminal Lake solution require the negotiation with Panama of a new treaty to determine the specific conditions for its construction. The last is a paramount consideration that cannot be ignored as has been done by all routine agencies that have studied the canal question.

In these general connections, Mr. Speaker, I would invite the attention of the Congress to my statement to the House on February 18, 1963, on "Panama Canal Procrastination Perilous" and to pending bills to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission. These bills include provisions that cover the transcendant diplomatic aspects of the canal problem and thus would serve to end uncertainties arising from this cause. Also, I would invite attention to my statement to the House on May 8, 1963, on "Panama Canal Questions: Immediate Action Required," and especially to the statesmanlike appraisal by Consulting Engineer E. S. Randolph of the 1960 Report of the Board of Consultants, Isthmian Canal Studies (H. Rept. No. 1960, 8t6h Cong.), which evaluation merits careful study by all concerned with the canal question.

The full text of the indicated editorial follows, and special attention is invited to its last paragraph:

[From the Panama Star & Herald, Republic of Panama, May 29, 1963]

THE SEA LEVEL CANAL THROUGH DARIEN AND THE 1903 TREATY

The possibility, not remote, that our country and the United States arrive at the necessary agreements for the proper North American agencies to proceed with the construction of a sea level canal in the Darien area, immediately brings to the fore the problem of deciding the disposition which would have to be made of the present interoceanic waterway.

It appears timely to have the record show on this issue that, if the intention of the United States in the future with respect to the present lock canal were its abandonment and its return to Panama as something already useless, there would be no objection to such a step, provided our country expressed its acquiescence to that formula, but not otherwise.

Based on the classic and traditional principle "pacta sunt servanda," which is one of the keystones of international law, the United States has held, at various times and opportunities, that the 1903 treaty, with its subsequent revisions and amendments, could not be abrogated by the unilateral decision of one of the parties. But, as is logical and elementary, our country could say the same thing, arguing with equal force that if the clauses of the treaty mentioned bind Panama, they also bind the United States to the same degree, measure, and promotion.

The foregoing premises having been established beyond argument on reasonable grounds, it follows immediately that the concession granted by our country in perpetuity to the United States, in 1903, for the concrete and specific purposes listed in that juridical instrument, is binding on Panama-true—but is equally binding upon the other contracting party. Hence, if the said concession was made—in perpetuity—to the United States for building and subsequently maintaining and operating an interoceanic canal, it is clearly evident that the United States could never, for any reason and by their exclusive will, give the Canal Zone a use different from that expressly consigned.

It cannot be supposed that anyone would attempt to give the provisions of the 1903 an interpretation different from that set forth above. Consequently, it is needless to say that without the express authority and consent of the Republic of Panama, the terms and stipulations of the treaty cannot be changed or modified by the United States, which being the beneficiaries of the concession granted therein, are able to comply with it.

Having established beyond argument that the United States cannot, by unilateral decision, alter the clauses of the 1903 treaty, it is clearly evident that just as the Republic of Panama committed itself to granting to the United States, in perpetuity, a strip of its land for building, operating, and maintaining an interoceanic canal, the United States committed itself, also in perpetuity, to operate and maintain the said waterway. And let it not be said that that concession involves only obligations for Panama and rights for the United States, for it would be absurd to maintain such a thing. Above all, because the grant was conditioned to clear and precise terms, as is shown not only by the text of the pertinent provisions, but by the eloquent fact that the United States, which has thus understood it, has never attempted—nor could it attempt—to give the Canal Zone neither a disposition nor an application different from that expressly consigned in the 1903 treaty—to construct, maintain, and operate an interoceanic canal—nor could they cease being the cause, so to speak, which led our country to becoming a party to the agreement. International treaties, as is well known, like bilateral contracts, generate obligations and rights for both parties, there being no juridical basis to the assertion, should any one make it, that the 1903 instrument is an exception.

If the Republic of Panama were to consent and permit the United States to close down the present canal, suspending its operations for good—which it is not likely to tolerate—such a step would be consequence of an agreement full of juridical value to bring about the cancellation of the 1903 treaty. But if Panama does not give its assent to such a formula, and the 1903 treaty remains in effect in the pertinent part, it would be inconceivable for the United States, ignoring and failing to comply with its obligations, would unilaterally suspend the functioning of the canal.

Flag Week Ceremonies in Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, in my district in Baltimore is located the Flag House, the home of Mrs. Mary Pickersgill, who made the flag which flew over Fort McHenry during the British bombardment in the War of 1812. It was the sight of this flag, still flying over the fort the morning of September 14, after a heavy 25-hour bombardment, which inspired Francis Scott Key to write "The Star-Spangled Banner."

Naturally, therefore, the observance of Flag Week is a great occasion in Baltimore and is always attended by special ceremonies. At the observance this year on June 9, the mayor of Baltimore, Theodore R. McKeldin, was the principal speaker. I believe his remarks are worthy of careful reading by all of us and therefore wish to insert them in the RECORD as follows:

REMARKS OF MAYOR THEODORE R. MCKELDIN AT THE STAR-SPANGLED BANNER FLAG HOUSE ASSOCIATION FLAG WEEK CEREMONIES, FLAG HOUSE, SUNDAY, JUNE 9, 1963

It is a great satisfaction to be able to make a Flag Day speech on this spot, for while the event through which Mrs. Mary Pickersgill became famous was none of our doing, suitable recognition of that event, as represented by this house is our doing. This house exists because Baltimore City is not altogether blind to the value of history. Here, by paying honor to the courage and devotion of the past, we add something to our own honor. The scriptural words "as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he," apply also to a city. What it admires it will come to be like. The more it admires greatness, the better its chance to be great.

The spirit that brought the Flag House into existence was never more needed than it is today. Please note, I said the spirit that created the Flag House, not the spirit that defended Fort McHenry so well that "the dawn's early light" showed that "our flag was still there." That spirit I am sure is still with us, but it leaps into a blaze only when some insolent foe fires upon the flag. The spirit that created the Flag House is different. It counts for most in time of peace. It is the spirit of determination that the Nation our heroes died to save shall be worthy of their sacrifice.

For no armed enemy has ever presented, or ever will present a threat to Baltimore half as dangerous as the ever-present threat that we, ourselves, may fall away from our former greatness and with our own hands undo the work to which the mighty men of the past dedicated life and fortune and sacred honor.

One means of avoiding the danger of backsliding is to keep ever in mind the heroic deeds of our forefathers. That is the object of this house. It is our way of performing an act as old as the written records of history—older, for the first records are accounts of deeds that were old when the records themselves were first made. Homer sang before his words were written. The bards of the British Isles, the tellers of the tales that Wagner fashioned into the ring, the legends of King Arthur and the song of Roland, were reciters before they were writers. But whether they worked with voice, or pen, or paintbrush, or sculptors chisel, they all worked to the same end—the end of keeping alive in the contemporary generation some spark of the spirit that inspired us "in the brave days of old."

Each age has its own way of doing this, and the Flag House is ours. It is our song of Roland, our statue of Horatius, our story of Arthur and the table round, our ensign and trumpet blast. But what shall it profit us if our eyes remain blind to the oriflamme and our ears deaf to the roll of the drums? That is why it is good for us to assemble on such an occasion as this to consider how we may remain worthy of the men who stood under its folds when the star-spangled banner was new.

For we need not think that we are released from responsibility because no hostile fleet now burdens the Chesapeake Bay, and no armed enemy stands upon the soil of North Point. We need not delude ourselves that liberty needs no defenders simply because "the rockets red glare, and bombs bursting in air" are no more than unhappy memories of long ago.

The exact opposite is the truth. American liberty never was in half as much danger from the British Army as it is now from the apathy and indifference of too many of our citizens. I wish I could say that, Baltimore is an exception to the rule, but you know and I know that the lethargy regarding public affairs that is notoriously prevalent in other parts of the country is not missing here.

More than that, it is less excusable to us than it would be in some newer city that has no such links with history as we have. Washington and Rochambeau marched their armies through our streets and soon thereafter those same streets echoed the clatter of a horse's hooves as the lone rider, Tench Tilghman, sped to Philadelphia with the news of victory. Joshua Barney, a flesh-and-blood man who was as romantic as any of the fictitious "Three Musketeers," Armistead, who held the fort "through the perilous fight," Col. Robert E. Lee, engineer of our harbor defenses, are only a few of those who have added the flitter of military fame to our history. Even more impressive is the list of defenders of liberty without medals or gold braid but with the same courage—Jared Sparks, apostle of religious liberty among Protestants, and the great cardinal who risked the displeasure of Rome in defense of the American ideal; Garrison, foe of slavery, and Taney, defender of law; poets, musicians, artisis, and scholars, far too many to be cataloged here, but who taught us the inestimable value of the free spirit—all are woven into the tapestry that is the story of Baltimore.

Would it not be inexcusable, then, for Baltimore, of all American cities, to be one to forget the meaning of American citizenship? To be an American is a privilege, yes, but it is also a responsibility and a Baltimorean carries as heavy a share of that responsibility as any other American for the very reason that so much of the history of the Nation was made here.

Mary Pickersgill was a woman who lived in a day when women were not admitted to full citizenship, much less to the dignities and burdens of public office. When the foe was at the gates she had no responsibility for manning the defenses. She was not even permitted to vote, but she had no doubt that whatever she could do she ought to do. She could at least sew a seam, and that she did, readily and well. It was merely a quirk of fate that made the strips of cloth she stitched together become the "Star-Spangled Banner" and she could have had no notion, as she labored in this house, that she was to live in imperishable memory.

But she did what she could, and in that lies her glory and her significance to you and me. Immortal fame comes to few; but the consciousness of duty faithfully discharged is available to you and me and every man and woman in this city of Baltimore. It is simply a matter of having the will to do as much as in us lies. Foes of liberty are still on the march, and the fact that they are for the most part invisible, intangible foes only makes them the more dangerous.

The Redcoats are gone, but hatred and prejudice, arrogance, greed, and blind stupidity still besiege this city, and if they are allowed to overrun it will destroy American liberty as surely and as effectively as it would have been destroyed by any of the foreign foes that have threatened it, from British kings to Communist commissars.

Furthermore, against these things military power is helpless, and civil power not much more effective. The real defense lies with the people, those Baltimoreans who are as willing to do what they can as Mary Pickersgill was. No one can promise that lasting fame will reward any of us, although the story of one faithful woman shows that it may. Yet one reward is certain. If a majority of our people rise in defense of liberty, liberty will stand, and the Baltimore of the future will weave into the tapestry of history threads of purple and gold that will make it more glorious than ever.

Here, then, at the Flag House this day, let us try to revive within our breasts something of the spirit that filled this place 149 years ago. If we can do so we shall not be assured of personal fame. As individuals, we may sink into oblivion but as a generation we shall be remembered with gratitude not unmixed with awe. If we defend liberty manfully, if we accept the responsibility of an American citizen cheerfully, and if we discharge our duty faithfully, it takes no prophet to foresee that some speaker may stand here 149 years hence and voice our praise. For that speaker will live in a greater and more glorious city than we have ever known, and will realize that he owes it to us.

National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on June 7, 1963, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held is golden anniversary convention. All Members are aware of the enormous contributions this organization has made over the year toward developing the water resources of our country.

The greetings of this House were extended to the persons present at the convention by our beloved Speaker, JOHN W. MCCORMACK. I am sure that all Members would be interested in his fine statement, as follows:

GREETINGS FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Remarks by the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK of Massachusetts, Speaker of the House of Representatives)

Mr. President, once again it is my happy privilege to extend a greeting to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

This is the 50th annual meeting of the congress. During 35 of those years, I have been a Member of the House of Representatives, and partially because my own district has been so concerned with the development of our water resources, I have had far more than a casual interest in the work and the objectives of the Rivers and Harbors Congress.

It is not an exaggeration to say that most of the progress that has been made in recent decades in the development of America's water resources has been due to the sense of urgency which has been stimulated by the activity of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

The success the Congress has had in encouraging and promoting the effective use of water and waterways is due in no small measure to the excellent leadership of such dedicated public servants as my good friend and your national vice president, Congressman BOB SIKES of Florida. Throughout his career he has been an outstanding exponent of the development of our water resources and his tireless work in behalf of the programs of this organization has made an exceptional contribution to the attainment of our objectives. He has earned the sincere gratitude of all who realize what the full use of water resources means to the progress and prosperity of America.

Organized more than 61 years ago, this congress has given invaluable assistance to regional, State, and local governments in the conservation, development, and control of the Nation's precious water supplies. It has always been nonpartisan in character and has never wavered from its singleness of purpose which is the sound and swift development of our water resources.

On the membership rolls of the organization are Governors, mayors, State legislators, water experts from industry, and I am proud to say—many of our colleagues in the House and Senate.

It is not mere coincidence that the period of greatest development of our water uses covers the lifespan of this congress. It has been the principal promoter of an ever-increasing degree of Federal participation in meeting State and local needs, notably in the fields of flood control, navigation, irrigation, and conservation.

Because the organization has no ax to grind except the progress of the national welfare as related to the use of water, it has historically had an influential voice in the executive and legislative branches of our Government. Its close relationships with committees of Congress, with the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and some 40 other Federal agencies dealing with water problems have resulted in great benefits to the prosperity of the Nation.

Improvements to rivers, harbors, inland waterways, and the Great Lakes system under the Federal navigation program have now resulted in alltime high tonnage of more than 1 billion tons of waterborne commerce a year.

Under the Federal flood control program begun in 1936, about 400 projects costing over $1 billion have been completed while projects having an estimated cost of about $5 billion are under construction. These projects have been highly effective in reducing flood damages. During the limited period they have been in operation (generally averaging less than 14 years), they have prevented flood damages of over $11 billion, thus returning 11 dollars for every 1 dollar of cost. Over $660 million of flood damage was prevented during fiscal year 1962.

A problem closely associated with the activities of the Congress, the abatement of water pollution, is deserving of our energetic advocacy. Because it has such serious implications for the health of our people, pollution of our streams and rivers is becoming an increasingly grave national problem. I firmly believe this menace should be attacked on a broad national front. It cannot be lightly dismissed as wholly a local responsibility. If we do, the desired improvements will never be made.

The plain facts are that in local communities where the pollution problem is most acute, the local governments simply cannot raise the necessary funds to eliminate the sources of infection without Federal assistance. They are already carrying a heavy tax burden. Rivers recognize no State boundary lines and neither do the germs of pollution which too many of our rivers are carrying to the detriment of many communities.

From personal experience, I know of several communities in our New England area which will be unable to cope with their pollution problems without Federal aid, and there are several hundred cities and towns in a similar condition throughout the country. Nature has endowed our land with an abundance of water, but it is obviously a relatively fixed supply. An increasing population and expanding industry are drawing more heavily each year on the available sources. More water is being consumed and more wastes are being discharged into our streams. These wastes cause the pollution which imperils our domestic water supplies, industrial uses, agriculture, fish, shellfish, and wildlife and recreational facilities.

When it is realized that two-thirds of our people get their drinking water from surface water supplies into which disease-carrying bacteria and toxic substances are being discharged, the menace in such a condition to the health of the Nation becomes real. The cure for this serious situation must be the construction of waste treatment and sewage disposal facilities wherever the problem prevails. I ask you if this is not a real problem for our Federal Government to aid?

The improvement of our waterways for shipping has resulted in enormous economic benefits to the Nation. We have seen countless instances as proof of this. Personally I am most familiar with the projects at Boston Harbor with which I have been closely associated throughout my congressional life. The development of this harbor has made possible the accommodation of ships of greater tonnage, bringing lower transportation costs to the industries in the area and encouraging new industry to locate there.

Unfortunately, expansion of the railroads is not likely in the future. Railroads are essential and we must not let them decay. But we must supplement their transportation efforts through progress in the expansion of our waterway system. History has borne out the economic value of our waterway projects. They will continue to contribute many advantages to a growing country. They will play a major role in the economic destiny of our country. We must do our full share in the greater and more prosperous America that lies ahead.

Like all of you, I am well aware that there are projects all over the country which, if further developed, would better serve not only local, but the national interests. As constructively exemplified in your work, however, there is a need to establish a priority system for such projects, even though we, by natural inclination, would like to accomplish the jobs all at once.. Consequently, I am hopeful, that as soon as possible, the many meritorious projects still being held in abeyance can also be considered and approved soon in successive years.

As we face the future, I want to commend you again, and express appreciation for the splendid work you are doing in this significant field. Moreover, I shall look forward to what I know will be the constructive results of this convention. In your efforts, I am confident, you will write another significant page in the history of the Nation's rivers and harbors development programs.

Another Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the American farmer, as so vividly illustrated in the recent wheat referendum, wants no part of Government controls. This dislike and, yes, distrust, has not just happened. It has been building up for a great number of years. One of the principal reasons for the Department of Agriculture's popularity downfall can be seen in a matter involving a Gratiot County farmer, Mr. Dale Wetzel, of rural Ithaca, Mich. Following is a newspaper article from the June 13 edition of the Gratiot County Herald, Ithaca, on this subject which I respectfully call to the attention of all Members. Mr. Wetzel, I believe, has accomplished a needed and admirable service in explaining clearly and simply the control plight confronting our Nation's farmers. His is not a lonely fight, for the vast majority of farmers have and continue to seek greater freedom and less Government controls and influence.

The article follows:

Dale Wetzel Gives Views on "Creeping Paralysis"

"I think it's time for people to wake up to the fact that we're slipping away from our government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

"This whole setup is something that started a long time ago and you might as well say it's like creeping paralysis—it's been taking ahold."

Speaking was Dale Wetzel of rural Ithaca who in recent months has been waging a not-so-silent battle with the Federal Government over a 1962 wheat allotment.

TO DATE

Thus far Wetzel has:

Refused to pay a $294.15 fine for growing 2½ acres too much wheat in 1962;

Told a U.S. attorney in Bay City's U.S. district court that "there's a difference between socialism and communism, and that's how they are spelled";

Asked for a prison term "that I could serve it with honor as an American citizen to set an example of what this whole mess is";

And finally, threatened to fight for a jury trial if he is fined.

Wetzel spells out the circumstances thusly:

In 1962 he had a wheat allotment of 17½ acres. Local representatives of the Agriculture Department's Stablization and Conservation Committee came to his farm a mile north and 2½ east of Ithaca and measured 20 acres of wheat—2½ acres too much.

FOUR CHOICES

Wetzel had four choices, he says:

(1) He could deliver the excess wheat to the local ASC office.

(2) He could pay a $294.15 fine.

(3) He could raise 2½ acres less than his allotment in 1963.

(4) He could sign up under the Government's feed program.

Wetzel did none. And although he planted no wheat in 1963, he says, the Government pressed the case, which made Wetzel mad.

"This is proof that they're not interested in not raising too much wheat, but rather only in telling you what to do."

Local authorities turned his case over to State officials, Wetzel says, and they in turn handed it to the Federal Government.

In May of this year, he received a summons to apear in U.S. district court in Bay City.

Wetzel appeared and said he wouldn't pay his fine. He repeated his contention that the Government's only interest was in "telling us what we had to do," adding that "if that's not a form of socialism, I'd like to have someone explain it to me."

According to Wetzel, the Government's attorney threatened a lien on his farm. Wetzel claims he would be denied a jury trial, "which is contradictory to the Constitution."

Dale Wetzel says his defiance isn't "because I don't love my country." But rather is "because I love my country." He believes that "when they take my freedom away from me, they've taken everything I've got."

Wetzel isn't afraid of the consequences, whatever they prove to be. "I'm not afraid. When you take away a man's freedom, what do we have left?"

"If I had to take 50 cents a bushel less for wheat, I'd do it instead of getting $1.50 and letting them tell me what to do," he asserts.

Of his current situation, Wetzel says, "For my own satisfaction, I wanted to prove to people around here what the whole mess was like."

NOT EXPLAINED

Wetzel argues that Government participation in agriculture via the controls program "never has been completely explained to the people for fear they wouldn't accept it.

"They've shoved this to the people and we can't blame anybody but the farmers themselves, because they thought they were going to get something for nothing."

Today, he says, the average farmer goes along with the program because "it's the road of least resistance."

Wetzel's attitude isn't of recent vintage. He says he never has supported the Government's activities in agriculture, never has been inside the ASC office and never has accepted a dollar from the Government programs.

He favors lifting of all subsidies and letting "supply and demand take care of itself."

"How can we send our children to school and teach them that this is a free enterprise system, then attempt to explain the restrictions on farmers?"

Congressman Mailliard Notes the California Legionnaire Supports Senator Kuchel's Stand Against Rightwing Extremists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the controversy surrounding my California colleague's recent Senate speech regarding the rightwing extremists, and certain allegations growing out of this controversy, I submit for the record the following editorial from the June 1 issue of the California Legionnaire indicating that organization's position concerning Senator KUCHEL and his speech:

Rightwing Extremists

For the past 45 years, ever since it was organized, the American Legion has been voicing warning to the American people of the dangers of the international Communist conspiracy.

In recent years a number of "Johnny come lately" organizations have seized on the Legion's basic policies, and then proceeded to twist them to suit their own purposes.

These organizations, known popularly as the "radical rights," have themselves sewed the seeds of discord. They have had the effrontery to brand such truly great Americans as General and former President Dwight D. Eisenhower and J. Edgar Hoover, the wonderfully able Director of the FBI, as members or dupes of the Communist conspiracy.

Under the guise of fighting communism, some of these groups have been spreading a program that is curiously akin to that of nazism and fascism; they have attempted to stir up racial and religious strife.

Recently, a distinguished Californian and Legionnaire, U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, took the floor of the Senate and lashed out against the "unadulterated venom, hoaxes, and lies" of some of these "self-styled patriotic groups."

Some groups attempted to use his words to further their own ends, by claiming Senator KUCHEL was attacking the Legion. This the Senator vigorously and emphatically denied. In a telegram to department headquarters he said:

"As an American and as a Legionnaire, I have the highest respect for the American Legion and its dedicated patriotism."

As an organization composed of men and women who have fought in three major wars for this country to preserve the American way of life and the four freedoms, the American Legion will continue to fight the inroads of atheistic communism.

And at the same time, the American Legion will continue to flight against nazism, fascism, dictatorship—against anything that would infringe the wonderful God-given liberty and freedom, won for us by our ancestors and preserved down through the years by the dedicated men and women who have been willing to give their lives in defense of their Nation.

The preamble to the American Legion constitution reads "For God and country * * *" and Legionnaires will ever continue to fight for God and country.

And with Legionnaire KUCHEL, we will continue to decry the activities of some self-styled patriotic groups.

All Republicans Against

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose herewith the following editorial from the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S.C., of May 28, 1963:

All Republicans Against

By a vote of 19 to 15 the House Agricultural Committee approved a cotton bill carrying out President Kennedy's recommendation for elimination of the present two-price system for the crop.

That is what the majority of the executives throughout the textile industry have been asking for for the past several years.

All 14 Republican members of the committee voted against the measure.

That shows where the Republican Party stands with respect to the textile industry.

Costs of Producing Cotton—Pt. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues several studies and analysis compiled by various State experimental stations on the costs and returns of cotton production. The first, "An Economic Analysis of Irrigated Cotton Production" by the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station—a part of the Texas A. & M. College system—on the middle Brazos River Valley, 1955–58, indicates that production costs on irrigated cotton was 23.2 cents per pound and 23.6 cents on dryland.

COSTS OF PRODUCING COTTON

PRODUCTION INPUTS AND COSTS

Preharvest production requirements for irrigated cotton are compared with normal requirements for dryland cotton in table 6. The data are not entirely comparable as they were not obtained from paired observations and they refer to different periods of time. The comparison affords some measure of of added production practices and an approximation of the amount of increase in production requirements in adjusting from dryland to irrigated cotton production.

The cost of average amounts of power and machinery, labor, and materials used in irrigated cotton production are shown in table 7. Material and labor costs are an average of those reported each year. Power and machinery costs, which include depreciation, interests on investment, repairs and fuel, oil, and maintenance costs are based on 1958 prices. Operating water cost is the average amount spent per acre for fuel or energy, oil, repairs, and maintenance on pumping equipment. Overhead irrigation costs consist of an allowance for depreciation, interest, and taxes on irrigation facilities excluding the investment in land forming. The investment in land forming is treated as a capital improvement, and only the labor and power costs required for maintenance are included as annual costs.

Harvest and associated costs include hand snapping, bracero services, hauling seed cotton to the gin, ginning, bag and ties, and hauling lint cotton to the warehouse. A substantial portion of the 1959–60 cotton crop was mechanically harvested, but only a few bales were mechanically harvested on the 12 farms during 1955–58.

Gross receipts per acre varied widely among years and among farms. They averaged $337, $307, $253, and $229 per acre in 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958, respectively. The gross receipts per acre ranged from $473 on one farm in 1955 to $145 per acre on another in 1958.

The price received by cooperating farmers averaged 31.73, 31.27, 26.56, and 28.80 cents per pound of lint cotton in 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958, respectively. Cottonseed averaged $64.75, $62.84, $49.61, and $39.91 per ton during the same respective years. Lint and seed qualities deteriorated under adverse weather in the fall of 1957, 1958, and 1960. In these years, approximately two-fifths of the crop was harvested before the fall rains began. Cotton harvested before the rains sold for 32 to 34 cents per pound of lint; whereas, weather-damaged cotton sold for about 23 cents. Cottonseed prices were generally lower in 1957–58 than in 1955–56. Seed prices were further depressed by weather damage in 1957–58. They ranged from $7 to $15 per ton below the price received before the quality was impaired.

The 4-year average price received was 29.61 cents per pound of lint and $54.57 per ton of seed.

Largely because of the shorter staple, the price received for nonirrigated cotton produced in 1955 was generally about 2 cents per pound lower than that received for irrigated cotton of the same quality. Cotton produced on land prepared for irrigation, but not irrigated in 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1960 was comparable in grade and staple length to undamaged irrigated cotton.

The estimated average specified preharvest costs for irrigated cotton are about $54 per acre more than for nonirrigated cotton, table 7. Assuming a yield of 400 pounds of lint per acre for nonirrigated cotton and the prices and costs shown in table 7, yields per acre for irrigated cotton would need to be about 220 pounds higher than nonirrigated cotton, 620 pounds, for returns to land management from irrigated cotton to equal those from nonirrigated cotton. For 1955–58 yields of irrigated cotton averaged 823 pounds of lint per acre, or about 423 pounds more than from nonirrigated cotton. On the average during this period, irrigated cotton was considerably more profitable than nonirrigated cotton. However, averages do not tell the entire story, as is indicated in the following section.

TABLE 7.—*Estimated returns and costs per acre, irrigated cotton, 1955–58 average compared with estimated normal returns and costs for dryland cotton, middle Brazos River Valley*

Item	Unit	Irrigated cotton			Dryland cotton [1]		
		Units per acre	Price per unit	Cost or return per acre	Units per acre	Price per unit	Cost or return per acre
		Number	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Number*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
Returns:							
Lint	Pound	823.0	[2] 0.3000	247	400.0	0.3000	120
Seed	do	1,317.0	[2] .0300	40	640.0	.0300	19
Total	do			[3] 287			[3] 139
Specified expenses:							
Preharvest:							
Power and machinery	Hour	6.6	[4] 2.75	18.15	5.8	[4] 2.85	16.53
Man labor:							
Machine operator	do	6.6	.52	3.43	5.8	.52	3.02
Hoe labor	do	31.0	.42	13.02	30.0	.42	12.60
Irrigation labor	do	12.0	.57	6.84			
Seed	Pound	45.0	.05	2.25	45.0	.05	2.25
Fertilizer: [5]							
Nitrogen [5]	do	77.0	.0975	7.51	40.0	.0975	3.90
P_2O_5 [5]	do	26.0	.10	2.60	20.0	.10	2.00
Insecticides:							
Applied by ground machine.[6]	Number	4.0	.64	2.56	6.0	.72	4.32
Applied by plane [7]	do	14.0	2.70	37.80	4.0	2.50	10.00
Water:							
Operating cost [8]				5.28			
Overhead cost [9]				8.36			
Ditch work				1.07			
Total preharvest				108.87			54.62
Harvest and associated cost [10]	Pound	823.0	.0995	81.89	400.0	.0995	39.80
Total specified costs				190.76			94.42
Return to land, management, and general farm overhead.				[3] 96			[3] 45
Production cost	Pound			.232			.236

[1] Adapted from TAES MP-228.

[2] The 1955–58 average prices received for irrigated cotton were 29.61 cents and 2.72 cents per pound of lint and seed, respectively. For purposes of comparison, a price of 30 cents per pound of lint and 3 cents per pound of seed is used for both irrigated and dryland cotton.

[3] Rounded to nearest dollar.

[4] Includes fixed and operating cost of farm machinery but not labor of operator.

[5] Pounds of nutrient element applied.

[6] Material cost only. Cost of applying included only power and machinery and machine operator.

[7] Materials and application.

[8] Expenditures for fuel or energy, oil, repairs, and maintenance for pumping water.

[9] Depreciation, interest, and taxes on irrigation facilities, excluding investment in land forming.

[10] Defoliant costs averaged $3.61 per acre on farms where used. Defoliant cost is not included in this cost summary.

EVALUATION OF RESULTS

Six years of experience indicate that irrigation of cotton can increase or decrease net income, depending largely upon the time and amount of rainfall received during the cotton-harvesting season. In years such as 1955, 1956, and 1959, irrigation increased returns from cotton materially. With weather at harvest time like that experienced in 1957, 1958, and 1960, luck and managerial skill are needed to increase income through irrigation. Under irrigation more cotton will be put on the stalk, but it requires more time and delays the harvest. With dry fall weather, the delay in harvest has no particular significance. But with a wet fall, the yield, and grade losses associated with delayed harvest are likely to reduce the net returns from irrigated cotton below those from nonirrigated cotton.

The amount of rainfall received in June and July, particularly July, affects the time and number of irrigations. Weather records for the 58-year period, 1903–60, are available for the Valley Junction Weather Station. Assuming that irrigation would be beneficial when July rainfall is 3 inches or less, these records indicate that irrigation is likely to be beneficial to some extent in 4 out of 5 years.

Harvest and grade losses result from heavy rains or from extended periods of damp weather. Weather data for the period of record, 1903–60, indicate the total amount of precipitation recorded by months. The period of time or number of days in which precipitation occurs during the month is not shown.

The probable occurrence of a damaging amount of precipitation (4 inches or more) during each September, October, or November is shown in table 8. The proportion of years in which monthly rainfall of 4 inches or more occurs during the fall harvest season is shown in table 9. Assuming that a total monthly rainfall of 4 inches or more will contribute to harvest and grade losses, these records indicate that a monthly rainfall of damaging proportions during 1 or more of the following months September, October, or November can be expected to occur in 5 out of 9 years. Contrary to general belief, these records indicate that a dry summer, as measured by precipitation during July, is not necessarily followed by a dry fall. With July rainfall of 2 inches or less, the chances for a damaging rain, 4 inches or more per month in October and November, are slightly greater than in years when July rainfall exceeds 2 inches, table 8. Regardles of the amount of precipitation received in July, there is a 1 to 3 chance that October rainfall will exceed 4 inches. Harvest and grade losses are also associated with extended periods of damp weather even though less than 4 inches of rain are received. The probability of escaping grade damage during the harvest season may be somewhat less than the data in table 8 would suggest. Favorable fall weather conditions like those in 1956 occurred only 5 times during 1903–60.

TABLE 8.—*Probable occurrence of damaging rainfall related to July precipitation, middle Brazos River Valley, Tex., Valley Junction weather records*

July precipitation		Chances for occurrence of 4 inches or more precipitation			
Inches	Frequency[1]	August	September	October	November
Under 1	1–3	1–10	1–10	1–3	2–5
1.01 to 2	1–3	1–6	1–6	1–3	1–3
2.01 to 3	1–6	1–4	1–10	1–3	2–9
3.01 and over	1–5	1–6	1–8	1–3	1–8
Average chance of occurrence		1–6	1–8	1–3	1–4

[1] Frequency in which July precipitation of the indicated amount is received.

The increased harvest costs and reduced gross returns caused by weather damage suggest that the most profitable use of irrigation involves adoption of cultural and irrigation practices designed to lessen the effects of damaging fall rains.

Such a program would likely involve a reduction in water inputs and slightly lower yield levels than those attempted in the past. A program of this kind was accidentally followed on some farms in 1957, 1958, and 1960 and was purposely adopted on 4 of the 12 farms in 1961. Essentially, the program involves land preparation, fertilization, planting, and all other input practices associated with irrigation except that the cotton crop will not be irrigated unless weather makes irrigation necessary. If irrigation is practiced, it will be terminated early in August, as recommended in TAES MP–470.[1]

This program stresses the insurance feature of irrigation rather than maximum yields. The reduced level of water use would probably result in lower yields in years with a dry open fall such as that of 1956; but, as it contributes to early maturity, it is likely to produce a higher average yield of quality cotton, particularly in years such as 1957, 1958, and 1960.

TABLE 9.—*Proportion of years in which monthly precipitation after July exceeds specified amounts, middle Brazos River Valley, Tex.*[1]

[In percent]

Month	Precipitation exceeding (inches)—						
	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
August	15.7	10.5	3.5	1.7	1.7	0	0
September	12.3	7.0	5.3	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
October	33.3	21.0	12.3	12.3	8.7	8.7	5.3
November	28.0	21.0	14.0	10.5	5.3	3.5	3.5
December	28.0	21.0	14.0	8.7	3.5	1.7	1.7

[1] Valley Junction weather records, 1903–60, inclusive.

Operating costs of water is another item that may have an important bearing on the profitableness of irrigation in the Middle Brazos River Valley. The operating costs—expenditure for fuel or energy, oil, repairs, and maintenance—shown in table 7 are 4-year average costs per acre for all farms in the study. These averages obscure variations in water cost per acre-inch among farms. Unit operating cases (cost per acre-inch) were highly variable, depending principally on difference in well capacity. Higher yielding wells had unit operating costs that were much less than those on low yielding wells. In 1956, for instance, operating costs ranged from 13 cents per acre-inch on an engine-powered pumping plant delivering 1,380 gallons per minute to $2.42 per acre-inch on a similarly powered plant delivering 125 gallons per minute. With similar well capacities, there was no appreciable difference in unit operating costs between pumps powered by electricity averaging 2.87 cents per kilowatt and those fueled by liquefied petroleum gas at 9 cents per gallon. Similar unit operating cost behavior has been noted in other areas, notably the high plains.[2]

The data indicates that unit operating costs increase sharply as well capacities decrease below 500 gallons per minute. A 50-percent decrease in capacity from the 500 gallons per minute level raises unit operaing costs from 33 to 69 cents per acre-inch. Approximately 12 percent of the wells included in the study had capacities of 250 gallons per minute or less, table 2.

Footnotes at end of speech.

---

[1] Hohn, C. M., Fisher, F. L., and Caldwell, A. G., "Moisture-Fertility Relations of Cotton at College Station, 1957–59," TAES MP–470, November 1960.

[2] Hughes, Wm. F., and Magee, A. C., "Changes in Investment and Irrigation Water Costs, Texas High Plains, 1950–54," TAES Bulletin 828, March 1956.

Mass Decorations From the Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, we pause today to commemorate the 22d anniversary of the mass deportations from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia which occurred in June 1941. By so doing, we remind ourselves once again that we in the United States enjoy the blessings of liberties while many peoples are suffering the terrors of Communist oppression. It is fitting that we pause to pay homage to the freedom-loving peoples of the Baltic States on the 22d anniversary of the martyrdom of thousands of Baltic citizens at the hands of Soviet troops.

These outrages against humanity were the aftermath of the forced incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union 1 year earlier. To understand the full tragedy of the mass deportations of June 1941 one must recall the historical context in which they took place. Lithuania has been known to history since the year 1009, when a number of Eastern European principalities joined together to form a state. The king of a united Lithuania was recognized in the 13th century, and shortly thereafter the boundaries of Lithuania extended into what is now the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. During the Middle Ages, Lithuanians were respected as a powerful and independent European state which was capable of turning back foreign invaders. The "eastern Slavs" enjoyed far more freedom than the residents of Moscow and strove to live in peace with neighboring peoples.

Lithuania, like Latvia, fell under Russion control in 1795, when the czar seized a substantial part of Poland and that country lost its independence. For the next century and one-quarter, the Baltic peoples suffered under Russian rule but, firmly committed to their ancient traditions of freedom and national independence, repeatedly sought to throw out the foreign rulers. Revolutionary efforts were not immediately successful, but neither were the Russian overlords able to wipe out memories of earlier days.

The period of czarist rule came to an end after the First World War, when the Baltic countries regained their ancient sovereignty. Although caught between the overwhelming forces of larger neighbors, the Baltic peoples fought for their independence, and for a brief two decades between the world wars, the ancient dreams of a return to independent Baltic nations were realized. For these two decades the peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia labored to establish modern government, and economies, while gaining respected places as members of the League of Nations. Yet even as they were immersed in their task of rebuilding their beloved homelands, new calamity struck. In 1939 the Soviet Union imposed mutual defense pacts on the Baltic countries in order to station Russian soldiers within their borders. In 1940 the three peaceful republics were forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union.

It was then that the Soviet Union imposed a wave of terror on the three Baltic peoples. Looking backward, czarist efforts at the "Russification" of the Baltics appear mild when compared to Stalin's brutal techniques. On June 14, 1941, the wave of deportations reached its peak, continuing in Lithuania for 5 more nights. Fifteen thousand Latvian men, women, and children were rounded up by Soviet secret police during a single night and transported in cattle cars to the slave labor camps of Siberia. Thousands of Lithuanians and Estonians were similarly rounded up and deported under equally inhuman conditions. The courageous Baltic peoples resisted these efforts, at times with their lives, but this reaction only resulted in plans for the total deportation of the Baltic peoples to northeast Russia and Siberia.

On this 22d anniversary of the mass deportations from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, the American people renew their vow to continue the age-old struggle for freedom. The hopes of the Baltic peoples are the hopes of the whole free world. We look forward to the day of deliverance, when the Baltic nations will resume their rightful place in the community of nations. We salute the passionate desire for freedom of the Baltic peoples, a desire which they share with freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

Remarks of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson at the University of Maryland, June 8, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, the University of Maryland has emerged as an important contributor to the ever-widening field of science. Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson lauded this fact, as well as the State of Maryland's stance among the top ten in science, scientific research, and scientific manpower, in a recent commencement address at the University of Maryland.

In a positive and forceful speech, Vice President Johnson also spoke about the possible results of man's dramatic progress in science, and the future relationship between government and science.

The text of Vice President Johnson's speech follows:

Remarks of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson at the University of Maryland, College Park, Md., June 8, 1963

So long as there have been commencement exercises, it has been traditional to assure each graduating class that they were about to enter a disturbed, plagued and gravely threatened world. This year many speakers seem to have found a new horizon of hopelessness.

If communism doesn't bury us, if socialism doesn't engulf us, if our debt and taxes don't topple on us, if morality doesn't collapse beneath us, the class of 1963 is told to rest secure because, in due time, we are sure to be overtaken and destroyed by the advance of science.

I do not accept this verdict on the future of man—or the consequences of mankind's present dramatic progress in science and all the fields of human knowledge. If I may, I would like to talk with you about this today—and especially about the future relationship of government and science.

In the early 1950's, the University of Maryland ranked among the first 10 of the Nation in football. For reasons we won't go into here, that is somewhat changed. However, today the State of Maryland ranks among the first 10 in science, in scientific activity and in scientific talent.

Maryland is making a major and impressive contribution to our national efforts in science.

But some are asking the question—what contribution are those national efforts making for all the people of all the States?

Is our space effort too dominant? Is it usurping too much of our scientific talent and ability? Is the concentration of space science depriving us of opportunities to learn what remains to be learned on and about earth? Is the space effort leading us to neglect other work we ought to be doing on earth?

If we as a nation had no competition, if we had no stakes of national prestige, if we had no considerations of national security, if there were no Communist Russia or no Communist China, if we had nothing but our self-respect and our tradition of free scientific inquiry, our effort in space today should differ very little from its present magnitude or its present priorities.

What we are and what we aspire to be as a nation rests upon the predicate of maintaining peace on earth. If peace is to be maintained on earth, freemen must acquire the competence to preserve space as a field of peace before it can be made into a new battlefield by tyranny. Were there no other considerations, this alone would require us to do what we are doing in space—and would permit us to do no less.

We are not reaching for prestige in space—we are reaching for peace. And this is considerably more urgent than many realize or others will yet admit.

In large measure, this perspective helps to answer other questions now being raised.

Space is clearly the great breakthrough of human knowledge—for centuries to come. We do not know—and the Soviets do not know—what the stars will tell us. We do know that to default the exploration of the universe of space would surely be as catastrophic in its consequences as if we had defaulted exploration of the universe of the atom. Our superiority in any scientific field will be brief and fading if we do not win and hold competence in this new and decisive realm of discovery.

In exploring space, we are exploring the environment of the earth itself. We are finding paths through a new dimension—and historically civilizations have stood or fallen according to their ability to move through a dimension.

We seek to make space an instrument for peace and the development of mankind. But if we abandon the field, space can be preempted by others as an instrument for aggression.

And in a world of competing social systems, we would be naive indeed if we failed to recognize how bleak the future would be if this new dimension became the realm of tyranny. For your children, and your children's children, an iron curtain would be drawn across the pathway to the stars.

What concerns me today is the nature of the fashionable outcry against science itself—and the source from which much of the most vocal criticism comes. In our enlightened intellectual community, many are parroting George Bernard Shaw's often quoted phrase, "Science is always wrong—it never solves a problem without creating 10 more."

Science is not creating our problems—it is creating answers to our problems. A rare moment of opportunity is upon us. But many to whom we should turn for affirmation, confidence, and enthusiasm are offering doubt, disenchantment, and despair.

A free society can longer outlive the failures of its scientists than the lack of faith of its philosophers. We of America cannot lead the world, we cannot keep up with the world, we cannot even follow closely behind the world if we permit our sophistication and abundance to degenerate into cynicism and arrogance.

As Shakespeare put it, "Our doubts are traitors"—because they make us lose the good we might win "by fearing to attempt."

As the best fed, best clothed, best housed, best educated people in all history, Americans today must not fear to attempt.

Space is a boon, not a boondoggle. We are talking superstition, not sense, when we talk of machines overpowering men. We are selling ourselves short when we show the white feather to nuclear fission.

As David Lilienthal said some years ago, "A world of science and great machines is still a world of men; our modern task is more difficult, but the opportunity for democratic methods can be even greater than in the days of the ax and the handloom.

Our challenge today is not to turn back from the horizons of physical science but to turn toward the new and greater horizons of political science.

The struggle of this century is a struggle between two political systems, free and slave. If science is pressed into the service of those who would enslave mankind, science must also be marshaled to support those who would keep men free.

If that goal is to be served, we must not permit the pace of physical science to outrun the performance of our political science.

Our public policy as well as our popular philosophy must embrace the greater opportunities being opened to us by science and put these new capabilities to greater use. This is our real challenge today.

We have a long and undistinguished record in America of failing to anticipate the promise and potential of each new age of science, invention, and discovery. Early in our history, there was an effort to close down the Patent Office on the theory that everything worth inventing had already been invented. Even so farsighted an American as Woodrow Wilson spent time denouncing the automobile. The steamboat, the locomotive, the airplane all brought prophecies of doom and gloom. We have learned a lesson we surely do not need to be taught again.

You of the class of 1963 do not graduate into hopeless times. On the contrary, unlike the class of 1953 or 1943, or 1933, you graduate into one of the most hopeful times in the history of man.

Our world today is moved and motivated as it has never been before by the enthusiasm, optimism, and confidence of peoples everywhere. These is war, there is poverty, there is ignorance. But for the first time, nations of Africa and Asia along with nations of Europe and the Americas are working together for world peace, for economic growth, for better education.

We are climbing toward the summit of man's experience and science is the lifeline that ties us all together. We cannot accept, we do not accept, the sudden cynicism of those who tell us this rope which lifts us up is in reality a noose about our necks.

As has been said, "The feeling of distrust is always the last which a great mind acquires."

The feeling of distrust of the future should be the last which a great nation such as ours acquires.

Report on Telstar II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, we are all intensely interested in the results achieved by Telstar II which was put in orbit by NASA for the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. This is the only communications satellite entirely financed by private industry from research on through its being placed in orbit, because American Telephone & Telegraph paid NASA for placing the satellite in orbit.

A full report up to June 12 on Telstar II is as follows:

TECHNICAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

COMMUNICATIONS TESTS

During the first 200 orbits of the Telstar II satellite, 15 public demonstrations, and about 273 technical tests were conducted.

The transmission characteristics of the satellite are identical to what they were in measurements before launching and are very nearly the same as those of the Telstar I satellite.

The broadband microwave communications signals received at the Andover ground station from Telstar II have been in the range of from minus 95 to minus 98 dbm. The VHF telemetry signals have been received at from minus 117 to minus 125 dbm.

During the first usable pass at Andover (pass No. 4) on the evening of May 7, the traveling-wave tube in the satellite's receiver was operated for about 11 minutes and a 7 minute television tape was sent from Andover to the satellite. The picture quality received at Andover was excellent. The French and British stations also received the last minute or so of the tape. Because of marginal telemetry reception at Andover, the traveling-wave tube was turned off early on pass No. 4.

Before pass No. 5, the sensitivity of the earth station telemetry receiver was improved by installing a dual notch filter to reduce the noise. As a result of the change, reliable telemetry data can now be obtained at signal levels as low as minus 126 dbm. Power in the command transmitter at Andover has been increased from 210 to 290 watts to lengthen the time during which the satellite can be commanded.

On the evening of May 8, the same tape that was sent the first night was transmitted by Andover to the satellite and the British and French ground stations received the entire transmission. Color TV was also transmitted with excellent results.

There have been several other TV demonstrations via Telstar II, including transmission from Europe to Andover. Technical tests have included differential phase and gain, noise loading and envelope delay distortion.

TRACKING

The tracking of the satellite also has met expectations. The precision tracker tracks Telstar II to within .02 of a degree and the autotrack system of the horn-reflector antenna tracks it to about .005 of a degree. Tracking experiments similar to those done with Telstar I are planned, using predicted orbital position for direct acquisition by the horn antenna and using the autotrack system for tracking. The purpose of this is to test operational techniques for acquisition and tracking with a minimum amount of predicted data. With this method, the precision tracker is not required as an acquisition aid.

ORBIT CHARACTERISTICS

The improved Thor-Delta rocket, launched by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration from Cape Canaveral, placed Telstar II in an orbit that is slightly higher than planned because the third stage booster was more powerful than a nominal one. The actual apogee of 6,713 statute miles compares to a planned apogee of 6,560 miles, while the actual perigee of 604 miles compares to a planned perigee of 575 miles. The actual inclination of the orbit of 42.7 degrees with respect to the equator is only slightly different from the planned inclination of 43 degrees. The actual period of orbit, 225.3 minutes, is slightly longer than the planned period of 221 minutes. Telstar II is traveling at more than 19,500 miles per hour at perigee, and about 8,400 mph. at apogee.

Telstar II was set spinning at a speed of 179 revolutions per minute, compared to an initial spin rate of 177 rpm. for Telstar I. The spin stabilizes the satellite and permits control of the axis to keep it nearly perpendicular to align from the sun to the satellite so the spin and the perpendicular axis does not allow any of the solar cells to be continuously in the sun, thus preventing their overheating and subsequent reduction of sensitivity. The spin rate slows gradually but as long as the satellite is spinning at any rate greater than 5 rpm., it will remain stabilized.

The angle of the spin axis of Telstar II in relation to a line drawn from the sun to the satellite (solar aspect) is 80.9 degrees compared to a range of from 80 to 100 degrees for Telstar I. Six special solar cells, acting as light detectors, on the satellite's skin provide information on the spin axis direction with respect to the sun. A telescope at Holmdel, N.J., also permits observation of sunlight flashes reflected from three mirrors on the satellite's surface. From this, it is possible to determine the angle between the spin axis and the ecliptic plane.

CONDITION OF SATELLITE

Telemetered data received from Telstar II indicates that temperatures inside and outside the satellite are normal. The skin temperature at the upper pole of Telstar II has been running between 35 and 50 degrees Fahrenheit and, at the lower pole, from zero to 10 degrees because of the solar aspect. When Telstar II is in the earth's shadow, however, these temperatures will drop as much as 40 degrees.

Within the satellite, the temperature in the electronic component canister has been running between 72° and 78° F., about the same as for Telstar I.

Pressure in the Telstar II canister has been rising gradually and is now averaging slightly more than 11 pounds per square inch. This rise was expected and is caused by the slow diffusion of trapped gases from the polyurethane foam that was used to encapsulate the subassemblies and to fill the electronics canister. The pressure is expected to stabilize soon.

Relatively steady pressure indicates there are no leaks in the canister. Telstar I could give no precise pressure measurements, other than showing that pressure was either between 1 pound and 5 pounds or more than 5 pounds. Telstar II measures pressures on a continuous scale up to 12.7 pounds.

SIGNAL LEVEL

Both the microwave and VHF signals received at Telstar II are weaker than those received by Telstar I because of the longer ranges at which Telstar II has been operating.

The signal level of the 6390 mc microwave signal (used for television, telephone, and other broadband communications signals) as received at the satellite has been averaging minus 70 to minus 74 dbm for Telstar II. This compares to an average of minus 62 to minus 65 dbm on Telstar I.

The 120 mc VHF signal (used for commands) has been averaging between minus 94 and minus 100 dbm received at the Telstar II satellite. Telstar I's received VHF signal averaged about minus 90 dbm.

The main satellite transmitter power output is 2¼ watts, the same as for Telstar I.

RADIATION EXPERIMENTS

The radiation measurement and radiation damage experiment is working well, according to telemetered data received thus far. It will take several weeks to analyze this data.

Preliminary data is available, however, on the radiation damage experiment. Two lightly shielded damage measuring silicon transistors mounted on the skin of the satellite took about four times as long to reach the same level of radiation damage as did a similar transistor on Telstar I. The reduced rate of damage on these transistors is attributed primarily to Telstar II's higher apogee which carries it for longer periods of time into the so-called "slot" between the Val Allen belts. The slot is a region of comparatively low-level radiation.

A lower exposure rate of the more heavily shielded devices in the satellite circuitry is also to be expected as a result of the partial decay of the higher energy electrons put into space by the high altitude nuclear tests carried out in the summer and fall of 1962. High energy electrons were responsible for the failure of the command decoder in Telstar I. They also contributed substantially to the degradation of the solar cells in Telstar I.

The radiation experiment also includes detectors for measuring electrons and protons, other silicon transistors with shielding, and solar cells with varying degrees of shielding to measure radiation damage.

POWER SUPPLY

The output of the 3,600 solar cells has been averaging about 525 milliamperes, compared to about 500 milliamperes for Telstar I during the early orbits. (This is not a significant difference.) The solar cells charge the 19-cell, nickel-cadmium storage battery, which telemetered data indicates is in good working condition. Because the battery is alternately charged and discharged, its terminal voltage varies; however the battery output is applied to a voltage regulator which is supplying a regulated 16 volts to the satellite's electronic circuits. This is comparable to the output of Telstar I's battery.

Hawaii State Society Awarded Presidential Citation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, under the able leadership of Mr. David M. Peters, a native of Hawaii, the Hawaii State Society, a member of the Conference of State Societies chartered by act of Congress on April 3, 1952, was cited by the President of the United States as the outstanding society of the conference for service to its membership during the period from June 1962 through May 1963.

On Sunday, June 9, 1963, the Hawaii State Society celebrated Kamehameha Day with a luau—Hawaiian feast—at Oxon Hill, Md. On this occasion the society also installed its new officers for the year 1963–64. Hawaii's Members of the House of Representatives had accompanied President Kennedy to Hawaii on his recent trip and were unable to attend the luau but were represented by their wives.

Mr. Peters' swan song as president of the society, I believe, is worthy of being called to the attention of the Members of the Congress. I ask unanimous consent of this body, therefore, that the speech be included in the RECORD in its entirety, as follows:

ADDRESS OF DAVID M. PETERS, PRESIDENT, HAWAII STATE SOCIETY

Aloha.

It is fitting that we should be celebrating the birthday of one of Hawaii's foremost leaders while the President of the United States focuses the attention of the world today on Hawaii, the crossroads of the Pacific, in his address to the mayors assembled there.

The objectives of the Hawaii State Society of Washington, D.C., are the promotion of the spirit of aloha and the perpetuation of Hawaiian traditions and customs. In the environment where that spirit of aloha prevails, the State of Hawaii has set an example of racial harmony and tolerance. It is extremely appropriate that the President should address the mayors of the United States there on a subject of national importance.

Particularly at this moment in America, the peaceful way of aloha points as a solution to many problems. In our newest State, our citizens of many ethnic groups are justifiably proud of their rights and responsibilities as Americans. The past experience of Hawaii provides a unique example in social evolution. Racial minorities in that paradise of the Pacific have always been recognized and respected and have made contributions to our American culture.

As we reflect on Hawaii's past we naturally think of the inspiring leader who first united the islands, King Kamehameha the First. Recently, President Kennedy, in directing that a Polaris submarine be named after this great Hawaiian, said:

"I believe that these submarines should be named for persons who stand out, not only among their contemporaries, but also, after searching comparison, among men of all generations. King Kamehameha's great humanitarian qualities, unusual ability in government, and military prowess clearly place him in that category. I have therefore asked the Secretary of the Navy to name a Polaris submarine in honor of King Kamehameha."

In celebrating the birthday of King Kamehameha we honor an ancient Hawaiian. We thus observe a Hawaiian custom. By means of this luau with its traditional Hawaiian foods, symbolisms, and pageantry, we in the Hawaii State Society are fulfilling the objectives of our society.

Aloha nui ka kou.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MAY 20, 1963.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Following is a resolution passed by the Antranig chapter of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation supporting passage of House Resolution 14–15 submitted by you which requests formation of a special Committee on Captive Nations:

"*Resolved:* The ARF Antranig Chapter of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation urges prompt release of House Resolution 14–15 and requests favorable action with regard to formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations."

We are also contacting our Congressman and Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, head of the Rules Committee with our request that your resolution be released for debate and passage.

We commend you for the position you have taken in this matter and pledge our support of your resolution.

Sincerely,
ARF ANTRANIG CHAPTER, ARMENIAN REVOLUTIONARY FEDERATION,
Dr. A. S. CHURUKIAN, *President.*
PEARL R. MOORADIAN, *Secretary.*
DETROIT, MICH.

APRIL 30, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: We, the officers and members of our organization, urge earnestly to submit the Flood resolution—House Resolution 14—to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your support. Such a Special Committee on the Captive Nations is vitally important to our Government and the American people. While Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of "national liberation" in Africa and Asia, we as a nation are not doing much to help the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations, which constitute a veritable weakness of the Soviet totalitarian system.

A special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a center of true konwledge and information on all the captive nations which information will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We strongly urge you, sir, to give your full support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee.

Respectfully yours,
ORGANIZATION FOR DEFENSE OF LEMKIVSCHYNA, BRANCH NO. 1, NEW YORK CITY.
MICHAEL KARCHOK,
PETER HEROYOLA.

DETROIT, MICH.,
May 17, 1963.

Hon. Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Building,
Washington, D.C.

Honorable SIR: It is with great pleasure that I congratulate you on your excellent effort in attempting to bring before the American people, through the Congress of the United States, the facts and the drama of the subjugation of once-free nations by the most tyrannical of tyrants, the Soviet Union.

While these facts are amply clear for those of us Americans who have brethren forced to carry the Communist yoke on their necks and who, as a basic human right, aspire for a free and independent fatherland of their own with the right to choose their own form of government, the general American public is ill-informed on the subject and, under present international political conditions, is predisposed to disregard the whole matter and to consider the status of the enslaved nations as "traditional" and the Communist regime "an historic State."

This is especially true when high officials of our Government, driven by unexplainable forces and using, apparently, logic totally divorced from facts, for reasons known only to themselves, make public statements about the "undesirability" of even referring "to these latter areas"—the Ukraine, Armenia or Gorgia and the other 11 independent democratic republics which were crushed under the red heel within the short span of 4 years. I am, of course, quoting the U.S. Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk.

My dear Sir, I know very well, and I'm sure that you know even better that such "sentiments" about and understandings of world affairs and political history are absurd and do not agree with the realities of life; they are inexcusable for any American—but especially for high Government officials. And it is because of this realization on your part and on the part of many of your colleagues in Congress, I am sure, that you have introduced H.R. 1415 calling for the formation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations—simply to enlighten the people on this very vital matter of foreign policy.

Perhaps it would be unrealistic at this time to expect the United States of America to extend material, financial or military aid to these nations; but surely we are not going to deny them the moral support of this great Nation, championing freedom, liberty, and human rights all over the world as it does. To make that denial would be to abdicate our role as the leading power, and, more importantly for me, as the greatest Nation of the world, champion of all peoples.

Let me assure you that all responsible Americans will join me in commending you for your efforts toward the creation of the so direly needed Special Committee on the Captive Nations when they know the real truths behind the crushing of the will and the freedom of the more than 114 million non-Russian peoples by the Red army and the sinister tactics of communism. And they can best do this only through the efforts of that committee.

I would like you to know, honorable Sir, that I am sending the Honorable Congressman Howard W. Smith, chairman of the House Rules Committee, and my own Representative in Congress the Honorable Martha W. Griffiths copies of this letter as well as individual letters urging them to do everything humanly possible in support of your bill, in getting it out of the Rules Committee for an airing and a discussion on the floor of the House and in its subsequent passage.

Again my sincerest thanks and congratulations for your efforts.

Respectfully yours,

Krikor Aladjadjian.

Fresno, Calif.,
May 12, 1963.

Congressman Daniel J. Flood,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Flood: I have expressed via letter that Representative B. F. Sisk from my district support House Resolutions 14 and 15 as well as his intercession with members of the House Rules Committee to release this legislation for House action.

Godspeed to you and your efforts and for the successful establishment of the Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Sincerely yours,

Nora Margosian.

New York, N.Y.,
May 16, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I would like to urge, most respectfully, that quick action be taken on House Resolution 14 to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations. The following considerations prompt me to support such legislation:

(1) The heavy responsibility of the United States for the enslavement of most of the captive nations.

(2) Since we are still members of the United Nations, we have an obligation under the charter to seek the enjoyment of human rights for the people of the captive nations.

(3) In addition to the obligation under international law to liberate the enslaved people, we have a moral obligation to do so and not to buy our temporary security at the expense of others' misery.

I would appreciate your comments as to the steps expected to be taken toward such legislation.

Yours very truly,

George Forrester.

Lexington High School Essays on Ship of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, recently the Lexington High School, in Lexington, Mass., held an essay contest in which students submitted essays on the "Ship of State." The winning essays, by Miss Lynn Barnett and Scott Burnham, are thoughtful, well-written statements of the importance of respect for our form of government. The students, both members of the honor group, have displayed a healthy awareness of the need to guard our representative form of government from encroachments on a day-to-day basis. I ask unanimous consent to include these superb essays in the Appendix of the Gongressional Record.

The essays follow:

LHS Students' Winning Essays on Ship of State

(By Lynn Barnett)

President Cleveland's statement, "The ship of democracy, which has weathered all storms, may sink through the mutiny of those on board," may be interpreted several ways, depending upon the definition applied to "mutiny." Probably the more frequently used definition would be a taking over, or a complete upheaval of an established organization. In this case, a democratic government would suddenly have little or no power and would command no respect from those people it previously governed. Often, merely the resulting chaos would sink the ship. However, I will concern myself with mutiny of another sort—mutiny in which the ship is sunk by the apathy of those aboard.

Indifference in such a vital matter as government cannot be approved. General disinterest all too frequently results in internal destruction through corruption or absolute power. To avoid such disaster, it is imperative that each person even remotely connected with the ship of democracy do his part to keep her afloat. When Thomas Jefferson, in the Declaration of Independence, wrote that all men are created equal, I am confident he was not limiting that equality to liberties alone, but to duty as well; for participation in government is not only a privilege but a responsibility of members of a democracy. In his famous Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln spoke of a government "of the people, for the people, and by the people." Emphasis on "of" and "by" shows that Lincoln too recognized the duty of every man toward government. Cicero once said that no man can escape duty. And so it is. William Morris delved further into the free opportunity of duty when he wrote: "Knowledge is a step which few may climb. While duty is a path all may tread."

In these two lines. Morris makes it evident that duty is one blessing all men share equally. However, all men do not share the duty of governmental participation.

But the struggle to keep the ship afloat is more than a duty. It is a right, an opportunity for self-satisfaction as well as organizational perfection—an opportunity which, unfortunately, few people have. Since this privilege is so far from being universal, there is all the more reason for retaining it. Individual apathy toward the opportunity of taking part in governmental administration must be condemned.

Lack of interest in Government—be it National, State, or town—paves the way for corruption within. It has been said that the mighty Roman empire fell not because of external forces but because of internal weakness. Even today there is evidence of such weaknesses. One outstanding example is in the State of Massachusetts, where a man by the name of Ianello was elected to the State legislature while still serving a prison sentence. Why? Because he had no opposition; responsible citizens did not care enough to contribute their own time and their own abilities. A fear of becoming too involved is preventing capable people from keeping our democracy democratic.

The more the general public mutinies against its own Government by ignoring its duty, the more likely is the chance that the ship of democracy may turn into a ship of dictatorship. By so doing, the public brings about a government with one-sided viewpoints and one-sided authority and power.

It would cease to be representative, in any sense of the word, of everyone. Instead of sailing a sip of equality and freedom, we would be driven toward despotism aboard a ship of inequality and restriction.

The time has come. We can no longer sit back and watch small handfuls of citizens, capable or not, run our governments. Public interst and support in local, State, and national affairs are necessary to prevent corruption and unconditional authority and power from leaking in. Indeed, such mutiny in the form of apathy can do nothing but sink the ship of democracy.

(By Scott Burnham)

The ship of democracy of the United States has weathered all storms. This democracy, established by the Declaration of Independence in 1776 and outlined by the Constitution in 1789, is still thriving, 187 years after its establishment. This fact alone substantiates the assertion that the democratic ship has weathered all storms.

But there have been many changes since 13 States and 20 million people became 50 and 186 respectively. The great struggles in that period of time, such as civil war, urbanization, immigration, and farm and labor strife, can be encompassed by the single theme, "Liberty versus order." Henry S. Commanger's theme of American history can also be used to help explain problems of representative government.

The ship of democracy is manned by the American people, not just by the officials who captain it, nor by the voters who comprise the majority of its crew, but even the youngest person who enjoys the benefits of American citizenship. The ship of democracy needs the willingness and interest of all the people to stay afloat.

Mutiny in democracy is not an active coup d'etat as in many other forms of government but a passive, cancerous shirking of responsibility and lack of interest. Many people think it is the extremist, whether right or leftwing, who is the underminer or American democracy. But he is not. He is only the obvious, visible scapegoat of the real troublemaker. The real troublemaker is the average American who shies away from arguing or following issues, who neglects to write to his Congressman or arouse interest in a cause, who feels himself removed from his elected officials and, therefore, does not campaign, concern himself with issues, or vote. He thinks he is keeping the ship afloat by staying out of trouble and not advancing unpopular viewpoints; he is really helping to sink it.

However, democracy guarantees the right not to take interest and does not force the shirker to take part. In ancient Athens, voters were forced weekly to a hillside meeting by Scythian archers and penalized for absence or tardiness. Democracy cannot use such methods to force interest upon the people. For democracy must be a voluntary individual concern. The main problem of representative government is to guarantee the liberty of the individual, while providing enough order in government. There must be a balance between apathy and forced participation.

This balance consists of arousing and maintaining interest in the affairs of the democratic state, so that there will be a willingness to participate. Interest is aroused largely through education. The United States deeply believes in this philosophy and has established free education for all Americans. The ability to read and write and think critically makes one aware of issues and of the personalities of candidates for office.

Education is used and can be used more fully for indoctrination in the mechanics of democracy. It is hard to participate in something so complex and difficult to understand so as to engulf the individual. It is the writer's opinion that many Americans view democracy as Joseph K. views the legal system in Franz Kafka's, "The Trial." The individual American should be trained in the mechanics of democracy so it will not overwhelm him. A fair comparison of democracy with other forms of government is extremely important in order that the individual may realize his role in maintaining the present system, or even in changing it by democratic means.

Use of mass media, such as radio, television, magazines, and newspapers, is extremely useful in the democratic state. These media can be used to arouse interest in a cause, as newspapers have done in cases of scandal and urban blight; to present fair appraisals and give opinions on issues, as editorials and news summaries often do; and to bring candidates for office into the public light, as tlevision-radio debates have recently done. Public interest, maintained by mass media, can help to end the scandals of government, the inefficiency and waste of money and resources, and the election of dishonest or incompetent officials.

Enthusiasm does not occur by chance, but has to be worked for. Experience in representative government is important for the young American, to make him aware of the responsibilities he will face when he is 21, and to encourage him to assume these responsibilities. This experience should not be restricted to the intelligent few, who should be encouraged to become responsible officeholders, but should be given to a cross section of young people. Democracy is a slow business, but it is everyone's business. Unless enthusiasm and interest replace apathy and tolerance, the ship of democracy will sink.

Now Is Time for Review of U.N. Role, Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Wichita, Kans., Eagle which I believe reflects some of the growing concern in the United States regarding the future of this world organization, and this Nation's participation—above and beyond all others—in financing its operations. My congressional mail indicates that many citizens are in accord with the views expressed in the following editorial:

NOW IS TIME FOR REVIEW OF U.N. ROLE, CHARTER

The United Nations is far from dead. But it is sick, afflicted with two ailments that could prove fatal unless remedies are found for them. The two are nonsupport and universality.

The seriousness of the first was illustrated this week when the Soviet Union announced haughtily that it would refuse to pay its share of any expenses assumed by the U.N. which, in the Soviet view, were unlawfully voted by the General Assembly.

Prior to this, the Kremlin has refused to pay its assessments for the Congo operations and the Middle Eastern force (on the Israeli-Egyptian border), contending that these should have been voted by the Security Council—where the U.S.S.R. could have vetoed them. Now the Soviets have extended their refusal to regular U.N. costs.

Other Communist-bloc nations are expected to follow suit. But they are not alone in this; France likewise has refused to pay its full share of the regular U.N. budget. As for the Congo operation, a total of 75 nations are behind in their contributions, and only the U.N. $200 million bond issue (mostly bought by the United States) has kept the peacekeeping force in the African nation.

The United States is assessed 32.02 percent of the regular U.N. budget and pays at the same rate for peace-keeping functions. But it also has been making voluntary contributions, so that it has paid about 47½ percent of the $300 million Congo costs.

This ailment is aggravated by the other—universality. By this is meant the extension of U.N. membership to scores of nations that have little to contribute to the international organization, either in effective participation or resources.

The U.N. was formed with 50 nations in 1945; it now has 110, many of them extremely small. In the original charter, the U.N. was supposed to be controlled in its major decisions by the five great nation permanent members of the Security Council. But this changed, and the United States had a large part in the change.

Pushed by the United States, the U.N approved a "uniting for peace" resolution on November 3, 1950, to keep the U.N. from being immobilized by Soviet vetoes during the Korean war. This resolution transferred most powers from the Council to the General Assembly.

Now this is returning to haunt the United States, because with a large number (perhaps even a majority on some issues) of irresponsible members, Assembly is being used increasingly against the original members, often to undermine U.S. foreign policy.

It can be argued that it is healthy for the U.N. to cease being under the U.S. thumb. But, healthy or not, this threat to our foreign policy will make it necessary to find other methods of protecting our national security.

If the United States must pay higher U.N. costs—as undoubtedly will happen if the Soviets and others get away with their payment refusals—this will make for a ridiculous and intolerable situation.

Despite this, the fact remains that there is a proper role for a well-run United Nations. So, the search should begin for ways to rebuild its structure.

Several proposals have been made to weigh the votes of nations in the Assembly by population, gross national product, or U.N. financial contributions. This might be the answer, but for it to gain approval would require two-thirds of both Council and Assembly, including all permanent Council members. This seems nigh impossible.

But no matter the obstacles, it is time the U.N. undertook a major review of its charter and its role as a world organization. If it doesn't, one day we'll awaken to find the United Nations truly deceased and buried alongside the League of Nations.

Cynicism as Handy Political Tool

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, the city of Danville has been harassed for more than 2 weeks with racial disturbances and violence which has been brought on by outsiders and by persons who are not familiar with our people or the problems. Danville is in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. I live only 30 miles from the city. I am well acquainted with the officials and the people of Danville. I know that they are capable of handling their own problems and that any situation which arises will be solved on a peaceable and satisfactory and just basis.

The bitterness which has arisen there is intense, but I am confident that it will subside and peace, harmony, and racial accord will again reign in that fine city if the outsiders will depart.

Marion S. Saunders, the editor of the Register, has expressed himself on the subject of the difficulties in Danville in an editorial appearing in that paper on Saturday, June 15, 1963, which under leave heretofore extended me is inserted in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From the Danville (Va.), Register, June 15, 1963]

CYNICISM AS HANDY POLITICAL TOOL

What has been going on in Danville and other cities in the name of freedom is not a spontaneous movement but a carefully laid plan that combines a centennial year of protest with the Kennedy campaign for reelection. The details long ago were worked out and the actions and statements dovetail so that they may advance what seems both causes but in reality is but one cause.

Militant Negro leaders were far from satisfied with the progress achieved by the race during their first hundred years of freedom in the United States. That progress far outstripped Negro achievement anywhere else in the world, to be sure; but, even so, it was not enough to placate the Negro leaders whose status depends upon convincing masses of people not yet ready to qualify for certain jobs that they are being denied employment by reason of color. As a Negro educator said in testifying before a Congressional committee in response to a heated charge by the late Walter White, executive secretary of the NAACP, "His business is agitating." That same explanation applied to a number of recently arrived brethren in Danville and they have been identified, too, at other centers of civil disobedience and criminal disturbances.

Early in this session of the Congress, President Kennedy made his move to create a new executive department of Urban Affairs and he made known his intention to appoint Dr. Robert Weaver, the highest ranking Negro in the administration, to be Secretary of Urban Affairs. This was just one of a batch of emancipation centennial bills intended to win favor with Negro voters as part of the preparations for the 1964 election.

Congress rebuffed the bid to enlarge the Executive Department and the Cabinet. At the same time, neither the House nor the Senate, despite some talk for buncombe heard here and there, has shown any real interest in civil rights legislation. When this attitude within the legislative branch became clear, something had to be done to alter the circumstances.

Dr. Martin Luther King sent his "Southern Christians" into a supposedly nonviolent campaign of mass demonstrations to constitute civil disobedience. While these demonstrations began as nonviolent exercises, soon participants began to break laws by halting traffic, trespassing, attacks, and using deadly weapons. That law violation was the premeditated intent is shown by their expressed determination to make the legal authorities in a score of cities fill their jails with them. It was one way of focusing public attention upon their antics and activities.

Dr. King and the Committee for Racial Equality even went back to the year 1212 to repeat the folly of a Dark Ages Pope who condoned the organization of a children's crusade in France and Germany to march to Jerusalem and by their obvious innocence redeem that holy city from the Saracens. The first group of children to cross the Alps and reach the Mediterranean were sold in slavery—not by the Saracens on the other side of Mare Nostrum but by some of the encouragers of the crusade. The second group, upon learning the fate of the first, turned back after crossing the Alps but many never saw home or family again. Jerusalem, incidentally, remained under the rule of the Ottoman Empire until freed by an Anglo-Saxon force—the very people now abused in the language of the zealot.

The cynicism of the President cannot be ignored as he uses the disturbances to further his own schemes. He is willing—as he has demonstrated—to use bayonet-tipped rifles in the hands of hardened paratroopers to force compliance with a legal order when that order favored a lone Negro. Yet, when a straggly mob of children led by a few professional agitators violate well-established laws as old as civilization itself and applicable to all colors, kinds and conditions of people, Mr. Kennedy sees it as "the fires of frustration and discord", and the President suggests that if new civil rights laws are not enacted in the Congress they will be in the streets.

That is a threat of pulling a Castro on the people of the United States. Laws in this country are not to be enacted from pressure or from political cynicism but rather from reasoned justice and right.

If anyone deliberately wants to retard the progress of the Negro, either in this country or in Africa, there are no indications of such. The Negro has been given a lot of assistance and encouragement and will continue to receive both in his legitimate endeavors to improve his lot and his circumstances but the white man has not yet achieved perfection nor is he likely soon to do so. Such progress as has been made by the white man was earned by diligent application and steadfast purpose, not by shouting and parading and cluttering up establishments where he often was not welcome. It will be the same with the Negro. Those who qualify for certain work will find it, because there always is room at the top and always too few with the qualifications demanded of the man or woman at the top.

Our white and our Negro citizens should not be carried away in the noise of the campaign to use them to achieve the ends of those who make a business of manipulating people—white and Negro.

The Kennedy campaign for a second term already is well underway. That is what all the shouting is about—that and the payoff to the agitators.

A Job Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the Record an editorial from the Hagerstown Morning Herald of June 12, 1963, which gives due credit to a hardworking, unpaid public servant who has, for the past 60 years, helped Maryland people keep tabs on daily weather information. In recognition of these long years of unselfish public service, President Kennedy sent a personal letter of commendation to this dedicated Maryland citizen. This is a fitting acknowledgment to this fine gentleman.

The text of the editorial follows:

A JOB WELL DONE

The delivery of a letter of commendation from President Kennedy to veteran weather observer, D. Paul Oswald, was certainly well deserved. Representative Carlton R. Sickles hit the nail right on the head when he spoke of Mr. Oswald's invaluable service to the city, State, and Nation.

Mr. Oswald has been keeping tabs on the weather for 60 years, but there obviously was something that neither President Kennedy nor Representatives Sickles had a way of knowing. That is the fact that every night at 9:30 Mr. Oswald calls the Morning Herald with all the vital weather statistics for the day.

Here is a man who earns no pay for his unselfish public service. But he earns more than mere money in the satisfaction of keeping his fellowmen informed about the elements, be the news good or bad.

Scholarship Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, a young resident of my San Diego district, Steven Carl Mann, has recently won the first place scholarship in an annual national competition, the Thom McAn Leadership Awards for 1963.

Steven receives a $1,000 scholarship, preceded by an all-expense trip to New York City and Washington, D.C. I am told he will be a visitor on Capitol Hill the second week in July.

President of his student body at San Diego's Abraham Lincoln High School, Steven Mann ranked fourth scholastically in a graduating class of 550. He had participated in an unusual special program which San Diego city schools provide for gifted and very able students. This includes special guidance and counseling, as well as "enriched" courses.

Steven has demonstrated a broad aptitude—for, in addition to gaining membership in the National Honor Society, he captained Lincoln High's varsity basketball team and participated in golf and crosscountry running.

The Thom McAn essay contest asked "Why Seek a College Education?" Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to inscribe Steven Mann's answer in the Record.

The essay follows:

COLLEGE EDUCATION AND LEADERSHIP

(By Steven Carl Mann)

"In the high-speed world of tomorrow," today's leaders are telling today's youth, "the emphasis will be more and more upon strong leadership." The desperate need for leaders is caused in part by the increased automation of our society, and the resulting tendency of our people to be stereotyped conformists. A leader is one who has certain qualities, either innate or projected, which stimulate others to follow his example. While the need for leaders is most obvious, we must see that these have been, and will be, leaders who have guided (or misguided) their peoples to disaster.

Herein lies the problem. At the same time that leaders must be encouraged, they must be educated to the refined ideals and basic truths of free people. Of course, the ideal place for receiving this advanced education is a college. For while leadership without education is disaster, a leadership with unclouded, educated perception is hope for mankind.

There is yet another light in which leadership and college can be seen together. That is leadership on the college campus. We recognize today that our colleges are the birthplace of our "free thinkers" and "angry young men." It is realized that these individualists are sometimes confused in their intense zeal to depart from the social mores.

The college campus has thus become the ideal testing ground for tomorrow's leaders. It is not to encourage conformity in itself that we curb the rebels, but to discourage the nonconformity which would completely abandon the precepts of truth and freedom.

It is obvious that college and leadership go hand in hand. College and the education it offers is the substance of mature leadership. And also it is just as clear that strong leadership is essential to the college campus to maintain the predominance of a free people's ideals.

Commencement, Class of 1963, LaSalle Military Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include my remarks to the graduating class of 1963 at La Salle Military Academy on Thursday, June 13, 1963:

Reverend Brother Raphael, faculty members, graduates, their parents and guests, first, let me say how grateful I am for the invitation to take part in this commencement program. But no words of thanks, however happily expressed, can convey my warm appreciation of the honor. It is a deep satisfaction to come home to La Salle, a great school of great traditions. Now I have a suspicion that some of you graduates were dismayed to hear that a Congressman would speak here today; as a group, Congressmen have a reputation for long and windy orations, but I hope to prove the exception to the rule. Nor do I intend to ladle out large doses of advice; whenever I am tempted to do so, I recall the story of the boy who was asked in an examination, "Who was Socrates?" His answer was short and to the point. "Socrates was a Greek," he said. "He went around giving people advice. The people poisoned him." Instead, I want to discuss with you what I call the "can do" philosophy—a resoluteness of spirit that enables us to view life as a challenge and to surmount the obstacles that are a part of life's course.

One of this country's most profound men—Abraham Lincoln—once illustrated the point in a story he told on himself. In the days when he was a circuit-riding country lawyer in Illinois, Lincoln was driving in his buggy along a narrow lane when he met a woman in another buggy coming in the opposite direction. Woods on both sides of the lane prevented either from turning around, so they stopped and just looked at one another. Finally, the woman spoke up. "I do declare," she said, "you're just about the ugliest man I ever saw." "Well, madam," Lincoln replied, "I have been told that, and I am inclined to agree with you. But there isn't really anything I can do about it, is there?" The woman thought a moment. Then she replied, "Well, you could at least stay home."

It taught him, Lincoln said in later years, that there is always something that a man can do in any situation.

Unfortunately, we are living in an era in which the can-do philosophy is considered old-fashioned, if not downright antisocial. The rare person who wants to de something—to solve a problem with reasoned action, to forcefully resolve a dilemma—is shunned as an eccentric or a troublemaker. He is told, "Don't rock the boat." Too many of us swerve from high purpose; we follow the line of least resistance, accommodating ourselves to the convenient and the expedient only to find that, inevitably, a problem avoided is still a problem. The civil rights crisis in the South—and in the North, to a lesser degree—is a case in point. The thinking people in the South know and have known for years that racial discrimination is morally indefensible; yet, knowing this, they evaded their responsibility in not correcting it, telling themselves that time somehow would take care of the problem. The result is that extremists on both sides have created an explosive situation while the moderates sit futilely by, wringing their hands.

By compromising in situations that call for action we eventually compromise ourselves. To acquisce in any delinquency is to condone it; when we shrug with cynical indifference at disclosures of graft and corruption in high places we in effect are encouraging more graft and corruption; when we accept a repairman's bill for work poorly done we are cheating ourselves and the repairman's subsequent customers. We are passive when we should be active. We tend to disengage ourselves from the responsibility that principle imposes. We would like to see a better world, of course, but we are unwilling to do anything about making it better.

But what, you might ask, can I do about it? Well, there are two approaches to life—the negative and the positive. Let's take the negative first. For an example of the negative carried to its ultimate, we have the beatnik. Here is a person who, having concluded that the world is rotten beyond redemption, decides to withdraw from it—unaware that the only real withdrawal is death. He discards his razor and his inhibitions and sulks in his pad, where he devotes most of his time to writing long and largely incomprehensible denunciations of the world as he finds it. To a certain extent, he is right; there is a great deal wrong with the world. But he has convinced himself that nothing can be done about it—conveniently forgetting that the world is a far finer one to live in than it was even a century ago. Who made it so? Not beatnik types, most assuredly, but people with vision, with character, and with courage enough to be nonconformists in the true sense of that word. And, incidentally, nonconformity is a much abused term. It has come to mean the beatnik, the rebel without a cause, the misfit who feels that simply by flouting the standards of conventional behavior he is in some manner striking a blow for freedom of the individual. But nonconformity is a matter of the mind, not of dress and behavior. The men who founded this Nation were nonconformists in the true meaning of the word. They were rebels with a cause—the cause of freedom.

Now let's look at the positive approach. Is it possible in today's complex and regimented society for the indivdual to make himself and his ideas felt? Is it wise to speak out as a resolute minority of one? Are the rewards greater to the conformist who goes along with the crowd? Is security more satisfying than challenge? We hear on all sides that the day of the individual is long since over, that this is the day of the organization man, the day of mass this and mass that.

There is in Washington today a man who in himself is the dramatic answer to these questions. His name is Hyman Rickover—Adm. Hyman Rickover. Someone once said that Admiral Rickover has made a career of being unpopular and, in some areas, he is unpopular. But this bothers him not at all; had he chosen to be popular the world would never have heard of him—and our country would be the worse for it. But the admiral had an idea—the nuclear-powered submarine—and he determined to fight for it. He spoke out, forcefully, when he could have taken the line of least resistance and quietly shelved his project in the face of criticism from those in authority who felt he was rocking the boat. The opponents of the *Nautilus*—and there were many—felt the project was foredoomed to failure. Just couldn't be done, they said. It was the old story of the bumblebee all over again. Aerodynamically, you know, the bumblebee's heavy fuselage is so out of proportion to his wingspan and powerplant that it is impossible for him to fly. But the bumblebee doesn't know that, and flies anyway. As the admiral was to say later, it was fortunate that his critics didn't believe in the *Nautilus;* convinced he would fail, they left him alone to successfully complete his project. The result of Rickover's willingness to court antagonism for what he believed in has given the country perhaps its most potent deterrent weapon—the Polaris missile submarine. And his criticism of American educational methods has had a profound effect on educators, who more and more are beginning to see the wisdom of fundamentals in our school. His was a lone voice, but it was heard loud and clear above the plaints of those who say the individual cannot make himself felt in our society.

If Admiral Rickover had taken the easy way, the conformist's way, he would have proceeded uneventfully to an honorable but obscure retirement. He chose instead to do something; his reward is the satisfaction of making a major contribution to the defense of his country. What material gain could possibly compare to his achievement?

But what about opportunity in today's world? Is it true, as we are told by the pessimists, that the frontier is no more, that there is nowhere left for a young man to seek his fortune; that corporate rigidity, union solidarity and government regulation leave room only for the human cog who is content to take his place in the giant wheel and revolve slowly toward retirement? Must a man go along with his superiors, even when he feels in his heart they are wrong, in order to succeed in the business world? Is there really room for the man who wants to do something when all around him he hears the refrain, "don't rock the boat"?

Well, again I can provide you a living answer in a man you all have seen on television—George Romney, former head of American Motors and right now embarked on what appears to be a promising political career as Governor of Michigan. As an automobile maker, Romney was a midget among the Detroit giants, who felt he should be thankful with the few crumbs that fell from the big table. But Romney had an idea. He felt the standard Detroit product was too big, too cumbersome and too costly to operate. He voiced his opinion, too—loudly and at very opportunity. In his term, the big car was a "Detroit dinosaur." Obviously, this sort of thing did not endear him to the Detroit faction. And when he had the temerity to suggest that what the American buyer realy wanted was a compact car, they derided him. Patiently, in the manner of a teacher with a not-too-bright pupil, they told him that they knew what the public wanted.

They had been in the automobile business much longer than he; they had spent millions on motivational research that told them, positively, that Americans would not buy a small car. Romney felt that motivational research was bunk, and said so, thereby exposing himself to additional scorn from various forward thinkers. But he decided to fly in the face of all this accumulated wisdom and build a compact car anyway; if he failed, the company stood a good chance of going under; yet he had the courage to challenge corporate conformity and go it alone. We all know the answer; a good many of you here today probably are driving one of the compacts that George Romney pioneered. It was also said that he couldn't be elected Governor of Michigan; but, like the bumblebee, he didn't know it. I would like to say that Governor Romney is a Democrat, but honesty compels me to admit that he is a Republican; anyway, this does prove that a Democrat can have nice things to say about a Republican once in a while. So, you see, there is room for the man of ideas in today's business world; it is still the individual who makes the impact, not what the pundits are fond of calling the masses. In fact, there is probably more room than ever before for the man with an idea and the determination to do something about it. In a time of creeping conformity, the nonconformist has a splendid opportunity.

Only a few years ago another man gave us a shining example of ideas in action. At 77—and not in robust health—he was chosen for a post of power and responsibility Those who selected him for the position assumed he would be an interim head—a caretaker, so to speak, to keep things tidy for his ultimate successor. This man could have, with all respect and honor, done just that. But he had a dream—two dreams, really—and despite his age and failing strength he was determined to do something to bring his cherished dream to reality.

This man broke with tradition in many ways, not always to the pleasure of those around him. He was not content with the status quo, though he might have prolonged his life had he been so; he gave unsparingly of himself; whatever ill he could remedy, he did. I am speaking, of course, of our beloved Pope John XXIII, whose greatness in his brief reign can be measured by the unprecedented tribute paid him in every part of the world, Catholic and non-Catholic alike, upon his sad death. He left as his legacy the first tentative—but nonetheless epochal—steps toward the fulfillment of his golden dream—peace for the world and eventual Christian unity.

Consider the inspiring example of this stalwart man when you are tempted to think of security instead of challenge. Security is a word I feel we use too frequently today. Now, I am not opposed to foresight and prudence, certainly; every thoughtful person ponders security toward the end of his working life. But too many today sacrifice the future for security. I keep thinking of something that a friend of mine told me not long ago; this man, an executive, was interviewing a young man for a starting job with his firm, a job with a good potential. The young man was bright, personable, and articulate. He was a graduate of a good school, he seemed well-grounded in the basics required for the job, and my friend had all but signed him on when he killed his chances with a single question. "What," he asked, "is the company's pension policy?" The young man was 22. "That question," my friend said, "told me volumes. Here was a young man simply looking for a job, not a future." What the young man had failed to learn was that success is its own security—and, anyway, as our President once observed, the only total security lies in prison. If total security is to be our goal, then a life-termer is a highly successful man.

Remember, the secure person is not necessarily a happy one; life without risk and challenge is like popcorn without salt; it soon cloys.

Admittedly, there are risks in today's world. The spector of nuclear holocaust haunts us all from time to time; but there have always been risks; in earlier times there were famine and pestilence; in the infant days of our own country the settlers lived under the constant and very real threat of death from marauding Indians. They accepted that risk, as we must accept those of our own time. This acceptance is one of the disciplines of life. We don't buy an automobile from the standpoint of how well it will hold up in a collision; neither do we live with the resignation that our demise in a nuclear Armageddon is inevitable. We consider the risks, and press on toward our goals.

There are challenges in today's world, too, more than ever before in history, though the hand-wringers will tell you that, in Alexander's anguished cry, there are no more worlds to conquer. That is bunk. We are right now on the threshold of the most dramatic era of exploration the world has ever known—that of space. When you are told that there are no more worlds to conquer, mention a name—that of Gordon Cooper. And space is but one area of opportunity—every day we read of breakthroughs in medicine, in electronics, in communications, in every field. It is a better world you are going into, also; we have made progress in social justice; not as much, perhaps, as we would have liked, but we have made progress nonetheless; all of us are far more conscious of injustice than we were only a generation ago; now we must translate our understanding into action; you of the younger generation will pioneer new breakthroughs in the humanities. The important thing is to be a doer, a participant, not a spectator. Get down out of the gallery and get on the stage. You may get a few boos from time to time, but you will get the rewards also.

Earlier, I mentioned that I would be sparing with advice—obviously, I don't wish to share Socrates' fate—and I hope I have been. But, in conclusion, I do wish to leave a few thoughts with you that, under close examination, appear suspiciously like advice. I would rather call them thoughts.

First, never sacrifice character to the spurious cult of popularity. It is far better to be respected than to be popular, whatever that loose word means. Have the courage of your convictions; speak out, not in anger or contentiously but from conviction, when you know you should; don't compromise and don't accommodate to what your heart tells you is wrong; if a friend was drowning, would you stop to think about getting your clothes soaked? Of course not. Your instinct would send you into the water in a second. Then let your instinct lead you in moral decisions; the inconvenienence, the trouble, or the unpopularity your decision might bring you will be fleeting; the solid satisfaction of adhering to principle will remain and strengthen you. Do not fear to be a nonconformist; if all of us were conformists we would still be living in caves back in the dim, Jurassic dawn. If the boat needs rocking, rock it. Set yourself a goal and work toward it unswervingly; work without a goal is only pointless drudgery; with a goal it is a thrilling challenge. And above all, keep in mind the lesson learned by Abraham Lincoln in his encounter with the woman in the lane—you can always do something in any situation that faces you in life—so do it. To close, I should like to leave you with what, to me, is one of the most inspiring credos I have ever heard. It was written by Mr. Dean Alfange, who calls it, and I quote, "My Creed." It is also mine, and I hope it will be yours. I quote:

"I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon, if I can. I seek opportunity, not security. I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the state look after me. I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build, to fail and succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole. I prefer the challenges of life to the guaranteed existence; the thrill of fulfillment to the state calm of utopia. I will not trade freedom for beneficence, nor my dignity for a handout. I will never cower before any master, nor bend to any threat. It is my heritage to stand erect, proud and unafraid; to think and act for myself, enjoy the benefit of my creations, and to face the world boldly and to say, this I have done. All this is what it means to be an American."

Thank you.

Valedictory Delivered at Capitol Page School by Kenneth L. Kaliher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on the 10th of June commencement exercises were held for the Capitol Page School. The Valedictory Message was delivered by a fine Minnesota lad by the name of Kenneth Kaliher.

I read this speech with interest and found this message, while a brief one, contained a challenging philosophy that we could all profit by.

Mr. Speaker, I would further add, that our country will be in good hands when young men such as Kenneth assume leadership positions. I congratulate Kenneth on his message.

The message follows:

VALEDICTORY DELIVERED AT CAPITOL PAGE SCHOOL COMMENCEMENT BY KENNETH L. KALIHER ON JUNE 10, 1963

Distinguished guests, faculty members, parents, and friends of the 20 seniors receiving their diplomas tonight, all plan college careers. As we embark on this, the most important phase of our education, it would be well for each of us to examine himself in relation to the world around him. We will go to college for many reasons: to develop our abilities in our chosen fields, to broaden our outlooks, to challenge and stimulate our minds, to enable us to contribute to, as well as gain from society, and, basically, to learn. But, in reality, in going to college we are first and foremost preparing ourselves for the future, better to be able to get along with and to serve society, not only in our own country, but in the entire world.

We can serve it first by acquiring knowledge. We must acquire knowledge in order to be able to make a living. We must learn to perform a particular duty, however, simple or involved, to fill a particular need in society. We should acquire knowledge to learn more about the world around us, for only through learning about it can we hope to understand it, its people, and its problems. We must also acquire knowledge to be able better to choose our leaders and spokesmen in government.

We can serve society by being good citizens. A good citizen takes an interest in, and keeps informed about government at all levels. The French philosopher and writer Jean Rousseau said:

"As soon as any man says of the affairs of the State, 'What does it matter to me?' the State may be given up for lost."

A good citizen willingly fulfills the obligations accompanying citizenship. He does so primarily by voting, but also by serving in the military, and by accepting jury duty when asked. The most basic sign of a truly "good citizen" is whether he is always a good citizen. Does he see and perform his less obvious civic duties, such as taking care of his property, respecting the rights, property, and feelings of others, and recognizing proper authority? As fellow citizens of the United States, we must see, and do, our duty to our country, in order to perpetuate our Government, not only as the servant of the people to do for them that which they cannot do for themselves, but as the guardian of our individual rights.

In acquiring knowledge, and in being good citizens, we constantly exercise many of our rights and privileges: freedom to choose our own vocation, freedom of the press (through which we keep informed and learn of others), freedom of suffrage (through which we can choose our governmental leaders, and by so doing, our government), freedom to participate in government (to run for these very offices if we so desire), the right to petition to express our opinions without fear of recrimination, the right to a fair trial, and many others. The best way to keep these individual rights and liberties alive is to exercise them to the utmost. This leads me to my third point.

We can serve society by being ourselves. We should take advantage of our God-given rights to think as we wish and to develop our own individual personalities. By so doing, each of us will become an individual in the true sense of the word.

It is important to maintain our personal opinions, views, feelings, preferences, likes, and dislikes, for in the words of the late Dean Whitney Griswold of Yale University, "Creative ideas do not spring from groups. They spring from individuals. The divine spark leaps from the finger of God to the finger of Adam." Dean Griswold questioned whether "Hamlet could have been written by a committee, or the Mona Lisa painted by a club? Could the New Testament have been composed as a conference report?" Obviously not, for in the security of a group, individual creative inspirations tend to drift to the background to make way for joint efforts which rarely express singular thoughts. Similarly, if we allow our minds to lapse into a state of "group thinking," they will fail to produce individual creative inspirations, and they will instead yield mediocre thoughts and ideas, intended to please everyone, but actually serving no purpose since they reflect on one particular opinion.

However, being an individual is all in vain if it is done only to be different. To fulfill our purpose, that of serving society, we must be ourselves, as we know we ought to be, as opposed to someone we think others might prefer us to be. In Galatians, chapter 6, verses 3–5, we read:

"For if a man think himself to be something, when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself. But let every man prove his own work, and then shall he find rejoicing in himself alone, and not in another. For every man shall bear his own burden."

If we try to be something we aren't, and can't be, we are truly deceiving ourselves, and no one else.

We will be going out into a world plagued by an international conspiracy, burdened with a threatening global struggle for the minds of men. As citizens of the United States, we enjoy the highest standard of living in the world, the most representative form of government, and more individual freedoms than any other civilized people on Earth. In order better to combat this conspiracy, we must guard our rights and liberties as our best defense against communism. The end result of the practice of our individual rights should be the exemplification, by every one of us, of how democracy, and the value it places upon the individual, combine to form a strengthened character, building a stronger populace, and a stronger nation, capable of standing up to any threat, or any challenge.

Thank you.

The California 23d District Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the special election held recently in the 23d District of California has given members of the Republican Party the opportunity to make a number of wild and erroneous claims.

The defeat of the Democratic candidate has been called a repudiation of the Kennedy administration, and a voters revolt against the policies of the Democratic Party.

This of course is simply not the case. I submit for the consideration of my colleagues an article from the Los Angeles Times of Thursday, June 13, 1963. Mr. Richard Bergholz, the well-known and distinguished political writer for that newspaper, puts the election in the 23d District into proper focus, and I trust this will silence any further speculation on the matter.

The article is as follows:

GOP OUTHUSTLED THE DEMOCRATS IN BIG RACE

(By Richard Bergholz)

If someone asks how it happened that Republicans captured the normally Democratic congressional seat in the 23d District Tuesday, there's a very brief, but succinct answer:

The Democrats simply blew it.

The hard fact is that with all their built-in advantages, with a 9 to 5 bulge in registration, the Democrats simply were outhustled, outcampaigned.

And you can pretty much chalk up as political oratory the contention that the results constitute a triumph for conservative over liberal dogma, or that they are in fact a repudiation of the New Frontier.

The fact is that issues had relatively little to do with the smashing upset triumph of Mayor Del Clawson, of Compton, a Republican, over Assemblyman Carley V. Porter, of Compton, the leading Democrat.

Perhaps the best—and briefest—diagnosis came from Representative Bob Wilson, of San Diego, who heads the National Republican Congressional Campaign Committee. The winning formula, he said from Washington, was "a good candidate, good management, and good organization."

Clawson, although soundly trounced by the late Representative Clyde Doyle, Democrat, of South Gate, in the November general election last year, presented himself as a clean-cut, successful city official who had helped cut taxes, who was by his own definition a bit right of center in the political spectrum but who was not an ultraconservative.

He had good management, to be sure. The same firm—Spencer-Roberts & Associates—which ran his campaign also had directed the successful special election effort for Republican Don Clausen, of Crescent City, in the First Congressional District in northern California last January. And it had jockeyed Councilman Louis Nowell to victory in the May 23 city election against the determined opposition of Mayor Samuel W. Yorty and his friends. Clawson not only had competent, professional advice; he heeded it.

And somehow or other, Republicans managed to pull in the same direction for this special effort—the far right and the moderates alike.

Nobody can say for sure, but it's a good guess that as many as 2,000 volunteers worked for Clawson and the GOP on election day. Some came from far outside the county. The big job: Turn out the vote—specifically, the 50,000 Republicans in the district.

It's obvious the effort succeeded, although there's no way to know exactly how many Republicans voted and how many Democrats. Certainly the final turnout—43 percent—far exceeded the 30 to 35 percent predicted by Registrar of Voters Ben Hite.

If the Democrats had put together a corresponding effort—in management, organization, and voter turnout—they might well have turned back the Clawson challenge, if for no other reason than that they had the sheer weight of numbers on their side.

Porter certainly could match Clawson in the matter of candidate credentials. He has built an impressive record of achievement in the State legislature. He was well known in much of the district. He had won reelection easily since 1949.

And therein lies part of the trouble.

Porter in all his past races had never felt the pressure of rugged, all-out campaigning. And running for Congress, particularly in a one-shot all-or-nothing special election, simply wasn't the same as standing for reelection in an assembly district.

Porter felt an obligation to tend to his duties in Sacramento during the current legislative session. He heads the important assembly committee on water and he takes his obligations seriously. The result: He campaigned only on a part-time basis—usually only on Fridays, Saturdays, and Sundays.

Clawson was working night and day.

Porter, for reasons best known to himself, steadfastly refused to bring in outside campaign management, the pros of the business. Instead, he put the campaign in the hands of Mrs. Ida Reynolds Brodie, who had been Doyle's field representative for years and who continued on the congressional payroll after his death.

Porter gambled, in effect, on getting enough of his own supporters and of the perennial Doyle supporters to the polls, mainly out of loyalty or habit, to overcome anything the Republicans and/or Clawson might do.

Did the presence of five Democrats on the ticket, as compared to three Republicans, affect the results? It doesn't appear so. The combined Democratic vote still fell short of Clawson's total.

Assembly Speaker Jesse Unruh, Democrat, of Inglewood, was indulging in a little political opportunism when he said in an election postmortem that Clawson's win signifies a move to the right on the part of the electorate.

Porter is a fairly conservative Democrat. And his posture during the campaign never was that of a way-out liberal. He and Clawson never came eyeball-to-eyeball on issues.

What Unruh was doing in his postmortem was sticking a little needle in the California Democratic council, a volunteer band of liberals with whom he has had some differences. Although the CDC officially had endorsed Porter, it was known they had no great affection for him. The CDC never has really prospered in Porter's assembly district, nor in the 23d Congressional District.

Democrats may get their vengeance next year when there will be party primaries and a general election. But there's nothing like a win such as Clawson's to perk up the GOP during the interim.

Address by Gov. Frank Clement, of Tennessee, at Region V Civil Defense Conference, New Orleans, La., June 3, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is true that an adequate civil defense program for our country can only exist through community understanding—that is, through community cooperation by the citizens of every city and State in America.

As my colleagues in the Congress know, civil defense as a necessary program for our country has been much debated—and much maligned by its detractors. On the positive need and the positive good of an organized civil defense program on the community level in America, I am pleased to commend to my colleagues in the Congress a fine speech delivered by the Honorable Frank Clement, Governor of Tennessee, in my home city of New Orleans. Governor Clement spoke on June 3 to Federal, State, and local community civil defense leaders attending the Federal Region V Civil Defense Conference in New Orleans, and I know his address was well received. He pointed out the very real progress which Tennessee has made in organizing and implementing a civil defense program for his State.

With these thoughts in mind, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the Record this recent address by Governor Clement. His speech follows:

REMARKS OF GOV. FRANK CLEMENT, REGION V CIVIL DEFENSE CONFERENCE, NEW ORLEANS, LA., JUNE 3, 1963

Colonel Erdmann, civil defense leaders from region V, ladies and gentlemen, when Governor Davis made his most gracious introduction a little bit ago, I couldn't help contrasting it with some of the introductions I have made, and it sure makes me resolve to do better in the future.

The fact that the Governor handled the truth rather loosely in places I will excuse, but I must always remind myself that flattery is like smoking.

It won't hurt you unless you inhale.

I want to congratulate you on this gathering and on the purpose behind it.

Your theme, civil defense through community understanding, certainly strikes at the heart of the No. 1 objective civil defense faces today.

Civil defense has had its problems.

One of them has been "expert-itis."

Too many "authorities" wrangling among themselves can keep the stark urgency of the program from getting through to the people themselves.

What we are trying to do here is certainly a long step in the right direction.

In my hometown of Dickson, Tenn., we had an old judge who loved above everything else, when he took off his robes, to get down on the Buffalo River fishing.

One summer term of court, he was about through with the docket when Saturday morning rolled around.

In fact, there was only one case remaining. So the old judge scheduled a fishing trip for noon.

He thought that would certainly allow him enough time to try the one simple case.

But to be doubly sure, he thought he'd swear in a special panel of jurors who would be able to handle it quickly.

So he got a panel of nothing but experts. Nothing but lawyers.

And 12 of them were selected, and the trial proceeded.

Since it was an uncomplicated case, with only one witness, the jury got the case a little after 9 o'clock, and the old judge felt pretty good.

More than 3 hours to go, and a panel of 12 experts to speed things along.

But 10 o'clock came.

And 11.

Finally at 11:30 he sent the bailiff in to see how soon a verdict might be expected.

When the bailiff returned he reported to the judge.

"Have they reached a verdict?" the judge asked.

"Verdict the Devil," said the bailiff, "They're just halfway through with nominating speeches for foreman of the jury."

Something like that has seemed at times in danger of happening to the civil defense program.

It has seemed that the program was producing more heat than light.

One of the basic requirements for success of the civil defense program is that it must rely upon the States and their local communities for the needed supply of volunteer trained workers.

Civil defense is too gigantic a national project to be dependent solely upon paid professional personnel.

Trained volunteers—by the hundreds of thousands—are therefore the determining factor as to whether the mission goes over or goes down.

We welcome this community-based theme in the realization that the program with which you are charged is outranked in its life-protecting obligations by no other national project today.

We welcome it in the knowledge that whatever the size of this delegation may be, you represent the lives, the fortunes, and the surviving future of the 180 million people who make up this country of ours.

We welcome it in thanks and appreciation, for you are the leaders who have overcome enormous difficulties and frequent high-level opposition in keeping the mission alive, and on a high priority basis.

In the last half decade, we have been participants in or witnesses of the most resounding discoveries and experimentations known to world history.

It was the 5-year-era that spanned space from sputnik to Gordon Cooper.

It was the 5-year-era that found two countries with that proof that they had landed rockets on the moon.

It was the quintet of years that found a young American going around this earth almost casually, 22 times in orbits of 90 minutes each, and then landing pinpoint in the Pacific.

It was the half decade which brought the two-country space race to zenith proportions, including an American satellite now riding the multi-million-mile highway to the planet Venus.

It was the half-decade of accomplishments in science and technology that relegated the most daring imagination of Buck Rogers to the status of toy spinning tops and glass marbles.

And it was the half decade in which the issue of personal survival reached its greatest proportions in our minds and in our civil defense planning.

Whether we plan out of fear, or out of foresight, or a combination of each, such planning is the most imperative necessity with us today in considering the mass survival of our people.

We are not normally creatures of fear and terror.

Defeatism is still a strange and unwanted word among us.

We are not a sitdown country.

We are not lag-backs.

But we are, by nature, the subjects of the hazards and apprehensions of survival.

We have the right to wonder:

"Where do I go, if I have a few seconds warning that the nuclear birds of death are on their way, and coming in my direction?"

We have the right to ask you leaders in the civil defense program:

"What sort of progress have you really made? Where are the shelters? What's in them? How long are they good for?"

We have the right to ask the Federal Government:

"Are you doing this civil defense job properly? Or are you letting secondary matters take precedence?"

We have the right to ask State governments:

"What is the status of your cooperation and relationship with Federal and local authorities in this matter of civil defense? What have you done toward the actual preparation of agencies of State government for civil defense—the department of health, the department of highways, the department of safety, the military department, the welfare department?"

We have the right to ask city and county governments:

"Have you really done this job right? Are you aware of its tremendous implications? Are your channels of communication with State and Federal Government ready for emergency use? Have you taken advantage of funds, materials, instructions, training schools, stockpiling, and other preparation available to you?"

And then we have the right and the duty to ask ourselves:

"Am I personally doing my share of this national task of preparation for survival? Are there ways I can improve my own contribution and participation?"

Yes, we have the right and the obligation to ask such sharp and pertinent questions of governmental agencies in the civil defense field.

But we do not have the right to say:

"I give up. It's too complicated. It's too hazy. I'll just go about my regular routine and take my chances. I'll just grab my family and run in whatever direction I can when the time comes, and if we don't have time, well, that's it."

No—we don't have the justification for that attitude.

It's not American.

It's not warranted.

It's not sensible.

It's not human.

Moreover—and this is the saving clause—it's not necessary.

The National, State and local civil defense organizations have already produced evidence of that.

Against the dread factor of millions of lives that undoubtedly would be destroyed in wholesale nuclear attacks, there is the factor of other millions in the same national area who would, by civil defense preparation, survive.

But the fight to survive—a fight that may eventually be won in a shelter—must begin in the will to live.

Without that initial outpouring of the will to live, the material factors of survival will crumble away.

A danger that can visit us at any time—as it has visited us before—is a depressingly low public apathy about the workability of civil defense.

We had an attack of that apathy a few years ago—and it came close to putting an end to civil defense—appropriations and all. There was a real fight of civil defense in the Congress for its own statutory survival. But survive it did—to resume the job of survival plans and accomplishments for all.

We have been warned by competent authorities that individual families must be prepared to live for at least 14 days after a hydrogen attack, with little or no help.

This, in effect, makes family survival the business of all.

For this reason alone, emphasis must be placed upon reaching effectively with the present phase of civil defense education as many people as possible—a saturation campaign.

They must be told in unminced words all now known of the civil defense story—and the telling of it must be repeated as new developments arise.

It's a massive call on our communications ability.

It's a principal duty of the civil defense program, and the cooperating governmental agencies.

In my State of Tennessee, where national defense projects range from Oak Ridge to the mysteries of the wind tunnel at Tullahoma, it is no military secret that you can in flying westward a few miles from Nashville look down upon a new circular rupture of the earth—a manmade little Grand Canyon of its own.

That is our newly developing emergency control center.

Bids have been opened and shortly construction will be begun on this center.

We hope never—but it is not inconceivable that it may serve as the temporary seat of our State government.

It is a quarter-million-dollar investment thus far, designed to offer fallout and some blast protection, but it will be the heart of the emergency communications network in the State, including amateur radio operations and Conelrad stations.

In other areas of the civil defense program, I am proud to report that my State—which is known as the Volunteer State, is living up to its reputation in the manner in which the public is taking hold of the civil defense complex.

Already this year 500 of our public school teachers have completed training courses and qualified as instructors under the civil defense adult education program.

In turn, these instructors have completed more than 300 classes in which more than 9,000 of our citizens were enrolled. It is hoped that as many as 40,000 will have been trained under this program before the end of the year.

In this vital area of medical self-help, Tennessee has lead the Nation in the number of its citizens graduating from the medical self-help training program, with 3,108 in the month of March, alone.

My State also leads the Nation in the number of prepositioned hospitals which have been cleared to receive additional supplies, upgrading them to 30-day operational capability.

Under a capable medical self-help steering committee headed by the president of the Tennessee Medical Association, the people of Tennessee are going forward quietly, but purposefully in the determination to do whatever must be done for survival in event of nuclear war.

Public shelter space has been found with a potential of 1,600,000, and we are moving with all possible speed toward the provision of stocked shelter space for every 1 of our 3½ million citizens.

So, when I say that my State has begun to move ahead in civil defense, what I really mean is that the people have begun to move ahead.

Your phrase "community understanding" is a good description of it.

Through seven hot wars and into this cold war, the State which gave the Nation Andrew Jackson and Alvin York and Nathan Bedford Forrest has accumulated a wealth of this community understanding.

And behind it is a quiet courage and singleness of purpose that rises to emergencies as a matter of course.

We have no monopoly on this.

Louisiana has it. And Texas and Oklahoma and Arkansas and New Mexico. That is why they are American.

What remains is for us—for you and me—who are the leaders they have entrusted with this crucial matter of survival, to lead in the tradition of American leadership.

There is a phrase that is part of our heritage that goes like this, "You shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

If we might paraphrase that lofty sentence, let us say to the world here today: "You shall give the people the truth and the people will do whatever is necessary for survival."

Thank you.

The Way Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including an editorial from the Richmond Times Dispatch of Sunday, June 16, 1963. Virginius Dabney is editor of the Richmond Times Dispatch and is recognized in literary circles as a great Virginia editor. He is one of the most respected men in the entire State of Virginia. He is gentle and moderate in his views. I am sure that Members of Congress, as well as other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will be interested in reading Mr. Dabney's expressions in regard to the present race troubles through which we are passing. The editorial from the Richmond Times Dispatch is as follows:

THE WAY OUT

Negro Americans must be given their constitutional rights. We have said this before and we reiterate it now. Injustices must be corrected, inequities abolished. All parts of the Nation have been guilty of treating colored citizens unfairly.

But neither the National Government nor the State and local governments should have to deal with complex and emotion-charged racial problems at what is, in effect, the point of a gun. Neither Washington nor Richmond nor any other capital city or locality should have to cope with mobs rioting through the streets, in violation of laws and court injunctions. No government worthy of the name will surrender to the threat, or the actuality, of force.

Since President Kennedy and his administration have encouraged the Negro mobs, and the President has said hardly one word about the necessity that the Negroes abandon these flagrantly illegal tactics, it is difficult now to bring matters under control. But unless this is done, we are in for something approaching large-scale anarchy.

Time was when President Kennedy recognized fully that when any individual or group begins breaking the law with impunity, there is danger of real trouble. For example, at the height of the University of Mississippi crisis last year, he issued a statement directed to the white people involved in the uproar around Oxford, in which he said:

"Our Nation is founded on the principle that observance of the law is the eternal safeguard of liberty and defiance of the law is the surest road to tyranny * * *.

"Even among law-abiding men, few laws are universally loved. But they are uniformly respected and not resisted. Americans are free, in short, to disagree with the law but not to disobey it. For any government of laws and not of men, no man—however prominent and powerful—and no mob—however unruly or boisterous—is entitled to defy a court of law."

But Mr. Kennedy shelved this eminently sound doctrine when he encouraged the recent Negro mobs in Birmingham and elsewhere. The fact that he did encourage them is testified to by two of his sympathetic interpreters—James Reston of the New York Times and Richard H. Rovere of the New Yorker.

What he will have to do now, as Negroes threaten ever wider and more devastating marches in Washington and numerous other cities throughout the Nation is to show conclusively that he is just as determined to stop lawlessness on the part of colored citizens as on the part of white. He must make it completely clear that no further violations will be tolerated from any quarter. We have never approved of sending Federal troops into States unnecessarily or contrary to law, but if such troops are to be sent at all, they will have to be used against lawless Negroes on exactly the same basis as they have been used against whites.

Once the President takes a clear and uncompromising position, and shows conclusively that members of both races will be treated exactly alike, he can address himself effectively to the requirements of the existing situation. We do not agree with him in all respects as to what those requirements are, but forthright action to stop the colored mobs is a prerequisite to the enactment of any reasonably effective program.

The killings and the beatings that have accompanied the demonstrations by mobs are deplorable in every respect, of course. The wanton murder of an NAACP official in Mississippi cannot be excused, but why is so little said concerning the slaying of a white man, an innocent bystander, in Lexington, N.C., on the night of June 6, and the shooting of a white High Point newspaper photographer in the back at the same time—both by Negro gunfire? Much genuine indignation has been expressed around the world, and rightly, over the ambush killing of the Negro in Mississippi. By contrast, most people have forgotten, if they ever knew, that a 24-year-old white man was shot fatally in North Carolina the previous week.

Be that as it may, let us all keep our heads in this crisis, and refrain from making inflammatory statements or otherwise increasing the danger of violence. That danger is great enough already. The Kennedy administration should set the example by calm and reasoned discussion, and also give clear assurances that it will not tolerate lawlessness from any quarter.

In that spirit, let us seek to correct those genuine injustices which still exist.

Reports to the United Nations Trusteeship Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I offer herewith the second of a series of statements delivered to members of the Trusteeship Council. This article concerns the progress which has been made in administrative and political fields with regard to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands during the past year. High Commissioner Goding's statement follows:

REPORTS TO THE UNITED NATIONS TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Before I begin a résumé of the past year's activities, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Micronesian people. I am constantly and increasingly reminded of their innate abilities, of their kindness and generosity, of their loyalty and devotion to democratic principles, of the rising generation's capacity to accept the responsibilities of their chosen professions, and to provide the leadership that should enable them to decide their own destiny in the world of nations, in the reasonably near future, more rapidly than would have been thought possible a few decades ago. It is these qualities of the Micronesian people which are mainly responsible for the splendid human relations existing in the Trust Territory, which was so well expressed by a recent visitor from Fiji, who, after traveling through the islands, remarked that although good race relations prevail elsewhere in the Pacific they could not be compared with the easy relations and complete acceptance of all races with one another, which is so apparent in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

At this point I would like also to say that one of the most gratifying experiences of the past year has been the vastly increased and growing interest and effort in Micronesia that has taken place among all segments of the U.S. Government, as well as among many private agencies and individuals, not only in the United States but indeed in many areas of the world; not only the interest, but the active support and direct aid of those agencies in a position to help was forthcoming when needed. This willingness—or indeed this eagerness—to help was demonstrated time and again during the past year. It was demonstrated when the administering authority sought, and was successful in acquiring, new legislation and greatly increased funds with which to intensify its efforts in all fields of endeavor. This was demonstrated when an outbreak of poliomyelitis occurred in the Marshall Islands, with the result that the disease was checked before it could spread to other areas of the territory. Again it was demonstated recently when Typhoon Olive spread through the Mariana Islands district, leaving in its wake a great deal of damage and destruction. The interest of the U.S. Government in the islands of the trust territory has made itself apparent in many other ways.

An interdepartmental task force, comprised of members of various Federal agencies, which had been set up the year before, was active in this period in working for needed legislation and providing other assistance. The 87th U.S. Congress passed a bill which included the trust territory in those areas which could receive Federal assistance in case of disaster. This law became effective last June, when President Kennedy approved it. Had it not been for this last-named action, the Trust Territory Administration would have been sorely pressed to provide emergency needs and permanent repairs arising as a result of the recent typhoon.

My colleagues and I have just come from the island of Saipan, to which we moved our headquarters a year ago, and over which the eye of the typhoon passed. This was the first major storm to strike Saipan in 49 years, and one of the most severe in the island's recorded history. Miraculously, no lives were lost, but the storm damaged or destroyed homes, farms, schools, hospitals, churches, commercial garden crops, and government installations of all types, in Rota and Tinian, as well as in Saipan. Because of the action of Congress and the President last June, assistance was immediately available. The President declared the stricken Marianas a major disaster area, and within 4 hours the needs had been surveyed and plans made for assistance. The American Red Cross, together with the Department of Agriculture, will dispense food as long as the need exists. With the aid of nurses from the U.S. Navy Hospital in Guam, typhoid inoculations were given to all residents in the stricken areas. A representative from the President's Office of Emergency Planning surveyed damage to public facilities, such as schools, powerplants, waterplants, dock facilities, and other government buildings, and estimated the damage at well over $2 million. Rehabilitation work already has begun; assistance has been given to help replace houses and local businesses. When I appeared before this body a year ago I presented a reassessment of our needs in the fields of education, economic development, public health, and major construction. This analysis highlighted the fact that we needed to set a much more rapid pace in the development of the trust territory. To do so meant vastly increased appropriations. Accordingly, a budget of $15 million was requested for the current fiscal year.

It is with a great deal of gratification that I am able to report that the full amount of the request was approved by the Congress. This is an increase of over 100 percent above the prior year's appropriation, and compares with annual appropriations which approximated $7 million for all functions of government for the previous several years. Active support for the increased appropriation came from all levels of government: from the Office of the President, the Department of the Interior, the Department of State, the Bureau of the Budget, the congressional committees concerned, and the U.S. Congress itself. All agreed wholeheartedly that the administering authority could meet the challenge it faced only by launching a vastly accelerated program. Enactment of a new law was necessary before the increased appropriation could be approved, since the statutory limitation of $7.5 million for trust territory administration had earlier been set by Congress. Our first step thus was to have the appropriation ceiling lifted. This was accomplished with the passage by Congress of a new authorization bill, in July 1962, which enabled us to request $15 million for our 1963 operations. Because the new law did not become effective in time for the increased appropriation to be included in the general appropriations bill for fiscal year 1963 it was necessary to submit a supplemental request for consideration of the newly authorized appropriations.

Accordingly, we submitted a supplementary budget to bring our 1963 appropriation up to the total of the $15 million authorized. Enactment was carried over to the 88th session of the U.S. Congress and, on May 17, of this year we received the second half of our increased appropriation. Although this delay temporarily held up some aspects of our accelerated construction program, the intervening period was used to good advantage in the perfecting of our planning. When the money became available, we were able to move more expeditiously into our construction program.

Other administrative events of major and far-reaching import took place during the year under review. The first was the unification of all the territory under civilian administration. By Executive Order of the President, the former Saipan district was placed under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior on July 1, 1962. The turnover of the former Saipan district to us by the Department of the Navy was accomplished in a smooth and exemplary manner and the naval administration is to be commended for the cooperation we received during this complex operation.

The integration of Saipan district also enabled us to bring about another long-sought amalgamation, that of unifying all the Mariana Islands into one district. On July 1, 1962, the Mariana Islands district was created from the former Rota and Saipan districts. Two events long sought by the people of the Mariana Islands, as well as by recent visiting missions and the Trusteeship Council, thus were brought to a successful culmination at the beginning of the year under review.

Along with the unification of Saipan Island and the Northern Mariana Islands with the rest of the territory went another historic event, that of the transfer of the headquarters of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to Saipan Island, thus establishing a provisional capital of the territory for the first time within its own boundaries. These two historic events have brought about increased cooperation among the people of the territory and have greatly stimulated political cohesion. The establishment of headquarters on Saipan has also enabled us to utilize to the maximum the services of qualified Micronesians on the headquarters staff, as well as to make easier our program of inservice training.

In every headquarters department there are now Micronesian staff members, with all districts being represented. Last year I set forth in detail the range of headquarters staff positions occupied by Micronesians and I will not repeat here except to say that in most areas the number has appreciably increased. Additionally, more than 50 clerical and other positions formerly held by U.S. citizens when we were located on Guam are now filled by local citizens. The replacement program continued also at the district level. In Palau, Mr. Takeo Yawo became the first Micronesian to be appointed assistant district administrator in administration affairs on a permanent basis.

Altogether during the past year some 65 Micronesians were placed in professional and senior executive posts in the trust territory, an increase of 150 percent over the previous year. There are 100 Micronesians holding senior positions, making up approximatley half of all the professional and top-level positions in the administration. We are also continuing the analysis of wage scales in the territory. Because of budgetary limitation, we have been unable to make a complete wage-scale readjustment, although a start was made last October when a substantial salary adjustment was made covering most of the lower and middle pay rates. An additional salary adjustment is scheduled for July soon after the beginning of the new fiscal year.

This wage increase will be instituted at all levels with special attention being given to the elimination of any inequities that still exist. A wage adjustment was also put into effect during the year for the Kwajalein area and in January 1963 the differential pay to Micronesians, when they are employed in districts other than their own, was raised from 15 to 25 percent.

Under the guidance of the new Headquarters Political Affairs Office, the political development program was speeded up considerably. This section is composed of a political affairs officer, who is both a political scientist and lawyer, and two Micronesian assistant political affairs officers, both holding degrees in political science. As each district congress met, it received technical advice from the political affairs office, thus aiding immeasurably in legislative drafting and in the improvement of legislative procedures. The political highlight of the year was the council of Micronesia session held in late September and early October in Koror, Palau. This was the first time that the council of Micronesia had met within the territory's boundaries, and its deliberations resulted in recommendations and resolutions which will profoundly affect the future political development of the territory.

The Council resolved that a true legislative body be created as soon as possible and, to achieve this end, established a Legislative Drafting Committee to begin preliminary work on the drafting of a constitution. At a meeting last fall the Council adopted an official Trust Territory flag in order that the territory might have a symbol of unity and identity. This flag, a miniature set of which I am pleased to present to members of this body with the compliments of the Council of Micronesia, consists of a circle of six white stars on a field of blue, representing the six districts of the Territory. The white stars also stand for peace, with the blue background symbolizing freedom and loyalty.

The Council also voted to hold a special session in March 1963 at the provisional capital in Saipan to consider the preliminary report of the Legislative Drafting Committee. This special session resulted in preliminary recommendations on the part of the Council as to the makeup of the legislative body. These recommendations are currently under study. While there are many steps still to be taken before a true territorial legislative organ can come into existence, I am more than ever confident that well before 1965 we shall have an effective territorial legislative organization operating in the territory.

Political progress continued also on the municipal and district level. The most important political event of the year on the district level was the formation and chartering of the Mariana Islands District Legislature. Chartered on January 7, 1963, the new body convened its first session on March 4, 1963. With the creation and chartering of the Mariana Islands District Legislature, the people of the district for the first time, through their chosen representatives, have a forum for the solution of problems facing the entire district since only municipal legislative bodies existed previously in Siapan, Rota, and Tinian.

Two significant events of general social and political import occurred during this past year. On August 2, 1962, the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service announced that visas for entry to the United States on the part of Trust Territory citizens no longer would be required when a citizen was proceeding in direct and continuous transit from the Trust Territory to the United States. All that a Trust Territory citizen now needs to enter the United States as a nonimmigrant is sufficient official identification. Certain minor regulations, such as securance of official acceptance by a school, however, still are in effect for Trust Territory residents who are applying for entrance as students.

A very significant event was the Executive order signed by President Kennedy on August 23, 1962 which among other things directed that regulations relating to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands be revised to facilitate free entry of U.S. citizens, U.S. investment, and U.S.-flag vessels into the area with the exception of Eniwetok, Bikini, and Kwajalein, which will continue to be under the control of the Department of Defense. In ending his message, the President stated: "I intend that these actions I have taken will foster responsible political development, stimulate new economic activity, and enable the people of the islands to participate fully in the world of today." This step, I believe, will do much to aid us in accomplishing the President's stated objectives.

Fire Island National Seashore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, over the past 5 years six different bills have been introduced by eight separate Members of Congress, all generally supporting the concept of the establishment of a National Seashore on the south shore of Long Island at Fire Island, Suffolk County, New York. As the Member in whose district most of Fire Island is located, I have scrutinized all of these bills carefully. Until recently all of these bills were couched in vague and general terms and in the absence of specific details the people of Suffolk County were unable to express their sentiments on such matters as the mileage and acreage to be acquired by the Federal Government, the manner of taking land and improvements thereon, the status of existing State, county and town parks on Fire Island, whether the parkland was to be left wild or developed for maximum usage, how access was to be provided, whether erosion control measures would be carried out, whether local interests would have any voice in park development and management, and many other items of great interest to the people most closely affected.

On June 10, 1963, the Secretary of the Interior released his report on the two earliest bills filed. This report provided detailed answers to many of the questions which my constituents had asked—it left many unanswered. Most of the answers it provided were satisfactory to the district; some were not.

In an effort to make constructive and specific recommendations as to the development of the park in the manner most beneficial to Suffolk County within the framework of the Federal law, I have this day introduced my own bill on the subject. It represents a great many hours of study of existing seashore legislation and of the particular facts applicable to Fire Island. I am indebted to the existing seashore legislation and to the legislation proposed by the Secretary of the Interior for much of the language contained therein. I am indebted to the Committee for a Fire Island National Seashore, the Suffolk County Council of the League of Women Voters, the Patchogue Chamber of Commerce, many of the garden clubs and conservation organizations of Suffolk County for many of the details and, above all, for the spirit of this legislation.

This bill differs from that proposed by the Secretary of the Interior in several important respects, among them the following:

First. It is aimed more specifically at conservation for the future and less directly at recreation for the present. To this end, while the entire 31-mile beach front of Fire Island would be held in public ownership, two specific tracts, the Sunken Forest area and an 8-mile section lying east of Ocean Ridge, are required to be held in an undeveloped condition. While no portion of the island qualifies as true wilderness, these two relatively wild and undeveloped areas should be retained in their present state, without the intrusion of roads, parking lots, or any facilities designed to encourage high density usage at the expense of the existing remote and tranquil atmosphere of these areas.

Second. The bill limits the area to be acquired by the Federal Government on Fire Island to the area between the Fire Island State Park and the Moriches Inlet County Park. These two areas, already in public ownership, should be retained for the residents of the State of New York and of Suffolk County, respectively. Within the national seashore area, the county and town governments have the option of either retaining their existing parks or turning their ownership and administration over to the Federal Government.

Third. The bill specifically adds to the bill recommended by the Secretary the substantial acreage available on several nearby islands in the Great South Bay, Bellport Bay, and Moriches Bay.

Fourth. The bill does not provide for the acquisition of any land east of the Moriches Inlet.

Fifth. The bill does give the Secretary a limited power to condemn improved property. This power is limited to the 8-mile undeveloped area east of Ocean Ridge and is designed to enable the creation of a true conservation area in this section. The relatively few homeowners involved would have the option of retaining any property thus condemned either for their lifetimes or for a fixed period of 25 years.

Sixth. The bill otherwise prohibits the condemnation of any homes actually existing or under construction on July 1, 1963. The January 1, 1963, date recommended by the Department of the Interior seems unfair to those who in good faith have started construction this year.

Seventh. The bill directs the Secretary to participate in and contribute to such erosion control plans as have been developed by the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army.

Eighth. The bill directs to the Secretary to contribute such land as may be necessary in the future for any new inlet in the Patchogue-West Sayville area upon the development of plans for such an inlet by the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, and approval of such a project by Congress.

Ninth. The bill limits the area exempt from condemnation around existing residences to 2 acres, but would allow 10 acres around existing commercial enterprises such as hotels, beach clubs, and marinas.

Tenth. The bill establishes a Fire Island National Seashore Advisory Commission to insure that local interests would have a continuing voice in the development, maintenance, and operation of the seashore.

I know that this bill cannot please all of the divergent national and local interests, pressures, and voices which will be heard on this legislation. It is an honest effort to produce conservation legislation which both Suffolk County and the Federal Government can live with.

Setbacks Shadow President's Trip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. The following article from the Christian Science Monitor of June 18 is recommended reading in view of the very fair and excellent appraisal of the current Federal scene.

SETBACKS SHADOW PRESIDENT'S TRIP

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—As President Kennedy prepares for his planned trip to Europe this week the country looks back over his 2½ years in office.

He faces a balky Congress, balky allies, and a balky world, and his administration has not turned out the way he expected at all.

Not for years has a Congress shown such a meager record of accomplishment as this one, and Washington now talks of a session lasting to Christmas.

Though the economy has almost steadily improved since Mr. Kennedy's taking office it lacks ebullience and sparkle, and there is an ominous undercurrent of unemployment, sluggishness, and maldistribution that baffles economists and that is far from the bright hopes of the man who was going to get the country "moving again."

Mr. Kennedy got the Trade Expansion Act through last year, but the obduracy of President de Gaulle of France makes its value problematical.

Now the tax cut-reform bill is at a critical point after 6 months, and already it is evident that it will be far different from what President Kennedy planned.

CIVIL RIGHTS ISSUE

The civil rights issue has leaped out after brooding 100 years and now dominates other domestic matters in Washington, occupying a major portion of the harassed Executive's time to the exclusion of affairs which had been scheduled. The issue flushed out by snarling police dogs of Birmingham has the earmarks of a social revolution, and it is Mr. Kennedy's sober task to try to see that it is a nonviolent one. That it will produce a filibuster is now generally accepted, and into what crisis that will lead the country, nobody knows.

Abroad Mr. Kennedy's path is just as uncertain.

Nearly every step which he proposes finds stern critics. His big appropriation for space exploration is denounced by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, though the success of the Soviets in putting man and woman in orbit may reduce that opposition.

His efforts to reach agreement with Moscow on nuclear testing find Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev intransigent abroad, and Senator Strom Thurmond, Democrat of South Carolina, and others critical at home.

PUBLICITY MASTERED

The ambitious plan for a United States of Europe, joined by trade agreements and under the nuclear leadership of the United States, is knocked into a cocked hat by General de Gaulle who has other ideas.

Unsolved foreign problems range from Vietnam to the Congo and on the U.S. doorstep still sits Fidel Castro.

As Mr. Kennedy looks about he can take take comfort in many things.

His popularity is high. Administrations totter in London, Bonn, Athens, and Rome but not in Washington where the President's authority stands firm, and his political opposition is relatively ineffective.

Though the economy is only fair, things are much better than in the recession in 1960 when he took over.

Mr. Kennedy is master of the avenues of publicity and his voice, when he cares to raise it as he did twice last week—first in his appeal for better relations with the Soviets and second on race relations—is the most powerful in America and perhaps the world.

Analysts are busy trying to figure out why the Kennedy record so far has been so unproductive.

Some things have been accomplished, but the record is lackluster compared with what Mr. Kennedy himself promised and hoped.

The President himself, in recent speeches, has tended to emphasize limitations of his Office rather than his possibilities.

Mankind Mourns Pope John XXIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call to the attention of the membership an editorial, "Mankind Mourns Pope John XXIII," appearing in the McKeesport (Pa.) Daily News on Tuesday, June 4, which the McKeesport City Council has asked to be made a part of the Congressional Record:

MANKIND MOURNS POPE JOHN XXIII

Pope John XXIII is supposed to have told one of the first callers after his elevation: "Here I am at the top of the heap and at the end of the road."

If he did say that, then Pope John was unmindful at the time that sufficient years would be left at the end of his long road to enable him to become one of the most important Pontiffs in all history.

It is difficult to realize now, after less than 5 years of his pontificate, the immensity of what Pope John actually accomplished.

He produced a new friendship among all Christians—a friendship that evolved from the goodwill he himself manifested in the Vatican Ecumenical Council which became a high point of his reign.

In his encyclical "Mater et Magistra," he gave his church and the world at large important advice on ways and means of settling many pressing social and labor problems.

Again in the encyclical, "Pacem in Terris," he appealed to all peace-minded men to work resolutely together for an international society based on justice and liberty for everyone.

These were the main papal acts and documents which will mark the official record of Pope John. But equally as significant, and perhaps even more valuable in the long run, will be that delightful, kind, and appealing image of the "good-natured Pope" which will stay in the minds of his contemporaries and become a hallowed memory to pass on to the future.

He was a man risen from the people, indeed. His father was an Italian sharecropper. John struggled for his education and became a dedicated priest. In time, he was lifted to the challenging position of a top Vatican diplomat where he gained a wide recognition as an expert on international politics and all its complexities.

During World War I, he was drafted into the Italian Army and served as a Medical Corps sergeant and then as an Army chaplain with the rank of lieutenant. He liked nothing better in later life than to recall that sergeant's post and muse as one might expect an old soldier to muse over times long past.

As Father Roncalli, he played such an active part in many Catholic movements in the years following that first big war that he was designated a monsignor and assigned to the Vatican's Secretariat of State. He later was named archbishop and became a well-known figure in Europe. His work in Paris and in the city he loved so much, Venice, made him one of the most popular of high-ranking clergymen.

However, it was as Pope that this lovable old man began exerting on a global scale that noble influence which will endure, we hope, forever. Despite the majesty and dignity of his office, his friendly, at times twinkling, personality never failed to come forth. He broke certain traditions which he didn't like and set new ones which are bound to make it easier for his successors to communicate with men of all creeds and nations.

John was close to humanity. He knew the world, and in no time the whole world seemed to know him. He worked in warm ways, the wonders of his mission to perform. What once seemed the almost insoluble situation of the Catholic prelates imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain, simplified itself in his judgment. He sought in a friendly manner to obtain their release, and even Soviet Premier Khrushchev was finding it difficult to refuse him.

What great tasks has John left behind? Foremost in his own scheme of things is that grand ecumenical council, now in recess. It was never far from his thoughts during his illness. He expressed hopes time and again in recent weeks that it be carried on in the liberal and tolerant manner he had set for it. We are certain that this fine wish will be respected.

Also, we are certain that as the years roll on in a world which must right itself in time, men of the character and personality of Pope John will come more and more to play important roles and exercise lasting power in the affairs of mankind. We say this because he so thoroughly demonstrated what a ready smile and a warm heart can do to inspire the public confidence and buttress the spiritual faith even in the most difficult of circumstances.

He was a true man of God.

The End of an Outstanding Naval Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, while there has been a great deal of speculation in the press concerning the administration's decision not to reappoint Adm. George W. Anderson as Chief of Naval Operations for a second 2-year term, little has been said about the affect this decision will have on the U.S. Navy. I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a column by Mr. Phil Goulding, the Cleveland Plain Dealer's Washington military correspondent, describing one of the reactions he has found in the Pentagon among the military. Mr. Goulding is, in my opinion, one of the most knowledgable and informed military writers in Washington. One of the most interesting points of his column is his conclusion that the termination of Admiral Anderson's naval career has caused a morale problem among certain elements of the Armed Forces, whether valid causes for the problem exists or not.

The column follows:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, June 8, 1963]

PRIVATE WIRE: IS MCNAMARA IN ERROR?

(By Phil G. Goulding)

WASHINGTON.—Many Pentagon officers are convinced that Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara made a grave and perhaps irreparable error in ending the naval career of Adm. George W. Anderson.

They are not speaking out publicly and it is unlikely that they will.

But any newsman who covers the Pentagon knows dozens of high-ranking officers on a personal and social basis. Some of these are anxious to discuss the Anderson case and McNamara's decision to appoint a new Chief of Naval Operations instead of giving the admiral a second 2-year term as all had expected.

Some among the talkative men know that this reporter accompanied Anderson to South Vietnam last summer and assume, therefore, that I will side with him on all issues. It is a natural, if erroneous, position.

But a great many other colonels and rear admirals and brigadier generals are unaware of this personal relationship—and yet are equally willing to sound off.

Nothing that McNamara has done has so shaken the Navy. The other services, while less directly concerned, are also disturbed.

The Secretary, quite properly, refuses to discuss the case. The admiral, quite obviously, does not know precisely what happened. But there is no doubt whatever in the minds of the officers who are upset. They're convinced Anderson wasn't reappointed simply because he did not bow low enough to McNamara.

While these officers dare not speak out, their feelings deserve attention. Whether their conclusion is valid is not necessarily the most important thing.

In their own words, this is their story:

The rules of the game have been profoundly altered since they entered the military service 20 or 25 years ago.

Their ultimate goal was to become chief of their service—chief of naval operations or chief of staff of the Army or Air Force.

Now they are wondering, for the first time, whether it was all a mistake.

Are the years of hard, dedicated work worthwhile when they can lead to such an abrupt termination of service?

"It has always been an article of faith," they say, "that the effort was worth whatever was required. Now that faith has been weakened."

Some of the officers say they will resign soon—purely because of the Anderson case. They use such words as "alarm" and "dismay," over the manner in which the views of high officers with 35 years of service are "disregarded" by the Secretary of Defense.

Most of the more senior officers who discuss the situation feel that their senior colleagues will stay on because of momentum, because their services are genuinely required or because of the strong attractions of service life.

"But these factors are not operative for the younger ones," they say.

One officer summed it up this way:

"Until our civilian leaders become aware of the serious situation developing, until they show signs of exercising their leadership less immoderately, the quality and esprit of the officer corps will continue to decline."

Secretary McNamara and his associates gain nothing by protesting to one another that these people simply do not understand what he is trying to do. He has a morale problem.

Majority in Favor of Trying Pope's World Peace Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, among the many significant contributions made by the late Pope John was his plea for the establishment of a world order which would bring an end to war. The urgency of establishing order out of the anarchy that prevails in international relations has been made clear by events of the past two decades. The concept of world peace under law is gaining ever-wider acceptance.

Recently the Minnesota poll, which is highly respected for its accuracy in assessing public opinion, took a survey within the State of Minnesota on this question. The results of the poll, published June 9, 1963, should be of interest to every Member of Congress.

The poll results with the accompanying statement are as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, June 9, 1963]

MAJORITY IN FAVOR OF TRYING POPE'S WORLD PEACE PLAN

Minnesotans are willing to try the late Pope John's idea of a strong world authority to maintain world peace. But most of them doubt that his plan will be adopted in the next few years.

In a statewide survey by the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota poll, 7 out of every 10 men and women say they would favor having the United States transfer to a world organization some of its right to decide the strength of its own Armed Forces, if all other nations also did so.

But at the same time, 69 percent don't think a single strong world authority can be set up "in the next several years."

Pope John issued his widely praised "Pacem in Terris" ("Peace on Earth") encyclical April 10. Covering many subjects, the papal message stated at one point: "Public authority having worldwide power * * * must be set up by common accord and not imposed by force. (It) must tackle and solve problems of an economic, social, political or cultural character which are posed by the universal common good."

To measure the impact in Minnesota of the Pope's encyclical, Minnesota poll field reporters put a series of questions to a balanced cross-section of State residents, aged 21 and older. The first question was:

"Pope John the 23d recently issued a message from the Vatican on the subject of world peace. Have you yourself heard or read anything about that message?"

Nearly one-half of the people (46 percent) recall reading or hearing about the Pope's message. One person in every ten cites the idea of a world authority to maintain peace as one of its main proposals.

Regardless of their familiarity with the papal encyclical, Minnesotans next were asked:

"Pope John has suggested a single world authority be set up to keep the peace. It would represent all nations and have more power than the present United Nations. Do you think such a world authority can be set up in the next several years, or not?"

The replies:

[In percent]

	Total	Men	Women
World authority can be set up	23	23	23
Cannot	69	72	66
Other answers	(1)	1	
No opinion	8	4	11
Total	100	100	100

[1] Less than 1 percent.

Twenty-eight percent of the Catholics interviewed and 22 percent of the Protestants believe a strong world agency could be established.

So do 28 percent of the adults having grade school training, 22 percent of those with high school education, and 20 percent of the college-trained men and women.

Another survey question was:

"Suppose that to set up an effective world authority to keep the peace, each nation must give up some of its rights to decide how large its armed forces should be, or about developing nuclear weapons. If all other nations were willing to do so, would you be in favor of, or against, having the United States also give up that right?"

The responses:

[In percent]

	Total	Men	Women
In favor	70	73	67
Against	21	21	22
Other answers	1	2	1
No opinion	8	4	10
Total	100	100	100

By educational level, those replying in favor include 77 percent of the college-trained group, 71 percent of the high school educated, and 63 percent of those having grade school training.

Colonial General Assembly Approved Free Public Schools in 1760

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the people of North Carolina are very proud of their public school system. For many years North Carolina has been in the forefront among the States in the Union in providing a free public school education for its citizens.

This great interest and concern over public education is something which is not new to the people of my great State. As far back as 1760 we find a North Carolina Colonial Assembly entreating the English sovereign to provide free schools in the royal colony of North Carolina.

I believe my colleagues will be interested to read the text of an address delivered to King George II of England by the Colonial Assembly of North Carolina in May 1760, which calls upon the English Crown to assist in providing free public education in North Carolina. I request that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The address follows:

COLONIAL GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED FREE PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN 1760

Just how long ago the idea of free public schools found favor with North Carolina legislators is made clearer by the recent discovery of a colonial legislative document on the subject. Historians give the people of North Carolina little or no credit for entertaining the idea of free public schools prior to 1800. Most often the first serious consideration of the idea is mentioned as being connected with the general assembly of 1817. Thus, the old legislative document printed below and labeled "Address to the King" will be new material for those interested in North Carolina history.

Ordered by the colonial general assembly in May, 1769, during the administration of Arthur Dobbs as Royal Governor, the "address" to King George II shows that free public schools had the sympathetic interest of the General Assembly of North Carolina at a much earlier date than has hitherto been supposed. The document may also serve as a background note pertinent to the much argued meaning of the clause in the State Constitution of 1776 which declared "that schools for the convenient instruction of youth should be established."

"ADDRESS TO THE KING ON BEHALF OF FREE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

"To the King's Most Excellent Majesty:

"The Humble Address of the Assembly of North Carolina.

"Most Gracious Sovereign: We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects the Assembly of North Carolina, embrace this first Opportunity of being convened in Assembly to Congratulate your Majesty upon the Success of your Arms in taking of Cape Breton, the Island of St. John & its dependencies, Reduction of Fort Frontenac, and the regaining Fort Duquesne.

"These acquisitions, truly Glorious to Your Majesty, tend to the Security and Protection of your Colonies, Confirm the Indians in their Allegiance and increase the Trade and Navigation of Great Britain, and afford us the pleasing hopes that thro' the Wisdom of

Your Majesty's Council and Conduct the Rights & Possessions of the Crown in North America will be entirely regained & effectually secured.

"We Humbly beg leave to assure Your Majesty that as we hitherto have, so we will to the utmost of our Power, cheerfully Contribute toward defending this Province against Invasions of the Enemy or Joining Your other Colonies on this Continent in vigorously carrying into Execution such wise Resolutions as Your Majesty shall take for making a Conquest of that Part of North America Yet Possessed by the subjects of the French King.

"Permit us, Sir, to return you our Most Grateful and sincere Thanks for the Singular Favor done this Province in the Grant made by your Majesty and Parliament of Fifty Thousand Pounds to North and South Carolina and Virginia towards reimbursing a Part of the Expenses they have been at in Prosecuting the Present War; Which cannot fail being of the most essential service to every Individual here, if the Proportion thereof which shall be allotted to this Government is duly applied.

"We observe with unfeigned concern great Immorality, and Profanity in the Lives and Manners of many of your Subjects in this Province as well as gross Ignorance, the Cause of which we must ascribe to the Want of an Orthodox and Pious Clergy and regular and Proper Schools and Seminaries of Learning.

"In the Present Session of Assembly we have Passed a Bill whereby better Provision is made for the Clergy than has been at any Time heretofore in this Government; and more we should have gladly done, that, Alas, Sir, the Country is so improverished in it's circumstances, through granting repeated aids to your Majesty for making the same defensible and in carrying on Expeditions in conjunction with your other Colonies against the French and their Indian Allies, that we can not give Sufficient Encouragement to the Clergy Nor Erect Proper Schools for the Education of our Youth. Permit us therefore most earnestly to entreat Your Majesty to Order and direct that the Proportion of the said Sum which shall be allotted to this Country be layed out & applied under such Rules and Regulations as to you in Your great Wisdom may seem expedient in Purchasing a Glebe for each Parish within this Province and making suitable Improvements thereon; And Erecting and Establishing a Freeschool in every County. This application we humbly apprehend will tend to Promote the Honor and Glory of God, True Religion, Piety and useful Learning as well as root out Prophaness and Immorality, And Cause the rising Generation to add their Grateful Prayers & Wishes to those of your Loyal Assembly that Your Majesty may long Possess & enjoy the Crown of Great Britain and the Dominions thereto belonging, together with the acquisitions lately made by your Majesty's Arms, and that the same may thereafter be transmitted thro's a Succession of illustrious Princes descended from you until the latest Period of Time.

"/s/ Sam Swann,
Speaker."

The Flag Plus Patriotism Equals America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I shared the Flag Day program with the students of Horatio Seymour School, one of the fine elementary schools of my home city of Utica. A highlight of this observance was an inspirational talk by Daniel Koppenhafer Jr., of 446 Lee Boulevard, Utica, N.Y. It was delivered with great poise and effectiveness, and at the conclusion it was met with thunderous applause. This demonstration of patriotic spirit was thrilling to witness and affirmed my confidence in the young people of today. Daniel's essay, although brief, expressed so dramatically and sincerely the meaning of our flag that I wish to share it with my colleagues.

The essay follows:

THE FLAG PLUS PATRIOTISM EQUALS AMERICA

Valley Forge, 1777–78: A barefoot boy of 17, his feet red with blood. He has a violent cough and a bad cold and shivers from the cold, but when he sees a flag he salutes, as every part of him looks like a storybook soldier. Why?

Gettysburg, Pa., July 1863: A Union flagholder shot in the stomach waits until he gives old glory to another man, then dies. Then the next flagholder leads a charge up a hill, he is shot, and plants the flag at the top and dies, his hand on the Stars and Stripes. Why?

Iwo Jima, 800 miles from Japan, 7½ square miles of rocks, sand, and blood: On February 23, 1945, a couple of Marines bring a flag to the top of Mount Suribachi where a famous picture is taken of them by Joe Rosenthal. Why?

Why do men go to the top of a mountain risking their lives just to put Old Glory on a hill. Why do they go across an open field in the face of enemy fire with just a flag in their hand. Is it they're brave or is it they're angry at the people who attack them. I think it's both. It's bravery because they see that flag waving and they know they are invincible under it. They're angry because they see some one shooting at "Old Glory," the flag of our country, and indirectly at all of us. The Stars and Stripes are sacred to this country and shall wave as long as this country is alive. Let us today reafirm our devotion to this flag. It has played and will play important roles in our country's history.

Using a Club To Convince Others

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, it was with a profound feeling of hope that I read in the Gloucester, Mass., Times of June 3, 1963, a letter to the editor by Mr. Russell S. Pond, of Derry, N.H. In this letter, Mr. Pond touched upon many interesting aspects of the tyrannical power wielded by an all-powerful executive who uses the awesome power of the military to enforce illegally his will upon the people of the South.

The writer also points out that the Northern press has been irresponsible in carrying out their duties by intentionally slanting news to favor their own prejudices, thereby creating a totally inaccurate image of the good people of the South.

My most sincere hope is that Mr. Pond's views are indicative of an awakening of Americans all over the Nation to the continued and intentional harassment of other Americans by persons seeking political power.

I submit to the attention of the House Mr. Pond's letter, aptly entitled "Using a Club To Convince Others."

The letter follows:

[From the Gloucester (Mass.) Times, June 3, 1963]

USING A CLUB TO CONVINCE OTHERS

EDITOR, GLOUCESTER TIMES:

It was a comfort to see the order given for the removal of Federal troops in Alabama but the comfort is short lived in view of the ramifications of the fact that they were illegally there in the first place. This is indicative of the fact that the rights and privileges of the States are being usurped as a result of Federal encroachment.

Article 4 of the U.S. Constitution states that the Federal Government is authorized to act against domestic violence only when that violence is directed against the Government to overthrow it or on the application of the legislature, or of the executive of a State.

No Federal court order was involved.

There was no violation of a Federal statute.

There was no abandonment of their functions by local police.

No call for assistance was issued.

The fact of the matter is that the local police were able to maintain remarkable control in spite of the fact that they were vastly outnumbered by a crazed mob. They have also been criticized for using dogs and firehoses but what would certain people have them use—machineguns?

Neither can they be criticized for charging Negroes with parading without a permit since the Negroes most certainly did and as an interesting sidelight you might be interested to learn that the ordinance against parading was passed in the 1920's for the protection of the Negro from the Ku Klux Klan.

I am not supporting segregation for the Constitution and Bill of Rights clearly allow all citizens full rights no matter what their color, creed, or race. What I support is law and order.

The Federal Government is culpable for a direct violation of the Constitution and we all remember what resulted in Mississippi from this—a riot and murder touched off by undisciplined Federal marshals. When the Government is allowed to assume powers that it was never meant to have then we are well on the way to a dictatorship and the American people can expect one any time they let down their guard.

Segregation, whether we like it or not, is a way of life in the South and has been for 100 years.

The Negro, contrary to what some responsible journals in the North would have us believe, is not living in slavery. He has been steadily making gains and doing it in a peaceful way without creating hatred and resentment on the part of the whites.

When some extremists like Martin Luther King and others come along and agitate for demonstrations that even included removing children from school and turning them into a sort of a Nazi youth corps then there can be just one result—more hatred and tensions than ever existed before.

The Gloucester Times is a liberal paper and I am a conservative. We do not always see eye to eye on issues but they print my letters. This is an example of the finest Jeffersonian principles that allows both sides of a story to be heard no matter how much it might rub against the grain. There are few liberal papers that do this now and the gentle editors of the Times are to be commended for their policy.

Suppose, however, that I were to come down to the Times office on any of my weekend stays and declare a certain conservative truth and if anybody disagreed with me, I were to take and club them over the head. After a while they might agree with me just so I would let them go but they would hate me ever afterwards.

The same holds true with the Negro who is now using a club on the Southern whites.

I would deny no man his rights but if he leads a mass of rabble against me I would, and justifiably I believe, fight him to the last no matter how right his cause might be.

The current batch of Negro leaders do little good for the colored cause. I suggest that they most properly be indicted for inciting to riot and cooler heads be allowed to prevail.

RUSSELL S. POND.

106 WEST BROADWAY, DERRY, N.H.

Medgar Evers—A Dedicated American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the brutal murder of Medgar W. Evers, Mississippi field representative for the NAACP, has shocked the Nation. Mr. Evers' courage and dedication to the cause of freedom serves as a continuing inspiration to all who cherish the principles upon which this Nation was founded. His unfailing commitment to liberty was articulated last summer in an interview with a CBS-TV reporter. In this interview he tells of the murder of two of his colleagues in the freedom fight in Mississippi, Reverend Lee and Reverend Courts. Mr. Evers also relates the reasons for his activities. I recommend that all Americans read the following transcript of portions of that interview which appeared in the New York Post on June 16, 1963. The interview follows:

A TALK WITH MEDGAR EVERS: IN A TV INTERVIEW FILMED LAST SUMMER, THE NAACP LEADER TOLD OF THE VIOLENCE THAT WAS TO TAKE HIS LIFE

(NOTE.—Medgar W. Evers, the NAACP official who was murdered this week in Jackson, Miss., had been interviewed last summer by CBS-TV Reporter Bill Peters on the voter registration drive in Mississippi. The following is a condensation of that interview, a portion of which was rebroadcast earlier this week.)

PETERS. I'm speaking with Mr. Medgar W. Evers, Mississippi Field Secretary for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Mr. Evers, can you tell me how long you've had this job?

EVERS. I've been field secretary for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People going into my eighth year.

PETERS. And during those 8 years, has there been an NAACP effort toward getting Negroes to vote and register?

EVERS. Yes, there has been—all over the State—an effort to get Negroes registered to vote in most of the counties where we're organized and even in a number of counties where we're not organized. We think now in terms of back in 1954 and 1955, when up in Belzoni, Miss., which is in Humphreys County, we had a very active chapter getting Negroes registered to vote.

The president of our branch there was Rev. G. W. Lee, and of course Reverend Lee was putting out a little handbill urging Negroes to go down to the registrar's office and he got a message from some unidentified person telling him to cease his activities, and of course he refused to cease these activities, and as a result of his refusal to not let people intimidate him, one Saturday afternoon, as he was driving home from the cleaners from downtown—a car drove up beside him with two men in it and shotgunned him to death. A little later on Rev. Courts—who was active in getting people registered to vote—was told to cease his activities. He refused to cease his activities in this same town of Belzoni and he was shot down as he made change in his store.

PETERS. Looking back over the 8 years that you've been engaged in this work, would you say that it has become more or less difficult for Negroes to register in Mississippi?

EVERS. Well, I would say that it has become, in some instances, more difficult for them to register, and in other instances possibly less difficult. I think in terms of some of the counties that I've mentioned—since 1954 they passed a literacy test bill which requires all persons to fill out a form consisting of some 21 questions and they make it most difficult for Negroes to register. For example, if you fail to cross your "t" or dot an "i," in a number of instances Negroes are refused the right to register. In other instances we find Negroes not even given the application form to fill out.

Just recently, down in Forest County, it was mentioned that one fellow was asked how many bubbles in a bar of soap, which was most difficult for anybody to—or impossible for that matter for anybody to answer. These are some of the questions that are asked Negroes when they go in, and some of the obstacles—some of the problems that we face in trying to register to vote here in Mississippi.

PETERS. Would you say that there is less violence now in connection with it?

EVERS. Well, we have not had violence in connection with voting that we had in 1955—not recently, that is—and I'd say that we are thankful for the role the Federal Government is playing in this regard. The Federal Government has gone in and filed a number of suits to make it possible for Negroes to register and vote in Mississippi. And this, of course, we are very proud of and we're most cooperative with the Federal Government in making affidavits available to them from Negroes who have been denied the right to register and vote.

PETERS. In your work, Mr. Evers, in the State of Mississippi, have you personally been subjected to any difficulties or problems?

EVERS. Yes, I have. I've suffered some personal difficulties. No. 1, I'm a native of the State, lived here all my life, but in 1958, as I came from a regional meeting in North Carolina, I boarded the bus in Meridian, Miss., on the front seat where I sat and was told to move by the police. I, of course, refused. I refused to move to the back of the bus after being ordered to do so by the driver. And after I refused, of course—of course, he got off the bus and went and called the police in Meridian and they conferred. About two carloads of police conferred. And after having conferred with one another, two came on the bus and asked to see my identification. I showed them my identification. And after having done that, they asked me to get off the bus and come over to the police station with them—which was across the street. I went over there with them and they asked me what I was trying to do—stir up trouble? I told them no, I was merely going home to my wife and children. Of course, I had two children at the time. And they said, well, you know how things are done here. I said, yes, I was born 30 miles from here, which was Decatur, Miss. And after some 15 or 20 minutes of interrogation they permitted me to go back to the bus.

I went and got back on the bus and, of course, I sat back on the front seat. And having refused to move again, the bus driver pulled off. I heard—as we moved away—a number of people say that "We should go on and pull him off." Of course, I sat there and some three blocks from the bus terminal a white man boarded the bus and struck me in the face. This was about 3 o'clock in the morning. I was alone. Of course, I refused to move and I came all the way to Jackson without any further incidents.

That along with many others—I've had a number of threatening calls—people calling me saying they were going to kill me, saying they were going to blow my home up and saying that I only had a few hours to live. I remember distinctly one individual calling with a pistol on the other end, and he hit the cylinder and of course you could hear that it was revolver. He said, "This is for you." And I said, well, whenever my time comes, I'm ready. And, well, we get such pranks pretty frequently. But that does not deter us from our goal of first-class citizenship and getting more people registered to vote and doing the things here that a democracy certainly is supposed to espouse and provide for its citizenry.

PETERS. Why do you feel that it is important for Negroes to vote?

EVERS. Well, I think it's necessary for all people to vote, and Negroes especially, with the conditions as they are here. For example, in Mississippi, we have police brutality galore. We have bad roads. We have a number of things that we don't get simply because Negroes do not vote. For example, here in Jackson there is not one single Negro policeman. There are some 60,000 Negroes who live in Jackson, Miss., with no Negroes represented on the police force. This, of course, is the result of the fact that Negroes are not voting. And once we become registered voters in the numbers that we should be, then, of course, we should get these Negro policemen and other individuals in good positions that will benefit all the people.

And I think another thing, too, and that's the fact that we're not interested in making Mississippi better or this country better for Negroes, we're interested in making this country better for people, for all of us, and we feel that only through voting, like we should—everyone voting—are we going to be able to do this. We would hope that everybody would be able to register and vote and be able to elect those officials who are going to best serve the community. And then we would not have, for example, many politicians who get on the stands and—and, of course, they appeal to prejudice and bigotry as a result of the fact that Negroes are not registered to vote. Once we are voting in the numbers that we should be voting, then we're not going to have these politicians getting on the soapboxes, making his first speech on the Negro, using the Negro to climb into office, and that's what we have here in Mississippi, and that's what we have in many other Southern communities where Negroes are not voting. So these are some of the reasons why Negroes, as well as white people, should be permitted to register and vote.

PETERS. Do you feel that in campaigns where the question of race is a paramount issue that perhaps some of the more important issues don't get discussed?

EVERS. Well, that's quite true. Many a candidate who runs for office and gets into office on the Negro question fails to really bring out to the constituency that he's supposed to represent what quality of man he really is. Because what he has done has been more or less to appeal to the emotions of the people rather than give them some concrete platform or some concrete plans that he intends to institute for the community or for the state that he represents. What he does—what he normally does is get into office on emotionalism and, of course, race emotionalism which is very paramount here in the State.

Peters. Are there places in Mississippi where the presence of a significant number of Negro voters had resulted in some progress?

Evers. Yes. There is one that I remember right offhand and that's Washington County, which is Greenville, Miss. In Greenville, Negroes comprise a large percentage of the total vote for the county. As a result of this large vote, you have Negro policemen. You have detectives and you have fairly good schools and you have a number of different things that we don't have, for example, here in Jackson. You have certainly no police brutality of any consequence in Washington County. I think now in terms of a coastal town, Gulfport—Negroes vote freely and they have a large number of voters there. They have Negro deputy sheriffs and they have Negro policemen. And, of course, you don't have the brutality that you have in areas where Negroes are not voting in large numbers. So, certainly, where they are voting, then, of course, you get better results all the way around.

Peters. In other words a Negro without a vote really has no appeal, no power to appeal for anything in his local government?

Evers. That's quite true. I think it's often said that a voteless people are a hopeless people. And I think that's true with us or true with anybody or any group of people. So it's necessary that we try to get our hands on the ballot and use it effectively. We're just not interested in voting so that conditions will be improved for Negroes. We want conditions improved for everybody. We feel that in this country that all persons should have an opportunity to register and vote and do the things that the Constitution guarantees them. That's all we're interested in.

Peters. Thank you very much, Mr. Evers.

Evers. Thank you, sir.

American Independence Day in Denmark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, this week the State of West Virginia celebrates its 100th birthday. Exactly 2 weeks thereafter, the Nation celebrates Independence Day and the 187th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence.

One of West Virginia's prominent steel executives, Borge Rosing of Huntington, W. Va., recently related to me in picturesque terms an annual event which occurs every July 4 in Denmark. Every Fourth of July, a meaningful and colorful celebration of American Independence Day takes place in the ancient heather-clad hills of Rebild National Park, Jutland, Denmark.

IMPRESSIVE AND COLORFUL CEREMONY

Ever since 1912, with the exception of a few war years, every Fourth of July has been celebrated in Rebild National Park, attracting upward of 40,000 Danish-born Americans and Danes, seated in the natural amphitheater around the platform. Borge Rosing has described graphically to me the scene at the golden anniversary festival of 1962 when the guests of honor were their Majesties King Frederik IX, Queen Ingrid, and Princess Nargrethe, heir to the crown of Denmark. The park has a natural bowl, formed by surrounding hills on which the 50 State flags of the United States are grouped, and over a speakers' platform on the floor of the bowl the American and Danish flags fly side by side. It is an impressive ceremony when selected American and Danish color guards hoist the respective flags of their Nations while everyone joins in singing the American and Danish national anthems. The colorful sight of the great silk flags, the large audience rising to sing the national anthems, and the stirring music by a large orchestra is a heart-moving event that no American can ever forget.

The late Dr. Max Henius, an eminent citizen and chemist of Chicago, Ill., first generated the idea of creating an American national park in Denmark. With his usual initiative and energy, Dr. Henius aroused interest among other Danish-born Americans in the project of a Danish-American park. The grounds in Rebild were bought for the purpose and after the first festival in 1912 the land was formally presented to the Danish Government as a gift from Americans of Danish origin.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY EXTENDS GREETINGS

Prior to the golden anniversary celebration in Rebild National Park, President Kennedy extended greetings with the following message: "Denmark and the United States have a great deal in common and a long history of cordial relations. No feature of the shared beliefs marking this pleasant association is more outstanding than our mutual respect for liberty and our jealous safeguarding of the dignity of the individual. Danes and Americans have celebrated Independence Day on July 4 at Rebild, Denmark, for 50 years. It is, I think, a most extraordinary example of international friendship when the people of another country celebrate American Independence Day on their own soil. In gathering each year at Rebild, Danes, and Americans pay solemn tribute to the democratic ideals and values cherished by each people. July 4, 1962 will mark the golden jubilee observance of the Rebild Independence Day ceremonies. I send my most cordial greetings on this occasion and hope that as many Americans as possible will take this opportunity to join with their countless Danish friends in enjoying this unique occasion."

THE GREAT CONTRIBUTION OF AMBASSADOR BLAIR

Planning and carrying forward these annual celebrations does not happen automatically. A direct and personal interest is being taken by the able American Ambassador to Denmark, His Excellency William McCormick Blair, Jr. To those who know Ambassador Blair, his energy, and leadership in this connection comes as no surprise. I had the good fortune to be associated with Ambassador Blair during the 1952 and 1956 presidential campaigns, particularly the latter, when he served as the closest adviser to Governor Adlai Stevenson. In his 2 years at our Embassy in Copenhagen, this keen and perceptive man has won the hearts of the Danish people.

WEST VIRGINIA IS PROUD OF BORGE ROSING

Ambassador Blair and his staff have provided magnificent help to the Rebild National Park board, under whose direction the celebrations are held. Three of the officers of this board reside in Denmark: Mr. Charles L. Hansen, president; Mr. Peter F. Heering, vice president; and Mr. Christian Moller, treasurer. The other two officers reside in the United States: Mr. Th. R. Knudsen, vice president, and Mr. Borge Rosing, secretary. Mr. Speaker, we in West Virginia are doubly proud that a man of Mr. Rosing's caliber should not only be a leader in our steel industry, but also is providing the enthusiastic support necessary to help make the annual celebrations in Denmark a great success.

These celebrations have strengthened the ties between Danes in the United States and their mother country. There is probably no other place in the world where Danish-American born American citizens and visiting Americans are so deeply stirred by pride and patriotism in and for their adopted country as in Rebild National Park on American Independence Day.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

Appendix

National Cultural Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, last Thursday, June 13, John S. Gleason, Jr., the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, spoke before a meeting of the National Cultural Center on its current fund drive. We are all aware of the importance of this effort to raise money for the National Cultural Center, and I think Mr. Gleason's remarks aptly express the responsibility of those of us connected with the Government to set the pace for the campaign.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Gleason's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN S. GLEASON, JR., ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, BEFORE A MEETING OF THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER FUND DRIVE, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART, JUNE 13, 1963

Gentlemen, just a little over 5 months ago our President read to the Congress a brilliant state of the Union message.

He began with these words:

"I congratulate you all—not merely on your electoral victory, but on your selected role in history."

I would like to borrow the President's words for my sentiment today, and begin by congratulating you on the role you are playing in what future generations of Americans will consider one of the great contributions to their cultural heritage.

In this drive to create a national cultural center, your role, the role of all Americans, and particularly those of us in Federal service, is a dual one:

We have the rare opportunity to participate at the very beginning of the creation of a living monument to the vitality of our civilization.

And we also can do something important for our children by presenting them with an instrument of culture that expresses the best of the past, and the concern of the present, for their future.

I purposely stress your role in this effort for one reason: Unless everyone in your agencies understands the urgency and importance of this drive, the campaign will not be successful within the Federal Government. And unless we in the Federal Government make a record we can be proud of we cannot expect people outside of the Government, and outside of Washington, to show more concern than we do ourselves. The spotlight is upon us and our performance will be watched closely by the country to see if we have the pride in our capital that they expect us to exhibit.

The President, in one of his very first messages to the American people, said, "Let the public service be a proud and lively career." This certainly is an opportunity to show our pride and our ability to produce.

Now, I am sure that I don't have to convince any of you here today of the importance of this effort.

But if there is any doubt about the importance of culture to our people just think back to last winter when the gallery directly above our heads was filled with long lines of Americans, many who had traveled hundreds of miles, intent on seeing the artistic treasure of the Old World and another age.

These long, slowly moving lines of art lovers were incontrovertible evidence of the deep desire of Americans from all walks of life to know the finest flower of culture.

They were proud that the first visit of the Mona Lisa from its shrine in Paris was to the capital of their country. How much more proud will they be when the rest of the world sees a great new expression of the New World and our own age rise here in Washington.

No, I am sure we here have no doubt of the importance of this campaign.

But since it is your responsibility to convince others, I did want to mention a few of the major considerations.

First, who is supporting this drive?

Well, I think it important that employees know that Congress has passed legislation strongly supporting the creation of a National Cultural Center through voluntary effort, and that this law specifically authorized a nationwide fund-raising campaign.

Therefore, your fund-raising efforts have full congressional support.

Next, this is a bipartisan program. It may not be well known, but the act establishing the center was signed by President Eisenhower. President Kennedy has pledged himself to support it and Presidents Hoover and Truman have strongly endorsed this campaign.

In addition, both business and labor are completely behind this campaign and have placed that support on the record.

Finally, the Civil Service Commission has unequivocally supported the campaign. Chairman Macy, for example, has clearly stated that he fully endorses this special governmentwide campaign and has urged all Federal employees to support it.

In short, you have bipartisan support for this drive from Congress, and from the President and past Presidents, from labor and business, and the Civil Service Commission has given its blessing to this effort.

Second, why should Federal employees, who after all already donate so generously to so many worthy funds, why should they again be asked to contribute? I think this is a legitimate question and I think there are a number of equally legitimate answers.

First and foremost, the person working for the Federal service does not have just another job, he is considered by many as a representative of the Government, with special responsibilities.

Rightly or wrongly, people expect more of a Federal employee than they would of the average person. In this instance, the country at large is watching to see whether employees of the Federal Government are willing to support a worthy and important program the results of which will be built where they can enjoy its facilities.

In summary, there are the following reasons why Federal employees would lend 100 percent support to this drive. These are:

(1) Many persons outside the Government in this area, and citizens in other parts of the country are looking to Federal employees in the Washington area, to see if we consider the cultural center worthy of support. Therefore, if all of us accept our responsibility as Federal employees to show by example to others that we are indeed proud of our opportunity to set the pace for those outside the Government, success of this campaign is almost certain. If we fail to contribute, others can point to us as their reason for holding back.

(2) We in the Washington area should remember that the center will be built here. We and our children will have the privilege of benefitting not only from the many cultural activities of the center itself, but the entire Washington metropolitan area will benefit from the improved cultural climate sparked by the center.

(3) When the center is finally built, a plaque will tell all of the fact that Federal employees contributed to the construction and arrangements are being made so that particular agencies or employees' organizations may undertake to designate a specific part of the center which will be identified as their contribution.

Incidentally, the Employees Association of the Veterans' Administration, has taken quite seriously the need for being a pacesetter. In a special meeting the VA Employees Association generously donated the $1,000, which I have here in my hand, to purchase a seat in the concert hall on behalf of our employees in the Washington area.

Of course, this only augments the far, far larger contribution that we expect from our employees acting individually.

The employees association contribution merely got the ball rolling in our agency.

I think it was a good beginning and a good and a good way to begin.

And you should consider approaching your own employee associations to see if they too might get things rolling and, similarly, set an example for all your employees.

This, of course, is precisely what the President had in mind when he asked that you bring this campaign to the attention of employees associations and groups and urge them to contribute.

Finally, a word about the method of solicitation. We aim at 100 percent participation.

I can't tell you how much each employee should contribute.

And you can't tell each employee how much to contribute, whether it be an hour's pay, which would be an acceptable amount, or some similar figure.

This is a voluntary campaign and so we can't set or suggest quotas.

But though no personal pressure should be contemplated in this campaign, all efforts should be made to create the kind of climate that will bring home to each individual employee his stake in this worthwhile effort, so important to the values that our forefathers have created and that our children will inherit.

Certainly we can stress the fact that unless each employee does his part, unless each individual employee looks at his role in our pacesetting effort, then the editorial columns of the newspapers are going to take a long, hard, and, I am sure, most unflattering look at the Government employee and his lack of concern about both our national cultural posture and the cultural climate in which his own children will live.

No, we can't set quotas, but we can make it plain that the immense amount of public interest in what we as Government employees do, will put each and every employee on trial.

We can give generously to this constructive purpose, and cover ourselves with pride and satisfaction, or we can give in a grudging, niggardly way, and cover ourselves with ridicule.

Which will it be?

The answer lies largely in your hands.

Government Lotteries of Greece, Cyprus, Malta, and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, among the 77 foreign countries throughout the world, Greece, Cyprus, Malta, and Turkey are 4 nations which operate government-run lotteries because they recognize the merit in regulation and control of the normal human urge to gamble and the tremendous benefits that result from such activity.

Greece is a small nation and one not overly blessed with natural resources. The Greeks work hard to earn their money and they, too, know a good revenue device when they see one. In 1962, the gross income of the two state lotteries came to almost $18 million. The government retained almost $4 million of which two-third went to various welfare, educational and scientific agencies and the balance reverted to the general revenue. It might be interesting to point out that last year's gross receipts were almost $3 million more than the previous year.

Cyprus first started its lotteries in 1956 but only three drawings were held before its independence in 1957. It started again in 1961. The gross receipts from running this government lottery amounted to almost $2 million in 1962. The net profit to the government came to almost $900,000. The funds are intended for development.

Malta has a government-run lottery which has only been in operation a short time but it has well proven its worth. In 1962, it took in over $1,317,000. The total annual net income to the government came to almost $200,000 which was applied to the general revenue funds of the Maltese Government.

Turkey has found the concept of a national lottery a happy and profitable device. Last year, the gross annual receipts came to almost $9 million. This represents a gain from the previous year. The net income to the government, after prizes and expenses, amounted to almost $4 million. These lottery revenues were transferred to the treasury without being specifically earmarked.

Mr. Speaker, if these small countries can operate successful national lotteries, why cannot the United States also do so? Here in America, where more money is gambled than in any other country in the world, we refuse to admit to reality, and as a' consequence, billions of gambling dollars flow each year into the treasuries of the crime empires.

When, Mr. Speaker, will we wake up? When will we allow gambling dollars to work for the public good rather than against it?

How long must the hard-pressed taxpayers of America wait for financial and sociological reality to prevail over entrenched hypocrisy?

A national lottery in the United States can easily pump into our treasury over $10 billion a year in additional revenue which can be used to bring tax relief to our wage earners and start reducing our national debt.

Costs of Producing Cotton—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, on the costs and returns of cotton production the following three tables are from a study by the Agriculture Experiment Station of Auburn University, Auburn, Ala., on "Costs and Returns From Crop Production in the Limestone Valley Areas of Alabama," February 1960. I think it is interesting to note that under existing practices the estimated cost was 24.6 cents per pound:

Cotton, existing practices: Estimated annual cost and returns per acre using a 3-plow tractor and hand harvesting, Limestone Valley areas, Alabama, 1958

Item	Description	Unit	Quantity	Rate	Amount
Receipts:					
Lint		Pound	500	$0.356	$178.00
Cottonseed		Ton	0.375	44.80	16.80
Total receipts					194.80
Cash expenses:					
Seed	Mechanically delinted and treated	Pound	32	.08	2.56
Fertilizer	6-8-8	Hundredweight	6.0	2.05	12.30
	Nitrate of soda	do	.75	2.95	2.21
Insectside	20 percent toxaphene	Pound	65.0	.085	5.52
Ginning	Includes bagging and ties	Bale	1	13.00	13.00
Tractor operating expense	Gas, oil, grease, and repairs	Hour	10.5	.95	9.98
Equipment operating expense	do				1.18
Truck	Hauling seasonal labor				4.00
Seasonal labor	Chopping and hoeing	Hour	17.0	.60	10.20
	Picking	Hundredweight	12.5	3.50	43.75
Total cash expenses					104.70
Returns over cash expenses					90.10
Noncash expenses:					
Labor	Regular	Hour	15.0	.60	9.00
Interest on operating capital					3.14
Noncash machinery expenses:					
Depreciation					4.08
Housing, taxes, insurance, and interest					2.23
Total noncash expenses					18.45
Net returns [1]					71.65
Production cost per pound					.246

[1] Represents returns to land and management.

Cotton, improved practices: Estimated annual costs and returns per acre using a 3-plow tractor, hand harvest and hand weed control, Limestone Valley areas, Alabama

Item	Description	Unit	Quantity	Rate	Amount
Receipts:					
Lint		Pound	700	$0.356	$249.20
Cottonseed		Ton	.595	44.80	26.66
Total receipts					275.86
Cash expenses:					
Seed	Recommended variety, certified and treated acid-delinted	Pound	24	.18	4.32
Liming [1]	Custom application		5.5		1.80
Fertilizer	4-12-12	Hundredweight	5.5	2.10	11.55
	Ammonium nitrate	do	1.4	3.75	5.25
Insecticide	Recommended	Pound	135	[2].14	18.90
Ginning	Includes bagging and ties	Bale	1.4	13.00	18.20
Tractor operating expense	Gas, oil, grease, and repairs	Hour	12.5	.95	11.88
Equipment operating expense	do				1.40
Trucking	Hauling seasonal labor				4.75
Seasonal labor:	Hoeing	Hour	7.0	.60	4.20
	Picking	Hundredweight	18.9	3.50	66.15
Total cash expenses					148.40
Returns over cash expenses					127.46
Noncash expenses:					
Labor	Regular	Hour	18.0	.60	10.80
Interest on operating capital					4.45
Noncash machinery expenses:					
Depreciation					5.23
Housing, taxes, insurance, and interest					2.62
Total noncash expenses					23.10
Net returns [3]					104.36
Production cost per pound					.245

[1] Since 2 tons of lime are required every 5 years, ⅕ of the $9 cost is charged off each year.

[2] The price used is for an insecticide that will kill toxaphene resistant weevils.

[3] Represents returns to land and management.

Cotton, improved practices: Estimated annual costs and returns per acre using a 3-plow tractor, mechanical harvest, and chemical weed control, Limestone Valley areas, Alabama

Item	Description	Unit	Quantity	Rate	Amount
Receipts:					
Lint		Pound	[1] 650	[2] $0.341	$221.65
Cottonseed		Ton	.533	44.80	23.88
Total receipts					245.53
Cash expenses:					
Seed	Recommended variety, certified, treated, acid delinted	Pound	16	.18	2.88
Liming [3]	Custom application				1.80
Fertilizer	4-12-12	Hundredweight	5.5	2.10	11.55
	Ammonium and nitrate	do	1.4	3.75	5.25
Preemergence chemical	Karmex (or ½ gallon CIPC, at $8.50 per gallon)	Gallon	.111	20.00	2.22
Postemergence oil		do	10	.35	3.50
Insecticide	Recommended	Pound	135	[4].14	18.90
Defoliant		do	30.0	.07	2.10
Ginning	Includes bagging and ties	Bale	1.33	13.00	17.29
Tractor operating expense	Gas, oil, grease, and repairs	Hour	12.0	.95	11.40
Equipment operating expense	do				1.82
Seasonal labor	Hoeing	do	2.0	.60	1.20
Custom picking		Pound	665	.06	39.90
Total cash expenses					119.81
Returns over cash expenses					125.72
Noncash expenses:					
Labor	Regular	Hour	13.6	.60	8.16
Interest on operating capital					3.53
Noncash machinery expenses:					
Depreciation					6.21
Housing, taxes, insurance, and interest					2.96
Total noncash expenses					20.86
Net returns [5]					104.86
Production cost per pound					.216

[1] 700 pounds of lint per acre minus 35 pounds added field loss resulting from mechanical harvest.

[2] $0.356 per pound less $0.015 per pound due to reduction in grade caused by mechanical harvest.

[3] Since 2 tons of lime are required every 5 years, ⅕ of the $9 cost is charged off each year.

[4] The price used is for an insecticide that will kill toxaphene resistant weevils.

[5] Represents returns to land and management.

The Way Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch which is a masterful presentation of the serious situation now confronting us.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAY OUT

Negro Americans must be given their constitutional rights. We have said this before and we reiterate it now. Injustices must be corrected, inequities abolished. All parts of the Nation have been guilty of treating colored citizens unfairly.

But neither the National Government nor the State and local governments should have to deal with complex and emotion-charged racial problems at what is, in effect, the point of a gun. Neither Washington nor Richmond nor any other capital city or locality should have to cope with mobs rioting through the streets, in violation of laws and court injunctions. No government worthy of the name will surrender to the threat, or the actuality, of force.

Since President Kennedy and his administration have encouraged the Negro mobs, and the President has said hardly one word about the necessity that the Negroes abandon these flagrantly illegal tactics, it is difficult now to bring matters under control. But unless this is done, we are in for something approaching large-scale anarchy.

Time was when President Kennedy recognized fully that when any individual or group begins breaking the law with impunity, there is danger of real trouble. For example, at the heigth of the University of Mississippi crisis last year, he issued a statement directed to the white people involved in the uproad around Oxford, in which he said:

"Our Nation is founded on the principle that observance of the law is the eternal safeguard of liberty and defiance of the law is the surest road to tyranny.

"Even among law-abiding men, few laws are universally loved. But they are uniformly respected and not resisted. Americans are free, in short, to disagree with the law but not to disobey it. For any government of laws and not of men, no man—however prominent and powerful—and no mob—however unruly or boisterous—is entitled to defy a court of law."

But Mr. Kennedy shelved this eminently sound doctrine when he encouraged the recent Negro mobs in Birmingham and elsewhere. The fact that he did encourage them is testified to by two of his sympathetic interpreters—James Reston of the New York Times and Richard H. Rovere of the New Yorker.

What he will have to do now, as Negroes threaten ever wider and more devastating marches in Washington and numerous other cities throughout the Nation is to show conclusively that he is just as determined to stop lawlessness on the part of colored citizens as on the part of white. He must make it completely clear that no further violations will be tolerated from any quarter. We have never approved of sending Federal troops into States unnecessarily or contrary to law, but if such troops are to be sent at all, they will have to be used against lawless Negroes on exactly the same basis as they have been used against whites.

Once the President takes a clear and uncompromising position, and shows conclusively that members of both races will be treated exactly alike, he can address himself affectively to the requirements of the existing situation. We do not agree with him in all respects as to what those requirements are, but forthright action to stop the colored mobs is a prerequisite to the enactment of any reasonably effective program.

The killings and the beatings that have accompanied the demonstrations by mobs are deplorable in every respect, of course. The wanton murder of an NAACP official in Mississippi cannot be excused, but why is so little said concerning the slaying of a white man, an innocent bystander, in Lexington, N.C., on the night of June 6, and the shooting of a white High Point newspaper photographer in the back at the same time—both by Negro gunfire? Much genuine indignation has been expressed around the world, and rightly, over the ambush killing of the Negro in Mississippi. By contrast, most people have forgotten, if they ever knew, that a 24-year-old white man was shot fatally in North Carolina the previous week.

Be that as it may, let us all keep our heads in this crisis, and refrain from making inflammatory statements or otherwise increasing the danger of violence. That danger is great enough already. The Kennedy administration should set the example by calm and reasoned discussion, and also give clear assurances that it will not tolerate lawlessness from any quarter.

In that spirit, let us seek to correct those genuine injustices which still exist.

Results of Irresponsible Government Fiscal Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate an editorial from the Wall Street Journal, dated May 2, 1963, and entitled "A Sad Little Happy Day." The editorial tells a sad, but true story about the results of irresponsible Government fiscal policies.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 2, 1963]

A SAD LITTLE HAPPY DAY

We had a little party on our street the other evening to mark what might have been a happy day. But it was really to celebrate a sad joke.

It was just 25 years ago this spring that our neighbor, then a young man on the threshold of 40, decided to take one of those annuity policies that would let him retire comfortably in his old age on $150 a month.

In that distant spring $150 a month was a lot of money and the money it took out of each month's budget to buy the annuity was not easily come by. Often it meant some pernsonal sacrifice, especially when the children went off to college and when, later, one of them came home bringing a new grandchild because the son-in-law had gone off to fight a war.

There were a few months, here and there, when our friend missed a payment and had to borrow against his equity. But somehow he caught up, and in the end all of the payments were made. For 25 years.

So now he's what's called a senior citizen and the happy day he dreamed of is here. True to its contract, the insurance company wrote him a letter saying that on the first of next month he would start receiving his annuity and wishing him a long life of pleasant ease. After so much sacrifice, it seemed to our friend worth some kind of celebration.

But we neighbors weren't gathered to celebrate his retirement because he couldn't. Today the $150 he thought he was buying are 150 pieces of paper that won't pay the grocery bill and the taxes, heat, light, water, insurance, and repairs on the house he has lived in all those years, even though its free of any mortgage.

We all laughed about it. We could laugh because our friend is not wholly dependent on his hard-earned annuity. He is lucky to have his health and a good job which he can keep a few more years.

Still, there was a sadness in the gaiety. It was sad to think of other people who also labored and saved for 25 years to make a dream come true and who may not be so lucky now that the dream is dross. And saddest of all to reflect how it came to happen that way.

For the truth of the matter is that our neighbor was defrauded by his Government. So has been every citizen who bought such a retirement policy, every person who long ago bought U.S. savings bonds, all the frugal people who for years have "put a little aside" in some bank for their old age.

It is not merely that these people, including our neighbor, have not gained what they hoped. Anyone who trusted his savings to U.S. dollars years ago has lost not only any value in interest but a part of his principal as well; the dollars he gets back are worth less than the ones he put in, sometimes worth only half as much. Far from being rewarded, those people have paid a penalty for their thrift.

Nor has this been an accident. For a generation now it has been the deliberate policy of the U.S. Government to depreciate the value of its money. In order to spend more money than it received from taxes, its policy has been to print new pieces of paper, watering the value of its paper dollars as shamelessly as any robber baron of the fabled past.

This is still the policy of the Government of the United States. It is presented under all sorts of fancy names, wrapped in all manner of persuasive language, but the policy is not changed by a fraudulent label. In the next fiscal year alone the Government intends to water the money supply by at least $12 billion.

They will tell you in Washington they do this to make the country prosperous and that a little inflation—some say 3 percent a year, some say 5 percent—is good for everybody. If it gets too bad, so they say, they have all sorts of controls to protect the dollar; the same kind we used before and which did anything but protect the dollar.

Finally, they will tell you that, if worse comes to worst, it really doesn't matter. Compared to all the good that's going to be done, what's a little theft from frugal, trusting people?

Just the same, at our neighbor's house the other evening the Secretary of the Treasury in person couldn't have sold a 10-year baby bond, much less a 25-year annuity. For not even he could pledge with a straight face that a decade hence the innocent will not have once again been cheated by their Government.

That's why we were sad when everybody drank a little toast to the happy day.

FBI National Academy Graduation Exercises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, this morning it was my privilege to attend the graduation of the 71st session of the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Academy.

These graduation exercises were the culmination of 12 weeks of intensive training in every phase of modern police technology. As a result of this training, 96 dedicated law enforcement officers have been added to the ranks of the FBI National Academy's more than 4,300 graduates. These 96 men come from throughout the United States and from a number of foreign countries. All have gained a better understanding of the universal nature of many law enforcement problems.

I was especially interested in this morning's ceremonies since Detective Lieutenant Anthony L. Fantigrossi, of the Rochester, N.Y., Police Bureau was one of the graduates. I am proud of this fine officer from my home community and the credit which is reflected by his successful completion of this special instruction.

All of us who attended these exercises were particularly impressed with the address given to the graduating class by Lyle C. Wilson, vice president of United Press International. The message of this distinguished journalist offers some penetrating comments that I am sure will be read with interest by my colleagues.

A DEBT TO REPAY

(Address by Lyle C. Wilson)

It is truly an honor to participate in this graduation ceremony of the FBI National Academy. As a Washington newsman, I have grown accustomed to observing and reporting, but seldom have I had the privilege of actively participating in so significant an event as this.

On behalf of the journalist friends of the FBI National Academy—not only those who help fill this auditorium to capacity today, but others throughout the United States and in other countries as well—I extend heartiest congratulations to the 96 outstanding members of this 71st session.

The past 12 weeks have been a period of hard work, self-discipline and personal deprivation for each of you. The curriculum of this training school is difficult. It requires continuous attention to detail, personal sharing of knowledge and abilities, as well as long hours of study both day and night by every officer who is fortunate enough to be selected to attend.

This morning, the 71st session stands on the threshold of graduation, each member a better man and a stronger asset to his department for having completed this course. And as you return to your homes—some as far away as Pakistan, Cyprus, Liberia, Ireland, and distant points of the Western Hemisphere—I hope you will reflect upon the debt you have incurred during the past 12 weeks in Washington, D.C. No your debt to J. Edgar Hoover and the men and women of the FBI—for Mr. Hoover is an elegant host; and I know that he and his staff feel genuinely honored to have had the opportunity to share their knowledge and their facilities with you.

Rather, I refer to the debt you have incurred at home:

The debt to the fellow members of your department who shouldered additional assignments and worked extra hours to fill the void created by your temporary absence;

Your debt to the citizens of your community, State or Nation, who, in most cases, have helped to defray the additional expenses you incurred while attending this tuition-free Academy; and

Your personal indebtedness to the body politic of the United States, whose fundamental belief in decency, law and justice made it possible, 28 years ago, for J. Edgar Hoover to found this "West Point of Law Enforcement."

To fit the popular conception of newspaper officials, I am supposed to be callous. But I'm not; nor are the overwhelming majority of newsmen. I felt the same sense of anxiety and pride as you did when *Faith 7* soared from its launching pad last month, carrying Astronaut Gordon Cooper on his orbital flight which was so vital to our space program. And I had the same feeling of personal loss as decent people everywhere when a man of great love and humility passed from this world at the Vatican in Rome less than 3 weeks ago.

When it comes to being a person of feeling and emotion, I plead guilty. I shall always feel indebted to John Glenn, Gordon Cooper, and the other members of our astronaut team who have risked their lives to forge new trails of scientific achievement and understanding. I shall always feel indebted to religious leaders such as Pope John to whom no sacrifice is too great if it promotes the cause of humanity. And I shall always feel indebted to the honest, hardworking "men in blue" who symbolize safety and comfort to the average citizen of the United States.

In the years ahead, I hope to see the power of the press exerted more strongly in behalf of the law enforcement profession—such as it was at the height of the gangster era of the 1930's. In those days, a corps of crusading newsmen—repulsed by the spread of gangsterism and the growth of juvenile crime clubs—seized upon the exploits of Mr. Hoover's G-Men to help create a true image of heroism in America.

As a newsman and as a law-abiding citizen, I am repulsed by many phenomena which I observe today in the field of crime and the administration of justice. There is, for example, the cold statistical fact that our country continues to ascend a spiraling staircase of lawless activity which seemingly has no end. Year after year, our national crime totals continue to grow; and a report released by the FBI 2 weeks ago indicates that 1963 will be no exception. Seven percent more crimes were recorded by police in the first 3 months of this year than during the same period of 1962.

How have we, as a people, attempted to meet this problem? In general, by aloofness, nodding acceptance, and an attitude of "Let Fred do it. It's not my responsibility."

Crime flourishes under conditions such as these. And, unfortunately, so do graft, corruption, and hare-brained schemes for reducing crime and rehabilitating criminals.

Americans have a dangerous tendency to be overly indulgent. We tolerate the mollycoddling of teenaged hoodlums who actually belong behind bars. And when these young terrorists reach adulthood, we calmly stand by while misdirected parole and probation authorities unleash them once more, unreformed and unrepentant, to prey upon society. How often police officers are required to pay with their lives for the blunders and abuses committed under a guise of rehabilitation.

In our courts, we permit the rights of society to be trampled by narrow-minded judges and attorneys whose overriding concern for the criminal has, all too often, obliterated the true meaning and purpose of our constitutional guarantees. The entire area of arrests, searches, seizures, and confessions—in particular—has been subjected to so many distorted interpretations and to such unrealistic demands that the conscientious police officer must be tempted to throw up his hands and seek a different career.

In the fight against the deadly menace of subversion, the overly indulgent attitude of Americans is obvious to an equally disturbing degree. Despite the FBI's fine efforts in penetrating the Communist Party, U.S.A., and gathering evidence of violations committed by the Party and its individual members, the Communists continue to walk the streets with seeming impunity. Never before have so many loopholes, technicalities, and delaying tactics been employed to thwart the interests of justice.

And while these Communists defiantly pile one court appeal upon another, they continue to do the Kremlin's bidding—undermining, infiltrating, spreading lies, and confusion. How truly incredible it is that the administrations of American colleges and universities have approved the appearance of Communist spokesmen on their campuses—knowing full well that they represent the same deadly conspiracy that has massacred millions of freedom-loving people in Hungary, China, East Germany, Cuba, and other slave camps of the Communist world.

This overindulgence may be attributed to several factors—misinformation, refusal to face the facts, wishful thinking. The most common cause, however, is sheer ignorance; and often it is a "calculated ignorance." I use the term "calculated ignorance" because there are many areas of information—particularly those which might prove unpleasant or disquieting to the conscience—that Americans tend to studiously avoid.

For the same reason that some persons will endure a tremendous amount of pain before they will visit a doctor or dentist, a great many others close their minds to obvious needs and problems confronting their community, their State, and their Nation. They purposely dodge the facts, because they are afraid of finding that something needs to be done.

This attitude of "calculated ignorance" has become far too prevalent where matters involving law enforcement are concerned.

How many citizens, I wonder, know the size of their local police department; the condition of its equipment; the adequacy of its budget? How many know the educational backgrounds or the training required of the officers who may be summoned to their homes at time of grave emergency any hour of the day or night? Only a very small percentage, I would venture to say.

A few minutes ago, I referred to the debt you have incurred by virtue of having attended this 71st session of the FBI National Academy—a debt to the local citizens and the departments you serve. You can repay this debt by courageous and forthright performance of duty; by providing an example to be looked up to by the people of your community and the members of your departments; by keeping the watchwords of this Academy—"knowledge, courage, integrity"—before you at all times.

You can repay this debt as spokesmen of good law enforcement. Seek out the responsible officials of your local newspapers and broadcasting stations. Appear before civic groups. Buttonhole influential members of the community. Make certain that they understand both the problems and the achievements of your department. Build a counteraction against any condition which hampers that department in the prompt, effective, and impartial performance of its duties.

The American people need honest, efficient law enforcement today as never before. Give your local citizens the facts—starkly, realistically. Remember that an informed public is your best assurance of support—the support which our law enforcement profession so richly deserves.

The Pastoral Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in 1961 the President's Joint Commission on Mental Health and Illness delivered a report to Congress which stated that one out of four persons in the United States has felt a need at one time or another for help with problems in living. The report also disclosed that among the individuals who said they had sought professional help with problems in living, 42 percent of these people consulted clergymen, 29 percent consulted physicians, 18 percent consulted psychiatrists or psychologists, and 10 percent consulted social agencies or marriage clinics.

But the surprising statistic revealed by the Commission report was that of those who turned to their clergyman, 1 out of 3 were regarded as having problems of serious dimensions, yet only 1 out of 10 was referred to psychiatric attention.

These findings were the catalyst for organizing in the District of Columbia a new and unique service center for assisting residents to face the complexities in today's world. The organization is called the Pastoral Institute. The institute is nondenominational and has been described as a joint venture between the clergy and psychiatry. I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief statement prepared by the Pastoral Institute on its purposes and objectives and an excellent article by Barbara Hogan which appeared in the Washington Post Potomac magazine section on May 26, 1963.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT PREPARED BY THE PASTORAL INSTITUTE

More and more, clergymen are asked for help by their parishioners who turn to them in time of personal crisis. They are presented with deep personal and emotional problems, some with serious psychiatric dimensions. Yet few clergymen have been trained to recognize these problems or to know what to do about them.

The Pastoral Institute has been organized to assist religious institutions become more forceful agents for better mental and emotional health by training the clergy to handle common pastoral problems, to recognize ones requiring medical care, and by providing a psychiatric clinic tailored to their needs.

The institute is an outgrowth of the concern and experience of a number of clergy and physicians in the Washington area who felt the need for a center where such programs of service, education, and research could be made available to the clergy and to the members of their congregations. After several years of study, the present structure of the institute was worked out to encompass three major objectives:

(1) To provide a clinic where the healing arts of medical science and the pastoral task of the church in the care of sick and troubled people could be coordinated.

(2) To conduct training programs for clergy to supplement the academic and theoretical education of a theological seminary; to train them in dealing with such common problems presented to them as those arising from marriage conflicts, family relationships, physical and mental illness, aging, alcholism, and delinquency; to train them in recognizing when problems are suitable for pastoral care and counseling and when they require medical or other professional attention; and to train them in the art of referral and interprofessional collaboration.

(3) To develop special programs in the care and treatment of alcoholism and in the training of clergymen who must deal with this acute and widespread problem.

[From the Washington Post, May 26, 1963]

NEW FAITH HEALERS FOR TROUBLED MINDS

(By Barbara Hogan)

Judy, a 19-year-old schizophrenic who last year "heard" God's voice and imagined herself the Virgin Mary, stared at the floor.

Her mother, buxom, pinch-lipped, spoke first: "I was never strict with Judy. She always had to do what I told her, but she was encouraged to make her own decisions."

"I wonder if you * * * we * * * weren't a little strict with the child," her husband suggested.

"You always gave her her way; somebody had to discipline her, assume some responsibility around our house," the wife retorted.

The husband smiled.

Other families in the room were silent; the minutes ticked by.

Finally, the psychiatrist spoke: "Your wife has just insulted you, Mr. ———. Why did you smile at her?"

"Maybe that's the thing to do," said a smiling man on the other side of the room, pressing his fingertips hard together.

The pastor, arms crossed, observed his parishioners.

It was the beginning of another session of family therapy in the clinical services division at the nondenominational Pastoral Institute of Washington, D.C.

The institute, at 3000 Connecticut Avenue NW., was set up in 1959 to seek and organize programs that would assist clergymen in meeting the needs of their disturbed parishioners. Last year, its 20 pastors and 20 psychiatrists (the majority are psychoanalysts) counseled nearly 500 persons.

Psychiatrists refer to the mother's first statement as the "double bind," a situation in which two contradictory "messages" are subtly conveyed to the daughter—(1) do as I tell you (2) do as you see fit—and the daughter (ignoring the contradiction and failing to object) attempts to respond appropriately to both. From this impossible endeavor a disintegrated personality can result.

"A psychosis," explained Dr. Maxwell Boverman, director of the family therapy unit at the institute, "is an attempt to handle or run away from a difficult situation or powerful feelings."

And who's to blame for the daughter's mental illness? "Every member of the family is involved and responsible," says Dr. Boverman. "The patient is not the only sick member of the family; the entire family is sick. Segregating the patient from the family by putting him in a hospital is not always the answer. You've got to cure the family, too.

"When they quit smiling, pretending compatibility, suppressing their hostilities, and have a healthy fight, all of these people will be on their way to getting straightened out."

"This family would have destroyed itself if the pastor hadn't brought them to the institute," an institute psychologist commented. "They simply refused to admit to themselves that this girl was mentally ill, or that they had a family problem."

Thus, as a member of the Pastoral Institute, the pastor assumes many roles. It is the pastor who must impress the families (his parishioners), firmly but sympathetically, with the fact that it is their responsibility to accept professional help with their problems.

It is, then, his job to contact one of the psychiatrists who works with the institute. The pastor usually attends the therapy sessions with the family, provides supportive treatment during therapy, and acts as a bridge between the psychiatrist and the patients' peripheral world—their friends, their church.

This cooperation of psychiatrists and pastors working together to help the emotionally disturbed has a profound significance for both psychiatry and the ministry. In fact, it's a revolutionary move on the part of the churches.

Historically, members of the two professions have regarded each other as antagonists. One source of resentment on the part of the pastor has been the secrecy which surrounds the therapy session. A young minister once raged, "I make a referral to the psychiatrist only to have him quietly close the door in my face and refuse me any information as to how the patient (my parishioner) is getting along."

Psychiatrists have observed with unrestrained horror the "bungling treatment" (exorcism, exhortations to prayer and penance) given by well-meaning but psychiatrically untrained men of God.

Not too many years ago (and it's still true in the less modern parish), the philandering husband, an alcoholic wife, a homosexual, an acutely depressed mother unable to manage her household, were branded "sinners," admonished by the pastor to cease their sinful ways.

Today's enlightened clergymen look upon aberrant behavior as a symptom of sickness rather than moral turpitude. "Anyway sin is a greatly misused word," the Reverend Knox Kreutzer, executive director of the Pastoral Institute, declared. "The word sin originated as a description of the fact that the world is loused up. Its meaning is distorted when it's used exclusively in the realm of morality."

Said the Reverend James R. Adams, "We've found that we (psychiatrists and pastors) are concerned with similar matters, we just have a different approach. We both want to help people to live fully, honestly, successfully, in tune with themselves, without hurting other people and with self-awareness. After all, a person can't move religiously until he's straightened out emotionally."

Impetus for the rapid expansion of the Pastoral Institute in this city was the report of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health presented to Congress in 1961. The report disclosed that 42 percent of those people who admitted seeking professional help with problems in living consulted their clergymen.

Yet the clergyman's training—inadequate in the scientific study of human behavior—leaves him feeling frustrated and overburdened when dealing with acute behavior problems.

"He feels forced to choose between staying out of the situation completely or being so caught up (in the situation) that his time and emotional reserves are nearly exhausted by his efforts," said the Reverend Mr. Adams.

Two major divisions of the institute now provide services which its members hope will solve these pastors' problems. Clinical services includes a group therapy unit, under the direction of Dr. Joseph Abrahams, dealing primarily with chronic marriage problems, like the husband who was jailed on a morals charge (homosexual activities) and his wife who is trying desperately to hold their marriage together.

Dr. Boverman heads the family therapy units, which deals with psychotics and acute family crises. In this division also are the alcoholism treatment unit, headed by Dr. Anthony Zappala with the Reverend Canon Richard Williams as associate director, and the Reverend Mr. Kreutzer's pastoral services unit which deals with religious problems: the divorced and remarried Catholic, for instance, who has been excommunicated from the sacraments, is suffering severe guilt and self-denunciation. "This requires careful study by a trainer pastoral counselor," said the Reverend Mr. Kreutzer.

The educational division provides training for resident psychiatrists at St. Elizabeths, under the direction of Dr. Herbert Cohen. It also provides seminars in which the pastors learn psychodynamics (human behavior and its motivations) and become better acquainted with the work of their allies in the medical profession.

In its infancy is the institute's 1-year program of internship for newly ordained clergymen. And beginning in September, it will pioneer a project to be called the urban-industrial training program. This will provide part-time training for theology students and full-time postgraduate training for young ministers in blighted downtown and factory areas which have very special, pressing social problems.

The Reverend Mr. Kreutzer sees the institute as "an opportunity for exploratory and experimental programs for problems that confront the church. If the task of the church is the improvement of living in the world, we need to devise new techniques, new institutional structures in order to do this."

It's a task that pastors and psychiatrists are learning to share.

Twentieth Anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in the annals of the long struggle for human freedom, few events can match the courageous and heroic uprising of the Jews of the Warsaw ghetto against the totalitarian state. As the Honorable Philip Klutznick stated:

> The fighters of the Warsaw ghetto did not fight because they thought they could win; but because they hoped by making human beasts pay a price for their animal appetities they could focus world attention on its own derelictions.

I am happy to include the speech given by the Honorable Philip Klutznick at Carnegie Hall on the anniversary date of the Warsaw ghetto uprising in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is worthy to be read by all those who believe in and fight for freedom:

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY, WARSAW GHETTO UPRISING, CARNEGIE HALL, NEW YORK CITY

Less than 2 weeks ago in Jewish homes everywhere the Passover began with the Seder service. The Haggadah recalled the ancient struggle for freedom. Our faith enjoins us to retell this story each year for it is the wisdom of the sages that a man must see himself as if he went forth from Egypt. This concept is singularly appropriate as well to the commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising.

A flurry of writings have appeared of late which indulge in second guessing the last attitudes and postures of those who were doomed by the bestial determination of an inhumane nazism. What would you and I have done had we been there? Would we have risen in an outburst of physical resistance like the martyrs of Warsaw or would we have accepted the inevitable as did many in the vile camps? To recall the events is essential, but to indulge in qualitative hindsight may tend to confuse the real issue. Does it matter how the doomed died now, or does it matter more that mankind stood by while a mass of people were destroyed only because of race and religion. The fighters of the Warsaw ghetto did not fight because they thought they could win; but because they hoped by making human beasts pay a price for their animal appetites they could focus world attention on its own derelictions. The Warsaw ghetto uprising throws an eerie light on the shame of the greater part of the universe which turned its head while human decency was stained with the blood of innocent victims no matter how they chose to die—whether with a grenade in hand or a prayer shawl over their shoulders.

Our meeting has a quasi-official tone. It was the Congress of the United States itself which by joint resolution called attention to this day. The President in consonance with the action of the Congress issued a proclamation on the 4th day of March 1963 inviting "the people of the United States to observe the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, April 21, 1963, with appropriate ceremonies and activities." We gather in response to this invitation.

All this affirms that the events we remember are not a parochial Jewish matter. In an imperfect world where human rights and freedom are still limited luxuries, the stirring saga of the Warsaw Ghetto may serve to ignite a new fervor for the importance of human rights and personal dignity. In man's painful march from the cave toward the sunlight of his oneness with God there are too few epochal events that spur us on in the unending struggle against the forces of darkness who would reduce much of mankind to the status of chattels. No matter how satisfying may be the momentary progress in this battle there remains the constant need for inspiration and impetus.

We must remember even with pain that good people all over the world blotted out the horrible and unbelievable vision of Nazi racism committing cold blooded murder and deplorable human despoilment. We know how wrong this was; but, has this terrible tragedy really etched a lasting lesson into our minds? We cannot bring back to life those who paid an ultimate price at the alter of Nazi darkness. But, we should ask ourselves with simple candor whether we are doing our best to warn the world that it must not happen again.

A man and his few followers who knew the bitterness of this cup designed a convention to outlaw genocide. For domestic political reasons our Senate has not moved to ratify this treaty although many nations have done so. The reasons given for delay are related intimately to our internal struggle to perfect human rights and opportunity; but the time has come to put an end to excuses which are wearing thin. The present administration has shown a friendly inclination to treat positively with appropriate international commitments in the human rights area. Primarily eligible is the genocide convention. It was the Congress who by joint resolution called attention to the events we commemorate and it was the President whose dramatic words invited observation of this anniversary. The executive and the Congress possess both the sagacity and statesmanship to dispose of technical objections and to find the open door to a ratification of the convention against genocide. The United States has ratified earlier conventions against human slavery—we can do no less against mass human murder.

I have tarried long enough among sophisticated diplomats who are inclined cynically to debase the currency of international conventions. It is true that even the commandment "Thou shalt not kill" from a higher source has not put a halt to homocide. But, this commandment and the genocide convention as well as other moral, legal, and international commitments pronounce a state of human enlightenment to which good people can repair at times of challenge. From the beginning of time the war between good and bad has been the plight of the human family. The United States is the acknowledged leader of the free world fighting for human goodness, freedom, and liberty. Our escutcheon and our credentials are soiled by our failure to ratify the genocide convention.

In the tradition of our people we do not mourn or lament—instead we glorify the Almighty. We acknowledge the greatness and vastness of this universe which is His and resolve that the hope for a world of goodness and peace shall be soon realized. In keeping with this mood this 20th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising is the appropriate moment for a great and good nation like ours to turn away from its reluctance and to ratify an international convention dedicated to the resolve that the tragedy of Warsaw shall not again blot the face of the universe.

Bracero System Believed Doomed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, following the defeat by this House of H.R. 5497, which would have extended Public Law 78 for another 2 years and continued the importation of Mexican bracero labor, some Members have suggested a 1-year extension of this statute, which will expire at the end of this year. Others have predicted various dire consequences for the affected farmers and growers if American workers are hired instead of Mexicans.

The proposal for a 1-year extension of Public Law 78 was rejected by the Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower of the Committee on Agriculture. I for one do not foresee calamitous effects as a result of the defeat of H.R. 5497. I note that the highly regarded west coast correspondent of the New York Times, Mr. Gladwin Hill, has reported that farmers in that area acknowledge that they can get along without imported labor. In the May 31 issue of the New York Times, Mr. Hill writes:

BRACERO SYSTEM BELIEVED DOOMED: COAST FARMERS PREDICT RUIN BUT THEY ARE DOUBTED

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, May 30.—Predictions of calamity came from western farmers today in the wake of the House of Representatives refusal to renew the Mexican seasonal labor importation statute, Public Law 78.

But to observers of western agriculture, the plaints had a familiar ring. Privately, growers have become increasingly aware that the handwriting was on the wall for this source of relatively cheap labor.

The importation of up to 500,000 seasonal workers a year, chiefly to California and Texas but at one time or another to half the States, was started as a World War II emergency measure.

Political pressures against this bracero system from organized labor and welfare organizations have been steadily mounting for more than a decade. They were blocked in Congress by farm State legislators, with their nonagricultural colleagues going along. Yesterday's House action signified chiefly that the latter group is no longer disposed to go along.

IMPLICATIONS WEIGHED

The principal implications of the reversal, as seen here, are:

A large-scale Western specialty crop agriculture, or factories in the fields, will be forced into arranging a more stable domestic labor supply, as some of its more progressive individual operators have long since done.

This may mean slightly higher production costs, and higher prices to consumers, or competitive attrition among producers, although a truly rationalized labor supply, in many economists' opinion, could prove more economical.

While larger employment of domestic farm labor promises little help to urban unemployment (the two types of labor not being very interchangeable), it may help greatly in the many problems of the Nation's 500,000 migrant farmworkers, who have been kept rootless by the pattern of seasonal short-term work.

Even if some congressional reprieve is arranged for Public Law 78, the system is seen here as in its final phase.

ONLY SMALL FRACTION

The Mexican labor has never been more than a small fraction of the total farm labor force—a fact cited by growers in extenuation of their use of aliens, and by economists as proof that they are not really needed.

But, as a grower once candidly put it, they have been "the salt in the stew." The small nucleus of Mexicans imported under contract, their wages prearranged, could serve as a lever in procuring the remaining needed domestic labor.

While, by various statistical approaches, the Mexicans have constituted as little as 1 percent of the labor supply, in individual local situations they might number as high as 20 percent at a given time, providing a very powerful lever.

In human terms, the bracero program has meant compounds, some resembling army camps, where the braceros sleep in barracks, eat in messhalls, and are dispatched out by the day by growers associations to farms that have provided themselves, weeks or months before, with Government certifications of "a shortage of domestic labor."

A big underlying factor of the bracero program has been specialization. Lemons, oranges, grapes, cotton, potatoes, carrots, lettuce, avocados and pecans all have special areas of California's coastal plain and inland valleys where they grow best, and growers who specialize in individual products. This means that an individual grower's need for labor may be concentrated in a few critical weeks of the year.

But such concerns as the DiGiorgio firms near Bakersfield have diversified crops and use a nearly fixed labor force the year around. State economists have suggested that growers generally could make similar arrangements individually or collectively.

The waning of the program has exemplified the classical economics of supply and demand. The cost of braceros to growers, in terms of bonds, transportation, insurance housing and food, has risen steadily toward the point where many employers could honestly say they were paying just as much as they would have to pay for domestic labor, if it was available. What they gained out of the arrangement was mainly the dependable supply, without having to bargain with domestic labor.

These steadily rising costs have encouraged mechanization, in operations ranging from cotton growing to lettuce packing, obviating much hand labor. Such trends, along with the increasing redtape of getting Government certification for braceros and the successive Congressional reductions in the import quota, in less than a decade have more than halved the bracero traffic from its peak—presaging its inevitable extinction.

This report by a responsible journalist should be heeded, I believe, and should serve as an antidote to some of the fears that have been expressed regarding expiration of Public Law 78 and the foreign contract labor it fostered.

I note also that the New York Times reported on June 16, 1963, that a well-informed, responsible group in California states that 150,000 domestic agricultural workers in that State alone are ready to replace the 73,000 braceros imported to meet farm labor requirements. Under unanimous consent I include this significant article in my remarks at this point:

[From the New York Times, June 16, 1963]

Need of Braceros in West Disputed: Surplus of Farmhands Seen by California Committee

Los Angeles, June 15.—California has 150,000 surplus domestic farmworkers available to take up any slack caused by the impending end of the Mexican bracero program.

That statement was made this week by the Rev. John G. Simmons, chairman of the Emergency Committee To Aid Farmworkers. Mr. Simmons appealed to Al Tieburg, State director of employment, to make full disclosure of the names of bracero users in California.

"Employers of imported Mexican nationals have successfully hidden their identity behind the names of grower associations," Mr. Simmons said in the letter. He continued:

"All of the 143,562 different braceros in California in 1962 were employed by only 7,694 growers—8 percent of the 99,000 farmers in California. Most of this 8 percent used only a few of the total number, while the largest growers used the great majority of the braceros.

"There is not a shred of evidence that these large operators cannot afford to pay the cost of hiring American workers. And there is incontrovertible evidence that California's unemployed seasonal farmworkers are available to fill the jobs of braceros."

STATE RECORDS ARE CITED

Mr. Simmons cited social security records maintained by the State department of employment as showing that 467,799 domestic workers were employed at some time last year on the State's farms, but that the peak number hired at one time, in September, was only 258,000. This, he said, indicated a total of almost 150,000 more farmworkers available than are employed at any one time.

"This is more than enough to replace the 72,900 foreign contract workers in California during the same peak period, and certainly enough to eliminate the need for braceros in all other periods," he said.

The Council of California Growers has maintained that the end of Public Law 78 this year will impose a particular hardship on small farmers.

The council says the labor gap cannot be filled by domestic hands in time to avert some losses to the State's $3 billion agricultural business.

Congress recently refused to extend the labor-importation law, first passed as a World War II measure to combat labor shortages.

The emergency committee headed by Mr. Simmons contends that the use of braceros not only has kept farm wages low, but has also hurt the small farmer by making it harder for him to compete with large-scale employers.

The Mexican Labor Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article which appeared in the June 13 issue of the Washington Post concerning the Mexican view of the so-called bracero program. There has been entirely too much emotionalism around the issue of whether or not the Mexican labor program is to be continued and I think that this article presents some very vital aspects of the issue from the viewpoint of our good neighbor to the south.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Curb on Braceros Gives Mexico Problems

(By Bert Quint)

Mexico City.—The recent decision by the U.S. House of Representatives to cut the flow of Mexican migrant laborers to the farms and ranches of the United States down to a trickle, threatens this country with an economic, and perhaps a political, crisis.

Since 1951, when the two nations signed an agreement formalizing the hitherto illegal traffic in peasants back and forth across the border, hundreds of thousands of Mexican braceros have entered the United States each year, providing cheap farm labor throughout the country, but especially in Texas, California, New Mexico, Arizona, Arkansas, and Colorado.

Every 2 years, the agreement had been renewed, despite increasing opposition from the AFL–CIO, which claims U.S. farm wages have been kept low because of the willingness of the Mexicans to work for sums that are great by their standards, but small by American standards.

In 1961, when the last extension was accorded, the labor group charged that negotiations for it between the United States and Mexican Governments were held "in haste and secrecy."

UNIONS NOW WINNERS

When the issue came to a vote this time, on May 29, organized labor won. The House rejected a proposed 2-year extension by a vote of 174–158. Unless a new bill is submitted to the Senate and passed by that group and the House changes its mind when it gets a second crack at it, the braceros program will die on December 31.

Several thousand Mexican farmhands will continue to enter the United States each year as permanent immigrants, and others undoubtedly will slip across the border illegally. But the bulk of Mexico's migrant labor force will be kept at home.

Some Mexican politicians reacted to the news of the House's surprising rejection of the bill by following the popular custom of trying to make the Mexican people believe they are not dependent on the United States for anything. They hailed the decision as "an end to the cancer which has been consuming the country, the migration of its workers."

MEXICAN WELL-BEING AFFECTED

Nevertheless, even they realize that, for two reasons, it is a migration vital to Mexican well-being.

It is a source of badly needed foreign exchange. The braceros who goes to the United States to work saves most of his money, or sends it or brings it home with him. Many Mexican villages, especially in the perennially drought-stricken northwest, depend on the income of the few braceros who work for 3 or 4 months in the United States and return with a few hundred dollars. The entire village lives for the rest of the year on this money.

The Bank of Mexico conservatively puts the revenue earned by the country this way at something over $30 million per year.

Then there is the matter of Mexican unemployment. There simply is not enough land to provide work for the 52.8 percent of the Mexican population that depends on agricultural labor for its livelihood.

Until 1959, the braceros entered the United States at the rate of 400,000 per year. More recently, because of increased farm mechanization, the need for them has lessened. In 1960, 325,000 entered, followed by about 300,000 in 1961 and 250,000 in 1962. This year, between 150,000 and 200,000 are expected to cross the border before the pact expires.

FARMERS CITE STOOP LABOR

Farmers, especially in California and the Southwest, insist that the need for them still exists. Americans, they say, are unwilling to engage in "stoop" labor, like picking cotton and beets. The AFL–CIO counters with the argument that, "if they were paid enough, they would do it," and has sought unsuccessfully for establishment of a minimum farm wage.

Times are hard as it is in the Mexican countryside. With a curb on employment on the other side of the Rio Grande, they will become harder. Communist agitators, already active in rural areas, probably will become more active and, with the peasants more deseprate than ever, likely will meet with more success than in the past.

The migrant labor pact, however, is not yet necessarily dead. The House vote was taken on May 29, when many farm State Representatives already had left Washington for the Memorial Day holidays. California's Gov. Edmund G. Brown has begun a campaign to put pressure on President Kennedy to have a new bill submitted for extension of the agreement, hoping that this time it would pass.

Town Meeting of the World Using Telstar II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on July 10, Mr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, has arranged for a "Town Meeting of the World" using communications satellite Telstar II for this discussion of important world issues.

Participants who have accepted the invitation are Anthony Eden, Dwight D. Eisenhower and Jean Monnet. Eden will participate from London, Eisenhower from Gettysburg or Denver, and Monnet from Paris or Brussels. A fourth participant may be added. The broadcast will be carried on the CBS network between 4 and 5 p.m. on July 10 and will be repeated between 7:30 and 8:30 p.m. on the same date.

In order that the program of the European Broadcasting Union may be better understood, the following speech was made before that organization by Frank Stanton on October 25, 1962 in which he outlined the potential functions and benefits that will accrue to the world through communications satellites:

TOWN MEETING OF THE WORLD USING TELSTAR II

(Remarks by Frank Stanton, president, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., New York City, October 25, 1962)

It is a privilege to speak to you during your conferences this eventful week.

Although the European Broadcasting Union is an old friend and ally of many of us in America, there is no question that Eurovision became a reality to most Americans only when Telstar first transmitted programs last July. There is no question, too, that few scientific innovations since the beginning of the space age have so captivated the imaginations of millions on both sides of the Atlantic and around the world as has the communications satellite. Nor was this a matter only of enthusiastic but impressionable well-wishers yearning for a concrete peaceful use of man's newfound scientific achievements.

Editorial comment both here and abroad, coming from hardbitten and hardheaded observers of world affairs, saw in Telstar the promising beginning of a new era of direct visual communications between the continents. The world's most noted historian, who has never been accused of empty optimism, saw the possibilities evoked by the communications satellite as "a great asset to mankind in its present struggle for survival. * * * A worldwide network of television broadcasting is going to expand the circle of everyone's personal acquaintances to a worldwide range; and this is the very thing that we most need in the dangerous chapter of history through which we are now passing."

What accounted for such an affirmative reaction to Telstar? Why were the prospects of a satellite communications system so eagerly grasped by so many knowledgeable people as the beginning of something of great promise? Are not those of us in broadcasting who are tempted to regard it as nothing but an extension of the coaxial cable or jet transport looking at it through the wrong end of the telescope? To find the answers I think that we must not only look at Telstar but consider also the background of the world from which it was launched.

Your own organization seems to me profoundly symbolic of a new spirit that is animating modern life. The 17 countries served by Eurovision represent virtually every line of culture, every national heritage, that has contributed significantly over the centuries to the construction of a western civilization. They stand for a rich variety of languages, of music, of art and architecture, of social and folk traditions, of ways of doing things and of ways of expressing themselves. To a nation like ours, largely peopled by aspiring immigrants from every country of Europe, all bringing with them, in addition to a resolute common purpose, their individual customs and usages, this pluralistic character of Eurovision seems vibrantly promising.

It is also significant to us, since one cannot think of Eurovision without thinking primarily of the future, that all six nations of the European Economic Community have active members in the EBU, and so do all of the Outer Seven in the European Free Trade Association. Despite the setbacks of recurring crises, the world is today organizing itself for a brighter future, in response to the rising expectations of men everywhere. In Europe, old barriers, old suspicions, old reservations are disappearing. Ancient limitations on the ability of different peoples to work together are being annihilated. The peoples of Asia and Africa, many of them already associate members of your union, who have won independence are beginning to build new societies and new economies. The imaginations of us in America are stirred by all this ferment, because we ourselves are the product of similar processes from an earlier and, in retrospect, less complicated period.

That Telstar was launched in this era of vast beginnings, and came along to link the New World with the old just when the forces of history are parallelizing our experiences, is a coincidence of immeaurably good omen.

Television in all our countries is necessarily in varying stages of development. It is a medium that presents complex practical problems, economic, technical, and legal. But the active and the associate members of EBU certainly represent also a variety of approaches to solutions. Some have quasi-government supervised television; some have only privately operated; some have both. Some television operations are supported by advertising, some by set owners, some by government, and some by a combination of these.

It seems to me inevitable that there is this variety in methods of operating television. The context of each country, by way both of its total character and of the economic and political facts of the moment, should decide its particular methods. It may want to change them, of course, or it may want to add to them. What is good and workable and sufficient now may be faulty, impracticable, or inadequate at some time in the future.

In the United States we have privately operated television stations and networks in competition with one another and earning their way, as other mass media here do, by contributing a useful and valuable service to the public and to commerce. We also have educational television, supported by a variety of sources and not operated by the Government. Commercial television has been generous in its financial support of educational television, and educational television has been generous in its criticism of commercial television.

We at CBS, and many of our colleagues in television in America, have urged increased development of UHF broadcasting because we believe that, in our particular national environment we can expect progress to be made best through increased competition, whether it is in entertainment, news, or education.

The competitive system in our country has been an inevitable concomitant of pluralism, and is a deeply rooted characteristic of the American pluralist society. Although it may take different forms in those countries where there is a single television service under government auspices, competition also inevitably becomes a factor there, too, even if it involves no more than competing with other media for the attention of an audience.

I see all this pluralism, that in Europe and that in the United States, as a great good. From it, a society derives not only the richness possible only with variety, but also a priceless vigor and vitality. The difficulty comes only when human failures allow the pluralist society to become a fragmented one, and this is a failure that has dogged the steps of man for a hundred generations. But when there is clarity of judgment, when there is a recognition of the realities of the human plight calling for the definition and pursuit of a common purpose, a pluralist society thus unified can move with enormous power and resourcefulness.

This is, I take it, the historic point of the sweeping present movements in world affairs. Europe, with the Common Market and EFTA, and with such practical solutions to specific problems as the formation of Air Union, is in the vanguard. But, surely, after they have gone through the nationalism inevitable among newly independent or emerging nations, other countries on other continents, too, will join forces in great cooperative ventures to advance the common welfare and security of their peoples. And I take the historic distinction of all this to be that the unity of purpose that binds men today is as far removed from old imperial monoliths as a truly pluralist society is from fractional tribalism.

I have emphasized this threshold upon which we find ourselves, because it seems to me that it is in achieving a unity of purpose that intercontinental television can make its most important, for all I know, its decisively important, contribution.

Before considering how this might come about, we should, however, be clear as to what a communications satellite cannot do. I cannot see how, within its present economic and technical bounds, Telstar, or any currently projected communicatons satellite system, can contribute significantly to the interchange of cultural or entertainment experiences in the predictable future. The peoples of all our countries have been reading one another's literature, acting one another's plays, playing one another's music for a long, long time. Television, as we all know, has itself participated extensively in this process through film and tape. I have no doubt that eventually communications satellites will greatly broaden the area of this nourishing activity and certainly multiply the audiences. In due time technological and scientific advances will very probably make television not only the most powerful, but perhaps also the most economical, way for the people of the world to share those experiences of the arts, of entertainment, of humor, of drama, and of relaxation that enter so importantly into the building of a national character. But the means of transmission in itself will not alter the substance of all this material, any more than the method of printing alters the substance of a book.

The pressing need of mankind, however, is to advance that unity of purpose about which I have spoken. Here, even within its present primordial dimensions, a communications satellite system can make a most valuable contribution.

It can do this, I think, primarily on two great fronts, reporting and discussing. I am sure that I do not need to dwell, before this audience, on the importance of these to the development of a unified approach to the problems of world peace and security and of the material betterment of man's lot everywhere.

We cannot achieve a common purpose or a unity of values unless people know what is going on and are able to conduct a dialog on its meaning and its implications. The events of this week, I think, underscore this. It would have been a great help in promulgating world understanding of the Cuba crisis if President Kennedy's ultimatum on Monday as well as the response had been broadcast on television around the globe. The strongest prop of a cynical and ruthless government or combine of governments is public ignorance. The surest guarantee of a society's aimless drifting is public indifference. With these twin failings, no society can succeed in either defining or achieving a worthwhile purpose. Having overcome them, none can fail.

The pages of history are written black and long with the desperation of millions that attest to this simple fact. Often in the past there has been little that could be done about this. But today we have at hand the tools to make an unprecedented beginning in wiping out ignorance and indifference forever, if we use them intelligently and venturesomely. It would be a criminal negligence that could haunt the human race to a bitter end, on the other hand, if we use them unwisely or fail to make the most of them.

Two weeks ago, in what was itself dramatic evidence of the groping of men's spirits everywhere toward unity, the Ecumenical Council opened its historic sessions in the Vatican. Not just news of this imposing event, but the actual event itself, was transmitted over all Europe, live and simultaneously, the instant it was occurring. Radiotelevisione Italiana did a superb job of production in covering the council, with imaginative, awe-inspiring camera work wholly consistent with the august proceedings. The transmission of the taped record to Eurovision's control point in Brussels, then to the French satellite earth station at Pleumeur-Boudou, to Telstar, back to earth again at Andover, Maine, and finally to New York to be seen by millions of Americans that same morning, was a magnificent triumph in intercontinental communications. At the same time, there was in America a variety of comment accompanying the pictorial coverage, as I assume there was in Europe.

There is a powerful contrast between all this and the last Ecumenical Council, nearly a hundred years ago, in 1869. The world and individual nations were dismembered and divided. Italy itself was split apart. The Franco-Prussian War was brewing to shake the continent. The Unite States, licking the stinging wounds of a civil war, was still not really united. Communications moved slowly and ineffectively. Vatican I—as the 1869 Ecumenical Council is now called—was a remote, far-off event, unreal even to those who read the trickle of news that came out of a Rome that was cut off from the rest of Italy. Today, on the other hand, the hopes of men of good will everywhere, whatever their faith, rose at the immediacy with which they witnessed Vatican II. The Council was a great and promising reality at the very moment that it met.

Broadcasting of this kind seems to me of the essence of what we are talking about. Such scientific advances as the launching of new manshoots, such political occasions as the election and inauguration of new governments, great disasters enlisting the sympathetic response of other peoples on humanitarian grounds, history making but unpredictable events in any area of human activity—these are the substance of the worldwide informational role that communications satellite systems can play in advancing man's knowledge and awareness of his fellow's activities. It does not mean that any of us will cede our traditional reporting diversities and methods to a supranational centralized journalistic authority. It is the substance of the event itself about which we are talking, and our covering commentary will still be our own as will followup reports.

This is the first step in the eventual fulfillment of the promise of Telstar. But it is only the first step. Life consists in action and reaction, and human beings are deprived of their birthright if they cannot act upon affairs and react to them. A prerequisite to useful action and constructive reaction is discussion, exploring all the sides, all the elements and all the implications of issues that are a common concern to appreciable numbers of the world's peoples.

It is no novelty any longer to observe that without the distillation of opinion there can be no societal action that can have a lasting effect. What we need is a world opinion distilled from an enlarged dialog, an exchange of views based not so much upon jealously guarded doctrines of misty origins as upon the nature and implications of situations in which we all have a stake.

Although some of the most trying situations before us may seem to be beyond useful discussion, there is no shortage of such central issues. A long catalog of questions, ranging from the atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons to trade barriers, is preoccupying the minds of men everywhere. We cannot and should not lock up discussion of these matters in diplomatic chambers and committee rooms. We cannot and should not make our views known only in the emotional heat of protest meetings and picketing. We cannot and should not limit discussion to the necessarily slow intermittency of printed journals. In television we cannot and should not restrict ourselves to the shipping back and forth of film and tape by jet. Through Telstar, we now can, and should, bring together the best minds, the most informed, most articulate, most concerned spokesmen, of all peoples to explore these urgent matters, together and face to face, with all our countries sitting in as witnesses.

The oldest and purest democratic forum in America, directly descended from the Athenian forum, is the town meeting. Here, at least once a year the inhabitants of old American villages get together to discuss issues upon which the town will be ultimately called to act. A moderator is chosen to preserve orderly discussion, but everything is open for all to hear, every side of an issue is examined, every viewpoint exposed. When the meeting is over, no one has any doubt about the issues being thoroughly aired.

CBS is now studying the technical conditions, the orbit path and duration of usability, under which Telstar can be used this coming spring, as it approaches its first anniversary, for a town meeting of the world. We will enlist the wisest, best informed men and women from all the participating nations, select a moderator who elicits the respect of the world and, in counsel with the best advisers we can find, choose a subject of worldwide interest and urgency. It will be frankly experimental, but we hope that it will set a pattern or at least establish a precedent for broadcasts of similar intent in the future.

Even though the communications satellite system may be 4 or 5 years away its use is too important to leave entirely to chance evolution. We need to study all its capabilities, its limitations, its possibilities. We need to construct a philosophy of intercontinental television and the programing appropriate and useful to it. We need to study, as was begun at your sessions here this week, the technical, legal, and economic problems. I have heard it contended that because shortwave radio was never fully used and never came up to the promise it held for the furtherance of an international dialogue, there is little prospect of Telstar and its successors achieving much more.

I deny both the relevance and force of this pallid argument.

The intrinsic power of television, with the immediacy of sight and sound, has added dimensions to communications unapproached before in history. And the world we live in, as I tried to point out earlier, is a new world, vastly different from any that has come and gone before. The capacities of this medium can be judged wisely only on its own terms and in its own time.

To this end I strongly endorse the suggestion made by Chairman Minow of the FCC, President Rydbeck of the EBU, Mr. D'Arcy of the UN, and Chairman Sarnoff of NBC, that there be an organized international approach to the study of the whole matter of world television broadcasting.

But preliminary to an international union, I suggest that the six U.S. associate members and CBC, the Canadian associate of EBU constitute themselves as a study group to determine whether it would be feasible to set up on this side of the Atlantic some kind of an administrative structure or machinery which would make the exchange of television programs from this continent to Europe, and to other continents more expeditious than is now the case. Included in the many problem areas of such a study would be the establishment of realistic ground rules for the coverage of great events without sacrificing journalistic freedom, and reducing the legal, technical, and other barriers to the flow of programing from continent to continent.

If we begin to think only, or even largely, in terms of limitations and difficulties, and then content ourselves with disparaging the significance of Telstar, of which so much is expected, we will fail miserably. What is needed here is an affirmative, creative approach.

It has been the verdict of serious, responsible men that of all the space projects in these past 5 years of historic scientific breakthroughs, none holds more direct promise for advancing mankind's real and immediate betterment than satellite communications. It can be, it is, at least a major opportunity to further understanding and accord among our people. Let us make the most of it.

Who Controls Public Schools?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, one of the arguments most often heard against Federal aid to education is Federal control. The Nevada Daily Mail of Nevada, Mo., recently published an editorial concerning control of public schools. Because of the importance of this issue to the question of Federal aid to education, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO CONTROLS PUBLIC SCHOOLS?

General Federal aid to primary and secondary education seems an unlikely prospect for some time to come.

Congress will not consider it this year. Yet it is still high in the realm of public debate.

A principal argument against it, of course, is that such assistance inevitably means U.S. control of education.

With countless opponents this fear is obviously genuine, though others evidently use the argument to cloak other objections.

Often the problem is expressed in this kind of question:

"Do you want to turn control of your schools over to Federal bureacrats in Washington?"

There are perhaps few educators who do not share concern that the Federal Government might become too assertive, once established in the field.

Nevertheless there is an opposite side to this coin. It can be stated in the question:

"What kind of control are you getting at the State and local level? And who asserts it?"

The query is pertinent because in recent years, in many places, a whole host of people of dubious qualification have attempted to dictate to school boards, administrators and teachers what should not be taught in our schools.

A university like Stanford can, as it recently did, refuse such "guidance" in the form of strings attached to money gifts. Public schools, dependent on public funds, are unhappily less able to resist often serious pressures from militant outsiders.

Many of these have very strong notions about history, politics, economics, sociology, and other practical matters.

The question any community should ask with regard to such complainants is this:

"What are their true credentials? What do they know of the subjects they want taught in their particular way? Is there any support, in the objective evidence, for such teachings?"

The classroom is not the courtroom. There are no strict rules of evidence. But a school must offer its students as much solid, verifiable fact as can be brought to bear on any topic under study.

It also must be a place given over to the free interplay of ideas and opinions. It ceases to be a school when outsiders can intervene to limit it to only those ideas and opinions they approve. The natural response then must be:

"Who are they to say?"

Many are ignorant amateurs who want to repeal a history they do not like and warp the present to their own unsupportable views.

Every community in the Nation should be making sure that knowledgeable, balanced fair-minded persons decide what is to be taught in its schools. And no one else.

Magna Carta 748th Anniversary: Encomium by Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, over a period of years, I have watched with growing concern the failure of our institutions of learning and the mass news media, through ignorance or design, to keep alive in the minds of our people the unique nature of their government under the historic contractual document known as the Constitution of the United States. As a consequence of this neglect, the signposts of the governmental structure that was planned to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity have fallen, and our people have lost their way in a welter of confusion. Few of them realize that our system of constitutional government, with its checks and balances, has a history tracing back to June 15, 1215, when the barons of England at Runnimede in Surrey, forced King John to approve and seal the first great charter of freedom, recorded in history as the Magna Carta.

Our country is, indeed, fortunate in having an organization dedicated to the perpetuation of the principles of constitutional government that are rooted in that historic document—the Baronial Order of Magna Carta, of which William Hannis Perot of Drexel Hill, Pa., is marshal.

The 1963 Magna Carta Day Award of the order was bestowed upon the Nation's great soldier-statesman, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, who, in 1962, was made an honorary life member of the Baronial Order by right of his descent from Richard de Clare, Earl of Clare and Hertford, one of about 26 barons from the more than 2,000 knights encamped at Runnimede who were designated as Sureties to compel the King to observe the Magna Carta.

It is uniquely fitting that the 748th anniversary of the approval and sealing of the Magna Carta was commemorated at Christ Church in Philadelphia. Within its sacred portals one can almost feel the presence of George Washington and the other founders of our country who worshiped there.

In an impressive service led by the rector, the Reverend Ernest A. Harding, D.D., a stirring part of it was the reading by Marshal Perot, chief officer of the order, of an eloquent and thoughtful letter from General MacArthur emphasizing the Magna Carta and the Constitution of the United States as having permitted our Nation's "evolution as a society of freemen" and as still serving as a "mighty bulwark against anarchy and chaos and ultimate reversion to slavery."

General MacArthur's ringing words, which included an appeal for Americans to form "an impenetrable phalanx against all efforts to weaken or nullify those noble guidelines in human affairs," should reverberate throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in furtherance of this desirable goal, I now quote the entire text of General MacArthur's letter, as follows:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
June 6, 1963.

DEAR MARSHAL PEROT: I regret that I will be unable to attend the commemorative services to be held by the Baronial Order of Magna Charta on June 15 at Christ Church in Philadelphia.

I wish, however, that you would present to the members of the order there present my warm greetings and heartfelt thanks for the honors the order has so graciously conferred upon me.

My sense of gratitude and distinction is highlighted by the deep reverence in which I hold the great charter, the memory of which it is the purpose of the order to perpetuate. For it was that historic document, wrested from King John on June 15, 1215, in the field at Runnemede, that became the keystone to the arch of American and British constitutional governments and placed in the hands of freemen everywhere and for all time the inalienable right to personal liberty and human freedom.

The service you render to America and to the cause of universal freedom is peculiarly significant now when some voices are raised in derogation of those charters which stand security for our liberties, by contending that they have become outmoded with the evolution of the human race and thus no longer serve the best interests of our society. Nothing could be more fallacious, nothing could be more threatening to those immutable concepts which form our proud heritage from the past. For it was those very charters—the Magna Charta which you memorialize and the Constitution of the United States—which have permitted our evolution as a society of freemen and serve today as a mighty bulwark against anarchy and chaos and ultimate reversion to slavery. May God grant that enough of our fellow Americans realize this to form an impenetrable phalanx against all effort to weaken or nullify those noble guidelines in human affairs which have so oriented our past as to insure the moral and spiritual greatness of our present.

Most faithfully,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR.

Echo From the Grassroots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Richmond, Va., News Leader of June 11, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECHO FROM THE GRASSROOTS

In the past fiscal year, individual Virginians paid more than $800 million in personal income taxes into the U.S. Treasury. Few of these taxpayers would suspect that an amount equal to $6 million of their taxes was spent on the following projects:

Purchase of 1,000 television sets to be used in underdeveloped countries where there is no electric power—$400,000.

To study why patients break appointments at pediatric clinics—$18,000.

A tour of U.S. defense plants by officials of Communist Poland—$10,000.

To establish a colony of baboons—$61,895.

To establish a colony of monkeys—$13,816.

To study the relationship between an infant monkey and its mother—$1,250,000.

Donation of a yacht to the millionaire emperior of Ethiopia—$3,100,000.

To produce a stereotatic atlas of the beagle brain—$9,775.

To study how synthetic detergents travel in percolating water—$20,991.

To study blood group genetics of Southampton Island Eskimos—$11,500.

To study diseases of the giant snail—$20,092.

To study the social role of aging wild horses—$8,205.

To study the information that might be contained in echoes—$13,837.

These are only a few of 66 similar items of outrageous expenditure of U.S. funds cited by freshman Congressman GENE SNYDER, of Kentucky, to support his statement that the Federal budget can be cut. He also gave some other examples, the cost of which could not be determined:

In Taiwan, the United States built a sawmill that couldn't handle the type of lumber produced there.

In Indonesia, millions of U.S. aid dollars were used to buy U.S. gold.

In Greece, U.S. aid bought suits for Greek undertakers.

In Kenya, government officials used U.S. aid to purchase extra wives.

In Lebanon, the United States built a stockbreeding farm with nine stalls for every bull.

In Liberia, millions of U.S. aid dollars were donated to reduce the level of poverty. This money was used to build a luxurious new palace for the Liberian President.

If those engaged in the $13,837 study to find out what information is contained in echoes would put their ears to the ground, they would hear an unusual echo from the grassroots: A groan of heartrending despair from the forgotten man, the American taxpayer.

Dairy Month in Cortland County, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, June is Dairy Month here in the United States. As a Member of this body I have the honor to represent more dairy farmers than any other Member of the House from my great Empire State of New York. New York State, as some people do not realize, is the second greatest dairy State in the Nation. Dairying is, in fact, so I am informed, still the greatest single industry in our State.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I was especially pleased the other day to read in the Cortland Standard, of Cortland, N.Y., a very interesting account of a meeting held in one of the top dairy counties in my district, Cortland County. This account, which appeared in the Standard on June 4, 1963, was written by that newspaper's farm editor, Mr. John Allen.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith Mr. Allen's interesting article on dairying in Cortland County, as follows:

[From the Cortland (N.Y.) Standard, June 4, 1963]

DAIRYING CONTRIBUTES SIZABLE AMOUNT OF MONEY TO COUNTY'S ECONOMY EACH AND EVERY YEAR

(By John Allen)

Dairying contributed $17,330,097.02 to the economy of Cortland County in 1962 solely from the sale of milk. The 1,306 herds in the county produced 412,764,901 pounds, or 191,983,675 quarts of milk.

Each year in June a committee is formed to observe June Dairy Month in the county. The official observance got its start with a "breakfast down on the farm" yesterday morning at the Donald Jones Farm, Houghton Hill, Homer.

The top event of the month will be the selection of Cortland County's dairy princess which will be held Saturday night at 8:30 on the stage of Schine's State Theater. The crowning will be preceded by a dairy parade at 2 p.m., a banquet for the 12 contestants, and the judging. Judges will be Mrs. Philip Cinquanti, Dr. Ross Allen, and Al Mills, district manager for Dairylea.

Free milk will be distributed on each of the four Friday nights in June at Loblaw's and First National Bank by four county farm organizations. In addition, at each of the meetings of service clubs where a June dairy month speaker appears free milk will be served ice cold in pitchers, compliments of the JDM committee.

At yesterday monrning's breakfast, H. Ira Blixt, county agricultural agent, told the guests that the county, with its fertile, well-drained valleys and fairly steep hillsides, is well suited to dairying. Although a relatively small county, a high proportion—73.7 percent—of its 321,280 acres is in farms. Only two counties in New York State are higher in this regard: Wyoming and Genesee.

The average size of the Cortland County farm is approximately 212 acres, and is operated by 1.5 to 2 men.

The average 50 milking cow farm has a total capital investment of $70,000 or about $1,400 per cow; $35,000 per man.

The county has a cow population of 40,893 and an average of 37 a herd.

Another $1.5 million is added to the milk income by the sale of cull cattle, purebred cattle and calves.

"The dairy farmer is a consumer of commodities and services," Blixt pointed out. "Last year the average operator spent about $10,000 for dairy feed, $1,000 for fertilizer, $700 for building repairs, $650 for electricity and telephone service, $1,000 for gas and $1,100 in taxes."

Attending the breakfast were: Robert Anthony, manager of Schine's State Theater, Robert Miner, personnel director for the South Cortland branch of Smith-Corona; Mayor Fay G. Simmons, Homer; Cuyler Chipman, Homer National Bank.

Mayor Joseph C. Mack, Cortland; Fred Ashcraft, editor and public relations director, Eastern Milk Producers Cooperative Association; Donald Bishop, manager of Cortland County Chamber of Commerce; David Martin, manager of Cortland office, New York Telephone Co.

Gordon Conklin, editor, American Agriculturalist; Frank Lehlbach, Trinity Corp.; Ronald Fish, Niagara-Mohawk Power Corp.; Robert Fanning, New York State Electric & Gas Co.; Morris Noss, president, Cortland County Development Corp.; Frank L. Greene, Homer supervisor.

Foreign Policy and Nuclear War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Dr. Robert Morris, formerly Chief Counsel of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, has been writing some outstanding columns on U.S. foreign policy. In a column dated June 13, 1963, and entitled "Merger Is the Goal," Dr. Morris has concisely and incisively analyzed the President's address of June 10 at American University on the subject of foreign policy and nuclear war.

I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column is ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MERGER IS THE GOAL

(By Robert Morris)

The President's commencement speech at American University in Washington is a most important reaffirmation, in one statement, of our policy that has, up until now, been released piecemeal. The doubters, who have been legion, can now no longer deny that our policy is to work toward an accommodation with the Soviet Union on the basis of a merger with the Soviet Union under the United Nations.

Those portions of the Rostow report which stated that our goal was a victory not of the United States over the Soviet Union, a victory not of capitalism over socialism, but rather a victory of men and nations under the banner of the United Nations have now been officially confirmed. The President used the term "Pax Americana" to disavow the hitherto traditional policy of the United States to extend liberty and freedom as civilization has known these thrilling concepts. This is a milestone.

Of disarmament President Kennedy said, "Our primary long-range interest in Geneva, however, is general and complete disarmament—designed to take place by stages, permitting parallel political developments to build the new institutions of peace which would take the place of arms."

This is the official 1963 reaffirmation of that September 1961 policy paper, State Department Document No. 7277. This has been slyly denied by our officials or rejected as fantastic by responsible persons in our society.

Our expressed policy has been to work toward the dismantling, in three stages, of national defense establishments and the creation of an all powerful international "peace force" controlled by the U.N. Under it we would be allowed only those weapons needed for internal policing.

On the world order, the President too reaffirmed what our policy papers have all recommended, the strengthening of the United Nations into a world government. His exact words were: "Meanwhile, we seek to strengthen the United Nations, to help solve its financial problems, to make it a more effective instrument for peace, to develop it into a genuine world security system—a system capable of resolving disputes on the basis of law, of insuring the security of the large and the small, and of creating conditions under which arms can finally be abolished."

The treaty we have put on the table at Geneva even provides that all nations would have to submit to the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. An all-powerful international army, with an all-powerful court under the same control as the army is world government. What else would an international rule of law imply? Law would not be what we have always known it to be but the consensus of the contributions of the Khrushchevs, the Maos, the Sukarnos, the Nassers, the Nkrumahs, and the Adlai Stevensons.

In this synthesis, as U Thant calls this merger, we would be 1 voice out of 126. Necessarily our heritage of religious and spiritual values, our common law tradition, our bill of rights, our free enterprise system will be diluted beyond recognition.

The question is, Do our people want this? They should have the opportunity of choosing. The threat of nuclear war is the justification for this surrender. Advocates of the plan, now in the saddle of Government have been pressing for this very thing long before the advent of nuclear weapons. They have used nuclear power, exaggerated it in Soviet hands, as a pretext for their purpose.

The United Nations was never intended to serve this purpose. The whole U.N. charter belies it. In fact, when the Senate was induced to sign the underlying treaty, Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius specifically guaranteed it was not an instrument of world government. Thus what U Thant and the President are proposing is even illegal.

What compounds the issue even more is the posture the President adopts for us. We are courting Khrushchev. Apparently we cession to draw him into the consensus. will continue to make concession after con- Thus his strength will be enormous when he deigns to move in.

No issue on the surface today is more fundamental than this. It should be openly discussed. It involves our very heritage.

Farley, Once Reviled, Now Is Respected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to call to the attention of the Members of the House two splendid editorials which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post Gazette on May 27, 1963, and in the Philadelphia Daily News on June 7, 1963, respectively, concerning the life and business career of that great statesman, my good friend, Jim Farley:

[From the Pittsburgh Gazette, May 27, 1963]

FARLEY, ONCE REVILED, NOW IS RESPECTED

(By Andrew Bernhard)

Anyone whose memory goes back to the early days of the New Deal remembers Big Jim Farley, who, as one of the men surrounding Franklin D. Roosevelt, was most often the target aimed at by enemies of the administration.

Big Jim was a politician to his fingertips. His abiding object was to get his man and his party into office and keep them there. He came from New York. He was a Democrat. So he was tabbed as a creature of Tammany.

When it wasn't judged convenient or prudent to attack Roosevelt, the administration's opponents took out after Farley and portrayed him as the incarnation of Tammany and all of the evils attributed to Tammany. But being schooled in the rough politics of New York Farley never let it appear that the attacks bothered him.

Most infuriating to the administration's enemies was Farley's success and his habit of being right, as when, in 1936, he predicted that Alf Landon would carry only two States. It's hard for us to swallow the correctness of an enemy's forecast.

Then, in 1940, Farley broke with Roosevelt over the third term issue. Almost over night, the man whom the anti-Roosevelt faction had execrated as the embodiment of all political evil, became a hero to the same people. As the Arab proverb has it, "the enemy of my enemy is my friend."

Today, by virtue of that break with Roosevelt and the fact that he is now to reach his 75th birthday on Thursday, Farley has become a respected elder statesman. Not of the stature of Herbert Hoover, Harry Truman, and Dwight Eisenhower, for there is a particular halo around the head of our ex-Presidents, but still well up in the national pantheon.

The Associated Press reports that on the eve of turning 75, Big Jim is much as he was when he was a cartoonist's delight, big—6 feet 2½ inches and 205 pounds—only a little white fringe around his shining pink head.

The former Democratic National Chairman and Postmaster General is as active as ever and is able, despite his duties as board chairman of Coca-Cola Export Corp., to devote much of his energy and time to politics.

He traveled more than 53,000 miles last year, 46,000 of them by air. "I spent nearly 106 hours in the air, attended 98 dinners and 78 business luncheons," he told the Associated Press. He keeps a record of everything.

How does he view the political situation today? Nothing he can see, he says, leads him to think that President Kennedy won't be reelected. "I think he has handled the situation well. I can visualize him going down as one of our greatest Presidents."

Farley believes that at this writing the Republican nomination of Rockefeller is a sure thing.

Of the man whom he helped put in office, Franklin Roosevelt, he says, "If he hadn't run for the third term he would have gone down in history as America's greatest President. The accomplishments of his first two terms were the greatest ever made by an American President."

Farley blames Roosevelt's third and fourth terms for many of the ills besetting the world today. "Those terms brought a great mind, but one worn by the weight of years and cares of state, to the all important conferences of Tehran and Yalta. We had a worn leader dividing the world in a series of concessions embodied in secret agreements which * * * are plaguing the world's children with blood, death, and fears."

Farley clearly has not forgiven his old boss.

[From the Philadelphia Daily News, June 7, 1963]

THE BEST MEMORY TEACHER

Philosophers, teachers, and members of the clergy have been telling us, time and again—a million times, maybe—that truth is a great tool to keep polished.

For one thing, if you pile one lie atop another, it's pretty hard to keep them in proper order in your memory file.

James A. Farley, the man who was campaign manager for President Franklin D. Roosevelt's first 2-term victories, was known for his remarkable memory.

Now, as he begins his 76th year, Farley gives a hint about how his memory got so good. Said Farley:

"I never lied to anyone who came to me seeking a favor or assistance. I would tell him the reason why something couldn't be done. Truth saves a lot of embarrassing questions, if you don't remember what you said."

Farley never told a truer truth.

Inadequacies in Military Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the first Member of this body to call the attention of the American people to our woeful inadequacies in military space was the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON]. The axiom that "he who controls the air controls the world" can be moved up a few hundred miles and changed to "he who controls aerospace controls the world."

Ours is a peaceful mission in space according to the administration but our enemy's mission is military. The Senator from Nevada in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post has written a very forceful and penetrating article "Are We Being Too Peaceful in Space?" I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE WE BEING TOO PEACEFUL IN SPACE?

(By Senator HOWARD W. CANNON)

A perilous notion grips Washington—that through some sort of gentleman's agreement with Russia we can quarantine space, can keep it from becoming a theater of war.

Wishfully the Nation gears its space program to peaceful purposes, blind to the fact that the Russians have no such inhibitions. While we dream, the Russians bend every effort to develop military space systems. Quite openly the are striving for a decisive advantage in that newly penetrated region.

"Peaceful purposes," the administration admits, means "keeping the peace" as well as engaging in scientific exploration and in commercial activities in space. President Kennedy has said we must insure that no other nation gains a position in space that would threaten our security. And we are orbiting numerous unmanned space vehicles which could have significant military purposes. But the disturbing fact is that we continue to put overwhelming emphasis on nonmililitary space programs and limit military efforts to a small list of defensive possibilities.

Elaborate reasons have been advanced for pursuing this policy. One used frequently is that we might somehow be able to keep space out of bounds for active warfare. The theory is that, by unilaterally avoiding development programs that could make space a combat theater in any war, we might induce the Russians to follow suit. This kind of thinking flies in the face of history. We have generally been able to discourage the Russians from a course of action only by confronting them with impressive deterrent power.

I see a discomforting parallel between our "space is for peace" attitude and our attempt from 1958 to 1961, to end competition in nuclear weapons by voluntary halting our nuclear test program.

While cobwebs gathered on our test installations in the Nevada desert and the Pacific, the Russians blithely went ahead with preparations for what was to be the most concentrated series of nuclear tests that has been held to date. Suddenly, after 3 years of naive inactivity on our part, the Russians broke the gentleman's agreement and wiped out much of this Nation's vital lead in nuclear technology.

What makes our wishful thinking in space all the more dangerous is that we do not enjoy the lead in space that we held in the nuclear field. Rather, we are still far behind the Soviet in some technical areas with enormous military potential. We are still handicapped by the inferior thrust of our largest rockets. The Russians can hurl much larger payloads into orbit, including their 50-megaton and 100-megaton bombs. We are still nowhere near matching the Soviet accomplishment of last summer in orbiting two manned Vostok spacecraft within a very short distance of one another. The date for our first rendezvous of two Gemini capsules, it would appear, has just been put back to 1965. It will greatly surprise me if the Russians have not actually joined two spacecraft in flight before this year is out and perhaps even transferred the cosmonauts flying them.

The logic of history should be enough to convince this Nation that, without an enforceable treaty limiting space activities—an unlikely eventuality—the Russians will do everything possible to exploit the military uses of space. But we need not content ourselves with the logic of history. Soviet leaders, starting with Nikita Khrushchev, have given repeated indications that the Soviet space program is aimed squarely at attaining military dominance in space.

In a speech delivered in December 1961, the Soviet Premier said: "When the imperialists decide the question of whether or not they should unleash war, the 50- and 100-megaton Soviet bombs will hang over their heads like the sword of Damocles." Later, in the same speech, he said: "If I could send up Gagarin and Titov, we could, of course, replace Gargarin and Titov with other freight, and land it where we would like to land it."

A second argument for limiting U.S. military space efforts has to do with the type of space threat we tend to think of first: bombs in orbit. The nub of this argument is that there is no point in anyone putting bombs in orbit, or on the moon, because such space-based nuclear systems would inevitably be costlier, less reliable, and less accurate than earth-based systems.

A big flaw in this reasoning is that it tends to view the Russians as mirror images of ourselves. I admit I see no immediate need for this country to push development of orbital bombers, although I do not rule out such a need at a later date. But just because space-based bombers might not fit our strategic needs for the moment, it does not follow that they would not fit Soviet ambitions. Soviet strategists may well have decided to capitalize on their advantages in rocket thrust and 100-megaton bombs.

A limited force of supersatellites carrying 100-megaton bombs might not be able to deliver nuclear blows as discriminatingly or efficiently as a bomber-Minuteman-Polaris force. Still, for a nation that has shown little hesitancy to employ blackmail, a satellite force might represent a decisive psychological weapon. You do not, after all, have to shoot something at someone to weaken him. Think what a psychological advantage the Russians would have gained had they got away with stationing offensive missiles in Cuba. What if they now turned around and placed comparable nuclear power in orbits not much farther vertically from U.S. targets than Cuba is from Miami horizontally?

To counter such a move, we might not see any gain in orbiting bomb-carrying satellites of our own. What we might urgently want would be satellites able to rendezvous with suspicious Soviet craft, detect whether they had weapons on board and, if need be, destroy them.

There are officials who, while granting such a possibility, put forward still another argument for deemphasizing military space programs. They are exponents of the so-called fallout theory, which runs this way: The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) plans to spend $20 billion putting a two-man expedition on the moon by 1970. In doing so, the civilian space agency will investigate almost every technical aspect of space operations. The Defense Department needs only to adapt the technical "fallout" of this and other NASA programs to its own requirements if a Soviet military threat in space materializes.

This pat theory will not withstand close examination. While many requirements for space flight apply equally to civilian and military operations, there are some unique military requirements no amount of civilian oriented effort will satisfy.

Military vehicles must react instantaneously to enemy thrusts. The launching of a scientific vehicle, by contrast, can ordinarily be delayed to await improvement in the weather or to permit a last-minute item-by-item checkout of the rocket. Military vehicles must operate from places dictated by military needs, not from a limited number of well-established launch pads at Cape Canaveral and other research centers. They must be able to return to base and fly another day, since military operations are likely to be repetitive, and the cost of launching one-shot vehicles would be unbearable.

There is another decisive difference. A military operation—in tanks, subs, planes or space vehicles—is not just a matter of having the right hardware. The best hardware is useless in war without crews trained for their mission, a well-oiled maintenance and supply system and an operational doctrine worked out not simply in a "think factory" but through field trials, the field in this case being space.

It takes time to build a ready-to-go military capability. Right now it may look as though earth-based systems constitute a force adequate to deter any strategic attack. But technology is advancing so swiftly it is possible that scientists might at any moment accomplish another "breakthrough" as significant as the perfection of the H-bomb. If they do, the capability to conduct military operations in space may suddenly become decisive.

The same objections hold, only more firmly, for the contention that the United States can take out adequate space insurance by developing a storehouse of "building blocks." The Titan III workhorse rocket booster; various infrared, optical and other apparatus for detecting what is aboard other nations' satellites; and an exotic line of winged space vehicles are examples of "building blocks" now being worked on. The theory is that if a Soviet space threat did become evident, the blocks could be pulled off the shelves and a military space force put together in short order. But what about mission training, supply and operational doctrine? There are months, more likely years, between the production of military equipment and the ability to use that equipment in an efficient way, particularly in a forbidding new environment.

There have been recent signs that highly placed officials are beginning to recognize the reality of the Soviet space threat. But in the past there have been similar ripples of interest that soon dissipated. Whatever new interest there is has not yet been translated into specific new space programs. Nor is there anything like adequate funding in the proposed space budget for the fiscal year starting July 1. I would like to see the Defense Department come to the Congress with a program calling for:

First. Speedy development of orbiting vehicles able to rendezvous with, inspect and, if necessary, disable potentially hostile spacecraft.

Second. An early opportunity for the Air Force to conduct complete space missions on its own so as to acquire vital across-the-board experience in space operations. The best course is for the Air Force to be authorized, as agent of the Defense Department, to orbit its own versions of the wingless, ballistic, two-man Gemini capsules NASA is building as a step in its man-on-the-moon program.

Third. NASA-Defense Department joint planning for development of an orbiting space station large enough for 20 to 30 crewmen. Provision would be made for crews to rotate every 2 to 4 weeks through use of space taxis. The permanent space station could serve as a command post for controlling space interceptors, orbital antimissile systems and other components of a military space force. Eventually we might want to orbit strategic space stations able to carry heavy payloads. When it becomes possible to deploy as many as 100 weapons, or several hundred, on a single space platform, the space bomber might for the first time become economically competitive with earth-based strategic systems.

(4) Stepped-up work on rocket boosters that could be recovered after launch and used again. An alternative is the ambitious concept of an "aerospace" plane that could takeoff conventionally from a runway, propel itself into orbit and eventually return to the takeoff runway.

TOO MUCH BUCK ROGERS?

The above proposals, prior to Sputnik I, would have sounded like the notions of someone who had read too much Buck Rogers. So much has happened since Sputnik I, however, that they should sound now like simple prudence for any nation intent on preserving its security.

They should. But will they? There are well-meaning scientists, some in high places, who doubt that space-based weapons could accomplish anything not better accomplished from nearer the earth. History indicates they are wrong, that they underestimate the speed of advancing technology. In any case, we cannot afford to gamble. If we dismiss the military potential in space, we may be startled one day—like the day Sputnik I was orbited—to discover, from the accomplishments of potential enemies, how wrong we have been. And by then, because technology is advancing in ever longer quantum jumps, it may be too late to do anything about it.

Secret of New Hampshire's Industrial Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the industrial director of the Division of Economic Development in the State of New Hampshire, Mr. Winfred L. Foss, recently wrote a splendid article setting forth the basis for New Hampshire's industrial progress. As he points out, the approach of our industries and the cooperating agencies of the State government has been remarkably free from the gimmickry that so often besets industrial expansion schemes. His message is a distillation of Yankee wisdom on this subject and describes New Hampshire's experience in a manner well suited to be useful to other States. I ask unanimous consent that his article, "New Hampshire Needs No Gimmicks," in the American Banker for June 10, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW HAMPSHIRE NEEDS NO GIMMICKS

The secret of New Hampshire's industrial growth is that "there is no secret."

New Hampshire has no "get industry quick" schemes. It cannot, under its constitution, give tax concessions to industry.

Its tax structure rates only average in its impact on industry. It has no enabling law permitting its towns and cities to bond themselves for industrial construction.

In spite of these limitations, for two decades New Hampshire has been building an industrial economy which one out-of-State observer recently characterized as "a bright spot in the Nation's economy."

Statistics tell the story:

New Hampshire ranks second among the States in the percentage of population employed in manufacturing.

Manufacturing employment continues to grow, reversing a national trend. The gain over the past decade approximated 5,000.

Nonmanufacturing employment is growing even faster, topping the rate of all other New England States.

New Hampshire's unemployment rate is usually the lowest in New England and consistently below the national average. In August 1962, it dropped to a phenomenal 2.6 percent.

Population growth (12.7 percent in the last decade) is the second most rapid in New England.

How come this record of growth and progress, in a State which confesses to having some handicaps and lays no claim to a pet formula?

Continuity of effort, plus a good industrial climate, are the major factors.

New Hampshire was one of the first States to get into the industrial development field, and some of its recently acquired industries are the results of efforts which had their beginning 30 years ago.

EARLY START

This early beginning was important. The record shows that the annual increase in New only partly from the influx of new industry—much of it results from the expansion of companies establishing here 5, 10 or 20 years ago. The increase has strong similarities to the increase of many at compound interest.

An example of how an industrial investment made a dozen years ago has paid steadily increasing dividends in industrial jobs is found in Nashua. Here, Sanders Associates established itself in the early 1950's with some 100 employees.

Steady and rapid growth has now made Sanders one of the State's largest employers, with more than 2,000 on its payroll at plants in Nashua and Manchester, and three additional plants in Massachusetts and New York.

An early start and a consistent follow-up have not, however, all by themselves, been responsible for New Hampshire's dynamic economy. Of greater importance is New Hampshire's "good industrial climate," in which labor attitudes are the major ingredient.

New Hampshire is not a State inhabited wholly by Yankees any more. It hasn't been since the last century, when thousands of French Canadians moved in to become weavers and spinners in the State's then-dominant textile industry.

But these newcomers already had many Yankee characteristics—and more rubbed off on them. By and large, New Hampshire workers are still characterized by the Yankee traits of self-sufficiency, independence, and pride.

All three of these traits are reflected in the New Hampshire worker's attitude toward unions. He isn't antiunion. As a matter of fact, some 50 percent of the State's industrial workers are union members. But he isn't union dominated, doesn't regard a union as an absolute essential, and prefers making his own decisions to having them made for him by a union.

The disposition of the New Hampshire worker to do his own bargaining and settle his own grievances is shown by the comment of one manufacturer:

"I don't have a union in my plant and don't expect to have one, so long as I leave my office door open to anybody who wants to come in and talk with me."

This type of camaraderie between employer and worker is typical. An out-of-State newspaperman, taken on a tour of the Keene plant of Miniature Precision Bearings, Inc., by Horace Gilbert, president, made this observation:

"I can't get over the number of workers who addressed the president of the company by his first name."

The first-name relationship works both ways. The typical industrial worker likes to be known as a person—not as a number—to his employer. Perhaps this wish to be an individual is the reason for his relative reluctance to merge himself into a union and let a bargaining agent do his talking for him.

These worker attitudes add up to one of New Hampshire's key attractions for industry—its low incidence of strikes and work stoppages. Consistently, New Hampshire has one of the best records in the Nation in number of man-days lost through work stoppages. Labor turnover is similarly low.

Along with cooperative and productive labor, New Hampshire offers the industrialist a tax structure which bears less heavily on the manufacturer than that of many other States.

New Hampshire is one of the few States with neither a corporate income tax nor a sales tax. For revenue, it leans heavily on taxes on parimutuel betting, alcoholic beverages, and tobacco. During the present session of the legislature, it took an additional step in this direction by creating a State-operated sweepstakes, forecast to bring in an additional $4 million or more per year.

These so-called voluntary taxes—voluntary because its citizens and guests don't have to pay them unless they choose to drink, smoke or gamble—are supplemented at the local level by a property tax levied on land, buildings and inventory.

New Hampshiremen freely confess that this tax structure has faults. There was strong opposition to the sweepstakes bill by people who thought that the State was depending too heavily on voluntary taxes. The property tax is generally regarded as too high and there has been a continuing demand that the tax on inventory be repealed as inequitable.

But there is no immediate prospect of any important change in tax structure, mostly because the present one works. Particularly, in this industry-conscious State, there have been few complaints from industry that the burden of taxation is excessive.

Industrialists generally find that they can live with this tax structure. One, a recent transplant to New Hampshire from another State, even went so far as to state that he expected that New Hampshire's tax structure and economic climate would result in a saving of $50,000 over cost in his previous location.

Although New Hampshire has no industrial development gimmicks, it has its share of what might be called aids to industry, some of which are unique.

The New Hampshire Industrial Park Authority is an agency of State government with broad powers. Originally, it was an agency to finance the development of raw land into industrial sites in cooperation with local agencies. It was also authorized to finance the construction of industrial plants. Two years ago, its powers were increased to enable it to guarantee loans to the extent necessary to make possible 100 percent financing of new industrial plants.

The New Hampshire Business Development Corp., a private agency, makes both construction and working capital loans to industry, usually in second position. It, also, had its powers broadened two years ago when the legislature revised its charter to permit it to guarantee loans to industry.

In addition to these State-wide agencies, there are 30-odd local industrial development corporations, some of which have been highly effective. One of these, Concord Regional Development Corp., was singled out by Donald R. Gilmore, regional economist, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, as outstanding among all such organizations in the Nation.

UPRISING, CARNEGIE HALL, NEW YORK CITY

All of these agencies have been exceedingly effective. It is significant to note, however, that their effectiveness has not been achieved at the expense of departures from sound business practice. There have been no special interest rates offered, and loans have had to stand up under rigid scrutiny.

Further, all industrial financing has been in cooperation with established banks and lending institutions. All of which is not surprising, since bankers have consistently been leaders in New Hampshire's industrial development effort, and fill many of the offices in these financing organizations.

Equally significantly, New Hampshire would still acquire industry even if it didn't have these aids. For example, the two largest industries locating in New Hampshire during the past 12 months drew on neither State nor local communities for financing assistance.

These were Sylvania Electric Products, which picked Exeter as the site for a new 600-employee plant (Sylvania's third in the State), and Tampax, Inc., which is building a 500-employee plant in Claremont.

What are New Hampshire's prospects for the future?

We will continue to attract new industry. However, we will probably find that the State stands to gain as much from assisting established industry as from attracting new industry.

In two areas of activity we can do much to promote the growth of that which we already have:

We can seek broader powers for the Industrial Park Authority in financing new plant facilities for New Hampshire manufacturers. And we can adopt a vigorous program of seeking to attract to New Hampshire the skilled labor and technicians necessary for future industrial growth.

Effectiveness of Research Sponsored by National Institutes of Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the ultimate value of funds invested in medical research cannot be measured because no one can foretell at what point work in the laboratory may unlock the mysteries of illnesses like cancer and heart diseast. Yet, criticism is directed occasionally at the National Institutes of Health for sponsorship of extensive research in various fields of medicine.

Dr. Howard A. Rusk, an assistant editor of the New York Times and internationally known chairman of the Department of Rehabilitation and Physical Medicine at New York University College of Medicine, has analyzed charges made against NIH. In an article in the Times of June 16, 1963, Dr. Rusk comments on the claim that Congress allocates to the Institutes more funds than can be used effectively. Study of testimony presented to House and Senate Appropriations Committees, he asserts, actually shows that our Nation's capacity for conducting medical research is still not being fully used, despite the annual increases in NIH funds for research.

Dr. Rusk, who has received numerous honors from public and private organizations for his achievements in medicine, concludes from his study of the record that the research program of the National Institutes of Health has demonstrated its soundness. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of his article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INSTITUTES OF HEALTH: RISING U.S. AID FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH IS CAUSE FOR PRIDE, NOT CRITICISM

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

Within the last year there has been mounting criticism of the National Institutes of Health from a relatively small number of people.

This criticism has been centered largely on the charge that the Institutes are granted more funds by the Congress than they can use effectively. The criticisms are usually sweeping generalizations lacking in documentation and evidence.

After a careful analysis of the exhaustive material gathered through extensive hearings each year by both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, one cannot help but conclude that these charges are not true.

It is correct that Federal support of medical research has grown rapidly since World War II. This, however, should be a cause for pride rather than for concern. The growths of research in defense, space, and industrial technology have been even more rapid.

QUESTIONS OF IMPORTANCE

Which is most important—to get a man on the moon before the Russians or to eradicate many of the diseases that kill and disable millions of Americans each year?

As Mike Gorman, executive director of the National Committee Against Mental Illness, pointed out recently, "the true yardstick by which these programs should be judged is how well they are succeeding in controlling or eradicating those major diseases which cost the American economy billions of dollars each year in medical outlays, lost wages and lost income taxes."

The truth of the matter is that despite increases in the budgets of the National Institutes of Health each year, our Nation's medical research capacity is still underutilized.

Each year all of the Institutes have far more applications approved by their advisory councils than they can finance within current budgets.

PROJECTS REVIEWED

The advisory councils, consisting of eminent scientists and leading citizens, review each individual project from the standpoint of scientific validity and scientific importance.

The National Institutes of Health have been authorized during the past 7 years to initiate a series of programs for the construction and equipping of health research facilities. This program provides matching funds up to 50 percent of the cost of an entire research building or a section of it.

So great has been the demand for health research facility funds that the $50 million authorized by Congress for the current fiscal year, ending this month, has already been awarded.

Outstanding against the $50 million expected to be available for the fiscal year beginning July 1 are awards approved by the advisory council totaling $61,963,291.

CENTERS ARE LINK

Another extensive program is the support of general clinical research centers in hospitals and other research institutions. These centers provide the link between basic medical research and its application to patients under rigidly controlled conditions.

There are 42 general clinical research centers in operation, and 22 others in various stages of development.

Based on experience, it is estimated that in the fiscal year beginning July 1 there will be a backlog of $7,100,000 in approved applications for which funds will not be available.

Another important program supports special research resources by providing unusual and highly specialized research tools and services for many departments and disciplines in one or more institutions.

This program supports 19 large computer centers, six LINC computer evaluation studies and one biomedical engineering center.

GRANTS WITHOUT FUNDS

It is estimated that the backlog of approved special research resources grants for the year beginning July 1 for which funds will not be available will be around $21 million.

The current and estimated backlog of approved grants for which funds are not available are for but one division of the National Institutes of Health. The same situation exists in most of the other divisions.

Critics of the National Institutes of Health have charged that unnecessary and unimportant research is supported in order to use up funds. Again an analysis of the facts shows this is not the case.

TREASURY GETS $40 MILLION

At the end of this month, which concludes the current fiscal year, the National Institutes of Health will return to the Treasury about $40 million out of a total of about $700 million appropriated by Congress for extramural research grants.

This results from the fact that the appropriations are made categorically and funds cannot be transferred from one program to another.

It is difficult to understand why a program as important as that of the National Institutes of Health, which has had the full support of the American people and which has demonstrated its soundness, should be singled out for such unjustified criticism.

Importance of American Principles and Ideals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the victims of the drive to establish a world government has been the great American ideal of patriotism, a strong spirit of dedication to our national heritage and the principles which have made our country the greatest the world has ever known. Mr. John Brock, vice president and general manager of Lowrance Newspapers in North Carolina, has written an important and interesting article on the subject of patriotism and its decline in America.

This article was published on March 13, 1963, in the Belmont Banner of Belmont, N.C., and has just come to my attention. I commend Mr. Brock for this and a number of other columns that he has written in an effort to increase American principles and ideals that must be promoted rather than forgotten.

I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Belmont (N.C.) Banner,
Mar. 13, 1963]

LISTEN: WHAT HAPPENED TO PATRIOTISM?

(By John Brock)

Is patriotism fading from the American scene?

Remember the days of—and prior to—World War II when the sight of "Old Glory" lifted the hearts of Americans to emphatic shouting or clapping? Times have changed.

Recently, an elderly gentleman stood on the downtown streets of a nearby city awaiting the passing of a parade. When the color guard came into sight, the old man raised himself majestically with his hand over his heart in that tribute of respect—the salute. Nearby a group of teenagers, sitting on the curb with cigarettes dangling from their lips, giggled at the old man's antics. To them, it was a corny gesture.

And it has recently been disclosed that at least one nearby school system has dispensed with the morning pledge of allegiance to the flag because "the schedule is simply too rushed."

The national complexion has changed. Today, anyone suggesting that America has a responsibility to itself of preserving democracy at any cost is automatically labeled by many as some sort of radical or extremist.

The word "superpatriot" has become a nasty label attached by many individuals with socialistic leanings to anyone who does not share their views. The term implies that it is possible to be too patriotic. Can this be true? Is it possible to be too patriotic? Were Nathan Hale, Patrick Henry, George Washington and the thousands who have risked or given their lives for their Nation too patriotic? They were superpatriots in a day when patriotism was respectable.

A lack of national purpose has created within young people a complete lack of understanding of democracy and the system of free enterprise.

A recent survey of 6,000 high school students representing a cross section of American youth revealed the following alarming concepts:

(1) Fifty-six percent said Government should take away (by force if necessary) from the rich and give to the poor. Karl Marx, the grandfather of communism said the same thing in his bible of communism—Das Kapital—when he said "* * * from each according to his ability; to each according to his need." Communism-socialism practices this belief.

(2) Sixty percent believed that the profit motive could be eliminated and not hurt the American system. In making such a ridiculous assertion they fail to realize that the profit motive is the pivot of free enterprise. Take it away and we have another system—communism.

(3) Sixty percent favored government control of the press, radio and television. What has happened to our dedication to the freedoms guaranteed in the Bill of Rights?

(4) Over 50 percent thought that most people are incapable of deciding for themselves and therefore the Government should decide for them. These American youngsters apparently share a common belief with Hitler, Stalin, Khrushchev, and so forth.

"These are only children," one may say. But these "children" will be going to the polls within the next 2 or 3 years to cast their votes for men who share the same distorted views. Who is at fault?

Our children are products of their environment. Perhaps, at the close of World War II we were fed up with bloodshed, ration stamps and bond rallies. Perhaps, we wanted to settle down and enjoy the victory we had won. For, after all, were we not being told that we had just fought a war to end all wars? Perhaps, we were so busy enjoying the fruitful postwar years that we forgot to tell our children why we had fought. We forgot to tell them about freedom and democracy and that they are worth fighting for.

There have been several isolated attempts recently to reinstate a program of indoctrination of schoolchildren in the concept of American liberty but these have for the most part faltered because of the unfavorable climate toward patriotism.

We have diluted ourselves into international involvements and organizations which in many cases are completely controlled by nations or individuals with concepts entirely contrary to the principles of democracy.

Through Communist inspired "thought control" we have allowed ourselves to become prejudiced against "patriots." Americanism has decayed.

We stand close to the point of no return. Unless we experience a sharp turn in our attitudes toward our personal liberties, our inherited freedom is doomed. Through political evolution, our democratic way of life is assuming the characteristics of socialism which is merely a degree of communism. We must stem the tide.

But we cannot hope to preserve freedom in an atmosphere in which there is no devotion to democratic principles. We must revive patriotism in America. We must reaffirm our belief that democracy is a God-endowed way of life—a way of life worth struggling to maintain.

Revival of patriotism is our last citadel of hope.

Imagined Dangers and Real Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, "Imagined Dangers and Real Issues" is the title of the lead editorial in today's Wall Street Journal, and it expresses the views I have stated in regard to the recent Supreme Court decision banning use of the Bible in public schools. I commend the reading of it to all Members of both Houses of the Congress.

The editorial follows:

IMAGINED DANGERS AND REAL ISSUES

Of all the dangers to a free society of which our forefathers were fearful, and against which they sought to safeguard the people in the Constitution, the one that time has proved of no danger is that the State would prescribe a religious belief.

In our history we have had many constitutional crises, some of which nearly tore the country apart. We are torn today by a constitutional issue, that of the treatment of our Negro citizens, which will require the utmost efforts of great minds to resolve without lasting political wounds.

But nowhere in our history will you find any serious threat by any church or sect to seize the State or to persuade the State to use its powers to establish it as the State religion.

This elementary fact of our history, quite apart from all of the philosophical arguments, seems to us to make absolute nonsense of the Supreme Court's decision about Bible readings in the public schools. A more ponderous effort upon a more trivial issue has rarely, if ever, emerged from the robed men who sit upon that bench.

This is not to say that the result of the decision is trivial, or that its consequences do not now raise grave questions. For what the Supreme Court has done, in the name of protecting us from the establishment of religion by the State, is to establish secularization—atheism, if you would have it bluntly—as the one belief to which the States' power will extend its protection.

Thus if you believe in the God of the Jews, the God of the Christians, or the God of Islam, you are denied absolutely any public expression of it in the schools which the public supports. Hereafter the views of the nonbeliever alone are sheltered by the full panoply of the State's police powers.

The legal and philosophical answer to this interpretation of the Constitution, it seems to us, has been well put by Mr. Justice Stewart. "We err * * * if we do not recognize, as a matter of history and as a matter of the imperatives of our free society, that religion and government must necessarily interact in countless ways." He cites example after example of the interaction—from the use of prayer in the opening of courts and Congress to the State support of chaplains to minister to those in the Armed Forces who, of their own choice, seek such ministry.

And he puts his finger surely upon the specious argument of Government "neutrality" about religion. The duty of the State is to "accommodate those differences" of belief which a free society makes inevitable, not to try to set up "impermissible categories" and so throw its weight against those who may desire public expression of their beliefs.

"A compulsory state educational system so structures a child's life," he observes, "that if religious exercises are held to be impermissible in schools, religion is placed at an artificial and state-created disadvantage." In short, not neutrality but state action against religion.

Yet much as we share Justice Stewart's views, it is not alone the philosophy of the Court majority that troubles us. Surely it is a distorition of the Constitution to suggest that when the Founding Fathers put into it the prohibition against "the establishment of religion" they were aiming even distantly at a prohibition against the reading of Scripture or of prayers in public bodies, including the schools. To them "establishment" meant literally setting up a state religion.

It is certainly a distortion of the views of such men as Madison and Jefferson and Roger Williams to suggest that their devotion to religious liberty is somehow the seed of the view to which this Court has now come, depriving people of the liberty to express their religious views openly in the school.

And what are we to make of it when this Court, in order to buttress this opinion, reminds us of the danger "that powerful sects * * * might bring about a fusion of governmental and religious functions"? Are we to suppose that this danger, rightly guarded against by the Constitution, is somehow now threatened because schoolchildren hear the Bible read?

Apparently so. For in warning us against this "minor encroachment" against the Constitution, the Court thunders that "the breach of neutrality that is today a trickling stream may all too soon become a raging torrent." Here, without doubt, is upside-down logic. For if there has been any consistent trend in our religious history, it is that what might once have been described as a raging torrent of religious intolerance has become by comparison a trickling stream.

It is this disparity between argument and reality, between cause and remedy, that troubles us in the Court's decision. Perhaps it is undesirable public policy—although we do not think so—to provide a moment of prayer, or a brief reading of the Scriptures, in a school whose purpose is to teach the ideas upon which Western society is based.

But it is wholly ridiculous to argue that this practice, followed by generation after generation without injury to our institutions, is now suddenly become a thing to undermine the Republic and demand the most absolute prohibitions against it in the name of the Constitution.

And it does not augur well for the future to see our highest judges torture history and turn metaphysical handsprings to justify that which they wish to decide. In the real constitutional issues which face the Nation today we should not have to fear that small minds will be brought to great questions.

Critics Disputed in Birch Findings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article appearing in the New York Times under date of June 13. This article gives a brief summary of a report filed by the Senate Un-American Activities Subcommittee of the California Legislature after an exhaustive investigation of the John Birch Society. This report found that the John Birch Society was not a subversive organization. It also found that the Communist Party in California had dwindled in membership but that the hardcore was more than making up for this in zeal and renewed activity, particularly through front organizations.

It also found that there were Communists in the SANE organization—a "ban-the-bomb" group.

The report challenged a widely quoted suggestion of State Attorney General Stanley Mosk to the effect that the John Birch Society's nucleus consisted primarily of "wealthy businessmen, retired military officers, and little old ladies in tennis shoes."

The article follows:

CRITICS DISPUTED IN BIRCH FINDINGS—CALIFORNIA SENATE'S INQUIRY UNCOVERS NO SUBVERSION

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, June 12—The California Senate's Un-American Activities Subcommittee reported today that it had not found the John Birch Society subversive or anti-Semitic, as its critics have charged.

The findings came in a 200-page report following a 2-year inquiry on political and quasi-political movements.

The panel also held that the Southern California section of the national committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy had become "a left-wing propaganda apparatus, contrary to the national organization's policies."

Regarding the Communist Party in California, the subcommittee reported that its membership had dwindled, but that its "hardcore" was "more than making up in zeal and renewed activity," particularly through front organizations.

It said the party had reversed its policy of nonsupport for the Black Muslim separatist movement.

The subcommittee, a standing body, was headed by Hugh Burns, Fresno Democrat, president pro tem of the senate. This was its 12th report. Its investigations on subversive activities have drawn national attention.

The inquiry on the ultraconservative Birch Society was made at the instance of the society's founder, Robert H. W. Welch, Jr., of Belmont, Mass. After 2 years, its zealous anti-Communist activities had aroused criticism, particularly in California.

The investigators took issue with many of Mr. Welch's rash views. They found that typical members of the society did not necessarily subscribe to his views.

The report challenged a widely quoted suggestion by State Attorney General Stanley Mosk that the society's nucleus consisted primarily of "wealthy businessmen, retired military officers and little old ladies in tennis shoes."

While the movement has "unstable" members, the 60-page Birch section of the report said, the members generally seem to be citizens particularly concerned about "the advances of the world Communist movement and the advances of Communist subversion in this country."

Membership in the State was estimated at 5,000 in 300 chapters, with perhaps 60,000 more "oriented toward the Birch program." That is about 1 percent of the State's electorate.

The investigation included interviewing pro- and anti-Birch people, documentation in 91 affidavits and sworn statements, and attendance at many society meetings.

"The alleged secrecy and conspiratorial atmosphere in which the society is said to operate, coupled with its authoritarian control, have provoked allegations that it is a fascist organization," the report said. "We found little evidence of secrecy, so far as the conduct of meetings was concerned.

"The feature that distinguishes the Birch Society from other anti-Communist groups is its combination of study and direct action."

Among Mr. Welch's views that the panel disputed were that Presidents Kennedy, Harry S. Truman, and Dwight D. Eisenhower had acted as Communist pawns and that the publication of the novel "Dr. Zhivago," by the antitotalitarian Soviet author, Boris Pasternak, was a Communist plot.

The report said the society had admittedly "adopted many Communist techniques" in organization and propaganda, but added:

"There is, of course, this distinction—the Communist Party is directed from abroad."

Regarding the SANE branch here, the subcommittee found that until 1961 it had adhered to the national organization's "nonpolitical" policies under the cochairmanship of Steve Allen, the entertainer and one of its prime movers, and Robert Ryan, the actor. Mr. Allen is national vice chairman of the organization, which is headed by Norman Cousins, editor of The Saturday Review.

Subsequently, however, the report continued, several key positions in the unit here were taken over by individuals with long records of Communist-line work.

The report dwelt especially on William R. Bidner, political-action chairman of the unit. It said he had "plunged the organization headlong" into the 1962 California political campaign, and now "defiantly refuses to obey the rules of the national movement, which it [the unit] has perverted into a left-wing propaganda apparatus."

Mr. Bidner was described as former executive director of the Mobilization for Democracy and the Civil Rights Congress, both of which the subcommittee classified as important Communist-front organizations.

In a comment today Dr. S. Mark Doran, a vice chairman of the Los Angeles SANE unit said, "there are no known Communists" in the group. Other officers could not be reached immediately.

The subcommittee, noting the growth of the Black Muslims, especially in New York and California, said:

"There is no question about its accomplishing much good for many of its own members rehabilitating many semiliterate Negroes who were alcoholics, drug addicts, and habitual criminals.

"At mass meetings, however, the studied restraints vanish and members are soon aroused to a high emotional fervor."

The other members of the subcommittee were Senators J. Howard Williams, Charles Brown, Aaron Quick, John F. Thompson, and Stephen Teale.

Federal Manpower Training Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as we pass legislation establishing programs to aid in area redevelopment or overcome deficiencies in employment, I find myself wondering about the effectiveness and results of the programs. Therefore, it was interesting to me to find in my own State of Oregon that a successful job training program in Astoria wherein 20 women are taking a 10-week course to become fish filleters is being watched with interest and is already proving valuable.

Astoria is a community that my colleague, Senator MORSE, and I speak about frequently as it has an excellent Government installation known as Tongue Point which is now idle and its deactivation has brought some economic distress to the area. At least this program will be a boost to the community not to mention the women themselves who are receiving financial aid while learning a new skill.

I ask unanimous consent that this article from the Oregon Labor Press be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASTORIANS LEARN NEW SKILLS IN UNIQUE TRAINEE PROGRAM

ASTORIA.—Twenty women are taking a 10-week course to become fish filleters through the Manpower Development Training Act in a program that marks several firsts.

It is the first on-the-job training program to be instituted in the Nation for women workers and is the first under the Manpower Development Act utilizing classroom and at-work training.

The program was instituted in ceremonies attended by officials of the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Apprenticeship, Oregon State Department of Employment, State Department of Education, Clatsop Community College, United Packinghouse Workers' Local 554, Astoria Seafood Dealers' Association, and Astoria Mayor Harry Steinbock.

Training started this week for the 20 women, who will fill an urgent need for journeymen filleters in the seafood processing industry of this Oregon coastal city.

In a joint statement, the various participating groups said their mutual cooperation "proved once again that Federal and State agencies working in unison can assist industry in many areas to provide the skilled manpower needed to reduce unemployment and bolster the local economy."

After 2 weeks of classroom instruction at the community college the women will be divided into four groups for on-the-job training at four plants. They will be paid $1.89 an hour in conformity with the current bargaining agreement between the plants and local 554.

Cost of the program is borne by the Federal Government and the local seafood industry, with the latter putting in about twice the amount provided by the Government.

Apprenticeship Bureau officials noted that the Manpower Development Act calls for adherence to existing union contracts in setting up such programs and that the act prohibits training courses that interfere or compete with existing apprenticeship programs.

Interest of Communists in the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Hanahan News, which is published in North Charleston, S.C., prints each week a very interesting column entitled, "Fact and Opinion by the Minuteman." This week's column entitled "Reds in the Canal" is particularly interesting and I feel merits the attention of the Members of this body. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that this column from the June 12, 1963, issue be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS IN THE CANAL

Aside from the possibility that a history examination may have contained a question about the Panama Canal and consequently we studied how and when it was built, have you ever given it more thought?

Until recently we hadn't. But the annual report for 1962 has now been released by the Panama Canal Co., said company being a corporate agency and instrumentality of the Government of the United States, and this prompted a little research which revealed more than a passing interest in the Canal is held by that short, fat man from the Ukraine and the rest of the international conspirators that go to make up the Communist hierarchy.

Consider these items. In the years 1931–32 Soviet espionage agents attempted to obtain a copy of the U.S. Army's highly secret "white plan" which was the operational plans for the Army in case of riot in the Panama Canal Zone.

In 1962 the volume of cargo moving through the canal to Red China totaled 877,000 long tons (a long ton is about 2,200 pounds), for an increase of 600 percent over 1961 and movements to Russia totaled 344,000 long tons, for an increase of 48 percent over the previous year. Sugar movements from Cuba accounted for the vast majority of this tonnage. In the return flow of cargo, Red China and Russia shipped 52,000 tons of cargo to Cuba via the Panama Canal.

In the 30-year span the Red interest seems to have shifted somewhat. It can only be surmised, but with reasonable accuracy, that the Soviet interest in the thirties was for subversion of a violent nature. Today's interest is for the more sophisticated style of economic subversion.

In 1963 we have the canal, bought and paid for around the turn of this century with American lives and money and subsequently maintained to this date in similar manner, being used by the Red conspiracy to foster trade, bring in wealth with which to wage war against the free world and particularly to support subversion in this hemisphere by the maintenance of the puppet Castro.

Knowing full well that whoever holds the canal has a hand on the jugular vein of seagoing commerce, the Soviet Union has waged an incessant battle against the United States in Panama.

Panamanians working for Uncle Sam earn anywhere from 20 to 180 percent more than they could earn working for either the Panamanian Government or private Panamanian employers, according to the U.S. News & World Report. Every year the United States pays Panama over $2 million as its negotiated share of the canal profits. In 1962 alone the United States put in over $16 million worth of improvements in the Canal Zone. In addition, the United States will pour over $25 million into Panama by 1970 under the Alliance for Progress plan of the Kennedy administration.

Despite this American contribution to the Panamanian economy, "baiting the United States" has become the national pastime. The situation is becoming highly combustible. Over the past few years leftist elements have instigated riots, threats to nationalize the Canal (as Nasser did the Suez), demands for higher share of canal revenues, pressure on the United States to raise Panamanian wages, agitation for the right to fly the Panamanian flag over the Canal—which by the treaty of 1903 is exclusively American property—and last year's attempt by Castro admiring Panamanian Assemblywoman Thelma King to have a bill passed which would have had Panama, and not the United States, inaugurate the American paid-for $20 million Thatcher Ferry Bridge.

That some of these pressures have had Nationalist support is not disputed. But by and large they have been planned in Moscow as part of an overall design to have America kicked out of a Panama that would then be ripe for Soviet takeover.

That Panamanian Nationalists could forever prevent a Soviet takeover is very doubtful. The Reds work on long range plans and have started in Panama's only college. Recent elections in the student body gave 60 out of 70 seats to the leftist orientated University Reformist Front. Student leaders admitted to Ralph K. Skinner of the Christian Science Monitor, a reliable anti-Communist and pro-American publication, that they had been trained in Castro's Cuba and other anti-American countries.

From the University of Panama must come the future leaders of the country and you don't get "Panama for Panamanians" style leaders out of the little red schoolhouse.

Pope John XXIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, in the 2 short weeks since the passing of Pope John XXIII, there have been millions of words spoken and written about this unfortunate event.

From political and spiritual leaders of the first magnitude to the Italian peasants who filled St. Peter's Square to overflowing, there have come universal expressions of sorrow.

The Nantucket Inquirer and Mirror has been able to express this universal feeling in a particularly fine and yet brief editorial. For this reason, I recommend it to my colleagues:

POPE JOHN XXIII

Pope John XXIII who died Monday was a great spiritual leader. He is mourned by people of all persuasions. His universal appeal grew from the excellence of his simplicity, his sincerity, his humility and his piety. The entire world has been immensely enriched by the quality of his character and by the saintly example he set. While Pope John is dead, the wholesome influence of his life lives on.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: We, the Bay Area "Rosdom" Chapter of the Armenian Youth Federation of America, have resolved to support passage of House Resolutions 14–15, calling for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

As Americans of Armenian ancestry, we firmly believe that the case of the captive nations must be presented to the public, in order to maintain and uphold the democratic ideals and standards of the United States of America. Establishment of such a committee, we feel, will provide the necessary mechanism to study and impart its recommendations for solution of the problem of captive nations.

Our feelings in this matter have also been related to Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the Rules Committee, in hopes that your resolution will be released for discussion and passage on the floor of Congress.

We would like to take this opportunity to commend your stand on this matter.

Sincerely,

SUSAN VARTANIAN.

DETROIT, MICH., *May 30, 1963*.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Am finally taking a few minutes to communicate to you a few words which I have been wanting to say to you for some time. You, sir, are to be complimented highly for your persistent and unrelenting efforts on behalf of establishing a congressional committee on captive nations. Our commitment to these nations is a morally binding one since our failures and our mistakes have played so large and significant a part in their enslavement. In spite of past history, we remain the one sole hope for liberation from Communist tyranny in the hearts and souls of the captive nations. I urge you to continue your praiseworthy efforts on the captive nations' behalf. And may your efforts prove fruitful. God bless you.

Sincerely,

DON LOBSINGER.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS
COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA BRANCH,
Richmond, Calif., May 29, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: We are very happy to hear of your efforts to create a committee on the captive nations in the House of Representatives, and we wholeheartedly support you.

We are enclosing a copy of our letter to Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH relative to House Resolution 14.

We are also enclosing a brochure published by our organization; it contains facts about Ukraine, one of the captive nations under Russian Communist domination.

Very truly yours,

ALEXANDER LYSKO,
President.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC., SAN FRANCISCO
BAY AREA BRANCH,
Richmond, Calif., May 29, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: As spokesman for our organization, I respectfully request your favorable consideration of the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14), which would create a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. Our reasoning is as follows:

The Russians make up less than half the population of the Soviet Union. The rest of the population consists of many different nationalities, some small in number, some large, but all having different historical backgrounds, languages, and customs from those of the Russian people. The Ukrainians (40 million) comprise the largest number of non-Russians dwelling in the Soviet Union. All these non-Russian nationalities were once independent, but became victims of Russian imperialism. All these subjugated peoples are treated as second-class citizens of the Soviet Union, and they are waiting for the right moment to cast off Russian domination and be free once again. Under Russian domination are also many nations we call satellites; they also are looking for the right moment to shake off the Russian yoke. This is the Achilles heel of Russia.

Unfortunately, too many Americans; including political leaders, seem to be uninformed about these elementary facts regarding the Soviet Union. Since the Soviet Union is the greatest threat to our democracy, it is imperative that we know the true facts about the Soviet Union. A permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives will be of tremendous use in supplying to the American people and their political leaders the necessary data about the Soviet Union and the problems of the subjugated peoples in the Soviet Union.

The existence of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives will give encouragement to the subjugated peoples and strengthen their resistance to their Russian Communist rulers.

For these reasons, the logical and certain consequences of creating such a committee will be a strengthening of the position of the United States and a weakening of the position of the Soviet Union.

I hope you will give due consideration to the above mentioned reasons and give your support to the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14).

I am enclosing a brochure published by our organization; it contains facts about Ukraine, one of the captive nations under Russian Communist domination.

Respectfully yours,

ALEXANDER LYSKO,
President.

ARMENIAN YOUTH FEDERATION
OF AMERICA,
Los Angeles, Calif., May 27, 1963.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The Musa Dagh Chapter of the Armenian Youth Federation of America would like to inform you that a resolution has been passed by our chapter supporting passage of House Resolution 14–15, submitted by you, which calls for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

The formation of such a committee is undoubtedly imperative to the security and welfare of the United States, and will give people under Soviet bondage a little hope for future freedom.

We are also contacting, in addition to this letter, Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the Rules Committee, urging him to support your resolution by releasing it to the House floor for quick debate and passage.

We take this opportunity to commend you for your stand in this matter, and to assure you of our support in your fight for your resolution.

Sincerely,

AYF MUSA DAGH CHAPTER,
VARTOUHY INJEYAN,
President.

ST. JOSEPH HIGH SCHOOL,
Cleveland, Ohio, May 26, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Just a brief letter to express to you my most sincere hope that your current efforts to bring House Resolution 14 to the floor of the House may prove to be successful.

I have written a letter to Chairman SMITH, of the Committee on Rules, expressing this same desire, and it is my hope that this letter might be able to do some good.

I was very sad to see that Secretary Rusk has taken a negative stand on this resolution. It is still very disconcerting to see the U.S. State Department stepping in to protect the interests of atheistic communism rather than those of the captive nations which are captive today partly because of similar State Department approaches to foreign policy.

It is my fervent hope that the resolution can be brought out of the Rules Committee and onto the floor in order that the will of the House can be made manifest.

With every good wish for your success, I remain.

Sincerely,

Brother JOHN PUTKA, S.M.

Imagined Dangers and Real Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court's recent decision with respect to prayers and Bible readings in our classrooms comes as a shock to those of us who believe in a Supreme Being.

An article appearing in the editorial section of the June 19 issue of the Wall Street Journal brings into perspective the precise character of this decision and poses its catastrophic implications with the respect to the American society.

I insert this article into the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

IMAGINED DANGERS AND REAL ISSUES

Of all the dangers to a free society of which our forefathers were fearful, and against which they sought to safeguard the people in the Constitution, the one that time has proved of no danger is that the state would prescribe a religious belief.

In our history we have had many constitutional crises, some of which nearly tore the country apart. We are torn today by a constitutional issue, that of the treatment of our Negro citizens, which will require the utmost efforts of great minds to resolve without lasting political wounds.

But nowhere in our history will you find any serious threat by any church or sect to seize the state or to persuade the state to use its powers to establish it as the state religion.

This elementary fact of our history, quite apart from all of the philosophical arguments, seems to us to make absolute nonsense of the Supreme Court's decision about Bible readings in the public schools. A more ponderous effort upon a more trivial issue has rarely, if ever, emerged from the robed men who sit upon that bench.

This is not to say that the result of the decision is trivial, or that its consequences do not now raise grave questions. For what the Supreme Court has done, in the name of protecting us from the establishment of religion by the state, is to establish secularization—atheism, if you would have it bluntly—as the one belief to which the state's power will extend its protection.

Thus if you believe in the God of the Jews, the God of the Christians, or the God of Islam, you are denied absolutely any public expression of it in the schools which the public supports. Hereafter the views of the nonbeliever alone are sheltered by the full panoply of the state's police powers.

The legal and philosophical answer to this interpretation of the Constitution, it seems to us, has been well put by Mr. Justice Stewart. "We err * * * if we do not recognize, as a matter of history and as a matter of the imperatives of our free society, that religion and Government must necessarily interact in countless ways." He cites example after example of the interaction—from the use of prayer in the opening of courts and Congress to the state support of chaplains to minister to those in the Armed Forces who, of their own choice, seek such ministry.

And he puts his finger surely upon the specious argument of Government neutrality about religion. The duty of the state is to accommodate those differences of belief which a free society makes inevitable, not to try to set up impermissible categories and so throw its weight against those who may desire public expression of their beliefs.

"A compulsory state educational system so structures a child's life," he observes, "that if religious exercises are held to be impermissible in schools, religion is placed at an artificial and state-created disadvantage." In short, not neutrality but State action against religion.

Yet much as we share Justice Stewart's views, it is not alone the philosophy of the Court majority that troubles us. Surely it is a distortion of the Constitution to suggest that when the Founding Fathers put into it the prohibition against "the establishment of religion" they were aiming even distantly at a prohibition against the reading of Scripture or of prayers in public bodies, including the schools. To them "establishment" meant literally setting up a state religion.

It is certainly a distortion of the views of such men as Madison and Jefferson and Roger Williams to suggest that their devotion to religious liberty is somehow the seed of the view to which this Court has now come, depriving people of the liberty to express their religious views openly in the school.

And what are we to make of it when this Court, in order to buttress this opinion, reminds us of the danger "that powerful sects * * * might bring about a fusion of governmental and religious functions"? Are we to suppose that this danger, rightly guarded against by the Constitution, is somehow now threatened because schoolchildren hear the Bible read?

Apparently so. For in warning us against this "minor encroachment" against the Constitution, the Court thunders that "the breach of neutrality that is today a trickling stream may all too soon become a raging torrent." Here, without doubt, is upside-down logic. For if there has been any consistent trend in our religious history, it is that what might once have been described as a raging torrent of religious intolerance has become by comparison a trickling stream.

It is this disparity between argument and reality, between cause and remedy, that troubles us in the Court's decision. Perhaps it is undesirable public policy—although we do not think so—to provide a moment of prayer, or a brief reading of the Scriptures, in a school whose purpose is to teach the ideas upon which Western society is based.

But it is wholly ridiculous to argue that this practice, followed by generation after generation without injury to our institutions, is now suddenly become a thing to undermine the Republic and demand the most absolute prohibitions against it in the name of the Constitution.

And it does not augur well for the future to see our highest judges torture history and turn metaphysical handsprings to justify that which they wish to decide. In the real constitutional issues which face the Nation today we should not have to fear that small minds will be brought to great questions.

New England Commercial Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the monthly magazine Boston, published by the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, in the May 1963 issue, carried an outstanding article by Richard Neff entitled "New Hope for Boston's Oldest Industry." New technology and the imagination of New England fisheries managers have created bright new hopes for the commercial fishing industry of the western North Atlantic. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW HOPE FOR BOSTON'S OLDEST INDUSTRY

(By Richard Neff)

About 2 years ago, the cold war came to New England's fishing industry.

Soviet fishing boats appeared on George's Bank near Cape Cod, and brought new international competition to fishing banks that were once almost a private reservation for Boston and New England fishermen.

For many New Englanders outside the fishing industry, this dramatized for the first time the period of challenge that currently faces the oldest industry in the six-State area.

People in the industry had, of course, been long aware of competition from a growing number of countries. But it took the advent of Soviet boats, and their inevitable association with the cold war, to awaken other Americans to what is happening these days in fishing grounds off the New England coasts.

Soviet trawlers, for all the sinister aura that surrounds them, are not the major competition for local fishermen. The Soviets fish primarily for herring (which has very little market in the United States) and ship it back to the U.S.S.R.

Competition comes instead from Canada, followed by Denmark, Iceland, Norway, and several other nations. Recently, a Japanese boat came to one of the more northerly fishing banks, bringing an added reminder that more nations are getting into the act.

All these countries have a perfect right to be there. The fishing banks are in international waters, governed only by certain international agreements about how fishing shall be done.

But what does it mean to local fishermen?

It means that 48 percent of fish consumed currently in the United States comes from foreign boats. Imports have more than doubled since 1949.

Also, it means that a relatively stable supply of fish is being sought by more and more boats.

Furthermore, these foreign vessels are new—mostly built with heavy government subsidies from their home governments. Icelandic and Norwegian fleets were built up after World War II largely with American economic help. Because of American labor costs and other factors, a fishing trawler costs about twice as much to build in the United States as it does in Europe, yet a law dating back to 1792 in this country forbids Americans to have trawlers built overseas.

Though foreign boats are generally quite new, New England vessels are an average of 25 years old. Until a new trawler was added recently to the Boston fleet, there had not been a new boat for the past 14 years.

Older boats cost more to insure, repair, and operate. They often lack adequate refrigeration facilities—necessary because fish perish quickly and must be brought some distance back to port. Poor living conditions on the older boats deter young men from joining the local fleet, thus making it still more uncompetitive with other nations.

Boston's fleet has declined from 120 boats after World War II to about 60. Up in Gloucester, the number has slipped from 400 to 100 during the same period, "and almost every month another fishing boat gives up and goes out of business," said former U.S. Senator Benjamin Smith, of Gloucester, in one of his Senate speeches last year.

Observers watching this decline recall that the fishing industry is the oldest in New England. Export trade began here back in the 1600's, with the shipment of cod to Europe. Capital reaped from this trade provided an important base for other industries such as textiles, jewelry, shoes, and confectionery.

Now—is this time-honored fishing industry about to die? Or is there hope for a revival?

Several vigorous imaginative leaders at Boston's fish pier and at other ports in New England, say emphatically, "There is great hope."

And they show you why.

One of these leaders is Thomas A. Fulham, chairman of Fulham Bros., Inc., a fish processing firm at the pier. In defiance of all pessimists who said, "it'll never work," Mr. Fulham and a group of associates formed the Boston Fishing Boat, Inc., and last year invested heavily in construction of a new trawler—the MV *Massachusetts*, a 124-foot, $485,000 boat that several months ago joined the local fleet. It is now doing "extremely well," pier officials report.

Mr. Fulham looks around the pier, with its many rusty, creaking boats, and explains, "if one man, living in a rundown area, paints his house, the neighbors may tend to follow suit. Eventually, the whole block may be revived."

Already Mr. Fulham's vision is having effect. The shipbuilding company in Sturgeon Bay, Wis., that built the MV *Massachusetts* decided to follow by building a boat of its own. It is expected to join the Boston fleet early in May and will become "the second freshly painted house on the block."

And beyond this, there is talk of more new boats.

Construction of the MV *Massachusetts* was made possible by a Federal subsidy of one-third of the cost, and a loan from the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co. The John Hancock loan was further evidence of Boston's confidence in the future of its fishing industry.

The Federal subsidy came under a law passed several years ago, providing for one-third subsidy of American built boats. This helps, local fishing people easy, but it is still not enough to compete with foreign boats that receive heavier aid.

Therefore they are working this year for Congressional passage of House bill 1026, which would raise the subsidy from 33⅓ percent to 50 percent.

Mr. Fulham reasons this way on the future of the fishing industry: "The supply of fish, so far as we know, will remain constant. There are ways of maintaining that supply, through careful international regulation and so forth, but there is little known, economical way to increase the supply of fish.

"But the population in the United States and all over the world is going up. The need for protein food is going up, at the same time that available land for cattle will go down. Population trends tell us we will have to turn more to the sea for our food."

A number of other leaders at Boston fish pier are also actively promoting the industry. One is Samuel H. Bloom, a second generation man in the fishing business and current president of the Boston Fisheries Association, Inc., a united organization that seeks to spark upward movement of the industry.

Another is Irving Usen, president-treasurer of O'Donnell-Usen Fisheries Corp., which owns a fleet of trawlers and a number of fish processing plants both here and overseas.

Still another is Hugh F. O'Rourke, former personnel specialist at General Electric and now secretary of the Boston Fisheries Association. Mr. O'Rourke handles public relations, labor relations, and watches over Federal and State legislation for local fishing interests.

O'Rourke points out that another path of progress for the local industry is to "raise the image of fish."

People in New England eat much fish, but more can be done across the country to sell the idea of fish as a delicacy, as well as healthful because of its large protein content.

Many fishing leaders respect the nationwide selling effort done for scallops in recent years by fishing interests in New Bedford.

Prior to the mid-1950's, very few Americans were eating sea scallops. People in New Bedford convinced civic leaders there as well as fishermen and boatowners to cooperate in a pilot advertising project in Hartford, Conn.

Hartford is known in the food industry as one of the hardest places in the United States to sell new types of food. A scallop promotional campaign was successful, and a national drive was soon launched under the direction of a Connecticut advertising firm. Press luncheons, recipe contests, and information to food editors supplemented careful, selective advertising.

As a result, by 1961 New Bedford's scallop fleet was landing a record 20,600,000 pounds of scallops valued at $7,800,000—over $1 million above the 1960 figure. New Bedford is now the second leading American fishing port, with $16,700,000 worth of all kinds of fish landed in 1962.

San Pedro, Calif., was first with $35,900,000, and Boston tied for third place with Brownsville-Port Isabel, Tex., each landing $10,500,000 worth of fish.

Boston leaders point out that this $10,500,000 figure is no mean amount for what is often supposed to be "a dying industry."

If promotional efforts similar to that in New Bedford can be carried out, the industry can grow by untold amounts.

O'Rourke says, in addition, that many types of fish in the sea have never been tried for widespread consumption, and that a little experimentation in this direction may also open up new markets.

There are other problems beside lack of new boats and the need for product promotion facing the local industry.

Some of these are:

Lack of latest technological equipment aboard the boats, labor problems on the fish piers, lack of quality consciousness among many fishermen in handling the fish and keeping the boats clean, and the widely fluctuating prices that make uncertainty for both fisherman and boatowners.

(A crew's pay depends not only on the amount of fish caught, but also on the day's market prices.)

New boats and expanded markets would, of course, help to alleviate these problems.

Observers of the industry generally agree that another needed element is more cooperation among fishermen, boat owners, and fish processors.

One veteran observer characterized the industry as "free enterprise ad absurdum." What he meant was that far greater teamwork is necessary for the general lifting of the industry. Most boats, for instance, are individually owned. In some instances, the crew, and not the captain of a boat determines what fish shall be caught on a given day.

"Today," says Charles H. W. Foster, Massachusetts Commissioner of Natural Resources, "the industry is somewhat like farming 50 years ago—at a point of history where individualism must give way to cooperation."

The industry has lacked leadership, both from within itself, or from State and Federal Government, he continued. The sea has always been wide open, and anyone who had a boat could go out, drop a line, and start fishing.

But now, he points out, the sea is too crowded, international competition too strenuous, and domestic market promotional needs too great to permit this individualism to continue.

Significant ventures in cooperation are of course the effort by Mr. Fulham's boat building group and the general work of the Boston Fisheries Association. But still more teamwork is needed.

Perhaps the most important point in Mr. Fulham's work is that a fish processor is taking an interest and financial investment in fishing itself. Rarely does a processor wish to involve himself with the many problems of boat owning, and this lack of joint interest is one of the major problems of the industry.

Still another need according to Mr. O'Rourke and others, is modernization of processing methods.

Ways must be found to process the fish faster, cheaper, and with less waste.

A boost for processing is expected to be available within the next few years as a result of pasteurization of fish.

Research done at Massachusetts Institute of Technology has shown that when fish are treated with light doses of gamma radiation from a cobalt 60 source and then refrigerated, the fish stay fresh for a period of several months.

And it isn't frozen. It remains soft and pliable, Mr. O'Rourke reports, adding that he ate some pasteurized fish that was some weks old and "it was just like fresh fish. I was amazed."

A laboratory for further study and experimentation with the process will go into operation in Gloucester this fall with the backing of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. The lab will cost some $600,000 and will have about $103,000 initially to carry on its work.

When processors are able to pasteurize their fish on a commercial basis, they will have the capacity to sell "fresh" fish anywhere in the United States. At present, of course, most fish sold in midcontinental areas is frozen, unless the fish is flown in from coastal areas at great cost.

Not waiting for the new pasteurization process to become available, Gorton's of Gloucester last year introduced a "fresh-lock" procedure of freezing fish.

Much flavor, texture, color, and nutritional elements in fish drain off when the fish are defrosted. Gorton's claim that its special brining process prevents this loss.

Another prospect of progress for New England fishermen in the development of "fish protein concentrate" or FPC.

FPC is a finely ground protein powder made by defatting, drying, and milling the whole fish. The powder can be used as an additive to many types of food and drink, and promises to be an important answer for food-scarce countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Fishing industry people grant that the United States and Europe, which already have ample protein foods, would not need much FPC.

But the prospects of sale to the developing countries are enormous.

One source close to FPC development estimates that the new product could mean that New England fishermen might sell from 300 million to 500 million more pounds of fish per year. Total pounds of fish landed in New England of all types in 1961 was 577 million pounds.

Thus, FPC conceivably could double the market of the local industry.

But there's a catch.

The Food and Drug Administration has so far forbidden FPC to be sold on the American market unless it is cleaned and eviscerated—that is, heads, tails, and intestines removed.

FPC people say such a process would hike their costs too much and make the product no longer available to poorer nations. And they can't sell on foreign markets a product that is forbidden in the United States, they state.

Further, they say, there is nothing unwholesome about using the whole fish. People eat whole herrings, oysters, and claims, and tripe, they point out.

The New England fishing industry would use primarily red hake for making FPC. Red hake is a perfectly edible fish that was often preferred over cod and haddock in colonial days. Hake is no longer used much commercially because it doesn't freeze as well as other fish.

An FPC pilot plant has been set up in New Bedford, but by and large there can be no FPC until the Food and Drug Administration changes its "aesthetic" evaluation of the product, say FPC supporters.

Another element of opposition comes from wheat and baking interests who feel that FPC, which has often been erroneously called "fish flour," might be a competitor for standard wheat flour.

Advocates say this is a misconception, that "you can't bake a loaf of bread with FPC."

Will the Food and Drug Administration change its ruling? FPC people hope so. The question is currently under study.

A factor of help for at least part of the local fishing industry is beginning to come from the Massachusetts State government, and more particularly, Mr. Foster's Department of Natural Resources.

Under legislation passed last year, the Department is empowered to take significant new steps to promote commercial as well as sport fishing in the territorial waters along the Bay State's 2,000-mile coastline.

(That 2,000-mile figure includes bays, rivers, inlets, and so forth.)

Mr. Foster feels that "great possibilities await the commercial fisheries" in the State's territorial waters, or the waters within 3 miles of the coastline. Foreign vessels are not permitted to fish within this area.

Some 15 percent of total fish landed in the State in 1958 came from within these waters, but now the growing problem of water pollution makes fishing less and less valuable.

Under the new law, the Department of Natural Resources gets 1 percent of gasoline-tax revenues, or about the amount paid by boat owners—roughly $900,000—for use in solving water pollution, enforcing fishing laws, and encouraging commercial fishing of bay scallops, oysters, and clams.

All this, then, is the story of New England's fishing industry, ancient and honored, that is now rising from a recently stagnated past to meet new challenges with vigor and vision.

Leaders of the industry will perhaps provide an outstanding example to the rest of the Nation, at a time when industries all over the United States gird for a period of increasing international competition.

Mr. Foster keynoted the new era for the fishing industry when he said:

"The sea is one of the last uncharted frontiers in the field of natural resources. * * * For too long we have been inward looking. Now it is necessary to look outward toward the sea."

Arthur Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring again the "Hoppe Humor" to the attention of readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Each and everyone will readily recognize the easy-flowing and witty style of the San Francisco Chronicle columnist whose articles will now be appearing in the Washington, D.C., Evening Star.

Several of his recent columns follow:

A MOTTO FOR THE TIMES

(By Arthur Hoppe)

It was a nice day and I was out in the back yard spraying aphis and thinking about an old-fashioned brass plaque I'd seen once on an elderly real estate man's desk. It said: "As I go through life I only pray I can make our world a little better place to live in." A very nice motto, I'm sure. Except, I decided, it isn't mine.

I decided this because I was spraying aphis. I used to spray aphis with a relatively clear conscience. True, I would feel a twinge now and then for the aphis I was slaughtering. (They're beautiful, jewellike creatures, if you examine them closely.) But you have to kill the beautiful aphis in order to make a beautiful garden.

But now, as I sprayed, I thought of Rachel Carson's book, "The Silent Spring," and all the fuss it's caused about pesticides. I don't really understand the ecology involved. But as I pumped the sprayer and killed the aphis in my Godlike way I had the uneasy feeling that I was poisoning generations of robins and bluebirds and butterflies yet unborn. And I felt guilty.

Earlier in the kitchen, I had washed my hands in detergent and watched the glistening bubbles slither down the drain. It used to be a most satisfying sight. Yet, now I thought of the documentary I had seen on television—dirty, virtually insoluble bubbles everywhere, polluting our streams, killing our fish, and fouling our drinking water. And I felt guilty.

And from the back porch I had looked across the valley to where the bulldozers had gouged into the greenly forested hill, laying bare the raw, red earth for a new, faster road—a road I am looking forward to using. And I had noticed the faint smear of smog hanging in the air. And particles of it, I thought, had come from the exhaust of my own car. And I felt guilty.

And I thought, as I sprayed, of all the times I had read of how man is plundering his planet—eroding its soil, polluting its waters, killing its living things, despoiling its very atmosphere. Selfish, egocentric man. And yet I had never before stopped to tote up the damage I alone have done in trying to reshape my own world closer to my desires—I alone with my modern sprays and my modern detergents, and my modern car.

And yet should I suffer gnats and mosquitoes and flies with an aerosol bomb at my fingertip? Should I struggle with grease while the detergent bottle stands there on the sink? Should I walk through life when I can ride in upholstered comfort? And I knew that, though perhaps I should, I won't.

And then I thought the saddest of thoughts: Inevitably, the physical world we all love so well will suffer for my being on it. Inevitably, I will leave it worse than I found it. Like a careless camper in the wilderness.

And if I had to cast a brass plaque in these times, the best it could say is: "As I go through life I only pray I can do as little damage to our world as possible."

CAN WE STAND STILL FOR EXERCISE?

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Oh, sin. Oh, lust. Oh, wanton corruption of our innocent youth. Oh, betrayal of * * *

I am speaking, of course, of Mr. Kennedy's physical fitness program. Which, you'll be shocked to know, is leading our little children down the path of "lustful flirting, adultery, divorce, disease, destruction, and judgment." Among other things.

Now I'm not saying Mr. Kennedy knew what he was doing. It would show disrespect to say Mr. Kennedy knew what he was doing. He simply promised "to get this country moving again." And at last we're moving. (Touch toes. One-two-three-four.) Up and down, anyway.

But the Citizens Committee for Better Education, a Fundamentalist Baptist group, knows what Mr. Kennedy's doing. That's because it's taken a close look at Mr. Kennedy's pilot program of calisthenics in the public schools of Springfield, Mo. And the committee is now fighting tooth and fang.

"The rhythmic exercises in this program is the first step in our schools toward widespread," says Mr. Phil Bashaw, their spokesman, "dance instruction." And you know what dancing leads to. You do, that is, if you have a Fundamentalist Baptist's interest in fundamentals.

And they are all too correct. You should see the many, many letters I receive hourly from desperate teenagers. Here is a typical one asking for help:

"Help," writes Annie M., typically. "I was just an ordinary teenager, interested only in motto tatting. And then our teacher, Mr. B., said we should take part in Mr. K.'s physical fitness program. I was torn. I knew the dangers of calisthenics. I had been warned. But I, foolish girl, thought I could take a few chin-ups without harm. I guess I just wanted to be one of the gang.

"And so—be still, my beating heart—grasped the bar, promising myself to hoist only one or two and go straight home. Up I went. Oh, the false feeling of soaring. Down I went. Oh, the sinking sensation. Up. Down. The mad cries of the crowd egged me on. I couldn't stop. I was—oh, everlasting shame—hooked.

"Must I confess that I polished off 162 chin-ups? Must I admit that I went on hardly knowing what I was doing, to knee bends? One-two-three-four. Over and over. Oh, the savage rhythm of deep knee bends still throbs in my soul.

"Am I to blame that in my delirium I allowed myself to be dragged into a Virginia reel? Let my story be an example to others. It is but a short step from turkey in the straw to the Lindy hop. And now Mr. B. (who has a waxed moustache) is teaching me—merciful heavens—the tango. Is there no hope for me?"

Yes, Annie M., there is no hope for you. The tango leads inevitably to the bunny hug and the bunny hug leads inevitably to * * *. But I cannot go on. Not in a family newspaper I cannot.

So you are but another tragic victim of leadership, Annie M. For all leaders have a mad, blind desire to get us moving. So that they can lead us. Usually astray.

But don't think too ill of Mr. Kennedy, Annie M. At least he made you fit. So be charitable. Be fair. And as you inexorably descend the path of wickedness, try to believe that perhaps he knew what he was doing after all. And that's what he made you fit for.

THERE'LL ALWAYS BE AN ENGLAND, TOOTSIE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Let us Americans not snipe at our stanch British allies in this, their darkest hour. Let us remember that they are, at heart, a good, decent, hard-working people. Even though frightfully oversexed.

And if British Cabinet Ministers wish to chase scantily clad girls around swimming pools (on their own time), let us strive to be broadminded. Let us not make the mistake of judging these hot-blooded Englishmen by our own more highly developed moral standards. Let us try to make allowances for their culture. Loose laced though it may be.

For only from this detached viewpoint, I feel, can we properly seek balanced answers to the grave international questions now being raised in the responsible American press. Such as: "What did the Russian naval officer really want from Christine Keeler?" (Food for thought, here.) "Can we share atom secrets with Miss Keeler?" (You know how flighty young girls are.) Or, most crucial of all: "Will Prime Minister Macmillan now tumble?" (And, I'm sure newspaper readers want to know, for whom?)

Let us, along with the experts, address ourselves to this last crucial question. There can be no denying the Conservative Party is in acute trouble, as we experts say, at home.

Indeed, let us visualize Mr. Macmillan at home right now. He has just finished a couple of practice laps around the pool in a sweatsuit, I would assume, and is packing the old gladstone while humming "La Vie en Rose." And then Mrs. Macmillan, a primrose in her teeth, pops in.

"Mrs. M. Carramba, mon amour, whither away?

"Mr. M. Cor blimey, carissima mia, while my heart stops at the thought of leaving you for even a night, duty calls. I must hie away to the Sussex-Wessex Conservative Club to deliver a major address entitled: 'Let Us Rally to the Party—No Matter How Late the Hour.'

"Mrs. M. The Conservative Club. Madre de Dois. But I thought you had promised you would always be faithful to me.

"Mr. M. And I will be, my turtle dove. Forever. Do not believe what you read in the papers. It will be naught but dreary old speeches and I will do naught but think of you. And now, do I have everything? Toothbrush, shaving mug, bathing suit, American defense secrets * * *.

"Mrs. M. Bathing suit. Aha, just as I thought.

"Mr. M. No, now, my dearest one. You do not understand. In this desperate hour I hoped only to save my party's image, at great personal sacrifice, by wearing a bathing suit. The idea may catch on and * * *. Coo, my lovely one, put down that umbrella stand."

Well, I know we proper Americans may not be visualizing British homelife quite accurately. (And thank goodness for that, I say.) But the problem remains that the Conservative Party may topple at any moment. Simply because its leader will not be able to get out of the house at night.

And I say we must rally to Mr. Macmillan's side in this critical hour of British history. The fate of the NATO alliance, the Common Market, the whole free world hangs in the balance.

We cannot, of course, condone Mr. Macmillan's Ministers, even though they were driven to these orgies by their hot British blood. But we must be tolerant. These men are, after all, the Conservatives. And just ask yourself: You want the Liberals to get in?

Political Witness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article entitled "Political Witness," appearing in the Southern California Presbyterian, by Midge Sherwood. Miss Sherwood challenges the oft-repeated statement that "conservatism is the rejection of new ideas and that liberalism espouses them."

I recommend the close examination of this thought-stimulating manuscript, and compare it with the philosophy of Dr. Schlesinger when he said, that "If socialism—that is, Government ownership of all significant means of production—is to preserve democracy, it must be brought about step by step." Noting that time is no obstacle, Schlesinger went on to say that "the gradual advance of socialism in the United States" could be brought about "through a series of New Deals." Today, Dr. Schlesinger is assistant to President Kennedy and directing one of that series, the New Frontier. He properly calls it democratic socialism. Its goal? The "welfare state."

The article follows:

POLITICAL WITNESS

(By Midge Sherwood)

"My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge."—Hosea 4: 6.

When a theologian ("Decision at the Polls," SCP November 1962) describes "conservatism" as the rejection of new ideas and "liberalism" as the espousal of them, it could be political naivete or it could be a complete collapse in communications. As Alice says, it could be any number of things in the land of wonder, including Humpty Dumpty's own definition, but one thing is certain: It is a total misunderstanding of terms.

I am a political conservative. At the same time I am a practicing Christian who, in 1952, was forced to admit that as a political independent, I didn't know a small "d" Democrat from a small "r" Republican; and that, for all of me, John Dewey was either the hero of Manila or the founder of the decimal system. That he was neither, but a secular humanist and therefore an anti-God influence upon our educational system, had yet to appall me. In short, "politically independent" was just a very nice name for "politically indifferent" and "politically ignorant."

I was not alone. As late as 1960, only 5 percent of the American voters were dues-paying members of a political party with a voice in their presidential conventions. We "let George do it," not even bothering to find out what George might be doing. But let us be charitable with the likes of me. In 1952, I was what many still are, a conservative unaware—unaware that I helped every political cause in the world except my own by not coming to grips with the term politically, socially, economically, but, above all, religiously. For, while I was unaware, many were very much aware of what they were doing and just where they—and we—were headed.

For example, in the May-June 1947 issue of Partisan Review, a political liberal named Arthur Schlesinger wrote: "If socialism—i.e., government ownership of all significant means of production—is to preserve democracy, it must be brought about step by step * * *." Noting that time is no obstacle, Schlesinger went on to say that "the gradual advance of socialism in the United States" could be brought about "through a series of New Deals." Today, Dr. Schlesinger is assistant to President Kennedy and directing one of that series, the New Frontier. He properly calls it Democratic Socialism. Its goals? The "welfare state."

Now, what has all this to do with religion? To be successful, the socialist must render obsolete the Ten Commandments that proclaim God as our fountain-head, preserve the family physically and morally, and establish private property (thou salt not steal) and personal accomplishment (thou shalt not covet). Small wonder that Churchill calls socialism "the gospel of envy." It envies God Himself and supplants Him with government. So, naturally, Schlesinger laments in Partisan Review that "too often people believe in patriotism or religion, or read comic books, go to the movies, play slot machines, and patronize dance halls. In one way or another they try to cure their discontent by narcotics rather than surgery." Calling for leadership by the intellectual, long since in John Dewey's corner, Schlesinger notes that it is the intellectual who is "more likely to escape from his confusion than the capitalist from his irresponsibility, or the worker from his impotence." It is no accident that the Kennedy administration is well staffed with Harvard professionals.

To date, I have heard no official church voice raised against Schlesinger's presumption in lumping religion with comic books; nor has his mood been likened to that of the master socialist brewer, Marx, who wrote more bluntly that "religion is the opium of the people." One wonders not only at our indifference, but at our long, long silence. But more than that, how is it possible for a religionist to lie in the same bed with a liberal? Rendering unto Caesar is one thing, but actually creating a Caesar is something else. For socialism of any form is that represented by the atheist Marx, whether it is labelled Democratic Socialism in the United States, Fabianism in England, Nazism in Germany, Fascism in Italy, Titoism, Maoism, Castroism, ad infinitum. And the tribe increases—although not with the love of God.

One trip to the library would clarify all these labels, and much more that space doesn't here permit; but too many of us have wanted to remain aloof, or aloft. As the old hymn goes, "There is no hiding place down there." Said my own minister once: "There are many battlegrounds in Christianity, but no safe balconies." What threat to belief, what evil, is or has ever been purely external or purely internal? Is God purely external or purely internal? To think we can wash our hands like Lady MacBeth, Pontius Pilate, or the Pavlovian-conditioned is to fashion our own limbo. Reality, be it hell or heaven, has to be faced in the end, whether we call it death, like an atheist, or the beginning, like a Christian. The political message is urgent: Political liberalism, or socialism under any label, is not the espousal of new ideas, but the return to a very, very old one—paganism.

Such liberalism recognizes no God, but the gods of all men; no Kingdom but the welfare state; no Bible, except its own malleable translation of the Bill of Rights; and no Commandments except its own variable code of ethics, set forth by an elite. It flies under the ephemeral flag of "progress." But think on this: If new ideas are always identified with progress, why has every civilization, pre-Rome to Great Britain, fallen flat on its face at the very height of its "progress?" New ideas, apparently, are not always good ideas. As a matter of fact, any historian may prove they are not even new.

We have now arrived at "conservatism"—what and why. Men like Burke, Lincoln, and Chesterton addressed conservatism to their times—men like Russell Kirk, Barry Goldwater, et al., are vocal in our time. But they can all be gelled into this one: Conservatism is the reconciliation of new ideas with old ideas. Consider for a moment that the Bible, always topical, is a reconciliation of new ideas with old ideas, and that Christ is the reconciliation of God and man. Then, it is at once apparent that any political philosophy of the believer must reflect God-given principle—a rose by any other name, despite the spate of campaign oratory.

In "Prospects for Conservatives," Russell Kirk defines conservatives as those who "seek to reconcile the best in the wisdom of our ancestors with the change which is essential to a vigorous civil social existence," who "believe in principle, or enduring values. * * * The liberal in American parlance has been a man in love with change." In "Up from Liberalism," William F. Buckley Jr. notes: "Many people are not satisfied to be unique merely in the eyes of God, and spend considerable energy in flight from any orthodoxy." Burke said his model of a statesman combined the disposition to preserve (conserve) with the ability to reform. In short, then, a conservative can be liberal, and often is, but a liberal can never be conservative. A liberal has nothing to conserve.

Paul, as usual, has timely counsel: "But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them. * * * For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." (II Timothy: 4: 3,4.) It is not without reason that Christ remains the same yesterday, today, and tomorrow, for "the hopes and fears of all the years" are truly met in Him yesterday, today, and tomorrow.

How can Christians not reconcile new ideas with old ideas? "Political problems are, at bottom, moral and religious problems," says Kirk; and any precinct worker can add "Amen." Consequently, in politics, as in all fields, there must be continuity, a reconciliation between the past and the present, which I personally like to think of as a communion of saints. For, to throw away the old is to toss overboard the very martyrs who died to conserve our religious, and, subsequently, our political freedom. For, since God is the author and personification of truth, and the truth "sets us free," then God is the giver of freedom. Christ himself said that he did not come to throw away the old law, but to fulfill it. He did not dispute the old Hebrew prophets; He simply fulfilled their prophecies. He did not transcend their teachings; He activated them. He did not repudiate, reinterpret, or dilute the holy word; He made it flesh.

People now, as then, are spiritually starved. "Do the work of an evangelist," says Paul. But, in a nation with freedom of speech to discuss politics and religion, we have refused to discuss either. In a nation with freedom of Christian witness, we have refused to testify. More Buddhist than Christian, we see, hear, and speak no evil. But the consequences of evil remain absolute; a man is just as dead, whether he was stabbed by a 19th century murderer, or by a 20th-century man psychologically influenced by his environment. And nowhere are the consequences of evil more glaring than in the "practical politics" that has replaced "principled politics"—practical politics so aptly defined by the late Sam Rayburn, "To get along, go along."

As Christians, we are going along all right, but we are not getting along as Christians, either in or out of the Judaic tradition. Let him who has eyes, see; and let him also read to become better informed. But, if the political conservative message has to be, or can possibly be, reduced to one word, let it be Christ's: Witness.

Marketing Agent for Public Power in Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, since the announcement that the Bonneville Power Administration will replace the Bureau of Reclamation as the marketing agent for public power in southern Idaho, advertisements have appeared in many newspapers in Idaho, paid for by the private power companies, attacking the decision. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on this subject may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARKETING AGENT FOR PUBLIC POWER IN SOUTHERN IDAHO

It is said that BPA power is subsidized, or is paid for by the taxpayers, and from this it is argued that the cheaper rates will not really be an advantage to Idahoans. This is not so. The BPA rate structure is geared to take care of all operating costs of the marketing agency, and to repay the capital costs of the generating and transmission facilities, with interest, within a reasonable amortization period. Funds accumulated for this purpose are now substantially ahead of schedule. The law requires that the repayment schedules must be met, from power revenues, in the years ahead. BPA rates are cheaper because the giant dams on the lower Snake and Columbia generate power efficiently, and because interest on the money to construct them is charged at about 3 percent (which is all it costs the Government to borrow this money) whereas private power companies pay to their stockholders rates ranging upward from 6 percent on the money invested. Anyone who has ever made mortgage payments knows what a difference it would make to double the rate of interest.

Some say that the private power companies now doing business in southern Idaho will be injured. This has not been the case in Oregon and Washington, where the private companies have prospered, while reducing their rates, in areas long served by BPA. There is a reason for this. The private companies justify their high rates in Idaho by saying that it costs more to deliver power to thinly populated areas, and that they could match the performance of the private companies in our neighbor States if they had large metropolitan areas to serve. Perhaps this is true. But BPA will not compete directly with the private companies. It will sell at reduced rates to the wholesale customers now served by the Bureau of Reclamation, and its lower rates will make it possible for large industrial users of electricity to bring their businesses to Idaho. This, in turn, will create new customers for the private companies, which will continue to sell to the new homes and ordinary business establishments, just as they do now. Experience in Oregon and Washington indicates that the private companies will then be able to reduce their rates, since they will be serving more customers in the same area, and still make a better profit for their stockholders.

It is argued that Idaho citizens will lose the taxes now paid by the power companies. But the private companies will continue to collect taxes from their customers, and pay them to local, State, and National governments, just as they do now. With more customers to collect from, they will pay more taxes, not less.

It is said that the lower BPA rates will not actually come to Idaho, because it will first be necessary to construct a transmission line which the Congress will not approve. This, too, is not the whole truth. The co-ops and municipalities which are now buying power from the Bureau of Reclamation will have their rates reduced, by an average of 40 percent, just as soon as new contracts can be negotiated. BPA does not have one set of rates for customers in Oregon and Washington and another for Idahoans. Co-ops, municipalities, and industrial users in Idaho will be able to buy this power at exactly the same rate they would pay if they were located next door to one of the big dams on the Columbia. BPA absorbs the cost of transmission to remote customers, just as the postal service absorbs the higher cost of rural mail delivery, from a uniform rate structure. For the time being, the power sold in Idaho will be the same power heretofore sold by the Bureau of Reclamation, which is generated in Idaho. The immediate difference is that the rates will be lowered to the BPA scale, and all of the revenues of the BPA system will be balanced against the cost of generation and distribution (which includes the cost of present and future reclamation projects repayable from power revenues) in Idaho. Studies show that new transmission facilities can be constructed when needed, and paid for, with interest, out of power revenues at the uniform BPA rate.

It is said that only a few in southern Idaho will benefit, and that this will be at the expense of those who still have to buy power from the private companies. In the first place, the number who will benefit right away from the lower BPA rate is substantial, about 25,000 farm and city families who now buy public power through their co-ops and city-owned distribution systems. In the second place, there will be no expense to the customers of the private companies. Finally, all who live in southern Idaho will eventually benefit, even if they continue to buy power from the private companies, through the lower rates made possible by increased demand, and resulting greater efficiency, in the operations of the private companies.

A few have asserted that there is something socialistic, or even communistic, about bringing BPA power to Idaho. Those who will be customers of the BPA are already buying power from the Government through the Bureau of Reclamation. It seems hardly necessary to point out that no "step toward socialism" is involved in transferring marketing responsibility from one agency of the Federal Government to another.

There are always some who resist change and progress, either because they do not understand its implications, or because they have been misled into believing that their personal interests will be adversely affected. No doubt this will be the case, at least for a time, with the extension of the BPA marketing area to southern Idaho. I am confident, however, that this change will have very general approval when the facts about it are widely known, and the benefits become visible to all.

Louis F. Koenig: Civic Leader and Outstanding Pittsburgh Business Executive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we in western Pennsylvania are proud of our local citizen, Louis F. Koenig, chairman of the board of Duquesne Brewing Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., and his remarkable business career spanning six decades—a career that set a rare and outstanding example. In Louis F. Koenig were combined the sterling qualities of character that made him a man eminently successful in the business world, and a tireless worker for far-reaching improvements in his community.

When we consider the scope of the role that Lou Koenig played in Duquesne Brewing Co.'s rise to a position of leadership in the brewing industry, it is truly amazing that he found so much time to devote to the welfare of his fellow man. The fine modern plant, good working conditions, and hundreds of loyal employees and their families attest to Lou Koenig's years of building, years of leadership, and years of service.

He began in 1903 as secretary to the secretary of Duquesne Brewing Co. He worked up through the ranks rapidly. His first high administrative position was the responsibility as vice president in charge of finance. He was elected president and chairman of the board in 1941. He resigned as president in 1954 but retained his position as chairman of the board until his untimely demise, which occurred on May 3, 1963.

Throughout this busy life, Louis F. Koenig found the time to contribute to the community where Duquesne Brewing Co. still makes its headquarters, Pittsburgh's South Side.

During the 1930's he was a director of the South Side Advancement Association, a volunteer group of businessmen which served the community by initiating and following to completion a vast series of valuable public improvement projects.

Lou Koenig also realized the necessity for improved and expanded medical care long before most Americans had begun to concern themselves with the increasing medical needs of a growing populace. In 1928, he became a director of South Side Hospital, a position of service he held until his death. He also served as cochairman of the hospital's building campaign, resulting in the fine present institution—the South Side Hospital.

In the loss of Louis F. Koenig, Pittsburgh's South Side, as well as the entire city, lost a staunch and constructive citizen who cannot be replaced. The benefits to human existence he helped create will continue to flourish and remain as perpetual tribute to him.

As a lifetime friend and admirer of Lou Koenig, as well as the Congressman representing a large part of the southern portions of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County, I am calling this dedicated life of Lou Koenig and his fine accomplishments to the attention of the U.S. Congress and the American people as a permanent memorial.

On Barring the Lord's Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent decision of the Supreme Court on the Lord's Prayer and public schools is most unfortunate. I agree with the dissent of Mr. Justice Potter Stewart, an outstanding jurist. In yesterday's Evening Star an excellent editorial appeared, which is must reading for everyone:

The Court Bars the Lord's Prayer

The Supreme Court has spoken. Both the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading have been barred from the public schools. This comes not as a surprise. But in our view it is a shame.

It all seems so silly. Writing for the majority, Justice Clark conjured up dreadful prospects if the Court should allow a prayer to be said in a public school. To permit such a thing, he argued, would depart from the concept of a government that must be neutral in religious matters. And he went on to say: "The breach of neutrality that is today a trickling stream may all too soon become a raging torrent." Perhaps there is something to be said for this as rhetoric. But it is nonsense when measured against the rise of secularism and materialism in this country since the Founding Fathers drafted the first amendment. We mention this because it helps a little in understanding what Justice Clark must have had in mind when he said that the application of his concept of neutrality requires "interpretation of a delicate sort." Delicate indeed.

Justice Stewart, the lone dissenter, stated his understanding of what is meant by the first amendment's guarantee of religious freedom. It is a forthright statement, and it appeals to us. "What our Constitution indispensably protects," he said, "is the freedom of each of us, be he Jew or agnostic, Christian or aethist, Buddhist or freethinker, to believe or disbelieve, to worship or not worship, to pray or to keep silent, according to his own conscience, uncoerced and unrestrained by government." To us, this is quite different from saying that the Constitution forbids one child, who may wish to do so, to recite the Lord's Prayer in a public school merely because some other child, who does not want to pray and who is not required to pray, objects.

Also interesting were some comments by Justice Goldberg in a concurring opinion, in which Justice Harlan joined.

Justice Goldberg, of course, agreed with the majority ruling. But he seemed a bit disturbed by Justice Clark's neutral concept. "Untutored devotion to the concept of neutrality," he said, "can lead * * * to a brooding and pervasive devotion to the secular and a passive, or even active, hostility to the religious." For our part, we think the Court's school rulings in the area of religion, although certainly not so intended, have already led to a climate of passive and perhaps even active hostility to the religious. At another point, Justice Goldberg, in what we take to be a reference to Justice Clark's trickling stream and raging torrent, added: "It is of course true that great consequences can grow from small beginnings, but the measure of constitutional adjudication is the ability and willingness to distinguish between real threat and mere shadow."

If we may put our own interpretation on this, we think it is a comment which hits the nail squarely on the head. For in this ruling, and in some of those that preceded it, the Court has done precisely what Justice Goldberg warned against—mistaken mere shadow for real threat.

In the process God and religion have all but been driven from the public schools. What remains? Will the baccalaureate service and Christmas carols be the next to go? Don't bet against it.

Great Man Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Daily Press, St. Marys, Pa.:

Great Man Dies

Death, the silent sentinel that has every human being tabbed for his or her final destiny at an already appointed time, yesterday tore a page off the calendar of Pope John and ended the career of probably the greatest figure of the 20th century.

Born of humble parentage, the son of an Italian tenant farmer, he never lost his childhood trace of humility and was never awed by the high churchly position to which he had been elevated.

Generally referred to as interim Pope when first elected a few months shy of his 77th birthday, he amazed the Christian and non-Christian world alike by his many innovations from his papal palace.

Nothing in his brief tenure compared to his calling of the first Vatican Council in Rome over a long period of years, summoning church figures from every section of the globe to meet in the Eternal City to map the future of the Roman Catholic Church.

Clergymen from other faiths were invited to attend as observers. Most of them were deeply impressed with the sincerity of the Pope, who wanted to draw all Christians closer together. He had hoped for resumption of the Council this coming September, something now left in the hands of his successor.

When the Pope first became gravely ill men and women of all faiths prayed for his recovery and as he became progressively worse, that he might have a happy death.

Some of the finest praise for this humble man came from clergymen of other religions, such as this tribute when the Supreme Pontiff was still living:

"We feel," said the Reverend Charles Fish, president of the Alburquerque, N. Mex., Ministerial Alliance, "that he is the one man in the world who can bring all churches together again as was our Lord's wish."

"Our prayers are all going out to him," said Rabbi Alber Plotkin of Phoenix, "I met with him in a public audience and found him the most humane, warm, energetic person I've ever known."

The Reverend Dr. Don M. Potter, executive director of the Protestant Council of the City of New York said the Pope's "welcome call for Christian unity has left an indelible mark on world history. His understanding, warmth and friendship toward non-Catholics has greatly advanced relationships among all men of good will."

We understand during services in the Lutheran Church in Johnsonburg last Friday night time was taken out to offer up prayers for Pope John's recovery.

This has been the typical reaction to the Holy Father's attempt to bring people of all faiths closer together that peace might prevail in the world and differences would be eliminated so all could live together in a friendly climate.

He has left an imprint on the world that will live long after his body has turned to dust.

Federal Subsidies: The Facts and the Fiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government has published an interesting report on the subject of Federal grants-in-aid. The title of the report is "Federal Subsidies: The Facts and the Fiction."

I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Federal Subsidies: The Facts and the Fiction

In selecting a title for this paper, the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government has purposely given preference to the term, Federal subsidies, over the more commonly used term, Federal grants-in-aid. We believe that the commonly used term is misleading because the word grant implies a gift. The implication is erroneous in this instance. Furthermore, the word aid implies that the grantor is in a superior position, offering gratuitous assistance to some needy individual or institution. That implication also is erroneous in this instance. Thus we have selected the term Federal subsidies as more accurately describing the subject to be discussed.

Reduced to its simplest terms, a Federal subsidy originates and operates in the following manner. A Member of Congress, or a member of the administration, decides that a specified service is a desirable one, and that a law establishing a program to provide the service should be enacted. A case in point is the Vaccination Assistance Act of 1962, which is supposed to provide immunization against polio, diptheria, whooping cough and tetanus. Congressman Oren Harris of Arkansas was of the opinion that such a program would be advantageous to the people of the United States. Presumably, he examined existing legislation in the 50 States, and concluded that it was inadequate. He therefore introduced a bill, H.R. 10541, that would authorize subsidies to States or localities planning immunization programs. The bill was debated briefly in the House of Representatives, with only 60-odd Members present, and passed July 26, 1962, on a voice vote. Several Members of the House made the point that passage of the bill would inject the Federal Government into an area of activity that properly should be reserved to the States and the local governments, but their arguments were in vain.[1]

The bill went to the Senate where it was approved without a hearing by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It was passed by the Senate on a voice vote, without debate, on October 4, 1962. On October 23, 1962, the President signed the bill authorizing $36 million to be distributed to States and localities by the U.S. Surgeon General during the next 3 years.

This is a fair example of how a Federal subsidy comes into existence. A need is asserted (usually for a very worthwhile purpose), a law is passed, and the money becomes available from the Federal Treasury.

WHO PAYS?

In the rush to accomplish this worthwhile objective, a number of important, and in some cases controlling, factors are overlooked. The most obvious error is the failure on the part of many legislators and administrators to observe that the money to finance the program must come from the people of the United States. Yet this is the most easily observable principle in all of government: if the Federal Government is to subsidize a program, the taxpayers of the Nation must put the money in the Federal treasury for that purpose. If the United States is to have a $36 million federally subsidized vaccination program, the people of the United States must pay to Uncle Sam $36 million in taxes, in addition to what they are now paying.

A related and similarly overlooked fact is that the people frequently have to pay additional State and local taxes in order to receive the Federal subsidies for which they have already been taxed at the Federal level. The reason is that two-thirds of all Federal subsidies are available only on what is called a "matching basis." This means that State and local governments have to put up some specified percentage of their own funds in order to receive the subsidy from the Federal Government. But the taxpayer who provides funds for State and local governments is the same taxpayer who provides funds for the Federal Government, so the people actually have to pay increased State and local taxes in order to receive Federal subsidies that they were taxed to provide.

These are matters affecting the pocketbook, and they are not trifling matters. In 1960 total expenses of these subsidy programs amounted to $12 billion, or $66 for every man, woman, and child in this Nation. For an average family of four, that means yearly taxes in the amount of $264 to maintain Federal subsidies and the "matching" funds required to receive these subsidies.

A BROADER TAX BASE

A second obvious error is the belief that the Federal Government is better situated financially to initiate and maintain these programs than are the States and localities. One frequently hears proponents of Federal subsidies maintain that the Federal Government has a broader taxing base than State and local governments. This argument is at best misleading. The States have basically the same tax resources that are available to the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, the States had power to levy direct taxes on income, the primary source of government revenue, long before the Federal Government was given that power. The sales tax, real estate tax, personal property tax and other taxes of less general use and acceptance are all available to State and local governments. There are some taxes used by the Federal Government that are not employed by State and local governments, and vice versa, but this does not justify the statement that the Federal Government has a broader taxing power than the States and local governments.

It quite possibly would be accurate to say that the Federal Government can more easily increase taxes than can State and local governments. This appears to be true, since the Federal Government now collects income taxes ranging from 20 percent to 91 percent of net income, while State governments, with the same taxing capability, have limited their income taxes generally to the 1- to 10-percent range. The reason for this would seem to be that the State governments are close to the people and are more sensitive to the popular demand for economy, while the Federal Government with its gigantic bureaus is separated from the people by long distances and by massive tangles of redtape.

Accordingly, it may be suggested that the "superior taxing power" of the Federal Government rests not upon a broader tax base, but upon the Federal Government's ability to increase taxes with relative impunity.[2] Phrased in another manner, the Congress is less subject to control of the people than are State and local governments. Do the proponents of Federal subsidies really mean that such spending programs should be passed upon by the legislative body that is least responsible to the people? Such a proposition would have found little support among the founders of this country, and should find little support among our people today.

SUPERIOR BORROWING POSITION

A related argument in favor of Federal subsidies is that the Federal Government occupies a borrowing position superior to that of the States and local governments. On close analysis, this argument falls of its own weight. The Federal indebtedness as of June 30, 1961, amounted to $289 billion. This sum is equivalent to 67.2 percent of national income. State debt is only 4.7 percent, and local debt is only 12.8 percent, of national income. Since 1932, the Federal debt has increased about four times as rapidly as State and local debt combined. In the decade from 1952 through 1961, the States as a whole showed surpluses of revenue over expenditure in 6 of the 10 years, with an overall deficit of only $300 million for the period. The Federal Government showed surpluses in only 3 of the 10 years, with an overall deficit of more than $35 billion. As a rule, State and local governments make provision for the systematic repayment of their debt obligations. The failure of the Federal Government to make such provisions may go far in explaining our huge Federal debt.

As of June 30, 1961, States and local governments had made loans to the Federal Government totaling $18.7 billion. Far from being in a superior borrowing position, it is apparent that the Federal Government actually is in a borrowing position inferior to that of the States and the local governments.[3]

INEQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION

Proponents of the many Federal subsidy programs have promoted the idea that these subsidies result in an equitable distribution of tax funds. Nothing could be further from the truth. For example, Federal subsidies returned to the State of Delaware during 1959 amounted to only 40 cents per dollar of taxes paid by Delaware citizens in support of the subsidy programs. The taxpayer in Mississippi received $4.18 for the dollar that he paid for the same purpose. The taxpayer in Connecticut received only 43 cents for his dollar, while the taxpayer in Arkansas received $3.35. A comparable situation exists in other States: The citizen of New Jersey receives 44 cents for his dollar; in New Mexico, the citizen receives $2.97 for each dollar. The New Jersey Taxpayer reports that in 1960 that State lost $143.1 million through Federal taxes that were spent for subsidies to other States. Pennsylvania lost $125.6 million; New York lost $206.5 million; Virginia lost $6.3 million. Some States, of course, showed a profit at the expense of the others. All things considered, it would be rather difficult to devise a more inequitable system of tax distribution.

FEDERAL CONTROL

One of the greatest illusions perpetrated by proponents of Federal subsidies is that control over the expenditure of funds is left in the hands of the States and localities concerned. While it would appear practical for control of the subsidy programs to be vested in those governments closest to the people and most closely connected with the operation of the programs, this is not the case at all. To the contrary, it is a fact that regulation by Congress and by Federal administrative agencies is a normal incident of each subsidy program. This regulation extends to policy and operations questions, as well as to financial considerations.

The result is that both the States and the local governments are rapidly becoming subordinate units of the Federal Government. Programs of a purely local nature, financed by taxes collected from the people in the locality, are in effect operated and controlled by the Federal Government in Washington.

A recent case from Ohio will serve to illustrate the point. In that State, employers had paid to the Federal Government $30 million in taxes for the administration of an unemployment compensation program. Of this amount, $17 million was to be returned to the State for the purpose of making unemployment compensation payments to qualified persons in Ohio. The Federal Department of Labor threatened to withhold the $17 million from the State of Ohio pending that State's adoption of two procedural rules. The money in question had been collected from Ohio. It was to be spent in Ohio by an administrative agency of that State. The program under which the money was to be distributed had been approved by the Ohio courts. Ohio's unemployment compensation administration had been in operation for over 22 years and in the last 5 years alone had handled 95,684 cases without a complaint. Yet, the Federal Department of Labor proposed to penalize the State of Ohio $17 million for failure to comply with federally established regulations for the distribution of this money. It is quite apparent that State and local governments are not left free to establish programs they believe proper with Federal subsidies. To the contrary, it appears that Federal regulation of an essential function touches upon its most minute detail and in at least some cases operates to the detriment of the people affected.

It is common knowledge, of course, that in urban renewal programs, Federal regulations touch upon virtually all areas of activity, including wages, hours of work, public housing, and a great many other items.

The area of farm subsidies is now so tangled and chaotic that it is difficult even for Members of Congress to understand what is taking place, but one thing is certain: The farmer is subjected to more Federal regulation in practically every area of his enterprise than he has ever been subjected to before.

In public welfare programs, where Federal subsidies play an all-important role, a summary and analysis of Federal-State regulations covers over 250 pages. A summary of Federal laws regulating urban renewal covers 62 pages.

In speaking against a proposed program of Federal subsidies for colleges and universities, John A. Howard, president of Rockford College, Illinois, is quoted as saying, "Any legislation which gives money away must have some restrictions to insure that the money is spent for the intended purpose." Furthermore, if the program is adopted, "the Federal Government, which proposes to underwrite a third of the cost of construction and provide substantial scholarships to

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

students, will become in one congressional vote the largest single customer of all private colleges and a substantial customer of all public ones."

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MUST ACT

Surely the most harmful and the most deceptive argument used in favor of Federal subsidies is typified in the statement, "the Federal Government must perform those functions that the State and local governments will not perform." This statement and its several variations are directly contrary to the U.S. Constitution, for they mean that any State power not used, or, in the opinion of the Federal Government, improperly used by a State, is conferred upon the Federal Government. The 10th amendment to the Constitution provides to the contrary, that "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." If a State legislature considers, for example, a State Vaccination Act, and passes such an act, this is perfectly proper. On the other hand, if a State legislature rejects such an act or fails to consider such an act, this does not confer on the Federal Government power to consider a Vaccination Act for all the States. As a matter of fact, the Constitution implicitly denies such a power in the Federal Government, though the Supreme Court has in recent years held to the contrary.

One of the basic purposes of the Fathers of this Nation in establishing a union that left the States free to handle their internal problems was to permit a diversity of experiment on the proper solution of complex problems. Thus in the prevention of contagious diseases, New York might decide that a statewide voluntary public vaccination program offers the best chance for success. Oregon might decide that each town, city, or county should be left free to establish its own program. Arizona might determine that people uncoerced by State pressure, and free of taxes to support such State programs, could best care for their own needs. If one plan proved better than the others, and equally suitable to most areas of the country, presumably that plan would be adopted by most States. Perhaps different plans would have varying appeal to different areas of the country. And if one plan proved detrimental to the interests of the people, that plan would be avoided, and its ill effects confined to the State that had attempted it. But with federally subsidized programs covering the entire Nation, the opportunity for experiment is curtailed, and we are reduced to an "all-or-nothing" situation. This is a far cry from Supreme Court Justice Harlan's observation that one of the great strengths of our Federal system of government is that we have in the 50 States 50 separate laboratories for social experiment.

Another basic purpose accomplished by reserving to the States the power to deal with their internal problems was the keeping of government as close to the people as possible. It was believed by the authors of our Constitution that the creation of an all-powerful Central Government would lead to restrictions on the liberty of the people. With this in mind, the Central Government was given power to act only in those cases when it was necessary or extraordinarily desirable for all the States to act as a single unit. With extreme caution, the powers to be exercised by the Central Government were expressly set forth in the Constitution, and the Congress was given power to do those things necessary and proper to give effect to the expressly enumerated powers. Those powers not given to the Central Government were reserved to the States, and the authors of our Constitution went so far as to have this basic principle explicitly stated in the 10th amendment. In this manner they guaranteed, or thought they guaranteed, for all time that all functions of government except those specifically delegated in the Constitution should be performed by those bodies of government closest to the people, the States. Jefferson, Madison, and those other authors of liberty as we have known it understood that government kept close under the watchful eyes of the people is good government; they knew what an all-powerful Central Government far from the watchful eyes of the people could become careless, incautious in the expenditure of public money, and unjust.

A POWERFUL HAND

Today the Federal Government, by managing more than 90 Federal subsidy programs accounting for the expenditure of $12 billion, is extending a powerful hand into the affairs of all the States, all the local governments, and every citizen in this country. Power feeds upon power, and the staggering growth of the subsidy programs in the last few decades attests to the increased power of the Federal Government over our day-to-day lives. "A power over a man's subsistence amounts to a power over his will."[4]

The commission does not maintain that all Federal subsidies are unnecessary and without constitutional justification. Some of these programs clearly fall within a proper interpretation of the power of Congress to maintain armies and navies, or within other powers delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution. But a great number of the subsidy programs, costing billions of dollars in tax funds each year, do not fall within any power granted to the Federal Government, and many improper programs are proposed each year. The inevitable result of continued expansion of Federal power in this field is the creation of an all-powerful Central Government that substantially controls the life of each citizen.

The waste, inefficiency, and corruption found in many of the subsidy programs only emphasize the need for change. Practically every day brings a new report of wasted welfare payments, scandal in agricultural subsidies, or questionable dealings in urban renewal projects. As we surrender more of our freedom to high Federal taxes, we receive in return more waste, inefficiency, and corruption. The situation is not improved by the fact that our Government officials may be making their best effort—if the program itself is faulty, honest administration cannot cure the defect.

A FIRST STEP

As a first step toward solution of this difficult problem, the commission recommends that all citizens and their representatives in government calmly consider on its merits each new proposal for a Federal subsidy. Any proposed Federal subsidy concerning a matter that can be solved within the framework of city, county, or State government should be rejected. Furthermore, any proposed program that does not reasonably fall within one of the powers delegated by the Constitution to the Federal Government should be rejected. If this is done and done faithfully, the normal course of events will bring about a reexamination of the more unnecessary existing subsidy programs. The industrial States of the North and Midwest will begin to understand that by a balanced program for reducing Federal subsidies they can actually improve their State programs and at the same time reduce the tax burden on their citizens. And perhaps it is not too much to expect that the Federal Government, as it is partially relieved of the expensive subsidy burden, may relieve the taxpayer of a portion of his burden.

---

[1] Representative Durno, of Oregon, who is also a doctor, had this to say: "I think this is a continuing program, or it will be, and if the Congress proposes to adopt this kind of a program, it should be continuing. I think it is going to be an expansive program which is going to involve a lot more diseases. * * * I don't think that it is the dollars in this bill or the medicine in this bill that is the answer. I think the answer is a continuation and an acceleration and an extension of the program of public health, and those public programs should originate at the county level and at the State level more than at the Federal level." 108 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10912.

Representative MARTIN of Nebraska noted that he had sent a questionnaire on this matter to his constituents and that 73 percent of the replies were in opposition to an appropriation of "Federal" money for this program. 108 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10911.

Representative DOMINICK, of Colorado, said, "For the life of me, I cannot understand why it is necessary for the Federal Government to get into this realm." He then entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Denver Post which related in detail the plan that had been developed and used successfully in that locality, without Federal assistance. 108 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10904, 10905.

[2] In 1961, 67 percent of all taxes collected in the United States went into the Federal Treasury. The States received only 16 cents and the local government only 17 cents of each tax dollar.

[3] See the appendix at the end of this article for the figures upon which the comparisons of this section are based.

[4] "The Federalist No. 79," at 497 (Wright ed. 1961) (Hamilton).

APPENDIX

FIGURES RELATING TO COMPARISON OF THE RELATIVE DEBT POSITIONS OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS; LATEST COMPARISONS ARE FOR THE YEAR 1961

National income for 1961, $430.2 billion[1].
Federal debt in 1932, $19.5 billion[2].
Federal debt in 1961, $289.0 billion[2].
State debt in 1932, $2.8 billion[3].
State debt in 1961, $20.0 billion[4].
Local debt in 1932, $16.4 billion[3].
Local debt in 1961, $55.0 billion[4].

State surpluses (+) and deficits (−) of general revenue over expenditure, 1952–61[5]

1952, + $1.0 billion.
1953, + $1.1 billion.
1954, + $0.1 billion.
1955, − $0.7 billion.
1956, + $0.5 billion.
1957, + $0.4 billion.
1958, − $1.9 billion.
1959, − $1.9 billion.
1960, + $1.2 billion.
1961, + $0.1 billion.

Federal surpluses (+) and deficits (−), 1952–61[6] *(excluding trust funds)*

1952, − $4.0 billion.
1953, − $9.4 billion.
1954, − $3.1 billion.
1955, − $4.2 billion.
1956, + $1.6 billion.
1957, + $1.6 billion.
1958, − $2.8 billion.
1959, − $12.4 billion.
1960, + $1.2 billion.
1961, − $3.9 billion.

State and local governments held $18.7 billion in securities issued by the Federal Government as of June 30, 1961.[7]

---

[1] "Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1962," p. 312.

[2] "Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 1962," p. 380.

[3] "Historical Statistics of the United States," U.S. Bureau of the Census, pp. 728–730.

[4] "Summary of Governmental Finances for 1961," U.S. Bureau of the Census, p. 24.

[5] "Compendium of State Government Finances in 1961," U.S. Bureau of the Census, page 1.

[6] "Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1961," page 415.

[7] Id., at p. 98.

Berlin: A New Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, my friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Rhode Island, recently delivered in the Senate an eloquent and perceptive address devoted, in part, to a discussion of our tendency to become transfixed in "frozen positions" on major questions of foreign policy. He called for creative efforts to attack old stalemates in new and different ways.

The Nation for June 22 carries a fine article by Senator PELL, summarizing his own suggestion for a new approach to the Berlin problem. It is a splendid example of fresh thinking, tightly reasoned and cogently presented. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BERLIN: A NEW APPROACH

(By Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, of Rhode Island)

(NOTE.—CLAIBORNE PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island, was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1960 by the largest plurality in the history of his State.)

Of the many centers of international crisis today, none is more potentially dangerous nor has festered longer than the situation in Berlin. For 18 years we have been confronting this problem, which has been sometimes deceptively quiescent, sometimes productive of violent localized struggle and loss of life, more often verging on eruption into conflict which could engulf us all. We have witnessed policies of "brinkmanship" and the maneuvering of armed forces into positions from which withdrawal is increasingly hazardous. We have gained at best a form of status quo—made, however, less favorable to our own national interests, to the interests of the German people and, indeed, of all who desire freedom everywhere by the construction of the Berlin wall.

In my opinion, we have for too long promoted expedients rather than a basic resolution for the problem. We need a fresh approach, and we need to take the initiative in this respect—before we are compelled once again to counter Communist-motivated action.

Recent diplomatic exchanges have produced nothing to encourage great optimism. Nevertheless, it would seem that the Communist armor is not as solid as it once appeared. Moscow and Peking are scarcely in total harmony. Premier Khrushchev has expressed a wish to negotiate, perhaps because all is not well within the monolithic structure of communism, perhaps because of his clumsy failure in Cuba to change the nuclear balance of power, perhaps because the threat of nuclear holocaust makes him realize that he has more to gain through peace. We should not place undue emphasis on any of these aspects; but the fact is that negotiations are possible. We should, therefore, come to the conference table well prepared.

What are the goals we should espouse for an honorable settlement vis-a-vis Berlin? We are pledged to preserve the liberty and the economic viability of the western part of the city, and we are committed to defend our right to maintain an appropriate garrison there. But there is one more goal for which we ought to strive: Guaranteed land access to the city itself.

At the conclusion of World War II, before hostilities between East and West became manifest, we did not insist on specific land access to Berlin. Instead, we preferred to have rights of general access. These were never formalized by treaty, and they have grown into a source of dispute which goes to the very root of the Berlin problem. Furthermore, West German travel to the city is subject to the whim of East German authorities; constant turmoil and confusion are the result. Thus, explicit land access to Berlin, through 110 miles of East German territory, is essential to the agreement we should now seek to reach.

I believe that the Berlin-to-Helmstedt highway is ideally suited to this purpose. There would be virtually no interference with the economic life of East Germany; the highway is equipped with 79 overpasses and 65 underpasses, which traverse without obstruction not only other thoroughfares, but the 21 railroads in the area. The highway could be internationalized, as President Kennedy has suggested; but, in any case, it must be defined by irrevocable guarantee.

Are the policies we have so far been pursuing geared to a formalizing of such an agreement? Since World War II we have championed the cause of a unified Germany. Is this stipulation—here and now— realistic? Or does it lead to irresolvable stalemate? Let us examine the situation more closely.

At present in Berlin two armed camps face each other across a monstrously inhuman barrier made of stone and barbed wire. The slightest jar on one side sets off a similar seismic rumble on the other. The Russians create an incident; we maneuver conspicuously a squadron of tanks—and meanwhile, East Berliners cannot cross to West Berlin, even to attend burials; only the coffin with its dead body is permitted through the wall. There is inordinate suffering; and times of crisis, though they may pass without catastrophe, leave tensions higher than before. If we in the free world, as members of the NATO alliance, allow this process to continue, surely there must come a day of reckoning.

How can we ease these tensions without jeopardizing the pledges we have made and which, at all costs, we must keep?

Our current policies provide no answer. Since 1954 we have encouraged and assisted Western Germany to build up its military might. Western Germany can now boast the most powerful non-Soviet ground force in Europe: an Army of 11 divisions and 253,000 men; a Navy of 177 ships and 28,000 men; and Air Force numbering 90,000. East Germany, in turn, has raised an Army of approximately 200,000, with a 14,000-man Navy and an Air Force of 10,000. These two establishments are, of course, the antithesis of the West's original 1946 concept of a unified Germany, stripped of its military potential and in a world at peace.

Times and circumstances obviously have changed; yet we persist in maintaining attitudes and frames of reference which look backward instead of ahead. It is high time we face the facts as they exist in 1963.

It seems inconceivable to me that either the United States or the Soviet Union, the Western Alliance or the Eastern Bloc, will agree on a disarmed, neutral Germany in the immediate future. The NATO nations certainly would not want Western Germany, the bulwark of their land forces, to withdraw its troops from their command. Nor will the Warsaw Pact Communist nations permit East Germany with its military resources to withdraw from the Communist orbit. Let us acknowledge these facts. The mere acknowledgment allows us to proceed to a new, present-day evaluation of the German situation.

To achieve a formal, ironclad guarantee from the Communists on our rights of land access to Berlin, certainly we can afford to acknowledge the continuing existence of the two German governments and agree, moreover, on the Oder-Neisse line as the East German-Polish border. Such an agreement would in no way infringe on our commitments for preserving West German freedom—and the Communists would not have gained control over a single human being or a single square inch of territory not already under their rule. By consistently refusing to deal with the de facto East German government, we strengthen the Soviet hand, rather than—as we would prefer to think—enfeeble it. We simply augment the stalemate.

But if we accept reality, not only do we open the door for a conclusive accord, but we would be nurturing an environment which could ultimately and successfully undermine the Communist satellite regimes. Poland is the leading industrial satellite nation in the Soviet European empire. Its estimated gross national product of $21.5 billion tops by $2 billion the GNP of East Germany. Only the Communist countries formally recognize the 283-mile, Polish Oder-Neisse frontier. If the West recognized this boundary as well, one of the chief bonds tying Poland to Russian would be severed; and the fundamental anti-Russian feelings of the Polish people, who inhabit the Oder-Neisse territories to the virtual exclusion of all other nationalities, would be given stimulating impetus. A spirit of unrest, of rebellion, is latent in all satellite countries. It cannot grow contagiously, however, while it is enclosed in the vise of unmoving policies.

I believe that the agreement I suggest would have immense, long-term benefits. To begin with, by seizing the initiative in the easement of tensions, we could concentrate more vigorously on the relaxation of the Communist controls at the Berlin wall itself. Amelioration of these conditions is of prime concern to Berliners, both East and West.

We could follow through with other methods of tension reduction. It would be possible to work out a revised status-of-forces in West Berlin, whereunder American, British and French forces would be garrisoned in West Berlin at the invitation of the West Berlin government. In turn, this would strengthen the position of Mayor Willy Brandt.

We could initiate steps with the Communists for a mutual slackening off of propaganda and intelligence operations and, in keeping with efforts presently being made by the West German government, trade could be normalized between West and East Germany and between West Germany and other nations—Poland, Czechosolovakia and Hungary—behind the curtain. In actuality, trade between East and West Germany today amounts to almost half a billion dollars annually; but it is hampered by lack of legitimization. It is well known that communism feeds on areas where poverty and low standards of living prevail. Prosperity has never been a Communist ally in the lands the Kremlin dominates; nor do we find in these lands the higher living standards which prosperous trade relations engender.

It has been suggested that the United Nations headquarters be moved to Berlin. To me this particular step appears somewhat extreme, and I would question its practicability. However, I see no reason why the European headquarters of the U.N. presently at the Palais des Nations in Geneva, and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, presently in Paris, should not be shifted to Berlin. I would prefer to see them in East Berlin, where their salutary effect, I feel, would be most productive; but no matter in what part of the city they were based, these two bodies would help ease political temperatures.

As tensions are reduced, so also would be reduced our current adverse balance-of-payments position. We are now spending more than $50 billion a year for national defense and supporting more than 400,000 men in Europe. No other NATO member makes a comparable outlay; no other has a longer draft period than our own. Yet our NATO allies are today enjoying a $4 billion-plus trade in consumer, nonstrategic goods with the Soviet bloc. In an environment where some military relaxation could be implemented, wouldn't it be possible for us to share in an expansion of peaceful and profitable trade?

We must face other realities, however, before considering a more serene future. Unfashionable as it may be to mention, the prospect of a rearmed and reunified Germany looms with a dark foreboding over a great many European minds. Not easy to forget is the fact that Germany has engaged in three aggressive wars in the past hundred years. The memory bolsters today's general acceptance of the premise that Germany should not be equipped with nuclear weapons; and it gives emphasis to our own point of view that the proliferation of these weapons should be prevented. On this most important single policy, for once, we and the Soviets agree. From a long-term viewpoint, though, no one nation can or should be singled out in this connection, no matter what her history or whether she has been victorious in a war or defeated.

For Eastern Europeans, the specter of a rearmed Germany has more alarming connotations. Communist authorities and satellite leaders exploit this apprehension, which is none the less genuine. Eastern Europe's fears are deeply rooted, stemming not only from brutalities suffered during World War II, but from centuries of earlier German attacks and occupation. We must not ignore the fact that a great majority of Eastern Europeans fear the Germans even more than they do the Russians.

The Poles, remembering all too vividly German conquest and subjugation, listen most uneasily when the usually reasonable Dr. Adenauer says that "the Oder-Neisse line is not Germany's frontier," and they are placed in the ironic position of having to choose the Russians as their defenders. A much more strident neo-Nazi West German minority calls for regaining the Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia. Surely, if a rearmed Germany should ever move eastward again, we would witness once more a European inferno.

Europeans also remember that twice within the past half-century Germany's future ability to wage war has been strengthened by arrangements and understandings reached with Russian rulers. Both the Rapallo Agreement in 1922 and the Ribbentrop Agreement in 1939 were calculated to allow Germany to concentrate its efforts against the West.

For these reasons alone, practical as well as psychological, I submit that a rearmed, reunified Germany is not necessarily the best bulwark against the Soviets.

Many intelligent and moderate Germans are today fully aware of the dangers inherent in militant reunification. As long ago as 1959, the German Social Democrats advanced the Deutschland Plan, accepting the Oder-Neiss frontier. Klaus von Bismark, grandson of the almost legendary old "Iron Chancellor" and now Director of the North Rhine-Westphalia radio network, recently added his support to this concept and suggested that, in accord with the current thinking in West Berlin, priority be given to the bettering of East German conditions. President Charles de Gaulle, whose opinions are frequently controversial, but whom we should seek to understand as basically a European realist, accepts the Oder-Neisse frontier as valid.

Our diplomatic tasks have never been more complex. The maintenance of a strong, coordinated Western alliance, with all parties in harmony, requires in itself exceptional energies. We must never for a moment forget, however, that the Communists are our chief enemy and that we are their number one target. And in this respect I firmly believe that a policy of total inflexibility is purposeless.

It seems obvious to me that a reunified, rearmed Germany—even if it were desirable—is not to be achieved by any means short of violent upheaval which even the most sanguinary among us strenuously wish to avoid. By gaining what we lack—guaranteed land access to the island of freedom which Berlin has come to be—in exchange for recognition of the de facto East German regime, we would be taking a long stride toward ending the cold war.

In effect, we would be exchanging hope for hopelessness—and we would be fostering those very conditions which, in my opinion, can alone lead to the ultimate goal we have traditionally championed: A unified, unarmed Germany in a peaceful community of nations. Two armed camps cannot in this case be forged into one. Patently, the Russians will never make this concession; but two armed camps, clearly and objectively acknowledged as such, can eventually be disarmed. There is the hope.

We must assume that the Soviet Union, confronted with its own internal and external anxieties and problems, is willing for an abatement of tensions. After all, the Russians, too, are realists. Let us, therefore, take the initiative in Berlin. For the first time in many years, we would have much to gain in this vital area, and nothing that is fundamental to our honor to lose.

The Case for Electoral College Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who are interested in improving upon the present system of electing Presidents, I would like to call attention to the following report of the Law Reform Committee on Electoral College Reform, New York State Chamber of Commerce, which gives an interesting historical background on the electoral college, as well as a brief analysis of the most popular proposals for changing the current system and a summary of recent public opinion polls indicating that a majority of the people favor some type of reform.

I believe that my colleagues and all others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will find this report to be an informative and thought-provoking document.

The report follows:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 7, 1963.

Mr. JOHN T. GWYNNE,
Secretary, New York Chamber of Commerce, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. GWYNNE: In view of the long agenda of committee reports and the annual election of officers and committees today I did not want to take the time of the meeting to mention some addenda that might be of interest to the membership in connection with the very comprehensive report for information only of the Law Reform Committee on Electoral College Reform.

I, therefore, now ask you instead, as you suggested, to add at the end of the Committee Report in the Monthly Bulletin this letter. In two presidential elections the electoral college was not able to elect a President. In 1800 there was a tie vote between Burr and Jefferson and the election was thrown into the House of Representatives, which elected Jefferson, and again in 1824 there were four candidates for President voted for in the electoral college none of whom had a majority, Adams, Clay, Crawford and Jackson, and the election was again determined by the House of Representatives for Adams.

In 1876 and 1888 there were Presidents Hayes and Harrison elected without the popular vote in their favor. In 1876 the electoral college failed to elect due to duplicate returns from three States, and an electoral commission had to be set up by Congress to determine the election which awarded it to Hayes. There was also an instance of where the U.S. Senate had to elect a Vice President alone in R. M. Johnson in 1836. I personally favor the abrogation of the electoral college and election by popular vote, which I have advocated since my article in 1920 in the New York American, and the former Independent Magazine about that period.

Very truly yours,
CHESTER D. PUGSLEY.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

The electoral college begins to function on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of every fourth year when qualified voters of the several States choose the presidential electors; it continues on the first Monday after the second Wednesday in December when the electors meet in their respective States to cast their votes for President and Vice President; and it ends on January 6, when the electoral votes are counted in the presence of the two Houses of Congress and the results are announced.

Efforts have been made for more than 50 years to change the electoral college procedures for electing the President and Vice President. After each succeeding national election a flurry of activity brings forth large numbers of bills to amend the electoral process, but aside from the changes wrought by the 12th, 20th, 22d, and 23d amendments to the Constitution, and these made little change in the actual procedures, there has been little success. The movement for reformation of the electoral process intensified when there is a close election or when the election results in the selection of a President by less than a majority of the popular vote.

The continuing efforts to alter or eliminate the electoral college arise from the conviction held by many that there are great inequities in the present system. With few exceptions, however—notably those in 1800, 1824, and 1876—the system has successfully elected a President, although on three occasions the man elected was a minority President, having received a smaller popular vote than his opponents, and on 14 occasions the man elected held only a plurality of the popular vote.

Those who favor a change in the electoral college system argue that it is inequitable because it does not permit a division of the electoral vote of a State between the candidates, but rather provides for a unit-rule or "winner-take-all" procedure which results in the disenfranchisement of great numbers of voters whose votes, in fact, are cast in favor of the opposing candidate. They contend that the present system places exaggerated importance on the larger and pivotal States to the extent that the major parties not only concentrate their campaigning in these areas but also generally choose the candidates from these few most populous States. Moreover, there is criticism of the philosophy and procedure of the contingent election in the House of Representatives where all the States are granted one vote in the choice for President. Finally, there is some feeling that the electoral college itself has become an archaic institution and should be abolished.

Those who are opposed to any change in the present system insist that it has withstood the test of time for almost two centuries and has produced only three minority Presidents; that on only two occasions has it been necessary to invoke the contingent election procedure; that the present system gives proper and adequate representation to the small and sparsely populated States; that any change in the bloc vote might produce splinter parties. Further, they reason that the method currently in use is time-tested and that any new innovation would be experimental. Finally, they contend that the proponents of electoral reform have failed to rally behind a single method they think is better than the present system, but rather offer a number of alternative methods upon which they cannot agree.

HOW THE PRESENT SYSTEM EVOLVED

Article II of the Constitution provides that: "Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which a State may be entitled in the Congress; but no Senator or Representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector."

In the early days of the Republic, the electors were chosen in a variety of manners; they were selected by the State legislatures, they were elected by the people in the districts, or they were elected on a statewide general ticket. The electors, thus chosen, were directed to cast ballots for two persons. The one receiving the highest number, if a majority, would be President; the second highest, the Vice President. In the event of a tie or the lack of a majority, the choice would be made by the House of Representatives.

In 1800, a tie between Jefferson and Burr, running for President and Vice President, respectively, on the Republican-Democrat party ticket, threw the election into the House where, after the 36th ballot, Jefferson was chosen. This dispute stimulated the consideration of reform—and the 12th amendment to the Constitution, ratified in 1804, resulted therefrom.

The 12th amendment eliminated any question as to the designees for the specific offices by providing that: "The electors shall meet in their respective States and vote by ballot for President and Vice President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the persons voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the persons voted for as Vice President."

The amendment also detailed the manner in which the votes would be tallied in the Congress. Amendment XII further provided that the House of Representatives would make the selection of the winning presidential candidate (if none received a majority of the electoral votes) by a ballot, with each State having one vote. A similar procedure was established for the Senate, for the selection of the Vice President.

The next change in the electoral process was made nearly 130 years later with the ratification of the 20th amendment in 1933. This amendment, known as the "lame duck" amendment, set the time for the assumption of office by the President and Vice President on the 20th day of January and set the opening meeting of Congress for the third of January. This eliminated the possibility of the choice of President and Vice President in a contingent election by a Congress which would remain in office only a few more weeks, rather than by the newly elected body. The amendment provided also that in the event the President elect dies before he is inaugurated, the Vice President shall become President.

The 22d amendment limiting to two the number of terms that a President may serve, and the 23d amendment enfranchising the eligible voters of the District of Columbia, are the most recent adjustments in the national election procedure, and like the preceding ones, make no fundamental alteration in the procedure of actually selecting a President and Vice President through the electoral college.

Statutory changes effecting the electoral process have been made by Congress, but these have dealt with the line of succession to office and measures establishing the time of elections, the time and place that electors will meet, and the procedures to be followed in Congress in tabulating the electoral votes.

HOW THE ELECTORS ARE CHOSEN

A great deal of the prerogative in determining electoral policy is delegated to the States in Article II of the Constitution which provides that the States shall appoint, in the manner directed by the legislature, a number of electors equal to the State's representation in Congress. Each State is permitted to determine for itself the manner in which such electors are chosen. At present it happens that electors in all the States are chosen on a general ticket at the election held in November of Presidential years. This method has been followed by all States, with a few exceptions, since 1836.

However, the States differ considerably in the manner in which the electors are nominated, in the manner they are presented on the ballot, and, most significantly, in the extent to which they are committed to cast their ballots for the candidates of the parties the electors presumably represent. In most States, the presidential electors are nominated by the State party conventions or the State committees, and in some they are nominated in a primary. In Florida, however, they are chosen by the Governor and in Pennsylvania by the presidential nominees of each party.

The pledge by the elector to cast his vote for a party's candidate is sometimes associated with the manner of nomination, or it is determined by the manner of presentation on the ballot. Where the so-called "presidential short ballot" (a ballot on which the names of the candidates for President and Vice President appear in lieu of the names of the electors) is used, there is an implication that the electors are expected to vote for these candidates. In the 33 States where this system has been adopted, State law contains a provision that a vote cast for the candidate is deemed to be a vote cast for the electors of the party whose names may not even appear on the ballot. In another group of States, an inference of a pledge may be made from the ballot on which the names of the electors are listed under the party insignia and names of the candidates. Provisions for the names of unpledged electors are made on the ballots in Alabama, Arkansas, and Georgia.

Many of the deficiencies and alleged inequities of the present system may be attributed to the adoption, by the States, of the general ticket method of selecting electors. By the simple act of electing the entire slate of electors of the party receiving a plurality of the votes, there is an automatic assignment of all the State's electoral votes to one candidate. While it is possible in some States to vote for individual electors, the trend in most States, now, is to vote for the presidential candidate in lieu of individual electors. The expanded use of voting machines is accelerating this process.

It is possible, therefore, to change the electoral procedure by having every State legislature reject the use of the general ticket method. In doing so a legislature could select another method, and it is entirely conceivable that a majority in a legislature, anticipating an unfavorable outcome in the next election, might attempt to fortify itself against such an eventuality by again changing the mode of appointing electors.

The result could be an instability in the manner of choosing electors. The alternative would be the determination of a mode of choosing the President that would be given the fixedness and permanence of a constitutional rule, and one that would seriously reduce the constitutional prerogative of the States to appoint the electors "in the manner directed by the legislatures."

THE ELECTORAL PROCESS IN OPERATION

The President and Vice President are chosen by the electoral college, an assemblage of electors which meets in each State to cast their ballots for the President and Vice President. While voters going to the polls usually think of themselves as voting for the President and Vice President, actually they vote only for the electors even though they may seldom know who the electors are.

The electors vote for the President and Vice President on separate ballots, and the lists are delivered to the President of the Senate on a date set by law. The President of the Senate acts as the presiding officer at a joint meeting of the Senate and House of Representatives on the 6th of January for the purpose of tabulating the electoral votes. If one candidate polls a majority of the electoral vote, the President of the Senate announces the vote; and that announcement is deemed a declaration of the persons elected President and Vice President.

In the event that no candidate receives a majority of the electoral vote, the Constitution requires that the House of Representatives immediately choose a President; and that the Senate choose a Vice President. The contingent method provides for the selection of a President by ballot in the House from among the candidates (not more than three) who received the highest number of electoral votes. Further, the Constitution provdes that in choosing the President, the votes in the House shall be taken by States, with each State entitled to one vote. The candidate for whom the vote of a State will be cast is determined by a polling of the State's Representatives. The one receiving the greatest number of votes will receive the one vote of the State, while a tie vote means the loss of the State's one vote. The choice of a Vice President is made in the Senate from the two candidates receiving the highest votes, by a method similar to that prescribed for the selection of the President. In the House the quorum required for this purpose is representation from two-thirds of the States, and in the Senate the quorum consists of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators. In both bodies, the candidate receiving the majority is the winner.

PROPOSALS TO REFORM THE ELECTORAL SYSTEM

Of the hundreds of bills submitted in Congress from time to time in efforts to revise the electoral college system, few have progressed beyond committee consideration. One of the more recent proposals, the Lodge-Gossett plan, was passed by the Senate in 1950, but could not muster the required two-thirds vote in the House of Representatives.

Many of the proposals are restatements of recommended changes which date from as early as 1826.

Since 1947, more than 100 proposals have been introduced to amend the Constitution with respect to the electoral process. They have centered on three basic methods of electing the President and Vice President—the direct election by popular vote plan; the district plan or Mundt-Coudert program; the proportional plan, as embodied in the Lodge-Gossett proposal. A fourth proposal which has been advanced was the combination plan or Daniel substitute plan which combines the district and proportional plans.

In addition, there have been a number of variations on the present system and on the above proposals that have been submitted for consideration. Prominent among these is the proposal that would incorporate in the Constitution the present practice of awarding all of a State's electoral votes to the candidate receiving the largest number of popular votes, but which would eliminate the electors. This has been called the direct election by the States method, because it provides that the people vote directly for candidates and cast their votes by State units of electoral votes.

THE DIRECT ELECTION PLAN

This proposal calls for the amendment of the Constitution to provide that the selection of the President and Vice President would be decided by a national direct vote of the people. The electoral college would be totally abolished.

The advocates of this proposal argue that this method of electing the President and Vice President would give a more accurate picture of relative party strength; that it would be simpler for the voter to understand; and that it would give the voter the actual choice, rather than merely an expression of preference which is now transmitted to someone else making the choice. They contend that this method would eliminate the weighting that occurs with the use of electoral votes and the resulting concentration by the candidates upon the winning of large key States, and that it would make every vote equal. Finally, the direct election method would eliminate the need for a contingent election procedure and thus prevent the election of a President who receives a minority of the popular vote.

Those who oppose the direct election plan hold that it would encourage the growth of minor parties and otherwise affect the two-party system; that it would remove a slight advantage given to voters in small States; that it would reduce the role of the States in the electoral process and permit the nationalization of election procedures; and finally, that it would be the most drastic method of eliminating whatever weaknesses may now exist in the electoral process.

THE DISTRICT PLAN

Popularly termed the Mundt-Coudert proposal, the district plan would preserve the electoral college, but would change the present procedure of giving the entire electoral vote to the winning candidate in the State. Instead, the electors would be chosen in each congressional district, with two electors chosen from the State at large. A State's electoral vote, therefore, would reflect the voter preferences in each congressional district, plus the State at large. Under this proposal the presidential candidate receiving the highest number of electoral votes would be chosen, provided he had a majority. Failing a majority, the Senate and House, meeting jointly, would elect a President from the top three candidates.

One variation of the Mundt-Coudert proposal was introduced by former Representative Coudert. This proposal would abolish the electoral college while retaining the other provisions of the district plan. The candidate receiving the plurality of votes cast in each district would be credited with one electoral vote and the State winner would receive the at-large votes. This proposal would follow the district plan in all other respects.

Those who favor the district plan contend that it has the advantage of providing a more accurate reflection of the popular vote than is now obtainable from the present system; that it is more favorable toward the establishment and maintenance of the two-party system; and that it would not create an unwanted precedent for a method of election by proportional representation for Congress. Further, the district plan, it is felt, would provide a harmony of expression between the vote for President and the vote for Representative in the same district; it would reduce the power of the large, "doubtful" States; and it would encourage greater voting participation in single-party States.

Those opposed to the district plan claim that it would not reflect the popular vote more accurately than the present system but rather would permit a candidate, by winning his districts by small majorities or pluralities while his opponent won his districts by resounding numbers, to get more electoral votes in a State while having only a minority of the State's total popular vote. They also believe that this plan would encourage excessive gerrymandering; would overweight the political power of rural areas; and that it would impair rather than strengthen the two-party system because it would permit minor parties to win congressional districts and thereby gain some electoral votes.

THE PROPORTIONAL PLAN

The most popular among the recent proposals for amendment of the electoral process has been the Lodge-Gossett plan, or proportional plan. This plan would abolish the electoral college but would retain the electoral vote, which would be apportioned in each State among the presidential candidates in accordance with the number of popular votes they receive. The candidate with the greatest number of mathematically computed electoral votes would be the winner. In the numerous variations on this plan there have been requirements that the winner have a majority of the electoral vote; while in the 1950 version of the Lodge-Gosset plan which passed the Senate, and in the original Daniel plan submitted in 1955, the winner was required to poll at least 40 percent of the total electoral vote. The Lodge-Gossett plan sets forth a contingent election procedure which specifies that the President would be chosen from the two candidates having the highest numbers of electoral votes by Congress, in joint session if no candidate polls the required percentage of the total electoral vote.

The supporters of the proportional plan claim that it would tend more accurately to reflect the popular vote, particularly in so-called "one-party" States; that it would be less likely to produce a minority President; and that it would give the voters a more direct voice in the choice of the President. Moreover, those favoring this method believe that it would act to strengthen the two-party system and eliminate the current tendency of the parties to concentrate election efforts in the so-called "pivotal" States.

Those advocating other plans or a maintenance of the present system believe that the proportional plan would enable minority parties to get electoral votes and thereby weaken the two-party system; that the vote would still be weighted in favor of small States and give undue importance to areas with less population; that the States would have less importance as units in the electoral process. In addition, they argue that the proportional plan might bring pressure for proportional representation in Congress and, possibly, Federal control over voting standards.

THE DANIEL SUBSTITUTE PLAN

In 1955, Senator Daniel and 19 others introduced Senate Joint Resolution 31 which was similar to the Lodge-Gossett plan. In the following year, those who favored the district plan and those who favored the proportional plan joined forces and offered a substitute to Senate Joint Resolution 31 which was known as the Daniel substitute plan. It was sponsored by 54 Senators. The amendment would permit each State to adopt either the district plan or the proportional plan. Under this substitute plan, a State could distribute its electoral votes among the three top candidates according to the popular vote; or a State legislature could decide that the electors would be chosen by congressional districts with two additional statewide votes.

THE NUMBERS GAME

To some extent the advocacy or opposition to a particular method of choosing the President and Vice President has been motivated by partisan consideration of the chances of a political party gaining top position in the Nation. Extensive analysis of voting patterns over numbers of years has probably influenced the choice of those who believe that a revised electoral system would improve their chances of winning, and would not result in a reversal in what they currently consider "safe" States.

The adoption of a different method of electing the President than currently in effet would not likely affect the outcome of elections in which there is a clear majority in favor of one candidate, except to reduce the margin of victory in the electoral count. But in a close election, as in the Kennedy-Nixon race in 1960, the outcome may well be determined by the method of selection used. For example, if the electoral votes in 1960 had been cast under the district plan, Mr. Nixon, the Republican Party candidate, would have emerged the victor.

Data on electoral vote in the 1952, 1956, and 1960 elections

	1952	1956	1960
POPULAR VOTE			
Republican	33,927,549	35,590,472	34,108,546
Democrat	27,311,316	26,022,752	34,227,096
Other	308,996	413,684	503,337
Total	61,547,861	62,026,908	68,838,979
PERCENTAGE OF POPULAR VOTE			
Republican	55.1	57.4	49.5
Democrat	44.4	42.0	49.7
Other	.5	.6	.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
ELECTORAL VOTE, PRESENT SYSTEM			
Republican	442	457	219
Democrat	89	74	303
Other			[1] 15
Total	531	531	537
ELECTORAL VOTE, DISTRICT PLAN			
Republican	375	413	280
Democrat	156	116	254
Other		2	3
Total	531	531	537
ELECTORAL VOTE, PROPORTIONAL PLAN			
Republican	288.5	296.683	263.662
Democrat	239.8	227.224	266.136
Other	2.7	7.093	7.202
Total	531.0	531.000	537.000

[1] Byrd.

A State-by-State view of the count under the different systems reveals a considerable disparity in the possible distribution of the electoral vote.

Result of the State electoral vote cast in 1960

State	Present system		District plan		Proportional plan	
	Republican	Democrat	Republican	Democrat	Republican	Democrat
Alabama	0	11	1	10	4.598	6.259
Alaska	3	0	3	0	1.527	1.473
Arizona	4	0	4	0	2.220	1.776
Arkansas	0	8	1	7	3.448	4.016
California	32	0	19	13	16.032	15.872
Colorado	6	0	5	1	3.276	2.694
Connecticut	0	8	1	7	3.704	4.296
Delaware	0	3	0	3	1.470	1.518
Florida	10	0	6	4	5.150	4.850
Georgia	0	12	0	12	4.488	7.512
Hawaii	0	3	0	3	1.500	1.500
Idaho	4	0	3	1	2.152	1.848
Illinois	0	27	15	12	13.446	13.500
Indiana	13	0	12	1	7.150	5.798
Iowa	10	0	10	0	5.670	4.320
Kansas	8	0	8	0	4.832	3.128
Kentucky	10	0	8	2	5.360	4.640
Louisiana	0	10	2	8	2.860	5.040
Maine	5	0	5	0	2.850	2.150
Maryland	0	9	3	6	4.176	4.824
Massachusetts	0	16	0	16	6.336	9.632
Michigan	0	20	10	10	9.760	10.180
Minnesota	0	11	4	7	5.412	5.566
Mississippi[1]	0	5	0	5	1.976	2.904
Missouri	0	13	7	6	6.461	6.539
Montana	4	0	3	1	2.044	1.944
Nebraska	6	0	6	0	3.726	2.274
Nevada	0	3	0	3	1.464	1.536
New Hampshire	4	0	4	0	2.136	1.856
New Jersey	0	16	6	10	7.872	8.000
New Mexico	0	4	0	4	1.976	2.008
New York	0	45	20	25	21.285	23.625
North Carolina	0	14	7	7	6.706	7.294
North Dakota	4	0	4	0	2.216	1.780
Ohio	25	0	20	5	13.325	11.675
Oklahoma	8	0	7	1	4.720	3.280
Oregon	6	0	6	0	3.156	2.844
Pennsylvania	0	32	15	17	15.584	16,352
Rhode Island	0	4	0	4	1.456	2.544
South Carolina	0	8	2	6	3.904	4.096
South Dakota	4	0	4	0	2.328	1.672
Tennessee	11	0	7	4	5.819	5.038
Texas	0	24	7	17	11.640	12.120
Utah	4	0	4	0	2.192	1.808
Vermont	3	0	3	0	1.758	1.242
Virginia	12	0	9	3	6.288	5.640
Washington	9	0	5	4	4.563	4.347
West Virginia	0	8	2	6	3.784	4.216
Wisconsin	12	0	9	3	6.216	5.760
Wyoming	3	0	3	0	1.650	1.350
Total	220	314	280	254	263.662	266.136

[1] Mississippi had 3 unpledged electoral votes which were cast for Senator HARRY BYRD, and these are not tallied in the total.

NOTE.—The total in the proportional plan excludes 7.202 electoral votes cast for other than major candidates.

It is evident from the record that the present system fails to reflect the fact that, in 1960, both presidential candidates polled less than a majority of the total national popular vote, or that the winner polled only 116,550 votes more than the loser out of a total of 68,838,979 votes. Furthermore, as indicated by a tabulation of the votes in the State of Illinois, the use of a different method of apportioning the electoral vote might have provided another result. Under the district plan, for example, Mr. Nixon would have received more electoral votes (15 to 12); and under the proportional plan Mr. Kennedy would have received 13,500 votes to Mr. Nixon's 13,466 electoral votes—either of which would have been a more accurate expression of voter preference than the granting of 27 electoral votes to one candidate on the basis of a 0.2 percent margin in the popular vote.

The need for amendment of the electoral process, however, carries beyond the actual political advantage that might be derived from the use of one method or the other. It should initially be based on the need to provide a more realistic reflection of voter preference than is now available through present electoral procedures.

In recent years a number of polls conducted by Mr. Gallup of the American Institute of Public Opinion have projected that a significant portion of the American public favored changing the method of electing the President. In 1950, the poll indicated that 57 percent of the American public favored changing the method of electing the President. In 1950, the poll indicated that 57 percent of the people favored the Lodge-Gossett amendment while 22 percent opposed it and the remainder had no opinion. Ten years later another Gallup poll showed 50 percent of the public supporting reform of the electoral college system, 28 percent opposed and 22 percent expressing no preference.

Inasmuch as the reform of the electoral college would require an amendment to the Constitution it is evident that such an effort must arouse greater interest across the Nation and a marshalling of support behind one of the proposed plans. In making a realistic appraisal of the possibility of gaining electoral reform it is clear that there is little public interest in such an effort and that is manifested almost exclusively at election time every 4 years; that there is a lack of general knowledge about the electoral process; that there is little organized effort to educate the public and to gain their support for electoral reform.

Clearly there is a need for informed comment on this subject as well as widespread discussion of the means of improving the electoral process. Perhaps this is a matter to which the associations of the bar across the Nation might address themselves as they did on the problem of presidential inability, and thus provide the influential and knowledgeable leadership that would be required to change and improve our electoral procedures.

COMMITTEE ON LAW REFORM, NEW YORK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

The People's Pope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "The People's Pope":

[From the Warren (Pa.) Times-Mirror, June 5, 1953]

THE PEOPLE'S POPE

The death of Pope John XXIII is being universally mourned by Catholics and by many non-Catholics. Of all the Pontiffs of the last century, this surely was "the people's Pope."

When Angelo Giuseppe Cardinal Roncalli was elected to the Chair of Peter in the fall of 1958, he was an unknown quantity. He was 77 years old, but robust and energetic. He was unashamedly of peasant stock, having been born in Italy's extreme north, at Sotto il Monte (Beneath the Mountain), which lies in the very shadow of the Alps. That country breeds strong, energetic men, and the future Pope, fourth of 12 children of the Roncalli family, was all of that.

During World War I he served in the ambulance corps and later was attached to the office of his bishop, in Bergamo, where he had attended seminary. He rose steadily but slowly through the ranks, becoming a bishop in 1925 and was transferred to the Vatican diplomatic corps, where he carried out numerous assignments under three Popes. He was named Patriarch of Venice in 1953, a few days after Pope Pius XII had named him a cardinal.

In a way it was ironic that this son of poor sharecroppers in the north of Italy should become the spiritual ruler of one of Italy's oldest and most aristocratic cities, but Cardinal Roncalli never made any bones about it. He like to think of himself as a parish priest with enlarged responsibilities, and it was this attitude he carried with him when he was elected Pope in 1958.

Pope John XXIII—a name he revived after centuries of disuse—broke many traditions. He did not keep meekly to his apartments or to the narrow route between the Vatican and nearby Castel Gondolfo, the papal summer residence. He got out and saw and did things, talked with people, turned up unexpectedly here and there and often startled staid Vatican workers and officials almost out of their wits.

On one occasion, a reliable story goes, he unceremoniously entered the public elevator which takes tourists and other visitors from the level of St. Peter's Square to the fabulous Borgia apartments, two floors up. The elevator operator, who had several other passengers aboard, was so thunderstruck that he couldn't move. After a rather long pause, His Holiness finally said to him, "My son, unless you make this thing go, we may be here all day." They went.

His visits to Rome's jails were legendary. He horrified some of the more staid Vatican populace by telling prisoners in one Roman jail that a relative of his had done some time, so he knew what it meant.

But beyond that, Pope John had two deep and abiding interests. One was the unification of the Christian faith and the other was the cause of peace. In the interest of the first, he called the Ecumenical Council which was scheduled to reconvene this year. In the second, he spoke out in his famous Christmas encyclical on peace in the world. For these two things he will be especially remembered in church history.

He was, in every sense, the "people's Pope." The outpouring of affection and grief among the Roman populace during his last illness is evidence of this. He was one of them and he spoke for them, and of them. His longest encyclical—the longest in church annals—was on the plight of the worker and the need for social progress. In this he turned the church's eyes squarely on the need for keeping leadership in social problems.

His predecessor, Pope Pius XII, has been spoken of as a saint and is noted for his deep piety. In the fullness of time, he may be enrolled in the calendar of saints. But it also is not beyond the realm of possibility that Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli, the son of poor sharecroppers but the beloved father of the poor, may also attain that distinction. He already is canonized in many hearts.

Extension of Section 221 Mortgage Insurance Authority

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, an issue is presently before the House that demands the support of every Representative from every district in the Nation. House Joint Resolution 467, a bill to extend the benefits of the Federal Housing Administration 221 housing program until 1965, is absolutely necessary if we are to continue to provide housing for our low and middle income citizens.

For many years the "package of tools" offered by Congress through the Federal Housing Administration has been among the most popular programs offered by the Federal Government. FHA has established itself as an efficient administrative agency and has good relations with both the public and the business community. Its programs have helped homeownership in the United States to reach an unprecedented level of 62.5 percent in 1961.

All FHA programs have been designed, in one way or another, to encourage homeownership by citizens who would otherwise be forced to remain renters all their lives. Section 221(d)(2) and section 221(d)(4) are exceptionally good examples.

Section 221 became a part of the Nation Housing Act in 1954 when Congress became concerned with the relocation of families from urban renewal projects. These families were largely renters and, for the most part, low on the income ladder. Their chances of homeownership were dim and the prospect of having to move to another slum area was ever present. Section 221 offered a chance for many of those unfortunate people to leave their old environment and reside in a suitable neighborhood either as renters or homeowners.

In 1961 sweeping revisions were made in the 221 program when it was recognized that it could be employed to meet the growing, and unmet, need for low and middle income housing other than relocation housing. Section 221(d)(2) differs from other FHA programs in that it requires a lower downpayment, in some cases has a longer mortgage term, and enjoys less restrictive minimum standards. Section 221(d)(4) offers encouragement to the construction of low and middle income apartments for those who need time to save for future homeownership.

Since enactment of these revisions in the 221 program in 1961 things have moved at a brisk pace. Under the d2 program 36,000 units have been insured and 62 projects covering 7,500 rental units have been insured under the d4 program.

It pleases me to lend my support to such a worthy program. The growing need for adequate housing in this country is a recognized fact. This is especially true in the area of low and middle income housing. These two FHA programs, the extension of which was reported favorably by both the House Subcommittee on Housing and the House Committee on Banking and Currency, deserve to be extended for another 2 years. House Joint Resolution 467 will legalize the continued benefits of these two vital FHA programs. This measure has received my enthusiastic support and I will continue to be a friend of such needed legislation. I trust that my fellow Congressmen will rally to the need in sufficient numbers so that this measure can pass without further hesitation.

Eleanor Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, millions of words have been written and millions more could be written to extol the many virtues of Eleanor Roosevelt. Those who have mourned her passing do not fall within a particular party, age, group, sex, or nationality for she was known throughout the world by men and women of all ages and in all walks of life.

Due to the affliction of her famous husband, Mrs. Roosevelt assumed a role that went far beyond that of a wife and mother. For a long period of time she was the eyes and ears of the President. Her deep feelings for and her efforts in behalf of the less fortunate endeared her to millions who never actually saw her, or heard her, or read her many books and articles.

Eleanor Roosevelt considered the problems of misfortune and misery as her own, regardless of where they occurred in the world. Her efforts in behalf of America's poor and unfortunate were not a recent thing since she labored tirelessly at a time when civil rights and civil liberties were not the outstanding subjects of the day.

It must also be said that her efforts gave courage to many other women and women's organizations throughout the country for she appeared on the American scene at a time when women were not easily accepted as leaders. To assume this role, she overcame a natural shyness in order to help further the political career of her illustrious husband, as well as to espouse the many causes that motivated her entire life.

Her many trips to Hartford, Conn., will long be treasured in the memory of those women with whom she worked so unselfishly. She spoke to many groups and she supported the causes in which she believed, invigorating all who came to know her in this community.

Reports to the United Nations Trusteeship Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I offer the third of a series of five articles presented to members of the United Nations Trusteeship Council. The second part of High Commissioner Goding's statement concerns our progress in economic development and transportation matters with regard to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands during the past year, as follows:

REPORTS TO THE UNITED NATIONS TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Without question the economic highlight of the year was the signing of a basic agreement with a major U.S. seafood company, under which the company will establish a commercial fishery industry in the Palau District. Several other commercial fishery concerns also conducted surveys in the Territory during the year, exploring possibilities for similar or related commercial fishery projects.

The opening of the Territory to outside private investment has drawn much attention from industrial concerns. Surveys have been conducted by representatives of the pineapple and sugar industries, as well as by other industries.

An Economic Development Loan Fund has been established by the administering authority, in which was placed an initial increment of $100,000 this past year; this has stimulated the development of small business and small-scale business enterprises. This loan fund is an addition to the present Chartered Trading Company Loan Fund, out of which loans were also made during the year. Their rules governing the latter fund, however, restrict loans to chartered trading companies. We are now seeking the removal of the present restrictions and plan to merge this fund with the general Economic Development Fund.

Additional funds for the Economic Development Loan Fund have been requested for the forthcoming year. To date the Fund has granted outright loans, as well as serving as a guarantor for commercial bank loans. By the latter method, the use of the Loan Fund has been expanded considerably. Loans made during the year ranged through a variety of small-scale business enterprises. It is hoped that the Fund can be rapidly expanded to make or underwrite large-scale development loans.

The year witnessed continued rapid expansion in credit unions and cooperatives, the number more than doubling that of the previous year. Others have submitted charters and bylaws for consideration or are in the preliminary stages of organization. Training in cooperative principles and procedures was also carried out through district conferences, and a major training session was held last autumn in Saipan for delegates from all districts.

Five districts now have branch banks, the latest branch having just opened this month in the Ponape District Center. Only Yap District now lacks a branch bank.

The growth of the local banks, as well as the flourishing of credit unions, is eloquent witness to increased economic development.

A few of the members of the Trusteeship Council present today may recall that 6 years ago the special representative reported on the results of a territory banking survey conducted for us by a banking concern. That survey was very pessimistic and reported that there appeared to be little opportunity for the establishment of branch banks in the foreseeable future. We now have five such branches and indications of more to come.

Although our outlook for commercial fishery development appears promising at long last, we are not neglecting our own fishery development projects. A small school of fisheries completed the first year of operation in Palau, and some 25 young men are undergoing training in tuna-fishing methods at the present time on tuna boats in Hawaii. Our pilot fishery project at Palau moves forward steadily. A boatbuilding expert was hired this past year to serve as a consultant to the Palau Boatbuilders Association, and a loan was made to this group; technical assistance and aid were also given to enable the group to erect a boatyard.

Our production of copra is now reaching the level found before the disastrous typhoons of 1957 and 1958, which so drastically cut production in the Marshalls, Ponape, Truk and Yap. Well over 13,000 tons of copra were produced during the last fiscal year, even though only 11,700 short tons had been sold at the close of last year. There was a sizable overall increase in copra revenue to producers compared with the preceding year, as a result of increased production. The Copra Stabilization Fund shrank considerably, since the fund maintained a constant price throughout the year in spite of falling market prices. The copra picture has now brightened somewhat. Prices are slightly higher, and decreased shipping costs enabled the fund a few months ago to realize the first profit on sales in over 2 years. If this trend continues, we hope to be able to bring the fund balance back up to a more normal level and to raise prices paid to the copra producer.

Revenue from fishing exports and vegetable produce again showed an appreciable increase. Fishing export revenue for the year was $85,000—a small figure, but one that is increasing annually, as may be seen by a comparison with last year's figure of $65,000. When local and inter-District sales are added, revenue from this source is close to $200,000. Vegetable produce revenue, going almost exclusively to the Islands of Rota, Tinian, and Saipan, increased to $95,000 in fiscal 1962, as compared to $68,000 for the previous year.

Local farmers markets have expanded. Events such as the opening of the Majuro Road in the Marshalls have made possible the local sale of large quantities of fresh produce to the District Centre in Majuro. In other Districts, also, as road improvement has occurred, farmers have been able to get their produce to the central markets, where there is a constant demand.

Increasing reliance on local fresh produce, local meat, fish and other local supplies is seen by comparing the volume of commodities imported into the Territory. In 1961, with a population of 77,900, total food imports came to $2,329,000. In fiscal year 1962, although the population had increased to 80,980, food imports were reduced to $1,883,000. Food imports are still high, but it is encouraging to note a downward trend. Canned fish is still imported in quantity, and it is our hope that this import can be cut considerably when the commercial fishing operation gets underway in Palau, since, indirectly, that operation will spur local production and consumption.

Coconut rehabilitation and replanting continue, as do other developmental programs in subsistence and cash crops.

Details of the agriculture program are given in full in our annual report. The cacao program is proceeding beyond expectations. Trees are beginning to bear, and, barring any unforeseen calamity, commercial production of cacao as a major crop will become a reality within the next few years. The cacao subsidy program described in our report has been an unusual success. Through this program, as well as private plantings, there are now estimated to be close to 2 million cacao seedlings and trees growing in the Territory, most of them in the Districts of Ponape, Truk, Palau, and Yap.

Ramie production is also showing unusual promise, and it is anticipated that the pilot project in Palau need be continued for only another year before local commercial development can take over.

To enable the copra producer to make use of coconut husk byproducts, coir fiber-processing is being developed through a pilot project in Truk.

The Farm Institute in Ponape concluded its first year of operation, and plans for expansion of this center for agriculture extension training are underway.

Continued emphasis is being placed on professional agricultural training at the university level abroad. This past year, two young graduates returned to the Territory with degrees in tropical agriculture. Additionally, some eight students have returned with advanced training, ranging from 2 to 5 years, in the field of agriculture. Six additional scholarship students are leaving this month for university training to join a group of some 12 other agricultural students already in school. Of this group, four are working toward advanced degrees, while the rest are still on the lower level of undergraduate work.

Special training in forestry methods and ricegrowing techniques were also offered to Micronesian agricultural extension agents during the year.

The operation of the Micronesian Products Center resulted in an approximate doubling of handicraft income during the past year, mainly for the woodcarvers of Palau. The center also indirectly sparked the formation of the Woodworkers Guild in that district. In the other districts, the promise of an immediate and steady market stimulated women's organizations as well as individuals to develop better handicraft. Handicraft selection boards have been established in all districts, and all handicraft is screened and evaluated prior to being sold to the center. The result has been a marked increase in quality of product. An interesting side development has been the remaking of traditional artifacts and ancient objects by older craftsmen. Many of these traditional objects have never been seen before by the younger Micronesians. These copies have sold exceedingly well and some are of a quality that exceed even the original counterparts now to be found only in the museums of Europe.

The past year saw the beginning of tourism for the Territory. While only a handful of "true tourists" managed to get to the Eastern Carolines or to Palau due to limited passenger capacity on our amphibious airplanes which still must be used on these flights, a few nonetheless did manage. The Marianas, however, has a small but flourishing tourist business. Our DC–4 plane, which is depicted on page 82 of the annual report, has a seating capacity of 57 and makes 3 flights a week from Guam to Saipan and, I might say, in the past few months almost always has been filled to capacity or near capacity. Additionally, two small private charter airlines located in Guam also fly between Guam and Rota-Tinian-Saipan, carrying tourists as well as businessmen. A number of subsidiary business establishments already have resulted, and plans are under way for greatly increasing hotel accommodations. Conditions have changed from those which prompted the former representative of Bolivia, in 1961, at the 27th session, to express rather serious doubts about the future of tourism when he rather ruefully complained that it seemed to him the only people who had access to the Territory were members of the U.S. Navy, the administration, Spanish nuns, anthropologists, and U.N. representatives. The reverse is now true. His list, I assure him, is now a small minority. Tourists of various nationalities are now a frequent sight on Saipan. With the completion of land airfields in all districts and the use of larger land-based planes, we expect tourism to become an important aspect of the local economy.

Several major advances can be recorded in the transportation area. The year saw the completion of the Truk dock and final dredging of the Truk Harbor. A 3,5000-ton motor vessel, the *North Star,* was acquired from the Department of Interior and is now in service, renamed the *Pacific Islander,* thus providing a second major logistic vessel. We will be able to provide 35-day service between the district centers, Guam-Saipan, and Japan. This will more than double the frequency of passenger and logistic services to all districts. We plan also to retire the remaining uneconomical AKL-class vessels now operated in our field trip service as soon as feasible and replace them with smaller, more economical and practical vessels. Two such new vessels already have been built to our specifications, the motor vessel *Militobi* and the motor vessel *Kaselehlia,* and are in service. Funding for an additional smaller field-trip vessel has been requested in our budget for the coming year.

As I previously indicated, a DC–4 aircraft was placed in regular service on July 1, 1962, between Guam and Saipan. Carrying 57 passengers and appreciable cargo, this plane also is used to fly to Angaur in Palau, and to Truk, on a monthly basis or as need demands. Flights can now be made to Yap with the opening of the new airfield there. When necessary, the DC–4 can also fly from Truk to Kwajalein-Majuro and back to Guam-Saipan by overflying Ponape.

Airfield construction is being accelerated since movement of additional staff and essential supplies is going to be necessary in support of our accelerated programs. Full utilization of DC–4 airplanes cannot be made until there are adequate land airfields at Koror and Ponape. A major accomplishment of the year was the completion of a 4,800-foot airstrip at Yap.

Hazardous water landings now can be dispensed with there, and, equally important, more essential air cargo and greatly increased numbers of passengers can be carried. Work also has been started on the Palau airfield. We hope to put this field in operation before the end of the next fiscal year, which will permit conversion of service to the western Carolines by DC–4 and other land-based planes. Improvements were made to the Truk and Majuro airfields as well as to airfields in Saipan. Ponape District thus is the last missing link in the needed chain of land airfields in the territory. The unusual ruggedness of Ponape Island poses special difficulties for airfield construction, but engineering surveys made last year have indicated that an airfield project is feasible. Additional engineering studies now are being conducted for the purpose of making a final site selection.

Considerable road improvements occurred during the year, some brought about completely through community-directed efforts while others were started as offshoots of major construction programs. The Marshall Islands district again demonstrated that road-building on a coral atoll could be accomplished by determination, willingness to work on the part of the people, and minimum assistance from the administration. With the example before them of a 35-mile road built the previous year by the people of Majuro, the people of Arno Atoll requested similar assistance from the administration in the form of a loan of a bulldozer and other equipment and constructed an 18½-mile road. Dedication took place a week ago and Arno Atoll now, like its sister atoll of Majuro, has all the tiny islands of its atoll linked by a road. The Marshalls district now has some 44 miles of road that did not exist a little over a year ago.

On Yap Island, the Yapese people through community effort have achieved magnificent results in rehabilitating roads and bridges. This came about through assistance from the Yap airfield project. Using equipment on a loan basis whenever this could be made available, the people of Yap have rebuilt many miles of roads on their own initiative during the year. This is in addition to the road to the new airfield constructed by the administration. Bridges have been repaired and, within a very short time, it will be possible to traverse the entire length of Yap Island by road.

Living as we do in a tropical climate, our physical facilities are subject to more rapid deterioration than is elsewhere normal. Our area also suffered greatly from the ravages of war. A limited budget in the past also kept our rate of new construction at a slow pace. The result was that although a few new facilities were always being constructed, the majority of the territory's physical facilities such as roads, utilities, schools, hospitals, and public buildings were aged and often worn beyond the point of repair. To support our accelerated education effort and to provide the need assistance to raise the territory's economic level, it is necessary that we accelerate almost every phase of our operating and maintenance activities.

For the year that is just drawing to a close, we requested and were granted $7½ million for construction purposes. Four million dollars of this will be used in the accelerated elementary school construction program and $3,300,000 in other construction activities. We have had well over a five-fold increase in our construction funds for this type of support activities.

For this coming fiscal year, due to start July 1, we have requested another $6 million for accelerated construction; $4 million to carry on aspects of the accelerated school construction program and an additional $2 million to continue our construction program in such vital areas as public health, economic development, and the construction or improvement of airfields, roads, utilities, and transportation facilities. With this increase in our overall construction programs, we feel we shall be able to make a very great advance in all aspects of our work.

The Mindszenty Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has been shocked by the surrender by our appeasement-minded State Department to the full accreditation of Red Hungary to the U.N. An editorial on Tuesday, June 11, in the Indianapolis News covers this matter in dramatic fashion, and I submit it for the RECORD as being especially worthy of our attention.

The editorial follows:

[From the Indianapolis News, June 11, 1963]

THE MINDSZENTY CASE

These are days of sweetness and light in the cold war—with all concerned talking amiably of "openings to the left," of accommodation with Moscow, of compromising antagonisms.

To judge from these statements, the free world has no irreconcilable differences with communism. The Soviet Union seemingly is a civilized nation like any other, and there is no reason we can't get along with it in brotherly good will.

There is, however, a ghost at this love feast—the ghost of Hungarian freedom. Many countries have been ground under the heel of Communist despotism. Many have paid the bitter price of free world "accommodation" with the tyrants of Moscow. But none lives more vividly in the mind of the world than the nation which rose in agony in the autumn of 1956.

Hungary is the dreadful symbol of what communism is really like. Not a reasonable though puzzling adversary, but a brutal, demonic force that smashes everything in its path. Not a civilized regime, but a barbarian oligarchy which has brought cruelty, torture and murder to levels hitherto unattempted. No a brother in the quest for peace, but an attack on religious civilization unparalleled in atheism, blasphemy, and satanic power.

To remember Hungary is to remember all this. It is to remember the woman and children obliterated by tanks in the streets of Budapest. It is to remmeber the rending horror of a nation brutalized and crushed by the very force with which we are now supposed to join in forgiving amity. It is to remember everything about communism which the Communists, and those who seek to appease them, would have us forget.

It therefore becomes essential for the accommodationists to scrub Hungary from our memories. That is the significance of the current campaign to confer respectability on the slave regime of Janos Kadar, by recognizing it in the United Nations. And it is the significance of the simultaneous effort to have Cardinal Mindszenty, Catholic Primate of Hungary and symbol of Hungarian anticommunism, removed from the public consciousness.

The Kennedy administration is committed to both these gestures in appeasement—openly to U.N. recognition for the Red regime in Budapest, more discreetly to the campaign against Mindszenty.

The story of these maneuverings is told in the June 18 issue of National Review, soon to appear on newsstands in this city. In an article entitled "Can Anyone Free Mindszenty?" author Alice Leone-Moats discusses the behind-the-scenes effort to persuade Mindszenty to leave his refuge in Hungary, and to give up his role as a symbol of resistance to the Communist regime.

Miss Moats discloses the previously unreported fact that U.S. diplomat George Kennan has journeyed to Budapest, where "it can safely be assumed that he has been sent * * * to work on Cardinal Mindszenty." To date, the Cardinal has successfully resisted the blandishments of the New Frontier and of the liberal element in Rome. He knows too well that accommodations with Moscow lead only to grief.

We hope the Cardinal continues steadfast in his purpose. So long as he remains in Budapest, a living witness to Communist infamy, the absurdity of appeasing Moscow must remain apparent to the world.

Foreign Policy and Nuclear Test Ban Negotiations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President. on last Thursday, June 13, 1963, I made an extensive speech on the Senate floor analyzing President Kennedy's speech on June 10 at American University on the subject of foreign policy and nuclear test ban negotiations. Since that time, I have had the opportunity to read an excellent analysis of the President's remarks by Fulton Lewis, Jr., as published in the June 12, 1963, Fulton Lewis, Jr. weekly newsletter, Exclusive. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the June 12, 1963 edition of Exclusive be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the edition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN POLICY AND NUCLEAR TEST BAN NEGOTIATIONS

The speech delivered by President Kennedy on Monday at American University has been described by the White House as a most important statement on foreign affairs. This is correct. The speech is epoch making and represents an open and detailed espousal of Rostowism, the theory which maintains that the United States must accommodate itself to the Soviet Union since the great danger facing the West is not Soviet domination but war.

The Washington Post puts it bluntly: "President Kennedy's speech at American University was much more than an appeal for a ban on nuclear testing. It was, indeed, another bid for an end to the cold war."

The President's speech demands the most careful content analysis. The administration's entire no-win appeasement policy here finds a public articulation never before presented in such rounded form. The speech explains the administration's past actions and projects the future line of foreign policy.

Here are the highlights:

Speaking on peace, the President asks: "What kind of peace do we seek?" Answering his own question the President says: "Not a Pax Americana enforced on the world by American weapons of war. Not the peace of the grave or the security of the slave. I am talking about genuine peace—not merely peace for Americans but peace for all men—not merely peace in our time but peace for all time."

It is amusing to note, parenthetically, that the President later in his address retreats from his utopian goal. He cautions: "I am not referring to the absolute, infinite concept of universal peace and good will of which some fantasies and fanatics still dream."

The President asks us to reexamine our attitude toward peace. He insists it is attainable even with the Soviet Union, on the ground that the Bolsheviks may change their nature and with the free West "live together with mutual tolerance, submitting their disputes to a just and peaceful settlement."

He argues: "History teaches us that enmities between nations, as between individuals, do not last forever. However fixed our likes and dislikes may seem, the tide of time an events will often bring surprising shifts in the relations between nations and neighbors. So let us persevere."

It is nothing short of amazing that the President would reduce the struggle between satanic communism and the free world to the tepid plane of likes and dislikes.

The President asks us to reexamine our attitude toward the Soviet Union. He finds it discouraging and sad that the Kremlin leaders may actually believe what their propagandists continually write, to the effect that American imperialist circles seek to achieve world domination by means of aggressive wars.

Disturbed by the gulf between us, the President gives voice to the now fashionable mirror-image theory whereby neither East nor West sees the other as it really is. Thus, he says that the Soviet misconception of Western foreign policy goals should itself serve as a warning—"a warning to the American people not to fall into the same trap as the Soviets, not to see only a distorted and desperate view of the other side, not to see conflict as inevitable, accommodation as impossible and communication as nothing more than an exchange of epithets and threats."

In effect, the President is saying that we misunderstand the nature of the Soviet Union when we accuse it of a sustained drive toward world domination. His is a bland version of Oppenheimer's early likening of East and West to two scorpions in a bottle.

To fortify his argument, the President strikes valiantly at a straw man. He points out that no government or social system is so evil that its people must be considered to be lacking in virtue.

"As Americans," he continues, "we find communism profoundly repugnant as a negation of personal freedom and dignity." Then rhapsodically: "But we can still hail the Russian people for their many achievements—in science and space, in economic and industrial growth, in culture and in acts of courage."

This is, of course, typical New Frontier sleight of hand in the realm of ideas. No responsible critic of the Soviet Union blames the Russian people for the power drives of their masters in the Kremlin. It is accepted as a truism that the Russian people are themselves among the first victims of the Bolshevik elite class.

For this same reason, the President's subsequent point has no meaning. Kennedy argues that the strongest trait in common between the peoples of our two countries is "our mutual abhorrence of war." But the Russian people have no voice in determining Soviet foreign policy and their masters have no abhorrence of war wherever convinced of a high probability of victory.

The President advances another argument which will doubtless increase the skepticism and uneasiness of our European allies. Kennedy emphasizes that in a total war the Soviet Union and the United States would become primary targets. "It is an ironical but accurate fact that the two strongest powers are the two in most danger of devastation. And even in the cold war * * * our two countries bear the heaviest burdens."

There can be no doubt that astute European diplomats, especially those influenced by De Gaulle's reasoning, will see in Kennedy's words a White House proposal to the Kremlin to strike a deal—for "peace," of course—certainly at the expense of enslaved Eastern Europe and probably at the expense of Western and Central Europe, particularly the still divided Germany.

Kennedy seeks to cover up a bit by adding that both the United States and its allies and the Soviet Union and its allies have a mutually deep interest in a just and genuine peace. This aside, one may ask how the administration believes it possible that the Soviets have an interest in a just peace.

Later in the speech Kennedy says: "The United States will make no deal with the Soviet Union at the expense of other nations and other peoples, not merely because they are our partners, but because their interests and ours converge."

Inevitably, one pictures De Gaulle saying in response: "Qui s'excuse, s'accuse."

The President asks us to reexamine our attitude toward the cold war. To those who know how to read between the lines, his remarks make it clear that the administration will continue its no-win policy along the entire front of the cold war—and specifically in Cuba.

"We must persevere in the search for peace in the hope that constructive changes within the Communist bloc might bring within reach solutions which now seem beyond us. * * * Above all, while always defending our vital interests, nuclear powers must avoid those confrontations which present an adversary with a choice of either a humiliating retreat or a nuclear war. To adopt that kind of a course in the nuclear age would be evidence only of the bankruptcy of our policy—or of a collective death wish for the world."

In a revealing passage, the President virtually admits that the administration seeks, not superiority, but mere parity in nuclear weapons. "American weapons are nonprovocative, carefully controlled, designed to deter, and capable of selective use. Our military forces are committed to peace and disciplined in self-restraint. Our diplomats are instructed to avoid unnecessary irritants and purely rhetorical hostility."

All such good little boys. Why? "It is our hope—and the purpose of allied policies—to convince the Soviet Union that she, too, should let each nation choose its own future, so long as that choice does not interfere with the choices of others."

The President announces two decisions. First, Khrushchev, Macmillan, and Kennedy have agreed on high-level discussions in Moscow looking toward early agreement on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Second, the United States will not conduct nuclear tests in the atmosphere so long as other states do not do so. "We will not be the first to resume."

As concerns a test-ban treaty, all too aware of the concessions he is prepared to make, Kennedy thus seeks to forestall criticism: "No treaty, however much it may be to the advantage of all, however tightly it may be worded, can provide absolute security against the risks of deception and evasion. But it can—if it is sufficiently effective in its enforcement and if it is sufficiently in the interests of its signers—offer far more security and far fewer risks than an unabated, uncontrolled, unpredictable arms race."

It is typical of the administration that it explains its unilateral ban on atmospheric testing as springing from a wish to make clear "our good faith and solemn convictions on the matter." Indeed, the Kennedy proposal goes farther, even, than the unfortunate Dodd resolution, which, as a first step at least, called for Soviet agreement to abandon atmospheric testing.

In an interview with Exclusive, Republican Representative Craig Hosmer of California pointed out that Kennedy's promise not to test in the atmosphere actually gives Khrushchev the power to decide when the United States is to test. He describes Kennedy's hat-in-hand, soft line approach as "fruitless and possibly very dangerous."

Hosmer sees these possibilities: "Either Kennedy does not understand how to bargain with the Kremlin—or if he does understand, he does not really want an acceptable test-ban treaty, for his is the worst way to go about it."

Democratic Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina calls the drive for a test-ban treaty with the Soviets and obsession. In his view, nuclear tests are required for our Nation: to provide a sure capability to penetrate a Soviet missile defense employing nuclear warheads; to assure the immunity of our second strike missile systems to a surprise enemy nuclear attack; to develop specialized nuclear warheads as a defense against satellite bombs and other terror weapons.

"United States nuclear superiority is, and has been, the deterrent to nuclear war since the Soviets developed the atomic bomb in 1949. Neither the United States nor the free world can afford to risk the loss of that deterrent by being lured into a 'nuclear ambush' or 'test-ban trap' by fear of the unknown."

Stefan T. Possony of the Hoover Institution warns: "The test-ban is a highly sophisticated stratagem based on the observation that Americans are so highly susceptible to high-sounding propaganda that they can be persuaded to commit political suicide. The trick is to disarm us and make us die by an infinite number of small steps. The test-ban stratagem is the most effective psychological warfare campaign of the century, a real breakthrough in the art of psychological warfare, just as radar, the fission bomb, the missile and sputnik constituted technological breakthroughs."

With Malice Toward None

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. WYDLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Long Island Press, written by news editor, David Jacobs, was chosen by the National Conference of Christians and Jews as the winner of one of six national awards for promoting brotherhood. "With Malice Toward None" contains a modern definition of brotherhood, and perhaps its logic will prompt us to take stock, examining our hearts and our minds, resulting in a true practice of religion and brotherhood.

The editorial follows:

WITH MALICE TOWARD NONE

The three major faiths—Catholics, Protestants, and Jews—will sponsor a national conference on religion and race next January.

Its purpose is to bring the joint moral force of the churches and synagogues to bear on the problem of racial segregation. It will mark the 100th year of the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation.

Discrimination is at the very core of the question raised by the moral illness of modern man: How can men be such consummate masters of things outside themselves and such helpless slaves to dark forces raging within themselves?

This is the question raised by the trial of Adolf Eichmann. Abba Eban, former Israeli ambassador to Washington and the United Nations, and now Israeli Minister of Education and Culture, writes eloquently of this in the current Reporter magazine.

The Eichmann trial, he said, affecting "every layer of social experience * * * teaches how discrimination, taking root in small beginnings, leads to vast and uncontrollable disaster. The outrages of Auschwitz and Treblinka could not have occurred had there not been tens of thousands of men who became accustomed to look at other men as though they were not human at all. A man cannot murder others in cold blood, he cannot dash a baby to the ground or fling children into a furnace, unless he is first convinced that they are not a part of his own humanity."

The OAS thug who, with ruthless efficiency, mows down helpless hosiptal patients shares with the Nazi the conviction that his victims are not part of his own humanity.

The "reverse freedom rides" represent a "tragic lack of humanity," said the Right Reverend Anson Phelps Stokes, Jr., bishop of the Massachusetts Episcopal diocese, last week.

"To use humans as pawns," he said, "and particularly as pawns in a bitter and cynical expression of hatred—is to lower ourselves below the standards of a civilized nation."

In these cases of discrimination the common denominator is hatred born of the frustration and fury of disappointed people who can't have what they want.

These creatures, in their infantile view of the world realities, cannot accept the fact of life that the world is full of complex problems that cannot be solved quickly, easily, and to their complete satisfaction in one, apocalyptic blaze of glory.

The Nazi, the OAS terrorist, the segregationist—all the little men with big hates—must find a simple answer, someone to blame, a scapegoat, because a scapegoat is less than human and can be eliminated. So they blame the Jews, blame the Negroes, blame the Moselms, blame the man on the right, blame the man on the left or blame the man who cut him off on the parkway. Destroy the object of blame and all will be well and you are a hero, and, like Eichmann, incapable of repentance.

Bishop Stokes said: "The only way to meet such cruelty is by wisdom and love."

He is profoundly correct. That is why we welcome the increasingly active role of religion in our daily lives. Religion and brotherhood are not reserved for sermons and meetings. They are practical answers, perhaps our only answer, to the great problems of our times.

Perhaps the first step toward finding wisdom and love is the recognition that there can be no simple, single immediate answer for what's plaguing the world, and that we must make the most of what's at hand. We must take the most difficult course of trying to understand the reasons for the world's difficulties and of trying to find the diverse and thorny paths out of those difficulties—with malice toward none.

Business Support for Truth in Packaging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, in a recent syndicated column appearing in the June 4 edition of the Capital Times of Madison, Wis., Sylvia Porter, a reporter of considerable reputation and by her own admission a housewife and shopper, suggested that it would be to the benefit of businessmen, particularly those producing, promoting, and selling supermarket goods, to weigh their practices against the truth-in-packaging bill and "beat Congress to the gun" by voluntarily conforming to the standards of the bill before it becomes law. I am a cosponsor of the bill in the House, and I agree wholeheartedly with Miss Porter. Certainly no one wants the Federal Government to standardize and regulate packaging unless there is a demonstrated need for it to do so. If steps were to be taken by manufacturers and sellers to protect the consumer against deceitful and misleading packaging, I would be the first to urge that truth-in-packaging legislation be defeated. Until the consumer can be assured that she is getting what she thinks she is getting for her shopping dollar however, I will support truth-in-packaging legislation.

Not only consumers are worried about deceptive packaging. The National Federation of Independent Business, a responsible and energetic organization of small businessmen, has been sending ballots to businessmen in my district by which they can express their views on pending legislation to their Congressman.

One of the proposals on which they have recently expressed their views is the truth-in-packaging bill.

I am pleased to report that these businessmen have been voting in favor of truth-in-packaging legislation by a margin of better than three to one.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Sylvia Porter article be placed in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times, June 4, 1963]

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH: TRUTH-IN-PACKAGING BILL PASSAGE APPEARS UNLIKELY

(By Sylvia Porter)

Passage by this session of Congress of the controversial "Truth in Packaging" bill appears unlikely, but it could squeak through. If I were a businessman who might be affected by this legislation, I'd take this as an invitation to beat Congress to the gun.

I would begin at once to attract more customers and make fatter profits by telling the American consumer that I already am doing everything the bill would force me to do and not doing anything the bill would forbid me to do. I would put over this message by every medium. I would do it in whatever role I played—as a manufacturer, distributor, designer, packager or retailer of personal and household goods.

The Truth in Packaging bill is the first major legislation ever introduced in Congress to control the packaging and labeling practices of American businessmen. It is strongly opposed by the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, many individual businessmen, but it also is strongly supported by consumer groups, labor unions, officials of the administration.

A Senate subcommittee, headed by Senator HART, Democrat, of Michigan, has completed hearings on the legislation and a subcommittee vote could come any day. "With luck," says a subcommittee spokesman, the bill could reach the Senate floor in July. A companion bill has been introduced in the House by Representative CELLER, Democrat, of New York. The "feeling" is that the Senate subcommittee spokesman is exaggerating when he says, "We think there's a good chance this year." But the bill obviously is being taken seriously; it could go through.

Since being introduced, the bill has been modified and Senator HART himself intends to recommend that provision for criminal penalties in the event of violation be eliminated from the bill. The key clauses, though, remain.

The bill would demand that the net weight or unit content of a package be displayed prominently on the front panel of a package in unqualified terms. It would prohibit "deceptive" packages—oversize boxes filled far below the buyer's expectations. It would set standards for meaningful size designations and servings. It would ban "cents off" and "economy size" promotions which are misleading and are only come-ons.

If and when this bill becomes law, it could be tough on the businessman who goes in for deceptive packaging and labeling gimmicks. But the vast majority of manufacturers, retailers, packagers, designers, and so forth, do not go in for this. Why, then, shouldn't an honest businessman turn the adverse publicity about practices which confuse, mislead or deceive consumers to his own advantage? Here is an opportunity to:

(1) Review all your own practices against the background of this truth in packaging legislation to make sure you are not deliberately or inadvertently carrying on unfair or deceptive practices. If you are deceiving us, we already are suspicious of your products and you should waste no time in regaining our confidence.

(2) Work out a program to tell us that you are, in fact, doing everything right and nothing wrong. This sort of ad in my newspaper would impress me, and I'm a housewife and shopper. I would appreciate big prominently displayed labels on packages which I could understand quickly as I walk through the supermarket. I wouldn't miss the phony "cents off" and "economy size" sales gimmicks which never have fooled me anyway, and I'm no great brain in the grocery store.

(3) Plan public appearances by your company's officials and meetings with customers, suppliers, etc., so that all your audiences know how you stand on this question of misleading consumers.

Rare Kirtland Warbler Selects Michigan Forest for Summer Vacation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the 10th Congressional District of Michigan, bounded on one side by Lake Huron and teeming with inland lakes, sparkling trout streams, and verdant timberland, has long been recognized as an outstanding tourist area.

A few days ago recognition was given a special group of tourists—tourists who have selected one area of the 10th District in preference to all other sections of the country. These are feathered tourists who winter in the Bahama Islands and spend their summers in a small area not far from Mio, Mich. I refer to the rare and perhaps vanishing songbird known as Kirtland's Warbler.

A 4,000-acre block in the Huron National Forest has just been set aside by the U.S. Forest Service as a management area to provide protected nesting habitat for Kirtland's Warblers. A 1961 bird census revealed that there are now less than 1,000 Kirtland's Warblers left in this country and they all migrate to the 10th District of Michigan for their nesting. The Kirtland's Warblers nests in large thickets of young jack pine, which must be between 5 and 15 feet high. Occasional nests are found in red or jack pine plantations. The nest is placed on the ground under the jack pine and is concealed among the blueberry, grasses, and other low-growing plants. The female lays 4 to 5 light-colored eggs. The Kirtland's Warbler usually returns to its former nesting site.

A little smaller than an Enlish sparrow, its best distinguishing features are: First, its bright plumage—bluish gray on the back with a yellow breast and dark side streaks; second, its habit of wagging its tail up and down; and, third, its loud warbling song.

The Michigan Department of Conservation has already set aside three tracts of State-owned jack-pine lands, totaling 11 acres as a preserve for the protection of these birds. Many individuals have expressed concern about the future of this songbird. People from all over the country have come to this general area to observe it. Much research has been undertaken to find out about the bird and ways to prevent it from becoming extinct.

Not only have the State and national governments given special recognition to this bird but the town of Mio, Mich., located in Oscoda County has erected a monument to this unique little bird. Referring to this monument the Oscoda County News reports:

> The stone structure being erected at Mio, in view of all M–33 travelers, will highlight a 4-foot high replica of this famous songster, which nests only in the jack pine barrens of Michigan's north central Lower Peninsula and winters somewhere in the Bahama Islands.
>
> The Kirtland's Warbler monument will be dedicated at the 4th annual Great Lakes Forestry Exposition in Mio, July 25, 26 and 27. The sculptor is a Kalkaska man, Leo Nelson, working with plastic and fiberglass to create a giant likeness of a bird weighing less than an ounce.
>
> Funds for the night-lighted and glass-protected cairn have been contributed by forestry exposition officials, the Oscoda County Board of Supervisors of Oscoda County, sportsmen's groups, the Mio Lions Club and local citizens. Charles Schaefer, Michigan Conservation Department artist, is acting as adviser to the sculptor.
>
> A bronze plaque will note that Mio is the center of the home range of the 1,000 Kirtland's Warblers estimated to exist. And at cornerstone laying ceremonies last weekend, the president of the Audubon Society of Michigan, Eugene E. Kenaga, of Midland, suggested that this colorful bird should replace the robin as the State's official symbol.
>
> "Then", Kenaga concluded, "Mio would be the official bird capital of Michigan."

This tract just dedicated to Kirtland's Warbler by the U.S. Forest Service will involve controlled burning, timber harvesting, and special plantings are made to produce the young pine required by the bird for nesting. The area is divided into 12 units or blocks, each about one-half square mile. A different unit is cut every 5 years, when the trees are 55 to 60 years old. Various stages of growth, ranging from openings to merchantable trees, will be maintained. In this way, portions of the area will always provide the desired nesting cover. This is the first songbird for which intensive forest management has been applied.

The area is under the direction of Mr. L. A. Pomerening, supervisor for the Huron National Forest, with headquarters at Cadillac, Mich.

Mr. Edward P. Cliff, Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, who was the principal speaker at the dedication ceremonies, pointed out that the Kirtland Warbler management area is the first known instance where intensive forest management is aimed at the protection of a single species of songbird.

With permission of my colleagues I wish to include in my remarks the address given by Mr. Cliff at these unusual ceremonies.

It follows:

THE KIRTLAND'S WARBLER MANAGEMENT AREA, HURON NATIONAL FOREST

(By Edward P. Cliff)

Our meeting here today is an historic event. We will visit areas where for the first time intensive forest management is being directed to benefit a single species of songbird—the rare Kirtland's Warbler.

I am very glad the U.S. Forest Service has had a part in this unique effort.

We are here to dedicate an area—a bit of ground. In doing this we are recognizing the importance of that bit of ground to a small and little-known songbird and, in a sense, the importance of that act to all of us.

In a larger sense I believe we are gathered to recognize a much more important thing—a basic concept; the attitude of Americans toward the stewardship of our public lands; the belief that somewhere on the land we own in common can be found the space to care for and protect the interests of even the smallest of our citizen-interest groups.

I also feel that in participating in the dedication of a small part of the Huron National Forest to the future welfare of this strange little bird the majority of Americans will never see, you are recognizing the Department of Agriculture's approach to the administration of the National Forest System to be in keeping with your idea of that concept. In a sense your being here is a vote of confidence on your part that the Forest Service will do the important things necessary in administering your national forests for all the people.

But importance is a most difficult thing to evaluate. Too often, I'm convinced, it is measured in terms of magnitude or chronology; "the biggest," "the most," "the first," etc. Our presence here today clearly indicates that to us there frequently are other criteria significant in measuring importance.

It's difficult to describe just how the Forest Service arrives at the relative importance of alternative possiblities in its making of multiple use decisions; how it was decided that more than 4,000 acres of the Huron National Forest should be dedicated to the welfare of a tiny songbird. I should like to try, however, to give perspective to our act today by comparing it with a few of the other things that are happening somewhere else in the National Forest System.

If yesterday was a typical workday, the National Forest System, was a beehive of activity—being a Friday, the end of the month, and a holiday weekend as well, things were happening even faster than usual from Maine to California and from Puerto Rico to Alaska.

Yesterday the sun rose on more than 4 million deer, elk, bighorn sheep, bear, and other big-game animals at home in their national forest habitat. Had yesterday occurred early in the big-game hunting season in all States, more than a 100,000 hunters would have hung a trophy by their camp before nightfall. That same sun also rose on many millions of small game and other animals in trees, burrows, and caves throughout the National Forest System.

Countless millions of birds stretched their wings and fed their young, and preened in the morning sun. Most of them represented groups much larger than the Kirtland's Warbler, but a few others like the great condors of the Los Padres National Forest in California share the warblers' need for a special home in the national forests.

If yesterday was an average day in May, 50 or 60 wildfires which had already charred about 700 acres of the national forests were detected and put out. Yesterday—in fact right now—lookouts are constantly scanning the horizon, patrol planes are in the air, and airtankers, smokejumpers, and suppression crews are standing by wherever the fire danger is high.

By noon yesterday, the sun shone hotly on the backs of about 6 million head of livestock grazing on the rangeland of the national forests and grasslands. Rangers were active in many areas inspecting the range, discussing its management with some of the more than 19,000 permittees involved, and generally administering the 1 in every 3 acres of the national forest system that is rangeland.

Yesterday more than 200 square miles of the national forests were photographed from the air to aid in mapmaking and resource management, and the work of Forest Service crews and contractors included more than 900 miles of road maintenance and the addition of more than 20 miles of new roads. They also rehabilitated more than 1,100 acres of rangeland; improved about 300 acres of fish and game habitat and 2,500 acres of timber stands; added to the still overcrowded supply of recreation facilities by constructing or reconstructing more than 200 family camp and picnic units; and over 400 acres of deteriorated watersheds and several miles of eroding stream channels and old roads were treated for watershed improvement purposes. Although the tree planting season is drawing to a close, crews were finishing up reforestation projects yesterday that saw about 225,000 acres planted or seeded during the past year.

The warming rays of yesterday's sun drove the trout and bass and other fish into the depths and shadows along many of the 81,000 miles of streams and rivers and thousands of lakes in the national forests. And yesterday, today, and tomorrow, an army of perhaps 500,000 men, women, and children—armed with fishing rods and much enthusiasm—is or will be matching with with inhabitants of national forest waters.

In fact, forest rangers and their assistants were especially busy yesterday preparing for the flood of visitors that will start this weekend and will not slacken until after Labor Day. We expect about 125 million recreation visits to the National Forests this year and right now, more than two million people are camping, picnicking, hiking, or otherwise enjoying their National Forests in person.

Yesterday, between breakfast and supper time, powersaws and logging trucks harvested about 40 million board feet of National Forest timber. For this timber, some 25,000 operators paid about one-half million dollars in the Federal Treasury. This wood, removed in accordance with sound silvicultural practices and detailed timber management plans, is the equivalent of that used in constructing about 4,000 houses. That harvest generated a day's labor for more than half a million breadwinners throughout the Nation—mostly in areas where a day's labor is getting hard to find.

Yes—yesterday was a busy day on the National Forests—but we all know that the days ahead will be equally full; probably even more so. It is exactly this fast-moving tempo—this unending working with current needs while looking ahead to the many and varied future needs of the people—that highlights the importance of what we are doing here today.

By our actions here today we are permanently securing one more piece into the great mosaic that is our National Forest System. And we are doing it as part of the multiple use philosophy of public forest management; a philosophy that accepts as equally important to the American people a day's work that accommodates a half-million fisherman and simultaneously contributes a half-million dollars in Treasury receipts for timber harvested; a day's work that sees it in the public interest both to harvest enough timber to build houses and homes for more than 4,000 families, and to set aside more than 4,000 acres to provide the same security for 1,000 tiny Kirtland's Warblers.

Lest I be misunderstood, I hasten to make it clear that we in the Forest Service are fully aware that we don't, or couldn't, do these things alone. Forty million board feet of national forest timber couldn't be harvested every working day without the help of the far-flung lumber industry that is making America a better place in which to live; and we couldn't have set this area aside today, and by so doing also make our country a better place in which to live, without the advice and assistance of our cooperators.

Cooperating agencies, both State and private, working with the Forest Service have made possible the development of the Kirtland's Warbler management area. Your research and long efforts to bring attention to this species provided the necessary information upon which we could base our management plans. Your farsightedness, together with the enthusiasm of local people who helped keep interest alive during the early studies on this species, is commendable.

The Forest Service has worked closely with the National Audubon Society on a number of projects, including, as I mentioned earlier, the creation of the special refuge on the Los Padres National Forest in California for the protection of another rare species, the California condor.

To me, it is very interesting to note how through the years the program and philosophy of the Audubon Society has broadened in scope to include all phases of resource use and development. Its fine magazine reflects this change. It repeatedly demonstrates a real concern in safeguarding the public interest in all our natural resources. Such sincere interest is essential to a real understanding of the many complex situations encountered in resource management.

I am also pleased to see the Michigan Natural Areas Council as one of the agencies cooperating with the Forest Service in the development of this area.

Of course the cooperation and assistance given by the Michigan Conservation Department, both to the Forest Service in connection with this particular area, and to those groups concerned with doing the best that can be done for the Kirtland's Warbler over all of its range, is well known and is appreciated.

In closing, I hope that events here today are ample proof—to those that might doubt—that the Forest Service is determined that its multiple use management of the National Forests does not become over-oriented in the direction of any of the major and better-known National Forest uses; that its resource management deliberations always shall consider all values, and its decisions always shall be premised on the fundamental principle that the combination of the results of all decisions must best serve the most people in the long run.

It is both a privilege and pleasure to meet with you here today, and to join in the dedication of a portion of one of the Nation's older National Forests to a new and unique purpose; an area to be specially managed for the rare Kirtland's Warbler.

Micawber and Haiti

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted I include the following editorial from the Washington, D.C., Sunday Star of June 9, 1963:

MICAWBER AND HAITI

The U.S. performance in the case of Haiti has been nothing short of ludicrous. First came an intensive propaganda buildup about the hatefulness of Francois Duvalier's regime. Then, taking our lead from the neighboring Dominican Republic, we shook our fist at the two-bit voodoo dictator, assembled an invasion force against him, evacuated American dependents from his capital city, sailed a fleet up and down off his coast, and put out the word that he was about to flee the country.

An absurd moment of truth ensued. Dr. Duvalier called a press conference: There must have been some mistake, he said. He was not planning to run away.

At which, if you please, the U.S. Government in effect now throws up its hands and says, "Oh well, if he wants to stay, of course, there is nothing more to be said about it."

One thing to say about it is that if the Eisenhower administration had ever marched up such a miserable little hill and then, at the first hint of resistance, scuttled back down again, the howls of the loyal Democratic opposition would have been heard round the world.

Dr. Duvalier, if he is capable of laughter, must be having a pretty good chuckle these days, as he contemplates the fumbling performance of the giant of the north. There is no doubt about his policy. He means to stay President of Haiti, certainly for 4 more illegal years, and to run the country as his private fief. The question is: What is our policy?

It seems painfully evident that the United States currently has no policy toward Haiti. It has sentiments, yes. Duvalier has violated the Haitian constitution to remain in office and he is a tyrant; therefore the United States opposes him. But it is not policy to wish someone to go away. Policy, in a case like this means assisting someone out of office or assisting someone else in.

Obviously we take the position nowadays that armed intervention cannot be undertaken in this hemisphere, barring a spectacular threat to our security like the presence somewhere of Soviet rockets. There are ways, however, of accomplishing these things.

For one thing, as we pointed out the other day, there is economic pressure. Our purchases from Haiti are not extensive. But, for instance, could we not get along without Haitian coffee while Duvalier remains in power?

Duvalier could be toppled, as he should be, by the Haitians themselves—relatively few of them. The men to topple him are there and, sooner or later, one of them will organize the job. They need guns, grenades, and explosives. If the United States remains a spectator, growling only when its nationals seem to be menanced, the next leader of Haiti will owe us even less than the present one.

If the State Department now virtuously argues that we cannot meddle in the affairs of neighboring countries, it has a short memory that any survivor of the Bay of Pigs or of the CIA-sponsored revolt against Jacobo Arbenz of Guatemala could refresh. It also should have heeded these promptings of reticence before our national prestige was conspicuously committed to the abortive effort last month.

Haiti, of course, is close to Cuba geographically, just as the two cases are closely parallel. If Duvalier were to invite the Russians in—or if Castro were to move against him—we would have no alternative but to take action, and fast. Should we permit so dangerous a vacuum to remain so inviting for so long?

The truth seems to be that this administration is quite cynically willing to put on the pressure where it thinks it may scare somebody, but also is quite cynically willing to forget the whole business when the opposition shows signs of life.

The result today is that in relation to Haiti our position is one of total inertia—waiting, like Mr. Micawber, for something to turn up. It is nowhere near good enough.

Never Too Young

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we are daily reminded of the terrible toll of highway deaths throughout our Nation. The continuing tragedy of these deaths cannot be eliminated by the acts of the Congress or State legislatures. Laws can control, to a degree, but only educated, responsible operators can themselves eliminate tragedy from their midst.

One of the most effective methods for insuring that the community has such operators driving on their roads is a driver training program. In one of the towns in my district, Kearny, N.J., such a training program has been in existence for many years. And, no doubt it has contributed greatly to the recent award to Kearny by the National Safety Council, for its outstanding accomplishment in traffic safety.

Recognition of this award was made editorially by the Newark Evening News, on Monday this week. Since this type of award, and this type of accomplishment is one that should be repeated in all towns and cities in all our districts, I would like to bring this to the attention of my colleagues at this time. I am sure that they will agree with me that the mayor, the school board, the teachers and all the adults and youngsters of the town must share in the credit for this outstanding accomplishment:

[From the Newark Evening News, June 17, 1963]

The National Safety Council's selection of Kearny as 1 of 181 U.S. communities cited for outstanding accomplishment in traffic safety provides recognition once again of the principle that the fight against highway accidents must begin in the schools.

Among the factors which led to Kearny's award are its high school driver education program, one of the first in New Jersey, its sturdy support of the Hudson County Teenage Safety Conference and its local safety council's unremitting campaign to promote safety consciousness among the town's youth starting in the elementary grades.

The national honor that has come to Kearny should give added support to the campaign to make driver instruction a compulsory part of the curriculum in New Jersey high schools. If the mounting toll of traffic accidents is ever to be checked, the fundamentals of safety must be instilled at an early age, before the driver of the future has been exposed to the bad habits of his elders.

Democracy and Despotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD "Democracy and Despotism: An Excerpt From Part II of Democracy in America," by Alexis de Toqueville, which has been reprinted by the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government through special arrangement with Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1963. Copyright Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1945.

This excerpt is introduced under brief comment by Mr. James J. Kilpatrick, a member of the State commission, and I ask that these introductory remarks be printed also in the order of their appearance in the report.

There being no objection, the booklet and introduction were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT SORT OF DESPOTISM DEMOCRATIC NATIONS HAVE TO FEAR

(Alexis de Tocqueville (1840))

I had remarked during my stay in the United States that a democratic state of society, similar to that of the Americans, might offer singular facilities for the establishment of despotism; and I perceived, upon my return to Europe, how much use had already been made, by most of our rulers, of the notions, the sentiments, and the wants created by this same social condition, for the purpose of extending the circle of their power. This led me to think that the nations of Christendom would perhaps eventually undergo some oppression like that which hung over several of the nations of the ancient world.

A more accurate examination of the subject, and 5 years of further mediation, have not diminished my fears, but have changed their object.

No sovereign ever lived in former ages so absolute or so powerful as to undertake to administer by his own agency, and without the assistance of intermediate powers, all the parts of a great empire; none ever attempted to subject all his subjects indiscriminately to strict uniformity of regulation and personally to tutor and direct every member of the community. The notion of such an undertaking never occurred to the human mind; and if any man had conceived it, the want of information, the imperfection of the administrative system, and, above all the natural obstacles caused by the inequality of conditions would speedily have checked the execution of so vast a design.

When the Roman emperors were at the height of their power, the different nations of the empire still preserved usages and customs of great diversity; although they were subject to the same monarch, most of the provinces were separately administered; they abounded in powerful and active municipalities; and although the whole government of the empire was centered in the hands of the Emperor alone and he always remained, in case of need, the supreme arbiter in all matters, yet the details of social life and private occupations lay for the most part beyond his control. The emperors possessed, it is true, an immense and unchecked power, which allowed them to gratify all their whimsical tastes and to employ for that purpose the whole strength of the state. They frequently abused that power arbitrarily to deprive their subjects of property or of life; their tyranny was extremely onerous to the few, but it did not reach the many; it was confined to some few main objects and neglected the rest; it was violent, but its range was limited.

It would seem that if despotism were to be established among the democratic nations of our days, it might assume a different character; it would be more extensive and more mild; it would degrade men without tormenting them. I do not question that, in an age of instruction and equality like our own, sovereigns might more easily succeed in collecting all political power into their own hands and might interfere more habitually and decidedly with the circle of private interests than any sovereign of antiquity could ever do. But this same principle of equality which facilitates despotism tempers its rigor. We have seen how the customs of society become more humane and gentle in proportion as men become more equal and alike. When no member of the community has much power or much wealth, tyranny is, as it were, without opportunities and a field of action. As all fortunes are scanty, the passions of men are naturally circumscribed, their imagination limited, their pleasures simple. This universal moderation moderates the sovereign himself and checks within certain limits the inordinate stretch of his desires.

Independently of these reasons, drawn from the nature of the state of society itself, I might add many others arising from causes beyond my subject; but I shall keep within the limits I have laid down.

Democratic governments may become violent and even cruel at certain periods of extreme effervescence or of great danger, but these crises will be rare and brief. When I consider the petty passions of our contemporaries, the mildness of their manners, the extent of their education, the purity of their religion, the gentleness of their morality, their regular and industrious habits, and the restraint which they almost all observe in their vices no less than in their virtues, I have no fear that they will meet with tyranny in their rules, but rather with guardians.

I think, then, that the species of oppression by which democratic nations are menaced is unlike anything that ever before existed in the world; our contemporaries will find no prototype of it in their memories. I seek in vain for an expression that will accurately convey the whole of the idea I have formed of it; the old words despotism and tyranny are inappropriate: the thing itself is new, and since I cannot name, I must attempt to define it.

I seek to trace the novel features under which despotism may appear in the world. The first thing that strikes the observation is an innumerable multitude of men, all equal and alike, incessantly endeavoring to procure the petty and paltry pleasures with which they glut their lives. Each of them, living apart, is as a stranger to the fate of all the rest; his children and his private friends constitute to him the whole of mankind. As for the rest of his fellow citizens, he is close to them, but does not see them; he touches them, but he does not feel them; he exists only in himself and for himself alone; and if his kindred still remain to him, he may be said at any rate to have lost his country.

Above this race of men stands an immense and tutelary power, which takes upon itself alone to secure their gratifications and to watch over their fate. That power is absolute, minute, regular, provident, and mild. It would be like the authority of a parent if, like that authority, its object was to prepare men for manhood; but it seeks, on the contrary, to keep them in perpetual childhood: it is well content that the people should rejoice, provided they think of nothing but rejoicing. For their happiness such a government willingly labors, but it chooses to be the sole agent and the only arbiter of that happiness; it provides for their security, foresees and supplies their necessities, facilitates their pleasures, manages their principal concerns, directs their industry, regulates the descent of property, and subdivides their inheritances: what remains, but to spare them all the care of thinking and all the trouble of living?

Thus it every day renders the exercise of the free agency of man less useful and less frequent; it circumscribes the will within a narrower range and gradually robs a man of all the uses of himself. The principle of equality has prepared men for these things; it has predisposed men to endure them and often to look on them as benefits.

After having thus successively taken each member of the community in its powerful grasp and fashioned him at will, the supreme power then extends its arm over the whole community. It covers the surface of society with a network of small complicated rules, minute and uniform, through which the most original minds and the most energetic characters cannot penetrate, to rise above the crowd. The will of man is not shattered, but softened, bent, and guided; men are seldom forced by it to act, but they are constantly restrained from acting. Such a power does not destroy, but it prevents existence; it does not tyrannize, but it compresses, enervates, extinguishes, and stupefies a people, till each nation is reduced to nothing better than a flock of timid and industrious animals, of which the government is the shepherd.

Practice of Law as a Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the attainment of excellence in the profession of law, especially in government service, is vitally important in our democratic society. On June 2, 1963, Mortimer M. Caplin, U.S. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, expressed the high ideals to which lawyers should aspire in a talk before the class night exercises at the School of Law of New York University.

On that occasion, Mr. Caplin, who early in his career earned a doctor of jurisprudence degree at that university, was awarded the New York University Presidential Citation, which reads as follows:

Be it hereby certified that in recognition of his outstanding services and attainments there has been entered upon the roster of honor of the university the award to Mortimer M. Caplin of this official citation with all the approbation, esteem, and respect implicit in such investiture

Mr. Speaker, the remarks made by Mr. Caplin at the New York University School of Law embody an expression of sentiments that should be read not only by lawyers, law students, and law professors but also by all citizens interested in good government. I feel privileged to place it in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT FOR TECHNICAL EXCELLENCE ALONE

(Remarks of Commissioner of Internal Revenue Mortimer M. Caplin, Before Class Night Exercises, School of Law, New York University, New York, June 2, 1963)

I am privileged to share this class night with you. Not only do I enjoy returning to an academic surrounding, but this particular setting brings back many fond recollections.

I remember a similar evening in 1940. Italy had sent troops into France, and President Franklin D. Roosevelt had just finished his famous dagger-in-the-back speech at our law school graduation at the University of Virginia. With diploma in hand, I drove off to my first law job and literally shouted with joy as I relished the thought of having completed my formal schooling.

I recall, too, the thrill of beginning law practice in a downtown New York office. These were exciting and wonderful years. Learning how to use the tools of the profession, learning how to apply practically countless days of casebook study and law school training. Intense work; many hours at night grappling with intriguing and often elusive problems; the emphasis on excellence and top craftsmanship; the joy that comes from appreciation of the art of weaving legal principles through the practice and procedure of the law; the heady satisfaction of serving a client, face to face, and helping him fulfill his business and personal desires in the most effective way, consistent with all phases of the law.

I

In a lawyer's life the great search for learning continues far beyond the law school. In fact, the more he masters the mechanics of his profession the more he become aware of broader horizons.

As he grows, the problems he is called upon to face become more complex, often with lurking subtleties. Of increasing importance to him is what Chief Justice Warren recently referred to as "the law beyond the law"—the realm of the ethical as compared to the legal—where "each of us is necessarily his own Chief Justice." More apparent to him over the years are the problems of conscience and propriety; and the practices which in the technical sense are perhaps ethical, but at which truly responsible practitioners look askance as "things that are not done."

With this broadening of experience and viewpoint, also comes a fuller understanding of the lawyer's most important asset—good judgment. How limited is knowledge of the latest statutes, regulations, and decisions without this other crucial factor. Yes, technical skill, finely honed ability to engage in sustained legal research and to make detailed legal analysis, all of these are vital to the successful practice of law. But they are not enough—if sound legal advice is to be given in a manner which accords with the full scope and traditions of the legal profession.

All of the relevant facts must be determined and effectively presented; controlling authorities must be found and properly analyzed; future trends must be identified; and the probable legal consequences must be carefully predicted. But when all this is done, when all the alternatives are assembled and understood, someone still must make the decision on what button is to be pressed. The law may permit your client to take a full giant step toward the goal of realizing the highest possible profits, but is it wise for him to go all the way—taking into account the interests of his fellow entrepreneurs, his employees, his customers, his competitors, the community in which he lives, and perhaps even his nation? That the proposed action is legal does not necessarily also mean that it is right.

Some may say that these are business judgments which the client himself must make. But everyday life is not divisible into neat airtight compartments. In advising clients to help them reach right decisions, the lawyer often will be called upon to exercise his best possible judgment on the total fact pattern—involving issues of law, business, ethics or otherwise. None of the most advanced of modern electronic computers will give him full answers. He will be leaning instead on his entire background, education, experience and scales of values.

II

Each of you is anxious to put his training and talents to immediate use. You either have a job or will have one soon, and you will be on your way toward becoming a full-fledged member of the bar. Marriage and raising a family will also occupy an important place in your life pattern. As a lawyer, you want assurance of being able to earn a living, support a family, and to attain a respectable standing in the legal profession.

But if your goals end here, you will reach a plateau much too early in your career. You may even face a gnawing questioning of whether this is the way you want to spend the remainder of your working days. What I have found—as I plumb my own experiences, and those of former students and friends—is a widespread search for purpose that permeates our society today. Excellence in performance and the ability to earn a good living are not enough for the thinking, modern man. He yearns for broader goals.

As your basic needs become more completely satisfied, these other desires will become more evident, if they have not already. Don't try to submerge them. Lay the groundwork today for fulfilling these broader goals. For this will permit you to lead a fuller and richer life, will make you a more effective lawyer, and will permit you to contribute to the community in which you live.

1. Keep up with your learning and the current developments in the law. Participate in continuing legal education programs and try your hand at some independent research and writing. Take advantage of the many opportunities at our law schools for postgraduate legal studies.

2. Don't confine your activities to the mere day-to-day practice of your profession. Broaden your search for knowledge and understanding. A great lawyer is a total man, wise in many fields.

3. Make your voice heard on the big issues of the day, whether in the legal field or otherwise. Use your knowledge and abilities to inform your community, to help mold public opinion, and to suggest sound courses of action.

Chief Justice Warren recently expressed concern about the absence of public discussion or debate on proposed amendments to the Constitution which are now being circulated among the States. Noting that the issues involved had aroused "practically no recognition by the bar of America," he pointed to the lofty traditions of the legal profession and said: "If proposals of this magnitude had been made in the early days of the Republic, the voice of the lawyers of that time would have been heard from one end of our land to the other. The great debate would be resounding in every legislative hall and in every place where scholars and statesmen gather. * * * If lawyers are not to be watchmen for the Constitution, on whom are we to rely?"

The Chief Justice has called upon the legal profession to fulfill its great responsibility of leadership, stating: "If that leadership is not forthcoming, whether because of timidity or inertia, it amounts to abdication of a solemn duty."

4. Join in your local bar activities; work on bar committees; strive for improvement of the law and its administration. Lend your time and skills to assisting Congress in formulating legislation; submit comments in writing; testify in person. Too often Congress is limited by having only the biased testimony of directly interested parties, without the benefit of the impartial views of the experts in the field.

5. Consider the possibility of teaching law on a full-time or part-time basis. Not only will it broaden your own knowledge, but it will also permit you to be creative to the highest possible degree—to participate in the training and development of young men and women, and to contribute to the improvement and better understanding of our legal system.

6. Give careful thought to serving your local, State or National Government. Some of you will be campaign workers; some will seek elected office; others will strive for a judgeship or high executive post. Many of you will want to seek employment with your government either early or late in your careers, or perhaps as a permanent career. Government service offers many stimulating and broadening opportunities. While it has a solid base of able and dedicated public servants, it is in great need of the continuous influx of persons like you, with your special training and viewpoint.

More than a decade ago David Lilienthal underscored the importance of public service when he said: "I propose that, out of the best and most productive years of each man's life, he should carve a segment in which he puts his private career aside to serve his community and his country, and thereby serve his children, his neighbors, his fellow men, and the cause of freedom."

Recently President Kennedy sounded a similar note at Vanderbilt University, pointing out that through public service "you will have the unequaled satisfaction of knowing that your character and talent are contributing to the direction and success of this free society."

I strongly concur in these views. I regard it as a privilege to serve in government, and have found the years there to be the most satisfying of my life.

III

I have not traced an easy trail for you. But those of you who follow it will find it stimulating and rewarding.

You have many advantages through personal ability, education, training and opportunity. These advantages are a great privilege in our worldwide society.

Chief Justice Warren has described the "enormous responsibility" which accompanies "great privilige" in an inspiring manner:

"The responsibility which is ours is to stimulate mankind to conduct its affairs with wisdom, with conscientiousness, with a view to the future, with an understanding of the public need, with a view to the long range perspectives of history, and above all, with great compassion for the individual."

As members of a great calling, be ready to accept this responsibility in full:

Strive to be a wise and compassionate legal counselor, with breadth and understanding;

Reject the role of a professional scrivener who views his responsibility as merely the echoing of the stated desires of clients;

Remember your personal obligations and personal interests, and make sure your voice is heard as an individual; and

Never forget that, in a democracy, it is we, the citizens of this country, who determine the type of society in which we live, as well as its ethical standards and moral tone.

These are our joint obligations. Over the history of our Nation, lawyers of America have contributed enormously to the strength and vitality of our democratic principles through their initiative and courage. The breathtaking crises of today again call on us for a renewed leadership and direction consistent with the highest traditions and highest ethics of a noble profession.

Shades of Hitler-and Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with each discovery of a former Nazi in the West German Government, the East German Communists beat the propaganda drums and denounce growing fascism in the imperialist Western World. Yet East Germany, at every level of society, is itself shot through with former Nazis. This has been documented, after several months of research, by a Russian-Jewish resident of Manhattan, who uses the pseudonym Eliyahu Yakira-Admata. His sources were various reports of anti-Nazi groups in Europe and this country. Mr. Clarity, a Tribune staff member, wrote the following article from Mr. Yakira-Admata's notes, and I place it into the RECORD at this point:

SHADES OF HITLER AND STALIN

(By Eliyahu Yakira-Admata and James F. Clarity)

The Nazis never left East Germany. They simply changed political labels, became loyal Communists and slipped themselves with official governmental connivance into every aspect of East German life.

Today, while the Communist East German Government howls indignantly at discoveries of former Nazis in high West German posts, ex-Hitlerites prosper in the "Democratic Republic" as parliamentary representatives, judges, mayors, educators, editors, writers, and cultural officials. Many of them were once active in there solution of the "population problem," which resulted in the murder of 2 million European Jews. Anti-Semitism, of course, is officially demode in East Germany now.

But former Nazis are full citizens in Communist Germany thanks to the People's Parliament, which in 1952 granted them amnesty with a paper reservation that war criminals were still liable to prosecution. The East German equivalent of the Nuernberg trials, however, is still an unlikely event of the future.

The list of Nazi Communists is long, documented, and surprising only to those who believe the Kremlin contention that fascism and communism can never share the same political bed.

Leopold Steidl joined the Nazi Party on May 1, 1933, and was given identification card No. 2675123. During World War II, Hitler made him an army colonel and awarded him the Knight's Cross medal. In 1944, the colonel was captured on the Russian front and immediately declared himself a Communist.

In 1950, Steidl organized former Nazi officers who had switched to Stalinism, and the organization elected him to parliament, where he is still a member. He is also the mayor of Weimar, a post which gave him the opportunity to speak at a ceremony eulogizing the victims of the Buchenwald extermination camp. He is the official custodian of a monument honoring the Buchenwald murdered. Heinz Haman, another former Hitler officer, is also a member of parliament, and an official of the Buchenwald memorial committee.

In addition to their other achievements under communism, both Steidl and Haman are vice presidents of the People's Parliament. They are only 2 of the 49 ex-Nazis who are members of this body.

Others include Friedrich Meyer, Herbert Kreger, Ernst Ostmeier, and Hans Brikner, all of whom were officers in Hitlers proud and murderous security service, which became known in Nazi-enslaved Europe simply as "SS."

Joachim Reik had a Nazi career as a personal SS guard of Hitler himself and as an officer of the "Death Corps Command" which ran the Jewish extermination center at Naidanek, near Lublin, Poland. He is also a member of parliament.

Former Nazis also abound in the East German educational system, where they now preach the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Khrushchev, instead of "Mein Kampf."

Rudolf Antziker is a professor of jurisprudence at the Karl Marx University, Leipzig. He joined the Nazis in 1943. Dr. Walter Ekermann, who became a Nazi on June 4, 1925, and was issued party card No. 7032, teaches pedagogy at a high school in Potsdam.

Hans Ertel, who entered Hitler's party early in 1940, is vice president of East Berlin's Scientific Academy. Hans Gunther Gitner, another ex-Nazi, is rector of the medical academy in Dresden. Another Hitler officer, Karl Welhagen, is a professor at the Humboldt University.

Other Nazis-turned Communist hold professorships at the universities of Freiberg, Rostok, and Greifswald. In 1933, Karl Nisler, Oscar Elsner and Hans Mitlacher became Nazis. Today they are professors in the Democratic Republic.

Nazi writers who once promulgated the idea of Aryan racial superiority now hack away at Communist themes in the world of East German letters. Kurt Herwart Ball, formerly editor in chief of the anti-Semitic periodical "Der Hammer" (the Hammer), is now a respected contributor to official East Berlin literature.

The chief editors of two East German publications, Hans Austard, of German Foreign Affairs, and Gunther Kretzscher, of New Germany, became Nazis in 1933. Journalists of lesser magnitude have long abandoned Hitler for Marx in their articles for newspapers, magazines and professional periodicals in East Germany. Kurt Blecha, Nazi membership card No. 8634832, is a top figure in the East German press agency, a mouthpiece for the Communist government.

At least two former Nazi judges have been given posts on the East German Supreme Court. Dr. Kurt Schumann, who received Nazi party card No. 5777794 in 1937, is believed to have sentenced thousands of Jews to the gas chamber during World War II. As a Communist, he has presided at numerous cases involving "political crimes" against the East German Republic. For his judicial services, Dr. Schumann has been awarded the "Fatherland Order of Merit" by Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev. Another East German Supreme Court judge who had allied himself with Hitler is Dr. Horst Hetsar, who has not attained the prominence in Communist circles achieved by Dr. Schumann.

East Germany also employs ex-Nazis to do international anti-Semitic dirty work. Professor Werner Hartke, president of the Scientific Academy at Pankow, is chairman of the German-Arabian Society, which nominally promotes friendship between East German and Arab.

Professor Hartke, in the old Hitler days, had a friend, Johann von Leers, who was an aide to Joseph Goebbels, the Feuhrer's Minister of Propaganda. Von Leers converted to Islam rather than communism, and is now the Chief Adviser on Jewish Affairs for United Arab Republic President Gamal Abdel Nasser. Von Leers also has a new name, Omar Amim, which he uses to advance neo-nazism in the Middle East.

On one visit to Cairo, Dr. Hartke met von Leers-Omar Amim and a second Nazi alumnus, SS Col. Leipold Gleim, who is one of President Nasser's personal bodyguards. Gleim, now known as El Nacher, assured his Hitler-day cronies that the chief function of the Egyptian Security Service was to combat zionism and, of course, all imperialism.

Heinrich Brandweiner, Nazi card No. 8123654, issued May 1, 1938, lectures at East German Universities when he is not working on international Communist propaganda campaigns. Born in Austria, Brandweiner was chief of the "secret police" inside the Communist delegations at the youth-peace festival in Vienna several years ago. During the Korean war he was active in spreading the report that the U.S. military forces were using germ warfare against the Chinese Communists. In 1952, Brandweiner recelevd the Lenin Peace Prize for his efforts.

On December 1, 1938, Ernst Grossman was issued Nazi party card No. 6855320. Later, he was a guard at the Sachsenhausen concentration camp and served with the Sachsenhausen-Orienburg "Death Battalion," an efficient group of "population" exterminators.

Since his conversion to communism, Grossman has been embraced in Volgagard (formerly Stalingrad) as a friend of the Soviet Union. Premier Khrushchev has awarded him the Worker Hero and Master Farmer medals, apparently for his work as chairman of the Agriculture Production Collective in the Democratic Republic. Grossman is also a deputy in the Erfurt District Parliament.

The late Adolf Eichmann was hiding in Argentina when one of his former gas chamber officers, Kurt Lange, was helping the East German Government establish an SS-type security force.

There are other smaller, Nazi-fry working for the East German Communists. Gerhard Exwert, card No. 403241, was a leader of Hitler's youth-indoctrination movement. Now he is an agricultural expert.

Karl Bramson, who became a Nazi in 1933, is a high school teacher and vice chairman of the Magdeburg District Soviet-German Friendship League.

Herbert Kruger is a full-fledged activist in the East German Communist Party. Once a Nazi judge, card No. 310206, Kruger deported thousands of Jews to concentration camps and later became a Hitler storm trooper. Today, students listen to his lectures at the Ulbricht Academy of Political Science and Law in Potsdam-Babelsberg. He is also a deputy in the national parliament.

If the East German Government is sincere in its expressions of horror at Nazis in high West German official positions, a thorough housecleaning in the Democratic Republic would help convince the world of this sincerity.

U.S. Aids Sukarno

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Era, Bradford, Pa., May 18, 1963:

U.S. AIDS SUKARNO

(By Andrew Tully)

WASHINGTON.—While we still have our shirt, the time has come for the United States to tell that lower-case bum in Indonesia to get lost.

They call him "President" Sukarno, but to anyone who has not spent the last 10 years on a desert island this reads "Dictator." Indonesia is not a republic but Sukarno's private property, complete with occasional martial law and a hot romance with communism.

While he is not tooling about his domain naming mountains after himself, Sukarno thumbs his nose at Uncle Sam by partying with Commies and suggesting it's about time Red China took a stick to India.

Lately, he has been making verbal swipes at Malaysia, which is scheduled to become a new nation August 31 when Malaya absorbs Singapore and the three British colonies adjacent to Indonesia. Malaya is Western-oriented and vigorously anti-Communist, and so Sukarno hints that he may have to take the country over.

U.S. SUPPORTS GESTAPO

It would seem time to cry enough after Uncle Sam has given Sukarno more than $750 million and received nothing in return but ideological kicks in the teeth, but the end is not in sight. To Congress's surprise, the Agency for International Development (AID) has revealed that it recently gave Sukarno $19.7 million in emergency aid, in addition to a $17 million loan announced March 6.

AID makes no bones of the fact that this dough has been handed Sukarno as a bribe to keep him from setting up housekeeping with the Commies.

And just to make sure this junior grade Hitler maintains his grip on his country, we have earmarked $2.7 million of that financial sop to equip and train a special unit of the Indonesian police to keep the Indonesians in their place. Apparently, you don't call that sort of special unit a Gestapo these days.

SO HE'S DISILLUSIONED

Sukarno is the prime example of the American policy of turning the other cheek in dealing with so-called emerging nations. Frank Coffin, deputy administrator of AID, confirmed this in an almost incredible statement to the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Indonesia is one of the countries which has been helped by the United States, he said, after they accepted aid from the Sino-Soviet axis "and have since become disillusioned with such aid."

In Main Street English, this means we don't mind if Sukarno accepts aid and ideological comfort from the Reds so long as he lets us force a few million bucks on him when he's having a lover's quarrel with the Commies.

BLOW TO GOOD FRIENDS

Ironically, our wooing of Sukarno is a slap in the face to one of our few friends in Asia, the 60-year-old Malayan Prime Minister, Abdul Rahman. But, of course, the trouble with Rahman is that he's anti-Communist and thus, apparently, suspect.

Rahman laughs at our argument that by keeping Sukarno in luxuries like the latest jet airliners—$20 million worth—we are preventing Indonesia from going Communist.

It is Rahman's contention that we should force Sukarno to make up his mind once and for all whether he wants to go Communist, and some of the experts here say it would be a good idea if we lost the guy. For Indonesia is 90 percent Moslem and the people undoubtedly would rise up and overthrow Sukarno rather than see their country handed over to those efficient office managers from Moscow or Peking.

Sukarno's latest vagary was to name the Indian Ocean after Indonesia. Give that guy a little more dough and he'll be trying to change the name of California.

Poet Laureate Paddy Joyce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein two outstanding poems by my dear and talented friend, Mr. Patrick Joyce, originally from my hometown of Clinton, Mass., and a close friend and neighbor of mine for years.

These poems are dedicated to the great Robert Frost, of enduring fame, and the late A. E. Housman, one of the finest of the English school poets.

Like all of Mr. Joyce's works, these poems captivate the spirit of these great artists, whose names will go down in the history of letters as among the very best in the English language.

The poems follow:

IN MEMORIAM, TWO POETS

ROBERT FROST, NEW ENGLAND

White on the hills in your hard land,
The lonely birches silent stand.
Stonewalls that blend with rock and rill
Bind fast their antique limits still.
Fences you fought through all your years
Still hold their hostages to fears.
Neighbors are near, but still can keep
Secrets that most have buried deep.
Answers you sought in vain to find
Still haunt the heart and hurt the mind.
What can we do, now death has stilled
Your voice and left the void unfilled?
But follow paths you long had set
Until your granite goals are met.
Your words of wisdom spur the weak,
Hearten the strong in what they speak.
All is not futile, all not lost,
While men remember Robert Frost.

A. E. HOUSMAN, ENGLAND

Sweet melancholy singer,
Of youthful days long fled;
Sad requiem chimes ringer,
Whose own voice now is dead;
No longer will you bring us,
In verse that drives to tears,
The loneliness of lassies
And lads in far-off years.

The roses that were flaming,
The flowers you used to know,
The gardens that were lovely
In England long ago;
Brave lancers riding handsome,
With hearts a lass could break,
Who fought in wars forgotten,
And died for England' sake.

Only your verse remembers,
Only your songs still sing
Of your love and our love,
And every vanished spring;
Of dreams long gone but golden,
Of life, bright, sad but true:
Sweet melancholy singer,
Our youth still lives in you.

An Outrage in Venezuela

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the attack on the American Military Mission in Venezuela, and the more recent attack on an American private enterprise there has proven the danger, if such proof were necessary, of the real threat from Communist Cuba. By giving Russia a full military base in the middle of this hemisphere to train and equip subversive elements, we have endangered the freedom of every republic in the hemisphere. Now at long last the Organization of American States has called for action on several fronts. Many of us in the Congress have been requesting this OAS program and urge its speedy adoption.

The Miami Herald recently pointed out this need in an editorial "An Outrage in Venezuela." Under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I include it in the RECORD:

PROVING THE OAS IS RIGHT—AN OUTRAGE IN VENEZUELA

The latest outrage in Venezuela ought to make July 3 an Independence Day for the New World.

Eight gunmen overpowered four Venezuelans guarding the headquarters of the U.S. military mission in Caracas. At pistol point, amid insults, they stripped off the clothing of six U.S. Army officers and gagged them. They splashed gasoline around the building, set it afire and fled with the military uniforms, weapons, and valuables of their victims.

Almost at the same moment, in Washington, D.C., a special committee of the Organization of American States filed its long-awaited report. The committee warned that Venezuela was Cuba's next target in the drive to communize the Western Hemisphere.

"There is no doubt," said the OAS committee, "that the Castro regime selected Venezuela as its primary objective."

Conquering Venezuela for communism is the avowed aim of the thugs who attacked the U.S. Army center in Caracas. Their raid could hardly have been timed better to encourage action on the OAS committee's warning.

The committee made a series of recommendations for blunting the Red dagger pointed at every government in the Americas. Here is the course of action proposed to the OAS by the representatives of eight nations:

1. Call on every member state for the facts about Communist activity and agents on its territory.
2. Convoke a meeting of the chiefs of security services and intelligence of all OAS members to suggest measures for blocking the export of communism from Cuba.
3. Cut off travel between Cuba and the rest of the hemisphere.

4. Halt the shipment of money and propaganda from Cuba to Latin America.

In support of this program, the OAS committee declared that Cuba has been transformed into a Soviet military camp and is being used as a training center and supply base for spreading communism. At present, the committee added, Red agents move at will about Latin America, infiltrating governments, labor unions, student and professional organizations.

The OAS group said agents in Latin America receive their orders direct from Moscow, Peking, and Havana. The 60-page document noted that communism "has found subversion the most effective method of conquering peoples and territories without the enormous risks that it would run with a world war."

The OAS Council will meet to consider this committee report on July 3. And that's why we say that date ought to become an Independence Day for the Americas through OAS action to liberate the hemisphere from Communist subversion.

The result will ensue if the United States reacts as it should to the indignities inflicted on members of its Armed Forces by Red hirelings in Caracas.

Demonstrations Overlook Individual Responsibility in Asking Government Solution for All Racial Troubles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in a society of freemen each individual must be judged on his own merits, he will be rewarded according to the extent of his own ability, initiative and character. This is a simple truth that has been overlooked by those who are leading the demonstrations to better the lot of Negro citizens in America.

Certainly no man should be denied his legitimate rights under the Constitution because of his race, but no law can guarantee equal opportunity and equal rewards for all because we do not all have equal abilities, equal capabilities, or even equal desires.

The only just solution to the problems now confronting us because of race will be a solution based on the moral issue of the responsibility of individual citizens and not demonstrations, violence, killings, or more laws.

As a part of these remarks I would like to include an extremely well written editorial by David Lawrence in the June 24 issue of U.S. News & World Report:

BUT—

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy addressed a nationwide television and radio audience on the night of June 11.

But—no spokesman for the opposition viewpoint from either party in Congress was given an opportunity afterwards to make a rebuttal to that same audience. Mr. Kennedy said:

"Difficulties over segregation and discrimination exist in every city, in every State of the Union, producing in many cities a rising tide of discontent that threatens the public safety."

But—the vast majority of the American people certainly didn't have this feeling of disarry or of imminent danger just a few months ago, before the so-called nonviolent demonstration stirred up violence and the Supreme Court of the United States suddenly divested local police authorities of their power to secure the conviction of persons guilty of inciting disorder. The President described the current situation as follows:

"The fires of frustration and discord are burning in every city, North and South, where legal remedies are not at hand. Redress is sought in the streets, in demonstrations, parades, and protests which create tensions and threaten violence and threaten lives."

But—were these demonstrations spontaneous, or were they organized and directed by persons who deliberately played upon the prejudices and enraged feelings of both sides? The President continued:

"It is better to settle these matters in the courts than on the streets, and new laws are needed at every level, but law alone cannot make men see right."

But—the President nevertheless insisted that laws of a repressive nature and of doubtful constitutionality be enacted to coerce the owners of private businesses to surrender their right to decide how best to maintain their customer relations. Mr. Kennedy declared:

"We face, therefore, a moral crisis as a country and a people. It cannot be met by repressive police action. It cannot be left to increased demonstrations in the streets. It cannot be quieted by token moves or talk. It is a time to act in the Congress, in your State and local legislative body and, above all, in all of our daily lives."

But—can a moral crisis be solved by intensifying the controversy through legislative proposals, especially when the people are not convinced that an invasion of their private rights by law is fair to them or that they should be called upon to give up their cherished right of "freedom of association," as the Supreme Court terms it? The President added:

"Those who do nothing are inviting shame as well as violence. Those who act boldly are recognizing right as well as as reality. * * * I shall ask the Congress of the United States to act, to make a commitment it has not fully made in this century to the proposition that race has no place in American life or law. * * *

"The old code of equity law under which we live commands for every wrong a remedy, but in too many communities, in too many parts of the country, wrongs are inflicted on Negro citizens and there are no remedies at law. Unless the Congress acts, their only remedy is the street."

But—wrongs are frequently inflicted on many whites, too, and the remedy is not sought in mob violence.

Legislation alone, argued the President, cannot solve this problem, and he then added that "it must be solved in the homes of every American in every community across our country."

But—if race prejudice has "no place in American life," does the President favor intermarriage of Negroes and whites, against which there is the biggest single prejudice between these two races today? Some States still have laws barring such marriages, and the Supreme Court has never invalidated them.

Does the President, moreover, favor laws requiring integration of private clubs and private schools? These organizations, along with labor unions, operate under the beneficent license of Federal and State law—tax exemption—and are thus State connected, as the Supreme Court could classify it.

Mr. Kennedy pointed out in his speech that the "lack of an adequate education denies the Negro a chance to get a decent job." He said that Negro students who have attended segregated schools have "suffered a loss which can never be restored."

But—if this be true, why have so many Negroes, in the North and the South, who have attended predominantly Negro schools and colleges been able to attain high positions in the business and professional world, while other Negroes who were educated in integrated schools failed? Is a person's success or failure in life dependent only on his schooling? Must we not realistically examine the worth of the individual himself?

The President said: "Every American ought to have the right to be treated as he would wish to be treated."

But—in reality every American ought to be treated as he deserves to be treated, namely, on the basis of his ability and moral character, and his consideration for the rights of his fellow man. This is the essence of responsible individualism in a free society.

Communists in Hawaii?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Congress to a letter of great significance which appeared in the Evening Star of this date, June 19, 1963, written by Dr. Lenora N. Bilger, former dean and now professor emeritus of chemistry at the University of Hawaii.

It has been my pleasure to be acquainted with Dr. Bilger for many years, ever since I was a student at the University of Hawaii. She is regarded with highest esteem in the State of Hawaii.

I agree with Dr. Bilger that the University of Hawaii rates high among the institutions of advanced learning in the world and that the East-West Center for Cultural and Technical Exchange is one of the finest influences for world peace ever conceived or put into active operation. These two great institutions were recently subjected to unjust, groundless attacks from a Member of Congress and an admiral of the Navy. As one closely associated with the university for many years, Dr. Bilger speaks with respectable authority; and I fully agree with her that there is no Communist infiltration at the University of Hawaii or the East-West Center.

Dr. Bilger's letter follows:

HAWAIIAN DEFENSE

In the past few days, by radio and press, the opinions on communism in Hawaii of Adm. Harry D. Felt, now stationed in Hawaii, and of a 1961 10-day visitor, Republican Congresswoman FRANCES P. BOLTON, have been revealed. Resentment and shock such as are seldom felt in the State of Hawaii have swept the islands.

I find it difficult to discover in any of the publicized experiences or statements of these two commentators any specific or precise information which might help to establish the soundness or veracity of their judgments. Where and from whom and under what circumstances have their very serious accusations come? These questions are answered by only vague and hazy comments such as, "It is very apparent when you go there (to the University of Hawaii)"; "I found much of the Communist influence"; "States as States should not exist so far away"; "I didn't like the atmosphere at all (University of Hawaii)"; and "I am a little out of my field, of course," etc.

I have been a member of the faculty of the University of Hawaii for 35 years, have served as dean, professor, department chairman, senior professor, chairman of important committees, and honorary member of the Woman's Honor Society. I am now professor emeritus of chemistry. I should know whereof I speak. With all of the very close association with students and faculty which these official positions would naturally provide, I have at no time sensed any signs of Communist infiltration into the University of Hawaii.

As far as Mrs. BOLTON's question, "Do you think we will probably be able to do something to strengthen that institution?" is concerned, may I say of the University of Hawaii, that its origins, its progress over only 50 years, it academic standards, and research, and the caliber of its faculty, have placed it high among institutions of advanced learning, not only in the United States but also abroad.

I have great confidence in my good friends, our two Representatives in the House and our two Members of the U.S. Senate and recommend them to everyone in the country for their honor, integrity, intelligence, and love of America and Hawaii as four men who are able and capable of providing the Nation with the truth about Hawaii in its relation to communism. I am confident that their influence will be met with regard to Hawaii's loyalty to the Nation.

A final word: In my opinion, the East-West Center of the University of Hawaii is one of the finest influences for world peace ever conceived or put into active operation.

And a question: Could this immediate flare of communism have a glimmer of relationship to the glorious reception accorded to President Kennedy upon his very recent visit to Hawaii?

LENORA N. BILGER.

HONOLULU.

Shippers Associations: A Necessary Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, in section 402(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act, the Congress has specifically excluded from economic regulation "the operations of a shipper, or a group or association of shippers, in consolidating or distributing freight for themselves or for the members thereof, on a nonprofit basis, for the purpose of securing the benefits of carload, truckload, or other volume rates."

There are many shippers associations organized for this purpose. Some of them are members of the American Institute for Shippers' Associations, a trade association which I had the privilege of addressing on the occasion of its third annual meeting in Washington May 23. Aside from shipper groups, the membership consists of some of the most reputable merchandising and manufacturing concerns in the country. I learned from them that, despite the exclusion in the act, shipper associations constantly are being harassed by suits and complaints filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission. In fact, 43 such complaints presently are pending before the Commission.

There may be some shipper groups operating not in consonance with the law. I hold no brief for them. I speak, however, for the legitimate shipper associations which have been under harassment no less than the illegal ones. It seems to me the ICC has been negligent in not setting down rules by which this segment of transportation may operate under the law. They are long overdue.

Morris H. Glazer, editor emeritus of Transport Topics, a national trucking publication, has discussed this subject in one of his columns. Under unanimous consent, I include this article at this point in the RECORD:

SHIPPER CO-OPS—GUIDELINES NEEDED TO DETERMINE WHEN EXEMPTION APPLIES

(By Morris H. Glazer)

"A Thief Has His Hand in Your Pocket" is the startling title of a pamphlet just issued by the Committee on Transportation Practices, a group representing motor common carrier interests. It treats of illegal trucking. Among other citations of illegality, it states:

"Since the COTP began its fight, a dozen bogus shipper associations have closed their doors. Nearly 1,000 companies and individuals have been named in complaints formally citing them for violations of the Interstate Commerce Act."

COTP, however, notes that "The reference to a thief in this brochure in no way refers to nor reflects upon the lawful transportation performed by the legitimate private carrier, the lawfully constituted shipper association, or the certificated motor carrier. All references to a thief herein apply only to those who engage in transportation practices that are illegal."

The question of what is a legally constituted shipper association presently is before the Commission by virtue of some 30 complaints filed in the last few years. Part IV, section 402(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act clothes certain shipper groups in legal raiment in stating that "The provisions of this part shall not be construed to apply to the operations of a shipper, or a group or association of shippers, in consolidating or distributing freight for themselves or for the members thereof, on a nonprofit basis, for the purpose of securing the benefits of carload, truckload, or other volume rates."

SHIPPER ASSOCIATION POSITION

The case for the shipper association allegedly operating within the framework of this exemption is ably presented in a brief filed recently with the Commission on Baltimore Shippers & Receivers Cooperative, et al. The defendants in this case "jointly and severally do not condone any illegal enterprise which seeks to siphon the strength of the common carrier industry," but they resent being treated as "second-class citizens who do not deserve due process and equal protection of the laws." Baltimore Shippers & Receivers has been accused of operating as a broker, motor carrier, and freight forwarder, without appropriate authority.

There apparently is more than a legal issue involved in this case. Traffic facts seem to indicate that the apparent guilt of Baltimore Shippers & Receivers may lie in its use of piggyback. According to the brief, Baltimore Shippers & Receivers paid line-haul motor carriers $208,295 in 1958, as against $41,810 in 1962, whereas the railroads received not one cent in 1958, but $558,333 in 1962.

The Baltimore Shippers group complain that they are being subjected to "the rankest form of harassment." The complaint against the cooperative was filed more than 2 years ago. Hearings were held October 25 and 26, November 19 and 20, 1962, and February 13 and 14, 1963, before Examiner Lawrence A. Van Dyke, Jr.

Baltimore Shippers & Receivers is a member of the American Institute for Shippers' Associations, Inc., a trade association embracing about 40 groups and individual shippers, which purports to subscribe to a "code of operations" for bona fide shippers' associations. Among other provisions, the code dictates that there shall be no paid solicitation by a shippers' association for freight; that they shall utilize the services of regulated carriers only; that they shall operate on a nonprofit basis, and that they shall not conduct private carriage.

RULING AWAITED IN KEY CASE

These are but a few of the guidelines of operation shipper groups believe are essential to maintain uncontested legal status. Others no doubt could be added, and the institute is looking to the Interstate Commerce Commission to enunciate them, perhaps in connection with its decision in the Atlanta Shippers Association, Inc., case. The issue of whether a bona fide shipper association may or may not operate as a corporation was argued recently before the entire Commission in the Atlanta Shippers case as a matter of general transportation importance. Division 1 of ICC held that the exemption under section 402(c) does not apply to corporations.

In the last 20 years, the Commission and the courts have had the opportunity to pass on the validity of certain shipper associations, some of which were incorporated. The leading decision in this field is the case of Pacific Coast Wholesalers, Inc. The Commission's initial decision in that case was handed down in November 1945. It found that Pacific Coast, a corporation, was a bona fide shippers' association within the meaning of the exemption. From 1945 to 1962, the Commission has interpreted the statutory exemption from freight forwarder regulation as extending to corporations along with other groups or forms of associations. Now Division 1 changes the interpretation, and, as a result, uncertainty, confusion, and litigation result. An early and definitive decision in the Atlanta Shippers case would be of great benefit to shipper groups, the carriers and the Commission, as well.

Hartford Rebuilds Its Central Business Area To Insure Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, my home city of Hartford has been engaged in a major redevelopment program which is reaching a point where the entire city is enthusiastic about what has been accomplished. Day by day, people are seeing come to fruition the hopes and dreams of past years.

At the same time, new and imaginative projects are being proposed. Just last week, new plans for the west of Hartford, based on development of an industrial park, and plans for a redevelopment program in East Hartford which would complement the Hartford plans, were discussed in the press.

A major magazine story has just appeared in the Engineering News-Record, written by Robert J. Stinson, himself formerly of Hartford and thoroughly familiar with the real estate and construction developments in the city. I believe it should be of interest to Members who have or who are contemplating such programs.

The article follows:

HARTFORD REBUILDS ITS CENTRAL BUSINESS AREA TO INSURE GROWTH

Within 3 years, building contractors have changed the face of Hartford. Before another 2 years pass, roadbuilders will change its map.

But reaching the point in this New England city's economic revival where $49-million worth of office towers stretch skyward required 11 years of planning, arguing and legal maneuvering.

A block north of this gleaming glass, steel and concrete commercial complex, crawler tractors chew at earth and cranes swing bridge steel into place along a section of a 3.6-mile highway that will curve through the city from border to border. The $78-million cross-city expressway (East-West Highway), like the urban redevelopment project, started taking shape about 15 years after its conception in 1945.

Both arrived on the scene under pressure from internal and external economic forces. The external economics—basically the Federal-aid highway and redevelopment programs—provided convenient vehicles for both projects. Local economics, however, exerted the greatest pressure.

Economic data, combined with the flight of major commercial and manufacturing companies from Hartford, alerted the public to the need for fast action.

It couldn't come too soon. In 1940, Hartford's population of 166,267 represented 51 percent of the population in the 26 surrounding communities that form the area's new concept of the capital region. By 1950 Hartford could claim only 45 percent of the capital region's 395,201 inhabitants. And the 1960 census showed the city's population had plunged to 32 percent of the region's population of 504,600. The decline continues today.

Comparative figures for retail sales were equally disconcerting. In 1959, retail sales in the capital region hit an estimated $760.7 million, according to the Connecticut State Development Commission. Hartford claimed 48 percent of the total. But in 1961, capital region retail sales volume soared to $829.2 million. Hartford's volume edged up to $369.9 million, 44 percent of the region's volume.

Only easy access on good highways and feeder streets to attractive shopping, business and entertainment facilities in the central business district could stem the decline of the city's relative economic importance.

It also needed attractive, economical rental housing. Apartments would not dramatically reverse the migration to the suburbs, but they could slow the outflow by attracting the younger and older persons who would live in the city if given a selection of attractive housing.

Once awakened, Hartford leaders quickly pushed residents of the city into action. In rapid order, the voters approved redevelopment bond issues totaling close to $10 million. Surveys and renderings came to life after moldering for years in the files of city planning and redevelopment officials. Construction equipment lumbered onto designated sites.

REDEVELOPMENT

In the beginning, about 1 year after Congress enacted the National Housing Act of 1949 with its title I provision for urban redevelopment, the city council established a redevelopment agency.

Then the City Plan Commission selected for redevelopment a 10-acre site between the Connecticut River and the central retail district. The tract formed one of the worst slums that have existed in New England.

Soon after obtaining planning funds in 1952 from the U.S. Government, Hartford lost ground while it fought a court case challenging its right to issue redevelopment bonds. Redevelopment opponents held some poignant, if not entirely valid arguments; the area designated sheltered 300 families; it contained 107 small business establishments; it had an Old World charm.

The facts of existing squalor, however, won the fight, and the courts found for the city in 1954. In 1956, the voters approved a bond issue to finance the city's share of land acquisition.

Two more years passed while the city acquired land and razed the buildings.

SUCCESS AND NEAR FAILURE

In 1958, from among half a dozen big-name developers from all parts of the Nation, the city selected as project sponsor, F. H. McGraw & Co., Inc., a Hartford-based construction company. It won with a proposal prepared by Charles Du Bose, of Hartford, in association with Emery Roth & Sons and Richard Roth, the latter two of New York City.

A tight money market intervened and the McGraw Co., failed to get financing. The project moved close to disaster at the end of 1959.

In the previous 3 to 4 years, however, events occurred that shook businessmen, city officials, and residents.

With no room to expand in the traffic-choked 18½ square miles of the city, major commercial and manufacturing companies moved to adjoining communities. The lengthy list included some of the Nation's biggest and most prosperous companies, including Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., employing more than 2,000 persons, and Fuller Brush Co., employing about 1,500. Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance bought land in an adjoining town and announced it would leave Hartford.

BREAKTHROUGH

Where physical decay had apparently failed, scouring of the economic base succeeded.

Gladden W. Baker, chairman of the finance committee of the Travelers Insurance Cos., saw the pall cast by Phoenix's announcement. He also saw a good investment as he looked from the Travelers building toward the cleared redevelopment site two blocks distant.

Travelers, with assets last year totaling more than $4.2 billion, formed a subsidiary, Constitution Plaza, Inc. With Roger C. Wilkins, a vice president of Travelers at its helm, the subsidiary bought the McGraw Co.'s interest in the redevelopment job. McGraw also got the construction contract.

The 4 years of public education previous to 1959 paid off. Officials of Phoenix Mutual changed their mind about moving the company to the suburbs. The city bought nearly 4 acres of land across the street from Constitution Plaza under a city-State redevelopment program and resold it to Phoenix. Although an entirely separate financial and construction venture, Phoenix's $9 million, 13-story elliptical building forms an integral part of the larger development. Harrison & Abramovitz, of New York City, designed this building.

The local radio and television station serving the area had also planned to leave the city, but reversed its decision and agreed to lease a major building in Constitution Plaza.

Hartford National Bank & Trust Co. signed up as major tenant for an 18-story building. Connecticut Bank & Trust Co. became the controlling tenant of the second office building, a 20-story tower.

With the major commitments in hand, Travelers ordered a work start in 1960 substantially along the lines of the concept developed by the McGraw Co.

Today, the project, which contains underground parking space for 1,800 cars, is more than 70 percent leased. The 18-story building is occupied. Radio and TV station WTIC is operating in its building, and Hartford Connecticut Bank & Trust is scheduled to open for business in its new 20-story headquarters June 24.

A five-story structure rising from a retail shopping area houses the Travelers Research Center and the Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce. The Phoenix building, under contract to George A. Fuller Co. of New York City, will be completed by the end of August. A 315-room, multistory hotel aims at completion by the end of this year.

ONLY A PIECE OF THE PROGRAM

The $40-million Constitution Plaza and its neighboring Phoenix Mutual project, represent only a part of the city's redevelopment program for the downtown area.

The others are:

Windsor Street: 71-acre project for commercial and manufacturing use. The city has acquired almost all of the land and razed more than 30 percent of the total. When developed, officials estimate investment in the area will exceed $21 million.

Bushnell Plaza: About 7 acres to be developed for high-rise apartment buildings containing about 300 dwelling units. The city opened proposals from eight bidders last month and selection of a developer is expected shortly. Robert J. Bliss, executive director of the redevelopment agency, estimates completed value at about $8 million, with completion scheduled in 1964 or 1965.

Underwood: A 33-acre late entry in the redevelopment program, officials shaped this program around Underwood Corp., a company employing 3,000 persons. The East-West Highway claimed its employee parking lot, a loss that company officials said could jeopardize the company's operations in the city. City officials hope for completion next year and estimated the project's value when finished at about $2.5 million. This project will combine razing of unserviceable units and renewal of structurally sound buildings.

Sheldon-Charter Oak, section A: A 37-acre project with 200 acres tagged for redevelopment. All of the residential buildings in the 37 acres will be demolished, while some of the industrial plants will remain.

Trumbull Street: A 21-acre project in the central business district, with a portion of the area within the city's retail core. A start on this project, which includes widening of the existing north-south thoroughfare to six lanes from its present two to four, will commence late this year.

Plans call for construction of municipal garages providing space for 800 to 1,000 cars, new retail space, and recreation and entertainment facilities. Officials says completed value will run to about $9 million.

The city planned this project as a means of providing balance for the retail core. Officails concede that construction of Constitution Plaza and additions to the city's largest department store, threw much of the retail weight east of Main Street along which side major retail units already face.

Parking and the hoped for entertainment center will bring shoppers into the westerly Trumbull Street area from where they will move east past the variety of retail shops in the section toward the department stores and Constitution Plaza.

REDEVELOPMENT SPILLOVER

Can it be done? A few diehards, of which very few remain since the appearance on the scene of Constitution Plaza, wonder if the overall city program can be digested.

Travelers accomplishment of Constitution Plaza, however, proved that spending begets spending.

Even before the insurance company arrived on the redevelopment scene, the head of the State's largest retail enterprise saw that prospective redevelopers and the city meant business and made the decision to invest in expansion. Mrs. Beatrice Fox Auerbach, head of G. Fox & Co., which ranks among the Nation's top 10 in gross department store sales, started a $7 million expansion program.

As Constitution Plaza began to take shape, the department store plans swelled. The now completed structures represent roughly $10 million to $12 million in new retail sales and warehouse investment.

The redevelopment project also wrought an innovation in the utility business; sale of both heating and cooling from one central plant located some distance from the project.

When planned in 1960 by the Hartford Gas Co., the company expected to supply 6,500 tons of refrigeration for air conditioning in the plaza project and the nearby Travelers buildings.

Demand from businesses along the route, however, required a larger capacity, so the order for an additional 4,500-ton chiller went out from the gas company to Carrier Corp.

With the plant now in operation, Hartford Gas Co. is the first to distribute chilled water as a metered utility. And the same steam boilers that power the refrigeration machines drive turbines in summer furnish heating steam in the winter.

The new utility thus meets the year-around temperature requirements of its customers.

The heating-cooling plant and the underground distribution lines serving Constitution Plaza and other businesses along the route cost about $5 million.

And Hartford National Bank & Trust Co., which took a major part of space in one of the new towers for a branch office, recently announced it would build a 25-story headquarters building on the site of the existing headquarters. Architects are Welton Beckett & Associates, of Los Angeles, and Jeter & Cook, of Hartford. Officials estimate the cost at $12 million. Demolition will start this summer.

When relocation of families in the Windsor Street redevelopment area presented some problems, the Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce took the initiative.

This private enterprise prime mover in Hartford's overall redevelopment, under the general management of Arthur J. Lumsden, established a separate nonprofit corporation to build 40 units of housing under the Federal Housing Administration's section 221(d)3. This $400,000 pilot operation pointed the way for profit-motivated private builders.

First Hartford Realty Corp., a publicly held real estate investment and development company, and its associated construction company, Green Manor Construction, built about 400 rental units under the FHA section. Cost ran to approximately $3.3 million.

Travelers Insurance, keeping up with the economic flow its pump priming started, invested about $6 million for modernization and renovation of its buildings. It also embarked on a new construction job on land adjoining its principal building facing on Main Street.

The company cleared some old buildings on the site. In their places, will be an underground parking garage, a three-story reception and main entrance structure and a block-square landscaped plaza. The company said the project will be completed next spring.

Although the construction explosion spread its benefits among a wide number of general and subcontracting companies in the area, the George A. Fuller Co. won a generour amount of the business.

The company holds about $60 million worth of contracts for building in and near the city, says Neil Horgan, vice president in charge of the company's Hartford operations. This total includes a $6 million, 8-story addition to the home office building of Aetna Life Insurance Co. in Hartford. Last year, Fuller completed a $5 million annex building for Aetna, which followed a $4 million wing erected in 1958.

HARD-CASH PAYOFF

Those who fight for redevelopment on the basis of sound economics, need only point to Constitution Plaza for their proof. Before redevelopment, the city assessed the plaza tract and the connected Phoenix Mutual site at $3.2 million and obtained tax revenues of less than $100,000 a year. Next year, the area will go on the books at about $30 million and bring in property tax revenues of $1.2 to $1.4 million a year. Net cost to the public through Federal, city and State outlays came to $3.6 million, which means the new tax revenues will capitalize the outlay in 3 years.

The project will also offset the loss of $8.5 million in assessed valuations claimed by the East-West Highway.

HIGHWAYS-PUBLIC WORKS

Traffic congestion struck Hartford soon after World War II, just as it did other cities across the country. As early as 1945, the late William H. Putnam, then chairman of the Hartford Flood Commission, offered an apparently simple solution: "Build a highway across the city from the eastern boundary at the Connecticut River to the western boundary at West Hartford."

He even submitted a proposed route. The idea won few backers. Getting traffic swiftly through the city seemed to lack urgency.

In 1848, G. Albert Hill, State highway commissioner at that time, picked up the idea. This aroused a lot of interest, most of it unfavorable. Everyone wanted the highway in someone's else's backyard or factory parking lot but not his own.

The controversy continued until 1954, each interest submitting its own idea of a proper route across the city. The proposal for the East-West Highway nearly got buried by the appointment of a special study commission in 1954. And if that hadn't killed it, the estimated cost would have done so.

By this time, however, the idea of five new bridges across the Connecticut River—two between Hartford and neighboring communities, and three outside the city to the north and south—produced even hotter arguments.

While the battle boiled, the State started construction of one bridge between Hartford and East Hartford. This one, the third serving Hartford, dumped traffic into the heart of the city when it was completed in 1957. Its aproaches also skirted one side of the tract now occupied by the Constitution Plaza development.

Over this $8 million span, christened Founders Bridge, traffic from the industrialized town of East Hartford surged into the center of Hartford in rush hours, with only narrow local streets available to carry the cars out to the suburbs in the west. Residents who once opposed the East-West Highway proposal now demanded that it be constructed.

High cost still posed a serious problem but the solution came in the form of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

Since Hartford lies almost dead center in the State, the city naturally became the hub of the Connecticut portion of the Interstate System, which ties into the New York, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island segments.

The proposed route of the East-West Highway across the city, falling neatly into I-84 running across the State, came under the umbrella of the 90 percent Federal-aid program.

A second highway, I-91, runs north and south along the river, scooping up traffic from New York State heading to Springfield and Worcester, Mass., as well as local traffic from motorists using the existing Charter Oak and Bulkeley bridges.

The Hartford section of I-84 that starts from the Connecticut River at Bulkeley Bridge and also I-91 made the Windsor Street renewal project ideal for development as an industrial commercial area. The heavy truck traffic this commercial-industrial complex will generate after completion will entirely avoid the central city. This will help eliminate one of the principal generators of traffic snarls that discourage incity shopping by nonresidents and even residents of Hartford.

THE FLOOD FIGHTERS

But the East-West Highway also offered the city a means of solving local flood control problems at some savings in cost. After the disastrous flood of 1936, the city built about 7 miles of dikes along the west bank of the Connecticut River.

In conjunction with the dike system, the Corps of Engineers enclosed the city's Park River in a two-barreled conduit that extends approximately 6,000 feet upstream from the Connecticut River. Total outlays for the conduit and the dikes came to $225 million.

The north and south branches of the Park River, however, still remained open and subject to flooding. Most of the time, these streams are docile, but occasionally in the past they swept angrily through the city, ripping and tearing some sections, sometimes just inundating.

In cooperation with the State and the Federal Government, the Hartford Flood Commission, headed by Charles W. Cooke, continues with the flood control program.

The effort consists of two projects, one for each of the branches of the Park River.

The projects include construction of eight dry reservoirs, improvement of about 9 miles of channel, and a 1-mile extension of the existing Park River conduit. Plans call for another mile of conduit when funds become available.

Other phases of the project now underway are replacement of three bridges, and enclosure of two small brooks in pressure conduits. Total outlays for the two projects underway will amount to $12 million, with the State and Federal Government sharing the costs.

The mile of Park River conduit under construction ties in with the East-West Highway job, so officials combined highway and conduit construction into five joint contracts administered by the State highway department.

WATER AND SEWERS

The highway project and the Constitution and Windsor Street redevelopment jobs made necessary both the relocation of existing water and sewer lines and the construction of new storm and sanitary lines.

The Windsor Street project set up a large sewer project, since it called for a major extension through the area. In the process, the metropolitan district commission, which handles water and sanitation facilities for seven communities including Hartford, took advantage of the opportunity to separate the combined sanitary and storm sewerlines. Although the separation of the two systems started about 5 years ago, the commission completed the largest part of the operation in the last 2 years in concert with redevelopment.

In the last 2 years, construction of connectors and an interceptor sewerline in the Constitution Plaza section resulted in outlays of roughly $1.3 million in each of the last 2 years.

So with the expenditure of each dollar, the city meets the demand of the catch phrase coined a decade ago by a local newspaper: "Go ahead, Hartford."

The School Prayer Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, amidst the controversy over the Supreme Court school prayer decision, the best comment that I have seen, which is in accord with my views, was the lead editorial in the Christian Science Monitor on June 19, 1963. This editorial is deserving of attention by persons of all faiths.

The editorial follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 19, 1963]

THE SCHOOL PRAYER DECISION

It may be hard for ardent religionists or laymen in the law to understand why a prescribed Bible reading or recitation of the Lord's Prayer in a public school violates the first amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

But when eight of the nine Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States agree that this is true, the lines of law and experience must be pretty clear, notwithstanding the one carefully reasoned dissent.

The gist of the matter is this: America is a land of mixed religious backgrounds. Much of the religious freedom enjoyed here stems from the fact that only by tolerance for diverse faiths or for no faith could a viable republic be built. This has called for the rule that neither Congress nor a State should make any law "respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Since a great majority of Americans believe in God, and since a lesser majority embrace one or another Christian faith, most of them probably would like to include some expression of reverence in the daily program of the public schools. But to agree on what specific form that expression should take, without offense or unkindness to some minority, has proved virtually impossible.

And every majority at some point breaks down into minorities, especially in a nation where more than 50 denominations or divisions of denominations each claim 100,000 or more adherents. Almost any one of these which might be in sympathy with one form of school prayer or religious reading might find itself unable to subscribe to another selected by the authorities.

Under this circumstance the Supreme Court has come to conclusions already reached in the United States by most educators and many churchmen: That separation of church and state is the only workable rule. And that, "The place of religion in our society is an exalted one, achieved through a long tradition of reliance on the home, the church, and the inviolable citadel of the individual heart and mind."

Private Utilities Are Taxed To Finance REA Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of June 18 shows how big government and the social planners are abusing American taxpayers. The Rural Electrification Administration was originally set up to assist rural areas to secure electric power. The job has long since been accomplished, but has REA been disbanded? Of course not, it is now being expanded, not because of the needs of isolated rural areas, but to create competition for private power companies and build public power projects.

Mr. Speaker, the principle is wrong. The private companies should not be asked to contribute to their own liquidation as we do when we take their tax money to create competition which takes away their business such as is being done in the case of the Upshur-Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation.

The Wall Street Journal editorial follows:

PARING THE PARITY

Since electric power is available to just about every farm in the country, it would seem logical for the Rural Electrification Administration to stop expanding. But since political instrumentalities are not necessarily logical, the REA is busily financing the building of more and bigger electric generating plants.

The justification is equally interesting, if not any more logical. Rural areas, REA Administrator Norman Clapp said recently, need to achieve a practical parity with urban areas in electric power supply and service if they are to participate in national growth." Whatever "parity" may mean in theory, it's easy enough to see how it works.

Take the case of the Southwestern Electric Power Co., an investor-owned utility serving a large area in Texas. A neighboring REA-associated co-op, the Upshur-Rural Electric Cooperative Corp., has been getting power from Southwestern at a special low rate. However, seeking to advance its parity status, the co-op has obtained a $9 million REA loan to build a generating plant of its own.

Though the REA says the co-op in 10 years will save about $1 million in power costs, the Government during that time will be paying 4 percent for the money it lends to the co-op at 2 percent, thus losing more than $1.5 million on the deal. To say nothing of the tax revenues it will lose on Southwestern's sales to the co-op. Besides, to dispose of its power the co-op needs a lot of new, non-rural customers for whom it must compete aggressively with the private company.

Such heavily weighted competition strikes us as paring parity pretty fine. It also compares unfavorably with the promise of the sponsors of the legislation creating REA; it was not the intent, they said, to let Government-subsidized, tax-exempt utility groups compete with private industry.

That was a long time ago, though. Too long, apparently, for the memories of supercharged politicians and power-lacking taxpayers.

Higher Education Facilities Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
June 11, 1963.

The Honorable JAMES G. FULTON,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: House bill 6143, Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, which was reported favorably by the Committee on Education and Labor on May 21, would provide much-needed assistance in several areas of higher education for which additional support will be urgently needed during the period the bill would cover.

The college housing program enacted in 1950 has been of incalculable benefit to the some 900 institutions of higher education that have participated in it, which institutions, incidentally, enroll approximately 85 percent of the Nation's students working for baccalaureate and higher degrees. Its provisions have made possible expansion of dormitories and dining room facilities to meet the growth of the total enrollment of degree-credit students from 2,116,440 in 1950–51 to 4,206,672 in 1962–63.

The relatively rapid growth of enrollment, of course, has created comparable needs for additional classroom, laboratory, and library space, and these needs are continuing to increase at an accelerated rate. Moreover, the growth of population has brought forth new demands for regional campuses offering the first 2 years of undergraduate work and graduate study at the master's level, strategically located at points away from established campuses where local groups can most effectively and economically served. Finally, advancing technology in its turn demands increasing numbers of well-trained semiprofessional technicians both to meet the needs of the new industry and to enable the fully trained professional people to extend their special competences to the greatest possible extent.

House bill 6142 meets all these needs for academic facilities very well. In my opinion, its provisions are not extravagant but, on the contrary, are quite realistic in assessing requirements for the 3-year period from 1963 through 1966. Careful administration can assure conservative use of the funds the bill would provide, so that extravagance would be avoided.

I hope that you will find it possible to support House bill 6143 in all the ways that your experience and good judgment suggest. Many future leaders of the Nation's complex society will benefit from the enactment of this legislation.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN GEISE,
Vice Chancellor for Regional Programs.

Appendix

Essays Written by Members of the Eighth Grade of Manalapan Township Public School About Their Recent Trip to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the permission granted me to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a few remarks, I am pleased to contain therein essays written by members of the eighth grade of the Manalapan Township Public School in Englishtown, N.J., about their recent trip to Washington. It has been my privilege to offer prizes for such essays to young students who come to my office in an effort to rouse the young people's interest in their Government, and I am most gratified with the results. The winners are determined by their teachers in the school, and the first prizewinner in this contest is Lynn Barshop, the second prizewinner is Linda Daum, and the third prizewinner is Virginia Mate.

The essays they wrote follow:

THE BEAUTY OF THE NATION'S CAPITAL

(By Lynn Barshop)

The beauty of Washington, D.C. lies far deeper than that of the picturesque view created by its splendid buildings and the eyecatching spectacle during cherry blossom time. Its beauty lies in the national heritage ever present in the atmosphere of Washington, D.C.

To American citizens, and citizens of any foreign shore alike, the National City represents the Nation's democratic freedom. Freedom in the great city is suggested in the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson inscribed in panels on the walls of his memorable monument together with the reverent feeling given in the inspiring Lincoln Memorial.

As a student, I have been anticipating the eighth grade Washington trip for many years. The trip proved that my eagerness was not unwarranted. I have been waiting impatiently to visit the Federal Bureau of Investigation Building, as were my fellow students. This Bureau made one feel secure in having such responsible people apprehending Federal criminals and protecting the welfare of us all.

Another building which interested me particularly was the Library of Congress. The library overwhelmed me with its countless number of books on its mountainous tiers of shelves. I appreciate modern art, therefore, I enjoyed the display of many works of abstract and nonobjective paintings.

In the National Archives we saw kept under guard such national treasures as the Constitution, Declaration of Independence, Bill of Rights, the Articles of the Confederation, and many more. It gives one a feeling of great awe to see these documents of freedom as they were originally drafted and makes one feel close to history.

In the Pan American Building, I most liked the tropical garden which contained many birds of the Latin American area and the displayed collection of flags of the countries south of the United States.

The Smithsonian Institution, both the old and new buildings, had exciting exhibitions on many subjects which were dealt with in an interesting manner and captured the attention of everyone.

George Washington's plantation, Mount Vernon, was a beautiful stop on our agenda. The house in which he lived was perfectly preserved with the most minute detail of authenticity.

Our visit to the Washington Monument was a trying one; because many of us insisted on walking up and down the monument. This endeavor proved to be a little too ambitious for most of us. The Washington Monument itself is a splendid structure which towers far above the surrounding cherry-tree tops and is mirrored in the reflecting lagoon. It is worthy of being considered America's Taj Mahal.

A magnificently decorated building was the White House, through which we were escorted. We were shown through the Blue, Red and Green Rooms as well as other rooms. In each of these rooms the prevailing color is that for which it is named. The rooms are adorned with lavish silks and tremendous glittering crystalline chandeliers.

As we traveled to another destination, we saw the monument depicting the flag raising at Iwo Jima. This monument is a tribute to the heroic men who struggled for our country in World War II. It gave all of us a thrill and made us all proud.

Our tour of the Nation's Capitol Building was an exceptional treat. The majority of States in the country, separately, contributed two statues each which were displayed there. We toured the sections in which Democrat and Republican Representatives hold their meetings.

Of all the aspects of our Washington trip, one of the most impressive to me was our interview with Representative AUCHINCLOSS in his office. Only in a country with freedoms such as Americans enjoy, could we young students have been sponsored on this wonderful trip and have been permitted to interrupt the busy schedule of our Representative.

It is a wonderful way to conclude our elementary education filled with the feeling of pride, in being an American.

IMPRESSIONS

(By Linda Daum)

Washington, D.C., made a great impression upon me as well as on my fellow classmates. It was such a seemingly unreal city. The structures were beautiful and the well-landscaped grounds gave the impression of a fairy tale come true. Yes, as I rode through Washington I felt as if I were about to wake up at any moment.

It was hard to realize that it wasn't fairyland or make-believe people. But it was real people in a real city, confronted with the problems of a very real country.

Our class was fortunate enough to see the Jefferson and Lincoln Memorials at night.

The memorial dedicated to Thomas Jefferson was altogether fitting and proper for such a man. There he stands, ready to face the situations of his time, and to look upon the country he loved.

The Lincoln Memorial was so right. It was and is so beautiful and too realistic for words. It truly fits his character. The statue of Lincoln was breathtaking. He seemed to seek me personally, with his eyes, and it was as if Mr. Lincoln was actually sitting there, tired, and deep in the thoughts of keeping our country united.

I was truly awed by the beauty of the Washington Monument at night. It was lovely to see it reaching into the sky, and it gave me an odd feeling of being extremely small. It reaches to the heavens so gracefully as if it were trying to reach God himself. To me it represents George Washington, looking for God's help, when things were very difficult, praising Him when he felt thankful, and I believe it was often for both.

The Capital of the United States is so right for our country, majestic as the mountains, peaceful as the plains.

Yes, our class learned that we have a capital of which we should be proud. For its beauty and organization, as well as the great men who serve our country from within its walls.

I am proud and grateful. I heave learned that Washington, D.C., truly represents its country and its people.

THE CITY OF ETERNITY

(By Virginia Mate)

The talking came to an abrupt halt as the majestic dome of the Capitol sprung into view. This was the first glimpse of Washington, D.C., for our eighth graders; and was not to be the last in the thrilling 2 days which followed.

May 8, 1963, looked like it was made to order for Manalapan Township. There was only one time during the entire trip when I wished for cooler weather, and that was while ascending the Washington Monument. But even that was worth the effort, for the view from the top momentarily took away all thoughts, other than genuine awe. The scene below was like a map unfolding in front of me, prophesying the days to come.

While touring the Federal Bureau of Investigation, I found myself wishing that I were a foreigner, so that I could more fully appreciate just what this cornerstone of American freedom stands for. This tour was one thing that will never erase itself from my mind.

The National Archives is probably one of the most respected places in all of Washington. In this building lie all the documentary evidence of our Nation's freedom and security, setting it apart from the rest of the world.

Silence descended upon our group as we made our way through the vast National Shrine of Immaculate Conception. Although not of the Catholic faith, I felt I could still appreciate this shrine to the God who made the dream of these United States come true.

Whatever thoughts I had of Washington during the day, were greatly increased and somewhat changed as the evening descended upon us. The city is as if transformed when the last shadow falls, and its true meaning and beauty are at last revealed.

I am really speaking of this transformation; namely, the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial. I have mentioned the Washington Monument before, but the whole meaning of this vast edifice was so greatly altered that I feel I must mention it again. This monument became a strikingly beautiful and significant example for the entire world to note, that one individual American could have done so much and meant so much to all his fellow countrymen.

The awe-inspiring statue of Abraham Lincoln cannot be described in mere adjectives either. To quote the words on the reverse side of a Lincoln Memorial postcard, "The Great Emancipator appears stern, pensive, or kindly, depending upon the angle of view. From any point, he gives an impression of tragic loneliness." I can now realize that my conception of Abraham Lincoln is also present in the hearts of many Americans.

The changing of the guard at Arlington National Cemetery impressed me very deeply. This was not the first time that I had witnessed this act, but even so, it meant just as much to me as if it were the first time. Some might think it unreasonable to go that far just for the graves of three "unknowns," but shrines similar to this built the foundation of our Nation's liberty; and without liberty this country could not stand for what it does, a nation respected and honored by the world and all its races, a nation to be proud to claim as your own—America.

Decision of the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Supreme Court's decision of last Monday against the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading has already brought a sharp reaction across this country. I have received telegrams, letters, and phone calls protesting this decision and expressing amazement that the Court would go out of its way through such a twisted process of reasoning to try to prohibit public schools from using the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading, particularly on a basis which was not made compulsory on the part of individual students.

I am pleased to call to the attention of the Senate editorial comments from the News & Courier of Charleston, S.C., and the Augusta Chronicle, of Augusta, Ga., on the subject of the Court's ruling against the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading. The editorial from the News & Courier is entitled "The Court on Prayer" and was printed in the June 19, 1963, issue. The editorial from the Augusta Chronicle also appeared on June 19, 1963, and is entitled "Tradition Given Another Blow." I am also pleased to call to the attention of the Senate an editorial from the Greenville Piedmont of June 19, 1963, entitled "May One Say a Prayer for the Supreme Court?"

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all three of these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont, June 19, 1963]

May One Say a Prayer for the Supreme Court?

A child bows his head, folds his hands and says, softly, "Our Father, Who art in Heaven."

He becomes a criminal.

A child listens intently as his teacher reads, "And Jesus said, suffer little children to come unto me."

The teacher is a criminal.

The child and the teacher are criminals because they were in a public school, and the U.S. Supreme Court says it is unconstitutional to use the Lord's Prayer and to read the Bible in such schools.

Is it far fetched to call them criminals? The Supreme Court has ruled their acts are unconstitutional. If an act is unconstitutional, it is illegal. If it is illegal, one who commits it has committed a crime. One who commits a crime is a criminal by definition.

The U.S. Supreme Court, by its own lights, has not gone far enough in its most recent decision. It should assume original jurisdiction and order mention of God stricken from the Declaration of Independence, from the Pledge of Allegiance, from the Nation's coins. That would be a logical sequel to its ban on the Lord's prayer and Bible reading.

[From the Charleston, (S.C.) News and Courier, June 19, 1963]

The Court on Prayer

In declaring unconstitutional the required reading of the Bible and reciting of the Lord's Prayer in public schools, the U.S. Supreme Court has encroached again on the authority of a State to regulate its educational system. As in the segregation decisions, the Court has further centralized power over the daily lives of the people in the Government at Washington, thereby sterngthening the hands of a few rulers over the United States.

Despite time-honored custom in many States that they may not guarantee to their citizens the opportunity for religious exercises. As Associate Justice Tom C. Clark has put it, Bible reading is permissible only when "present objectively as part of a secular program of education." In other words, the Bible will have a role in public education only insofar as it is treated as a historical document, such as the Domesday Book or the Works of Shakespeare.

In ruling that the Government must be neutral on religion, the Court has taken a position opposing the official acknowledgment of a Supreme Being, despite the assurance by some of the justices that they have no intention of outlawing oaths of office or prayer in the U.S. Senate.

The full meaning of the Court's decision will not be known until the final decree is issued in the fall. Indeed it may be many years before it is known how much secularization of the schools this decision will require.

When the segregation decision was made in 1954, it was interpreted only to require an absence of discrimination. Today, Federal courts are insisting on mingling of the races in each and every school, even though this may involve the crossing of district lines. In time, the Supreme Court may move to the total emination of religious writings and influences from the public school system.

We believe, however, that religion may be bootlegged in the schools precisely as freedom of association may be bootlegged elsewhere in society. If the American people want their children to share in a religious heritage during their education, they will find means of keeping spiritual influences and instruction in the classroom. If they don't care enough, education will become as secularized as it is in the Soviet Union. In time, the United States itself could become an officially godless state.

While the religious implications of the decision have not been fully clarified, the constitutional nature of the new restrictions on the States should be clear to all. The Supreme Court is determined that education should become a process under tight Federal control. The content of the school curriculum and the method of instruction will be under constant court review. The justices not only want the Federal courts to act as school boards, but as field supervisors in charge of secularization.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, June 19, 1963]

Tradition Given Another Blow

The deep concern that so many Americans feel in the wake of the latest ruling on religion handed down by the U.S. Supreme Court is understandable.

And it runs deep, we think, despite news dispatches which indicate that the intensity of reaction is not so great as that which attended a ruling last June when the Court held that recitation of a State-prepared prayer in a public school was unconstitutional.

Yet, it seems to us that the current decision cuts much deeper into the warp and woof of American life than did last year's ruling.

It is not so much a matter of the destruction of the moral bedrock of this Nation, as some seem to feel, nor does it, in our opinion, strike "an irreparable blow to religious freedom and morality," as Senator Herman Talmadge may justifiably believe.

It does, however, represent a continuation of the seeming perpetual process by which the Supreme Court has been chipping away at fundamental traditions of America. It is, as one clergyman phrased it, "a sad departure from this Nation's heritage under God."

Unlike the 1962 case, where the Court held that it is unconstitutional for a State to order recitation of a State-prepared prayer, the current decision involves reading of the Bible and recitation of the Lord's Prayer.

It is a far cry from a prayer prepared by some State bureaucrat to one offered by the Son of God Himself.

Obviously cognizant of the outraged criticism heaped on him and other members of the Court following their 1962 ruling, Justice Clark, in offering the majority opinion, sought to placate a segment of American society this time by suggesting that an objective study of religion become a regular part of the school curriculum because of the "exalted" position which religion holds in the American scheme of things.

While this may be considered admirable, the Court's magnanimity pales somewhat in light of the facts, a significant one of which is that objectivity will be lost almost completely on the age group for whom the reading of the Bible and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer is most needed.

We contend that while on the one hand the daily devotionals to which the Supreme Court objects represent little threat to the well-being of the children involved, the action of the Court represents—in our judgment—a very definite and specific threat to the children's concept of America and its religious heritage.

Each may now well ask of what value is religion as a way of life if the highest Court in the land rules that they may not hear it discussed, other than as a course of study. They may now well say that it cannot be worth very much.

We hold with the Savannah Morning News that since this particular Court has established itself as an authority on sociological considerations which outweigh legal precedent, it should be the first to ponder the impact on society of a series of rulings which strike at our moral heritage.

Much is being made by supporters of the Court's decision that it has turned back religion to where it belongs—to the homes and churches of the Nation. While we hold that they have a point—that the basic moral stamina of America must have its origin in the home and church—we suggest this does not mean that religion is not to be a part of our everyday lives, to be practiced, observed, and encouraged publicly as well as privately.

For a Nation that was founded under God and for the express purpose of worshiping Him, surely prayer is as much a part of our public life as of our private life.

If that be true then—and we think it is—the Supreme Court again has turned its back on the majority of the people of the United States and, in our opinion, on the intent of the Founding Fathers.

For that reason, we applaud Representative G. Elliot Hagan of Georgia's First District in his plan to introduce a constitutional amendment relative to the situation. In fact, we encourage him to give consideration to the suggestion of Richard Cardinal Cushing, who has urged an amendment to permit the reading of the Bible to be required in public schools.

Imagined Dangers and Real Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of June 19, 1963, concerning the recent Supreme Court decision on prayer in public schools. I hope my colleagues in the Congress will take a few minutes to read it.

IMAGINED DANGERS AND REAL ISSUES

Of all the dangers to a free society of which our forefathers were fearful, and against which they sought to safeguard the people in the Constitution, the one that time has proved of no danger is that the state would prescribe a religious belief.

In our history we have had many constitutional crises, some of which nearly tore the country apart. We are torn today by a constitutional issue, that of the treatment of our Negro citizens, which will require the utmost efforts of great minds to resolve without lasting political wounds.

But nowhere in our history will you find any serious threat by any church or sect to seize the state or to persuade the state to use its powers to establish it as the state religion.

This elementary fact of our history, quite apart from all of the philosophical arguments, seems to us to make absolute nonsense of the Supreme Court's decision about Bible readings in the public schools. A more ponderous effort upon a more trivial issue has rarely, if ever, emerged from the robed men who sit upon that bench.

This is not to say that the result of the decision is trivial, or that its consequences do not now raise grave questions. For what the Supreme Court has done, in the name of protecting us from the establishment of religion by the state, is to establish secularization—atheism, if you would have it bluntly—as the one belief to which the state's power will extend its protection.

Thus if you believe in the God of the Jews, the God of the Christians, or the God of Islam, you are denied absolutely any public expression of it in the schools which the public support. Hereafter the views of the nonbeliever alone are sheltered by the full panoply of the State's police powers.

The legal and philosophical answer to this interpretation of the Constitution, it seems to us, has been well put by Mr. Justice Stewart. "We err * * *if we do not recognize, as a matter of history and as a matter of the imperatives of our free society, that religion and government must necessarily interact in countless ways." He cites example after example of the interaction—from the use of prayer in the opening of courts and Congress to the state support of chaplains to minister to those in the Armed Forces who, of their own choice, seek such ministry.

And he puts his finger surely upon the specious argument of Government neutrality about religion. The duty of the state is to accommodate those difference of belief which a free society makes inevitable, not to try to set up impermissible categories and so throw its weight against those who may desire public expression of their beliefs.

"A compulsory state educational system so structures a child's life," he observes, "that if religious exercises are held to be impermissible in schools, religion is placed at an artificial and state-created disadvantage." In short, not neutrality but state action against religion.

Yet much as we share Justice Stewart's views, it is not alone the philosophy of the Court majority that troubles us. Surely it is a distortion of the Constitution to suggest that when the Founding Fathers put into it the prohibition against the establishment of religion they were aiming even distantly at a prohibition against the reading of Scripture or of prayers in public bodies, including the schools. To them "establishment" meant literally setting up a state religion.

It is certainly a distortion of the views of such men as Madison and Jefferson and Roger Williams to suggest that their devotion to religious liberty is somehow the seed of the view to which this Court has now come, depriving people of the liberty to express their religious views openly in the school.

And what are we to make of it when this Court, in order to buttress this opinion, reminds us of the danger "that powerful sects * * * might bring about a fusion of governmental and religious functions"? Are we to suppose that this danger, rightly guarded against by the Constitution, is somehow now threatened because schoolchildren hear the Bible read?

Apparently so. For in warning us against this "minor encroachment" against the Constitution, the Court thunders that "the breach of neutrality that is today a trickling stream may all too soon become a raging torrent." Here, without doubt, is upside down logic. For if there has been any consistent trend in our religious history, it is that what might once have been described as a raging torrent of religious intolerance has become by comparison a trickling stream.

It is this disparity between argument and reality, between cause and remedy, that troubles us in the Court's decision. Perhaps it is undesirable public policy—although we do not think so—to provide a moment of prayer, or a brief reading of the Scriptures, in a school whose purpose is to teach the ideas upon which Western society is based.

But it is wholly ridiculous to argue that this practice, followed by generation after generation without injury to our institutions, is now suddenly become a thing to undermine the Republic and demand the most absolute prohibitions against it in the name of the Constitution.

And it does not augur well for the future to see our highest judges torture history and turn metaphysical handsprings to justify that which they wish to decide. In the real constitutional issues which face the Nation today we should not have to fear that small minds will be brought to great questions.

New Sources of Nutritious Foodstuffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, one of the greatest problems which the world faces today is that of hunger. Although this has long been a grave challenge to mankind, with the great increase in population the world will have to produce more than eight times the present world food supply in 80 years.

However, science is making great strides toward locating and producing new sources of nutritious foodstuffs. We in Massachusetts are particularly interested in the progress being made in the development of a protein-rich powder produced from whole fish—popularly known as fish flour. These relatively untouched fishery resources, if wisely managed, could go a long way toward alleviating the age-old problem of hunger.

I think my colleagues will be most interested in the developments in this field, and therefore ask unanimous consent that Secretary Udall's remarks before the World Food Congress on this subject be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL BEFORE THE WORLD FOOD CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 6, 1963

It is a particular pleasure to meet such a broad spectrum of natural resource interest as is represented in this Congress. As Secretary of what in effect is America's department of natural resources, I have had the opportunity for 2 years of meeting with various groups, organizations that reflect the diversity of Interior's activities.

In many of these cross-country meetings, I note a subtle, if occasionally minute, change. For on the leadership level of such industries as oil, coal, timber, and fisheries I find more and more men whose conversations denote a movement away from parochial self-interest into the more urgent question of how, today, can this Nation, this world, manage, utilize, and at the same time enhance and protect our natural resources. For everywhere today men are slowly realizing that science and economic drives are a team that improperly guided can run roughshod over the very elements that make the world livable.

For this reason, fishermen become treatymakers; an oil company adjusts its operations to save a herd of Alaska moose or a flock of birds, more and more timbermen curry, rather than denude the mountainside.

It is the growing numbers of the conservation-minded men of industry that are helping to turn the spotlight of approbation on those who flout nature's laws and pollute the streams, peel off the mountainside for minerals, misuse pesticides, overgraze the rangelands, or otherwise provide another wrenching alteration of our environment.

When Gifford Pinchot, at the turn of the century coined the word "conservation" he was relating it primarily to preservation of the forests. A few voices had cried out in the past against the destruction of this bounty, but they were dismissed as the keening of poets.

Even the voice of the scientist went unheeded. You will find among the files of the Smithsonian Institution today a quiet letter from a botanist and member of the National Academy of Sciences, written in 1876. The letter, accompanied by a series of photos depicting an Illinois forest, reads in part: "They were made with the object of preserving some record, sufficiently reliable, of the grandeur of the primitive forest of the Mississippi Valley."

The letter concluded sadly: "They have been taken none too soon, for few of the magnificent trees represented in these views will be standing a few years hence."

Today almost a century later, the greatest conservation challenge of our generation is not mere preservation. It is the creation of new techniques to meet the population explosion and provide liveable cities; adequate open spaces and unspoiled streams, clean air and productive soil, ample power and ample supplies of food.

Recently the National Academy of Sciences in its report on Natural Resources observed: "Science and technology enter into a new role. Rather than merely being an aid to resource conservation, they are now seen as charting the route to a principal avenue of solution."

To meet one of the world's grave resource challenges, the feeding of a growing army of the hungry, we are charting a new route. Aided by men of science, we have set forth to plumb that 70 percent of the earth that remains unexplored—the ocean depths. Thus, we may better discover and utilize the sea's bounties for the world's hungry.

As President Kennedy observed recently: "To meet the vast needs of an expanded population, the bounty of the sea must be made more available. Within 2 decades, our own Nation will require over a million more tons of seafood than we now harvest."

The world picture is increasingly grim and Lord Boyd Orr, former director of the U.S. Food and Agricultural Organization, and Nobel Peace Prize winner, states that within 80 years the world must produce more than 8 times the present world food supply.

Today, we in the Department of the Interior are meeting this challenge in a multifront drive to raise this Nation's harvest from the sea, and at the same time, pass along to the free world, our scientific findings in this field.

The fisheries research programs now underway number into the hundreds. However, one above all others shines as a beacon of hope for the 80 percent of the world's population today receiving insufficient daily protein diet, which is a rather dainty way of describing spirit-sapping hunger that for millions annually is an epitaph.

This project, which our scientists in the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries have with limited resources, virtually led the world in research, envisions the creation and distribution of a fish protein concentrate.

This product is made from a whole fish reduced to a protein-rich powder easily added to cereals or other basic foodstuffs. By utilizing the unharvested fish of U.S. waters alone, it can provide supplemental animal protein for 1 billion people for 300 days at the cost of less than one-half cent per person per day.

The value of fish as a protein supplement has been recognized since the beginning of time. The problem has been one of distribution.

Harvesting fish is of only limited value if weight, susceptibility to spoilage, or transportation costs preclude shipping from coastal areas into the interior, where there often is a dense concentration of population. This is a baffling problem. It must be solved before fishery products make their full contribution toward solution of the overall world food problem.

Fish protein concentrate, however, would overcome the disadvantages of weight, spoilage, and high costs of distribution that are common to many other products. FPC is nutritious, adaptable to many diets, and easily packaged in various sizes. It is an outstanding example of wise resource use.

We believe that this food supplement, the intrinsic nutritional value of which is already well established, can eventually be obtained by any one of a number of different processing methods and in a variety of forms ranging from a white, bland-tasting powder to a dark, flavorful paste. Further, it can be manufactured from fish species not now used as food. We are convinced that we are at the threshold of a new and important marine food industry which, if it can be helped safely over the first difficult stages of development, will assume a position of major importance both here in the United States and abroad.

Today, in many parts of the world, and even off our own coasts, vast and sometimes unassessed fishery resources, capable of being converted into fish protein concentrate, are still available. If we are to alleviate the world's hunger and malnutrition these resources must be used to supplement the crops from the land. It seems obvious that these relatively untouched resources of the sea constitute the last unexploited, readily available source of animal protein. Wisely managed, this large renewable resource will contribute importantly toward solution of the very problems under consideration at this Congress.

It is especially significant that fish and shellfish provide the high quality protein so essential as a supplement in the food of millions throughout the world who now depend, of necessity, largely on diets of land crops such as cereals and vegetables.

Much of the world's hunger, ranging from acute, extreme starvation to chronic, marginal dietary deficiencies, is a problem not only of how much food but of what kind. The most serious among the causes of hunger is protein malnutrition, frequently induced by a deficiency of the right kind of proteins, those, in fact, that cannot be synthesized by the human organism, and hence should be eaten every day. These essential proteins can be most readily found, in the correct proportions, only in the tissues of animals.

We in the Department of the Interior are not alone in our research and development work on fish protein concentrate. Other nations, also with both economic and humanitarian motivations, are similarly active. But the Department's program, recently initiated by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and now moving into high gear, is accorded a high priority. President Kennedy, in a recent public statement, described the program as vital to this Nation's efforts toward the betterment of mankind. A recent National Academy of Sciences report agrees.

We are confident that it will be possible to produce a fish protein concentrate containing 90 percent of high quality proteins at a cost of 10 to 15 cents per pound to the consumer. It has been estimated that the minimum daily requirement of protein, 70 grams, could be supplied through fish protein concentrate at a cost per person of about 2 cents a day.

Because a project of this potential and universal significance must be a cooperative effort we have resolved to work in the closest cooperation with the United Nations, and especially the specialized agencies to whom much credit must go for initiating and stimulating new efforts in fish protein concentrate.

While the idea of manufacturing fish protein concentrate is not new the time has now come to translate that idea into large-scale production of a product that holds such great promise for the benefit of mankind. This much we owe to ourselves and to our friends throughout the world who look to us for help in solving their hunger problems. The day may never come when hunger will no longer stalk the earth. Nevertheless we must not cease to dedicate our collective minds and energies toward the attainment of that goal.

Arm Twisting on the Wheat Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot today about freedom—and rights. All who believe in freedom have their own varying ways of expressing their belief. The farmers of this Nation have obviously expressed a belief in free economy for the farmer. They showed this by their vote in the wheat referendum.

It seems a travesty for the farmer, who believes in freedom of choice, to have to pay taxes to support Government bureaus who try to take away their freedom.

The column by Richard Wilson appearing in the Washington Evening Star of June 19, 1963, expresses something that I feel is worthy of being read by the Congress and the public.

I would like to include this article with my remarks here today in the Appendix of the Record:

Arm Twisting on the Wheat Vote

(By Richard Wilson)

Arm twisting, one of the favorite techniques on the New Frontier, has been disclosed on a new and rather more impressive level.

The arm-twisting method was noted previously in the steel price controversy, the Cuban prisoners deal, and the more benign drive for funds for a $30 million National Cultural Center. This technique has attained respectability in the Kennedy administration and officials can see nothing wrong in it, for they conceive their cause to be just.

The method consists of psychologically suggestive pressure on individuals or corporations to support or go along with Government actions. When skillfully applied, the individual cannot honestly charge that he was threatened with reprisal or tempted by reward; he only knows he has been shaken up. He may have an antitrust suit pending and have his mind on this when exposed to Government persuasion; but the persuaders, of course, say they do not have this in mind at all, only the public welfare.

In the new instance the pressure was perhaps more overt. In fact, it was crude. The farm bureaucracy openly and threateningly brought pressure on federally licensed radio and TV stations to give free time for the Government's version of the issues in the national wheat referendum.

No subtlety was involved. A national directive went out to State managers and local committeemen of the farm program to bring to the attention of radio and TV stations that they are federally licensed for 3 years only and the renewal of their license could depend upon the adequacy of their public service programs. This responsibility was particularly compelling, it was stated, with respect to public service agricultural programs.

The innuendo of the directive was amazing. Public service programing, it was stated, is promised by radio-TV stations "in return for two special favors granted by the Government," exclusive use of a broadcast frequency, and "the policy of the Government not to establish federally operated stations in competition with stations being operated commercially." Of course, the directive added, this does not make stations "subject to dictation."

The directive was sent out by Ray Fitzgerald, Deputy Administrator for State and County Operations of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, presumably with the approval of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman.

With vague images evoked of licenses revoked or Government operated competitors, a good many radio and TV stations complied. A spot check shows that prime time was wrangled in Indiana, Kentucky, and Minnesota, and probably elsewhere on a broader scale. Some of the stations gave their time willingly enough; they wanted just such programs. Others felt they were highly pressured.

It might be supposed that this was only in the interest of serving the wheat farmers with a factual, unbiased view of the issues before them.

But Mr. Fitzgerald's directive belies this trusting view in one sentence: "As you know, interests representing one point of view in the referendum are blanketing radio and television stations with material in heavy quantities. It is not expected that we can match the flood of material from this group, which is also in a position to buy time. But it is essential that we act aggressively to make use of public service time of radio and television stations at times of day when farm people are listening."

Farm people listened and voted. The Government could not get even a majority for the adoption of its compulsory control program for wheat. A two-thirds majority was necessary for its adoption. Rather than submit either to authoritarian control of their farms or the methods of the not-so-hidden persuaders, wheat farmers were ready to take the risk of lower income.

Now the same bureaucracy which had so little knowledge of the people it was serving has adopted a dog-in-the-manger attitude toward new legislation. Wheat farmers would readily consider a new program patterned after the voluntary programs for feed grains coupled with acreage retirement.

But the bureaucracy still has its mind on arm-twisting. Let the farmers suffer a little and they'll come back with their tails between their legs. This was a bad technique in the beginning. It is bad now. Mr. Kennedy would do well to bring it to an end and make a constructive beginning on a new wheat program that farmers want.

Land of the Mighty Ramp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to bring to your attention an article in the Washington Star of June 9, 1963, on the subject of ramps, a subject which, in the olfactory sense, may have far-reaching consequences.

My State of West Virginia is sometimes called the Land of the Ramp, a title one can only appreciate properly if he is able to take part in the annual pursuit of the ramp, as thousands do each spring. For the benefit of those unfortunate persons who are unable to do so, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAND OF THE MIGHTY RAMP

They say, back in the hills of West Virginia, that at the height of the ramp harvesting season children have to be sent home from school and patrons put out of movie houses because they stink so of ramps.

They say they have know husbands who have eaten an excess of ramps to be packed off into separate rooms by their nonramp-eating wives and that if you eat ramps today, not only will your breath still reek of ramps a week later, but the aroma will be coming out your pores.

So what is this potent food that drives the noneaters in panic from the eaters?

A ramp is an innocent looking member of the lily family that grows wild in the hardwood forests usually at the elevation above 3,000 feet. Often their broad delicate green leaves are seen in the early spring poking up through the snow. Long before most greenery has sprouted in the high country, patches of ramps attractively speckle the forest floor.

They are pretty; but just eat a handful, and pow—there goes the top of your head.

Unless, of course, you are an inveterate ramp eater, as so many are in the mountains of West Virginia, where eating ramps has been a tradition for generations.

As one native near Spruce Knob, which is loaded with ramps, observe in that wonderful hill dialect: "Most people feel they ain't shed winter 'til they've ate a messaramps in spring."

A "messaramps"—they always speak of mess of ramps as one word—is like a spring tonic to the mountain people. The theory is that back in the days before refrigerated foods came to the hills, ramps were the first fresh green edibles the local people could lay their hands on in breaking out of their harsh winter's confinement.

They trekked in large numbers, whole families together, up the mountain sides to dig them some ramps. They still do. And they still call each harvesting a "ramp festival." But nowadays the natives are not alone. Ramp eaters come from as far away as California to go on ramp grubbing festivals in West Virginia. An Arlington physician, Dr. George Green, makes regular pilgrimages, surfeiting himself on a mess and distributing the rest to friends around town—and probably winning no additional friends until the aroma has left his system.

The potency of ramps stems from the fact that they have all the strongest characteristics of onion and garlic, which also are members of the lily family, but less demure about their appearance than ramps. So potent are ramps that, according to Clint Davis, a ramp-eating Washington desk slave who works for the U.S. Forest Service, "the only defense against ramps is to eat a few yourself."

Being deep rooted and tender stemmed, ramps must be dug out of the ground. The customary tool is what the locals call the "grubbin' hoe." They must be harvested in early spring before the stems get tough and the flavor strong enough to separate the nerve ganglia from one's eyeballs.

Ramps may be eaten either raw or cooked. Customary mountain cookery, such as that featured at local church ramp suppers, is to boil the ramps, leaves and all, with a ham hock, just like green beans. The locals usually don't bother to parboil the greens. One of them, Harry Gordon, who stays in a place called Shot Cherry Cabin, says "you're a sissy if you parboil."

Another popular recipe is offered by Mrs. Louis Hedrick, who lives on Spruce Knob Mountain. "I don't mind if you call me a hillbilly," she cackled good naturedly by way of introduction, "but I mix a messaramps with fried spareribs. My husband likes a messaramps scrambled with eggs."

Then, some say, ramps are good mixed in a tossed salad.

But don't let your enthusiasm get too far out of hand. There are some, even in the hill country, who apparently would rather die than eat ramps. Out on a recent ramp festival we, who couldn't tell an eatin' ramp from a boat-loadin' platform, ran across a West Virginian eating roast beef and mashed potatoes in a roadside restaurant.

And how did he feel about ramps? His answer: They stink like a skunk, and he never eats them himself. They give him a headache.

Proposed Acquisition of the Ansley Wilcox House, Buffalo, N.Y., as a National Historical Shrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of all my colleagues recent important developments in the proposed acquisition of the Ansley Wilcox house in Buffalo, N.Y., by the Federal Government as a national historical shrine.

A three-man subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee including Representatives CAREY and O'BRIEN, of New York, and SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, met in Buffalo this past Monday to hold hearings on my bill—H.R. 3500—to preserve for the future one of America's most prominent and historic homes.

This subcommittee heard witnesses from all walks of life unanimously ask Congress to preserve the Wilcox Mansion and to save it from the wrecking crews. Built in 1838, the house has been visited by Presidents Taylor, Van Buren, Lincoln, McKinley, Taft, Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt. In addition to these seven Presidential visitors, President Millard Fillmore of Buffalo was a regular guest in the Wilcox home, and Theodore Roosevelt took his oath of office as President there in 1901. Truly, this is a national shrine which merits the recognition and protection of the Federal Government now.

Mr. Speaker, there is more to this house than four walls; there is a spirit of inspiration within its walls for future generations of Americans, young and old. As leading educators have said, there is more to history than textbook learning. Here, we have a chance to bring our great heritage to life.

Hundreds of letters have come to me urging preservation of this home, one of only two private homes in the country where the Presidential oath has been administered. Since the Interior Department reviewed my acquisition proposal, extra information and encouragement has come to me, from the people of western New York and elsewhere, pointing out the lack of historical sites in our part of the country, and showing the easy accessibility of the Wilcox Mansion in the heart of a great city for tourists in the area on their way to Niagara Falls.

I submit to the attention of the House the following newspaper accounts of the broad public and official interest shown at the subcommittee hearing to preserve the Wilcox home:

[From the Buffalo Evening News, June 17, 1963]

CONGRESSMEN PLEDGE AID IN PRESERVING WILCOX HOUSE: "WE CAN HEAR THE CLANK OF BULLDOZERS," SAYS HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMAN O'BRIEN

Three Congressmen sat in a Federal courtroom today and for 2½ hours listened to 16 witnesses in unanimous agreement occasionally asked questions and joked.

Subject of the hearing was the Ansley Wilcox House, 641 Delaware Ave., which all 16 want designated as a national historic site.

At the close, Representative Leo W. O'Brien, Democrat of Albany, chairman of the three-man subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee said:

"I'll do everything in my power to preserve the Wilcox House as a historic shrine * * *. This deserves congressional consideration * * *."

SINGULAR OPPORTUNITY

"There is a sense of urgency here. We can hear the clank of those bulldozers * * *," he said.

"Don't worry about this committee. But bombard the Department of the Interior and the Secretary of the Interior. Get them on our side."

Representative John P. Saylor, Republican of Pennsylvania, said:

"I will do everything in my power to see that the Ansley Wilcox House is preserved."

Representative Hugh L. Carey, Democrat, of Brooklyn, who arrived midway in the meeting, said:

"This is a singular opportunity for Congress to act on behalf of the whole Nation."

NO DISSENTERS

Representative Dulski, of Buffalo, present for the entire meeting in the U.S. Courthouse on Niagara Square, is sponsor of legislation to designate the Wilson mansion a national historic site.

The Wilcox House is one of only four sites outside Washington where the Presidential oath has been administered. Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office there in 1901 after President McKinley's assassination.

The 16 witnesses variously read or made statements from 5 to 15 minutes long, reviewing the home's history and emphasizing its historical importance.

No dissenters spoke.

In answer to a question, Walter McCausland, vice president of the Buffalo and Erie County Historical Society, estimated the assessed value of the house and its lands as $227,000.

Mark F. Soukup, a Junior Chamber of Commerce vice president, livened the proceedings with a suggestion that the Mark Twain home be incorporated as a "dual historical site."

This suggestion was received cooly by the Congressmen, who thought it would "entangle something of a poetic nature with something of an historic nature."

Dr. Julian Park, past president of the Historical Society, added his support.

ATTENDED BY 42

Also speaking in behalf of the legislation were representatives of the Common Council, County Department of Planning, Erie County Historical Federation.

American Institute of Architects, Chamber of Commerce, Buffalo Federation of Women's Clubs, Rotary Club, County American Legion.

Buffalo Public School System, State University at Buffalo, Sons of the American Revolution and the Society of Colonial Wars, the North Street Community Association, and several private parties.

A statement was submitted in behalf of the diocesan schools.

Forty-two persons attended the hearing.

ANSLEY WILCOX DAY IS PROCLAIMED

Acting Mayor Chester C. Gorski has proclaimed today Ansley Wilcox Day and urged citizens to participate in the House of Representatives subcommittee hearing "to reflect the views of our citizenry" on preservation of the Wilcox home as a national historic site.

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express, June 18, 1963]

O'BRIEN SUPPORTS PLEA FOR SHRINE

(By Margaret Fess)

After pledging support Monday to the acquisition of the Ansley Wilcox mansion as a national shrine to Theodore Roosevelt, Representative Leo W. O'Brien urged local residents to "bombard the Secretary of the Interior with everything you have."

Representative O'Brien, of Albany, served as chairman of a three-man subcommittee hearing on the shrine in the U.S. courthouse. Support also was pledged by the other two members, Representative Hugh Cary, Brooklyn, and Representative John P. Saylor, of Pennsylvania.

A bill to acquire the property was introduced into the House of Representatives on February 7 by Representative Thaddeus J. Dulski, of Buffalo, who also took part at the hearing.

O'Brien urged appeals to the Secretary of the Interior after he pointed out that opposition to the undertaking had arisen in the Department of the Interior.

The mansion at 641 Delaware Avenue, is owned by Oliver M. Lawrence, 224 Wellington Road, and currently is leased to the Benderson Development Co., Inc., 135 Delaware Avenue.

Theodore Roosevelt was sworn in there as President of the United States in September 1901.

"We will leave here with a sense of urgency, mindful that there must be action to prevent the bulldozers from wiping out an historic structure," said O'Brien.

"It is my feeling that too many historic shrines are crowded into just a few areas, and there are not enough in others. We owe it to this community, the Nation, and future generation to preserve this shrine for future generations."

VISITED BY MANY PRESIDENTS

Roy W. Nagle, an authority on local history, said that the Wilcox mansion was the only structure left in the city with enough historic background to warrant its preservation.

Nagle pointed out that the house had probably been visited by more President's than any other residence outside of Washington, D.C.

Among the President who had been in the mansion, he said, were Zachary Taylor, who visited there in 1838; Martin Van Buren, 1839; Abraham Lincoln, 1861; William McKinley, 1879; Theodore Roosevelt, 1901; William Taft, 1908; Woodrow Wilson, 1912, and Franklin Roosevelt, 1931.

Millard Fillmore, 13th President of the United States, who lived in Buffalo, was a regular guest in the home.

The house was built in 1838. In more recent years it had served as the Kathryn Lawrence Restaurant. The property is assessed at $227,000.

Appearing as witnesses urging the preservation of the structure were: Walter McCausland, vice president of the board of the Erie County Historical Society; Roland Benzow, Buffalo Common Council; Ralph Barnes, commissioner of the Erie County Planning Department; Mrs. Victor Reinstein, president of the Erie County Historical Federation; Olaf W. Shelgren, American Institute of Architects; Mrs. J. Paul Lapey, president, Buffalo Federation of Women's Clubs.

Dr. Burton A. Hoffman, chairman, Civic Affairs Committee of the Buffalo Rotary Club; Harvey Skuse, Erie County American Legion commander; Dr. Joseph Manch, Buffalo superintendent of schools; Dr. Miles Slatin, assistant dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, University of Buffalo; Robert W. Newcomb, president of the Sons of the American Revolution; Mrs. Richard M. Glazier; Allan G. McTaggart, and Mark F. Soukup, of the junior chamber of commerce.

[From the Buffalo Evening News, June 18, 1963]

MAKE IT A SHRINE

The campaign to preserve the Ansley Wilcox House as a national historic shrine received good impetus at a public hearing conducted here Monday by a House subcommittee.

Not only did numerous civic groups and individuals give evidence of strong citizen interest in this important cause but the three members comprising the subcommittee all agreed it merits favorable consideration in Congress.

This, however, doesn't mean the effort to save the Delaware Avenue building where Teddy Roosevelt took the Presidential oath in 1901 necessarily has been won. The subcommittee chairman, Representative O'Brien, Democrat, of Albany, offered both encouragement and explicit practical advice when he said at the close of the hearing: "Don't worry about this committee. But bombard the Department of the Interior and the Secretary of the Interior. Get them on our side."

Bombarding the Interior Department alone, however, could be a waste of time, since Secretary Udall has been adamant against using the home as a national shrine. The main hope that this can be accomplished lies with Congress. Congress must want this, and the Interior Department must be made aware of that fact, if the Wilcox home is to be taken over as a national historic shrine.

Pavilion of Spain—The New York World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record remarks by Robert Moses, president of the New York

World's Fair, at the cornerstone laying for the pavilion of Spain, June 18, 1963.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR, 1964–65 AT THE CORNERSTONE LAYING FOR THE PAVILION OF SPAIN, JUNE 18, 1963

Ambassador Garrigues, Commissioner General de Saez and friends: The Government of Spain has placed in the hands of exceptionally able, attractive, and enthusiastic representatives the planning, building, and equipping of a pavilion and exhibits of surpassing ingenuity with superb evidences of Spanish genius, culture, and enterprise.

You speak for a civilization which has placed its seal indelibly upon half the people of this continent. Here at Flushing Meadow you embrace an opportunity to impress the image of the new Spain upon the whole world.

I for one was sorry that the U.S.S.R. finally decided not to exhibit where the recent achievements of this colossus might have been seen in honest, open competition with the latest products of the free world. It is therefore not without significance that you of Spain occupy the space originally set aside for the U.S.S.R. Here you will make a profound impression of what is at once an old and a new Iberian civilization.

We extend to you the sincere hand of friendship and our pledge of fullest cooperation.

Military Pay Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, my good friend, Elmer M. Jackson, Jr., vice president, editor, and general manager of Capital-Gazette Press, Inc., has provided me with a letter which he received from a naval officer regarding the pending military pay legislation.

I was very much impressed with the views set forth by this naval officer. In order that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read the frank and sincere comments of a member of the armed services, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am writing to you as an influential newsman, concerning the new military pay legislation recently passed by the House and soon to come before the Senate.

Let me preface my remarks by saying that I am very concerned about the fantastic level of our country's national debt. Indeed, if there were some way, I would gladly include my monthly bills a payment toward the principal of this debt. I am concerned about our world stature and our apparent inability to compete in the marketplace of the world as we once did, and as we should. Much of this is a result of our many moral and political commitments throughout the world. I cannot see any way of reducing these commitments without the gravest of dangers to us all. The future of our children is entwined with the acts of our Government.

I do not believe in Government subsidies, or Government being in business. Private enterprise is capable of doing so much so well, more quickly and cheaper. However, my chosen career is one that must be classified as Government service as only a government could or should support a Navy. We are (the Navy, that is) a major policy arm of U.S. action. Time and again our Armed Forces, and the Navy in particular, have been the prime instrument for keeping the peace without even firing a shot. I know that you are well aware of this by virtue of both your personal and professional contacts.

The present pay bill is not only inadequate, but it is to be delayed until October 1 or the first of the month following passage.

We have not had a pay raise since 1958. That in itself really isn't so bad as I can't go along categorically with everyone getting pay raises because time has passed. Pay raises, provided in most pay plans, call for added pay as compensation for better results displayed on the job. These should be earned, and in most cases they are.

However, our civil servants and virtually all employees of industry have had their pay raised substantially rather recently. In fact, while military pay raises have been delayed and debated, another raise for civil service workers appears in the offing.

Last year an official Department of Defense news release showed that a raise in military pay and allowances was not needed because virtually all of the men were living within their means. Actually, most of the men weren't spending more than they were paid because of their resolve to live in a substandard manner. In fact, the relief agencies around the country have, for years, been shocked by the needy status of some servicemen and their families. Good responsible petty officers earn so little that in some States they qualify for local relief payments.

As an officer, I am honor and duty bound to try to convince enlistedmen to stay in the service. Supposedly fringe benefits are expected to fill the pay gap but what is left of benefits are slowly being taken away.

Commissary prices, where service folk are obliged to shop, are often higher than the larger chain stores. And, medical services are the greatest example to be found against socialized medicine. When medical aid is available, each doctor has to take care of so many people that he feels that the best he can do is "plug the dike." He can do nothing to strengthen it. The Department of Defense assigns one doctor per 1,000 men with no thought given to the number of dependents or retired persons in the area.

To add to the service man's concern over the future, there is talk of virtually eliminating retirement as we know it today. Word is that service of 30 years, instead of 20, will be demanded in the future. If such a tightening up happens we will lose many men, both officers and enlisted.

The level of housing standards forced upon a majority of us away from Naval stations is so low that the situation is appalling. Rents are so high that our $80 to $100 housing allowance won't procure fit living accommodations. As of January 1, 1963, Congress granted a moderate increase in basic allowance for quarters. Our equally generous landlords throughout the country quickly established equal raises in rentals. In many cases, personally known to me, rents went up the exact amount of the basic allowance for quarters raise.

At the same time Congress and the Department of Defense made certain rule changes to "level out inequities" which reduced this raise of say $13 a month for some men, down to a net increase of $1 a month for others. Many men actually ended up with an overall reduction in pay.

The proposed new pay bill will also have some similar catches in it.

I do wish that you would apply your personal influence and that of your papers to this problem described above, of our Government's penny-wise and dollar-foolish policy.

I know many, many men with long service, who are so fed up with what they call shabby treatment, they are getting out of uniform and throwing away 15 years service instead of waiting for retirement. Money spent on a reasonable pay raise would be small compared to what it will cost to send greenhorns to school to replace the men who are dropping out. Nuclear power training is listed as costing $10,000 to $35,000 per man. How can we afford to replace men with years of valuable experience!

A pay raise is badly needed now. Debates won't fill this need.

The Department of Defense recommended an increase of from $47.88 per month to approximately $70 per month for officers' basic allowance for subsistence. The House dropped this increase to $51 a month. An enlisted man unable to subsist in a Government mess receives compensation up to $77.10 a month. How then can an officer be expected to pay for his own meals for some $30 less per month? It is to be hoped that the raise change proposed by the House will be restored by the Senate.

In summary, the proposed pay raise is inadequate as many men stand to lose money due to rule changes. Officer basic allowance for subsistance allowances ought to be raised to a level which is at least equal to that allowed enlisted men.

A pay raise should be instituted immediately. True, the cost would be huge but its effect upon morale would be electrifying, and many officers and men who are well trained to protect the best interests of all the people of our great Nation, and who wish to do so, would be persuaded to remain in the service. When they step down the loss to our country can't be measured in dollars.

The Greater Philadelphia Committee for Medical-Pharmaceutical Sciences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. WEAVER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Leroy E. Burney, vice president for health sciences, Temple University, and former Surgeon General of the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, recently appeared before the Senate Government Operations Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations. Dr. Burney spoke as the representative of the Greater Philadelphia Committee for Medical-Pharmaceutical Sciences.

The responsibilities for the health of the American people are broad in scope, and Dr. Burney has concisely stated the aims and purposes of the Greater Philadelphia committee whereby the medical profession, medical schools, and pharmaceutical industry and the Federal Government working together may achieve continuing medical and pharmaceutical progress.

As part of my remarks, I include Dr. Burney's statement in full in the belief that the recommendations and ideas of this committee will be of interest and encouragement to all of us concerned with the health needs of the American people, and all people:

THE GREATER PHILADELPHIA COMMITTEE FOR MEDICAL-PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCE

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, it is a pleasure and an honor to appear before you today. It is an especial pleasure to renew my friendship with your distinguished chairman, Senator HUMPHREY, whose interest in and support of health programs, national and international, throughout the years has been of inestimable value in and out of Government.

I come before you as a representative of the Greater Philadelphia Committee for Medical-Pharmaceutical Sciences to tell you about our concept of the Food and Drug Administration, its organization, administration and financing.

Philadelphia is the oldest and one of the largest medical centers in our country. One of every 12 graduates of all medical schools in the United States is trained by our five medical schools.

Also, metropolitan Philadelphia has long been a center for the pharmaceutical industry, and it produces 20 percent of all prescription pharmaceuticals.

There has always been fine cooperation in medical and biologic research between the individual medical schools and the pharmaceutical industry in the Philadelphia area. But the complexities and diversity of research and research training today and tomorrow demand greater interdependence, more effective communication and joint action in some instances. What is required is for us to minimize our differences and maximize our potential for the greatest good to the greatest number, at home and abroad.

At the same time, the Federal Government is assuming an increasing role in the support and regulation of drug research. This is inevitable in a society like ours. This very fact, however, requires a contribution by us in medical education and research and in the pharmaceutical industry to the development of the intelligent and constructive leadership in which your committee and others on a national level are so deeply interested.

Mr. Chairman, you and the other distinguished members of your committee are as concerned as we that Federal leadership, support, and regulatory functions must evolve without impeding progress in drug research and development and without domination of either medical schools or pharmaceutical industry.

Dr. Thomas Durant, chairman of the Department of Medicine, Temple University Medical School, and president of the College of Physicians of Philadelphia, conceived of an organization like ours several months ago and convened a group to discuss what improvements we might make in our own locale and what leadership we might provide nationally. Our College of Physicians lent its good offices to these exploratory talks.

Out of this preliminary meeting was born the Greater Philadelphia Committee for Medical-Pharmaceutical Sciences, composed of representatives of our five medical schools and of five leading pharmaceutical manufacturers, with the common objective of working together for the betterment of medical-pharmaceutical research and for better health. It will function under the aegis of the College of Physicians of Philadelphia.

Participants are the deans of all five Philadelphia medical schools—Hahnemann Medical College, the Jefferson Medical College, the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, Temple University School of Medicine, and Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania. (Woman's Medical College is last only because this list is arranged alphabetically.)

The pharmaceutical companies which have joined us in this cooperative program are McNeil Laboratories, Merck Sharp & Dohme, William H. Rorer Inc., Smith Kline & French Laboratories, and Wyeth Laboratories. Their representatives on the Greater Philadelphia Committee are from both management and the medical departments of these five concerns.

Our charter, or statement of purpose, expresses our fundamental, common thinking in five short paragraphs. I will read only these paragraphs now, if I may, and ask that the entire statement of purpose be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my prepared statement:

"The time has come when those of us who are concerned with clinical and pharmaceutical research in medical schools and industry must be interested not only in industry-academic relationships, but also in the major developments that are occurring on the Federal level in relation to research, development, and testing of drugs.

"Medical schools and the industry hopefully are in a position to contribute a measure of intelligent judgment on how these matters should be managed.

"The medical schools and the pharmaceutical industry in the Philadelphia area are working more closely together, and they feel an obligation to participate and make their views known in the deliberations now going on in Washington. The committee established by the Philadelphia medical schools and pharmaceutical firms is proud of the great joint accomplishments of pharmaceutical science and medical science in the development of new drugs over the years, which has made the level of health care in the United States higher than anywhere else in th world, and is anxious that new laws and new regulations not be permitted to interfere with the continuation of past dramatic progress. In fact, the committee wishes to do everything in its power to facilitate the continuation of drug and medical progress.

"In embarking on any constructive approach to the problems now facing the pharmaceutical and medical sciences in the development and clinical use of new drugs, the common interests of the two sciences, and the public interest, require that the preclinical and clinical evaluation of new drugs be conducted at the highest possible level of professional competence in all participating disciplines.

"Both the medical profession and the pharmaceutical industry have important responsibilities relating to the support and conduct of clinical research with new chemotherapeutic agents, and should cooperate in developing programs and procedures to comply with the far-reaching provisions of the 1962 drug amendments to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act."

The Philadelphia committee has authorized me to speak for it with regard to a number of fundamental matters relating to medical-pharmaceutical research, development and regulation, and the individual responsibilities of Government, the medical profession, and the industry.

Any observations outside the scope of the committee's approved resolutions should be regarded as my own, and not necessarily those of our committee nor of Temple University.

I can briefly summarize our position on the fundamental issues to which we have so far given consideration. The Greater Philadelphia Committee for Medical-Pharmaceutical Sciences believes that:

1. Steps should be taken to adjust the FDA's posture from that of a regulatory and enforcement agency to that of a scientifically oriented organization with regulatory responsibilities.

The need for such a reorientation was cited by the 1962 FDA Citizens Advisory Committee, and we were pleased to note the recent statement of Mr. Boisfeuillet Jones, special assistant to the HEW Secretary for health and medical affairs, that FDA and the HEW Department expect to follow the general pattern of the CAC recommendations for reorganization and upgrading of FDA's scientific activities.

The medical profession and the pharmaceutical industry, for their parts, should support steps being taken by the Government to improve FDA's scientific capabilities and its stature in the scientific community.

2. The Federal regulatory agencies empowered by law to pass upon the safety and effectiveness of new drugs (primarily the FDA) must have the personnel and resources they need to properly carry out their responsibilities.

The salary structure to which it must conform is at least in part responsible for FDA's past and present difficulties in recruiting scientific and administrative personnel of necessary high caliber.

Salaries of FDA's medical doctors, medical scientists and senior administrators should be at least as high as those paid by other research agencies of the Federal Government and by the medical schools.

This won't be easy to bring about, because salaries authorized for any one Government department are always evaluated by Congress in the light of the total Federal salary structure. This is as it should be, except that in the opinion of our committee, the particular staffing problems of particular agencies in scientific and technical fields should receive individual consideration.

As a first step in the right direction, the medical profession and the pharmaceutical industry should support the increases recommended by the President in the 1963–64 budget of the Food and Drug Administration, and such other increases as may be required in the future for effective administration of essential FDA programs. The fiscal year 1964 budget for FDA, as approved by the House, is $38,805,000 and we are glad that it represents a nearly 6-million-dollar increase over fiscal year 1963.

3. The medical profession and the pharmaceutical industry should urge careful consideration, by officials responsible for FDA management, of the recommendations of the 1962 Citizens Advisory Committee report on FDA.

Our committee particularly recommends prompt appointment of a permanent National Advisory Council.

Already responsible for regulatory and enforcement activities in areas so vital to the Nation's health and welfare, and with additional scientific functions proposed for it, the FDA cannot meet its responsibilities and seize its opportunities without such an advisory council.

One of the great strengths of the National Institutes of Health has been its Advisory Councils—to advise, support, and be critically constructive.

I cannot stress too strongly the essential nature of this proposed FDA Advisory Council, not only because of its value to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs and to his staff; but to those of us in health-related activities and, finally, to you and other Members of Congress.

Returning to FDA's highly critical personnel problems, we believe the agency must be staffed with medical doctors and scientists who are at least as well qualified as their colleagues among non-Government clinicians and scientists in medical schools, hospitals and the pharmaceutical industry.

In our opinion, the crux of FDA's current problem—and it is one of fairly long standing—is how to create an environment that will permit Commissioner Larrick and his associates to attract and retain well qualified personnel in both scientific and administrative posts.

People are what make programs work, in the Federal Government no less than in the academic and business worlds. The Food and Drug Administration must be able to recruit and retain the best kinds of people to run its important programs if these programs are to be effectively conducted.

This principle was emphasized, as you know, by the 1962 Citizens Advisory Committee. We have felt that the committee's recommendations merited greater study and consideration than they appear to have received from FDA and the HEW Department for some time after they were presented to the Secretary.

We were glad to learn, from Mr. Jones' recent comments before another congressional committee, that many of the CAC recommendations are now being implemented.

We were particularly gratified at Mr. Jones' assurances of prompt action to establish the permanent National Advisory Council for FDA.

It is our view that the membership of this important new council should include representatives of the medical profession and of the prescription drug industry.

Mr. Chairman, we are proud that the Greater Philadelphia area was the first in the United States to conceive of and actually establish a continuing organization of medical schools and pharmaceutical firms to work toward a meeting of minds on the great problems of medical and pharmaceutical research in the laboratories and in the clinics.

The problems are common ones, and so are our ultimate interests—to do what we can to contribute to continued medical and pharmaceutical progress.

I hasten to add that, of course, all pharmaceutical manufacturers must earn profits for their stockholders if they are to continue to function as segments of the American competitive enterprise system.

But it's equally true that no leading pharmaceutical house would long retain a position of leadership if it was not heavily—and successfully—engaged in research and development of new drugs.

So the industry's profit-oriented motivations and the medical schools' health and welfare motivations merge in our hospitals and clinics around the country, where the validity of research and development is put to the final test—will a new chemotherapeutic agent make a sick man or woman well again, or ease the patient's lot in a significantly measurable way?

We in the medical schools have no financial stake in the development of new drugs, new devices or new techniques of treatment. Our professional stake, as physicians and as teachers of tomorrow's physicians, is in medical and pharmaceutical progress. But it gets pretty personal. Every living one of us stands to win or lose as medical research takes a halting step forward, or fails to progress.

So we hope that our Philadelphia committee can become a model for cooperation between pharmaceutical manufacturers and medical schools throughout the country, and that there may eventually be regional and even national programs.

This completes my presentation on the recommendations of the Greater Philadelphia Committee for Medical-Pharmaceutical Sciences.

But in closing I would like to call your attention to the fact that the medical profession generally, acting through its national organization, is rising to the challenges inherent in medical-pharmaceutical progress and ever-more-comprehensive Government regulation of drug development, evaluation and distribution.

A notable example of forward-looking action on the part of the Nation's physicians is the American Medical Association's new Registry of Adverse Reactions, which already is functioning on a "pilot-plant" basis in Chicago and will ultimately be expanded to include hospitals all over the United States.

It follows the highly successful pattern of the blood dyscrasia registry maintained for some years by the section on adverse reactions of the AMA Council on Drugs.

This AMA pilot operation was blueprinted to encompass all the 65 accredited hospitals in the Chicago area, plus a teaching hospital or other institution of comparable high stature in each of 15 widely separated metropolitan areas. Only a small handful of the 65 hospitals in the Chicago area declined AMA's invitation to cooperate in the pilot study.

Plans for the registry of adverse reactions were charted by physicians and medical scientists in (1) medical practice; (2) the medical schools; (3) the pharmaceutical industry; (4) the Food and Drug Administration; (5) the Public Health Service; and (6) the Health, Education, and Welfare Department.

This is a specific example of how all interested parties—those in Government, industry, medical practice, and medical education—can and do work together to develop programs needed to provide better medical care for our people, better drug research and development, and better regulation by Government.

We in Philadelphia are working together on our own adverse reactions reporting system, in close cooperation with the AMA. At a meeting 2 weeks ago, our committee approved the AMA registry in principle and established a subcommittee to develop the methodology of a Greater Philadelphia program, with our teaching hospitals as its nucleus.

My thanks for your courtesy, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, in permitting me to appear before you today. If you have any questions, I will be glad to try to answer them.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE: GREATER PHILADELPHIA COMMITTEE ON MEDICAL-PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES

The time has come when those of us who are concerned with clinical and pharmaceutical research in medical schools and industry must be interested not only in industry-academic relationships, but also in the major developments that are occurring on the Federal level in relation to research, development and testing of drugs.

Medical schools and the industry hopefully are in a position to contribute a measure of intelligent judgment on how these matters should be managed.

The medical schools and the pharmaceutical industry in the Philadelphia area are working more closely together, and they feel an obligation to participate and make their views known in the deliberations now going on in Washington. The committee established by the Philadelphia medical schools and pharmaceutical firms is proud of the great joint accomplishments of pharmaceutical science and medical science in the development of new drugs over the years, which has made the level of health care in the United States higher than anywhere else in the world, and is anxious that new laws and new regulations not be permitted to interfere with the continuation of past dramatic progress. In fact, the committee wishes to do everything in its power to facilitate the continuation of drug and medical progress.

In embarking on any constructive approach to the problems now facing the pharmaceutical and medical sciences in the development and clinical use of new drugs, the common interests of the two sciences, and the public interest, require that the preclinical and clinical evaluation of new drugs be conducted at the highest possible level of professional competence in all participating disciplines.

Both the medical profession and the pharmaceutical industry have important responsibilities relating to the support and conduct of clinical research with new chemotherapeutic agents, and should cooperate in developing programs and procedures to comply with the far reaching provisions of the 1962 Drug Amendments to the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act.

It is the consensus of this temporary committee convened by the College of Physicians of Philadelphia that:

1. The administrative and research problems created by enactment of the 1962 Drug Amendments must not be permitted to slow the advance of medical science nor otherwise adversely affect the health of our people.

2. The Federal regulatory agencies empowered by law to pass upon the safety and effectiveness of new drugs (primarily, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration) must have the personnel and organization they need properly to carry out their responsibilities.

FDA must be staffed with medical doctors and scientists who are at least as well qualified as their peers among non-Government clinicians and scientists in medical schools, hospitals, and the pharmaceutical industry who develop and study new drugs, first in the laboratory and then in the clinic.

Support should be given by the medical profession and the pharmaceutical industry to recommendations for (a) an increased FDA budget, as proposed by the President and now pending in Congress, and (b) reorganization and strengthening of the FDA to improve its scientific capabilities and its stature in the scientific community. The recommendations of the Citizens Advisory Committee to the Secretary of HEW deserve careful consideration, especially the appointment as soon as possible of a permanent National Advisory Council.

In recognition of the fact that responsibility devolves on local as well as national bodies in the medical profession and the pharmaceutical industry, it is

Resolved, That this temporary committee constitute itself as the Greater Philadelphia Committee for Medical-Pharmaceutical Sciences, and that it have as its purpose a broad concern for medical-pharmaceutical research, in all of its phases, and for all related matters that affect the health of the American people.

Centennial Marks the Beginning of a New Epoch in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, everyone is aware of the fact that this is the year of West Virginia's first centennial celebration. I was delighted to find that the Washington Post, in its issue of June 16, 1963, had an article describing the celebration and its colorful ceremonies.

Furthermore, the Post's article pointed out that not only are we in the Mountain State celebrating 100 years of progress, but we are also marking a period in our history when we are rapidly expanding our industrial facilities. For many decades the name of West Virginia was synonymous with coal, timber, and other raw materials. But now my State also takes pride in our growing number of factories, research centers, and technical institutes which we hope will give us a leading role in the age of technology.

I believe this article in the Post is of general interest, and therefore I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the Record, as follows:

West Virginia Marks 100 Years of Statehood

Today in West Virginia the bells of Liberty are ringing sweetly, from Wheeling to Welch, from Ceredo to Charles Town. The tolling will reach a crescendo on June 20, the date that marks 100 years of statehood for the rugged mountaineers.

The first white man to see West Virginia probably did so from the top of the towering Allegheny Mountains in the early 1600's and was undoubtedly a member of the party that settled Jamestown.

In the three and a half centuries following its discovery, West Virginia's development has been painfully slow, but this very slowness is presently one of its greatest assets.

Of the Eastern States, it is West Virginia that can offer the most in dense forests and wild, rugged, but beautiful terrain. Its economy has been depressed, but its potential—in a 20th century space age—appears to be unlimited.

After the retreat of the French from the Ohio regions in 1768, six Indian nations sold the land that was to become the Virginia Territory to the English. By 1775 more than 30,000 pioneers had settled in its mountains and valleys. More important, a year earlier a ragged band of Colonials fought the Battle of Point Pleasant, a prelude to the Revolutionary War. At Fort Henry, now Wheeling, the last battle of the Revolution was waged on September 10, 1782.

From 1795 until 1861 the history of western Virginia was largely that of controversy with eastern Virginia. The mountains formed a geographic boundary between the two sections that separated society and economics and finally, politics. A constitution for a new State was ratified in 1862. It was first called Kanawha, but the name West Virginia was finally adopted. On June 20, 1863, the 35th State was admitted to the Union.

By 1870, West Virginia had awakened industrially and its natural resources were desired by the Nation. For more than 30 years it led the country in the production of high-grade coal although the specialization has less significance in an automated era.

The social and economic makeup of West Virginia now is undergoing a marked change with a trend toward urbanization, and a shift in employment from coal mining to other industries. In recent years the State has become a world center of radioastronomy with a giant radio complex at Green Bank.

However, this year in West Virginia, the past looks as attractive as the future and visitor and native plan to have a good old time recalling the good old days.

Four Nations in Trouble—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, starting today, I will insert in the Appendix of the Congressional Record a series of articles on four Latin American nations where trouble is brewing. These are written by a young, alert reporter, Joseph Albright, who spent 5 weeks in the areas, during May and June of this year.

I think Mr. Albright's reporting will contribute to better understanding of our problems and what has to be done by the United States to correct a disturbing situation:

The Dominicans Move to the Left

(By Joseph Albright)

Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic.—On an avenue once adorned with bronze and marble testimonials to playboy-dictator Rafael Trujillo, a motorbike putt-putts through the night, carrying two Dominicans and an American.

"President Bosch is insane," cried the Dominican businessman riding in the middle. "He is turning this country into a second Cuba."

"You're the one who's crazy, amigo. Bosch is doing a lot for the people," insisted the driver, one of Bosch's internal security men now off duty.

The young businessman whispered over his shoulder to the American: "He gets mad at me for criticizing his hero, but he cannot do anything about it—there is nobody to turn me in to."

A lot was revealed in 15 seconds. This was the Dominican Republic, where for 31 years no citizen would dare to speak against President Trujillo even within the confines of the citizen's own home. Yet today citizens feel free enough to criticize the president even while a government agent listens.

For those 31 years Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina ran this island nation as his own medieval domain. His subjects learned to exist in a dumb, unquestioning terror, because the word of El Benefactor, however capricious, was an absolute command. Any complaint could bring the omnipresent secret police, the SIM, and their torture prisons.

The order changed, 2 years ago, when a dozen men assassinated Trujillo on a country road. But with the fall of the dictatorship a new spectre loomed. Across the Windward Passage in Cuba, dictator Fulgencio Batista's fall had produced a Fidel Castro, and in the Dominican Republic the Communists took heart and tried to accomplish a repeat performance. In the giddy transformation away from dictatorship, the pendulum did indeed swing far to the left, but miraculously, not as far as communism.

STILL A NEVER-NEVER LAND

Somehow the Council of State, a caretaker government, managed last December 20 to hold a free and honest election, the nation's first since 1924. Fifty-nine percent of the votes went to Juan Bosch, who appealed to the landless, the poor farmer, the unemployed and the Negro. Bosch's first 100 days are now over and he is still in office. But his country remains an amorphous never-never land, shaken by an explosion of political controversy. Now it acts more like a democracy than anything else—as the businessman on the motorbike can attest. But the final shape of the government (Communist? Real democracy? Military dictatorship?) has yet to crystallize.

Much depends on the abilities and secret aspirations of Bosch, a dedicated reformer who is tightly bracketed between critics with short patience on both the extreme left and the center-right. Even Bosch's admirers say he has the moody temperament of an artist (during 28 years of anti-Trujillo exile he wrote essays and novels), and that his skin is too easily pierced by criticism. When an obscure Jesuit called him a Communist last fall, he abruptly withdrew from the presidential campaign. Later he changed his mind and turned the priest's attack to advantage. But fears persist that if the political flak gets too thick in some future crisis, he might resign again in the manner of Brazil's Janio Quadros.

With all his foibles, Bosch appears to be the only non-Communist who is attractive enough and revolutionary enough to hold the loyalty of restive peasants and workers.

Attractive Bosch certainly is; with his rugged, sharply defined features, he looks surprisingly like Barry Goldwater. His thatch of silvery white hair earns him the nickname "Snow White." (The members of the interim government were "the Seven Dwarfs.") To stress a departure from the Trujillo way of life, Bosch moves around in a Pontiac (not a Lincoln Continental) and rents a roomy but unpalatial ranch house with a clothesline outside his living room window.

PROBLEM IS TO DELIVER

"To have a very humble daily life," Bosch said in an interview. "It's very important in teaching the people about democracy."

While campaigning, Bosch and his followers made lavish promises: jobs, hot meals, houses, land, TV sets, sewers, electric refrigerators. Now his big problem is how to deliver the goods or to rationalize it when he can't. If he fails, it is not for lack of trying. "I wake up at 5 in the morning, and I work until 10 or 11 at night," he explained. But his cabinet is mediocre, the civil service is incompetent and patronage-ridden, and Bosch is poor at delegating authority.

He said that one of his main campaign pledges—that 5,000 peasant families would get their own farms this year under a land-reform program—cannot be fulfilled. "The most difficult thing in 1963 will be to normalize the national budget," he said. "The former government budgeted $21 million for agrarian reform this year, but they only had figures on paper—there was not one cent for it in the treasury."

This will be hard to get over to a man who wants land. After all, didn't the interim government confiscate 2 million acres from the Trujillos? But Trujillo obtained much of that land by fraud and forced sales, and now it cannot be parceled out while former owners are pressing claims. And with varying terrains and soils it takes time for the Agrarian Institute to plot out family-sized units that will each theoretically produce a $1,200-a-year income. Still to be resolved is a crucial policy question: If a 10-acre plot produces a minimum living standard, what happens when a farmer dies and his 10 children want to split it up?

While dramatic accomplishments have been slow in coming, Bosch has made much of the need to reorganize. "I have had to be a crusader for austerity," he said. With a flourish he has chopped the salaries of government officials earning more than $500 a month and trimmed his own monthly paycheck from $2,600 to $1,500. Then he cracked down on misuse of government autos (driver bought $3 worth of gasoline, signed a chit for $5, pocketed $1 and kicked back $1 to the gas station), and whacked 5,000 nonexistent names from the public works payroll. His government is still full of entrenched corruption, however. It is common knowledge that many company commanders in the Dominican army keep $300 to $400 a month from money sent them to buy rations for their troops. And that is nothing compared to the size of procurement kickbacks to higher officers, according to military sources. "I doubt if Bosch or anyone else can stop it," said one colonel.

Among educated, prosperous Dominicans, there is a common belief that Bosch is soft on communism. Their chief spokesman is Dr. Virato Fiallo, who in 1961 led the fight to wrest the government from Trujillo's heirs—and then lost to Bosch on election day last December. "I don't believe President Bosch is a Communist—right now," Fiallo said in an interview. "But the biggest problem in the Caribbean today is Fidel Castro, and Bosch hasn't decided which side he is on."

Fiallo said flatly that some of Bosch's cabinet ministers ("possibly three") are secret Communists today. The 67-year-old UCN leader was hazy about naming names, but he said he "believed" Dr. Miguel A. Dominguez Guerra, interior and police minister, is a Communist. Competent independent sources said Dominguez Guerra is indeed open to suspicion but nothing has been proven. He represents the extreme leftwing of Bosch's leftist Dominican Revolutionary Party (PRD), and in preelection maneuvering last year Dominguez Guerra's faction was intimately tied to the pro-Communist 14th of June Party. It may or may not be significant that Dominguez Guerra's brother-in-law is Tulio Arvela, a member of the Dominican Communist Party central committee.

Extreme leftists in the cabinet are not the only source of concern. Fiallo views it with alarm that Bosch permitted the return from Cuba of about a dozen well-known Communists, including Maximo Lopez Molina, Communist Party boss who had been deported by the interim government. And for a few months after Bosch's inauguration in February, the government granted permits for known Communist and fellow travelers to use government buildings in outlying towns for their rallies. Manuel Tavarez Justo, head of the pro-Communist 14th of June Party, traveled from city hall to city hall preaching that Lenimism is the only way to happiness. After outcries from conservatives, Bosch put a stop to this. But Bosch so far has made no similiar move to block the interim government's action permitting Communist theoretician Dato Pagan Perdomo to set up Marxist indoctrination sessions for 300 pupils in a government-owned girls' school.

A minority of foreign diplomats tend to agree with Fiallo. Venezuelan envoy Rafael Leon Morales warned his foreign minister in a confidential cable, that Bosch's PRD party was infiltrated by Communists. The cable somehow was leaked to the newspapers and Leon was recalled from Santo Domingo, amid countercharges that he was linked with Bosch's opposition. But a European diplomat said that "Bosch believes if he gives the Commies enough rope they will hang themselves. That, unfortunately, is the delusion that overcame Czechoslovakia."

Bosch replies that the Communist issue is a phony, promoted by reactionaries who dread social and economic reforms—"people of ill minds, paralyzed by terror," he says. Privately, Boscho fears the democratic fabric in the Dominican Republic may not yet be strong enough to withstand an all-out terrorist campaign such as the Venezuelan Communists have mounted against President Romulo Betancourt.

What he says for publication—sitting in his livingroom, leaning back in his reclining armchair, surrounded by everything to read from Etruscan art books to Gore Vidal's scathing Esquire article on Bobby Kennedy—is more philosophical. "We have made several good goals, and we are advancing toward them. If we succeed in our fight against intolerable socio-economic conditions, I am not afraid of communism here."

Ask him whether the Communists won't gain advantage from their freedom of movement and he answers: "We cannot be schizophrenic. We cannot be half dictatorship and half democracy." Bosch's defenders note that when the Communist-controlled government workers federation attempted a general strike recently, the president immediately crushed it by firing the leaders.

Politics aside, the average Juan has enjoyed a sharp rise in living standards since Trujillo's death. Typical is the sugarcane cutter: whose daily wages are up from 70 cents to $2.50 inside 2 years. True, his wife is complaining that rice now costs 18 cents a pound instead of 12 cents last year. But for the first time he is able to increase his consumption of meat and bread.

All this has resulted from a slow leveling of income between rich and poor (though average per-capita income here hasn't changed much from $200 a year). The most worrisome blot on the picture is unemployment, which is estimated at about 12 percent nationally and a dangerous 25 percent in the cities. Other problems—illiteracy, inadequate housing, the transportation network—are being attacked with the help of $53 million from the Alliance for Progress.

About half the unemployment can be blamed on the Trujillo family, which squeezed $150 million from the Dominican economy between 1959 and 1961. The capital drain created an economic depression that is just now showing signs of being cured. Nonetheless, though few Dominicans admit it, in the long run Trujillo did a lot toward developing the nation's economy. Perhaps his only motive was to line his pockets, but he left behind a monumental money-making machine from which all can now benefit—everything from 12 sugar mills to a factory that bottles a fake aphrodisiac. Said one grudging admirer: "He was a robber baron, but he ran a pretty efficient hacienda."

Will Congress Act in Fright?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I should like to extend my remarks and to include an editorial from the Roanoke Times of Saturday, June 15, 1963. This is a newspaper that has been recognized in the past for its moderate views of racial matters. Its expression of opinion in this editorial is in line with that policy. So many people in this country at this very moment want to give in to demonstrations and lawlessness. This causes an alarming situation, especially in view of the frightening bills now facing Congress. The sound and only way to have law enforcement is on a local level, leaving the interpretation and the enforcement up to the community or locality in which it is to apply. Surely Congress will not yield to such a threat as the administration and the lawless demonstrators now are bringing upon the Nation. The Roanoke Times is a fine newspaper, and I hope my colleagues will digest with care this particular editorial, which is as follows:

WILL CONGRESS ACT IN FRIGHT?

If there is obstruction to President Kennedy's new civil rights proposals in Congress, the Negro activists announce they will organize a huge march on the Capitol. The Reverend George Lawrence, assistant to Dr. Martin Luther King, has threatened to send sit-in demonstrators to congressional corridors and galleries if there is a southern filibuster in the Senate against the legislation to be sought by the President.

This is a brazen attempt to intimidate the legislative branch of the Government to force the instant enactment of questionable laws including some, apparently, which would scrap constitutional concepts about the rights of private property.

It is this sort of pressure which extremist Negro leaders have organized throughout the Nation and brought to verge of explosion into fearful racial violence. A Chief Executive who is supposed to be the President of all the people has tolerantly looked upon defiance of local and State police authority to keep the peace and, in effect, contributed to the rise of tensions. The President's failure to speak out from the eminence of his office, reminding the Negroes that they have a duty to act within the law makes inescapable the conclusion that he is more sensitive to the expediency of appeasing a strong political minority than he is to the broad interests of all the people in this period of crisis.

Now that there is the threat to club Congress into doing the will of the Negro leaders, to frighten elected Representatives into hasty action that would imperil basic privileges of persons and their property, what will Mr. Kennedy do? Will he continue to apologize for people who take the law into their own hands, who contend that the end justifies the means, that equality overnight in every area of living is an excuse for bringing the Nation to the edge of violent chaos? Deliberation in enactment of legislation—and this includes the lawful provision for unlimited debate—is one of the safeguards of the country. The implication of the demonstration threat is that Congress can be compelled to surrender to a minority's precise wishes with the hot breath of the mob upon its neck.

It so happens that there is a law against the invasion of the premises of Congress by assemblages of demonstrators. This was pointed out Thursday by Senator ROBERTSON of Virginia. It was enforced on one notable instance—when the veterans staged the bonus marches in 1934, requiring the use of troops to restrain them.

But under the implied doctrine of an administration that says law must be respected by some under pain of severe penalty but can be disobeyed by others with impunity one can only wonder now whether the Congress of the United States itself will be allowed to make grave decisions free of threats within its very precincts.

In the midst of our tragedy of race conflict, another tragedy is that the leadership in the White House seems incapable of impartially summoning all Americans of whatever color or race to the responsibilities of citizenship. The future is gloomy indeed if Congress, too, allows itself to be swept along by the tide of passion and prejudice.

Death of R. M. Hitt, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Monday, South Carolina lost one of its most capable, respected, and beloved newsmen when Mr. R. M. Hitt, Sr., of Bamberg, S.C., passed away. Mr. Hitt was editor and publisher of the Bamberg Herald for many years. He also served with other weekly newspapers in South Carolina prior to becoming editor and publisher of the Bamberg Herald. Both as a community leader and editor, Mr. Hitt's personal integrity and his editorial eloquence had profound effects for good on his community and throughout the State where his editorial comments were often reprinted and quoted. Mr. Hitt was also a very devoted husband and father. The high regard in which his children are held in their respective communities is an indication of the fine training they received in the home of Mr. Hitt and his late wife, Weinona Strom Hitt, who served as a great inspiration to Mr. Hitt by her strong Christian traits of character and her intellectual attainments.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a newspaper article from the News and Courier on June 18, 1963, entitled "R. M. Hitt, Sr., of Bamberg, Dies" and also an editorial from the News and Courier of June 19, 1963, entitled "R. M. Hitt' and an editorial from the Augusta Chronicle of June 19, 1963, entitled "R. M. Hitt."

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the News and Courier, June 18, 1963]

R. M. Hitt, Sr., of Bamberg, Dies

Bamberg.—R. M. Hitt Sr., 76, longtime editor and publisher of the Bamberg Herald died Monday after a lingering illness.

Funeral services will take place at 4 p.m. Tuesday in the First Baptist Church with the Reverend Dr. James P. Carroll, pastor, officiating, assisted by the Reverend W. F. Baker, pastor of Trinity Methodist Church, and the Reverend William C. Frierson of Denmark, retired Presbyterian minister.

Honorary pallbearers will be Senator Strom Thurmond, former Governor James F. Byrnes, deacons of the First Baptist Church, and officers of the Edisto Building and Loan Association.

Active pallbearers will be Mr. Hitt's nephews.

A newspaperman all his life, Mr. Hitt retired from the Bamberg Herald in 1951 after 37 years as editor and publisher. Shortly thereafter he found he disliked inactivity and agreed to keep books for the newspaper and perform other chores from a private office he had opened for himself.

In time he took on other duties and was soon back in harness full time. When his final illness forced him into hospitals and his home for weeks at a time, he continued to write editorials and lament the fact that he couldn't get down to the shop. He was determined to keep on writing as long as he had the strength to strike a typewriter key.

He started his career at the age of 18, leaving the Aiken Institute near the close of his high school education to go to work.

He was born Sept. 22, 1886 in Aiken County, a son of the Reverend Wayne Montgomery Hitt, a Baptist preacher, and Mrs. Eugenia Carter Hitt.

As a young man living in Montmorenci, a small town in Aiken County, he was a correspondent for the Aiken Journal and Review, then edited by James F. Byrnes who was later to become Governor of the State, United States Senator and Secretary of State.

Mr. Hitt attended a Sunday School picnic and turned in such a competent account that Editor Byrnes offered him a job as a reporter in Aiken.

Together with his reporting duties he took on the job of corresponding for The News and Courier, The Augusta Chronical. The State and other South Carolina metropolitan dailies. He continued these ties with The News and Courier and The Augusta Chronical for many years throughout his journalistic career.

During his 7 years on the staff of the Journal and Review he learned both the newspaper business and the printing trade and in 1910 felt qualified to form a partnership with Walter E. Duncan, former comptroller general of South Carolina. Together they purchased the Aiken Recorder. Later Mr. Hitt bought out Mr. Duncan, changed the name of the paper to the Aiken Sentinel and became editor and publisher.

In 1911 Mr. Hitt married Miss Weinona Strom, of Edgefield County, and a few weeks later he came to work to find that the sheriff had declared the Aiken Sentinel defunct. He and Mrs. Hitt moved to Timmonsville where he became editor of the Enterprise without missing a day's work.

During the next 25 or 30 years Mr. Hitt repaid all the money he had borrowed from friends in an effort to keep the Sentinel from going under.

Less than a year after the Hitts had moved to Timmonsville, the Enterprise was sold and Mr. Hitt went to the Darlington News and Press. From there he moved to the Newberry Herald and News.

In 1914, learning that the editorship of the Bamberg Herald was open, he formed a partnership with the late Roy M. Bruce and they leased the weekly, publishing it together until Mr. Bruce died in 1930.

In 1922 Mr. Hitt organized the Edisto Building & Loan Association and served as its secretary and treasurer for many years.

He was a life deacon in the Bamberg Baptist Church and for many years was secretary and treasurer of the Sunday school.

He was a member of the Bamberg Lions Club, the Men's Garden Club and the Bamberg Business Association. He served as secretary of the county Democratic convention for more than 20 years.

His views on the operation of weekly newspapers were traditional.

"We do not compete with the daily newspapers," he said. "Our aim is to print news about homefolks and to leave world and national news to the dailies."

Readers of the Bamberg Herald never had occasion to wonder about the editor's position on important issues. His editorials were always positive and to the point. He was proud of the fact that he never allowed a "canned" editorial to appear in his columns.

"If an editor can't write his own editorials," he said, "he shouldn't have any."

The Bamberg Herald never missed an issue during Mr. Hitt's regime. During the depression of 30 years ago there were many anxious weeks when advertising revenue in an issue was barely sufficient to pay the postage for the distribution of the paper.

For many months after the fourth and last bank in Bamberg closed its doors, the Herald seldom received enough cash to pay off its employees. Whatever cash was available was distributed by the publisher and weekly entries were made in a ledger showing how much back pay was due each employee. In time these obligations were paid with interest.

Under his leadership the Bamberg Herald was regarded as a clear and forthright yoice in the weekly press of South Carolina and his official retirement resulted in editorial praise for both his professional capabilities and his personal character as a coworker in the newspaper field.

Surviving Mr. Hitt are one son, R. M. Hitt, Jr., editor of the Charleston Evening Post; two daughters, Mrs. Charles L. Stuckey of Charlotte, and Mrs. Thomas B. Thrailkill of Bamberg, and 10 grandchildren.

[From the Augusta Chronicle, June 19, 1963]

R. M. Hitt

When death came early Monday at Bamberg to R. M. Hitt, South Carolina in general and the low country in particular were diminished in stature and worth.

For more than half a century the impact of this dedicated newspaperman had been felt on journalism throughout the Palmetto State. It was especially impressive in Bamberg County where, until his retirement in 1951, he had served as editor and publisher of the enterprising Bamberg Herald for 37 years.

True newspaperman that he was, however, Mr. Hitt could not long permit inactivity to rob him of his love of the press and his desire to remain a part of the community in which he had settled after gaining his interest in newspaper work at Montmorenci in Aiken County, near where he was born. Shortly after his retirement, he undertook a subordinate role in production of the Herald, but in time was back in full harness. Even when his final illness forced him into hospitals and his home for weeks at a time, he wrote his forceful editorials, carrying on the tradition his newspaper had established during the half century he was associated with it.

The tenacity with which he fought his final illness was characteristic of the determination which marked his every endeavor, and it pointed up perhaps as well as any gesture could, his zest for life.

R. M. Hitt will be missed, not alone in his hometown of Bamberg, but wherever South Carolina newspapermen gather for many years to come.

[From the News and Courier, June 19, 1963]

R. M. Hitt

If we were to pick a model for the role of smalltown editor, we would not have to look farther afield than the presiding spirit for the last 49 years of the Bamberg Herald. Now that Robert Melvin Hitt has died at age 76, we feel more free to express fully our admiration than we would in respect for his modesty, have said to his face.

Though he chose to spend his newspaper career of nearly 60 years in the weekly field of journalism, Mr. Hitt had qualities that would have fitted him well in any league of our craft—and for that matter, many another profession. He had a good head for business, as well as a clear, terse style of writing.

He also moved with a natural dignity that inspired immediate confidence. Nobody ever had reason to feel that his trust in Mr. Hitt was misplaced. His code of ethics was simple, direct and unyielding. Yet his humanity and his sense of humor tempered what might in a lesser man have become a puritanical view of life.

We often quoted his editorials because they were timely, short and sensible. We cannot say as much for the usual product of many a famous metropolitan gazette.

The small town field that Mr. Hitt chose for himself by no means is the measure of a small man. Some of the traditions of journalism are being kept better today among weeklies than by the daily press.

Mr. Hitt's first newspaper work was in Aiken. Later he was in Timmonsville, Darlington, and Newberry. In 1914 he settled in Bamberg. He retired in 1951, and finding life dull without an office, worked himself back into harness at the Herald. Mr. Hitt was writing editorials until his final illness made him quit. Failing health was the only thing that could keep him from a calling that he served with devotion, integrity, and skill.

The Image of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include an editorial from the Danville Register, edited by W. Marion Saunders of that city. Mr. Saunders is an able, distinguished, and well-known editor. In the light of the happenings of recent date and the efforts to give more power to the Government and the Attorney General of the United States, I think it is time that we gave more thought to local law enforcement and to the leaving of these vexing and troublesome problems in the hands of local people and local officials. I commend the editorial to the Members of the Congress, as well as to all thoughtful citizens. The editorial is as follows:

[From the Register, Danville, Va., June 19, 1963]

THE IMAGE OF JUSTICE

The image of that blind goddess, justice, has been of majestic proportion in this part of the country longer than the existence of our Government built upon the concept that all men are free and are equal before the law. A noble creation, justice is the image by which she has been known since Virginians of earlier generations gave meaning to her lines and substance to her form.

Unless given some protection by those in high places bearing the primary if not the major responsibility for her safety, justice may be batted about after the manner of the drudge whose husband believes the best way to handle a woman is to beat her twice a day whether she needs it or not.

Danville and Virginia have ordinances and statutes enacted as necessary for the maintenance of peace and order. When these laws were violated repeatedly by a group of people, the corporation court issued a restraining order against illegal actions in a number of specified instances, including incitement to riot. Cases involving violation of the restraining order and, therefore, contempt of the State court, currently are being tried.

Justice is having her skirts dragged through the mud because plaintiffs in an omnibus suit, to bring about court-directed integration in some fields already integrated and in others still segregated, were the first of the demonstrators to violate the laws of the city and State and they also were the first to violate the terms of the restraining order.

After flouting the law in a manner to undermine it throughout the Nation and to bring disrespect upon the whole system of justice, the free-wheeling plaintiffs in the omnibus suit now have gone before a Federal court and asked it to take all the actions out of the city and State courts and hold that charges of blocking traffic and incitement to riot and other specific violations are invasions of the constitutional rights of the lawbreakers.

By thus going before the U.S. district court, the plantiffs in the pending omnibus suit and the defendants in the city and State criminal actions have shown to the public their inherent disregard for the law and for the administration of justice in Danville since they repeatedly had demonstrated that when the laws do not serve their individual purposes and aims in applying pressures, they will violate such laws with impunity.

The degredation of justice leaves all the community besmirched. And the stain is all the deeper, it seems, when the head of the U.S. Department of Justice appeals by telephone to one of the grossest violators of the laws to cease his violations and those of others joining him in demonstrating their contempt of the judiciary of Virginia and the law enforcement agencies of the city and State. Had Attorney General Robert Kennedy warned Elder Lawrence Campbell that the laws in Danville would be enforced with all the power needed, justice could and would be preserved unsullied in Danville.

All the violations of law have been committed under a firm belief that once the white community had absorbed all the trouble it could stand, the first demand of the rioters—that all charges against them and their fellow demonstrators be dropped—would be met as a matter of course.

Unless the law violators here are disabused of any such impression in court, more trouble will be experienced here and in other cities.

Mayor Stinson has said he would not confer or negotiate with people under charges. The mayor should adhere to that rule. Otherwise, all persons with alleged grievances may dirty their hands—and themselves—as preparation for consultations to attain that which they seek. It is not—and should not be—a rule of the courts that he who seeks a legal privilege or right can get it by illegal means.

Hall of Science—The New York World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record remarks by Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair, at the ground breaking of the hall of science, Flushing Meadows, June 19, 1963.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR, 1964–65, AT THE GROUND BREAKING OF THE HALL OF SCIENCE, FLUSHING MEADOW, JUNE 19, 1963

We were concerned for a long time about the conspicuous absence of an adequate exhibit of space and science at Flushing Meadow.

We tried in vain every known expedient and device, every legitimate pressure, hard and soft sell and charm, through our most persuasive and skillful representatives and friends, to fill this gap. Finally, at the last possible moment, due to the lively concern of the city administration, the intervention of Mayor Wagner, the personal enthusiasm of Paul Screvane, and the persistence of Guy Tozzoli, we miraculously met the problem, not only for the fair's 2 years but for a permanent city hall of science.

This hall will occupy a strategic, accessible, and expandable place in the completed Flushing Meadow Park—something not only for the fast-growing borough of Queens, but for all of New York and its visitors as a living symbol of the most extraordinary quarter century of human progress in discovery and invention since the beginning of recorded history.

We have entrusted the form of this hall to Wallace Harrison, distinguished chief architect of the United Nations Capitol. Commissioner Reidy is in charge of construction. It will be a tough assignment to finish on time, but not beyond those dedicated to it.

In the words of the ancients, we pray with complete confidence that this may be a happy and auspicious occasion.

The Highway Trust Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a copy of the letter from Hon. Rex M. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, Bureau of Public Roads, which gives data on the revenues and expenditures of the Highway Trust Fund.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS,
Washington, D.C., June 19, 1963.

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: Your letter of June 11 discusses the Staunton News Leader's use of the quotation: "2 billion of Federal road money is diverted to nonhighway purposes." We frequently hear or read similar statements that are based on incomplete or inaccurate information.

It is inaccurate to refer to the Federal excise tax on automobiles as a road-user tax. The tax on automobiles was originally imposed at 3 percent on October 4, 1917, increased to 5 percent February 25, 1919, decreased to 3 percent again on March 29, 1926, and repealed effective May 29, 1928. An excise tax of 3 percent was again imposed on automobiles effective June 21, 1932. This was increased to 3½ percent July 1, 1940, to 7 percent October 1, 1941, and to the present 10-percent rate November 1, 1951. Although the long-range highway financing program adopted in 1956 originally provided that part of the tax on automobiles would go to the highway trust fund, the law was later amended before this provision took effect, and no revenue from the excise tax on automobiles ever went into the trust fund.

All of the net revenues (after refunds) from motor fuel, tires, innertubes, tread rubber, trucks, buses and trailers, and the use tax on vehicles weighing more than 26,000 pounds when loaded do go into the trust fund; and not 1 penny of the highway trust fund revenues has ever been used for other than highway purposes.

I am enclosing copies of our table TF–301, that lists the items taxed, the tax rates since the beginning of the trust fund, and the net revenue to the trust fund from each item for each year the trust fund has existed through the end of fiscal year 1962.

It is hoped that this information is in sufficient detail, but if it is not, we have complete data on the revenues and expenditures of the highway trust fund and shall be glad to supply any additional information you may wish.

Sincerely yours,

REX M. WHITTON,
Federal Highway Administrator.

Net revenues to the Highway Trust Fund, 1957–1962 [1]

[In millions of dollars]

Item	Tax rate	Fiscal year					
		1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
Motor fuel	3 cents per gallon July 1, 1956, through Sept. 30, 1959; 4 cents per gallon thereafter.	1,326	1,608	1,657	2,044	2,361	2,374
Tires	8 cents per pound for highway tires, and 5 cents per pound for other tires July 1, 1956, through June 30, 1961; 10 cents per pound for highway tires and 5 cents per pound for other tires thereafter. For fiscal year 1957 only, 3 cents per pound on highway tires accrued to the trust fund. After June 30, 1957, all tire tax accrued to the trust fund.	82	244	247	281	246	327
Innertubes	9 cents per pound July 1, 1956, through June 30, 1961; 10 cents per pound thereafter. None of the revenues accrued to the trust fund in fiscal year 1957. After June 30, 1957, all innertube tax accrued to the trust fund.	----------	17	15	19	15	17
Tread rubber	3 cents per pound July 1, 1956, through June 30, 1961; 5 cents per pound thereafter.	11	13	14	15	14	23
Trucks, buses, and trailers	10 percent of manufacturer's wholesale price of which ½ accrues to the trust fund during the period July 1, 1957, through June 30, 1962; all thereafter. During fiscal year 1957, ⅛ of the tax accrued to the trust fund.	34	111	107	142	115	128
Vehicle use	$1.50 per 1,000 pounds gross weight for vehicles that weigh more than 26,000 pounds when loaded, July 1, 1956, through June 30, 1961; $3 per 1,000 pounds gross weight thereafter.	26	33	34	38	47	80
Total from excises		1,479	2,026	2,074	2,539	2,798	2,949
Interest on investments		3	18	13	−3	1	7
Total		1,482	2,044	2,087	2,536	2,799	2,956

[1] All amounts are net, after refunds have been paid.

Deportations in the Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, June 14 marks the 22d anniversary of the deportation of thousands of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians to the interior of Russia. This outrage against humanity occurred exactly 1 year after the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union. It is fitting that the Members of this House take note of this solemn occasion.

After the Baltic States were forced to join the Soviet Union in 1940 under pressure of Russian troops, a reign of terror was unleashed on the peaceful citizens of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The Soviet Union tried to impose its own way of life upon the Baltic peoples, and when these efforts met with resistance, thousands who were opposed to the Soviet experiment were subjected to exile, deportation, execution, and imprisonment. What started as a program of bringing schools, government, transportation, and banks under Soviet control ended with plans to transplant wholesale all the Baltic peoples into Russia.

The deportations reached their peaks during a 5-day period starting June 14, 1941. During these few days, thousands of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians were arrested and deported to the interior of Russia. This crime against humanity was not accepted without resistance. Revolts fomented by underground groups occurred in several cities, a radio station was seized in Lithuania, and, as the rebellion spread, a Lithuanian insurgent government was set up. But the small Baltic States could not withstand the brute force exerted by their mammouth neighbors to the east and west, who were determined to suppress the Baltic States and exploit them in every manner.

Mr. Speaker, the Baltic States, like all countries under Communist rule, belong properly to the community of free nations. The ideals of freedom and independence remain alive in the men, women, and children of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. As we recall the horrors of the mass deportations which occurred 22 years ago today, we firmly vow to leave the lamp of liberty lighted for all people behind the Iron Curtain.

Communication by Satellite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House an address delivered before the Federal Bar Association in Washington, D.C., on June 4, 1963, by George J. Feldman. His remarks are of special interest because of his background in this field. Mr. Feldman was the director and chief counsel to the House Select Committee on Astronautics and Outer Space; he also was a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Committee on Outer Space and now is an incorporator and one of the initial directors of the Communications Satellite Corp. In addition to the foregoing Mr. Feldman was a member of U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO and from time to time has undertaken other special assignments.

His address follows:

COMMUNICATION BY SATELLITE

(Address of George J. Feldman Before Federal Bar Association, Washington, D.C. June 4, 1963)

We have now taken the first steps toward a new era in international communication. The emerging space age, fathered by the technological revolution, has witnessed the heroic exploits of men in space, and has brought into experimental being the forecast of weather via satellite and the potential satellite system for international communication.

The experimental vehicles Echo, a passive reflector, and Telstar and Relay, random orbit repeater experiments, have gripped the imagination of people in various parts of the world. Echo as a small star has been seen by millions who shared the unity of an identity of wonder.

The television transmissions via the Telstar vehicle are familiar to all, as television via satellite became a reality, spanning space and ocean in almost instantaneous time. Thus in drama has the stage been set.

This is the experimental phase. The reality of a viable communication system remains to be accomplished with the accompaniment of hard work, hard and yet imaginative intelligence, and cooperation, nationally and internationally.

The advance of technology ultimately simplifies and expedites the execution of given tasks and objectives. But the translation of the advancing technology into the reality of a functioning system brings to the fore a complexity of problems and challenges of unprecedented character and degree.

It is those problems that are now being tackled in the great effort to lift the promise of the experiment to the function of the working system.

Primary to the effort is the reality that a system of communication by satellite will be brought into living being and will in many ways transform international communications in a revolutionary way.

This is the essential. Along the way there are the secondary, or even fundamentally more removed, clashes and skirmishes, and articulation of narrower concepts of method in the often polarized world of political and economic viewpoint in words that combat.

As counsel and director of the House Select Committee, as a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations committee on outer space, and now as one of the incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp., I have been really privileged to be closely associated with a living adventure of our times and to have played a part in the organizational structure and direction that must take place to bring technology to practical, working reality.

I wish to make it clear, however, that I speak to you here in a personal capacity, in views that are my own and not as a designated representative.

The problems of bringing an international communication system into being are manifold in their complexity. They involve technological considerations of choice, conditioned by economics, and surrounded by international economic and political considerations.

The magical solution is hard work, the patience of understanding and the elements of good-will engendered by respect for the problems to be overcome.

Public Law 87-624, the "Communications Satellite Act of 1962" sets forth the guidelines for the U.S. effort. Its declaration of policy and purpose states:

"The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States to establish, in conjunction and in cooperation with other countries, as expeditiously as practicable a commercial communications satellite system, as part of an improved global communications network, which will be responsive to public needs and national objectives, which will serve the communication needs of the United States and other countries, and which will contribute to world peace and understanding.

"The new and expanded telecommunication services are to be made available as promptly as possible and are to be extended to provide global coverage at the earliest practicable date. In effectuating this program, care and attention will be directed toward providing such services to economically less developed countries and areas as well as those more highly developed, toward efficient and economical use of the electromagnetic frequency spectrum, and toward the reflection of the benefits of this new technology in both quality of services and charges for such services.

"In order to facilitate this development and to provide for the widest possible participation by private enterprise, U.S. participation in the global system shall be in the form of a private corporation, subject to appropriate governmental regulation. It is the intent of Congress that all authorized users shall have nondiscriminatory access to the system; that maximum competition be maintained in the provision of equipment and services utilized by the system; that the corporation created under this act be so organized and operated as to maintain and strengthen competition in the provision of communications services to the public; and that the activities of the corporation created under this act and of the persons or companies participating in the ownership of the corporation shall be consistent with the Federal antitrust laws."

This is the directive and in the act are spelled out functions of the corporation to implement the declaration of policy and purpose and relationships and responsibilities of the President of the United States, and agencies of the executive branch, as well as the corporation itself.

Among the specifics the President of the United States is to "aid in the planining and development and foster the execution of a national program for the establishment and operation, as expeditiously as possible of a commercial communications satellite system." And again: He shall "exercise such supervision over relationships of the corporation with foreign governments or entities or with international bodies as may be appropriate to assure that such relationships shall be consistent with the national interest and foreign policy of the United States."

Other functions in the national program are assigned directly to various Government agencies and to the corporation itself. The corporation itself, is authorized under the act to "plan, initiate, construct, own, manage and operate itself or in conjunction with foreign governments or business entities a commercial communication satellite system." Other specific powers flowing from this authorization are designated.

The execution of this national program and the task faced by the corporation is difficult, complex, and truly formidable and should be viewed by the objective with understanding. This is the uncharted region of technology, international relationship and agreements, and national support. There are hard choices to be weighed; rapid yet deep study and decisions of magnitude.

The project is launched and this important effort is underway. For its part the corporation is developing its key officers and staff. Its principal officers have begun initial exploratory talks with communications officials of other countries. Technical experts are coming in. A crack organization is in process of assembly.

The problems to be faced are integral. The choice of technological approach, dependent upon the state of the art, condition the economics. A random orbit system will require more elaborate and intricate handling, or receiving stations. A synchronous, or stationary satellite will require less elaborate receiving stations but will have to be in itself a more intricate and costly mechanism, with stronger booster power to get it up there, and more precise requirements for guidance and on-board equipment. And you have to have spares, in case your system is impaired.

The choice of system, and please bear in mind that we are speaking here of a system and not an experimental vehicle, in turn is of importance to the international users. How do they participate? Do they own stations? Do they furnish personnel? What about their own research and development? And in addition to the economics there is the political national interest and national pride in participation.

The European community has been actively discussing its role. Intensive talks have been taking place on the subject of relationship. The interest is very high.

It is high also in other parts of the world. The first exploratory conferences have been held and there will be talks with communications officials of other countries.

And what of the Soviet Union? The U.S.S.R. has indicated cooperation on the weather program, and in principle on the so-called hot line. How will it respond to the communication satellite?

Up to this point the United States has been the innovator and leader in this field, with great benefit to our national prestige, and international standing and with the satisfaction of pioneering a part of the future. Having taken this pioneering step, we have now assumed our share of responsibility and the latter is the operative word.

In the international sphere, the United Nations organization has shown strong interest in communication satellites, not only as a vehicle to transmit events of the U.N. itself, but as a means of bringing the world into closer relationships via communication. Of course, it is what is said that counts, and not the speed with which you say it. But in transport and communication our world continues to shrink as distance and time are compressed.

In a direct sense, the forthcoming Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference of the International Telecommunications Union—a specialized agency of the U.N.—is of especial importance. This is to take place in October. Its agenda includes the allocations of frequencies for the communications satellite program. These frequencies are the lifelines of communication. Thus, this international conference is of great importance.

In addition to the international aspects, the corporation has its own unique structure, under the act of Congress. Its incorporators, as you know, were appointed by the President of the United States. Having been approved by the Senate they are now constituted as an initial board of directors, with the addition of the principal officers, Leo D. Welch, as chairman and chief executive officer, and Joseph V. Charyk, as president.

Looking ahead, when the corporation is ready to go to the public for issuance of stock, when a clearer picture of technological choice, economics, international arrangements, has been brought into focus, with a clearer indication of how much capital is required, then the corporate directorship will assume a different form.

There are two series of stock. One for all the carriers; one for the general public, with the directive for wide dispersal. There will be a 15-member board, 6 representatives of the general public; 6 of all the carriers; and 3 appointed by the President of the United States.

The economics of operation in the light of other communication methods such as cable, and microwave, has been evaluated in the light of rising curves of communication demand, which will be further accelerated by availability of means.

The satellite is not only a vehicle for point to point transmission. It provides a mechanism for varied geographical simultaneous use, as the spokes to the hub of a wheel.

It can transmit telephone, written messages, facsimile, and data, and the transmission of other forms of data exchange may become a very large area of traffic.

It would be difficult indeed to emerge full blown into a global system. And an evolutionary approach may be indicated.

I refer again to the declaration of policy and purpose of the Congress, to establish "as expeditiously as practicable a commercial communications satellite system, as part of an improved global communications network, which will be responsive to public needs and national objectives, which will serve the communication needs of the United States and other countries, and which will contribute to world peace and understanding."

To accomplish this national goal will take strong, intelligent effort and work.

The communication satellite has arrived of experimental age. It will be brought into being as a working system. The United States has no monopoly on its creation. There are others who are capable of doing it. There is strong worldwide interest. The corporation is beginning to tackle the formidable problems in earnest enthusiasm, and I may say in the spirit of the dedication that accompanies a pioneering effort of responsibility. The expert group being assembled can make a substantial contribution of national benefit, as it researches and develops its program. It is time to give this effort the understanding required. For much is at stake for all.

Martyrs' Blood, Birchers' Seed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert a column by Lucius Beebe which appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle on March 18, 1963, as follows:

MARTYRS' BLOOD, BIRCHERS' SEED

(By Lucius Beebe)

If I were one of what the English so grandly term "the press lords" of the American scene, especially in California, not one of the hired hands, but one of the owners, publishers, and editorial directors who determine policies and give the orders that unleash the thunderbolts, I would take a long, hard and perhaps educational look at something called the John Birch Society.

Were I one of these highly placed folk, all of whom are fairly well indoctrinated in the belief that they wield vast power and are instrumental in shaping the destinies of nations, I think I would come away from such an inquiry with a somewhat less exalted notion of my own dread power and infallibility of authority.

This would be the occasion for my humility.

No group or organization in the history of American politics or public life has been subjected to such a prolonged, concerted, malicious, mendacious, determined, and hysterical smear at the hands of supposedly responsible publicists as the John Birch Society. The smear originated in the writings of an editorial malcontent in Santa Barbara and spread rapidly in the belief that here was a minority group so microscopic and without influence that it could be villified into oblivion with no risk at all to anyone concerned.

No two-bit columnist, no sick joke night club wit, no time serving political jefe at the public hog trough, especially in Sacramento, no editorial pundit armed with the educated language of disciplined distortion and misrepresentation, no professional peepul's friend with his hand in the peepul's pocket, no maggot intelligence of the college campus, no rancid liberal in the ragbag ranks of the peace marchers, but hastened with banshee screams to gang up on the Birchers.

They were subjected alike to the fearful frownings of disfavor of the lowest elements of skid road and the supposedly most responsible editorial minds of the daily press and other communications media. Nobody but took a fast swipe at the defenseless Birchers.

Nobody, that is, but a large and apparently ever growing segment of public opinion which is gathered to the Birchers' ways of thinking, if not their factual ranks of enrollment, with every fresh barrage of dead cats from the gloomy mandarins of the press and radio. Numbers of people began to see in the alleged subversion attributed to the Birchers what used, once in the almost forgotten past, to be known as plain American patriotism.

I do not propose to discuss the merits of the fundamental credo of the John Birch Society. I am not familiar with its tenets except that it has clamored for the impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren, a sentiment warmly shared by a formidable number of Americans who never heard of Dr. Robert Welch.

I am given to understand, too, that the more militant Birchers have had the audacity to make snoot faces at the godlike image of former President Eisenhower which, in the current American scheme of things, is tantamount to spitting on the flag or sneering at mother, but may well be revised in the long hindsight of history.

Granted the Birchers have been off bounds and often preposterous. But does anybody in his right mind believe them to be more preposterous than some of the capers of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People? Or the American Civil Liberties Union, a confraternity of Moscow-inspired shysters which might, for the immeasurable benefit of society in general, be liquidated? With flamethrowers.

Now, it is apparent from the screams of terror in the public prints and outrage from the public mendicants holding elective office, in California especially, that the Birchers are multiplying like Connecticut River shad and growing daily in solid political importance.

It is safe to say that as their numbers increase and their authority waxes, virtues will begin to appear in the John Birch Society that have not previously been perceived. As long as their numbers were microscopic they could be kicked around with impunity, but Governor Brown has never been known to view as completely evil any group in excess of three persons enrolled as California voters.

Nor is any newspaper publisher or radio station owner who hopes to be in business next year going out of his way to alienate a ponderable and apparently growing potential for circulation and the purchase of the merchandise and services they advertise.

This is no brief for the John Birch Society, merely an educated guess that their status in the community is going to be subject to a sharp revision upward having its origins in the business offices of a number of newspapers, radio stations and department stores which take a dim view of bankruptcy.

This department itself is not a joiner of anything and is of the firm belief that any five persons gathered together for any purpose whatsoever more urgent than a floating crap game are a mob and should be dispersed with fire hoses.

There is an ancient proverb stemming, I think, from the days of the religious wars of the 16th and 17th centuries: "Martyrs' Blood, Church's Seed." Its validity has never been more explicitly affirmed than in the reaction to the calculated universal smear accorded the John Birch Society.

Blackjacking Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, a shocking article on how the Kennedy administration bulldozes private enterprise into doing its bidding is discussed in an excellent article by Richard Wilson in yesterday's Evening Star:

ARM TWISTING ON THE WHEAT VOTE—PRESSURE FOR FREE RADIO AND TV TIME FOR GOVERNMENT VERSION IS CHARGED

(By Richard Wilson)

Arm twisting, one of the favorite techniques on the New Frontier, has been disclosed on a new and rather more impressive level.

The arm twisting method was noted previously in the steel price controversy, the Cuban prisoners deal, and the more benign drive for funds for a $30 million National Cultural Center. This technique has attained respectability in the Kennedy administration and officials can see nothing wrong in it for they conceive their cause to be just.

The method consists of psychologically suggestive pressure on individuals or corporations to support or go along with Government actions. When skillfully applied, the individual cannot honestly charge that he was threatened with reprisal or tempted by reward; he only knows he has been shaken up. He may have an antitrust suit pending and have his mind on this when exposed to Government persuasion; but the persuaders, of course, say they do not have this in mind at all, only the public welfare.

In the new instance the pressure was perhaps more overt. In fact, it was crude. The farm bureaucracy openly and threateningly brought pressure on federally licensed radio and TV stations to give free time for the Government's version of the issues in the national wheat referendum.

No subtlety was involved. A national directive went out to State managers and local committeemen of the farm program to bring to the attention of radio and TV stations that they are federally licensed for 3 years only and the renewal of their license could depend upon the adequacy of their public service programs. This responsibility was particularly compelling, it was stated, with respect to public service agricultural programs.

The innuendo of the directive was amazing. Public service programing, it was stated, is promised by radio-TV stations "in return for two special favors granted by the Government," exclusive use of a broadcast frequency, and "the policy of the Government not to establish federally operated stations in competition with stations being operated commercially." Of course, the directive added, this does not make stations "subject to dictation."

The directive was sent out by Ray Fitzgerald, Deputy Administrator for State and county operations of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, presumably with the approval of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman.

With vague images evoked of licenses revoked or Government-operated competitors, a good many radio and TV stations complied. A spot check shows that prime time was wangled in Indiana, Kentucky, and Minnesota, and probably elsewhere on a broader scale. Some of the stations gave their time willingly enough; they wanted just such programs. Others felt they were highly pressured.

It might be supposed that this was only in the interest of serving the wheat farmers with a factual, unbiased view of the issues before them.

But Mr. Fitzgerald's directive belies this trusting view in one sentence: "As you know, interests representing one point of view in the referendum are blanketing radio and television stations with material in heavy quantities. It is not expected that we can match the flood of material from this group, which is also in a position to buy time. But it is essential that we act aggressively to make use of public service time of radio and television stations at times of day when farm people are listening."

Farm people listened and voted. The Government could not get even a majority for the adoption of its compulsory control program for wheat. A two-thirds majority was necessary for its adoption. Rather than submit either to authoritarian control of their farms or the methods of the not-so-hidden persuaders, wheat farmers were ready to take the risk of lower income.

Now the same bureaucracy which had so little knowledge of the people it was serving has adopted a dog-in-the-manger attitude toward new legislation. Wheat farmers would readily consider a new program patterned after the voluntary programs for feed grains coupled with acreage retirement.

But the bureaucracy still has its mind on arm-twisting. Let the farmers suffer a little and they'll come back with their tails between their legs. This was a bad technique in the beginning. It is bad now. Mr. Kennedy would do well to bring it to an end and make a constructive beginning on a new wheat program that farmers want.

Arm Twisting on the Wheat Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I conclude the following editorial by Richard Wilson which appeared in the June 19, 1963, edition of the Washington Evening Star. What Mr. Wilson has to say regarding the recent wheat referendum should be of interest to farmers and non-farmers alike.

ARM TWISTING ON THE WHEAT VOTE—PRESSURE FOR FREE RADIO AND TV TIME FOR GOVERNMENT VERSION IS CHARGED

(By Richard Wilson)

Arm twisting, one of the favorite techniques on the New Frontier, has been disclosed on a new and rather more impressive level.

The arm twisting method was noted previously in the steel price controversy, the Cuban prisoners deal, and the more benign drive for funds for a $30 million National Cultural Center. This technique has attained respectability in the Kennedy administration and officials can see nothing wrong in it for they conceive their cause to be just.

The method consists of psychologically suggestive pressure on individuals or corporations to support or go along with Government actions. When skillfully applied, the individual cannot honestly charge that he was threatened with reprisal or tempted by reward; he only knows he has been shaken up. He may have an antitrust suit pending and have his mind on this when exposed to Government persuasion; but the persuaders, of course, say they do not have this in mind at all, only the public welfare.

In the new instance the pressure was perhaps more overt. In fact, it was crude. The farm bureaucracy openly and threateningly brought pressure on federally licensed radio and TV stations to give free time for the Government's version of the issues in the national wheat referendum.

No subtlety was involved. A national directive went out to State managers and local committeemen of the farm program to bring to the attention of radio and TV stations that they are federally licensed for 3 years only and the renewal of their license could depend upon the adequacy of their public service programs. This responsibility was particularly compelling, it was stated, with respect to public service agricultural programs.

The innuendo of the directive was amazing. Public service programing, it was stated, is promised by radio-TV stations "in return for two special favors granted by the Government," exclusive use of a broadcast frequency, and "the policy of the Government not to establish federally operated stations in competition with stations being operated commercially." Of course, the directive added, this does not make stations "subject to dictation."

The directive was sent out by Ray Fitzgerald, deputy administrator for State and county operations of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, presumably with the approval of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman.

With vague images evoked of licenses revoked or Government operated competitors, a good many radio and TV stations complied. A spot check shows that prime time was wangled in Indiana, Kentucky, and Minnesota, and probably elsewhere on a broader scale. Some of the stations gave their time willingly enough; they wanted just such programs. Others felt they were highly pressured.

It might be supposed that this was only in the interest of serving the wheat farmers with a factual, unbiased view of the issues before them.

But Mr. Fitzgerald's directive belies this trusting view in one sentence: "As you know, interests representing one point of view in the referendum are blanketing radio and television stations with material in heavy quantities. It is not expected that we can match the flood of material from this group, which is also in a position to buy time. But it is essential that we act aggressively to make use of public service time of radio and television stations at times of day when farm people are listening."

Farm people listened and voted. The Government could not get even a majority for the adoption of its compulsory control program for wheat. A two-thirds majority was necessary for its adoption. Rather than submit either to authoritarian control of their farms or the methods of the not-so-hidden persuaders, wheat farmers were ready to take the risk of lower income.

Now the same bureaucracy which had so little knowledge of the people it was serving has adopted a dog-in-the-manger attitude toward new legislation. Wheat farmers would readily consider a new program patterned after the voluntary programs for feed grains coupled with acreage retirement.

But the bureaucracy still has its mind on arm-twisting. Let the farmers suffer a little and they'll come back with their tails between their legs. This was a bad technique in the beginning. It is bad now. Mr. Kennedy would do well to bring it to an end and make a constructive beginning on a new wheat program that farmers want.

Put Social Security Back Where It Belongs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Asbury Park Evening Press on June 11 printed an editorial "Put Social Security Back Where It Belongs," which contains much sound reasoning and American common sense. I hope that my colleagues will read this editorial because I believe they will be impressed by it.

I could never see the justification of refusing payment of social security to those entitled to it because they were earning money through their own efforts. After all it is their money which they have saved up against the day of retirement and they are entitled to receive it. I hope the study that is now being made recognizes this fact and that Congress will amend the law to correct this injustice.

The editorial follows:

[From the Asbury Park (N.J.), Evening Press, June 11, 1963]

PUT SOCIAL SECURITY BACK WHERE IT BELONGS

The decision of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony J. Celebrezze to make an extensive study of the entire social security system is long overdue. As the Press has repeatedly pointed out the idea of social security is good. We supported it when it was first advanced but its development has been something less than its advocates had hoped for.

The weakness of present social security laws may be traced back to the reasoning which permeated the thinking of the first Roosevelt administration. Then it was not enough to pass a needed piece of legislation. Instead the legislation had to serve the dual purpose of furthering some so-called social reform dreamed up by the unemployed theorists who infested the early days of the New Deal. One of these social panaceas, supposed to solve many of our problems was the idea that young people should be kept out of the labor market as long as possible and older workers should be taken out of the market as soon as possible. All sorts of restrictions were placed up employment of the young and heavy liability was impressed upon employers of adolescents. All of this tended to reduce the hiring of young people and increase the ranks of the idle where delinquency breeds. At the same time every inducement was made to get the older worker out of the labor market. To further this unwise program social security was subverted from a detirement annuity to a welfare program designed to encourage early retirement.

Oddly enough, while the social security administration was striving to get the older worker out of gainful employment other social agencies have been browbeating employers to employ the oldsters and give them a chance to prove their worth in the world. Experts in the field of mental health tell us that employment is good for old as well as young and all sorts of activities are planned to keep elderly people from deteriorating through inactivity. This is one of the interesting phenomena which results when a disingenuous administration sells a social theory, now discarded, under the guise of something else. Delaying the employment of young people and speeding the retirement of older workers should be pressed on its own merits, not as a condition of obtaining an annuity.

Since its inception the social security program has demanded that, upon reaching a specified age, an individual limit himself to a job paying a nominal salary or forfeit his social security income for which he has paid and to which he is entitled. The injustice of this situation is apparent when it is realized that an individual might have an income from investments running into hundreds of thousands of dollars and still be eligible to collect his social security payments. But the person of modest means who might live quite comfortably on his social security payments plus his salary, finds that a strict limit is placed upon the amount he may earn as additional income. His wealthier friend, however, may have his social security and enjoy a limitless income so long as it comes from a source other than salary. President Kennedy's father, many times a millionaire, might have become eligible for social security upon reaching 65 without limiting his other income. Yet an employee of the senior Kennedy is forced to give up his social security unless he is willing to forego employment yielding more than the limit allowed by law.

Social security was designed to be an annuity payable to those under its coverage when they reached a specified age. This annuity is paid for by the contributions of the employee and his employer. It belongs to the recipient when he reaches his 65th birthday, under certain circumstances when he reaches the earlier age of 62. It is quibbling to say that a man should spend his life paying for an annuity and then tell him that he cannot have it unless he is willing to forego the higher standard of living which he might earn through continued employment. Let's return social security to the original concept of a compulsory annuity paid for by employee and employer alike and stop using it as a means of promoting exploded social theories.

Evidence Shows Interior Secretary Avoids Use of Condemnation Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, when the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee recently held hearings on S. 1137, my bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore, there was considerable pro and con discussion on the desirability of giving the Secretary of Interior power of condemnation to acquire privately owned property for park purposes. In the bill I introduced to provide Oregon with a new park unit, this matter is dealt with by depriving the Secretary of condemnation powers over improved private residential property. This provision was included because it has become apparent in national seashore planning that the existence of private homes within the park boundaries is not inconsistent with recreation objectives.

The Washington correspondent for several Oregon newspapers, Mr. A. Robert Smith, recently visited the Cape Cod National Seashore in search of information on the manner in which property condemnation has been handled in that area. He discovered that since establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore by Congress only 1 out of about 2,000 property owners has had his property condemned. Moreover, the Park Superintendent told him that it is conceivable that few, if any, of the residents would be forced to sell their homes, and that most of the commercial enterprises will be allowed to continue. This is most significant, in my opinion, because the legislation which passed Congress to establish the Cape Cod unit gives the Secretary broad powers to acquire property by condemnation. In my bill, however, he has only limited authority in this field.

I ask consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD with my remarks the newspaper article entitled, "Cape Cod Park Easy on Private Property," which appeared in the Oregon Statesman, June 12, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPE COD PARK EASY ON PRIVATE PROPERTY

(By A. Robert Smith)

CAPE COD, MASS.—In the nearly 2 years since Congress approved Cape Cod National Seashore, only 1 out of 2,000 property owners has had his property condemned by the Federal Government.

If this suggests the easy-does-it approach of the National Park Service in gaining the cooperation of Cape Cod residents for creation of this 27,000-acre park, it also indicates that no citizen can openly defy the law establishing this new park. The citizen who tested the law defied the prohibition against building new homes in the park, refused advice to quit, and so the Government condemned.

The Federal versus private property issue is much more pronounced here on Cape Cod than it is on the Oregon coast where an Oregon Dunes National Seashore is proposed under bills pending in Congress, although this is the issue which opponents of the Dunes park usually cite. It is more pronounced here because Cape Cod park involves roughly twice as much private property as would be included in an Oregon Dunes park under the Neuberger bill and many times more than under the Duncan bill.

The amount of private land in the Oregon Dunes park, as outlined to the Congress last month by Interior Secretary Stewart Udall, would be 11,700 acres. The Cape Code seashore, when completed, will include 21,000 acres of private property, plus 6,000 acres of State land, for a park roughly 27,000 acres in total area.

The Park Service is busy trying to acquire the unimproved land, which makes up the bulk of the 3,000 separate private tracts held by 2,000 individual owners. The tracts of improved property contain 700 private homes and 85 business establishments. Congress armed the Park Service with the power of condemnation over all this private property—and authorized $16 million to pay for acquisition costs.

Park Superintendent Robert F. Gibbs says it is conceivable that few if any of these residents will be forced to sell their homes, and that most of the commercial enterprises will be allowed to continue.

The chief reason for this security on the part of residents is that Congress provided that if local zoning regulations are adopted to safeguard the park against honkytonk commercialism, then the Federal power to condemn residential property could not be used. After the Cape Cod Act was approved, the Interior Department issued minimum zoning regulations it would approve for property within the park. While aimed at halting uncontrolled commercialization, they would permit establishment of such new enterprises as boathouses, overnight lodgings, fishing activities, artists' studios, crop farming but not "such objectionable uses as a piggery," and they would allow such small home occupations as the making and selling of traditional Cape Cod products produced on the premises.

To date four of the six towns in the park have adopted zoning bylaws as tough or tougher than those prescribed by Interior, and the other two towns are working on new codes. The towns are anxious to preserve their residential communities against condemnation because this will mean the homeowners will continue to pay taxes to the town.

Since the Park Service has opened its office here at Eastham, midway down the cape, a number of residents have volunteered to sell their homes to the Government. Gibbs said many were older persons with no children to whom they wished to pass on their property. In these cases negotiated sales are arranged.

A resident electing to stay in the park may not keep an unlimited amount of his land with his home. For those homeowners with more than a small plot of ground, the act allows them to keep at least 3 acres. Gibbs said his office takes into account the arrangement of such related facilities as the well or garden and in some instances has allowed 5 acres.

The pending Oregon Dunes bills deny the Park Service the power to condemn residential property, regardless of whether or not zoning bylaws are adopted locally. This was a concession to vocal opponents.

But the Oregon Dunes legislation follows the Cape Cod Act in giving the Government the power to condemn undesirable business establishments in the park. The standards for judging commercial enterprises are not spelled out in either case.

All 85 businesses in Cape Cod Park got blanket permits to continue operating through 1963. Gibbs said he intends to be lenient with nearly all of them in future years. He pinpointed one "dive that should be eliminated." It's not that the Park Service objects to liquor being served within the park, explained Gibbs, but the type of place dispensing drinks would govern whether it will get the permit it needs to continue operations.

There are only four places holding liquor licenses in the park, he said. Two others are "a very nice motel and a seafood restaurant," which will be permitted to continue. The fourth is a "rundown old hotel" which has indicated its willingness to sell out to the Government. If present negotiations for a sale are fruitful, the hotel will be torn down, said Gibbs.

There is only one large industrial enterprise in the park which for 40 years has been digging sand out of this scenic peninsula to supply railroads with brake sand, among other industrial uses. This will probably be closed out gradually, Gibbs said, and several small sand and clay pits which supply materials for road construction may be curtailed.

There are three auto service stations in the park which will continue. Other enterprises are mostly of the gift shop and tourist home variety, plus a few doctors and other professional men with offices in their homes, said Gibbs approvingly.

In passing on each commercial enterprise, the park superintendent said he makes the decision with the advice of the Cape Cod Advisory Commission, composed of 10 local citizens: one appointed by Udall; two by the Governor; one by Barnstable County and one each from the six towns, Eastham, Chatham, Truro, Wellfleet, Orleans, and Provincetown. The commision meets monthly with Gibbs.

"Several members of the commission were opponents of the park, and one is still violently opposed to it," said Gibbs. "It shows that it isn't stacked."

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, the President has delivered his message on civil rights, and the Congress will now consider it.

Demonstrations and violence hardly make a proper background for the calm deliberation that sound legislation demands. It seems, therefore, that we should review some basic principles, hoping to remove this issue from the clamor of the streets.

First, we must once again acknowledge that the Supreme Court decision of 1954 is still the law of the land. It is the law, and it will remain the law. Accordingly, we must recognize that all governmental, or publicly supported or controlled facilities must be made available to all citizens.

Second, the 14th and 15th amendments, forged in the bloodshed of a century ago, are the law of the land. Their guarantees must extend to every citizen. Nor can there be any justification for withholding or denying any of the rights there secured on grounds of race or color. Particularly, the right to vote must be extended to all persons, without regard to color, who can qualify under fairly administered standards. Those who seek, by harassment, subterfuge, or intimidation, to deny the ballot to others do nothing but invite federally supervised voting procedures. Unless justice be done at the courthouse, it will be done at the Capitol.

Third, there remains the question of fairplay on the part of privately owned facilities serving the public. Is it fair that some Americans are admitted, and others turned away? Is it fair that some Americans are welcomed on one side of a store, and rejected on the other? If we seek fairplay, then we must acknowledge that it is lacking here.

Is the remedy found in a public accommodations law of nationwide application? Such a law would say to proprietors throughout the Nation: "You may no longer select your own customers, but must serve all who come." Is it right to so restrict every American businessman in the operation of his own business? Is it right that every American's investment be so regulated? Is it right that every American proprietor no longer may serve whom he chooses—whether that choice be wise or foolish, worthy or spiteful? I think not. I do not think that prudence dictates such a mandatory rule as the national public accommodations proposal, and I cannot support it.

Those communities which have enacted similar laws have done so on the basis of local sentiment and desire. Any such decision should be made locally, not nationally.

The problem of fairplay must be solved, but a national law is no solution. Atlanta is trying to find its own answers. Answers will be found elsewhere when community leaders speak out—and when all citizens exercise a full measure of patience, compassion, and respect for order.

Our Nation can overcome its problems—but we must solve them, not ignore them. Long term solutions are still to be found, not in hastily passed statutes, but in a full and fair opportunity for every American to attend a good school, to earn a good income, and to achieve full development of his own talents and abilities.

Be assured that after the last demonstrator has gone home; after the last denunciation has been made; after the last bill has been signed into law—the problems of providing opportunities for jobs, housing, education, and a full life will yet remain.

If the only legacy of this trying hour is bitterness and frustration, all Americans, white and Negro, will be the losers.

Oklahoma Contractors and Highway Department Establish New Lines of Communication and Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article prepared from a paper presented by the author, Mr. John C. McConnell, at the Mississippi Valley Conference of State Highway Departments, and published in the May issue of the Constructor, a national trade magazine. The article describes the positive steps taken cooperatively and on their own initiative by the Oklahoma Department of Highways and the construction industry "to establish greater control, coordination, and communication" in the conduct of the highway program. Movement in this direction was recommended by the Committee on Public Works and should add materially to protection of the taxpayer's investment and realization of full value on every dollar put into our national Federal-aid highway projects.

The article is as follows:

Necessity is the mother of invention, and of a real need was born the Oklahoma Department of Highways-AGC Joint Committee. In order to throw some light upon this need, permit me to recount a little recent Oklahoma history.

STATE WAS TARGET

About 4 years ago, my State became, as have other States since that time, the target of Federal investigators and considerable adverse writing and reporting in connection with alleged misconduct and corruption in the building of the 51st Street (Skelly) bypass in Tulsa.

For months following the initial investigation, there were charges, inquiries, committees and committee reports, and more critical reporting by some national publications.

Probably one of the most conclusive reports of the whole affair came from retired General Buchannan, of the firm of Spencer J. Buchannan and Associates, who was at that time on the civil engineering staff of Texas A. & M. College and who was one of the pioneer founders of the Soils Research Center at Vicksburg, Miss. General Buchannan was and is considered a leading authority in soils. An interpretation of his report may be summed up with the statement that there was no intent, nor should there be any criminal liabilities, on either the part of the contractor or of the department of highways.

NO MALINTENT FOUND

In concluding his report, General Buchannan said: "During the course of this study, particular attention has been given to evidence of fraud or intent to falsify on the part of representatives of all parties concerned with the projects. No evidence or indication of malintent was found. Willingly given cooperation and assistance has been mutually enjoyed during the course of the study."

Finally, when the smoke had cleared, no corruption, no fraud, and no willful misconduct on the part of contractors or department personnel remained. In their place, however, lingered a suspicious, accusing public, and an urgent need for improved coordination, control, and communication. The highway industry in Oklahoma—both governmental and private—stood convicted, not of fraud and corruption, but of an almost apathetic neglect of an aggressive and cooperative approach toward improving our construction efforts.

COMMITTEE FORMED

When the initial shock wore off, leaders of both segments of our industry began to search for not only a means of preventing damage to the highway industry from any future investigations, but also for a permanent and effective vehicle of communication between the highway department and the construction industry. Thus, a joint highway department-contractor committee came into being.

The commitee meets regularly for about 2 hours on the morning preceeding the department's monthly division engineers meeting. Representing the department of highways are the heads of those divisions who have the most direct contact with individual contractors of the State. This group includes the director of highways, the chief engineer, the assistant chief engineer, the construction engineer, the design engineer, the bridge engineer, a field division engineer, and the materials test engineer. Representation is rotated among the eight existing field division engineers of the department.

CONTRACTORS REPRESENTED

Contractors are represented by the executive secretary of the State's AGC group and by at least one of each of the various types of contractors engaged in highway construction, such as paving contractors, grading contractors, and bridge contractors. Contractor representation also is rotated so that every contractor belonging to AGC will have an opportunity to serve. Also, at each meeting an effort is made to see that both large and small contractors are equally represented.

When the joint committee was first organized, the association individually notified all its members of the purpose and procedures of the committee and solicited their cooperation and active participation. Prior to each monthly session, all contractors are given an opportunity to submit discussion items. Likewise, all contractor members of AGC are informed of the committee actions and recommendations.

Immediately following the committee's morning meeting, the attending field division engineer makes a summary report to the department's division engineers meeting.

From the beginning, these joint meetings were open to the public. The local press was invited and did attend the first two or three sessions. Their interest soon waned, however, and reporters rarely appear now because of the technical aspects of the discussions.

The committees does not sit as a representative body for any one individual or construction firm, but as an aid to the industry as a whole. Its purpose is not to pull anyone's chestnuts out of the fire, but to attack our mutual problems.

Of course, individuals often request discussion of items with which they are presently concerned, and they are discussed, without reference to personalities, provided they are of importance to the whole industry. Many such discussions of individual obstacles and problems have prevented industrywide headaches.

ACTS AS SOUNDING BOARD

Primarily the committee acts as a sounding board for new ideas, new procedures, new policies, and new techniques. Ideas and proposals are exposed to both the contractor's and highway department's viewpoints before they are made effective. This monthly meeting is the only place where top leaders of both AGC and the highway department meet officially to consider the problems of the industry. Immediately following the Federal investigaticn of the 51st Street bypass, much of the confidence of both contractors and highway department personnel was shattered. These joint committee meetings have, to a large extent, restored this confidence and the ability of both segments of the industry to make needed decisions.

Discussion items at these joint meetings cover a wide range of subjects in an effort to arrive at a mutual solution to mutual problems. While we feel that considerable success has been achieved, it goes without saying that we certainly have not solved all our problems nor always found the perfect solution to others.

Some of the most frequent discussions at our monthly conferences revolve around highway department specifications and special provisions, their interpretation and implementation, and other changes necessitated by the changing construction scene.

PAYMENT DISCUSSED

Another subject often batted around concerns payment to contractors, including the method of payment, pay items, and departmental problems concerning the speed of payments, and in particular the expeditious handling of final estimate payments to contractors. A great deal of good has been achieved in this latter area. These improvements have done much to bring us closer together as an industry.

The committee has worked toward resolving many knotty problems centering around bid-checks, bid-bonds, and contractor qualifications, and has attempted to attack them in a manner beneficial both to the industry and the taxpayer.

A great deal of the attention of the committee has been focused on the critical need of the department for better trained inspection personnel, better working conditions so that the department can attract and retain qualified people, inservice training programs, and even on the subject of gifts to employees of the department.

Our efforts have extended into the areas of material specifications, particularly with an eye toward upgrading local materials when possible. Also, we have dealt with design problems, attempting to see that jobs offered for bid are broken up so that smaller contractors have an opportunity to bid more often, if such can be accomplished without forcing State taxpayers to suffer.

There are times when means of greater cooperation between contractors, the department of highways, Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and the Bureau of Public Roads, occupy our attention. On occasion, representatives of the Bureau of Public Roads have sat in with us. As a matter of fact, our meetings have often helped the department bring local problems to the attention of these agencies.

These conferences have helped all of us realize more fully how important it is that strict specifications be followed and that bids by contractors be made accordingly. From the meetings, we have all better understood the importance of having specifications which do not have absolute limits, but rather range limits so that we can physically stay within that range.

PRECONSTRUCTION CONFERENCES

One other notable result of the conferences should be mentioned and that is the inauguration of preconstruction conferences between local highway department personnel and the successful contractor on a newly contracted project. These field conferences help get possible future conflicts into the open before the job begins, facilitate interpretation of plans and specifications—and they do include working schedules. The conferences have become very popular with both the highway department and contractors.

We are extremely optimistic concerning the future of these conferences and their results, for we feel that we have just scratched the surface. Both the department and the contractors now feel free to air their problems openly, without fear of vindictiveness. I must admit that at our first meetings both groups were afraid to call a spade a spade.

LEADERSHIP CITED

The success we have achieved thus far through the joint committee, enabling the department of highways to better understand the contractors' viewpoint, and vice versa, would not have been possible without aggressive and farsighted leadership on both sides, and more particularly, the leadership afforded us by our young and energetic director of highways, Frank D. Lyons.

Only through such constant and continuing efforts toward greater control, coordination, and communication between the various segments of the highway industry, can we hope to adequately serve the taxpayers of our State and Nation. They are both the recipients and judges of our efforts.

Four Nations in Trouble—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, here is the second article on the four Latin American nations in trouble, written by Joseph Albright:

FOUR NEIGHBORS IN TROUBLE—HAITI SUFFERS, AND HOPES

(By Joseph Albright)

PORT-AU-PRINCE.—The real heartbreak story of Haiti is not how cruel life is under dictator Francois (Papa Doc) Duvalier but that the Haitian lot will be wretched no matter who occupies the palace.

As one economist stationed here said: "You could take 55 percent of the Haitian people and drown them in the Atlantic Ocean without doing the slightest damage to the national economy." That, the economist said, is a conservative picture of the country's underemployment and unemployment. It's been that way—now a little up, then a little down—for decades.

Into 5,000 square miles that qualify as arable are squeezed more than 4 million people, 9 out of 10 of them total illiterates who live in mud-and-wattle shacks and worship voodoo gods. Not even in India or Red China does the population average 800 to the square mile, but the situation in Haiti is even worse than the figures show. Thanks to a century and a half of splintering by inheritance, the typical Haitian peasant doesn't have his own small farm. He owns perhaps four tiny slivers (sometimes as small as 1/20th of an acre) that may be 10 miles apart.

A KICKBACK IS CUSTOMARY

If a Haitian is young and strong, he may get a job for 70 cents a day—but often he has to kick back some of it to a local politician or be replaced. Statistically, a typical Haitian's monthly income is $6 and he owns one hoe and one machete. But averaging distorts the country like a funny-house mirror image. Fully half of all Haitians are outside the money economy, subsisting on what they can grow, beg, trade or steal. The top-level minority includes the old mulatto elite, descended from French planters and Negro slave girls, now educated and prospering as businessmen; and the black middle class, socially inferior to the mulatto elite but in firm control of the government bureaucracy.

Featherbedding here is an epidemic because jobs are so scarce. In almost any government office, three employees lounge for each one that has work. One bureau has five full-time chauffeurs for its one auto—which doesn't run. The result of overstaffing is that an estimated 80 percent of the national budget goes for salaries and almost nothing for permanent improvements.

Haiti's controls on filth and disease are still so primitive that about one out of five Haitians dies in infancy. From a ghoulishly practical viewpoint, this is a blessing; high infant mortality keeps the population increase down to 2 percent a year, quite low for a backward country.

But inevitably the 20th century will have its effect. In the Artibonite Valley, the Mellon family has built the $3,500,000 Albert Schweitzer Hospital. Dedicated doctors—such as Robert McGovern of Hempstead—have patiently spread the word to midwives that despite custom it is unwise to rub an infant's umbilical cord in charcoal or dung. If midwives all over Haiti were to accept this, a great killer disease known as neonatal tetanus could be licked, and the rate of population growth would probably double.

More than half of Haiti is barren—mountains, swamps, cactus flats. What remains for farmland has been milked of its productivity by 4 centuries of intense and often inept cultivation. Haiti exported more in 1788, a year before the French revolution, than it did in any year during the Duvalier revolution. Because this western third of Hispaniola has no coal, generations of Haitians have attacked once-dense forest with machetes, stripping bare the hillsides to produce cooking charcoal. Tropical rainstorms then peeled away the topsoil and dumped it into the Caribbean. (Farmers often speed erosion by digging furrows up and down the hillsides, instead of across. Ironically, here in Port-au-Prince, erosion is a regular source of employment. After a rainstorm fertile mud is 6 inches thick on parts of Harry Truman Boulevard, and scores of able-bodied men are hired to scrape it away.

The link that completes a vicious circle is the apathy of a disease-ridden, ignorant, malnutrition-weakened nation. Over and over again, Haitians tell a visitor it's up to the United States to solve all the problems. "Why don't you make Haiti into another Puerto Rico?" asks an unemployed houseboy whose last boss left for the United States in 1961.

"The Alliance for Progress has never done anything for the people of Haiti, and it's because we're Negroes," says Haiti's tough Interior Minister Luc Francois.

Since 1945, almost $100 million in foreign aid has flowed into Haiti, with little lasting result.

What is the answer?

Not mining, because the only minerals here are a little copper and a little bauxite. Not land reform, because nearly all farmland is already cut up. How about education? Trained Haitians are in great demand, but experts say it's about twice as hard to attack illiteracy here as in the rest of the hemisphere. Although French is Haiti's official language, teaching it in a rural school is like teaching a foreign tongue. Nine out of ten Haitians peak only a French-like conglomeration known as Creole, which is essentially not a written language.

Despite everything, there are some slight possibilities for a better future. A quarter of the national revenue usually comes from American tourists, but since the Cuban crisis last October this source has been a dribble. If the Haitians get around to building their long-planned jet airport, the flow of tourists might be greater than ever. At least that would help the government, the beggars and the luxury hotels in Port-au-Prince. And if Duvalier's government should fall, his successor would probably get U.S. foreign aid, which might be used to encourage or establish canneries, processing plants, and other job-producing industries based on agriculture.

Someone has calculated that the average Haitian cow weighs exactly 598 pounds, but with feeding she would be healthier. And if Haitian coffee were cultivated instead of grown wild, the yearly crop would easily double. More to the point, many a Haitian 5-year-old has a swollen belly and skinny legs because of malnutrition. He'd be appreciably better off if his mother stopped believing bananas are unhealthy.

If dreams of a better future are what block out communism, the barriers here are dangerously weak.

The Bloody Regime of Janos Kadar in Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I know many of my colleagues share my concern over the administration's efforts to recognize the bloody regime of Janos Kadar in Hungary. The State Department has written a propaganda paper on the Kadar regime as part of the softening up process.

In this connection, I am sure my colleagues will be interested in excerpts from a letter I received from one of my constituents who knows of the situation in Hungary through intimate knowledge. I feel his views accurately reflect the thinking of many people who know through firsthand experience the suffering of the Hungarian people under Communist rule:

> DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is with anxiety that I read that the State Department is circulating a pamphlet to sell to Congress and to the American people the idea of recognition of the Communist regime of Janos Kadar, of Hungary.
>
> If this administration succeeds in this action, the United States will be the one who threw the last shovel of earth on the grave of martyrs for freedom who, it seems, sacrificed their lives in vain.
>
> This administration already committed the unpardonable sin of allowing the removal of the Hungarian question from the U.N. agenda and of putting it into the do-nothing Moscow oriented hands of the Secretary General. The recognition of Kadar would completely extinguish all hopes for freedom of the enslaved people behind the Iron Curtain.
>
> I as a Hungarian born but now an American citizen ask you to do everything in your power to prevent this atrocious action by the President.
>
> I can prove from letters received that life in Hungary is as miserable as before and any softening in attitude is superficial and is advanced in order to gain this moral victory—diplomatic recognition by the U.S.A.
>
> Furthermore may I bring to your attention the report that appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on the sufferings of Hungarians of Transylvania ruled by Rumania. The report tells how the Rumanians in their hatred toward the 2 million Hungarians imprison them by the thousands, deport them to the malaria inflicted delta of the Danube, and execute them for no more reason than for their being Hungarians. In other words, Rumania is practicing genocide. The situation is so unbearable that the Hungarian clergy turned to Russia for help. The clergy asked for annexation of Transylvania by Russia. Imagine this.
>
> Please look into this situation and do everything in your power to stop this double oppression, Communist and Rumanian, of Hungarians in Transylvania.

Space Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the relationship between industry and Government is a subject of continuing study as new responsibilities reach proportions that were undreamed of only a decade ago. The effects of accelerating Government programs are felt in every aspect of our economy and our educational system, and have left unanswered many questions of policy and direction and unsolved many problems of potentially serious consequence.

Recently the Stanford Research Institute of California completed a 374-page study of this relationship as it affects the new aerospace industries. The recommendations in the report call for action by industry and Government to improve efficiency, reduce costs and provide better aerospace products. This is rapidly becoming a very expensive industry in which the taxpayer has a very substantial interest, and the extent and scope of the program has become a matter of increasing concern.

The Stanford study has been summarized and its recommendations clearly presented in an industrial publication. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the summary article entitled "Aerospace Economics," which appears in the magazine Aerospace, June 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AEROSPACE ECONOMICS

("It is the practice of the U.S. Government to depend primarily upon private industry for the conception, the research and development and the production of defense and space systems. The achievements of industry have helped to preserve the security and the international technical reputation of the country. However, many representatives of both industry and Government believe that the industry-Government relationship is not as creative, productive or rewarding to the parties involved as it should be."—From the preface to the Stanford Research Institute report.)

A detailed analysis of "The Industry-Government Aerospace Relationship," just completed by Stanford Research Institute, emphasizes there are "significant and difficult" problems that must be overcome if the relationship is to continue fully to meet its promise.

The Menlo Park, Calif., research organization, working under a contract from the Aerospace Industries Association, declares in its report that only a limited segment of U.S. private industry is equipped to develop the hardware needed for defense and space operations. SRI states that current requirements for facilities, talents and technology are so specialized and extensive "that there is little alternative but for the companies involved to continue to devote their principal attention to Government contracts." SRI points out that aerospace firms "must be ready to fulfill Government requirements for hardware because they are the only major source and yet be flexible enough to survive if Government demands slacken."

During the 45 years since World War I, SRI indicates, the aerospace industry can look back on four major accomplishments:

It has successfully applied advanced technology to hardware.

It has produced large quantities of such hardware for its principal customer, the Government.

It has survived periods of great uncertainty and very little business.

It has adapted itself readily to the technical challenges of the space age.

SRI says the fact that this transition was accomplished "is a tribute to the industry's management, as well as to the many far-sighted Government officials with whom the industry has worked." The industry's history is one of change, SRI adds, "with its managements' attention caught up in the rapid expansion and precipitous contraction of business as well as with dramatic advances in technology."

The report cites the conflicts and frictions that result from differing objectives of our economic and political systems as reflected in the industry-Government aerospace relationship and suggests that the preponderance of bargaining strength is on the Government's side. The United States has "strength through control of funds, definition of goals, timing and technique, encouragement of competition, participation in management, the application of political pressures and power to terminate contracts."

According to SRI, the industry's chief balancing force lies in the fact that it "retains most of the capability, initiative, and creativeness to accomplish the complex tasks that appear necessary to assure the Nation's survival." SRI also states, "It is industry that is supposed to be able to utilize the Nation's resources of manpower, money, and material in the most efficient ways. It is industry that is in a position to recognize the real cost and time delays involved in the Government's attempts to utilize defense and space contracts to achieve social and economic ends. I is industry, not Government, that could more aggressively lead the way in developing newer and more efficient means of reaching hardware goals." The Stanford study calls on the aerospace industry to recognize these responsibilities and challenges and urges that aerospace firms not dissipate their talents by defending themselves occasionally without justification and often ineffectively against what they consider overregulation and overmanagement by the Government.

The SRI study group reports 12 trends now influence the relationship between the industry and the Government. The changing relationship is caused by:

(1) An increasing national and international pressure for spectacular technical advances.

(2) A decreasing requirement for volume production of system hardware and an increasing attention to research and development.

(3) A reduction in the number of large systems authorized and funded.

(4) A move toward making single systems fill multiservice needs.

(5) Greater attention to system definition prior to contracting.

(6) A centralization of major procurement decisions in the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

(7) An increasing emphasis on competitive award of contracts.

(8) Increasing pressure for more general geographic distribution of contracts.

(9) Increasing us of cost-plus-incentive-fee contracts rather than cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts.

(10) Increasing pressure on industry to assume a greater share of the risks in defense-space activity.

(11) Increasing detailing of procurement regulations and closer Government supervision of contractor activities.

(12) Increasing military attention to relatively unsophisticated, conventional warfare systems.

Cited as "major problems now present in the industry-Government aerospace relationship" are:

Industry consideration that its technical performance, costs, income, and reputation are being affected adversely by overregulation, conflicting regulations, ineffective administration of regulations, close (and not always capable) Government surveillance of its activities and burdening of the procurement process with socioeconomic objectives.

The attitude of many Government officials, based on past experience, that without close supervision or risk-carrying incentives, industry cannot always be depended upon to fulfill its contractual obligations on time or at reasonable cost.

The general belief of industry executives that the Government's often inconsistent, loosely specified, but increasingly stringent attitude concerning allowable costs is detrimental to the industry's well-being.

Disagreement between industry and Government over the profit rate that constitutes an adequate return. This disagreement stems largely from varying opinions concerning the extent of risks borne by the industry and industry's cost in maintaining and advancing technical capability.

The absence of a "free-market" environment in which the industry and Government do business, which requires special attention to the balancing of capacity with requirements. The means to accomplish this desirable objective have yet to be resolved.

In trying to explain the reasons why these problems exist, SRI researchers pinpoint:

(1) The seeming lack of complete mutual confidence and respect between industry and Government.

(2) Absence of a clear understanding and general acceptance of industry's and Government's proper roles in the relationship by all levels of the business community and by Federal employees involved.

(3) Industry's failure to appreciate fully the nature of the often delicate interactions that must take place between Government agencies in reaching decisions of importance to the relationship. Also, industry may not fully realize the full significance to Government officials involved or to the industry itself of the unfavorable reactions generated by contract schedule slippages and overexpenditures.

(4) The failure of Government representatives, in turn, to recognize or admit to the impact on industry's performance of conflicting, vague, voluminous, and changing regulations, and their inconsistent interpretation and administration.

(5) A tendency on the part of the (military) services as buying agences to devote too little attention to the formulation of requirements, thereby specifying needs too generally, using the need for action and flexibility as justification. Auditing of technical factors is difficult.

(6) In contrast, cost and contract audits are easily and frequently made. The result may be that Congress and the buying agencies pay too much attention to preventive legislation and regulation. In this way the transgressions or failures of some become the bases for continuing burdens and expense to all.

(7) Congress, in attempting to protect the public interest, has enacted legislation and established agencies whose subsequent actions, vis-a-vis industry, are not fully coordinated and are frequently conflicting.

(8) The flexible CPFF contracts applied to programs involving high technological risk have led to some inefficient practices and increased costs in both industry and Government.

(9) The detrimental impact on delivery schedules and cost targets of program changes encouraged by generalized specifications may not be fully appreciated by either industry or Government.

(10) Even though some key Government procurement officials admit to overmanaging industry and express the desire to disengage, steps to do so have been limited to the application of CPIF-type contracts and study of regulations that might be relaxed when such contracts are employed.

(11) The Government's reduction of facility funds and limitations on progress payments are shifting to industry a greater burden in maintaining an adequate aerospace capability. The shift is well underway. However, there has not been agreement on the extent to which the risk should be shared between industry and Government or on the level of industry compensation warranted.

(12) The relationship between industry and Government until recently was of great material and economic consequence only during actual war. Major industrial activity in support of the national defense in peacetime accounted for a relatively small portion of the Nation's gross national product (GNP). Since Korea, however, world tensions and weapons capabilities have required the maintenance of an aerospace industry capability that alone generates about 3 percent of our gross national product and an even greater proportion of U.S. manufacturing volume and employment. Thus, location and relative efficiency of this industrial operation have become matters of current national interest and concern, and some political activity. This has increased the stresses and strains in the relationship.

(13) However much it might wish to the contrary a major portion of the industry is not free enterprise in the classic sense of the term and does not operate as such. Because of its almost complete dependence on the Government, it seldom takes firm positions in opposition to the Government's desires, however justified.

On the matter of regulating the aerospace industry, the SRI study points out that this control is not exercised by an independent commission (e.g., Civil Aeronautics Board, Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Power Commission) before which the public and industry can present their cases. SRI reports this control is accomplished "unilaterally through procurement regulations and other provisions that may be included in Government contracts." The result of these Government actions, according to SRI, is they "to some degree transform the members of the aerospace industry into closely controlled agents of the Government for the operation of arsenals for modern weaponry and space exploration." SRI suggests that the anomaly is, "the aerospace firms are expected to act with the drive, efficiency, and flexibility usually attributed to private enterprise."

SRI's research team suggests that industry "learn how to retain the advantages that private enterprise offers society, while serving the vital needs of the Nation and selling to a customer with formidable bargaining power." The Government at the same time is urged to learn to distinguish "between those regulations that protect the public's financial interests without jeopardizing the national security and those regulations where short-run financial savings are outweighed by the loss of industrial incentive and creative ability."

The report declares that partly because of failures on the industry's part the aerospace industry currently "is overwhelmed with Government redtape and surveillance," adding that this is "a period of discomfort and disenchantment on all sides."

Noting that Government agencies and the aerospace industry work closely in research and development and weapon system procurement, and that industry is considered essential as a source for new ideas, SRI researchers nevertheless emphasize that initiative for even the first step—demonstration of feasibility—normally rests with the Government because of high costs. This single fact, the report states, "more than any other, has contributed to industry's uncertainty about its future business." SRI also points out that managements are often more concerned with getting the contract than managing it because "past performance is not necessarily a major factor in the awarding of new business" and cites the current lack "in the Defense Department, at least, of a reasonable and generally applied method of contractor performance evaluation."

The SRI report indicates that the industry's future cannot be predicted with any degree of certainty. Relations with other nations and space progress will be determining factors. Governmental efforts to centralize control of procurement, limit the number of weapon systems, increase competition, supervise work in process and make greater use of incentive-type contracts will also be influential. SRI's report concludes: "Whether or not, in the face of these moves, the industry can maintain its initiative and unique abilities remains to be seen."

Dr. Lanier—Bay County Radio Bible Class

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to submit for printing in the Record a letter from a good friend and a constitutent. He is Mr. George D. Lanier. I am highly impressed by the sincerity and broad understanding expressed in his letter and by his fine and generous attitude toward others. Mr. Lanier is one of the leading lights in the Bay County Radio Bible Class, an inspiring interdenominational movement which could well be initiated in other communities. It is good to get a letter like this.

June 11, 1963.

Hon. Bob Sikes,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Sikes: Thank you very much for the "Bob Sikes Report," I have enjoyed its contents very much as contents denote the very thing you represent and that is progress.

There are no people more deserving than the people of Holmes and Washington Counties, their gratitude for you and your efforts in their behalf will never die. Your giving credit where credit is due concerning the dog fly control exploits your concern for the commendable efforts of others who also unselfishly promote progress for the welfare of the general public. The Naval Aviation Museum will be a credit to the South and to west Florida, I do not think there is anything that gives an individual more ambition than to view that which has pioneered success in any field and being an old Navy man I can be prejudiced in my feelings for those who had the foresight to preserve the past with such an establishment.

Your expressions of the late Pope John XXIII is what makes democracy so wonderful, when we can see the good in others, and then be able to express it. Being a true Protestant does not close my eyes that there is good in all realms of religion. Some of my best friends, if not the best are Roman Catholics and they are the kind of people that respect a man for his efforts toward unity regardless of faith. I too, believe that Pope John was such a man. The one valuable asset I possess is the ability to appreciate men who humble themselves unselfishly through life and even into death, before humanity so that humanity can thrive in unity with the abundance of substance provided for by the same Almighty Creator, and to appreciate these men who have used their talents in the exposition of that abundance for those who have not developed their own talents enough to do it themselves.

Enclosed and accompanied by this letter is a list of men who compose a Sunday school class, men of many different categories but who in harmony express themselves individually in the eyes of the Almighty but who join together as a body in doing so. All these men so far as I know are very ardent friends of yours. Some have risen and fallen within the eyes of the public, others have never accomplished anything of material value, several have, but in unity they all seek spiritual value and within the realms of the class there are none who consider themselves better than the other but who strive to help the other when such help is needed.

A man who saw such a need for this type of unity is a man who knows the ultimate of success, yet who humbles himself to recognize the poorest member of it and also contribtues to the support of the independance of the class which is broadcast each Sunday from the courtroom of the Bay County judges office via radio station WDLP. A man who is physically handicapped but by his relentless courage thrives from the inspiration of doing good by others in his final years of life which he is becoming more conscious of as days go by.

Mr. A. M. Lewis, Sr., the man I speak of, a man who has individually contributed as much or more to the growth of Bay County and Panama City than any other man in the area, needs some sort of recognition before his death in appreciation for his accomplishment within the realms of progress, not as an individual but for the population as a whole.

Each time one of his friends pass into the great beyond, his individual loss is as if he had lost his personal fortune of material wealth, which I'm sure he would rather lose.

There were times when honor and tribute were given to such people as Mr. Lewis; his life began during this era and I personally feel that his life would be more complete if some public recognition could be bestowed upon him while he yet lives.

I would like to see unity in the Panama City area and firmly believe that this would be a step toward such unity. I believe harmony would prevail where it has failed if public participation could bring about togetherness when such a move is one direction that being not the honor of an individual, but honoring the accomplishments of the individual when such accomplishments have honored the public as has been the case of Mr. Lewis' accomplishments.

Thank you for your patience in reading this letter, I remain,

Your friend,

GEORGE D. LANIER.

Max Rogal: Outstanding Pittsburgh Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tributes to Max Rogal, outstanding Pittsburgh citizen:

[From the Weekly, Feb. 15, 1963]

A LETTER TO MAX ROGAL

FEBRUARY 6, 1963.

DEAR UNCLE MAX: This is from the young lady to whom you were so nice to at the Y this past Sunday. I would like to thank you for myself and my friends for treating us to lunch. All of us hope to see you at the Y some other Sunday, for we are always down there for the Keystone A.Z.A. basketball games. Thank you again.

Yours very truly,

SHARLENE M.

This letter was addressed to Max Rogal at the Y and received on Wednesday, February 6, the day our beloved "Uncle Max" passed away. It is a simple letter from a teenage girl. No elaborate encomium, no flowery phases, very brief.

In a sense it expresses the meaning of Max Rogal's life—his love and concern for people, especially the young and the old.

Max Rogal wanted to make everybody happy. His cheerful smile lit up the corridors of hospitals and breathed a ray of cheerfulness into the lives of the crippled and infirm, young and old. His jaunty exuberance at the Y every Sunday and most Saturdays was a highlight in the experiences of the day to those with whom he came into contact. You knew Max was there and you were happy for it. He was warm, outgoing, encouraging, sympathetic, kind, generous, lovable. He was Max Rogal.

When Max walked into any room you knew he was there. He lit up the place with his broad smile, his arm-around-the-shoulder friendliness. Max had more friends than any one we knew. And his friends were loyal and devoted.

His warmth and sympathy for others frequently hid some of his personal pains. No one knew when Max was upset, or disturbed or not feeling well. He turned his pains outward, he focused his worries on others, and he gave of himself for their happiness.

When you come to the Y next Sunday, Sharlene, you will see Uncle Max, if you look hard enough. He will be in the coffee shop, in the lobby, in the corridors, in the health club—his white linen handkerchief hanging from his breast pocket, his warm, jovial smile and rich friendly voice greeting the young boys and girls and the older men and women and the little children and their mothers. Greeting them, trying to make them a little happier, making them feel wanted and needed.

The spirit of Max Rogal will always be at the Y. Because the people at the Y, people everywhere, have felt the love and the spirit of our Uncle Max.

And so the Sharlenes of the Y, and the boys and girls who felt his warm touch, and the men and women who knew his friendship, the leaders and the followers, the great and the small, all of us join in the sorrow of his family and friends in mourning his departure, and together we express our thanks and our pride for the privilege of having been able to share his light and warmth even for so short a time on this earth.

A TRIBUTE FROM THE Y BOARD OF DIRECTORS: MAX ROGAL

(By Harry R. Savage, president of the Y)

What causes a man to actually devote his life to his fellows? Is it the desire to treat others as one would be treated? Is it a glorification and sanctification of life and a desire to guarantee it to others?

No assembly hall in town could even momentarily house the recipients of his beneficence. If there was such an assemblage, many would have to be wheeled or carried in, for the sick, in body, in spirit, the impoverished in any way were his concern.

He was the epitome of the ancient concept of Zdakkah. To him it was only right to help, righteous to give of himself and of his possessions. His only selfishness lay in that he wanted to help more than anyone else. He seemed almost driven by the need to help. No one will ever be able to catalog his total beneficence, because, despite the normal publicity for certain acts, more were performed in silence and anonymity. He enjoyed the later arrived at circumstances of his life which allowed him to carry out his yearning to live righteously—to give Zdakkah, to help, because it is only right to help.

He was unusually sentimental and self-effacing. He was immediately and deeply touched by anyone who remembered anything about him, as though he wasn't worth the effort of their remembering.

He loved the Yiddish folk and its lore. As was true of most of his generation, he had not the opportunity to acquire great academic armament. Nevertheless, he respected and understood the life of the intellect and made it possible for many others to share in it. He had an amazing facility for putting things into the proper order of rightness and goodness.

But above all else, he saw situations in relation to the individual person. Even though he had frequently to toe-in with a cause for the many, his greatest concern was always with the condition of the one, the single, the person by himself. One might miss seeing this about him because if one added up the total of single individuals about whom he was concerned, it began to assume the quantity and quality of a mass of people.

If he would sometimes trip over the foul lines of the social service agencies, it was because he didn't want to know about any ground rules other than: if a man needed help you gave it to him. He was a person of genuine concern and especially on a Ponim El Ponim, face to face—basis. He was the indispensable dispenser and he could not see the need for any fancy "chochmehs" if it was obvious to him that there was an immediate need to be met. He was a "one man rescue squad" operating 24 hours a day.

He was Max Rogal. There is no other like him.

JUDGES' CHAMBERS,
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS,
Pittsburgh, Pa., February 20, 1963.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR JIM: Max Rogal was more than an ordinary citizen in the Pittsburgh community, where he was born and lived his life since January 6, 1900. Max was a symbol in the community, a symbol of love for his fellow man. He firmly believed in the Biblical philosophy: "Do not hate thy brother in thy heart but love thy neighbor as thyself." And Max loved them all. He was Uncle Max or Cousin Max to everybody, regardless of race, color, or creed. He loved children. This year he was the third highest newsboy in the Pittsburgh Press Newsboys contest, raising funds for the Children's Hospital, and in 10 years he raised over $107,000 for the Children's Hospital; and Mr. Rom, the superintendent of the Children's Hospital, and all the young patients knew and idolized Uncle Max. Uncle Max had a great interest in the Western Pennsylvania School for the Blind in Oakland, Pittsburgh, Pa., and was a frequent visitor and the minute he entered the school all the blind youngsters knew it and a wild cry by all was Uncle Max is here. He was a frequent visitor there and the Children's Hospital and brought gifts every time he visited the school and the hospital.

To every adult he was Cousin Max, and to every youngster in Allegheny County, Uncle Max's voice is now stilled, only a memory of a great living humanitarian.

He was first vice president of the Montefiore Hospital; president of the Y.M. and W.H.A., Pittsburgh; member of many organizations, including the Judge Samuel A. Weiss B'nai B'rith Lodge No. 2382, and the Oakland Lodge, F. & A.M. No. 176, and a partner of the Rogal Co. insurance firm, Pittsburgh. He leaves surviving a widow, Leah Rogal, two children, Mrs. Art Fiedel, and Mrs. Jack Coppersmith, and four grandchildren.

We all feel that only the body has died; his spirit will always live in the shelter of God's love and mercy.

May God always bless the soul of Uncle Max Rogal.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL A. WEISS.

For a Mess of Pottage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a very thoughtful editorial from the Spokane Valley Herald, one of the truly fine weekly newspapers in my district.

The editorial poignantly points up the question: "Does Government Need To Down-Grade Self-Reliance in its Strivings To Promise Security." It goes further to suggest clearer lines of philosophies between Republicans and Democrats. This would make our political campaigns more meaningful to citizens and more constructive for our future.

The editorial follows:

BONING UP IS NEEDED

The people of America have been engaged in a heated debate for three decades as to the direction government and economic progress should take. On the one hand there have been those who feel, as did the inspired little group of men who conceived our form of government, that a society which gets along with minimal government will, in the long run, furnish the environment for the greatest economic and cultural advancement for the greatest number of its citizens. On the other hand have been those who show little faith in the ability of people to care for their own needs and who feel that it will always take an elite group invested with the powers of government to tell them what is best for them.

This is not a new debate. In Frederic Bastiat's book, "The Law" appears this opening statement:

"The law perverted. And the police powers of the state perverted along with it. The law, I say, not only turned from its proper purpose but made to follow an entirely contrary purpose. The law becomes the weapon of every kind of greed. Instead of checking crime, the law itself is guilty of the evils it is supposed to punish.

"If this is true, it is a serious fact, and moral duty requires me to call the attention of my fellow citizens to it."

This could have been written by a citizen today, alarmed at the growing power of government over its citizens, and one looking back to the days in this country when federal government was a minor factor in the lives of the citizens. As a matter of fact, this statement was written in France in 1850 following the revolution of February 1848, when France was rapidly turning to complete socialism.

The other night, Congressman TOM PELLY of Seattle spoke to a gathering sponsored by the Spokane Young Republicans. He too, was concerned with the encroaching tentacles of the Federal octopus; and he, like Frederic Bastiat, was sounding the alarm against authoritarianism and totalitarianism. While listening to him, it dawned on us why the spokesmen for the minimal theory of government seem to not be making converts.

Congressman PELLY's speech was studded with statements like these: "We Republicans believe in decentralization of government." "We Republicans are alarmed at the growing national debt, deficit spending and the fiscal irresponsibility being exhibited in Washington." "We believe that only under the free enterprise system does the standard of living of a nation's people realize its full potential."

In these generalities may lie the seeds of Republican failure to capture the pools, because what the Republicans are failing to do is to appeal to that very trait of human self-interest which they seek to preserve. Voters also have self-interests. The Democrats have appealed to these for 30 years with profitable results. When Democratic candidates tell groups of voters that he will work for their material well being through government handouts, they find they are talking to responsive ears. The Republican generalities don't have that personal-gain appeal. Sure, the former may concede he can find himself better off in the long run through the operations of a truly free economy, but he's interested in shorter-term gains. He wants to know what you can do for him sooner. Besides, think of the painful transition period which would come if we did abandon government paternalism.

It seems to us that what the Republican candidates are going to have to do is become much better versed in the mechanics of the free enterprise system so they can prove positively that each voter will be better off if restraints are put on Government; if the free market is allowed to operate; if competition is unfettered. Republican candidates must be able to answer all questions that are tossed them as to the merits of the American system as it was originally conceived. They must be able to devastate with irrefutable logic the fuzzy theories of those who seek to mislead us that there is an easy way to material and spiritual progress.

All these things can be done, but it is going to take more homework than Republican hopefuls have shown they have been doing.

Along with the spreading of the free economy gospel, Republicans have another powerful weapon of persuasion which they have not fully capitalized upon—the horrible end result of encroaching government—slavery. This is no theory. It is being demonstrated to hundreds of millions of people in many nations. Everywhere in the world we can see people who are the victims of governmental tyranny. Republicans should never let Americans forget this. The fact that millions have and are risking their lives to flee the all-encompassing governments of East Germany and China are cruel, hard facts which cannot be denied. The plight of these people and their desperate attempts to free themselves should constantly be held up before the American voter to remind him what a precious thing freedom is.

Exploitation of strong and correct principles of this kind is the only way the Republicans can hope to capture the favor of the American voter and they are going to have to begin right now.

Reports to the United Nations Trusteeship Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I offer the fourth of a series of articles presented to members of the United Nations Trusteeship Council. In this article, High Commissioner Goding reports on the progress made in educational and public health fields within the Trust Territory of the Pacific islands during the past year. In this regard Mr. Goding spoke as follows:

REPORTS TO THE UNITED NATIONS TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

EDUCATION

As I have already indicated, we are placing major emphasis on greatly expanded support of public elementary education in the territory. Of the present year's budget of $15 million, over $4 million is being used to construct some 240 classrooms and some 100 housing units for an approximate 140 U.S. elementary schoolteachers. The bulk of the elementary school classroom construction and teacher housing must, of necessity in most districts for the first year, be in or near the district center, but our plans call for extension of the program until all public elementary schools are included. For the coming fiscal year starting July 1, we have requested an additional $4 million to continue the elementary school construction program. Thus, this coming year we hope to construct 248 additional new classrooms making a grand total of 488 new elementary school classrooms. Some 128 additional teacher housing units will be erected to make a total of 268 teacher houses.

For education program operations for the coming year, we have requested $2,280,000 which is an increase of $1,200,000 over the present level of education funding. Most of this program increase will be utilized in employment of approximately 140 elementary school teachers to staff the elementary schools which we are building in our accelerated education development program. The following year, funds will be requested for an additional 100 U.S. teachers to reach a total of 240. Within the next 2 years there will be at least one U.S. teacher teaching in English in every public elementary school in the territory. Concurrently, a program of upgrading present Micronesian elementary teachers will be carried out. This program will include inservice training on the job, special summer training sessions in the districts, attendance at our Teacher Institute in Ponape and a vastly increased program of college training for present and prospective teachers in Guam, Hawaii and mainland United States.

The scope and magnitude of the accelerated elementary education program is such that it is not possible in this brief exposition to convey details. For those members of the council who may be interested in specific details as to implementation as to degree and rate of speed of penetration into the outlying areas, I shall be pleased to furnish such details during the question period.

This tremendous increase of support of elementary school education will, of course, have great impact on all our other educational programs.

Many recommendations made by this council over the past several years are incorporated in our accelerated education program and are either in the process of implementation or soon will be. One of these to which a great deal of attention has been given is that of the teaching of English and of using English as the medium of instruction in the elementary schools. This program already is being implemented at selected elementary schools in the various districts and it will become a reality for all of our public elementary schools as U.S. teachers arrive and start teaching. We intend to have as many as we can of the 140 U.S. schoolteachers slated for the first year of operation on the job in the elementary schools with the opening of the school year this September. A crash program of classroom construction, teacher housing, and teacher recruitment currently is in full swing.

The vastness of our area, the differences inherent between the tiny low coral atolls and the sizable, mountainous high islands, the difficulties of transportation, will mean faster pace of development in some areas than in others. I assure the members of the council, though, that no area will be overlooked and that the children in the remote coral atolls far from the district center will as promptly as possible have the same elementary school opportunities as will their cousins in the more urban district centers.

Concern was expressed at last year's meeting by some members that the entrance age of elementary school children, which we had lowered to 7 years, still was high and that the entrance age should be set at 6 years. It is intended to lower the compulsory age of entrance to 6 years as our facilities permit. To require compulsory school attendance at 6 before we have sufficient teachers or classrooms would gain little. I am confident, however, that we will be able to place the entrance age at 6 years during this coming year. Currently, there are hundreds of children of 6 years of age in our public schools. I might further add that our thinking on the elementary school level is going beyond this. Under study is the feasibility of eventually establishing a preprimary year of school which would concentrate on teaching children oral English before they enter first grade.

Implementation moved steadily forward on the establishment of consolidated junior-senior high schools. In all districts other than Yap, the 10th grade was started in September 1962 and the 11th grade will be opened this coming September. Yap will start the 10th grade this fall. This past year, some of the 10th grade Yap students enrolled in the Pacific Island Central School in Ponape, while a number went to Palau to take the special vocational arts course in the Palau High School. By the fall of 1964, all districts should have full 4-year high schools in operation. Replanning of junior-senior high school building needs indicated the need for additional classroom buildings and dormitories for all districts. Some of these additional high school buildings had been completed or were nearing completion at the close of the fiscal year. A new classroom building was completed and a vocational shop building is under construction at Truk. In the Marshalls, two new classroom buildings and a school administration building were added to the high school unit. A new classroom building and a vocational arts building were completed at the Palau District High School.

The Pacific Central Island School continued in Ponape, but with a somewhat changed makeup since most of the entering freshmen, other than Yapese students, were 10th grade students from Ponape. Within another 2 years, the main student body at PICS will be predominantly Ponapean and the original Pacific Islands School will have become the Ponape District High School. A new post-high school unit, however, was added during the year. This was the interdistrict teacher training institute, which combines high school and post-graduate high school work with specialized training in teacher education. The teacher training institute was established at PICS because of this high school's somewhat central location and the established facilities already there. Additionally, a boys' dormitory and classroom building were constructed on the PICS campus for the institute. The aim of the institute is to upgrade schoolteachers. Teachers who do not have a full high school degree can work toward high school accreditation as well as earn credits in the teacher training institute.

Increased emphasis was given during the year to students in the field of higher education who were studying outside the territory. Some 239 students were in high school outside the territory, with all but 13 of these being in Guam school. Most were on sponsorship arrangements whereby a student lived with a private family.

The trust territory administration provided a full-time student counselor to look after their welfare, set up a system of reduced fares on the territory's planes and ships, and, additionally, in January 1963, the administration agreed to provide free transportation to Guam for all bona fide sponsored students.

Some 126 students also were studying in institutions of college level on Guam or abroad during the year. Of these, 65 were on full scholarship from the administration. During the year, work began on a college dormitory at the College of Guam. Although primarily for scholarship students, the dormitory will be open to other trust territory students as well. A major increase in scholarships for the forthcoming school year will come about since the number of district scholars has been increased from three per district to five per district starting with the college term which opens this month. Thus, there will be a 60-percent increase in the number of Government scholarship students this coming school year.

PUBLIC HEALTH

Two new modern hospitals were put into operation in the trust territory during the past year, one in Majuro in the Marshall Islands and the other in Saipan in the Mariana Islands. These, together with the new hospital that was opened in Palau 18 months ago, provide modern hospital facilities in three of our six districts.

New hospitals in the other three districts will be constructed within the next 2 or 3 years. Planning for hospital units in Truk and Ponape is now underway and construction of the new Truk District Hospital should be initiated during the next few months. Also, site studies for a new hospital in Yap have started, although actual construction will not be undertaken for another 2 years.

Some additional facilities are required on the three new hospitals already in use. The $900,000 hospital complex that was opened in Saipan last September received considerable damage during the recent typhoon. Repair of the buildings was started immediately after the storm under the rehabilitation program of the Office of Emergency Planning and is expected to be complete within the next month. The hospital in the Marshalls is completed except for the construction of a few minor subsidiary buildings; and a new kitchen and dining hall wing is nearing completion in the hospital in Palau.

In addition to district hospitals, our public health expansion program calls for field hospitals to be located in key spots of population concentration away from the district centers. Three such subhospitals are now in operation at Rota, Kusaie, and Ebeye in the Kwajalein Atoll. The latter facility was completely renovated and modernized during the past year. These together with nearly 100 outlying island dispensaries and the increased personnel needs of the new district hospitals, require the training of additional medical personnel—doctors, technicians, and nurses. In fact, the shortage of trained personnel, especially nurses, is affecting not only our hospital needs but our plans for improved outisland health services.

Various steps are being taken to meet these growing demands. Our medical scholarship program is being increased. Presently 10 medical students are attending schools in the Philippines, Hawaii, and the United States working toward medical degrees. Also in process are programs for inservice and outside postgraduate training for our present medical officers. The recruiting of six doctors from the United States is now underway, each to be a specialist in a different field of medicine. These will provide further and continuing inservice training in their special fields to our Micronesian doctors, one to be stationed in each of the six districts and to be rotated at intervals.

The trust territory continues to be faced with an acute shortage of graduate nurses. Not only do we not have enough graduate nurses but there is a constant attrition in the ranks, for evidently the young men of the territory have found that nurses make excellent wives and mothers. We need at least 20 new graduate nurses a year for the next 5 years merely to meet the minimum expansion needs in all districts.

To meet this demand, the Trust Territory School of Nursing, presently located in Palau, will be moved next month to the island of Saipan where temporary buildings will be occupied until permanent buildings can be constructed. Work already has started on the first of the new permanent School of Nursing buildings which are to be an adjunct to the new Saipan hospital. The immediate move to temporary buildings will make it possible to double the present enrollment from 15 to 30 and further expansion to 50 to 60 students will be possible as soon as the new buildings are finished.

In the field of dental services, one of the most important events of the year was the graduation of 10 students from the school of dental nursing in December 1962. This was the school's first graduation. A new class of 10 students enrolled for the new 2-year course in January of 1963. Preventive dental treatment was expanded not expanded not only at district centers but in all outlying areas during the year.

During March and April 1963, a public health task force team under interdepartmental sponsorship visited the territory to study and observe our public health program. This visit was the result of one of the recommendations of the President's Task Force on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The team, consisting of a U.S. Public Health expert, a sanitarian and nurse consultant, was accompanied by the program officer of the Office of Territories, and is now engaged in preparing a report on their findings. We are looking forward with much interest to the team's report and recommendations since we are seeking at all times to improve the health service in the territory.

It is with regret that I must report on two events in public health that were severe blows to the Trust Territory. The first of these tragic events was an outbreak, in early January, 1963, of type I virus polio at Ebeye, Kwajalein Atoll, in the Marshall Islands district. More than 200 cases of poliomyelitis with 11 deaths resulted in the district, 88 percent of which were children under the age of 7 years. Some 50 patients, nearly all below the age of 7, were left with significant residual paralysis.

An immediate mass vaccination program using Sabin oral vaccine and application of strict quarantine regulations confined the epidemic to the Marshall Islands. A mass oral vaccination program also was at once launched throughout the rest of the Territory for type I polio and in all districts the final stages of the mass innoculation program for type II and type III polio currently is underway. When this is finished sometime next month, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands will be one of the very areas in the world where 100 percent polio vaccination coverage has been accomplished.

Again, when our need was urgent, we received prompt and generous support and assistance from the Department of Interior, the U.S. Navy, the Transport Co. of Texas in Kwajalein, the Communicable Disease Control Center of the U.S. Public Health Service, from other agencies and from many generous individuals.

Equally important is the aid that has been pledged for the long-range rehabilitation program that will be needed for the afflicted children. Special polio clinic facilities will be constructed as the new Majuro Hospital, special equipment is being procured, and staff are receiving specialized training.

To help us meet the costs of long-range rehabilitation, we are receiving the unstinting support of the American Red Cross which is providing a physiotherapist, the national foundation which is providing services of specialized polio treatment teams, as well as transportation funds and funds to provide braces for children who will need special care and treatment in Honolulu. The Shriners Crippled Children's Hospital in Honolulu, for its part, has offered to provide hospitalization for those children who must be sent to Honolulu for specialized treatment. The bulk of the affected children, however, will be cared for and treated at the polio clinic we are adding to the new hospital in Majuro.

The other tragic event was the loss a month ago of our director of public health, the late Dr. Harrie E. Macdonald. More than any other person, he was responsible for the solid foundation of our present public health system. He had confidence and pride in the competence of our Micronesian doctors and in their ability to conduct public health programs in the districts. Having brought the Territory's Public Health Service to this point, he was working at the time of his death on the first phase of an expanded program of training for our Micronesian doctors.

LAND MATTERS

With the appointment of a Land and Claims Administrator on the headquarters staff, land matters of all types have been expedited during the past year.

The land dispute involving the entire island of Angaur in the Palau district and, dating from 1908 through the German and Japanese administrations, as well as ours, was brought on June 8, 1962, to a successful conclusion. Some 1,980 acres of land formerly held in public domain were deeded to private owners. A similar dispute of 20 years' duration, involving all of the Arakabesan Island in Palau, was settled in August 1962. Over 90 percent of Arakabesan Island was returned to private ownership and private claims to the remainder of the island were released. Homesteading in Palau also was expedited, with more than 1,700 acres being homesteaded and an additional 4,000 acres opened for homesteading on Babelthuap and Koror Islands.

In the Marshall Islands, eminent domain cases were heard by the High Court concerning Government use of land on three small islets in the Kwajalein Atoll. Judgment was entered in two cases and compensation allowed in the amount of $40,359.46 for use rights to 71.1 acres.

As the U.S. representative has already informed the council, legislation which would provide a means for judicial settlement of the land claims of Kwajalein Island and Dalap Island of Majuro Atoll is at present under consideration by the U.S. Congress. In brief, the bill would permit the claimants to file a petition with the U.S. Court of Claims for just comepnsation. It provides also for administrative settlement by the High Commissioner if the claimants desire to seek this procedure within limits of payment which are set forth in the bill.

This concludes my statement of the general trends in the political, social, and economic fields. We have had throughout the year the wholehearted support of the people of the territory. With this, and the continued aid of the administering authority, I have confidence that our programs will move forward with ever increasing speed on all fronts.

I am grateful for this opportunity to present this report, and I shall endeavor to provide, as far as I am able, any additional information which members of this council may desire.

Foreign Aid Program Biggest Flop in History, Says Passman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by the gentleman from Louisiana, OTTO E. PASSMAN, which was published recently, together with an editor's note, in the Times-Picayune of New Orleans, La., as well as other newspapers.

As the editor's note indicates, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] is the best qualified Member of the Congress to write and speak on this subject for he is the veteran chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee which deals directly with the annual multi-billion-dollar appropriations for the foreign handout program.

It is safe to say, Mr. Speaker, that because of Mr. PASSMAN's knowledge of this subject and his tenacity, together with the support that has been given him by some members of his subcommittee as well as the full Appropriations Committee, the taxpayers of the Nation have been saved hundreds of millions of dollars that would otherwise have been washed down the drain by the free-wheeling spenders.

The article follows:

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM BIGGEST FLOP IN HISTORY, SAYS PASSMAN

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Representative OTTO PASSMAN, Democrat, of Louisiana, is the foremost congressional critic of U.S. foreign assistance expenditures. As the 9-year chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and a 15-year member of the full committee, Representative PASSMAN has assembled a huge fund of facts on foreign aid. In this article especially written for Advance News Service, Mr. PASSMAN gives his views on the effectiveness of the program.)

(By Hon. OTTO E. PASSMAN, of Louisiana)

WASHINGTON.—After all these years of pouring out America's wealth and resources to countries all over the world through foreign aid, the vast scope of this immensely complex program—much, if not most, of which, indisputably, has been, and is, ill conceived, badly executed, unrealistic, and enormously wasteful—still is not generally understood by the public. So it is urgently important that every citizen should take a closer and more careful look at it.

Foreign aid since the end of World War II has cost the United States more than $120 billion (including assistance through international organizations, oversea military construction, and interest on the money we have borrowed to give away). And basically failing to accomplish its intended objectives, it has been the greatest foreign-policy flop in history. The evidence in support of this assertion is available in abundance, and needs only to be examined and analyzed.

Of the aggregate amount of our aid, $100 billion, in round figures, has been given out on a unilateral basis, going into 111 foreign nations and entities, including Communist, Communist-leaning, and so-called neutralist countries alike. In addition to this, indirect aid has been extended by the United States through capital investments, exceeding $5.1 billion in five different international financial institutions, which have, in turn, disbursed assistance totaling more than $7.5 billion.

OUTLAY LISTED

Since July 1, 1945, our country has put $44.7 billion of direct aid into Europe, $21.8 billion into the Far East, $17.8 billion into the Near East and South Asia, $6.8 billion into Latin America, $1.8 billion into Africa, and has distributed another $4 billion on a non-regional basis.

Twenty-two countries have each received more than $1 billion of this aid, ranging from $9.4 billion for France down to $1.1 billion for Norway—with, in descending order as to amounts, other recipients in this category being the United Kingdom, Italy, Korea, West Germany, China (Taiwan), India, Turkey, Japan, Greece, The Netherlands, Vietnam Yugoslovia, Belgium-Luxembourg, Brazil, Pakistan, the Philippines, Spain, Indochina, Iran, and Austria.

Thirty-one other nations have each received amounts ranging downward from $1 billion to $100 million, from $908 million to Denmark to more than $100 million to Panama, with the other recipients in between these two being Israel, Mexico, Thailand, Chile, Indonesia, Argentina, UAR (Egypt), Poland, Portugal, Peru, Laos, Colombia, Morocco, Jordan, Cambodia, Tunisia, Venezuela, Bolivia Afghanistan, Libya, Ethiopia, Guatemala, the Congo (Leopoldville), Ghana, Ireland, Ecuador, West Berlin, Liberia, and Sweden.

Thirty-three more countries (and entities) have received total sums ranging from $100 million down to $10 million each, and 25 others have each received up to as much as $10 million.

TREND UPWARD

But, even so, after all this money and all these years—and despite the seriously damaging drain the program is making on our economy—the trend for expanding foreign aid continues upward, rather than heading downward.

This year, for example, the United States is giving economic aid to at least 73 countries and seven entities and, fantastic though it is, military assistance to 70 countries. This program not only is uncontrolled, but it is uncontrollable; and it is imperative, in our own national interest, that it be drastically curtailed and lightly administered.

Substantially as a result of our aid, over the past 10 years U.S. gold reserves have been reduced from more than $23 billion to less than $16 billion and, while this has been going on, foreign "free-world" countries also have increased their short-term dollar credits from less than $11 billion to $25 billion.

In contrast, the United States is strugging under the burden of a borrowed-money public debt of $305 billion—which is some $25 billion more than the combined public debts of all the other 112 countries of the world—and, on top of that, has statutory obligations calling for the payout of money for services previously rendered amounting to approximately $746 billion. The two, together, make a real obligation for our Government already in existence amounting to the incomprehensible sum of $1 trillion, 51 billion.

DOLLARS GO OUT

During the past 13 years we have had a balance of payments deficit in every year but one, with the total of dollars going out of our country over the dollars coming in exceeding $24.3 billion. And, in addition to that alarming fact, which is attributable in large measure to foreign aid, our favorable balance of trade is steadily dwindling, as the United States becomes increasingly less competitive in world markets.

Many of the proponents of our foreign-aid program point to the fact that it amounts to but a relatively small percentage of our gross national product. While I do not regard this as a valid argument for this type of indiscriminate spending, it is well for us to note that of our $554 billion GNP last year, $137 billion of it was represented by taxes at the various levels of government.

Furthermore, if, for example, the 1940 price tags were placed on our 1962 output of goods and services, our GNP last year would have been only about $263 billion, and not $554 billion. Today's dollar is worth only about 44 cents as compared to the dollar in 1940, when our foreign aid was started prior to World War II, and the program since then has been a significant factor in this slashing, through inflation, of 56 cents from the dollar's purchasing power.

No other nation in the world, except the United States, is actually giving away its wealth, through foreign aid.

England and France have extended assistance of $1.4 and $3.1 billion, respectively, chiefly to their former colonies and dependencies. West Germany, Japan, Israel, and a few others are providing some foreign assistance in small amounts. But these five countries named have been direct postwar beneficiaries of our unilateral aid amounting to a total of more than $27.6 billion. Nevertheless, their aid to others has not been of the giveaway type.

REDS GIVE CREDITS

The Sino-Soviet bloc has also extended some credits for goods and services to other countries, on a relatively limited scale. The total for these authorizations for the 9 years through 1962 is reported at $5.1 billion, but of this sum only $1.3 billion has actually been provided. And none of it was put out as a gift.

All of these Soviet dealings have, in fact, involved either banker-type loans or profitable barter deals. The Soviets invariably expect repayment in needed usable goods and hard cash and, consequently, assess the capabilities of the various areas to which they extend credits according to their ability to pay.

On the other hand, we give our aid away outright or cloak the gifts in the guise of loans, most of which are completely phony.

They have a 40-year period for repayment, a 10-year period of grace before the recipient is supposed to start repaying anything at all, and then at the rate of 1 percent a year on the principal, with no interest charge (although a token service fee of three-fourths of 1 percent a year is imposed).

But that is only a part of the story of our so-called loans, another revealing part being that whatever repayments might possibly be received are not returned to the U.S. Treasury, but are put right back into the foreign-aid program for further "loans."

When, I wonder, will the American taxpayers more fully awaken to the amazing facts of our foreign-aid follies—and demand meaningful corrective action? The hour is already late.

Praise of Public Employment Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the House Appropriations Subcommittee, chaired by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. John Fogarty, was considering the fiscal year 1964 appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, HEW, and related agencies which contains funds for operation of the public employment service. At that time a campaign of letters, telegrams, and personal visits was being directed to Members of the House and particularly to members of the Appropriations Subcommittee by a group of private employment agencies in an effort to discredit the public employment service and create a demand for a reduction in its appropriation. After learning about this campaign, a substantial number of employers, community officials, and other citizens of my State wrote to Chairman Fogarty in support of the appropriation for the public employment service.

Mr. Speaker, I have received copies of a number of these letters, the contents of which I want to share with my colleagues in the House. I should add that the approval of the California State Employment Service expressed by the writers comes as no surprise to me since this service has been doing an outstanding job in serving California jobseekers and employers for many years.

The above-mentioned material follows:

United Community Fund of
San Francisco,
April 5, 1963.

Hon. John E. Fogarty,
Chairman, House Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee, Department of Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Reference 1964 appropriation request for grants to States for employment service administration. As frequent user, excellent services San Francisco office, California State Employment Service, we would deplore budget cut which would result curtailment of service. Strongly urge continuing support present level.

Mrs. Florette White Pomeroy,
Executive Director.

Florence Crittenton Home,
San Francisco, Calif., April 5, 1963.

Hon. John E. Fogarty,
Chairman, House Appropriations, Subcommittee on Department of Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Fogarty: I am writing to urge continued support of State employment services. The California State Employment Service makes a very significant contribution to our community, businessmen, and services. As an employer myself, I have found their assistance invaluable, both in the areas of professional staff and nonprofessional. Any curtailment of their program would be a serious loss to effective help for employers and to appropriate employment for those seeking jobs. I would urge that you give this thoughtful consideration and continued support.

Very truly yours,

Jean Bolton,
Executive Director.

April 5, 1963.

Hon. John Fogarty,
Chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

This is to give the urgent support by the San Francisco Youth Association for an adequate appropriation for the Department of Labor, HEW, and related agencies.

The SFYA is particularly interested in the work of the California Department of Employment with particular reference to their valuable work with youth and students.

Thomas A. Rowe,
Executive Director.

San Francisco, Calif., *April 5, 1963.*

Hon. John E. Fogarty,
Chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Department of Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I have been informed that lobbyists for private placement bureaus are attempting to reduce the appropriations for support of State departments of employment. This would obviously reduce the effectiveness of their service in placing job applicants and would react to the disadvantage of both the person seeking employment and the employer. In my opinion it would also be in direct conflict with the Government's policy of full employment.

As a consulting engineer I use the State of California Department of Employment services almost exclusively for the necessary personnel for my operations. I find it is far more satisfactory than any other means known to me to obtain qualified personnel. It is also the only means that I know of whereby the employer and employee can be brought together in their mutual interest, without either or both having to pay what is often an exorbitant fee for the services of a private agency.

I trust that the reasons I have presented will justify your support of an adequate appropriation for the Department of Employment Placement Bureaus.

Yours very truly,

Robert E. Grady.

American Standard Plumbing & Heating Division,
Richmond, Calif., April 5, 1693.

Hon. John E. Fogarty,
Chairman, House of Appropriations Subcommittee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Fogarty: We use the services of the California Department of Employment, Richmond branch, in the recruiting of labor for this plan. In employing hourly and salary personnel, it has been our practice to call up the Department of Employment to provide us with job candidates.

We urge that you recommend the Department of Employment to receive the same appropriation or an increased appropriation to enable them to continue their program.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

J. T. Gallagher,
Manager, Industrial Relations.

Dewey and Almy Chemical Division, W. R. Grace & Co.,
April 16, 1963.

Hon. John E. Fogarty,
Chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Department of Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We have frequently hired employees through the California State Employment Service, and find the work of this agency to be effective and efficient.

Curtailment of the activities of this branch of our Department of Labor would not be beneficial to local employer groups, and I urge that its activities be permitted to continue on their present basis.

Very truly yours,

Russell K. Homer,
Field Service Manager,
A. C. Horn Products.

John E. Fogarty,
Chairman, House Appropriation Subcommittee on Department of Labor, Health, Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I have had occasion to use the services of the California State Employment Service in selecting employes for the nursery I manage, and would like to endorse the important work of the Public Employment Service in this State.

Both myself and the employees I have selected from this source have been impressed with the effectiveness of the Department's service. We urge that you and your committee continue your support of the Public Employment Service.

Sincerely yours,

Donald M. Horton,
Manager, Fullerton Sales Yard, Armstrong Nurseries.

Waterman Corp. of California,
April 8, 1963.

Hon. John E. Fogarty,
Chairman, House Appropriations Committee on Department of Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

We have used Department of Employment, State of California, for many years and feel it renders the community and employers a very worthwhile service.

Perry Patton,
Vice President.

Tops Chemical Co.,
Richmond, Calif., April 5, 1963.

Hon. John E. Fogarty,
Chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Have you ever used the services offered by the department of employment? Assuming that you have, I'm certain that there is no question concerning the present appropriation under consideration for that department. In the event that you have never had an occasion to use these services, I would like you to consider my opinion of them, as I do use them frequently.

I feel that the services offered by the department of employment, especially in the field of placement aid to the unemployed, is one of the most valuable performed for the general public. It is a service that benefits not only the unemployed, but it has a valuable function for the employer as well. Most of the personnel here at Tops has come to us via this service, and I know from personal experience that many of these people would have been unemployed for a much greater length of time had it not been offered. And I would have had a much more difficult problem locating men of the caliber required in our operation.

If the aforementioned service should be discontinued, it would pave the way for racketeers in the private field which would eventually require legislation far more expensive than the present program.

Trusting that you will use your influence wisely in this matter, I remain.

Sincerely,

D. C. Aston,
Production Manager.

San Francisco Fashion Industries,
San Francisco, Calif.

Hon. John E. Fogarty, *Chairman,*
House Appropriations Subcommittee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Reference budget appropriation for public employment services in the Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security. California garment manufacturing industry urges such services be continued or expanded as they are vital to our employment needs.

Leonard Joseph,
Executive Director.

Noller Control Systems, Inc.,
April 10, 1963.

Hon. John E. Fogarty,
Chairman, House Appropriations Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Fogarty: This is to put on record that our organization, Noller Control Systems, Inc., has in the past used services of the California Department of Employment for securing personnel.

We have always found the department of employment to be very cooperative and to do their best to insure that qualified applicants are referred to us.

It is our hope that this service will always be available to ourselves and to other employers who may need to call on them from time to time. It would, in our opinion, be detrimental to the interests of both employer and employee should the functions of placement rest solely in the hands of private enterprise. Both types of organization serve a need to the community and this need we feel can be best met by their continuing existence.

Yours truly,

P. T. Whitmore,
Treasurer.

Monterey County Building Trades Council,
Monterey, Calif.

Hon. John E. Fogarty,
Chairman of Subcommittee on Appropriations, Department of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We are vitally interested in your committee's work in regard to the Bureau of Employment Security funds and would urge favorable consideration of proposed budget as presented.

Sincerely,

Russell S. Hansen,
Secretary.

Kroehler Manufacturing Co.,
April 5, 1963.

Hon. John E. Fogarty,
Chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee, Department of Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Hayward office, Department of Employment, most cooperative and helpful in recruiting work force of 200 testing, etc., at time plant was established and for past 5 years. We urge every consideration be given to continuing these services.

Harold T. Fogarty,
Industrial Relations, Supervisor.

Hillhaven Convalescent Hospital, Inc.,
San Rafael, Calif., April 5, 1963.

Hon. John E. Fogarty,
Chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee, Department of Labor, HEW and Related Agencies, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Our hospital has recently participated in the nurse's aide training program through the California State department of employment and under the Manpower Act. Subsequent to this training period, we were able to employ several persons trained by the program.

I want to express our appreciation of this program and of the workers made available to us and very much desire the continuance of such programs.

Very truly yours,

Helen G. Riggs, R.N.,
Administrator.

Grove Valve and Regulator Co.
Oakland, Calif., April 5, 1963.

Hon. John E. Fogarty, *House Appropriation Subcommittee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

Dear Sir: In interest of the amount of funds available to the California department of employment, the placement section should have its funds at a sufficient level to maintain adequate facilities to do an excellent job of placing those employees who find themselves on the unemployment insurance rolls. Specifically, the present time would not be an appropriate time to diminish the funds available to the Placement Section of the department of employment while the Nation is faced with such a large percentage of unemployed persons. It would be more appropriate to increase their funds in order that they could properly do the job of placing people on gainfully employed jobs.

We, as an employer, consistently call upon the department of employment for applicants for our job openings.

Thank you in advance for your considerations.

Very truly yours.

W. E. Mitchell, Jr.,
Personnel Director.

Wayne Manufacturing Co.,
Pomona, Calif., April 5, 1963.

Hon. John E. Fogarty,
Chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee, Department of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: It is my understanding that your Committee is meeting Tuesday, April 9th, to consider appropriations for maintenance of Departments of Employment.

The Wayne Manufacturing Co. would like to go on record to the effect that the offices of the California department of employment, who handle our employment problems by referring qualified applicants and payment of unemployment benefits, do an outstanding job. We are particularly pleased with the operation of the Pomona office and feel that any cut in appropriations which might affect the service that they offer to California employers and citizens would be untimely in light of the present unemployment situation in our State.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Black,
Personnel Manager.

Riverside Cement Co.,
Riverside, Calif., April 5, 1963.

Hon. John E. Fogarty,
Chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee, Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We understand there has been serious opposition as to whether the State department of employment should be allowed moneys in their budget sufficient to continue providing placement services to employers and applicants.

We strongly urge that this be defeated and the budget allowance continue to provide ample finances to continue the placement services rendered.

The Riverside office of the California Department of Employment is an excellent example of how well such a service can be operated. They have been of immeasurable value in their many years of service assisting us with our employment requirements and we are confident they will continue to serve not only us but the community as well in this connection.

Very truly yours,

R. E. Bouer,
Vice President, Personnel.

San Marcos, Calif.,
April 5, 1963.

Hon. John E. Fogarty,
Chairman, House Appropriation Subcommittee on Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We understand that the subcommittee is considering allocation of funds to the Bureau of Employment Security for fiscal 1964 operation.

We urge favorable consideration of the Bureau's budget request. The services which are being provided by the California State Department of Employment are very necessary in the public interest.

Very truly yours,
Aero-Cal Metal Fabricators, Inc.
C. E. Treadway, *Factory Manager.*

Palomar College,
San Marcos, Calif., April 5, 1963.

Hon. John E. Fogarty,
Chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Department of Labor and HEW and Related Agencies, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Sir: I understand that the subcommittee is considering allocation of funds to the Bureau of Employment Security for fall, 1964, operations. I urge favorable consideration of the Bureau's budget request, and feel that the services which are being provided by the State employment service are heavily weighted in the public interest.

We at Palomar College, in this part of California, have by necessity become familiar with industrial employment problems in this area. The accomplishments and continuous positive services of the California employment offices in this area have done much to alleviate growing unemployment problems. I am sure that employers here would keenly regret any cut in the services of this agency.

Sincerely,

John W. Dunn,
President.

Indio Chamber of Commerce,
Indio, Calif.

Hon. John E. Fogarty,
Chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

We understand there is a possibility that appropriations for the State employment services may be curtailed.

We strongly protest any cut in appropriations inasmuch as it would curtail services provided by the California State Department of Employment.

We have worked in close cooperation with the Indio Branch of the California Department of Employment and find they are providing such a needed service for this community that we feel a cut in appropriations in any degree whatsoever will have a very adverse effect on our economy.

E. F. Pearson,
President.

Escondido Chamber of Commerce,
April 5, 1963.

The Honorable John E. Fogarty,
Chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Departments of Labor and HEW and Related Agencies, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We understand that the subcommittee is considering allocation of funds to the Bureau of Employment Security for fiscal 1964 operation.

We urge favorable consideration of the Bureau's budget request, and we feel that the services which are being provided by the California State Employment Service are heavily weighted in the public interest.

Sincerely,

C. M. Younger,
Manager.

El Centro, Calif.,
April 8, 1963.

Hon. John E. Fogarty, *Chairman,*
House Appropriations Subcommittee on Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies, House of Representatives:

Request favorable consideration for budget for State employment agencies. Services very satisfactory for communities and urgently needed this area.

Herb Koenig,
Mayor of El Centro, Calif.

Union Sugar Division,
Consolidated Foods Corp.,
Betteravia, Calif., April 8, 1963.

Hon. J. E. Fogarty, *Chairman,*
House Appropriations Subcommittee of Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies, House of Representatives, Washington D.C.:

We understand that the request for appropriation for operation of the State employment agencies is now coming before your committee for hearing. The California State Employment Service is doing an outstanding job and is particularly valuable to us in California agriculture. We urge your committee to act favorably in considering the request of the Bureau of Employment Security for operation of the State agencies.

R. N. Winters,
Director of Agriculture.

April 6, 1963.

Hon. John E. Fogarty,
Chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee, Department of Labor, Health, Education, Welfare, and Related Agencies, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I should like to take this opportunity to tell you how pleased we have been to have the enthusiastic cooperation of the Fullerton office of the California State Employment Service in the implementation of our public service programing.

For several years we have broadcast job opportunity annocuncements which have been furnished us by the office. It has been my understanding that these broadcasts have been very helpful in bringing employers and prospective employees together with happy results for many. I believe this is an excellent public service and that it should be maintained. Futhermore, we have had the pleasure of broadcasting several series of weekly programs, one dealing with careers for young people and the other which is on the air at the present time, exploring the vast opportunities for all those who have moved into this area which has such an extraordinary growth. These broadcasts bring to the microphone outstanding representatives of our great industrial complex as well as authorities on ecnomics and its many related subjects. These programs have been made possible because of the interest and cooperation of the State employment service.

I sincerely hope that nothing will interfere with our being able to continue this valuable program service.

Very truly yours,

Dan Russell,
Vice president-station manager.

April 4, 1963.

Hon. John E. Fogarty,
Chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Department of Labor, Health, Education, and Related Agencies, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

It has been brought to my attention that your committee is currently considering allocation of funds for public employment offices.

Litton Systems, Inc., guidance and control systems division has for the last several months received more constructive support from the California State Employment Service for professional and nonprofessional manpower needs than any other single source.

This division is currently engaged in necessary and important military work for the U.S. Government and NATO allies. Our ability to attract and retain comparable highly skilled manpower contributes to the security of the free world.

Current practices in Southern California is that almost without exception corporations must pay the fee for placement of qualified candidates submitted by private professional agencies which results in an expense borne both by the U.S. Government and the taxpayer.

We are desirous of enabling the technical communities and the technical companies to engage in employment relationships in the most economical professional and expeditiously manner.

I personally feel that the California State Employment Service is the best equipped office to perform this service.

I would be willing to appear before your subcommittees to express my views in more detail should you desire or by correspondence if you wish.

James Colvin,
Litton Systems, Inc.

The Ralph M. Parsons Co.,
April 5, 1963.

Hon. John E. Fogarty,
Chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Our firm respectfully requests favorable action on the Federal budget appropriation as submitted for aid to the Department of Employment for the 50 States of the Union.

We are engaged in military defense engineering as contractors and subcontratcors on many large projects. Our costs to the military are greatly reduced by the assistance we receive from a most effective and efficient organiaztion, the California State Department of Employment.

Very truly yours,

THE RALPH M. PARSONS CO.
CARL DE VILBISS,
Personnel Manager.

SWAN ENGINEERING, INC.,
Oceanside, Calif., April 8, 1963.

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
Chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee, Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I understand that the Appropriation Subcommittee is conducting hearings on April 9, to consider allocation of funds to the Bureau of Employment Security for fiscal 1964 operations and would like to urge favorable consideration to the Bureau's budget request. The service being provided by the California State Employment Service is heavily weighted in the public interest.

Their assistance to this firm is screening applicants for several categories of work has been extreemly helpful and has resulted in a very low rate of turnover. The service provided by the California State Employment people in our area has resulted in permanent employment for many workers who have been dislocated because of cancellation or changes in Government defense contracts.

Sincerely,

DAVE HOWARD,
Personnel Manager.

ULTRONIX, INC.,
San Mateo, Calif., April 5, 1963.

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: As chairman, House Appropriation Subcommittee on Department of Labor, we would like to request that you please give favorable consideration on appropriation requests for employment service.

California Department of Employment has given us outstanding cooperation and assistance in our recruiting and placement.

We would further like to encourage that this appropriation be increased due to the ever-growing costs involved with the recruiting and living costs in this area.

Yours very truly,

JAMES MEREDITH,
Personnel Director.

AMERICAN ELECTRONICS OF ANAHEIM,
April 5, 1963.

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
Chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Department of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Realizing that your subcommittee is currently considering budget recommendations for the coming fiscal year, I feel this is the most appropriate time to express the views of a major employer in the southern California area concerning the fine job the California Department of Employment is performing for both the employer and the unemployed.

Although the department of employment has consistently operated on limited funds during the past few years it has expanded its service to assist employers in locating the technical and professional help much needed by defense contractors in this area as well as assisting in the reduction of unemployment by properly placing those qualified people looking for work.

As you well know, placements promptly and properly made not only get the unemployed back to work at no expense to them, but also saves the employer money through lower claims and charges to his reserve account.

Consequently, I urge you and your committee to favorably consider the budget submitted for the department of employment for the next fiscal year.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. HAYNES,
Industrial Relations Manager.

The Facts About Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, all of us in Congress have received numerous scathing reports, plaintiff appeals, indictments, and heartrendering stories concerning the crisis in Cuba. None, however, reflect more poignantly the gravity of the internal situation in Cuba than these statistics, published by the "Cuban Student Directorate," which I commend to my colleagues' attention, as follows:

Food prices in Communist Cuba

Product	Before 1959	Now	
		Official	Black market
Oil .... pound..	$0.35	$0.60	$1.20
Lard .... do....	.23	.26	2.50
Rice .... do....	$0.15-.16	.22	1.20
Beans .... do....	.12-.18	.28	.55
Meat .... do....	.08	--------	--------
	.35	.45	2.50
	.43	--------	--------
Pork .... do....	.60	1.00	2.50
Chicken .... do....	.36	.55	2.50
Snapper .... do....	.30	--------	1.00
Eggs .... each..	.05	.26	1.00
Milk .... quart..	.14	.25	.75
Butter .... ⅛ pound..	.08	.17	1.00
Cheese .... pound..	.40	.60	1.30
Turkey .... do....	.50	.80	1.60
Soap .... price of 1..	.10	.22	.50
Detergents ... medium size..	.20	.38	.60
Bathing soap .... each..	.10	.22	.35
Potatoes .... pound..	.05	.15	.20-.25
Toothpaste ..... small size..	.15	.30	.80

NOTE.—These products can only be bought with rationing cards. Even though the Communist government has set official prices to all of them, they have to be bought—most of the time—in the black market at high prices which vary according to the demand and the scarcity.

SOME STATISTICS ON THE CASTRO COMMUNIST REGIME

EXODUS OF CUBANS

(a) Since January 1, 1959, up to the present moment, approximately 449,450 Cubans have left the island; that is, more than 6.6 percent of the whole population. About 2,742 of these have traveled illegally, using small boats. It is estimated that nearly 200 have perished trying to reach the United States. The Cuban refugees are distributed as follows:

United States	385,000
Latin America	42,000
Europe	21,000
Other countries	1,450
Total	449,450

(b) About 230,000 persons are at the present time in Cuba awaiting the opportunity to leave. They are in possession of a passport and visa waiver.

(c) There are 385,000 persons trying to fulfill the requirements for leaving the island. It is estimated that more than 16 percent of the Cuban population has left or intends to leave the country.

TERROR IN CUBA

(a) Men killed or executed by a firing squad of Cuba's Red regime since January 1, 1959, to date:

Sentenced and executed by revolutionary tribunals	2,876
Executed without trial	4,245
Killed in action	2,962
Missing	634
Total of deaths	10,717

This grand total can be classified in the following manner:

Military men	3,462
Workers	2,677
Farmers	2,473
Professionals	783
Students	711
Owners of small businesses	228
Catholics	187
Industry men	71
Foreigners	62
Property owners	63
Total	10,717

(b) It is estimated that since January 1, 1959, to the present time, about 965,000, more than 14 percent of the island's population, have been arrested for political reasons. Today, approximately 81,706 are imprisoned. They have been distributed in this way:

In fortresses, jails, prisons	63,440
In concentration camps	16,120
In the headquarters of the G-2 (secret police) and similar places	2,146
Total	81,706

Can I Be, or Should I Do?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, Seattle's Ballard High School which is located in my congressional district has added first- and third-place national winners in the Thom McAn Leadership Awards program to the three other national winners from that school since 1959.

Ballard High's first-place winner in this year's contest is Miss Connie Ann Black, who receives a $1,000 scholarship and an all-expense trip to Washington and New York City as top girl contender among the 1,923 entries from 1,176 high schools throughout the country. The other winner for this high school is Eric M. Kauffman, who receives a $250 third-place scholarship. Eric's brother and sister won second-place scholarships in 1959 and 1960, respectively.

The Thom McAn essay contest is sponsored annually to assist deserving students and to stress education's role in good citizenship and leadership. This year's contest asked "Why Seek a College Education?" and, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD at this point the text of Connie Black's unique and interesting answer to this question:

CAN I BE, OR SHOULD I DO?

(By Connie Ann Black)

"My son is president of his school's student body," she stated proudly, matter-of-factly. "What does your son do?"

She answered quietly, "Do? What does anyone do? My son is—that is enough."

Some men are "born" leaders and they become presidents, newspaper editors, and den fathers. They organize corporations, hospitals, and citizens' city-beautiful committes; they guide, propel, conduct, and direct. Without them there would be no organized institutions—no republics, labor unions, church hierarchies, or PTA's.

Other men are—and that is enough. Their leadership is neither active nor passive, but exists as an intangible part of their personalities. These men are loved, honored, or despised because of what they are and not because of what they do. In them, deed and being are one.

In me deed and being are often one. I don't want to be Senior Honor Society Secretary or First Woman Executive of the United States, and I resent it when people suggest that I should run for an office, should "do something." Sometimes I wish I could become a botanist living in a laboratory crowded with geraniums and hybrid pea plants or a professional student consuming semester after semester of calculus, world history, and paleontology. I think how marvelous it would be if I went to college, majored in English, received a degree in pediatric medicine, and then became a passive leader. I could tickle my patients' toes and discuss Far Eastern politics and Aristotelian logic with their parents. I would be—and that would be enough.

But then something—my rational mind, my conscience, something—says, "Are you capable of becoming a quiet leader Are you sure that you could just 'be,' and the world would benefit?" And I reply, "Yes, Yes, this is the kind of leader I am meant to be. I would * * * well, I would * * * really, I mean * * * I don't know. I don't know."

I am going to college to study the humanities—to learn of artists, scientists, and philosophers; to understand myself. During 4 years of study I will grow a little taller and begin to think a little more maturely. I will be able to decide whether I should be president or quiet leader. Then I will know that I must "do" or that I should "be."

Cuba's Power Grid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to submit an article which appeared in the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily on June 15. The author, Mr. Jesse Gordon, has been listed by Andrew Tully in "CIA: The Inside Story," as one of the few expert observers on conditions within the island:

CUBA'S POWER GRID

(By Jesse Gordon)

Recent reports that Khrushchev has promised to build a second 300,000-kilowat powerplant for Castro—the largest in Cuba—highlights the enormous contribution the Russians and Czechoslovakians are making to Cuba's electric power grid and the island's industrialization program.

Some observers believe that Khrushchev's pledge to Castro for the 300,000 kilowatt powerplant was designed to assuage the Cuban leader's still-hurt feelings resulting from the Soviet backdown on the missile crisis. But whatever its motivation, the new plant will add significantly to the Communist bloc's contribution to Cuba's electrification.

Following is a summary of what Soviet-bloc countries are building for Castro's growing power grid, according to Mario Fleites, head of Cuba's Department of Electrification:

In early 1964, and early 1965, four Soviet-built power stations, each generating 50,000 kilowatts, will be installed at Mariel, Province of Pinar del Rio. The Mariel site will be the location for new glass and aluminum factories, including a shipyard.

A large electric powerplant at Nipe, on the northern coast of Cuba, to be built by 1967, which will generate 300,000 kilowatts and cost $50 million. It will serve the expansion needs of the Moa Bay nickel plant nearby, and a new nickel plant to cost $250 million, which the Russians are also building at Nipe.

Two Soviet-built power stations generating 50,000 kilowatts each will be completed by 1966 at Santiago de Cuba in the Province of Oriente. An entire industrial development project is going up in this area, including a factory to manufacture autos and trucks.

A Czech-built plant generating power of 30,000 kilowatts will be completed by July 1964 and installed at O'Bourke (Cienfuegos). Two more Czech plants, each generating 60,000 kilowatts, are being erected at Nuevitas in Camaguey Province, and will be finished by October 1965. The Nuevitas power sources will supply current to a complex of new factories in the area for the manufacture of fertilizers, electrodes, barbed wire, and cement.

A Czech-built 30,000-kilowatt plant is to be constructed at Punta Martillo, 15 miles from Manzanillo in Oriente and will be finished by 1966. The present power station at Matanzas will be increased by 37,500 kilowatts with the installation of a turbogenerator manufactured in France. The Matanzas site will include new factories for fertilizers, acids, and a textile mill.

The 5-year electrification plan is estimated to cost $210 million, according to Fleites. This is exclusive of Khrushchev's recent promise to Fidel Castro of an additional powerplant.

"Before determining the location of new powerplants," Fleites said, "it is necessary to take into account all possible annual increases in maximum demand or peak load. In figuring the peak load, a yearly increase of 10 percent is estimated."

Fleites, who works directly under Che Guevara, the Minister of Industry, took his B.S. in mechanical engineering at Louisiana State University in 1946, and his master's degree in electrical engineering at the University of Michigan. He later worked in the United States.

State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary Appropriation Bill, 1964

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7063) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered to H.R. 7063 by the distinguished gentleman from California which would reduce by $19,491,000 the appropriation for contributions to international organizations recommended by the Committee on Appropriations. Purportedly, the assumption of this amendment was that the figure represented an unpaid just debt owed by the United Nations to the U.S. Department of Defense for expenses incurred by the peacekeeping efforts in the Congo. The gentleman from California contended that this reduction would actually be taken only from the U.S. assessment for membership in the United Nations, which figure is $31,330,445. He held that the withholding of such funds would signify only a sense of fiscal responsibility on the part of Congress, and the fulfillment of just commitments both by the United Nations—in that it would thereby eliminate a debt, though without direct action on its part—and by the United States—as one principle of membership is cognizance by the member of the financial obligations of the body to which he belongs.

Unfortunately the amendment revealed a lack of awareness both of the nature of the appropriation itself, and of the purposes for which the funds will be employed. The appropriations recommended were for membership and other regular assessments pursuant to being an integral part of the United Nations, and were well within the 33⅓-percent ceiling imposed by American law on the financial obligations of our great Nation to any international organization. In addition, the money recommended had nothing whatsoever to do with peacekeeping operations in the Middle East, the Congo, or anywhere else all of which was eloquently stated by the gentleman from New York in debate over the amendment. Such contingencies are seen to by other means, beyond the normal assessments which will be covered by the $81,305,000 recommended in this bill for contributions to international organizations. What the amendment entailed, in actuality, was a withdrawal by the United States from the fulfillment of its normal membership obligations, much in the manner with which the Soviet Union is accustomed to approach its financial obligations to the United Nations. In fact, it is for just such irresponsible fiscal behavior that the Soviet Union is facing the crisis of the loss of its vote in the General Assembly.

Most tragic, however, are the human implications presented in a discussion of the impact of such a cut in the international organizations appropriation. One need only review the list of agencies and organizations which will receive financial contributions from the proposed $81,305,000; among them are: The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—(UNESCO; the World Health Organization—WHO; the Food and Agriculture Organization—FAO; the International Labor Organizational Labor Organization—ILO; the Inter-American Children's Institute; the Pan American Health Organization. Contributions to these organizations alone total more than $27 million, and human assistance—and HOPE—rendered thereby more than justify the financial commitment. The improvement of standards of living, the amelioration of working conditions, the elimination of disease, the provision for children of greater opportunities for growing up in a world where they have a chance, the introduction of education, food, and other facets of societal well-being and advancement into areas which have not yet entered the 20th century on equal terms with other nations of the world—all of these would suffer from any proposed cut.

What of defensive and political alinements which insure the security of the United States? The Organization of American States is one of the international organizations supported by this appropriation, as are NATO, SEATO, the Colombo Plan, and the OECD. Any proposals to reduce our commitments and/or support to these organizations must be viewed in the cold light of national security, and within the broader perspective of the respect in which we are held by other nations of the world. Relationships with our Latin-American neighbors, the question of the Atlantic Alliance, and the precariousness of the situation in Asia render a reduction in American support well-nigh inconceivable at this time.

Other organizations which would receive funds from the recommended appropriations are the international administrative organizations, the services rendered by which are essentially of a nonpolitical, cooperative nature among nations, and are aimed at international harmonization and coordination of such matters as weights and measures, telecommunications, and celestial exploration.

In summation, one can see that any reduction in the amount recommended by the Committee on Appropriations for contributions to international organizations would be most detrimental to the U.S. position of leadership in the promotion of world peace, freedom from disease, freedom from hunger, advancement of educational opportunities, and in the preservation of that body which provides the forum for reconciliation and cooperation among nations. The proposed amendment, which would reduce the allocation by more than $19 million, seems to maintain as its underlying objective the weakening and eventual dissolution of the entire United Nations structure, for without U.S. leadership, commitment, and responsibility, that body is able to retain no truly effective hope for the maintenance of international peace or the reduction of tensions between states. Failure to live up to our obligations of membership places us in the position of tacit accord with the Soviet Union's objective of breaking up the United Nations, as the gentleman from New York pointed out in the debate on the amendment.

Even with a mature realization of its inherent limitations, we must recognize that the United Nations has played a highly significant role in international relations. The settlement of disputes between states and the containment of skirmishes which threaten wider conflict, the facilitation of independence and freedom for formerly dependent territories, the advances in human welfare in underdeveloped areas of the world, and the provision of a forum for peace—all these factors make it incumbent upon the Congress to approve the full amount of the contributions to international organizations, as recommended by the Committee on Appropriations.

State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary Appropriation Bill, 1964

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7063) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I shall find it necessary to vote against this bill. This, to me, presents a difficult situation because my committee reported the bill. I realize that it covers many agencies of Government, most aof which are doing satisfactory work. It may appear inconsistent to vote against a bill which contains funds for many necessary functions of Government, but I vote against it to protest a situation which I consider intolerable. I refer in particular to the Supreme Court decision outlawing Bible reading and recital of the Lord's Prayer in public schools. Apparently this is in keeping with the Court's preoccupation with the new fetish for minority rights. In recent years the Court has plunged headlong into a morass of social experiments, wholly without precedent, which in substance say that any so-called rights demanded by a vocal minority must prevail over the views of the majority. In its zeal to give the militant minority whatever it chooses to demand in the name of "rights," the Court perforce has ridden roughshod over the rights of the majority. The net effect of the Court's new strained interpretations of its constitutional responsibilities is to undermine all human rights. No individual henceforth can consider himself secure in any rights and protections heretofore commonly understood and assumed.

In its most recent ruling, the U.S. Supreme Court has struck a body blow at our Constitution. It has placed an interpretation of the wording of the Constitution that was never intended by the Founding Fathers. They were deeply religious men. All they sought to do was to prevent the establishment of a state church. They could not have dreamed that their wording would be used as an argument against religion itself. To take religion out of the public schools is to take a long step toward the adoption of an atheistic doctrine. This is another blow at the bright symbolism which made this country the hope of the world for so many years. The decision has cheapened America and weakened its moral strength. I sincerely hope the Congress will rebel against the things that are happening to our country and its people and reassert the principles which made us a great nation. As a first step, the Supreme Court must be curbed. My vote against this bill is a vote against the Supreme Court for which funds are carried in the bill. The situation brought on by the Court is so grave that I consider a protest vote is necessary.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Magic Allure of Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, we Montanans have never been shy about extolling the virtues of our State. We know it is an outdoorsman's paradise with scenic attractions challenging those of any State. But we always are pleased when an out-of-stater acknowledges it. We are particularly pleased when he does so before an audience.

This has happened again—this time in an article written by Mr. Pete Czura in the June 1963 issue of Steel Labor. Mr. Czura's article is entitled "Big Sky Country Holds Magic Allure." Seldom have I read a stronger endorsement of the scenic and recreation attractions of any State than in this article.

> If there is one State in this country that offers a variety of outdoor activities—which would please even the most discriminating outdoorsman—it must be Montana—

Writes Mr. Czura. I agree and hereby invite my colleagues to visit Montana's "Big Sky Country" to see for themselves.

Mr. President, I join other Montanans in thanking Mr. Czura for his fine article on the attractions of our State. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG SKY COUNTRY HOLDS MAGIC ALLURE

(By Pete Czura)

If there is one State in this country that offers a variety of outdoor activities—which would please even the most discriminating outdoorsman—it must be Montana.

Tagged with the monicker of "Big Sky Country" visitors can find topnotch angling water in either streams or lakes, excellent camping facilities, boating in such scenic spots as Gateway of the Mountains near Helena, prospecting at old gold diggings and many other activities.

Best of all, you can make solo ventures or have the entire family tag along to enjoy the wonders of this State.

Most impressive would be the majestic mountains soaring in jagged formations against a sky-blue backdrop.

Everywhere you turn, particularly in the western end of Montana, breathtaking vistas of unsurpassed beauty will have you stopping the car for some quick color picturetaking.

But it's the fishing which is the magic lure for most sportsmen.

If you want variety where can you top catches like walleye, sauger, dolly vardens, rainbows, brooks, browns, whitefish, bass, and rare grayling.

If hunting is your meat, then moose, elk, big horn sheep, Rocky Mountain goat, bear, and caribou will whet the appetite of any big game hunter coming here.

Montana's vast outdoors offers some of the finest remaining natural trout streams in the world. Many of these streams are world renowned.

Four major watersheds—the Missouri, Yellowstone, Kootenai, and Clark Fork—and their many tributaries give the angler a wide choice of excellent fishing.

For those who enjoy the thrill of marveling at nature's handiwork, there is the Yellowstone National Park, Glacier National Park and many State parks.

Yellowstone is nature's wonderland, world-famous for spouting geysers, steaming pools, mountains, canyons, vast forests of green and waterfalls comprising over two million acres of scenic beauty.

The spectacular Red Lodge-Cooke City highway to Yellowstone climbs nearly 11,000 feet in the Beartooth mountains.

Here is some of Montana's most rugged beauty—purple canyons, white glaciers, rushing streams, sparkling lakes, fields of glorious wild flowers, and views of vistas as large as all of New England States.

At Glacier National Park, the Going-to-the-Sun Road is a 50-mile stretch running through the park, crossing the Continental Divide at Logan Pass.

Lofty peaks, sheer cliffs, crystal waterfalls, dense forests, distant glaciers, meadows of brilliant blossoms and proud mountain goats make up its changing panorama.

Yes, you could do worse by going elsewhere but you couldn't do any better with a trip to the Big Sky Country. For more details write to Montana State Chamber of Commerce, Helena, Mont.

Pope Paul VI's First Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker the first address of Pope Paul VI under a Vatican City dateline of June 22, 1963, as published in the June 23 issue of the Sunday Star of Washington, D.C., follows:

PAUL VI'S FIRST ADDRESS: "TRUTH, FREEDOM, PEACE AMONG PEOPLES"

(NOTE.—VATICAN CITY, June 22.—Following is an unofficial English translation of today's first address by Pope Paul VI. It was made from an official Vatican translation in Italian of the original Latin.)

Venerable brothers and beloved sons of the whole world. On this day dedicated to the most precious heart of Jesus—in the act of assuming the office of guiding the flock of the Lord, which according to the expression of St. Augustine is above all an office of love in exercise of paternal and solicitous charity toward all the sheep redeemed by the precious blood of Jesus Christ—the first sentiment that among others flows from our heart is one of secure confidence in the almighty help of the Lord.

He who indicated His adorable will through the consensus of our venerable brothers, the fathers of the sacred college, by granting us the care and the responsibility of the holy church, will be able to infuse in our soul, trembling from the vastness of the burden imposed, a vigilant and serene force, an untiring zeal for his glory, a missionary anxiety for the universal, clear, and persuasive spreading of the gospel.

PRAISES PREDECESSORS

At the beginning of our pontifical ministry, it is agreeable to our spirit to remember our predecessors who left us a spiritual, sacred, and glorious heritage; Pius XI, with his indomitable spiritual strength; Pius XII, who illuminated the church with the light of teaching full of knowledge, and finally John XXIII, who gave to the whole world an example of his singular goodness.

But in a very particular way we love to remember, with mindful and moving piety, the figure of the late John XXIII, who in the brief but very intense period of his ministry, was able to bring near to him the hearts of men, even those distant, with his unceasing solicitude, with his sincere, and concrete goodness for the humble, with the clearly pastoral character of his actions, qualities to which the particularly enchanting and human gift of his great heart was added.

The enlightenment exercised on souls was a steady progress from clarity to more clarity, as an ardent flame, up to the final personal sacrifice, suffered with that spiritual strength which moved the world by uniting mankind around his bed of pain and by making them a single heart and a single spirit in a sole palpitation of great respect, veneration, and prayer.

The heritage we receive from the hands of our predecessors show us in full the gravity of the office which stands before us.

ECUMENICAL COUNCIL

The preeminent part of our pontificate will be occupied with the continuation of the second Vatican Ecumenical Council, on which the eyes of all men of good will are focused. This will be the principal work, for which we intend to devote all the energies which the Lord gave us so that the Catholic Church, shining over the world as a sign to the nations afar off (Isaiah 5: 26) can attract all men to it, through the majesty of its organism, through the youthfulness of its spirit, through the renovation of its structure, through the multiplicity of its strenth, coming "ex omni tribu, et lingua, et populo, et natione" (Apocalypse V: 9) (from every tribe and tongue and people and nation).

This will be the first thought of the pontifical ministry, so that it will be proclaimed always higher before the world, that only in the Gospel of Jesus there is the awaited and desired salvation:

"For there is no other name under Heaven given to men by which we must be saved" (Acts 4: 12).

In this light will take place for the revision of the code of canon law, the prosecution of efforts, following the lines set by the great social encyclicals of our predecessors, for the consolidation of justice in civil, social, and international life, in truth and freedom and in respect of reciprocal duties and rights.

SOLUTION OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS

The certain order of love for others, a test of love for God, demands of all men a more equal solution of social problems: demands aid and care for underdeveloped countries in which the level of life is not often worthy of human dignity; requires a voluntary study of a universal scale for the improvement of the conditions of life.

The new epoch which the conquests of space have opened to mankind will be singularly blessed by the Lord if men know truly how to recognize each other as brothers rather than competitors. And build a world order in saintly fear of God, in respect of His laws, in the sweet light of charity and mutual collaboration.

Our work, with the aid of God, also will be to undertake every effort for the conservation of the great good of peace among peoples—a peace which is not only an absence of warlike rivalries and armed factions, but a reflection of the order wished by the Lord, Creator and Redeemer, a constructive and strong will for understanding and brotherhood, a clear-cut expression of good will, a never ceasing desire of active concord, inspired to the true well-being of mankind, in unaffected love (II Corinthians 6: 6).

At this moment, in which all mankind looks to this chair of truth, and to he who has been called to represent on earth the Divine Savior, we can only renew the appeal for loyal, frank, willing understanding which unites mankind in reciprocal and sincere respect: (renew) the invitation to undertake every effort to save mankind, by favoring the peaceful development of rights bestowed by God and by facilitating the spiritual and religious life so that it be carried to the most vivid and profound adoration of the Creator.

PLEA FOR WORLD PEACE

We do not lack encouraging signs coming to us from men of good will; we thank the Lord as we offer to all our serene but firm cooperation for maintaining the great gift of peace in the world.

Our pontifical service will be finally, to pursue with every commitment the great work launched with so much hope and with bright expectation by our predecessor, John XXIII: the achievement of that "ut unum sint" (that all may be one) so awaited by all and for which he [John] offered his life.

The common aspiration to reintegrate the unity sorrowfully broken in the past will find in us an echo of fervent will and moving prayer, in awareness of the office bestowed upon us by Jesus: "Simon, Simon * * * I have prayed for thee, that thy faith may not fail; and do thou * * * strengthen thy brethren" (Luke 22: 31–32).

We open our arms to all those who glory in the name of Christ. We call them with the sweet name of brothers, and let them know they will find in us constant comprehension and benevolence, that they will find in Rome the paternal house which sublimates and underlines with new splendor the treasuries of their history, of their cultural patrimony and of their spiritual heritage.

DISCIPLES OF CHRIST

Venerable brothers and beloved children, the vastness of the work which awaits our poor strength is such to frighten the humble priest called to the pageantry of the great keys: But we will dedicate to it our prayer and our daily effort. We need your collaboration and your invocation which rises to God in a fragrant odor (Ephesians 5: 2) for the pastor of the universal church.

Because of this, emotional and grateful thoughts go to all the children of the Catholic Church, who give the world the testimony of their faith, the spectacle of their union, the royal splendor of their dignity, because "the disciples of Christ—as Clement Alexander said—are kings in virtue of Christ the King."

We salute above all the most worthy members of the sacred college who have shared with us the trepidation and the prayer of these days of expectancy. We salute our particular benevolence to the venerable brothers in the episcopates of both East and West, who in all the continents "are acting as ambassadors on behalf of Christ, God, as it were, appealing through us" (II Corinthians 5: 20); and we already enjoy the happiness of embracing them all in the second session of the Ecumenical Council.

In a special way we love to express our esteem for the Roman Curia, whose task, so honorable and full of responsibility, is that of giving from so near (its) collaboration to the vicar of Christ. We are certain that its most dignified work will be of valid help for us, because we have known directly for a long time its diligence, its "sense of the church," its prudence in acting, and we especially appreciated it, together with all the bishops, during the preparatory phase and celebration of the second Vatican Ecumenical Council.

HAILS PARISH PRIESTS

We address ourselves, then, with fatherly spirit to parish pastors, priests and religious, who, untiredly and silently, often lacking any help in their loneliness, commit their lives to extending the kingdom of God on earth; nor do we forget souls consecrated to God in prayerful immolation and in multiple charitable activities.

At the beginning of our pontifical office, which is committed to the successor of St. Peter as Bishop of Rome, we cannot but turn ourself with an affectionate embrace toward the beloved children of the diocese of Rome, who have accepted with such swiftness the pastoral enterprises of our predecessor. And we believe that they, answering true charity with charity, will continue to give glad fruits of virtue, because toward them, as the nearest (children) of the chair of St. Peter, turn the eyes of Catholics from all over the world.

Then moved by the sweetness of memories, we send a greeting filled with every particular affection to all the most beloved faithful of the Ambrosian (Milan) archdiocese, who we have loved much in these years "in the heart of Christ Jesus" (Philippians 1: 8) and from whom we have received so many consolations, as from most beloved children.

And, too, memory goes also to our diocese of origin (Brescia), with the wish of remaining always faithful to the gospel of our Lord, to what gives honor and grace and nobility even to the human relations of life.

PRAISES MISSIONARIES

In particular we wish that the brothers and children in these regions where the church is impeded from using its rights feel themselves near to us.

They have been called to participate even nearer to the cross of Christ, which will be followed, we are sure, by the radiant dawn of resurrection. They will finally be able to return to the full exercise of their pastoral ministry, which, for its own institution, is for the benefit not only of individual souls, but also for the nations in which it is exercised.

It is dear to us, further, to encourage and bless from the depth of our heart the most beloved missionaries, the apples of our eye, who in all the continents, in the outposts of the church, spread the gospel of Jesus; may they always glory in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ (Galatians 6: 15), bearing with love the eventual adversities and trials, certain that the help of God will never be lacking for those who live and work only for Him.

We address ourselves with particular praise to the members of Catholic Action who aid the church's hierarchy in the apostolate, and to all those who work in the various national and international organizations.

LOVE FOR THOSE WHO SUFFER

We embrace, then, with fatherly love all those who suffer—the sick, the poor, the convicts, and the exiles, the refugees.

And we salute, finally, all our children in Christ, among whom we love to remember especially the bold and generous young, in whom is the sure hope of a better future; the innocent infants; the pure and simple souls; both the humble and the great of the earth; all the craftsmen and laborers, whose often grave and heavy fatigue we know well and greatly appreciate; the men of culture and study, of teaching, and science, the journalists and public relations men, the politicians and the heads of state, praying that all, each in his place of responsibility, give their contribution for the construction of an order, ever more just in principles, more efficacious in applying law, more sound in private and public morality, more willing in the defense of peace.

Let the very strength of God, without whose help nothing is valid and nothing is holy, pass over the world as a great flame of faith and love that enkindles all men of good will, that enlightens the paths of reciprocal collaboration, that draws over humanity, ever and always, the abundance of divine bounty.

LET US PROCEED IN PEACE

In the face of starting our serious ministry, we are supported by the words of Christ, full of comfort, whereby He promised Peter and his successors to remain with the church "even unto the consummation of the world" (Matthew 28:20); sustained by the motherly protection of the most blessed Virgin Mary, mother of God and our mother, to whom we entrust our pontificate from its very start, together with the help and prayer of the apostles Peter and Paul and all the saints.

In pledge of this celestial assistance, and happily encouraged by good energies, scattered through the world, we are pleased to give, as the first fruit of our fatherly benevolence to you, venerable brothers and beloved children, and to all the human family, the apostolic blessing.

In the name of the Lord.

Let us proceed in peace.

Supreme Court Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate several more editorials from South Carolina newspapers on the subject of the Supreme Court's unfortunate decision last week against the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading in the public schools. The editorials are as follows: "Sad Departure" which was printed in the June 20 issue of the Aiken Standard and Review; "The Lord's Prayer Decision" from the June 19, 1963, issue of the Columbia Record; "Prelude to Bootlegged Religion" from the June 19, 1963, issue of the Greenville News; and "God and the Supreme Court" as was printed in the June 20, 1963, issue of the State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these editorials together with a column by Mr. David Lawrence in the June 20, 1963, issue of the Evening Star entiled, "Explaining School Prayer Ruling: Fact That Controversy Is Just Beginning Is Seen From Complexity of Issues," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials and column were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Aiken Standard and Review, June 20, 1963]

Sad Departure

The Supreme Court of this Nation has made another of its infamous interpretations of the Constitution pertaining to religion and this latest strikes at the very foundation of this Nation and its people.

When the Court renders a decision against the religious practices of the people, in its schools, and in its instruction of its youth it only serves to whittle away at the underpinning of moral structure, to eliminate the one thing which has made the Nation great and powerful, under God.

The Court, in its interpretations and rulings in the past few years, has proved conclusively that it is not rendering decisions in keeping with a democracy but in keeping with communistic and atheist ideals.

It has struck a mortal blow to religious freedom and morality; it has, by its action encouraged atheism and given new hope to communism to further encroach upon the Nation.

Surely, the reading of the Bible, the world's bestseller among, and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer in schools, is not contrary to the concepts of Americans, a free people, believing in God and practicing His religion and way of life.

What is in the future of this Nation if such rulings continue? A life without God, a homeland where man is superior to God, a nation without belief?

The United States of America is rapidly going down to degradation and internal deterioration and the cause can be laid directly at the feet of the Supreme Court.

It is beyond comprehension that such a ruling could emanate from such a learned body of men, all supposed to render decisions affecting the best interests of all concerned with the Nation's best interests foremost in everything.

The Court has passed the bounds of Americanism. It, in its actions, has proved to be a more undermining force toward deterioration of the Nation than communism and the Congress of the United States should use its power to curb such actions and to place the Court back again upon a constitutional basis.

[From the Columbia Record, June 19, 1963]

The Lord's Prayer Decision

There has been little, if any, doubt for about a year over the Supreme Court's decision on governmental requirement of Bible reading and recitation of the Lord's Prayer in public schools. Since June 25, 1962, Court observers have known that such recitations would be ruled unconstitutional

It was on June 25 of last year that the Court ruled that a 22-word official prayer in New York's public schools violated the first amendment. With that ruling, Bible reading and the Lord's Prayer as part of public school activities were doomed.

The Court's 1962 judgment was best summarized in the paragraphs that read: "It is neither sacrilegious nor antireligious to say that each separate government in this country should stay out of the business of writing or sanctioning official prayers and leave that purely religious function to the people themselves and to those the people choose to look to for religious guidance * * * it is no part of the business of government to compose official prayers for any group of the American people to recite as part of a religious program carried on by government."

With this attitude, the Court judgment of this week was clearly forecast.

The Record should like to reemphasize what it said last year: that the Court decision, although it follows the thinking of the Court in the sharply divided 1947 decision of *Everson* v. *Board of Education,* reverses the 18th, 19th, and early 20th century conceptions of the first amendment.

The original proposals leading to the first amendment, introduced in the House of Representatives by James Madison, centered around the authority of the National Congress and the Central Government. The whole power over the subject of religion was left exclusively to the State governments, to be acted upon according to their own sense of justice and the State constitutions.

The intent of the framers of the Constitution was perfectly clear, beyond disputation. The learned Joseph Story, in his "Commentaries," has said:

"Probably at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and of the amendment to it now under consideration, the general if not the universal sentiment in America was, that Christianity ought to receive encouragement from the state so far as was not incompatible with the private rights of conscience and the freedom of religious worship. An attempt to level all religions, and to make it a matter of state policy to hold all in utter indifference, would have created universal disapprobation, if not universal indignation."

As late as 1898, Cooley could expound the no establishment clause: "By establishment of religion is meant the setting up or recognition of a state church, or at least the conferring upon one church of special favors and advantages which are denied to others. It was never intended by the Constitution that the Government should be prohibited from recognizing religion * * * where it might be done without drawing invidious distinctions between different religious beliefs, organizations, or sects."

The "wall of separation between church and state" doctrine which the Court utilized on Monday can be traced to an 1802 letter from President Jefferson to a group of Danbury, Conn., Baptists. But the 20th century jurists have ignored, unhappily, Jefferson's very keen distinction that he made between the powers of the Central Government with regard to "the free exercise" of religion.

Even in the 1879 decision of *Reynolds* v. *United States,* the unanimous Court was also careful to single out that Congress could not do.

The Everson decision in 1947 greatly enlarged the "wall of separation" application and pointed directly to the 1963 decision.

Whether individual classes of school children, of their own volition, might elect to utilize the Lord's Prayer and Bible readings is a matter that the Court has not definitely settled.

What is certain is that the Court has said that government, whether local or State or National, may not require such reading and recitation.

[From the Greenville News, June 19, 1963]

Prelude to Bootlegged Religion?

"What," asked the disturbed reader who was trying to grasp the meaning of the latest prevacation series of decisions, "is the U.S. Supreme Court trying to do? What is it doing to the Constitution?"

The present philosophy of the highest Court in the land, whose word in a single case has come to be proclaimed the "law of the land," irresistible and unchangeable as the laws of the Medes and Persians, defies definition.

But, perhaps, one of the better known quatrains of the Rubaiyat Omar Khayyam, who, incidentally, was an atheist, will provide a partial description of what the Court is about. It goes like this:

> Ah Love! could you and I with Fate conspire
> To grasp this sorry Scheme of Things entire,
> Would we not shatter it to bits—and then
> Re-mould it nearer to the Heart's desire!

Substitute the words "political expediency" for the word "love" in the first line above and one just about has it. The Supreme Court has heeded arguments that the Constitution does not mean what it says, that it changes as times and circumstances change and should be drastically altered to meet present day needs and desires, mainly the latter. It seems to have concluded that the Nation's basic law is, indeed, a "sorry scheme of things."

And, conspiring with political expediency, it has indeed, grasped it, almost "entire" and is in the process of shattering it to bits and remaking it nearer to what its majority thinks it ought to be.

We, and others both more and less learned in the law, have been saying this for years. We deplored more the departure from the basic law and long-established precedent in the antisegregation cases than we did the predictably tragic sociological and legal consequences of the decisions themselves.

The Court last year ruled that no State official may require the reading of a prescribed prayer (that is, one written by an official of the State and ordered to be used) in a public school classroom. This year it went on to say that neither can readings from the Bible, including the Lord's Prayer, be required. More people now see what we meant.

The Court already had just about finished tearing the 1st and 14th amendments to bits and had gone a long way toward remaking them. It further shattered and remolded both in its Bible reading and prayer decisions.

The pertinent portion of the first amendment forbids Congress to make any laws affecting an establishment of religion. This quite clearly was intended to prevent the Government from establishing a state religion and making all citizens adhere to it, to attend the same church no matter what their choice.

English kings had done that to the colonists and it was a factor in their final revolt.

The pertinent provision of the 14th amendment guarantees to all citizens "equal protection of the law."

Two or more families brought suits in the courts of Pennsylvania and Maryland seeking to have the practices broken down by being declared unconstitutional. One group was atheistic, believing in no God; the other, much to our sorrow, was non-Christian but devout believers in God.

They argued that for the authorities to compel their children to sit through Christian devotional services (1) violated the principle of separation of church and state and (2) denied them equal protection of the law.

That the other 29 children in a classroom with the optimum number of 30 pupils might be Christians and desired the devotionals, was not for the Court a valid argument.

Both the plaintiffs and the Court not only ignored the rights of the Christian or religious majority's right to spare the atheist exposure to religion but ignored also the fact that this is a Christian country, founded by Christians whose forebears fled their homelands for the New World in search of, among other things, religious freedom.

If it can be argued that the Constitution should protect the freedom of one from religion, it can be more strongly argued that its purpose is to guarantee the freedom of the majority to seek religion.

The Court carefully refrained from ruling on the question of whether classroom devotionals can be held on a voluntary basis. But what it did say has the same effect. In the classroom the teacher is an agent of the state and whatever he or she says or does is "state action."

The Supreme Court has made its law, but it may find it hard to enforce. We've an idea there'll be a lot of religion, Bible reading and prayer bootlegged into the Nation's classrooms.

On the positive side, the decision may hopefully move the churches and the homes into more zeal and effort in the teaching of religion to their children.

And the Court may be in the position of the foolish prophets of whom old Omar wrote:

"Their words to scorn are scattered, and their mouths are stopt with dust."

[From the State, June 20, 1963]

GOD AND THE SUPREME COURT

"One nation, under God," or so we say in our Pledge of Allegiance.

That may be so, says the Supreme Court of the United States, but let's not bring God into the classroom under the auspices of any State. Last year the Supreme Court told New York that it could not prescribe a nonsectarian prayer to be said (voluntarily) by schoolchildren.

This year, the Court tells Maryland and Pennsylvania that neither Bible reading nor recitation of the Lord's Prayer can be required as a part of the school program.

To allow such a practice, the Court, feels would violate that portion of the first amendment to the Constitution which states that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion."

But what does the ban against Bible reading and prayer do to that other part of the same first amendment which forbids Congress from prohibiting the free exercise of religion?

Basically, this year's Supreme Court rulings—just as did last year's—tend to shift all evidences of religious worship from the school back into the home and the church. Since that is where worship really belongs, there should be no reluctance on the part of parents or preachers to assume, or reassume, the responsibility of bringing up their children in a God-centered environment.

But it is a sad thing to see American traditions degenerate to the point where there is a public outcry against Bible reading and school prayers—especially when all children are left free to participate or not participate in such activities.

And it is disturbing to witness the Supreme Court once again stamp the Federal foot upon the rights of States.

The Constitution clearly says that "the Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment," etc. But the Supreme Court, leaning as usual upon the dubious doctrines prescribed in the 14th amendment, forbids the States from doing those things which initially were forbidden to the Central Government.

Centralization and irreligion are growing apace in these United States.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., June 20, 1963]

EXPLAINING SCHOOL PRAYER RULING

(By David Lawrence)

The controversy over prayers in public schools is just beginning. The problem is how to explain the latest decision of the Supreme Court of the United States to the American people—and, for that matter, to peoples abroad.

The highest court of the State of Maryland, for instance, said it was all right to say prayers in public schools. Two professed atheists disputed this, and the Supreme Court of the United States sided with them and reversed Maryland's highest court.

In Moscow, it has been repeatedly contended that atheism is preferable to any religion, and it has been insisted that there is no God. What shall be said to the students in American schools on this point? How can it be explained to countries whose governments do not forbid unrestricted religious worship?

A prominent Senator from a northern State was telling his friends this week that, when his children came home from school the other day, they said the teacher had "forgotten to say the Lord's Prayer." The prayer, which has been a regular part of the morning exercises in the school, really had been discontinued without explanation.

But what can a teacher say to the children? Suppose the student asks whether there is a God. May the teacher answer the question? To do so might offend the believers in atheism and this, according to the Supreme Court, could violate the Constitution. How might a teacher explain the latest ruling to the students? It might be done this way:

"The Supreme Court has said that we must not pray at our morning exercises or any other time in the schoolroom. It says this violates the Constitution, which forbids Congress to pass any law 'respecting an establishment of religion.'"

"But," then asks the student, "did Congress pass such a law?"

"No," replies the teacher. "Some of the States did, however, and the Supreme Court says no State can pass such a law, either."

"Where," asks the student, "can that be found in the Constitution?"

"It isn't there," replies the teacher, "but the Supreme Court says the 14th amendment covers it just the same, even though laws about religion aren't mentioned."

"But doesn't this mean," asks the student, "that now we do what the atheists say we must do—not mention God? Isn't that a kind of religion, too?"

"All I can do," answers the teacher, "is to quote to you what the Supreme Court says in its opinion. It is as follows:

"'It is insisted that unless these religious exercises are permitted a "religion of secularism" is established in the schools. We agree of course that the State may not establish a "religion of secularism" in the sense of affirmatively opposing or showing hostility to religion, thus "preferring those who believe in no religion over those who do believe." We do not agree, however, that this decision in any sense has that effect.'"

But who can be sure what effect there will be on the mind of the schoolchild who has been told day after day that there is a God, and then suddenly is told that the Supreme Court has ordered the teacher not to say so any longer in the schoolroom or to permit any prayers whatsoever in a public school?

A nationwide campaign of education is going to be necessary to explain not only what the Court forbade, but why it is convinced that a prayer in school might be offensive to those who don't believe in God or in any prayers at all.

Can the people decide this issue for themselves by a vote? Senator J. GLENN BEALL of Maryland, Republican, says he took a poll in his State and found that 71 percent of the people favor Bible reading in the schools. Several Senators have proposed that an amendment to the Federal Constitution be adopted which would read as follows:

"Nothing contained in this Constitution shall be construed to prohibit the authority administering any school, school system, or educational institution supported in whole or in part from any public funds from providing for the participation by the students thereof in any periods of Bible reading or nonsectarian prayer if such participation is voluntary."

The sponsors of the foregoing are Senators WILLIAMS of Delaware, BEALL of Maryland, BENNETT of Utah, GOLDWATER of Arizona, ALLOTT of Colorado, and CARLSON of Kansas.

Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Democrat, also is proposing a constitutional amendment which not only would uphold the constitutionality of Bible reading and prayers in public schools but would "preserve references to belief in or reliance upon God and any invocation of aid from God in governmental or public document, proceeding, ceremony and upon any coinage, currency or obligation of the United States that is standing or may come in the future years."

But amendments of this kind may or may not be adopted. Meanwhile, the issues in the controversy over prayers are growing in complexity, and the average man will wonder why his children in school can't be told by their teachers that there is a God or what the Ten Commandments say about morality.

American Jewish Committee Statements on the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues two significant statements adopted by the 56th annual meeting of the American Jewish Committee held on May 16 to 19, 1963. The statements concern the situation in the Middle East, which is becoming increasingly more precarious. I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 152 which calls upon the United States to guarantee the existing borders of Israel and for the creation of a nuclear free zone in the Middle East. The American Jewish Committee statements are important additions to the discussion of the Middle East problem, and I urge all my colleagues to read them carefully.

The statements follows:

STATEMENTS BY THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE, 56TH ANNUAL MEETING, NEW YORK, N.Y., MAY 19, 1963

THE MIDDLE EAST

Current developments in the Middle East confirm that this strategic area continues to be a center of violence and political instability. The threat to international peace has now substantially increased.

Arab animosity toward Israel continues without abatement. The joint declaration, signed in Cairo on April 17, 1963, establishing a federation among the United Arab Republic (Egypt), the Syrian Arab Republic, and Iraq, incorporates for the first time in a constitutional document the liberation of Palestine as a basic objective. Unless effective action is taken now, there is real danger of armed conflict in the area.

The United States, as leader of the free world, must assume a primary and continuing responsibility, both directly and through the United Nations, for the maintenance of peace and security in this turbulent region.

The American Jewish Committee welcomes President Kennedy's statement, at his press conference of May 8, 1963, that our Government's policy supports "the security of both Israel and her neighbors," seeks "to limit the Near East arms race," and is "strongly opposed to the use of force, or the threat of force, in the Near East." We are also gratified by the President's reaffirmation that "in the event of aggression, or the preparation for aggression, whether direct or indirect, we would support appropriate measures in the United Nations and adopt other courses of action on our own to prevent or put a stop to such aggression."

The President thus confirms fundamental and long-standing tenets of our foreign policy. We believe his statement should be supplemented and clarified to preclude any possibility of miscalculation as to the firm determination of the United States to employ its full resources to meet any threat to peace in the Middle East. Our Government should make clear—as it did during the Lebanese and Jordanian crises of 1958—that covert acts designed to provoke internal upheaval can constitute aggression as much as direct military action.

The continuation of indirect aggression today may precipitate an even more explosive situation than 5 years ago. Our official recognition of the Nasser-backed rebel regime in Yemen—whose power is maintained only through the continued presence of one-third of Egypt's regular army—has created doubts about our determination to oppose subversion and military aggression in the area.

The United States should vigorously pursue all avenues of negotiation, particularly with the Soviet Union, to remove the Middle East from the cold war arena. But as long as the Soviet bloc continues to supply Arab countries with ultramodern weapons—including jet fighters, bombers, submarines, and missiles—effective limitation of armaments is virtually impossible. The United States and other Western powers should take immediate and sustained action to maintain the balance of arms between the Arab countries and Israel.

The swift destructiveness of modern weapons, particularly when used against small and vulnerable nations, makes prior assurances of U.S. assistance crucial. A formal U.S. guarantee of the independence and integrity of any state in the Middle East which requests such a guarantee would have a significant deterrent effect. It would discourage open military aggression. It would also reduce the likelihood that a peaceful nation which considered its security threatened might undertake defensive counteraction, on its own, to stem indirect aggression by others wish to upset the present tenuous balance in the area.

We further urge our Government to press for the elimination of inflammatory Arab propaganda and hate campaigns, which are a major obstacle to peace in the Middle East.

Our Government's policy of impartiality toward all nations in the Middle East cannot succeed unless they are willing, in all good faith, to coexist. In the absence of good faith, our policy of equal treatment seems to condone, if not actively support, the aggressive designs of the Arab States against the very existence of Israel. Our present policy has not succeeded in convincing President Nasser to fulfill his promise to withdraw Egyptian military forces from Yemen. Nor has it deterred him from seeking arms in increasing quantities from the Soviet bloc, thereby furthering Communist penetration.

Finally, a peace settlement between Israel and the Arab States is essential to the creation of a stable and secure Middle East. We urge our Government steadfastly to continue its efforts toward this prime objective.

The American Jewish Committee believes that implementation of U.S. policy requires our Government to (1) clearly define what it would consider aggression; (2) intensify efforts to end the arms race in the area, meanwhile assuring that the balance of arms is not upset; (3) provide a formal guarantee, upon request, of the independence and integrity of any state in the region; (4) vigorously discourage the violent hate campaign against Israel conducted by the Arab States; and (5) reevaluate the present U.S. policy of impartiality toward peaceful nations and those nations pursuing belligerent policies inimical to the peace and stability of the Middle East.

GERMAN SCIENTISTS IN EGYPT

The recent disclosures of the contributions being made by citizens of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Arab Republic's program toward the development of advanced armaments, whose primary objective is the domination of the Middle East, have aroused great concern throughout the Western world.

The American Jewish Committee feels that the efforts of Western scientists and technicians to create a more powerful war machine has exacerbated tensions in the Middle East. These activities have increased the danger of an accelerated Middle East arms race which may lead to war.

There is evidence that some of the Germans employed by the United Arab Republic are pro-Nazi and have expressed strong antidemocratic and anti-Semitic attitudes. The United Arab Republic has made warfare and aggression a foundation of its foreign policy. It has publicly proclaimed, in violation of international agreements, its intention to destroy the State of Israel whose population consists largely of survivors of the Nazi holocaust. In view of the history of the Nazi era, we are sure that the German Government and a large sector of German public opinion are particularly sensitive to the participation of German nationals in activities which increase the possibility of war.

The German Government has condemned such activities and declared that it is eager "to cause the return to Germany of German scientists whose activities abroad could contribute to an increase in political tensions." Many outstanding figures in political, religious, and academic life are trying to put this decision into effect.

We therefore urge the Federal Republic of Germany to utilize existing legal and administrative means to prevent her citizens from contributing to the war potential of the United Arab Republic. In addition, we hope the Federal Republic of Germany will seek new means, if necessary, to control such activities. In this connection the present efforts in the Bundestag to seek amendments to the basic law are encouraging.

The Madness of a Mob

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of Monday, June 24, 1963, entitled "The Madness of a Mob."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MADNESS OF A MOB

When the Supreme Court a decade ago first struck down official segregation in the public schools, the most vocal Southern opponents—the people called "extremists"—defended segregation with two arguments.

One was that the Negro people as a group, whatever the individual exceptions, were neither sufficiently socially advanced nor politically mature for full integration into the community.

The second contention was that the political leaders fighting Southern segregation practices had a more far-reaching objective than the mere striking down of the segregation laws themselves. The cry was that the ultimate aim was not merely the admission of able and qualified Negroes into white schools but the forcible amalgamation of the two races, socially and otherwise, without regard to any other considerations of the effects of this on society or other people's rights.

Not the least of the tragedies in the present racial situation is that a good many Negro leaders and a great many white politicians seem now bent on lending support to these terrible allegations.

Inflamed by their leaders, the Negro people are deserting the orderly ways society has provided for the redress of their grievances, the very ways which have brought them so much progress in the space of a decade. They are turning from courts to the streets, from arguments to riots.

Look not merely at Birmingham. Look at New York or Pennsylvania, Illinois or California. Look at the Nation's Capital. Not only have there been riotous clashes as mobs poured into the streets, but Negro leaders have announced that if the local authorities don't do thus-and-so, and at once, they will choke the streets with bigger mobs.

The excuse for all this, we are told, is that the Negro's very gains make further patience intolerable. Perhaps so. Yet those who persuade the Negroes that violence is the instant remedy for all ills, or encourage them to practice Government by rioting, give ammunition to those who say the Negro is socially and politically immature. In this Nation both of these ideas strike at the very heart of society itself.

So too do some of the remedies put forward by many political leaders, whether done from a desire of political gain or from a fear of violence.

In New York State, where race bars no one from a public school, the State Board of Education says equal rights are not enough. The slightest separation of the races, from whatever cause, must be obliterated. School children must be hauled back and forth like pawns on a chessboard to achieve an arbitrary "balance" decreed by the political authorities.

Now this is, first of all, as brutal a charge of Negro inferiority as any from the wildest Southern extremists, for it accepts the idea that the numerical presence of white children automatically raises the educational level of a school, or conversely that too many Negro pupils lowers it. Beyond that, this policy ceases to be an extension to all of the equal protection of the laws. It is the denial to all of freedom under law. A Negro family that does not want its child carried to a distant school is equal in helplessness under the power of the State.

On the national level too, politicians talk more and more of applying the brute force of Government to compel people to conduct their private lives as the State directs, hardly pausing to think how this remedy would alter a free society. If some had their way, no man would be free to choose his neighbors, his children's associates, to whom he will give lodging or to whom he will sell a hot dog.

Few political leaders any longer dare to try to distinguish between a just and worthy cause—the assurance of equal political rights for all citizens in our society—and a headlong assault against society itself, its ways of living and its way of ordering the laws by which it lives.

Not the least of the dangers in this is that, if unchecked, it will breed a reaction, as a crowd's excesses always do, and the injury will be not the least to the Negro's own cause. But make no mistake about it. It will be an injury to all if hysteria makes it impossible for a reasonable voice to be heard, if we let the reason of men be engulfed in the madness of a mob.

Youth of All Nations, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GAYLORD NELSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the work of a voluntary group of young people working to increase international understanding by means of personal friendships.

The group, Youth of All Nations, Inc., of 16 St. Luke's Place, New York 14, N.Y., is directed by a Wisconsin native, Miss Clara Leiser, who during World War II worked to help young refugees in making friends and to acquaint young Americans with young people in other nations.

To explain the program of Youth of All Nations, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from a constituent, Donald Hahn, of Platteville, Wis., as well as a letter from Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State, about the group.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

PLATTEVILLE, WIS.,
March 26, 1963.

U.S. Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: I write to you about an organization that helps to create personal friendships between the peoples of the world and yet is little heard about. It is my hope that through some publication or statement that you could make public, knowledge of this organization might be made available to greater numbers.

The subject of my letter is Youth of All Nations, Inc., YOAN for short, whose headquarters are at 16 Saint Luke's Place, New York 14, N.Y. Only a few months ago was I myself introduced to YOAN, and already I am corresponding with persons my own age in Germany, Italy, South Africa, and India. I am a civil engineering student at Wisconsin State College and Institute of Technology at Platteville. Time for me is rather limited, but I feel that my leisure moments are well spent when I sit down pen in hand, to fight the misconceptions of our country through healthful friendships. In my short period of writing I have discovered that my pen-friend are eager to hear a personally painted picture of America. Perhaps if more of us here in the United States would take a few minutes to jot down a few cordial, unglorified words in a friendly letter, a network of international connections might help to weld the world together in friendship.

Membership in YOAN has many advantages for serious minded teenagers and college level individuals desiring foreign contact. With a preliminary questionnaire concerning hobbies, interests, schooling, ambitions, etc., an applicant is selectively matched with a compatible pen-friend. YOAN's magazine, called Mirror for Youth and sent to all members, is basically a letter sharing publication to help spread the value of one letter to many. Furthermore, there is the growth of knowledge about another country, unsplashingly presented by one of its citizens. YOAN is a way for an individual to show his effort for world peace and concord; even though one person can do relatively little, the collective force of many could be great.

Youth of All Nations, Inc., is a nonprofit-making, nonpartisan, nonsectarian, and independent international correspondence agency. It was founded by Miss Clara Leiser, a Wisconsin native, during World War II to assist young wartime refugees in making friends, and to help acquaint young Americans with some phases of their oversea contemporaries' life. Today Miss Leiser heads YOAN and is working hard so that more pen-friendships can be set up—my letter to you is intended to help Miss Leiser in her endeavor.

Would you possibly be able to forward what I have said, to your associates in some publication? If you would be kind enough to do this, please ask interested persons aged 14 to 24 (these are not rigid age limits) to mail a stamped, self-addressed envelope and 10 cents (for handling expenses) to Youth of All Nations, Inc., 16 Saint Luke's Place, New York 14, N.Y.

I extend to you a sincere thank you for any assistance you can offer.

Yours very truly,
DONALD HAHN.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., April 19, 1963.

HON. GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: Thank you for your letter of April 10, 1963, and the letter from your constituent, Donald Hahn, of Platteville, Wis., who has asked you to publicize the letter writing organization, Youth of All Nations, Inc., in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The latter communication is returned to you as you requested.

Youth of All Nations is recognized by other "pen pal" organizations as a reputable group which promotes the exchange of letters between young peoples of different countries. It was affiliated with the letter writing committee of the people to people program until the letterwriting committee ceased fuctioning in 1962.

I hope that this information will be useful to you in replying to your constituent. If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

Memorial Day Message of Commanding General of the 5th Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Gen. C. G. Dodge is the able and popular commanding general of the 5th Army, the headquarters of which is in the district which I have the honor to represent. Chicago is very proud of the 5th Army and between the officers and enlisted personnel and the people of the local community there is the warmest of cordiality.

I am extending my remarks to include a Memorial Day editorial written by General Dodge as the guest editorialist for the Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic.

The editorial address follows:

GENERAL DODGE'S MEMORIAL DAY EDITORIAL

Memorial Day has a special meaning to members of the Armed Forces. It is a day set aside in honor of American servicemen who, in times of peace and war, died that our Nation might live.

The tradition of paying homage to the dead is older than Christianity. In ancient Greece neglect of honors due the dead was a crime. At the insistence of the parents of dead Athenian soldiers, a general who had successfully defended the city against enemy invasion was executed. In his haste to return to Athens to join a victory celebration he had left unburied his warriors who had fallen in battle.

Memorial Day is a variation of this almost universal and time-honored custom. The United States is, however, the first country to have set aside one day each year in commemoration of all who died in its military service.

This annual remembrance dates back to the historic general order issued 95 years ago by Gen. John A. Logan, of Illinois, on May 5. General Logan was then commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic. "The 30th day of May," the order read, "would be a day for decorating the graves of the comrades who died in defense of their country * * * and whose bodies now lie in almost every city, village, or hamlet churchyard in the land." He expressed the hope "that it will be kept up from year to year," and it has.

Since its inception, Memorial Day has increased in significance and public attention. It honors the memory of some 493,000 Americans, both the Blue and the Gray, who gave their lives in the War Between the States, and of the close to 600,000 Americans who, shoulder to shoulder in conflicts that followed, died in fighting tyranny and preserving the sacred rights and the freedoms upon which our country was founded.

The soldier at Gettysburg, the Rough Rider who fell on San Juan Hill, the doughboy in the shadows of the Argonne Forest, the fighting man killed on Normandy Beach or on Pork Chop Hill—all are honored on Memorial Day by an America strong in the convictions to which they dedicated their services and their lives.

A symbol of what Memorial Day means to us can be seen on that day, and on every day, at the Arlington National Cemetery. There a sentry regularly paces back and forth in front of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier which marks the final resting place of three comrades in arms.

To the people of our country this march of the sentry at Arlington Cemetery is indeed symbolical of their respect to our honored dead, of the nationwide tribute particularly brought into focus and exemplified by Memorial Day.

It has been said, and well said, that a nation which values anything more than freedom quite likely will lose that freedom. And if it is money or comfort it values more, it will lose that, too.

Today, in a period of relative peace around the world, we of Fifth Army and fellow members of the Armed Forces continue to dedicate our skills and arms in the service of our country and the cause of liberty.

Memorial Day reminds us that we shall deserve to survive and to prosper only to the degree that we are willing to pay the price of freedom: in the precious coin of courage, self-discipline, and steadfast devotion to the great principles of our American faith.

Best New Way To Beat King-Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the propaganda for the King-Anderson social security approach to the health problems of the elderly continues, although there are vastly better ways of dealing with them. I hope that the Ways and Means Committee and the House will have the opportunity to consider my bill, H.R. 388, which is a companion bill of H.R. 21 introduced by my colleague, Congressman FRANK BOW, described in the following article from Medical Economics for June 7, 1963, by John S. DeTar, M.D.:

Best New Way To Beat King-Anderson

The threat of Government control of medical care through social security financing might be eliminated once and for all during the present session of the Congress, but not by merely attacking the King-Anderson type of legislation. A positive alternative program is needed. Representative FRANK T. BOW, Republican, of Ohio, has that alternative—his health insurance benefits bill. It would provide the aged with comprehensive hospital and medical insurance coverage to be paid for in part by Federal funds.

Since Government funds would be used, what advantage does the Bow bill have over King-Anderson? One advantage is that participation would not be compulsory. The person over 65 would retain the freedom to take Federal help or leave it. Were he to take it, he would choose his own doctor and hospital without Federal intervention. There would be no bureaucrats checking on deductibles, diagnoses or hospital stays, because each oldster would have a contract with a private insurance company—not with the Federal Government. Since the program would encourage the aged to seek medical-hospital insurance protection of their own choosing, it would help keep the Blues and the commercial carriers competitive. Since it would best serve the lower income groups, it would eliminate much of the present cost of indigent care. And since it would supplement Kerr-Mills, it would help end the threat of Government control of medicine via social-security-financed medical care.

When dynamic Mr. Bow recently explained his plan to an audience of over 2,000 family doctors in Chicago, he was rewarded with prolonged applause. Many of the doctors asked where his plan had been hiding and why the A.M.A. is not supporting it. I now ask the same question. In fact, over a year ago I asked in this column for a program that would provide persons over 65 with Blue plan policies to be purchased with Federal funds on a tax-deductible basis. I am still convinced that the aged are going to get Blue plan protection or something like it, that Federal funds will be used to buy that protection and that the program will be administered through social security—unless Mr. Bow's plan or something like it is adopted.

The Bow bill, if passed—at this writing it's in the hands of the House Ways and Means Committee—would allow a tax credit of up to $150 for each individual over 65 who is covered by a comprehensive medical-hospital-care policy. Alternatively, the son who buys such coverage for his parents could take the tax credit. So could the ex-employer who buys the coverage for his retired employees.

That tax-deductible feature has two advantages: It would provide an incentive for individual effort in giving oldsters much-needed health insurance. And it would hold the Government's administrative costs to a minimum. In fact, no new bureau would be needed; the Internal Revenue Service would administer the plan.

What about the retired person who has little or no income and no family or ex-employer to buy coverage for him? He's provided for, too. The Bow bill would make a certificate worth $150 available to him. The certificate could be used only for buying health insurance coverage. The insurer would turn in such certificates to the U.S. Treasury and get cash in return. By financing the cost of these certificates through general funds, we would spread the expense over the entire population—instead of increasing social security taxes on the young employed.

Would $150 a year be enough to provide adequate coverage? Very likely. That figure comes from private insurance experts. They believe that competition among health insurance carriers for a market estimated at 14 million oldsters would keep costs down to that amount.

Yet if the Bow bill is so good, why hasn't the AMA endorsed it? Quite obviously because of the use of Federal funds. I don't doubt the risk of that. But is that risk worth taking? I'm sure it is—if taken in support of an alternative to social security-financed medicine, an alternative that's more comprehensive than Kerr-Mills. I'm also sure that the time to choose that alternative is now. Though this Bow bill isn't perfect, it does merit the careful scrutiny of all who value private enterprise above Federal control and free competition above Government monopoly.

The Thin Fabric of Social Harmony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, on May 27 and 28 the citizens of my State were privileged to hear one of our great radio stations speak out on the subject of racial harmony. The broadcast emanated from radio station WOWO, the Fort Wayne outlet of the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co.

This editorial correctly points out that the quest for racial equality must be a national, not a regional effort. It emphasizes quite properly, that a first step in this direction is equal opportunity for employment.

Mr. President, I am proud that the views contained in this editorial were voiced in my own State of Indiana for an audience composed largely of Hoosiers. But the message of the editorial is appropriate for citizens of every State and every region.

Above all, this is encouraging evidence that Americans are becoming increasingly aware of the intimate relationship between civil rights and individual attitudes and actions.

In order for others to benefit from reading this editorial, I ask unanimous consent to have its text printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Thin Fabric of Racial Harmony

(By Carl W. Vandagrift)

If eloquence were a true measure of progress in race relations, racial discrimination would not exist. Much has been written and spoken of the political, moral, legal, social, and economic soundness of racial equality, but words have won few battles for the Negro and the ugly scar of racial discrimination remains more fact than fiction in the country today.

The thin fabric of racial harmony in the North has created a certain distasteful hypocrisy among many northern citizens who view with alarm and concern the racial unrest in the South. Because Negro impatience has not given way to bitterness, anger, and hate in northern cities and because of a tradition of racial tolerance, most of us assume the northern Negro, unlike his southern brother, is content with his lot. Most people recognize and, at the same time deplore the fact that most northern Negroes may not live where they choose, are last hired and first fired, and educationally deprived. We deplore, but we are still slow to act. Racial harmony in the North is, at best, a thin thread and someday this thread may break in the manner of Birmingham or Greensboro. It could happen here in Fort Wayne, Ind.

The fact that it could happen in Fort Wayne was pointed up recently by a local Negro leader, Robert Wilkerson, executive secretary of the Fort Wayne Urban League. Because employment opportunities are often the basis of Negro problems, Wilkerson challenged a group a group of local business and industrial leaders to do more than a "politely compromising job of hiring Negroes." He maintained there has been no serious effort to integrate the Negro into local business and industry, pointing out that if only three local plants were to lay off their Negro workers, four-fifths of Fort Wayne's Negro families would need public help within 10 days. Wilkerson's point was that if the Negro is to be integrated into the American middle-class way of life, equal employment opportunities represent a vital first step. Otherwise, the Negro is doomed to remain in his ghetto of poverty, which, in turn, breeds apathy and lack of motivation.

We, at WOWO, believe that employment of Negroes on the basis of ability, and not color, offers the opportunity for business and industry to establish by deeds, not words, a chance for complete community integration of the Negro. Failure to provide for equal opportunity for our Negro citizens will only foster Negro impatience and discontent. Fort Wayne is not Birmingham, Ala., but the thread of racial harmony here may be thinner than you think.

We Have Lost the "Old Man"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, last weekend citizens of the 19th Illinois Congressional District suffered a real loss with the death of Mr. Harold Truax.

Mr. Truax, the founder of Truax Traer Coal Co., was one of Illinois' most illustrious citizens and the people of his local community have lost a true friend.

We was prominent in circles of coal producers throughout the Nation. He served as president of the Illinois Coal Operators Association, the Illinois Mining Institute, and was active in YMCA work.

Not because of his success in the business world do we mourn his death, but rather because of the many fine deeds he did for his community, and the splendid contribution he made in the area of land reclamation.

Mr. Truax was a pioneer in this field and was responsible for the improvement of hundreds of acres of wasteland in western Illinois. His dream of creating something of beauty and usefulness for his community has gained national prominence. He will be truly missed.

An editorial in the Canton Daily Ledger describes better than I the esteem in which he was held and I am pleased to make this a part of the RECORD:

WE HAVE LOST THE "OLD MAN"

Nicknamed the Old Man, Mr. Harold Truax fulfilled the American dream of the last generation.

His beginnings were certainly humble. Through hard work and intelligent business decisions the Old Man fought his way up through the business world to the very top.

He was equally at home in a pair of coveralls, wandering around the feedlot of a farm or the bottom of a mine pit, or in a silk suit, presiding over a board of directors meeting in Chicago.

His vision of reclamation of strip-mined land prompted the development of Wee-Ma-Tuk Country Club, an area devoted to all-around living and recreation. The Old Man's dream of creating something of beauty and usefulness for our community has gained national prominence.

He had three traits which made him stand out.

First, there was the pioneer spirit and willingness to work to realize his ambitions.

Next, a rugged individualism allowed him to speak his mind without being afraid of what others might think.

Humility was the third trait.

Even after he arrived at the top of the business world the Old Man remained humble—a trait which many, if not most, men lose.

America needs more men like Mr. Truax.

Independence of the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Belatedly, Mr. Speaker, we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of the Republic of the Philippines, Diosdado P. Macapagal; and His Excellency the Philippine Ambassador to the United States, Amelito R. Mutuc, on the occasion of the anniversary of her independence.

It was on June 12, 1898, that General Emilio Aguinaldo proclaimed the Philippines Independence from Spain, after centuries of subjugation. Although that independence was soon eclipsed by several decades of U.S. rule, that rule was in the nature of political tutelage which was terminated as soon as it became clear to all concerned that the people of the Philippines were indeed fully capable of standing on their own feet.

The Philippines received its independence from the United States in 1946, but in view of the transitory nature of the period of American rule, it is fitting that the independence of the Philippines be dated from 1898, when its people first breathed the exhilarating air of freedom. No one can phrase this point more eloquently than President Macapagal has done when he said:

> A nation is born into freedom on the day when such a people, molded into a nation by a process of cultural evolution and sense of oneness born of common struggle and suffering, announces to the world that it asserts its natural right to liberty and is ready to defend it with blood, life, and honor.

It was almost 187 years ago that our American Declaration of Independence was signed. Our forefathers, like yours, were ready to defend their natural right to liberty with their blood, life and honor. Thus both our nations, through their respective struggles for independence, have earned the right to the title of defenders of freedom.

But another equally important reason for referring to our two nations as defenders of freedom is that we are both stanch advocates of the representative form of government, believing in the fundamental principles that government shall be based on the consent of the governed, and that man has certain unalienable rights, among which are the rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

In addition to these solid moral, ideological, and political bonds between our two nations, there is the unforgettable shared experience of Americans and Filipinos fighting shoulder to shoulder on Bataan and holding on to Corregidor; the shared experience of the Bataan death march and the prison camps; and the shared experience of together liberating the Philippines from the Japanese conqueror. What a magnificent demonstration of the mutual respect and mutual loyalty between our two nations, when in the darkest days of World War II the Filipinos, whom we had then been governing for four decades, stood side by side with us, even to the bitter end in those situations where no other end was available.

Our shared experiences in World War II, and our more recent experiences with the multitude of military, political, and ideological challenges facing us in the post-war world, have served to remind us that freedom can never be taken for granted. To preserve freedom under the challenge of alien ideologies, we must be ever willing to defend and strengthen our free institutions as ardently as our forefathers worked to establish them. The American people are proud to have been associated with the Philippine people in this noble venture in the past, and look forward to a continued association for this purpose for years to come.

The Madness of a Mob

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial which appeared in this morning's Wall Street Journal and which should appeal to common sense and reason among all of our citizens.

I do not believe that any of us, North or South, can in truth subscribe to a double standard of civil conduct. State and local laws must be respected by all of our citizens and no segment of the population can be granted immunity to the law simply because they find the law, State or local, displeasing. The present civil rights strife in this country must be reduced to a law and order proposition or the rights of the whole population will be transgressed and impaired.

Following is the editorial entitled "The Madness of a Mob," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of June 24, 1963:

THE MADNESS OF A MOB

When the Supreme Court, a decade ago, first struck down official segregation in the public schools, the most vocal southern opponents—the people called "extremists"—defended segregation with two arguments.

One was that the Negro people as a group, whatever the individual exceptions, were neither sufficiently socially advanced nor politically mature for full integration into the community.

The second contention was that the political leaders fighting southern segregation practices had a more far reaching objective than the mere striking down of the segregation laws themselves. The cry was that the ultimate aim was not merely the admission of able and qualified Negroes into white schools but the forcible amalgamation of the two races, socially and otherwise, without regard to any other considerations of the effects of this on society or other people's rights.

Not the least of the tragedies in the present racial situation is that a good many Negro leaders and a great many white politicians seem now bent on lending support to these terrible allegations.

Inflamed by their leaders, the Negro people are deserting the orderly ways society has provided for the redress of their grievances, the very ways which have brought them so much progress in the space of a decade. They are turning from courts to the streets, from arguments to riots.

Look not merely at Birmingham. Look at New York or Pennsylvania, Illinois or California. Look at the Nation's Capital. Not only have there been riotous clashes as mobs poured into the streets, but Negro leaders have announced that if the local authorities don't do thus-and-so, and at once, they will choke the streets with bigger mobs.

The excuse for all this, we are told, is that the Negro's very gains make further patience intolerable. Perhaps so. Yet those who persuade the Negroes that violence is the instant remedy for all ills, or encourage them to practice government by rioting, give ammunition to those who say the Negro is socially and politically immature. In this Nation both of these ideas strike at the very heart of society itself.

So too do some of the remedies put forward by many political leaders, whether done from a desire of political gain or from a fear of violence.

In New York State, where race bars no one from a public school, the State board of education says equal rights are not enough. The slightest separation of the races, from whatever cause, must be obliterated. Schoolchildren must be hauled back and forth like pawns on a chessboard to achieve an arbitrary balance decreed by the political authorities.

Now this is, first of all, as brutal a charge of Negro inferiority as any from the wildest southern extremists, for it accepts the idea that the numerical presence of white children automatically raises the educational level of a school, or conversely that too many Negro pupils lowers it. Beyond that, this policy ceases to be an extension to all of the equal protection of the laws. It is the denial to all of freedom under law. A Negro family that does not want its child carried to a distant school is equal in helplessness under the power of the State.

On the national level too, politicians talk more and more of applying the brute force of Government to compel people to conduct their private lives as the State directs, hardly pausing to think how this remedy would alter a free society. If some had their way, no man would be free to choose his neighbors, his children's associates, to whom he will give lodging or to whom he will sell a hotdog.

Few political leaders any longer dare to try to distinguish between a just and worthy cause—the assurance of equal political rights for all citizens in our society—and a headlong assault against society itself, its ways of living and its ways of ordering the laws by which it lives.

Not the least of the dangers in this is that, if unchecked, it will breed a reaction, as a crowd's excesses always do, and the injury will be not the least to the Negro's own cause. But make no mistake about it. It will be an injury to all if hysteria makes it impossible for a reasonable voice to be heard, if we let the reason of men be engulfed in the madness of a mob.

Detection of Emphysema

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Erwin Knoll, of the Advance News Service recently wrote an article appearing in several of the newspapers throughout the country on the demonstration that is to be put on here at the Capitol for the detection of emphysema.

This demonstration could not be possible without the complete cooperation of you, Mr. Speaker, a dedicated man to the health and welfare of our people and to Dr. George Calver, the Capitol physician.

I would like at this point to insert in the RECORD Mr. Knoll's article:

SCIENTISTS TO TEST SOLONS—LUNGPOWER IS DISEASE CLUE

(By Erwin Knoll)

WASHINGTON.—The lungpower of the Nation's legislators will undergo scientific testing late next month, but the aim will not be to determine who is the biggest blowhard on Capitol Hill.

Members of Congress will be asked to take part in a respiratory disease screening program which could point the way to a dramatic breakthrough in the detection of lung ailments.

W. K. Grimley, executive secretary of the Alabama Tuberculosis Association, disclosed here that a uniquely-equipped mobile research vehicle will be brought to the Capitol grounds the week of July 22 to apply the tests to Congressmen.

The project, arranged by Representative KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Democrat, of Alabama, in cooperation with the U.S. Public Health Service, is designed to focus national attention on a pioneer medical screening program established in Alabama 1 year ago.

Sponsors of the Alabama effort—including the State's tuberculosis associations, the Medical College of Alabama, and the Public Health Service's Division of Air Pollution—hope the demonstration may lead to establishment of a nationwide screening program which could save thousands of lives and relieve much suffering from increasingly prevalent lung diseases.

The key instrument in the mobile research van is a pulmonary performance recorder that measures the way human lungs function during the breathing process in much the same way that the electrocardiogram gages heart action and the fluoroscope shows intestinal functions.

Coupled with the pulmonary performance recorder in the screening program are a chest X-ray, an air pollution sampling technique, and a personal questionnaire covering such points as occupational history, medical background, smoking habits, and home heating and air-conditioning factors.

Researchers hope this combination of data will lead to early identification and treatment of unsuspected instances of lung disease, indicate how widespread lung disease is in the population and in which groups it is most likely to occur, and furnish clues to the causes of lung disease, and their prevention.

A representative sampling of 10,000 persons has been screened in the Alabama program so far, and that number is to be doubled in the next year. Some 10 percent of the individuals tested have been found to suffer from lung conditions warranting immediate medical attention.

A major target of the project is emphysema, a lung ailment characterized by acute shortness of breath and linked to areas of high air pollution as well as to heavy cigarette smoking. The disease now claims a higher death rate than tuberculosis.

Early stages of emphysema are generally not revealed by chest X-rays and the Alabama researchers hope the respiratory tests will furnish a more reliable diagnostic technique.

They also plan to follow up some of the tested individuals over a 5-year period to see how many develop pulmonary symptoms later on and to attempt to isolate the factors that cause disease.

Members of Congress could prove to be active subjects for the screening program: emphysema occurs most often in men over 35 who are characterized by much nervous activity.

Discrimination in U.S. Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the June 20, 1963, issue of the Columbia Record, of Columbia, S.C., contains some important facts and editorial opinions on current employment policies and practices of the administration. This very interesting editorial is entitled "Discrimination in U.S. Jobs." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISCRIMINATION IN U.S. JOBS

Aw, come off it.

Federal officials in South Carolina and elsewhere who contend that they aren't stretching rules and bending the law in favor of the Negro in hirings and promotions are abusing the truth.

In this State, and in other communities, Federal jobs are being dispensed solely on the basis of race. In its zeal to achieve some sort of mystical balance of employment, the Kennedy administration is establishing not a Fair Employment Practices Commission, but a Discriminatory Employment Practices Commission.

One national writer has concluded that, across the Nation, while "Federal agencies, with the approval and indeed the encouragement of the Civil Service Commission, are stretching rules a bit to give Negroes a better chance at promotions and hirings; white employees have not been hurt materially in the process."

Joseph Young has written, "There is some evidence that the Kennedy administration has engaged in politics in promotions and appointments of some Negroes, particularly in the Post Office Department. The National Association of Postal Supervisors says that some Negroes selected for promotion to key assignments in the Post Office Department appear to have been selected more for their Democratic Party and civil rights group connections than for their experience and ability."

In Dallas, the United Federation of Postal Clerks complained when 3 Negroes were promoted to postal supervisory jobs over 53 other white employees who were ahead of them on the promotion register.

In New Orleans, the Army Corps of Engineers has recently required its appointment officers to forward to district headquarters the reasons for not hiring Negro applicants from the job register. No such reasons are required when whites are not hired.

In Washington, "some career officials say they are being pressured to promote Negroes even though they aren't the best qualified for the jobs."

In the Nation's Capitol, also, there is talk of a quota system for the Veteran's Administration whereby a certain number of supervisory jobs must go to Negroes, regardless of qualifications. There are rumors that the Labor Department has a double standard for typist applicants—40 words a minute for whites and 20 words for Negroes. The Air Force reportedly wants its Negro employees used primarily in activities where they are in contact with the public, and hence get across the point that the Air Force has abolished discrimination.

But that's Washington, Dallas, and New Orleans, you might contend. This couldn't be happening in Columbia.

Oh—couldn't it?

Take the case of the Air Force, desiring to have its Negro employees confront the public. One Federal office in Columbia within the fortnight was ordered to hire a Negro "for the front office" to persuade Columbians that there was no discrimination.

This same office is under orders from Washington to hire any qualified Negro applicant above the two lowest civil service grades. It doesn't matter if there's an opening or not. The Federal Agency has been instructed to "create" a job and let Washington worry about the funds.

Quite obviously, if a qualified white applicant appears—there is no opening.

At another Federal agency just this past week, a white secretary resigned. The telephone jangled. Washington called. "Hire a Negro replacement," was the instruction. Next morning three Negro applicants appeared. One was hired.

At still another Federal agency, white women employees who go on extended leave (maternity, for example) have no assurance that their jobs will be waiting when they return. In the past, there's been no doubt about it. Now, this Agency is busily engaged in hiring Negro women to create a balanced employment.

Shall we go on? Had enough?

The truth is that Federal agencies are discriminating in favor of Negroes in their employment and promotion activities—twisting and bending the law and civil service regulations.

Federal officials who blandly assert that employment proceeds now without regard to color or creed aren't being truthful. Jobs are being given to Negroes because they are Negroes. These same jobs are not available to white applicants.

Independence of Mali

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on June 20, the Federation of Mali celebrated her third anniversary of independence. We wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of the Mali Federation, Modibo Keita; and His Excellency the Mali Ambassador to the United States, Oumar Sow.

On June 20, 1960, the Mali Federation, comprising the former French Soudan and Senegal, became an independent state within the French community. The federation was not a lasting one, for historical and immediate differences led to its breakup by August. The two member states amicably parted, with Soudan retaining the name Mali.

The new Republic of Mali, proclaimed on September 22, 1960, was the heir of an ancient and brilliant empire which flouirshed in Africa around the time the European continent was experiencing what historians have popularly called its "dark ages." The Mali empire extended over a large portion of West Africa, and its Islamic civilization was dynamic and prosperous. The people and government of the new Mali are determined to emulate the Mali of the past.

The Republic of Mali shares common borders with Mauritania, Senegal, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Upper Volta, and the Sahara. It has always been a crossroads on the trans-Saharan trade routes, and its age-old settlements such as Timbuctoo conjure up images of the Arabian Nights.

But Mali is as much of the 20th century as of the past. It has been a center of political activity since World War II when Modibo Keita, now the President of Mali, the late Mamadou Konate, and several other prominent Soudanese were among the cofounders of the regional political movement, Rassemblement Democrtaique Africain.

Since achieving independence Mali has been an active force working toward greater unity on the African continent, in the Ghana-Guinea-Mali union, as one of the founders of the Casablanca group, and recently at Addis Ababa as a stanch supporter of an inter-African unity charter. Reporting back to the people of Mali after the Charter of the Organization of African Unity had been signed, President Keita stated that an important step had been taken to frustrate attempts at division and crystallization of Africa into antagonistic blocs.

The spirit of the new Mali is accurately reflected in the constitution of the republic. Reaffirming the rights and liberties of man and of the citizen, the preamble provides that the republic "shall create the conditions necessary for the harmonious development of the individual and the family as the center of a modern society, with full respect for the African personality." The preamble enumerates certain rights: the right to employment and to rest, the right to strike, and the right to assemble into organizations of cooperation or organizations created by one's choice for the promotion and defense of professional interests.

The new Mali deserves our congratulations for its dynamic resurgence. President Modibo Keita is one of Africa's rising young political leaders who is becoming known and who is being listened to throughout the African continent. Mali's economy is being transformed by carefully thought out development plans. The people of Mali are engaged in building schools and working the land in a huge national investissement humain—human investment—development program.

On this third anniversary of independence we salute the people of Mali and President Modibo Keita for 3 years of noteworthy accomplishments and express our best wishes for Mali's continuing development and prosperity.

Hon. William Jennings Bryan Dorn: The Launching of the "John C. Calhoun"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday June 22, 1963, at Newport News, Va., the SSB(N) 630—the U.S.S. *John C. Calhoun*--was launched.

This Polaris submarine bears the name of one of the most illustrious men ever to grace the Halls of the Congress of the United States. President Kennedy, in his book "Profiles in Courage," said "who formed with Webster the most outstanding triumvirate the Senate has ever known, Henry Clay and John C. Calhoun."

Harriet Martineau, the English spinster, referred to Calhoun as the "cast iron man who looks as if he had never been born and never could be extinguished."

He could have—

Said Webster—

demolished Newton, Calvin, or even John Locke as a logician.

President Kennedy, in his book above referred to, had this to say—

His speeches, stripped of all excess verbiage, marched across the Senate floor in even columns, measured, disciplined, carrying all before them.

It is little wonder that President Kennedy, at my request, designated such an important instrument in our arsenal of freedom for a man who championed in cause so dear to the heart of every living South Carolinian.

The speaker for the occasion was the brilliant orator, our beloved colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN. Mr. DORN's magnificent address, delivered in his inimitable oratorical style, brought round after round of spontaneous patriotic applause. No one could have suppressed Mr. DORN on this occasion. Mr. Speaker, South Carolina was proud of Mr. DORN's performance for her favorite son. South Carolina is proud of Mr. DORN.

I want the Congress of the United States and America to read his address. Capt. G. A. Wright, chaplain for the 5th Naval District delivered a most appropriate prayer for the occasion. I want to insert this prayer just before Mr. DORN's address:

PRAYER BY CAPT. G. A. WRIGHT

Almighty and Ever-loving God, whose way is in the sea and across the ocean waves, whose path winds silently through the dark, deep waters, at this solemn moment we invoke Thy devine blessing upon this launching ceremony. In Thy mercy, O God, help us to lift this occasion to a level where we may experience the triumph of the best within us. We confess that we are not always ready to acknowledge either Thy sovereignty or our dependence upon Thee. Too often have we failed to recognize Thy power, even when the evidence around us—and within us—was remembering. Give us, therefore, the insight to demonstrate Thy praise not only in words but in deeds, and may we never, never fail Thee. For all who have contributed to the total effort—human and material—essential to the making of this exciting occasion a present reality, we readily raise our gratitude and appreciation. Especially do we remember with thanks the unnamed American who in one way or another shoulder the higher cost of keeping the free world free. We commend to Thee the officers and men who share the awesome responsibility of manning and controlling this mighty Polaris submarine. May they and all who follow ever serve with loyalty, courage, and devotion as *John C. Calhoun* fulfills whatever mission assigned. "Eternal Father, stay and save, whose arms doth bind the restless wave," save us from the temptation to place our security and trust in ships, in arms alone, when our real strength lies in the determination to place patriotism before self-interest, truth before propaganda, law before tyranny and faith in God before unbelief and self-sufficing. We who love freedom more than life pray this prayer in the name and for the sake of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

ADDRESS OF WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, DEMOCRAT, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, AT THE LAUNCHING OF THE POLARIS SUBMARINE U.S.S. "JOHN C. CALHOUN," NEWPORT NEWS, VA., JUNE 22, 1963

England in the year 1500 was a small dot on the map of the world. Her population and land area were insignificant when compared to the populations and land masses of Eurasia. England had experienced invasion and conquest by the Romans and Normans. Around the year 1500 British leaders were aware there would be future attempts at conquests of their native land by foreign powers. These were men of great foresight. They had imagination and vision. They had keen insight into future eventualities and future dangers. They formulated a policy for survival. They took an inventory and found that England could muster no great land armies and had access to limited natural resources. These intrepid leaders turned to science and technology as a means of survival. England turned to her skills and to the industrials arts. England did the things she could do best. She built a navy—the superior of any in the world. She destroyed the Spanish Armada and for nearly 400 years Britannia ruled the waves. Her great navy controlled the seven seas of the world. She led the world in commerce. The sun never set on the English language, English art, literature, and culture. British law, the Christian religion, and dignity of the individual followed the British fleet to the very ends of the earth. The British Navy with their Union Jack was the symbol of peace and civilized power. Our country today is much indebted for our own freedom to the imperial British Navy.

The United States, as it faces the future, is confronted with a similar problem. We are outnumbered numerically, and in the face of Communist expansion we are small geographically. We cannot muster the largest land armies in the world to insure freedom and peace. Our only hope of survival and our only hope to maintain free world leadership and to preserve the peace is through superior leadership in science and technology. Only as long as we stay ahead of our potential enemies in the field of scientific research and development, can we hope to remain the arsenal of democracy and the heart and core of freedom. The hopes and aspirations of all free peoples look to this Nation for leadership during these critical times. We must accept the challenge. We have no alternative.

The launching of the *John C. Calhoun* here today is a manifestation of our determination to keep the sea lanes of the world open to all nations and to all people. We must police the waterways of the world so that freemen can remain free and continue active in the cause of spreading freedom. There will be attempts in the future to control the seas of the world for evil, for conquest, and for slavery. There will be attempts by the forces of totalitarianism to control the air, the winds, the air currents, and the weather. There will be attempts by these forces of autocracy to control the currents of the sea. We are on the threshold of the greatest challenge in all the history of civilization. We must be first. There is no place in the world of today for second best. The nation that controls the seas of the world and is first in space will control the world for the next 1,000 years. The choice is for good or for evil. We have no other. We must lead and insure freedom, ethics, morality, and peace even beyond our own time.

Science and technology, control of the sealanes, control of space, leadership, science and technology for what? To preserve the fundamental principles enunciated in the Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and its Bill of Rights. The importance and dignity and worth of the individual, a basic belief that man is more than a grain of sand on the seashore of time to be shoveled by the masters of the state for their own selfish glory and power. Millennial days have not come. Oppression, slavery, poverty are abroad even in this modern world. These evils flourish and grow in the areas under control of dictators and those seeking to infiltrate and conquer the world. In those areas of true representative government, those with a republican form of government with majority rule, we find on the other hand a maximum of liberty, tolerance, understanding, law and order, culture, and a higher standard of living. This is still the world of the strong and the weak, of the oppressor and the oppressed, and until the millennial years, the United States must remain invincible on the sea, on the land, in the air, and in the space beyond the air. Our Armed Forces will be truly peace forces.

This nuclear powered *John C. Calhoun* is a magnificent instrumentality of peace. It will embody the traditions, the heritages, and and the esprit de corps of the U.S. Navy. The U.S. Navy from John Paul Jones down to this hour has played a major role in the freedom and growth of this Republic. The glorious history of the U.S. Navy will be exemplified in the *John C. Calhoun* and in its crew, its officers. and those industrial artists of this great shipbuilding yard who no less than those in uniform are making a contribution to the cause of peace and freedom.

In the budding days of this Republic, John C. Calhoun, the statesman, played a leading role in the emergence of the new Nation as a growing world power. It was John C. Calhoun, the nationalist, serving in Congress as one of the famous war hawks who was determined that the United States would take its rightful place among the great powers of the world. It was in this era of Calhoun that the world first realized that a new and powerful nation was developing. As Secretary of War under President James Monroe, Calhoun reorganized our national defense and gave it dignity and respect. He was far ahead of his time and advocated measures of military preparedness which were adopted 100 years later.

Calhoun was a member of the President's Cabinet when the famous Monroe Doctrine was formulated and became the cornerstone of American foreign policy in the Western Hemisphere. This great policy which has served this Nation and the free world so admirably for 150 years is not dead. It could become the springboard from which a worldwide Monroe Doctrine could be established. In reality our foreign policy today opposing aggression anywhere is a modern extension of this fearless policy of Monroe and Calhoun. When the Monroe Doctrine was declared, the United States was a comparatively weak Nation. Our military weakness was overcome by our courage. Our determination, our courage, and the cooperation of the English Navy preserved the Western Hemisphere from foreign aggression. In facing the problems of the world today, we must exhibit this same courage. We must resist aggression anywhere and everywhere.

The submarine *John C. Calhoun* will play an important role in implementing, preserving, and enforcing our foreign policy of resistance to aggression. Cuba in the possession of a powerful foreign power is a violation of the time-honored policy as enunciated in the Monroe Doctrine. Cuba, under the domination of a foreign power and with instrumentalities of scientific warfare, is in a position to challenge our control of the most vital sealanes of the world. It dominates the Panama Canal, the link between the Atlantic and the Pacific. This strategic island, the Formosa of the Atlantic, divides the western Atlantic. It separates North America from South America. It is strategically the most important spot in the Western Hemisphere and cannot be permitted to remain in the hands of those sworn to destroy Western civilization. The peaceful withdrawal of these foreign forces of aggression in Cuba can only be accomplished through American determination and strength. Any implementation of our policy to compel withdrawal of these aggressors from Cuba must necessarily be largely a function of the U.S. Navy. The *John C. Calhoun* and more to follow are a necessary and vital part of American plans to preserve the peace in the Western Hemisphere and insure the security and peace of the world.

The courage, integrity, statesmanship, and leadership of John C. Calhoun was again manifested when he was Secretary of State under President Tyler. While Secretary of State, Texas was admitted to the Union. The Nation experienced great territorial expansion, national growth, and increased international prestige. John C. Calhoun realized that the United States must become a great continental power stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific. As a continental power today, our influence is felt in the Atlantic and the Pacific as well as throughout the world.

The career of John C. Calhoun typifies the opportunity open to all Americans today regardless of station in life. John C. Calhoun believed in opportunity. He believed in duty. His life was dedicated to national service. John C. Calhoun was born in Abbeville District on the western frontier of South Carolina at the close of the Revolutionary War. He attended the famous log cabin school of Dr. Moses Waddell where discipline, physical labor, the classics, and Bible study created leadership which influenced the destiny of the United States.

Calhoun left the rugged frontier and completed his education at Yale and the Litchfield, Conn., Law School. He became a member of the South Carolina General Assembly, Congressman of the United States, Secretary of War, and Vice President under John Q. Adams and Andrew Jackson. He resigned the Vice Presidency to represent South Carolina in the U.S. Senate where he became a member of the great triumvirate with Henry Clay and Daniel Webster. After his tenure as Secretary of State under President Tyler, Calhoun again returned to the U.S. Senate where his career ended in 1850.

John C. Calhoun was recently selected as one of the five greatest U.S. Senators of all time. This committee of selection was headed by Senator John F. Kennedy, now President of the United States. John C. Calhoun's son-in-law, Thomas G. Clemson, provided for the donation of the old Calhoun plantation to the State of South Carolina for a State college. Clemson College today is a monument to John C. Calhoun and Thomas G. Clemson. The Calhoun mansion on the Clemson campus is a national shrine visited by thousands.

With this environment, this heritage, and Calhoun's example of devoted service, it was natural for Clemson to furnish more officers to the Army during World War II than any American college with the single exception of Texas A. & M.

John C. Calhoun was a champion. He was no common man. He was an uncommon man. Calhoun excelled in his defense of principle and in his denunciation of wrong.

The Calhoun family and my fellow citizens are greatly honored to have this great instrumentality of defense and peace named in honor of our greatest statesman. It is indeed gratifying to know that the name of John C. Calhoun, a missile in his day, will be launched again in the cause of freedom, justice, and national honor.

But—

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the June 24, 1963 issue of U.S. News & World Report contains an important editorial by the editor of this outstanding magazine Mr. David Lawrence. It is entitled

"But—" and points up the fact that for the most part only one side of the battle of the so-called "civil rights" is being presented to the American public through too many of the news media. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

But—

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy addressed a nationwide television and radio audience on the night of June 11.

But—no spokesman for the opposition viewpoint from either party in Congress was given an opportunity afterwards to make a rebuttal to that same audience. Mr. Kennedy said:

"Difficulties over segregation and discrimination exist in every city, in every State of the Union, producing in many cities a rising tide of discontent that threatens the public safety."

But—the vast majority of the American people certainly didn't have this feeling of disarray or of imminent danger just a few months ago, before the so-called "nonviolent" demonstrations stirred up violence and the Supreme Court of the United States suddenly divested local police authorities of their power to secure the conviction of persons guilty of inciting disorder. The President described the current situation as follows:

"The fires of frustration and discord are burning in every city, North and South, where legal remedies are not at hand. Redress is sought in the streets, in demonstrations, parades and protests which create tensions and threaten violence and threaten lives."

But—were these demonstrations spontaneous, or were they organized and directed by persons who deliberately played upon the prejudices and enraged feelings of both sides? The President continued:

"It is better to settle these matters in the courts than on the streets, and new laws are needed at every level, but law alone cannot make men see right."

But—the President nevertheless insisted that laws of a repressive nature and of doubtful constitutionality be enacted to coerce the owners of private businesses to surrender their right to decide how best to maintain their customer relations. Mr. Kennedy declared:

"We face, therefore, a moral crisis as a country and a people. It cannot be met by repressive police action. It cannot be left to increased demonstrations in the streets. It cannot be quieted by token moves or talk. It is a time to act in the Congress, in your State and local legislative body and, above all, in all of our daily lives."

But—can a moral crisis be solved by intensifying the controversy through legislative proposals, especially when the people are not convinced that an invasion of their private rights by law is fair to them or that they should be called upon to give up their cherished right of "freedom of association," as the Supreme Court terms it? The President added:

"Those who do nothing are inviting shame as well as violence. Those who act boldly are recognizing right as well as reality. * * * I shall ask the Congress of the United States to act, to make a commitment it has not fully made in this century to the proposition that race has no place in American life or law. * * *

"The old code of equity law under which we live commands for every wrong a remedy, but in too many communities, in too many parts of the country, wrongs are inflicted on Negro citizens and there are no remedies at law. Unles the Congress acts, their only remedy is the street."

But—wrongs are frequently inflicted on many whites, too, and the remedy is not sought in mob violence.

Legislation alone, argued the President, cannot solve this problem, and he then added that "it must be solved in the homes of every American in every community across our country."

But—if race prejudice has "no place in American life," does the President favor intermarriage of Negroes and whites, against which there is the biggest single prejudice between these two races today? Some States still have laws barring such marriages, and the Supreme Court has never invalidated them.

Does the President, moreover, favor laws requiring integration of private clubs and private schools? These organizations, along with labor unions, operate under the beneficent license of Federal and State law—tax exemption—and are thus State connected, as the Supreme Court could classify it.

Mr. Kennedy pointed out in his speech that the "lack of an adequate education denies the Negro a chance to get a decent job." He said that Negro students who have attended segregated schools have "suffered a loss which can never be restored."

But—if this be true, why have so many Negroes, in the North and the South, who have attended predominantly Negro schools and colleges been able to attain high positions in the business and professional world, while other Negroes who were educated in integrated schools failed? Is a person's success or failure in life dependent only on his schooling? Must we not realistically examine the worth of the individual himself?

The President said: "Every American ought to have the right to be treated as he would wish to be treated."

But—in reality every American ought to be treated as he deserves to be treated, namely, on the basis of his ability and moral character, and his consideration for the rights of his fellow man. This is the essence of responsible individualism in a free society.

Administrator of Veterans' Affairs Refutes Statements of Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an analysis on the subject of nonservice-connected pensions prepared by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Honorable John S. Gleason, of statements distributed by national headquarters of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., and sent to Members of Congress following Administrator Gleason's appearance before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on April 3, 1963.

The analysis follows:

Analysis by the Veterans' Administration of the Open Letter to the Members of Congress From the Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc.

Following hearings by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, the national headquarters of the Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc., sent Members of Congress an open letter attacking the statement on pension made by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs before the committee on April 3, 1963.

This letter is a mixture of half-truths, error, and a play on words. It is not responsive to Administrator John S. Gleason's statement. It evidences either a lack of knowledge of present laws and understanding of what H.R. 2332 proposes or a calculated intention to mislead.

The letter says: "Statements by the Administrator need clarification * * * proper and careful research of the true facts have not been made available."

Comment: The statements of the Administrator were factual and were based on long study of the operations of the pension program and careful analysis of pending legislative proposals.

The letter says: "An all-or-nothing law never applied to pensions for veterans of World War I."

Comment: The all-or-nothing principle did apply to World War I veterans. Prior to Public Law 86–211, the current pension law which became effective July 1, 1960, there was no graduated scale of payments. If income was within limits by 1 cent all of the pension was paid, or if income was 1 cent over limits nothing was paid. Public Law 86–211 raised income limits, introduced a graduated scale providing lesser pension for those with more income and greater pension for those with lesser income.

The letter says: "The Administrator's statement that H.R. 2332 would return to the all-or-nothing principle is unfounded."

Comment: H.R. 2332 proposes a flat rate pension of $100 monthly. If income is within provided limits, a veteran would get all, or, if the limits are exceeded, he would receive nothing.

The letter says: "In his concern for those most in need, the Administrator has erroneously reported that H.R. 2332 makes no provision to help a married veteran with two children * * * that the bill would increase this veteran's pension by $10 monthly."

Comment: This statement shows the writer's misunderstanding of either the provisions of Public Law 86–211 or the proposals of H.R. 2332 or both. H.R. 2332 provides no increase to help the married veteran with two children who is most in need, that is, whose annual income does not exceed $1,000. As a matter of fact, such veterans under Public Law 86–211 now receive $100 monthly. Under H.R. 2332, their rate would still be $100 monthly. What H.R. 2332 actually permits is payment of $1,200 a year to a veteran with three children, or two children, or one child, or even to a veteran with no dependent. A veteran with only one dependent, under H.R. 2332 would be permitted to receive $1,200 a year pension even though he were getting the maximum social security payment and had $3,600 yearly in other income. This would pay pension to many with incomes far in excess of the median income of the average male which is only $4,081.

The letter says: "Public Law 86–211 has caused hardship. 'The major veterans organizations have stated * * * that 86–211 has caused hardship * * * and have asked that this bill be amended or done away with.' "

Comment: On the contrary, the Congress has, through passage of Public Law 86–211, made important and substantial increases in the amount of pension paid and the numbers to whom pension may now go. That law raised annual limits on income governing payment of pension from $1,400 to $1,800 for single veterans, widows, and children; these limits were raised from $2,700 to $3,000 for veterans with dependents and widows with children. It pays pension to hundreds not previously eligible for any pension. The new law provides increased rates for thousands; substantial increases. These increases range up to $21.25 monthly for veterans with three dependents, up to $26.88 monthly for widows with three children. This increase provided by Congress is still available to thousands not receiving it who may benefit by merely electing under the new law.

The letter says: "The Veterans' Administration's argument against excluding all of the spouse's income in determining a veteran's entitlement because it permits him to create his own need is an unfair accusation; preposterous and presumptuous."

Comment: A spouse's income is family income. If available to the veteran, it affects his need for pension and should be considered. Even so, only about 1½ percent of all pension cases are effected by this provision of law. Yet we know, under prior law, many veterans did transfer income-producing property to their wives in order to reduce their own income and thus be eligible for pension. This practice is not a presumption but an established fact. It is inconsistent for any group to deny the existence of this practice while seeking legislation to condone it.

The letter says: "Who can define need, and why should it apply to veterans and their dependents."

Comment: Need has long been defined in and is well known to our laws. Historically, pension has been based on the concept of need. This is so because pension is paid for disability or death not related to service to veterans or their widows who, because of reduced income, need some supplement to prevent want. No one wants to see a fellow human being in need, veteran or nonveteran; it is, however, grossly inequitable to ask a host of taxpayers, veterans included, to share their earnings with individuals already receiving income greater than that of the taxpayer.

The letter says: "Can it be possible the Administrator [would] * * * want all non-service-connected veterans to be penniless in order to receive a pension? It is a well known fact that citizens who have never served their country, and are on the welfare rolls, are receiving more consideration than the veteran."

Comment: These statements are untrue. Pensions under present law are now being paid to single individuals with incomes up to $1,800 and to married persons and those with children with incomes up to $3,000 a year. Persons with incomes approaching $3,000 yearly are certainly not penniless and, in computing income, the current pension law does not consider donations from public or private relief or welfare organizations. Further, local welfare departments make no distinction between veterans and nonveterans in their attempts to meet human needs.

The letter says: "The organization is concerned that the Administrator did not mention the aid and attendance allowance proposed by H.R. 2332."

Comment: H.R. 2332 carries exactly the same aid and attendance allowance of $70 as the present law. Since in H.R. 2332 no change was proposed, there was no reason to mention aid and attendance.

The letter says: "It is unbelievable the VA has questioned the 90 days' service requirement for eligibility to pension."

Comment: This is an erroneous conclusion. The Administrator did not question the eligibility period required for pension. He did compare the $100 monthly benefit H.R. 2332 would pay those with as little as 90 days' service, and with little consideration for need, with the $90 military retirement pay a corporal would receive after 20 years of service.

The letter says: "The Administrator failed to mention that H.R. 2332 would grant increases to widows. It asks the question, 'Is it possible that anyone can conceive that any human being can live on $50.40 per month?' It expresses wonder that the Administrator had failed to give consideration to widows who had sacrificed their loved ones in three major wars."

Comment: This reflects inaccuracy and false assumptions. Widows receiving but $50.40 per month must surely have income in excess of $600 per year from other sources or they would have elected benefits under Public Law 86–211 of $60 per month. The distinction between pension for widows and other benefits such as compensation for service-connected death must be kept in mind. Pension for widows is provided for those whose husbands have died from causes not related to service. Death compensation or dependency and indemnity compensation, on the other hand, are provided for widows who sacrificed their loved ones in the three major wars. Those widows mentioned in the letter must be receiving the greater service-connected benefit.

The letter says: "Wonder is expressed at the Administrator's mention of a tax-free pension. It asserts that a retired corporal of the regular establishment receiving retirement benefits based on 20 years' service would be permitted by H.R. 2332 to waive his retirement pay to accept pension if he served in World War I; that no such right of election is provided by Public Law 86–211."

Comment: This conclusion is also untrue. Public Law 86–211 did not eliminate the veteran's right to waive so much of his military retirement as equals the amount payable as pension. Therefore, the question of waiver was not mentioned by the Administrator. In the concrete example he gave of a corporal with 20 years' service receiving retirement pay, tax-free pension was mentioned because the corporal must pay income tax on his retirement pay while pension is not taxable.

The letter says: "Acknowledging that H.R. 2332 would provide an income up to $6,000 a year for veterans over 65 years of age, the writer took issue with the Administrator for failing to specify the number of such individuals."

Comment: The Administrator showed that one-half the male population of the United States have incomes under $4,081 yearly. Any bill providing a pension which purports to be based on need is poorly founded if it permits anyone to be eligible who is in the $6,000 annual income bracket.

Community Mental Health Centers Act of 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I am again pleased to join with my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Rhode Island, Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, in introducing a fourth bill in the field of mental illness and mental retardation. This bill, the "Community Mental Health Centers Act of 1963" has two main provisions: First, the authorization of grants to the States to construct comprehensive community mental health centers and second, the authorization of short-term project grants for the initial staffing cost of these centers.

With Congressman FOGARTY I stress the crucial need for action in this field. As I did in my last message on this topic, I refer to my remarks in the RECORD on March 19, 1963, which is a comprehensive analysis of this field of legislation.

The President's message on mental retardation indicated the need for community mental health centers. This need has been supported by recent developments in mental health activities throughout the country which reveal that a large percentage of the mentally ill can be cared for in their home communities if adequate services are provided. However, in all but a few communities in the Nation, these facilities do not exist.

The community mental health center will correct this situation by providing early diagnosis, outpatient and inpatient treatment, and transitorial and rehabilitative services. We will help to provide community service to community people to solve a community problem. Basically, the patient will be able to proceed from diagnosis through treatment and recovery to rehabilitation in the shortest time.

This program has precedent in the Hill-Burton Act where Federal funds have long been used to help meet the cost of constructing health facilities. Health facilities are an integral and necessary part of our national mental health program.

Mr. Speaker, I again commend the efforts of the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island. He has constantly urged this House to pass legislation which will lessen the burden of those suffering from mental illness and mental retardation. I salute him for his efforts in this vital matter, unequaled in the Congress and I join with him in urging passage of this legislation.

Only Way to Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the June 9, 1963, Palestine (Tex.) Herald-Press editorial concerning the dispute between the railroads and the firemen. The editorial suggests negotiation as the only way a human dispute can be settled with a hope for justice:

ONLY WAY TO JUSTICE

The Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, holding a State meeting here, has laid down a challenge to the railroads.

If the roads, as they have announced, inaugurate new rules changes proposed by a Presidential commission, the firemen will strike. The union says it is willing to negotiate but that the railroads are not. And its members are hopping mad about accusations that have been made against them in a nationwide campaign waged for the last several years by the railroads of the United States.

The railroads have charged featherbedding. They have said firemen are unnecessary on freight trains. They claim losses of multiplied millions each year and, by inference, blame featherbedding with just about all of their financial woes.

Except for the comment that we never have seen a fireman touring the country in a private car, we claim no knowledge whatever about who gets the gravy in railroad operation. We don't know how many firemen are actually needed or how many miles ought to constitute a day's work on a railroad.

We do believe, however, that the firemen have a point when they are angered by railroad attacks against them. The attack has been bitter and sustained. Men who have worked, we suppose faithfully, for years and are still working, have been branded as just about everything but common thief for the simple reason that the railroads say that now they don't need them any more.

And the sad thing about it all, we believe, is that all this bitterness may have been unnecessary.

One thing you can say about railroads in general: when they set out to make a point, they drive it home to stay. If they want to abandon a profitless train, their mathematicians will make it appear that one more run by local so-and-so will wreck the railroad and ruin the national economy. When they oppose a canal project, as they now are opposing the Trinity River canalization plan, they convert millions into billions with a straight face and then repeat the fraud when their hand is called.

Public relations is a modern science that wasn't invented when the rails won the West, and somehow the railroads haven't discovered it yet. Therefore, although the roads desperately need fares on the few passenger trains they still operate, they'll send your baggage on a future train—not the one you're riding—and they make no apparent effort to arrange schedules so that trains connect without murderous layovers.

The railroads turned their attack on the firemen with typical gusto and, we suspect, typical exaggeration. Who can blame the men for being sore?

We have an idea there's bound to be room for give on both sides and that, even at this late date, a way might be found to avoid thrusting sudden hardship on large numbers of people and to permit the railroads to make economies at the same time. The way won't be found by shouting or accusations. It might be found, as some of the union officials suggested here, by sincere negotiations.

That, after all, is the only way a human dispute can ever be settled with a hope for anything like justice.

The Wrong and the Remedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal of June 20, 1963, contains a very perceptive editorial entitled "The Wrong and the Remedy." This editorial is in connection with the administration's civil rights package which has been introduced in Congress. The editors of the Wall Street Journal have cut through all the propaganda surrounding these proposals and gone to the crux of the matter—a further extension of central authority and control. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 20, 1963]

THE WRONG AND THE REMEDY

More than 3 months ago President Kennedy proposed additional civil-rights legislation, principally concerned with strengthening the voting privilege for Negroes. Presumably, after long consideration, this bill was the sum of what Mr. Kennedy thought necessary to meet the problem.

Yesterday Mr. Kennedy sent to Capitol Hill new and far more sweeping recommendations. His message is frankly a response, developed only in the past few weeks, to the increasing violence which is marring race relations. The fires of frustration and discord, he says, are burning hotter than ever; worse explosions are in store unless the Federal Government leads the way to immediate remedies.

We find this tone of haste, almost of political panic, deeply disturbing. This, if nothing else, raises the most serious questions about the proposed remedy, particularly as it applies to privately owned "accommodations" which serve the public.

It is true, at least in our opinion and that of most Americans, that a Negro traveler should be able to stop at a public inn and not be turned away solely because of his race. It is a fact that he is still denied that opportunity in many places. That is a wrong which, as the President says, calls for a remedy.

But it is also true, as the President acknowledges, that it is being rapidly remedied. Some 30 States, the District of Columbia and numerous cities have enacted laws against discrimination in places of public accommodation; in addition, merchants have done it on their own. In Mr. Kennedy's words, "many doors long closed to Negroes, North and South, have been opened."

In those circumstances it is a question whether a Federal law is needed to remedy what is already being remedied. The President's only real justification is that the progress is not fast enough. That seems to us a dubious justification for a law of this nature.

One of the proffered legal excuses for it is the Constitution's interstate commerce clause. Under this interpretation, almost every retail establishment in the Nation, from the lowliest hot-dog stand to the grandest hotel, could be swept under new Federal control, because almost all at some time use goods that cross State lines or serve people that do. Whatever else it may be, this is a swift and surging expansion of central authority.

The other proffered constitutional basis for the measure is the 14th amendment provision that no State law shall permit unequal treatment of any of its citizens. But the amendment also says no State shall deprive any person of property without due process of law. Antidiscrimination legislation, whether local or Federal, must risk doing just that.

Suppose a woman makes a meager living taking transients in her own home. If she does not want to accept Negroes, is she subject to the penalties of the law? If so and she refuses to comply, she has the choice of giving up her livelihood. Or the owner of a modest restaurant may not feel any personal prejudice and yet know that if he opens his doors his clientele will become exclusively Negro; if he doesn't want that, he also has the choice of abandoning his property.

Does the Negro citizen's right to equality of treatment transcend another citizen's right to use his property as he sees fit? If so, it is not a very big step to decreeing that the private homeowner is no longer free to dispose of his property as he chooses.

The sad part is that the clash of rights does not have to be brought to this point. With patience and a minimal amount of good will on each side, it can be resolved by individuals and within communities. The proof is that it is being resolved in so many places, North and South.

If nothing at all were being done to improve the Negro's position, the Federal Government's case for the course of compulsion would be more understandable. As it is, the Nation should think hard about a legislative course conceived in such haste, with such highly political overtones, and proposed as a conscious concession to illegal mob violence.

Most particularly we should all be concerned about the underlying attitude: That where there is a wrong, any remedy will do—no matter what fresh wrongs the remedy brings forth.

A Salute to the Latin Community of Miami, Fla., and the Newspaper Diario Las Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Miami is now the undisputed "Gateway of the Americas," attributable in large measure to the efforts of Greater Miami's Latin American community. Their cooperative efforts, integrated and coordinated with the industrial, political, and business community, have provided a most important and valuable link between the United States and our friends to the south.

It is reliably estimated that there are between 150,000 and 200,000 permanent residents in south Florida whose heritage is Latin American. Coupled with the Cuban refugees, the Latin population is estimated to be 350,000 to 400,000.

Their presence and efforts in the south Florida community have resulted in a bilingual populace, and have encouraged and enhanced hemispheric culture and trade. Both small and large businesses in the Miami area are supplying the needs of Latin America, and Latin American businesses are in turn supplying the needs of south Florida and the Nation.

The University of Miami has gained international recognition as the finest Latin American study center in the United States. Students from throughout Latin America attended University of Miami courses. Among the faculty are many outstanding professionals from the various countries of Latin America.

The influence of Greater Miami's Latin American community played a large part in the inauguration of the program, "Operation Amigo." Since started by the Miami Herald and Dade County school officials, 758 Latin high school students have visited the United States, and about the same number of American high school students have visited their Latin friends in their homeland.

Latin influence has contributed immeasurably to the proposed Inter-American Trade and Cultural Center known as Interama. Interama will promote and further the trade contacts and cultural relations between Latin and North Americans.

Today 20 of the 34 airlines serving the Miami International Airport, one of the largest in the world, serve the many cities of Latin America.

But the biggest contribution Greater Miami's Latin American community has made in hemispheric relations is their promotion of freedom and equality which has led to the recognition of Greater Miami as the cold war capital of the Western Hemisphere. With the creation of the Communist State in Cuba, the danger of Communist subversion and revolution throughout the hemisphere has increased. The Miami Inter-American community is and has for some time been working hard to preserve the existing hemispheric democratic ideals and to thwart the hemispheric threat posed by the monolithic system of communism.

The newspaper Diario Las Americas, published at Miami, Fla., in continually promoting the goals of solidarity, freedom, and equality, has taken a lead position in the battle of free man in the Western Hemisphere against the posed threat of Communist tyranny and served as an important link between the sovereign countries of Latin America and the United States in this joint effort.

Vice President and Editor Francisco Aguirre and Vice President and Director Horacio Aguirre deserve high commendation for their exemplary efforts to promote and further these important democratic ideals.

Diario Las Americas—the Americas Daily began publication on July 4, 1953. Very appropriately on the 4th of July, 1963, Diario Las Americas celebrates its 10th anniversary.

Since its inception, its policy has been constantly embodied in the following mottos: "For a better understanding between the Americas" and "for liberty, culture, and hemispheric solidarity."

The date for initiation of publication was purposely selected to coincide with the anniversary of the independence of the United States of America. Thus, its founders rendered tribute to this great Nation and also made known, frankly and categorically, the ideological inclinations of Diario Las Americas—the Americas Daily.

The city of Miami, Fla., was selected after careful study of inter-American problems and the conclusion was arrived at as a result of that study that this location would facilitate the paper's transportation to the Caribbean area and the other nations of the hemisphere, since Miami is geographically convenient to all the capitals of the Western Hemisphere.

Circumstances have since demonstrated that Miami, Fla. is the ideal location since, in addition to the geographical factor, destiny has made it the political capital of the cold war in the Americas.

Diario Las Americas—the Americas Daily is basically a newspaper destined to serve the communities of the 21 capital cities of the Western Hemisphere, from Washington to Buenos Aires. Both its editorial policy and its multiple news columns, give it an inter-American character which make it stand out over the other newspapers published in the United States and in Latin America. It could well be said of Diario Las Americas—the Americas Daily that it is a newspaper absolutely specialized in the political, economic, and social developments of the Western Hemisphere.

The capital city best served, both from the point of distribution and news coverage, is Washington, D.C., where the paper arrives every night for early morning delivery to offices such as the U.S. Congress, the State Department, Export-Import Bank, Inter-American Bank, World Bank, Organization of American States, Pan American Sanitary Bureau, and Latin American Embassies. It is on sale at newsstands, hotels, drugstores, and other retail establishments where it can be purchased by the Spanish-speaking population of the Metropolitan Washington area. In that way, complete saturation of inter-American public opinion in this capital city is obtained.

Within the policy of Diario Las Americas—the Americas Daily there is a very important role which consists of guiding its Spanish-speaking readers, both foreign-born and by descent, to a better understanding of the grave responsibilities and great sacrifices of the United States in the defense of western civilization.

Considering hemispheric security from a news angle, the newspaper publishes information relative to the various areas of the world where communism carries out its plan for world conquest, be these, according to circumstances, Moscow, Peipang, Laos, the Congo, or Berlin. Naturally, and for obvious reasons, the greater emphasis is placed on news resulting from deliverance of the Cuban Revolution to international communism by Fidel Castro, and from the struggle for liberation of the anti-Communist forces in Cuba.

It is indeed fortunate that Diario Las Americas was well established at the time refugees from the terrors of Castro's communistic dictatorship began to arrive at Miami for through this paper's leadership both the citizens of Greater Miami and the Cubans alike were better equipped to accept their individual and joint responsibilities.

The contribution of the permanent Latin Community and the Diario Las Americas in cooperation with the churches, voluntary relief agencies, and Federal, State, and local government brought about an orderly transition and mutual acceptance of the customs and desires of all parties. Importantly, they established a deep sense of mutual cooperation and understanding—complete rapport. All became "sympatico" in a situation which some had earlier termed "impossible." A tribute to all concerned.

Typical of the Diario's editorials are the following which were picked at random from recent editions:

[From the Diario Las Americas, June 15, 1963]

The Communist Agitation All Over America

A quick glance at the continental press is enough to realize that the Soviet imperialism based in red Cuba has let loose a wave of violence and agitation all over the Western Hemisphere, with the deliberate purpose of creating chaos.

Not only one must think about what is happening in Venezuela, where the Communists are spreading terror with delinquent actions of all sorts, but one must also think of less significant acts in the line of violence, but which fulfill important goals in favor of Russia and which are taking place in almost all the Latin American countries.

In one way or another, under the guise of alleged replevins for labor unions and of a general social order, the agents of Soviet imperialism are carrying out agitation campaigns and a certain type of strike that have no other aim than subverting the democratic order for the benefit of international communism. Of course, this does not mean that everything has a Marxist inspiration, because there can well be movements with sound intentions aiming at social replevins compatible with Christian morality and with the democratic ideology. But, unfortunately, these cases are a minority. What abounds nowadays is the agitation planned by Russia and directed and financed from Soviet Cuba, the Cuba Fidel Castro turned over to Moscow on its knees and in chains.

The Communists have an extraordinary ability to provoke unrest, to infiltrate in any movement though fundamentally it may have nothing of Communist delinquency, and to achieve with this ability the creation of propitious conditions for the stirring of political and social passions. Based on this, precisely, is that the Communists have obtained some victories in America, including the subjugation of Cuba. First come the agitation, the discredit of the social and political institutions, crime and sabotage, and then comes, as it happened in Jose Marti's island, the open military occupation by the imperialist power, Russia.

The democratic governments that really respect and dignify the democratic representative system, as well as the live forces of each American nation, must seriously dedicate to fight with energy, as far as the circumstances demand, these campaigns of sabotage and agitation, forerunners of chaos, to which the agents of Soviet imperialism in America have been dedicated.

[From the Diario Las Americas, June 16, 1963]

Russia's Mysteries

In a country where no freedom of information exists and where the form of government is totalitarian, the people ignore everything and the world knows very little of what goes on within the borders of that country. A categoric example of that is provided by everything that has to do with the space experiments and flights of the Soviet Union.

Moscow announces to the world it has placed a spaceship with a cosmonaut in orbit after everything has turned out right. No one knows before the official announcement when or where the ship will be launched into space. That is why, with more than enough reason and basing on certain scientific observations, it is asserted that the Kremlin, in its disproportionate desire for propaganda, in the irresponsible pursuit of anticipated triumphs, has sent to their deaths in space trial flights many human beings who stayed in orbit unable to return to earth. Naturally, on those failures there have never been any official communiques issued by the Soviet dictatorship.

In contrast with those patterns of mystery, which are typical of totalitarian regimes, when the United States of America, which constitute a nation of freedom, are going to do a space experiment, the whole world knows ways out in advance that it will take place, and the press correspondents, native and foreigh, including those representing the Soviet tyranny, are present in Cape Canaveral and follow the whole process step by step. And whenever there were postponements or failures, it all was of the public domain, though there may always be fools who grant those temporary scientific misses a special importance they do not have. In Russia the failures are far greater, with the only difference that, because of the total absence of public freedoms, they are not known to the world.

Sometimes, in the United States so much is published about certain tests carried on by the Government and which has to do with the national security, that extremes of imprudence are reached. However, it has to happen so in a country that, like this, pays full respect to freedom, and in its names the restriction of information, even in cases dealing with the national security, is reduced to a very liberal minimum. And when the restriction goes beyond certain limits, the voice of public protests rises, as it happened in the wake of the grave events of last year's October, during the Cuban crisis.

In Russia everything is a mystery, and that mystery is maintained on the basis of terror. The only thing the Red czars have not been able to hide, is that the people live wretchedly in order that the Soviet State may be rich and may have the necessary resources to carry out the aims of the imperialist policy.

[From the Diario Las Americas, June 20, 1963]

WHAT CAN BE ACHIEVED WITH FREE ENTERPRISE

Constantly a certain type of economists is heard to say that to achieve social progress in Latin America it is necessary to adopt extreme measures, which, though they do not say so openly, reduce in a considerable and dangerous extent the field of action of private initiative and, consequently, of free enterprise. This is a thesis which has never been applied in the United States and which no one would dare to insinuate here as the solution for the economic and social problems that may have existed or that still exist in the country.

The United States of America have attained an extremely high level of civilized life for its people, and all the comforts enjoyed by this country are derived from work and from production done within the respect for private property and in the shadow of institutions that guarantee the operation of free enterprise. Representative democracy, in the political field, has fulfilled the indispensable and transcendental mission of permitting and stimulating the flourishing of the trade and economy of the United States. And the social laws fitting within this system of representative democracy have been capable of giving the people in general these living conditions that the Russians do not even imagine, and which are admired by the other countries of the world. Khrushchev himself, when he visited the United States, did not hide his astonishment at the amount of automobiles, in astronomical numbers, afforded by the great working mass of the American people.

In Latin America it might be needed some laws of prudent regulation in what pertains to taxes and to social relations, so that the democratic representative States—not a totalitarian state of the left or of the right—may fulfill certain indispensable functions coordinators of the national activity. But not needed are extreme laws in which the suspicious tendency to smother the individual in his right to ownership and initiative may be a characteristic discouraging the producer and which also may discourage the conscientious worker, the one who thinks that if the production sources are lacking, simultaneously the opportunities of work decrease.

And, as a fundamental thing, it must be said that in Latin America more than tax and social laws, needed is political stability understood in terms of responsible freedom and of serious republican institutions. Of course, the fiscal and social legislative dispositions which prudence and modern technique recommend, should be adopted with reasonable celerity.

The basic reason of what is being called "economic underdevelopment" is the lack of political stability and of administrative rectitude.

[From the Diario Las Americas, June 21, 1963]

THE SOVIET OCCUPATION OF CUBA AND THE RED SUBVERSION IN LATIN AMERICA

Not even one of the Communist acts of subversion which have been taking place in America for the last 4½ years can be considered as isolated, as if they were a purely local matter without international ramifications. In reality, never a subversive act of Communist making takes place not having those ramifications. But it so happens that in this case everything that goes on obeys to a plan of political precision and of coordinated international delinquency. The military occupation of Cuba by Russia has turned this island into a gigantic base of Communist operations against the dignity, the peace, the security, the liberty, and the independence of the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

From Havana come the money, the weapons, the orders, and the written and broadcast propaganda to all America; and that propaganda, and that money, and those orders, and those weapons, are solely devoted to the destruction of the Christian, democratic, and social values of our nations. And all this happens without the adoption up to this moment, with all the energy the serious circumstances demand, of the physical measures necessary to defeat dictator Fidel Castro and to expel from Cuba the Soviet intervention, that intervention which is violating the right of the Cuban people—who are anti-Communist—to self-determination. Indeed, in Cuba the right of self-determination has been violated because with bloody-stained foreign bayonets, on the Cuban people has been imposed a regime they repudiate with all the strength of their spirits and of their Christian and democratic convictions.

As long as Cuba is Soviet territory, as long as the military occupation exists there, openly or disguisedly, as long as politically and economically Cuba is a Russian colony, there will be subversion in America, there will be uprisings, crimes, abductions, plundering, fires, and all that organized by international communism in this hemisphere with the perverse purpose of putting America on its knees before Russia.

From Cuba, planned, directed, and fed is this vast campaign of extermination and hate, and it will be very difficult for the American nations to cast off this yoke of subversion which has befallen them, should Jose Marti's island continue being the base of Soviet operations in the Western Hemisphere.

The democratic governments and the live forces of each Amerimcan nation despite the existence of the Russian occupation of Cuba, should try to find soon the way to put an end to the Communist delinquency, or at least to reduce it considerably.

I extend congratulations to Diario Las Americas—the Americas Daily on its 10th anniversary of service to the Hispanic-American community of Florida and the United States. From its modest but ambitious beginning, appropriately on the Fourth of July, 1953, your Diario has become a most valuable outlet for inter-American opinion and a bridge of understanding between the Americas, on which all of us who must deal with the problems of the hemisphere depend for information and guidance as to the true aspirations of the Latin American peoples. Our very best wishes are extended on this occasion and may Diario Las Americas—the Americas Daily continue to grow and prosper as our links with Latin America are strengthened.

Renewed Individual Effort Must Stem Judicial Tide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the American people are becoming accustomed to periodic decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States which strike at the customs and traditions of our country.

The political, social, and economic structure of our Nation is slowly but surely being transformed through decisions of the Court. Instead of interpreting the Constitution, the Court, for all practical purposes, has been amending our fundamental law to reflect the majority views of its members.

In the latest series of decisions, which have struck at the heart of some of our most cherished freedoms, the Court has once again stated that divine prayer and other voluntary religious observances have no place in our public school system.

I deplore this decision. The Founding Fathers surely did not intend that the provision they placed in the Constitution providing for the separation of church and state would be used to eliminate God from our classrooms.

Mr. Speaker, the Shelby (N.C.) Daily Star, an outstanding newspaper in my congressional district, carried an excellent editorial on the recent Supreme Court decision on June 18, 1963. I certainly concur with the conclusions reached in the editorial, and I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From the Shelby (N.C.) Daily Star, June 18, 1963]

RENEWED INDIVIDUAL EFFORT MUST STEM JUDICIAL TIDE

The U.S. Supreme Court once ruled it unconstitutional to compel public school children to salute the American flag.

Students, however, from Rhode Island to California and from Wisconsin to Florida have continued through the years to stand in unison and proudly salute their country's flag while repeating the Pledge of Allegiance, which specifically declares this to be "one nation under God."

So it is and so it must always be.

The greatness of this Nation took root in the strongly religious soil, our currency declares our trust in God, Members of the highest legislative bodies in the country begin each session with prayer, each new President takes an oath "before God" and business, civic, social, and fraternal organizations from coast to coast traditionally recognize the sovereignty of God with appropriate ceremonies.

Now eight of the High Court's nine Justices—at the urging of an avowed atheist—have declared it unconstitutional for a State to require Bible reading and recitation of the Lord's Prayer in public schools on the grounds that such policies violate terms of the first amendment.

North Carolina has no such law. But opinion seems to be divided at this point as to how strict interpretation of the Court's decision will affect school prayers and Bible study of even voluntary motivation.

The first amendment stipulates that, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. * * *" That hardly seems firm ground for Monday's decision, although the eight Justices now contend that the 14th amendment extends the 1st to the States.

The eight Justices have said nothing that will kill the longstanding debate over whether or not the wording of the first amendment can in good conscience be extended to cover State as well as Federal Governments.

There is little consolation in Justice Clark's observation that the Court's prayer-banning decision was not intended to bar the study of the Bible or of religion "when presented objectively as part of a secular program of education."

We are in full agreement with Justice Potter Stewart's dissenting opinion declaring that the Court's refusal to permit school prayer could be viewed as "the establishment of a religion of secularism" in these United States.

In attempting to save the principle of separation of church and state, the eight Justices have played into the hands of a misguided minority element and taken a giant step toward undermining the profound meaning and importance of religion to the past and future greatness of this country.

But, as in the case of the flag decision, we are confident that the Monday decision will not remove the Lord's Prayer and the Bible from the classrooms of the United States.

The States, as fas as the Court is concerned, can't require such study. The Supreme Court is the Nation's highest tribunal and its decision must be abided by—if not agreed with and respected—if law and order are to prevail.

But the people of this Nation can act to make certain that the public influence of religion is not diminished to a catastrophic degree.

Rather than fall meekly before a judicial haymaker, the people must be spurred by the decision to a greater respect and appreciation of our religious heritage.

Renewed religious effort on the part of every individual American can assure that the beliefs which made this country great will not be washed away by a tide of misguided judicial opinion.

Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following letters addressed to the President of the United States and to me written by one of my constituents Mr. Price P. Sanders, of North Las Vegas, Nev., relative to the present civil rights strife. I feel Mr. Sanders' remarks should have an opportunity to be read by as many as possible:

NORTH LAS VEGAS, NEV.

HON WALTER S. BARING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BARING: I am enclosing a copy of a letter I am sending the President of the United States of America. I am not so naive as to suppose he will even see the letter much less read it. This is why I am sending the copy to you. It simply represents an honest effort to communicate with my congressional representative and an endeavor to be represented.

There are several things that prompted this letter. One of these things being that it is not easy to pick up the morning newspaper and have to read about one American throwing rocks at another. It isn't easy to hear the news commentator tell about an presumed American sniping and killing another. It isn't easy to look at the news photographs showing policemen hitting people over the head with billyclubs; the very same people who paid taxes to provide funds for these same policemen to protect them.

There are other kinds of reasons for this letter too. It isn't easy to watch 20 million Americans feel sorry for themselves and blatantly demand more than they deserve or for that matter, more than anybody deserves. To see these people just hand over their fate to minority group politics and indicate preference in becoming political orphans rather than becoming genuine American citizens is a sad sight indeed.

To see this thing happening to my country is like watching a good man and good friend fatally ill heave and sigh for the lack of knowing why he is going to die.

Acknowledge please that in sending you the copy of this letter, I am trying to fulfill my obligation that each man has to his ideas. Neither offense nor audacity is intended.

Yours truly,
PRICE P. SANDERS.

NORTH LAS VEGAS, NEV.,
June 17, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: An editorial in the June 14, 1963, issue of Life magazine which disclosed your forthcoming attempt to use the Constitution's interstate commerce clause to "desegregate the roadside diner selling an out-of-State can of beans" has prompted me to write this letter.

It appears that the lack of being able to define the present racial controversy is more of a problem than the controversy itself. If it could be accurately defined, I'm sure it could be more simply solved. In order to define it, however, it should first be reduced to its most fundamental quantity.

On the one hand, you have a well-represented minority of Negro Americans in complete control or on the offensive, I should say, only because they enjoy mutual possession of a common purpose—racial equality. The majority here, being all other Americans, has no common purpose and because of this their efforts appear erratic and result in confusion like those of someone guilty of something. Most of them don't realize that there are two problems instead of one; segregation of schools being one of these problems, and racial equality being the other.

The school issue is simple. If local, State, and Federal agencies have used money collected indiscriminately by taxes to build the schools, it can in no way be justifiable in discriminating against anyone wanting to attend them.

The racial equality problem is, at best, only distantly related to the school desegregation issue. This is true because it affects people other than Negroes. There is, in America, discrimination against Catholics, Jews, Mexican Americans, Puerto Rican Americans, Italian Americans, and any other minority group that you are able to call to mind. For this reason, Negro Americans should not have indicated to the rest of the world that they are unique in being the brunt of this dilemma. They have indicated this, however, and it should have by now rendered their plight less right, less moral, and less strong.

The leaders of this Negro push for racial equality know full well that in having mutual purpose and in having some moral justification in pursuing that purpose the become almost irresistible. However, they push so hard for job equality, economic equality, and racial equality, etc., forever using this morality theme, the strain begins to test its purity. It appears to have some flaws.

The most obvious of these is that, in general, racial equality in America is more than lip service. The U.S. Congress enjoys Negro membership. All of America, indeed the whole world has acknowledged the work of George Washington Carver who discovered hundreds of uses for the peanut and its byproducts. In so doing, he almost singlehandedly put the South on its economic feet. Jackie Robinson, Joe Louis, Sammy Davis, Jr., and Louie Armstrong are Negro and furthermore they are American. Each of these men succeeded despite prejudice and they continue to give to all men every where. Thurgood Marshall himself, the great-grandson of a slave, was quite able to distinguish himself, as a great lawyer winning 29 out of 32 cases argued before the Supreme Court of the United States. He was later appointed to the U.S. Court of Appeals and is now widely known as the leading legal spokesman for the NAACP.

If we agree that there is discrimination in America, then we must also agree that there is discrimination all over the world. There is discrimination against Christians and Jews in Russia. There is discrimination against certain castes in India. There is discrimination against Negroes in South Africa (far more than in America) and in Latin America there is discrimination against the poor. This Nation is unique not because there is discrimination here but because there is freedom here. Had there not been this freedom, you would never have heard of Joe Louis or Sammy Davis, Jr., and Thurgood Marshall or George Washington Carver.

Here then is the problem in the proper perspective; racial equality is only a facet of the gem of freedom. Racial inequality is not the whole problem; it is only one small part. The rape of Hungary is another part of this problem. Cuba is a part. The Black Muslim movement, the Nazi movement, and the Birch movement are all parts of the very same problem. The problem is that every Negro American, every oriental American, every Catholic American, and every other American, including the President, had momentarily forgotten just what freedom is.

I'll spell it out: Freedom is when no one man nor any group of men may impose their will upon the rights of any other man or group of men. It's that simple. Democracy is a condition that was brought about to create an ideal environment for any man to work without having to worry about someone taking his wife or his property, his children or his ideas away from him while he was busy. Thus America—in honor of the individual who simply wanted to work and remain solely responsible for his own failures and his own successes. This design just isn't supposed to fit minorities or majorities. It isn't made for dictators or kings or Muslims or Nazis. It is only for individuals.

Did George Washington distinguish himself as a Caucasian Protestant? He might have, but he distinguished himself as an American first. Did Abraham Lincoln distinguish himself as a member of a minority group of hillbilly country people from Kentucky? I think not. He too was an American first. Did Hitler think of Jesse Owens as a Negro during the 1936 Olympic games in Berlin? It occurs to me that Jesse did as much as anybody to disprove the master race idea that Hitler was promoting in those days. He did it in the name of America. It was incidental to Hitler that he was a Negro.

Twenty-seven years and two wars later, the Black Muslim movement not only forbids white membership but openly teaches racial inequality. "The white people are all devils," they say, "and we don't want any part of them." I admit that I am curious as to why the Constitution hasn't been referred to here. At any rate, this Muslim movement renders, once again, the total plight of the Negro community in America less right, less moral, and less strong.

At this point I realize that the problem is still not solved but it should be clearer as to what the problem is. The part that the President of the United States will play in its solution causes within me great anxiety. He has indicated that he would like to have a law passed to make it illegal for one man not to let another man have access to his business. If such a law ever becomes a reality then freedom in America will have been another Utopia that will have never really existed. There should be no such law because a man's business might well be as sacred as his home. This is only natural because, like his home, he created it. Furthermore, it represents his property. If, then, another law is passed to make it illegal for him to hire anyone he pleases or fire anyone he pleases, then it might as well not even be his property. A most significant fact emerges here; if either or both of these laws are passed, each Negro in America will have lost more individual liberty than he will have gained. This is because the Constitution guarantees the freedom of the individual and the Emancipation Proclamation guarantees the Negro the right to express himself as an individual the same as anybody else. The authenticity of these two documents has been illustrated countless times by the Negroes who have distinguished themselves in any number of creative fields, professions and trades.

It is important to note that if the rights of the individual are protected, there is simply no need to create laws to protect any minority group from racial or even religious discrimination. Each individual is supposed to be constitutionally endowed with the right to worship as he pleases, work as he pleases, say as he pleases, read as he pleases, and even think as he pleases so long as he does not impose upon the rights of anyone else.

We are all aware that some of the strongest convictions are held by the most ignorant people. This applies to Negro Americans and white Americans both. What many people don't realize is that even ignorance is a freedom. It is an absurd freedom but a freedom nevertheless.

To illustrate this idea, allow me to describe the possible character of some American. He is articulate. He is forthright and basically honest. He is even compassionate. He possesses all of these attributes and many more and still fails to recognize one of the greatest truths of all time—all men are created equal. A law forcing him to think otherwise is as tyrannical as any act in history that inhibited human freedom. A law forbidding any man the right to refuse the service of his business to any other man for any reason will not enhance our constitutional privileges. On the contrary, it will destroy them.

The issue here, I once again point out, is neither racial equality nor the lack of it. It is that if everyone in America is to remain free, then no man nor any group of men may impose their will upon the rights of any other man or any other group of men. This applies to American Negroes and American Presidents just like anybody else.

If the Negroes in America are ever to enjoy the crystal pure, authentic racial equality they seek, they must individually rise above the ignorance of all people, including their own, and prove by action and deed they truly are equal to other men. This has been done many times already but will have to be done again and again and again. If they succeed, and it is imperative they do, they will have done more than their share of removing that seemingly inevitable ignorance that has hindered man for so long. They will have confirmed that there is dignity in humanity despite all of the evidence to the contrary. When they have succeeded they will have helped establish another great truth—freedom is not a commodity to be bargained and traded for; it is a test that all men must acknowledge if they are to ever enjoy it.

Yours truly,

PRICE P. SANDERS.

Reaping the Harvest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Aiken Standard and Review, the daily publication of my hometown of Aiken, S.C., has presented to its readers some very pertinent comments on the racial violence now being fomented in many American communities by groups which have been encouraged to ignore the orderly processes of law and order. I commend this editorial entitled "Reaping the Harvest" in the June 20, 1963, issue of the Aiken Standard and Review to my colleagues in the Senate and the Members of the House to whom it is indirectly addressed. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REAPING THE HARVEST

The Kennedy brothers, one now the President of the United States and the other Attorney General, sowed the seeds of turmoil, strife and tribulation during the presidential campaign with elaborate promises based upon political expediency.

Today the people of this Nation are reaping the bitter harvest.

Today's demonstrations, racial clashes, turmoil and unrest are directly attributable to the President and his brother and unless the Congress of the United States steps in and curbs the power then shall the nation eventually reap a still bitterer harvest of more bloodshed, unrest and finally bring to an end a proud and mighty nation built upon the concepts of democracy as outlined by our Founding Fathers in the Constitution.

In line with policy of expediency is the Supreme Court which has struck down item upon item contained in the historic document and has even gone so far as to tell American businessmen how to conduct free enterprise—the very thing which made America great.

It cannot be understood how Government can take the position that it can control private endeavor—to say whom and what it shall cater to and in so doing demonstrate very clearly that the present administration is concerned only with political progress, not preservation of the Nation as a democracy, but seeks for it a nation ruled by a dynasty.

Neither the Negro race, nor the white race has the privilege to demonstrate in any place in the Nation if it is contrary to the laws of municipal or State government and in the event such demonstrations occur that are contrary to ordinances then shall the offenders be punished just as are any offenders of law and order.

It is not understandable why this administration should spend millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money, both white and Negro, in upholding the action of one race and ignoring the right of the other.

Unless the people of the Nation, in lawful and legal manner, call upon the Congress to bring to an end such actions by the administration then the future of this Nation in racial strife and disturbances will be filled with violence, even war between the races, and the end of a glorious nation built upon principles of democracy and constitutional government, and triumph of communism.

Don't Punish the Farmer for His Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, since the wheat referendum, May 21, there has been abundant speculation concerning prospects for wheat legislation. Farmer mail indicates a majority voted "no" because of strict controls; veiled threats from the Secretary, the President, and other administration leaders; an overdose of propaganda, along with general irritations with one farm program or another over the years.

Unfortunately, some feel the American wheat farmer should be punished for exercising his independence. This prompts me to point out an editorial in the June 5, Kansas City Star, "Don't Punish the Farmer for His Vote."

The editorial is both analytical and objective, and should be of interest.

DON'T PUNISH THE FARMER FOR HIS VOTE

The administration and certain congressional leaders seem to be saying that farmers should be punished for voting as they did in the wheat referendum. It is an unthinking attitude that smacks of revenge in the first reaction to defeat.

Various statements from Washington, no matter how sweetly they are phrased, are clear enough: The farmers have made their bed, now let them lie in it. There is an assumption that after 1 year, under a free market, farmers will come crawling back for help. And that they will meekly vote for the program which they turned down this year. You hear restated over and over the assertions by the chairmen of the agriculture committees in the House and Senate, that no new wheat legislation will be passed.

On the referendum ballot, the farmers could make but two marks, "yes" or "no."

If they voted "yes," they would have accepted a program under which there would be both acreage controls and a limitation on the number of bushels of wheat they could sell for the maximum support rate of $2. A "no" vote, in effect, was for another but voluntary program. Under this program, there are no controls on acreage. Price support is only 50 percent of parity ($1.25 a bushel). It is close to a free market.

There was no middle choice on the ballot. Just how the individual farmers reasoned will never be known. Certainly they voted against the controls program and all it implied. But whether they also were demanding an end to all Government aid on wheat price and production remains to be seen. After all, with the Government owning a billion-bushel surplus of the grain, a completely free market is an illusion. A free market assumes that prices will be made in the marketplace by the law of supply and demand. As long as the Government can throw huge surpluses on the market at any time, the law of supply and demand can't function normally.

But if we assume that farmers were voting for a free market, is this something for which they should be condemned? Instead of proposing that farmers "boil in their own oil," why not an expression of hope that the free market will work eventually, and a statement to the effect that the Government is prepared to move toward it with practical steps?

We're not certain at the moment just what the course ahead should be for wheat. However, if new legislation is required, if there is a middle-ground program that farmers would accept with perhaps lower price supports, Congress ought to consider it on its merits. If the choice is to be an eventual free market, the Government should take all steps possible to develop a favorable climate for its operation. Wheat is a major factor in the Nation's economy. It should not be the toy of political pique.

Undoubtedly, the administration's efforts to force farmers to vote "yes" in the wheat referendum backfired. It was a factor in the program's defeat. The effort to make farmers wish they had voted differently, could backfire, too.

Welcome to Chemstrand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to report to the Congress, through the media of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and to the Nation, the advent of a new industrial effort in my district of South Carolina. I speak of the new plant at Blacksburg, S.C., Cherokee County, in my congressional district.

We are happy to have Chemstrand and we welcome them to South Carolina and to Blacksburg. We expect to offer for them the same fine political climate we have offered to many other industries who have come to South Carolina. We want to help and we will cooperate in assuring that this production is beneficial to the Nation, to the investors of Chemstrand and to the people who work in the plant.

At this point I enclose the story of this dedication as accurately reported in the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S.C., of Thursday, June 20, 1963.

CHEMSTRAND DEDICATES NEW PLANT

Several company officials along with State, county and local governmental representatives took part in a 30-minute dedication service Tuesday for the new Chemstrand Co. plant on Interstate Highway No. 85 near Blacksburg.

Several hundred persons who attended were guests of the company at a barbecue luncheon which followed.

The dedication was held in one wing of the huge building which covers 8 acres of ground. Robert C. Reese, the plant manager, presided.

An invocation was offered by Rev. Coy R. Miller, pastor of the Blacksburg First Baptist Church. Short talks were made by Edward A. O'Neal, Jr., of New York, president of Chemstrand; P. W. Runge, a vice president and general manager; Chauncey Lever, of Columbia, director of the community relations division of the State development board; and Macon Miller, of Columbia, director of industrial relations of the State Chamber of Commerce.

Dr. T. A. Campbell, Sr., of Blacksburg, acting as a representative of the Blacksburg Chamber of Comerce, presented Mr. O'Neal with a scroll of appreciation from that organization.

Chemstrand officials, including President O'Neal, Vice President Runge and General Manager Reese expressed complete satisfaction with the type of employees and with the quality of the work performed in the plant.

Starting operations only a few months ago with 100 employes, the facility now has 135 and officials said the number will grow to 200 by the end of this year.

The possibility of expansion depends on the trend of business in the future.

However, the officials pointed to the Greenwood facility which began operating 4 years ago with 400 employees and now has 1,100. The company's Pensacola plant began with less than half of the present total of around 6,000.

At a press conference held before the dedication, Mr. Runge said the Blacksburg site had been chosen after about 100 possible locations in several southern States had been considered. He pointed out the facility is on Interstate 85 and the main line of the Southern Railway, making unsurpassed transportation service available.

Company officials classified the Blacksburg plant as the main distribution center for the firm. It was pointed out a wide variety of products are being brought in by rail shipments and are being distributed in smaller shipments by trucks.

The fact that this immediate area is centrally located with respect to the textile industry had much to do with the selection of the Blacksburg site, it was stated.

South Carolina Gov. Donald S. Russell told a group informally Monday night:

"I want to give every possible evidence we appreciate the fact that this fine organization has located in our State and is continuing to grow here. We are extremely happy to have you here.

"We are interested in giving you good, honest government—the kind that will encourage industry to come here, and the kind under which industry can thrive."

Chemstrand Co.'s newest facility is a nylon processing plant and warehouse located on a 150-acre tract near Blacksburg in the heart of a booming textile manufacturing area.

Key words for this new plant are "customer service," for in the processing facility nylon filament yarn is wound on huge spools, known as beams, and readied for shipment to Chemstrand customers. The six large warehouse bays permit adequate storage of yarn so that customers' needs may be met more swiftly and efficiently.

The total plant covers some 315,000 square feet of floor space, with a total of 8 acres under roof. Manufacturing, service, and office areas cover about 75,020 square feet. Each of the warehouse bays covers 40,000 square feet, for a total of 240,000, and has a ceiling of 25 feet.

The warehouse wings were constructed of reinforced concrete slabs, each one 15 feet, 8 inches wide, and 29 feet 6 inches high, and weighing 22 tons. The warehouse bays have a total of 22 doors, 10 for freight cars and 12 for trucks. Between two major warehouse wings, is a paved loading area for trucks. This area covers an additional 62,900 square feet.

Chemstrand, a division of Monsanto Chemical Co., announced plans for the new Blacksburg plant in October 1962. Construction was done by Daniel Construction Co. of Greenville, S.C.

Chemstrand Co.'s plant at Blasksburg is the third Chemstrand installation to begin operations in South Carolina in less than 3 years.

Chemstrand, a leading producer of chemical textile fibers, first announced plans to join South Carolina's growing industrial community in June 1959, with its proposed nylon plant at Greenwood. That plant first began commercial operations in October 1960, and since that time has undergone two major expansions, more than tripling the size of the initial plant. It now employs more than 1,100 South Carolina residents. Nylon filament yarn produced at Greenwood finds wide applications in apparel and home furnishings in the United States and abroad.

Chemstrand announced plans for its Management Information Center at Greenville in April 1961. Construction of the center was started in September 1961, and the new building was dedicated in the early spring of 1962. The Management Information Center, which brings representatives of all principal management functions together at one location, provides all segments of the company with up-to-the-minute information through the use of a modern electronic computer system and an extensive and high-speed communications network.

Plans for the Blacksburg plant were announced in October 1962, with work beginning almost immediately. The new facility includes a nylon warping operation and extensive warehousing to provide even better customer service to Chemstrand customers in this important textile manufacturing area.

Typewriter Keys Are Silent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, today I learned about the death of a newspaperman, Mr. William Coston Carver, former managing editor of the Bellingham, Wash., Herald.

There is little that I can do to console the people of Bellingham and Whatcom County, whom he served for so many years. The keys of his ancient typewriter, which sad beside his rolltop desk are silent. But, I am confident those who follow will be guided by the spirit with which he served not only his newspaper, but also his community.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Bellingham Herald, which explains much about this man who was an inspiration to those who knew him either personally or through the words he wrote:

DEATH OF AN EDITOR

We knew W. C. Carver at different times and in different ways. First, as a teenage contemporary and good friend of his two children. Later as an employee. And finally as one who occupied the office that was his for so many years.

In our school days, he seemed an awesome figure, for he was the editor of the Herald and we had been bitten by the journalism bug and hoped to be a newspaperman ourself.

Later he was to become our "boss," though that words needs quote marks around it, for the relationship never seemed that rigid. Our youthful awe changed to deep respect, along with appreciation for his wisdom and kindliness.

Since his retirement 5 years ago, after the better part of a half century's service to this newspaper, he had been a valued friend and a coffee-drinking colleague. The "Mr. Carver" of our youth, who had become the "Chief" of our reporting days on the paper, now had become "W. C." or "Cos."

William Coston Carver was a superb writer. But he was an unobstrusive man, one who shunned the spotlight. Among friends, he was never at a loss for a good-humored and gracious comment, but when he spoke to the public in general, it was through the anonymity of his typewriter.

That typewriter. It was a standing joke at the Herald, the way Mr. Carver hung onto that turn-of-the-century relic, and it amused him, too. But he was dead serious about keeping it. The thousands, nay millions, of words that came alive through its fragile frame and slender keys * * * they were a team, and he was not about to give it up for one of those new models. He wrote with it, whimsically and knowledgeably, right up to his final weeks, and it had been our hope that we would get, from its battered platen, additional feature stories such as the memorable one he wrote recently on the history of the name Bellingham.

But that was not to be, and now it is our task to write the obituary of a well-loved friend. He was a personal inspiration, too, though it would have embarrassed him if we had ever said so. So here we sit, in the office that was so much a part of him for most of his life, and grope for words. What shall we say that will convey something of his talent and his widom and his gentle personality? "Keep it short," he might have said. Very well. He was a dedicated newspaperman, with a lexicographer's gift for language. He was a gentle man. And he was an American idealist, in his quiet way, one who never lost his identification with the virtues that built the Nation he loved. He will be missed.

Pacem in Terris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional editorial was written by the national commander of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, Edward F. McElroy, on the outstanding life and death of His Holiness, Pope John XXIII, and as part of my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, I include this dissertation:

We of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America are most grieved at the death of the holy father. Our wonderful church leader was the full example of charity, zeal, and simplicity. Pope John the XXIII brought to the Catholic Church and to the world the vigor and stamina that is usually found within a person of a younger age.

Just a few weeks ago, I had the pelasure and honor of leading 142 men, women, and children to Rome for an audience with the holy father. The holy father stated to me, "Welcome to the Vatican, Commander, have all your veterans pray for peace so there will be no new veterans." Pope John was a veteran of two wars and we of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States felt extremely close to him.

Congressman William H. Harsha Announces Results of Public Opinion Poll of Ohio's Sixth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months, I have been conducting a public opinion poll in the Sixth Congressional District of Ohio, which I have the honor to represent here. It has been my purpose to solicit the opinions of the people to determine their feeling about important issues that are awaiting action by the House of Representatives so that I could give the best represesntation possible. Participation in the poll was not limited to any special group. Through the mailing of a questionnaire and the cooperation of district newspapers, which kindly reprinted the questionnaire as a public service, the opportunity to participate was made available to all of those interested in expressing their views.

The poll contained 12 questions relating to matters of domestic and foreign policy. The results of this opinion survey are now available. It is surprising that the tabulation indicates such definite trends in the thinking of the people of the district. The results show that opinions on over half of the questions registered more than 65 percent support or opposition.

The people expressed great concern over the weakness of our foreign policy and the concessions being offered to the Soviet Union by relaxing inspection requirements on nuclear testing.

Another issue of vital importance and concern to the citizens of the Sixth District is the proposed tax cut. Apparently, the great majority answering the questionnaire felt a comparable reduction in Federal spending should accompany any tax cut.

Of course, there was considerable opposition to the Federal Government entering the field of education at the elementary and secondary level. Apparently, the citizens of the Sixth District feel this is a matter of local concern that should be handled by the communities and school districts primarily involved.

Likewise, considerable opposition was expressed to the large expenditures in foreign aid.

Every survey has its limitations. Brevity in questioning does not permit comprehensive answers embracing all facets of an issue. It is extremely difficult to answer a question by a simple yes or no.

Many thousands of persons returning the questionnaire added comments discussing the issues. Although these comments are extremely helpful to me in assessing the feelings of the people of the district, it is not possible, unfortunately, to reflect them in statistical form. However, I wish to point out that a very large proportion of those making comments expressed serious concern and outspoken opposition to increasing the powers of the President and greater Federal expenditures that are producing mounting deficits and adding to the burden of the national debt.

Following are the detailed results of the poll:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you favor an across-the-board cut in your income taxes?			
(a) If there is a comparable reduction in Federal spending?	82.6	9.0	8.4
(b) If there is not a comparareduction in Federal spending?	11.7	49.2	38.1
2. Do you favor Federal aid in the form of loans and grants to colleges?	38.9	52.0	9.1
3. Do you believe the Federal Government should provide Federal aid for local teachers' salaries?	12.2	84.2	3.6
4. Do you believe the Federal Government should provide Federal aid for local elementary and secondary school construction?	29.0	65.0	6.0
5. Do you favor the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps?	42.4	43.4	14.2
6. Do you favor a domestic Peace Corps?	22.7	61.3	16.0
7. Do you favor the passage of the Urban Mass Transit Act, involving $500,000,000 in grants for urban transportation facilities?	8.9	77.1	14.0
8. Do you favor further U.S. concessions to obtain a nuclear test ban?	12.7	78.1	9.2
9. Do you favor the extension of the Feed Grain Act?	12.6	49.5	37.9
10. Do you favor an extensive reduction in our foreign aid expenditures?	88.3	8.3	3.4
11. Do you favor continued U.S. financial support of so-called United Nations peace-keeping operations?	20.4	66.3	13.3
12. Are you satisfied with our policy toward Cuba?			
(a) Would you favor a complete blockade?	65.6	13.3	21.1
(b) Would you favor an invasion of Cuba?	29.2	32.6	38.2

The Dissenters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Hartsville Messenger, of Hartsville, S.C., has printed in its June 20, 1963, edition an eloquent editorial plea for more actions of independent thinking and voting on the part of Members of Congress in this age when conformity, unfortunately, appears to be the order of the day. As this editorial is directed particularly to the Congress, I feel that it should be made available for all Members of both Houses to read. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "The Dissenters" be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Dissenters

From time to time we hear sounds from politicians and writers to the effect that their patience with dissenters is wearing thin. In Congress, especially, in recent years the trend has been toward conformity.

The party line is sold as the vital thing. In both the House and the Senate, the party leaders stress loyalty to the party, to the party line. The Senator or Congressman who deviates from the "line" is punished in a number of ways—by not getting on good committees, by not getting patronage from the White House, etc., etc.

We need Congressmen and Senators who will stand up on the floor of their legislative House and tell the country what they really think, with the gloves off. We need men who will shun the patronage and the favors of the party, the favors of the all-powerful administration in power, if necessary, and speak the independent truth.

Let us have the mavericks. Let us return to the day when a bill—in either the Senate or the House—is decided on its merits, on the debate which precedes the vote.

The country will benefit because of every legislator and citizen who speaks his mind, independently. The country needs the dissenters. A nation of conformists can be led astray.

From our earliest pioneer days, we have respected the dissenter; let us never forget his right and his place in our scheme of democracy.

Whose Rights Are at Stake?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Augusta Chronicle, of Augusta, Ga., has published in its June 20, 1963, edition two editorials which I commend to the membership of the Congress. One is entitled "Whose Rights Are at Stake?" and the other is entitled "King Abuses His Race." I ask unanimous consent that both of these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whose Rights Are at Stake?

President Kennedy has rejected the long established right of every American to free enterprise and free choice in the civil rights package he has presented to Congress.

In his effort to obtain a compulsory acceptance of the Negro at every level of business and society, the Nation's Chief Executive is asking the American people to discard the system which has made this country great—and could make it greater. He is asking them to substitute socialism as their way of life, and to believe that all human problems can be legislated away and all ills of our society be eliminated by enactment of a law.

Mr. Kennedy terms his legislation solutions "which should be acceptable to all fairminded men," yet he himself has approached this problem in less than a fairminded manner.

While he has ostensibly sought a solution within the framework of America's private enterprise system the President has given it no chance to prove itself.

In recent weeks he has assembled at the White House representatives of various areas of business, calling upon each to forfeit their right to operate their establishments as they are entitled under the Constitution of the United States.

Now, without waiting for them to undertake to carry out his bidding, giving each an opportunity to turn to his own conscience for the real solution to our national dilemma, Mr. Kennedy has gone to the Congress and, in the name of civil rights, asked that body to take away from all the people of the United States every last vestige of State rights and individual freedoms left to them.

Adoption of the entire package Mr. Kennedy proposes would, as Senator **Herman Talmadge** said yesterday, "subject the people to a Federal judicial and executive tyranny which would completely destroy the right of man to 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' "

There are, we hasten to admit sections of the President's legislative proposal which deserve favorable action within the Congress.

No one should be permitted to deny to any Negro, otherwise qualified, the right to register and the right to cast a ballot. We think there is merit in the President's proposal to broaden the manpower development and training program, and to provide for expanded vocational education facilities.

We concur with Senator Talmadge, however, in his belief that it should not be in the scope of Congress to deny private businesses, built and paid for by private individuals, the right to determine, according to their own will, whom they will serve and will not serve.

To give to the Attorney General the authority to file civil suits against private business firms which deny their "advantages, privileges, and facilities" to any individual would be to turn over to Government control of private business.

The loss, in our judgment, would be as great in the long run to the Negro as to the white American.

In a sense, Mr. Kennedy has taken a cowardly approach to an admittedly difficult problem.

Instead of laying before the Negro his responsibility as a citizen and the need for him to strive for his goal of equality in an atmosphere of law and order, Mr. Kennedy has encouraged the Negro, it seems to us, to demonstrate in a reckless and unlawful manner and to trample upon the rights of others.

Why, we wonder, as we have asked before, has not the President called in the leaders of the NAACP and CORE, as he has leaders of labor, business, industry, and religion, and placed before them their obligation to respect the rights of others?

The President, we hold, has, in his civil rights package, turned his back on the Constitution, on tradition and on commonsense. He has, in our opinion, decided to shuck the pressures to which he has been subjected, pressures that he thinks might weigh against his second bid for the Presidency, and turn them over to Congress. Now, if his socialistic program fails of passage he can always turn to the Negro segment of our population with "clean" hands and declare that he tried. Congress, then, would be the "fall guy."

No one may successfully argue that the President of the United States should not serve as a leader for all citizens of this land. But that duty does not impose on a President the necessity for eliminating property rights in his bid to extend so-called human rights.

Without property rights there can be no human rights.

King Abuses His Race

Just last Monday a CORE leader predicted that the arrival of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in Gadsden, Ala., would trigger a desegregation drive in that city which, he said, "is really going to break loose."

Tuesday night the "breaking loose" occurred. Whipped into a chanting, stomping, aboriginal mob by the Montgomery witch doctor, the misguided Negroes staged sitdowns at the courthouse and at nearby downtown variety store. Four hundred and sixty-six who refused to move when ordered to do so by police were arrested and jailed.

Thus began, we predict, another Albany and another Birmingham, each a festering imprint of the King trademark wherein race relations are strained to the breaking point, not for the benefit of the Negro, but for the King coffers and the Kremlin cause.

While it is important to point out that King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference collected an estimated $300,000 as a result of his Birmingham campaign, the importance lies in how it was done rather than why it was done.

Moreover, the fact itself that King obtained this much money is not nearly so important to be revealed as is a bit of the background of this so-called practitioner of nonviolence.

Late last fall the Chronicle editorially declared that King had in his employ as acting executive director of his Leadership Conference a man identified as Hunter Pitts O'Dell but using the alias of Jack H. O'Dell. We cited the Communist associations of Hunter Pitts O'Dell and were pleased to learn shortly thereafter that because of the publicity given his relationship with O'Dell, King had removed him from his job in the SCLC.

Now, we have learned that O'Dell was not discharged at all, but simply went "underground" with the King organization. He is still masterminding many of the conference's activities, using thousands of unsuspecting Negroes—who think they have a lily-pure leader in King—as pawns in an avowed effort by the Communist Party to break down relations in the South between the white and Negro races.

The mention of King's collection of some $300,000 in his Birmingham drive simply highlights another tie he has been known to have with a subversive group.

Tocsin, an anti-Communist weekly paper published in California, reported that a letter asking financial help in the Birmingham demonstrations, was mass-circulated last month by King's SCLC.

"Under King's signature," said Tocsin, the letter was sent out in envelopes bearing addresses printed from plates belonging to the National Guardian, a New York Communist weekly."

The Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications which was prepared and released by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House lists the National Guardian, and says "it has manifested itself from the beginning as a virtual official propaganda arm of Soviet Russia."

What a shame it is that Negroes are permitting themselves to be used by this man King, not only stirring themselves into a frenzy, but antagonizing whites, many of who want to help the Negro in his just demands for equality but who are unwilling to be trampled underfoot by Communist-inspired efforts designed to drive a wedge between whites and Negroes of America.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable. I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

RACINE, WIS.,
May 29, 1963.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The Racine chapter of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation informs you that a resolution has been passed by our unit supporting passage of House Resolution 14, submitted by you, which calls for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Recent developments worldwide and in Washington make the formation of such a committee imperative to the security and welfare of the United States, and will bring added hope to the tyrannised peoples of the once free nations today in Soviet bondage.

We are in addition to this letter, contacting our Congressman as well as Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, head of the Rules Committee, urging him to release your resolution to the House floor for quick debate and passage.

May I take this opportunity to commend you for your stand in this regard, and to assure you of our every support of your measure?

Sincerely,
TOROS KOUYCUJIAN,
Secretary.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 16, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Old House Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE MR. FLOOD: I received your letter of June 1, 1963, requesting me to act and forwarding me the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, February 14, 1963, in which you did commend the Americans of Lithuanian descent for their efforts to expose the Soviet imperialist colonial system and the plight of the unhappy people under it.

I am happy to say that your speech made a great impression upon me. Your efforts for the passage of the measure to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives deserve the highest praise. May they be as successful as you did show in all your time as the Representative of the 11th District of Pennsylvania.

With these warm wishes and respects, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
ALOIZAS VALUSIS.

UKRAINIAN STUDENT ASSOCIATION
"ZAREVO,"
New York, N.Y., May 11, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The people of the captive nations are being systematically deprived of the exercise of fundamental freedoms and basic rights under the yoke of Russian imperialism.

Therefore, we the undersigned, American students of Ukrainian ancestry wholeheartedly approve and support Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD's worthwhile proposition for the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, and urge that quick action be taken on House Resolution 14, for the passage of the said resolution.

We remain respectfully yours,
Total number of signatures: 197.
IRENE DEMYDOWYCZ.

JUNE 15, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Both my mother and I congratulate you for the work you have done on the above resolution. We are following the progress of this resolution carefully and sincerely hope that it will be possible to organize a Special Committee on Captive Nations. Much work needs to be done in this respect, and I am glad that you have seen fit to take the initial steps.

Sincerely,
MISS VIRGINIA NALBANDEAN.
LYNN, MASS.

WEST ROXBURY, MASS.,
May 7, 1963.

Hon. TORBERT H. MACDONALD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MACDONALD: We can start to exploit the weaknesses in the Communist colonial empire by developing an effective policy toward the captive nations.

Last January, Congressmen FLOOD and DERWINSKI, introduced House Resolution 14 and House Resolution 15, respectively, which would implement the Captive Nations Week resolution of 1959 and establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations. This committee would conduct inquiries into, study, and prepare concrete recommendations for an effective similar resolution.

On behalf of the Boston branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee I am asking you to—

1. Introduce a resolution of your own to establish a Committee on Captive Nations;
2. Support House Resolution 14 introduced by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD;
3. Use your influence in the House Rules Committee, to which House Resolution 14 was assigned, and especially with the chairman of House Rules Committee, HOWARD W. SMITH, to initiate action on the proposed legislation by opening public hearings.

Although this request does not come from your district, we believe that our fight with communism and our support for the captive nations is of national concern and must have the support of all Americans.

Your action and support in this matter will do much for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Sincerely yours,
UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC., BOSTON BRANCH
OREST SZEZUDLUK, *Public Relations.*

Nuclear Test Bans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, before committing ourselves to trusting the Soviet again—as we did in Cuba—it is well to consider all factors. Henry J. Taylor does just this in today's Washington Daily News, in a very penetrating article on the practicalities of detection:

A DETECTION CHALLENGE

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Bomb test ban negotiator William C. Foster has been challenged regarding the entire practicability of our Government's safeguards against Soviet violations and the administration's declared willingness to allow America's security to depend on "black box" detections.

Searching Khrushchev's mind is like frisking a seal. And Kremlin test ban untrustworthiness (typical) already has been demonstrated. I saw the nuclear test ban debated with the Russians in Geneva, Switzerland, in 340 sessions over a period of 34 months. Then Khrushchev broke the ban September 9, 1961.

Thereafter, officials here in Washington further and further negotiated America's inspection demands downhill into proposing some 20 "black boxes" as monitors. These would record Soviet underground explosions on photographic chart films. At intervals—which can mean long after the event—the graphs would be dispatched out of Russia for "interpretation" by Western experts. Security?

By passing, for a moment, that time weakness in our watered-down proposal, the black box itself needs some public exposure. Worried, practical executives of large American oil exploration enterprises, famous as the best in the world, utilize similar seismographic equipment daily and under all conditions.

What is to our public only an intriguing name—"black box"—is often to them a fickle, temperamental, irascible chatterbox. It's indispensable. It's also enormously tricky. And the bomb-detection "black boxes" do differ substantially. But theory, these practical men insist, is one thing; practicability in detecting Soviet violations this way is quite another.

Basic field seismographic equipment, for deep oil exploration, reacts to carefully placed dynamite charges. Even this involves the presence of about 17 experts at the moment of the explosion (vital factor). Widespread clusters of geophones and vacuum tubes or transistors monitor the seismic vibrations into vastly complex instruments previously timed to the exact location, intensity, and whatnot of that particular explosion. Then the dogfight begins with the debatable interpretations of the wiggles registered on the film.

Regardless of any conceivable scientific breakthroughs, practical men point out that a great wiggle debate with Khrushchev is a profoundly questionable basis on which to establish American policy and the potential security of the United States.

The U.S.S.R. covers one-sixth the earth's land area. It is 32 times the size of Texas and has 11 time zones to our 4. Suppose a film comes out of Khrushchev's closed paradise July 1. Our experts see a wiggle indicated for last April 14. Triangulation among the black boxes indicates the vicinity of Tashkent in the Aral Sea area. The State Department asks Khrushchev what was going on around Tashkent April 14. He says an itsy-bitsy earthquake tremor was going around Tashkent last April 14. In fact, all Russian university seismographs recorded it, of course, etc. Where do we go from there?

Our national security goes out of the black box into the ash can exactly as it did when we negotiated our Cuban on-site missile inspection demand downhill to nothing. "It's a dead issue, I guess," President Kennedy has said of that minimum demand by the American people for our security. And we're doing the same thing all over again.

An Era of Rule in Racial Disorder by Edict and Federal Guns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues and all others who read the RECORD, an editorial which appeared in the Shreveport Times on June 13, under the title, "An Era of Rule in Racial Disorder by Edict and Federal Guns."

It is an excellent commentary and one that should be pondered by all of us who are faced with the responsibility of considering the civil rights legislation which will shortly come before us. This editorial is worthy background material for all to read prior to that day and I present it here for the consideration of my colleagues:

AN ERA OF RULE IN RACIAL DISORDER BY EDICT AND FEDERAL GUNS

Gov. George C. Wallace, of Alabama, conducted himself with splendid dignity, restraint, and poise in imposing himself—his own body as embodying the sovereignty of a sovereign State—against admission of two Negro students to the University of Alabama.

From the start—weeks ago—Governor Wallace had taken every possible step to make certain that there would be no violence. There was none. There never was even the slightest intent on his part to present physical resistance to Federal guns. He sought always to keep the whole issue of federally ordered integration on a constitutional basis and in the courts, where it belongs and must remain under our American system of government and jurisprudence.

Every step by the Governor of Alabama was aimed at taking the issue out of the streets, where it had brought demonstrations in Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and a dozen other States, North and South—with bloodshed and death in some. In writing (by personal telegram), Governor Wallace had guaranteed to President Kennedy that there would be no violence when the Negro students sought to register Tuesday; that the National Guard troops he had called into active service would be used only to prevent violence and not for any other purpose—such as directly or indirectly preventing registration of the Negroes.

Governor Wallace sought just one thing: A complete, final, and constitutional showdown in the Federal courts on the sovereignty of a State and the sovereignty of its chief executive as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States—particularly in the 10th amendment—and now overthrown by the U.S. Supreme Court.

What Governor Wallace sought to determine was whether the courts would nullify inherent, traditional, and constitutional authority of the Governor of a State whose government functioned as a republic, in accordance with the Federal Constitution which, in turn, established the Federal Government as a Republic, and as having only such powers as those specifically delegated to it by the States. To make the sovereignty issue clear, he interposed his own body as symbolic of his State's sovereignty.

THE PRESIDENT INSISTS ON FEDERAL TROOPS

Despite the clear-cut issue which Governor Wallace raised and the clear-cut manner in which he explained what he would do and what he would not do in furthering the constitutional principles on which he stood, President Kennedy at the last minute federalized the Alabama National Guard when there was no need and no justification of any kind for such action.

The only use of the federalized National Guard—by the President—was to compel its commanding general—a veteran of combat in his country's service—to humiliate himself and his Governor in public. Under the Presidential orders the general, in a choked voice, called on the Governor to step aside. He did so. But there never was a semblance of reason for the President of the United States to force two American citizens to so humiliate themselves in public. Had the President not sent the troops, all problems at stake would have moved on into final court action.

Actually, the Governor did not bar anybody or prevent anybody from passing through the door or from registering at the university. It is questionable, indeed, whether any Federal court, or the Federal Department of Justice, can bring any kind of charge or make any kind of case—in anything approaching justice—against the Alabama chief executive.

Looked at in its true light, the course of Governor Wallace is one that should bring pride to the American people regardless of what geographical portion of the Nation may be their home.

In Arkansas, there had been violence under the course of Governor Faubus, which had to be taken in somewhat snap judgment manner and without precedent as a guide.

In Louisiana, five special sessions of the legislature called by the Governor had ended only in futility, plus perhaps further agitating street demonstrations in New Orleans.

In Mississippi, lack of any well worked out plan by the Governor—or failure to follow any such plan—created a situation which brought death to two persons.

In Tuscaloosa Tuesday there was peace and quiet and law and order even as tension was so tight that many expected all hell to break loose if Governor Wallace even came to Tuscaloosa. He came; and all was quiet.

When the Tuscaloosa incident had ended, President Kennedy quickly usurped all television and radio networks to try to tell the people "his side." It seemed a rather feeble effort. There had been no justification whatever for federalizing National Guard troops which Governor Wallace was holding distant from the scene of his own activities and which he had pledged would be called into action only if there was violence and Tuscaloosa police were unable to handle it. It seemed almost as if the President knew he was wrong and thought fast talk might avert criticism.

The President's plea chiefly was one to "take the racial problems out of the streets and into the courts." Surely, he has done nothing to encourage a transfer of the racial issues from the streets—where Negro mobs have "demonstrated" over and over in more than two score cities, less than half in the Deep South. It was not white people who put race problems in streets of Tuscaloosa, Oxford or Birmingham—or in other places.

Now, there has been bloodshed, in the streets. It is not all in the South. Nor did the initial attacks in various bloody incidents come always from whites.

Much will be made over the murder of a Negro integration leader in Jackson, Mississippi, Tuesday night. Much was made over the killing of two white bystanders at Oxford, Miss., with no one knowing who fired the bullets, and over the murder of an itinerant white integration agitator in Alabama.

But not so much has been made—certainly not by the Kennedys—over the killing of a white bystander and wounding of another white bystander in Lexington, N.C., a few days ago through bullets fired at them without known provocation by Negroes concealed in a Negro apartment building.

Probably not much will be made—in Washington—over the shooting of two white men Tuesday night who were merely standing at the side of a white-owned building in a Negro section which had been set on fire—at Cambridge, Md. Negroes "demonstrated" when the school board voted down integration and Negroes reportedly set fire to white-owned buildings. The shooting by Negroes followed.

Ten white Philadelphia police were hospitalized after being beaten up by Negro street demonstrators. There has been other racial violence far outside the South.

DISORDERS BREAKING OUT FROM COAST TO COAST

A New York Times chart last Sunday showed more than 20 Negro street demonstrations in California, Massachusetts, New Jersey and New York since May 1. A Wall Street Journal roundup article yesterday told of many Northern cities—as well as Southern—establishing or enlarging police dog units and training special forces to handle racial violence.

What has happened is that government of people by legislative statutes with adjudication by courts now has been supplanted in racial matters—through personal action of the President of the United States and the Attorney General of the United States—by government through court edict enforced by Federal guns.

That has brought frustration—desperate frustration—to people not only in the South but in other parts of the Nation. It is a combination of frustration and desperation that is certain to breed more and more trouble so long as the White House and Department of Justice maintain the policy of rule by court edict and military force whenever Negroes call for their "rights"—with the President ordering out troops on his mere personal suspicion that there might be some disorders somewhere, sometime. There was no Federal issue in Birmingham when he called up the troops. In Tuscaloosa there was absolute guarantee against violence.

Law no longer satisfies the Negro leaders. They must have the quick acting of a form of at least creeping dictatorship backed by Federal guns from Washington. They are getting it more and more every day; and every day people—North and South—become more and more frustrated; desperately so. The President calls for leadership around the Nation. Where it is needed—and must start to be effective—is in Washington.

Some say the President and his brother are frightened by the forces they have turned loose. Perhaps they should be, for communications between worthwhile leadership of two races has just about been destroyed and so-called Negro leaders publicly have derided the President for not going even further in rule by edict backed by guns.

Report From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

THE COMMITTEE AND THE BILL

Each month I get many letters urging me to support or oppose various legislation. Since lawmaking is the primary duty of a Congressman, I carefully consider each letter. Some write urging me to vote "no" on a particular bill when it hasn't yet been introduced in Congress. Others, seeing that a particular bill has been introduced, write the next day urging me to take a stand on it and give them my opinion on the bill.

Many times I immediately know my own feeling on the subject matter of a particular bill. But my 18 years experience in Congress has taught me that it is far wiser and more responsible to wait until the bill is reported out of committee before taking a position. When I reply to a constituent that my position on a bill is not yet firm, I am accused of being wishy-washy.

When a bill is introduced in Congress, it is referred to a particular committee where it receives much detailed study. Here the merits of a measure are put into workable form, much more easily than could be accomplished before 435 House Members. What goes into a committee does not always come out; what does come out often differs considerably from the original bill.

Take the President's tax reform bill, for example. Of 37 specific tax reform measures presented to the Ways and Means Committee, 22 have been approved, 6 have been rejected, and 9 are still under study. Any of the approved or rejected items can be changed at any time. When the tax reform measure was first introduced, I received a deluge of letters urging me to vote against the measure because of several items contained in the bill. To date, the committee has rejected several of the President's proposals, including the charitable contribution deduction, travel expense deduction, and others. After having rejected the President's proposal on a section of the oil depletion tax law, the committee reversed itself and approved it.

When I answer a letter stating that I have not yet formed an opinion on a particular bill, I am not being wishy-washy or evasive. A doctor cannot treat a patient until he knows all the symptoms, and I cannot vote on a bill until all the changes in it have been made. It is possible, while a bill is in committee, to support a bill one day and be against it the next, in light of committee action.

FEDERAL LOANS APPROVED

Improved electrical service is due for rural consumers in my district with announcement this month of approval of a $980,000 loan by the REA to Northwest Electric Co-op, Inc., Woodward. The loan is for construction of 143 miles of distribution line to serve 320 consumers, and other system improvements.

Also approved was a $49,000 study by the Area Redevelopment Administration on developing tourist facilities in eastern and south central Oklahoma. A total of 41 counties are involved. The Bureau of Indian Affairs will provide $5,000 for the study, to be carried out in Grady, Jefferson, and Stephens Counties in my district.

Speaking of ARA, five votes defeated the bill to authorize appropriations of $455.5 million to continue the program. Since the program was begun 2 years ago, $3.8 million has been spent in my district alone, creating jobs for almost 1,000 persons. It takes time to get applications processed and it takes time to build factories and plants. It can't be done overnight. Opponents who charged that the program "failed to produce" should have realized this.

PROSPECTS FOR NEW WHEAT LEGISLATION

Letters from farmers this month talk of one thing—new wheat legislation. Some say "let the farmer stew in his own juice," others want new legislation. "Support the new wheat bill," they say, although there are three different wheat bills before Congress.

One bill would continue the present wheat program for 2 years and call for a new referendum. Another would set up a voluntary program with wheat acreage being added to the feed grain base. Farmers would get acreage payments for diverting wheat. A third bill would wipe all bills off the books and start over. Supports would be set at the average world market price for the past 3 years. Supplies would be brought down by a major voluntary cropland retirement program, with payments on a bid basis.

This part of the bill is seen as the trouble spot. Farmers generally grow all they can and few worry about surpluses, observers feel. It is feared that a return to the Benson farm program and high surpluses would result. At this time, there does not seem to be much inclination on the part of Congress to enact new wheat legislation. Hearings are due, but when they will be held is uncertain. The urban Congressman, who has always gone along with the farmer, may be tiring of helping the farmer at the expense of the city dweller. As for myself, I will work for whatever legislation is best for the wheat farmers in my district. More than 12,000 farmers voted against the referendum, but more than 10,000 voted for it. Some kind of legislation will be needed.

SOMEONE IS NUTS

Former President Eisenhower said this month that "anyone who would spend $40 billion to put a man on the moon is 'nuts.'" Well, the Russians must be nuts because they are working like crazy to get there first. Anyone who wants to live on earth with a Russian man-in-the-moon is nuts. Militarily, a moon-based rocket force would be impossible to cope with. Economically, the new metals or minerals yet undiscovered by man would certainly prove advantageous to science. Let's not kid ourselves into believing the Russians would give us one-half of the moon if they claimed it first. They haven't done so on earth, by any means. It has always been part of many to seek out, to explore. Imagine a conversation between King Ferdinand, Queen Isabella, and Christopher Columbus: The date, 1492:

"King FERDINAND. Chris old boy, I understand you want to take your boat out into the ocean and go exploring.

"COLUMBUS. That's right Ferdy, I believe there is something out there besides a lot of water.

"ISABELLA. Anyone who would take a boat to the edge of the ocean and risk falling off the world is nuts. You can sit here on your soft cushion and eat peeled grapes. Anyway, if we want to increase our world prestige we can send the Vice King down to southern Spain on a good-will tour.

"COLUMBUS. That wouldn't work. They would probably throw eggs at him.

"King FERDINAND. I'm against this ocean trip because of the cost.

"COLUMBUS. At least you don't have to worry about a congress. Just give me three ships, three crews, some pocket change and I'll be off.

"King FERDINAND. Why can't we send an instrument over there in a bottle and get information about that land?

"COLUMBUS. We can, but how are you going to get samples of minerals, forest, and vegetation and all that jazz if you don't send a man. Besides, everyone knows Prussia is exploring, they may get there first.

"King FERDINDAND. Nope, sorry Chris. You can't go. In the first place, there is nothing worth having out there, and in the second place I've got to stand recoronation this fall and there has been entirely too much junketing lately. Let's spend our money on bubonic plague research.

"COLUMBUS. OK, maybe the history books will give me credit for the trip anyway.

"King FERDINAND. Maybe, but they will long remember me as the King that stood for 'lazy faire,' individual individualism, and what's good for General Engine is good enough for me."

Anytime I may be of service to you, please call on me.

Cordially your friend,

VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Member of Congress.

Et Tu, Brute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, my weekly newsletter dated June 24, 1963, makes reference to two legislative proposals pending before the Congress and also to the recent Supreme Court decision against the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading. I would like to share these comments, Mr. President, with the Members of the House and the Senate, so I ask unanimous consent that this newsletter entitled "Et Tu, Brute" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ET TU, BRUTE

Labels do not provide a sufficient basis for judging a product. For instance, the goals of communism are evil; but they are not evil just because they are advocated by the Communists. The goals of communism are evil in themselves, and are no less evil and despicable when promoted by other than Communists.

Two principal goals of communism are to destroy private property and to "dethrone God." According to Marx, the institution of private property is the economic tool for enslavement of the masses, and religion is the opiate of the people. Americans are aware that communism is evil, but are often less perceptive when others, neither foreigners nor Communists, seek to achieve the same evil ends—particularly when these evil ends are hidden behind ostensibly noble causes and purposes.

Efforts from within and without the National Government are now being directed at eroding both property and religious rights in the United States, with varying degrees of success.

The tax bill proposed by the administration provides one example of such efforts. Under existing law, taxpayers may deduct from the amount of their income all of the interest paid and the amount of contributions to churches and charities which does not exceed 30 percent of their adjusted gross income. The administration has proposed that only the amounts of contributions and interest which exceed 5 percent of adjusted gross income be deductible.

The nondeductibility of the first 5 percent includes the bulk of all contributions and interest. According to the Internal Revenue Service, based on the returns filed in 1963, only on 19 percent of the returns filed were interest deductions in excess of this first 5 percent claimed. Also, only on 15 percent of returns filed were deductions for contributions in excess of this first 5 percent claimed.

A taxpayer who has an income of $8,000 can now deduct all the contributions he makes up to $2,400, and all the interest he pays. Under the administration's proposal, however, he could not deduct the first $400 in contributions which he makes, nor could he deduct the first $400 in interest which he pays. If this taxpayer made contributions of $400 or more, and paid interest of $400 or more, he would have to pay taxes on this additional $800. Under this proposal, the taxpayer would not only have less incentive to make contributions to his church and charities, and to own his own home, but he would also have less money with which to do these things.

There are other examples. The recent decision of the Supreme Court that Bible reading and the Lord's Prayer in public schools is unconstitutional, even when anyone who objects to participation can be excused, struck a major blow at the religious heritage of our people. And already the American Civil Liberties Union, which financed and conducted the lawsuit in the prayer and Bible reading case, has commenced a lawsuit in California seeking to have the words "under God" in the pledge of allegiance declared unconstitutional. These suits are brought in the name of freedom of religion, but what they are designed to insure is not freedom of religion, but freedom from religion.

The latest assault on private property takes the form of a "civil rights" proposal sent to the Congress by the administration. Under this proposal, private owners of hotels, motels, restaurants, places of amusement, and retail businesses would be prohibited from exercising their property rights to refuse admission to their property or service on their property, to anyone they desire. Previous laws have limited the use of property by forbidding its use in certain ways which might hurt others, but this new proposal would prescribe affirmative ways in which people must use their property. In simple language, it changes the tenor of the law from do not's to do's.

There is no consolation in the fact that assaults on property and religious rights are made piecemeal, through the process of "gradualism." Once the precedents are established, as was evident from the prayer decisions of the Supreme Court, the pace of erosion increases.

Evil is no less evil when perpetrated with a "noble" motive or by a nice "respectable" person or group; and a man who loses his liberty is no less deprived because his liberty was taken from him by natives of his own country who profess high motives, rather than by foreigners who profess an alien ideology.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND.

SST: Milestone or Millstone?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial taken from Business/Commercial Aviation magazine, entitled "SST: Milestone or Millstone?"

SST: MILESTONE OR MILLSTONE?

(By W. G. Osmun)

The President has now proposed a supersonic transport program for the United States. While the details are a carefully guarded secret, we know enough about how the plan has been prepared to make us fear for the survival of our present airline industry. The issues raised by the SST program go far beyond mere survival of airlines as private businesses; what's at stake here is the quality of our transportation complex as well as how much this complex will cost the taxpayer.

Consider first the economics of the SST. Government proposals suggest that the Federal funds being advanced to develop the SST will be recovered from the airlines who buy the machines. This assumes that SST operation will be a moneymaking venture. Nothing could be further from the truth. No known proposal for an early SST offers lower seat-mile costs than do today's jets. Supersonic travel will be premium travel: the fare that would have to be charged just to break even would make today's luxury jet fares look like intercity bus fares. The real reason for the supersonic transport is prestige: prestige for the nation that builds and sells a successful SST, prestige for the airline that uses one. Any attempt to justify the SST program on other grounds is outright deception.

Once we recognize the SST for what it is, an effort to regain our national prestige, two corrolaries automatically follow. First, someone, beside the air traveler or the airline must pay for the prestige. Supersonic air travel will have to be subsidized air travel. Unless Congress and the President are prepared to accept this, they should drop the program at once.

Second, since prestige is the basic reason for going supersonic, timeliness is all important. The first one to design and produce an acceptable SST will get the bulk of the orders. Because the market is limited, a later—but better—SST is very likely to find few buyers left. We are in a race—winner take all—and our competitors across the Atlantic already have a headstart. If we don't plan to start a crash program to overtake them, maybe we should bow out gracefullly before we lose our shirt.

Another major cause for concern over the success of the SST program is FAA's active leadership of the development effort. This is a new, untried partnership: it is, therefore, more than usually open to mistakes. Moreover, FAA's most recent research and development efforts are not exactly confidence inspiring.

Because a successful SST program demands speed, we are most reluctant to urge that Congress investigate before voting the funds. Yet we cannot afford speed in the wrong direction. The cost of mistakes is prohibitive. The chances for miscalculation are great; and, too many questions still need answers. The choices we make in SST development will either let us hold on to world leadership and private enterprise in civil aviation—or lose both. Congress should investigate the SST program immediately, to make sure that we have the plan to win—and that we can afford the results.

Independence of Kuwait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, Kuwait celebrated the third anniversary of her independence. We wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Highness, the Amir of Kuwait, Shaikh Sir Abdullah al-Salim al-Subah; and the Honorable Talaat Ghoussien, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of Kuwait to the United States.

A progressive nation, a welfare state, a modern metropolis—these are the titles which would be used when speaking of Kuwait. As a progressive nation, a constitution was recently promulgated by the ruler to give his subjects a say in the running of the government. This document established a National Assembly, to be freely elected by the people, as was the case in the recent elections held last January.

It is a welfare state since many public services are given free to the people. Modern schools, including primary, secondary, and college, have been built to stress the desires of the head of state to have the people of Kuwait educated. And in each degree of education, all is paid for by the government. Modern hospitals and clinics, too, have been erected to care for the ills of the people. And as with education, all expenses are paid for by the state.

It is a modern metropolis, for rising from the desert sands along the Persian Gulf is the city of Kuwait. Well planned with wide streets, parks, government buildings, and housing developments, the city now boasts air conditioning, movies, and electrical equipment, which we in the United States take for granted but which are scarce in other parts of the world, to make living quite comfortable for both foreigner and citizen.

These improvements, though, have been recent innovations to Kuwait. Recognized as an independent sheikdom in 1899 by Great Britain, but under the protection of British forces and allowing its foreign affairs to be handled by London, Kuwait was thus preserved as a separate entity from the encroaching claims of the Turkish and German empires. During the early years of the 20th Century, the populace continued in their old ways, as exporters of dates and pearls and go-betweens for goods arriving through the Persian Gulf route, a peaceful people living their lives as their fathers did. Modernization came suddenly and swiftly with the discovery of oil in 1938. Today everything one sees in Kuwait is derived from oil. It is estimated that under the sands of Kuwait is located the richest and largest oil deposit in the world. After World War II when oil production in the Middle East surged ahead, money flowed into the country. With the wisdom of a benevolent leader, Sheik Abdullah as-Sabah, who was elected ruler in 1950, initiated his programs of reform and development.

Even with the development projects for the state, oil royalties continued to increase too rapidly for the country to absorb. Foreign investment programs were begun so that the idle capital would be useful to others. And when this proved insufficient, there was established a fund for Middle East development, to abet the progress of the countries in the Middle East. To date, there have been loans granted to Jordan, the Sudan, and Libya, with several others under consideration.

Kuwait is a shining example for the other oil countries of the Middle East to follow. Everyone in Kuwait benefits from the liberal policies of the government. As fourth largest oil producer in the world, its security is assured for many years. Yet the government is looking ahead to the time when their oil pools will have been depleted. New industries have been inaugurated to diversify the economy. Harbor facilities were improved so that its ports will once again become a lure for world commerce.

Amicable relations with the United States has been the rule since gaining complete independence from British protection on June 19, 1961, with our Navy using its harbors and port facilities several times a year. Mutual respect and admiration has grown up between American oil personnel and Kuwaitis, further cementing a strong bond. It is thus with pride that we may claim Kuwait as our friend. On this their second anniversary of independence, let us express our sincere admiration for their success and hope for their continued prosperity and good will.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, today we are bordering on national hysteria in the demonstrations, the demands, the actions now being taken in the name of civil rights. The basic rights of Americans should be a subject for calm and reasonable discussion. Untold harm may result from some of the present tactics employing force, violence and pressure.

In the midst of the sound and the fury I would like to inject two editorials from the Dallas Morning News which appeal to reason rather than political expediency and emotional outbursts. The first is an editorial discussion on civil rights. The second is a reprint of an article written in 1948 by Davis Lee, Negro publisher in Newark, N.J. The reprint appeared in the Dallas Morning News of June 21, 1963:

[From the Dallas Morning News, June 21, 1963]

CIVIL RIGHTS

The philosophy which motivates many Negro leaders today—and now apparently guides the thinking of the President of the United States—is that the "end justifies the means." In the pursuit of worthwhile goals, they are willing to do permanent damage to the fabric of a free society.

It is often argued that Negroes in America have been denied gains for 100 years and that they will wait no longer. Is this really true? In the last 9 years alone, since the 1954 *Brown* v. *Board of Education* decision handed down by the Supreme Court, racial barriers have come down in an astonishing number of areas.

Not only has segregation been outlawed in public schools, but barriers have come down in all of the following: State colleges and universities, interstate transportation, local transportation, municipal recreation facilities, public beaches. These and other gains have been achieved through court action. In numerous cases additional gains have been won through voluntary action.

Apparently, this is not enough. It has merely whetted the appetite for more. The Negro today—or at least his leaders—wants total eradication of discrimination. And he wants it now. Apparently the President of the United States is prepared to give it to him.

Mr. Kennedy has offered the most radical solution to the race problem ever proposed by a Chief Executive—a solution which goes even beyond the most extreme measures advanced during Reconstruction.

There are so many unacceptable elements in the President's civil rights bill that it is difficult to go beyond the bare surface of them.

He would use the race issue as a lever to expand existing and proposed Federal projects by hundreds of millions of dollars and to grant the Attorney General vastly increased authority. He would delegate to himself the power to deny funds appropriated by Congress for almost any purpose—power which even he admitted to be unconstitutional 2 months ago.

But the worst portion of the civil rights proposal is the assault on private property. In the name of equal rights, the President would forbid virtually every businessman in America from discriminating in his private establishment.

The authority for these radical proposals, according to the President, is the 14th amendment, which by no stretch of the imagination justifies or permits such actions. The President tipped his hand at one point in his message to Congress when he said that the overriding argument in favor of his solutions is that they are "right." The end, in other words, justifies the means.

There is one precedent for what the President has proposed. That is the civil rights act passed by radical reconstructionists in Congress in 1875. Even that measure, however, did not go as far as Mr. Kennedy goes today. And more important, it was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in a series of decisions handed down on October 15, 1883.

Every member of the Supreme Court at that time had supported the North during the Civil War. All were sympathetic to the Negro and had defended his legal rights in numerous cases. Yet by an 8 to 1 decision, the Court declared the 1875 civil rights act invalid, saying that the Constitution provided no authority for the Federal Government to regulate social discrimination and that the 14th amendment did not encompass private acts of discrimination.

That decision to this day has not been reversed. It is the "law of the land," as defenders of the Court are prone to say. Is the President now willing to challenge that decision with his own standard of what is right?

The package of civil rights bills which Congress was asked Wednesday to pass represents another instance of big government getting bigger at the expense of the individual, the private property owner, the States, and local communities.

Washington, it seems is to tell us all how to live, what we can earn and even with whom we must eat.

The Negro should be warned that such power, in the hands of a national government, tomorrow can be used against those whom it proposes to help today.

[From the Dallas Morning News, June 21, 1963]

A NEGRO LOOKS AT CIVIL RIGHTS

(NOTE.—In 1948 when Harry Truman was running for President against Tom Dewey and the civil rights issue was boiling over, the News ran this editorial from the Newark (N.J.) Telegram by its Negro publisher, Mr. Lee. It is reprinted after several requests.)

(By Davis Lee)

I have just returned from an extensive tour of the South. In addition to meeting and talking with our agents and distributors who get our newspapers out to the more than 500,000 readers in the South, I met both Negroes and whites in the urban and rural centers.

Because of these personal observations, studies and contacts, I feel that I can speak with some degree of authority. I am certainly in a better position to voice an opinion than the Negro leader who occupies a suite in downtown New York and bases his opinions on the South from the distorted stories he reads in the Negro press and in the Daily Worker.

The racial lines in the South are so clearly drawn and defined there can be no confusion. When I am in Virginia or South Carolina I don't wonder if I will be served if I walk into a white restaurant. I know the score. However, I have walked into several right here in New Jersey where we have a civil rights law, and have been refused service.

The whites in the South stay with their own and the Negroes do likewise. This one fact has been the economic salvation of the Negro in the South. Atlanta, Ga., compares favorably with Newark in size and population. Negroes there own and control millions dollars worth of business. All of the Negro business in New Jersey will not amount to as much as our race has in one city in Georgia. This is also true in South Carolina and Virginia.

New Jersey today boasts of more civil rights legislation than any other State in the Union, and State government itself practices more discrimination than Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, or Georgia. New Jersey employs one Negro in the motor vehicle department. All of the States above mentioned employ plenty.

No matter what a Negro wants to do, he can do it in the South. In Spartanburg, S.C., Ernest Collins, a young Negro, operates a large funeral home, a taxicab business, a filling station, a grocery store, has several buses, runs a large farm, and a night club.

Mr. Collins couldn't do all that in New Jersey or New York. The only bus line operated by Negroes is in the South. The Safe Bus Co., in Winston-Salem, N.C., owns and operates over a hundred. If a Negro in New Jersey or New York had the money and attempted to obtain a franchise to operate a line he would not only be turned down, but he would be lucky if he didn't get a bullet in the back.

The attitude of the southerners toward our race is a natural psychological reaction and aftermath of the Civil War. Negroes were the properties of these people.

Certainly you could not expect the South to forget this in 75 or even 150 years. That feeling has passed from one generation to another, but it is not one of hatred for the Negro. The South just doesn't believe that the Negro has grown up. No section of the country has made more progress in finding a workable solution to the Negro problem than the South. Naturally southerners are resentful when the North attempts to ram a civil rights program down their throats.

The entire race program in America is wrong. Our approach is wrong. We expend all our energies, and spend millions of dollars trying to convince white people that we are as good as they are, that we are equals. Joe Louis is not looked upon as a Negro but the greatest fighter of all time, loved and admired by whites in South Carolina as much as by those in Michigan. He convinced the world, not by propaganda and agitation, but by demonstration.

Our fight for recognition, justice, civil rights and equality should be carried on within the race. Let us demonstrate to the world by our living standards, our conduct, our ability and intelligence that we are the equal of any man, and when we shall have done this the entire world, including the South, will accept us on our terms. Our present program of threats and agitation makes enemies out of our friends.

Big Steel: Management and Labor Collective Bargaining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the successful agreement entered into by the big steel, labor and management, was happy news not only to all steel workers and their families, but to American business and the public generally. These recent negotiations displayed outstanding statesmanship on the part of the heads of the steel workers union and steel management. It demonstrates that good faith collective bargaining on both sides, will successfully terminate in a fair decision for the benefit of both parties concerned and the Nation.

The following editorial by Dale E. Belles, Jr., editor of the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, further illustrates the good sense used by both sides in the steel agreement:

THE STEEL PEACE

The steel news is good news. That's true even though it is not startling.

Victor Riesel, whose "Inside Labor" column has reliable lines laid to many union sources, brought Post-Tribune readers a prediction of the settlement well over a month ago. Industry publications followed soon with similar indications from their side of the table. Wire service feelers began to show results along the same line. Finally, Riesel was even flatter in his forecast of peace in an article in this paper just a week ago on the eve of the climactic USM Executive Board and Wage Policy Committee meetings.

Still, that powerful a barrage of forecasts has been off target before, so it was comforting to get the formal reassurance Thursday.

What was accomplished was important. Pleasant as the extended vacations will be, they are more important in spreading of jobs among more people in the expanding, but increasingly mechanized, steel center of northwest Indiana. Assurance of steel peace into 1965, much longer than had been expected, is a major gain for the steel industry.

But probably more important was the way in which it was accomplished. The joint labor-management human relations committee, working hard for months, ironed out the issues quietly. Since its numerous members, working separately on many knotty issues, are human beings, there probably were many heated arguments before the accord was reached. But it was reached without the last-minute sense of panic attendant on previous settlements.

A way has been found. It is possibly too much to hope that it will always prove so smooth a way. Still, it has been traveled once with much less shock on either side than is felt on the often-traveled, but always rocky byway of the strike. One can hope that it may be traveled again—and again.

There may be some letdown in the feverish production of recent months which was partly spurred by strike fears among both producers and consumers. Still, indications along the general business front, are that the demand for steel is growing.

It should be a good year for a peaceful steel industry and its workers. That means it should be a good year for northwest Indiana.

Like we said, the steel news is good news. It may not be startling but it's exhilarating.

A Republic, if You Can Keep It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, entitled, "A Republic, if You Can Keep It."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REPUBLIC, IF YOU CAN KEEP IT

Neither the Congress of the United States nor the Legislature of California should attempt to legislate with a "gun at its head."

A disgraceful demonstration at Sacramento took place last Friday where publicly seeking individuals invaded the legislative chamber and sprawled in the Capitol corridors until removed by the police.

They have done a great disservice to the cause they are supposed to be helping, namely the fair housing bill (AB 1240) now pending before a Senate committee.

If legislators allow themselves to be intimidated by such actions they are no longer qualifed to be lawmakers in this the largest State in the Union.

To abdicate their responsibilities and yield to the mob invasion of the seat of the government of California would justify a massive repudiation of all such legislators by the overwhelming majority of the people of California at the polls in November of 1964.

At the conclusion of the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention in 1787, Dr. Benjamin Franklin was asked what kind of a government had been given the American people. He replied: "We have given you a Republic, if you can keep it."

The German people started to lose their first Republic when the "brown shirted" storm troopers took over the streets and intimidated holders of public office and the general public as well.

The time has come for every citizen to make known to his legislators, National and State, that we expect each to do his part in preserving the Republic.

This means orderly enactment of law by an appeal to reason and the due process of the legislative system. This may take longer but it is a more and sound procedure than yielding to mobs attempting to disrupt the legislative process.

Every American citizen has a right, under our Constitution, to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. It does not give him a right to obstruct the legislative, executive or judicial functions of the Government.

Every American citizen who can meet the standards for voting established by the State governments, under the Federal Constitution, is entitled to register and vote without regard to race, creed or sex.

Civil rights are far more broad than racial rights alone. They include the right to own property, to manage and to dispose of it; to have freedom of speech, of religion and of the press; to safely walk the streets of our cities day or night; to associate with friends of one's own choice; to travel abroad and at home. These also are among our civil rights as citizens. The rights of one group of our people must not nullify the rights of other citizens.

The Constitutional process of amendment may be slow, but if sufficiently concerned, the American people have shown it can be amended, and has been 23 times. We must never allow amendments by usurpation of legislative, executive, judicial or mob power, all of which are contrary to the Constitutional procedure established.

Dr. Seaborg's Address on Science and Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include excerpts from the address of Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, before the National

Conference on Higher Education in Chicago:

Education for the Third Revolution

It is an honor to be invited here to address this distinguished gathering of educators. There is, in my opinion, no more important activity of our society than the education of our young people to the limit of their talents. If this has always been so, it is more true today than ever in a dynamic society in which advancement and even survival depend upon the maximum cultivation of intellectual resources. It is with great pleasure, therefore, that I join with you in considering the most important basic issues of our time.

The word "revolution" has become quite popular in the last decade—and with considerable justification. There is hardly another word to describe what is going on in our world and within its various fragments. * * *

If we are to make sound decisions about higher education, we must understand the nature of our world and the forces that created it. Let us look back briefly to perceive, if we can, some of the major influences in the development of our modern world. A few centuries ago Western society was essentially static and authoritarian. For the individual, life was temporary, a transitional period before a good and better life that lay beyond. The individual—his needs and aspirations in this world—was of secondary importance. The obligation of the individual was to accept the world as it was. Disease, hunger, drudgery, indignity, natural calamities, war—these were man's inescapable portion. The origin and nature of the earth and the universe were explained for all time, and one need not ask questions. There was little evidence of collective consciousness that man himself might change his world. One endured an ordained system.

The change was slow in coming. It began with those great movements we now characterize as the Renaissance and the Reformation. Men in all walks of life began to question the established order—in law and religion, in politics and literature, in philosophy and art. In science, Corpernicus and Galileo overturned a fixed image of the universe and the earth's relation to it. Upon the pedestal of Christian ideals, thinkers of the enlightenment enshrined the individual. Ideas of freedom, equality, and inherent rights took hold. The concept of the government as the servant, not the master, of the indivdual arose.. If the individual's happiness and well-being were important, then it followed that steps could and should be taken to improve his condition. And these improvements might be effected by ordering society to that end. Science was viewed as a powerful instrument for the improvement of individual human life. Creative evolution replaced passive acceptance of a static world.

The first practical implementation of these liberal, humanitarian views—constituting a new philosophical concept of man—occurred with the American Revolution.

* * * * *

At first glance it appears that we are living today in an advanced phase of the industrial revolution. Yet I believe we have entered a distinctly new era in the past two or three decades. I believe we have embarked upon a third great movement which I call the third revolution—the scientific revolution. The philosophical motivation of this period remains the same as the previous one—the urge to creative evolution, to implement the modern concept of man with conditions of life that do justice to that concept. There is, I believe, an important departure—and one that is important to us in considering educational decisions for the future.

During the industrial revolution, science, a bright hope of the liberal ideals of the 18th century, developed slowly, especially in our own country. Moreover, economic creativeness, although beholden to fairly obvious applications of scientific knowledge, was not closely weeded to the advances in fundamental science. In our own country, certainly, science was a peripheral world, apart from the mainstream of social effort.

I believe it is possible to identify a drastic change in the relationship between science and economic creativity and between science and society as a whole during the last quarter of a century. One factor has been the enormous explosion of fundamental knowledge in virtually every branch of science.

* * * * *

Having attempted to understand some of the forces that molded our present society, let me proceed to a task urged upon me by the invitation to speak here; namely, to attempt to visualize the future of scientific developments as background that may be useful in making decisions in higher education. * * * I predict—possibly to your surprise—that my error will be this: that although my predictions may seem dramatic or sensational at present, these estimates will turn out to be too conservative.

What, then, seems to be the future of the Third Revolution?

The most important source of creative evolution in the future will continue to be, as it has been in the past, fundamental scientific research—the kind of investigations that give us a better understanding of the true nature of our world. * * *

We cannot foresee what scientists will learn about our universe. We know that knowledge gained in the past has radically altered our world. Now, armed with enormously greater powers of exploration, we can predict with confidence that the discoveries of the next two decades will revolutionize our concepts of nature and vastly increase our ability to create a world of our choosing.

Our crystal ball contains little hint of the laws of nature that will be discovered in the future. But with the knowledge of the past it is possible to foresee, to some limited extent, the potential effect of the application of science in the future. In the limited time, I shall touch on just a few, varied examples of the social effects of science including some that, even though inconspicuous, can have a far-reaching influence on our daily lives.

One of the most active of all fields of science today is the study of the solid state and its technological application to the unusual class of materials called semiconductors. The best known of these is the transistor. Here, we have a tiny chip of solid matter which can control an electric current in much the same way that this is done by a radio tube. * * *

Transistors are manufactured by the millions today for use in small portable radios, computers, space satellites, television sets, and in hundreds of other less well-known applications. Yet its invention was first announced less than 15 years ago. * * *

Scientists and technologists are excited about the potentials opened up by the laser, a new device which makes it possible to produce extremely intense and sharply defined beams of light. An ordinary light bulb puts out light waves of all colors, but a laser beam is very sharply tuned, like a radio station. Scientists have already shot laser beams off the moon and back, and are learning how such beams can be used to carry information of all kinds—even telephone and television signals. It will be possible to make a laser beam more intense than the entire output of energy of our sun at that particular wavelength. If we ever communicate with civilizations outside of our own solar system, it may well be along such a laser beam.

* * * * *

It seems to me almost inevitable that the life of every human being either on or away from our planet will become more and more interrelated through advances in science and technology. For centuries, one of the most isolated groups of people in the world has been living in the high Andes Mountains of South America. They are the descendants of the ancient Incas. Yet today, the most highly prized possession of many of these Indians is often a transistor radio. In a few years, it may very well be a transistorized television set picking up signals from orbiting relay satellites. If you may pardon my saying so, in the Atomic Energy Commission we feel certain that those satellites will derive their electrical energy from long-lived nuclear energy powerplants.

* * * * *

Every living cell contains in its nucleus a small amount of a very important material called deoxyribonucleic acid, or DNA for short. This is a most precious stuff, because it sets the pattern for everything that the developing cell becomes. It determines whether it turns into an oak tree or a polar bear. In man, it can help determine whether he becomes a helpless idiot or a mighty genius like Sir Isaac Newton. In just the past year, chemists, geneticists and biochemists, all working together, have helped to find out the kind of code that the DNA uses to put amino acids together to make simple kinds of proteins.

This is really just a beginning, but one which may be tremendously significant. We are still a long way away from complete understanding of how a single fertilized egg develops into a human baby—with all its potentialities. But we have made the first long steps in understanding, and with understanding may eventually come control. In the years to come, perhaps we shall learn how to measure and direct the heredity of plants and animals to develop essentially new and different species, tailormade to our specifications.

* * * * *

There is another aspect of controlled heredity to which we should begin to give thought. One day we may have achieved the ability to determine the genetic characteristics of a human infant. Imagine the complexity of the problem society would then face. By what means would the decision be made on the characteristics of the new individual? This is possibly as intricate a problem as man has ever faced. Perhaps now—really not very long before we may have this power—is a good time to begin considering this serious question.

* * * * *

A few years ago, farmers in Australia were dismayed when some of their sheep started to die, and no one could discover the cause; no germs or viruses seemed to be responsible. Finally, a clever scientist found that what was really killing the sheep was not the presence of some factor, but its absence. In these areas where the sheep were dying off, the soil was deficient in the element cobalt. When small amounts of cobalt were put into their food, the ailing animals got well again and thrived as any other healthy sheep. We can note here that the amounts of cobalt needed by the sheep were extremely small, down in the range of parts per million.

We know that many other trace elements are normally present in the body but we are only beginning to find out which ones are particularly important to our well-being. This will be an important field of medical research in the next few years, and neutron activation is a highly sensitive tool which will help us to discover a number of answers we need to know. Some of these are involved with the relationships between arsenic in cigarette tobaccos and lung cancer, the action of certain trace elements such as vanadium on tooth decay, and manganese on bone formation. Our own blood is red because it contains a complex organic molecule containing iron. Some of the creatures that live in the oceans have blood that is green, however, because it contains copper. There is even a primitive kind of animal in the ocean, called the ascidian, whose blood contains the element vanadium. We need to know a great deal more about the functions of these metals in such biological systems, and again neutron activation may be the instrument that will tell us much which will ultimately be useful in maintaining human health and vigor.

* * * * *

A better understanding of the biochemical processes of aging may yet let us extend our lifetimes far beyond the Biblical threescore and ten. Improved medical care and prevention and even total eradication of many diseases may not be far off.

Yet an ever-increasing population, and one which lives longer and longer will bring with it a whole horde of new problems—social, economic, political, and particularly educational. The world will be more complex and the teacher's responsibilities and opportunities much greater.

It would seem that a shorter workweek, resulting from increased automation, will almost certainly appear. Our children will have more and more time available to them—theoretically—as leisure. Perhaps by 1993, the average office or factory worker will be putting in only a 24-hour workweek, with plenty of long weekends.

* * * * *

We are well aware of the quantitative demands that will be placed on undergraduate schools in the years ahead. It appears that, whereas some 18 percent, or 400,000, of the Nation's 22-year-olds took baccalaureate degrees in 1960, some 25 percent, or 875,000, will receive such degrees in 1970. If we keep as our goal the maintenance of high quality in education, these figures appear staggering. Yet we are not without experience with explosive expansion, although on a smaller scale, since in 1940 only 8 percent, or 190,000, of our 22-year-olds acquired baccalaureate degrees.

There is one suggestion about the undergraduate curriculum I should like to discuss in more detail. It has to do with the education of the generalist upon whom we depend so much for leadership and for informed influence in the democratic process. Let me define in part the problem of educating the generalist by considering the kind of individual who can live a consequential life in, and who can contribute significantly to, a free and dynamic scientific society. I believe he must have a firm grasp of his liberal-humanitarian heritage. He must comprehend the value of freedom and truth, and be sensitive to significance in art, literature, music and philosophy. He should be intellectually flexible, and receptive to new knowledge and to new patterns of living as old worlds crumble. He must be able to differentiate between intrinsic and superficial values; to understand and act upon the knowledge that the value of creative evolution lies not in mere acquisition of material wealth and leisure but in the capacity of these things to help him achieve more meaningful fulfillment. He must be responsible, and contribute his full share, intelligently, to democratic processes.

* * * * *

My discussion here of the undergraduate curriculum will revolve about a single theme: that tens of thousands of young men and women are leaving the halls of higher education each year with allegedly liberal educations but who in fact have little or no knowledge of science. If a liberally educated person is one who can make critical judgments of his society and his time, who today is liberally educated if he knows nothing about science? It would be foolhardy and undesirable to try to make every bright student a scientist. It would be impossible to stock a general student's head with scientific facts sufficient for him to be knowledgeable, even for a brief time after graduation, about the broad expanse of science. Yet it is most unfortunate to send him into a world evolving swiftly under the impact of scientific knowledge without a grasp of scientific method, an elementary undertanding of the larger principles of science, an appreciation of the influence of science in philosophy, economics and history, and a knowledge of the power and dynamics of science in creative evolution.

The implications for your task of making critical decisions in higher education seem obvious. Your responsibility is to educate the leaders of tomorrow's world. That world will be dominated increasingly by science and technology. Wherever your future graduates go—into business, politics, industry, government, teaching, or whatever field—they will find their effectiveness and their rewards greatly increased by a knowledge of science. In the healthy working of the democratic process, a wider understanding of the dynamics of science is imperative. I believe that one of the critical decisions the participants in this Conference could make would be to work for a return of science to a significant place in general education.

* * * * *

It is not my suggestion that broad cultural instruction should be reduced at the expense of increased science content. A sound foundation in our cultural heritage, in appreciation of art, music, literature and human thought, is essential to the fulfillment made possible by creative evolution. Therefore, I would by no means confine my academic cross-fertilization to the inclusion of science-oriented professors in nonscience departments. Rather, I would give some appointments in the science departments to teachers who have special interests in the arts, the humanities and the social sciences—men who could relate these cultural interests to the natural sciences.

In these ways, I believe we could significantly increase literacy of science, as well as increase cultural literacy among scientists, without doing violence to the academic structure.

In connection with this whole area of cross-fertilization, I should like to mention a contribution that is being made by one of the Atomic Energy Commission laboratories, the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Starting on June 17, Oak Ridge will conduct a 6-week summer institute of "Humanistic Discussions in Science." The institute is designed to provide nonscience university and college teachers with an increased awareness of science in general and nuclear science in particular in order that they may incorporate a fuller discussion of science within the context of their own disciplines. Participants in the institute will be selected primarily from departments of economics, government, history, philosophy, political science and sociology. An important consideration in selecting the 30 participants will be the applicant's degree of interest in science. I believe programs of this kind merit the careful consideration of the academic community.

* * * * *

I cite these developments as a prelude to another major recommendation for a critical decision in higher education: Namely, that you work to extend, as far as feasible, your graduate programs with the assistance of the Federal Government. There has been considerable debate about the desirability of Federal support, especially for faculty and facilities. I believe the experience of the post-World War II period, in which Federal Government has come to support more than half of our scientific research, demonstrates that techniques can be developed which increase the capacities of our graduate schools without depriving them of their independence. The Federal Government appears to be a needed source of the funds required for the necessary expansion. It appears likely that growing support for Federal assistance will help place the ambitious goals of expansion of graduate education within reach.

In summary, we have inherited a revolutionary philosophical concept of man as an architect of his environment, a concept that seemed to flower only about two centuries ago. Men gained confidence in this idea when their economic energy and inventions brought unparalleled modifications of life through the industrial revolution. In the period starting some two decades ago, which may be designated as the beginning of the third revolution, Western man became irrevocably dedicated to the concept of creative evolution. The future of the third revolution—of man's power to mold the world to his liking—is almost unlimited.

Wausau High Gets National Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GAYLORD NELSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the senior high school at Wausau, Wis., has been selected as the 1964 winner of the Bellamy Flag Award.

Judging in the 23d annual competition for the Bellamy Award was limited to Wisconsin high schools. Wausau Senior High School won out over 73 other schools in Wisconsin for the honor.

The award presentation will take place October 11, 1964.

I ask unanimous consent to have an editorial from the May 17, 1963 issue of the Wausau Daily Record-Herald printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAUSAU HIGH GETS NATIONAL RECOGNITION

A high honor, one of a number received in recent years, has been bestowed upon Wausau Senior High School. There is every indication that our public high school richly deserves the national Bellamy Flag Award, perhaps the highest tribute ever paid the local institution and one which is highly coveted among the secondary schools of the Nation.

Only one such award is made each year in the United States. While judging was limited to Wisconsin schools this year, our school won out over 73 others nominated for the honor. We join a select list of 22 past winners, including Central High School, of Chattanooga, Tenn., the 1963 winner.

An indication of the importance of the award is that Principal Marshall Taylor has already received letters and telegrams of congratulations from 14 Governors, 18 Senators, 10 Congressmen and a host of other noted educators, Cabinet members, widely known entertainers and others.

There are three good reasons why the Bellamy Award will be presented at Wausau Senior High on October 11, 1964. They are: Administration, teachers, and students.

From the top, the Wausau Board of Education has set down ground rules which have made possible the growth of an outstanding institution of learning. No small measure of the success is due Superintendent G. W. Bannerman, the energetic and widely recognized educator who has insisted upon one of the finest high school staffs anywhere.

Cited particularly for his leadership was Mr. Taylor, who, while comparatively new on the job as principal, has pushed for new and higher goals for our school. As the award citation states, he has "presented an image deserving of the Bellamy Award."

Teachers were specifically cited for "exceptionally high caliber" and for having "tireless devotion" and being "without jealousies."

Students have demonstrated good citizenship and patriotism which has made their school worthy of the award.

Other specific reasons are cited for granting the award to Wausau High, including one that says that the "local press is thorough in promoting a good local educational system," according to Miss Margarette Miller, Portsmouth, Va., director of the award. We are particularly proud of that statement because a good educational system is a continuing objective of this newspaper.

But giving credit where credit is due, the award was won, as previously stated, by outstanding administration, teachers and students. We salute you, educators, and students.

No Job Discrimination in Washington County, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the following article on nondiscriminatory hiring policies practiced by the overwhelming majority of business establishments in Washington County, Md. The intensive study by the United Church Women of Washington County reveals the progress which has been made in achieving equality of job opportunity for all county citizens. The report calls attention to those factors other than discrimination which prevent Negroes from obtaining jobs. The Congress of the United States would be wise to reflect on these factors with an eye to considering remedial legislation in this important area.

JOB BIAS UNSEEN AT 23 FIRMS HERE

(By Harry Warner)

Twenty-three business establishments in Washington County employing 4,256 persons have reported that their personnel practices are completely nondiscriminatory with respect to race.

Ten of these establishments employ 57 Negroes at the present time. Thirteen of the employers, whose work force consists of 286 persons not including any Negroes at the present time, indicate that they would give consideration to qualified Negroes for any job in their employment when vacancies occur.

These figures are part of the report of an intensive study made by the United Church Women of Washington County in cooperation with the Washington County Council of Churches. The project grew out of a study entitled "Assignment: Race."

A special committee of the United Church Women, including Negro members, prepared and distributed a questionnaire, with assurance to employers that names of persons and businesses would not be released and that only summary statistics would be issued.

The purpose of the project is to give encouragement to employers, to Negroes, and to the community at large for progress in human relations, and to strengthen the sense of Christian social responsibility for fair employment practices in Washington County.

The number of replies is sufficiently large and diverse, the committee believes, to indicate trends and to be representative. Members of the committee have expressed deep appreciation to the many employers and personnel officers who not only filled out the questionnaire but added explanation and interpretation, providing real help in the study.

Replies to the questionnaire were received from 243 businesses, employing 8,486 persons, including 214 Negroes.

Although 1960 census figures reported 23,379 employed in the county, this figure includes self-employed persons, businesses limited to members of the family of the proprietor, domestics, and jobs covered in a previous study of employment practices in hotels, motels, and restaurants. Other employers, some of whom employ a substantial number of persons, are not counted in the statistics in the committee's report, because these employers indicate that their records do not include information on race. Some employers answered only parts of the questionnaire.

Although the figures may not represent jobs vacant at the present time, 25 business places employing some Negroes indicate that a limited number of additional job classifications are open to Negroes.

A total of 52 employers who do not presently employ Negroes indicate that they have areas of work other than janitorial and maintenance which are open to Negroes; 19 employers offer only janitorial and maintenance work to Negroes; and 77 employers indicate they would employ Negroes in a limited number of other areas including professional positions, sales, secretarial, mechanical, and general office work.

Of those employers now providing jobs for Negroes, two indicated that Negroes are not eligible for advancement on the basis applied to white employees. Seven stated categorically they would not employ Negroes.

A limited number of businesses reported willingness to provide seasonal employment for white or Negro students. Five employers limited opportunities for such seasonal work to white students.

One of the more unexpected features in the replies was the report by 52 employers that no Negro has applied to them for employment. Fifteen employers said they had received applications from Negores not qualified for the jobs they were seeking.

Correspondence attached to questionnaires returned and information supplied in interviews indicated these factors other than racial discrimination affecting employment of Negroes in Washington County: Competition for jobs due to high rate of unemployment, the influence of seniority in rehiring, the need of Negroes for more training, and the assumption, unwarranted in some instances, that employers would not hire Negroes even if they were qualified.

As a further development of this project, the United Church Women plan to prepare and make available to employers a file of job applications filled out by Negro young people who are recent graduates and by other young people who believe they could qualify for higher classifications of work than those in which they are presently employed.

Members of the Christian social relations committee of the United Church Women who prepared the questionnaire and participated in its distribution are Mesdames Kenneth Adams, W. H. Arata, William H. Babylon, William H. Brish, J. Russell Butcher, Robert H. Dowie, Asher Edelman, Fred C. Ernst, W. Ronald Fearer, Walter C. Hollins, Aaron E. Johnson, Frank F. Lusby, Patsy Marks, Harry G. Miles, Howard Spessard, W. C. Shroeder, W. H. Stewart, Lawrence N. Strunk, George Whetstone, and Miss Ann Whitmore.

Members of the Washington County Council of Churches who cooperated in an advisory capacity are the Reverend W. Ronald Fearer, the Reverend G. Bartow Harris, the Reverend Ivan G. Naugle, and W. H. Stewart.

Surrender to Castro?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration has been moving closer and closer to appeasement with the Soviets and Castro. Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, in a very disturbing report, indicate what is going on. The President should be frank enough to state the same without hiding behind a New York attorney who has no business making foreign policy for the United States.

The report follows:

A SHIFT ON CASTRO STUDIED

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy is deliberating a gradual shift in U.S. policy toward Dictator Fidel Castro's Communist regime in Cuba.

For more than a month, the President and his top foreign policy advisers have been discussing a plan under which the United States would resume contact with Castro on both an informal and formal basis.

Under this backstage scheme, New York attorney James Donovan, who negotiated the $53 million ransom of the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion prisoners, would fly to Havana and Moscow to seek the withdrawal of all Soviet combat forces from Cuba.

In exchange for their removal, the United States would agree to a step-by-step normalization of diplomatic and trade relations with the Red-ruled Castro dictatorship over a 2-year period.

As a first step, the United States would reopen its Embassy in Havana by sending a Chargé d'Affaires there. At present the Swiss Ambassador is handling U.S. affairs.

An exchange of ambassadors and lifting of the trade embargo against Castro would follow after sufficient time had elapsed to make such a drastic readjustment palatable to the people and Congress.

This far-reaching shift in Cuban relations is part of President Kennedy's policy of seeking accommodations with Russia and its satellite bloc for the avowed purpose of reducing the risk of nuclear war by moderating tensions.

White House insiders say the proposed switch in Cuba policy fits squarely with strategy enunciated recently by the President in a speech that "Any plan of action in the Caribbean has to take into account conditions and potential developments between the United States and U.S.S.R."

The President favors 47-year-old Donovan for this highly explosive diplomatic mission for two reasons: His acceptability to Castro and Khrushchev, and his close ties with key administration officials, notably Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

After Donovan arranged the swap of Soviet spy Abel for U-2 pilot Francis Gary Powers, the President wrote him, "The type of negotiations you undertook, where diplomatic channels had been unavailing, is unique, and you conducted it with the greatest skill and courage."

Castro's enthusiasm for Donovan is about on a par with that of the President. In feelers through diplomatic channels to the State Department, the Cuban dictator has indicated he would accepted Donovan as negotiator. Words to that effect have been conveyed on three separate occasions—March 8, May 12, and May 19.

A decision on this momentous scheme will not be made until after the President returns from his European trip.

By that time the White House staff hopes to know whether the House Foreign Affairs Committee will undertake an inquiry into Donovan's previous Cuban negotiations. Republican committeemen are vigorously pressing for such an investigation. They have strongly urged it in a joint letter to Representative Thomas Morgan, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, chairman.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—Congressional Record, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the Record:

Clarksdale, Miss.,
May 22, 1963.

Representative Daniel Flood,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Here is the text of a letter just written to Secretary Dean Rusk:

"Inasmuch as I have read you are opposing the passage of the captive nations resolution by the House of Representatives, because it might be insulting to the Communist overlords I want to state, as an American citizen, that I am in complete opposition to your stand. I would like to suggest you not bother too much about the Communists' sensitivities. A few considerations for those who are crushed under their boots seem to be in order."

Very truly,
Money Luckett.

Ukrainian Congress Committee
of America, Inc.,
New Britain, Conn., May 28, 1963.

Dear Congressman Smith: On behalf of our organization, we urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration. Such a Committee on Captive Nations is vitally important both for our Government and the American people at large. While Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of national liberation in Africa and Asia, we as a nation are not doing much to help the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations which constitute a veritable weakness of the Soviet totalitarian empire.

A Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a reservoir of true and unbiased knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, which knowledge will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We strongly urge you, Congressman Smith, to give your full and qualified support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,
Steven Perun,
President.
William Glover,
Vice President.

Los Angeles, Calif., *May 28, 1963.*
Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Flood: I have sent the accompanying letter to Hon. Howard W. Smith, chairman of House Rules Committee.

I would like to thank you especially for introducing the House Resolution 14 and for your consistent support of Ukraine and all other captive nations.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,
Bohdan Nicholas Horeczko.

May 28, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Smith: The Flood resolution, House Resolution 14, creating the Committee on Captive Nations is one of the most promising means of striking at Communist Russia. It aims at the most vulnerable spot in the Communist system—the captive nations.

It's up to you, sir, and your committee, whether or not this resolution passes. My family and I strongly urge your favorable consideration of this matter.

Thanking you in advance.

Sincerely yours,
Bohdan Nicholas Horeczko.

West Roxbury, Mass., *May 7, 1963.*
The Honorable Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman O'Neill: We can start to exploit the weaknesses in the Communist colonial empire by developing an effective policy toward the captive nations.

Last January, Congressmen Flood and Derwinski introduced House Resolution 14 and House Resolution 15 respectively which would implement the Captive Nations Week resolution of 1959 and establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations. This committee would conduct inquiries into, study, and prepare concrete recommendations for an effective U.S. policy toward the captive nations. Many other Congressmen introduced similar resolutions.

On behalf of the Boston Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee I am asking you: (1) to introduce a resolution of your own to establish a committee on captive nations; (2) to support House Resolution 14 introduced by Congressman Daniel J. Flood; (3) to use your influence in the House Rules Committee, to which House Resolution 14 was assigned, and especially with the chairman of the House Rules Committee, Howard W. Smith, to initiate action on the proposed legislation by opening public hearings.

Although this request does not come from your district, we believe that our fight with communism and our support for the captive nations is of national concern and must have the support of all Americans.

Your action and support in this matter will do much for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Sincerely yours,
Ukrainian Congress Committee of
America, Inc., Boston Branch,
Orest Szczudluk, *Public Relations.*

Resolution

1. We, American citizens of Ukrainian descent, of New Haven, Conn., gathered at the rally held on March 23, 1963, support the resolution of the U.S. Congress on the Captive Nations Week and ask the House Rules Committee to place before the U.S. House of Representatives the draft resolution of Congressman Flood concerning the creation of a Special Captive Nations Committee.

2. We condemn the statement of Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, that Ukraine, Georgia, and Armenia are component integral parts of Russia and we request the President of the United States to rectify the injustice done to those nations and to correct the negative opinions regarding the United States of American held by the peoples of these nations; because, actually, the United States of America is the defender and vanguard of worldwide forces for freedom.

4. During the coming summer we are commemorating the 10th anniversary of the first uprising after the Second World War of Ukrainian and other non-Russian prisoners of concentration camps at Vorkuta, and call all freedom-loving people to pay respects to the heroic fighters for freedom and national independence of Ukraine and other colonially enslaved nations.

Dr. Michael Snihurowycz,
Chairman of the Presidium,
Wasyl Zakorczemnyj,
Secretary
(For the Presidium of the Rally).

Independence of Senegal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on June 20, Senegal celebrated the 3d year of its independence. We wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of the Senegalese Republic, Leopold Sedar Senghor; and His Excellency the Senegalese Ambassador to the United States, Ousmane Socé Diop, on this memorable occasion.

Senegal became independent, first as a member of the Mali Federation, composed of Senegal and the former French Soudan, and then as a republic. In its 3 years of independence Senegal has proved its responsibility, both as a modern democratic state and as a respected voice on the African scene and in the world community.

Under French sponsorship the Republic of Senegal was admitted to the United Nations on September 28, 1960. As a member of the United Nations Senegal has cast its vote with the West on important issues. At the 17th General Assembly, for example, Senegal opposed the seating of Communist China and accepted the World Court opinion on financing U.N. peacekeeping.

On the African scene Senegal has continually been a strong supporter and leader of movements for African unity—as a member of the Brazzaville group of former French Africa, as a supporter of the larger Afro-Malagasy Union, and as a signatory of the Charter of African unity which emerged from the recent Addis Ababa conference of African states. This succession of steps toward inter-African unity follows the thinking of Senegalese President Senghor, who has often repeated that the first stage toward African unity had to be the establishment of regional unity.

Senegal has a modern educational system and an expanding university at Dakar. Located in a beautiful natural setting on the shore of the Cape Verde Peninsula, Dakar University offers instruction equal to that of European universities and makes it possible for African students who could not afford study abroad to receive higher education in their own country.

Senegal has public health and preventive medical services similar to those in Europe. Every large town has a clinic, and mobile health units have been organized to meet the needs of the rural population.

Senegal's economy is prosperous and is expanding. The basis of the economy is agriculture—peanuts is the main cash crop—but Senegal has succeeded in diversifying its economy. There is a growing processing industry centered in Dakar, and mining is also being developed. The port of Dakar is an essential factor in Senegal's prosperity, for it lies at the crossroads of three continents: Africa, Europe, and America; it is a leading port in Africa south of the Sahara. Senegal's relatively extensive road, rail, and air system also contributes significantly to the country's vigorous economic life by facilitating the transportation of produce from the interior to the coast. The growing number of processing plants, chemical plants, and building concerns make Senegal the most highly industrialized country of former French West Africa.

The Senegal success story cannot be recounted without giving due credit to the dramatis personnae—the energetic Senegalese and, above all, Senegal's statesman president, Leopold Sedar Senghor. Even prior to independence M. Senghor had achieved a noteworthy reputation in politics, as Deputy for Senegal in the French National Assembly, as Secretary of State for Scientific Research in the French Government, as founder of an African political party. Since independence President Senghor's reputation has become worldwide. Statesman, intellectual, the author of numerous volumes of poetry and essays, Leopold Sedar Senghor is a president of whom the Senegalese people may be very proud.

Our best wishes, President Senghor and the people of Senegal, on this anniversary of your independence.

Four Nations in Trouble—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, here is the third of Joseph Albright's six articles on four Latin American nations where trouble is brewing:

[From Newsday, June 19, 1963]

FOUR NEIGHBORS IN TROUBLE—"PAPA DOC" AND HIS ENEMIES

(By Joseph Albright)

PORT-AU-PRINCE.—Everybody talked about getting rid of Haiti's brutal dictatorship, but that's about all they did—talk.

The truth about the recent Haitian crisis is that President Francois Papa Doc Duvalier really was vulnerable, but his enemies were too inept to destroy him. Today his position appears somewhat stronger, but he still is not safe.

When spring came to Haiti this year, wild hopes flickered that somebody—somehow—would overthrow the soft-spoken little man, who looks like the friendly undertaker but is one of the hemisphere's last old-style strongmen. But as May became June in this Negro republic just 40 miles off Cuba, hope turned to despair.

Duvalier's victory was not a case of a superefficient police state crushing a formidable opposition—but rather of a lightweight outmaneuvering indecisive featherweights. "One well-placed incendiary bullet would blow his whole palace sky high because there is an ammo dump in the basement," said a military expert. A foreign intelligence man stationed here went further. "There are holes in his security system. If I were ordered to do the job, I could personally assassinate Duvalier inside of 48 hours, even if he never left the palace. Or it would take only 20 well-trained men to capture Duvalier alive."

GRAVY TRAIN KEEPS ROLLING

Whatever his weaknesses, Duvalier was clever enough to keep the loyalty of his own political machine. Members of Duvalier's entourage had reason to fear their gravy train would stop if the leader fell, but little to gain if they joined the opposition. To the 350-man palace guard, Duvalier had just given spiffy new blue uniforms, worth $150, complete with $40 high leather boots. To the Tonton Macoutes—Creole for "Bogeymen" and the local nickname for Duvalier's secret police—and the denim-shirted civil militiamen want new-found power and guns. To higher-ups in the organization went freedom to "tax" local shopkeepers without turning in the proceeds. At the same time, Duvalier shunned high living, thus avoiding jealousies that might be focused upward at him from his followers. In contrast to the late dictator Rafael Trujillo of the Dominican Republic, who had dozens of mistresses and about 100 illegitimate children, Duvalier lived quietly with his wife, Simone, and two children.

Mass opposition to Duvalier was never more than a weak undercurrent. A great many Haitans privately hoped someone else would take the risk of ousting the little dictator before his constitutional term expired on May 15. Thousands of others didn't care; after all, wasn't Duvalier a Negro? Weren't some of his enemies mulattos? Duvalier's past record of immunity ("He only has to lift his finger one-quarter of an inch and you are dead," said the friend of a machinegun murder victim) explains why many Haitians want Duvalier out. It also explains why they are keeping quiet; too many others have been shot, stabbed, literally crucified, strangled with barbed wire, tortured, sexually mutilated, or thrown in jail.

Those who actively opposed Duvalier attached their hopes first to dissident officers in the Haitian Army. Frequently in the past the Haitian officers' corps had intervened in political crises, and this time the officers' determination had allegedly been stiffened by a U.S. training mission commanded by Marine Col. Robert D. Heinl. An army coup d'etat was planned for April, but a loyalist Haitian lieutenant tipped off Duvalier in time for him to crush it.

The leader of the planned coup, Col. Charles Tournier, was beaten to death during interrogation, then his naked body was tossed on a cobblestone street, perforated with a broken bottle. That was the last of the army's resistance. Sixty-four officers fled into foreign embassies, went into hiding, or were arrested. The outcome of the plot was no surprise to foreign military experts. One said sadly: "I've never met one of these officers who could plan his way out of a paper bag."

Hopes then shifted to Clement Barbot, murderous onetime chieftain of Duvalier's hated Tonton Macoutes. He was one of perhaps 15 anti-Duvalier politicians who hid in Port-au-Prince. But only Barbot was heard from; first with a clandestine leaflet bravely warning that by May 15 "Operation Dry Cleaning" would eliminate "the pestiferous insects who war with the gorilla (Duvalier)," then with an attempt to kidnap Duvalier's children. Underground sources confidently predicted that Barbot had secret allies among Duvalier's bodyguard who would soon pull the trigger. They never did. Barbot, always dangerous himself, still manages to toss a few bombs in the capital and avoid arrest but at last word he was down to six active followers.

It appeared once that a group of Haitian exiles in the Dominican Republic would launch a sort of overland Bay of Pigs invasion, abetted by Dominican President Juan Bosch. But the exiles had a falling out over leadership, proving an old Haitian proverb: "Whoever has a head thinks he can wear the crown." Finally the plotters broke camp, accusing Bosch of taking away their firearms. Meanwhile, Duvalier had exploited Bosch's involvement to rally national pride. The appeal worked. Haitians still remember that in October 1937 about 10,000 of their countrymen were massacred in the Dominican Republic by Bosch's predecessor, Trujillo. Bosch still believes he can topple Duvalier. "How. That's a professional secret," he says.

For many Haitians in the opposition, U.S. intervention—perhaps with Organization of American States window dressing—was the only solid hope all along. The U.S. State Department went as far as ordering a withdrawal of diplomats' families, sounding out Latin-American nations on the use of force, and finally suspending diplomatic contacts with the Haitian Government after May 15. All the while, a Navy carrier, carrying helicopters full of U.S. Marines, steamed around the Bay of Gonaives, just over the horizon.

From Washington reports, it appears that high U.S. officials based their planning on unfounded intelligence reports that Duvalier would flee to Paris by mid-May. The State Department believed, as Under Secretary George Ball indicated publicly, that Duvalier's government appeared to be disintegrating. Washington officials now admit the rumors of Duvalier's imminent departure were probably planted by Duvalier himself, apparently in hopes of staving off U.S. intervention. When "Papa Doc" failed to flee, the United States backtracked.

By suspending diplomatic contacts and then quickly restoring them, the U.S. Government achieved what it hoped most to avoid; it incurred the wrath of both Duvalier and his opponents. An influential Haitian cabinet minister told Newsday: "It's just about like Birmingham. You don't like the Haitian Government because we are Negroes." The same day, a sworn foe of Duvalier told an American: "Your Secretary of State received Duvalier's foreign minister, and your Mr. Rusk sold out."

Through the entire 2-month crisis, Duvalier was the one clear gainer. All he really did was sit tight in the palace, but his enemies made him look like Horatius at the bridge. "I have 4 million little black brothers," says Duvalier. "When they ask me who is our mother, I say 'the Virgin.' But when they ask who is our father, then I must answer, you have no one but me." One stray bullet could easily change that, but for now he's right.

Ohio State Employment Service May Close Due to Lack of Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that the offices of the State Employment Service in Ohio and several other States may be closed for the balance of the fiscal year because the Administrator of the U.S. Employment Service has exhausted his funds and cannot pay the various States the full amount that is due them for administrative expenses.

In Ohio, for example, I am told that $454,000 is due the State employment service from U.S. Employment Service and cannot be paid.

Fortunately, Willard P. Dudley, the new director of the Ohio agency, has been trying to save money and has budgeted so that he would have had a surplus of $206,000 on June 30 if he had received the full amount due from the Federal Government. In so doing, he has resisted the efforts of Federal representatives who, only a few weeks ago, were urging him to spend more so that he would not show a large surplus at the end of the year.

The default on the part of the U.S. Employment Service leaves Mr. Dudley $248,000 short of the amount he must have, mostly for payroll, for the rest of this month, even after all savings from nonpersonnel items have been transferred to the payroll account.

He will have no funds to pay his employees after tomorrow unless Mr. Robert C. Goodwin, the Administrator of U.S. Employment Service, is able to work a miracle and produce the money.

Mr. Dudley is asking his employees to volunteer to maintain service for the unemployed, even though they have no assurance they can ever receive payment for such services for the rest of June.

If the Administrator of the U.S. Employment Service has obligated his agency beyond its appropriations, I am certain the House will wish to have a full investigation. This is a very serious situation indeed.

It is a serious situation for men and women who are out of work or who become unemployed in the next 10 days. Unless volunteers work without pay, these people will not be able to register and report as required by law. They will not be eligible for their weekly checks. And the newly unemployed will not be able to register and begin to draw compensation.

I would like to suggest that Members refer to my speech in the House April 30 which appears on pages 7001–7008 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date. They may find therein some explanation of why the U.S. Employment Service is now unable to completely fulfill its obligation to the State services in Ohio and elsewhere.

In that speech I revealed how the Goodwin agency here in Washington has insisted that the State agencies turn their backs on the unemployed, who should be their primary responsibility, and are spending large sums of money to lease new buildings and furnish new offices in elegant fashion so that they may attract professional and white-collar people who are looking for better jobs. Th bureaucrats who staff these agencies explain that the clients they wish to attract do not like the atmosphere of an unemployment compensation office. In short, they consider the unemployed unfit to associate with those who have jobs and this is a disgrace and an outrage.

An explanation of the U.S. Employment Service deficiency may be found also in the thousands of inches of classified advertising that have been inserted in the newspapers of this Nation, most of it for the purpose of recruiting people who are employed.

I am certain that there would be no question of a deficiency today if U.S. Employment Service were not trying to take over the work of college placement officers, and going into the field of high school counseling for which its employees have no competence.

By way of explanation for those who may be unfamiliar with the arrangements between the State and Federal agencies, let me say that the States collect through their own taxes on employers the amounts required to pay unemployment compensation. The Federal Government also taxes these employers and it is from the Federal collection that funds are dispensed to the States to pay for the administration and operation of the system. Thus, the Federal authorities have a great deal of purse string control over the States, and they have used this control to insist that the States expand services into areas not related in any way to the primary responsibility of serving the unemployed.

It is a crying shame that this empire building now results in cutting off services to the unemployed for the remainder of the fiscal year unless, of course, employees in Ohio respond to the appeal for volunteer help and similar or other arrangements can be made in other States.

It should be made crystal clear that closing these offices is a Federal responsibility and it is not the result of any State government program. The Federal agency has defaulted on its obligation to the States. It has failed to provide the funds that are due the States and which the States have been urged to spend.

Incidenally, it may be of interest that the total Federal payment to Ohio this year for administration of the employment service is about $17 million, while Ohio employers contribute over $26 million to the fund from which this money is distributed.

Arm Twisting on the Wheat Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the surprising developments of the year was the rejection of further Government controls by the wheat farmers in the recently held national wheat referendum.

A good deal of the discussion that has been held since that vote must necessarily include the question concerning the method in which the administration, through officials in the Agriculture Department, attempted to pressure farmers into supporting the administration position.

Columnist Richard Wilson, in a column appearing in the June 19 edition of the Washington Star, turns attention to the pressure the Government brought to bear at the time of the wheat referendum.

Since the subject has far-reaching repercussions, I ask leave to place it into the RECORD at this point for widespread consideration.

ARM TWISTING ON THE WHEAT VOTE

(By Richard Wilson)

Arm twisting, one of the favorite techniques on the New Frontier, has been disclosed on a new and rather more impressive level.

The arm twisting method was noted previously in the steel price controversy, the Cuban prisoners deal, and the more benign drive for funds for a $30 million National Cultural Center. This technique has attained respectability in the Kennedy administration and officials can see nothing wrong in it for they conceive their cause to be just.

The method consists of psychologically suggestive pressure on individuals or corporations to support or go along with Government actions. When skillfully applied, the individual cannot honestly charge that he was threatened with reprisal or tempted by reward; he only knows he has been shaken up. He may have an antitrust suit pending and have his mind on this when exposed to Government persuasion; but the persuaders, of course, say they do not have this in mind at all, only the public welfare.

In the new instance the pressure was perhaps more overt. In fact, it was crude. The farm bureaucracy openly and threateningly brought pressure on federally licensed radio and TV stations to give free time for the Government's version of the issues in the national wheat referendum.

No subtlety was involved. A national directive went out to State managers and local committeemen of the farm program to bring to the attention of radio and TV stations that they are federally licensed for 3 years only and the renewal of their license could depend upon the adequacy of their public service programs. This responsibility was particularly compelling, it was stated, with respect to public service agricultural programs.

The innuendo of the directive was amazing. Public service programing, it was stated, is promised by radio-TV stations "in return for two special favors granted by the Government," exclusive use of a broadcast frequency, and "the policy of the Government not to establish federally operated stations in competition with stations being operated commercially." Of course, the directive added, this does not make stations "subject to dictation."

The directive was sent out by Ray Fitzgerald, Deputy Administrator for State and County Operations of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, presumably with the approval of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman.

With vague images evoked of licenses revoked or Government-operated competitors, a good many radio and TV stations complied. A spot check shows that prime time was wangled in Indiana, Kentucky, and Minnesota, and probably elsewhere on a broader scale. Some of the stations gave their time willingly enough; they wanted just such programs. Others felt they were highly pressured.

It might be supposed that this was only in the interest of serving the wheat farmers with a factual, unbiased view of the issues before them.

But Mr. Fitzgerald's directive belies this trusting view in one sentence: "As you know, interests representing one point of view in the referendum are blanketing radio and television stations with material in heavy quantities. It is not expected that we can match the flood of material from this group, which is also in a position to buy time. But it is essential that we act aggressively to make use of public service time of radio and television stations at times of day when farm people are listening."

Farm people listened and voted. The Government could not get even a majority for the adoption of its compulsory control program for wheat. A two-thirds majority was necessary for its adoption. Rather than submit either to authoritarian control of their farms or the methods of the not-so-hidden persuaders, wheat farmers were ready to take the risk of lower income.

Now the same bureaucracy which had so little knowledge of the people it was serving has adopted a dog-in-the-manger attitude toward new legislation. Wheat farmers would readily consider a new program patterned after the voluntary programs for feed grains coupled with acreage retirement.

But the bureaucracy still has its mind on arm twisting. Let the farmers suffer a little and they'll come back with their tails between their legs. This was a bad technique in the beginning. It is bad now. Mr. Kennedy would do well to bring it to an end and make a constructive beginning on a new wheat program that farmers want.

Four Nations in Trouble—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, here is the fourth of Joseph Albright's six articles on four Latin American nations where trouble is brewing:

[From Newsday, June 20, 1963]

FOUR NEIGHBORS IN TROUBLE—RED MENACE IN VENEZUELA

(By Joseph Albright)

CARACAS.—Black smoke from 10,000 tires and inner tubes shot up from the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. warehouse. Special armed guards had been hired, but four youths with tommyguns tied them up, poured gasoline on the floor, flipped incendiary bombs, and escaped without a trace. It was another $500,000 victory last week for the Communist saboteurs and terrorists who call themselves the Armed Forces of National Liberation (FALN).

"We are not anarchists," the sanctimonious boss of the Venezuelan Communist Party, Gustavo Machado, told Newsday. "We don't want to destroy Venezuela, we want to construct. After all, it's our country. But this is war."

It is war on President Romulo Betacourt, who John F. Kennedy called "No. 1 enemy" of the Reds in Latin America. Venezuela is the one nation in the hemisphere where the Communists are openly seeking power by revolutionary violence instead of by peaceful "democratic" maneuvering. Their motives aren't hard to unravel. Because Betancourt knows grassroots politics, his Democratic Action Party has gradually squeezed the Communists out of the peasant organizations and labor unions. Because he is serious about social reforming, he threatens to demonstrate that at least somewhere the Alliance for Progress really works.

OIL RESERVES COVETED

Yet Venezuela might well have been Fidel Castro's top-priority target for subversion even if Betancourt had not kept the local Communists from their potential mass support. Less than one five-hundredth of the world's inhabitants are Venezuelans, but they happen to live above more than 16,800 million barrels of untapped petroleum. If Castro could get control, he would suddenly have an oil reserve as big as that of Texas. Beside, Venezuela has one of the world's richer iron ore deposits, plus gold, diamonds, aluminum, and almost half of all U.S. investments in Latin America. Venezuela's mineral riches cause drooling among Cuban planners, whose economy would collapse without regular oil transfusions from Russia. If the anti-Bentancourt rebels win out in Venezuela, said Cuban Communist boss Blas Roca last January 23, "then all of America shall burn."

The FALN terrorists have been doing better against Betancourt than Venezuela officials and their well-wishers in the U.S. State Department like to admit. "The so-called FALN exists only in the imagination of the gangsters themselves, and that of newspaper reporters," insists Betancourt's hard-nosed interior minister, Carlos Andres Perez. Out of a nation of 7,523,999 only 500 are active terrorists, says Andres Perez. Unfortunately, his words aren't as loud as the bullets and handgrenades that punctuate the nights. If an anti-Castro underground in Cuba were to pull off even one FALN-type stunt, its leaders would become free world heroes in a day.

What the FALN wants most of all is to assassinate or overthrow Betancourt, and in this they have so far failed. Last week, in the most recent attempt on his life, three Communists planted a bomb near Betancourt, but it fizzled. Betancourt used the incident to spread a nationwide dragnet for suspected terrorists. The FALN also tried hard to prevent Betancourt's trip to Washington last February, but only succeeded in converting a good will trip into a triumph.

Although Betancourt was a Communist himself in the early 1930's, he has convinced even the conservative Venezuelan military that he really wants to stamp out the FALN. His most agonizing problem is that somehow he cannot seem to do it. So far the FALN's major target, beside policemen's backs and Betancourt, has been American firms doing business in Venezuela. Direct FALN-inflicted damages to U.S. enterprises probably have not exceeded $10 million, but the cost to Venezuela's future is much heavier. One Communist aim is to scare away investors, and in this the FALN has been successful.

Reliable economists say that as much as $420 million more capital flowed out of Venezuela last year than flowed in, and that "disinvestment" continues in 1963. At least some of this is the direct result of Red sabotage. Yet what has surprised many Venezueleans is that the FALN probably could have destroyed much more if it had wanted. The FALN doesn't botch a demolition job through incompetence. These are skilled saboteurs and machinegun marksmen, many of them trained in Cuba, and they are clever enough to raid a well-guarded U.S. military mission in Caracas and steal American officers' pants. Instead of all-out destruction, the terrorists seem to be playing cat and mouse with Betancourt's inefficient police, apparently hoping that the Venezuelan army will panic and stage a revolt. Many experts say that if the FALN ever decreed a scorched-earth policy, as the secret army organization terrorists did in Algeria, the toll would be horrifying.

No city in the world has a more inspiring view from the slums than Caracas. Inhabitants of the jerry-built hovels on the hillsides can see mile after mile of the rich people's Venezuela—including 18-story office buildings, superhighway traffic jams, and an oh-so-fashionable country club. It's a bitter sight for those who live in one of these thousands of foul-smelling one-room shacks on the hill.

After 4 years of Betancourt's fast-paced social reforming, Venezuela's main long-range problem is still this obvious chasm between haves and have-nots. Venezuela's poor aren't so badly off by South America's pitifully low living standards. (From the leaky roof of many a wretched shack sprouts a TV antenna.) But the bottom half of Venezula's population still derives little if any direct benefit from the $4 million a day pumped into the Venezuelan economy by the oil industry alone. It is this sort of cleavage that could produce a mass Communist uprising if left unattended.

All that oil is of course an opportunity as well as a burden. "If the Alliance for Progress cannot work here, then it cannot work anywhere," said one U.S. economist. Betancourt has convinced many doubters that he didn't flub his chance. Since 1959 he has resettled 56,000 families on new farms averaging 27 acres each, thus increasing agricultural production 25 percent. He has built 5,000 new schools, cutting the published illiteracy rate from 57 to 27 percent. And instead of funneling 70 percent of all public works into Caracas, as did his predecessors, Betancourt allocated 70 percent to neglected rural areas where poverty was most intense. And the Alliance for Progress has pledged $200 million in loans to Venezuela, but most of the funds come from oil.

What disturbs this picture of progress is that Betancourt's term expires in less than a year, and he is legally barred from another. The transition period during the next 18 months promises to be one prolonged crisis in Venezuela, with the outcome much in doubt. Although there are many who feel that Betancourt is not indispensable, his supporters feel he is essential to the nation's stability. "The trouble is," said one diplomat, "there aren't any more Betancourts."

A Statement on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, the administration has submitted to Congress an omnibus civil rights bill. I am fearful this legislation is the result of much pressure by groups that, in some instances, have taken the law into their own hands.

It was reported in the press that the President has not requested but has suggested that the various organizations that are vying for funds and leadership hold off their demonstrations here in Washington until Congress has had time to fully consider the matter; following a meeting with the President at the White House, Dr. Martin Luther King stated that demonstrations would continue and that the President neither agreed nor disagreed.

I want to serve notice here and now that the Congress will not be pushed or coerced into the enactment of this legislation. We, who are opposed to this legislation, intend that the people of America, have presented to them the unnecessity of this legislation's enactment by full discussion of its harmful effects. This legislation, under the guise of enforced integration, abandons all property rights. It destroys local government and States rights.

At the present time many States, outside the South, have laws requiring that there be no discrimination in restaurants, bars, hotels, and so forth; and, yet, by public opinion and usage, these laws are not enforced. Thus, under this legislation, the Federal Government, in effect, says to these States: "We do not like the way you are running your affairs, and we will just take over."

Some say that this legislation is essential in order to insure a good image of this country before the world. After all is said and done, let us be more interested in constitutional government and in our own country than in world opinion.

Since those favoring this legislation make haste to inform the press what occurred after various White House conferences, let me present for the RECORD a short statement recently made by Hon. James J. Carter, President of the Alabama Bar Association, at the White House conference of lawyers. This statement, not only reflects the views of an able attorney, but of many Alabamians:

(James J. Carter, president, Alabama State Bar)

Law is for everyone. Without law, liberty would be nonexistent. Alabamians have traditionally been lawminded people. We are still a lawminded people. Our respect for law and order is deeply ingrained; and, even in the fact of strong provocations and agitations, our people have responded wtih commendable dignity and restraint. Patience and restraint, however, grow thin at times when outside meddlers and fundraisers with sanctimonious professions of righteousness and piety, and under the spurious label of "nonviolence," seek to incite and inflame peaceful communities.

We are sick and tired of having the white citizens of our State unjustly pictured as lawless hoodlums. When Negroes fill the streets and seek to precipitate clashes and incidents; when at the hands of a mob made up of Negroes a policeman is stabbed in the back; when a white taxicab driver has his vehicle overturned and burned and his life almost taken by "nonviolent" demonstrators; when a thousand or more Negro children, at the behest of fund-seeking agitators, abandon school and discipline and run wild through the streets and stores; when buildings are set on fire and Negro mobs stone the firemen who come to extinguish the flame; the so-called nonviolence campaign is revealed as a provocative movement not only lacking respect for law and order, but filled with vitriolic contempt therefor.

In the name of law and order the time is long past due when people in high places in this country should stop encouraging, and should speak out against, the exhibitionists and publicity seekers who seek to inflame the emotions of man with what they call "nonviolent" "freedom rides," "freedom walks," and "kneel-ins," "sit-ins," and street "demonstrations." These are devices of duress and pressure and threats, and pressure begets pressure and chronic hostility. Law and order is not just for white citizens. Negroes, too, are subject to law and order. The many blessings of liberty which can be enjoyed only in an orderly society, carry with them many responsibilities. To destroy order in the name of liberty is to incite anarchy. Order can no more be rightly abandoned by Negroes than by white persons.

Law and order has not broken down in Alabama, and I am confident that it will not. In past weeks the agitators in Birmingham, with their so-called nonviolent mobs, taunted and defied the duly constituted authorities who with patience, courage, and fortitude performed the unpleasant duties that were theirs. Anarchy did not prevail.

Father Albert S. Foley, chairman of the Alabama Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, was quoted in a press dispatch of May 11, 1963, as saying: "The white community of Birmingham has observed law and order." Another press dispatch said: "Foley said a member of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) which King heads, told him the group's treasury was nearly depleted and the demonstrations were needed to spark lagging contributions." Is this responsible conduct, or just a front for a massive fundraising campaign?

Law and order? Yes. But Negro agitators and their sympathizers and followers are not a privileged class above the law, and they should not be encouraged to so believe. The lives, liberty, and property of citizens should not be allowed to be placed in jeopardy by any lawless element, black or white.

The Trigger Is Pulled on the Cocked Pistol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, failure of the Congress to extend Public Law 78 has resulted in a serious handicap to California agriculture.

Attached is an editorial by Jack Pickett which appeared in the California Farmer on June 15, 1963, and also an editorial entitled "Keep the Braceros" from the Half Moon Bay Review of June 20, 1963:

THE TRIGGER IS PULLED ON THE COCKED PISTOL

(By Jack Pickett)

When we opened the morning paper and discovered that the Mexican National Program was dead the shock was as though an old friend had died. A very serious mistake has been made. This is not the right thing for domestic workers, organized labor, agriculture, Mexico, anyone.

California will suffer. Mexico will suffer. Domestic labor will not benefit, and we think that in the long run organized labor will be greatly embarrassed.

The blame for this mistake lies solely in the lap of organized labor. It put the tag of "slave labor" on the Mexicans, and then created the impression that if the Mexican nationals were withdrawn from this country, agriculture could absorb all the floating unemployed.

Let's take a moment to look at organized labor since it created this problem. One of the interesting developments in this country has been the sophistication of organized labor. It is reaching for higher quality leaders—lawyers, economists. It is earning a place at the bargaining table. But one interesting phenomenon is that numerically, organized labor is still relatively unimportant in relation to the authority it commands. On the other hand, by intelligent direction it has cast its influence, primarily political, way beyond the logic of its numerical strength.

Why would 13 California Congressmen vote to kill the Mexican national program when the President was talking about a 1-year extension and Governor Brown had personally intervened for a 2-year extension?

We talked about organized labor's sophistication, but it continues to make some very myopic mistakes. In killing the bracero program we think it has either overlooked or carefully screened from view some very important facts:

1. There is absolutely no correlation between national unemployment and availability of jobs on farms.
2. It is cruel and unjust to expect the unemployed of industry to move into the totally different and physically exhausting jobs of agriculture.
3. Increasing the pay scale of agriculture's menial tasks will not attract the unemployed of industry to the fields.
4. Organized labor stands to do great financial harm to the biggest industry in the Nation's most politically potent State. This may prove to be embarrassing to the political image of labor's new maturity.

To enlarge on one of these points: It seems very evident that labor thinks it has left a back door open. If important farm industries fail or are curtailed by the lack of Mexican National laborers, we predict that organized labor will charge that the jobs could be filled if agriculture would greatly increase its wage scale to attract domestic help.

It is self-evident that the farmers of all the world are in competition. Our tariff history shows a tremendous reduction in our agricultural rates with a great bulk of them in the 5-percent bracket and eligible to be totally eliminated by the President under the new powers granted him by this Congress.

If doubling agricultural rates would correct unemployment, then we would point out that the same logic applies to industry. And in many segments of our economy, labor has the power to bring certain industries to their knees. But no one would suggest that they correct unemployment by a huge increase in their wage scale.

We belabor this wage angle as we are afraid that organized labor will take advantage of this situation to ram through some drastic farm labor legislation in Sacramento. For example, AB 2227, sponsored by Song, Democrat, of Los Angeles, would make the grower pay the State $15 for every worker he employed under a new program covering food, housing, medical care and a guaranteed minimum employment period. AB 2514 gives the Department of Employment the power to set minimum wages by crop areas.

We would also like to put in a word for our friends in Mexico. They might look upon this action as quite a slap in the face. The bracero was the source of the third largest amount of outside income to that country. What happens now? Do we start a foreign aid program to Mexico? Do we give them a $100 million a year out of your tax pocket, out of the tax pocket of organized labor? What happens if Mexico retaliates by shutting off all the green card holders?

The present Mexican national program, runs until December 31. In the next 6 months, we either have to prove we have the knowledge and political know-how to get another bill through Congress extending the Mexican national program, or we have to retailor a big segment of our agriculture in California on a crash basis.

[From the Half Moon Bay (Calif.) Review, June 20, 1963]

Keep the Braceros

As more investigation is done on the subject, it has become more evident that Congress made a serious mistake last month in failing to approve a law to keep part-time Mexican labor in California.

The simple fact of the matter is that native Americans are unable and, in most cases, unwilling to do the "stoop labor" required to harvest certain crops in California and specialty crops of the coastside area.

The reasons are well known. The American who is unemployed would, in many cases, prefer to draw the unemployment checks which come from taxes on business. The Mexican bracero is trained to work in the field before he arrives and is willing to work.

For the stability of California agriculture, there should be no further delay in renewing the bracero arrangement. It is unfortunate that Kennedy's Secretary of Agriculture has failed to take steps to aid farming rather than injure it, which will be the result if the Mexicans are not allowed to return.

No Common Ownership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, because of the great interest in the difficulties being faced by the domestic transportation industry I should like to include in the RECORD the following editorial from Transport Topics under date of June 24, 1963, which is self-explanatory and will assist in enlightening the membership on one phase of this problem. The editorial is as follows:

No Common Ownership

Let there be no misapprehensions. The organized trucking industry as represented by American Trucking Associations is strongly opposed to ownership of any one form of transportation by any other mode.

The executive committee of ATA last week made that plain in a unanimous vote. It thereby reaffirmed a policy adopted 20 years ago.

It might seem strange that the committee would find the necessity to make clear again a policy from which the organization never has deviated. But—in the recent past there too frequently has been circulated by opponents of independent trucking an insinuation that the old policy no longer stands, and that there are plenty who believe that common ownership of modes of transportation might, after all, be a good thing.

Bringing the subject of the trucking industry position to a head has been recent agitation of freight forwarders for congressional enactment of legislation that would allow them to own and operate interstate motor carriers. ATA has declared repeatedly that it is unalterably opposed.

The ownership policy now reaffirmed:

"Whereas the American Trucking Associations, Inc., has consistently opposed the entrance of railroads into the field of motor carrier transportation; and

"Whereas there is now an increasing prospect of the emergence of another form of freight transportation, namely, by air; and

"Whereas strangulation of existing agencies and a trend toward monopolistic control of transportation would be of great public harm, as well as harm to the independent trucking industry: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the directors of the American Trucking Associations instruct the staff of the association to resist encroachment by any form of transportation upon another and that the association support vigorously any legislation designed to prohibit such an encroachment."

The ATA executive committee is elected by motor carriers themselves, in the best traditions of democratic procedure. It is a safe bet that when the committee speaks it does so for the trucking industry.

Four Nations in Trouble—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, here is the fifth of Joseph Albright's six articles on four Latin American nations where trouble is brewing:

[From Newsday, June 21, 1963]

Four Neighbors in Trouble—Venezuelan Democracy Faces a Test

(By Joseph Albright)

CARACAS.—In the maelstrom of Latin-American politics, "turning point" is a cruelly overburdened phrase. But few events deserve it more than the Venezuelan elections due late this year to choose a successor to President Romula Betancourt.

In the 142 years since Simon Bolivar won independence from Spain, Venezuela's grim procession of dictators has been interrupted by 51 major rebellions, 16 violent overthrows, 26 different constitutions and a few short spasms of democracy. Not once during the last 100 years of all that turbulence has a democratically-chosen civilian leader either finished his term or turned over his office to a freely-elected successor.

Betancourt, elected by the people 5 years ago and legally barred from succeeding himself, is obsessed with breaking both precedents by retiring in March 1964. He may fail. Already he has suppressed 26 plots and assassination attempts, and worse is probably still ahead. But if Betancourt succeeds, democracy will score a victory that will echo throughout South America. Communist startegy calls for an increased tempo of uprisings, bombings, shootings, and burnings in an effort to create such chaos that elections would be impossible.

INCUMBENT COALITION VICTORY LIKELY

But should the balloting come off as planned next November or December, the most likely outcome is a victory for the incumbent coalition of Betancourt's moderately leftist Democratic Action (AD) Party and the centrist Social Christian Party (COPEI). Since Betancourt founded it in 1941, AD has won every election it fought, thanks to its hammerlock on the peasants and labor organizations. After 4 years in office, the AD has a treasury that is fairly brimming now, and this will enable party workers to haul bus after bus of voters to the polls.

AD has inherited some disadvantages of incumbency, too, among them a 13.2-percent unemployment rate; howls about Government extravagance, and some firm suspicion that AD functionaries are financing their campaign by taking kickbacks from textile smugglers. What's more, two leftwing splinters have broken off from AD to form rival parties close to the Communists. Nonetheless, most observers believe AD again has the votes to win. An AD–COPEI victory would mesh with the U.S. State Department's long-range strategy in Latin America, for it would probably keep Venezuela anti-Castro, pro-United States, and pro-Alliance for Progress.

The strongest possible challenge to AD–COPEI could come from a stop-Betancourt coalition, made up chiefly of leftists. A united front has an outside change of winning, but so far minor party leaders have been unable to coalesce. If these leaders can come together, then Jovito Villalba, longtime leader of Venezuela's second strongest party, the Republican Democratic Union, would appear to be the most probable united-front candidate. Villalba, who lived as an exile for 3 years in Rego Park, Queens, talks now as though he would probably lead Venezuela toward a more neutralist foreign policy, similar to Brazil and Mexico. "What we advocate toward Cuba is nonintervention, and that is a two-way street," he said in an interview. "That means nonintervention by the United States and other Latin American countries in Cuba's affairs." Bidding for extreme leftist backing, Villalba criticizes Betancourt's steps to outlaw the Communist Party and doesn't deny he would accept Red support for the united front.

Handsome Vice Adm. Wolfgang Larrazabal, who was head of a provisional government when Vice President Nixon was mobbed in Caracas in 1958, is another possible united-front candidate. Conservatives distrust Larrazabal because he once supplied arms to Fidel Castro and because he accepted Communist backing in the 1958 election. Of all the candidates who have a chance of winning, Larrazabal is thought to be the one who would cause Venezuela's conservative military to rise up in revolt.

A ticklish problem faces the AD party in nominating a candidate to succeed Betancourt. The obvious front-runner is party president Raul Leoni, 56, an old party regular. "He has no sex appeal, but he has as tight a grasp on party machinery as Nixon had in the GOP in 1960," said one analyst. Leoni is not yet a sure thing, however, Rafael Caldera of centrist COPEI reportedly is reluctant to join a coalition if Leoni is the AD candidate, feeling Leoni is too doctrinaire about his old-line socialism.

AD's dilemma is this: If the leftist opposition does agree on a united-front candidate, then AD might need outside support not only from COPEI but also from an important businessmen's pressure group that opposes Leoni. In that case, Leoni might well be dumped in favor of Interior Minister Carlos Andres Perez, 39, or some other compromise candidate not so closely linked with the so-called AD old guard.

MACHADO VIEWS PROSPECTS

For the Venezuelan Communist Party and its crypto-Communist affiliate, the Independent Revolutionary Movement (MIR), the election poses a mortal threat. Not that they expect to elect a Communist president peacefully—apparently not even in their wildest imaginations do Venezuelan Communist leaders think they can do that. In his comfortable duplex in an upper-middle-class district in Caracas, Communist Party boss Gustavo Machado fingered his Scotch-and-water and admitted: "We don't think in terms of a Communist government in these elections, but rather of joining a coalition with all who want to liberate Venezuela from the monopolists."

Where the Communists are really in danger is in the congressional elections. Last year the Communist Party and MIR were suspended from political activities, and now action is pending before the Venezuelan Supreme Court to make the anti-Red ban permanent. For years congressional immunity for a handful of Communist deputies has helped keep the party dangerous in Venezuela by enabling leaders to travel freely, stirring violence at home and serving as couriers to Havana and Moscow. The supreme court theoretically could keep all Communists from being elected to Congress this year, although the Reds would probably try running the same old faces under a new label.

A teenage leftist the other night smeared "viva Comunistas" in red enamel on a schoolhouse wall. The next day someone else took a pushbutton spray can and changed two letters, making it "viva Romulistas" in loyalty to Romulo Betancourt. And so the campaign will go, on every level of persuasion from street brawling to polished logic, until it reaches a crescendo next December when the votes are counted.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of June 22, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

The fifth amendment: "No person shall be * * * deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

The 10th amendment: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The 14th amendment: Section 1: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. * * * Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

To bring some reasonableness from the current political and emotional controversy on civil rights, it is necessary to examine the question within the framework of the Constitution and the 5th, 10th, and 14th amendments which bear directly upon it. Much of the difficulty in the present situation is because the President, the Attorney General and those who aspire to leadership of the Negro race now want discrimination in favor of the Negroes and against the whites.

Equal justice under the law as defined by the Constitution is the only safe guarantee of the rights of all our people including the Negroes. In a speech in the House this week I pointed out: the scales of justice must be balanced for the protection of all law-abiding citizens of every color, race, and national origin. We cannot allow white men to die at the hands of Negroes without just as vigorous protest and all-out effort to bring to justice the murderers as when a Negro dies. I called to the attention of the House the murder in Hoboken, N.J., last week of Walter Glockner, a 27-year-old truckdriver who was shot in the back and killed because he was fighting for more democracy and better treatment for the members of his local union. In contrast to the murder of Medgar Evers, the Negro leader in Mississippi, there was no public outcry at the murder of Walter Glockner, no message to his wife and two small daughters from the President, no announcement by the Attorney General that the full force of the FBI would be used to track down his murderers. The entire country was shocked at the brutal and cowardly murder of Medgar Evers. Murder is a dastardly business and its perpetrators should be run down and punished whether the victim is a Negro leader such as Medgar Evers, or a union member, Walter Glockner, or a young white soldier who was run over by a group of Negroes in a drunken brawl in Washington this week. (These people have now been arrested and it is hoped a full investigation and proper punishment will be made.) Medgar Evers was fighting for a cause in which he believed as was Walter Glockner and they will have died for no reason at all at the hands of depraved assailants and they will have lived and died in vain, as will others both black and white, unless the forces of law and order and the power of Government dispenses justice equally and does not make martyrs out of slain Negroes, and just statistics of white men who die at the hands of Negroes. To insure the rights of all, let us pray that the God-fearing people of America, both colored and white, will rise in justified anger at using death as a political weapon and demand that all the forces of law and order be brought into play to bring to justice those who defy the laws, those who commit murder.

Essential, too, in the protection of civil rights is to keep in mind the constitutional guarantees in the 5th and 14th amendments calling for the protection of property rights. Property rights can easily be called the theme in the economic struggle in the world today between free people and communism. The basis of capitalism, our system of individual freedom, is founded in the right to the private ownership of property, the right to do what one will with one's own. We must do nothing in this country to jeopardize the precious human right of property ownership. In this area, therefore, it is completely proper for me to own and operate a facility which sells goods or serves food or houses just red headed people or one-legged people, or any criteria which I, the owner, determine. It may be poor economics and I may go out of business, but this, too, is my precious right, the right to serve whom I please, to associate with whom I please, to hire whom I please based on the qualifications and ability I determine necessary in the people I employ.

In the area of public ownership, where the money of all the taxpayers is used to maintain and operate the facility, such facilities must be opened and integrated and all served equally because all the people pay taxes. There is a grave question of the right of the Federal Government to be in the business of supporting recreational facilities, swimming pools, etc., but once we have accepted the right of the Government to spend the taxpayers' money thus, then all taxpayers must be permitted to participate in the benefits.

As to a Federal FEPC, again we cannot demand through Federal legislation that private employers hire on the basis of race. Employment is a matter of hiring those who are able to do the job the employer must have done and who have the skills, the knowledge and the ability to perform the job. To demand hiring practices on any other basis will lead to greater injustices and even more intolerable inequities. No man should be held back in Federal employment because of his race, but he should not be hired or advanced on the basis of race alone. Important also is the fact that while the Negroes comprise only 10 percent of the population of 186 million people in this country, they already hold jobs, especially in government, far beyond this percentage. In Washington in such agencies as the Post Office Department, General Services Administration, etc., employment for Negroes runs as high as 40 to 50 percent. The danger in the current climate of mob action, violence and weighting the laws to favor the Negro is the breakdown in constitutional gauarantees of civil rights with the inevitable reaction that could lose for the Negro all the gains he has made and he, along with all our other citizens suffer because of the weakening of our system of society.

CURRENT ISSUES

The "hot line" agreement, is frightening in its implications. It could lead to the ultimate failure in the long list of Kennedy failures—the destruction of our country and victory for the Communists. This could happen because of the Communist's admitted lack of honor in keeping agreements and in using lies in international relations.

Those supporting the decisions against reading the Bible and prayer in public schools seem unaware of the religious heritage of this Nation, the fact that it was founded by those who believed in the Deity and interwove into our basic concept of government faith in God. The real danger in the recent decisions is seen in a new move in a suit filed by the American Civil Liberties Union to eliminate the words "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance. There is evidently a planned and organized drive to eliminate the religious beliefs of our forefathers from all phases of our national life. This move will be successful unless we who continue to hold our faith in a Supreme Being take steps now to protect our religious heritage from the atheist and antireligious.

Equality Without Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose an editorial from the Roanoke Times of Thursday morning, June 20, 1963. The editorial relates to the present racial tensions and comments upon the force bills which have recently been offered.

The editorial is as follows:

EQUALITY WITHOUT FREEDOM

Mr. Kennedy has laid his sweeping civil rights program before Congress. The American people and Congress will be under every obligation to look closely at this package of proposals.

In the first place, nothing is to be gained by mincing words concerning the far-reaching nature of the President's formula for guaranteeing Negro equality. It is a delusion to think that what he wants can be brought about without erosion of the rights of all citizens. This is implicit in the proposal to force desegregation of public facilities under private ownership and the design to eliminate racial preference in employment. In order to gratify a minority's violent clamor for immediate equality in every phase of national life, Mr. Kennedy is quite ready to circumscribe traditional property rights which have always been bulwarks of individual liberty.

Equality, regardless of the Negro's right to enjoy it from every standpoint of justice and morality, cannot be achieved by force laws and the posting of Federal policemen and prosecutors to supervise behavior of people in every phase of social, cultural and economic existence. Nor can one subscribe to the doctrine that in order to secure quick equality for one segment of the population there is justification for taking away personal liberties of the remainder. One evil of a society cannot be corrected by imposition of another evil.

A police state is virtually the connotation of the vast scope of what the President proposes. And it envisions the conferring of extraordinary coercive power upon individuals, as is the significance of the plan to give the Attorney General authority to initiate school desegregation suits in the name of the Government on the basis of an individual's complaint.

The alarming thing in all of this is Mr. Kennedy's equanimity in continuing to justify violence and disregard of law in a minority's endeaver to change the political and social structure of the Nation. His reference to "peaceful demonstrations," even in his message to Congress, is a stark and incomprehensible refusal to admit the reality of the grim contempt for law, the invitation to mob action, that is daily seen upon the streets of our cities. The President, who has scarcely lifted his voice to remind Negroes of their duty and responsibility to preserve public peace, cries "crisis" and pretends that the instigators of violence and chaos are not holding a gun at his head.

If the President does not choose to see the tragic developments about him, there are millions of people who can. Deeply the Nation must come to wonder whether at a fearful moment when events called for a great President, destiny gave it one unequal to the challenge.

Laos Proves an Old Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I believe it behooves every American to search his conscience to see if he can justify current U.S. policies vis-a-vis the setbacks which we have suffered in Laos.

To continue to accept at face value all the promises, treaties, and agreements of our Communist enemy is nothing short of suicide, in my view. The prime example at present is the turn of events in Laos, where the Communist forces reneged on their promises even while the agreement was being reached. For further illumination of this treachery, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a copy of an article by Andrew Tully which appeared in the Tulsa (Okla.) World on May 5:

LAOS PROVES AN OLD TRUTH

(By Andrew Tully)

WASHINGTON.—In Laos, the United States has been shown up again as the apparently incurable Pollyanna of the international family. Once again, the Communists in the Kremlin have broken a pledge we naive Americans believed they would keep.

Whatever happened last week or will happen next week—in Laos or elsewhere—is of significance only in reaffirming the fact of international life that the Communists haven't changed a bit. That is, they continue to hew to the classic Soviet-Communist policy of keeping the enemy off balance by first a zig and then a zag.

In the case of Laos, the zig was the 14-nation Geneva accord in July of 1962 which set up a three-way government of pro-Communist, neutralist, and rightist elements. The accord called for the removal of all foreign troops from the country, and it was hailed as a formula for keeping the peace.

Diplomatic howls implied that the zag was not apparent until last week, when the Soviet Union refused to join Great Britain in an appeal to warring Laotion factions to cease and desist. Actually, the Communists gave notice of their treachery several months ago, when they kept 5,000 North Vietnamese Communist forces in Laos although the United States removed its 600 military advisers to the rightwing troops of Gen. Phoumi Nosavan.

What is incredible is the West's surprise over the "sudden" intransigence of the Kremlin. In the first place, it was not sudden, since the Reds never showed any intention of removing their troops from Laos. Secondly, history has shown that it is an intrinsic premise of long-range Communist policy that treaties are made to be broken. Over the past 40 years, the world has been littered with hundreds of broken Soviet promises.

Franklin D. Roosevelt fell for these promises, and so did Harry Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower. President Kennedy now is showing that he, too, cannot resist believing what Moscow tells him.

The problem here is that the American Government under any administration is one of integrity, which believes in the sanctity of its name on the dotted line. We hold that treaties are meant to be kept, and it is to be hoped we shall continue to do so. But in dealing with the Communist empire, dedicated to the overthrow of capitalism, the United States should have learned by now that it is not only morally permissible but absolutely necessary to cut a few corners in self-defense.

Our mistake is that we rested with the Laos settlement. We accepted the Soviet Union's word in good faith. Meanwhile, almost before the ink was dry on the settlement, the Communists set in motion the maneuvers which eventually built up to the zag of refusing to intervene for peace's sake. Besides keeping their troops in Laos, they pressured the neutralists into fighting among themselves. They certainly ignored and probably encouraged the troublemaking operations of the Communist Pathet Lao forces. They whipped up dissension within the International Control Commission charged with policing the Geneva accord.

In short, they did for their side what we should have been doing for ours. The United States should have kept its forces in Laos until provided with proof the Communist troops had left. It should have used every trick of international politics to influence and strengthen the neutralists and the rightwingers. It should have exerted the toughest pressure on the Control Commission. After all these years, we should have faced the reality that the only way to protect an agreement with communism is to police it constantly.

What we did, as usual, was to wave a piece of paper under the Kremlin's nose. It didn't even create much of a breeze.

Hon. Francis E. Walter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, many well-deserved tributes have been paid to our late colleague, the Honorable Francis E. Walter. The letter that follows, written by a Czech political refugee in Munich, Germany, is, although brief, a most eloquent expression of the high esteem in which freedom-loving people the world over held Chairman Walter, and continue to hold his memory:

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SCHADEBERG: I am deeply grieved after learning about the death of the chairman of the HCUA, the Honorable Francis E. Walter. As a Czech political refugee, I learned of Mr. Walter in 1955 and had the honor to meet him several times in his office in Washington in 1958 and 1961.

He was always very kind and helpful, a most human being and therefore a decisive adversary of the evil international communism. He achieved real human greatness. I believe that he was one of the greatest Americans and men who have ever lived.

I would like to express to you, who were his friend and cooperator, my sincere and deeply felt condolence.

Yours very sincerely,

George Brada.

A Special Committee on Captive Nations and the Fifth Captive Nations Week Observance

SPEECH

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Public Law 86-90—the famous Captive Nations Week resolution which Congress passed in July 1959—the American people will next month again observe Captive Nations Week. As in yesteryear, from Maine to Hawaii, from Florida to Alaska, Americans will by individual voice or organized rallies and ceremonies speak out in behalf of over 22 captive nations in Eurasia and this hemisphere. In the week of July 14-20 they will urge that our Government renew its moral and political determination to seek the liberation and freedom of Cuba and the two dozen captive nations in Eastern Europe and Asia. Our people will be celebrating the Fifth Captive Nations Week Observance.

PERFECT OCCASION FOR A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

This fifth observance of Captive Nations Week presents us in Congress with a perfect occasion for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations. As many times in the past, this body can exercise leadership in a field that is of basic importance to the security of our Nation. No one seeks more to bury the truths and realities about all the captive nations than the Russian leader Khrushchev himself. Regrettably, there are many in this country, both in high and low stations, who would seek to accommodate him in this respect. In effect, they would have us throw into disuse one of our most formidable weapons in the cold war.

I cannot believe that we in Congress are prepared to disarm ourselves because the sensitivities of Khrushchev or a Mao tse-tung might be aroused. This powerful political weapon as represented by the captive nations of Europe, Asia and in this hemisphere must be provided for, strengthened, and constantly fueled so that our people will never forget their obligations to the preservation and expansion of freedom; so that our adversaries will not forget our determination to meet these obligations. As elected representatives of our people, we in Congress have a fundamental responsibility to perform—the responsibility of informing our people about all the captive nations, the responsibility of constantly investigating and studying developments in these nations, the responsibility of discerning the opportunities presented by these developments for the advance of world freedom.

This heavy responsibility can only be met in any satisfactory way by the formation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. And the perfect occasion for this act is now on the eve of the fifth observance of Captive Nations Week. The occasion is now for Congress to exercise its leadership in this vital field.

THREE DOZEN RESOLUTIONS CALL FOR A HEARING

Mr. Speaker, in the Rules Committee there are at present three dozen resolutions for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. These resolutions call for a hearing and a vote. I have requested the chairman of the Rules Committee to consider the proposal of a special committee in the light of all the maneuvers that have been staged these past 2 years to stall decisive action on this vital proposal.

ARMENIA AND RUSK

Mr. Speaker, in the judgment of numerous authorities on the Soviet Union the letter sent by Secretary of State Rusk to the Honorable Howard W. Smith, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, should have been accepted as conclusive evidence of the real and pressing need for an investigative special committee. That letter of August 1961, stands as a classic in educated ignorance concerning the captive nations in the U.S.S.R. To conceive of "Ukraine, Armenia, or Georgia" as "traditional parts of the Soviet Union" and then to state that "Reference to these latter areas places the U.S. Government in the undesirable position of seeming to advocate the dismemberment of an historical State"—as though the Soviet Union were an historical State—leaves much to be desired in adequate understanding of the realities and forces at work in the U.S.S.R.

Recently, it was my privilege to address Americans of Armenian descent convening in Washington. They not only expressed to me their amazement at this deficient understanding by our Secretary of State, but also revealed their indignation over the fact that Moscow, at least in its propaganda, shows a more rational appreciation of the national being of Armenia than does our Secretary of State and countless others like him. The American Committee for the Independence of Armenia has issued a most illuminating statement on "Self-Determination and Armenia: Need for the Formation of A Special House Committee on Captive Nations." For the benefit of our Members, I include this statement at this point in the Record:

SELF-DETERMINATION AND ARMENIA

Impressed by the public reaction to the first Captive Nations Week resolution of Congress,[1] in March of 1961, Congressman Daniel J. Flood, Democrat of Pennsylvania, introduced before the 87th Congress[2] a bill, still languishing in the House Rules Committee for reasons discussed below, proposing the formation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Mr. Flood's bill was followed by the filing of 28 similar proposals by Congressmen of both parties.[3]

Mr. Flood perhaps little foresaw the reaction his perfectly sensible proposal would trigger in the Department of State.

When Congressman Smith, head of the House Rules Committee, called for a hearing on the Flood and correlated bills, strong testimony was heard from proponents of the measure, while nobody appeared in opposition. Mr. Smith nevertheless found himself under pressure to hold what were to be patently delaying "added hearings." These never took place. Instead, a motion to table the Flood bill was boldly made before the Rules Committee—and defeated.

Attempts to delay, postpone and finally cancel outright consideration of the bill led to a bizarre episode. It was generally known that the Department of State looked with displeasure on the Flood proposal; and in order to bring to the surface the in-camera opposition, State was invited to testify before the rules group.

The Secretary of State however responded by way of a letter addressed to Congressman Smith, which read in essential part:

"The President and I have both expressed the conviction that a final settlement of the problem of Berlin, of Germany and of Central Europe must take account of the right of self-determination of the peoples concerned. However, the U.S. Government's position is weakened by any action which confuses the rights of formerly independent peoples or nations with the status of areas, such as the Ukraine, Armenia or Georgia, which are traditional parts of the Soviet Union. Reference to these latter areas places the U.S. Government in the undesirable position of seeming to advocate the dismemberment of a historical state."[4]

The extraordinary proposition that Armenia, the Ukraine and Georgia are "traditional parts of the Soviet Union," and that reference to these "latter areas places the U.S. Government in the undesirable position of seeming to advocate the dismemberment of a historical state," seems clearly to spell out what appears to be a departmental policy with reference to the colonial states ingested federally and forcibly into the Soviet Union.

ARMENIA VERSUS THE SOVIET—WHICH IS THE HISTORICAL STATE?

The suggestion that Armenia is an area, while the Soviet is "a historical state" is absurd. It constitutes a misjudgment of the facts. The opposite is more to the truth: Armenia is the historical state, the Soviet Union, the area.

The "historical state" of the U.S.S.R. has been in existence for scarcely 40 years; Armenia was a nation—fulfilling all the functions, qualifications, and attributes of nationhood—when the Russian steppes came to the attention of early historiographers as the abode of a remote, wild and nomadic people known vaguely as the Scythians.

Ancient Armenia was the contemporary of Assyria, Elam, Chaldea, Babylon, Sumerea, Judea, Egypt, the Hittites, Greece, Macedonia, Medes, Zoroastrian Persia, and other early states, all of whom it has survived. It was the land of Eden, and on its "mountains of Ararat" the Ark came to rest. Its aboriginal ethnic strain bolstered by the arrival and absorption of Greek colonists from Thessaly, Armenia maintained its sovereignty at a time when most of the nations of the known world were succumbing to the "wolflike Assyrian." The earliest of Western historians were familar with Armenia.[5] The Avesta referred to Armenia as "that blessed land of purity."

Footnotes at end of speech.

The fiercely independent nature of the Armenian nation became a legend in ancient days. Such political fugitives as Hannibal sought refuge in Armenia and there observed the Armenian King Artaxiad establishing for the first time in documented history a recognizable enlightened feudal order in which the peasantry was safeguarded by monarchic decree from the exploitation of the nobility.

Armenia reached its territorial zenith during the reign of Tigranes (the Great) (95–54 B.C.), who fought against the incrustation of Roman power in Asia Minor. Its orientation, indeed its ethnic structure and cultural and other predelictions have always been Western in form, although the creative and talented people of Armenia have created a unique cultural heritage which has served as the perfect bridge between East and West.

Armenia remotely developed and perfected its own Indo-European tongue which, characteristically of the nature of the nation it serves, is an independent branch of that family of languages. Again characteristically, in A.D. 278 Armenia pioneered in the massive Christian revolution, becoming the first nation in history to adopt that religion as the state religion. It has jealously guarded the independence of its great National Armenian Apostolic Church of Christ through the harrowing centuries.

In A.D. 404, it devised its own alphabet as another step toward preserving and asserting the independent character of the nation and people.

Armenia is a nation with its own national language, its own national alphabet, its own national church, its own national culture and traditions. It is a nation that has distinguished itself in the annals of mankind by its doggedly successful effort to preserve its nationhood in the face of some 18 major invasions that have swept over the land and brought into Armenia some of the fiercest conquerors of history. It is in the living example of the futility of genocide. It blesses national fortitude. It seems hardly credible that such a nation can even in the wildest of imagination be termed an area or a traditional part of an entity geographically and politically defined for but four decades.

Now let us take a look at that historical state—the Soviet Union.

The area known as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is composed presently of 15 so-called republics. One of these, the largest, the Russian Federated Soviet Socialist Republic, is the only Republic that is in major part Russian, but even that Russian unit has incorporated into itself areas of states, once free, or still free.[6]

In the U.S.S.R. many tongues are spoken. There are as many cultures as there are peoples. There are literally hundreds of ethnic and racial and linguistic stocks. All these were brought together in statehood through subversion and aggression. The Kremlin is trying desperately to create a "one nation with one language, one people," but this russifying effort betrays its areal nature. Each of the 14 Republics attached to the Russian Republic has been forcibly annexed. It is a fabricated, manufactured, multinational, ersatz entity, with no historical background. It is composed of once independent nations, such as Armenians; and it is remarkable that the Department of State finds this motley to be a historical state, while such nations as Armenia, Georgia and the Ukraine which antedate the establishment of the Soviet Union by hundreds and in some cases thousands of years, and that of the founding of Russia by at least hundreds of years are thought to be areas and traditional parts of the Soviet Union.

Whatever its reasons, the Rusk letter makes it quite plain that the incorporated states of the Soviet Union are without the pale of the American doctrine of self-determination. In this apparently there is regrettable agreement with the Bolsheviks, who say, according to Mr. Douglas Dillon, present Secretary of the Treasury, that, "since we have determined that our Soviet is, by self-determination, not an imperial state, no people have the right to escape from it." [7]

ARMENIA: HOW THINGS HAVE CHANGED

We can best emphasize the grotesque change that is taking place in American policy by again citing Armenia.

How times have changed. In 1915, the Armenian people were subjected to a terrible ordeal of massacre and deportation on the part of the Turkish conqueror. Scarcely 2 years later, in one of the real miracles in the history of mankind, the nation that ought to have died fielded an army, replaced the departed Russian forces, fought its oppressor alone, defeated him and, as the proud "little ally" [8] of the Western Powers, established itself as the "Independent Republic of Armenia."

Its doughty army, unaided, staved off a Turkish offensive directed at the oil city of Baku, on the Caspian, thus preventing the forces of Germany, the ally of Turkey, from receiving needed petroleum supplies. German, Turk, English, French, and American—friend and foe alike—marveled at the courage of the little Armenian Army.[9] In recognition of its statehood and its contributions to the Allied victory, Armenia in 1919 was given de facto recognition by the U.S. Government and almost all the other Western Powers, pending the deliberations and final decisions of the Paris Peace Conference relating to the boundaries, but not the sovereignty, of the new republic.

Armenia thus exchanged diplomatic representatives with the American Government. American aid poured into the republic. An American mandate of the nation was seriously proposed—one of the rare instances in the history of the United States that a mandate proposition of this type has gotten as far as the United States Senate—but was turned down only because of the rising tide of American isolationism directed against what was cynically being termed Wilson's "globaloney." The independence of Armenia Wilson made one of the principal platforms of his 14 points, and the President himself actually executed at the behest of the Allies his celebrated delineation of the boundaries of the Armenian Republic [10]—which included what is today the Armenian Soviet Republic, as well as other historically Armenian soil presently held by Turkey.

By 1920, the Armenian republic had made important strides towards ameliorating the chaotic conditions it had inherited. A national democratic election—the first of its kind ever held in Asia Minor—had given the Nation its popular government; industry had been established, the educational system had been prefected, free enterprise, encouraged by the Government, was producing a healthy economy and excellent future national prospects. Into this exciting atmosphere of national reconstruction intruded the Communist. An abortive May Revolt was suppressed as Turkish pressure exerted by the Kemalist tide grew on Armenia and Turkish and Soviet diplomats met secrettly in Moscow. Finally, in a joint attack, Soviet and Turkish forces attacked Armenia and destroyed the democratic government—even at a moment when Armenian officials were closeted with Soviet representatives in an attempt to avoid war.[11] Shades of Pearl Harbor! Feverish in its opiatic dream of isolationism, the West moved not a hand to save Armenia.

THE CAPTIVE WORLD

The terrible pattern of operations which wrested from the West one of its more valued and deserving democratic republics was to be repeated in similar form throughout the Soviet era of expansion. In all, 14 independent states fell to Soviet subversion and outright military aggression and are now—or so we are assured—"traditional parts of the Soviet Union" which apparently qualifies as a historical state through aggression, not self-determination:

(1) Armenia, independent May 28, 1918, fell December 2, 1920; (2) Azerbaijan, independent May 29, 1918, fell 1920; (3) Byelorussia, independent March 25, 1918, fell 1921; (4) Cossackia (Kuban), independent February 16, 1918, fell 1920; (5) Cossackia (Don), independent May 5, 1920, fell 1920; (6) Estonia, independent February 24, 1918, fell June 1940; (7) Democratic Republic of the Far East, independent April 4, 1920, fell same year; (8) Democratic Republic of the North Caucasus, independent May 11, 1918, fell 1920; (9) Georgia, independent May 26, 1918, fell 1920; (10) Idel-Ural, independent November 12, 1917, fell 1920; (11) Latvia, independent November 18, 1918, fell June 1920; (12) Lithuania, independent February 16, 1918, fell June 1940; (13) Turkestan,[12] independent, April15, 1922, fell later same year; (14) Ukraine, independent January 22, 1918, fell 1920.[13]

These are today outright, incorporated colonies of the Soviet—captive states despite the constitutional privilege given them to secede from the Soviet Union—something which no republic has dared attempt to do.[14]

To these imperial subjects may be added the so-called satellites in Europe, nations so enmeshed in the political, geopolitical, economic and social structure of the "mother" Soviet Union as to make their nominal independence, as that of the republic states—the incorporated slave states—a simple and cruel mockery.

In the incorporated captive states enumerated above, there dwell about 114 million people—of non-Russian persuasion. This figure does not cover other smaller non-Russian tribal groups in the Soviet Union. On the other hand, the mastering Russians total only about 96 million, a perfect example of a minority group dominating a majority—and of course a classic colonial syndrome.

If we were to take the populations of all the nations mentioned as once free in the congressional Captive Nations Week resolution, add to them the people of the Russian Republic, we would find that there are today in the Communist world dominated by Moscow 906,822,000 people—approximately 36 percent of the population of the entire world. The vast majority of these of course are non-Russians.

Now then, if it is American policy to exert honorable power as a factor in ensuring its own security, then it would be wisdom itself to aspire to the disintegration of such a vast empire motivated today by the Moscow Communist dream of world revolution, an ill-begotten empire being geared by Moscow for the communisation of the world.

At least, the United States ought not to act to encourage the stronger congealment of Moscow's hold over its captives; nor should it discourage the aspirations of the captive peoples to return to their former status.

If the U.S. Government is retailoring its colonial thinking to conform with the euphoric vision that the Soviet Union is "mellowing" and given time it will "mature," it ought to keep in mind that the Soviet Union emerged from World War II with a gain of 262,000 square miles of territory and over 22 millions of people. The expansion of the imperial power of Soviet Russia has since World War II greatly accelerated, at a time when according to Dr. Bunche, the Western colonial community has dwindled to 100 million. Since the formation of the United Nations, according to the same official, 700 million people have been freed of colonial bondage.[15] What Mr. Bunche did not say, however, is that not one of those

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

who have been freed was a former Soviet slave.

While colonialism in the West diminishes to its death, the colonialism of the Soviet expands and flourishes.

NONPREDETERMINATION

One would think that the departmental misinterpretation of history regarding the status of the Ukraine, Armenia, and Georgia in connection with the Soviet would be disturbance sufficient to Americans whose parental nations are Soviet captives, but these same Americans are equally disturbed by the failure of the Department to take a positive stand favoring the extension of the basic American precept of self-determination to the incorporated, once free nations of the U.S.S.R. In this regard, lately there have been strong indications that the Department has rather hit upon a formula bearing an interesting neologistic label—"nonpredetermination."

According to a Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, departmental thinking goes somethink like this:

"The attitude of the U.S. Government toward the aspirations of the peoples of the Soviet Union which sometimes has been termed a policy of nonpredetermination, is in fact a corollary of our fundamental policy favoring the right of self-determination. What this policy is that, while continuing to affirm our sympathy and support for the just aspirations of the many peoples of the Soviet Union, the U.S. Government does not presume here and now to define these aspirations as they exist, or may develop, or to prejudge the political arrangements which might be preferred by these peoples if they were free to choose them, tomorrow, or 10 years hence."[16]

This sentiment, expressed before the same gathering which had been assured by a Presidential message, that, "the U.S. Government strongly supports the just aspirations of all peoples to national independence, governments of their own choosing,"[17] led a great nationalities newspaper to comment bitterly:

"But the tone of his [the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State] and the message of President Kennedy are as far apart as the North and South Poles. While President Kennedy speaks openly of the basic goal of U.S. foreign policy, which pledges the support of all peoples in the struggle for freedom and national independence, the State Department pays lipservice to the principles of national self-determination by introducing a statement on 'nonpredetermination.'"[18]

And this of course is a perfect example of the fatal strabismus of American foreign policy today—the inability of all concerned to agree on what America thinks ought to be done about the colonies of the Soviet Union. It is a remarkable proposition—that is, remarkable for America—that the Department proposes. It means that America does not feel that people who are enslaved will choose freedom and sovereignty (as America itself did) when once they have been freed of their chains.

What must be clearly understood by all concerned is that the captive nations groups are not waging their grim struggle against communism simply so that communism may be destroyed only to be succeeded by foreign mastery of any other or similar type or form. The continued existence of the present Soviet Russian empire in any shape as it is imperially and territorially and politically constituted today is not acceptable to the captive nations groups. If the Department feels that anything less than sovereignty—that is national independence—may ensue upon the application of a free self-determination test among the captive states, it is very, very wrong.

Did anyone in the U.S. Government have any doubts whatsoever that the Indian people, once freed of their colonial status, would choose to govern themselves, rather than throw themselves under the hegemony of another colonial power?

Those who argue that "we don't know what the peoples of the U.S.S.R. are really thinking," simply are not in touch with the realities of the situation. It would be wise for them to repeat with Mr. Nehru:

"Aggression has awakened the Indian people to the realization that those who live in a dream world cannot defend their freedom."[19]

NEED FOR A CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE

It has of course been the simple burden of this paper to cast light on a confused and tragically mishandled situation which may very well bear with the very security of the United States of America, as well as its strategic interests and the peace of the world:

"It is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations (of both Europe and Asia) in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalistic form is psychopolitical."[20]

The entire situation, with its grim push and pull, its contradictions, its misunderstandings, shows the crying need for a specialist committee of the legislative branch of Government to study and bring to light all the facts on captive nations in order to help our Government produce an equitable foreign policy relating to the aspirations of the captive nations of the U.S.S.R. House Resolution 211 and similar resolutions propose just that and ought to enjoy the support of every responsible American public official.

America's best interests, and the interests of the free world, demand that Mr. FLOOD's bill, or a similar measure, be immediately read out of the Rules Committee and presented to the House floor for full debate and acceptance.

Mr. FLOOD's proposition is simply this:

"The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and other subjugated nations, also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in those nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspirations to regain their national and individual freedoms."[21]

Only thus can there evolve in Washington an internationalism of responsibility.

---

[1] S.J. Res. 111, H.J. Res. 454, 459, passed on four consecutive annual occasions accompanied by a Presidential Proclamation.

[2] Filed as H.R. 211, 87th Cong., 1st sess.

[3] Notably, H.R. 267, of Congressman Edward Derwinski, Republican, of Illionis. Bills have also been entered by Congressmen Philbin, Rodino, Stratton, Halpern, Conte, Cunningham, Bow, William E. Miller, Bruce, Collier, Dwyer, Wallhauser, Rostenkowski, Schadeberg, Pucinski, Robison, Dulski, MacGregor, Morse, Dingell, Farbstein, Becker, King, Clark, and former Congressman, now Governor of Pennsylvania, Scranton.

[4] An excellent reprint of this letter appears in The Ukrainian Quarterly (winter 1961; vol. XVII, No. 4), p. 295. It ought to be noted that a second letter to Mr. Smith from the same source sought to give assurance that "there is no change in the U.S. Government's long established policy toward the peoples of the U.S.S.R." but failed to withdraw its interpretation of what it considered to be the status of the Ukraine, Armenia, and Georgia (vid., op. cit., 298, for the text of this letter as well as a discussion).

[5] For instance, Herodotus, Strabo, Pliny, Ptolemy, etc.

[6] As an example, the Finnish-Karelian Republic was incorporated into the R.F.S.S.R. in 1956, but of course was a part of free Finland before its annexation by the Soviet. Other once-free states are today wholly or in part annexed by the R.F.S.S.R.

[7] See the text of this remarkable speech, delivered before a gathering of Polish Americans while Mr. Dillon was Undersecretary of State in the Eisenhower Cabinet, in Hairenik Weekly, Boston, Oct. 3, 1960.

[8] The expression is that of Clemenceau. See Pasdermadjian's excellent study, "Why Armenia Should Be Free," Boston, 1919.

[9] See especially, the memoirs of Generals Ludendorff and von Sanders. There are similar statements on record from Allenby, Haig, Lloyd George, President Wilson, Ambasador Morgenthau, and the American military.

[10] President Wilson submitted his delineation of the Armenian boundaries through the American Ambassador in Paris to the Secretariat General of the Paris Peace Conference on Nov. 24, 1920.

[11] The events of the sovietization of Armenia are graphically and accurately related in Special Report No. 5, of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, House of Representatives, 83d Cong., 2d sess.; Washington, 1955.

[12] The Turkestan Independent Republic has been separated into four parts—the Kirghiz, Tadhik, Uzbek, and Turkmen so-called republics.

[13] For interesting added statistical data in this regard, see Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki's "The Captive Nations."

[14] It is significant that the Armenians remain to this date the first and only once-free nation integrated into the Soviet Union which successfully revolted against and expelled a Soviet Government. This occurred as a result of the famous February 18 Armenian revolt. See Special Report No. 5 (footnote 11, this study).

[15] Dr. Ralph Bunche, an official of the U.S. United Nations delegation, is quoted in this regard in the Washington Evening Star, Dec. 15, 1960.

[16] A quotation from a speech delivered before the 8th Trienniel Congress of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, on Oct. 12, 1962, by the Honorable Carl T. Rowan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. See text of speech in Svoboda, Ukrainian Weekly, Oct. 20, 1962.

[17] Op. cit.

[18] Op. cit.

[19] As quoted in Boston Herald, Nov. 28, 1962.

[20] Par. 12 of Congressman FLOOD's H. Res. 211.

[21] Lines 20 to 25 p. 4, and lines 1 to 3, p. 5, in official publication of Congressman FLOOD's H. Res. 211.

Four Nations in Trouble—VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, here is the last of Joseph Albright's six articles on four Latin American nations where trouble is brewing:

[From Newsday, June 22, 1963]

FOUR NEIGHBORS IN TROUBLE—STRIFE AND REDS IN BRITISH GUIANA

(By Joseph Albright)

GEORGETOWN.—This little chunk of South American real estate could be the world's forgotten country, except for such facts as these:

The government is run by a clique of fanatical Communists and pro-Communists, among whose chieftains is a tough lady Red from Chicago.

For 64 days the country has been slowly strangled by a general strike, the longest in any nation's history. The strike could either overthrow the Communist government or permanently debilitate the opposition.

British Guiana may be on the threshold of a gory civil war between descendants of freed Negro slaves and East Indians brought here as indentured servants to replace them.

There is a dream-world quality about all this, because British Guiana is far from primitive. Supposedly communism thrives on poverty and ignorance, but an estimated 80 perecnt of adult Guyanese can read and write. Only 3 of 20 Latin-American republics claim a higher literacy rate. Here in Georgetown, where the speaker of parliament wears a powdered white wig, graduates of Harvard, Oxford, and the London School of Economics sit over brandy-and-soda discussing cricket wickets and Gladstone. At a moonlight political rally recently, an orator appealed for solidarity by quoting two verses of Byron and three phrases in Latin. With a $266-a-year per capita income, British Guiana is not a rich nation. But two-thirds of her Latin-American neighbors—including the biggest, Brazil—are poorer.

But make no mistake. Only one fact prevents British Guiana from becoming international communism's first base of operation in the South American mainland. It is still a British colony. It will not stay a British colony forever. Already the 600,000 Guyanese have been granted internal self-government, and London has agreed in principal to confer full independence at some early, but unspecific, date. The colonial office strongly wants to pull out as soon as possible, leaving behind the Republic of Guyana, but so far it has deferred to U.S. fears of a second Cuba in this hemisphere. What the British will do if Labor Party Leader Harold Wilson becomes Prime Minister is anyone's guess.

British Guiana's plunge toward communism resulted largely from the political magnetism of one handsome leader and the organizing skills of his American-born wife. The man is 45-year-old Premier Cheddi B. Jagan. One of 11 children of a poor Guyanese sugar worker, Jagan founded the now-ruling People's Progressive Party (PPP) after studying (from 1936 to 1942) at Howard University and Northwestern Dental School. One of British Guiana's great turning points came in the early 1940's when Jagan fell in love with and married Chicagoan Janet Rosenberg, an activist in the Young Communist League.

When you ask Jagan whether he is now a Communist, he makes a heroic effort to avoid being pinned down. His consistent position—which he repeated with great charm and vigor in an interview—is that he accepts no dictates from Havana or Moscow but is a Marxian socialist. Unquestionably this is Jagan's wisest tack, since British Guiana is still awaiting independence and at the same time would like to get on President Kennedy's foreign aid list.

But there can no longer be much question that Communist is the right word for Jagan. Last year the usually elusive Premier was called to testify at a colonial office hearing and was cross-examined by a skilled trial lawyer from an opposition party.

"Do you accept the Communist doctrine of Marxism and Leninism?" asked the lawyer.

"I believe in Marxism," replied Jagan.

"And Leninism."

"Yes."

CASTRO CALLED THE GREATEST

The questioner then asked the handsome Premier whether he could think of any of Fidel Castro's or Nikita Khrushchev's policies with which he disagreed. Jagan could not. According to an earlier Jagan statement, Castro is the "greatest liberator of the 20th century."

What Jagan proposes is a native brand of communism, not like that in Cuba perhaps, but communism nevertheless. He insists, for example, that he will never junk the British parliamentary system. And because only one half of 1 percent of British Guiana is now cultivated, he says he won't have to expropriate private land. Ten years ago Jagan wrote: "We are a Socialist Party, and nationalization of the sugar industry and indeed all major industries is our objective." Now, however, he speaks of a "mixed economy" and no nationalization.

His wife, Janet, is more extremist in the Communist spectrum. Last year on a visit to East Germany, she stood on the Communist side of the Berlin wall and lauded its builders for having prevented infiltration of "counterrevolutionaries and Fascist provocateurs" into East Berlin. She is the editor of the PPP newspaper, which declared recently that in its dealings with the United States, Cuba is "an innocent virgin relentlessly pursued by a sex maniac." Besides Janet, other hardline extremists in the PPP include Party Chairman Brindley H. Benn (who says "it is easier to stop tomorrow than to stop communism"); Harvard-educated Labor Minister Ranji Chandisingh; and Moses Bhagwan, head of a Communist-dominated youth organization.

Here in Georgetown, it came as no surprise the other day when Jagan chose his wife to head the powerful Home Affairs Ministery. Janet is widely regarded as both the brains and the spine in the Jagan twosome—particularly the brains. As an official British Government report put it after a riot last year: "Dr. Jagan was not endowed with the breadth of vision which would have enabled him to foresee that his purpose was progressing toward a lamentable end. Nor did he possess the nimbleness of intellect, or dexterity of political maneuvering, which allows a politician to change his plan of action." This makes dealing with Jagan difficult, officials complain, because he frequently changes his mind after talking to Janet.

Ironically, in her tiny, stark office on the second floor of Freedom House, the PPP headquarters, British Guiana's first lady first gives the appearance of an American bride too shy to speak out for fear of summoning her absent husband's wrath. "You should ask Premier Jagan," she said, parrying questions about PPP plans. Now 43 and mother of two, Mrs. Jagan is plump, spectacled, and wears little makeup to conceal her wrinkles. How does she feel toward her birthland? "I think the United States has been hysterical on the subject of Cuba," she said. "My view is the United States should learn to live with the changes in the world, and Cuba is one of those changes." Like her husband, Janet denies she is a Communist. "We are enders of colonialism," she said. "Neither Dr. Jagan nor I have ever held a party card." But, she added, "they call me all sorts of things, including a whore, but it doesn't bother me."

RACE RIVALRY AT FAULT

British Guiana has a deep reservoir of anti-Jagan sentiment, and it would be nice to portray it as resistance to communism. In reality, however, it is the result of bitterness between the numerically superior East Indians and Negroes. Race rivalry was far below the surface here until 1955, when Negro Lawyer Forbes Burnham broke with Jagan to form his own predominantly Negro party. At election time in 1957, the unfortunate slogan "Apaan Jhaati"—Hindi for "Vote Your Race"—made its first of many appearances. Ever since, almost solidly Negro Georgetown has flocked to Burnham's People's National Congress (PNC), while the almost solidly-East Indian rural areas have lined up behind Jagan's PPP. The third strongest party, soft drink tycoon Peter D'Aguiar's United Force, appeals chiefly to Catholics, Portuguese, Amerindians, businessmen and anti-Communists.

Although it would be comforting to picture either Burnham or D'Aguiar as the perfect solution for British Guiana's problems neither really qualifies. The British Government's board of inquiry into the February 1962 riots accused D'Aguiar of flirting with half-truths and disingenuousness and strongly implied that Burnham had fomented racialism. Both are brilliant, attractive men, but both are extremists in their own parties. "I am very far to the left," says Socialist Burnham, accurately. For his part, D'Aguiar sees a Communist plot behind every move by Jagan, including income taxes.

Jagan probably isn't as open to charges of racialism as is Burnham, but there is no doubt that bloc voting perpetuates communism. Many East Indians who are prosperous, conservative property owners don't like communism but still vote for Jagan. "Cheddi he's our boy," they say. What they want above all is to avoid Burnham.

The vote in 1961 was Jagan, 42.63 percent; Burnham, 40.99 percent; D'Aguiar, 16.38 percent. In the future, Jagan's margin seems certain to increase, if only because the East Indians have been multiplying almost twice as fast as the Negroes. It is calculated that by 1970 East India voters will have an absolute majority, so not even a Burnham-D'Aguiar coalition could beat Jagan.

Recently the coals of raciasm have been blown red hot by a nationwide general strike of the 40,000-man trades union council (TUC). The strike is now in its 10th week. Originally the pretext was a Jagan-proposed labor-management bill, but for many the strike soon turned into a last-ditch effort to force Jagan's resignation. "We are out to insure that this government does not bring comunism and Castroism to our country, and we intend to do it peacefully, by a general strike, but if that means overthrowing the government, so be it," said TUC Leader Richard Ishmael.

Said Burnham: "I think Jagan is going to reach a breaking point in another month, if not sooner."

Jagan declares that he doesn't think his government can be overthrown, but if it is, "Our supporters will not take it sitting down. There will be war and a blood bath. There will be a second Congo here."

To which Burnham says, "If the PNC wanted to kill Jagan, it's easy as kissing hands. But it would be stupid. All you would have is terrorism and counter-terrorism."

British Guiana may be verging on a bloody race war, despite leaders' appeals for peace. The other day a band of Negro "freedom fighters" barricaded Jagan inside parliament by a mass "sit-in" at the exits. When Jagan's car started through the crowds, his bodyguards fired into the air, but somehow four Negroes were hit and wounded. Sometime later, an East Indian accidently struck an elderly Negro with his jeep. Suddenly an angry mob of 500 Negroes formed around the jeep, some mouthing threats and obscenities. The driver escaped, but not before his jeep bowled over five more Negroes. There followed a wave of unprovoked attacks on East Indian pedestrians and looting of East Indians' stores.

On February 16, 1962, a rumor that a Negro child had been killed by tear gas was all it took to spark a day of uncontrolled rioting in Georgetown in which six were killed and 56 business places looted and burned. Today tension is much higher because almost no one can find bread, salt, butter, margarine, flour, cigarettes, or gasoline—except on the black markets, where cigarettes are 25 cents each and gasoline $1 a pint. "A hungry people is an angry people," says Ishmael.

Any number of long-term solutions have been offered for British Guiana, but none seems promising now. One political expert went through a long explanation of how moderates in all three parties might someday join to save their country, but then added: "The chances of British Guiana literally destroying itself are much greater."

Finally, he pointed to a line concerning British Guiana by a historian named Rodway: "It's almost a wonder," wrote Rodway in 1894, "that the colony has not been abandoned altogether."

What Freedom Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cecil L. Murray, an outstanding young man from my congressional district who lives at Newton, N.C., recently won the Voice of Democracy contest in our State.

His winning speech, "What Freedom Means to Me," is a splendid analysis of the fundamental principles which govern a free society. I know that my colleagues will find Cecil Murray's remarks to be of interest, and I include his speech in the Appendix of the Record.

What Freedom Means to Me

The bus halted; the students piled out. Before us towered the hated "wall of shame," severing the main arteries of one of the largest cities in the world. The laughter which had accompanied our bus ride changed into silence as we stared at the crosses which marked the spots of ultimate liberation for those who had unsuccessfully sought to escape from East Berlin to West Berlin. While several of us were walking farther along the length of the wall, we noticed a middle-aged woman standing and looking across the cement-and-barbed-wire barrier. She kept talking, seemingly to no one in particular. Curious, one of my friends asked the woman what she was doing. Her reply was so slow and deliberate that even I with my sparse knowledge of German could understand. She pointed to a fourth story window on the East side. In it stood another woman staring impassively back at us. "That's my sister," said the middle-aged woman. "I come here every day to talk to her. She is permitted to look out the window, but she knows that if she makes any sign of recognition the Communists will move her away from the wall far back into the city." At that moment, perhaps for the first time in my life, I became aware of the meaning of freedom.

That I, as an American, should have been so imperceptive of the significance of this profound word is not unnatural; for freedom is such an obvious and integral part of our very existence in this "land of the free" that we oftentimes take it for granted.

The bold liberty-or-death proclamation of Patrick Henry, the assertion of our Founding Fathers of the unalienable rights of liberty, the affirmation of man's basic freedoms in the Bill of Rights, and the principles set forth in the four freedoms of Franklin D. Roosevelt—all of these we proudly boast as our American heritage.

However, to our forefathers, freedom was more than a mere political abstraction; freedom was a proposition worth dying for. Victor Hugo once said: "Greater than the tread of mighty armies is an idea whose hour is come." In 1776 for our young land, that idea was freedom. Freedom to those "angry young men" in the Thirteen Colonies was an unquenchable flame of desire, a spark which smoldered under the injustices of British rule and finally burst into a mighty inferno consuming the continent and driving the oppressor to the sea.

In our great Nation the sweet taste of freedom's precious nectar is infinite. Our freedom is the gay laughter of children, the charity, the compassion of the American people. Our freedom is the freedom of choice which God intended all men to have—the right to speak, to worship, to dissent, to dream, to build, to succeed—yes, even to fail.

Stephen Vincent Benet once inscribed this petition to Almighty God: "Grant us brotherhood. * * * If our brothers are oppressed, then we are oppressed. If they hunger, we hunger. If their freedom is taken away, our freedom is not secure." The churches of Germany defy the Communist wall of shame by proclaiming: "We are yet all brothers." "Freedom," in the words of Russell Bavenport, "is not to limit but to share; and freedom here is freedom everywhere." A world brotherhood in which all men enjoy and respect the blessings of liberty, a world which is an incandescent sphere of justice and equality shadowed by no human or ideological oppression, a world in which there are no walls to separate man from man—this is what freedom means to me.

Cold War Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on last June 15, our colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable Edwin E. Willis, delivered an address before the National Conference on Cold War Education at Tampa, Fla., an organization established by recent action of the National Governors Conference. It is my understanding that Gov. Farris Bryant of Florida, is, along with the National Governors Conference, very much interested in this subject. The gathering consisted of a large number from many sections of the country to discuss and consider this most important study. The address of our colleague, Congressman Willis, is an able and outstanding one characteristic of his public utterances. I commend the address to the attention, not only of the Members of Congress, but to others who subscribe to and read the Congressional Record.

I have known Hon. Edwin E. Willis for a long time. He has recently become chairman of the Committee on un-American Activities of the House of Representatives to succeed that other great American, the late Honorable Francis E. Walter. I have worked with Edwin E. Willis ever since I have been a Member of Congress, and have had the privilege and the opportunity of serving with him on the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, as well as on the Committee on un-American Activities.

I know him to be one of the ablest and one of the most devoted public servants. We are fortunate to have a man like Congressman Willis in the House of Representatives and particularly fortunate to have him succeed to the chairmanship of the committee which he heads.

In the address which the Congressman delivered at Tampa, Fla., before the conference hereinbefore referred to, he cites some of the important truths which are brought out by the activities of the Committee he steers. They involve factors that every American should be aware of and concern himself with. For this reason, I hope that his remarks will be widely read. The address is as follows:

Address of Hon. Edwin E. Willis, Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities 1963 Conference on Cold War Education, Tampa, Fla.

Governor Bryant, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is truly an honor for me to address so noted an audience on so vital a subject. I first wish to extend my congratulations and my appreciation to you, Governor, and to the Institute for American Strategy, for undertaking—and successfully carrying out—a project so important to the preesrvation of all freedoms in which we believe and to welfare not only of our country, but of humanity itself. I say this because, as we all know, the fate of the world depends so largely on what the United States does—or does not do—today, particularly in the field of foreign relations. And—there can be no question about this—conferences such as this can, and will, ultimately have great influence in shaping the future policies of the United States.

My congratulations, also, to all those who have attended this conference. By your very presence you have demonstrated your comprehension of the most important truth of our time—the truth that our country, our civilization, and freedom itself, face a most serious threat, a threat different from any we faced before, a new type of adversary whose operations must be understood, studied, and analyzed if we are not to fall victime to his rapacity as so many millions of other people have.

As successful as this conference has been, it is my sincere hope that there will be many more of them, and that each one will be successively bigger and better. These conferences are, in truth, the key to victory in the cold war which, our heritage dictates, we must fight to a successful conclusion.

Knowledge is the beginning, the essential first, in finding the answer to any problem, whether it be the development of a cure for disease, a means for preventing economic disruption, for correcting educational deficiencies, or eliminating crime. All these things are enemies of mankind and of nations. We must find a solution to them, we must war against them—and it is enlightening in this respect to consider that the first rule of warfare—know your enemy—is really the first rule of all human attempts to solve any problem.

The American people have actually been following this rule of warfare for years in attacking the problems they face. Of late, for example, they have contributed millions of dollars for cancer research and, for this very reason, great progress has been made in the field. Cases formerly declared incurable are cured today, and we are getting closer and closer to the achievement of our ultimate goal—an actual cure for cancer.

We must do the same about mankind's deadliest enemy—communism—a cancer which destroys not only men's bodies, but which also warps, corrupts, and degrades their minds, in addition to killing their souls.

We have lagged in this field in the past, but there are definite signs that we are now on the way. This meeting, the formation of the Committee on Cold War Education of the National Governors' Conference, the introduction of courses on Americanism versus communism in many schools all are indications that the American people are waking up to what they must do to preserve their freedom—study communism. They are beginning to realize, as does any competent military commander, that they cannot meet and defeat their enemy—except by pure luck—unless they know him well. They are beginning to understand that this country will not have any real security until the bulk of its citizens and its officials understand the basic philosophy and doctrines of communism, its objectives and—equally, or more important—the means, the strategy and tactics, the tricks and deceptions, the falsehoods and half-truths, the Communists use and will use to achieve those objectives.

Understanding all these things is a large order, because the Communist effort is a total effort—national and international—political, economic, military, diplomatic, cultural, propagandistic, agitational, subversive—covering every facet of human activity. In addition to what has already been done, there must be further study and the most careful distillation of the facts developed in order to cram all the information needed into relatively simple, practical and effective courses on communism that can be taught in our high schools and colleges, and also made available to adults.

This, as I said, is a large order—but we can do it, and we will do it—you will do it.

Some excellent study courses have already been developed, as here in the State of Florida. But this is a new area we are exploring, and much work, research and experimentation remains to be done in it. Improvements and refinements will be made—with your help and that of others who have a sincere and intelligent interest in the field.

You will pardon me, I hope, for saying a few words at this point on the subject of Congress and cold war education, and paying tribute, not to myself, but to many past Members of the Congress—some of them still serving in the House—for their alertness on this subject.

It was 25 years ago that the House of Representatives took official and effective notice of the Communist threat to this country by establishing the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. Eighteen years ago it made the committee a standing one. On two occasions before 1938—in 1930 and again in 1934—the House established special committees to investigate Communist activities and propaganda.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities functions basically in the same manner as all other congressional committees do. All have a primarily legislative function. It is their duty in their respective fields—agriculture, labor, banking, subversion and internal security, and so forth—to hold hearings in order to develop the facts that will assist them in weighing the pros and cons of proposed legislation, and determining whether particular bills merit being reported to the full House for action. When a bill is so reported, the committee hearings and report on it stimulate debate and provide information that helps the other Members of Congress determine how they will vote on the bill. Committees, of course, also have the duty to recommend new legislation as it is needed and to propose amendments to existing laws to correct deficiencies or weaknesses in them.

Although the Committee on Un-American Activities has often been attacked—usually through distortion—on this as on other issues, the fact of the matter is that its record in the legislative area compares favorably with that of any other committee. Over 40 of the legislative recommendations made by the committee in the field of national security over the years have been enacted into law.

In the very nature of things, the committee has not made many recommendations in the policy field, the area covered by executive action rather than by law. Despite this fact, over a dozen of its recommendations in the policy area have been adopted by the executive branch of the Government.

All committees, too, have a watchdog or "oversight" function—keeping an eye on the administration of the law by the executive branch of the Government. Here too, the committee has performed creditably. A recent example of effective committee action in this field was its investigation of security practices in the National Security Agency, following the defection of two NSA mathematicians to the Soviet Union.

Because of the super-secret nature of NSA and its operations, these hearings were held in executive session. There was no fanfare or publicity attached to them. This investigation, however, led not only to 22 reforms in NSA security procedures, but to the dismissal of the Director of Personnel, the "resignation" of the Director of Security, and two other employees in the Office of Security Service—and also to the ouster of 26 other NSA employees for reason of sex deviation.

More important, perhaps, is the fact that, just a few weeks ago, the House passed a bill, drafted by the committee on the basis of facts developed in its investigation, that will guarantee the implementation of better security procedures in the NSA in the future. Through this investigation the committee carried out both its oversight and its legislative functions.

The Committee on Un-American Activities differs from all other committees except one, however, in that it is specifically designated an investigating committee. It has a mandate to continually keep its eye on, to investigate subversive activities and the dissemination of Communist propaganda in this country and to report its findings to the House. Only the Government Operations Committee has similar, continuing investigative authority. The House perceived, when it established the Committee on Un-American Activities, that the problem it faced was such that extensive use would have to be made of Congress' power to investigate if the problem of internal subversion was to be dealt with effectively. History has often demonstrated that when dealing with some problems, revelation of the truth—giving the public the facts it cannot itself uncover—has as much, or more, corrective value than does legislation.

Criticism has been made of committee investigations. It has been charged that its procedures or methods are unfair or violative of constitutional rights. Some of this criticism has come from well intentioned but misinformed persons, and some from those with ulterior motives.

The truth of the matter is that in the area of procedures or methods, the Committee on Un-American Activities has actually been a congressional pacesetter. It was the first committee in the House to publish specific rules of procedure. It has followed these rules for several years before they were published. It has had a subcommittee on rules of procedure which has worked over the years to refine and improve committee procedures. All Members of the House have been invited by this subcommittee to submit any recommendations they cared to make. The sparcity of the suggestions received is an indication of how firm the House is in its belief that the committee's methods are eminently fair.

The Special Committee on Communist Strategy, Tactics, and Objectives of the American Bar Association, after each one of its members had reviewed a varied selection of committee hearings, issued the following report:

"The congressional committees investigating communism, and in particular the House Un-American Activities Committee, have been attacked on the ground that they have engaged in smear campaigns and have invaded the constitutional rights of persons investigated. Your committee is impressed with the fairness with which the hearings before that committee have been conducted. * * * We are satisfied that the witnesses called to testify before the committee are being treated fairly and properly in all respects and we also feel satisfied that each witness is accorded full proptection so far as his constitutional or other legal rights are involved."

What I would like to stress today, however, in talking about the committee, is the relationship of its activities to cold war education.

In a certain sense, the committee, like other congressional committees, is basically an educational institution. Its function, through investigation, research, and interrogation of witnesses is to develop facts—primarily as I stated before, for legislative purposes. But facts are facts, and they are educational no matter what purpose they are developed for. For this reason, the committees' hearings, reports, and consultations—and over 500 volumes of them have been published over the years—have served a very definite educational need. I believe it can be truthfully said that they have played a major role not only in alerting the American people to the dangers of communism but also in stimulating interest in the study of communism.

All of you, I am sure, have heard or read statements or implications to the contrary. A very definite effort has been made by some persons and groups to create the impression that the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities is basically shallow, not too informative, on the extremist or flamboyant side and, therefore, of little value to the scholar or to any person who really wishes to understand communism.

Again, there is much evidence that the opposite is true. Not only Members of the Congress, but educators, clergymen, civic leaders, businessmen, and officials of the executive branch use committee publications as sources of material for public addresses. The committee's documents are also used as texts and as supplemental reading material in high schools and colleges, seminars, in the training of Government personnel, and even by foreign governments.

I don't want to take too much time proving this point, but assert as a fact that dozens of scholars, as the footnotes and indexes of their books indicate, have made extensive use of committee documents.

The facts—as briefly as they have been outlined here—indicate that the publications of the committee are useful source material for cold war education. They are not, of course, prepared as textbooks; nevertheless, they contain much information of value in the preparation of courses and for supplemental reading. The fact that, largely in response to popular demand, about 7½ million copies of the committee's publications have been distributed throughout the country, is an indication of their value and the real role they have played in educating the American people on the subject of communism and the threat it poses to our way of life.

The very concept of cold war education is controversial. This neither surprises nor dismays me, and I am sure it will not deter any of you from the pioneer role you have assumed in this field. Cold war education is a new concept and new concepts often are controversial. There is resistance to them from those not fully informed, those who are not forward-looking, and those who have an ax to grind. Most of this resistance can and will be overcome, just as obstacles to worthwhile innovations of the past have been.

The point has been made and much emphasized of late that courses in communism must be thoroughly objective and must not be mere indoctrination against communism. Generally speaking, I agree with this completely. Such courses must be factual and objective. If they are not, we are merely miseducating ourselves and our children about the enemy we face and are thereby reducing the chances of success in resisting his attack. It would be foolish, to say the least, to do that. No rational person can object to the idea that cold war education must be thorough, objective, sober, and that it should not be composed of mere ranting against communism, with no constructive answers, and suggestions.

But I view with caution the warnings put forth by some against any indoctrination at all in teaching about communism, and especially as they apply the word indoctrination.

Communism proposes a way of life vastly different from our own. Our students are presented with a way of life proposed by the Communists. Is it just as good as our own? Is it better? Is it worse?

Are our Federal prisons better or worse than Soviet slave labor camps?

Which judicial system is better—ours or the Soviet's?

Which property ownership system is better—ours or the Soviet's?

Is our concept of freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion better or worse than that which prevails in the Soviet Union?

The student must make a judgment, and, given the facts on both sides of these and other questions, he usually comes out with sound answers. But there comes a point when he seeks and looks to the experience and wisdom of his teachers and elders for help and guidance. It appears to me that they have an obligation in this respect. There are some who call this indoctrination. I regard it as mature and educated assistance to the student in making a proper judgment.

Hand in hand with education about communism—if we are to have effective cold war education—we must have thorough education in Americanism. We cannot expect our students to love their country and institutions deeply and, therefore, to act in their defense if they are ignorant of them. They must know and appreciate the principles on which this Nation is founded, its history, its institutions, its great traditions and heroes. Only if they know these things, will they be able to appreciate how real and how serious the threat of communism is.

I am certainly no advocate of jingoism or excessive nationalism, but I do know that concentration on muckrating and the debunking of American heroes and institutions is no way to develop loyalty. I know that this kind of teaching weakens loyalty, undermines patriotism and, therefore, aids those who would destroy our freedom.

Our country is not perfect. It has its weaknesses and imperfections. There are some not so noble events in its history. But, at the same time, when compared with any other country on earth—and when our system is compared with any other—we have nothing to be ashamed of and much to be proud of. I am not appealing for suppression of all that is not good in our past. I am appealing for objective teaching of both the good and the bad, because the good, the great and the glorious so far outweigh the bad that objective teaching cannot help but instill pride and love of country.

Too often in the past, the teaching of American history and government has been neglected in some institutions and, when it has been given, it has not been objective; there has been over-emphasis on the debunking and failure to give fair time and consideration to all that is glorious in our past. The result has been the development of the apathetic, uncommitted citizen, the political neutralist who exists in a vacuum as far as patriotism is concerned.

We must face the reality that the man who stands for nothing, can fall for anything, that nature abhors a vacuum, that the Communists and other totalitarians are always eager to fill politically empty minds with their insidious philosophy, and they can fill such minds much more easily than any others. Our youth want and need belief. If we don't give it to them, someone else will.

We face a great challenge today. But we are a great Nation. We have great public officials, great educators, great citizens. We will meet that challenge in a great way—as we have met all such challenges in the past. There is no question in my mind but that we will achieve victory in the cold far—through education and through educated action.

TVA: An Expensive Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the recent 30th birthday of TVA was a rather expensive anniversary for taxpayers.

Ballyhooed for so-called low cost power, TVA rates are possible only only because of the generosity of the U.S. Treasury.

Robert and Helen Haller's Hamilton (Ill.) Press had the following editorial on June 13:

AN EXPENSIVE PARTY

The other day the Tennessee Valley Authority observed its 30th birthday. And it was an occasion worth noting—for more reasons than one.

To begin with, TVA is quite some operation. It services an 80,000-square-mile area in seven States. It provides power for 1.5 million customers. It has 31 major hydroelectric dams along with 10 steam-generating plants.

So much for its resources and services. But these is much more to the TVA story.

This was the most expensive birthday party the guests ever paid for, given involuntarily by more than 60 million American taxpayers, the vast majority of whom don't patronize TVA. Over $2 billion has been invested by taxpayers in its facilities. It pays no Federal income taxes, whereas the investor-owned utilities pay about 25 percent of their revenues in taxes of all kinds. TVA makes payments to local governments in lieu of taxes, but these are much less than investor-owned utilities doing a comparable business would pay.

That isn't all. In addition to these tremendous, special-privilege tax advantages, TVA gets a variety of free (that is, taxpayer-financed) services from other governmental agencies, pays no excise taxes, is not required to pay State public utility taxes or State income taxes, and it gets reduced freight rates from land-grant railroads.

The final irony is that, when the TVA was formed as a Government corporation 30 years ago, the intention was that its primary purpose was to control floods and improve navigation, and that electric power would be an incidental byproduct. But, in 1961, 83 percent of the total TVA investment was devoted to electric power operations.

Talk about that camel who managed to get his nose under the tent.

Communism in the Himalayas—Threat and Response

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in October and November of last year the Chinese Communists launched massive attacks along India's long northern border. The Indian Government urgently requested military assistance from the West to bolster its faltering military forces. That aid was forthcoming by airlift, and it has continued under the Nassau agreement with Great Britain. But the threat of Chinese Communist aggression of India—the danger of further Communist expansion in south and southeast Asia remains. Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, ranking minority member of the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, has devoted his most recent newsletter to his Massachusetts constituents to this problem. It is entitled "Communism in the Himalayas—Threat and Response." In it Senator SALTONSTALL supports continuing U.S. military assistance for India and gives the reasons why. He also emphasizes our traditional relationship with Pakistan and calls for a unified approach on the south Asian subcontinent to the Communist threat. I consider his steady thoughts on this urgent subject extremely persuasive as we attempt to fashion our national policy in this area of the world, and therefore call the attention of my colleagues to this newsletter by placing it in the Appendix today.

COMMUNISM IN THE HIMALAYAS—THREAT AND RESPONSE

In October and November of last fall Communist China launched massive attacks on India's northern border. This threat to the destiny of freedom in south Asia remains a serious one, and upon India's ability to hold her ground successfully rests the free world's chances of resisting another thrust of Communist expansion.

This presents the United States with a challenge and an opportunity—a challenge to our pledge to do what we can to contain Communist expansion, and an opportunity to help a newly conscious democracy grow stronger as a nation capable of maintaining her freedom. Yet in its response the United States faces an intricate problem, given our own limited resources and our traditional friendship with Pakistan.

Since her independence in 1947, India has struggled for political unity among peoples of divergent linguistic and regional groupings, and painfully sought for them real economic growth and an improved standard of living. In foreign affairs, Prime Minister Nehru has followed a nonalinement policy on the grounds that neither East nor West has a monopoly on right and that India, with her limited resources, could play a more helpful role in the cold war if she kept herself free from entangling alliances. At times, this policy has brought her into disagreement with the interests of the United States.

But last fall, Indian illusions about Chinese Communist friendship were rudely shocked with the invasion by her giant neighbor to the North. Faced with overwhelming defeats suffered by her own army and no certain knowledge of how far the Chinese would drive, Mr. Nehru requested immediate and extensive Western military aid. Assistance in winter clothing, medical supplies, communications, ammunition, and other equipment was provided by U.S. airlift, proving anew the Western commitment to the cause of freedom.

At Nassau in December of last year, Britain and the United States agreed to a joint program of $120 million in military aid, equally divided, to prepare India in priority areas for possilbe renewed Communist aggression in the near future. Twelve U.S. Air Force C–130's were sent to help India lift troops and supplies to the forward areas. A U.S. team was dispatched to study India's indigenous defense production requirements and possible external assistance in this area, and a Joint United States-Commonwealth military team studied India's air defense capability and requirements in light of the possibility of Chinese Communist air attacks in the future. U.S. Defense and State Department officials are currently studying possible ongoing aid as the Nassau program is being completed, and our Government continues to consult closely with the British on the problem.

What has happened in India as a result of the Communist aggression and the unhesitating Western support? First, there is a passionate public resolve to meet the threat to India. Personal jewelry was contributed to the Indian National Defense Fund by villagers throughout India. There are many more volunteers for the Indian military than can effectively be inducted. In the parliament as well as in the responsible Ministeries of the Indian Government there is an urgent program underway for rebuilding the Indian military establishment.

Second, there is a new awareness, a seriousness, in New Delhi concerning the nature of the Communist threat. Defense Minister Khrishna Menon was forced out of the cabinet and his political influence has strongly declined. Although India has stated her firm reaffirmation of nonalignment, this policy is now cast in more disciplined terms with a greater emphasis on the ideals of democracy. India's President Radhakhrishnan during his recent state visit to the United States said: "We are pledged to adopt the democratic way of life, and we will not be deterred from that pledge. Nonalignment does not mean any equivocation or giving away of the fundamental principles of democracy."

But where does all of this leave Pakistan? There are persistent noises of discontent coming from Karachi to indicate that our old friend and steadfast ally is not only unhappy about the amount of Western military aid for India, but also genuinely fearful of the possibility of future deployment of India's expanding military against Pakistan. A number of objective observers feel India did not cooperate in the recent unproductive talks on the India-Pakistan Kashmir dispute. Indo-Pak difficulties remain unsolved, and persist as a serious obstacle to any effective and continuing defense of the subcontinent. Although our Government has attempted to help in efforts to resolve the Kashmir problem it does not wish to tie military assistance to such a solution. The Communist menace is too real; the implications of India's resolve to fight back too important for the future of south and southeast Asia.

On the other hand, we must honor Pakistan's legitimate concerns. And we cannot in any respect—morally, fiscally, militarily—afford to support the military establishments of two nations inimical to each other. This is the nub of the problem. It is not unsolvable, but it is extremely difficult. The United States can neither abandon Pakistan because it has not been attacked by Communist China nor ignore India's call for help because its military strength poses a potential threat to Pakistan.

As in most of the pressing international dilemmas we encounter, the United States must, in cooperation with the United Kingdom and other countries, seek sensibly and creatively to find the right formula to serve the valid mutual interest of both countries. This is crucially in our own interest, given the strategic importance of south and southeast Asia.

We must seek to serve the basic priorities within the Indian military in our aid program, encouraging a gradual buildup closely tailored to the specific nature of the threat faced and the capacity to absorb outside help, and avoiding the waste incurred by too rapid a pace or too sophisticated materiel. At the same time, India must be convinced absolutely of U.S. convictions concerning subcontinentwide defense and our inviolate friendship for Pakistan. We must keep in closer touch with Pakistan about military aid to India and general matters affecting the subcontinent, and seek to find additional ways to assist Pakistan without at the same time pushing an arms race in south Asia.

No one is sure of the next moves by the Chinese Communists in south Asia, but it is certain they will maintain as many alternatives as possible leading to political intimidation or actual physical conquest, and act as soon as weakness presents itself. Western assistance is needed to provide both a firm deterrent to further totalitarian adventurism and the means to effectively combat the enemy. The type and quantity of U.S. aid to India and Pakistan in the future cannot help but be influenced by how well they can work together against the common threat of Communist China.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

This Reform Is Plain Double Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recent events in the Ways and Means Committee, even though of a tentative nature, indicate that the public will be saddled with some of the more obnoxious provisions of the administration tax bill.

A very timely and effective editorial on this subject appeared in the Friday, June 21, edition of the Denver Post, which I place into the RECORD at this point:

THIS REFORM IS PLAIN DOUBLE TAXATION

The House Ways and Means Committee has been busy in Washington putting together, at President Kennedy's request but not in his best interest, a package of what are loosely called tax reforms. The assembly job has not yet been completed, but from the looks of some of the pieces, the committee is putting together a monster.

The latest piece of this Frankenstein product agreed on by Congressman WILBUR MILLS' committee is the scheme to raise (mind you, this is part of the Kennedy tax reduction package) $500 million in new revenue by curbing itemized tax deductions for individuals.

Under the proposed restrictions, individual taxpayers would no longer be allowed to take deductions from taxable income for State and local taxes paid on gasoline, auto tags, and drivers licenses, cigarettes and beverages or on a variety of selective sales taxes (like levies on hotel bills) or special taxes.

So far, congressional and administration tax writers have not proposed eliminating the deduction of such big items as State and local real estate taxes, income taxes or general sales taxes. But the direction they are taking is clear, and it would only be a short step through this open door for the elimination of such deductions as well.

Thus the general taxpayer would be paying on already taxed income, one more instance of double taxation and a rather blatant one at that.

Just how widespread would be the effect of the tentative Ways and Means Committee decision to restrict the itemized deductions for taxes paid is indicated by Treasury figures which show that deductions were itemized on 24 million of the 61 million individual income tax returns filed in 1961.

These tax-on-tax provisions are supposed to be committee substitutes for the so-called reforms proposed by the administration which would have disallowed itemized deductions unless they exceeded 5 percent of a taxpayer's income. Administration proposals could have had an adverse effect of charitable donations, persons paying mortgage interest, and so on. The committee's provisions are less severe, particularly as they affect certain groups—like real estate interests. The committee is also being more gentle on the oil industry.

This newspaper warned when the President tied his tax cut proposal to a tax reform package that he was hobbling chances for both a meaningful tax cut (one that could spur both investment and consumption) and real reform.

We foresaw that every so-called reform would affect some interest or group and that each would have to have its chance to make its case. Obviously, the lobbyists have been active. The committee's work to date shows that.

One thing we didn't foresee was that the committee, faced with the choice of reforming against a group which could actively lobby and reforming against the general taxpayers, would give the works to the latter. But the tax-on-tax proposal which has now been put in the projected bill is that kind of reform.

The recent curb on expense account deductions, plus the wavering doubletalk about tying tax reform to tax reduction, has made Americans more tax-conscious than at any time in our history since the Boston Tea Party.

So, if the general taxpayers don't have a lobby, they do have a way of fighting back. They can do so at the polls on election day, and it is there that they may pay Mr. Kennedy back for the work of a Democratically-dominated committee.

We don't know whether this thought will give the tax writers pause. But their progress toward reform to date certainly should. If this is the best they can do, they ought to give up the effort.

Anticigarette Campaign Commendable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Americans have become greatly concerned over the effects of cigarette smoking on our health. Many conflicting reports have been issued by all kinds of experts, but more and more points are being made which indicate that smoking is a real threat to health.

While many older citizens may not heed warnings of medical experts, the young people of this Nation must be informed about the possible adverse effect of smoking.

The Florida Medical Association has just begun a program in our State aimed at young people, to educate them properly in this regard.

In an editorial in the Fort Lauderdale News, Editor Jack Gore outlines the medical association program and praises the association for this good work.

Because of its interest to all Members of Congress, I include this editorial in the RECORD:

ANTICIGARETTE CAMPAIGN PRAISEWORTHY PLAN OF STATE MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

There is little question today but that millions of adult Americans who have been "hooked" by the cigarette habit will solidly applaud the action of the Florida Medical Association this past Sunday in urging the formation of a nationwide program designed to influence young people not to start smoking.

These doctors know well enough that there isn't much point to urging heavy smokers who have been at it a long time to give up the habit in the interest of their own health and well-being. Millions of smokers may want to "kick" the habit, but it's a most difficult thing to do and for every smoker who quits there are hundreds who try and who fail simply because they just can't overcome their own desires.

That's why any campaign aimed at driving home the dangers inherent in this habit must be aimed at those who haven't started it yet, or who haven't been at it long enough for it to become fully established.

These are our young people in high school and in college, a million of whom it is currently estimated will be doomed to die of lung cancer if the present trend is continued.

As the FMA was told by a leading chest surgeon last week, "100 percent of well-controlled studies have shown there is a direct connection between cigarette smoking and cancer.

"In my 20 years as a chest surgeon," this doctor declared, "most of the death certificates I have signed were due to conditions which were either caused or aggravated by smoking."

Cigarette companies, of course, are prone to challenge any findings which relate the rising incidence of lung cancer and other diseases like chronic bronchitis and emphysema to smoking. Yet, more and more doctors and medical authorities have now become completely convinced that heavy smoking over an extended period of time is definitely conducive to the development of cancer and other lung diseases and they think it is time that America's young people are more thoroughly indoctrinated into the dangers of smoking.

We are in complete agreement with these doctors and medical authorities on this point and we think every person who has picked up the smoking habit will concur that it is far easier not to start smoking than to give it up once it has become an established habit.

Smoking, of course, isn't a habit that is peculiar to America or Americans. It is worldwide in its scope and has now become so engrained in so many people that there is virtually no hope of eliminating it. Yet, while there may be little hope of inducing confirmed smokers to give up the habit, there is increasing hope that an intelligent and informative campaign aimed at inducing the younger generation not to begin smoking can do a lot of good and save a lot of lives and that's the kind of campaign the FMA would like to get started in this country.

Such a campaign has already been launched in England over the objections of the tobacco industry and has already produced billboards and other devices geared to the objective of informing young people about the dangers inherent in adoption of the smoking habit.

What is now being done in England is what the FMA would like to see started in this country, and one of the objectives of the FMA is to try to get the American Medical Association at its mid-June convention in Atlantic City to adopt the same resolution the Florida group adopted Sunday.

There will be some who will say doctors, many of whom smoke, have no business speaking out on this controversial subject. But if the medical profession isn't to speak out who is going to do it? And what group has more cause to speak out than those who are faced with the responsibility of treating men and women who have incurred lung cancer, bronchitis or some other disability presumably brought on or aggravated by smoking.

As the FMA resolution declares:

"The preponderance of evidence indicates that cigarette smoking is strongly implicated in the genesis of lung cancer, chronic bronchitis and emphysema."

If this be so then the medical profession not only has a right but a duty to inform the American people about what excessive smoking may do to their health.

It is too late, of course, to stop the rising incidence of fatal lung cancer among long-time, heavy smokers in the older age groups. But, certainly, it isn't too late to indoctrinate our younger people into what they may be letting themselves in for by picking up the smoking habit and encouraging them not to adopt it.

We know of very few smokers who would not like to quit if they could. We know very few, also, who would encourage anyone to start, as once started it is a mighty tough habit to drop. Doctors know this better than anyone else and that is why we are happy to see the Florida Medical Association getting behind a program to alert our young people to what they feel are the health dangers inherent in smoking.

JACK W. GORE.

An Address by the Right Honorable Lester B. Pearson, Prime Minister of Canada, at the 118th Annual Commencement Exercises, University of Notre Dame, June 9, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the University of Notre Dame, which is located in the congressional district I represent, was recently honored, as indeed were all the citizens of our country, by the visit of a distinguished world figure and the chief executive of our neighbor to the north, the Right Honorable Lester B. Pearson, Prime Minister of Canada.

Prime Minister Pearson delivered the principal address at the 118th annual commencement exercises at the University of Notre Dame on June 9, 1963.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Pearson's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

TEXT OF AN ADDRESS BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE LESTER B. PEARSON, PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA, AT THE 118TH ANNUAL COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, JUNE 9, 1963

I thank the university—deeply and sincerely—for the honor it has done me today in making me one of its honorary graduates. I thank its president, Father Hesburgh, especially. His invitation came to me before I became Prime Minister of Canada. It was then a personal honor for which I was very grateful; as it is now, in addition, a recognition of the office I hold in a country that is your neighbor to the north.

An honorary degree has one certain effect upon me. It makes me value much more the degree that I earned.

By the same token, my football coaching duties at the University of Toronto many years ago, have given me a better appreciation of the finer points of touch football. For this I am grateful.

The moral of this is that you can never know when or what college experience will prove valuable after you graduate.

NOTRE DAME AND CANADA

Notre Dame has many historical connections with Canada.

The Order of the Holy Cross is well known and highly esteemed in my country where it is engaged in the work of education to the great benefit of our people.

Notre Dame's founder, Father Sorin, as general of the order, guided much of its early work in Canada. Your seventh president, Father Thomas Walsh, was born in Canada. For many years the enrollment at Notre Dame has included a significant number of Canadian students who have later contributed to the development of my country. John Wintermeyer, who took his degree here, is the leader of the Liberal Party in Ontario and a collaborator of mine. The president of the National Liberal Federation, my friend Senator John Connolly, who is with me today, was for some time a member of your faculty.

If you were to visit the largely French-speaking Province of Quebec, you would find the name "Notre Dame" attached to villages, hospitals, convents, and churches.

In the early 17th century, as one of our poets has put it: "The winds of God were blowing over France, kindling the hearths and altars, changing vows of rote into an alphabet of flame."

This began the French era of our history. The language and traditions and spirit of France became a part of Canada's religious, cultural, and political heritage.

Many years later, priests and lay brothers from France came with Father Sorin to this part of underdeveloped America. Here they found freedom. Like their compatriots who went to Canada, they also established a classical college. They trained young men in the arts, the humanities, the social sciences, and religion. The cultivation and ennoblement of the human spirit was their purpose. As a result of their work, better men have left these college halls, better citizens have gone out into many communities.

We owe much to such institutions. They have given us men of letters, judgment, and of moral purpose; men who have recognized that our Western civilization is founded on enduring spiritual values; on the dignity and worth of the human personality.

LEADERSHIP

Cardinal Enriquez, had he been with us today, might have led me to emphasize this point. His Eminence has given great leadership in his native Chile, and indeed throughout Latin America, in his pronouncements upon the social conditions of his people. But the sad reason for his absence is well enough known. Pope John, whose death all men lament, as all men rejoice in the nobility of his life, the greatness and glory of his achievement for all humanity; Pope John, in his great encyclicals and by his efforts through the Vatican Council to unify all men, has encouraged us to hope that the West can bring that leadership to the world which is more than the leadership of power or economics or politics.

In our complex world, the leadership we need is of many kinds and must operate in many fields. In seeking it, I believe that your country and mine can work, must work, together. Of all the reasons for this, the most important is that together we can contribute more to the fundamental needs and hopes of freemen than either of us can contribute alone.

We in Canada are your northern neighbor; and in a sense your closest neighbor. Our common border spans a continent and runs close to many of the biggest centers of population in both of our countries. Its importance to both of us was recognized in the communique issued by the President and myself after our recent meeting at Hyannis Port. I would like to quote two sentences from that communique:

"While it is essential that there should be respect for the common border which symbolizes the independence and national identity of two countries, it is also important that this border should not be a barrier to cooperation which could benefit both of them. Wise cooperation across the border can enhance rather than diminish the sovereignty of each country by making it stronger and more prosperous than before."

UNITED STATES-CANADIAN COOPERATION

From this cooperation we both have much to gain for ourselves. Materially, our trade is the biggest between any two countries in the world. But there is a far wider point than that. It is of the utmost importance that the relationship between our two countries should be an example to the world; an example of how two free and independent countries—of great disparity in power—can work together without fear on the part of the smaller, or force on the part of the larger.

Let me put it in a different way, and with the bluntness that we can use with each other. If U.S. cooperation with Canada were not close and happy, with whom could you cooperate closely and happily?

This point was forcibly put, 6 years ago, by a Canadian writing in that great American journal, Foreign Affairs.

He said: "The ability of the United States to get on well with Canada is the first and most direct test of her ability to get on well with every other smaller power—Canada is the world's hostage of American good intentions. Canada is of good repute in the free world. If Canadians said that they were being brow-beaten by the Americans, if they said that their interests were being seriously prejudiced by the United States, the world's sympathy would lie overwhelmingly with Canada. (That, I may insert, is the price you have to pay for being top dog; the sympathy we enjoy is that which attaches to and cheers us smaller dogs.)

"The world sees Canada as a country very like the United States—if the Americans could not get on well with Canada, with whom could they get on well?—Good relations with Canada—the good relations of discussion and cooperation, of some real give and take in policy—are a primary interest of the United States."

Having suggested that we are of some importance to you, let me hasten to say that you are of very obvious, and often of overwhelming importance, to us. Geography, history, economics, defense, combine to make your interests in world affairs very largely our interests. When your security is weakened, we have cause to worry. When freedom falters with you, ours is diminished.

WE ARE ESSENTIAL TO EACH OTHER

The basis of our relationship, in short, is that we are essential to each other.

It was not always so. For a long time, in the formative years of our two countries, we were by no means the best of friends, or even very good neighbors. Indeed, I should tell you that only yesterday I was taking part in celebrating the 150th anniversary of a battle in which we repelled American invaders; at least we did in our history books. Yours are less accurate. That was a long time ago. I think that both our countries are entitled to some sense of satisfaction about the way in which we have since worked out a peaceful relationship.

It has not been altogether easy, and I don't expect it to become easy. There are and always will be difficulties and differences of interest between us. It would be folly to ignore them. A country is a whole that is greater than the sum of its parts.

But it has parts. And those parts have their own particular interests. Individual industries in Canada, particular areas of Canada, inevitably have interests which are competitive with the interests of individual industries and particular areas of your country. The very closeness, the acute interdependence, of our relationship means that there are bound to be a great many differences.

Those are the facts of life. It is evidence of the nature of our neighborhood that we do not have to worry morbidly about them; or allow them to poison our relationship. Perhaps I should say it ought to be the nature of our neighborhood, and usually it has been. We should be able to take differences in stride; as good friends who know how to take the broad view, to make the general interest prevail, and therefore to accommodate the minor differences with reason and restraint.

OUR POLITICAL TRADITIONS HAVE SAME ROOTS

We will the better be able to do this if we remember that the things we have in common are much greater than the things that divide us. The political traditions of the United States and of Canada are from the same roots. Each of us has tried to build a society that gives first place to the individual man; his needs, his hopes, his rights, his responsibilities. Our methods are in some ways different, and our efforts on both sides less than perfect, but on balance we can both claim some success in our dedication to the free society. We stand together also in our common dedication to the ways of peace and in our common determination to cooperate and prevail in the cause of freedom and fair dealing between nations. We stand together in the Atlantic Alliance which has proved itself to be the shield of a free world, and in a United Nations which is groping toward a world brotherhood which in our nuclear, jet-propelled age has become a necessity for survival itself.

I am sure that to you at this university, who are students of history and of ideas, these things that our countries have in common need no emphasis from me. Of our differences you may be less aware; the differences which make the good relationship. I do not think so much of our differences in particular interests. Those are normal and can be dealt with. I think of another and central relationship which I have already mentioned, the enormous disparity in power between the two countries. You are gigantic, a superpower. Canada is far from that.

From this, two consequences follow. We are always watching Big Brother to see what trouble he might get us into—while at times protesting at the fact that Big Brother is not watching us. You are unaware. We are uneasy. This can cause misunderstandings that should be avoided.

BIG POWER AND SMALLER POWER

A second consequence of your being a big power and our being a much smaller power is that you and we at times react differently to international problems. Despite all that we have in common as North Americans, we often look at things through very different telescopes. We share this difference of viewpoint with other smaller countries.

Our distinction, among those smaller powers, is that we are North American. We are very close to you in so many ways; closer to you than other countries.

There are bound to be these differences between us, arising primarily from the contrasts of size and power and responsibility; but we do not have to allow those differences to divide us. On the contrary, the objective we can and should set for ourselves is to make the differences work for us, to the benefit of both our countries and of international relationships generally.

By making the differences work for us, I mean that we can complement each other's policies and ideas. I mean that, on the foundation of our own close partnership, there are ways of some importance in which Canada can assist in the broader partnership of both our countries with others; with the North Atlantic community, with the members of the Commonwealth, with the new and developing nations in the world. Our very lack of power makes possible for us a certain measure of ease and flexibility in international relationships which is not possible for the giant. You cannot sneeze without other countries thinking they are getting a cold and feeling inclined to blame it on you. We can sneeze with impunity.

We have much in common with the smaller nations of Europe; and our own political and economic development is recent enough for us to have considerable sympathy with the problems of the newer nations.

A PARTNERSHIP OF SPECIAL VALUE

I am bold enough to believe that these circumstances give to our partnership with you a special value. It is more than a partnership of direct mutual benefit. It is more than an example of a good relationship between two nations. It is also a partnership in which, if we work wisely together, we can do a more constructive job in international relationships than either you, as the big power, or we, as a smaller power, could do if there were no such partnership; or if history had created in the northern part of this continent one nation instead of two. Because there are two nations, I believe that we are creating more vigorous and more satisfying communities than could ever have been produced within one framework.

That is part of the challenge that faces my country. I hope that in talking about it I have said something of more general value to the people to whom I am primarily speaking—to the graduating class of 1963 at Notre Dame and to the members of the faculty who have worked with the class to make this great day possible. As a Canadian, I admire the great work your forefathers have done to shape this Nation and make it a mighty force for freedom, progress, and peace in the world. Your generation will soon be carrying on that work. It is a more difficult and challenging task now. You will be called on to meet new tests and overcome new challenges. Whatever you may choose to do after you leave the university, you will have to make your own contribution as citizens to the solution of problems that face your country.

In doing so, I hope you will continue to feel the value of your partnership with Canadians.

I feel myself a deep sense of the value and of the necessity of that partnership. I share that feeling with the vast majority of all Canadians. I shall do my own best to preserve and strengthen it, on the only foundation that can endure, friendship and cooperation based on mutual respect and good understanding between our two nations.

Milwaukee Religious Leaders Protest Anti-Semitism in U.S.S.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, recently 10 religious leaders in Milwaukee, Wis., representing the Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Protestant, and Jewish faiths joined together in a statement which was sent to Premier Khrushchev protesting antisemitism in the Soviet Union. The letter also was signed by Mayor Henry Maier and Dr. J. M. Klotsche, provost of the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.

The signers urge Mr. Khrushchev to put into practice the freedom of religion so often preached by Soviet leaders. They note that Jews behind the Iron Curtain are not even accorded the minimal rights grudgingly conceded to other religions. Khrushchev is asked to end restrictions on the practice of Judaism.

This interfaith document, itself a hopeful sign of unity between those who embrace Judeo-Christian tradition, is a compelling and forceful statement for freedom of conscience and religion. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *June 1, 1963.*

Chairman NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV,
The Kremlin,
Moscow, U.S.S.R.

DEAR CHAIRMAN KHRUSHCHEV: Having read the message addressed to you on December 7 by 46 American Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, urging the elimination of anti-Jewish discrimination in the Soviet Union, we add our endorsement to this appeal.

We urge your government to cease this discrimination and mistreatment described in the following statement:

"The Soviet Union declares it is a champion of human dignity and equality. No nation has been more persevering in pronouncing itself a defender of minority rights.

"Soviet spokesmen cite your country's constitution, wherein equality of citizens is guaranteed, as proof that religious discrimination is not countenanced in the U.S.S.R. You yourself have said: "The question of a man's religion is not asked in our country. It is a matter for the conscience of the person concerned. We look upon a person as a person."

"BUT WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

"The Soviet Government's persistent enmity to religion is a matter of historical record. While most faiths are permitted bare necessities, such as requisites for worship, sacred literature, theological seminaries, and central bodies, their activities are sternly circumscribed. Devout citizens—Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox—suffer harassment. Nowhere, not even within the walls of church or mosque, is religion secure from surveillance. This is a fact of Soviet life.

"It is also a fact that within the narrow framework of permissible religious practice, discrimination is enforced. Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union, numbering close to 3 million, are denied minimal rights conceded to adherents of other creeds.

"Hard pressed as they are by blanket restraints, none of the other major religions of the Soviet people, neither the Orthodox, Armenian, Catholic, or Protestant churches, neither Buddhism nor Islam, have been subjected to the extraordinary disabilities inflicted on Judaism and its followers.

"Legally constituted Jewish congregations are isolated from one another. They are forbidden to organize a central body. They are allowed no contact with Jewish religious groups in other countries. Their leaders are singled out for abuse.

"Since June 1961, synagogue presidents in six cities have been arbitrarily removed from office; Jewish communal leaders in Leningrad and Moscow have been sentenced to prison for the alleged crime of meeting with foreign visitors to their synagogues.

"Scores of synagogues have been closed by the state. The few that remain are served by rabbis who were ordained more than 40 years ago. For more than a generation, Jewish theological seminaries have been banned, except for a lone yeshiva in Moscow, opened in 1956. Its enrollment, never permitted to exceed 20, was reduced to 4 in April in 1962.

"No Jewish Bible has been printed in 40 years. No articles for Jewish ritual can be produced. This year, for the first time in Soviet history, even the sale of unleavened bread, essential to observance of the Passover, was banned. The prayers of Judaism are said in Hebrew, yet the teaching of that language is prohibited.

"Although half a million Jews declared Yiddish as their mother tongue in the Soviet census of 1959, their hundreds of schools, their once-flourishing theaters have been stamped out. Much small ethnic or linguistic groups have schools, theaters, books and newspapers in their own languages.

"These conditions conjure up memories of the anti-Semitic Stalin regime, which you yourself have denounced.

"According to the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the constitutions of enlightened countries, freedom of conscience and expression is vested unconditionally in every human being.

"Unless the Soviet Government conforms its behavior to this universal standard and to its own professed principles, it forfeits the confidence of all peoples.

"When will synagogues and Jewish seminaries be reestablished, imprisoned synagogue leaders set free, the ban on unleavened bread rescinded, ritual articles and Jewish prayerbooks made available?

"When will the Yiddish-language institutions that sustained Soviet Jewish culture and education be restored?

"When will Jewish congregations, like those of other religions be able to form a central body, to join in fellowship for the continuity of their faith?

"The world awaits your response.

"By deeds alone, can your Government confirm that the Soviet Union in truth upholds the rights of minorities and the equal dignity of man."

Very truly yours,

Donald H. V. Hallock, Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Milwaukee; J. M. Klotsche, Provost, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee; Rev. L. S. Beauchamp, President, Wisconsin Baptist State Convention; Rev. Jack J. Luikens, President, Milwauke Ministerial Association; Henry W. Maier, Mayor, City of Milwaukee; E. C. Pommerening, Executive Secretary, Lutheran Men in America; Father R. A. Parr, Director, Milwaukee Archdiocesan Legion of Decency Committee; Maurice H. Terry, Executive Director, National Conference of Christian and Jews; Rev. Milan D. Brkich, President, Eastern Orthodox Clergy of Wisconsin; Louis J. Swichkow, President, Wisconsin Council of Rabbis; Father William F. Kelley, S.J., President, Marquette University; Charlotte W. Tewelen, Chairman, Milwaukee Chapter, American Jewish Committee.

The Situation in Danville, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I enclose an editorial from the Danville Register of Thursday, June 20, 1963, which I feel will be of interest to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial is as follows:

THE PUPIL ASSIGNMENTS IN DANVILLE

The action of the State Pupil Placement Board in assigning 10 Negro children to 4 previously all-white schools for next year—and 1 application still pending—brings Danville in line with other major cities in the State by starting integration of public schools at the elementary and secondary levels. Only Martinsville, among first class cities, continues with no Negro pupils assigned to white schools.

Action by the State Pupil Placement Board in making the local assignments catches no one here by surprise. The parents of the children involved filed their applications before the last session of schools ended. They were processed and sent to the State agency by the school board by June 1, and the decision made was in line with the policy of the State.

It will be accepted by Danville citizens. There will be some citizens who dislike what has happened but among these will be a substantial number who accept it as a legal and expected development.

It will be accepted by a large number of people, white and Negro, who consider it as marking the end to one phase and the beginning of another in public education.

A substantial number of Negro parents will regard the assignments at this time as providing proof of the wisdom of their decision during the early 1950's to press for better schools for the whole community rather than for integration of those had at the time.

Tolerance has existed in Danville—no matter how erroneous an opinion has been spread across the nation in recent days by the sensation-hunters of the press and by the television networks who looked only for inflammatory talk from the violence-making professionals sent here by travelers under false banners of nonviolence. Tolerance among white and among Negro citizens made possible approval by more than two-thirds of all voters in three separate referenda of more than $8.5 million in bonds of the city of Danville for capital construction funds.

During the years since 1950 Danville has spent more than $11 billion for school construction. Since the 1954 decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in the schools case, Danville has spent an average of a million dollars a year for capital improvements.

During this period the whole public school system of our city has been rebuilt and the instruction program improved in every field and phase of education.

Such handsome and utilitarian structures as George Washington and John L. Langston high schools; Irvin W. Taylor, Edwin A. Gibson, Grove Park, G. L. H. Johnson, Woodberry Hills, and Cedarbrook schools were not in existence when the decision outlawing required segregation came in 1954.

There is not a knowledgeable person in Danville, Negro or white, who for a moment would agree that any one of the three bond issues could have mustered the required two-thirds favorable vote had the atmosphere at the time of balloting been inflamed by the antics of demonstrators willfully violating the laws of the city and the State.

The Negro leadership that quietly cooperated with the community in helping to ease the way for changes all have seen to be inevitable has been more fruitful than the course of violence and preachments of disregard for law.

The lapse of 9 years between the Court decision and the first integration in Danville schools reflects no lack of aspirations among Danville Negroes but rather a willingness to put first things first and make orderly progress toward their goals rather than precipitate community explosions by pressing for unrealistic goals. By their patience, and by the cooperation of the white community, a better school system to serve all children of the growing city is in operation today and will continue to be.

Over the years since 1954 some of the time bought for adjustment of viewpoints and for accommodations to altered circumstances has drawn criticism from the impatient but it has paid off for all people looking to the future relationships in the community.

The Danville School Board deserves the confidence and the appreciation of the whole community. So does the administrative officers of the municipality and of the Commonwealth of Virginia. The first pupil placement board, which operated with Governors Almond and Harrison as the attorneys general of Virginia, deserve the thanks of the whole people because they prevented precipitate race-mixing at a time more of it would have resulted in additional Prince Edwards, because the dilemma posed by the early forced integration made the choices equally obnoxious to many localities. Since then, the time gained has brought acceptance of orderly integration of schools as the course of the future and it has started and is well on the way without disturbing incidents.

Patience in the school situation was matched in patience in other fields and has proven just as fruitful. The statement issued on Wednesday by the Retail Merchants Association reflects the extent to which discrimination has been brought to an end voluntarily by merchants and other business establishments. A decent approach requires a decent response, and a respectful approach begets a respectful hearing and consideration. As time passes, more and more Negro people will be used to fill a variety of jobs not now generally open to them—largely because they have not been qualified applicants and applicants with satisfactory work experience—the essential for any white person obtaining employment in such jobs.

The one certain way to keep many such jobs from opening to Negro applicants is to stir up trouble for the prospective employer because somebody insists such a job is his or hers by right rather than by qualifications and availability.

Governor Harrison has stated clearly his conviction that the problems arising out of the racial situations best can be worked out at the community level—and by the people in each community. With that the Danville Register wholeheartedly agrees. Efforts to assist any group here in recent weeks has been only to toss oil on the fires. Hate—such as has existed—has been imported into Danville to counter the groundswell of good will that long prevailed in the community. The troublemaking faltered time and again, only to see the flames stirred anew by new arrivals from Atlanta, Washington, and elsewhere.

Mayor Julian R. Stinson's statement should serve notice on the "outsiders," whatever their color or their causes, that law and order will be enforced in Danville and that the violaters of the good conduct expected from all citizens cannot obtain any concessions from the authorities of Danville.

Respect for the law and for each other is the best course—the only course—for people who live in a community where decency is expected, yea required, of all.

Some Constitutional Principles, of Rule by Law, Being Flouted by the Supreme Court and Executive Department Flagrantly Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix to the Record a press release dated June 4, 1963, by the Honorable Hamilton A. Long, of New York City, in which he discusses some of the constitutional principles which are being flouted in our country today. Mr. Long is a retired attorney and a writer on constitutional law. His opinion is worthy of consideration.

The press release follows:

Some Constitutional Principles, of Rule by Law, Being Flouted by the Supreme Court and Executive Department Flagrantly Today

The constitutional principles that (a) the 14th amendment did not make the Bill of Rights applicable against the States and (b) a power which is granted under the Constitution to the Federal Government cannot be misused by it to accomplish some prohibited end, as well as other basic principles, are being flouted continuingly and increasingly by Federal usurpers: most newsworthily at present by the Supreme Court and executive department; according to an "open letter to the President" issued today by Hamilton A. Long—a member of the New York bar (retired) and a writer on constitutional law. U.S. Supreme Court decisions were cited by him supporting both points; and he stated this is appropos of current violations, actual and proposed, of liberty of individuals—regarding their constitutional property rights—under the guise of misconstrued equality, distorted from its constitutional meaning.

"AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT"

"1. The 14th amendment did not make the Bill of Rights applicable against the States, as proved conclusively by a distinguished and lengthy article, based upon exhaustive research, by Stanford University's former Law Prof. Charles Fairman—supplemented by another splendid article by his colleague there, Prof. Stanley Morrison—in the Stanford Law Review of December 1949. Citing the Fairman article, the Supreme Court admitted the truth of this proposition in the 1959 Bartkus case (p. 124 of opinion), stating:

" 'We have held from the beginning and uniformly that the due process clause of the 14th amendment does not apply to the States any of the provisions of the first eight amendments as such.[1] The relevant historical materials have been canvassed by this Court and by legal scholars.[2] These materials demonstrate conclusively that the Congress and the members of the legislatures of the ratifying States did not contemplate that the 14th amendment was a shorthand incorporation of the first eight amendments making them applicable as explicit restrictions upon the States.' "

"No scholar possessing requisite competence and intellectual integrity would pretend to the contrary. The two articles mentioned above exposed, scorned, Justice Hugo Black's conflicting pretenses as being based upon inexcusably inadequate research.

"2. A power granted to the Federal Government under the Constitution cannot be misused to accomplish a prohibited end, as the Supreme Court soundly decided in the Butler (AAA) case in 1936, pages 73–74 of opinion; namely, the power to tax and spend cannot be misued to effect control over agriculture, farmers. This decision, entirely in keeping with the controlling intent with which the Constitution was framed and adopted (and no contrary amendment was ever adopted), continues to be the correct construction of the Constitution; which makes null and void the conflicting decision in 1942 in the *Wickard* case by which the Court committed rank usurpation.

"3. Individual liberty—for instance, that part of liberty pertaining to the constitutional rights of owners of private property—can never properly be sacrificed in the name of equality, misconstrued to have a meaning never contemplated by the Framers and adopters of the original Constitution or of any amendment. Equality—meaning only in the eyes of God and of law, according to the Declaration of Independence—is always subject to the duty aspect of individual liberty-responsibility, including the legal and moral duty to respect others' equal, constitutional, rights. The limits of the right to equality stop where the limits of the right to liberty begin; neither can ever infringe upon the other's area, constitutionally.

4. The foregoing is apropos, for example, of current violations and proposed violations of the constitutional rights of property—such

---

[1] Citing earlier cases.

[2] Citing the Fairman article (mentioned above).

as stores and restaurants; and it is particularly pertinent regarding those who violate Rule by Law, including law and order, to achieve ends in violation of others' constitutional rights—falsely pretending that the end justifies the means: bankrupt morally.

"HAMILTON A. LONG.

"NEW YORK CITY, *June 4, 1963*."

Frederick County, Md., Schools and Impacted Area Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, there is some feeling among my distinguished colleagues that the Federal Government's aid to federally impacted school districts helps to finance educational programs of frills and trivia because the educational expenditures of the school systems of these impacted areas are not keeping pace with the efforts of the Federal Government. I would like to call to the attention of the House the following tables which are concerned with payments made under Public Law 874 to the Board of Education of Frederick County, Md.

In table 1, it should be noted that both the number and the percent of federally connected schoolchildren is increasing in Frederick County. Along with this increase in the number of federally connected schoolchildren enrolled in the county schools, there is a corresponding increase in the expenditures made by the county itself for educational purposes.

Table 2, which shows cost per pupil for education in the county, indicates the sizable amounts of money spent each year for every student.

From table 3 we learn that the Frederick County appropriations each year for school purposes are increasing at a rapid rate.

As these tables prove, the Board of Education of Frederick County, Md., is meeting its responsibility with regard to funds which it receives from the Federal Government. Total local expenditures for education in Frederick County have kept pace with the Federal grants, while educational standards have been maintained at a high level. The experience of Frederick County serves as another example of the need and of the value of aid to federally impacted school districts.

TABLE 1.—*Board of Education of Frederick County, Md.—Receipts from Federal Government under Public Law 874*

	Average daily attendance					Percent federally connected	Total current expenses	Public Law 874 payments	Rate of payment
	3a. Live on	3b. Live off	Total Federal	Non-Federal	All pupils				
1951–52								$18,403.33	$93.98
1952–53								42,350.28	101.43
1953–54	48.2	931.9	980.1	9,713.8	10,693.9	9.2	$2,295,179.92	49,863.03	115.32
1954–55	41.7	1,029.0	1,070.7	9,924.3	10,995.0	9.7	2,553,577.85	72,590.80	123.55
1955–56	40.3	1,186.4	1,226.7	10,155.0	11,381.7	10.8	2,896,316.30	67,840.80	130.29
1956–57	45.3	1,419.2	1,464.5	10,346.1	11,810.6	12.4	3,163,797.07	90,766.56	145.20
1957–58	62.8	1,518.3	1,581.1	10,500.8	12,081.9	13.1	4,093,588.23	115,633.00	151.45
1958–59	66.5	1,507.7	1,574.2	10,890.2	12,464.4	12.6	4,948,699.36	132,304.15	161.15
1959–60	95.2	1,744.9	1,840.1	11,082.3	12,922.4	14.3	5,083,030.94	174,537.00	180.40
1960–61	107.4	1,967.8	2,075.2	11,261.9	13,337.1	15.6	5,383,242.43	198,003.00	185.05
1961–62	102.78	2,059.06	2,161.8	11,469.9	13,631.7	16.0	5,897,927.99	227,383.00	200.78
1962–63									216.57

TABLE 2.—*Board of Education of Frederick County, Frederick, Md.—Cost per pupil belonging, grades 1–12: Current expenses, including administration and fixed charges, Frederick County public day schools, 1951–63*

School year:	*Cost per pupil*
1951–52	[1] $179.33
1952–53	184.04
1953–54	188.15
1954–55	200.11
1955–56	222.37
1956–57	234.37
1957–58	277.75
1958–59	332.10
1959–60	343.35
1960–61	372.55
1961–62	[2] 410.60
1962–63	[3] 421.00

[1] Data from annual reports, Maryland State Department of Education.

[2] Calculated, Board of Education of Frederick County.

[3] Estimated, Board of Education of Frederick County.

TABLE 3.—*Board of Education of Frederick County, Md.—Local revenue appropriations* [1]

Year	Appropriations for all school purposes	Percent of total for school	Published tax rate
1951	$975,339	49.7	1.35
1952	1,444,703	52.8	1.34
1953	1,252,484	33.4	1.40
1954	1,456,546	44.2	1.40
1955	1,585,275	37.9	1.40
1956	1,669,790	37.0	1.54
1957	2,029,129	49.8	1.54
1958	2,457,550	56.9	1.54
1959	2,821,253	50.3	1.70
1960	3,109,991	48.2	1.88

[1] Data from annual reports, Maryland StateDepartment of Education.

Conflict of Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, two problems of conflict of interest have come to public attention recently as a result of investigations by congressional committees. Although the basic goal of each of these investigations is an examination of the procurement procedures in the Pentagon, the possibility of a conflict of interest is strong in both cases on the basis of evidence that is already clearly established in the records of the McClellan Permanent Investigating Subcommittee and the Stennis Preparedness Subcommittee.

I am not stating that the men involved—Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell Gilpatric and Navy Secretary Fred Korth—have been involved in acts that are a violation of the criminal law on "conflicts of interest." The question of law violations remains to be determined by the evidence the McClellan subcommittee and the Stennis subcommittee may produce in the next few weeks.

It is clear from the evidence produced that Deputy Defense Secretary Gilpatric and Navy Secretary Korth have been careless with the ethical standards that must govern the conduct of all high governmental officials. This is a careless pattern that is improper, even if the men involved have somehow been able to rationalize and justify their activities to themselves.

Such carelessness should not and cannot be tolerated in any governmental activity. This is particularly true of the activities of two of the highest officials in the Pentagon—Gilpatric, the No. 2 man in that establishment, and Korth, the topman in the Navy.

It is time for Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara to speak out clearly on this issue to inform all officials of the Pentagon that he does not condone questionable or improper activity, even if that activity may not constitute a pattern that justifies criminal prosecution. The Defense Secretary must set the tone for an agency that spends more than $50 billion a year—more than half of our total budget. It is not enough for him to say that no law is violated.

When Secretary McNamara appeared before the McClellan subcommittee on March 21, 1963, he commented on the possibility of "conflicts of interest" in answer to questions by Chairman McCLELLAN:

> I want to say we share the same objective as the committee. We desire that there be no influence whatsoever of self-interest in the decisionmaking process of the Pentagon. To the best of my knowledge, there is none. I have insisted that others in the Department adhere to the same standards I do. And I

> think any investigation of the committee will show that those are the highest in the Government.

Since that testimony by Secretary McNamara, there has been considerable evidence and testimony that has demonstrated the careless pattern of ethics. It is now time for Secretary McNamara to speak out forcefully with regard to the activities of Gilpatric and Korth in the TFX warplane contract award and the X-22 award for the vertical short takeoff and landing craft.

Gilpatric, former lawyer for General Dynamics, did not disqualify himself from a large role in the TFX contract competition that pitted General Dynamics against Boeing. The high-level Source Selection Board was unanimous in recommending Boeing on the basis of superior performance and a lower price. Yet, we find that Gilpatric, Korth, Air Secretary Eugene Zuckert all joined in promoting selection of General Dynamics by Secretary McNamara.

General Dynamics was awarded the contract on a program that may total $6.5 billion. It should be clear to everyone that Gilpatric should have disqualified himself from any role in this contract competition. This is particularly true when one notes that the McClellan subcommittee evidence also establishes:

First. Gilpatric's law firm, Cravath, Swaine & Moore, has continued to represent General Dynamics up to the present time and has received law fees of more than $300,000.

Second. One of Gilpatric's law firm partners has been named a director of General Dynamics.

Third. Gilpatric is leaving the Government this summer and has indicated he will return to the law firm which still represents General Dynamics.

Fourth. Gilpatric has refused to tell reporters of the fees he has received from his law firm since joining the Government in January 1961, and he has specifically refused to discuss whether any of the General Dynamics fees have been directly or indirectly routed to his pocket.

This case alone demands close attention by the House and Senate. It demands close attention by the American people. It demands that President Kennedy speak out and take the kind of action that indicates he has meant what he has said about establishing high ethical standards in Government. Silence on the part of President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara amounts to condoning this type of relationship which is careless and unhealthy at best. Certainly, we should be on guard so that this is not another case of careless Government ethics being rewarded with a medal and a commendation as happened under the Truman administration and the Eisenhower administration.

Navy Secretary Korth told the Senate Armed Services Committee on January 18, 1962:

> I do retain stock in several banks, in one small children's garment manufacturing company in Jamaica which does no business with the Government or with the Defense Establishment, and, likewise, own certain real estate ranches.

The severing of relationships with all firms that have direct relationships with the Defense Department is commendable. However, the investigation of the X-22 contract by the Stennis Preparedness Subcommittee has demonstrated the problem of retaining any interest in a large banking institution that may indirectly have an interest in the award of large defense contracts.

Korth was president of Continental National Bank, Fort Worth, Tex., at the time he was named Navy Secretary. He was also a director of Bell Aerospace Corp., and the Bell company used the Continental National Bank as a financial institution. Korth says he plans to return to the bank.

This past relationship, and his plans to return to the Continental National Bank, does create a problem of a conflict of interest when the Bell Aerospace Corp. or any other firm doing business with Continental Bank is involved in a contract competition that must be considered by the Navy.

Testimony before the Stennis subcommittee involved just such a competition betwen the Bell company and the Douglas Aircraft Co. for construction of an experimental vertical takeoff plane. Examine the documented facts:

The Navy source selection team was unanimous for the Douglas Co. on the basis of a superior technical proposal and a lower price by about $350,000. The Bell company proposal was rated as "unacceptable" on four major areas.

Navy Secretary Korth stated that he was disassociating himself from the X-22 decision, which he certainly should have done in the light of his prior relationship with Bell. However, he continued to keep abreast of the X-22 negotiations, and sat in on the briefings by the technical experts.

Deputy Defense Secretary Gilpatric made the decision to give the contract to Bell. He admitted the superior technical proposal by Douglas. He said he had no information on the lower price proposal by Douglas. He said he had no information that Bell was unacceptable in four areas. Gilpatric said he decided, without research or documentation, that Bell was better from a standpoint of management and experience. He said he consulted only one man on this—Navy Secretary Korth.

Certainly at this point, Gilpatric should have known he should not have consulted a man who had disqualified himself. If Gilpatric was so insensitive to the problem of ethics involved, Korth should have informed him that he would have nothing to say on the subject. Even with no consultation, this type of an arrangement is difficult to handle to avoid the influence of Korth's past relationship with Bell as a banker and as a director. Somehow, Gilpatric failed to recognize the problem and assured the Stennis subcommittee that Korth could be "objective, since I had to make the decision, and he did not."

The ridiculous reasoning of Gilpatric in this case is best demonstrated by simply calling your attention to the questioning of Gilpatric by Committee Counsel James Kendall:

> KENDALL. Now, as I understand it, Mr. Secretary, Secretary Korth entirely disassociated himself from this award because of his previous connection with Bell in the banking business, and as a member of the Bell Board of Directors, is that correct?
>
> GILPATRIC. Yes.
>
> KENDALL. Then why did you go back to Secretary Korth to ask information about Bell's management?
>
> GILPATRIC. Well, I approached him in a different capacity than in a capacity as Secretary of the Navy. I asked him for a personal opinion on a matter with which he had had knowledge and experience. I did not ask him to help advise me in making a decision. I asked him to give me a judgment on certain facts. And I felt that I could rely on his judgment as being objective, since I had to make the decision, and he did not.
>
> KENDALL. And he gave the Bell management a higher rating, is that correct?
>
> GILPATRIC. He told me that I could have confidence in the present management as contrasted with the competence of previous managements.

It is my judgment that the Government could terminate either the TFX contract or the X-22 contract on the basis that it is infected with a conflict of interest that is against public policy. Even with the evidence that is in the record at this stage, this case would seem to be comparable to the Dixon-Yates case in which the dual role of a financial adviser was the issue. I believe that President Kennedy, McNamara and others in the administration should read that Dixon-Yates opinion by the Supreme Court—United States against Mississippi Valley Generating Co., January 9, 1961—relative to the high standard that must be retained.

The Court stated:

> Section 434 is one of several penal conflict-of-interest statutes which were designed to prohibit Government officials from engaging in conduct that might be inimical to the best interests of the general public. * * *
>
> The statute is directed at an evil which endangers the very fabric of a democratic society, for a democracy is effective only if the people have faith in those who govern, and that faith is bound to be shattered when high officials and their appointees engage in activities which arouse suspicions of malfeasance and corruption. * * *
>
> The question is whether the Government may disaffirm a contract which is infected by an illegal conflict of interest. As we have indicated, the public policy embodied in section 434 requires nonennforcement, and this is true even though the conflict of interest was caused or condoned by high Government officials. The same policy which prevents an administrative official from exempting his subordinates from the coverage of the statute also dictates that the actions of such an official not be construed as requiring enforcement of an illegal contract.

When the pattern of activity by Gilpatric and Korth is measured against the opinion of the Supreme Court in the Dixon-Yates case, it would appear to be found wanting. It might be well for President Kennedy to make a sincere effort to measure the Gilpatric role against the standards of ethics in his campaign speeches and in his comments since taking office.

If he fails to do this he will be negligent. If he awards Gilpatric a medal or other commendation when Gilpatric leaves office, it will amount to administration approval of a highly questionable affair.

Appendix

Deficits Are Not Good for the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, with the constant talk about the President's tax bill, it is well to observe our spending habits. Less income and more outgo spell inflation and trouble. Lyle C. Wilson, in today's Washington Daily News, thinks so, too.

The article follows:

DEFICIT PLAGUES KENNEDY

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

The Democrats are making progress in the field of Treasury deficits. Their deficits are getting bigger.

President Kennedy has not yet matched the whopper turned in by Dwight D. Eisenhower for the fiscal year 1959. But Mr. Kennedy is gaining. Ike's big red number was $12.4 billion. Mr. Kennedy began modestly at first. His fiscal year 1961 Treasury deficit was a mere $3.8 billion. In fiscal 1960 Ike had turned up a surplus of $1.2. But that trend was too good to last. After a modest first-year beginning, Mr. Kennedy came up in fiscal 1962 with a Treasury deficit of $6.3 billion. Secretary Douglas Dillon toted up the Treasury's books as of last May 31 and found that for the first 11 months of the current 1963 fiscal year, the Treasury deficit was an imposing $10.6 billion. Mr. Dillon expects that figure to have shrunk some this month so that when the fiscal year ends at midnight, June 30, the deficit will be down to about $8.8 billion.

But the upward trend is well established. Mr. Dillon estimates that the deficit in the next, 1964 fiscal year, will hit $11.9 billion. That figure may be somewhat gimmicked because it is a matter of pride and politics with the Kennedys to keep their deficits below the 1959 whopper charged to Ike. Even so, the recorded and estimated Kennedy deficits for 1961–64, inclusive, is $32.7 billion. The final figures are likely to be even larger.

When the President sent to Congress 18 months ago the budget for the current, 1963 fiscal year, he predicted a surplus of $463 million. Mr. Kennedy's economists are wishful thinkers, however. They misled him into a calculation that a booming business revival would greatly boost Treasury revenue in fiscal 1963. They did not press for economies in Government spending as a hedge against any revenue miscalculation.

On their advice, Mr. Kennedy finds himself entrapped in the quicksands of deficit spending with no chance of being rescued in his first White House term and not much hope of rescue if he is President for another 4 years beyond that.

Deficit spending has become a political way of life, especially for the Democrats. Mr. Kennedy's economists have toyed with the idea of a pump priming spending program to give the economy a shot in the arm. They turned finally to a massive tax reduction which would be accompanied by more Treasury deficits at least through fiscal year 1967. They have not much interest in exploring the possibility of reducing Government spending toward a balanced budget.

There are sober warnings that endless deficits—27 since 1930—seriously undermine the purchasing power of the dollar. The buck is worth about 45 cents now as compared to what it would buy in 1939. Sober warnings, too, that the unfavorable balance of international payments hurts the U.S. dollar.

President Alfred Hayes of the New York Federal Reserve Bank said in an April speech before the Economic Club: "The international payments deficit remains much too high. A prolongation of heavy deficits cannot fail to damage the dollar badly."

Mr. Hayes was talking about the dollar in your pocket and your dollar in the bank. President Kennedy's proper pride in his place in history, may turn his economists to consider economy before he leaves the White House. And it may turn his foreign aid advisers to think harder about the imbalance of international payments and their effects on your dollars in pocket and bank.

Moving Toward a Police State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a great number of newspapers in this country are speaking out editorially in strong terms against the President's civil rights proposals. One of the best I have seen on this subject has been printed in the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., on June 21, 1963, and is entitled "Moving Toward a Police State." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOVING TOWARD A POLICE STATE

(NOTE.—Laws they are not which public approbation has not made so.—Richard Hooker, 1594.)

In his sweeping recommendations to Congress for a whole new set of oppressive civil rights laws, President Kennedy has asked of the American people and their elected representatives powers which neither he nor any other President or administration should have.

The present U.S. Supreme Court, whch already has made a shambles of legal precedent in the field of private relationships between divergent groups, might declare them valid, but at least one and most probably more of Mr. Kennedy's proposals would have been declared unconstitutional by the Court of a generation or two ago.

More important, many of the American people will reject them on their face as an unwarranted extension of the powers of the executive branch of the Government to regulate relationships which should be left to individual choice and mutual consent.

If they stop and think what the runaway Federal courts could do with those laws in interpreting them as they are contested by persons surely to be charged of violating them, the majority will reject them out of fear for the future, no matter how much they favor the immediate purpose.

Mr. Kennedy piously told Congress that he wanted the laws as a means of putting an end to "rancor, violence, disunity, and national shame."

If for no reason other than that set forth in the quotation above from Richard Hooker, who lived in a time of absolute monarchs, or royal dictators, the laws will not work. The people will not stand for the Federal Government to tell them what they can and can't do with their private property, as restive as they are already under the restrictions the Central Government has gradually forced upon them.

Instead of putting an end to bitterness and strife, as Mr. Kennedy says, they will only add to them. He has made things worse merely by failing to place the blame for the situation where it belongs.

By the time they have been passed—and we doubt that Congress can or will pass them—the Nation may be disunited and torn by bitterness and violence greater than it has seen at any time since the tragic and ruinous Reconstruction.

In that era the Federal Government ran roughshod over the rights of white men and left both them and the freed slaves in a state of poverty that a century of progress brought about by hard work, not by Federal plans and programs, has not entirely wiped out. Only by the same ruthless use of martial law could he enforce the proposed statutes.

It was Abraham Lincoln who said in one of his speeches before he became President that of all the methods of seeking redress of wrongs, mob violence was the most evil and the least effective.

Yet is is against a background of mob violence that the President is asking for these laws. Once fairly peaceful protest marches and sit-ins have turned into outright and savage attacks against the law and law enforcement officers.

He knows, or should, that they have resulted from the ever more radical actions of rival crusaders leading emotion-charged groups of Negroes who little know what they are seeking and understand nothing of the methods by which it can be achieved.

Oh, yes, he paid lipservice to local peace and good order. He urged the Negroes to stop their unlawful demonstrations, at least until Congress has had a chance to act in an atmosphere of peace and calm. But he has cited this very unrest, this wholesale civil disobedience, the threat of Negro leaders to defy all laws and all levels of government authority in justification for his demands.

Laws to protect civil liberty, which is something quite different from what the Negro leaders are demanding, we have in plenty. And the President himself said that laws alone would not solve the problems. Indeed they will not. They will only make them worse.

His proposal to forbid any discrimination by an establishment offering goods and services to the public is but a step away from seizure of private property without due process of law, a violation of a basic constitutional principle.

The instigation of suits by the Department of Justice to force integration is an entirely new and dangerous procedure. The Department has the power to enforce any Federal laws, but there is no law requiring integration and Congress has repeatedly refused to enact such.

The power to withhold Federal funds and projects from communities where officials practice discrimination apparently would make the bureaucrats the judges of the facts. And what a mighty political weapon that would be.

His job-retraining program would be costly and wasteful. Senator Humphrey mentioned a billion dollars. In practice it probably would turn into a vast welfare program. It is an extension of a program already in effect.

In one case history in this program, it cost the taxpayers almost as much to retrain a coal miner for a job that didn't exist as it does to train a jet pilot or an Army officer.

The proposed law against discrimination in both public and private employment almost certainly would result in discrimination in favor of the Negro, rather than equal opportunity.

Unfortunately, Mr. Kennedy is in a political dilemma and is trying to scheme his way out of it. He made a lot of rash civil rights promises during the campaign of 1960. After a few months in office he found he couldn't possibly keep them. Now he is in danger of losing the Negro vote because he hasn't thus far led them to the golden streets.

On civil rights, he has painted himself into a corner. He has made still more promises, signed a few executive orders, demanded preferential legislation, some of which he has gotten. The Negroes have not been satisfied.

The demonstrations got worse as more fund-collecting organizations started shows of their own. He made the mistake of openly encouraging the demonstrations. Now they threaten wholesale civil disorder and he is trying to head it off with drastic civil rights legislation.

Recent months have shown that the United States could easily become a police state, with the President sending into any community marshals and troops at will. Enactment of the laws he proposes would just about make it complete by further threatening the Nation with a race war.

Government Lotteries of Czechoslovakia, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, and Nepal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to tell the Members of this House about four more foreign countries which utilize government-run lotteries to not only yield high revenues but to control and regulate the normal human urge to gamble.

Out of 77 foreign countries Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, and Nepal are included as those nations which recognize and accept the gambling spirit of its people and operate government-run lotteries for the people's welfare and the government's need.

Czechoslovakia is one of the few Communist nations to operate a lottery and has found it very productive as far as profits are concerned. Last year, the gross receipts came to over $8⅓ million. After payment of prizes and expenses of running the lottery, the net income to the government was about $2½ million. The profits are used for construction of new factories, and hospitals, and cultural purposes.

Denmark, like the other countries where government controlled and operated lotteries are legal and proper, has reduced gambling to an orderly minimum by state control. They have no underworld problems and illegal betting is not the source of difficulty to the police as it is here in the United States.

The gross receipts for 1962 were $7,812,000. After prizes, the net income to the government was $652,000. The above figures are higher than the previous year. The profits to the government were applied to the general fund of the treasury.

Dominican Republic is a small nation but derives monetary benefit from its recognition of the fact that people like to gamble.

In 1962, the gross receipts came to over $34¼ million. The government's income, some $6⅓ million, was not earmarked for any particular project but was rather applied to the general fund of the treasury.

Nepal, although a small and poor country, has two privately-run lotteries which are supervised by the government. The gross receipts from running both lotteries were $53,288. The net income came to about $20,000 which was earmarked for the Tuberculosis Association of Nepal and Funeral Association.

Mr. Speaker, we can derive a tremendous revenue here in the United States if we copied a page from the story of these foreign countries. We can, through a national lottery in the United States bring into the coffers of our Treasury over $10 billion a year in needed additional funds. Only a national lottery can provide us with added moneys to give a tax cut to our hard-pressed taxpayers and start reducing our national debt.

Mr. Speaker, why cannot we follow the wisdom of our foreign friends? Why cannot we even follow the example of New Hampshire?

Coal Was Not the First Major Industry in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, long before the western counties of Virginia became an independent State, natural resources formed the basis of local industry. In its issue of June 16, 1963, the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail describes the use made of mineral deposits in western Virginia prior to the Civil War.

Many years before the coal fields were developed, ironmaking and saltmaking were big industries in the land that is now my State. Saltmaking goes back over 200 years, to the early Colonial days and to primitive methods originated by the Indians. Ironmaking goes back to 1790, when the first furnace was built at Kings Creek, in Hancock County. Soon, every kind of hardware, from cannonballs to railroad spikes, was produced locally. In 1860 still another natural resource came into prominence when an oil boom took place at Burning Springs, in Wirt County, and also at Parkersburg, in Wood County.

Mr. President, the early industrial development of West Virginia, as told in this article in the Gazette-Mail, is an important part of the industrial history of America. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Strong Industrial Pattern in Regime Before Civil War

A well-defined pattern of industrial structure had developed in western Virginia, now West Virginia, long before the Civil War.

Ironmaking and saltmaking were big industries then and in both, western Virginia was a national leader. By 1860, steamboats had been plying the Ohio and sections of the Kanawha and Monagahela Rivers for decades. The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, with its promise of prosperity to come, had pushed through the mountains to the Ohio River at Wheeling and Parkersburg, each a stepping-off point for Midwest pioneers.

By 1860, Charleston, then the center of one of the Nation's largest salt industries, had a population of 1,520; Parkersburg, 2,493; Wheeling, 14,083, and Martinsburg, 3,364. Harpers Ferry, site of a U.S. arsenal and rifle works, had more than 3,000 persons and was one of the important towns of Virginia. Clarksburg, Fairmont and Morgantown were flourishing small towns.

The State's first boom town, Burning Springs in Wirt County, which now has a population of 25 persons, had a population estimated at 4,000 to 6,000 persons in 1860. The Burning Springs oil boom began on May 1, 1860, with a 100-barrel well. The bubble burst suddenly on May 30, 1863, when Confederate Gen. William Jones and his raiders burned the wells, tanks and barges. This strike was only 9 months after the Drake well at Titusville, Pa., and though the boom was short lived it proved the forerunner of intense development later.

There were other industries, too, such as boatyards, tanneries, textile mills, sawmills and grain mills. Hardy pioneers had barely tasted the profits from coal, oil, gas and timber. The real development of these industries came later, spurred by outside capital.

Almost from the start, natural resources formed the basis of the State's industrial structure, a condition that led to irritation and friction with the plantation economy of the Old Dominion. In fact, this economic difference was a basic cause of the formation of West Virginia.

The first known industry, other than home crafts, in what is now West Virginia was salt making. The Indians knew that if they boiled water from natural brine springs they could produce salt. Artifacts found around some of the State's salt springs indicate that saltmaking had been practiced for a long time before the coming of white settlers. Mary Draper Ingles, a white woman captured by the Shawnees, was put to work boiling water from a spring located near the present town of Malden in 1755. A village of Delaware Indians was reported to be making salt in the Little Kanawha Valley area in 1770.

White settlers soon adopted the Indian method of making salt and then made improvements by digging and drilling wells and by more efficient evaporating methods. While Kanawha County was still a part of Virginia, the area around Charleston produced more than a million bushels of salt a year and ranked among the three largest salt centers in the Nation. Smaller quantities were produced also at sites on the Elk, Little Kanawha, and Ohio Rivers.

Production records show that the Kanawha region produced 150 bushels of salt a day as early as 1797. The peak was reached in 1850 with a total output of 3,142,000 barrels and then a decline began. By 1873, the salt industry was on its way out.

Salt production called for ingenuity and in their efforts to become efficient, the early producers became pioneers in new equipment and new methods that were to be used later by other industries. "Uncle Billie" Morris, a salt-well driller in the Kanawha area, invented slips or jars for drilling tools that were later used in oil and gas well drilling. Salt producers, who at first copied the Indian method of using wood for fuel, later used coal and natural gas to fire their furnaces. The Kanawha Salt Co., organized in 1817 as a cooperative to control prices and production, probably was the first industrial trust in America.

The first iron ore furnace west of the Alleghenies was erected on Kings Creek in Hancock County in 1790. This furnace made cannon balls, which helped Perry win the Battle of Lake Erie in the War of 1812. Iron ore furnaces sprang up in a number of places in West Virginia, including the Morgantown area and the Northern Panhandle. The iron was used to supply rails and spikes and locomotives for railroads, to furnish hoes and axes for farmers and picks and shovels for miners.

West Virginia's first steel mill was established at Wheeling in 1832. Then the State's steel industry was concentrated in the Wheeling area which rivaled Pittsburgh industrially. The discovery of rich iron ore beds in the Great Lakes area later brought and end to the use of low grade ore from West Virginia but the steel industry continued to grow in the Northern Panhandle because of coal and river transportation.

The lumber industry in West Virginia grew very slowly at first. The water-powered sawmill, introduced about 1755, had its impact and railroad and river transportation provided new markets, but it was not until 1881 when the steam-powered band mill was introduced that lumber came into its own.

Wheeling was one of the pioneer industrial towns west of the Alleghenies. The National Road, the first wagon route between the east and the Ohio River, was opend to Wheeling in 1818. A year before that, the Washington, one of the first successful steamboats on the Ohio, was built at Wheeling. Now the boatbuilding industry boomed along with iron manufacture; glass factories were started, and taverns, blacksmith shops and provision stores sprang up.

In 1831, the flow of imports through Wheeling was so heavy that the town was made a port of entry by Congress. In 1836, Wheeling was an incorporated city and within 10 years waterworks were being built. By 1849, Wheeling became known as the Nail City because of its iron works, and a bitter fight was being waged with Pittsburgh as to which city would become the leading manufacturing center of the West.

Parkersburg, incorporated in 1810, also was an early industrial center. By 1844, it was one of the most important towns on the Ohio River. Its population had grown to 1,400 and it had many taverns, stores, a bank, boatyard, tanneries, and other small industrial plants. Parkersburg's first real boom, however, came in 1860 with the drilling of the first oil wells along the Hughes and Little Kanawha Rivers. Progress was interrupted briefly during the Civil War but development resumed when peace was restored.

Clarksburg, though handicapped by lack of steamboat transportation, nevertheless had boatyards and wagon shops as early as 1798 and in 1810 had its first newspaper. Whisky and some flour were floated on flatboats down at West Fork and the Monongahela Rivers to Pittsburgh or taken across the mountains on packhorses. Generally, however, grain was fed to livestock which could transport itself to eastern markets.

Martinsburg had its biggest boom, starting in 1837 when the right-of-way survey for the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad was starting. Prosperity continued until interrupted by the Civil War.

Harpers Ferry, another eastern panhandle town, was thriving before the Civil War. In 1796, Congress had ordered an arsenal established there because of the abundance of waterpower. The arsenal and the later addition of Hall's Rifle Works changed a placid village into a busy community of 3,000 and one of the most important towns in Virginia.

A number of other towns in western Virginia had industry well before the Civil War, including Point Pleasant where a boatyard was built in 1849; Morgantown, which had stores, taverns, potteries, wagon shops, boatyards, two tanneries, a distillery and ironworks before 1800; Fairmont, which had woolen mills by 1831; Grafton, which became a railroad center about 1856; Berkeley Springs, a resort town, and Lewisburg, an educational and cultural center.

There were many other small towns and villages that had industries—a distillery (whisky was a big business then), a boatyard, a shop, a gristmill or weaving looms. Most of the production, however, was for home consumption.

Huntington, Beckley, Bluefield, and other southern West Virginia towns were yet to make their marks. West Virginia's multibillion dollar coalfield, its oil and gas fields, its timber boom were yet to come.

A Way To Save Dropouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Abraham D. Beame, comptroller of the city of New York, at the annual luncheon of the Westchester Region Women's American ORT at the Hotel Americana, New York City, on June 11, 1963.

REMARKS BY COMPTROLLER ABRAHAM D. BEAME AT ANNUAL LUNCHEON OF WESTCHESTER REGION WOMEN'S AMERICAN ORT

For many years—as a city official concerned with the basic problems of people, and as a member of Jewish welfare and community groups—I have watched the work of Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training. I have taken pride in the great amount of good you are doing for our people, and for the world.

As a former teacher, I have been intensely interested in the instruction which is the basis of the work of the Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training. I have been especially impressed by the broad range of pupils to whose welfare you are dedicated—people of all ages and of many backgrounds.

I have always felt inspired by ORT's creed, that man can best be helped by being assisted to become independent, self-supporting, and self-respecting. And for some time now, it has been apparent to me that this creed is not limited to refugees from Algeria, fugitives from Red oppression, or survivors of concentration camps.

Here in our cities, our suburbs, indeed, throughout our Nation, there are lessons to be learned from ORT's reason for existence. Most American communities face a growing crisis with a large and restless portion of our population, who also need training, guidance, and jobs. I refer to young people in the late teens and early twenties.

A report by the U.S. Department of Labor, just last week, showed a big increase in the number of teenagers who are not going back to school, and are looking for jobs. The Department said that the number of jobless youngsters rose 300,000 during the month of May alone.

The Federal labor experts also said that by 1965, New York State alone will have nearly 600,000 teenage employables. That's close to 8 percent of the total for the whole country, and an increase of 23.5 percent in the State for a 5-year period.

The future of our own democracy, and of the world, depends upon these boys and girls. Those who have been trained and educated sufficiently to take positions almost at once in businesses, laboratories, and the professions are not our problem youth. Our concern must be directed toward the thousands who have cut their education too short, so that they lack the minimum needed to qualify for regular employment.

Here in New York City we have a growing contingent of these aimless young people. The records show that about 39,500 boys and girls received academic high school diplomas last year, while almost 17,000 others dropped out before completing this minimum of education.

And even more to the point, our vocational high schools should be producing a steady stream of recruits for the essential trades and services, but they had more dropouts than graduates. The statistics show that 5,571 received diplomas, but 6,299 quit.

A report by the Taconic Foundation last year showed that the Food Trades High School had 10 dropouts for each 5 graduates. The Printing Trades High School saw five youngsters quitting school for each five graduated. Schools dealing with the clothing industries—one of New York City's largest sources of jobs—lost four dropouts for each six graduates.

The youth board says that there are now an accumulated total of 96,000 boys and girls in the ages between 14 and 19, who dropped out of elementary, junior high, and high schools, 96,000 youngsters facing a complex and competitive world, without the basic tools.

The figures for New York City may be somewhat higher than those for surrounding areas, because we have more children from disadvantaged homes and families unfamiliar with our language.

But, the same problem is moving into the suburbs. We've been warned that the regional population will increase 6 million by 1980, and most of the increase will be outside the city. You'll be facing problems on our scale more and more as the years pass.

Up to now, it has become habitual to call on Government to solve these problems. But, Government alone cannot solve them. Federal funds have been used in various programs to help train youth for productive jobs. Some of these pilot projects have been successful, but only in limited areas and among small numbers of young people.

The time has come for our leaders of commerce and industry to understand that the future of these boys and girls will be an important factor in the future health of our entire economy. These aimless youngsters should be part of the useful manpower—and also the buying consumers—of the future.

Every effort should be made to encourage business and industry to jump into this campaign with both feet for their own benefit, as well as for the good of the community.

The Federal Government should consider the use of special incentives for the more active participation of business and industry. Such an incentive could very well take the form of a tax credit for any business which takes untrained youngsters off the streets, trains them for useful work, and gives them jobs.

Business and industry would benefit from such a program, by having a new pool of young and vital manpower, trained to the specific needs of specific jobs. The entire community would gain, now and in future years, from the increased purchasing power of more consumers with regular incomes to spend. And Government would benefit, by turning idle boys and girls into good, producing, taxpaying citizens.

There is nothing too startling about this idea of tax incentives. Government offers increasingly liberal tax allowances for constructing new facilities—so, why not tax credits for building and training manpower? Government provides incentives in depressed areas * * * and large segments of our youth are a depressed area of society.

But I want to stress, as forcefully as I can, that no such program can hope to be successful unless it is based on a firm and unquestionable foundation of nondiscrimination. There must be no limitations of race or creed, in any place where these incentives are offered. The people's money must be used for the advantage of all the people * * * not just selected groups.

I am glad to have the opportunity to discuss this idea with a group from outside our city, because it is important to realize that the solution to the problem of untrained, jobless youth cannot affect one community alone.

Law Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, delivered a very excellent brief address at Exhibition Hall, Rockefeller Center, during the ceremonies attendant upon "Law Observance" by the Federal Bar Association. I ask unanimous consent that his very excellent and inspirational speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW OBSERVANCE

(By Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, of New York)

The history of civilizations is the history of law. The obverse is equally true. What is law, after all, but sensitivity to the rights of others—civil rights, civil liberties, personal and property rights. Where there is a wrong, there must be a remedy, and it is this search for the remedy that distinguishes civilized man from man who embraces the law of the jungle.

The Ten Commandments, the Golden Rule, the Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights in our Constitution are fundamental laws that propelled man forward.

Robert Frost said, "Good fences make good neighbors." The law is the fence that defines the rights and privileges and immunities of each of us so that we can live securely in understanding of our own rights as well as those of our neighbors. Every infraction of the law injures the fabric of society, which means it injures you as an integral part of that fabric.

To many, the concept of anarchy is attractive. Unfortunately, the facts of life belie that concept every day, if not every hour. Man has not reached that degree of perfectability. For the anarchist himself this may be an ideal state but what if his next door neighbor turns anarchist on him?

Law is the resolution of conflicting interests. Where there is a lawlessness, there is chaos, confusion, lack of definition, and more often than not, the letting of blood—indeed war.

Thus, as civilized people, we pursue the ideal, some day to realize a world of law and order where adjusting claims are achieved through the due process of law and not by way of the dust of an exploded atom bomb.

The law would be useless unless observed—as useless as whispering into the ear of a corpse. It would only be a pious declaration.

We are a government of law—not of men. All men, high or low, must respect and observe the law. No Governor like a Wallace can be above the law. As Lord Coke informed King James, there is a law above the King.

"Equal justice under the law" is the ringing slogan on the facade of the U.S. Supreme Court Building. The law must be color blind. Black and white alike must observe it. All are equal under the law.

The Usurpation of State Powers by the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, many thoughtful Americans are discussing and analyzing the development of Federal power in the last three decades. State authority has surely declined as economic dependence upon Washington has grown. The temptation of Federal funds and a desire not to be left behind in getting a share from the Federal Treasury produces long-range consequences that has weakened the will and perhaps even the ability of States to meet the needs of their own people.

This trend is discussed forcefully and well in the following editorial broadcast on June 11 by the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co. of Charlotte, N.C. I wish to recommend it for careful reading by the Congress.

In a much reviewed book, "The Coming World Transformation," Prof. Ferdinand Lundberg, of New York University, expresses the opinion that in 25 to 150 years the State governments in this country will disappear as such and become mere administrative divisions of the Federal Government' like French departments.

The idea is not new. Reviewers of the book have said that this trend began during the great depression when State governments, unable to perform the services expected of them, turned to the Federal Government for grants in aid. That explanation is true only insofar as economic dependence is concerned, because the quickest way for any government to dissipate its independence is to make itself economically dependent on another.

It is, however, unsound to believe that the States cannot perform the required services. The Federal Government has no sources of money that the States do not have, because it gets its revenue by taxing the same people. States and municipalities have found it easier to go to Washington for grants-in-aid than to perform the service themselves. They are like the sea gulls that lived on the waste from a fish cannery and starved to death when the cannery closed because they had forgotten how to catch their own fish.

This economic dependence has led to a still more insidious weakening of the State governments through questionable interpretation of the Federal Constitution. The general welfare clause, for example, has been stretched to cover almost anything the Federal Government wants to do.

The interstate commerce clause also has been pulled out of shape. The 10th amendment, which says that any powers not specifically delegated to the Federal Government are kept by the States, has been practically forgotten. That part of the fifth amendment which says that private property shall not be taken for public use without due process of law has been nullified by the withholding tax.

These are only a few examples of how the States have surrendered without a fight to the usurpation of their powers by the Federal authorities. Hardly anybody protests, because almost a fifth of the people are getting checks from the U.S. Treasury.

First they pay the money in taxes, and then they receive it back in checks for almost innumerable so-called services. They are being bribed with their own money to bypass the State government and hold out tincups to Washington.

Whether this trend has gone too far to be reversed we don't know, but at the present rate our unique system which has protected individual liberty better than any other ever devised will become like scores of all-powerful central governments under which the ordinary man is more a subject than a citizen.

Kennedy and Dictators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Greenville Piedmont, of Greenville, S.C., has printed in its June 21, 1963, issue some pertinent editorial comments on the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1963. The editorial is entitled "Kennedy and Dictators." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY AND DICTATORS

President Kennedy raised the ghost of Reconstruction in his civil rights message to Congress.

If his bill were enacted into law, it would give him and his brother, the Attorney General, dictatorial powers of the greatest magnitude, powers of grave import to every individual and business in the country, powers more immense than have ever before in this country been entrusted to two men.

Most of the weapons in the Kennedy bill were held at the throat of the South, but no region of the country would escape their effect.

Broadly, the bill would outlaw racial discrimination in stores, hotels, restaurants, theaters, and all privately owned places which serve the public.

It would outlaw discrimination in schools, jobs, and at the polling place.

It would allow the Attorney General to institute school desegregation suits on his own and would give him punitive powers of enforcement.

It would give President Kennedy the power to withhold public money for such localities as he chooses.

It would spend as much as a billion dollars on training Negroes and other untrained persons.

It would force the employment of Negroes regardless of the wishes of the employer.

The bill speaks for itself.

But there is one clear implication that lies beneath the surface of the wording. It is that the Kennedys are trying to take to themselves massive powers of enforcement, punishment, and retaliation such as this country has never seen, but which are comparable to those invested in themselves by men like Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini.

The "Slick" Approach of Red Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, if the United States is to successfully resist the relentless aggression of communism, and if the free world is to persevere through to victory, it is imperative that we understand the diverse means of Communist encroachment.

An extremely valuable article concerning the Kremlin's very dangerous, yet little appreciated, and use of oil as an instrument of aggression appeared in the April 1963 issue of the VFW American Security Reporter. As Members of this House are aware, the VFW American Security Reporter is the widely respected monthly publication of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and is devoted exclusively to startegic matters. The VFW American Security Reporter is published under the supervision of Mr. Byron B. Gentry, the national comander in chief of the VFW Mr. Gentry, a distinguished attorney and author, is a personal friend of many Members of this House.

The article I refer to is entitled, "The Slick Approach of Red Aggression," and was written by Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, USMC, retired, Director, National Security and Foreign Affairs. I believe that this article is particularly significant in that it relates the increased importance which the Soviet Union is placing on commerce as a weapon in the protracted conflict in which we are engaged.

Oil, as General Hittle points out, is a major instrument of Communist commercial warfare.

The article is exceptionally noteworthy in that it quotes extensively from a recent speech by Mr. George F. Getty II, the president of the Tidewater Oil Co. Mr. Getty is widely recognized as a leading authority on oil production, distribution, and the overall economic and strategic aspects of the petroleum industry. His remarks are particularly interesting in that they are based upon his recent observations during a month-long tour of Soviet oil areas. Mr. Getty delivered a speech in Fort Worth, Tex. The speech has been recognized as one of the most perceptive, informative, and authoritative evaluations of Soviet Russia's intentions and capabilities with respect to oil exports.

Because of the importance of this article in the VFW American Security Reporter, and the extremely valuable information contained in the excerpts from Mr. George F. Getty's speech, I commend it to the attention of Members of this House. The text of the article follows:

THE "SLICK" APPROACH OF RED AGGRESSION

The Kremlin uses every means available as weapons for furthering Red aggression. Thus, the more industrialized the Soviet Union becomes, the more diverse become the tools of conquest.

For some years following the Red Revolution in Russia, the popular caraciture of the Communist terrorist was a bushy-bearded Bolshevik with a fused bomb in each hand. But, as the Soviet Union has matured—but not mellowed—and become stronger the means of expanding the Red realm have become more diverse and subtile, and hence more dangerous.

Today the agent-provocateur of Communist aggression is no longer the wild-eyed, bomb-throwing Bolshevik. He has been supplanted in large measure by a Communist in a blue serge suit, carrying a briefcase containing sales lists and order blanks. All of this serves to underline how important commerce has become in the scheme of Red aggression. Merely because Khrushchev may have discarded Stalin's preference for cannon and tirade, and has adopted a more sophisticated emphasis upon commerce and trade, does not mean that Communist aggression is lessening or less vicious.

As the Kremlin strategists well realize, commerce is one of the most effective means to gain entry into a country, weaken its bonds of alliance to the West, and create a closer relationship with the Soviet Union.

It is in the light of these considerations that the Soviet Union's increasing use of oil as a weapon of Communist trade expansion becomes all the more important and dangerous. The Kremlin is placing constantly heavier emphasis upon oil as a weapon of economic expansion into non-Communist areas. They are doing it for two very fundamental reasons: First, because oil is an indispensable requirement for every nation in the modern world; and second, the Soviet Union has lots of oil.

One of the most informative and authoritative evaluations of Soviet oil production and export was presented by Mr. George F. Getty II, in a recent speech in Fort Worth, Tex. Mr. Getty, president of the Tidewater Oil Co., based his report on firsthand observation obtained during a month of touring Soviet oil areas.

Here are some of the key points of Mr. Getty's Fort Worth speech:

"In 15 years, from 1946 to 1962, they increased oil production from only 432,000 barrels a day to 3.3 million barrels. That's quite a jump. Some time ago, we made the same increase in our own production, but it took us 31 years from 1907 to 1939.

"With production of about 3.3 million barrels a day, in world production they are second only to our own 7 million barrels daily. And they are continuing to close the production gap. For the end of their present 7-year plan, in 1965, they have targeted production at 4.8 million barrels daily. * * *

"The Soviet Union also is expanding its merchant fleet. Soviet officials stated that luckily they don't have to build tankers because the free world has been so nice and built so many extra ones which are available at low charter rates. But we gathered from several conversations and recent reports that large tankers, 25,000 to 35,000 tons, are being constructed on the Black Sea. * * *

"I am convinced that the Soviets have used and will continue to use their abundant oil resources to expedite their own industrial expansion and to extend their political influence, undermine freedom, and spread communism in the free world.

"The Soviets crude oil production allowed them in 1953 to export 35,000 barrels a day to the free world. In 1961, this jumped to a 610,000-barrels-a-day average, or 3 percent of the free world oil demand. * * *

"Let's not kid ourselves. They are going to trade their oil for this equipment and these facilities, as well as for raw materials, food, chemicals, and other commodities from manufacturers and producers in the free world. One can't get around the fact that this trade with the Communists has been, and will be, freely entered into by many nations because, as in all enduring commercial relationships, both parties expect to benefit. Over a billion dollars worth of plant, equipment, and metal goods were sold to the Communist bloc by the free world in 1960.

"Take Italy, for example, the Soviets bartered 100,000 barrels of crude oil a day over a 5-year period—about 20 percent of the Italian oil requirements—in return for specific quantities of much needed 40-inch pipe, pumps, synthetic fibers, and other essentials. Italy picks up the oil at Black Sea ports at a price equivalent to $1 a barrel. At that price, it's hardly worth taking oil out of the ground in Texas."

The vast implications of Soviet use of oil as an instrument of aggression can be realized from Mr. Getty's remarks.

Literally and figuratively, the methods of Communist aggression are more "slick" and subtle and more pervasive than in the past.

Lincoln White, Consul General at Melbourne, Australia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I note that Lincoln White, a native of my hometown of Chattanooga, is leaving his position in the Department of State in Washington to become consul general at Melbourne, Australia.

I would like to take this opportunity to wish Mr. White well in his new assignment and to commend him warmly for the outstanding job he has done as chief spokesman in this vital branch of our Government. I think that the editorial which appeared in the Knoxville News Sentinel expresses the high esteem in which Lincoln White has always been held by all those who have had contact with him.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINC WHITE'S CREDO

In his years in Washington chief State Department spokesman Lincoln White has had one credo: Never knowingly to mislead a newsman seeking facts.

That is a difficult credo for a Government press agent—and especially for one whose daily fare is in the woolly world of foreign policy. But a generation of grateful reporters can testify that Linc White has observed it well.

Now Linc, at 57, is leaving the Capital to be consul general at Melbourne, Australia. We don't know exactly what that entails. But we do know Linc will do a good job. And that any American in Melbourne who calls up his consul at 3 a.m. with an excited question will get a straight and factual answer delivered in a calm Tennessee drawl. (Mr. White is a native of Chattanooga.)

The 200th Anniversary of Warwick, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to call the attention of my colleagues to a birthday of considerable significance that is being celebrated this year, 1963—the 200th anniversary of the founding of the town of Warwick, Mass. The celebration of the anniversary of any birthday is a noteworthy event, yet the anniversary of the incorporation of this outstanding Massachusetts community commands special consideration for Warwick's record of civic achievement extends back into history to pre-Revolutionary days.

The original territory of Warwick consisted of a tract of land granted in 1735 to the descendants of 39 soldiers who took part in the Canadian expedition of 1690. The men were under the command of Capt. Andrew Gardner. All of them except Samuel Newell perished on the expedition. The grant was known as Roxbury Canada and Gardner's Canada until the incorporation of the tract as the town of Warwick.

The first meeting of the proprietors was held at the house of James Jarvis in Roxbury on September 22, 1736. A committee was chosen to lay out the house lots, each lot to contain not less than 50 nor more than 60 acres.

Although the lots were laid out as early as 1737, they remained unsettled until shortly before 1744. The exact date of the first settlement is not known because the proprietors' records were lost for several years. Among the first settlers were Joseph Goodell, Samuel Bennett, Deacon James Ball, Amos Marsh, Solomon Eager, Thomas Rich, Moses Leonard, Col. Samuel Williams, Deacon Silas Towne, Col. Joseph Mayo, Caleb Mayo, Capt. John Goldsbury, Mark Moore, and Jonathan Moore.

It can be assumed that the settlement did not proceed rapidly because in 1749 the proprietors offered a bounty of £20 to each settler, £10 to be paid in advance, £5 after 1 year, and £5 at the end of the second year. In 1751 the bounty was increase to £30. This action resulted in an increase in the number of inhabitants, and in 1753 the proprietors raised £50 to build a sawmill, chose a committee to build a meeting house, and named another committee to lay out and clear a road to Pequeage.

The sawmill committee contracted with Ebenezer Locke to erect the structure but was dissuaded from the undertaking by reports of Indian depredations. A second attempt to build the mill was successful and it was put in operation in 1759. In the same year £26 13s. 4d. was appropriated to build a gristmill. It was located on Black Brook, and was completed in 1761.

On July 6, 1757, the proprietors appropriated £8 "to fortify Mr. Samuel Scott's house, by making a good, picketed fort, encompassing the same 4 rods square, for the safety of the inhabitants." This fort was the only one ever built in Warwick.

On December 3, 1760, the First Congregational church was organized with 26 members. On the same day, the Reverend Lemuel Hedge, a graduate of Harvard in 1759, was ordained as the first pastor. Suspected of Tory sympathies during the Revolution, he was persecuted relentlessly and died in 1777. His successor, the Reverend Samuel Reed, settled in 1779 and served as pastor until his death in 1812. After Mr. Reed's death the church became Unitarian and the Reverend Preserved Smith was pastor from 1814 until 1844. The Second Congregational Church was organized in 1829 with 30 members. The Baptist Church was set off from Royalston and organized as a separate church in 1843.

On December 27, 1762, the proprietors of the tract joined with the inhabitants in petitioning the General Court to designate the plantation as a town, and on February 17, 1763, the town was incorporated. The name of the town has been ascribed to a desire to honor Warwick, England, or Guy, Earl of Warwick, but there is no record to establish definitely the origin of the name. The first town meeting was held on May 9, 1763, with Seth Field as moderator.

When the tract was granted to the original owners in 1735, 1 of the 63 equal shares of land was ordered set apart for schools. The first move made by the town toward the support of education was in 1768, when £10 was appropriated for that purpose. It was decided to have a moving school, with a master in the winter and a mistress in the summer. The first teacher seems to have been Mrs. Hannah Rawson, who was employed to teach the summer school at 4 s. 6 d. per week.

Warwick took an active part in our revolutionary struggle. In September 1774 the town meeting voted to procure for the town a stock of powder and lead, and "to adhere strictly to our chartered rights and privileges and to defend them to the utmost of our capacity, and that we will be in readiness to afford relief forthwith should our brethren in Boston or elsewhere be distressed by troops sent to enforce a compliance with the unconstitutional and oppressive acts of the British Parliament."

In the autumn of the same year, 25 Warwick men joined a company of Minutemen organized at Northfield under the command of Capt. Eldad Wright. They marched to Cambridge with the company soon after the clash at Lexington and Concord.

The majority of the people of Warwick were opposed to the War of 1812, but the town sent a number of volunteers into the armed service. Warwick furnished 79 soldiers in the Civil War, 26 of whom died in the service.

Warwick is largely an agricultural area. However it has had various industrial enterprises at different times throughout its history. Among those industries were sawmills, shops for the processing of wooden articles, a boot factory, and a short-lived glass plant.

This year Warwick pauses to review its past with pride. Patriotic devotion to American ideals is not measured by size alone. In the two centuries that have passed, Warwick has exemplified much that is best in our American heritage.

Democrats Make Pitch for Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose herewith an editorial from the Cheraw Chronicle, Cheraw, S.C., of June 20, 1963:

DEMOCRATS MAKE PITCH FOR YOUTH

There are differences between the Democratic and Republican parties, differences that mean a lot to the average citizen in a semirural, low-income county such as Chesterfield.

Yet the Democratic Party of South Carolina faces a big challenge from Republicans because its leaders have failed to teach party principles to young people coming up from the ranks.

We are concerned about this complacent, lazy, self-satisfied attitude of Democrats. The party needs the enthusiasm and idealism of youth.

We must enlist their loyalty at the precinct level. We can get it if we seek it. We can also lose it by default to the Republicans.

The Democrats stand to lose much because they are entrenched in power. There are too many old political leaders jealous of their powers and privileges. If we deprive young men and women of an opportunity to serve, they will go where they can.

There is no reason why we should permit Republicans to lay claim to middle-class young men and women—the type to head up civic clubs and own their own businesses, the natural leaders of the community. Yet we see more and more young people of the managerial class swing over into the GOP column.

This must come from a lack of understanding on their part of basic political principles separating the two great parties. The Democrats—traditionally the do-something party—ought to exert the strongest attraction to energetic, idealistic young folks.

We suggest precinct-level organization, county dinners, and other meetings to organize Chesterfield County. County Chairman Jones, take note.

West Virginia Gaining in the Battle for Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the struggle to achieve full employment in our Nation is largely a struggle to develop new industries. My State of West Virginia, I am proud to say, is playing a significant part in this struggle.

The story of the all-out effort the Mountain State is making to attract new industry is related in an article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Sunday Gazette-Mail. The article tells how West Virginians are using sound business methods rather than "gimmicks," to accomplish this goal.

A bold advertising campaign is underway to point up the industrial potential of West Virginia. Research facilities are blazing a path to new manufacturing opportunities. And a strengthened State department of commerce is using bond issues to finance recreational parks and other facilities to make factory sites desirable from the point of view of employees and their families.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE MAKING GAINS IN BATTLE FOR INDUSTRY

There is a fight going on all over the United States 24 hours a day. It is for new industry that brings new payrolls and prosperity.

In it, city is pitted against city, county against county, State against State, and even region against region.

West Virginia is involved and uses all of the standard weapons, although some of them have just recently been acquired through legislation.

Heading the campaign for the State is the new commerce department, an outgrowth of the old industrial and publicity commission, a shoestring operation, and an industrial development authority that was just getting started when it was absorbed by commerce in 1961.

Commerce Commissioner Hulett C. Smith believes in using all the standard methods, but not gimmicks like tax exemptions, gifts and writeoffs. His philosophy is this:

"We use what we consider reasonable and prudent attractions for industry that are fair, not only to new industry but to those already here. We offer, with revenue bonds, and through the industrial development loans, whatever financial assistance is necessary to keep us competitive. And they do keep us competitive.

"Our tax limitation amendment on excess levies means our tax base is pretty well set. To a businessman, this stability in our tax structure means he will know what he's buying in West Virginia and that his tax bill will stay reasonably close to what it is when he comes here.

"Basically, if it takes a gimmick to get a prospect, you'll find you haven't gained a solid, responsible firm. Responsible firms, like responsible citizens, are opposed to gimmicks."

Through the industrial development authority, an industrial prospect can get a new factory, and equipment. Operated by the State, the IDA makes loans to local business development groups which, in turn, build plants and lease them to industry. The industry arranges the rest of its financing through private sources and/or Federal agencies.

Under a recent act of the legislature, the commerce department was put on equal footing with some of its competing neighbors in surrounding States. This act permits governmental subdivisions to issue revenue bonds to construct industrial parks and factory-inducing facilities.

As in all such enterprises, advertising plays a leading role, and the Commerce Department each year spends $175,000 in newspapers, magazines, and on radio and television. Just a few years ago, such a sum was unthinkable.

Just recently, the Department paid the New York Times $15,000 as its share of the cost of a special magazine supplement, devoted entirely to West Virginia and its industrial potential. A full-page ad ran in the Wall Street Journal, showing successful American businessmen, well known to Wall Street, but perhaps unknown as native West Virginians.

In addition to the advertising, the Commerce Department has access to research facilities at West Virginia University and Marshall University, to help any industrial prospect with just about any technological problem.

WVU is making a study now on the manufacture of glue laminated beams and new clay products. The wood study is part of a large program intended to inspire new industrial development based on the State's abundance of hardwoods, now processed chiefly in other States.

But all of these things—the tax structure, the advertising, the loans, the bonds and the research—are merely weapons to be used by the hard core of the State's industrial development efforts.

This is the staff of trained, professional people who make up the Commerce Department's industrial development division. They are the ones who handle the contacts produced by the advertising and furnished by utilities and railroads which are as interested as the State in bringing in new payrolls.

They show the visitors the available sites and explain what the State and the communities can do for them.

This is a typical monthly report of the division, compiled last winter, one of the State's worst on record:

Number of industrialists who expressed an interest in locating plants in West Virginia, 25; number of new contacts, 8; number of visits made to firms outside West Virginia, 4; number of inspection trips by industrialists to West Virginia, 2, and number of communities shown to prospects, 9.

That same month, as a result of similar efforts in preceding months, five firms announced new manufacturing facilities. They ranged from a small one employing 5 persons at Berkeley Springs to 1 employing 50 persons at Paw Paw.

In the same month, the division assisted in getting access roads for two industrial sites, organized a local industrial development corporation, got a new tenant for a closed plant, and obtained a building for a new plant.

The following month, also in the dead of winter, was a bellringer. Five firms, with a total employment of 500, decided to come to West Virginia, all as a result of groundwork laid months before.

The Black Code of 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate a most incisive analysis of the President's proposed civil rights program for 1963. The editorial from the June 21, 1963, issue of the Columbia Record is entitled "The Black Code of 1963," a most appropriate title not only for the editorial, but for the President's proposed program.

Mr. President, this program, if approved by the Congress, would impose a new Reconstruction period not only on the people of the South, but on all the people of this Nation because this legislation would restrict the liberties of all Americans in an effort to appease disorderly mob actions which serve best of all the cause of the forces of communism.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BLACK CODE OF 1963

"All human error is impatience, a premature renunciation of method."—FRANZ KAFKA.

Reading President Kennedy's proposals for legislation and announcement of forthcoming Executive actions on Negro grievances, and reflecting upon their consequences, is an astonishing experience. Those analysts who have immediately assessed the Kennedy program as the most radical since Reconstruction do not exaggerate; in fact, they are engaging in classic Anglo-Saxon understatement.

The Kennedy "black code of 1963" so far exceeds in scope and effect the original Reconstruction legislation that historians might be forced to rename the radical laws as "the gray code."

Whereas radical Thaddeus Stevens a century ago howled that "the whole fabric of southern society must be changed," President Kennedy demands that the entire social fabric of the Nation, not just a region, be forever altered.

Although in his message to Congress he paid lipservice to moderation and persuasion, he failed to compromise one jot or tittle with either Republicans or southern Democrats.

If the Congress adopts his legislative proposals, these—coupled with his announced Executive actions—will insure that (1) the full force of the Federal Government will be mobilized to enforce the removal of racial distinctions from all areas of public and private life with the possible exceptions of the home and the church; (2) all remaining vestiges of State and local power remaining in American democracy will vanish under the radiation in meaning of the commerce clause; (3) the right of private property will become forever subject to the changing whim of the central government; and (4) morality, a property of private conscience, will become eternally subject to the full coercive power of government.

Quite clearly, when the President said that "race has no place in American life," he meant it.

What would be the effect in South Carolina of the proposed legislation and Executive acts? Public schools would be swiftly integrated, private businesses would be compelled to make all of their facilities immediately available to Negroes, a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission would insist upon nondiscriminatory hiring of employees, almost all housing would be immediately available to Negro purchasers, all agencies and individuals receiving any Federal funds in this State would be forbidden to discriminate directly or indirectly, job training and literacy programs and schools would be expanded under Federal control.

In addition, for all complaints of a racial nature not expressly covered by law (refusal of a private country club, for example, to admit a Negro) would be referred to the President's catchall Community Relations Service.

To make the effects of the 1963 black code even more understandable, these things will happen:

Attorney General Kennedy could decide when and to what extent the schools of Anderson, Columbia, Charleston or Clarendon would be integrated.

A barbershop or a beauty parlor would not be allowed to turn away Negro customers.

A restaurant, hotel, theater or department store would not be allowed to refuse service to Negroes.

A homeowner or contractor or real estate agency could not refuse to sell any home to a Negro simply because of race.

An employer could not turn down a Negro applicant for employment solely because of race.

And all programs in this State receiving any Federal funds whatsoever would not be allowed to discriminate, in any fashion, without losing their Federal funds.

Although the President speaks of local action and individual responsibility, his total program leaves little—if anything—for local communities to do, except in the area of purely private activities. (What these now are, one can hardly know.)

Were the President not an impatient and impetuous man, many of the problems of the current Negro passion could have been and would have been solved locally. He himself recognized that "the response of the American people of this (an earlier) appeal to their principles and obligations has been reassuring. Private progress * * * has been marked * * * Local biracial committees, under private and public sponsorship, have mushroomed."

But the President has abandoned persuasion and cooperation and has substituted coercion. Responsibility in 1963 demanded of the President less passion and more reason in his legislative proposals; counsel to the Negro community that his noble address on the obligations of the Nation to law included the Negro citizens, as well as whites; and, above all, patience. Men who live by law must be patient.

Tampering With the Form of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of June 25, 1963:

TAMPERING WITH THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT

When a great many people find themselves deeply disturbed by the course of their government, it is natural that they should cast about for ways to alter it. And when they think themselves frustrated at the ballot box, it is understandable if they are tempted to alter the form of government itself.

It is this feeling of frustration, we think, that has led a good many people to support three amendments to the U.S. Constitution, each of which would make a major change not merely in the Nation's law but in the way in which its law is made and carried out.

One of these, for example, would change the amending clause of the Constitution itself. Whereas now the State legislatures are only ratifying bodies, they would hereafter be able to propose constitutional amendments directly and then ratify their own proposals. The effect would be to make it easier to change the Constitution for whatever passing political purpose.

The second suggested amendment would take away from the Supreme Court jurisdiction over any case relating to the apportionment of seats in a State legislature. The third would abolish entirely the Supreme Court's role as the final adjudicator of the Constitution by superimposing upon it a 50-judge "Court of the Union" with the power to review and reverse many decisions of the present Supreme Court.

Now none of these proposals, we think, are as horrendous as their opponents claim. A system which permits State legislatures, or two-thirds of them, to propose Constitutional amendments is as logical a method as the present one where they originate in Congress or in a special constitutional convention. It might just as well have been adopted by the original framers as the one they finally chose.

So too might the original framers have vested the supreme judicial authority in a court composed of judges chosen in a different manner from the way in which they are presently selected. Whether there be nine judges or 50 is less important than that such a court exist and that it be independent of the other branches of the Government.

Yet for all of that, it does not seem to us that these are wise proposals. Those who advocate them mistake both the cause of their complaint and the nature of the remedy. More, they misunderstand the central virtue of the Constitution itself.

The complaint behind each of these proposals is, in essence, the growth of Federal power over the power of the States, and in particular the power of the Federal judiciary, where five men out of nine can turn the law upside down overnight.

There is substance in the complaint, but there is already no lack of remedies. All along two-thirds of the State legislatures have had the power to initiate limiting constitutional amendments to the Federal power had they so been moved; they can call a constitutional convention at any time. All along the people have had the power to elect to Congress men who would restrain the Federal power. All along the States have had the power to so act themselves as to forestall these encroachments of the Federal power.

We think it regrettable, but we think it is true that the Nation has passed through a generation in which the people as a whole have acquiesced in, and often even encouraged, this enlargement of the Central Government beyond any true needs. The fault, if that it be, lies not with the form of our governmental institutions but rather with the political impulses given to those institutions.

In any event, the mechanism for amending the Constitution can hardly be charged with rendering that document immune to the changes which the people have desired. It has been changed 23 times. Four other amendments (one of which is still pending) have met their bars not in Congress but in the State legislatures.

As for the Supreme Court, it is certainly not heartening to see its judges splitting in every direction, frequently reversing themselves, and sometimes snarling at each other in public like disgruntled schoolboys. It is disheartening to see the law often left in disarray.

But this too is a public fault—the fault of Presidents treating judgeships as presents for political friends, of Senators willing to confirm them, and of people unaroused to loud protest until the judges hand down a decision that dismays them. In short, the failings of the Supreme Court are the failings of men. And the judges of any new "Court of the Union" would be no less men, no less politically chosen.

Therein is the mistake in all these proposals. It is one thing to change the substantive law of the Constitution—to put in prohibition, or take it out—when the people will have it so. It is something else to make political frustration of the moment an excuse for tinkering with the forms of government that have served us so long so well.

But Some People Simply Never Get the Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the successful launching into space of a Russian woman, Valentina Tereshkova, is among other things, an answer to the viewpoint that a woman's place is in the home.

It demonstrates that homemakers can also be spacemakers and that the capacities and capabilities of American women have not yet been fully recognized.

This month, Congress sent to President Kennedy an equal-pay-for-women bill. This bill was signed into law. This small terrestrial step at long last placed the American woman in equal wage status as American men—a move that long ago had been accomplished in other nations of the Western industrial world.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I introduce in the RECORD excerpts from an article in the June 28, 1963, issue of Life magazine that was written by Clare Boothe Luce

entitled "But Some People Simply Never Get the Message":

But Some People Simply Never Get the Message

(By Clare Boothe Luce)

Why did the Soviet Union launch a woman cosmonaut into space? Failure of American men to give the right answer to this question may yet prove to be their costliest cold war blunder. But already they are giving the wrong answers.

The first wrong answer is coming from U.S. "space experts." According to the press, they hold—to a man—the view that Valentina Tereshkova was fired from the launching pad as a Soviet space program female guinea pig, and that the experiment is useless, at least for the foreseeable future.

Harold M. Schmeck, Jr., writing in the New York Times, reported: "If space exploration continues to grow * * * women are considered likely to play a part in it over the long range * * * but there appears to be no hard evidence that female physiology or psychology would confer any special advantages on a woman space traveler * * *." Astronaut John Glenn commented more cautiously that "so far we felt the qualifications we were looking for * * * were best taken care of by men." An unidentified NASA spokesman gave much stronger vent to his prejudices. He said that the talk of an American space woman "makes me sick at my stomach."

The second wrong answer, stemming from the first (the inherent superiority of men as astronauts), is that the Russians launched Valentina as a propaganda gimmick. Lt. Gen. Leighton Davis, commander of the Air Force Missile Test Center at Cape Canaveral, dismissed the flight as "merely a publicity stunt."

It is easy for the American male to dismiss Russia's thrust of a woman cosmonaut into space as propaganda. The advertising fraternity has long used sex to sell everything from deodorants to automobiles. It is easy for Americans to assume that once again "sexiness" has rung the bell: the flight of the seagull has made far bigger world headlines than a solo flight of the hawk would have done.

But neither the answer that Valentina Tereshkova is a scientific guinea pig of small worth or that she is the Moscow version of Madison Avenue's sexy publicity gimmicks is the right answer. The right answer is that Soviet Russia put a woman into space because communism preaches and, since the revolution of 1917, has tried to practice the inherent equality of men and women.

The progress of women in all Communist countries, but especially in the U.S.S.R., has been spectacular. In 1929 there were but 3,118,000 Soviet women who earned wages and salaries; in 1961 there were 31,609,000. In 1917, Russia had 600 women engineers; by 1961 there were 379,000, or 31 percent of all the engineers in the U.S.S.R. In 1961, 53 percent of the professional people in the Soviet Union were women. Of the total membership of the Supreme Soviet today, 26 percent are women. Some 20,000 village Soviets are headed by women.

But the brightest example of women's advance in Russia has been in the medical profession. Of all Russian doctors and surgeons, 74 percent are women—332,400 women physicians in 1962, while last year the AMA listed only a little more than 14,000 in the United States.

The Communist system confronts the American system in a life-and-death struggle. Russia's men know it; so do her women. They do a far greater amount of manual or heavy labor than American women do. Many visitors returning from the Soviet Union point to the numbers of women who are mixing cement, driving buses, pitching hay, sweeping streets. Russian leadership utilizes to the utmost the brainpower and the muscle power of Russian women at every level of society.

It is against this background of the participation of Russian women in every effort, from sweeping the stables to combing the stars, that we must view the flight of the first woman cosmonaut.

The astronaut of today is the world's most prestigious popular idol. Once launched into space he holds in his hands something far more costly and precious than the millions of dollars' worth of equipment in his capsule; he holds the prestige and the honor of his country. These have been entrusted to him because he is deemed to possess high technical skills and even higher virtues of intelligence, endurance, resourcefulness, discipline, courage, and the capacity to make life-and-death decisions. But the astronaut is also something else: he is the symbol of the way of life of his nation.

In entrusting a 26-year-old girl with a cosmonaut mission, the Soviet Union has given its women unmistakable proof that it believes them to possess these same virtues. The flight of Valentina Tereshkova is, consequently, symbolic of the emancipation of the Communist woman. It symbolizes to Russian women that they actively share (not passively bask, like American women) in the glory of conquering space.

News reports after Valentina's blast-off said that women were dancing in the streets of Moscow while men hurled compliments and showered kisses upon them. Not so in America. The flight has become a source of bitter argument between the sexes. Miss Jerrie Cobb, one of the 13 American women pilots who have passed tests for space flights—not including the hurdle of male prejudice—warned NASA, and then the U.S. Congress a year ago, that Russia was preparing to put a woman in orbit. She said that she has been a consultant to NASA since 1961. But this high-woman-on-the-token-pole added acidly, "I'm the most unconsulted consultant in any Government agency."

Another woman pilot who has passed astronaut tests, Jane Hart, wife of Michigan's Senator PHILIP A. HART, said even more bitterly, "I'm tempted to go out to the barn and tell the whole story to my horse and listen to him laugh."

It is estimated that Elizabeth Taylor, America's current female idol, will bring $60 million clinking into the tills of 20th Century-Fox. But few who understand women can doubt that Junior Lt. Valentina Tereshkova delivered a performance of far greater value to at least 60 million Russians.

Why Aircraft Firms Came to West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, when my State of West Virginia set out to persuade aircraft firms to locate new plants within its borders, many persons were skeptical. They asked the question, "Why should aircraft manufacturers want to set up shop on such rugged terrain, when they have all the flatlands of the West at their disposal?"

This question is answered fully in an article in the June 16, 1963, issue of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail. Offsetting the more favorable terrain and climate of the West is the factor of labor personnel. The two aircraft manufacturers, Lockheed and North American, which built plants in West Virginia, were convinced that workers in West Virginia had a zeal and enthusiasm for their work that is highly desirable in a precision industry.

This healthy working morale, together with an alert and responsible civic leadership, provided the impetus that brought the aircraft industry to the West Virginia cities of Clarksburg and Princeton. Mr. President, I believe the story told in this article in the Gazette-Mail provides a valuable lesson for all communities seeking industrialization. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Two Aircraft Firms Located in West Virginia Despite Common Belief Mountains Precluded It

Nobody would look at mountainous West Virginia and associate this State with the manufacture of aircraft. That's for the plains of Texas and Kansas, and the deserts of California.

But, the truth is, two of the giants of the industry looked at West Virginia, liked what they saw, and are now dues-paying mountaineers.

They are Lockheed and North American, each with a plant at opposite ends of the State, and both reported doing well. Just as important, they are employing West Virginians who have adapted themselves to an industry none believed would come here.

Lockheed, with about 225 on the payroll, is building parts for the C–130 Hercules at Clarksburg, part of a $1-billion contract that is the largest such pact in the history of the Federal Government. And the size of the contract indicates Lockheed will be busy in West Virginia for a long time.

Down at Princeton, at the southern end of the turnpike, North American is making electronic guidance control systems for the Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile. It employs about 300 persons.

Both companies started operations last year and, the question is: Why did they decide to come here?

Two West Virginia Governors, a Democrat and a Republican, traveled to California in past years in an effort to get some of the moguls of the aircraft industry to take a look at West Virginia. Gov. William C. Marland tried it in 1955, Gov. Cecil H. Underwood in 1960.

Without question, both succeeded to the extent that the industry was made aware of West Virginia as the source of a large, intelligent, available labor pool.

And they had a sentimental factor in their favor, as far as North American was concerned, in that the late board chairman of that firm, James H. (Dutch) Kindleberger, was a native of Wheeling.

For all that, North American didn't come rushing to this State, but waited until 1961 to send a survey team of executives here to study such aspects as local manufacturing capabilities, transportation facilities, and the availability of labor and skills.

The same year, the Federal Government gave a preference, in defense contracts, to those companies that would do part of the contract work in States where unemployment was chronic. In addition, the Government also agreed to underwrite the cost of retraining the unemployed for defense work.

But there are many depressed areas in the United States besides West Virginia, and there are many communities in West Virginia with available and willing labor pools.

Thomas L. Regan, manager of North American's Princeton plant, gave this insight to his firm's decision to locate there, saying:

"In the original (survey) report of May 3, 1961, each of 12 West Virginia communities was evaluated on all the points I have mentioned. For the Bluefield-Princeton area of Mercer County there was this observation: 'Alert civic leaders anxious to attract new industry.' This does not mean that such a condition was lacking in other communities, and in fact, a similar observation was made for at least one other locality. Nor do I mean to say that community spirit was the deciding factor. But we probably would not have located here without it.

"Now, any community can make promises; they are not very expensive. But it is most important to note that the people whom we contacted in Mercer County not only gave repeated expressions of the desire to cooperate, but followed through in a most thorough manner * * * This cooperation prevailed not only before we were committed to this area by the purchase of property, but has continued with undiminished enthusiasm since that time."

Regan also gave an assist to the State government, particularly the Commerce Department and the State Road Commission. Improvements were needed in access roads and bridges to the plant site. When these needs were made known to the State officials, Regan said, "workmen labored overtime and on weekends to surface these roads and complete an important bridge crossing."

Regan gave this endorsement to West Virginia labor:

"It was our sincere regret that we were unable to offer enough openings for all who applied. But it is a matter of deep gratification to us that our employees here have been excellent performers; company morale is high; and many of the first employees hired have since been promoted to supervisory posts."

Very kind words are these, but there is more to them than their ego-tickling qualities. For, as Regan also pointed out, the future of the plant, including its rate of possible expansion, depends on its record of efficiency and quality.

Lockheed has had much the same experience. But, unlike North American it did not have to build its plant, and therein lies one of its main reasons for locating in West Virginia.

There was a mine machinery factory in Harrison County, owned and operated by a West Virginia firm that sold out to an out-of-State company, leaving the building without a tenant.

Harrison County industry seekers went after that site with the same enthusiasm and zeal as did the people of Mercer County. And, when Lockheed got down to a choice of places, that building, plus the labor pool, training facilities, and preference for an economically depressed area weighted the scales in favor of West Virginia.

What Next?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Union Daily Times, Union, S.C.:

WHAT NEXT?

Despite denials, the Supreme Court of the United States has taken a further step toward eliminating God from our public life. It has ruled that it is unconstitutional to ask for His help and guidance and to read from His word in public schools.

Most were not surprised at the decision of the Court in light of its ruling of about a year ago concerning a nonsectarian prayer. However many are wondering what the next step will be. Will Congress and courts dispense with all reference to God in their activities; will they eliminate openinging prayers, the invocation of God's guidance upon their activities? Will we rewrite our pledge of allegiance to the flag? Will we eliminate the reference to God in the coin of the realm?

The decision of the Court represents another of its tragic decisions wherein they are allowing a minority to rule. They have centered on one part of the provision of the Constitution, that against the establishment of religion, and have forsaken the other provision that guarantees the free exercise thereof. We do not have freedom of religion, but freedom from religion and unless the Christian people rise up and correct the situation it will get worse. If the Constitution does in truth deny this right, then it must be changed.

In their efforts to appease the communistic element and the small group of loud-mouthed atheists, they have denied the rights of the majority. How long will we as citizens of this Nation or God in His rulership of the creation, continue to allow them to sit in judgment? They have gone so far afield that they have forgotten that their power to judge has its origin in the gift of God and that the ruler of this universe will hold them accountable for the judgments they make upon this earth.

It will be a fearful thing for them when they face the Creator with the decision they have made, denying the right of children and teachers to seek God's guidance and to read from His Holy Word. It is an ungodly decision that cannot and must not stand.

Kennedy's Turn Toward Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, The Indianapolis Star of Indianapolis, Ind., has printed in its June 16, 1963, issue an outstanding editorial analysis of the President's June 10 address at American University on the subject of U.S. foreign policy in the cold war. The editorial is entitled "Kennedy's Turn Toward Peace" and I ask unanimous consent that this be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY'S TURN TOWARD PEACE

"We do not negotiate on the basis of the give-and-take-principle. We have nothing whatsoever to give—we will not make any concessions because our proposals do not form the basis of a barter deal." Nikita Khrushchev, Tirana, Albania, May 1959.

World peace will be achieved by "a gradual evolution of human institutions in a series of concrete actions and effective agreements which are in the interests of all concerned," President John F. Kennedy at the American University, Washington, D.C., June 10, 1963.

The contrast between these two statements is clear. The Soviet leader has no intention of negotiating any agreement with us except when we make concessions. The President will seek new agreements without demanding concessions. The President hopes that Khrushchev will find areas in which it will be to his interest to grant concessions. Khrushchev knows that he does not have to grant concessions before the negotiations begin. His position, often stated is "What is mine is mine, what is yours is negotiable."

But the President doesn't listen to Khrushchev. He listens to those "useful idiots" who surround him and keep telling him that "Khrushchev is mellowing," that communism is becoming less savage, that if we will just be nice to Khrushchev he will be nice to us.

He has embarked on a 180-degree turn in American foreign policy—a turn from containment to appeasement. He has told us that Americans must now "reexamine their attitude toward three fundamental international issues; world peace, Soviet Russia, and the cold war."

"No government or social system is so evil," he said, "that its people must be considered as lacking in virtue." Americans and Russians "have many traits in common" and "the strongest of which is the mutual abhorrence of war."

What, may we ask, has this got to do with U.S. relations with the Soviet government? The government of Russia does not represent the poeple of Russia. Doesn't the President know this yet? Does he really think that the vicious Kadar government in Hungary represents the Hungarian people? Does he really think that any Communist government is representative of the people it subdues and governs?

Where was Mr. Kennedy when Soviet troops marched into Hungary? Where was he when Soviet arms were killing American soldiers and Marines in Korea? What "constructive changes within the Communist bloc" has he seen that make him believe that we can make agreements with the Communists "which now seem beyond us?"

Where was Mr. Kennedy when Premier Krushchev launched his vitriolic attack on President Eisenhower in Paris—right after the sweetness and light of the Spirit of Camp David? Does he now propose a new spirit of Washington that is supposed to last longer than the spirit of Camp David or the spirit of Geneva that preceeded it?

The President is often pictured as a student of history. What history? Certainly not recent history of Communist pact and promise. He speaks of "effective agreements" with the Communists. We have signed 52 agreements with the Soviet Union in the last 20 years and they have broken 50 of them. What gives the President the idea that any future agreements will be more effective—a few secret letters from Khrushchev?

The President is doing exactly what the Communists want him to do. This is obvious from the high praise his speech is getting in Pravda and Izvestia and the whole claque of Communist publications and officials of Eastern Europe. As Star Foreign Editor Michael Padev reported Friday, Communist praises for his statesmanlike view are fulsome in all Communist countries.

The President is holding out his hand—and ours—in a gesture of peace and good will. Roosevelt did this and got a stab in the back for his pains. Truman did it and got the Korean war. Eisenhower did it and got insulted and vilified before the whole world for his trouble. Mr. Kennedy tried it in Vienna while Khrushchev planned his missile bases in Cuba.

Can't President Kennedy learn anything from this?

Suppose it were Hitler to whom the President were addressing his "turn toward peace." Does the President really believe that Khrushchev is any different from Hitler, that he will keep an agreement any more reliably than Hitler? Khrushchev has murdered as many people as Hitler and enslaved millions more. Why should he be trusted when you look at his record of treachery, aggression, and enslavement?

Mr. Kennedy is living in a dreamworld contrived by his coterie of intellectuals who believe that "Khrushchev is mellowing." Because he and the American people hope for peace he concludes that Khrushchev, along with his people hopes for peace. On what grounds? Where is the evidence? In Soviet slave camps? In Hungary? In Russian controlled Cuba? On what does he base his wishful thoughts?

The President has said he wants to avoid, from now on, any more "confrontations." He is thus telling Khrushchev in advance that he can threaten us but we will not do anything to counter that threat—to avoid a nuclear holocaust." In future negotiations he has promised to make concessions. Khruschev has promised nothing. He will now give nothing since he knows he doesn't have to.

The President now proposes to offer peace to a regime that has publicly declared war on American freedom and all that it stands for. He has shut his eyes to the history of brutality, ruthlessness, amorality, aggressiveness, cunning, and bloody-handed tyranny that has already conquered by subversion and terror a third of the world.

The only kind of peace the Kremlin will offer us is the peace of surrender.

Will President Kennedy, like his predecessors, reach for peace through the surrender of more people's liberties?

Let us pray that he does not.

Housing Program on Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, an article in the Sunday magazine section of the June 2 issue of the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune called attention to a new housing program on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation. The article described it as "one of the most unique housing programs ever undertaken in Montana."

This program is a good example of how many citizens of my State have welcomed their Federal Government as a partner in their efforts to help themselves. This is the type of working relationship that I like to see between the people and their government, for it will result soon in new, low-rent homes for families now living in substandard housing.

It was the Housing Act of 1961 which made this program of community development possible. It was the initiative of the Fort Peck Tribal Council that put the program to work for residents of the reservation. A loan and contributions contract between the Fort Peck Housing Authority and the Public Housing Administration calls for construction of 40 low-rent homes at a total development cost of $598,510. The work is being done under a two-fold financial aid contract—including a maximum Federal loan of $538,659. The second provision of the contract is for annual contributions by the Government to help keep rents within the reach of low-income families.

This program, and others like it, are helping to ease the twin problems of joblessness and substandard housing plaguing so many of the Indian reservations of our Nation. The Fort Peck Indians are to be commended for their efforts to eliminate substandard housing on their reservation. They are showing through this and other programs that the Government can be a strong partner in the big job of improving their living conditions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Great Falls Tribune article, written by Mr. R. H. Scherger and describing the housing program on the Port Peck Indian Reservation, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORT PECK RESERVATION INDIANS LAUNCH PROGRAM TO PROVIDE LOW-RENT HOUSING FOR TRIBE MEMBERS

POPLAR.—One of the most unique housing programs ever undertaken in Montana is underway on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation.

Twenty houses now under construction at Poplar, utilizing Public Housing Administration funds, will provide low rental dwellings for Indian families.

Plans call for 20 more to be built in Wolf Point, and an additional 15 homes for Indian senior citizens will be built later this year at both Poplar and Wolf Point. There is a possibility the total number of homes to be built under the program will exceed the 55 now planned for.

Appointment of a five-member housing authority committee by the Fort Peck Tribal Council was the initial step in getting the program launched. Committee members are Norman Hollow, Eva Mae Smith, Clifford Knutson, Robert Penner, and Bill Youpee, who was named chairman.

An architect from Montana was chosen, with approval of the PHA, and under direction of the committee plans were drawn for the family units. Tom Smith, a tribal member, was chosen tribal contracting officer. Lou Street, a local building contractor, was hired as general construction superintendent, and Tom Mulloy of Anaconda was hired as project foreman. Under special provisions of the project, tribal members may be hired to do the actual construction work, and presently all the laborers and craftsmen working on the project are Indians.

A special force account provision in the program permits the contracting officer to hold material bid lettings whenever necessary. Each letting is advertised and the final results have proven that suppliers vie keenly to furnish materials required.

The program is helping alleviate two problems that have long plagued the reservation—adequate housing and unemployment.

Other reservations are investigating the possibilities of FHA- and GI-insured loan programs. Many of the tribes have recceived funds from oil, gas, and land leases. These moneys have been put into revolving funds with the result that any responsible member of the tribe may borrow to remodel or build a house. He repays the loan at reasonable interest.

Also in the initial development stage is a new self-help program that permits the individual to build his own home. Families may also joint together to erect homes for each member of the group and on some reservations the tribal member can choose his own contractor.

All Montana reservation members are watching the Poplar project closely. However, some reservations have particular problems that are delaying their plans.

One case is that of the Northern Cheyennes of the Tongue River Reservation in southeastern Montana. They have already established a housing authority committee. The Engineering Department of Montana State College was asked to draw a suitable housing plan, with an eye to utilizing all potential buildings products on the reservation.

Carlo DiCicco, instructor at the college, designed a home specifying ponderosa pine that is milled near Lame Deer. The house is a one-level, four-bedroom unit with a central family room.

Since the Cheyennes have massive reserves of coal and wood, but no natural gas, the units were designed for automatic coal stokers and wood stoves.

The Public Housing Administration has temporarily turned thumbs down on the project because of the poor economic condition that exists on the Cheyennes' reservation. The Bureau indicates it believes the average tribal member cannot make enough money to repay the Government loan.

Other reservations do not have this problem. A portion of funds provided by the sale of the Yellowtail Dam site are now being used on the Crow Reservation for the tribal housing program. Nevertheless, the trend has been established and it is definite now that any tribal member who wants a better home may obtain one. The means are now available—except for the northern Cheyennes.

Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column from the Des Moines, Iowa, Register, of June 21, 1963, by Richard Wilson. Mr. Wilson makes some timely observations concerning civil rights legislation:

RESPONSIBILITY

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—It is little noted but the Democratic majority in the Senate is exactly the number needed to force a vote on the President's new civil rights program.

A two-thirds vote of the Senate can break a filibuster. The Democrats have 67 votes and the Republicans 33. Yet it will be charged, in fact it is already intimated, that the Republicans will be responsible if Congress fails to pass a new civil rights law.

This is the reason why Republican leaders have conferred with President Kennedy on a bipartisan approach with their fingers crossed. However sincere the President's motives, Senate Republicans will not be spared mendacious attack if civil rights legislation is not passed.

NO CONTROL OF DEMOCRATS

Yet the reason why such legislation cannot be passed lies in the simple fact that the Kennedy administration has no control of the overwhelming Democratic majorities in the Senate and House.

The Democratic majority is like Barnum & Bailey's menagerie, a big tent housing carefully caged animals which would eat each other up in the jungle. The Senate Democratic leaders say they cannot break a filibuster and pass the President's program without 20 to 25 Republican votes. Therefore, the Republicans are to blame if they don't vote to a man for the President's program.

Democratic leaders could well afford to blush while making such a confession of the ineffectuality of their powers of leadership. Nor is their ineffectuality confined to civil rights. They cannot claim that only on the racial issue are the fierce conflicts within the Democratic Party exposed. The flagrant schism is equally evident on social, economic, and labor legislation.

PRESTIGE IS LOW

Whatever the President's popularity in this and other countries, his prestige in Congress is low. According to old hands in Congress, the resentment against him has no parallel except possibly the revolt against Franklin D. Roosevelt when he sought to pack the Supreme Court with new appointees. Roosevelt lost his hold on Congress then, though he continued to enjoy a public adulation which Kennedy has never had in anywhere near the same degree.

The congressional discontent with Kennedy is not confined to the southern Democrats, nor the Republicans. The liberals are dissatisfied with what they consider to be half measures. Even some of the moderates think that Kennedy has helped to create, by unfulfillable promises and bravura statements, the conditions for racial demonstrations of a dangerous character. When faced by this dangerous condition, the Kennedy tone quickly changes: Equality will have to come slowly and not by legislation alone.

THE GAINS UNDER IKE

It is in this atmosphere that the President has proposed his program to hasten the inevitable advance of Negroes toward higher levels of equality. And it is a shame that this question cannot be considered apart from its political aspects.

But those political aspects exist and it is truly amazing that Negro leaders do not recognize them. Negroes made their greatest advances since emancipation in a Republican administration.

Whatever Negro leaders may think today, no civil rights legislation was recommended to Congress by Roosevelt and none was enacted. Harry Truman was the first President to offer a comprehensive program. It was not enacted. Dwight Eisenhower offered a program in 1956 and it was enacted in major part. Again in 1960 on Eisenhower's initiative civil rights legislation was enacted.

PLACING BLAME

In spite of the urgent promises of the Democratic platform of 1960, Kennedy delayed for more than 2 years offering any kind of general civil rights legislation, and he does so now under the pressure of mounting racial demonstrations, and with sentiment built up in Congress against him.

These are the facts. Now it is to be seen whether Kennedy, with two-thirds of Congress under Democratic control, can do as much as Eisenhower, whose party did not have control of Congress.

And if Kennedy cannot win, then let the blame go where it ought to.

Fair Trade Anything but Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been pleased to read in the June 23, 1963, issue of the Times and Democrat of Orangeburg, S.C., an excellent editorial which was originally published in the Asheville Citizen of Asheville, N.C. The editorial is entitled "Fair Trade Anything but Fair."

Mr. President, there is now pending in the Commerce Committee of the Senate, legislation which would foist on the American consumer a national fair trade law under the pleasant sounding name of quality stabilization. Mr. President, in view of the fact that this question seems to become an issue in the Commerce Committee each year, and also generates a certain amount of correspondence to all Members of the Congress, I commend these editorial comments from the Asheville Citizen to the Members of the Congress for their consideration. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIR TRADE ANYTHING BUT FAIR

A report from Washington notes that the lobbyists are active again in support of a Federal fair trade law. They've altered the label a little; what they're asking now is a "quality stabilization" act.

Under any name, the proposal would penalize American consumers. What the fair-traders seek is a Federal statute allowing manufacturers to dictate to merchants the prices at which brand-name products are to be sold to the public. Any retailer who refused to cooperate would lose his right to use the brand-name goods in reduced-price sales.

The proposal aimed, of course, at what the sponsors claim is "cutthroat competition" by chain stores, discount houses, and other outlets that offer bargain buys, sometimes at a loss, to attract trade away from the independent merchants. There's even a good deal of truth in the charge, commercial enterprise being what it is. But the principle goes deeper:

Such laws, thus far confined to State acts, offer potential protection for the retailer whose operation is inefficient. They discourage free competition and merchandising initiative. And they can result in brand-name products that are priced so excessively high as to constitute profiteering.

Such laws have failed at the State level. During the last 10 years the various State courts have thrown out 21 fair-trade acts, and two U.S. Supreme Court decisions have made effective enforcement difficult.. Even a Federal law, assuming it could meet the court requirements, would be unenforceable if the cut-rate retailers merely pasted their own label on the brand-name products they buy.

Fair trade, in our view, is anything but fair to consumers. It violates the intent, if not the legalistic letter, of the antitrust laws. It abuses the free enterprise concept. Perhaps the absence of competitive abuses; its adoption would create greater potential evils. Price fixing, either through fair trade or quality stabilization, is unfair and unwarranted. The lobbyists ride a dangerous steed.

Manufacturing Industry Coming of Age in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in this age of worldwide competitive industralization, we are faced with the challenge of maintaining our high standards of living by keeping up with the rapid pace of the times. I am happy to report that my State of West Virginia is making an encouraging effort to meet this challenge.

In its issue of June 16, 1963, the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail has an important article analyzing the coming of age of the manufacturing industry in West Virginia. The article describes how, in the past decade, manufactured products have come to surpass in value the products of the well-known natural resources of the Mountain State.

Taking advantage of the inexhaustible supply of West Virginia coal, new manufacturing plants have been springing up along the Ohio and Kanawha Rivers since World War II in ever increasing numbers. Aluminum, steel, nickel, plastics, detergents, rubber and glass are only a few of the important industrial products which are now being manufactured on a large scale in these two valleys.

Native resources, at the same time, are finding new markets as a result of economic research programs. West Virginia timber, for example, is providing the raw material for a variety of new wood products that serve the building trade. Experiments in the gasification of coal are pointing the way to increased employment of this locally abundant fuel. Exciting possibilities are being explored in the field of new coal uses.

The story of West Virginia's industrial development is of such importance to our nation that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY GROWTH PHENOMENAL DURING LAST DECADE

(By Bernard Gainer)

The past decade has marked the coming of age of the manufacturing industry in West Virginia.

During the 1950's, for the first time in the State's history, this facet of the State's economy has surpassed in value of products that of the natural resources industry.

This period also has brought tremendous growth, principally in chemicals, to the Ohio and Kanawha Valleys area, a development that has earned for the region such titles as

"American Ruhr," "Boiling Ohio," and "Magic Valley."

The manufacturing industry has expanded also in other areas of the State, particularly in the eastern panhandle and in the north-central area, but growth in these sections has not been nearly as spectacular as it has along the State's two principal navigable waterways.

Growth in the Ohio and Kanawha Valleys region has been spurred on by the construction of some of the Nation's largest electric power generating plants, built by the Appalachian and Monongahela Power Cos. Another huge powerplant, by the Virginia Electric Power Co. on Stony River, Grant County, is now under construction; and still another, just getting underway by affiliates of the Monongahela Power Co. on the Monongahela River, near the West Virginia-Pennsylvania line, should bring new industrial development in those areas. The Monongahela Power Co. also has announced plans for a new generating plant on the Blackwater River, near Davis.

Most of the development in the Ohio Valley has come since the end of World War II. One of the largest, the Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. plant at Ravenswood, changed a farming community into an industrial center after its establishment in the mid-1950's.

Other new plants, or facilities that have been greatly expanded, in recent years include Koppers Co. at Chester and East Steubenville; Solvay Process and National Aniline Divisions of Allied Chemical Corp., Union Carbide Olefins Division, and Mountaineer Carbon, all near Moundsville; Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.'s Chemical Division and Mobay Chemical Co., at Natrium; Union Carbide Silicones Division and FMC's Chlor-Alkali Division at Bens Run; and the American Cyanamid Co. at Willow Island.

New or expanded plants in the Parkersburg area include American Viscose Corp., E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Marbon Chemical Division of Borg-Warner, Johns-Manville Fiber Glass, and Carborundum Metals.

New plants established between Ravenswood and Huntington include Vanadium Corp. at New Haven, Celanese Corp. of America at Gallipolis Ferry, and the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. at Apple Grove.

There have been some tremendous expansions of plants in the Huntington area, including the $25 million project now underway at the Huntington Alloy Products Division of International Nickel. Other plants theer that have enjoyed periods of expansion in recent years include Adel Division of General Metals, American Car & Foundry Division of ACF Industries, Houdaille Industries, Standard Ultramarine & Color Co., Connors Steel Division of H. K. Porter Co., and others.

South of Huntington, the Montecatini Chemical Co. of Milan, Italy, through its subsidy, the Novamont Corp., established its first manufacturing facility in America at Neale, in Wayne County, in the late 1950's.

Union Carbide Chemicals Co.'s continued expansion, highlighted by its multimillion dollar research center at South Charleston, and FMC Corporation's acquisition and utilization of the big naval ordnance plant, also in South Charleston, have featured the amazing development in the Kanawha Valley.

FMC not only has expanded its chemical facilities in this area but also has established a plant for construtcion of armored vehicles for the Defense Department. Union Carbide, in addition to its new research center, has had a number of major expansions of its facilities at South Charleston, Institute and Alloy. The E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. plant at Belle has had a number of expansions in the past decades and now is in the midst of another, of multimillion-dollar proportions. Another major addition in the Valley has been the Goodrich-Gulf Chemical Corp., which moved into the former synthetic rubber plant at Institute and since has expanded its operations.

Other chemical plants in the Kanawha Valley, most of which are continuously modernizing or expanding their facilities include American Viscose at Nitro, Diamond Alkali at Belle, Onde Division of Union Carbide at South Charleston and Monsanto at Nitro.

Listed under their various product classifications, other new plants in West Virginia since the early 1950's, include the following:

Apparel—Kellwood Corp. of Spencer, Kleeson Co. of Moundsville, Reidbord Bros. at Buckhannon and Elkins, Grafton Manufacturing Co. of Grafton, Colshire Manufacturing Co. of Morgantown, Pennsboro Manufacturing Co. of Pennsboro, Dee-Mure Brassiere Co. of Hamlin, and the Logan Manufacturing Co. of Logan.

Wood products—Georgia-Pacific Lumber Co. at Pineville, J. B. Belcher Lumber Co. at Durbin, Webster Woodworking Co. at Webster Springs, National Seating & Dimensions Co. at Varney, Norbute Corp. at Elkins.

Glass—Corning Glass Works, new installations at Paden City and Martinsburg and a new plant by its subsidiary, Corhart Refractories, at Buckhannon; and McBride Glass Co. of Clarksburg. The Owens-Illinois Co. at Fairmont and the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. at Clarksburg also have expanded their facilities.

Fabricated metals—Ravens Metals Co., new plants at Elizabeth and Ellenboro; Sterling Enterprises, Morgantown and Reedsville. A number of plants, including Cerro de Pasco (Fairmont Aluminum) at Fairmont, have been expanded.

Electronics—Recent new plants include Melpar at Fairmont and Beckley, Wells Industries at Charles Town, Galis Electric at Morgantown and Fairmont, Appalachian Electronics and Greenbrier Instruments at Ronceverte, Electronic Control System at Fairmont, and Carol Electronics at Martinsburg. The Beckley Manufacturing Co. of Beckley and Westinghouse Corp. at Fairmont have announced major expansions.

Charcoal—The Kingsford Co. at Parsons and the Hughes Smokeless Co. at Belington are among the newer plants. Roseville Charcoal Co. at Bentree and Swiss has expanded its operations.

Aviation industries—the Lockheed Co.'s plant at Clarksburg and North American Aviation's plant at Princeton, both established within the past 2 years, are among the State's first plants devoted to the aviation industry.

Miscellaneous plants include Rubber Fabricators, at Grantsville and Richwood; Baby World, infant accessory plant at Grafton; and Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing, printing products plant, at Middleway.

In the summer of 1961, the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co. released what it called "A Forecast of the Economy of West Virginia," projected to 1970.

C. & P. statisticians sought to combine all the significant sectors of the State economy into a "gross State product," similar to the national production measures released periodically by the U.S. Department of Commerce.

From the beginning, C. & P. officials admitted their economic forecast was on the conservative side. Allowances were made for the influx of Government aid, but principally the forecast adhered to conventional business progression. Here's what they found in the decade ahead:

Existing industry will continue at about the present pace, with not much increase in employment during the next decade.

Attraction of new industry with new job opportunities calls for a change in attitude of the people of West Virginia and their political leaders.

Already, C. & P. statisticians are hard at work revising their estimates, for dramatic developments in the industrial field within the past 18 months has changed the outlook considerably.

On the national scene, for example, American industry plans to spend a record $40 billion on new plants and equipment in 1963, a development that wasn't foreseeable 2 years ago. West Virginia is expected to share in this economic upsurge.

But more specifically, Federal programs such as the Area Redevelopment Act and increased Small Business Administration activity have spurred a number of small business ventures in the Mountain State over the past 2 years. The State department of commerce reports a total of 63 new plants started in West Virginia in 1961 to 1963 and 53 major expansions during the same period. These industrial developments resulted in a total of 14,429 new permanent jobs, with an added payroll of $58.4 million to the West Virginia economy. Total investment in this 2-year period has reached $428 million.

Among the major new industries which have announced location in West Virginia during the centennial year are: Moore Business Forms, Inc., a national concern which will build a $3 million plant at Buckhannon employing 175 workers, and West Virginia Wood Products Co., a flakeboard industry being established with ARA financing at Sutton. When it gets into operation, Wood Products will employ 300 workers and have a $1 million annual payroll.

Recently U.S. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD estimated that "more than 5,000 new jobs and a $14 million increase in industrial income will accrue to West Virginia as a result of 43 new wood products facilities" either planned or placed in operation during 1962. BYRD said that these new facilities will represent an investment of more than $11 million.

At the time of its original forecast, C. & P. researchers found no bright promise where existing industry is concerned. They found "a surprising number of firms in West Virginia report no firm plans either for expansion or extensive modernization."

All in all, the researchers concluded, "an increase in employment of 5,500 persons by 1965, and 5,500 more by 1970, is expected by the 87 private industrial firms in this survey."

On the basis of Department of Commerce figures, the employment increase predicted for 1965 already has been tripled within a short space of 2 years.

Overall, the C. & P. survey sees a boost in State employment of about 25,000 by 1970, but not all of it, by a long shot, will be in industries. Here is what the long-range outlook shows:

Coal employed 49,600 men to produce 119.5 million tons in 1960; there will be 155 million tons brought to the surface in 1970 by 42,800 men.

Stone, clay and glass products, lumber and wood, and textile mills employed 36,800 in 1961; they will employ 29,600 in 1970.

Chemicals, by 1970, will provide 33,600 jobs, or 6,500 more than they provided in 1961. Primary metals will increase to 26,600, compared to 24,300 in 1961. Manufacturing of durable goods will gain 2,500 jobs, nondurable goods 3,800.

Obviously, from the foregoing, West Virginia's opportunity to stop its outmigration and hope for full employment rests with new industry. What are the prospects?

West Virginia University, seeking a Federal grant to establish a research center to help all of the Appalachian region, pointed to this State's great assets, its people, its vast reserves of mineral resources, and its favorable proximity to markets. Then it said:

"Unfortunately, the many impressive advantages of West Virginia are somewhat nullified by some important disadvantages. The most serious of these are the inadequate highway system, a largely undeserved reputation for poor labor relations, and inadequate community facilities.

"Other shortcomings which have been noted by industrial managements are physically unattractive communities, shortages of certain types of skilled labor, and deficiencies in the public school system. Although these shortcomings have severely hampered the industrial development of the State, it is noteworthy that nearly all are remediable defects, capable of being corrected or alleviated."

A start has been made toward correction of some. The State had a 10-year road program that will, by road commission estimates, cost $1.6 billion by 1972. A modest effort was made by the legislature this year to increase teachers' salaries and enrich the school program.

Marshall Universiy, also seeking to establish a research center to promote economic growth, calls attention to the same environmental problems outlined by West Virginia University. It said:

"Not to be overlooked are the social needs of the people. By social it meant the sense of satisfaction and pride, the knowledge of doing a significant job as compared with the Nation as a whole.

"The working man who is disenfranchised by an impoverished economy in his chosen county or State soon becomes embittered toward what he calls his 'lot in life'. His attitudes become negative. He offers no positive suggestions to overcome his plight. Lacking sufficient funds for business investment, he remains in the doldrums of unemployment and continues on the public dole.

In the meantime, the man living with this problem night and day is State Commerce Commission Hulett C. Smith. But one of his main jobs is to seek new industry and, when asked to discuss some of the important problem confronting the industrial growth of this State, he said:

"One of the greatest obstacles is the attitude of the people themselves. If we take an industrial prospect into a community and he's made to feel he's wanted, it's so much better than making him sell himself to the people.

"But people will say to him: 'You've got plenty of money. Why should we help you?' And he will say to them: 'I can't live here alone. If I get in trouble I want to know I can bank on this community. If I can't, I'll go elsewhere.'"

This attitude does not apply alone to new industry or industrial prospects, Smith said, adding:

"Too many people take for granted the industry they've got and, one day, they wake up and find it is gone."

Horne Sets High Standard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the Florida Legislature has recently adjourned after one of the most pressing sessions in my State's history. Presiding over the sessions of the house of representatives was my distinguished friend, the Honorable Mallory Horne, a young, aggressive and able statesman, who wrote in this session of the Florida Legislature a record of tremendous leadership.

The success which the house had in solving some of the most difficult problems that it has had to face, was due largely to the leadership of this able young attorney, who serves as one of the two representatives of Leon County, and might I add, I was privileged to serve for two terms with him in our Florida Legislature.

In paying tribute to him, I would like to have printed the very fine editorial which appeared in the Tallahassee Democrat on Wednesday, June 19, 1963, which read as follows:

The legislature's selection of House Speaker Mallory Horne as runnerup for the award of most valuable member of the house is well deserved.

For nearly all of his five terms, this Tallahassee lawyer has been one of the most influential members.

But this session, as speaker of the house, Horne really came into his own. Using the words of his colleagues, he has provided "effective guidance without heavyhandedness." He has also shown "fairness, moderation, leadership, and boundless energy."

We can recall the day when a committee hearing got completely out of order. Horne stepped in from his speaker's office and, by unprecedented action, firmly restored the decorum by threatening to use the house arrest powers or dissolve the committee.

It is in his role as presiding officer that Speaker Horne has most distinguished himself. With a quick and sure knowledge of parliamentary procedure unrivalled in recent years on that rostrum, and a tactful good humor in the chair, he has kept the largest and greenest house membership in history moving in orderly fashion through its deliberations.

It seems likely that Horne will not be a member of the 1965 legislature. He gave up his house seat in helping to bring about a compromise reapportionment.

However, his political role in Leon County and Florida develops, his activities in this session set a high standard for future speakers.

Youth Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose herewith an editorial from the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S.C., of June 20, 1963, regarding youth unemployment:

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

The increase in teenage unemployment during the month of May underscores one of the most persistent problems facing the United States today—the problem of jobless youth. While it is true that a great many of the teenagers listed as unemployed during the month of May are looking for summer jobs while they are still in school—and, therefore, could not accept a job until school is adjourned—it is equally true that the month by month figures on teenage employment are indicative of a situation that demands action.

During 1962, the unemployment rate for our youngsters averaged 13 percent, as compared to an adult rate of 4 to 5 percent. Since January of this year, the teenage rate of unemployment has not fallen below 13.9 percent. In April, the rate was 15.6 percent. In May, during a month when unemployment among adult men decreased, the rate of unemployment for teenagers climbed to 17.8 percent. The teenagers employment problem is complicated by the big increase in population in this age group, and the declining number of unskilled jobs in today's labor market.

These figures reflect a critical situation; a situation which could develop into one of the most explosive social problems in the Nation's history. Board action is needed to improve our educational system, stem the school dropout rate, and extend training opportunities of jobless youth.

In terms of a full-employment economy for the future of our country, it is extremely important that we concentrate our most vigorous attention on this problem. The recommendations of the President's Committee on Youth Employment pursue this goal, and—on a more immediate basis—the President's proposals to the Congress in the fields of economic growth, educational development, and youth employment are directed specifically toward the problem.

Research That Is Insuring a Future for the Anthracite Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William Bellano, president, Glen Alden Coal Co., with offices at Ashley, Pa., in my congressional district, delivered a highly informative address on coal research at the Fuel Merchants Association of New Jersey convention held in Atlantic City April 23–25, 1963. It gives me great pleasure to make Mr. Bellano's address a part of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The address follows:

RESEARCH THAT IS INSURING A FUTURE FOR THE ANTHRACITE INDUSTRY

(By William Bellano)

It is with sincere pleasure that I can report to you today of the research that is insuring a future for the anthracite industry. This research will also benefit the retail fuel dealer.

Up until recently very little moneys were expended by Government or private industry; however, through legislation, both on the State and Federal level, research agencies were created. Coal research and development expenditures, both bituminous and anthracite, average $20 million a year; of which nearly half is Federal money. The disparity between coal research effort and competitive fuels is very great; it is estimated that the petroleum industry expends nearly $300 million yearly, principally for petrochemicals and military projects. Government expenditures in the area of fuel and energy, including nuclear energy, total about $500 million per year.

MINING RESEARCH

Current research in anthracite is conditioned by the present economic status of the industry and the types of markets in which it can still compete. The emphasis has been for reduced costs through development of new, improved and more efficient mining equipment, cheaper and safer methods of roof support, and better methods for transporting the product from the face to the preparation plant and to market. Foremost underground development is the mining of anthracite hydraulically. Water at 5,000 pounds per square inch and 300 gallons per minute has been successfully used at the Sugar Notch Mine of the Glen Alden Coal Co. This work is expected to be followed by hydraulic hoisting and hydraulic transport to the preparation plant.

Anthracite strip mining has undergone significant changes in recent years which have increased productivity, reduced costs, and increased recoverable reserves. Noteworthy are improved draglines and shovels, high-speed large diameter rotary drills, ammonium nitrate explosives and larger haulage trucks of 65 tons and over.

In coal preparation, research emphasis has been placed on fine coal cleaning methods and maximum recovery of all products for which mining costs have been paid for. New automated plants utilizing dense-medium washing processes have been constructed, and old plants have been renovated to utilize the latest improvements such as the Dyna Whirlpool Process.

RESEARCH AGENCIES

Governmental anthracite research activity is today directed through three agencies—the Interior Department's Office of Coal Research, the U.S. Bureau of Mines, and the Coal Research Board of Pennsylvania. The Office of Coal Research and the Coal Research Board do not directly engage in research but act as a clearinghouse for research proposals by both private and educational groups and try to disseminate the proposed projects so that there is no duplication of effort and consequently research dollars wasted. The U.S. Bureau of Mines has well staffed and equipped facilities for laboratory and field research projects of varying types and degree.

OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

The Office of Coal Research was created by Congress on July 7, 1960. The majority of its research effort has been directed to the bituminous industry; however, the two major projects which are of benefit to anthracite are:

1. A contract for the large-scale commercial use of anthracite in the manufacture of acetylene and other gaseous products. A commercial plant producing acetylene, fuel gas, and a high-quality coal residue may consume from 2 to 3 million tons per year.

2. A contract in the amount of $86,000 covering a 12-month study of the export market for U.S. coals, including anthracite. This study will place special emphasis on trade prospects with Common Market countries and other European nations, Japan and Canada.

New ideas of value and interest to the anthracite industry are welcome by the Office of Coal Research. The range of projects considered includes economics and marketing, mining and preparation and utilization. This work complements but does not and should not supersede research efforts on State, university and industry levels.

U.S. BUREAU OF MINES

For many years the U.S. Bureau of Mines was the only major group conducting anthracite research projects in mining, preparation and utilization. Research activities of the Division of Anthracite are conducted at the Anthracite Research Center, Schuylkill Haven, Pa. The center consists of a modern laboratory and office with a trained staff of 80 professional and technical personnel.

MINING PROJECTS

Cooperative mining projects include continuing tests of a hydraulic mining jumbo at the Glen Alden Coal Co.'s Sugar Notch Mine. This installation was activated in 1961 and has proved successful enough to warrant plans for a combined system of hydraulic mining, hoisting and possibly transport to the breaker. In another cooperative project, the bureau is installing a large diameter boring machine which will be tested as a possible mining device.

UTILIZATION

Utilization projects under study include:

1. Currently, Schuylkill Haven testing station is conducting tests on the calcining of anthracite for the electrometallurgical industry to produce amorphous electrodes, pot liners and carbon brick; also, calcined anthracite has been developed as a superior cupola fuel to replace foundry coke.

2. A surface chemical process is being studied to produce low ash anthracite from 0 to 1 percent ash for the chemical carbon industry in order to produce carbon-based chemicals, pigments, inks, solid fuel propellants and fuel cells.

3. High-pressure gasification of both coal and breaker refuse to produce synthetic natural gas for pipeline use—several of the major pipeline companies have indicated interest in this project since they question gas reserves in the United States and would prefer obtaining a suitable product closer to their eastern markets.

4. Utilization of anthracite fines—barley through No. 5—as a suitable injection fuel for blast furnace use; experimental results of which show that this method is superior to both fuel oil and gas injection which is currently being used on a production basis.

5. Utilization of anthracite to produce prereduce iron ore pellets for use in blast furnaces for the production of pig iron. By using prereduce pellets the steel companies advise that they can increase furnace production by 15 to 20 percent, which means a saving of approximately $12 million in capital costs per unit should construction of additional furnaces be required to meet the production demands.

PREPARATION

Anthracite preparation projects are being undertaken to determine equipment and processing necessary to achieve selected premium products. Methods for producing minus 1 percent ash anthracite, minimum size, conventionally pulverized coal and ultra-fine product are being investigated. Washability studies are being conducted, and an investigation is being made of the effectiveness of cyclones as a means of sizing and deashing anthracite in commercial plants. Another study is being made of possible recovery and handling of minus 400-mesh coal from silt basins.

COAL RESEARCH BOARD OF PENNSYLVANIA

Although their funds have been limited throughout the years, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania through their coal research board has conducted more research projects on the utilization of anthracite than any other single group. Currently a project is underway to study the utilization of anthracite breaker refuse to produce marginal fuel for power generation and the metallurgical and ceramic industries and chemical byproducts for the basic chemical industry.

1. By being able to utilize all the products of our mining operation, we can reduce our overall production costs and ultimately these savings will be passed on to the retail dealer.

2. The new administration in Harrisburg feels that the salvation of both bituminous and anthracite mining in the State rests on our ability to be able to find new markets and new uses for our product, and to be able to produce at lower costs and to produce under safe working conditions.

The 1964 fiscal program for research is as follows:

(a) For a study of use of coal in processing other minerals, $100,000; (b) $50,000 to develop an integrated train transportation system from the anthracite and bituminous coalfields to electric utilities; (c) $100,000 to improve unsightly conditions in the coalfields and to alleviate air and stream pollution problems; (d) $50,000 for studies on the prevention of mine disasters; (e) $75,000 for a study of foreign markets for coal; and (f) $100,000 for studies on the utilization of nuclear heat for the gasification and liquification of Pennsylvania coals.

COAL POLICY—PENNSYLVANIA

The Joint State Government Commission for Pennsylvania recently published an important report on "Coal in Pennsylvania—recent developments and prospects." A panel of technical advisors recommended a coal policy for Pennsylvania that calls for:

1. Progressive legislation to reduce coal costs.

2. Development of economical transportation system for shipment of Pennsylvania-produced coal.

3. Removal of discriminatory freight rates which impede free flow of coal in domestic and foreign markets.

4. Investigation of hydraulic mining and transport of coal.

5. Research funds for the development of new uses and expanded markets.

GLEN ALDEN PROJECTS

Last, but not least, our company has been the only major producer supporting private research to any degree. We are currently conducting studies at Penn State, Villanova, and through independent research and engineering companies along with cooperative studies with the U.S. Bureau of Mines. We are:

1. Studying how to best produce low ash anthracite for the industrial and European markets and for special uses.

2. We are working with the major steel companies in their work on fuel injection systems for blast furnaces.

3. We are about to enter into a combustion program with the Canton Stoker Co. to utilize anthracite in high-pressure package boiler units—a heating market we have been unable to get into because of the lack of equipment.

4. Conducting studies on acid mine drainage with the State department of health in order to prevent stream pollution and to help upgrade the rivers and tributaries in the mining region.

5. We have worked with a manufacturer and have expended over $1 million to install an experimental new heavy media cleaning system at our Huber breaker in order to produce for both the industrial and retail market a fuel which can be tailor made to your requirements.

COAL RESEARCH AND THE DEALER

From a fuel dealer's point of view you will probably question what good this research will do for you, since most of it lends itself to the industrial and export markets. However, without the industrial and export markets we would be unable to enjoy maximum production and full working time and consequently many of the retail sizes would be in short supply. The long-range future of the industry depends to a large extent upon the success of its research programs to find new uses and new markets for anthracite. This, coupled with aggressive selling at retail level, will insure you, the dealer, and we, the producer, of a healthy and profitable industry for years to come.

Harvesting the Forest for the Present and the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the State of West Virginia once contained 15½ million acres of virgin forest, including one of the finest stands of hardwood timber the world has ever seen. In the course of history, the busy ax and saw and the careless match combined forces to reduce the vast forests at an alarming rate.

Fortunately, the spirit of intelligent conservation made itself known at an early date in the Mountain State. Forestry as a profession appeared in West Virginia in the beginning of the present century, and in the course of time forest management became an important statewide program.

Indiscriminate timber cutting was controlled, and devastated areas were replanted. As a result, two-thirds of West Virginia is still covered with forests, with an annual timber yield of approximately 1½ billion board feet. Thus we have learned how to consume our forests, as timber, and still keep them, as a protection for the land and as a source of delight to our people.

The story of West Virginia's forests is admirably told in an article by Lester McClung in the June 16, 1963, edition of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Harvesting the Forest for the Present and Future

(By Lester McClung)

Practically all of West Virginia's 15½ million acres of surface was a vast forest area when white man first laid eyes upon it. This forest contained a mixture of hardwoods second to none in the world. The white pine area was mainly limited to the Greenbrier Valley and other areas east of the Allegheny Mountains. Red spruce and hemlock were found at the higher elevations and were so dense that one could travel for miles reaching from one trunk to another. Early residents reported that the sun only reached the ground in occasional spots under this evergreen forest, keeping it so dark that reading a newspaper on a clear day was difficult.

The principal forest game species found at that time included the black bear, mountain lion, occasional bisons, deer, squirrel, grouse, and turkey.

These forests also harbored Indians often hostile to the early white settlers. The unbroken forest areas and the Indians found on them were deterrent to the settlements of the white man.

Records indicate that logging in the eastern part of our present State was done as early as 1735 and along the Ohio River by 1775. Except for few small sawmills located along the major watercourses, little lumber was produced in those early years. It has been estimated that the virgin forests contained 150 billion board feet of timber.

The cut for 1869 is recorded at 76 million board feet. To illustrate the increased rate of cutting for the next four decades, the year of 1909 saw the peak of lumber production when 1½ billion board feet were harvested. It is further estimated that an additional half billion board feet were harvested in the form of posts, ties, rails, shingles, props, poles and tanning wood and bark. This is equal to a drain of approximately two billion board feet of timber harvested from West Virginia's forests a single year.

From that peak year of production the decline began and reached its lowest ebb with 327 million board feet in 1939 and has since increased back to 400 million board feet in 1958. Production has not varied materially in recent years.

For many years West Virginia led all States in the production of hardwood lumber. One softwood sawmill is reported to have cut 200,000 board feet per day or a total of 60 million annually.

When the first cutting crews moved into the Greenbrier Valley in preparation for the largest river drives ever made in West Virginia, it was common talk that there was so much timber that it never could all be cut and that it would grow back faster than it could be harvested. How foolhardy those individuals were because within their lifetime they saw the last of the vast white pine forests disappear from the scene.

Before all of the virgin timber was exploited in West Virginia, efforts were being made by a few conservation-minded people to protect and manage our forest resources. In 1897 the West Virginia Legislature created the office of game and fish warden who also was delegated some degree of responsibility for protection of the forests from its worst enemy—fire.

The game and fish commission was created in 1921 with three members appointed in an advisory capacity. This same year the first State forest fire warden was appointed. The status was changed again in 1929 to the game, fish, and forestry commission with the office of chief forester created which was filled by Harold Newins, the first technically trained forester in our State's government.

Another change occurred in 1939 with the creation of the Conservation Commission of West Virginia. This provided for the position of State forester and chiefs of the divisions of game, fish, and State parks. Between that time and 1961, when the conservation commission was superseded by the department of natural resources, the forestry program broadened to include assistance to private landowners of forest management, reforestation, watershed programs, and the operations of State forests under a multiple-use program as well as the usual responsibility for protection.

The Federal Government was not unaware of the problems brought on at the exploitation of the early virgin forests of our State. A major flood on the watershed of the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers created damages estimated at $100 million, most of which occurred to the city of Pittsburgh. Public indignation was heard in Washington and paved the way for the passage in 1911 of the Weeke's law which authorized acquisition of public lands as national forests to protect the headwaters of navigable streams. Immediate action was taken by Congress with the authorization in March 1911, by the National Forest Reservation Commission for the creation of the Monongahela National Forest in West Virginia. Actual work began in 1914 for the development of this national forest which today has more than 800,000 acres on the watersheds of the Monongahela, Kanawha, Potomac, and James Rivers. It is operating today on a multiple-use program in which timber production, watershed protection, fire protection, and recreation are all given consideration.

Forestry, like many professions, has grown slowly but solidly in West Virginia. In 1900 a handful of professional foresters in the United States formed the Society of American Foresters which now continues to represent the profession. There are approximately 175 members of the profession in West Virginia employed by the State and Federal Government, by private industries and others who are self-employed.

The period of greatest development in our forest resources appeared between the period of 1933 and 1942 during which time the Civilian Conservation Corps had many camps on National and State forest properties. During this period several of the State forests were acquired and developed, and much work was accomplished on the national forests. The fire control program progressed rapidly through the construction of additional fire towers, observers cabins, telephone lines and access roads. This program did more than develop resources, it developed character in a large segment of the youth of this country by assigning them responsibilities and giving them opportunities in the great outdoors.

On the authority of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954 the Department of Natural Resources is responsible for the forest management work on approved small watershed projects. This is an effort to control the flow of water at the headwaters of our streams through a good land-use program based on the capability of such land.

Industry has not been asleep to the need of proper forest management as mentioned earlier by a number of foresters presently employed.

To further emphasize the need for management, the National Tree Farm System was inaugurated in 1941. West Virginia joined this national movement when the first tree farm was dedicated in Raleigh County on the property of the New River Co. The program has grown in West Virginia to 82 tree farms representing approximately 250,000 acres of woodlands which formally are dedicated to the production of forest crops. This program in West Virginia is sponsored by the forest industries committee of the American Forest Products Industries and has a goal of adding 100,000 acres during our centennial year.

Educators long have recognized the need for professional forestry in our State. Our own West Virginia University added to its curriculum one in the profession of forestry beginning with the fall term of 1935 graduating its first class in 1939. Dr. W. C. Percival, a ranger on the Monongahela National Forest, was given the assignment of directing the first efforts of the division of forestry at WVU and has continued to the present time as its director. His graduates are well known throughout many States. Particularly, those in the Deep South where many forest industries have large forestry staffs.

Besides the teaching program the division continues research in several fields of forestry. Part of the research is conducted at the university forest which is a 7,500-acre area of Cooper's Rock State Forest near Morgantown.

New facilities are being provided for graduate study programs and increased research activities. This is most satisfactory since the research is centered around the hardwoods that are native to our Appalachian area.

Other research is being conducted by the Mountain Research Center at Elkins and Parsons which is a branch station of the Northeastern Forest Experiment Station. A second branch now is being developed at Princeton and will be concerned primarily with forest products marketing.

The remaining 10 million acres of forests, if properly managed, are capable of annually growing the equivalent of the lumber production in 1909 which was 1½ billion board feet. This points up the tremendous potential that our forests possess in adding to the industrial potential of our State. If we can assume that such production would be further manufactured to consumers' goods, we end up with an astronomical number of employees and the resulting income that our forests could produce. We must first, however, in order to enjoy such prosperity, give top consideration to protecting such forests from fire, insects and diseases and also to bring every acre under its maximum production through recommended practices.

At the beginning of our second century of statehood there should be a dedication of every West Virginian, whether landowner or not, to the adequate protection and the best possible management in order that our forests will remain the greatest renewable natural resource upon which our State is dependent.

Developing Appalachia: Hill Region To Get Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article appearing in the Licking Valley Courier, June 20, 1963, West Liberty, Ky., by Mr. Earl Kinner, publisher, entitled "Developing Appalachia: Hill Region To Get Aid":

DEVELOPING APPALACHIA: HILL REGION TO GET AID

(By Earl Kinner)

President Kennedy, who recently committed the Federal Government to a more effective development program for the eight-State Appalachian region, is sending Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to Kentucky this week to meet with officials and area leaders.

Mr. Roosevelt has been named by the President to become chairman of a Federal-State commission to be formed for the purpose of creating a comprehensive Appalachian regional development program.

He will be at Jenny Wiley State Park near Prestonsburg Thursday of this week and will spend the morning conferring with department heads of the State government. In the afternoon he will meet with area leaders of east Kentucky (a part of the Appalachian region).

The Appalachian region extending from western Pennsylvania southwest to Alabama, has generally failed to progress with the rest of the Nation and is now considered a depressed region, majorly because of the mountainous terrain, recurring flood damage from steep-rushing streams, mined out coal areas, and denuded forest land. As a result of the region's depressed economic condition, the living standard has not kept pace wtih the rest of the Nation, and many thousands of Appalachian people have outmigrated to industrial sections. Many thousands that remain are existing on sub-American standards.

Appalachian region embraces the mountainous parts of Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, and Alabama.

Existing programs for waterway development, flood protection, conservation, and highway development, that are generally available to the economy seldom are sufficient to do the intended job in a mountain region and more often are not applicable to such a region.

Thus, it becomes necessary to intensify existing programs or create a special program to fit the region. It seems that the Federal Government has decided to create a special program for the region modeled after a plan proposed in 1960 by the Appalachian Governors council.

The President definitely committed the Federal Government to a special regional program for the Appalachian States when on April 9 he said:

"A serious problem of emergency nature exists in the Appalachian region which demands special action. The Federal establishment is to be committed to work with the Conference of Appalachian Governors to achieve as many short term benefits as possible on the one hand (accelerated public works projects, ARA projects, flood control dams, etc.), and to begin immediately to formulate a comprehensive regional program on the other hand. A State-Federal committee is to be formed to formulate the program. This committee is to review opportunities for improvement in the 1964 and 1965 Federal budget as they pertain to Appalachia."

Later the President named Under Secretary of Commerce Roosevelt to be chairman in organizing the regional committee to create a regional development program for Appalachia.

While ARA, Public Works Act, flood control, job retraining, and other Federal programs have helped in some degree, the Appalachian region must have an overall program based on the region's specific needs. These needs are different from needs in other areas, and are more specific.

Area leaders will be called upon to help with formulating a regional program. What is needed?

What type program will bring Appalachia out of the doldrums and restore the region to its rightful status in America's growing economy?

We have editorialized many times on many problems and many programs, both for immediate and for long-term achievement.

But when the Federal Government forms a compact with the eight Appalachian States to promote a regional improvement program for their depressed mountainous areas we must be specific.

This newspaper does not speak for all of Appalachia. But we do speak our piece for our own region—the foothills and mountains of east Kentucky, one of the most beautiful and picturesque regions in all America, a region that holds the last stronghold of pure Anglo-Saxon stock, a region of small farms, rushing mountain streams, forested hills, friendly people—a potential Switzerland of contented families and a vacationland unsurpassed in mid-America.

Already a mountain gardenspot, our east Kentucky could be the vacationland for mid-America and our native hill people could again enjoy a wholesome living standard, kept busy on small farms, in reforestation and timbering jobs, in wood product plants, and paper mills, in small craft centers, in catering to the thousands of tourists soon to flood the Appalachian area.

It could be all this—if * * * if our region were developed to its full potential.

But a depressed area cannot lift itself by its own bootstraps, particularly a mountain region that is already denuded of its virgin forests, shorn of most of its coal, and ravaged periodically by rushing flash floods, short of connecting highways, and lacking many of the things that make for wholesome living, such as proper housing, proper educational facilities, libraries, hospitals, and colleges.

For such a potential gardenspot in a highland region the State and Federal Governments might well establish a regional authority like the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Great Plains Regional Authority, and others, and bring the region to its rightful fruition.

That is what we hope for. And we think this is what is envisioned. It will take long-term planning by a regional commission.

But in the meantime we should not grow lax in our plans to take advantage of short-term projects such as are now offered by the Area Redevelopment Administration, the Accelerated Public Works Act, the Kerr-Hill Act, the Soil Conservation Service, the State's reforestation program, highway program, parks and airfield programs, community college program, etc. These should all be pursued to the fullest, and immediately.

Then for the long pull, we suggest a regional program that would recognize these opportunities and develop them to the fullest:

Waterway improvement. Our mountain streams offer great opportunity for recreation, and as water supply for industrial purposes and people. But instead they now are sources of periodic danger due to flooding that devastates farmland and towns part of the year, and run sluggish and contaminated the rest of the year.

To correct this and realize their full potential we need a threefold program geared especially to mountain terrain:

1. Clean out, deepen and straighten channels immediately.

2. Create a small watershed program that will benefit hill farmers like the same program now benefits farmers in flatland areas. But a special program will be needed. The present small watershed program, though liberalized recently, still is inadequate. To date no watershed in east Kentucky has qualified under the liberalized cost-benefit ratio formula. Some watershed projects that straighten and deepen channels, build dams on tributaries for reservoir retention of floodwaters, and beautify banks and drain adjacent land—this program is sorely needed to protect hill farmers from periodic flash floods that have so devastated our scarce farming lands.

3. Build lakes for recreational purposes in areas that will do least damage to farmland and at the same time aid in flood control programs on our major waterways.

Reforestation and wood use plants. This program offers great promise. It already has been started in a small way, thanks to the State-Federal program of tree nurseries and cost-aid to planting trees, and the establishment of the wood use plant by the Kellogg Foundation and the State at Quicksand.

But the wood use plant must be expanded and continued to the fullest. It will find profitable ways to utilize marketable timber at home and use native labor in plants that are found to be practicable. Too, it will find ways to utilize all products of a tree, and thus eliminate wasteful timbering and marketing practices of the past that have impoverished so large a part of this greatest hardwood producing area of the Nation.

In addition to reforestation and fire control, training schools to produce craftsmen in wood manufacturing need be established. And a marketing program for wood products must be started.

Too, all possibilities of establishing paper and pulp mills must be explored, so that all types of timber may be marketed.

And also the arts-crafts centers started by the State need be continued. They offer part-time work for people in their homes as well as in small crafts shops.

Parks and tourism. Tourists spend an average of $7 to $11 per day. And the State parks service counted 610,000 visitors at five east Kentucky parks last year—Natural Bridge, Carter Caves, Greenbo Lake, Jenny Wiley, and Dewey Lake.

Tourism will bring in more new money with the least investment of any program—that is if our mountain gardenland is developed to its fullest potential. The State already has established parks in some areas of this gardenland, and is building access roads. But more parks, more small lakes and motels and dining places are needed, and needed almost immediately.

Several of east Kentucky's most beautiful mountain areas now are inaccessible. Access roads need to be built so tourists can enjoy a vacation in our area to the fullest. Access roads particularly should be built to the ledges overlooking the Rough of Red River, a breath-taking beautiful expanse of mountain stream. Also access roads need to be built into other scenic and historic places, like Hells Half Acre in Magoffin County, the narrows of Licking in Menifee and Morgan, the Woodsbend area in Morgan, and many other such scenic areas.

But more than this, a program to preserve historic homes and public buildings in the hills, to mark historic sites, and prepare travel brochures and maps—this is needed to help keep the tourists an extra day. Too, a program to preserve our hill folksongs, folk dances and traditions, and make them available to visiting tourists—this needs attention. City people don't want to see city things when they come to the mountains—they want to see mountain things. For this reason mountain museums and libraries with mountain rooms need to be started.

All these will help bring in new money in tourist dollars, and the flow will increase with the years.

Highways: The mountain parkway leads through a part of our mountain gardenland, and it has popularized motoring into the mountains. But access roads and feeder prongs are needed. A northeast prong to connect the parkway's hub with U.S. 60 and I–64 somewhere in the tristate area would be a main tourist route from the north and east into the mountain vacationland in mideast Kentucky. It is a project of first importance. With a regional authority it need not wait on a traffic count to justify its building, but could be built with the assurance that the resultant traffic count would justify its costs.

Education and the arts: In all of east Kentucky there is not a State institution of higher learning from Morehead south to Virginia and from Richmond east to West Virginia. Expansion of the community junior college program is a dire need if the graduating high school seniors of the mountains are to receive equal opportunity for higher education. Federal aid for junior colleges is needed, particularly so in the depressed areas of east Kentucky, for higher education is beyond the economic means of most high school graduates, and too many of them have to go north to industrial centers or join the Army. They need to be given the opportunity to get a college education and stay at home and help develop the region.

Too, the area vocational schools need to be expanded to take care of ever larger classes of trainees needed in developing the region and providing craftsmen for new plants. Also the job retraining program to train idled workers for new jobs needs expanding, and not be limited to trainees for whom a job is already available. There will be additional jobs for trained craftsmen.

This program of waterways improvement, parks and tourists attractions, highways and access roads, reforestation and wood use plants, crafts training and community colleges—these and the preservation of our hill traditions, folk songs, historic buildings, plus the addition of numerous small lakes—this we think will help east Kentucky develop into the mountain garden spot and vacationland it deserves to be. Meanwhile, small watershed projects to protect scarce farmlands in mountain watersheds are needed to keep our small farmers self-sustaining.

National Forests Recognized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a recent public service advertisement sponsored by the Richfield Oil Co. and published in Sunset, Life, Time, Newsweek, and American Forests magazines deserves the attention of Members of the House. I believe that this advertisement and others which Richfield has sponsored over the past several years are a significant contribution to the conservation effort in this country.

In the State of California, where we are so heavily dependent upon the resources of the national forests, many of the people are not fully aware of how these valuable public properties are managed by the Department of Agriculture's Forest Service. With ever increasing use in my State, as well as across the Nation, I think it is vitally important that more people understand their stake in the 186-million-acre national forest system.

Under unanimous consent and with concurrence of the Speaker, I include this public service advertisement, depicting the new symbol of the national forest, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From Sunset, June 1963]

A NEW SYMBOL FOR OUR FORESTS

Water, crystal clear, tumbling down a mountainside, wood for our homes, food for wildlife, cattle, sheep, the memory of an incomparable vacation—these are just a few of the many ways in which our national forests serve us daily.

To make Americans more aware of the benefits which come from the planned, multiple use of our forests, the U.S. Forest Service, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, has recently designed a national forests emblem depicting these many uses. Based on an ancient symbol for wood, it shows a tree design with five loops or branches representing recreation, forage, wood, water, and wildlife.

America has just so much land. To conserve all of its values, we must make it available for a wide variety of uses. That's why Richfield encourages the use of its oil lands for a number of worthwhile purposes. Only in this way can we protect our great outdoors and still fully develop our natural resources.

Reaping the Whirlwind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the State, of Columbia, S.C., has published in its June 19, 1963, issue an editorial which has caused much favorable comment in South Carolina. It is entitled "Reaping the Whirlwind" and carries with it some very telling editorial admonitions about the current efforts of this administration to try to ram its civil rights program down the throats of all the American people. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REAPING THE WHIRLWIND

Having sown the wind, the Kennedy administration now is beginning to reap the whirlwind of racial passions.

The President and the Attorney General are professing shock over the virulence and the violence of the racial antagonisms which are being unleashed throughout the United States.

Yet, more than any other persons, these two men are responsible for the racial fever which now is raising temperatures across the land.

It was these two men—out of politics rather than piety—who began fanning the dying embers of racial animosities. It was the two Kennedys who began catering to the likes of Martin Luther King, in their brazen bid for Negro votes. It was this Kennedy administration which marshalled all of its might to compel the mixing of races, not only in schools, but also in housing and in commerce—trampling the rights of citizens who would exercise their choice of association.

It was this same Kennedy administration which gave its sanction to the "right to riot" when exercised by Negroes seeking to snatch by pressure a degree of acceptance which they have been unable to establish by their own personal performance.

Yet today, President Kennedy and Attorney General Kennedy stand aghast at the spectacle of mounting racial friction from one end of our country to the other.

What else could they reasonably have expected from their constant prating of the wrongs, more alleged than real, which have been done to the Negro?

The propaganda mills of the Federal Government and the political chicanery of the administration have done their work well and have wrought havoc. Any group of people can be goaded and cajoled into thinking that they are exploited if they are told so long enough and loudly enough.

But it is something else again to put brakes to the black juggernaut which has gained momentum through the constant shoving of the powerful Kennedy and Company political machine. Now the juggernaut careens out of control, and threatens to outpace those who set it in motion. There is no telling who will be crushed in its patch of destruction.

We are all being threatened—Americans and American institutions alike. Already, our property rights as well as our personal rights are being trampled underfoot—in the mad rush to achieve brotherhood by brute force. The very foundations of our American Republic are under attack.

Are the Kennedys and their cohorts so obsessed with the feel of power, so utterly convinced of their own righteousness, that—heedless of consequence—they will plunge our country into complete chaos?

Will the Kennedys recklessly insist upon a degree of race mixing which will force our country into amalgamation—or to anarchy?

Mass Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Representatives ULLMAN, DUNCAN and myself, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a true copy of the House Joint Memorial 4 enacted by the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon that relates to mass transportation:

House Joint Memorial 4

To His Excellency, the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the mass transportation of people is essential in alleviating the smog and vehicular traffic problems of urban areas of the United States; and

Whereas modern mass transportation systems would cut down the traffic in urban areas; and

Whereas the mass transportation of people is as important as vehicular traffic in urban areas; and

Whereas the right-of-way for mass transportation can be more economically obtained at the same time as right-of-way for highway construction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to study the possibility of providing Federal matching funds in Federal highway projects to be used in securing right-of-way for mass transportation purchased in conjunction with right-of-way for Federal highways.

2. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by house March 15, 1963.

Readopted by house May 20, 1963.

Cecil L. Edwards,
Chief Clerk of House.
Clarence Barton,
Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate May 17, 1963.

Ben Musa,
President of Senate.

"My 25 Years on Capitol Hill"—An Address by Beecher Hess, Minority Postmaster, U.S. House of Representatives, Before Greenville, Ohio, Rotary Club, March 12, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of Beecher Hess as Minority Postmaster of the House of Representatives, makes it appropriate to bring to the attention of the Members, a speech which he delivered earlier this year before the Greenville, Ohio, Rotary Club, in which he discussed his "25 Years on Capitol Hill." This will bestir memories for many of us and under leave to extend my remarks, I include this address by Beecher Hess in the Appendix of the Record:

My 25 Years on Capitol Hill

(By Beecher E. Hess, Minority Postmaster, House of Representatives, U.S. Capitol, to Rotary Club, Greenville, Ohio)

Greetings. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to meet with you here in Greenville today and to participate in your program.

Having just returned from Washington, I bring you greetings from your Fourth District Congressman, Hon. William M. McCulloch and from Hon. Robert Taft, Jr., your Congressman at Large from Ohio.

I might say that I make it a rule before speaking to any group, to learn something of its history, its purposes, and objectives. I have always been interested in Rotary, since it seems to be a part of every town and community. As you travel about, you will see the Rotary Wheel at the entrance to a city, with its welcome and time and date of its weekly meetings.

Some time ago I received several books on the history of Rotary from the Library of Congress. Back in 1905 Paul Harris, a young lawyer in Chicago, feeling the need for friendship and fellowship, conceived the idea for Rotary as we know it today. He believed that men engaged in various fields of endeavor, by joining together, could contribute to a better world by accepting the motto "Service Above Self—He Who Profits Most Serves Best."

For more than 50 years, Rotary, founded on the principle of service has performed well. It has pursued the idea of fellowship and friendship in business and professional relations.

Today, with more than 8,000 clubs, international in its scope, it wields an important influence in the affairs of community and state.

Heretofore when appearing before civic clubs, my topic for discussion has been "Washington Facts and Rumors." But since I am concluding a quarter century on Capitol Hill this year, I shall confine my remarks to the high spots of my experiences and observations during this period of time.

Twenty-five years in the annals of history is a very short period, but in human life it represents more than one-third of the average lifespan.

We who have lived in the last quarter century have seen great developments take place. A boom in population, scientific progress, educational advances, added public services, military buildup, foreign aid, to mention only a few.

We have witnessed the beginning and conclusion of the greatest war of all time, World War II. We are still in the throes of its aftermath. Atomic warfare (with its horrors and devastation) causes any prudent person to conclude that another large-scale conflict of this nature must be avoided if our civilization is to continue.

These and many other responsibilities have brought about Government expansion to the point where it now employs more people and spends more money than any other nation in the world.

Back in the 75th Congress, 1937–39, your Senators were Robert J. Buckley and Victor Donahey. Frank Kloeb and Walter Albaugh were your congressional district Representatives. John McSweeney and Harold G. Mosier were your Congressmen at Large. In the next Congress and for several succeeding Congresses, Robert Jones, of Lima, was your Representative. Then came the present Congressman, Hon. William M. McCulloch, who has represented you for the past 16 years.

Of the 25 members of the Ohio congressional delegation in 1937–39, only two remain today. In the Senate, 11 Senators have served you from that 1937–39 period. Of the 177 Republican Members of the House of Representatives today only 3 were there 25 years ago. Time takes its toll, and only change remains unchanged.

And what of these men and women who have served in the legislative halls of our National Government? Who were they? Who are they? Where did they come from? What was their background? In your representative from of government, each one of them was elected by the majority of the voters in their district. They were sent to Washington as a result of our two-party system, which from our early history as a Nation has served us well under our Constitution.

Under this system the voter usually has a choice of two candidates. He or she makes a choice and votes accordingly. The Congressional candidates are selected by the parties (Republican, Democrat or Independent). Generally, and with few exceptions these candidates are of good reputation and have a record of public service. In the vast majority of cases they have had experience in local, county or State government. They have come up through the ranks where they were subjected to public scrutiny. It is rare indeed that a crooked candidate is nominated or elected and if he is he does not stay long.

As I approach my retirement, one of my greatest satisfactions is the memeory I have of the great men and women who have served in our Congress and to have had the privilege of working with them. With few exceptions the Representatives who have served you in your National Government have been men of honor, capable and dedicated to the Rotarian motto of "Ideal Service."

One of the things that distresses me most in these modern times is the seeming growing trend of making light of or belittling the men and women that we send to Congress. Yes, the men in whose hands we place the destiny of our country. One Congressman told me just recently of the time when he was mayor of his city. When walking down the street people would point to him with pride and say, "There goes our mayor." Now they say, "There goes a politician," meant to be a derogatory implication. This is a rank injustice and hardly in keeping with the rules of fair play.

Congressmen are made the butt of jokes on radio, TV, and in the press. They are referred to as politicians and not as statesmen. However, I recognize the term "politician" as complimentary and respectable. Webster defines the word as "one versed or experienced in the science of government."

Most of these men are dedicated to legislative service for the benefit of their fellow men and not for the personal gain they receive. From my own personal knowledge I know that the great majority of them could make more money in private life, pursuing their professions or business careers than they make in being a Congressman.

This disparagement of Senators and Congressmen is of more or less recent origin. Up until a few years ago, at least when I was a boy and young man, we looked up to our congressional leaders as outstanding men, deserving of honor and respect. Today, many times they are ridiculed and criticized and their motives impugned.

Every good citizen, whatever his status may be, has some knowledge of our American system of government, its operation and function. Every John Q. Citizen is a politician. It ill behooves any good American to cast aspersions on Congressmen who are sincerely trying to make our political system serve the best interests of our Nation.

You, who are members of this Rotary Club are leaders in this community. You are all familiar with the public issues of the day. You have your own judgments and opinions. They may or may not coincide with those of your Congressman, but I am sure that everyone within the hearing of my voice would give credit to your Representative, Bill McCulloch, for being honest, sincere, and conscientious. In my opinion he typifies the rank and file of the Members of the House of Representatives.

Of course there are always some exceptions. Of the some 2,000 who have come and gone in the Congress of the United States during the past 25 years, only a few have failed to measure up to the high standard of congressional membership.

It has often been said, that if this country ever falls the victim of a foreign ideology, it will be from within and not from without. Loss of national pride, lack of interest in our own great history, due reverence for our flag and all that it stands for are all steps of our national decline.

One of the most distressing facts that my 25 years in Washington has brought to me so forcibly is this growing lack of regard for our public servants. We have more than 2½ million people working for our Federal Government. Their jobs in the main are routine and we do not hear much about them. As a class they do not make the news headlines. But let one of them go wrong—then the finger of suspicion is leveled at the whole group. Even a minor infraction is often exaggerated until it becomes sensational. Unfortunately government is limited in publicizing its work and achievements. In the field of private business firms and corporations spend millions advertising their products. Other millions are spent building good will. Not so in government. They plod along unseen and unheard. Sometimes I think that government would have a much better image if we spent a few million in the press and on the air telling the public what we have done and what we are doing. For instance the average citizen has only a faint idea of the duties and responsibilities of a Congressman. They have no idea of the long hours in committees, the demands of constituents, the time required for legislative study and research, public and private meetings, the handling of voluminous amounts of mail, and so on and on. If the public knew the truth there would be less criticism and more cooperation. This goes from the Congress down to the township board of trustees.

I have set forth as one of my objectives of retirement to do what I can in my humble way, to overcome the attitude of indifference, criticism, if not even derision and actual scorn for the men and women who represent us in Congress and to inculcate the high esteem due our Representatives whom we elect and send to the greatest deliberative body on earth.

Our country has become the great Nation that it is, because of the statesmanship we have had from the Founding Fathers to the present time. The least that we can do is to perpetuate their memory and pass it on to our posterity.

This age, the 25 years past, will provide its great men as history is written. Who are the men who will be remembered 180 years from now as Washington is remembered today?

What were the greatest events in the past quarter century? In my opinion there were three. (1) World War II, (2) the initiation of atomic power, and (3) the rise to world leadership of the United States of America.

Necessarily men are associated with events. Leadership and authority at the time the events I mentioned took place will naturally be referred to by historians. In these instances it will be Harry S. Truman as President, (he was in the right place at the right time), and Dwight D. Eisenhower as the victorious general and military leader.

In the Senate Robert A. Taft of Ohio was accorded the distinction, by a select committee, to be chosen as one of the five greatest Senators.

In the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn, who served for approximately 20 of the past 25 years as Speaker of the House, having broken all records for the length of service in this capacity, will be remembered in the far distant future.

Of the greatest national events that took place on the floor of the House of Representatives during this last quarter century, there are many that I shall never forget. One was the declaration of war. The sadness that was so keenly felt by all and the weeping and complete breakdown of a Congresswoman who had voted against the declaration.

Many serious questions as the years rolled by, were voted upon, and I have stood on the floor of the House and heard the Ministers, Kings and Queens, speak from the rostrum of the House Chamber, all impressive, usually those from foreign lands winding up by asking for some economic aid, just a wee small loan.

Yes, I have heard our Presidents from Hoover to Kennedy address the joint sessions of the Congress. I believe that every one of them was sincere in what he presented. I did not agree with some of the things that were advocated, but whether he was Democrat or Republican, he was my President, and in my opinion he spoke his honest convictions.

There were three individuals who made the greatest impression upon me, and strangely enough, not one was a President.

1. During the years of World War II, a speech before Congress by Winston Churchill was, in my opinion, the greatest from the standpoint of oratory and personality. He had magnetism, perfect command of language, and was most convincing.

2. In April of 1952, the appearance of General Douglas MacArthur was undoubtedly the most dramatic scene that ever took place in our National Capitol. Impeccable in appearance, with perfect military dignity, and a charm and grace, he captivated the audience from the moment he entered the Chamber. When he concluded his speech with the now famous remarks, "Old soldiers never die, they just fade away, God bless you and goodby," he received the most astounding ovation that I have ever heard. At that moment that audience would have made him king of the world.

3. And then the third, how different from the other two, but just as great if not greater was the honor shown to Col. John Glenn. Everyone was happy. There was a folksy attitude and Colonel Glenn handled the situation perfectly. First he recognized all of his buddies and his family. He was most humble and sincere. He gave credit to the country as a whole for the success of his global flight. His remarks, his demeanor, and his personality left a lasting impression upon all who saw and heard him. He was proud of his country and his flag and was pleased to mention his spiritual conviction and his belief in God. In a word he was "All American."

I have been asked many times, "What is the most important issue before the American people?" It would be impossible to give one issue preference because we have our domestic problems and of course we have our international. Internationally, all would agree that communism, its spread or containment is the issue.

Domestically, I am convinced that the race problem is our greatest national issue. Perhaps in your community it has never been a problem. It is usually thought of as being identified with the South, it was their worry. Now we know that its ramifications are nationwide. We see it not only in education, schools, universities, etc., but in labor unions, housing projects, and in every phase of commerce. The large urban centers will have to cope with it for many years to come.

At the time that I began my work in Washington, we had the Father Coughlin movement, he was going to run the moneychangers out of the temple. Then there was Huey Long, with his share-the-wealth program, every man would have his own castle. And there was Dr. Townsend, with perhaps the largest organization in the field of reforms. At one time, the Townsend plan for old-age pensions had more than 10,000 clubs throughout the country. These organizations have largely been forgotten but they contributed to and perhaps were responsible for the social security system that we have today. In 1936 old-age assistance provided approximately a $19 per month pension for about 345,000 elderly and indigent persons. Today, the social security fund of over $22 billion represents the largest single fund within our own or any other government.

In our international relations there are approximately 90 different countries, who are in some manner or another, obligated to these United States. Many of the small countries throughout the world, Africa, and Asia in particular, have gained their independence, and have set forth to govern themselves. I have talked to some of their representatives. Invariably they say they want to emulate us and to follow the course of our democratic system. But they fail to recognize their lack of leadership. They have no Washingtons, Jeffersons, Franklins, Adams, and the many others who fashioned our Constitution. My opinion of this grave situation is that we will be carrying them for many years to come.

I have seen Government grow increasingly larger each year. Before this session of Congress is over we will have raised our debt limit to about $310 billion. And just what is a billion dollars? Someone figured out that if you placed $1 bills on top of each other, a billion of them would be 6,777 miles high. If you gave your wife a billion dollars and told her to spend $1,000 a day, she would not be back for 300 years.

Serious as the situation is, and with the balancing of the national budget so far ahead that no one cares to predict when it may happen, the loss of our gold, and other features of our economy uncertain, you would think that the average citizen would be greatly alarmed and disturbed. But such is not the case. The average citizen does not seem to care about our fiscal structure. But leaders in various communities throughout the country, Rotarians if you please, should make this their business.

The Pennsylvania Dutch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the homeland of the Pennsylvania Dutch will be visited over the July 4 holidays by people from all over the United States. They will come for the annual Pennsylvania Dutch festival in little Kutztown, in the heart of the Dutch country near Reading, Pa.

From foreign lands too, they will come. Ambassadors and representatives of foreign nations have planned to participate in the festivities. The visiting guests will share the hospitality of the Dutch community and will visit farms and historic shrines.

The folk festival will begin next Saturday, June 29. It will run from June 29 through July 6. Last year more than 175,000 persons came from all over the country to sample the famous Pennsylvania Dutch cooking, to observe skilled craftsmen at work and to take part in such distinctive Pennsylvania Dutch customs as jigging, hoe-downing and free-for-all square dancing.

The Pennsylvania Dutch Folk Festival is the only one of its kind in America, where the traditions of the forefathers are presented as they were more than 250 years ago when these "Dutchmen" came from Switzerland and the Palatinate areas in search of religious and political freedom.

In view of the historic importance of the Dutch country in Pennsylvania as the place where the Americanization process had its initial beginning and as a glowing example of the nonconformist tolerance characterizing our free Nation, I am pleased to extend invitations to all my colleagues and their constituents to attend the 14th annual Pennsylvania Dutch folk festival.

Many of my colleagues have asked for information about Pennsylvania Dutch folks, where they live, and how to get to the Dutch country from Washington.

The heart of the Pennsylvania Dutch country is 150 miles from Washington. One route is the Baltimore-Washington Parkway to the Baltimore Beltway exit. North on the Beltway to the exit for Interstate 83. North on Interstate 83 to exit for U.S. 30 on the York, Pa., bypass. Route 30 east into Lancaster. Kutztown is 58 miles from Lancaster on Route 222.

Another route is by way of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway to Route 40; east on 40 to Route 222 through Lancaster and Reading to Kutztown.

WHO ARE THE PENNSYLVANIA DUTCH?

First of all, they are not Holland-Dutch. They have no connection with Holland-Dutch culture. They are the descendants of the 18th century German and Swiss wave of migration across the Atlantic, with a few German-dialect-speaking Alsatians and Lorrainers in the bargain. In most cases the ancestors of the present Dutch were prerevolutionary Americans, colonial German dialect-speaking immigrants.

After 200 years in America there can be no question of pure Dutch strains. Intermarriage with the Quaker, the Scotch-Irish, and other strains began in the colonial period, and in areas where the German dialect known as Pennsylvania Dutch predominated—as for instance the Eisenhower country of Lykens Valley in Dauphin County—the Scotch-Irish and English minority was absorbed into the Dutch majority and adopted the Dutch tongue.

Hence in that valley, northward of Harrisburg, we have in 1956 Dutch-speaking families of Dunleavy (Scotch-Irish name), Davis (Welsh name), and Buffington (English Quaker name) all as Dutch as sauerkraut—an expression which in the Dutch country is an affectionate rather than a derogatory one—but with family names and family heritages that go back to the British Isles.

Radically more important than blood in a definition of Dutchness is culture. Pennsylvania Dutch is not a blood-based, DAR-type, restricted-membership organization. Pennsylvania Dutch is—or better, was—a culture, a curious mixture of continental and British Isles folkways that was created here in the Dutch country and is to some extent still preserved in the cultural aspic of the dialect.

Actually the elements of the culture which we today call "Pennsylvania Dutch" are very much of a mixture. Pennsylvania was never a "Little Germany" where pipesmoking and beer-drinking peasants transplanted their entire homeland way of life. There was always, from the very beginning, the interplay of culture with the Scotch-Irish and Quaker neighbors, an interplay which spread both ways.

The typical "Pennsylvania barn"—the Swiss or bank barn—that two-story affair with stables on the ground floor and the threshing floors and mows approached from a drive-in entrance from a higher level—is a Continental adaptation. The Quakers and Scotch-Irish borrowed this barn pattern, and Pennsylvanians spread it as far west as Iowa. On the other hand, the typical Pennsylvania farmhouse was English Georgian in pattern—and the Dutchman borrowed it from his English-speaking neighbors. It was an even trade.

Through migration from Pennsylvania, these mixed patterns, American rather than European, were transplanted elsewhere. There was from Pennsylvania, beginning before the Revolution and continuing throughout the 19th century, a three-fold migration. Southward the Conestoga Wagons rolled into Maryland and Virginia—the western parts, which therefore became different in culture from the slavebound tidewater areas—and Dutch-speaking Pennsylvanians got as far south as the Carolinas by Revolutionary times.

Westward they went into Ohio—whose rural culture is half Pennsylvanian—straight through the Middle West, reaching Kansas by Civil War times. Northward they went too—into the Genesee country of western New York, and across the King's border into Ontario. While the Dutch dialect was spoken for years in these secondary settlements, it is (except for the Amish settlements of the West) defunct in West and South, but in Ontario, through cultural lag fostered by religious difference (again among "plain" Mennonites) it is still very much alive.

Hence the term "Dutch country," as we use it, means basically the dialect-speaking areas of Pennsylvania. Within Pennsylvania the Dutch country is roughly southeastern Pennsylvania—the triangle you can draw yourself by connecting Stroudsburg with Somerset. It overlaps however into parts of central Pennsylvania—Centre and Clinton, Union and Snyder Counties—and spilled over originally into the counties of western Maryland and the upper Shenandoah Valley of Virginia which were until 1850 culturally part of the Dutch country, the Mason and Dixon line notwithstanding. It was this area where the "Pennsylvania Dutch dialect was spoken and where the Dutch culture developed—all by 1800."

The Dutch culture was transplanted southward, westward, northward, into isolated areas where the Dutch dialect lasted for a time and then—with the exception of Amish and conservative Mennonite communities—disappeared.

Two Pennsylvania Dutch customs are now part of the national heritage—the Christmas tree and the Easter bunny. But without the 19th century German emigration—which came to all parts of the country—it is difficult to say whether these customs would have won their way into general acceptance from the colonial emigration to Pennsylvania alone.

The nearest claimants to national renown are log architecture, which spread from the Delaware Basin to all of frontier America; the Conestoga wagon, which became the covered wagon of the moving frontier; and the Pennsylvania or Lancaster rifle, which, known popularly as the "Kentucky rifle," helped materially in making possible the westward expansion of the frontiersman.

The national renown of the Pennsylvania Dutch which is apparent today, inspired chiefly by tourist interest which has come principally since the Second World War, centers on three separate facets of the historic Dutch culture: Pennsylvania Dutch folk art, Pennsylvania Dutch cookery, and the Pennsylvania Dutch plain people.

Interest in the plain Dutch, is, basically, from the tourist standpoint, interest in a past way of life which has disappeared in other parts of the country. In areas or cultures isolated by geography, language, or religion, older patterns have a way of hanging on when they are dead elsewhere. This is what the sociologists call cultural lag—the survival of earlier ways into a changed situation—and this always interests the tourist, whether he finds it in isolated parts of Europe or in Pennsylvania Dutchland.

The most important fact of the present national interest in things Pennsylvania Dutch is that the plain Dutch have captured the imagination of the American outsider, and the Amish have become the symbol of everything Pennsylvanian.

The Pennsylvania Dutch timed their activities by almanac. The exhibit at the folk festival will show how the almanac—next to the Bible—was the most important book in Pennsylvania Dutch farm homes.

It hung then—and hangs today—on a peg in a prominent spot in the farm kitchen, and was the key to "moon farming."

The exhibit will also show farm activities and how their timing was determined by the phase of the moon or the sign of the Zodiac; from the proper moon phase for felling a tree, splitting it into rails, and setting the fence to the sign of the Zodiac indicating the time to sow grain, even to the time to put the meat in the smokehouse so it would not lose weight.

Exhibits will show laying 18th century tile; a dryhouse in operation; a village blacksmith at work; shaving shingles for roofing; linen making; preparing flax; hex sign painting; an old-fashioned country store; churning cream into butter; lye making; playing party games, and an old-time "lumpa" party.

Portrayal of horse-and-buggy travel in the Dutch country and of the life of the Amish and other plain people add to the interest of the pageant which illustrates the life and activities of the study Pennsylvania Dutch and the role they played in the history of the State and Nation.

The visit of U.N. delegates from 30 different nations will add international interest and glamor to the event. The U.N. group will arrive at Kutztown on July 3. The Pennsylvania Dutch Society will be host to U.N. delegates and their wives. The U.N. group will appear for the July 4 program and activities which will be the highlight of the festival which will run from June 29 to July 6.

Catholic War Veterans Honor a Truly Civic-Minded Citizen of Chicago: E. John Sierocinski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a truly civic-minded Chicagoan was recently honored by the presentation of the National Commander's Award of the Catholic War Veterans, U.S.A. Mr. E. John Sierocinski is a man who takes his citizenship seriously and who has served the Chicago community in many ways. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Edward F. McElroy, National Commander of the Catholic War Veterans, U.S.A., in presenting the National Commander's Award to Mr. Sierocinski at ceremonies held in the Bismarck Hotel, June 4, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Edward F. McElroy, National Commander, Catholic War Veterans, U.S.A., June 4, 1963, on Presentation of National Commander's Award to E. John Sierocinski

It is my privilege this afternoon, on behalf of the Catholic War Veterans, to make a brief commentary on the exceptional gentleman we honor today.

To characterize E. John Sierocinski briefly, is somewhat like trying to squeeze all the postal regulations into a pocketbook edition.

E. John is a man of many admirable traits. He is soft spoken but quick witted: he is easygoing but forceful: he is reserved yet candid. He believes the first requisite of a good conversationalist is to be a good listener. These are the obvious characteristics of a man who has been reared in a wholesome family atmosphere. They are the characteristics of a person who appreciates his family, his church, and his country.

If you were to sit down with E. John to discuss the idea of personal philosophies I'm sure he would modestly say, "A man's philosophy should simply be, to be honest with himself."

But E. John's philosophy is more than this, in addition to his devotion to God, family and country, he practices an active policy of good citizenship. His idea of good citizenship embodies all that stands for loyalty and personal integrity. He believes that if you cannot conscientiously know that you are fostering these virtues * * * then you can't call yourself a good citizen. He has often said, "We in this country are 'citizens,' * * * not 'subjects'."

We become "subjects" when we lose sight of the responsibilities of our citizenship.

This is a refreshing philosophy in a time when the name superpatriot has taken on a somewhat odious meaning.

Patriotism means the same thing today, that it meant on December 7, 1941. It means the same thing it meant on July 4, 1776. To many it means more.

It means more than national pride. Patriotism has always included a strong love for one's own city and community. Countless people will criticize the United States, but these same people will think twice before they say anything about Texas, Brooklyn, or Bridgeport.

E. John Sierocinski's patriotism—his good citizenship—is best shown by the outstanding contributions he has made to his community and his city.

He has served as chairman of no less than seven major fundraising drives on a community and a citywide level. He organized the 26th Street Chamber of Commerce, the Lawndale Crawford Neighborhood Council, and just recently his untiring efforts resulted in the formation of the South Lawndale Community Conservation Commission.

He serves his city as a director of the Chicago public library and as treasurer of Mayor Daley's youth foundation. He holds office in eight different civic organizations.

He is a member of more than 23 organizations representing veteran groups, civic advisory committees, fraternal organizations, business associations and fraternal groups.

I might add that while he devotes much time to these various humanitarian activities he also runs a highly successful business. His ingenuity in the savings and loan field has brought him national acclaim.

In paying tribute to our guest of honor this afternoon I must mention that his efforts on behalf of his fellowman have been recognized before. He has received honors and citations from organizations ranging from the Boy Scouts of America, "Oscar", to the "Award of Merit" presented by the city of Chicago.

Poor Roads Explain Much of Haiti's Woes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, there appeared in the Washington Daily News of May 9 an interesting article, pointing out how an underdeveloped country like Haiti has suffered from an inadequate road system. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the Record as follows:

Poor Roads Explain Much of Haiti's Woes

(By Clayton Willis)

Port-au-Prince, Haiti.—In the modern world of motorized transportation, one of the most important lines of communication and commerce in any country, is roads. Sadly underdeveloped Haiti has about the worst ones imaginable. The roads explain much of Haiti's cultural and economic backwardness and her political troubles today.

Take the road from this capital city to the nearest Dominican Republic border town, Jimani: For the first 10 miles of this 40-mile trip the road is in relatively good shape. Then, as you move out into the extremely arid last 30 miles, maintenance becomes increasingly poor. Much of it isn't paved at all. That's until you reach Ganthier.

There you encounter an even worse hole-infested dirt road thru sun-baked, hilly country until you get to Fond Parisien. From that point on the highway is impossible, if not impassable. You can get through, but that's about all, and at a snail's pace. Pot holes everywhere. There are washouts in many places. Nothing is being done about them.

SIGNIFICANT

Yet, this road could be a salutary, peaceful and profitable route of exchange between Haiti and the Dominican Republic. Not only for trade, but, of course, for some tourists. Then there's the obvious area development that could go along with improved driving conditions. There's another potential enterprise, stymied today because of this same poor road from Port-au-Prince eastward 40 miles to the Dominican border. This is Lake Etang Saumatre—a fine spot for tourist hotel facilities and water skiing. The road skirts the lake for most of the 10-mile stretch from Fond Parisien to the frontier. But it's a brute of a road today.

Another "road" that is so bad it must be seen to be believed is the one from Port-au-Prince west and to the south to one of the largest towns on the south coast of Haiti—Jacmel. I made this 4-hour, 60-mile trip by jeep. It's about the only way it can be done. Hard, steady driving was needed to average 15 miles an hour.

SEACOAST

Best part is west along the seacoast to Gressier and Leogane. But through the sugar cane plantations the road is an appalling series of chuckholes and marooned bridges. You have to be on the lookout for detours around the cement bridges, washed out on both sides, standing like islands in the middle of stream beds.

But, that's only the beginning. A few miles on, the road goes up into the mountains and over them to Jacmel. If you don't like driving in water, go by plane; much of the rest of the jaunt is across streams. If the water is high, obviously you don't go to Jacmel that way, because at several spots you must drive up streams a 100 or 200 yards at a stretch. The only "maintenance" I saw was being done by a few workmen replacing a few rocks at a ford.

Cost of putting in a decent road through those eroded, dry mountains would be colossal. Maintenance, if one was ever built, would be high.

But the final touch comes when you finally reach the end of the road, and find you must buy a ticket to enter the colorful, poverty stricken, rundown, colonial city of Jacmel.

This ticket is a "tax" not charged by Jacmel, but by the Duvalier strongman government in Port-au-Prince, back at the other end of the line.

Reports to the United Nations Trusteeship Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Congressional Record the

final of a series of articles presented to members of the United Nations Trusteeship Council. The following address was delivered by Mr. Vicente N. Santos, Member of the Council of Micronesia, President of the Mariana District Legislature, and Special Adviser to the High Commissioner. Mr. Santos' presentation is as follows:

REPORT TO THE UNITED NATIONS TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Mr. Chairman, it is an honor for me to attend this meeting of the Trusteeship Council. I consider it an unusual honor because this is the first time that I have traveled outside the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands I should like to extend to the Council warm greetings from the people of the Trust Territory. At the same time I feel certain that I shall gain a very profitable experience during my stay here and from my participation in the meeting.

I am very grateful to the Government of the Trust Territory and the United States for this opportunity of serving as an adviser to the U.S. delegation.

During the past 10 years I have been teaching about the purposes and functions of the United Nations and its various organs. My students have spent many hours studying the activities of this body and we recognize that the United Nations, including the Trusteeship Council, is an important instrument toward helping the progress of humanity everywhere on the face of the earth.

I am pleased to inform the Council that the people of the trust territory are deeply conscious of the function of the Trusteeship Council and its activities in assisting them to meet their needs. Our people look to the United Nations as a great organization in bringing about good relations among nations, helping to bring freedom to all peoples and to maintain peace and security for the enjoyment of all mankind. Perhaps we are particularly conscious of the need for peace since our island was one of the major battlefield areas of World War II. We have seen what war does; we have had our homes destroyed and have lost our loved ones. We do not want this to happen again anywhere in the world.

I am from Saipan, having been born in Garapan, Saipan, in 1933. I began my schooling during the Japanese administration but had completed only 1 year of my education before the end of the war. After the war I entered the American school and in 1951 graduated from the Pacific Islands Teacher Training School, which was then at Truk.

I began teaching immediately after graduation, first in one of our elementary schools. In 1952 I became a teacher in the District Junior High School and have been teaching in junior high school since that time. By profession I am a social science and history teacher and have been concerned mainly with civics, a field which is very important in our new and developing political life. Currently, in addition to handling social science classes, I serve as assistant principal for the new public high school of the Marianas District.

I am a member of the Council of Micronesia and also a congressman in the new Marianas District Legislature. Prior to this, I had the privilege of serving as a congressman in the Saipan Municipal Congress, as legislative secretary from 1960 to 1961 and as vice speaker in 1962.

I am fortunate in having traveled and visited all the district centers except Yap. These trips have given me firsthand information on the political movements and aspirations of each district. The trips were made under the auspices of the Council of Micronesia, which set up three subcommittees—political, economic, and social—to study conditions in the territory. I was elected a member of the political subcommittee for 1961–62. Our subcommittee visited each district, meeting with the District Congress officials and other important leaders.

I had the privilege of sitting with the Ponape, Palau and Marshall congresses while they were in session. I was astonished at the performance and the ability of the men who were striving to better the living conditions of their people. It was through education that these men acquired the necessary knowledge to help them proceed and move forward toward the kind of life they believe men ought to live. These men, of course, are the leaders in their own communities. Many have left their homes in order to obtain the knowledge required to assist their people. We believe that education is what makes the dream of these men come true. It is education that makes everything possible in our modern civilization.

People in the trust territory feel that education is a vital necessity for procuring a better living. More and more young men and women all over the trust territory are interested in getting higher education. They are forever in search of ways of acquiring it. The government of the trust territory is aware of this particular matter and has increased the number of scholarships this year to meet the need. District congresses also are appropriating funds for additional scholarships and special training.

Parents in the trust territory today understand the importance of education. They have come to a point where they have to modify the old, traditional belief that sons and daughters should always stay at home with the family. Today many of our children are away from their parents, attending schools on Guam, the PICS on Ponape, in the United States, or elsewhere. Because of this change on the part of the parents also, many Micronesians are now holding important positions both in the district centers and at headquarters on Saipan. These positions fall into all categories—political, economic, social, educational, judiciary, and so forth. This is quite evident especially in the public health department, where all the hospitals in the districts are headed by Micronesians. It is perhaps worth while to mention the person responsible for the progress which has been achieved in the field of health, for he is a man who will always be remembered in the hearts of the Micronesians. He is the late Dr. Harrie E. Macdonald. We owe him all honor and respect for his untiring efforts and devotion to the improvement of health in the trust territory. In the department of education, two districts are headed by Micronesians. There are two young men working now in the political affairs office at headquarters, and each district has political affairs officers. I believe the Council is aware of the gradual improvement of Micronesian employment conditions in the trust territory. Many important jobs are today held by Micronesians. This is possible because of advanced training and schooling offered by our government.

One of the most significant events, which took place on July 1, 1962, was the unification of the administration of the trust territory under civil government. I know that the Council is pleased with this result. With the new change in administration, Rota District was incorporated with Saipan District and a new district was formed, the Marianas District. Immediately the leaders in the Marianas, with the assistance of the political affairs personnel from headquarters, initiated the creation of a district legislature. After several weeks of preparation and planning, the members of the charter convention adopted the district legislature charter for the Mariana Islands.

In March of this year the Mariana Islands District Legislature convened its first session in the history of the Marianas. This is a manifestation of the political progress which is taking place in the trust territory. I was honored by being elected its first president.

Another important event was the transfer of trust territory headquarters to the soil of the territory itself. This transfer will bring the people of the territory closer together, creating greater understanding and cooperation among them and at the same time strengthening their feeling of political unity. This unity was manifested during the special session of the Council of Micronesia which was held at Headquarters, Saipan, this past March, when the major issue of the formation of a "territorial congress" was discussed. The primary objective of the session was to decide whether this body should be a bicameral or unicameral one. After a lengthy discussion on this matter the Council finally decided, by a majority vote, to recommend for consideration the bicameral system. Personally, I favor the unicameral system. At this stage of our development, such a body would, I feel, be less complicated.

Another item worthy of mention is the interest of the people in their Government. This is manifested through the many elections held in the past. More and more people are participating in the elections. It used to be that a candidate needed only a handful of voters to be elected. Very few people were interested in the affairs of their government. But today, at least in my district, a candidate must work day and night for his election. People are aware of the importance of good government and they judge a candidate's ability and performance accordingly.

In the Marianas where we have political parties, especially on the island of Saipan, people are very conscious of their Government. The political leaders who hold seats in the municipal congress and the district legislature must produce results or else they will not be reelected at the next election. Personally, I would like to see other districts adopt political parties. I know that political parties are new in our territory, but they are not new in the world. Political parties, I feel, help insure that qualified candidates run for office, and provide better public officials.

Social conditions in the trust territory are progressing rapidly. People are gaining a better understanding and appreciation of 20th century civilization, and health conditions are improving under the supervision of public health personnel. Trust territory students are studying for medical degrees. Nurses are also playing a very important part in the improvement of health. Without their assistance the doctors would find it difficult to accomplish their tasks. A few months ago a polio protection program for the whole trust territory was initiated.

Perhaps this is an appropriate time to mention the typhoon which hit the Marianas. Typhoon Olive, with winds of 115 miles per hour and gusts up to 123 knots, smashed into Saipan on April 30 of this year. Saipan was severely damaged. Among the major damage was the destruction of part of the new District Hospital. Supply warehouses and public works buildings suffered great damages also. Powerlines were downed. About 95 percent of all houses on Saipan also suffered some damage, with about 30 percent total destruction of local buildings. Three villages suffered damages, the worst being Tanapag, Chalan Kanoa, and San Roque. No lives were lost, however, and only one minor injury resulted from the typhoon.

The people are very grateful for the generous assistance received from various groups and organizations. The U.S. Navy in Guam provided transportation for inspection teams, shipment of medical supplies, and naval hospital personnel to help in administering typhoid inoculations. The American Red Cross and other agencies gave immediate assistance. As a resident of Saipan and on behalf of my people, I wish to extend to all the people, groups, agencies, and organizations who have extended their assistance to us in one way or another, our appreciation, which also goes to the government of the trust territory for its quick and generous assistance during the time of disaster.

In the field of economic development the territory is also progressing. Many business enterprises, both large and small, are helping to boost the economy of the territory. At the same time, the Government is providing experts in the field of economics, both in the districts and at headquarters level.

We are trying our best to share in the solution of these problems of our islands. We look to the council for advice and guidance.

Before I withdraw, I wish to extend my appreciation to this council for this opportunity to appear before it. And lastly, for this great organization, the United Nations, I pray that its many hours of meetings and debates will bring success in the maintenance of happiness, peace, and security for all mankind.

Federal Government Pollutes Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, recently the House of Representatives Water Pollution Subcommittee has been hearing testimony on the problem of the soiling of natural waters by improper disposal of wastes. The editorial which follows suggestions that the Federal Government has been a prime offender in the destruction of our drinking water supply and recreational streams. If the Federal Government is to set the pace in correcting this menace to the health and well-being of the Nation, then excuses must be replaced by actions based on forward-looking responsibility:

[From the Hagerstown (Md.) Morning Herald, June 13, 1963]

POOR FISH

Pollution of streams and underground water is a serious problem, menacing health, destroying wild life, and spoiling outdoor fun. Many minds are dealing with it, and billions of dollars are being spent to correct it.

An usual, it has been suggested that the Federal Government get into the act, and the House Water Pollution Subcommittee has been hearing testimony about the problem. Imagine the Federal chagrin when the evidence showed that one of the most serious spoilers of our water supply is the Federal Government.

The worst kill of fish recorded in the Nation last year occurred inside the city of Washington itself, where 3.2 million alewives (a kind of herring) died as the result of waste that found its way into the Anacosta River from a highway project.

But the Federal offenses span the Nation. The Army dumps 248,000 gallons of untreated waste into the Hudson daily. The major polluter of Cape May, N.J., harbor turns out to be the Coast Guard Station. The Navy set-up at Lakehurst, N.J., dumps its domestic waste into the Toms River, and 5 miles below it enters a recreational lake.

Bigger figures are available. At Charlestown, S.C., Navy installations and a hospital, dump 2.4 million gallons of industrial waste and raw sewage into the Cooper River, and 5.8 million gallons of sewage a day flow from Army installations into the waters of Hawaii.

These are examples, of which there are many. In all, the Federal Government is said to account for 3 percent of all pollution of American waters—a high figure when you consider that most Federal facilities are served by community sewage systems like all the other buildings in town.

Water pollution can be controlled. The interstate compact for this purpose on the Ohio River has induced industries and governments to spend a billion dollars for control facilities with beneficial results. Other areas have similar programs, and all should have.

The Government pleads that budgetary considerations are the reason for its offenses. The Federal role as a major polluter brings into question the value of its proferred leadership in dealing with this problem. And if it hasn't enough money to curb its own waste why ask it for funds to curb the waste of others?

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russia Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expensive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., *June 14, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: It is our understanding that several measures have been introduced in the House of Representatives to authorize the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

We urge you to take quick action on House Resolution 14 and to support any measure which would enable the United States to aid captive nations.

Sincerely,

STANLEY SIDLAUSKAS.

RACINE, WIS., *May 29, 1963.*

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The Racine chapter of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation informs you that a resolution has been passed by our unit supporting passage of House Resolution 14, submitted by you, which calls for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Recent developments worldwide and in Washington make the formation of such a committee imperative to the security and welfare of the United States, and will bring added hope to the tyrannized peoples of the once free nations today in Soviet bondage.

We are, in addition to this letter, contacting our Congressman as well as Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, head of the Rules Committee, urging him to release your resolution to the House floor for quick debate and passage.

May I take this opportunity to commend you for your stand in this regard, and to assure you of our every support of your measure?

Sincerely,

JACK KAMALIAN,
President.

DOUGLAS, MICH., *June 15, 1963.*

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: I heard you on the "Manion Forum," June 2, 1963, and what you said startled me. As you suggested I wrote my Congressmen, and told them of this situation.

I am interested in the bill you have introduced to create a Captive Nations Committee. I think that such a committee would give great hope to the people of these nations. Also it could inform the American people of what is happening in the captive countries.

Would you please send me a copy of this resolution, and several of the speeches you have given on the floor explaining it?

Keep up the good work in keeping our Republic free.

Yours truly,

PETER R. CHASE.

SUPREME COMMITTEE FOR
LIBERATION OF LITHUANIA,
New York, N.Y., June 15, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN: The Soviet Government knows well that the colonial rule under which it holds Lithuania and other captive European nations oppressed and exploited cannot last forever. The world movement for abolition of colonial systems will sooner or later compel the U.S.S.R. to restore the rights of self-determination to the nations which Soviet Russia has enslaved during the last decades. Moscow leaders also are aware that the captive nations are struggling for their liberation from the Soviet colonial system.

The Kremlin is therefore very sensitive to the official steps taken by the free countries in favor of freedom to men and nations. Under pressure of such steps, the Soviet Union already has brought certain changes in its empire of slaves. Moscow would do more in this sense if demanded by the United States and other Western Powers.

In this conjunction the House Resolution 14, if passed, appears of paramount importance. The Special Committee on Captive Nations will be able both to keep the House informed on the developments within the Communist camp as well as to promote the cause of freedom.

I, therefore, respectfully request your authoritative support of the House Resolution 14 to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations, which will witness for years to come of the American interest in the restoration of the inalienable right of men and nations to live under governments of their own free choice.

Respectfully yours,

Dr. A. TRIMAKAS,
President.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 5, 1963.

Mr. WALTER TUSTANIWSKY,
Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. TUSTANIWSKY: Thank you for your letter of May 25 regarding Congressman FLOOD's House Resolution 14 which would create a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

I am familiar with this resolution and believe that all the ethnic groups are in full accord with the purposes of it.

You may rest assured that when it is presented to the House of Representatives for action, it will have my fullest support.

It was a pleasure to learn of the interest and views of your fine organization concerning this matter.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD M. RYAN,
Member of Congress.

Beauty as Well as Brawn in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the State of West Virginia is famous for the brawn of its miners and the rugged grandeur of its mountainous terrain. Perhaps less familiar is the fact that my State is also an important producer of objects of beauty and delicacy.

For example, in the field of handblown glassware, West Virginia leads the entire Nation. Our glassware is admired in the windows of many great churches, such as the Washington Cathedral here in the Capital. The fascinating history of the handblown glass industry, from its inception at Jamestown in 1608 to its present flourishing status, is told in a recent article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Sunday Gazette-Mail.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANDBLOWN GLASSWARE

In 1608 at Jamestown, Va., North America's first industry was born—molten glass was shaped into objects of beauty.

Today, some 350 years later there are plants throughout West Virginia doing much the same work that was done at Jamestown, much in the same manner as then a 1,000 years earlier.

The Mountain State is by far the top producer of handblown glassware in the United States, holding more than 50 percent of the market.

Nearly 30 fancy glassware plants dot the State.

At these places are produced handmade glass articles that rank with the finest produced throughout the world in such countries as Italy, England, France and Germany.

Morgantown Glassware Guild, Inc., at Morgantown is the producer of nationally famous blown glassware that has graced the American home for more than 60 years. The firm is the maker of the official crystal service at the White House.

At Williamstown near Parkersburg is located Fenton Art Glass Co., makers of milk glass and early American design color glass.

West Virginia Glass Specialty Co., Inc., at Weston, is a leader in the field of popular types of glass such as apothecary jars, florists glassware, hurricane lamp shades, candy jars and many different kinds of drinkware.

Viking Glass Co., at New Martinsville, keeps in mind both America's historic past and at the same time looks to the future. While continuing to produce early American articles, the firm also searches for new style ideas and glass futures. Their new design trends have become an influence in the modern American home.

There's Rainbow Art Glass Co., Inc., at Huntington, Bischoff Glass Co., at Culloden, and Blenko Glass Co., Inc., at Milton.

Blenko is probably the best example of the old tradition of glassmaking being carried out in the space age.

The company's name comes from William Blenko, a British glassmaker who after three unsuccessful attempts to establish a glassmaking industry in this country finally succeeded at Milton.

In 1922 Blenko was 70. His son, William H. Blenko, joined him the following year, and for 7 years they struggled in a business which seemed to hold no future.

Although it was the height of the depression, William H. Blenko saw a future in his business.

While Blenko had been producing glass exclusively for church windows and related uses, a need was seen for some other product.

An arrangement was made with a large New England department store to make handmade flower vases and tableware. This ware was previously being imported from Venice and instead of the restricted field of making glass for church windows, the company found opened to a new, wider and highly promising field.

Since then the name of Blenko Glass has spread far and wide. Much of the glass in the windows of Washington Cathedral, the cathedrals of St. John the Divine and St. Patrick in New York City, the Harkness Library at Yale and the Cathedral at Monterrey, Mexico, is Blenko.

Since 1937 Blenko has been the licensed manufacturer of all glass reproductions at Colonial Williamsburg.

Blenko is a flourishing business, employing about 150 persons. It has a great effect on the town of Milton, for 99 percent of the annual payroll of almost $1 million goes to local employees.

The factory, as do the other handblown operations in the State, attracts thousands of visitors every year from all over the United States. Visitors are welcome to tour the factory or to browse through the myriad of interesting glass pieces in the display room.

Tourists marvel at the beehive of activity at the plant.

Tools used are the same as those used hundreds of years ago, and the basic operations are unchanged. The forms are hand carved from applewood and sticks and paddles of charcoal are used for shaping.

The job of glassblowing is truly an art.

One of the Old World traditions is that fine blassblowing could only be handed down from father to son.

This has been disproved by Blenko, for the craftsmen have learned the art on the job, from experienced glass blowers to be sure, but without any limitations of close-guarded family secrets.

In Blenko's beginning there were two Swedish glassworkers who were highly experienced in such work. Three of four men who learned from them are still on the job, and are teaching others.

Truly interested boys practice on their own time, learning and improving as they go along. This is more a personal art than a mechanical process.

Glassworkers work around a furnace in teams of six which are called "shops," and each shop works independently of any other shop. The two top men are the "blower", who gives the piece its preliminary shape, and the "finisher" who does the final shaping.

Many more hours of skilled work and planning goes into a piece of glassware before it reaches the furnace stage.

After the basic design comes off the drawing boards begins the delicate and exacting process of selecting the right ingredients to produce the desired color and texture.

Only after weeks of testing and retesting is the article ready for production.

What does the future hold for the earliest of American industries?

The outlook for the State and the Nation's flat glass and glass container industry is rather bleak because increased foreign imports have grabbed much of the market.

But the picture is more promising for the handblown industry, according to William H. Blenko, Jr., executive vice president of the Milton firm.

Blenko, as do the other fancy glass plants, finds itself in much the same situation as back in 1922—competing against imports.

Before the depression it was because foreign glassware held the market because of its high quality. Today, the problem is cheaper prices.

While weekly salaries of more than $100 are not uncommon for an American glassworker, Blenko said he recently read that some French workers in the field were striking for a $15 weekly salary.

"Imports have certainly plagued the industry, especially in the stemware field," he said, "but I see a bright future."

"I think that the companies that are progressive, have a good design and a good product certainly have a bright and promising future."

Blenko plans to construct new and larger display and sales rooms in the near future and has prospects of new markets for their products.

While West Virginia is making an all-out effort this centennial year to gain a new image, the handblown glass industry continues to products that make the Mountain States a great name in glass handcrafts.

U.S. Prestige Continues To Slide as Kennedy Failures Mount

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, probably no administration in the history of the United States has had such a record of complete failure as the present one.

Our domestic policies are in a shambles with law-defying mobs running rampant in cities across the land; people are being hurt and killed and all the President can suggest as a solution is to give in to the demands of those who are creating the disorder. Stultifying tax rates and ever increasing Federal spending at the insistence of the President are fast drying up capital needed for new ventures and an expanding economy with the result that our economic growth is being strangled by an ever-expanding Federal bureaucracy.

Abroad, U.S. prestige and power has never been as low. Our enemies are becoming bolder, more arrogant and are making more and more demands for surrender of the principles for which we have stood throughout our history. Communism is strengthening its hold in the Western Hemisphere, our allies seem to have lost all confidence in U.S. leadership and are openly contemptuous in demanding more money as a price of future alliances.

The bright golden promises of the candidate of the New Frontier are now tarnished with the leaden burden of a President who has been unable to understand or cope with the problems which confront the Chief Executive of this Nation. Only the people can now save America and we, the Congress of the United States, have a bounden duty to the people to reassert our Constitutional responsibilities and demand that the President stay within the bounds of his constitutional authority. In this way we may be able to halt the headlong rush to ruin in which we are now engaged until the people have had an opportunity to remove the inept leadership of this administration and replace it with a leader capable of meeting the problems of this decade.

The following excerpt from the Newsgram page of the U.S. News & World Report of July 1 sums up in concise language the failures of the Kennedy administration and some of the awful results:

NEWSGRAM

President Kennedy, for the time at least, finds the breaks going against him. That's true both at home and in his dealings with the world outside.

At home, Negro demands are broader and more insistent than any expected. Abroad, nothing at the moment seems to be going right on any continent.

The President is lucky that this is 1963, not election year 1964.

The outside world seems less and less interested in U.S. leadership. Other countries still like U.S. dollars and protection, but not U.S. ideas.

Mr. Kennedy, with his travels, is not likely to change that trend.

France, of course, is going her own way. Great Britain is shaken by political scandal and a tottering Conservative Government. Labor, if and when it takes over, will veer toward "neutralism" and more welfare-state plans.

Italy has veered strongly leftward. Germany remains a firm U.S. ally, but is about to change Chancellors. The Germans, all of a sudden, find that they are in a highly favorable bargaining position in dealing with the United States.

West Europe is drifting, with the drift not to United States liking.

It's much the same in this hemisphere. Canada is joining Latin America in penalizing American investors. Canada's new Government appears to be as uncertain an ally as the old—or maybe more so.

Cuba, of course, is a Russian satellite. Brazil, biggest of countries in South America, wants more and more money as the price of holding back from much closer ties with Russia. Castro, backed by Russia, is active everywhere.

Vietnam, where U.S. troops are fighting in southeast Asia, is in a very serious political mess. That war isn't going well. Laos has about been given up. Thailand is suspicious of U.S. motives. Pakistan, formerly a firm U.S. ally, has been offended. Nehru's India keeps trying to play off United States and Russia in the interest of more aid for herself.

Congress, all the while, is tiring of trying to buy friends everywhere.

So Mr. Kennedy has plenty to think about besides the Negro problem. The Negro demand at home is for "compensatory positive discrimination." It's for Government action to discriminate in favor of Negroes. The President now is asking Congress for power to give to Negroes much of what they demand.

Seven Out of Ten Say Negroes Are Justified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Minnesota poll, widely known for its accuracy, conducted interviews on civil rights early in June.

Although most voters did not favor the demonstrations by Negroes in the South, the overwhelming majority felt that Negroes are justified in asking for an end to segregation. The poll shows that 71 percent feel the Negroes are justified and only 17 percent that they are unjustified.

The poll follows:

[From the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune, June 23, 1963]

PUBLIC BACKS NEGRO DRIVE FOR PROMPT END TO SEGREGATION

Seven out of ten Minnesotans say that Negroes "are justified in asking that segregation be ended promptly in the South."

And 6 out of 10 believe the Federal Government "should take a more active part than it has up to now" in the southern crisis over race relations.

But an equally large number of State adults—6 out of 10—disapprove of the demonstrations which Negroes have been staging in the South in behalf of desegregation.

Those are findings in a just-completed survey by the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota Poll, in which a representative cross section of the State's voting-age men and women was questioned.

Interviewing took place June 7–11.

The series of questions began with this:

"Lately Negro groups in a number of southern cities have been staging demonstrations to get rid of segregation practices in stores, parks, and other areas which the public uses. In general, do you approve or disapprove of the demonstrations by Negroes in the South?"

The replies:

[In percent]

	Total	Men	Women
Approve of demonstrations	32	38	27
Disapprove	62	57	67
Qualified answers	1	([1])	2
No opinion	5	5	4
Total	100	100	100

[1] Less than 1 percent.

Only among college-educated Minnesotans is there a majority (51 percent) expression of approval of the Negro demonstrations.

Interviewers then asked:

"At some demonstrations, Negroes have been arrested in large numbers and violence has broken out. Do you feel the violence has been due mainly to the white people, or mainly to the Negroes?"

The answers:

[In percent]

	Total	Men	Women
Violence due mainly to white people	37	37	37
Due mainly to Negroes	25	26	23
"Due mainly to both"	28	29	28
Qualified answers	1	1	1
No opinion	9	7	11
Total	100	100	100

The next question was:

"Is it your feeling that Negroes are or are not justified in asking that segregation be ended promptly in the South?"

The replies:

[In percent]

	Total	Men	Women
Negroes are justified	71	67	74
Not justified	17	21	14
Qualified answers	6	7	4
No opinion	6	5	8
Total	100	100	100

The most frequent qualified comment is "it's going to take time—segregation isn't going to disappear overnight." A few persons say the Negroes "are pushing it too hard."

There is statewide agreement, among urban and rural people, those on all educational levels, and in all age groups, that the Negroes "are justified" in seeking a prompt end to segregation in the South.

Even among Minnesotans who disapprove of the Negro demonstrations in southern areas, a majority uphold the Negroes' right to press for an early end to segregation practices.

The final question was:

"Do you think the Federal Government should take a more active part than it has up to now in the white-and-Negro relations problem in the South, or do you think it should take a less active part?"

(President Kennedy last Thursday sent to Congress a request for immediate enactment of a series of civil rights laws, aimed at barring discrimination in jobs, voting, schools, and public accommodations.)

The answers:

[In percent]

	Total	Men	Women
Government should take more active part	60	61	60
Should take less active part	17	17	17
"Should go on doing what it has been doing"	17	17	16
Qualified answers	1	1	1
No opinion	5	4	6
Total	100	100	100

In a few instances, people say "I don't think the Federal Government can solve it" or "if the States can't handle it, then the Federal Government should step in."

But the public feeling throughout Minnesota is that the Government in Washington should do more than it has been doing to bring about a settlement of the South's racial problem.

More Voices Are Raised To Oppose Price Fixing Through So-Called Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the American consumer is often the forgotten man in the halls of Congress. It is, therefore, gratifying to hear more voices being raised in protest against the wholesale vertical price fixing which would be fostered by the so-called quality stabilization bills now before both Houses of Congress.

I do not always see eye to eye with the Wall Street Journal, but the issue for June 11, 1963, contains a cogent editorial pointing out the damage which these so-called quality stabilization bills would do to our competitive American free enterprise system. The Wall Street Journal said:

STRICTLY AMERICAN

An organization bearing the august title of the Bureau for the Advancement of Independent Retailing warns that "hundreds of thousands of the Nation's * * * proprietors of independent retail business are today fighting a life-and-death struggle. * * * The great American dream—the opportunity for a citizen to start and run his own business—appears to be verging on a nightmare."

What has made things all that desperate? It's that familiar old monster, competition. Mainly, according to the complaint, it's those price-cutting big stores, the discount houses and chains. To fight this competition the bureau urges passage of fair trade legislation, a species of which is again before Congress; it would prohibit any merchant anywhere from selling a national brand product at a price lower than that set by the manufacturer.

Under a fair trade law—or, to describe it more accurately, a price-fixing law—the bureau says that "the consumer will be paying no more than her neighbor for a particular branded article. * * * One price to every customer is strictly American."

Is it now? We had always thought competing for customers with lower prices, better service and other ways was one of the most American things about America. Just as we'd thought the same about the consumer's interest in, and ingenuity in finding, a bargain.

Indeed, price-fixing is usually considered so un-American that some Americans who try it get thrown in the clink. We are sure the drum-beaters for fair trade, in and out of Congress, wouldn't want that to happen to them. And we can't help wondering what history books they get their nightmares out of.

Indeed, even in Maryland, a fair trade State, Governor Tawes recently vetoed a bill which would have extended to liquor the retail price fixing fostered by fair trade. In his veto message, Governor Tawes pointed out that such legislation:

Would eliminate price competition at the retail level, shifting such competition to the wholesaling and manufacturing level. Such a shift, in my opinion, invites collusive agreements to the detriment of the consumer. And, while it may be true that many consumers do not save under the present system, it is equally true that the opportunity to save does exist now. I would be most reluctant to deny consumers this opportunity. In this regard, the State cannot promote the interest of the small liquor dealer at the expense of the vast majority of citizens.

But, perhaps the most significant reason for my rejection * * * is that this bill is not consistent with the economic system that has prevailed in the United States for centuries. For the State to disregard the laws of supply and demand, for the State to superimpose its will upon the operations of a free market would establish a precedent that harbors serious consequences.

Finally, I am especially pleased that a refreshing new voice—the President's Consumer Advisory Council—has joined the chorus of opposition to quality stabilization. In a trenchant statement issued last week, the Council called upon us to preserve consumers from the artificially high rigged prices which will surely follow if we succumb to the lobbies and inflict fair trade price fixing on the American people. The Consumer Advisory Council's statement follows:

STATEMENT BY CONSUMER ADVISORY COUNCIL ON QUALITY STABILIZATION BILLS, INCLUDING S. 774 AND H.R. 3669

We oppose these bills and all similar attempts at price fixing at the retail level which have been sponsored under the name of "fair trading," "resale price maintenance," and "quality stabilization." Such attempts to limit freedom of individual merchants to sell goods at prices they choose are antithetical to the free enterprise system and, hence, to the best interests of American consumers.

These bills propose, in effect, that the Federal Government should protect a manufacturer who wants to establish the minimum price at which his product will be sold at retail. It would give manufacturers the right to prohibit retailers from selling brand name or trademarked goods at prices other than the retail price established by the manufacturer. Such legislation would limit competition, inhibit innovation and progress at the retail level, and would also tend to encourage price fixing at the manufacturers' level. In any event, it would tend to deny consumers the benefit of downward price adjustments which flow from increased efficiency and improvements in production and distribution.

We are not impressed by the argument that such legislation would aid small business. The evidence in States which have fair trade legislation indicates the contrary to be the result, since it encourages the introduction by large retail businesses of private brands and other techniques for avoiding the effect of the legislation.

We believe that so-called quality stabilization (fair trade) bills are inimical to the interests of consumers. They violate the third right of the consumer as stated in the President's consumer message, the "right to choose, to be assured, wherever possible, access to a variety of products and services at competitive prices." We, therefore, commend the administration for its opposition to these bills.

The members of the Consumer Advisory Council are:

Dr. Helen G. Canoyer, chairman, dean, New York State College of Home Economics, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Mr. David W. Angevine, public relations director, Cooperative League of the U.S.A., Washington, D.C.

Dr. Persia Campbell, professor and chairman, Economics Department, Queens College of City University, Flushing, N.Y.

Mr. Stephen M. Du Brul, Jr., partner, Lehman Bros., New York, N.Y.

Mrs. John G. Lee, past president, League of Women Voters, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Edward S. Lewis, executive director, Urban League of Greater New York, New York, N.Y.

Hon. Walter F. Mondale, attorney general, State of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.

Dr. Richard L. D., Morse, professor and head, Department of Family Economics, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans.

Mrs. Helen E. Nelson, California consumer counsel, Governor's Office, Sacramento, Calif.

Dr. Caroline Ware, consultant, Vienna, Va.

Dr. Colston E. Warne, president, Consumers Union of United States, Inc., professor of economics, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.

The Consumer Advisory Council, the distinguished Governor of Maryland, and the Wall Street Journal are welcome additions to the ranks of the opponents of "fair" trade which already include the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, the American Bar Association and the AFL–CIO.

Fidelity to the competitive free enterprise system which has served America so well, and a decent regard for the interest of consumers—your constituents and mine—alike require us to reject this latest assault, under the Jolly Roger of "quality stabilization," on the right of Americans to buy and sell in a free market.

Vote Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 1963, I was at Cape Canaveral on my duties as a member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee.

On rollcall No. 45 on May 14, 1963, on House bill 5517, supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal 1963, motion to adopt the conference report, I would have voted "No."

On rollcall No. 46 on May 14, 1963, on House bill 5517, supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal 1963, motion ordering previous question on amendment to the Senate Philippine war claims rider, I would have voted "No."

On rollcall No. 48 on May 14, 1963, on House Resolution 340, I would have voted "No."

This Reform Is Plain Double Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Denver Post raises some basic questions about the so-called reforms now being developed in the administration tax program. Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the RECORD for the consideration of all those who want to see an equitable tax program developed:

THIS REFORM IS PLAIN DOUBLE TAXATION

The House Ways and Means Committee has been busy in Washington putting together, at President Kennedy's request, but not in his best interest, a package of what are loosely called tax reforms. The assembly job has not yet been completed, but from the looks of some of the pieces, the committee is putting together a monster.

The latest piece of this Frankenstein product agreed on by Congressman WILBUR MILLS' committee is the scheme to raise—mind you, this is part of the Kennedy tax reduction package—$500 million in new revenue by curbing itemized tax deductions for individuals.

Under the proposed restrictions, individual taxpayers would no longer be allowed to take deductions from taxable income for State and local taxes paid on gasoline, auto tags and drivers licenses, cigarettes and beverages or on a variety of selective sales taxes (like levies on hotel bills) or special taxes.

So far, congressional and administration tax writers have not proposed eliminating the deduction of such big items as State and local real estate taxes, income taxes or general sales taxes. But the direction they are taking is clear, and it would only be a short step through this open door for the elimination of such deductions as well.

Thus the general taxpayer would be paying on already taxed income, one more instance of double taxation and a rather blatant one at that.

Just how widespread would be the effect of the "tentative" Ways and Means Committee decision to restrict the itemized deductions for taxes paid is indicated by Treasury figures which show that deductions were itemized on 24 million of the 61 million individual income tax returns filed in 1961.

These tax-on-tax provisions are supposed to be committee substitutes for the so-called reforms proposed by the administration which would have disallowed itemized deductions unless they exceeded 5 per cent of a taxpayer's income. Administration proposals could have had an adverse effect on charitable donations, persons paying mortgage interest and so on. The committee's provisions are less severe, particularly as they affect certain groups—like real estate interests. The committee is also being more gentle on the oil industry.

This newspaper warned when the President tied his tax cut proposal to a tax reform package that he was hobbling chances for both a meaningful tax cut (one that could spur both investment and consumption) and real reform.

We foresaw that every so-called reform would affect some interest or group and that each would have to have its chance to make its case. Obviously, the lobbyists have been active. The committee's work to date shows that.

One thing we didn't foresee was that the committee, faced with the choice of "reforming" against a group which could actively lobby and "reforming" against the general taxpayers, would give the works to the latter. But the tax-on-tax proposal which has now been put in the projected bill is that kind of reform.

The recent curb on expense account deductions, plus the wavering doubletalk about tying tax reform to tax reduction, has made Americans more tax conscious than at any time in our history since the Boston Tea Party.

So, if the general taxpayers don't have a lobby, they do have a way of fighting back. They can do so at the polls on election day, and it is there that they may pay Mr. Kennedy back for the work of a Democratically-dominated committee.

We don't know whether this thought will give the tax writers pause. But their progress toward "reform" to date certainly should. If this is the best they can do, they ought to give up the effort.

The Milwaukee Journal's Russell Lynch Warns of the Slowdown in the Acquisition of Wet Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following recent article from the Milwaukee Journal:

The reprieve for wild ducks, wrung from Congress by sportsmen and conservationists after more than a decade of fighting, is in danger of being wiped out by attrition. The wetlands acquisition program, begun 2 years ago with great fanfare and a $140 million price tag, is 60 percent behind schedule. And many Congressmen seem inclined to let it wither.

By this time, 297,000 acres were to have been acquired. Only 127,000 have been purchased or leased. The program was scheduled to hit full stride in the third fiscal year, starting July 1, with a $25 million budget and a target of 589,000 acres. Congress now proposes to allow only $10 million.

WIN BY ONE VOTE

This appropriation, shrunk by the Budget Bureau and cut by committee, recently survived by only a single vote in the House of Representatives.

The pinch has been made worse by a 2-year decline in duck-hunting stamp sales.

The wetlands program is in real trouble. Forces that want to save the ducks face the prospect of making their fight all over again.

The one-vote margin in the House is likely to encourage the Budget Bureau to chop future budgets, although the 7-year acquisition program can be carried out now only if the pending $10 million appropriation is tripled for the remaining years.

COUNTIES COMPLAIN

Even large appropriations can carry the program only part way unless Congress also satisfies revenue demands of counties wherein the desired wetlands lie. The counties complain that their moneys shrink when land is removed from the tax roll for conservation.

The Governor's approval must be obtained before a purchase in any State will be sanctioned by the Migratory Bird Commission, which supervises the program. Governors of the Dakotas refuse to approve when a county objects, and these States have most of the Nation's primed duck production habitat, the prairie potholes.

Minnesota relented somewhat from a similar attitude but still restricts purchases.

The Oregon Legislature recently voted counties power to block purchases but the Governor vetoed the bill, saying his power was already sufficient.

Chairman BONNER, Democrat, of North Carolina, of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries a few weeks ago asked for the Interior Department's views on the pending bills. The Department urged priority for its own bill, which would continue annual payments of 25 percent of refuge revenues to counties and add three-quarters of 1 percent of the cost of purchased land.

Congressional opponents have used the Dakota situation as an excuse for slashing appropriations, arguing that more money could not be used. The facts are that the Migratory Bird Commission has approved many more purchases than funds permit and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has a big backlog of options, some of which may expire.

Acquisitions could proceed much faster elsewhere while the Dakota problem is being solved, up to a certain point. That point, Interior Department sources say, has not been reached.

The long fight to save the ducks reached a climax in October 1961 when Congress authorized the Interior Department to borrow $105 million from the Treasury over a 7-year period and to use duck stamp revenues also. After that, the stamp revenues are to repay the Treasury.

The Department's plan under this financing arrangement was outlined in March 1962 by Frank P. Briggs, Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife. It called for a slow start while the wildlife bureau geared up, with heavy buying to begin after July 1, 1963.

The Department estimated that about $140 million would be available, with which it proposed to acquire 2,970,000 acres.

Briggs scheduled spending of $5 million in fiscal 1962, all out of duck stamp revenue. Duck stamp sales fell sharply and the program was cut back about $1,200,000.

For 1963, spending was to be $12 million. But Congress appropriated only 7 million and duck stamp receipts fell $600,000 below those of 1962.

The program was to hit full stride in fiscal 1964, with a budget of $25 million. Congress has indicated it will provide only $10 million and nobody knows what will happen to stamp sales.

The prairie pothole country, with its duck production potential, was a major target of the program outlined by Briggs, with 1,821,000 acres to be acquired in the central flyway. The wildlife bureau has put a great deal of effort and time into this region, bucking local opposition and Governors' disapprovals.

In preparation for this article, a report on progress in the pothole country was requested. This was the situation as of May 31: North Dakota, 40,624 acres purchased, 14,243 leased; South Dakota, 7,373 purchased, 3,467 leased; Minnesota, 1,999 purchased, 83 leased; Nebraska, 590 purchased, none leased.

These add up to 68,369 acres, not much of a dent in the 1,821,000-acre goal—a total too pitiful to be mentioned if it did not define, shockingly, the state of the wetlands program.

Medgar Evers Offered His Life, His Fortune, His Sacred Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the funeral of Medgar Evers at Arlington National Cemetery was a solemn tribute to an American hero in mankind's struggle for freedom. Charles W. Bailey, correspondent for the Minneapolis Tribune, captured the mood and significance of the event in his report in the Tribune for June 20:

AT BURIAL IN ARLINGTON—"HE WAS CUT DOWN LIKE A FLOWER," EULOGIZER SAYS

ARLINGTON, VA.—The humid haze of early summer lay hot and heavy on Washington, D.C., but here across the river, under the oak trees, the air was fresh and cool.

The little girl sat on a folding chair, her mother on one side and her older brother on the other. The child's face was blank and bemused, almost dazed. Around her stood a thousand others. Closer in, a score of men with cameras crept and scuttled and snapped their shutters at her.

In the center of the crowd, just in front of the girl and her brother and her mother, stood six soldiers. They held an American flag stiffly over the casket in which the little girl's father was to be buried.

All around stood the small white headstones. Closest to the new grave, they marked men from New Mexico, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Minnesota, North Carolina.

"In the midst of life," the preacher said, "we are in death * * * he cometh up and is cut down like a flower." A big airliner, just airborne from the nearby field, drowned out the rest of the prayer, and the little girl twisted her feet and looked up, trying to see the plane.

Something touched the girl's hand and she looked down. It was her mother's hand, seeking hers and enfolding it.

The words went on, but the little girl seemed not to be listening. She sat still in her wide-skirted white dress, its color seeming brighter in contrast to the black clothes of all around her.

A man's voice snapped out a muted command, higher up on the hill, and there was the rattle of rifle bolts, a warning in the quiet. But neither the child nor her mother seemed to have heard this, for the crash of the three volleys shattered their composure.

Then, from above, came the long sad sweet notes of taps, just 24 notes in all. The bugler stood over the crest of the bill, out of sight of graveside, and it was probably just as well. Surely no man could play those notes every day, as this one must, if he had also to look at those who have to listen.

The little girl wept for the first time now, as did her mother. The boy gave his sister a clean handkerchief. She twisted it in her hands as other men spoke at the graveside.

There were two men from the American Veterans Committee, which had long known the girl's father as a worker and a companion, and which only a fortnight ago had elected him to its national board. Their words seem not to touch the girl or her family, despite the sorrow in them and in the speakers.

Then another man, the director of the organization for which her father worked, began to speak, and the little girl began to listen.

This man did not pray or read from scriptures, as others had earlier. Instead, he spoke the words of the Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

He said that the man being buried "believed in those principles" and that when the time came, he had put on his uniform and gone "far from Decatur, Miss. * * * to help a strange people who, like those he left behind, were threatened by racism."

He told how the little girl's father came home to Mississippi—to "the land he refused to disown"—and how he turned down opportunities to move elsewhere.

The speaker referred again to the Declaration of Independence, this time to its closing sentence. "Every time he left his family," he said, "he too was offering his life, his fortune, his sacred honor. That offering was finally accepted. He believed in his country. It now remains to be seen whether his country believes in him."

When the speaker finished, another man stepped forward and led the crowd in a hymn—the only one sung. It was a song the little girl's father had often led at home:

"We shall all be free;
We shall all be free;
We shall all be free;
Oh, deep in my heart
I do believe
We shall all be free—someday."

Now the little girl wept again, and then, looking at her mother and seeing her weeping too, sobbed aloud and clung to her uncle's arm. He lifted her into his lap.

The six soldiers at the grave, moving for the first time in a half hour, silently and in intricate pattern folded the flag. Silently they passed it to a chaplain; silently he took it to the widow. She hugged it to her, seeing nothing as the chaplain saluted her and turned away.

Then the little girl and her brother and her mother were taken away, leaving their father and husband under the oak trees with the others who, like him, earned in war their right to lie there.

In a few weeks, he too will have a little headstone, with an inscription like all the thousands of others on the hills and in the hollows under the trees. His will say: Medgar Evers, Mississippi.

Full Justice to the Negro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the Minneapolis Star expressed the overwhelming sentiment of the people of Minnesota in favor of President Kennedy's civil rights program.

Yesterday my colleagues from Minnesota, Congressmen ALEC OLSON, JOHN BLATNIK, and JOE KARTH, and I backed up the President by each introducing the Civil Rights Act of 1963.

Let us hope that the debate on these proposals will be dignified and orderly as suggested by the Star editorial. Let us proceed with the crucial business of guaranteeing full justice to the Negro.

The editorial follows:

J.F.K. ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The civil rights program which Mr. Kennedy submitted to Congress Wednesday is a far-reaching one. It contains many elements of controversy. Ideally it should be considered in an atmosphere purged of emotion; the debate should be dignified and orderly, the background one of national restraint, if not of calm.

There are two possibilities which weigh most heavily against this ideal situation. The first is the threatened filibuster by southern Senators. This could tie the Senate into knots for weeks. Old wounds would be opened, new ones created, passions inflamed, relationships embittered.

The second disturbing possibility lies in the threats of some Negroes to carry their street demonstrations into the Halls of Congress. This would not help their cause; it would, in our opinion, seriously harm it. The resentment of Congress against coercive action of this sort would be wholly justifiable. The President's warning against "unruly tactics or pressures" is quite in order.

The civil rights program extends to many areas. These include voting, education, employment, equal access to hotels, restaurants, theaters, etc., and vocational training. The equal access proposals may provoke some of the angriest debate.

We believe that most Americans favor the objectives of this program. We think that they sense, with the President, "the growing moral crisis" in race relations and that they share his hope that Congress, setting aside political and sectional ties, will proceed with the crucial business of guaranteeing full justice to the Negro.

Is Congress Becoming Nonessential?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the great strength of the system of government adopted by our Founding Fathers was in the constitutional powers of three distinct branches of Government, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial.

There is a grave danger that Congress may become so ineffective through the delegation of its constitutional responsibilities that the people may, indeed, determine it is not an essential part of our Government. If this day comes to pass, we, the Members of Congress, must bear the responsibility because we will have failed to stop the erosion of the powers and the responsibilities invested in the legislative by the Constitution. In the past 3 years Congress has, on repeated occasions, abrogated its authority and given unconstitutional powers to the President in such fields as spending, tariffs, and in areas going to the very heart of legislative responsibility. The Congress has wrung its collective hands, but has taken no action to halt the raid on legislation powers by the Supreme

Court. Through its actions over the past decade it would seem nine men have decided they are the Government of the United States and have taken unto themselves the power of legislation and the determination of the rights and privileges of the people.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. News & World Report in the July 1 issue reviews the powers which the Supreme Court has seized. In the hope that such a review may arouse Members to the danger we face as a republic because of these unconstitutional raids by the Supreme Court, I include the article as a part of these remarks:

THE CHANGING UNITED STATES: EFFECTS OF SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

(It's a vastly different America from what it was when Earl Warren ascended the Supreme Court Bench as Chief Justice 10 years ago. Most of the changes are outgrowths of decisions by the "Warren Court." Race relations, State political affairs, interstate disputes over water rights, municipal police practices, actions by Congress—all have been altered by the impact of Supreme Court decisions that reach into areas long avoided. And the term just ended indicates no letup in Court rulings that will force changes in more and more fields.)

Chief Justice Earl Warren on June 17 ended another term of the Supreme Court. Brought to a close was the first decade of what has become known as the "Warren Court."

The Warren decade has wrought something of a revolution in the balance of governmental powers. It saw the Supreme Court extend its authority to one broad field after another, treading in areas once regarded as reserved by the Constitution to Congress or State and local authority.

Ahead lies a vast new exercise in Supreme Court authority. The Court, at its next term, will hear cases calling on the Court to establish "guidelines" for the apportionment of State legislatures. The Court, in the term just ended, had already struck down Georgia's "unit system" in primary elections on the grounds that the system discriminated unfairly against city voters and in favor of rural voters.

Former Justice Felix Frankfurter once described election laws as a "political thicket" which the Court should not enter. The Court now has firmly rejected Justice Frankfurter's advice.

As the decade of the Warren Court ended, organized Negroes—encouraged by Court decisions to protect their rights—had taken to the streets in many cities—North and South. The Court recently had held that local laws against trespass could not be applied to sit-in demonstrations where cities had a policy of racial segregation.

The Court under Chief Justice Warren is described by many legal scholars as taking an "activist" approach to legal problems and to have a tendency to extend its powers.

A signal of what to expect came on May 17, 1954. On that day, the Court overturned the doctrine of "separate but equal" facilities for the races in public schools. Later, the Court ordered schools to be desegregated "with all deliberate speed." Since that time, U.S. troops have been called out three times in an effort to help bring about integration in the schools.

At its latest term, Justice Arthur Goldberg, speaking for the Court, said the school decision "never contemplated that the concept of 'deliberate speed' would countenance indefinite delay in elimination of social barriers in schools * * *."

The reaction to the school decision has been far reaching. There has been a flight of white people from central cities to suburbs. A degree of token integration has taken place in border states and in many States of the South. In the North, school-attendance figures suggest that there is more actual segregation than at the time the Court acted. What has taken place is "de facto" segregation as whites left the cities.

Now to be undertaken is a drive to break up the system of neighborhood schools. New York's State education department ordered on June 18 that steps be taken to transfer pupils on a basis of race when a school district in the State becomes 50 percent or more colored. New York city already has been transferring 14,000 Negro pupils to attend predominantly white schools in an effort to overcome "de facto" segregation.

In one of the last acts of its decade, the Warren Court on June 17 reaffirmed an earlier decision that prayer cannot be required in public schools.

The Court during the 10 years under Chief Justice Warren has made decisions that have brought it into conflict with chief justices of State supreme courts, with the American Bar Association, and with Congress.

State authority, during this period, has been whittled away in the fields of criminal prosecutions, in labor relations, in election laws, as well as in race relations. During the same period, the powers of investigating committees of Congress also have been restricted.

Sharp controversy arose over Warren Court decisions in 1957 and 1958 that dealt with loyalty and security, passport authority, investigation of subversives, and criminal prosecutions. On August 23, 1958, the Conference of Chief Justices of the States approved a report that was highly critical of the Court. This report complained, among other things, that the Supreme Court encroached on State authority and "too often * * * tended to adopt the role of policymaker without proper judicial restraint."

On February 24, 1959, the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association adopted resolutions urging Congress to overturn a series of Supreme Court decisions involving the loyalty of Government employees and national security. During the 1958 session of the 85th Congress, the House passed four bills aimed at reversing Supreme Court decisions. All of these measures died in the Senate.

After the 1958 session of Congress, the Court appeared to be controlled by a somewhat more conservative majority, consisting of Justices Felix Frankfurter, John M. Harlan, Charles E. Whittaker, Tom C. Clark, and Potter Stewart. Decisons on some loyalty and security cases indicated that this majority had modified some earlier decisions.

The complexion of the Court now appears to have changed aagin. Justics Frankfurter and Whittaker have retired, to be replaced by Justices Arthur Goldberg and Byron White, appointed by President Kennedy. Decisions during the term just ended indicate that a new majority now controls comprising Chief Justice Warren and Justices Hugo L. Black, William O. Douglas, William J. Brennan, and Goldberg.

During the 1963 term, the Court continued to throw what it considered the protective arm of the Constitution around suspected criminals. It decided 8 to 1 that Federal rules regarding searches and seizures must apply to all State courts. Many States had been more lenient than Federal courts in accepting evidence gathered by police.

The Court ruled unanimously that States must provide attorneys for needy defendants who cannot afford to retain one. Some States had not appointed counsel in instances of minor crimes. These provisions for free counsel to needy defendants also were extended to carrying appeals from convictions.

Disputes with Congress: The 1963 term brought further disputes with Congress. A law that Congress passed to strip U.S. citizenship from native-born persons who fled the country to escape military service was struck down as unconstitutional. That decision was 5 to 4, with the new Warren majority in control.

Another 5-to-4 decision held that a former Communist could not be deported because the Justice Department had failed to prove that the defendant knew the aims and purposes of his party.

On the last day of the term, the Court struck again at the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It overturned the conviction of a man held in contempt of Congress for refusing to testify about Communist activities in the steel industry. By 5 to 4, the Court decided that the committee had not strictly observed its own rules.

The Court continued during the 1963 term to step into racial issues in localities. It directed Memphis, Tenn., to desegregate "promptly" its parks, libraries and museums. It struck down a school-transfer plan in Tennessee. It held that Negroes in Illinois could take a segregation question in Federal court even though they had not exhausted all the remedies offered by the State.

The Court was unanimous, too, in striking down a Missouri law to protect the public from strikes in utilities. That law authorized the Governor to seize utilities and operate them when strikes were threatened. The Justices said the State law must yield to the Federal Taft-Hartley Act which permitted strikes in privately owned utilities.

For the first time, the Court applied the antitrust law to bank mergers. The Justice Department was upheld in opposing a merger of two Philadelphia banks even though banking officials had previously approved the merger. In dissenting from this decision, Justice Harlan noted that Congress repeatedly had refused to apply the antitrust law to banks. Now a Court majority had done it.

Judicial legislation: Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat of Virginia, said of this decision: "I was shocked to hear of the Supreme Court's decision in the Philadelphia bank-merger case. This is one of the most incredible cases of judicial legislation which the Court has handed down."

A similar reaction took place when a five-Justice majority gave the Interior Secretary complete authority to allocate Colorado River water to California, Arizona, and Nevada in times of water scarcity. Justice Douglas, dissenting, charged: "It (this case) will, I think, be marked as the baldest attempt by judges in modern times to spin their own philosophy into the fabric of the law, in derogation of the will of the legislature."

This view was echoed on June 19 by Representative CHARLES H. WILSON, Democrat of California. Referring to the water decision, he said: "With every major decision the Court hands down, new laws are made. Our entire way of life in this country is being revised and remolded by the nine justices of the Supreme Court. * * * It would seem that almost everyone is making law except Congress."

The trend of the Warren Court in using its judicial authority to promote change in more and more fields shows no sign of abating.

A Tribute to Eleanor Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to pay my respects to the late Eleanor Roosevelt, whose loss the world shall have reason to mourn for many a day to come.

A woman of intelligence, of vitality, conscience, and good humor, she brought perceptivity, excitement, charity, and pleasure to all with whom she came in contact.

Never choosing to run for political office herself, she nonetheless was all her life associated with political matters and deeply concerned in the worldwide struggle for human dignity, a struggle hinging on political as well as economic and social considerations.

As the niece of President Theodore Roosevelt and the wife of Franklin D. Roosevelt, she lived in an atmosphere of political fireworks during every phase of her existence.

While still a young woman, she joined the board of the League of Women Voters, took part in the work of the Women's Trade Union League, and, in 1924, assumed an active role in the State and National committees of the Democratic Party.

She continued to increase her activity with lectures, parties, and speeches in the interest of popular political enlightenment, education, and welfare. In 1926 she was associated with the foundation of the Valkill Shop, a nonprofit furniture factory in Hyde Park, inaugurated with the object of employing disabled workingmen. She also served for a time as director and teacher at a private school for girls, before the election of her husband, Franklin D. Roosevelt, to the office of Governor of New York State, established her in the role she was to play for many years, that of close collaborator and unofficial adviser to the most dynamic political leader in the land.

As the wife of a Governor, Mrs. Roosevelt was busier than ever, acquiring and disseminating ideas. She became a director of the Foreign Policy Association and of the City Housing Corp. In addition, she became a syndicated newspaper columnist, edited a magazine, and judged contests.

In 1933 she entered the White House, in company with her husband, and promptly set about establishing a hundred delightful traditions of her own. One of these was a weekly press conference with the ladies of the press; another was a carefree, informal atmosphere, involving many grandchildren and a large number of galloping puppy dogs. The White House had never experienced such a commotion. "We call it a hotel," Mrs. Roosevelt used to say.

When the war came she saw her four sons enter the service, supported the war effort through her newspaper column, assisted in many wartime fund-raising operations, and flew to England, to visit American servicemen overseas.

Her worldwide reputation grew apace, exceeding that of any American woman in history, and her followers, numbering in the millions, came to regard her as they well might regard a close cousin.

Following the death of her husband, Eleanor Roosevelt entered a new phase of her career, as a member of the American delegation to the United Nations. Here again, as in all other areas, she excelled while at the same time making friends.

At the close of her career, Eleanor Roosevelt was just as vibrant, just as delightful, just as wonderful as ever. Her departure from this life has made the rainbow a shade less brilliant, perhaps—but her memory, on the other hand, shall serve to lighten the path for any who care to follow in her footsteps—and these, we can rest assured, will number in the millions.

Conscience and Understanding, Not Force, the Key to Human Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the President's efforts in the area of race relations are probably due to the same failure he has achieved in all other areas of our national life with which he has tried to experiment. The failure will be for the same reason, his misunderstanding of human nature and his lack of knowledge of people.

Our relationships with one another can never be directed by force, but rather through knowledge, understanding and conscience. The Negroes, who today are looking for President Kennedy to use the power of his office to enforce discrimination in their favor, may regret the day they deserted the steady march of progress through orderly processes based on reason for resort to violence and intimidation.

The following editorial from the Dallas Times Herald points out why the President's call for force is doomed before it starts:

> BECAUSE WE ARE HUMAN
>
> The President has called for the Nation to follow a pattern of civil rights which may be hopeless. It may be hopeless not because we are southerners or northerners or black or white, but because we are human.
>
> Human nature will conform to just so much law. Fairness in life and equal acceptance are ultimately matters of the human spirit rather than of legislation.
>
> There is no doubt that the President's worthy intentions are to make the Negro's opportunities equal to the white's in every possible instance. But there is a growing threat of demands being made which cannot possibly be met by any law or any enforcement of a law: demands which intrude into the field of human acceptance rather than human rights.
>
> Many Negro demonstrators seem to be hinting that they want, "more and now," rights to an extent that no race has them. Neither President Kennedy nor any other agency can give certain rights to either white or black races for they are those rights of choice, of personal persuasion. This matter of choice is why we have 586 different Protestant Christian denominations in the United States. It is the reason some of us sell insurance and some work on newspapers but others wouldn't do either if you offered them the chance.
>
> So there must be some realism injected into the planning being done by the White House. It is the same kind of realism which tells churches that proclaiming, "Go and sin no more," will not effect a moral revision, even if backed by force.
>
> There cannot be a Federal marshall or a National Guardsman patroling every conscience in our Nation. The only command to love that the individual obeys comes from inside.
>
> Ironically, the Negro himself could be the one who most endangers the progress of his own advance. Demonstrations designed to dramatize the Negro's case have slipped from sound hands in many cases and the fear of racial rioting is springing up in every section of the Nation.
>
> If the Negroes persist in demonstrations that border on rebellion, threatening the peace of all in a community, or if such demonstrations are held as a suspended threat over Congress, the possibility of future gains will go tumbling. Public confidence in the Negro's responsibility as a citizen will be shaken. Americans don't like intimidation.
>
> Recent events in the South have shown that there is a great deal of white conscience operating voluntarily. We must assume that much of it is motivated by love of our fellow man, regardless of color, and not because of force.
>
> Witness the progress of integration in Dallas. It has been achieved without mass demonstrations or threats and intimidation. It has been accomplished peacefully because men sat around a table and planned. Dallas Negro leaders have used wisdom and patience, not threats and emotional uprisings.
>
> The civil rights bill proposed by the President will carry "voluntary" a step further and make it mandatory. Up to a certain point this will be effective and, in some fields, necessary. But it will never bring about a kind of equality that simply doesn't exist, and Negro leaders must recognize when the limits of racial equality have been reached and the realms of human acceptance are entered.

The National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the new increase in the national debt limit has just become law, and we are again faced with increased interest costs in servicing the debt. And we still do not have a systematic debt retirement law.

For the past few years I have sponsored a planned debt retirement bill, which would require each budget presented to the Congress to contain a provision equal to at least 1 percent of the debt, to be applied to reduction of the debt.

One percent is a small step, but one in the right direction. It would decrease our interest payments, and place more funds in the economy.

A recent editorial in Christian Economics by Oscar Cooley, associate professor of economics, Ohio Northern University, asks us if we should ever pay the debt. This thought-provoking article should be read by all interested in this vital subject, and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

> SHOULD WE PAY THE DEBT?
>
> (By Oscar W. Cooley)
>
> The debt of the U.S. Government is about $300 billion. This is only the contractual,

interest-bearing debt, represented by promises to pay; the Government also has huge obligations in the form of social security pensions and guarantees of the debts of others. The contractural debt is increasing.

When an individual or private organization goes into debt, it is done with the intent of repayment, eventually if not promptly. Should not the citizen demand that his government, too, pay its debts?

Some dismiss the debt with a casual, "Oh, well, we owe it to ourselves." Is this true? If we "owe it to ourselves" does this mean that we have no cause to worry about how big the debt is getting? Does it mean we can just forget about paying it off? What an alibi for improvidence.

Little of the debt, it is true, is owed to foreigners. Most of it is represented by bonds held by Americans, including individuals, banks, insurance companies, pension funds, and other institutions. It is a debt which is owed by all the American people as citizens to some of the American people as bondholders.

Thus, the debt is a real and bona fide obligation. It also is a burden; consider the nearly $10 billion which must be raised each year to pay the interest. Like other real and burdensome debts, it should be paid.

Those who oppose paying the debt point out that a considerable portion of the debt is held by commercial banks. To pay it, the Treasury would draw on the Government's deposits in the banks and this would reduce the total deposits of the banks.

These deposits are "checkbook money." Thus, the repayment would cancel or destroy part of the Nation's money supply. This, they warn, would be deflationary, or price-depressing, in its effect.

In short, according to this theory, much of our money supply depends upon the national debt, and if the debt were paid the money supply would shrink accordingly. With less money in circulation, prices would fall and there would be depression. Thus, they think it would be disastrous to pay the national debt. By the same reasoning, they favor increasing the debt, since this creates more money and generates more inflation, which they think is good for business.

This line of reasoning has but one end: ever accelerating inflation, ending in destruction of the American dollar, which would probably mean destruction of the American economy and of the entire free world.

It is not true that payment of the national debt would be disastrous.

Assuming the debt were paid the erstwhile bondholders, be they individuals, insurance companies, banks, or whatnot, would now have more money to lend to other borrowers; that is, to private individuals and firms. A great new pool of credit would become available to producers. The supply of loanable funds being increased, interest rates would fall and business would receive enormous stimulation from the new credit available.

Not to be ignored is the psychological lift which businessmen would get from a demonstration that the Government had actually adopted a policy of paying its debts. It would be proof that fiscal sanity had, at long last, replaced legal counterfeiting.

The Government debt represents a hoarding of the Nation's credit. When held by the Government, it cannot be used by business. To the extent that the Government debt is paid, to that extent are excess reserves of the banking system set free to be loaned to producers. Conversely, to increase the Government debt still more is to take still more lifegiving credit away from private enterprise.

Furthermore, to pay the Government debt and thus allow business to contract more debt would be to extinguish sterile, nonproductive debt and to substitute productive debt in its place, for most Government borrowing finances consumption, while business borrowing finances investment and capital creation.

Another reason why it would be better to have more business debt and less Government debt is that when business debt comes due it is customarily paid. Thus, the debtor periodically proves his ability to pay—demonstrates his creditworthiness. Then the creditor is able to make other, similar loans. Government debt, on the other hand, is seldom repaid and the money represented by the debt does not become available for relending. When business borrows, it uses the credit temporarily. When Government borrows, it takes over the credit and monopolizes it, permanently. Business credit is flexible; Government credit is rigid and inflexible.

The very size of the debt causes some to feel it is hopeless to try to repay it. But this is defeatism. Somehow we manage each year to raise the huge sum needed to pay the interest; it stands to reason that a similar sum could be found to apply on the debt principal yearly.

The statement, "We owe it to ourselves," is a cliche by which Americans persuade themselves that they dwell in a never-never land, a sort of financial utopia where we can incur debt that is not debt—where we can get and get without ever having to give.

The Consumer Advisory Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Helen G. Canoyer, dean of the New York State College of Home Economics at Cornell University and chairman of the Consumer Advisory Council of the Council of Economic Advisers. The article appears in the March 1963 issue of the Journal of Home Economics and concerns every citizen who wants—as a consumer—to get a fair deal.

Since the Executive has taken the initiative in setting up the Consumer Advisory Council, I hope that Congress will now act on my House Resolution 18 which would create a select committee to be known as the Committee on Consumer Interests. Such a committee would be authorized to conduct a study and investigation of all problems affecting consumer interests and provide the results of these studies and investigations to the Congress so that remedial legislation can be enacted.

The article follows:

THE CONSUMER ADVISORY COUNCIL

(By Helen G. Canoyer, dean, New York State College of Home Economics at Cornell Universary, Chairman of the Consumer Advisory Council [1])

President Kennedy called for the creation of a Consumer Advisory Council in his message to Congress of March 15, 1962. In that message, which was the first on the subject of a "consumer's protection and interest program" ever delivered by a President, he asserted that the consumer was entitled to certain rights. These rights, he said, include:

"(1) The right to safety—to be protected against the marketing of goods which are hazardous to health or life.

"(2) The right to be informed—to be protected against fraudulent, deceitful, or grossly misleading information, advertising, labeling, or other practices, and to be given the facts he needs to make an informed choice.

"(3) The right to choose—to be assured, wherever possible, access to a variety of products and services at competitive prices; and in those industries in which competition is not workable and Government regulation is substituted, an assurance of satisfactory quality and service at fair prices.

"(4) The right to be heard—to be assured that consumer interests will receive full and sympathetic consideration in the formulation of Government policy, and fair and expeditious treatment in its administrative tribunals."

In pursuit of the fourth right—the right to be heard—President Kennedy asked the Council of Economic Advisers to create the Consumer Advisory Council. Because he had observed a "* * * failure of governmental machinery to assure specific consideration of the consumer's needs and point of view," the President directed that such a Council be formed to "examine and provide advice to the Government on issues of broad economic policy, on governmental programs protecting consumer needs, and on needed improvements in the flow of consumer research material to the public; the Consumers' Council will also give interested individuals and organizations a voice in these matters." This Council was appointed in July 1962.

The President also directed that "the head of each Federal agency whose activities bear significantly on consumer welfare designate a special assistant in his office to advise and assist him in assuring adequate and effective attention to consumer interests in the work of the agency, to act as liaison with consumer and related organizations, and to place increased emphasis on preparing and making available pertinent research findings for consumers in clear and usable form." Such liaison officers have been appointed in 22 departments and agencies.

It is a broad responsibility that President Kennedy has given to this new Consumer Advisory Council. Although the powers of this Council are only advisory, it is the first time in the history of our country that the consumer is represented at this high a level in the executive branch of the Federal Government. Protection and education of the consumer have been, with a few exceptions, a relatively minor incident of government. The Federal Government has from time to time joined in a general movement for consumer education through research and publicity undertaken by various departments and bureaus. However, even today, little by way of permanent and constructive work has been done. Although for over 30 years there have been successes and failures in attempts to represent the consumer at the Federal level, one lesson can be learned from this experience, which is that consumer representation in government, if it is to be effective, must be at the highest level and must be given strong support not only by the executive branch of the Government but by the consumers themselves.

Hopefully, the President's phrase "the right to be heard" will be of historic import because the Consumer Advisory Council has been granted authority to speak about and on behalf of "the consumer" to the executive branch of the Government. The Council has some staff support and a working relationship with the special assistants for consumer affairs referred to above. The functions of the Council are to point out to the 22 Federal agencies and departments and the Council of Economic Advisers areas of special concern to the consumer and to suggest modifications and new departures in consumer protection and consumer education.

---

[1] Other members are David W. Angevine, Dr. Persia Campbell, Stephen M. DuBrul, Mrs. John G. Lee, Dr. Edward S. Lewis, Hon. Walter F. Mondale, Dr. Richard L. D. Morse, Mrs. Helen E. Nelson, Dr. Caroline Ware, Dr. Colston E. Warne.

There has been some success with various kinds of consumer representation at the State level. However, the few prior experiences in the Federal Government have been short lived and hampered with limitations. Therefore, this Consumer Advisory Council must experiment with programs and procedures. Lacking a successful precedent or a clearly charted course, the Council has felt it necessary to be very cautious in defining its role and in selecting topics for consideration. To date, the Council has selected from a long list of important subjects four problems on which to concentrate during the first year. These topics are:

1. Consumer standards, grades, and labels: Study of governmental consumer standards of identity, quality, quantity, safety, and product performance, including assessment from the consumer point of view of systems of grades, labels, and quality designation.

2. Two-way flow of information and opinion between government and the consumer: To prepare recommendations for improving the two-way flow of information and opinion between government and the consumer public. These recommendations will be based on a survey of present governmental and nongovernmental materials and conference experiences and a consideration of supplementary and/or co-ordinated programs.

3. Effective consumer representation in government: To examine and advise on different structures and procedures to achieve adequate and effective representation and participation of the consumer in government.

4. Consumer credit and economic welfare: Consider procedures for providing continuing economic indication of consumer welfare and measures designated to fix the growth and stability of the economy by their impact on consumers.

I would be less than frank if I did not indicate to you that it is difficult to chart a path for the Consumer Advisory Council with is present pioneer working relations to departments and agencies of the Federal Government and the Executive Office of the President. Answers must be worked out to questions which are fundamental to the succes of the Council. For example, in being advisory to the Federal Government must we be a confidential and "inside" adviser, or may we deal openly and through the press with controversial questions? How do we relate our activities to the many private organizations interested in consumer matters? Should we give most of our attention to particular legislative proposals or to broad issues which lie behind, or even apart from, such proposals?

In its first year of existence, the Consumer Advisory Council is determined to develop answers to basic questions and we hope to work out a constructive role for ourselves within the Government. But regardless of what role we select, it should be remembered that most of our contributions to the consumer will be of such an indirect nature that the Council's influence will be, no doubt, unrecognized by most consumers. This is true largely because we are not authorized as an "action group"; our responsibility is to convince others of the merit of our recommendations.

In all of our Council work we are conscious of the fact that home economists are deeply interested in what we are doing. We rely heavily upon your interest and moral support. All members of the Council realize that the professional home economists are a great force at work in advancing the consumer interest. Through your research and your cooperative extension and classroom teaching, you bring to the activity of consuming the expert and the scientific attitude. It is my hope that the Consumer Advisory Council and the American Home Economics Association will work together closely in reaching our mutual goal—the greatest wellbeing of consumers.

Bigoted Attack Exposed by Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, we are living in a period of American history during which time a great deal of attention is being given to bigotry and racial discrimination.

We are witnessing the struggle of the Negro community to achieve its constitutional rights in various parts of our country. While the headlines capture the endeavors of the Negro people to achieve civil liberties, there are hidden attacks upon other minority groups in our country.

I think it is deplorable when a newspaper in our country undertakes to editorially attack the Jewish people who are in a position of leadership within the United States. Such insidious actions must be exposed lest they undermine the entire fabric of our great American democracy.

I am pleased to see the courage of a newspaper in my congressional district in setting the record straight by exposing a bigoted attack made by a competing newspaper.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Alameda Times Star, Alameda, Calif., on Tuesday, June 11:

BIGOTED ATTACK EXPOSED BY TRUTH

A recent issue of the Hayward Daily Review in an editorial entitled "Policy Questions" took the position that, in event of a new outburst of warfare between Nasser's United Arab Republic and Israel, the Jews of the United States would force this country into war as an Israeli ally.

In support of that contention the editorial said: "There is no doubt there has been a strong Jewish influence on national administration and will continue."

To back that up it quoted from "Intelligence Digest," a British newsletter edited by Kenneth De Courcy, of London, to the effect that "Jewish influence in America will force the administration to intervene." The Daily Review then cited a list of persons who hold important positions in the administration as evidence of the Jewish influence.

According to the Daily Review, the list includes "Arthur Goldberg, former labor secretary, now appointed to the Supreme Court; Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury; Newton M. Minow, in control of communications; Pierre Salinger, the President's secretary; Mortimer Caplan, Commissioner of Internal Revenue; Arthur Schlissinger [sic]; W. Willard Wirtz, Labor Secretary; Walt W. Rostow; Walter W. Heller, economic adviser; Thomas Sorenson, U.S. Export-Import Bank; Theodore Sorenson, assistant to the President."

The Daily Review editorial continues: These are just a few of the many (Jews) named by the publication but they serve to demonstrate the importance of Jewish influence at the Capital. Add to them the chiefs of the NBC and CBS networks and the New York Times.

Aside from the bigoted viewpoint of the Hayward newspaper and that of the publication which it used to promote its argument, both were inaccurate in their influential list of Jews.

Dillon is an Episcopalian; Schlesinger is a Unitarian, and Sorenson is a Unitarian. Likewise, while we have not been able to determine the specific religious faith of all others cited in the list, it is a fact that many are not Jewish.

In view of the foregoing one cannot help wonder how the Hayward newspaper would account for what happened nearly a decade ago when Nasser's plan to take over Israel was forestalled by the combined forces of Israel, France, and Great Britain. Whatever Jewish influence there is now in the United States is certainly no stronger than it was then when President Eisenhower moved promptly to let it be known that the United States was completely opposed to any fighting in the Near East, and the fighting perforce ceased.

In other words, President Eisenhower acted swiftly on the side of peace, a course to which President Kennedy has committed himself on several occasions, including those involving Nasser's UAR and the Republic of Israel.

It must be admitted, of course, that the majority of Jews in the United States—and the majority of Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Baptists, Methodists, etc.—have all been seeking to influence the administration in the cause of peace, whether its head was Kennedy or Eisenhower. There was practically 100 percent unanimity in the country on the action of Eisenhower in putting a stop to fighting in the Sinai area, and we see no reason whatever to suppose that there would not be that same unanimity today, or whenever it is that the Arab dictator decides to go adventuring with Nazi-trained troops and Nazi-made rockets.

And just for the record, it is our belief that the people of these various faiths in the United States would also go all out in demanding action from the administration if Israel were suddenly to start adventuring against Nasser.

The reason why is that the world, including the United States and Soviet Russia, cannot afford such a war which might all too easily turn into a global conflict. There are too many brushfire wars going on already for such a doubtful luxury to be permitted.

As for the "Intelligence Digest" of Kenneth De Courcy, we wish to point out that it has declined greatly from the day when it scooped the world on the first Soviet atomic explosion back in the late 1940's. The decline first became noticeable about 1952 when the writer of this editorial was astonished to see an account in the publication of a "flying saucer" with Russian inscriptions on it that had come down on a road behind the Iron Curtain and was carefully examined by De Courcy's informants.

That was a scoop too, of course, but one that was never corroborated so far as is known. And it also was an excellent index of the trend De Courcy's publication was to take.

Though "Intelligence Digest" had long since given some indication of becoming a publication with strong anti-Semitic leanings, from then on its progress became accelerated * * * but on the way downhill, so that within the past two years it has actually reached the point where there is very near to a word-for-word similarity between some of its writings and those of Gerald L. K. Smith's Nazi-type publication, "The Cross and The Flag."

What that means, of course, is that De Courcy's publication has reached the very nadir of ignorance, hate and misinformation. And that, in turn, means that no responsible writer would quote from it as a source of anything other than such things.

Yet the Daily Review sought to utilize material from the latter publication in asserting its claim of "Jewish influence at the capital."

It is seldom that The Times-Star has felt the need to criticize another newspaper.

But we believe the greatly inaccurate, bigoted editorial of the Daily Review warranted a critical analysis based on truth.

It is unfortunate that in a Nation founded on the principle of freedom of worship an American newspaper would show such high disregard for this freedom in attempting to promote hate and bigotry.

It is even more outrageous that the Daily Review would do so without having a single shred of factual evidence—only claims of a tainted foreign publication.

The 1963 Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, early in the year when I began preparations for polling my constituents with my annual questionnaire I determined that I would use a new and fresh approach in obtaining their views, giving them an opportunity to express their opinions with more than just a simple "yes" or "no" answer. Therefore, at the request of the entire seven-member Washington State congressional delegation the Political Science Department of the University of Washington prepared a questionnaire which would give the respondent the choice of expressing himself in varying degrees as to his feelings.

I was pleased to accept the assistance of the University in preparing this opinion poll and consequently in early April I mailed it to approximately 45,000 registered voters in the First Congressional District.

The response to this poll was gratifying in that the return was roughly the same percentage as last year—to wit, about 22 percent. Many different conclusions can and probably will be drawn from the tabulation of this questionnaire, which I believe will be of interest. Inasmuch as the language used was totally prepared by a disinterested group of political science professors there is no question of bias.

Mr. Speaker, believing that the Members of the House and other readers of the RECORD will be interested in the views of the residents of the First Congressional District of Washington I include hereafter the tabulation as prepared by IBM:

THE 1963 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

I. MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE

The six most frequently indicated important issues before the country today were named in the following order of importance with all other issues being tabulated as miscellaneous:

	Percent
National Economy and Unemployment	32
Foreign Affairs and Cuba	30
Big Government	14
Communism	11
Education	5
Peace and Disarmament	3
Miscellaneous	5

II. YOUR OVERALL VIEWS

1. In your opinion, how good a job is the President doing now? (1) 8.7 percent excellent, (2) 19.0 percent good (3) 28.9 percent fair, (4) 36.1 percent poor, (5) 4.3 percent I just don't know.

How strongly do you hold this view? (1) 62.6 percent very strongly, (2) 33.9 percent fairly strongly, (3) 1.0 percent don't care too much.

2. In your opinion, how good a job is the Congress doing now? (1) 1.7 excellent, (2) 21.5 percent good, (3) 45.1 percent fair, (4) 24.0 percent poor, (5) 4.3 percent I just don't know.

How strongly do you hold this view? (1) 46.0 percent very strongly, (2) 49.3 percent fairly strongly, (3) .7 percent don't care too much.

III. ISSUES BEFORE THE CONGRESS

These questions give you a chance to express your general feeling about certain issues. You should answer the question about the tax cut, for example, on the basis of your general feeling about the desirability of a tax cut. Do not answer on the basis of your view about some specific kind of tax cut, such as a tax cut combined with a reduction in spending. Of course different things are important to different people, so we don't expect everyone to have an opinion on all these issues.

[In percent]

	No opinion (1)	Very much in favor (2)	Somewhat in favor (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat opposed (5)	Very much opposed (6)	Total in favor (7)	Total opposed (8)
1. One issue before Congress is the question of a tax cut. Supporters argue that an immediate tax cut is a "must" to stimulate a lagging economy. Opponents argue that a tax cut will lead to deficits if spending isn't cut at the same time. How do you feel about a tax cut?	0.6	35.1	18.0	3.5	16.1	23.2	53.1	39.3
2. Another question is Federal aid to education. Supporters argue that the funds would help relieve crowded classrooms and that we must educate our children now if we are to remain strong in the long run. Opponents argue that such a program would lead to Federal control of education and raise difficult questions about aid to parochial schools. How do you feel about Federal aid to education?	.5	21.6	10.1	2.7	13.9	49.1	31.7	63.0
3. The creation of a Department of Urban Affairs has been proposed. Supporters argue that cities need help to deal with such problems as housing, transportation, and delinquency. Opponents argue that an Urban Affairs Department would lead to more Federal involvement in local affairs. How do you feel about a Department of Urban Affairs	1.8	12.1	7.8	6.2	13.5	56.8	19.9	70.3
4. The medicare program is before Congress again. Supporters argue that retired persons need help to meet high medical costs, and that the program would use the reliable social security system. Opponents argue that the needy aged already have some help, and that the social security deduction is too high now. How do you feel about the medicare program	.5	26.7	11.5	3.4	10.3	45.8	38.2	56 1
5. The foreign aid program is an important foreign policy issue. Supporters argue than new nations need help to avoid falling to communism, and that military aid is important to U.S. security. Opponents argue that the program has been badly administered and that we have been throwing money down "ratholes." How do you feel about foreign aid?	0.4	15.0	20.6	3.5	24.8	31.8	35.6	46.6
6. Some people say Congress needs to be reorganized. Supporters argue that the present system gives too much power to a few old men. Opponents argue that the present system prevents "railroading" a bill through without necessary debate. How do you feel about congressional reorganization?	6.9	24.4	17.6	13.2	14.2	20.0	42.0	34.2

IV. OPTIONAL FACTUAL INFORMATION

It is helpful to have some background information for tabulation: Sex, (1) 72.6 percent male, (2) 21.6 percent female. Age (1) 6.5 percent under 30, (2) 47.1 percent 30 to 50, (3) 44.9 percent over 50. Marital status, (1) 5.8 percent single, (2) 84.1 percent married, (3) 2.4 percent divorced, (4) 6.3 percent widowed. Political preference, (1) 14.9 percent Democrat, (2) 51.8 percent Republican, (3) 27.5 percent independent.

Note: Each column does not necessarily add up to 100 percent inasmuch as some persons did not answer all questions.

U.S. Relations With Yugoslavia—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the second of two illuminating articles on United States-Yugoslavia relations by Graham Hovey, Minneapolis Tribune European correspondent.

The article follows:

TITO'S BREAK WITH RUSSIA HAS SERVED TO AID AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY OBJECTIVES

(By Graham Hovey)

BELGRADE, YUGOSLAVIA.—There are two things about Marshal Josip Tito's Yugoslavia that Western specialists wish were better understood in America.

One is the benefits the United States and its allies have gained from Yugoslavia's independence of the Soviet Union after Tito's dramatic break with Stalin in 1948.

The other is the present pattern of American-Yugoslav economic cooperation, based almost entirely on trade and not on grant aid.

Western experts believe Tito's successful defiance of Moscow contributed directly to these major international developments:

1. The crushing of the bloody revolt that had threatened to bring Greece into the Communist camp, once Tito had closed his border to the Red guerrillas.
2. Settlement of the Trieste dispute between Yugoslavia and Italy, eliminating an explosive problem that could have provoked World War III.
3. Conclusion of the state treaty of 1955 which restored full freedom and independence to Austria and brought withdrawal of Soviet and Western forces from that country.

Experts doubt if any of these developments favorable for our side could have happened had Tito remained the favorite son of the Kremlin and Yugoslavia a loyal Soviet satellite.

Some would add two other points by way of completing perspective on Tito's defection from Moscow.

The first was the value for the West during critical early years of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization buildup of having Tito's forces guarding Yugoslavia's long frontier with three Soviet satellite states.

Americans were satisfied that Tito's army would resist any attack, and this had the effect at that time of adding 30 tough divisions to the defense against Soviet aggression.

Tito's defection had, in the first place, removed Soviet bloc military power from the Dalmation coast, where it had menaced Italy and Greece in the years immediately after World War II.

The second additional point some experts make is that the defection of tiny Albania from the Soviet bloc would have been impossible had Yugoslavia remained in it.

This hasn't made Albania a friend of the United States but it has meant the dismantling of Soviet submarines bases in that country and further loosening of Soviet bloc solidarity.

No one argues that Tito did what he did primarily to please the United States. The point is that what he did in important instances advanced American foreign policy objectives.

Most Americans involved with Yugoslav problems believe these benefits have been worth what they cost the United States in military and economic aid to Tito since 1948.

Yugoslavia got nearly $1.8 billion in all forms of economic assistance from the United States and another $700 to $800 million in direct military aid.

But barring some unexpected development, officials say the aid phase of American-Yugoslav economic relations now is over; that improving regular trade is now our objective. They doubt that this has been made clear to Americans generally.

The military aid program ended 5 years ago on Yugoslav initiative, for example. Since 1958, Yugoslavia has paid cash for any military equipment acquired in America.

Officials in Belgrade are mystified that even Members of Congress often assume that the United States is still furnishing large quantities of military hardware gratis to Tito.

They were particularly baffled at the uproar when Senator JOHN C. TOWER, Republican, Texas, discovered that the United States was selling Tito some jet fighter planes obsolete for our uses since the Korean war, and instructing some Yugoslavs in Texas how to fly and maintain them.

Yugoslavia last got assistance from the U.S. Development Loan Fund and the Export-Import Bank in 1961 to help bring off its sweeping currency reform.

The biggest item remains the shipment of surplus American agricultural products to Yugoslavia under U.S. Public Law 480, but even this will be terminated as a form of aid shortly.

Diplomats believe Yugoslavia would enjoy a better image with Americans if these facts about the shift from aid to trade and the advantages for our side of Tito's independence from Moscow were more widely known.

In that event, they say, the Kennedy administration would not be facing a tough battle to persuade Congress to permit continuation of most-favored-nation status for Yugoslavia.

They admit, however, that Tito could help his own cause in America most if he would not line up with Russia so often on such touchy issues as Fidel Castro's Cuba, Berlin and nuclear testing.

Thus you can find diplomats in Belgrade who say the 1962 action of Congress in denying Yugoslavia most-favored-nation privileges may have been useful as a warning to Tito—even though they now hope fervently for its early repeal.

Canon Arterton Discusses the Importance of Choices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include the inspiring address of the Reverend Frederick H. Arterton, canon of the Washington Cathedral, delivered at the 1963 commencement of St. Albans School, Washington, D.C.:

THE IMPORTANCE OF CHOICES

Not long ago, so it is said, a man was reading aloud to his wife—reading a magazine article that declared that we in the United States were well on the way to having a socialized order. It is reported that the wife was one of those irritating women who ask what things mean. So, of course, she asked what a "socialized order" meant. He replied, "It means that the government is going to take over everything and run it." "Run everything?" she asked. "Yes, run everything." She thought this over for a time and then said, quietly, "Well, they are going to have a very hard time with that St. Albans boy that lives down the street."

Now I cannot vouch for the truth of that story. But I can vouch for the truth which that story reveals, namely, that there are great areas of every person's life over which he alone has control. As we grow older, more and more freedom of choice and freedom of action are given to us. So it is that in a score of ways every day, each of us directs his own life, and affects the lives of others, by the decisions and the choices that he makes.

Some of our choices, of course are minor ones. Of themselves, they may seem relatively unimportant. For instance, you may say: "Now, with homework off my back, I have an evening free: How shall I use it? Shall I watch TV? Shall I read a good book? Or shall I gather the gang and hack around?" Relatively minor choices, you see—made today and forgotten tomorrow. And they are significant only in the fact that constant repetition of any one of them leads to the formation of habits, good, or bad, and these habits may seriously affect our judgment when we come to make more important choices.

But now, so far as the major decisions are concerned, you know that, as the saying goes, "a lot rides on that kind of a pitch." Little decisions may make little difference, but big ones are turning points that can affect the whole course of our lives. Over the past few months, for example, you have made the choice of a college—or perhaps it would be nearer the truth to say that a college has made a choice of you. In either case, a decision has been made which will exercise a tremendous influence on your whole life.

And then—and much sooner than you now think—college will be over, and what then? More major choices must be faced: More major decisions given. "Shall I go on to graduate school or no? When should I do my military service? What girl should I marry? (Or perhaps, what girl will have me?) What should my life work be? What path shall I take that will give me a life that is most useful to others and most satisfying to myself?" Choices, choices, choices. And the decisions we make concerning them determine our future.

You remember how the poet, Robert Frost, puts the matter before us all:

"I shall be telling this with a sigh
Somewhere ages and ages hence;
Two roads diverged in a wood, and I—
I took the one less traveled by,
And that has made all the difference."

Yes, every one of us comes often to the crossroads of choices, and our decisions—as Robert Frost says—make "all the difference."

Now, if all this be true, it follows—does it not?—that every one of us ought to be keen for anything that will help us make good choices and wise decisions in life. Well, it is right at this point that one of the main purposes of St. Albans is to assist in developing minds that are both informed and reflective. That's why the math and Latin and the history and the chemistry and all the rest. Important they are, too—very. But every member of the faculty and staff would be quick to say that just the training of your minds, per se, is no guarantee whatever that wise decisions and constructive living will follow. In the history of our land, for example, some of our most notorious criminals have had highly trained minds. Indeed, as my associate, Dr. Heath, recently pointed out to this graduating class, "the decisions that plunged us into the holocaust of two world wars were made and carried out by the best educated people in the world."

No. We do not make good choices solely on the basis of how much "book larnin" we can absorb. Therefore, to quote Dr. Heath again, "I'm sure that the faculty is much more concerned that you should be a fine person than that you should be a knowledgeable one." When all is said and done, the fine person who makes wise decisions and good choices, makes them because of his high standards and convictions and ideals. And these, in turn, are motivated by his spiritual upbringing and outlook.

It is just here, of course, that, in varying degrees, all schools—and particularly St. Albans School—seek to supplement home and church in the character-building that is so essential to the good life. Here's a direct quote from a book called "Letters

From a Headmaster's Study." Perhaps you know the author, who writes:

"A school like St. Albans exists to teach reading, writing, and arithmetic, and to teach them well. But, more important, it exists to enable every boy to know and worship God. And if he knows and worships God, he will have a set of values that will enable him to live richly and helpfully."

We have the high hope and conviction that the total impact of this "holy hill"—the Cathedral, the Little Sanctuary, the services, the classes, the activities, the athletics and all the people involved—have made their contribution in giving you that sensitivity to things of the spirit that is indispensable if you are to make sound judgments and wise decisions that lead to constructive actions.

I dare say—though I am sure you would never make a speech about it—I dare say that every one of you would acknowledge that in this area of life of which we have been speaking, St. Albans has given you much. And, as I bring this section to a close, I cannot refrain from quoting Scripture. I quote it without comment, but ponder it, I beg you: "Jesus said, 'To whom much is given, from him shall much be expected.' "

Now, finally, there are a great many commencement speakers who seem to me to be impossibly idealistic and optimistic. You know the type: "Members of the graduating class, the future is yours. You are the hope of the world. Don your armor, mount your white charger, go out and battle the evils of the world. Go, brave youth, go! The victory will be yours!" And, on the other hand, there are the hardheaded realists with much practical advice to give. You know this type, too: "Forget all this inspirational stuff. The world is your oyster—success can be yours. Get out in business; marry the boss's daughter; make a million bucks; trade in your white charger for a Sting Ray; and live happily ever after."

No such advice from me. Not in this tangled and tragic present. Indeed, I can put all I've tried to say—and all I want to say—in one brief sentence; namely, in the all-important matter of making choices and decisions—particularly the major ones—give the best you have to the highest that you know. You will not always be able to do this, of course. You will fail again and again, even as we have failed. But the important thing is that your faces should be set in that direction—the direction of trying to give the best you have to the highest that you know. All of us who are so proud of you, so devoted to you, cannot ask for more. We dare not ask for less.

I conclude with two short stories that will, I hope, make my theme song live in your minds and hearts. One of these stories is ancient; one is modern; both of them are true. Listen: (this is a very free translation) And when Jesus was walking in the road, a rich young man came running up and fell at His feet and asked Him, "Good Master, tell me, what must I do in this life to be sure of life everlasting?" And Jesus said, "You know the Commandments. Keep them." And the young man said, "I have always kept them." And Jesus, looking on him, loved him, and said, "There is just one thing you have missed. And to find that, you must get rid of your possessions that you love far to much. Then come, follow me." At these words the face of the young man fell, and he turned away grieved, for he had great possessions.*

Here, at Jesus' invitation to join Him, that young man was confronted with a major choice—a lifegiving choice. But the world was too much with him; he was too enamored of his possessions and privileges. He made his decision, and that decision was to decline to give the best he had to the highest that he knew. And so? So he passes from the picture and is never heard of again.

Now the modern story, also true. Several years ago, you remember, the people of Hungary flamed out in white-hot revolt against Soviet domination. The Russian reprisals were swift and terrible. Tens of thousands attempted to escape to neighboring Austria and freedom. And, happily, thousands of them made it. An Austrian boy of 16 led hundreds of them across unguarded sections of the border by night. Then, alas, he was caught in Hungary and, before being sentenced to death, we went through the mockery of a trial. "Why did you do this thing?" asked the Soviet judge. "Because I have come to believe that it is God's will that all people should be free," replied the boy. "Well," said the judge, with a sneer, "your decision and your course of action would be all right if God's kingdom had come. But it hasn't." Said the boy, "It has for me."

You know, and I know, that the memory of that boy—his decision and his words and actions—will live a long, long time. And why? Because his choice was to give the best that he had to the highest he knew. His major decision was to live his life in tune with the will and purposes of a great and good God as he understood them.

So may it be with you.

So may it be with us all.

Let us pray: O God and Father of us all: In the choices of life that are constantly set before us, grant that we make decisions and take actions that are in accordance with Thy gracious will; thereby giving the best we have to the highest we can possibly know. We ask it in the Master's name. Amen.

Promise or Performance—Tax Cut Needed Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the new tax proposals can help close the gap between promise and performance in the field of economic growth. Some recent remarks by the Honorable Douglas Dillon before the National Coal Association Convention stress the importance of an overall tax cut.

His remarks follow:

There comes an hour in the life of every nation when the gap between promise and performance must be closed. Such an hour is striking now in the field of economic growth.

Several months ago, the gap between our economic performance and our potential was more readily apparent than it is today, when we see the pace of business activity picking up, and the business outlook seemingly bright. But we cannot let present prospects blind us to the fact that the current upturn in our economy holds out little hope of giving us the momentum we need to achieve our goal of full employment.

Last month, more than four million Americans actively seeking work could not find it. Even more disturbing, unemployment among teenagers climbed from 16 percent in April to 18 percent in May. That was the highest jobless figure for teenagers since the Labor Department began recording its figures on a seasonal basis in 1949. The young people born in 1946—the first year of the postwar baby boom—have begun to enter the labor force. They will continue to enter it in increasingly large numbers. During the mid-sixties, our labor force will have to absorb an inflow of nearly three million young people each year, compared to less than two million during the midfifties—an increase of 50 percent.

This prospect alone presents us with a formidable problem. And it will be compounded as automation and modernization displace greater numbers of workers and lessen the demand for unskilled and semiskilled labor.

As measured by output per man-hours, the productivity of American business has risen by more than 10 percent over the past 2 years. Like other industries, the coal industry has been helped considerably by the two tax measures of last year—the investment credit, and the liberalized guidelines for depreciation. Those tax changes—and even more, the new tax proposals made by President Kennedy—will give added impetus to the striking advances in productivity that have made the U.S. coal industry one of the most competitive in the world. It has been estimated, for example, that American mines which produce coal for export average about 12 tons per man per day—as compared with 1½ tons per man per day for West German mines. And some of the newer U.S. minnes produce as much as 40 to 50 tons per man per day.

Unfortunately, the pace-setting productivity increases that have long been a hallmark of the American coal industry have not been consistently reflected in rising coal exports. Last year, those exports increased for the first time since 1957. I hope last year's rise may be a portent of things to come—not only because of the benefits higher exports would bring to you, but because increased coal exports would be of considerable help in easing the imbalance in our international payments.

It is essential that we continue to encourage in every American business the kind of progress that has placed the coal industry in the forefront of our march toward great productivity. But even as we do so, we cannot forget that productivity increases can also be accompanied by less welcome increases in unemployment.

As a nation, therefore, we face the difficult and double challenge of not only sustaining and encouraging the upswing in productivity, but at the same time providing the millions of new jobs we will need to replace obsolete ones and to absorb our new workers. If our economy is to provide those jobs, it will have to grow at a considerably faster pace than has been the case during the present upturn. Our total output will have to increase by far more than the $25 to $30 billion that appears in sight for 1963.

Look, for example, at what has happened over the past 12 months: One year ago, we had a gross national product of $552 billion and an unemployment rate of 5½ percent. Yet, while today GNP has risen to $580 billion—$28 billion higher than a year ago—unemployment is verging on 6 percent. To put it another way, we would need an average rise in GNP of $14 billion a quarter—beginning now—to close the gap between output and employment by the end of 1964.

Yet, since last fall, our economy has been growing by only a little more than $8 billion a quarter. At that rate, and assuming that our potential output grows at its present pace, it would take us 10 long years to reach our interim full employment target of 4 percent unemployment.

We simply cannot tolerate that kind of delay—and that is why the President has submitted tax proposals designed to achieve the more rapid, sustained, and balanced growth we must have. Let us consider them briefly.

The proposed reduction from 52 to 47 percent in the corporate tax rate—combined with last year's investment credit and depreciation reform—would cut business taxes by a total of $5 billion. That total would give business 40 percent of the overall tax reduction, provide a strong and continuing stimulus toward accelerated economic growth, and increase the profitability of new business investment by almost 30 percent.

Anyone who is skeptical about the effect of corporate rate cuts should take a hard look at the results of last year's tax changes. A recent survey of capital spending by the Commerce Department and the Securities and Exchange Commission estimates that expenditures for plant and equipment in 1963 will rise to more than $39 billion from a level of some $37 billion for 1962. And, as an earlier McGraw-Hill survey pointed out, businessmen gave credit to last year's tax reforms for at least 43 percent of their increased capital expenditures.

Reducing busines taxes alone, however, cannot do the whole job. For we need not only to increase business productivity, but to expand—and expand dramatically—the overall markets for business output. No company will produce more goods, or new goods, without markets to absorb them. The best way to assure those markets is to assure that consumer purchasing power expands as our capacity to produce expands. The President's tax proposals would accomplish this by reducing personal income tax rates from the present range of 20 to 91 percent to a much lower range of 14 to 65 percent. Such a cut in individual rates, combined with the proposed corporate rate reduction, would total $13.6 billion. The rate cuts may, of course, be somewhat revised in the bill that emerges from the House Ways and Means Committee. But I am confident that the net tax reduction will not be far from the proposed $10.3 billion.

The impact of that overall tax cut will be felt throughout the economy far faster than most people realize. If the President's program were to receive final approval by October 1st, the entire $10 billion in tax relief would be released into the economy within the following 15 months. The ultimate effect would be several times $10 billion—as evidenced by the report of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, which estimated that it would eventually increase our annual Gross National Product by as much as $40 billion.

It would be a mistake, however, to measure the effectiveness of the overall tax program in dollar terms alone. For in the final analysis, what it will mean is more and better job and educational opportunities for millions of our citizens, greater profitability, productivity, and incentives for business and business investment, and increased Government revenues to provide for our growing national needs without risking large deficits.

The question of Federal expenditures and deficits has loomed large in public discussion of the President's tax proposals. I would like to devote some time to it today, for it is a question that has too often been beclouded with misunderstanding.

First of all, let me say that the reason we have had large deficits in recent years—either in this or in preceding administrations—is not because of excessive or unnecessary spending by the Federal Government. The real reason is simply that our economy has not been operating at levels high enough to produce the revenues we need to meet the demands of our rapidly growing population and the increased costs of defense and space.

Let us look at some of the facts involved in the issue of expenditure control: One very elementary point—which too many choose to ignore—was made by President Eisenhower in his 1960 budget message, and I quote:

"We must not forget that a rapidly growing population creates virtually automatic increases in many Federal responsibilities."

The Director of the Budget, Kermit Gordon has provided some very telling examples of this population rise and of its impact on Federal services: By the end of fiscal 1964, the budget year on which we are now working, there will be 10 million more Americans than there were the day President Kennedy took office. Between fiscal years 1962 and 1964, the volume of mail will rise by more than 6 percent, the number of veterans or survivors receiving pensions by 10 percent, beneficiaries under the old-age and survivors insurance program by 16 percent. Those are by no means all the figures one could cite, but they are enough to make the simple point that we are a growing nation which requires growing national services to meet the needs of its people and of its business and its industry.

President Kennedy, without neglecting essential national needs, has exercised, is exercising, and will continue to exercise a firm control over expenditures. Our budget has increased rapidly over the past 3 years, but fully 70 percent of the total increase from 1961 through 1964 has been in the areas of defense, space, and the inescapable interest on the public debt. When you include the 1964 Budget as submitted by the President, then—apart from defense and space—the total increase in all expenditures during the first 3 years of his administration will be $800 million less than the similar increase during the preceding 3 years from 1958 to 1961.

The facts are there for those who are willing to recognize them. I have no quarrel with those who do scrutinize the facts and who, after intelligent examination, pinpoint where they think cuts can be made. But seldom has any single issue generated so much loose and spend-thrift oratory as this matter of Government expenditures. It is hardly responsible, fiscally or otherwise, to pluck from the blue air—or from the nostalgic past—some arbitrary figure and proclaim it as the magic limit expenditures must never exceed, or as the exact amount expenditures must be cut.

Some who are seriously and honestly concerned with fiscal integrity are currently suggesting that fiscal 1964 expenditures should not exceed the fiscal 1963 level. That suggestion, I am afraid, is completely out of touch with the realities of fiscal life and national needs. The truth is that the entire $4.5 billion budget increase from 1963 to 1964 can be accounted for by increases in only three areas; defense, space, and interest on the public debt. The total of all other expenditures is being held below 1963 levels.

To reduce the total fiscal 1964 budget to the 1963 level would call for cutting defense and space expenditures by $4.5 billion, or cutting a similar amount from all other programs—which have already been held below their 1963 level—or some combination of the two.

The impracticality of such an arbitrary cut becomes apparent when one realizes that while the administration presents the budget and Congress considers it on an annual basis, the programs whose cost is expressed in the budget are in large part continuing programs which involve not only plans but commitments for years ahead. For example, over 40 percent of the fiscal 1964 expenditure budget involves payments from unspent authorizations enacted in previous years, most of which are already obligated. And there are other items—such as veterans pensions—which, while they are in a somewhat different category, are inherently contractual in nature.

Let us look at specifics: Where would you cut the budget to reduce fiscal 1964 expenditures by $4.5 billion?

The $4.5 billion increase was in space, defense, and interest on the public debt. Suppose you tried to cut the defense budget by $4.5 billion, where would you look first? Research and development costs $7.1 billion, so you would have to cut that more than in half. Procurement costs $16.4 billion, most of which represents payments on contracts already far along and funded out of earlier appropriations. Therefore, budget cuts here would have little effect in 1964, but rather in 1965 or even later. To reduce procurement expenditures in fiscal 1964 we would have to severely stretch our programs already underway and funded by appropriations which have already been made.

Expenditures for maintaining our standing defense forces at home and abroad total $25.9 billion. This amount is funded from the current budget, so it is here that we must cut if we wish to hold 1964 expenditures to 1963 levels. A cut of one-sixth in this area would provide almost $4.5 billion. But it would mean reducing the Army by more than two divisions—more than twice the total increase in manpower since this administration took office, reducing the Navy by more than 140 ships, reducing the Air Force by 14 combat wings, and so on right down the line. I doubt if there are many Americans who would favor such a course.

The same thing applies to the space budget. Here, the National Association of Manufacturers has suggested a cut of $1.4 billion in the $5.7 billion of new spending authority requested by the President. But even if such a drastic cut were made, it would only reduce actual 1964 expenditures by a little over $500 million.

My point is not that the budget cannot be cut, but simply that it cannot be cut arbitrarily or fitted into a fixed mold such as the 1963 expenditure total. We must not forget either that the fiscal 1964 budget is an extremely tight budget—one of the tightest ever proposed. It has already been cut—and hugely—by the administration itself. Since January, the President has reduced his fiscal 1964 requests by some $615 million. Before that, a full $19 billion was trimmed from agency requests.

In the final analysis, the only real solution for our recent large budget deficits is to increase our economic growth to the point where it will produce enough revenues to finance, within the context of a balanced budget, the minimum programs required to meet our national needs at home and abroad. Not only will substantial tax reduction in 1963 help generate that growth, but—as the President has repeatedly pledged—a large portion of the increased revenues that result will be applied toward eliminating the current deficit.

This is the positive approach to the budget issue—the approach that can help us to achieve our potential as a Nation, both in economic and human terms. Prompt and substantial tax reduction will, of course, greatly increase the potential for American business. Even more important, it will greatly increase opportunity for all Americans. Finally, and perhaps most important of all, by strengthening our economy, it will increase the ability of our entire Nation to provide a better and more secure life for this generation and the generations to come.

C. & O. Canal History Is the History of Our Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, one of the great historical and recreational features of the Potomac River Valley, has been familiar to me all my life. I have always been fascinated by the history of the C. & O. Canal, for its past is inextricably linked with the history of our great Republic. Because I believe that we should be more aware of this heritage, I call to the attention of all Americans the following history of the C. & O. Canal by Robert H. Riecks which appeared in the July–August 1963 issue of Listen:

Recreational Waterway

(By Robert H. Riecks)

The sun-dappled towpath stretched in a long curve until it and the canal disappeared around a bend. It was a sunny, early June morning that brought back a flood of memories of the time when I was a little boy following my father down the steps from Chain Bridge to the towpath along the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal. From there it was a long and thrilling hike through the woods and over rocks until we came to the Potomac River, where my father loved to fish.

The whole countryside was different then. The canal was harder to get to, and the scenery was much more rugged. To get there, you came out from the city by electric trolley car, and got off at a little waystation and walked down a wooded pathway to the canal. At Chain Bridge, you went part way out on the bridge and then climbed down a set of steps to the towpath below.

Big canalboats pulled by mules would go by. They looked awfully big to me then. I later found out that they were 92 feet long and 14½ feet wide, which just allowed them to fit into the locks, that were exactly 15 feet wide. Most of the boats had names, such as "George Washington," or "Henry Clay," or "Susan," or "Enterprise," or even "Grandpa."

The canal boat was not only a business but had become a way of life for the captain and his family who lived aboard. And so "Grandpa" could bring a chuckle to your lips if you happened to see him on a Monday morning, loaded with 130 tons of grimy coal from Cumberland, gliding along at mule speed (perhaps 4 miles an hour) with a varicolored "fashion show" hung out on his wash line.

There was an aft cabin where the skipper and his family lived. It usually had a tarp stretched above it and out in front of the door to give added living room, especially in the summertime when it became very hot where the trees grew close along the canal's edge to shut off the breeze. The children played on deck much the same as we played in our backyards in Washington, D.C.

Through the window of the smaller center cabin we could see bales of hay. This was aptly called the "hayhouse," for here was stored the fuel for the mule power. Through the windows of the front cabin you might see the spare mules, for this was where they were kept. A large boat had a complement of five. Each barge always had three cabins.

If a boat looked particularly dirty you knew that it carried mostly coal. During the period of the canal's operation, more than a million tons were loaded. There were all kinds of other things, too, such as corn, flour salt, beef, pork, apples, peaches, lumber, plaster, stone, ore, ale, beer, whisky, barley, buckwheat, and all manner of provisions. In fact, about anything was carried on these boats.

To see one of the boats enter a lock was a thrilling experience for a small boy. Each lock was 100 feet long, and when a boat had entered and the lower gates were closed (if it was going upstream), the fit was so close it looked as if the boat were wedged in the stone of the lock. Then the water would begin to rush in from the bottom as the lock tender opened the iron gates in the bottom of the lock at the upstream end. Slowly the barge would rise until it was level with the water in the upper channel. It had risen eight feet. The driver started his mules and slowly the big boat would come out of the lock and again start its journey.

There were 74 of these lift locks, so that when a boat had gone from Georgetown, D.C., to Cumberland, Md., it had risen about 600 feet. In the upper reaches the waterway narrowed to 60 feet, while the standard in the lower stretches was 80.

The canal had long passed the heyday of its operation (the 1870's) when I first became acquainted with it. The records of that earlier time show that there were 540 boats in use, and that 100 had locked through as a given point in one day.

At Paw Paw, W. Va., the canal passed underground more than 3,000 feet. This was an expensive accomplishment. But the construction that intrigued me the most was that of the aqueducts for carrying the waterway over rivers and creeks. The only one I remember seeing was the one that spanned the Potomac River at Georgetown, D.C., and gave the canal a 7-mile extension to Alexandria, Va. It seemed strange to see a boat traveling in water, on a bridge over another body of water. The abutments for this aqueduct were removed from the Potomac's channel last year.

There was also an aqueduct at Seneca, Md. It now stands empty and deserted, filled with grass. There is one at Williamsport, Md., too. The most picturesque of all is the long one (483 feet) over the Monocacy River. It has seven 54-foot arches made of quartzite.

When the canal was built as far as Cumberland, it had cost $11 million, or about $60,000 per mile.

While George Washington is generally credited with being the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal's organizer, actually his Potomac Co., created in 1785 with the intention of clearing obstructions from the Potomac River and using it as a commercial waterway, only built short-skirting canals around the river's worst falls. The longest of these (1,200 yards) was at Great Falls, on the Virginia side of the Potomac. There were two others on that side and only two on the Maryland side. The much-later Chesapeake and Ohio Canal was a continuous waterway constructed entirely on the Maryland side.

The Potomac Co. started its operations in 1802 with the use of small hand-propelled raftlike boats which used the river's currents as much as possible. The service was not dependable and was soon abandoned. Washington in the meantime had resigned as its president to become the President of the United States.

The canal is not owned by the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad, as some suppose, but got its name from the builder's intentions to connect the Chesapeake Bay area with the Ohio River at Pittsburgh, Pa. Because of legal and financial difficulties the construction stopped at Cumberland, Md., although the original name was retained.

When President John Quincy Adams lifted the first shovelful of earth for the construction of the canal on July 4, 1828, he was not thinking of recreation. America was on the move westward, and this was during what has since come to be called the great canal building era. The Erie Canal had been a great success, and there were now more than 4,000 miles of canals under construction or being planned. It was in this same year that the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad started building from Washington, D.C., to Cumberland, which in many places paralleled the C. & O. Canal. They were able to reach Cumberland 8 years ahead of the canal.

The boats could carry heavy goods at one-fourth the price of the overland freight wagons, and so the canal, the railroad, and the horse and wagon competed for the heavy westward trade through the Potomac River Valley.

The canal's most formidable competition, however, came from the heavy rains and floods which caused extensive damage over a long period. In 1889, the Johnstown flood destroyed long sections of the canal. The company never completely recovered from this catastrophe, although it continued to operate until 1924.

The canal was purchased by the Federal Government in 1938 and is today administered by the National Park Service. Stretching its narrow right-of-way for 184.5 miles, the 4,253 acres are probably America's most unique recreation area.

Today as I hike the towpath it all seems like a dream, for now much of the canal is only a big open ditch filled with grass, bushes, and trees. The work of restoration is progressing and in some places water has again been turned into the canal. In the restored Georgetown division, park naturalists conduct guided trips along the towpath and tours aboard a mule-drawn barge. But it is the sections that are quiet and seldom visited that I like the best, for whether or not there is water in the canal, there can hardly be a better place for the nature lover.

It was in one of these areas that I saw my first pileated woodpecker. They are not common in the Washington area, and about 4 years ago when we heard that one had been seen along the canal, we immediately did our best to locate him but with no success. Another time while hiking with two friends I saw a flash of wings, and there it was. If you are a bird watcher you will understand the experience of such a moment.

It was also in one of these more isolated sections, where there is no water in the canal, that I found out how fast a snake can really move. I was returning, alone with my memories of the once-busy waterway, when a large black snake shot out from the right side about 15 feet ahead of me and headed for the canal's ditch. Since I am used to the outdoors, snakes are not new to me and I have no particular fear of them, only to treat with proper respect those that are poisonous. I stopped to see why the excessive speed. He seemed to hesitate at the canal's edge, and then with the most amazing burst of speed I have seen in a wild creature he dipped over the edge and down into the canal's grass-filled ditch, and slithered along the top of the foot-high grass almost to the other side before he disappeared under the grass. It was as though someone had a string in his nose and had jerked him across. If a man can run a mile in 4 minutes, this snake can run it in 2, I thought. Later I found out that the snake was a black racer and could easily outrun a man.

There are canoeists, hikers, bird watchers, bicycle riders, and fishermen to be found all along the canal's banks. I have seen the colorful wood duck, and, in the migratory period, hundreds of warblers. The fox is perhaps the largest of 4-footed wildlife to be seen.

At Great Falls there are several locks. You will marvel at the condition of the stonework after more than 130 years. Here also is the old Great Falls Tavern built in 1830 as a rest stop for visitors along the canal.

If you like the things that make for better living—fresh air, sunshine, exercise, the smell of woods, the music of running water, wild flowers, the flash of a bird through the trees—the canal will help you be a better American today the same as it once helped build a better America in earlier years of our country's history.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Labor-Management Talks To Review Problems Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when labor-management relations get somewhat complicated, it is indeed reassuring to find some people like Joseph Pulitzer, Jr., editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, who think more can be accomplished by calm discussion.

In a recent article of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mr. Pulitzer's suggestion is fully explored, and I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

LABOR-MANAGEMENT TALKS TO REVIEW PROBLEMS URGED

Joseph Pulitzer, Jr., editor of the Post-Dispatch, last night proposed periodic meetings between representatives of labor and management "where each group could, without commitment, review mutual problems."

Speaking at a dinner at the Mayfair Hotel for more than 60 persons representing management and the 2,250 employees of the Post-Dispatch, radio station KSD and television station KSD–TV, Pulitzer said:

"Widespread attention is being given to various means of consultation prior to that which takes place in a tense, crisis-ridden atmosphere arising from protracted negotiations. Perhaps we need a forum for an exchange of views in good-tempered, lively debate—an examination of objectives, a reasonable dialog where mutual respect could flourish.

"I would like to propose that we who are here tonight—management representatives and union representatives—consider the benefits which might be derived from informal contact at periodic intervals. Perhaps it could take the form of lunch meetings where each group could, without commitment, review mutual problems. If understanding could be nourished by such meetings they would, I believe, be well worthwhile and could contribute significantly to elevating the collective bargaining process.

"The way to tackle problems is to bring them frankly into the open, in a climate free of tension and crisis."

Describing the recently settled New York newspaper strike and lockout as "one of the mournful chapters in American journalism," the editor suggested that "with the guidance of the New York experience, we must surely find a way to compose differences before they become disagreements; to resolve disagreements before they become disputes, and to settle disputes before they lead to the destructiveness of a strike or lockout."

He continued:

"Reasonable men, well-informed, mature, responsible men, should not fail to recognize that strikes or lockouts no longer in our day represent the court of last resort. Inevitably, after a prolonged shutdown, the disputants are reconciled in a compromise imposed by public opinion or by Government representatives speaking for public opinion.

"The force to prevent such a disaster must be reason—reason applied not without self-interest—aided by a number of instruments which should not be neglected. These include the National Labor Relations Board to settle grievances arising under the Labor-Management Relations Act; the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, to advise, consult, mediate with impartiality and detachment, bringing fresh air into the stalemate of entrenched positions; finally, and in my view preferably, as the ultimate solution, there is voluntary and binding arbitration.

"Men of good will holding honest differences should be able to use these implements without loss of stature. If the collective bargaining process cannot be refined to achieve reasonable solutions of differences between labor and management, the privilege of collective bargaining may well be limited; public displeasure may deprive us of all freedom of action by insisting on mandatory regulation."

Citing the contributions to the free press of all those employed in the field of communication, Pulitzer said that because a democratic society cannot function without an informed public, "each assignment, each task on the Post-Dispatch is clothed with particular dignity." Without the cooperation of all concerned, he continued, the newspaper and the television and radio stations could not present "in a distinguished report the news of * * * the world, nor could we challenge the indifference of society or illuminate the issues."

"I believe our mutual success," Pulitzer said, "would be benefited by an accommodation between the duty of the free press to furnish the public with news, and the democratic process of trade unionism, based upon legally protected free collective bargaining."

Referring to the overused word "automation" Pulitzer said:

"Automation does not mean any more to me than the advance from handset composition to the linecasting machine. The truth is that in the newspaper business, as in any other, we must go forward or perish."

Enumerating some of the technological research now in progress, Pulitzer remarked that "not all of the new ideas will prove suitable to our industry, and those that do will not come to pass overnight."

"There is not going to be any dread day when we suddenly find machines and computers doing all the work at the Post-Dispatch," the publisher assured his listeners. "The newspaper will continue to depend first of all on people."

Sixteen unions whose members are employed at the Post-Dispatch, KSD and KSD–TV were represented at the dinner.

Dartmouth Honors Eddie Perrin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, recently a good friend and former neighbor of mine, Edward F. Perrin, of West Hartford, Conn., was elected to serve on Dartmouth College's Alumni Council for the coming year.

The 50-member alumni council's responsibilties includes nomination of alumni trustees, a program providing alumni interviews for all prospective Dartmouth students and an annual alumni fund campaign.

Ed Perrin has contributed richly to the life of his community and his country. He served in the infantry during World War II, winning a Bronze Star with an oak leaf cluster.

He has a great interest in athletics. During his Dartmouth days he was a varsity baseball player and is presently a scout for the New York Mets in eastern Connecticut. He devotes a great deal of his time to the wholesome, character-building activities of the Little League and his work with young boys has borne many fruits. Recently, Ed Perrin was elected secretary of the new Hall of Fame Foundation in Hartford.

He is a trustee of the Kingswood School in West Hartford and is active in the affairs of the Hartford Heart Association and many other charitable groups.

He is an outstanding man who has enriched the life of his community in many ways, and I am happy to have this opportunity to point with pride to his achievements.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a newspaper article from the Hartford Times, entitled "Alma Mater Dartmouth Honors Eddie Perrin," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALMA MATER DARTMOUTH HONORS EDDIE PERRIN

Edward F. Perrin, of West Hartford, industrial division, Plimpton & Hills Corp. of Hartford, has been elected to serve on Dartmouth College's Alumni Council next year.

Mr. Perrin was chosen as a regional representative by Dartmouth alumni clubs in southern New England. He is a member of the class of 1938.

Dartmouth's 50-member Alumni Council is the senate of its alumni. The council's responsibilities include nomination of alumni trustees, a program providing alumni interviews for all prospective Dartmouth students and an annual alumni fund campaign, which this year has a goal of $1,250,000.

Mr. Perrin is district enrollment chairman for Dartmouth and is alumni president and a trustee of the Kingswood School in West Hartford. He is active in community affairs and has served as special events chairman for the Hartford Heart Association.

A varsty baseball player as an undergraduate at Dartmouth, Mr. Perrin has remained active in athletics as a football official, little league manager, and scout for the New York Mets in eastern Connecticut.

During World War II he served with the Army Infantry in England and France, earning a Bronze Star with oak leaf cluster with the 79th Division.

He was recently elected secretary of the new Hall of Fame Foundation in Hartford.

Nuclear Ambush: The Test Ban Trap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the most comprehensive study ever made of the test ban issue, in both theory and practice, lies between the covers of a new book entitled "Nuclear Ambush" and subtitled "The Test Ban Trap." Written by Earl H. Voss, the distinguished diplomatic correspondent of the Washington Star newspaper, "Nuclear Ambush" has just been published by the Henry Regnery Co. This work is must reading for any person who wishes to be informed on this subject. I believe it to be a responsibility of any person who seeks to promulgate views regarding either the wisdom or the unwisdom of a test ban first to fully inform himself on the facts of the subject as set forth in this book.

On June 6 the Indianapolis News made the book the subject of its lead editorial as follows:

NUCLEAR AMBUSH

It is a rare week that does not bring forth a dispatch from Geneva, Switzerland, saying the United States and the Soviet Union have failed to agree on a nuclear test-ban treaty.

These fruitless conversations have become a routine part of our Government's daily affairs. We are so accustomed to them, that few people would be able to say why America spends so much time, money and effort in pursuing them.

We can therefore be grateful for the appearance of a book which recalls the reasons for this weary go-round in futility, by an author who has devoted a great deal of study and reflection to the subject. The book is "Nuclear Ambush," aptly subtitled "The Test-Ban Trap" (Henry Regnery Co.). The author is Earl H. Voss, distinguished diplomatic correspondent of the Washington Evening Star.

Debunking arguments in behalf of a test ban, Voss discusses the original reason alleged in their behalf: That continued testing was "poisoning" the earth's atmosphere with radiation, covering the globe with fallout, endangering lives and sowing mutational disasters for generations to come. It was a wave of hysteria on this score which led to the voluntary suspension of U.S. tests in 1958. It is the same hysteria which, among other confustions, impels the present drive for an agreement on stopping the tests today.

Radiation, from atomic fallout or any other source, is measured in roentgens. A dose of 600 roentgens, or X-rays, would be fatal. A dose of 100 roentgens may make the victim more susceptible to leukemia or bone cancer. Below 25 roentgens, there are no known harmful effects. In the terminology of radiation studies, 25 roentgens of sudden exposure to radiation is considered to be the "threshold" dose.

Keeping those figures in mind, consider Voss' findings on the supposedly "lethal" effects of atomic testing:

"Man's natural environment gives him a 70-year dose of radiation 17 to 35 times greater than he will receive from fallout from all tests by all countries of the world up to 1961.

"The doses men receive from radioactive fallout are far too small for their effects to be noticed. At the peak of exposure in May 1959, people in Illinois are estimated to have been absorbing a dose rate of eight-millionths of a roentgen per hour or one-fifteenth roentgen per year, had the peak dose persisted. The average annual dose from natural backround radiation in the United States is one-tenth roentgen. * * * Fallout radioactivity would have to deliver doses hundreds of times greater than the present dose to produce detectable effects."

In short, the amount of radiation received from atmospheric atomic tests is considerably smaller than that received from the natural radiation of the earth itself, or from countless other sources like wristwatch dials, X-ray machines, etc. And the cumulative radiation from all these sources, atomic testing included, is infinitely smaller than the amount of radiation which science knows to be dangerous.

Yet, in order to escape this threat, America is urged to give up its strategic defense against communism and become defenseless in the face of its enemy.

Water Research Centers at Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate recently passed S. 2, a bill to establish water research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities and to generally broaden and accelerate the whole range of water research activities. Among the Senators who have been strong advocates of this necessary effort, none has worked more diligently than the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

A fine editorial in the Marshall (Tex.) News Messenger discusses the good possibility that research into water problems could result in savings in water development programs as well as leading toward the relief of the critical water situation in many parts of this country.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN PAY OFF

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH is correct in his estimate that Texas is vitally concerned over the fate of a bill to establish water research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities. YARBOROUGH is coauthor of the bill, S. 2, which has passed the Senate. It would provide funds on a matching basis with States to promote water research at institutions where it could be done at less cost.

With $10 billion annually being spent on water facilities in the United States, research funds on water conservation, purification and other things amount to only three-fourths of 1 percent of that.

Research possibly could trim thousands of dollars off the cost of water development and speed the day when water supplies would meet all Texas needs. They don't meet the needs of all areas now, and with the population explosion and industrial development the day may be near when growth will be halted because of water limitations.

We need both the research centers and water experts. If they could come up with an answer as to how to reduce evaporation, it would save almost as much surface water as is currently used in Texas.

Making Democracy Work Better

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I welcomed to my office the winners of the McGee Senate internship contest. The two young people who won that contest spent a week here in Washington watching democracy in action.

Mr. President, the three prominent Wyoming citizens who judged the essays submitted as part of this contest told me that the hardest part of their job was deciding among the many fine essays submitted on the subject "Making Democracy Work Better."

After reading these essays I can agree that our young people are very well acquainted with how their government functions and the problems that beset us in the space age.

Mr. President, I am convinced that the essays would be pleasant remainders of the worth and dedication of our young people to persons throughout the Nation. Therefore I would like to have those essays submitted by honorable mention winners in the McGee Senate internship contest printed in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that two essays, by Craig C. Cheney of Jackson, Wyo., and James D. Hollon of Lusk, Wyo., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK BETTER

(By Craig C. Chenney, Jackson, Wyo.)

America, the land of the free; this thought stands out in our minds whenever we think of our country—a country unusually rich in natural resources and industry, a country with a productive capacity second to none in the world. But, most of all, ours is a country exhibiting to the world the supreme example of success of a democracy, one founded upon fundamental human rights, and free business enterprise. The American flag is part of our national heritage too, and all Americans have the right to raise their hands in salute thereof, and rely on the democracy and freedom represented in that symbol. Whether old or young, wrinkled or smooth, colored or white, crippled or healthy, the hands of all Americans have equal blessings, and can reach forward to partake of the God-given freedoms and constitutional rights symbolized by our flag and guaranteed by our Constitution.

We know we are a world power. We think of ourselves as freedom lovers. But do we honestly support and participate in the policies and functioning of our Government? Do we even realize that we have blessings of liberty far surpassing most other countries? The first step in "Making Democracy Work Better" is to understand what democracy means. Once we do, we can begin to more fully appreciate our democratic way of life and find the solution to problems which may be confronting us or opposing our freedoms. As in the past, true Americanism is the basis for preserving our God-given liberties today.

A second way to improve the working of democracy is to understand communism. This current period in history might well be termed the trial of freedom, because of the two opposing political systems presently in conflict in the world as to the degree of human rights. These doctrines are those of communism, as practiced in the Soviet Union primarily, and democracy, as founded in the United States of America. We can strengthen our case in the trial of freedom by properly understanding the designs and motives of communism in our lives. This is the second step in making democracy work better. Communism, as we know claims to have eliminated the caste system in society and made all persons equal. This is true in that all are equally pressured in their beliefs, are all equally propagandized throughout their lives, and are all equally denied the blessings of personal freedom and democracy.

The final decision must come from within our country. By human nature, an elective or free governing system has more mild supporters than a strongly propagandized totalitarian type. People just take their rights for granted. There are not enough in America today who study and learn of our basic human rights in comparison with other dogmas, and thereby more fully appreciate them. How many times in the last week alone have headlines throughout the country shown how we abuse this democracy or the rights of others? A current hotspot now is Birmingham, Ala. Demonstrations and parades continue in full force each day due to the inability of whites and Negroes to exist peacefully side by side with the same constitutional rights as Americans. How many cases today are known of riots being started in large cities by a select few who overrun the rest? When the questions of the Jews, or the Negroes, or communistic organizations in our country crop up, what is done about them? Is a practical and fair solution sought for? Do we strongly defend Americanism when others downgrade us for our beliefs? How many of us actually realize that our greatest potential means of destruction will come from within—from an internal breakdown? This then is the final step to understand, as Americans, in making democracy work better. Democracy functions best when applied on an individual basis.

These are three important ways in which we can "Make Democracy Work Better." If we truly understand democracy and appreciate our Constitution and its guaranteed rights we will not stop with just these three. We will go on and study and learn and find out more ways in which we can help our country and its inherent democracy. Then we will apply these findings to the betterment of our country as just the beginning of true progress and accomplishment by Americans in fulfilling our country's obligations. Truly, these are the ways in which we can "Make Democracy Work Better."

Making Democracy Work Better

(By James Duff Hollon, Niobrara County High School)

Democracy is not only a government, it is a spirit or attitude working toward a more progressive life. This is the common objective for the people of the United States, who are concerned with its state of well-being. It is for the life in a democracy that thousands of men have given their lives to protect against those who oppose its principles. The goals of a democracy include liberty, justice, self-government, and peace. These goals are the basis for our Government, each goal has had its interpretation tested by many contradictions. It has been through the efforts of individuals in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches that the people of the United States have made their advancement, thus far in an overall outlook of greatness.

In time a democracy encounters many prominent problems which endanger the security of such a system. Being a government of the people, it falls on the citizens' shoulders to try and help their leaders solve these problems.

I believe the first step is to strengthen democracy in the United States, so that other systems such as communism cannot start internal corruption. The second step is to keep external pressure on democracy at a low ebb, in order to have a united and not divided free world. Other democratic countries must be kept strong, and the military weapons which they use have to be up to date.

The third step is to let all the people in the world know what democracy is and what it offers; then when they want to change their governmental systems to a democracy the countries of the Free World should aid these revolters.

I am going to give concise reference to problems which now exist and how they might be overcome by making democracy work better.

The buildup of nuclear arms by Communist countries has been a threat to the United States of America and other imperialist countries of the West. In particular the Soviet Union has stressed space exploration and the testing of nuclear weapons for their own advancement and for the advancement of communism. The threat of military attack has been strengthened by the Communist takeover in Cuba.

Are we supporting a North Atlantic nuclear force or our own nuclear force? In my opinion, the United States should make her policy for developing her own missiles. Not to completely forget a North Atlantic nuclear force, but wait until the missiles are conventional and then try such an organization. This has led to many questions in reference to our missile program.

Another problem which exists in the United States, in conjunction with communism, is the influence of communism on the American people and the attention this party has received. Through education, communism can be presented in its true form, but this does solve the problem. In colleges and large cities, conditions are perfect for the camouflage of Communist congregations. Certain names, which act as a camouflage, sound patriotic; but people find after they join them that they are Communist organizations. This not only supports the Communist cause, but it helps to corrupt the morals of citizens who are trying to be patriotic to their country. Is moral corruption of patriotism continuing? Corruption will continue if we continue to let Communist agitators stay in the United States. As far as the average citizen knows the Federal Bureau of Invesitgtaion is keeping a constant surveillance on these Communist agitators. This takes a tremendous organization, but the Supreme Court is interpretating laws in such a way that it is slowing up the Federal Bureau of Investigation's activity. This is harmful to our security. Our principles of freedom must be upheld, by the Supreme Court of the United States. If such agitators are causing unrest, could it be that our check and balance system is overriding each other, that we might be defeating our own cause? By allowing Communists to bring more people into their party is certainly not being patriotic nor helping the United States. Acts, which concern the civil rights, are very technically defined and protected, but the possibility of internal corruption is still evident.

The ability to increase trade and the growth of the economy in any country has a direct bearing upon the people's living standards, and thus it is very important. The survival of a democracy or of any system depends upon its ability to keep its people free from hunger and boredom. In the United States of America there have been very few times when the people have gone hungry or didn't have an opportunity to work. However, as the age of automation increases, unemployment and hard times have not been an oddity in some portions of the United States. At the present time about 6 percent of our labor force are unemployed. Democracy is continually on trial and the economy of the country is a proving ground for the advantages and disadvantages of democracy.

A system which has a good economy usually is very stable. I believe we can increase the trade between ourselves and our allies. Not only will the increase of trade help our allies by bringing up their economies, but it will also help the United States by increasing our trade. We are very dependent upon import-export exchange markets, like all the other countries of the free world; and it is through this trading of goods, ideas, and new developments that we can help each other.

We in America take the many freedoms of the democratic system for granted, but it is also our obligation to let other people know what our system has to offer. Many systems of government and their leaders oppose these thoughts; consequently, many people have no knowledge of democracy. They know nothing but a totalitarian type of government. People like the Hungarians tried a revolt but could not overthrow the Communists without help. When there is resistance to such dictators, we in the United States have failed to give these unfortunate people the assistance necessary for the freedom from communism.

Recently a young German named Siegfried Linke, came to the United States. He was an ordinary mechanic, who had witnessed the building of the Berlin wall. He talked before the student body on April 2, in English, which was self-taught. Siegfried spoke of the Communists building the wall and was disappointed when the United States did not interfere as they did in Cuba. The people of Berlin approve of the actions of the United States, but are astonished when we do not stand firm in all cases. When I asked him if there was a possibility of revolt against the Communists in East Germany, his reply was what I had expected: "We want to revolt, but you cannot fight tanks with rocks."

I know our Government has brought the desire for freedom to millions of people through the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe. In the free world this has been our ambition; however, people who fight must have help. It is not like the American Revolution when both sides had the same kind of guns, and the outcome depended upon courage and strategy. Today people who are revolting need arms to fight against an aristocracy. The revolters have the courage, but they don't have the weapons which are necessary to overthrow a government. Does the United States dare take steps to aid the revolters?

Democracy is a fine system. We must keep democracy strong in the United States and in other democratic countries.

The St. Paul Industrial Training School, Henderson County, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper article from the recent issue of the Dallas (Tex.) News. The article relates to concern St. Paul Industrial Training School. In truth, it is a brief life story of a wonderful couple, Prof. J. W. Smothers, and his wife, Alice, who many years ago committed themselves to the seemingly insurmountable task of building this school. With increasing hard work and complete dedication to the service of God and the children given to their care, their success is evidenced by the physical plant now existing; but an even greater monument to them is the more than 4,000 neglected Negro children, each of whom have made good citizens, who have been nurtured and taught by the Smothers.

The article follows:

A LOT OF FAITH, HOPE, AND HARD WORK MADE ST. PAUL'S

(By Frank X. Tolbert)

"St. Paul has been an all-Negro community since olden times. We want to keep it that way," said Mrs. Alice Smothers of St. Paul, Henderson County. "We want to live in our own backyard. And yet we want it to be a beautiful and comfortable and cultured backyard. We're not jawing and fighting and pushing and demanding things. We're working hard and praying hard. And we are getting things done. When we came here 35 years ago, St. Paul was a place of ignorance and misery and despair. The jungles of Africa weren't far away." Mrs. Smothers and her big, gentle, intelligent husband, J. W. Smothers, are cofounders of an incredible institution called St. Paul Industrial Training School. It is sometimes described in eastern Henderson County as a "Negro orphans home." This is a very poor description. For, with hard work, plenty of shrewd intelligence, and evangelistic zeal they have raised and educated around 4,000 underprivileged Negro children. They started with nothing, and they still don't have any money, but it would take $1 million to replace the school's lands and buildings and equipment.

St. Paul is in sandy farmlands just to the north of Malakoff, a town named for a battleground of the Crimean War. St. Paul became a kind of battleground for Mr. and Mrs. Smothers when they came there 35 years ago from Alabama. He was a graduate of Hampton Institute in Virginia and was hired to teach agriculture at the miserable little St. Paul school. She was a high school graduate and the daughter of Dr. J. R. Wingfield, a trustee at Tuskegee Institute, the founder of a home and school for underprivileged Negro children and a Methodist college (Lomax-Hannon) back in Alabama. Alice, who has since earned a degree, was also hired to teach at St. Paul.

The couple from Alabama was distressed by their shack of a school. They pledged $150 a month of their combined $175 a month teaching salaries for an $8,000 loan to build their own school and home for neglected Negro children. J. W. is a genius at farming. "No one can raise more corn on sandy uphill land," said one of his white neighbors. They raised most of their food "and scratched along on that $25 for the rest."

Alice Smothers is a vibrant, fast-walking, fast-talking woman, a typical 1963 woman in many ways. And yet when her strong, sweet face was in repose, when she was listening, she seemed to me a model for what a sculptor would want if he were molding the face of some long-ago saint.

She has been the money raiser for St. Paul. Once when the school was about to close for the want of $1,000 she went to Houston and walked for 10 miles "through a section of fine homes," knocking on doors and asking for contributions.

She was refused at all doors until she came to a big colonial mansion. "I'd asked the Lord for a friend," said Alice. She found one at the home of Mrs. Susan V. McAshan. "She had a beautiful dog and the dog loved me at first sight," said Alice Smothers. Mrs. McAshan, daughter of Will Clayton, wrote out a check for $1,000 right then. Later, when they'd learned the true integrity that is back of the St. Paul School, Mrs. McAshan and her father gave $20,000 toward a high school building.

"If it hadn't been for R. W. Fair of Tyler we'd have been finished at one time, too," said Alice Smothers. They were hauling their water. Mr. and Mrs. Fair put in a water system, and have done many other wonderful things for the school. Alice says she prays every night for everyone "who has even given a crumb to our school." She must pray for a long time. For the list of those who have helped St. Paul includes names such as Clint Murchison, Sr., Mrs. W. W. Fondren of Houston, the late William Fleming of Fort Worth, Harry W. Bass and Clyde H. Alexander and Paul Pewitt of Dallas, R. W. Knight and W. C. Strube of Corsicana, Mrs. Frances Bankston and LeRoy Kirby of Malakoff. There are too many names to fit into this space.

The Angus Wynnes, father and son, for instance, have been good friends. And there will be a "day" this summer for the Negro orphans at Six Flags Over Texas.

A tornado wiped out the school in December 1942. "We had five buildings by that time," said Alice. "J. W. and the kids got in wagons and followed the path of the cyclone and picked up everything they could including timber. They followed for 14 miles and then came back and built some shacks which did us for a spell until our white friends came to the rescue."

J. W. and Alice have five children of their own. "You might say the Lord has given us more than 4,000 other children. And all these have turned out well," said Alice. Six of the women teachers in the St. Paul School were raised by the Smothers. And to these 4,000, J. W. is "Big Daddy" and Alice is "Little Mamma."

The Big Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, entitled, "The Big Freedom."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BIG FREEDOM

In response to a question on "Meet the Press" last night, Bobby Kennedy said yes, he believes in freedom of association; but when the questions got right down to the President's pending civil rights bill, it turned out that he doesn't believe in it very much.

This is important, because the doctrine of freedom of association offers the one remaining hope for a peaceful resolution of this racial crisis. If this ancient concept of personal liberty can be elevated to the status of other first amendment rights of free speech, free press, and free exercise of religion, a constitutional framework can be developed in which these formidable problems of race relations can be worked out. But if the freedom is lost, through want of fair understanding, the American Republic inevitably must move from one compulsion to another.

The "Jim Crow" laws of the South (and of many Northern States also) rested for many years on what was thought to be a secure foundation of constitutional law. So far as public institutions were concerned, the theory was that separate but equal accommodations did not violence to the 14th amendment. The Supreme Court repeatedly upheld that view. So far as private facilities were concerned—restaurants, movies, and the like—the theory was that the States had the right, through their police power, to reduce points of possible interracial friction and to give legal sanction to the prevailing social customs of the white majority.

Now these concepts have been swept away. No law that requires racial separation any longer is worth the paper it is written on. And for our own part, setting aside all 10th amendment arguments for the moment, we are willing to concede that such laws are wrong for this reason: They violate the principle of freedom of association. When the law says to a restaurant owner who may be entirely agreeable to serving Negroes, "You shall not serve Negroes," the law violates the owner's right of free association. When a State's judicial machinery is employed to prevent a man from selling or renting his property to a Negro, if he wants to, the same thing is true; a man's right to control and to dispose of his property is as precious as his right to engage in free speech.

The school segregation cases of 1954 started out on a wholly negative basis, pursuant to the 14th amendment. The Court said to the States and localities: "You must not segregate." Very well. But the vice of Mr. Kennedy's bill, and the growing evil of court decisions in this field, is that the whole thrust of the law is being reversed. From "you must not segregate" the courts move to "you must integrate." The soda fountain proprietor who once was told, "you may not" now is to be told, "you must." Under the President's plan, the businessman trades one compulsion for another.

One denial of freedom seems to us as bad as the other. If the owner of the Liberal Bar and Grill wants to serve both white and Negro patrons, that should be his right; but if the owners of the Jackson Ward Cafe or the Citizens Council Diner want to serve Negroes only, or whites only, this would seem to us to be their clear right as well.

Such a constitutional structure has freely movable walls. The breezes of social change can blow through it, but rights of privacy and personal taste may be preserved as well. Men are not compelled to act or not to act; they are free to respond voluntarily to whatever social and economic pressures may be applied.

The President's bill, so warmly defended by the Attorney General, would destroy such freedom of association althogether. By its own terms, it would compel the owner of every soda fountain in the South, regardless of the nature of the community or the wishes of white customers who have provided all his business in the past, to admit unwelcome intruders to what often is a little neighborhood club. At this point, we cease to have free association; we have compulsory association; and in the enforcement of such compulsions, in the ironical name of freedom, we invite a tyranny instead.

The People Must Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Thurman Sensing, executive vice president of the Southern States Industrial Council, has produced an outstanding editorial column on the Supreme Court decision against the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading in the schools. It is entitled "The People Must Speak" and is available for publication this week in newspapers across the country.

I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEOPLE MUST SPEAK

Your children in the public schools can never again recite the beautiful words of the Lord's Prayer nor hear the Bible read as they begin their day.

The Supreme Court has so ruled—and the Supreme Court, some say, now makes the law of the land.

The effect of the decisions of the Supreme Court last June and again this June regarding prayer and the reading of the Bible in the public schools is to move the United States toward the status of an officially godless nation.

To be sure, there always has been and always should be separation of church and state in America. But a proper separation of church and state should not be twisted to give atheism a veto over public recognition of the Almighty.

God cannot be kept from the public schools. Who will be cited for contempt? Will U.S. troops be sent? Will the National Guard be federalized? Are 2 atheists—and 8 supporters on the Supreme Court—to deprive nearly 40 million public school students of their heritage?

From the founding of the first public schools in this country, reading from the Bible has been an accepted practice. It has contributed to the moral character of generations of Americans. It has symbolized that ordinary men must obey not only the laws of their State and Nation but the higher law of God.

The Supreme Court has said that the U.S. Government should be neutral toward religion. That is about what the Soviet Government position is today. It is an officially godless state that permits some religious bodies to function. But religion as such is forbidden a place in public education or public ceremonial in Russia. That is the very position that the Supreme Court wants to adopt in and for America.

It should be realized that the decision rendered by the U.S. Supreme Court might have been rendered by a Russian court. Certainly, they in no way take into account the traditions of this country. The Declaration of Independence clearly states the author's trust in a "divine province." Again and again through all the state papers of our country and its Presidents and Governors is faith in Almighty God stressed as the cardinal principle of American life.

The thousands of churches that dot our landscape and dominate our cities, the dozens of seminaries, and the respect accorded religious observances, all characterize this Nation and people as religious in the deepest sense. America is a land of liberty because free citizens believe that their freedom is rooted in religious freedom and respect for God's will.

Now, after 186 years of national life, the Supreme Court wants to remove religion from our public life. The Court wants to stick religion behind church doors on Sunday. Isn't it strange that it took the Supreme Court 186 years to find out that religion in the public schools is unconstitutional?

President Kennedy said a year ago that the Supreme Court's decisions must be respected, no matter how much one may disagree with them. He urged more private prayer. But private prayer isn't the issue. Of course, we have a right to that; even people in Russia can pray in private. The issue is prayer in the hearing of our young people of this Nation. No, Americans cannot respect a decision that shows disrespect of religious faith—faith in God. When the Supreme Court strives to drive God out of the schools of the country, then it is time for the people and the Congress to take action to repudiate a ruling that outrages the deepest beliefs of generations of citizens.

The apathy, the lethargy, the resignation with which so many people, so many Members of Congress, even so many of the clergy have received these decisions are all indicative of the low moral state we have reached in this country. But it is not to be believed that this attitude is the will of the majority of people. There comes a time, when their leaders won't, that the people must act—and that time is now. If the Supreme Court won't listen and the administration won't listen—and we know by now that they won't—then Congress will, provided the people speak in a loud enough voice. And Congress can do something about it—if it will.

Diario las Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Fourth of July is not only the anniversary of the independence of our great Nation. It also marks the 10th birthday of a newspaper which has become a force for unity and liberty throughout the Western Hemisphere.

The Spanish-language newspaper, Diario las Americas, started publication in Miami on July 4, 1953, a date purposely chosen to render tribute to the United States and the freedom and opportunity it affords its citizens.

Diario las Americas has constantly kept in mind the goals embodied in its mottoes: "For a Better Understanding Between the Americas," and "For Liberty, Culture, and Hemispheric Solidarity."

Today, this newspaper is distributed in 21 capitals throughout the Western Hemisphere from Washington to Buenos Aires. Its stories and its factual presentations are trusted and its editorial opinions are valued. It has provided a factual window to the Western Hemisphere, in depth, in focus and with clarity and understanding.

Certainly, Latin Americans have a much better understanding of the difficulties their countries are facing, and the assistance we are attempting to provide, because of this excellent newspaper.

It has explained in great detail the dangers of Castro and communism in our hemisphere and has depicited the need for a philosophy of hope, rather than despair, throughout the Americas.

May I wish Diario las Americas a most happy anniversary and my commendations to Editor Francisco Aguirre and Director Horacio Aguirre for a most excellent daily chronicle of significant happenings in the Western Hemisphere.

Address by Hon. Jerry Voorhis Before the 17th General Assembly of the United World Federalists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the 17th General Assembly of the United World Federalists held in Boston the last weekend in May.

As everyone knows, Mr. Speaker, UWF is the respected bipartisan organization dedicated to the strengthening of the United Nations and to a world free from war under international law.

Our former colleague, Jerry Voorhis, was the Chairman of the Assembly and, of course, did his usual spendid job. At the close of the Assembly Mr. Voorhis made a few brief closing remarks, and it is my pleasure to include them below for the appreciation of my colleagues:

REMARKS OF THE CHAIRMAN, JERRY VOORHIS, BEFORE THE CLOSING PLENARY SESSION OF THE 17TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS

Mankind as a whole has got to be able to speak and act in its own defense. Mankind as a whole has got to have authority to say to every nation and to all their science: "Thou shalt not kill man."

Hard to do? Yes. Ever been done before? No. Never before was it necessary for human survival.

Is it possible? It has to be because it is not only an answer but the only answer to man's stark peril.

Any precedent? Yes. Every human society that has survived has had to control violence and impose enough law upon its members to keep them from destroying each other.

The difference today is that the "society" that has to preserve itself is the entire human race.

How might it be done? By giving the United Nations power and authority to enforce a law of peace on every nation all over the world. By making modern science the servant of man's welfare instead of the agent of his probable destruction.

Would Russia agree? Would China? Would we? Yes, would we? We have to answer that last question before we can try to get answers to the others. Or to any questions that amount to anything much today.

Anyway, it would be better if we could know that we had tried.

Science Advisory Staffs for the House and Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago, I introduced H.R. 6866, a bill designed to provide Congress with independent staffs of scientists and technicians to remove the great dependence of the legislative branch upon the executive branch for guidance in the formulation of policy upon the innumerable technical questions with which Congress must deal in the space age.

The response to this proposal both from my colleagues in the House and from members of the scientific community, has been very favorable. I have asked for public hearings on the bill where these expressions of opinion and suggestions for improvement could be made formally.

The interest of the scientific community in the proposal is reflected in the following article which appeared in Science, the weekly magazine published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science. One error appears in this otherwise excellent summary of the bill where I am referred to as a "freshman Member." I am happy to set this straight by confirming that I am privileged to be serving my second term as Representative of the Fourth District of Connecticut.

Bill Providing Science Advisory Staffs for House and Senate May Be a Step in a New Direction

One swallow maketh not summer, but the introduction last week in the House of Representatives of a bill to establish a science advisory staff in both the House and the Senate, comes as a further sign of the growing uneasiness of Congress over its lack of access to competent and objective advice on scientific matters.

It should be recognized that, in the congressional scheme of things, this new bill (H.R. 6866), introduced by Representative Abner W. Sibal, Republican of Connecticut, has rather meager immediate prospects, both because it is a brand new legislative idea, and because it was put forward by a freshman member of the minority party. A realistic view of the measure probably is that it is an opening bid and serves a useful purpose by spelling out a plan for improving the science advisory apparatus of Congress and by making that plan available for criticism and, perhaps, for eventual action.

If the odds appear to be against early success for the Sibal proposal, the sentiments Sibal expressed in a statement issued when he introduced the bill are gaining force in Congress.

"For a long time," said Sibal, "the executive branch has had a near monopoly of scientific talent in Government. Although the President and the major departments and agencies have scientific staffs which consult on the tremendous range of highly technical issues concerning the Government, Congress does not. Members of Congress, who are nearly always people untrained in science, have to rely chiefly on scientists from the executive branch whose task is to defend their programs and seek the funds to run them.

"It has become increasingly difficult for Congressmen to question programs sent down from the executive side. This is extremely serious when one considers that it is Congress that must decide whether to vote the money and, if so, how much. Right now, for example, we are weighing the question of whether to authorize billions and billions in the race to the moon. We should not have to be so dependent on the executive for technical advice. The lack of independent scientific resources must be corrected if Congress is to fulfill its responsibilities as direct representatives of the people and is not to become, through lack of proper tools, a mere rubberstamp for the executive branch."

Under Sibal's proposal, each House of Congress would get a science advisory staff headed by three professionals "available to the committees and Members of the House of Congress within which it is established and to conference committees of the two Houses of Congress to give scientific advice and assistance in the analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of legislation or proposed legislation."

The three-man staff could not be expected to assist on all the questions on science and technology that the legislators might put to them, but would be expected to arrange for the services of consultants and for the convening of panels of experts on terms much the same as those now offered by the executive agencies.

Each of the two science advisory groups would be composed of a Director and two associates. The salary of the Director would be $21,500, and the salaries of the associates, $20,000 a year. The Sibal bill specifies that the triumvirates be appointed on the basis of merit and "without reference to political affiliation," but adds an insurance clause which provides that the Director and one associate shall be appointed by the ranking majority officer of the House in question and that the other associate shall be appointed by the minority leader.

The potential difficulties in organizing a science secretariat for Congress, even one of modest size, are not far to seek. First, it might be difficult to prevail on first-rate scientists to leave their laboratories or university posts to work in the highly charged political atmosphere of Congress.

Some way would have to be found to protect the science advisory staff from becoming an answering service for the not inconsiderable flow of congressional mail touching on matters of science and science policy. Most of these letters from constituents would be trivial scientifically, but for legislators they are anything but trivial politically.

A further difficulty is the absence of a precedent. No staff agecny in Congress performs functions similar to those which would be expected of the science advisory staff. The closest thing to a model is probably the Office of the Legislative Counsel, a bill-drafting service which employs a staff of lawyers to embody the members' legislative intentions in proper form. But the counsel's men are not called upon for the evaluative work which would be expected of the science staff.

Perhaps most significant, the science staff, working in Congress, with its many strong magnetic fields, might develop its own loyalties to persons and programs and lose the objectivity which is the chief reason for its being there.

The Sibal bill anticipates some of these difficulties. Terms for the advisers would be 3 years, and no adviser would be permitted to serve more than 6 years. There would be a top age limit of 55, "to keep an emphasis on youth and creativity," according to Sibal.

To qualify for one of the three top positions on either staff, a scientist would have to hold a doctorate or its equivalent. The bill also specifies that one staff member hold his degree in biology, one in chemistry, and one in physics.

The best chance for innovation in the apparatus of providing Congress with advice on science would probably come at a time of general reform of the structure and rules of Congress. While discussion of such a reform is planned (but not yet scheduled) in the Senate Rules Committee, the pressure for reform, which seemed strong at the beginning of the session, now appears to have slackened.

Nevertheless, Congress is showing interest in sound scientific dissent against official policy set by the executive agencies—the lunar landing program is an example—and is looking increasingly to the scientific community for help in seeing the other side of the question.—J.W.

Pensions for Veterans of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Randall], while a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee in both the 86th and the 87th Congresses introduced his own bill that would have provided for a pension for World War I veterans. He has a reputation for being a tireless worker in behalf of veterans legislation. He has been a consistent supporter over the years of a separate pension for World War I veterans.

In the 88th Congress I introduced H.R. 2332, which has been endorsed by veterans of World War I of the United States of America. Because of his support for my bill, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the Record portions of a speech Mr. Randall delivered before the department convention of the District of Columbia of the World War I Veterans organization at the Hamilton Hotel on Saturday, the 15th of June 1963:

Let's Be Fair, Then Let's Hurry

(By William J. Randall, Member of Congress, Fourth Missouri District)

Chairman Eslin, National Vice Commander Kime, Department Commander Moore, Department President Iverson, members of the Department of the District of Columbia, ladies and gentlemen, it is very pleasant to be here with you today. I always welcome an apearance before a World War I veterans organization.

As most of you know, I was for two terms a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. I know all of the members of that committee and I know they are sincere, but for some reason or other not much ever seems to happen in the way of a separate pension for World War I veterans. The veterans in my home district in years past continued to ask about inaction by the committee. I have told them repeatedly I was in favor of a separate pension, but it seemed no real progress could ever be accomplished within the committee. To prove my sincerity, I signed the discharge petition which came so very close to being successful in 1962. I am sure I share the opinion of most Members of Congress that the use of a discharge petition should be resorted to most infrequently. But equally true, most of us believe that there are instances when an exception should be made and it is where bills have been introduced and have not been given a full, adequate hearing or if given a hearing, the full committee is never given an opportunity to vote the bill as it is said, up or down, which means reported favorably or tabled within the committee.

I know most of you are wondering why it is there is no favorable action on H.R. 2332 or companion bills, and I thought I would pass on to you some of the criticism of these measures which is mentioned and overheard in informal conversation among Members and others.

1. It is said that a $100 a month pension departs from the test that such a large monthly sum is only for those with substantial physical disability and further that the income limits should be set much lower than have been proposed. My answer to these critics is that they should take a look at the figures recently released by the Department of Commerce, which stated an annual income of $3,600 for a single person or $4,000 for a married couple is necessary to maintain the average standard of living in this country. These figures are, mind you, a norm, not just for the elderly with their higher medical expenses.

2. There is the objection that there would be a lot of new veterans added to the pension rolls today. It is argued that those now receiving pensions would be benefited only partially. But my friends, it is this kind of criticism that contains the implicit admission that the existing limitations on income are too low. It is unrealistic that a man should not have a pension of any kind if he has an income of over $1,800. As the Department of Commerce figures I have just related show, there is a definite need among those with an income of any amount less than $2,400.

3. No matter how the objection or criticism to World War I pensions may be expressed, it all comes back to the matter of cost. It is estimated by the VA that the cost for fiscal 1964 would be about $1 billion. While it is admitted this figure would drop in each succeeding year because of the deaths of pension recipients, we think this matter of cost should be considered in the light of our national income or correlated to our gross national product. Put in this light, the present cost of veterans' benefits is less than in the 1890's or even in the 1930's, notwithstanding the fact that the number of veterans has increased from 3 to 14 percent of the total population. Here is a fact that may cause you to ponder with surprise and even shake your head; because in the year 1963, the total veterans' expenditures consumed less than 8 percent of all Federal tax receipts compared to 30 percent in the early 1930's. Now here are some more figures that are either forgotten or for some reason are just never presented and that is if we would take the projected approximate cost of $1 billion per year for the new World War I pension program and add it to the current total VA annual cost of $5.3 billion, this would bring the total to only $6.3 billion, which would be far less than the $8.3 billion spent on veterans' programs in 1947. If we could afford to spend $8.3 billion in 1947 with a much smaller national product, surely we can afford a little over $6 billion in 1963, with a much greater national income.

Ladies and gentlemen, I hope you will let me talk with you for a few minutes on reasons why there should be an immediate enactment of a World War I pension program. First, it is right in principle and just in purpose. The World War I veteran has fulfilled his obligation, although he regarded it at the same time as a privilege; but now that the waving of flags and the joyful parades are over, the Nation is obligated to these men. I submit to you that this obligation has not been fulfilled. Actually, it is not an obligation but an opportunity of the Nation to come to the help of these forgotten men in their greatest hour of need. Whatever is done should not be done as though it were an act of charity but with the feeling of gratitude that it is the doing of a thing that is long overdue. Second, there is strong, ample precedent for the enactment of such a separate pension. The American philosophy toward pensions for veterans is unique in all the annals of history. It was our beloved Gen. George Washington who set the precedent when he said those who serve the Nation in times of war become in a sense a privileged class; that those who risk their life and limb in the preservation of the Nation are entitled to a pension.

While any war is dreadful, we should remember that World War I was fought in trenches filled with vermin, filth, and disease and has been called the "dirtiest of wars." The doughboys of 1917–18 received only the meager sum of $21 per month and remember it was in World War I there was used a weapon that had never been used before or has not been used since, the most despicable and most cowardly form of warfare, the use of poison gas. Because of this gas, men were blinded, men went insane, and some who survived eagerly prayed for the day when the gracious Lord would free them from their suffering.

Another strong justification for the immediate passage of World War I pensions is that for the World War I vets there was no "52—20 Club" or the payment of $20 for 52 weeks as was paid to World War II veterans out of a job and seeking work. There was no GI Bill of Rights, no housing, or small business loans. All a World War I veteran received was $60 on discharge or barely enough for a suit of clothing and a pair of shoes. Third, a strong additional reason for enactment now of a separate pension is that it would accelerate the economy much in the manner of the Accelerated Public Works program and stimulate purchasing power in like manner suggested as the principle for a tax cut. Today we hear so much talk about the necessity to accelerate our economy and for good reason, but why is it that those who are interested in acceleration of our economy cannot see that money paid to veterans under a World War I pension would be spent monthly in their community and would go directly into the stream of purchasing power. It would better the economy of that community immediately and the country as a whole and yet would be subject to taxation against those where it was spent, which in turn would offset the cost of the pension. There is no doubt that pensions to veterans would increase the business tempo throughout the Nation and would go a long way to reduce our chronic unemployment problem we read so much about. It would stimulate the economy at the point where it would do the most good, that is, increasing purchasing power for the buying of consumer goods.

As we have gone along today, we have tried to inform you of some of the current objections we hear to a World War I pension, but we have also tried to tell you why we think your desire for a separate pension is both meritorious and justified. That brings us up to the big problem—why nothing happens? For my own part, I believe there should be some immediate benefit voted for those who have gone unbenefited so long. But it may be that I am in a minority, and I have tried to analyze why this may be so. Everyone in the present Congress is interested in economy and the reduction of nonessential expenditures, and rightly so. But there are always a lot of knights who seem to be crusading for economy just a little more conspicuously than the other Members. But these same Members never hesitate to vote additional benefits for the veterans of World War II or the Korean conflict, yet nothing for the veterans for World War I. Why is this so? My analysis may be cold and cruel, but I think that it is because most Members feel that by not voting for a World War I pension, in their own mind they think they are working in the national interest for economy but the truth of the matter, down deep in their hearts they think they are safe from popular reprisal because there are not enough World War I veterans around to work a reprisal against them. They fear the reprisal of World War II and Korean veterans but not that of the doughboy of 1917 and 1918.

Ladies and gentlemen, if it is true Members of Congress have no real concern or sympathy for World War I veterans, this can only mean the fight for a separate pension must be left to organizations such as yours to enlist in the Congress Members who will act because your cause is right in principle and just in purpose and not through fear of popular reprisal. I say to you that if the laws enacted for the benefit of needy veterans of World War II and Korea were good, these laws clearly imply the propriety of looking out for the World War I veterans to an equal extent. This is why I resent so strongly the charge that when a Member such as myself appears before a meeting of World War I veterans like yours here today he has an ax to grind and his purpose is political. I say that from a standpoint of numbers alone, this kind of a charge is impossible to be true. There may be around a few Congressmen whose conscience hurts them now and then because they voted for World War II benefits and yet none up to now for World War I veterans, but these personal worries are not going to help much to get your bill through Congress this session. As I have said before, if your bill could reach the House floor; I am certain it would pass the House. The big job is to get the bill from committee and to the floor of the House.

Earlier I quoted from General Washington, and now let me quote from another great President of our country, Abraham Lincoln, who said, "It is the duty of all of us to provide for those who bore the brunt of battle." I have never been opposed to the principle of foreign aid so long as it is spent in a reasonable amount. But I say that if we have money to care for others in the world we should first—let me emphasize—first care for our own needy. Let us never disown any of our own veterans.

Our past Presidents have been responsible for some of the most stimulating thoughts regarding veteran's pensions. None is more deserving of repetition than those of President Theodore Roosevelt in his first message to Congress in 1901. While he at that time referred to Veterans of the Civil War, his language is equally appropriate today when he said, "No other citizen deserves so well of the Republic as the veteran. They did the one deed which if left undone, would have meant that all else in our history went for nothing. But for their steadfast promise

The difference today is that the "society" that has to preserve itself is the entire human race.

How might it be done? By giving the United Nations power and authority to enforce a law of peace on every nation all over the world. By making modern science the servant of man's welfare instead of the agent of his probable destruction.

Would Russia agree? Would China? Would we? Yes, would we? We have to answer that last question before we can try to get answers to the others. Or to any questions that amount to anything much today.

Anyway, it would be better if we could know that we had tried.

Science Advisory Staffs for the House and Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago, I introduced H.R. 6866, a bill designed to provide Congress with independent staffs of scientists and technicians to remove the great dependence of the legislative branch upon the executive branch for guidance in the formulation of policy upon the innumerable technical questions with which Congress must deal in the space age.

The response to this proposal both from my colleagues in the House and from members of the scientific community, has been very favorable. I have asked for public hearings on the bill where these expressions of opinion and suggestions for improvement could be made formally.

The interest of the scientific community in the proposal is reflected in the following article which appeared in Science, the weekly magazine published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science. One error appears in this otherwise excellent summary of the bill where I am referred to as a "freshman Member." I am happy to set this straight by confirming that I am privileged to be serving my second term as Representative of the Fourth District of Connecticut.

BILL PROVIDING SCIENCE ADVISORY STAFFS FOR HOUSE AND SENATE MAY BE A STEP IN A NEW DIRECTION

One swallow maketh not summer, but the introduction last week in the House of Representatives of a bill to establish a science advisory staff in both the House and the Senate, comes as a further sign of the growing uneasiness of Congress over its lack of access to competent and objective advice on scientific matters.

It should be recognized that, in the congressional scheme of things, this new bill (H.R. 6866), introduced by Representative ABNER W. SIBAL, Republican of Connecticut, has rather meager immediate prospects, both because it is a brand new legislative idea, and because it was put forward by a freshman member of the minority party. A realistic view of the measure probably is that it is an opening bid and serves a useful purpose by spelling out a plan for improving the science advisory apparatus of Congress and by making that plan available for criticism and, perhaps, for eventual action.

If the odds appear to be against early success for the Sibal proposal, the sentiments SIBAL expressed in a statement issued when he introduced the bill are gaining force in Congress.

"For a long time," said SIBAL, "the executive branch has had a near monopoly of scientific talent in Government. Although the President and the major departments and agencies have scientific staffs which consult on the tremendous range of highly technical issues concerning the Government, Congress does not. Members of Congress, who are nearly always people untrained in science, have to rely chiefly on scientists from the executive branch whose task is to defend their programs and seek the funds to run them.

"It has become increasingly difficult for Congressmen to question programs sent down from the executive side. This is extremely serious when one considers that it is Congress that must decide whether to vote the money and, if so, how much. Right now, for example, we are weighing the question of whether to authorize billions and billions in the race to the moon. We should not have to be so dependent on the executive for technical advice. The lack of independent scientific resources must be corrected if Congress is to fulfill its responsibilities as direct representatives of the people and is not to become, through lack of proper tools, a mere rubberstamp for the executive branch."

Under SIBAL's proposal, each House of Congress would get a science advisory staff headed by three professionals "available to the committees and Members of the House of Congress within which it is established and to conference committees of the two Houses of Congress to give scientific advice and assistance in the analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of legislation or proposed legislation."

The three-man staff could not be expected to assist on all the questions on science and technology that the legislators might put to them, but would be expected to arrange for the services of consultants and for the convening of panels of experts on terms much the same as those now offered by the executive agencies.

Each of the two science advisory groups would be composed of a Director and two associates. The salary of the Director would be $21,500, and the salaries of the associates, $20,000 a year. The Sibal bill specifies that the triumvirates be appointed on the basis of merit and "without reference to political affiliation," but adds an insurance clause which provides that the Director and one associate shall be appointed by the ranking majority officer of the House in question and that the other associate shall be appointed by the minority leader.

The potential difficulties in organizing a science secretariat for Congress, even one of modest size, are not far to seek. First, it might be difficult to prevail on first-rate scientists to leave their laboratories or university posts to work in the highly charged political atmosphere of Congress.

Some way would have to be found to protect the science advisory staff from becoming an answering service for the not inconsiderable flow of congressional mail touching on matters of science and science policy. Most of these letters from constituents would be trivial scientifically, but for legislators they are anything but trivial politically.

A further difficulty is the absence of a precedent. No staff agecny in Congress performs functions similar to those which would be expected of the science advisory staff. The closest thing to a model is probably the Office of the Legislative Counsel, a bill-drafting service which employs a staff of lawyers to embody the members' legislative intentions in proper form. But the counsel's men are not called upon for the evaluative work which would be expected of the science staff.

Perhaps most significant, the science staff, working in Congress, with its many strong magnetic fields, might develop its own loyalties to persons and programs and lose the objectivity which is the chief reason for its being there.

The Sibal bill anticipates some of these difficulties. Terms for the advisers would be 3 years, and no adviser would be permitted to serve more than 6 years. There would be a top age limit of 55, "to keep an emphasis on youth and creativity," according to SIBAL.

To qualify for one of the three top positions on either staff, a scientist would have to hold a doctorate or its equivalent. The bill also specifies that one staff member hold his degree in biology, one in chemistry, and one in physics.

The best chance for innovation in the apparatus of providing Congress with advice on science would probably come at a time of general reform of the structure and rules of Congress. While discussion of such a reform is planned (but not yet scheduled) in the Senate Rules Committee, the pressure for reform, which seemed strong at the beginning of the session, now appears to have slackened.

Nevertheless, Congress is showing interest in sound scientific dissent against official policy set by the executive agencies—the lunar landing program is an example—and is looking increasingly to the scientific community for help in seeing the other side of the question.—J.W.

Pensions for Veterans of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL], while a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee in both the 86th and the 87th Congresses introduced his own bill that would have provided for a pension for World War I veterans. He has a reputation for being a tireless worker in behalf of veterans legislation. He has been a consistent supporter over the years of a separate pension for World War I veterans.

In the 88th Congress I introduced H.R. 2332, which has been endorsed by veterans of World War I of the United States of America. Because of his support for my bill, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the RECORD portions of a speech Mr. RANDALL delivered before the department convention of the District of Columbia of the World War I Veterans organization at the Hamilton Hotel on Saturday, the 15th of June 1963:

LET'S BE FAIR, THEN LET'S HURRY

(By WILLIAM J. RANDALL, Member of Congress, Fourth Missouri District)

Chairman Eslin, National Vice Commander Kime, Department Commander Moore, Department President Iverson, members of the Department of the District of Columbia, ladies and gentlemen, it is very pleasant to be here with you today. I always welcome an apearance before a World War I veterans organization.

As most of you know, I was for two terms a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. I know all of the members of that committee and I know they are sincere, but for some reason or other not much ever seems to happen in the way of a separate pension for World War I veterans. The veterans in my home district in years past continued to ask about inaction by the committee. I have told them repeatedly I was in favor of a separate pension, but it seemed no real progress could ever be accomplished within the committee. To prove my sincerity, I signed the discharge petition which came so very close to being successful in 1962. I am sure I share the opinion of most Members of Congress that the use of a discharge petition should be resorted to most infrequently. But equally true, most of us believe that there are instances when an exception should be made and it is where bills have been introduced and have not been given a full, adequate hearing or if given a hearing, the full committee is never given an opportunity to vote the bill as it is said, up or down, which means reported favorably or tabled within the committee.

I know most of you are wondering why it is there is no favorable action on H.R. 2332 or companion bills, and I thought I would pass on to you some of the criticism of these measures which is mentioned and overheard in informal conversation among Members and others.

1. It is said that a $100 a month pension departs from the test that such a large monthly sum is only for those with substantial physical disability and further that the income limits should be set much lower than have been proposed. My answer to these critics is that they should take a look at the figures recently released by the Department of Commerce, which stated an annual income of $3,600 for a single person or $4,000 for a married couple is necessary to maintain the average standard of living in this country. These figures are, mind you, a norm, not just for the elderly with their higher medical expenses.

2. There is the objection that there would be a lot of new veterans added to the pension rolls today. It is argued that those now receiving pensions would be benefited only partially. But my friends, it is this kind of criticism that contains the implicit admission that the existing limitations on income are too low. It is unrealistic that a man should not have a pension of any kind if he has an income of over $1,800. As the Department of Commerce figures I have just related show, there is a definite need among those with an income of any amount less than $2,400.

3. No matter how the objection or criticism to World War I pensions may be expressed, it all comes back to the matter of cost. It is estimated by the VA that the cost for fiscal 1964 would be about $1 billion. While it is admitted this figure would drop in each succeeding year because of the deaths of pension recipients, we think this matter of cost should be considered in the light of our national income or correlated to our gross national product. Put in this light, the present cost of veterans' benefits is less than in the 1890's or even in the 1930's, notwithstanding the fact that the number of veterans has increased from 3 to 14 percent of the total population. Here is a fact that may cause you to ponder with surprise and even shake your head; because in the year 1963, the total veterans' expenditures consumed less than 8 percent of all Federal tax receipts compared to 30 percent in the early 1930's. Now here are some more figures that are either forgotten or for some reason are just never presented and that is if we would take the projected approximate cost of $1 billion per year for the new World War I pension program and add it to the current total VA annual cost of $5.3 billion, this would bring the total to only $6.3 billion, which would be far less than the $8.3 billion spent on veterans' programs in 1947. If we could afford to spend $8.3 billion in 1947 with a much smaller national product, surely we can afford a little over $6 billion in 1963, with a much greater national income.

Ladies and gentlemen, I hope you will let me talk with you for a few minutes on reasons why there should be an immediate enactment of a World War I pension program. First, it is right in principle and just in purpose. The World War I veteran has fulfilled his obligation, although he regarded it at the same time as a privilege; but now that the waving of flags and the joyful parades are over, the Nation is obligated to these men. I submit to you that this obligation has not been fulfilled. Actually, it is not an obligation but an opportunity of the Nation to come to the help of these forgotten men in their greatest hour of need. Whatever is done should not be done as though it were an act of charity but with the feeling of gratitude that it is the doing of a thing that is long overdue. Second, there is strong, ample precedent for the enactment of such a separate pension. The American philosophy toward pensions for veterans is unique in all the annals of history. It was our beloved Gen. George Washington who set the precedent when he said those who serve the Nation in times of war become in a sense a privileged class; that those who risk their life and limb in the preservation of the Nation are entitled to a pension.

While any war is dreadful, we should remember that World War I was fought in trenches filled with vermin, filth, and disease and has been called the "dirtiest of wars." The doughboys of 1917–18 received only the meager sum of $21 per month and remember it was in World War I there was used a weapon that had never been used before or has not been used since, the most despicable and most cowardly form of warfare, the use of poison gas. Because of this gas, men were blinded, men went insane, and some who survived eagerly prayed for the day when the gracious Lord would free them from their suffering.

Another strong justification for the immediate passage of World War I pensions is that for the World War I vets there was no "52—20 Club" or the payment of $20 for 52 weeks as was paid to World War II veterans out of a job and seeking work. There was no GI Bill of Rights, no housing, or small business loans. All a World War I veteran received was $60 on discharge or barely enough for a suit of clothing and a pair of shoes. Third, a strong additional reason for enactment now of a separate pension is that it would accelerate the economy much in the manner of the Accelerated Public Works program and stimulate purchasing power in like manner suggested as the principle for a tax cut. Today we hear so much talk about the necessity to accelerate our economy and for good reason, but why is it that those who are interested in acceleration of our economy cannot see that money paid to veterans under a World War I pension would be spent monthly in their community and would go directly into the stream of purchasing power. It would better the economy of that community immediately and the country as a whole and yet would be subject to taxation against those where it was spent, which in turn would offset the cost of the pension. There is no doubt that pensions to veterans would increase the business tempo throughout the Nation and would go a long way to reduce our chronic unemployment problem we read so much about. It would stimulate the economy at the point where it would do the most good, that is, increasing purchasing power for the buying of consumer goods.

As we have gone along today, we have tried to inform you of some of the current objections we hear to a World War I pension, but we have also tried to tell you why we think your desire for a separate pension is both meritorious and justified. That brings us up to the big problem—why nothing happens? For my own part, I believe there should be some immediate benefit voted for those who have gone unbenefited so long. But it may be that I am in a minority, and I have tried to analyze why this may be so. Everyone in the present Congress is interested in economy and the reduction of nonessential expenditures, and rightly so. But there are always a lot of knights who seem to be crusading for economy just a little more conspicuously than the other Members. But these same Members never hesitate to vote additional benefits for the veterans of World War II or the Korean conflict, yet nothing for the veterans for World War I. Why is this so? My analysis may be cold and cruel, but I think that it is because most Members feel that by not voting for a World War I pension, in their own mind they think they are working in the national interest for economy but the truth of the matter, down deep in their hearts they think they are safe from popular reprisal because there are not enough World War I veterans around to work a reprisal against them. They fear the reprisal of World War II and Korean veterans but not that of the doughboy of 1917 and 1918.

Ladies and gentlemen, if it is true Members of Congress have no real concern or sympathy for World War I veterans, this can only mean the fight for a separate pension must be left to organizations such as yours to enlist in the Congress Members who will act because your cause is right in principle and just in purpose and not through fear of popular reprisal. I say to you that if the laws enacted for the benefit of needy veterans of World War II and Korea were good, these laws clearly imply the propriety of looking out for the World War I veterans to an equal extent. This is why I resent so strongly the charge that when a Member such as myself appears before a meeting of World War I veterans like yours here today he has an ax to grind and his purpose is political. I say that from a standpoint of numbers alone, this kind of a charge is impossible to be true. There may be around a few Congressmen whose conscience hurts them now and then because they voted for World War II benefits and yet none up to now for World War I veterans, but these personal worries are not going to help much to get your bill through Congress this session. As I have said before, if your bill could reach the House floor; I am certain it would pass the House. The big job is to get the bill from committee and to the floor of the House.

Earlier I quoted from General Washington, and now let me quote from another great President of our country, Abraham Lincoln, who said, "It is the duty of all of us to provide for those who bore the brunt of battle." I have never been opposed to the principle of foreign aid so long as it is spent in a reasonable amount. But I say that if we have money to care for others in the world we should first—let me emphasize—first care for our own needy. Let us never disown any of our own veterans.

Our past Presidents have been responsible for some of the most stimulating thoughts regarding veteran's pensions. None is more deserving of repetition than those of President Theodore Roosevelt in his first message to Congress in 1901. While he at that time referred to Veterans of the Civil War, his language is equally appropriate today when he said, "No other citizen deserves so well of the Republic as the veteran. They did the one deed which if left undone, would have meant that all else in our history went for nothing. But for their steadfast promise all our annals would be meaningless and our great experiment in popular freedom and self-government a gloomy failure." This most appropriately applies to the just claim made of our country by the veterans of World War I.

I have stated publicly that I would oppose another increase in Congressional salaries until we could make some progress toward balancing the Federal budget, but the fact remains that Members of Congress have voted themselves three salary increases since the close of World War II and they have never done anything at all for Veterans of World War I. Regardless of how you, the Members of Congress, or any person in this country may feel about the matter of the pension for World War I Veterans, the truth is, whatever is going to be done should be considered quickly because time is fleeting. There were 5 million men in World War I. Now there are only 2,300,000 veterans left today. Their average age is 69.8 years. One hundred fifty-five thousand are going on each year. In any discussion about these pensions, first let's be fair, yet frank; then let's hurry.

Mexicans Troubled Over Move To End Bracero Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Dallas Morning News, of Thursday, June 13, 1963, carried a meaningful feature article by David Weber.

The article was written in Mexico City where the writer observed at first hand the value and benefits of the Mexican labor law to bracero workers, their families and the Republic of Mexico itself. These farm workers bring back to their country words of praise for the American people and the farmers for whom they worked.

I commend this splendid article to the Members of the House, which is as follows:

MEXICANS TROUBLED OVER MOVE TO END BRACERO PLAN

(By David Weber)

MEXICO CITY.—Mexico could be in serious trouble if the United States closes its doors to "braceros," the migratory farm workers who every year go north of the border to help bring in the crops.

The U.S. House of Representatives voted to terminate the bracero program at the end of this year. Although it may be reversed, the decision has thrown many thoughtful Mexicans into deep gloom.

If the bracero is legislated out of existence, they fear, Mexico's economy and possibly its political stability will suffer.

Bracero dollars, about 35 million of them every year, have traditionally made up a third of Mexico's favorable balance of payments. More significant than the loss of dollars is the burden that these 200,000 workers would throw on the already strained rural unemployment in Mexico.

The lack of food, work and land—exaggerated in recent years by persistent droughts and Mexico's inexorable population growth—has turned the docile peasant into an active and angry political factor that is particularly worrying to the Government because of next year's presidential election. If the bracero is added to the huge rural unemployment lists, the situation could be explosive.

Some Mexican leaders, however, are making a studied effort to shrug off the possible demise of the bracero program. It hurts their nationalistic pride to see native sons having to go to another country to earn a living.

Braceros themselves have no such compunction. They are all too happy to be among the chosen few who can go over to the "other side" and work at stoop labor for a few months for U.S. dollars. Often these earnings tide them and their families over the entire year.

"I was up in Texas for 3 months last year," said Indalecio Morquecho," and made $450. When I got home I invested part of the money here and there and this is what has kept us going, mostly." Morquecho, 33, has four children. Between bracero trips, he finds occasional work as a relief driver on a city bus. The pay is $1.40 a day. "This doesn't quite cover the rent, but it is something. It has kept me busy until the hiring started again."

The trouble is that for Morquecho and thousands of other professional braceros, there isn't any hiring. Automation on U.S. farms has steadily cut into jobs for Mexican farmhands. Then, too, there has been pressure from U.S. labor groups, higher minimum wages that some farmers say have forced them to cut back the number of workers they can hire. Five years ago, nearly a half million Mexican workers crossed over into the United States. Last year, there were fewer than 200,000.

For this reason, every day is a heartbreaking repetition of unopened doors and unsigned contract papers for literally thousands of experienced braceros who patiently gather in the shady plaza before the old Cuidadela hiring center in Mexico City. They show up every morning and press in as close as they can to the peeling gray doors which open from time to time to admit a trickle of applicants. Blue-helmeted police grenadiers armed with clubs and tear-gas guns keep pushing them back, but as soon as the guard relaxes they push forward again hopefully. All day they wait, until at last they see the officials come out and get in their cars and drive home. The hopeful braceros drift off then, but the next morning they are back again.

"What else can we do?" asked Salvador Perez Carmona, a weathered man who has spent the last 5 summers in either Texas or California. "It's too late for most of us to learn a new trade. Farming is our work, but there's no work for us now. Not even up there, on the other side."

Defense Nourishes Gadget Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD W. CANNON

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the electronics industry has become one of the most significant and growing enterprises in this industrial nation of ours.

As the industry has grown, it has raised some problems, not the least of which flows from its great significance for our national defense effort. I was therefore pleased to see an incisive article written by Allen M. Smythe relating to efforts which should interest all of us to make more economic use of electronic parts in our procurement policies.

The electronics industry, in my opinion, is destined to play an increasingly important role in national security in the years ahead, and the article which appeared June 14 in the Washington Evening Star points out its growing significance. Since there is a great need to encourage the Department of Defense to simplify and standardize their electronic equipment, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE NOURISHES GADGET INDUSTRY

(By Allen M. Smythe)

Electronics industry is booming because of military orders. Of the $13.8 billion business expected this year by the industry, $8 billion will be defense orders. These amounts are for electronic hardware.

In addition, the Pentagon expects to spend $2 billion for electronic research and development, 90 percent of which will go to private contractors. This amount has remained constant for several years although defense research varies from $5 to $7 billion annually.

There is no sharp line of demarcation between some electrical products and electronic material. However, defense officials and the industry includes in the electronic category such items as, guidance systems, radar, infrared products, communications, navigation systems, fire-control, thermoelectric conversions, solar cells, countermeasures, computers and data processing.

The volume of this "expensive gadgetry" has led the cost-conscious Defense Secretary McNamara to urge the three armed services to simplify and standardize their electronic equipment. Save for a slow but steadily increasing reliability and some important developments in microelectronics, his exhortations have been in vain.

Mr. McNamara's assignment to Defense Supply Agency to handle the common-use electrical and electronic items affects only a very small part and value of the equipment used.

Most of the defense electronic purchases go to the contractor in the form of subcontracts, often in the second and third tier. This is because electronic products are now interwoven in all weapon systems.

Electronic equipment may run as high as 40 percent dollarwise, in the expensive ground equipment for ballistic missiles. In the missiles alone, the percentage may be 15 to 20.

Defense vehicles average only 5 percent of their cost for electronics, mainly communication equipment. Aircraft costs for electronics vary from 15 to 35 percent. The higher percentage applies to fighters and bombers which have fire-control and long range guidance.

All naval vessels carry expensive and specially designed electronic equipment. It varies according to the ship's mission. Because of vibration and distance from supply depots, most equipment is delivered with a generous package of parts.

Much of the defense research and development is being directed now toward microelectronics.

Common use items assigned to the Defense Supply Agency to buy include, resistors, circuit breakers, tubes, switches, relays, solenoids, coils and transformers. DSA buying of these items will be around $105 million this year and will double next year.

DSA handles 12,000 orders a day against an inventory of over 400,000 items. These items and parts are used to repair an imposing roster of weapon systems and electronic subsystems. Handling this $335 million inventory requires 4,450 employees.

Independence of Malagasy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today the Republic of Malagasy celebrates the third anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of the Republic of Malagasy, Philibert Tsiranana; and His Excellency the Malagasy Ambassador to the United States, Louis Rakotomala.

Red Isle, Ile de Boeuf, Island of Mystery—these are some of the epithets that have been applied to the island of Madagascar, which achieved independence from France on June 26, 1960, as the Malagasy Republic. Fourth largest among the islands of the world, Madagascar's total area is approximately equal to that of our States of New Mexico and Colorado combined.

Island of Mystery is a fitting name for Madagascar, for the origins of the Malgache people are shrouded in uncertainty. Early historical accounts indicate that the island's first settlers probably migrated by raft or canoe from the area around Malaya and Indonesia some 2,000 years ago; the matrix of the island's culture is Malayo-Indonesian. Although Madagascar lies 250 to 500 miles off the coast of southeast Africa, its atmosphere is more oriental than African. It has, in fact, been called "Africa's Asian Island." Its language recalls Malayan rather than an African tongue. Its countryside is dotted by mile after mile of rice paddies. In Tananarive, the capital and largest city, the visitor can see rickshas pulled along the winding cobblestone streets.

The history of the world's fourth largest island has been made more interesting still by the mingling of cultures. Its coastal regions were settled by Africans who migrated from the continent. Beginning about the 12th century Arab traders established posts on the coast and added immigrants to the island population. From the 17th century on Europeans—Portuguese, Dutch, French, and British—added their settlements to an already heterogeneous civilization. Malagasy has truly been "porous to the winds of the world," as its national poet and Minister of Economic Affairs has proudly stated.

Malagasy's emergence as a modern independent state was made possible only because the country's leaders were able to weld the island's diverse cultural elements into a harmonious community. Since independence the Republic has achieved considerable success in furthering the integrating of its diverse cultures and in expanding its economic development.

In politics the Malagasy Government has been stable, moderate, and pro-Western. The Malagasy Republic has an opposition party and opposition press, and no Malagasy is in prison for his political views. In external relations the Republic's insularity has not resulted in isolationism. It became a member of the Monrovia group and the Union of African and Malagasy States, and recently at Addis Ababa signed the charter of inter-African unity. The Malagasy Republic has been a member of the United Nations since the year of its independence.

In the economic sphere the Malagasy Republic has one very important asset—it is self-sufficient. It has a rich variety of animal, vegetable, and mineral resources and has been able not only to feed a population that is growing at the rate of nearly 3 percent a year but also to increase its exports of agricultural products. Malagasy's development plan has resulted in the further improvement of agriculture and the extension of cultivation.

In the field of education exceptional advances have been made. There are now about 2,500 primary schools, and there has been a rapid increase in the number of youths receiving a secondary and higher education.

In summary, we salute you, President Tsiranana and the Malgache people, for your accomplishments in the first 3 years of independence and wish you continued success in the future.

Modern Art Comes to West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail, in its issue of June 16, 1963, has an article dealing with modern art in West Virginia during this centennial year of my State. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ART IN APPALACHIA

On Sunday, January 27, 1963, modern art came to West Virginia.

Prior to that date, discussions of the subject were probably limited to teachers and a few amateur painters whose work was regarded with amusement, or, at best, a kindly tolerance reserved for those who are not entirely normal.

But on that Sunday—a day that for West Virginians may live in infamy as great as a Sunday in December 1941—the winners of the West Virginia Centennial painting and sculpture competition were announced.

Overnight, as the president of West Virginia University later remarked to a Charleston luncheon club, of the State's 1,860,000 population, "1 million became art critics." The other 860,000, according to the university president, were basketball coaches.

The winning painting, the center of the controversy, was called "West Virginia Moon" and its creator was an art instructor at West Virginia University, Joseph F. Moss, who later told a newspaper writer that the whole thing had come to him in a dream. "Maybe I shouldn't tell you this," Moss said. "Some people think I'm a nut already." He was right.

Moss' sanity, along with that of the Texas art museum director who had picked the winners, James Johnson Sweeney, was publicly questioned. The names of Moss and Sweeney were anathema to West Virginians who felt put upon, tricked, degraded, and ridiculed by "West Virginia Moon."

What stirred up all the trouble was a construction of six battered boards on which had been nailed part of a screen door. In the door stood the stick figure of a man and in the upper left-hand section of the painting, or construction, or what-have-you, was a ghostly looking moon. For this, Moss received $1,963—and more unkind words than he could count.

The man on the street, whose untutored opinion on any subject is believed by newspaper editors to be gospel and therefore eagerly sought, was voluble in denunciation of Moss, Sweeney, "West Virginia Moon," and anyone or anything else within striking range. "It's terrible," said Mrs. Dorothy Abbot, of 4908 Noyes Avenue. "It's ugly," said Mrs. Dora Pritt, of 315 10th Street, Belle. "It's nothing," said Mrs. J. G. Bordas, of 1568 Jackson Street. "It's atrocious and sickening," said Charleston's Mayor John Shanklin. "It doesn't look too becoming," said Richard Brennion, of 1578 Clark Road, age 11.

"What has West Virginia done to Texas that this fellow Sweeney would do this to us?" asked a State legislator plaintively.

Bernard F. Weipper, a Charleston artist whose paintings are of the representational school, accused Judge Sweeney of throwing out any painting that was recognizable, including Weipper's. "He prefers ugliness in place of beauty, disorder in place of harmony, and senselessness in place of reason," said Weipper, his beard bristling. "He who steals our art show steals trash."

A Charleston junk dealer, Walter Clark, declared his place of business to be an art museum. Clark was roundly and publicly applauded and, evidently taking this as a call from the electorate, later donned a cowboy hat and ran for the Republican mayoralty nomination. He was defeated.

Meanwhile back at the art museum in Texas, Sweeney was defending himself. "The pictures and sculptures which received prizes I thought were very good, excellent," he said. "I picked what I liked best. I don't pretend I'm right or wrong and I don't pretend the next man would agree with me. St. Thomas Aquinas was once asked what was his standard of judgment and he said the standard of the highest trained sensibility. It was on that basis that I made my selection."

And Moss had his defenders.

"I'm very much in favor of 'West Virginia Moon,' " said Mrs. Janice Arnold, who paints under the name Janice Washburn. "In principle, it's the greatest thing that's happened to West Virginia in 100 years. People have been stimulated to talk about art and that's no small achievement. I'm delighted that 'Hawk's Nest at Sunrise' or 'Sunset on the Kanawha,' or something like that didn't win. Photography has advanced so far now that I feel if you want realism, take a picture. Let the artist use his imagination and put his feelings on canvas. We've got to learn not to take just accepted things for beauty."

Miss Lucina Keane, an art teacher at Morris Harvey College, dismissed most of the outcry against "West Virginia Moon," saying: "Such expressions are to be expected when there are innovations in any field. The remarks reflect the state of esthetic development of the speaker more than they describe the work of art."

Dwight D. Eisenhower was dragged into the controversy by Mrs. Lynn Laskin, director of the art gallery at sunrise where the centennial exhibit was later shown. The former President, said Mrs. Laskin, "said that freedom of the arts is a basic freedom—that the artist must be free to create."

Prof. John Clarkson, head of the university's art department, argued that West Virginians should be proud of the exhibit, including "West Virginia Moon," and that the show was one "that might be seen, without embarrassment, in New York, London, Paris, or Rome, the art centers of the world."

In spite of the voices asking reason, however, the natives continued restless. Letters to the editor poured in to newspapers in such floods that they were shortened to paragraphs and finally simply words. And, the words weren't flattering. Sometimes they weren't even coherent.

What of the artist himself? Contacted at the time his work had been picked as the winner, Moss said: "I can see the possibility that people may be offended by this but I hope they don't take it that way. I think if they look at it they might find a condition that exists in West Virginia that I've tried to indicate with this painting. It might be the moon that shines over West Virginia. I realize that it shines over the entire world. It looks different when it shines over West Virginia, maybe. It isn't anything intended to be uncomplimentary. It looks complimentary, maybe."

A couple of months later, Moss again was interviewed. This time he wasn't quite so defensive.

"I certainly didn't mean to belittle West Virginia," he said. "You may say that I am proud of West Virginia, and I also see faults in West Virginia: I thought my old boards were beautiful, and as a matter of fact I think this painting is beautiful. Beauty is relative, you know."

Beauty is relative—a rose by any other name—and "West Virginia Moon" just might have had another name. When Moss arrived in Huntington to deliver his entry, he reported, he found out that the paintings had to have titles. Until then he hadn't given it much thought. So much for hidden significance there.

"West Virginia Moon" tended to overshadow the rest of the paintings and sculpture chosen for exhibition—all of which were modern, impressionistic, and abstract. Any one of them would have been enough to rouse the backwoods ire of a West Virginian whose feeling is that the highest art is reflected in the magazine covers of Norman Rockwell. Taken together, they made him see red.

This same West Virginian was slightly taken aback, however, by art criticism from an entirely unexpected source—Soviet Premier Khrushchev. Khrushchev had told Russian artists in no uncertain terms that he wanted paintings of tractors that looked like tractors and no more of this messing around. The West Virginian who had been screaming about "West Virginia Moon" being a blot on the State's escutcheon found himself the uncomfortable bedfellow of the tubby Communist boss.

As the art exhibit moved about the State, "West Virginia Moon" attracted crowds of curious spectators in droves. Its nearest rival was a piece of sculpture made out of what looked like the rusted crankshaft of an automobile and entitled "Mother, Is the Gold Star Still in the Window?"

At first the West Virginia Centennial Commission had shaken in its boots and run for cover when the winners were announced. But as arguments grew louder and controversy piled on controversy, the centennial commission realized it had a gold mine.

"It suddenly dawned on us that everyone was talking about this," an employee of the commission said. "It was just about the first thing to do with the centennial that had been talked about. Most people, I guess, had been pretty lethargic up until then. The centennial seemed to be dragging its feet—no one really seemed interested. Then 'West Virginia Moon' came along and no one was talking about anything else. It was wonderful."

While this might seem an acceptance of the philosophy, "I don't care what you say about me just so you spell my name right," it was true. For the first time, a centennial event had aroused the interest of the people of the State.

The merits of "West Virginia Moon" and the other centennial art exhibits as art will have to be left to the experts. Suffice to say that, whatever the final judgment, no work of art in the past 100 years had attracted such attention in the Mountain State. And it was a safe bet that at least another 100 years might pass before art and West Virginia collided with such force again.

Lottery Thriving in New Zealand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, as sponsor of legislation to establish a national lottery in the United States as a means of raising $10 billion a year in additional revenue, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House an article that appeared in the Sunday, June 23, issue of the New York Times.

I heartily recommend that every Member of this House read this article:

LOTTERY THRIVING IN NEW ZEALAND

AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND, June 22.—To any American State planning to establish a lottery, the advice from New Zealand would be: "Beware of the profits."

New Zealand inaugurated a legal lottery a year and a half ago. During that time most of the criticisms have died down, but arguments about what to do with the surplus have become steadily more heated.

Churches and other antigambling interests objected to the introduction of the lottery, but this new game of chance rapidly became so firmly established that they have seen little point in continuing to campaign against it.

Predictions that it would foster a gambling mania have not been fulfilled. At the outset business was very brisk. The demand for tickets exceeded the supply. But now the lottery has settled down to a regular routine, with about one drawing a week. Recently there has been even a slight falling-off in demand.

Tickets in the New Zealand state lottery, called the "Golden Kiwi," cost 70 cents each. Drawings are held after 250,000 tickets are sold. The first prize is $33,000. There are 2,010 prizes in each lottery, with total prize money of $92,400.

PROFITS PROVE EMBARRASSING

The Government has been pleased at the tax paid on tickets—$1,750,000 from the first 100 drawings—but it has been gravely embarrassed about utilization of the profits. These have amounted to $5,040,000 from the 100 lotteries.

This was the last problem anyone expected. Under the law, proceeds go to worthy causes, and when business exceeded expectations the Government was happy to see the sums which became available for this purpose.

But the Government has found that giving money away is an even more thankless task than raising taxes. Except for a few organizations that object to lottery profits on moral grounds, almost every charitable, artistic, educational, youth, senior citizens, sporting or recreational enterprise in the country feels entitled to a share in the profits.

Those that have not received grants complain loudly that their cases are far better than those of societies that have been favored.

Buyers of tickets believe more money should go into the prizes.

Taxpayers want the profits paid into Government funds, so that the income tax can be cut.

SCIENTISTS WANT A SUBSIDY

Scientists declare that research is the most neglected of all causes, and will return the biggest dividends if subsidized.

Newspapers say that instead of frittering away a few dollars on a Boy Scout den here and a ladies' bowling club there, the Government should devote the whole amount to one major interest, such as hospitals.

Special criticism is being directed at the fact that politicians control the disposal of largess, leading to fears of its use as patronage.

Now the harassed Minister of Internal Affairs, Sir Leon Gotz, has turned the problem over to an elaborate system of committees. A controlling body has been set up with representatives of both political parties and nonpolitical interests. Six advisory committees deal with scientific research, medical affairs, welfare, youth and recreation, aged and infirm, and art and culture.

But the Government is still in trouble. Complaints are pouring in that the system is unwieldy, that profits are accumulating while committees ponder, and that a sense of purpose and direction is lacking.

Critics may still bring further changes in the method of disposal. The Government is finding that lottery profits are far from being political assets.

NEW HAMPSHIRE ALONE IN UNITED STATES

New Hampshire, under a bill signed last April 30, became the first State in the United States since 1894 to have a legal lottery. Principal opposition to the measure had been on moral grounds.

Starting some time after next March 1, there will be two drawings a year, for a total of $200,000 in prizes. The problem of what to do with any profits will not arise; the money is earmarked for school aid.

Out-of-State patrons are expected to contribute heavily to the success of the lottery. New Hampshire has only 607,000 people, not enough to buy a sufficient number of the $3 tickets to make the scheme a major source of revenue.

Let Congress Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the thinking and the reasoning of the people back home on issues confronting us are most important to the Members of the Congress. A very good editorial on this matter appeared on June 25 in the Morning Call, a leading newspaper of Allentown, Pa. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I quote the said editorial, as follows:

Let Congress Know

Congress may not be the most perfect watchdog, but it's the only one taxpayers have in Washington and there are times when it deserves considerably more thanks than usually is given.

The other week, for example, it prevented appropriation of a half billion dollars more for the Area Redevelopment Administration. After a careful look at the agency, it discovered that while the cost was high the results were meager and often bad.

Now the record of foreign aid is being scanned and indications are another half billion will be saved. Here Congress generally is more sensitive than the executive branch and considerably more thoughtful of the taxpayer than the State Department.

Administration efforts to create an expensive Department of Urban Affairs also have been blocked by 'the legislative arm. The department would have given the Federal Government an important voice in the affairs of American cities and ultimately would have added a few billion dollars to annual national budgets.

There's a good chance it will defeat the mass transportation bill and save more money. This administration gimmick is little more than a plan under which everyone would join in paying the commuter's carfare at income tax time rather than having riders drop their own coins in the fare box.

Certainly Congress is not faultless. It has been responsible for some expensive follies. However, the big drive to have the Federal Government spend increasing slices of the American family budget generally is launched by the executive departments.

The pressures on Congress to spend and spend are tremendous. When it cuts a few million here and there or refuses to go along with new programs some thanks are due from those who exert even greater pressures. These are the voters who elect all Senators and Representatives and to whom many are quite sensitive.

Racial Disturbances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, two editorials written by Mr. George Shannon, editor of the Shreveport Journal, on the subject of racial disturbances, have particularly impressed me recently, in that they highlight an aspect that is often conveniently omitted in the newspapers of the North and East.

The first is entitled "Not Appalling, but Tragic" and pinpoints the callousness of the racists when the victim in these tragedies is white rather than Negro.

The second editorial, "Racial Crisis in Indiana," concerns itself with a recent crisis in Greenfield, Ind., when, for the first time, the full impact of racial mixing was brought home to the residents of that northern town. It confirms the conviction many of us in the South have had for years; that, what has always been put aside as "a southern problem" would be recognized as everyone's problem once it had touched them.

I commend both these editorials to the attention of my colleagues.

Racial Crisis in Indiana

Greenfield, Ind., is in the throes of a racial crisis.

It all started when Eli Lilly & Co. announced recently that about 140 of its Indianapolis employees would be transferred to its expanded Greenfield plant. More than a dozen of these employees are Negro technicians.

For an account of Greenfield's reaction, read the following paragraphs from a news story in the Indianapolis Times of May 26:

"Greenfield, like many small cities surrounding Indianapolis, has virtually no Negroes. There is just one Negro family in the city now.

"Weston Village is the subdivision which seems likely to be the first neighborhood integrated in Greenfield.

"The 13-year-old subdivision contains about 400 residents in houses which range from upper middle class to middle class. It is not advisable for anyone to buy there who makes much less than $6,000 a year.

"Leon Bush, Lilly technician, makes somewhat more than that. He lives in Indianapolis. He is a Negro.

"About 3 weeks ago, Bush and his wife Ladema, knowing that he would be working in Greenfield soon, drove to that city to look for a home.

"Charles Adams, a developer of Weston Village, showed them through a model home. Bush expressed an interest in the house and said he would return in a few days to discuss the deal further.

"Before Bush returned, Adams had deeded the house to somebody else.

"But the fact that a Negro couple was seen examining a model home in an all-white neighborhood was enough to start a crisis.

"With city officials and civic leaders officially silent, wild rumors that a Negro wave soon would be moving in on Greenfield started to spread.

"Developer Adams, Mayor Clifford Fields and Eli Lilly & Co. officials both in Greenfield and Indianapolis were bombarded with calls. Some callers were merely concerned and wanted information, some were anonymous and obscene. * * *

"What about the people most directly affected, the people of Weston Village?

"The answers ranged from a terse 'No comment, I don't want to make a statement, period,' to a 20-minute dissertation on the Negro problem in America.

" 'I came to Greenfield to escape the problem of changing neighborhoods in big cities,' one person said, in indicating he did not approve of Negroes in Weston Village.

" 'Integration is being pushed too fast,' said another Weston Villager. 'Just when moderates are beginning to call for a cautious approach, politicians, both State and national, push it right away.'

" 'I'm worried about my investment * * * who wouldn't be?' said another. 'They tell us these people are high salaried and won't depress property values, but what if everyone moves out?'

" 'Those people who moved here to escape the problem in the cities have no gripe in my opinion,' said one outspoken woman. 'How long do they think they can run away from a problem?'

"Although most persons did not care to give an opinion, it seemed likely that most oppose integration."

We in the South can sympathize with Greenfield's concern about racial integration. What we can't understand, however, is why the people of Greenfield and other northern communities whose attitude toward race-mixing obviously is the same as southerners' don't make their voices heard in their State capitals and in Washington.

It would seem that northerners such as these are in favor of integration for the South, but oppose it for their own section of the country.

We don't know of a single city in the South where 12 Negro industrial technicians and their families would not be welcomed as new residents. The difference, it seems, is that Southern communities have segregated areas, whereas many northern cities, in which few, if any, Negroes reside, are not so well prepared.

The white northerner in these communities really does not want racial integration any more than the white southerner. He just pretends he does—until he's put to the test.

Not Appalling, but Tragic

An Associated Press dispatch from Washington quoted President Kennedy as being "appalled by the barbarity" of the slaying of Medgar W. Evers, NAACP leader in Jackson, Miss., who was shot from ambush early Wednesday.

It is understandable that all Americans should be appalled by this terrible crime. At this writing, it has not been established whether Evers was slain by a white assassin or a Negro, although the northern press has seized upon the conclusion that his killer is bound to be white.

A few hours before Evers was slain a 17-year-old white girl was viciously raped by two Negroes in peacefully integrated Dallas, Tex. Police reported a large amount of blood on the grass and on the wall of a museum where the double rape occurred. A pocketknife also was left behind. A doctor told police the girl required a blood transfusion.

The Associated Press sent thousands of words around the world concerning the Evers slaying. Only five paragraphs about the Dallas rape case found their way into AP dispatch published by the Journal.

It is appalling to the President of the United States that a Negro NAACP leader should be slain. But apparently he accepts as an everyday occurrence the knife-rape of a teenage girl by two Negroes.

The situation into which the President is plunging this Nation with his agitations for race mixing is not just appalling—it's tragic.

Impact of a "Hemisfair" on Latin America Outlined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues in the Congress a very fine talk made by one of my constituents which touches on a subject of interest to us all, the Alliance for Progress.

For more than a year now, the people of San Antonio, Tex., have been planning a Fair of the Americas, or HemisFair, which will take place in 1968. Mr. William R. Sinkin, president of the HemisFair Corp., together with a committee of dedicated citizens, has devoted more than a year of study and work to this project. Mr. Sinkin is a department store executive and has been a leader in civic affairs for many years.

Because of the importance which this HemisFair will have on our overt relationships with the Latin American countries, I, under unanimous consent, include in the Appendix of today's RECORD the copy of a talk made by Mr. Sinkin before the Taxpayer's League on June 19, 1963:

REMARKS OF WILLIAM R. SINKIN

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, the Hemisfair, or Fair of the Americas, was originated more than a year ago as a result of Congressman HENRY B. GONZALEZ' program for developing San Antonio's vast market potentials through free enterprise with countries south of the border; creating an economic, educational, and cultural gateway not only to Mexico but to Central and South America as well.

Over a period of time, your Planning Committee adopted the following theme:

"The Fair of the Americas has for its purpose the reaffirmation of those basic ideals of individual liberty and personal dignity which constitute the foundation of friendship and peace that has endured in the Western Hemisphere through the years; and to the promotion of an even greater degree of unanimity whereby the peoples of the world may witness sovereign and independent countries working together in common accord for their mutual development and prosperity.

"The fair is dedicated to the achievements of the Americas in commerce and industry, in science, art, education, and the professions; to the creation of a mart as a continuing showcase for the skills and trades and culture of the Western Hemisphere; to the celebration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of the city of San Antonio; to fine entertainment; to the establishment of a permanent program of industrial training for peoples of world areas, utilizing American ingenuity and skill to help develop their countries; to the development of a legacy of permanent structures and facilities that will live on as a tribute to this community of nations and the fair."

That is our theme.

Our scope is an imaginative one. In broad terms and in keeping with the theme such things as these could be done:

1. A tremendous historical pageant celebrating the city's 250th anniversary.

2. A symphony of the Americas to be commissioned by the fair, and international or Pan American exhibitions to be held.

3. An interhemisphere meeting under the sponsorship of the OAS.

4. Exhibits in a permanent trade fair building of products of the Americas from Canada to Terra del Fuega.

5. An international rodeo and livestock show with such participants as the gauchos from Argentina.

6. An international medical meeting tied in with our new medical center.

7. Ballet, dramas, music, Broadway plays, operas.

8. Stardrome museum of space with talking telescopes.

9. Voice of America broadcasts and communication exhibits.

10. A permanent personnel training center.

11. An international competition of painting and sculpture.

12. A wide and comprehensive exhibit of arts and crafts from this continent beginning with the pre-Columbian art and coming up to modern creations.

13. A permanent trade fair building, a permanent auditorium and coliseum.

14. An institute of Latin American affairs—seminars, research library, and archives.

So we have our theme and an illustration of some of the imaginative attractions which can be offered by the HemisFair.

These two will, because of their very magnitude and because of their importance to this country and the world today, give us a third ingredient, I am sure, which is an excellence of execution.

We have had a feasibility study made and we have been advised that our HemisFair will bring up to 8.5 million visitors to San Antonio—and this is a conservative estimate. We also know now that we can have a successful fair with its resultant impact upon our economy; the eyes of the Nation, the eyes of the world will be turned toward San Antonio for 184 days in 1968. And what they will see will be San Antonians standing in a marketplace of their own creation, proving that an Alliance for Progress plan on a people-to-people basis can be made to work, so successfully as to make it a permanent, established fact into the future, engendering the kind of good will between nations that comes from the direct application of the free enterprise system.

We are all working together in this great effort, business and professional people, and the enthusiasm has been consistently wonderful.

There are a lot of problems ahead, a lot of work to be done. But we do not lack the imagination, the will to work and the enthusiasm to succeed. And these ingredients are bound to bring us a successful HemisFair which will provide an example to all men, everywhere, as to what the Western Hemisphere has accomplished, is accomplishing and intends to accomplish. Thank you.

Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, one problem that concerns all of us intimately is the proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is vital to the future of mankind that we find some way to prevent this from happening and the most easily obtainable and logical way would be through a treaty banning nuclear explosions.

Many individuals and many groups are actively working for a test ban treaty, Mr. Chairman, as well as our own and other governments. One of these groups is the Middle Atlantic Conference of Congregational Christian Churches. In this connection, I would like to have printed in the RECORD a resolution submitted by the Washington Association Committee and adopted by the conference at its 33d annual meeting at Upper Montclair, N.J., on May 6 and 7 of this year. The conference covers New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, the District of Columbia, and northern Virginia.

The resolution follows:

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY AND REDUCTION OF NUCLEAR DELIVERY SYSTEMS

Whereas it is urgent that strenuous efforts be made to reduce international tensions and move toward an era of understanding, friendship and good will among peoples and nations; and

Whereas we are convinced that a treaty to end nuclear weapons tests would deter additional countries from becoming nuclear powers by generating world pressure for adherence to the agreement; and

Whereas both the East and the West proved that nuclear tests above ground, under water and in outer space can be detected from outside the country in which they are held with the only remaining disagreement being detection of underground tests, and the means of policing; and

Whereas a sizable reduction by both sides in the number of nuclear weapons stockpiles and their delivery systems would help diminish much of the current international tension and release needed resources for more constructive purposes; and

Whereas we recognize that even a large-scale reduction in nuclear delivery systems can be considered only a step toward our goal of worldwide disarmament under the rule of law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates of the Middle Atlantic Conference of Congregational Christian Churches acting as a Conference of the United Church of Christ propose that our Government vigorously continue its efforts to achieve a treaty banning all nuclear tests (carefully exploring the proposals of the nonalined nations as a means of closing the negotiating gap); and be it further

Resolved, That we urge our Government and the United Nations to continue to press at once for measures which would reduce the present stockpiles of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems as soon as possible; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge all pastors and members of the United Church of Christ to work and pray with all concerned peoples for a workable nuclear test ban treaty, a progressive reduction in nuclear delivery systems, and support of the United Nations in its efforts to end the cold war and bring lasting peace among the nations of the world.

The South Dakota Poll on the 1964 Presidential Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, on June 20, 1963, the South Dakota poll, a very reliable barometer of political thinking in South Dakota conducted by a number of the leading daily newspapers in the State, announced the results of a survey on the 1964 presidential election. I think their findings are significant, and will be of interest to my colleagues.

With President Kennedy assumed to be the 1964 Democratic candidate, poll participants were asked whom they would select if he were opposed by four frequently mentioned Republican contenders. Based on the results, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER would give Kennedy the toughest competition. The replies on the Kennedy-Goldwater competition were as follows:

John F. Kennedy, 45; BARRY GOLDWATER, 44; undecided, 11.

GOLDWATER is the choice of 57 percent of the respondents in the Second Congressional District which I represent, as compared to 40 percent for Kennedy.

The results of the other trial matches were as follows:

John F. Kennedy, 44; Richard Nixon, 40; undecided, 16.

John F. Kennedy, 47; George Romney, 36; undecided, 17.

John F. Kennedy, 50; Nelson Rockefeller, 36; undecided, 14.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—Congressional Record, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the Record:

Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Hamtramck and North Eastern Detroit Branch,
Detroit, Mich., May 25, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: Americans of Ukrainian descent, members of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Hamtramck and North Eastern Detroit Branch, which is a Michigan chapter of the nationwide organization, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., all appeal to you to consider favorabley in your House Rules Committee the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14), which calls for the creation of a special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives in Washington.

The establishment of such a committee would be in the best interest of our Nation. From one aspect the committee would supply our Government with important information on the plight of the captive nations and thus help to shape our foreign policy and would also show to many nations, enslaved by the tyrannical Russian hammer and sickle, our sympathy and understanding. In addition, a creation of this committee would be a real answer to the Soviet propaganda concerning colonialism.

Therefore, we most urgently implore you to support the creation of such a committee in the current session of the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

Mary C. Podgorska, Secretary; Walter Tustaniwsky, Chairman; Members: Michael Laska, Michael Wytiahlowsky, Walter Ryzyj, Leontyna Halazenko, Maria Andahzjak, Dr. E. Andrussak, W. Reshctylsnich, Nan Pancrak, W. Reschctysnick, Ivan Pancrak, M. Duzzz, Sophie Parfanowyez, M.D., Joseph Bajko, Joseph Kushnir, Filipina Sterchaluk, Wasyl Sterchaluk, Alexander Maritczar, Jaroslaw Konopada, Theodosia Stelmach, Ostap Zacharkilo, Nick Gwozd, Peter Rohatynshyi, Ilks Wasyluk, Michael Kryzanowski, Andrew Hychles, Adam Ryzyj, Nicola Konchak, George Bronikowsky, Mychajts Bohaanowycz, Midych Wolodymyr, Walter Ploshchansky.

Adrian Krupsky, Iwan Senkiw, Frank Bchestro, Lubomyr Luczyn, Orest Sobol, Alexander Monchak, Nicholas Kostiuk, Michael M. Shumylo, Semeh Duigaro, Leonard Shumejko, Stanley Litkewyczs, Sophie Tustaniwsky, John Kowalenko, Sofia Kowalenko, Joseph D. Harashevsky, Alexander Wakoneczny1, Maria Stadnyk, Roman Stadnyk, Hryhory Korbiak, Wasyl Wowk, Dmytro Truss, Lubomyr Kios, William Harasymiw, Peter Demchuk, Walter Brunec, Anton Kobylansky, Wasyl Czykalowsky, Luka Flys.

Peter Sosky, John Souriko, Mykola Woskres, Homtromich Nowoczk, Ananey Nykonchak, Yaroslav Tarnavsuy, Peter Shinuriwsky, Alexander Dalkunyk, Dmytro Hyka, Paul Tkach, Joseph Porwkuych, Eugene Repeta, William Senkiw, Stephen Mychajliw, Michael Los, Iwan Dytel, John Butry, Andrew Mazuryk, Mike C. Samoszenko, Orest Kawka, Tanas Hayda, William Pluta, Hiroslan, E. Togan, Roman W. Andrushkiw, Roman Didycky, Alex Maritczak, Russ Kauzman, Jerry Sereduik.

Jaroslaw Ploshchansky, Lubomyr Kinal, Rostyslav Basko, Alexander Seredynsky, Bohdan Storozuk, John Kapustis, Stephan Skypakewych, Wolodymyr Dyhdalo, Josaphat Zuk, Nicholas Kunynskyj, Albert J. DiMatteo, George A. LaPonsa, Steven Chorkawy, Bohdan Andrushkiw, Anthony Zaplitny, Stephania Zaplitny, Olga Laska, Sewera Bronikowski, Steve Hrynczuk, Nikolaus Hryszczyszyn, Dmytro Paluch, Wolodymyr Holowaty, Nicholas Kawecky, Ewhen Kryzaniwskyj, Iwan Kotelka, Walter Kusznir, Paul Bytz, Magdalena Obuchiwsky.

New London, Conn.,
June 16, 1963.

Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Enclosed you will find the copies of the letters which I sent to (1) the chairman of the Committee of Rules of the House of Representatives and (2) my Congressman.

On this opportunity I want to express my sincerest thanks to you for your initiative in commemorating of the 45th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania in the House of Representatives.

I hope that we will see Lithuania free in the near future and the persons who are working hard for its freedom will be never forgotten by that nation.

Very sincerely yours,

John Jasys,
Former District Judge in Lithuania.

New London, Conn.
June 16, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: The Honorable Thomas J. Dodd, a distinguished Senator from Connecticut, on the 14th of February declared in the U.S. Senate:

"Liberation is not a pipedream. It is the only conceivable way in which we can recapture the political offensive. And, as every schoolboy knows, a side which defends itself when attacked but never takes the offensive, is bound to lose. The same is true in politics.

"A point in history has been reached where men who are free must come to the aid of those who seek to be free—because if they do not, the chances are that they will lose their own freedom".

I have quoted only a few lines of the Senator speech which is the best one ever told on the matter of liberation of captive nations.

Yes, we who are free must come to the aid of those who are enslaved by the Red tyranny. We must take a offensive.

Therefore I urge you to take a quick action on House Resolution 14.

Respectfully yours,

John Jasys.

New London, Conn.,
June 16, 1963.

Hon. William St. Onge,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: The Honorable Daniel J. Flood, a distinguished Congressman from Pennsylvania—the State in which my grandfather lost his life in the coal mines—sent to me the valuable booklet, "The Speeches of Various Members in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives on the 45th Anniversary of Declaration of Independence of Lithuania."

Incidently I received this booklet on June 15, 1963—on the day of 23d anniversary when "the Soviet Union tore up its treaty obligations with its small neighbor on the Baltic Sea, invaded Lithuania and the other two Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia, suppressed their freedom and independence, and has subjected them to ruthless Communist exploitation ever since," quotation from your fine speech.

I and my family, being thankful for your fine declaration in the House of Representatives and for the introduction of your resolution on the liberation of Baltic States, urge you to do everything possible that quick action might be taken on your resolution and also on the House Resolution 14, now under consideration in the Committee of Rules.

Respectfully yours,

John Jasys.

West Roxbury, Mass.,
May 7, 1963.

Hon. Hastings Keith,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Keith: We can start to exploit the weaknesses in the Communist colonial empire by developing an effective policy toward the captive nations.

Last January, Congressmen Flood and Derwinski introduced House Resolutions 14 and 15, respectively, which would implement the Captive Nations Week resolution of 1959 and establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. This committee would conduct inquiries into, study and prepare concrete recommendations for an effective U.S. policy toward the captive nations.

On behalf of our committee, I am asking you to support House Resolution 14. Although this request comes to you not from your district, but our fight with communism and our support for the captive nations is of national concern and must have the support of all Americans.

Presently, House Resolution 14 is pending before the House Committee on Rules.

Your call or note to Congressmen H. W. SMITH, chairman of House Rules Committee, favoring House Resolution 14 would stir the committee to action. The committee would open public hearings on the proposed legislation and consequently bring the measure to the floor in the House of Representatives.

Your action and support in this matter will do much for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Sincerely yours,
UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC., BOSTON BRANCH,
OREST SZCZUDLUK,
Public Relations.

RACINE, WIS.,
May 29, 1963.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The Racine Committee of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation informs you that a resolution has been passed by our unit supporting passage of House Resolution 14, submitted by you, which calls for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Recent developments worldwide and in Washington make the formation of such a Committee imperative to the security and welfare of the United States, and will bring added hope to the tyrannized people of the once free nations today in Soviet bondage.

We are, in addition to this letter contacting our Congressman as well as Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, head of the Rules Committee, urging him to release your resolution to the House floor for quick debate and passage.

May I take this opportunity to commend you for your stand in this regard, and to assure you of our every support of your measure?

Sincerely,
DR. G. BUHADOUR.

Bold Cuba Policy Urged Upon United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the menacing question of Cuba was discussed by leaders and specialists in civic, Latin American, military, and strategic affairs. Reports from this meeting were published by Freedom House in a booklet entitled, "What Can We Do About Cuba?" It was also brought out by the New York Times, June 4, 1963, saying the bold Cuban policy was urged upon that United States.

All members of the conference agreed upon three points: First, Castro's regime can be toppled without U.S. military action; second, hit-and-run raids are contributing to Castro's difficulties, and third, raids not staged from bases on U.S. soil do not endanger the peace.

The committee was in consensus on the following subjects: the necessity of taking risks in policy, a call for a clear exposition of this country's commitment, the desirability of forthright leadership and bipartisan consultations, expanded support for Cuban exiles and freedom fighters, a program for training of refugees, greater efforts for social and economic welfare in Latin America, the danger of military dictatorships and the trend toward neutralism. Following is the article from the New York Times, June 4, 1963:

[From the New York Times, June 4, 1963]

BOLD CUBA POLICY URGED UPON UNITED STATES; GOAL OF LIBERATION BACKED IN FREEDOM HOUSE REPORT

A national policy to liberate Cuba "by all necessary means" was urged yesterday by a group of civilian leaders in a report published by Freedom House.

The report was based on a 3-day assembly held 5 weeks ago at New York University's Gould House, Ardsley-on-Hudson. The conference was attended by 25 specialists in Latin American affairs and military and strategic problems of the cold war, and leaders in related fields.

There was often sharp division between the members of the conference. On the other hand there was fairly close agreement on three points: (1) Castro's regime can be toppled without U.S. military action; (2) hit-and-run raids are contributing to Castro's difficulties; and (3) raids not staged from bases on U.S. soil do not endanger the peace.

QUESTION POSED

The Freedom House report asked why there had been no "tough, ironclad ban on the shipment of American goods in any vessel of any line that trades with Cuba."

The proposal was made that "an outstanding personality" be appointed to a Federal post on Cuba, or Latin American affairs.

There was support of a proposal that the Alliance for Progress activities—such as the labor institutes now underway—be enlarged. The report continued:

"Through every possible channel, we must assist the organized underground inside Cuba, bring to bear our extensive resources and experience."

The report concluded:

"Our leaders must keep us informed of the facts and their plans for the future; we must keep our leaders informed of the people's judgment and willingness to sacrifice."

The report said that there were many intermediate alternatives between U.S. policy toward Cuba and invasion.

Thirty-five possible forms of action were specified in the report to demonstrate that the United States has many options for resolving the Cuban problem without resort to unilateral force.

U.S. PROCRASTINATION SCORED

Participants of the conference concluded that U.S. procrastination toward the regime of Premier Fidel Castro permits further Communist entrenchment and makes the goal of removing Castro and/or Soviet troops more manageable.

The participants also concluded that the nature of Cuba's economy under a post-Castro government should be decided by elected representatives of the Cuban people without any form of U.S. dictation.

The report advocated support for the Alliance for Progress and increased efforts to raise Latin American living standards.

But it warned that essential social reforms must not be considered a substitute for direct, militant opposition to communism.

The group noted that the Marshall plan did not take hold until the North Atlantic Treaty Organization provided the shield against the military threat of communism.

The report summarized major areas of consensus among the participants, many of whom differed sharply on other subjects: The necessity of taking risks in policy, a call for a clear exposition of this country's commitment, the desirability of forthright leadership and bipartisan consultations, expanded support for Cuban exiles and freedom fighters, a program for training for refugees, greater efforts for social and economic welfare in Latin America, the danger of military dictatorships and the trend toward neutralism.

The conference was convened by freedom house in association with the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba.

Discussion leaders included Prof. Frank Tannenbaum of the school of International Affairs at Columbia University, Leo Cherne, executive director of the Research Institute of America, and Daniel James, author and executive secretary of the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba.

The Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent and thought-provoking editorial by Mr. O. Roy Chalk, publisher and editor in chief of El Diario-LaPrensa, which was published in that newspaper in New York City on June 24, 1963. The editorial follows:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS?

(By O. Roy Chalk)

In our opinion, the reason for the basic failure of the Alliance for Progress lies in the fact that those who administer AID and have the responsibility for its implementation either lack the authority to act in accordance with their convictions or lack the "guts" to make a decision on their own responsibility. Apparently, the advisory committee of outside agencies, World Bank, Treasury, etc., who are not charged with the responsibilities of administering the Alliance for Progress have taken backstage control and have transformed, what was intended as a spirited horse, into a twisted, slow-moving camel. A change in authority, organization, and decisionmaking power is a matter of immediate urgency.

If the administrators of the Alliance for Progress and the Agency for International Development actually have both authority as well as responsibility, but because of outside agency coercion lack the courage of their convictions and fear to oppose such committees, then this authority and responsibility should be taken from them. It should then be placed in the hands of a businesslike authority willing to perform its duties. Such an authority could be a newly proposed inter-American business authority.

Another obvious weakness of the Alliance for Progress is its cross-eyed focal direction. While appearing to be watching the interest of people, it sees only governments. The Alliance is concentrating too much on government-to-government programs rather than people-to-people programs. Social reforms, agrarian reforms and governmental public projects are admirable. But when the Alliance puts excessive emphasis on this governmental area and too little in areas of private industry, then the Alliance is overlooking its greatest opportunity and its major strength. Aiding people to aid themselves in the industrial growth of Latin America, assisting people to raise their standards of living and to create more jobs for more people should be major immediate objectives underlying the spirit of the Alliance rather than long-delayed byproducts of governmental largesse. Such industrial development by inter-American private enterprise could be a massive weapon to fight communism at the point of communism's greatest weakness—the stomach of hungry men. An alliance of inter-American people with inter-American people—an alliance of inter-American businessmen with inter-American businessmen for progress in Latin America should be the focus of the Agency for International Development rather than upon an alliance of governments for governments.

In a constructive sense, we would suggest deferred action on appropriations for government-to-government projects (e.g. $500 million for a government steel plant) and immediate authorization for inter-American people-to-people projects.

Land of Oak Trees and Sky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in Raleigh County, W. Va., the soil is rich and productive, the people enterprising and industrious, and the climate is especially conducive to good health. That is why Raleigh County has not only survived difficult times, resulting from depletion of her timber lands and the mining of her rich coal deposits by machines that replaced hundreds of miners, but she has been able to forge ahead by building on agriculture, small industry, recreation, and tourism.

The story of Raleigh County's comeback from a situation of economic depression is no guarded secret. It results from the fact that Raleigh Countians have a mutuality of interest in the potentials inherent in their county, and this generally seems to convert itself into a force for progress.

In the June 16, 1963, edition of the Charleston, W. Va., Sunday Gazette-Mail, an article entitled "Comeback—Raleigh County Survives Fall of Timber, Coal" related the history of that county from early colonial days. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that others may read how Raleigh County "rolled with the punch" and now hopes for better days to come.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMEBACK—RALEIGH COUNTY SURVIVES FALL OF TIMBER, COAL

Named for Sir Walter Raleigh, soldier, sailor, author, and adventurer who planted the first English Coloney on American shores, Raleigh County was formed January 23, 1850, from the southern portion of what was then Fayette County, Va.

The county has an area of 610.15 square miles and the population in 1950 was 96,273. Since that time, due to a recession in the coal industry and automation in the mines, the county has lost approximately 20,000 persons who were forced to leave and secure employment elsewhere.

A poet has termed the plateau section, about 100,000 acres in the interior of the county, as the "land of oak trees and sky."

The climate is excellent throughout the county but in the plateau region where Beckley, its biggest city, is located, the climate is especially conducive to good health. The altitude is from 2,400 to 2,500 feet above sea level in this particular section.

The act creating Raleigh County also made Beckley the county seat and Beckley was incorporated the same year the county was created. The city was named for Gen. Alfred Beckley, an early settler, who was the son of John Beckley, clerk of the National House of Representatives during the administrations of Presidents Washington, Adams, and Jefferson. Beckley was also the first Librarian of Congress.

General Beckley brought his family into the wilderness from Pittsburgh in 1837 and built a home which they aptly called "Wildwood." The name of his home lives on as the name of the first cemetery in the town, Wildwood Cemetery, located in the eastern section of Beckley.

The General Beckley family and those who followed them into the untamed plateau country soon afterward cultivated the land. In the pioneer era all Raleigh Countians made a living by farming and there were fine farms within the county's boundaries. In most sections the soil was rich and productive.

Later the timbermen came to cut the virgin timber and send it to market. It was the county's first industrial boom. But this era was short lived and when the best timber was gone the county's future looked dark and foreboding. Much of the land where the city of Beckley now stands was once a huge pine forest. Valuable hardwoods flourished in most sections too.

With the development of the coal industry Raleigh County had its most extensive upturn in economy. And in the heyday of the mining business when most of the work was performed by manual labor the city of Beckley had the highest per capita retail trade of any city east of the Mississippi River. Farming was almost forgotten. Coal was king—and it was the proud boast of civic boosters that the coal would last for 100 years. Thus the county became almost a one-business area, and that business was coal.

Most of the inhabitants lived off the bounty of King Coal, whether or not they even saw the inside of a coal mine. With the intense mechanization of the coal industry the county's economic bubble burst in the 1950's. Erstwhile bustling, busy coal towns became ghost towns. There are many left in the county today.

The city of Beckley which was once acclaimed as the "Smokeless Coal Capital of the World," had to turn, like the remainder of Raleigh County, to new pursuits.

Charles Hodel, publisher of Beckley's two daily newspapers, a man who had practically grown up with the city, was imbued with the idea that there must be a return to agriculture which had once been the main industry. Through his efforts the Beckley area rural development program was begun in 1949 and it has made great strides. Agriculture, livestock farming, and such have helped take up the economic slack caused by the loss of the once-fat mining payrolls. Coal is still mined in Raleigh County—but coal is no longer king.

The West Virginia Turnpike which was built between Princeton and Charleston gave Beckley and Raleigh County a better method of quick transportation and Raleigh County Memorial Airport proves to be another great asset to a county which had at time past been semi-isolated.

Today the Beckley area of the county where the population is heaviest, has turned to the task of getting small industrial plants. It has been a hospital center for years, with five major hospitals and a major multiple-service clinic. Included in the hospitals is Pinecrest Sanitarium, a State-owned and operated institution for tuberculosis patients. Raleigh County also has a beautiful new public health center building.

Beckley has modern public buildings such as a new post office, giant armory and fieldhouse, a public recreation building, Soldiers and Sailors Memorial Building which houses the Raleigh County Public Library.

The county today makes a strong bid for tourism—and the bid already is paying dividends. People from all over the United States come to see the epic Civil War drama—"Honey in the Rock"—which is presented in the summer months in an outdoor amphitheater at Grandview State Park.

New River Park near Beckley, already a beauty spot, is being rapidly developed. In the park is an exhibition coal mine which opened to the public last year and attracted 13,500 visitors. At Stotesbury, once a thriving mining town, is a coal museum which also attracts many tourists. Little Beaver Park and Fitzpatrick Park offers swimming, boating, and picnicking facilities. Stephen's Lake is another recreation center being developed by the county.

Raleigh County has learned to "roll with the punch," to borrow a phrase from the prizefight business. It has weathered the recession in coal and is building on tourism, small industrial plants, recreational facilities, and its merited fame as a medical and hospital center.

In addition to the county seat city of Beckley, the other municipalities are Lester, Mabscott, Rhodell, and Sophia.

John Frank Stevens: Builder of the Golden West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, over a period of years I have devoted much time and effort to the study of Isthmian Canal history and problems. While the results of my endeavors have been rewarding in many ways, the greatest compensation has been the discovery of the character of those who made the Panama Canal possible.

Preeminent among the engineering leaders in the story of the construction of the great tropical waterway was John Frank Stevens, of West Gardiner, Maine, 1853–1943, whose career included important assignments in three continents—North America, Europe, and Asia.

As Chief Engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission, 1905–07, he rescued the Panama Canal undertaking from disaster, organized the forces for its construction, developed the plan for its design, led in the movement in the Congress for its adoption, and brought the project to the point where its success was a certainty, with a completion date that he estimated as January 1915.

Resigning from canal service in 1907 for reasons that he never publicly disclosed, this action, which was regretted by many of his admirers at the time, served to deprive him of immediate recognition for his notable contributions at Panama.

With the passage of the years, however, the part that Stevens played in the construction of the Panama Canal is viewed in better perspective. Largely as the result of the publication in 1947 of the well-known book, "And the Mountains Will Move," by Capt. Miles P. DuVal, Jr., while serving in the Panama Canal organization, 1941–44, Stevens' fame began to rise. In 1956, it was my privilege, in an address before the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D.C., to acclaim this great engineer as the basic architect of the Panama Canal, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 29, 1956, page 9285.

It was therefore, with the greatest interest that I have read a chapter on Stevens in the local history book, "Maine Immortals," by Wilbur D. Spencer, 1932. In the foreword, the author states that it was his original intention that no living person should be included in his volume, on the ancient assumption that it is not safe to evaluate any person's full achievement before his death. He followed this view with but one exception—John Frank Stevens. This exception by the author has been fully vindicated.

At a memorable ceremony on October 13, 1962, in Balboa, C.Z., the U.S. Government gave full recognition to the contributions of Stevens by naming the town's principal traffic circle as Stevens Circle and unveiling a monument in his honor which bears the significant inscription, "'The Canal Is His Monument'—Goethals."

In a moving address on that occasion, Under Secretary of the Army, Stephen Ailes, who as a boy had known Stevens and had spent many hours in conversations with the celebrated engineer, told the true story, which I quoted in a statement to the House of Representatives under the title "John F. Stevens: The Panama Canal Is His Greatest Monument," see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 28, 1963.

In order that students of the career of John F. Stevens may know more about this extraordinary engineering leader, I quote the indicated chapter in "Maine Immortals":

JOHN FRANK STEVENS: BUILDER OF THE GOLDEN WEST

(By Wilbur D. Spenser)

John Frank, son of John and Harriet Leslie (French) Stevens, was born April 25, 1853, in West Gardiner, where he secured a limited education. While he failed to attain the highest rank in his classes in the public schools, he did reach the early conclusion that there could be no limit to achievement with honest effort, and that real satisfaction in life came from the accomplishment of something which had formerly seemed impossible.

On account of particular proficiency in mathematics, the boy decided, at the age of 19, to become a civil engineer. With that object in view he began work at Lewiston as a chainman, but with little practical knowledge of surveying. From Maine he went westward to Minneapolis, which was then an isolated outpost of but 15,000 population, situated upon the verge of the uninhabited prairie. There, as a member of the local field squad, he advanced from rodman to the position of transit operator.

With little hope of promotion in the Minnesota region, the young surveyor, who in the meantime had found a western wife (formerly of Boston), proceeded to Texas, where he worked upon a contingent basis, without wages, until his personal funds were exhausted and his railroad company had become insolvent. As a consequence he was forced to hire out as a common laborer, driving spikes on a local construction job for one dollar and ten cents a day. The same situation prevailed until 1878, when as an engineer he was employed continuously by the Denver & Rio Grande, Colorado & New Mexico, and Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railways.

In 1882 Stevens became attached to the extension department of the Canadian Pacific Railway. In the new position he was charged with general supervision of all new track lines, worked steadily throughout the day and traversed the country in preliminary surveys more than half of each night, living wholly in the open and obtaining such rest as occasion would permit. Accordingly, between May and November of his first year with the Canadian company, his tireless crews spun out 1,000 miles of shining rails across the virgin country. That feat, spanning one twenty-fifth of the entire circumference of the globe, still stands as a world's record for a single summer.

The next 3 years of the engineer's life were spent in locating a roadbed westward through the almost impregnable Rockies. Much of the travel was performed on foot, with enough mule trains to transport provisions for 2 or 3 weeks. As civilization was left behind it became necessary to improvise wagon trails, live out of doors and sleep in camp, sometimes rolled in wet blankets.

The course taken was along the overhanging edges of precipices, often 3,000 feet deep, where a misstep meant certain destruction and where the preliminary surveys were conducted in midair for hours, with no anchorage but a projecting crag or a cluster of dwarfed trees to support the rope swings. At the end of one season, when the freezing rains sat in and the footing was coated with ice, the work became so perilous that several of the employees and 30 of the mules lost their lives by slipping over the cliffs, while the foreman himself in several instances barely escaped a similar fate.

It was the engineer's custom to divest himself of hat, coat, and other unnecessary clothing and lead in the roughest work with his enthusiastic assistants, who boasted that no obstacle was too great to defeat his plans. Hence, it was largely due to his constant aggressiveness that the Canadian Pacific reached the western coast in 1885, 5 years in advance of the date stipulated in its charter from the provincial government.

At that stage Cyclopean projects had become merely matters of course in the mind of the Maine engineer and he subsequently completed several difficult branch lines for competing roads.

In 1889 an event occurred which made Stevens internationally famous. He had been summoned by Hill, the mastermind of railroad undertakings, to explore the northwestern boundary of the United States for a feasible route for the extension of the Great Northern Railway over the Rocky and Cascade Mountains. To many, the idea of traversing that area with a satisfactory transportation system, 1,500 miles in length, was preposterous. While it was much easier to plan than execute such a project, the Maine man accepted the commission, with the intimation that, if a short cut could be found through the ranges, the distance could be reduced 125 miles.

It was a truly Herculean task and the adventuresome engineer undertook the discovery alone, relying upon securing information from the aborigines. The opening which he sought was reported by native legend to be situated in the basin of the Marias River, but none of the Indians could be induced to accompany him on account of the prevalent superstitions that death would be the penalty for trespass in a region which was supposed to be inhabited by an evil spirit.

With a strange Indian as a guide, by whom he was soon deserted, Stevens pushed his way up into the snow-filled ranges early in December. The snow was then 5 feet deep, the temperature far below zero, and more than once he nearly lost his life. Finally, almost by accident, he stumbled into Marias Pass, from which the Columbia River winds down the western slope. The lowest point at which the notch crosses the range is at an altitude of about a mile above sea level.

And through the new pass, engineered by the discoverer, Great Northern trains still crawl, caterpillarlike, at one point passing over a trestle thousands of feet above the bottom of a gorge, penetrating the hanging wall of a cliff on a downward semicircular grade and emerging into daylight far below, where they recross the same canyon at the proper depression.

Difficult feats had become an open book to the wizard, and his last spectacular achievement was the construction of a tunnel nearly 3 miles long in the Cascades, where the whole roadway zigzagged across snowy summits. He severed his connection with the Great Northern in 1903, but was employed by other ambitious railroad directorates as long as he cared to follow his profession. In 1905, he was selected by the U.S. Government to insure the completion of the Panama Canal and solved many of the initial problems, including the excavation of Culebra Cut, which was supposed to be impossible.

In 1917, in recognition of his practical experience and remarkable judgment in a most difficult and dangerous field, Stevens was made official head, as Minister Plenipotentiary of the American Advisory Commission to reorganize and, in the emergency, to operate the Trans-Siberian and connecting Chinese railway systems. The results of that appointment were so satisfactory to the five nations concerned in rehabilitation that all united in bestowing medals upon the American official.

Eight years later the famous engineer was still in the public eye. At that stage in his long career he was awarded the John Fritz Medal on account of his outstanding achievements among leaders of his profession. During the same year the medalist was honored by the erection of a life-sized bronze statue of himself at the gateway to Marias Pass, as a lasting testimonial to his faithful and unparalleled record as agent of a great transportation system that had attained its full ideals.

The subject of this biography is a resident of Baltimore, Md., and a recent report states that he is the holder of the Franklin Institute Gold Medal as well as the recipient of many other distinctive titles, honors, and degrees.

Godspeed, Gen. William J. Verbeck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on June 28, 1963, the esteemed, beloved and outstanding commanding officer of Fort Devens, Mass., in my district, Maj. Gen. William J. Verbeck, is retiring after 41 years of magnificent service to our country.

As has been so well pointed out by the Fort Devens Dispatch, General Verbeck will leave behind him a host of friends and neighbors, among them every community in the central Massachusetts area and, indeed every community where he is known.

Of a famous fighting Army family with a long background of most meritorious contributions to our national defense and security, highly trained for his important tasks, endowed by nature with great powers and ability, personality, courage and dedication, General Verbeck has made a record during his Army service that will long be gratefully remembered by the Army, the Nation, and our people.

I have taken occasion to speak briefly of some of his achievements, but, admittedly, nothing I might be able to say, could possibly encompass them all, nor could it portray the real scope, magnitude, and depth of General Verbeck's contributions to the country. I have written him on the occasion of his retirement, expressing as best I could, my feelings of pride and gratitude, mingled with sadness at his departure from Fort Devens and the Army.

Under unanimous consent, I include as part of my remarks General Verbeck's farewell message as it recently appeared in the Fort Devens Dispatch and the letter I have written him on the occasion of his retirement:

FAREWELL MESSAGE OF MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM J. VERBECK

It is time to say farewell.

As many of you know, an Army career is, in a sense, a never-ending series of goodbys—to friends you have made and may never see again; to posts you have enjoyed and to some you haven't; to episodes in your life you want always to remember, and to some you'd rather forget.

This marks my last Army goodby. I have said many in the 41 years I've worn the uniform of the United States. This is the hardest.

The Army in which I was commissioned in 1927, as a second lieutenant fresh out of West Point, was a good Army—well led and depending on good people to do its work.

The Army I leave today is a better Army. It is better equipped; better trained. It is the product of a nation more willing than we were 36 years ago to assume the role of world leadership, with all the difficult responsibilities that role entails.

The Army is better and the Nation is stronger because of battles we have fought and, from straining every resource at the very threshold of defeat, ultimately have won.

There was the civil struggle of depression in the 1930's. From it emerged a sadder but wiser—far wiser—population.

There were the early days—the black days—of World War II. We were not prepared and our Nation easily might have paid the supreme price.

And there were the first months of the Korean conflict when our soldiers again gave their blood to give the Nation precious time to prepare.

And there is today. Today missiles are poised as machetes flash in dense jungles, posing still another, a new threat to our way of life.

This time, however, I think we stand ready. Our Army has drawn heavily from the acid test of experience. Now, active units stand ready to fight nuclear, conventional, and unconventional battles—to fight these battles and to win them.

For us here at Fort Devens, this should be of especial significance. We live and work a mere dozen miles from the scene of our Army's beginnings, at "the rude bridge that arched the flood" at Concord, so many years ago.

There, an enraged citizenry took up arms for a way of life, even as each of you has done.

When the war was over, these people returned to their farms and shops—but still stood ready.

I think we stand ready today, in much the same way. Perhaps as ready as our Nation has been, during peacetime, within any of our memories.

And so my goodby to you, though difficult to say, has an aspect of gladness.

I have been here at Fort Devens nearly 4 years. In all of my commissioned service this is the longest I have been in one place. I will be sorry to leave Fort Devens. I like the people here in the nearby communities and in the command, and I like the locality.

My wife and I leave an Army which has given us a life of great reward.

We are proud to know the worth of the things and the people to whom we now must bid a reluctant farewell.

JUNE 24, 1963.

Maj. Gen. WILLIAM J. VERBECK,
Commanding,
Fort Devens, Mass.

DEAR BILL: I will always deeply treasure the copy of the Fort Devens Dispatch portraying your outstanding career in the Army.

The pictorial presentation of your military life, in association with your lovely gracious wife and so many of our national leaders, is most impressive and touched me deeply.

When it comes to talking or writing about a great fellow like you, those of us who know you and your unselfish, monumental contributions are necessarily under definite limitations. You have left a great ineradicable mark of distinction upon the history of the Army during your tenure, one attesting great ability, unreserved dedication, noteworthy, memorable contributions, and superb courage.

The Army, the Nation, and your friends are proud of you, Bill, and we all realize the greatness of your achievements, the infinite magnitude of your devotion and loyalty, the depth and penetration of your leadership, the unforgettable influence of your gracious magnanimous personality, and the kindness of your great heart.

It is with a sense of deepest gratitude as well as real loss that I hail you upon your retirement. I again tender you, Mrs. Verbeck, and your lovely family my heartiest congratulations and deepest thanks.

As you can imagine, I have known many great men and leaders in my day, in and out of military and public life, but truly none of them, however great and noble, could ever surpass you. You stand at the very top of that fine company of loyal Americans that I have been privileged to look up to, to laud, to appreciate and admire with all my heart, and like all those who have known you, to hold you deeply in my affections.

Though your retirement leaves me sorrowful, I think it embodies a real occasion for joy, pride, gratitude, and warm congratulation for one who has done so much for our country. I don't know what your plans are, Bill, but I want you to make sure that you and your family keep in touch with me, so that whenever it is possible, I may be able to serve you and yours in every way I can.

When you leave Fort Devens you will carry our highest esteem, admiration, and affection with you everywhere you go and I hope you will always be mindful of how much we all think of you.

God keep, love, and guide you and yours always.

Warm regards and best wishes to all.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

Our Bible, Our Court, Our Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial that appeared in the Sunday, June 22, issue of the Anadarko Daily News, which is published by Mr. Wallace Kidd and Mr. Joe W. McBride, and which expresses the confidence and faith that will lead our country in the days ahead:

SIGNS OF A STRONGER FUTURE

A delegate to the recent Girls State, Janet Jackson, spoke to members of the Kiwanis Club who had sent her to the annual training program at Chickasha as their delegate.

In her report, the student had this to say:

"I believe in America and for what it stands.

"I believe in America—a land where man may worship God according to the dictates of his own heart and where the church of God speaks not with the voice of a dictator but with the voice of God.

"I believe in America, where it rejects hatred and intolerance and cherishes goodwill and understanding.

"I believe in America, a land where man is captain of his soul and the architect of his destiny."

There was more to her report, all of it reflecting the great good that comes from the annual sponsorship of Girls State by the American Legion Auxiliary and of Boys State by the American Legion.

But the thing that was most striking was her strong belief that this Nation is the hope for those plagued with unanswered problems.

Despite interpretations of the Nation's highest court on use of the Bible and the Lord's Prayer in public schools, this does remain the Nation of Christian belief and freedom of worship.

Despite the turmoil which tears many communities apart in their racial struggle, this does remain the Nation which rejects hatred and intolerance.

Our young citizens see this even if their elders do not.

"As youth, the future of our peace and freedom is in our own hands."

This is the way one delegate to Girls State sees her country and what lies ahead. And we feel better, knowing there is hope for the United States of America because there are young people who can do a better job than we.

Musical Concerts Organized Throughout West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the growth of organized musical concerts throughout my State of West Virginia is recorded in a recent issue of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail. Beckley, Bluefield, Charleston, Clarksburg, Huntington, Parkersburg, Point Pleasant, and Wheeling have all taken their places among the cities of America visited by major musical artists.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Organized community concert series are offered in about a half-dozen cities in the State, while in cities like Huntington and Wheeling there are regular series presented on an independent booking basis though that situation has not always existed. By the same token, before the days of the Community Music Association, here there were concert series booked through a variety of artist managements by individuals as well as organizations.

Charleston's association is the oldest and largest.

There are others in Beckley, Bluefield, Clarksburg, and Parkersburg, while Point Pleasant and Gallipolis, Ohio, cooperate in sponsoring a series jointly. The local group came into being back in 1932 with the first concert series presented during the 1933–34 season. Appearing that season were Jose Iturbi, Jascha Heifetz, and Greta Stueckgold. The series was held in the Shrine Mosque.

The following season saw the series lengthened to four concerts, and featured the following artists: Ossip Gabrilowitsch, Nathan Milstein, Lotte Lehmann, and Richard Bonelli. The next year, with continuing growth in membership, the concerts were moved to Charleston High School where the series was lengthened to five. Rose Bampton and Gregor Piatigorsky were presented in joint recital, while the other artists were Richard Crooks, Helen Jepson, Dalies Frantz, and Nino Martini.

With the 1936–37, and with continuing widespread community interst, a symphony orchestra was booked for the first time as well as a ballet. The archestra was Cincinnati's, then directed by Eugene Goossens. Ballet was presented by Trudi Schoop and her colleagues from Switzerland.

Since that time a symphony orchestra has been a regular attraction of the concert series. Ballet has turned up frequently and has included such famous troupes as Ballet Russe de Monte Carlo, Chicago Opera Ballet, and the San Francisco Ballet. After the move to the then newly constructed Municipal Auditorium in the Fall of 1939, opera was added and the Philadelphia Symphony was brought here for the first time. Opera was presented by the San Carlo Opera Co.

The association's first president was the late Harry Silverstein, who served from 1932 until 1943. It was Silverstein who was largely responsible for the building of the Municipal Auditorium, one of the principal purposes of which was to make possible a more suitable and larger hall for Community Music Association concerts. Annual association membership then taxed the capacity of the high school accommodations.

Dr. G. G. Irwin succeeded Silverstein as president, and then in 1952, Mrs. Nan P. Kay, the incumbent president, took over. Prior to that she had been active constantly in the association, and, in fact, had been in charge of the special gifts campaign for the first concert series. She has been chairman of the majority of the season membership drives.

As Mrs. Kay pointed out recently, the purpose of the association, is to bring the finest artists in the realm of music and dance to Charleston, with attention also being given to the presentation of rising new talent. Only through participation in the organized audience plan, she opined, can such talent be presented with season tickets within the range of the average music lover's pocketbook.

Mr. Kay and Simon H. Galperin, also an active leader in the city's cultural life, today are the only two association board members who were members of the original board. Present board officers also include Mr. James H. Davis, III, a vice president, Ida D. Jones, treasurer, and Florence Kravitz, secretary.

In addition to being one of the oldest groups operating under the organized audience scheme, Charleston's association is recognized as being one of the outstanding of its kind in the Nation. Its annual concert series compares favorably with those offered under a similar arrangement in much bigger cities, both as to number and calibre of attractions. Over the years it has brought to Charleston a wide selection of the leading talent available.

In that category have been Heifetz, Mme. Lehmann, Kirsten Flagstad, Josef Hofmann, Rudolph Serkin, Erica Morini, Eleanor Steberber, Arthur Rubenstein, James Melton, Richard Tucker, Lily Pons, Philadelphia, Cleveland and London Philharmonic orchestras, Robert Shaw Chorale, and many others.

Port of New York Channel Improvement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD the statement of the Port of New York Authority before the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, on June 21, 1963, recommending appropriations for a proposed waterfront cleanup study in New York Harbor.

On April 30, 1963, the House Public Works Committee, of which the Honorable CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, of New York, is chairman, approved a resolution recommending to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees that $95,000 be appropriated for the study by the U.S. Corps of Engineers. The Senate Public Works Committee adopted an identical resolution. Last week witnesses were heard by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. This is a matter of great concern to the city of New York. The channel improvements are needed and I hope the Appropriations Committee will approve the appropriation for the survey. Debris and drift present serious dangers to navigation in New York Harbor. We are concerned not only because of damage to craft, but such a situation can make a bad impression upon all who use our great port of New York—the principal gateway for our country's foreign trade, and the main port of entry for millions of visitors.

The following statement of the Port of New York Authority vividly presents the need and urgency of the matter:

STATEMENT OF THE PORT OF NEW YORK AUTHORITY BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE U.S. SENATE, RECOMMENDING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NAVIGATION REVIEW STUDY: NEW YORK HARBOR—DRIFT COLLECTION, JUNE 21, 1963

The Port of New York Authority is charged with the responsibility of bringing to the attention of appropriate Federal agencies the need for channel and waterway improvements both within the port district and connecting to its hinterland. Under this responsibility, the Port of New York Authority has taken the initiative in bringing the problem of damage-causing drift and debris in New York Harbor to the attention of Congress through a widely distributed "Proposal for Action."

On March 29 the Senate Committee on Public Works approved a resolution sponsored jointly by the four Senators representing the bi-State port of New York district—Senators WILLIAMS and CASE, of New Jersey, and Senators JAVITS and KEATING, of New York. The resolution authorized a navigation review study of the "New York Harbor—Drift Collection" project. An identical resolution was sponsored before the House Public Works Committee by 17 Congressmen from New York and New Jersey districts and was adopted on April 30. Almost every municipal governing body and community group in the cities along the New York-New Jersey port waterfront has also endorsed and supported this review of the "New York Harbor—Drift Collection" project. The text of the identical resolutions follows:

"That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors created under section 3 of the River and Harbor Act, approved June 13, 1902, be and is hereby requested to review the project, 'New York Harbor—Collection and Removal of Driftwood,' as authorized by section 6 of the River and Harbor Act, approved July 3, 1930, and previous legislation, with a view to determining whether it is advisable to modify the existing project in any way at the present time, with particular reference to the elimination of the source of driftwood and debris by removal and disposal of dilapidated structures and derelicts along the shores of New York and its tributary waters, that constitute possible obstacles or hazards or produce damage to existing navigation."

SURVEY OF DAMAGE TO NAVIGATION CAUSED BY DRIFT

In an effort to document the damage caused by driftwood and other floating debris in the port of New York, the port authority conducted a survey of habor craft operators and pleasure boat owners in and around the harbor. Our survey revealed that over $8 million in damage is caused by floating debris annually. Commercial harbor craft operators reported about $4 million in damages to hulls, propellers, and rudders, and small pleasure boats reported a further $4.3 million in annual damage from this navigation hazard.

There are approximately 4,000 commercial harbor craft operating in and around New York Harbor. This includes such craft as tugboats, barges, lighters, and self-propelled tankers, as well as ferryboats and patrol boats of the Coast Guard and police department. The port authority survey indicates that commercial craft serving New York Harbor, which perform such a vital economic function in the commerce of our country, incur annually somewhere around $2 million in direct damages to hulls, rudders, and propellers as a result of floating driftwood, timbers, and other flotsam. Indirect costs in the nature of increased insurance premiums and loss of operating time, are shown to constitute about another $2 million per year.

Approximately 200,000 pleasure boats cruise the waters of the New York-New Jersey Port area. The port authority survey indicated that in 1962 approximately 5,000 incurred damage by collision with drifts. The total direct and indirect cost as a result of damage to these craft amounted to about $4.3 million.

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

The New York-New Jersey Port is the principal gateway for this country's foreign trade. Since World War II a vast locally financed program of reconstruction and modernization has been underway throughout the port of New York to maintain its position as the principal handler of oceanborne foreign commerce for the United States. The Port of New York Authority, the city of New York through its department of marine and aviation, and various private industrial and marine interests have invested $350 million in new commercial port terminals since World War II. A further investment of almost the same amount will be spent in the next 10 years by local port interests to continue to provide the modern port facilities needed to insure the vitality and viability of the New York-New Jersey Port for the future.

Despite this tremendous achievement, however, there are still large segments of our 650-mile watefront and adjacent water area which are rundown, littered, and dilapidated. Old piers, derelict barges, scows and vessel hulls, and other deteriorating waterfront structures have been abandoned along portions of the port of New York's waterfront and been permitted to lie idle and fall apart. These wrecks that are strewn about the port of New York are the principal sources of driftwood and other flotsam which are such a serious hazard to navigation.

The fact that parts of our waterfront are in this condition is not to say that responsible officials have been neglectful. On the contrary, a review of the record of the past quarter century will reveal that State and municipal officials, both in New York and New Jersey, have attempted in various ways and at various times to remedy the situation. These efforts, unfortunately, resulted in only minimal, localized improvements and have not had a significant effect on the steadily worsening condition of the waterfront in the port as a whole.

Individual community attempts to clean up sections of the waterfront have been faced with such obstacles as the overriding role of admiralty law, which gives owners of watercraft the right to beach and abandon craft that are in danger of foundering. Who is to say that a barge or other watercraft that has outlived its economic usefulness is not "in danger of foundering"? As a result, old barges, scows and other assortments of derelict watercraft found littering the shores of many sections of the port's waterfront have been found by the courts to be "wrecked craft" in the admiralty sense of the law, even though it is recognized that the port's waterfront is being used as a dumping ground by owners of useless or worn-out watercraft.

DRIFT COLLECTION—A FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY

As a result of this situation, and because of the relatively long history of the situation, debris from these wrecks and derelicts has increasingly found its way into the channels of the port and has developed into a serious hazard for navigation unique to this port. As early as 1915, shipping in the port of New York-New Jersey was recognized by Congress to have a unique need for protection against damage from floating debris. In 1930 Congress authorized the Army Engineers to establish a specific and regular maintenance program to protect vessels against such damages in New York Harbor and its tributary waters. The principal action taken by the Army Engineers under this program has been to attempt to retrieve and remove from the navigation channels as much of the floating debris as possible. This attempt at "retrieving" has been carried out by the Army Engineers in recent years by means of a specially designed vessel called the "Driftmaster." This vessel is built on a catamaran-type hull and is navigated to pass over any observed flotsam in a "swallowing" fashion, thus catching debris between the twin hulls of the vessel in a suspended net. When the net is full, the vessel moves to a "burn barge" anchored in the harbor where the accumulated driftwood is transferred and burned.

During the 1961 fiscal year, the "Driftmaster" collected over one-half million cubic feet of driftwood ranging in size from small scraps of wood to timbers of large dimensions, including pier pilings and pieces of ship and boat wreckage. The cost to the U.S. Government of this drift collection project in fiscal year 1961 amounted to $453,879. The average annual cost over the past 5 years was $432,139; the cumulative cost of these operations through the end of 1961 fiscal year amounted to $7,526,124.

While this drift collection activity of the Army Engineers has lessened the drift damage somewhat over the years, it can never be expected to conquer the problem. The power of the U.S. Army Engineers in their operation of the "Driftmaster" is restricted under appropriation acts and the regulations of the Corps of Engineers against policing of the water area inside established pierhead lines. Lack of power to go right up to the shoreline has limited the effect of even the minor scale current program. It seems, therefore, that a program is needed in the port of New York which would permit the Army Engineers to remove the source of the damage-causing drift in the harbor and allow them to revise means of preventing a recurrence of the condition in the future.

Since the protection of shipping in the New York-New Jersey port through the removal of drift from channels has historically been a Federal responsibility exercised by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, it is proposed that this responsibility be extended to permit the elimination of the source of drift. The proposed study will enable the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to reexamine the New York Harbor drift collection project to determine the advisability and justification of broadening the project.

The study would include a complete survey of the New York-New Jersey Harbor and its tributary waters for sources of debris. The study will make it possible for the Army Engineers to make a determnation on the procedures for carrying out a project including such matters as temporary waivers of proprietary interest in or the institution of proceedings to have such hulks or derelict structures declared a menace to navigation.

The Army Engineers has estimated that the New York Harbor drift collection study will take them approximately 1 year to complete and will require an appropriation of $95,000.

Because this project is so vital to the safety of navigation in New York Harbor, and the protection of both commercial and pleasure craft, the Port of New York Authority recommends that this committee recommend to Congress the allocation of $95,000 to commence and complete the study of the New York Harbor drift collection in the next fiscal year.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the courtesy of permitting me to testify on behalf of this important New York Harbor study project.

Problem of Leadership Important to Nation—YMCA and Reader's Digest Foundation Sponsor Significant Youth Governors Conference in Nation's Capital—35 States Represented

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the problem of school dropouts, juvenile delinquency, and youth unemployment have evoked much serious comment and aroused a high degree of public concern. Our national security is truly and tangibly threatened by huge numbers of young Americans who are not receiving needed education, or are unsuited to assume fruitful positions in the business world.

During 1962, there were 1.4 million youths between the ages of 16 and 24 who were unable to find employment. Young people in that age group composed more than one-third of the national unemployment figure despite the fact that they comprised less than 17 percent of the total labor force. Unemployment for these young citizens reached 11.3 percent during 1962—double the rate of the labor force as a whole—which means that of every nine Americans aged 16 to 24 who were in the labor force, one was unemployed.

The gravity of this unfortunate situation is multiplied by the following facts: The Department of Labor has estimated that by 1970 the labor force will grow to 85.5 million, an increase of 17 percent over 1960, and that nearly one-half the increase during this decade will be youths 24 years of age and under.

In other words, while the total labor force is growing by 17 percent, the number of youths in the labor force will be increasing by 45 percent—nearly three times as fast.

An equally sobering report is that of the Federal Bureau of Investigation wherein statistics are cited which reveal that in 1961, the most recent year for which figures are available, there was a 4 percent increase in the number of arrests of persons under age 18, as compared to 1960. Juveniles in 1961, accounted for 59 percent of all automobile thefts, 48 percent of larceny arrests, and 47 percent of all arrests for burglary. In light of these data it is clear that there are undesirable influences, stresses and factors which are harmfully affecting the youth of America.

However, it is encouraging to note that FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has stated that it is his belief that the vast majority of the Nation's young people are good citizens, worthy of the trust placed in them.

Mr. President, I heartily share the belief of Mr. Hoover, and concur in his statement that there is responsibility, capability and potentiality within the hearts and minds of young Americans. This conviction has been engraved even more deeply by my contact with the young men and women who this week are participating in the National YMCA Youth Governors Conference in Washington, D.C.

Under the sponsorship of the Young Men's Christian Association, and the Reader's Digest Foundation, some 35 alert young leaders are visiting the Nation's Capital June 23 through 26. They are the Youth Governors of their States, and were chosen in statewide elections by the members of YMCA's Hi-Y programs.

For more than 25 years the "Y" has carried forward its Youth in Government program, one of the finest of our citizenship training activities for high school age students. Today it exists in nearly every State. YMCA clubs are formed in the high schools, and through democratic processes the students then select senators, assemblymen and governors who once each year gather at the State capitals, forming model Hi-Y legislatures.

We can be proud as we watch those youngsters in action. They take their positions very seriously. They are thoroughly informed on the legislative process and parliamentary practice; the know-how to draft a bill; they can debate it on the floor.

It is by no means a once-a-year program, but rather a constant effort to inculcate in every community a richer understanding of the heritage and history of our democratic way of life, and to foster in the minds of the young a greater understanding of how our Government functions. Its aim is to develop and sustain moral fortitude and courage in the solution of public problems, and to provide helpful preparation for later participation in the policy-determining aspects of the democratic process.

This week the Nation's Capital has been the testing ground for 34 young men and one young lady—outstanding Americans elected by their peers as representatives of YMCA organizations from every part of their States. We welcome them to Washington and applaud their positive efforts to make this country a better place in which to live.

They are visiting many Federal agencies, governmental officials and points of historical and current interest. They have counseled with many of us in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. They bring with them the bright, intense, and inquiring minds of the young.

Mr. President, I commend the public spirited work of the YMCA and the Reader's Digest Foundation in making possible this valuable laboratory experience in America, Americans, and Americanism.

I request unanimous consent that certain material describing the Youth in Government program and the National YMCA Youth Governors Conference be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Purpose of the Youth and Government Program

The purpose of the youth and government program of the YMCA is to prepare a selected group of young men and women for moral and political leadership in the American democratic process by providing guidance, training, and experience in the theory and practice of determining public policy.

A PROGRAM FOR HI-Y

It is essentially a program for potential leaders in public life, drawn from the student bodies of high schools throughout the State by standards established and developed by the Hi-Y Clubs of the YMCA.

It is designed to confirm the principles of democracy in every member; to develop and sustain moral fortitude and courage in the solution of public problems; and to prepare for effective participation in the policy determining aspects of the democratic process.

It is not a conference, class, or roundtable. It is a thoroughly developed educational movement containing all of the sweep, permanence, and significance of other youth movements, but dedicated to methods and principles entirely unique.

The youth and government program is peculiarly adapted to the Hi-Y Clubs of the YMCA.

The Hi-Y Clubs of America offer the best reservoir of potential youth leaders that are immediately available for this purpose.

The Hi-Y Clubs constitute the only youth movement that has at once permanence, unity, and leadership, and members with qualities that promise successful participation in public life.

The Hi-Y Clubs have behind them a long experience in citizenship training programs and in the development of ethical standards. They have an established administrative stability which forms a firm base upon which to build.

Membership is voluntary and includes boys and girls of all races, creeds, and colors.

METHOD

Building upon this purpose, the youth and government program includes training, practice, and application.

1. Training: A permanent and continuing process at the local level, involving parliamentary practice, public debate, bill drafting, and the less systematic but more difficult guidance in the prepaartion of materials, the art of policy adjustments, the evaluation of proposals, and the discipline of public responsibility.

2. Practice: A combination of high school forums, public meetings, and discussion groups culminating in a session of the youth legislature held in the legislative halls of their State capitol.

3. Application: Applying the training and practice acquired in the program to the problems of local communities, through systematic local efforts designed to obtain the added experience that accompanies active participation in public affairs.

The Hi-Y Legislator's Creed

As a worthy citizen of my community, I have an obligation to:

Appreciate the close relationship between an efficient public school system and the future of our democracy;

Make the most of all educational and recreational opportunities;

Realize that a good character and a strong personality are essential for success in life;

Appreciate the fact that there exist great inequities of educational opportunities;

Understand the nature, causes, extent and the cost of crime;

Examine some of the causes of juvenile delinquency and the methods used in the treatment of offenders;

Examine the probable effects of crime upon our established institutions and national well-being;

Be aware of the relationship of national good health to the success of our democratic way of life;

Realize the significance of the home as a basic social institution;

Recognize the problems which the Nation faces in improving family living;

Understand the necessity to establish and maintain happy, healthful and secure family lives of our own;

Display a spirit of tolerance for all races and nationalities;

Understand sympathetically the problems confronting the Negro and foreign-born minorities;

Appreciate the contribution which the foreign-born have made to American life;

Understand sympathetically the problems that confront both the producer and consumer of goods;

Become familiar with what is being done to raise American standards of living;

Appreciate the need for a changed social and economic status of the worker;

Recognize interdependence and cooperation in industrial relations as factors basic to the welfare of society as a whole;

Understand that taxation constitutes the best means of providing the services which people demand of their government.

The 10 Steps in the YMCA Youth and Government Program

1. Local Hi-Y Club decides to participate and elects legislators: "Senators" and "assemblymen" are elected by the high school YMCA groups (Hi-Y Clubs) of the towns and cities of the State. Whenever it is possible, it is recommended that these "legislators" be commissioned by the local mayor, or other appropriate local governing body, on the forms provided by the State YMCA office.

2. Organize to determine areas for legislation: Participating Hi-Y Clubs explore State issues of vital concern to youth of their local communities for the possible subjects of their bills.

3. Consider nominating a State officer: Nominations for Governor, and other State offices, are filed with the committee on elections by the local Hi-Y Clubs.

4. Study parliamentary procedure used at the model legislature: It is important that procedures at the model legislature accurately reflect the process by which the legislature is governed.

5. Participate in the prelegislative assembly: A prelegislative conference for training in State government and legislative procedure is held at one or more cooperating universities. In some large cities prelegislative conferences are held by Hi-Y districts.

6. Elect the officers: The candidates for State offices are the featured speakers in the Governor's forum and the youth and government panel at the prelegislative conference preceding the election.

7. Prepare bills for the model legislature: Local Hi-Y Clubs discuss and draw up bills suitable for State legislative action which are submitted to the model legislature by their legislators.

8. State officers receive training: The officers elected by the delegates receive special training for the performance of their responsibility at the State capitol.

9. The model legislature convenes: Legislators attend and conduct their model legislature at the State capitol.

10. Go into action in their home community: Reports of the model legislature and the bills passed by the legislators are given to the local Hi-Y Club, the local authorities who commissioned the legislators, the local civic groups, the local YMCA board of directors, and any other local citizens who would be interested in or affected by the bills. The Hi-Y Club then organizes a local youth and government program.

YMCA Governors

Bill Shamblin, Northport, Ala.; Carlton Gerald Savory, Tucson, Ariz.; Darryl Craig Meyers, Sacramento, Calif.; Jon Russell Pearson, Pueblo, Colo.; Kenneth Alexander Sabol, Bridgeport, Conn.; Gary Alan Patchen, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.; Ronald Kelly Ogletree, Columbus, Ga.; Mark Toshiyuki Yamamura, Honolulu, Hawaii; Henry Edward Kronbach, Mountain Home, Idaho; Gary Ennis Fears, Ottumwa, Iowa; Robert Emery Sears, Kansas City, Kans.; Susan Jean Kumpe, South Fort Mitchell, Ky.; Alvin Bardine King, Lake Charles, La.; Paul Arthur Todd, Caribou, Maine; Douglas Newton White, Annapolis, Md.; Edward Philip Caffarella, Jr., Saugus, Mass.; H. David Dekker, Grand Rapids, Mich.; David Herbert Hozza, St. Paul, Minn., James Gordon Rogers, Jr., Kansas City, Mo.; David MacMahill, Omaha, Nebr.; Theodore Allen Davis, Claremont, N.H.; William Townsend Brooks, Woodbury Heights, N.J.; Samuel LaVerne Cunningham, Los Alamos, N. Mex.; William Ronald McCormick, Lockport, N.Y.; Timothy Voorhees Dix, Kent, Ohio; William Arthur Young, Ponca City, Okla.; Randell Clifford Guyer, Jr., Baker, Oreg.; Ray Firth, Pittsburgh, Pa.; John Michael Nystrom, Cranston, R.I.; Alan Lamar Cates, Chattanooga, Tenn.; Donald Allan Eggleton, Houston, Tex.; Peter William Duke, Montpelier, Vt.; Stuart Alan Dodson, Hot Springs, Va.; Omar Sigmund Parker, Jr., Hoquiem, Wash.; and Victor Earl Savicki, West Allis, Wis.

Linn Noah, Outstanding Editor and Civic Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as a long time friend and admirer of W. P. Linn Noah, I want to pay tribute to him for his many years of civic and community service in the Pittsburgh and Allegheny County, Pa., area.

Mr. W. P. Linn Noah, who died on Sunday, February 17, 1963, at his home in Mount Washington, Pittsburgh, Pa., after a long illnes, had been a newspaper publisher for 53 years. Linn Noah founded the Hill Top Record—now called the South Hills Record—in 1904, guiding the paper as its publisher through lean and prosperous years until his retirement on August 10, 1956.

Born August 10, 1877, in Butler, Pa., he moved to Pittsburgh in the 1890's. He was educated in the North Side and Allen grade schools, graduated from Fifth Avenue High School and attended Grove City College. He began his career as a teacher in the Butler schools, then returned to Pittsburgh to teach and become the principal of the old Montooth School.

Back in 1904 when the "Hill Top" area in the South Hills section of Pittsburgh was in its earliest stages of progress, Linn Noah entered the newspaper field as publisher of the Hill Top Record.

He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Phoebe B. Lawson Noah, whom he married in 1912. Mr. and Mrs. Noah celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary on July 29, 1962. Also surviving are three sons, William O. Noah, Jack O. Noah, and C. Dale Noah; two daughters, Mrs. Vera Y. Ziegler of Baldwin Township and Betty Mae Noah at home; also six grandchildren, Robert and Jack Noah, Gary Ziegler, Linn D. and Charles F. Noah, and Kathleen Louise Noah; also one great granddaughter, Melissa Lynn Noah.

Included in the list of the many newspaper writers who received a start under Mr. Noah's guidance are the late Havey Boyle, Post-Gazette sports editor; the late Lou Wollen, Press baseball writer; Joe Bradis, Associated Press correspondent; Paul Kurtz, Press scholastic sports editor; Dan McGibbeny, Post-Gazette executive sports editor; also Guy Miller and Ray Waterkotte, former Pittsburgh Post-Gazette writers.

He was the last charter member of the Knoxville United Presbyterian Church and was one of the founders of the Mount Oliver Business Men's Association.

Mr. Noah served for 52 years as a director of the St. Clair Deposit Bank. He was a founder and a past governor of Hill Top Moose No. 151, Franklin Lodge No. 221, F. & A.M.; Duquesne Royal Arch Chapter No. 193; Syria Temple; Mount Moriah Council No. 2; Pittsburgh Commandery No. 1, Knights Templar; BPOE—Elks—1196; Aerie No. 1520, Fraternal Order of Eagles; Odd Fellows, and Greater Beneficial Union.

As Linn Noah's son, C. Dale Noah, the well-known editor of the Brookline Journal, a successful weekly newspaper in the South Hills district of Pittsburgh, so proudly said about his father:

> We will miss Dad, but we will always remember him as such a wonderful man * * * a wonderful dad.

As a fellow newspaper publisher in the South Hills area of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County, and as Linn Noah's Congressman, I want to pay this tribute to such a fine man in our community, who made so many contributions by his pioneering work in establish a community newspaper and serving the community and the people of our area.

As a matter of fact, he had such a good spirit and had to battle with so much physical disability through the loss of his legs some years ago, that he was really an inspiration to me, and I know many others in western Pennsylvania who feel the same way. We people of Pittsburgh are proud of the strength of character, and the civic contribution of Linn Noah.

Following is an article by C. Dale Noah:

[From the Brookline Journal, Feb. 21, 1963]

My Dad: A Wonderful Man

(By C. Dale Noah, editor)

My dad, W. P. Linn Noah, passed away Sunday morning, February 17. Mother said he just went to sleep. We know Dad suffered during the past 6 months and now we also know he is free from pain and God has taken him into His Kingdom.

But, oh how we will miss him. He was a good husband to mother and a good father to my brothers and sisters and me. Stern when he had to be to put across a point, but always willing to forgive when we children had done something a little out of line.

Dad was a wonderful teacher. People would sit by the hour and listen to his advice and enjoy hearing about the trips he had taken to all parts of the United States and far-off countries.

A score of budding newspapermen were started on their newspaper careers working under Dad. He was a hard and exacting teacher, but he had patience personified. What little I know of the newspaper business I must certainly attribute to my dad.

I can hear my dad saying, "My boy, you must learn business acumen, be honest in your dealings and forthright in your manner and you will be successful in your work."

As I look back to when I was a boy, I will always remember the Friday nights Dad would take my brothers and me down to the old farm market on Water Street. We would walk along the big cobblestones near the river looking over the fruits and vegetables the farmers had to offer. We would select a basket of tomatoes, and usually a basket of peaches, apples, or pears and then load up the car.

The best part of all was a visit to a restaurant near the marketplace, where Dad treated us to a hotdog and a big dish of homemade baked beans. I know for sure the hotdog and baked beans appealed to us more than lugging home the fruits and vegetables.

I remember vividly the times I would ask Mother if I could take my scooter and ride over to see Dad at his office. Our home was on Beltzhoover Avenue, toward Grandview Park, and I would have to travel all the way to Mount Oliver (quite a trip for a young fellow) just to have the chance of riding home with Dad in his car when he finished work.

Yes, and I remember that Dad would always say a blessing at the table, and then he taught us so that we could take turns at the evening meal.

We will miss Dad, but we will always remember him as such a wonderful man * * * a wonderful dad.

The Menacing School Dropout Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the school dropout problem is one barometer of our times. It is an indicator of the unrest and lack of direction that plagues many of our youth today. Like many other States, Maryland is seriously concerned with this problem. In a recent issue of the magazine entitled "Baltimore," published monthly by the Baltimore Association of Commerce, Dr. George B. Brain, superintendent of Baltimore public schools, discusses the dropout problem. The statistics that he cites are probably similar to those of many other urban areas. However, there are some hopeful signs that, in Baltimore City, exceptional progress is being made against the school dropout problem.

The text of this article follows:

The Menacing School Dropout Problem

(By George B. Brain, superintendent, Baltimore Public Schools)

Each year almost a million lost, bewildered, defeated, hopeless youngsters will drop out of school before graduation. They will enter a world which has little place for them. Constantly running from work half done, from school half completed, from dreams half realized, these dropouts will be unable to find work of any kind. Those who do will generally be restricted to such unskilled jobs in the service trades as filling station attendants, stock clerks and car washers. But the great tragedy here is the fact that the jobs these youngsters can handle are rapidly disappearing.

For example, during the last 10 years 50,000 elevator operator jobs disappeared in the city of New York alone. Automated inspection equipment for checking transistors now permits 4 men to do the work that 100 did a few years ago. Six men with modern machinery can lay the same amount of railroad tracks today as one hundred unskilled laborers did previously.

PERTINENT FACTS

Here are some more startling facts which bear on the national problem of school dropouts and unemployment:

1. During the 1962–63 school year about 800,000 young people throughout the United States between the ages of 16 and 21 have been out of work and looking for jobs. This represents almost the entire population of Baltimore City.

2. About one in six of all of those who are out of school and unemployed are between the ages of 16 and 21. This age group makes up only 1 out of 14 in the Nation's labor force.

3. Unemployment among the teenage Negro youths is double that of white youths.

4. During this coming decade more than 26,000 young persons will leave school to seek jobs, 40 percent more than during the decade of the fifties.

In the State of Maryland, youth may legally drop out of school upon reaching age 16. In Baltimore City, a great number of youths have done just that. If we go back 5 years to the 1957–58 school year, we see that about one out of every three students who could legally drop out of our schools did so.

TREND DOWN, TOTAL HIGH

But fortunately the trend in dropouts in Baltimore City is decreasing. Whereas 5 years ago the dropout rate stood at 35 percent, last year during the 1961–62 school year it dropped to 22.8 percent.

Yet percentage figures alone do not reveal the whole story. While the rate of dropouts has been decreasing, the total number of dropouts has remained high. Five years ago in 1957–58 almost 7,000 students dropped out of the Baltimore City Public Schools. Our bureau of research estimates that some 6,000 youths will probably drop out of school this year.

We now estimate that approximately 20 percent of those who enter the seventh grade in Baltimore City junior high schools will drop out of school before high school graduation. This rate has been computed on the basis of data obtained last year and represents a substantial improvement over the rates obtained for the previous 5 years.

AGE FACTOR

The typical Baltimore City dropout is 16 years and 11 months of age and left school in the second month of the 11th grade. As compared with 5 years ago dropouts this year are slightly older and have stayed in school longer and exhibited more overageness for their grade.

The holding power of grades 7, 8, 9, and 10 has shown a marked tendency to improve, which suggests that there should be a decline in the dropout rate in the years immediately ahead.

Many kinds of studies have been made on the assumption that the number of dropouts could be greatly reduced if we once learned why pupils drop out of school. However, youth who drop out of school do not readily supply the necessary information. Many of them give vague and meaningless reasons for leaving school. On questionnaires where they are asked to check reasons for leaving school, dropouts generally tend to check those items that will show themselves in the best light.

REASONS FOR DROPOUTS

Dropouts frequently give two reasons for leaving school: (1) Financial need, and (2) dislike of school.

Financial need may include anything from contributing to the support of the family to buying a car or the items necessary to please the lady of the student's choice.

Dislike of school is just as inclusive. The dropout may say that he dislikes school because he's discouraged over his academic progress or he dislikes a certain teacher or subject. Or he may mean that he sees no practical value in the subject he is studying, or that he feels excluded from the social life of other boys and girls attending the same school.

One of the greatest single factors in school dropouts is their inability to read. Study after study has shown that the average dropout is 2 years or more retarded in reading.

Our present school programs are based upon the ability of the child to read and understand. Pupils who do not read well enough to do the work of their grade satisfactorily are apt to fail and constant failure brings in its wake discouragement, discontent, and disillusionment.

DROPOUT PATTERN

There is a common cluster of characteristics which can be used to identify the dropout. They include:

1. The dropout resides more often than not in a homogeneous area of low socioeconomic status.

2. The dropout does not have the skill, responsibility, and personal and social adjustment necessary to obtain and hold a part-time job while attending school and he does not obtain a good job after leaving school, does not hold one job for long, and makes a relatively poor work record.

3. The dropout in his personal adjustment lacks the ability to gain status, is socially immature, irresponsible, defensive, and pessimistic about his vocational future.

4. The dropout is sometimes socially withdrawn and sometimes aggressive. He lacks close friends, and is not a constructive leader. The dropout seldom participates in extracurricular activities while attending school.

5. The dropout girl often plans to marry early and is likely to be sexually precocious.

6. The dropout is academically below average, a poor reader, and often absent from school, clashes frequently with his teachers who have a tendency to reject him on the basis of academic inadequacy.

7. The dropout's system of values causes him to reject school, self, and competitive situations.

8. The dropout often regrets looking ahead to leaving school, but it is to him the lesser of two evils, for he feels frustrated and socially insecure in the school situation.

9. The dropout has extreme difficulty seeing the possibility of education as a means to vocational success, and can find no suitable training program in our schools as presently organized to meet his real needs.

10. The dropout's parents are indifferent to school and while they may not express negative feelings toward the school, they will not act to intervene on the occasion of their child's leaving the school.

The schools alone cannot solve the dropout problem. The combined forces of school, home, and community are needed. There are few neighborhoods in which some types of civic action is not possible that will also assist the schools in combating the school dropout problem. Campaigns for better street lighting or more frequent garbage collection, community action to clean up a neighborhood lot so that baseball can be played off the street, and similar activities are simple but meaningful introductions to one of the major lessons the pupil must learn—that joint action is one of the necessities of life today. The list of action needs is endless, the major need from the standpoint of a potential dropout is that he participate, that he feel the thrill of common action for common aims, so that he can see the results, and so that he may come to feel that life consists of something more than defeats. He should be learning this both inside and outside of the school.

Audubon Society Long Ago Confirmed Destructive Habits of Golden Eagle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that a law was enacted at the last session of the Congress designed to protect the Golden Eagle except in instances where wild game and domesticated animals were being destroyed by the eagles. In the latter situation, the Secretary of Interior was directed to grant permits for the destruction of the predators.

At the behest of the Audubon Society, the Secretary of Interior issued a regulation which prohibited the use of airplanes in destroying the eagles in areas where permits authorized the killing of eagles. That has resulted in virtually tying the hands of ranchmen and farmers who are victims of these birds. Up to this time the only effective method of coping with the depredating eagles has been through the use of airplanes in finding and chasing them in the areas of their inaccessible habitats.

Despite the avalanche of proof to the contrary, some Audubon partisans are still heard to contend that the Golden Eagle does not destroy lambs, kids, and other livestock.

Mr. M. D. Gleason, a prominent ranchman of Kerrville, Tex., who lost 10 percent of his lamb crop this year to the eagles, cites the Audubon Society itself as authority for the fact that the Golden

Eagle depredates upon lambs, kids, poultry, and wild game. Citing as his authority "Birds of America," edited by T. Gilbert Pearson, when the latter was President of the National Association of Audubon Societies, Mr. Gleason quotes from that authority as follows:

The food of the Golden Eagle consists of fawns, rabbits, woodchucks, prairie dogs, and ground squirrels among mammals, and turkeys, grouse, and waterfowl among birds. At times it attacks also the young of domesticated animals, notably lambs, pigs, goats, and poultry. It has been known to attack calves and colts, but such instances must be exceptional and when the birds are hard pressed by hunger.

Over extensive areas of the West the Golden Eagle unites with other birds of prey to keep many species of noxious rodents in check, and must be considered beneficial. In the more thickly inhabited regions, however, where such food is scarce, they often do great damage by carrying off lambs, young pigs, kids, and poultry. As many as 400 lambs are reported to have been taken from contiguous ranges in one season. It thus will be seen that in one region the bird should be protected and in another kept in check.

Views of Country Beautiful and Catholic Herald-Citizen on the Supreme Court's Prayer Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, recent comments on the Supreme Court's prayer decisions in Country Beautiful and in the Milwaukee Catholic Herald-Citizen state thoughtful but opposing points of view.

The Country Beautiful editorial, written by Robert Leckie:

THE RIGHTS OF MAJORITIES

On February 27 of this year two new challenges to the validity of prayers or Bible readings in public schools were heard by the U.S. Supreme Court. Both protests were based on the first amendment to the Constitution. In one of them—filed by a Baltimore mother who is raising her son as an atheist, and who argued that saying the Lord's Prayer in Baltimore public schools violated her son's rights under the first amendment, even though objecting pupils might be excused from the recitation—it became again apparent that 171 years after the ratification of the Bill of Rights, the U.S. Supreme Court is still uncertain of the precise meaning of the first amendment. Here is a wire service report on an exchange between Justices Potter Stewart and Hugo L. Black:

"When Stewart commented that the Baltimore parents wanted the prayer 'for the free exercise of their religion,' Black broke in to declare: 'They want to use the taxpayers' money to carry on their religious exercises.'"

The point here is not that Justice Black does not seem to understand that to turn down one side of a coin is to turn up the other, that to outlaw prayer or reverence for God in the public schools is to use the power of the state to enforce another religious conviction, namely atheism or agnosticism. For if atheism and agnosticism are not religions, they are at least theological statements which counter the belief "God is" with the denial "God is not" or the shrug "God may be." True enough, sectarian belief is by all means to be excluded from tax-supported schools, but to put all belief to the ban is to leave the field to denial and doubt, for it is in the nature of both to regard all silence on the subject of God as a victory. Nevertheless, this is not the point.

The real issue seems to be whether we Americans still wish to bind ourselves by the wording of a law which, in its religious freedom clause, has no rival elsewhere in the Constitution for vagueness and ambiguity. Here, in its entirety, is that clause: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof * * *." What does this mean? How do we interpret it? Do we conclude that the Bill of Rights absolutely prohibits using taxpayers' money to support any religion in any shape or form, or do we argue that, the American Protestant sects being already numerous, with Catholics and Jews already present in the Union, to say nothing of the great mass of "the unchurched," Congress simply forbid the erection of any established church, in the manner of the state Church of England or the Catholic Church in Spain, because to do so would be to the detriment of all others? And, finally, did the Founding Fathers consider the freedom of worship so sacred that they categorically forbade any infringement of it?

However we interpret this clause, we will find, to paraphrase Prof. Charles B. Nutting, dean of the National Law Center at George Washington University, that the first amendment means both more than it says and less than it says.

If we believe that freedom of worship is inviolable, what about the man who practices the cult of human sacrifice? What of polygamy as a religious belief, or a religious fanatic intruding on your privacy with a blaring sound truck? Are these allowed? No. Obviously, then the first amendment means more than it says when it guarantees the freedom of worship. Some religions, if they may be so dignified, seem to be inimical to society.

But supposing we declare that the first amendment prohibits any support to any religion? We have only to see chaplains in the Armed Forces and in Congress, public funds following veterans to the church-related college of their choice under the GI bill, Federal aid to church-related institutions such as hospitals, free lunch programs, free textbooks, or bus transportation for parochial school children, to discover that this "wall of separation between church and state"—the phrase of Thomas Jefferson, incidentally, and to be found nowhere in the Constitution—has been pierced, penetrated, and punctured. Since its very inception, the U.S. Government has been giving forms of support to religious sects, thus making it clear that on this count the first amendment means less than it says.

And if the very ambiguity of this first amendment can be seized upon by unbelievers as a stick to beat believers with, if the present Supreme Court can suggest in decision after decision on this subject that our Founding Fathers not only wanted the separation of church and state, but the separation of God and state, when we all know that all our institutions presuppose a Supreme Being, and that the fathers have stamped the holy name of God on most of their documents, on our coins, currency, courts and sessions of Congress, then it behooves us Americans of the mid-20th century to take another look at this amendment and decide whether we want it to be left so dangerously vague and uncertain.

Do we want one of our society's greatest safeguards, the principle of separation of church and state, to be spelled out and written into this amendment with clarity? Shall we acknowledge that the Government has always, in one form or another, given support to religious sects and mark the limit beyond which the Government cannot go? Or do we prefer to rescind all supports?

Certainly there are grave risks to be run in rewriting the religion clause of the first amendment. On the one hand, religion may enrich itself at the expense of the unchurched and certain religions may become more powerful than others. On the other, the public schools may become the captive of atheists and agnostics and in removing the name of God from all our coinage, pledges and oaths we will, in effect, proclaim ourselves an atheist state.

Perhaps these risks are so truly hazardous that it would be well to leave the amendment as ambiguous as it is. Nevertheless in the wake of the disputes and divisions which challenges based on it continue to provoke, it would seem wise at least to look the first amendment over again. For it is we, not the Founding Fathers, who are bound by it. Moreover, we live in a pluralist society vastly different from the de facto Protestantism of the young Republic. There are in America now representatives of practically every belief or nonbelief extant, and they all have rights to be protected.

Still, we have to put a query to ourselves, granting that active support of or opposition to a particular religion is out of the question. That query is: Do we want our Government to be friendly or not friendly to religious practice? Asking ourselves this, let us remember that on the supreme question of the existence of God it is not possible to be neutral. Whether you say of God that He is, is not, or may be, you theologize. The atheists and agnostics are quite aware of this when they ask that the slightest color of belief be expunged from the schools, leaving the blank walls of nonbelief.

And in looking over the first amendment with the eyes of a pluralist society, conscious of the rights of everyone, we might, in this age of passionate defense of the rights of the individual and minorities, remember the rights of society and majorities as well.

The Catholic Herald-Citizen editorial, as reported in the Milwaukee Journal:

The Supreme Court's decision against public school Bible reading and recitation of the Lord's Prayer was hailed by the Catholic Herald-Citizen as reasonable, in contrast to many Catholic comments which have opposed the ruling.

"The furor that will be raised by the current decision will come from those who are unaware of our country's history," Msgr. Franklyn J. Kennedy, editorial manager of the official publication of the Milwaukee Catholic archdiocese, said in a signed editorial. His statement paralleled much of the Protestant comment on the issue.

RECALL 1890 RULING

"The facts are simple: The Bible, because of the various versions used by different religions and denominations, is a religious denominational book," Monsignor Kennedy wrote, "Reading from a particular denominational version in a public school means that that particular version is preferred to all others."

The editorial recalled that the Wisconsin supreme court in 1890 upheld the objection of Catholic parents and prohibited the reading of the Bible in public schools of this State.

It added that the Lord's Prayer was a Christian prayer and said:

"Christians—Catholic and Protestants—would properly be disturbed if their children in public schools were expected to be present for the saying of a Mohammedan or a Buddhist prayer.

"The Constitution of this country, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, has said that the public school system shall not promote a particular religious belief."

SAYS DECISION IS CLEAR

Monsignor Kennedy said the decision made it clear that tax supported public educational systems were not to be used to promote a specific denominational religion.

Unlike the Herald Citizen's comments, a survey this week showed that U.S. Roman Catholic bishops and spokesmen generally deplored the Supreme Court decision.

Some said the ruling clearly showed that church related schools must now be considered for Federal funds to education, since it would be discrimination not to include them in any aid program passed by Congress.

In Rome, Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston, said a constitutional amendment was needed to counteract the Court's decision.

SEES LOSS OF HERITAGE

James Francis Cardinal McIntyre of Los Angeles, also in Rome for the conclave that elected a new Pope, criticized the decision as an abandonment of "our American heritage of philosophy, of religion, and of freedom."

An editorial prepared for the June 29 issue of America, a national Catholic weekly magazine, said that the decision must lead logically to granting equal aid to all schools.

Monsignor Kennedy advised those who were upset by the decision to turn their attention to the furthering of religious instruction of the young by word and example.

"The decision is not against God; it is not against the Bible; it is not against prayer," he said.

"From what we have read, it simply states that the reading of a denominational Bible and the saying of a denominational prayer is contrary to the first amendment.

Actions of the Consumer Advisory Council Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD actions of the Consumer Advisory Council meeting held June 3 and 4 in opposition to the quality stabilization bills, S. 774 and H.R. 3669, to authorize manufacturers to fix prices in violation of the rights of consumers and retailers:

STATEMENT BY CONSUMER ADVISORY COUNCIL ON QUALITY STABILIZATION BILLS, INCLUDING S. 774 AND H.R. 3669

We oppose these bills and all similar attempts at price fixing at the retail level which have been sponsored under the name of "fairtrading," "resale price maintenance," and "quality stabilization." Such attempts to limit freedom of individual merchants to sell goods at prices they choose are antiethical to the free enterprise system and, hence, to the best interests of American consumers.

These bills propose, in effect, that the Federal Government should protect a manufacturer who wants to establish the minimum price at which his product will be sold at retail. It would give manufacturers the right to prohibit retailers from selling brand name or trademarked goods at prices other than the retail price established by the manufacturer. Such legislation would limit competition, inhibit innovation and progress at the retail level, and would also tend to encourage price fixing at the manufacturers' level. In any event, it would tend to deny consumers the benefit of downward price adjustments which flow from increased efficiency and improvements in production and distribution.

We are not impressed by the argument that such legislation would aid small business. The evidence in States which have fair trade legislation indicates the contrary to be the result, since it encourages the introduction by large retail businesses of private brands and other techniques for avoiding the effect of the legislation.

We believe that so-called quality stabilization (fair trade) bills are inimical to the interests of consumers. They violate the third right of the consumer as stated in the President's consumer message, the "right to choose—to be assured, wherever possible, access to a variety of products and services at competitive prices." We, therefore, commend the administration for its opposition to these bills.

House Small Business Committee Praised by Druggists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the House Small Business Committee, Hon. JOE L. EVINS, in announcing the aims of that committee at the beginning of the 88th Congress, stated that it would be the purpose of the committee to take a positive approach in helping small business. In the short period which the committee has operated during the 88th Congress, it is apparent that Chairman EVINS' positive approach is reaping dividends for the small business community of the Nation.

An excellent example of this is the hearings conducted by the Small Business Committee pertaining to the Federal Trade Commission advisory opinion dealing with cooperative advertising by retailers. At a time when small retailers throughout the Nation were alarmed and bewildered by the opinion handed down by the Commission and the conflicting views of the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department, the Small Business Committee promptly and properly moved into action and scheduled hearings for the purpose of clarifying the matter.

An article pertaining to this in the Drug Trade News of June 24, 1963, by Stephens Rippey, entitled "Mr. EVINS Does a Good Turn," has been called to my attention and I, in turn, believe it proper that it be called to the attention of the other Members of the House at this time.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this article at this point in the RECORD:

MR. EVINS DOES A GOOD TURN

It is not difficult in Washington to get the impression that, by and large, Congressional committee hearings represent a great waste of time, and achieve little more than personal publicity for the chairman.

Like many impressions, this one is not altogether correct. Many Congressional hearings are fruitful in one way or another. One example is that held by the House Small Business Committee, of which Representative JOE L. EVINS, Democrat, of Tennessee, is chairman, on the Federal Trade Commission's advisory opinion dealing with cooperative advertising by retailers.

This opinion, it may be recalled, involved an elaborate plan put together by Marketing Programs, Inc., New York City, for druggists in Lowell, Mass., and Iowa. Under the plan, Marketing Programs would solicit promotional allowances from national advertisers for individual stores which normally couldn't qualify because of small volume. The funds would be used to place ads, sponsored by local drug groups, which would offer weekly "specials." It was hoped the plan would spread all over the country, but FTC spiked it.

FTC's sweeping advisory opinion brought consternation to the advertising field, and particularly to independent retailers, for it condemned all cooperative advertising which mentioned prices, terms or conditions of sale. Mr. Evins stepped into the midst of the furor with his 1-day hearing May 3. This brought assurances to local retailers that no Federal agency is likely to take action to stop co-op advertising, even though prices are stated, if it represents no more than a bona fide effort by independent local retailers to match in some respects their chain store or discount house competition.

Since the Evins hearing, scarcely a whisper has been heard here about the illegality of co-op advertising by groups of independent retailers. The feeling is that the issue is dead; that it was killed by the testimony received at Mr. EVINS' hearing from Government officials. Perhaps the matter has not been settled with the finality of a Supreme Court decision, or with a law such as that proposed by Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, which would specifically authorize this type of advertising. But, for all practical purposes, it has been settled.

The forthcoming report of the House Small Business Committee on the subject is expected to take this position. The report of course; will have no legal standing, but it will serve as a reminder to the enforcement agencies that the dust has been laid and that no public interest will be served in stirring it up again.

WILL ACCEPT DISTINCTION

It is expected the committee will accept the distinction made by the enforcement agencies between the legality of schemes such as that dreamed up by Marketing Programs and those originated by local merchants to get the benefit of promotional allowances to enable them better to compete. Nothing has happened, or is expected to, to stop such co-op institutional advertising as is being done by Florida druggists with some success under Marketing Programs' aegis.

The strongest assurance that local druggists may get together in co-op ad programs, even though these involve price (but not price fixing in its usual sense) was given by Assistant Attorney General Lee Loevinger, now a member of the Federal Communications Commission. He flatly told the committee that, so far as the Department of Justice is concerned, this already is the law. He noted the Department had examined such plans in the past and had refrained from taking action against them.

Federal Trade Commission Chairman Paul Rand Dixon wasn't as specific as Mr. Loevinger. He was bound to stand by the advisory opinion, but he made it clear this applied only to the specifics of the Marketing Programs plan as submitted to FTC.

Integration: It Isn't Easy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article about a distinguished and courageous American, Mr. James Del Rio, which appeared in the December 3, 1962, issue of Newsweek:

INTEGRATION: IT ISN'T EASY

John L. Patterson didn't want to move to Harrington Hills, but his wife Annie did—and so, of course, they moved. Annie, a big and handsome woman of 36, was expecting a second child and she was determined that this one, unlike her 14-year-old daughter, Aloak, would not have to grow up in the Pontiac, Mich., Negro ghetto known as Little Africa.

"I thought Harrington Hills was a real nice neighborhood," Annie Patterson said last week. John Patterson, a strapping 190-pound press operator in the Pontiac Division of General Motors Corp. for the past 11 years, bought a $14,000 all-brick house on a tidy 110- by 150-foot plot and braced himself for the ordeal of being one of the four Negro families on the block.

It is about as he had expected. "Sometimes when we come home," he said, "the neighbors come to the windows and look at us and then turn around and sit down."

The Pattersons, nevertheless, settled in without violence or intimidation, part of a quiet, almost unreported revolution that has smashed neighborhood segregation in Pontiac. Just 4 years ago, Pontiac, which is 25 miles from Detroit and has a population of some 84,000, was as tightly segregated as most cities, with nearly all of its 15,000 Negroes squeezed into one area; today, 250 Negro families have moved into previously all-white sections all over town.

The key figure in Pontiac's revolution is a hard-running Detroit real estate man named James Del Rio, who was too busy to get his high school diploma until his 35th birthday (3 years ago). Del Rio's plan: He took listings of houses repossessed by the Veterans' Administration and Federal Housing Administration requiring little or no down payment and sold them to Negroes.

BETTER LATE

Del Rio, in fact, has progressed so well that he seemed almost indifferent last week when President Kennedy signed the Executive order banning discrimination in all housing assisted by Federal funds.

"It has been a one-man battle far too long," said Del Rio. "I would have welcomed the President's order when he first took office * * * but the Pontiac plan is a 4-year-old reality.

"The thing just came to me," he said last week. "Here was this big glut of houses vacant—already financed by the Government. All that, and 70 percent or more of 450,000 Negroes living in Detroit in substandard housing."

For Del Rio's purposes, the plan had other attractions. Because these houses were, in fact, Federal property, the new occupants wouldn't have to depend on unsympathetic local police for protection; they could call on the Federal Bureau of Investigation if necessary. And since the houses were scattered widely, Del Rio could rapidly integrate most of a city's neighborhoods. "Then," he explained, "they [whites] would have no place to run."

ASH BARREL

The man who brought off the revolution of Pontiac doesn't know whether he is a Negro or not, although he chooses to live as one. Del Rio has the features and complexion of an American Indian. He was plucked out of an ash barrel in a Detroit alley at the age of 2 hours, adopted by a Jewish man and his Negro wife, and reared in a Negro area as James Cohen, Jr. (He later changed the name.)

While still a schoolboy he worked in auto-body repair shops and even after he went to work for Ford Motor Co. as an arc welder and blueprint reader, he ran his own fender-bending business. Soon he had enough money to buy a house on then-segregated Grand Boulevard in Detroit. All went well until his Negro foster mother came to live with him. Then representatives of the real-estate agency that had sold him the house tried to repossess it. After consulting his lawyer about his rights, Del Rio stood guard with a loaded shotgun.

Ironically, the pressure on Del Rio gave him the means to do something about Negro housing. The white neighbors bought back his house and gave him $1,500 as a bribe. With it he bought two more houses and soon was in the real estate business, a business that grew into Associate Brokers Investment Co., Inc., which grossed $2 million last year and employs 30 salesmen.

Del Rio's long-term goal remained the ending of segregated housing.

NOT EASY

It is Del Rio's belief that in Pontiac he has been able to start changing the pattern. At least one Negro family is now living in 10 of the 11 U.S. Census Bureau areas within Pontiac's limits.

Will the program work elsewhere?

It isn't all roses, as John Patterson and his wife are learning. Nor is it easy, as Del Rio will concede. The hardest part is getting free access to the Government's list of repossessed houses. While the VA correctly states that it has never kept segregated lists of repossessions, pressures from white real-estate brokers can make it hard on any Negro broker who wants to handle certain properties. The FHA also has forbidden its regional offices to give listings to selected brokers, a system that kept housing segregated, but the pressure remains.

Del Rio is undismayed. He intends to put the plan in operation in a new area —"somewhere in Detroit," he said. "It will work anywhere."

West Virginian in the Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, West Virginia's claim to prominence in our national pastime, baseball, is advanced in an article in the June 16, 1963, issue of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIAN IN THE HALL OF FAME

You can take your Ted Williamses, Stan Musials, Rogers Hornsbys, Ty Cobbs, etc., but a West Virginian of the 19th century named Jesse Cail Burkett took a back seat to none of them.

For some strange reason, Burkett's name isn't mentioned in the same breath as some of the other great hitters in the game, but his record speaks for itself.

He was a batting star of the majors for 16 years as an outfielder for the New York Giants, Cleveland, St. Louis, all three National League Clubs then, as well as the St. Louis and Boston Clubs of the American League.

He shares with Roger Hornsby and Ty Cobb the record of hitting .400 or better three times: .423 in 1895, .410 in 1896, and .402 in 1898.

He won the batting championship in 1895 and 1896 and for his great feats in the game, was admitted to the Baseball Hall of Fame in 1946 as its 37th member.

He wound up with a lifetime batting average of .342 with 2,872 hits in 8,380 times at bat in 2,063 games. He went direct from the Ohio Valley sandlots to the big leagues.

He was born on December 4, 1868, in Wheeling.

Distinguished Veteran John Holden Served His Nation Well

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Veterans' Subcommittee I call the Senate's attention to the distinguished service which one of the veterans of the United States rendered to his country. I refer to Mr. John Holden, of Los Angeles, Calif., who passed away last Friday. During World War I, Mr. Holden served in the American Expeditionary Forces at Mont Blanc Ridge in the Champagne sector where he was wounded during a strafing attack by a German airplane. Soon after receiving this wound, he was hit by 48-shell fragments and lost one eye. His wounds were so serious that they were considered fatal. But, not only did he survive, he returned to his native State of Utah where he served as auditor before moving to California in 1931. In addition he helped to found three of our most distinguished veterans' organizations—the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans. Mr. Holden is an outstanding example of the illustrious service which the veterans of this country have rendered in civilian life as well as in the Armed Forces, for which the entire Nation owes them a debt of gratitude.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article on Mr. Holden's death, printed in the New York Times, of Tuesday, June 18, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN HOLDEN, VETERAN, 67; WOUNDS CALLED FATAL IN 1918

LOS ANGELES.—John E. Holden, a leader of veterans groups, died of cancer on Friday—45 years after suffering war wounds the doctors were sure would prove fatal. His age was 67.

Mr. Holden survived his World War I injuries to become Auditor of Utah, and he was later a leader in California Republican affairs. He helped found the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. Holden lost an eye and was wounded 48 times by shell fragments while serving with the American Expeditionary Forces at Mont Blanc Ridge in the Champagne sector. He had been wounded earlier by a strafing German airplane. He was called one of the worst wounded survivors of the war.

Later Mr. Holden returned to his native State, Utah, and worked as a reporter with The Salt Lake City Tribune while completing his education as an accountant. He came here in 1931.

He leaves his wife, Helen; a son, two daughters, a brother, and two sisters.

Ancient Crafts Maintained in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the June 16, 1963, issue of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail called attention to many ancient, traditional cottage crafts still being fostered in the mountains of West Virginia.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in the Gazette-Mail be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM WILL PROVIDE MARKET FOR CRAFTSMEN

(By Barbara S. Beury)

Among West Virginia pioneers, creative work in art was usually limited to the making and decoration of useful objects—furniture, baskets, implements, pottery, utensils, and textiles.

The crafts were handed down from generation to generation, sons and daughters learning from their elders how to handle tools and materials and how to achieve beauty and durability in the finished product.

Within the traditional styles and methods, individual craftsmen distinguished themselves for their skill and imagination and even embarked upon specialization.

Some of the patterns of these crafts often reached such intricacy and charm that they are eagerly copied today by craftsmen and designers.

This mountain culture has led to the development of many unique crafts and distinctive art forms. Many West Virginians have kept alive the crafts and skills handed to them by their forefathers, such as spinning, weaving, pottery making, basket making and wood carving and have developed the older forms into modern craft and art items.

In the last decade, little support has been given to the encouragement of production and marketing of handmade products. In 1932 the Mountaineer Craftsmen's Co-operative association was organized at Morgantown by the American Friends Service Committee of Philadelphia. The association, a member of the Southern Highland Handicraft Guild, tried to develop a program comprising furniture making, weaving, quilting, basketery, iron and other metalwork but met with meager success. In 1838 the Associated Craftsmen of West Virginia was organized to assist craftsmen in marketing products. The few sales outlets set up in the State parks and other tourist centers were the end result of this association.

A new program to give State artists and craftsmen a chance to show their wares and to develop new markets for them through a comprehensive arts and crafts program has now been organized by the West Virginia Department of Commerce. This program, which is just getting underway, is designed to turn hobbies and pastimes into profit for the State's skilled craftsmen and artists. It is the first statewide attempt to organize the program with a well-defined marketing procedure and 2,000 new or upgraded jobs as the ultimate goal.

David Callaghan, appointed by Commerce Commissioner Hulett C. Smith, to head this arts and crafts program is presently asking every craftsman to send in a sample of his work so that it may be evaluated and marketed. In every case, Callaghan asks that the sender place a suggested price on his product so that he may be advised on what to expect in the way of sales. To date more than 100 samples of varied arts and crafts have been received and more are arriving every day.

This marketing assistance is the chief function of the Department of Commerce at this stage in the development. Over the past few years a number of talented craftsmen have given up their trade because they had no marketing outlets. In the future the department will act as a liaison agent between artists and craftsmen and the various marketing outlets, both within West Virginia and in surrounding States.

Preliminary arrangements have been made to provide a showcase in the statehouse rotunda in order to give the hundreds of tourists that pass through the statehouse each year a chance to see some of the crafts that are produced in West Virginia. In order to make these crafts available for the tourist to purchase on-the-spot, the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation is establishing a crafts shop in the west wing of the capitol.

Other craft outlets which will be in operation by the first of summer or are now operative include: Blackwater Falls and Hawks Nest State Parks, the new Daniel Boone Flower and Gift Shoppe in Charleston, Wellman's gift shop on U.S. 60 between South Charleston and St. Albans' and Ponderosa Craft Center at Rainelle.

Perhaps the largest single outlet designed to sell West Virginia crafts is Skyland, Inc., Craft Center of Bluefield, W. Va., which will handle craft items on both a wholesale and retail basis. The firm should be operational by July.

The New York World's Fair offers a unique opportunity for craft marketing. According to Commerce Commissioner Hulett C. Smith, the West Virginia Pavilion will sell West Virginia handicrafts with the major objective of displaying the native skills of West Virginia while providing a volume outlet to the products of craftsmen.

Highlighting the 1963 arts and crafts program will be the Arts and Crafts Fair to be held at Cedar Lakes at Ripley, July 3–7. The fair, co-sponsored by the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture and Vocational Education, will provide a complete display of wares for the retailer to view. Craftsmen will be able to set up their operations, produce their goods and contract sales on the fairground. This fair will be unique because it will offer nightly entertainment, demonstrations and other fun-filled events for everyone to enjoy.

The whole idea of the recent emphasis on arts and crafts is to make the traveler in the future thing of expert handicrafted goods when he thinks of West Virginia. But over and above that, the primary reason for the program is to allow the people of West Virginia to make a living at something that most of them are now doing as a pastime.

A good indication of what the arts and crafts program can bring in the way of increased income for West Virginia may be found in millions of dollars of handcrafted glassware sold every year by the some 22 glass plants in West Virginia carrying on this age-old art. Another, more recent craft development is the production of coal jewelry. With only about four companies in the State making these souvenirs, sales last year went into the thousands. Additional markets are being found outside the State this year and the financial success of these items in the future is virtually assured.

State commerce officials believe that the same end can be accomplished with many West Virginia crafts. The primary hurdle is get the people organized, and to develop markets for their goods.

This brings up another long-range objective of the current program. The groundwork is now being completed for an artists and craftsmen guild which will serve as a statewide fraternity through which goods can be distributed and marketed. Standards of craft work will be established to improve the quality of products.

Since the early frontier days of West Virginia the mountain people have lived by the work of their hands and have developed their own ways of finding self-satisfaction through works of art. The march of time and the progress it brings has eliminated the necessity for many of the early craft and art forms. It seems fitting then that during West Virginia's Centennial Year a program is being developed to keep alive the many crafts and skills handed these people by their forefathers for the world to enjoy.

Strictly American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Wall Street Journal on Tuesday, June 11, 1963, entitled "Strictly American" in opposition to the price-fixing legislation H.R. 3669, titled the quality brands stabilization bill, whose purpose is to take bread off the table and money out of the pocket of the American consumer:

STRICTLY AMERICAN

An organization bearing the august title of the Bureau for the Advancement of Independent Retailing warns that "hundreds of thousands of the Nation's * * * proprietors of independent retail business are today fighting a life-and-death struggle. * * * The great American dream—the opportunity for a citizen to start and run his own business—appears to be verging on a nightmare."

What has made things all that desperate? It's that familiar old monster, competition. Mainly, according to the complaint, it's those price-cutting big stores, the discount houses and chains. To fight this competition the bureau urges passage of "fair trade" legislation, a species of which is again before Congress; it would prohibit any merchant anywhere from selling a national brand product at a price lower than that set by the manufacturer.

Under a fair trade law—or, to describe it more accurately, a price-fixing law—the bureau says that "the consumer will be paying no more than her neighbor for a particular branded article. * * * One price to every customer is strictly American."

Is it now. We had always thought competing for customers with lower prices, better service and other ways was one of the most American things about America. Just as we'd thought the same about the consumer's interest in, and ingenuity in finding, a bargain.

Indeed, price-fixing is usually considered so un-American that some Americans who try it get thrown in the clink. We are sure the drumbeaters for fair trade, in and out of Congress, wouldn't want that to happen to them. And we can't help wondering what history books they get their nightmares out of.

Bokara Steel Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the raging controversy over the Bokara steel project in India has generated the normal amount of questionable statements from those who want to confuse the issues regarding United States aid to India and other countries.

Recently the Washington Post printed a letter from Bharat Ram, president, Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, which brings together the kind of factual information needed by the American people to make an informed judgment on this complex issue, and which they have every right to have access to. For this and related reasons, I include the letter from the letters column of the Washington Post of June 20, 1963:

BOKARA STEEL PROJECT

I want to correct an impression in some quarters in the United States that Indian private enterprise views with varying degrees of disagreeableness the Bokara steel project. This is obviously based on an imperfect knowledge of Indian conditions and our requirements of steel.

Currently, the per capita consumption of steel in India, taking into account domestic output and imports, is 11 kilograms; and this is one of the lowest in the world. Today, there are six steel plants—two in the private and four in the public sector—altogether producing about 4 million tons of steel, and the share of each sector being nearly equal.

Chronologically, private enterprise steel units in India are older, and historically they had to overcome a number of serious impediments, of which the attitude of the prenational government was an important one. Strange as it may seem, it is only after the formulation of the industrial policy resolution which has reserved steel for the public sector that substantial expansion, thanks to the assistance of the authorities, has taken place in the private sector units.

The Government of India's steel policy vis-a-vis public and private sectors of the industry is one of nondiscrimination and equal treatment. This policy was recently reiterated by the Indian Minister for Steel and Heavy Industries. It has drawn favorable comment from the leaders of the Indian steel industry in private hands, and according to them competition between the two sectors of the Indian steel industry will not arise in view of the rationalized and controlled operation of the two sectors. So, to the Indian steel industry Bokara does not present any problem of disadvantageous competition.

Looked at from another side—the consumption angle—additional output is required not only to build up the infra-structure of the economy, but also for fabrication purposes, the capacity of which is mostly in the private sector. The engineering units are running below the level of installed capacity mainly on account of paucity of steel and the position can be remedied only if larger supplies of this basic raw material are made available as speedily as possible.

I am also of the view that the lack of adequate quantities of steel is standing in the way of a more rapid development of private sector industries, including small industries where there is a marked tendency to take to metallurgical based operations, and of which steel based are the most significant. Currently, India is importing more than 1 million tons of steel and the foreign exchange expended is about $200 million. Valuable as steel is, and precisely for this reason, it will be highly unsatisfactory not to improve the domestic supply position as early as possible.

The installation of the Bokara steel plant is a hope which is strongly held by Indian enterprise, because on it will depend the utilization of the installed capacity of the Indian engineering industry, its expansion, and the competitive position of private enterprise—in short, the future strength of the Indian economy.

BHARAT RAM,
President, Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry.
NEW DELHI.

Tribute to Mrs. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, she was a woman for the ages. It is doubtful whether we shall see her like again. There is no doubt whatever that it is impossible to praise adequately or to describe appropriately the magnitude of her achievement.

As a wife and mother, as First Lady, as an ambassador to the United Nations, as a fighter for humanity and a crusader for justice, she filled all of these roles with wisdom, with courage, with fervor, and with dedication to the welfare of mankind.

She was beloved by all at the time of her death. Those who had criticized her when she was her eminent husband's peripatetic visitor of breadlines, orphanages, slums, and the other places of sorrow and tribulation of the years of the great depression, those critics had come in time to admire and respect her. Most of the world had come to love her.

Her causes were many, her triumphs were manifold, her sympathies were quick, her touch was sure, her commonsense was vast, and to know her friendship was indeed a blessing.

The country is poorer by her death, but richer by the contributions over the years which no one but she could have made. She was an inspiration to the women of America to exercise the power which their votes gave them. She awakened abroad a regard for America and Americans by her travels about the globe, and her terribly obvious concern for the poor, the oppressed, the spurned, and the forgotten of every creed and race, in every country, and at all times.

Her memory will never pass from our recollection.

Where's Johnson?—Role in Racial Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Where's Johnson?—Role in Racial Crisis," by Roscoe Drummond, a distinguished commentator, on Saturday, June 8, 1963, in the Washington (D.C.) Post.

The article points out the continuing splendid efforts of the distinguished Vice President of the United States to achieve full equality for all men and merits fair consideration and careful scrutiny by all:

WHERE'S JOHNSON?—ROLE IN RACIAL CRISIS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

At a time when the administration, after much prodding by friends, critics, and events, is becoming more active in the area of racial justice, where is LYNDON B. JOHNSON? What is the Vice President saying and doing? What role is he playing in this anxious period?

As the Democratic Majority Leader of the Senate during the Eisenhower administration, LYNDON JOHNSON guided to enactment the first civil rights legislation since Reconstruction.

As a candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1960, Lyndon Johnson was coldly rejected by most Democratic liberal groups as an incurable, backward-looking Dixiecrat—which he never was.

To the surprise of nobody who knows him, the Vice President is today engaged—obviously with the approval of Mr. Kennedy—in a mission which he deems absolutely central to the cause of steadily achieving racial justice for the Negro within the framework of law and order.

That mission is to help demonstrate to American Negroes that the conscience of the Nation and the conscience of the Government are on their side in the fight for equality of opportunity and status and to strengthen this conscience at every possible point.

Here is what the Vice President has been saying over a period of several months. It is directed at the conscience of the community on the issue of racial justice:

On progress: "We are well past the stage where half a loaf will do—progress will come faster as sensible men and women realize that they cannot afford—morally and economically—to abandon the field to the forces of unreason."

On violence: "I hope we relearn the lesson that issues which are not settled by justice and fair play will sooner or later be settled by force and violence."

What law can't do: "It is said repeatedly that no law can implant reasonable attitudes among human beings. I agree. It is also totally irrelevant to the issues that divide our country today."

What law can do: "The law cannot bring reasonable men and women together to work out their differences. But it can restrain unreasonable men and women from imposing their will on a community—and then the reasonable people can and will get together and work out their problems themselves. It can prevent the extremists from trampling over the rights of others. It can open the doors of equal opportunity which have been slammed shut by those who fear that when men and women can compete on an equal basis and are equal before the law they will turn out to be rather equal after all."

On ultimate solutions: "The ultimate solutions must spring from the people themselves. But that is not—and will not be—an excuse for sitting idly by while minorities obstruct the efforts of just and reasonable men and women to find solutions."

On patience: "To ask for patience from the Negro is to ask him to give more of what he has already given anough. But to fail to to ask of him—and of all Americans—perservance within the processes of a free and responsible society would be to fail to ask what the national interest requires of all its citizens."

It seems to me that Vice President JOHNSON is saying the three things which most need to be said—and understood:

That as Negroes feel sure that the conscience of the community in on their side, the process of achieving racial justice will be tolerable to them.

That while laws do not themselves remove racial bias from people, they put the initiative in the hands of those intent upon dissolving racial discrimination through equal protection and equal opportuinty.

That the overriding need now is for reasonable men and women to take this initiative.

Sugar Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, while the attention of the country in recent weeks has been turned to other areas, it is important that we in the Congress should not forget the nature of the current crisis in the price of sugar, which has continued without any real sign of relief. The Washington Food Report of the Food Institute issued May 4, 1963, and of the same publication issued May 18, 1963, included certain materials which I believe should be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the consideration of Members in studying this problem. As is shown by these articles, the problem seems clearly to result from policies of restrictions, foreign subsidies, and price setting unrelated to market conditions and potential market conditions. To call these conditions to our attention again, this material is submitted for consideration:

[From the Washington Food Report, May 4, 1963]

ARE SUGAR PRICES FINALLY REACHING A PEAK?

New round of increases this week for cane refined sent New York market up to $12.10 a hundred pounds—reflected recent advances on raw sugar. This was the ninth increase since January 1, when refined sugar was $9.80 a hundred pounds in New York. Some brokers in contact with soft drink manufacturers, confectioners, canners and bakers have expressed fears that when ballooning sugar prices come back to earth, the sugar industry will have lost part of its market to substitute sweeteners.

Restraining influence on the market is the approaching crop of beet sugar, with a larger U.S. supply indicated this year. National Confectioners Association is hopeful the Government "will consider eliminating the present 62½-cent-per-hundred-pounds duty on sugar," as a source of relief to the candy industry and other major sugar users.

[From the Washington Food Report, May 18, 1963]

SUGAR MARKET STILL KEEPS CLIMBING, FORCING PRICES FOR MANY PRODUCTS HIGHER

Fruit canners and freezers are among users who have been forced to revise their cost estimates upward. Coca-Cola Co., the Nation's biggest consumer of sugar raised its price for concentrate sold to bottlers, and warned: "We will have to put on another increase in the next quarter if sugar prices stay at current levels." A general price rise throughout the candy industry "within a couple of weeks" is predicted by a Cleveland candymaker. Ice cream producers also are likely to increase prices soon—Borden and Foremost have indicated they are weighing the decision to increase wholesale prices of their ice cream products.

Eastern cane refiners boosted prices 75 cents a hundred pounds—the 12th rise this year. Meanwhile, the Government revealed that foreign producers have applied for the right to sell only 63,500 tons of raw sugar here—only about a fourth of the global quota increase announced May 6. In California, beet growers hope to get the highest price in history this summer.

WHERE UNITED STATES GETS SUGAR, AND WHO USES IT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In view of the confusion surrounding the spiraling price of refined sugar in recent weeks, we thought you might be interested in some basic facts about where our sugar comes from, and who the major industrial and nonindustrial users are.)

Early this month, the Department of Agriculture revised its estimates of U.S. sugar requirements for 1963, putting it at approximately 10 million tons. More than a third of this is expected to come from Continental U.S. growers of cane and beet sugar (1 million tons and 2.7 million tons, respectively).

Another 1 million tons will come from Hawaii, and about 870,000 tons from Puerto Rico. Leading foreign supplier of sugar to this coutry is Republic of the Philippines, with 1.2 million tons slated for 1963. Other regular "quota" foreign suppliers will ship about 6.9 million tons to the United States. The "global quota" set by USDA this year is 1.7 million tons.

MAJOR USERS

Deliveries of both industrial and nonindustrial users last year totaled 117.6 hundred-pound bags, according to Government figures. Among leading nonindustrial users were retail grocers, 25.5 million bags, and hotels, restaurants and institutions, 1.3 million bags.

Last year's deliveries to industrial users included the following: Beverages, 26.4 million hundred-pound bags; bakery, cereal and allied products, 22.4 million bags; confectionery and related products, 17.3 million bags; ice cream and dairy products, 8 million bags; canned, bottled and frozen foods, jams, jellies and preserves, 17 million bags; other food users 5.3 million bags; nonfood purposes, 1.6 million bags.

The beverage industry used 13.5 percent of all sugar consumed in the U.S. in 1961, or about one-fourth of the sugar delivered to industrial users, states a report issued last week by USDA. Nearly 95 percent of the caloric sweeteners delivered to that industry was sugar, about 2 percent was dextrose and 3 percent corn syrup.

Principal causes of the steady rise of prices of both domestic and world spot prices of sugar since the first of the year—with refined selling in New York at the highest price is some 43 years—are the two successively bad winters in Western Europe, a big beet sugar producer, and a sharp drop in the output of Cuba, the world's largest supplier of cane sugar.

The Magnificent Restoration at Saugus of the First Ironworks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, a major weapon in the cold war that confronts the world today—especially in the contest for the mind of men—is in the preservation of the visual and inspiring evidences of our history as revealed in the ennobling architecture and places of our history.

We must not permit the cold and unimaginative eye of the historically blind to determine the destiny of our great historic monuments. Suppose some people, insensitive to the significance of a historic scence, had wiped out our majestic statehouse in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, or Faneuil Hall, or the Old North Church, in the name of progress? What a tremendous spiritual and economic loss our Commonwealth would have suffered. It is up to all Americans from every facet of government and private endeavor to preserve the tangible symbols and monuments of the American tradition.

A notable example of a privately achieved restoration that deserves high praise is that of the ancient iron works in Saugus, Mass. This dates back to the 17th century. The modern iron industry made this possible through the efforts of the American Iron and Steel Institute of New York. This industrial manifestation of history is significant because it was here in Saugus 3 centuries ago that "the successful, sustained, and integrated production of cast and wrought iron was first achieved within the limits of the United States."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a speech on the

importance of preserving historical sites which I prepared for delivery at the 20th annual meeting of the First Ironworks Association at the Saugus Iron Works Restoration:

This magnificent restoration at Saugus of the first ironworks in America is a tribute to the industrial pioneers of three centuries ago.

But it is more than that. It is a monument to the love of place and country, the historical imagination, and the extraordinary capacity for hard work in the face of many setbacks of those dedicated men and women who were responsible for the restoration project itself.

Their work is an inspiration and a model for those citizens of our vast country who, too, are anxious that the sites and structures of their history not be lost to them, lost to their children, or lost to the future. Our past will have a future if the struggles of those who are called preservationists meet with success.

That success can come only with the support of the communities in which the preservationists are active. Such support can be induced only by the example of a model restoration, a masterpiece of historical recreation, such as the ironworks restoration of Saugus, Mass.

Miss M. Louise Hawkes, whose ancestors lived in the Saugus of the early Massachusetts Bay Colony, should receive much of the credit. She first fought for the retention of the ironmaster's house in Saugus when it was proposed to take it to Dearborn, Mich., and make it part of the Ford museum there. Her efforts won the support of Governor Saltonstall in 1941, and eventually of Henry Ford himself.

The Parson Roby Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution played a crucially important role in the early days of the project by purchasing the land on which had stood, in the years so long ago, the slag pile, a forge, and the first blast furnace in the new world.

Mr. J. Sanger Attwill of Lynn became president of an organization incorporated in 1943 to work for the restoration, the first iron works association. Mr. Quincy Bent, a summer resident of Cape Ann, and a retired steel company executive, became an enthusiastic backer of the project after attending the association's early meetings, and interested the board of directors of the American Iron and Steel Institute in restoring America's first productive blast furnace.

The results of the dedication of those early pioneers of the restoration project, and of the efforts of the skilled, talented, selfless people they enlisted to help them, are here before our eyes. The sight of their work is indeed an awesome stimulus to anyone's historical imagination.

Geologists, biologists, metallurgists, historians, archaeologists, architects, educators, researchers, librarians, State, county, and town officials, citizens of Saugus, all helped, all made their contribution, and all of them deserve thanks and congratulations.

The great New England poet Longfellow said, "We may build more stately habitations, fill our rooms with paintings and sculpture, but we cannot buy with gold the old associations."

What is the purpose of saving old buildings, or restoring them? Some may ask, "Why save old places: What can they contribute to living in the world today?"

We need authentic, tangible reminders of our national and local traditions to make us feel a part of the best in our heritage. Properly presented, they breathe life into past experience. The most cleverly illustrated children's book cannot compare with a visit to this Saugus Ironworks restoration, to the Shaker Village in Hancock, Mass., to the Plymouth restoration, to colonial Williamsburg, or to any of the rest, as a means of giving boys, girls, and for that matter, their parents, the feel of the life of our past as a people, as a colony, as a young country, as a Nation. A morning at one of these places is not merely a history lesson, but an unforgettable taste of an earlier America.

Each town has something in its past worth saving, something worth noting, something worth celebrating, something worth putting up a marker about, something worth describing in the local paper, something worth making real for the children and the grandchildren to come.

There has been a marked increase in the efforts of citizens' groups to preserve historical sites. After years of struggle to make itself heard, the message of the preservationists is beginning to be understood.

The Secretary of the Interior has endeavored to assist the preservationists, and to help spread their message. He recently wrote in a quarterly magazine devoted to the current reporting of events concerning historic preservation that, "The time has come to provide machinery in our laws for the automatic preservation of historic sites when they fall into the surplus or unneeded category. Provision should be made, not for their sale, but for their addition to our great system of national parks and memorials, or their transfer to independent groups or patriotic organization which have an interest in their preservation for time and generations to come."

We must bend every effort to preserve the great symbols of America's heritage. I believe that our historic sites and buildings are precious to us as a Nation in the same way that the documents of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution are precious and worthy of preservation.

The preservation of the American heritage of freedom itself is involved in the necessity of keeping before our people the relics of our historic past.

This means buildings rich in historic sentiment and inspiration.

This means battlefields that tell the story of sacrifice, and hold up examples of patriotism and honor to our young people.

It means, above all, an attitude of mind that holds in reverence and esteem these monuments and mementos of our past.

In our respect for the grandeur and the glory of our past rests our survival in the future.

Although the program for historical preservation is a national one, history and geography have combined to make certain areas of our country rich and abundant in memories and mementos of the American tradition.

The area north of Boston is one of these areas.

In our State of Massachusetts, in our capital, Boston, and in the Seventh Massachusetts Congressional District which I have the honor of representing in the House of Representatives of the United States, we have a sensitivity and an awareness that makes us keenly and particularly aware of the character, the stamina, the independence, and the rugged patriotism that gave birth to our Nation.

Because the holiday on which we celebrate that national origin, Independence Day, is so close upon us, and because it would be difficult if not an impossible task to detail the outstanding events that have occurred during the many long years of the distinguished history of the towns and cities that make up the Seventh Massachusetts Congressional District, I can only speak briefly of a few incidents here that are connected with our beginnings as a Nation.

The desire to preserve and restore the sites and buildings of our historic past is a function of the exercise of a historical imagination which interests itself in the history of one's own locality. And, of course, my locality, my constitutional responsibility, and my major interest in life, is the welfare, the history, and the people of my district, the citizens of Saugus, Lynnfield, Wakefield, Malden, Medford, Arlington, Belmont, Everett, Chelsea, Revere, and Winthrop.

In colonial and Revolutionary times, Arlington was part of Cambridge and was known as Menotomy. This area has been ruthlessly altered, especially during the past half century. Almost all of the landmarks associated with the British retreat that formerly lay east of Lexington, through the present Arlington to Charlestown, are now irretrievably gone.

But a notable exception is the Jason Russell house near the corner of Massachusetts Avenue and Jason Street, just west of Arlington Center. The house is remarkable not only in its own right, but also because it is one structure out of the many that stood in the path of the Redcoats that has not succumbed entirely to the ferocious dictates of utility and change.

The old house is a monument to Arlington's colonial and revolutionary past. No better choice as a subject for historical preservation could have been found by the Arlington Historical Society in 1923.

The gray-clapboarded dwelling was erected about the year 1680. It has real worth as an architectural antiquity in addition to its unusual interest as the scene of the mass murder of a dozen Revolutionary patriots.

Through what was later to be Arlington, Paul Revere passed on his way to give warning of the approaching British expedition to Lexington and Concord. The famous ride led in later years to the naming of one of Arlington's streets as Paul Revere Road. The men of the area harassed the British on their retreat, and fierce fighting took place at Jason Russell's farmhouse.

The last Russell descendant vacated the House in 1890, and it was then turned about, and moved back from the road. The stone tablet placed at this time refers to the site of the house of Jason Russell rather than to the house itself. Though the house may have been considered as good as lost when it was moved, the Arlington Historical Society persevered in recovering it at a later date, and it survives today concealed by neighboring residences that have transformed the aspect of a colonial farm into part of a densely occupied suburb.

The early history of Arlington's neighbor, the town of Belmont, is to be found in the stories of the sections from which it was formed. It was incorporated in 1859, and was constituted of sections from Waltham, West Cambridge, and Watertown. Watertown was settled in the beginning of the Massachusetts Bay colony, and as newcomers moved out from this old settlement they seem unaccountably to have overlooked the Belmont section. Fresh Pond, on its eastern border, was an attraction for some, but even there only a few people located in the early days. However, when ice became one of the exports of New England, Fresh Pond became the seat of this industry, and ice cut from it was shipped in large quantities to the West Indies.

The region that we know as the town of Wakefield belonged to the Saugus Indians whose chief lived where the city of Lynn is now located. Land was not conveyed to the white settlers until 1686, although settlers had been there much earlier under a grant from the colony's general court which called what is now Reading and Wakefield, Lynn Village. In the French and Indian Wars, men from Wakefield were at the capture of Louisburg, and served with General Wolfe at Quebec.

Wakefield's minutemen organized and were drilling at the first signs of trouble with Great Britain, and they served with distinction at Lexington, at Saratoga, and Valley Forge. Wakefield sent more than 400 men into the Continental Army.

In Malden, at Route 1 on Broadway, there is a marker of the old Indian trail over which the first white men passed through this region in 1629. They were William, Richard and Ralph Sprague, and they journeyed from Naumkeag (Salem) to Mishawam (Charlestown).

Malden men received some military training in the Indian wars prior to 1775, and in the military companies that were formed in anticipation of the war with Britain. As early as 1770 the town voted to use none of the imported English-taxed tea, and a few years later the inhabitants stated their grievances against the English Government and their intention of resisting further oppression. The town lived up to its intentions. Although it had a population of only 983, of whom at least 400 were under 16, it sent more than 175 men to the Continental Army.

Everett, established in 1870, was originally part of Malden, one of the first things done by the very early settlers of the Everett region in colonial times was to establish a penny ferry connecting the area with Boston. This was the only direct means of reaching Boston then, and the ferry remained in service until the opening of the "Malden Bridge" in 1787.

Everett was settled more than two centuries before it became a town. The squawsachem of the Indians conveyed a large tract to the white settlers in 1639 which included the section. In 1649 the general court set up the town of Malden, which included the Everett section of the Mystic side as the entire area was then called.

Medford is rich in the historical associations of Colonial and Revolutionary days. It was settled in 1630 by employees of Matthew Cradock, a London merchant. There is a marker at the Mystic Valley Parkway near Main Street on the site of the old ford over the Mystic River used until the building by Cradock's orders of a bridge at what was called Medford Center.

There is also a marker on the site of the lodge and lookout of Nanepashemit, the sachem of the Nipmuc Indians. His stockaded village, called Mystic, was about half a mile to the westward near High and Grove Streets in West Medford.

A marker locates the Royall House, a mansion built by Isaac Royall who came to Medford from Antigua in 1737. His son, Isaac Royall, a Loyalist during the Revolution, founded at Harvard what is now the oldest law professorship in the United States. During the Revolution, this house was the headquarters of General John Stark throughout the siege of Boston.

Medford was staunch in the revolutionary cause. Her company of 59 minutemen commanded by Isaac Hall fought at Lexington and Concord, and men, munitions, and money were supplied the Continental forces during the long and hard years that followed. Three citizens of Medford distinguished themselves as officers, Colonel John Brooks, later Governor of Massachusetts, Colonel Ebenezer Francis, mortally wounded at Whitehall, New York, and his brother John Francis who served continuously for 6 years in the Continental Army.

Daniel Townsend of Lynnfield was killed during the retreat of the British from the Concord fight. His body was found to have seven bullet wounds. His remains were taken to Lynnfield and according to an account written in 1875 "lay the next night in the Bancroft house, where the bloodstains remained for many years afterward."

One of the Revolutionary heroes of Saugus was Captain David Parker who mustered his company at an early hour on the day of the Concord fight, and marched it quickly to the scene where his men fought gallantly.

Although Chelsea was remote from the conflict, and the route to it circuitous, some of her citizens rendered important service. When provisions were sent to the relief of the British at Concord the convoy was intercepted at Arlington by a group of patriots led by the Reverend Mr. Payson of Chelsea.

The Chelsea company at Concord that day was commanded by Captain Samuel Sprague.

You have perhaps heard it said that history is to a nation what memory is to an individual. But this is more than a figure of speech; it contains a truth. We cannot afford to lose by neglect what is irreplaceable. We should all know our local, county, State, and National historical societies in their effort to save what is worth saving and which must be saved immediately, or lost forever.

There are many, many historical societies, and other similarly interested groups in Massachusetts. The directory of the National Trust of Historic Preservation lists the following member organizations in Massachusetts (and, of course, there are others which are not associated with the National Trust): the Balch House Associates of the Beverly Historical Society, the Beacon Hill Architectural Commission, the Beacon Hill Civic Association, the Castle Hill Foundation, the Chesterwood Studio Museum, the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, Your Own First Iron Works Association, the Gore Place Society, the Historic Districts Commission of the Town of Nantucket, the Ipswich Historical Society, the Milton Historical Society, the Nantucket Historical Association, the Old Dartmouth Historical Society, the Old South Association in Boston, Old Sturbridge Village, the Peabody Museum of Salem, the Pilgrim Society, the Plimoth Society, the Plimoth Plantation, the Porter-Phelps-Huntington Foundation, the Shaker Community in Pittsfield, and the Women's City Club of Boston.

A citizen's interest and knowledge of the history of his locality and his support of its historical society is part of his strength in these times of crisis and peril for the cause of freedom. A major weapon in the incredible and nerve-wracking cold war in which we find ourselves is the preservation of the visual and inspiring evidences of our country's career as it is revealed in the ennobling architecture and places of its history.

We must not let the ruthless hand of material progress reduce to rubble and oblivious our great national landmarks, wherever they may be.

The aspiration of the preservationists is to perform a national service for the American people and for freedom everywhere at a moment in history which is critically dangerous. Their desire is to help make the American people, themselves, conscious of their immense contribution to the Western World in the theory and practice of free political and legal institutions.

The preservationists' purpose is to thwart the propaganda that defaces the picture of our country before the world. The goal is to present visual, living, documented proof, some of it brick and stone, in hills and squares, in parks and commons, in heights and halls, in churches and statehouses, in homes and military sites, in all of these, proof that for the American people the cause of freedom was always the inner soul of their being.

Not only would our own countrymen see and learn and understand from the truths expressed in stone, mortar, and locale, but visitors by the millions from abroad would come to know the elementary facts and ideals of our tradition.

Millions of Americans plan tours abroad to look at old cities and beautiful monuments. Yet the very things that Americans seek for abroad they destroy at home. Old buildings are broken up in the United States as fast as used packing crates.

The preservation of the American heritage is thus and in fact a prodigious educational endeavor. We are not collecting museum pieces. We are not providing entertainment and picnic grounds. We are preserving American history.

If we in this area hold our unique and irreplaceable relics in the proper respect, and save them forever free from demolition, we shall have set an example that the rest of the country will gladly and rightly follow.

But it is up to us here, at the very center of these veritable reservoirs of our past, to create and emphasize this sense of history.

The current Civil War Centennial celebrations accomplish such a purpose, and do something more besides. Such celebrations are not without their proper economic side, if this aspect of the matter is intelligently motivated and wisely handled.

It is my understanding, based on information furnished to me by the report of chambers of commerce, that some 9 billions of dollars will be spent by tourists viewing historic scenes of the American Civil War during the centennial celebrations. Here are primarily educational enterprises, saturated with historical significance, that provide as byproducts highly desirable and beneficial economic gains for the localities which support them.

But, to be interesting and significant, historic places need not be associated with the Civil War, or with the battles of any war, for that mater. Every year thousands and thousands of people visit Washington Irving's mansion, Theodore Roosevelt's home in Oyster Bay, Long Island, Franklin Roosevelt's home at Hyde Park. These houses tell us something about great men. They add to our judgment and taste. They are authentic American history.

There is so much to be seen in Boston and in the areas around it. The scene of the Boston Massacre, Faneuil Hall, North Square and the old North Church, Dorchester Heights, Bunker Hill, the Capitol Building itself, the old corner bookstore, the Thomas Crease house, Shirley place and the Shirley-Eustis house, the Old South Meetinghouse, the Lexington and Concord Battle Road, the Minuteman National Historical Park in the towns of Lexington, Lincoln, and Concord, all of these constitute an historical treasure trove. Perhaps none of them surpasses in fidelity to historical detail the Saugus Ironworks restoration.

I think that we may justifiably hope that each year an increasing number of our people will become aware of what needs to be done in the field of local history and historic preservation.

As you know, and as I know, and as anyone may see by this restoration of the Saugus Ironworks, when Americans become convinced that something should be done, it will be done, and it is done, and it is well done.

Community of Telephone, Tex., Gives Nation an Example of Self-Help by a Small Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in the soaring plans being made for the age of the giant metropolis, the role of the tiny community of America in the space age is often overlooked. Yet their problems of development are sometimes far more difficult and are faced by the residents of these small communities with less help than larger cities, and with virtually no public credit when good work is done.

One small community in Texas has done such fine work in handling its own problems that its 200 residents have attracted statewide attention for their achievement.

In my opinion the work they have done in this community—Telephone, in Fannin County, Tex.—across the Red River from Oklahoma, is deserving of national recognition. I commend each and every citizen of Telephone, Tex., for their enterprise and community spirit that has achieved this national recognition. There is enterprise in Telephone.

I ask unanimous consent that an article by Associated Press writer Ronnie Thompson entitled "Dying Telephone Finds New Life" from the Sunday, June 22, 1963, edition of the San Antonio Express News, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Top Rural Community—Dying Telephone Finds New Life

(By Ronnie Thompson)

(Telephone, a tiny community near the banks of the Red River on the Texas-Oklahoma border, recently was named Texas' top rural community of 1963 by Texas A. & M. College's Extension Service. The less than 200 residents of Telephone are proud, because not many years ago their little town was dying.)

Telephone, Tex.—Like many Texas farming communities, Telephone once was a bustling town.

On Saturdays, wagons and buggies were so thick that hitching space was hard to find.

That was many years ago when its land was naturally rich. "King Cotton" ruled, corn grew tall and straight.

But like many such communities—Telephone—named in 1880 when Alexander Graham Bell's invention was new—began to die as industry took over America.

Many farmers were unable to stay abreast of mechanization and advanced techinques. Erosion took its toll, leaving tired, wornout soil. The boll weevil moved in to stay. Families left their farms to move to cities. Homes stood vacant.

As the years went by, the population dwindled. Children who grew up on the farms left to seek greater opportunities.

The relative handful that remained came to realize the seriousness of their plight. Last year 39 families decided to change things.

Twelve months later, after an extensive soil development and general improvement program, the northeast Texas community near the Red River was named the State's top rural community.

When residents speak of Telephone, they're talking about a cluster of farms drawn together by a few small stores, three churches, a post office and a barber shop.

A COMMON PURPOSE

Bob Old, farmer and president of the Telephone Community Improvement Club, describes it this way:

"We're just a group of people who have a common purpose * * * we call ourselves a community.

"We're pretty poor but we decided to change this. Our land had to be made richer * * * through proper fertilization.

During the last 12 months, five test plots of cotton were planted under controlled fertilization. The average yield was brought up from 378 pounds to 433 pounds of lint per acre—roughly .68 bales per acre.

Area farmers have put these results to work this year.

Similar discoveries were made in test plots of cotton and peanuts, other major crops.

Telephone has long range plans. By 1965, it hopes to have an average of a bale-per-acre cotton, 60-bushel-per-acre corn, and 60-bushel-per-acre peanuts.

Such yields, Old said, would raise farm family income $3,000. Last year's total farm gross income for the community was $302,000.

When the Texas A. & M. Extension Service's contest judges came to town, the development club had 34 major accomplishments listed from April 1, 1962, to April 1, 1963—the period judged.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Aside from a general sprucing up, these accomplishments included:

Organization of an oral polio immunization drive which resulted in 2,194 immunizations.

Construction of three new homes and remodeling of 17 others.

A fund drive for club projects which raised $1,187.30 with no individual contribution more than $25.

A Parent-Teachers Association box supper which raised $1,000 to help maintain a five-teacher school.

Also, less than a decade ago, the quiet Fannin County community didn't even have a telephone to match its name. Now, 37 out of 39 families have telephones.

The community received $450 for winning first place in the Texas Community Improvement Association.

"We're all proud," Old said. "But we're not going to let it go at that.

"We are determined to increase our income, to have economic opportunities for young and old to have better homes, better health conditions, better recreation, and better knowledge of our business and our world around us."

Free Friends of the Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, July 13, in conjunction with the national observation of Captive Nations Week of July 14–20, the Free Friends of the Captive Nations will parade in St. Louis as a manifestation of the fact that they have not forgotten the scores of millions of men and women who are citizens of the captive nations of the world.

It is strange, indeed, that those very nations Soviet Russia and Communist China which are actively undertaking a most determined program of colonalism can talk and be heard concerning the virtues of anti-imperialism and decolonization. The recent histories of Hungary and Tibet on the one hand and of the emerging nations of Africa on the other are tangible evidence of the true identity of the present-day imperialists. The facts are a firm rebuttal to the allegations of the Soviet Union, Red China, and certain self-styled neutral nations. But it is not enough to allow the facts to rebut the propaganda. In every possible way we must assert our determination to remain free ourselves and to reaffirm our unwillingness to be content as long as millions remain in bondage.

We must adopt a positive approach to the problems of our foreign policy. We cannot be content with the preservation of our own freedom, but must work to insure success and freedom for captive peoples the world over. We must make the world conscious of our belief that freedom is for all people and that true self-determination is the heart of freedom. It is for all people to choose the course of their future and to have the opportunity periodically to reassess their choice. Until the world is such that the citizens of all its nations have more than the right passively to assent to an oppressive form of government and more than the right to make a once and binding choice of government, we cannot rest content.

Accordingly, it is proper that we celebrate Captive Nations Week as a symbol of our consciousness of the present fate of these peoples and our determination that they shall not be forgotten. We are the present hope of these nations and must continue to be their hope for the future.

U.N. Achievements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in one way the U.N.'s present financial crisis has been beneficial; for it has stimulated many of our citizens and those of the free world to take stock of what the U.N. has achieved in the 17½ years since its inception. In the article which follows, Andrew W. Cordier, dean of the School of International Affairs of Columbia University and one of the foremost American experts on international organization, comments on the effectiveness of the U.N.:

It is argued in some quarters that the United Nations is ineffective—that we must rely on our NATO allies rather than on an organization of over 100 nations of different political systems, races, cultural backgrounds and economic development. This argument avoids the real issue. In the current world situation both NATO and the United Nations are essential. It is not a case of either one or the other. NATO is necessary and should be strengthened as a protection agains possible Communist aggression, while the United Nations is necessary and should be strengthened to cope with the many world problems and crises which could easily spread into major conflagrations. For example, the United Nations has in the last 6 years prevented at least three major conflicts, one in the Middle East, one in the Congo, one in New Guinea, and has recently turned a potential explosion in Ruanda-Urundi into a peaceful, constructive development of people from colonialism to freedom.

Again it is said, pursuing another line of argument, that the United Nations has been rendered useless by the Soviet veto. Yet in spite of over 100 Soviet vetoes in the Security Council and many Soviet negative votes in the General Assembly, the United Nations has acted forcefully on a wide range of political and economic problems. For example, the campaign of the Soviets against Dag Hammarskjold was defeated by a vote of confidence of 83 to 11. The Soviet campaign to replace a single Secretary General by a three-man "troika" had no support in any quarter, and U Thant was selected to complete Dag Hammarskjold's term of office. The United Nations Charter was based on the assumption of great power cooperation. The absence of this cooperation has been compensated for, sometimes decisively, by the collective strength and support of smaller powers joined in efforts, with ourselves, to achieve peaceful solutions.

It is also sometimes said that the small powers now can out-vote the great powers in the General Assembly and that therefore the United Nations is becoming "irresponsible." But the record as of today does not confirm this argument. For example, in the last General Assembly, by the end of the February session, 138 resolutions had been passed. Of these 89 were passed unanimously; 21 unanimously with a few abstentions; and 28 by a split vote, but with the necessary majority. During the last decade the General Assembly passed some 1,100 resolutions and only on somewhat less than a dozen of these, involving matters of direct interest, did the U.S. delegation find itself on the minority side. If we believe generally in a world community, we must become adjusted psychologically, in common with all other members, to being listed ocassionally on the minority side. The danger of being frequently outvoted in the General Assembly just does not exist under present circumstances.

It is argued by some that the United Nations is too costly. In strict concordance with our national wealth and income, in relation to other members, we pay about one-third of the United Nations budget. Yet all of the dollars spent by all of the United Nations agencies, on all United Nations programs, amount this year to $1.11 for each American. This compares with $280 per American spent for armaments. The real question with regard to the financial burden is not alone what other members of the United Nations will pay, but how deeply we believe, as Americans, in the principles for which the United Nations exists—and in the reasonably good record that it has made in support of these principles and our basic self-interest.

Community Theaters Spreading in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the widespread development of the community theater in West Virginia is described by the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail in its issue of June 16, 1963. Beckley, Charleston, Huntington, Logan, Parkersburg, Ripley, St. Albans, and Wheeling all now have regular dramatic presentations.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The 40th Year for Players

As in the case of many community theaters throughout the country, the Kanawha Players, of Charleston, came about as a result of the influence exercised by the Drama League of America formed in Evanston, Ill., back in the early part of this century. It was a reading and discussion group with the expressed purpose of elevating the theater to art in this country, and the interest aroused in turn brought about the formation of a number of actual theaters.

Charleston had its chapter of the Drama League, a small group of people who dreamed of having their own little theater, and producing quality plays, a dream that materialized into what is now the oldest, and in all probability, the strongest little theater organization in West Virginia. The Kanawha Players are now in the midst of the 40th season.

It was in the summer of 1922 that the group comprising the league chapter gathered together and engaged Miss Rose Fortier, a member of the faculty of the Mason College of Music and Fine Arts, as director, and thus their dream became crystallized into Kanawha Players.

Guiding lights at the historic occasion included Mrs. Hugh Nicholson, Miss Laura May Haughwout, Mrs. Harrold Sterrett, Mrs. Hunter McClintic, Miss Eleanor Chilton, Howard Baer, Abney Payne, Neil French, Sydney Laidley, and L. T. Bengston.

Today there are more than a half dozen community theaters in the State, others including Logan Community Players, St. Albans Little Theater, Beckley Curtain Callers, Community Players of Huntington, Kith 'n Hills Theater Society, Ripley, Little Theater of Wheeling, Inc., and Actors' Guild of Parkersburg, Inc.

W. S. Mason, head of the Mason School and a leading pioneer in the development of Charleston's musical life, became the first musical director for the Kanawha Players. Music for many years was an integral part of every play, the orchestra playing during intermission as well as before and after the play.

In November of 1922 the first offering was placed before the Charleston public. It comprised three one-act plays, which have come to be described as "grassroots plays, representative of the new realism." Several hundred people attended two performances given at Thomas Jefferson Junior High School, then Charleston High School. Audience reaction was favorable, and five more productions followed that season.

In the fall of 1923 Perceval Reniers, an early product of Harvard Universitys famous "47" Workshop, founded by George Pierce Baker, arrived in Charleston to replace Miss Fortier, who had left. He pieced out his salary by teaching elocution at the Mason School.

Now an established novelist and playwright, Reniers, who lives at White Sulphur Springs, stayed long enough to marry Ashton Fitzhugh Woodman, daughter of a prominent Charleston family. His leaving was brought about by the inability of the Players to pay him a salary any longer. That was in the spring of 1924, and Mrs. Phil Conley finished the season by directing "Smilin' Through."

For the next 2 years the Players continued to operate without professional directors. Then at the end of 1925, the group that had kept the organization going leased the old Methodist Church building on the corner of Washington and Dickinson streets, where the post office now stands. The Players promptly named it the Playhouse and became incorporated.

The Playhouse was used for rehearsals, first-night parties, meetings, and various social events as well as for theater. It seated 300 persons. By 1926 membership, both active and sustaining, had increased to around 400. Season tickets made their appearance for the first time. The cost was $10 for six plays.

Bruce McLeod, an old vaudeville trouper, who worked for a local utility company, was hired as part-time director. Plays averaged four performances, and the hit of the 1926-27 season was "Seventh Heaven." Since that time, of course, the players, like many cultural organizations that have to operate without subsidy, have had their ups and downs, and at times have faced what at the time appeared like sudden death, but there has always been a nucleus of zealots, happily, who have insisted on carrying on despite handicaps and the lack of local talent, such as was the case before World War II.

The first of the directors of note was Ramon Savich, who came in 1929 and remained four seasons. Edward J. Crowley, who was hired in 1934, and who remained for but a single season, exhibited real gifts as a director. He was followed by Richard N. Gage, who was in charge for 11 seasons, and who unquestionably was one of the players' outstanding directors, ranking along with the current holder of the position, Chris Ringham, Jr., who came in the fall of 1955.

Over the years the players have been pushed about from pillar to post, since the Playhouse fire April 10, 1936. Plays have been presented in such disparate places as Billy Bryant's old showboat, Intermediate Court, Shrine Mosque, Municipal Auditorium, Morris Harvey College Auditorium, Charleston Woman's Club, United Fuel Gas Auditorium, and, of course, the Civic Center Little Theater, the best of all.

For a time a policy of importing professional talent in guest artist roles was followed. Among those coming from outside were Dulcie Cooper, Elsa Wilbur, Matthew Smith, Lowell Gilmore, Staats Cotsworth, and William Cragin.

However, their performances do not stand out in one's mind as much as do those of some local people who made frequent appearances, among them being Charles F. Stuart, who was in the first production and is still with the players, Vondea Hamilton Mann, Elizabeth Sala Summers, Mimi Ohley Pickering, Silas W. Pickering, Mrs. J. Blackburn Watts, Louise Howell Dabney, Preston McClanahan, Ruth Downes, Charles Gilmour, William Snyder, and Dewey E. S. Kuhns.

An interesting sidelight stems from the fact that Mary Lee Settle, novelist, became attracted to the players following the arrival of Gage on the scene, and acted in several productions. While with the players, she gathered material of her first novel, "The Love Eaters," a story of theater and social snobbery.

Productions during the 40 seasons have been widely varying both as to quality and character of the play. Shakespeare, Shaw, Barrie, Noel Coward, Molnar Giraudoux, Albert Husson, A. A. Milne, Chekov, Pirandello, and Emlyn Williams have been among the foreign playwrights represented, while the more prominent native playwrights have included Eugene O'Neill, Maxwell Anderson, Robert E. Sherwood, William Saroyan, Arthur Miller, John van Druten, Sidney Howard, John Patrick, Tennessee Williams, Paul Osborn, and Sidney Kingsley.

With the arrival of the centennial year of West Virginia, the players are again enjoying an era of prosperity with membership high and with audiences for performances for the most part being very satisfactory. In addition, the practice of giving experimental productions at the Kanawha City workshop is now in its second season and is attracting increased public interest.

As a special bonus centennial attraction the players in May presented a play by a West Virginia playwright and novelist that is based on a historical event very pertinent to the State's 100-year birthday. It was "The Anvil" by Julia Davis, and it deals with the trial of John Brown, the famous abolitionist, known for his attack on Harpers Ferry in 1859 when he and his men captured an armory and planned to free the Negro slaves by force.

WINS Asks Tax Break for Entertainers, Authors, and Ballplayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a most thoughtful radio editorial which was broadcast by WINS on May 29, 1963. The editorial points out the present effect of the Internal Revenue Code on entertainers, authors, and ballplayers whose income is high 1 year and low the next because of the nature of their business. The editorial praises President Kennedy's proposal that a person whose yearly gross income jumps one-third over the average of the previous 4 years could add up his income for all 5 years, strike an average, and pay his income tax on the basis of this average. I believe that this is eminently fair and urge that all my colleagues support this tax reform.

The editorial follows:

TAX RELIEF FOR BALLPLAYERS, ACTORS, AND AUTHORS

(By Mark Olds)

Meet Barry Smith, standup comic, a funny man with tax woes he just can't seem to laugh off.

For years, Barry had knocked around nightclubs, hoping to get his big break. His average yearly earnings during this gruelling apprenticeship—$5,000 per annum.

Then last year, something incredible happened. He suddenly came out of nowhere and became big box office, and when income tax time rolled around, he found himself in the 90-percent bracket, keeping about $10,000 out of the $100,000 he had earned. Over the last 5 years, our mythical comedian had earned about $120,000 and had taken home only $26,000.

Good deal for the Treasury. Bad news for Barry.

Now, however, Barry may get some relief. So might the thousands of actors, ballplayers and authors who are in the same bind—that of having incomes that fluctuate violently from year to year.

The break would come from a bit of Kennedy-backed tax reform that is now awaiting approval in the House action basket.

The bill would work this way: If a taxpayer's yearly gross jumps one-third over the average of the previous 4 years, he could add up all his income for all 5 years, strike an average, and pay the average figure as his tax for each year.

A fair solution, WINS feels, for the long-neglected problem of people with incomes that vary tremendously from year to year.

WINS, therefore, urges New York City's congressional delegation to rally behind the measure, and help it gain passage.

The U.N.: Political Leadership for the Nonalined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, some of the ways in which the U.N. contributes to the political order of the world community were not foreseen in the charter, nor are they easily and commonly recognized. The following excerpt from an article by Herbert Nicholas points out a little-discussed U.N. function, that of providing political direction to the nonalined nations:

Put in the narrower perspective of "the West's interests, it is the membership of these states in the U.N., and, as a corollary, their participation in the tasks (e.g., the Congo force) of the organization as well as in the benefits (e.g., technical aid) that provide the strongest guarantees that their nonalinement will not end in their being swept into the Communist embrace. Useless to allege—or indeed to deny—that they introduce elements of unpredictability, uncertainty, irresponsibility, even, upon occasion, sheer incomprehension, into the workings of the U.N. But this is because these elements exist in the real world to which we and they belong. The temptation to exclude them from the U.N. is the temptation to preserve a neat and cosy model at the price of distorting what reality is like. But it is also true that the votes they cast and the speeches they will untiringly make will be more or less responsible according as they have more or less faith in the impartiality and courage of the executive head of the organization. Dag Hammarskjöld had to suffer much at the hands of those he tried to help but if the record of this tenure proves anything it proves this. In the present "twilight of colonialism" we shall never see the independent states of Africa line up behind the leadership of a European great power as the Latin Americans did behind the United States. The one chance of retaining their support for some sort of orderly and peaceful development in international relations, rather than being seduced by communism or relapsing into anarchy, lies in the leadership of a U.N. Secretary-General they can trust—though, of course, he in turn will need all the support the Western Powers can give him.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Voluntary Action, Not Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the recklessness of trying to force people how to think and act and conduct their private lives and businesses in the area of human relations is more than ever being brought to the attention of the American people as a result of the President's so-called civil rights package of proposed legislation.

The Atlanta Journal, in a number of recent editorials, has pointed out that problems concerning personal and private activities are matters which should be resolved voluntarily, according to local conditions and individual consciences, and not by threats, coercion and highhandedness by the Federal Government.

I ask unanimous consent that two of these editorials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT SHOULD BE VOLUNTARY

There is a right way and a wrong way to do things, a hard way and an easy way, a voluntary and an involuntary way.

When local conditions make possible the desegregation of facilities such as hotels and restaurants on a voluntary basis, that is all right.

The key word is voluntary and that is the way it should be done.

Such has been the Atlanta system so far, a gradual process based on conversation, negotiation and collective bargaining.

The results have been sensible solutions sensibly arrived at.

Compulsion by Washington?

It is not needed in places where local conditions make voluntary solutions possible.

In places where local conditions are impossible, compulsion would only add to the strain and resentment.

National politics notwithstanding, local customs, traditions, and usage must be honored in working out these problems. Any other course is reckless.

GOVERNMENT BY MINORITY?

When a politician starts preaching on moral issues an election most likely is coming up.

Expediency generally is the basic morality in politics. And the correct thing to do is that which will win the most votes.

So it is with the package of civil rights bills turned over to Congress by the President. This package contains some dangerous articles, some of which are impossible of enforcement and some of which should be impossible to pass.

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE describes it as setting up a police state in the area of human relations.

It does about everything except name the military governors and provinces.

The package is a strong bid for the Negro vote which the administration already has. If it is true, as some suggest, that the administration has been panicked or blackmailed into this by some of the most radical of the Negro leaders, it could be the biggest backfire in recent political history.

The majority may remember it has rights, too.

The President says he wants it to calm racial tensions. It very well could increase them by encouraging irresponsible agitators in the belief that they are beyond the law, or can order laws written.

The bills were submitted to Congress after a great softening up barrage by bellwether columnists and other commentators.

The greatest favor Congress now can do the country is scrutinize and debate every comma in these measures.

They are not necessary. Some are dangerous. There are other solutions.

Majorities have their rights, too. As Representative CARL VINSON of Milledgeville tells us, the President's proposals are based on the concept that minorities have rights which supersede their obligations.

This is both dangerous and immoral. It would be fine if it also turned out to be inexpedient.

William Lowndes Calhoun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to meet Adm. William L. Calhoun at the launching last Saturday, June 22, of the Polaris submarine, *John C. Calhoun*, in Newport News, Va. Admiral Calhoun's lovely daughter, Rosalie, christened the *John C. Calhoun;* and the admiral's charming wife was the matron of honor. Admiral Calhoun is a great grandson of the famous South Carolina statesman. Admiral Calhoun rendered this Nation and the free world magnificent service during World War II as the genius behind the unexcelled logistic support for our Pacific Fleet and the highly successful campaigns of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

The following is a brief résumé of the long and briliant career of Admiral Calhoun:

ADM. WILLIAM L. CALHOUN

William Lowndes Calhoun was born in Palatka, Fla., on July 13, 1884, son of Benjamin Putman and Julia Catherine (Peterman) Calhoun. He attended Palatka High School, and was appointed to the U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., from his native State in 1902. As a midshipman he was a member of the rifle team. Graduated on February 12, 1906, he served the 2 years at sea, then required by law, and was commissioned on February 12, 1908. He subsequently advanced to the rank of vice admiral to date from February 27, 1942, and was transferred to the retired list of the U.S. Navy in that rank on December 1, 1946. On January 14, 1954, at Coronado, Calif., Fleet Adm. C. W. Nimitz, U.S. Navy, delivered Admiral Calhoun a commission dated August 7, 1947, promoting him to admiral on the retired list.

Ordered first to the U.S.S. *Chattanooga*, on Asiatic station, he remained aboard until November 1908, then reported to the commander in chief, Atlantic Fleet, for duty in the U.S.S. *New Jersey*. In May 1909 he was ordered to Puget Sound, Wash., to join the U.S.S. *Maryland*, and served on board that armored cruiser until 1913, as gunnery officer for 18 months, and for 1 month as chief engineer as additional duty. During that period the *Maryland* won the Gunnery Trophy and Battle Efficiency Pennant. In July 1913 he reported as Inspector of Ordnance of the Connecticut District, Watervliet Arsenal, West Troy, N.Y., and Lake Torpedo Boat Co., Bridgeport, Conn.; and in December 1914 was assigned additional duty as Inspector-Instructor of Naval Militia, Bridgeport and South Norwalk.

From August 1915 until December of that year he had instruction in submarines on board the U.S.S. *Columbia*, U.S.S. *Tonopah*, and U.S.S. *Cheyenne*, and qualified for command of submarines. He was then ordered to Long Beach, Calif., to fit out the U.S.S. *L–7*, as prospective commanding officer. When so assigned he had additional duty as inspector of machinery and ordnance at Craig Shipbuilding Co., Long Beach, and works of Hall Scott Motor Co., West Berkeley, Calif. As additional duty he also commanded the U.S.S. *Farragut*, was inspector-instructor of naval militia at Los Angeles and Santa Barbara, and in June 1917 served as acting inspector of machinery, works of the California Shipbuilding Co., at Long Beach, and as a member of the Joint Merchant Vessel Board, 12th District Section, in San Francisco.

Detached from the U.S.S. *L–7* on December 6, 1917, the day before she was placed in commission, he became commander, Submarine Force Division 1, U.S. Atlantic Fleet, later designated commander, Submarine Flotilla 1, Atlantic. In December 1918, after the armistice, he was assigned additional duty as commander, Submarine Base and Naval Air Station, Coco Solo, C.Z. He assumes command when that base was commissioned in 1919, and that year was awarded the Victory Medal with submarine clasp. In April 1919 he had temporary duty with the Cruiser Force, U.S. Fleet, and in May joined the U.S.S. *Mississippi*, in which he served as gunnery officer until December 1920. The *Mississippi* won the highest individual ship gunnery honors for the years 1919–20.

In February 1921 he reported for duty in connection with fitting out the U.S.S. *California* as the battleship's prospective gunnery officer. Before she was commissioned, however, he was assigned duty as Naval Inspector of Ordnance in Charge, Naval Ammunition Depot, Mare Island, Calif., where he served from April 1921 to July 1923. He then assumed command of the U.S.S. *Young*, and was serving as her commanding officer when that destroyer went aground at Point Honda, Calif., on September 8, 1923. The ensuing court of inquiry and general court-martial rendered a verdict of fully acquitted.

He was awarded a letter of commendation by the Secretary of the Navy which included the following statement: "His coolness, intelligence and seamanlike ability shown after the vessel under his command stranded, was the outstanding feature of the disaster. Every member of the crew who reached the beach owed his life to Commander Calhoun."

In December 1923, following temporary duty on the U.S.S. *Melville*, he reported to the battleship U.S.S. *Maryland*, commissioned in 1921. He served as her navigator until June 1925, when he was detached at Honolulu, T.H., then returned to the United States for a second tour of duty as Naval Inspector of Ordnance in Charge, Naval Ammunition Depot, Mare Island. He next served as commander, Division 31, Destroyer Squadrons, Battle Fleet, his pennant on the U.S.S. *Farragut*. That division won the battle efficiency penant in 1928, and for continued battle efficiency attained while he was in command, June 1927 to June 1929, he received letters of commendation from President Calvin Coolidge and Secretary of the Navy Curtis D. Wilbur.

Completing the senior course at the Naval War College, Newport, R.I., in May 1930, he served from June of that year until February 1932 as head of the department of navigation at the Naval Academy. He then returned to sea as commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Rochester*, and from July 1933 until July 1934 served as chief of staff to Commander Base Force, U.S. Fleet, reporting to Headquarters, 11th Naval District, San Diego, Calif., for his next tour of duty. On June 5, 1937, he assumed command of the U.S.S. *California*, which he had assisted in fitting out in 1921. He remained in that command until January 1938, when he was designated chief of staff and aide to Commander Battleships, Battle Force. In November 1938 he was commissioned rear admiral.

He attended the advanced course at the Naval War College for 6 months, and on December 27, 1939, became Commander, Base Force, U.S. Fleet, redesignated Base Force, Pacific Fleet in February 1941. From August of that year until February 1942 he had additional duty as Commander, Train Squadron 2. On February 27, 1942, he became commander, Service Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet, with the accompanying rank of vice admiral, and served in that capacity until March 1945. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal and the Legion of Merit, with citations, in part, to follow:

Distinguished Service Medal: "For exceptionally meritorious service * * * as Commander Base Force and Commander Service Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet, in connection with operations against the enemy in the Pacific War Area from December 1939 to February 1945. Charged with logistic support or the Pacific Fleet and naval shore-based establishments in the Pacific Ocean Area, (he) applied keen intelligence and resourceful initiative to the complexities of his assignment and, working with tireless energy, planned and organized a greatly enlarged service of supply which enabled him to provide personnel, provisions, fuel and ammunition for all fleet operations and thereby accommodate the vital needs of our constantly increasing naval forces in this strategic theater of war with remarkable expediency."

Legion of Merit: "For exceptionally meritorious conduct * * * while attached temporarily to the staff of Commander South Pacific, during the period 18 October to 7 December 1942 * * * (He) was instrumental in initiating and establishing the logistic supply system for the South Pacific Forces * * * in the face of most difficult transportation problems and concurrent combat reactions."

From March 6 to October 1945 he served as commander, South Pacific Force and Area, and was awarded a Gold Star in lieu of the second Legion of Merit for outstanding services and swill in the performance of his duties. The citation states that he was "instrumental in promptly initiating and administering efficient measures for moving personnel and supplies forward from the South Pacific Area into the more advanced combat areas * * * resulting in the acceleration of the campaign in the Central Pacific."

Returning to the United States in October 1945, he had temporary duty in the Office of the Inspector General, Navy Department, and in February 1946 reported to commander, Western Sea Frontier, for duty as general inspector for that area. In April 1946 he was ordered relieved of all active duty and, following a period of leave, was transferred to the retired list after 44 years of active naval service. On January 14, 1954, he was given the combat promotion to admiral, U.S. Navy, retired, his commission dated August 7, 1947. Fleet Adm. C. W. Nimitz flew from Berkeley to Coronado to make personal delivery of this commission at the Naval Air Station, San Diego.

In addition to the Distinguished Service Medal and the Legion of Merit with Gold Star in lieu of the second award, Admiral Calhoun has been designated to wear the Combat "V" and has the Nicaraguan Campaign Medal; the Victory Medal, Submarine Clasp (World War I); the Yangtze Service Medal; American Defense Service Medal, Fleet Clasp; the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal; and the World War II Victory Medal.

Admiral Calhoun is a great grandson of Mr. John Caldwell Calhoun, Vice President of the United States, from South Carolina. He was married on February 10, 1946, to Miss Rosalie Oneschuk, of Milford, Mass., ex-first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps. Mrs. Calhoun served from June 1943 to August 1945 in the South Pacific Force, at 8th Army General Hospital, Dumbea, New Caledonia. They reside at 1115 Alameda Boulevard, Coronado, Calif. They have two sons, Alexander Oneschuk Calhoun, and Patrick Noble Calhoun; and a daughter, Rosalie Julia Calhoun. He has two sons by a former marriage, William L. Calhoun, Jr., and John C. Calhoun.

United States Hires Unqualified Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD another outstanding editorial from the Columbia Record, of Columbia, S.C. This editorial is entitled "United States Hires Unqualified Negroes," and was printed in the June 24, 1963, issue of the Columbia Record. It is the sequel to another excellent editorial from the Columbia Record which I placed in the RECORD on page A3945 on June 24, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES HIRES UNQUALIFIED NEGROES

(Denial of the right to work is unfair, regardless of its victim. It is doubly unfair to throw its burden on an individual because of his race or color.—President Kennedy.)

Nowhere in his civil rights message to Congress did President Kennedy note with righteous indignation a discrimination in employment that grows daily by leaps and bounds, all across the Nation. The discrimination, transcending the law, is directed from Washington.

The President ignored the discrimination "because of race or color" because the white citizen is its victim, the employer is the Federal Government, and the whole drive is the result of extraordinary pressures brought by Vice President JOHNSON's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

These things are happening in the United States:

1. The Civil Service Commission regulations are being reduced to a meaningless shamble;
2. Unqualified Negroes are being hired even though qualified whites are being rejected;
3. Federal agents are hunting Negro applicants in the boondocks, even though white applicants are being spurned;
4. Unrealistic and illogical "percentages" of Negro employees are being forced on local agencies;
5. And Federal supervisory officials are threatened with the loss of their own jobs if such discriminations are not made in favor of the Negro.

Last Thursday (June 20) the Record cataloged a series of such startling violations of any respectable concept of "fair employment." Since that time, we've not only corroborated the incidents but have received communications about similar ones and even more astonishing revelations.

Federal supervisory officials, we have now learned, have been instructed by their Washington directors to hire certain percentages of Negro employees or be fired. In several instances, the top personnel were given the choice of implementing the program, being transferred, or resigning Government employ.

The only qualification, in some agencies, an applicant needs in this weird June month of 1963 is "the right color." The color is not white.

It doesn't matter whether the new Negro employees are qualified or unqualified. Washington has directed that "unqualified Negroes be placed on temporary employment" for 800 hours, at the end of which time the employee is to be qualified. (Eight hundred hours adds up to about 5 months.)

If a Federal agency can scrounge around and find more than its "quota" of qualified Negroes, it has been given instructions to hire them. "Disregard the fact that there is no opening. Hire them. Forget about the money. Washington'll supply it."

The vital civil service register, at the heart and core of the Government's merit system, has gone by the boards. In one southern area, the register was simply abolished. Object: to hire and upgrade Negroes with a total disregard for civil service regulations.

In other areas, the Civil Service Commission has just been bypassed or ignored.

"Never before," said one Federal official, "has my agency been involved in politics. Never. Now, it's completely saturated."

With all the seriousness that the Record can muster, it appeals to Congress to immediately investigate such violations. We may have reached the point where, also, Congress must establish a counterpart to Vice President JOHNSON's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Federal jobs.

It might be called the Committee on Equal White Employment Opportunity.

Inequities in Expense Account Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. The serious economic effects brought on by the Revenue Act of 1962 and the confusion surrounding it as it pertains to travel and entertainment expenditures have led me to introduce a bill, H.R. 6244. This bill would abolish the artificial and arbitrary standards of the present law in favor of a standard of reasonableness.

The repressive economic effects of the present law will result in the abolition of 140,000 jobs and a loss of $1 billion in sales in the food and lodging industry if allowed to continue, according to a survey taken by the National Restaurant Association. In New York City alone, an annual sales loss of $117 million and the elimination of 14,000 jobs can be expected. The Revenue Act of 1962 was designed to produce revenue; unfortunately it is causing a tremendous sales loss and resultant unemployment, the ultimate effect being the loss of revenue. Treasury Department statistics indicated that $100 million in increased revenue could be expected, but $50 million in lost income from workers can be anticipated and $30 million in lost taxes from vanished business income. When we add $126 million for unemployment compensation benefits, we can see a loss of more money than the law had intended to produce.

What is the cause of all this? Much of the loss of business in the food and lodging industry can be attributed to the confusion surrounding the law. A befuddlement among the business community as to what is, and what is no longer, deductible is heightened by the 174 pages of implementing regulations that attempt to clarify the law and set down the recordkeeping requirements.

Why is the businessman confused? Because he is faced with new and totally unrealistic artificial standards of deductibility. No longer is he safe when he incurs an ordinary and necessary expense in the business entertainment area. He must consider the surroundings not in the light of his own intentions or practices but as they will appear to the revenue agent who audits his return.

If he wants to entertain merely to convey good will, he must do so in a quiet place, for there he does not have to talk business. If the place is too noisy to talk business, the businessman can still get the deduction by talking business. The question of deductibility thus seems to center on what is noisy. Perhaps the presence of more than two musicians would constitute a noisy place. To assure compliance with the law, the restaurant owner discharges all of his musicians. They stand in the unemployment lines knowing their former employer now runs a quiet place. No one seems to have an adequate answer for them as to why it should be necessary.

I have introduced a bill that would eliminate these apparently arbitrary standards that can only ultimately bring disrespect of the law itself. My bill would adopt a standard of reasonableness as the determinant of deductibility. Such a standard can be understood by the business community. It is already present in the Internal Revenue Code. Having worked in other fields, it will work in the expense account area. Why should travel and entertainment expenditures be treated any differently from any other business expenditures? Adequate but not unduly burdensome records must still be kept. Such a standard leaves no loopholes for cheaters, but neither does it penalize the honest businessman by confusing him with artificial standards and oppressive recordkeeping.

Green Bank, W. Va., Home of Radio Astronomy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the West Virginia town of Green Bank, in Pocahontas County, is the home of one of the most unusual scientific facilities in the world—the National Radio Astronomy Observatory.

According to the June 16, 1963, issue of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail, radio astronomy is one of the most important new sciences for exploring the nature of the universe. I ask unanimous consent that the Gazette-Mail's article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the Record, as follows:

GREEN BANK, W. VA., HOME OF RADIO ASTRONOMY

Selection of a radio telescope as the official emblem of the centennial commission is symbolic of West Virginia's emergence as an important contributor to the space age.

The State not only is a world leader in the burgeoning science of radio astronomy but it also is participating in the effort to make the United States paramount in the peaceful and military use of missiles and satellite boosters.

With the establishment of the National Radio Astronomy Observatory at Green Bank, West Virginia became the home of a scientific facility unmatched in the remainder of the world.

NRAO is a unique institution in radio astronomy. It is designed, with the support of the Federal Government, through the National Science Foundation, to permit scientists to press outward to the most distant reaches of the universe.

Radio astronomy is a new science brought into being by Karl Jansky in 1931. While doing research work at the Bell Telephone Laboratories, Jansky discovered that some radio noise was reaching earth from outer space.

Astronomers now know that the earth is continually bathed in a flood of cosmic noise—a cacophony of whistles, howls, screeches, moans, and whispers. Radio astronomers are able to make sense of the sounds and from them make deductions about the nature of the universe.

Their most important tools for doing this are the giant radio telescopes that dominate the landscape in out of the way locations like Green Bank. The telescopes actually are extremely sensitive radio receivers.

They have to be located in isolated regions because the amount of manmade noises that are found in or near population centers would cause interference severe enough to make them unworkable.

At Green Bank, more than a dozen radio telescopes are in operation. The two most important are parabolic shaped receivers with diameters of 85 and 300 feet. The latter is the largest steerable telescope in the world.

Astronomers at the center have done important work on planets within the solar system and on galaxies—the Milky Way as well as others.

Galactic studies eventually hint at solutions to the greatest mystery of all: The way in which the universe was created. The radio window has given science an enlarged view of the fundamental processes of nature.

Green Bank already has added to man's knowledge. It was in Pocahontas County that the intense heat of Venus was firmly established. The hypothesis was reinforced by the voyage of Mariner II past Venus. Green Bank cooperated in the Mariner program with a series of fixed observations coordinated with those made by the satellite.

NRAO also has made the only formal attempt to locate life that scientists agree exists outside the universe. Project Ozma, although brief and of limited capability, nonetheless excited the imagination of the world.

With the addition of new instruments at the observatory—a continuous process since its creation—the consensus is that NRAO will add substantially to man's knowledge of the universe.

SBA Announces New Loan Guarantee Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in line with the recommendations of the Interagency Committee on Federal Credit Programs, Administrator John E. Horne, of the Small Business Administration, has announced a new loan guarantee plan and under unanimous consent I include a press release on this announcement in the Appendix of the Record. The press release follows:

A new loan guarantee plan, in line with recommendations made to President Kennedy last February by the Interagency Committee on Federal Credit Programs, was announced today by the Small Business Administration.

The new loan plan, which goes into effect July 1, modifies SBA's old deferred bank participation loan agreement, and changes the regulations Covering such loans, to conform with the Committee recommendations.

The Committee recommended that Government-financed credit programs should supplement or stimulate private lending, rather than substitute for it, and President Kennedy suggested that all Federal credit agencies be guided by the principles outlined in the recommendations.

The loan guarantee plan has the full endorsement of the American Bankers Association, and is a forward step designed to enable commercial banks to continue their cooperation with SBA in providing term loans to small concerns.

In announcing the loan guarantee plan, Small Business Administrator John E. Horne said, "We are very appreciative of the cooperation we have received from the commercial banks of the country, and we are gratified that the loan guarantee plan has the full support of the American Bankers Association.

"I am sure the Nation's commercial banks will find our new program attractive and will cooperate with us in making this type of small business financing effective."

For a guarantee not exceeding 75 percent of the loan the bank will pay SBA one-half of 1 percent guarantee fee a year; and for a guarantee in an amount in excess of 75 percent of the loan, it will pay a guarantee fee to the SBA of 1 percent a year.

Under the new program, SBA will agree to purchase the guaranteed portion, not in excess of 90 percent of the outstanding loan, but only upon default, and further agrees to make available a liquidity advance to the bank up to the extent of the guaranteed portion of the loan if it is not in default. The liquidity privilege will be for a period or periods aggregating not more than 90 days during any 12 months from the date of the issuance of the guarantee. The minimum time of any period for which the bank may obtain an advance is 15 days. The bank will pay the SBA interest at the rate of 4½ percent per annum during the time it uses the liquidity privilege.

Mr. Horne said that other SBA loan plans, which include direct loans to small businesses as well as other types of bank participation agreements, will remain unchanged. Deferred bank participation loans approved by SBA prior to the July 1 deadline will, of course, not be affected by the revised loan plan.

The guarantee feature is also available under the simplified bank loan participation plan (SELP).

Religion Leaves the School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it certainly is not surprising that the Supreme Court's decision in Abington School District against Schempp and Murray against Curlett has been met with a mixed reaction and a great deal of misunderstanding on the part of the American public at large. However, the decision has been accepted even by those who disagree with it in whole or in part, in the hope that it is in the best interests of our Nation and our future, as expressed by the following editorial from the Hune 19 Tri-County Publications of Anoka County, Minn.:

RELIGION LEAVES THE SCHOOL

Seldom has an event aroused the widespread discussion and divergence of opinion resulting from this week's Supreme Court decision banning prayer in the public schools.

Because the suit leading up to the ruling was instituted by an avowed atheist, there are many who rightfully view this as a glaring example of minority rule, disbelievers being few and far between in our American society.

But the sagacious jurists who rendered the majority decision were compelled to look far beyond their personal feelings. They found implications of the state versus church factor, as well as the constitutional right to freedom of thought. Only time will prove the wisdom or fallacy of their verdict.

One effect of the decision is to place responsibility for moral teachings squarely on the shoulders of parents and the church, which is probably where it belonged in the first place. The family which believes in prayer is not likely to be a family of delinquents, and society generally finds little to criticize in the home where Bible reading or religious instruction is practiced.

Wise parents will accept the challenge by placing greater stress on moral virtues in the rearing of their offspring.

We personally deplore the decision. A nonsecular prayer at the opening of the school day serves just as valid a purpose as an invocation at a banquet or any group gathering. It is an American institution which has had a sobering influence from our Nation's beginnings up to the present.

If this decision results in a closer bond among those who believe, and at the same time protects the rights of the individual, it will have served a useful purpose.

Homage to a Supreme Being

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the controversy over the Supreme Court's Bible reading decision continues.

If it did nothing more it appears to have been responsible for some churchmen bringing a rather serious indictment upon themselves. They are probably charter members of the "honest confession good for the soul" group. I refer to those who state this decision will inevitably inspire churches to do more work among their followers. It indicates further many are now indicating they were "coasting" when they might well have been more gainfully employed "pushing".

The following editorial the York (Pa.) Dispatch, presents a new approach to the problem:

THE PLACE OF RELIGION

"The place of religion in our society," wrote Supreme Court Justice Tom Clark, "is an exalted one, achieved through a long tradition of reliance on the home, the church and the inviolable citadel of the individual heart and mind."

With these words we find no fault.

But we very strenuously dispute the Supreme Court's decision outlawing devotional Bible reading and recitation of the Lord's prayer in public school classrooms.

And we question the views of various churchmen who hold the Supreme Court decision to be correct and who contend, moreover, that it is helpful in that it will inspire churches to greater work among their followers.

Are we to believe that churches have not been functioning at full capacity, that ministers have been remiss, depending upon the school to carry the word of God to children?

Who? Where?

The implication that the Supreme Court ruled out the teaching of religion in the public schools is misleading, and goes to the heart of the controversy over Bible reading and the recitation of prayer in the classroom.

Bible reading and praying was never intended as a period of religious instruction or, if you will, a period of proselytization. Rather, the practice was one of homage to God.

What the Supreme Court has denied is not religious instruction, but religious homage. It has, in effect, endorsed the view of those who deny or question that God exists by blacking him out of the Nation's schools.

Miss Sallie's Last "Amen"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time an editorial column of my good friend, John Lopp, of the Auburndale (Fla.) Star, entitled "Miss Sallie's Last 'Amen'."

I commend this article to all readers of the RECORD. It speaks for itself. I wonder if this is the direction toward which we are now headed. The editorial follows:

MISS SALLIE'S LAST "AMEN"

(By John D. Lopp)

The little red schoolhouse had been newly painted. The floor was freshly oiled, the windows neatly washed.

Miss Sallie Smith, who had taught in that tiny mountain-locked valley for more than 40 years, had taken especial pains to see that each picture hung perfectly straight on the newly painted wall above the cleanly washed blackboards.

Looking through the window, Miss Sallie could see a cloud of dust rising up from the winding road trailing down from Peak's Nob, the only entry into the valley.

Miss Sallie could see other things, too. Just outside the window stood a huge truck, loaded with strange equipment and with "New Frontier Broadcasting Co." painted on its side. From the top peered down a cameralike device, its single eye trained through the window.

Farther back there were more trucks, painted a military green, with company and the regimental identification letters and numbers of a crack combat command.

And around the trucks were soldiers in battle garb—green fatigue uniforms, complete with tin hats, ammunition belts, entrenching tools, gas masks, and canteens.

They stood at parade rest just beyond the rocky baseball diamond, where Miss Sallie had watched three generations of Pleasant Valley children play scrub and choose-up and one-eyed cat at recess time and before the start of school each morning when weather permitted.

The children weren't playing ball this morning. They clustered in groups around the soldiers, or eyed the TV truck with awe and distrust.

Miss Sallie looked at the face of the old Seth Thomas clock high on the wall behind her desk.

"It's time," she sighed as she reached for the brass hand bell with which she had summoned generation after generation in from play. Beside it on her desk the torn scraps of paper which had been a cease and desist order, signed by a Federal judge and served on her that very morning by the trim Army officer that led the troops surrounding the school.

She had methodically torn it up after the colonel had read it to her.

She had been tempted to throw the tiny pieces into his face—but she had restrained herself in time. One must be an example for the children, she had told herself as she bit her lips and dropped the crumpled bits on her desk.

On her way to the door she hesitated long enough to wipe a speck of dust from the picture of George Washington. She paused before a painting of Mollie Pitcher firing her cannon, and another of Barbara Fritchie leaning out of an upstairs window and waving Old Glory.

"If I can only be as brave," she whispered softly as she opened the door and rang the bell.

She faced the children a few minutes later.

It was, she knew, the last time she would ever look into their faces—today bright with extra scrubbing and excitement above the collars of Sunday shirts and best dresses.

"We will begin in the usual manner," she told the class, by reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

She led the recitation, stressing the phrase "under God" and wondering if the soldiers outside could hear and if the microphone attached to the TV truck was picking up her voice.

The pledge finished, the children bowed their heads, just as they and the children before them had done every schoolday for the 40 years that she has directed the tiny classroom.

"Our Father," she began, struggling to keep her voice from trembling, "Who art in heaven."

The blended voices had reached "Forgive us our trespasses" when the blow of gun butts splintered the door—knocked it off the hinges.

Burly paratroopers in tin helmets and with submachineguns, at ready, stomped through the shattered doorway and advanced toward her.

One child—and only one—screamed. The others continued the prayer just as if the troopers were not filing into the classroom.

"For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, forever." The voices were high with terror now as two husky sergeants seized the teacher, clamping her arms behind her and half leading, half dragging her toward the shattered door.

Miss Sallie was ashamed of her "Amen." It wasn't as loud and clear as she had intended, but the force by which she was half dragged across the schoolyard and into a waiting truck made it difficult to say even so simple and sincere a word.

The children were herded into the truck beside her. Two armed guards swung up on the tailgate, with fixed bayonets on their carbines.

The motor roared.

"Take 'em to camp 14," the colonel ordered, as he pushed back his shiny steel helmet and turned to look directly into the eye of the TV camera that had greedily followed the drama.

"That, by God, should be the last Amen," he remarked for all the world to see and hear.

And it was.

God had finally been eliminated from the last school in the whole of the people's democracy of the United States of America.

Foreign Gambling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to take the Members of this House to Europe and observe the gambling operations in four more foreign countries. These nations are among the 77 foreign countries which recognize and accept the fact that the urge to gamble is a universal, instinctive human trait which should be controlled and regulated for the Government's benefit and the people's welfare.

England has, since 1956, a premium bond lottery. Under this proposal, the interest earned on the bonds is paid in the form of prizes. In addition thereto, England does have many other forms of legalized gambling such as horse racing, dog racing, and football pools. Last year, the Government sold $199 million in bonds and awarded $43 million in prizes. This lottery device has helped England sell its bonds which prior thereto were not selling sufficiently to meet the Government's need for revenue.

Finland is a small nation of a little over 4 million people, but size notwithstanding, it is noted for cultural and artistic attainment. The Finns are not a rich people, and they find it difficult to provide for the sustenance and promotion of their cultural heritage. They are quite dependent upon the national lottery as a means to this end. There is no evidence that they find this money somewhat tainted, for unlike many Americans they are not plagued by pious hypocrisy in these matters.

In 1962, the total gross receipts came to over $6 million. The net income to the Government amounted to over $2 million. The profit was divided for the promotion of science and fine arts, the national opera and the national theater.

Gibraltar does very well with its lottery operation. The total gross receipts for 1962 amounted to $1,776,000. After payment of prizes and expenses, the total net income to the Government came to $417,000. The profits are used to help finance the building of new houses for the people.

Holland is also a small nation but its lottery operation is a very profitable one. The Dutch recognize that people love to gamble and it is better that they be able to do so under Government auspices. In 1962, the gross receipts came to almost $10 million. The Government's share was over $1 million which was turned over as general revenue.

Mr. Speaker, we, in the United States would do well to come to the same realization with our own national lottery. Gambling in this country is a $50-billion-a-year industry which is practically untapped. If we were not blind to human and financial reality, we could learn quite a bit from all of these foreign countries. A national lottery in the United States can easily and voluntarily pump into our own Treasury over $10 billion a year in new revenue which would allow a tax cut and a reduction of our national debt. What are we waiting for?

Dangerous Trend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Henry J. Taylor has given eloquent expression to his opposition to the Supreme Court decision against prayers and Bible reading in his column published in the June 24, 1963, issue of the State of Columbia, S.C. The column is entitled "Religious Traditions Shaken by Court: How Wise Are Our Judges?" I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix with this column an excellent editorial setting forth the concern over this decision by the editors of the Camden Chronicle of Camden, S.C. This editorial is entitled "Dangerous Trend," and was printed in the June 24, 1963, issue of this outstanding South Carolina newspaper.

There being no objection, the column and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the State, Columbia, S.C., June 24, 1963]

RELIGIOUS TRADITIONS SHAKEN BY COURT—HOW WISE ARE OUR JUDGES?

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The Supreme Court has done it again. Once more these nine men on an earthly bench have given millions and millions of Americans a sort of forlorn feeling.

While they ruled (first time) that it is compulsory to allow "Lady Chatterley's Lover" to be sent through the U.S. mails and books of filth and pornography to flood our newsstands and bookstores, it cannot be compulsory to read the Bible and the Lord's Prayer in schools.

A substantial body of editorialists say the decision is legal and right. I assume it is both. However, many of our most eminent lawyers insist today's Supreme Court itself often acts unconstitutionally. They claim it attempts to legislate (not its function) as well as adjudicate. For several years the legal world has been afire with this debate.

Moreover, of course, Supreme Court decisions are not literally the "law of the land," as is a Federal statute, but simply the "law of the case." In a future case the Supreme Court may reverse itself. It very often does.

Long ago, de Tocqueville said, "The law is never able to catch more than a part of life; an equally important vital part usually defies and escapes legal definition." But marble halls can be heady wine in this respect and the first thing you know the narrower eyes of pedantic minds can come to imagine that the law—or what they think is the law—is life.

Yet the true glory in our Founding Fathers who wrote the Constitution, which these men now judge, was the absence of a pedantic mentality.

Spiritual necessities and other intangibles are the root of America and the root of our Constitution itself.

When our forefathers landed here the first thing they did when they got off the ship was to kneel down under the open sky and thank God they had come here—to meet God in the way they thought right.

The one small prayer-candle of Thanksgiving lighted near Plymouth Rock on that crisp winter evening of three centuries ago, and shedding its faith in this new continent, has burned ever since. As Lincoln once said: "Tear down the flag of Christ and Old Glory will sink of its own weight."

Certainly today's Supreme Court's interpretation of the law in one direction after another is not—positively not—intended to tear down the spiritual flag. But does it show much recognition of how important it is to keep it up?

Not alone in this respect but in others, you would sometimes think that through all the generations of Americans this was the first Supreme Court we ever had; that no other Supreme Court had ever looked at our Constitution until these men came along, to put us and all their predecessors straight.

Many Court Justices more learned and distinguished—including Chief Justice John Marshall—than any man on today's Court have looked benignly on "In God We Trust," for example, before these minds conceived any legal conflict whatever.

In fact, it seems evident that such a magnificent treasurer and defender of intangibles as Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes would be appalled by the computer-like behaviorism of these current deciders.

Why, there's more good democracy and self-government in the Sermon on the Mount alone than in any hundred rulings these jurists could supply, and all of it treats with intangibles.

In simple truth, the greatest believer in the rights of man, more powerful and earnest than all the Justices who ever lived, was He, the Savior, who founded all progressive thought.

America is known around the world as the country whose basic principles are founded in the principles of God. We can only hope that today's men on this highest bench will leave our country better off for having been here. Yet, in the frail collection of blood, bones and brains that we all are, these men themselves must sometimes blush to realize how often and how far the pedantic mind has strayed them from humility and from De Tocqueville alike.

[From the Camden Chronicle, June 24, 1963]

DANGEROUS TREND

Across the Nation much has been spoken and written in regard to the recent Supreme Court ruling on prayers in the public schools. The ruling itself is relatively insignificant in its immediate and restricted context; it assumes entirely different proportions and dimensions when viewed in the light of what has been and that toward which it might well move.

In the last several decades the Supreme Court has made a bold, if not reckless departure from tradition and precedent. To an alarming degree it has tossed aside the decisions of the past and in so doing has drawn unto itself a position of power that is dangerous. The ruling, per se, deals only with a required prayer. Could it be that the next and logical ruling would be to make it unlawful to offer any prayer in a given school? Will the day come when no invocation or benediction could be pronounced at the various school functions? Will the day come when high schools and universities would be denied the privilege of holding a religious emphasis week, voluntarily entered into by the pupils? It appears that the more recent decision is another step in that direction.

There was a time when a place on the Supreme Court was considered the highest honor that could come to a lawyer. To a very large extent that is not true in the same degree. The decisions of recent years have placed the society in a position of not knowing what to count on. Many of them have placed question marks over, for example, the right of free association and the right to dispose of property.

Few of the decisions have been really significant in the limited frame of reference. Almost all of them have had a bold and disturbing bearing as side effects and as an index of what is to come. It appears that by judicial decision and executive order the American way of life is being altered while individual liberties are being weakened.

Address by Hon. J. Edward Day, Postmaster General, on the Occasion of the 25th Anniversary of the Civil Aeronautics Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Alan S. Boyd, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board was host on yesterday to a luncheon on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the Civil Aeronautics Board at which time Hon. J. Edward Day delivered an excellent address, which I am pleased to recommend be included in the Appendix of the RECORD—believing that Postmaster General Day's remarks will be of interest to my colleagues and others and that it should receive wider circulation.

The text of Postmaster General Day's address follows:

ADDRESS BY J. EDWARD DAY, POSTMASTER GENERAL, 25TH ANNIVERSARY LUNCHEON OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, SHERATON PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 26, 1963

It is a great pleasure to join in celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Yesterday at about this same time I addressed the Aero Club of Washington, so I am really flying high this week.

From my rather lofty vantage point I congratulate the members and staff of the CAB—past and present—on a successful quarter century of assistance to civil aviation. The Civil Aeronautics Board has guided American aviation through a period of phenomenal progress, change, and expansion. It has aided the airlines during the difficult transition to the jet age.

The Civil Aeronautics Act was passed by Congress in 1938 to end the economic chaos and near anarchy which prevailed in the aviation industry. The act was designed to check the uncontrolled competition of the previous decade and to give the young industry a chance to develop in an orderly manner. The act recognized that the healthy growth of aviation and reasonable rates were closely tied to the public interest.

The original act has been revised, but its successor, the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, imposes upon the CAB essentially the same declaration of national policy as the 1938 act. The CAB must consider both the needs of the public and of the aviation industry. Chairman Boyd has stated the CAB's duty in the following way:

"We must see to it that the United States has a healthy, vigorous air transportation system which meets the public and national needs. It must be safe, adequate, economical, and efficient. Its charges must be reasonable. It must be without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantage, or unfair or destructive competitive practices. Its development must be sound."

As you can see, this is no easy assignment. It is complicated by the fact that the CAB was not able to start with a clean slate. All 11 existing trunk carriers are the same airlines, or the successors to the same airlines, that acquired "grandfather rights" under the 1938 act. The large carriers were formed on the basis of factors other than a well-planned national air route system.

The CAB also came under great pressure from both the industry and the public to allow more routes, more airplanes, and more markets. The great improvements in airplan design and the heightened awareness of air travel brought about by World War II added to the demand. The Board had its work cut out for it in its attempt to order and channel the incredible postwar expansion in the industry.

Today, the 11 domestic trunkline carriers serve more than 600 points over routes in excess of 185,000 miles in length. Twenty-four smaller carriers provide service to some 900 smaller communities over routes in excess of 88,000 miles. Three carriers provide domestic all-cargo service to 38 points over routes in excess of 14,000 miles and another 15 carriers are licensed to provide supplemental services. Fifteen carriers are authorized to provide service to a total of 428 points outside the United States over routes in excess of 320,000 miles.

The modernization and expansion of air service is still affecting postal operations. Less than 2 weeks ago in Alaska the last of our dogsled teams that still carried mail was replaced by an airplane. I want to make clear that this was done to speed up service and not to get even with dogs for biting letter carriers.

Although the CAB oversees this vast, complex network, it has only about 800 employees, making it one of the smallest agencies in the Government. But its fine work has made it one of the best known, and it has demonstrated that size is not the best criterion of value.

The Post Office Department is considerably older than the CAB; Ben Franklin was Postmaster General under the Continental Congress and the Postmaster General has been a member of the Cabinet since the administration of Andrew Jackson.

We have 585,000 employees, making us by far the largest civilian agency in the U.S. Government. We had 150,000 employees even back in 1890. We handle 16 times as much mail today, with less than 4 times as many employees.

The Post Office Department is old but not ossified. We, too, are still vigorous, lively, and changing. The Department played an important role in the development of commercial aviation in this country, and we still give an important assist to the airlines which carry our mail.

Between 1938 and 1953, the rates the Post Office Department paid to the airlines included subsidies that were fixed by the CAB. After 1953, the subsidies were paid directly by the CAB. The Post Office Department now pays only a fair charge for the services rendered by the carriers.

The CAB's stabilization of the airline industry has greatly helped us in providing reliable and rapid air mail service. The Department will spend about $93 million on air transportation this fiscal year. Twenty-five years ago, when the CAB was founded, that figure was under $25 million. Since this earlier figure reflects a subsidy, the change is actually even larger than is indicated.

Americans today send nearly 2 billion pieces of air mail annually, an increase of 750 percent over 1938. The increase in air mail poundage in the last 25 years is twice that large, about 1,500 percent.

Like every other Federal agency, operating in a dynamic political and economic climate, the CAB has at times been enmeshed in controversy and has upon occasion been attacked. Some of the criticism has stemmed from the fact that the CAB must balance its twin functions of promotion and regulation.

It has by now become more or less expected that a member of an independent Federal commission will, upon retiring, immediately call for its abolition or substantial revision. Newton Minow followed the accepted ritual when he vacated his FCC office on the seventh floor of our Post Office Department building recently. Louis J. Hector, on retiring from the CAB in 1959, wrote President Eisenhower:

"Not with the Founding Fathers as members of its Board do I think the CAB as now organized could fulfill its obligations to the American people."

I don't know of any Postmaster General who has suggested that the Post Office Department be disbanded. However, sometimes we are told by others that the Post Office should be a private corporation operated for profit instead of a great public service agency. In this connection, the following item appeared on the front page of one of our Washington newspapers not long ago:

"A second, separate John Birch Society—calling for abolition of the 'socialistic' Post Office Department and cola beverages—is now operating with headquarters in Baltimore, it was revealed yesterday.

"The Baltimore organization, whose full name is the John Birch Chowder and Marching Society, is headed by Attorney Leonard J. Kerpelman.

"Kerpelman said the society's No. 1 aim is to wage its opposition to the Post Office Department.

"'By socialistically delivering people's messages for them,' he said, 'the Post Office Department makes people weak, dependent and without moral fiber, instead of leaving them to deliver their own messages, which would make them strong, independent and morality fibrous.'

"Kerpelman described his society as an ancient one, driven underground by prohibition: 'We regard the more recent John Birch Society, the one that hogged all the publicity, as a very late starter. Our society is better fit to deal with world problems today, because we have been underground for so long we are more completely uncontaminated by any ideas of the last millennium.'"

Of course, I don't agree with Mr. Kerpelman's Chowder and Marching Society. I think that a strong and efficient Post Office Department is indispensable to a thriving economy, just as the work of the CAB has been indispensable to the ordered expansion of American aviation.

The Post Office Department is proud of its own role in starting commercial aviation. The Department's air mail service initiated the commercial use of the airplane, which before that time had been built only for military or exhibition purposes.

Congress authorized contracts for the carriage of mail by airplane in 1911. Since the cost could not exceed other means of transportation, air mail flights did not actually begin until 1918. The first trip was not auspicious. Careful plans had been laid which called for a plane to fly from Washington to New York, with a stop in Philadelphia. On the morning of May 15, 1918, in the presence of President Wilson and other Government figures, including an obscure young Assistant Secretary of the Navy called Franklin D. Roosevelt, a pioneering aviator set out with the first load of air mail.

But he got his directional signals mixed up and wound up in Waldorf, Maryland. His mail had to be carried back to Washington and taken to New York by train.

Despite the faltering start, air mail routes were gradually established over much of the country. The Post Office Department made the first transcontinental flight from New York to San Francisco on September 8, 1920, with the plane carrying 16,000 letters and averaging 80 miles an hour.

In those days, flying was a dangerous, uncertain, and sometimes madcap business. Runways for take-off or landing did not exist and there was no air-to-ground communication, no beam to follow, and no marked course. The mail planes were converted Army DeHavilands with open cockpits, fabric-covered wooden frames, and a top speed of 100 miles per hour. Once a pilot left a field nobody knew where—or if—he was until he arrived.

The few instruments on the panel were of uncertain accuracy and adaptability. Gasoline capacity limited the plane to a few hours flight, and the motors were unpredictable and tended to stop at any time. When the motor stopped it could be started only by spinning the propeller, a difficult job which resulted in many bruises and some near decapitations.

Two hundred and twenty-one planes were used in the air mail service from May 1918, to October 1921. Only 50 of these were in flying condition at the end of the period. Another 26 were still available but undergoing repair. Of the others, 101 had crashed, 7 burned, and 37 had to be withdrawn for one reason or another.

Thirty men were killed in air mail service in about the same period. In 1920, there was one fatality for each 100,000 miles flown. By comparison, the 1962 fatality rate for scheduled domestic passenger service was one fatality for each 172 million miles flown, a fine tribute to the air safety work done by the CAB and FAA.

The men attracted to the hazardous job of flying the mail in the early days were a daring, temperamental and carefree group. The Post Office Department had no choice but to accommodate itself to their hi-jinks and eccentricities, because as one official said with resignation, "the mail must go, but who in hell is going to take it?"

The pilots seemed fond of letting the mail wait around in balmy weather, but took a kind of fierce pride in defying bad weather. One man took time off to bombard a village with toilet paper. Another arranged to buzz antelopes into a fence corner where a confederate waited to butcher them.

The most famous of all airmail pilots was Charles Lindbergh, who served on a contract route between Chicago and St. Louis. Flying northbound on this route on November 3, 1926, Lindbergh ran out of fuel and was forced to jump from his plane. Dean Smith, a colleague of Lindbergh's reported a crash landing with this terse message:

"Landed on cow—killed cow—scared me. Smith."

Another airmail pilot, one Kenneth Unger, was forced to crash land after his motor failed. Unhurt, he borrowed a horse to return to town. Evidently, he was less skillful in handling the horse than his plane, because the horse threw him for another crash landing, and this time he broke his ankle.

Lindbergh took a leave of absence from the airmail service to make his historic flight from New York to Paris in May 1927. During a Paris interview, Lindbergh said, "I am an airmail pilot and expect to fly the mail again." And, as a matter of fact, he later did fly his old route between Chicago and St. Louis once again.

Although the Post Office Department actually carried mail up to August 1927, it gradually surrendered its operations as soon as contractors with the ability and sufficient financial backing to perform the service could be secured. The Department fostered and nurtured commercial aviation and then turned it over to private enterprise.

We have other examples of a similar pattern in Post Office history. In most industrialized foreign countries, telephone, telegraph, and broadcasting facilities are owned by the government. In the United States, we feel that these functions are best left in private hands. However, the telegraph began as a Government-fostered enterprise in this country.

A telegraph line was opened between Washington and Baltimore in 1845. It was built at Government expense by its inventor, Samuel F. B. Morse. Postmaster General Cave Johnson fixed the cost at 1 cent for every 4 characters.

When Morse offered his patent to the Government for $100,000, the Post Office Department turned it down as unpromising. Postmaster General Johnson advised Morse "that the operation of the telegraph between Washington and Baltimore had not satisfied him that under any rate of postage that could be adopted, its revenues could be made equal to its expenditures."

Postmaster General Johnson's crystal ball was a mite clouded, but so were the crystal balls of later seers. Here is a story that appeared in a Boston newspaper about three-quarters of a century ago:

"A man about 46 years of age, giving the name of Joshua Coppersmith, has been arrested in New York for attempting to extort funds from ignorant and superstitious people by exhibiting a device which he says will convey the human voice over metallic wires. He calls the instrument a telephone which is obviously intended to imitate the word 'telegraph' and win the confidence of those who know the success of the latter instrument. Well-informed people know that it is impossible to transmit the human voice over wires as may be done with dots and dashes and signals of the Morse Code, and that, even were it possible to do so, the thing would be of no practical value. The authorities who apprehended this criminal are to be congratulated, and it is hoped that his punishment will be prompt and fitting, that it may serve as an example to other conscienceless schemers who enrich themselves at the expense of their fellow creatures."

The bad prophets have not been restricted to the field of communications. As late as 1901, Wilbur Wright doubted that man would fly "within a thousand years."

We need not feel superior to the bad guessers of times past. Wilbur Wright, despite his own skepticism, went on to fly the first heavier-than-air machine with his brother only 2 years later. We have a copious share of the timid and unimaginative amongst us today.

There are those who are against the attempt to fly a man to the moon because they say it would cost too much. There are those who oppose renewed efforts to reach a test-ban agreement on the grounds that we have failed before. There are those whose only answer 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation to the demands for equality and justice of Negro Americans is more patience and further delay. The following words were written by Abraham Lincoln in 1862:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the story present. * * * As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves."

Today, we must, once again, disenthrall ourselves.

I wish the Civil Aeronautics Board a happy birthday and continued success in guiding the aviation industry.

Happy landings to all of you.

Retail Gasoline Selling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a situation present not only in my section but in many sections of the country in the field of retail gasoline selling. This was pointed out in my testimony before the Dual Distribution Subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee.

Mr. Chairman, as a Congressman who is especially interested in the plight of small business, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to appear as a witness before your Subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business.

In this age of big business, gasoline service station operation, as one segment of the so-called service industries, remains eminently suited to small-scale enterprise.

More than 206,000 gasoline dealers throughout the Nation service about 72 million vehicles each year. These dealers are mainly supplied with gasoline and other petroleum products by huge oil companies, which frequently are also their landlords.

It is no wonder, then, that small operators of gasoline service stations are continually harassed by unfair tactics used by the great oil empires to widen their stranglehold upon the entire petroleum industry. Among these devices are price fixing, price wars, and unfair economic pressures arising from the practice of dual distribution.

First, price fixing is an abuse which occurs frequently in the retail gasoline field. Just recently, on March 11 of this year, the major oil companies simultaneously announced a price increase of 5 to 7 cents per gallon in the Greater Boston area. As I stated at that time, this general hike in gasoline prices, announced on the same day and for similar amounts, went far beyond mere coincidence and appeared to amount to collusive and illegal price fixing. The Justice Department acceded to my request for an immediate investigation of this situation. John Galgay, regional head for New England of the Anti-Trust Division, has sent several investigators to probe the March 11 price hike. He has assured me that if evidence of an illegal price-fixing agreement is obtained, the Justice Department will take appropriate action under the Federal antitrust laws. It is interesting to note that during the last 10 days, when Justice Department investigators were in the Boston area, the major oil companies have lowered the price of gasoline by a substantial amount. However, as of midnight Monday of this week, Esso Standard and Mobile raised the price of gasoline 5.8 cents per gallon in most zones in the Greater Boston area. The consuming public and the gasoline station dealer are subjected to seesawing price increases and decreases at the whim and fancy of the major oil company's manipulations.

I am fully aware of the fact that the independent gasoline station operators were not responsible for the decision to raise prices. Instead, this pricing decision was made by the major oil companies. It is the independent dealer, the individual gas station operator, and the consuming public who are the victims of collusive action by the major oil companies.

Similar instances of price fixing on the west coast were discussed last year before the House Select Committee on Small Business. For example, a Shell Oil Co. dealer testified that the lease on his station had been canceled because of noncompliance with the price policy of his supplier. Although no direct threats had been made to him for failure to comply with the company's price policy, he had been warned to follow dictated prices. He stated that since Shell representatives regularly told him the price to charge, he naturally was convinced that the lease cancellation was related to his independent pricing policies. Gasoline station dealers in the Greater Boston area have told me of similar experiences.

Second, in recent years, the incidence of price wars among gasoline dealers in designated locations has been even more prevalent than that of across-the-board price-fixing.

The evils of such price cutting were vividly described in the Wall Street Journal, issue of May 2, 1962, with reference to the State of Texas.

"In the shadow of the Alamo a battle for business survival began here last June. It has been fanning out since, and is now about to engulf much of the Nation.

"On the defensive are the owners of small filling stations who buy gasoline on the open market and sell it at cut prices under brand names not identifiable with any oil company. Last summer there were 250 of these private-brand stations around San Antonio, and they sold half the area's gasoline. Then Gulf Oil Corp. chose them as the first target for a new market weapon: Economy-grade gasoline sold at Gulf pumps for the same price as private-brand gas and 2 cents a gallon below Gulf's regular grade.

"Today, a devastating price war has left fewer than 100 of the private-brand San Antonio area stations in business. They account for only 15 percent of the market. And their decline has encouraged Gulf and other major oil companies to introduce subregular economy gas in other markets—touching off savage price battles almost everywhere as private-brand stations cut pump tags in an usually vain attempt to maintain their traditional discount."

Frederick H. Moore, executive secretary of the Retail Gasoline Dealers' Association of Massachusetts, has said that the price war situation has reached the "height of ridiculousness" and the gasoline market has gotten away from wholesaler and retailer business principles to the point where destructive price wars become the normal thing. In a recent letter, Mr. Moore informed me of the pricing problems in Massachusetts: "Over the years, before we were faced with destructive price wars, the major supplying oil companies would only have three to five wholesale, or tank wagon price changes throughout the year, and they would be only what they called seasonable changes. In 1962, and so far in 1963, we have had roughly 75 up-and-down wholesale price changes so that the dealers and the consumers never know what the retail price is from day to day."

The devastating impact of price wars upon the gasoline station operator may be seen from the statement provided me by a retail gasoline dealer in Quincy, Mass. This dealer said that the oil company forced him to change the price of gasoline at his station over 100 times in 1962. He stated that gasoline is delivered on Friday; the salesman is apt to call him on Thursday and tell him to cut his prices 2 cents effective midnight. However, when his gas is delivered on Friday, the oil company only reimburses him 1 cent per gallon and then only on a half load instead of a full load. This dealer stated that prices have been changed over 25 times this year, with the salesman calling in the new price the day before.

Throughout 1962 and the early months of this year price wars continued to characterize the retail gasoline market in many regions of the country. Gasoline price wars, where the public benefits at the whim of the major oil companies, characterize the situation in the Greater Boston area.

Who are the victims of these abuses in retail marketing of gasoline? The small businessman and the consumer. Even in the case of price wars, when consumers temporarily benefit from drastic reductions in the price of gasoline, in the process, retailers are frequently eliminated from the marketplace. Eventually the old price level returns.

Mr. Chairman, I have received extensive mail from gasoline service station dealers who charge that these unfair competitive tactics will force them out of business. For fear of retribution for these dealers, I cannot divulge the names of those who have written to me on this subject. However, each and everyone is in complete agreement with my efforts to investigate such abuses and to give adequate and proper protection to small business. A typical letter which I received was written by an independent gasoline station dealer who said that "if I gave my name I would be out of business fast." His letter stated: "Congratulations on your gasoline probe. It is tremendous. This time they all raised their prices together. These prices only involve discounts which are increased or lowered at the discretion of the oil companies. In the last 2 years their 'price stabilizations' were made over 90 times. At no time has the tank wagon price been changed—only the discounts change. Why? and why the changes so many times? The public be damned say the oil companies. Gas dealers profits are down while oil company profits are up. For proof, read their profit reports. They are breaking records; dealers are breaking their backs. Don't let us down."

It is true that in accordance with existing antitrust laws and regulations, both the U.S. Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission have taken action to restrain the major oil companies from using unfair coercive tactics against small gasoline retailers. But governmental lawsuits and investigations are cumbersome and time consuming and evidence of wrongdoing is frequently difficult to prove.

The continued existence of abuses in the field of retail marketing of gasoline and other petroleum and allied products, in spite of our laws and regulations, demands the immediate attention of the Congress. If mere public airing does not exert sufficient pressure on the large oil companies to correct these conditions immediately, I firmly believe that legislative action by Congress will be imperative.

Much is said of the vital importance of small business in our American economy. No group of interested persons knows more intimately the continual squeeze play by big business on small business than this committee, before which I have the honor of appearing today.

Youth Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEIL STAEBLER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, as further evidence of the growing realization that we have in the President's youth employment opportunities program, a real chance to make a major break-through in the area of solving the problems of our younger people, I would

like to submit this report of the comments of Police Chief Rolland J. Gainsley, of Ann Arbor, Mich.:

Police Chief Pleads for Youth Bill

Ann Arbor Police Chief Rolland J. Gainsley today issued an appeal for local support of President Kennedy's youth employment and conservation bill.

The bill, sponsored by U.S. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, has been passed by the Senate and is expected to go before the House shortly.

Gainsley said, "Common sense and justice compel establishment of this program which will give many thousands of currently unemployed young persons a chance to find employment, to be paid for their services, and to acquire skills and work experience that will give them a solid start in their working lives.

"Provisions in this legislation provide a practical means of attacking the high school dropout problem and the juvenile delinquency associated with that problem.

"Young men and women no longer in school constitute already 18 percent of our total unemployment, although they comprise only 7 percent of the labor force. These figures reflect a serious national situation. Idle youth on our city streets create a host of problems.

"During the 1960's an estimated 7½ million youths will enter the job market with less than a high school education. Unless something is done to help equip them to live in a skilled economy, they will pile up helplessly against the rising barriers to unskilled labor.

"In the last decade, juvenile delinquency cases brought before the courts have more than doubled, and arrests of youth increased 86 percent, until they numbered almost one million arrests a year in 1960—15 percent of all arrests.

"Favorable House action on the Youth employment and conservation bill will provide work and training for youths from the age of 16 through 21.

"Members of the Youth Conservation Corps will receive $60 a month in wages. They will be given lodging, board, work clothes, tools and equipment, medical, and other necessities.

"The corpsmen will be under the direct supervision of adult conservationists, foresters, rangers, and others. They will work on and receive training in various jobs and projects involving general areas as erosion, stream control, reforestation, and construction of outdoor recreation and camp facilities.

"In addition, the corpsmen will be given technical training and educational skills through classroom periods after work hours. The need for this new youth program is evident. It was designed to reduce unemployment and train more young workers who would otherwise be idle. They must be given a chance to work before they may take to crime instead," Gainesley said.

Rev. Francis P. Donnelly, S.J., Memorial Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on the 26th and 27th of next month the University of Scranton will pay a singularly appropriate tribute to the late Reverend Francis P. Donnelly, S.J., who, from a humble beginning in Pittston, Pa., in my congressional district, became one of the Nation's leading educators prior to his death in 1959. The university will hold this 2-day conference on the modern trends in the teaching of English. To better understand the immense stature of Father Donnelly, I quote the New York Times upon his death in April 1959. The Times referred to him as "one of the foremost Jesuit teachers, writers, and educators of this century." In the "Personal and Pertinent" column of the Scranton Times of June 8, 1963, the writer of that column, Mr. Neil Whitney, capsuled Father Donnelly's illustrious career very well, and it gives me great pleasure to make the aforementioned column a part of my remarks today.

The University of Scranton is planning a singularly appropriate tribute to the late Rev. Frances P. Donnelly, S.J., who, from a humble beginning in Pittson, became one of the Nation's leading educators prior to his death in 1959. The university, according to an announcement from the office of its president, Rev. John J. Long, S.J., will hold the Francis P. Donnelly, S.J., Memorial Conference on July 26 and 27. The conference will be concerned with modern trends in the teaching of English. It will emphasize, in an introductory manner, the recent discoveries in the field of language study. Among these discoveries is the linquistic method of language teaching. Linguistics is a scientific investigation of the structure and development of the structure and development of language. The progrem for the July memorial conference is being arranged by Dr. Robert Lodge, chairman of the university's English department; Rev. Richard Grady, S.J., cochairman and author of the movie hit "Angels in the Outfield," and Alfred Rotondaro, faculty member in the English department. Conference lectures will be given on fundamentals of linguistics, analysis of texts, use of the new methods in literature courses and other associated topics. The speakers will include Professors Frank L. Ryan and John J. Murray of the university faculty; Prof. Robert Minshall of Bucknell University, and Prof. Edward James of Catholic University of America. All of these educators are familiar with the work of Father Donnelly, who was a nationally known teached of rhetoric. He was associated at various times during his 50-year teaching career with Holy Cross, Gonzaga, and Boston Colleges, and Fordham University. His books on the teaching of English, "Model English I" (1902), "Model English II" (1919, "Persuasive Speech" (1931) among many others, are still being used in schools all over the country.

In an article about Father Donnelly which appeared in this space on March 11, I reprinted his famous poem, "What an Irishman Means by Machree." I have since learned from Charles A. McCarthy, the well-known Pittston historian, that Father Donnelly received his early inspiration and encouragement as a poet from T. A. Daly, the popular Philadelphia poet. Mr. Daly, for many years before his death, wrote a syndicated poem entitled "The Daly Ditty." It was generally written in the Italian vernacular and appeared in this newspaper as a daily feature back in the twenties. Father Donnelly first saw the light of day on the second floor of the building at 79 South Main Street, Pittston, on December 10, 1869. His father, the late Cornelius Donnelly, was engaged in the undertaking and furniture business at that address. The priest's early studies were at St. John's Academy of Pittston. In 1884 he attended classes at Pittston Borough School, at which time the late Thaddeus M. Conniff of Plains township was the principal. In later years Mr. Conniff recalled that Father Donnelly and the late Thomas A. Grace, who served for many years as a member of the Luzerne County Board of Assessors, were his first Latin students in Pittston. As a boy Father Donnelly, with many companions from his neighborhood, was fond of swimming in the Susquehanna River in the summertime. These occasions were the inspiration for his poem, "The Susquehanna," in which he described "the days that are no more" and mentioned swimming at the old "Sandy Bottom," near the foot of Dock Street, in Pittston. After completing 50 years as a teacher, the last 23 of them at Fordham, Father Donnelly retired in 1952 because of ill health. When he passed away on April 18, 1959, the New York Times referred to him as "one of the foremost Jesuit teachers, writers, and educators of this century."

Red Spies Via Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, two congressional committees, the Organization of American States, numerous Members of Congress, and private individuals have warned of the explosive situation resulting from Communist subversive activity throughout Latin America now being directed from Soviet Cuba. We may be facing the possibility that Moscow-trained agents are entering the United States under the guise of Cuban "refugees," as described in the following Allen-Scott column in the June 26 St. Paul Pioneer Press:

Red Spies Via Cuba

WASHINGTON.—Hundreds of Moscow-trained agents are entering the United States as Cuban refugees.

These Spanish-speaking Communists, some of them veterans of the Spanish Civil War, have come in with the thousands of Cuban refugees who have been admitted to the United States since last fall's missile crisis.

According to sworn testimony before the Senate internal security subcommittee by reliable, anti-Castro refugees, the Red agents are concentrating on infiltrating the splintered refugee groups and are a principal reason for the seething dissension among them.

A highly regarded attorney in Miami, representing a number of these Cuban organizations, has turned over to the Senators detailed evidence that Dictator Castro and his Russian henchmen personally selected about half of the passenger list of one Red Cross ship that recently brought approximately 1,000 refugees to the United States.

This startling information is supported by intelligence reports that the Kremlin is using the Cuban refugee traffic as a means of infiltrating Moscow-trained agents into the United States and Latin American countries.

The Miami attorney, who requested that his identification be kept secret because of the classified nature of his activities, bluntly blamed this extraordinary situation on the lax screening of refugees by immigration authorities.

He flatly charged that policies of the Kennedy administration, as formulated by the State and Justice Departments, are permitting hundreds of Red agents easy access to the United States while barring anti-Castro raids on Cuba.

The Senate committee, headed by Senator JAMES EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, plans to ask FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover for his expert views on the number of Russian agents who have entered from Cuba and the danger they present to the country's internal security.

The Kennedy administration has no "hard intelligence" to support the State Department's curious claim that Russia does not have sufficient troops in Cuba to exert control there.

According to the latest estimate of the Central Intelligence Agency, Russia still has "between 12,500 and 17,500" troops in Cuba. The most recent report of the Defense Intelligence Agency places the number as high as 32,000.

Neither the CIA nor DIA estimates support the State Department's disclaimer on the control of Cuba. Instead, both intelligence Agencies have considerable evidence that Cuba's foreign policy is laid down by Moscow, and Castro is administering it with the "advice and consent" of five Russian generals stationed in Cuba.

It is definitely known that Secretary Rusk was all set to announce that Russian combat forces had been withdrawn from there when this column revealed that CIA and military intelligence authorities were refusing to back such a declaration.

Administration insiders are saying privately the White House "advised" Rusk to change his statement to the effect that "there is a thinning out of Soviet troops."

This carefully worded explanation was slipped to a hand-picked group of newsmen at a dinner given by Rusk ostensibly to brief them on the President's European trip.

This intelligence dispute has been raging inside the administration since early this month when the White House mysteriously ordered the first low-level reconnaissance flight over Cuba since last February. Until this flight was personally approved by the President, at least a half-dozen requests for such missions by military and intelligence authorities had been turned down.

Aerial photos of this low-level flight revealed that two Soviet camps had been evacuated and that Russian combat units had left these areas. The photos also showed new Soviet military depots, indicating the Russians were apparantely trying to secrete their equipment.

On the basis of this information, CIA and military intelligence are strongly inclined to the view that Soviet combat units are still on the island. This belief is further supported by the fact that there is no positive information that the troops have been withdrawn, although their exact whereabouts are unknown.

Mason County, W. Va., Was Intended To Be a New Colony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the town of Point Pleasant, located in what is now Mason County, W. Va., was designated by royal decree in 1771 to be the capital of a new western colony, according to an article in the June 16, 1963, issue of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail.

The article tells how plans for forming the new colony at the juncture of the Ohio and Kanawha Rivers were stymied by the outbreak of the Revolutionary War. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

POINT PLEASANT, SITE OF BLOODY CONFLICT

The capital of the new colony was to be where two great rivers, the Ohio and the Great Kanawha, met. The name of the colony would be Vandalia.

Gov. Robert Dinwiddie, of Virginia, had proposed the idea as early as 1756. In 1771 Thomas Walpole and Benjamin Franklin submitted a petition to the king, asking for the new colony, and it met with royal approval.

But the Revolutionary War arrived, and everyone lost sight of the new colony. Point Pleasant, though rich in history, didn't become the capital of anything except Mason County.

La Salle had been to the area earlier for the French—about 1669. Christopher Gist arrived in 1750, and George Washington slept there in 1770. Permanent settlement at Point Pleasant began with occupation of the site by the Virginia troops of Gen. Andrew Lewis on October 6, 1774, on lands owned by Thomas Lewis.

On October 10, one of the bloodiest battles ever fought by the red men and the white latecomers became the chief event of Lord Dunmore's war. The confederated tribes led by Chief Cornstalk were beaten, and the Virginia border was advanced from the Allegheny crest to the broad Ohio.

Mason County was formed in 1804 from the western portion of Kanawha. It took its name from George Mason, author of the Virginia Constitution and member of the convention that framed the Constitution of the United States.

The bottom lands of the Ohio and Kanawha valleys were attractive to settlers. Farms and herds from earliest times constituted a sizable segment of the county's wealth. Coal, oil, gas, and salt brines, were plentiful. Great stands of timber covered the hills, but like the woodland of other counties became depleted later.

Even before 1860, as today, Mason County was building boats and sending them to sea, and part of the timber depletion resulted from use of fine oak in the vessels.

The *Sumpter*, a Mason-built ship, was used during the Mexican War.

As one of the counties in the Ohio Valley, Mason faces the future with optimism.

Among its attractions are Tuendie-wei Park in Point Pleasant, commemorating the famous battle; and a large State public hunting area.

Is the Trip Necessary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of controversy appears to exist regarding the present trip of the Chief Executive to Europe.

The following editorial from the Gazette and Daily, York, Pa., is submitted without comment:

A LEMON

President Kennedy's trip to Europe would seem to have been undertaken at the poorest of times. The political situation in the major nations of West Europe and in Great Britain is in a state of flux, to say the least. New governments and new heads of government will soon be in power, meaning that the people with whom the President is talking officially are lameducks. At home the civil rights crisis in Washington and elsewhere ought to require the President's persistent, close attention. Friends at home and abroad advised him to postpone his planned trip. But off he went anyway. Why?

Mr. Kennedy is really on a campaign tour. He is attempting to sell the Europeans on something which at first glance they did not want. The item is the so-called multilateral seaborne nuclear force, established within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which is to say under the effective control of the United States. This is quite a scheme. It envisages ships equipped with nuclear weapons, manned by personnel from a number of nations, including West Germany, cruising the Mediterranean and Baltic Seas and the Atlantic coastal waters of Western Europe.

Policymakers in Washington have confided that the complicated notion was developed as a means of keeping nuclear weapons from the independent possession and command of West Germany. Not that there is apparently any great U.S. objection to this. It is just that the Soviet Union has let it be known that a nuclear-armed West Germany is completely unacceptable. "The Soviet Union is pathological on that score," a high State Department official told a group of newsmen not long ago. So the problem arose: How to relate West Germany and nuclear weapons without upsetting the applecart, which is to say, without beginning world war III. Some bizarre brainstorming then produced this multilateral concoction.

Thus Mr. Kennedy's trip. At least it surely looks that way. An international politics campaign trip, studded with private talks, public speeches, appearances before vast throngs. Just like 1960, here in his own country, all over again. Complete with doubletalk also, as is customary in campaign oratory. The President tells the West Germans we will never let them down, that he is prepared to risk U.S. cities in defense of Western Europe—basically he is pleading for agreement to permit the United States to manage the area's military operations—and at the same time he throws a curve, you might say, over the Berlin wall in the direction of the Soviet Union by remarking that this Western alliance, founded to deter a new war, "must now find a way to a new peace."

Who knows what all this means? Is it plain old politics? Well, sure. But more besides. It is almost desperate politics simply because the President's platform is so weak. The multilateral nuclear seaborne idea is a lemon. What a product for a President to travel thousands of miles to sell. We suspect that Mr. Kennedy conceives of it as a creature of strength which may help him to negotiate a German settlement with the Soviet Union, preferably before the domestic presidential campaign of 1964. But the point is that playing politics with nuclear weapons and West Germany combined is playing with fire. Isn't any one of us puzzled and unsettled at the spectacle of hundreds of thousands of massed Germans shouting over and over the name of the President of the United States?

Defense Subsistence Supply Agency Oversea Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, with the Department of Defense under heavy criticism these days both as to policy and appropriation requests, it is a pleasure for me to take note of a recent report of the fine work that Department is doing in my district in furtherance of an expression of congressional opinion last year that more purchases should be made in this country for oversea consumption.

I am very proud that my second district of New Jersey, being the agricultural southern end of the State, has been chosen as the site of a trial run for shipping perishable fruits and vegetables, and all credit should be given to those in the military who are in charge of this program and to those farmers and shippers in my district who are cooperating.

I report from a news release of the New Jersey Department of Agriculture under the excellent directorship of Philip Alampi, the secretary of agriculture, which details the program and what is being accomplished:

Two shipments of New Jersey-grown produce totaling approximately 700 packages are on their way to France and Germany where they will be unloaded and distributed to U.S. military personnel stationed in those countries.

The shipments, one of iceberg lettuce and one of lettuce and cabbage, were purchased by the U.S. Defense Subsistence Supply Agency from Nardelli Bros., Cedarville produce distributors. The purchase was arranged in cooperation with the State Department of Agriculture, which has furnished office space for two military buyers at its Bridgeton office, to facilitate sales of south Jersey vegetables and fruits to the military government.

The specially designed refrigerated trailer bodies in which the New Jersey lettuce and cabbage will travel to France and Germany were loaded and sealed at Cedarville, trucked to the Brooklyn Army Terminal, and there placed on board ship. They will not be opened until they arrive in Germany where they will be unsealed and inspected by a military buyer there. The refrigerated bodies were coupled together and transported to shipside as one unit.

The shipment from New Jersey is part of a test program being conducted by the Defense Subsistence Agency to determine if perishable fruits and vegetables from the United States will arrive overseas in good condition. The project is part of a Department of Defense effort to purchase as many supplies for our troops abroad in this country as possible.

Lettuce for the shipment was grown at Cedarbrook Farms, Cedarville, owned by Dennis Sorantino. The cabbage was grown on the farms of Robert Jeffers and John Sorantino, both of Cedarville.

After cutting, the produce was inspected by Federal-State fruit and vegetable inspectors, employed by the New Jersey Agricultural Society. All military purchases must conform to specified U.S. grades and/or military specifications. After loading, the vans filled with lettuce and cabbage were run through the vacuum-cooler at the Cedarville Cooperative Marketing Association to remove field heat and improve keeping quality.

The military buyers stationed at Bridgeton who arranged the purchase are John Wanczyk and Joseph Solomon. Military buyers are expected to be stationed at the Department of Agriculture's Bridgeton office throughout the growing season to facilitate purchases of area crops.

The Best We Have

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Shelbyville News:

THE BEST WE HAVE

Congress is seldom dramatic as a body, although some of its Members hit the headlines in committee activities of many kinds. Sometimes the people seem irked at the pace Congress keeps, and Presidents and their fans then cry out against the supposed stumbling block of the "do-nothing" body. Such cries are being heard again now.

Congress deserves more public esteem and even gratitude than it has, although it has its faults individually and collectively and needs to be brought to task from time to time.

But let's take a look at some of its actions.

Congress has prevented appropriations of half a billion dollars more for the Area Redevelopment Administration after a careful look at the agency in which it discovered that, while the expense was high, the results were meager and often bad. Certainly saving so much money is doing something.

Congress now is combing carefully through the foreign aid record, and it looks as if its work in this field will save at least half a billion more. The public does not share the illusion of some figures in the executive branch that money sent abroad for any old purpose serves the interests of this Nation. Congress is more sensitive to public reaction on issues than the executive branch, and in cutting foreign aid will be serving the American taxpayer—an individual who often seems of no apparent concern to the State Department.

Congress has blocked an end run by the administration to create an expensive Department of Urban Affairs. Such a department would have given the Federal Government a large voice in the affairs of American cities. If the Federal Government were qualified to run cities, Washington, D.C., would be the best run city in the Nation. Mildly, it isn't.

There's a good chance that Congress will defeat the mass transportation bill, saving more money for taxpayers. This is nothing more than a plan under which we would all pay each other's carfare at income tax time instead of dropping coins in the fare box when we ride. Those who ride, no matter how rich, would be subsidized, and those who do not ride, no matter how poor, would pay. The ideology and the practicality of this approach are indefensible. The executive branch would saddle us with this, but Congress probably will save the day.

Certainly, as we said, Congress is not faultless, and some very expensive follies have originated there. But the big drive to have the Federal Government spend increasing slices of the American family budget to expand its activities in every corner of the Nation and every quarter of the globe does not come from Congress, but from the various executive departments.

Congress may not be a perfect watchdog, but it's the best one we have.

President Unable To Lead His Overwhelming Democrat Majority in House and Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's Democratic Party has overwhelming majorities in both House and Senate—sufficient votes to put through any legislative program the White House proposes if the Chief Executive possesses the leadership to round up the necessary votes.

Under these conditions the Republicans cannot be blamed for the defeat of the President's recommendations in spite of the efforts of the propaganda machine of the administration to lead the public to believe otherwise.

This is particularly true with respect to civil rights legislation. The situation is very ably described by columnist Richard Wilson in the Washington Star on June 26, 1963. His article follows:

PUTTING RIGHTS PROGRAM THROUGH: DEMOCRATS REMINDED THEY HAVE VOTES AND CAN'T BLAME GOP IF BILL STALLS

(By Richard Wilson)

It is little noted, but the Democratic majority in the U.S. Senate is exactly the number needed to force a vote on the President's new civil rights program.

A two-thirds vote of the Senate can break a filibuster. The Democrats have 67 votes and the Republicans 33. Yet it will be charged, in fact it is already intimated, that Republicans will be responsible if Congress fails to pass a new civil rights law.

This is the reason Republican leaders have conferred with President Kennedy on a bipartisan approach with their fingers crossed. However sincere the President's motives, Republicans in the Senate will not be spared mendacious attack if civil rights legislation fails of passage.

Yet the reason why such legislation cannot be passed lies in the simple fact that the Kennedy administration has no control of the overwhelming Democratic majorities in the Senate and House.

The Democratic majority is like Barnum & Bailey's menagerie, a big tent housing carefully caged animals which would eat each other in the jungle. The Senate Democratic leaders say they cannot break a filibuster and pass the President's program without 20 to 25 Republican votes. Therefore the Republicans are to blame if they don't vote to a man for the President's program.

Democratic leaders could well afford to blush while making such a confession of the ineffectuality of their powers of leadership. Nor is their ineffectuality confined to civil rights. They cannot claim that only on the racial issue are the fierce conflicts within the Democratic Party exposed. The flagrant schism is equally evident on social, economic, and labor legislation.

Whatever the President's popularity in this and other countries, his prestige in the Congress of the United States is at low ebb. According to old hands in Congress, the resentment against the President of the United States has no parallel except possibly the revolt against Franklin D. Roosevelt when he sought to pack the Supreme Court with new appointees. Roosevelt lost his hold on Congress then, though he continued to enjoy a public adulation which Mr. Kennedy has never had in anywhere near the same degree.

The congressional discontent with Mr. Kennedy is not confined to the Southern Democrats, nor the Republicans. The liberals are dissatisfied with what they consider to be half measures. Even some of the moderates think Mr. Kennedy has helped to create, by unfulfillable promises and bravura statements, the conditions for racial demonstrations of a dangerous character. When faced by this dangerous condition, the Kennedy tone quickly changes. Equality will have to come slowly and not by legislation alone.

It is in this atmosphere that the President has proposed his program to hasten the inevitable advance of Negroes toward higher levels of equality. And it is a shame that this question cannot be considered apart from its political aspects.

But those political aspects exist and it is truly amazing that Negro leaders do not recognize them. Negroes made their greatest advances since their emancipation in a Republican administration. Whatever Negro leaders may think today, no civil rights legislation was recommended to Congress by Roosevelt and none was enacted. Harry Truman was the first President to offer a comprehensive program. It was not enacted. President Eisenhower offered a program in 1956 and it was enacted in major part. Again in 1960 on President Eisenhower's initiative civil rights legislation was enacted.

In spite of the urgent promises of the Democratic platform of 1960, Mr. Kennedy delayed for more than 2 years offering any kind of general civil rights legislation, and he does so now under the pressure of mounting racial demonstration, and with sentiment built up in Congress against him.

These are the facts. Now it is to be seen whether President Kennedy, with two-thirds of Congress under Democratic control, can do as much as did President Eisenhower, whose party did not have control of Congress.

And if Mr. Kennedy cannot win, then let the blame go where it ought to.

Interference in College Placement Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called on various occasions to complaints of interference in college placement programs by the U.S. Employment Service. Sometime ago I wrote the Service about these complaints and was told that the USES was simply performing a service and not trying to create any additional work. But the concern of Federal activity in this area still persists. In this morning's mail I received a copy of a resolution by the Ohio Society of Professional Engineers as follows:

> The Ohio Society of Professional Engineers Board of Trustees compliments NSPE for its stand opposing the attempt by the Bureau of Employment Service to take over college placement activities at our colleges and universities. OSPE will exert a vigorous effort to inform the Members of Congress from Ohio to the danger in this attempt to inject the Federal Government into an activity which is and should be the responsibility of the colleges and universities.

The danger of this is that it amounts to Government intervention into an area which should be left entirely to private enterprise. It means that the Government could eventually control the hiring and placing of college graduates by determining where and for whom the graduate can work which was never intended to be the function of the USES. Its original purpose was simply to help persons find jobs who had no other way. Because of the seriousness of the matter and the concern of many persons, I also bring to the attention of the House the following article which appeared in the May 6, 1963, issue of the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune:

GOVERNMENT MOVING IN ON COLLEGE PLACEMENT?

(By Marion Cracraft)

Is the U.S. Department of Labor setting up shop to tell industry whom it must employ in the way of college-trained technical people—and by the same token to tell college students where they must work?

The signs point that way. This came to light in the last few days (as far as I am concerned, at least) when the superintendent of Pan American Petroleum Corp.'s industrial relations department at Oaklahoma City issued a strongly worded statement expressing Pan American's opposition.

Since then, I have done a little checking here and there, and I don't like what I've found.

Apparently this thing has been going on quietly, for a year or more. What it boils down to is this: Instead of industry (all industry, not just oil) going to the college campuses, interviewing prospective graduates, and striking a bargain for their services, ultimately the USES intends to take over this function, replace the college placement bureaus, and the private negotiation, with a system of assignment.

Not that anyone will admit this. I learned that in several instances companies have made inquiry as to what was going on, and were told, in form letter fashion, that the U.S. Employment Service was just trying to be helpful.

This is a wonderful example of how bureaus grow. The Pan Am statement, for instance, pointed out that "The program will of course require considerable expansion of USES offices and personnel. The Labor Department over the past 2 years has raised the USES budget by some $41 million, to a total of $130 million."

Again quoting from the Pan Am statement: "One Labor Department idea would call for a central agency, possibly in Washington, where electronic data computers would match data from all over the Nation on job openings and applicants."

"Presumably," the statement said, "this would mean that this Government agency could and would assign individual Americans to jobs, regardless of the mutual interests of employee and employer."

The company said it believes the USES plan "would duplicate, at considerable expense to the taxpayers, functions now being handled satisfactorily by the colleges, and will further serve to create employment conditions totally disadvantageous to all parties. It could easily lead to complete manpower control by Washington, along with complete dictation of wages, hours, and working conditions."

How can a thing like this get started? It's easy, if the colleges, and businessmen, don't rear up and holler.

For instance, I learned that the first one company knew of the new system was when a small college wrote to the company management, in substance: "Look, you've always interviewed some of our graduates, and hired some. Now these Government people have moved in on us; are telling us what to do. We need help."

It turned out that this reprehensible invasion had all been made very quietly, and not too many in industry were aware of it.

Another company, in Houston, took the matter up with a committee of the chamber of commerce. The committee adopted a strong resolution and submitted it to the Houston Chamber of Commerce board for approval. But the board quashed it, on the theory, "We've just got the big NASA space center underway, and we can't afford to make the Government mad at us."

We all know that the uses were created in the first place to assist those persons who couldn't find jobs any other way.

Just the same as the REA was originally created to provide electricity where it wasn't economically feasible for private utilities to build lines. Just the same as the aid to dependent children program originally was created to alleviate suffering in fatherless families. And look what's happened to those two, in 30 years.

In Russia they assign jobs—and people. They tell them when, where, and for how much.

Do you want your college graduate son or daughter to be a statistic, or a free agent? I don't think I've overemphasized this. But you might look into it for yourself.

Defeat for Decency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, I include in the Appendix an editorial from the Palestine (Tex.) Herald-Press, concerning the recent Supreme Court decision against Bible reading in public schools.

The Court has found a way to guarantee that pornographic and obscene literature must be given all protections, but holds that the Bible must be barred. These holdings can only be construed as defeats for decency, which is pointed out in the editorial.

The editorial follows:

DEFEAT FOR DECENCY

There ought to be cheers from the atheists, and certainly Communists will feel smug about it—for the Supreme Court again has struck down the Bible.

The Court ruled against Bible reading in school, acting on cases originating in Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Florida.

Thus once again the Court rules in favor of the wishes of a tiny minority and against the wishes of the vast majority of Americans, who agree with the fundamental principles taught by the Bible whether they happen to be active Christians or not.

The Court's banning of the Bible from public school teaching goes farther than merely rap the Christian religion. It interferes with the ability of public schools to teach the history of mankind. The Bible is a history, covering the development of civilized man. No person, regardless of his religious belief or his lack of religious belief can know much about the history of the world without learning much that has the Bible as its source.

Equally as true is it that no American can understand the history of our own country, the reason for its founding or the inspiration of our Constitution, without full recognition of the part the Christian religion, and the Bible played, and still play.

Congress opens its sessions with prayer. Our whole system, including the very money with which we trade, is loaded with references to God. Our plan of government—freedom, free enterprise, individual rights—in reality is a system based on the principles of Christianity.

Trying to understand human history without reference to Christianity is an impossibility.

But the schools have to get along without the Bible because the Supreme Court says so. It's a sad defeat for education, and for decency.

Myopia in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of Industrial Research, there appears an editorial called "Myopia in Space." I think this editorial would be worthwhile reading for Members of Congress and others since it undertakes to reemphasize a basic philosophy underlying our national space effort:

MYOPIA IN SPACE

One of the hottest topics in Washington these days is the manned lunar landing program. Economy-minded Republicans and Democrats, as well as representatives of the scientific community, have been taking potshots at the multibillion-dollar Apollo program—designed to place a manned spacecraft on the moon by 1970.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT and other Members of Congress have objected to the lunar project on the grounds that the funds could be put to better use in the solution of unemployment, education, housing, transportation, and slum problems. Dr. Warren Weaver, former president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, has questioned the accelerated pace and scientific value of a manned landing, as opposed to greater emphasis on instrument probes. Even former President Eisenhower has called for cutbacks in defense and space spending as a means of reducing the Federal budget.

All of these critics agree that the proposed lunar landing is important, but they object to the priority being given the Apollo program. They believe that just as much can be learned—and gained—through a more leisurely and less costly space program. This is the position of Science magazine, spokesman for the AAAS.

There is considerable merit in these arguments, but they fail to take full account of the political, economic, and scientific significance of a manned lunar landing. The thinking of these critics, in our opinion, is rather naive, somewhat shortsighted, and quite unrealistic. No one knows for certain how much the space program is going to cost. Robert C. Seamans, Jr., NASA Deputy Administrator, has estimated that the United States will spend between $50 and $60 billion on space projects during the 1960's. Fortune magazine says the bill will run closer to $75 billion or more. But, whatever the cost, we believe the United States must move ahead in space exploration as rapidly and broadly as possible. It no longer is a matter of choice.

Whether we like it or not, Uncle Sam is engaged in a battle of survival with the Soviet Union. At the moment, it is a cold war with each side striving for a political or propaganda advantage. The conquest of space could decide whether it becomes a hot war.

The space race also has economic overtones. Instead of being a burden, the space program—and the lunar project, in particular—is stimulating the economy. In any event, the United States, in our opinion, has the necessary resources to solve both its earthly and space problems.

Perhaps the most telling argument for going to the moon and engaging in other space activities is the new knowledge and opportunities that are likely to result from such exploration. The information gathered from artificial satellites, instrument probes, and especially manned flights will help unlock the secrets of the universe and open the way to a future as different from the present as our civilization is from the dark ages.

Can the AAAS and certain politicians be so unimaginative not to see that this is not just another Government project likened to housing or transportation; but the most important opportunity for new knowledge ever undertaken in the history of man? The manned lunar landing, as the first step in the exploitation of new worlds, new sciences, and new technologies, makes even the discovery of America a minor accomplishment by comparison.

Contained in the concept of space exploitation is at once an economic substitute for war, an opportunity for peace on earth, an answer to overpopulation, and, more important, an unprecedented expansion of everything we know! The exploration of space and the planets presents a future so wonderful as to make its accomplishment imperative at almost any cost. It is the next logical move in man's quest for new knowledge and a better way of life.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that some Members of Congress, certain spokesmen for the Kennedy administration, and some members of the press are playing politics in the literal meaning of that term with the current effort by American Negroes to gain equal rights throughout America.

There are those who would like to see the Republican Party cast in a "damned if you do, damned if you don't" mold on this issue, in spite of the Republican record on civil rights both in this Congress and in the last 10 years. The following editorial column by Mr. Richard Wilson, chief of the Cowles Publications Washington Bureau, puts the present picture in proper perspective. The column appeared in the June 23 Minneapolis Tribune and the June 26 Washington Star:

J.F.K. CAN'T BLAME REPUBLICANS IF CONGRESS BLOCKS RIGHTS PLAN

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—It is little noted but the Democratic majority in the U.S. Senate is exactly the number needed to force a vote on the President's new civil rights program.

A two-thirds vote of the Senate can break a filibuster. The Democrats have 67 votes and the Republicans 33. Yet it will be charged, in fact it is already intimated, that Republicans will be responsible if Congress fails to pass a new civil rights law.

This is the reason why Republican leaders have conferred with President Kennedy on a bipartisan approach with their fingers crossed. However sincere the President's motives, Republicans in the Senate will not be spared mendacious attack if civil rights legislation is not passed.

Yet the reason why such legislation cannot be passed lies in the simple fact that the Kennedy administration has no control of the overwhelming Democratic majorities in the Senate and House.

The Democratic majority is like Barnum and Bailey's menagerie, a big tent housing carefully caged animals which would eat each other up in the jungle. The Senate Democratic leaders say they cannot break a filibuster and pass the President's program without 20 to 25 Republican votes. Therefore, the Republicans are to blame if they don't vote to a man for the President's program.

Democratic leaders could well afford to blush while making such a confession of the ineffectuality of their powers of leadership. Nor is their ineffectuality confined to civil rights. They cannot claim that only on the racial issue are the fierce conflicts within the Democratic party exposed. The flagrant schism is equally evident on social, economic and labor legislation.

Whatever the President's popularity in this and other countries, his prestige in Congress is at low ebb. According to old hands in Congress the resentment against the President has no parallel except possibly the revolt against Franklin D. Roosevelt when he sought to pack the Supreme Court with new appointees. Roosevelt lost his hold on Congress then though he continued to enjoy a public adulation which Mr. Kennedy has never had in anywhere near the same degree.

The congressional discontent with President Kennedy is not confined to the southern Democrats, or the Republicans. The liberals are dissatisfied with what they consider to be half measures. Even some of the moderates think Mr. Kennedy has helped to create, by unfulfillable promises and bravura statements, the conditions for racial demonstrations of a dangerous character. When faced by this dangerous condition, the Kennedy tone quickly changes: Equality will have to come slowly and not by legislation alone.

It is in this atmosphere that the President has proposed his program to hasten the inevitable advance of Negroes toward higher levels of equality. And it is a shame that this question cannot be considered apart from its political aspects.

But those political aspects exist and it is truly amazing that Negro leaders do not recognize them. Negroes made their greatest advances since their emancipation in a Republican administration. Whatever Negro leaders may think today, no civil rights legislation was recommended to Congress by Roosevelt and none was enacted. Harry Truman was the first President to offer a comprehensive program. It was not enacted. Eisenhower offered a program in 1956 and it was enacted in major part. Again in 1960, on Eisenhower's initiative, civil rights legislation was enacted.

In spite of the urgent promises of the Democratic platform of 1960, Mr. Kennedy delayed for more than 2 years offering any kind of general civil rights legislation, and he does so under the pressure of mounting racial demonstrations, and with sentiment built up in Congress against him.

These are the facts. Now it is to be seen whether Mr. Kennedy, with two-thirds of Congress under Democratic control, can do as much as Eisenhower, whose party did not have control of Congress.

And if Mr. Kennedy cannot win, then let the blame go where it ought to.

Addresses of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, we all are highly appreciative of the great work the Vice President is doing in many areas and the solid support he is giving President Kennedy. I had the privilege of seconding the nomination of LYNDON B. JOHNSON for Vice President at the 1960 Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles. He has lived up to everything we said about him then.

The Vice President is dedicated to making our democracy a reality and by his stirring speeches and his chairmanship of the President's Committee on Equality of Opportunity he has carried that dedication into action.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address by our distinguished Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, to the American College Public Relations Association in Chicago, Ill., on Tuesday, June 25, 1963, and another address to the Contractors and Union Leaders Conference on E.E.O. at St. Louis, Mo., on June 25, 1963.

The addresses follow:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON BEFORE THE AMERICAN COLLEGE PUBLIC RELATIONS ASSOCIATION, CHICAGO, ILL., JUNE 25, 1963

A NATIONAL CONCERN

In 1924 I stood on a platform under a warm Texas sky in a star-filled Texas night and graduated from Johnson City High School in the hill country where I was born.

There were six of us, four boys and two girls, in that graduating class.

Last month, under a sky much the same as it was 39 years ago, I spoke to the 1963 graduating class of Johnson City High School, a class of 24 strong.

I suppose those youngsters will remember as much of what I said to them as I remember of the words spoken to me on my graduation night—that is to say, nothing at all.

But in those 39 years, in that brief blink of time as we count time in the history books, the world and its ways have gone through a convulsing change.

In the life span of those young graduates, strange and wonderful things have happened.

The earth has been shrunk but its dimensions have widened. We have supersonic airplanes and manned space flights, television and Telstar. We have painkillers and pushbuttons, computers and cyclotrons, and we also have hydrogen bombs and ballistic missiles.

The winds of today's world run swifter than a weaver's shuttle.

Ninety percent of all the scientists who ever lived are living today.

More mathematics has been created since the beginning of the 20th century than in all the rest of history combined.

Ninety percent of all the drugs being prescribed by physicians today were not even known 10 years ago.

Three-fourths of all the people who will work in industry in 1975 will be producing products that have not yet been invented or discovered.

This is not a time for timid minds and torpid spirits.

It is a time for finding the best of solutions to the worst of problems.

One of our big problems is higher education.

UNHAPPY FACTS

The words of Alfred North Whitehead, that wise and prophetic Harvard teacher, come back across half a century to haunt us today:

"In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute, the race that does not value trained intelligence is doomed. * * * Tomorrow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgment which will then be pronounced on the uneducated."

Professor Whitehead's words live more vividly when you examine some of today's unhappy facts.

For example, there is our educational posture compared to the Soviet Union. Studies by the National Academy of Sciences and National Research Council show us that:

In the production of technically trained people in engineering and the physical and biological sciences, the Russians double our output.

By 1970 we'll need 1,200,000 new scientists. We'll be lucky to train three-fourths that many.

During that same period, the Russians will turn out 2,500,000 scientists and engineers.

Some 60 percent of all Soviet degrees are awarded in engineering and/or the sciences. We award about 25 percent.

The Soviets overlook nothing in their assault on scientific illiteracy. Chancellor Litchfield of Pittsburg warns that we are not keeping pace with the Russians in the way they utilize the brainpower of women.

By his estimate, 35 percent of the engineering faculties in Soviet universities and 39 percent of the engineering students are women. By contrast, only 7 percent of U.S. scientists are women.

Moreover, the Russians are spending about 6 percent of their gross national product on education. We spend about 3.5 percent. In a truer perspective, we have at least 50 percent more students attending our colleges and universities. But the disturbing thing here is the Soviet determination to put first things first in educational emphasis.

These are facts that caused President Kennedy to describe technical and scientific education "one of the most critical problems facting the Nation."

He has, as you know, not only illuminated the problem. He's trying to do something about it in the Congress.

But there is another area of concern to me. And I know it's troublesome to you, too.

Our best estimates tell us by 1970 we'll have 7 million youngsters in colleges and universities and possibly 8½ million by 1975. That last figure happens to be just double the total for 1963. In some areas of the Nation, the number of high school graduates will almost triple in the next decade.

They are stunning statistics.

But they run alongside some other incredible estimates.

THE CHALLENGE

A recent study indicates that the United States may have to spend as much as $12 billion annually for colleges and universities by 1970.

Our needs are enormous.

Our needs are urgent.

Unless we want to go to bed by the light of a Communist moon; unless we resign ourselves to surrender and return to the tusk and the tooth; we have no choice but to meet headon this challenge.

Walter Lippman has written: "We must measure our educational effort as we do our military effort—not by what it would be easy and convenient to do, but by what is necessary to do in order that the Nation may survive and flourish. We have learned that we are quite rich enough to defend ourselves, whatever the cost. We must now learn that we are quite rich enough to educate ourselves as we need to be educated."

There are ways to do just that.

We must seize the ways and make them work for us.

PROBLEM OF PARTNERSHIP

We must attack this problem in a partnership for national profit; a partnership of colleges and universities, business and industry, State and Federal Government, and students and parents.

The colleges and universities themselves can help.

In this audience are many—and I commend them—who have worked and are working on plans of development to prepare your schools for the years of stress ahead.

The States have a role and a responsibility. They need to exercise both.

Experience over the years has made one fact clear: You pay for a proper system of higher education in one way or another. Either you pay for it positively by considering funds for this purpose as an investment in the future—or—you fail to provide enough funds and you pay negatively in lost payrolls, lost taxes, and worst of all, lost opportunities for our young citizens.

In truth, the State that demands the most from its future has no choice. It must invest fully in its institutions of higher education. It cannot turn away from this decision any more than it can turn away from tomorrow.

Students and their parents can help.

Parents can purchase higher education for their children. It is a sound investment. It is commonly agreed that an undergraduate degree adds about $100,000 to the graduate's lifetime earning power.

The Federal Government can help greatly, too.

I'm not unaware that suggesting Federal aid for education is to many good citizens the same as dining with the devil. However, I recall that during World War II Sir Winston Churchill once growled that if Hitler invaded Hell, he would rise in the House of Commons to say a good word for the Devil.

LOCAL PROBLEM—NATIONAL CONCERN

The facts are simple and the facts are these: Education is primarily a local problem. It has always been a local problem.

The Federal Government has never intruded on that province. Since the Morrill Act of 1862, the Federal Government has recognized the needs and the importance of a healthy educational system. In that 100 years of Federal participation in education, there has been no control—there has been no sinister conspiracy—there has been no menace, no threat, no skulduggery of any kind. Most of the fears of Federal domination have been either the imaginings of folks who didn't have all the facts. or demagogues who feast on fear to win votes.

While education is a local problem, it is also a national concern.

If our national posture must be stern, our national purpose must be strong.

The question is not whether we should have Federal help for local education. That was resolved 100 years ago.

The question now is how best can the national Government help the private arena and the local government keep their higher education healthy.

For these are unpeaceful and unusual times.

Today we look down the brazen throat of war, and hold our courage to the sticking place.

Today we are searching out the secrets of a lonely universe, never before explored.

Today we are advancing on the ancient enemies of mankind: disease, ignorance, and poverty.

Today we are making contact with a tomorrow that will make yesterday seem shamefully barren.

We are doing all this ahd we will bo more.

The reason—education.

I am glad to speak my thoughts to this organization which is accomplishing much for higher education.

But there is much more to be done.

Perhaps this partnership of colleges, universities, business, industry, State, and Federal Government, and parents and students joined in common concert may be the answer.

I know it must be so. I know this because I believe in this land and its people, because we are strong and free, because we understand.

That, in its highest sense, is the reason for higher education.

Remarks by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson at Contractors and Union Leaders Conference on EEO, St. Louis, Mo., June 25, 1963

You have been assembled here today as serious-minded men and women dedicated to a serious purpose—the fulfillment of the promises of a free society.

I congratulate you. You have come under one compulsion only—the desire to fulfill your obligations of citizenship to a country which you love.

It would be idle to ignore the background against which this meeting is being held. During the past few months, we have witnessed the strong protests of people who feel—with justice—that they have been denied their rights for too many decades.

This meeting is not being held in response to the demonstrations—in fact, it was planned before the demonstrations were conceived. But the demonstrations themselves—however controversial—have highlighted the urgency of what we are attempting to do.

No problem is ever solved until we first understand it. And I believe we must realize that we are facing not one, but two problems which are interrelated but which require separate approaches.

First, there is the problem of discrimination itself—the kind of action that says a man will be judged on his ancestry without regard to his merits.

Second, there is the problem of the impact that decades of this discrimination have had on men and women—and this problem, though less obvious, is more subtle and more difficult to overcome than the first.

Our country is making progress on a solution to the first problem. We would be less than candid if we said that the problem has been solved or that we are even close to a solution. But we have made a start and I am confident that we will make enormous strides in the period immediately—and I do mean immediately—ahead of us.

However, if those of us assembled in this room could pass a resolution that had the magic power to abolish racial discrimination totally by midnight, we would still wake up tomorrow in a highly imperfect—and highly unequal—world. We would still find 10 percent of our population battling for economic survival against handicaps that would discourage all but the stoutest and boldest.

The bars that have been erected against men because of their race, their creed and their color have not been bars against jobs solely. Even more importantly, they have been bars against the opportunity to qualify for the jobs.

And after decades in which men have been barred from jobs and barred from the training for those jobs, still a third factor arises. It is a psychological barrier that makes a man reluctant to even try to qualify for a job when a lifetime of experience—and his father's experience and his grandfather's experience before him—has demonstrated the heartbreaking futility of such efforts.

Too many young men and women, with stars in their eyes and music in their hearts, have stormed the heights only to find the last mile guarded by an implacable gate inscribed "Admission by approved ancestry only." A few—a pitiful handful—have passed the gate but only because they possessed talents and determination far in excess of that required by others for whom the gate swings easily.

And for every 1 who knocked and was denied, there were 10 others who lost heart and dropped out of the struggle.

My experience in the field of equal employment opportunity has demonstrated one thing to me conclusively. The basic issue at stake is the good faith of the majority. Until that has been proved, there will be no solution to the problem we are facing.

To find the answer, we must work together. And if we search our hearts and our souls, we must, in candor, concede that the minority has some basis for skepticism.

I believe in the good faith of the majority. Otherwise there would be no reason for us to be here today, taking time out from crowded schedules when that time might be used for individual profit and gain.

We must admit there has been lethargy; a tendency to look the other way; a preoccupation with our own individual affairs that has blinded us to what is happening to our fellow men. But I have known very few people in my life who are not men of good will and the few exceptions have been those so obsessed by their fears that they had lost the capacity for hope.

You are not men and women obsessed by your fears—you have achieved too much in this world to be fearful. You are men and women who are capable of reasoning together to reach constructive solutions. And the solutions must be reached by you in your local communities.

The Federal Government will not shirk its obligations. But the ultimate answer to the problems must go beyond the actions the Federal Government can take.

We can help. We can offer advice which you yourself must judge as to its merits. We can maintain channels of communication. We can employ Federal power to protect the constitutional rights of every American citizen regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. We can pass laws defining those rights. We can outlaw discrimination in a broad series of fields.

It is apparent by now that we will act to the limit of our powers to enforce justice. But banning discrimination does not—by itself—create equal opportunity.

Somewhere, somehow people must sit down together and work out their problems. Equal opportunity requires more than a negative ban against evil; it requires a positive affirmation for good—and practical methods of achieving the goal.

We must find ways of making up for the lost years of educational opportunities.

We must find ways of persuading our young people that the door of opportunity is now open and that they can pass through if they only train themselves.

We must find ways of eliminating employment patterns that react—like litmus paper—to a color test.

And, above all, we must find jobs—useful, productive jobs that will strengthen America and make all our citizens full participants in our economy.

Do not think for a moment that this problem can—or should—be solved by disregarding the total job situation. We are not trying to replace a group of people who now have jobs with another group that does not. That would merely be sharing the misery—a concept unworthy of America. What we wish to do instead is to share the benefits of our economy—and spur it to new heights by adding to it productive workers whose services we have previously denied ourselves.

I do not believe we are so barren of imagination or so pauperized in initiative that we can no longer expand our prosperity. I do not believe that we lack the skill to train our people in useful occupations—and bring them together with work that has to be done.

Nor do I believe that it is an adequate answer to say that we must continue to be unfair in employment because there are not enough jobs to go around.

Here in St. Louis the community is moving. The mayor has taken the initiative and has set up a committee to act—not just to talk. That means much to me because this conference would be wasted if it amounted to nothing but pious expressions of good will.

The St. Louis committee can count upon the help and cooperation of the President's Committee. I hope we are called upon frequently. And I hope community action programs are set up in every city in our land.

There is just one thought I wish to leave with you in closing.

We are not here to do anybody a favor—and I doubt whether any favors are wanted. We are not trying to create a privileged group. Nor are we trying to create an artificial "equality."

We are trying to establish justice and to make up—as best we can—for wrongs. And we are proceeding on the assumption that where men and women have equal opportunity they will turn out to be rather equal after all.

This is an opportunity to do what is morally right and what is right for America. You have my best wishes, my full support, and my high hopes for success.

Winning Friends and Influencing Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Rec-

ORD, I include the following editorial from the June 27, 1963, edition of the Wall Street Journal:

Winning Friends and Influencing Nations

Suppose for a moment that the President of France, paying a visit to neighboring Canada, should use the occasion to assail the President of the United States and to appeal to the American people to reverse his policies.

Would you then suppose that this would improve relations between France and the United States? Put the U.S. President in a better mood to discuss differences amicably? Inspire the Americans to turn against their own President?

We don't think so. It would take a superhuman man in the White House not to be annoyed. And Americans would hardly be acting like Americans if they did not resent it. People may not always agree with their cousins and their sisters and their aunts, but they don't like outsiders meddling in family affairs.

Yet this is what President Kennedy tried to do to French affairs the other day in his speech at Frankfurt, in neighboring West Germany. So we don't find it too surprising that the French feel offended.

Mr. Kennedy carefully refrained from mentioning by name either General de Gaulle or France. But everyone understood his meaning when he assailed "those who would * * * split one ally from another" and those who "welcome any Western disarray." The reference was to General de Gaulle's opposition to British entry into the Common Market, his stubbornness about an independent French atomic force and his uncoöperativeness in NATO.

The French press ran bold headlines, "Kennedy Attacks De Gaulle." Washington made no effort to disguise the purpose of the speech. The State Department, according to the New York Times, was pleased at this rebuff to De Gaulle, hailing it as a justified statement of Mr. Kennedy's irritation with the general.

That irritation, we agree, is understandable and not without some justification. France is the keystone to many things in Europe, from the Common Market to NATO, and therefore the key to our European policy. With French cooperation we can hope to see much accomplished. Without it, all will be more difficult. And France has been frustratingly uncooperative.

But what, then, should be the objective? To chastise the recalcitrant general? Or to try to win back the lost cooperation and do what we can to influence the French Government to our view of the needs of Europe?

Whenever anyone has to deal with recalcitrant people, there is perhaps a certain therapeutic value in giving vent to one's feelings in public. Yet experience, as well as commonsense, suggests that the relief from frustration may be purchased at the price of hardening the attitudes that are themselves the cause of the frustration. Blunt remarks that may be fruitful in the privacy of the bargaining room have a way of backfiring when they are shouted from the housetops.

This is as true in diplomacy as it is in Dale Carnegie's little handbook. If we have now some disarray in the Western alliance, it is due at least in part to the habit we have lately fallen into of acerbating differences with wounding words in public statements.

Just recently we had a dramatic illustration of this when a few American words precipitated a governmental crisis in Canada, the ill effects of which have not yet disappeared. Indeed it was an earlier snub of General de Gaulle—his exclusion from the Bermuda conference at which Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Macmillan discussed arrangements for both France and Europe—that did much to bring United States-French differences to their present hard estate.

As a statement of America's continuing commitments to Europe, militarily and economically, the President's Franfurt speech has much to recommend it. But to use one country as a forum to prick its neighbor with barbed words strikes us as a dubious way to win friends and to influence in our direction the course of nations.

The Court Bars the Lord's Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. BROMWELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, being a Potter Stewart man myself, I was pleased by the editorial in the Washington Star of Tuesday, June 18. Meditating on the facts that 64 percent of our people claim church membership, and 39 States have encouraged religious observances in public schools and that there seems to be a minimum of clerical protest of the Supreme Court decisions of June 17, the editorial seemed lonely, courageous, and altogether right. It still, surprisingly, does.

The editorial follows:

The Court Bars the Lord's Prayer

The Supreme Court has spoken. Both the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading have been barred from the public schools. This comes not as a surprise. But in our view it is a shame.

It all seems so silly. Writing for the majority, Justice Clark conjured up dreadful prospects if the Court should allow a prayer to be said in a public school. To permit such a thing, he argued, would depart from the concept of a government that must be "neutral" in religious matters. And he went on to say: "The breach of neutrality that is today a trickling stream may all too soon become a raging torrent." Perhaps there is something to be said for this as rhetoric. But it is nonsense when measured against the rise of secularism and materialism in this country since the Founding Fathers drafted the first amendment. We mention this because it helps a little in understanding what Justice Clark must have had in mind when he said that the application of his concept of neutrality requires "interpretation of a delicate sort." Delicate indeed.

Justice Stewart, the lone dissenter, stated his understanding of what is meant by the first amendment's guarantee of religious freedom. It is a forthright statement, and it appeals to us. "What our Constitution indispensably protects," he said, "is the freedom of each of us, be he Jew or Agnostic, Christian or Atheist, Buddhist or Freethinker, to believe or disbelieve, to worship or not worship, to pray or to keep silent, according to his own conscience, uncoerced and unrestrained by Government." To us, this is quite different from saying that the Constitution forbids one child, who may wish to do so, to recite the Lord's Prayer in a public school merely because some other child, who does not want to pray and who is not required to pray, objects.

Also interesting were some comments by Justice Golberg in a concurring opinion, in which Justice Harlan joined.

Justice Goldberg, of course, agreed with the majority ruling. But he seemed a bit disturbed by Justice Clark's neutral concept. "Untutored devotion to the concept of neutrality," he said, "can lead * * * to a brooding and pervasive devotion to the secular and a passive, or even active, hostility to the religious." For our part, we think the Court's school rulings in the area of religion, although certainly not so intended, have already led to a climate of passive and perhaps even active hostility to the religious. At another point, Justice Goldberg, in what we take to be a reference to Justice Clark's trickling stream and raging torrent, added: "It is, of course, true that great consequences can grow from small beginnings, but the measure of constitutional adjudication is the ability and willingness to distinguish between real threat and mere shadow."

If we may put our own interpretation on this, we think it is a comment which hits the nail squarely on the head. For in this ruling, and in some of those that preceded it, the court has done precisely what Justice Goldberg warned against—mistaken mere shadow for real threat.

In the process God and religion have all but been driven from the public schools. What remains? Will the baccalaureate service and Christmas carols be the next to go? Don't bet against it.

Morals and Free World's State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, any student of ancient history who observes the American political scene today can show striking parallels between the decline of the Roman Empire and what has been occurring in the United States. Unfortunately, few have the perspective afforded by long residence in Washington and Rome.

One such person is Constantine Brown, the distinguished columnist of the Evening Star of Washington, D.C., who, in his article from Rome in the June 22, 1963, issue of that paper, deals forthrightly with some of the causes of the plight of the free world in the crucial struggle that lies ahead.

In order to give Mr. Brown's thoughtful column a wider circulation, I quote it as part of my remarks:

Morals and Free World's State—High Life in High Places Called Sign of Disarmament of Ideologies

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME.—The castastrophic ills of the world today are not due to political, but to moral deterioration. As a former Italian Prime Minister said recently, "What we are seeing is a disarmament of ideologies."

We are seeing an unprecedented weakening of moral fiber throughout the free world and no amount of billions spent on armed might, nor calculated risks in disarmament agreements, will make any difference so long as basic moral values are cast aside.

The Roman Empire did not fall under the impact of barbarian attacks alone. The fall was preceded by a preference for an easy, careless life by the leadership which offered bread and circuses to the people to cover its own moral degradation.

The high civilization, the "dolce vita," which the Roman Empire enjoyed just before its destruction can be compared to that which exists in the present free world. Wherever we look there are scandals, strife, and apathy as the danger to our civilization stares us in the face.

The Profumo scandal in England is a typical example of the sorry situation in a country which in the past set a high standard of morality in public life. A close examination of the Profumo affair shows that behind it is the ever present shadow of the Communists, always ready to take advantage of the frailties of men.

The personal life and amorous adventures of the British war minister, we are assured, had nothing to do with his disgrace or the troubles of the Tory cabinet. Men in public life are no longer expected to be above reproach as Caesar's wife, we are told. The fact that Profumo lied to Parliament was his great crime. But behind all this remains the fact that the head of the British Army became indelicately involved with Christine Keeler and a Russian spy. And as though this was not enough, quite unashamedly, a night club offered this call girl a contract at a fabulous figure for a 12-week appearance as an emcee.

The barbarian hordes from the East do not want nor need to imitate their predecessors of centuries ago by taking a military risk. They need only to gently push and encourage the moral collapse of their victims. Wherever we look in this distraught world we find the hand of the Muscovites behind every crisis.

In West Germany, Chancellor Adenauer was forced to announce his retirement because of Der Spiegel scandal. On the surface this was a badly managed affair by the "Bavarian bull." Defense Minister Franz Joseph Strauss. But actually, Der Spiegel and its editors were suspected by the German and other intelligence services as a channel for the Soviet espionage system. Had the matter of the badly managed arrest of Der Spiegel editors not caused so much international uproar, an orderly inquiry would have shown how deep the Russian espionage had penetrated into German ministries.

This would have shown, as in Britain, sexual perversion, bribery, and corruption. But the Germans, still suffering from a guilt complex because of two world wars they initiated, preferred to hush up an affair in which one of the ministers had acted undemocratically.

But even the United States shows a deterioration unworthy of a young and strong nation. Political ambitions have caused men to shut their eyes to our moral disarmament under the cover of "freedom of speech," "freedom of religion" and "constitutional rights." Under these noble covers provided us by our Founding Fathers, obscenity in literature is permissive; Jesus has been downgraded and a leading theologian discusses the "irrelevance of God" who is "almost ridiculous."

The racial crisis which presents an unprecedented threat to America is one of racial integration rather than of desegregation. If our leaders who are now in office were to take a little time and study the available records of the last 30 years they would find that the Communists have worked assiduously and patiently to bring about the present state of the Nation. While Premier Khrushchev denounces the moral degradation of Russian artists, the Communists encourage it in the free world. While Russian writers are publishing poetry and classics, our bookstalls provide either moral trash or leftist propaganda in abundance.

The free world is collapsing morally while dolce vita and power politics prevail, beclouding the real meaning of the crisis. And modern architecture being what it is, there won't be any glorious ruins to remind future tourists that at least we had good taste, if not good sense.

Customs Screens Red Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have read with great interest an article on Communist propaganda which appeared in the Washington Post on June 16, written by a very prominent columnist, Mr. Jerry Klutz. As chairman of a subcommittee which heard testimony pertaining to this menace, I wish to bring this article to the attention of the House:

CUSTOMS SCREENS RED PROPAGANDA

(By Jerry Kluttz)

NEW YORK, June 15.—A window washer, with worry showing on his face, appeared at about 6 o'clock on a recent morning at the main post office in downtown Manhattan and in his broken English made it known that it was urgent for him to see someone in authority.

Later, he was ushered in to see an official. He presented a card he had received from the postmaster. It asked if he wanted mail that was being held at the post office because the Customs Bureau had declared it to contain Communist political propaganda.

Nervously, he kept repeating that he didn't want to have any trouble with the Government; that he wasn't a Communist, that he didn't subscribe to the material and he didn't know how his name and address had gotten on the list.

The official reassured the window washer that the post office was merely enforcing a law passed recently by Congress: the controversial Cunningham rider. All he needed to do was check two boxes on the return card and he would not get the mail being held for him and similar mail that might arrive in the future. This he did.

ACCEPTING MAIL OPTIONAL

But Federal officials can never be certain whether the window washer, and others like him, honestly don't want the material or they are fearful of trouble with Uncle Sam if they accept it. Addressees sent cards from postmasters have the option of accepting or rejecting mail being detained for them and also similar mail that arrives later.

"This isn't censorship," Irving Fishman, Deputy Collector of Customs in New York, explained. "We merely screen the mail from Communist countries. People who want the mail get it and no questions are asked. Mail is stopped at the post offices and isn't delivered to those who don't want it," the 56-year-old career executive said. "Besides, censorship is a dirty word and the American public has an instant dislike for any Federal agency or official who tries to tell it what it can or can't read."

Fishman, whose New York office determines what is or isn't Communist political propaganda in mail shipped from overseas, revealed that many refugees from Communist nations were delighted to have such mail stopped at post offices.

COMMUNIST TARGETS

Many of these people, he explained, are targets of various Communist repatriation programs; they are asked to return to the homeland, told that things there have changed for the better, and that they will be forgiven for any past acts.

"They become alarmed over mail like this," Fishman said. "They tell us they're trying to forget the past and to hide out and lose themselves in this country. They can't understand how their new addresses become known behind the Iron Curtain."

But the Post Office Department has revealed it has its own methods of protecting such persons from unwanted mail. All the refugees need do is notify their local postmasters in writing that they don't want such mail and it will be returned to the sender as "undeliverable." The Department provides this service regardless of the Cunningham amendment.

Actually, very little of the mail that arrives here from Communist nations and classified as Communist political propaganda is rejected by addressees under the amendment that became effective last January 7. The bulk of it is delivered promptly to them.

CHECKING POINTS SET UP

Customs and Post Office have worked together on a joint operation to carry out the law. Checking points in post offices in New York, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, New Orleans, El Paso, Miami, Honolulu and San Juan have been set up to screen the mail. San Juan still isn't fully operative.

As most mail from Communist countries arrives at these points it is sent to a section for "restricted mail," manned by specially trained Customs and postal employes who screen it.

Since the law is new, meaningful statistics were compiled for only March, April, and May. In each of those months about 2.6 million pieces of mail arrived from Communist countries. Roughly half of it was released immediately as being exempt under the law. It was addressed to schools, libraries, registered foreign agents, etc. Sealed mail also is cleared without delay.

The remainder was detained by Customs for closer screening, which means its foreign language experts read some of the unsealed mail such as pamphlets and other printed documents. Much of it is cleared and sent on its way.

Customs employees must refer any suspect mail to Fishman. The mail is in various foreign languages as well as English. Fishman makes the final determination whether the mail does or doesn't carry Communist political propaganda.

In March, he declared that 89,000 pieces contained propaganda, in April, 106,000, and in May, 90,000.

But the bulk of this mail, 81,000 pieces in March, 97,000 in April, and 82,000 in May, is delivered to addressees by Post Office, which determined that they wish to receive the material. This mail is addressed to newspapers, radio and TV stations, magazines, and other news media. Post Office has concluded they should get the mail without interference.

For various reasons such as those related earlier by the refugees, Post Office concluded that 1,531 pieces in March, 4,369 in April, and 2,963 in May were unwanted by the addressees.

The postmasters then send inquiries to the addressees of the relatively few remaining pieces to ask them if they want or don't want the mail delivered to them.

In March, 3,682 notices covering 6,185 pieces of mail were sent; in April and May inquiries on 4,543 and 5,709 pieces were sent addressees.

The record is incomplete but in those months 711 in March, 522 in April, and 365 in May asked that all mail of that type be sent to them. Of those who, like the window washer, wanted none of it, there were 679, 539, and 617, respectively. About 400 in each of the 3 months requested some, but not all, of the mail. The remainder was either undeliverable, the wrong addresses, or the addressees didn't return the cards and Post Office assumed they didn't want the mail. They were told that assumption would be made if they didn't hear from them within 20 days.

Officials in both Customs and Post Office agree that a relatively small amount of unwanted mail from Communist countries is screened out by the Cunningham amendment.

Fishman, a 35-year veteran in Customs, has the unenviable task of making the decision on Communist political propaganda and he isn't always sure, after years of studying the subject, what it is himself.

"It doesn't stand still, you know," he told me, "one batch of mail deals with the situation in Cuba, another with the race problem in Alabama and Mississippi, and still another with southeast Asia."

Fishman also explained that the mood of the Nation at the time was a contributing factor that he must consider. "If we, as a matter of national policy, become more friendly with a Communist nation we're more likely to allow their mail to come in," he explained. "But if relations with that same country become tense and serious, well, we're more likely to screen their mail more closely."

He recalled that the first mail screening program was set up during the late 1930's to halt the flow of Nazi propaganda from Germany and that the Cunningham amendment had evolved from it.

Fishman said he'd welcome a clear-cut ruling by the Supreme Court on the question of just what is Communist political propaganda because "it would make my job easier and get a lot of people off my back."

He said that he had been informed that the American Civil Liberties Union would test the constitutionality of the law and he's hoping that the Court, in its decision, will define propaganda and whether his decisions of what is propaganda are right or wrong. "I dislike," he emphasized, "to make arbitrary decisions."

Attorneys, however, suspect that the ACLU will attack the law on the ground that the constitutional rights of citizens are being invaded by Post Office in maintaining lists of persons who get Communist political propaganda.

Some time ago, Fishman said, the Government sent him to the Western European countries to study how they handled Communist propaganda.

"Neither France nor England," he related, "showed too much concern over the matter although their national police were quite aware of the problem. Generally, they were content to allow local police handle it.

"They knew about our screening system and neither wanted to have anything like it. They use the direct approach. If the propaganda becomes too violent and offensive, the police confiscate and burn it and very little is said about it."

The 17th Annual Pittsburgh World Trade Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, world trade is a substantial part of the Pittsburgh economy. Products worth $219 million were exported by 359 Pittsburgh area firms in 1961. Thus, a very great part of the Pittsburgh labor, owes its income directly to international trade.

On the 20th of this month, the World Trade Council of the Chamber of Commerce sponsored its 17th Annual Pittsburgh World Trade Conference. At that conference, James Bush, a Director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington gave some very important advice in his keynote speech. Mr. Bush pointed to our serious balance-of-payments situation and outlined the positive role that the Bank and its export members have played through the traditional method of Treasury authorization.

The speech follows:

"To Be, or Not To Be (an Exporter), That Is the Question"

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I have chosen the topic, "To Be, or Not To Be (an Exporter), That Is the Question," because I have been informed that a substantial number of those in the audience today are right now studying this very question of whether or not they want to tackle the export markets of the world. There are, of course, many of you who have not only been exporting but actually investing abroad for many, many years. Consequently, I invite the indulgence of you seasoned campaigners while I make a few general remarks concerning the great opportunities that exist today for thousands of American concerns in foreign markets.

It is an astounding and regrettable fact that over 275,000 manufacturing concerns in the United States produce only for the domestic market and have never exported a single piece of their product to overseas areas. As a matter of fact, only 4 percent of all the manufacturing concerns in this country export any part of their product, which is a pitiful percentage compared to almost any other industrialized nation you can name.

UNITED STATES IN GENERAL

Although the United States has been and is the world's largest exporter to the tune of some $20 billion, as well as importer to the tune of about $16 billion, and although its business concerns have put in place some $35 billion of direct foreign investments on which they earn almost $4 billion a year, the gruesome reality faces us, which we can ill afford to ignore, that we must increase our exports against dollar repayment by very substantial proportions and put in place many billions of dollars of additional direct foreign investments if we are to survive the bitter and ever-increasing competition that faces our Nation from almost all parts of the world.

WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA

Western Pennsylvania has many concerns which, over the years, have done outstanding jobs, not only in exporting their products, but also in making actual plant investments abroad which have been responsible for repatriating hundreds of millions, if not billions, of U.S. dollars. Not less important, they have been responsible for the creation of jobs and for benefits to your local economy generally.

In spite of these achievements, there still exists in this great industrial area a large number of small- and medium-sized concerns which have not directed their attention to oversea sales and investment and, I am sorry to say, you have many financial institutions which have done little or nothing to provide nonrecourse financing to assist their customers in selling or investing abroad. I am very sorry to say to you today, and I hope that you will excuse my complete frankness, that financial institutions in eastern Pennsylvania have done a lot better job than those in the western part of this State.

Incidentally, I would like to pay tribute at this time to your Congressman, Bill Moorhead, who has been a stanch supporter of Eximbank. Only recently he made a stirring speech on the floor of the House urging his fellow Congressman to enact legislation increasing Eximbank's lending authority from $7 to $9 billion by direct borrowing authority from the U.S. Treasury. We are grateful to him for this strong support.

We are also indebted to your distinguished Senator, Joe Clark, who, as a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, has backed Eximbank to the hilt in its request for increased borrowing authority. All business in this State should be grateful to him.

The actual fact is that a vast majority of U.S. private business and financial institutions may be passing up one of the greatest challenges and opportunities that will come their way in this decade. You have only to look at your next-door neighbor, the Aluminum Co. of America, to note that it derives something like 65 percent of its net income from foreign operations. Another neighbor, H. J. Heinz, with its 57 varieties, has derived as much as 50 percent of its gross sales and 64 percent of its net profits from its foreign subsidiaries. The international operations of your great Gulf Oil Corp. contributed $135 million, or 40 percent of its 1961 net income, which is no mean achievement by itself. Such other western Pennsylvania concerns as Joy Manufacturing, Westinghouse Electric, Koppers Co., Blaw-Knox, Jones & Laughlin, and others, have sold hundreds of millions of dollars worth of their products to oversea customers, much to the benefit of their stockholders, employees, and to this area generally.

FOREIGN CREDIT INSURANCE ASSOCIATION

Now I should like to review with you some of the activities of the Export-Import Bank so that you may better understand the facilities that it offers to U.S. exporters and financial institutions. A little over a year ago, Eximbank instituted a program of insurance designed to provide U.S. exporters with export credit insurance comparable to that which had been in effect for some years in many European countries and for 42 years in the United Kingdom. In order to furnish more convenient facilities to U.S. exporters and in conformity with our mandate from Congress to supplement and not compete with private capital, the private insurance industry was invited to participate in the program. The Foreign Credit Insurance Association (FCIA) was formed with a few companies in February 1962, and now includes over 70 leading U.S. marine, casualty and property insurance companies. With headquarters at 110 William Street, New York City, it is served by insurance agents and brokers throughout the country. A commission is paid to an agent or broker on every policy issued. This is in the spirit of American private enterprise.

FCIA, on behalf of itself and Eximbank, issues insurance covering either comprehensive risks (both credit and political) or political risks alone, on both short-term and medium-term export transactions. Sales on terms up to 180 days, or in some cases up to 1 year, are considered short term; sales from 181 days to 5 years are considered medium term. Under short-term policies, the exporter must insure all of his eligible foreign sales, or at least enough of them to give FCIA and Eximbank a "reasonable spread of risk." Medium-term policies are issued on a case-by-case basis.

Credit risks are defined as failure of payment to the exporter because of insolvency of or protracted default by the buyer. Political risks are defined as actions taken by foreign governments which prevent payment by the buyer, such as currency inconvertibility, expropriation, cancellation of import license, etc. The exporter is not covered 100 percent by the insurance policy. He is obliged to carry for his own account from 5 to 15 percent of the political risk under either the comprehensive or political risk policy, and 15 percent of the credit risk under the comprehensive policy. Moreover, on medium-term sales, a buyer must make a downpayment of 10 to 20 percent. Of course, the insurance policies cover only the financed portion of the sale. Premiums are charged commensurate with the risk covered, varying according to the country of the importer and the terms of the credit. As between Eximbank and FCIA, the bank carries the political risk in all policies, and the two agencies share equally in the credit risk in comprehensive policies. As the program progresses, the insurance association is expected to take more of the credit risk and ultimately 100 percent of it.

As my good friend George Moore, president of the First National City Bank of New York, once told us, "If private financial institutions are not willing to take the credit risks, they don't deserve to be called bankers." The same philosophy should, in my opinion, apply to these gigantic insurance companies.

Export credit insurance enables the exporter to extend credit to his overseas customers with assurance that unforeseen adverse developments abroad will not expose him to large losses, thus protecting him against impairment of his working capital. Of equal importance, exporters find it easier to obtain financing for their transactions from commercial banks or other financial institutions, to which the insurance policies or their proceeds may be assigned. From its inception in February 1962, through May 31, 1963, FCIA has issued some 1,500 comprehensive policies in an amount of well over $500 million. Over 150 of these policies were issued to companies that never exported before. It is also interesting that 25 percent of these policies were assigned as collateral to U.S. financial institutions which assisted the exporters in financing the transactions.

EXIMBANK PROGRAMS WITH PRIVATE BANKS

In addition to the insurance programs, Export-Import Bank, in late 1961, enlarged and improved its commercial bank guarantee program. Nonrecourse financing of medium-term transactions is provided to exporters by commercial banks, the latter obtaining guarantees from Eximbank on a case-by-case basis. Eximbank provides the commercial bank with a political risk guarantee on the early maturities of a medium-term transaction in which the commercial bank assumes the credit risk, and a guarantee covering both political and credit risks on the remainder of the term of the transaction, provided that the commercial bank carries the paper from beginning to end. It is important to note that the commercial bank furnishes the major portion of the funds to finance the transactions without any recourse on the exporter.

It is customary in international trade circles for the foreign buyer to make a cash payment of 10 to 20 percent before or at the time of delivery of the merchandise and for the exporter to retain 15 percent of the financed portion for his own account and risk, this retention being spread equally through the life of the credit. During the first 18 months of this program, Eximbank has issued guarantees under this and similar programs totaling $375 million. We hope that, as time goes on, this activity will stimulate commercial banks throughout the country to take an increasingly active role in financing our export trade without recourse on the exporters. However, western Pennsylvania bankers will have to "perk up" in this program because I am sorry to say that during this period, eastern Pennsylvania banks have originated over 60 exporter credits under Eximbank guarantees, whereas western Pennsylvania banks have originated only 4 or 5.

You might be interested to know that, since the beginning of this program in late 1961, some 65 U.S. commercial banks or Edge Act corporations have received 835 guarantees or participations from Eximbank involving export transactions totaling $180 million. These figures do not include commercial jet aircraft and numerous commodity transactions which Eximbank guaranteed and which had an invoice value of another $200 million.

Only last week, Eximbank announced further refinements and improvements in its program, the most important ones being:

1. Eximbank will now rely on the credit judgment of the originating commercial bank in transactions involving an invoice value up to $200,000 each. The former limit was only $50,000.

2. Eximbank will now give advance approval of the political risk portion of its guarantee. This enables the commercial bank to negotiate transactions with its customers with the advance knowledge that Eximbank will or will not accept the political risk. Obviously, if the answer is negative, the private bank in most instances can dispense with the costly and time-consuming credit investigation of the foreign buyer.

On these new guarantee and insurance programs Eximbank is disseminating information through a variety of devices and organizations. The Credit Policy Committee and the Small Business Council Committee of the American Bankers Association published a booklet this past February entitled, "World Trade Is Banking's Business." This booklet described and heartily endorsed the above programs and stressed the opportunities that they afford to increase the export business of this country. The booklet was distributed by the ABA to 17,500 member banks and their branches, which represent approximately 95 percent of all bank units in this country. Other commercial and business associations are contemplating publishing a separate booklet for the benefit of U.S. exporters and prospective exporters.

PROJECT LOANS—LONGER TERM

In dollar magnitude, Eximbank's project loans have traditionally constituted the great bulk of the Bank's volume. These longer term loans will, of course, be continued. In facilitating the export of U.S. goods and services, the project loan accomplishes for large transactions what the exporter credit guarantee accomplishes for the smaller ones. The project loan made directly to a foreign borrower involves the many items of equipment and services which go into the creation or the major expansion of an industrial, mining, public utility or other enterprise. The exporter type of transaction, contrariwise, generally involves one or more "shelf" items of equipment going to the end user, or to a distributor for resale.

As a basis for making a project loan, Eximbank satisfies itself (1) that there is reasonable assurance of repayment; (2) that adequate resources are available to complete the project; (3) that the project is technically sound; and (4) that the project will benefit the economy and, frequently, that it will strengthen the foreign exchange position of the borrowing country. One of your Pittsburgh banks participated with Eximbank in financing one such project in Mexico a year of two ago.

From the standpoint of American business, the major impact of Eximbank's project lending is upon literally thousands of U.S. manufacturers and suppliers who are enabled thereby to sell equipment, materials and services abroad and to receive prompt payment. Although the number of prime contractors associated with a particular project loan may be small, thousands of orders flow to U.S. industry through subcontractors.

Loans of this type made by Eximbank are dollar credits, placed in U.S. banks, to pay for actual purchases of U.S. merchandise and services. Eximbank's dollars do not leave this country, only the American equipment, services, etc., which are exported. By financing sound projects abroad, Eximbank has helped to make American equipment and skills known throughout the world and has established a basis for a continuing flow of spare parts and repeat orders. A good example of this occurred 2 or 3 years ago when Eximbank made a loan of $115 million to a private copper mining venture in Peru. U.S. exporters received orders not only for all of the original $115 million, but also repeat orders for all manner of spare parts and merchandise, even food for the commissary, at the rate of $1 million per month. These spares and supplies were paid for in cash by the Peruvian borrower. Your industry and labor in western Pennsylvania have benefited greatly from these project loans and it is safe to say that they have received orders running into several hundred million dollars over the past few years as a result of Eximbank's having provided the funds for the U.S. dollar costs.

EMERGENCY TRADE CREDITS

Occasionally Eximbank fulfills its basic purpose of facilitating the foreign trade of the United States by extending so-called emergency trade credits. This type of credit is made when a friendly country, normally a good customer of the United States, experiences temporary exchange difficulties which threaten to impede or even cut off its customary level of imports from the United States. As in all of its other activities, the dollars loaned by Eximbank under such credits are tied to U.S. purchases.

LINES OF CREDIT

Another important facility offered by Eximbank for the benefit of U.S. business is the "line of credit" which Eximbank extends from time to time to foreign governments or the agencies thereof, and also to privately owned finance companies or banks abroad. Under these credits the borrowing bank or finance company reloans Eximbank's funds to a very large number of small- and medium-sized concerns in the host country which could not possibly afford to deal directly with Eximbank. All of the money under these lines is credited to the account of the borrower in a U.S. commercial bank which, in turn, disburses the money to the U.S. suppliers which have received orders from the borrower. This device enables Eximbank to loan to and collect from one reliable borrower, who may be located 10,000 miles away, but who knows his customer's needs and capabilities. On one credit of this type, extended by Eximbank 2 or 3 years ago, over 900 U.S. suppliers in 37 States received orders and, incidentally, were paid in cash from the proceeds of Eximbank's credit.

CONCLUSIONS

In summing up my remarks today, I would like to emphasize the following points:

1. Neither Government nor industry can afford the peril of continuing large deficits in our country's international balance of payments. As a nation we must become much more "export minded" to insure a continuing and increasing reflow of U.S. dollars back to the United States.

2. American business, banking, labor, and governmental agencies must cooperate with each other far more closely than they have in the past. It is more true today than it was 100 years ago when Abraham Lincoln said, "We must all hang together or we will all hang separately."

3. Government, labor, industry, and agriculture must bury their ancient myths about each other and unite in a common cause. These myths, as durable as those of Karl Marx and Adam Smith about capitalism, have survived wars, depressions, and even prosperous eras, but they are about as useful in running the complex machinery of the modern world as a sledge hammer.

4. We shall have to improve and refine programs which will harness the economic power of industry, finance, and agriculture with the political power of Government. As equal partners we have a reasonable chance of surviving the explosive forces which face us around the world.

5. Ignorance is the archenemy of progress. Our educational institutions as a whole, indeed starting at the high school level, will have to do a much better job in preparing our young men and women for the field of foreign trade, which offers such tremendous opportunities for interesting lives and profitable careers.

6. The American people must throw off once and for all their deplorable desuetude and degenerating detachment from foreign trade and go about the job of proving to the world that we are still its best salesmen and best technicians and, more important, that we still have the power, the energy and the will to overcome temporary obstacles and build an export trade for this country to a volume undreamed of by this or previous generations.

Thank you.

Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, many of us in both Houses of the Congress have been pointing out for over 2 years that we must maintain maximum alertness regarding events in Cuba. Former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, in remarks recently made at Newberry College, again reminded the President that we must not allow Mr. Khrushchev to think that after we awoke last October, we turned over and went back to sleep.

Yet the following articles by Columnists R. S. Allen and Paul Scott outlines what may be a coming "Cuba Policy Shift" by the Kennedy administration. In undertaking this shift, the administration will apparently attempt to normalize our relations with both Castro and Khrushchev by seeking accommodations with Russia and moderating tensions of the cold war. In order to make this drastic readjustment palatable to the American people, the change will take place over a period of time, probably to lull the American people into a slumber on Cuba deeper than that of the administration.

After the unanimous reports of the Seldon committee in the House, the Stennis committee in the Senate, the special eight-nation investigating committee of the Organization of American States, and the Task Force on Cuba and Subversion in the Western Hemisphere of the House Republican Policy Committee, it is clear beyond any doubt that such accommodation as that discussed below is contrary to both our national interest and security, and that of the entire hemisphere as well.

Excerpts of former Secretary Byrne's remarks from the June 13 Minneapolis Star and the Allen-Scott column from the June 21 St. Paul Pioneer Press follow:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, June 13, 1963]

OUR SLUMBER AND CUBA

(By James F. Byrnes)

(Excerpts from an address by the former Secretary of State at Newberry College)

There is some justification for believing that ever since his first meeting with President Kennedy at Vienna, (Soviet Premier) Khrushchev has believed he could expect a softer attitude from us. There is no other way of explaining his unexpected action to make of Cuba a Communist Gibraltar.

As he proceeded for a year to establish a bastion of military power at our very door, with atomic power sufficient to destroy not only the United States but all of Latin America, he truly changed the balance of power in the world. Instead of consuming a year or two in building long-range missiles, which from bases in Russia could strike a target in the United States, now he could use short-range missiles from his Cuban bases.

Suddenly he was confronted by the President with a demand to remove his weapons. He yielded, to the gratification of every American. But what has happened since October does not justify gratification. It does cause some fears.

When Khrushchev agreed to the removal of the strategic weapons, he indicated agreement to on-site inspection by United Nations authorities. A few days later we were told that Castro refused to agree and the Soviets would have to support Castro's position.

I am confident the Soviets could force Castro to agree to the inspection at any time. That was only an excuse. However, we abandoned our demand and no one of us is certain of the number of Soviet weapons and combat forecs in Cuba today.

In the presence of thousands of spectators Khrushchev (now has) pledged all-out support of his Communist brother, Castro, and of Cuba. This pledge has been heralded to the world. Upon it Castro is certain to rely and may act.

It is obvious that Latin American republics will conclude that we are unable to protect them. They will be subverted one by one until all of South America is lost and the Communist goal of isolating the United States has been attained.

Khrushchev knows that by his duplicity he put us to sleep for more than a year. He must not be allowed to think that when we awoke last October, we turned over and went back to sleep.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press, June 21, 1963]

CUBA POLICY SHIFT

(By R. S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy is deliberating a gradual shift in U.S. policy toward dictator Fidel Castro's Communist regime in Cuba.

For more than a month, the President and his top foreign policy avdisers have been discussing a plan under which the United States would resume "contact" with Castro on both "an informal and formal basis."

Under this backstage scheme, New York attorney James Donovan, who negotiated the $53-million ransom of the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion prisoners, would fly to Havana and Moscow to seek the withdrawal of all Soviet combat forces from Cuba.

In exchange for their removal, the United States would agree to a step-by-step normalization of diplomatic and trade relations with the Red-ruled Castro dictatorship over a 2-year period.

As a first step, the United States would reopen its embassy in Havana by sending a charge d'affaires there. At present the Swiss Ambassador is handling U.S. affairs.

An exchange of ambassadors and lifting of the trade embargo against Castro would follow after sufficient time had elapsed to make such a drastic "readjustment" palatable to the people and Congress.

This far-reaching shift in Cuban relations is part of President Kennedy's policy of seeking accommodations with Russia and its satellite bloc for the avowed purpose of reducing the risk of nuclear war by moderating tensions.

White House insiders say the proposed switch in Cuba policy fits squarely with strategy enunciated recently by the President in a speech that "any plan of action in the Caribbean has to take into account conditions and potential developments between the United tSates and U.S.S.R."

The President favors 47-year-old Donovan for this highly explosive diplomatic mission for two reasons: his "acceptability" to Castro and Khrushchev, and his close ties with key administration officials, notably Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

After Donovan arranged the swap of Soviet spy Abel for U-2 pilot Francis Gary Powers, the President wrote him, "The type of negotiations you undertook, where diplomatic channels had been unavailing, is unique, and you conducted it with the greatest skill and courage."

Castro's enthusiasm for Donovan is about on a par with that of the President. In feelers through diplomatic channels to the State Department, the Cuban dictator has indicated he would accept Donovan as negotiator. Words to that effect have been conveyed on three separate occasions—March 8, May 12, and May 19.

A decision on this momentous scheme will not be made until after the President returns from his European trip.

By that time the White House staff hopes to know whether the House Foreign Affairs Committee will undertake an inquiry into Donovan's previous Cuban negotiations. Republican committeemen are vigorously pressing for such an investigation. They have strongly urged it in a joint letter to Representative THOMAS MORGAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

Intelligence reports that around 100,000 Cubans are in Castro's jails for refusing to accept communism. Also that some 250,000 Cubans have fled, and another 180,000 are awaiting approval and transportation to leave. Senator JOHN STENNIS' Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee is preparing a new report on Castro-Communist subversion, sabotage, and guerrilla warfare against Latin American countries. The report, slated for release next month, will warn that Castro has ordered an increase in these operations.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the Record:

Chillicothe, Ohio,
June 16, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Please support House Resolution 14 dealing with the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

I am sure that you are well aware of the fact that the Soviet Union is a colonial empire where some 100 million non-Russians (Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Armenians, etc.) are being ruled against their will by the Russians. In my opinion this is the major weakness point of the Soviet Union and it could be utilized to a full advantage by the United States in the cold war which is to continue. Establishment of the abovementioned committee would be a very important step in this direction.

Sincerely,
Z. C. Prusas.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1963.

Mr. Walter Tustaniwsky,
Chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Detroit, Mich.

Dear Mr. Tustaniwsky: This will acknowledge your letter of May 25.

I strongly support Congressman Flood's House Resolution 14 calling for creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations, and, accordingly, am introducing an identical bill in the House.

Sincerely yours,
August E. Johansen.

West Roxbury, Mass.,
May 7, 1963.

Hon. Edward P. Boland,
U.S. Representative,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Boland: We appreciate your speaking in behalf of Ukrainian Independence Day observance in the House of Representatives on January 24, 1963.

I am sure you will agree with me that our support for freedom of Ukraine and other captive nations under the Communist domination must go beyond the realm of remarks and concentrate on a concrete measure—the creation of a Permanent House Committee on Captive Nations. House Resolutions 14 and 15, introduced by Congressmen Flood and Derwinski, respectively, call for the establishment of such a committee.

Presently House Resolutions 14 and 15 are pending before the House Committee on Rules.

In the spirit of your remarks, we ask and urge you to support these resolutions. Furthermore, your call or note to Congressman Howard W. Smith, chairman of House Rules Committee, favoring House Resolutions 14 and 15 would stir the committee to action. The committee would open public hearings on the proposed legislation and consequently bring the measure to the floor in the House of Representatives.

Your continuing interest in this matter can and will do much for the captive nations.

Sincerely yours,
Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Boston Branch
Orest Szczudluk, *Public Relations.*

San Francisco, Calif.,
June 6, 1963.

Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
House Rules Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Flood: I support wholeheartedly the establishment of Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives and urge you as a member of the House Committee on Rules to expedite the passage of all such legislation now being held up in the committee.

Very truly yours,
E. Kalyimagi.

New Haven, Conn.,
June 12, 1963.

Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Flood: Enclosed is a copy of a letter sent by our organization to the Honorable Howard W. Smith, Congressman, which is self-explanatory.

May we congratulate you on the Flood resolution and urge you to continue your work on this very worthy cause. We remain,

Respectfully yours,
John I. Kyzyk, D.D.S.,
President, Holy Name Society.
New Haven, Conn.

New Haven, Conn.,
June 12, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: We, the entire membership, of the Holy Name Society, of St. Michael's Ukrainian Catholic Church, New Haven, Conn., sincerely urge you, to give your full support to submission of the Flood resolution to vote by your committee. The importance of such a Captive Nations Committee, to both our Government and the American people, we truly feel is immeasurable. What is the greatest weakness of the Soviet totalitarian system? The captive non-Russian nations so unwillingly held in slavery by the Soviet.

We are desperately in need of a Committee on the Captive Nations, which would furnish our Government with unbiased, vital, and truthful information. We feel certain that the truth will do much in stopping the Soviet system from spreading.

To such a worthy cause, we feel you will want to give your full support. Please support the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee. Thanking you, we remain,

Respectfully yours,
John I. Kyzyk, D.D.S.,
President, Holy Name Society.

West Virginia Coal Competes With World Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in this age of rising industrialism all around the world, I am happy to report that West Virginia coal is still able to compete successfully in foreign markets with coal produced by countries with much lower standards of living than ours.

The dramatic story of how modernization and mechanization are helping West Virginia coal mines to maintain their leadership in coal output is told in the June 16, 1963, issue of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail. The Gazette-Mail's article also presents an encouraging picture of increased coal demand in the near future, as a primary source of energy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the Record, as follows:

Coal: New Expansion Beginning

(By George Lawless)

Coal, once called a dying industry, appears to be entering a period of dynamic expansion.

All authoritative forecasts about U.S. energy point to this expansion in coal consumption. Many also indicated that coal's relative contribution to total energy demand will expand, implying a faster rate of growth for coal than for other fuels.

Resources of the Future, Inc., a private research organization engaged in the study of energy economics, forecasts that coal output use will rise to 768 million tons by 1975. This would represent an increase of 355 million tons over the 1960 level of 413 million tons.

Phillip Sporn, president of the American Electric Power Co. and a recognized expert on energy problems, indicates that by 1975 coal will account for about 33 percent of total energy consumption in the United States.

This would be well in excess of the less than 25 percent which coal has supplied in recent years.

These forecasts are based on a number of factors. Coal's loss of markets to space heating and railroad fueling has already run out. These losses will no longer offset gains in coal use in other areas. By far the most important other area is electric utilities, which are using coal at a sharply rising rate.

S. L. Jewell, vice president of Peabody Coal Co., told a utility group recently that "there is little doubt that coal will make substantial gains in the utility market. In 1960 the utilities burned 176.5 million tons of coal. Some spokesmen for the industry have predicted that this volume will more than double by 1975."

The National Coal Association estimates that in 1965 electric utility consumption of coal will amount to about 245 million tons.

During the past 50 years, the bituminous coal industry has undergone an almost complete transformation in both methods and markets. Today, total mechanization is the key to the industry's ability to grow. Although revolutionary changes in mining methods have transpired in the past decade, mechanzation is not new.

Actually, mechanization of coal mining started in a small way in the 1870's when the coal cutting machine first replaced the miner's pick. By 1913, half of all underground coal was machine cut. In 1953, it was virtually 100 percent machine cut. Meanwhile, mechanical loading equipment began replacing the hand shovel in the early 1920's and by 1917 mobile machines, duckbills, and scrapers loaded about 60 percent of all underground coal mined.

In 1962, more than 90 percent of all underground coal was mechanically loaded.

Paralleling these advances was the modernization of underground transportation.

Mechanical conveyors and shuttle cars after World War II began to take over in increasing numbers. In less than 20 years, from 1945 to 1962, the total miles of gathering and haulage conveyors had more than quadrupled. At the same time, the use of larger coal hauling cars and more powerful locomotives grew rapidly.

The effect of all this on the coal industry can be measured in terms of increased production per man-day. During the 12 years from 1949 to 1962, output per production worker increased more than 85 percent and production jumped from 6.4 tons to about 12.4 tons per man-day. Productivity during that period increased more rapidly than in the previous three decades.

The result of this rapid mechanization was a tremendous dislocation of labor. A spokesman for the United Mine Workers of America said "membership has fallen from a high of 600,000 in 1923 to the present number which is approximately 140,000 to 150,000 working coal miners."

But increased productivity also has resulted in steadily increasing wages for those working. In West Virginia, miners earned an average of $118.83 per week during 1962. In the first 2 months of 1963, the average weekly wage jumped to $127.55.

Moreover, this increase in productivity has enabled America's coal industry to compete successfully in major world markets. Growing use of supercollieries which substantially reduce delivered costs by combining speed with great capacity makes Japan the top oversea customer, with 9 million tons of high-quality American coal shipped in 1962.

Volume shipments and lower production costs permit U.S. coal to be competitive in the Ruhr region of Germany which is a major coal producing area. In fact, many major oversea markets for American coal have their own coal deposits close at hand. The British steel and ceramics industries have repeatedly sought permission to import American coal, claiming a savings of $2.50 to $4 a ton under their own price. These requests have been denied by the British Government.

Greater productivity and more efficient mining methods have enabled many companies to survive and grow in the face of adverse market conditions in the 1940–50 era. For example, North American Coal Corp. moved up from 40th ranking to 9th largest coal producer in the industry during the past two decades, or from 2.4 million tons produced in 1942 to more than 6 million tons in 1962.

The record of such companies is all the more impressive when viewed in the light of a sharp decline of established markets. In 1944, for instance, class I railroads used a high of 132 million tons of coal to power steam locomotives. In 1962, less than 2 million tons were used for this purpose, reflecting the evolution from steam to diesel power. Retail deliveries for home heating which hit a high of 122 million tons in 1944 fell to about 27 million tons in 1962.

Industrial uses of coal, excluding coke ovens, failed to maintain the high consumption rate of 167 million tons in 1943, falling to 92 million in 1962. All this posed a serious problem for the industry.

The emergence of electric utilities from a modest consumer of 77 million tons in 1944 to more than 190 million tons in 1962 was a bright spot which partially offset the effects of declining coal use by other major uses.

So evident is this growth trend in the utility market that, despite the fact that the coal industry's excess capacity is almost 49 percent of its current production, new deep mines are being planned or drilled daily.

From 1947 to 1961, for example, there were 49 new deep mines of more than 500 tons daily capacity opened in the United States. West Virginia claimed 17 of these new mines, with a total daily capacity of 31,700 tons.

Meanwhile, research and development activities by coal producers, equipment manufacturers, coal-using industries, the UMWA and Federal and State Governments are uncovering many new applications for coal as a fuel for use in a variety of industries.

Processing industries, such as steel and cement, will require many millions of tons of coal in the years ahead. Powdered coal and coal oil slurry are now being injected into iron-making furnaces to replace part of the higher-priced coke charge, and the first coal-burning gas turbine-electric locomotive in railroad history is now undergoing road tests.

George A. Lamb, director of the newly created U.S. Office of Coal Research, said recently that a proposal to extract alumina from shale and clay mined along with coal "looks very good." At present all alumina, used in the manufacture of aluminum, is made from bauxite—and 90 percent of the bauxite is imported.

Among other developments that show promise are fuel cells, now being made experimentally, which permit the direct conversion of coal into electricity; the magnetohydrodynamic power generator which potentially could use coal as a home-heating fuel; and the gasification, liquefaction and hydrogenation techniques, now under study, for producing liquid and gaseous fuels, as well as byproduct chemicals, from coal.

The potentials for coal's future are reinforced by the possibility that it will, in the form of "coal by wire," be able to work its way back into space heating and even into railways. Many authorities foresee a rapid growth in the number of electrically heated homes in the years ahead. One prediction is that within the next two decades 18 million American homes will be heated by electricity, compared with about a million homes at present. This alone would represent a market for at least 216 million tons of coal even if electric utilities were to use coal for only 60 percent of their energy requirements, compared to over 66 percent today.

As far as railroads are concerned, several eastern carriers for several years have been pushing plans to electrify their lines. Some believe that it is only a matter of time before these blueprints become reality. John W. Barringer, president of the Pittsburgh & Lake Erie Railroad, predicts that electrification will prove as much superior to the diesel-electric locomotive as the diesel was to the reciprocating steam engine. Any major breakthrough in this area would open up a vast market for coal.

Indeed, if any single one of these developments now undergoing research study should prove economically feasible, the future of the coal industry in the next 50 years will see even greater evolutionary changes than we have witnessed in the past 50 years.

Time To Buy Chips or Go Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I, under unanimous consent, insert in the Record an editorial written by Donald Cammack and published in the Buffalo (S. Dak.) Times-Herald, one of South Dakota's very good weekly publications.

The editorial is entitled "Time To Buy Chips or Go Home." I am certain every Member of Congress will enjoy the editorial as much as I have.

The editorial is as follows:

Time To Buy Chips or Go Home

There comes a time sooner or later when everyone must make the decision of whether to buy chips and start playing his own game instead of tagging along trying to outluck his opponent at his type game, or give up, and go home.

We feel that 1964 is this time for the Republican Party.

For the past 30 years the Republicans have groaned and moaned about the mishandling of the Government by Democratic administration or by Republican administrations outweighed by Democratic majorities in Congress. However, when it came time to select a standard bearer for the party, they have beat the woods for a candidate who would be as nearly like the Democratic candidate as possible without changing his label. This has been done on what we think is the mistaken theory that the people will not vote for a conservative candidate who believes and acts on the principals of conservative government "of the people, by the people, and for the people" which has always been the mark of the Republican Party. On the theory that a mild candidate who clings to the top of the fence will appeal to the independent voters and the lukewarm Democrats, Republicans have been outvoted at the polls by minute numbers representing less than one voter in each precinct. This one vote, in our opinion, has been the Republican who stayed home because he had too little choice at the polls to affect him, either way the election went.

In 1964 this could be changed, if Republicans have guts enough to take a new stack of chips and play the game with their own cards instead of trying to outguess the folks across the table in the hope of splitting the pot or getting back their ante.

With Senator Barry Goldwater carrying the banner, all voters would know where the Republican Party stood. The conservative voter who has been wishing for years for a candidate he could back would have the opportunity to express himself at the polls. There would be an end to the me-tooism which has brought us a choice of liberal Democrats or liberal Republicans who must study for months to find which banner they should carry.

To be sure, Senator Goldwater is not an out-and-out candidate. But it is time he also either bought chips or went home. He talks like a candidate, he acts like a candidate, and folks want him for a candidate. In a recent news story, he was credited with describing himself as "pooping along the campaign trail." It is not his way to poop along, and it is our opinion that unless he quits pooping along and puts his feet on the trail in a good, brisk walk in a direction folks can see, both Goldwater and the Republican Party are going to miss the best opportunity of a generation to find out what direction the American people are interested in taking their government.

Independence of the Republic of the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, the Republic of the Congo will celebrate the third anniversary of her independence. On this memorable occasion, we wish to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of the Republic of the Congo, Joseph Kasavubu, and the Congolese Ambassador to the United States, Mario Cardoso.

When H. M. Stanley reached the Congo Basin over 80 years ago, the land of his discovery was one of lush but uncontrolled forests pierced by the rushing Congo River. Today the city of Leopoldville, a metropolis of over 3 million people, stands near the spot where Stanley pitched camp. The Congo has seen many changes in the intervening years, some of them creative, some of them damaging, some of them nearly tragic, but today the Congo is ready to meet a future which holds much promise.

The first 2½ years of independence were very difficult ones for the Republic of the Congo. Violence, secession, inflation, famine were among the problems the new nation had to face. It was in desperation that the young government turned to the United Nations for help on July 12, 1960, just 12 days after the country had achieved independence. The Congo's trials were just beginning; until January 1963 sporadic civil war was to continue in spite of the United Nations presence. The repercussions of political schisms and armed conflicts on the administrative organization of the country and on its fiscal situation were grave, but the Congo survived. The Congo survived its first 2½ years of tribulation, and today it is rebuilding, reorganizing, and reintegrating politically, economically, and socially into a viable federal state.

A leading actor in the drama of national reconciliation has been the Congo's able premier, Cyrille Adoula. His conciliatory policy, inaugurated after the surrender of Katanga, has offered firm hope that civil strife in the Congo is over once and for all and has provided a useful basis for reconstruction.

A new flurry of activity is going on in the Congo very different from the internecine struggles of yesterday. Today the activity is cooperative—cooperation between Belgians and Congolese, between United Nations and Congolese, and between Congolese and Congolese. Belgium has reestablished diplomatic ties with Leopoldville, and Belgian administrators and technicians have been called back to aid the Government in reorganizing its public finances and industry. United Nations technical assistance is helping to fill the gap between the demand for and the supply of skilled personnel, and the ONUC force is being slowly withdrawn while the Congo force publique is being built up. The Congolese Army is being retrained, and Congolese legislators are trying to work out the remaining political problems in parliament.

Reinvigoration of the economy is also brightening the Congo's outlook for the future. The economy of mineral-rich Katanga Province has been reintegrated with that of the rest of the Congo. During 1962 the profits of Union Miniere increased more than 50 percent and in December Union Miniere opened a new copper-concentrating plant. Belgian investments of over $3 billion have not been lost, and new investments have been made since independence. Industries in Leopoldville Province have increased their production by 30 percent as compared with preindependence days.

On this anniversary of independence we offer our congratulations to the Congolese who have worked tirelessly to reconstruct their nation and express our hopes that the path of national development will be a smooth one from now on.

Mob Madness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of June 24, 1963.

This editorial is clearly stated and warns us of a danger that involves every resident of this Nation. It is as follows:

THE MADNESS OF A MOB

When the Supreme Court, a decade ago, first struck down official segregation in the public schools, the most vocal Southern opponents—the people called "extremists"—defended segregation with two arguments.

One was that the Negro people as a group, whatever the individual exceptions, were neither sufficiently socially advanced nor politically mature for full integration into the community.

The second contention was that the political leaders fighting Southern segregation practices had a more far-reaching objective than the mere striking down of the segregation laws themselves. The cry was that the ultimate aim was not merely the admission of able and qualified Negroes into white schools but the forcible amalgamation of the two races, socially and otherwise, without regard to any other considerations of the effects of this on society or other people's rights.

Not the least of the tragedies in the present racial situation is that a good many Negro leaders and a great many white politicians seem now bent on lending support to these terrible allegations.

Inflamed by their leaders, the Negro people are deserting the orderly ways society has provided for the redress of their grievances, the very ways which have brought them so much progress in the space of a decade. They are turning from courts to the streets, from arguments to riots.

Look not merely at Birmingham. Look at New York or Pennsylvania, Illinois or California. Look at the Nation's Capital. Not only have there been riotous clashes as mobs poured into the streets, but Negro leaders have announced that if the local authorities don't do thus-and-so, and at once, they will choke the streets with bigger mobs.

The excuse for all this, we are told, is that the Negro's very gains make further patience intolerable. Perhaps so. Yet those who persuade the Negroes that violence is the instant remedy for all ills, or encourage them to practice government by rioting, give ammunition to those who say the Negro is socially and politically immature. In this Nation both of these ideas strike at the very heart of society itself.

So too do some of the remedies put forward by many political leaders, whether done from a desire of political gain or from a fear of violence.

In New York State, where race bars no one from a public school, the State board of education says equal rights are not enough. The slightest separation of the races, from whatever cause, must be obliterated. Schoolchildren must be hauled back and forth like pawns on a chessboard to achieve an arbitrary balance decreed by the political authorities.

Now this is, first of all, as brutal a charge of Negro inferiority as any from the wildest southern extremists, for it accepts the idea that the numerical presence of white children automatically raises the educational level of a school, or conversely that too many Negro pupils lowers it. Beyond that, this policy ceases to be an extension to all of the equal protection of the laws. It is the denial to all of freedom under law. A Negro family that does not want its child carried to a distant school is equal in helplessness under the power of the State.

On the national level too, politicians talk more and more of applying the brute force of Government to compel people to conduct their private lives as the State directs, hardly pausing to think how this remedy would alter a free society. If some had their way, no man would be free to choose his neighbors, his children's associates, to whom he will give lodging, or to whom he will sell a hotdog.

Few political leaders any longer dare to try to distinguish between a just and worthy cause—the assurance of equal political rights for all citizens in our society—and a headlong assault against society itself, its ways of living and its ways of ordering the laws by which it lives.

Not the least of the dangers in this is that, if unchecked, it will breed a reaction, as a crowd's excesses always do, and the injury will be not the least to the Negro's own cause. But made no mistake about it. It will be an injury to all if hysteria makes it impossible for a reasonable voice to be heard, if we let the reason of men be engulfed in the madness of a mob.

The Hungry Horse (Mont.) News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, almost 17 years ago a young Navy veteran, native of North Dakota, came from New York to Montana to found what was to become one of the outstanding weekly newspapers in the Nation.

I refer to the Hungary Horse News in Columbia Falls, Mont., and its editor and publisher, Mel Ruder, whose journalistic career offers evidence that a hard-working conscientious newspaperman can still become his own boss in this age of newspaper consolidation.

I have been an admirer of Mel Ruder's since he started his paper on little more than a shoestring in August of 1946. From its modest beginnings, the Hungry Horse News—located near the Hungry Horse Dam and Reservoir on the South Fork of the Flathead River—has grown into one of the more successful weekly newspapers in the Pacific Northwest. And the paper's reputation is not confined to community, State or region. It is nationwide, a fact borne out by the national awards won by the editor.

The population of Columbia Falls in 1960 stood at 2,132. Circulation of the Hungry Horse News, however, is more 3,500. There are not many community newspapers which can boast a circulation nearly double the size of the community in which they are located. This fact is a tribute to the hard work and high professional standards of one man—Mel Ruder.

Mr. President, the March 1963 issue of the Quill, a monthly magazine published by the professional journalistic society, Sigma Delta Chi, carried an article describing the Hungry Horse News and its founder. I ask unanimous consent that the article, written by Mr. Joseph Mader, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Today our society is so organized, integrated, mechanized, coordinated and animated that man is denied one of his strongest inherent drives—the need for identification.

For the creative man—say the journalists—this frustration in loss of individuality is intolerable. But it is not insoluble. The answer lies, I believe, in the newspaper that reflects the man. For most aspiring journalists, that would limit them to the community newspaper—the "weakly," as pseudocynics and captious critics of the weekly sometimes snidely call it.

Let others make out an equal case for the suburban press. It is being demonstrated daily as a satisfying and profitable outlet for the creative energies of newsmen. But it is not of this growing and inviting field that I write today.

I choose as living proof of a great adventure in newspapering that is still open to the daring, the ingenious and the hardworking man or woman—the community newspaper.

How many newsmen, actual or aspiring, have said: "The only life for me would be to have my own paper."

Few can achieve that goal today. The complexities of publication, added to the sharpness of competition for audience and the advertising dollar, constitute formidable walls. But it is to these few I would beckon, though the call could well be welcomed by many.

To present my example, this is a report on one who realized his dream. In short, this is the story of Melvin H. Ruder and the Hungry Horse News. He is its founder, editor, and publisher.

Never heard of it, you say? Well then, you are not reading your professional journals or the Congressional Record closely enough. See Congressional Record, August 14, 1962, for instance.

Founded August 8, 1946, in a two-story log cabin in Columbia Falls, Mont., the Hungry Horse News started from scratch. As Ruder put it: "We started with a camera, a portable typewriter, $2.50 desk, and Navy savings."

Without seeking to butter up a newsman who doesn't need it, I might say that Ruder started with much more than that. Going for him he had a lot of good ideas, a consummate skill at ferreting out news, a keen eye for a photo and the artistry and patience to get it, an extraordinary amount of enterprise and a deep reserve of guts.

He has built his newspaper from the ground and a log cabin, and has reached a circulation of just under 4,000, the highest of any weekly in Montana. He served as president of the Montana State Press Association in 1958. He was named to the Governor's special committee to encourage tourism in Montana. His paper became the official newspaper of Flathead County through competitive bidding, even though it is not published in the county seat of Kalispell, city of 10,151, which has a daily.

And, should anyone question the wisdom of the Flathead county commissioners, it might be pointed out that the Hungry Horse News is published in a town of 2,132 population. What other community weekly newspaper in the United States can boast a paid circulation nearly twice the number of men, women, and children within the city limits? Flathead County has 32,965 people (1960 census) and 32,964 know about, and often read, the Hungry Horse News (1963 opinionated guess).

Ruder perhaps feels fenced in at times (indeed, he complains only of the grind), but to offset that feeling, he has served as correspondent for four dailies, including also the one in Kalispell for a time.

"We'll scoop ourselves on accidents, fires, and so forth," he says, with what sparks of dedication to news.

Not only is he dedicated, but knowledgeable on world affairs. He has had experience as a university teacher, national park publicity photographer, industrial public relations worker, and at sea and in foreign lands as a Navy officer. A few years ago he was among the first few journalists to take an undersea cruise on the Nautilus off New London, Conn. A year or so later he made an observation tour of NASA activities at Cape Canaveral, Fla.. In between, he has hopped over much of the Nation and capped his 1962 summer by covering, in person and en camera, the entire Seattle World's Fair on opening day.

Provincial? Ingrown? Narrow horizons? Would that more of our metropolitan journalists knew such boundaries.

He was elected a director of the Bank of Columbia Falls in 1949. He tells it this way:

"Had to borrow money to purchase the stock. I was elated. I'm a bank director who at the time didn't know what it was to have more than $100 cash."

The success of the Hungry Horse News is a tribute to editorial process, determination in balanced and honest reporting, a devotion to community affairs and homegrown reporting of those affairs, a concentration on photographic coverage that would put many a daily to shame, a distinterest in anything canned, whether it be news, editorials, cartoons, features or handouts. His philosophy is a complete disavowal of the idea that the editor is only a mirror to reflect developments, without providing them with the flavor and commentary that puts them in their proper setting.

Says Ruder: "I don't consider myself an unbiased reporter. I believe that a weekly editor should practice personal journalism."

In nugget form that paper's success story stems from—

An eight-column newspaper—almost as wide as it is long.

Every inch of copy with local impact.

Every page (almost) decorated with some of the finest news and human interest pictures that have ever delighted these farsighted optics.

Every editorial locally written, with local application, and signed by the editor, who produces them all.

Every column and every correspondent's contribution clearly attributed.

Every story covered that's fit for family reading, even when it tells about the editor's own vagaries and mishaps as a driver resulting in confrontation with the law.

Every dog, cat, horse, mouse, muskrat, deer, elk, moose, bear, antelope, mountain goat, lion, and sheep within a 50-mile range that gets into the news is reported, photographed, and maybe interviewed. If they're not newsworthy, they are educated to become so.

Every tot becomes a candidate for immortalization in a Hungry Horse News picture—especially if he or she is cute, cunning, or capricious.

Every VIP who comes within whistling distance of Columbia Falls is cornered and photographed—and by simply stepping outside the News' office, he is captured on film with a background made up of the breathtaking peaks in and around Glacier National Park.

Every issue during recent years has had a charming, localized, and highly personalized column by the News' own Washington correspondent. (Alas, the lure of the mountains and the West drew him away from the capital late in 1962.)

Every once in a while the News carries as a regular feature (that is, as regular as an Indian U.S. marshal can be on an Indian reservation which bursts with irregularities) a column of news from Heart Butte, Mont. This is written by one John Tatsey, "the police," as he identifies himself. Its language is of a flavor that would give dyspepsia to H. W. Fowler, cause a severe case of migraine for Bergen Evans, and inspire Theodore M. Bernstein to write another "Watch Your Language." And Ruder has it set in type just as John writes it—an exercise in freedom of expression that deserves a memorial. But John has often been memorialized by Congress, for his literary pieces have been reproduced intact in the Congressional Record. In truth, the Hungry Horse News may have to credit its frequent mention in the Record to Tatsey more than to its more restrained talent.

An audit-minded reader will rightly ask: "How is the News doing as a business?"

Well, in circulation it's tops, as noted above: scattered in 47 States, 2,405 in the county; 2,730 in Montana; nearly 1,000 in other States; and more than a score in foreign countries. Subscription prices vary from 10 cents for single copies to $3 for 6 months or $5 a year outside Montana.

Admittedly, not all of that out-of-county circulation is profitable to local advertisers, but they recognize the pull this newspaper has for potential visitors to the Flathead and Glacier National Park. Tourism and sports are big business in Columbia Falls, as in most of Montana. Advertisers are loyal and regular. They get a good return on their investment. And they strongly support the two big pictorial special editions Ruder publishes each year—one a summer vacation special, the other a pre-Christmas holiday confection.

Figures on gross and net incomes worry Ruder some. They have not kept proportional pace with the amazing growth in circulation nor with advancing costs of production.

For example: he reports that in 1955 the paper's gross was slightly more than $50,000, with a net of $11,000. In 1960 the gross was $59,636, but dropped in 1961 to $55,623, with a net of $8,940.[1]

Somewhat dolefully, if modestly, Ruder writes: "I don't think we are particularly a success story. We were much more so 5 and 10 years ago. * * * Obviously this is a free land. We are completely solvent, and I could leave. I don't want to. * * * We are not depressed. For one thing, we are too busy."

---

[1] In 1962, says Ruder, "we hit our circulation peak. This was also a good year financially because it was an election advertising year and the first year of the county official newspaper contract. We also had a smaller payroll of $22,205.51 compared to $26,032.80 for 1961. The 1962 gross, I anticipate, will be back to about $60,000."

Solvent? You bet. Consider this: from a first-floor cabin shop, originally sparsely outfitted with much used and some cast-off equipment, the inventory now shows almost all new machinery. Nearly all of the stuff with which volume 1, No. 1 was founded has made way for brand new tools, machinery and office installations since 1950.

Ruder boils down the investment factors and comments:

"We started with a $600 Linotype purchased from a preacher in Miles City. Now, we have a building on which we carry $15,000 insurance, a 90 percent policy that doesn't cover foundations, etc. It would cost better than $20,000 to replace the structure. The original building was erected when carpenters got under $2 an hour; now they are paid $3.50. Our equipment insurance covers $16,000 replacement, with the last revision made in 1960. Our stock shows at $2,500, but that should be listed at more."

Taken into consideration must be such family acquisitions as: a $25,000 home, complete with two fireplaces, a Hammond organ in a 30-foot living room with big windows; about 2 acres of forested land—and all paid for. The same thing might be said for the eyestopping Hungry Horse News building, with its big lawn—all paid for.

"In our financial solvency," Ruder points out, "Ruth (his wife) has been an important factor. We built our home in 1951 when we were still paying for the office and equipment and she continued to teach at the high school, full time for 2 years and part time for 2 years until we got on our feet."

Ruder has a payroll that includes a printer foreman, a journeyman printer and apprentice; a preacher, who works 2 days as a printer's helper; a housewife, who works on subscriptions and types correspondents' and columnists' work; a writer of social items; a high school student who helps with mailing and does yard work; his wife, who helps with the bookkeeping and general records; and a daughter, now a freshman at Montana State University, who has been earning money as a News' typist, proofreader and subscription file keeper.

Ruder pays his printer foreman $145 a week minimum and another printer $121. "We'd be in a pickle without good printers," he comments. "You cannot have a decent paper without good printers and they are worth their salary."

Lest the reader conclude, quite understandably, that this is a biased report, I invited the evaluation of the Hungry Horse News and its editor from representative leaders of Columbia Falls, Mont. Here are excerpts from what two wrote:

Mayor LaMar G. Orndorff: The Hungry Horse News is an outstanding weekly newspaper. Many local people wait at the post office on Thursday evening to get their copies. The editorials influence and carry much weight with local citizens. The news, mostly local in scope, is pleasantly presented and well received by the readers. * * * I would sum up by saying that the Hungry Horse News editor is an outstanding citizen working for progress in this area and is certainly an economic asset to our city.

D.A. Davall, president of the Junior Chamber of Commerce: "Mel is energetic and extremely thorough in his research, fussy as an old maid about the quality of his printing, and he has a personal character reputation that is to be envied. * * * People here are proud of the paper."

But, I weigh as of great importance the unsolicited opinions of an assortment of readers from near and far, selected from letters to the editor. As Ruder says, "These messages constitute some of the rewards of this business." Here are excerpts from a sampling:

Mrs. Betty P. Smith, Monrovia, Calif.: "Your very interesting Christmas paper came today and all the lovely snow scenes and scenic pictures were so enjoyed by me. * * * I shall keep the scenic section, as I do love to look at all that wonderful country.

Mr. and Mrs. David Nelson, West Kalispell, Mont.: We are going to send it (the Christmas special edition) to a cousin in Sweden, one to Norway, and one to our son in Plentywood, Mont. We sure enjoy the Hungry Horse News. * * * It is the best present she (a daughter) could give me. It is the best paper we ever had, with the wonderful pictures, and we have had papers from all over the East and West.

Mel's own summation on acceptance (social and otherwise), ethics, and identification, expressed to me at various times:

"I'm not a popular editor here. We don't entertain much. I'm not a joiner, but I've been to more school board meetings through the years than has any members of the board. * * * I don't play poker with the boys, or join in the morning coffee break.

"There's much personal satisfaction living in the Flathead, and we like the rustic log Hungry Horse News Building * * * and our home with its view of the mountains * * * and we like our neighbors. We have been favored with a good staff. * * * I expect a man stays more alive working on a paper than teaching. * * * I'd really like this life 100 percent, if it permitted some days away. * * * I'd like to be a publisher who could pick up (a few of) those trips with some ease." (Ruder referred especially to an Air Force invitation to go to Cape Canaveral again, this time Oct. 23–25, 1962, during Cuba turmoil.)

At infrequent times Mel has been disposed to wax a bit philosophic about his profession:

"Have you noticed that we are getting more personal in our journalism? Now we'll banner story a trip to a Canadian park or the Bismark (N. Dak.) Zoo, and we sell papers. Those personal stories do better than the conventional city council meeting line stories."

Periodically, in his observations about his work, he touches on the fact that there is too much of it, that night work is an accepted 4- or 5-day-a-week affair, that vacations come too frequently and are too short. But, he sums up:

"We like being editor of the Hungry Horse News. * * * It is a good life being editor-reporter-photographer of a picture newspaper in scenic America. * * * We'd like the job better were it 51 instead of 52 full weeks each year."

I like this further note, on which I rest the case for the weekly newsman:

"Have some good friends. * * * Get along fine with the preachers. * * * I'm something of a moralist and one of my achievements was turning down the lottery drawn number at the summer rodeo which would have given me a free round-trip for two to the Seattle Fair (or $250). I won't accept a lottery winning. It's the second time I've won and turned down the prize. Because I don't smoke, people think I don't drink. We do when we feel like it."

I'll bet he also feels that he wouldn't trade places with Henry Luce.

Mark Van Doren on Robert Frost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly honored to bring to my colleagues' attention a memorable article written by Mark Van Doren on his close friend, Robert Frost.

Entitled "Recollections of Robert Frost," the article appeared in an excellent publication sponsored by the Friends of the Columbia University Libraries, namely, Columbia Library Columns. The article appeared in the May 1963 issue.

As a famous and distinguished poet and Pulitizer Prize winner, Van Doren knew Robert Frost for more than 40 years. It was Van Doren who was selected to read some of Frost's poems at the memorial service for Frost held in my district—at Amherst, Mass.—shortly after the death of the beloved poet.

Now that Frost is dead, there continues to be a strangeness in the New England that he revered. I noticed this and commented upon it during a recent trip to the area that he loved so well. What is reassuring is the certainty that Frost will be read and reread as long as men stay on this earth and remember.

This remarkable tribute by Mark Van Doren, more than anything I have read, brings the enduring qualities of the great poet to mind. I am indeed happy and proud to make it available for a wider readership:

RECOLLECTIONS OF ROBERT FROST

(By Mark Van Doren)

My first meeting with Robert Frost must have been more than 40 years ago, for it preceded the publication of his volume of verse New Hampshire (1923), one poem in which he had just been writing. My brother Carl, who never missed an opportunity to do me good, had taken me to lunch with Frost, I do not remember where or on what day; and Frost told both of us about this poem, "The Star-Splitter" in which a man burns down his house and uses the insurance to buy a telescope with which to see the stars. I was not aware then of how much the stars meant to Frost himself: they were to become the most powerful theme perhaps in all his poetry.

At the moment I was more interested in something he said about the way he wrote a poem, or rather, got ready to write it. No notes, he insisted, nothing written down—oh, maybe a single word on a small piece of paper, but even that should somehow get displaced. It was only by writing the poem, slowly or swiftly as the case might be, that he could discover what its subject was. Not that he liked the word "subject" either. No, it was more like "something on the chest that had to be got off," something undefined till the poem was there to define it. If a prose note could have done this for him, a prose note would have been enough. Prose, however, did not suffice. There had to be a poem to tell him what he felt. And to tell others, if they cared to know.

Which last reminds me that until his dying day, Frost refused to say what any of his poems meant. "It means what it says," he declared, and of course this was the proper—as it is the classic—answer to that question which ought never to be asked—even by schoolteachers, and indeed least of all by them. But here was Frost saying in 1963 what he had said before in 1923; he was all one piece, he was consistent throughout. His great themes occur and reoccur, and possibly they are all but aspects of a single theme with which he was possessed from the start, though it will never be easy to say what that was. Something, however, to do with the difficulty of knowing. He wanted to know, and he found it hard. The desire made him serious, the difficulty made him humorous, as two couplets, written years apart, compendiously attest:

"We dance round in a ring and suppose
But the Secret sits in the middle and knows.
Forgive O Lord, my little jokes on Thee
And I'll forgive Thy great big one on me."

My next memory of him dates from the time preceding the publication of "West-Running Brook" (1928), several poems out of which he sent to me at the Nation, where I was literary editor, saying that I could print them if I liked. Of course, I printed them all, after some charming correspondence about changes he wished to make; he was never done with a poem, he said, until it was beyond recall. It was perhaps during the same year that he wrote me in another connection, this time quite sharpy. I was compiling "An Anthology of World Poetry," and I had asked him, he thought for too few of his poems. My choice, if I remember his words, was slighting and perfunctory; and he suggested that we both forget the whole thing. My letter explaining the grand scale on which the volume was conceived, a scale precluding the use of many poems by any contemporary American, was answered at once by a very sweet one in which he nobly took everything back. I had asked him for further poems, acknowledging after all the justice of his complaint, but this was not his point at the moment. "Treat me well," he wrote, "and you'll be expected to treat me better." So we ended on good terms with each other and those same terms persisted with each other, and those same terms persisted till his death.

Their very persistence could trouble me sometimes. He did me many favors—for example, he recommended me to his own publisher—and he often expressed regard for me behind my back, knowing doubtless that word of this would reach me, as it invariably did. Why then did I not seek him out more often than I did? For although I loved and respected no living writer more than I did him, I still did not follow him about. Not that he wanted to be followed about, but he noticed something special in my case; and one evening when I sat next to him in the apartment of Joseph Blumenthal, the printer whose work he valued before that of all others, he suddenly leaned over and asked me: "Why don't we see each other oftener?" I decided then and there to speak the truth. "It's quite simple," I grinned and said: "I'm afraid." "Afraid of what?" Of course, he knew, but I told him anyway. "Why, of being found out. Of learning that your illusions about me, such as they are, have suddenly been shattered by something I said or did. So I say and do as little as I can. I merely write about you and review you from a distance." He leaned over again, this time far enough so that he could tap my knee. "Now, now. Nobody's ever found out. There's nothing to that." There was plenty to it though, and 30 years earlier he had said so in his poem "Revelation":

"But oh, the agitated heart
Till someone really find us out."

The heart, that fine poem says, both does and does not want to be revealed. And only now was this fully clear to me.

I did see Frost on many occasions; or failing that, messages went back and forth between us. He knew my opinion of his poetry, for I stated it in articles and reviews, preferring, as I had said to him, the public to the private way of letting him know. Face to face, we said remarkably little about his work. "Is it holding up?" he might suddenly ask me. "It certainly is," might be all that I would answer, and the understatement satisfied him. He always pretended not to have read what was written about him. This fooled nobody, though once it almost fooled me. In 1949, after my review of his "Complete Poems" had appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, I was sitting at dinner with him and others at the Bread Loaf Inn, Vermont. I hoped he had read this particular piece, but concluded otherwise when someone asked him if he had and he seemed to mutter "No." I appealed to Mrs. Morrison next to me realizing that she knew if anybody did, and was astonished to hear her whisper: "He knows it by heart." The review, let me say here, had taken for its text the whole of "Revelation." Both of us again had been found out.

My last meeting with Frost was in May of 1962, when I spent 2 days with him at his cabin up the hill from Mrs. Morrison's house in Vermont. A motion picture about him was underway, and I had been asked to talk with him before the cameras. (My wife and I, visitors there two summers earlier, had of course enjoyed our afternoon without benefit of technicians.) Even with the technicians on this occasion, the time passed easily, and we talked of many things I wish now that I could remember every word. Come to think of it, I did see him once after this, at the Poetry Festival in Washington during October, 1962. But then he was usually in a crowd, and I did not push forward. Nor could I stay for the evening performance when he remarked, in an interval between two poems he was reading: "Poetry and politics? They're not quite the same. Poetry is about the grief, politics about the grievances." I suppose he never said anything better than that.

For Civil Rights but Against Bigger Government in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I am for civil rights. Civil means citizenship and I am for citizenship rights for all Americans. We must not and would not turn back the clock. The colored people are now attending all public schools down in my part of the country. And so far as I am concerned, they may come to my church and I have seen some of them do so or they may join my church with my vote supporting them. On several occasions I have spoken in their churches when they have invited me to come. They fought for our country. They pay taxes to support our Government. They are entitled to go to tax-supported schools, tax-supported libraries, tax-supported parks and golf courses. And certainly Christianity requires courtesy, civility, compassion, decency, and kindness for all members of the human family one toward another, regardless of race or color.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are now being told by the Kennedy administration that we should enact a law under the guise of civil rights to declare practically all business enterprises, big and little, as component parts of interstate commerce so that the Attorney General, Robert Kennedy, will have authority to compel any privately owned business to surrender its freedom and do exactly what big government thinks should be done under a given set of circumstances. Now I am against that proposal "with all four feet off the ground."

If a privately owned business wants to refuse my own self any service of any kind, whether a haircut or a hamburger or a bed for the night, that business enterprise ought to have that right. If the business does not like my appearance or my manner of speech or my personality, then under "freedom's holy light" it should have a perfect right to decline me and to refuse my money.

Like Thomas Jefferson, I am against the exercise of tyranny over mankind. And I am against destroying the freedom of privately owned business in order to meet all the whims of every organized group that says we need an absolute Government up in Washington so as to tell us how and why and where to run our privately owned business that we have bought with our blood and sweat and toil and tears.

The courts have already, in my way of thinking, reached the point of complete absurdity in construing nearly all vocations and commercial activities on earth as a part of interstate commerce. This has been done by proponents of big government who wish to make it even bigger. Autocracy does not always take the form of a crowned head upon a tyrant. Sometimes you may even find it in a plutocracy here on the Potomac. Or you may bet your best Barlow knife that it could bounce up in some big bureaucracy or even in a Federal court calling itself an arm of Government.

I stand with Abraham Lincoln who once said:

> Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves and, under a just God, cannot long retain it.

And I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we should not deny this same desired freedom to any privately owned business, whether big, or little, to operate within the scope of its own discretion and according to prevailing law rather than according to the dictatorship of big government up in Washington a thousand miles away from Joe Doakes' front door or the cash register of some private business enterprise back in the hinterlands of America.

When the Lord was here on earth He interfered with private business operations only one time and that was when these operations were being conducted in the sacred precincts of the temple itself rather than in privately owned stalls out in the market place. On that particular occasion, He made a whip and drove all of them out of the temple. But on other occasions, it seems that people were permitted to exercise their free choices within the discretion of their consciences even though this policy did produce a cross. I believe we should always have reasonable freedom in the legal conduct of a privately owned business. This seems to be good Americanism and I am willing to stand on this and abide by it.

If we run every peanut stand in America from Washington, then we are no better off than all those unfortunate people whose lives and liberties are completely dominated and governed from the Kremlin. "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people" does not refer to the people on Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington but rather to the people on Main Street out in some Podunk, Mo. Let us hope and trust that the wellsprings of our Government will always be right out among the people rather than among the big cats and bureaucrats up here in Washington.

The Preposterous Civil Rights Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial which appeared in the Vicksburg, Miss., Evening Post of June 20, 1963, the editor aptly points out the tremendous and unconstitutional powers which the Attorney General of the United States would be assuming if the President's civil rights package is written into law.

The editorial emphasized that the issue of civil rights is not a movement of freedom-loving people, but is a shrewdly calculated drive of power-mad politicians wishing to dupe good Americans into the belief that the only way to provide equal opportunity is to give the Federal Government more coercive powers. These extraordinary powers would be used against Americans who still uphold the sanctity of the Constitution.

I commend this editorial to the attention of the House:

THE CIVIL RIGHTS PACKAGE PROPOSAL

The most far reaching, and we might add preposterous, proposal ever submitted by an American President went to the Congress yesterday. President Kennedy's omnibus civil rights proposal is a misnomer. Masquerading under the guise of rights, it strikes down the rights of private individuals and completely negates one of the inalienable rights referred to in the Declaration of Independence—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The forced integration under this proposal will strip away from the individual his liberty and his freedom to choose his associates, to determine how his business should be conducted, and how he should manage his own affairs.

The clever hand of the Attorney General of the United States is clearly seen in the proposal.

Under the President's proposal, the Attorney General would have the authority to sue in an alleged discrimination case, if the rejected individual could not finance the case himself. Which means the Attorney General would sue in every case. The proposal also would authorize the Attorney General to initiate Federal court suits to force desegregation of public schools and colleges when students have been denied equal protection of the laws, which would open the gates to a flood of unwarranted and questionable complaints.

What man living, should have such power in America? The hysteria which has been created by the racial demonstrations, has been fanned and encouraged by the Attorney General, and the President used the racial demonstrations as a threat to win support for his program.

We strongly urge the members of the Mississippi delegation in the Congress, and particularly Senators EASTLAND and STENNIS, to oppose this vicious legislation with every ounce of their energy. Althugh aimed at the South in particular, the program strikes at the very vitals of the American concept, for wholesale compulsion has no part in a free nation, nor will legislation, passed under the stress of passion and politics, do anything but damage the Nation.

It was particularly impressive that the President cautioned against any demonstrations at the Capitol to protest an expected southern filibuster against his proposals, stating: "Unruly tactics or pressures will not help and may hinder the effective consideration of these measures." Yet he was silent when unruly tactics and pressures were used, and are still being used in other sections. While playing politics to the limit, Mr. Kennedy piously begged the Congress to set aside sectional and political ties.

The battle has been joined. It is a battle of compulsion against freedom—of political power against liberty, and it will be fought under the umbrella of passion and emotion which has been deliberately created to help establish a complete Federal dictatorship.

West Side Committee for Civil Rights, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report to my colleagues the formation of the West Side Committee for Civil Rights. This committee is a splendid example of what can be done and must be done in communities everywhere to help in the civil rights struggle. The West Side Committee has widespread sponsorship and support throughout the community. The following is a list of sponsoring organizations:

The list of sponsoring organizations now include: FDR-Woodrow Wilson Democrats; Heights Reform Democrats; Hudson Conservation Project; League of West Side Organizations; New York Chapter, NAACP; Physicians' Forum; Reform Independent Democrats; Riverside Democrats; Riverside Park Playgrounds Committee; Stephen Wise Free Synagogue; West Side Chapter, American Jewish Congress; Manhattan Women's Division, American Jewish Congress; West Side Democrats; Ansonia Independent Democrats; P.S. No. 87; West Side Chapter of the ADA; Association of Catholic Trade Unions; Ethical Culture Society; Bloomingdale Conservation Project; West 88th–91st Neighborhood Association; West 87th Street Block Association; Riverside Edgecomb Neighborhood Association; Washington Heights; Hamilton Grange Culture Committee; Strykers Bay Neighborhood Council; and Catholic Young Adults Club.

The committee was not organized to be just a committee of good intentions, but an active force for civil rights. It has issued a remarkable document entitled "A Declaration of Responsibility" which spells out its program. I believe that this document merits our attention. In addition, on June 25 the committee sponsored a successful rally for civil right on the West Side at which Rev. Fred L. Shuttlesworth of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference delivered an inspired address.

I submit for the attention of my colleagues the Declaration of Responsibility of the West Side Committee for Civil Rights:

A DECLARATION OF RESPONSIBILITY

(By the West Side Committee for Civil Rights)

Residents of the West Side of New York, of all races, creeds, and ethnic origins, extend the hand of fellowship to our fellow citizens in the South who are valiantly seeking to attain the liberties and equalities which are the essence of American democracy.

We accept our own responsibility to participate actively in the struggle.

We congratulate President Kennedy on his recent firm support of the just demands of Negroes, North and South, for the implementation of their civil, academic, and legal rights. We look forward to the introduction and passage of Federal legislation that will promote more effective integration in the public schools, State-supported colleges, universities, and public facilities, abolish restrictive covenants in housing, eliminate discrimination in business, industry and labor unions, and repeal poll taxes and literacy tests for voters.

In the meanwhile, however, we demand that the President now use the extensive executive powers already at his command to end the disrespect for human rights and dignity now rampant in the South.

But the principal responsibility, we accept for ourselves—to participate actively in the struggle of the Negro and Puerto Rican in our own neighborhood for equality of education of opportunity and of status. Therefore, West Side residents of whatever race, creed, origin, or economic status, who live side by side, resolve to do so as brothers—and, to that end, join in the following solemn pledges:

We pledge:

1. To support and respect municipal, State and Federal antidiscrimination laws.
2. To assure our landlords that we will welcome people of all races as next door neighbors.
3. To appeal to landlords, realtors and lending institutions to end all discriminatory practices in West Side housing—and to exert the pressure of public condemnation on those who do not respond.
4. To insure, through constant vigilance and specific action, that business, industry and banking in our area be conducted without discrimination in policy and practices.
5. To pay particular attention to the hiring practices of restaurants, building sites and utility companies in our neighborhood.
6. To exert all possible influence on labor unions to open their memberships and training programs to Negroes and Puerto Ricans.
7. To support the complete integration of our public schools, not only in terms of total school population, but also on the classroom level.
8. To encourage the further integration of our neighborhood's independent schools as well.
9. To see to it that our own children, in their most impressionable years, learn the value of brotherhood by example and practice as by precept.
10. To reevaluate our own individual attitudes and activities, so as to end all vestiges of prejudice and discrimination in all aspects of our own daily lives.

To these ends we resolve to maintain the West Side Committee for Civil Rights as a permanent organization to assure the implementation of our firm resolves—and we invite all our neighbors to join us in this declaration of responsibility.

We pledge the devotion of hand and heart to the democratic principles of equality, justice and brotherhood, which alone can translate the American dream into the American reality, here on the West Side and throughout our beloved country.

Law of the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Revilo P. Oliver has written a cogent review of Warren Jefferson Davis' newest book entitled "Law of the Land," published by Carlton Press.

I am sure Members will find the following excerpts from Dr. Oliver's review to be of interest, particularly in the light of recent events:

EXCERPTS FROM REVIEW OF "LAW OF THE LAND," BY DR. REVILO P. OLIVER, MEMBER OF THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Much has been written about the present Supreme Court, but the fundamental issues are, I believe, most clearly presented from the legal point of view in a book just published: Warren Jefferson Davis' "Law of the Land," Carlton Press, New York, $3.50.

Mr. Davis is a recognized authority on jurisprudence. Among his numerous books are treatises on Aeronautical Law, and the Law of Radio Communications, which are highly esteemed even by "liberals" in our law schools. In his new book, he reviews the anti-American acts of the persons who are acting as Justices of our Supreme Court, and he suggests appropriate legal means of protecting the United States against them.

Mr. Davis shows that the Court has repeatedly repudiated the Constitution, and even the basic concept of law itself, by impudently claiming that the Constitution changes whenever it is the whim of the Supreme Court to say that conditions have changed. This cheap sophistry, unworthy of a high school freshman in a practice debate, makes the Court's violation of law but the more disgraceful.

Mr. Davis further shows that the Court is already laying the foundation for a final act of usurpation and treason.

Mr. Davis considers the Court's usurpation in the context of the whole drive to destroy the sovereignty of each of the States united by the Constitution. He does not forget, as some bitter critics of the Court seem to do, that the responsibility for the progressive subversion of our Republic cannot be placed on the Court alone.

As Mr. Davis points out, adequate and fully Constitutional remedies for each and every one of the Court's misdeeds have been always available to the Congress, to the legislatures of the several States, and to the American people—and at the time that he wrote, not one of these remedies had been invoked. The responsibility for the subversion, therefore, must be shared by all who sat idly by and permitted it.

When we consider the activities of the Court, therefore, we must follow Mr. Davis in distinguishing clearly between decisions which, however erroneous or perverse, are made in the exercise of the "limited authority that may lawfully be exercised by the Court under the Constitution, and decisions in which the Court arrogates to itself powers not granted to it by the Constitution. The former are valid; the latter have no more legal force than a rhyme in Mother Goose.

As Mr. Davis says: "It is clear that where the members of the Court have not acted within the authority granted, we are not dealing with a Court, but with the unauthorized and therefore unlawful acts of the individual members."

It is not possible to dispute this conclusion.

Mr. Davis' book is perhaps most valuable because it will force every reader to think about what the law really is.

Nontariff Curbs Against American Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the contents of an article from the New York Times are worthy of comment. It does not tell one-fourth of the barriers that are now in existence and have been known to be in force against items produced in the United States for export.

The people who supported the administration's trade bill in the last session of Congress have seen two assumptions blow up and come to naught: first, that Britain would be admitted to the Common Market; and second that the nations involved would readily remove their nontariff curbs.

The administration's strategy of pushing this trade legislation through without more evidence and facts has created a great deal of uncertainty, and has raised more serious problems for our nation than previously existed.

The case of coal and the poultry industry offers ample proof as to the validity of that statement.

As a part of my remarks, I would like to include the article written by Richard E. Mooney:

U.S. STUDIES NONTARIFF CURBS IN PREPARING FOR TRADE TALKS

(By Richard E. Mooney)

WASHINGTON, June 1.—Osaka, Japan, prohibits wide automobiles—Detroit size—from its downtown streets during business hours. France prohibits advertising of grain liquors—whiskies, but not wines.

These are two examples of nontariff restrictions on trade, restrictions that can be just as effective as tariffs and often even more so. If an Osakan cannot drive an American car downtown, why should he buy one? If a Frenchman cannot read burbon advertising, what is to whet his taste for it?

These and other nontariff barriers are the very heart of preparations under way here now for the big international trade negotiations next year. At this junction, these preparations take two forms.

First, Christian A. Herter, chief United States negotiator, and his staff are giving priority attention to tariffs that are exceptionally high, to see whether they really impede trade in the high-tariff item or whether the trouble lies with nontariff factors.

Second, the Department of Commerce is conferring with industry after industry to find out what the nontariff barriers are. It found out about French advertising from the burbon industry just this week.

The work of the Herter office, joined by officials of the State and Commerce Departments, is aimed at a special clause written into last week's agreement in Geneva on the general terms for the 1964 negotiations.

The general terms are that tariff reduction shall be substantial, equal, and across the board. The special clause, inserted at France's insistence, says that in cases in which one country's tariffs are particularly out of line with others, special adjustments—extra large cuts—shall be made.

CLOSE SCRUTINY SEEN

It was also agreed, however, that the special cuts would be made only where the tariff disparity is meaningful in trade terms—that is, where the high tariff, and not something else, is the meaningful obstacle to greater trade. The U.S. view is that close scrutiny will show that most extra-high tariffs are not meaningful.

High tariffs on woolens, for instance, seem to be no impediment to imports. This is why the U.S. industry is fighting so hard for more curbs. More to the point, however, is the case of many chemicals, another high-tariff group. Trade is limited. But the meaningful limitation is not the tariff rate itself. It is a special U.S. law that governs how the tariff is to be calculated.

In still other cases it will surely be found that a high tariff really is an obstacle, and in these cases the special cuts will take effect.

The precise rules for special cuts have yet to be negotiated. It is this that the Herter office is preparing for now, developing the U.S. position.

The Commerce Department's present series of conferences supplies grist for Mr. Herter's current exercise, but is aimed more specifically at preparing for the big negotiations next year. The Department is inviting industries to recommend what Mr. Herter and his team should ask for at the bargaining table.

Would a cut in whisky tariffs permit greater sales in France, or should the United States demand repeal of the advertising ban? As one official evpressed it, "a big tariff cut means no more than shipping empty boxes if there is still a real restriction inside the country."

Osaka's limit on cars, and France's on liquor ads, may not seem to spell the end of trade. But Italy has a road tax that puts an extra $450 duty on standard American cars, $170 on U.S. compacts, $44 on Volkswagons and only $17 on homegrown Fiats. And Brazil and Colombia require that importers deposit the full price—or more—of an imported item in advance of importation, thus tying up the importer's money and adding to the expense of importing. And Canada requires that tariffs on textiles be calculated on the basis of the highest price of sale in the last 6 months, effectively inhibiting the importation of low-price mill ends.

This is just a partial list. The department plans to have it completed by the end of August, after hearing perhaps 50 major industries that are, or could be, important international traders.

Actual negotiations on nontariff barriers will be difficult. If the barrier is a tax law, for instance, it could be repealed only by the legislature, not by a government negotiator at an international conference. In fact, this may be the way the deal is worked out—by tentative agreements among negotiators, subject to approval of their Congresses and Parliaments.

The consideration of nontariff barriers serves other purposes, too. As noted above, it helps in the evaluation of when a tariff cut is meaningful and when not. And the Commerce Department expects that it may also find some restrictions that are illegal on their face, because they violate the standing rules of the 50-nations General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The Wilderness Bill Means Positive Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a call from some lumbermen who came into my office the other day and some visits with various Members of the House have led me to believe that there is one misunderstanding about the Wilderness Bill that can be readily corrected. It has to do with what is being called positive action by Congress.

The wilderness bill from the very beginning has called for positive action by Congress. That has been its purpose, and that seems to be the reason why it has been opposed by some of the very people who are creating this present misunderstanding.

A few facts will be helpful and very interesting.

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES NOW TAKE THEIR OWN STEPS

The first fact is that by not taking positive action in this field—by not exercising its prerogatives—the Congress has created a vacuum and as a result we have seen administrative agencies take their own steps without congressional action.

The Forest Service and the Secretary of Agriculture, with no specific authorization by Congress, have established more than 80 areas of wilderness comprising almost 15 million acres. By simply basing their action on broad authority to determine the use and occupancy of national forests, they have set up wilderness areas, and they have later abolished some of them, too.

Since we passed the Multiple Use Act of 1960 they have had a freer hand than ever. That act told them that "the establishment and maintenance of areas of wilderness are consistent with the purposes and provisions of this act."

According to a special study conducted for the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission there are some 7.1 million acres in the national forests that are not now classified or protected as wilderness but are in wilderness condition and within such tracts of at least 100,000 acres in extent.

Thus, in present circumstances, in the absence of positive congressional action regarding wilderness, a Secretary of Agriculture, if he wished to, could put 7.1 million acres of presently unclassified national forest land within wilderness areas that he could now establish. Or, if he wished to, he could abolish areas within which there are now preserved more than 14 million acres of wilderness. The fate of some 21 million acres of wilderness is in his hands, in the absence of congressional directives.

CONGRESS IS RESPONSIBLE

The Constitution however, makes Congress responsible for these lands, and it is the purpose of the wilderness bill to meet this responsibility.

Certainly not all, but certainly also a great deal, of the argument now about the wilderness bill's failure to provide for positive action by Congress comes from opponents of wilderness preservation who are trying to frustrate the enactment of wilderness protective legislation. Or, if they cannot defeat it, they want to write into it procedures that will make it possible for them to stall progress in establishing the areas of wilderness it authorizes.

WHAT THE WILDERNESS BILL DOES

The lumbermen whose visit suggested this statement were surprised when they read what actually is in the bill.

The bill, of course, establishes a national policy to preserve wilderness and sets up standards and guidelines for handling wilderness. It relates only to Federal lands and, of course, only to lands that are in a wilderness condition at present—and, futhermore, only to such lands that are within the National Park system, within wildlife refuges and ranges, or within the 8 percent of national forest lands comprising the less than 15 million acres already classified for wilderness protection.

By this bill the Congress says that these three categories of lands—these particular areas—are to be considered for inclusion in a National Wilderness Preservation System. It says positively also that only Congress can make any addition to this system in the future—"only after specific affirmative authorization by law."

THE ARGUMENT ABOUT POSITIVE ACTION

The argument about positive action relates particularly to a procedure that is provided for a careful review of the wilderness lands and their permanent inclusion in the Wilderness System on the basis of such a review.

Bear in mind that this review relates only to the lands that Congress by the act says are to be considered, and all these lands are now in some kind of administrative status as wilderness.

The review instructions then direct the administrators to make a study of the areas and on the basis of the study to formulate recommendations regarding just what portions of these congressionally specified areas shall be permanently protected.

Then the bill—and this is in section 3(f)—says that either House of Congress may reject the recommendations, but that if neither House has done this within a specified period, the areas that have thus been nominated by Congress and found suitable upon careful administrative investigation shall automatically take their place in the wilderness system.

This is what opponents of the bill are calling a congressional veto procedure. The trouble with their alternative proposals is that the procedures they suggest would allow wilderness opponents to stall action regarding each of the particular areas involved until it might pass out of existence as wilderness by other provisions of the law. Just as some of these people have succeeded in frustrating the wilderness bill itself they would be glad to have procedures established providing for their future stalling tactics.

CONSISTENCY

Seven year ago when I introduced the first wilderness bill in the House of Representatives, it was attacked by some foresters who went so far as to say that by this measure the Congress would be usurping the privileges of the U.S. Forest Service. They were opposed to having Congress legislate on the subject.

Although their usurpation argument was ridiculous, there was some merit in their insisting that the reviews on the ground and the public hearings for the actual determination of areas to be protected could best be handled administratively.

It is in part a result of this that the wilderness bill does give to the administrative agency the task of making such studies and conducting hearings as a basis for the final recommendations regarding the areas that Congress authorizes for wilderness consideration.

Now some of the same people who 7 years ago opposed the wilderness bill for usurping bureau prerogatives are saying that it is giving the bureaus authority and surrendering congressional prerogatives.

Such people may seem to be inconsistant. Actually they are very consistent—consistently opposed to proposals that will preserve wilderness.

WILDERNESS ADVOCATES WANT POSITIVE ACTION

Let me emphasize that it is the purpose of advocates of the wilderness bill to see positive action by Congress in establishing a sound national wilderness preservation policy and a program to make this policy effective on the land.

Any proposals that provide for more positive congressional action will have our support if they likewise insure the protection as wilderness of the areas provided for in the act until Congress does take further positive action.

Congress by this act is not giving away its authority. It is giving instructions. It is not surrendering its prerogatives. It is exercising them.

BILL'S PROVISIONS DESCRIBED

Here are the provisions of the bill—H.R. 930, which I have introduced, and the other House bills that are identical with it.

After stating the national policy to preserve wilderness and establishing definitions, the measure states in section 3 the areas to be included in a wilderness system.

This is a positive provision by Congress. It provides for inclusion of three kinds of areas—national forest areas, National Park System areas, and areas in wildlife refuges and ranges. And then in section 3(h) the bill says:

> The addition of any area to, or the elimination of any area from, the wilderness system which is not specifically provided for under the provisions of this Act shall be made only after specific affirmative authorization by law for such addition or elimination.

The national forest areas placed by this measure within the wilderness system are 84 in number and include in the aggregate 14,318,575 acres—out of our national forest total of more than 180 million acres.

Forty-seven of these areas—with 8,220,043 acres—become a permanent part of the wilderness system on passage of the act. These are areas that have already been carefully reviewed by the Forest Service, subjected to the public-hearing procedures of that Service, and given a permanent status.

The other 37 areas, called primitive areas and comprising 6,098,532 acres, are to be subjected to the further review that Congress provides for in this measure. After completion of the review for each area the Secretary of Agriculture is to report his findings to the President. The President is then to make his recommendations, and if Congress does not reject them they become effective in a specified time.

This is the provision on which the positive-action-by-Congress argument is centered. It is as follows—section 3(f) in H.R. 930 and other House bills:

> Any recommendation of the President made in accordance with the provisions of this section shall take effect upon the day following the adjournment sine die of the first complete session of the Congress following the date or dates on which such recommendation was received by the United States Senate and the House of Representatives; but only if prior to such adjournment neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives shall have approved a resolution declaring itself opposed to such recommendation: *Provided,* That in the case of a recommendation covering two or more separate areas, such resolution of opposition may be limited to one or more of the areas covered, in which event the balance of the recommendation shall take effect as before provided: *Provided further,* That where a resolution of opposition to any such recommendation has been introduced, a hearing thereon shall be held within thirty days by the committee to which such resolution has been referred: *Provided further,* That any such resolution shall be subject to the procedures provided under the provisions of sections 203 through 206 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C., 133z–12—1133–15) for a resolution of either House of Congress: *And provided further,* That if Congress rejects a recommendation of the President with regard to the inclusion or exclusion of an area or portions thereof the land shall continue in status quo until a subsequent recommendation of the President with regard to that area shall have become effective or until Congress shall have determined otherwise by law.

In the Senate-passed act, S. 4, this section is as follows:

> Any recommendation of the President made in accordance with the provisions of this section shall take effect upon the day following the adjournment sine die of the first complete session of the Congress following the date or dates on which such recommendation was received by the United States Senate and the House of Representatives; but only if prior to such adjournment neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives shall have approved a resolution declaring itself opposed to such recommendation: *Provided,* That in the case of a recommendation covering two or more separate areas, such resolution of opposition may be limited to one or more of the areas covered, in which event the balance of the recommendation shall take effect as before provided: *Provided further,* That where a resolution of opposition to any such recommendation has been introduced, a hearing thereon shall be held within thirty days by the committee to which such resolution has been referred. Any such resolution shall be subject to the procedures provided under the provisions of sections 203 through 206 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C., secs. 133z–12—133z–15) for a resolution of either House of Congress: *And provided further,* That a motion to discharge the committee shall not be in order until the time for the committee to hold a hearing has elapsed.

This is the section regarding which my earlier remarks apply in offering agreement to any provisions more satisfactory to others, provided the protection of the areas as wilderness is assured while the specified procedures are being followed.

Areas within the National Park System and within wildlife refuges and ranges will be handled in a manner similar to that provided for the primitive areas, and in accordance with section 3(f).

There is little argument, however, regarding the park and refuge areas, as these lands already have been withdrawn from commercial use in commodity production.

The argument has centered recently around the 37 primitive areas, the 6,098,532 acres, within national forests, where timber production and mining may be carried on if there is not protection as wilderness.

This is a relatively small proportion of our 180 million acres of national forest land. It is indeed my hope that we can soon eliminate disagreement regarding these lands, which are of such great wilderness importance, and realize the consensus we all want in enacting our basic wilderness protection legislation. It is with this objective that I have sought the clarification and have attempted the explanations made in these remarks.

Military Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, we are all confident that under the able leadership of Senator Richard B. Russell the military pay bill will be acted upon promptly in the other body and will soon become law. It is my understanding that the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia has appointed a subcommittee and hearings will start on this urgently needed bill at an early date. The enactment of a military pay bill is long overdue. The final passage of this bill at an early date will be a tremendous boost to the morale of our servicemen and women throughout the world.

Almost daily our weapons system grows more complex. This is indeed the age of science and technology. This fact was never more evident to me than when attending the launching of the Polaris submarine, the *John C. Calhoun,* at Newport News, last Saturday. The skill necessary to operate this magnificent instrumentality of defense is beyond comprehension. The same is true of the equipment being operated by the Army, the Air Force, and the Marines. The very existence of this country depends upon the skill, efficiency, and technical training of our armed services. The men and women in our Defense Establishment are devoted and patriotic. They deserve the highest recognition, and they deserve the very best that America can furnish in the way of adequately trained additional personnel.

The last general military pay increase was 4½ years ago. Private industry has been able to outbid our armed services through higher wages and salaries. The men and women of our armed forces are taking renewed hope from Senator Russell's leadership and sense of justice.

Ling-Temco-Vought, Inc., Research and Development of a Nuclear-Powered Low-Altitude Supersonic Vehicle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the independent research initiated with their own funds by companies in the aeroplane field is a factor of tremendous importance in the maintenance of our national defense program.

It is with pride that I call the attention of my colleagues to an example of such research in my own State of Texas, where Ling-Temco-Vought, Inc., recently has been awarded an Air Force contract for continuation of the technology toward development of a nuclear-powered low-altitude supersonic vehicle—LASV.

The immediate objective, according to Gifford K. Johnson, LTV president, is to provide data leading to the development of a nuclear-powered ramjet. Such a vehicle, if proven feasible, would have practically unlimited range, and could lead to flight at such low altitudes as to make radar detection extremely difficult.

The point that I believe should be stressed is that LTV's aerospace division, Chance Vought, Corp., has been working on the concept of such a vehicle for the last 5 years. It was in 1958 that the corporation initiated studies on a project called SLAM—for supersonic low-altitude missile. Since then the corporation has invested more than $3 million of its own funds in research and development in connection with the project. Now a new, important step has been taken in the Air Force-sponsored program.

The new contract awarded LTV by the Air Force Systems Command's Aeronautical Systems Division at Dayton, Ohio, covers tests, studies, and investigations necessary for development of an airframe, propulsion, avionics, and systems study technology for the nuclear-powered project.

As explained by Dr. W. J. Hesse, director of the LTV project, the key to a nuclear ramjet vehicle's long-range and low-altitude capability lies in the fact that just 1 pound of nuclear fuel, when fissioned, produces as much heat as the burning of 2 million pounds of gasoline. Such a vehicle should have virtually unlimited range at sea level.

Mr. Speaker, both the Air Force and Ling-Temco-Vought deserve a commendation for their work toward developing a nuclear-powered low-altitude supersonic vehicle. It is through such cooperative effort that our defense establishment can be kept at a high point of readiness. And that, most certainly, is a must in the world of today.

Ads in AMA News Tell Significant Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Saturday, May 25, 1963, issue of Labor, a publication of the Railroad Brotherhoods which speaks well for itself. The editorial about the ads in the AMA News tells pretty clearly the difference between some of those who oppose hospitalization for the aged within the framework of the social security system as sponsored by myself and a number of other Members of this body and some of the old folks who would be beneficiaries thereof with a median wage of a little over $1,000 per individual and $2,500 per couple. I would surmise that no such advertising appears in the publications of the proponents of hospitalization for the aged in the social security system.

The editorial follows:

ADS IN AMA NEWS TELL SIGNIFICANT STORY

The latest issue of the AMA News, published by the American Medical Association, indicates one reason why that organization opposes the "Medicare" bill and virtually all other measures which would make medical services more available to Americans, young or old, who cannot afford to pay for them now. This reason is that doctors are doing very well with things as they are.

How does the AMA News reveal that? By the contents of its advertising columns? Advertisers and the agencies which place their ads pick a publication read by persons who are good "prospects" for particular products, and the main thing that makes a good prospect is that he has enough money to pay for the product.

Almost all the ads in the AMA News are for expensive luxury items. For example:

A full-page ad for Cadillac cars. A big ad for the Mercedes-Benz, a costly imported car. One suggesting that a Citroen car is the "best choice" for a doctor to buy and use while touring Europe. One urging doctors to "grab your sailor hat and head for your OMC boat dealer" for a nifty little cruiser called a Funabout.

"Prescription for Doctors" is the headline over an ad which urges well-heeled physicians to "get away from it all in an Avion travel trailer, complete with hot and cold running water, modern kitchen and bath, deluxe appointments." Another ad offers "the Airstream land yacht, a personal highway cruiser."

Doctors are invited to raise Shetland ponies "for fun and profit. A trainer will deliver, establish on your property, instruct in care and handling." They also are invited to "go first class (to Europe) on a Holland-America ship. Relax in total luxury."

Or they can relax in several luxury hotels advertised in the AMA News. For example, "Hawaii calls" doctors to take their choice of two expensive hotels in the "exotic islands."

Other ads offer various "investment opportunities" to doctors. Life insurance companies offer "specialized" policies to doctors, who should buy them in gratitude for the cooperation the AMA has always had from the insurance company lobby in campaigns against medical and pension benefits under the social security and railroad retirement systems.

The advertising experts know their business, and they think doctors are doing pretty well. So why should the kind of doctors the AMA speaks for want any change from things as they are? Why worry about the old folks and other less-well-off people who are not getting the medical care they need?

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the Young Republican Club of the District of Columbia last week, by resolution, affirmed the principles of the Eisenhower administration in endorsing Captive Nations Week. Because of its vital importance to our Nation and the whole free world, I bring to the attention of my colleagues the Young Republican resolution. It follows:

CAPTIVE NATIONS RESOLUTION

Whereas there are many millions of human beings whose individual freedoms are suppressed by Communist tyranny and whose nations are held captive by the imperialistic conquests of the Soviet Union and Red China; and

Whereas these millions of human beings are brethren to the more fortunate individuals who comprise this great Nation of ours; and

Whereas the principles set forth in our Declaration of Independence, and our Bill of Rights have inspired human beings throughout the entire world to revolt against tyranny and declare their national independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Young Republican Club of the District of Columbia in meeting assembled this 17th day of June 1963, That on this fourth annual anniversary of Captive Nations Week, we, the District of Columbia Young Republicans, are not reconciled to the captivity of millions by Communist masters, and do extend our sentiments and invite every American concerned with the freedom of our Nation to participate with us, and rededicate themselves to the cause of individual freedom and national independence; not only during the week of July 14–20, but every week throughout the year: Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Members of the Congress, and that copies be released to the various news media.

Pomfret, Conn., Celebrates 250th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 29, the town of Pomfret, Conn., will be celebrating the 250th anniversary of its existence. Pomfret is located in my congressional district, which embraces the eastern part of the State. I am, therefore, planning to be there and to join with the citizens of the community in the festivities of the day.

Old in history and tradition, the town of Pomfret has succeeded in retaining much of its old-time charm and beauty for which many of the New England communities are so famous. It is nestled in the rolling hills of northeastern Connecticut and is one of the diminishing number of communities in our part of the country which still maintains a rustic and gentle way of life so characteristic of America a generation or two ago. The onrush of the mechanical age, the impact of the modern-day industrial society, somehow has eluded Pomfret. Nevertheless, its inhabitants are none the worse off and perhaps even a shade happier than those of us who have become adjusted to the modern age of gadgets and gimmicks.

The town of Pomfret was named and incorporated in the year 1713. It was settled by pioneer colonists in the early period of American history. Because of its beautiful location and its rural atmosphere, is has been for many years a summer resort for city dwellers. Its principal industry to this day is still agriculture. Within its 38 square miles of area are many apple and peach orchards, as well as dairy farms. Its population numbers 2,200.

The 250th anniversary of Pomfret will actually be observed over a period of 2 days, June 28 and 29, during which time many distinguished guests from all parts of Connecticut will participate. Among these are Gov. John N. Dempsey, Senator Thomas A. Dodd, Senator Abraham A. Ribicoff, and many others. Many events have been planned by the arrangements committee for those 2 days, and these include a parade, sky divers, games, an anniversary ball, a barbecue, a singing program, contests, a block dance, a fireworks display, and others.

But the historical phases of the celebration have not been overlooked. There will be a tour of the historic sites of this 250-year-old town, which lists more than 90 homes built before the year 1800 and each of these will be marked with the date of its construction. Among these houses are the following: a house built by Daniel Trowbridge around the years 1730–35, which to this day includes hardware dating back to early Colonial times; the old Benjamin Hubbard home built around 1765–1800; the Carson House which dates back to 1708–57, with its beautiful furnishings; the Goodell home, an early American home, built around 1750–90; the Marcy Hollow Blacksmith Shop built in 1818 and continuously operated until 1946. Other historic buildings include the Pomfret Library which was first started in 1739, the Pomfret Congregational Church, and the Abington Congregational Church, the oldest active church in Connecticut.

All of these places, as well as other spots of historic interest, will be identified for visitors. The town library will have special exhibits for the occasion. The celebration will undoubtedly be the largest public event ever to take place in Pomfret in all the 250 years of its history.

As the Representative from that area in Congress, I want to pay a well-deserved tribute to those early settlers of Pomfret who helped build our country through their hard work, their struggles, and their sacrifices. The record of their achievements lives to this day in the hearts and memories of their descendants who can take pride in the legacy handed down to them, a legacy of patriotism and devotion to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the citizens of Pomfret on this festive occasion. All of us in eastern Connecticut take great pride in this community and its fine families. We are confident that Pomfret's 250th anniversary will be a great and successful event, and we hope that the next 250 years in the history of this community will be as happy and prosperous for its people as it has been in the past.

In recognition of this anniversary, I am pleased to introduce a resolution in the House of Representatives to extend greetings and congratulations of this House to the people of Pomfret. The text of my resolution reads as follows:

RESOLUTION CONGRATULATING THE TOWN OF POMFRET, CONN., ON ITS 250TH ANNIVERSARY

Whereas the town of Pomfret, Conn., was first named and incorporated in 1713; and

Whereas this year marks the 250th anniversary of that incorporation; and

Whereas Pomfret's rustic beauty and gentle way of life are characteristic of America's small towns and villages, and

Whereas its many historic homes, buildings, and other places of interest are everpresent reminders of the earliest days of this Nation; and

Whereas ceremonies and programs on June 28 and 29 of this year will mark the town's celebration of this anniversary: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its congratulations and best wishes to the citizens of Pomfret, Conn., on the occasion of this anniversary, and acknowledges the many contributions this town has made during the past 250 years, and which it undoubtedly will continue to make to the life of this Nation.

Making Democracy Work Better

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced into the RECORD two honorable mention essays submitted for the McGEE Senate Internship contest because I believe them to be of such high caliber as to be of interest to many persons. Today I would like to ask unanimous consent that two more of these essays, by Allen C. Johnson, of Sheridan, Wyo., and Martha E. Burton, of Afton, Wyo., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK BETTER

(By Martha E. Burton, Afton, Wyo.)

No civilization has ultimately withstood time. It seems that each civilization has an age. According to the rise and fall or empires, the average age for a civilization is 200 years. Each civilization goes through a cycle. It starts with bondage, goes to spiritual faith, great courage, liberty, abundance, selfishness, complacency, apathy, dependence, and the back again to bondage.

In 13 years, the United States of America will be 200 years of age. We have passed through some sort of cycle. It didn't start with democracy. Actually it began as bondage. Then some men gained a great spiritual faith in their own potential to rule themselves. As they developed great courage, they fought for liberty and won. Our liberty was purchased with blood and sacrifice and it should leave a mark on our patriotism. Since that time our Nation has developed into a great democracy and has come a long way in the cycle. Many men and women have given their lives to preserve our way of life. Now, we are living in a golden age, reaping the harvests that our forefathers planted with toil and hardship. We have hit the peak, and may go down the other side if we are not mindful of our responsibilities.

Do you know any American who is selfish? Do you know a complacent citizen? Have you met anyone who is willing to live on someone else's work? Is there any danger of us completing the cycle and returning to bondage?

Any alert citizen will answer positive to these questions. There is living proof all around. There is a strong force in the world today that is aimed primarily at bringing the United States into bondage. We have something to fight against, and we have something to fight for—our democracy—our way of life. What is it going to take to preserve our democracy and make it work better, rise to new peaks?

A democracy is like a chain. A chain is no better than its weakest link. The strength of a chain depends upon the strength of its individual members. Our democracy is no better than its weakest citizen. Since the people rule, the strength of our Nation depends upon its individual citizens.

America will rise or fall, depending on what we, her citizens, do. Many citizens are weak and slothful links in our Nation, willing to let someone else do everything. It's much easier that way. Some are content to let the Government support them. Many don't think they are important enough to voice an opinion or vote in the elections, but certainly want all they can get from the Government. This is a moving trend. This is where we must take action to make our democracy work better.

I am an American citizen. Am I a strong or weak link? Let's see what it takes.

A strong American is educated, mentally, physically, socially, and spiritually. Mentally, he has a well-trained and alert mind. He reacts to everything about him. Physically, he is strong and healthy, with good habits. He is skilled and trained to take his place in our economic chain. He is prepared to support himself and his family. Socially, he has learned to get along with others. He enjoys life. Spiritually, he has found his rightful relationship to his Maker so that he might participate "in one nation, under God."

A strong American is a participator. He can provide leadership or can be an effective follower. At election time, he knows his candidates and is out voting. He's not the one with the my-vote-won't-count attitude.

A good American isn't a complainer. If there's something wrong, he will do something about it. He is building better American communities. He is in touch with his representatives in the Government and supports the high ideals of the Nation.

An effective American has his own political platform. It isn't necessarily all Democratic or all Republican but he knows how he stands on all the issues. He knows what is happening.

A strong American does not want something for nothing. He is a worker. It is he who supports the Government; the Government does not support him.

A good American comes from good homes, homes where truth, and love, and security, and faith are realities. He is building an environment and atmosphere conducive to making young Americans strong.

Ambition and work are another part of a good American. He has the ambition and drive to create new industries, develop new techniques, and invent new machines. He is making out Nation progress economically, politically, and socially.

Many things make a vital American. Most of all, however, he is the one who pursues right. He does not follow the easiest rut. Sir James Jeans once said, "Democracy is ever eager for rapid progress, and the only progress which can be rapid is progress downhill." This certainly seems to be true. Some citizens want as much as they can get as soon as possible. They remove themselves from the workings of their government except when they can get something. If something can be presently had that is satisfactory, then there is no patience to work for something better in the future. Because of this, they are making our Federal Government more and more paternalistic, taking the initiative from themselves because of the effect it involves to keep it.

One can see how imperative it is that our citizens assume their responsibilities and become strong links in our democracy. We are facing one of the greatest challenges at this time. Many forces are working to undermine democracy. We must work to plant the vital seeds of individual strength for a continued golden age for America. We must make sure that our descendants will be living in a democracy. If we do not assume this responsibility of strong citizenship, our democracy may break.

It is my responsibility to make my individual link strong. I will try to assume my duties. Will you?

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK BETTER

(By Allen C. Johnson, Sheridan, Wyo.)

Centuries of experience in the workings of democracy have given us a foundation of government firmly established in both duration and success. Since the early Greecian democracies, this form of government has traveled a grim and challenging path, but a path that has brought it safely to the 20th century altered only for the better. Democracy has been tried and tested innumerable times throughout the centuries. And these tests and trials have provided overwhelming evidence that democracy is the most perfect and practical form of government ever invented.

Today we are faced with challenge to make democracy work better. With an ever-increasing population and new and different problems popping up every day, constant efforts must be made to keep America's Government functioning properly. The responsibility for making our Government work better, however, does not lie solely with our elective and appointive officials. A great deal of the responsibility lies with each citizen.

Before we attempt to say what each citizen must do to make democracy work better, let us examine what some of the problemt are in our society.

First, we have become a materialistic society. We measure our success in the number of television sets we own and the number of cars we have parked in our driveways. We forget, oftentimes, to measure a man by his deeds and accomplishments rather than by his possessions. It certainly was not men whose sole interest was money that gained our Nation independence and set up the form of government that we enjoy today. These were men who would give everything they had, even their lives, that they might breathe freely in a land that was free. If we are going to make democracy work better, we must first of all want more than anything else that our great Government succeed now and forever.

Second, the people of the United States have become disinterested in the workings of the Government. It has become almost a chore to get people interested in community as well as statewide and nationwide projects that are in the public interest. We take for granted the rights and privileges that thousands of men died to gain and thousands more died to preserve. A disappointing 60 percent of the population turn out to vote on election day. Our right of suffrage is the most valuable right we possess, and yet 40 percent of the people prefer to let the other fellow do the voting while they lounge in front of the TV set or swing a club at the local golf course. The people are losing the close attachment between elected officials and voters that is so very necessary to the success of a democracy.

If we wish to make democracy work better we must have a rebirth of pride in our Nation and our great heritage of freedom and equality for all. We must renew that tingling feeling that runs up the spine and makes a person stand a little straighter and a little prouder when he hears the flag pledge or the national anthem. We must get the people to realize that all they have here in these United States of America has been given to them. That the rights and privileges we enjoy today are a gift from some great patriot who had a dream of a land where men could be free and fought and perhaps died that that dream should come true.

Making democracy work better is a big task. It requires courage, leadership, and a great desire to maintain the principles of freedom and democracy.

The 20th century will be a severe testing ground, not only for democracy, but for our will to preserve it. We will be tattered and torn by communism; we will be severely shaken by internal stagnation and dissension; but the people of the United States along with their Government will survive these harassments if we have the will and courage to do so. If we are willing to sacrifice, to do our little bit for America, the bright shining star of freedom, the great Western bastion of capitalism will never fade from the heavens.

We, the people of the United States of America, are challenged to make democracy work better. But we have no choice. The only choice is that we must make democracy work better. It is our duty, our right, our privilege to assure future generations that government "of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this earth."

Grants to Medical Schools by the Procter & Gamble Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House a recent generous gift of the Procter & Gamble Co. to various medical schools throughout the country. The details of these grants are included in the following statement. The company is, I feel, to be commended by the Nation generally for its interest and generosity in this necessary program of building up the medical schools:

GRANTS TO MEDICAL SCHOOLS BY THE PROCTER & GAMBLE CO.

Procter & Gamble today announced a program of grants to medical schools, including the University of Cincinnati, totaling $475,000 over the next 5 years.

Six of the schools, located at Columbia University, the University of Chicago, Harvard University, Johns Hopkins University, the University of Pennsylvania, and Washington University, will receive $15,000 each year to be used as medical school officials decide.

The College of Medicine of the University of Cincinnati was given $25,000, and will use it to finance a complete study of the medical curriculum.

Howard Morgens, president of Procter & Gamble, announced the medical school program as an addition to other activities by P. & G. on behalf of higher education in the United States. The new program will bring the company's total support of independent colleges and universities to more than $1,300,000 a year.

"Six of these schools were selected for direct support because of the number and quality of the teachers of medicine which they have contributed to the staffs of virtually all of the Nation's medical schools," Mr. Morgens said.

"We believe that support of these schools, on which other medical teaching institutions depend heavily for their teaching staffs, will help improve the teaching of medicine and will help increase the number of practicing physicians available to the U.S. population," he added.

"It is for this reason that we feel special assistance to these schools of medicine is warranted."

Mr. Morgens took note of the declining ratio of doctors to population, stating that the present ratio of 1 doctor for each 740 persons in the country is expected to drop to 1 for each 1,125 persons by 1975 under present rates of doctor training.

"With more people living longer, due partly to advances in medicine itself," the statement by Mr. Morgens continued, "the need for more doctors becomes quite evident. And while more doctors are needed, fewer are available due to the requirements of specialization in training and the expense of attending medical school for many years before entering practice.

"It is our hope that, through this support of the schools which produce the largest numbers of teachers, the effect of the worsening ratio of doctors to population can be partly offset."

The $25,000 gift to the medical college of the University of Cincinnati will be paid over a 3-year period, during which a study will be made of the school's curriculum to compare it with courses offered at other medical schools. Faculty teams appointed by Dr. Clifford G. Grulee, Jr., dean of the U.C. College of Medicine, will visit campuses of other institutions to exchange curriculum information and to bring back suggestions for improvement.

"Reorganization of administrative responsibilities in the medical college of the university, plus acquisition of control of General Hospital, seems to us to provide U.C. with an opportunity to make even greater contributions to medical education than it has in the past," Mr. Morgens said.

"The decision by officials of the medical college to use the money to study its curriculum is, in itself, indicative of the type of continuing self-analysis and improvement to which the university is dedicated."

Addition of the medical program to P. & G.'s educational support activities makes seven different ways in which the Cincinnati firm supports higher education.

A scholarship program, in effect since 1954, provides full tuition and incidental payments for 240 students each year. Another activity, initiated by P. & G. in 1957, provides $20,000 per year to each of 14 major American universities, while a third supplies $15,000 annually to each of 5 graduate schools of education. A fourth program provides $113,000 a year to 40 State associations of colleges for division among their member schools. Fellowships in technical fields and special grants to educational organizations also are paid each year by P. & G.

Three Words Vital to West Coast Shipbuilding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on June 25, the Alameda Times Star published an editorial entitled "Three Words Vital to West Coast Shipbuilding" that I think is of sufficient importance to have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The matter of protecting the private shipyards on the Pacific coast is one that is important in the defense of our country. In the event of an emergency, these yards would be called upon to do the job they did so effectively during World War II.

The views on this subject are also shared by the San Francisco Chronicle who, on the same day, published an editorial entitled "The Private Share."

Under unanimous consent I include these two editorials in the Appendix of the RECORD so all may read them:

[From the Alameda Times Star, June 25, 1963]

THREE WORDS VITAL TO WEST COAST SHIPBUILDING

When a report released by the Navy's Bureau of Ships baldly states that "it costs from 10 to 25 percent more to build or repair ships in a Navy yard than in a private yard," one would think there would be little opposition to legislation stipulating that no less than 35 percent of all Navy ship repair work be performed in private yards. But thanks to the Alice-in-Wonderland type of thinking of some Members of Congress there is an all too real chance that legislation to that effect will be emasculated, and by the simple process of altering only three words.

The legislation referred to involves Section 537 of the Defense Appropriations Act, 1964. It is in the form of a motion on the floor of the House for the amendment of section 537, in the part regarding the proportion of Navy ship repair work that is to be done in Navy and private shipyards. The motion calls for the language of section 537 to be changed so it conforms with Section 541 of the Defense Appropriations Act of 1963 which requires that no less than 35 percent of all Navy ship repair work be performed in private yards.

But this motion, which would be of great benefit to the shipbuilding industry of the entire country, has been most effectively torpedoed through the Defense Subcommittee's switching the three words no less than to read no more than. Other than that switch and the translation of 35 percent into $335 million, which is about 35 percent of the total to be spent by the Navy in work of this kind, there was no change.

And there didn't need to be for the grim purpose of cutting down the amount that might be spent for ship repair in private yards. For under the "no more than" version there is no requirement to spend anything at all in private yards, not even 1 percent. In other words, if the "no more than" version becomes law, then the private yards may get only that part of the ship repair work which the Navy yards are unable to handle owing to a glut of work.

Quite aside from the 10 to 25 percent additional expense to the general taxpayer, would such a condition have any other adverse effect on him?

The answer is "Yes." On the west coast alone, thanks to the favoritism shown to Navy shipyards and against the private ones, no less than five major shipyards have closed since the end of World War II. Elsewhere in the country 15 others have gone out of business. And, of course, with more and more ships built for private account being constructed in foreign yards, the amount of work available for our own is so rapidly shrinking that unless there is a fair division of Navy ship repair work there will be a severe loss in shipbuilding skills.

What that means is that American private shipyards will not only be in a still worse position to compete with foreign ones, but also, in event of a national emergency, they will not be able to serve the country's needs with the necessary efficiency.

In addition, there will be an increase in the pool of unemployed workers which is already dangerously large—thanks to the increasing disemployment through automation and other factors.

Such a compound price is ridiculously high for any country to pay for increasing the work in Navy shipyards, especially in view of the fact that if it were required that 35 percent of all Navy ship repair work be done in private yards, it would be performed at a cost of around 25 percent less.

Since it is quite likely that a vote in the House may come this week, we urge the Representatives to see to it that the words "no less than" take the place of "no more than" in the appropriate part of section 537 of the Defense Appropriation Act, 1964.

For if that is done, it will both save money for all taxpayers and also stimulate the private shipbuilding industry that is vital to all America.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, June 25, 1963]

THE PRIVATE SHARE

The Arthur Andersen study on comparative costs of shipbuilding and ship repair in Navy and private yards was released 10 days ago. It shows costs are from 10 to 25 percent more in Navy yards. These results certainly argue for the private yards getting their share of the work. Under this year's legislation, they are supposed to have 35 percent of all ship conversions and repairs, but in the upcoming appropriations bill that percentage has been removed and the Navy directed to spend "no more than $355 million" in private yards.

The howls of Navy yard employee associations have been heard by Congress, but the public interest in having strong, private shipworking facilities should override that noise. We urge Congress to put back the directive to the Navy to use private yards for 35 percent of its repair and conversion work.

"Living With the Federal Budget"—An Address by Kermit Gordon, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Washington, D.C., April 19, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most useful analyses of the Federal Budget and its significance that I have seen was an address by the distinguished Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Kermit Gordon, which was delivered before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, D.C., on April 19, 1963.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to include the text of Mr. Gordon's address at this point in the RECORD:

LIVING WITH THE FEDERAL BUDGET

It takes a certain foolhardiness for a new Budget Director to stand up before a roomful of newspaper editors less than 4 months after his appointment and only 4 days after his listeners have mailed off their income tax returns. For, if all the newspaper editorials assailing the Federal Budget were gathered together in one place, they would fill the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—as indeed they have. When my distinguished predecessor as Budget Director moved over to the Agency for International Development, a Washington columnist said that he had been promoted from the least glamorous job in Washington to the most unpopular—but I have had frequent occasion in the last 4 months to wonder whether the job he vacated does not merit both of those distinctions.

It was not many years ago that the mere mention of the Federal Budget could be counted on to produce a deep soporific effect on any audience. But times have changed; there exists today—to put it mildly—a lively interest in the subject. I propose to capitalize on this new attentiveness by communicating the reflections of a new Budget Director on the chastely bound gray volume which has been put in his charge.

The Federal Budget is a formidable document. Compounded of Arabic numerals and latinized prose, it reflects the needs, hopes, and fears of a complex, growing, and increasingly wealthy society. It is the point of convergence of forces as diverse as an outbreak of hog cholera, a Chinese attack on India, floods in eastern Kentucky, juvenile delinquency on our city streets, a successful Venus probe, and an easing of mortgage money. But all of these vital and diverse forces must, of necessity, be transformed through the budgetary process into the cold common denominator of dollars. So it is dollars we must talk about.

The President's administrative budget for fiscal 1964 calls for expenditures of $98.8 billion. Let's look at this number from two points of view: First, what are we buying with it? Second, are we spending too much?

WHAT IS INCLUDED IN THE BUDGET DOLLAR

Of each dollar of expenditures in the administrative budget, 55 cents goes for national defense. For this expenditure we are buying a defensive shield, a retaliatory force, and a research and development program which is the principal bulwark of world peace. We have greatly strengthened both our conventional forces and our nuclear capacity since President Kennedy took office. Our national defense rests today on a foundation of 2,700,000 men under arms, an increase of about 200,000 since the end of 1960. We now have 16 combat ready divisions—up 5 over January 1961; 210 intercontinental ballistic missiles in place—up 200 over January 1961; 10 Polaris submarines—7 more than 2 years ago; 21 Air Force tactical air wings—5 more than 2 years ago; and a naval fleet of 836 ships—up 40 over January 1961. And we are steadily increasing the efficiency with which we are spending our defense dollars.

Four cents of every dollar goes for our space program. This is the minimum rate of spending which is necessary to achieve the goal of a manned lunar landing in the decade of the 1960's. With this 4 cents, we are buying a mobilization of science and technology to make the United States first in space and to unlock the secrets of a vast and mysterious scientific frontier.

Ten cents of every dollar goes to pay interest on the national debt—80 percent of which was incurred during the two World Wars and the Korean conflict. These interest payments go directly or indirectly to every person who owns a Government bond, an insurance policy, or a bank account—which means that they go to nearly everybody.

Six cents of every dollar goes for veterans' medical care, disability compensation, pensions, and other benefits to veterans and their survivors.

Four cents of every dollar goes to strengthen the military security and spur the economic growth of other nations whose stability and progress are important to the security of the United States.

These programs together account for 79 cents of every dollar. The other 21 cents goes for what are loosely referred to as "domestic welfare programs." With this 21 cents we buy every other service and function which is included in the administrative budget. Among the services we buy for this 21 cents are heart and cancer research, air safety, abatement of water pollution, hospital construction and modernization, maintenance of our national parks and forests, the redevelopment of depressed areas, the retraining of the unemployed, school lunches for our children, water supplies for water-short areas, meat inspection, college dormitories, flood control, urban renewal, weather forecasts, and protection against harmful cosmetics and drugs. And these are only a few.

Of this 21 cents the Federal Government uses 14 cents to finance its own activities and turns over the remaining 7 cents to States and localities to help them provide better public services. Looking at the same 21 cents another way, 16 cents goes for current outlays, while the remaining 5 cents is used to acquire physical and financial assets—hospitals, airports, hydroelectric dams, mortgages, etc.

This, very briefly, is what we buy with the $98.8 billion we spend. Now let me turn to the question are we spending too much?

It is a certifiable fact that Federal spending has been increasing steadily. As President Kennedy said last year: "It is true that in recent history each new administration has spent much more money than its predecessor. Thus, President Roosevelt outspent President Hoover, and with allowances for the special case of the Second World War, President Truman outspent President Roosevelt. Just to prove that this was not a partisan matter, President Eisenhower outspent President Truman by the handsome figure of $182 billion. It is even possible something of this trend may continue."

NATION'S NEED CONSTANTLY CHANGING

But to ask whether we are spending too much implies a comparison with something. Simply to compare dollar expenditures in 1963 with expenditures in 1923, or 1953, or even 1962, overlooks the fact that we are today a different Nation than we were in any of those years. Our needs are constantly changing, our resources are constantly changing, and even the unit of measurement has changed from earlier years.

This fundamental point was put effectively by President Eisenhower when he said in his 1960 budget message: "Inescapable demands resulting from new technology and the growth of our Nation, and new requirements resulting from the changing nature of our society, will generate Federal expenditures in future years * * *. We must not forget that a rapidly growing population creates virtually automatic increases in many Federal responsibilities."

Here are some examples: Between the fiscal years 1962 and 1964, the number of tax returns will rise 2.5 percent; the volume of mail will grow 6.4 percent; visitors to our national parks will increase by 7 percent; the number of veterans or survivors receiving pensions will rise by 10 percent; aircraft landings and takeoffs at airports with Federal towers will go up by 11 percent; beneficiaries under the old-age and survivors insurance program will increase by 16 percent; the number of patents granted will rise by 20 percent; and passports issued will increase by 25 percent.

Consider what has been happening to our population. We are now debating the 1964 budget. By the end of that fiscal year, there will be 10 million more Americans than there were the day President Kennedy took office. This means that we will add to the United States in this short period a number of people which is more than half the population of Canada. And since 1939, we have added to our population a number of people substantially greater than the present population of France.

Consider, also, the growth in our output of goods and services—our gross national product. Measured in the same current dollars we use to count Federal expenditures, our gross national product has increased more than fivefold since 1939. It has increased 57 percent in the last decade.

Finally, each Federal expenditure dollar buys less today than it did in earlier years. Though we have had relative price stability for the last 5 years, our price level has more than doubled since 1939 and is about 10 percent above its level a decade ago.

The single most important fact about the trend of Federal expenditures over recent decades is the vast expansion of our national defense program. Who in 1939 even dreamed of atomic energy, of missiles, of space flights, of a cold war with 2,700,000 servicemen in uniform during peacetime and defense research budgets of $9 billion? Our defense budget in 1939 was 1 percent of gross national product, in 1949, 5 percent, and in 1963, 9 percent.

FEDERAL BUDGET EXPENDITURES TIGHTENED SINCE 1939

But apart from national defense, Federal budget expenditures have been tightly contained in recent years. As a proportion of gross national product, they are substantially lower today (at 7 percent) than they were before the war in 1939 (at 9 percent) or after the war in 1949 (at 10 percent). Even including national defense, Federal budget expenditures in recent years have been remarkably stable as a proportion of gross national product; during the latter 1950's, they averaged about 16½ percent of gross national product, and that is where they are today.

Nor do the statistics give much comfort to the common view that the Federal Government is eclipsing and eroding the State and local governments. A quarter of a century ago, nondefense expenditures in the Federal budget were just about equal to total State and local expenditures; today, these Federal expenditures are about 60 percent of State and local expenditures. Of the more than 9 million civilian employees of governments in the United States today, about 7 million are employed by State and local governments, and 2,500,000 by the Federal Government. Since 1948, State and local employment has risen by 81 percent, while Federal civilian employment has risen by 22 percent—or by less than the rate of growth in the population as a whole.

In 1952, we had 1.6 Federal civilian employees for each 100 people in the population. By 1957, the figure was down to 1.4 Today we have 1.3 Federal employees to serve every hundred people.

Let me add that, of these 2,500,000 Federal civilian employees, 1 million are employed by the Defense Department, about 600,000 by the Post Office Department, and about 200,000 by the Veterans' Administration. Everything else that the Federal Government does is accomplished by 650,000 employees, and this number is substantially smaller than total employment in the telephone industry.

But what about the trend of expenditures in the budgets of the Kennedy administration? The 1964 administrative budget calls for a $4.5 billion increase in expenditures over 1963. The whole of this increase—indeed, more than the whole of the increase—is accounted for by expenditures for national defense, space, and interest. All other expenditures, taken together, will actually decline from 1963 to 1964.

If all three Kennedy budgets—1962 through 1964—are looked at together, they tell essentially the same story. The great bulk of the increase—actually 70 percent of it—has been in the defense, space, and interest category. Over the 3-year period from 1961 to 1964, budget expenditures for all other purposes taken together will increase by $4.5 billion. This compares with an increase of $5 billion in the same category over the preceding 3 fiscal years.

These figures lend little support to the assertion that the budget is out of control. On the contrary—and I am free to say this because I joined the Budget Bureau too late to have a part in the process—the achievement of reducing 1964 expenditures below the 1963 level for all activities other than defense, space, and interest, seems to me a noteworthy accomplishment in budgetary discipline.

FUTURE BUDGETARY POLICY

But what of the future?

The President's program for tax reduction and reform—designed to spur the expansion of our economy and the achievement of full employment—has major implications for our future budgetary policy. The President has pledged that, as the tax cut becomes fully effective and the economy climbs toward full employment, a substantial part of the increased revenues generated by economic expansion will be applied to the reduction of the deficit. This declaration commits the administration to a policy of sustained expenditure restraint. Our work on the 1965 budget, which is already underway, is moving along lines consistent with this policy.

This does not mean a freeze on new programs—a moratorium on prudent planning by the Federal Government to respond to the changing needs of a growing country. It does mean—and it means emphatically—that vigorous efforts will be made to find economies in existing Government programs, in order that the net impact of new activities on the Federal budget will be held to a minimum.

We have only begun to appreciate the enormous contribution which improved efficiency in Government operations can make to budgetary control. Better management and cost reduction can make a major contribution toward resolving the conflict between expanding public needs and the need to limit total expenditures.

Any doubts as to the great potential of management improvement should be resolved by the spectacular accomplishments—realized and prospective—of the Defense Department's procurement and logistics cost reduction program. The program was announced last year by Secretary McNamara. It will produce nearly $2 billion of identifiable savings in this fiscal year. Savings are estimated at $2.7 billion in fiscal year 1964 and $3.5 billion in fiscal year 1965. The program is not a vague estimate of future economies; it is fully in effect today, and it is reshaping procurement and management practices in the Department of Defense.

The magnitude of the Defense economy program can be grasped more readily if it is compared with the future costs of the legislative proposals in the President's current legislative program. For example:

Closer calculations of procurement needs and fuller use of excess inventory in place of new procurement will save more in the next 2 fiscal years than the cost in these years of the proposed increase in the pay of our Armed Forces.

The shift from noncompetitive to competitive procurement, and the shift from cost-plus-fixed fee to fixed or incentive price contracts will save more in 1964 and 1965 than the total cost of the President's omnibus education program—including aid to school construction and teachers' salaries, college facilities, library and graduate school grants, student loans and fellowships, and adult and vocational education.

The elimination of "gold plating" in procurement specifications—that is, redesigning items which are fancier or more capable than they need to be to do their job—will save more in 1964 and 1965 than the cost of the President's youth employment opportunities program.

Improved equipment maintenance through better management will save as much in these 2 years as the entire cost of the President's mass transit program.

The closing or reduction of unnecessary installations in the Defense Department will save more than the total cost in 1964 and 1965 of the President's program for hospital construction and aid to medical education.

To put the comparison in its most striking form, Secretary McNamara's cost reduction program will realize savings in the next 2 fiscal years which will exceed the total cost of the legislative program which the President has proposed to the Congress this year.

EFFICIENCY IN MANAGEMENT OF GOVERNMENT

The drive for better management in the Federal Government extends far beyond the limits of the Department of Defense. Efficiency in Government is not an issue between the parties. Many management gains were accomplished by the last administration and this administration has sought to maintain and accelerate the momentum. Let me describe briefly some of the major efforts which are under way today to get the public business done more efficiently, more speedily, and more economically.

The U.S. Government was the first user of automatic data processing equipment and is today the largest user in the world of electronic computers. If you buy a postal money order, the transaction will be recorded on the automatic data processing equipment. If you carry Veterans' Administration life insurance, your account will be serviced by automatic data processing. If you apply for a driver's license in any one of 46 States, your application may be processed by an electronic computer in the Bureau of Public Roads to determine whether you have ever been denied a license in another State for drunken driving or involvement in a fatal accident. If you inquire about the status of your social security account, the information will be supplied speedily by an automatic data processing system. If you answer a census questionnaire, the information will be processed by automatic data processing.

These are just a few of the many uses of electronic data processing systems in the Federal Government which have provided better service for the taxpayer and saved him money. For example, each employee of the Insurance Service of the Veterans' Administration serviced about 350 policies in 1950, 1,500 policies in 1960, and 1,700 today. Over this period, the Veterans' Administration has reduced the number of employees required to handle its 6 million policies from 17,000 to 3,000.

The Federal Government has one of the most extensive and productive employee suggestion systems in the country. Last year, Federal agencies adopted more than 100,000 suggestions submitted by employees. These suggestions yielded measurable savings of nearly $65 million, for which employees received cash awards of nearly $3 million. For example, an engineer in the Navy's Bureau of Ships saved the Navy over $5 million by devising an ingenious method to enable drydocks to accommodate vessels of deeper draft—thus eliminating the need to excavate the floor of the drydock. Another engineer—this one in the Corps of Engineers—redesigned certain turbines used in hydroelectric power projects, improving the efficiency of the units and thus allowing smaller units to be utilized. Savings realized from this improvement aggregate $21 million so far.

Substantial savings can be realized simply through better organization and management of the Government's activities. In July of 1961, the Federal Power Commission had a backlog of 116 natural gas pipeline rate cases, some dating back to 1954, which involved potential refunds to consumers of $1 billion. The Federal Power Commission instituted a new settlement program, emphasizing the disposition of cases through conference rather than in lengthy formal proceedings. By January of this year, the backlog, including new cases, had been reduced to 48, and the Federal Power Commission had ordered refunds to consumers of $350 million and reduced rates by $62 million a year.

I do not wish to leave the impression that the administration is suspended in a state of euphoria with respect to the outlook for efficiency in public management. Utopia is not that close. I will freely confess that I know of management situations in the Federal Government which need correction—though I am not going to name them. My point is that we have made encouraging progress, and that we have proved that the Federal Government can face up to change and take the route of cost reduction without any sacrifice in the quality of the work it does. You are going to hear a lot more about cost reduction efforts in the Federal Government. We will not let up in pursuing opportunities to modernize and improve Government operations, to save manpower, to lower overhead, to take some risks if necessary in trying out new ideas and practices, to shake up systems and procedures that have long been taken for granted, and to search out and bring into question longstanding programs or services that may no longer rate the priority they deserved when they were initiated.

There is, of course, an alluring short-cut to economy in Government which simply bypasses these difficult matters of detail. It is a method often urged—the method of indiscriminate, across-the-board cuts. But I believe the record shows that this method has not in the past made a lasting contribution to the cause of Government economy—nor would I expect it to do so in the future.

The harder road, but in the last analysis the more rewarding one, is to weigh each public program and expenditure category on its own merits and against the merits of others; to decide what must be done now and what can wait; to pursue cost-reduction, assess user charges more broadly on those who benefit from special Government service and privileges, cut out unneeded installations even though it may cause some pain and recrimination, and keep at it. This, I submit, is the responsible road to Government economy. It has the further merit that it works, and it is this framework within which the budgets of this administration will be shaped.

Lawrence General Hospital Ceremonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, last week the Lawrence (Mass.) General Hospital held ground-breaking ceremonies for the start of a $3.5 million building program. This project is a tribute to the hard work and devotion of hospital officials and community leaders who were anxious to see this hospital continue and extend its good works in the Greater Lawrence area.

I would like to share with my colleagues a superb report of the ceremonies, therefore, I wish to include the account which appeared in the June 21 issue of the Lawrence Evening Eagle Tribune at this point:

GROUND BROKEN FOR HOSPITAL WING

Ground-breaking ceremonies for a $3.5 million building program at Lawrence General Hospital were held Friday on the hospital grounds.

Federal, State and local government officials joined with hospital trustees, medical and nursing staff officials at the ceremony.

The first shovelful of earth was turned by Mrs. Abbot Stevens, honorary chairman and trustee, whose late husband headed the community campaign in 1954 that resulted in erection of the hospital's Stevens Building.

Joining her were Dean K. Webster, president of the board of trustees, Dr. John R. McDermott, president of the medical staff, Arthur Sweeney, general chairman of the building fund committee, Daniel F. Cahill, Lawrence postmaster and vice chairman of the building fund, and Dr. Milton J. Meyers, vice chairman of the building fund.

The invocation was given by Rabbi Harry Roth of Temple Emanuel, hospital chaplain, and the prayer was read by Rev. E. Leslie Shaw, minister of the United Congregational Church, Protestant hospital chaplain. Benediction was given by Very Rev. Alfred M. Natali, O.S.A., pastor of Holy Rosary Church, Catholic chaplain at the hospital.

SPEAKERS

Speakers included Congressman F. Bradford Morse, Mayor John J. Buckley, Dr. Henry C. Huntley, New England Regional Director of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. A. Daniel Rubenstein, director, Bureau of Hospital facilities for Massachusetts, Dr. John R. McDermott, Laurence Loughlin, representing U.S. Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Capt. Anthony Camuso, representing Gov. Endicott Peabody and Dean K. Webster, Jr., president of the board of trustees of Lawrence General Hospital.

Several hundred greater Lawrence residents attended the ceremony on the lawn in front of the main entrance to the hospital.

Mrs. Andrew B. Sutherland, honorary president of the board of trustees was on the platform.

The building program calls for construction of a 7-story hospital wing which will provide space for 120 new patient beds, bringing the total to 300.

MUST RAISE $1,750,000

The new wing will also contain six major operating rooms, kitchen and dining departments and laundry facilities.

The Federal Government has provided a grant of $1,750,000 to the hospital, largest approved to date in Massachusetts under the public works acceleration program.

A matching $1,750,000 must be raised locally.

Arthur Sweeney, general campaign chairman, told Friday's gathering that $577,000 had been raised to date including $250,000 in accumulated hospital funds.

GUESTS AT CEREMONY

Special guests at the ceremony included Mrs. Andrew B. Sutherland, honorary president of the hospital; Congressman William H. Bates; R. Ashton Smith, director of the Lawrence General Hospital; Mother Angela Therese, R.N., administrator of Bon Secours Hospital; Dr. Nicandro F. DeCesare, president of the Clover Hill Hospital; Denis J. Demanche, administrator of Clover Hill Hospital; Francis G. Fosmire, superintendent of the Bessie M. Burke Memorial Hospital; William M. Burke Memorial Hospital; William J. Kilcoyne, chairman of the board of trustees, Burke Hospital; Lincoln Clark, president of Lowell General Hospital and

Roy C. Stephenson, director of Lowell General Hospital.

Sister Mary Consolata, administrator of St. John's Hospital, Lowell; Sister St. Celestine, administrator of St. Joseph's Hospital, Lowell; Dr. Robert T. Lambers, director of Hale Hospital, Haverhill; Harold L. Hutchins, Jr., president of the Massachusetts Hospital Association; Henry G. Brickman, executive director, Massachusetts Hospital Association; A. Creed Barnett, president of Tamblyn & Brown, Inc.; Donald Ritchie, James H. Tirchie and Associates, architects; and Murray H. Lilly, president of Columbia Construction Co.

Local governments were represented by Selectmen James D. Wilson, Andover, Chester W. Woekel, Methuen, William A. Finneran, North Andover, and George Gelt, Salem, N.H., chairmen of their respective boards of selectmen.

Members of the Lawrence City Council attending included Aldermen Nicholas J. Callahan, Gerald A. Guilmette and Vincent P. Foley, and Peter A. Hewett, secretary to Mayor Buckley.

Nuclear Test Moratorium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, we are fast approaching the time when Mr. Harriman will leave for his latest mission to Moscow. This time he will endeavor to negotiate a nuclear test ban treaty. He will do this at a time when the President has proclaimed a unilateral suspension of atmospheric testing by the United States and at a time when the Soviet Premier has indicated that he has already reneged completely on the principle of onsite inspection.

I fear that the President's proclamation of a unilateral test ban on the part of the United States will prove to be a very poor bargaining tactic. It has been since President Kennedy's announcement of our willingness to unilaterally suspend tests in the atmosphere that Pravda has undertaken to reiterate the fact that the Soviets are now unwilling to permit onsite inspection at all. We wonder how many lessons of this kind the administration will have to absorb before it learns what seems to be a very basic and elementary fact: The Soviets merely respond to any show of weakness on our part by a further hardening of their own position.

Although millions of Americans will join in the hope and prayer that a nuclear test ban treaty with ironclad guarantees against cheating can someday be achieved, this is certainly no time to abandon our insistence on the principle of onsite inspection.

Under leave to include extraneous matter with these remarks, I should like to include an excellent editorial entitled "Text Moratorium," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on June 19, 1963.

I believe that this editorial very succinctly points out that the administration ought to stop kidding itself with respect to the motives and intentions of the Soviet Union.

TEST MORATORIUM

The President's self-imposed moratorium on nuclear testing in the atmosphere seems to us a bad move. It is offered as a first step toward disarmament. In fact, it is not a "first." It is not a step toward anything in particular. And, in the opinion of the Chiefs of Staff, it is not safe.

The real "first step" was taken late in 1958 when President Eisenhower joined in a tacit agreement with the Russians to stop all nuclear testing. This moratorium lasted right up to the day in 1961 when the Russians broke it with a series of the biggest nuclear explosions the world has ever seen. While piously praising the first step in public, the Russians had been preparing in secret to violate it. The first step toward disarmament turned out to be a great leap forward for Russian nuclear-arms technology.

Even if the moratorium had endured it would have been meaningless as a step toward disarmament. It would not have stopped France or China or the Israelis or Egyptians from pressing on with nuclear weapons. It would not have reduced stockpiles or ended laboratory experiments with new weapons. It would not have wiped the secret of the A-bomb from the minds of the world's scientists. It would not have established a precedent for effective disarmament policing.

The second moratorium will not do any of those things, either. And this moratorium may hurt America's defense. President Kennedy did not ask the Chiefs of Staff for their professional military opinions on the moratorium. If he had asked them, he would have found that all three believe our own defense needs require further testing in the atmosphere. Their reasons are complex and so far have been kept classified. But we urge the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee which is studying testing and disarmament, to question the Chiefs in closed session about those reasons. A censored transcript of the testimony should then be made public.

As we understand it, the administration's own informed guess is that there is less than 1 chance in 20 that the Russians will agree to a test ban at the Moscow talks next month. They are expected to resume atmospheric tests shortly thereafter. We, of course, want to "make a record," as the propagandists put it, in this business. But not many occupants of the grandstand are likely to be fooled, and we ought to stop kidding around.

Missiles of Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call our colleagues' attention to an important open letter addressed to President Kennedy from the United Zionists-Revisionists of America. As one who is deeply interested in the preservation and continuance of the State of Israel while at the same time concerned with the possible escalation of arms in the Middle East, I consider this article to be of such significance that it should be read by all my fellow Americans.

The American public must be made aware of the destructive weapons which are at this time being built by President Nasser of the United Arab Republic. It is most probable that the American taxpayer through foreign aid to the United Arab Republic is helping to build these forces of destruction which will be used to obliterate the State and the people of Israel.

Furthermore the use of German scientists, some of whom are former Nazis, to construct these rockets and planes, only perpetuates Nazi Germany's genocide against the Jews who fled to Israel seeking only peace from the holocaust of war and extermination.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, since the subject is timely and consequential, I should like at this time to insert into the RECORD the above mentioned open letter:

HITLER'S SHADOW OVER THE MIDDLE EAST—AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Eighteen years ago the American Army and the armies of our allies destroyed Hitler's might. Today Hitler's shadow is rising again over the Middle East. To our dismay, we note that the new brand of Hitlerism is bolstered by a myopic and untenable American diplomacy.

Gamal Abdel Nasser, the ruler of Egypt, has proclaimed repeatedly his determination to destroy Israel. A stated purpose of the Arab federation now in formation under Nasser's leadership is to "liberate Palestine" and drive the Jews into the sea.

AIDED BY THE UNITED STATES

Your administration, Mr. President, supports Nasser with $250 million annually in economic aid. This enables him to divert large sums from the impoverished Egyptian economy for the massive buying of arms from Soviet Russia: Tanks, heavy guns, MIG's, and submarines.

This enables him, also, to hire German scientists who worked for Hitler's war machine to erect missile sites and build rockets and Messerschmitt fast-flying bombers. American money is thus contributing to Nasser's military build-up to strike against Israel.

Your administration is also bolstering Nasser's ambitions diplomatically. It helped him in Yemen. It smooths the way for his domination over the Arab states. Nasser is using this growing power to tighten the ring around Israel.

A THREAT OF GENOCIDE

The very existence of Israel and its people is in grave danger. The threat of a new genocide hangs over the lives of 2 million Jews in Israel. The victims of Hitler, the remnants saved from his destruction camps who found refuge in Israel, are threatened again with extermination.

Can the United States close its eyes to the danger that threatens them? Must we strengthen the hand poised to strike them down?

LULLING AMERICA TO SLEEP

The State Department, however, is lulling the American people to sleep with respect to Nasser's intentions. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs published a report on May 23 regarding the testimony of Mr. James P. Grant, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs. Mr. Grant stated that Egypt is currently more peaceful toward Israel and has put the Israeli issue "in the icebox." He added that he does not believe that Egypt intends to use its forces against Israel "as of this time." He also said that in the last several years "actions have increasingly become a matter of words against Israel, and not so much action."

Isn't this a frivolous gamble with the very existence of Israel at stake? Can one believe that Nasser really has peaceful intentions? Can one rely on his promises to behave—especially after his broken pledge to remove his army from Yemen?

Mr. Grant also stated that "the Egyptians maintain their armed forces for a variety of reasons." Against whom is Nasser arming himself with the most deadly offensive weapons if not against Israel? Are we to ignore in disbelief the repeated Arab threats to annihilate Israel, as we ignored Hitler's "Mein Kampf"?

Your State Department, Mr. President, seems to ignore all this and continues the policy of trusting, aiding and abetting Nasser. This policy is as immoral as it is unwise and harmful, not only to Israel but also to the national interests of the United States.

INSULTS AND MENACE TO AMERICA

You must be aware by now, Mr. President, that the hope of wooing Nasser away from his Communist mentors has proved woefully illusory. Notwithstanding the bounties we have showered upon the United Arab Republic, it continues to side with Khrushchev. While suppressing the Communist party at home, Nasser's representatives in the U.N. and elsewhere follow the Communist line. His press and radio continue their torrent of insults and abuse against the American people and Government.

A SOVIET OUTPOST

Americans became aroused when Soviet technicians began building missile sites in Cuba. This is rightly considered a menace to the safety of the Western Hemisphere. Are the Soviet technicians in the United Arab Republic and in Yemen any less of a menace to the safety of the free nations in the Middle East, to our allies and to our strategic, political and economic interests in the area?

REACTIONARY PAN-ARABISM

Nasser is raising the spectre of Pan-Arabism. These Pan-movements—Hitler's Pan-Germanism and Pan-Slavism before it—have always been by their very nature reactionary, aggressive and explosive, menacing the freedom and the peace of the world. Nasser's Pan-Arabism is no different.

We submit that the United States cannot support Nasser's Pan-Arabism in good conscience. By appeasing Nasser we are only encouraging his Pan-Arab reactionary and aggressive strivings.

THE DANGER OF APPEASEMENT

It is now generally realized that, had the Allied Powers acted in time to stop Hitler instead of appeasing him, humanity would have been spared the tragedies of the Great War and its aftermath. We should bear this in mind now, when Hitler's shadow again threatens world peace in the Middle East.

Appeasement does not pay. France has learned this lesson. Her courageous support of Israel has in no way affected her position in the Middle East. The Arab States are angry, but they respect and accept the straightforward French stand. Should this not also be a lesson to our country?

Mr. President, the cause of peace and justice requires that you, as the head of the Nation that leads the free world, act before it is too late. Strengthen the forces of freedom in the Middle East. Give Israel the necessary means to deter Nasser's war-drive and spare humanity a new holocaust.

WORDS ARE NOT ENOUGH—ACTION IS NEEDED

Mere words, Mr. President, will not deter Nasser from mounting aggression against Israel and other independent nations. Mere expressions of friendship will not secure the existence of Israel. Even assurances of American support to Israel in case of an Arab attack will prove hollow, should Arab missiles fall on Israeli cities.

Israel is the only stable and democratic state in the Middle East, a true friend of the United States and our only reliable ally in that part of the world. Israel has a right to expect sufficient arms from the United States to deter Arab aggression. She must be supplied with the means to defend herself effectively, if attacked.

Mr. President, you stated that you propose to stand by Israel. May we respectfully request that you resolve this sentiment into a firm decision to supply Israel with the weapons she requires for her security.

May we also ask you to announce your support for the resolution by a group of U.S. Senators of both parties submitted to the Senate for a mutual security pact between the United States and Israel.

Respectfully yours,
UNITED ZIONISTS-REVISIONISTS OF AMERICA, INC.,
JOSEPH SCHECHTMAN,
Chairman, National Council.
IRWIN HEIMOWITZ, *Secretary.*

No Alibis, Mr. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in Los Angeles, on September 9, 1960, candidate Kennedy made the following lofty promises:

1. The Democratic Party—in its platform—has a program of future action (on civil rights) which will insure equality of opportunity to all Americans. And I am proud of our platform. I believe in our platform. And in 1961, I intend to see that its pledges are carried out. (Changed on delivery to read: "So let us make it very clear that when the Democratic Party wrote its platform in July, it meant it in September and in November and in January. In 1961 I intend to see that those commitments are carried out.")

2. First, as a legislative leader, the President must give us the legal weapons needed to enforce the constitutional rights of every American. * * * He himself must draft the programs—transmit them to the Congress—and fight for their enactment, taking his case to the people if the Congress is slow in acting.

3. Such legislation is already being prepared. I have asked Senator CLARK of Pennsylvania and Congressman CELLER of New York to prepare a bill embodying all the pledges of the Democratic platform, and that bill will be among the first orders of business when a new Congress meets in January.

Is it not strange that Representative CELLER did not introduce the President's bill until June 1963?

In line with the President's usual practice of shifting the blame from himself to someone else, Richard Wilson, in yesterday's Washington Evening Star, lays the facts on the line:

PUTTING RIGHTS PROGRAM THROUGH—DEMOCRATS REMINDED THEY HAVE VOTES AND CAN'T BLAME G.O.P. IF BILLS STALL

(By Richard Wilson)

It is little noted, but the Democratic majority in the U.S. Senate is exactly the number needed to force a vote on the President's new civil rights program.

A two-thirds vote of the Senate can break a filibuster. The Democrats have 67 votes and the Republicans 33. Yet it will be charged, in fact it is already intimated, that Republicans will be responsible if Congress fails to pass a new civil rights law.

This is the reason Republican leaders have conferred with President Kennedy on a bipartisan approach with their fingers crossed. However sincere the President's motives, Republicans in the Senate will not be spared mendacious attack if civil rights legislation fails of passage.

Yet the reason why such legislation cannot be passed lies in the simple fact that the Kennedy administration has no control of the overwhelming Democratic majorities in the Senate and House.

The Democratic majority is like Barnum & Bailey's menagerie, a big tent housing carefully caged animals which would eat each other in the jungle. The Senate Democratic leaders say they cannot break a filibuster and pass the President's program without 20 to 25 Republican votes. Therefore the Republicans are to blame if they don't vote to a man for the President's program.

Democratic leaders could well afford to blush while making such a confession of the ineffectuality of their powers of leadership. Nor is their ineffectuality confined to civil rights. They cannot claim that only on the racial issue are the fierce conflicts within the Democratic Party exposed. The flagrant schism is equally evident on social, economic, and labor legislation.

Whatever the President's popularity in this and other countries, his prestige in the Congress of the United States is at low ebb. According to old hands in Congress, the resentment against the President of the United States has no parallel except possibly the revolt against Franklin D. Roosevelt when he sought to pack the Supreme Court with new appointees. Roosevelt lost his hold on Congress then, though he continued to enjoy a public adulation which Mr. Kennedy has never had in anywhere near the same degree.

The congressional discontent with Mr. Kennedy is not confined to the Southern Democrats, nor the Republicans. The liberals are dissatisfied with what they consider to be half measures. Even some of the moderates think Mr. Kennedy has helped to create, by unfulfillable promises and bravura statements, the conditions for racial demonstrations of a dangerous character. When faced by this dangerous condition, the Kennedy tone quickly changes. Equality will have to come slow and not by legislation alone.

It is in this atmosphere that the President has proposed his program to hasten the inevitable advance of Negroes toward higher levels of equality. And it is a shame that this question cannot be considered apart from its political aspects.

But those political aspects exist and it is truly amazing that Negro leaders do not recognize them. Negroes made their greatest advances since their emancipation in a Republican administration. Whatever Negro leaders may think today, no civil rights legislation was recommended to Congress by Roosevelt and none was enacted. Harry Truman was the first President to offer a comprehensive program. It was not enacted. President Eisenhower offered a program in 1956 and it was enacted in major part. Again in 1960 on President Eisenhower's initiative civil rights legislation was enacted.

In spite of the urgent promises of the Democratic platform of 1960, Mr. Kennedy delayed for more than 2 years offering any kind of general civil rights legislation, and he does so now under the pressure of mounting racial demonstration, and with sentiment built up in Congress against him.

Thees are the facts. Now it is to be seen whether President Kennedy, with two-thirds of Congress under Democratic control, can do as much as did President Eisenhower, whose party did not have control of Congress.

And if Mr. Kennedy cannot win, then let the blame go where it ought to.

Dr. Walter Compton, of Elkhart, Ind., Returns National Treasure to Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago Dr. Walter A. Compton, executive vice president of Miles Laboratories, Elkhart, Ind., and a distinguished citizen of my congressional district, performed a generous act of international significance which I believe is deserving of public recognition.

Earlier this year Dr. Compton returned to Japan the 700-year-old Samurai sword which the Japanese regard as one of the three most valuable such swords among the national treasures of Japan. This 13th century art object, known as the Kunimune sword, was turned over by Dr. Compton to the Swords Preservation Society in Tokyo on March 28.

Dr. Compton, a collector of Japanese swords, was decorated with Japan's Order of the Rising Sun and was made an honorary member of the Society for the Preservation of Japanese Art Swords for his unselfish act.

I am pleased to insert at this point in the RECORD the text of a letter to Dr. Compton from Assistant Secretary of State Lucius D. Battle who wrote to express the appreciation of the U.S. Government to Dr. Compton for what Assistant Secretary Battle described as his "magnanimous act."

Letter from Assistant Secretary of State Battle follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington.

DR. WALTER A. COMPTON,
Miles Laboratories, Inc.
Elkhart, Ind.

DEAR DR. COMPTON: Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana, has informed me of your magnanimous act in returning to the Japanese people the Kunimune sword, one of the most important national treasures of Japan.

On behalf of the Department of State I should like to express to you my appreciation for your generosity. It is always a great pleasure to hear of actions by individual Americans which assist us in our efforts to maintain the vast fund of good will which exists in Japan toward the American people. Such individual expressions of friendship may in fact be more effective than governmental efforts in fostering that friendship. Perhaps the personal loss of the sword to you may be assuaged somewhat by the realization that its return to Japan will enhance the image of our Nation in that very important country of the Far East.

Very sincerely yours,
LUCIUS D. BATTLE.

Under unanimous consent, I also include in the RECORD an article by Bettie East published in the Elkhart Truth concerning Dr. Compton's gift as well as an editorial from that newspaper entitled "Elkhartan's Deed of Good Will."

The article and editorial follows:

ELKHARTAN RETURNS NATIONAL TREASURE TO JAPAN—FIND BY DR. COMPTON BRINGS DECORATION

(By Bettie East)

Dr. Walter A. Compton, executive vice president of Miles Laboratories, Inc., was carrying a shotgun case when he departed for Japan late in March to attend a Japanese medical association congress.

In the case was an extremely nondescript-appearing sword, slightly curved and about 3 feet in length, which, to the uninformed, would appear to be of no particular value.

Dr. Compton returned here about a week ago, without the blade, but decorated with Japan's Order of the Rising Sun and bearing the distinction of an honorary member of the Society For Preservation of Japanese Art Swords.

The shotgun case which Dr. Compton guarded so closely on his jet flight to Tokyo was used to return to the Japanese people one of their most important cultural art properties, a blade identified by them with the spirit or "kami," of one of that country's foremost national shrines.

Dr. Compton returned to Japan the 700-year-old Samurai sword which he had identified as a Bizen Saburo Kunimune; one of the three most valauble Japanese swords among the nation's national treasures.

The Kunimune (the name identifies it as the product of its 13th century smith, Saburo Kunimune of Bizen) is the first sword designated a national treasure to be returned to Japan after World War II. There were 42 blades considered "national treasures" or "important art objects" lost in the confusion of the war's ending.

How the blade traveled from a national shrine in the southern Kyushu Province of Japan to a souvenir collection in Eastern United States is not known, and, as Dr. Compton said, is immaterial. At the end of the war Gen. Douglas MacArthur directed that all Japanese national monuments, including such swords, should be respected by occupying forces.

The Kunimune, which Dr. Compton presented to the Society for the Preservation of Japanese Art Swords for display in the National Museum at Tokyo, is the hereditary treasure, or kami, of the Satsuma clan, one of the great clans of Kyushu, the southernmost island of Japan. The warlike clan, founded in about A.D. 1200, contributed many military leaders to Japan's history.

The sword has been continually in Shimazu (Satsuma clan) family possession since the beginning of the 13th century. In the 1920's it was dedicated to the national shrine in the Satsuma Province—the Terukuni Jinja, at Kagoshima—by a descendant of the former feudals lords of Shimazu, to mark the 700th anniversary of the family's founding.

Dr. Compton considers his identification of the sword as the Kunimune a connecting link in a chain of coincidence. But one of Japan's top ranking authorities on the art of blades said, "I choose to agree with you—but, I call it providential."

The many coincidences, or, if you will, acts of providence, which led to the sword's recognition are evident in Dr. Compton's account of his discovery. Contrary to earlier national press service reports that Dr. Compton had purchased the sword from a west coast dealer, the sword was shrouded in anonymity in the weapons collection of a Pennsylvania resident, and actual identification was made iin Dr. Compton's study at his home here.

A collector for 30 years, Dr. Compton is constantly searching for Japanese artifacts, swords in particular, and in his travels makes it a point to contact other blade collectors and antique dealers. Four years ago on a personal jaunt to Pennsylvania he stopped at Hagerstown, Md. While there he became acquainted with a gun collector, and asked the man to contact him if ever he ran into any blades in which he thought Dr. Compton might be interested.

The man telephoned Dr. Compton late in February and said he was traveling from Pittsburgh, Pa., to Chicago the first week in March and had "a few things to show him."

PURCHASES TWO OF COLLECTION

Upon the collector's arrival in Elkhart, Dr. Compton examined the proffered items and found all but two of little consequence. He purchased the two which had aroused his interest, and explained to the dealer that the one, he felt sure, was of "great importance." Just how important he did not realize at cursory examination.

The pair talked until midnight. The collector told Dr. Compton he had had the blade several years, and, to his recollection, had picked it up in a collection of souvenirs. On several occasions he had considered giving the blade, and its simple wooden sheath, to a clergyman friend in view of the fact that markings on the blade appeared to be of religious significance.

IDENTIFIES SWORD FROM PHOTOGRAPH

After his visitor left, Dr. Compton browsed through his vast library of books and photographs of Japanese sword art. At 2:30 in the morning he identified the Kunimune from a photograph.

On March 25 Dr. Compton wrote the Tokyo National Museum. "After careful consideration, it is my determination that this blade should be returned to Japan," he wrote. "It is additionally my hope that it can be retained with other great masterpieces of this art in the custody of the Tokyo National Museum where students can have ready access to it.

"It is a great pleasure to donate it to the Japanese nation," he concluded.

Acknowledgement of his offer came promptly from Nagatake Asano, director of the Tokyo National Museum, and Moritatsu Hosokawa, president of the Society for Preservation of Japanese Art Swords.

On his first day in Tokyo Dr. Compton turned the sword over to society members at the museum. Honorary membership in the society also was conferred on the Elkhart physician, and he was given two rare short swords as gifts.

NOTES MEMBERSHIP CERTIFICATE

Dr. Compton's membership certificate hails his distinguished contribution over the years for the cause of preservation and artistic appreciation of Japanese swords.

The next morning the museum displayed 25 of its most important blades for Dr. Compton's examination. This was followed by the ceremony at which the Fourth Cross of the Rising Sun was conferred on the Elkhartan. The ceremony took place in the office of Shunsaku Kawahara, chairman of the Cultural Assets Protection Commission.

He called attention to the coincidence that in an area of more than 3,000 square miles and among 200 million people where the artistic character and importance of these swords remains almost wholly unknown, one of the few individual students of that art capable of recognizing it would chance to encounter and identify it.

Many years of study have brought his knowledge of the subject, collection of blades and library to the point of today. His current collection numbers 350 to 400 blades.

He considers his library of some 300 or more volumes as important as his blades.

UNRECOGNIZED ART FORM

Dr. Compton explained that his interest lies in his belief that these swords represent an unrecognized art form which he believes comparable to Grecian architecture and Italian painting. He said he also is interested in steel as differentiated from iron. Steel is man-made, it doesn't exist in nature, and he considers it one of man's most important discoveries in material form. In blademaking the great art represented in steelmaking is controlled to the point where it becomes a thing of beauty, he said.

ELKHARTAN'S DEED OF GOOD WILL

The recent return to Japan of that 700-year-old Samurai sword by Elkhartan Dr. Walter Compton, executive vice president of Miles Laboratories, Inc., is one of the finest acts in behalf of international good will by one person which ever has come to our attention.

It's not easy for Americans to grasp fully what the sword means to Japan.

Whereas American history as we know it dates from the discovery of America by Columbus, the Japanese look back to the Emperor Jannu, first of the imperial line, who ruled some 2,600 years ago.

The particular sword found by Dr. Compton was a Kunimune, produced in the 13th century. It was turned out by a Japanese artisan of great skill—at a time when the United States we know today was a wilderness.

What if a fragment of Columbus' ship *Santa Maria* were found? Even that would fall short of what the Kunimune sword means to the Japanese.

For the Kunimune found by Dr. Compton has spiritual, cultural, and patriotic significance, all in one object. It is rated as one of the three most valuable swords among the Japanese national treasures.

Amidst the swirling political, economic, and social changes since VJ Day, the Japanese have clung to their symbolic traditions.

Japan today is modern, peace-loving, and democratic. Way back on January 1, 1946, the Japanese Emperor Hirohito disavowed his family's claim to divine origin. Yet Japanese affection for Hirohito has increased, if anything. Today he is an admired symbol of national unity.

The Japanese look with affection upon symbolic links with the past, somewhat as Americans see no inconsistency in restoring Williamsburg, Va., as it was in monarchical days.

With this background, we begin to see how Dr. Compton's action must appear to the Japanese.

Here is an American so interested and so well versed in Japanese culture that he was able to identify the importance of a rare Japanese art treasure, after buying it from an obscure source.

Here is an American, moreover, who rated the feelings of others—in a foreign country—ahead of his own natural wish to add to an already valuable personal collection.

Here was the living refutation of the idea, too often peddled by critics, that Americans don't try to learn and respect others' traditions, that they think only of themselves and making money.

The gratitude of the Japanese has been evidenced by the decoration of Dr. Compton with the Fourth Cross Order of the Rising Sun, with the seal of the Japanese emperor.

Dr. Compton reflects great credit both upon our community of Elkhart and upon our Nation for this deed.

Freedom Is a Two-Way Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 25, I introduced House Joint resolution 515, which has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. My resolution would have the effect of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to certain nonsectarian religious observances. It contains four sections, the first three of which spell out some of our freedoms which concern many of our citizens. The last section merely provides for proper ratification as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.

My resolution is short and to the point. I would like to take each of the three sections, step by step, and give some reasons why I felt impelled to introduce the resolution.

> SECTION 1. The right to voluntarily offer, read from, or listen to nonsectarian prayers, or to permit provision of time for prayerful meditation in public schools, public institutions, and other public places shall not be denied or abridged.

This section grew from the Supreme Court decision on June 25, 1962, by a six to one majority, that a prayer recommended by the New York Board of Regents—which the New York Court of Appeals had decided was all right as long as the schools did not compel any pupil to join in the prayer over his or her parents' objections—was inconsistent with the establishment clause of the first amendment to our Constitution. This is known as the Engel against Vitale case. Two of our Supreme Court Justices, Justice Frankfurter and Justice White, took no part in consideration or decision of this case. The opinion of the Court was delivered by Justice Black, and concurred in by all the other Justices, with the exception of Justice Stewart—who most definitely dissented.

Justice Stewart contended that the Court had misapplied a great constitutional principle. Rather than feeling the New York Regents' prayer interfered with the free exercise of anybody's religion, he felt that "to deny the wish of these school children to join in reciting this prayer is to deny them the opportunity of sharing in the spiritual heritage of our Nation."

We all know that the Constitution has always forbidden State favoritism to any religion, but when the State encourages or cooperates with religion, it—according to a 1952 decision by Justice Douglas—"follows the best of our traditions."

I do not believe the Justices were being intentionally antireligious—as some claim—but on the other hand—it is difficult to keep from gaining an impression that America is according to these Supreme Court decisions, essentially an unreligious Nation. This we know is not true, for in many many areas our Government encourages religion—as long as it is a free decision of the individual citizen to accept, reject, or choose which religion he wishes to follow or not follow. This freedom, as I have stated, is a two-way street. My resolution would simply make certain that our citizens can travel both ways on that street—in other words, the street is not entirely blocked off.

> SEC. 2. The right to voluntarily read from or listen to the reading of sacred scriptures in public schools, public institutions, and other public places shall not be denied or abridged.

This section of my resolution grew out of the most recent Supreme Court decision on June 17, 1963, involving a school district in Pennsylvania against Schempp and the Baltimore City Board of School Commissioners versus Murray—which presented the issues in the context of State action requiring that schools begin each day with readings from the Bible. In this case, Justice Clark delivered the opinion of the Court, and held that the practices at issue and the laws requiring them were unconstitutional under the establishment clause of the first amendment, as applied to the States through the 14th amendment's guarantee of liberty. All the Supreme Court Justices concurred in this decision with the exception—again—of Justice Stewart.

Justice Stewart stated that he accepted "without question that the liberty guaranteed by the 14th amendment against impairment by the States embraces in full the right of free exercise of religion protected by the first amendment." He also accepted "too the proposition that the 14th amendment has somehow absorbed the establishment clause, although it is not without irony that a constitutional provision evidently designed to leave the States free to go their own way should now have become a restriction upon their autonomy." He did not, however, agree with the "insensitive definition of the establishment clause contained in the Court's opinion, nor with the different, but, I think, equally mechanistic definitions contained in the separate opinions which have been filed." Justice Stewart further stated that "for a compulsory State educational system so structures a child's life that if religious exercises are held to be an impermissible activity in schools, religion is placed at an artificial and State-created disadvantage." Further, "Viewed in this light, permission of such exercises for those who want them is necessary if the schools are truly to be neutral in the matter of religion." Justice Stewart then clearly stated what seems to be the opinion of many as to what this case has brought about, and I quote:

> And a refusal to permit religious exercises thus is seen, not as the realization of State neutrality, but rather as the establishment of a religion of secularism, or at the least, as Government support of the beliefs of those who think that religious exercises should be conducted only in private.

In my resolution, I specifically use the phrase "reading of sacred scriptures" in place of the Bible, or Holy Writ, or Holy scriptures. Sacred scriptures, as I have used it, can mean any sacred writing—of whatever faith, or even—if the atheist so chooses—the sacred writing outlining his atheistic belief. I would like to again quote from Justice Stewart's opinion to bolster my use of "reading of sacred scriptures":

> What our Constitution indispensably protects is the freedom of each of us, be he Jew, or agnostic, Christian or atheist, Buddhist or freethinker, to believe or disbelieve, to

> worship or not worship, to pray or keep silent, according to his own conscience, uncoerced and unrestrained by government. It is conceivable that these school boards, or even all school boards, might eventually find it impossible to administer a system of religious exercises during school hours in such a way as to meet this constitutional standard—in such a way as completely to free from any sort of official coercion those who do not affirmatively want to participate. But I think we must not assume that school boards so lack the qualities of inventiveness and good will as to make impossible the achievement of that goal.

Justice Stewart contended that the cases before the court contained mere prophecy, rather than proof, that children who did not want to listen to Bible reading were handicapped—or that the excusal provision was so administered as to carry overtones of social inferiority. He also felt in the case of the Maryland—Baltimore City Board of School Commissioners against Murray—that that case was before the Supreme Court on a demurrer—and the issue of whether or not a teacher could be dismissed for refusal to participate seems—among many others—never to have been raised.

He concluded that both cases should be remanded for further hearings, or in other words—for the taking of additional evidence.

Let me point out that my resolution concerns not only schools, but public institutions and other public places. I feel it is important to amend the Constitution in such a way that both mischief-makers or serious objectors, cannot take away our two-way freedoms. In protecting the one side—we must not leave the other side unprotected, or without defense. Neither must we be so neutralized that the rights of all are denied.

Section 3 of my resolution states:

> The right to make reference to belief in or reliance upon God, or to invoke the aid of God, in any governmental or public document, proceeding, or ceremony, or upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States shall not be denied or abridged.

Now this may seem to be a case of borrowing trouble. Many may not think that this is necessary. I do, however, and in support of my feeling will quote from a statement made by Justice Clark in delivering his opinion to the Court on the Pennsylvania and Maryland Bible-reading cases:

> The breach of neutrality that is today a trickling stream may all too soon become a raging torrent and, in the words of Madison, "it is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties."

While Justice Clark used this statement to buttress his legal arguments forbidding the Bible-reading exercises in public schools, it is clear that it can just as easily be used by those of us whose feelings are exactly opposite. Justice Douglas, who also concurred with Justice Clark and the six others, made the statement which brought about my fear, and the fears of others on this issue when he said:

> Establishment of a religion can be achieved in several ways. The church and state can be one; the church may control the state or the state may control the church; or the relationship may take one of several possible forms of a working arangement between the two bodies."

He went on to state:

> But the establishment clause is not limited to precluding the State itself from conducting religious exercises. It also forbids the State to employ its facilities or funds in a way that gives any church, or all churches, greater strength in our society than it would have by relying on its members alone. * * * Through the mechanism of the State, all of the people are being required to finance a religious exercise that only some of the people want and that violates the sensibilities of others. The most effective way to establish any institution is to finance it; and this truth is reflected in the appeals by church groups for public funds to finance their religious schools. * * * Such contributions may not be made by the State even in a minor degree without violating the establishment clause. It is not the amount of public funds expended; as this case illustrates, it is the use to which public funds are put that is controlling. For the first amendment does not say that some forms of establishment are allowed; it says that "no law respecting an establishment of religion" shall be made. What may not be done directly may not be done indirectly lest the establishment clause become a mockery.

This to me means that these two cases, decided by the Supreme Court, are only the beginning of "the trickling stream" that "may all too soon become a raging torrent."

Sooner or later, those who object to even the word God being used, will find some means of bringing cases before the Supreme Court to delete the word from our Pledge of Allegiance, from our currency, from our national anthem, and the Internal Revenue Service will be enjoined from permitting our churches the tax exemption they now enjoy, along with other nonsecular institutions in this country. Granted that some of our Justices have said there is no danger of some of these things being done because—in the words of Justice Brennan, in his concurrence in the Maryland and Pennsylvania cases:

> While it is not, of course, appropriate for this Court to decide questions not presently before it, I venture to suggest that religious exercises in the public schools present a unique problem. For not every involvement of religion in public life violates the establishment clause. Our decision in these cases does not clearly forecast anything about the constitutionality of other types of interdependence between religious and other public institutions. Specifically, I believe that the line we must draw between the permissible and the impermissible is one which accords with history and faithfully reflects the understanding of the Founding Fathers.

On the other hand, Justice Clark, who delivered the opinion of the Court admitted the "accord with history" in these words:

> It is true that religion has been closely identified with our history and Government. As we said in *Engel* v. *Vitale,* (370 U.S. 421 434 (1962), "The history of man is inseparable from the history of religion. And * * * since the beginning of that history many people have devoutly believed that 'More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of.'" In *Zorach* v. *Clauson,* 343 U.S. 306,313 (1952), we gave specific recognition to the proposition that "we are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being." The fact that the Founding Fathers believed devotedly that there was a God and that the unalienable rights of man were rooted in Him is clearly evidenced in their writings, from the Mayflower Compact to the Constitution itself.

Yet, Justice Clark, who linked the accord with history and understanding of the Founding Fathers which Justice Brennan stated would prevent many other institutions in American life from being attacked—might find it necessary at a future time to decide other cases brought before the Supreme Court in the same manner he decided the Maryland and Pennsylvania cases.

I do not feel our Supreme Court Justices, as a body, to be hostile to religion in this country. I am sure their opinions are sincerely stated and they feel they are properly buttressed by legal and historical arguments. However, our Supreme Court might find itself on the horns of dilemmas in the future—and the makeup of the Court changes from time to time.

For these reasons, I feel it incumbent to introduce my resolution, embodying several aspects of our national life which are entangled with our inescapable history of being a religious people. Again—let me reiterate—freedom is a two-way street. We must not prevent it being traveled in both directions—and above all—we must not allow it to be blocked at either end of the street.

Magna Carta of Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present to the Members of the House an account of the discussions of the "Magna Carta of Space" at the Congress of the Inter-American Bar Association in Panama in April of this year. The account appears in the Panama American.

The article is primarily devoted to the remarks of William A. Hyman, who originally proposed the "Magna Carta of Space" at a convention of the Inter-American Bar Association held in Bogotá, Colombia, in February 1961. Mr. Hyman's comments at this most recent conference afford us an ample and worthwhile discussion of a very timely concern. Through his efforts in regard to the legal problems of space travel he reveals himself to be a forward-looking thinker eminently capable of offering concrete and constructive recommendations.

Mr. Hyman, who was chairman of the Special Committee on Interplanetary Space Law at the convention, is a trial lawyer of international repute. With the unanimous consent of the House I include this article in the Record:

[From the Panama American, Panama City, Republic of Panama, Apr. 25, 1963]

BAR CONVENTION HEARS NOTED LAWYER DISCUSS SOVEREIGNTY-IN-SPACE ISSUE

Legal eyes and ears about this world are turned toward thhe Republic of Panama and its capital this week where internationally famed attorneys are creating the basis of laws on the control of outer space to submit to the General Assembly of the United Nations and subcommittees pertaining thereto as among principal resolutions on their agenda.

"The Space Committee of the United Nations has failed to give due consideration and take appropriate action on the important question of sovereignty and security as they become involved in the use of space," said William A. Hyman, of New York City and an internationally known trial lawyer who spoke yesterday before the 13th Conference of Inter-American Bar Convention now in session in Hotel El Panama Hilton.

Hyman, former chairman of the American Bar Association Subcommittee on Air Space, and former member of the committee on aeronautical law, is author of "The Magna Carta of Space—the Legal Lodestar." He presented a resolution before the Inter-American Bar Association during its convention held in Bogotá, Colombia, in February 1961. The resolution was fully approved at that session and ratified by the new council in May of that year.

Yesterday Hyman, chairman of the special committee on interplanetary space law, presented his "Magna Carta of Space."

In pointing out that the U.N. Space Committee has failed to give due consideration to the subject, Chairman Hyman said, "It failed to request the General Assembly of the United Nations and the proper authorities therein to make mandatory the application of international law and the United Nations Charter to outer space and the celestial bodies."

"While regrettably the complete and satisfactory statement of basic principles was not established, yet certain other developments provide a basis for hope and encouragement," he continued. "It must be noted that the Committee on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space of the United Nations has now adopted the position that it is desirable to have a statement of basic legal principles rather than await the completion of an extensive code."

"It is clear to all that weapons alone will not provide security," Hyman emphasized as he commented upon the mad dash for superiority in nuclear arsenals as a deterrent to international provocations that may lead to war. The distinguished lawyer declared that a statement of basic principles can be found in specific recommendations by the Space Committee he heads are contained in the Magna Carta of Space which will provide a moral and ethical as well as legal restraints against impulsive, or premeditated military action.

Hyman submitted his Magna Carta of Space yesterday as the basis upon which a declaration might be favorably recommended to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The noted attorney pointed out that Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, in a speech before Georgia Institute of Technology in February of this year said that a society governed by law will not allow these great scientific discoveries to be used for destructive purposes.

"World without law is hellbent for destruction with, or without scientific discoveries" Chairman Hyman quoted the Chief Justice as saying in his speech.

Continuing his description of what he termed a "legal vacuum in space" under his Magna Carta, Hyman reminded his audience that in December 1962 Dr. William Hayward Pickering and his team received messages from *Mariner II* 36 millions miles of space away from Earth and in the vicinity of Venus, which was the first time in history a traveler from Earth was cruising in that range of the heavens and the feat was hailed as the greatest achievement to date in the scientific quest of space.

"If the launching of *Lunik IV* by the Soviet April 2, of this year to place a robot on the moon, preparatory to placing a man there and if it had been successful, would prompt the question of whether a claim might be made by U.S.S.R. of ownership, or exclusive control—political or commercial * * *," Hyman pointed out.

"The Soviet stated that no claim of ownership would be made by it and that 'the moon belonged to the world', yet in the absence of the restraining force of an international agreement declaring that space and the interplanetary world belong to all; i.e., that it is res communis, there would be no bar to a reversal of the position of the Soviet—except catastrophic war," he continued.

In his "Magna Carta of Space," Hyman gave what he calls a "lesson in history—and a prophecy" this morning and took his fellows back to the time of Christopher Columbus when that farsighted sailor dared to pioneer in uncharted space—of the 15th century, the high seas.

"When Columbus sought a new route to India, going east by going west, he was subjected to much ridicule," Hyman stated "in those days not only the average person but leaders and scientists contended the world was flat. * * * Columbus urged that it was round." Upon this scientific assumption the rest is history, but Chairman Hyman stressed the fact that his royal backers conveniently forgot some of the terms of their very businesslike contract with Columbus.

"Today, approximately $40 billion is being and will be spent by the United States of America in the race with the Soviet to place a man on the moon," the attorney declared. "Will this happen—will there be a new migration to the moon * * * and will there be need for acceleration of this migration into the interplanetary world?" he questioned.

Referring to devastating weapons of destruction in an effort to maintain the "murderous balance of terror," Hyman said, "If a small amount of the cost of contemplated extermination were devoted to the cause of survival, undoubtedly science, aided by the restraint of law would give us greater assurance of peace and a better guarantee against extinction."

"Today is the day of the irrevocable decision," Hyman concluded. "Once a world-nuclear devastating attack has been made, there can be no recalling the blow; there cannot even be sufficient retaliation to avoid world catastrophe."

In closing Hyman stated that, "The void in space is law—it must be terminated."

"The apathy of the public is cause for grave concern. Since government will not often act until made to act by the aroused will of the people," the speaker warned. "The callous indifference may be due to the failure on the part of leaders of nations to correctly, fully, and properly inform the common man as to the implication of the impact on life caused by uncontrolled and lawless science."

"Law all too frequently awaits the development of a great crisis before it goes into action" Chairman Hyman said in closing, "Science without the control of law is the enemy of mankind but science under the control of law is the benefactor of mankind—the time for blastoff is long past—we have been too long on the launching pad. We must now go, go, go.

The Chain of Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, because of its remote geographical location the civil war in Yemen has had very little attention in the United States. Apparently even the American press is not aware of the decisive role being played by the United States. I insert into the RECORD at this point, an editorial which appeared in the Richmond, Va., News Leader on June 19, and commend it to the attention of all the Members:

THE CHAIN OF COMMAND

Since the revolution in Yemen began 10 months ago, it has not been difficult to tell whose side the State Department is on. The United States has been backing a group of anti-Western socialist rebels with every direct diplomatic weapon at hand. Indirectly, the United States has supplied the money which lets Nasser keep 28,000 Egyptian troops in Yemen. Last weekend, this bizarre policy took a new twist: The State Department told newsmen rather offhandedly that there are 900 to 1,000 Soviet "technicians and instructors" training the Yemeni forces we are supporting.

The Soviets have trained the Yemeni to use American aid effectively. More than 200 villages loyal to the royal Imam have been burnt with napalm jelly dropped from Soviet-made bombers. Soviets have been known to copilot these planes, which the Egyptians have put at the disposal of the revolutionaries. The latest bombing raid was just last week. It leveled a seaport in Saudi Arabia, a country the United States is pledged to defend.

In the scabrous politics of the Middle East, there are seldom any clear-cut choices to be made. The old Imam, the political and religious leader of Yemen, was distinctly a feudal relic. His son, Mohamad al-Badr, represents the legal and legitimate government of Yemen; his hold over the imagination of his people is so strong that 28,000 Egyptian troops have failed to subdue him and his cause. Yet the State Department—and the U.N.—last December rushed in to recognize the invading Egyptians as the official regime.

Both the United States and the U.N. should have known exactly what was happening in Yemen. In March, Dr. Ralph Bunche went to Yemen at the request of U Thant. Dr. Bunche, with his usual affinity for Marxist revolutions, decided that Nasser's troops had won the day. Although he pointedly refused to visit Saudi Arabia, he blamed Saudi Arabia for inciting resistance to the Socialists. A few days later the United States sent diplomat Ellsworth Bunker to inspect the scene. Mr. Bunker is the man who negotiated the give-away of Dutch New Guinea to pro-Communist Indonesia, and who laid the foundations for aid to Communist-infiltrated Brazil; Mr. Bunker reported that the Yemeni Socialists were in complete control of Yemen.

Yet neither Dr. Bunche, who is still presumably a citizen of the United States, nor Mr. Bunker seemed to notice that the Soviet technicians were already pouring into

Yemen, training troops, and leading missions of Soviet-made TU-16's, twin-jet medium bombers. They recommended a truce which would require both Saudi Arabia and Egypt to withdraw—leaving the Socialists in control, supported by direct U.S. aid. Saudi Arabia reluctantly agreed; Egypt has refused to withdraw her troops. Since the attack on the Saudi Arabian seaport, the State Department belatedly acknowledges that there are Soviet technicians in Yemen.

Even the most elemental intelligence service could discover that a regime we are supporting is using Soviet-made bombers. And who could be training illiterate tribesmen in the servicing and use of sophisticated Soviet equipment? After the exhausting rush to recognize the Socialist regime, State was too tired to ask questions. Even American newsmen have visited the military compounds of Socialists. Yet the first news of Soviet men and machines involved in the combat comes many months later from a Washington press conference.

Curiously enough, the State Department still supports the Yemeni Socialists. It reportedly backs Nasser in his refusal to recognize the U.N. truce. The best clue comes from some recent testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee: It seems that the United States has its own military training program for Yemeni Socialist officers. Both the Russians and the Americans are competing to train men to attack Western Allies and interests. No doubt it takes time to work out the chain of command.

Remarks at American Nuclear Society Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on June 18 I addressed the American Nuclear Society in Salt Lake City. Numerous requests have been received for copies of these remarks indicating sufficient interest in the subject matter to warrant inclusion below of pertinent extracts:

THE ATOM 1963

In 1963 the atom is "on dead center," and, I believe, its forthcoming movement is up. It can be so with considerable thrust if those responsible for the political aspects of the business perform as capably as you who are responsible for its technical aspects.

This view pertains specifically to the atom in its role as a power source—that is the principle subject of your technical sessions here in Salt Lake—but also peripherally to to its own potentialities.

HOW THE ATOM GOT ON DEAD CENTER

Perhaps the best way to see clearly how we can get off dead center is to take a quick look at how we got there, even after public and private expenditures of almost $2 billion on peacetime power from the atom. This figure, of course, does not include military expenditures beginning with the Manhattan project which have made substantial contributions both in know-how and physical assets which support civilian nuclear power, such as the diffusion plants providing enriched uranium, fuel element reprocessing facilities, and the like.

At least two major miscalculations—of which nobody in particular and everybody in general were guilty—played a major part in establishing today's dead centerism.

First, there was a serious undercalculation of the practical difficulties involved in converting the energy locked in the atomic mass to kilowatts on transmission lines. These problems need no elaboration—the members of this society are all too familiar with them. It is sufficient to say that in relation to initial expectations the net result has been a massive stretchout of the time scale for the promises of the peaceful atom to fall due.

Second, there was a serious overcalculation of the magnitude of economic benefits to be achieved from the peaceful atom. Following World War II, a war-weary and war-impoverished world desperately sought a magical horn of plenty as a panacea for all its ills. Practically free and unlimited power from the atom became the popular prescription.

As it all turned out, getting kilowatts out of the atom proved no easy job and once we got them we discovered they possess no inherent virtues—they must stand equally in economic competition with any other kilowatts.

The chilling disillusionments consequent on these major miscalculations inevitably brought on a confusing period of reassessment as to both the problems and the objectives of our nuclear program. During this period, our nuclear power efforts variously were aimed at "beating the Russians," or "international prestige," or just plain "salvaging the investment" with a series of Government sponsored experimental and demonstration programs to keep the U.S. nuclear capabilities and industries alive until some good use could be found for them.

Fortunately the time of "agonizing reappraisal" is now at its end and we have at hand sensible objectives, a realistic idea of the difficulties that must be surmounted to achieve them and a reasonable time schedule for bringing the whole operation to fruition. All we need do is adopt them as national policy.

THE AEC'S REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT

They were blueprinted last November in the Atomic Energy Commission's report to the President on civilian nuclear power. Someday that document may become known as the Magna Carta of nuclear energy. Today it is a powerful outline for getting some place worthwhile—in a proper manner—and at a time realistically related to the facts of economic and technical life.

Reviewing the Nation's conventional energy resources as against the rising rate of energy consumption, the report shows exhaustion of low-cost fossil fuels within a century or less. Apply to this circumstance ordinary rules of economics and it gives us this clear objective for our program as well as its desirable estimated time of arrival; namely, by the end of this century, nuclear power should supply one-half the electric energy generated in the Nation and assume all the total increase in electric energy requirements thereafter.

Next the report reviews the fission energy content of the Nation's nuclear resources and finds a portion available at reasonable cost from rich readily available ores and a portion available only at increasing costs from poorer ores more costly to extract. This means fuel for thermal converters like fossil fuels is limited and exhaustible. Apply to this circumstance the ordinary rules of economics and it gives us this clear blueprint for the technological direction of our program; namely:

Initial phase: Prompt stimulation of the use of thermal technologies now passed or passing the threshold of economic competitiveness with fossil-fuel power stations in higher cost fuel areas.

Intermediate phase: A transition stage characterized by improving nuclear plant economics through higher temperatures, longer fuel life, and other technical improvements, including the introduction of such improved converters as spectral shift, sodium graphite, gas cooled, and heavy water moderated reactors.

Final phase: A long-range program of developing breeder reactors to utilize the full potential of energy available in nuclear fuels, and thereby not just conserve our national nuclear energy resources, but actually multiply them.

We are now well into the initial phase and making progress in the intermediate and final phases. It should be emphasized that the intermediate advanced converter phase will last considerably longer than might be expected from technological considerations alone. Our electric energy requirements approximately double each decade. By the end of this century they will be tremendous. Consumption of conventional fuels will have increased by a factor of four or five. The use of improved converters will necessarily continue well into the early decades of the 21st century while the breeders are generating a sufficient supply of new fissionable materials to pick up and keep pace with the still-growing energy demands.

There are only two possible hitches in implementing the program called for by the AEC's magnificent report. One is technical. The other political.

Should somehow the mysteries of controlled fusion be solved, then our fission program would require wholesale reevaluation. But I hardly believe this technical contingency is immediate enough to change our fission plans for a long time to come.

Only in the political front is the threat, at least of delay, a little more real. When the report was issued in November, I believe the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy generally shared the view that it was a commendable job and would generally have the endorsement of the administration. However, during our February "202" hearings, we were told that another study was being made of research and development in all the energy resource areas. It was quite apparent that the administration had not given its endorsement to the program proposed by the Commission. It has not yet done so.

Now, in the law, we have an old maxim which says, "There must be an end to litigation." The maxim has equal applicability here—there must be an end to studies and to studies of studies. You can hook the best turbine up to a study and it still won't produce a kilowatt of electricity.

I hope—and I believe that my colleagues on the Joint Committee share my hope—that the administration will indicate its endorsement of the Commission's recommendations on the civilian nuclear power program. Unless this endorsement is forthcoming, then I predict that the atomic energy program will drift aimlessly on a sea of inept leadership. I am sure, however, that the Joint Committee will this year, and for as long as is possible in its future authorizations of annual funds, proceed as though the report had been endorsed and make every preparation to achieve its objectives at the time they are needed.

JOINT COMMITTEE AUTHORIZATION RESPONSIBILITY

This matter of authorization power currently is a sore point with the Joint Committee and I would like to discuss it with you for a moment.

Members of the Subcommittee on Legislation have been reviewing the AEC's authorization budget for fiscal year 1964, and we are somewhat concerned.

As you undoubtedly know, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 requires only that funds for construction or for the cooperative power reactor demonstration program be authorized annually by the Joint Committee. The entire spectrum of the remaining budget, including research and development expenditures, is not subject to review by the committee. Appropriations are made under a blanket authorization provision contained in the 1954 act.

A quick look at the AEC's budget for fiscal year 1964 gives a perspective on this matter. The Commission has requested a total of $2¾ billion. In sharp contrast, the Commission's authorization bill requests only about $200 million for construction items and the demonstration program. The hard figures show that only about 8 percent of the overall AEC budget will be subjected to the scrutiny of a formal authorization process by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Through the authorization of construction projects it was possible in the early years of the atomic energy program to exercise a quantum of control over the direction of programs roughly commensurate with the Joint Committee's responsibilities. This was true because in the early days, the Commission was just beginning to build the capital plant required for an expanding atomic program, but now, that capital plant is in being. For the most part, I think it can be said that today, the guts of the atomic energy program resides in the operating budget, and this is precisely the area where the Joint Committee has no statutory authority whatever.

Now why is this important? Here I think it is necessary to say a word about the committee and its responsibilities. It was created as the specialized arm of the Congress concerned with the field of atomic energy. The committee is now entering its 18th year of active participation in the atomic energy program and on the whole, I believe it has been remarkably successful. It has a record of conscientious and generally bipartisan handling of atomic energy affairs which is, I believe, well known to the entire industry.

In short, the Congress has entrusted some extremely grave responsibilities to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. But the facts are that the course of events over the years has constantly diminished the reviewing power of the committee needed to carry out those responsibilities. The incongruous fact is that although the Commission is required by law to keep the Joint Committee currently and fully informed as to all its activities, this specialized arm of the Congress at this moment has no statutory right of review over 92 percent of the expenditures of the Atomic Energy Commission.

I believe that this problem has reached the point where if something is not done in the very near future, effective congressional control over atomic energy expenditures will be seriously threatened. Every day we see practical illustrations of the problem. For instance, the Joint Committee is asked to recommend the authorization of a specific construction project. But very often substantial funds have already been committed for preliminary development work long before congressional authorization is sought. And the construction project itself may well be only a small part of an enormous overall program of research and development. I think this is especially true in the area of physical research where the authorization for the construction of an accelerator, for instance, may only represent a minute part of the research and development program built around that facility.

In short, it seems to me that once the joint committee authorizes a specific construction project, we are "off to the races." Its authorization of a small portion of an over-all project may signal the "green light" for a mammoth program requiring large annual expenditures indefinitely into the future.

In the field of reactor development, I think that we on the committee can see a trend toward the construction of experimental reactor facilities by private groups, the Sefor project, for instance. But it should be kept in mind that, in many cases, the AEC provides all of the funds for research and development, without which these facilities would not be built.

In general, I think that the private approach to the construction of such facilities is a good idea. I strongly support increased private initiative in the atomic energy business. However, the fact is that the Atomic Energy Commission is able to obligate literally tens of millions of dollars for R. & D. over many years without any review by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Unless the Congress is able to exercise some control, it is possible that an indefinite number of reactor facilities may be built upon the basis of enormous Government commitments for R. & D., without any real review by the Joint Committee.

Let me sum it up this way. The Congress and the American people have vested a grave trust in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The committee is charged with the responsibility for legislative oversight of the Nation's atomic energy program. The committee must be given adequate authority to carry out this responsibility. I believe that my general views on this matter are shared by most other committee members. I don't think it is any secret to you that the committee has been influential in the atomic energy field, despite the restrictions imposed upon it by its limited authority under the current law. However, I think the time has come when the committee's statutory authority should be made equal to its solemn responsibilities.

With that kind of authority, to begin legislative oversight early in the game I believe the Joint Committee could have been effective at the beginning of the SNAP programs in bringing about a better organizational and administrative setup and a firmer targeting of objectives.

With that kind of early oversight, I feel the rover program might be proceeding without some of its current frustrating delays. Pluto either would have been chopped off at an early date or given a definite green light. Instead it is being slowly strangled to death because no one really wants to take responsibility for a firm "go" or "no go."

It is also suggested that armed with increased authorization power the committee might assist considerably in accelerating decisions definitely to pursue or definitely to abandon numerous other costly areas of study and investigation. Thereby, both scientific manpower and money might be channeled more effectively into development areas of most promise.

ARMY MILITARY REACTORS PROGRAM

I have in mind here the current mess in the Army Military Reactors Program, in which there are requirements pending or threatened for small, medium, and large portable reactors—small, medium, and large mobile reactors—six different breeds in all—plus something for somewhere in the Antarctic at sometime—all with past, present, or planned efforts involving untold hundreds of millions of dollars—all for some uses or other which range from clear and specific to as ambiguous and nebulous as political party platforms.

This particular situation was brought to light during recent authorization hearings of the JCAE when a question was asked about a $12 million line item for the military compact reactor. It elicited the reply that it was just part of a $55 million project, which a few days later turned up with a new price tag of $77 million, and which by all past experience would probably end up costing at least twice that amount. Not only that, almost $10 million already had been spent on the project as of the first moment it arrived at a point where the Joint Committee had anything to say about it.

A distressing feature of the incident was the disclosure of an apparent lack of any clear coordination between these various military reactor programs. Whether mobile or potable, high, low or medium-powered, each eractor type seems automatically to bring on a totally new and costly individual program. I could ascertain no thought at all of evaluating how low-powered reactors already researched, developed and in the hardware stage might be scaled up to meet medium and high-powered requirements or more powerful hardware scaled down to meet lower power requirements.

Perhaps the most distressing feature of the incident, to my mind however, was the apparent total submission of the AEC's military reactors branch to Department of Defense performance requirements and specifications—irrespective of how drastically the cost and technical problems of producing the end product might be eased by only a modest relaxation in such requirements as time for setting up and breaking down a mobile plant, some slight easing in weight and number of package limitations, and like items. In such matters, there is a vast need during early stages of decision for a reasonable adjustment of military desires to known and predictable capabilities of the nuclear arts. Perhaps the Joint Committee is not the only authority with the knowledge to do this, but likely it is one of the few with both the knowledge, power, the will, and the courage to do so.

Right now the Army's military reactor program suffers to an extent from the same lack of reasonable objectives, reasonably defined, which plagued the civilian reactors program before the Commission's November report. It is the same kind of "we don't know where we're going" sickness which killed off the aircraft nuclear propulsion program. In contrast, a very definite objective for the naval nuclear reactors program—specified and reiterated over and over again by the Joint Committee back in the old days when circumstances placed its authorization power closer to the initiation of programs than now—plus, of course, a hard driving relentless boss—proved up the value and feasibility of intimate legislative-executive interrelationship in such matters.

U.S.S. "THRESHER" INQUIRY

The committee's relationship with the naval nuclear programs, as a matter of tradition, still remains closed today. At all times a member of the JCAE'S staff was present during both public and secret hearings of the Naval Court of Inquiry on the *Thresher* tragedy. Periodic reports were made to the committee membership in executive session and the committee has reserved its privilege to take such action, if any, as it deems proper in the premises. I cannot comment at this time as to what the committee may do.

NEW NUCLEAR ATTACK SUBS

However, I would like to state my personal convictions, held long before the *Thresher's* loss, that the Navy has yet to capitalize on the full potentialities inherent in naval nuclear propulsion. It has done a magnificent job with the Polaris submarines and the aircraft carriers—ships which necessarily must be large in size and therefore follow conventional warship design patterns. Where it has failed is in respect to the hunter-killer submarines like *Thresher*.

Brute forcing materials and fabrication techniques to their limits has been employed to balloon hulls to dimensions large enough to envelope all of today's bulky antisubmarine warfare paraphernalia and to strengthen them sufficiently to cope with new operating parameters of speed, depth, and endurance. *Thresher* has proved this to be a risky business. I believe naval architects and engineers must stop magnifying old blueprints and turn to new concepts of a totally miniaturized submarines of the ASW type—miniaturizing the nuclear powerplant, all electronic fighting and naviagting equipment and other internal features as well as the hull itself. I visualize an attack submarine perhaps only 100 feet in length compared with the *Thresher's* almost 300-foot length—a crew reduced from some 125 to perhaps 15—semiautomatic control of practically all functions of the vessel—and possibly the use of such wholly unconventional materials as aluminum or plastics rather than steel to construct the hull. Development would be expensive, of course, but production costs, bearing almost linear relationship to tonnage, would be vastly reduced. Within the limits of naval construction budgets, it might be possible to build four of these new miniaturized subs capable of vastly increased performance in every respect for the cost of one *Thresher*. Possibly both the size and the lethal striking power of our undersea fleet could be tremendously increased by this novel concept of development—which is the natural and logical extension of the potentialities of naval nuclear reactors.

GROWING OPPOSITION TO SITING OF REACTORS

While in the mood to pass out free advice, I would like to close with a suggestion as to how this group might make a much needed nontechnical contribution toward advancing the cause of the nuclear industry.

One of the most disturbing trends which I can detect affecting the future of atomic energy is the increasing opposition to the siting of nuclear reactors in various parts of the United States. The opposition takes many forms. There is, of course, always the opposition of some people who live in the proximity of a proposed industrial facility. But in the case of nuclear reactors, for the most part, their fears grow out of a lack of understanding. And then there is the opposition of those who really should know better. For instance, we find the former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. David Lilienthal, making wild and unfounded charges concerning the location of a nuclear reactor near Manhattan. And then we find the Secretary of the Interior, "Earthquake McUdall," during an acute attack of "seismophobia" raising public hue and cry against the proposed Bodega Bay reactor because, like the Stanford linear accelerator, it will be sited near the San Andreas Fault. We find Chairman Joseph C. Swidler, of the Federal Power Commission, just a few days ago in Denver, telling the electric power industry it is spending far too many research and development dollars on nuclear technology.

Although I do not generally subscribe to the "conspiracy theory of history," I cannot help but wonder whether there is an organized campaign against atomic energy being developed by people whose motives are less than pure.

In any event, regardless of the reasons for the growing opposition to the siting of nuclear reactors, I think it is imperative that the industry take steps to create some type of independent body which could provide the concerned public with the facts on nuclear reactor safety. I am afraid that if some action is not taken along these lines in the near future, a very major obstacle to the development of civilian nuclear power will be created.

I believe that an organization like the American Nuclear Society which is composed of individuals with the necessary specialized knowledge has a duty—acting as an organization or through individual members—to educate the layman.

Do not permit false information to stand unchallenged—do not permit the public to be inundated with false information directed toward developing public opposition to peaceful uses of nuclear energy without taking steps to correct the situation.

Each one of you in your home area, when you see a false statement made in a local newspaper or periodical about the dangers of nuclear reactors, should write to that paper or magazine and give them the true facts. You have a duty to the public as well as to your profession to do so.

Fighters for Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Times of June 18 there appeared a letter from three distinguished New York lawyers, Bruce Bromley, Bethuel M. Webster, and Samuel I. Rosenman, outlining the record of the NAACP legal defense fund.

There has been a tendency on the part of some to criticize the NAACP for being too cautious in its approach to civil rights. That is a most unfair criticism. I think that this letter has done a great deal to set the record straight.

It should be noted that the letter is signed by a bipartisan group of leading lawyers, two Republicans and one Democrat:

FIGHTERS FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

(NOTE.—The writers of the following letter are three distinguished members of the bar.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Every morning's newspaper proclaims the increased tempo of the struggle to obtain some semblance of equality for the citizens of the United States who are Negroes. In recent months, direct nonviolent action has emerged as a significant tactic in this struggle.

We recognize the important effect which this kind of action has had on the consciousness and conscience of all Americans of good will. It captures headlines, and serves to awaken public recognition of the problem. But in order to obtain any lasting benefits from the courageous acts of those men and women—white and black—on the streets of Jackson or in the lunchrooms of Birmingham, it will always be necessary ultimately to resort to the courts of law.

We feel that the public should more clearly recognize that permanent progress in civil rights has been the realization of justice under law and by the processes of the law. Too little known is the fact that this recent progress under law has been very largely the work of a private, voluntary organization—the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund.

INVOLVEMENT IN CASES

The fund has been involved in virtually every major civil rights case of the past generation. In the past 100 days alone its record in the courts has been nothing short of fantastic. This legal aid organization, formerly directed by Judge Thurgood Marshall and now under the direction of Jack Greenberg, its chief counsel, and Mrs. Constance Motley, its associate counsel, has during this brief period of a little over 3 months achieved the following:

A decision in the U.S. Supreme Court invalidating the arrest of "sit-ins" for trespass in stores which are required to segregate by city ordinance or public pronouncement of high municipal officials.

A decision in the U.S. Supreme Court declaring that the right of equal access to public recreational facilities is an immediate one; and that the "deliberate speed" doctrine applicable to schools does not apply to public parks.

A decision in the circuit court of appeals securing reinstatement of 1,100 students expelled from Birmingham elementary and high schools during the recent demonstrations there.

A decision in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama requiring admission of Negroes to the University of Alabama.

A decision in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit requiring the admission of Negroes to the public schools of Savannah, Ga.

A decision in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi directing the admission of Cleve McDowell, a second Negro student, to the University of Mississippi Law School.

Two decisions in the U.S. Supreme Court June 3, 1963, further tightening the standards of *Brown* v. *Board of Education*.

The filing of a suit to reduce the number of Congressmen from States which discriminate against Negroes at the polls.

BIRMINGHAM ARRESTS

In addition, the fund has pending more than 120 cases, including protest demonstration cases involving well over 6,000 defendants, among them every one of 2,500 Negro citizens arrested in Birmingham.

This unprecedented recent record calls to mind the major milestones of successes in court which it has obtained in the last 20 years:

Year 1944: Supreme Court decision holding that Negroes cannot be excluded from voting in primaries;

Year 1948: Supreme Court decision outlawing racial restrictive covenants in deeds of real estate;

Year 1954: Supreme Court decision directing desegregation of public schools in the United States;

Year 1962: Decision of the Court of Appeals for the Firth Circuit directing the University of Mississippi to admit James Meredith, a Negro;

Years 1946, 1956: Supreme Court decisions securing the right to travel without discrimination in interstate and intrastate travel, respectively.

It is difficult to picture what race relations in the United States would be today if this modest organization of 9 lawyers working with 80 cooperating attorneys in the South had not been so successfully using the processes of the courts, relying on the Constitution of the United States to bring about equality for all Americans.

BRUCE BROMLEY,
BETHUEL M. WEBSTER,
SAMUEL I. ROSENMAN.

Dr. Hazel K. Stiebling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, on June 20 Dr. Hazel K. Stiebling retired as Deputy Administrator of the Department of Agriculture's Nutrition and Consumer-Use Research, after a fruitful and distinguished career of 33 years of public service. On the same day, the Department announced that the two research divisions formerly headed by Dr. Stiebling would be consolidated with the four research divisions assigned to development of improved utilization of farm commodities.

It seems to me that this "merger," as the Agriculture Department's press release terms it, is likely to be a sad case of a whale swallowing a valiant fish. I fear that the Department's consumer-oriented research will inevitably be subordinated to its vastly larger program of commodity utilization research which is conducted primarily in the interest of producers.

I have asked Secretary Freeman to explain the steps he is taking to assure continuance of a vigorous consumer-oriented research program in spite of this consolidation. I am confident that this is his intention, but the history of his Department in this respect does not breed confidence. Hence I call this administrative "merger" to the attention of the House to emphasize the importance of action on H.R. 6865 which would establish an independent Office of Consumers. If H.R. 6865 were enacted, a competent, independent unit of Government acting solely in the interest of consumers, would give all of us some assurance that agencies ostensibly working for the consumer were not subordinated to others functioning in the interest of organized producers.

Only the Unusable Are Freed by East Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the natural interest that has been regenerated by the public with the news stories of the President's reaction to the Berlin wall, I think it timely that we point out many other conditions which exist in East Germany.

Columnist Sterling Slappey, in his column of June 14 in the Los Angeles Times, discusses the apparent policies of the East German dictatorship in permitting a handful of their citizens to reach freedom. I insert this article into the Record at this point:

ONLY THE UNUSABLE ARE FREED BY EAST GERMANY

(By Sterling Slappey)

Bonn.—In the past few days, 12 East Germans have been allowed by the Communists to leave East Berlin. As each crossed the frontier, the Communists began drumming out propaganda.

The propaganda is surely one of the most cynical programs undertaken to date by the regime of Walter Ulbricht.

In the words of Ulbricht, the 12 East Germans were "citizens of our republic who have received permission to leave." They were going to join members of their families in the West.

This was all true enough, but what Ulbricht neglected to say became apparent as the 12 crossed over. They were either very old, very ill, or very young.

They were, as has now been determined by Western sources, all classed officially in East Germany as "unusable in the production process."

This means simply that the East German Communists no longer wanted them and were anxious for them to become a burden on West Berlin and West Germany.

Over the last 2 years, about 6,000 persons have been granted permission to leave East Germany, the great majority classed as unusable. The Communists even neglected to take up the refugees' identity cards, some of which were stamped "unusable."

As each departed, Ulbricht's public relations and propaganda operators planted stories in the Communist press throughout East Germany calculated to show how goodhearted the regime is and that there really is no Iron Curtain in Berlin.

Before the Berlin wall went up in August 1961, about 2.5 million East Germans fled to the West. Instead of being old, ill, or too young to work, most of these refugees were doctors, lawyers, teachers, students, farmers, and laborers.

The wall, in one way or another, cut between several thousand parents and their children. Today, nearly 2 years after the wall was built, there are an estimated 1,600 children still in East Germany whose parents or guardians are in the West.

One of the most pathetic sights in West Berlin until recently was a mother who each night went to the spot on the border where her daughter had crossed a few hours before the Communists began erecting the wall. The child went to see an aunt and, at last reckoning, has never been allowed to rejoin her parents.

The Communists approve exit visas for children only occasionally. Every time one leaves, the propaganda mill turns anew.

The youngsters kept by the Communists live for the most part in camps, since they usually have no relatives in the East. Communist indoctrination is heavy in the camps. Much of this is in violation of the so-called East German Constitution, which theoretically gives a person the right of choice of domicile.

Six months ago two boys, one 5, and the other 6, somehow got across the East German border. Communist police put them in a youth camp at Magdeburg and the boys' parents in West Germany were not notified for 8 weeks.

Two months after the notice, after the parents had filed an appeal for their release, East German agents went to the parents and said the boys could come home if the parents would spy for the Communists. The parents refused and reported the affair to West German authorities.

There was a storm of protest, but not for still another 2 months did the boys come home. When they did, Ulbricht hailed the event as a humanitarian act.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Who Profits From Risk?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 28, 1963

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the almost incalculable worth of even our first modest step into space communications has been demonstrated several times in recent weeks, as in the recent relaying of spoken words and photographic images of newsworthy events across the Atlantic. If we ever are to establish a dependable basis for lasting peace, greater knowledge and understanding on the part of all peoples is an indispensable ingredient. Even the limited utility so far of Telstar hints at the great potential in bringing the farflung nations of the world closer together by such devices.

The significance of the initial space satellite in terms of service and potential economic benefits, and the role which nuclear-age communications play in modern existence, were dramatically described in a recent talk before the Los Angeles Rotary Club last June 14 in my home State by the chairman of the board of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Frederick R. Kappel, whose company is pioneering in this field. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of his speech published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO PROFITS FROM RISK?

(By Frederick R. Kappel)

It is a pleasure to be here and I greatly appreciate your invitation.

The last time I was in Los Angeles was 3 years ago this month. The way things move in this part of the world, I can see that if I had stayed away longer I'd really have trouble catching up.

Three years ago Memorial Coliseum was still pretending to be a ball park, Pacific Telephone's investment in California was $700 million less than it is today, and I was over at UCLA talking about the possibility of satellite communications and feeling like Buck Rogers.

I said I thought the possibility was very good indeed. I said this because I had gone over the subject thoroughly with our Bell Laboratories scientists and engineers—it was clear that they were optimistic—and I felt great confidence in their judgment and their ability to meet the various problems and accomplish the job.

Now the evidence by actual test has shown that they were right and the confidence was justified. Telstar I, a first for the United States last year, and Telstar II today, have demonstrated the feasibility of satellite communications, and if another 3 or 4 years don't see a commercial satellite system shaping up to supplement the growing network of ocean telephone cables, I for one will be greatly disappointed.

I speak of both cables and satellites because I am certain that both will be needed in the future to handle oversea communications, which are increasing at a very fast rate—almost explosively fast. Our responsibility in the Bell System of course is to be ready to give the service people want when they want it, and that is why we have been so active in both the cable field and the satellite field.

In the latter, as you probably know, the responsibility for getting a commercial system into being now lies with the recently incorporated Communications Satellite Corp. Theirs is a many-sided and important job. They will have arrangements to make with the communication agencies of foreign countries. They will have financing to do. They will have to decide what kind of system is best suited to meet the fast-growing immediate need. And then comes the whole business of getting the satellites designed, manufactured, and launched—all in a manner that will insure the economic practicability of the system as well as its technical quality.

At that point the satellite corporation would be ready to rent communication channels, and at this end of the line, so to speak, we in the Bell System would probably be their biggest customer. That is, we would be their customer for channels that we would use to serve our customers.

The reason for the Telstars, then—both of them—is obvious. The first need has been to get as much knowledge as possible, as fast as possible, about the technology of space communications. We in the Bell System wanted to make every reasonable contribution toward getting the information required for sound economic judgment about satellites designed for this purpose. And as a future user of the satellite corporation's facilities, we find it greatly to our advantage to have actual experience right now in using space communication channels, learning how to operate ground stations, and so on. All this experimentation and the knowledge gained from it speed the day when a commercial system can be placed in service, and this is very important to us because, as I said, time is pressing.

At the same time we are proceeding to develop and build improved ocean cable systems. A third transatlantic telephone cable will be laid this summer, a cable to Japan in 1964, and there are other projects already scheduled. Here I want to repeat one thought to make sure there is no misunderstanding. Cable and satellite systems will complement each other and there is no question in my mind of the need for both. To forecast or plug for international communications by one means only, whether it be cables or satellites, flies in the face of common sense and years of experience in planning and providing dependable service.

We need and use both cable and microwave radio systems on land. This has been true for many years. In the same way, in future years, we shall need and use both cables and satellites (which are nothing more than microwave relay stations in the sky) for overseas communications.

Now to get back to California—I referred to Pacific Telephone's California investment. When I visited Los Angeles in 1960 it was $2,600,000,000. As of today, it is up around $3,300,000,000. This as I said represents an increase of $700 million in just 3 years.

I don't know how you feel about it, but to Carl Lindeman and me this is an awful lot of money. Yet this is the kind of money it takes for the Bell System to do its part in serving growing California.

Last month one California family decided to move to New York and that was front-page news. However, I understand the net inward movement to this State from other parts of the country is now about 1,000 people a day. With that kind of tide running, there's no question that the telephone companies and in fact all the utilities have tremendous and ever-increasing service obligations to fulfill.

That brings me to the title of this talk. I called it "Who Profits From Risk?" because I wanted to talk generally about the encouragement of risk-taking, and the point I wanted to make is simply that the benefits or profits from well-considered business risks are pervasive and flow in all directions.

Who profits from risk? Obviously not everyone all the time; ours is a profit and loss system, and the word "risk" means just what it says. But the successful risks bring profit not just to a business but to its customers—in fact to them first of all, for it is surely they who profit most when business is encouraged to venture and innovate, to open new roads, to offer new goods and services and create new orders of value.

Likewise, to create employment in this growing Nation, with its rapidly increasing labor force, we simply must have profits that are sufficient to attract capital and spur investment to meet new needs.

But let me use another word here instead of "profits." The word I want is "profitability"—and the distinction is important. It is a great mistake to measure prosperity in total profits as the country grows. It is downright misleading. The fact is, total profits can grow while profitability declines—in which case the employment problem, for example, is more aggravated than helped. It is profitability, nothing else—the ability to profit from risk—that is essential to create new investment that expands employment.

Profit for everyone—this is what our profit system, our private enterprise system, our private risk system, can and must accomplish. This, to me, is everlastingly the goal to shoot for. But it is a goal that can be realized only if the hope of profit for the enterpriser stirs his enthusiasm and impels him to accept the discipline of risk.

I said I wanted to talk about this generally and I do. But I can't ignore the time and place I am in. Here in California, as it happens, the profitability of the Bell System has been limited to a level that I would have to call marginal at best. I believe this would have a depressing and deadening effect if it should prevail across the country.

I won't take your time with this at length, but will only make a few points briefly. If Bell System earnings generally were limited as they are in this State, in my judgment we could not obtain on sound terms all the capital we need. We would be forced to go slow on new construction to introduce improvements. We would not have the same confidence and active interest on the part of more than 2 million share owners. We could hardly carry on a research and development program of the same depth and breadth as that in which we are currently engaged. I don't see how we could avoid trimming back some of the tremendous investment we are making each year not only to meet and anticipate growth, but also to modernize communication equipment and introduce new and improved services for business, for agriculture, for government, and for the home. In short, I would say the almost certain results would be less construction, less service improvement, less progress, less employment, and a lesser tax contribution to help meet the needs of local, State, and Federal Government.

Now I shall leave such disturbing comment and get to a more cheerful note.

It seems to me that around the country there is coming to be a better understanding of the function of business profit than I could sense a few years ago. I haven't any attitude surveys to prove it, but I think there are indicators. It also seems to me that some of the strongest come straight from Washington. For all the differences of viewpoint among businessmen on policies and programs—and there are certainly wide differences—nevertheless I sense that increasingly, leaders in government do recognize the need for vitality in the private sector of the economy; they do understand that the dynamo of profit is essential for economic growth; they do know that financial strength in your business and mine is the necessary foundation on which to build the future.

I have even seen signs of this understanding in some of the more liberal magazines. Not long ago one of them, although it couldn't resist describing "the profit squeeze" as a "battered cliché," nevertheless pointed out that "the prospect of a buck" in profits was stimulating plant investment in helping the economy. The language wasn't very complimentary but the insight was correct. And the same liberal journal has even said, apropos of my own business (and I quote), "It is possible of course to argue that the public is better served in the long run by letting the company earn enough in the short run to stimulate forward-looking planning and investment."

A somewhat grudging statement, perhaps, but if enough writers will only be grudging in the same way, that will be wonderful. What matters is simply the basic understanding that profit encourages forward-looking risk and everyone, as I said, profits from that.

I can't help asking, however—when are we going to see this point in clear language and bold type in the economics textbooks? I have searched through more than one and I just do not find it. Teaching economics without centering attention on risk and profit is like making a watch without the works. The hands simply will not move; and I might add—the young people in this country won't be able to tell the time of day in an economic sense.

This leads me to another aspect of profiting from risk; I mean the effect of risk on individual people and hence on the character of the business they are working in. I am quite sure the managers in any business need the experience of running risks more or less constantly and learning the consequences whether they are good or bad, welcome or unwelcome. They have to find out that a good risk and good judgment on it will bring reward, and a poor risk its penalty. Otherwise I don't see how they will develop the personal qualities that produce a quality job.

Risk is a discipline everybody needs. I don't mean risking your life or your safety or your bottom dollar, but the everyday risks of taking personal responsibility, of choosing one way against another, of making a decision and being ready to answer for it, of saying yes and saying no, of measuring the competition and determining the way to meet or beat it. And I think the liveliness of this discipline is immeasurably heightened when the opportunities for reward are open-ended, as in competitive industry, and when in a regulated business there is enough latitude to stimulate and challenge intense personal effort.

What any business needs is the urge to do its damnedest, and this takes people who have that urge. It don't see financial reward as the only source of it—there are other factors that are equally important, and for many people, much more so. But we need all sources of energy and drive, not just some of them, and I am simply saying that the opportunity for healthy profit, the knowledge that real ability and top performance will have their reward—these are vital to developing the discipline, the alertness, and the judgment that people must have to make a great business.

If I were to try to single out the one thing in our business that might be called most important to our future, I would say it is the spirit in individual managers that makes them alive and sensitive to every opportunity to get something done tomorrow just a little better than they see it being done today. And this same spirit will have to operate inside them to build the personal competence they need, because nobody can fix anything if he doesn't know how. It isn't just a matter of applying old experience, it is a matter of being dedicated to get new experience too. But this kind of dedication isn't generated in a static atmosphere. A stodgy boss can discourage it. The weight of the rule book can press it down. Finicky regulation can put a dead-end sign in front of it. Taxation that walks off with the fruits of effort can kill it. Public distrust, a general political or public view that business needs to be held down, confined, supervised, restrained, limited, curbed, controlled—these are bound to weaken the will of individuals to dedicate their best to business life.

I am going to say again however that I think public understanding of the importance of lively, vital, successful private enterprise is growing. I think this understanding is on an upward trend. I think more people are realizing that profit is the prime mover of economic progress—that this is the engine that creates new investment, new productive wealth, and new jobs for a rapidly growing labor force. In fact, I think it is more and more widely understood that without adequate margins of profit in the private sector of the economy, the country can never attain a more favorable rate of economic growth. Just as an indication of this understanding, let me remind you that with all the uncertainties that surround Federal tax policy and legislation, there seems to be no disagreement today on the fundamental goal of increasing business activity and profit that will ultimately yield increased total tax revenues.

If I am right in what I have been saying, then it seems to me it just emphasizes all over again what a tremendous responsibility we in business have.

We have the responsibility to produce public value that could not be produced in any other way.

We have the responsibility to set goals for ourselves that we will have to strain to reach.

We have the responsibility to speak out on existing or proposed policies that may interfere with our doing our best—I don't mean just stating opinions, but giving the facts and the reasons behind our views.

We have the responsibility to give employees challenge to grow on, and to build managers who can do everything tomorrow better than you and I can do it today.

We have the responsibility to increase day-to-day efficiency and equally to make the most intelligent use of profit and all capital funds.

We have the responsibility to discern consumer wants more acutely, and to meet them more promptly and with greater imagination.

We have the responsibility for constant research and innovation.

We have the responsibility to live by ethical standards that will operate to improve every aspect of our job.

You may say this all sounds idealistic but I say we had better be idealistic and no mistake about it. There is no conflict between being realistic and being idealistic. There is no conflict between working hard for fair rewards and being fair in business dealings. No one can always be right, but he can always try.

Can free enterprise serve private aims and public ends? I not only believe it can, I am sure it must.

So far as the Bell System is concerned, we think our job, our mission, is to put communication services at your disposal that will exceed your best expectations. Even as I say that, I am well aware that many times we fall short of what you want and what we want to do. But we have no complacence about it—we are deeply concerned to do better. We have new systems and services now just starting, and we have more to come, that will do more and more for you. We are sure they will increase the efficiency of all business, reduce costs, help increase your profits, and help you produce better values for your customers. We are not going to be satisfied to give you anything less.

In widening the range and variety of communication services, I will just say in conclusion, we have imparted to our own business a considerably higher degree of risk than we faced in the past. Optional features, conveniences, and arrangements of one sort or another all introduce new elements or risk. But we have acted with our eyes open. We hope regulatory commissions will be progressive and objective enough to see the public value in a rate of profitability that is consistent with these risks. And we have the strong hope and determination, likewise, that the answer to the question, "Who profits from our risk?" will be, in one word—everyone.

Thank you.

Address by Postmaster General Day at 25th Anniversary Luncheon of Civil Aeronautics Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 28, 1963

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on June 26, 1963, the Postmaster General of the United States, Hon. J. Edward Day, was called upon to deliver the principal address at a luncheon in honor of the Civil Aeronautics Board, celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Board.

For the benefit of all those who did not have the privilege of hearing this excellent address, I ask unanimous consent to have the Postmaster General's remarks printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by J. Edward Day, Postmaster General, at 25th Anniversary Luncheon of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., June 26, 1963

It is a great leasure to join in celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Yesterday at about this same time I addressed the Aero Club of Washington, so I am really flying high this week.

From my rather lofty vantage point I congratulate the members and staff of the CAB—past and present—on a successful quarter century of assistance to civil aviation. The Civil Aeronautics Board has guided American aviation through a period of phenomenal progress, change, and expansion. It has aided the airlines during the difficult transition to the jet age.

The Civil Aeronautics Act was passed by Congress in 1938 to end the economic chaos and near anarchy which prevailed in the aviation industry. The act was designed to check the uncontrolled competition of the previous decade and to give the young industry a chance to develop in an orderly manner. The act recognized that the healthy growth of aviation and reasonable rates were closely tied to the public interest.

The original act has been revised, but its successor, the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, imposes upon the CAB essentially the same declaration of national policy as the 1938 act. The CAB must consider both the needs of the public and of the aviation industry. Chairman Boyd has stated the CAB's duty in the following way:

"We must see to it that the United States has a healthy, vigorous air transportation system which meets the public and national needs. It must be safe, adequate, economical and efficient. Its charges must be reasonable. It must be without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages or unfair or destructive competitive practices. Its development must be sound."

As you can see, this is no easy assignment. It is complicated by the fact that the CAB was not able to start with a clean slate. All 11 existing trunk carriers are the same airlines, or the successors to the same airlines, that acquired "grandfather rights" under the 1938 act. The large carriers were formed on the basis of factors other than a well planned national air route system.

The CAB also came under great pressure from both the industry and the public to allow more routes, more airplanes, and more markets. The great improvements in airplane design and the heightened awareness of air travel brought about by World War II added to the demand. The Board had its work cut out for it in its attempt to order and channel the incredible postwar expansion in the industry.

Today, the 11 domestic trunkline carriers serve more than 600 points over routes in excess of 185,000 miles in length. Twenty-four smaller carriers provide service to some 900 smaller communities over routes in excess of 88,000 miles. Three carriers provide domestic all-cargo service to 38 points over routes in excess of 14,000 miles and another 15 carriers are licensed to provide supplemental services. Fifteen carriers are authorized to provide service to a total of 428 points outside the United States over routes in excess of 320,000 miles.

The modernization and expansion of air service is still affecting postal operations. Less than 2 weeks ago in Alaska the last of our dogsled teams that still carried mail was replaced by an airplane. I want to make clear that this was done to speed up service and not to get even with dogs for biting letter carriers.

Although the CAB oversees this vast, complex network, it has only about 800 employees, making it one of the smallest agencies in the Government. But its fine work has made it one of the best known, and it has demonstrated that size is not the best criterion of value.

The Post Office Department is considerably older than the CAB; Ben Franklin was Postmaster General under the Continental Congress and the Postmaster General has been a member of the Cabinet since the administration of Andrew Jackson.

We have 585,000 employees, making us by far the largest civilian agency in the U.S. Government. We had 150,000 employees even back in 1890. We handle 16 times as much mail today, with less than 4 times as many employees.

The Post Office Department is old but not ossified. We, too, are still vigorous, lively, and changing. The Department played an important role in the development of commercial aviation in this country, and we still give an important assist to the airlines which carry our mail.

Between 1938 and 1953, the rates the Post Office Department paid to the airlines included subsidies that were fixed by the CAB. After 1953, the subsidies were paid directly by the CAB. The Post Office Department now pays only a fair charge for the services rendered by the carriers.

The CAB's stabilization of the airline industry has greatly helped us in providing reliable and rapid airmail service. The Department will spend about $93 million on air transportation this fiscal year. Twenty-five years ago, when the CAB was founded, that figure was under $25 million. Since this earlier figure reflects a subsidy, the change is actually even larger than is indicated.

Americans today send nearly 2 billion pieces of airmail annually, an increase of 750 percent over 1938. The increase in airmail poundage in the last 25 years is twice that large, about 1,500 percent.

Like every other Federal agency, operating in a dynamic political and economic climate, the CAB has at times been enmeshed in controversy and has upon occasion been attacked. Some of the criticism has stemmed from the fact that the CAB must balance its twin functions of promotion and regulation.

It has now become more or less expected that a member of an independent Federal commission will, upon retiring, immediately call for its abolition or substantial revision. Newton Minow followed the accepted ritual when he vacated his FCC Office on the seventh floor of our Post Office Department building recently. Louis J. Hector, on retiring from the CAB in 1959, wrote President Eisenhower:

"Not with the Founding Fathers as members of its Board do I think the CAB as now organized could fulfill its obligations to the American people."

I don't know of any Postmaster General who has suggested that the Post Office Department be disbanded. However, sometimes we are told by others that the Post Office should be a private corporation operated for profit intsead of a great public service agency. In this connection, the following item appeared on the front page of one of our Washington newspapers not long ago:

"A second, separate John Birch Society—calling for abolition of the socialistic Post Office Department and cola beverages—is now operating with headquarters in Baltimore, it was revealed yesterday.

"The Baltimore organization, whose full name is the John Birch Chowder and Marching Society, is headed by Attorney Leonard J. Kerpelman.

"Kerpelman said the society's No. 1 aim is to wage its opposition to the Post Office Department.

" 'By socialistically delivering people's messages for them,' he said, 'the Post Office Department makes people weak, dependent and without moral fiber, instead of leaving them to deliver their own messages, which would make them strong, independent, and morally fibrous.'

"Kerpelman described his society as an ancient one, driven underground by Prohibition: 'We regard the more recent John Birch Society, the one that hogged all the publicity, as a very late starter. Our society is better fit to deal with world problems today, because we have been underground for so long we are more completely uncontaminated by any ideas of the last millennium.' "

Of course, I don't agree with Mr. Kerpelman's Chowder and Marching Society. I think that a strong and efficient Post Office Department is indispensable to a thriving economy, just as the work of the CAB has been indispensable to the ordered expansion of American aviation.

The Post Office Department is proud of its own role in starting commercial aviation. The Department's airmail service initiated the commercial use of the airplane, which before that time had been built only for military or exhibition purposes.

Congress authorized contracts for the carriage of mail by airplane in 1911. Since the cost could not exceed other means of transportation, airmail flights did not actually begin until 1918. The first trip was not auspicious. Careful plans had been laid which called for a plane to fly from Washington to New York, with a stop in Philadelphia. On the morning of May 15, 1918, in the presence of President Wilson and other Government figures, including an obscure young Assistant Secretary of the Navy called Franklin D. Roosevelt, a pioneering aviator set out with the first load of airmail.

But he got his directional signals mixed up and wound up in Waldorf, Md. His mail had to be carried back to Washington and taken to New York by train.

Despite the faltering start, airmail routes were gradually established over much of the country. The Post Office Department made the first transcontinental flight from New York to San Francisco on September 8, 1920, with the plane carrying 16,000 letters and averaging 80 miles an hour.

In those days, flying was a dangerous, uncertain, and sometimes madcap business. Runways for takeoff or landing did not exist and there was no air-to-ground communication, no beam to follow, and no marked course. The mail planes were converted Army DeHavilands with open cockpits, fabric-covered wooden frames, and a top speed of 100 miles per hour. Once a pilot left a field nobody knew where—or if—he was until he arrived.

The few instruments on the panel were of uncertain accuracy and adaptability. Gasoline capacity limited the plane to a few hours' flight, and the motors were unpredictable and tended to stop at any time. When the motor stopped it could be started only by spinning the propeller, a difficult job which resulted in many bruises and some near decapitations.

Two hundred and twenty-one planes were used in the airmail service from May 1918 to October 1921. Only 50 of these were in flying condition at the end of the period. Another 26 were still available but undergoing repair. Of the others, 101 had crashed, 7 burned, and 37 had to be withdrawn for one reason or another.

Thirty men were killed in airmail service in about the same period. In 1920 there was one fatality for each 100,000 miles flown. By comparison, the 1962 fatality rate for scheduled domestic passenger service was one fatality for each 172 million miles flown, a fine tribute to the air safety work done by the CAB and FAA.

The men attracted to hazardous job of flying the mail in the early days were a daring, temperamental and carefree group. The Post Office Department had no choice but to accommodate itself to their hijinks and eccentricities, because as some official said with resignation, "the mail must go, but who in hell is going to take it?"

The pilots seemed fond of letting the mail wait around in balmy weather, but took a kind of fierce pride in defying bad weather. One man took time off to bombard a village with toilet paper. Another arranged to buzz antelopes into a fence corner where a confederated waited to butcher them.

The most famous of all air mail pilots was Charles Lindbergh, who served on a contract route between Chicago and St. Louis. Flying northbound on this route on November

3, 1926, Lindbergh ran out of fuel and was forced to jump from his plane. Dean Smith, a colleague of Lindbergh's reported a crash landing with this terse message:

"Landed on cow, killed cow, scared me. Smith." Another air mail pilot, one Kenneth Unger, was forced to crash land after his motor failed. Unhurt, he borrowed a horse to return to town. Evidently, he was less skilled in handling the horse than his plane, because the horse threw him for another crash landing, and this time he broke his ankle.

Lindbergh took a leave of absence from air mail service to make his historic flight from New York to Paris in May 1927. During a Paris interview, Lindbergh said, "I am an air mail pilot and expect to fly the mail again." And, as a matter of fact, he later did fly his old route between Chicago and St. Louis once again.

Although the Post Office Department actually carried mail up to August 1927, it gradually surrendered its operations as soon as contractors with the ability and sufficient financial backing to perform the service could be secured. The Department fostered and nurtured commercial aviation and then turned it over to private enterprise.

We have other examples of a similar pattern in Post Office history. In most industrialized foreign countries, telephone, telegraph, and broadcasting facilities are owned by the government. In the United States, we feel that these functions are best left in private hands. However, the telegraph began as a Government-fostered enterprise in this country.

A telegraph line was opened between Washington and Baltimore in 1845. It was built at Government expense by its inventor, Samuel F. B. Morse. Postmaster General Cave Johnson fixed the cost at 1 cent for every four characters.

When Morse offered his patent to the Government for $100,000, the Post Office Department turned it down as unpromising. Postmaster General Johnson advised Morse "that the operation of the telegraph between Washington and Baltimore had not satisfied him that under any rate of postage that could be adopted, its revenues could be made equal to its expenditures."

Postmaster General Johnson's crystal ball was a mite clouded, but so were the crystal balls of later seers. Here is a story that appeared in a Boston newspaper about three-quarters of a century ago:

"A man about 46 years of age, giving the name of Joshua Coppersmith, has been arrested in New York for attempting to extort funds from ignorant and superstitious people by exhibiting a device which he says will convey the human voice over metallic wires. He calls the instrument a 'telephone' which is obviously intended to imitate the word 'telegraph' and win the confidence of those who know the success of the latter instrument. Well-informed people know that it is impossible to transmit the human voice over wires as may be done with dots and dashes and signals of the Morse Code, and that, even were it possible to do so, the thing would be of no practical value. The authorities who apprehended this criminal are to be congratulated, and it is hoped that his punishment will be prompt and fitting, that it may serve as an example to other conscienceless schemers who enrich themselves at the expense of their fellow creatures."

The bad prophets have not been restricted to the field of communications. As late as 1901, Wilbur Wright doubted that man would fly "within a thousand years."

We need not feel superior to the bad guessers of times past. Wilbur Wright, despite his own skepticism, went on to fly the first heavier-than-air machine with his brother only 2 years later. We have a copious share of the timid and unimaginative amongst us today.

There are those who are against the attempt to fly a man to the moon because they say it would cost too much. There are those who oppose renewed efforts to reach a test-ban agreement on the grounds that we have failed before. There are those whose only answer 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation to the demands for equality and justice of Negro Americans is more patience and further delay. The following words were written by Abraham Lincoln in 1862:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. * * * As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves."

Today, we must, once again, disenthrall ourselves.

I wish the Civil Aeronautics Board a happy birthday and continued success in guiding the aviation industry.

Happy landings to all of you.

Making Democracy Work Better

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 28, 1963

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I have been receiving many favorable comments on the quality of the essays written by the honorable mention winners of the McGee Senate Internship Contest. I ask unanimous consent to have two more of these essays, by Deborah Davis and Robert P. Schuster, both of Natrona County High School in Casper, Wyo., printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK BETTER

(By Deborah Davis, Natrona County High School)

Montesquieu, in the Spirit of Laws, volume 38, stated that, "The ideal democracy consists of institutional arrangements for arriving at political decisions which realize the common good by making the people itself decide issues through the election of individuals who are to assemble to carry out its will." Yet the Federalist, volume 43, goes on to elaborate upon, "the confusion and intemperance of the multitude," adding that, "In all very numerous assemblies, of whatever character composed, passion never fails to wrest the scepter from reason. Had every Athenian citizen been a Socrates, every Athenian assembly would still have been a mob." This conflict is essentially the problem in American politics today; we must work to represent fairly the various factions and minority groups in Congress, yet we must achieve a national cohesion to expedite policymaking decisions. Our current political structure is, for the most part, the product of the original Constitutional Convention of 175 years ago, and deserves the veneration we have accorded it. But it is also a system of checks and balances and interlocked gears of Government which requires the consensus of many groups and leaders before the Nation can act, and which forces us to pay a heavy price of delay and devitalization.

An architect of the Constitution, James Madison, believing in majority rule, yet afraid of majority tyranny, designed a political model to prevent popular forces working through the Government from being too strong. Essentially the Madisonians deal with one another by bargaining and accommodation rather than by direction and command. They are often divided over specific policies, but what unites them is the joint defense of a system that consolidates their power.

The Jeffersonian strategy stressed majority rule as against the Madisonian system of minority checks; and according to the strategy, size and diversity would be enough of a check against majority tyranny. Jefferson believed that sectional, economic, and other group lines would cut across parties to form overlapping membership so that no majority could afford to be politically immoderate if it hoped to maintain itself. Under the Jefferson formula, once a majority party had been pieced together and its leaders had taken over the three branches of government, the majority could govern rather freely and vigorously within its broad mandate as Jefferson did.

Effective majority rule on a national scale in a continental nation demands a durable popular majority organized by a leader who can depend on his followers in moments of need. The Madisonian emphasis in American politics has resulted in a four-party system in which both the Democratic and Republican parties are split in what has been termed "Congressional" parties, which draw power from relatively small, local interests (the Madisonion minority factions), as opposed by the "Presidential" parties, which draw power and perspective from large national interests (the diverse Jeffersonian majorities).

The base of the congressional system is the one-party district, as established and protected by the State legislatures. Since State legislatures are usually controlled year after year by the same party, the legislatures naturally carve up the districts to benefit their own party. They can make every congressional district approximately equal in population and absolve the legislature from the charge of gerrymandering, yet at the same time divide the State so expertly that some districts remain, or become, hopelessly noncompetative. In congressional elections, aside from great sweeps, about 150 Republican and about the same number of Democratic seats never switch to the other party.

The Congressmen from a "safe seat" is politically committed to the status quo. He operates in a world of political localism because he does not want to disturb the existing arrangements, and he has a wonderful incentive to stay put—the rule of senority. No other major Western democracy rewards its politicans with so much power for so little relevant accomplishment. The congressionalists, the committee chairmen, are generally for States rights, local elections, restricted franchise, minority rights, rural overrepresentation, checks and balances, congressional power, the danger of "mass" rule, powerful committees, the senority system, the filibuster—in short, the Madisonian system in all its ramifications.

The Presidential party, headed by the President, emerges as a champion of national principles. Although the congressional party can gerrymander within the congressional districts, the Presidential party has the electoral college which favors the urban masses and therefore a national orientation. The Presidential party generally follows the lines of world government, the abolition of war, altruistic relations with the outside world, academic fiscal policy, redistribution of wealth, brotherhood, majority rule, progress, welfare for the underprivileged, science and scientific, attitude, and civil liberties. The congressional party is not so much against these principles as they are primarily for other, which principles I have already mentioned. The congressional and Presidential parties diverge into two very different and opposed ways of life, and the clash between them produces four-party politics in America.

We can choose bold and creative national leaders without giving them the means to make their leadership effective. They must manage multiparty coalitions as the French, for example, did before de Gaulle. To act, American leaders have had to gain the concurrence not simply of a majority of the voters, but of majorities of different sets of voters organized around leaders in mutually checking and foot dragging sectors of government. The price of this has been enfeebled policy.

To improve the situation, we need a new kind of bipartisanship. We need national control of national interests. The presidential and congressional parties must be merged organizationally. For example, national offices like President, Senator, and Representative ought to be placed together on the ballot and separate from candidates for State and local offices, so that voters could choose national officers on national criteria and local officers on local criteria.

The National Government should control national elections. It is ridiculous that a man who moves to Alabama or Mississippi must wait 2 years before he can vote for presidential candidates he has observed for years. The national parties must build grassroots memberships which are orientated to the national party's tradition, doctrine, and policy.

The parties and their candidates should be financed on a mass, popular, systematic basis. It is better that a lot of people give a little than a few give a lot. A large dues-paying membership of the national party should help, and there should be legal restrictions on the total amount of money that one man (or family) can contribute.

Representatives should be elected to a 4-year term, to coincide with presidential terms. The 2-year term is an anachronism, and the off-year elections form one of the bases of the congressional party system. The 22d amendment should be repealed. Many people feel that it makes a "lameduck" of a second-term President.

The electoral college should be changed, although any change should be considered in light of its effect of four-party politics. Perhaps if the congressional parties gave up their gerrymandered and one-party districts, the presidential parties would yield their own gerrymandering in the electoral college.

I list these proposals in a mixed spirit of humility and conviction. I realize that I am a minor and haven't even voted in a national election yet. I can't possibly be familiar with all the problems that face both parties, yet I am convinced that unless we adopt these proposals we will be unable to define our national purpose and mobilize our strength rapidly enough to be able to attack the complex problems that beset us at home and abroad.

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK BETTER

(By Robert Parks Schuster, Natrona County High School)

"The destiny of mankind is not decided by material computation. When great causes are on the move in the world * * * we learn that we are spirits, not animals and that something is going on in space and time, which, whether we like it or not, spells duty."

These words were spoken by Winston Churchill in 1941 when the call for duty was necessary for the preservation of democracy—a war was being waged. Today we are involved in another war, a war of convictions, a war of ideals, a war not to be won by bullets and missiles, yet the call to duty is as demanding.

Charles Dorsey has said that: "Like human behavior, a civilization is made, not born. Like life itself, it must be nourished day by day, ceaselessly, with new energy, and new materials, or it sickens and dies." In other words, it is an individual responsibility, your responsibility and my responsibility to nourish our system of government—democracy—so that it will not decay. To make democracy better, we must meet the challenges to freedom.

These challenges to freedom may be overt in the form of a 50 megaton bomb or covert in the form of communism. Our fathers fought in wars where the challenges were made completely clear as the cold steel of the bayonet slid into their body. The challenge was just as great yet not as clear when our soldiers were captured and brainwashed.

The most glaring challenge, however, is our internal weakness. As the youth and adults in a free society, we are given more rights, more privileges, and necessarily more responsibilities than in any other political systems. We must fulfill these responsibilities. This is our duty, yet we fail; this is our responsibility, yet we neglect it; this is our challenge, yet we do not meet it.

In a free society, this end can be reached by many methods. We can develop pride in our government, we can cultivate desire and patriotism; we can vote intelligently; we can individually learn what freedom is.

The key word in all of these methods is the individual. Freedom is an individual experience and the challenges of this experience must be met by the individual, not by an unrelated group.

R. L. Sharpe in his poem "The Builders" has expressed this idea:

> "To each is given a bag of tools,
> A shapeless mass, a set of rules;
> And each must make, 'ere life is done,
> A stumbling block, or a stepping stone."

We have all by birth been given our bag of tools—the ideals of democracy. It is up to the individual to decide before he dies whether his contribution will be one that facilitates or impedes freedom's progress. Our system of government depends upon this decision.

Indonesia Moves Toward the West—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the aspects of Indonesia's shift to a position more favorable to the West was the result of a quiet but successful U.S. diplomatic mission handling the question of private U.S. oil rights. An article in this week's Business Week tells the story of the Watt mission and assesses its importance for United States-Indonesian relations:

U.S. DIPLOMATIC TRIUMPH IN INDONESIA

After many years of turbulence in world affairs, a narrowly averted crisis seldom gets much attention in this country, even if the trouble blows up in an area where vital economic and strategic interests are at stake.

This fact was demonstrated during the past month when an explosive situation over private U.S. oil rights in Indonesia was damped down by quiet U.S. diplomatic intervention. The results may possibly have as profound an effect on our world power position as the highly publicized showdowns that have occurred during recent years in other parts of the world.

Whether or not the implications of this diplomatic intervention will be so far reaching, there can be no doubt about the importance of the administration's decision to try to break the impasse that had developed between the Government of Indonesia and the oil companies operating there—Stanvac, Caltex, and Shell. President Kennedy gave the delicate assignment to a good-offices mission headed by Lt. Gov. Wilson W. Wyatt, of Kentucky, and including international oil consultant Walter J. Levy.

TROUBLE AHEAD

At the time this mission was appointed, it seemed clear that President Sukarno's regime and the oil companies were on a collision course that could only lead to outright oil expropriation, to further economic deterioration in Indonesia, and ultimately to a complete Communist takeover.

It remains to be seen whether Sukarno will really stick with the essentials of the oil settlement—allowing the companies to operate as contractors for 20 years—and with his apparent commitment to check Indonesia's slide toward economic chaos and communism. But the administration now feels there is reason to be cautiously optimistic on both counts. And at least some of the oil executives involved seem to share this view.

If such a judgment can be only tentative for the present, there are some fairly definite conclusions that can be drawn from the whole episode:

Much can be gained if the U.S. Government moves into an inflammable situation quickly and decisively, instead of waiting to react after an explosion has come. In the background, of course, there must be a basic administration policy of never throwing in the sponge where vital interests are at stake, unless the situation has passed over the brink into utter hopelessness.

In the case of economically underdeveloped nations that are recipients of much-needed U.S. aid and are also hosts to important U.S. private investments, recent efforts to link foreign-aid policy with the protection of private investment give very real advantages to U.S. negotiators. It is enough to point to the Hickenlooper amendment to last year's foreign-aid law and to this year's Clay report on foreign aid, both of which stress the protection of private investment in the developing nations.

U.S. companies with investments abroad, especially those operating on a large and worldwide scale, increasingly recognize the necessity of adjusting to nationalistic forces. These companies also are becoming more willing to accept—in their dealings with the United States and foreign governments—something that might be called vaguely their public responsibility.

The story of the Wyatt mission, even when told in brief, indicates why these conclusions can be drawn, and are being drawn in Washington today.

COMMUNIST THREAT

Even before the oil impasse became critical, there was a danger that Moscow and Peiping would become the predominant military and economic influences in Indonesia. At the same time, Sukarno kept stalling on a promise to cooperate with the International Monetary Fund on an economic stabilization program that would be linked with future U.S. aid. In addition, he was launching verbal attacks against the budding Federation of Malaysia.

For the oil companies, the outlook was more immediately bleak. Sukarno had just issued a regulation that called, in effect, for expropriation if the companies did not agree with the government on a new setup. Although the companies had agreed on 60–40 split of income and to a gradual takeover of their local distributing and refining facilities, the terms for the takeover were impossibly harsh—so harsh that when the government set a June 15 deadline the companies felt that they had no choice except to prepare to get out.

At this point, the two U.S. oil companies sought Washington's help. And, with Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman working in the background, the Wyatt mission was put together quickly—though before it left for Tokyo some differences had to be ironed out between mission officials and oil executives.

Plus factors: In the Tokyo negotiations, which lasted only 4 days—but almost on a night and day basis—two things apparently contributed the most to getting Sukarno's agreement to a settlement the companies felt they could live with.

Wyatt's understanding approach to the development problems faced by Sukarno combined with his skillful imputation that the strong backing for the Clay report in Congress meant only one thing for Indonesia—an oil settlement or no more U.S. aid.

Levy's reputation as a highly knowledgeable but fair mediator in problems that have arisen between developing nations and the big international oil companies. At one stage of the Tokyo negotiations, Levy virtually became a consultant to the Indonesians.

Wherever the credit should go, a dangerous crisis has been averted, new preparations are being made for the IMF to take a hand in solving Indonesia's economic troubles, and Sukarno is talking cooperation with the Philippines and the Malaysian Federation that is to come into existence in August.

White Sulphur Springs Early American Spa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 28, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the well-known West Virginia resort of White Sulphur Springs is probably the earliest American "healing water" site on record, according to an article in the June 16, 1963, issue of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail. "Water worship" was practiced at White Sulhpur Springs by Indian tribes long before the advent of the white man, this historically important article informs us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS: SYMBOL OF ETERNAL HOPE

(By Margot Coley)

Even before the American Colonies were but a fringe on the Atlantic Coast and our territory was a vast wilderness, Indians in the area were drawn to the "healing waters" that is now White Sulphur Springs. For water worship was part of their cult, and this warm sparkling liquid spouting from the earth, seemingly with no specific source, entranced as well as soothed them. Nearby, a salt lick attracted buffalo, elk and deer, so the Indian was further motivated by the prospect of a successful hunt in addition to the refreshing spring.

Later, in 1788 as the early settlers—now citizens of a new country—pushed forward to the western frontier, word of the "miraculous" waters spread after a Mrs. Anderson sought and was granted relief from a rheumatic malady by treatments using water from the spring. This first "cure" inspired others to seek the solace of the waters.

In these early years, crude shelters and tents were built on the surrounding hillsides; later, rows of cabins and cottages, named after the young Republic's Southern States, were erected. The first of these were built by James Calwell, Michael Bowyer, a former Continental Army soldier, John Latrobe, and Stephen Henderson, a wealthy Louisiana sugar planter. It was Henderson who built the two-story Federal Cottage in 1816, one year after our second war with England ended. This first private dwelling became the President's Cottage, now a museum, because of the many Chief Executives who stayed there; White Sulphur Springs boasted the names of Van Buren, Tyler, Fillmore, Buchanan and later, Pierce, Harrison, Jackson and Arthur.

And, as more people converged on the spring and imbibed its tonic, another element appeared—social conviviality. People who were drawn together by the common bond of the healthful spring and its palliative effects, also realized the prospects of gay social encounters. Habit and custom evolved specific times when it was correct and proper to meet at the spring and drink of it. In 1830, the Spring House was erected providing not only shelter for the waters, but a meeting place for the early promenading guests. It stands today, as then, a symbol of mankind's hopes and aspirations for health and well-being.

By 1858 the cottages and tavern were outmoded and insufficient to handle the patrons who converged in great droves on White Sulphur Springs when the surrounding sentinels of mountains guarding the valley turned to green. In that same year, the Old White Hotel was built; and to this hostelry over 700 guests would travel by coach, barouche, and horseback. A panorama of travel-Kanawha Turnpike (now U.S. Route 60) with much dust-raising crunching of wheels and blasts of old riding horns signifying arrivals of vast numbers of people. Then, as now, some of the ladies insisted on a prior stop to adjust their hairdos and attire in order to make the proper first impression. Most of them, by this time, consisted of rich planters from the South, capitalists from the North, and politicians from every State, then in existence, who came not only for the waters, but to close business deals, seek prospective husbands for their belles, and make and break Senators. The prominence of the spring society was such that no one of note neglected to court its attention.

For three short seasons, the gay social whirl and hospitality of the Old South held sway. There was no season at all in the spring of 1861; the great maelstrom of the Civil War engulfed the mountain valley and shrouded the Nation in despair.

But throughout the great conflict, providence selected the Old White as a haven for the weary, war-torn soldier—and being just—served both the Blue and the Gray. For the buildings were considered a military advantage, and both sides craved control of its property. For the first of two times, the hotel became a hospital offering aid, sanctuary, and solace to the wounded. While Abraham Lincoln was signing West Virginia into statehood in 1863 and the fortunes of war were swinging like a pendulum, men who came to White Sulphur under orders rested and were nourished here. After the Battle of Dry Creek in August of 1863, the wounded were brought to the great reception hall. Those who died, both northerners and Southerners alike, are buried in cemeteries on the property.

It was during the Civil War that the old resort was almost razed. The northern troops, under the command of Gen. David Hunter, were preparing to depart, and in keeping with military tactics, he gave orders for all the buildings to be burned. However, Capt. Henry du Pont (of Delaware ancestry) calculated that their forces might return to this area, and confident of a future occupation, suggested the order be countermanded. Again, fate took a hand in saving the spring for the future, as the orders were rescinded.

After the war, even while the Nation was trying to heal its wounds, the first few seasons were inevitably slow. But in the summer of 1867, the noted soldier-statesman, gentleman and scholar Gen. Robert E. Lee chose White Sulphur for his summer residence. His presence alone caused countless thousands of people to throng to the spring just to see him—"the old, the young, the belle, the beau, the white-haired elder and the stately matron bowed low before the great general—the spurless knight of a cause which, though lost, was sacred." The spring again became the social mecca of not only the South, but leaders and businessmen and political aspirants from the North. And in the period of three seasons—General Lee was the unofficial guiding force of the Old White. People instinctively turned away from the horrors of the war and sought the relief afforded by a holiday at the Old White. The halls resounded with the dancing steps and musical notes of promenades and balls as the buoyant, animated, and spirited life of the spring was revived.

In 1870 the railroad came to White Sulphur; although signaling the death knell of the romantic horse-drawn carriages, the trains became the driving force enabling more and more countrymen to satisfy their most earnest desires to be a part of the spring's society.

What started out as a simple watering place, by the turn of the century had become a social playground of world renown. In 1910 the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, seeking to increase passenger revenue, purchased the old White Hotel and cottages and proceeded to build the main building that is the central portion of Greenbrier today. Improvements were added to the sports facilities—two golf courses, tennis courts, a bath wing—the first of many additions to attract and lure visitors.

As season after season unfolded and innovations in housing and modern inventions were given impetus by World War I, it became evident that the old White Hotel would not survive another fire examination, and it was reluctantly torn down in 1922, leaving the Greenbrier's main section as the resort proper. The heyday of the private railroad car was in force these years, for when the Vanderbilts, the Armours, or the Prince of Wales had a hankering for a visit to White Sulphur, the ever-present private railway car was evidence of society's attendance.

Even as the country was in the throes of a depression, Greenbrier airport began operation; families of wealth and social position locked up their townhouses and country estates and flocked to the Greenbrier, escaping the operating expenses involved in their own property, but seeking the mode of life the resort offered.

But all too soon shadows of World War II descended only 24 hours after Congress declared war in December of 1941, and the hotel was turned into an internment center for German and Japanese diplomats. Under terms of international law enemy diplomats are guaranteed full protection. It took some time for the Government to arrange exchange of diplomats and in the interim 3,000 of these foreign representatives were cared for, guarded, and protected at the Greenbrier. These diplomats took advantage of their good fortune and enjoyed their safe retreat in the mountains. They departed; the hotel was about to reopen when fate stepped in for the second time within 100 years and transformed the resort into a hospital. Only this time the hospital became a center for vascular surgery, neurosurgery, and general medicine. Operated under the direction of the Surgeon General of the United States, it was called Ashford General Hospital and over 20,000 soldiers and veterans were treated here. Once again the wounded and war weary sought and received care and sanctuary.

At war's end, the hotel was put up for sale. For a while it was feared the resort would fade just as other springs in the area had been lost through disrepair and neglect. Then the C. & O Railway, impelled by motives of preserving a historic landmark and heritage that was, and is the "Old White," bought it back from the Government and proceeded making the Greenbrier the showcase resort of the Nation. To do this, millions of dollars were used to restore the hotel and cottages and to landscape the 7,000-acre etsate. Many pages have been written of the interior decorator Dorothy Draper and her use of flamboyant colors against the background of white arches and columns. The mammoth refurbishing took 2 years to complete and it is said that the guests were arriving for the 1948 gala as Mrs. Draper and aids slipped out the back door.

Today, the continuity is still unbroken after 185 years. The historical heritage that belongs uniquely to The Greenbrier reflects the cultural and traditional attainments of our country. The retreat, the haven that was once sought only for the curing waters, has taken on new dimensions of hope and comfort. As in the gracious olden days, few members of society—diplomats, politicians or royalty can resist the spring's appeal. By expanding sporting facilities and accommodations unparalleled anywhere in the world, it has become "The Resort That's a Way of Life." Each succeeding generation of owners and managers have kept up with the times without forgetting its heritage of service and hospitality.

The latest addition, The West Virginia Wing, is a salute to the Mountain State on the occasion of its 100th birthday.

Significantly, it is Hebe, the cup bearer and goddess of youth, which tops the historic spring house. She offers the serenity of the mountains, lavish surroundings and spirited occupations—sports, hobbies, or merely the quiet sustenance gained from a peaceful mountain visit; and, as always, White Sulphur Springs itself.

Essays on Student's Role in Government and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 28, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, each year since I have been in Congress, I have attempted to arouse the interest of the youth in Government and in politics. For it is the youth who will be responsible for the direction our future takes; it is the youth of America who must participate more than ever before in America's political life. It was with these ideas in mind that I have each year invited seniors in New Jersey high schools to participate in a competition for summer scholarships in my office. Judges select the scholarship winners on the basis of their achievements in school and community, together with essays submitted by all applicants. The three students selected by the judges spend 2 weeks at my office in Washington observing at firsthand the workings of their Government.

This year I asked the students to submit essays discussing the student's role in Government and politics. Their responses were immediate and most encouraging. More than 200 seniors in New Jersey high schools wrote essays which were intelligent and surprisingly comprehensive.

Judges must have had a difficult time in choosing the final winners. But, as in every competition, some must emerge victors. I am pleased to announce therefore that the winners are: Sidney H. Stein, 55 Minell Place, Teaneck, representing the northern Jersey area; David L. Harding, 613 Brielle Avenue, Brielle, representing the central Jersey area; and Joel B. Korin, 215 South 32d Street, Camden, representing the southern Jersey area.

The students who were chosen have written stimulating essays: Each represents a different approach to the students' role. Consider, for example, the following three statements:

David L. Harding:

> In order to gain the best in government and politics it is the students' role to question, to argue, to debate all aspects of these established forms: their purpose and structure, their procedures and programs.

Joel Korin:

> The students' role in government and politics is mostly a preparatory role; it is part of the learning experience. It is designed to prepare the individual for intelligent and active participation in government and politics.

Sidney H. Stein:

> In order to fulfill his role in government, the student must not only be familiar with our own system of government but he must also know the principles and ideas behind the other systems of government which are practices today. Above all, the student must learn that tolerance of opinions foreign to his own is of the utmost importance. Democracy can survive only under a strong interplay of ideas created by the existence of different and perhaps widely divergent viewpoints.

It is heartening to see statements like these which are indicative of the high caliber of the applications submitted by all the youngsters involved. I'm convinced that these high school seniors are part of a vast, rich resource of intelligent young people ready and willing to take an active and creative part in the functioning of their community, State, and country.

Mr. President, it is with great pride that I ask the Members of this body for unanimous consent to have the three winning essays printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Student Role in Government and Politics

(By Joel Korin, Woodrow Wilson High School)

The student's role in government and politics is mostly a preparatory role; it is part of the learning experience. It is designed to prepare the individual for intelligent and active participation in government and politics. The student must obtain a knowledge of the historical heritage of the United States. He must understand how our Government functions on all levels by familiarizing himself with the United States Constitution and Federal and local Government structures. He should have an understanding of the important laws and vital court decisions; only then can he be an intelligent, active member of our society.

But a student's role in this field is quite interesting, not just dull, formal or didactic, because it is, or should be, a participating role. Permit me to trace an individual's role in government and politics during his life as a student.

The role of an elementary student is just that, elementary. In this phase of education the student receives a basic understanding of the rudiments of the American way of life. Because of the student's immaturity, the opportunities for participation in self-government offered at this time are limited.

In junior high school the student receives his initial contact with organized student government. The American way is self-government, and the students will select their peers as their leaders.

As a student approaches maturity and at the same time high school, new vistas of learning and activities are opened to him. Student council is now a well-run organization with numerous activities and increased participation. Welfare drives, campaigning and selecting of officers, student court, social and recreational functions, and the formation of a liaison between students and administration—all of these enter into the plan. Other activities, also run on a self-rule basis, offer the student opportunities to excel in a particular field of interest.

It is during this time that in certain individuals leadership qualities develop and, with the proper guidance, improve. The job of the schools is to provide capable guidance to aid and better existing leadership qualities.

The activities and courses of a high school must be geared to give a student a basic working education in government since, in some cases, high school is the termination of formal education and the inception of a life-long career. An ill-prepared student can become an ill-prepared citizen incapable of performing the necessary obligations and duties thereof.

In college many students expand their role in training and experiencing activities in preparation for active roles in government and politics. Organization structure is similar to that of high school, but it covers a wider area. Leadership qualities manifested in high school may not be sufficient to make one a leader on a college campus; a higher caliber leader is found here. This individual, the campus leader, is the leader of the future.

The college student will have many definite ideas and will demonstrate his feelings to others. Most prevalent in today's society are "Freedom Riders" and "Ban the Bomb" advocates. Whether the demonstrations are in accordance with or opposed to the national administration is immaterial; the students are forming opinions and, as voting citizens, will try to have their demands met. The demonstrations must be influenced by reason, not emotions, which lead to violence as exemplified by the recent Mississippi University outrage.

Until he enters college, a student's role in politics may be theoretical; but while attending college, the student reaches his majority and can exercise his voting right. His leanings toward a political party may have been primarily influenced by his parents, but while he is away from home and exposed to political discussions, he may broaden his political philosophy, or his political views may change materially. On many campuses the interested student will find Young Democrat and Young Republican Clubs that nurture the knowledge and participation of a student in local and national political life.

I have traced the steps of growth and learning and have tried to show how interest in these vital topics is fostered. It is the job of the American school systems to provide the knowledge and practical self-government necessary to make a graduate a person ready, willing, and able to assume the responsibility of good citizenship. The schools must do their part to abolish political apathy in future citizens.

My school has done this job by affording me the opportunity to debate on topics of national interest such as Federal aid to education, NATO, the U.N., and the Common Market. I was given the opportunity to participate in a model OAS and to act as majority whip of the House of Representatives in the Temple University Civic Forum League. I have listened to addresses by State and Federal judges, and I witnessed courtroom proceedings during Law Day U.S.A. ceremonies. Do all schools offer such a program for citizens of the next generation?

By these activities the schools take born or naturalized Americans and transform them into convinced Americans, believing in the ideals of democracy and the American way of life. The role of the student is to learn and participate and by doing so he prepares himself for active, intelligent citizenship.

THE STUDENT'S ROLE IN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

(By Sidney H. Stein)

The student today has a massive role to play in government and politics. One of his jobs can be to act as a watchdog of society and see that no personal liberties are abridged by governmental action. Personal freedom and liberty are recognized as the goals of politics. Governments, therefore, are established to provide the means to obtain these goals. The student can act to see that the liberties which are granted to all citizens by the Constitution are maintained.

How can he do this? First of all, the student must constantly be aware of what his Government is doing in the Nation's Capital, in his own State capital, and in his own local town. Radio, television and newspapers give to the reader accounts of governmental developments. A casual glance at a daily newspaper is not sufficient. In order to be a politically alert person, the student must learn the reasons behind legislation, as well as the arguments for and against an issue, whether it is on the national, State or local scene.

It is the duty of the student to express his opinions to his elected representatives in government. It is the student's responsibility to see that any government in the United States remains a government of and by the people. Any capable, intelligent student can work actively to be a responsible student. As such, he should know the advantages, as well as the disadvantages of the two party system as practiced in the United States. He should be aware of the platforms of each party, and should know their positions on all major issues. Since the delegates who are elected to office run the business of government, it is important to know the personal stands and ideas of each candidate.

The student must also be well informed about the history and development of our own system of Government, as well as the philosophical basis of democracy. Before any society can be criticized for its shortcomings, it is necessary to delve into its roots and find out whether or not it is possible to correct any deficiencies, without upsetting the extremely delicate balance that is Government.

In order to fulfill his role in Government, the student must not only be familiar with our own system of Government, but he must also know the principles and ideas behind the other systems of Government which are practiced today. Above all, the student must learn that tolerance of opinions foreign to his own is of the utmost importance. Democracy can survive only under a strong interplay of ideas created by the existence of different, and perhaps widely divergent, viewpoints.

The student's role in Government and politics is indeed, potentially influential. He can act to protect our personal liberties, and he can activity perticipate in Government by expressing his personal views to his elected representatives. The student has an obligation to become a responsible citizen and voter. He should know the plaftorms and candidates of each party, and should always realize that the presence of differing opinions is a healthy sign. Knowing the principles behind the systems of Governments, as well as knowing the functions, history, and problems of our own Government are also important areas for the student. Every teenager in the United States has an obligation, as well as a right, to fulfill his role in Government and politics.

THE STUDENT'S ROLE IN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

(By David L. Harding)

Even the most superficial examination of the theory of government reveals that in order to have the most efficient system of government possible those most suited for the job of governing must rule. Yet our Nation's founders, in order to avoid the tyrannical faults of such a system, formed a government based on the belief that men can rule themselves. They did this because they had a strong belief in man's intelligence and self-control: qualities which they also believed could be, and had to be, strengthened through education.

Today's student, therefore, among other things, is in training for self-government. It is imperative that he should make an effort to educate himself in any and all aspects of government; that he should strive to become well-informed about events of local, State, National, and international importance; that he should gain experience in making and expressing original opinions on a variety of topics related to government.

A brief look at history tells us another fact about government: that a given system of government will gradually cease to function acceptably, and will be replaced either peacefully or forcibly, unless it is a constant state of evolution, geared to meeting the needs of its people. Therefore it would seem that two basic types of people are essential for good government: intelligent administrators and creative planners. These two general groups have frequently been referred to as the "doers" and the "thinkers," respectively. In reality, though, these are not true titles, for it is indeed necessary for administrators to think, and for planners to act.

In many respects this Nation's government executives and legislators fall into the category of the administrators, while the Nation's students definitely fall into that of planners. It may seem a little ridiculous to say that students plan our Nation's future, but the ideas and opinions that young people form while students will be the foundation for the ideas and opinions that they will use in molding the shape and course of our Government in later years. In order to gain the best in government and politics it is the student's role to question, to argue, to debate all aspects of these established forms: their purpose and structure, their procedures and programs.

This is not to say that it is the student's role to be cynical; but rather that he must be openly critical. Just as administrators must be free to exercise their intelligence without excessive outside influence (such as from lobbyists), planners must be free to use their creativity without undue restraint (such as from extremists and those dedicated to the status quo). Only through originality that comes from a critical and objective approach can our political and governmental system be improved and changed so as to survive.

In summation, the student has a twofold role to fulfill in government and politics: He must educate himself so as to be capable of governing himself intelligently; he must think objectively and creatively so as to assure his Nation of continued progress and advancement. Whether today's students are fulfilling their role is a debatable point. The fact that there is room for improvement is not in question. The present moment is always the most opportune one for profound thought and action.

Remarks of Robert Moses at First Press Conference on Fair Progress, Flushing Meadow, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 28, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of Robert Moses, president of New York World's Fair, at the first press conference on fair progress, held in the Press Building, Flushing, N.Y., on June 27, 1963.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES

We at the fair build. The press in its many manifestations reports. Who am I to explain our respective missions and to acknowledge our dependence upon you?

These are the three big dilemmas we all share—to accept without rancor the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune and still believe in Divine Providence, to witness the gullibility of the public and still believe in the democratic process, and to recognize the fickleness of the electorate and still believe that in the long run the people are right.

We have a faith beyond logic which inclines us to believe in a sort of built-in super eustachian tube and a sixth or common sense which keep the feet of the people, and maintain balance and equilibrium in our democracy.

It all gets down, does it not, to education? That's where you of the fourth estate come in. You are the great communicators. Your job, day in and day out, is to provide not merely the news but the unvarnished facts and unbiased comment on them. If your words and pictures are illuminated by occasional gleams of humor, so much the better.

At the risk of boring you, let me state briefly our 10 objectives at Flushing Meadow. They are:

1. Promotion of peace through understanding, but the fair offers more than a bright symbol and an eloquent slogan. We aim to show that on a shrinking globe in an expanding universe, the continents and peo-

ple draw closer together and must learn to live in harmony.

2. Attractions which will insure respect for New York on its 300th anniversary, help us to show that in the three centuries of welcome to strangers yearning to breathe free, New York has not evolved, as one might occasionally think from the more lurid press exposures, into a place of moneygrubbing, wrath, and tears.

3. Free competition of all peoples in the Olympic tradition of the finest in art, talent, skill, discovery, and invention. In this competition we expect that the advantages of American free enterprise will become obvious. We cannot precisely define democracy. Only by our works shall you know us.

4. No dictated, centrally controlled design. No predominant architectural school or movement. Design and content left to exhibitors, subject only to simple rules to insure safety, sanitation, space, and landscaping.

5. Special attention to religious pavilions and to those of new republics.

6. Fun as well as culture and industry, but no cheap midway.

7. Adequate access by all means of travel, including a permanent arterial system to serve future needs.

8. At least 70 million visitors.

9. A cash balance at the end of the fair sufficient to pay all debts and to complete Flushing Meadow Park.

10. Opening on time.

You cannot blame us for believing that in pursuing these objectives energetically, we are entitled to the support of all decent citizens who are proud of our town and loyal to it. Ours is a private nonprofit corporation authorized by special act to build and operate a great exposition and at the close to have a sufficient balance to finish a great city park.

Error is the besetting sin of journalism, perhaps occasionally acknowledged in the confessional, but almost never publicly. At worst it is no more reprehensible than incompetence in administration and insolence in office which are our besetting sins, the existence of which we too usually vehemently deny.

So let there be some mystery about our respective professions, and let us admit that we are all human and potentially brothers. This realization will lead to much pleasant companionship. Let's be working partners in bringing the world to New York in 1964 and 1965. Go easy on our deficiencies. We strive for, but make no claim to, omniscience and perfection. Do not, we ask, overemphasize the absentees. At the end of the first season they may be sorry they stayed out.

As a step in this direction, we start this afternoon the first of a series of press conferences on Fair progress. We are not shrinking violets or sensitive plants and constructive questions won't irritate us. The heads of the staff are here so that you will be speaking directly to those who are shouldering the responsibilities.

Conservation of Our Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including two articles written by Edward J. Meeman, editor emeritus of the Memphis Press-Scimitar and conservation editor of the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

No man in the United States has had a keener vision about the necessity of conserving our natural resources, the development of parks, the protection of wildlife, than has Mr. Meeman. In one of these articles he writes of an interview with Laurance Rockefeller. Mr. Rockefeller has given millions of family funds to provide outdoor recreation to Americans who want clean and wholesome opportunities to enjoy our great God-given gifts of nature. In the other, he writes interestingly about plans so close to the Nation's Capital. There is a growing interest in this whole study of recreation. With the shortening of the workweek and the increase in population it grows more and more important that we provide adequate facilities for genuine and wholesome use of leisure time.

Secretary Udall expressed to me his personal appreciation of the help accorded the whole movement by Mr. Meeman. I hope that the editor emeritus of this fine newspaper will continue to write articles on this subject, and I shall be pleased to share with my colleagues and to the hundreds of thousands of readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his writings.

The articles follow:

[From the Memphis Press-Scimitar, May 6, 1963]

TOWPATH BECOMES A FOOT PATH—WE SHOULD ADD TO IT AND MAKE IT A NATIONAL PARK

(By Edward J. Meeman)

At 8 a.m., L. Kay Thomas, naturalist of the National Park Service, called for me at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Washington. He got me back there at 11 a.m.

In the 3 hours I had time for a delightful and satisfying experience of scenic driving and contact with Nature. This timing shows how close lies the proposed Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park to one of the centers of civilization, the Capital of the United States of America.

On the way out, our route was through a beautiful residential section of Washington and the charming suburb of Glen Echo, Md., sights worth seeing in themselves; on the return, our route was over the interesting MacArthur Boulevard.

We parked and walked to the Great Falls Tavern, where travelers on the canal, which winds along the Potomac from Washington, 185 miles to Cumberland, Md., stopped to rest. We examined the old dam and lock. We noted that the canal was only 15½ feet wide and the locks only 16 feet deep between their stout stone walls, so the boats could not have been large. Mr. Thomas told me that the canal rises by means of 74 locks some 600 feet from tidewater to the Alleghenies.

WASHINGTON'S IDEA

George Washington first saw the significance of the canal route, but the first spadeful of earth in building the canal was turned by President John Quincy Adams.

We walked over a strong footbridge to an island, and over another footbridge to the bank of the river where we saw the Great Falls. The actual falls are only a small part of a cascade of white water plunging over huge rocks. It is a sight worth going far to see.

The walk along the smooth towpath, where Justice William O. Douglas of the Supreme Court recently did his 50 Kennedy miles, is a joy to body and spirit. Trees bend branches down on both sides of the canal. Some of these were dogwood and redbud in bloom. On the ground were masses of purple phlox. Naturalist Thomas pointed out the purple flower of the paw-paw which I had never seen, though I had eaten the fruit in my boyhood walks at Evansville in Garvin's Grove, now citified Garvin Park where no paw-paw will grow.

ROCKY BANKS

We came to a steep rock cliff where the canal had been blasted through, now mellowed with vegetation.

There was a chorus of bird songs and no sounds of civilization to break its harmony. But that civilization often crowds too close upon this refuge from it. The Government owns the canal and the 5,200 adjacent acres which belonged to it. Since those acres stretch out thinly for 165 miles, it isn't nearly enough land.

So Senator BEALL and Representative MATHIAS of Maryland, Senator DOUGLAS of Illinois, and others have a bill in Congress to add 10,200 acres at a cost of $1.5 million and make the whole thing a national park as 450 acres of it already is. The bill should pass at this session. If you agree, write your Congressman.

[From the Memphis Press-Scimitar, May 8, 1963]

CONSERVATIONIST LAURANCE ROCKEFELLER URGES FEES, TAXES FOR RECREATION: CITES NEED TO BUILD UP OUR OUTDOOR AREAS

(By Edward J. Meeman)

NEW YORK.—Laurance S. Rockefeller has given millions of family funds and big sums of the money he himself has made to provide outdoor recreation to Americans who want respite from the concrete and asphalt of our spreading cities.

The Rockefeller contributions to us, the people, have included a tropical paradise in the Virgin Islands, now a national park, a mountain on the Hudson, and a vast amount of scenery in the Rockies, plus camps in which to snuggle in foam rubber rest after a rugged day in the open.

As a student at Princeton, Mr. Rockefeller took every philosophy course that was offered. As a philanthropist, he has a philosophy which includes the thought that private gifts need be supplemented by large-scale investments of the people themselves in their outdoor resources.

This I learned in a talk with him about conservation in the family offices on the 56th floor of 30 Rockefeller Plaza.

He sat at a desk which was not clean—it was obviously that of a man who was working hard at many things.

NO GOOD IF FREE?

"The other day," he said, "Mrs. Bertha Spafford Vester, the dedicated woman who gives her life in the service of the needy in the Jordan section of Jerusalem, told me of a man who poured some medicine that had been given him on the ground. 'It can't be any good because I got it for nothing,' the man said."

Mr. Rockefeller urged the public investment in recreation in two forms—user fees to be paid by the sportsmen, campers, and scenery lovers who visit our parks, forests, lakes, and beaches, and tax funds to provide proper development and maintenance of public outdoor areas.

"Land acquisition is not enough," he said. "You multiply an area's usefulness when you provide proper facilities for public enjoyment."

Mr. Rockefeller's leadership as Chairman of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission (ORRRC) has led to the establishment of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department of the Interior. The Bureau coordinates the work of 20 Federal agencies and, if pending legislation is approved, would channel grants-in-aid to States undertaking outdoor recreation programs. Mr. Rockefeller is the active honorary Chairman of the Citizens Committee for the ORRRC report, working to have the report's 50 recommendations put into practice by the States, the Federal Government and private landowners. Some of these mean spending more money for public recreation but most add up to ways and means of getting more recreation opportunities from the landscape that's already available.

Also, he recently was elected chairman of the New York State Council of Parks, of which he had been vice chairman since 1960. As head of the council he has a large responsibility to see that the $100 million which the people of New York voted in recent years for parkland acquisition is wisely invested.

"The vote was 3 to 1 in 1960 on a $75 million bond issue for park and recreation areas," he pointed out. "On top of that the people last year voted another $25 million for the same purpose by about the same margin. This vote should have convinced the politicians that they should no longer give outdoor recreation low priority. Yet this is what happened: When the legislature was asked for some $8 million for capital construction in existing parks, what came through was much less than $1 million. They ignored the fact that the more you spend for development, the more use per acre of a natural area you can get.

RECREATION AS A NECESSITY

"There are other examples of shortsightedness in dealing with appropriations for development. Congress declined to provide access to Glacier Bay, Alaska—you have to have a yacht if you want to see it. After voting to establish a National Seashore on Cape Cod, they cut out the appropriation for the acquisition of in-holdings In the pending Land and Water Conservation Bill which provides for raising $150 million, all but 10 percent is earmarked for land acquisition.

"Funds for the development and maintenance of recreation are always the first item cut out of a budget. We need to upgrade recreation, make it co-equal with education and health, consider it a necessity. Recreation has been eating the crumbs—now we demand to sit at the table.

"Why? Because recreation in the out-of-doors is so important a part of our lives—so much a part that its benefits are usually taken for granted, left unspoken and thus passed over at the legislative table."

Mr. Rockefeller believes it worthwhile to spell out that outdoor recreation satisfies every man's basic need for physical activity and a spiritual and mental lift.

Furthermore, he said, the outdoors had much to do in the shaping of our national character and is essential to its continued vitality. That is a big reason why opportunities for it must be assured to all Americans, now and in the future.

Mr. Rockefeller is interested in the Nature Centers which local groups in many communities are establishing with guidance from the National Audubon Society. School groups flock to these centers and learn about nature in a natural setting.

"They will also learn to vote intelligently on conservation," he says.

THE VALUE OF WALKS

Mr. Rockefeller knows from experience the value of nature walks to a youngster. It was the habit of his father, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., to take him, as he did his brothers, on long hikes on nature trails. The father thoughtfully carried pieces of maple sugar and chocolate which he doled out to them.

I suggested that not only should virgin areas be acquired, but it would be practical to acquire also comparatively cheap cut-over and even wornout land near cities and restore them to a completely natural state.

"Architects have succeeded, by consulting records and pictures, in restoring badly damaged historic buildings accurately to their original beauty," I pointed out. "Why cannot our biologists rebuild original nature on such tracts?"

Mr. Rockefeller agreed it should be done.

His conservation interests range widely. As the result of a recent mission to Africa he will, by gifts from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund of which he is president, make possible the establishment of zoos in three African cities. "It is hoped that, seeing their animals in zoos, the African people will become fond and proud of them, and will not make the mistake we Americans made when we thought of our wild buffalo only as meat and hides, but will see their magnificent herds as something which they and tourists can enjoy. Those herds are an invaluable tourist attraction."

Canada's 12-Mile Limit Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, Canada and the United States have a community of interest in many economic areas. Likewise, we have conflicts of interest. However, I believe that every Canadian, just as every American, knows that the welfare of each country is linked closely and our economies are dependent one upon the other.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of writing an article on Canada's proposal for a 12-mile fishing limit and I have urged that our Government explore Canadian Prime Minister Pearson's proposal in this regard.

Because it is timely, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the newspaper article which appeared in the June 23, 1963, issue of the Seattle Times:

FISH RIGHTS OFF CANADA NOT EXPENDABLE

(By Representative THOMAS M. PELLY)

WASHINGTON.—On June 4, the Prime Minister of Canada announced the unilateral extension of his country's claimed territorial waters. A 12-mile fishing zone, established on the so-called straight-baseline principle, will take effect in mid-May 1964. This Canadian action could have serious effects upon the fishing industry of the American Pacific Northwest.

The announcement was not unexpected. Since the U.N. General Assembly on the Law of the Sea in 1956, when a Canadian official supported the concept of a narrow territorial sea and a broader contiguous zone for fishery control, Canadians have urged extensions of their jurisdiction in waters close to the coast of Canada. Although the Canadians have in the past endeavored to achieve new and wider fishery and territorial limits through negotiations, failure to achieve an agreement strengthened the position of those Canadians advocating unilateral action.

For many years, U.S. fishermen have been fishing in waters close to the west coast of Canada. The first were fishermen who worked the rich halibut grounds off British Columbia. Although the halibut fishery has since expanded north and west along the coast to the Bering Sea, these grounds—early discovered—are still of considerable importance to American fishermen. If U.S. fishing for halibut within the Canadian 12-mile limit is eliminated, a maximum of 330 vessels and 1,500 fishermen will be affected.

American salmon trollers have also conducted a fishery in waters along the west coast of Vancouver Island. The catch of salmon from this fishery within 12 miles of the coast annually yields about 1,700,000 pounds, or $535,000, to U.S. fishermen.

A major development since the Second World War has been the expansion of the trawling industry in the Pacific Northwest. Today, some 120 vessels working out of Washington ports, land 40 million pounds of fish annually, valued at over $2 million to the fishermen. In 1962, out of a total Pacific Northwest trawl catch of 75 million pounds, about 18 million pounds (valued at $900,000) came from within the Canadian 12-mile limit.

The U.S. fisheries off the Canadian coast in the Pacific Northwest have been carried on for such a long time that U.S. fishermen, in our judgment, have established certain historic rights. We would consider it neither just nor equitable for Canada to abolish these fisheries by fiat, as it were. We would fully expect our own Government to take measures consistent with the long history of U.S. participation in these fisheries and to prevent injury to U.S. fishermen who presently fish those waters.

The consequences of such a move on Canada's part would not be felt in the Pacific Northwest alone. Important U.S. fisheries based in New England ports are carried on off the Canadian coast in the Atlantic Ocean.

But our historic rights are so well-established and our tradition of working out fishery problems amicably with Canada so firm, that I have no doubt that the two Governments can solve these problems. It seems to me the Canadian Government is prepared to recognize these rights and, therefore, that our Government should accept the Canadian invitation to find a mutually agreeable solution to the serious problem now before us.

In connection with these negotiations my chief concern from past experience is a wishywashy attitude on the part of our State Department, which seems to feel that the American fishing interests are expendable in consideration of the so-called broad picture.

It should be pointed out to the Canadians that vast quantities of the Canadian fish catch are marketed in the United States. During the 5-year period from 1956 to 1960, inclusive, Canadian exports of fishery products to the United States averaged about $101 million annually, or 70 percent by value of Canada's exports of fishery products. We should let it be known that the sharing of this U.S. market by Canadian fishermen is a privilege, not a right.

Furthermore, it is a privilege that U.S. fishermen and other Americans are asking the U.S. Congress to withhold from any nation which takes unjust action against American fishermen.

But I do not suggest that we threaten, because there is no room for threats between Canadians and Americans. I mean, rather, that we make sure that Canada is aware of the realities of the situation, just as we are when we recognize that we cannot change history by ignoring the 12-mile limit problem and hoping that it will go away.

Historic Boone County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 28, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, what is now the West Virginia county named after Daniel Boone was a virgin forest 300 years ago, inhabited only by wildlife—including buffalo—and only occasionally visited by Indians. The story of how this wilderness became the present Boone County is told in an article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail of June 16, 1963.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

VIRGIN FORESTS COVERED BOONE

(By Luther R. Jones)

(NOTE.—This brief compilation of the history of Boone County is based almost entirely on the exhaustive research, articles, and notes of Sig Clafson.)

What is now Boone County was virgin forest 300 years ago, filled with wildlife, and visited occasionally by a hunting party of Indians.

It is possible the Adena peoples preceded the Indians in this area. At least their influence is evident in a few piles of stones about the country and sign writing near Julian.

The first recorded visit of white men to the area was in 1742 when Peter Salley led an exploring party into this area, naming Coal River from the abundance of coal.

A land survey in 1784 on Clear Fork above Whitesville mentions a corner tree "on which Gen. (Andrew) Lewis, Samuel Lewis, and others carved their names in 1774," following the defeat of Cornstalk at Point Pleasant.

Following the French and Indian and Revolutionary Wars, Virginia made land grants covering much of the valley to Virginians who fought in those wars. But Indian troubles discouraged settlement. Land speculators grabbed most of the land, but let it revert to Virginia for unpaid taxes when settlers failed to buy.

Mad Anthony Wayne's defeat of the Indians at the Battle of Fallen Timbers on the Maumee in Northern Ohio in 1794 put an end to Indian raids; and settlers followed "seng" diggers and hunters via buffalo traces, through low mountain gaps into the area. It is recorded that the last buffalo in West Virginia was killed on Coal River in 1825, and, according to tradition, by John Dolin.

John Toney who patented lands on Big Coal in 1793 was probably the first settler in the county, followed by Thomas Price (near Danville) in 1805. Phillip Ballard, a Revolutionary soldier, and sons-in-law, John Sparr, Claiborne Rucker and Matthias Kessinger, settled about Madison in 1806, giving name to Ruckers Branch and Spaars Creek.

Settlement continued rapidly, and their descendants dot the valley today.

In 1909, the Virginia Assembly created Cabell County out of Kanawha, including lands west of Spruce and Little Coal. Logan County, created in 1824, embracing Pond Fork, Spruce Fork and Little Coal north to Lick Creek (below Danville).

In 1846, St. Clair Ballard, who represented Logan County in the Virginia Assembly, introduced a bill, which was passed, creating Boone County in 1847.

Tradition says that Ballard named the county Boone because his mother, Chloe Flynn and her sister had been rescued from the Indians by Daniel Boone, then residing in Kanawha.

The act of creating Boone County appointed justices of the peace, empowered to establish a county seat. Land was purchased below the mouth of Spruce in what is now the country club addition to Madison and a courthouse, county clerk's office, and a jail built, followed shortly by a few residences and a store or two.

The county seat variously called Ballardsville and Boone Courthouse was burned by Union troops in a clash with Confederate forces—the combatants being chiefly militia units from Boone, Kanawha and Logan.

In 1865, a courthouse and jail (present municipal building) were built opposite each other on what is now Main Street out of brick burned on the sport from clay excavated nearby. The new county seat was named Madison after James Madison Laidley, a Charleston attorney who assisted in the organization of the county government.

In 1834, the Virginia Assembly declared Big Coal navigable to Marsh Fork and later appropriated $96,000 for construction of eight locks and dams to Peytona, built under the supervision of Maj. William S. Rosecrans, who was to become a famous Union general in the Civil War.

The total cost of the system was $208,975, with coal companies organized to mine and ship cannel coal paying some $112,975.

Cannel coal was in demand for making coal oil. A narrow gage railroad was built from the loading dock at Peytona about 1 mile up Droddy where a mine was opened. At first, barges loaded with cannel coal were floated out of Coal River, with steamboats taking over with completion of the locks.

Cannel coal mining, closed down during the war, continued fitfully and meagerly until 1884 when kerosene replaced coal oil.

Racine sought to have the courthouse moved to that community in 1896, but the voters turned the proposal down.

The old brick courthouse at Madison was condemned in 1913 and the foundation of the present courthouse was started in 1915, financed by a special levy authorized by the legislature. In 1915, Danville appealed to the voters to move the courthouse to that community. Again the voters said, "No." The new courthouse was completed in 1921, with funds raised by an extra levy authorized by the legislature and a bond issue voted by the people.

The Coal River Railroad, now a branch line of the C. & O., starting at St. Albans in 1905, was built to Madison by late 1907. First coal shipments from Boone were made in 1909, 3,865 tons by the Coal River Mining Co. of Peytona and 600 tons of cannel coal by Spruce River Coal Co. At one time in the late 1920's, there were some 25 mines operating in the county.

In 1921, when the UMWA was trying desperately to organize the mines of southern West Virginia, several hundred miners marched through this county, seizing a C. & O. train, and engaged the deputized forces of Sheriff Don Chafin of Logan County on Blair Mountain. A company of Federal troops was stationed in Madison during the critical period.

Successful unionization of most all West Virginia coal mines did not occur until Franklin Roosevelt was elected President.

Gradually the number of mine operations in the county decreased as:

Several mines were worked out;

As mine wages and wildcat strikes increased;

As welfare royalty, starting at 20 cents increased to 40 cents; and

As oil became sharply competitive.

There are left in the county the equivalent of five large mines, a stripping operation, and perhaps 20 small truck mines that together may equal another large mine. Whether called mechanization or automation, mine employment in the county has been reduced to one-third of its former status.

The pre-1900 virgin forests that covered the hills of Boone County are no longer virgin, but timber still grows there and timbering still goes on.

The once productive oil industry of Joes Creek still yields a trickle.

Hope Natural Gas Co. continues to drill productive gas wells; also Peake Gas Co. Owens, Libby Owens, South Penn Oil Co., Cabot Gas Co. and United Fuel have large gas producing holdings in the county.

A network of surfaced highway covers the county, including one of the most scenic roads in the State, W. Va. 79 from Boone into Wyoming. What is now 119 reached Madison in 1924. Boone County earned the honor of "Pilot County" in Gov. W. W. Barron's centennial cleanup and beautification program.

While Boone County's population decreased from 33,173 in 1950 to approximately 28,000 in 1963, due to changes in the coal industry, the number of children in grade and high school, not including dropouts, is 7,720. Boone County has a modern, efficient school system, and a hard-working, well-trained group of teachers.

Madison is one of the most attractive county seats in the State, with good people and excellent churches.

The Jobs Order for Negroes: A Two-Edged Sword

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I again call attention of the House to an Executive order signed by the President of the United States, setting up a Board, which arrogates unto itself authority to make judicial findings on alleged discrimination—anywhere in the land—in hiring on jobs in which Federal money in whole or in part is used. This also applies to military installations. The tragic thing about this order, Mr. Speaker, is that it is not based on any law passed by the Congress of the United States.

The effect of such a drastic and unprecedented move will be to hold an economic sword at the heart of every community in America based on the whim of some political order or mandate handed down by this de facto group.

Mr. Speaker, the complete, abject and total surrender of this administration to those who claim to be the spokesmen for the Negroes of America is a two-edged sword. This opens up a Pandora's box which may only be shut by endless civil strife in America. It is a two-edged sword because it will have its effect on election day—everywhere in America.

The eminent columnist, David Lawrence, has written an excellent article on this subject appearng in the Washington Evening Star on Wednesday, June 26. Under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose this well-written article:

THE JOBS ORDER FOR NEGROES—PRESIDENT'S DIRECTIVE SAID TO REQUIRE VIRTUAL DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WHITES

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy may be coming to a turning point in his political career. It could cost him reelection in 1964.

Any issue that touches the home or the pocketbook or the job of a citizen takes precedence over all other questions. No matter what an administration has accomplished in other fields, the voter tends to register a negative verdict if a grievance directly affects his economic future.

The Kennedy administration has opened up a Pandora's box of trouble for itself. An Executive order—which isn't based on a single law passed by Congress—has just been issued requiring that a virtual discrimination against white workers be imposed as a means of removing discrimination against Negro workers.

The new order not only applies to all businessmen having contracts with the Government for goods or services, but extends to contractors for any construction in which Federal funds are in any way involved and to every subcontractor with whom they do business and every company from which they buy raw materials or other products. It is perhaps the most sweeping decree ever issued by any American President without authority given him by Congress or the Constitution. It involves tens of billions of dollars of business transactions which the Government carries on every year by contract or through its programs of loans, grants or insurance of funds for construction of buildings, repairs and alterations, as well as the creation of new highways and repairing old ones.

The political effect of this will not be felt for several months, but—judging by letters received from different parts of the country—it will produce one of the most deep-seated antagonisms known in American politics.

Already a protest is being raised by the white worker who fears he will be displaced at his job, though the order hasn't yet taken effect. But even before its issuance, Negro leaders were demanding that a certain quota of Negroes be hired—they are asking for 25 percent of the work force on all jobs let by New York City to private contractors. This has raised fears that the merit system will be brushed aside by compulsion and that the number of unemployed whites will materially increase. The President's edict reads in part as follows:

"The contractor will take such action with respect to any subcontract or purchase order as the contracting agency may direct as a means of enforcing such provisions, including sanctions for noncompliance."

This includes Government supervision of "employment, upgrading, demotion or transfer," as well as "layoff or termination, rates of pay or other forms of compensation."

The Government order says exemptions will be made but doesn't explain exactly under what circumstances, thus leaving the impression that the purpose of the Executive order is to intimidate all employers. The net effect will be also to frighten white employees about their jobs, and that's where the political impact will begin to spread throughout the country. It is already disturbing many persons directly employed in Government departments, such as the Post Office. A politically motivated employment system cannot succeed even with the best intentions and supposedly high purpose.

Perhaps the most powerful negative force that has been unleashed thus far is in connection with the efforts of governments of Northern States, like New York, to deny all white children the right to go to schools which are attended only by students from their immediate neighborhoods. This may require that quotas of both white and Negro children be transferred considerable distances by bus so as to eliminate "racially imbalanced" schools—defined by the Commissioner of Education of New York State as schools in which the enrollment is more than 50 percent Negro. Already students from the Negro schools in New York City are being moved into predominantly white schools. It is being urged that white children be similarly moved to schools in Negro neighborhoods. All this is allegedly an effort to provide better education for the Negro children.

So if the handling of the school problem causes aggravation among white citizens and if there is an uneasiness among workers as to their future employment, there will doubtless be in the 1964 campaign an exodus of white voters from the Democratic Party in the populous Northern States which have hitherto voted so regularly for that party. Any gain in the Negro vote—which, ever since the relief subsidies of the 1930's has moved over in large part to the Democratic Party—would hardly offset now the loss of white voters.

So it isn't just in the South where the Kennedy administration today is in political trouble. The mass demonstrations have by no means helped the situation for the President. For many such protest parades have been held in the North, where racial friction, though not as widely publicized heretofore, has for the last few years been increasing due to the influx of Negroes in large numbers from the South.

The Kennedy administration, which has been making a direct bid for Negro votes by responding to the demands of Negro leaders, will soon try to find ways to appease the white vote. But the effect of what has already happened can hardly be minimized, and that's why the outlook for the 1964 election contest has suddenly changed from what seemed a certainty to a big uncertainty for the administration.

Peace Corps Volunteers From Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the March-April issue of the Oregon Stater carried a very interesting and informative article about the fine work that Oregon State University graduates are doing all over the world with the Peace Corps. Under unanimous consent, I insert the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THEY JOINED THE PEACE CORPS

(By Howard Matson)

On December 22, at the Union Church in Copacahana, Brazil, Myra McBride, 1959, Peace Corps volunteer, became the wife of fellow Peace Corps member Bob Anderson.

The wedding ceremony was almost a Peace Corp project because most of the families and State-side friends were unable to attend. So, as Myra described it:

"Our brother and sister volunteers did everything for us," she said.

"Our wedding party consisted of a Brazilian host sister a volunteer from Puerto Rico, and a sister volunteer from Michigan. The men assisting were our National Project leader, our medical doctor, and a fellow volunteer from Iowa. The role of 'Father McBride' was ably handled by our Peace Corps representative."

The wedding ceremony of Peace Corps Volunteer Myra McBride came off without a hitch—thanks to the Peace Corps members. And this may simply illustrate the remarkable versatility of member of the Peace Corps. Whether its slogging up a slippery jungle trail to a remote village, teaching children in Africa, or explaining latest agricultural techniques in East Pakistan, the Peace Corps has adapted remarkably well to conditions in foreign countries. And arranging for weddings comes under the heading of things the Peace Corps can do.

At the time this report was made, there were 23 Oregon State alumni who are volunteers in 18 different countries. There are many Oregon State University students who are planning on entering the Peace Corps for the 2-year period of service after graduation or before they graduate.

Mrs. Mabel Mack, 1928, an assistant director of extension services, is the Peace Corps representative on the campus.

Most everyone is familiar with the Peace Corps and what they are trying to do. For a governmental program established by Congress only in September of 1961, there has been a tremendous surge of enthusiasm, publicity, and actual good works in this short period of time.

Briefly, the Peace Corps objectives are to promote world peace and friendship by making available to interested countries Americans who will:

1. Help the people of these countries meet their needs for trained manpower.
2. Help promote a better understanding of the American people on the part of the peoples served.
3. Help promote a better understanding of other peoples on the part of the American people.

To do this the Peace Corps has established a realistic, tough, dedicated program which selects realistic, tough, dedicated people of all ages who have all sorts of skills and talents necessary to help people of other countries advance their standard of living.

The Oregon Stater magazine corresponded with a number of Oregon State University alumni in Peace Corps work. Not all responded to the invitation to write down some of their thoughts about the program and their life. This was understandable, since many of the Oregon Staters are living in remote areas and have few enough hours in a day to fill out another questionnaire.

Indeed, one volunteer wrote: "Please edit the slightly sarcastic tone of some of my replies but at this stage in the game most Peace Corps volunteers have had so many questionnaires thrown at them that one more sometimes seems like the last straw."

However, the information received indicates a Peace Corps volunteer to be intelligent, specialized, devoted to the Peace Corps objectives, and highly altruistic. Any romantic ideas of exotic living in foreign lands of the travel brochures have long since been knocked into a cocked hat by realistic training programs developed by the corps.

Myra McBride Anderson majored in elementary education at Oregon State. She received her first experience living abroad in Japan as an international farm youth exchange student. After graduation, she taught school in Corvallis and then volunteered for the Peace Corps.

She obtained her first training in Washington, D.C. Her second phase of training was in Puerto Rico where she received intensive language instruction and completed a physical conditioning program. As in all Peace Corps training, Myra's training concluded with orientation in the host country before actual work began.

Myra's work first consisted of working with the 4–S clubs (4–H equivalents) in Brazil in the rural Minas Gerais country. Since marriage, Myra has started her second year in the Corps by assisting the 4–S work at the state office in Belo Horizonte.

"We feel that our Peace Corps in the 4–S program is making a small but significant contribution toward helping our neighbors in Brazil. We have only 8 months in the field working with our extension counterparts but we are seeing results.

"The many bumpy kilometers driven over dirt roads, the hours spent in making home visits, the countless cups of coffee drunk in rural homes and time spent to study Portuguese, and so forth is paying dividends in stronger 4–S clubs."

Another Peace Corps veteran doing important work in Kuala Lumpur, Malaya is Willard D. Weiss, 1957. Prior to volunteering, he had worked for 2 years for a Portland engineering firm and was doing graduate work at Oregon State University in structural engineering.

Weiss entered the Peace Corps training at Northern Illinois University in March of 1962 for a 12-week orientation course. He arrived in Malaya in June with a group of 31 volunteers. The Oregon State University engineer is assigned to the Public Works Department of the Federation of Malaya and is doing bridge design.

Weiss says: "Our office is responsible for design of all Federal highway bridges for Malaya. The standards of engineering design are practically equivalent to that of a State highway department in the United States.

"My major acomplishments, besides a number of small jobs, have been the design of a highway bridge at Bentong and an overpass for a new highway junction."

Weiss makes a particular point of showing that the standards of work are high.

"As you can see, it is a far cry from the usual notion of Peace Corps work—groveling in the mud, etc. I think the popular conception of the Peace Corps is still a bit inaccurate."

Why do Americans join the Peace Corps? Well, Willard Weiss had a good reason.

"Basically, I was motivated by a desire to be of service in an area where that service is most urgently needed. Obviously, an engineer can make a valuable contribution to society almost anywhere—even in Portland.

"Rather than serve a society which is already affluent, has all its basic needs satisfied, and is now in need of a higher level of facilities—wouldn't it be better to concentrate on the society that is still struggling to get food in its stomach, roofs over its heads, and clothes on its back"?

Weiss acknowledged that what he says "probably sounds very idealistic." But he goes on to add that "I think it is also very realistic. The various nations of the world are now sufficiently interdependent that we Americans are directly involved with the well-being of countries such as Malaya. Therefore, my assistance in developing Malaya's highway transportation system, is I feel, a responsibility that cannot be denied.

"They (the Malayans) harbor some misconceptions about us—mostly acquired through American movies—but these are not hostile or dangerous in any way, just require adjustment."

In Nigeria, Grace Hamilton, 1959, is teaching zoology and biology at Queen's College, a girls secondary boarding school in Yaba near Lagos. She is part of the sixth installment of a number of volunteers scattered throughout Nigeria.

Grace took her training during October, November, and December at Columbia University Teacher's College and arrived in Nigeria in early January.

She is interested in finding out what it is like to live in other cultures.

She wrote: "The Peace Corps gives more opportunity for a person-to-person exchange than do many assistance programs. Any exchanges for the purpose of good will and strengthening the amenities between peoples of the various countries will tend to magnify the common bonds all people have and to minimize the differences.

"It is harder for people to develop hatreds against each other when they have had first hand contact with one another under amiable conditions. I like to think that I can have some small part in promoting a world condition in which differences can be settled without recourse to war. If I can do my part in helping the Pace Corps idea to succeed, I will be happy."

Miss Hamilton said that at first her experiences in Nigeria were a bit frustrating but that things improved rapidly.

"Odd as it may sound," she said, "my most gratifying experience was demonstrating the dissection of the dogfish brain in preparation for my zoology students doing the same. Anything which one can make real for them gives gratifying results."

She is enthusiastic about the Peace Corps idea and says "the United States can be proud that the Peace Corps concept germinated on American soil."

Volunteer Dale Martin, 1961, is one of 150 Peace Corps members assigned to the Dominican Republic. He is living in San Juan, a farming center of 24,000. At Oregon State he majored in agronomy and animal husbandry. Now he is organizing local boys into 4–H clubs, teaching improved farming and livestock methods in an effort to break the one-crop hold of sugar on which the economy is 70 percent dependent.

Dale remarked: "Rural people are alike throughout the world. I felt at home the first day I got here and I feel more so with each passing day."

One of 600 Peace Corps members assigned to the Philippine Islands, Courtney Lantz, 1960, joined the Peace Corps last June after doing graduate work in meteorology at Oregon State University. He took an intensive 10-week preparatory session in San Francisco before going to the Philippines.

Lantz was the first Peace corpsman to be assigned to Gapan, located northeast of Manila in the central plains of Luzon. He is teaching physics at the Neuva Ecija South High School.

"We were welcomed and accepted with open arms," he said. Lantz has 150 physics students in three classes. "Two years over here will be equivalent to 3 years in college as far as I'm concerned.

"I have no complaints about my students," he added. "I have good ones and bad ones, bright ones and slow ones, energetic ones and lazy ones—just like in the United States or anywhere else in the world."

Other Oregon Staters assigned by country include: Jim and Billie Cairns, 1959, India; Glenn Chambers, 1961, Bolivia; James Chapman, 1961, West Pakistan; Betty Ann Cline, 1957, Philippines; Richard Crist, 1965, Guatemala; Sandra Good, 1961, Peru; Irvan Guss, 1961, British Honduras.

Sandra Johnson, 1961, Malaya; William Mehloff, 1960, Philippines; Preston Minto, 1958, Chile; Ambrosia Noetzel, India; Sara Officer, 1958, Ceylon; Kent Oldenburg, 1960, Colombia; William Russell, Pakistan; Richard A. Smith, 1961, Dominican Republic; Melvin (Tobe) Zweygardt, 1962, Senegal (Africa); Saundra Silverman, Philippines.

In addition, Dr. William Unsoeld, 1951, is deputy area representative for the Peace Corps in Nepal where some 80 American teachers are helping establish vocational high schools, colleges, and agricultural extension units. He is now participating on the American mountain climbing expedition on 29,028-foot Mount Everest.

In a very short time, these alumni will be joined by other Oregon Staters. One student is Curtis Paskett, 1964, who hopes to go to the Virgin Islands.

A senior in agriculture, Dave Hipply, Akron, Ohio, feels that the Peace Corps is a good way to pass on information to others. Reading the book "The Ugly American" opened his eyes to what could be accomplished through a program such as the Peace Corps.

There are approximately 25 Oregon State University students who hope to enter the Peace Corps program within a short time. They will join almost 4,500 Americans who are now overseas. It is expected that this number will almost double by the end of 1963.

The efforts of these Oregon State alumni and the thousands of Americans like them have not passed unnoticed. Every country has asked for double or triple the number of volunteers already at work.

Columbia's President Valencia said in his inaugural address: "The mission which they (volunteers) are furthering is truly extraordinary and meritorious, worthy of continental integration that this Peace Corps which allows a young man from Chicago to know the thoughts of a man from Sabanalarga or Firavitoba."

Certainly, not everyone is enthusiastic over the Peace Corps. Some Americans still believe that this relatively new program must be tried and tested over a longer period of time. Others simply believe it to be another governmental agency which may mushroom into an unwieldy redtaped organization.

However, Oregon State University alumni reporting direct from the field believe the Peace Corps is a very worthwhile program.

"But," as Peace Corps member Willard Weiss notes, "it is a sobering fact that most of the good that is done by volunteers won't be apparent until long after they have left their host country."

Tribute to Admiral McLintock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased indeed to commend to the attention of my colleagues the following tribute to Rear Adm. Gordon McLintock contained in a resolution adopted by the Board of Governors of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy Alumni Association. I have known Admiral McLintock for many years. He is a very able and conscientious man and has done a magnificent job as Superintendent of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy. In that capacity he has brought full accreditation to the Academy, as well as national recognition.

The resolution follows:

On the occasion of the fifteenth anniversary of the superintendency of Rear Adm. Gordon McLintock at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N.Y., the alumni association of the Academy in recognition of his outstanding performance and relationship with the sons of Kings Point, and

Whereas during his tenure in office the Academy has been accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Universities, and

Whereas its graduates now receive a fully accredited Bachelor of Sciences Degree, and

Whereas the Academy received recognition as a permanent Federal educational institution, and

Whereas his personal efforts have resulted in the construction and dedication of the only national memorial chapel to the merchant marine honored dead of World Wars I and II, and

Whereas his efforts have achieved much beneficial legislation for the Academy and the merchant marine, and

Whereas his leadership has inspired the continuing improvement in the Academy curricula to meet the demands and technological advances from a modern and nuclear merchant marine, and

Whereas under his able administration the Academy has undergone modernization of its training facilities to meet the current and future skills of a merchant marine officer in a changing technological profession, and

Whereas he has fostered a program of educational assistance to developing nations thus achieving international recognition for the Academy: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Governors of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy Alumni Association and its chapters represented at its annual meeting held on March 30, 1963 acknowledge and publish in gratitude and in full appreciation the Superintendent's dedication and continuing services to the Academy, the merchant marine and Nation.

Indonesia Moves Toward the West—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the political stance of Indonesia has long been a subject of great concern in this country, and rightly so. Indonesia's population of 97 million people and great potential for economic development make her a country of great importance to the free world. Recently, therefore, many people have been extremely pleased to see a change in direction in Indonesian politics, a shift to a position more favorable to the West. Robert R. Brunn, in the Christian Science Monitor of June 13, outlines some of the features of this new position.

The article follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 13, 1963]

WEST REASSESSES SUKARNO STANCE

(By Robert R. Brunn)

WASHINGTON.—Indonesia has moved strongly to ward the West recently, so much so that President Sukarno's association with Communist China is being fully reassessed.

All the latest developments put together show an almost startling emergence of a new Sukarno stance more favorable to the West. Officials here are cautious but hopeful:

Item: Before the end of July, President Sukarno meets with the Malayan Prime Minister, Prince Abdul Rahman, and President Macapagal of the Philippines to discuss a loose confederation. Obvious aim: to counter any Chinese Communist drive farther into southeast Asia.

Item: An Indonesian economic stabilization program is quietly launched, the result of extensive talks with the International Monetary Fund in Washington. An IMF team heads toward Jakarta shortly to firm up the plan. As this attack on inflation, and economic mismanagement gathers momentum, it gradually should tie the nation closer to the Western economy.

Item: Highly technical plans are going forward to place the Indonesian oil industry under a combination of U.S. private enterprise and gradual rather than drastic nationalization. The successful American mission, headed by Wilson Wyatt, is thought by officials here to have prevented a disastrous deterioration of relations between Washington and Jakarta, and to have prevented Chinese Communist access to the oil.

Item: While in Tokyo recently, President Sukarno went out of his way to seek Japanese aid in bringing Indonesia back into the Western-oriented 1964 Olympic games. The President, after an argument with Israel, Natinalist China, and India had tried to set up his own global games, partly to placate Communist China.

Item: In widely publicized Tokyo talks, the Indonesian President and the Malayan President agreed to stop acrimonious personal exchanges over the formation of the new Malaysian Federation set for August 31. At the three-nation summit talks next month, this problem will be threshed out further, probably with the Malaysians refusing to agree with President Sukarno that the federation should not be formed.

What interests experts on southeast Asia is the Tuesday communique from Manila where the three nations have taken a solid step toward a Malay federation, planning to go into the closest association.

Regular consultations are planned. This new grouping could have the most profound meaning for the anti-Communist movement in southeast Asia. Indonesia, Malaya, and the Philippines are highly conscious of the Chinese Communist pressures on Laos and South Vietnam.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Department of Defense Appropriation Bill, 1964

SPEECH
OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7179) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the committee is to be congratulated on this bill. It meets the situation as effectively as possibly could be done under the circumstances which confront us.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the chairman of the subcommittee, is to be especially felicitated on the manner in which he has handled the bill both in the committee and on the floor.

In my opinion, he knows more about the needs covered by the bill than anybody on the Hill or in the Pentagon. He is an experienced parliamentarian, a practical administrator, and an expert diplomat. He secures results with the least friction of any man I know and that has been particularly true of the handling of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill and the report on this bill mark a new and commendable development. When the final draft was before the subcommittee, it was realized that its significance transcended that of most bills to come before the House in this session of Congress, in that it is in effect a declaration of policy on national defense and international relations, and as such will be taken by the world, by our allies and by our enemies, as an indication of the attitude of the Congress, the administration, and the people of the United States on the course to be followed during the coming year at least.

With this in view the subcommittee agreed unanimously to report the bill with complete agreement on both sides of the aisle, and in accordance with that agreement it comes to the floor with the support of every member of the committee.

Of course, no such bill is entirely agreeable to everybody, but this bill has been so drafted as to come as near being such a bill as general agreement on the part of the committee could make it. The entire committee, composed of experienced men, naturally of many diverse opinions on minor features of the program and its achievement, present this bill for the final consideration of the House. They offer no individual amendments and it is hoped that the Members of the House will accept it and pass it with the same considered unanimity.

By way of résumé, the purpose is to support the President of the United States as the leader and spokesman of the Nation and insofar as this legislation is concerned to support the position he has taken and which he is taking and which he will take in any emergency that may arise in this connection. It is indicative of our unqualified endorsement of our Military Establishment and is to be taken as a token of our determination to support free government both at home and abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has expired.

(Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the several references to Secretary McNamara, the Secretary of Defense, during the course of the debate is directly in point. He is, during war and undeclared war, the most important of the President's advisers. And under his wise and stringent administration the traditional American policy of civilian control has been fully maintained.

Through the years the position has been held by some of our ablest statesmen. But too often they have been mere figureheads. The generals and admirals dictated and the Secretaries of Defense signed on the dotted line.

Generals and admirals always insist on fighting the next war with the weapons of the last war. Symbolically the generals cling to the cavalry and Maginot lines and the admirals to dreadnaughts and carriers. Realists like Gen. Billy Mitchell, Secretary Talbott, Admiral Rickover and all who urged development of missiles and nuclear submarines have been ignored and persecuted and Russia is today 3 years ahead of us. Only the nuclear-driven, missile-firing submarine perfected by Admiral Rickover against every obstacle is keeping the peace of the world.

President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara are at last bringing order to the Pentagon and security to the Nation and have the approval of the committee and, I trust the approval of the House.

Some fear has been expressed here this afternoon that we may not be providing for enough men. If the fortunes of the war are to be determined by the number of divisions in the field then we are hopelessly outclassed by China and Russia. But modern warfare is no longer a matter of massed troops. War is today a matter of mechanics and chemistry. Getting there "fustest with the mostest" is a long since discarded strategy.

This bill gives us what we need and where we need it. It is to be hoped that the House will give the bill and the committee and the President and the Secretary a unanimous vote of approval.

The Vote Against Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, over permission to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of this honorable body to a recent editorial printed in the Oakland Tribune. This newspaper is published by a man who gained considerable stature in the Congress of the United States, former Senator William F. Knowland, and I feel my colleagues will be interested in his remarks:

THE VOTE AGAINST KENNEDY

The victory of a Republican to fill the House seat of the late Democratic Congressman Clyde Doyle in California's 23d District is a matter of profound national significance.

Republican DEL CLAWSON won in a breeze, in spite of the President's recent visit to the Los Angeles area, in spite of the heavily Democratic registration in the district, and in spite of Democratic claims of a split in the Republican Party of California.

CLAWSON'S victory is the second Republican triumph in California this year. Last February Republican DON CLAUSEN won an easy victory in northern California's First Congressional District.

The new Congressman is a moderate conservative, who strongly advocated a more firm policy on Cuba than the Kennedy administration has shown so far; a cutback on foreign aid, and a reduction in Federal spending and taxation.

While it is true that Republicans have won several such special elections, the mere historical capacity of the GOP to mount a powerful off-year campaign does not explain how a Republican could win so handily in a district which contains almost twice as many registered Democrats as Republicans.

These two Republican victories are powerful evidence that the GOP reflects the dreams and aspirations of the average voter, while the New Frontier does not. For 2 years now, the man on the street has watched a politically oriented President formulate his policy with a constant eye on the popularity polls rather than a burning desire to remedy conditions at home and abroad.

The average voter is well aware that the world has been plunged into chronic crisis ever since the Kennedy administration ascended to power. To be sure, there were crises during Ike's administration, but not the relentless, unremitting disharmony that plagues the world today. If you doubt it, ask yourself whether you can remember such nonstop racial violence during Ike's years, or whether you can recollect such a continuous period of international trouble.

The most distinctive earmark of the Kennedy administration has been its incapacity to cope with domestic and international discontent. Beneath the flood of rhetoric from the administration lies a paralysis and lack of idealism, and the voter in the street knows it.

The disappointment of the electorate in the Kennedy administration is now being reflected at the ballot box. Congressman CLAWSON goes to Washington with a powerful mandate.

Independence of Algeria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today Algeria celebrates the first anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the Prime Minister, Ahmed Ben Bella; and His Excellency, the Algerian Ambassador to the United States, Cherif Gellal.

One year has elapsed since the free and independent State of Algeria was proclaimed by a tumultuous and victorious people. Seven and one-half years of war, the bloodbaths and terrorism, which resulted in thousands of casualties, emphasized the will and determination of the Algerian people to gain their freedom. Subjected since 1830 to French imperialism and direct incorporation into the French nation, the people were given the chance on July 1, 1962, to freely choose their future, either to remain a part of the French nation or to elect independence. The outcome was predestined.

During this eventful year, the Algerian Government was faced with mammoth undertakings, problems which had to be corrected immediately. Political instability finally solidified under the leadership of Ahmed Ben Bella. With his guidance, the government attempted to cope with severe famine, unemployment, a bare treasury and economic chaos in general, which resulted from a mass exodus of the French community residing in Algeria. Appealing to the people to follow a program of austerity while, at the same time, calling upon the nations of the world for succor, Ben Bella has managed to bring the national economy into some semblance of order. The major problems remain; but with the United States supplying wheat and other foodstuffs and the French development capital, it is hoped that the Algerian population will soon be able to stand alone by their own efforts and enjoy the freedom for which they fought so long and hard.

Algeria has taken an active role in international affairs. Mr. Ben Bella's policies on Arab unity are closely linked with those of President Nasser of the United Arab Republic. At the same time, Algeria is assuming a dominate position in North Africa by favoring a Maghreb federation among Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia. At the recent Addis Ababa conference of the heads of state of the African nations, here again, Algeria was strongly in the fore. Looked upon as a leading force in Africa, Premier Ben Bella was accorded an ovation when he spoke of African unity and independence for all African territories.

Algeria's future looks bright. Its prestige is guaranteed by the Afro-Asian nations. Oil development in the Sahara will grant unlimited funds for industrialization of the nation. Internal perseverence and aid from its allies and friends will cause the present unstable conditions to disapear. By the progressive plants of its leaders, Algeria is thus assured of a strong democratic and prosperous future.

On its first anniversary of independence, let us in the United States extend our greetings to the people of this democratic North African state and wish them rapid progress and prosperity during the forthcoming year.

Republicans Versus Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, what is the best way to help the Communist Party? Work to defeat Republican candidates in 1964. This is the recommendation of no less an authority than Gus Hall himself, the Soviet-trained general secretary to the CPUSA

Conversely, Hall wrote in the most recent issue of the Sunday Worker, official publication of American Reds, election of Republicans can be expected to bring down on the United States what to Communists is worse than eternal perdition—freedom from Soviet dictates. Although he held to the usual Communist line that both major American political parties have certain ties with imperialists, Hall praised President Kennedy for keeping "lines of communication open" with Russia. J.F.K. atoned for his blockade of Cuba, Hall declared by quarantining Cuban exiles and banning raids, bombings and invasions of Castro's stronghold.

Hall's 10,000-work report, entitled "Political Parties and the 1964 Elections," was particularly praiseworthy of J.F.K.'s handling of civil rights, noting that the President had sent troops into Mississippi and Alabama.

> The recognition of these realities does not make one a partisan or a supporter of the President—

The Communist Party U.S.A.'s No. 1 spokesman said.

> At the same time, they do not isolate us from the broad movement which has relationships with the administration.

The "broad movements," Hall explained, include youth and civil rights groups engaged in "ever more militant mass actions," peace movements and labor organizations. Through all such lines, he added, the Communist Party, U.S.A., can "keep a constant line of contact with administration forces." Hall said that almost all "people's political movements," which is the way the Red-indoctrinated refer to programs they want furthered, operate "within the orbit of the Democratic Party." He urged the "serious left" to support these movements wholeheartedly.

The Hall message, originally delivered in May at a secret meeting of Communist leaders but not made public until last Sunday, directed American Reds to concentrate their attack on rightist forces which are about to "capture the leadership of the Republican Party on all levels." Hall told the Communists not to put up their own candidates in 1964 or support any movement for a new party, but to support "Negro candidates, peace candidates, and labor candidates" in the primaries.

> We can give the ultra-right war forces a trouncing—

Hall said.

> This can be the election that creates the firm foundation for a new political alignment in our country.

Among legislative and judicial "reforms" the Communists must work for, Hall asserted, are the abolition of States rights. He also called for a literal junking of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Customs Censoring of Obscene Literature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Jerry Kluttz which appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, June 9, 1963:

CENSORING OBSCENE LITERATURE IS BECOMING MORE DIFFICULT TASK

(By Jerry Kluttz)

NEW YORK.—In 1930 a public outcry was raised when the Government through the Post Office here, labeled as obscene a picture postcard of the nudes in the Vatican's famed Sistine Chapel.

The Customs Bureau, which has responsibility for screening obscene material brought into the country under the Tariff Act, was directed to pay closer attention to the problem. It assigned Irving Fishman, a young attorney here, to the task.

Now, years later, Fishman is a 56-year-old civil servant who is deputy collector for restricted merchandise and is widely regarded as a leading authority on obscenity. He has been described as the conscience of the Nation on the problem.

The employee has changed with the times. He's grey around the temples, he's a bit stouter, and he's the first to say his thinking and that of his agency also has changed with the years.

"In a job like this," he philosophized in his well-cluttered office, "your thinking must be modern and your actions must be in line with what the public will accept today—not yesterday.

"We can't sit here," he continued, "and apply the same standards to obscenity that we used 25 or even 10 years ago. As individuals we see more, hear more, and read more than we did a few years ago. Dress and other acceptable customs change and we must keep up with them.

The civil servant ran his fingers through his hair and nodded in agreement that his job was difficult. But he hastened to explain that it was relatively easy to spot hardcore pornography such as action pictures of various sex acts, filthy writing, etc.

Most difficult, he added, were the borderline questions which the Bureau must answer such as how much sex is acceptable by the public, and what portion of a book, magazine, or film can be devoted to sex and be acceptable.

STANDARDS APPLIED

Generally, Fishman explained, the Bureau applies two standards in making its decisions and they are (1) Does the material excite prurient interest, a question raised by the Supreme Court, and (2) is it acceptable by community standards?

He conceded that the Bureau was forever groping for the right answers to them and he expressed the hope that the Supreme Court would hand down definitive rulings on what is and isn't obscene.

"We'd love to have more specific rulings by the courts as it would make our jobs easier," Fishman declared, adding, "Now everyone has his own definition of obscenity and rarely do any two agree."

The deputy collector revealed he advocates creation of a citizens' committee of distinguished artists and writers to advise the Bureau on obscenity matters.

"If I'm in doubt on a case," Fishman explained, "I pass it on to Philip Nichols, our Commissioner, and if he, too, has doubts we refer it to Hunington Cairns, General Counsel of the National Gallery of Arts, for an advisory opinion."

He praised Cairns, an authority in the cultural field, for the advice and counsel he had freely given the Bureau on obscenity matters. "I wish we could pay him something but we can't," Fishman remarked.

CHANGES MADE

The civil servant has little patience with importers and others who regard anyone who works for the Government as having never read a book or appreciated a work of art. "These people," he said matter-of-factly, "don't realize the vast changes we have made over the years."

Fishman recalled that every literary classic that mentioned sex and films of foreign boxing matches were considered immoral and were barred from entry into this country when he first took over his job. Furthermore, he added, there were no standards or guidelines for Customs employees to follow to determine what is or isn't obscene.

"I remember asking an inspector," he related, "why he had held up a book and he casually told me he hadn't read it but that it did have several pictures which he thought were suggestive, that the book was very expensive and therefore it must be very bad. Anything that smacked of sex was considered obscene, even a picture of a woman raising her skirt."

But in those early days off-color material wasn't too much of a problem because comparatively little of it reached our shores from abroad.

But today it's vastly different. Sexy pictures, books, magazines and film are big and profitable businesses and the rich American market is the object of nearly all foreign operators in them.

The operators are skillful and resourceful. In fact, some of them want Customs to hold up their material in the hopes of cashing in on a flurry of free publicity that will arouse the public curiosity.

PUBLICITY SOUGHT

A week ago an importer of a foreign movie sent messages to the New York critics to protest that Customs was holding up the film on an obscenity charge even before it had reached the agency. Other importers, through public relations offices, have urged Fishman to delay clearances of their material so they can publicize it.

Nudist magazines that extoll the health aspects of walking around in the sun without clothes must be cleared by Customs under a Supreme Court ruling. But the same provocative and suggestive pictures of nudes in another publication is likely to be banned. One of the new problems facing Customs is what to do about a magazine for homosexuals which is being shipped here.

Much of the questionable material is pictures of sex acts which are sent to individuals, mainly students, by either sealed firstclass or airmail. The letters are usually addressed by hand to make them appear routine.

But the postal clerks learn quick to spot suspect letters and they are sent to another section of the General Post Office here which is staffed by members of Fishman's staff.

CONSENT NEEDED

Customs writes to the addressee and requests authorization to open and inspect the envelope's contents to see if it contains dutiable merchandise. If the addressee refuses, the letters are returned to the sender. If he agrees and the material is ruled obscene, the addressee has the opportunity to have an administrative review of the ruling.

The Bureau here last year confiscated more than 115,000 letters, packages and film which were classified obscene under the 1842 Tariff Act as amended. Eventually, it was all turned over to the Federal Court here which ordered it destroyed by U.S. Marshals.

As I was leaving our interview, Fishman gazed around the ceiling of his office and wondered out loud how much real concern the average citizen has over the growing volume of obscene material. He said he had talked with many Federal and State officials and citizens about it and that they all deplore the drive to get the material in the hands of the Nation's youths but none of them follow up to do anything about it.

"They all just hope someone will come along and sweep it under the rug, but we have a law to enforce and we have to do something about it," he concluded.

Bracero Vital in Salinas Valley

SPEECH

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, recently here in Washington, D.C., Hard-en Krisp brand asparagus was sold for 69 cents a pound, retail. This was a quality product grown in the Salinas Valley in my district. A few braceros assisted in the production of this asparagus. Although the bracero comprised only a small percentage of the total labor force, he was vital. Other labor was not available. Without the bracero, the asparagus would not have been harvested. The return to the farmer was less than 9 cents per pound. The balance of 60 cents for every pound went to labor, braceros, shippers, manufacturers, truckers, suppliers, grocers, and so forth, throughout the United States.

This farmer and a few braceros made it possible for literally thousands of other persons throughout the United States to earn a livelihood and to enjoy healthful and delicious asparagus.

Without this farmer and these few braceros, these thousands of small and large businessmen and employees will suffer losses of employment. Consumers will be deprived of this asparagus.

May I suggest that Members of Congress inquire in their respective districts concerning the numbers of people dependent upon the row crop vegetable industry in my district for their livelihood. Also I would be interested in hearing from a housewife in any congressional district who would prefer the discontinuance of the bracero program if she knew that the supply of salad vegetables would be markedly diminished and the price increased thereby.

I would like to request the Members of Congress to open-mindedly reconsider the bracero program and its many direct and indirect consequnces upon the businessman, employee, and consumer in his own district. I believe he would then find merit in some extension of the bracero program.

Marilyn Hoffman's Report on Her Week in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the number of students from Iowa colleges and universities who participate in the Week in Washington project which I sponsor, in cooperation with the Iowa Center for Education in politics, is increasing. During the week of May 5-11, 1963, Miss Marilyn Hoffman, a student at Upper Iowa University, Fayette, Iowa, was one of the participants. The following is her report on her activities and her impression of this week in the Nation's Capital.

MARILYN HOFFMAN'S REPORT

I flew by American Airline jet to Washington and had a very pleasant trip.

That Sunday evening (May 5) Congressman SCHWENGEL took us (Mike Carver, Juris Poncius, Judie Moellering, and myself) to the National Gallery of Art where we saw a string quartet perform and toured the Gallery. We then went to the Lincoln Memorial. We went below to see where a Lincoln Museum is planned and to the top of the Memorial which gave a panoramic view of Maryland, Virginia, and Washington, D.C.

On Monday, May 6, we met Congressman's SCHWENGEL's staff, looked through his mail, and had our pictures taken with him which appeared in the Des Moines Register. We then went to the Library of Congress and met with Dr. Hugh Elsbree, Director of Legislative Reference. We had a most informative tour of the Library and met with David Mearns, head of the Manuscript Division. He took us into the manuscript vaults where we saw the original writings of Presidents, political leaders of the United States, and American authors and poets. I was impressed with the personal diary of James Madison at the Constitutional Convention.

In the afternoon we went to the Supreme Court. Our guide was one of the clerks to one of the Justices so he was most informative. I was awed by the Court since it is one of my major interests in the political scheme of things. Afterwards we attended House sessions.

That evening the four of us went to the cinerama, "How the West Was Won," which was excellent.

On Tuesday, May 7, we went to the subcommittee hearing of the Public Works Committee of which Mr. Schwengel is a member. James Wright, of Texas, was the chairman. I then went to visit Representative Quie, of Minnesota, who is a personal friend of the family. Judie and I then went to the Senate Committee on Commerce of which Senator Bartlett, of Alaska, is chairman.

I then visited a friend who is a legislative assistant to Congressman Quie. He gave me a tour of American, George Washington, and Georgetown Universities.

That evening Congressman and Mrs. Schwengel took Judie and me to a cocktail party for Congressmen and their wives that were elected to the 84th Congress. There was a cocktail hour first and then we attended a private showing of a motion picture that hasn't been released to the public yet. This picture was about the Strategic Air Command. Afterward a lavish buffet was held.

On Wednesday morning Julie and I attended a congressional secretaries' prayer breakfast. Then all four of us attended a Department of State briefing. A career officer of the Foreign Service gave us a tour of the State Department building. We were able to see Secretary of State Dean Rusk's office as well as the Under Secretaries of State.

We visited Senator Miller and the five of us had our picture taken with him. We then attended House and Senate sessions. After this we visited with Congressman H. R. Gross and had a delightful discussion concerning foreign aid and policy.

Thursday, Julie and I received a wonderful tour of the White House. The White House was so impressive in its new decor. President Kennedy and his family were upstairs but unfortunately we were not able to see them.

Juris and I then went to the Democratic national headquarters where we met Dick Rausch and Jim Hunt, national Young Democratic college director. We had a most interesting conversation and Mr. Hunt asked me if I would like to help at the national Young Democrats convention next fall at Las Vegas. Needless to say, I did not refuse.

At noon the four of us were the dinner guests of Congressmen Smith and Schwengel. Mr. James T. Clark, clerk to the District of Columbia Committee was also a guest. He is a brother of the professor (Dr. Charles B. Clark) I work for at upper Iowa and was very glad that I got to met him.

Mike, Juris, Judie and I then visited with Senator Hickenlooper which we enjoyed. Judie and I attended Senate sessions where we just happened to meet 44 West Point Cadets. We then went to House and Senate committee hearings.

On Friday, May 10, we went to the Public Works Committee in the House and later in the morning we met Congressman John Brademas, of Indiana, after trying to track him down for 4 days.

In the afternoon Judie and I visited the Russian Embassy. Our guide was a young man who had only been in the United States 2 months and was head of the cultural division. He gave us a great deal of Russian literature on their stands such as their position in the United Nations, disarmament, etc. He was quite surprised when I started to converse with my limited Russian vocabulary. Incidentally, the whole Embassy was carpeted in red. Afterward we returned to the House and attended a hearing of the Health, Education, and Welfare Committee.

On Saturday, May 11, we flew back on an American jet.

Among the many Senators and Representatives I met were Senators Douglas, Morse, Humphrey, McCarthy, Yarborough, Bible, Miller, Hickenlooper, and Inouye. The Representatives were Green, Hall, Ford, Bromwell, McCormack, Udall, Wright, Ullman, Brademas, Quie, Albert, and Lankford. These were not all of the Congressmen that I met; however, I cannot remember all of them.

It is very hard to single out any particular thing that I saw as everything was so impressive. It awed and fascinated me and most of all furthered my aim to be the best citizen possible. Ever since I was about 5 years old I have wanted to be a lawyer and would like to specialize in international law. I also love politics and if the opportunity presents itself possibly someday I will run for one of the Houses of Congress. I have already mentioned the deep impact of the Supreme Court on me.

This trip strengthened my deep faith in the American system of government, its institutions and traditions. Everything gave me a profound sense of being a good citizen working for the betterment of the United States and of all mankind.

I cannot begin to thank the Iowa Center for Education in Politics, the Democratic Party of Iowa, and Congressman Schwengel, his wife, and his staff enough for all the consideration they have shown me. I am truly grateful for all the appreciation shown me.

When Virginia Joined the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an article entitled "When Virginia Joined the Union," prepared by the distinguished newspaper editor, Mr. J. J. Kilpatrick, and which was printed on the editorial page of the Richmond News Leader, June 25, 1963, as follows:

When Virginia Joined the Union

One of the greatest dramas in American political history came to its climax here in Richmond 175 years ago today, when Virginia ratified the Constitution of the United States.

To re-read the debates of the convention of 1788 is to find oneself caught irresistibly in the unfolding of a play on some vast historic stage. Among the delegates were a dozen of the greatest figures of the Revolutionary period—Patrick Henry, Edmund Pendleton, James Madison, John Marshall, James Monroe, Edmund Randolph, George Mason, George Wythe, Henry Lee, William Grayson, and George Nicholas. They met in the New Academy on Shockoe Hill, and for 3 weeks of brilliant and often passionate argument, they subjected the proposed new Constitution to exhausting debate.

In the end, Virginia ratified. The vote was 89 to 79. A switch of half a dozen votes from the Madison-Pendleton Federalists to the Henry-Mason anti-Federalists would have kept Virginia, at least temporarily, out of the new Union. It is not too much to say that such a change in the vote would have stopped the infant Nation in its tracks. Virginia was then the most powerful State in the Confederation. Without her concurrence, Georgia and South Carolina would have been separated from sister States to the north, and most likely North Carolina would not have agreed at all.

But the vote was to enter the Union. Madison and Pendleton won, and Henry and Mason lost, but the antagonists mutually left to posterity a fascinating example of shrewd prophecy, keen insight, and learned debate on the towering questions of the role of government in a free society.

The student of American history who is not familiar with Elliot's "Debates of the Virginia Convention" owes himself the pleasure of re-reading these superlative addresses. David Robertson, a leading shorthand reporter of the post-Revolutionary period, took the speeches down as they fell from the orators' lips. In 1828, Jonathan Elliot published a five-volume edition of proceedings attendant upon adoption of the Constitution.

The Virginia Debates, in 487 pages, form volume II of the series; they are by far the best of the several reports. Out of the yellowing pages, the figures emerge with a startling and immediate clarity—the brooding, doubting Randolph; the soft-spoken and scholarly Madison; Mason of the golden tongue; the sober Marshall; and dominating the whole play, as statesman, prophet, Shakespearean actor, the eloquent figure of Patrick Henry, chief foe of the Constitution.

The Convention was called to order on Monday, June 2, 1788. Pendleton, though he was well known to be an ardent supporter of the Constitution, was elected unanimously as the Convention's president. It was the last moment of harmony the convention was to experience.

Monday and Tuesday passed in the routine business of organizing the Convention, considering contested elections, and naming committees. A little before noon on the morning of Wednesday, the fourth, the Convention resolved itself into a committee of the whole, with George Wythe, teacher and jurist, in the chair.

A brief skirmish followed at once, as the sides tested each other. Patrick Henry moved to explore the authority of the Convention at Philadelphia in 1787 to draft an entirely new Constitution, rather than merely to revise the Articles of Confederation. Pendleton moved swiftly to head off an exercise in futility; he could not find any degree of propriety in reading those papers. Henry withdrew his motion, quite content at having nettled an old antagonist so early in the game. The preamble and the first sections of article I were read.

Wilson Nicholas, a proponent of ratification, opened the debate with a long and tedious discussion of the Constitution's provisions for a House of Representatives. He wandered over the whole scene, reviewing legislative bodies from the reigns of Edward I in England and Louis XI in France. He attempted to anticipate the objection that the proposed new Congress would usurp powers of the State legislatures. He thought this most unlikely. At last he subsided, and Henry obtained the floor.

It must have been an electric moment, of the kind known in every parliamentary body. Henry had just passed his 52d birthday, but he was prematurely old. He had served twice as Governor, holding the office for 5 years, and had gained a reputation as the State's foremost orator. His hostility to the Constitution had been the talk of Virginia for the past 9 months.

"Mr. Chairman," he began, "the public mind, as well as my own, is extremely uneasy." A year ago, in the summer of 1787, the people were in a perfect repose. What extreme danger could justify the drastic measures here proposed? The object was to sever the confederacy by which the States had been bound together. And for what? Is the real existence of the country threatened?

Henry laid down the theme he was to develop constantly for the next 3 weeks: "This proposal of altering our Federal Government is of a most alarming nature. You ought to be extremely cautious, watchful, jealous of your liberty; for instead of securing your rights, you may lose them forever. If this new Government will not come up to the expectation of the people, and they should be disappointed, their liberty will be lost, and tyranny must and will arise."

Then Henry pounced upon the preamble fashioned by members of the Convention of 1787. He had the highest veneration for those gentlemen, but, sir, what right had they to say "We, the people?" Who authorized them to speak the language of "We, the people," instead of "We, the States"? If the States are not the agents of this compact, then the instrument must provide for one great consolidated national government. He yielded the floor.

Henry's opening barrage had been unexpectedly brief. Gov. Edmund Randolph, 35, a handsome figure of a man, arose to reply. He had been a Delegate to the 1787 Convention; he had there refused to sign the proposed new Constitution; he had distributed a public letter outlining his objections to it. Now he had reversed his position completely. Eight States already had ratified. Only one more was necessary to bring the Constitution into operation. Obviously, the Union would be formed, but if Virginia refused to accede, the Union would be as promptly dissolved. "And I will assent to the lopping of this limb [meaning his arm]before I assent to the dissolution of the Union."

Randolph (and later Madison and Pendleton) then sought to brush aside Henry's attack on the preamble. Plainly, "We, the people" was to be understood to mean "We, the people of each ratifying State," for no State would be bound by the Constitution unless it agreed. He thought Henry's objection trivial. Randolph's speech was strong, but it was short of the violent exchange that later was to see the two Virginians inches apart in white-faced fury.

George Mason obtained the floor, for the first truly brilliant speech of the Convention. He was then 63, an aristocrat, cynic, critic, intellectual. The very idea of converting what was formerly a confederation into a consolidated government seemed to him totally subversive of every principle which hitherto had governed the confederation. This power is calculated to annihilate totally the State governments. These two concurrent powers cannot exist long together; the one will destroy the other, and because the General Government will be in every respect more powerful than the States, the latter must give way to the former. Was there even an instance in history of a General National Government extending over so extensive a country, with such a variety of climates and local interests, in which the people retained their liberty?

Mason spoke for no more than half an hour, before Madison ended the day's proceedings with a few conciliator remarks, but the lines of the conflict had been clearly established. The overriding questions went to the people's liberties: Would they be kept secure under a new Constitution that contained no Bill of Rights? Second, could the States prevent the Central Government from assuming such massive powers that a national despotism would result?

Pendleton opened debate on the fifth by denying that the new government would result in despotism. The power delegated to the central authority extends only to the general purposes of the Union. "It does not intermeddle with the local particular affairs of the States." Could the Congress make a law controlling the transfer of property in Virginia? Plainly not. He wondered how any gentleman could conceive an idea of a possibility of the former's destroying the latter.

Henry Lee, of Westmoreland, the incomparable "Lighthorse Harry," obtained the floor briefly, in order to goad Henry with a burst of savage sarcasm. He had expected Henry to demonstrate that eclat and brilliancy which had so distinguished him in the past, but had heard nothing but an expression of horrors and apprehensions which had left the gentleman tremblingly fearful for the fate of the Commonwealth. Had the gentleman come to judge, or merely to alarm?

"Mr. Chairman," replied Henry, "I am much obliged to the very worthy gentleman for his encomium."

Then, for the space of several hours, Henry turned the full eloquence of his oratorical powers and the full range of his mind to the pending proposal as a whole. He was to speak many times again before the Convention adjourned, but his address of June 5 summed up the whole of his position.

His first argument was that men who wish to preserve their liberty must always be suspicious of government. Was it suggested that our magistrates be freely trusted? Sir, he cried, suspicion is a virture, as long as its object is the preservation of the public good, and as long as it stays within proper bonds. "Guard with jealous attention the public liberty. Suspect everyone who approaches that jewel."

He referred to certain provisions, later to be thoroughly discussed, by which the Central Government could put down licentiousness, tumult, and riot. The new form of government, he acknowledged, might effectively prevent this, yet there is another thing it will as effectually do: It will oppress and ruin the people. "I am not well versed in history, but I will submit to your recollection, whether liberty has been destroyed most often by the licentiousness of the people, or by the tyranny of rules? I imagine, sir, you will find the balance on the side of tyranny."

Henry's dominant theme was power. All power, he foresaw, ultimately would end in the hands of the Central Government. What then? Will the oppressor let go of the oppressed? Was there ever an instance? Can the annals of mankind exhibit one single example, where rulers overcharged with power, willingly let go the oppressed? The willing relinquishment of power is one of those things which human nature never was, nor ever will be, capable of.

It was said that the new Constitution provided adequate checks and balances against such a catastrophe. Henry denounced the idea. "There will be no checks, no real balances, in this Government. What can avail your specious, imaginary balances, your rope-dancing, chain-rattling, ridiculous ideal checks and contrivances?"

What was the primary object of changing the Government? Was it merely to achieve union? He counted himself a friend of union. "I am a lover of the American union; the dissolution of the union is most abhorent to my mind; but, sir, the first thing I have at heart is American liberty, the second thing is American union."

Henry liked no part of the proposed Constitution. In colorful, biting phrases, he swept the instrument fore and aft. The provisions relating to the judiciary had been praised, "but on examination you will find this judiciary oppressively constructed." The President had been given very great powers—the powers of a king. "If your American chief be a man of ambition and abilities, how easy it is for him to render himself absolute. The Army is in his hands, and the President in the field at the head of his army can prescribe the terms on which he shall reign master. Your militia will leave you and assist in making him king, and fight against you; and what have you to oppose this force? What then will become of you and your rights? Will not absolute despotism ensue?"

When Henry at last took his chair that Thursday afternoon, the Convention of 1788 had been badly shaken. Governor Randolph was plainly irritated. "Mr. Chairman," he said testily, "if we go on in this irregular manner, instead of 3 to 6 weeks, it will take us 6 months to decide this question." He adjourned the day's proceedings, and on the following day took the floor himself to respond to Henry's attack.

This was Randolph's great speech beginning, "Mr. Chairman, I am a child of the Revolution." In masterful fashion, he defended the necessity for a new Constitution, defined the flaws of the old Confederation, insisted that the powers delegated to the Central Government were necessary for the formation of a strong and adequate authority.

So the debates continued. Patrick Henry and George Mason foresaw abuse of the Federal Government's power of direct taxation. Francis Corbin and James Madison discounted the possibility. Corbin thought "no danger was to be apprehended from the power of direct taxation, since there was every reason to believe it would be very seldom used." Henry did not believe it: "The splendid maintenance of the President and of the Members of both Houses, and the salaries and fees of the swarm of officers and dependents of the Government will cost this continent immense sums."

With biting invective, Henry turned on Randolph personally. Randolph once had opposed the Constitution. Now he supported it. "This seems to me strange and unaccountable. Something extraordinary must have operated to produce so great a change in his opinion." Randolph had painted a terrible picture of the dangers to which Virginia would be subjected, from within and without, if she refused to ratify. "I am not acquainted with the arts of painting. Some gentlemen have a peculiar talent for them. They are practiced with great ingenuity on this occasion."

An angry Randolph replied: "I find myself attacked in the most illiberal manner by the honorable gentleman. I disdain his aspersions, and his insinuations. His asperity is warranted by no principle of parliamentary decency, nor compatible with the least shadow of friendship; and if our friendship must fall, let it fall, like Lucifer, never to rise again." Randolph read the text of his public letter of the preceding fall, objecting to the Constitution, and in a gesture of contempt threw it upon the clerk's table "for the inspection of the curious and malicious."

During the second week of the convention, debate turned again to the prospective fate of the States. Monroe was strongly impressed with the necessity of having a firm national government, but this one, he thought, must end in tyranny. Was it possible, he asked, for the Congress to fashion laws that would operate fairly upon such different States? Would the men of Georgia understand the situation of the people of New Hampshire? He could see no real checks upon the Government.

Madison, speaking so quietly that the shorthand reporter often had difficulty in hearing him, repeatedly insisted that the Central Government would not overwhelm the States: "Will any gentleman compare the number of persons which will be employed in the General Government with the number of those which will be in the State governments? The number of dependents upon the State government will be infinitely greater than those on the General Government. I may say with truth that there never was a more economical government in any age or country, nor which will require fewer hands, or give less influence."

Patrick Henry came roaring back at Madison: "The State governments, says he, will possess greater advantages than the General Government, and will consequently prevail. His opinion and mine are diametrically opposite. Bring forth the Federal allurements, and compare them with the poor, contemptible things that the State legislatures can bring forth. A constable is the only man who is not obliged to swear paramount allegiance to this beloved Congress. On the other hand, there are rich, fat Federal emoluments—your rich, snug, fine, fat Federal offices, the number of collectors of taxes and excises will outnumber anything from the States. Who can cope with the excisemen and taxmen?"

William Grayson, of Prince William County, a brilliant countryman and soldier, supported Henry's position. Madison had pointed to constitutional provisions prohibiting Members of the Congress from being appointed to other Federal offices. The Senate's powers of confirmation would act upon the growth of Presidential powers. Grayson was not convinced: "Is there any clause to hinder them from giving offices to uncles, nephews, brothers, and other relations and friends?" The contentions of Marshall and Pendleton that good men would be chosen for Federal office made no impression on Grayson. The followers of Cromwell must have used the same argument; other factions in times past had pleaded the excellence of human nature to justify the delegation of power. "But power ought to have such checks and limitations as to prevent bad men from abusing it; it ought to be granted on a supposition that men will be bad, for it may be eventually so."

Henry concurred: "Too much suspicion may be corrected. If you give too little power today, you may give more tomorrow. But the reverse of the proposition will not hold. If you give too much power today, you cannot retake it tomorrow—for tomorrow will never come for that purpose."

Scarcely a provision of the Constitution escaped the critics' fire. They did not like the idea of a District of Columbia. Said Mason: "It may be a sanctuary for the blackest crimes." They did not like the creation of a Vice President. "The Vice President," said Mason, "appears to me to be not only an unnecessary but a dangerous officer." They did not like the clause giving the Supreme Court jurisdiction over all cases "arising under the Constitution."

"What objects will not this expression extend to?" asked Mason. "Such laws may be formed as will go to every object of private property. When we consider the nature of these [Federal] courts, we must conclude that their effect and operation will be utterly to destroy the State governments."

Grayson agreed with Mason: "The jurisdiction of all cases arising under the Constitution, and the laws of the Union, is of stupendous magnitude. It is impossible for human nature to trace its extent. This Court has more power than any court under heaven. One set of judges ought not to have this power—and judges particularly who have temptation always before their eyes."

Even Randolph expressed grave misgivings: "What do we mean by the words, 'arising under the Constitution'? What do they relate to? I conceive this to be very ambiguous. If my interpretation be right, the word 'arising' will be carried so far that it will be made use of to aid and extend the Federal jurisdiction."

By Monday, June 23, the Convention's temper was badly frayed. Henry and Madison had quarreled publicly. George Nicholas so roundly insulted Henry that Pendleton had to restore order. One rough countryman, weary of Patrick Henry's "bugbears and hobgoblins," among them an apprehension for the validity of Indian purchases, noisily suggested that "if the gentleman does not like this Government, let him go and live among the Indians."

On Tuesday, the 24th, so violent a storm arose that the convention had to suspend for a time, while thunder crashed around Shockoe Hill. In the later afternoon, agreement finally was hammered out between the contending sides upon a resolution of ratification, expressly reserving the right of the people of Virginia to resume their powers "whensoever the same shall be perverted to their injury or oppression," and asserting that "every power not granted remains with them and at their will." The resolution conveyed Virginia's understanding that "among other essential rights, the liberty of conscience and of the press cannot be canceled, abridged, restrained, or modified by any authority of the United States." Twenty specific amendments to the Constitution, in the nature of a bill of rights, were prepared for recommendation.

On Wednesday, the 25th, the first decisive vote was taken. Henry's forces moved to postpone ratification until a further convention of all the States could be called for adoption of a bill of rights. They lost, 88–80. The final vote on ratification then was taken immediately. One delegate, David Patteson, switched from Henry's side to Pendleton's, and the Constitution was ratified 89–79.

In one sense, the historic vote was anticlimactic. Apparently unknown to the Virginia delegates, the new Union already had come into being the previous Saturday, when New Hampshire became the ninth State to ratify. But the role of Virginia, largest and wealthiest of the States, was so vital to the undertaking that Federalists set up a cry of rejoicing. A month later, on July 26, New York reluctantly came along by a convention vote of 30–27; the later ratifications of North Carolina, in the winter of 1789, and Rhode Island in the spring of 1790, made all of the "13 separate sovereignties," as Madison always called them, equal parties to a compact that now binds 50 indestructible States to an indestructible Union.—J.J.K.

Bishop Lichtenberger Suggests a Positive Program for Individual Involvement in Civil Rights Struggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Most Reverend Arthur Lichtenberger, presiding bishop of our Nation's 3,500,000 Episcopalians, calls for active support in racial protests against present injustice. He advocates all immediate efforts to assist Negroes in their legitimate cry for human rights. Bishop Lichtenberger says, "Only as we take every step possible to join with each other across lines of racial separation in a common struggle for justice will our unity in the spirit become a present reality." He urges an unmistakable identification of the church, at all levels of its life, with those who are victims of oppression.

His is a fine example of direct, forceful leadership being taken in the vital area of civil rights. Specific measures he suggests are: first, personal involvement in community problems; second, financial assistance; and, third, direct action to correct the injustice. The text of his Whitsunday message on this issue follows:

WHITSUNDAY MESSAGE FROM PRESIDING BISHOP

(By the Most Reverend Arthur Lichtenberger)

Recent events in a number of American communities—Birmingham, Chicago, Nashville, New York, and Raleigh, to mention only the most prominent—underscore the fact that countless citizens have lost patience with the slow pace of response to their legitimate cry for human rights. Pleas of moderation or caution about timing on the part of white leaders are seen increasingly as an unwillingness to face the truth about the appalling injustice which more than a tenth of our citizens suffer daily. While we are thankful for the progress that has been made, this is not enough.

Our church's position on racial inclusiveness within its own body and its responsibility for racial justice in society has been made clear on many occasions by the general convention. But there is urgent need to demonstrate by specific actions what God has laid on us. Such actions must move beyond expressions of corporate penitence for our failures to an unmistakable identification of the church, at all levels of its life, with those who are victims of oppression.

I think of the words we sing as we hail the ascended Christ, "Lord and ruler of all men," and of our prayers at Whitsuntide as we ask God to work His will in us through His Holy Spirit. And then in contrast to our praises and our prayers our failure to put ourselves at the disposal of the Holy Spirit becomes painfully clear. Only as we take every step possible to join with each other across lines of racial separation in a common struggle for justice will our unity in the spirit become a present reality.

It is not enough for the church to exhort men to be good. Men, women, and children are today risking their livelihood and their lives in protesting for their rights. We must support and strengthen their protest in every way possible, rather than give support to the forces of resistance by our silence. It should be a cause of rejoicing to the Christian community that Negro Americans and oppressed peoples everywhere are displaying a heightened sense of human dignity in their refusal to accept second-class citizenship any longer.

The right to vote, to eat a hamburger where you want, to have a decent job, to live in a house fit for habitation: these are not rights to be litigated or negotiated. It is our shame that demonstrations must be carried out to win them. These constitutional rights belong to the Negro as to the white, because we are all men and we are all citizens. The white man needs to recognize this if he is to preserve his own humanity. It is a mark of the inversion of values in our society that those who today struggle to make the American experiment a reality through their protest are accused of disturbing the peace—and that more often than not the church remains silent on this, our greatest domestic moral crisis.

I commend these specific measures to your attention:

1. I would ask you to involve yourselves. The crisis in communities North and South in such matters as housing, employment, public accommodations, and schools is steadily mounting. It is the duty of every Christian citizen to know fully what is happening in his own community, and actively to support efforts to meet the problems he encounters.

2. I would also ask you to give money as an expression of our unity and as a sign of our support for the end of racial injustice in this land. The struggle of Negro Americans for their rights is costly, both in terms

of personal sacrifice and of money, and they need help.

3. I would ask you to take action. Discrimination within the body of the church itself is an intolerable scandal. Every congregation has a continuing need to examine its own life and to renew those efforts necessary to insure its inclusiveness fully. Diocesan and church-related agencies, schools and other institutions also have a considerable distance to go in bringing their practices up to the standard of the clear position of the church on race. I call attention to the firm action of the recent convention of the Diocese of Washington which directed all diocesan-related institutions to eliminate any discriminatory practices within 6 months. It further requested the bishop and executive council to take steps necessary to disassociate such diocesan- and parish-related institutions from moral or financial support if these practices are not eliminated in the specified time. I believe we must make known where we stand unmistakably.

So I write with a deep sense of the urgency of the racial crisis in our country and the necessity for the church to act. Present events reveal the possible imminence of catastrophe. The entire Christian community must pray and act.

Independence of Rwanda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today the Republic of Rwanda celebrates the first anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Republic of Rwanda, Gregoire Kayibanda; and His Excellency, the Rwanda Ambassador to the United States, Lazare Mtakaniye.

Until news of its approaching independence on July 1, 1962, reached the press few people had ever heard of the Republic of Rwanda. Bounded on the west by the Republic of the Congo, on the north by Uganda, on the east by Tanganyika, on the south by Burundi to which it was formerly joined in U.N. trusteeship, it is a tiny mountainous country nearly lost in the huge expanse of the African Continent. Rwanda is a land of rich natural beauty, a region of contrast, with high mountains in the north and west sloping sharply down to the shores of Lake Kivu.

It was just a year ago on July 1 that the Belgian flag came down and the new red, yellow, and green flag with a large "R" on it was hoisted in ceremonies marking the independence of this tiny republic of 2,500,000 people. The capital of Kigali was joyous, for independence meant the end of more than 70 years of foreign rule, first as a German colony and then as a Belgian mandate and trust territory.

Rwanda was once before an independent state, prior to the German occupation. The story of its early history is, in fact, as fascinating tale of successive waves of conquest which determined the ethnic composition of the country and its social, economic, and political structure. The original inhabitants of Rwanda, the Twa, a race related to the pygmies, today represent less than 1 percent of the total population. They are chiefly hunters and pottery-makers who live in small groups which have little contact with each other and with the other ethnic groups of Rwanda.

The first wave of conquest, dating to an early period, brought to Rwanda the Hutu, a Bantu race which came from the north and northeast and which today comprises approximately 85 percent of the Rwanda population. The Hutu were a farming people who, with the introduction of coffee as a cash crop by the Belgians, have become coffee planters.

The last African conquerors of Rwanda, the Tutsi, a people of Hamitic origin, entered the country probably sometime in the 15th century, presumably from the region of the headwaters of the Nile. Although they were far inferior in numbers to the already established Hutu, because they had cattle—a commodity in great demand among the Hutu—they easily established a system of feudal control over the numerically stronger race. This feudal system lasted nearly until independence.

Independence for Rwanda was a revolutionary step both in terms of political and of social change, for events in the few years prior to independence brought the Hutu to the ascendancy that was properly theirs as the numerical majority. In January 1961 the Hutu parties proclaimed the deposition of the Tutsi king and established a republic with an elective president. Fears that violence would break out between Hutu and Tutsi on independence was not realized. Since independence Rwanda has been moving steadily along the path of democratic government and peaceful development.

On the first anniversary of their independence we congratulate President Kayibanda and the Rwandan people for their success in working together toward the achievement of their goals as an independent state and a respected member of the world community.

The Problems Presented by Termination of the Bracero Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently, the California Feature Service carried a very comprehensive article on problems created by the termination of Public Law 78, the bracero program, previously rejected by this body. Where I am positive one of the prime reasons for previous rejection was due to a lack of complete understanding of the program, I feel it is mandatory that those of us affected by and familiar with the program in California should present articles or information in the RECORD for the other Members' evaluation. I believe this article by Mr. James Dorais, a well-known civic and political leader of San Francisco, provides a broad spectrum of information that I submit for the reading of my colleagues:

(By James Dorais)

Who will provide the hard stoop labor required to harvest California's specialty crops—tomatoes, melons, strawberries, lettuce, and the like—now that Congress has killed the bracero program.

Termination of Public Law 78, which authorized employment of Mexican farmworkers in the United States for temporary periods, raises the serious question of whether California farms devoted to the growing of specialty crops will have to be diverted to cotton, grain and other crops in surplus supply. If California is to continue to be an important source of vegetable production for U.S. consumers, someone will have to come up soon with an answer to the problem of who will replace the braceros during the peak harvest periods.

LOOKING THE OTHER WAY

Organized labor, which pushed hard for congressional action to terminate the agreement with Mexico, has been strangely silent. The reason, obviously, is that very few American workers can be found, unemployment or no unemployment, who are willing to undertake this hard, seasonal work.

An assembly bill to put the State in the farmworker recruitment business has been given the "interim committee study" kiss of death. Apparently the plan was considered too costly to be of any practical benefit.

The State department of employment is relaxing child labor rules to encourage high school boys to take to the fields to harvest crops. But under the relaxed restrictions, they could work only 6 hours a day, every other day. On alternate days, apparently, the berries would be picked by the birds.

GREEN CARD INFLUX

The most likely replacement for bracero is the "green card" Mexican immigrant.

A green card man—so-called because of the color of his alien registration card—is a Mexican national who enters the United States under an immigrant visa. Unlike the bracero, who had a contract for a specified period of employment and had to return when the contract expired, the green card worker need only be armed with an offer of employment. Once here, he does not have to accept the offer, nor does he have to return. Unlike the bracero, he may bring his wife and family, and become a permanent resident.

Last year, some 54,952 green cards were issued by U.S. immigrant authorities to Mexican nationals. It is estimated that the great majority of them remained in this country, mostly in California.

There is no U.S. quota on immigrants from Mexico. With the death of the bracero program, an enormous increase in green card immigrants can be expected. At the end of the harvest season, most of them will drift to the large cities to compete with U.S. workers for industrial jobs.

Independence of Burundi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today the Kingdom of Burundi celebrates the first anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excllency, Mwami Mwambtsa IV; and His Excellency, Joseph Mbazumutima, the Burundi Ambassador to the United States.

On July 1, 1962, just a year ago, the Kingdom of Burundi, together with its sister republic, Rwanda, emerged as an independent nation. Few of Burundi's approximately 3 million people had ever been outside this tiny country snuggled peacefully in the mountains of central Africa, for the steeply rising Mountains of the Moon served to isolate Burundi from the rest of the world.

Since independence, however, Burundi has been thrust onto the world scene and has taken up its responsibilities as an independent nation on the African Continent and as a member of the world community. On September 18, 1962, Burundi was admitted to membership in the United Nations. In May 1963 Burundi's constitutional monarch, Mwambtsa IV, was among the more than 30 African heads of state who attended the Addis Ababa Conference, called for the purpose of drafting an African unity charter. In addition, there has been some discussion of Burundi's eventually joining an East African federation. Now that it has taken its place among the sovereign nations of the world Burundi can no longer remain in isolation behind the Mountains of the Moon.

The capital of Burundi, Usumbura, is a pretty town scenically situated at the northern tip of Lake Tanganyika. Almost all types of tropical plants thrive there, and there are flowers and flowering trees everywhere the year round. The town itself, which is a colorful, interestingly-planned town somewhat reminiscent of small towns in southern California, stretches along the shores of the lake and backs up a gentle hillside. To the east of Usumbura the mountains rise steeply to 8,000 feet, continuing as rolling hills to the border of Tanganyika.

Agriculture is the chief economic activity of Burundi, and the rolling hillsides are intensively cultivated and terraced. Burundi's main products are coffee, cotton, and hides; the country depends on them for the foreign exchange needed to purchase industrial products and equipment.

In contrast to the turbulence which independence brought to another former Belgian dependency, the Congo, calm has prevailed in Burundi during its first year of independence. The atmosphere was set by King Mwambtsa IV at the Burundi independence celebrations last July when he appealed to the Africans and to the foreigners in Burundi to "work together in a common effort to make this Burundi a peaceful, hardworking, prosperous, and perfectly happy country." At the same time he called on the government to "pursue this difficult task that Belgium hands over to us today to create resources without which our country would go to ruin."

On the first anniversary of their independence we commend King Mwambtsa IV and the people of Burundi for their untiring dedication to the goals set on independence day. They have pursued diligently the difficult task of creating resources and have successfully worked together to make Burundi peaceful and prosperous. We wish them continuing success.

House Un-American Activities Committee and Its Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, on the final day of its spring session, the Supreme Court, by the closest possible 5-to-4 majority on the narrowest grounds conceivable, reversed the contempt conviction of Edward Yellin for the manner in which he had refused to testify about Communist associations before the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1958. The Supreme Court's decision in this case prompted the St. Louis Globe-Democrat to publish an excellent editorial on June 19 pointing out how "dogmatic leftists" pounce upon every such opportunity to renew their war against the Committee on Un-American Activities, despite the committee's vital contribution to the security of the Nation for a quarter of a century. I commend this editorial to all of my colleagues and under unanimous consent, include it in the RECORD:

HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE AND ITS ENEMIES

In a 5–4 decision, the Supreme Court has voided the contempt conviction of Edward Yellin, who refused to answer questions of the House Committee on Un-American Activities about Communist agents in an Indiana steel mill. The Court held that the House Un-American Activities Committee improperly handled the case. This should sound a clarion call for the liberals to take up the cudgels against House Un-American Activities Committee once again.

Indeed, mention the House Un-American Activities Committee among a group of dogmatic leftists and one can note a strange reaction. Many will begin puffing heavily, and the eyes of other dilate much in the manner of an old fire horse at the gong of the familiar bell.

This Nation needs the House Un-American Activities Committee—simply because the threat of communism is at its most perilous. The numbers-game sharpies argue that the American Red Party has been reduced to 10,000 members and thus the danger is minimized. This arithmetic is consoling only to a blind man who equates ostensible Communist numbers with Communist strength.

The good Communist does not advertise, and only the dreamer believes all those who are no longer "card-carriers" have had a sudden change of heart. The man who can pervert a good liberal organization to Moscow's ends is many times more valuable to the Soviets than the acknowledged Red on the rostrum.

Alger Hiss was more dangerous than Gus Hall. The wolf becomes more dangerous when he dons the garb of the sheep. Has the lesson of the bearded liberal in the Cuban hills been forgotten?

Indeed, differences between the internal and external Communist threat are largely semantic and geographical differences. The American Communist Party is an arm of the Soviet Union.

HUAC merely fights on one front against this enemy, just as the CIA, the FBI, the USIA, foreign aid and America's Armed Forces fight on other fronts.

HUAC pillories witnesses, its critics charge.

After accumulating prima facie evidence, committee members call men whose apparent goal is to bring down the Republic. The Congressmen often walk to work through a gang of picketing yahoos, screaming "Fascist," "Inquisitor," then face a witness who reads a statement damning them and their colleagues as witch hunters who despise American liberties and the Constitution.

The witness takes the fifth amendment and leaves—to cheers of the yahoos—then tours the country in the garb of a martyr.

What legislation has come to the committee, critics demand. The Internal Security Act of 1950 was largely due to their efforts, and so despised is it by the Reds they fought it 11 years up to the Supreme Court.

In addition, HUAC has compiled an unrivaled library of facts on the Red conspiracy, which the committee's enemies might do well to peruse. Exposure—just as exposure by rackets committees—is itself an invaluable weapon in this war.

This mountain of testimony is often used improperly to smear good men, critics charge. If that is true, the incidents are to be condemned and the wrongs righted. But innocent men are jailed and executed under our laws and courts. Should we destroy the laws and courts?

This is not the 18th century. America can still handle heresy in the marketplace of ideas.

But we cannot—at least for long—tolerate conspirators working for a foreign power in our midst.

Men of good will fighting HUAC would do better to give us some weapon to battle the enemy inside our gates. They could show this Nation how to work effectively under its Constitution, or if need be to change this Constitution so the Nazis of the thirties and Reds of today could not work openly to destroy the very freedoms we have provided.

All that these intellectuals and men of good will seem to be doing today is seeing to it that our enemies are allowed to work unhindered among us to bring an end to this Republic.

Suits Against Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix to the RECORD an editorial of June 12, 1963, in the Palestine (Tex.) Herald-Press, reciting the difficulties facing many businesses, and ultimately paid for by the mass of consumers, wherein the businesses are harrassed by baseless lawsuits instituted without investigation.

The editorial follows:

SUITS AGAINST BUSINESS

The Los Angeles Times, in a recent article, says, "Justice is rapidly becoming too expensive for the average business firm to afford.

More and more corporations are refusing to fight government suits against them—not because they are guilty but because the cost of proving innocence is ruinous."

The newspaper gives some "rather terrifying instances" of what it is talking about. In one of these, 29 oil companies, accused by the Federal Government of price fixing, spent a protracted period of time in court before the case was dismissed by a rather irate judge. The companies proved their innocence, but proving it cost them $10 million.

Three salt firms, accused in a similar manner, also won in court, at a cost of $750,000.

Another smaller company was exonerated by the Supreme Court, but the company's sales fell away to nearly nothing during the litigation, and the company had to borrow to pay off its $285,000 of legal costs.

Attacking "big business," the "heartless corporations," has always been a maneuver popular with politicians. But these needless accusations that are not sufficiently documented to make a case in court have other effects besides crippling, and sometimes wrecking, the companies involved. They hurt the national economy and they add to the burden of the American people.

Business expansion, a necessity if the availability of jobs is going to meet the needs of an expanding population, cannot hit its needed pace in an atmosphere of hostility from the Federal Government. Crippling taxes are sufficient damper on business without adding threats of time in court for the innocent.

And American consumers really pay the cost, through their purchases, whenever business is hit by heavy new expenses.

In this and many other ways the Federal Government shows it is not only too big. It's too busy.

Filing unnecessary and unwarranted suits against business, like filing trumped-up charges against individuals, is not in the American tradition. The people should demand of their Department of Justice that it make sure of a company's wrongdoing before the company is hauled into court.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL,
Racine, Wis., June 15, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed you will find a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted at the mass meeting of American citizens of Baltic descent of this community gathered to protest the forceful occupations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania by Soviet Union on June 15, 1940.

This meeting was held today at the St. Casimir's Hall, 815 Park Avenue, Racine, Wis., and was sponsored by our organization.

Very truly yours,
PETER PETRUSAITIS,
Secretary.

Whereas on June 15, 1940, Soviet Russia forcibly occupied Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania while breaking solemnly signed treaties and agreements; and

Whereas the peoples of these countries are colonial slaves of Russianized communism; and

Whereas the Communist rulers are building or easing tensions of the cold war for their own expedience; and

Whereas Communist signed treaties are not worth the paper on which they have been signed: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this mass meeting strongly supports creation of a Congressional Committee on Captive Nations (H. Res. 14); and be it further

Resolved, That this mass meeting wholeheartedly endorses and vigorously supports all the resolutions before the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives which are requiring the Russian colonialism in the Baltic States would be investigated; and be it further

Resolved, That we should take a very careful study of the present and the past before entering into any new kind of agreement with the Communist governments, because it is about time to stop hurting the American image at home and abroad; and be it finally

Resolved, That this mass meeting express its gratitude and admiration to the President of the United States, Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for strenuous efforts to better the standards of living, for enormous tasks to achieve stable peace and social justice and especially for nonrecognition of the incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into Soviet Union.

MARTIN KASPARAITIS,
President, Lithuanian American Council, Racine, Wis., Branch.
VALENTINS JAUNKALNIETIS,
Representative, Latvian Americans of Racine.
MRS. OLGA MALBE,
Representative, Estonian Americans of Racine.

RACINE, WIS.,
May 29, 1963.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The Racine Chapter of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation informs you that a resolution has been passed by our unit supporting passage of House Resolution 14, submitted by you, which calls for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Recent developments worldwide and in Washington make the formation of such a committee imperative to the security and welfare of the United States, and will bring added hope to the tyrannised peoples of the once free nations today in Soviet bondage.

We are in addition to this letter, contacting our Congressman as well as Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, head of the Rules Committee, urging him to release your resolution to the House floor for quick debate and passage.

May I take this opportunity to commend you for your stand in this regard, and to assure you of our every support of your measure?

Sincerely,
HARRY KALVONJIAN.

CHICAGO LITHUANIAN COUNCIL,
June 14, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed is a copy of letter to the President of the United States, adopted by a meeting of Chicago Lithuanians today, which is self-explanatory.

Your support of the just cause of liberty and independence for Lithuania is sincerely appreciated by American Lithuanians. We hope and pray that you will continue doing your utmost to help the Lithuanian nation, as well as all the other presently enslaved and subjugated countries, to regain complete freedom and independence.

Respectfully yours,
CHICAGO LITHUANIAN COUNCIL,
ALFONSE F. WILLS, *President.*
J. SKORUBSKUS, *Secretary.*

CHICAGO LITHUANIAN COUNCIL,
June 14, 1963.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Gathered at the Lithuanian Youth Center in Chicago to observe the anniversary of the June 15, 1940, Soviet occupation of Lithuania and the subsequent mass arrests and deportation of Lithuanians to Siberia and elsewhere in Russia, which acts are continuing to this day, we Chicagoans of Lithuanian descent address you, Mr. President, with a restatement of the following facts:

1. Whereas the Soviet Union, in signing secret agreements with Germany on August 23 and September 28, 1939, aimed at annexing Lithuania to its territory, and whereas, by signing these secret agreements and carrying them out—occupying Lithuania on June 15, 1940, and continuing this occupation to this day—Soviet Russia has violated and is still violating a whole series of international agreements and treaties.

2. Whereas Lithuania today has been factually made into a Soviet Russian colony, where the Moscow-imposed and directed Communist regime has deprived the inhabitants of their civil and political rights, as well as the freedoms of the individual person, of religion, of a free press and free speech, which are the inherent rights of all peoples.

We therefore request you, Mr. President, to take every possible measure to help to bring about the withdrawal of the foreign regime forced upon Lithuania by Soviet Russia, so that Lithuania could again independently exercise her political sovereignty and her citizens could again freely use all their political and civil rights and freedoms.

Respectfully yours,
CHICAGO LITHUANIAN COUNCIL,
——— ———,
President.
——— ———,
Secretary.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC., BOSTON BRANCH,
West Roxbury, Mass., May 7, 1963.

The HONORABLE F. BRADFORD MORSE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORSE: We appreciate your speaking in behalf of Ukrainian Indepence Day observed in the House of Representatives on January 24, 1963.

I am sure you will agree with me that our support for freedom of Ukraine and other captive nations under the Communist domination must go beyond the realm of remarks and concentrate on a concrete measure; the creation of a permanent House Committee on Captive Nations. House Resolutions 14 and 15, introduced by Congressmen FLOOD and DERWINSKI respectively, call for the establishment of such a committee.

Presently House Resolutions 14 and 15 are pending before the House Committee on Rules.

In the spirit of your remarks, we ask and urge you to support these resolutions. Furthermore, your call or note to Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of House Rules Committee, favoring House Resolutions 14 and 15 would stir the committee to action. The committee would open public hearings on the proposed legislation and consequently bring the measure to the floor in the House of Representatives.

Your continuing interest in this matter can and will do much for the captive nations.

Sincerely yours,
OREST SZCZUDLUK,
Public Relations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1963.

Mr. WALTER TUSTANIWSKY,
Chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. TUSTANIWSKY: Your letter of May 25 in reference to the establishment of a special committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives has been received.

I agree that the establishment of such a committee would be beneficial to our Nation and I have therefore introduced in accordance with your suggestion, a bill identical to that of Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, House Resolution 14.

Thank you for calling the matter to my attention and best regards.

Sincerely,
GERALD R. FORD,
Member of Congress.

The Civil Rights Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, the June 26 issue of the Washington Evening Star carried a headline story which brings into focus the central issue of the civil rights question with greater clarity than anything any one man could possibly have done alone.

The news story I refer to is not the opinion of a columnist; it is not the opinion of a politician. It is not even the opinion of a member of the white race.

It is the voice of a typical Negro community.

I cannot resist commenting additionally, that the report says the reaction was "unexpected" and authorities were having a "hard time" with their plan of callously shifting these young Negro children from the school of their choice to ones they do not want to attend.

What a tragic commentary it is that the authorities closest to the situation know so little about the true wish of the majority of the Negro race to be left alone and not be used as a political pawn.

I sincerely hope every Member of the House will read the story below; not only in its full written text, but read the true message which is written in heartbreak between the printed lines:

NEGRO PARENTS BALK AT SCHOOL TRANSFERS: ARE RELUCTANT ON PUPIL SHIFTS IN ALEXANDRIA

(By Brian Kelly)

Alexandria school officials for the first time have initiated the transfer of Negro pupils into predominantly white schools, and report that they had a hard time persuading a majority to leave all-Negro classes.

The unexpected situation was disclosed by the city's school authorities yesterday after it was announced in Richmond that the State Pupil Placement Board had approved the transfer of 147 Negro children into predominantly white Alexandria schools at the school board's request. Another 48 integration transfers initiated by pupils also were approved.

It was the first time the city has initiated transfer of Negro pupils into predominantly white schools. In the past, all integration has occurred as a result of applications filed by the Negroes themselves.

TWO HUNDRED PUPILS INVOLVED

The move came about because the school administration decided last month to shift some 200 Negro pupils from overcrowded elementary facilities of their own to nearby integrated schools.

Parents of about 50 students agreed to the idea quickly, but parents of about 100 balked at the proposal. Another 50 were opposed altogether.

This disclosure was made by John C. Albohm, division superintendent, in explaining his school system's unprecedented "administrative action" transferring Negro pupils to the nearly all-white schools.

Superintendent Albohm, who took his post last March, reported to the school board in May that overcrowded conditions at Lyles Crouch and Charles Houston Elementary Schools for Negroes called for an adjustment.

As a result of conferences with the school board, it was decided the school administration legally could assign the Negro pupils in the overcrowded schools to classrooms elsewhere, subject to the approval of the placement board in Richmond, he said.

Thus, 147 Negro students from the two elementary schools will attend the Prince Street, Ficklin and Lee Elementary Schools next fall, he said. The other 48 who initiated their own applications will be scattered throughout the system of 20 school plants.

MOST ARE RELUCTANT

Most of the parents approached on the transfer were "reluctant" and had to be "persuaded," he said. Among the reasons given school officials were fears the academic pace would be tougher in the so-called white schools; the Lyles Crouch facilities, at least were newer and better than the white facilities, and some parents did not want white teachers for their children, he said.

Another group apparently opposed special "reinforced learning" sessions being considered for a number of Negro students attending integrated schools in Alexandria, the superintendent added.

While all the city's formerly white schools have been desegregated, the added 195 Negro students will result in 400 to 500 Negroes attending desegregated schools altogether next school year. In addition, further "administrative" shifts may have to be made this summer or next fall to offset still more enrollment increases expected at the overcrowded Negro facilities, Superintendent Albohm said.

Use of Government Aids Urged on Area Businessmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on June 27 Buffalo, N.Y., was honored to have as its guest the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., Under Secretary of the U.S. Department of Commerce, for a day-long regional conference sponsored by the Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce and the U.S. Department of Commerce.

The following article, written by Mr. Dean Richmond, of the Buffalo Evening News, gives a very clear picture of what occurred at the conference:

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIDS URGED ON AREA BUSINESSMEN—F.D.R., JR., POINTS TO SERVICES INDUSTRY CAN UTILIZE IN COMPETING WITH FOREIGN ENTERPRISES

(By Dean Richmond)

A broad and many-faceted program to spur economic growth of the Niagara frontier by way of industrial modernization was sketched in fine detail in Buffalo today.

The blueprint for a pattern of vigorous growth was outlined by a team of experts from industry, Government, and commerce at a day-long regional conference, sponsored by the Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce and the U.S. Commerce Department, in the Statler Hilton.

The vital significance of the conference was underscored by several recent plant closings and cutbacks and a recent study which showed that the Buffalo-Syracuse region has the third highest machine-tool obsolescence in the Nation.

HELP AND ENCOURAGE

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., Under Secretary of the U.S. Department of Commerce, told the session that the administration looks to private business to provide the dynamic growth the economy needs to absorb the growing labor force and to increase the standard of living.

"All that the Government can do is help and, we hope, encourage, but the job belongs to the individual businessman," said Mr. Roosevelt.

The Under Secretary, who took office this spring, said the Washington administration recognizes the increasing importance of closer cooperation between business and government. Drawing a parallel with foreign businessmen and the relationships they have with their governments, the son of the late President declared:

USE SERVICE MORE EFFECTIVELY

"The relationship between government and business abroad is so intimate that at times it is difficult to distinguish when one is dealing with a businessman and when one is dealing with the government.

"While we are not suggesting that we emulate in all respects the arrangements that exist abroad, we are convinced our businessmen should use more effectively the services the government can provide and that the government should have a more accurate knowledge of real problems with which our business community is confronted."

Daniel L. Goldy, of Washington, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Administrator, Business and Defense Services Administration, told the group that he doesn't know of any areas in the United States that is more richly endowed with natural and manmade resources.

PERIODS OF ADJUSTMENT

The Buffalo area is sitting in the balance and is either going to go ahead or fall behind.

He said that local industry has a tremendous opportunity to take advantage of the markets of Western Europe "if you're willing to modernize to compete."

At a morning session President Ellis C. Knobloch of the Spaulding Fibre Co., Inc., of Tonawanda, outlined the benefits and pitfalls of plant modernization on which the company has spent more than $10 million since 1948.

People tend to resist change, Mr. Knobloch remarked, and therefore the value of modernization must be "sold" to the people whom it will affect.

"They must understand the reasons for the change and recognize that this is going to improve their lot in life, after some initial, perhaps difficult, periods of adjustment," he added.

TO IMPROVE EARNINGS

Mr. Knobloch called attention to the need for retraining workers on new, modern equipment, pointing out that modernization of a specific department or plant may mean fewer people working. He said it is Spaulding Fibre's intention to absorb such workers into other jobs as modernization efforts increase business volume.

"Thus, automation is a solution—not a problem—in the unemployment question, since lack of modernization means falling behind competition and the eventual demise of the company," Mr. Knobloch declared.

Mr. Knobloch warned businessmen not to become "so entranced with the shiny new equipment and the mechanical wonders which it will perform that we lose sight of our goal, which is to improve our earnings."

The Spaulding Fibre presidnt advised businessmen considering modernization to perform careful, detailed market studies, using their own marketing force, industrial associations, and Department of Commerce aids.

INVESTIGATE EQUIPMENT

In modernization, consideration should be given, Mr. Knobloch said, to location of the facilities, making sure that the area selected is the best in terms of labor and government climate, transportation, taxation, power and water resources, and closeness to customers and suppliers.

"We must make sure that a complete and thorough investigation is made of all equipment available before modernizing so that we avoid making merely an exact copy of our present machinery," Mr. Knobloch warned.

Executive Vice President Charles F. Light, of the Buffalo area chamber, outlined a checklist of guidance facilities and aids available to companies considering a modernization program.

HEATH, O'NEIL CHAIRMEN

Among government aids discussed today were tax incentives, consultation services, area redevelopment assistance, manpower retraining programs, aids for export expansion, industrial analyses, statistical services, financing, and others.

William R. Heath, president of the Buffalo Forge Co., and regional vice president of teh Associated Industries of New York State, was chairman of the morning session. Edward V. O'Neil, a chamber director and vice president-general manager, Donner-Hanna Coke Corp., was afternoon chairman.

The gathering was welcomed by H. Kaye Kerr, of Albany, executive director, New York State Job Development Authority. Mr. Roosevelt was introduced by Charles R. Diebold, president of the chamber and of the Western Savings Bank.

Madison County, Illinois, Bar Association Opposes "Supercourt"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the June 28, 1963, edition of the Washington Post:

COURT IN MIDDLE OF MIDWEST DEBATE ON STATES' RIGHTS

EDWARDSVILLE, ILL., June 26.—The U.S. Supreme Court was vigorously criticized and defended tonight in a debate on three proposed States' rights amendments to the Constitution.

The debate was held before the Madison County Bar Association, in reply to Chief Justice Earl Warren's call for a great national debate on the subject.

Florida Supreme Court Justice Millard Caldwell, speaking in favor of the proposed amendments, charged that "the U.S. Supreme Court has risen above the Constitution and usurped powers belonging to the States."

St. Louis attorney Arthur J. Freund, speaking against the amendments, said the Supreme Court members are special guardians of legal procedure and that the amendments are a "ruinous road toward establishing a confederacy."

THREE VOTED DOWN

After the debate, Bar Association members voted 40 to 13 against one amendment that would take away from the Federal courts all jurisdiction over State legislation apportionment, and another that would change the amending process of the Constitution. The group voted 43 to 10 against the third amendment, which would establish a "supercourt" of the 50 State chief justices with power to overrule the Supreme Court.

Caldwell, a former Florida Governor, said the amendments came about as a result of nationwide unrest over the Supreme Court decisions that, "repudiate constitutional principles and previous Court decisions."

"The founders of our Constitution," Caldwell said, "made it crystal clear that all the powers not specifically delegated to the Federal Government are delegates to the States. The National Government is encroaching on State authority * * * (and) swallowing up the liberty of the people."

Caldwell, who once served in the House of Representatives, said Congress and the Supreme Court no longer respect the Constitution, "nor do they even pay lip service to the States. They have lost the respect of the people."

CALLS IDEA SHOCKING

In reply, Freund said the attempt to convert the Nation into a confederacy "would shatter our Government to the separate political entities."

"It is shocking that one proposal provides for amending the Constitution without any national deliberation anywhere," Freund said. "It carries the idea that Americans are not a unified people."

On the proposed "supercourt," Judge Caldwell said:

"I would rather risk the future of America on the 50 State chief justices than on nine political appointees who are there for life and responsible to no one."

In reply, Freund said such a court would be too large for effective deliberations and its members would not be concerned principally with interpreting the Constitution.

Republic of Panama: Demand for "Interim Compensation"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions in addresses in the Congress, I have emphasized that the official diplomatic position of the Republic of Panama is that the launching of a new isthmian canal different from the existing waterway will require a new treaty to determine the specific conditions for its construction. This position will apply whether such new canal is to be located within the Canal Zone or in the Republic of Panama.

The latest twist in attempted Panamanian extortions is for $10 million a year as "interim compensation" before a new Panama Canal treaty is negotiated. Such demand, Mr. Speaker, is unthinkable and would be made only because the supine weakness on the part of our officials encourages political blackmail. Moreover, it is further evidence of the necessity for the Congress, without further delay, to clarify and make definite our isthmian canal policy, as contemplated by House Concurrent Resolution 105, and to stop further giveaways of our land and property in the Canal Zone, as provided in H.R. 3999.

The details of the proposed "interim compensation," now being agitated on the isthmus, which is separate from the benefits given Panama under the Alliance for Progress, were published in the April 30, 1963, issue of the Panama American and will be quoted at the end of my remarks.

In its relations with Panama, our country has been generous. In addition to funds injected into the Panamanian economy annually from Canal Zone sources, the United States has been giving, and will continue to give, to Panama many millions of dollars through the socalled Alliance for Progress, and apparently even without the thanks of the Panamanian Government.

In these connections, it must be borne in mind that the Panama Canal is a self-sustaining interoceanic public utility operated pursuant to law and treaty. The present annual net income is around $3 million, but the annuity now paid Panama is $1,930,000. The small margin of the net income is soon dissipated on emergent situations arising from the maintenance and operation of the canal.

Our Government has expended over $1.5 billions in the construction and protection of the Panama Canal. Thus the excess of the net income is indeed a thin line of fiscal safety for the tremendous responsibility which our Nation must discharge in and about the Panama Canal.

The extravagant demands on the part of Panama show how unrealistic and unreasonable the Panamanian Government has become. An increase of more than the net income for Panama would bankrupt the canal, unless tolls are raised or taxes increased to cover the deficit. If tolls are substantially increased, this would lessen the use of the canal with loss of toll revenue and also serve to destroy the shipping under our flag.

In view of the situation thus presented, it is truly amazing that such exorbitant demands against the United States should be made and seriously advanced. It is even more amazing that responsible officials of our Government should treat them with the dignity that is now being displayed.

If our Government acquiesces in these connections, it will certainly bring about the liquidation of the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal by the United States and, ultimately, the destruction of the Republic of Panama. As to the latter, our friends in Panama must be made to understand that the very existence of their country depends on the presence of U.S. power in the Canal Zone for the control, management, and protection of the canal. Whenever the United States throws up its hands and leaves the isthmus, a Communist takeover will fill the ensuing vacuum. Why should the best interests of Panama be clouded by these impossible demands made under the stimulus of nationalistic zeal without regard to the realistic conditions involved?

Statesmanship of the two countries requires not only an understanding of the past and present of the canal enterprise, but also the possibilities of the future. As to the last, destiny has brought Panama and the United States into close historical association; and their interests are mutual.

The people of Panama must realize this fact and their government must not undertake a course of action which, in its ultimate effect, is bound to be suicidal. If the United States withdraws from the isthmus, Panama, like Cuba, will fall into the Soviet orbit. All of Latin America would soon follow, and the world revolutionary dream of a Soviet America will come to fullest fruition.

The indicated news story follows:

[From the Panama American, Apr. 30, 1963]

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA MISSION LEAVES FOR WASHINGTON TALKS: WILL DISCUSS COMPENSATIONS PENDING TREATY

A Panamanian mission leaves early today for Washington, D.C., to discuss "interim compensations" for Panama for the operation of the Panama Canal pending a review of existing treaties.

Planning Director David Samudio and Prof. Ruben D. Carles, Jr., of the University of Panama, compose the mission. They will be joined in Washington by Panamanian Ambassador Augusto G. Arango.

Official sources have indicated that Panama is asking for $10 million a year during 5 years, which is the time that Panamanian officials estimate will elapse before a new Panama Canal treaty is negotiated.

President Roberto F. Chiari is understood to have outlined the proposal to President John F. Kennedy at the President's Conference in San Jose, Costa Rica, last March.

Panama's official position is that construction of a new canal will require a new treaty. They estimate that about 5 years will elapse before this occurs is based on the generally accepted prospect that by 1970 the United States must have made the decision for replacement of the present waterway. Panamanian officials figure that actual treaty negotiations would take about 3 years and that in order to meet the 1970 deadline the United States would have to undertake negotiations in approximately 2 years' time.

The "interim compensations," in Panama's view, would cover the fair benefits this country claims it is not receiving now under the present Canal treaties. They would be separate from any Alliance for Progress financial assistance.

The Panamanian mission is expected to start discussions with U.S. officials in Washington late this week. The proposed compensations would be invested, according to official sources, in highway construction and electrification of rural areas principally.

Independence of Somalia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today the Republic of Somalia celebrates the third anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Republic of Somalia, Abdullah Aden; and His Excellency, the Somali Ambassador to the United States, Dr. Omar Mohallim.

The Somali Republic—comparable in area to our States of Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi combined—covers approximately 178,000 square miles on the eastern horn of Africa. Bounded by the Gulf of Aden to the north, Somalia stretches from the easternmost point of Africa 1,180 miles southwestward along the Indian Ocean. On the African Continent it is bounded by Ethiopia and Kenya.

The forecast was unpropitious when British Somaliland became independent on June 26, 1960, to merge 5 days later with Somalia, a former United Nations trust territory under Italian administration. Pessimists pointed out that little preparation had been made for this union, that the newly independent country had few natural resources, and that its political system based on rigid clanism was hardly adaptable to 20th century democracy. The pessimists predicted that the new nation could not long survive.

The balance sheet 3 years later, however, shows that the Somali Republic has not only survived but that it has also achieved steady progress since independence. When the two territories united, a coalition government was formed under the premiership of Dr. Abdirashid Ali Shermarke. In spite of several political crises and cabinet changes this government is still in power. Although the democratic constitution—which provides for a representative President as head of state and an executive Prime Minister and Council of Ministers—was drafted in Italian administered Somalia prior to unification, it has now been ratified in the area formerly under British control. The National Assembly has confirmed by election the choice of Abdullah Aden as its first President; Mr. Aden had been provisional President from the day of Somali independence.

In the economic sphere also the dire predictions have been proven false. The mainstay of the country's economy has continued to be the export of bananas and of hides, skins, and livestock, but a wide range of development projects has been undertaken to improve these traditional industries and to diversify the economy. The fruit industry is being expanded; cotton, wheat, and sorghum cultivation are being developed. New industries—cement, textiles, and meat and dairy products—are being introduced. Port facilities are being extended; work on a $2½ million U.S.-aided port development scheme at Kismayu began in September 1962. Also in 1962 a hydrological and resources survey of considerable importance to the Somali Republic's long-term economic development was initiated with financial assistance from the U.N. Special Fund.

As a result of this progress, it is expected that within a few years the Somali Republic will be able to balance its budget without recourse to the foreign aid it has depended on in the past. When Dr. Shermarke visited the United States in 1962, he told President Kennedy that Somalia could not overcome its problems by its efforts alone but that it had to become economically as well as politically independent if it was to achieve a better life for its people.

Our congratulations to the Somali Government and people for the commendable progress they have achieved in 3 short years of independence.

Lincoln Memorial Trail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution adopted by the Lincoln Club of Southern Indiana, May 16, 1963, and submitted by Thalia S. Woods, community improvement chairman, as follows:

LINCOLN MEMORIAL TRAIL

Resolved, That the Lincoln Club of Southern Indiana reiterate its endorsement of an improved Lincoln memorial trail from Lincoln's birthplace in Kentucky through Indiana to Springfield, Ill., and earnestly requests: (1) That the trail follow as nearly as possible the authentic route traveled by the Lincolns in 1816 and 1830; (2) that the 1935 statute of Indiana authorizing the Lincoln trail through Indiana be reviewed in the light of new evidence; and (3) that side roads in southern Indiana over which Abraham Lincoln so often traveled be included in the Lincoln Memorial Trail.

Mrs. RUTH JONES AYER,
President, Lincoln Club of Southern Indiana.
Mrs. BLANCHE SCHNUCK,
Secretary, Lincoln Club of Southern Indiana.

Taxes and the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the studies by the Conference on Economic Progress are always of particular interest to me. The latest, entitled "Taxes and the Public Interest," is a study of tax policy, in the perspective of the problems of the whole economy. Because of the scope of this work, I recommend it in its entirety to my colleagues. The summary and theme follow:

TAXES AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

I. SUMMARY AND THEME: ADJUSTING TAX POLICY TO OUR VITAL NATIONAL NEEDS

The administration has sounded the right note

President Kennedy deserves support in his courageous and historic decision to recommend a large deliberate increase in the Federal budget deficit. Large tax reduction is now desirable, and even overdue. All experience and reason dictate this course, in an economy suffering for many years and now from vast idleness of manpower and plant. Restoration of the American economy to maximum economic performance is very much more important than whether the Federal budget shows a deficit or surplus. And all experience and reason also make it clear that this restoration is the only safe or sure road toward improvement in the condition of the Federal budget itself.

This study supports the general thrust of the President's efforts. But the President has also stated, with characteristic openmindedness and recognition of the very nature of our Federal system, that the Congress may improve his tax proposal substantially. This study seeks to help point the way to this improvement.

The worsening current unemployment situation and outlook

In May 1963, full-time unemployment as officially reported rose to 5.9 percent (seasonally adjusted) of the civilian labor force. This was higher than in any month of 1962, despite a much-heralded quickening of the economic upturn thus far in 1963. And despite an economic upturn which started more than 2 years ago, the average rate of unemployment as officially reported during the first 5 months of 1963 was 5.8 percent, or considerably higher than the 5.6 percent reported for 1962 as a whole. Further, when account is taken of the full-time equivalent of part-time unemployment, and of the concealed unemployment resulting from the repressive effect of scant job opportunity upon the anticipated growth in the civilian labor force, the true level of unemployment during the first 5 months of 1963 averaged about 9.4 percent (seasonally adjusted) of the civilian labor force. This was slightly higher than in 1962, and contrasted more sharply with 8.5 percent in the nonrecessionary year 1959 and only 5.8 percent in the nonrecessionary year 1956. Most current forecasts are that unemployment will continue to rise substantially in the foreseeable future, unless stronger counteracting measures are taken.

Impact of unemployment upon the young, and upon racial tensions

Although the official reports show full-time unemployment at 5.9 percent of the civilian labor force in May 1963, the rate of unemployment when so measured was 18 percent among teenagers seeking permanent gainful employment for the first time. This contrasted with 14 percent in May 1962. The human consequences of conveying to these young people the impression that our economic system can make no utilization of them are incalculable. These consequences go to the very roots of the rising tide of delinquency, crime, and low morale among the young.

Meanwhile, excessively large concentration of denial of economic opportunity among minority groups, and fear that any job gained by a member of a minority group takes a job away from somebody else, is much more at the heart of the rising tide of racial tensions than is usually acknowledged. The lesson we are now learning so painfully, having dealt inadequately with these potential racial tensions until they reached explosive force, should warn us of what may be in the offing if the amount of unemployment itself reaches explosive force—as it certainly will in a few short years if current trends continue.

Continuation of inadequate economic growth rate

The reasons for continuation of the chronic rise in unemployment are that the upward movement of the economy from early 1961 to date has been much too slow, compared with the growth rate required to reduce unemployment, in view of the growth in the labor force and the accelerated pace of automation, technology, and productivity gains. Contrasted with an economic growth rate in real terms of 7.8 percent during 1954–55 [1] and 6.7 percent during 1958–59,[2] the rate was only 5.4 percent during 1961–62,[3] only 3.3 percent from the first quarter 1962 to first quarter 1963, and only 4.1 percent (seasonally adjusted annual rate) during the quickening of the upturn from fourth quarter 1962 to first quarter 1963.

Continuing rise in the production gap

The production gap is the difference between actual production and production at maximum utilization of our productive potentials. Measured in uniform 1962 dollars, this production gap rose from 4.5 percent of maximum production in 1956 to 9.2 percent in 1959, 11.6 percent in 1962, and a seasonally adjusted annual rate 11.9 percent in first quarter 1963.[4] In first quarter 1963, the seasonally adjusted annual rate of the production gap was in excess of $76 billion. The much lower official estimate of this production gap—though still intolerably large—results from underappraisal of the rate of growth needed to achieve economic restoration, and this has been responsible for official overestimates of the expected reduction of unemployment to date.

The way is open for needed policy improvements

Aside from the current tax proposal, it is essential to point out that the disappointing economic developments since the commencement of the upturn from the 1960–61 recession have not been due primarily to failure to achieve programs thus far recommended. These programs—area redevelopment, training and retraining of workers, public works, and the tax changes of 1962 (both legislative and by Treasury action)—were approved with modifications of no great significance to subsequent economic developments. The monetary policies of the Federal Reserve System during these years have met with the overt approval of the administration.

The trade program was also enacted, partly on the ground that it would measurably help our own economy. Developments since then support earlier warnings that, while the trade program was eminently desirable on many grounds, it could not be expected appreciably to reduce domestic unemployment nor substantially to accelerate our rate of economic growth.[5] Efforts thus far to improve our balance of payments and gold position have not been more successful than forecast by earlier conference studies. These studies suggested that the approach to this insistent problem has been inadequate.[6]

Significance of accuracy of previous conference studies

The recommendations in this study may carry more weight because earlier conference studies have been vindicated by subsequent events. In mid-1954, the first conference study pointed to the danger that our average annual rate of economic growth might be only 2.5 percent during the period 1953–60 as a whole.[7] This turned out to be exactly correct. In early 1961, a conference study forecast that economic policies then in being and under active consideration were unlikely to achieve an economic growth rate anywhere close to the needed rate; and that early 1963 might well find us with full-time unemployment near 6 percent of the civilian labor force.[8] This also turned out to be entirely correct. In late 1962, in the face of other more optimistic forecasts, still another conference study appraised quite accurately the economic developments during the 9 months since then.[9]

The core reason for our poor economic performance

Persistent and chronically rising idle plant and manpower mean essentially that our actual demand for ultimate goods and services is falling far short of our ability to produce them. This actual demand for ultimate goods and services takes two forms: the private spending of almost 190 million consumers, and the public spending of governments at all levels for what we need as a nation but cannot buy individually nor through our private organizations. The core task, therefore, is to expand the volume of this private and public consumption sufficiently to draw forth maximum utilization of our manpower and plants on a sustained basis.

The problem of private business investment

Private business investment is the third component in total economic activity or total national production, the other two being private consumer spending and public outlays. This private investment also needs to expand at a more rewarding rate than it actually has on the average during the past decade as a whole.

But this long-term deficient average has not been caused substantially by an inadequate level of per-unit profit margins after taxes, nor by inadequate availability of other types of funds and saving available for investment. Entirely to the contrary, during each of the three periods of economic upturn

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

following each of the three economic recessions since early 1953, private investment in the plant and equipment which add to our ability to produce has been so ebullient as to cause these means of production to expand far more rapidly than expansion of demand for ultimate products through private consumption and public outlays. When the overcapacity resulting from these relatively excessive investment booms became sufficiently large, investment was cut back sharply. And this, along with the much larger deficiencies in demand for ultimate products, brought on the periods of economic stagnation and recession.

We are not now in a period of economic recession. But we are in a period approximating stagnation, when our actual growth rate is measured against our needed growth rate at this stage of the restoration process. And the same imbalances between investment and ultimate demand which brought on our earlier difficulties are manifest in the economy today.

Errors in national economic policies, relevant to our poor economic performance

During the period under review, Federal spending has been held too low. The tight money policy and higher interest rates have redistributed scores of billions of dollars in a regressive direction, and also reduced funds available for public spending for constructive purposes, thus contributing to the imbalances between investment and consumption. Many programs, such as the social security program, have not been expanded rapidly enough to do their share toward adequate expansion of consumption. Farm income, despite some improvement, has not been brought close enough to parity with other incomes on a per capita basis. Popular and public pressures, exerted for the legitimate purpose of preventing wage rate increases from exceeding productivity gains, have in practical consequence resulted in wage rate increases during the most recent years which have lagged far behind productivity gains, thus adding greatly to the private consumption deficiency.

Undesirable trends in national tax policies, 1945–63

Federal personal income tax changes from 1939 through 1945 had a very progressive effect upon income distribution, in that they helped those at lower levels of income more than those higher up. This was one among many factors which contributed to our phenomenal economic performance during World War II, and to rising living standards despite immense allocation of our resources to war production. But tax changes since 1945, including the tax changes of 1948, 1954, and 1962, have been regressive, in that they have helped those at the higher levels of income more than those lower down. Aimed excessively at stimulation of investment, and insufficiently at stimulation of private consumption, these tax policies have accentuated the imbalances at the center of our economic difficulties. These regressive tax changes have also worked against advancement of economic and social justice.

While tax reductions in 1954 gave a temporary fillip to the economy and helped to reverse the 1953–54 recession, we at no subsequent time achieved anywhere near full economic restoration. And the Federal tax structure which has existed from 1945 forward has been among the factors in the unsatisfactory economic growth rate 1953–63, including three recessions.

Regressive nature of State and local taxation

The adverse effects of the trend since 1945 toward a less progressive Federal tax policy—which really means a regressive trend—have been greatly aggravated by the absolutely regressive nature of State and local taxation. When all types of taxes at all levels are taken into account, our economy is functioning, and our people are living, under a tax system which we do not comprehend at all when we look only at the Federal personal income tax structure.

Main defects in the 1963 tax proposal

Drawing upon this analysis, the main defects in the 1963 tax proposal are:

1. Without the reforms, and properly taking into account the corporate tax concessions of 1962, this study estimates that the proposal would assign about $8 billion of the total tax cut to the stimulation of investment, and about 7.5 billion to the stimulation of consumption. This estimate necessarily takes into account, not only the corporate tax cuts, but also the proportion of the personal tax cut received by higher income taxpayers which they would be likely to save for investment purposes.[10] Taking into account the proposed reforms, this study estimates that more than 4½ billion of the total net tax changes would be assigned to the investment function, and less than $6¼ billion to the consumption function. This pattern of allocation between the investment function and the consumption function, without or even with the reforms, is ill adjusted to our economic problem today, and repeats errors committed in earlier years;

2. The proposed personal tax cuts would redistribute income regressively. The personal tax cuts without the reforms would increase the disposable (after-tax) income of the $3,000 income-tax payer by only 0.4 percent; the $5,000 income-tax payer, 1.8 percent; and the $10,000 income-tax payer 3.5 percent. But the disposable income of the $50,000 income-tax payer would be increased 9.7 percent; the $100,000 income-tax payer, 16.3 percent; and the $200,000 income-tax payer 31.1 percent.[11]

Even with the reforms, the disposable income of the $3,000 income taxpayer would be increased only 2 percent; the $5,000 income taxpayer, 3.1 percent; and the $10,000 income taxpayer, 3.5 percent. But the disposable income of the $50,000 income taxpayer would be increased 6.3 percent; the $100,000 income taxpayer, 11.2 percent; and the $200,000 income taxpayer, 23.8 percent. This kind of distribution of tax reduction would work counter to a sustainable balance between investment and consumption, and is not justifiable on economic or social grounds.

It is no answer to say that, because of the current structure of the Federal personal income tax system, any substantial reduction of tax rates must result in the high income taxpayer receiving a much larger percentage increase in his disposable income than the low income taxpayer. It is perfectly feasible, as will be shown, to reconstruct the proposed personal income tax cuts so as to avoid this consequence. Besides, as will also be shown, programs other than tax reduction should be relied upon more heavily in order to promote the needed economic and social results;

3. The proposed tax changes are also too small and far too slow to add much toward economic restoration. This study estimates that, for reasonably full economic restoration sometime in 1965, our total national production needs to be about $57 billion higher in 1964, and about $85 billion higher in 1965, than it is likely to rise to if our national economic policies were to remain virtually in status quo. Vividly in contrast with these needed additions of 57 billion and 85 billion, respectively, this study estimates that the proposed tax reduction, including all of its indirect effects, would add only about $12.9 billion to what total national production would otherwise be likely to rise to in the first calendar year in which the proposal would be applied, and would add only about 27.6 billion to what total national production would otherwise be likely to rise to in 1965 or 1966, the first year when the tax proposal would be in full effect.

Needed changes in tax plan: $10 billion tax cut now, benefiting mainly the low- and middle-income taxpayers

1. The first priority immediate tax action should be limited to cutting the 20 percent flat rate, applicable to the first 2,000 of taxable income, to an average rate of considerably less than 15 percent, with much larger reduction in the rate applicable to the first $1,000 than to the second $1,000. For a married couple filing a joint return, the lower of these two rates would be applicable to the first $2,000, and the higher to the second $2,000. In addition, the standard exemption for a family of four, now $2,400, should be lifted to $3,400. Even this would be about 53 percent lower in real terms (allowing for the change in the purchasing power of the dollar) than the $3,300 exemption in 1939. This first priority tax reduction would have an annual value of about $10 billion, all of which should take effect at once; [12]

2. All other tax action should be deferred until the first priority tax cut is accomplished. The attempt to combine all phases of tax reduction in one extremely complex tax package is almost certain to prevent sufficient focus upon the first priority need, jeopardize some of the desirable tax reforms, lead to enactment of some very undesirable so-called reforms, and result in a net tax program very poorly adjusted to economic growth, the priorities of our national needs, and economic justice;

3. Reductions in corporate tax rates are not needed for reasons already stated, and would be wasteful when compared with other great national priorities which could be served through an equivalent increase in Federal domestic public spending. Some slight corporate tax reduction might be desirable, if concentrated upon improving the position of small business;

4. Personal income tax cuts for those in the upper-middle and higher income groups, beyond the benefits which would receive from the first priority tax cut suggested above, are not of high urgency on economic grounds, and of no urgency on social grounds. When such tax cuts are undertaken, they and any corporate tax cuts should be compensated for in full by the closing of loopholes.

Why tax cuts alone cannot carry the whole load

Even the $10 billion personal tax reduction suggested in this study, including its effects upon the stimulative value of the 1962 tax action, would increase total national production by only about $36 billion in the first full year. As already indicated, this would be much too little. Beyond this, the nature of the unemployment problem requires vigorous additional approaches. Tax reduction at best would stimulate more demand largely for types of goods now being produced by industries where the rate of elimination of jobs by technology and automation is extremely rapid. Because of these industrial trends, expansion of job opportunity in these industries in the years ahead would be severely limited, even if the demand for their products were increased to the maximum limits of feasibility.

Thus, private and public investment must be expanded greatly with respect to those types of goods and services for which our national needs are so huge and pressing that even the trends in technology and automation would not prevent vast job expansion in these areas. These areas include housing and urban renewal, mass transportation, resources development, educational and health services and facilities, and a wide range of other human services. This will require much more Federal spending, not

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

only for purely public programs, but also as a part of new admixtures of public and private spending—such as those required for renewal of urban areas.

Immediately needed $3 billion increase in the Federal budget for domestic programs

Toward these employment ends, and even more so because of our national needs for the programs themselves, this study proposes an immediate $3 billion addition to the domestic programs now continued in the fiscal 1964 budget (without reducing any of the items in that budget for national security and other international purposes, and for space research and technology). As elements in a long-range program to meet adequately the great priorities of our domestic public needs, consistent with our growing economic potentials, this study suggests that per capita Federal outlays for education should be almost tripled, comparing calendar 1966 with the fiscal 1964 budget. Outlays per capita for health services and research should be almost doubled, and outlays for housing and community development should be multiplied about eight times.[13] Outlays per capita for all domestic programs (measured in uniform 1962 dollars) should rise from $186.83 to $221.11.

However, in a properly growing economy, total Federal outlays for all purposes as suggested in this study (allowing also for indicated increases for national security and other international purposes, and space research and technology) would decline from an estimated 16.80 percent of total national production in fiscal 1964 to 15.91 percent in calendar 1966. This means that, even with the suggested tax reduction and spending increase program, we could in the years ahead, as a dividend on adequate economic growth, come much closer to a balanced Federal budget over the years immediately ahead than during the past decade, and balance the budget when maximum prosperity is sustained for a few years.

Need for still other expansionary national economic policies

Even the suggested combination of tax reduction and increased public spending would neither fully restore nor adequately maintain maximum employment and production. As already suggested, the whole social security program needs to be greatly liberalized. Improved farm legislation is essential. The minimum wage floor needs to be higher, with coverage expanded. Instead of the deplorable current tightening of monetary policy by the Federal Reserve System, we need a much more expansionary monetary policy and much lower interest rates.

With all of this, the major portion of needed growth must come through expansionary action in the private sector of the economy. But the first inducement to this expansionary action would be the concrete assurance by the Federal Government that it is responding fully to its obligations under the Employment Act of 1946.

Improved implementation of the Employment Act of 1946

The basic reason why current policy proposals are not sufficiently attuned to our national capabilities and needs is that they have not been geared adequately to the long-range and short-range quantitative goals for maximum employment, production, and purchasing power called for by the Employment Act of 1946.

Even while Western European countries are achieving high growth rates and low unemployment under "indicative planning," we are not utilizing fully the very Employment Act which initially inspired these efforts overseas.

Even while these countries have learned from us the manifold economic benefits of mass consumption, we are moving away from our earlier prime stress upon this factor in economic growth.

Even while so much of the world has come to associate economic growth with reduction of poverty and advancement of social justice, we are insufficiently recognizing that, especially in view of our unrivaled productive powers, rapid reduction of poverty and advancement of social justice are prerequisites for adequate and sustained economic growth.

And even while the totalitarians, despite some miscalculations and setbacks, are continuing to outpace us in their rates of economic growth, we have not marshaled that national purposefulness about which we talked so much after the first sputnik in 1957—an all-embracing purposefulness applied just as vigorously to our great domestic needs as to maintaining our national security and landing on the moon.

This study has been directed by Leon H. Keyserling, with the assistance of Mary Dublin Keyserling, Philip M. Ritz, and Nettie S. Shapiro.

---

[1] Following 1953–54 recession.

[2] Following 1957–58 recession.

[3] Following 1960–61 recession.

[4] Again, only nonrecessionary earlier years are contrasted with the current situation.

[5] See the Conference study, "Poverty and Deprivation in the United States," April 1962, especially p. 2.

[6] See "Key Policies for Full Employment," September 1962, especially ch. VII.

[7] "Toward Full Employment and Full Production," July 1954, especially pp. 32–34.

[8] "Jobs and Growth," May 1961, especially ch. IX.

[9] "Key Policies for Full Employment," especially ch. I.

[10] If these families were to save much less and spend much more of their tax cuts than this study estimates, which might happen, the very substantial lifting of their living standards concurrently with very little improvement in the living standards of lower income families, by means of tax reduction, would be indeed indefensible on general social grounds.

[11] Assuming a married couple with two children or other dependents. The changes in disposable incomes are what really count. The percentage cuts in tax rates are merely mathematical formulas for arriving at the income results.

[12] A simple alternative method, accomplishing close to the same result, would leave the present tax structure intact, but allow every taxpayer, spouse, and dependent a credit of $1.50 per week against a tax liability computed under present law.

[13] In absolute terms, the educational increase would be by far the largest. For elaboration of these and other needs, see the Conference study, the "Federal Budget and the General Welfare," December 1959.

Resolution of Commendation of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the woods, waters, and wildlife of our Commonwealth have been a source of pride for all Pennsylvanians; and

Whereas there has been an increased cause for legitimate concern over the preservation of such natural resources; and

Whereas there is now a paramount need for citizen awareness of and participation in the natural resources conservation movement; and

Whereas the Duquesne Brewing Co. of Pittsburgh has recently adopted a three-point conservation program designed to help safeguard and provide for the judicious use of our natural resources; and

Whereas such a program will immeasurably benefit the conservation movement: Therefore, be it.

Resolved, That the Senate of Pennsylvania commends the Duquesne Brewing Co. and its president, John A. Friday, Jr., for initiative, farsightedness, and corporate good citizenship in embarking upon such an important task and for serving as an example to all citizens of the Commonwealth that conservation should be the concern of industry as well as government and sportsmen's and civic groups.

The Frightening Job Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial by Messrs. Rowland Evans and Robert Novak entitled "Inside Report: The Frightening Job Gap," which appeared in the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times-Herald of June 26, 1963.

This excellent editorial very wisely and clearly points up the urgent need for President Kennedy's tax proposal. Without legislation to provide opportunity for all of our people to work the probability of offering full employment and job opportunities to all of our people in our society pales and the opportunity to do full justice to our Negro population becomes rather slight.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Washington Post & Times-Herald, June 26, 1963]

INSIDE REPORT: THE FRIGHTENING JOB GAP

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

It is impossible to exaggerate the jobs-and-training crisis that now, like a bursting dam, threatens to engulf the economy and nullify the administration's new attack on racial discrimination.

The crisis has two main parts: The implacable toll of automation and technology, which in the 1960's alone will affect no fewer than 22 million jobs, and the sudden maturing of the record postwar crop of babies, now entering the labor force in unprecedented numbers.

A simple statistic tells the story. To stay even, an average of 300,000 new jobs must be found every month, but the number of jobs actually opening up in today's economy is far, far less.

Thus the job gap is steadily getting worse.

In his civil rights message to Congress, President Kennedy asked for an emergency $400 million for more manpower training, vocational training, youth employment, and other Federal programs that are supposed to soften the impact of automation and the population explosion.

Although this is a mere drop in the bucket, Congress is now so agitated over the civil rights legislation that it may never get around to voting the funds. And yet without a crash attack to narrow the job gap and train new jobseekers for the automated economy that lies ahead, the economic side of the race crisis is bound to worsen.

The reason for this is all too clear. Most of the thouasnds of Negroes in the Southern States who are now migrating to the industrial centers up north have no technological skills at all.

This country was able to absorb previous mass migrations—from Ireland and Italy, for example—because of unskilled jobs in the mines, in the textile mills, building railroads, digging canals and working with the shovel, pick and plow. Today the pick and shovel are as out of date as the old-fashioned elevator—and in New York alone more than 45,000 elevator operators are said to have lost their jobs to the pushbutton.

In the last 3 years, total employment went up by 2.5 million, but jobs for unskilled workers suffered an absolute decline of 200,000. An additional 300,000 farm jobs also disappeared.

What this means is that the unskilled jobseeker is all but doomed to the dole. Only the educated and trained can compete in the job markets of the 1960's, and the Negro is neither educated nor trained. The cutthroat competition for jobs is harshest for him, the most unskilled of all.

President Kennedy and his economists were quiet aware of all this when they decided, in January 1961, to sacrifice the campaign pledge for new civil rights legislation in order to hold southern support and concentrate on other programs, including public education which they thought necessary to ease the job-and-training crisis.

But what has happened? The job crisis is as "frightening" (to quote Under Secretary of Labor John F. Henning) as it was in January 1961, if not more so. It has really not begun to be solved. Indeed, it may not be soluble at all.

If the administration could not get enough of its bread-and-butter program through Congress without the complication of a civil rights battle, will it be safe to do so now that the Southern Democrats are up in arms?

On the answer to that question hangs the fate of the President's $400-million emergency request, the youth employment opportunities bill, the area development bill and the tax cut, all of which the administration regards as tools to narrow the job gap.

There is no question, of course, about the President's commitment to the civil rights program. The question is whether and how much it will endanger the rest of his program. Because if the job gap isn't narrowed, not all the civil rights bills in the world will do justice to the Negro.

Benefits Multiplied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I know that urban renewal has meant a great deal to many American communities, but I would like to give my colleagues in the House some idea of its significance to Norfolk.

Norfolk is Virginia's largest city, and its accomplishments in slum clearance and urban renewal have been phenomenal. In a recent issue of the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot, there was a short article concerning the economic benefits which urban renewal has brought to Norfolk. I quote it below:

BENEFITS MULTIPLIED

In terms of dollars and cents, nearly everyone in Norfolk has profited as a result of the vast low-rent housing projects.

As supporters of urban renewal here predicted and, in some cases staked their business reputation on, the late 1940's slum clearance has paid off. And is still paying off.

Jobs, especially in the construction trades, have been plentiful. This has expanded the economic opportunity for many persons in Tidewater, but chiefly among the semiskilled and underemployed, who lived, largely, in the slums that have been ripped down wholesale.

There has been a discernible spiral of benefits to the city and the citizen derived from Norfolk's public housing.

Dramatic evidence of the benefits of low-rent housing show up in the city tax assessor's office.

Mrs. Kate Carlton lives in a typical project apartment. It is located in the 900 block of St. Paul Street and is 1 of 12 apartments, each with a bath.

PAY LESS, GET MORE

The housing authority will pay the city $324.35 in lieu of taxes this year on the 12-family unit. The occupants of the building, if their incomes remain stable during the year, will pay the authority $4,584 for rent.

In contrast to the clean, uncluttered apartment are 3 buildings in the 1200 block of Wide Street that house 12 families. The condition of the buildings is described by a housing authority survey as "very poor." The 12 apartments each have 3 rooms and a bath.

The total annual real estate tax assessment on the three buildings is $272.70. The tenants will pay the owners (if all the units are rented for the full year) $5,161.20 for rent this year.

Thus, the 12 tenants on Wide Street will be paying $577.20 more for "very poor" housing than the 12 tenants who live in safe, decent housing on St. Paul Street. And the housing authority will pay $51.65 more in taxes than the owners of the property on Wide Street.

Former Mayor W. Fred Duckworth, now president and general manager of the Tidewater Virginia Development Council, said recently low-rent housing sparked most of the major improvements in the city and many in the area during the past decade.

"There have been three facets to public housing," said Duckworth, whose terms of office spanned the 12 years during which most of the redevelopment projects were undertaken.

First, he said, Negroes have been provided with decent housing. "And that was what we needed to eradicate Negro slums in the downtown. That, in turn, gave us land for commercial development."

Second, with improved housing came improved health and sanitation for the more than 15,000 persons moved from the shabby properties. "This cut down the terrific costs in fire prevention, in policing, and in welfare cases," Duckworth said.

"A third result of low-rent housing is that, in my opinion, it has sparked what I estimate conservatively to be $525 million in construction alone around here.

"The two tunnels to Portsmouth were built because of it. They generated the tunnel to Hampton. And that generated the Chesapeake Bay-Bridge tunnel, and all the other construction we've had around here.

"This has kept our city unemployment rate below any of the three adjacent States," Duckworth said.

The Redevelopment and Housing Authority estimates that roughly $182 million has been pumped into the city's economy to clear the 485 acres, build housing projects, and change street patterns. This figure is broken down into $25 million from the Federal Government, $12 million from the city, $71 million for public projects, $25 million for housing facilities, and $47 million in private investments.

"The housing that has been built by the Redevelopment and Housing Authority hasn't cost the city anything. It has paid off in taxes," Duckworth said.

For project dwellers, more money has been available from their incomes for "the better things in life," as it were. This is reflected in retail sales, which are up 70 percent from 1948; and bank clearings which are up 92 percent since the same year.

Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as far back as November 17, 1959, President Eisenhower publicly recognized our mounting balance-of-payments deficit. An important aspect of the proclamation which he issued in this matter ordered Government agencies to emphasize the procurement of goods and services from American rather than foreign sources. Nevertheless, our balance-of-payments deficit continued, and it is considered by President Kennedy to be a primary economic problem facing the Nation. The United States has had an adverse balance in its international payments which has amounted to over $17.5 billion since 1958.

Continuation of concern over this problem has led to the passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. This act recognizes our critical need to increase exports. But trade and shipping go hand in hand.

The regularity of service and equity of rates upon which trade depends can be guaranteed only if a country has ships manned by its citizens in operation under its own flag. However, a merchant marine is also important for its balance-of-payments earnings. The American-flag merchant fleet on its own annually earns or conserves the equivalent of about one-fifth of the favorable surplus which occurs in our sales of exports over imports. Even at that, this contribution is made at a time when many of our ships sail with only partially filled holds. The greater use of American-flag ships could substantially contribute to a further increase in our balance-of-payments earnings.

It is a well-known fact that American-flag carryings have steadily dwindled to the point where they presently represent overall only about 10 percent of our foreign trade. Even American-flag liner companies, which operate the fastest and most efficient ships in the world over regular trade routes at competitive rates carry less than 30 percent of the total liner cargo which moves over these routes in our foreign trade. This pitiful situation exists even with the benefit of our cargo preference law which requires that at least 50 percent of our Government or Government-generated cargoes move on American-flag ships. It is my understanding that in other countries, without the benefit of such laws, far more substantial portions of their national commerce are carried by their national fleets. For example, ships of the United Kingdom carry 50 percent of her own foreign trade, France 62 percent, Italy 63 percent, Japan 50 percent, Norway 50 percent, and so forth.

The Secretary of Commerce, Luther H. Hodges, was questioned about this lack of use of U.S.-flag shipping during hearings on the appropriations for his agency several months ago. The gentleman from New York, Representative ROONEY, referred to foreign assistance programs and the costs of maintaining an American merchant martine. He asked the Secretary why the American merchant marine should not be carrying a greater percentage of Government cargoes. He pointed out that the law merely says "not less than 50 percent," and said he could not understand why this percentage is not 75 or 90 percent. Secretary Hodges confessed that he "cannot make other agencies put their cargoes in U.S.-flag ships."

This leads me to mention something which has just come to my attention which indicates that fortunately there exists in the Congress, at least, a willingness and desire to approach these serious problems on a national basis. This is reflected in a recommendation made by the Agricultural Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee contained in House Report No. 355 covering H.R. 6754 on page 45, as follows:

> The use of foreign ships for the shipment of a portion of commodities under Public Law 480 and other foreign assistance programs has again been brought to the attention of the committee. In view of the balance-of-payments deficit facing the United States, it is recommended that American vessels be used for the shipment of commodities under this program to a much greater extent than at present.

This recommendation recognizes that the ocean transportation of surplus commodities is an important step in the general belt-tightening which must take place in the fiscal aspects of our foreign assistance programs. This is particularly significant, because the expression of judgment in this matter comes from a committee of the Congress which is normally concerned only with the agricultural community. It reflects a statesmanlike appreciation that our balance-of-payments deficit, which has placed the sanctity and stability of the dollar in serious jeopardy, must transcend all areas of limited interest. I believe that you will agree that the farmers' stake is just as great as that of our automobile workers and all other segments of the economy. Unfortunately, when the dollar is threatened, nobody stands to pay a potentially bigger price than the common man, whether he be a farmer, a metalworker, or a small business owner.

As a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I wish to add my endorsement to this recommendation of the Agricultural Subcommittee. The Department of Agriculture is the world's largest user of ocean transportation. Thus, it should be able to do more in this regard than any other agency of our Government. In certain situations, no doubt, the increased use of U.S.-flag vessels may involve higher costs. However, to put things in their proper perspective, such higher shipping costs should be considered in the same vein as other areas of our economy. There are many cases known to all of us where U.S. procurement has been considered desirable and beneficial both to our country's balance of payments and to U.S. industry even though at a somewhat greater cost than foreign procurement. This same philosophy of approach applies as well to the additional use of U.S.-flag shipping which can and should be made. The fact of the matter is that when U.S. ships are used they will earn or conserve for balance-of-payments purposes 77 cents on every dollar spent on ocean freight.

This matter is of such transcending importance that all areas of possible improvement must be utilized to their fullest. The Department of Agriculture is an agency of the U.S. Government. The agricultural community must recognize that this is a national problem. I am sure that individual farmers appreciate this to the same extent as all of our other citizens. This country has never had a lack of support from its citizens in times of national trial. The Agriculture Department cannot afford to turn its back upon those things which must be done. I therefore look forward to a prompt reaction by the Department in taking early and appropriate steps to effectuate this reasonable recommendation.

The Wilderness Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable misunderstanding about the costs of wilderness trips. Many find it worth while to employ guides and hire horses for such trips, and of course such arrangements cost money. Others, however have found that excursions into areas of wilderness can be among the cheapest of vacations.

My attention has recently been called to two items in the May 15, 1963, issue of the Missoulian published in Missoula, Mont., that deal with this misunderstanding with good humor. One of these is a news dispatch from Great Falls, Mont., that tells about a new organization formed by five newsmen and printers who hiked about 150 miles in the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area last summer. These fellows have formed their organization in response to criticism that wilderness areas can be enjoyed only by affluent persons. They called their organization the Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Our Wilderness Area and its Affluent Users"—SPCOWAIAU. One of the five members said that their 150-mile fishing and camping trip in the wilderness cost each of them less than $20 for the week's vacation.

The other item quotes a letter written by J. D. Ellen, of Missoula, Mont., on this same issue telling of a trip by his entire family of six.

Mr. Ellen said that during their family hike "we saw no beer cans, pop bottles, or cartons." He quotes the philosopher Senaca saying "Keep your silent sanctuaries, for in them the eternal perspective is preserved," and concluded: "If we, as a nation, cannot make it without mining, cutting, and eroding the last acre of remoteness then we should turn in our suits."

These two items from the Missoulian entitled "Wilderness Backers Reply to Senator" and "Wilderness Areas" are as follows:

WILDERNESS BACKERS REPLY TO SENATOR

GREAT FALLS.—Five affluent Great Falls Tribune newsmen and printers who hiked about 150 miles in the Bob Marshall wilderness area last summer fishing and camping are forming a Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Our Wilderness Area and Its Affluent Users.

Formation of the SPCOWAIAU came in response to a critic of the wilderness bill, Senator GORDON ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado. He argued Monday in Washington that such areas could be enjoyed only by affluent persons who could afford to hire guides and packhorses.

Charter members are Dick Coon, Ken Payton, John Polston, Jim Schmit, and Ken Hofferber.

One member noted it cost each less than $20 for a week's vacation. "It's cheaper than staying at home," he said. "Maybe that's why I'm not so affluent at home."

WILDERNESS AREAS

A recent Associated Press dispatch quoted Senator GORDON L. ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado, as saying wilderness areas "could be enjoyed only by affluent persons who could afford to hire guides and packhorses."

On that point I have written Senator ALLOTT as follows:

"Last year my entire family (six) including Kimberly, age 6, spent the night and enjoyed 2 days in the roadless area 5 miles beyond Elk Summit. This is in the Powell Ranger District of the Clearwater National Forest. We hired no guide and we walked.

"During the hike into this beautiful area we saw no beer cans, pop bottles, or cartons. This can no longer be said of the area along the Lachsa, where an old car body or two already litter this river recently given the superhighway treatment.

"Senacour, a philosopher, once said, 'Keep your silent sanctuaries, for in them the eternal perspective is preserved.'

"If we, as a nation, can't make it without mining, cutting, and eroding the last acre of remoteness then we should turn in our suits.

"J. D. ELLEN,
"Missoula."

President Kennedy's Moral Fiber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the Congressional Record an article appearing in the Michigan Chronicle, Saturday, June 15, 1963, by Dr. Broadus N. Butler, a distinguished educator, scholar, and commentator in the Michigan Chronicle:

President Kennedy's Moral Fiber

(By Dr. Broadus N. Butler)

A few years ago, the moral position of the executive branch of our Government reached a genuinely low ebb when the former President utterly failed to acknowledge the gravity of the series of racial crises that shocked the Nation. He remained almost ostrich-like through a series of church and synagogue bombings. He was pushed to the wall by the Little Rock crisis; but, even after that episode, we remember his strange reply when he was queried by reporters about a later bombing of a synagogue in Atlanta. It came out something like this: "I am not a lawyer. My father taught me to respect the Confederacy. These are matters for the courts, however, I abhor violence." We shall never forget how shocked and disappointed the Nation felt as those words were repeated on news media throughout that day.

By contrast, President John F. Kennedy is showing both executive stature and the strong moral fiber which is demanded of the office of President of the United States. He is making a direct and forthright interpretation of the realities of racial segregation and discrimination in the economic and educational institutions of our Nation and interpreting to the people how these burdens affect all other facets of our national life.

He is the first President to our knowledge, and certainly the first President in our lifetime, to officially recognize the fact of segregation as a national menace in the North as well as the South and to deal with it directly without trying to couch it in broad vagaries about civil rights as an abstraction from the facts of this life and this day. He has not postponed the approach to solution of these problems to some distant future. Instead, he has given priority to the elimination of racial and religious segregation as present moral, obligations of the Federal, State, and local governments—and as a contractual obligation of the private sector of our economy.

Long before the present crises, President Kennedy, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, and then Secretary of Labor, now Supreme Court Justice, Arthur Goldberg established the official posture of the executive branch of Government as a positive instrument for the increase of equality of economic opportunity for all citizens.

The Vice President established a Compliance Division of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity with enforcement machinery that works down to the spot wherever complaints are validly established. This committee took on the Lockheed Aircraft Co. in Marietta, Ga., when that company balked. Five billions of dollars of Government contracts were held by that company at the time. The company soon saw the wisdom of compliance, and it is now a model and showplace of productive and profitable integration, having increased significantly in morale, efficiency, and productivity.

The President responded frankly to the fact of northern racial discrimination and isolated the thorny problem of housing segregation and the consequent de facto school segregation as basic economic problems which must be solved. He was first to acknowledge that his own Executive housing order is insufficient and that it must be bolstered by positive initiative in FHA and VA housing offices.

It is a fair appraisal that President Kennedy is responding to the challenge of segregation and to the opportunities of integration as no other President in the history of the United States has been able to do. President Kennedy has had one distinct advantage in this opportunity. For all time before, during the entire history of our Nation—from the time of the writing of the first article of the U.S. Constitution—the coalition of Southern States and conservative powers in Southern States have held overwhelming majority control of the legislative branch of Government and significant control over the judiciary, including the Supreme Court. Their political power was vested in racial segregation. Now it is established and recognized, even at the White House, that "The day of the political racist is gone in the South."

The President now courageously states that it is the aim of the Executive Office to move the pace of civil rights "as fast as possible," and further, "It is a national policy that these rights should be granted."

It is in this spirit of forthright integrity that the President has alined the Justice Department completely on the side of the rights of the protesting and aggrieved Negroes seeking dignity throughout the land. He has placed support for the extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission and the push for new legislation to enable the Justice Department to be more effective in the amplification of civil rights cases as top priority action in Congress. He has called conferences of State Governors, city mayors, top U.S. businessmen, and top U.S. union officials, to place before them a definition of their responsibility to the law of the land and to receive from them their pledge of cooperation and compliance.

He simultaneously reached to the heart of the economics of racial discrimination by issuing a compliance Executive Order No. 10925 to all Government contract agencies, unions, and departments, which begins: "Denial of the right to work is unfair, regardless of its victim. It is doubly unfair to throw its burden most heavily on someone because of his race or color."

So, it is now our responsibility to move responsibly with the tide of the time, and to support and encourage the President to continue in his firm moral dedication. He must be encouraged to continue in this economic amplification of the solution to the problems of racial segregation and discrimination which have been and are now our national shame. He is in the path of wisdom and right dedication. May all Americans be wise enough—and unified enough—to bear out their responsibility to support and encourage him.

Burger Yachts Finish One-Two in Annapolis-Newport Ocean Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I note that the two overall winners in the recent Annapolis to Newport ocean race were two yachts built by the Burger Boat Co., of Manitowoc, Wis., in my congressional district.

The winner on corrected time was *Dyna*, a 57-foot yawl owned by Clayton Ewing, now of Easton, Md., and formerly of Green Bay, Wis. *Dyna* finished second on elapsed time. Finishing second on corrected time and first on elapsed time was *Challenge*, a 64-foot auxiliary sloop owned by George F. Johnson, of Ardmore, Pa.

Both yachts were built by Burger Boat Co. and have welded aluminum hulls—a new development in yacht construction pioneered by Burger.

Burger is a proud producer of custom yachts—both motor and sail—and the integrity of its management and the skill of its workers has won it an international reputation. The company has been building fine boats since 1863 when its founder—Henry B. Burger—began construction of sailboats for commercial fishermen on Lake Michigan. The Burger family has been active in the management of the company since that time and the present head of the company, Henry E. Burger, is a grandson of the founder.

It is fitting that the hundredth anniversary of the founding of the firm should be climaxed by the splendid performance of Burger-built yachts in one of America's principal ocean races. I congratulate the company, its owners and its workers on this outstanding achievement.

Corporations and Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article:

Corporations and Conservation

The entry of the Duquesne Brewing Co., into conservation is a significant one and it partially fills a major vacuum that has existed in the whole field of conservation since its weak beginning in this State at the turn of the century. For the most part, the serious damage to our natural resources has been done by industry. The lumber, coal, steel, chemical, oil and gas and leather industries of past years have helped to denude our forests, pollute our streams, erode our soil and in general, profit from the treasures of the soil.

At the same time, corporations are made up of human beings, and in some of them, there has been an awakening to the need for conservation. The lumber industry saw the need first and began reforestation at the insistence of Gifford Pinchot. The oil and gas companies have begun to control spillage and use care in the construction of roads and drilling sites. And it was the steel industry that spent millions to clean the air over Pittsburgh.

Yet, a great deal more needs to be done. Industry needs conservation as much as the individual. Industry must learn the high cost of polluted water in terms of expensive filtering systems. Industry must realize that it no longer can afford to waste a resource.

The corporation, with its manpower, its equipment, its brainpower and ability to keep the public informed, must learn to participate in the vital field of conservation. This is no job for trout fishermen or weekend picnickers. Methods must be devised to seal mines, reclaim streams, retain topsoil, use chemicals wisely. Industrial organizations have the ability and the powers to do these things. Much of their overall success in the future depends on what they do in this field.

Already much has been done in the form of research grants, support of organizations such as the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy and others, but more must be done by the corporation or the task will fall to the State. For the job must be done—and if the greatest effort is forced continually upon the State, the position of the corporation in a free society will be weakened. Industry must carry a heavy load, for it has taken great treasures from our lands, forests, soil and minerals. It is high time that industrial concerns of this and all States make a searching examination of conscience in this matter.

The Old Fourth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, all Americans will pause in their normal activities to celebrate our Independence Day. It is a great day—our independence, our Government, our free enterprise system—are the envy of the world.

We often wonder if true appreciation is still felt by our own citizens, and for this reason I insert into the RECORD a timely and dramatic editorial which appeared in the June 20 edition of the Southwest Messenger Press. I feel it is so embracive in its commentary that no further comment on my part is necessary:

THE OLD FOURTH

The Fourth of July—Independence Day. What a world of color, of drama, of history, those few little words bring to mind, and especially to those of an age who can remember what the Fourth used to mean.

It was a day of fun, of course. There were games, complete with prizes for young and old alike, running the gamut from three-legged races to shooting matches. There were the family picnics, and sturdy old tables groaned under them. There were the fireworks, now banned almost everywhere, except in formal displays, for safety reasons. There were the orators—they ran the full gambit from good to indifferent to bad, but they all had one thing in common—dedication, passion, pride in Nation, its heritage, its future. There were the great brass bands, the members standing tall in their pressed, polished uniforms. There were the rollcalls of the towering names that had provided leadership in molding and making a Nation fit to stand with any nation—Washington, Madison, Monroe, Jefferson, the Adamses, Franklin * * * And the flags, proud against the sky, flew everywhere.

We still celebrate the Fourth. It's still a national holiday. But something vital has gone out of it. Whatever the reason, the Nation is poorer, weaker, and smaller because of that. Times have changed. We have grown, prospered, learned sophistications, enjoyed vast material progress. But is the old pride, the old sense of faith in Nation and in its destiny, the old courage, still with us?

Each must answer that question for himself. But let him ponder deeply and honestly before answering as another Fourth comes near.

Wilderness Bill Needs Some Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the wilderness bill is to secure for the American people—of present and future generations—the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness.

Because our country is becoming more and more industrialized and urbanized, it is for our younger and future generations that the bill is primarily concerned. Sometimes the adults believe they have to solve all our problems—that our young people are not aware of what our country faces.

I have always had a great faith in the youth of this country and their awareness to our problems. I was vividly reminded of this fact when a letter entitled "Wilderness Bill Needs Some Help," was brought to my attention. It is most significant that the letter was written by Tim Wason, a sixth grade student in South Holland, Ill. Under unanimous consent, I include the article as follows:

SOUTH HOLLAND, ILL.

Mr. SAYLOR,
Representative from Pennsylvania,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I know very well you are the leading conservationist in the House. Since you are, and the wilderness bill is coming up soon, I thought you would like the article I enclose. (From the Hammond Times.) To be of most value to the wilderness bill I suggest you put it in the RECORD.

Our purpose is the same, to have the wilderness bill enacted into law. I have been working here in Illinois to that goal. I hope the enclosed article will bring us closer to that goal.

Sincerely,

TIM WASON,
Sixth Grade.

WILDERNESS BILL NEEDS SOME HELP

Have you ever seen a brook trout rise from the water in the reflection of a mountain whose glorious top is crowned with snow?

Have you stood face to face with a cow elk, knowing that within miles there is no one?

Have you felt the call of the wild?

If you have felt a love of nature, you will be interested in what I am going to say about the wilderness bill. Let me explain the bill. It gives the status of wilderness to 8 million acres. The bill gives rules by which this area is to be governed.

Only an act of Congress can make an exception to these rules. At the moment, the Secretary of Agriculture can change an area by himself. The bill distributes this tremendous power to Congress.

This way we, the people, can write our Congressmen, suggesting they vote this or that way. Congress is better informed than one man, simply because more people are going to write to Congress than the Secretary.

The wilderness bill has passed the Senate and is in the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Last year it didn't get out of the committee.

Why? Lobbies. Mining, lumbering and cattle-raising organizations have lobbies working against the wilderness bill. The House has heard the lobbies. Now, let the House hear you.

Peace is found in just two places; in the hand of God and in Mother Nature's pocket.

Our wilderness is at stake. Write your Congressman. Get through to him.

TIM WASON,
Sixth Grade, Hoover School.
SOUTH HOLLAND.

A New Era in Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial opinion by Harold C. Lund, vice president of the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., over station KDKA, Pittsburgh, Pa.:

A NEW ERA IN CONSERVATION

(Editorial opinion by Harold C. Lund, vice president, Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., Inc., stations KDKA-TV, KDKA radio)

For too many years, business and industry have been on the wrong side of conservation. Industrial firms are a major contributor to stream pollution. They have exploited our natural resources—water, timber, coal, and other minerals—with little concern about restoration. Industry, with the exception of the Harmon Creek Coal Co. and a very few others, has put very little back into the land to replace what it has taken out.

It is most significant, therefore, that a Pittsburgh firm has organized a conservation program aimed at safeguarding the woods, waters, and wildlife of our tri-State area. Duquesne Brewing Co. is the first to officially embrace conservation and make it a part of its organization. Bill Walsh, a veteran outdoors writer and broadcaster, has been named to head up Duquesne's program. He will serve as conservation director for the company—with these main objectives.

First. To support and cooperate with government agencies, sportsmen's clubs, conservation groups, and other organizations and individual sportsmen.

Second. He will spearhead a public education campaign to arouse public interest and support for conservation.

Third. He will work on specific projects such as the elimination of stream pollution, the restoration of land, reforestation, and erosion control.

As President John Friday, Jr., explains the company objectives and we quote: "We are coming to face the fact that conservation is everybody's job * * * not just a task for hunters and fishermen. It has become increasingly evident that the conservation movement can benefit immeasurably from the support of business and industry."

Yes, conservation is everybody's job. And it can benefit business and industry. The trouble is that industry has been slow in realizing its own self-interest in conserving our precious natural resources—especially our streams and woods.

We hope that Duquesne's conservation program will reverse the trend to destroy * * * and mark the beginning of a new era of enlightened interest in preserving or restoring our natural resources. Conservation badly needs the support, leadership, and direction that industry can give it. We strongly recommend the Duquesne program for consideration of other industrial firms in our area.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of June 29, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

The Department of Defense appropriation bill for 1964 involved $47 billion divided in this way—military personnel, $12.8 billion; operation and maintenance, $11.6 billion, procurement, $15.7 billion; research, development, testing and evaluation, $6.9 billion. Divided between the services in this way—Army, $12 billion; Navy, $14.3 billion; Air Force $18.3 billion; defense agencies, $2.2 billion. These sums do not include military assistance in foreign aid, military construction at home and abroad, military family housing, and civil defense. The final bill cut $1.9 billion from the budget estimates. The bill, the report and Members of Congress assume that we now have and will continue to maintain military superiority over any other power. Some say that we cannot prove this, but then neither can it be disproved. We know we need better weapons for antisub warfare. We know that we need an anti-missile missile which would render enemy missiles and attacks impotent. Most assume that no other nation has such a missile. We know, too, that any approach of stalemate as equality in military strength with communism would be a grave danger since Russian and Chinese leaders would be delivering ultimatums to the United States. We also know we must develop new weapons systems, never being content with weapons of the past. The RS–70, the mach 3 aircraft, Dyna-Soar, and other futuristic air transportation must continue to be developed. In our defense the BMEWS (ballistic missile early warning system) and SAGE (semiautomatic ground environment) protect continental United States from missiles and aircraft; and these defenses must be strengthened to foolproof if possible. Concurrent problems are found in contract award protocol that in any subvert competitive bids; Government in business operations in manufacturing, distribution, insurance, banking, etc., and the impact on the U.S. economy if, as, and when the Government cuts back in military spending. Most important to remember, of course, is the need for a strong, free economy from the profits of which taxes can be paid to provide the money necessary to maintain our military readiness. Military weapons and manpower are nonproductive and a drain on or wealth. We must continue to phase out old type weapons, replacing them with new revolutionary weapons far ahead of our enemies.

U.S. COMMUNISTS AND THE 1964 ELECTIONS

An amazing statement, frightening in its implications, has been issued by the general secretary of the Communist Party U.S.A. In a 10,000 word statement, "Political Parties and the 1964 Elections," Gus Hall, general secretary of the party, takes a stand on President Kennedy and the Democratic Party. Republicans are rejected en masse by Hall. He calls for the defeat of all GOP candidates in 1964. He terms Republican candidates "sinister." Leadership in the Republican Party consists of a "cabal", Communist Hall claims, and says it is riding roughshod over confused and moderating counsel.

Hall waxes eloquent when he speaks of the good work being done by Kennedy and the Democrats. He praises Kennedy because the latter has "kept the lines of communication open with Russia." He says Kennedy's quarantine of Cuban exiles and his ban on raids, bombing and invasion of Cuba by freedom fighters make up for his "mistake" of blockading the island last year.

Hall says Kennedy's sending of troops into Mississippi and Alabama, maintaining a cooperative position with Rev. Martin Luther King and other actions merit Communist Party approval. "The time has come," Hall declared, "to abolish the theory of States rights in this Nation."

Hall spoke of a broad movement, which the Communists back, consisting of labor organizations, peace movements, and youth and civil rights groups engaged in ever more militant actions. He said the country needs a new Federal charter (the present one is the Constitution). Kennedy also has called for a new Constitution. Hall said the Communist Party would not field its own candidates next year but would work to "shape decisions on Negro candidates, peace candidates and labor candidates in the primaries."

Making no bones about who should warrant support of Communist Party members and sympathizers, Hall said: "Almost all people's political movements (Communist jargon for party line movements) are operating within the orbit of the Democratic Party, and the serious left must, therefore, give support to these movements." Perhaps even many Democrats may be a little frightened at the statements of Gus Hall, and will want to repudiate them and the policies of the administration which bring forth such strong approval of the Communist Party.

ALGER COMMENTS THIS WEEK ON PERTINENT ISSUES

Probably no administration in the history of the United States has had such a record of complete failure as the present one. Our domestic policies are in a shamble with law-defying mobs running rampant in cities across the land; people are being hurt and killed and all the President can suggest as a solution is to give in to the demands of those who are creating the disorder. Stultifying taxes and ever increasing Federal spending at the insistence of the President are fast drying up capital needed for new ventures and an expanding economy with the result that our economic growth is being strangled by an ever-expanding Federal bureaucracy. Abroad, U.S. prestige and power has never been as low. Our enemies are becoming bolder, more arrogant and are making more and more demands for surrender of the principles for which we have stood throughout our history. Communism is strengthening its hold on the Western Hemisphere, our allies seem to have lost all confidence in U.S. leadership and are openly contemptuous in demanding more money as a price of future alliances. The bright golden promises of the candidate of the New Frontier are now tarnished with the leaden burden of a President who has been unable to understand or cope with the problems which confront the Chief Executive of this Nation.

The great strength of the system of government adopted by our Founding Fathers was in the constitutional powers of three distinct branches of government, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. There is a grave danger that Congress may become so ineffective through the delegation of its constitutional responsibilities, that the people may, indeed, determine it is not an essential part of our Government. If this day comes, Congress must bear the responsibility because we have failed to stop the erosion of our legislative powers by the President and the Supreme Court.

The President's efforts in the area of race relations are probably due the same failure he has achieved in all other areas of our national life with which he has tried to experiment. The failure will be for the same reason, his misunderstanding of human nature and his lack of knowledge of people. Our relationship with one another can never be directed by force, but rather through knowledge, understanding and conscience. The Negroes, who today are looking for President Kennedy to use the power of his office to enforce discrimination in their favor, may regret the day they deserted the steady march of progress through orderly processes based on reason in favor of a resort to violence and intimidation.

The Peoria Journal Star Speaks Out on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Peoria Journal Star has spoken out very forcefully on its editorial page a number of times on the issue of civil rights and its attendant problems. We have a sizable Negro population in the city of Peoria and its environs and we are convinced that all the answers do not lie in Federal legislation, but rather what we as a people feel and do voluntarily in our local communities to eliminate prejudices and discrimination. Notwithstanding the fact that the following manuscript is estimated to make approximately 2¼ pages at a cost of $202.50, under unanimous consent I include the editorials appearing in the Peoria Journal Star periodically since April 22, 1963, and June 19, 1963. The articles follow in chronological order:

[From the Peoria, Ill., Journal Star, Apr. 22, 1963]

MARTIN LUTHER KING PUTS MOBS TO SHAME

An emotional mob on Chicago's South Side last week tried to frighten a Negro family which proposed to move into their neighborhood. The mob, fortunately, was dispersed by police.

The disorder in Chicago reminds us of the remarkable self-discipline of Negroes both in the North and in the South, but especially those led (in tactics and spiritually) by the remarkable Martin Luther King.

He puts to shame some of the New York intellectual Negro authors who blast "the white man's religion." He has made Christianity (simply by practicing it) a major force in his efforts to obtain justice in the South. His Christian courage dispels fear.

Eruptions in the South are caused by fear on the part of segregationists. Fear, as usual, stimulates these emotional outbreaks, and violent reactions.

It is courage that stands up to mob action as Martin Luther King and his followers do in a way that doesn't give an inch—but in a way is calculated to prove that the fear is groundless.

He put frightened and excited mobs and frightened and excited officials, in the position of panicking and attacking orderly groups, often at prayer or singing hymns and nothing more "inciting to riot" than that.

King's policy is, of course, the classic demonstration of the dignity and fortitude of a people; the classic tactic that moves both the mind and heart of men.

The Reverend King's spiritual leadership of southern Negroes is the biggest contribution being made anywhere by anyone to obtaining Negro equality in law, in practical reality, and in the minds and hearts of men as well, which is where the ultimate victory lies.

The actions of his followers demonstrate determination, courage, and moral strength that practice the equality of attitude he seeks (rather than meet prejudice with prejudice), and a dignity which not only exalts his followers but puts those who have opposed him in wild-eyed, frantic, extreme acts to the kind of shame that will constantly diminish their numbers.

It seems to us that the Reverend King is taking the path to a true solution of an American problem, a solution for all of us by being a solution for the Negro people—not just a technical victory available only to an occasional Negro who can muster a battery of lawyers.

He has earned the admiration of all who take pride in the human spirit, and consider it as infinitely important as color of skin is unimportant in measuring the worth of a person.

C. L. DANCEY.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, May 14, 1963]

BIRMINGHAM AND SPRINGFIELD—NEEDED: MEN OF SENSE AND GOOD WILL

Everyone knows that brutality was not the objective in Birmingham, and a holdup of relief checks wasn't the objective in Springfield. Yet, both of these have come to pass partly because people have gotten terribly mixed up in just what their aim and objective is.

The Reverend Martin Luther King's aim in Birmingham was to further the principle of integration, that no man should be judged good or bad because of his color. He maintained that objective in spite of instances of brutal response to peaceful demonstrations by firehoses and police dogs.

Then, a couple of bombings by people who violently oppose that idea, and who believe in a "color line"—probably intended for just that purpose—so inflamed King's followers that they forgot that objective and adopted a completely opposite one.

They then drew the color line themselves and in the fever of the moment attacked several passing people for the simple crime of being white. This was a denial of everything they were demonstrating for and seeking to prove—that no man should be judged simply because of his color.

In a different way, this same confusion of objectives has caused much of the mess in Springfield, Ill. A few people, who prefer to see public aid as a race issue, have succeeded in completely confusing and smoking over the principle that no man should be judged on the basis of his color.

Some have done it out of a basic prejudice that indolence is a racial characteristic and is being encouraged for political reasons in the Chicago political machine at everybody's expense.

Others have done it in the equal conviction that the Negro will respond to any politician who appeals to black bigotry versus white bigotry. With one eye on the colored vote, they make the pure, straight-out racial appeal.

One is as guilty as the other.

What is needed is not a black versus white, nor white versus black objective. What is needed is a common disdain among men of good will against bigots—and that means white men of good will and black men of good will against white bigots and black bigots, alike.

Otherwise, the only just principle in the whole thing gets lost.

In the heat of such misguided emotions and personal hurt, everybody loses. In this confusion of objectives, the only hope of the future and the only moral and just aim is being lost—for there is not much good will left these days in either Birmingham or Springfield.

And we can build nothing but more suffering out of the ill will being generated, and the boost to bigotry on both sides that has come.

We need to see men of sense and of good will make a comeback in both places.

[From the Peoria, Ill., Journal Star, May 15, 1963]

NEGRO PROGRESS: IT'S REAL

Too much has been said about the Negro on relief, with special emphasis on the Chicago statistics, in recent weeks. There is a very important other side to that coin.

In that same city of Chicago, hit by a mass migration from the South, the average income of the nonwhite population has increased 88 percent in 10 years.

The specific 10 years on which figures are available are those between 1950 and 1960.

In 1950, only 4.4 percent of the nonwhite population there earned over $6,000 a year. Today it is something in excess of 34 percent, having increased more than 11 times over.

Negroes, so recently migrated in large numbers from rural States of the South, have started up economically early and fast, at a rate that dwarfs the aid statistics.

The vast majority of Negroes, in spite of the many handicaps under which they have labored, are not reliefers, and real progress is being made here in the North in spite of the natural discontented claims some of them sometimes make, themselves, about it being just as bad North as South.

This progress will have more to do with genuine equality than any other factor, for when the Negro has a free vote to cast (which is coming in the South and exists in the North) and earned money to spend freely and by his own choice in significant amounts, the problems of discrimination will fade away.

To put it crudely but realistically, when it is normal in our society to be interested in how a man votes and how a man spends his money (and our political leaders want votes and our business enterprises want money), respect becomes automatic.

The cold facts of the surging start of economic progress is more significant and involves more people than the relief relationships that have had so much public attention and made so much noise.

And it will have the further effect as it gathers steam of a growing awareness among the Negro youth of the chance to join in this very real upward progress if they prepare themselves for the jobs and opportunities of the future.

Laws may help, but it would be unjust to pretend that this sort of thing can be brought about miraculously, overnight, by law.

Like everything else worthwhile in this world, it comes to pass largely through the ingenuity and the efforts of thousands of individuals contributing to the sum total of progress in thousands of little ways.

Without that, nothing basic really happens.

That is happening in this country, today.

FAIR HOUSING WOULD HELP

One law which can help to eliminate racial prejudice in Illinois is the proposed fair housing law which attracted hundreds of Negroes to listen to it being debated last week in Springfield.

It squeaked out of committee by a single vote and is expected to pass the House of Representatives. In the Senate, insiders say, it will have real trouble.

The bill may not be the finest piece of legislation from a technical standpoint, but it puts forth a principle which should be adopted. Intelligent amendment in the House could have a great deal to do with the bill's eventual fate.

It would be a shame if this bill—which intends only to prohibit real estate men from refusing to sell, rent, or lease housing in good neighborhoods to Negro customers—were killed again because of objections to its technical provisions. If its backers can do this, we can see no alternative but its adoption by the legislature.

In Peoria there is no question that qualified Negro buyers are being discriminated against. It is also true in Chicago, and this fact alone has a great deal to do with great cost of public assistance in that city. The rent-gougers (who are mostly gouging us taxpayers) are able to operate basically because thousands of Negroes are denied the right to rent and buy in many neighborhoods.

In addition to helping the Negro family to better enjoy and use the fruits of his labor, a fair housing law would liberate a great many real estate salesmen from the prison of intolerance which racial segregation has made of their business.

Beyond this the law would be good for the conscience of most of Illinois' white citizens who know segregation is wrong, but see no sensible method of doing much about it. The force of law can be used in Illinois to the credit of mankind just as effectively as it has been used for his discredit in Birmingham.

Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New York, Oregon, and Pennsylvania have seen the need for fair housing laws. Our Federal Government has made its stand vitally clear. Illinois should do the same thing.

[From the Peoria, Ill., Journal Star, May 25, 1963]

PEORIA MISTREATS ITS NEGROES

We want you to read two letters on this page.

Both are from Negroes who live in an integrated neighborhood near the intersection of Gale and Nebraska Avenues.

They think that their neighborhood is on the verage of becoming an all-Negro ghetto and they blame real estate agents for this.

We don't know how much of the fault for this developing re-segregation can be laid to real estate salesmen, but we do know that the problem is not one of their invention nor one that they can solve without help from all Peorians.

We talked to the man who tried to buy Mrs. Ashby's house on Gale. He is convinced that he cannot sell houses in her neighborhood to any except Negroes—simply because white buyers do not want to live near Negroes.

He admitted he had solicited at least one of Mrs. Ashby's neighbors in an effort to get him to sell his house. He said his company has for sale signs on three other houses in the neighborhood. He named, off the top of his head, five other real estate firms which have signs in the neighborhood.

He said for all practical purposes every house in the neighborhood is for sale. He said this always happens when a Negro family moves into an all-white area.

He said that the same thing will be happening very shortly in the 600 block East Wilson Avenue where the first Negro families recently moved in. He urged us to watch and see if he wasn't right.

We talked to a Negro real estate salesman. He confirmed everything said by the salesman who offended Mrs. Ashby. He referred to the 600 block East Wilson as the chosen area.

"The chosen area," the Negro salesman said, has been "chosen" by real estate agents as an area where they will push the sale of homes to Negroes. The Negro agent has an interest in the neighborhood, too.

Will the Gale-Nebraska neighborhood and "The Chosen Area" develop into Negro ghettos?

Negro leaders hope not. They are discouraging other Negroes from buying in either neighborhood.

This is a hard task and it does not appear to be meeting much success. It is difficult to convince anybody who needs and can afford a better house not to take advantage of these two neighborhoods.

But the task faced by Negro leaders is not as difficult as the one posed for the white leadership of our community, which must find a way to remove the barrier of bigotry which causes the problem.

The white leadership in Little Rock, Birmingham, and elsewhere has failed miserably to meet this problem. Problems of the same kind are in the making in Peoria and we think that we had better become aware of them.

The American Negro is being mistreated not only in the South but also right here in Peoria.

We can rail at the stupidity of white southerners and be very convincing, but can we look at our own community and see the same sort of thing developing? Can we afford to let it develop?

We think not. And the first step toward preventing it is to try to understand what is happening.

You can help by reading the letters from Mrs. Ashby and Mr. Givens.

You can also read the adjoining letter from the Freedom of Residence Committee. It made us feel pretty good—until Mrs. Ashby and Mr. Givens wrote us.

It is going to take a lot more than editorials to solve this problem.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, June 14, 1963]

A Shooting and Individual Rights

"If I die, it will be in a good cause. I am fighting for America the same as the soldiers in Vietnam."

These were prophetic words of a man who has since been shot in the back because he fought for the basic principle of this land—individual rights. He fought that fight where it is toughest now—as a Negro in the Deep South.

The shot in the back is a symbol in American society, too. It is the ultimate symbol of fear, cowardice, and criminality. Nobody wants to be associated with that kind of action, and in recent days the white people of Jackson have been more concerned to disassociate themselves from that wanton murder, and to catch the killers, than they have been previously in curbing Negro rights. The murder clearly emerges now as a stunning blow to the segregationist, while the struggle for civil rights goes forward stronger than ever.

And we believe that the struggle for civil rights is a fight for America—not just in competition with Russia in the cold war—but in a much more basic sense.

This democracy of ours is not a pure democracy based on the absolute rights of a political majority.

This country is based on the principle not of majority rule, but of the basic inviolable rights of every individual human being.

Our first principle is freedom, and democracy comes second as the political instrument that best preserves freedom so long as the majority at any given time is prevented from abusing the rights of not just a minority group—but of any individual human being.

No minority can protect its rights as such successfully. The majority cannot even do that. The only way any one of us or group of us can protect or win equal rights is to stand on the principle of being zealous in the defense of the rights of every individual, white or black, rich or poor, North or South.

In doing this, we have not achieved perfection, and in a human society probably never will. But the principle is the closest thing to perfection that can be found for the foundation of social organization and political organization.

Our lack of perfection was dramatically illustrated by the President's speech on civil rights in which more than 2 years after his campaign pledges on this score, on the heels of massive public disorder, the murders of two Negro leaders, and the repeated dispatch of Federal troops to southern cities, he now expresses a need for Federal legislation in a hastily scheduled television address.

The final evidence of our lack of perfection lies in the simple fact that the sum total of what the President has proposed does not add one solitary bit of assistance to the problem of discrimination in this State of Illinois.

He has not proposed a single thing that does not already exist as State law and practice in Illinois. His proposals would represent progress in Mississippi and Alabama, but offer nothing whatever in Illinois.

Progress here is up to us, as it has been from the beginning.

It is a good cause. Individual rights is the heart of American political philosophy, the reason an independent America exists. And individual rights embody the core as well as the moral ethics of every religious and moral concept worthy of such a classification.

Everybody, whether aware of it or not, has a stake in obtaining and preserving the human, individual rights of every American, for only thus can anybody ultimately preserve his own.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, June 15, 1963]

An Old Saying and Prejudice

"Give them an inch and they'll take a mile."

You've heard this saying. You've heard it said with a sneer about Negroes—and you've probably heard it said with something more like a mixture of fear and confusion.

These attitudes do not spring forth full blown out of the empty air. Wrong though they may be, there is some seed, some grain, some reality that causes them to be born, to grow, and to persist. It may be a misunderstanding, but the misunderstanding in itself is a fact, a reality, a reason one must recognize and deal with.

We will not argue the obvious silliness of a majority of 10 to 1 that fears some sort of mysterious spectre of being inundated by a minority.

The "mile" sought is still some distance short of full justice.

Some folks have a genuine fear that if justice is achieved by the American Negro, he won't stop there—but will seek to employ the same methods and tactics to obtaining special advantages over all the rest of the population.

"Give him an inch and he'll take a mile," is an old, old saying, and over the years has been applied to a whole series of vastly different kinds of minority groups. Such a thing is not some kind of racial personality trait. That's nonsense.

The occasional incident that jolts people into this old saying—and they do happen—usually has a simple and obvious explanation.

When you build a high dam and let the water pile up with more and more pressure behind it, and then you open one little gate in that dam, do you expect the water to just trickle out?

Of course, not. It comes with a rush.

When you dam up housing for people of one color or one religion, let the pressure build, and then open just one little gate in that dam, what do you expect? A trickle?

When you dam up people's natural rights, unnaturally, and let the pressure build up, and then open one little gate, what do you expect?

When you restrict facilities for the use of a people, and let that pressure build up, and then open one facility, naturally you get something of an unnatural flood to that one facility.

When people who have been socially restricted find a place they can go freely without restrictions, real or subtle, that place naturally is apt to get a lot of their attention.

But one has to be nearly blind not to recognize that the reason for any such happenings is directly caused by the dam of restrictions, and the pressure thus caused, and not by any inherent characteristics of the people involved.

"Give them an inch and they'll take a mile," is unjust. And even on those occasions when there seems to be a physical instance that provokes this age-old argument of prejudice, a good look will reveal that the real trouble is that we have built a high dam (that shouldn't exist), salved our consciences with a few small gates * * * and it ill befits us then to complain that at times there is an unnatural flow if you happen to be standing in front of one of those little gates.

Let's put, "Give them an inch and they'll take a mile" on the same shelf with, "The only good Indian is a dead Indian."

The only thing more foolish than such an axiom on the part of the settlers was a similar attitude toward whites on the part of the Indians. It was more foolish in direct proportion to the numbers involved.

Statements which treat any group—black, white or purple—as a faceless mass are wrong sociologically, psychologically, logically, anthropologically, scientifically, historically, and morally.

[From the Peoria, Ill., Journal Star, June 19, 1963]

Peoria Must Not Wait

We believe that Peorians, generally and regardless of color, were disappointed when the Peoria Commission on Human Relations failed to muster a quorum this week and seemed to have a wait and see attitude in the bargain.

"Wait and see" is a form of nonleadership that people have been getting far too much of from Washington, D.C., without it becoming the watchword in Peoria.

We need the leadership of a vigorous commission on human relations in Peoria. We need it because such a commission can bring into play many forces in the community that cannot be reached otherwise to speed the end of discrimination and of discriminatory practices.

The commission has a long and creditable record in this field during years when it was often "swimming against the tide." It would be a shame for them to falter and get confused now that the tide is clearly running the right way, and the opportunity presents itself for much more rapid progress than in the past.

A strong commission, and its fidelity to the principle of nondiscrimination can command broader support among the majority of Peoria citizens than any other organization. There are a good many more people who are pro-human rights than there are more narrowly simply pro-Negro.

Perhaps, part of the hesitation of the commission at this critical time comes out of the confusion faced by a good many people in the face of the recent NAACP "boycotts," which on the surface apparently seem to many people to be simply coercive masures to force vulnerable employers to hire in a discriminatory manner, giving preference to Negroes and discrimination against whites.

In the eyes of many, it even appears that there is a demand to fire qualified jobholders for the sole crime of being white, so they can be replaced by Negroes.

This is an unfortunate reaction and this cannot be the intention or the policy of the NAACP. The NAACP in this State fought long and hard for fair employment practice legislation, and with the support of many people who believe in equal rights regardless of color, have achieved such a law at long last.

It is now illegal to discriminate against any man in hiring policies because of his color, black or white. The NAACP stood on that principle. It would be madness to forsake it now, and devastating if evidence of such coercive pressure were used as evidence in a case before the FEPC to prove that a white job applicant was discriminated against. Such would be more than ironic.

Such is plainly not the real aim of these demonstrations and boycotts. They are anticipating discrimination, with good reason, and seeking to forestall it—after a long period of frustrating, quiet attempts at persuasion.

Nevertheless, rightly or wrongly, it is clear that a good many people do not have full confidence in NAACP leadership to represent their principles of human rights. There's no point hiding from that reality.

Yet, the NAACP has, can, and doubtless will make great contributions to the cause of colored people and of human rights, not the least of these being the job of keeping folks who are personally not touched by the realities of the situation from comfortably relaxing and thus ignoring the fact that discrimination exists.

It does exist. It handicaps people in our society from reaching their full potential. It handicaps our society from reaching its full potential.

We need an active, strong commission of human relations. We need an officially supported—and financially supported—commission that can and will operate in many areas more effectively than any other kind of organization, and that can point out targets for reform in a way that will have public confidence in the justice of the targets on the grounds of discrimination.

The lack of too high a fever in the Peoria situation, and the number of intelligent people with good sense involved in it, gives us a golden opportunity to get these problems solved in the best possible way and with the least risk of serious trouble, or long continued injustice, either one.

Let's make the most of that opportunity—not fritter it away waiting for the national uproar to get worse.

Peoria can be a leader in this field—and get it over with—and save ourselves years of struggle and pain affecting both Negro and white.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Round Top, Tex., Has Century-Old Outstanding July 4 Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, the historic town of Round Top, Fayette County, Tex., was settled during the days of the Republic of Texas. Famous men lived there. It was an influential point in the early history of the Republic and the State.

One hundred twelve years ago Round Top began an all-out celebration of the Fourth of July. This tribute to the founding of our Nation is still paid on Independence Day each each year at Round Top. I challenge any other town in the United States of similar population to match Round Top, Tex., in its fervent and thorough dedication of its Fourth of July celebration.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article from the Houston Post of Sunday, June 30, 1963, under the title "Round Top Knows How To Celebrate Fourth: For 112 Years, a Grand Tradition."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Houston Post, June 30, 1963]

ROUND TOP KNOWS HOW TO CELEBRATE FOURTH—FOR 112 YEARS, A GRAND TRADITION

(By Marguerite Johnston)

Round Top.—The historic old town of Round Top, Tex., population 124, is getting ready to celebrate its 112th observance of the Fourth of July.

Perhaps the smallest incorporated community in the State with a functioning government, Round Top had its first celebration on July 4, 1851.

But Round Top was not new by Texas standards.

A few German settlers came into Fayette County before the county was organized.

But most of the early settlers at Round Top were Americans of English stock—the Ledbetters, Flacks, McGuires, Taylors, Pullens, Hills, Wades, Waldens, Robisons, Gaithers, and Townsends among them.

The pioneer settlers had Indians to fight, land to clear and independence to win.

The Townsend family had more men in the San Jacinto campaign than any other family. And Joel Robison was one of the party who captured Santa Anna.

Robison was the only Texan who could speak Spanish, and took Santa Ana up behind him on his saddle for the ride back to camp.

In gratitude, Santa Ana gave Robison a handsomely embroidered vest, which all the young men of Round Top borrowed to wear when they married.

The American settlers came to grow cotton on the rich black soil, and established a plantation society.

They worshipped at the Florida Chapel and sent their children to the Round Top Academy on the Ledbetter Plantation.

But in 1842, Count Joseph Boos-Waldeck, a cousin of Queen Victoria, came to Texas as representative of the Adelsverein to settle colonies in Texas.

The Adelsverein paid $3,321 for 4,248 acres of rich farming land—75 cents an acre. Spending a total of $22,000, the agent added house, barns, and slaves until Nassau Farm was a famous show place.

Ill fated as a project, Nassau became under Prince Carl of Solms-Braunfels the scene of horse races and $15,000 feasts.

Kit Taylor, with 200 slaves, was the largest slave holder in the county.

By 1850, Round Top had a population of 150, two stores, two blacksmith shops, two taverns, a post office, and a line of triweekly stages.

It had got its name from a big white octagonal house—Soergel's House—which had a tower on top visible for miles.

Beginning in 1850, the German settlers began buying town lots, and they built houses of stone similar to those they had known in Germany. Ehrgott Bauer and Conrad Schuddemagen were the first Germans to buy in town.

At the first Fourth of July celebration in 1851, H. Ledbetter, town marshal, led the procession, and Isaac Lafayette Hill of Round Top, a hero of San Jacinto, gave the main address.

After dinner, toasts were drunk to "The American Union—may we live to see its preservation and that its dissolution may be as distant as the end of time."

A decade later, Round Top was marching off to join the Confederacy.

The Round Top Mounted Infantry was commanded by Capt. G. F. Ernest. The Round Top guerrillas were under Capt. J. C. Gaithers. The present mayor's grandfather was among those who went off the to that war, never to return.

Round Top saw no reason to give up celebrating the Fourth of July.

At the war's end, Federal troops were stationed in town, and a carpetbag government took over.

Kit Taylor walked away from his plantation—leaving the chickens, geese, pea fowls, farm implements, horses and cattle untended, leaving the newly freed slaves without leadership or employment.

Most of the American-English planters moved out rapidly after the war, and increasingly the Germans moved in.

The Reverend Adam Neuthard, organized a Bethlehem Lutheran congregation of 1866, and the present day massive old stone church with flying buttresses was completed in 1867.

Traugott Wantke built the pipe organ, carving each pipe from the native cedars.

Mr. Neuthard, reputedly a master of Hebrew, Greek, Latin, French, German, and English, opened Round Top's first boarding school.

In 1870, Round Top applied for a charter in a move to throw over carpetbag rule, and in 1877 was incorporated by the legislature.

In the 20th century, Round Top's young people have gone off to college and to wars. Some come back. Newcomers move in.

To maintain the dignity of being an incorporated city, Round Top must pay for a great many public services which a less independent community might turn over to the county budget.

The city government, the Round Top Rifle Association, and the Do-Your Duty Club keep the town the pleasant, self-sufficient place it is.

Oldest is the government, now composed of Mayor Don Nagel, Aldermen Herman Birkelbach (secretary) Dennis Sacks, Wesley Albers, and Bobby Banik. Town marshal for the past 44 years is Ernest Emmrich.

The Round Top Rifle Association, chartered in 1873 is the chief sponsor with the government of the Fourth of July celebration, parade, and barbecue. Wesley Kraus is president, Paul Jaster vice president, Aubrey Markwardt secretary, and Johnny Krause treasurer.

The Do-Your-Duty Club, youngest of the three, was founded in 1935 to restore and maintain the public square. Its first president was Mrs. Willie Sacks, and the club painted the townhall, planted shrubs, paved the sidewalks, and took on the task of maintaining the streets on the four sides of the square.

Past presidents are Mesdames Lydia Fricks, Stella Schlabach, Delia Sacks, Lydia Nagel, Lucille Birkelbach, and Sedie Knutzen.

Under the present president, Mrs. E. G. Murphy, the 17 members have given bazaars and picnics familiar to women's organizations everywhere to finance essential community projects—including remodeling the fire house.

Almost everyone in town is busy now getting ready for the Fourth of July parade which will begin at 10 a.m.—just as the parade began in 1851. Last year, 218 mounted riders, 7 covered wagons, gaily decorated floats, and antique buggies and cars and wagons formed the parade.

Former Mayor J. G. Banik, who as teacher and writer collects Round Top lore, was the speaker.

This year the parade will begin at 10, barbecue will be served at noon at the Rifle Association, a baseball game will be played in the afternoon, and a dance will be held at night.

After 112 years, Round Top knows how to celebrate the Fourth of July.

Language Played Dominant Role in Conversion of Slovaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, during the delivery of the official prayer on Monday by the Reverend Michael J. Churak, supreme chaplain of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America, he mentioned SS. Cyril and Methodius, apostles of the Slovak nation, who brought Christianity to the people of present Slovakia 11 centuries ago.

In order to encourage the present generation to learn languages, which is being done by President Kennedy's administration, it should be recalled that knowledge of languages played a dominant role in converting the Slav people, as explained in the following article by Mr. John C. Sciranka, American-Slovak journalist of Passaic, N.J.:

Language of the People Played a Dominant Role in Conversion of Slovaks 1,100 Years Ago by SS. Cyril and Methodius

(By John C. Sciranka)

We often hear that history repeats itself. This we can apply to the mission of SS. Cyril and Methodius 11 centuries ago to our Slovak and Slavonic ancestors and our life in America.

When we analyze the history of American Slovaks and their progress, we must admit that the same is true about our pioneers in this great country as it was, when Slovak Ruler Rastislav invited apostles SS. Cyril and Methodius to Slovakia in 863.

During this 11th centennial of the Slovak apostles we find that even though Red Prague is today exploiting this 11th centenary for Communist advantage and propaganda, it remains a fact that the popularity of these Slav apostles is greatest here in our own United States. Why? No place, either in Communist Czechoslovakia, Russia, Bulgaria, or Yugoslavia, no one will be able to count that many churches and societies dedicated to the honor of SS. Cyril and Methodius, as here in our own America in the past century.

To us, who have been trained and adopted the culture of the Western civilization and the spirit of religious and political tolerance, it may seem sometimes strange, if not surprising to observe what an importance our Slavonic pioneers and especially our Slovak elders have given these two saints. The Slovak language and Slovak customs are after all matters of pure belief and idealism and these matters are very often hard to understand, if not completely misunderstood especially among the young generation. No matter how old, or young we are, it remains a matter of fact that SS. Cyril and Methodius were great in every respect. They left behind an enormous and interesting story. Of all the pieces we have gathered together, we witness that the greatness of their deeds and the greatness of their spirit, with which they have operated in their times, is almost incredible.

We have but before us a question: why did our fathers dedicate these many churches to the two saints? The answer to this question can be found in the tradition itself. The answer, however, is that it was because when our fathers arrived in this country everything was completely strange to them and they were surrounded by people of all nationalities an it took years of hard effort to master the new and strange official language. We know for a fact, that the English language was a barrier and if one wants to master it even on the elementary level, it certainly does raise problems even to our young generation born and raised in the United States. The English language was certainly the cause and a strong reason why our fathers gathered together and decided to write to bishops in Slovakia for Slovak priests. And then on, under their guidance, they built their little churches and centers throughout all the places, where they have found employment. The story behind this story is that every one of these priests, who was sent by the bishops of Slovakia to our United States, did in fact the same that SS. Cyril and Methodius had done 1,100 years ago. They were simple missionaries and this because of the request our fathers have made to the bishops in Slovakia. The idea is thus absolutely identical with that of Ruler Rastislav, who dispatched his ambassadors to the Emperor Michael 3d with request to be so kind as to send to our forefathers holy men, who could preach the word of God in their own tongue. Is there perhaps any other proof necessary, that the story of SS. Cyril and Methodius did repeat itself here in our own beloved country?

Going further, the two saints are great, because they have mastered the Slavonic language and so made themselves understood among the Slavonic tribes and nations. They knew it so well, that some historic sources consider them of being of Slavonic descent. We do not know this as a matter of fact, because they mastered several other languages as easily as Slavonic and they were considered in Constantinople as diplomats and respected learned men. The mission, to go and to preach Christianity to the Slav people, seems not exactly the only thing they could do. It is a fact that they were offered comfortable and much more promissing positions in Constantiople by the emperor himesIf. And most probably this information would also still remain unknown, if we would not have uncovered in the history of the Turks sources on how the Bulgarians were converted to Christianity. The details in general were compiled exactly 100 years ago. And the best part of this story is, that this work was not done by any Slovak, but by two English ladies knew little about them while visiting Bulgaria during the observance of the Millenium of SS. Cyril and Methodius. On that occasion we must confess, that the two particular ladies knew little about the Slovaks, or that SS. Cyril and Methodius were invited by their ruler Rastislav. What they didn't know is not important, but what they learned is of importance to everyone of us, and whether we are of Slovak descent or any other nationality. They tell us, that some 80 million Slavs observed the Millenium of SS. Cyril and Methodius. They did not know, however, how did St. Cyril got into the picture of converting the Bulgarians to Christianity, for the simple reason, because they did not know, that both of them went to Slovakia, after St. Methodius was successful in converting the Bulgarians. What they did know is on the other hand of tremendous importance to us Slovaks, because they have told the story how St. Methodius who was in the Slovak legends known as a very talented painter-artist, painted in the King Bogoris, hunting lodge the scene of the final judgment; which was some 500 years later, by coincidence or knowing, again reproduced by no one else but Michaelangelo in the Sistine Chapel and known as the last judgment day. Yes, there is still a great story pending and to be revealed on this particular subject, but the most important story that was told by Mrs. Mackenzie and Irby remains that, of the women of noble birth: King Bogoris' sister. The lady in question was being detained in Constantinople as a hostage and since St. Methodius was concerned in captives of war, he on her intervention did two remarkable things. He prompted the release of captive and also her and then he accepted her invitation (year 869), to go to the Bulgarian Court and seek the conversion to Christianity of her brother the king and the Bulgarian people. We do not know the name of this noble woman, which is the cause of this great story and probably, why SS. Cyril and Methodius accepted the mission to the lands of our forefathers.

This writer acknowledges with thanks and appreciation sincere cooperation of Mr. John P. Hanak, who is a talented researcher on the Slovak and Slavonic history.

We also learn another very important news, that the Slav nations and tribes had their own alphabet, known as glagolitic. It is stated in same source, that it is not known when or by whom it was invented, or even where it was in use is not clear. About the year 860, it is said, Cyril invented, what has ever since been known as the Cyrillic alphabet and this enabled the Slavonic language to writing. The Serbians still employ this alphabet, while the Bulgarians make use of the modified form of the same character, which ever since the days of Peter the Great, has been in use in Russia. As being stated, there is an older and ruder Slavonic alphabet called the glagolitic.

Research on Coal Liquefication Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Madam President, a spokesman for the coal industry, Mr. Eric H. Reichl, has pointed out that there is a great need for research on more advantageous ways of utilizing the energy of coal. Writing in the July 1, 1963, issue of the United Mine Workers Journal, Mr. Reichl compares the $20 million spent annually on coal research with the $200 million spent by the Atomic Energy Commission to perfect nuclear production of electric energy. He warns that if coal is to continue as a principal source of energy, sufficient funds must be invested in research to overcome the inconveniences of coal as a solid fuel, perhaps by liquefying it.

Because of the importance of this article to coal-producing regions of our Nation, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the United Mine Workers Journal, July 1, 1963]

Consol's Research Chief Warns: The Coal Industry Had Better Wake Up

(By Eric H. Reichl, vice president, research, Consolidation Coal Co.)

Ladies and gentlemen, I noticed that I am the only coal man on this panel. Perhaps this is just accidental; but I rather think it is symoblic of the general attitude of the coal industry toward research. I believe that the industry on the whole is not sold on either the need or the merits of research. Yet, it seems to me that rarely has an industry needed research so desperately as does the coal industry at this time. Whatever the reason for this attitude, let me tell you how it all looks from the point of view of the coal researcher and I will just briefly add up my own thoughts based on the 15 years with the research division at Consolidation Coal Co.

First, let me describe the setting. Visualize, if you please, a quiet little mining town south of Pittsburgh, called Library. In this little town are located our research facilities, recently described by a high official of our Government, as follows:

"Facilities which are antiquated; a research section split up in several different buildings, none of them constructed for research work. They were old warehouses—they were old storehouses just converted to handle the research."

While I might not describe our facilities in quite this way, I can understand why they might appear so to someone who is accustomed to the glass and marble palaces one has come to expect today at research centers.

In spite of this setting, I feel there are good reasons to be proud of some of the results that have come out of these old storehouses and warehouses because I think these results are significant and have been of importance to the entire coal industry. Before I get into these results, let me first make a few general comments.

First, is research really needed?

My management thought so as early as 15 years ago. Looking at coal's situation today, it would seem to me at least that research is even more needed today; in fact it is desperately needed.

I happen to be convinced that atomic energy poses a threat to this industry which is deadly indeed. I come to this conclusion because I believe in research and because we can look at the phenomenal results which over $1 billion spent on atomic energy research has already achieved over the 15 years since our division was formed.

Furthermore, the AEC spends research dollars right now at a rate equivalent to about 50 cents for every ton of coal mined in this country, most of it aimed at eliminating coal as a source of electric energy. In other words, 50 cents per ton is what the competition spends on research trying to take our market away. How much do we spend on keeping it?

Assuming that the need for research is real, the second question which arises is this: "What should the target of coal research be?"

I am tempted to add it all up in a very brief comment by stating that research should try to overcome the one unfortunate circumstance which is a burden to coal and that is the simple fact that it is a solid. I would like to spend more of my allotted time to tell you what we at Consol did toward this end. But let me first comment on the other areas which do not fall under the classification of "making coal liquid."

With this I mean specifically the use of coal in steel making and in the production of chemicals.

I think we must recognize that the steel industry is spending far more research money trying to reduce the use of coke, or coal for that matter, than we can hope to match. Again this research has been very successful as you well know and, on the whole, steelmaking represents, what I would think, a declining market for coal.

There are, of course, many specific problems regarding the use of coal in the steel mill which must be attended to and we are doing a lot of it in our own laboratory, but it does not hit at the basic marketing problem coal faces today. So I will not discuss it any further.

If research on coal in steelmaking cannot help the picture, neither can research on the production of chemicals solve this problem. Very simply, the volume is too small. There have been some very major attempts to reach this specific goal, particularly those of Union Carbide and if I may say so, those of our own. However, broadly speaking, chemicals are no solution to the problem of marketing large volumes of coal.

So let us go back now to the main research job: How to overcome the disadvantage coal carries by virtue of its solid state. The disadvantage is a very real one. Solids are expensive to handle, expensive to transport, and as a form of energy, nobody wants it (unless we consider uranium pellets).

Our overall theme song, therefore, has been, and remains today, to make coal over into some sort of a fluid; to put it into such a form that we can somehow move it through a piece of pipe—or for that matter, through a wire; but this is another problem. In our research program, this form has ranged from coal-water slurry to liquid fuels to pipeline gas—anything as long as it is a fluid.

Not all phases of our work are equally advanced, of course. Right or wrong we started out by assigning priorities to various parts of the overall job. We had to, to keep a reasonable budget because after all, we are only a single private company and had to use our own money. We did not have any government research funds.

So the first job we tackled was somehow to break down the transportation burden. As you know, we developed and demonstrated the crosscountry pipelining of coal and the utilization of slurry in power stations. Whatever you may wish to say about our pipeline development, its effect on freight rates is undeniable.

This was a very major research job, including all phases such as laboratory, pilot plant and commercial demonstration of various aspects of this technique. I would like to say the full potential of coal pipelines has never been fully realized. To do this will require a much greater show of interest on the part of the industry, and also on the part of the consumer. Of course the consumer has atomic energy as backstop; maybe a little more atomic pressure on the industry will bring about a renewed interest in the line. In the meantime, at least we can enjoy the new era of railroad freight ratemaking.

Anyway, this research job is behind us and our work, as far as handling and transportation goes, now centers on coarse, raw coal. We are completely openminded about this, whether it is wet or dry, pipe or belt, truck or rail, we will look at all schemes—anything which might cut the cost between the face and the point of shipment or point of use.

When we consider our program as a whole, the coal pipeline appears simply as a first stage of coal liquefaction. It still aims only at coal's existing markets whether it is power or steel. The next and technical far more difficult job will involve the actual conversion of coal in order to enter the liquid and gaseous fuel market. Consider first the incentive to do this.

If we process coal at all, it will surely be at the mine, and there we can bring to bear coal's overwhelming advantages—the large reserves, their geographic location, and, above all, the price at the mine—because at the mine mouth, liquid fuels, for instance gasoline, costs about 7 times as much as coal, and gas is almost 3 times as much. With thin kind of margin, the chances are good for successful research, and we have pursued this goal ever since we were in business.

Now as far as the liquid fuel market is concerned, it is, of course, a fact that there is an abundance, an excess of such fuels around. But this is true for gas, for oil, for coal, and even for uranium. The problem is not to fill a badly needed gap of liquid fuels. The problem is to find a badly needed new use for coal.

The liquid fuel market is very large, and if our work should be successful, maybe the oil industry will permit us to add a little sidestream to the 2 million barrels of liquid fuels which are imported into this country daily.

They will, of course, not do this out of kindness, but I don't think we need any special breaks. In fact, if coal conversion is not fully competitive, it will be useless. And this brings me to the present state of this art.

I imagine some of you will have noted the newspaper stories about our process and the fact that OCR may desire to speed the development right through the pilot plant phase. I don't know whether this will happen or not; but there is one thing I do know. As a result of this interest by the Government, this development of ours has been checked, rechecked, crosschecked, evaluated, and appraised now for over 2 years—by us, by people in the oil industry, by large engineering firms and by the Government. I gather the consensus after all this is that, given a fair price for coal and an adequate return on investment, the cost of gasoline, for instance, would lie between 12 to 14 cents per gallon. It cannot be tied down any closer than that at the present time.

I am not going to argue here whether this is a gold mine or a barely marginal proposition. But I do know that it means one heck of a lot of progress; because when the last major effort in this field was wound up 10 years ago by the Office of Synthetic Fuels after spending $87 million on it, the price of gasoline from coal had been appraised at around 28 to 35 cents a gallon.

I think we have made real headway in our "old warehouses" in Library and have set a new standard for research on liquid fuels from coal. No project now deserves attention and much less any pilot plant effort if it is not at least as promising. I would say par for this course has now been reestablished at a much lower level.

The second largest fluid energy market is, of course, the gas business. Time is too short here and I cannot get into this in any detail but the production of pipeline gas from coal is obviously a very worthwhile objective; maybe there are some questions on this later. We, ourselves, have been in it for almost as long as we have had a research group. In fact, we are in it today jointly with two major gas companies. In this connection, I believe it is foolish to argue as an alternate for conversion of coal to liquids or to gases. Really, both are desirable goals. Both are essentially necessary for us.

And while we are on this subject, I would add that we will probably find it desirable to convert coal into gases and liquids and electricity, all at one time; split the solid coal into several forms of fluid energy and power. This is likely to be the most economic approach and is, in fact, exactly the same as one does with crude oil.

Let me, in closing, ask you for the one thing our work needs more than anything else and that is a friendly, receptive atmosphere to research. I think we should recognize that in spite of the present upsurge in the coal business, the long-rang survival depends on continued, rapid change in all aspects of this industry, in the mining methods, in the transportation methods, and in the form in which coal is finally sold to the customer.

Research can develop such new methods and forms and I hope you will find them to your liking and will be ready to adopt them as fast as they become available. In the absence of this acceptance, coal research will, indeed, remain stillborn.

State Aid to the Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, the New York State Council on the Arts has set a pattern of State support for the arts which is being emulated by an increasing number of State governments in all parts of the Nation.

The movement has been spreading rapidly but unevenly in form and plan. This development is a welcome response by the people to the growing consciousness of the place of the visual and performing arts in our Nation's life, and it should be fostered and encouraged. A national agency is essential to provide continuing stimulation and standards in the distribution of our creative resources. This is the service which can be rendered by a U.S. Arts Foundation such as the one I have proposed in my bill and in the bill submitted by Senator HUMPHREY, and which was emphasized in the report of August Heckscher, the President's consultant on the arts.

At the recent convention of the American Symphony Orchestra League in San Francisco, John H. MacFadyen, executive director of the New York State Council on the Arts, called attention to the essential role of Government in any program to develop the Nation's cultural resources. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. MacFadyen's address entitled "America's Approach to the Arts," which was delivered at the convention keynote luncheon, June 20, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S APPROACH TO THE ARTS

(Address by John H. MacFadyen)

The subject of today's meeting is an appropriate challenge for the combined conventions of the American Symphony Orchestra League and Community Arts Councils Inc. The American approach, like the American dream, is a popular and extremely vague epithet. It has been subject to intense and personal interpretation and interpolation, and I don't need to point out that it doesn't take much interpolation to turn epithet into epitpah. Sometimes I'm afraid that that may be what's happening to the American approach. At the moment, America's approach to the arts is not working; it's not working because it is not total, and I, for one, am convinced that it won't work until it is total. We are still arguing the question of the validity of Government support for the arts, but the argument generally revolves around whether or not Government support should replace other sources of patronage, or will replace other sources of patronage. The question is not either/or, it's both. In fact it's more than both, it's all.

There has been a peculiar tradition in the development of patronage in general and patronage for the arts in particular to look on each succeeding source as it emerges as the final salvation. At least this has been true in the succession of the benevolent individual, the foundation, the university, corporations and business, and to some extent labor. It has been a little like watching children on a treasure hunt—as each new clue is discovered they all rush to the hiding place certain that they will find the grand prize. In arts patronage, the latest rock to be turned over revealed government, and everyone has rushed in to scramble the hearing records with laments and demands. Characteristic of the analogy there have, of course, been some who have contented themselves with minor prizes, withdrawing from the search and secretly hiding them from the others. But generally just about everyone has jumped into the fray.

Now even Government is not a simple single source of patronage. It is complex and multiple and there exists within it a wide range of legitimate concerns. Government includes at least municipal and county government, at least the executive, conservation, education, health, correction, public service and commerce divisions of State government, and at least some of the present departments of the Federal Government including the executive branch and State, Defense, Interior, Commerce and Health, Education and Welfare.

Beginning back there with the all-important benevolent individual, I have just listed 21 potentially significant sources of patronage. There may be others, but until these 21 are assuming their appropriate shares in a logically interrelated way I will not be satisfied with America's approach to the arts.

As director of the New York State Council on the Arts, my specific knowledge is largely limited to only one of these 21 sources, the executive branch of State government. But aside from some comment on our program I would like to examine the broader aspects of the developing State support across the United States.

Around the end of March, I forwarded copies of the report, "New York State Council on the Arts, 1962," to the governors of the 50 States. In an accompanying letter I asked them four general questions. So far, we have received 30 replies, from Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

To my first question, "Is support for the arts considered a legitimate concern of your State government?" 18 gave a categorical yes, none answered flatly no, 2 gave no answer, 6 were indefinite and 4 felt that the question was premature on a State policy level. Personally, I was surprised and impressed to find two-fifths of our States accepting without question the principle of State support for the arts. This alone is a remarkably encouraging sign. Without identifying the source, let me give you a selection of these answers:

"I do think that support for the arts is a legitimate concern of State government. Of course, the extent to which such support may be extended must necessarily depend on resources, financial and otherwise."

And from another, "I believe that support for the arts on the part of State government is both proper and beneficial, providing always that support is given in such a way as to insure complete freedom of expression on the part of the artist."

Or another, "I would certainly say that we consider support for the arts a legitimate concern of State government. However, I feel that such support does not necessarily mean direct financial outlay since the pattern of operation of various other State agencies and institutions gives a great deal of support at the present time. I am particularly aware of the kind of support that comes from the extension services of our various colleges and universities."

And still another says, "it is my personal feeling that the State governments have a very definite role to play in this area as a means of enabling our citizens to enjoy richer and more complete personal lives."

These are personal expressions from some of our governors.

My second question asked, "Does your State have a long-range plan for developing its cultural resources?" and here the picture becomes a bit more clouded. Only three answered yes, the rest were indefinite, and the three yeses implied a somewhat limited interpretation of the expression, "cultural resources." In many instances, however, it was indicated that State commissions had been established with this planning as part of their responsibility. In New York, long-range planning is implicit in our legislation, but the council is no where near the point where long-range goals could be more than loosely defined.

Questions 3 and 4 were more difficult to answer: "What, in your opinion, is the appropriate relationship of State patronage to the creative artist; the performing artist; the institutions for interpretation of the visual and performing arts?" and "can you suggest ways in which the State can encourage the development of all other potential sources of patronage for the arts?"

Those that did answer suggested techniques that State governments will attempt to develop. Seven, including New York, appear to have legislated arts councils or commissions with broad responsibility to all the arts. Three have less formal commissions made up of private citizens or appointed by the Governor without specific legislation. Seven States are limited to giving some direct support to museums, historical societies, symphony orchestras and other performing arts, or festivals. The remainder appear to limit their support to direct education.

The New York State Council on the Arts, established in 1960, is, as I said, part of the executive branch of State government. It is generally charged to encourage participation in and appreciation of the arts. The State department of education supports numerous programs of direct arts education in the public schools, the State university system, the libraries, and the State museum. We feel that the department of conservation should participate in the development of public facilities for the arts and in the preservation of important buildings and other significant works of art. The departments of health and correction can use the arts in imaginative ways in searching for solutions to their problems; the department of public service can also help with the development of facilities, and the department of commerce is responsible for presenting the State's artistic or cultural image to the Nation and the world. I would hope that eventually the State arts council would be able to function as an effective coordinating agency for these many and diversified programs. In the meantime we are exploring our immediate responsibilities.

The council's programs fall into four categories. The touring professional performing arts program is devised to make it possible for communities throughout the State to present the highest quality concerts, theater, opera, and ballet and dance. Our support is to the local sponsors to permit their offering approved companies within prescribed ticket price limitations. Similarly, top quality exhibitions of the visual arts are circulated to local museums, schools or colleges, or arts centers, with council support. The educational program supports the introduction of professional performances and other direct projects into the public schools. The special projects program is primarily devoted to improving the opportunities for the emerging creative or performing artist to be seen or heard. The technical assistance program is designed to improve the standards of amateur community arts through providing expert consultation to the local organizations.

While these four categories loosely define our operations we are constantly searching for ways to encourage logical cooperation among organizations with similar objectives. The council recently helped to guide the establishment of a New York State opera league with this in mind. You will be interested here in our studies of the symphony orchestras in New York State being undertaken by the American Symphony Orchestra League staff. Preliminary findings indicate that 163 orchestras were surveyed including 33 which were unclassified due to lack of response and 26 currently defunct or with temporarily suspended seasons. Of the remaining 104, 3 are classified as major orchestra, 2 as metropolitan orchestra, 8 as other professional orchestras, 62 as community orchestras, 26 as college and university orchestras and 3 as youth orchestras. These classifications follow the American Symphony Orchestra League categories used to designate the financial scope of an orchestra's operations.

Following the council's regional division of the State, the geographical groupings indicate 13 orchestras in the 8 counties of the western area, 13 in the 12 counties of the Finger Lakes area, 9 in the 9 counties of the central area, 5 orchestras in the 11 eastern area counties, 5 in the 13 counties of the Adirondack area, and 59 orchestras in the 9 counties of Metropolitan New York City area.

In a summary of the findings of the survey, Mrs. Thompson noted that approximately 10 percent of the known orchestras in the United States were in New York State and, of these, approximately two-thirds have been founded in the past 20 years. New York State's orchestras play at least 1,200 concerts each year to an estimated audience of about 2 million persons, exclusive of radio and television. Gross annual expenditures for orchestral operations total about $5 million of which 45 percent must be raised through patronage.

Plans are being made to initiate the second phase of the survey which will seek some specific answers to the question of how greater cooperation and coordination among these orchestras may contribute to increasing audiences and patronage and raising the standards of performance.

This is an indication of what New York State, executive branch, is trying to accomplish with its one twenty-first of the total patronage picture. I think it is a gratifying start, but in terms of the potential, our achievement is extremely modest. I have also suggested the nationwide climate developing for broadening State support. Each State has its particular artistic indentity and to this extent the programs that emerge will naturally differ.

They will, however, have certain considerations in common. These I have pointed out in a general guide to State support programs prepared in answer to the numerous requests for information received in our office. They include:

Motives: There will be a variety of motives behind interest in State support. What these motives may be is of relatively little importance provided they are recognized for what they are and for their potential danger to the overall concern. It would not be reasonable to expect anyone who has devoted a lifetime to the development and support of a symphony orchestra to totally abandon this devotion in order to promote a broader artistic concept. But if the sole ambition, in urging a State program, is limited to improving the specific economic welfare to that orchestra, the protagonist will be ill-suited to exercise any substantial influence on that State program. Specialized interest and knowledge is indispensable to development but it must not become exclusive.

Public persuasion: In approaching a legislature, as well in fact as any recalcitrant source of potential patronage, our sins of omission are enormous. Too frequently an obscure obligation is implied without proper definition or justification. These people are human beings with diverse personal backgrounds and interests; they become a majority when there is a clear understanding of the importance of their collective action. Social welfare legislation is enacted not because each legislator has personally experienced poverty, sickness, and ignorance, but because he is keenly aware of the moral and indeed the political implications of his concern for these inequities. It is less important to convert the legislature into art lovers than it is to demonstrate to them the significance of the arts in the development of society.

Legislation: The preparation of legislation for introduction into a State legislature is, of course, a highly technical task and demands the attention of competent legal counsel. State constitutions differ and specific bills will be developed within the limitations determined therein.

Goals and techniques: The principal function of State support is to encourage higher standards in, and greater public exposure to all the arts. An initial survey will be helpful in generally determining the extent and quality of a State's cultural resources, their economic well-being and existing sources of support, and their appeal to the public interest. While much of this information will be statistical the quality evaluation should be candid and professional. The main function of this survey will be to determine a point of departure toward the establishment of broad goals. These goals should be realistically projected over a long period of time and general planning for their achievement should follow.

A State goal of better art for more people deals essentially with the interpretive. Before many States can make significant progress toward this goal in all the arts they must develop public recognition of and interest in quality, and general and special educational programs directed toward sustaining this interest and eventually producing this quality. It should be pointed out that in many parts of the country the population pattern is such that interstate cooperation is the most logical approach. Frequently this may require the subordination of "State pride," but I hope we have reached the point in national maturity where this ideal can be achieved.

In the establishment of broad goals and the development of techniques professional advisers can play a crucial role. They should be chosen for their special ability to relate their knowledge and experience to the particular program of a given State; they may well be the most effective protection against Government support becoming Government control.

Stripped of the various disguises intended to make it acceptable to the public and palatable to the lawmaker, we are dealing finally, as I have said, with another source of patronage to the arts: The State government. To play the role of patron in any field involves the risk of the delusion that patronage, in itself, can create. In the end, this is the special gift of talent to a human soul. Motives behind patronage are as diverse as its sources, whether individual, foundation, business or the various levels of Government. But if patronage cannot create, it may be creative depending on the imagination of the source. The sources themselves will fall into categories of concern particular to their nature, dealing broadly with the creative, the interpretive, or the audience. As these sources emerge under the complex but vital American system they will find their logical place within a category. To find this logical place for State support is our collective challenge. To some extent this will inevitably be a trial and error search, and as we are answerable to the taxpayer we must hope for his patience and indulgence. But Government responsibility for its share of patronage of the arts in America has been too long neglected. That we are now endeavoring to assume this responsibility puts us all in the service of a very special cause, which is only part of the dream, America's total approach to the arts.

Alliance, Ohio, Honors an Outstanding Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, in these days of racial unrest it seems to me that a bright spot appears in my congressional district.

Alliance, Ohio, has honored an outstanding citizen. A Negro. They have named a new school library for Curvis Rhyne.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to call Curvis Rhyne my friend. I am delighted that he has received this well-deserved honor. Alliance, Ohio, is also to be congratulated.

The following article is from the Alliance Review, June 19, 1963:

Library Named for Rhyne

A living memorial to one of Alliance's leading Negro citizens, Second Ward Councilman Curvis F. Rhyne, was established by the Alliance Board of Education in unprecedented action last night.

The new library in the new addition under construction at North Franklin School will be known as the Curvis F. Rhyne Library.

The honor to Rhyne, latest in a series which have been forthcoming since he stepped into political circles on an active basis 12 years ago, was approved in a resolution adopted by the board of education.

Board President John L. Russell sponsored the resolution for the 40-year-old employee of Transue and Williams Steel Forging Corp.

PRESIDED AT CEREMONY

Rhyne recently served as master of ceremonies for ground-breaking at the school project.

The resolution adopted by council reads as follows:

"Whereas, Curvis F. Rhyne has been outstanding in his community to bring about the establishment of a new school building presently known as the Franklin Street School and has worked herein and diligently among various peoples to secure the new building and deserves recognition for his efforts: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That inasmuch as the new Franklin school shall have as a part of its structure a school library to be maintained by the Alliance public school system, that in recognition of the achievements of Curvis F. Rhyne, that the said new library in said Franklin Street School, be known as the Curvis F. Rhyne Library, and that the room be dedicated with future date to be established by the board of education and by the superintendent of schools."

Russell referred to Rhyne as very level headed and temperate and said he has done a splendid job in helping get out the vote. Russell added, "He has worked among his people, especially to bring about this school project."

Dr. L. E. Law, superintendent of schools, said Rhyne had been "most cooperative" with the schools.

IN SIXTH TERM

Rhyne is married and resides at 1029 East Noble Street. He is completing his sixth 2-

year term on council which he has served as president pro tem.

He has been very active in affairs of the Tabernacle Baptist Church and Negro masonic activities. He was also instrumental in bringing the annual convention of the Federated Democratic Clubs of Ohio to Alliance 2 years ago.

Rhyne has been a champion of the local Negro History Week observances here and served as president of the Alliance Negro History Club.

Rhyne attended high school and college in Georgia and has taken parliamentary law and political science courses at Alliance High School and Mount Union College.

Col. Paul G. Benedum Calls for Individual Responsibility, Energy, in Commencement Address at Alderson-Broaddus College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, on May 27, 1963, the graduating class of Alderson-Broaddus College, Philippi, W. Va., was addressed by Col. Paul G. Benedum, president of the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation. This institution, under the leadership of President Richard E. Shearer, is developing a constructive system of training for thousands of students from West Virginia and other States. As a business leader and philanthropist Col. Benedum has been instrumental in advancing many worthwhile programs designed to improve educational facilities in the Mountain State. The Benedum Foundation, formed by the late industrialist, Michael L. Benedum, is appreciated as an organization which major interests have been to enhance educational opportunities for young Americans.

Speaking at the 92d commencement exercises, the native West Virginian pointed out that freedom is not without its costs, and that each citizen has a responsibility to be an alert, interested and informed participant in the determination of public policy. He said that—

> During the course of the next few years we shall determine whether we remain a free republic or become guinea pigs of Soviet Russia's 20th century experiment in scientific materialism. This is not a mass decision. This is an individual decision. This is your decision and my decision. Will we make whatever sacrifice may be necessary to preserve that freedom which heretofore we have been willing to defend at any cost, or will the epitaph for our society read, "this civilization died because it didn't want to be bothered?"

He further emphasized the need for self-reliance and diligence in solving the series of complex problems which confront us on the domestic scene.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the address of Col. Paul G. Benedum at the commencement exercises of Alderson-Broaddus College, May 27, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM IS NOT FREE

(Commencement address by Paul G. Benedum)

In the Mountain State, 1963 is a great anniversary year. West Virginia is celebrating its centennial with a bold new spirit—an event worthy of recognition, as a tribute to men and women whose forebears were the brave pioneers that first challenged the wilderness. It is the story of a proud heritage wherefore I hurry to confirm my identification as a native son.

Well known on this campus is the circumstance that you too are observing a birthday anniversary—your ninety-second. Importantly, 1871 witnessed the founding of an institution now bearing the name Alderson-Broaddus College, which welcomes without regard to race, creed, sex, or economic status, students, and friends and commencement speakers. A very comforting thought to me, a Methodist and trustee of neighboring West Virginia Wesleyan College.

Some years ago the proud owner of the greatest race horse in the country, "Man 'O War," placed a sign over the horse's stall which bore the legend, "This is the fastest horse the world has ever seen." Beneath these words some wag—or maybe a philosopher—had written in bold hand, "And this is the fastest world a horse has ever seen."

This morning I should like to speak briefly on the academic "State of the Union" in the 19th year of the cold war with some emphasis on the nearly forgotten admonition of 200 years ago, that "freedom is not free" and never was; the inescapable price of freedom being eternal vigilance; and to remind you that on the highway of life, a "left turn" is not necessarily the right direction if we wish to maintain our freedom and liberties.

During the past quarter century I have read with a sad heart the writings of far too many Americans who seem to have contracted an alien infection with deplorable symptoms. Some of them have been brash enough to suggest that our forefathers were more interested in protecting their money and property than in giving their fellow Americans any more liberty. In effect, they are rewriting history much in the same fashion we glibly accuse the Russians of doing.

I make no bold claim that a study of the past will serve as an unfailing guide to the problems of the present, but it is just those who have been scornful of the past who are first to miss their footing in the future; it is just those who praise famous men and ponder over their experience who order their own lives aright and leave the world the richer for their passing through it.

Along with those who criticize and downgrade their country are others who criticize and downgrade business profits. In so doing, they neglect to remember that profits are also indispensable to the welfare of our economy for Uncle Sam is a major shareholder in such profits through heavy corporate and dividend taxes (52 percent corporation—91 percent individual).

My good friend, Perry Gresham, president of Bethany College, has said, "Indolence, ignorance and immorality are greater threats to America than the Communist conspiracy." I do not agree with my friend that they are greater threats, but I do say they are a calculated part of the whole threat that will lead us down the primrose path to the concentration camp.

Dr. Gresham says, "When students find more interest in beach riots at Fort Lauderdale than they find in chemistry or history, there is cause for alarm." He says, "In an age when people form associations to eliminate competition or win more pay for less work, there is little moral fiber in the body politic. The old-fashioned Christian doctrine of work must be recovered if our civilization is to survive. The drive for less work is a threat to the mental health of our Nation as well as to the morals and the economy."

I agree and I'll go further. When a ham comedian, movie actor or singer without education, training or ability is better known and can command a larger audience, more respect and a hundred times as much salary as our scientists and teachers, there is something wrong with us. When our magazines, newspapers and TV feel that they must exploit shooting, sex and sensationalism in order to sell, there is something wrong with us. How can we expect other nations to respect us?

Visitors to our shores are aghast to discover that America is not peopled entirely by gangsters, cowboys, juvenile hoodlums and crooners. Why must they come here to find that out? Why don't we see that we have better salesmen going to them? Any company that presented its product in such unfavorable light would soon go bankrupt and out of business. We are supposed to be the greatest advertisers and salesmen in the world. We all agree we're selling the greatest product. But nobody is buying. Why?

I agree with Frank Masland. "We should educate thousands of students from other countries, particularly the underdeveloped countries; those newly nationalized and those still colonial, stipulating that the students major in American history, American economic history and in business administration so that they may learn of the basis for the American free enterprise system.

"With a background beginning with the Pilgrim Fathers and leading through the industrial age, he will know why we celebrate Thanksgiving Day and why we value so highly the life and property and freedom of the individual. Russia has been training foreign nationals for 25 years. Graduates are thoroughly indoctrinated by professionals in the art. In a Russian school there is no danger of a faculty member being fuzzy-minded about capitalism. Those nationals we can persuade to attend our schools should leave our shores thoroughly indoctrinated with the virtues of our system and the evils of communism. This is one program we cannot afford not to underwrite."

The word traitor is defined as one who is guilty of treason; and treason is defined by the Constitution as giving aid or comfort to the enemy. If communism in general is our enemy then anyone who gives aid or comfort or abets the advance of communism is guilty of treason and is a traitor. The favorite tool of the Communist is the unsuspected traitor, whether he be a Government employee, an editor, the composer of a slanted headline, a commentator, a columnist, a faculty member, a labor leader, a business or professional man, a student or anyone else.

Now, none of us want to be a traitor. I'm sure none of us would do anything to give aid and comfort to an enemy. But did you ever think that every time you break a law, no matter how trivial—or defend a habitual lawbreaker—every time you flaunt discipline and authority, every time you say something detrimental about your country, without trying to be constructive, every time you promote indolence, every time you want something for nothing, every time you countenance or support immorality, every time you tread on the rights of others or demand some selfish, special privilege for yourself, every time you take from Peter to pay Paul, every time you support some theory without first thoroughly studying your history to be sure it hasn't failed in the past and that it is in conformity with the sacred traditions of the American way of life you are easing the work of—and thus giving comfort and, in effect, aid to our enemies.

Let us stop and think and be sure we are honorable Americans.

God created man and gave him freedom of choice. What we are today, what we have today, is the result of the forces of good and the forces of evil—of the efforts of men of goodwill and the efforts of men of evil intent. The more we seek freedom from want and freedom from fear through centralized or socialized government, the less we shall possess of the freedom of choice. When we turn to a government for our wants, the quid pro quo is the right to choose. The only freedom which all men possess equally is the freedom of choice. Men are not equal in any other respect, except in the sight of God.

During the course of the next few years we shall determine whether we remain a free republic or become guinea pigs of Soviet Russia's 20th century experiment in scientific materialism. This is not a mass decision. This is an individual decision. This is your decision and my own decision. Will we make whatever sacrifice may be necessary to preserve that freedom which heretofore we have been willing to defend at any cost or will the epitaph for our society read, "This civilization died because it didn't want to be bothered."

For bear this in mind: Our civilization is based upon religion—upon belief in a final divine authority. Until communism appeared on the scene, we lived in a world of believers, whether Buddhist or Hindu, Jew or Gentile, primitive savage or the boulevardier of gay Paree. Where the flood of communism has covered the land, believers have died and religion perished. Khrushchev, knowing his listeners would soon forget (even as they forgot what Hitler said and wrote) boasted that "either communism or capitalism will go."

The issue can no longer be avoided. Either God is or He is not. Either a man possesses value only as a servant of the state or his value is as a servant of his Creator. Either God is the truth or the Kremlin is the truth—but not both. Either God is omnipotent or communism is omnipotent. There can be no compromise. One will go down before the other.

We are capitalists; we are believers. We are the mortal enemies of the Communist atheist. We have looked at the march of communism in Europe, Asia, Central and South America, and in our own beloved country. We have counted the score. It is clear to anyone who is not afraid to look that the rate at which communism is absorbing land and people is such that we free citizens of the United States will make our final determinative decisions within the next few years. That statement is altogether plausible if projected in the light of history for in 1945, 7 percent of the world's people were behind the Iron Curtain—now, 40 percent. Those decisions we reach will determine whether we remain a free people or whether they are our last free decisions.

Big Jim Farley: A Giant in Time of Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, sometimes we have the feeling that giants walk the face of the earth. Times of peril produce great men. Thirty-years ago this Nation was on the brink of ruin, as the great depression fastened down upon us. Great men came forward to match and to master this hour of crisis and fear. I shall not enumerate the others, but Big Jim Farley was one of the giants of the time.

Big Jim piloted Franklin D. Roosevelt into the White House.

This was enough for one man to do in a lifetime, but Big Jim will always be remembered for his own sake, as well as in the reflected glory of F.D.R. As the principal politician of the day, he established a legacy of dignity, acumen, statesmanship and patriotism for all politicians to live by. Politics is the science and the art of selecting leaders and of the management of the affairs of public policy in a free society. I feel that our system of free government is vastly more virile and secure because of the precepts and the qualities practiced by this great man, by the example he set, in the science and the art of politics.

I shall mention, too, that this man has had marked success in business, and is vigorous today in leadership in various and important undertakings of business and public affairs.

Mentally he is brilliant. Physically he is big and strong. He thinks clean and lives righteously. He has a heart of gold.

Big Jim recently celebrated his 75th birthday anniversary. Reporters gathered around him, asking questions. A great newspaper in North Carolina, the Burlington Daily Times-News, has published an editorial about what he had to say. This is of such general interest, Mr. Speaker, that with the permission of the House I submit it for publication in the Appendix of the RECORD of the proceedings of the Congress.

The editorial follows:

GREAT MEN OF A LIFETIME ARE NAMED BY JIM FARLEY

James A. "Big Jim" Farley today resides in New York where, at 75 years of age, he is an active chairman of the board for Coca-Cola Export Corp., and where he still is vitally interested in politics.

He hasn't been in the national political picture strongly since the early 1940's when he broke with President Franklin D. Roosevelt, although his name still is synonymous with an opinion on national affairs and developments.

He has known some of the great people of our times, and he has known untold numbers of regular precinct workers. He has been a part of some of the great revolutions of our time, as in the Roosevelt era, and he has been a part of some of the more recognized failures and disappointments.

When he celebrated his birthday recently, an alert newsman asked him his selection of the greatest men of a lifetime.

His reply:

Herbert Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Franco, Churchill, Truman, John F. Kennedy, Charles de Gaulle, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the late Pope John XXIII, and the late Pius XII.

Among his explanations, he said President Truman had "the courage of a bank burglar," and that President Kennedy was "better prepared beforehand than any other President in American history and * * * his greatest accomplishments still lie ahead."

His other opinions:

Hoover: "One of the most unselfishly patriotic Americans I have ever been privileged to meet. I have great admiration for him * * * which grows with the passing of years."

Roosevelt: Books have been written about how Farley felt socially snubbed by the Roosevelts at Hyde Park. Yet he said of Roosevelt himself: "I do think that the advances made during the first 8 great years were the most important in the history of American politics, the most important in the history of our Country. * * * Mr. Roosevelt gave great leadership during the war period."

MacArthur: "I always felt that General MacArthur was the greatest military man this country has ever produced. And one of the finest minds it has ever produced."

Truman: "He is certain to go down in history as one of the greatest presidents. He made at least 8 or 10 important decisions taking great courage. He has the courage of a lion." Which decisions? The Hiroshima bomb? The Marshall plan? The NATO involvement? The Korean war? The Greek War? The recall of General MacArthur? ("I'd rather not list them.")

Kennedy: "I think he was better equipped to shoulder the responsibility of the presidency than any of the others before him. Better than Mr. Roosevelt? Why sure. Kennedy's knowledge of history, his political experience, his war activities, his keen mind, his personality, all of these factors. I think he will go down as one of the great Presidents. And sincerely believe that his greatest achievements lie in the years ahead."

Franco: "I still believe General Franco has given to his country leadership it could not have been given by anybody else. He has helped peace in Europe. The nations there are very happy with the way Spain has acted and, in my opinion, justly so."

Eisenhower: "He has been very friendly to me. I have for him the greatest admiration and affection. President Eisenhower's military leadership will always be remembered."

This group represents the opinion of a man who has known and studied the lives of the most eminent personalities in the world. It will not become a national document nor selection.

Yet it prompts further thought. Who has been left off? Who shouldn't be included? If you were making such a list, who would get the honors?

Mercedese Miller Reports on Her Week in Washington Experience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the students from Iowa colleges and universities who come to the Nation's Capital to take part in the "Week in Washington" program, which is now in its 9th year, experience a broadened concept of government and politics.

Miss Mercedese Miller, of Chariton, Iowa, a student at Drake University, Des Moines, was one of the two students participating in the program the week of May 12–18. Her report on the week's activities is further testimony to the effectiveness of the program. Under leave to extend my remarks, I request that Miss Miller's report appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The report follows:

REPORT OF WEEK IN WASHINGTON TRIP SPONSORED BY IOWA CENTER FOR EDUCATION IN POLITICS, THE DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN PARTIES OF IOWA, U.S. CONGRESSMEN NEAL SMITH AND FRED SCHWENGEL OF IOWA, MAY 12 TO 18, 1963

(By Mercedese Miller)

I arrived in Washington, D.C. by train at 10:30 a.m., Sunday, May 12, and went to the home of my hosts for the week, Congressman and Mrs. Fred Schwengel.

On Sunday afternoon, Mr. SCHWENGEL'S secretary took me to the Armed Forces Day ceremony held at the foot of the Washington Monument. This ceremony was a beautiful colored display of the bands and drill teams of every branch of our Armed Forces.

After the ceremony, we took a short trip to Arlington Cemetery arriving in time to see the changing of the guard at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, a very impressive ceremony. The Iwo Jima War Memorial was our next stop. It is a huge bronze and marble monument of the raising of the flag on Iwo Jima.

When we arrived back at the SCHWENGEL'S for dinner, my roommate for the week had arrived also. She was Janet Ackerman, a senior at the State University of Iowa. After dinner, Congressman SCHWENGEL took Jan and I for a tour of the Lincoln Memorial. It is an awesome marble structure which is even more impressive at night. From the basement to the roof, we toured the structure and marveled at the skyline of the city with the bright lights shining in the darkness.

Early Monday morning, Jan and I met Congressman SCHWENGEL'S office staff and received our schedules for the rest of the week's activities. Mr. Bert Bandstra, Congressman SMITH'S administrative assistant, introduced us to Bill Gluba of St. Ambrose College and Keith Meyer of Cornell College who would be accompanying us throughout the week's activities. The rest of the day was spent touring the Supreme Court Building and observing the Court in session and visiting both the House and Senate sessions. We also visited Congressman SMITH'S office and met his staff.

The remainder of the week was spent in touring the Library of Congress, the National Art Gallery, the National Archives Building, a tour of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Justice Department Building, a tour of the news department and studios of the National Broadcasting Co., a tour of the White House which was one of the most exquisite and impressive stops of our visit, the Democratic National Committee Headquarters, and the State Department Building. We also enjoyed watching the Washington Senators play the Baltimore Orioles one evening in the newly constructed ultramodern D.C. Stadium.

On Wednesday noon, we had lunch in the House dining room with Congressmen SMITH and SCHWENGEL. Following this lunch, Congressman SCHWENGEL took us on an extended tour of the Capitol. That evening, I attended the second session of the convention of the District of Columbia Young Democrats held at Georgetown University.

On Thursday morning, Jan, Bill, Keith, and I attended hearings of House and Senate committees.

It was certainly a week full of excitement in every possible interpretation of the word. I believe that the entire trip will remain a highlight in my memory for many years to come. Besides the elegance and cleanness of this city, I think I will remember most, the friendliness of the people I met. They were all wonderful to me and certainly played a major part in making my trip a wonderful memory.

I would like to sincerely and gratefully thank each and every person who made this trip possible for me—especially the Iowa Center for Education in Politics and the Democratic State Central Committee of Iowa. I would also like to say a great big thank you to my hosts for the week Congressman and Mrs. FRED SCHWENGEL, Congressman NEAL SMITH, and office staffs of both Congressmen SMITH and SCHWENGEL, and the people at the Democratic National Committee.

I hope that many more Iowa college students who have an interest in our Government and political structure will have an opportunity to take this same trip in years to come. It is one which they, as well as I, will never forget.

The Supreme Court Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, the June 30, 1963, issue of the News and Courier, of Charleston, S.C., carries an excellent column by Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., entitled "God Go Home." This column by Mr. Buckley, who is the editor of National Review and a noted author, columnist, and speaker, is concerned with the Supreme Court decision against the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading.

I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that it might be available to all the Members of this body.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOD GO HOME

(By W. F. Buckley)

The Supreme Court's decision outlawing the Lord's Prayer and the Bible from the public schools was to be expected, always supposing it is safe to expect the Supreme Court to act consistently.

If it is unconstitutional, as 1 year ago we were told it is, to open public school sessions with a bland little prayer minted by and satisfactory to the Protestants, Catholics, and Jews of New York State, it was predictable that anything as heady as the Lord's Prayer, or the Beatitudes, didn't have a chance.

But I wish to focus here on phenomena which have nothing to do with the legal merits of the prayer decision (though I would not wish to proceed without modestly registering my opinion that the legal reasoning was outrageously bad).

A year ago when the Supreme Court ruled against the so-called Regents Prayer, the entire country was shocked. There was good reason for this.

We are a pragmatic people. And the very idea that a nondenominational sentence of formal piety uttered in a public school constituted a breach in the principle of the separation of church and state—a principle on which almost all Americans agree—was intuitively discarded as just plain phony baloney.

Fanaticism was clearly at work in the Supreme Court. Fanaticism, defined as the taking of a good idea (separation of church and state) to preposterous lengths (no common prayer in the public schools).

That is why, almost uniformly, the people, and their elected representatives, expressed their spontaneous resentment in all kinds of ways. When the decision was announced, you may remember, the Governors of the several States were gathered at their annual meeting, and no les than 49 out of 50 of them declared in favor of a constitutional amendment to undo the Court's fanatical improvisation.

Protests were heard across the length and breadth of the land, from the conservative Catholic Cardinal Spellman of New York, to the liberal Protestant Bishop Pike of San Francisco. A half dozen Congressmen introduced amendments to the Constitution. Whereupon nothing happened, nothing at all.

Not quite nothing, as a matter of fact. The secularists and their fellow travelers went immediately to work. The Court's decision was tenaciously defended by those practiced sophists who can weave an argument uniting any commonly shared premise with any desired conclusion whatsoever.

The spectacle of the elders of the National Council of Churches joining to give approval to the exclusion of religion from the public schools of the Nation will surely go down in the history of irony, as the black mass of rationalist toleration.

One might have expected such action if the Republic were in fact living under the shadow of a looming theocracy.

But under existing conditions, the resolution of the Council tends to support the allegation of many Protestant opponents of it, namely, that the Council's concerns are primarily secular.

The success of the defenders of last year's decision is manifest in the relative quiet with which last week's decision was met. True, some of the same voices spoke out in protest.

True, several prominent legislators introduced a fresh series of amendments to the Constitution. But with the possible exception of the Committee for Religious Liberty, which is planning an extensive campaign for the amendment of the Constitution, no truly serious effort has been launched.

Now I am interested in this phenomenon for two reasons. The first is the issue actually involved.

I do not believe a society is free which coercively requires attendance at public schools (only the privileged few have any economic alternative), and then extirpates every trace of religion from that school as fanatically as any religious zealot ever tried to exorcise sin from a pagan city.

But then more broadly, I am fascinated, and concerned, by the increasing submissiveness of the American people.

In the course of a single year, a genuinely outraged majority cooled off without doing anything about a challenge to three of the very deepest human commitments, the commitment to one's God, the commitment to one's freedom, and the commitment to one's country—for all three are involved in the question of whether a community is free to grant God a place in the schooling of the future generations of Americans.

What happened? Did the cogency of the arguments of the extremist separatists win over the average American mind, converting him to the Court's point of view?

No; what happened was not the result of a rational dialog, but the result of a national lassitude.

Will the effort now be made? Now that the Bible itself is challenged? Is the calm deceptive?

One hopes so. Remember, this is not a call to impeach Earl Warren. Merely to tell him that if in fact the Constitution says what he and his colleagues say it does—a fascinating discovery, by the way, which eluded the Supreme Court for 170 years, why let's simply change the Constitution.

If the Supreme Court says the Constitution didn't really mean for us to be free, why let's just smile nicely and say, "Well, let's go and fix that Constitution, so it will end up saying what the people who wrote it thought it said."

Fair enough?

High School Students Replace Braceros in Yolo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the testimony of this Representative before Senator WILLIAMS' Subcommittee on Migratory Farm Labor last week, California farmers are evidencing ability to solve their own agricultural labor problems in spite of congressional action.

Yolo County, one of the richest agricultural counties of the Fourth Congressional District, utilizing 15,000 braceros last year, paying good average wages, faced with a curtailment of the bracero program, is this year trying a labor experiment with young people.

Paul Mapes, a leading staff reporter with the Woodland Daily Democrat, told pictorially the story. The feature article is as follows:

FIRST DAY WITH THE LONG HOE

(By Paul Mapes)

"Now listen, fellas," the foreman said after they had boarded the bus, "you're going out to work. So knock off the horseplay until afterward."

It was 6 a.m. There were 20 young men between the ages of 16 and 18 in the bus. For many this would be the first time they ever really had a full day's job. Young, they could play baseball, football, or swim all day. It remained to be seen whether or not they could work.

Oldsters doubted it. "Today's kids," they said, "don't know how to work, don't want to work, and won't work."

But the young men, first, had said they wanted to work. The local office of the State department of employment under George Davis determined to give them a try. Dennis Hampton, a graduate student in agricultural education at UCD was hired by the department to recruit the young men and try to gain the cooperation of the growers.

Some growers queried immediately burst out with the old adage of not "sending a boy out to do a man's job." Others reflected on the quality day labor from Sacramento's Second Street and figured the kids couldn't possibly be any worse.

Other growers felt with the department that jobs for the Nation's youth were scarce and that a great amount of labor was needed in the fields. Public Law 78, the bracero program had been defeated by Congress, the full development of local sources of labor was needed. Boys of 16 would become men shortly, were, in fact, in a great hurry to get to be men.

The men who would boss them had no psychology degrees, were not acknowledged experts in the handling of boys. They knew the work of the fields. They knew men, and how to handle them.

Chester (Smokey) Brune, field boss for the first crew Friday, looking out over his gang spread up and down the rows of a beet field, said, "I'm glad to see them here. They're learning pretty fast, and you know something?

"Everybody seems to want to sell kids short and for them it's almost like a depression * * * at least in town. Sure they don't go hungry like in the depression, and they have clothes, but they can't get a job. Lots of times they have nothing going on."

Older men interminably try to tell younger men how rough they had it implying that the difficulties and hardships overcome contributed materially to the sterling present state of their characters.

They may be right. At least the rough times seem to be the ones men remember best if their bragging is any indication. And the man who has no hard times to remember will invent them.

Friday, for the 20 young men in the first crew, wasn't too bad. They were working under Smokey who is all man and very savvy. They were hoeing beets in a good field with long-handled hoes on a day in which the sun was not too murderous.

There would be other days, other foremen, rougher fields, and hotter days. Ahead was the short hoe and tomatoes.

The attitude of Friday's gang was summed up in the question asked by several, "when do we get to go 8 hours?"

At present there are two crews of Woodland youth working. A list will probably have been made up for the third crew by the time this article is being read. The pay is $1 to $1.05 per hour. Local department of employment manager Davis has said that if the 16-year-olds "work out," we'll drop the age to 14 and give the younger boys a chance."

There were no dropouts from the first day's crew. But the season is long and it will be up to the boys who want to become men to see how far the program goes.

He Voted His Conviction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Berlin (N.H.) Reporter on June 27, 1963, entitled "He Voted His Conviction."

This complimentary editorial from one of the outstanding weekly newspapers in my State refers to Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire's Second District and his vote against extension and enlargement of the Area Redevelopment Act. I may say that this is an issue on which Congressman CLEVELAND and myself are in complete agreement and, indeed, he did display the courage of his convictions in voting against a measure he knew to be wrong in principle and reckless in application. In my judgment, the great majority of responsible people in his district will applaud his action.

I am only too glad to have this opportunity of bringing to the attention of the Senate and the American public this fine editorial comment about one of New Hampshire's able and aggressive young Congressmen.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HE VOTED HIS CONVICTION

You'e got to give Congressman JIM CLEVELAND credit. He's not afraid to vote his conviction.

CLEVELAND voted "no" on an administration-backed bill to authorize $450 million more for area redevelopment.. His vote was even more significant because two of the six counties which he represents in Congress have been designated as being eligible for area redevelopment funds.

Gov. John King charged that CLEVELAND had turned his back on the unemployed of the "North Country."

CLEVELAND said he voted against the bill because he did not feel the additional $450 million was needed. He declared that only about a fourth of the money for industrial and busines loans and for public facilities had been used in the first 2 years of the original 4-year program.

The Congressman also charged the Area Redevelopment Administration with gross mismanagement, that the ARA was responsible for pirating industry from the Northeast to escape from taxes, organized labor, and higher prevailing wages and that the program has not helped to increase employment.

Said CLEVELAND, "I read the committee reports and listened carefully to the debate on the floor of the House. I did so with an open mind. I voted against additional funds for ARA at this time on the basis of the evidence.

It would have been easy for CLEVELAND to vote for the $450 million authorization. It could have helped gain him votes in Coos and Grafton Counties.

But instead he voted "no" because he felt felt he should.

Whether you agree or not with CLEVELAND's vote, you've got to take off your hat to a fellow who will cast his vote on conviction, not political expediency.

Communistic Revolutionary Directions: Interceptions and Interpretation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a statement to the House in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 28, 1963, I quoted the final column by Louis F. Budenz from the May 23 issue of the Tablet of Brooklyn, N.Y., along with a perceptive appreciation of the work of this writer by Patrick F. Scanlon, able and fearless managing editor of that well-known diocesan newspaper.

Responding to my statement, Mr. Budenz, on June 11, wrote me a most significant letter. In it, he emphasized the bold misuses by the Communist revolutionary conspiracy of the "freedom of the press" to destroy freedom and stressed the necessity for intercepting and properly interpreting the directions that are being issued to this conspiracy as matters of the highest importance to the security of the United States.

In order that the responsible investigative agencies of our Government, educational institutions, students of subversive activities, writers, and editors of the loyal press may have this important message of Mr. Budenz, I quote the entire text of his letter:

LOUIS FRANCIS BUDENZ,
Newport, R.I., June 11, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Please let me thank you for your kind thoughtfulness in reprinting my last column and the comments of Patrick F. Scanlon in the Congressional Record of May 28.

It has been distressing to me that there seems to be no one to grasp the torch of inside information as to how the Communists proceed to carry on communication with Moscow. One of the astounding features of present-day history is their bold communication with each other through the misuse of "freedom of the press" to destroy freedom. To intercept this message of directions—through a proper interpretation of the World Marxist Review, New Times, International Affairs, Peking Review, Political Affairs, and the Worker—remains of the highest importance to the security of the United States.

You can therefore understand how reluctantly I gave up this work, and how much I appreciate your having called attention to it in the Journal of the Congress.

May I ask from you and yours an occasional prayer now and then for me and my family?

Respectfully and sincerely,
Louis Francis Budenz.

Nylon Nurtured in Kanawha County, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Madam President, the West Virginia town of Belle, in Kanawha County, is credited with a major role in the development of one of our modern scientific miracles—nylon. The story of how the little pilot plant at Belle grew into one of the largest synthetic factories in the world is told in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail of June 16, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Nylon Nurtured in Kanawha County, W. Va.

A widely held misunderstanding approaching the edge of myth has it that nylon's conception and birth occurred here in the Kanawha Valley at the plant of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. in Belle.

We didn't spawn it here in the Magic Valley, but let none take away the fact that we nurtured and cradled it into a fantastic maturity that has revolutionized the textile world.

It is a long story that spins on the bobbins of probing as far as back as 1929 when du Pont scientists pointed research at creating a distinctly new fiber. Ultimately this became nylon.

The first pilot plant of commercial size was erected at Belle and there the intermediates from which nylon is spun into its multitude of products from hose and underwear to ropes stronger than steel began reaching the processing plants. The Belle plant today, remodeled not so long ago at a cost of millions, is the second largest owned by du Pont. The largest is at Orange, Tex. The Belle operation is a marvel of automation. Once scores controlled it. Now five men have charge of each shift, plus a scattered few others available for corrective adjustments in event of equipment malfunction.

Nylon is not a trademark like many names jealously guarded in industrial families. It is a generic term which means it may vary in properties, form or use—like wood or glass.

When du Pont initiated its fundamental research program in chemistry it had embarked on a program destined during the next 10 years, to produce a whole new field of man-made fibers—the synthetics. Unlike other man-made fibers, such as rayon and acetate, they bear no relationship to plant life, but are wholly compounded from chemicals.

In its early development stages, du Pont dubbed nylon as fiber "66." Yet in the experimental stage, it produced bristles for tooth brushes, a yarn from which stockings were knitted and a sewing thread. It showed promise.

In 1938, du Pont named "66" nylon, the name it bears today, and began construction at Belle of a plant for large scale production.

Bringing nylon from the laboratory to commercial production caused many difficulties. Chemistry and manufacturing processes were so new that it emerged into a pioneer effort. New equipment had to be designed; new materials were tested for use in much of the equipment. Before plant designs were turned over to construction engineers, 230 scientists were engaged on the development projects at one time or another. When the new plant began operating in 1939, $27,000,000 had been spent for research and operating investment.

Basic chemicals from which nylon is made are obtained from such raw materials as coal, petroleum, natural gas, corn cobs, air and water. Between these raw materials and the finished nylon fiber are long, complicated and expensive chemical manufacturing processes.

Belle produces two intermediates—hexamethylene diamine and adipic acid by a series of chemical steps. Most of the necessary components are now extracted from natural gas. Until not long ago they came from coked coal.

Hexamethylene diamine and adipic acid make a nylon salt as white as snow and fine as talc that is shipped from Belle in tank cars to processing plants where they are made into textile fibers and other forms.

To make fibers, the two basic materials are placed into an autoclave. This is a giant pressure cooker. Here heat and pressure combines the molecules of the two chemicals into giant molecules, or linear polymers.

Nylon fibers are formed by pumping molten nylon through minute holes in a spinneret. It is a metal disk. The size ranges from that of a silver dollar to four inches in diameter. The holes are so small that they can be seen only by holding the spinneret to a strong light. As the filaments hit the air, they solidify, and are gathered together to become yarn. Next the yarn is stretched or drawn between a system of rollers. It is the drawing process that gives elasticity and great strength to the finished yarn. After inspection the drawn filament is ready for shipment.

Filament yarn is used in three ways. A single strand may be used to make a yarn of great strength and smoothness. This is called monofilament yarn. It is used in sheer hosiery, blouses, veils and gowns.

Multifilament yarn can be formed by twisting a number of tiny, endless strands together. It forms yarns of various sizes. It is the type most widely used for ready-to-wear and home furinshings.

Nylon staples are made by crimping continuous filaments and then cutting them into short, uniform lengths. It is shipped in large sizes like bales of cotton. Rugs, carpets, socks, and pile jacket linings are made from it.

Nylon in the form you see it is made in Du Pont plants at Seaford, Del., Martinsville and Richmond, Va., and Chattanooga, Tenn.

Possibly the most outstanding characteristic of nylon is its strength. Weight for weight, it is stronger than steel wire, yet it weighs less than any other commonly used textile fiber. For this reason, it can be made into sheer fabrics which, at the same time, are practical and durable. Nylon also has superior resistance to abrasion and wear. It reduces friction to a minimum when rubbing against other surfaces.

Nylon is now used in a gamut that runs from evening dresses to industrial beltings; blouses for women, dresses, brassieres, girdles, gloves, slips and panties, swimsuits, rainwear, anklets, pajamas, ski jackets, snowsuits, golf bags, knitting yarns, luggage, umbrellas, sewing thread, ribbons, curtains, draperies, rope, twine, cord, and you name it.

Where did it all start?

Not at Belle, but the results of Du Pont research were destined to have a significant impact on this community.

More than 30 years ago when Du Pont set out to create a new fiber attention was first directed at a study of derivatives of cellulose, particularly the ethers and new types of esters. These materials, although capable of being spun into yarns, appeared to offer no significant advantage in cost or properties compared with the known types of rayon.

The words in the paragraph above are generally those of Dr. E. K. Bolton, Du Pont's chemical director. They were published in a paper written for Industrial and Engineering Chemistry in January of 1942.

Dr. Bolton wrote that during the course of this investigation, certain nitrogen-containing derivatives of cellulose were prepared with the thought that amino or substituted amino groups would modify the properties of cellulose, particularly its dyeing characteristics, and make it approach in this respect, more closely to silk and wool. The investigation resulted in failure.

While this work was underway, Dr. Bolton noted that a background of scientific work on linear polymers was being laid under the direction of Wallace H. Carothers and associates. He said this led eventually to the development of nylon yarn.

How did Du Pont discover nylon and circumstances which led to the invention of this class of polyamides?

Dr. C. M. A. Stine, former chemical director and later vice president in charge of all Du Pont research, looked toward the future and brought the brilliant Carothers from Harvard University to Wilmington.

Dr. Carothers, given a small group of expert organic chemists to work with and a free field of choice, chose to work in the field of polymerization by condensation and the structure of substances of high molecular weight. It was a little explored field and Carothers study of polycondensation whereby linear polymers are produced led eventually to the invention of nylon, Dr. Bolton revealed.

After extended research that had advanced into cold drawn processes of nylon that revealed a product with amazing textile strength, Dr. Carothers at a meeting of the American Chemical Society in Buffalo, N.Y., predicted the possibility of making women's stockings from antifreeze and castor oil. In layman's language, it was called a reasonably accurate statement.

Experiments of Dr. Carothers led back to the intermediates known today and Dr. Bolton writes that although adipic acid was produced commercially in Germany, it became necessary to develop a new process to meet condition's at the Du Pont's Belle plant. Here, because of the catalytic technique involved, it was decided to make the intermediate. Hexamethylenediamine was only a laboratory curiosity and a process for its commercial production had to be worked out. But it was believed it could be made from adipic acid. This proved successful.

The process as finally developed for the manufacture of nylon and its fabrication into yarn may be briefly outlined as follows, Dr. Bolton wrote: For the present type of nylon, adipic acid and hexamethylenediamine are combined to form a salt which is charged into an autoclave where polymerization is carried out. Stabilizers are added to control molecular weight and viscosity.

Most of the literature readily available today concerns the tremendous first acceptance of nylon and the massive production efforts to meet that demand. Present consumption in all quarters—private, commercial and industrial—must be staggering.

Spun from imagination and pulled from sources man once considered intangible, it has revolutionized many facets of our life.

It's a test tube baby grown up.

Today you sit in the cradle that rocked a giant into maturity.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—Congressional Record, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the Record:

Paterson, N.J., *June 7, 1963.*

Congressman Daniel J. Flood,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Congressman: We, the undersigned, are interested in supporting passage of House Resolution 14, which was submitted by you, which calls for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

We feel the formation of such a committee will bring hope to those enslaved peoples who formerly enjoyed the right of freemen in a free nation.

As Americans of Armenian ancestry, we are especially interested in the successful formation of a committee such as proposed by you, because the position of our parental nation, now incorporated into the Soviet structure, has been often misunderstood. We feel that such a special committee will develop the true facts relative to Armenia and other captive states to the benefit of the truth and the position of the United States as the beacon light of world freedom.

We are, in addition to this letter, contacting our Congressman as well as Congressman Howard W. Smith, head of the Rules Committee, urging him to release your resolution to the House floor for debate and passage.

May we also thank you for your stand in this matter, and to assure you of our every support of our measure.

Sincerely,

Albert Kachadrian, Henry D. Bouquoin, ——, Joseph Levine, Joel G. Rose, August S. Darate, Harold Christman, C. Leroy ——, Harold B. Lee, E. C. Bleu, Anton Luchrsen, Al Walsh, C. William Elhairn, Jr., Edward Stewartz, D.S.C., Arthur Kachadrian, Joseph Heitzman, Fred Vogel, Edward J. Moore, Edith M. Moore, Arthur Lamortine, Mary Lamortine, Ovagem Nacaian, Helene Naggan Leonard Vorchansky, Nina Vorchansky, Josye Kowshly, Sam Sheber, S. T. Wellvoch, Joseph Pfeifer, Paul Krindinger, —— ——, and Peter ——.

June 18, 1963.

Mr. Albert Kachadrian,
Paterson, N.J.

Dear Mr. Kachadrian: I have received the petition urging my support of Congressman Daniel J. Flood's resolution to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

I certainly agree with you on the vital need for this measure, and I shall send Congressman Flood a copy of this letter so that he will know that he can expect my full and wholehearted cooperation.

You are to be commended for your humane interest in this vital subject.

Sincerely,

Charles J. Joelson,
Member of Congress.

Harrisburg, Pa.,
June 12, 1963.

Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: With deep appreciation for your courageous stand in behalf of the captives of the Russian prison of nations, I am sending you the copies of my communication to the President of the United States, for your information.

Yours sincerely,

George T. Vasley.

Harrisburg, Pa., *June 11, 1963.*

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Senator John F. Kennedy stated in his speech on June 14, 1960, in the Senate of the United States: "And as long as Mr. Khrushchev is convinced that the balance of the world power is shifting his way, no amount of either smiles or toughness, neither Camp David talks nor kitchen debates, can compel him to enter fruitful negotiations."

I can reasonably assume that the next presidential candidate will repeat this thoughtful Senator's statement by extending it with an updated supplement: "Thalidomide pills, such as a site inspection in Cuba or a hot line between Washington, D.C., and the Kremlin, will not divert this Nation from the road of self-destruction."

Also, I can expect that the sponsors of the hot line, from outside and inside our State Department, will exercise their full power to prevent the forthcoming proclamation of the Captive Nations Week; or, at least, modify the original Public Law 86–90 to such a degree that complete satisfaction would be granted the party at the Kremlin end of the hot line. The Russians, who are grandmasters of the genocide policy, fear their captives more intensely than the technological power of the whole so-called free world.

While the Russian successors of Genghis Khans are driving, consistently and persistently, toward the world domination, we are helplessly floating in a twilight zone of reckless recognizition of Bolshevism since November 16, 1933, when the last scattered clouds of martyrized millions of Ukrainian souls were approaching their heavenly frontiers.

We cannot indefinitely cheat old man time who carefully recorded not only our words but our deeds as derived from the Atlantic Charter, the Monroe Doctrine, and the Declaration of Independence—all moral and strategic cornerstones of the foundation of this Nation.

In conclusion, I would like to quote the following proclamation taken from a letter from the CCCP of U.S.S.R. to the CCCP of China, as printed in Pravda of April 3, 1963: "Our party has taken upon itself an international obligation to help all the nations to achieve and secure their national independence and to complete a total obliteration of colonial system." Here is evidence of a strong parallelism between our foreign policy and the Russian policy in regard to their ultimate goal: the distintegration of all colonial systems, except the Russian one. And for this purpose we are going to provide Russian liberators with a very hot line in addition to our generous gifts, such as the lend lease, atomic secrets, Czech uranium mines, and 200 million white slaves.

To express more explicitly my opinion on Mr. Gorkin's hot line (the first device not invented by the Russians, as far as I know) I am attaching copies of six 1960 letters dealing with this subject, and a cartoon titled "Slavery Against Freedoms."

Sincerely yours,

George T. Vasley.

June 12, 1963.

Congressman Daniel J. Flood,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Flood: As an American of Armenian ancestry I am very much interested in your bill, House Resolution 14–15, for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Please continue your fine work in behalf of this bill. I am sure it will please you to know that there are many other Americans of Armenian ancestry who admire your determination regarding this bill.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Armena Bizios.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., June 3, 1963.

Mr. Walter Tustaniwsky,
Chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee Of Americans, Inc., Hamtramck and North Eastern Detroit Branch, Detroit, Mich.

Dear Mr. Tustaniwsky: Thank you for your letter of May 25th. I have been a supporter of the Committee on the Captive Nations, and I appreciate your comments regarding Congressman Flood's resolution.

I shall be happy to support his resolution, although I don't feel it necessary, at this point, to introduce a similar bill.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

Neil Staebler,
Member of Congress.

Communication by Satellite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, an important Conference on Space Science and Space Law was conducted at the University of Oklahoma at Norman on June 18, 1963. One of the prominent speakers to address the conference, and certainly one of those most intimately acquainted with the space communications program on a day-to-day, project-to-project basis, was Mr. George J. Feldman. Mr. Feldman was counsel and director of the House Select Committee on Astronautics which in 1958 did the initial work leading to the formation of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency. He is an attorney who has pioneered in the field of space communications law and is currently serving as a Presidential appointee to the Board of Incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp. Mr. Feldman's remarks on the problems of bringing an international communications system into being and fitting the technology into applied programs are as follows:

Communication by Satellite

(Address of George J. Feldman)

We have now taken the first steps toward a new era in international communication. The emerging space age, fathered by the technological revolution, has witnessed the heroic exploits of men in space, and has brought into experimental being the forecast of weather via satellite and the potential satellite system for international communication.

The experimental vehicle Echo, a passive reflector, and Telestar and Relay, random orbit repeater experiments, have gripped the imagination of people in various parts of the world. Echo as a small star has been seen by millions who shared a unity of wonder as they watched it cross the twilight sky.

The television transmissions via the Telestar vehicle are familiar to all, as television via satellite became a reality, spanning space and ocean simultaneously. Thus has the stage been set.

This is the experimental phase. The reality of a viable communication system remains to be accomplished with the accompaniment of hard work, hard and yet imaginative intelligence, and cooperation, nationally and internationally.

The advance of technology ultimately simplifies and expedites the execution of given tasks and objectives. But the translation of the advancing technology into the reality of a functioning system brings to the fore a complexity of problems and challenges of unprecedented character and degree.

It is those problems that are now being tackled in the great effort to lift the promise of the experiment to the function of the working system.

Primary to the effort is the realization of a system of communication by satellite that will be brought into living being and will transform international communications in many revolutionary ways.

This is the essential. Along the way there are the secondary, or even more removed, clashes and skirmishes and articulation of narrower concepts of method in the often polarized and conflicting world of political and economic viewpoints.

As counsel and director of the House Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration, as a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Committee on Outer Space, and now as one of the incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corporation, I have been really privileged to be closely associated with a living adventure of our times and to have played a part in the organizational structure and direction that must take place to bring technology to practical, working reality.

I wish to make it clear, however, that I speak to you here in a personal capacity, in views that are my own and not as a designated representative of any official body.

The problems of bringing an international communication system into being are manifold in their complexity. They involve technological considerations of choice, conditioned by economics, and surrounded by international economic and political considerations.

The magical solution involves hard work, the patience of understanding and the elements of good will engendered by respect for the problems to be overcome.

Public Law 87-624, the Communications Satellite Act of 1962, sets forth the guidelines for the U.S. effort. Its declaration of policy and purpose states—and I quote this verbatim since the language is highly descriptive:

"The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States to establish, in conjunction and in cooperation with other countries, as expeditiously as practicable a commercial communications satellite system, as part of an improved global communications network, which will be responsive to public needs and national objectives, which will serve the communication needs of the United States and other countries, and which will contribute to world peace and understanding.

"The new and expanded telecommunication services are to be made available as promptly as possible and are to be extended to provided global coverage at the earliest practicable date. In effectuating this program, care and attention will be directed toward providing such services to economically less developed countries and areas as well as those more highly developed, toward efficient and economical use of the electromagnetic frequency spectrum, and toward the reflection of the benefits of this new technology in both quality of services and charges for such services.

"In order to facilitate this development and to provide for the widest possible participation by private enterprise, U.S. participation in the global system shall be in the form of a private corporation, subject to appropriate governmental regulation. It is the intent of Congress that all authorized users shall have nondiscriminatory access to the system; that maximum competition be maintained in the provision of equipment and services utilized by the system; that the corporation created under this act be so organized and operated as to maintain and strengthen competition in the provision of communications services to the public; and that the activities of the corporation created under this act and of persons or companies participating in the ownership of the corporation shall be consistent with the Federal antitrust laws."

This is the directive, and in the act are spelled out the functions of the corporation to implement the "Declaration of Policy and Purpose" and relationships and responsibilities of the President of the United States, plus agencies of the executive branch, as well as the corporation itself.

Among the specifics, the President of the United States is to "aid in the planning and development and foster the execution of a national program for the establishment and operation, as expeditiously as possible of a commercial communications satellite system." And again: He shall "exercise such supervision over relationships of the corporation with foreign governments or entities or with international bodies as may be appropriate to assure that such relationships shall be consistent with the national interest and foreign policy of the United States."

Other functions in the national program are assigned directly to various Government agencies and to the corporation itself. The corporation is authorized under the act to "plan, initiate, construct, own, manage and operate itself or in conjunction with foreign governments or business entities a commercial communication satellite system." Other specific powers flowing from this authorization are designated.

The execution of this national program and the task faced by the corporation is difficult, complex, and truly formidable and should be viewed by the objective with understanding. This is the uncharted region of technology, international relationship and agreements, and national support. There are hard choices to be weighed; rapid yet deep study and decisions of magnitude.

The project is launched and this important effort is underway. For its part the corporation is developing its key officers and staff. Its principal officers have begun initial exploratory talks with communications officials of other countries. Technical experts are coming in. A crack organization is in process of assembly.

The problems to be faced are integral. The choice of technological approach—dependent upon the state of the art—condition the economics. A random orbit system will require more elaborate and intricate handling, or receiving stations. A synchronous, or stationary satellite will require less elaborate receiving stations but will have to be in itself a more intricate and costly mechanism, with stronger booster power to get it up there, and more precise requirements for guidance and on-board equipment. And you have to have spares, in case the system is impaired.

The choice of system—and please bear in mind that we are speaking here of a system and not an experimental vehicle—in turn is of importance to the international users. How do they participate? Do they own stations? Do they furnish personnel? What about their own research and development? And in addition to the economics there is the political national interest and national pride in participation.

The European community has been actively discussing its role. Intensive talks have been taking place on the subject of relationship. The interest is very high.

It is high also in other parts of the world. The first exploratory conferences have been held and there will be talks with communications officials of other countries.

And what of the Soviet Union? The U.S.S.R. has indicated cooperation on the weather program, and in principle on the so-called hot-line. How will it respond to the communication satellite?

Up to this point the United States has been the innovator and leader in this field, with great benefit to our national prestige, and international standing and with the satisfaction of pioneering a part of the future. Having taken this pioneering step, we have now assumed our share of responsibility and the latter is the operative word.

In the international sphere, the United Nations organization has shown strong interest in communication satellites, not only as a vehicle to transmit events of the U.N. itself, but as a means of bringing the world into closer relationships via communication. Of course, it is what is said that counts, and not the speed with which you say it. But in transport and communication our world continues to shrink as distance and time are compressed.

In a direct sense, the forthcoming Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference of the International Telecommunications Union—a specialized agency of the U.N.—is of especial importance. This is to take place in October. Its agenda includes the allocations of frequencies for the communications satellite program. These frequencies are the the lifelines of communication. Thus, this international conference is of great importance.

In addition to the international aspects, the corporation has its own unique structure, under the act of Congress. Its incorporators, as you know, were appointed by the President of the United States. Having been approved by the Senate they are now constituted as an initial board of directors, with the addition of the principal officers, Leo D. Welch, as chairman and chief executive officer, and Joseph V. Charyk, as president.

Looking ahead, when the corporation is ready to go to the public for issuance of stock—when a clearer picture of technological choice, economics, international arrangements—has been brought into focus, with a clearer indication of how much capital is required—then the corporate directorship will assume a different form.

There are two series of stock—one for all the carriers, one for the general public, with the directive for wide dispersal. There will be a 15-member board—6 representatives of the general public, 6 of all the carriers, and 3 appointed by the President of the United States.

The economics of operation in the light of other communication methods, such as cable and microwave, have been evaluated in the light of rising curves of communication demand, which will be further accelerated by the emergence of new types of channels.

The satellite is not only a vehicle for point-to-point transmission. It provides a mechanism for varied geographical, simultaneous use, as the spokes to the hub of a wheel.

It can transmit telephone, written messages, facsimile, and data, and the transmission of other forms of data exchange may become a very large area of traffic.

It would be difficult, indeed, to emerge full blown into a global system, and an evolutionary approach may be indicated.

I refer again to the declaration of policy and purpose of the Congress, to establish "as expeditiously as practicable a commercial communications satellite system, as part of an improved global communications network, which will be responsive to public needs and national objectives, which will serve the communication needs of the United States and other countries, and which will contribute to world peace and understanding."

To accomplish this national goal will take strong, intelligent effort and work.

The communication satellite has arrived of experimental age. It will be brought into being as a working system. The United States has no monopoly on its creation. There are others who are capable of doing it. There is strong worldwide interest. The corporation is beginning to tackle the formidable problems in earnest enthusiasm, and I may say in the spirit of the kind of dedication that accompanies a pioneering effort of responsibility. The expert group being assembled can make a substantial contribution of national benefit, as it researches and develops its program. It is time to give this effort the understanding required, for much is at stake for all.

It would seem that several years of intensive effort are required to bring an international satellite communications system into practical being. The problems of technology and economics will be searchingly examined by the corporation itself and probably with the assistance of outside studies. The criteria for adherence of various countries of their business entities will be established. These developments will run parallel. Perhaps a prototype system will be a first step.

The effort will be rapid, yet intensively thorough, for these are no light decisions that are being confronted in this pioneering endeavor. The difficulties will be overcome and in a few years a new and revolutionary communications system by satellite will have emerged and the world will have taken on a new dimension.

States' Rights Must Be Preserved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Carroll County Times of June 20, 1963 entitled "States Rights Must Be Preserved."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATES' RIGHTS MUST BE PRESERVED

Fear of the loss of States' rights is not new. Some of the problems, perhaps, are relatively new—integration, reapportionment, the farm problem, urban renewal, Federal aid to education, to name a few.

However, two of our Presidents looked ahead and said:

"The remedy for ill-considered legislation by the States, the remedy alike for neglect and mistakes on the part of their several governments, lies not outside the States, but within them.

"The mistakes which they themselves correct will sink deeper into the consciousness of their people than the mistake which Congress may rush in to correct for them, thrusting upon them what they have not learned to desire.

"They will either themselves learn their mistakes, by such intimate and domestic processes as will penetrate or else they will prove that what might have been a mistake for other States or regions of the country was no mistake for them, and the country will have been saved its wholesome variety.

"In no case will their failure to correct their own measures prove that the Federal Government might have forced wisdom upon them."

Still closer to our time, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, while Governor of New York, had the following to say on the proper relationship between the States and Federal Government.

"Fortunately for the stability of our Nation, it was already apparent that the vastness of our territory presented wide geographical and climatic differences which gave to the States wide differences in the nature of their industry, their agriculture and their commerce.

"Thus, already it was clear to the framers of our Constitution that the greatest possible liberty of self-government must be given to each State, and that any national administration attempting to make all laws for the whole Nation, such as was wholly practical in Great Britain, would inevitably result at some future time in dissolution of the Union itself."

What a difference a few years made, for after Roosevelt became President he started the country on the road to a strong central government and welfare state.

The preservation of home rule by the States is not to be misunderstood as jealous commonwealths seeking their own aggrandizement at the expense of sister States. It is a fundamental necessity if we are to remain a truly united country.

The whole success of our Republic has not been because the will of the majority was forced upon the minority, but because it has been a republic, where through a division of government into units called States, the rights and interests of the minorities have been respected and have been given a voice in the control of affairs.

It is very important in this great Nation of ours that the smallest political unit manage its own affairs as it is that the smallest family tend to its own business.

If the fundamental rights of the States are ever fully destroyed, as the present administration and the U.S. Supreme Court are trying to do by unconstitutional means, then the fundamental rights of the people will soon be lost in like manner.

Cuban Exiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Cuban Exiles Talk Too Much." The editorial was published in the June 25 issue of the New York Herald Tribune, which I avidly read, for if I did not read the New York Herald Tribune avidly, I would not be able to keep up with the fallacious program of the Republican Party.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, June 25, 1963]

CUBAN EXILES TALK TOO MUCH

The tongues of the Cuban exiles are their greatest handicap.

They embarrassed and angered the U.S. Government.

They confused Cuban public opinion both at home and abroad.

They even endangered the lives of Cuban fighters who infiltrated the island to join the underground revolutionary movement.

When secret preparations were being made for the Bay of Pigs invasion of 1961, Antonio de Varona, one of the political leaders of the Cuban exiles, invited a photographer to take and publish pictures showing him reviewing Cuban units in training. American agents were infuriated. The operation was supposed to be covert. Varona helped make it overt. But he got his picture and his publicity.

Now he's done it again. A new effort is being made by a number of exile groups to send guerrillas into Cuba with a view to building up the revolutionary movement inside the island. This is a long, difficult, and dangerous task, requiring the utmost secrecy.

Yet the first group of the reformed Cuban Revolutionary Council hardly set foot on Cuban soil before Varona trumpeted his "war communique No. 1."

Castro did not collapse. But the head of the Cuban Revolutionary Council did. Antonio Maceo, who took over when Miro Cardona resigned, quit in protest against those who wag their tongues and imperil the lives of Cuban patriots.

If the fall of Castro is delayed, the Cuban exiles will have to thank their tongues for it.

Sudeten German Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I was invited by Dr. Walter Becher, secretary general of the Sudetendeutscher Association, Inc., to send a comment to the Sudeton German people in connection with the celebration of the Sudeton German Day. I was pleased to do this and, subsequently, I have received a letter from Dr. Becher to the American people containing kind regards to us on our celebration of Independence Day, July 4.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I respectfully submit this heartening exchange of letters to the attention of this honorable body and the American people, as follows:

Dear Mr. Becher: As a descendant of the German people, I take special pride in joining with you in the celebration of Sudeten German Day. As a Member of the Congress of the United States, I wholeheartedly join with you in a meaningful rededication to the cause of individual freedom for all people and sincere cooperation between nations.

Our direction must be relentless toward freedom of the hearts, minds, and bodies of all men. Our goal must be peace and happiness for all men, each in his own way. In this goal, we always will be brothers, regardles of time or distance or place.

Most cordial greetings.

Dear Representative Clausen: I deeply appreciate the kind words of message you sent to our Sudeten German Day which took place on Whitsuntide, in Stüttgart, Germany. Your words were made known to the Sudeten German people for whom they are a great encouragement.

The Sudeten German Day was successful and about 400,000 persons took part in it. The Prime Ministers of Bavaria and Baden-Württemberg and the Federal Minister of Defense, Kai Uwe von Hassel, were festival speakers, along with our president, the Federal Minister Dr. Hans-Christoph Seebohm. Chancellor Adenauer sent a letter of greetings.

Your most kind message was a great honor for us and I thank you very sincerely for it on behalf of all Sudeten German people.

With kindest personal regards,

Yours very sincerely.

Dear Representative Clausen: On the occasion of July 4, the American Independence Day, please accept my best congratulations. We over here in Germany hope and pray, that the American traditions of the past will ultimately prevail and freedom restored in both Western and Eastern hemispheres.

On your National Independence Day, the Sudeten German people send you all the best wishes for your great country, for you, and your future work.

With kindest personal regards,

Yours very sincerely.

The Antimissile Missile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, Dr. Robert Morris, former president of the University of Dallas in Dallas, Tex., and one-time chief counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, has prepared an outstanding news column on the subject of Dr. Edward Teller's remarks last week on Capitol Hill about nuclear testing and an antimissile defense system. Dr. Morris writes a column for publication in a number of newspapers around the country. The name of the column is "Around the World," and this issue is entitled "The Antimissile Missile." I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Antimissile Missile

There are events that break into the news from time to time that focus attention on the underlying military posture of Washington and cause some healthful agitation. Such an event was the statement of Dr. Edward Teller who told a hundred members of the House of Representatives, headed by Steven B. Derounian, Republican, of New York, that the Soviet Union is now ahead of us in the field of nuclear explosives and "might be the first to develop an effective defense against missiles."

Dr. Teller, according to the news dispatches went on to urge our testing of nuclear defense weapons. This testing would not have to be of big weapons, he said. This recommendation, of course goes against the grain of our policy planners whose principal preoccupation today seems to be with disarmament and the cessation of nuclear testing.

The underlying situation that serious people have been trying to bring to the surface is grave indeed. If the Soviets can develop an effective antimissile missile they will be able to blunt our whole missile system. As we have been pointing out in this column, our present military plans call for the withdrawal of most of our foreign bases, our B–47's, our B–52's, the attack bombers, and for reliance instead on polaris submarines and home continent-based ICBM's. We thus seem to be moving into the waiting trap.

For if the Soviets can develop (and I am told that they now have the weapon at some stage of production) an effective antimissile missile, we will be at the mercy of the pitiless Khrushchev. That is the fact.

In response to this situation, it is most extraordinary that our Defense Department is deliberately not developing our only practicable antimissile missile, the Nike Zeus. Secretary McNamara has decided against this for reasons that I and many other people cannot determine and instead talks, even vaguely, about the Nike X which cannot be developed until 1969—long after the Soviets may have developed their dread weapon.

It would certainly seem that the orders should be full steam ahead on this vital weapon. Yet our whole posture is one of preoccupation with the cessation of nuclear testing and of disarmament.

In 1958 when we had clear superiority over the Communists in nuclear power, we unilaterally suspended testing. Khrushchev, true to form, tested and in many respects caught up to us. Instead of learning from this act of folly we are virtually doing the same thing all over again.

Unless we go ahead and develop an antimissile missile we may probably not have another chance because we will be in a position to be the object of nuclear blackmail. This seems to be the elemental meaning of what Dr. Teller is telling us and the meaning of the course of retreat that the President's nuclear advisers are now steering. In his reported statement, Dr. Teller said that if the Soviets obtain this weapon "we may be only a few years away from total destruction."

Dr. Teller told the Congressman that the situation that exists can be described by a parable. The United States is learning swordmanship by reading a book while the Communists are out practicing with swords.

To accentuate the folly of our present tactic of building up popular confidence in the Soviet, preliminary to a test ban agreement and disarmament, the news of the Teller statement broke on the same day as the news of the arrest of Col. Stig Wennerstrom, Swedish disarmament adviser at Geneva and formerly air attaché in Washington. The announcement carried the news that Dr. Wennerstrom has been, through all his high assignments, with access to Western secrets, including our own, a confirmed spy for the Soviets.

We have been giving and giving. The Soviets have been taking and taking. This formula is inexorably leading us to our destruction.

Why Outlaw God?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to include two articles by Mr. George Todt, columnist for the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner. Mr. Todt is a fearless and unrestricted writer on current issues, and reflects, I believe, the thinking of most patriotic Americans and runs counter to current reporting of most of our correspondents.

The articles follow:

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner]

Why Outlaw God?

(By George Todt)

The latest decision of the U.S. Supreme Court which bans the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading in the schools may be legitimate, technically speaking, but is extremely unpopular with most citizens.

This controversial judicial matter will join others which have distressed the public so much in recent years: (1) the Steve Nelson case; (2) Mallory case; (3) Watkins case; (4) Sweezy case; (5) Yates case; and (6) the Slochower case.

None of these have added considerably to the stature of the Supreme Court in this dangerous and uneasy time of the Cold War. On the contrary, they have provided much fuel for those who would downgrade the Court. It is a pity.

This group of nine high justices is supposed to represent one of our most hallowed American institutions. Many regard it as nearly sacrosanct and not subject to criticism or review. Can it do no wrong?

All institutions are subject to human frailties and no men are perfect. Not even justices of the U.S. Supreme Court.

A down to earth study of the controversial cases we have mentioned will find few Americans sympathetic to the majority decisions handed down from the bench.

The present decision in question, regarding prayer in the schools, likely will understandably generate a great deal of public indignation. Why?

Not because we fail to recognize that church and state deserve to be segregated—we are almost 100 percent behind this correct premise—but because it is ungrateful, bad manners and insulting to our God to run Him arbitrarily off the schoolground.

The Republic of the United States was built mainly on two great ideas: (1) that God ruled in the affairs of men, and (2) individual liberty.

We were a religious people and also we were unusually tolerant of others who may not have believed as did the majority of our citizens.

The United States is predominantly a Christian nation in the Judeo-Christian tradition, but Jew, Mohammedan, Shintoist, Buddhist, Brahmin—yes, and atheists, too—are welcome to their individual religious beliefs.

Here the Christian majority has rarely tyrannized the minority, except in the case of the persecuted Mormons more than 100 years ago.

By the same token, the minority ought not to tyrannize the majority, either.

If the Supreme Court bans the paying of respect to Almighty God in our public schools, it ought to be fair and outlaw anything smacking or secular atheism, too.

Let's not ape Communist Iron Curtain countries where mention of God to students is taboo. Let's continue the American tradition. Let's always show our respect for the Creator of mankind.

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, June 18, 1963]

How Now Brown?

(By George Todt)

The vicious un-American vendetta of hate conducted against the embattled John Birch Society over the past 2 years has been established as unfounded, unnecessary, and uncalled for by the California Senate Fact-Finding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities.

The thoughtless, careless, and tireless innuendoes of subversion against JBS are now shown—at long last—to be phony as $3 bills.

These martyrs to confused public opinion have every right to bring some heavy law suits against certain hatemongers for outright defamation of character. Why not?

HOW ABOUT AMENDS?

Will these character assassins apologize and make amends now?

This is to be doubted by the writer. Instead, my guess is that more tired old cliches will swirl about the controversial Robert Welch—and the 100,000 innocent Birchers across the Nation will be ignored.

My friends run the gamut from right to left, and I have known a great many individual members of the JBS. Two of the local leaders in the movement, former Congressman Edgar W. Heistand and John Rousselot, have been good friends over the years. I did not turn my back on them because of the vile persecution of their group. They and others like them are good Americans in every sense. Why discriminate here?

I think those who have slandered JBS will now seek other flimsy excuses to bring their bias and intolerance to bear. There are obvious reasons for it.

In the first place, the Communists are not the only ones who oppose the pro-American society. There are at least two other important segments of anti-Birch sentiment. First, the Fabian movement in the United States—which is centered in the Americans for Democratic Action. Second, friends, admirers, and apologists for Chief Justice Earl Warren.

WHY IT HAPPENED

Let me point out carefully that I am not inferring any tieup between these three divergent groups—except their venomous hatred of the John Birch Society. However, this stems from differing reasons. What are they?

As for the ADA position in this matter, the JBS is guilty of a far greater crime than merely being anti-Communist; for it is also against Fabian socialism at the same time. The Fabians in our country are admittedly dead set against the Bolshevik Communist international leadership emanating from Moscow.

THE WARREN ANGLE

But ADA philosophy and fundamental ideology stems more from the Marxist Manifesto than the Founding Fathers at Philadelphia. Their thinking contains much of Menshivism, Sidney and Beatrice Webb, and Arthur Schlesinger.

As long as a patriotic American society is merely against Red Bolshevik communism, the ADA is not too concerned. But when it attacks Fabianism—ah, that is a different matter. Which may help us to understand the position of ADA versus JBS.

Much of the attacks against JBS have been emotional, even hysterical, diatribes against it for its sturdy opposition to Chief Justice Warren. Many of his adherents, including newspaper publishers, owed him favors when he was Governor of California. Does that explain it?

Artistry of West Virginia Glassblowers Lauded in Article in Potomac Magazine—First Lady and Mrs. Johnson Use Tableware Handcrafted in Mountain State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, a source of gratification to West Virginians is the recognition which has deservedly come to their glass industry. Becoming respected throughout the world, the artisans of the factories in the Mountain State produce handcrafted glassware which is a credit to the patience and initiative of our citizenry.

Some 30 of the 70 glass-producing firms in the Mountain State engage in the time-honored process of glassblowing, a fascinating and exacting method used in the making of fine tableware and ornamental pieces. The complex series of separate operations required in the production of handblown glass truly sets sets it apart in the realm of genuine art. Those that engage in this ancient practice are revered for their skills.

Last year, the Nation's First Lady, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, added considerable impetus to the rising popularity of West Virginia glass products during her televised tour of the White House. She called attention, in her helpful explanations, to the beautiful tableware which is used at White House state dinners and luncheons, and which was produced in the Monongahela Valley, at Morgantown. Immediately the demand soared upward.

Since that time yet another famous Washington lady has chosen West Virginia glass to grace her table. Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, wife of the Vice President, uses simple stem goblets and wine glasses from three separate West Virginia firms at the Johnson home in the District of Columbia. In fact, she and her husband often use heavy crystal ash trays bearing the Vice Presidential seal as wedding gifts.

Madam President, on Sunday, June 30, 1963, an interesting and informative article concerning West Virginia glassblowing was published in the Potomac magazine of the Washington Post and Times Herald. Following a visit to the plant which makes "The President's House" glassware, and an interview with Sam Hayden, of the Morgantown, W. Va., Glassware Guild, Inc., reporter Aubrey Graves wrote a lucid description of the steps involved in the blowing of glass. From the glowing ovens to the final polishing process the glass is carefully monitored to insure the high degree of excellence which has come to be characteristic of the entire glass-producing industry in West Virginia.

I ask unanimous consent that the article "Mountain State Glassware Becomes 'The President's House,'" in the Potomac magazine of the Washington Post and Times Herald, Sunday, June 30, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post Potomac, June 30, 1963]

Mountain State Glassware Becomes "The President's House"

(By Aubrey Graves)

Next time you drop by the White House for dinner and lift a piece of Jacqueline's crystal service, bear this in mind: it took 15 people, all with specialized, high-paid skills, to produce that seemingly simple glass from which you are slaking your thirst.

This was one of many fascinating items of intelligence imparted by Manager Sam Hayden of the Morgantown, W. Va., Glassware Guild, Inc., during a recent tour of its plant.

Things there are humming since Mrs. Kennedy personally selected a certain mouth-blown, handcrafted design for its graceful simplicity.

The design, made of lead crystal and available in 18 items, is called The President's House.

To make glass, he explained, you need fire, plenty of steady, blasting hot, glaring fire. The temperature of molten glass when it is being "worked" is around 2,500° F. Because it takes 28 hours to melt the materials that become molten glass, a giant, 18-pot furnace is kept roaring day and night.

The ingredients of molten glass (basically fine silicate sand, soda and lime, are mixed in a large wooden box. Added quality, luster and durability are imparted by potash, nitre and lead. And in every batch some "cullet" (scraps of broken up glass) goes on top.

Copper, manganese, cobalt, iron, nickel and chrome oxides are added for coloring. But to achieve one certain hue, plain oats and brown sugar are thrown into the fiery pot. The carbon they produce tints the finished glass a magnificent amber.

Workers who make basic pieces like tumblers or stemware are the gatherer, the blower, the cracking off boy and the carrying-in boy (or girl).

The gatherer sticks a long hollow metal rod into the pot. As the road is turned, its bell-shaped end gathers a blob of molten glass.

In seconds, the blob is ready; the gatherer breathes a short, sharp wisp of air into the pipe and hands it to the blower.

Artfully, the blower spins the road until he has the sidewalls of the blob even. Agilely, he places the still white hot but rapidly cooling blob in the open mold and closes it.

Inside the mold, the original puff of air swells and forces the molten glass to expand into a thinner and thinner shell.

As he blows, the blower keeps turning the rod in circles and half-circles until he feels the glass is just tight enough in the mold to be properly formed. The mold is opened and out comes a gleaming piece with a cap on it.

The cracking off boy then carries the rod a few steps to an asbestos-covered "cradle," where a chisel he snaps or "cracks" the blown glass article away from the end of the rod.

The glass article is lifted in front of a pipe that emits a constant blast of cool air. Next, the carrying-in boy takes the glassware to an endless conveyor called the lehr (pronounced "lair.")

The reason for the lehr is to prevent the formed glass from cooling too fast. The decline in temperature must be gradual and regulated; otherwise, the unevenly cooling surfaces of the glass would pull against each other so hard that the entire thing would shatter.

For the first 40 minutes of the glass' 2-hour cooling-off journey on this slow-moving conveyor, fire boxes maintain a gradually reducing temperature. This is called the annealing (toughening) process important in the making of fine glass.

Next the glass goes to a cutting and finishing room where, among other operations, the excess top that's like a bottle cap is cut off. After a water rinse, the glass goes to a glazing machine.

There is never a perfect piece of hand-blown glass—and that is part of its beauty. The artists' hands create masterpieces no machinery can match. But even the most expensive creation will have some infinitesimal flaw.

ACCION

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, an article appeared in yesterday's Wall Street Journal about ACCION—Americans for Community Cooperation in Other Nations—an organization comprised of Americans and Venezuelans who are working to help thousands of have-nots in the slums of Venezuela to help themselves.

The article describes a project which has aided the residents of La Laja in the town of San Felix who used to spend one-third of their wages to buy water. Now a modern pipeline brings them the same free water service which the other residents of San Felix enjoy. This pipeline was installed by the local residents guided by ACCION.

Other projects which have been undertaken by ACCION include the opening of an abandoned factory in the farming community of Magdalena to make rugs and furniture. The factory now has 10 men working full time and in addition provides cash income to 70 women who work in their homes.

ACCION has also sent its participants into the politically explosive areas, including the universities where they have made progress in educating some of the students in the capitalist system.

ACCION has about 80 Venezuelan and American fieldworkers, including a small administrative and recruiting staff in the United States. The fieldworkers, most of whom are recent college graduates receive about $150 per month.

ACCION differs from the Peace Corps in that it is a private group. Its financing is entirely from voluntary contributions and its participants have a much greater freedom in their work.

ACCION has been such a success that four other Latin American countries have inquired about the possibilities of obtaining ACCION missions. C. Allan Stewart, U.S. ambassador in Caracas has said that "ACCION is transforming the image of the United States in Venezuela."

This is the type of private sector involvement that I am very much in favor of. It provides a very useful task for our young people in complimenting our AID program and the Peace Corps.

I have been participating in this project by trying to enlist the cooperation of certain of our airlines and the Civil Aeronautics Board in transporting the field workers of ACCION to Venezuela on a space available basis.

I am proud of the small part that I have been able to play in the work of this organization.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 1, 1963]

UNITED STATES, VENEZUELA FIRMS HELP SUPPORT YANKEE "PRIVATE PEACE CORPS"—PEPSI-COLA, UNITED STATES STEEL ASSIST "ACCION" GROUP WHICH GUIDES LATINS IN SELF-HELP PROJECTS

(By Neil Ulman)

Residents of La Laja, a rundown section of the town of San Felix in eastern Venezuela, used to spend about one-third of their weekly wages buying water to slake their thirst and wash off the slum dirt. The water was hauled in by truck and sold at 40 cents a barrel.

Now, however, a modern pipeline brings La Laja the same free water service received by other sections of San Felix. And in the midst of La Laja's tin and carboard shanties a baseball field and basketball court recently have sprung up.

These improvements were made by residents of the neighborhood, or barrio, guided by a novel organization called ACCION. Led by U.S. citizens, but independent of the U.S. Government, ACCION operates as a sort of private Peace Corps. The group has organized a number of self-help projects in or near Venezuelan cities and its leaders are planning to extend its activities to other Latin American countries.

ACCION has about 80 Venezuelan and American fieldworkers, including some now in training, and a small administrative and recruiting staff in the United States. The fieldworkers, most of them recent college graduates, earn $150 a month. ACCION's 1963 budget of $225,000, up from $130,000 in 1962, will be covered by contributions from some 60 United States and Venezuelan firms. Among them: United States Steel Corp., Gulf Oil Corp., Banco Mercantil Agricola and Banco del Caribe.

TOWN HALL CONCEPT

After studying local problems, ACCION workers select a project and then try to enlist the aid of local government officials and businessmen. Fieldworkers encourage residents to elect their own leaders and run community meetings, for eventually ACCION hopes to turn over all its projects to the Venezuelans. "We're trying to instill the old American town hall concept," says Joseph A. Blatchford, ACCION's 28-year-old leader and founder.

Two ACCION members from Los Angeles, Suzy Navarette and Winifrid Marisch, persuaded slum dwellers in Caracas to renovate an old building in the neighborhood and turn it into a community center. Here residents take courses in reading, sewing, cooking and mechanics and plan neighborhood improvements such as a new sewer system.

"Over 110 leadership meetings have been held," says Miss Navarette, "The Centro Communal is now the focal point for the people of the neighborhood. They are learning to carry out in an organized fashion their ideas for social betterment."

ACCION fieldworker Russell Scarato, from St. Louis, says a cooperative factory he helped to organize "has taught the workers the function of a private business enterprise and the value and impact it can have in a community." The factory turns out rugs and furniture from woven fiber, harvested locally in the northern Venezuelan state of Aragua.

SAVINGS FUND

The workers deposit 10 percent of their monthly earnings along with dividends they receive from the cooperative in a saving and credit fund. Mr. Scarato says the fund will be used to grant loans to the workers for education, home improvements, and for small business ventures of their own.

ACCION was conceived by Mr. Blatchford in 1959 after his travels in South America convinced him that such a group could help democracy flourish there. He originally hoped to launch ACCION in Colombia. But when the Peace Corps announced its plans for that country, Mr. Blatchford switched to Venezuela where the first ACCION workers arrived in the fall of 1961. Now, officials say, the group has an invitation from Nicaragua and is looking into opportunities in Chile, the Dominican Republic, and Mexico.

Mr. Blatchford frequently tours the United States to raise funds and line up businessmen and college faculty members to help with recruiting. ACCION recently selected 35 new fieldworkers, out of 225 applicants, mainly for their leadership abilities and resourcefulness, rather than because of specialized technical backgrounds. After a brief indoctrination in the United States the trainees will go to Venezuela to study Spanish for several months.

American companies which make contributions to ACCION regard their support mainly as a public service. But Donald M. Kendall, president of Pepsi-Cola International, the foreign subsidiary of Pepsi-Cola Co., believes Pepsi's $3,300 contribution also "makes good business sense." Says Mr. Kendall: "Anything we can do to improve the standard of living is going to improve the purchasing power of the people."

Bible Reading and Prayer in the Classroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the recent Supreme Court decision prohibiting Bible readings and prayers in our classrooms has proved disturbing to a large mass of the American citizenry.

Disappointment always seeks consolation, and perhaps a seed of this can be found to be contained in the following article entitled "Reflections Amplified," as appearing in the June 27 issue of the Enterprise, a prominent weekly publication issued in Lisbon Falls, Maine:

[From the Lisbon Falls (Maine) Enterprise, June 27, 1963]

BIBLE READING AND PRAYER IN THE CLASSROOM

We certainly wish to applaud in the strongest fashion the decision of the Supreme Court that ungodliness is the American way. We have been generating a big mad at the Russians now for years because they are atheists, and this should put an end to that foolishness. The Supreme Court, in finding that the Bible "serves no purpose" has certainly alerted the citizenry to a grave danger, and now that they have got the Bible out of the schools of the country we hope they take the next step and get all the books out of the schools.

We hope, too, that they proceed to rewrite a lot of the things that have come down to us from an ignorant past, when nobody knew very much because the Supreme Court had not yet been developed into its full omniscience. The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, for instance. It must be changed at once, so it will go: "* * * one nation, indivisible, under the Supreme Court, with antidiscrimination for all."

The motto of the Nation must be changed too. "In God We Trust" is no longer useful to a nation whose supreme arbiters of right and justice have denied the general premise. Congress will be obliged to pause in its headling career down the primrose path of Christian progress, and will have to rewrite the motto so it says, "In the Supreme Court We Trust." And as for the Latin the old "E Pluribus Unum" will have to go, too. "Super Pluribois Aeternos Iudices" would be all right. It would look nice on the coins. Then Latin dictionaries and grammars could be banned, so nobody could check on hurried efforts to remember the case endings.

The Gettysburgh Address should be changed, too. "* * *that this Nation, under the Supreme Court, shall have a new birth of freedom." This new freedom, under the Supreme Court, shall mean, of course, that it is no longer the function of a people to bring their children up in reverence of the divine plan, or to inculcate the accepted verities of morality. In teaching our youngsters about the great Abraham Lincoln, or Benjamin Franklin, we must never tell them that they read the Bible and thereby derived much of the wisdom, compassion and judgment that forwarded their careers. Children in American schools must never again be told the awful story, so thoroughly un-American, that George Washington knelt at Valley Forge and asked Almighty (one word deleted here by order of the Supreme Court) for guidance in his perplexity.

Now that the Supreme Court of the United States of America has taken over the functions of deity, and has set itself up as a greater authority than the Scriptures, unlimited horizons lie ahead. Shakespeare can be deleted next, and then Wadsworth and Longfellow, and eventually the arithmetics. In time, all knowledge and instruction can be eliminated from the schedule, and the child will be graduated at last in a full ignorance of everything. We can do away with all this going to school to get a degree and a certificate, and there will be no more shortage of teachers.

Personally, we have long advocated that the Bible be done away entirely. What a great amount of time has been spent in pulpits explaining it to pious listeners, when the same thing can be done much better at home. There are so many things we have foolishly left to the public school system, when we could do it much better at home. We don't even need baseball teams in our public schools, a boy can play it much better at home, by himself. The Supreme Court has surely made a tremendously wise observation.

When Balaam's ass turned and spoke to him like a man, we must assume it was really the Supreme Court that did it, and not the disguised instruction of deity. And at whatever time ye shall hear the sackbut, peesaltree, cornet, drums, violin, flute, oboe, and all other musick, then shall ye bow down to the Supreme Court. And if ye do not, then shall ye become a bad American in the eyes of the publick, and they shall cast ye into the burning, fiery furnace. Behold, how joyfully they dance before the ark of the Supreme Court as it convenes.

If the Bible had absolutely no spiritual significance whatever, and remained only as a profane record of an ancient people, its value as a document is incalculable. What a pity that its perpetuation has come about on secular grounds. How wise has been the Supreme Court to see this, and to give the Bible the left-handed boost of being banned. Now that the Bible has been put in the category of dirty novels and nasty pictures by the Supreme Court, we expect the young folks will sneak out back of the barn to read it, and bootleg copies will appear under the counters in the magazine stands. All this is to the good, for all is well now that the Bible is an evil thing.

Preserve the Historic Wilcox House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on June 17 a three-man subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, including Representatives CAREY and O'BRIEN of New York and SAYLOR of Pennsylvania, met in Buffalo, N.Y., to hold hearings on my bill, House Resolution 3500, to preserve for the future one of America's most prominent and historic homes, the Ansley Wilcox house.

On June 20 I placed into the RECORD articles which appeared in our Buffalo newspapers concerning this hearing.

At this point in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Courier Express on June 18, relative to the preservation of the Ansley Wilcox house.

The editorial follows:

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express, June 18, 1963]

PRESERVE THE HISTORIC WILCOX HOUSE

The Ansley Wilcox mansion on Delaware Avenue, steeped in 125 years of history, will fall before the onslaught of the bulldozers unless the Government steps in to preserve it. A three-man subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has promised to do what it can to save the building in which Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office as President of the United States in 1901.

The mansion was built in 1838 and over the years it has been a resting place for the great and the near great.

Its greatest historical value lies in the fact that it is one of only four sites outside the capitol in which the Presidential oath of office has been administered. Certainly this alone makes it worthy of preservation as a national historic shrine.

Representative THADDEUS J. DULSKI has sponsored a bill to have the Government acquire the property and in view of the subcommittee's strong, if unofficial, endorsement there seems to be a good chance that the bill will be approved. But the Secretary of the Interior is somewhat less than enthusiastic about the idea. Subcommittee Chairman LEO W. O'BRIEN, a native of Buffalo, has urged that appeals for preservation of the mansion be sent to the Secretary. This we should all do, not only for the sake of Buffalo but the benefit of the entire Nation.

A Break for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, the June 25 edition of the State Newspaper of Columbia, S.C., contains an editorial entitled "A Break for Agriculture." This editorial deals with the increased appropriation which the House of Representatives approved for the soil and water conservation programs. This editorial is indicative of the support for these programs in my State, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BREAK FOR AGRICULTURE

Agriculture gets a break. In relation to some of the Federal spending of the times it is modest, but important—and deserved.

In acting on the appropriations bill to finance the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the House of Representatives approved a net increase of $825,000 for technical assistance to the 30 new soil and water conservation districts expected to be organized in the next 12 months.

The House also voted an increase of $1,072,500 for much needed increases in technical aid in the 2,930 existing soil and water conservation districts. This is the first time in many years that the House has noted, with this kind of favorable action, the steadily enlarging backlog of work that has been piling up in the older districts.

In granting the increased appropriations for Soil Conservation Service aid to districts, the House approved without change the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations headed by Representative JAMIE WHITTEN, of Mississippi.

The bill carries a total of $63,222,000 for the watershed program, an increase of $1,845,650 over the current fiscal year. One million of this increase is earmarked for an expansion of cooperative survey work in river basins, providing a total of $3,042,900 for such work. Sixteen such surveys have already been started and eight new ones are to be initiated.

Two important changes in financing of watershed work have been included, both adding desirable flexibility in administration and calculated to help move the program ahead with less redtape. One eliminates the allocation of a specific amount for watershed planning and investigations, specifying that the Department is expected to transfer funds from watershed improvement work in whatever amounts may be necessary to proceed on all qualified applications. The other eliminates precise numbering of new watershed project starts during the coming year, declaring that no numerical restriction of this type should be placed on the projects.

Soil Conservation Association members are highly pleased with these provisions of the new legislation, and the general reaction should be the same. Of all the Government agencies, the Soil Conservation Service and its cooperators, the Soil Conservation districts, probably have more friends than any Government bureau. It does good basic turns to various segments of society as well as the public.

Its work is outstanding in the categories of flood prevention, erosion control, and storage of vital water for all purposes, which has helped hold up the water table. It does much work in the interest of fish and wildlife, improving fishing and hunting throughout the land.

Many persons are properly grateful for the dedicated men and effective work of the service.

J.F.K. Fails To Interpret History

SPEECH
OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, many of us will agree that President Kennedy deported himself well on his tour of Europe. His homely visit to his fatherland struck the intimate pride of anyone with ancestors in Europe. The syntax and word selection of his speeches were brilliant.

However, another facet of the tour worries many of our citizens. For the considered, erudite view of the "loyal opposition," I commend the following editorial from the Monterey Peninsula Herald, by Allen Griffin, editor and publisher.

President John F. Kennedy's visit to Europe is an ill-fated tour that will bring no benefits to the United States and that possibly could bring ill fortune to Europe.

The President is visiting several countries that are under lame duck control. Adenauer of Germany, a great man whose place in history is already well carved, is in the last months of his career as Chief of State of that country. One of his greatest achievements was the rapport that he and President De Gaulle developed for the benefit of Europe's future.

In Italy, President Kennedy will deal with a government that may be no government at all. It is a bird of passage, here today and gone tomorrow. It is without any substantial influence in the affairs of other countries of Europe.

In England, President Kennedy has only to deal with the Macmillan government, unless it is thrown out in the meantime. It is a government that has been besmirched by the sex scandal of one of its leading ex-members. Nobody knows how many other scandals of similar poor odor are to be revealed.

There is only one government of a great power in Europe today that is sound, dependable, and free of scandal.

That is the Government of France under Gen. Charles de Gaulle.

In order to avoid any possible breath of contact with that government, the President of the United States had his flight adjusted so that he would not even fly over the free air of independent France. This is our misfortune, our miscalculation, and a repetition of the blunders made by Franklin Delano Roosevelt in regard to De Gaulle and, to a lesser extent, by President Truman in regard to De Gaulle.

Our capacity for no-see-'em ship is almost beyond belief. The President and his advisers are supposed to be omnivorous readers. Perhaps they read without paying the least bit of attention to the subject matter of their reading. The subject matter is in the fascinating and instructive series of writings by Gen. Charles de Gaulle that are his war memoirs. There are three volumes, "The Call to Honor," "Unity," and "Salvation." If the leaders of this country had only been attentive enough to history to read these three volumes, they would not have made the mistakes that they are again making in spite of the instructions of history.

Another learned gentleman who receives far more praise than he deserves, except for his golf (which is very good), is Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas.

Not content with leaving the problem in its current seriousness, Senator FULBRIGHT endeavors to make it worse by declaring publicly that France is hostile to NATO because France is still "overcompensating" for her bad performance during World War II. The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in a television program Sunday declared for all the world to hear that "the performance of France during World War II was not very creditable." France's pride has also been wounded, according to FULBRIGHT, by the country's "failure to operate a self-governing democracy" in the postwar years. Such wounded people, he says, must be handled "with kid gloves."

It appears that the United States, due to the kind of leadership it has in the White House and in the Senate, is intent upon doing endless damage to the relationships of the United States with the most powerful and, without doubt, the greatest country in Europe today, and the one under the most farsighted and determined leadership. This is fantastic. This is incredible.

If President Kennedy succeeds in any of his current efforts in Europe, his success will not strengthen NATO, it will not make friends for the United States, it will not lead to peace in this world.

The President of the United States seems to be determined to cause a rift between the two ancient enemies, France and Germany, who have, under the great leadership of Adenauer and De Gaulle, brought about a rapport that has promised a Europe at peace. For every person who looks forward to a period, a long period, of peace within Europe, this is a mistake beyond any calculation. It is sophomoric in its concept. It is vain and egotistical. It is utterly lacking in any conception of the role of history.

Famed Kanawha Valley Began With Salt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Madam President, the Kanawha River Valley in West Virginia is one of the most important chemical producing regions of our country. The story of how this chemical industry grew from a simple salt mining operation in 1794 to a huge complex of chemical works in 1963 is told in the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail of June 16, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAMED KANAWHA VALLEY BEGAN WITH SALT

(By George Lawless)

On the banks of the beautiful Kanawha River in 1794, Joseph Ruffner set up West Virginia's first chemical plant.

He staked out 502 acres to drill for one of America's most vital commodities, salt. Three years later Elisha Brooks started a 24-kettle operation on land leased from Ruffner. Daily output was about 150 pounds. In time the red salt from Kanawha became known as the best salt produced in the country; it was the only salt free from calcium sulphate.

The peak years for the salt industry in the Kanawha Valley were 1842–55 when more than 3 million bushels of salt were produced annually. During the Civil War production declined because of lack of fuel. Explosives, necessary in the mining of coal, were needed in the war.

The demand for salt in the Kanawha Region declined still further after 1870 when Chicago replaced Cincinnati as the meat packing center of the Nation. Michigan salt captured the Chicago market.

The Dickinson Salt Works of Malden (built on land which originally belong to George Washington) alone remained operating in the valley after the 1890's.

In 1915, the Warner-Klipstein Co. opened up the Kanawha Valley using the salt brines to produce chlorine and caustic soda.

By the end of the 1920's the company, now known as the Chlor-Alkali Division of FMC Corp., had become the largest chlorine producing plant in the world, with 17 wells pumping up brine. The introduction of a fabulous new textile, rayon, created a burgeoning demand for carbon disulphide, a product also used in the manufacture of carbon tetrachloride. These were added to a growing list of products which included trichlorethylene, caustic potash, bromine, and ethylene dibromide.

Salt brine was the basis for West Virginia's early chemical industry. War gave it further impetus.

In 1913 an English firm, Rollins Chemical Co., was induced to settle in the Kanawha Valley. It later became Barium Reduction Co. at South Charleston and a division of Columbia Southern.

During World War I the Federal Government spent millions of dollars to build its Nitro Government Plant, a crash program similar to Oak Ridge during World War II. The huge munitions plant never got into production before the armistice, but disposal of the surplus buildings paved the way for the establishment of American Viscose Corp., Monsanto Chemical Co., and Ohio-Apex Co., today a subsidiary of FMC Corp.

Union Carbide Chemicals Co. was established at Clendenin in 1920, moved to South Charleston in 1925, E. I. du Pont de Nemours started its plant at Belle in 1926.

Until the end of World War II, the Kanawha Valley was the center of the chemical industry in West Virginia. In 1947, there were 47 chemical and allied plants in the Mountain State; they employed about 18,000 workers.

The postwar boom saw a tremendous surge of chemical plant construction in West Virginia. But the industry turned away from the already crowded Kanawha Valley and invaded the resource-rich Ohio Valley.

In 1945, only one major chemical plant, Allied Chemical near Moundsville, was operating along the West Virginia section of the Ohio.

Through 1958, 15 major chemical producers moved into the area. As a result of this immense growth, the Ohio Valley has become one of the Nation's major chemical-producing centers. According to a survey of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, there have been more than 130 major new chemical plants or plant additions constructed on the banks of the river or its navigable tributaries since 1950.

Perhaps the greatest single year of growth for West Virginia was in 1959, when 30 chemical and allied plants were built, at a total investment of $43.7 million producing 2,055 jobs. In addition, that same year 33 existing plants announced expansions totaling $37.4 million and producing 2,884 jobs.

Today, West Virginia produces about 4 percent of the national chemical output and ranks 12th among the top States in chemical production.

It is perhaps significant to note that two of the Mountain State's most recent chemical facilities have been located outside the Kanawha and Ohio Valleys. Novamont Corp., a subsidiary of the Montacatini Chemical complex of Milan, Italy, was established at Neal on the Big Sandy River with an initial investment of $10 million. Subsequent expansions at the site are expected to push the total investment close to $40 million. Another major chemical installation has grown in Mineral County. It is the Allegheny Ballistics Laboratory which produces rocket propellents, built at an initial cost of more than $4 million. Manganese Chemical Co., a production unit for manganese alloys built at a cost of more than $1,500,000, is another major unit located away from the great waterways.

A listing of major chemical plant additions and expansions in the past year is indicative of the solid strength of West Virginia's chemical base, and points to steady growth for the future.

New facilities, their products and cost for 1962 are: Union Carbide at South Charleston, vinyl, $1 million plus; Mobay Chemicals, natrium, isocyanates and polyesters, $12 million; Pittsburgh Plate Glass Chemical Division, natrium, $1 million plus; Carbide Institute, cellulose, $500,000; Marbon Chemical Co., Washington, thermoplastic resins, $10 million plus; DuPont Belle Works, continuing modernization in $15 million program; Carbide at South Charleston, $1 million plus; DuPont Belle Works, Vazo unit, $1 million plus; Union Carbide, Institute, isocyanate, $4 million; DuPont, Parkersburg, $1 million plus, FMC Corp., South Charleston, peroxide, $2 million; Goodrich-Gulf Chemicals, Institute, synthetic rubber, $4 million; Pittsburgh Plate, natrium, $1 million plus.

Bible Reading in the Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Madam President, my attention has been directed to an address delivered by the Reverend Walter G. J. Hards, of St. David's Church in Baltimore.

I was so impressed with the simple eloquence used by Reverend Hards in discussing the Supreme Court's decision regarding Bible reading in the schools that I wish to make the reverend's thoughts available to my colleagues. Speaking as a citizen, rather than as a member of the clergy, Reverend Hards sums up the feelings of what I believe to be a great majority of the American people.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Reverend Hards' address be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

St. David's Church: Second Sunday After Trinity, June 23, 1963

I have no biblical text for this morning and have no intention of preaching a sermon. I am speaking as a citizen, not as a priest of the church. What I am going to say, therefore, must not be understood as the teaching of the Episcopal Church, but as my own beliefs, shared, indeed, by many other people.

I was disappointed by the ruling of the Supreme Court last Monday. The decision is now the law of the land and we must obey it, of that, there is no doubt. My dismay is occasioned by three considerations.

First, I cannot for the life of me see how this decision is an interpretation of the first amendment. You may object that I am not a lawyer, and that is why I cannot square the decision with the amendment. I'm not a lawyer but I can read English and know something about English and American history. The first amendment seems so perfectly clear to me. You know it: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The elected Representatives of the people, the Congress, alone has the power to make laws. The Supreme Court does not. There is no disagreement about that. The crucial word in the present decision of the Supreme Court is the term "establishment." The Fathers of the Constitution and of the amendments knew full well the significance of the term. Some of them had lived under an established religion. Others were fully aware of the problems which arose when one faith was the established religion of a country.

Consider the religious situation when the amendment became the law of the land. The Anglican Church, the established Church of England, Ireland, and Wales, harassed the Puritans and the Papists who were not members of the established religion. The Roman Church had been the established Church of France, the Huguenots had suffered for their faith under that establishment. Congregationalism was the Established Church of Massachusetts and the Anglicans and Roman Catholics were persecuted by the Puritans.

The evidence was conclusive. The Fathers of the Constitution saw that the establishment of a religion resulted in the persecution of dissenters. The Fathers willed that no religion should be established in this country, in order that all men might be free to practice their own faith. Hence the first amendment.

What concerns me is that the present Supreme Court has changed the definition of the word "establishment," and by that very fact has altered the meaning of the first amendment. Establishment now means the association of religion with the state, and the majority of the Justices has ruled that religion cannot be associated with the state. We are now to have a secular Government, that is to say, a Government which recognizes no power other than its own. The Government as government no longer stands under God. Individuals in government do, of course, but not the Government. This bothers me.

Two other questions related to this point equally concern me. The first is a purely political one. This: If the Supreme Court by changing the meaning of words can in effect make new laws, what happens to the constitutional framework of our Government which states that Congress shall make laws?

The second question is simply this: Where will the implementation of this new law end? The beginning is clear—no more religious services in our State schools. A movement is now under foot to remove the legend, "In God we trust," from our coins. Will the iconoclasts then go to work on our public buildings and with cold chisel remove from them every sign or word which has any religious significance? Will there be protests that the prayers with which Congress begins its day be declared unconstitutional? Will all prayers at State and Federal inaugurations of Government officials be prohibited? If not, why not? Will chaplaincies in State institutions, hospitals, prisons, be forbidden? On what grounds will the State pay the salaries of chaplains in the Armed Forces? It has been argued that in order that the military may have freedom of religion, the state must provide chaplains for them. But will not someone point out that chaplains are needed only on the field of battle or when our servicemen are assigned to pagan countries? The military can certainly attend the local churches in this country. So why chaplains on stateside installations?

On the basis of the Supreme Court's decision I can see no logical stopping place, except the complete eradication of religion from our Government and all its agencies. And when that happens, whether in our lifetime or that of our descendents, it will be difficult to distinguish this country from the Soviet Union.

"Oh," you say, "that's not fair. The first amendment clearly states that the Government shall make no laws prohibiting the free exercise of religion." I know it does. But what will that mean when the State is completely secularized. The Constitution of the Soviet Union in chapter 10, article 124, states: "In order to ensure to citizens freedom of conscience, the church in the U.S.S.R. is separate from the state, and the school from the church. Freedom of religious worship and of antireligious propaganda is recognized for all citizens. What's wrong with that? What has happened to religious people in Russia?

Where are we going? This is what bothers me.

In the second place, I am equally concerned about the secular concept, accepted by some of our religious leaders, that religion is for the home and church. Well, of course, it is. It is the primary task of parents to pass on to their children the religious heritage they have received from their fathers. It is the work of the church to complement this teaching. Sectarian teaching of religion belongs nowhere else than in the home and the church. Such teaching in the schools is only possible where the church, whichever branch of it may be, is the established church of a nation. Obviously in a pluralistic society, such as ours, there can be no sectarian education in public schools.

But can there be any religious education? The Supreme Court says "No." This bothers me. There are vast numbers of children who never set foot inside a church, whose parents are not antireligious, but merely areligious. These children are now to be educated without any notion of the fundamental principles derived from our Judeo-Christian heritage. When questions of morality are raised, they will be answered, I presume, in terms of what the State believes is right or wrong. They will no longer hear the Ten Commandments, for they are taken from the Old Testament. They will no longer hear the Lord's Prayer.

The other evening I listened to a TV program in which there was a scene from a schoolroom during the opening religious exercises. The children repeated with reverence the Lord's Prayer. As I listened to them I could not but think what a powerful influence for good these words must have on them, even when at this stage of life they may well have said them by rote. "Our Father." Here is the affirmation that there is a power, a benevolent power, above the Government. I thought about each phrase in that prayer. Some might never be understood by those whose religious education is limited to this simple service. But, at least, they heard the words "forgive," "temptation," "evil." In years to come they will need to forgive, to fight against temptation, to avoid evil.

Multitudes of our youth will no longer have this aid to a moral life.

I am also bothered because this new philosophy, that religion is to be taught in the home and the church, suggests that religion is for the home and church. The secularists in Russia have no objection to religious practices in the home and to prayers being said in the church. This is allowed. What is not permitted is that religion should move out into the mainstream of life.

The decision of the Supreme Court is not antireligious in itself, but in its implications it encloses religion and in the long run will tend to stifle it.

The third, and last, question which concerns me about the Supreme Court's decision, is that it seems that minorities unduly influence our Government. I hear a great deal of disparagement of rule by the majority, but I believe in it. The President is elected by a majority vote. The Governor is chosen in the same way. The men who make our laws are put into office by a majority of the electorate.

The members of the Supreme Court, political appointees, are not elected. It bothers me that they seem to be interpreting the law in favor of the minority. Mrs. Madeline Murray, in a television interview, said that there are 6,000 students at Poly, and that her son alone protested against the religious ceremonies. That is some minority, isn't it? One out of six thousand. The minority, needless to say, has rights, but not the right to impose its will on the majority.

This adulation of the minority is evident in our news media. A change of the subject matter will only illustrate the point. In the troubles at Cambridge I have read in the newspapers Mrs. Gloria Richardson's remarks about the white political leaders of that city. I have seen on television the same lady and other integrationist leaders. But, to date, I have heard very little of the other side.

I am not suggesting the minority, whether racial, religious, or political, does not have the full rights of citizenship. I am not intimating that the majority is always right. All I'm affirming is that the rights of the majority cannot be set aside by the minority. That is one reason why I am diametrically opposed to the Communist system.

The Supreme Court has spoken. We must obey. But I heartily concur with the statement released by the archbishop of Baltimore in which he said that the Supreme Court's decision was "another regrettable step on a journey which the Supreme Court should never have commenced." The question is, Where will this journey end?

If you are concerned that the journey not end where the present decision of the Supreme Court seems to indicate that it will, then may I suggest that you contact your Senator and let him know of your feelings. Senator BEALL of Maryland has introduced a proposed constitutional amendment allowing prayer in public schools. His proposed amendment states that nothing in the Constitution shall be construed as prohibiting the public schools "from providing for the voluntary participation by the students thereof in the reading of passages from the Bible or in regularly scheduled periods of nonsectarian prayer." If you agree with him, tell him.

New York City Commission on Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, constant vigilance is the major safeguard against the erosion of individual rights even where the battle for such rights has been fought and won. This is a truism which the people of New York City have learned, and it is one which all of us in the United States must continually remember. In a metropolitan area like New York, the people who live and work there are derived from many races and nationalities, and they have had to learn to live and work together in peace and equality. For them the New York City Commission on Human Rights has an important function to perform, and over the years this municipal agency has successfully shouldered a vital responsibility.

The problem of discrimination and inequality as it affects the North is the subject of an address by Hon. Stanley H. Lowell, chairman of the city commission on human rights. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD his remarks at the annual meeting of the Citizens Committee for Children, June 4, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY HON. STANLEY H. LOWELL

I note that I have been introduced as the chairman of the agency in charge. I am afraid that no government agency, certainly not on a municipal level, can take full responsibility in seeking the solutions to what I consider to be America's number one national problem. The City Commission on Human Rights is a drop in the bucket in a desert of inequality and inequity. It is not possible to pass the burden on to government at any level if we are to face the issue of equality for all in our society today. What we must do, the changes we must make, reach down into our very genes. Our thinking, our feeling, our actions must be reassessed and reexamined. This is the depth to which I believe we are all involved in the revolution which is sweeping America today.

On one thing I believe all in this room can agree. As Stanley Isaacs would have said, the concept of equality for all is for us a simple moral issue. It has only an ethical base. If we are to act for equality and equality of opportunity in America, it must be because it is wrong not to do so and it must not be because if we fail to do so the new African and Asian States will not be our friends. I know that you join me in rejecting this frequently expressed pragmatic answer to racial relations.

We have the laws in New York City and New York State. They can be better, but we have the laws. We have the official agencies to administer the laws—and they can be better too, but we have them.

What the liberal community must understand and recognize is that the American Negro generically—across the board—wants and demands equality now—not tomorrow.

He has waited since 1863, a full 100 years since the Emancipation Proclamation. In the year 1963 we have the Era of the New Emancipation, or even more accurately, the Era of the True Emancipation.

And the problem that we must face up to is that the American Negro cannot achieve true equality solely by using the laws, by using the devices and by using the means which we liberals have created over the past 50 years.

What is the "Open City" of which Stanley Isaacs dreamed? One where each individual will be treated without regard to race, color or creed as he seeks the essentials of our society—job opportunity, job advancement, housing and education. This is the concept of legality. This is the concept that we know as "colorblind"—without regard to color.

But how does this work out in practice today? If a particular industry in our city that will go unnamed is found to have not one single executive in firm after firm who is a Negro, the pressures of our time operate on this theoretical industry and it then assures all the government and private agencies in touch with them that they will hire personnel from this moment on "without regard to race, color or creed."

But, when we leave this consensus on morality, we may then also reach a parting of the ways. I firmly believe that the liberals of New York City and the North have lost touch with the racial problem. The rules have changed on them overnight. It will no longer be possible to ease our consciences by (1) articles in learned intellectual publications, (2) letters to the editor of the New York Times, (3) mixed cocktail meetings in living rooms, and (4) what I call for want of a better term, "letterhead helpfulness" and that includes your yearly contribution to the NAACP. Wrestling with the problem of inequality in our time is no longer a job for diletantes.

What some of my friends do not appear to understand is that it is not the extremists, the nationalists, who are today leading the movement for equality in America and in our own city. It is our friends in the NAACP and CORE and the Urban League who must lead it. For if they do not move aggressively and swiftly and without compromise, the Roy Wilkins, Jim Farmers, Whitney Youngs, and the Martin Luther Kings will be swept aside to make way for new leadership who will reflect the "guts" feelings of the American Negro.

We must also recognize that the problem in the North is essentially different in concept and base from the problem in the South. In the South, the battle is for legal equality. In the North, it is a battle for true, real, actual equality. In the South the Negro is seeking equal treatment under the law. The President is about to propose a national law against discrimination in public accommodations. It will not affect us in any way in New York.

However, if this hypothetical industry agrees to hire "without regard to color," we may get one Negro or two or three employed there in the next 3, 4, 5, or 10 years or none. This is pursuant to our principle of "color blind"; this is the evolutionary process. This is our legal standard, but I ask you is the law up-to-date? What are the realities? Isn't it a little late for us to tell the Negro that we are now operating under the concept of "color blind" when we have spent 100 years or more in being "color conscious" with respect to him?

When the American Negro demands true equality today, will he wait—is he prepared to wait while the process of "color blind" takes hold in the generations to come? In housing, we use every possible device, because we are "color conscious," to prevent the spread of Jim Crow. In our schools, we establish an "open enrollment" program—carefully avoiding the use of the word "integration," giving minority parents a choice of where to send their children under certain pre-conditions because we are "color conscious."

Are we prepared to accept the realities and the actuality of being "color conscious" in the basic area that cries out for action—in employment, and job opportunity and job advancement? Or to phrase it another way, will American Negroes accept more "tokenism" in the present state of our thinking?

I do not underestimate this dilemma in our society. The American Negro may well say "no discrimination because of race or color" is an excellent principle for those who have been on the "inside" these many years. But, how do we, he may also say, who have been on the "outside" make up for the deprivations, the inequities, the losses, the bias and prejudice of the past century and more?

Do we liberals say "get in line and wait a decade or decades to pass to right the wrongs of two centuries?"

I know Stanley Isaacs would join me in asking: How do we even up the score?

Eulogy to the "Thresher"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. CANNON

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. CANNON. Madam President, the tragedy of the U.S.S. *Thresher* still lingers in the memory and conscience of all Americans.

Recently, Mr. Ked Riding, of Las Vegas, Nev., composed a poem honoring the brave men of that submarine and underscoring the meaning which the tragedy of the *Thresher* holds for all freemen.

I ask unanimous consent to have this poem printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EULOGY TO THE THRESHER

(By Ked Riding)

The laughing waves
Now mark the spot
Of those now gone,
But not for naught.
We are below, the brave and free,
For cause of humanity.
We played the game
Up to the end.
We are happy now,
We don't pretend.
Our cause was just, and
To you to show
The need to probe
The depths below.
We've won our cause,
We're now set free,
As others before
For humanity.
You need not cry
For us below.
From faraway places
We see countless faces.
We join these friends
Who showed the way,
To find tomorrow
And not today.
The need is great,
The cause is just,
We'll ne'er forget
E Pluribus.
Our cries now join
The millions before;
Those murdered, those tortured,
Those burned ashore.
Our cause has not
Been done in vain,
Ere tyranny ends
We'll keep our wain,
And call on God
To end your plight,
Even though we're sunk
Clear out of sight.

Kalita Humphreys Theater of Dallas Wins National Recognition for Its Efforts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, the people of Dallas, Tex., and indeed all Texans, are proud of the Kalita Humphreys Theater and of the brilliant and imaginative work being done there by the Dallas Theater Center.

In this beautiful building Frank Lloyd Wright successfully applied his concept of organic unity to the practical problem of theater design. The Dallas Theater Center is accepting the challenge of performing in this great theater, and it has already provided its audiences with many memorable evenings.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a very perceptive article by Howard Taubman, appearing in today's New York Times, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEATER: WRIGHT PLAYHOUSE USED BY DALLAS GROUP—INSPIRED BY CLASSICS OF GREECE AND KABUKI

(By Howard Taubman)

DALLAS, July 1.—The Kalita Humphreys Theater, one of Frank Lloyd Wright's last buildings, in itself justifies a visit to this city.

In addition, the Dallas Theater Center, which uses Wright's concrete dream as its base of operations, is worth consideration. For it is an attempt to combine in one organization a resident performance company, a forum of new playwrights, a postgraduate dramatic school and children's training in stage disciplines.

First, the theater. As architecture, it is one of Wright's happiest solutions to a practical problem. His theater draws inspiration from classic models—the gently inclined amphitheater of Greece's Golden Age and the ancient Kabuki in Japan.

Set in a wooded, hilly section of this bursting city, the building, with its spherical shapes, is reminiscent of the Guggenheim Museum in New York.

Stage and auditorium almost merge, seeming to complete a circle. The tiered seats occupy an arc of 180 degrees, while the main stage is circular. There are wide side stages that can be merged into or separated from it.

Playing space and spectators' area are unified without the excessive formality of the proscenium theater or the insistent intimacy of some arena stages.

The equipment, of course, is as modern as a fan jet. The center stage revolves, and there is an ingenious circular grid over it. A curtain that can be used for effects of transparency descends in a semicircle like a vast cobweb lowered from a branch by a host of invisible spiders.

Wright began thinking about a theater decades before he designed this one in 1955. If he needed advice on the technical requirements of backstage equipment, he had a clear image of the spirit his theater should emulate. With its terraces and its fountain outside and its graceful, relaxed mood inside, it is graciously inviting.

In the 3 years that the Dallas Theater Center has performed in the building, it has experimented with various production ideas and has yet to discover all the possibilities. If one glances at the repertory and talks with Paul Baker, director of the center, and with members of his staff, one gathers that approaches from utmost realism to advanced techniques have been tried.

A production of Chekhov's "The Three Sisters," which I saw the other night, was faithful in its naturalistic detail, from the samovar to the sisters' dresses. Garcia Lorca's "Blood Wedding," which is being presented this week, is being done with economy and impressionistic effects.

The center retains 14 resident actors, paying them from $85 to $125 a week for a 10-month season. They are not members of Equity, though a number of those in "The Three Sisters" played with professional competence.

The center's policy is to bring together graduate students—some on scholarships and others who pay their way—in writing, staging, design and acting. A master's degree has been offered in conjunction with Baylor University.

The scope of the center's production is ambitious. A glance at this season's schedule shows that the theater has attempted new and old works, classics, and popular stuff.

Whether the present company is ready for all it is asked to do can be answered only by one who has seen it in a variety of works. The production of "The Three Sisters," while intelligent and sensitive, lacked the finish and subtlety Chekhov should have. David Purseley, Ronald Wilcox and Ken Latimer showed more than promise.

It is Mr. Baker's hope that the center will develop its own company of the highest caliber as it carries out its educational duties. One suspects that in a sense this is a bootstrap operation and that artistic progress might be speeded if the troupe could have some thoroughly seasoned profesional players.

Budgeted at $225,000 a year and giving almost 250 performances a season, the Dallas Theater Center is an unusual venture in repertory theater and stage training. It deserves to be watched and studied.

West Virginia: The Child of the Rebellion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Madam President, on June 20, 1863, the first Governor of the new State of West Virginia was inaugurated at Wheeling. The story of that great day in the history of the Mountain State is told by John Morgan in the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail for June 16, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHILD OF THE REBELLION

(By John Morgan)

"And grant we pray Thee, Almighty God, that this State, born amidst tears and blood and fire and desolation, may long be preserved, and from its little beginning may grow to be a might and a power that shall make those who come after us look upon it with joy and gladness and pride of heart."

So prayed Rev. J. T. McLure as inaugural ceremonies for the first Governor of the new State of West Virginia were opened in Wheeling at 11 a.m. June 20, 1863.

Earlier, the new State officials, a brigade band, and units of the West Virginia militia paraded from the McLure house to the Linsly institute building, the first statehouse.

Flags of all sizes were displayed on housetops and in the stores and residences along the route. They were said to be almost as thick as the locusts that were then occupying the suburbs and surrounding countryside in great numbers.

Very eager residents and visitors crowded streets and yards, looked through windows and gazed from roofs to watch the historic proceedings.

It was what the Wheeling Intelligencer termed a "great gala day in the city." The newspaper said there were "thousands of people here from abroad, and the city turned out its entire population."

The weather was tricky, with clouds moving over occasionally to cut off pleasant sunshine. There were a few little showers that didn't dampen the ceremonies.

State Senator Chester D. Hubbard of Ohio County (great-grandfather of State Senator Chester R. Hubbard, Republican, of Ohio, stood on a large platform in front of the institute building to call the large crowd to order.

The principal speakers were Arthur I. Boreman of Parkersburg, the first Governor; and Francis H. Pierpont of Fairmont, chief executive for the reorganized government of Virginia and also known as the "father of West Virginia."

Pierpont, in a farewell address, noted that his official relation with the western part of Virginia ended "last night at 12 o'clock," the hour that West Virginia became a separate State under a proclamation by President Abraham Lincoln.

He mentioned that it had been 2 years since he became head of the reorganized government. He made a brief reference to the dark days when he took office.

"My fellow citizens," Pierpont said, "I confess that then hung over my heart the darkest pall that ever shrouded it. We were entering upon the fearful experiment, unskilled in the Government of the State or the Nation. I confess I could not see far ahead."

The loyal Governor hastened to say that he didn't want to brood over the past. As the continuing head of the reorganized government (with his headquarters moved from Wheeling to Alexandria), Pierpont pledged that he would do all he could "to help suppress the unholy rebellion."

"My only exhortation to you is, lose not your sacred liberties," Pierpont declared. Applause followed.

Pointing to a large flag that hung over the street, Pierpont said:

"Fight as long as a mountain presents a site for a battery or a grotto remains to serve as a rifle pit. Never abandon that flag. Never yield the right of a free man."

In formally bidding farewell, Pierpont declared:

"My desire is to see West Virginia free from all shackles that shackle man. May she from this small beginning today grow to be the proudest State in all the glorious galaxy of States that form the Nation."

He introduced Boreman as a man who "in this cause is as true as steel." A voice in the crowd said: "That's the kind we want."

After prolonged cheers were given for Pierpont and Boreman, the new Governor began his address:

"Fellow citizens, to be permitted to participate in the most humble capacity in the organization of the State of West Virginia would be an honor, but to be called by the unanimous vote of her people to accept the highest office in their gift and to the performance of its duties at a time so much difficulty and danger as at the present, excites in my heart the profoundest gratitude toward them for the confidence thus reposed in me."

The 39-year-old Boreman, a stern-faced man with a full-flowing black beard, pledged complete cooperation with the Federal authorities "in all those measures deemed necessary for the suppression of the rebellion."

"While the war continues," he said, "I must necessarily be engaged in attending to military matters and to the defense of the State, and it may not, therefore, be expected that I shall give much time at present to the internal civil policy of the State, but even amidst surrounding difficulties and dangers they shall not be entirely forgotten."

More of Boreman's address:

"I shall do whatever may be in my power during my term of office to advance the agricultural, mining, manufacturing, and commercial interests of the State.

"And it shall be my especial pride and pleasure to assist in the establishment of a system of education throughout the State that may give to every child among us, whether rich or poor, an education that may fit them for respectable positions in society.

"And to you gentlemen of the senate and house of delegates, I shall look for aid and assistance for the exercise of a liberal policy in these times of trial; and I feel assured from your known intelligence and patriotism that I shall receive your cordial cooperation and support in the discharge of the duties of my office."

More cheers were given for Boreman, and then the crowd called for the eminent Waitman T. Willey, of Morgantown, to make a speech. He had completed a term in the U.S. Senate as a representative of the reorganized government of Virginia. Later he became one of West Virginia's first two U.S. Senators.

"What we have longed for and labored for and prayed for is a fixed fact," Willey told the standing crowd. "West Virginia is a fixed fact. She is one of the Union of States. ("Good," somebody said.)

"I don't know whether the State has been placed on the new banner or not, but when it shall have been placed there, I feel in my heart to appeal to my fellow citizens and especially you who carry arms to swear beneath the old flag that it shall never be struck therefrom." (Tumultuous cheering.)

Willey, in his inimitable fashion, inspired and entertained the crowd, which knew him best as the author of the "Willey amendment," a provision in the State constitution that provided for gradual emancipation of slaves.

As he was about to conclude, Willey said: "I will not detain you any longer. (A voice said: "Go on all day if you want to.") Well * * * I could not talk to you all day. I am nearly broken down. I have been skedaddling lately." (Laughter.)

After the speaking, 35 little girls, representing the 35 States, sang "E Pluribus Unum." And then the band played the "Star Spangled Banner."

As the program was closing, three cheers were given for West Virginia and three for the United States.

At last the child of the rebellion was born at Wheeling, the cradle of freedom from Old Virginia. The 35th State was officially, ceremoniously and finally a part of the Union.

In the early afternoon, Boreman took the oath of office in the house of delegates chamber in the Institute Building. The oath was administered by Samuel P. Hildreth, a notary public.

That evening another large crowd gathered at the Wheeling wharf on the Ohio River to witness a spectacular fireworks display. It was reported that "the pyrotechnics were grand, varied, and beautiful," and they "elicited universal murmers of admiration."

In the firing of national salutes, the right hand of Capt. Morris W. Downing was severely injured by the premature explosion of a cannon.

Boreman later sent the legislature a written message in which he deplored the rebellion, but rejoiced in the "fact accomplished of separate statehood."

He concluded the message this way:

"We have entered upon the discharge of our respective duties. They are arduous and delicate. The future of the new State, for weal or woe, may be in our hands."

The New York Post, soon after Boreman was elected, made this observation:

"The 35th State is now added to the American Union. Born amid the turmoil of the Civil War and cradled by the storm, we expect from her a robustness, a tone and energy to which the Old Dominion has been a stranger. She has begun well."

Commenting on the final formalities that made West Virginia a reality, historian Granville Davisson Hall summed up the feelings of those close to the statehood movement:

"At last we had come to the end of the toilsome road, the close of the fierce, the bitter, enduring struggle; had triumphed the perils by land and sea, by flood and field, the assaults of the open, the snares of secret foes—the timidity of the fainthearted, the rashness of the bold.

"At last we were out of the wilderness, not only in sight but in possession of the promised land. The past, with its anxieties and bitterness, was to be forgotten, save for its lessons of wisdom and patience; and now all faces turned to the future, rosy in the dawn of enfranchisement and progress."

West Virginia, indeed, after the long years under the eastern governmental majority, was a fixed fact.

A dispatch on page 8 of the June 21, 1863, edition of the New York Times:

"Wheeling, W. Va., Saturday, June 20—The State of West Virginia is now a fixed fact.

"Hon. A. J. Boreman was today inaugurated as the first Governor of the State.

"Business was universally suspended, and the citizens turned out en masse to usher in the new State. Business houses and private residences were gaily decorated with flags.

"The day closed with a brilliant display of fireworks."

On July 3, just 13 days after West Virginia became a State, the Battle of Gettysburg ended in victory for Union forces. On the next day, Vicksburg fell to Federal troops. In less than 2 years, the war was over.

West Virginia, the Mountain State, a child of the tears and blood and fire and desolation, lived with a measure of might and power and glory for 100 years.

Oxford Observes 250th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, July of this year marks the 250th anniversary of the establishment of Oxford, Mass., one of the fine communities in my district, which will celebrate this noteworthy date next week with an outstanding program of events during the July 4 holiday weekend.

Actually, however, the history of Oxford goes back farther in time than these 250 years of progress because John Eliot, the missionary, in 1674 converted to Christianity some 12 Indian families, comprising about 60 people, in the Nipmuck village then known as Manchaug.

A few years later, the General Court in 1683 granted the 65-square-mile tract to five absentee proprietors and the plantation was given the name of Oxford after the famous university town of England. From this land the French Huguenots received a grant of 2,500 acres, which they first settled in 1687 and again in 1699 after Indian raids forced abandonment of the first settlement. The Huguenot resettlement also proved to be ill-fated when Queen Anne's War caused the French at New Oxford to disperse.

It is at the close of Queen Anne's War that English settlement of Oxford began in 1713 and this date marks the permanent establishment of Oxford.

The Oxford grant originally consisted of 41,250 acres or about 65 square miles and from this original area have come the towns of Charlton and Webster, part of Dudley, Southbridge, Sturbridge, Auburn, and Leicester, and some portions of Millbury, Sutton, and Douglas.

This is an area, Mr. Speaker, which was settled by pioneer colonists in the very earliest days of American history. The Oxford community grew slowly because the times were troubled. The constant threat of Indian wars and periodic Indian raids between ominous periods of uneasy peace did little to encourage the growth of frontier settlements, but despite all these hazards, first the Huguenots and then the English began to carve out of the wilderness after bitter sacrifices, toil and struggle, the little settlement which has grown to the thriving Oxford community of today.

History records that the early settlers of Oxford built a church, a fort, grist mill, saw mill and houses, cleared fields and planted crops. This is the story of the early New England communities, told and retold as the pioneers sought new lands and new homes in the wilderness. First of all, these devout and patriotic people established places of worship, meeting houses, schools, and libraries. The rows of stone walls which cover so much of the New England countryside are silent, but impressive testimony to their industry and laborious work.

Today, families residing in Oxford and its neighbor towns sprung from the original Oxford grant can trace their beginnings to these early settlers who helped to bring civilization to the wilderness and forge the great tradition, eventful history, and proud heritage which have made our Nation what it is today among the peoples of the world.

The history of Oxford is truly an inspiring account of the lives of a strong and fearless people whose sacrifices helped to build a strong nation. It is not even possible in the brief time available to me to recite the highlights and accomplishments of the Oxford community because the history of the town abounds with feats of great courage during pioneer days and incidents which touch upon the growth and progress of our land.

Revolutionary War records show that Oxford furnished two companies of Minutemen when the alarm was spread from Lexington on April 19, 1775. Oxford men fought at Bunker Hill, the evacuation of Boston and Saratoga. Before the war ended, Oxford and area towns had furnished a full regiment of 10 companies, all volunteers.

One of the great heroes of the Revolutionary War was Gen. Ebenezer Learned of Oxford, who led troops in one of the great decisive battles of the war at Saratoga.

Again on April 19, but this time in the year 1861, Oxford organized a company for service in the Civil War. This unit is reported as the first to be fully equipped and trained in the area. Oxford furnished a total of 290 men in the Civil War, going over its quotas each time new calls for troops were made. A total of 62 died in service.

In World War I, 157 men and 2 nurses served from Oxford, while a total of 553 men and 21 women fought on battlefronts all over the world in World War II. Oxford suffered the loss of 18 of its finest young men in this bloody conflict. About 125 men from Oxford served in the Korean war.

The newcomer to Oxford is immediately struck with the beauty of this typical New England town. Before him stretches an unusually wide Main Street graced with lovely, well kept homes set back from the highway. In the town center proper, this attractive stretch of road is about 120 feet wide and runs for about a mile to delight and charm the visitor. This is easily the widest Main Street and one of the most lovely in the whole of New England. Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes in 1881 said of Oxford:

> After Plymouth, I do not think there is any locality in New England more interesting.

Visitors who travel slowly along Main Street or linger in the town can perceive living history about them. There is the oldest standing Universalist Church in the world built in 1794. The park at East Main and Main Streets contains the stone in which the Indians of the early Nipmuck settlement ground their corn.

In 1812 Samuel Slater, founder of American cotton manufacture with the first power spinning mill he set up in Pawtucket, R.I., established a mill in Oxford, now Webster, and Oxford became known as what one historian describes as "the town of mill wrights, almost every mechanic in the place was a mill-wright."

From the Slater manufacturing enterprises grew the population and early prosperity of Oxford, which became well known throughout New England for its skilled artisans in millwrighting, pulling-mills and shafts. The first American broadcloth is believed to have been made in the Slater mill in Oxford.

Oxford is the birthplace of Clara Barton, one of America's great humanitarians and founder of the American Red Cross. About a mile from the main highway in North Oxford on Clara Barton Road is her birthplace, preserved as a public memorial by the Association of Universalist Women. She is buried in North Cemetery.

Clara Barton became a schoolteacher at 15 and later organized the first public school in Bordentown, N.J. From there she went to Washington where she became a clerk in the U.S. Patent Office. She is believed to be the first woman to become a Government employee.

During the Civil War, she served without pay or commission, working on the battlefield and enduring for 4 years the rigors and dangers of soldier life side by side with the surgeons on hard-fought battlefields. After the war, on behalf of President Lincoln, she spent 4 years hunting missing soldiers, assisting in the marking of 13,000 graves and located the graves of over 30,000 missing soldiers.

She went to Switzerland in 1870 to rest, but soon was again on the battlefields of the Franco-Prussian war where she became acquainted with the work of the International Red Cross. Upon her return to this country, she waged a 7-year fight to get the United States to join the International Red Cross. She is author of the American amendment to distribute relief not only in time of war, but in times of such disasters as floods, earthquakes, and fires.

Another distinguished Oxford native is the late Dr. Elliott P. Joslin, the world famed authority on diabetes. Through his assistance, the U.S. Public Health Service established a diabetic center in Oxford where the first community study of diabetes was made. In 1953, with the help of friends and grateful patients, Dr. Joslin founded the Diabetes Foundation, Inc. to promote research, teaching, and summer camps for diabetic children.

Mr. Speaker, in observance of its 250th anniversary, Oxford has arranged a varied program of events to coincide with the Fourth of July holiday period, which should long be remembered by the Central Massachusetts area. On Wednesday, July 3, the Oxford High School band will give a concert at Woodward Field, North Oxford, and this will be followed by fireworks and a bonfire in the Greenbriar area under the auspices of the Oxford police and fire departments.

Thursday, July 4, will be celebrated as "Remembering Day" with the dedication of the World War II and Korean Conflict plaque and flag pole at Town Hall. This will be followed by a military parade to Carbuncle Park where John White Fellows will deliver an address. The parade units will then go to North Cemetery for the unveiling of the Clara Barton and Dr. Elliott P. Joslin Memorial.

Other events include a parachute jump and National Aeronautics and Space Agency exhibit. The day's program will end with an anniversary ball in Wellington Memorial Auditorium.

Friday will feature such youth day activities as a doll carriage parade, bicycle parade, soap box derby, horseshoe tournament, track and field events, a marathon from Webster to Oxford, baseball games, basketball games, record hop and square dance festival.

Saturday events include a firemen's parade and muster, firemen's street fair and a dance at Wellington Auditorium.

On Sunday, anniversary services will be held in all Oxford churches. An anniversary parade with floats, marching units, antique cars and the Ferko String Mummers Band of Philadelphia will highlight the closing events of the celebration.

As it can be seen from this recital of anniversary events, Oxford has planned a truly impressive program for the entertainment of the townspeople and the many visitors from neighboring towns. One special aspect, Mr. Speaker, should be signaled out for mention: the program is a simple and dignified one which represents months of hard work and effort on the part of many people to help make Oxford's 250th anniversary a memorable one. The program is in keeping with the cherished and long-remembered programs which took place during earlier anniversary observances.

Those outstanding celebrations will be relived again next week in Oxford and, Mr. Speaker, in recognition of this 250th anniversary of the establishment of Oxford, I have introduced a special resolution, extending greetings and felicitations to the town of Oxford, which I am honored and privileged to represent in the Congress.

I am exceedingly proud of the community of Oxford and I hail, salute, and congratulate its fine people on this great anniversary.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the text of my resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The material follows:

RESOLUTION OF OXFORD'S 250TH ANNIVERSARY

Whereas the year 1963 marks the 250th anniversary of the establishment of the town of Oxford, Massachusetts; and

Whereas from the time of settlement in 1687 the people of Oxford have figured conspicuously in the development and growth of this Nation; and

Whereas the observance of the 250th anniversary of Oxford will be celebrated July 3 through July 7, 1963, with impressive community ceremonies, large public gatherings and widespread participation of Massachusetts citizens and visitors from other States and places; and

Whereas Oxford is a progressive community of about ten thousand citizens, rich in historic interest, noted for its fervent civic spirit and for its many famous sons and daughters who distinguished themselves in many fields of endeavor and many facets of American civilization, and faithfully devoted to American institutions and ideals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its greetings and felicitations to the people of Oxford, Massachusetts, on the occasion of the 250th anniversary of this community and the House of Representatives further expresses its appreciation for the splendid services rendered to the Nation by the citizens of Oxford during the past 250 years.

Long-Range Space Communications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Sylvania Electric Products, Inc., on the development of the first battery-operated portable millimeter radio system for special communications.

This development is important when you consider that one of the major uses of millimeter systems is long-range space communications. Such a system could project a very narrow and intense beam from one space ship to another.

The system was developed by Sylvania Electronic Systems, a division of the company, which has its headquarters at Waltham, Mass. It was displayed June 4, 5, and 6 at the 17th annual Armed Forces Communications and Electronics Association convention and exhibition here in Washington.

The theme of that convention was "Communications-Electronics Goes Beyond All Borders" and thousands of representatives of industry, Government agencies, and the military visited the exhibits of the various companies.

The $300 Million Swat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the June 1963 issue of St. Jude, a national Catholic monthly, entitled "The $300 Million Swat" pointing up in a careful and reasoned way some of the dangers inherent in the use of massive programs of poison sprays of the new long lived types.

The article follows:

THE $300 MILLION SWAT

(By Richard P. Frisbie)

It wasn't such a "silent spring" after all. Along with the chorus of birdsong and the buzz of the first flies was heard the angry reaction of the pesticide industry to one of the best-selling books of the past year, "Silent Spring," by Rachel Carson.

Since the Second World War, the chemical companies that manufacture insect and weed poisons have been thriving. Homeowners battling mosquitos on the patio and weeds in the lawn as well as vast agricultural enterprises that spray thousands of acres have supported an expanding market for new and more effective poisons. The size of this market is now about $300 million a year. Among wildlife experts and conservationists, the increasing use of new poisons aroused fears that some species of wildlife might be exterminated. Rachel Carson, a marine biologist who is also a successful author, collected voluminous evidence of harm to plants, animals, and human beings caused by unwise use of pesticides, then stated the case against pesticides as forcefully as she could in "Silent Spring."

In the literary tradition of such books as "Uncle Tom's Cabin," which have given impetus to reforms, "Silent Spring" swats the pesticide industry smack between Dun and Bradstreet, along with Government officials who have allowed spraying to get out of hand. At least eight congressional committees, four governmental departments, three special boards and commissions, and the White House itself are studyng the questions Miss Carson has raised. Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, of Oregon, and Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, of Michigan, are among the lawmakers who have announced determination to press for new controls on use of pesticides. Justice William O. Douglas, of the U.S. Supreme Court, wrote a blurb for the Book-of-the-Month Club, in which he called the book "the most important chronicle of this century for the human race." He explained, "We need a bill of rights against the 20th-century poisoners of the human race. The book is a call for immediate action and for effective control of all merchants of poison."

Consumers Union published a specal paper-covered edition "as a public service project." Universities from Maine to the west coast planned symposiums. In the grassroots (already saturated with DDT, 2,4–D, and other pesticide chemicals) countless citizens' committees demanded investigations and pressured local officials to stop poisoning the robins in the park.

"Silent Spring" is not Miss Carson's first successful book. Three others, "Under the Sea Wind," "The Sea Around Us," and "The Edge of the Sea," were praised for their literary grace. "The Sea Around Us" won several honors, including the National Book Award, translation into 30 languages, and a place on best-seller lists for 86 weeks.

Miss Carson began her career as a literary scientist while a student at Pennsylvania College for Women, where she studied both English and biology. She attended Johns Hopkins University for graduate work in marine biology, then became an editor for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. During her years with the Fish and Wildlife Service, she became increasingly alarmed to see deadly poisons being used everywhere to control and alter the environment of countless species, including man. After the success of her previous books enabled her to give full time to writing, she determined to speak out about this subtle danger—less dramatic than nuclear warfare but potentially as menacing—before it was too late.

A soft-spoken woman in her midfifties, Rachel Carson has been largely ignoring the controversy set off by "Silent Spring." Living quietly at her home near Silver Spring, Md., she currently is working on a book for children about exploring nature, "a more peaceful subject," she commented to reporters. Understandably, she wishes to remain aloof from two kinds of extremists.

One set, composed partly of people who also think electricity is leaking at them out of the sockets, consider Miss Carson their savior from the dark forces trying to get them with poisonous sprays from the air. They have swamped her with letters. The anti-Carson extremists, apparently without having read her book, accuse her of advocating a halt to all use of insecticides in agriculture, with disastrous results for our food supply. Miss Carson has said she doesn't have to defend herself from these critics because her friends are doing it for her.

At the heart of the problem are three issues far larger than the problem of pesticides and what Rachel Carson said about them:

The difficulty of getting a clearcut answer from the scientific community when several disciplines are involved.

Knowledge accumulates so rapidly today that scientists are forced to specialize more and more narrowly. They don't always understand each other readily, and the differences in their backgrounds may give them conflicting points of view. In the pesticide case, there is a tendency for entomologists, chemists, and assorted agricultural scientists to be anti-Carson. Ecologists, ornithologists, zoologists, and conservation and wildlife experts tend to be pro-Carson.

The conflict between short-range interests and long-range interests.

Water-pollution, air-pollution, waste of natural resources, destruction of scenery and open spaces—all are opposed by citizens who want to be good stewards and pass on Adam's estate to future generations as intact as possible. However, there are many groups with much to gain here and now by continuing to pipe sewage into the bay, drain marshlands, kill trespassing species, and turn technology loose on the countryside.

It is oversimplification to assume that the short-range interests are entirely selfish. Farmers, for instance, can correctly point out that it would not be in the general interest to ban all use of insecticides at once. Besides ruining many farmers suddenly defenseless against insect attack on their crops, such an extreme measure would lead to food shortages and higher prices.

The folly of trying to "control nature" by putting a rope around our own necks.

"The basic fallacy," comments Brooks Atkinson, New York Times columnist, "is the assumption that man can control nature."

Miss Carson's conclusion is this: "The 'control of nature' is a phrase conceived in arrogance, born of the Neanderthal age of biology and philosophy, when it was supposed that nature exists for the convenience of man. The concepts and practices of applied entomology for the most part date from that Stone Age of science. It is our alarming misfortune that so primitive a science has armed itself with the most modern and terrible weapons, and that in turning them against the insects it has also turned them against the earth."

Rachel Carson also asks: "Who has decided—who has the right to decide—for the countless legions of people who were not consulted that the supreme value is a world without insects, even though it be also a sterile world ungraced by the curving wing of a bird in flight?"

"Silent Spring" is based on years of research. It takes 55 pages merely to list the principal sources of data. However, the author chose to call the citizenry to arms rather than present an objective review of the situation, with prophetic wrath qualified to a whisper. In the foreword to the special edition, Dexter Masters, directors of Consumers Union, concedes that the book is one-sided:

"From the wide range of her factual material she has proceeded to some conclusions with respect to dangers to human health which seem to Consumers Union's medical advisers extreme. Her strictures on the Government regulatory apparatus, which certainly needs the tightening she says it needs, seem to us to overlook somewhat the considerable tightening which has taken place in the past few years."

But on balance, Masters concludes, "Silent Spring" "may help greatly to redress the balance in this area altogether to the public good."

The victims of Miss Carson's swat have responded with a vigorous buzz of rebuttal. Attacks on the book for its "one-sidedness" by various speakers formed a substantial part of the program for an American Chemical Society meeting in Atlantic City. Parke C. Brinkley, chief executive officer of the National Agricultural Chemicals Association, said: "Any harm that is caused by the use of pesticides is greatly overcompensated by the good they do." The Monsanto Chemical Co., issued a pamphlet parodying "Silent Spring" and Rachel Carson's flowing style. Titled "The Desolate Year," it portrayed what would happen if the United States tried to get through a year entirely without pesticides. "Insect and weed raced each other for strawberry patch, garden plot and field of grain." Louis A. McLean, secretary of the Velsicol Chemical Corp., personally wrote a 20-page booklet, "The Necessity, Value and Safety of Pesticides." An ill-humored document which attacks unnamed "scare writers," it indicates that anyone who questions the wisdom of current pesticide practice is a "science-fiction writer," a nut, or worse.

The following paragraph from McLean's pamphlet apparently voices the fears of the more disturbed branch of the pesticide industry:

"Those science-fictionists do not like to admit that their propaganda suits the sinister purpose of those on the other side of the Iron Curtain who wish to establish in the mind of the public the thought that pesticide manufacturers, as a part of American business, are amoral and willing to do anything for a buck * * * There is no intent to suggest that any person named or referred to by indirection in this writing is a fellow-traveler. The fact is, however, those sinister influences exist."

Besides discovering a Communist plot under the flower bed, the chemical industry has advanced arguments in behalf of pesticides in a moderate and scientific tone. The trade journal Chemical Week advised the industry to avoid attacking Rachel Carson directly and concentrate on getting good publicity about the importance of chemicals in preserving food from insects and fighting insect-borne diseases. "We're not answering Rachel Carson directly," said Allen E. Settle, director of public relations of the Manufacturing Chemists' Association. "She will always have her own following. We are trying to tell our own story, not fight a battle with Rachel Carson." MCA has been mailing news releases about the benefits of chemical pesticides to 2,200 publications a month. A stream of suggested scripts goes to broadcasting stations. Special mailings are addressed to opinion leaders in science, industry, and Government. American Cyanamid, an important pesticide producer, also is sending out material to communications media and sponsoring a lecturer, Dr. Robert White-Stevens, described by a Cyanamid executive as "a brilliant scientist and compelling speaker. He usually has people seeing things his way."

The result of this substantial public relations campaign is a plague of articles in newspapers and magazines saying, in effect, that pesticides are good for you. An example is a brief article that appeared in the authoritative weekly, Science News Letter. Headlined "Pest Control Handicapped," it subtly reflects the point of view of the pesticide industry. The first sentence reads: "The fight against the insects that menace food and health has an added handicap this coming year because nature and wildlife lovers are being urged to conduct an anti-insecticide campaign."

The rest of the report relates that the National Wildlife Federation and the National Audubon Society are organizing support for biological control programs that, without eliminating pesticides, would minimize their use. Careful readers will note many other examples for months to come of the effectiveness of the industry's campaign to plant its point of view in the public consciousness. The industry has a right, of course, to tell its side of the story. One merely wishes that editors would be perceptive enough not to parrot the industry's line.

What exactly did the lady say that started so much uproar? She began by noting that "the history of life on earth has been a history of interaction between living things and their surroundings." There is no such things as a "balance of nature" considered as a static condition. There always have been harmful substances and forces in the world, from arsenic compounds in the rocks to radiation from the sky. Given eons of time, living things have adjusted.

During the past 25 years, however, more than 200 new basic chemicals, sold under thousands of brand names, have been created to kill insects, weeds, rodents, and other organisms described as "pests." In the form of dusts, sprays, and aerosols they have been widely applied to farms, gardens, forests, and homes. Most of them belong to a class of extremely toxic chemicals called chlorinated hydrocarbons. There hasn't been time to learn much about the full effects of these substances on living creatures, but even the Eskimos have been exposed.

Rachel Carson suspects that some of these compounds may cause cancer and damage the human race genetically. As for wildlife, she cites example after example of harmless or valuable species slaughtered as a byproduct of pesticide campaigns.

These insecticides are not selective poisons; they do not single out the one species of which we desire to be rid. Each of them is used for the simple reason that it is a deadly poison. It therefore poisons all life with which it comes in contact: the cat beloved of some family, the farmer's cattle, the rabbit in the field and the horned lark out of the sky."

To which the chemical industry replies by arguing that pesticides are not harmful when used in the concentrations directed on the label. There are several principles that undermine this argument. First is the fact that rain and melting snow wash pesticides into lakes and streams, increasing the concentration in some places. Fish are almost "fantastically sensitive" to chlorinated hydrocarbons. There is no dependable way to test for all these chemicals in water and no way to remove them. As the pesticides used by various individuals mingle haphazardly in runoff, unexpected new chemical reactions may occur. "The possible interactions between these freely mixed chemicals are deeply disturbing to officials of the U.S. Health Service, who have expressed the fear that the production of harmful substances from comparatively innocuous chemicals may be taking place on quite a wide scale."

Pesticides become concentrated also within the bodies of wild creatures. Earthworms chew their way through lightly treated soil, picking up and storing more and more of the poison in their bodies. A small toad eats several of these Borgia-style worms. Then, when a bird or a small mammal seizes the toad it might be better off with a snort of poison straight from the bottle. Once a pesticide is introduced into the food chain of wildlife the ultimate consequences are unpredictable. As for harmful residues on human food, "farmers very frequently exceed the prescribed dosages, use the chemical too close to the time of harvest, use several insecticides where one would do and in other ways display the common human failure to read the fine print." Since less than 1 percent of the crops in interstate commerce can be inspected through existing facilities, the protection offered the consumer by the Government is strictly random. Legislation to tighten up crop inspection is one of the most probable early results of "Silent Spring."

It seems to be a law of nature that attempts to control insects and weeds with chemicals will be self-defeating in the long-run. Insects, with their rapid sequence of generations, are better able to survive in a poisoned environment than man himself. House flies develop resistance to insecticides in as short a time as 2 months. Poison frequently kills off the natural enemies of the target species. If one breeding pair of the latter survive, the species may come back stronger than ever. There was a bitter fight on Long Island in 1957 between the U.S. Department of Agriculture and conservationists opposed to spraying from planes over towns, gardens, farms, forests, and marshes to eradicate the gypsy moth. Livestock, bees, and wildlife were killed. Crops were lost because of illegal residues that made them unmarketable. In the wake of the public outcry, it was learned that the expensive spraying programs had been futile—gypsy moths were again becoming numerous. Attempts to control ragweed with blanket spraying has had similar results in many parts of the country. The spraying kills competing plants and the following year the ragweed sprouts up again from seeds, thicker than ever.

Why is there dispute over principles of ecology that seem so plain?

"This is an era of specialists," Miss Carson writes, "each of whom sees his own problem and is unaware of or intolerant of the larger frame into which it fits. It is also an era dominated by industry, in which the right to make a dollar at whatever cost is seldom challenged."

The major chemical companies pour money into universities to support research on insecticides while study of control by biological methods lags. "It was reported in 1960 that only 2 percent of all the economic entomologists in the country were then working in the field of biological controls. A substantial number of the remaining 98 percent were engaged in research on chemical insecticides."

In any case, "the entomologist, whose specialty is insects, is not * * * psychologically disposed to look for undesirable side effects of his control program."

One of the classic successes of biological control was the introduction of the Australian ladybug to save the California citrus industry. Before 1890, the cottony cushion scale, an insect, had killed hundreds of thousands of trees. Then a U.S. Department of Agriculture expert noticed a ladybug feeding on the scale in a garden in North Adelaide, Australia. Brought to California, the ladybugs multiplied and greedily gobbled up the destructive scale insects. Many other desrtuctive species have been controlled in this way, without harming other species. Biological controls are specific.

Last spring I sent to a bug farm in California for a shipment of live ladybugs and praying mantis egg cases, with which I undertook to introduce biological insect control in my garden. The theory was that the ladybugs would eat the little insects and the praying mantises would attack the big ones. The difficulty I had in judging the results illustrates why people in a hurry may prefer insecticides. My army of insect predators disappeared into the shrubbery and I never saw any of them again except for one ladybug that alighted on my bare stomach while I was taking a nap in the sun toward the end of July.

I used no insecticides all summer long. Whether the insect population of the garden was higher, lower, or about the same as usual I couldn't decide. But I was quite certain that while the children were playing in the bushes they were not brushing poisons off the leaves onto their skins.

Plant poisons are widely used to spray along roadsides to eliminate tall shrubs and trees that threaten utility wires and obstruct drivers' vision. When the whole roadside is sprayed, nearly all the plants within reach are killed, destroying the homes and food of wildlife as well as blighting the scenery with a brown scar. This costly operation has to be repeated every year. If only the tall plants were sprayed selectively, a thick stand of low shrubbery would be encouraged. Since a plant community of this type is extremely resistant to invasion by tree seedlings, a single spraying could remain effective for as long as 20 years. Obviously, the more chemicals are used the better sales are for chemical manufacturers. It would be surprising if the pesticide manufacturers showed enthusiasm for biological control programs requiring little or no chemical spraying. Rachel Carson's basic argument is that our goals can be achieved by a combination of biological controls and narrow, selective use of chemical pesticides; while to continue the present heedless mass sprayings is to threaten all life on earth, including our own.

During the coming months, as the pesticide industry defends its position, much will be said of the vital role of pesticides in helping maintain food production in a hungry world. It will help keep the controversy in perspective to remember that Rachel Carson never suggested that we should stop using them entirely.

What she wrote was this: "All this is not to say there is no insect problem and no need of control. I am saying, rather, that control must be geared to realities, not to mythical situations, and that the methods employed must be such that they do not destroy us along with the insects."

Because of "Silent Spring," millions of Americans will pause this summer to reflect before they load up their spray guns and drench the landscape with assorted poisons. They might read all the fine print on the label. They might even decide that a bug or two in the bushes or a couple of weeds in the lawn are preferable to a garden in which no birds sing.

The New Leader of the Opposition Party in England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, a very interesting article concerning the new leader of the Opposition Party in England has just appeared in the London Observer, and I think it will be of interest to my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO IS HAROLD WILSON?—A CONVERSATION WITH LABOR'S LEADER

(NOTE.—The man who could be Britain's next Prime Minister has evoked more speculation about his character, ambitions and principles than any political figure of the day. Below, in the first of two conversations with Kenneth Harris, the leader of the Labor Party answers questions about his life and his views.)

HARRIS. Some men go into politics almost as a matter of course and some go in because of some personal Damacus. Why are you in politics?

WILSON. I suppose the short answer is because politics are in me, as far back as I can remember. Farther than that: they were in my family for generations before me, as they were in the families of dozens of members of the Labor Party. The first time I can remember thinking systematically about politics was when I was seven. I was in hospital with appendicitis. My parents came in to see me the night after my operation and I told them not to stay too long or they'd be too late to vote—for Philip Snowden. Then when I was 10 I went to West Australia where my uncle was an Australian M.P. and later on President of the Upper House. That was my first visit to a politician.

HARRIS. Why was your family so politically minded?

WILSON. They were nonconformist by religion and radical by temperament. The Lib.-Lab. tradition. The day after the 1906 election results came out in Manchester, my grandfather—he was a Sunday school superintendent—chose for the hymn "Sound the loud timbrel o'er Egypt's dark sea. Jehovah hath triumphed, his people are free." It's the old story of the pursuit of religious freedom and indignation with social injustice combining to conflict with the established political order. My other grandfather, too, was a deeply religious man who believed that politics represented the nation's application of religious principles.

In my boyhood it was chapel and the Scout movement, that kind of pattern. My wife's the daughter of a Congregationalist minister. I met her at a sports club. So I was impregnated with nonconformity. It was the soil out of which the Labor Party grew. Incidentally, there are plenty of second generation nonconformist radicals in the Labor Party, men and women whose approach to politics stems from the religious values their parents planted in them. There are a lot of first generations, too. I dont' think you can understand the Labor Party if you don't bear that in mind. Or the trade union movement. Or the co-op.

Harris. Does the religious side of the inheritance mean anything to you today? Are you a religious man?

Wilson. I have religious beliefs, yes, and they have very much affected my political views. But I'm no theologian. I didn't think my views out until a few years ago when a Sunday newspaper asked me to write an article on the subject of "Why I Believe in God." I'd taken my own religious views for granted, rather as I've taken my political views for granted—I'd never had any emotional or intellectual crisis which made me think them out. My Scout troop used to take over the church services for 1 day each year. I was tremendously moved by one of our Rovers preaching on the subject: "He hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." Another, the next year, "I have come that they might have life and that they might have it more abundantly." Those thoughts were really at the bottom of my political views.

Politics seems to me to be applying values which we taken for granted in personal life, such as being good neighbors, to the bigger, broader problems of group, and national, and international relationships. In my early twenties I got a bit rebellious and had a dreadful row in the Christian World. I felt the church was too obsessed with personal vices, such as drink, and not concerned enough with social evils such as unemployment and poverty.

Harris. Does your religion exclude notions about God?

Wilson. Oh, no. This was the problem I had to deal with in that article. In it I referred to my mother who had died 2 years earlier. I was very fond of her. I found I couldn't believe—and I reckon I'm a pretty rational kind of man—that death was the end of my mother. I simply cannot believe there is not some kind of an after life. And if there is an after life, then the idea of God, and then of Christ, is relatively easy to accept.

Our senses are limited to five and we can no more perceive religious realities than, say, a man born deaf can understand music, and a man born without sight can understand what color is. They will accept that these things exist. They can't know them—they have to depend on faith. We are in the same position with religious realities. But a faith, a belief which doesn't express itself in service seems pretty dubious to me. I'm not going to be so arrogant as to say that every Christian in politics must belong to my party. There are profoundly religious men in the Conservative and Liberal parties who believe that their party represents the political fulfillment of their religious views.

Harris. You talk of the nonconformist-radical influence on the development of your political views. How much has Marx influenced you?

Wilson. Not at all. I've studied the subject as history; you can't begin to understand the Russians without it. But quite honestly, I've never read Das Kapital. I got only as far as page 2—that's where the footnote is nearly a page long. I felt that two sentences of main text and a page of footnote were too much.

Harris. Who has influenced you?

Wilson. Well, as I have said, my parents and the Scout movement. The Fourth Scout Law "A Scout is a friend to all and a brother to every other Scout." When I was 12 the Yorkshire Post ran a competition. You had to say who your hero was, and why, in fewer than 100 words. I won—if you can imagine me saying anything in under 100 words. Baden-Powell.

But that was indirect influence. The two men who influenced me most, directly, were schoolmasters. One of them is still alive—in his 80's—I hear from him from time to time. A lifelong Socialist. Not by argument, but by example. He was a great teacher—unselfish and unstinting. When I was 14 I caught typhoid, and missed two terms at school. When I got back to school, I was miles behind—miles. It looked hopeless. I reckoned I could catch up in things like history—you could do it by reading—and in other subjects. But not in mathematics. Especially not in algebra—they'd done quadratics and goodness knows what while I was away. The second day of term he called me up to his desk. He said, "If you put in an extra hour every afternoon after school closes, you should be able to make it all up this term. If you're willing to do it, I am." I did.

Harris. Was the other schoolmaster a Socialist?

Wilson. Yes; a much younger man. He died very young. He was killed on Scafell. It was a great blow when he died. He was a first-class teacher—classics scholar—and a natural athlete. He used to take us to hear any interesting man who was speaking in reasonable distance. I remember going to hear Sir Norman Angell with him.

Harris. You seem to have a high regard for teachers.

Wilson. Coming from my kind of background, the teachers were the most important adults in your life. And my mother and my sister were teachers, and two uncles. Politics is education.

Harris. What was your father?

Wilson. You might describe him as a white coat worker. He was an industrial chemist working in a laboratory in a long white coat.

Harris. I read somewhere you had inherited a remarkable memory from him? Apparently you never forget anything you have read. Photographic memory?

Wilson. I wish it were true. In some ways my memory is hopeless. I could never learn poetry, never memorize anq kind of prose text, in fact, anything visual at all, such as maps. Remembering faces is supposed to be a must for politicians, I'm afraid I'm not very good at faces, either. But I have got this peculiar memory—it's nothing to do with intelligence—just a matter of facts sticking in my mind—for dates and figures.

Harris. Can you give me an example?

Wilson. Well, I know that the first time you and I met was October 31, 1955. I was having a meal with a friend of mine last night and he mentioned my going to see him once at his country cottage several years ago. The date came into my head immediately, May 8, 1948, plus or minus a day or two. I don't have to think about it, you understand; it just comes into my head. Just before I was elected leader of the party. the Prime Minister, in the Nassau debate, quoted something he said Hugh Gaitskell had said. I got up at once, said he had misquoted Hugh and gave the date and number of the column in Hansard, where he would find the correct version. I find now that my memory is not as good as it used to be for this kind of thing. After a period of 10 to 15 years I can be 48 hours out either way on a date, sometimes more, though I can still remember figures.

Harris. Have you inherited anything else from your father?

Wilson. A good constitution. There's never anything wrong with me that 8 hours sleep won't cure. One of my greatest pieces of luck is that I can sleep on a train very easily. Physical health is enormously important in politics, and I am glad to say—I hope, anyway—I don't think it is going to worry me.

Harris. Why did you decide to go into Parliament?

Wilson. I was a temporary civil servant during the war. I worked very closely with four Ministers. Two of them—one was Labor, one was Conservative—got things done. Two of them, one Labor, one Tory, didn't. They were all getting the same quality advice and information from their civil servants, but as I say, two got things done, two didn't.

I saw that in spite of the importance of the civil service the role of the Minister was crucial. Under a strong Minister things got done. Under a weak one, they just didn't. If you wanted to be sure of getting things done, you had better go into politics. Of course, I didn't know whether I would ever be a Minister—perhaps not for 20 or 30 years. Quite apart from this fundamental and very formative personal lesson, I found that experience of the civil service invaluable.

Harris. What did you learn from it?

Wilson. Well, one thing—I hope this isn't too cynical—I learned was that for about 3 months the civil servants study a new Minister to see where he is vulnerable, so that they shall be able to play on it whenever they want to break him down, get control of him when any issue comes up in which he is particularly interested.

Stafford Cripps, for instance, when he was president of the board of trade. In Stafford's case they played on his strength, not his weakness. Stafford was an extraordinarily moral person. They played on that. I remember when we were short of timber, and were finding it very hard to get any. They said to Stafford, "There are only two things you can do, president: you can either cut the housing program now or muddle through and gamble on a breakdown in the next 3 months." Of course, Stafford, as they knew he would, decided to press for the cut. The next year, when I had followed him as president, they came to me with the same choice.

Harris. What did you do?

Wilson. I said, "There's a third choice, Get more timber." We combed the world and we got it.

Harris. Did they find your weak spot?

Wilson. Yes, of course. In those days, I was a glutton for detail. I'd read everything that was put on to my desk. It was a very big department, one-tenth of the whole administrative civil service, and I felt I had to know all that was going on. So I was submerged with detail. I'm trying to restrain this weakness now. The leader of a political party has got to delegate. You've got to face the fact that at the most you can do your own job and half another man's. The job of the leader of the opposition isn't to play an instrument but to conduct the orchestra. I've been an instrumentalist and I can go back to it for an individual debate. But now my job is to conduct.

It's the same with being Prime Minister. The Prime Minister is finally responsible for all policy. But he can't know all the detail or do the departmental infighting. I don't know as much about what's going on in the Middle East or southeast Asia now as Patrick Gordon Walker does, and I'd be a fool if I tried. I don't intend to try and know the answer to every single question of foreign policy which could conceivably come up at any moment. But I would take good care that somebody in the Cabinet did, and that he can tell it to me when it is needed.

Harris. Incidentally, do you think the general election may be won on foreign policy?

Wilson. No. Not won on foreign policy. General elections can be lost on foreign policy, but not won. Your foreign policy has got to make sense to people, and if it doesn't, you'll lose. And your shadow Foreign Secretary must inspire trust and a feeling that he is sound and responsible. But the decisive issues are usually domestic. It was the Tories' line on domestic affairs which got them in in 1959. It's our line on domestic issues that will get us home this time.

Harris. I've taken you off the point. I was asking who had influenced you?

Wilson. At Oxford my tutors; for example, my tutor in politics, R. B. McCallum, who is Master of Pembroke now. A Liberal, politically. He taught me so much about the mechanisims of politics, such as Parliamentary standing orders, the work of the Public Accounts Committee and so on. When I became a don at University College there was G. D. H. Cole, a Socialist. Both had a lot of influence on my ideas, and on the training of my mind.

HARRIS. Who had personal influence on you at Oxford?

WILSON. Beveridge. I was his assistant—his research assistant—for a couple of years before the war. I went to Jesus on a history scholarship, but I read philosophy, politics, and economics, and economics became my field. Beveridge had a lot of influence on me. For instance, he taught me to work hard. I thought I knew what hard work was long before I met him, but I found I hadn't really started.

I went off for 2 or 3 months with him to a cottage each long vacation to help with research. He was working on the problem of unemployment. Beveridge used to get up at 6 a.m. and go for a swim. At 7 we sat down at the same table and worked solidly till 9. Then we had breakfast. When I say work, I mean work. Slide rule in one hand, pencil in the other, making seasonal corections of the 100 Ministry of Labor listed industries. After breakfast we would work on to lunch, then on through the afternoon to dinnertime. In the evening, we'd play bridge. That was the part of the day I dreaded. Lady Beveridge was a very formidable and critical partner, and I was not very good.

BUILT-IN FACTOR

Beveridge was a difficult man, you know—difficult to get on with and intolerant of inefficiency or sloppy thinking. In a way it was best to keep working with him; being engrossed and extended, he was easier to get on with.

HARRIS. Did you learn anything from him about unemployment?

WILSON. Yes, and much of it is still relevant. I learned something too about the weakness of a dedicated scholar and administrator. I'd realized for some time that he hadn't grasped the fact that unemployment on the scale and of the kind he was dealing with was a built-in factor of the pre-Keynesian economy—not an unfortunate accident, frictional, or anything like that, but positively built in.

NO SCRIPTING

I remember his face, very puzzled, one day after he had visited a camp for unemployed men. He said he couldn't understand why decent able-bodied men like the ones we had seen could be out of work. He didn't want to face the real problem. He wanted to think in terms of frictional unemployment. My father was out of work at the time. I remember once or twice helping him fill out application forms—two fingers on the typewriter. I explained to Beveridge that my father's unemployment wasn't frictional. He didn't realize—until much later—that there was a fundamental problem of underdemand in the economy.

One thing I learned from him was that a great man does his own work. His own essential work, at any rate. Beveridge had his research assistant, but only so that more could be done than he could do himself, not to save himself doing anything. It's always the same. You've got to do the essential work yourself, such as preparing your own speeches. I couldn't stand script writers. But, as I say, more than anything, Beveridge reinforced my own puritan attitude to work.

HARRIS. When you say puritan, * * *

WILSON. It's not until very recently—a year or so ago, perhaps—that I haven't always been driven by a feeling that there is something to be done and I really ought to be doing it. I think it's the old puritan inheritance. I don't make any claims for it. But not until a year or so ago could I sit down on a Sunday night, say, pick up a book, a biography or some historical essays, and sit back without a feeling that I oughtn't to be doing it.

Even now I find myself saying that if I spend an evening enjoying myself, I shall work better the next day, which is only a kind of inversion of the old feeling of guilt. I play golf, of course, have for years. I like it very much, and I enjoy relaxing; but, until recently, always somewhat in the teeth of this feeling that I ought to be doing some work.

HARRIS. Are you a puritan in the more general sense?

WILSON. Not in the least. I use the word "puritan" as a kind of shorthand. I can't say I admire conventional puritan morality. I think there's too much truth in the crack that the Puritans were against bear-baiting not because it caused pain to the bear but because it gave pleasure to the spectators. I put tolerance and group morality above abstinence and a preoccupation with personal shortcomings.

Mr. and Mrs. 6694

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the Government has been fascinated by serial numbers, alphabetic abbreviations, and machine codes. Alphabet agencies are still popular, and their birth rate does not appear to have suffered any bubble burst in the bureaucratic population explosion.

Nowadays numbers are king, however. Everyone is involved in a gigantic and complicated numbers game. The Post Office's zip code is the latest in the attempt to assign a number to everything.

Allan A. Seiler, editor of the Pike County Republican, Pittsfield, Ill., feels that such numerical progress may someday lead to numbers instead of names for people. After all, why learn both? His June 26 editorial makes enjoyable but thoughtful reading:

BY THE NUMBERS

The Post Office Department is asking us to add a five digit number to our letters, called a zip code. The idea is that it will speed up delivery of the mail.

We are all in favor of anything that will improve mail service and if a zip code will help, we're for it.

But we do wonder where this fervor for converting us to a numerical society is going to end. The Federal Government and big business seem to have an irresistible urge to make us do everything by the numbers.

The telephone companies have thrown out the familiar and colorful exchanges, such as Meadowlark and Edgewater, in favor of cold, hard-to-remember numbers. We have prefixes, suffixes, and area codes. In addressing mail now we need to remember postal zones and zip codes.

Your name means nothing in the vast recordkeeping machinery of the Federal Government. It's your Social Security number that is sacred. See that it's written on everything.

Big department stores and book and record clubs keep their accounts according to your assigned number. Insurance companies the same way. When you write an inquiry to them don't just sign your name, add your number.

Maybe in the next century we will simply dispense with people's names entirely and identify everybody by number.

If weekly newspapers are still writing personals by then, you might read something like this:

"Mr. and Mrs. 6694 and their son, 6694, Jr., spent the weekend visiting Mr. and Mrs. 3847 and other home folks. A good time was had by all, reminiscing about early days and recalling people by quaint names they once had, such as Smith, and Jones, and Quackenbush."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Twenty-two-Star Flag That Greeted the President

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with a transcending pride, which I know is shared by the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], and all the colleagues from our State on both sides of the aisle, that I inform the House that it was the Illinois version of the grand and glorious Stars and Stripes that greeted President Kennedy on his arrival in Italy. I would remark were it not already a matter of common knowledge, that Illinois always occupies a front seat when history is being made.

In this instance, however, a sense of fairness impels me to accord a share of the glory to the State of Alabama, 1 year a junior to Illinois in statehood.

Illinois was the 21st State to be admitted into the Union. That was on December 3, 1818. I have searched high and wide for a 21-star flag. None is to be found, and I have come to the conclusion that a 21-star flag, marking Illinois' admission to statehood was never actually made, although there is an artist's sketch of how the flag would have looked.

But a year and 11 days later—on December 14, 1819, to be exact—Alabama was admitted to the Union, the 22d member of that exalted sisterhood. Then in 1820 the official flag of the United States was one with 22 stars. How many of these were actually manufactured and flown in the breezes of freedom I do not know. But I do know that one is preciously preserved in Illinois, and I dare say one is as preciously preserved in Alabama. It is jointly the Illinois and Alabama version of the Stars and Stripes.

The remainder of the story is told in this Associated Press dispatch from Bellagio, Italy:

TWENTY-TWO-STAR FLAG TO GREET J.F.K.

BELLAGIO, ITALY.—An American flag with 22 stars, about a century and a half old, was hung out here Sunday to welcome President Kennedy on his first visit to Italy.

The flag, believed to be the oldest Star-Spangled Banner in Italy, was run up proudly by the Hotel du Parc, near Villa Serbelloni where Mr. Kennedy is making a one-night stopover between London and Rome.

The hotel owners say the flag apparently was made about 1820. It has been in possession of the hotel since 1850. But nobody here remembers who brought the old banner here, or why.

Mr. Speaker, I venture the conjecture that the flag that greeted President Kennedy in 1963 was taken to Italy in 1820 by a loyal but wandering son of Illinois. Illinois in 1820 was so much older than Alabama in statehood, that conjectures it might have been taken over by a wandering son of Alabama would seem nonsense. Seniority had a place then as now.

Pertinent Views of a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ODIN LANGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 5, 1963

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Rhoda L. Matson, of Fergus Falls, I am including a copy of her letter to my office of recent date. Inasmuch as it expresses some very pertinent views on 10 different subjects, which I know are of prime interest to every Member of this House, I am sure that each of us will find both interest and benefit in her remarks.

A copy of her letter follows:

I am writing you because my family and friends are much concerned and really worried at the way President Kennedy is weakening our country, and destroying our principles and yielding to Khrushchev. As our Representative in Washington, we beg you to help put our country back on the right road.

1. He advocates making a treaty with Russia to ban testing. We must not do this for in these dangerous times we must be free to test and prepare to defend ourselves as we see the need, especially since the Communists will keep on testing whether they make a treaty or not. He has also advocated that the United States disarm and let the United Nations have an army to police the world. This is madness, and would be the end of our freedom, since there are Communists in the United Nations. In fact we should get out of the U.N. entirely seeing it has Communist members. He should never have been allowed to borrow the United Nations money, and the U.N. uses this money to help Communist countries like Cuba. Within the safety of the United Nations the Communists plot to destroy America.

2. We should stop all foreign aid to Communist or neutral countries. Where in our Constitution is the President given the power to give our tax money to foreign countries?

3. Do not allow President Kenendy to raise the debt limit. Instead we should cut down on all expenses and spending until we are out of debt. We must keep strong militarily always, but all space expense should be stopped until we are out of debt. Please try to stop the wild spending and waste.

4. We should have an amendment to the Constitution which states the Bible must be read daily and prayer allowed in our public schools without comment. We are favoring an enemy communism who is seeking continually to destroy us and so far we have been losing the battle. Only with God's help can we survive as a free nation. We dare not leave religion to the church and home for we have too many homes without religion and many people never go to church. We do not see how the Supreme Court could make this decision for the Constitution says we must not forbid the exercise of religion. Crime and juvenile delinquency are increasing. Bible reading and prayer are needed daily.

5. We must get communism out of Cuba, uphold the Monroe Doctrine and never again let them set foot in the Western Hemisphere. We should help all countries such as Hungary who ask for our help to fight the Communists. Kennedy should be impeached for not giving the Cuban freedom fighters the air support and other help they needed, and for not removing all the Russian military installations in Cuba. We should encourage the Cuban exiles instead of forbidding them to attack Castro. We should let the Cubans set up their Cuban Government on our base at Guantanamo as Senator ALLOTT proposed and help them if they need help. We should stop being afraid of Russia or of what they or other countries may think.

6. We should stop all segregation in public places all at once. Surely the poor Negroes have waited long enough. They pay taxes and fight for our country and must be given equal privileges. We should withhold all Federal aid, etc. from anyone who practices discrimination.

7. We want the Government to keep out of our affairs. We don't want Kennedy's medical bill or Federal aid to education. If we would stop our Government from running corporations and let private companies take them over, it would be better all around. We would not be taxed to pay for the Government employees and the private-owned concerns would pay taxes to the Government from their earnings. That way we would soon be out of debt.

8. We should stop trying to do business with the Communists, stop making treaties with them, and stop being afraid of them, and stop trying to please them as Kennedy is doing. God does not want us to have anything to do with godless nations. We should stop trying to peacefully exist with the Communists. Neither can we work together with them as our President suggests.

9. We also feel that our military men who have made the Army their profession are better qualified to make Army plans and decisions than the Secretary of Defense or other Government men.

10. Please to be on the watch so we do not lose our freedom of speech, and freedom to broadcast. There have been rumors that the Federal Communications Commission is to forbid certain shortwave and radio stations.

I hope I have not written too much. We people back home are deeply concerned at the way things are going. It seems our once proud, noble country is now surrendering her principles because we are afraid we may displease other countries or bring on a way, War is not the worst that can happen. Surrender to communism is worse. Our Communist enemy is like a bully, the more we yield to him the bolder he gets.

Sincerely,

RHODA L. MATSON.

Leroy Corey Reports on His "Week in Washington"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Leroy Corey, of Morning Sun, Iowa, a student at Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, was one of two students from Iowa who took part in the "Week in Washington" project June 9–15, which I sponsor to give college students a better understanding of government and politics.

Mr. Corey has submitted a report on his activities and impressions for the week. I find these reports a pertinent testimony to democracy in action. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Corey's "Week in Washington" report in the Appendix of the Record:

> The following is an account of my activities for the week June 9–15, 1963, during which time I participated in the "Week in Washington" program as a guest of Congressman Fred Schwengel:
>
> MONDAY, JUNE 10
>
> I and the other students in the program began the week by meeting Congressman Schwengel's staff and reading some of the mail he had received. Next, we visited with Mr. Schwengel for a few minutes and then had our pictures taken with him. After that we went to the Supreme Court Building for the purpose of watching the Court in session. However, we had to wait in line and before our turn came the Court adjourned for a week and we had to settle for a tour of the building instead. During the rest of the day we visited both the House and the Senate. The House was occupied with a series of speeches on various topics including a number of attacks upon the President's recent foreign policy address. If I may say so, I considered the attacks rather well deserved. The business before the Senate was somewhat the same. The part we heard was highlighted by an exchange on right-to-work laws with Senators Goldwater and Lausche being for such laws and Senator Williams of New Jersey opposing them.
>
> TUESDAY, JUNE 11
>
> At 9:15 we reported to the office of Dr. Elsbree, Director of the Legislative Reference Service. Dr. Elsbree talked with us about the LRS for a while and then we were taken on a tour of the Library of Congress. After that we attended a hearing of the Senate Public Works Committee. We then had luncheon with Congressmen Smith and Schwengel and newspaper columnist Clark Mollenhoff. After lunch Mr. Schwengel gave us a most interesting and informative tour of the Capitol Building. The rest of the day was spent watching the House and Senate.
>
> WEDNESDAY, JUNE 12
>
> The first item on the agenda was a visit to the State Department and a briefing by a Department official followed. The official talked about some of the problems facing the country today and what was being done to solve them. After his speech the audience was given a chance to ask questions. I stated that several Members of Congress including Senators Dodd and Keating had at times raised objections to the sale of certain types of strategic goods to the Soviet Union and Red China by us and our allies with said strategic goods including such things as machine tools, jet airliners, cargo ships, oil pipelines, floating docks, and in extreme cases even entire factories. I then asked the official what justification—if any—could be offered for permitting these sales in view of the fact that these goods are of such a nature as to contribute materially to the industrial and military development of the Communists. The official's first remark was to question the authenticity of my statement but after some discussion that was cleared up in my favor. The official then stated that the justification usually offered is that these sales force the Communists to depend on us for these goods rather than to build their own capacity to produce them. I countered by asking him if it is was not a fact that the Communists ordinarily simply copy our goods and then produce their own rather than establish a dependency upon us. This he admitted is the case. He then, in effect, gave the answer that he should have given in the first place, namely that Senators Dodd, Keating, and others are correct, that we are in fact selling goods to the Communists that we have no business selling them, and that the only worthwhile justification that the State Department can offer is that some of our allies insist on selling such goods so why should we penalize our exporters by not letting them do likewise? One wonders if more pressure on our allies could not be effective. I will also state that I consider the entire briefing to have been a rather obvious whitewashing job for U.S. foreign policy. The official's attitude seemed to be "yes we have problems but don't worry, little children. The State Department is on the job." I will also state for the record that my Republican colleague, Mr. Wilson thought about as much of that briefing as I did. At least one our two Democratic friends (Mr. Ptacek) felt differently and I therefore cited the strategic goods question in detail in order to justify my conclusion.
>
> After the briefing we attended a session of the House and then had lunch with Mr. Freburg and Mr. Bandstra, administrative assistants for Congressmen Schwengel and Smith, respectively. In the afternoon we watched the House debate on the ARA bill and saw the Kennedy administration take a major defeat on it.
>
> THURSDAY, JUNE 13
>
> In the morning Mr. Wilson and I visited the GOP National Headquarters. We were shown around the offices, were told how the party functions, and were given several pamphlets about the party. We also visited the Draft Goldwater Headquarters and the headquarters of Advance magazine.
>
> In the afternoon we attended a session of the Senate and later visited Congressmen Bromwell and Hoeven and Senator Miller in their respective offices.
>
> FRIDAY, JUNE 14
>
> In the morning we toured the White House and also attended a hearing of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee. We also visited Congressman Gross in his office.
>
> In the afternoon we visited the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and in the evening we rounded out a very fine week by hearing Congressman Schwengel deliver the Flag Day address in the Capitol.
>
> In conclusion let me say that I found the "Week in Washington" an extremely informative and valuable experience. I cannot express too strongly my gratitude to Congressmen Schwengel, his family, and his staff, and to the Iowa Center for Education in Politics for making this experience possible.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Leroy Corey,
> *Morning Sun, Iowa, Iowa State University.*

A Threat to the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 5, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, at the 56th annual meeting of the American Jewish Committee held in New York City on May 16–19, 1963, there were adopted two statements among many which I hold to be specially enlightening and, at the same time, so important that attention should be called to them. Both pertain to the Middle East and the threat of an arms race, since rockets are now being constructed in the United Arab Republic by German scientists.

I have held that these weapons being developed and built constitute a threat to the peace of the area. They, in fact, threaten the very existence of Israel. Cairo has continually vowed to drive the Jews into the sea and unite the land of Palestine with the Arab world. With these rockets, it is possible to achieve such an end since their striking range covers the entire land area of Israel.

I have suggested that the U.S. Government use its power to insure that escalation of armaments will not occur in the Middle East and that the frontiers of Israel are guaranteed against aggression from neighboring states. Furthermore I have called for U.S. economic aid to be discontinued to the United Arab Republic for it can be readily surmised that these moneys are being used in the development and construction of these weapons of destruction. Finally, I have deplored the passiveness and disinterest of the West German Government by permitting German scientists to be used to develop these mass destruction weapons.

I continue to call upon our Government to find an immediate solution to these problems. An arms race in the Middle East would create an unstable atmosphere and endanger the peace of the world. Therefore escalation must be prevented from occurring.

Not only do I assert these demands. The statements from the American Jewish Committee iterate what I state now and have stated in the past, and I quote:

> The American Jewish Committee believes that implementation of U.S. policy requires our Government to: (1) clearly define what it would consider "aggression"; (2) intensify efforts to end the arms race in the area, meanwhile assuring that the balance of arms is not upset; (3) provide a formal guarantee, upon request, of the independence and integrity of any state in the region; (4) vigorously discourage the violent hate campaign against Israel conducted by the Arab States; and (5) reevaluate the present U.S. policy of impartiality toward peaceful nations and those nations pursuing belligerent policies inimical to the peace and stability of the Middle East.

To emphasize my position and, at the same time, present a concise summary of the events in the Middle East to which I refer, I should like to insert into the Record at this time, the entire texts of these two statements which I have mentioned and which, I am certain, will be of interest to my colleagues and their constituents, the people of the United States:

STATEMENT ON THE MIDDLE EAST

Current developments in the Middle East confirm that this strategic area continues to be a center of violence and political instability. The threat to international peace has now substantially increased.

Arab animosity toward Israel continues without abatement. The joint declaration, signed in Cairo on April 17, 1963, establishing a federation among the United Arab Republic (Egypt), the Syrian Arab Republic and Iraq, incorporates for the first time in a constitutional document the "liberation of Palestine" as a basic objective. Unless effective action is taken now, there is real danger of armed conflict in the area.

The United States, as leader of the free world, must assume a primary and continuing responsibility, both directly and through the United Nations, for the maintenance of peace and security in this turbulent region.

The American Jewish Committee welcomes President Kennedy's statement, at his press conference of May 8, 1963, that our Government's policy supports "the security of both Israel and her neighbors," seeks "to limit the Near East arms race," and is "strongly opposed to the use of force, or the threat of force, in the Near East." We are also gratified by the President's reaffirmation that "in the event of aggression, or the preparation for aggression, whether direct or indirect, we would support appropriate measures in the United Nations and adopt other courses of action on our own to prevent or put a stop to such aggression."

The President thus confirms fundamental and longstanding tenets of our foreign policy. We believe his statement should be supplemented and clarified to preclude any possibility of miscalculation as to the firm determination of the United States to employ its full resources to meet any threat to peace in the Middle East. Our Government should make clear—as it did during the Lebanese and Jordanian crises of 1958—that covert acts designed to provoke internal upheaval can constitute aggression as much as direct military action.

The continuation of indirect aggression today may precipitate an even more explosive situation than 5 years ago. Our official recognition of the Nasser-backed rebel regime in Yemen—whose power is maintained only through the continued presence of one-third of Egypt's regular army—has created doubts about our determination to oppose subversion and military aggression in the area.

The United States should vigorously pursue all avenues of negotiation, particularly with the Soviet Union, to remove the Middle East from the cold war arena. But as long as the Soviet bloc continues to supply Arab countries with ultramodern weapons—including jet fighters, bombers, submarines, and missiles—effective limitation of armaments is virtually impossible. The United States and other Western Powers should take immediate and sustained action to maintain the balance of arms between the Arab countries and Israel.

The swift destructiveness of modern weapons, particularly when used against small and vulnerable nations, makes prior assurances of U.S. assistance crucial. A formal U.S. guarantee of the independence and integrity of any state in the Middle East which requests such a guarantee would have a significant deterrent effect. It would discourage open military aggression. It would also reduce the likelihood that a peaceful nation which considered its security threatened might undertake defensive counteraction, on its own, to stem indirect aggression by others wishing to upset the present tenuous balance in the area.

We further urge our Government to press for the elimination of inflammatory Arab propaganda and hate campaigns, which are a major obstacle to peace in the Middle East.

Our Government's policy of impartiality toward all nations in the Middle East cannot succeed unless they are willing, in all good faith, to coexist. In the absence of good faith, our policy of equal treatment seems to condone, if not actively support, the aggressive designs of the Arab states against the very existence of Israel. Our present policy has not succeeded in convincing President Nasser to fufill his promise to withdraw Egyptian military forces from Yemen. Nor has it deterred him from seeking arms in increasing quantities from the Soviet bloc, thereby furthering Communist penetration.

Finally, a peace settlement between Israel and the Arab states is essential to the creation of a stable and secure Middle East. We urge our Government steadfastly to continue its efforts toward this prime objective.

The American Jewish Committee believes that implementation of U.S. policy requires our Government to: (1) clearly define what it would consider "aggression"; (2) intensify efforts to end the arms race in the area, meanwhile assuring that the balance of arms is not upset; (3) provide a formal guarantee, upon request, of the independence and integrity of any state in the region; (4) vigorously discourage the violent hate campaign against Israel conducted by the Arab states; and (5) reevaluate the present U.S. policy of impartiality toward peaceful nations and those nations pursuing belligerent policies inimical to the peace and stability of the Middle East.

STATEMENT ON GERMAN SCIENTISTS IN EGYPT

The recent disclosures of the contributions being made by citizens of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Arab Republic's program toward the development of advanced armaments, whose primary objective is the domination of the Middle East, have aroused great concern throughout the Western World.

The American Jewish Committee feels that the efforts of Western scientists and technicians to create a more powerful war machine has exacerbated tensions in the Middle East. These activities have increased the danger of an accelerated Middle East arms race which may lead to war.

There is evidence that some of the Germans employed by the UAR are pro-Nazi and have expressed strong antidemocratic and anti-Semitic attitudes. The UAR has made warfare and aggression a foundation of its foreign policy. It has publicly proclaimed, in violation of international agreements, its intention to destroy the State of Israel whose population consists largely of survivors of the Nazi holocaust. In view of the history of the Nazi era, we are sure that the German Government and a large sector of German public opinion are particularly sensitive to the participation of German nationals in activities which increase the possibility of war.

The German Government has condemned such activities and declared that it is eager "to cause the return to Germany of German scientists whose activities abroad could contribute to an increase in political tensions." Many outstanding figures in political, religious, and academic life are trying to put this decision into effect.

We therefore urge the Federal Republic of Germany to utilize existing legal and administrative means to prevent her citizens from contributing to the war potential of the United Arab Republic. In addition, we hope the Federal Republic of Germany will seek new means, if necessary, to control such activities. In this connection the present efforts in the Bundestag to seek amendments to the basic law are encouraging.

Remain Free of Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 5, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Independence Day celebration naturally calls for a review and reappraisal of the many facets of our national life. The Des Plaines Valley News, an independent publication in south suburban Cook County, in its issue of Thursday, June 27, contained a most provocative editorial discussing the Fourth of July observance.

By its very nature, I feel this editorial will inspire comment and reappraisal as it stirs us to thought:

REMAIN FREE OF CONTROLS

Drama, history, flags, and fun marked the observance of the Fourth of July in communities throughout our Nation.

There were fireworks, now banned except for those patriotic displays by various communities for safety reasons. There were orators that voiced their pride in our Nation and its heritage. Some orators were bad, some good. Yet, all voiced their devotion, passion, and pride in the Nation's future.

Mention was always given to the great names that provided leadership to the new Nation; Washington, Madison, Monroe, Jefferson, Adams, Franklin, while the Nation was a tiny infant amongst the powerful nations in Europe.

Our Nation has enjoyed vast material progress during the last decade. Every citizen has grown and prospered.

However, the old sense of work that stimulated the old progress has almost vanished. Only the recent farmer's vote on the wheat controls convinces us that work rather than Government controls mean progress.

It is sad to see the signs of decay. The discipline that challenged our Puritan ancestors into fighting Indians, the French, and British was one of effort. In recent years, our laws have made relief an honorable career. Some areas have made it mandatory that able-bodied persons work out direct relief rather than handing out public funds to individuals who have no thought of working, and were criticized.

The great painters and sculptors of the past were so interested in the purity of their result that many of them snatched bodies en route to the cemetery in order to study the muscle and body formation. Centuries later we stare at the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel or the works of past artists and marvel at their trueness to life.

Today? We find that even animals that brush their hand across a canvas are acclaimed great artists and persons that toss chewing gum, glass, and gobs of paint on a bit of canvas are given full page writeups in national magazines.

Look at literature. The educational level of any community can be seen by the display of texts in the corner drugstore or neighborhood newsstand. If there is a rot to be blotted out it is the display of sexual literature.

Ban the selling of this? No. The idea is to educate the residents to select what is good and what is bad. If no buyer purchased those girlie magazines they soon would be withdrawn by reason of income.

Independence was the choice of our Nation. But, the dimensions of the "breath of freedom" should be reexamined. To allow irresponsibility to become a desirable trait, to hang paintings upside down and have such paintings be labeled art, is a sign that we are confused.

If a publication can sell out its issue because it contains a photo of a maiden without clothes, the morals of our Nation are on the degrade.

Confusion, distrust, graft, and cesspool morals are signs of decay. Unless more people follow the example of the farmers who voted for self-discipline rather than Government controls, our Nation will follow the path of those which perished.

If you are disturbed about the condition of our land today, you are one of the few remaining independent thinking individuals within our Nation. If you think that everything is all right, better read histories of the nations that perished for lack of effort in holding to the vitality that made them great.

Experimental Program Trains Unskilled and Jobless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 5, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most promising hopes for a solution to the Nation's long-term unemployment problem lies in the establishment of well-planned and effective worker training programs. One example of such a program is that being conducted experimentally at the Virginia State College, which was described in a recent New York Times article.

Here, groups of unskilled workers are being given different amounts and types of training. Afterward, a record will be kept of their employment histories in order to determine which of the teaching methods has been most effective.

It is already apparent that, with the aid of personal counseling, it will be possible to teach a man enough in a year to enable him to hold a job in the modern world.

Because this program will have important implications for our entire job retraining effort, under unanimous consent I offer this article from the June 24 issue of the Times to be included in the RECORD:

JOBLESS TAUGHT SKILLS AND HOPE—UNITED STATES TRAINS 94 IN VIRGINIA EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM

(By John D. Pomfret)

NORFOLK, VA., June 21.—Walter J. Wilkins, a shy, earnest 37-year-old Negro, sat in the living room of his small apartment in a public low-rent housing project here and said quietly: "I'm going to stick it out. At my age, I figure it's now or never."

He was talking about his determination, despite seemingly insuperable obstacles, to finish a 1-year training program at the Norfolk division of Virginia State College.

To Mr. Wilkins, the program means gaining a skill as an electronics technician and the prospect of the first steady job he has ever had. To the Nation, the program may turn out to mean far more.

It is a highly experimental effort to see what can be done to solve the problems that lie beyond the end of discrimination in hiring. Hundreds of thousands of men and women, because of frustration, apathy, lack of motivation or proper education or training, will be unable to qualify for the jobs open to them for the first time.

The program is intended to see what combination of courses and instruction techniques work best to fit Mr. Wilkins and 93 other unskilled, jobless Negro men—half of whom are illiterate—for the modern world of work.

FOUR HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS AID SOUGHT

The lessons being learned could be of great importance if Congress grants the $400 million asked last week by President Kennedy for stepped-up education and training as part of his civil rights program.

On Monday and Tuesday, Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz will meet at the college here with representatives of 15 southeastern colleges to ask them to establish similar programs.

All of the colleges have a vocational orientation, but not all are Negro. Labor Department officials point out that the problems of illiteracy and inadequate training afflict many whites as well.

The central lesson that seems to be emerging from the program here is that in a year's time it is possible, with the most intensive and dedicated staff work, to teach an illiterate, unskilled man enough reading and writing, job skills, and fresh attitudes toward work for him to get and keep a job.

But it is a hard, uphill battle.

One problem has been the meagerness of the training allowances paid to the students to support themselves and their families.

The program is being financed by the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. The latter has put up $125,000 for the training and the former about the same amount for allowances.

The law limits the allowances to the amount of the average weekly unemployment insurance benefit in the State where the training is undertaken.

This means the Virginia trainees receive $27 a week.

Many of them were impoverished to begin with, and have been slowly sinking deep into debt. Many are being pursued by creditors. They are unable to provide their children with proper clothing. Some with large families are eating poorly.

Despite these circumstances, only six trainees have dropped out in the 8 months the program has been underway. College officials regard this as strong evidence of the determination of the trainees to learn a skill.

With 4 months to go, however, and summer jobs opening up in nearby resort areas, college officials are fearful that the pressure to make more money may force more trainees out of the program.

Project staff members have chipped in money, furniture, clothing, and food to help the trainees. They have gotten trainees out of jail and helped them settle fights with their wives. They have taken care of trainees who have been sick and bolstered their morale in hundreds of private conversations.

Project officials are convinced that personal counseling must accompany any successful effort to train the chronically unemployed.

The trainees are divided into two groups. Half get only vocational training in electronics, masonry, janitorial work, automobile mechanics, or sheet metal work. The other half get this plus instruction in reading, writing, and mathematics and occupational counseling.

There are two other control groups, of 50 men each, who were picked because they had the same personal characteristics as the trainees. One group is given infrequent, simulated job counseling intended to make them feel part of the experiment but not to be of much real worth. The other group is given nothing.

The plan is to follow the employment histories of all four groups for a year after the training is completed.

Perhaps the most fascinating aspect of the program is the effort to move the trainees away from the world of idleness, frustration, and apathy toward the world of work and aspiration.

They are being taught that it is important to get up in the morning and be on time for class. They are told that they cannot afford to take a week off when a relative dies because the job they hope to get may not be there when they return to it.

State and Local Taxes Continue To Rise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 5, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, at the time that Congress is being pressed to reduce Federal taxes in order to stimulate the economy, individual States and cities are revising their tax rates upward in order to meet revenue needs.

According to an article in the June 24 edition of the New York Times, a large number of State and local cigarette, liquor, and gas taxes are being raised in an attempt to obtain new revenue—often against strong local opposition. Other tax increases are slated to be voted by State legislatures still in session.

Since Federal tax reduction and reform must always be considered in the light of State and local tax developments, I ask unanimous consent that this article be included in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, June 24, 1963]

STATES CONTINUE TO RAISE TAXES AS UNITED STATES PRESSES FOR REDUCTIONS

(By Robert Metz)

While the Federal Government is pressing tax cuts as a means of freeing the economy from an artificial restraint on growth, the States and cities are looking for—and finding—new sources of revenue to meet their burgeoning needs.

The State and local governments, however, are acting in the face of growing restiveness and even open revolt.

New York City's Mayor Wagner met criticism within his own official family when he raised the sales tax from 3 to 4 percent and tried unsuccessfully to impose it on those taking delivery outside the city.

Other new city taxes, particularly, an occupancy tax on business sparked an unusually aggressive fight by the business community. The tax got through the legislative channels only to be attacked on constitutional grounds in the courts. The case is now pending.

A similar attack has already proved successful in Indiana. A new 2 percent sales tax there, effective July 1, was struck down by a circuit court. The tax could be reinstated, of course, but its future is in doubt.

In Nevada, voters had a chance to express themselves directly on a legislated rise from 2 to 3 percent in the sales tax rate. They turned it down in a special referendum.

Gov. John W. Reynolds, of Wisconsin, a Democrat, vetoed a law making the State's selective sales tax general.

This resistance to added taxes—the list is long—comes at a time when the Federal proposal to lower personal and corporate income taxes by $10 billion seems in doubt.

Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon said last week that the whole tax reduction program could be put in effect in 15 months if given final approval by October 1. However, the bill is still in the lower House. The Ways and Means Committee has temporarily suspended hearings while its tentative actions are digested by technical staff.

Some observers doubt the program hurdles ahead.

The Ways and Means Committee has tentatively adopted an item that will disappoint the travelers, smokers, and consumers of alcoholic beverages. State excise taxes on gasoline, tobacco, and liquor will not be deductible.

Commerce Clearinghouse lists 11 States and New York City with new cigarette taxes; Idaho, from 6 to 7 cents; Indiana, from 3 to 4 cents; Iowa, from 4 to 5 cents; Minnesota, from 7 to 8 cents; Nebraska, from 4 to 6 cents; New Jersey, from 7 to 8 cents; New York City, from 2 to 4 cents plus the State levy of 5 cents; North Dakota, from 6 to 7 cents; Pennsylvania, from 6 to 8 cents; South Dakota, from 5 to 6 cents; Tennessee, from 5 to 7 cents; Utah, from 4 to 8 cents, and West Virginia made its temporary 4-cent rate permanent. The old rate was 2 cents.

Arizona and Minnesota each raised their gasoline taxes from 5 to 6 cents.

Eleven States increased their liquor taxes. Alabama raised taxes on malt and brewed beverages from 2 to 4 cents on 12 ounces; Idaho increased State store sales surcharges from 7.5 to 10 percent; Iowa imposed a 10-percent gross receipts tax on private clubs selling liquor for on-the-premises consumption; Nebraska raised beer taxes from 4 to 6 cents a gallon and liquor taxes from $1.20 to $1.60 a gallon.

New Jersey liquor taxes were increased from $1.50 to $1.80 a gallon; New Mexico increased beer taxes from 5.5 to 8 cents a gallon, wine taxes from 30 to 40 cents a gallon, hard liquor under 100 proof from $1.30 to $1.50 a gallon, and over 100 proof from $2.10 to $2.40 a gallon.

North Dakota raised ale, beer, and malt beverage taxes from 4 to 8 cents for the 4-year period ending July 1, 1967; Pennsylvania raised its emergency tax on net prices of wines and liquors sold by the control board from 10 to 15 percent. South Dakota raised its beer tax from $2 to $4 a barrel, and imposed general increases in all alcoholic liquor taxes. Tennessee raised its tax on alcoholic spirits from $2 to $2.50 a gallon; and Wyoming increased its malt liquor tax from 2 to 6 cents a gallon.

There are further moves slated. Nineteen State legislatures are still in session.

Tribute to Eleanor Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 5, 1963

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, seldom in history has one woman earned the respect and admiration of as many people throughout the world as did Anna Eleanor Roosevelt. For more than 40 years—as a member of the League of Women Voters, later as First Lady, and finally as an internationally esteemed figure—Eleanor Roosevelt worked unceasingly on behalf of her fellow men and women. Her interests and activities were as far ranging as the problems of a rapidly changing world.

Here was a woman whose heart knew no bounds in its concern for human suffering and deprivation. Mrs. Roosevelt was a great friend of the impoverished and the underprivileged, both in word and in deed. She espoused the cause of equal rights and equal opportunities for all our citizens at a time when such pleas were scattered and unpopular. Later, as American delegate to the Human Rights Convention of 1946 and to the General Assembly from 1946 to 1953, her vistas extended even further, until they encompassed all humanity.

Many disagreed with her, but in time even her critics came to respect her. Millions more regarded her with the deepest affection, an affection matched only by our sorrow at her decease. This was a woman with strength of mind and warmth of heart. The memory of Eleanor Roosevelt will long be cherished as one who achieved greatness through her devotion to mankind.

Dedication of Monument to Dr. Robert H. Goddard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a speech I made on May 11, 1963, at the dedication of a monument to the world famed, Dr. Robert H. Goddard, pioneer discoverer of modern rockets and missiles which recently took place at Fort Devens, Mass., in my district:

It is a very great honor for me to be present today at this moving dedication of a beautiful monument for our great citizen, scientist, and friend, Dr. Robert H. Goddard, of beloved memory.

The Nation and the world will applaud the action of General Verbeck, his staff and the Army in making this historic dedication possible, and we are all grateful to Mr. Samuel Hopley and Miss Jean Hopley for their deep interest and many efforts in bringing this most appropriate monument and placque to reality. We are grateful to all who assisted in this valued project.

It is especially appropriate that Mrs. Goddard, who helped her famous husband so effectively during his life, and who has taken part in many efforts to perpetuate his memory, should be with us today.

The Nation and the world has come to realize the greatness and significance of Dr. Goddard's tremendous contributions.

He has been honored in innumerable ways. The Congress of the United States has struck off a gold medal in high tribute to him. Our great space center, so meaningful to us, in terms of the national security, space exploration and the advancement of science, bears his name. Many memorials to honor him have been established in this country and elsewhere to bring enduring luster to his achievements.

And it is in our best traditions indeed that this memorial should be established here at Fort Devens, where years ago this great dedicated, gifted man performed some of his earliest and most important experiments.

No one could possibly describe, let alone evaluate, the reach, the depth and the everlasting vital importance of Dr. Goddard's work. Born in struggle and sacrifice, conceived in genius, carried out with a courage and determination that would not be denied, Dr. Goddard's contributions now rank by common concensus with the most epochal ever achieved by man.

The ideas he generated and developed have already carried us to the reaches of space. No one could predict today the extent they will permit us in the future to penetrate, indeed to conquer, problems and adventures that have challenged the human race since its inception.

If the counsel, advice and discoveries of this great man had been heeded and acted upon when first proclaimed, our mastery of space would doubtless be vastly more extended than it is today, and some of the security problems we now face would probably be much less compelling than they are.

But we must live for the future, for the enlargement of human knowledge, for progress, for advancement, for improvement in the status of man and his control over his environment, for the broad ideals of freedom we stand for, for better conditions, better relations and peace in the Nation and the world.

As we proudly and gratefully dedicate this monument, to a very great man, a neighbor and a friend, whose name will go down the unbroken channels of history through ages yet to come, we might well ponder and remember the words of Dr. Goddard at his high school graduation delivered years ago in June 1904.

"It is difficult to say what is impossible, for the dream of yesterday is the hope of today and the reality of tomorrow."

May the dreams, the hopes and the realities, which Dr. Goddard's rich fruitful life have brought to all of us, continue to be reflected in the years ahead in the knowledge, wisdom, well-being, peace and happiness of our own great Nation and the world.

ARA Backers Happy To Pin Blame; and Happy To Forget History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 5, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, increased appropriations of $455.5 million for ARA were recently voted down in the House because first, the agency had not made full use of the funds it already had; second, the loans and grants were used to finance unneeded businesses which duplicated existing facilities; third, financial aid under the program served merely to pirate away enterprises from one location to another; fourth, help went largely to motels and tourist promotions rather than to new industry; and, most important and telling; and fifth, it did not magically create new jobs despite the original predictions of the Government planners. All of this could have been foretold from the history of the 1930's.

Used as a political football, the added ARA appropriations is still kicking around. From a recent editorial in the Area News, Gillespie, Ill., we learn that ARA proponents are squeezing out the last drop of political vinegar against those thoughtful legislators who opposed the bill. This politicking does not change the facts of history.

The editorial from Charles and Eva Blanchard's the Area News, edited by Eugene Paytt, is as follows:

"A TRAGEDY"—REPUBLICANS VOTE AGAINST UNEMPLOYMENT

On June 12, the 152 Republicans in the House of Representatives voted against extension of the area redevelopment activities which is, in effect, a vote against the unemployed.

According to the Democratic National Committee: "On the ARA, the House Republicans voted 91 percent against the unemployed.

"On the accelerated public works vote, they voted 88 percent against the unemployed.

"In the Senate, the Republicans voted 75 percent against public works.

"And on a job-creating youth bill, the GOP Members of the Senate voted an incredible 96 percent against helping these out-of-school, out-of-work young people.

"The Republicans refuse to face the problems that beset us today."

The New Deal was inaugurated in 1933, which was supposed to bring us out of the great depression, World War II came along bringing the Nation out of the slump in a hurry. During these years we have had the biggest national budget ever. Naturally our taxes too went up, new taxes were added—for the duration, but once a tax, always a tax.

Following the war, the paternal government was resumed. Aid from the Government, both personal and public projects, looked very good. The Government was good to us, keeping us without working—"giving" us all manner of public improvements, as well as making friends all over the world by giving and lending. Naturally our taxes began to go up, up, up, then we realized that it is not the government, but our own money that is being used.

We tried every idea thought up by the braintrusts in Washington, all that would put thousands to work and bring undreamed of prosperity to the country. We have seen them come and go, with the same fizzling results. We tried the CCC camps for the unemployed youth of the Nation, now we would form another, with probably the only difference being, they would cost double of what they did before. We kept the jobless, resulting in a class that wants nothing more than unemployment checks.

We forget, but perhaps these Republicans are remembering that our greatest eras of prosperity came from private industry, when they were unhampered by Government regulations, huge taxes and keeping books for the Government. In fact big business and the labor unions were just beginning to work together in harmony when the social minded went into action.

We have seen high Government officials, sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States, rise up and say, it is outmoded and is holding back advancement.

Unfortunately these isms that have not got the country moving, have been adopted by the Democratic Party, but not by all Democrats. Republicans too took up the cry of something for nothing for all people, but more sensible people are now thinking and realizing that what made America great, was not government aid, but initiative, free enterprise, liberty, justice, the ability to think big and create big; private industry, big business, unhampered by too many Government regulations and confiscatory taxes, fair and sensible cooperation of unions. All of these built America—not socialism, fascism, or communism.

May our Congressmen regardless of party, guard Congress that the power of rule may never be usurped by one man, now or in the future; may they again think of America first, may they look after the guarding of our shores, by seeing that our defenses and striking ability are strong.

Not the Supreme Law of the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 19 I made some relevant comments on the floor of this honorable House in reference to the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in the Arizona against California case.

My remarks were entitled "Who Now Makes the Law." I have had some interesting letters in response to my comments at that time, and I am gratified that a great many of our citizens seem to share my misgivings over the assumption of lawmaking powers by other branches of the Government.

I believe that the present philosophy of our Supreme Court is open to question. The criticism is coming from many sections of our society—not just the extreme rightwing. I am a moderate myself and I find that other moderate Democrats share my concern and believe that a real abuse of power is involved.

An article on the Supreme Court has recently been brought to my attention and I feel that it sheds a great deal of light on the problem. The author is a former Member of this distinguished House, Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, who served as a Democratic Member from Indiana during the years 1931–39.

Mr. Pettengill is an attorney at law by profession and his article is so impressive that I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The article is as follows:

NOT THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND

(By Samuel B. Pettengill)

The general acceptance of today's slogan that nine or even five men, neither elected nor removable by the people, can rewrite the Constitution as they see fit, and that it then becomes everybody's duty to accept their views as law, is a long stride toward Bonapartism in this country.

The saying that "The Constitution is what the Supreme Court says it is," is attributed to Charles Evans Hughes. But I have a letter from a former Justice of the Supreme Court who says that Hughes told him that he was speaking in a jocular mood, and had always regretted his remark.

A decision by the U.S. Supreme Court on a constitutional question is not any kind of law.

This is because a court has no authority to make law, or amend the Constitution. Its judgment, whether right or wrong, is, of course binding on the litigants in the case, unless reversed on appeal. But it is not binding on other persons. As Chief Justice Harlan F. Stone said in 1942, a court's judgment "is binding only on the parties to the particular proceedings" (*Columbia Broadcasting Co.* v. *United States*, 316 U.S. 407). This statement by the Chief Justice should dispose of the question, especially as there was no dissent to it.

A RIGHT TO DISAGREE

It is true, of course, that other persons may agree that the reasons given by a court for its decision are sound and right, and decide to follow them in similar situations. But they may not agree, and that is their right. Why? Because a court judgment is not law. No court has the authority to make law.

Law can be laid down only by those who have the authority to make law. In our country, that authority is given only to legislators, elected by the people, and removable by the people. Or it is in the people themselves in adopting, or amending their Constitution, Federal, or State. There let it remain.

The Constitution says how it can be amended—only by the people, in the manner prescribed. No court is mentioned.

Second, the Constitution says that all legislative, or lawmaking, powers of the Federal Government are vested in Congress. It does not make the Supreme Court a constitutional convention. As all Federal legislative power is vested in Congress, none is vested in the Supreme Court.

Third, the Constitution says that "this Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made (by Congress) in pursuance thereof (plus treaties) shall be the supreme law of the land" and all "judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution."

All judges take this oath. It is a contradiction in terms to argue that a judge can lawfully change what he has taken an oath to support. This was universally accepted until recently.

As Chief Justice Marshall said in 1824, "Judicial power, as contradistinguished from the power of the law, has no existence. Courts are the mere instruments of the law and can will nothing." They can decide cases, rightly or wrongly, and the parties to the case are bound by their judgments, but no one else. If their decisions were to bind other persons, then such persons would be ruled against without being heard, without "their day in court." This would violate all concepts of justice and law.

Judges can say what they think the Constitution means, and apply that to the decision of the case before them. They can overrule, or refuse to follow what they or other judges have previously thought was the law. But they cannot make law, or rewrite the Constitution. A court decision is an opinion.

On the other hand, Congress, in which is vested all legislative powers of the Federal Government, can decide what it thinks should be the law, by a majority vote, what it thinks becomes law, assuming that it is constitutional. But what a court thinks should be the law, does not become law because it thinks it should.

If that were not true, the Supreme Court could never overrule its own previous interpretation of the Constitution as it has done time and again. But if these previous decisions were the supreme law of the land which the judges had sworn to uphold, how could they reverse such decisions without violating their oath?

That the Supreme Court has at times acted as a superlegislature has been many times stated by the Supreme Court judges themselves in dissenting opinions. Conferences of the chief justices and attorneys general of the States have also charged the Supreme Court with violating the Constitution.

Those who are making a fetish of the segregation decision should remember that the opponents of slavery were once shouted down by the same political ballyhoo. The Fugitive Slave Act of 1850, which was held constitutional by the Supreme Court, was not considered "the supreme law of the land" by men and women of the highest character in the North who kept right on helping fugitive slaves to freedom via the "underground railroad." The shoe was then on the other foot.

The same thing can be said of the Dred Scott decision of 1857. Did the people of the North bow down to this decision as the supreme law of the land, binding on them? They did not. In fact, the man who did more to abolish slavery than any other, Abraham Lincoln, said that if he were a Member of Congress, and the same question arose, he would not be bound by the Dred Scott decision. And so, on other occasions, Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson said that while a court decision bound the litigants, it did not bind them.

In the interest of stability and uniformity of the law, it is generally desirable that lower Federal and State courts should abide by a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, even if they think it is wrong. But they do so, not because the Constitution says they must—for it does not—but for the practical reason that if they do not abide by it, they will be reversed on appeal.

DANGERS OF BLIND FAITH

It is also true that a court may participate in the lawmaking process by giving reasons for its decision which seem so convincing that they are gradually accepted by the people as good law. This is how the common law of England developed.

For example, the reasons by Chief Justice Marshall for deciding that an act of Congress is unconstitutional when clearly repugnant to the Constitution, were so powerful and convincing that other judges, Congress and the people gradually accepted his decision as sound law under which they wished to live. The process is like that of a principal ratifying the act of his agent. But Marshall did not make law by his own say-so. He had no such power.

The political shibboleth that "the Constitution is what the judges say it is," no matter what, is so destructive of constitutional principles, that every patriotic American should condemn it. For there is a rapidly growing concentration of governmental, economic and financial power in Washington, and particularly in the Chief Executive, who appoints all Federal judges.

If this trend is not soon reversed, then the statement by a high official that "the Constitution was written for an entirely different period in our Nation's history" may become the epitaph of American liberty.

Decision of the Supreme Court Concerning the Bible Reading and Prayers in Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON FUQUA
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, at this time, when it is of such great concern to so many of us that the Supreme Court of the United States has handed down a decision which would ban the reading of the Bible and reciting of the Lord's Prayer in our public schools, I feel it is most appropriate to insert the following senate resolution of our Florida State Legislature concerning this decision to show the great concern of the many people over our entire Nation:

A SENATE RESOLUTION DEPLORING AND CONDEMNING THE DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES BANNING BIBLE READING AND RECITAL OF THE LORD'S PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States on Monday, June 17, 1963, ruled unconstitutional the reading of the Bible and recital of the Lord's Prayer in public schools in cases from the States of Maryland and Pennsylvania, and

Whereas the ruling ignores the pronouncements of this same Court in 1892 in the case of *Holy Trinity Church* v. *United States,* where it said, "* * * this is a religious people. This is historically true. From the discovery of this continent to the present hour there is a single voice making this affirmation," and again in 1951 in the case of *Zorach* v. *Clauson,* this Court said, "We are a religious people whose constitution presupposes a supreme being," and

Whereas this ruling amounts to a mandate to public schools in all States, and

Whereas this senate and the vast majority of our countrymen hold fast to the belief that the United States of America became a great nation and will remain freedom's stronghold only if she remains true to her religious heritage and tradition and that a godless nation cannot survive; and

Whereas the Court's decision based upon the complaint of an atheist is offensive and contrary to our way of life and can only result in injustice and discrimination against the great majority of our people to the comfort and pleasure of agnostics and to the comfort and pleasure of this country's enemies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida, That this senate go on record as deploring and condemning this unwarranted and arbitrary restriction of the reading of the Bible and recital of the Lord's Prayer in our public schools as pronounced in the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby requested and urged to immediately take the necessary action to minimize the damage done by this decision either by submitting a constitutional amendment or whatever else is deemed appropriate; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be dispatched to the President and Secretary of the U.S. Senate and to the Speaker and Secretary of the U.S. House of Representatives and to each member of Florida's congressional delegation.

The Mattachine Society of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DOWDY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 5, 1963

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, it came to my attention last fall that the District of Columbia government had granted a society of homosexuals a license to solicit charitable contributions in the District of Columbia. This license was issued to the Mattachine Society of Washington, and at that time, the Superintendent of the License and Permit Division stated that his office had no legal authority to deny such a permit to any nonprofit organization which complied with all the requirements of filing for same. This was fully disclosed in an item carried in the Sunday, Washington, D.C., Star, of September 16, 1962, which article I include following these remarks.

I introduced a bill in the last Congress to correct this situation, but it was too late to receive action at that time. Earlier this year, I introduced the bill again, as H.R. 5990, with the earnest hope that it will receive the approval of this Congress.

In order that the Members of Congress may be fully advised, I would call attention to the fact that I believe all of us received a letter from the President of the Mattachine Society of Washington, in August of last year, in which he enclosed an excerpt from the constitution of his society, and a news release which he had just issued. To refresh memory, I include those matters with my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I regard this situation as highly improper. If the laws of the District of Columbia indeed do not authorize the refusal of a solicitation license or any other official recognition to a society such as this, whose illegal activities are revolting to normal society, then I feel that it is our duty to provide such authority without delay.

The Mattachine Society is admittedly a group of homosexuals. The acts of these people are banned under the laws of God, the laws of nature, and are in violation of the laws of man. I think a situation which requires them to be permitted a license to solicit charitable funds for the promotion of their sexual deviations is a bad law, and should be changed forthwith.

The material follows:

[From the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., Sept. 16, 1962]

GROUP AIDING DEVIATES ISSUED CHARITY LICENSE

The Mattachine Society of Washington, an organization formed to protect homosexuals from discrimination, has been granted a certificate by the District license office to solicit funds in Washington.

The application said that the organization wanted to raise funds to help give the homosexual equal status with his fellow men.

District records show the newly organized society was granted its certificate to ask for contributions under the Charitable Solicitations Act on August 14.

C. T. Nottingham, Superintendent of Licenses and Permits, said his office had no authority to deny a solicitation permit to any organization whose representatives answer all questions on the permit application form.

The license chief added that he had informed society representatives that if the group solicits as much as $1, he would order them to open their books and records for examination. If such an order is not complied with, he said, the licensing department will move to have the society's permit revoked.

The president of the society, who asked that his name not be used, said that his organization "is dedicated to improving the status of homosexuals in our society in the interest both of that minority group and of the Nation."

The society president said that so far no funds have been solicited.

Asked how many members the society had in the Washington area, he replied, "We would prefer not to say. It is small but growing rapidly."

He said that the original Mattachine Society was founded in San Francisco 10 or 12 years ago. Other independent Mattachine Societies, he said, have been organized in New York and several other American cities.

The organizations took their names, he said, from the mattachines, court jesters in the Middle Ages, who were permitted to make pointed social commentaries which would have been tolerated from no one else.

THE MATTACHINE SOCIETY
OF WASHINGTON,
Washington, D.C., August 28, 1962.

Hon. ———,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ———: Enclosed, for your interest and information, is a formal statement of the purposes of the Mattachine Society of Washington, a newly formed organization, devoted to the improvement of the status of our country's 15 million homosexuals.

Included, also, is a copy of our news release, which was submitted to the Washington newspapers and others, and to the various press services.

The question of homosexuality, and the prejudice against it, both personal and official, is a serious one, involving, as it does, more than 1 out of every 10 American citizens, including roughly a quarter-million in, each, the Federal civil service, the Armed Forces, and security-sensitive positions in private industry, and at least 10 percent of your constituents.

We feel that the Government's approach is archaic, unrealistic, and inconsistent with basic American principles. We feel, in addition, that it is inexcusably and unnecessarily wasteful of trained manpower and of the taxpayers' money.

We realize that this area presents you with many potential problems, some of them quite subtle and touchy ones of politics and public relations, and that they are not always subject to easy solution, but policies of repression, persecution, and exclusion will not prove to be workable ones in the case of this minority, any more than they have, throughout history, in the case of other minorities. This is a problem which must be worked with, constructively, not worked against, destructively, as is now the case. A fresh approach by the Federal Government is badly needed.

We welcome any comments which you may have on this subject.

We will be pleased to meet with you personally, at your convenience, to discuss these and related matters.

Thank you for your consideration of our position.

Sincerely yours,
FRANKLIN E. KAMENY,
President.

EXCERPTS OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE MATTACHINE SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON

Article II. Purpose:

SEC. 1. It is the purpose of this organization to act by any lawful means:

(a) To secure for homosexuals the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, as proclaimed for all men by the Declaration of Independence; and to secure for homosexuals the basic rights and liberties established by the word and the spirit of the Constitution of the United States;

(b) To equalize the status and position of the homosexual with those of the heterosexual by achieving equality under law, equality of opportunity, equality in the society of his fellow men, and by eliminating adverse prejudice, both private and official;

(c) To secure for the homosexual the right, as a human being, to develop and achieve his full potential and dignity, and the right, as a citizen, to make his maximum contribution to the society in which he lives;

(d) To inform and enlighten the public about homosexuals and homosexuality;

(e) To assist, protect, and counsel the homosexual in need.

SEC. 2. It is not a purpose of this organization to act as a social group, or as an agency for personal introductions.

SEC. 3. This organization will cooperate with other minority organizations which are striving for the realization of full civil rights and liberties for all.

MATTACHINE SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON

The formation of a new social action group in the Greater Washington, D.C., area is announced. This group, the Mattachine Society of Washington, is dedicated to improving the status of the homosexual in our society, in the interest both of that minority group and of the Nation. The society discusses and acts upon all problems relating to the homosexual, both general and specific.

Guest speakers will address the group from time to time on a variety of relevant subjects. The society is also setting up a professional referral service—doctors, lawyers, clergymen, etc.—for the homosexual in need.

The organization feels that the homosexual today is where the Negro was in the 1920's, except that the Negro has had, at worst, the mere indifference of his Government and, at best, its active assistance, whereas the homosexual has always had to contend with the active hostility of his Government. For this reason, it is time that a strong initiative be taken to obtain for the homosexual minority—a minority in no way different, as such, from other of our national minority groups—the same rights, provided in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, as are guaranteed to all citizens. These include the rights to the pursuit of happiness, and to equality of opportunity; the right, as human beings, to develop and achieve their full potential and dignity; and the right, as citizens, to be allowed to make their maximum contribution to the society in which they live—rights which Federal policy and practice now deny them.

The society feels that prejudice directed against an individual, for no cause other than an unconventional sexual preference, is unwarranted, and that harsh, discriminatory action taken on the basis of such prejudice, with its incident waste of useful talent and manpower, is not consistent with the national welfare. It is felt that personal and popular prejudice cannot be eliminated as long as official prejudice exists and is indulged.

For this reason, the society's primary effort will be directed to four main areas: First, the clearly improper, discriminatory policies of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, policies which are plainly unconstitutional, and which operate against the best interests of the country, in that they act to deprive the Nation of the services of many clearly well-qualified citizens who have much to offer. That these policies are quite needless is demonstrated by the fact that, despite them, there are at least 200,000 homosexuals in the Federal service, and have been for many years, with no ill effects.

Second, the Armed Forces' needless and harshly administered policies of exclusion. The present practice of giving less than fully honorable discharges to homosexuals is unnecessarily vicious. In view of the fact that the Armed Forces also presently include at least a quarter-million homosexuals in all ranks, without ill effects, and that over a million served well and honorably in World War II, present policy seems open to serious question.

Third, the illogical policies of our security-clearance system for civilian and military Government personnel, and for those in private industry, under which all homosexuals, as a group, are regarded as security risks, without consideration of the merits of each individual case. Despite the continuing presence of some quarter-million homosexuals with security clearances, at all levels, and within the cognizance of all agencies, the number of breaches of security resulting from homosexuality is virtually, if not actually, nil. Examination will show that present policies foster just that susceptibility to blackmail against which these policies are supposed to protect.

Fourth, the area of local law, both its provisions and its administration and enforcement. The society feels that the example of the State of Illinois should be followed, in legalizing private relations on the part of consenting adults, but that, in any case, action must be taken against existing, often flagrant and shocking abuses and violations of due process and of proper rights, liberties, and freedoms in this area.

The organization seeks a reassessment and reconsideration of present, totally unrealistic Federal policy and practice, law and regulation, on homosexuality. A New Frontier approach to official policies and practices which relegate over 15 million Americans to second-class citizenship is long overdue and badly needed. The Government, hitherto, has attempted to sweep this problem under the rug and, ostrichlike, has refused to face the situation or to deal with it in a logical fashion.

The Mattachine Society of Washington is confident that all intelligent, informed, public-spirited citizens will join them in their efforts to achieve a fresh and reasonable approach to this problem.

The Presbyterian Church of Gettysburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege for me to claim Dr. Charles W. Heathcote as one of my most distinguished constituents. Dr. Heathcote is professor emeritus of history at the West Chester State College and is recognized in my home county as one of our leading authorities on Pennsylvania history.

At his request I am pleased to include as a part of these remarks an article which he has just prepared describing the important role filled by the Presbyterian Church of Gettysburg during those momentous days of 100 years ago. This interesting article, which follows, is commended to perusal by all the devotees of Civil War history.

A CHURCH REDEDICATED

(By Charles W. Heathcote, Ph. D.)

The dedication of the Presbyterian Church of Gettysburg is an inspiration and credit to the community. The Reverend R. A. MacAskill, as minister, his congregation and friends are to be congratulated in the reconstruction of the church which is beautiful in its stately architectural simplicity.

The service of dedication began on Sunday morning June 23 when Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, stated clerk, the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, was the preacher at the morning service. At 8 p.m. the church dedication service was held when Dr. Donald Macleod, professor of homiletics, president of Princeton Theological

Seminary was the preacher. The organ dedication service was held on Monday evening, June 24, with Mr. Robert Clippinger, organist, Gettysburg Lutheran Theological Seminary at the console. Services appropriate to thanksgiving for the new building continued throughout the week.

This congregation has had a long and unusual history. As early as 1739 the Scotch-Irish who landed at New Castle, Del., and Philadelphia, in large numbers crossed the mountains of Pennsylvania and settled in this area which eventually became Gettysburg. These early Scotch-Irish pioneers did much to establish religious, civic, and economic freedom in our country. The church was founded in 1740 and down through the years changes and improvements have been made.

During the time of the Battle of Gettysburg, July 1, 2, 3, 1863, this church in cooperation with the other churches was used as a hospital. This church is not only a historic shrine because of its founding by deeply religious people, but after the Battle of Gettysburg, Governor Curtin of Pennsylvania appointed David Wills of Gettysburg, who later became judge of Adams County, to be chairman of a group of citizens to purchase ground for the establishment of a national cemetery. Attorney Wills was also authorized to arrange for the dedication of a national cemetery, and he invited President Lincoln to deliver the dedicatory address and to be his house guest during his stay in Gettysburg, which invitation the President gladly accepted. The day of dedication was set for November 19, 1863. After Lincoln delivered his address, which has since became immortal, he returned to the Wills' residence. During the afternoon many people came to the Wills' home to pay their respects to the President. Mr. Wills had arranged for a service of thanksgiving at the Presbyterian Church.

Among the guests who called upon the President was John Burns, a humble shoemaker of Gettysburg. He was a veteran of the Mexican War and kept his gun above the open fireplace in the living room. When he heard the opening guns on the first day's battle of Gettysburg, July 1, 1863, he took his gun from above the fireplace and marched out to the battle area. The commanding officer ordered him to the rear but he refused to obey the command. He was seriously wounded, but his devoted wife nursed him back to health. While Lincoln was guest in the Wills home, the President met John Burns and congratulated the brave veteran.

Finally, Mr. Wills told the President it was time to attend the service in the Presbyterian Church and that the carriage would arrive to take the President to the church. The President, however, declined, stating he would walk, and taking John Burns by one arm and Secretary of State Seward by the other arm, the three walked to the Presbyterian Church. As President Lincoln was very tall, wearing his high silk hat made him tower above his companions, and when the people saw what Lincoln was doing they were astonished. Since it was necessary for the President and his Secretary of State to leave early in order to return to Washington, they parted with John Burns who remained until the conclusion of the service. (The pew in which they sat bears an appropriate marker.)

It has been often remarked that only a dedicated Lincoln could properly dedicate a national cemetery where large numbers of soldiers were buried who gave their lives in order to save the Union. Thus it is that this church and congregation continue in their rededication to carry on the service for God and fellowman. May they continue to prosper under God's blessing and it is the conviction of many that this church should be declared as a national shrine by the proper governmental agency.

Arthur Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, hither or yon with Art Hoppe, it is always interesting and in practically all instances great fun.

I believe the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will concur when they read the following observations presented by one of our most popular columnists as he views situations in various locales:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, June 20, 1963]

INSIDE STORY OF THE INSIDE STORY

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—It is the duty of us ace newsmen, as you know, to create a better informed public by ferreting out the inside story of the news behind the news. So that you, a better informed public, will know what's really going on.

And Washington, nerve center of the free world, is, of course, the place to ferret them out, as anybody in Washington will tell you.

But, if I may reveal a trade secret, we ace newsmen don't really have to ferret them out. They're kind of lying around everywhere. In fact, everybody who is anybody knows hundreds of inside stories which they are dying to press on us ace newsmen. So we will realize they are somebody.

In fact, I've been here 12 hours and already my notebook is chock filled with inside stories. Allow me to quote a few pages so you will be a better informed public.

Mr. Kennedy has high hopes of pushing a vigorous civil rights bill through Congress.

Mr. Kennedy has some hope of pushing a compromise civil rights bill through Congress.

If he doesn't get some kind of civil rights bill through Congress, Mr. Kennedy will kill himself.

Mr. JOHNSON has suddenly become a northern liberal. Not because he wishes to run for President in 1968. But because that is what he has always been in his heart. (His what?)

But Mr. Kennedy remains confident as he knows that Mr. JOHNSON will continue to carry the South for the Democrats.

Like a cross.

Miss Christine Keeler is really a CIA agent.

She is not. That's a rumor planted by the CIA to improve the image of its agents.

Mr. Kennedy has confided to close associates that he is now gravely concerned about either the Nassau pact, the NASA pact, or the Nasser pact. They asked him to write down which.

That's a joke.

It is not.

Mr. Shriver, Mr. Rusk, Mr. McNamara, and Mr. Billmark are threatening to quit their jobs in protest over lack of firm Government support. Mr. Billmark, however, is the only one to confirm this. "If they don't make 18th Street all one way," said Mr. Billmark in an angry statement issued from the driver's seat of his traffic-stalled taxicab, "I'm going to quit."

While Mr. Billmark doesn't trust the Government, it is also true that the northern liberals don't trust Mr. Johnson, who doesn't trust Mr. Bobbie Kennedy, who doesn't trust Mr. Adlai Stevenson, who doesn't trust the Irish Mafia, who don't trust anybody.

And in Washington, that's a good idea.

And that's just the beginning. My notebook is chock filled with a whole lot of other inside stories that would interest you. And now that you are feeling, I'm sure, like a better informed public, let me caution you that this is only the beginning. My notebook is chock filled with scores of other inside stories that you wouldn't even believe.

So if you will excuse me, I will now go lock myself in my hotel room. I figure if I hear one more inside story, I will begin to understand what's going on around here.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, June 17, 1963]

FOLKS ARE FOLKS, THE WORLD O'ER

(By Arthur Hoppe)

We're certainly having interesting discussions these days on disarmament, peace, and human brotherhood. But do you know we can't understand what one-fourth the human race is talking about? It's because they speak Chinese.

This shocking news comes from the current issue of Scientific American. Which says that "much less than 1 percent" of what the Chinese are currently saying in their books and periodicals is being translated into English, French, or German. Mainly because we just don't have enough friends who read Chinese.

And of course we can't speak to the Chinese directly. We don't recognize them. We have to pretend they're not there because they've been bad. But at least I thought we knew what they were talking to themselves about. And we don't. It's awful.

So you can imagine the jubilation on our side when our scientists at IBM came up with a machine to translate Chinese into English. And it worked. Here was an invention in the field of human communications to rank with the telegraph and telephone. Here was the dawn of a new era. At last we would find out what the Chinese were talking about.

And from the article in Scientific American, you can kind of visualize the historic scene at IBM. There are the scientists—the older ones looking like Mr. Samuel F. B. Morse and the younger ones like Mr. Don Ameche. With trembling fingers they insert the incomprehensible ideographs from a current Chinese periodical into the maw of the machine. It beeps, it flashes, it whirs.

What will be this historic message to our Western civilization? Will it be a grandiose phrase like Mr. Morse's "What hath God wrought?" Or will it be the more folksy, "Mr. Watson, come here, I want you," that Mr. Ameche made so famous?

Finally, the inscrutable machine disgorges these first words of a new era in human understanding. And posterity is indebted to Scientific American for recording them. For what this epic translation said was:

"Modern guided missile already possible carry with warhead of hydrogen bomb and atomic bomb, therefore, it is one kind weapon with very big power of destruction."

So at last we know what the Chinese are talking about. Personally, I would have preferred "What hath God wrought?" Or even, "24-hour service—dress shirts our specialty." But you have to accept the world as you find it, I say.

And as long as that's what the Chinese are talking about, I think maybe we ought to chat with them a bit. After all, the message shows the we've got a lot in common, real mutual interests and all that. In fact, you might say we speak the same language.

Well, that's mutual understanding for you. Our scientists invent this vastly complex machine only to discover that, as the kindly old philosophers say, folks are pretty much the same the whole world over.

And now that we've discovered that I think I'll go dig a fallout shelter.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, June 23, 1963]

DIPLOMACY IS A STUFFED EGG

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—I hope you remember my best friend, Mr. Dick Tuck. He is the distinguished political scientist who traveled faithfully with Mr. Nixon in the last two campaigns and, though very modest, helped the reporters make crowd estimates. Which were very modest, perhaps, I suppose, because Mr. Tuck was working for the Democrats.

Since then the question, "Whatever happened to Dick Tuck?" has been asked by many people, most of them creditors. And I'm glad to report that he's right here in Washington, moving in diplomatic circles, primarily from the hors d'oeuvre table to the bar and back again. "It's a living," says Mr. Tuck modestly, "if you like stuffed eggs."

As there are only two or three diplomatic receptions out on embassy row a week, Mr. Tuck does have his lean days. But he has put his keen, analytical mind to work and now has great plans for the future. He told me about them when we went out to say goodby to the Afghanistanian Ambassador, who had requested the pleasure of the company at his farewell party of a friend of Mr. Tuck's, who couldn't go, fortunately.

It was a garden party. Perhaps a half hundred guests who had come to bid a fond farewell to the good old Ambassador from Whats its name, as one lady put it, were milling about.

Mr. Tuck selected several high protein hors d'oeuvres, and a waiter handed him a drink with a warm smile of recognition. I said I hadn't realized Mr. Tuck was so well known in Afghanistanian circles. "Oh, no," said Mr. Tuck. "Actually, the food, the drinks, and the waiters are the same at all these receptions, because they are from a catering service. It makes for a staple diet and familiar faces."

And monotony? "Well, yes," said Mr. Tuck, "but it's lucrative, and I plan to break into the field." Catering drinks? "No," said Mr. Tuck, "catering guests."

Guests? "Yes," he said. "Live guests cause a lot of breakage. And they often fail to appear. I plan to cater stuffed guests to each of our 109 embassies for their receptions. I will prop them up on the lawn at 6 p.m. and take them in at 8 p.m. Satisfaction guaranteed." But wouldn't that make for inane conversation? "Listen to what they talk about now," he said. I did and agreed he had a great idea there, all right. "It's a beginning," said Mr. Tuck, glowing with vision. "I will then expand to cater ambassadors." Ambassadors? "Yes. As you know, the prime function of the 109 Ambassadors in Washington is to give these receptions. Think of the money catered ambassadors would save many a small country in year-round maintenance alone."

A radical idea, I said. "Not at all," he said. "Stop and think. We now send foreign-aid money to all these underprivileged little countries, which they send back to Washington to toss these lavish catered receptions. My plan for catered ambassadors and catered guests simply streamlines the whole procedure and will save us millions." I was so moved by Mr. Tuck's logic that, in tribute, I copped the last stuffed egg and slipped it into his bowser bag.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, June 25, 1963]

JUST PLAIN JACK ALWAYS IN STYLE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Good morning, friends in televisionland. It's time once again for another episode of Just Plain Jack, the heartwarming story of a young man's struggle to win votes and influence history.

As we join Just Plain Jack today, we find him on a grand tour of Europe to have a word with each of his old friends. Like "goodby." At the moment he, Sis Eunice, and Portly Pierre, the faithful retainer, are knocking on the door of Pibbledy Park Manor in Sussex-Wessex.

JACK. I sure hope good old Mac can put us up. After the way that stuffy Chuck de Gaulle——

PORTLY PIERRE. Well, maybe he really didn't have a room, Chief. It's the height of the tourist season, you know.

SIS EUNICE. You should've cracked him one, Jack? "Mal why sot kell pense," I always say. It means those French have got dirty minds.

(The door opens a crack and Mr. Macmillan, baggy-eyed and haggard, surveys them nervously.)

MAC (unchaining the door). Oh, it's you. Sorry. I thought it was another of my ministers selling True Confessions.

JACK (shocked). Mac, old friend, you look terrible.

MAC. It's the scandal. I fear I'm about to get the sack.

JACK. You too, eh? It seems everybody I talk to in Europe is about to lose his job. Talk about your unemployment rate. But it's no excuse for letting yourself go to pot. When faced with adversity, I say, do pushups. We must get this country moving again. Even though it isn't mine. We must get you people back in the swim. We must pool our efforts to——

MAC (shuddering). Swim? Pool? Please don't mention those words. I haven't been able to look at a pool for 3 weeks.

JACK. Nonsense. That's just what you need, an invigorating dip in the pristine water of——

MAC. Christine who?

JACK. It'll tone up your flabby muscles and relax you. Come on, Pierre. Come on, Sis.

SIS EUNICE (excitedly). Oh, a British swimming party. I've been reading about them. Wait'll I get on my track shoes.

JACK. Great. When you're ready, give me a call, girl.

MAC. You want what?

JACK. Mac, you're so jumpy.

MAC. You would be too, old boy, if all your ministers were chasing girls around pools in the buff.

JACK (patting him on the back). I know. It's an awful shock to learn that the leaders of one of the world's great powers would behave in such an undignified manner. But it's no reason to give up swimming.

MAC (pulling himself together). I suppose you're right.

JACK. You bet. You've just got to dress for it properly. And seeing it's warm out this evening, I'd suggest white dinner jackets with our black ties. Last one in is a rotten egg.

Will Mac take the plunge? Or will Jack have to get pushy? Can Mac build a new image based on the black tie? Alone?

Tune in to our next episode, folks. And meantime, as you go down the byways of life, remember: When skies are grey, when you haven't a friend, things will still go swimmingly as long as you've got just plain jack.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, June 26, 1963]

ALL IS FAIR IN LOVE AND WEST VHTNNNG

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—The Pentagon is having a terrible time with our 12,000 military advisers in South Vietnam, who have been advising their way through the jungles of that bastion of democracy for the past couple of years. Often engaging the enemy in hand-to-hand advice.

It seems our GI's keep griping to visiting ace newsmen that it looks like a long, lousy war, primarily because the loyal royal Vietnam Army is not very keen on taking advice. Particularly if it involves getting up out of the trenches and shooting somebody. And all these gripes, of course, are creating a most unfavorable image of the war. Which hurts Pentagon appropriations.

But our Army has launched a strong counterattack. It has advised our 12,000 advisers to "accentuate the positive and eliminate the negative." Which sounds very cheery. "Your approach to the questions of the press," the official Army directive goes on, "should emphasize the positive aspects of your activities and avoid gratuitous criticism. Emphasize the feeling of achievement, the hopes for the future and optimism in general." Or else.

Well, you may not believe this, but we faced the very same situation in the neighboring democratic bastion of West Vhtnnng, the only nation on which I'm an expert. The results were most peculiar.

It was in the 18th year of President Ngo Mahn Ngo's lightning campaign to wipe out the dread Viet-narians, who were all Moscow-trained peasants. His 16 divisions of U.S. military advisers were all in the frontlines, giving advice tooth and nail. Indeed, they would occasionally even try dragging a loyal royal troop up to the frontlines to advise personally. But it didn't work very well. Every time they'd advise a loyal royal troop to stick his bayonet in a fellow Vhtnnngian, he'd swoon.

So the Pentagon issued an official directive saying: "If you can't say something nice about somebody, it's 30 days on the rockpile."

The very next day, U.S. Military Adviser First Class Homer Crabtree was interviewed in the frontlines by ace newsmen, who asked his assessment of his Vhtnnngian comrades in arms.

"Gentlemen," said Mr. Crabtree, thinking carefully, "in my 50 years of soldiering, I never did see more lovable fighting men than these loyal royal troops. Why, these tough jungle warriors can compose sad love songs 48 hours straight on a handful of rice. When it comes to love, they can take it and dish it out, no matter how heavy the enemy fire."

So the stories started pouring in about how lovable the Vhtnnngians were and how lovely love was. And even some people in Washington began to wonder if loving people wasn't better than sticking bayonets into them. Indeed, there was talk of cutting $86.19 from the Pentagon's budget to establish a bureau of love. What a crisis.

But just when all looked hopeless, the Pentagon's assistant under secretary for improving the image of war came up with a radical solution. The first directive to our advisers in West Vhtnnng was canceled and a second issued which said: "Henceforth, when asked your opinion of the war itself or of the fighting capabilities of the loyal royal troops, say exactly what you think."

And it worked. For while our GI's expressed their opinions to our ace newsmen in thousands and thousands of words, not a one of them was printable.

A California Poet Speaks on the Four Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it has truly been said that poetry is the greatest of all the arts. In my own State of California we have many talented men and women who by their gifts are able to brighten our days and lighten the load we carry in this war-weary world.

Mrs. Zelma Dennis, a resident of my district, has contributed many poems to newspapers and magazines both in this country and abroad. She is listed in the International Who's Who of Poetry; Who's Who of American Women; is past president of Poets Haven; and is a member of the California Chaparral Poets, and many other organizations of poets and artists. Mrs. Dennis is the author of six brochures of poetry and holds a number of awards for her work.

Zelma S. Dennis has written four poems—one for each of the Four Freedoms. I believe they are of sufficient merit to be brought to the attention of my colleagues and I hereby offer them for consideration.

The poems are as follows:

Freedom of Speech

When man first crept from ignorance to light,
And found that words could shape the future's way,
He became articulate, desiring right
And wisdom for the balance of each day.
When passion is subservient, not rule,
Man's thoughts are lofty striving for all good.
Free speech when born of truth is the greatest tool
To forge enduring bonds of brotherhood.
America your challenge for each one
Is guard the flame that feeds the fiery words
To keep our history brave from sun to sun,
From snow-clad peak to every sea-deep surge.
Free speech is key that has for every man
Design of heaven or hell, since it began.

—*Zelma S. Dennis.*

Freedom From Fear

The whiplash of the tyrant long held sway
And people fled to seek a new frontier,
Where children yet unborn might someday play
In youthful frolic undimmed by desolate fear.
The journey from far lands was perilwrought
But courage found its welcome on this shore
Where heart-felt dreams were filled at last and caught
Transforming tired lives to vital core.
Here knowledge lighted pathways and illumned
The scroll of time. All doubt its icy grasp
Relinquished life, and verdant hope now bloomed
With starry vision held in freedom's clasp.
This land predestined joy of life-to-be,
Bore in each breast a hallowed guarantee.

—*Zelma S. Dennis.*

Freedom of Religion

From out dark canyons of oppressive years
Where cruel minds had persecuted Faith.
We found your light oh Liberty, with tears
Of Joy, for Hope was not a ghostly wraith.
We knelt before the altars of belief
In gratitude each gave his special prayer.
No longer sorrow and unending grief
For worship was our own with God to share.
Here in this land no shackles bound our thought,
We soared to heights on inspiration's wing.
Our liberated souls reached truth that caught
New generations where glad hearts could sing
To God, whose glory held this land in peace,
And gave man's prayer unlimited release.

—*Zelma S. Dennis.*

Freedom From Want

To move untrammeled in life's great pursuit
Both solely or united is our own.
This opportunity is Freedom's fruit
Unique unto America alone.
We hold this truth that man is free to work,
To choose his labor or create at will.
For everyone who toils, and does not shirk
The menial finds enterprise can fill
His life and make it reach its highest peak.
This is reward endeavor truly made,
Contentment is its gift that all men seek,
Accomplishment his satisfaction paid.
American you give in Liberty
The will to work and serve humanity.

—*Zelma S. Dennis.*

George and Everett Williams, of Boulder, Colo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, now and then a breath of fresh air sweeps across the communities in which we live. In my hometown of Boulder, Colo., two community leaders have given the University of Colorado the largest gift it has ever received.

George and Everett Williams' achievements are symbolic of the best aspects of our way of life. Through their own efforts they have followed the path of free enterprise to eminent success. Now they have shared the financial rewards of their success with the University of Colorado.

I include the article from the Boulder Daily Camera that describes their generous gift:

Boulder Men To Give the University of Colorado Its Largest Gift in History

Two Boulder men Friday offered the University of Colorado the largest gift it has ever received—a gift designed to produce a $20 million endowment and housing for 4,000 students.

The whopping offer was accepted enthusiastically by the University of Colorado's Board of Regents at their regular meeting. Regent Richard Bernick called it the "most fantastic thing I've ever heard of."

The philanthropists are George and Everett Williams, longtime friends and stanch supporters of the University of Colorado. The brothers are subdivision developers and real estate investors. George is currently in Europe but Everett was on hand.

The University of Colorado will receive half the income from the $20 million endowment for the first 49 years or less and all of the income thereafter.

Blake Heister, of Denver, attorney for the Williams brothers; Hobart D. Wagener, Boulder architect who will design the project, and Dean of Students Arthur H. Kiendl, Jr., explained the offer to the regents.

DETAILS OF PLAN

The plan will include:

1. One thousand five hundred units for four thousand male and female students.
2. Faculty housing for 70 families.
3. Commercial shops to serve the entire project.
4. A conference center big enough to handle 1,000 conferees, with auditorium, meeting rooms and dining facilities. Enough space will be provided for 300 conferees year around and up to 2,000 in the summer.
5. A recreation center for the behavioral sciences.
6. Recreational facilities, including an 18-hole golf course, swimming pool, ice skating rink and other facilities.

Site of the proposed project is 90 acres owned by the Williams brothers bounded by the Denver-Boulder Turnpike, Baseline Road and Frazier Meadows on the south and east.

Colorado University has absolutely no financial responsibility in this plan.

FOUNDATION UNNAMED

The Williams brothers will serve on the foundation board with several other persons to be designated. Then, after the 49 years or less, the foundation—as yet unnamed—will dissolve and the whole thing will go to the university with no strings attached.

Cost of the building is estimated at $18 to $20 million.

Land valued at over $1 million, according to Heister, will be donated to Colorado University outright.

Kiendl was particularly enthusiastic over the "unique possibility" such a setup would offer. Nothing like it has ever been done before at any college or university.

CITY SQUARE LIVING

"This idea will get us back to the city square idea type of living," Kiendl said. "This is one of the truly exciting ideas in higher education."

The dean of students, who has resigned his post effective June 30, called the idea an "educational community for democracy." He emphasized the importance of faculty and students living in close proximity to each other, thus "great thinkers are not kept away from the students."

Target date for completion of part of the project—some of the housing units and recreation facilities—is the fall of 1965.

Wagener said the complex will be built around a village square which will be the hub of the community. One- and two-story apartment buildings will be featured on the perimeter, gradually rising to 10 or possibly 12 stories at the center.

Negotiations have been going on for more than a year between the Williams brothers and various Colorado University officials, including President Quigg Newton, Vice President Eugene H. Wilson, Business Manager Leo Hill and Kiendl.

Great Oaks From Little Acorns Grow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the Orland Unit-Register, Thursday, June 6, 1963, carried a meaningful article relating to the scheduled official opening on July 19, 1963, of the port of Sacramento.

The article reflects the high points of a 47-year history of a plan to bring ocean commerce 100 miles inland to our capital city.

I commend this splendid article to the Members of the House, which is as follows:

GREAT OAKS FROM LITTLE ACORNS GROW

"Great oaks from little acorns grow." Just a copybook maxim but one which applies particularly well to an event of paramount interest to every citizen of the rich Sacramento Valley. This important event will take place the latter part of this month when the $55 million port of Sacramento is officially opened to deep sea freighters from every corner of the globe.

No one can foresee the effect this completed project will have on the economy of the entire north State. The opening of this modern deep sea port located within a stone's throw of the capital city, will make Sacramento a world commerce center with the vast agricultural wealth of the Sacramento Valley being siphoned through this magnificent manmade harbor and distributed by oceangoing freighters to the far corners of the earth.

That little acorn which has grown into the mighty oak was planted only 47 years ago, when a few civic-minded Sacramentans saw, only dimly at that time, the vision of a great inland port for ocean-going ships at their front door. The chief credit for this great achievement must go to Maj. Paul M. Norboe, assistant State engineer back in 1916. But let us give you a bit of background that led up to this big dedication day.

Sacramento was indeed a major point of call for those small ocean-going craft back in the gold rush days. River commerce, including many a stanch sailing vessel, commenced its twisting way up the natural river channel from the wide expanse of Suisun Bay as early as 1841 when a schooner owned by the ambitious John Sutter shuttled at intervals between Sutter's Fort and the sleeping village of Yerba Buena.

It was in this manner that John Bidwell, Sutter's top assistant, carted by tiny schooner the remains of the Russian settlement at Fort Ross up the coast from the bay entrance. Sutter had purchased the entire settlement from the Russians for a song and Bidwell took a couple of years to transport all the tools and equipment, horses, and mules left behind by the discouraged Russians.

For 7 uneventful years Sutter's schooner made its trip down the winding channel of the Sacramento carrying hides and tallow for shipment and bringing back needed supplies for the fort. Then in the hectic days of 1848 after gold was discovered at Sutter's mill on the American River, the sleepy Sacramento River really came into its own. The following decade showed traffic jams of barques, brigs, schooners, sailing vessels, and river steamers in the narrow, twisting channel as San Francisco sluffed off its dreamy Yerba Buena title and Sacramento became the gateway to the Sierra mines.

A high point in river traffic which cluttered up the winding channel was the arrival from the bay of the 1,000-ton steamer, *Chrysopolis*, a $200,000 vessel capable of carrying 1,000 passengers. Rivalry among river steamboat lines resulted in many dangerous and daring river races, several of which resulted in disaster and tragedy when overextended steam boilers blew up. But with the coming of the railroads, river transportation dropped to a low ebb at the turn of the century except for the nightly trips in the teen years of the majestic twin stern whellers, the *Delta Queen* and the *Delta King*.

But forward-looking Sacramentans by 1910 felt a growing need of a study of the great river's possibilities, especially that of bringing deep sea freighters to Sacramento. Finally the legislature authorized a study of this project but forgot to authorize a single penny to underwrite the study. Then in 1914, the idea was given a decided impetus when the *Grace Dollar* steamed up the winding channel to discharge 1 million board-feet of lumber at the old wharf below the I Street bridge.

This and subsequent lumber shipments prompted Maj. Paul M. Norboe, then assistant State engineer, to take over the task of activating the slumbering river study. Acting largely on his own, the official collected endless data and presented the plan to a rather indifferent Sacramento Chamber of Commerce. This group finally obtained an appropriation of $3,500 from a reluctant board of supervisors and this amount was matched by the State.

December 5, 1916, was a red-letter day for Sacramento for on that day Hiram W. Johnson, then Governor and later U.S. Senator, a native son of Sacramento, drove the first survey stake for the Sacramento deep channel ship canal. But World War I halted all work as skilled engineers were not to be had. In 1922, however, the lengthy survey was completed and a deep water channel project was recommended. But like so many such surveys, it was filed and only grathered dust.

In 1925, the survey was dusted off again and the findings again affirmed but pigeonholed to gather dust until 1933. Then the U.S. Senate became interested and requested the Corps of Army Engineers to study the project. But this came to little or nothing and it was not until 9 years later that the project finally got off the drawing board. A fund of $100,000 was finally raised in Sacramento to promote the project and in 1946, Congress finally authorized the deep channel construction with local interests furnishing the necessary rights of way across the delta lands.

The Sacramento-Yolo Port District was approved at an election on April 15, 1947, and a $3.75 million bond issue authorized 2 years later. But the Korean conflict stopped work and it took Congress 5 long years, under the continuous prodding of our good friend, Congressman JOHN E. MOSS, to get the job back on the track again. Federal appropriations under Moss's watchful eye, have varied yearly from $1.5 million to $6 million.

Most of the construction involved the dredging of a channel 30 feet deep and 200 feet wide at the bottom. This manmade channel leaves the Sacramento River near Rio Vista and cuts through the Yolo Bypass to Lake Washington, a natural lake in West Sacramento which has been deepened and enlarged to provide a perfect turnabout basin for ocean going freighters. The channel saves 15 miles in travel time between Sacramento and the Pacific Ocean, besides eliminating the many narrow twists and turns in the river channel above Rio Vista. Ultra modern terminal facilities have been completed at Lake Washington.

Now everything is in order for the big day some time this month when the dedication ceremonies will be held probably at the facilities at Lake Washington. A delegation of Port Sacramento boosters left last month to tell the story of the new Pacific coast port, to a dozen European cities, extolling the virtues of Port Sacramento, this deep sea harbor only 100 miles up the Sacramento River from the Golden Gate. Foreign shipping concerns are being urged to view the new port and take advantage of its facilities. This includes fine terminals for the bulk handling of valley produce so that these products can be loaded by bulk into the holds of the deep sea freighters.

Some idea of the possible savings to valley growers is the statement of officials of the Farmers Rice Growers Cooperative whose 450 members process a quarter of the rice grown in California. They expect to save annually a quarter of a million dollars when the new port facilities swing into action. They have completed an 8-year construction program at the port at a cost of $3 million giving the cooperative one of the most modern rice processing plants in the world.

The new port of Sacramento, the realization of a dream of nearly half a century, will have stiff and vigorous competition for oceangoing traffic. This competition will be especially stiff from the older inland port at Stockton on the San Joaquin River, which for years has held valuable contacts with oceangoing freighter lines. Stiff competition will also come from the established facilities of many years about San Francisco Bay.

But the backers of Port Sacramento hold an ace card in the fact that the huge volume of valley produce is 100 miles nearer ocean commerce than it was before the port was built. They are certain that the entire fabulously rich north valley will look to the new port at its door through which it will siphon its wealth of produce from farms, ranches, orchards, mines, and forests.

And into such oaks do the little acorns planted a half century ago, grow.

More Drains Like TVA Are What Country Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an outstanding editorial from the Nashville Tennessean on the TVA:

MORE DRAINS LIKE TVA ARE WHAT COUNTRY NEEDS

The harpies in Congress have begun their annual quibbling over the appropriation asked by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The TVA has asked Congress for $44,284,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1. To listen to the Goldwaters and the Eisenhowers, who regard TVA as a hoax or as creeping socialism, one would think this was a major portion of the Nation's $99 billion budget.

But a comparison of figures will show what an insignificant sum it is when regarded in the light of returns to all the people of the country. These, incidentally, are figures which the enemies of TVA never pass along to their constituents so that TVA can be judged fairly by the Americans it serves.

Although TVA asks for $44 million, it will be operating on a budget of $427 million. The rest will come from the sale of electric power and of TVA bonds.

While TVA asks Congress for $44 million for the next fiscal year, it has in the past fiscal year paid back into the U.S. Treasury $49 million—including repayment on principal and a return of dividend on the remaining appropriations investment. Since 1943, TVA has paid to the Treasury $397 million, which is almost equal to the cost of the major power facilities.

TVA and its power distributors also paid out during the past fiscal year $20 million in taxes—or in lieu of taxes to State and local governments.

Instead of the $44 million which is necessary to continue existing expansion, Congress should be considering the appropriation of much more to get started on vitally needed new expansion projects in the Tennessee Valley.

The money asked is required to continue construction of the Beech River tributary development project in west Tennessee, to continue construction on Melton Hill Dam and rehabilitate chemical facilities at Wilson Dam.

But in addition to these, Congress needs to make funds available to TVA to get started on numerous other tributary development projects such as the Elk River and Duck River, and to begin early development of the Between the Lakes Park on Barkley and Kentucky Lakes.

TVA obviously is held in higher regard in Washington now than it was during the do-nothing administration of President Eisenhower. But still this regard has not been properly translated into action that will develop the potential of the valley as it should be.

In his observance of TVA's 30th anniversary at Muscle Shoals in May, President Kennedy noted that "there are those who say that the TVA has finished its job and outlived its challenge.

"But all the essential roles of TVA remain, their importance increasing as the importance of this area's atomic energy, military and commercial activities increase * * *.

"In short, the work of TVA will never be over." There was a time during the Eisenhower years when there was a question about this point.

It is difficult to understand how some Congressmen can justify their views of economy by voting billions for foreign aid and then bickering over a few million for TVA. The foreign aid program, undoubtedly, has done a lot of good. But it is doubtful if it has done more in any country to sharpen the image of American democracy than TVA has done by staying home and playing host to thousands of foreign visitors each year.

Visitors from every country regard TVA as a model of a free people's cooperative effort with the Government. And it is the influence this has had in their countries that always occupies their attention—not the arms and munitions sent abroad by this country.

It is strange that the one appropriation Congress can make with a return of the money guaranteed is the one that causes the most nonsensical debate. With hardly a qualm, it pours millions into rivers and harbors and highways with never a cent to be returned. But when a TVA appropriation comes up—one in which the money eventually will be returned—many Congressmen seem to regard it as a "drain on the taxpayer."

Congress would serve the people better if it looked for more "drains" of this type.

Our Water Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. A. D. Willard, Jr., president of WGAC radio station, Augusta, Ga., presented an editorial to his radio audience on our water supply. I feel that it should reach an even wider audience through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial follows:

EDITORIAL BY A. D. WILLARD, JR.—WGAC, APRIL 29 AND 30, 1963

We believe that our lawmakers in Washington think too little about economy, but when their minds do turn in that direction, their thinking is sometimes sadly misplaced.

There is the matter of our water supply, for instance. Senator GORDON ALLOTT, a Republican from Colorado, has been leading a fight in the Senate to reduce a bill that would authorize some $20 million a year for water research. We are glad to note that his fight appears to be unsuccessful and that the money will be forthcoming.

This country has plenty of food, plenty of oil, plenty of steel; in fact, plenty of everything but water. In places along the gulf coast in Texas and in many of the far Western States, the matter of water supply is one of the great tragedies of this age.

A Congressman from California once remarked in Washington that if his State had a water supply equal to that of Georgia the wealth of his people would become unbounded. He said a lack of water was stifling both agriculture and industry and that the Nation should spend millions if necessary to provide for the distillation of sea water.

And now, strangely enough, we find a Senator who is opposed to spending a modest sum for the promotion of the Nation's water resources. The time may come, unless something is done to better our water situation, when we would be willing to even spend billions of dollars to insure an adequate supply of water.

In Anderson County, over in South Carolina, where industry has been seriously handicapped for lack of water, the sum of $800,000 has been set up to finance a water commission whose duty will be to make provision for making water available in such quantity as is needed. Ultimately, that county hopes to pipe its water from Hartwell Lake.

No, Senator, there are too many other ways for your august body to economize. Do not stand in the way of giving the people all the water they need.

Moderation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the U.S. Congress an editorial that appeared in the Quincy Patriot Ledger's Saturday, July 6, 1963, edition.

This editorial is very timely and it expresses the grave concern that is on the minds of every responsible public official in the Nation's Capital. The threat of a march on the Capitol by 100,000 persons offers many problems. I certainly hope that in the coming weeks that cooler heads will prevail, and that Congress will be able to conduct its business in an atmosphere of calmness where laws can be enacted for all the people with justice for all and malice toward none.

The editorial follows:

MODERATION NEEDED

If the United States is to solve its racial problem without serious eruptions of violence and bloodshed, the extremists of both white and Negro factions must be kept under control.

The racial problem admittedly is an emotional issue for many whites and many Negroes. Yet this problem cannot be solved by emotion; it will take a lot of commonsense, calm moderation, patience and intelligence. If emotions are allowed to rule, this country is headed for serious trouble.

In Chicago, incidents at a civil rights rally on the Fourth of July plainly showed the danger of not keeping extremists under control. Fortunately, no one was injured, although the situation was tense and the rally could have turned into a nasty riot.

Prior to the rally, a large demonstration parade was led by Chicago Mayor Richard J. Daley. Both events were sponsored by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, as part of its annual convention.

At the rally, Mayor Daley was booed from the platform. Demonstrators carrying placards denouncing him pushed to the front of the audience. A Negro clergyman, the Reverend Dr. J. H. Jackson, president of the National (Negro) Baptist Convention, was booed loudly when he tried to speak and was withdrawn as a speaker. As the Reverend Dr. Jackson started to leave, a group of Negroes ran after him shouting: "Kill him! Kill him!" The clergyman was rescued by ushers.

Mayor Daley is recognized as a liberal and has had a good record in racial matters. As evidence of his good will toward the NAACP, he had led the demonstrtaion march before the rally. However, the mayor had aroused the anger of Negroes a few days before the rally when he told the opening session of the NAACP convention that there were no Negro ghettos in Chicago.

The Reverend Dr. Jackson incurred the wrath of Negro extremists by opposing a planned march on Washington to coincide with the congressional debate on President Kennedy's civil rights program. The wisdom of this proposed march on Washington is questioned by many because of the possibility of violence.

The NAACP leadership, composed of moderates like the Reverend Martin Luther King Jr., reportedly was dismayed and shocked at the militant actions of the crowd at the rally.

Obviously, the rowdy elements in the crowd were allowed to act without restraint, and it was fortunate that no violence occurred. It is apparent that there was insufficient police protection at the rally to control these extremists. This was a grave mistake on the part of the city officials responsible for keeping the peace.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, who was allowed to speak at the rally, warned the Negroes to be extremely careful in the coming months not to allow themselves to be provoked by their opponents into committing physical violence that could be turned against them. He stressed the need for self-control and group discipline.

In view of the explosive nature of this issue, it is imperative that the extremists of both the whites and the Negroes should not be allowed to control the situation. Adequate police protection should be supplied during civil rights demonstrations.

Moderate Negro and white leaders must exercise their leadership. The extremists and their emotions must be kept under tight control, while the Nation is seeking a solution to this difficult and dangerous issue.

Proposed Wage Hour Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, for some months the Department of Labor has given careful consideration to the wording of proposed regulations concerning executive and administrative employees under wage and hour law. Mr. Clarence T. Lundquist, Administrator, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division of the Department of Labor, has just advised me as follows:

> Proposed regulations concerning executive and administrative employees under wage and hour law being sent to Federal Register for publication in next few days, with opportunity to comment thereon for 30 days after publication. The proposed regulations will not contain footnote concerning management trainees, but if substantial interest is expressed in the 30-day period in regard to management trainees, we will give careful consideration to scheduling quickly a hearing, giving labor and management full opportunity to present their views.

In view of the particular interest in the proposed regulations, I wish to emphasize to my colleagues the importance of timely comment thereon, and call to their attention that such comments should be sent to the Department within 30 days following publication in the Federal Register.

Pete Ptacek Reports on His "Week in Washington"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, another of the students to participate in the "Week in Washington" program which my office sponsors to give college students a better understanding of government and politics, was Mr. Pete Ptacek of Webster City, Iowa, a student at the State University of Iowa.

Mr. Ptacek was my guest during the week of June 9 to 15. He has submitted a report on his activities and I am pleased to bring it to the attention of my colleagues. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Ptacek's report in the Appendix of the Record:

JUNE 17, 1963.

THE CENTER FOR EDUCATION IN POLITICS,
Division of Special Services,
Iowa City, Iowa.

DEAR SIRS: The following is a report on my week in Washington, spent the week of June 9–15. Most of it will be a day-by-day account of my activities.

On the first day, Monday, the highlight was the debating witnessed on the floor of the Senate. Senator Goldwater and a Democrat who I think was Williams debated the right to work issue, and later the same Democrat introduced and argued for a bill to help the transient workers.

On Tuesday we were given a briefing on the legislative reference service that is provided for Congressmen, and then a tour of the Library of Congress. I was quite surprised to learn of the variety of helpful services that are provided for the Representatives and Senators. We then had a luncheon with Congressmen Smith and Schwengel and reporter Clark Mollenhoff. The discussion that ensued among the three of them was very enlightening. After the luncheon Mr. Schwengel took us on a tour of the Capitol, and we were introduced to parts of it I'm sure we never would have been able to see in any other way. In the evening we enjoyed a concert, and then took in various historical landmarks.

The next day we were given a briefing by a State Department official. I was heartened to see the intelligence and knowledge possessed by this individual, and I hope there are a lot more people of his caliber working in the Department. We had luncheon with the two administrative assistants, Mr. Bandstra and Mr. Charles Freburg. Again, the conversation was very interesting. In the afternoon we witnessed a very good debate in the House on a renewal of the Area Redevelopment Assistance Act, which was defeated later in the day.

Thursday, after visiting Democratic national headquarters, we saw some very interesting events on the floors of both the House and Senate. On the House side was an excellent debate on the proposed renewal of the Excise Tax (emergency) Act. Early in the afternoon on the Senate side, I saw a Republican attacking the foreign policy that Kennedy had announced the Monday before. Later, I got in on the last part of a long speech by Senator Morse, in which he was attacking military aid to the European countries that can afford to pay more of it themselves. Senators Long and Church gave Morse some brief help while I was watching.

After a tour of the White House early Friday morning, I saw what was perhaps the highlight of the week for me. This was the Senate Foreign Relations Committee questioning first United Press International and then the operator of an editorial writing service. It was shocking to see revealed the facts that showed that in effect the UPI had been serving as an information gathering agent of foreign governments in recent years. The implications of this were revealed clearly by Committee Chairman Fulbright. Later in the day we saw the Government printing service. In the evening we viewed the Flag Day ceremonies in the Capitol, at which Congressman Schwengel spoke, and then viewed various displays and documents within the National Archives Building.

I would like to mention the wonderful cooperation and hospitality that was shown to Lee Roy and myself by Congressman Schwengel, Congressman Smith, and Mr. Schwengel's staff. They helped us to see the most important things and made us feel very welcome. They were always ready to take time off from their busy schedules to give us the needed aid.

Sincerely,

PETE PTACEK.

Catholic War Veterans Honor Congressman Rodino

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, when recognition has been made of the efforts and achievements of a fellow Member of Congress, I take great pleasure in bringing it to the attention of this body. I am sure that we all share my feelings in congratulating our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino], who was recently honored by the New Jersey Department of the Catholic War Veterans.

At the annual conference of that esteemed organization held in Atlantic City during June 7, 8, and 9, 1963, the State commander presented awards bestowed for service rendered "for God, for country, and for home," the highest honors bestowed by the Catholic War Veterans. Our colleague was cited for his achievements in the area specified as "for home."

We in the Congress are particularly aware of the efforts of our colleague to unite families and to further international cooperation and peace and, I am sure, heartily endorse the choice of the Catholic War Veterans.

In addition, Peter W. Rodino III, the Congressman's young son, received a special award for his "Little People to Little People" program. As we know, father and son jointly are developing this program, a project designed to promote letters of friendship among the children of the world, which has been mentioned and encouraged previously by Members of this body. This worthwhile program offers much potential for future international cooperation by establishing personal contacts and friendships where ignorance and prejudice previously existed.

At this point, I wish to offer my encouragement to the continuing progress of the "little people" program and repeat my congratulations to my good friend as the recipient of such an honor from the Catholic War Veterans.

Negro Attorney Says Integration Irrelevant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, above the hysterical cries of the racists who have hypnotized themselves into believing that all the deficiencies of the Negro race will be solved once it can be mixed with the white race, there has come a statement from a young Negro attorney in Birmingham which says what we who believe in the orderly and peaceful separation of the races have said for years.

His statement that the current drive to mix the races will destroy rather than create pride and dignity in the Negro is like the proverbial breath of fresh air in the fetid atmosphere created by the professional racist agitators. I wholeheartedly support his stand that Negroes forget about integration and develop their own talents and resources.

The Associated Press story as it appeared in the Shreveport Journal is as follows:

NEGRO ATTORNEY SAYS INTEGRATION IRRELEVANT TO PROGRESS OF RACE

BIRMINGHAM.—A young Negro attorney said racial integration is irrelevant to the progress of his race and that current civil rights campaigns "destroy rather than create pride and dignity in the Negro."

Desegregation drives such as the one here have done nothing to improve the Negro, said the attorney, 27-year-old Donald Warden, of Oakland, Calif.

Warden is president of the Afro-American Association, a new movement aimed at self-improvement of the Negro. He came to Birmingham to set up a chapter of his organization.

He issued a debate challenge to Martin Luther King, Jr., one of the integration leaders who have pushed the drive in Birmingham.

GOING TO COURT

"And next time an integration campaign starts, I'm going to court for an injunction against the leaders to prevent them from collecting money from the masses of the people unless they admit it isn't going to benefit the people," he said.

Warden said desegregation benefits only the middle class Negro who wants to disassociate himself from the lower class Negro.

He said his plan was to create jobs, emphasize education, and vocational training.

COULDN'T AFFORD IT

"If the downtown lunch counters are desegregated," Warden said, "the bulk of Birmingham's black community couldn't afford to buy a 50-cent hamburger."

"Why not put up a factory that would create a hundred jobs?"

"In terms of financing, the money that has been spent on demonstrations—on bonding people out of jail—could have opened up factories with 200 to 300 jobs."

Warden proposes that Negroes forget about integration and, through pooling their resources develop an economic structure of their own.

Four Hundred and Fifty-five Million More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the loud "hurrahs" of the recently observed Independence Day still ring in our ears as I ask the consent of my colleagues to insert a timely editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This editorial was carried in the Harvard, Ill., Herald, July 4, 1963.

Founded in 1887, the Harvard Herald acquired and merged with the Harvard Independent, which was founded in 1865, in 1924. The editor and publisher is Lowell A. Nye.

Well prepared, and qualified for employment with the Nation's largest and most widely quoted dailies, Lowell Nye remains a country editor because of his devotion to his country, his family, and his community. To him, the Harvard Herald is the voice of the people, and he gives it depth and devotion. Through its columns he brings the world and its facets, the Nation and its issues, the community and its joys and sorrows to his readers. "Management" and "slanted" are utterly foreign to his editorial policies. I commend his candor:

FOUR HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIVE MILLION MORE

There is still some sort of hypnotic haze over the U.S. Senate. That body's behavior last week when it came to the so-called Area Redevelopment Administration, which has charge of doling out funds for depressed areas of the Nation, is beyond understanding. The Senate voted 65 to 30 to give the ARA $455 million more when the agency could not use $264 million previously voted to it.

Surely our own Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, who championed this bill in the first place is in a hypocritical position. He pleads for economy on the one hand and then steers this wasteful appropriation through to successful passage on the other.

The ARA program, supposed to come up with federally financed projects that will reduce unemployment, has achieved one jobmaking result that we can expect from all bureaucrats. The ARA has already added 522 employees to the Federal payroll in trying to administer these funds.

The House has voted 209 to 204 to kill this new ARA appropriation. Now that the Senate has its day, the bill goes back to the House for reconsideration.

All over the country there is a cry for getting the Federal Government out of private enterprise. Witness the recent wheat farmer vote. But the U.S. Senate doesn't understand the country's mood. It is in some sort of hypnotic haze. If PAUL DOUGLAS is the skilled hypnotist, we could wish he would practice his art in some place other than the taxpayer's arena.

We can only hope the House of Representatives again votes "No."

Shortcomings in Public Affairs of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, frequently we find the columnists of various papers calling the attention of the public to affairs of Government in such a way as to dramatize the shortcomings as in the case of a column by Terrence O'Flaherty in the San Francisco Chronicle on July 2 and the one by George Dixon in the Washington Post of July 5. Both columns follow:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, July 2, 1963]

I FOUND ADVENTURE

(By Terrence O'Flaherty)

Television's newest adventure series, "Bold Journey" starring Jack Kennedy, has been playing on all three networks for the past 10 days, sponsored by the people of the United States. It is one of the season's most expensive summer replacements so naturally only the American taxpayer could be expected to foot the bill.

The opening episode was titled "Big Jack in Berlin"—the one with the surprise ending where he sacrificed all the American cities. This was a strong start and it wasn't likely that the episodes to follow could top such a finale. And they didn't.

Others were: "Jack at the Wall," "Jack Goes Home" or "Did Your Grandfather Come From Ireland?" plus "Jack in England" and "Jack at the Vatican." Yet to come: "Jack Flies Back" and "Home Again Hyannis Port."

In all cases the star was poised, handsome, forceful and he knew his lines. The sponsors were undoubtedly pleased, although the audience ratings are still to be revealed. Certainly the "studio" audience liked the programs immensely.

Despite the variety of locale there is a sameness about the scenery. The airport in Berlin looks like the one in Ireland which looks like the one in Rome. One might suspect the whole series was filmed on the back lot at MGM. There is also a sameness about the automobiles. According to my box score, Mr. Kennedy was seen Getting Out of Cars: 27 times; Getting Into Cars: 46 times. As Gertrude Stein would say: "A car is a car is a car."

One therefore wonders why the star and crew were flown so far and wide for foreign locales. There are plenty of foreign extras available through Central Casting, Hollywood.

One memorable episode in the series occurred when Jack was greeted by Prime Minister Macmillan (or was it Chancellor Adenauer?) at the airport in London (or was it Ireland?) and spoke to the crowds of Italians (or were they Germans?) and they all agreed that his visit to England (or was it Ireland?) was the greatest thing to happen to them since they were liberated from the Nazis (or was it the English?).

There is one line that I wish the writer had put into the script somewhere in the series: the financial aid that has been—and is still being given generously to all our friends and enemies overseas came—and is still coming—out of the daily paychecks of all Americans, rich or poor, old or young.

Unfortunately 999 Europeans out of 1,000 think that it comes from a hole in the ground somewhere near Fort Knox and it was something we could easily do without.

[From the Washington Post, July 5, 1963]

TOURS ANONYMOUS

(By George Dixon)

LAS VEGAS, NEV.—There are more press agents and press agents' photographers per square foot along this strip of air (and otherwise) conditioned desert than any place else on earth. Periodically they go nuts with frustration on orders of the State Department in Washington.

Foreign chiefs of state, who would be good for front page spreads in most of the newspapers of the world, keep dropping into Las Vegas to do things they wouldn't dare do at home—but if they request anonymity they get it.

Our State Department snatches the ballpoint pens out of the hands of the press agents and the cameras out of the hands of the photogs.

The entrepreneurs of the Las Vegas fleshpots have entered into an effective working compact with Secretary of State Dean Rusk to keep visiting foreign leaders nameless during their stay here, if they wish to be nameless.

If the renowned guests desire some kind of identity wherewith to make covert contacts of one sort or another, they can request the fleshpot-State Department combo to furnish them with an incognito, or an alias.

The State Department furnishes this priceless service through an apparatus I never heard of until now. It carries the impressive name of Governmental Affairs Institute, and operates from a lavish setup at 1726 Massachusetts Avenue NW. on Washington's embassy row. If you happen to be a foreign king or queen and want to go highjinksing on the cuff, just give it a call.

I would never suggest it was deliberate, but in adopting the name of Governmental Affairs Institute it could convey the impression to the untutored that it was connected with the U.S. Government. But no, it's a private concern.

The Government has only one connection with it, purely nominal. It's the Governmental Affairs Institute's only customer, and through you, my taxpaying pals, pays all the bills.

The foreign dignitaries tour this country, and even when they come to Las Vegas, it's on our tab.

The way they're routed piles up the biggest possible travel bill. Let's take the typical visit of a ruler from the Far East:

He's booked across the Pacific to San Francisco, then across our continent to New York. Then to Washington, often to be a guest of President Kennedy at Blair House. After Washington comes this crisscross bookings:

Back to New York, to Chicago, to Cleveland, to Boston, to Detroit, to Houston, to Dallas, to Los Angeles, to San Francisco, to Sacramento (they all want to see Gov. Pat Brown), to Denver, to Las Vegas (which is missing from the published itinerary), to Los Angeles, to Seattle, to San Francisco, to Honolulu—and back home.

This free service is for top politicos. Two other private concerns are under contract to the State Department to cuff-ride students, teachers, culturalists, and such. The Institute for International Education handles scholars. I don't dare let myself conjecture too wildly about the remaining one, the Experiment for International Living. Maybe it's for venturesome foreigners who want to experiment?

The Government Affairs Institute provides by far the most luxurious service. If the visiting nabob desires a personal shepherd, the GAI gets him an escort officer from the State Department. The escort officer protects him from any possible discovery by the press when they get to Las Vegas.

This latter service is especially appreciated if the visiting ruler is also the religious leader back home.

The head of church and state can thus anonymously savor the attractions of Las Vegas—and still maintain his—or her—national image of being death on booze, gambling, and dolls who are not draped all over—sometimes including the kisser.

Nuclear Submarine Launching Speeches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on June 22 the skill and ingenuity of American know-how was illustrated in graphic fashion. On that day four nuclear submarines were launched, three on the east coast and one on the west coast. They were the *Tecumseh*, the *Flasher*, the *John C. Calhoun* and the *Daniel Boone*.

The *Tecumseh* and the *Flasher* were launched at Groton, Conn. I had a particular interest in this ceremony because my wife, Inez, was sponsor of the *Tecumseh*. Mrs. Paul B. Fay, Jr., wife of the Under Secretary of the Navy, was sponsor of the *Flasher*. Joint ceremonies were held and the launches of the two submarines were simultaneous.

Participating in the launching of the *Tecumseh* were Mr. J. William Jones, Jr., president, General Dynamics/Electric Boat; Rear Adm. Lawson P. Ramage, USN, deputy commander, Submarine Force Atlantic Fleet; and Senator JOHN O. PASTORE. Participating in the launching of the *Flasher* were Mr. Roger Lewis, president, General Dynamics Corp.; Rear Adm. William A. Brockett, USN, chief, Bureau of Ships; and Vice Adm. Elton W. Grenfell, USN, commander, Submarine Force Atlantic Fleet.

It is my privilege to submit for printing in the RECORD the statements made on this memorable occasion, as follows:

"TECUMSEH" LAUNCHING SPEECHES

REMARKS BY MR. JONES

Mrs. Sikes, Senator Pastore, Admiral Ramage, Representative Sikes, Navy friends, and friends of the Navy and Electric Boat, on behalf of our more than 16,000 employees, it gives me great pleasure to welcome you here on this beautiful day for the launching of our ninth Polaris submarine, the *Tecumseh*.

You will be interested to know that Jerome Shawnee and his family, who drove all the way from Tulsa, Okla., is with us today. He is the chief of the Shawnee Tribe and will ride the *Tecumseh* down the ways.

This is an especially proud day for Electric Boat and the U.S. Navy because before the sun has set today four nuclear submarines will have been launched, if you will permit me, sort of a grand slam homer for the forces of freedom.

We at Electric Boat are privileged to participate in this important occasion by launching two of the four submarines—the *Tecumseh*, a fleet ballistic missile submarine which you are witnessing, and in our south yard the *Flasher*, an attack-type submarine. It is our plan to launch these two submarines at the same time and at this moment, Roger Lewis, president of General Dynamics, is handling the ceremonies in the south yard.

In launching these ships, however, we leave the making of significant records to those dedicated submariners who will soon take them to sea with the serious mission of keeping the peace. The very best efforts of the designers and shipbuilders can only begin to approach the level of performance turned in by the men of our submarine force.

Again, let me say how pleased we are to have you all with us today.

TELEGRAM FROM VICE ADM. H. G. RICKOVER

I regret circumstances prevent me from attending the launching of *Flasher* and *Tecumseh*. Please extend my warm regards to all those Electric Boat personnel who contributed to this event.

H. G. RICKOVER,
Vice Admiral, U.S.N.

PRESENTING THE SPONSOR

Our sponsor for the *Tecumseh* is Mrs. Robbert Sikes, of Laurel Hill, Fla. She is the wife of Representative ROBERT SIKES, of the First Congressional District who we are honored to have here on the platform today.

Mrs. Sikes is obviously a very active woman in civic affairs. She is a member of the Congressional Wives Club, the Woman's National Democratic Club of Washington, D.C., a member of the Florida State Society, and is a past president of that organization. I am honored to present to you our gracious sponsor, Mrs. Sikes.

INTRODUCTION OF ADMIRAL RAMAGE

We are especially happy to have with us today one of the Navy's top submariners, one who has devoted a lifetime of service to the submarine force. He has a most enviable record in the service of his country. During World War II a grateful Nation bestowed on him its highest decoration, the Medal of Honor. He has served with distinction in his present post as deputy commander, Submarine Force, Atlantic Fleet, and has done so well, in fact, that he has received a well-deserved promotion which, we are sorry to say, will take him from this area. He has been promoted to vice admiral as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Fleet Operations and Readiness. It is my great pleasure to present to you Adm. Lawson P. Ramage.

REMARKS BY ADMIRAL RAMAGE

Mrs. Sikes, Senator Pastore, Mr. Jones, this is truly a day to remember. To all of us the launching of this great ship *Tecumseh* has some special personal significance.

To our wonderful sponsor let me say how pleased and honored we are to have you with us on this occasion.

To Mr. Jones and everyone in the Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics, I wish to extend my congratulations and the Navy's appreciation for this and the many other great contributions you are making to our growing submarine force. You all are indeed longstanding members of the family.

To all the officers and men of the *Tecumseh's* blue and gold crews I know how proud you are to be assigned to this fine new ship—we all wish you every success in fitting out and in the fulfillment of your ultimate mission.

To all of us, what we see here today represents the results of the highest coordination between the designers, builders, suppliers, and operators.

It represents the highest motivation and dedication to the service of our great country.

All this, the *Tecumseh*, has in large measure. I know she will come on to be another strong pillar for peace.

We are all tremendously proud to be Americans and at times like this we have every right to be. May it ever be so.

INTRODUCTION OF SENATOR PASTORE

Our principle speaker today is a native of our neighboring State of Rhode Island, a place that is home to large segment of our work force, a fact which adds to our pleasure in welcoming him to this shipyard. Most of his life has been devoted to public service. He has served in the Rhode Island General Assembly, as assistant attorney general as Lieutenant Governor and Governor of that great State. The people of Rhode Island elected him to the U.S. Senate in 1950 and he has served them and the Nation faithfully and with distinction for the past 13 years. Ladies and gentlemen, the senior Senator from Rhode Island and the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Honorable JOHN O. PASTORE.

REMARKS OF U.S. SENATOR JOHN C. PASTORE ON OCCASION OF THE LAUNCHING OF THE "TECUMSEH," GROTON, CONN., JUNE 22, 1963

My fellow Americans, it is a moment of high privilege and a source of personal honor and official satisfaction to me to have a part in these memorable ceremonies today. The launching of this submarine marks another major step in the defense of our Nation and the preservation of freedom.

Tecumseh was a brave Indian enemy who died just 150 years ago.

Tecumseh is the beloved idol of victory of Annapolis.

Tecumseh is the proud name of this good ship that joins our first line of defense, and our best hope for peace.

As a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, I also have the honor of representing the arm of the Congress which played a dominant role in supporting the development effort which brought to reality the incomparable weapon system that this great ship represents.

The achievement of the nuclear submarine was not without doubters and discouragement and difficulties.

Yet, who would have believed in those days, or even later, if you will, when the world's first nuclear ship, the *Nautilus*, was launched from this same yard, that within a few years a partnership of nuclear submarines and Polaris missiles would result in the creation of America's first line of defense.

These doubts, discouragements, and difficulties were solved and resolved by Americans in and out of uniform, by scientists and technicians, officers and civilians, who worked as a team in the arduous days of development.

Our Nation certainly owes a great debt of gratitude to Admiral Rickover and Admiral Raborn, the naval officers who so capably directed the development of the two major systems incorporated in the Polaris submarine.

And our debt runs to the officers and men who man these ships—who, at great personal hardship to themselves and their families, spend months away from home in the lonely expanses of the great ocean so that the rest of us may enjoy the privileges of American freedom.

We can never fully repay the young men who make up the crews of these ships and who so courageously face the ever-present dangers of the sea.

Today I wish to pay particular tribute to the men and women who share a major responsibility for the high standards and accomplishments of the U.S. Navy. Notwithstanding the great achievements of our scientists; the capabilities of our best designers and the bravery and devotion of our naval officers and crews, all of this would be to no avail without the capabilities and conscientious devotion to detail of the thousands upon thousands of shipyard workers.

America will ever be grateful to its many civilian workmen who labor at this yard to build our ships and to keep us free. Never has there been demanded of craftsmen such a degree of perfection as from you who build the nuclear submarine.

Your integrity, your honor, and your pride as well as your skill of mind and of hand, furnish the built-in triumph that is now the *Tecumseh*. You, the workers of this yard and, I am proud to say, many of you residents of my own State of Rhode Island, have just reason to be proud of your accomplishments and we salute you, not only for your outstanding manual skills, but for your great sense of responsibility.

There are few endeavors in the field of labor where dependence upon the integrity, honor, and pride of the craftsman is as vital as in the building of these ships.

We often speak proudly of our country as the ship of state. America is a ship that rides on the labor, loyalty, and love of each of us.

This is a time of tempest, a time of testing, and surely we shall strive to meet every test in our time, for united we shall ride out every storm to that fair day of decency, dignity, freedom, and peace that is heaven's promise to all men of good will.

This is a high moment of history, a high moment of hope and happiness for all the world as this good ship, the *Tecumseh*, moves down the ways.

It is a moment of pride, pride that is yours in a job well done.

It is a moment of appreciation, appreciation which is ours as grateful Americans.

It is a moment of prayer, that Almighty God will make every voyage of the *Tecumseh* a peaceful one.

"Flasher" Launching Speeches

REMARKS BY MR. LEWIS

Good morning ladies and gentlemen, it's a privilege to welcome you on this glorious day for an altogether proud and remarkable ceremony.

The launching of any large ship is a signal occasion, bringing together, as it does, the builders, the users, and those who wish her godspeed.

But today we are all part of an occasion quite special. For the first time in history, two nuclear submarines—the *Flasher*, and the *Tecumseh*—will be launched simultaneously.

The occasion is marked by the fact that the board of directors of General Dynamics and their wives are with us today, and that Mrs. Fay, who will christen this ship, is here with her three fine children, her husband, the Under Secretary of the Navy, and her friends.

We of General Dynamics are particularly pleased because the ship to be launched here bears the name *Flasher*, an honored one for Groton shipbuilders.

Just 20 years ago, on June 20, 1943, Electric Boat launched the original *Flasher* which went into a truly remarkable record in combat, sinking more than 100,000 tons of enemy shipping. As that *Flasher* symbolizes the contribution of this yard made to victory in war, this second *Flasher* will symbolize another contribution, one to the defense of freedom and the maintenance of peace.

It is our earnest hope that this submarine will never be called on to prove herself as was her predecessor. However, we believe she is a good ship, and that she will measure up to any task or challenge she may face. And we know too, that the men who sail her will do so with the same spirit and dedication as that shown by the men of the original *Flasher*, a spirit and dedication which is part of the Navy's great tradition.

We have built this ship with that tradition in mind. And we have done so with the guidance of a fine and competent partner, the Navy's Bureau of Ships.

We are pleased and honored to have with us today, the Chief of the Bureau, a man who, incidentally, is a native of eastern Connecticut, and who worked here at Electric Boat briefly before entering the Naval Academy, Rear Adm. William A. Brockett.

Admiral Brockett.

ADMIRAL BROCKETT'S REMARKS

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, scientists explain their rapid technological advances of recent years by saying that they stand on the shoulders of giants. They mean, of course, that their work is based on that of those who proceded them. The same thing is no less true of the construction of our highly intricate and competent submarines of today.

In this hydrodynamically efficient hull, such as *Flasher* has, are neatly fitted the products of years of research and development. Dedicated men of many disciplines, naval architects, marine, electrical, mechanical, and electronic engineers—have devoted their best efforts, over the years, to this end product.

Electric Boat is known throughout the world as a principal repository of these very special skills. This remarkable ship is the product of many distinguished ancestors, the O, the R, the S boats, the fleet submarines of World War II, the *Albacore* (the hull form), and most importantly the *Nautilus*, in which the quantum advance to nuclear propulsion was proved out.

The translation of concepts into reality represented by the *Flasher* is not easy. It requires the special abilities of many skilled craftsmen, and I commend their contribution. As *Flasher* slides down the ways, we can all feel pride at this tangible evidence of the brains, the effort, the teamwork, which can produce such outstanding ships for the Nation's defense.

Thank you.

INTRODUCTION OF ADMIRAL GRENFELL

Thank you Admiral Brockett. We are indeed honored to have with us today one of the operating fleet's most distinguished leaders, the man who directs the activities of most of our Navy's nuclear submarines. He is a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy, holds a master of science degree from the University of California, and for heroism in combat has been awarded the Navy Cross, the Silver Star Medal, and the Legion of Merit. I am proud and honored to present as our principal speaker the commander of the Submarine Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet, Vice Adm. Elton W. Grenfell.

Admiral Grenfell.

ADDRESS BY VICE ADM. E. W. GRENFELL, U.S. NAVY, COMMANDER, SUBMARINE FORCE, U.S. ATLANTIC FLEET

It is a great privilege for me to join you here today in helping to launch this fine new ship upon her future career in the Submarine Force.

Once again, the Navy is deeply grateful to the men of Electric Boat for building us another ship which is destined for an important role in the defense of the free world.

So it is a very special privilege for me to join my old friends at Electric Boat and thank them personally for the newest of their many contributions to modern seapower and to our own national security.

Today, this 22d day of June, 1963, is a notable day in the 63 year history of our submarine Force. Few here are unaware that this is the scene for two submarine launchings, and many of us here know that *John C. Calhoun* at Newport News and *Daniel Boone* at Mare Island are also being launched today; but all of you should know that this is the first time in our history that we have launched any submarine on the 22d of June or four submarines on any one day in peacetime.

This is a remarkable achievement for our Nation's submarine builders and, a credit to the teamwork with the Navy which made it possible. We pay high tribute to Electric Boat for their lion's share in this accomplishment; and we are proud of our Nation's oldest submarine building shipyard on this memorable day.

We have shared many significant occasions with Electric Boat but June 20, 1943, was marked for a particular kind of glory. On that wartime day 20 years ago the Navy joined with Electric Boat in the launching of another *Flasher*. The small group which assembled for that occasion had little reason to foresee that this new submarine would someday carve for itself a place in U.S. submarine history which was second to none in naval warfare. As that *Flasher* slid down the ways they knew only that this weapon of destruction had commenced the first leg of her long journey to enter the war in the Pacific.

No one could know that during her relatively short 14-month career in the war zone *Flasher* would prove to be the greatest tonnage sweeper of all our submarines. Under the command of Lcdr. Reuben Whitaker and later Lcdr. George Grider, *Flasher* sank more shipping in her short career than was sunk by any submarine in our naval history.

Perhaps her greatest patrol was made in late 1944 under Lcdr. George Grider who is with us here today.

Engaging in two of the most violent actions of the war *Flasher* sank two destroyers and four tankers.

That outstanding submarine was awarded the Presidential Unit Citation for its success on the third, fourth, and fifth patrols, all during 1944. The last part of that citation said "her brilliant record of achievement is a reflection of the personal valor and superb seamanship of her officers and men."

Today we are gathered to honor this newest ship of the modern submarine navy. *Flasher* is not merely its name, or just any name. As she is christened remember that we also honor the men of the first *Flasher* who have set the standard of personal perfection for the men who will man her successor.

As she is launched we are witness to an ancient and stirring rite. This marvel of engineering is about to become a ship—to inherit the tradition from John Paul Jones to the present—and to receive the spirit of those who built her and those that will man her.

It is perhaps appropriate to pause for a moment and reflect upon the significance of this occasion. First of all, we are privileged today to take part in the ceremony which will start on her way a splendid example of the wonderful teamwork between industry and the Navy. Our national security rests in great measure upon this team as never before in history.

Secondly, our shores have been defended by sailormen in stout New England ships since the birth of our Nation. We see before us another great ship to add to this Yankee tradition.

It is not enough that a nation number the hulls of a fleet of ships and call them warships. For in order to make a significant contribution to peace, these ships must be recognized by their potential adversaries as being ships which can in fact carry their country's flag into battle and deliver heavy punishment upon their enemy. The greater the recognized ability of the ship to make war, the greater is her contribution to peace. *Flasher's* contribution is certain to be a most significant one.

Actually, the ship before us is merely the hull of the man-of-war which she will soon become. The skilled craftsmen of electric boats have just begun to install the several thousand miles of wiring and the piping and equipment which are required to make her ready for sea. Step by step she will be made ready to join the fleet.

We in the fleet are eager to have *Flasher* join us in keeping the peace. She is the 10th attack submarine of the *Thresher* class to be launched, and from our experience at sea we know of the unparalleled capabilities of this class of submarine. We need as many of these fine submarines as our Nation can afford to build. We do expect, indeed, that they will become the fleet boat of our future submarine navy.

Third, the alliances of free nations around the world depend upon the ability of the people of the United States to project their power for good across the sea. This new *Flasher* will contribute, and did her namesake, to insuring that this Nation with her ideals of individual freedom will prevail at sea in the presence of those who would oppose us. She is needed in our fleet as much as was her predecessor who was born only to demonstrate her will, her skill, and her strength on the testing ground of the Pacific war.

At the same time we recognize that the unprecedented military capabilities of these ships has also meant unprecedented complexity. Thus, we are able to see in these ships the most advanced technology of any in the world. This, in turn, has imposed a tremendous challenge upon the men who are to man this ship, and a challenge far greater than that for which the first *Flasher* received a presidential unit citation.

To Commander Carnahan and the officers and men of this *Flasher* I ask only that you too be found worthy of the challenge you will meet henceforth. I bid you good luck in all adversity, in fair weather or foul, in peace or war.

As *Flasher* slides down the ways into her future I trust that all of us may join in the traditional and reverent hope that *Flasher* will be blessed throughout her life with fair winds and following seas.

INTRODUCTION OF MRS. FAY

Thank you Admiral Grenfell. We of Electric Boat are proud and jealous of our role as a partner in the builder-user team that produces these great machines.

Ladies and gentlemen, it's now my very great pleasure to introduce to you the attractive and gracious sponsor of this submarine. She is the mother of Kathy, Paul, and Sally, who are here today. She is active in community affairs in her own home town of San Francisco. She's active in Navy affairs in Washington. It's a great pleasure to introduce to you Mrs. Paul B. Fay, Jr., our sponsor.

MRS. FAY'S REMARKS

When Secretary Korth telephoned me and asked me if I would like to become the sponsor of the *Flasher*, our household was in a turmoil of excitement. In fact, the last thing my son said to me today was: "Mom, if you don't crack that bottle, you're going to be in big trouble with the crew of the *Flasher*."

So I hope everybody's praying for me.

But what I really came to say was that I am deeply grateful to be given the opportunity to launch the *Flasher*. For I know that our country's strength and safety depends in a great measure on our atomic submarines.

For these ships are no better than the officers and men who operate them. Last night, after talking to Commander Carnahan, I realized that our coming officers and crew will be motivated, dedicated, and well trained.

I would like to salute the skipper, the coming officers and crew, the technicians, the workmen, who I know will always be faithful to the trust that our country has placed in them.

Thank you.

Is Sukarno Shifting Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interesting editorial, and a most encouraging one, from the New York Times of July 8, 1963, with respect to the policy of the Government of Indonesia.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, July 8, 1963]

IS SUKARNO SHIFTING POLICY?

Has the Indonesia of President Sukarno veered significantly toward moderation? There is evidence that such a turn may have occurred.

Suddenly dropping expropriation threats, Jakarta has given American and British oil companies in Indonesia at least 20 more years of assured operations. The Sukarno Government has ceased its menacing opposition to Malaysia and instead is considering a regional cooperation pact with the proposed new state and the Philippines. Moves have been made that will probably lead Indonesia to reverse plans not to participate in the 1964 Olympic games in Tokyo.

Rational new internal measures have been taken: fresh incentives for exporters, decontrol of some prices, termination of Government subsidies for certain state enterprises, liberalized marketing and pricing policies. An International Monetary Fund team of specialists drafting a general economic stabilization program is being given sympathetic attention. A new determination to cut state expenditures and balance the budget has been expressed.

The Indonesian economy desperately needs stabilizing through sensible Government measures and foreign aid available only in this and other Western countries. Indonesia has nothing to gain but trouble through continued attemps to sabotage Malaysia. Such factors as these constitute realistic motivations for abandonment of Jakarta's adventuristic, Communist-leaning policies of the past.

A new course would not be easy at first. Economic stabilization would bring hardships to some sections of the population. The big Indonesian Communist Party could be expected to create political and economic disruptions. It is too early to say definitely whether the Sukarno Government has decided to face the difficulties and permanently steer a new direction. But indicators so far are intriguing signs of what could be a development of major importance for Indonesia and all southeast Asia.

Ambassador Bowles Explodes Myths About Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the following article by Ambassador Chester Bowles in the New York Times magaine of June 16, 1963:

MYTHS ABOUT AFRICA AND THE REALITY

(By Chester Bowles)

In Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 32 African nations recently concluded a chiefs of state conference to develop the maximum basis for political and economic cooperation. Only the Republic of South Africa was absent. This is but one mark of the changes that have swept Africa from a position of unheeded obscurity to a place of primary world interest—and sometimes confusion.

Eight years ago, when I first visited Africa south of the Sahara, 29 of these nations existed only as colonies or as trusteeship territories. There was no Bureau of African Affairs in the State Department, and only two centers of African studies in the United States. In all of Africa there were only four American embassies.

In the weeks that my wife and I spent traveling down the African West Coast to the Congo, across to the Rhodesias and west to Uganda, Kenya, and Ethiopia, we came to see Africa as an awakening giant, stretching its limbs and opening its eyes to the first faint prospect of freedom.

Yet with notable exceptions, largely in British West Africa, European civil servants appeared as serenely confident of the permanance of things as their grandfathers had been in the days of Queen Victoria. How, some would ask, could we expect the European settlers of East Africa to compromise their pleasant and profitable existence under pressure from uneducated natives?

Outside of British West Africa only a handful of forward-looking European leaders were conscious of the trend toward change and were ready to move with the times, and even for them the pace was too swift. Before the war, they had been doing things to the Africans. Now, belatedly, they were striving honestly to do things for them. With a few exceptions they had not yet learned to do things with them.

On each of the half dozen trips which I have taken to Africa since then, I have seen the pace of change rapidly accelerating and our own efforts expanding in response. The 4 American embassies of 1955 have now become 31, headed by an extremely competent group of ambassadors, most of them vigorous younger men. Our U.S. Information Service libraries have increased to 51; Americans serving in Africa in our embassies, consulates, USIS posts and Agency for International Development missions now total almost 3,000, in addition to 1,500 members of the Peace Corps.

In the meantime, here in the United States the flow of books, documentaries, articles, and lectures on African history, politics, geography and culture has reached floodtide. The African Bureau of the State Department, nonexistent 8 years ago, has grown into a remarkably dedicated and effective organization, manned in large part by younger Foreign Service officers.

Our present policies by and large appear admirably well keyed to the realities of the new Africa, and our new administrative apparatus is competent to carry them out. What is urgently needed now is deeper congressional and public understanding of the economic and political forces that are shaping Africa's future, and a clearer recognition of the degree to which developments in Africa affect our own security interests.

In this framework let us examine some of the current popular stereotypes in regard to Africa which stand in the way of such understanding:

RACIAL ANTAGONISM—BLACK HATING WHITE—IS STILL A DOMINANT FACTOR

Contrary to this general impression, Africa's new leaders—with few exceptions—are neither antiwhite nor anti-European. In spite of the long and often humiliating colonial experience, few hold grudges against either the former colonial powers or their own European minorities.

For instance, the African leaders of modern Kenya insist that while their first concern is to secure independence, this should be accomplished in such a way that the European minority will be given a sense of personal security and participation in building the new nation. In what was once known as French West Africa we find the same friendliness toward the former colonial rulers—the same willingness to live and let live, to forget past wrongs.

The Republic of Guinea offers a dramatic example of this resilience. In 1958, when President Sékou Touré decided to leave the French Union, the exasperated French reduced their investments in Guinea and recalled many of their doctors, technicians, and teachers. Then, when the United States was slow to respond to Touré's desire for American assistance for fear of antagonizing our French allies, Guinea turned to the Soviet Union for economic aid. The Kremlin responded favorably, and some American policymakers promptly wrote off this new African nation as a probable Communist satellite.

Yet, in the face of the most difficult pressures and adjustments, Guinea's young leaders have maintained a refreshingly sound perspective, which includes a genuine desire to reestablish friendly relations with the French, for whom they continue to express respect and even affection. In this cold war period of violence and bitterness such tolerance is heartening.

Nor are these isolated cases. With the exception of Algeria, transition from African colonialism to African freedom has been achieved with surprisingly little violence. Indeed, in the recent interval of difficult adjustment—during which 25 African nations south of the Sahara emerged from colonial rule—fewer than 8,000 people have been killed, and this includes the Mau Mau revolt in Kenya and the Congolese civil war. When we compare this relatively orderly transition with the mass killings that accompanied comparable revolutionary changes in China, Russia or even the Indian subcontinent, it seems miraculous.

It should be added that the Africans responsible for this mature style of transition are themselves notable for their youth, enthusiasm, and humility. In country after country, these new leaders have appeared to come out of nowhere; most of them are under 45 and many are in their thirties.

AFRICAN LEADERS ARE UNREALISTIC VISIONARIES IN THEIR VIEWS ON ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

On the contrary, the objective visitor will be impressed with the sophistication with which most African planners are approaching this challenge. In 1955, to be sure, the few African nationalist leaders with whom I was permitted to talk were dreaming of independence in terms of nuclear reactors, global airlines and steel mills. These visions of economic gardenur, however, have long since been replaced by a remarkably down-to-earth understanding of achievable goals and priorities.

When a foreign visitor asks African leaders to list their requirements for national development, he will find their replies not only realistic but also surprisingly uniform.

Their first concern is for expanded and improved education, including technical education; the new African faith in education is passionate.

Second, they are likely to emphasize rural development, with particular stress on more productive agriculture through extension work, experimental farms, low-interest credit cooperatives and commercial fertilizers.

Third is the need for improved communications—roads, railroads, telephone and telegraph installations.

And, fourth, they may stress the need for small industries that can manufacture the inexpensive consumer goods that in non-Communist countries must be relied upon to provide the incentives for increased production in both rural and urban areas.

Many African leaders point out that a major share of such industries should be located in the small provincial towns so that the headlong rush into the large cities can be slowed down and a more rewarding life created near their homes, where the people feel more secure.

ALL OF AFRICA IS THE SAME—A SINGLE GREAT MASS OF LAND AND PROBLEMS

Against this, sensitive American visitors to the new Africa will be impressed with the diversity of this great continent and the pride that each new nation is taking in its own future.

Africans want to be masters of their own destinies—and for this reason most African leaders demonstrate an acute awareness of the threat to their independence posed by international communism. Because they know by experience how uncomfortable it is to be ruled by others, however generous and well-intentioned, a fierce sense of independence is everywhere evident. This is often expressed in an almost belligerent determination to build their own future within the framework of their own culture and above all, not to appear to be influenced by outsiders—particularly by white foreigners.

While this new sense of national identity may strike us as a distorted and often exasperating reflection of the spirit of freedom, the world Communist movement—still dreaming great dreams of dominant ties with the new African states—will find it a formidable political obstacle to its ambitions.

Yet the new Africa is surprisingly free of provincialism. Side by side with a fierce dedication to independent growth is a sober realization of the need for cooperation among neighbors in viable geographic units. Although hopes for a full-blown, all-African political federation at this stage are unrealistic, there is a steadily growing movement toward forms of multinational cooperation in both East and West Africa, as the conference in Addis Ababa demonstrated.

Most African leaders are realists who believe that small African nations of a few million people each, many of them with crazy-quilt borders that are a legacy of clashing 19th-century European colonial ambitions, have much to gain by merging development plans and governmental services with those of their neighbors. Farsighted Africans even see these economic ties as a first important step toward increasing political integration.

AFRICA'S PROBLEMS ARE SO VAST THAT MAJOR ECONOMIC PROGRESS IS IMPOSSIBLE IN THE FORESEEABLE FUTURE

The very opposite is the case. Africa's economic potential is limitless. By 1975, when its short supply of educated and technically skilled manpower will be substantially eased, the rate of per capita income growth in most of Africa may be faster than in either Latin America or Asia.

Although the obstacles created by inadequate education and inexperience in public administration are formidable, they are likely to be overcome more rapidly than many observers think. And, once this is accomplished, Africa's vast economic promise will become dramatically evident.

For one thing, only two or three African countries are plagued with the deeply rooted resistance to political reforms on the part of an entrenched elite that one often finds in other underdeveloped continents. And although some observers regard the tribal system in most parts of Africa as a similar barrier, they may be surprised to see the relative ease with which many of these tribal arrangements, including the common ownership of land, evolve into constructive systems of cooperative ownership and management.

Another important African advantage over the long haul is the extraordinarily favorable ratio, in most African nations, of people to natural resources. The Congro and the Sudan, in particular, illustrate the possibilities. Each of these new countries is about two thirds the size of India and may be expected to possess a similar percentage of India's natural resources. Yet the population on India is 440 million, while the population of the Sudan and the Congo is approximately 13 million each.

The economic implications are self-evident. Once sufficient numbers of trained and educated Congolese and Sudanese are available to help organize and develop their vast natural resources, the per capita incomes in both countries may be expected to grow far more rapidly than in India, in spite of the demonstrated vitality and capacity of Indian democracy.

This development is likely to be spearheaded by the rapid introduction into Africa of labor saving machinery, with the consequent growth of a well paid core of industrial workers and a developing middle class. While the more heavily populated Asian countries may be resisting modern machinery because its first impact is to throw people out of work, the new African nations are likely to face an increasing labor shortage and a consequent rapid increase in wages and purchasing power as machinery is introduced to fill the gap.

Although on balance Africa's present development and long-term future prospects appear remarkably promising, we should not overlook the dangers. A sober view must take into account certain built-in political traps which in several areas could turn the present generally favorable situation into disaster. One of the most important and pressing of them has been the Congo.

Before the Congo achieved independence in 1960, the province of Katanga, through its vast copper exports, supplied the Central Government with nearly half of its foreign exchange and half its annual tax income. Not only its transportation system, but much of the rest of the Congolese economy was financed by this single natural resource.

If Katanga had ultimately seceded, we would almost surely have witnessed a bloody civil war in the heart of Africa and the political disintegration of a potentially wealthy country nearly one-third the size of the United States. This would have invited Communist intervention in the very heart of Africa.

Faced with this situation, the United States would have been forced to choose between turning its back on a dangerous political debacle or acting unilaterally and at substantial cost to pick up the pieces. Fortunately we made the right choice—to support a request from the Congo Government for U.N. aid—and today the United Nations is striving to help this once profitable colony transform itself into a viable, unified nation. History will view this as a fateful decision. American failure to support the U.N. effort would have produced an impact far beyond the Congo itself.

How, then, should the United States deal with the new Africa?

The first requirement is continuing, courageous support for the right of all peoples to determine their own forms of government. Respect for this fundamental right is an intrinsic part of our American faith which we can never afford to compromise.

In 1825, Prince Metternich, the spokesman for reaction in post-Napoleonic Europe, in referring to American support for the Greek war of liberation from the Turks, said: "Wherever a subject people seek revolutionary change, there you will find the Americans applauding those who succeed and bemoaning those who fail." In today's revolutionary world, similar support for self-determination must be an integral part of our political strength.

Second, while wholeheartedly supporting the right of all peoples to govern themselves, we should recognize the difficult adjustment facing our friends in Europe. Once the strength of the African independence movement became clear, the British, the French, and the Belgians (with some admitted lapses) have conducted themselves generally with understanding, flexibility and skill. Let us then forgo patronizing lectures in dealing with our European associates. Our joint interests will best be served by an earnest effort to understand their problems and to work with them toward realistic solutions.

Third, in the last few years, the Bureau of African Affairs in the State Department has developed great sensitivity and competence under the leadership of Assistant Secretary G. Mennen Williams. Let us continue to strengthen this key organization.

Fourth, the Peace Corps appears to be ideally suited to the needs of Africa. In Ethiopia, Tanganyika, Nigeria, Cameroon, and Liberia, I have met serious young Americans who are a profound credit to this country and a promise of increased world understanding among the younger generation. The Peace Corps is the most outstanding new contribution to foreign policy in the last decade. In Africa, as elsewhere, it should be expanded rapidly.

Fifth, we should join with other capital-exporting nations to make sure that those African countries that are able to absorb economic assistance are supported, and, equally important, that they are given the right kind of help. In line with the priorities set by responsible African leaders, education should be given major emphasis, followed by integrated development of the rural areas, agricultural extension, public administration, health services, and road construction.

Insofar as possible, we should encourage local initiative in these undertakings, particularly in the construction of schools, clinics, and roads. A simple, bamboo-mud school or a connecting road built by parents and other villagers in the tradition of our own rural development will contribute far more to the orderly political growth of a village than a better constructed road or a show-place school built with no local involvement.

Some American observers suggest that the ex-colonial countries—Britain, France, and Belgium—should be urged to take the lead in furnishing economic assistance to Africa. In effect this has already occurred. In 1962 the contribution of the former colonial powers amounted to $1.1 billion while U.S. assistance was a little more than one-third that amount. However, we must be careful not to allow others to put a ceiling on our own efforts. The emerging African nations will continue to need substantial American help not only to speed their development but to underscore their new independence from European domination.

Sixth, we should not compromise our own interests or principles in an effort to win African applause on short-term issues where we honestly believe that they are wrong and we are right. A strained effort to curry favor by agreeing with African leaders, regardless of the circumstances, will not create the solid ground necessary for an enduring partnership. In the U.N., for example, we find ourselves on most issues voting with the African nations because we share with them a desire for a freer, more prosperous, more peaceful world. But when issues arise about which we fail to see eye to eye, we have not hesitated to say so.

However, let us curb our impatience when particular situations fail to develop as we think they should. The new African nations, having at long last thrown off British, French and Belgian rule, have no desire to be either Russianized or Americanized. They want to be Africanized, and in a hurry.

Although they share our hopes and fears on most aspects of world affairs, they are anxiously and often belligerently determined to maintain their own identities. When they sense that their independent judgment is being compromised they will go out of their way to assert it regradless of what we say or think—and even regardless of their own immediate interests.

In this regard, we should also keep our perspective when African leaders make speeches or offer U.N. resolutions which we consider to reflect undue impatience and emotionalism. We should remember that early in our history—and even from time to time today—we have done likewise. Furthermore, many African capitals do not yet have large and experienced civil-service systems, aided by extensive research and public-information organizations. This sometimes results in speeches or resolutions based on inadequate or outdated information. With the passage of time, however, this situation will correct itself.

Finally, let us remember that in the postwar years, when we Americans were learning by hard, painful experience about the nature of communism and the deviousness of Communist diplomacy, most of the present crop of African leaders were living under colonial governments as obscure civil servants, budding young lawyers or university students, absorbed with their own affairs. As in our own case, experience is the only reliable teacher, and experience takes time.

Supreme Court Decision on Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, in today's mail, I received a copy of Dr. Henry B. Luffberry's statement to his church congregation. This statement was called to my attention by a former Wisconsin resident, now a member of Dr. Luffberry's congregation. I recommend the reading of this statement to each Member of the House of Representatives. The statement follows:

A STATEMENT TO MY CONGREGATION

(By Dr. Henry B. Luffberry)

(NOTE.—Comments of the pastor of St. Paul's Lutheran Church, Washington, D.C., on the Sunday following the Supreme Court decision on Bible reading and prayer in the public schools.)

It is the function of the Supreme Court to interpret the Constitution, and nothing I am about to say should be interpreted as questioning the competence and authority of the Court.

It has been the function of the prophetic ministry since the time of Isaiah to interpret the spiritual significance of secular and political events.

The Supreme Court decision of June 17, 1963, came as no surprise to me. But I did not welcome it as some churchmen who threw in the sponge a year ago. And I do not gloss over its importance as some who say already that religion belongs only in the church and home. And I certainly do not herald it as a new bastion in the separation of church and state; but rather I see in it the further crumbling of the spiritual foundations of our democracy. For to me the decision of June 17 has one tragic implication above all others:

The first amendment introduces what we have long called the bill of rights. That amendment contains two clauses. The first—the establishment clause—is intended to protect us from the imposition of a state religion. The second—the free exercise clause—is intended to protect us from governmental interference with the free exercise of religion. I repeat: To protect us from governmental interference with free exercise of religion! To the Founding Fathers, and to generations of Americans who succeeded them, these provisions were a mighty bulwark defending our right to worship.

But in recent years these guarantees have been used frequently for selfish ends in the interests of atheism, agnosticism and secularism. There has been a growing confusion as to whether the right not to worship is inherent in the right to worship. Some have equated these rights and contended that indifference to God is itself a religion.

The decision of June 17 is the culmination of this quarter century of confusion. In my opinion the tragic lasting effect of that decision is that the right not to worship is now held to be a higher freedom than the right to worship.

This deplorable situation will be with us a long time. It may seem to some that there is nothing we can do. But I urge you as Christians to let the implications of the decision of June 17 weigh upon your conscience, realizing that every day and every week you make a choice between these two rights—the right not to worship, or the right to worship. And if we would preserve what is left of the sacred heritage that came from our forefathers, we must manifest before our children, our community and our world the conviction that we consider the right to worship our highest freedom. May God help us so to do.

Failure of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under the title of "Why I Am Opposed to Foreign Aid," the New York Times magazine of

July 7, 1963, carries an article written by a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, the Honorable OTTO E. PASSMAN.

In the article Mr. PASSMAN summarizes his opposition to the global foreign handout program and some of the reasons why he is leading the fight in the House Appropriations Committee to drastically curtail spending for this purpose and thus give a measure of relief to America's hard-pressed taxpayers.

The New York Times article follows:

FAILURE OF FOREIGN AID

(By OTTO E. PASSMAN)

("Most powerful congressional antagonist of foreign aid." This is how Capitol Hill observers characterize Representative OTTO E. PASSMAN, Democrat, of Louisiana, who holds the key job of chairman of the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriations. The Times magazine asked Mr. PASSMAN why he opposes the program. Here is his reply.)

Secretary of State Rusk saw fit recently to accuse Members of Congress and others who favor substantial reductions in this country's spending for foreign aid of "cooperating with global Communist strategy." It is regrettable that the Secretary made such an intemperate and groundless statement but, no matter what his real opinions are, the remarks tie right in with the unrealistic point of view held by many overidealistic people in the executive branch of Government regarding the vast and complex worldwide foreign aid program.

I am one of those the Secretary was talking about. I am opposed to foreign aid; it has been, in my opinion, one of the greatest foreign policy failures in history. But as a realist, I recognize that it is, however, distasteful, a political "fact of life" today.

Our foreign aid is the basis of such foreign policy as we have. Over the past 16 years, Washington administrations have made long-term "moral" commitments that involve our country's good faith and that must, as a matter of course, be fulfilled. Even if the Executive were to decree a fundamental shift in foreign aid policy—surely an unlikely possibility—considerable time would be required to carry out the change. Nations all over the world have come to expect largess from us. They would need time to make substantial adjustments—time to cure themselves of what has become literally an "addiction" to foreign aid.

Such is the "political fact" of foreign aid. In view of that fact, my work as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriations is not to end the program at one stroke but rather to help "contain" it, to encourage commonsense in its policies and operations and to curb as much as possible its waste and mismanagement.

However, this necessarily limited effort in no way alters my personal belief that the whole program is wrong. I believe it is wrong for four main reasons:

First, it has undermined the dollar. In one form or another, U.S. foreign aid has gone to 104 countries at a cost since the end of World War II of $120 billion, if we include the interest on the money we have borrowed to give away. The impact of all this on our own fiscal position becomes obvious if we consider how the program works.

When nations are credited with foreign aid dollars against which they can place orders for goods and services, the invoices for these goods and services are sent to the U.S. Treasury for payment—from the taxpayers' till—rather than to the government which receives the shipment. In normal commercial practice, when the United States sells a nation goods or services, we receive something in return—dollars, gold, or goods and services. Under our foreign-aid program, however, it as one-way deal—the goods or services go out, the U.S. Treasury pays the bill, and the United States receives nothing of a tangible commercial nature in return.

So great has been America's outpouring of wealth through foreign aid that many of the recipient nations have accumulated dollars far in excess of their needs. Consequently, they demand gold in exchange for the dollars, and in the past 10 years our gold reserves have been reduced from more than $23 billion to less than $16 billion. Over the same period, other "free world" countries increased their gold holdings from $13 billion to nearly $25 billion and their short-term dollar credits from less than $11 billion to $25 billion. For these dollar credits, those countries can demand gold, and if such a demand should come, the United States could not meet it.

This is the condition that is fundamentally at the root of our dangerous balance-of-payments situation. And, subsequently as a result of our fiscally irresponsible action, the annual budget deficits increase, and the public debt—already exceeding by $24 billion the combined public debts of all other nations of the world—continues to rise at an alarming rate. Some day the debt must either be repaid, or repudiated through inflation.

My second criticism is that foreign aid has made the dollar a symbol of international charity. It has inculcated in less-favored nations the belief that the United States is morally responsible for bringing the whole world up to our standards of living and freedom by using our taxpayers' money.

The fact is, the majority of the aid-recipent countries do not, and will not, tax their own people at rates even remotely close to the U.S. rates to assist in bringing about the improved standards which we say we are trying to help them attain. Our aid is treated rather generally by recipients as a substitute for internal initiative and effort and in many cases it cannot be effectively utilized.

In the third place, the aid program has become not only an added tax on our producers, but also a subsidy to our foreign competitors. While rapidly depleting our own wealth and resources, it has been a primary reason for our increasingly noncompetitive position in word markets. Largely because of our wasteful giving, our prices have become so high that we cannot now compete successfully in world trade without the Federal Government's subsidizing our exports by as much as 30 percent.

Finally, despite our tremendous aid expenditures and commitments, our world position remains a precarious one. Within a relatively brief span of years, our country became great, free and respected, in large measure because we had a firm but fair foreign policy based substantially upon trade. Today, through foreign aid, we have substituted "dollar diplomacy," a foreign policy that is a new concept among the family of nations—a weak policy, bordering on appeasement. We have been dissipating our resources in the hope that we shall acquire friends, yet there is little evidence that we have done so.

These are some of the general failings of the foreign aid program as I see them—and I consider them serious enough to call the whole program into question. But, as I have said, it is politically impossible to abolish it now. Therefore, I believe we should recognize and attempt to remedy as many as possible of the faults of the present operation.

Cited briefly, here are a few of the more readily evident shortcomings:

(1) There has not been adequate advance planning, in the form of firm technical and financial arrangements, and we have failed to reach definitive understandings with recipient countries on just what projects are essential. As a result, too many projects have been undertaken in individual countries, and assistance has been dispersed over too wide an area. Quantities of material have been delivered that are greater than the recipient countries need or can use.

(2) In several countries, the official exchange rates used by the U.S. Government have substantially overvalued the local currencies. The use of such rates has unduly increased the dollar cost of our aid; and also, in some of the countries, the use of these unrealistic exchange rates has resulted in windfall profits to importers and provided incentives for speculation and irregular practices.

(3) There has been a lack of qualified personnel and an oversupply of unqualified or poorly qualified personnel.

(4) In the military aid program, the objectives have not been sufficiently clarified so as to distinguish between forces which are justifiable on the basis of military roles and missions and those which are equipped and maintained for other than military reasons.

(5) We have acceded to too many requests for prestige projects. Many nations, including those that are relatively newly independent, seek status by building huge dams, steel mills, superhighways, and national airlines, all financed by the U.S. taxpayer. We have placed entirely too much emphasis on meeting the personal desires of foreign political leaders for such prestige-builders.

Without delay, our spending for foreign aid—in all of its categories—ought to be drastically curtailed. The time is here to start on the task of gradually phasing out the foreign aid program as a whole. Meanwhile, we should try, by tightening up the loose administration, cutting down on overstaffing and eliminating as many as possible of the impractical and overidealistic plans and projects, to reduce substantially the number of good American dollars that are wasted.

National Rivers and Harbors Congress Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress already know, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held its 50th national convention on June 4–7 in Washington, D.C. For half a century, this organization has helped governmental and private interests to develop the vast water resources of our country. Through its contributions, it has earned the respect and admiration of people nationwide. The high regard in which the National Rivers and Harbors Congress is held may be seen from the following telegram which President Kennedy sent to the Convention on June 7, 1963:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., June 7, 1963.

I am pleased to send greetings to the 50th convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and I am confident your meeting will be productive.

Our mutual concern for the progressive, orderly, and balanced development of our Nation's water and related land resources so vital to our growing and complex society is reflected in the Federal budget for 1964. Funds were requested for the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Soil Conservation Service to start construction on a large number of new projects as well as to continue those started in previous years.

We are continuing to make progress on the courses of action which I reported to you last year; for example, in the abatement of water pollution, the provision of recreation opportunities, and the formulation of water resources projects under the new standards which reflect the policies of this administration.

Since last year some important developments have occurred in the field of natural resources research. The National Academy of Sciences reported on research needs and opportunities related to our natural resources requirements. The Federal Council on Science and Technology has helped materially to strengthen the total Government research effort relating to natural resources. Based on the Council's studies, this administration supports the legislation now in Congress to provide grants to colleges and universities for water resources research.

We must intensify our planning efforts to provide for the best use, and combination of uses, of our natural resources, to harmonize conflicting objectives, and to establish priorities, to meet foreseeable short- and long-term needs. We are hopeful that legislation will be enacted which would provide effective machinery for the cooperative and coordinated planning by the various agencies involved, both Federal and State. Pending enactment of such legislation, the Federal agencies concerned have worked together to prepare a coordinated schedule of river basin planning, and the first step in that effort is reflected in the 1964 budget. Those agencies are continuing to work to effect improved coordination and to clarify planning concepts.

So vast and vital an undertaking as the development of our water resources involves many problems such as those relating to the allocation of project costs, reimbursement, and cost sharing between the Federal Government and non-Federal bodies. I have requested the four Cabinet Secretaries who would comprise the Water Resources Council to study these matters and to make their recommendations to me.

The agenda for your convention indicates that you, too, will be discussing some of the vital issues relating to the rational conservation and development of our water resources. My very best wishes to your members and delegates in this effort.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Cuban Tragedy—Blunder or Betrayal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article entitled "Cuban Tragedy—Blunder or Betrayal?" by Don Brooks. This article appeared in the magazine Evolve published by the conservative students of the San Diego State College. The article is well documented and brings out the many reasons that the Kennedy administration is trying to hide the truth behind the fiasco of the Bay of Pigs.

The article follows:

CUBAN TRAGEDY—BLUNDER OR BETRAYAL?

(By Don Brooks)

On April 17, 1961, 1,400 young Cubans tried to liberate their homeland from the Communists. Their attempt failed; but why all the secrecy now, 2 years later, concerning this attempt? What is the administration trying to hide? There have been two major investigations of this matter. Why have the results been kept from the public? If the story told by the Cubans is false, then the administration should have nothing to fear in publicizing the truth. But if the events happened just as the freedom fighters say they did, then there is every reason to fear exposure.

Castro's Communist regime is a blemish on President Kennedy's "image"; a blemish which will remain there as long as Cuba remains a center for Communist infection. Every week, every day, every hour, Communists are building Cuba into a larger base for both weapons and subversion. The only question is: Which will destroy us first? Time is running out. But don't expect the present administration to do anything. It is still too busy trying to hush up the April 17 invasion. So many mistakes were made that it becomes evident that they were more than just mistakes.[1]

Robert Kennedy's statements have changed what seemed to be a bad mistake on the part of the President into a direct charge of complete incompetence on the part of the President, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Security Council, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. If our military establishment is as incompetent as the Attorney General suggests in a small military operation 90 miles from our shore, how can we have any confidence in our ability to judge and fight a war thousands of miles away in South Vietnam or Berlin or any other place?

Mr. Kennedy's (Robert) attempt to absolve Mr. Kennedy (John) opened a closet door that had been securely closed. That closet contained 160 skeletons—Cuban skeletons.[2] Mr. Kennedy (J.) called off the scheduled air strike that would have wiped out Castro's seven remaining airplanes.[3] Those planes sank two of the liberators' ships and drove the others away, leaving 1,400 men without supplies. This doomed the invasion and cost the lives of about 160 Cubans and at least 4 Americans. Someone doesn't want the facts revealed, but all Americans have a right to know why an American-sponsored venture was allowed to fail.

On April 15, 1961, three B-26 bombers attacked Castro's airfields.[4] Adlai Stevenson, U.S. representative to the U.N., denied that the United States had anything to do wih the attack. Later, when he learned that the U.S. had sponsored the bombers, he went to President Kennedy and insisted that no further action of this kind be taken.[5]

According to Robert Kennedy, the President then gave instructions that the air attack scheduled to coincide with the invasion should not take place unless those having the responsibility felt that it was absolutely necessary, in which case they should discuss it further with him.[6]

The identity of "those having the responsibility" is a little vague. Some of the highest military officers were not informed until many hours later—after it was too late to "discuss it further."[6]

When the freedom fighters began their attack Monday morning, they discovered that Castro still had an air force. After two of the invaders' ships had been sunk, President Kennedy gave permission for the Cuban patriots to attack the Communist airfields in Cuba, and an airstrike did take place after dark that day.

The assault was made by three B-26's, which are not equipped for night bombing. They aimed at three airports, and somehow managed to hit one. This attack did not accomplish very much. It was too little and too late. Castro's planes had already determined the fate of the entire invasion.[6]

The idea was not merely to get an air strike—but to get it at the right time to destroy Castro's air force on the ground; or, at least, to keep his jets so busy that they would not bother the invaders as they made their assault on Cuba.

One of the ships that Castro destroyed was the *Rio Escondido*. It sank in shallow water with the entire 5th battalion on board. Most of the troops reached the shore, but the battalion was never able to fight. The other ship, the *Houston*, blew up "like the Fourth of July." These vessels carried all of the invaders' antiaircraft guns, armored trucks, key communication equipment, and most of their ammunition.[7]

The rest of the flotilla was driven from the bay. Other supplies that did not reach the invaders on the beach were antitank mines, grenades, mortar shells, food, water, gasoline and bombs for the air force. No boats were able to make deliveries after that first day.[7]

As a result of Castro's air attack on the "invasion fleet," the only supplies the anti-Castro troops had were what they carried ashore and what they received from two inadequate airdrops. On one of the drops, the patriots had asked for bazooka grenades and 50-caliber ammunition; they received hand grenades and 30-caliber ammunition. On the other, much of the equipment was parachuted into a swamp and lost.[7]

The airstrike planned to accompany the actual invasion was so essential that calling it off amounted to betrayal of the invaders. The plans had included an airstrip on the beach, where the anti-Castro planes would be able to refuel. This would have made them available for airpower for the infantry and for attacking Castro's forces as well. But the last minute order from the President gave the Communist planes a chance to make such a heavy air attack that the liberators were unable to get their fuel ashore. This meant that the freedom fliers had to fly 700 miles from Nicaragua to attack, and then 700 miles back to be refueled. Thus the Cuban patriots were provided with almost no effective air cover.[8]

The entire liberation air force consisted of 15 obsolete World War II B-26 medium bombers and 9 C-54, C-46, and C-47 transport planes. Tail guns were removed from the B-26 bombers so that more fuel could be carried for the 700-mile flight to Cuba; this made the bombers helpless against Castro's jet fighters. The American advisers explained this away by saying, "The air will be ours." Since the 700-mile flight from Nicaragua left the bombers with only about 20 minutes of flying time to stay over the beachhead, for the other 40 minutes of each hour, the patriots had no air cover. When it was all over, 13 of the original 15 liberation bombers had been either shot down or damaged beyond use.[3]

Attorney General Kennedy says that no U.S. air support was ever planned. But Dagoberto Darias, commander of one of the transport ships, says that 22 jets bearing the freedom fighters' war insignia and the Cuban banner flew over the support flotilla on the morning of April 17.[3] This showed that the United States was prepared to give air cover. However, the jets merely circled without joining the fight, while Castro's jets blasted the invading troops.[1]

On January 21, Robert Kennedy stated flatly that no Americans had been killed in the invasion.[8] A contradictory report indicates that 18 military-trained, combat-experienced American airmen were hired to re-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

place the inexperienced and exhausted Cuban air crews.[9] Twelve of these men were from the Arkansas National Guard.[8] Four Birmingham fliers, all members of the Alabama Air National Guard, were shot down April 19, 1961, over the Bay of Pigs. The Government claims that they were killed in a C–46 cargo plane. Another version is that they were in B–26 bombers, two in each plane.[10]

Governor Faubus of Arkansas reported that a National Guard plane, which had been "removed from service" by the Federal Government, turned up as part of the invasion forces.[8]

On April 10, the young Cubans were flown to Nicaragua, to see the "invasion fleet" that had been mobilized by the CIA.[2] The five ships of the "Invincible Armada" ranged from small, World War II transports to old fishing yachts. There was one remodeled landing craft. Some 17-foot glass-fiber boats, which had originally been intended for use on quiet, inland water, were to be used for landing barges on the assault landings.[7]

As a morale booster, they discovered that the equipment had not been checked out, radios had not been set on the proper frequencies, and tank turrets would not work. On the morning of the invasion, they found that the winches on the ships would not operate, and there was no rope on board to lower equipment from the ships to the landing barges. But that wasn't all. The motors on the barges were faulty, and had to be repaired and adjusted under fire from Castro's forces.[7]

One group of men stated that during their training, they lived on canned rations and artificial fruit drink. At the same time, steaks obviously flown in for them were trucked off and sold in Guatemala iCty. Each man was issued one uniform for the duration, and it was worn out by the time of the invasion. There were five showers to be shared by a thousand men.[1]

One group of 140 paratroopers was taken by plane from Guatemala to Nicaragua for the final jump to Cuba. By the time of the final takeoff, they had not slept for 2 nights. Thirty-two fully equipped men were crowded into each small transport plane. The men sat wedged into their seats, with neither food nor water, for more than 7 hours during the flight to Cuba. They were almost exhausted when the time came to bail out for their assault on Castro.[1] In addition to this, they arrived an hour after sunrise. This 1-hour delay cost the lives of three men who were shot before they even reached the ground.[7]

The chief of communications for the freedom fighters was given neither the necessary codes nor the assigned radio frequencies. The main communications center for the invasion went down with one of the ships that Castro's planes had sunk. Except for the jeep radios, there was only one radio ashore. Because he had not been given the assigned frequencies, it took the chief of communications 5 hours of fiddling with the dials before he managed to contact the headquarters on one of the vessels offshore.[7]

Photo intelligence had reported that the beach was sandy. It turned out to be a rocky beach. This meant that the landing craft could not come all the way into shore to unload the vehicles.[7] A picture of rocks was interpreted as a picture of sand. If this is a typical mistake made by those who work with photo reconnaissance, how can anyone claim to know that all of the missiles have been removed from Cuba, to say nothing of distinguishing between offensive and defensive weapons? If this was not a mistake, one must assume that the freedom fighters were intentionally given false information.

In spite of this misinformation, the liberators did manage to get five tanks ashore.[7] But Castro had over 100 tanks, mostly Soviet T–34's.[4] The invaders were armed with the 75-millimeter recoilless rifles—which had proved ineffective against Soviet T–34 tanks in Korea. The turrets on the invaders' tanks would not turn, but the American instructors told the invaders that the tanks were only to frighten Castro's forces. Some of the infantrymen carried Garand rifles, but they were given ammunition clips for the old Springfield rifles.[7]

The military commander of the invasion force, Col. Jose Perez San Roman, wanted to have thousands of leaflets printed to be dropped all over Cuba by planes. The leaflets were to call upon the people to rise against Castro, their Communist oppressor. At the last moment, the U.S. Government informed San Roman that it could not approve this plan.[2]

The American instructors assured the Cubans that Castro's military was ripe for revolt. They said that the 80 infiltrators who had been working since December had accomplished their mission, and that the whole population would join the liberators. They gave assurances that Castro would be overthrown within 72 hours.[7] However, Allen Dulles, former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, recently admitted that the CIA never really expected a Cuban uprising when the Bay of Pigs invasion was being planned.[11]

A few days before the invasion took place, President Kennedy publicly announced that under no circumstances would the United States intervene with force in Cuba.[6] This announcement not only tied the President's hands, it guaranteed the absence of a general anti-Castro uprising.

The freedom fighters thought that this statement must be just a trick to throw the Communists off guard.[3] The liberators couldn't believe that they were the ones who were being tricked. They had always been assured of—and had always counted on—receiving any support required for the success of the invasion.[3]

The anti-Castro underground had organized teams of eight men each. Upon orders from the American invasion headquarters, these teams were to lead a general uprising against Castro. They were to destroy key facilities and bridges. Hundreds of anti-Castro volunteers had been sent into the hills to await the dropping of arms by air, at which time they were to join the assault on Castro.[1]

The underground leaders kept in touch with the invasion headquarters by radio. They were constantly told to wait for final orders, which would be coordinated with the landing.[1]

But their orders never came. Castro's own radio gave the underground its first knowledge of the invasion. The volunteers in the hills were finally told by radio that the arms drop was off. When they came out of the hills, many of them were captured and thrown into prison.[1]

Nevertheless, the invading troops killed an estimated 1,800 of Castro's soldiers, wounded 4,000, and captured 800. That means five Castro casualties for every Cuban freedom fighter put ashore during the invasion.[7]

At 9 a.m. on Wednesday, a U.S. warship, within sight of the shore, asked by radio if the invaders wanted to be evacuated. The freedom fighters answered that they needed air support to get the frontline invaders back to the beachhead if they were to be evacuated.[7]

Air support was promised. It would arrive in 10 minutes, then in 6 minutes, then in 3. They were told that the planes were passing over the command ship and would arrive in a minute. To our shame, the air support never did come. The liberators asked for a naval bombardment. The ship replied that it could not.[7]

On the third day of asking what had happened to the support they had been promised, the patriots were told that they would be given no further support, and that they were on their own.[8] The situation was hopeless, so the invading troops attempted to reach the U.S. warships off the Cuban coast. But the warships left the freedom fighters to the mercy of Castro.[1] Even those in lifeboats or struggling in the water were abandoned.[2]

The United States had appointed some Cuban officers to be in charge of thousands of dollars in cash. In the event that the invasion failed, the liberators were to be given $20 each. This would help them lose themselves in the Cuban population. When the time came for this plan to go into operation, the officers and the money could not be found.[1]

At 5 p.m. on Wednesday, Commander San Roman issued the order for the brigade to break up into guerrilla units and try to reach the Escambray Mountains, which were 50 miles away.[7]

The Bay of Pigs was not the first site selected for the landing. A place farther away from Havana, more difficult for Castro's forces to reach, had previously been chosen. At that site, the plan was given a 50–50 chance of success. Then, for various reasons, it was changed to the Bay of Pigs—nearer to Havana, and easier for Castro's forces to reach. There, the military experts gave the invasion less than an even chance.[6]

The invasion plan approved by the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff required that the invaders control the air over Cuba.[5] The fact that the invaders were denied air support and cover cannot be charged against the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They were overruled.

The Bay of Pigs invasion was an American-sponsored operation. The Cuban invasion forces had been trained by American military men. The patriots had been supplied with American weapons. Even the planning, including the choice of invasion site, was done by Americans.[6]

Two American aircraft carriers lay nearby when the invasion took place. There were several American destroyers on hand. There was even a battalion of U.S. Marines. The tragedy is that those American forces were forbidden by the President to help the Cuban freedom fighters win the American-sponsored invasion of their homeland.[6]

Whether the invasion would have succeeded if Kennedy had not called off the air strike, is perhaps debatable. But the experts agree that 1,400 invaders, without supplies, could not conquer Castro's 400,000 troops.[4] J.F.K.'s order to call off the air strike, scheduled for Monday morning, was the reason the invaders were without supplies. It seems probable that the air strike would have turned the tide in favor of the invaders because they would have had air superiority.

The Bay of Pigs invasion is over. It cost the lives of at least 160 brave young men, but this is no reason to abandon 6½ million people to ruthless communism. They cannot revolt from the inside; Castro's "defensive" weapons would out down those who would try. Therefore, help must come from the outside. As of this date, the United States is still on the "outside." But conditions are changing. If the Communists trained in Cuba can successfully subvert our southern neighbors, then we will not be far behind them. It is for these reasons that the United States must initiate a full-scale offensive to drive the Communists out of Cuba.

This is not a problem of missiles, it is a problem of principles—the principles of human dignity and freedom. And for these principles we should be willing to make any sacrifice. What Abraham Lincoln said at Gettysburg should be applied to Cuba:

"It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take in-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

creased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

---

[1] Ray Henle, "The Bay of Pigs—What Really Happened," Human Events, Mar. 2, 1963, pp. 175–176.

[2] Manuel Penabaz, "We Were Betrayed," U.S. News & World Report, Jan. 14, 1963, pp. 46–49.

[3] "The Air Will be Ours," U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 4, 1963, pp. 33–36.

[4] "Will Cuba Be Rescued?" U.S. News & World Report, May 1, 1961, pp. 37–40.

[5] Stewart Alsop, "The Lessons of the Cuban Disaster," Reader's Digest, Sept. 1961, pp. 43–48.

[6] "How Kennedy Upset Cuban Invasion," U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 4, 1963, pp. 29–33.

[7] "Real Story of the Bay of Pigs," U.S. News & World Report, Jan. 7, 1963, pp. 38–41.

[8] "Senate Must Investigate Cuban Blunder," Human Events, Mar. 23, 1963, p. 238.

[9] "Eighteen U.S. Pilots Hired at Bay of Pigs," San Diego Union, Mar. 2, 1963, p. a–1.

[10] "Invasion Flier's Mother Hits Kennedy Action," San Diego Union, Feb. 28, 1963, p. a–10.

[11] "Cuban Uprising Is Discounted," San Diego Union, Feb. 18, 1963, p. a–4.

The Supreme Court Honored for the Efficient Administration of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the American Judicature Society, celebrating its 50th anniversary, has honored the Supreme Court by adopting a resolution acknowledging the role that the Court has played in insuring that all Americans receive equal justice under the law. The society itself was founded in 1913 to promote the efficient administration of justice. Its journal has served through the years as a clearinghouse of fact and opinion with respect to all phases of the administration of justice and its improvement.

The resolution honoring the Supreme Court was published in the society's golden anniversary issue in April and follows:

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE EFFICIENT ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: 1913–63

Whereas the American Judicature Society, founded in 1913 to promote the efficient administration of justice by means of research, publication, and participation in judicial reform, is completing its first 50 years of service to that cause; and

Whereas the American Judicature Society, from its founding, has advocated unified court organization, effective administrative methods, and modern rules of procedure to provide all persons with fair and expeditious adjudication of their rights and responsibilities under law; and

Whereas the American Judicature Society, on the occasion of its golden anniversary, is honoring outstanding leadership, whether by persons or institutions, in furthering the efficient administration of justice during the past half century; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, during these years, has encouraged and assisted in the establishment of the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Judicial Councils of the Circuits, and the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, provided leadership in developing the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, and continues to foster inquiry, insight, and action to assure more effective administration of justice in an age of change; and

Whereas the American Judicature Society recognizes that each and all of these achievements not only have facilitated prompt and uniform disposition of claims in Federal courts but also have become models for State and local courts throughout this Nation and in the community of nations;

Therefore, The American Judicature Society respectfully acknowledges these pioneering endeavors as symbolic of the ongoing effort by the Supreme Court of the United States to improve the efficient administration of justice and to insure to all persons equal justice under law.

"Gettysburg: Yesterday and Today"—An Address by Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., President, University of Notre Dame, Battle of Gettysburg Centennial Observance, Gettysburg, Pa., June 29, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the people of our country are again facing an issue which stirred America 100 years ago, the issue of making freedom real for all our citizens, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a splendid address which speaks to this issue in moving terms.

I refer to the remarks of the distinguished president of the University of Notre Dame, the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., which were delivered at the centennial observance of the Battle of Gettysburg on June 29, 1963, at Gettysburg, Pa.

The text of Father Hesburgh's address, "Gettysburg: Yesterday and Today," follows:

GETTYSBURG: YESTERDAY AND TODAY

(Address delivered by Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president, University of Notre Dame, Battle of Gettysburg centennial observance, Gettysburg, Pa., June 29, 1963)

Our ceremony began this morning with the blessing of a new plaque attached to the old statue of Father William Corby, one of Notre Dame's distinguished presidents, standing on a rock raising his hand in eternal absolution on a battlefield now empty of the troops who once stood before him on that fateful July 2 morning, 100 years ago, except for those who rest forever beneath this hallowed soil. Much of the scene is lost in 100 years. We would do well to listen to one who was there, who saw what happened, and who recorded it. The writer is Maj. Gen. St. Clair Mulholland, then a colonel in the Irish brigade.

"Now (as the 3d Corps is being pressed back) help is called for, and Hancock tells Caldwell to have his men ready. 'Fall in,' and the men run to their places. 'Take arms,' and the four brigades of Zook, Cross, Brook, and Kelly are ready for the fray. There are yet a few minutes to spare before starting, and time is occupied by one of the most impressive religious ceremonies I have ever witnessed. The Irish brigade, which had been commanded formerly by Gen. Thomas Francis Meagher, and whose green flag had been unfurled in every battle in which the Army of the Potomac had been engaged from the first Bull Run to Appomattox, and was now commanded by Col. Patrick Kelly of the 88th New York, formed a part of this division. The brigade stood in column of regiments, closed in mass. As a large majority of its members were Catholics, the chaplain of the brigade, Rev. William Corby, proposed to give a general absolution to all the men before going into the fight. * * * Father Corby stood on a large rock in front of the brigade. Addressing the men, he explained what he was about to do, saying that each one could receive the benefit of the absolution by making a sincere act of contrition * * * urging them to do their duty, and reminding them of the high and sacred nature of their trust as soldiers and the noble object for which they fought * * * the brigade was standing at 'order arms.' As he closed his address, every man, Catholic and non-Catholic, fell on his knees with his head bowed down. Then, stretching his right hand toward the brigade, Cather Corby pronounced the words of absolution.

"AWE-INSPIRING SCENE

"The scene was more than impressive; it was awe inspiring. Nearby stood a brilliant throng of officers who had gathered to witness this very unusual occurrance, and while there was profound silence in the ranks of the Second Corps, yet over to the left, out by the peach orchard and Little Round Top, where Weed and Vincent and Hazlitt were dying, the roar of the battle rose and swelled and reechoed through the woods, making music more sublime than ever sounded through cathedral aisle. The act seemed to be in harmony with the surroundings. I do not think there was a man in the brigade who did not offer up a heartfelt prayer. For some, it was their last; they knelt there in their grave clothes. In less than half an hour many of them were numbered with the dead of July 2. Who can doubt that their prayers were good? What was wanting in the eloquence of the priest to move them to repentance was supplied in the incidents of the fight."

Father Corby himself wrote a quarter of a century later: "That general absolution was intended for all, not only for our brigade, but for all, North or South, who were susceptible of it and who were about to appear before their judge. Let us hope that many thousands of souls, purified by hardships, fasting, prayer and blood, met a favorable sentence on the ever memorable battlefield of Gettysburg."

THE GREAT TASK REMAINING

What does all of this drama mean to us, a hundred years later, as we stand on the same battlefield? The least that might be expected is that we would understand today, what Father Corby called "the noble object for which they fought" and died. We, too, await our judgment. As President Lincoln put it so magnificently: **"The world will little note nor long remember, what we say here, but can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they have, thus far, so nobly carried on. It** is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they here gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation shall have a new birth of freedom."

This, I take it, is what the Civil War was all about, it was for freedom, and specifically for the freedom of Negro Americans, that it was fought. If we forget this unfinished business, then there will be nothing but mockery in this centennial celebration. We will have missed the deep and tragic issues that cost so many lives.

Bruce Catton has put it so well that I shall not attempt to improve upon his language: "We know that in a strange, almost mystic way, modern America began to take shape in the Civil War. We also know that something priceless was won for us in it—that our American horizon was somehow broadened by it, that it left us with a deeper and more challenging responsibility, with a piece of unfinished business which demands our most earnest attention. * * * The Civil War meant that the Negro slave would become an American citizen and it left us with the eternal, inescapable obligation to see to it that that citizenship is made good.* * * Winning that freedom for the Negro, we won it also for all the people who then or ever would become Americans, including ourselves. We can never have permanently, a second-class citizenship in America. Because of the Civil War, we are not that kind of country.* * * We bought that commitment at the price of 600,000 lives. More Americans than died in all our wars from the American Revolution to Korea. It is something we can never ignore."

OUR UNFINISHED BUSINESS

What better place to ponder our unfinished business this morning than at Gettysburg, where so much of the blood and sweat and tears, that are the price of freedom, were paid. Gettysburg is not just a battlefield; it is a scared shrine of freedom won again, in new proportion, for a nation "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." The struggle, heroically engaged here, still goes on as we commit ourselves anew to this proposition in every village and city of every State in America. The Civil War did not solve the tragic issue; it merely reestablished the proposition and left to us the task of making the promise of our Constitution come true for all Americans.

I am not so sure that President Lincoln always saw this as a moral issue. One of his biographers, Thomas, tells us that when the City of Washington was ringed around by Confederate troops, and the war seemed lost, he suddenly realized with new clarity, what the war was all about. At that time, Thomas says, Lincoln made a promise to God, that if Washington were spared, he would at the earliest opportunity proclaim the moral issue in its clearest terms. Washington was spared, and with the new year, Lincoln, against the advice of his whole Cabinet, made the Emancipation Proclamation. Making it, he flew in the face of practical expediency, and stood clearly and unequivocally on the point of morality. That he was right, and the politicians wrong, might be deduced from his most endearing title here, and especially in all of the new nations around the world: The Great Emancipator.

THE WORK OF FREEDOM

It may not have occurred to you, but each one of us must be, in these our times, great emancipators, to finish up in this centenary year as completely and as dramatically as possible, in all our own communities across the land, the unfinished business of which Lincoln spoke here: the work of freedom. Our President has now spoken out upon the moral issue that faces us all. Our Congress has before it a bill that attempts to hasten the completion of the unfinished business. There may well be another battle of Gettysburg in the Congress, but in the end the issue must be settled as it was settled here, for we are a nation committed to the proposition that all men were created equal. Anything less than that is unworthy of the thousands of men who died here. But when all the laws have been enacted, when all of the judgments of the Supreme Court are assessed, when all the presidential speeches are recorded, there still remains the real unfinished business. Individual Americans died here, and only individual Americans can make that for which these soldiers died at Gettysburg come true in their own communities. Moral issues must be recognized and acknowledged in individual hearts and consciences. The appalling dearth of freedom for millions of Negro Americans today, in voting, in employment, in housing, in education, in public accommodations, and in the administration of justice, is not something automatic. It is a positive act; it is freedom denied by one American to another American, and until every white American decides to act morally toward every Negro American, there is no end to the unfinished business.

The sounds of battle have died away. The heroic deeds are done. Gettysburg is cloaked in peace. But the issue raised and bloodily engaged here still clamors for a final answer. There is six times more Americans in America now than there were at the time of the Civil War. Can we give a final answer at long last? Can we finally make freedom live for all Americans? Only if each one of us dedicates ourselves "to the great task still remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation shall have a new birth in freedom."

THE TRUE CHALLENGE OF GETTYSBURG

This I believe, is the true challenge of Gettysburg today. May all Americans hear it deeply in their hearts and souls and may they ponder the real depths of this greatest domestic challenge of our times which can be expressed no better than President Lincoln expressed it in terms of human equality: "Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived (in liberty) can long endure." Battlefields are like this. They confront us, as they confronted the brave men who made this place a landmark of heroism, with the ultimate of all moral tests: survival.

We are not asked to die, but to live in the spirit of this place. And if we are not capable of upholding the inner core of what America really stands for, no one of us deserves the blessings of liberty for which these men died. Survival, without nationwide liberty, would be a travesty of the victory won here, at the turning point of a bitter, tragic war; it would be a sad anticlimax to the centennial that we celebrate at Gettysburg. America, and the world, deserves better of us, and of these hallowed dead. May each of us be equal to the challenge of Gettysburg: freedom to the free.

Education: Pay for Play?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, legislators and the general public would be considerably more impressed with the sincerity of the arguments for Federal aid to colleges and universities if more of these institutions, themselves, showed more interest and initiative in getting down to the serious business of cutting out playboy athletics and spending time and energy, instead, to raise funds for serious educational purposes

The cost of H.R. 6143, reported by the Education and Labor Committee, would be $1,195 million for just the beginning 3 years. Frankly, there is little evidence that shows a need exists for this Federal aid.

Where are the leaders of our colleges and universities? Which path do they want? Scholarship or play? If there is not enough money to go around it seems unreasonable to expect American taxpayers to cough up to pay the expenses of both.

The following editorial is by Sid Landfield, editor of the Mount Sterling, Ill., Democrat-Message, in his June 5 issue:

JUST WHO IS EDUCATING WHOM?

If you had control of athletic teams of 57 major American colleges and the publicity and profits they brought in were worth millions of dollars, and suddenly you found that some of the brothers were getting a little greedy and knifing each other a little, like offering a kid more to come to one school after he had promised he was going to another—or maybe throwing in a scholarship for his girl as a fringe benefit—what would you do?

Would you say, "OK, we will have contracts. Anybody who says he is going one place and winds up another is a rotten egg and loses a year of eligibility"? Or would you say, "College presidents, kindly inform your faculty athletic committees, athletic directors, coaches and alumni that these are what we laughingly call educational institutions, and henceforth there will be no further pro football, basketball, or pole vaulting—or—to pro wrestling with the lot of you"?

A young lad named Joyce, who is the managing editor of the Cowl, the honor-rated weekly in Providence (R.I.) College, where all basketball fans know was won the National Invitational Tournament in New York last winter, had a few thing to say which deserve at least a small ear. A few days after the team had been feted with gifts which included a legislative proclamation, student Joyce had the intestinal fortitude to mention the event and the NFL, and the Georgia-Alabama exposés in successive paragraphs, in his column in the May 1 issue of the Cowl. He went on as follows:

"It is high time that the guardians of intercollegiate athletics renounced their ostrich-like position and took a closer look at the environment that their programs are breeding. Certainly they would have very little to be proud of. A. Whitney Griswold, the recently deceased president of Yale University, has said of athletic scholarships—they are one of the greatest educational swindles ever perpetrated on American youth.

"University leaders have been idealistically bleating that collegiate sports build character, responsibility and maturity among their athletes (as well as paying the mortgage on the new library). If this is the case, the sports pages with ever-increasing incidents of betting, illegal recruiting, and general immorality, certainly don't reflect this. How character, responsibility and maturity can be developed by allowing 'jerks' to take special tests, come to class when they want to, get away with virtually everything, and still be showered with gifts, is incomprehensible."

The fact is, of course, that in far too many instances college sports have assumed the character of businesses—in both scope and financial condition. The athletes involved become virtual "members of the board," and the adage of "practice, practice, practice," has been replaced by "practice, banquets, and recruiting."

The young editor then said his own school's basketball team was rapidly "approaching corporate status" and called for a reexamination of "goals and values."

We wonder how popular the young editor was around the campus after writing that?

Meanwhile his moneyed elders can reflect on what an NCAA councilor was forced to observe recently: "In some football conferences, football teams are more important than college presidents."

P.S. Help. Help. And as the man once lamented, "I sent my boy to college and spent $10,000—and all I got was a quarter (back)."

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

Appendix

"The Continuing American Revolution and the American Negro"—Address by George S. McGovern of South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, our colleague the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] recently delivered a most thought provoking and superb address before the New York State Young Democrats Convention relating to the position of the American Negro in our present day society. The Senator's excellent analysis of this question, in my opinion, merits a careful reading by every Member of this body. It is indeed a distinct privilege for me to bring this address to the Senate's attention. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONTINUING AMERICAN REVOLUTION AND THE AMERICAN NEGRO

(Address by Senator GEORGE McGOVERN, of South Dakota)

My fellow young Democrats, I hope you will permit this salutation, because it is always pleasurable to consider oneself young, and it is a proud privilege to be a Democrat. Of course, as the classmate of Senator TED KENNEDY and Senator BIRCH BAYH I must admit that there are those even in the venerable Senate who have a stronger claim than I to march under the banner of youth. These are the days in Washington when if a man of 40 walks into a Government conference room, half the occupants will rise in respect to his advanced years.

In a very real sense, the Democratic Party is marked by both youth and age. No other political party anywhere in the world has enjoyed so long a continuous existence. As political organizations go, the Democratic Party is an old party. But our party is also the party of youth, in that our best leaders have always understood the necessity for renewal and rejuvenation.

Tonight, I ask you to consider the urgent need for renewal against the backdrop of the most serious moral crisis facing our Nation—the status of the Negro in America.

The year 1963 marks the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, whose unfulfilled hope continues as our most conspicuous failure in the cause of human dignity, both at home and abroad.

It is no longer possible to separate our domestic condition from our international posture. Thus, no weapon in the Communist propaganda arsenal is so damaging as the stark truth about race relations in the United States. In a world of oppressed colored people struggling for new dignity, no amount of millions spent on the Voice of America can offset the louder voice of racial discrimination.

But the real crisis for America is not so much the image that we project abroad as it is the true moral strength that we maintain in our own land and in our individual hearts. Let us pray God that President Kennedy, the Congress of the United States, the Democratic Party, and the American people will meet that crisis in the best traditions of the Republic. For if we fail here, we shall fail everywhere. What is now at stake is the message of our churches and the practice of democracy.

I do not believe that any of us can really think that the Negro condition is other than the "shame" President Kennedy has called it. We have known for a long time the facts he presented to the Nation so movingly last Tuesday night, but we have comforted ourselves in the knowledge that some steps have been taken on behalf of the Negro. To be sure, a series of decisions of the Supreme Court have cleared important ground. Furthermore, the Kennedy administration has worked harder and accomplished more through executive action for the Negro than any previous administration. Likewise, important civil rights legislation was passed in 1957 and 1960.

So, some of us have been amazed to find in spite of progress, we have misjudged the cry of the Negro for full citizenship. We must swiftly muster all the wisdom and courage we can, for we are going to have to act quickly on a much broader scale. The Negro people have set in motion a moral revolution based on the Judeo-Christian ethic and the politics of Jefferson and Lincoln. That is the power of the democratic ideal which in the long run cannot be denied. It can be resisted, and clubbed, and shot at from ambush, but it cannot be contained, and each new advance will feed new demands until every American is fully free.

As Walter Lippmann puts it: "There is, so to speak, a point of no return in a movement for the redress of grievances. That point is where gradual reform and token appeasement become suddenly not only insufficient but irritating * * *. Then, instead of putting up with a little done slowly, there is a demand that much must be done suddenly."

This is one of the enduring lessons of the American Revolution. That revolution was not born of the cruelest oppression in British imperial history. Indeed, the Colonies enjoyed a comparatively high degree of freedom and independence. Yet, in a condition far better than others had endured, there suddenly came from the ferment of freedom a demand for independence—a willingness to stake lives, fortunes, and sacred honor on the gamble for liberty. Why?

Certainly, the idea was not born in 1776. It had long been affirmed in the ancient Scriptures which the colonial fathers knew so well. Likewise, for centuries prior to 1776, the political and legal expression of the brotherhood of man and the sanctity of the individual had been growing in Anglo-Saxon law. When Jefferson penned the Declaration of Independence, he borrowed heavily from the earlier words of the Englishman, John Locke.

The day before our forefathers were Americans, they were Englishmen steeped in English traditions of law and government. Yet, they severed the ties with the mother country. They insisted on the full measure of their heritage. They insisted on being better Englishmen and truer practitioners of English philosophy than King George III desired. Their demands and demonstrations (of which the Boston Tea Party is only the most celebrated) reached a point of no return, the revolution was on, and Englishmen along the eastern shore of this continent became Americans.

I think if we can understand the spirit of 1776, we can better appreciate the rising expectations that are convulsing the American Negro community and the developing continents of the globe.

The American Revolution and countless other historic demands for a redress of grievances all indicate that the cause of freedom is fired by its own gains. The Negro's march toward full acceptance will accelerate rather than diminish with the victories of each passing day.

Martin Luther King and James Meredith and Medgar Evers have without question moved the Negro's demand for full citizenship to the point of no return.

What, then, is the next order of business—if we reject the possibility of widespread military or police suppression.

I believe it is the legislation which the President is about to propose to the Congress: (1) Extension of the Civil Rights Commission; (2) strengthening of Negro voting rights; (3) empowering the Attorney General to file school desegregation suits; and (4) prohibition of racial discrimination in public places, restaurants, stores, hotels, and theaters.

I earnestly hope that the President will also decide to call for the establishment of a Fair Employment Practice Code.

It will not be easy, but we are going to pass legislation to eliminate the last barriers to equal rights for the Negro. There will be a filibuster, and it will be long and bitter. But we're going to win even if we have to stay in session until Christmas. Indeed, we have no right to celebrate the spirit of Christmas unless by the end of this centennial of the Emancipiation, a full charter of civil rights is incorporated in the law of the land.

We are going to succeed because the American people will not tolerate the only remaining alternative, which is a massive suppression on a mounting scale of the Negro and his white friends.

The Negro's demand for civil justice is greatly complicated by his hunger for better jobs and better schools and better housing at a time when all of these are in short supply for both whites and Negroes. The only answer here is a stepped-up U.S. economy leading to full employment, a stronger program of Federal assistance to schools, and expansion of home construction.

I am one Senator who believes that these domestic needs are so urgent and so fundamental to the strength of our Nation that we ought to shift some of our massive military budget to constructive purposes here at home. We now have enough overkill to destroy the Soviet Union more than 1,200 times. Why not settle for a military capacity along more reasonable lines, and divert a few billion to the desperately needed priorities of jobs, education, health, and housing for those Negroes and whites who languish at the bottom of our affluent society? There can be no denying the fact that racial tensions are aggravated when there are not enough jobs and houses and schools to meet the Nation's needs. Thus, the cry of the Negro for a bigger piece of the national pie has set in motion new pressures for fuller employment in an expanding economy. We should not forget that once the colonists launched the war for independence from England, they unleashed forces that led also to a social revolution of American life.

Even this is not the whole issue in the Negro's challenge, however, and perhaps not the most fundamental. The President has referred to a "moral problem" rooted in our hearts where laws cannot reach. This is the longing of every human being to be accepted as a person of worth, not because it is the law, but because it is right.

I think that in their own way, the Negro demonstrator and his spokesmen are trying to reach this deeper dimension of the racial problem.

We may be better able to comprehend the message of Birmingham and Jackson in 1963 if we see it as a continuance of the forces unleashed at Philadelphia and Boston in 1776. For it seems to me that the Negro is saying to the white man: "If we are not accepted as your brothers, you cannot hold the birthright of America. If we are not free and equal, you cannot be free and equal. If we are not full members of society, your pursuit of happiness is endangered. If America cannot exemplify human dignity and equality at home, how can she hold steady the torch of freedom around the world?"

The Negro, in short, is echoing the words which Adams and Paine and Jefferson dispatched to King George and to their fellow colonist nearly two centuries ago.

I do not press the analogy to suggest that the American Negro wants to withdraw from the Union. The Black Muslim may talk this way, but in so doing, he stands outside the mainstream of Negro life—both religiously and politically; thus, his leadership of his own people is limited to a small fragment.

The American Negro longs to be an American first and a Negro second. He has been molded by America's traditions and culture. He has been schooled in the doctrine of freedom and has died for it on foreign battlefields.

The nonviolent resistance of Martin Luther King—the lunch counter sit-ins, the bus rides, the street parades—have been associated with Gandhi. But Gandhi borrowed the idea from Henry David Thoreau and the New Testament.

The Negro's capacity to refrain from violence even when he is being kicked in the face stems from the religious and cultural traditions of his American past. It came first from the slave balconies of the churches, then from the segregated colored church and from preachers barely literate enough to read the Scriptures and sing the gospel hymns. They were sensitive to the longings of the soul, however, and beyond some doctors of divinity they were attuned to that "man of sorrows, acquainted with grief." Out of the depths of his spirit the Negro created indigenous American art—the spiritual, the blues and jazz.

In this spirit the Negro writer is saying that the frustration which drives the Negro into the streets, the lunchrooms, and the bus terminals is a desperate act of caring about the American ideal. He has been carrying on an unrequited love affair with America until his heart has burst its bounds.

Many voices may be heard in the Negro writer, but I would illustrate with James Baldwin who has been poignant on the theme of the estrangement of both Negro and white in America from each other and from their past. Baldwin was rebel enough and like many a white American who became an expatriate to Europe after World War I, he sought out Paris after World War II.

He found out what the best of his predecessors did—that he had to come home. It is more remarkable in him, though, for he did not know he had a home. From the vantage point of Europe, he found his country. He found out how profoundly American he was. He develops the theme in many places in his "Notes of a Native Son," the very title being itself significant. One brilliant essay develops his confrontation with a native African with whom he had tried to identify in order to recover his racial past. He finds it cannot be done. He is alienated from the African. He is an American. A hybrid American perhaps, physically and in every other aspect of life which is dominated by the memory of the auction block, but still American and linked to his white brother:

"Dimly and for the first time," he writes, "there begins to fall into perspective the nature of the roles they have played in the lives and history of each other. Now he is bone of their bone, flesh of their flesh; they have loved and hated and obsessed and feared each other and his blood is in their soil. Therefore, he cannot deny them, nor can they ever be divorced."

Baldwin goes on to say that he just cannot explain this to the African. Of course, he must establish himself in relation to a past, but he knows that it must be an American one:

"What time will bring Americans," he writes, "is at last their own identity. It is on this dangerous voyage and in the same boat that the American Negro will make peace with himself and with the voiceless many thousands gone before him."

In a recent television spotlight on the Negro in Washington, a colored minister said of his people: "They are too sophisticated to pray, and too angry to laugh." I thought in response that the white man is also "too sophisticated to pray, and too anxious to laugh." The way back will not be easy for either of us, either to the petition for grace on both sides, or the facing of his guilts by the white and the disciplining of his anger by the Negro. It will take us a while to meet and talk and pray as equals. We do not necessarily need to agree upon all matters. Dignity and reason and hopefully a little humor will show the way.

I believe that as both of us renew our heritage, as we relearn our history and tradition, we shall together re-earn freedom. The great Goethe once wrote:

"What you have inherited from your fathers, earn it, in order truly to possess it."

The Reverend S. D. Whitney, Negro minister of Jackson, Miss., speaking at a memorial service for the slain Medgar Evers said: "Somewhere in the dark a sniper waited to play his part as the coward. But bullets do not destroy ideas. Nothing destroys an idea but a better idea. And the best idea is freedom. That is what he was fighting for."

And that is what we are called to do. If we heed that call, old words will be born anew and we will indeed become "One Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

L. E. Worley Receives Jefferson Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to acknowledge an outstanding award which a longtime friend and fellow citizen of Muskogee, Okla., was recently awarded.

The Thomas Jefferson citation, presented by the Department of Commerce Weather Bureau, was recently presented to L. E. Worley of Muskogee for his many years of faithful and accurate public service as a volunteer weather observer.

Mr. Worley richly deserves this distinguished recognition. I think the inscription on the Thomas Jefferson citation which was signed by Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges ably points out why L. E. Worley was picked as one of only five weather observers throughout the Nation to be honored.

The citation notes that Mr. Worley was named for the honor:

> For his 38 years of exceptionally faithful service as volunteer weather observer at Muskogee, Okla.; for superior effort in maintaining complete and legible records of accurate observations; for prompt mailing of reports; for efficient rainfall reporting; and for the highest level of cooperation.

We in Muskogee owe a great debt of gratitude to L. E. Worley. He has indeed made a significant contribution in the area of public service to his fellow citizens through his efforts for the past 38 years as our community's volunteer weather observer.

For this reason, and for the many other contributions Mr. Worley has made to our city, I express my personal appreciation and the appreciation of the city of Muskogee to him. We congratulate him on receiving the Thomas Jefferson award.

On this occasion, I wish also to pay tribute to Secretary of Commerce Hodges and to the Weather Bureau for making possible this recognition to volunteer weather observers for their outstanding achievement.

I think it is fitting and proper that this award honoring outstanding accomplishments in the field of meteorological observations should be named for that great American, Thomas Jefferson, who took an almost unbroken series of weather observations from 1776 to 1816.

My sincere congratulations are extended to L. E. Worley and the other four Jefferson award winners. Their volunteer service as weather observers has indeed been faithful to the Jeffersonian tradition.

First Iron Furnace in West Located in Hancock County, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, according to an article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail of June 16, 1963, the first iron furnace erected west of the Alleghenies was located on Kings Creek, in Hancock County, W. Va. This furnace played an important part, in the history of our Nation, as a supplier of military needs such as cannonballs for Commodore Perry's warships which engaged the British on Lake Erie in the War of 1812.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRY CAME EARLY TO HANCOCK

John Hancock put his name on the Declaration of Independence. West Virginia puts his name on the State's smallest county.

Two years before President Hancock signed the historic document, Peter Tarr had erected the first iron furnace west of the Alleghenies on Kings Creek, near Weirton.

Peter Tarr isn't as famous as John Hancock, but it was that furnace that cast the cannon balls used by Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry to batter down the British fleet on Lake Erie in the War of 1812.

The State's northernmost county had several things in its favor from far back:

It bordered the mighty Ohio River, a gateway to the West. Its gentle hills were well adapted to farming and growing fruit. It had an abundance of fire clay for brick production. It made an early start in the development of the chinaware industry. Coal strata underlay the county. There was some oil and gas, and an early carbon black plant. A high quality of wool was marketed from its sheep. Iron and Steel were important to the area, including Hancock and Weirton.

Today, members of a car-oriented culture turn to Waterford Park to watch thoroughbred horses race. For those who prefer to escape from the cities and industrial complexes, there is Tomlinson Run, West Virginia's most northern State park.

Government Lotteries of El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to take the Members of this House to Central America where the benefits of a national lottery are recognized and accepted by those countries in that part of the world.

El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama are among the 77 foreign countries which show that considerable revenue can be derived from Government regulated, controlled, and supervised gambling.

El Salvador is a tiny country which took in last year almost $6 million. After payment of prizes and expenses, the net profit to the Government came to almost $1 million. The governing legislation provides that the purpose of the lottery is to increase Government revenue for social and welfare expenditures.

Guatemala, although a small nation, has the fiscal wisdom to recognize and accept the worth of a national lottery. In 1962, the gross receipts came to over $2,632,000. The net income to the Government was over $680,000. The net income is placed in a general fund which is used for the construction of the National Theater and for national institutions of culture.

Honduras, also a small and poor country, realizes considerable profits from its national lottery. In 1962, the gross receipts came to about $15 million. The net income amounted to almost $2½ million which was earmarked by the Government for health centers and clinics throughout the country.

Nicaragua did very well last year. It took in over $4 million in gross receipts. After payment of prizes, the total net income to the Government, in 1962, was almost $800,000. These funds are earmarked for the support of hospitals and other forms of social assistance.

Panama has shown that gambling does not have to serve evil ends. In 1962, the total gross receipts were almost $39 million. The net income to the Government, after allowing for prizes and other expenses, was over $6 million. This profit is used to support national hospitals, orphanages, and welfare organizations. A part of these funds are sent to the National Red Cross and various local charities.

Mr. Speaker, in these five countries as well as in all 77 foreign nations, the gambling urge is centralized and channeled so as to achieve beneficial ends. Gambling dollars in all of these countries are not used to shore up racketeers as in the United States. They are used for the people's welfare and the government's need.

When we fully realize the merits of a national lottery, we too will be able to siphon funds from the pockets of gangsters into the pockets of hard-pressed taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, if we would only open our eyes and see beyond our noses, we would see that a national lottery in the United States could offer a great deal to our people. We can easily and voluntarily pump into our Government coffers over $10 billion a year in needed additional revenue which can help provide a tax cut and reduction of our national debt.

How much longer must the American taxpayer continue to be the victim of pure and simple hypocrisy?

Meet Dick Maher, Seer of Cleveland Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, one of the most outstanding political columnists in the Nation today is Richard L. Maher, politics editor of the Cleveland Press, a member of the Scripps-Howard League of Newspapers and one of the great newspapers of Ohio and the country. For over 30 years Dick Maher has shown extraordinary perception and insight in the political problems of the State and the Nation. It is very rare, indeed, that this 20th century Nostradamus has failed to predict accurately the outcome of an election or a political situation.

More important, his reputation for fairness and integrity surpasses that of his prophetic insight. In all the years that I have known him and read his column, I have never found him to be unjust or to use his position to take advantage of those who may disagree with him. He has the admiration and respect of political leaders and citizens of both parties, and this has been manifested on many occasions.

Mr. President, in the Scripps-Howard News of July 1963, there appeared an excellent article, "Meet Dick Maher, Seer of Cleveland Politics." I commend this to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEET DICK MAHER, SEER OF CLEVELAND POLITICS

(By Bob Love)

A 20th-century Nostradamus has been covering politics for the Cleveland Press for the last 30 years, under the byline of Richard L. Maher.

So amazingly accurate are his political predictions that 10 years ago it was agreed around the Cleveland Press city room that to the old saying, "nothing is sure except death and taxes," should be added: "and Dick Maher's political predictions."

The man is just almost never wrong on any electoral contest, whether it be local, State, or national. He has come to be regarded and respect as one of the Midwest's most acute observers on politics and government.

Contrary to all polls and to the opinions of his colleagues, Maher forecast in 1940 that President Roosevelt would carry Ohio in his bid for a third term. He was not only correct in predicting F.D.R.'s Ohio victory, but came within a shade of the correct percentage.

For this display of prophetic insight and for his coverage of the campaign, he was awarded the Cleveland Newspaper Guild Award for news reporting.

Like Nostradamus, though, the man hasn't always been correct in crystalballing it. Like so many of his seers, Maher thought that in 1948 Dewey would top Truman.

His most recent bit of accurate predicting was on the State elections last November. Maher wrote 3 days before the election:

"James A. Rhodes, will top Governor DiSalle by upward of 100,000 votes. Ralph S. Locher will rout his Republican rival for mayor by 60,000 votes, perhaps even more. FRANK J. LAUSCHE, seeking a second term in the U.S. Senate, will swamp his GOP challenger, John Marshall Briley, by a vote that may run to half-a-million majority."

LAUSCHE won by a 600,000 majority and Locher by nearly a quarter-of-a-million. Rhodes is now Governor of Ohio by a record half-a-million votes.

His amazing record at forecasting election results and his unprejudiced and analytical writing have won him an enviable national reputation.

Without seeking it, Maher has become the confidante of many nationally celebrated people. One day early in 1960 a phone call for Maher came to the city desk.

It was Joe Kennedy, the President's father, in New York, anxious to talk over results with Maher, whom he had heard of, but never met.

They talked for half an hour, and afterwards Maher was able to predict that West Virginia would go big for Kennedy, which it did.

It was in 1932 that Maher became politics editor of the Cleveland Press, 4 years after he had joined the paper as general assignment reporter and rewrite man. He was assistant city editor from 1929 to 1932. He started his newspaper career with the old Cleveland News in 1921.

Maher is trusted and respected by the leaders of both political parties. So well regarded, in fact, that 800 persons from the 2 parties were in attendance at a recent dinner in his honor.

He was being honored by the Ripon Club, a 30-year-old Republican organization, but those in attendance did not have to declare their party.

It was on this occasion that editor Louis B. Seltzer declared: "No one who ever met Dick Maher, or knows him, or works with him, or has confided in him, has anything but the most wholesome respect, regard, and affection for him."

Maher held every office in the Cleveland Council, Knights of Columbus, and was Grand Knight for 2 years before he was 30. In 1948 the K. of C. made him Catholic man-of-the-year.

Dick and his wife, Lucile, have four children. Lucile H., is a school nurse in Las Vegas, Nev., Francis R. and Thomas P. are in the insurance business, and Edward J. is a second-year law student at Georgetown University.

Atlanta's Women of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, each year the city of Atlanta, Ga., chooses five women of the year in the fields of business, civic service, arts, professions, education, and from these five, the woman of the year for Atlanta is selected. This is the 20th anniversary of this outstanding program and Dixie Business magazine, published by Mr. Hubert F. Lee, has paid tribute to all those honored since it was initiated in 1943.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATLANTA WOMAN OF YEAR

The 20th annual dinner to honor the Woman of the Year for Atlanta was like attending the Metropolitan Opera in its historic glory.

We were partial to Mrs. Anne E. Lewis, whose Georgia magazine is one of the finest which our publisher bragged on even before the ink was dry on the first issue.

Dr. Paul West was there pulling for one of his Fulton County teachers, Mrs. Ruby H. Crowe, who was crowned Woman of the Year.

There were five categories: Mrs. Lewis, business; Mrs. Ernest Vandiver, civic service; Mrs. Frank Ferst, arts; Mary Louise Rheay, professions; and Ruby Crowe, education.

Charles Jagels who, with Mrs. John Knox, started it all in 1943, was there, along with many of those honored during the past 20 years.

Doris Lockerman, who was Woman of the Year in business in 1948, wrote in her January 31, 1963, column in the Constitution:

"After 20 years, the woman-of-the-year ceremony is still as fresh, as polished, as dressed up proud as it was in the war years when womanpower was something to be courted and cherished."

ATLANTA FEDERAL SAVINGS 1963

With the dispatch of a business executive, it was announced that the 1963 sponsor would be the Atlanta Savings and Loan Association, with W. O. duVall, the president, representing the sponsors.

The Woman of the Year board for initial planning includes Mrs. William C. Shreve, chairman, and Mrs. Samuel C. Inman, cochairman, Mrs. Henry D. Furniss, Miss Helen McDuffie, Mrs. John S. Knox, and Mrs. Thomas Hal Clarke.

Mrs. Ruby H. Crowe, 1962 Woman of the Year, was added to the board, along with Mrs. Thorwald Eros, Jr., and Mrs. Claiborne Glover, Jr.

Other board members include Mrs. Donald Hastings, who arranged the flowers that were breathtaking; Mrs. Charles T. Pottinger, woman of the year secretary; Mrs. Robert Adamson, Mrs. Harold Cooledge, Mrs. Samuel C. Inman, Mrs. James D. Robinson, Mrs. Albert Thornton, and Mrs. Robert Watt.

For Mrs. Anne E. Lewis it was a fitting tribute that marked her 6th year as editor and publisher of Georgia magazine, which she started in 1957 in Decatur, Ga.

At 18, she graduated from Columbia College, S.C., and taught school for 3 years, then married William "Bill" W. Lewis in 1925.

At Whitmire, Mrs. Lewis reared five children, wrote articles and for 3 years pubpublished the Whitmire (S.C.) News before moving to Decatur, Ga., in 1952.

Mrs. Lewis once wrote, "Publishing is a terrible tar baby—there is no getting unstuck from it."

Mrs. Lewis is gracious as she is competent. The Georgia House of Representatives gave her a citation, one of many honors she has earned.

Here is the list of those honored for distinguished service over the years since 1943.

In 1943: Mrs. Edna Benton, Dr. Winton Elizabeth Gambrell, Mrs. Lon Grove, Miss Ira Jarrell, Miss Rhode Kaufman, Dr. Mary Stuart MacDougall, Mrs. Frances Abreu, Davison-Paxson Co., sponsor.

In 1944: Miss Byrd Blankenship, Mrs. Leonard Haas, Mrs. Granger Hansell, Dr. Ellen Finley Kiser, Mrs. Herbert Oliver, Mrs. W. W. Rushton, Mrs. G. W. Hamm; Georgia Power Co., sponsor.

In 1945: Miss Jessie Candish, Mrs. James H. Crosland, Miss Ethleen Lasseter, Mrs. Ralph E. Nolan, Mrs. James O'H. Sanders, Mrs. Carroll West; Atlantic Coca Cola Bottling Co., sponsor.

In 1946: Miss Katherine Comfort, Mrs. Robert H. Jones, Jr., Mrs. Frank E. Lowenstein, Miss Florence Van Sickler, Dr. Catherine Sims, Mrs. Francis C. Dwyer; Atlantic Gas Light Co., sponsor.

In 1947: Mrs. Dorothy Alexander, Miss Angela Cox, Mrs. Charles R. Liebman, Dr. Elizabeth Martin, Miss Ruth Sheafe, Miss Ira Jarrell; Retail Credit Co., sponsor.

In 1948: Mrs. Dorothy Floyd, Mrs. Eugene Harrington, Miss Anna Kothe, Mrs. Doris Lockerman, Mrs. Howard C. Smith, Jr.; J. P. Allen & Co., sponsor.

In 1949: Miss Ruth E. Haverty, Mrs. Fanny D. Hinton, Mrs. Turner E. Smith, Mrs. Laurie Davis Webster, Miss Dorothy Orr; Southwestern Bell T. & T. Co., sponsor.

In 1950: Mrs. Mark Kate Duslin, Miss Jessie Lowe, Mrs. Chester E. Martin, Miss Anne Grace O'Callaghan, Miss Margaret Bryan (Mrs. C. Evans Joseph); Sears, Roebuck & Co., sponsor.

In 1951: Mrs. John L. Harper, Mrs. Clifford M. Ragsdale, Mrs. Wm. M. Robertson, Mrs. T. Erwin Schneider, Miss Ella May Thorton, Miss Evelyn Ewing; Scripto, Inc., sponsor.

In 1952: Miss Emma Billingsley, Miss Judy King, Dr. Evangeline Papageorge, Mrs. Angus Perkerson, Miss Margaret Shannon, Miss Kitty Thomson; C. & S. National Bank, sponsor.

In 1953: Mrs. Howell Ross Hanson, Mrs. Robt. C. Hunt, Mrs. F. W. Patterson, Miss Ruth Weegand, Mrs. Goodrich E. White, Dr. Leila Denmark; First National Bank, sponsor.

In 1954: Miss Tommie Dora Barker, Lt. Col. Ruby G. Bradley, Mrs. Gertude Harris, Mrs. Raymond Massey, Miss Catherine Rice, Mrs. Mills B. Lane, Jr.; The Coca Cola Co., sponsor.

In 1955: Mrs. Frank Kells Boland, Mrs. Edwin McCarty, Miss Ruth McMillan, Miss Elizabeth Stevenson, Mrs. Chas, H. Williams, Miss Ruth Blair; Lockheed Aircraft Corp., sponsor.

In 1956: Miss Sara Frances McDonald, Miss Virginia McJenkins, Miss Celestine Sibley, Miss Eunice White, Mrs. Rembert Marshall; Trust Co. of Georgia, sponsor.

In 1957: Miss Katharine C. Bleckley, Mrs. Dan Byrd, Jr., Mrs. Walter B. Spivey, Mrs. Elizabeth A. Sterling, Miss Nora Belle Emerson; Ford Division, Ford Motor Co., sponsor.

In 1958: Miss Carolyn Hope Becknell, Dr. Vernelle Fox, Mrs. Patricia Noot LaHatte, Dr. Catherine Strateman Sims, Mrs. Annie Sue Brown; Delta Air Lines, sponsor.

In 1959: Mrs. J. B. Clifton, Mrs. Ernest Felber, Mrs. Carolyn Pennisi, Mrs. Herman E. (Betty) Talmadge, Mrs. Leon Frohsin; Colonial Stores, sponsor.

In 1960: Mrs. Lovic P. Baker, Mrs. Gutherie Foster, Dr. Mamie Joe Jones, Dr. Jane Russell Wilhelmi, Mrs. James N. Frazer; Atlanta Biltmore Hotel, sponsor.

In 1961: Mrs. T. M. Breeden, Jr., Mrs. Leonard Hass, Miss Kathleen Elizabeth MacKay, Mrs. Richard A. Trotter; Bank of Georgia, sponsor.

In 1962: Mrs. Frank Ferst, Mrs. Ann E. Lewis, Miss Louise Rheay, Mrs. S. Ernest Vandiver, Mrs. Ruby H. Crowe; Coca Cola and Sprite, sponsors.

Rabbi Ranson Brotherhood Chapel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, Temple Sharey Tefilo in the city of East Orange, N.J., recently dedicated a brotherhood chapel in honor of its former Rabbi Marius Ranson.

On this occasion, Mr. George E. Stringfellow, general chairman of the East Orange centennial committee, gave outstanding tribute to the services Rabbi Ranson gave to his fellowman and to his community.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby place Mr. Stringfellow's address in the RECORD.

RABBI RANSON BROTHERHOOD CHAPEL

President Fielo, Rabbi Soltes, Rabbi Ranson, Mayor Kelly, friends and neighbors, as general chairman of East Orange's Centennial Committee, I am delighted to extend the organization's greetings and best wishes to the members of Temple Sharey Tefilo on the occasion of the dedication of this beautiful brotherhood chapel in honor of the Temple's former rabbi, Marius Ranson. As chairman of a large civic group of citizens of all faiths, I am honored to be invited to participate in this dedication service.

This temple for years has been recognized as one of the community's great assets. We, the citizens of East Orange, therefore share with you the benefits of a dream that has become a reality.

RABBI RANSON

Your setting aside in this fine new building a brotherhood chapel in honor of my friend, Rabbi Marius Ranson, is I am sure appreciated by everyone in this community. We of this area owe much to Rabbi Ranson for his contribution to the spiritual uplift of our people during the long period in which he served this highly respected temple with efficiency and distinction. Those of us who know him (and his friends are legion) feel that he richly deserves the honor which you are bestowing upon him today and we are pleased that you are doing it while he and his gracious wife, daughter and grandchildren can enjoy it.

Dr. Ranson was long accepted by the community as our rabbi. My association with him before he went to Florida was always pleasant and mentally profitable.

My work with our rabbi convinced me that his sole recreation, his only pleasure, his real compensation, his only measure of success in life is the opportunity to be of service to his fellow man and for the expression of friendship to all men. No nobler life can any man live.

While the rabbi delivered good sermons, it is my candid opinion that he preached a better sermon with his life than with his lips, and that, in my opinion, is an accomplishment which few men attain.

I believe it was Aristotle, that great lover of democracy who, in his wisdom said, "The greatest compliment one man can pay another is to say that he is a good citizen." That is the compliment I truthfully pay to my good friend, mankind's benefactor, your honored guest, Dr. Rabbi Marius Ranson.

Wyoming County, W. Va., Settled by Veterans of the Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Wyoming County in West Virginia is proud of the fact that its earliest settlers were veterans of the American Revolution. Many of these settlers became prosperous farmers and plantation owners who dominated county politicis until the Civil War.

An interesting historical article on Wyoming County appears in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail of June 16, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WYOMING COUNTY, W. VA., SETTLED BY VETERANS OF THE REVOLUTION

Wyoming County was created December 17, 1849, by Act of the General Assembly, by division of Logan County. The movement was sponsored by leading citizens of both upper and lower Logan, led by James H. Ferguson, an attorney.

Statistics of the time read: Present area 507.2 square miles; terrain generally steep and rocky, heavily timbered; one large and other smaller areas of good farmland; extensive areas underlaid with smokeless coal and natural gas. Population 1,583 whites, 61 slaves, 1 free black. County government organized March 22, 1850.

Prosperous farmers and plantation owners dominated county government and politics, and held county offices until Civil War.

Earliest settlers were veterans of the Revolution. First settlement made by John Cooke, 1799, called "Cookes," later named Oceana, was county seat until 1907. Most of our settlers came from Kentucky, Virginia, and North Carolina. Three of them owned slaves.

The ensuing decade saw a steady growth in population and progress generally. The people lived by farming, trading, digging ginseng, and various trades. There were dozens of water grist mills and a few whipsaw type sawmills. The inadequate public schools were supplemented by private subscription schools. Methodist and Baptist circuit riders preached at the three Baptist churches and homes. Population in 1860: 2,861.

In 1861: Recruiting began immediately after secession of Virginia. County government ceased to function, the county offices were locked up and no records kept. The only local fighting was done by Home Guards. Public buildings and records were not damaged, and few homes were burned.

In 1865: H. J. Samuels reorganized the county government and held court. Five men were indicted for war crimes, two of whom were subsequently tried and convicted. Union men took over the county government. The school system and Baptist churches were reorganized.

In 1874: Speculators bought extensive areas of timberlands, and there was talk of a railroad to facilitate development of timber and coal. A weekly newspaper was established at Oceana. There were substantial settlements in every section of Wyoming, with postal routes and post offices, and dirt roads connecting them with mills and the county seat.

In 1884: Philadelphia interests began buying coal and mineral rights. In 1903 T. N. Barnsdall bought the first of many tracts of coal, oil, and gas, with mining and removal rights. Natural gas was discovered on Milam Fork 1918, and made available for domestic use in that area.

Extensive drilling during the 1940's by Hope Natural Gas Co. and others resulted in construction of two large and costly gas stations, laying pipelines for transportation of gas, and gas made available for domestic use around 1940. Drilling continues.

Between 1882 and 1903, nine different companies considered building a railroad into Wyoming. In 1905 the Virginian Railway built its line through upper Wyoming coalfields. The first commercial mine opened near Mullens, 1912, beginning a period of phenomenal growth and prosperity which lasted into the 1920's.

In 1891: Outside interests began timbering operations in Oceana district, floating logs down Guyandot River to market. In 1895, C. Crane & Co. began operations, floating logs down creeks by means of splash dams, into the Guyandot, and continued in business until 1912. Timbering on a smaller scale and sawmilling continue to this day. Population 1890, 6,247.

In 1895, 90 frame, one-room schoolhouses replaced the log cabins. Beginning 1909, seven district high schools were established, which now have modern fireproof buildings and modern equipment for teaching and athletics. Few one- or two-room schools remain. Trade school established 1942. Population 1900: 8,380.

Population 1950: 37,590, reduced to 34,834 in 1960, by loss of miners and business caused by mechanizing mines.

The Democrats regained control of Wyoming, 1932, and continue in power.

In 1963: Our three municipalities have approved water supply, garbage and sewage disposal, firefighting equipment, paved streets, limited recreational facilities. The county has two banks, two weekly newspapers, 125 churches, various civic clubs and secret orders, medical and dental facilities, one general hospital, three clinics, three funeral homes, ambulance service, two dry cleaning plants, self-service laundries, supermarkets, chain grocery stores, electric power since 1926, telephone service since 1936, TV service, and permanent courthouse, jail and county annex.

MARY K. BOWMAN.

Remarks by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, July 4, 1963, at Philadelphia, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to place in the RECORD remarks delivered by the Vice President of the United States on July 4, 1963, at Philadelphia marking the 187th observance of Independence Day.

It is significant that in this time of world challenge, in this day of national soul searching, in this decade while men and women of all countries seek equality and justice, the Vice President of these United States in these remarks gives validity to the immortal concepts as expressed by the words of our Constitution:

PROTECTION OF LIBERTY

On this honored day, here before this historic hall, we come together to celebrate the birth of our country. Yet it is the special privilege of our generation to know that this is not the cradle of liberty for Americans alone—it is, in a far larger sense, the cradle of liberty and independence for all mankind.

What was wrought here in the 18th century has changed the world in this 20th century. To the farthest corner of the globe, men inspired by the Declaration of Independence have themselves declared their own independence. Fifty new nations have been created since World War II. None has chosen to adopt the Communist system but many have adopted the ideas—and even the very language—of the great documents of our American heritage.

Of this, we can be justly proud. But the patriot is not content with pride alone—he is concerned first and always with performance. This is the challenge of our system and our society lays before all Americans today.

We are challenged to measure ourselves—to measure our own performance today—by that eternal standard set forth on this 4th of July in 1776.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

On those words of 1776—and on the belief those words express—history's strongest nation and most successful society has been built. By the meaning we give to those words in this year of 1963, the fate and future of our Nation—and the success of the cause we are privileged to lead—may well be determined.

This is a challenge. It is not an indictment. Our system has not failed. It is not in danger of failing. Our national soul is not lost. It is not in danger of being lost. The standards of law and order are not coming down—on the contrary, we can believe that they are now rising higher. For our whole history has been a history of enlarging the protections of individual liberty, even as we are called and challenged to do once more today.

Hardly had the Constitution been written than the people demanded of their leaders the protections of their liberties embodied in the Bill of Rights. The sons and grandsons of the Founding Fathers were challenged to extend those protections to the slave. Their sons and grandsons were, in turn, petitioned in the streets and public places to extend equality to women as well as men. We, as their heirs, have been challenged no less forcefull to mobilize our arms, our resources, and our young men to protect and defend the liberties of freemen throughout the world.

It has been the destiny of each generation of Americans to make liberty more secure for all by making liberty more certain for each of us. This is clearly the great destiny—and great privilege—which we of this generation face in our own land now.

The words on which our Nation stands—the words on which it has stood 187 years—are clear and unmistakable. We would demean ourselves, we would demean our patriotism, we would demean our dignity as freemen to interrupt the course of our national progress to enter upon a prolonged debate about either the meaning of those words—or the obligation they impose upon us to honor and fulfill their meaning.

The words of the Declaration of Independence—the words of the Constitution of the United States—do not need to be further interpreted.

They need to be implemented—for all Americans.

But implementation is not the work of government alone.

Governments can never be more just than the hearts of those from whom they derive their just powers. If we are to enjoy a just and tranquil society, we must reach decisions in our private hearts even as we strive to reach decisions in our public policies. This is our real challenge today.

These times—the issues of this moment in our history—call out for men and women who love their country to step forward with responsible leadership to implement in our national life the ideals of our national literature.

In every State, in every community, in every American home we have the capability to answer the needs of this moment. It is the responsibility of each individual to put those capabilities to work to secure the answers required for the success of our system and society.

If we as a nation are to stand up to our full height in the world, we must be concerned with nobler things than denying one another the simple right to sit down in public places.

If we as a nation are to stay in front of the world we must occupy ourselves with more important concerns than asking one another to step to the rear of public vehicles.

If we are to commit our arms, our resources and the lives of our young men to support the right of freemen to come and go without molestation or harrassment to a free city such as Berlin, we can make no less a commitment to assure the right of all our fellow countrymen to come and go without embarrassment or harrassment along the highways of America itself.

We of this generation have proved ourselves worthy heirs of those who assembled here on July 4, 1776. We, no less than they, have pledged "our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor" to preserve for freemen throughout the globe life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. What we have done so courageously for others, let us now do proudly for ourselves.

This is the spirit of this Day of Independence—the spirit of America itself. For as Thomas Jefferson wrote in the last letter before he died on the 50th anniversary of this great day:

"All eyes are opened, or opening, to the rights of man * * * For ourselves, let the annual return of this day forever refresh our recollection of these rights and an undiminished devotion to them."

Proposed Freedom Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently the Minneapolis Star published an editorial concerning the pending bill to establish a Freedom Academy. In response to this editorial I have received a letter from my friend, Henry Mayers, of Los Angeles, Calif., in which Mr. Mayers seeks to clarify certain points made in the editorial.

Since I believe that members of the Senate will be interested in these points of clarification, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Mayers' letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 22, 1963.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: On May 8, 1963, the Minneapolis Star published an editorial entitled "Different Academies," which referred to the Freedom Academy bill (S. 414) as proposing "to emulate the Russians in Cuba and train nationals of other nations in murder, sabotage and general subversion."

This is not an isolated example of such defamation of the nature of the Freedom Academy bill and the objectives of its senatorial sponsors and citizen advocates.

But as the above newspaper is the most prominent one in the State of Minnesota, I call it to your attention as a typical example of the confusion and misinformation that exists concerning the bill, not only in the American press, but throughout official Washington itself.

As you know, the bill's statement of congressional findings and policy says "Not only do we need to improve the existing instruments, but a wide range of additional methods and means in both Government and private sectors must be worked out and integrated—to defeat the many forms of Communist aggression and to extend the area of freedom, national independence and self-government—in accord with our ethic."

What the bill proposes be researched and taught in a Freedom Academy will be no more subject to ethical challenge than what is to be taught in the State Department's proposed National Academy of Foreign Affairs bill (S. 865). But the Freedom Academy would give such training in greater depth and on a wider scale.

The State Department's bill does not go far enough in reaching all segments of Foreign Service personnel who should receive training, and it makes a mere gesture toward the training of non-Government personnel. The Freedom Academy bill undertakes serious research and development, leading to training programs for such private sector groups as the U.S. oversea business community, foreign correspondents, students at foreign universities, tourists and other segments of our society likely to be confronted with the realities of Communist political warfare abroad.

The Freedom Academy bill also provides for the training of Government personnel and private citizens of other free world nations. The assumption is that if such training is useful for Americans, it is equally, if not more useful for the nationals of other countries who continually face the assault of the Kremlin's highly trained political warriors, operating in their homeland.

Needless to say, the training is in the principles of freedom and democratic change, not in how to defend current U.S. policies.

I have met a surprising number of officials in Washington, some in the very highest echelons of the Government, who freely dispense misinformation concerning the Freedom Academy bill. Few, if any of them, have troubled to read the bill. I know I can count on your cooperation in calling for unprejudiced consideration of this bipartisan legislation by every American concerned with a realistic approach to the cold war challenge.

Sincerely,

HENRY MAYERS,
Chairman, Cold War Council.

J. Edgar Hoover Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the permission given to me, I am pleased to include with my brief remarks a copy of a resolution passed on the 20th day of June 1963, at the 51st Annual Conference of the New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police commending the leadership and cooperation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation under its immortal Director, J. Edgar Hoover

I am sure that my colleagues and every true American feel a real sense of indebtedness to Mr. Hoover for his unselfish and devoted attention to the demands of his office and the meticulous care and thoroughness in the discharge of his duties. He is an example to all of us and I know an inspiration to many.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF NEW JERSEY STATE ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE

Whereas the members of the New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police and their respective departments continually receive excellent cooperation and assistance from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, and its various divisions; and

Whereas Director Hoover and Special Agent in Charge of New Jersey Ralph W. Bachman have diligently supported the aims, objectives, and ideals of this association and assisted tremendously in police training in New Jersey; and

Whereas the members of this association sincerely appreciate a most inspiring and timely address presented by Special Agent in Charge Ralph W. Bachman, during our 51st annual conference: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this conference and a copy transmitted to Director Hoover with our greetings and best wishes and heartfelt appreciation for the splendid cooperation and assistance continually received, and our confidence and trust in Director Hoover and his associates affiliated with the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of said resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, and to Special Agent in Charge Ralph W. Bachman, as well as the Governor of the State of New Jersey, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes, and the U.S. Senators and Congressmen in the State of New Jersey.

Adopted, this 20th day of June 1963, at the 51st annual conference of the New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police held at Spring Lake, N.J.

Chief John W. Budd,
President.

Attest:

Chase Runyon,
Secretary.

Corn Tassel for National Flower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include House Concurrent Resolution 16 recently adopted by the Iowa General Assembly urging the Congress of the United States to adopt the corn tassel as the national floral emblem, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 16

Whereas in recognition of the importance of corn to our Nation's Founding Fathers, present citizens and future generations; and

Whereas in gratitude for nature's gift of this versatile and vital, lifegiving plant; and

Whereas in view of the fact that this native plant of the United States grows in all 50 of the United States; and

Whereas in realization that this plain, homespun, simple and tough-of-fiber plant with its earthiness and unaffected genuineness will give the United States a truly unique floral symbol; and

Whereas in view of the fortunate geographical position of Iowa as heart of the Nation's great Corn Belt: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That the 60th General Assembly of the State of Iowa urges the Congress of the United States to adopt the corn tassel as the national floral emblem; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the Chief Clerk of the House to the President of the United States, and to each Member of the Iowa delegation of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

Robert W. Naden,
Speaker of the House.
William R. Kendrick,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Coercion of Government by Mob Violence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, reading the editorial views of many of our newspapers and magazines, it is evident that our Nation is becoming increasingly conscious of the pressures currently being exerted upon them to accept government by force rather than by choice. Mob violence and demonstrations have never and will never justify government by the mob.

In the July 1 issue of U.S. News & World Report there appeared an interesting and all too true editorial by David Lawrence entitled, "Government by Mob." Mr. Lawrence, in reviewing the history of this Nation, brings out the fascinating and forgotten story of the ratification of the 14th amendment. This amendment, on which the administration's recently proposed civil rights legislation is largely based, was indeed never honestly ratified as a part of the Constitution. In reviewing this history and the coercion which caused the so-called ratification of the 14th amendment, Mr. Lawrence asks if under a system of democratic government there is a place for fraud or the coercion of government by mob violence. Is this not exactly what is happening in America today? Are we again going to be forced by the violence displayed by a mob to accept principles and laws contrary to that which we believe to be best for our States and our Nation as a whole?

I also have an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of June 24 entitled "The Madness of the Mob." Here again we find the same warning against allowing hysteria to provoke the voice of the mob to be heard above the voice of reasonable, logical thinkers.

Mr. President, I ask that both of these fine, wise editorials be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered printed in the Record, as follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, July 1, 1963]

GOVERNMENT BY MOB

(By David Lawrence)

Government in a free country cannot submit to lawmaking under coercion. We can never accept the doctrine that, because an objective is worthy, the means of attaining it does not matter.

President Kennedy, in his latest message to Congress, testifies, in effect, to the fact that the mob has sought to influence the acts of Government. He says:

"During the weeks past, street demonstrations, mass picketing and parades have brought these matters to the Nation's attention in dramatic fashion in many cities throughout the United States.

"This has happened because these racial injustices are real and no other remedy was in sight.

"But, as feelings have risen in recent days, these demonstrations have increasingly endangered lives and property, enflamed emotions and unnecessarily divided communities. They are not the way in which this country should rid itself of racial discrimination. Violence is never justified; and, while peaceful communication, deliberation and petitions of protest continue, I want to caution against demonstrations which can lead to violence."

But is it true that, when the demonstrations that provoked violence began a few weeks ago, "no other remedy was in sight"? Was the President unable to present a "civil rights" program in the last 2 years, and did it become feasible for him to do so, politically or otherwise, only when lives and property were threatened?

No President is justified at any time in seeking to impose unconstitutional "remedies" in order to satisfy the pressures of the mob. American history records many a tragedy because government succumbed to the doctrine that "the end justifies the means."

For instance, can the very 14th amendment—on which the proposed "civil rights" legislation is largely based—be accepted as ever having been honestly "ratified" as a part of the Constitution?

The record shows a transparent fraud. The legislatures of the Southern States were regarded as legal when after the war, they ratified the 13th amendment, abolishing slavery. But these same legislatures were branded as illegal by Congress the moment they rejected the 14th amendment. A law was passed by Congress in 1867 over the President's veto ordering the Southern States to ratify the 14th amendment or be deprived of statehood. Yet Presidents Lincoln and Johnson had insisted that the Southern States were never legally out of the Union.

Congress, however, not only scorned the legal position of the southern States, but disregarded the wishes of Ohio and New Jersey, which ratified the amendment and then rescinded their action. The Secretary of State, William H. Seward, was doubtful that there had been any legal ratification and said so publicly, whereupon Congress, by resolution, ordered him to proclaim the 14th amendment as duly ratified.

Nowhere in the Constitution is Congress given the right to order a State to ratify or reject an amendment to the Constitution, nor can a proclamation by the Secretary of State make lawful a ratification that is plainly spurious. The Supreme Court of the United States has consistently refused for many decades to rule on the evidence in this notorious case. As recently as 1939, the Court brushed aside a problem involved in the ratification process by saying this was a "political question." In its plea of avoidance, the Court said it could not review an action by Congress in this category. But the Supreme Court has not declined to declare unconstitutional other actions of Congress.

President Kennedy, in a recent address, said there have been "100 years of delay" in giving equal rights to all citizens. There now have been 95 years of delay in getting an explicit ruling from the judiciary on the fraud committed in 1868, when the so-called 14th amendment was declared "ratified." Everybody at the time knew that the members of southern legislatures which had ratified the 13th amendment were arbitrarily unseated, and that the new hand-picked members—a large number of whom were Negroes who could neither read nor write—were coerced by military rule to vote for ratification of the 14th amendment. The history books tell the story.

Should not this bother the conscience of the American people? It is no answer to say that, since the objective was good and the principle of equal rights is correct, we need not worry about the letter of the law or any acts of deception. This is the philosophy of Machiavelli—that "the end justifies the means." It is at variance with the concept of a written constitution.

Government by mob, whether in 1868 or 1962, is not government by law. Sooner or later, a troubled conscience will lead the Nation to correct a grievous error and adopt a legalized 14th amendment.

A remedy for illegality is never unavailable in a truly free society.

Under a constitutional system, there is no place for fraud or the coercion of government by mob rule.

[From the Wall Street Journal June 24, 1963]

The Madness of a Mob

When the Supreme Court a decade ago first struck down official segregation in the public schools, the most vocal Southern opponents—the people called extremists—defended segregation with two arguments.

One was that the Negro people as a group, whatever the individual exceptions, were neither sufficiently socially advanced nor politically mature for full integration into the community.

The second contention was that the political leaders fighting southern segregation practices had a more far-reaching objective than the mere striking down of the segregation laws themselves. The cry was that the ultimate aim was not merely the admission of able and qualified Negroes into white schools but the forcible amalgamation of the two races, socially and otherwise, without regard to any other considerations of the effects of this on society or other people's rights.

Not the least of the tragedies in the present racial situation is that a good many Negro leaders and a great many white politicians seem now bent on lending support to these terrible allegations.

Inflamed by their leaders, the Negro people are deserting the orderly ways society has provided for the redress of their grievances, the very ways which have brought them so much progress in the space of a decade. They are turning from courts to the streets, from arguments to riots.

Look not merely at Birmingham. Look at New York or Pennsylvania, Illinois or California. Look at the Nation's Capital. Not only have there been riotous clashes as mobs poured into the streets, but Negro leaders have announced that if the local authorities don't do thus-and-so, and at once, they will choke the streets with bigger mobs.

The excuse for all this, we are told, is that the Negro's very gains make further patience intolerable. Perhaps so. Yet those who persuade the Negroes that violence is the instant remedy for all ills, or encourage them to practice government by rioting, give ammunition to those who say the Negro is socially and politically immature. In this Nation both of these ideas strike at the very heart of society itself.

So, too, do some of the remedies put forward by many political leaders, whether done from a desire of political gain or from a fear of violence.

In New York State, where race bars no one from a public school, the State board of education says equal rights are not enough. The slightest separation of the races, from whatever cause, must be obliterated. School children must be hauled back and forth like pawns on a chessboard to achieve an arbitrary balance decreed by the political authorities.

Now this is, first of all, as brutal a charge of Negro inferiority as any from the wildest southern extremists, for it accepts the idea that the numerical presence of white children automatically raises the educational level of a school, or conversely, that too many Negro pupils lowers it. Beyond that, this policy ceases to be an extension to all of the equal protection of the laws. It is the denial to all of freedom under law. A Negro family that does not want its child carried to a distant school is equal in helplessness under the power of the State.

On the national level, too, politicians talk more and more of applying the brute force of government to compel people to conduct their private lives as the State directs, hardly pausing to think how this remedy would alter a free society. If some had their way, no man would be free to choose his neighbors, his children's associates, to whom he will give lodging, or to whom he will sell a hot dog.

Few political leaders any longer dare to try to distinguish between a just and worthy cause—the assurance of equal political rights for all citizens in our society—and a headlong assault against society itself, its ways of living, and its ways of ordering the laws by which it lives.

Not the least of the dangers in this is that, if unchecked, it will breed a reaction, as a crowd's excesses always do, and the injury will be not the least to the Negro's own cause. But make no mistake about it. It will be an injury to all if hysteria makes it impossible for a reasonable voice to be heard, if we let the reason of men be engulfed in the madness of a mob.

United States Versus Ecuador: Unrealistic Limits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the New Orleans Times-Picayune:

United States Versus Ecuador: Unrealistic Limits

Both Ecuador and the United States are in unrealistic positions relative to territorial-waters limits; and Canada's declaration of a 12-mile zone for fishing purposes seems nearer sense than any other.

The heavy fining of two U.S. tuna boats seized off Ponte Perales (not on our maps), Manabi Province, Ecuador, has climaxed an incident blurred in factual detail.

References have been made to Ecuador's fantastic 200-mile limit; and to distances of 12 to 14 miles from shore which assertedly were kept by all members of a U.S. tuna fleet. According to one report, Ecuadoran patrolmen charge that two of the boats came not only within the 3-mile limit but to within a mile of shore clandestinely. According to the U.S. State Department, the 3-mile limit was not violated; and in the U.S. view no legal basis could therefore exist for the charges.

Whether the conflicts, extraordinary in themselves, between 1 mile and 12 to 14 miles, or 3 miles and 14 miles, in the two versions can be reconciled, or a correct location ascertained by impartial parties, remains to be seen.

But even if it were ascertained, the question would remain as to the exact wording of the Ecuadoran charges. Violation of the 200-mile limit, would be a charge, for example, that would precipitate a long-brewing issue. It has been alleged by the U.S. fishers that Ecuador charges stiff fees for fishing licenses within her waters, and they leave the impression that these licenses and waters are of 200-mile scope. They say that they quit paying the fees; that this aroused Ecuador's ire; and that when they ventured to observe a sort of 12-mile limit of their own, two of the boats were seized in retaliation, and a frameup was executed placing them in violation not only of a 12-mile but a 3-mile limit. Such charges are not to be lightly considered or accepted.

Though the U.S. 3-mile limit position is historic, and evinces some concern for certain other nations than the United States; though any truly realistic formula is impossible today that uses any of the historic standards, the failure of the United States to move closer to a compromise is hard to understand. One would think administrative opposition to historic boundaries of coastal States of the United States remains somehow stubbornly ascendant. Yet these were sea-bottom, not sea-surface boundaries, for the purposes which Congress held to in the tidelands controversy.

The New Breed of Coal Miner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, earlier last week, on July 2, I spoke at some length regarding the effects on employment in the United States which are resulting from automation, and which will be increasingly evident with the extension of cybernation. I discussed also the serious implications which the processes of automation and cybernation hold with regard to upgrading the skills of the American work force and strengthening the American educational system at every level.

Apropos of my earlier remarks, I draw the attention of my colleagues to an article in the Pittsburgh Press, of July 2, which describes the functions of the "new breed of coal miner" employed at the Gateway Coal Co., of Pennsylvania. This miner, who is also representative of many of the miners employed in the modern and automated mines of our State of West Virginia, never touches a lump of coal. He supervises the machinery and conveyer belts by means of a closed-circuit television system located 500 feet beneath the surface of the earth.

The article points out, Mr. President, that through such technological innovations as this, the bituminous coal industry is in the process of regaining its economic vitality and one again assuming a competitive position in the fossil fuels market in America and in the export trade. I commend the article to my fellow Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Press, July 2, 1963]

Meet the New Breed of Coal Miner

(By Robert Dietsch)

Pittsburgh, July 2.—Five days a week, 47-year-old Paul E. Knepp rides an elevator 500 feet down into the earth to reach his job in a coal mine.

But he doesn't come close to a single lump of coal. Mr. Knepp doesn't even get his hands dirty.

He spends the day watching television—monitoring a battery of four cameras which keep tabs on the 4,000 tons of coal taken from the mine every 8 hours.

In another unique feature, the coal is moved to the mine tipple not by traditional narrowgage railroad but my 9½ miles of conveyor belts.

SHOW STRIDES

The closed circuit TV system and the conveyor belt illustrate the strides made in recent years by the coal industry.

Thanks to good steel production, increased use of coal by electric utilities and higher exports, coal is chalking up one of its best records in years.

As is widely recognized, coal has had its troubles. It was knocked off its pedestal as the "king of fuels" by cross-country natural-gas pipelines and a switch to diesel locomotives by the railroads.

But through automation and successful merchandising of the utility markets, coal has come a long way back.

PREWAR LEVELS

Employment never will return to pre-World War II levels. The job total has been reduced 400 percent since Mr. Knepp began working as an outside mine laborer in 1937.

But as is the case with other heavy industries, today's coal-mining jobs generally call for more skill and more training to match physical improvements made by employers.

The Gateway Coal Co., for example, invested $7.5 million to improve the big mine where Knepp works.

Gateway—owned by the Pittsburgh Steel Co., Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. and Shenango, Inc.—says a "room and pillar" mining technique will permit its 500 employees to recover 95 percent of the coal estimated to be buried on its 12,500-acre property 70 miles north of here on the Monongahela River.

The Gateway coal will be used for steelmaking. Last year, the entire steel industry used 82 million tons of coal.

Big Step for World Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times, of July 8, 1963:

BIG STEP FOR WORLD LAW—DESPITE COMIC AND SERIOUS PROBLEMS, PARLAY FOR PEACE MADE VITAL STRIDES

(By Anthony Lewis)

ATHENS, July 7.—Bringing together lawyers from 105 countries to consider the place of law in international relations can present problems both comic and serious. The exhausted sponsors of the first World Conference on Peace Through Law know that after a week of meeting here. At a formal dinner for 1,000 lawyers and their wives someone had the idea of releasing 40 doves as a symbol of peace. Some flew into the chandeliers. Others went under the tables where they pecked at the diners' feet. The proceedings were suspended for an hour while the waiters chased the birds out.

The ceiling of one restaurant in the new Athens Hilton collapsed during the conference, but fortunately no lawyers were hit.

EMBARRASSING MOMENTS

One morning a young Greek leftist started denouncing the royal family. At a dinner one American at the microphone introduced honored guests and kept saying how hard it was to pronounce their names.

Despite episodes like those, the conference went remarkably well.

From such remote areas as Nepal and Niger, lawyers with little or no diplomatic experience, were able to communicate and share ideas. They were made to feel part of the worldwide profession.

This interchange among lawyers of different races, politics, and religions was one underlying purpose of the conference. The new world organization created by this meeting will hold further conferences and push for international exchanges of lawyers.

The interracial character of the conference was especially striking. The Americans present included a number of Negroes, and there was much talk about the racial crisis in the United States.

The absence of delegates from all the Communist countries but Yugoslavia was a severe disappointment. But an attack on the conference by the Communist-led International Association of Democratic Lawyers evidently fell flat.

MISTAKE BY RUSSIANS

One African delegate said he thought the Soviet Union and other Communist nations made a great mistake in boycotting the meeting. He said they missed an opportunity to talk with genuinely curious lawyers of the new countries, many of them men of influence at home.

All week the most serious problem was the suspicion of U.S. domination. The Americans proposed the conference and raised nearly all the money for it, and there was the feeling they might try to shape the result to their liking.

Most of this feeling was dispelled at the final session when amendments proposed by Asian, African and Latin American delegates were adopted.

The Asians and Africans demonstrated their responsibilities by refusing to support, as out of place at a legal conference, a motion to denounce "imperialism."

AWARENESS OF PROBLEM

In fact, most of the Americans participating recognized the delicacy of the situation from the new countries, many delegates from the smaller, newer countries were shy or inexperienced and did not take part in the hard work of drafting and debating.

Many problems lie ahead. The new World Peace Through Law Center will have to be financed, and it may be difficult to raise enough money outside the United States to avoid the charge of American domination.

In any case, a large scale effort is being made to get the lawyers of the world together on a basis of equality.

The phrases of international law often seem vague and its aspirations starryeyed. But a veteran American lawyer here said this meeting, which he called inconceivable 10 years ago, will do enough if it makes all these lawyers "go home and think some more about the world and peace."

Domestic Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the prime purposes of the proposed National Service Corps is to arouse concern throughout the Nation for the millions of Americans who do not share in our national prosperity or who, in one way or another, do not enjoy the basic necessities of a decent or hopeful life.

It is heartening, even in these days of early discussion about the corps, to find that many individuals and groups are already discovering ways in which the corps would be helpful to people in their home areas. One such suggestion was offered on June 13 in the Scottsdale Daily Progress, Scottsdale, Ariz. An editorial in that issue described the national need, and it also suggested specific projects at which Service Corps volunteers could serve in Arizona.

Mr. President, the editorial reminds us that we can preach democracy abroad only if we face up to our own trouble spots, and I think that this message cannot be repeated often enough. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Scottsdale (Ariz.) Daily Progress, June 13, 1963]

DOMESTIC PEACE CORPS

("The oversea success of our Peace Corps volunteers * * * carrying skills and ideals to needy people suggests the merit of similar corps serving our own community needs," President John F. Kennedy, January 14, 1963.)

It is now 2 years since the oversea Peace Corps was launched amidst skepticism, fear, and ridicule. But in that short time the Peace Corps has done more to win friends for America than most of the polished diplomacy of the past. Equally important, however, it has broadened the vision and made better citizens out of thousands of our young people.

The idea of a domestic Peace Corps may not be as glamorous as is oversea service; nevertheless, it can provide the same benefits to the participants and it can be of great value to millions of suffering Americans.

We frequently overlook the fact that there are suffering people in our own country, but exist they do. According to testimony before Congress, some 32 million Americans can be classified as poor, sick, weak, and unmotivated. These are the people who would be helped by the Peace Corps.

Domestic Peace Corps volunteers working with needy Indians, migratory workers, refugees, mental patients, juvenile delinquents, etc. will not be successful in all cases, and mistakes will be made. But they will perform a valuable service for vast groups of our people who cannot help themselves.

Peace Corps workers at home, like their coworkers abroad, will by example, help to motivate other citizens to give of themselves and to work to better their own communities.

Even though the bill is a long way from passage in Congress more than 50 communities have already submitted projects—several Arizona communities are among them.

Typical of the need in Arizona is the poverty on the Indian reservation 3 miles from Scottsdale's city hall, the desperate need for helpers in the State mental hospital, and the degradation of farm workers 8 miles south in the Guadalupe area.

This is a wonderful country, but we must not close our eyes to its problems. Although a domestic Peace Corps will not solve all of the problems, it is a step in the right direction and it should be made a reality.

Only when we face up to our own trouble spots can we face other nations and preach democracy with a good conscience.

Space and the National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include in the RECORD the address made by Dr. Edward C. Welsh at the Conference on Space Science and Space Law at the University of Oklahoma.

Dr. Welsh spoke to the conference out of a wealth of knowledge acquired throughout a distinguished career which includes service in such varied roles as that of college professor, economic adviser to the National Secruity Resources Board, policy adviser to the RFC Administrator and assistant to Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri. His economics background includes experience in the foreign as well as the domestic environment. Hs major contribution to the development of private enterprise in postwar Japan earned him a Supreme Command Allied Powers citation.

Dr. Welsh spoke to the conference from the vantage point of his present position as executive secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

He identified some of the economic and military values of our space program, pointing out that the investment in moon shots creates new jobs, materials markets, facilities and greater impetus for technical training at all levels, right here on earth. For 20 cents per capita per week over the past 6 years and a total investment of less than $10 billion, he said, we have received a flow of new processes, new inventions, new products, and new ideas which have stimulated greater demand for consumers' goods and greater savings and investments.

The following article describes the constructive and positive economic and military values which are being realized through our space program:

SPACE AND THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

(By Dr. Edward C. Welsh)

It is a privilege for me to participate in this Conference on Space Science and Space Law. I have known for some time of the constructive work being done in the field of space knowledge, here at this great university. I was also impressed with the enthusiasm about this conference conveyed by Congressman CARL ALBERT, the majority leader of the House of Representatives, who urged me to be with you on this occasion.

By way of introduction to some remarks about the impact of space on our economy, I suggest that I might be labeled an objective partisan in regard to the significance of our national space program. At least, I know I am partisan, and such a self-appraisal requires some objectivity. Moreover, I accord few credits to those who would go slow with space exploration or those who find few benefits flowing from our space activities. As I have stated on previous occasions: When such "go slow" advocates wake up and enter the twentieth century, they will indeed discover that the head-hiding ostrich is not our national bird.

It is also pertinent perhaps to mention that I find myself at odds with those self-appointed critics who discount the importance of our space program because they cannot measure precisely in quantitative terms many of the benefits flowing therefrom. There are few more blind than individuals who believe only those things exist which can be accurately measured. Such a state of mind points to the inadequacy of the measurer and not to the nonexistence of the benefits. How can one pretend to measure the benefits the people of this country receive from our educational system or from the accumulation of knowledge obtained through research and development? What precise value would one attach to our legal system or our democratic processes? How would one place a dollar value on the protection we receive from our military forces? Yet, we know these things have immense values. They are real. They are important. So, to a considerable extent, can we attribute values to our space program.

It is part of my mission today to identify some of the values of the space program to our economy. In so doing, I will, for good reason, be imprecise, but that is insufficient cause for taking the impact lightly. As I have indicated, I have little patience for those who translate an indefinite quantity into a zero.

EMPLOYMENT

The introduction of a vital new activity, accompanied as it is with substantial cash resources, is bound to affect the employment of people. Even those who are critical do not challenge this about the space program. In fact, they point in the other direction and assert that the increased demand for personnel will be so great that it will create shortages, particularly in certain areas of competence. This is a clear recognition of the space program as a vitalizing factor in the economy.

I might suggest somewhat parenthetically that any constructive program which increases the demand for skilled people is a positive and favorable element in our economy. While it takes time to increase the supply, it is axiomatic that such an increase in demand will in turn stimulate an increase in the supply. Hence, the space program puts into motion forces which may well increase the average quality of our population, from the point of view of education and training. Scientific and technological manpower are always essential ingredients in a progressive economy. This is particularly true as we enter the space age. On the other hand, we should avoid concluding that the space program is an all-consuming user of this highly valuable and scarce manpower. Currently, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and its contractors employ 42,000 scientists and engineers, or about 3 percent of the national supply. This leaves about 97 percent not directly affected by that agency's efforts. The projection is that by 1970 NASA and its contractors may be employing as much as 6 percent of the total supply of scientists and engineers. In any event, the impact is significant, but not overwhelming, and through its university and fellowship assistance program, NASA is fostering a significant increase in the total supply of highly trained individuals.

It is worth noting that there was a shortage of able and highly skilled men and women before the space program began, and there probably will be a shortage even when the space program has become firmly established as a permanent characteristic of our economy. At the present time, however, there is no solid evidence that research and development in nonspace activities is suffering from the diversion of technical manpower. Moreover, I believe that the university faculties are being enriched by the experiences of those who leave the campuses temporarily in order to contribute their knowledge and experience in the space program.

Corollary with the dynamic demand effect of the space program on trained people is the tendency of this factor to cause incomes to rise relatively faster for those with such scarce qualifications. So it would follow that research and development personnel would be expected to receive a somewhat higher percentage of the total national income than has been heretofore the case. This impact runs the gamut from medicine to metallurgy and from engineering to nuclear physics.

There is often an overlooked feature of this manpower picture; i.e., that the rapidly growing introduction of computers and other calculating and measuring devices has a tendency to increase sharply the output of individual researchers and thereby lessen the severity of the trained manpower shortage. Calculations which normally took days of work and scores of pencils can now be made in a matter of minutes, through the automation of this time-consuming portion of research work.

Summarizing this glance at the impact of the space program on employment, I suggest the following observations:

1. There is an increased demand for personnel as a result of the space program.
2. This increased demand stimulates a growth in supply, particularly for scarce skills.
3. The highly skilled will tend to get increases in income, which in turn will stimulate a further increase in supply.
4. The space program will divert few skilled personnel from areas in which there is already a high demand for their competences, except from universities, and in this latter category, the move may be temporary, and the net results stimulating as the more experienced researchers return to the campuses.
5. Automation is accelerating research output and is, to a degree, minimizing the severity of specialized shortages.
6. The smallest effect on employment will come in the areas of unskilled labor.

QUALITY OF OUTPUT

One of the major demands of the space age is higher quality and greater precision in production. Shoddy work and imperfect materials have no place in the production of space engines, spacecraft, or ground support equipment. The whole success of a space mission may well hinge upon the absence of any inferior component or workmanship. Consequently, the space program has ushered in a new and higher standard of performance, not just on the part of major contractors but the thousands of suppliers and subcontractors. This significant change from an economy which tended to stress quantity over quality will have an impact on many industries, not just those directly connected with the space program. This calls for a high level of craftsmanship and large quantity output—a combination which has not sufficiently characterized our production.

Approximate measurements and approximate tolerances will not do in the space industry. In fact, the selection of companies for space work will be increasingly made on the reputation for quality of output and of the manpower employed, rather than upon previous sales records or upon the size and elaborate nature of their physical facilities.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

There are those who lament the fact that such a large portion—perhaps as much as 70 percent—of the total research and development being carried out by this country is funded by the Government. First of all, it is important to note that there is a lot of research, both basic and applied, being done. We would have a really serious basis for worry, if that were not the case. It seems to me that the source of the financing is much less important than is the fact that it is being carried out. The space program is a major stimulus to this increase in research—and research is a basic tool of progress. Where is most of this research and development being done: in private companies and institutions. Why does it require Government financing: partly because private companies have had such shortrun views that they have not done the research they could afford, partly because they would rather have the Government take the risk and they take possibly smaller but more assured profits, and partly because so much of the research has direct application to missions primarily governmental in character. This is not a case of the Government's taking the research and development job away from private companies but rather it is a situation in which the Government has moved in so as to fill a gap.

In any event, an accelerated dimenison of research has been added, and the entire economy stands to benefit therefrom.

NATIONAL BUDGETS

The funds requested for space activities for this coming fiscal year amount to about $7.6 billion. This total includes money for NASA, Defense, AEC, the Weather Bureau, and the National Science Foundation. The annual expenditure will be substantially less than the budget request, as there are so many long leadtime construction and hardware items involved, for which funds get committed well ahead of when the actual bills have to be paid.

The impact of the space budget, however, is greater than its size would indicate. For example, a major portion of it goes for research and development, with the attendant flow of new processes, new inventions, new products, and new ideas which stimulate many sectors of the economy. So far, during the past 6 years we have spent less than $10 billion on all aspects of space development and exploration. This has averaged less than 20 cents per capita per week. Contrary to the careless thinking of some critics, this money has been spent for materials, jobs, facilities, etc. right here on earth rather than on the moon or some distant planet. In other words, its stimulating effect has resulted in a greater demand for consumers' goods and greater savings and investments.

It is unrealistic to conclude that, if this money were not going into space work, it would necessarily flow into other essentials such as slum clearance, education, and cancer research. The facts are that we have been spending more for those essentials since there has been a space program; the space program contributes to such progress; and it is not likely that the Congress would vote more money for such other projects if there were no demand for space funds. This is not an either/or proposition. This country can and should afford funds for all of its essentials, including the space program. It is somewhat ironical that we spent more betting on the horse races last year than we did on the whole space program and yet there are individuals who assert with all seriousness that the space budgets may bankrupt the country. Incidentally, I have no objection to betting on horse races, but it is a strain on one's credulity to believe such activity to be as economically constructive as research and development in improving electronics, propulsion, health services, etc. All of the latter—and many more—benefits flow from the space program. I have even heard self-styled intellectuals point out that betting on horse races just results in a redistribution of money—in one person's pocket and out of another. I wonder what they think happens to money spent for space—just disappear? No, the space program also acts to redistribute income. The difference is that in the distribution process the money is doing something constructive when it is spent on space.

ECONOMIC BENEFITS

In a society as complex as ours, it is difficult, if not impossible, to trace each innovation to its source. Consequently, in summarizing some of the benefits which flow from our space efforts, I am constrained to avoid claiming sole attribution of any particular change to any one force. However, major credit for the following benefits should go to the space program:

1. Comprehensive knowledge and understanding about the sun's influence on the earth, the nature of interplanetary space environment, and the origin of the solar system, as well as of life itself.

2. Widespread transoceanic communications, global weather forecasting, improved forest fire detection, and high accuracy navigation.

3. Increased ability and experience in managing major research and development efforts, expansion of capital facilities, and encouragement of high standards of quality production.

4. A wide range of improvements and developments in metals, alloys, and ceramics.

5. Development of high temperature gas-cooled graphite moderated reactors and liquid metal cooled reactors; development of radioisotope power sources as well as instruments for measuring degrees of radiation; and application of thermoelectric and thermionic conversion of heat to electric energy.

6. Accelerated use of liquid oxygen in steelmaking; new coatings for temperature control of buildings; more effective transfer of chemical energy into electrical energy; and substantial progress in the whole field of electronics.

7. Increased accuracy and reduced costs in measuring hot steel rods; development of effective filters against detergents; stimulation of the use of Fiberglas refraction welding tape; development of new coatings for plywood and furniture; and improved medical equipment for hospitals.

The list of new developments and areas of improvement could be extended considerably. The important fact is that the space program has introduced an element of vitality and the pioneering spirit which has often been dormant in this country except during periods of war. It is, in my judgment, an excellent example of how a government-fostered program can and does develop benefits which, in turn, strengthen the private enterprise system.

NATIONAL INCOME

In view of what I have already said, it may be unnecessary to refer to the effect of the space program on national income—on national productivity. However, I believe it is necessary, because there are those who speak out so confidently and narrowly about the expense of the space program without weighing in the other and more important aspect—namely, what does such expenditure accomplish? While we are the first to agree that precise measurements are not possible, it is generally agreed that the space program stimulates education, expands research and development, augments total productivity, increases employment, raises quality of private company performance, and improves our international relations. All of those effects add significantly to the viability of our economy—in other words, increase our total national income and gross national product. Such an effect also increases to a significant degree the size of the base upon which our taxes are levied. Put more specifically, the space program is a profitable investment which will more than pay for itself.

NATIONAL SECURITY

The greater our military strength and the more certain that aggressors are that we will use such strength to maintain our freedom, the healthier is the atmosphere within which private enterprise can and will thrive. The space program has an important contribution to this state of national security. It is true that both our policy and our practices direct that all of our space activities be for peaceful purposes. Surely, no activity is more peaceful in effect than that which discourages war. Weakness encourages aggression. Alertness and strength discourage it. Space capabilities which increase our strength—economically and militarily—deter aggression. I am convinced that the strength of our military forces has been the major deterrent to those who would impose their system and their controls over free peoples.

Our peaceful application of space competence to national security can be subdivided into the following categories:

1. Support of our terrestrial Armed Forces so that they may carry out their established missions more effectively. Illustrations of this type of support are in communications, meteorology, navigation, and mapping.

2. Increase in our alertness against pending dangers and our knowledge of potentially hostile territories through early warning and observation capabilities.

3. Competence to examine and neutralize, if necessary, hostile and threatening spacecraft.

There is an additional category of military space activity, i.e., orbiting weapons of mass destruction in space. We have, however, taken a policy position against such activity unless forced to do so by the hostile action of others.

INTERNATIONAL STATUS

In this capsuled attempt to identify some of the points of impact which the space program makes upon our economy, I do not want to overlook the international aspects. We are concerned, and rightly so, with the image the people of other countries have of the United States. We gain from a "prestige image." The ideal picture is that of a nation of strength in ideas, in technology, in freedom, in standards of living, and in military power to protect the viability of the other prestige ingredients. The space program, effectively and imaginatively conducted, contributes positively to all of those ingredients. Of even greater importance is the potential impact the space program can have on world peace through substituting competition in space exploration for competition in building nuclear striking power. If sanity prevails, the path to the stars can be the path to peace.

Hampshire County, W. Va., Surveyed by Washington for Lord Fairfax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, many of our counties in West Virginia were named after famous men; but one, Hampshire County, received its name because Lord Fairfax, the great land proprietor, was impressed by the fine drove of hogs he saw from the area at Winchester, Va. Lord Fairfax, who had engaged George Washington to make several surveys in this region for him, evidently had hopes that Hampshire would some day rival Hampshire, England, in agricultural produce.

The agricultural growth of this county is chronicled in an article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail of June 16, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

ENGLAND'S FINE HOG REGION GAVE HAMPSHIRE ITS NAME

It's the oldest county in West Virginia.

When Hampshire County, then in Virginia, was formed back in 1753, it was named after an English shire. Romney, the oldest county seat in West Virginia, was named after an English town. England, apparently, was more popular than it was to be a few years later.

Lord Fairfax reportedly saw a drove of fine hogs from the area at Winchester and said that when a new county was formed, it should be named after the English shire famed for its fine hogs.

The line of travel through Hampshire County in frontier days was a series of rude forts—Cox, Capon, Edward, and Pearsoll—where pioneer families fled during the invasions by tribes allied with the French.

George Washington, who made several surveys in the section for Fairfax, left a note of the "great company of people * * * who followed us through the woods" and spoke Dutch.

Romney must have been a desirable place a century ago—it changed hands between Union and Confederate troops 56 times. Today it's the site of State schools for the deaf and blind.

Hampshire early established itself as one of the finest fruit-growing counties of the State. Production of peaches later diminished somewhat in favor of apples, but Hampshire's role as an orchard county remained important. A timber-preserving plant was established by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.

The fine hogs still are produced there, and it is one of the State's sheep-growing areas.

Ice Mountain has been heard of by far more people than have seen it. Short Mountain and Nathaniel Mountain public hunting areas are in Hampshire County, as is part of George Washington National Forest.

Schadeberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution adopted May 1 by Republicans in Wisconsin's First Congressional District pays tribute to Representative HENRY C. SCHADEBERG for his forthright fight to retain and strengthen those American liberties and principles of government which have made this Nation the envy of the world. This resolution is not only an indication of the high esteem Representative SCHADEBERG's constituency has for him, but it expresses the sentiment, I am sure, of all freedom-loving Americans who are acquainted with his outstanding work in Congress.

Whereas we believe in constitutionalism which recognizes a higher moral order in the universe and enacts only those laws that are in conformity with it; and

Whereas we believe in republicanism in which public issues are decided by the representatives of the people and on which the people should be consulted; and

Whereas we believe in federalism with dispersion of power in which the people most directly concerned make the rules on issues at the nearest level of government; and

Whereas we believe in voluntaryism as the best basis for constructive action in which we can agree to disagree and thereby join or not join in those causes as we voluntarily chose under our heritage of individual liberty; and

Whereas we recognize with grave concern and a humility that derives from our respect for human rights and freedom that these beliefs are challenged and these rights threatened by increasing governmental participation in all facets of our daily lives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by this First Congressional District, duly assembled in caucus, That we pay special tribute to Congressman HENRY C. SCHADEBERG who by his consistent voting record and his forthright actions has demonstrated that he stands firmly for this American concept of individual liberty, private property and limited government and will fight with courage against those forces that wittingly or unwittingly would destroy us from within; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this meeting send an appropriate copy of this resolution to Congressman SCHADEBERG and that by suitable means bring this tribute to the attention of Mr. SCHADEBERG's colleagues in Congress.

No Property Rights, and Human Rights Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Spartanburg Herald, of Spartanburg, S.C., has printed in July 4, 1963, issue an excellent editorial which makes an important point about human rights. It is entitled "No Property Rights, and Human Rights Die." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Herald, July 4, 1963]

NO PROPERTY RIGHTS, AND HUMAN RIGHTS DIE

Somebody uttered a catch phrase that was repeated as a slogan that has become a theme that threatens to alter the very form of the system which made America great and free.

Human rights are more important than property rights, they said.

So now, in the minds of a multitude, the Kennedy proposal for a rigid "civil rights" law becomes a battle between human rights and property rights. They are saying so every day.

How tragic they cannot see that destruction of property rights is destruction of human rights.

The two are inseparable. They cannot be pitted one against the other.

Take away the rights of an owner over his own property—be it a business, a home, an automobile—and you have undermined the pillar of the American economic system.

For private ownership, controlled by free individuals, is the strength and the backbone of a free nation.

"Human rights are higher than property rights."

That was the theme when Fidel Castro's Government confiscated the property of free people in Cuba. But when property rights were gone, human rights followed the same course down the sewer.

Significantly, the privileges of private ownership go first where freedom is failing.

Tyranny always installs itself as the champion of "human rights." And it always proclaims these rights to be superior to the right of humans to be free to control their own affairs.

"Human rights are higher than property rights."

A slogan made in America, misapplied cynically and politically, says it much better than Karl Marx ever did. But the sentiment is exactly his.

It is just as wrong as his philosophy is wrong.

Because there can never be human freedom without personal liberty; there cannot be human rights without individual rights.

Human rights will never be created by the destruction of individual freedom.

And bitter tears when the world had changed will not restore a twit of it.

Government Socialism Destroys Our Heritages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union, San Diego, Calif., June 23, 1963:

GOVERNMENT SOCIALISM DESTROYS OUR HERITAGES

We have today an enemy of freedom which, in its own way, is as much an enemy to our way of life as is the nuclear might of communism's armies.

The Red foe is apparent to all; his purpose has been boldly stated many times—he will try by any means at his disposal to enslave the world.

Our other foe is Big Government, which has been growing for many decades. Its leaders do not come out boldly and tell us they would take away our freedoms. Instead, they lull us with promises of improving our way of life, of caring for us from cradle to the grave, of largesse without limit.

Some of our elected leaders and representatives for many decades have boldly stated that Big Government must rule—that the people don't know what is best for them; that our Constitution is old fashioned and should be replaced; that a powerful elite must guide our every move.

Big Government is no idle threat. Its nibbling at our rights is well underway—the handwriting on the wall is plain for all to see, and our apathy blinds us.

Tax-and-spend is the motto. Dispense favors with a lavish hand, and gradually make every citizen dependent on government. Don't worry about where the money is coming from—just borrow it, and spend, spend, spend.

Big Government would tell our farmers what and how much to grow—and sell our surpluses abroad at a loss, with the taxpayers footing the bill; it would build huge hydroelectric plants, operating at a loss—paid by our taxes, of course—competing with stockholder-owned businesses that also pay taxes; it donates millions to a myriad of projects, many unnecessary, or which could be financed best under our birthright of free enterprise.

Bureaucracy is becoming more and more solidly entrenched. Departments, bureaus, commissions—once started, they go on and on, growing bigger and bigger, spending more and more millions of the taxpayers' money.

Our debt grows by the billions; inflation saps our savings. We are told not to worry—Big Government knows what is best for us. We just owe the money to ourselves, so it doesn't matter.

But it does matter. Big Government is leading us blithely down the road to fiscal disaster, with the excuse that it is "taking care of us." But if we look closely at the velvet glove we can see that it covers an iron hand that would rob us, little by little, of our freedoms.

Let's take care of ourselves for a change. Let's give free enterprise a chance. Free enterprise—the right to live as free men—made this Nation great. Let's be done with the socialism that is robbing America of its heritages as a way of life.

Remember July 4 of 187 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday we celebrated the anniversary of our independence. To many Americans it was merely another vacation from the routine of everyday work. It was a time that some went on picnics, some to the baseball game, some took their families on an outing, and still others just flopped around and did nothing.

I wonder how many actually gave any thought to the true significance of the occasion and what a wonderful day this was in the history of America. I wonder how many of us gave any thought to what has transpired over these 187 years of our growth.

Two young men in my district who are struggling to make a success of a small town newspaper believe in America and are proud of our heritage. They have given some thought to the importance of July 4 and I recommend for your reading what they have to say concerning this holiday:

[From the Farmington (Ill.) Bugle, July 4, 1963]

REMEMBER JULY 4 OF 187 YEARS AGO

On this day (July 4) 187 years ago, a man named Richard Lee proposed to Congress "that these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown; and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain is, and ought to be, dissolved."

Lee's proposal was seconded by John Adams, and afterward, Thomas Jefferson drew up the Declaration of Independence.

It was then the United States of America was born.

Since that time this Nation has grown to a point where it is now considered by many persons to be the epitome of the individual's self-esteem through its democratic and freedom-loving ways.

Lately, however (the past few decades), the same Nation's peoples, through greediness, laziness, complacency, and what-have-you, are slowly destroying that freedom which our brave forefathers bravely invoked and generations after them have died fighting for.

Our freedom and self-esteem are not lost yet, but they will not last long at the present rate of decline.

Every American on this date should go back and study the birth of this Nation and the philosophies of John Stuart Mill and John Locke, whose philosophies led to the creation of the United States of America. How do we compare today with the thinking of 187 years ago?

Member of Anti-Red Board Quits, Raps High Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, if June 25 does not become a national holiday in the Communist world, they will be missing one of the greatest causes for a celebration that has come their way in a long time.

On June 25 of this year, Mr. James Reese Duncan, resigned as a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board and this must have brought great joy to the hearts of the Communist leaders, for he was one of their stanchest nemeses. At the same time, we of the free world, have lost a bulwark that will not be easily replaced.

Freed by his resignation, Mr. Duncan is able to say some of the things he has been forbidden to say while a member of the Board. Some of us have known that what he has now said was true, but heretofore, it has been difficult to speak with real authority. Mr. Duncan gives us that authority now.

He says, without equivocation that the recent decisions of the Supreme Court have aided and abetted our Communist enemies within and without this country. Though he stops a step or two of charging the Court with treason, it requires little of the imagination to understand his message and sense all the things he has not said in the story I insert below.

It appeared in the June 26 issue of the Washington Evening Star and should be read and pondered by every Member of this body:

MEMBER OF ANTI-RED BOARD QUITS, RAPS HIGH COURT

(By Jerry Kline)

A departing member of the Subversive Activities Control Board has bowed out of office with some angry words for "outrageous" Supreme Court decisions which he considers "favorable to subversive activities" in this country.

The parting comments came from James Reese Duncan, whose retirement from the subversion watchdog agency was effective at midnight last night, freeing him to discuss publicly for the first time views he had held for many years.

"The trend of decision in the last 10 years—and in most instances by the same judges—has been favorable to extreme left-wingers, Communists, and subversives in general," said Judge Duncan, who has been known as judge since his days on the Municipal Court bench in his native Alexandria.

NAMED BY EISENHOWER

Judge Duncan, 62, was appointed to the board by former President Eisenhower in 1956. Because of ill health, he recently submitted his resignation to President Kennedy, who accepted it with reluctance.

The five-member board, a quasi-judicial body, determines which groups will be placed on the Attorney General's subversive list.

"I haven't agreed with the vast majority of Supreme Court decisions in the subversive field, and there's quite a number of them," said Judge Duncan as he reviewed his career in an interview.

"The Supreme Court is ignoring the feelings of millions of Americans. If you submitted it to a vote by the people—which, of course, isn't practical—the referendum would turn out 5 to 1 against the Court's decisions.

"The Justices are lifetime appointees who make our laws and aren't always guided by established principles."

In the most crucial case in which Judge Duncan participated, the Supreme Court upheld the control board's order requiring the Communist Party to register as an agent of the Soviet Union, but the case was inexcusably delayed in the courts, he said.

The order originally was issued 3 years before he joined the board, but the issue went to the Supreme Court three times and the order was reaffirmed twice by the board before it became final in October 1961. Meanwhile, scores of cases which depended on the outcome of the party case remained pending in the courts and before the board.

PRAISES FRANKFURTER

"It's aggravating that this key case stayed so long in the courts," he said. "It involved the security of 180 million Americans. How can we afford to take so many years?" A "speed-up" in court actions is indicated by that case, he said.

Judge Duncan had special praise for former Justice Frankfurter, who wrote the majority opinion in the case, and little praise for other Justices.

"He had more sense than any two or three of them put together and he was considered by some to be a liberal," said the conservative Virginia Democrat.

"On national issues, when the chips were down, you could depend on Frankfurter. He was probably the most brilliant man on the Supreme Court in many years."

If not imperiling the Nation, many Supreme Court decisions have at least increased the task of ferreting out subversives, he indicated.

In some cases, the Court has "played politics," and in others, it has "played a game of semantics," he said.

In one instance, he said, the Court, "by a stroke of the pen, knocked out the subversive security laws of 42 States" when it ruled the Federal Government has pre-empted the field of internal security.

The case, decided in 1956, involved an acknowledged Communist Party member, Steve Nelson, who had been convicted by a lower Pennsylvania court under the State's sedition act. The State supreme court reversed the decision, and the U.S. Court upheld the latter ruling.

Three judges dissented, noting that the United States Code, which includes the Smith Act, also provides that the law should not be held to "impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States."

FUTURE APPEARS BRIGHT

"They had to override this law to do what they did," Judge Duncan said. "I just don't know how they could do it. The net effect is bad. It was good to have the States ready to prosecute a subversive since Federal prosecutors are not always effective in many cases because of the Supreme Court."

But the future of the control board appears "bright" since the Communist Party case was completed, he said. However, the general public continues to be largely uninformed about subversive activities, he added.

"Too many people are too busy to take the time to better inform themselves."

While subversive activity has decreased, it still operates subtly, he said.

"On the whole, Communists are not the most forthright people you've ever met. After you've proved they're Communists, they deny it all over again."

Doddridge County, W. Va., Founded by Famous Attorney in 1845

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on February 4, 1845, a brilliant young lawyer was honored by having the newly created Virginia—now West Virginia—county of Doddridge named after him.. Phillip Doddridge, whose eloquence was compared with the earlier Patrick Henry, took a leading role in creating the new county out of the surrounding counties of Harrison, Lewis, Ritchie, and Tyler.

A colorful story about the origin of Doddridge County is told in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail of June 16, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

DODDRIDGE COUNTY, W. VA., FOUNDED BY FAMOUS ATTORNEY IN 1845

When West Virginia entered the Union on June 20, 1863, Doddridge County was already 18 years old. As a result of the labors of a brilliant young Frenchman named Joseph H. Diss Debar (who had but recently come to this country from France) aided by a gifted and able lawyer and statesman, Phillip Doddridge, the Virginia Assembly had passed an act February 4, 1845, creating a new county, Doddridge, named in honor of the statesman, who had so generously aided in its founding. Therefore, from February 4, 1845, the birthday of Doddridge County, to June 20, 1863, a period of 18 years, the new county was Doddridge County, Va.

Young Diss Debar had come to America with his beautiful young wife on the same ship which brought Charles Dickens on his first visit to the new world. This was in 1842. The young couple settled in Cove District, founding St. Clara, named for Mrs. Diss Debar. Years later, as a member of the West Virginia Legislature, he immortalized himself by designing the West Virginia State seal. Of Mr. Doddridge, who aided in founding the new county which was to bear his name, Chief Justice John Marshall, had said, "No more brilliant young lawyer practices before the Supreme Court. His eloquence is comparable to that of the earlier Patrick Henry."

Why were the citizens unhappy living in the fringes of the surrounding counties—Harrison, Lewis, Ritchie, and Tyler? Government was too far from the people. If a man in Central District wished to record a deed, secure a marriage license, or file a contract, he had to travel on foot or horseback to Harrisville or Middlebourne—a long day's journey. A citizen from Smithburg or Morgansville would go to Clarksburg to transact legal business. There were no fast means of travel in those days—not even railroads.

The new county was divided into eight magisterial districts, each rating a magistrate, who could hold court, and a board of education, whose business it was to levy taxes and provide and maintain schools. The districts were, and still are, Central, Cove, Grant, Greenbrier, McClellan, New Milton, Southwest, and West Union.

The county is well watered by Middle Island Creek and its large tributaries, Meathouse Fork, Tom's Fork, Buckeye, and Arnolds Creek, all of which are fine streams in themselves. In McClellan District is another good stream, McElroy Creek—with its tributaries it stretches for many miles. These streams of Doddridge County are rich with edible fish of many kinds, and with fur bearing game along their banks to make Doddridge County a fisherman's and hunter's paradise.

West Union, the county seat, and Chicago are about the same age, both having been founded about the year 1820. The city on Lake Michigan has slightly outgrown our town but the race is not yet over.

The people came early to Doddridge. In 1850 there were about 3,000 inhabitants. The family names were essentially the same as now. There were the Davises, the Smiths, the Jonses, the Williamses, and the Fords. The Allens were at what later became Center Point. Stores, schools, and churches sprang up all over the county. Good roads and automobiles have made these interesting, good smelling country stores, community centers, and schools obsolete.

—WALTER B. SWENTZEL.

President Chiang Kai-shek's Opinions as to Sino-Soviet Dispute and Red Infiltration of Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, for all too long there has been too much wishful thinking that the dispute between the Soviet Union and Red China will result in those two powerful Communist nations destroying each other's aggressive capabilities.

Such a happy development has not occurred. The hard reality is that, despite this dispute between the Russian and Red Chinese, world communism has continued its expansionist efforts. Sound-thinking observers have long warned that there is nothing but disappointment and potential disaster resulting from basing any aspects of our foreign policy or national security thinking on the expectation that the Sino-Soviet dispute will result in conflict between those two nations. Consequently, it was with deep satisfaction that I noted the recent comments by President Chiang Kai-shek concerning the nature of the dispute between the Soviet Union and Red China.

The record shows clearly that President Chiang Kai-shek has been fighting communism longer than any of the leaders in the free world today—in fact ever since 1926 when he broke with the Communist elements in China. No individual today has a more intimate knowledge of the objectives, techniques, and leading figures of the Communist movement.

President Chiang expressed his views concerning the Sino-Soviet dispute, as well as his evaluation of the increasingly close relationships between Indonesia and communism, in a meeting with Mr. Joseph J. Lombardo, senior vice commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, director, national security and foreign affairs, VFW.

President Chiang's views on these two basic subjects were reported in an article by Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, dirctor, VFW national security and foreign affairs, and distributed nationally to the press by the North American Newspaper Alliance.

Because of the importance of President Chiang Kai-shek's opinion, his views are an important contribution to our understanding of the worldwide Communist movement, I would at this point like to include the article "Communist Dispute Blamed on Mao-Khrushchev," by Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, director of national security and foreign affairs of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, appearing in the San Diego Union, May 26, 1963.

COMMUNIST DISPUTE BLAMED ON MAO-KHRUSHCHEV FEUD

(By Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired)

WASHINGTON.—The Russian-Red Chinese dispute remains basically an argument between Mao Tse-tung and Khrushchev, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek said in an interview.

"Nothing in the last year has happened to change my view that the Chinese Communist-U.S.S.R. dispute is a personal feud between Mao Tse-tung and Khrushchev, and that it will continue as long as both are in power," the President of Free China said.

This rift between the Red leaders does not destroy the ideological relationship between the Communist Parties of Communist China and the Soviet Union," he added.

"Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung are arguing over methods of gaining the Communist objectives—they are not arguing about basic objectives," Chiang said. "Their common objective is the triumph of communism and the destruction of freedom."

The recent announcement that Communist China is sending a top-level delegation to Moscow, to discuss the rift between Mao Tse-tung and Khrushchev, substantiates President Chiang's views as to the continuing ideological relationship between the Communist Russian and Chinese Communist Parties.

In reply to another question, the Generalissimo said he doesn't believe President Sukarno is a Communist, even though the Indonesian leader is playing Red China's game.

"The Indonesian leaders are drifting into Communist control," Chiang said. "Sukarno and his advisers don't know the techniques and methods by which the Reds are infiltrating Indonesia.

"The Indonesians think they are able to work with and use the Communists while, in fact, the opposite is the case. The Communists are using Sukarno.

"The Indonesian Government will wake up too late. With Indonesia and mainland China Communist, all Asia would be faced with disaster.

"Sukarno is not a Communist but he is unintentionally falling into the Red trap—and the result is the same."

The private interview with Chiang was granted to me and Joseph J. Lombardo, senior vice commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It took place in the presidential palace there.

President Chiang appeared to be in excellent health. He has a spring to his walk, stands erectly, and looks much younger than his 76 years. I was impressed by his keen mind, his quiet sense of humor, and his detailed knowledge of world affairs.

Military Compensation and Veterans' Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the 45th annual convention of the New Hampshire Department of the American Legion, held in Rochester, N.H., on June 20–23, 1963, singled out two especially pressing needs in the field of military compensation and veterans' benefits. In my opinion, their resolutions in support of expanded veterans' employment services and the enactment of the military pay bill now before the Senate are exceptionally well drafted and convincing. With the thought that these statements will be of help to my colleagues I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it is the established policy of the Federal Government to assume responsibility for the rehabilitation and welfare of its veterans; and

Whereas all competent authorities agree that no rehabilitation is complete without establishment in gainful employment; and

Whereas because of the changing economic pattern, employment in any one area is not and never will be a stable condition but transcends local and State boundaries; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States tends to economize on all appropriations for veterans' services at a time when such services are needed, not only for the veterans of World War I and World War II, but for the veterans of the Korean campaign; and

Whereas the Veterans Employment Service has been subject in the intervening years to repeated efforts to reduce the personnel by cutting the appropriations for the service and thereby eliminating the procuring of job opportunities for veterans, especially disabled veterans: Therefore be it

Resolved by the New Hampshire Department the American Legion, in convention assembled this 22d day of June 1963, in Rochester, N.H., recommends that Congress appropriate adequate funds so that the Veterans Employment Service can make continuous progress in the development of its service to veterans and disabled veterans in the field of gainful employment; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to all Members of the Congress from New Hampshire and to the next national convention.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the American Legion has long advocated a strong military establishment to protect the security of the United States from all enemies; and

Whereas the present technical requirements of the modern military establishment are such that the Government is spending millions of dollars each year to train military personnel to operate and maintain the complex, vital equipment required; and

Whereas present pay scales for the military personnel have had no adjustments to meet the rising costs of living since 1952; and

Whereas the present pay scales do not meet even the barest minimum requirements of present-day living standards especially for those married and attempting to raise families, and because of this trained personnel are forced to leave the military and seek more profitable employment with private industry; and

Whereas this continued turnover of personnel is costing more millions of dollars each year to train new people to operate and maintain highly technical equipments: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Department of New Hampshire, the American Legion, in convention assembled this 23d day of June 1963, at Rochester, N.H., That the American Legion puts its full endorsement to Senate bill 847 known as the Armed Forces pay adjustment bill now before the U.S. Senate in an endeavor to rectify this continued loss of trained personnel; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our elected representatives in both the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives requesting their assistance to secure the passage of Senate bill 847.

Bill Minot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened to record the death of Bill Minot of Greenwich, Conn., a close personal friend who, in an all too short life, compiled an admirable record of service to his State and community. Bill was a tireless worker who never failed to respond to whatever public call was made upon him, no matter how long or dreary the task. He held public office and high posts in the Republican Party, including that of State finance chairman. Bill is already greatly missed by his numerous friends. The editor of the Greenwich Times rightly notes that Greenwich has lost an exceptional citizen.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I offer the entire editorial tribute to Bill Minot, as follows:

BILL MINOT

The untimely death of William A. G. Minot at the early age of 47, after a long illness, came as a shock to his many friends in the town and throughout the State of Connecticut, for Bill Minot was a popular individual.

He was an important figure in the business and political world, a man who had served in the diplomatic service of his country, who had been administrative assistant to former Gov. John Lodge, an effective moneyraiser for the State Republican organization, having headed more than one finance drive. He represented Greenwich in the general assembly, where he won the respect and admiration of his fellow legislators on both sides of the political fence and he served with distinction as chairman of the Republican Town Committee, a post he held at the time of his death.

As chairman of the GOP, Bill Minot was interested in keeping the Republican Party in Greenwich united and harmonious, a difficult task, considering there is hardly an election campaign without an outcropping of factional differences.

Bill Minot, a man with personality and ability in any area which he served, had hundreds of friends. He liked people and people liked him.

His talents will be missed. He will be missed. Greenwich has lost an exceptional citizen.

We extend our deepest sympathy to his family.

Property Owners' Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, my attention has been called to the Property Owners' Bill of Rights as published by the National Association of Real Estate Boards on June 4, 1963, in Chicago, Ill. I think it is important that this Property Owners' Bill of Rights be brought to the attention of the Members of this body as we are preparing to consider the so-called civil rights legislation which would deny property rights to individuals by Government regulation and control of the use of an individual's private property. I refer to the so-called public accommodations bill now pending before the Commerce Committee of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this copy of the Property Owners' Bill of Rights be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPERTY OWNERS' BILL OF RIGHTS

In 1789, the people of America were fearful that government might restrict their freedom. The first Congress of the United States, in that year, proposed a Bill of Rights.

The Bill of Rights, essentially, tells the Government what it cannot do. The statements comprise the first 10 amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

The Bill of Rights has had a profound impact upon the history of the world.

Forty million immigrants gave up much to come to this land, seeking something promised here—and only here. Many countries have abundant natural resources, vast vacant lands, and climate as good as America.

They came here for the promise of security—the promise of freedom—for the precious right to live as free men with equal opportunity for all.

In July of 1868, a new guarantee of freedom was ratified. Its purpose was to guard against human slavery. Its guarantees were for the equal protection of all.

This new guarantee of freedom is the 14th amendment. It reads, in part, as follows:

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

The vital importance of these Federal laws was reemphasized in a recent statement of the Chief Justice of the United States in which he urged the retention of "government of laws in preference to a government of men."

Today, the rights and freedoms of the individual American property owner are being eroded. This endangers the rights and freedom of all Americans. Therefore, a Bill of Rights to protect the American property owner is needed.

It is self-evident that the erosion of these freedoms will destroy the free enterprising, individual American.

It is our solemn belief that the individual American property owner, regardless of race, color, or creed, must be allowed, under law, to retain:

(1) The right of privacy;

(2) The right to choose his own friends;

(3) The right to own and enjoy property according to his own dictates;

(4) The right to occupy and dispose of property without governmental interference in accordance with the dictates of his conscience;

(5) The right of all equally to enjoy property without interference by laws giving special privilege to any group or groups;

(6) The right to maintain what, in his opinion, are congenial surroundings for tenants;

(7) The right to contract with a real estate broker or other representative of his choice and to authorize him to act for him according to his instructions;

(8) The right to determine the acceptability and desirability of any prospective buyer or tenant of his property;

(9) The right of every American to choose who in his opinion are congenial tenants in any property he owns—to maintain the stability and security of his income; and

(10) The right to enjoy the freedom to accept, reject, negotiate, or not negotiate with others.

Loss of these rights diminishes personal freedom and creates a springboard for further erosion of liberty.

Roane County, W. Va., Explored Nearly 200 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in 1765, nearly 200 years ago, a party of soldiers passed through the region now known as Roane County, W. Va. The subsequent history of Roane County is told in an article in the June 16, 1963, issue of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the Record, as follows:

Roane County, W. Va., Explored Nearly 200 Years Ago

While West Virginia is this year celebrating her 100th birthday, Roane County has the distinction of already passing that milestone. The county of Roane was created by an act of the Virginia General Assembly on March 11, 1856, 7 years before West Virginia became a State. But long before 1856, probably 1814, the first families were living in what is now Roane County. Parts of this county had been surveyed as early as 1785; had been visited by Jesse Hughes, the great scout and Indian fighter, as early as 1774, and a party of soldiers from Fort Pitt (Pittsburgh), had passed through in 1765.

The county was named for Judge Roane of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, whose wife was Anne, the daughter of Patrick Henry. The county seat was named for Capt. John Spencer, a native of Roane County. In her early days the city of Spencer was known as Tanner's Crossroads, the first settler here having been Samuel Tanner who made his first home under a rock cliff and near a cold spring, hence the name of the stream flowing through the town, Spring Creek. The Spencer High School is now situated on the top of that historic cliff, with the high school athletic field immediately in front. Later, it was known as Cassville, and for a time was called New California: a family who lived in the same section had decided to move on, saying they were headed for California; but when they got as far as Spencer, probably a distance of 10 or 15 miles, decide to stay and forget about going any further.

The first settlers in the vicinity of Reedy came there in 1816 and the first post office in the county was established at Reedy in 1853.

The greatest asset of any land is the people and Roane County may well be unique, the progressive people who have lived here have proved this over and over again. Drilling for oil and gas began in the county as early as 1868 and over the years Roane County has produced many millions of barrels of high grade crude oil and many millions of cubic feet of natural gas. The city of Spencer began using natural gas for light and heat in 1897. The Nation's largest underground natural gas storage system is located here. With industry and manufacturing becoming greater, still Roane Countians look to the land; if not for a livelihood, then for a way of life, this being a region of many small farms and good homes.

Roane County has much of which to be proud: first of all, the land, which supports some of the finest cattle in the Nation. Spencer Manufacturing Co., founded in 1948, employs several hundred people and produces fine knitwear. The Spencer Livestock Exchange is one of the largest markets in the Eastern United States. The greatly expanded Monarch Rubber Co. is the result of the experiments of a former dentist of the town. Located about 8 miles from Spencer is the 1,000-acre Methodist Education Center. Not nearly complete as yet, the West Virginia Methodist Conference will use this center for workshops, conferences, and official meeting and for camping. Roane County and Spencer is proud of the splendid new armory, home of the 150th Armored Calvalry Regiment of the West Virginia National Guard. Spencer State Hospital was opened here in 1893.

Inaugurated in 1955, the Roane County Black Walnut Festival is one of the highlights of the year. A Black Walnut Queen is chosen from one of the counties comprising the Little Kanawha Regional Council. This county ships more walnuts than any other in West Virginia.

The years that have elapsed since Roane was formed from parts of Gilmer, Jackson, and Kanawha Counties have brought many changes. The city of Spencer was chartered in 1858; four-fifths of the town was destroyed by fire in 1887. The railroad came in 1890. We have a modern system of highways, the county being crossed by U.S. routes 119 and 33. Living is good in Roane County.

Maxine B. Kee.

The Trigger Is Pulled on the Cocked Pistol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorials from the California Farmer, June 15, 1963:

The Trigger Is Pulled on the Cocked Pistol

(By Jack Pickett)

When we opened the morning paper and discovered that the Mexican National Program was dead the shock was as though an old friend had died. A very serious mistake has been made. This is not the right thing for domestic workers, organized labor, agriculture, Mexico, anyone.

California will suffer. Mexico will suffer. Domestic labor will not benefit, and we think that in the long run organized labor will be greatly embarrassed.

The blame for this mistake lies solely in the lap of organized labor. It put the tag of "slave labor" on the Mexicans, and then created the impression that if the Mexican Nationals were withdrawn from this country, agriculture could absorb all the floating unemployed.

Let's take a moment to look at organized labor since it created this problem. One of the interesting developments in this country has been the sophistication of organized labor. It is reaching for higher quality leaders—lawyers, economists. It is earning a place at the bargaining table. But one interesting phenomenon is that numerically, organized labor is still relatively unimportant in relation to the authority it commands. On the other hand, by intelligent direction it has cast its influence, primarily political, way beyond the logic of its numerical strength.

Why would 13 California Congressmen vote to kill the Mexican national program when the President was talking about a 1-year extension and Governor Brown had personally intervened for a 2-year extension?

We talked about organized labor's sophistication, but it continues to make some very myopic mistakes. In killing the bracero program we think it has either overlooked or carefully screened from view some very important facts:

1. There is absolutely no correlation between national unemployment and availability of jobs on farms.

2. It is cruel and unjust to expect the unemployed of industry to move into the totally different and physically exhausting jobs of agriculture.

3. Increasing the pay scale of agriculture's menial tasks will not attract the unemployed of industry to the fields.

4. Organized labor stands to do great financial harm to the biggest industry in the Nation's most politically potent State. This

may prove to be embarrassing to the political image of labor's new maturity.

To enlarge on one of these points: It seems very evident that labor thinks it has left a back door open. If important farm industries fail or are curtailed by the lack of Mexican national laborers, we predict that organized labor will charge that the jobs could be filled if agriculture would greatly increase its wage scale to attract domestic help.

It is self-evident that the farmers of all the world are in competition. Our tariff history shows a tremendous reduction in our agricultural rates with a great bulk of them in the 5-percent bracket and eligible to be totally eliminated by the President under the new powers granted him by this Congress.

If doubling agricultural rates would correct unemployment, then we would point out that the same logic applies to industry. And in many segments of our economy, labor has the power to bring certain industries to their knees. But no one would suggest that they correct unemployment by a huge increase in their wage scale.

We belabor this wage angle as we are afraid that organized labor will take advantage of this situation to ram through some drastic farm labor legislation in Sacramento. For example, AB 2227, sponsored by Song, Democrat of Los Angeles, would make the grower pay the State $15 for every worker he employed under a new program covering food, housing, medical care and a guaranteed minimum employment period. AB 2514 gives the department of employment the power to set minimum wages by crop areas.

We would also like to put in a word for our friends in Mexico. They might look upon this action as quite a slap in the face. The bracero was the source of the third largest amount of outside income to that country. What happens now? Do we start a foreign-aid program to Mexico? Do we give them a $100 million a year out of your tax pocket, out of the tax pocket of organized labor? What happens if Mexico retaliates by shutting off all the green card holders?

The present Mexican national program runs until December 31. In the next 6 months, we either have to prove we have the knowledge and political know-how to get another bill through Congress extending the Mexican national program, or we have to re-tailor a big segment of our agriculture in California on a crash basis.

CONGRATULATIONS, WHEAT FARMERS

We had fully intended writing an editorial about the wheat referendum before the vote. Needless to say, we are quite pleased at the result. Personally, we think that the prestige of the farmer has gone up in the general public's estimation.

It takes a tremendous amount of courage to pull yourself out of the public trough after the Socialists have trapped you and threatened you.

Now the big question is, What will happen from this point on? The Socialists have been challenged. If they are too obvious in their efforts to punish the wheatgrowers by dumping and other devices, they will expose their own viciousness.

It is rather amusing to see the panic and apprehension in the ranks of the socialistic government planners now that private enterprise has "broken out." If this trend were to continue thousands of government planners would have to go back to work and what a strain that would be.

But just keep your eyes open. We are about to see how the "apparatus" works when the first major battle is lost.

Incidentally, the entire farm industry of this State is deeply indebted to the Farm Bureau on local levels and the national level for the magnificent fight they put up to preserve freedom of enterprise.

The free market will adjust if they will only give it time to do so. To offset this eventuality the Socialists will be busy pressing panic buttons, trying to sabotage the workings of the free market, and numerous pieces of legislation to "correct" the situation and return it to bureaucratic hands.

Stand fast, wheatgrowers of the Nation. You have a magnificent opportunity to start a landslide toward freedom.

Holland Society of New York's 1963 Trip to Holland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a short description of the Holland Society of New York's 1963 trip to Holland.

It was written by J. Cornell Schenck of the Holland Society. Howard Van Arsdale of Washington, D.C., was the chairman of the pilgrimage committee for the society.

The trip began on the 28th of April when 140 members of the Holland Society of New York, many of them residents of New Jersey, departed for Holland. The trip concluded on May 20—date of departure from Holland.

There being no objection, the description was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Seven hours after departure our group landed at Schepol, Amsterdam's airport. It was now 2:30 a.m. New York time; 7:30 a.m. in Amsterdam. Despite the early hour, Messrs. van Damm and van Teylingen were on hand to welcome us, and the officers of the society were escorted to a very handsome and comfortable room where we were photographed and interviewed by the press. We were then waived through customs and immigration authorities to the buses waiting to take us to the hotel.

Most of us spent the better part of the day unpacking and getting ready for the official reception tendered us by the Netherlands Government in the sacrosanct hall of the Knights at the Hague. This is usually reserved for heads of state or major international conferences, as well as the scene of the annual opening of Parliament by the Queen, so that it was a very signal honor indeed to be received there by the Minister of Justice, Dr. Albert C. W. Beerman and, also, our Ambassador, John S. Rice. These colorful proceedings were telecast all over the country.

Bright and early on Tuesday morning we drove in our four buses to the tulip fields, where many of us purchased bulbs. We then proceeded to Keukenhoff, a former private estate. We had lunch at Volendam and then were ferried to the Isle of Marken, both of which have now lost importance as fishing ports because of the sealing off of the Zuider Zee.

On our return trip to Amsterdam we stopped at the picture-book village of Broek, where we were shown through a cheese farm as well as a Dutch shoe "factory" and visited a charming old church, whose pulpit prominently displayed an old fashioned hourglass.

On Wednesday we went to the auction sheds at Aalsmeer where hothouse flowers are sold for export to all parts of Europe and beyond. Then we drove to Rotterdam, where we had coffee atop the Euromast, a sort of Dutch Eiffel Tower, and then we had a waterborne tour of the port of Rotterdam, the largest in Europe.

The burgomaster's reception at the city hall (which had escaped damage during the war, and which flew the American flag in our honor) was the high point of the day. At the conclusion of our reception, the organist played our national anthem, and we distinguished ourselves by making the rafters ring with the stirring words of the "Star-Spangled Banner."

On Thursday we drove to the ancient university city of Leiden, where the burgomaster greeted us in the vastly impressive Church of St. Peter. We left about noon for The Hague, where the acting burgomaster received us in the council room of the old town hall—another room usually reserved for royalty. A luncheon on the "old wedding room" followed the ceremonies.

At Delft the Director of Public Relations met us at the Prinzen Hof where William the Silent lived and met his tragic end. A short talk on the history of the town preceded a walk along the canals to the "New Church" (c. 1400) where the "Father of his Country" and most of the succeeding heads of the ruling House of Orange-Nassau are buried, including the late Queen Wilhelmina. A special exhibition of priceless antique Delft ware was opened to us.

Friday, May 3, 1963 is a day which will live forever in the annals of the Holland Society of New York for we participated in the solemn ceremonies of Holland's Day of Remembrance of those, both military and civilian, who lost their lives in World War II.

Our drive to Alkmaar gave no hint of what was in store for us. Our reception there was informal and delightful. Our President Vreeland astounded all by his knowledge of Dutch history. After eating we visited the famous cheese market and then headed back to Amsterdam to participate in the observance of the 18th anniversary of the liberation of the Netherlands. The first part of the service took place in the old Lutheran Church on the Spui. The central portion of the interior was reserved for high-ranking members of the Government, the nobility, the diplomatic corps, generals and admirals of Holland and its allies, and Messrs. Vreeland, Van Aarsdale, and Van Pelt, who later placed a wreath at the National Monument. Fifty seats in the center portion of the church were reserved for other members of the society. After an organ prelude a Protestant chaplain read a passage from Isaiah. This was followed by an address from the chief rabbi of Amsterdam, and then a Roman Catholic chaplain lead the congregation in the Lord's Prayer. This was followed by the singing of the last stanza of the "Wilhelmus." The master of ceremonies then read the order of precedence and our group followed the distinguished guests. The procession in dead silence from the church to the National Monument on the Dam was impressive and our own flags carried by Messrs. Amerman, DeGroat, Van Dyke, and Van Sinderen, led the entire procession.

Everyone came to attention for the arrival of Queen Juliana and Prince Bernhard. They laid the first wreath. Our society's wreath was accorded a place of honor. After the conclusion of these impressive rites, in which we were greatly honored to be invited to participate, all the members were received by the burgomaster of Amsterdam. We ascended a staircase at the top of which a steward, in full regalia, bicorne hat and staff of office, announced each arrival. Each of us on leaving was presented with a silver pin bearing the three St. Andrew's crosses which form such a prominent part of the coat of arms of Amsterdam and also of New Amsterdam.

Everyone who participated in the trip literally got the thrill of a lifetime and we were all grateful to those who conceived the idea. Above all we salute our Dutch cousins who entertained us so royally. We are very proud of our common heritage and of the Holland Society.

It's a "Dam" Shame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the New York Times carried an interesting editorial about the Glen Canyon Dam and its destruction of the "gentlest, most intimate of the mighty canyons of Colorado, indeed one of the outstanding natural scenic places anywhere in America."

The editorial also points out that the eradication of so beautiful a land presents a puzzling commentary on the values of our society. It states, "compounding the tragedy is the very real doubt that the dam is actually needed."

Reading this interesting editorial, I could not help but remember an interesting observation made by Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas in his book, "My Wilderness." Douglas observed, "We pay farmers not to produce certain crops. Why not pay the Army Engineers not to build dams?" This statement might also be expanded to include the Bureau of Reclamation.

Because of the timeliness of the New York Times editorial, I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD at this point and urge all of my colleagues to consider its importance seriously.

THE GLEN CANYON DAM

Earlier this year the floodgates of Glen Canyon Dam were closed, signaling the completion of a major engineering feat to control the Colorado River for hydroelectric power and irrigation. Now the flow has been halted halfway up the nearly 200-mile-long Glen Canyon, from northern Arizona northeastward across southern Utah, as the waters fill in behind the dam.

Many who knew the Glen say it was the gentlest, most intimate of the mighty canyons of the Colorado, indeed one of the outstanding natural scenic places anywhere in America. In 1869, when the first survey boat trip was made down the river, John Wesley Powell (after whom the reservoir is to be named) found infinitely fascinating the variety of natural features of this unusual canyon: "past these towering monuments, past these mounded billows of orange sandstone, past these oak-set glens, past these fern-decked alcoves, past these mural curves, we glide hour after hour, stopping now and then, as our attention is arrested by some new wonder."

The eradication of so beautiful a land presents a puzzling commentary on the values of our society. Glen Canyon could have been placed beside Yosemite or Yellowstone to inspire future generations with its unsurpassed natural beauty. Instead, the loss of Glen beneath the silty waters of Lake Powell will surely become one of the tragedies of the conservation effort in the 20th century. Compounding the tragedy is the very real doubt that the dam is actually needed.

As the Sierra Club points out in its magnificent new book, "The Place No One Knew: Glen Canyon on the Colorado," the loss of Glen can become a lesson for the future, a lesson to Americans that our failure vigorously to protect the best of our scenic heritage means we are sure to lose a great deal of it.

Supreme Court Decision on Bible Reading and Prayer in the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I was impressed by a succinct and forthright comment on the recent decision of the Supreme Court relating to the Lord's Prayer and reading from the Scripture in the public schools by Dr. Henry B. Luffberry, pastor of St. Paul's Lutheran Church, Washington, D.C. I think it well worthy of the attention of the Members of Congress. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATEMENT TO MY CONGREGATION

(By Dr. Henry B. Luffberry)

(Comments of the pastor of St. Paul's Lutheran Church, Washington, D.C., on the Sunday following the Supreme Court decision on Bible reading and prayer in the public schools.)

It is the function of the Supreme Court to interpret the Constitution, and nothing I am about to say should be interpreted as questioning the competence and authority of the Court.

It has been the function of the prophetic ministry since the time of Isaiah to interpret the spiritual significance of secular and political events.

The Supreme Court decision of June 17, 1963, came as no surprise to me. But I did not welcome it as some churchmen who threw in the sponge a year ago. And I do not gloss over its importance as some who say already that religion belongs only in the church and home. And I certainly do not herald it as a new bastion in the separation of church and state; but rather I see in it the further crumbling of the spiritual foundations of our democracy. For to me the decision of June 17 has one tragic implication above all others:

The first amendment introduces what we have long called "the Bill of Rights." That amendment contains two clauses. The first—the establishment clause—is intended to protect us from the imposition of a state religion. The second—the free exercise clause—is intended to protect us from governmental interference with the free exercise of religion. I repeat: To protect us from governmental interference with free exercise of religion. To the Founding Fathers, and to generations of Americans who succeeded them, these provisions were a mighty bulwark defending our right to worship.

But in recent years these guarantees have been used frequently for selfish ends in the interests of atheism, agnosticism and secularism. There has been a growing confusion as to whether the right not to worship is inherent in the right to worship. Some have equated these rights and contended that indifference to God is itself a religion.

The decision of June 17 is the culmination of this quarter century of confusion. In my opinion the tragic lasting effect of that decision is that the right not to worship is now held to be a higher freedom than the right to worship.

This deplorable situation will be with us a long time. It may seem to some that there is nothing we can do. But I urge you as Christians to let the implications of the decision of June 17 weigh upon your conscience, realizing that every day and every week you make a choice between these two rights—the right not to worship, or the right to worship. And if we would preserve what is left of the sacred heritage that came from our forefathers, we must manifest before our children, our community and our world the conviction that we consider the right to worship our highest freedom. May God help us so to do.

First Grimes Golden Apple Grown in Brooke County, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Brooke County, W. Va., is proud of its contributions to the progress of our Nation in the fields of religion, industry, and agriculture. An article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail of June 16, 1963, points out, for example, that the first Grimes Golden apple tree to be cultivated in American was planted near Wellsburg, the county seat.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

BROOKE HOME OF FAMED APPLE

The first Grimes Golden apple tree stood about 2 miles east of Wellsburg. The first Episcopal Church west of the Alleghenies was erected on the Follansbee-Eldersville Road in 1793.

The founder of the Disciples of Christ was born at Bethany, which appropriately was named after a town in Palestine.

Brooke County was organized in 1797 and was named for Gov. Robert Brooke, Virginia's chief executive of the year before. Brooke might have taken a dim view of the county which bore his name if he'd been alive at the time it was near the center of the move to secede from Virginia.

Fortunately for those who confuse Charles Town and Charleston, Wellsburg doesn't wear its original name now: it was chartered as Charlestown in 1791.

The name was changed in 1816 to Wellsburg, after Alexander Wells, son-in-law of Charles Prather, builder of the first large flour warehouse in the East.

The same community also was the home of two other men who contributed to history: Patrick Gass, member of the Lewis and Clark expedition; and Dr. Joseph Doddridge, author of "Frontier Notes."

Railroads, the broad Ohio River, and coal played their part in Brooke's development. So did steel, tinplate and glass. Today its location in the booming Ohio Valley is one of its advantages in greeting the State's second century.

The League School After 10 Years—Its Meaning and Its Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note the 10th anniversary of the League School for Seriously Disturbed Children, in Brooklyn, directed by Dr. Carl Fenichel. This unique school is a tribute to Dr. Fenichel and his staff of 33 whose dedicated efforts have made possible a better existence for many children who otherwise would spend their entire life in the darkness of despair.

I salute Dr. Fenichel and his staff whose contribution has been noted by educators and psychiatrists over the world and from every section and almost every State in our country. I am pleased to include in the RECORD, the director's address at the annual luncheon in the Grand Ballroom of the Hotel Pierre, New York on May 25, as follows:

THE LEAGUE SCHOOL AFTER 10 YEARS: ITS MEANING AND ITS MISSION

(An address by Carl Fenichel, Ed. D., director, at the annual luncheon, League School for Seriously Disturbed Children, Saturday, May 25, 1963, Grand Ballroom, Hotel Pierre, New York)

Not too long ago each of us lived through the ghastly ordeal of 129 men horribly trapped and hopelessly doomed many fathoms deep at the bottom of a vast, cold and dark ocean. For a brief moment in time the sudden impact of that tragedy touched all of us and impelled us as human beings to identify closely and intimately with the anguish of others, alone and helpless at the edge of doom. Unfortunately, nothing we could do could bring them back to us.

We who are here today are vitally concerned with a vast army of children all over America who, at this very moment, are hopelessly, chronically and desperately trapped in the long, dark terror of mental illness—many of whom could be brought back to us if people cared enough to make a commitment.

Today we meet to honor a small commitment that was made 10 years ago when the league school, conceived and launched by a tiny band of people who cared enough, demonstrated by deed and action that mental illness is an illness and not a crime and that children who suffer from it shall not be excluded from the human race.

Exclusion and punishment have been society's two prescriptions for the mentally ill throughout the ages. With morbid monotony, mankind has always insisted that a nail which sticks out must be hammered down. Down through the centuries, the mentally ill, because they stick out, have been hammered down, cast out and stored away—out of sight and mind of all but their families. Always they have been despised and disposed of; always they met torture rather than treatment.

All too slowly, punishment gave way to pity, and the horrors and inhumanities of the dungeons and the asylums gave way to the more civilized practices of custody and containment. What once we saw as evil we began to see as sickness. But the arrival of the atomic age found 20th century America still anchored to its 19th century heritage of isolating mentally sick men, women and children in vast cold storage cells called State hospitals.

And then, one decade ago, it happened. We opened a door on a drab, obscure street in Brooklyn and through that door they came—mentally sick children who had turned away from our world, and parents whose desperate cries for help had been turned down by that very same world.

They came to us after long and agonizing journeys down dead end streets of rejection, beating on doors that never opened. Wherever these parents went for help they met the same reception of community indifference and unconcern. Wherever these children went—schools, clinics, or neighborhoods—they were denied entry into life.

Outside of the State hospitals and a few costly residential centers there was nothing for these parents who wanted only to help and to hold on to their children. And so—when all other doors were shut and all hope drained—they came to us. And that small, ordinary brownstone that housed a mortgage, a dream, and the league school became a mansion of mercy to parents and children weighed down with grief that was heavy and deep. If we had done nothing more than open a door to human beings abandoned by the community and carrying a burden they could never lay down, our existence would have been more than justified.

But something more than people came across that threshold. Through that door and out of that agony came a touch of hope, a measure of acceptance and a brand new idea—a simple but significant idea that challenged the wornout legend of separating a child from his family and removing him from his community as the best and only solution for mental illness. What we offered was a simple alternative: To take these children out of hiding and give them a chance to live and grow within their own families and communities.

Out of that alternative grew a brand new concept of treatment—one that substituted the day school, the home, and the neighborhood for the hospital bed, the overcrowded ward and the locked door. What the league school started and gave voice and direction to was a historically new kind of community facility in our country—the day treatment center for severely disturbed children.

A decade of yesterdays have come and gone since that small door opened in 1953. Our 10th birthday is a time to remember the trials and triumphs of those yesterdays and to browse among old memories without getting lost in them. It is also a time for honest appraisal when we can measure the distance we have come and take stock of where we are going.

At the beginning there was nothing—no funds, no resources, no community support. All we had to start with were two sick children, a staff of three, a debt of $8,000, and an unmet budget of $19,000. Our only resource was the dedication of the handful of parents, trustees, and friends to break through some of the doom that surrounded mental illness. And yet it was this most precious of human resources, compounded by a tremendous sense of purpose, that carried us across a decade of debts and deficits to our present 3-story building filled beyond capacity with 52 children, a staff of 33, and an unmet budget of more than $165,000.

But size of budget, area of building, number of people on staff, or children on register do not begin to tell the story of how far we have come. The true scale and dimensions of the league school can only be measured by the pioneering influence we have had and the profound impact we have made.

From small, unpromising beginnings, out of all proportion to our numbers and our resources, the league school idea began to take hold and to grow. Out of a great need we had started something that had a momentum all its own.

The opening of our day treatment school, along with the growing day hospital and open hospital movement, were bringing home a few simple truths. We were discovering that much of the withdrawal and disability that we once believed was part of mental illness came from the locked and isolated way of life imposed by society on the mentally ill. We were beginning to recognize that cutting off the mentally ill from normal life experiences robs them of the chance to develop and use skills and capacities necessary for growth and thus compounds disabilities already there.

This is certainly true of mentally ill children. A mentally ill child excluded from school—the most vital learning experience open to children—is bound to be more helpless and disabled than he might otherwise be. And yet every community in America had been perpetuating the disabilities of deeply disturbed children by barring them from its schools.

I remember vividly those early days when we went to the State department of education up in Albany asking for support of the league school only to be told that a day treatment school for mentally sick children was a medical and not an educational responsibility. When we appealed to local mental health agencies for help we learned that their funds were earmarked for hospitals and clinics and that we rightfully belonged in the field of education. These officials, we found out, were not trying to pass the buck. The sad truth was that neither the department of education nor the department of mental hygiene had the needed support of legislation, funds or public demand to assume responsibility for day treatment schools like ours. Like any new, unknown and untried idea we had to prove by deed and demonstrate by example the true worth of our pilot project. By our performance, we had to persuade professionals and government agencies that our children could be helped within the community and that their problems and needs were the joint responsibility of educational and mental health agencies on Federal, State and community levels.

Fortunately, our emphasis on education and habilitation rather than on custody and segregation put us in the vanguard of an idea with power so compelling that it could not be ignored. Once hidden on a quiet one-way street in Brooklyn, the league school gradually opened new and broad highways that spanned a continent and beyond. It would be difficult to measure the distance and add up the mileage covered by all the educators, psychiatrists, pediatricians, psychologists, and community leaders—eager to observe and study the day treatment idea—who have come to us from Canada, Hawaii, Italy, England, Finland, France, Spain, Scotland, Pakistan, Portugal, Israel, Sweden, British West Indies, Switzerland, Australia, and from every section and nearly every State of our country. By mail, by telephone, and by visits and conferences we helped to launch and guide schools like ours that were slowly beginning to evolve across the Nation.

At the same time, our small bridgehead of hope planted on a dark continent of indifference and despair began to win gradual recognition and support from governmental agencies on Federal, State and city levels.

In 1956, the New York State Department of Mental Hygiene, eager to explore the value of day treatment centers for mentally ill children, gave the school a 5-year grant.

In 1957, the National Institute of Mental Health gave us a 5-year grant to establish the first demonstration nursery school for schizophrenic children.

In 1959, a study of residential and day centers for mentally ill children throughout the State, made by the New York State Interdepartmental Health Resources Board declared: "It cannot be emphasized too much that the children at the league school are as sick as those at any hospital. * * * The league school is the most conspicuous instance of seriously disturbed children being maintained in the community by dint of outpatient service." The report concluded with a recommendation that community day centers be made the core of treatment facilities for seriously disturbed children.

In 1960, the New York City Community Mental Health Board agreed to support the league school's clinical services.

In 1961, the New York State Department of Mental Hygiene, by administrative act, gave official recognition to day treatment centers like the league school as an essential community mental health facility, eligible for mental health funds along with hospitals and clinics.

In September 1962, the New York City Board of Education agreed to sponsor and support a small board of education annex at the league school as part of its expanding services for severely disturbed children.

And just 3 months ago, in February 1963, President Kennedy, in the first presidential message in American history ever devoted exclusively to mental illness and mental retardation, asked Congress to appropriate funds for the construction of a vast network of community mental health centers throughout the country. "New knowledge," said the President, "makes it possible for most of the mentally ill to be treated in their own community. Reliance on the cold mercy of custodial isolation must be supplanted by the open warmth of community concern and capability."

And so now—after 10 years—it has come to pass. The community day treatment center idea has won official recognition and acceptance by educators and mental health officials and by agencies on city, State, Federal and even presidential level. By deed and by dedication what was once a vague vision is on its way to becoming a valid fact.

Even more important than our pioneering role in launching and winning acceptance for the day school idea has been our unique policy of giving preference and priority—not to those children easiest to help—but to those who need help most. The 5-year report made to Congress in 1961 by the Joint Commission on Mental Illness pointed up the sad fact that outside of State hospitals, most psychiatrists, psychologists, clinics and agencies devote nearly all their time to the minor and more easily treatable forms of mental illness and exclude those suffering from severe mental illness and psychoses. In sharp contrast to those professionals who have become prisoners of their own pessimism, the league school has accepted children who are as sick as those in State hospitals, children who were turned down by every institution except the State hospital.

The league school is equally proud of having sparked another new trend that is beginning to win professional acceptance in programs for seriously disturbed children—the practice of employing the discipline of special education and the specially trained teacher as the major therapeutic agent. In most hospitals, clinics and agencies the treatment of the mentally ill is still reserved for the traditional trinity—the psychiatrist, the psychologist and the social worker—with major emphasis on 1 or 2 hours of individual therapy per week by one of these three disciplines. At the league school the daily 6-hour program of special education has always played the key role. It is a program that pools the special knowledge, findings and skills of every member of the clinical team into a personal prescription for each child's daily learning and living experiences.

Within the past few years there is an ever-growing awareness in the mental health field that teachers trained in special education have a most important therapeutic contribution to make and that the classroom desk can help solve the critical problem of the inadequate hospital bed and the costly and seldom accessible psychiatric couch.

Another proud chapter in the history of the league school has been our attitude toward the parents of our children. Right from the start we were confronted with many authorities in the field of mental illness who thought they were shedding new light on the illness when they found someone to blame for it. Mankind has always had to find or invent an explanation for something it didn't understand. In the old days mental illness was blamed on the evil work of devils and demons. Now that we've become a little more sophisticated a new scapegoat had to be found. There are in our field today some very influential opinion makers who build headlines and reputations on the prevailing practice that if you aren't sure why serious mental illness happens to a child, pin it on rejecting, overprotective, underprotective, or refrigerated parents.

A recent professional publication attributes much of childhood schizophrenia to what it calls parental perplexity. Now anyone who has lived and worked with schizophrenic children will honestly and humbly concede that there is no shortage of perplexity in our field—not only parental perplexity but psychiatric perplexity, psychological perplexity, pediatric perplexity as well as neurological and biochemical perplexity. If professionals in the field are perplexed it isn't difficult to understand why parents would be too. The sad truth is that everyone is more or less perplexed about how and why childhood mental illness happens.

No one knows what part of mental illness is constitutional, psychological, or chemical in origin and how much of it is an accident of chromosomes, glands, metabolism, prenatal infection or injury, and 101 other interacting forces about which we know so woefully little.

We at the league school have learned long ago—without intensive statistical research—that serious mental illness can strike any family. We have seen it come to children of good, warm, loving and understanding parents and exempt children of cold, rejecting and perplexed parents. It obviously has no more respect or regard for wealth, race, intelligence, class, color or creed than a case of mumps or measles.

And yet, because of occupational prejudice by many professionals in the field, our parents—who were rejected by nearly everyone in the community including their mentally ill child—were made to feel that it was their own rejection or perplexity which caused or contributed to the illness of their child.

We know that much of the credit for the success of our day school movement belongs to those pioneering parents who resisted institutionalization of their children. It was the splendid strength and quiet courage of so many of these parents as well as their love and acceptance of their child that made it possible for them to bear the burden and bitterness of keeping a mentally ill child at home and in a community that had rejected him.

Over the years we have come to know the desperate plight of parents struggling to come to terms with the bitter tragedy of mental illness. We know the sick despair and the nightmares that haunt the dreams of parents trying to plan the grim, uncertain future of a child robbed of nearly every promise and potential for living. We know the long and bitter vigil of families with children on long waiting lists that move much too slowly while parents watch the fleeting days of childhood grow shorter and the shadows longer.

And when the long vigil is over and their child is finally accepted at the school our parents soon learn that there are no instant remedies, no quick, slick solutions and certainly, as yet, no cure for serious childhood mental illness.

In a decade that is accustomed to miracle breakthroughs in science and the thrives on instant coffee, instant soup, and instant TV dinners we must work with and settle for recipes and prescriptions that are neither instant, certain, or exact. We have no golden guarantees to offer and no banners of total victory to raise. Even with the most tender loving care, professional understanding and sensitive handling we know that our skills and tools are neither adequate nor precise enough to help every child. While we work with an unwillingness to despair we have found the humility and the bitter wisdom to recognize and admit the awful reality of failure whenever it occurs.

Each year we share the agonizing decisions that parents face when, after years at the school, with little or no success, the State hospital or residential placement is recommended for a child who can no longer be contained at home without serious damage and disruption to family life.

Each year the school makes a followup study of all former children including those in State hospitals. Fortunately, with improved treatment services at many State hospitals, some of these children eventually do return to their families, improved and better able to function. But here are some direct quotes from hospital reports on some of our children whose young lives seem to be spent before they have even begun:

Charles D., age 11: "He is quiet but restless, aloof, self-centered and completely disregards his surroundings. He has no speech, no friends."

Martin S., age 13: "He sits and rocks, is unresponsive, has spells of giggling or crying, or sits with his fingers in his ears, emitting screams."

Gilbert S., age 14: "He sits hitting his knee with a piece of paper, making strange sounds; can stop upon request but returns to the same pattern in about 5 minutes. He has no friends, no speech, and spends his time pacing the floor."

We who live in the valley of the shadows of these failures know that the pain and the pathology of mental illness is real. We live with the long, deep silences of the mute and speechless and with the sad, strange cries of the frightened and the lost. We have seen the anguish on faces of children always in panic and have looked into eyes too familiar with failure.

We have held the helpless hands of children forever groping for other human hands and have watched the frenzied fingers that seek urgent relief by strange, feverish rituals. We are familiar with faces that have never known laughter and we have listened to laughter that is hollow and without joy.

We know the essential emptiness and poverty of lives drained of all meaning and spent mostly in clutching a shred of string or staring vacantly into space. We have heard the tragic accent of many who echo only empty sounds or phrases and have listened to those who hold strange monologs with themselves. We have seen bodies whirling, rocking, racing frantically and forever in motion, and have watched others retreat to walls, floors or corners in remote and desolute isolation.

Yes, the pain and the anguish of mental illness have been sharp and always close to us these past 10 years. Our working hours are never marked with the drama or excitement of miracle cures or spectacular successes but with the single mission and fervent hope that we can someday reach and touch the lives of each of our children.

We know that while we may not be able to heal their hurt we can often ease their pain. Our moments of triumph come from watching a child slowly emerge from his twilight existence and begin to contact a tiny fragment of the world, its sights, colors, rhythms, shapes and sounds—and to find them good. Each year we gain heart and hope watching these small triumphs grow larger: The disorganized, incoherent child of last year who now speaks and uses language to communicate and reach people; the once helpless and dependent ones now proud of their newly found power to feed, toilet and dress themselves; the wild and explosive ones who are beginning to enjoy the quiet and comfort of controlling their own body impulses and sensations; the growing appetite for life of children, once locked in their own private world, who have now joined the give-and-take world of games, play and other children—mentally ill children who are ready to rejoin the human race.

And there is that deeper personal and professional pride that comes from watching the mind of a child begin to come alive to the wonder of symbols, numbers and words and to the magic of books and academic learning. At our school this year are 26 children, once considered uneducable, who are now reading and doing some form of academic work, many of whom will eventually return to a regular school.

And here are just a few very recent follow-up reports on some of our alumni who have already made the big step back:

Robert M., age 13: "He is now attending a public junior high, is in the 7th grade and doing exceptionally well. His latest report card marks were 90 in science, 90 in math and 95 in language. He has just made honor roll. He was recently elected by his classmates as their class representative to the student organization."

William S., age 10: "He attends a public school in Brooklyn and has come a long way. He has made a marvelous social adjustment and is well liked by his teachers and classmates. He shows steady improvement, good self-control, cooperates with the tasks presented him and is well-adjusted to classroom situations. His academic work shows marked improvement. He is an eager pupil and enjoys group play as well as academic work. He has improved physically, mentally and emotionally."

Harold M., age 12: "He is now in the 7th grade at the Ethical Cultural School, 1 year ahead of his age. Is well above his grade in reading, spelling, math and social studies. He gets along very well with his peers and has been singing with his center's choir on TV channel 4."

Stanley R., age 17: "He is now a junior in one of the outstanding academic high schools in Brooklyn. He is happy, healthy, has many friends and enjoys an active social life. His chief interest is in writing and his fourth published poem appeared in the most recent issue of the school magazine. He excels in science and in English and was advanced an entire year above his grade."

These then are our triumphs—bringing back to our world some of those children who were once hopelessly, chronically and desperately trapped in the long, dark terror of mental illness. Here is the challenge and the reward that give us the heart and the will to live with failure and go on searching for the unknown possibilities that may lie within any of our children.

And now, before I close, I would like to express my gratitude to all of you who have shared our struggles and made our triumphs possible—our staff, our board of trustees, our parents, our governmental agencies—Federal, State and city—and all the many wonderful supporting groups and individuals—some of whom are listed on our honor roll—all of whom are listed in our hearts.

You who have made all this possible must realize that from this moment on the league school's past becomes prologue for the unfinished business still before us. We who spent a decade clearing through a jungle heavy with inertia and despair must now break new ground for bigger dreams that ask fulfillment.

On land obtained from the city in the Medical Center of Brooklyn a new league school building will rise—one that will house a nursery, a day treatment center and school, a sheltered workshop and habilitation center for adolescents, an adjustment center for young adults, a psychiatric clinic and a diagnostic, training, and research center.

I know that many of you will be asking the very question we asked ourselves when we had to raise $6,000 for our first building and $27,000 for our present one. Can we afford it? How can we—who end up each year with a huge deficit we are not sure we can meet—raise money for a building that will cost $500,000? Do we dare make this move? All I can give you is the same answer we have given many times before—do we dare not to?

Can we put a price tag on the desperately sick children at our school and the countless others who are waiting outside trying to come in? What is the market price of a handful of hope and how do you assess the value of a measure of dignity? How much is the mind of a child worth?

While we wait for answers let us remember that the league school did not just happen. It had to be dreamed of, worked for, and kept alive by the hands and hearts and minds of many people.

Together we can build a new house for the tortured and troubled minds of children—a house that will be a haven of hope and a declaration of concern set in concrete and steel. So on this, our 10th anniversary, let us—who have taken the suffering of others upon ourselves—begin to build our new house—a house that will be a monument not to the past but to the world of tomorrow—a house where no child will be a stranger and afraid.

The Great Significance of Pope John's Apostolic Letter on SS. Cyril and Methodius' Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Sunday, July 7, 1963, the Slav nations in general and the American Slovaks in particular observed the 11th centennial of the arrival in A.D. 863 of their apostles SS. Cyril and Methodius to what is now Slovakia. It was from there that they started their most important mission of evangelizing the Slavonic nations.

Earlier this year, there was a pilgrimage of the Eastern District of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America at the Shrine of Immaculate Conception, Washington, D.C., on Sunday, June 30, 1963. Americans came from the Eastern States to pay homage to these patrons.

The preparations for this jubilee year started 2 years ago when a campaign was launched for the erection of an Institute of SS. Cyril and Methodius in Rome at a cost of a million dollars. The campaign was directed by the Most Reverend Bishop Andrew G. Grutka, D.D., of Gary, Ind., for the training of priests for Slovakia, now under communistic rule. This institute will be dedicated on September 15, 1963. Pilgrims from the United States will attend. Former Apostolic Delegate to United States, His Eminence Amleto Cardinal Cicognani, papal secretary of state, will pontificate in the Basilica of St. Clement, where St. Cyril, who died in Rome in February 869, is buried.

The great significance of this 11th centenary was enriched by the apostolic letter entitled "Magnifici Eventus," which the late Holy Father, Pope John XXIII, issued on May 11, 1963, in honor of this event. According to Mr. John C. Sciranka, American-Slovak journalist of Passaic, N.J., who has written about this historical event on numerous occasions, this anniversary will add much to the spiritual uplift and moral strength of the captive nations, whose great benefactors were these two missionaries and apostles.

On the day of the issuance of this apostolic letter, Pope John XXIII blessed the cornerstone of the institute being built in their honor in Rome, which Eugene Cardinal Tisserent later placed on the structure and will dedicate the edifice on September 15, 1963.

Mr. Sciranka further stated that a century ago, 80 million Slavs over the world paid tribute to these apostles during their millenium. Later in 1880, Pope Leo XIII, issued in their honor an encyclical "Grande Munus," which is being mentioned in programs during this year's anniversary.

This event has special meaning in New Jersey, where the memory of the two apostles is revered in two churches that bear their names. Sixty years ago SS. Cyril and Methodius Church was established in Boonton, N.J. The present pastor is the Right Reverend Monsignor Andrew V. Stafan, V. C., vice chancellor of the Paterson diocese. A half century ago, the Church of SS. Cyril and Methodius was established in Clifton, N.J. Many such societies in New Jersey are dedicated to these two apostles. The anniversary was also the subject of a memorable program recently in the Parish of the Holy Trinity, at Perth Amboy, N.J. The Reverend Michael J. Churak is pastor there.

In order to appreciate and understand the great mission of the Slavonic nations in this cold war against communism in the spirit and traditions of SS. Cyril and Methodius, who are to the Slovaks and the Slavs what St. Boniface is to the Germans and St. Patrick to the Irish, on this the 11th centenary, I call to your attention and wish everyone interested in the spiritual crusade for freedom and justice of the captive nations, to read the Apostolic Letter of Pope John XXIII, released by the NCWC News Service from Rome on May 14, 1963, and circulated by the Eastern District of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America, which met in Washington on June 30, 1963.

The following text appeared in the Advocate, official organ of the Newark, N.J., archdiocese and Paterson, N.J., diocese on May 23, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HOLY FATHER'S LETTER COMMEMORATES WORK OF SS. CYRIL AND METHODIUS

In the hidden design of God's providence, the centennial celebration of a glorious event is taking place at the moment that the Second Ecumenical Council of the Vatican is being held. It also seems to be closely connected with the purposes of this general council. It was just 11 centuries ago this year that the two noble Apostles, St. Cyril and St. Methodius arrived in Great Moravia from Constantinople.

Certainly nothing can be more useful for individual nations, nothing more remarkable for the great benefit it brings than that, under the radiance of the Sun of Justice, the light of the Gospel shine forth on the people (cf. II Corinthians 4, 6) and thus new members enter into the Christian family. Such an event, so worthy of special remembrance, had its beginnings among the Moravians and the Slovaks, and later among the many other Slav nations due to the providential arrival of these great men.

It is never proper to keep silent about heavenly blessings. That is particularly true when is comes to solemnly recalling that families of nations have been granted the dignity by God, Who is rich in mercy (cf. Ephesians 2, 4) of being transferred to the kingdom of His beloved Son (cf. Colossians 1, 13) and of being adorned with the nobility of Christians.

For this reason, venerable brethren, bishops of the Slav nations, we have decided to send this letter to you in order to make some reflections upon so glorious event and, through our fatherly and loving exhortation, to urge you and the clergy and people entrusted to your care, to celebrate it with a worthy and reverent tribute.

WORK OF SAINTS

It will be your task to arrange that, with fitting praise, there be presented to each of your flocks the life, the talents, the journeys, the accomplishments, the labors and fatigues which SS. Cyril and Methodius underwent in order to convert them to Christ and to lead them more and more toward a human and civilized culture.

It cannot be denied that other efforts towards the same end were made in those regions by other men before them. But the results obtained were meager and delayed and looked forward to a more propitious time and better adapted methods when, through the outpouring of divine grace, there would come the acceptable time and the day of salvation (cf. II Corinthians 6, 2).

Should anyone seek to know the principal reasons why the apostolic efforts of SS. Cyril and Methodius bore such prolific fruit he will easily understand that it was a result of the fact that there were "poor in the world's eye to be rich in faith" (James 2, 5), "men rich in virtue and zealous for perfection" (Ecclesiastes 44, 6), united to the see of Peter and dedicated to it, truly and completely Catholic and apostolic in every sense of the word.

The praise due them was clearly expressed by our predecessor of happy memory. Pius XI, in the words: "Why are we surprised if Cyril and Methodius—whom we can call sons of Orient, Byzantines by nationality, Greeks by birth, Romans by mission, Slavs by the fruits of their apostolate—made themselves all things to all men that all might be gained to the unity of the Catholic church?" (Apostolic Letter to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes and of the Republic of Czechoslovakia, A.A.S. 1927, 95).

ASSIGNMENT TO SLAVS

It will be helpful for us to examine, even if briefly and summarily, the accounts which narrate their history. They were born in Thessalonika, twin brothers, equal in their zeal for the faith, different in the talents with which they were gifted.

One distinguished himself as a magistrate, the other in the study of philosophy. Both, after devoting themselves among various dangerous circumstances to laborious sacred missions among the Arabas and Khazars, retired to the solitude of Mount Olympus in Bithynia.

Sent by Michael III, Emperor of Byzantium, to Rastislav, Prince of Great Moravia, who had asked him for worthy preachers of the gospel, they were received with tremendous joy, and without delay they took up the evangelical mission to which they had devoted themselves.

In a short time, a great harvest sprang up in a remarkable manner. It happened that the evangelical task they had undertaken was rendered easier by the fact that a newly created alphabet was used to express the language of the Slavs and that it was into their own language that the sacred books of the Old and New Testaments as well as the liturgical books of both the Roman and the Byzantine rite were translated.

When both brothers came to Rome to give an account of their activities to the Roman pontiff and to receive directives about what was to be done, they were received with every honor by Hadrian II. The same sovereign pontiff, after recognizing the unsullied orthodoxy of the faith of the two heralds of the Gospel, saw to it that holy orders were conferred upon Methodius and some of their disciples.

DEATH OF CYRIL

When Cyril, mature in virtue more than age, died at Rome a short time afterward, he was given a solemn funeral and his body was placed within the city in the church of St. Clement with the highest honors. Methodius, however, was appointed archbishop of Pannonia and Great Moravia, and also received the charge of looking after the spiritual progress of the Slav nations as papal legate.

This holy man undertook his new work with a strong and courageous spirit. First of all, he established and strengthened, with due moderation, the ecclesiastical discipline of his territory. He then undertook arduous journeys throughout this vast region and he instructed in the Christian faith, in addition to the Moravians, Slovaks and Slovenes, also the Bohemians, Poles and Croats and, through disciples trained by him, the Serbs, Macedonians and Bulgarians through whom the Ukrainians, Russians and White Ruthenians also received instruction.

We do not feel that we should pass over the return of Methodius to Rome in order to vindicate himself properly before John VIII for having introduced the Slav language into the sacred ceremonies. There he was absolved of every accusation. Confirmed in all the offices entrusted to him by Hadrian II, in particular the Slav mission, he carried them out with even greater zeal.

In fact, he always considered it a holy and sacred thing to be firmly attached to the Roman Church by the strictest bonds of charity and faith and to exercise his sacred ministry in reverent obedience to the Apostolic See which is the support of truth and Christian unity.

After undergoing many labors and sufferings for the name and glory of Christ, he finished this earthly life on the 6th of April, 885, and was buried in the principal church of Great Moravia.

VENERATION SPREADS

The religious veneration, the great honor and renown of SS. Cyril and Methodius sprang up and spread far and wide across every age and through every place. This induced Leo XIII to extoll the special praises of these brother Apostles in his encyclical letter Grande Munus. The same Roman pontiff decreed that their feast day and veneration should be extended to the entire church so that, set into the candelabrum of the church of God, they might give forth a more brilliant light.

Since we are moved by the same respect as that of our predecessor and the conditions of the present age as well as the anniversary being commemorated demand it, we wish and desire that, inspired by a reverent zeal, you and all your countrymen who bear the name of Christian, raise eyes and minds to those holy and heavenly helpers as to friendly stars.

The more necessary for you to have the divine help close at hand, and not mere human help, the more you should rely on their intercession. For in heaven they continue, by their powerful prayers, to keep close to the demands of the enterprises they undertook and their provident love, far from being quenched, keeps watch even more diligently.

DESIRE FOR UNITY

You know, venerable brethren, that with fervent desires we have striven and labored so that the orientals who glory in the name of Christian separated from the communion of the apostolic see may be zealous toward reestablishing it and that by gradually fulfilling the prayer of Christ, unity of one flock and shepherd may be realized.

The desires of the Second Ecumenical Council of the Vatican, at which—bringing pleasure to the heart and promise of fair hope—even observer delegates of the separated churches have been present, reach out toward the same end.

The voice of the times is the voice of God. By more than one indication and by arguments which are not few nor insignificant, it seems to urge and impel toward the desired restoration of this communion and peace.

In the most noble and useful cause of reestablishing harmonious bonds in the unity of integral faith, from which there will undoubtedly be born a new order of happiness in the Christian world, the things which unite both sides are much greater than those which separate them. Now both must prepare the roads which will be of solid construction and which, if there will be mutual understanding and fraternal charity, will lead to the desired success. This eagerness to fulfill the will of God strengthens all things, hopes all things, sustains all things.

What great contribution has been made toward this end by the association founded by Anthony Martin Slomsek, bishop of Maribor, and developed by Anthony Cyril Stojan, archbishop of Olomouc, to which the name of Apostolate of SS. Cyril and Methodius was given.

How effective were the congresses which were held at Velehrad, near the sacred relics of St. Methodius. The noteworthy and gratifying results which thus developed for a common gain strongly accentuate the fervent wish for better circumstances which will make more easy the resumption and promotion of work already so happily begun.

LETTER TO CONGRESS

We remember that in 1927, when we held the office of apostolic delegate in Bulgaria, we wrote to the president of the Congress of Velehrad: "I desire that a joyful voice coming out of Bulgaria may reach you and, through you, may be spread among all those assembled in Velehrad because a solemn convocation is being held near the sacred memorials of SS. Cyril and Methodius. This voice bears testimony to the fact that Catholics here share in the prayers, studies, deliberations, and petitions which Slav Catholics express and manifest for the union of the churches.

"Truly we seem to be the grains of wheat scattered upon the mountains, according to the beautiful image of the ancient Christian prayer, grains which indeed unite together to form delicious bread. Through the intercession of SS. Cyril and Methodius, may God bless your fraternal union of spirits and may the heavenly grace grant it a visible sign." (Acta v. Conv. Velehr. p. 61.)

It was at that time that we began a particular custom of praying to God not only for the beloved Bulgarian people but also for all the peoples who made the name of Christ shine forth in the heart of Europe.

Then was our heart deeply touched and this impulse moved us each day during the years that followed to pour out confident prayers to God in a spirit of tender reverence. In these prayers it is our custom to join to the blessed mother of Jesus, SS. Cyril and Methodius and all the other saints of east and west so that by their ever-powerful patronage they might beg of God the fulfillment of that brotherhood and peace so much desired.

Because one easily becomes tired in carrying on the effort for blessed unity, there are teachers and patrons to spur one on, SS. Cyril and Methodius, who, like two lights in the heavens, illuminate the road upon which one has embarked. Surely these two holy pillars of unity are praying much for all the holy city which is the church and for the peoples entrusted to their care: Cyril and Methodius, two olive trees, two candelabra, two anointed sons who stand before the Lord of the whole earth (cf. II Machabees 15, 14; Apocalypse 11, 4; Zechariah 4, II–14).

ST. CYRIL'S PRAYER

How suitable, how loving, and how fitting for present circumstances is the prayer which St. Cyril, dying in Rome, uttered to ask great heavenly graces for the people committed to his care: "O Lord God, who have created all the orders of angels and spiritual powers, who have stretched forth the heavens and established the earth * * * make Your church grow in numbers and gather all together in unity; establish all Your chosen ones in the harmony of Your true faith and Your right confession and inspire in their hearts the word of Your hearing * * * so that they may gird themselves to do what is good and pleasing to you" (Slavic Life of Constantine, ch. XVIII).

On the occasion on the commemoration of this happy event, with the greatest reverence should thanks be rendered to God for the indescribable benefit which was conferred on the Christian community by the suspicious coming of SS. Cyril and Methodius.

For through them directly, or through their disciples, the Christian faith and human culture were brought to the Slav nations. Thus there flourished, under the influence of the grace of the Gospel, those gifts happily implanted by nature which are the ornament of these nations: a vivid sense of the divine, a generous nature, a rich and diversified talent, an inclination toward a refined culture, a rich disposition toward the fine arts, a boundless sense of hospitality, all of which offer confident hopes for their future.

Unhappily, in many of their countries, these heavenly blessings—the gifts received from their ancestors and the noble name of Christian—are sadly condemned. Heaven grant that shame may be felt for despising what should be esteemed and loved and that, by a change in the attitude of their rulers—which we trust will come about—the tempest will be transformed into a calm breeze.

REQUEST FOR PRAYER

That the Christian religion, the treasure of inestimable value handed down from their ancestors, may be preserved intact for your people, we urge you this year to intensify supplications to God, prayers, holy sacrifices, tears and the fruit of good works, possessing the mystery of faith in a pure conscience (1 Timothy 3, 9).

The Ruler and Director of all things and times, having been appeased, as is our prayerful hope, will turn afflictions and sadness into better things and will prepare consolations for those who trust in His aid and protection so that the joy will be greater as it was less expected.

We have learned that the celebration of this 11th centenary is being commemorated by certain significant efforts to perpetuate it for the adornment and profit of religion. For example, studies on the history of SS. Cyril and Methodius and their teaching will be published, pilgrimages will be organized.

Add to these other undertakings so that by zealous efforts these two apostles may in some way return to honor among your people and the torch which they brought may burn more brightly and be raised on high.

Toward this end also have we destined for some of your principal churches the candles which we solemnly blessed on the Feast of the Purification of a sign of Christ given as the illumination of your peoples and the cause of common salvation, who appeared among you by means of the two disseminators of evangelical light.

Therefore, as we strongly desire that the coming celebration of the anniversary of SS. Cyril and Methodius should be celebrated in a particularly fitting and fruitful manner and may leave behind it evidence of spiritual increase and lasting effects, we invoke the effective assistance of God and, as a sign and pledge of divine benefits, we lovingly bestow on you, venerable brethren, and on the clergy and faithful committed to your charge, apostolic blessing.

Given at Rome, at St. Peters. May 11, Feast of SS. Cyril and Methodius according to the Byzantine-Slav rite, in the year 1963, the fifth of our pontificate.

Too Proud To Integrate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Bob Craig, an outstanding reporter and columnist for the Spartanburg Journal of Spartansburg, S.C., has written a very interesting column which poses a challenge to American Negroes who evidence little or no pride in their own racial heritage. The column is entitled "Too Proud To Integrate." I ask unanimous consent that this column which appeared in the June 24, 1963, issue of the Spartanburg Journal be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Journal, June 24, 1963]

TOO PROUD TO INTEGRATE

There is a great lesson to be learned by the American Negro from the French Canadian.

For at a time when some American Negroes are striving to lose their identities in the vast swell of the white races, the French Canadian is fighting to retain his individuality.

He is not ashamed to speak the language he loves: French. He is not ashamed to cling to the church of his choice, Catholic. Nor is he ashamed to bring up his children in separate schools so that they may learn the ways and belief of their forefathers. In fact, he insists on separate schools.

Here in Canada, French Canadians have battled for their own identity since the British first took the land from France.

Here, public signs are printed in two languages: a testimony to the determination of the French Canadian to remain proudly a French Canadian.

Here, two languages are recognized in the national Parliament.

This segregation of nationality is not forced upon the French minority. Instead it is enforced upon the English speaking majority by the French speaking minority.

For the French want, above all to be just what they are: French-speaking Canadians.

Quebec is the heart of French Canada. And there is where most French Canadians congregate. Here is the home of the FLQ, a terrorist organization devoted to the precepts of segregation.

In the United States, from California to South Carolina there are some Negroes who want to be swallowed up in white society. They want quite desperately not to be Negroes.

And some of them believe sincerely that somehow being legally integrated into white society will solve their major problem: poverty.

But the truth is that legal integration has solved none of the Negro's problems in the United States. He is still segregated, discriminated against and even hated in the great northern cities where segregation is against the law.

But worse still, he has been forced, in exchange for his legal integration, to give up his pride in his race.

Despite what anyone says, there is no natural shame to being born a Negro. But there is sort of built-in shame to poverty.

The American Negro is building his own history. He has risen from slavery to what he is today mainly by pulling himself up by his own bootstraps. There are those who claim he must have U.S. assistance to rise any higher.

But this is selling the Negro race short. What it does with its own future is mainly up to the Negro himself.

Whether he builds a history for his race where his children can be proud of is a decision which only he can make.

With all the talk of integration and the political fodder which both Democrats and Republicans have made of it, the national integration movement to date has done nothing to actually improve the lot of the Negro. For the Negro's problem is rooted not in segregation but it economics.

In the main, the South Carolina Negro community has shown a great resistance to the stampede which professional fund raisers have tried to push upon him.

The Negro almost seems to be telling us that he too knows his future lies in economics, not in grandstand acts which provide a lot of national publicity but no real progress for the Negro.

The Negro has more to gain by improving his educational facilities than he does by integrating them. For it seems unlikely that integration and improvement are synonymous anywhere in this Nation.

What the Negro does need to know is that being a Negro should give him as much pride as being a Scotsman, a Frenchman, or an Englishman. To attempt to destroy the American Negro by losing him in our society is nothing more than an admission that the Negro is inferior.

Or to put it another way, to integrate the Negro is really to disintegrate him.

Military Field Mass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker. It appears fitting that one of the first functions in connection with the observance of the centennary of the Battle of Gettysburg was a religious one. On Saturday, June 29, at 12 o'clock noon, Bishop George L. Leech of the Harrisburg diocese of the Catholic Church was the celebrant at a field mass. Six hundred fourth degree Knights of Columbus formed a living cross and presented a sabre salute at the elevation of the mass.

This observance was conducted at the Eternal Light Peace Memorial.

The following address was delivered by Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president, University of Notre Dame:

(Address delivered by Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president, University of Notre Dame, Battle of Gettysburg, centennial observance, Gettysburg, Pa., June 29, 1963)

GETTYSBURG: YESTERDAY AND TODAY

Our ceremony began this morning with the blessing of a new plaque attached to the old statute of Father William Corby, one of Notre Dame's distinguished presidents, standing on a rock raising his hand in eternal absolution on a battlefield now empty of the troops who once stood before him on that fateful July 2 morning, 100 years ago, except for those who rest forever beneath this hollowed soil. Much of the scene is lost in a hundred years. We would do well to listen to one who was there, who saw what happened, and who recorded it. The writer is Maj. Gen. St. Clair Mulholland, then a colonel in the Irish Brigade.

"Now (as the 3d Corps is being pressed back) help is called for, and Hancock tells Caldwell to have his men ready. 'Fall in,' and the men run to their places. 'Take arms,' and the four brigades of Zook, Cross, Brook, and Kelly are ready for the fray. There are yet a few minutes to spare before starting, and time is occupied by one of the most impressive religious ceremonies I have ever witnessed. The Irish Brigade, which had been commanded formerly by Gen. Thomas Francis Meagher, and whose green flag had been unfurled in every battle in which the Army of the Potomac had been engaged from the first Bull Run to Appomattox, and was now commanded by Col. Patrick Kelly of the 88th New York, formed a part of this division. The brigade stood in column of regiments, closed in mass. As a large majority of its members were Catholics, the chaplain of the brigade, Rev. William Corby, proposed to give a general absolution to all the men before going into the fight. * * * Father Corby stood on a large rock in front of the brigade. Addressing the men, he explained what he was about to do, saying that each one could receive the benefit of the absolution by making a sincere act of contrition * * * urging them to do their duty, and reminding them of the high and sacred nature of their trust as soldiers and the noble object for which they fought * * * the brigade was standing at 'Order arms.' As he closed his address, every man, Catholic and non-Catholic, fell on his knees with his head bowed down. Then stretching his right hand toward the brigade, Father Corby pronounced the words of absolution.

"The scene was more than impressive; it was awe-inspiring. Nearby stood a brilliant throng of officers who had gathered to witness this very unusual occurence, and while there was profound silence in the ranks of the Second Corps, yet over to the left, out by the peach orchard and Little Round Top, where Weed and Vincent and Hazlitt were dying, the roar of the battle rose and swelled and reechoed through the woods, making music more sublime than ever sounded through cathedral aisle. The act seemed to be in harmony with the surroundings. I do not think there was a man in the brigade who did not offer up a heartfelt prayer. For some, it was their last; they knelt there in their grave clothes. In less than half an hour many of them were numbered with the dead of July 2. Who can doubt that their prayers were good? What was wanting in the eloquence of the priest to move them to repentance was supplied in the incidents of the fight."

Father Corby himself wrote a quarter of a century later: "That general absolution was intended for all, not only for our brigade, but for all, North or South, who were susceptible of it and who were about to appear before their Judge. Let us hope that many thousands of souls, purified by hardships, fasting, prayer and blood, met a favorable sentence on the ever memorable battlefield of Gettysburg."

What does all of this drama mean to us, a hundred years later, as we stand on the same battlefield? The least that might be expected is that we would understand today, what Father Corby called the noble object for which they fought * * * and died. We, too, await our judgment. As President Lincoln put it so magnificently: "The world will little note nor long remember, what we say here, but can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they have, thus far, so nobly carried on. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they here gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation shall have a new birth of freedom."

This, I take it, is what the Civil War was all about, it was for freedom, and specifically for the freedom of Negro Americans, that it was fought. If we forget this unfinished business, then there will be nothing but mockery in this centennial celebration. We will have missed the deep and tragic issues that cost so many lives.

Bruce Catton has put it so well that I shall not attempt to improve upon his language: "We know that in a strange, almost mystic way, modern America began to take shape in the Civil War. We also know that something priceless was won for us in it—that our American horizon was somehow broadened by it, that it left us with a deeper and more challenging responsibility, with a piece of unfinished business which demands our most earnest attention * * *. The Civil War meant that the Negro slave would become an American citizen and it left us with the eternal, inescapable obligation to see to it that that citizenship is made good. Winning that freedom for the Negro, we won it also for all the people who then or ever would become Americans—including ourselves. We can never have, permanently, a second-class citizenship in America. Because of the Civil War, we are not that kind of country. We bought that commitment at the price of 600,000 lives; more Americans than died in all our wars from the American Revolution to Korea. It is something we can never ignore."

What better place to ponder our unfinished business this morning than at Gettysburg, where so much of the blood and sweat and tears, that are the price of freedom, were paid. Gettysburg is not just a battlefield; it is a sacred shrine of freedom won again, in new proportion, for a nation "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." The struggle, heroically engaged here, still goes on as we commit ourselves anew to this proposition in every village and city of every State in America. The Civil War did not solve the tragic issue, it merely reestablished the proposition and left to us the task of making the promise of our Constitution come true for all Americans.

I am not so sure that President Lincoln always saw this as a moral issue. One of his biographers, Thomas, tells us that when the city of Washington was ringed around by Confederate troops, and the war seemed lost, he suddenly realized with new clarity, what the war was all about. At that time, Thomas says, Lincoln made a promise to God, that if Washington were spared, he would at the earliest opportunity proclaim the moral issue in its clearest terms. Washington was spared, and with the new year, Lincoln, against the advice of his whole Cabinet, made the Emancipation Proclamation. Making it, he flew in the face of practical expediency, and stood clearly and unequivocally on the point of morality. That he was right, and the politicians wrong, might be deduced from his most endearing title here, and especially in all of the new nations around the world: the Great Emancipator.

It may not have occurred to you, but each one of us must be, in these our times, great emancipators, to finish up in this centenary year as completely and as dramatically as possible, in all our own communities across the land, the unfinished business of which Lincoln spoke here: the work of freedom. Our President has now spoken out upon the moral issue that faces us all. Our Congress has before it a bill that attempts to hasten the completion of the unfinished business. There may well be another battle of Gettysburg in the Congress, but in the end the issue must be settled as it was settled here, for we are a nation committed to the proposition that all men were created equal. Anything less than that is unworthy of the thousands of men who died here. But when all the laws have been enacted, when all of the judgments of the Supreme Court are assessed, when all the Presidential speeches are recorded, there still remains the real unfinished business. Individual Americans died here, and only individual Americans can make that for which these soldiers died at Gettysburg come true in their own communities. Moral issues must be recognized and acknowledged in individual hearts and consciences. The appalling dearth of freedom for millions of Negro Americans today, in voting, in employment, in housing, in education, in public accommodations, and in the administration of justice, is not something automatic. It is a positive act; it is freedom denied by one American to another American, and until every white American decides to act morally toward every Negro American, thre is no end to the unfinished business.

The sounds of battle have died away. The heroic deeds are done. Gettysburg is cloaked in peace. But the issue raised and bloodily engaged here still clamors for a final answer. There are six times more Americans in America now than there were at the time of the Civil War. Can we give a final answer at long last? Can we finally make freedom live for all Americans? Only if each one of us dedicates ourselves "to the great task still remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation shall have a new birth in freedom."

This I believe, is the true challenge of Gettysburg today. May all Americans hear it deeply in their hearts and souls and may they ponder the real depths of this greatest domestic challenge of our times which can be expressed no better than President Lincoln expressed it in terms of human equality: "Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived (in liberty) can long endure." Battlefields are like this. They confront us, as they confronted the brave men who made this place a landmark of heroism, with the ultimate of all moral tests: survival.

We are not asked to die, but to live in the spirit of this place. And if we are not capable of upholding the inner core of what America really stands for, no one of us deserves the blessings of liberty for which these men died. Survival, without nationwide liberty, would be a travesty of the victory won here, at the turning point of a bitter, tragic war; it would be a sad anticlimax to the centennial that we celebrate at Gettysburg. America, and the world, deserves better of us, and of these hallowed dead. May each of us be equal to the challenge of Gettysburg: freedom to the free.

Salt Production First Industry in the Kanawha Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Kanawha Valley of West Virginia, now famous for it chemical output, has a continuous history as a sources of valued chemicals dating back to the Indian days. According to an article in the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail of June 16, 1963, the first big salt lick in the valley was discovered by Shawnee and Delaware Indians on the trail of buffalo.

This interesting article tells how the salt-making methods of the Indians were learned by a white woman, Mary Ingles, who was captured by the Shawnees and later escaped. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

OLD STUFF TO INDIANS—THEY STARTED CHEMICAL INDUSTRY LONG BEFORE WHITE MAN CAME

Long before the white man ever thought of coming to the Kanawha Valley, the Indians operated the area's first chemical industry.

The Shawnees and Delawares knew the valley as their happy hunting grounds where game abounded. It was not long after they ventured into the woodlands, teeming with wildlife along the sparkling rivers, that they discovered a big buffalo lick in the Campbells Creek area.

Salt.

The animals knew the lick well and visited it often in order to satisfy their craving for salt. The Indians also prized salt greatly. With it they cured the meat from game killed in the valley and used it to preserve the skins. Although it was heavy, they carried it in baskets and in dugout canoes to their camps in Ohio where their squaws regarded it highly.

True, their method of obtaining it was primitive in the light of today's modern Food Machinery and Chemical Corp. installation in South Charleston. And, whereas the Indians evaporated salt to meet their needs from only a few gallons of brine, the FMC plant sends several hundred thousands of gallons of brine flowing through its multimillion dollar operation each day, using it to produce a score of important products from salt.

But the Indians were here first.

One of the first white persons to know of the salt spring and surrounding salt marsh near present-day Malden was a woman, Mrs. Mary Ingles, whom the Shawnees captured during a raid on the Drapers Meadow settlement in Virginia in 1755. The old settlement is located near today's Blacksburg, Va.

Young Mary Draper, who had married William Ingles in 1750 in the first wedding west of the Alleghenies, was an outdoors girl in the best frontier fashion. She could ride and shoot, cook and sew, handle an ax or trap a beaver. The Indians took her and her two sons, 2 and 4, and her sister-in-law, Betty.

Three days out on the trail leading to the Kanawha Valley, Mary Ingles gave birth to a baby daughter. She was 23 at the time. The raiding party and their captives traveled along the Bluestone River, across Flat Top Mountain, down Paint Creek, and across the Kanawha, making their way up the north side to the salt lick.

There the Indians put their captives to work boiling brine while they rested and hunted. The Indians used a hollowed out log for the brine, throwing hot rocks into it to aid its evaporation. Mrs. Ingles learned her salt-making from her captives, helped cure their meat, and was taken on downriver to Cincinnati before making her escape and walking her way back to Virginia amid terrible hardships. (She left behind her daughter and was separated from her sons, one of whom, however, was recovered from the Indians later).

Later one of her grandsons, Dr. John P. Hale, operated the largest furnace for salt-making in the valley at Snow Hill and built a fleet of steamboats to carry salt to the packinghouses of Cincinnati in the mid-1800's.

In 1797 Elisha Brooks opened the first commercial salt operation in the Kanawha Valley, leasing the salt marsh from its new owner, Joseph Ruffner, a farmer from the Shenandoah Valley in Virginia, who had moved here in 1794 to settle and make salt. Brooks used hollowed-out logs, called gums, and sunk them into the ground in order to obtain his brine. He was able to make 150 pounds of salt a day by this method, selling it for 8 to 10 cents a pound.

A few years later Ruffner, on his death bed, urged his sons to begin making salt. They did so, first using a hollowed-out sycamore tree, 4 feet in diameter, and sinking it over a suspected source of brine. Their efforts proved discouraging, however, and they moved it several times. When they finally obtained brine, it was not saline enough in content to make their efforts worthwhile.

The Ruffner boys then drilled deeper and deeper with the crude tools of frontier days and in 1808, at the depth of 40 feet, they broke through a fissure of rock that yielded a strong flow of brine. From these pioneering efforts, they were able to make a bushel of salt from 200 gallons of brine. Elisha Brooks had needed 500 gallons of brine for a bushel, so progress was being made.

One of the Ruffner brothers, Tobias, suspected that there was a great saline reservoir of salt underneath the rocks below the valley. He drilled even deeper despite the laughter of critics and, at 410 feet struck an artesian stream from which spouted clear, sparkling brine. Now a bushel of salt could be made from 45 gallons of brine.

Furnaces and evaporating methods improved as well as materials which went into tubing for wells. The Ruffners had started out with wood, then tin, copper, iron and later steel. Everyone along the river began drilling for salt and the industry soon attracted tinsmiths, barrelmakers, blacksmiths, wagonmakers and the like. Malden, first known as Ruffner's Salt Works, later as Saltsborough, Terra Salis and Kanawha Salines, was the city of the valley in those days and outshone Charleston in its progressiveness for years.

Some of the finer old homes of the valley now grace its quiet, shaded streets where once the salt barons lived.

The Kanawha Valley salt operators, who had forged one of the three largest salt manufacturing centers in the young United States, by now were firmly in business. By 1817 there were 52 furnaces handling brine from 20 wells and producing 700,000 bushels of salt a year. Production was beginning to run ahead of demand the price fell from 10 cents to 4 cents a pound.

This led, in 1818, to what is believed to be the first industrial trust in America. The salt-makers formed one company—the Kanawha Salt Co.—to protect themselves against market fluctuations by restricting the manufacture of salt. Each of the 12 subscribers signed a bond for $50,000 to be forfeited if he violated any of the trust's agreements.

This worked well for 16 years before poor management and court litigation ended it.

The golden years of Kanawha salt production ran from 1842 to 1855 when the valley hummed with activity, steamboats and barges making regular runs with salt and passengers for Cincinnati, then the center of meat packing in the United States. The peak production year was 1846 when the salt makers produced 3,224,786 bushels.

Later, Chicago replaced Cincinnati as the meat packing center of the country and cheaper Michigan salt won the market from Kanawha, leading to the decline of the industry here.

But salt was not through.

Shortly before America entered World War I, the Warner-Klipstein Co. chose the Kanawha Valley to locate because of the availability of brine, coal, natural gas, labor, and transportation facilities. The war had cut off supplies of chlorine and alkalis from Germany and Warner-Klipstein began making chlorine and caustic soda from the valley's brine underlying its plant in South Charleston.

The Westvaco Chlorine Products Corp. succeeded the Warner-Klipstein Co. and by the end of the 1920's had become the largest chlorine producing plant in the world, getting its supplies of brine from 17 wells drilled to a depth of 1,800 feet, most of them on the company's plant property. It also produced other important salt byproducts: carbon disulfide, carbon tetrachloride, grain and soil fumigants, fluids for fire extinguishers, ammonia, liquid caustic soda, and potash, bromine, and other products now shipped by the ton to other manufacturers.

During the chemical industry expansion of the mid-twenties, Carbide & Carbon Corp. took up a site adjoining the Westvaco plant to be near a source of chlorine to use in making its glycol antifreeze for a product everyone knows today by the name of "Prestone."

But there came a period in the history of the South Charleston plant, now operated by FMC, that it operated at a severe economic disadvantage in comparison with newer plants located near salt beds of greater salinity. This forced FMC to find a more economical source of brine for chlorine production and, fortunately for the Kanawha Valley, it did so without leaving West Virginia.

On Bens Run in Tyler County, FMC drilled wells into the southern-most edge of the great bed of rock salt which underlies several States and began extracting a brine which was higher in saline content—25 percent against 8.3 percent for local brine. The Bens Run brine is transported by barge to the South Charleston plant without great economic handicap and enabled FMC to completely modernize its facilities there.

During the 1950's 450 new Hooker cells were installed for the decomposition of brine, each of which has a capacity of 1 ton of chlorine a day. Although the plant is located 177 river miles from its source of salt supply, this presents little trouble as the FMC installation is a uniquely integrated, diversified, and versatile operation.

Salt to the pioneers was a necessary item to sustain life. Today, to most of the descendants of these pioneers, it is a welcome table seasoning. To a giant chemical plant which gives employment to thousands and pours millions of dollars into the local economy, it is the muscle that lends strength to the industry.

The Indians were first to find it valuable but certainly not the last.

SS. Cyril and Methodius Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Governor of Pennsylvania, William W. Scranton, officially proclaimed the week of July 1 to 7 as the SS. Cyril and Methodius Week, in honor of these two patron saints of the Slavonic and Slovak peoples.

Many societies and churches throughout our Nation are dedicated to these two great apostles. During the month of July, they wil lbe honored in all the cities and towns where Slavonic and Slovak citizens reside. In my State of Pennsylvania, in Luzerne County, the Slovaks met on July 4 to observe American Slovak Day. It was the 41st time such a day has been observed in Luzerne County. On July 11 the Slovaks of western Pennsylvania will meet for their 40th annual Slovak Day at Kennywood Park. The Most Reverend Bishop John J. Wright, D.D., will celebrate mass and be the principal speaker.

SS. Cyril and Methodius had as their predecessors many missionaries from Ireland.

I ask unanimous consent that an article by Mr. John C. Sciranka, which describes in some detail the historical conditions that existed in Slovakia when the Irish missionaries and the Slovak saints carried on their distinguished work, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Mr. Sciranka is a distinguished American Slovak journalist and a native of Pittsburgh.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IRISH MONKS—PREDECESSORS OF SS. CYRIL AND METHODIUS IN SLOVAKIA

(By John C. Sciranka)

On July 7, 1963, the Slovaks in particular and the Slaves in general will observe the 11th centenary of the arrival of SS. Cyril and Methodius to the present Slovakia. They are being honored by all their admirers and His Eminence Cardinal Spellman, invited Most Rev. Andrew G. Grutka, bishop, Gary Ind., who is an American of Slovak descent, to preach at St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City, where on June 22, 1963, tribute was also paid to the Irish monks, who were predecessors of these two apostles in what is known now as Slovakia.

We learn from history that 200 years prior to the arrival of SS. Cyril and Methodius to Slovakia, the following historical events took place: St. Boniface, previously known as Winifred, was born at Devonshire, England, in 680 A.D. At the age of 7 he was brought to the monastery and educated there. Later he visited Rome on two occasions. During the first visit he received from the Pope the authorization to christianize Germany. Pursuing in his missionary work, he initiated and organized foundations of eight bishoprics: Regensburg, Passau, Freising, Salzburg, Erfurt, Wurzburg, Baraburg and later Eichstadt.

When Boniface became Archbishop of Mainz, he trained his own monks and invited from Ireland and England additional monks and nuns. Some of them became his successors. He is the founder of the monastery at Fulda, where some monks of SS. Cyril and Methodius found refuge.

Two of the Irish monks became bishops of Salzburg. First was the Irish Abbot of Salzburg. He was succeded by Fergal (Latinized: Virgilius—known also Aethicus Ister—the Danube philosopher). Fergal had disputes with Boniface, but was cleared in Rome. Prior to Fergal the Salzburg diocese was run by the Abbot in a Celtic fashion.

For the Slovaks it is of great importance that Slavs lived in the Salzburg and Passau provinces. Two hundred years later when St. Methodius was elevated on his second trip to Rome Archbishop of Syrmia (Sirmium in Pannonia) his archdiocese spread between the Rivers Raabe—Drave and Save and included parts of the provinces of Salzburg and Passau. Thus the enemnities and persecution followed by the clergy and by Karloman and Arnulf. Salzburg is known in Slovak and Slav history as Solnohrad.

It is an undisputed historical fact that the Slovaks new about Christianity long before the arrival of SS. Cyril and Methodius (863 A.D.). They knew and heard about it from Roman soldiers stationed in the garrisons along the Danube River, especially the famous Devin (Theben) near Bratislava. The Slovaks knew about the life and mission of St. Emeram, who was born in the seventh century in the city of Poitou in Aquitania a Roman province in Gaul. It was a Slovak ruler, Pribina, who dedicated the first Christian church to St. Emeram's honor and memory, 30 years prior to the arrival of SS. Cyril and Methodius (830 A.D.) and almost 200 years after St. Emeram arrived in Regensburg, Bavaria, a distance of some 300 miles from Nitra. Of great interest is also the fact and the story, that Irish monks have labored in the lands of Great Moravia and Panonia from Bavaria. They also preached Chistianity with great zeal already in the seventh century.

"History of Nations," page 70, states that "Pippin, like all the French rulers after him, until the Revolution of 1789 perceived the advantage of having the Church on his side. In the early part of the seventh century several Christian missionaries, principally Irish, had begun their labors among the Alemani and the Bavarains, but the greater part of these people, with all Thuringians, Saxons, and Frisians were still worshippers of the old pagan gods. Pippin saw that through the Church these Germans might be civilized and become accustomed to authority and obedience. He therefore lent his aid to the monks, and all the southern part of Germany became Christian in a few years. Force was employed as well as persuasion; but at that time the end was considered to sanction any means."

And on page 72 in the same "History of Nations" we read that "The work of conversion, encouraged by Pippin of Heristal as a political measure, was still continued by the zeal of the Irish and Anglo-Saxon missionaries, and in the beginning of the eight century it received a powerful impulse from a new apostle, a man of singular ability and courage. He was a Saxon of England, born in Devonshire in the year 680, and Winifred by name." He was educated in a monastery, went to Rome and offered his ability to the Pope and was commissioned to undertake the Christianizing of central Germany. It is related that at Geismar, in the land of the Hessians, he cut down with his own hands an aged oak tree dedicated to pagan god Thor. On second visit to Rome he was appointed by the Pope as Archbishop of Mayence and ordered to take on the name of Boniface (Benefactor). The spot where he built his first Christian church is about 12 miles from Gotha, at a foot of the Thuringian Mountains, is marked by a colossal candlestick of granite, surmounted by a golden flame. In 755 he undertook a mission to Friesland, where he failed as a young monk. He was slain by a fierce pagan and died as a martyr and was enrolled among the number of Saints.

During that period attempts were made to Christianize the Slovaks. The Irish monks labored in Slovakia but not knowing the language of the people well, they did not make success in their mission.

The conversion of the people of the Kingdom of Great Moravia, whose Slovak rulers—Pribina, built a first Christian church and Rastislav invited SS. Cyril and Methodius from Constantinople's emperor, Michael III, to come to the country, accomplished this huge task for they mastered the language of the people.

If we aline the missionary work these two saints have done in the form of historical dates, the picture looks about like this:

Year 860: St. Methodius brought the conversion of King Bogoris and the Bulgarians.

Year 863: SS. Cyril and Methodius arrived in the Kingdom of Great Moravia and secured the conversion of the Slovaks.

Year 868: The Slav apostles came to Rome, where Pope Hadrian elevated them to the rank of bishops and approved the Slavonic liturgy.

Year 869: In February St. Cyril died in Rome and was buried in the St. Clement's Basilica.

St. Methodius returned to Great Moravia and finds that Ruler Rastislav passed away also. On his return from Rome St. Methodius stopped and spent some time at the court of Prince Kocel, ruler of Pannonia.

According to the Annals in Fulda, St. Methodius was viciously persecuted by German rulers and clergy. He was shut up in a monastery and lost his eyesight.

Year 874: St. Methodius remained a loving servant of God and baptized the Prince of Bohemia, Borzivoi, who built and dedicated the first Christian church of Bohemia to the honor and memory of St. Clement, whose body SS. Cyril and Methodius, with the help and assistance of a Jewish leader Cohen (Khagan), they brought to Constantinople.

Year 966: Prince Borzivoi's great-granddaughter, Dubravka, daughter of Boleslav, brother of St. Vaclav (St. Wenceslaus) married the prince of Poles, Mieczyslav and brought about the conversion to Christianity of Poland.

This is a general picture of the historical influence of SS. Cyril and Methodius. There are many comments about them in the history and literature of many nations, but the most appropriate comment ever written to the story of SS. Cyril and Methodius is in the "History of Nations," by Collier, Vol. XVII, page 34, where it states:

"The Slavs of the Western Rite have by no means forgotten the great apostles of their race; their millennium was celebrated in 1863 with imposing solemnity, and they are still considered the representatives of that liturgy and religious unity of the Slavs which is the dream of many. Cyril and Methodius deserve a far higher place in religious history than has hitherto been assigned to them. Their knowledge, their zeal for the Gospel, their indomitable perseverance, have nothing to fear from comparison with the apostles of Germany."

Summarizing the material and research was made with a cooperation of a close friend, John P. Hanak. The facts remain true that from that day to this the language of the Cyrillic Scriptures has remained the sacred language of the Bulgarians, the Serbians and the Russians. The modern dialects have not so far deviated from it, but it is still easily understood by all families of the Slavonic nations and especially by the Slovaks, since the Slovak language is in the linguistic circles considered as the key to all Slavonic languages.

Just like the language played a dominant role in conversion of our ancestors 11 centuries ago, it will play again when it will be necessary for missonaries who speak it to preach the Gospel of Christ in Slovakia, now under Communist rule.

Set Up the Service Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the proposal to create a National Service Corps, patterned after the oversea Peace Corps, has received widespread and bipartisan support. Malcolm Forbes, the distinguished publisher and editor of a major business magazine, recently testified before the Subcommittee on the National Service Corps. In eloquent terms, he enthusiastically supported it as an idealistic but businesslike means of helping the needy, the sick, and the deprived. Recently he wrote an editorial which answers some of the objections raised against this proposal. As the editorial so aptly states—

> Seldom has an administration measure provided for so much potential good by so few people at so little cost. Tapping and intelligently directing the great reservoir of idealism and patriotism of so many Americans in such a potentially productive manner ought to be warmly supported.

Always an articulate spokesman, Mr. Forbes could not have provided a better rebuttal to the naysayers. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SET UP THE SERVICE CORPS

The other day, at their invitation, I appeared before the House and later the Senate Labor Subcommittees holding hearings on the administration's proposed National Service Corps—a sort of homefront Peace Corps. Forbes had expressed strong support for the measure when it was introduced.

The proposal strikes me as so sound that I was surprised and disappointed to learn it faces "tough sledding" on Capitol Hill. As described by its sponsors:

"The major purpose of the proposed National Service Corps is to provide, through the dramatic but practical example set by a small corps of volunteers, the means of calling up the talents and idealism of large numbers of our citizens to assist the 32 million Americans who are socially and economically handicapped. Beginning with a small number of volunteers and a small number of projects, the National Service Corps would work with deprived groups including migrant laborers, American Indians and refugees. Other fields in which the National Service Corps might work are health, mental health, education and welfare in low economic areas and in correctional institutions. Volunteers would be provided only at the request of public or private agencies, State and local. * * * Corpsmen will receive no salaries as such. * * * The program would start with 150 to 300 men and women. Gradually expanding to the maximum authorized enrollments, the corps would reach 1,000 by the end of fiscal year 1964 and 5,000 in perhaps 3 years. * * * The corps' value would extend far beyond the authorized expenditure, in that it would stimulate increased local efforts to solve community problems. The corpsmen will provide manpower for overburdened local organizations; and they will encourage and inspire local volunteers to do similar work. The goal of the corps will be, by the efforts of a few, to ignite the energies of many."

From the questions directed to me by committee members, one principal Republican line of attack on the measure became clear. Congressman PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Republican, of New Jersey, repeatedly queried me as to why the Federal Government had any responsibility or business in any of these proposed areas other than perhaps projects pertaining to migrant labor and Indians. "Why isn't it the business of States to do this sort of thing?" he wanted to know as he expressed deep suspicion that the proposal would result in new and unjustifiable expansion of Federal activities, interferences, and payrolls. Congressman ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Republican, of Michigan, with equal vigor and obviously sincere cynicism pointed out that in the bill itself there were no criteria enumerated for the selection of corpsmen, nor anything specific requiring approval by State or local agencies for projects in areas and activities where they personally operate.

If the committee chooses, it can, of course, remedy such specific complaints by covering these points in the language of the bill. Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN's fundamental reservation is perhaps more difficult to answer simply. His argument strikes a most responsive chord in many. Most of us, justifiably, are indeed leery of ever-and-ever extending, expanding Federal agencies and controls.

However, I don't think that argument applies with validity to the proposed Service Corps. Made up of volunteers, as in the case of the wonderfully successful Peace Corps, these single or two or three corpsmen projects would only be undertaken at the request of and work in cooperation with existing State and local agencies and institutions. If the small print of the bill doesn't provide for this as outlined by its sponsors, it wouldn't be difficult to write such language into the measure.

Apathy and hostility to the "Feds" present the great obstacles. I hope they can be overcome. Seldom has an administration measure provided for so much potential good by so few people at so little cost. Tapping and intelligently directing the great reservoir of idealism and patriotism of so many Americans in such a potentially productive manner ought to be warmly supported.

Bountiful Government: It Gives, but It Also Takes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of July 3, 1963:

BOUNTIFUL GOVERNMENT: IT GIVES, BUT IT ALSO TAKES

Paternalism in its basic sense implies a father's care for his dependent children, a practice to be commended. The same principle, however, extended to government, eventually could produce generation after generation of citizens physically adult but mentally clinging forever to the coattails of a bountiful government.

Webster defines paternalism, when used in connection with government, as: "The principles or practices of a government that undertakes to supply needs or regulate conduct of the governed in matters affecting them as individuals as well as in their relations to the state and to each other, on the assumption that it can best secure their highest welfare."

We hesitate to edit Webster, but, in our opinion, the word "false" should be inserted before "assumption" in the above definition. The administration's complex legislative program is almost wholly based on the erroneous assumption that Americans lack the maturity to fend for themselves.

Government, therefore, must be constantly on hand to lead its children through the labyrinth of life, else we would perish by the wayside in abysmal confusion.

This is indeed a strange philosophy in the light of this country's history. The very founding of this Nation was due to individual enterprise, the system that gave substance to what once was only man's dream.

Former President Eisenhower is convinced that paternalistic government, as practiced by the administration, is an "insidious encroachment" on individual rights.

Speaking at the centennial celebration of the Battle of Gettysburg he said: "For every right I shift to Government, I lose something of my individual rights and opportunities. * * * Bemused by glittering Government pledges to relieve us of sometimes burdensome responsibilities for self, family, and community, and bewitched by enticing offers of unneeded subsidy, we need to constantly rededicate ourselves to liberty, duty, and democracy, never forgetting self-restraint."

The administration is stubbornly determined to foist more and more paternalism upon the American public in an effort to concentrate more and more power in Central Government. This year, for example, the outlay for Federal-State-local projects will total about $14 billion, an increase of almost 30 percent in 1 year.

But the fault for this trend does not belong alone to Federal Government. Individual citizens, local communities, and State governments have made only feeble protests against encroachment of their rights.

Mr. Eisenhower succinctly summed up the problem: "Does self-government for me mean sturdy self-reliance—depending upon myself for all those things, tangible and intangible, that I am able, without Government interference, to provide myself and my family?

"Or—would I rather take from a paternalistic government every possible immediate advantage it can give, even if I do not really need it?"

By the Numbers—Integrate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on June 13, 1963, the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces known as the Gesell Committee made some very drastic recommendations to the President with regard to the controversial subject of integration of the races. One of the recommendations contained in this report was a proposal that military base commanders be required to engage in concerted efforts to force integration of the races in community and private business establishments off the military reservations. The report recommended that military commanders be graded on the fervor which they displayed in engaging in this sociological experiment outside the sphere of their jurisdiction and also on the concrete results obtained by their intermeddling in community and private activities. In addition, the report goes so far as to recommend that military bases be closed in areas where base commanders are not successful in forcing desegregation and integration of the races.

I am disturbed, Mr. President, that these recommendations would receive any consideration by the President of the United States. On June 21, 1963, the President wrote a letter to the Secretary of Defense and in this letter he in effect endorsed the recommendation of the Gesell Committee. He told the Secretary to review the recommendations and to report on them within 30 days.

Mr. President, the extreme recommendations have already met with deep concern and opposition among many persons who have read the news reports on the recommendations. I have recently read three outstanding editorial comments on these recommendations. One of the editorials is entitled "By the Numbers—Integrate," and is from the Columbia Record, of Columbia, S.C., dated June 27, 1963. Another is entitled "Bringing in the Troops" and was printed in the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., dated July 6, 1963; and the third is entitled, "Presidential Directives Impose Civil Rights Ideas in Every Area," and was printed in the Fort Lauderdale News on Thursday, June 27, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, June 27, 1963]

By the Numbers—Integrate

Columbia, Charleston, Sumter, and Myrtle Beach might not have to wait on congressional disposition of Negro rights legislation before making up their minds about desegregating public accommodations, housing, and schools. President Kennedy has decided to use military bases as a blackjack to club these cities into submission.

These four South Carolina communities face the choice of desegregating or losing Fort Jackson, the Naval Base, Shaw, and Myrtle Beach Air Force Bases. Unless substantial progress is made in opening public places, apartments and homes and public schools to Negroes, these cities might have their military bases closed.

The President has ordered Secretary of Defense McNamara to report to him within 30 days on action taken on complaints of discrimination cited by a special committee.

The report came from the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, a seven-man group chaired by Gerhard A. Gessell, a Washington lawyer. Most of the Committee's complaints concerned off-base discrimination in cities near posts and stations.

Mr. Kennedy dispatched the report to McNamara with orders to report within a month on what progress has been made in carrying out the recommendations.

In a letter to the Defense Chief accompanying the report, Mr. Kennedy said, "Discriminatory practices are morally wrong wherever they occur—they are especially inequitable and iniquitous when they inconvenience and embarrass those serving in the armed services, and their families.

"Responsible citizens of all races in these communities should work together to open up public accommodations and housing for Negro personnel and their dependents. This effort is required by the interests of our national defense, national policy, and basic considerations of human decency."

What does the report say the armed services should do?

In the first place, base commanders (like those at Fort Jackson, the naval base, and the airbase) should be "given more explicit orders and more detailed directives" to oppose off-base discrimination (meaning Columbia, Charleston, Sumter, and Myrtle Beach).

The energy and achievements of local base commanders in carrying out desegregation of adjacent communities should affect the officer's career. The report said that the Pentagon should monitor the progress of the local commander's efforts, and his "initiative and achievement" should affect his future promotions.

How would military commanders go about achieving integration of the nearby communities? The report suggests that base commanders (in a "vigorous new program of action") should sponsor interracial communities of military people and local civilians. Legal action should be brought against public places that "discriminate against Negroes." Segregated public facilities should be declared "off limits" for soldiers.

And if the communities do not respond and integrate housing, public accommodations, and schools, then consideration will be given to closing the bases.

(The report also dealt with on-base practices, recommending that assignment and promotion patterns stress opportunities for Negroes, bus and taxi transportation be integrated and that a "failure to invite a sufficient number of Negro girls for dances and parties" be rectified.)

The use of defense funds and the Defense Establishment to achieve the President's purpose may startle some South Carolinians. But for those who've been aware for a long time that the Kennedys have employed the defense agency and its vast millions as a political slush fund (witness the Donaldson Air Force Base travesty), the action comes as no surprise.

What is particularly disconcerting and disheartening, however, is Mr. Kennedy's persistence in calling for "local cooperation" while he waves the Federal shillelagh.

"Responsible citizens should cooperate," he says and adds, "should cooperate—or else."

[From the News and Courier, Charleston, S.C., July 6, 1963]

Bringing in the Troops

In ordering base commanders to permit their men to take part in race demonstrations while off duty, the Department of Defense has opened up a new area of incredible danger to public safety.

Permission to demonstrate may be read in some quarters as encouragement. Heretofore servicemen were not allowed to join marches and other demonstrations full of political and social dynamite.

The Armed Forces rightly have been dedicated to defense of the country, not attacks on customs and institutions or promotion of political causes. The order from the Department of Defense has been reported by Charles Bartlett, a Washington newspaperman who is a close personal friend of President Kennedy. Mr. Bartlett says the order instructs commanders to allow "Negro military men to participate, during off-duty hours and in mufti, in nonviolent demonstrations which are being staged in many southern cities near Federal installations. This is a reversal of a previous policy."

As we see it, the order is merely a first step. If Negro military men are to be permitted to march—off duty and in civilian clothes—the time will come when the race designation too will be changed, and servicemen of any race will have permission to demonstrate. If the ranks of demonstrators grow thin from weariness of "volunteers," who is to know when the troops receive orders to march? In or out of uniform, they are at all times in military service and subject to orders from the Department of Defense.

Secretary Robert McNamara is listed among the founding members of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, a branch of the Fund for the Republic. This organization has been a breeding ground for ideas on how to remake the American Republic. The order releasing soldiers, sailors, and airmen from military discipline to demonstrate in their off time against the laws and customs of communities where they are quartered would be in line with policies of the Fund for the Republic. Thus infection has crept into the ranks of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force by direct order from the Pentagon.

At the same time, Mr. Bartlett discloses that the Department of Defense is about to give proprietors of business concerns the choice of serving all customers, or being declared off limits to servicemen. Hotels, restaurants, taverns, and other places which cater to white patrons would be the targets.

Mr. Bartlett's article, which appeared July 4 on page 1 of the Charleston Evening Post, contains some of the most explosive material we have yet seen come out of Washington. Such notions, carried to a logical conclusion, would remove control of troops from their commanders and turn over the military forces for use in punitive actions to compel public compliance. If such a policy is not the making of a police state, it is the next thing to it.

[From the Fort Lauderdale News, June 27, 1963]

Presidential Directives Impose Civil Rights Ideas in Every Area

President Kennedy has issued two orders in connection with imposing his administration's ideas of how civil rights measures should be enforced through the use of naked Federal power; and all other considerations be hanged.

One directive was to Defense Secretary McNamara instructing him to report his views within 30 days on a White House committee recommendation that the armed services consider shutting down military installations near cities or localities where racial discrimination is widespread.

The other was an Executive order authorizing all Federal Government agencies to cut off Federal funds, which are taxpayers' money, from any federally assisted construction project where discrimination against Negroes allegedly is practiced.

The latter Executive edict ties in with an earlier Presidential directive that all housing construction financed through Federal Housing Authority or Veterans' Administration systems be open to integration, or else.

Obviously, the instructions to McNamara are a repeat of the maneuver that broke the back of the steel price increase a year ago. At that time, the weight of Federal power was used through the threat to cancel any Government contracts with steel firms that raised their prices against the President's wishes.

Since virtually every major steel company is engaged in some form of defense or construction work for the Government, each one faced costly cancellation of contracts and they knuckled under.

And now, possibly recalling the effectiveness of his angry action as a one-man price control agency, the President is prepared to repeat the procedures to impose his personal interpretation of integration ground rules upon every metropolitan area in the Nation, insofar as the defense installations are concerned, and upon a vast segment of the economy in most every corner of the Nation, insofar as the Executive order on construction is concerned.

Each of these instructions is shocking in that they invade the private realms of the economy and also accomplish the objectives of two of the administration's civil rights proposals that are headed for stiff opposition in the Congress.

Carried out, the Executive orders turn into an accomplished fact the intentions of the administration's support for legislation for a Fair Employment Practices Commission and for punitive action against businesses engaged in interstate commerce that do not comply with Federal standards of integration.

Moreover, the President's actions cast upon these bills the light of political opportunism and imply that their main purpose is to expose to the pressures of massive Negro demonstrations the Members of Congress who seek to preserve the few remaining rights of the American private business sector.

But as shocking as both new orders are, the threat to close down the military installations is by itself utterly frightening because it indicates that the American defense system can be manipulated—yes, toyed with—according to Presidential whim or angered vengeance.

What this order would mean is that regardless of the monetary cost, regardless of the effect on the local economy and regardless of the resulting weakening of the domestic defense operations, the President apparently is willing to sacrifice the security of entire population centers if they are accused of "widespread discrimination," whatever that definition may be.

This order is so rash that we seriously wonder if the President was aware of all of its ramifications when he sent the directive to his Defense Secretary. If he were not, this is a new high in irresponsibility as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief of American Armed Forces. If he were cognizant of its full meaning, then his action was a new low in callous use of Presidential powers.

Tampa, for example, may be accused of "widespread discrimination" because there are Negro demonstrations in that city. Under the President's directive, MacDill Air Force Base there could be closed and the Nation would lose the advantages of Strategic Air Force bombers operating from there, close to Cuba.

The same would be true for the radar picket planes stationed at Orlando's McCoy Air Force Base; for the fighter protection at Patrick Air Force Base at Cape Canaveral; for bombers at Homestead Air Force Base south of Miami; the Navy installations at Key West and at Jacksonville; all the work at Eglin Air Proving Grounds at Fort Walton Beach, and fighter training at Tyndall Air Force Base at Panama City.

In fact, the entire southeastern sector of the North American Defense Command could be disrupted because its headquarters are at Montgomery, Ala. And the list goes on and on. Then there's the question of whether there is a form of actual discrimination in northern metropolitan centers that are ringed by defense missile installations, including the President's own Boston, where thousands of Negro children played hookey just recently, protesting alleged discrimination in the schools.

We find it difficult to believe such an order can be carried out, and we sincerely hope it isn't. In that case, it should not be summarily forgotten, however, for it illustrates clearly that a strong Federal Government considers its best weapon against the American people is the people's own money, disguised as Federal handouts.

William A. Mullen.

Ohio County, W. Va., Settled in 1714

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the history of Ohio County, W. Va., is told in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail issue of June 16, 1963. The region was originally settled by German colonists in 1714, but was actually mapped out as a county shortly after the Declaration of Independence.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the Record, as follows:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) Gazette-Mail, June 16, 1963]

Ohio County, W. Va., Settled in 1714

Ohio County, one of the oldest in the State, was formed 4 months after the signing of the Declaration of Independence. A brief account of the beginning of Ohio County before 1776 shows the gradual development and the historic importance of the background of the first county of the State. It was originally a part of Spotsylvania County, Va., and the territory was settled by German colonists in 1714. Later subdivisions were made as follows: In 1734 Orange County, Va., was formed, and this comprised the whole of the Colony of western Virginia; in 1738 Frederick and Augusta Counties were formed from Orange County; and in October 1776 the General Assembly of Virginia passed an act to ascertain the county of Augusta and the district of West Augusta. The area of West Augusta appears to have been evolved rather than created by law. This particular territory included all of the lands of old Virginia from the Blue Ridge west, with the southern boundary extending to the Mississippi River.

Ohio County was one of the three original counties formed from West Augusta County in October 1776. This act passed by the general assembly of Virginia divided the territory into three distinct counties; Ohio which included the entire section known as the Panhandle, Monongalia and Yohogania. The greater part of Yohogania County fell within the territory of Pennsylvania. When the boundary line between that State and Virginia was established, the residue was by the act of 1785, added to Ohio County, and Yohogania County became extinct.

The original area of Ohio County was 1,432 square miles which was subsequently reduced to a length of 12 miles and a width of 15 miles. The decrease in area was due to the formation of new counties out of its original territory. Brooke, Hancock, Marshall, Tyler, and Wetzel Counties were all formed from Ohio County. Only Brooke and Hancock Counties have smaller land areas, and Ohio County formerly one of the largest now ranks fifty-third in the State with its present 109 square miles. It is interesting to note that Ohio County could not have been formed after West Virginia was declared a State, for the Constitution of 1863 says, "no new county having an area of less than 400 square miles * * * may be formed."

It was named for the Ohio River and the Indian term for "beautiful river," sometimes called the "great river."

Until the act of the general assembly of Virginia in 1776 creating Ohio County the formation of new counties seems to have grown from customs rather than laws. The passing of this act led to the unification of groups, which had previously been small or acted independently.

By the same act which created Ohio County, provision was made for a meeting of the landowners of the new county for the purpose of selecting the most convenient place for holding courts. West Liberty was chosen the county seat and remained so from 1776–1797. On January 6, 1777, electors met at the house of Ezekiell De Witt and the oath of justice of peace was administered to David Shepherd, Silas Hedges, William Scott, and James Caldwell, by James McMechen, Esq. The following recommendations were made to the Governor of Virginia, that he appoint David Shepherd, Esq., as county lieutenant, Silas Hedges, Esq., as colonel, and Mr. David McClure as major of the militia. January 7, 1777 the members of the court designated Zachariah Sprigg and Silas Hedges to contract with Abraham Van Metre "for not less than 2 acres of land on which to erect public buildings."

About 6 months later, June 2, 1778 the court met at the house of Andrew Ramsey, and the courthouse was completed sometime in 1779. The first attorneys were admitted to practice November 2, 1778. George Brent of Ohio County, and Philip Pendleton was appointed the commonwealth attorneys. In the spring of 1780 meetings were held at the home of Zachariah Sprigg on Short Creek, Ohio County.

In 1797 there was considerable agitation to move the county seat to Wheeling. Records of June 5, 1797 contain the following entry, "Ordered that the commissioners who were appointed on behalf of the county to erect public buildings at West Liberty be authorized to cancel their agreement made with Samuel Beck, and that they do desist from further prosecuting said building until further orders."

The court was moved to Wheeling December 27, 1797, by an act of the General Assembly of Virginia which "ordered that the town of Wheeling be henceforth the place for holding courts in this county."

May 7, 1798, the first court held in Wheeling was in Smith's House which was run by John Gooding. In June 1798, authorization was given to erect a courthouse, jail, stocks, whipping post in the middle of the present 10th Street (Madison). Court was held in this small building about 30 feet square until March 17, 1836. The assembly of Virginia at that time authorized the relocation of the courthouse and other public buildings in Ohio County, and purchased two lots at the southeast corner of 12th and Chapline Streets for a new courthouse building. The cornerstone was laid on April 10, 1893, and this building remained the official courthouse of Ohio County until the State Capitol was acquired for courthouse purposes in 1885. The seat of justice is now in the new city-county building dedicated January 30, 1960. This building is built on the same site as the old capitol building at 16th and Chapline Streets, and for a little over a century and a half Wheeling has been the seat of Ohio County and the court of Ohio County.

In 1872 Ohio County was redistricted, and under the new constitution the authorized governing board was changed from a board of supervisors to the board of county commissioners. The powers of this board were increased and they established the following districts: Clay, Center, Madison, and Union within Wheeling's corporation. Washington and Ritchie each were partially within the city limits. Three other districts outside the city limits were established: Liberty, Richland, and Triadelphia Districts. The present districts are the same as above, the only change being that in 1920 when the Greater Wheeling plan was adopted the suburban towns of Warwood, Fulton, Leatherwood, Woodsdale, Edgewood, Pleasant Valley, and Elm Grove with intervening and contiguous territory were annexed to the city greatly extending its boundaries and population. A quarter of a century later parts of Richland and Ritchie districts were annexed to the city proper and thereby making the city proper to include practically all of Ohio County. The towns outside the city limits notable of mention are Clearview, Triadelphia and West Liberty.

Historically speaking, Ohio County has a long and notable record from the days of border warfare to the present atomic age. Events too numerous to mention took place in Ohio County. Some of the most outstanding being: the last battle of the Revolutionary War was fought at Fort Henry, the completion of the National Road to Wheeling, the suspension bridge, the coming of the B. & O. Railroad, and it was here in Ohio County that the State of West Virginia was formed. Mass meetings and conventions held in the city of Wheeling 1861–63 culminated in the formation of the State and the inauguration of Gov. Arthur I. Boreman, June 20, 1863.

Wheeling is the chief city of northern West Virginia, and is the county seat. The original site was settled by Ebenezer Zane and his brothers Silas and Jonathan in 1769. The county is one of the leading industrial counties of the State, and the manufacturing enterprises are diversified. The county has many natural advantages for manufacturing purposes. There is a good seam of coal, natural gas. The shipping facilities are convenient and the extent and use of the Ohio River facilitate this very much. It is convenient to markets, and is in proximity to the supply of raw materials. It also has many commercial advantages, and is included in the metropolitan area which includes cities and towns from the State of Ohio. Wheeling and Ohio County move forward in the line of destiny and will always be in the lead both industrially as well as commercially. Ohio County, the result of many subdivisions and changes has remained to be one of the leading counties of our State.

New Hampshire and the Civil War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a portion of the Journal of the New Hampshire House of Representatives for Tuesday, June 11, 1963, containing an address entitled "New Hampshire and the Civil War," delivered to the house by Dr. J. Duane Squires.

Dr. Squires, who heads the department of social studies at Colby Junior College, in New London, N.H., and also serves as chairman of the New Hampshire Civil War Centennial Commission, is an acknowledged authority on the history of my State and the valiant participation by New Hampshire regiments in the great Civil War. This address by Dr. Squires is distinguished not only for its contribution to our store of historical knowledge, but also for its application to the grave problems which beset us as a nation united, just 100 years after we were torn by internal strife. As Dr. Squires states with accuracy, the task for which men died then is not yet finished, if we are to meet our responsibilities to the free world.

I believe Members of Congress and the American public will find this excellent address by Dr. Squires well worth reading.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New Hampshire and the Civil War

One hundred years ago this morning the advance units of the army of Gen. Robert E. Lee were on the march north from Virginia into Pennsylvania; the powerful forces of Gen. U. S. Grant were surrounding Vicksburgs in Mississippi; and the cavalry of Gen. John H. Morgan of Kentucky were in the opening stages of their famous raid north of the Ohio River. Your predecessors in this legislature were in the process of electing Joseph A. Gilmore as Governor of New Hampshire, and were engaged in implementing the first national draft law, as passed by Congress in March 1863.

Today, a century later, we are joining the Nation in commemorating the actions and achievements of our forefathers a hundred years ago. As that great man, whose portrait hangs behind me, President Abraham Lincoln, once said: "It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this." For the twin objectives were the preservation and maintenance of our National Union, and the securing of better relations among the races which comprise the Nation. In the noble words of Daniel Webster, whose portrait also graces this chamber, "Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

What part did our beloved State play in this mighty conflict between 1861 and 1865? Let me seek to answer that question from three perspectives. First, I wish to consider the military contributions of New Hampshire to the Civil War. Second, let me suggest some of the ways in which the home front served the fighting men. And, in the third place, permit me to indicate certain areas in which New Hampshire contributed to and participated in the larger aspects of the Civil War. To an audience like this it is pertinent to observe that many of the decisions and actions which I shall narrate were made in this very building in which we now are, by the then legislature, by the then Governors and their council members, and by the other high officials of New Hampshire between 1861 and 1865.

First, then, to the military contributions of this State to the Armed Forces of the United States in the Civil War. When that great struggle began in 1861, there were 12 local military companies in this State. A remnant of the militia system of the earlier days, these volunteer groups had a total membership of 760 men. The several Governors and the legislatures during the ensuing 4 years authorized the formation of no fewer than 18 infantry regiments, each comprising 780 officers and men. The 1st New Hampshire, enlisted in 1861, was a 90-day regiment. The regiments numbered from 2 through 14 were 3-year regiments. The 15th, 16th, 17th, and 18th were 9-month regiments. As you walk the corridors of this building you will see at least 16 portraits on the walls, indicating some of the noted officers who commanded these famous regiments of the Civil War. Their flags ornament the great hall downstairs, and their achievements are written clearly on the pages of military history.

In addition to these 18 regiments of infantry, New Hampshire furnished 4 companies of cavalry, 3 companies of Berdan's Sharpshooters—some prototypes of whom we have here today—certain artillery units, and many volunteers in the armed forces of our sister States. More than 3,000 New Hampshire men served in the U.S. Navy, and almost 400 in the U.S. Marine Corps. You all are aware of the accomplishments of the famous U.S. warship built at Portsmouth in 1861 and named the U.S.S. *Kearsarge*. It was the first of a long line of ships to bear that name, the most recent of which last month picked Astronaut Gordon Cooper from the waters of the Pacific Ocean following his 22 orbits around the world. You are aware, also, that the Portsmouth Navy Yard built and commissioned the first battleship ever to be called the *New Hampshire*, launched in 1864. We all may be proud of the fact that the first U.S. Air Corps in our entire history was founded in 1861 by a native of the town of Randolph in this State, T. S. C. Lowe.

By the Federal census of 1860 our State's population was 326,073. All in all, I calculate that more than 33,000 different men from New Hampshire participated in the armed services of the United States during the war. As you veterans of more recent conflicts know, when any government puts upward of 10 percent of its whole population into uniform, it has made a tremendous effort. And that is exactly what New Hampshire did between 1861 and 1865.

Let me now speak briefly about certain ways in which the New Hampshire home front aided the men in uniform. I begin with a comment on the role played by our State in the U.S. Sanitary Commission. This was the predecessor of the Red Cross, since that organization had not yet come into existence. Early in 1864 the U.S. Sanitary Commission fair in Manchester netted several thousands of dollars for the beneficent work of this group.

In addition to the work of the U.S. Sanitary Commission, the State legislature authorized the appointment of official agents to provide and care for the sick and wounded soldiers of New Hampshire who were scattered in the great hospitals throughout the North. Among these was the Webster Hospital in Manchester. Just a 100 years ago next month, five men from our State were sent by the Governor to Gettysburg to aid the suffering soldiers from New Hampshire who had been injured in that terrible battle. Many of our most able medical men volunteered for service with the Armed Forces. Among these were Dr. John M. Brown of Hinsdale, Dr. Luther V. Bell of Francestown, Dr. A. B. Crosby of Gilmanton, Dr. George F. French of Dover, and Dr. J. T. Adams of Claremont. You all know the wonderful work of such New Hampshire nurses as Harriet P. Dame of Concord and Sarah Low of Dover.

Supplementing the missions of mercy performed by doctors, nurses, and similar services were the efforts of the New Hampshire Legislature to assist the fightingmen in other ways. Early in the war the lawmakers in Concord gave permission to the towns and cities to raise money for the benefit of the families of men in the armed services. The aggregate payments under the authority of this act reached almost $2 million. In addition, during the later years of the war, when volunteers were less numerous than they had been in 1861, the legislature authorized the payment of a State bounty of $100 for each recruit, and permitted the towns and cities to augment this with additional amounts. Still another legislative service to the fighting men was the enactment of the first absentee voting law in our State's history. Passed by the legislature on August 16, 1864, this law permitted men in uniform to vote by absentee ballot. That autumn more than 2,700 such New Hampshire votes were cast. Thus a modern principle was introduced into our public life.

An extremely important contribution of the New Hampshire home front to the men at war was the productive output of the factories and farms of the State. From our great textile mills came blankets, cotton and woolen cloth, hosiery, and some ready-made clothing. From our machine shops came all manner of items for the Quartermaster General, ranging from locomotives to nails. From the farms and forests of New Hampshire came lumber, meat, and grain. From mines and quarries came granite, mica, and some copper. Truly from Coos to the sea the energetic people of New Hampshire, alike in the town and in the country, supplied the sinews of war to the armed services.

The problem of prisoner exchange during the Civil War was a most vexing one. Hundreds of thousands of men on each side were captured at one time or another and incarcerated in forlorn prison camps. The only practical way for release from these camps, in which so many men on each side perished, was prisoner exchange. It might interest you in this chamber to note that the legal cartel by which this exchange was made possible was signed in 1862 in behalf of the United States by Maj. Gen. John A. Dix. A native of Boscawen, his full-length portrait hangs only a few feet from this rostrum.

Now, in the third place, I would like to indicate certain ways in which New Hampshire contributed to and participated in the larger aspects of the Civil War. It cannot be too greatly stressed that the 4 years from 1861 to 1865 were among the most vital in American history. This was so, not alone because of events on the battlefield and on the home front, but also from the viewpoint of the enduring accomplishments of our Nation. Time permits me to summarize only six of these.

In 1862 U.S. Senator Henry Wilson of Massachusetts introduced a bill into Congress to create a national award for valor to be known as the Medal of Honor. This bill was signed by President Lincoln later that summer, and the first medals were soon granted. For 101 years, this medal has been esteemed as the highest award for military valor in the gift of the United States. Twenty New Hampshire men won it during the Civil War. You and I may be proud that Henry Wilson was a native of Farmington, N.H., in which community his name is still an honored one.

A century ago Congress enacted legislation which produced the system of National Banks as we know them today. Prior to 1863 in our country and in our State there had been no such thing as a "national bank." Banks in New Hampshire were chartered by the legislature in a manner familiar to you all. But by the end of the war there were 14 of the new national banks in New Hampshire, and their presence in our banking system has been continuous ever since.

In 1863, also, Congress passed the laws which began the Pacific railroads. These great national projects, as important then as the Interstate Highway System is today, included in the beginning the Union Pacific from Omaha to San Francisco, and the Northern Pacific, from Duluth to Seattle. It is a matter of pride to observe that one of the principal engineers in laying out the western stretches of the Union Pacific was Samuel S. Montague, a native of Keene.

In 1862, thanks to the efforts of Senator Justin S. Morrill of our sister State of Vermont, Congress enacted one of the most important laws in its entire history. This was the so-called Land Grant College Act, by which every State in the Union was authorized to establish a college of agriculture and mechanic arts. This was to be aided by a Federal grant in the amount of 30,000 acres of public land for every member which that State then had in Congress. The New Hampshire Legislature promptly accepted the provisions of this law, and in 1866 authorized the establishment of such a college in this State. Originally set up in Hanover, it was, as you know, later moved to Durham, and in 1923 by permission of this body became the University of New Hampshire.

President Lincoln's Secretary of the Treasury was Salmon P. Chase, a native of Cornish, N.H., and a graduate of Dartmouth College. In 1861, with the approval of the President, Secretary Chase authorized the stamping of the famous words, "In God We Trust" on a then minted coin, the 2-cent piece. Eventually this sentence was to appear on all American coins and on our currency as well. But it is worth remembering that it began during the Civil War.

One final relationship of New Hampshire to the enduring accomplishments of our Nation may be noted. That was the abolition of slavery. Although there is no evidence that our men rushed to enlist in 1861 because of an overpowering desire to free the slaves in the South, as the war went on sentiment in this State hardened. In 1862, the New Hampshire Legislature thanked Congress for abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia, and in that same year sent a message to the President urging the enlistment of Negroes in the Armed Forces of the Nation. There is little doubt that this memorial from our legislature encouraged President Lincoln to issue his Preliminary Emancipation Proclamation in September 1862, and the final Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863.

Allen Nevins, the Chairman of the U.S. Civil War Centennial Commission, has spoken of the lasting effect of the release of peaceful energies in this Nation between 1861 and 1865, made possible by the outcome of the battles of the Civil War. When today you hear or read of the Congressional Medal of Honor, of national banks, of transcontinental railroads, of land-grant colleges, of the inscription on our money, and of the emancipation of the Negro, reflect and be proud that our New Hampshire forbears played a significant and honorable part in all six of these momentous developments.

During the Civil War New Hampshire had four Governors: Ichabod Goodwin of Portsmouth, who bore the heavy responsibility of readying the State for war after the firing on Ft. Sumter; Nathaniel S. Berry of Hebron, who was a friend of President Lincoln, and who encouraged the latter on the Negro problem; Joseph A. Gilmore of Concord, who greeted Mrs. Lincoln and her two sons when they visited New Hampshire a hundred years ago this summer; and Frederick Smyth of Manchester, who supervised the demobilizing of the State after the war. Among the New Hampshire men in high position with the National Government at Washington during the war years were U.S. Senator John P. Hale of Dover, whose statue stands on the Capitol Plaza; Senators Aaron H. Cragin of Lebanon and Daniel Clark of Manchester; Congressman Edward H. Rollins of Concord; Nehemiah G. Ordway of Warner, who long served as Sergeant at Arms for the House of Representatives; Amos Tuck of Exeter; and George G. Fogg of Dover.

These, then, ladies and gentlemen, are three perspectives from which we today should view the war years between 1861 and 1865 and New Hampshire's part therein: (1) The military contributions of our State to the United States; (2) the ways in which the home front served the fighting men; and (3) the part that New Hampshire played in the enduring accomplishments of the war to our Nation. It is these three aspects which the New Hampshire Civil War Centennial Commission, many of whose members are your guests this morning, have been seeking to explain during the past years. It is these three aspects of the war which I trust your honorable body will call to mind when thinking of the great struggle of a century ago.

No man or woman of 1963 can understand our country today unless he or she has some grasp of the Civil War and what it meant to this Nation. That great struggle shaped our way of life and our national ideals almost as much as did the War for Independence itself. Because this is so, a commemoration of it is amply justified by this generation today. The love for the Union which Webster set forth in his immortal words I have already quoted, and the desire of the American people to give equal justice to both the great racial groups of which this Nation of ours is composed—these twin ideals are just as much a matter of concern today as they were in 1861. Those of you who read the moving address by Vice President Johnson on May 30, 1963, will understand what I mean.

"It is for us, the living," said President Lincoln at Gettysburg just a century ago this autumn, "* * * to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced." True in 1863; true in 1963. The task for which millions of people worked and for which so many thousands suffered and died between 1861 and 1865 is not yet finished. It still calls for dedicated men and women, lawmakers, executive officers, citizens in general. As President Lincoln said in his annual message to the Congress in December 1862: "We—even we here—hold the power and bear the responsibility. * * * We shall nobly save, or meanly lose, the last best hope of the earth." Your Excellency, and distinguished men and women of this Legislature, that is the meaning and the challenge of the Civil War commemoration to us in New Hampshire in 1963.

Dr. J. Duane Squires,
Chairman, Department of Social Studies, Colby Junior College, New London, N.H.

June 11, 1963.

Local Initiative and Government Cooperation Produce Big Results in Southern Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in southern Indiana through the rural area development and ARA programs, local initiative along with State and Federal cooperation have produced very encouraging results. New industry is being developed, flood waters are being controlled, water resources are being developed, and rural living is being improved through increased income, better housing, and electrification.

On May 27 and 28, I accompanied Secretary of Agriculture Freeman on a tour of southern Indiana so that he could see, firsthand, what is being accomplished there.

The July issue of the Indiana Rural News, devoted several pages to description and commentary on the RAD programs and the Secretary's visit. I have selected an article and an editorial which I believe are particularly worthy of the attention of the Senate and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOOSIERS ARE HELPING THEMSELVES TO BRIGHT, NEW FUTURE IN SOUTHERN INDIANA

(By Vernon Orton)

Southern Indiana is on the threshold of a bright new future. It is forging ahead at the hands of its richest resource—its people. A new and better way of life is being unfolded for undeveloped and underdeveloped countries in that region.

This inspiring revelation was dramatically and forcefully brought home to members of Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman's party as they made a tour of Rural Areas Development projects in nine counties May 27–28.

New industry is coming in, floods are being eliminated, water resources are being developed, farms are better managed and protected, and rural living is being improved through increased income, better housing and electrification.

The new era of living for residents of the area is resulting from the programs being carried out cooperatively by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's RAD Division, the U.S. Department of Commerce's Area Redevelopment Administration projects and other Federal, State, and local agencies and organizations.

Some local REMC's are involved directly in specific developments through participation in the section 6 loan program of the Rural Electrification Administration, by which money can be borrowed by the REMC and reloaned to industrial firms for the purchase of electrical machinery, equipment and supplies.

Other REMC's are giving time, effort and support to the preparation of overall economic development plans in cooperation with local chambers of commerce and other organizations; and to implementing these plans when they are approved by the designated State and Federal agencies.

Economic development activities in the rural southern Indiana area range from improvement of farm and rural housing to location of new industry. They include industries which provide jobs for rural people and which furnish markets for timber and other natural resources, job training, water systems serving rural people, small watershed projects, soil and water conservation and woodland improvement.

Also rural electrification, development of outdoor recreation on private land and of scenic and historic attractions to draw an increasing number of tourists are included. Improvements for navigation and recreation on the Ohio River which forms the boundary between Indiana and Kentucky are another phase.

The overall RAD program involves industrial loans through ARA and REA; community facility loans and grants through ARA, and, to a limited extent, through the Farmers Home Administration; rural housing loans, including a special program for financing housing construction for persons over 65; job training programs which provide rural people with the opportunity to learn new skills which can be used in the new plants being constructed as part of the RAD program.

These programs complement the current programs being carried out by other agencies of the Department of Agriculture—Soil Conservation Service, FHA, Forest Service, Federal Extension Service, Farmer Cooperative Service, REA—which are dedicated to building rural resources, as pointed out by Secretary Freeman.

The ARA, he said, is helping boost the local economy in many rural areas. Since the first ARA loan and grant were made in 1961, ARA has made a total of $57 million in loans and grants in rural areas to start 154 projects; 97 loans to private concerns totalling $31 million; loans and grants to help 57 public facilities, a total of $26 million.

The 154 projects involve 20,000 new jobs. In the 850 rural counties designated as eligible for ARA aid, more than 4,600 development projects have been proposed by local people.

"It has been encouraging," Secretary Freeman commented, "to see people of all occupations—professional men, farmers, and businessmen—working together on industrial and community projects. I am proud of what the Department of Agriculture and other Federal and State agencies have been able to do to help.

"New industry is vitally important to rural America. Agriculture is important to the economy of this area and will become more important, but agriculture alone cannot absorb the present work force of rural America. To keep the youth who want to stay in this area, there must be many more job opportunities. These are being provided through the RAD program."

Visited on the tour through and over (by bus and helicopter) nine southern Indiana counties—Harrison, Perry, Spencer, Crawford, Orange, Martin, Dubois, Clark, and Washington—were 20 projects including water supply, watershed and flood control, industries, training school for industrial workers, rural housing, new locks and dam on the Ohio River, Hoosier National Forest recreation areas, forage and family farms, recreation lakes and the Lincoln National Memorial.

Secretary Freeman noted along the route that local people are combining their own resources with those available from many local, State, and Federal agencies and departments in the RAD program.

"These people," he said, "represent the key element of any RAD program. With local initiative and leadership much can be accomplished. Without it—progress will never come."

The Lincoln Hills area of southern Indiana has been selected as the first in the United States to receive Department of Agriculture help in a Resource Conservation and Development project, Secretary Freeman announced during the tour.

"This pilot project in Indiana," he said, "will speed up water resource development, recreation and tourist development, land use adjustments and industrial development in a rural area of more than 1 million acres of land in Harrison, Crawford, Perry, and Spencer Counties."

The Secretary pointed out that through this new and experimental approach to improved land use and development of natural resources, a large number of farmers, city people, communities and organizations can join together to develop and use all resources of the area to improve the regional economy and offer more attractive job opportunities for young people.

USDA assistance to local organizers of the project, he pointed out, will begin shortly after July 1 through the SCS, if Congress appropriates funds for this purpose. The initial work will be to help local people develop an overall resource development program which will pinpoint how local, State, and Federal resources can be used to the best advantage in carrying out the project.

Five million people live within a 200-mile radius of this test project, Secretary Freeman said. "I urge urban and city groups in this area to consider joining with local leaders to explore ways of working together. Farmers would have an additional source of income from their lands, and urban residents would have an outdoor recreation area reserved specifically for their use.

"The four-county Lincoln Hills area is rich in natural beauty and there is great potential for developing its resources to serve new uses." The region is amply endowed with breathtaking scenery, especially along the Ohio River.

The Lincoln Hills Resource Conservation and Development project is sponsored by the Lincoln Hills RAD committee and the local soil conservation districts in the four counties. It has been endorsed by Governor Matthew Welsh, who pledged the resources and assistance of the State and its agencies in forwarding the planning and carrying out of the project if it is approved.

Resource Conservation and Development projects were authorized in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 to provide for accelerating going conservation and development programs, plus using all new programs in a concentrated and coordinated effort to strengthen the economy of an area when local people wanted this type of help.

"We consider the Resource Conservation and Development project as another—and one of our most promising—new tool in the RAD program that already is nationwide in scope," the Secretary noted.

"Southern Indiana will be the first testing ground. The proposed project area is 85 percent rural. About 61,000 people live in the area. More than 51,000 live in rural areas.

"Here in Indiana, you have well over 700 people at work on RAD committees—and an untold number of other local people helping to get the job done. And in all of America, there are 58,000 people serving on RAD committee's in 1,930 counties.

"It is a tremendous force of initiative, leadership, ingenuity and just plain hard work that will not be denied the fruits of economic development."

Complementing and supporting these efforts are the new and existing program of the USDA, the Secretary pointed out, placing new emphasis on communities instead of commodities—on people instead of program.

"All the Department's resources and services are coordinated to help," he declared, "and there is extensive aid from other Federal departments and independent agencies, from the State and from local government," the Secretary reemphasized.

Through this combination of local leadership and local, State, and Federal resources, the Secretary said, all of us together are seeking to gain such high national goals as:

Helping rural America to give direction and purpose to its adjustment to rapid changes.

Readjusting rural land use patterns to make more land available for the increasing needs of outdoor recreation and open spaces, while reducing cropland acres.

Fully protecting and developing the Nation's soil, water, forests, grass, fish, wildlife, and open spaces.

Strengthening the family farm pattern, while insuring an efficient productive source of food and fiber in a way that increased efficiency does not mean less income to the producer.

Encouraging more rapid industrialization and expansion of commercial enterprise in rural areas and thus providing new employment and other nonfarm economic opportunities.

Providing adequate public facilities and service in rural areas.

"On this 2-day tour I have seen every one of these goals being achieved," Secretary Freeman observed.

Importance of recreational facilities and tourism in developing the economy were stressed by the Secretary. "I think it logical for most of us, when thinking of ways to create more jobs, payrolls and ways to put more money into circulation, to think of bringing in an industry. But there are other ways to accomplish the same objective."

In his major address on the tour, given before a crowd of 1,500 at the Perry County 4-H Club Fairgrounds between Cannelton and Tell City, following a chicken barbecue May 27, the Secretary said in part:

"RAD is an effort, based on the desire of the rural community to progress, to do three things: First, to infuse new capital into rural America. Second, to find an answer to the problems of overproduction by converting cropland to new uses which will produce better incomes for people on the land through filling the unmet needs of people in the city and suburban areas. Third, to encourage a new alinement of the resources of land and water and people in rural America to expand the rural economy. * * *

"I have been enormously impressed by the projects I have seen today, by the energy which the people of southern Indiana are giving to the task of creating new opportunity for themselves * * * and by the spirit of hope which I sense so strongly among you."

In summing up the tour, which began at Louisville and concluded in Evansville—with participants including Members of Congress or their representatives, officials of the USDA and Department of Commerce, State and Federal officials and a dozen Washington correspondents—Secretary Freeman concluded:

"In the past 2 days we have seen a corner of rural America that is surging ahead with economic development. The whole of America will benefit, as well as southern Indiana."

BY THE PEOPLE

Revitalizing the area economy and improving the pattern of living in Indiana, particularly in the southern part of the State, are the rural areas development projects and other programs of Federal, State, and local assistance.

Prospects for a bright future in southern Indiana's undeveloped and underdeveloped areas are impressive, as evidenced in the RAD tour made of 20 projects in 9 southern Indiana counties, May 27–28, by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and his party.

The inspiring feature about this development is in its approach—placing new emphasis on communities instead of commodities—on people instead of programs. It is a group of complementing projects of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Indiana REMC's participating in the program are to be congratulated on the contributions they are making to the projects being carried on by the various Federal departments and their agencies, in cooperation with State and local governments and organizations.

They are taking the initiative in cooperating with these various groups, including local chambers of commerce and other civic organizations, spending time, money, and effort in preparing overall economic development plans and implementing projects approved by designated State and Federal agencies.

Their efforts will be reflected not only in increased revenue in some instances due to new industries, businesses and residences added to their lines, but the general resulting improvements in the economy of the region will create better and more enjoyable living conditions for all.

Particularly pointed out during Secretary Freeman's tour were the activities of the Harrison County REMC and Southern Indiana REC, Inc.:

Harrison County REMC secured a section 5 loan to assist in the establishing of a new industry now being developed in its service territory—the Indiana Glass Sand Co., near Elizabeth, where the ground now is being prepared for a $774,770 plant for the mining of high grade silica sand. The plant, when completed, will employ 33 persons.

Southern Indiana REC is cooperating with private and local and Federal Government financing agencies in a proposed $3 million industrial development at Tell City, also through a section 5 loan. If approved, the contemplated particle board plant of Storrs Wood Products Co., is expected to employ 45 people with a $6,500 weekly payroll. This would increase to 65 employees and a $8,500 weekly payroll at the end of the first year. In addition, about 400 people would have employment cutting, sawing, gathering and trucking timber to the plant.

Rural areas development committees in the counties and in the areas have had the help of extension service specialists and agents in RAD efforts. The committees have had the assistance of USDA's agencies, coordinated into technical action panels, to be more responsive to the projects and programs initiated by local people.

The committees have had the help of the State department of conservation, the State department of agriculture, commerce and public relation, tourist assistance council, State highway department and other State agencies as well as county and municipal governments.

But local leadership and the support of local people—farm and nonfarm—is primarily responsible for the surge of economic development in southern Indiana.

Faith and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been impressed with an article in the June 21, 1963, issue of Christianity Today which contains a reprint of remarks by Mr. J. Howard Pew before the 15th annual meeting of the National Council of United Presbyterian Men held in Chicago, Ill. The article is entitled "Faith and Freedom" and is one of the most eloquent addresses I have ever read on the subject of freedom and relationship to faith in God. Mr. Pew is a distinguished Christian layman who has won world renown as a philanthropist and successful businessman. He is chairman of the board of the Sun Oil Co.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reprint of Mr. Pew's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAITH AND FREEDOM

(By J. Howard Pew)

(NOTE.—J. Howard Pew is a distinguished Christian layman who has befriended many evangelical causes. This essay contains his remarks to the 15th annual meeting of the National Council of United Presbyterian Men held in Chicago, Ill.)

Faith as used in the Bible means far more than just believing or understanding. St. Paul tells us that faith is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." And so if we would have faith in the biblical sense, we must first accept Christ as our Lord and Savior, and then, through the working of the Holy Spirit, make our will subject to God's will. Once an individual has achieved faith, Christian freedom results from the exercise of that faith.

All of our so-called freedoms stem from Christian freedom. Without Christian freedom, no freedom is possible. Freedom therefore is indivisible. Freedom can exist only in a state whose people generally accept honesty, truth, fairness, generosity, justice, and charity as a rule for their conduct. If the people of a state accept instead bribery, guile, cupidity, deception, selfishness, and dishonesty, then the strong exploit the weak, might becomes right, and anarchy stalks the land. Freedom for the individual under such conditions is no longer possible. But honesty, truth, fairness, generosity, justice, and charity are the attributes of Christianity. Thus, if we would have freedom, we must first have faith in God.

St. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians admonishes us to "stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." In 1790, John Philpot Curran, the great Irish patriot, enunciated the same principle when in a speech to his constituency he said: "The condition under which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance, which condition if he break, servitude is at once the consequence of his crime and the punishment of his guilt."

Liberty, therefore, is a Christian concept, but people must first have faith in God before they can enjoy the blessings of liberty, for God is the author of liberty. Then they must fight for the preservation of that liberty. Their failure to do so is a crime, the puishment for which is servitude.

From the 1st until the 15th century liberty was rare, because the people either were lacking in faith or were unwilling to fight for their liberty. During this period there was little or no material progress; each generation lived just as did its forebears. Population was controlled by the amount of food that could be produced, and a large percentage of the people died of starvation. Then in the 15th century came the Reformation. Under the Reformation men's consciences were freed. Thereafter they were able to exercise their genius, initiative, and ingenuity. Machines gradually increased the productive capacity of labor on the farms. One hundred and fifty years ago it required 90 percent of the American people to produce sufficient food to maintain our population. Today 8 percent of the American people produce more food than our entire population can consume.

For over a hundred years freedom flourished in our land. When I graduated from college in 1900, America truly was the land of opportunity. Had the Government at that time been disposed to control our economic activities, as it does today, the oil industry to which I have devoted more than 60 years of my life might well have been an entirely different industry than it is. Let me tell you something about the development of the oil industry and its companion, the motor car industry, and speculate as to what might have been the attitude of a national economic planning board back in 1900, if one had existed at that time, toward these industries.

At that time there were being operated in this country some 8,500 motor cars, consuming approximately 85,000 barrels of gasoline a year. That is just about enough gasoline to keep the cars of today on the road for between 1 and 2 minutes. Now let us imagine Mr. Ford, with his great vision of the automobile's future, appearing before that board and asking that in their program for the next decade they provide a few billions of dollars of capital, along with the necessary labor and material, for his industry. The board would have recognized in Mr. Ford a mild lunatic. They would have asked him where he expected to get the gasoline for all those cars and would have pointed out that neither the gasoline nor the crude oil from which to make it was anywhere in sight—and they would have refused Mr. Ford's request. A sophisticated public would have laughed at Mr. Ford while the board set down genius as insanity and inventive ability as lunacy, and that would have ended all foolish talk about horseless carriages and flying machines.

But fortunately for the 40 million families in this country who today derive pleasure and satisfaction from the operation of their cars, there was no such board in the year 1900. And so Mr. Ford, not worrying about where his gasoline was coming from, went right ahead building more cars and better cars, until presently he was turning out more than a million cars a year.

It was fortunate for those in the petroleum industry, also, that there was no such board, for they to went right ahead drilling more wells and deeper wells and sometimes finding oil. They brought technology to their assistance in the form of geology and geophysics and thereby discovered new oil fields. And so the oil industry, doing each year those things which would have been impossible the year before, was always able to keep just a step ahead of the thirst for gasoline of those multiplying millions of automobiles.

The first telephone was installed on the White House desk of General Grant. After he had talked into his end of the wire and listened to the answering voice until he was thoroughly satisfied that the thing really would work, he leaned back in his chair and said: "Yes, it is truly remarkable; but who in the world would ever want to use one of them?" Now, General Garnt was quite a man. He won a great war and was twice President. But I submit that this incident justifies the gravest doubts about the wisdom of any economic planning board which he might have appointed—and as President, according to our present-day planners, he would have had to appoint just such a board.

The richest story of them all is one I ran across in a report put out by the Patent Office Society. About the middle of the last century, it was proposed in Washington to construct a new building to house the Patent Office. The congressional committee called in Mr. Ellsworth, who was then the U.S. Commissioner of Patents, and asked his advice. Commissioner Ellsworth counseled against to large or too expensive a building, because invention had just about reached its limit. He related the astounding advances that had been made in the mechanical arts during his lifetime and predicted a cessation of activity in the field of invention—there just wasn't anything else left to invent.

At this point I made a little investigation of my own, and I found that up until Ellsworth's time there had been taken out in this country some 3,327 patents; since then, however, almost 3 million patents have been granted—just a little increase of some 90,000 percent. So much for that one Government official, who undoubtedly would have been a member of the National Economic Planning Board if one had existed at that time. But Commissioner Ellsworth was not so illiberal as are most of our modern planners. He didn't believe there could be many more inventions, but in any event he did not propose to suppress them.

American industry under freedom has raised the standard of living of the American people in a way which was undreamed of even 100 years ago. But freedom has also been responsible for great progress in the field of medicine. Let me illustrate by telling you the story of Ephraim McDowell.

One hundred and forty years ago Ephraim McDowell was a practicing physician in Danville, Ky., then a small hamlet on the edge of the wilderness. A few days before Christmas he was summoned 60 miles to see a patient, a Mrs. Crawford. The local doctor had told her that she was pregnant, but after 10 or 11 months had passed, her condition became so alarming that Dr. McDowell was called into consultation. He diagnosed her case as ovarian tumor. No surgeon had ever dared operate in such a case, because it was popularly believed that any contact of the outside atmosphere with the interior of the abdominal cavity meant certain death. But Dr. McDowell had long believed such an operation possible, and he persuaded Mrs. Crawford to let him do it. The operation had to be performed at the doctor's home, where he had all of his surgical equipment, and so Mrs. Crawford accompanied him on horseback the 60 miles back to Danville, suffering excruciating pain at every step.

When the village learned of this unheard-of operation, feeling ran high against Dr. McDowell. The people were determined to stop the operation, either by law or by a mob, if necessary. But Dr. McDowell was undaunted. Even though he knew the operation might result in the death of his patient—and certain death to him if his patient died—nevertheless he was prepared to take the risk.

The operation was performed on Christmas morning. When the services in the local church were over, the people gathered in front of the doctor's home with a rope around a tree, prepared to hang him just as soon as the patient died. Becoming impatient, they tried to break into the house but were stopped by the sheriff. All this was before the development of anesthesia, and the story has it that Mrs. Crawford sang hymns to drown out the pain while the doctor worked. Despite the yelling of the patient on the inside and the howling of the mob on the outside, Dr. McDowell performed the first abdominal operation in the history of medicine. Mrs. Crawford not only survived the operation but lived to be over 80 years of age.

Today the operation for appendicitis alone saves over a million lives per year. What do you think would have been the attitude of a government medical board 140 years ago toward such an operation? And what do you think would have been the status of medicine today if during these last 140 years medicine had been socialized throughout the world? I suspect it would be just exactly what it was before Dr. McDowell performed that amazing operation.

When he was 18 years of age, Galileo, attended his devotions at the Pisa Cathedral, watched the caretaker stand on the side of the nave, draw the chandelier toward him, and then after lighting the lamp release it. Galileo was fascinated as he watched that great chandelier swing in a great arc over the nave. Then with his pulse he calculated the elapsed time for each swing and was amazed to find that as the arc of the swing was reduced, the elapsed time remained constant. This is the principle employed in most of our reliable clocks of today. A clock in which the length and weight of the pendulum have been accurately adjusted will keep perfect time.

Subsequently, Galileo discovered the telescope, the microscope, the thermometer, and an infinite number of mathematical formulas, and made many other scientific discoveries. He was the first man to prove that the earth is a globe and revolves around the sun, and he also worked out the equinoxes. That the moon revolves around the earth—in fact, much of our knowledge of astronomy—was first discovered by Galileo.

But instead of giving him the acclaim which he had earned, the church accused him of heresy. The church felt impelled to take this action because it assumed the responsibility for all economic, social, and political activities. It had accepted Aristotle's erroneous concepts of astronomy, but it could not now change its position: to do so would admit that the church was fallible. And so it was decreed that Galileo had violated the Holy Scriptures, and, under threat of the most terrifying forms of the Inquisition, he was compelled to recant and was banished from his country. Thus was ended the usefulness of the greatest scientific mind ever developed in the history of the world.

Today most of our Protestant denominations have lobbyists in Washington who on behalf of their 30 or 40 million members are dictating to our Senators and Congressmen the kind of legislation which should be enacted on almost every conceivable economic, social, and political subject. Now, I submit that unless this is stopped, the time is not too far distant when we will have a Protestant inquisition—20th-century pattern—which will rival in effectiveness the Roman Catholic Inquisition of the Middle Ages.

The truth is that no planning authority could possibly have foreseen, planned, and organized such an amazing spectacle of human progress as the world has witnessed right here in this country during the last hundred years. No trust or combination—ecclesiastical, private, or governmental—could have accomplished it. This foresight could have been achieved, but only if there had been a wide-open invitation to all the genius, inventive ability, organizing capacity, and managerial skill of a great people—nobody barred, no invention rejected, and no idea untried.

Everyone must have his chance, and under our American system of free enterprise and equal opportunity, everyone gets just that chance. It is our freedom that has brought us to this high estate—intellectual freedom, religious freedom, political freedom, industrial freedom—freedom to dream, to think, to experiment, to invent, to match wits in friendly competition—freedom to be an individual. That is our great American heritage. With so many political witch doctors abroad in the land teaching communism, fascism, planned and dictated economies, governmental paternalism, and all the other isms, I urge you to guard well that heritage and to turn a deaf ear to all their sophistries. When a people come to look upon their government or their church as the source of all their rights, there will surely come a time when they will look upon the same government or church as the source of all their wrongs. That is the history of all planned, dictated economies. That is the history of tyranny. To each of us is assigned a part in the great drama of life, and we can play our parts with the greatest measure of perfection only as free, unhampered individuals. Surely it is not thinkable that in the light which shines through this 20th century, a great progressive people will be beguiled into turning back to the ways of controlled economies and dictated social programs.

I believe that the church is the only institution that can save this country from communism. The reason for this is quite simple: Communism is atheistic—the church is Christian; the one is the very antithesis of the other. The church must inculcate in the minds and hearts of its people that God alone is the Lord of Creation. When the church takes its stand that man is a creature of God, it denies the very concept of communism.

Communism, crime, and delinquency are not caused by poverty, bad laws, poor housing, or any other economic, social, or political condition. They are caused by sin. The only way to eradicate sin is by the redemptive power of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The church is God's instrument to carry the Gospel to man.

In one of his great sermons Dr. McCartney told of an old Saxon king who set out with his army to put down a rebellion in a distant province of his kingdom. When the insurrection had been quelled and the army of rebels defeated, he placed a candle in the archway of the castle in which he had his headquarters. Then, lighting the candle, he sent his herald to announce to those who had been in rebellion that all who surrendered and who took the oath of allegiance while the candle still burned would be saved. The king offered to them his clemency and mercy, but the offer was limited to the life of that candle.

We are all living on candle time. While the candle still burns, let us accept Christ as our Lord and Saviour. Let us by our life and witness spread the Gospel. And let us through faith acquire Christian freedom, which alone can make this country a better and finer place in which our children and our children's children may live and work.

There is a little poem which illustrates what I have in mind far better than any words of mine could. It is entitled "The Bridge Builder." I have long since forgotten the name of its author.

"An old man traveling a lone highway,
Came at evening, cold and gray,
To a chasm deep and wide,
Through which there flowed a sullen tide.
The old man crossed in the twilight dim,
For the sullen stream held no fear for him.
He turned when he reached the other side
And built a bridge to span the tide.
'Old man!' cried a fellow pilgrim near,
'Why waste your strength with your building here;
Your journey will end with the ending day,
And you never again will pass this way;
You have crossed the chasm deep and wide,
Why build a bridge at eventide?'
"The builder raised his old gray head,
'Good friend, on the path I have come,' he said,
'There followeth after me today
A youth whose feet will pass this way.
This stream which has meant naught to me,
To that fair-haired boy may a pitfall be;
He, too, must cross in the twilight dim.
Good friend, I am building this bridge for him.'"

Control of Public Opinion as a Factor in the Concentration of Economic Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech delivered by Dr. Horace M. Gray, professor of economics in the University of Illinois before the Mid West Economics Association at St. Louis, Mo.

CONTROL OF PUBLIC OPINION AS A FACTOR IN THE CONCENTRATION OF ECONOMIC POWER

I. INTRODUCTION

"Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed,
That he is grown so great?"

Cassius, that lean and hungry man, who slept not well at night, read much, was a great observer and saw quite through the deeds of men, in this classic query about the source of Caesar's power, raised the ultimate question that must be asked about every concentration of power, whether it be political, economic, military, social or religious. What is the source of this power? How was it concentrated in the first instance? How is it nourished and sustained? By what means is it preserved against external hazards? How does it justify its ways to man?

Those who cannot resist the lure of metaphysics look to the stars for answer. They scan the heavens for some grand cosmic design by which the mundane affairs of society are ordered and determined. They profess to discern universal principles, laws or forces—organic, naturalistic, technological, deterministic, necessitous—the operation of which requires, and therefore produces, extreme concentration of economic power. Thus, man does not will or contrive monopoly; rather, it is thrust upon him by relentless fate or necessity, to which he must submit because he can do no other.

The querulous Cassius, however, warns us against these mythmakers:

"The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars but in ourselves, that we are underlings."

If we heed this earthy, practical advice we shall look not to the stars but to our own institutions, including our values and attitudes, to discover the true sources of concentrated power. What, we shall ask, are the institutional foundations of monopoly. How do clever, ruthless and ambitious men, by the manipulation and perversion of institutions, concentrate economic power? Having once concentrated it how, by continued manipulation of institutions, do they maintain it in a presumably hostile environment? How may a democratic society, which fears and distrusts monopoly, modify its institutions, or change their operation, to reduce or diffuse an excessive concentration of economic power? The great merit of this institutional approach is that it enables us to apply the time-honored rule that what certain men, in pursuit of their self-interest, have joined together other men, acting collectively for the general good, may disjoin.

II. SHIFTS IN THE INSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATIONS OF MONOPOLY

Over time the institutional foundations of monopoly have shifted significantly. During the feudal and monarchial periods of Western development monopoly rested primarily on exclusive grants of privilege. The monopolist held from the feudal lord or king and exercised power under the prerogative; his tenure was on sufferance and he could be stripped of his privilege at the pleasure of the sovereign. When, during the 17th and 18th centuries, absolutism was displaced by parliamentary democracy and free capitalism special privilege fell into disfavor. The royal prerogative was limited and the power of privilege was transferred to parliament, where it was used sparingly and only in generalized forms. Henceforth, special privilege ceased to be regarded as the principal source of monopoly power. It was not, as will be noted later, proscribed or eradicated; rather, it was reduced to a state of dormancy or temporary desuetude, from which in the fullness of time it would blossom forth with renewed vigor.

At this juncture Adam Smith advanced his famous theory of conspiracy as the foundation of monopoly. In the absence of special privilege, and in the context of his natural competition, there could logically be only one source of monopoly—the inherent propensity of businessmen to conspire against the public interest. This, of course, was not a new idea; the English common law had been dealing with such conspiracies for years. What Smith did was to elevate business conspiracy from a petty offense against local markets and individuals to the exalted status of a crime against society. It was the chief enemy and chronic disrupter of an otherwise universal and beneficent natural harmony. This powerful dramatization of conspiracy as the sole cause of monopoly fixed the pattern of thought for over 100 years and its influence is still strongly reflected in our antitrust policy.

After the Civil War, however, opinion shifted to the view that monopoly depended in large measure on the engrossment of scarce, strategically situated physical property, such as: lands, forests, water, minerals, routes, sites, transportation, industrial and public utility facilities. Since private property, by definition, was exclusive, it followed that some degree of monopoly power was an inevitable concomitant of the private property system. This power became oppressive and harmful only when the process of engrossment and consolidation accentuated scarcity to an intolerable degree. In the absence of conspiracy, then, monopoly was not a separate and readily distinguishable evil per se, but rather a special, localized aberration of private capitalism. It could not be challenged directly without jeopardizing the basic institution of private property. On this premise, resort was had to taxation, regulation, or attempted dissolution to ameliorate the ill effects of monopoly.

Around the turn of the century attention shifted to a special form of private property—money, credit and liquid investment capital. Was not, men asked, control of financial capital by a few great bankers and financiers the ultimate source of economic power? Was not financial capital a more important pillar of monopoly than physical capital? Investigation of these questions raised a great hue and cry against the Money Trust, Wall Street, and the Money Changers in the Temple. Subsequent reforms, including public regulation and the creation of new financial institutions, served to abate somewhat the intensity of popular feeling on this score. Although the problem still persists in attenuated form few today would contend that centralized control of financial capital is the main institutional foundation of monopoly.

In recent years, however, say within the last 40 years, the modern corporation has come to be regarded as the principal institution of monopoly. In traditional terms, the corporation is merely Economic Man, Incorporated—a Gargantuan Economic Man, endowed with supernatural powers of growth, extension, acquisition, proliferation and combination. Thus equipped, it can engross physical property, centralize financial capital, unify physical and financial property, combine functions and create economic empires that transcend in scope and power the wildest fantasies of natural economic man. By the alchemy of incorporation the latter, with his puny powers and limited aspirations, has been transformed into corporate man, released from the mundane fetters which heretofore have bound him, and launched on the fatal quest for omnipotent power. Henceforth, the monopoly problem is for all practical purposes synonymous with the corporation problem.

III. FOUNDATIONS OF "CORPORATE COLLECTIVISM"

The corporate system has evolved to the point where we now have the most highly concentrated privated power structure in all history—a system in which a relatively few giant corporations effectively dominate the national economy. We have become dependent on them for the realization of national objectives, such as: full employment, maximum output and purchasing power, investment, technological progress, growth and international security. This dependency of a great industrial society on the decisions of an irresponsible, self-perpetuating corporate elite, operating from the top command posts of a few giant corporations, is a new phenomenon in American experience—one so strange to our traditions that we lack even an accurate name for it. For want of a better nomenclature the term "corporate collectivism" will suffice temporarily.

Economists, with their traditional market orientation and predilection for materialistic, quantitative analysis, have been singularly inept and backward in diagnosing this new development. They have tended to explain monopoly in terms of control over strategic physical and market factors, and to regard the corporation as merely a superior institutional device for facilitating such control. This limited approach, while useful so far as it goes, fails to provide an adequate or realistic explanation of modern monopoly. It is significant that, since World War II, much of the bold, avant garde, pioneering investigation in this area has come from noneconomists—students of history, politics, philosophy, theology, jurisprudence, sociology, social psychology, administration, organization, and communications. Uninhibited by self-imposed disciplinary restraints, they have faced the challenge of corporate power and sought to explore both its inner mysteries and its social consequences.

What do the reconnaisance reports of these venturesome noneconomic scouts tell us? In brief, what we should have recognized long since: That corporate collectivism is not economic man, incorporated, but rather a complex institution for the concentration and administration of the totality of private power, which embraces political and social as well as economic power. They tell us that the institutional foundations of monopoly power are radically different than we have heretofore assumed; that on the old substratum of control over physical and market factors there has been reared an imposing superstructure of power based on control of certain nonmaterial, intangible, incommensurable elements that are political and social in character; that corporate collectivism does not and cannot restrict its control to purely economic activities but, in order to preserve its power, must reach out to control knowledge, Government, and public opinion. The latter, then, become the new and indispensable foundations of modern monopoly power.

These studies indicate further that, notwithstanding its outward facade of seemingly overweening power, corporate collectivism is extremely vulnerable and insecure. Its power is illegitimate, having been usurped without public sanction and frequently in violation of the law. It is irresponsible, being answerable to no superior public authority for its conduct and decisions. It is restrictive, exploitative, and aggressive vis-a-vis the people and free institutions. It is antidemocratic, being driven by its inner compulsions to destroy freedom, corrupt government, and pervert the democratic process. Because its hand is against every man, every man's hand is potentially against it. This is the Achilles heel of corporate collectivism, the area of its fatal vulnerability. This is the ever present danger which haunts the wakeful dreams of those who sit in the seats of the mighty and drives them relentlessly to strive for total power. They do not need such power for the prosaic function of making steel billets, plyboard, or tin cans but they must have it to maintain their dominant status in society.

In the last analysis, the power thrust of modern monopoly is limited by its ability to control and direct public opinion. The public, as it may elect, can be either the source or the nemesis of concentrated economic power—either the grantor or the gainsayer. No one is more acutely aware of this dual possibility than those who are responsible for the management of our giant corporations. They must control public opinion to achieve power, in the first instance, and subsequently to maintain and increase it. This is the reason they assign such high priority to public relations, or the engineering of consent, and devote such lavish outlays to it. This high-level, power-oriented activity should not be confused with the banal, low-level hucksterism about which critics have written so scathingly of late. The former serves power; it deals with ideas, values, interest and social attitudes; it belongs in the realm of statecraft. The latter is concerned with the sale of goods; it belongs to the raucous, bustling marketplace where both honest tradesmen and charlatans cry their wares. While functionally discrete, public relations and hucksterism do in practice frequently overlap and become intermingled for various institutional reasons, so that separate accounting is difficult or impossible, but this does not preclude their separation for purposes of discussion of their quite different social roles.

IV. TYPES OF PROPAGANDA

While the common purpose of all big business propaganda is to justify the ways of corporate power to a skeptical public. the patterns and techniques are carefully tailored to cope with the particular vulnerabilities which threaten the power structure. Thus, it may be said that propaganda techniques are predetermined by the nature of the vulnerabilities. Several main types may be distinguished.

A. Responsibility

If it were generally understood that all monopoly is humanly contrived and that it rests on some form of privilege then the game would be lost. Hence, it is imperative that the public be deceived as to the true institutional sources of monopoly power. This is attempted by a tour de force appeal to metaphysics—responsibility for monopoly must be shifted from man to the gods, from institutions to necessity.

Businessmen, it is said, do not consciously seek or contrive monopoly; rather, it is thrust upon them by the operation of inscrutable and inexorable forces beyond their control. These external determinants—call them fate, destiny or necessity—or naturalistic, organic, historic, technological, economic laws—require the concentration of economic power for their fulfillment. Man, by this reckoning, is merely the agent of a preordained process which he neither wills nor can avoid. If fate or necessity decrees that monopoly shall exist, then how can man be held responsible for it? The reluctant monopolist is thus cast in the role of Atlas condemned by the gods to bear the crushing weight of the world on his shoulders. He merits public sympathy rather than condemnation.

B. Identification with public interest

The ancient tradition of an irrepressible conflict between monopoly and the public interest must be replaced by a plausible identity of interest between the two. The predatory wolf of traditional folklore, monopoly, must be disguised in the sheep's clothing of free, competitive capitalism. This camouflage job is the special assignment of the "imagemakers"—the high priests of the public relations cult.

The giant monopolistic corporation is portrayed as a dedicated exemplar of free enterprise. It is active, daring, efficient, progressive, ever alert to improve its product, reduce costs, expand output and reduce prices. It strives unceasingly for the attainment of national economic goals. It is socially responsible, dedicated to all good works, solicitous for the general welfare, deeply concerned to protect the interests of labor, consumers, investors, and the community, and stanchly committed to uphold democratic freedoms. It recognizes its very special obligation to defend the American way of life against those sinister forces, never precisely identified, which insidiously seek to undermine and destroy it.

C. Social dependency

Warming to their work, the "image makers" go beyond the mere assertion of mutuality of interest to suggest that modern society is dependent on big business for its economic welfare and security. It is big business that produces the goods, provides the jobs, makes the investments, conducts the research, defends the Nation against foreign enemies, sustains the public sector of the economy, and makes possible the American standard of living.

It follows, therefore, that society must not only recognize and accept big business as a beneficent institution, but, going farther, must accord it special treatment commensurate with its responsibilities and society's dependence on it. This means that society must create a "favorable climate," or a "favorable environment," within which big business can operate effectively to fulfill its self-declared mission. The price, in terms of protection, subsides, incentives and other special privileges, may seem high at first glance but really it is quite cheap when one considers all the benefits certain to accrue and the disasters which otherwise would impend.

D. Denigration of alternatives

Concentrated economic power does not brook rivals easily, nor is it tolerant toward alternative institutions which challenge its dominance. It would destroy them ruthlessly if it dared, but this is a delicate operation since these alternatives are protected by law and public favor. Hence, big business propaganda must dissemble its covert hostility by a subtle, indirect process of suggestion calculated to downgrade and discredit these alternatives.

Thus, we are told that big business is productive, technically competent, efficient, and dynamic, while small business, by contrast, is weak, technically backward, inefficient, wasteful, unstable, and static. Big business is competitive in a good, or constructive, sense, while small business is competitive in a bad, or destructive, sense. Cooperative enterprise is an alternative of dubious merit, having failed in many instances, being dangerously akin to socialism, and incompatible with the American tradition. Public enterprise, in all forms and at all levels, is quite unthinkable, being notoriously corrupt, wasteful, inefficient, and bureaucratic. Even worse, it is socialistic and a menace to freedom. With the alternatives thus foreclosed by their demonstrated inferiority, society has no rational choice except to recognize big business as the superior form of organization.

E. Rationalization of misbehavior

This self-glorification will lack credibility unless techniques can be devised to deny, conceal, explain, or justify the aggressive actions of monopolists. This may be a bit difficult if the offenders have pleaded guilty, or been convicted, or lodged in gaol as common criminals. The artistry of the propagandists, however, is equal to the challenge; they have devised a set of defensive tactics that might well arouse the envy of the Green Bay Packers.

The law, as everyone knows, is an ass, being obsolete, unrealistic, and so ambiguous that even the most conscientious citizen cannot possibly distinguish between legality and illegality. Conspiracy was not proven; the Court merely inferred it. Substantial lessening of competition was not proven; the Court arbitrarily applied the subjective per se doctrine. The alleged offense was the work of underlings, acting without the knowledge, and contrary to the express orders, of their superior officers. Prices and bids, it is true, were identical but any college sophomore recognizes this as evidence of active competition. There were, to be sure, certain selective price reductions but these reflected competition, not discrimination as alleged. Had the Court adopted a realistic definition of the market, instead of the theoretical construct propounded by Professor X, there would have been no case whatever for restraint of trade. The parties were merely following the standard policy of modern business, trying to stabilize the market and avoid disastrous, cutthroat competition—both laudable competitive goals and both consistent with the public interest.

Thus, whatever the offense, and regardless of the evidence, guilt is absolved and transformed into virtue by casuistry and upside-down semantics. The monopolist is portrayed as an eminent public benefactor, an ardent free enterpriser, who fell afoul of the law from an excess of competitive zeal. The real culprits, it appears, are the outmoded, unrealistic, ambiguous laws, the misguided courts, the politically inspired enforcement agencies, and the professors who perpetuate the conventional wisdom and folklore of the 18th century. Clearly the wrong party is in jail.

F. Privilege

Monopoly, being a creature of privilege, must, if it is to survive and aggrandize its power, retain all existing privileges and secure new ones if possible. This brings it into direct conflict with the democratic, egalitarian principle of "privilege for none, equality for all." It becomes necessary, therefore, to obscure and sublimate this conflict. This the propagandist accomplishes by a semantic trick. The word "privilege" is never used; instead, the special favors of government are termed stimuli, incentives, or compensation to promote some desirable public purpose which otherwise could not be achieved because of the extraordinary risks, costs, or difficulties involved.

This propaganda is a crude distortion of the theory that "the end justifies the means." It misrepresents the end as some public purpose, when in reality it is private privilege. By excluding alternatives it creates the impression that this is the only possible means by which the professed end can be attained. It conceals the fact that monopoly is antithetical to the end posited; that the monopolist will pocket the subsidy and sabotage the end. Notwithstanding these distortions, such propaganda in recent times has yielded a rich harvest of special privileges for big business.

G. National policy

Big business, however, must do more than merely defend, justify and promote monopoly by direct means; its ultimate power and survival demand that it extend its domination to the broader area of national politics. This compulsion leads to the attempted unification of economic and political power, which Marxist theorists regard as the final stage of monopoly capitalism It is dramatic evidence of the precarious status of big business in the modern world that it feels constrained to exert a controlling influence over: taxation, public spending, monetary policy, regulation of business, communications, labor and social legislation, natural resources development, scientific research and technology, international economic relations, foreign aid and military policy.

How does big business justify its intrusion into national politics and its large outlays for political activity and propaganda in connection therewith? How does it conceal its selfish interest in promoting favorable and defeating unfavorable legislation? In general, it relies on two techniques: identification of its self-interest with the public welfare, and appeal to "a devil theory." The first involves direct, positive affirmation of a mutuality of interest; the second involves creation of "a devil" from whose sinister designs only big business can save us.

The Nation, it is alleged, is beset by subversive forces and false ideologies which threaten to destroy democratic freedom and private capitalism, and to plunge the country into Socialist tyranny. The danger is very real because the agents of subversion, though few in number perhaps, are inordinately clever, articulate and persuasive, and their ideas have a fatally seductive appeal for the masses because of their humanitarian overtones. Big business, dedicated as it is to democracy, free competitive enterprise and public welfare, has a sacred mission to warn the people of this menace and to instruct them how best to combat it. By happy coincidence the most effective way to frustrate these insidious designs is to support national policies recommended by big business.

H. Cold war

The cold war is the greatest bonanza ever vouchsafed to the propagandists of big business. It provides a readymade foreign devil of monstrous capacity for evil; it insures, for his containment, a sustained flow of public funds equivalent to approximately 10 percent of the Nation's productivity; it creates a chronic emergency from which only big business can save us; it generates opportunities for profits, economic power and political domination beyond any limits heretofore conceivable; best of all from the propagandist's viewpoint, it provides a club of fear, intimidation and social ostracism with which to silence all criticism and dissent. An ideal situation exists for big business to seize power and assume responsibility for national defense and defense-related activities on its own terms.

This is exactly what it has done. The result is a big business-military-science-political combination which represents the greatest concentration of economic and political power ever witnessed in a supposedly free nation. The operation of this system is aptly described by Edgar Snow as "autoimperialism." Unlike old fashioned imperialism, which was outerdirected, this new style is innerdirected—that is, toward exploitation of the American people. Each year the Federal Government extracts from the people, by taxation and inflation, some $60 billion for defense and defense-related purposes; it then distributes these funds throughout the combination, a large proportion going to a small number of giant corporations on noncompetitive, negotiated procurement contracts. Thus, the purchasing power of the people is funneled by the Federal Government into the coffers of big business under the guise of protecting them from communism. A goodly portion of this money, whether channeled through big business or budgeted in the military departments, goes to support the vast propaganda apparatus, whose function it is to keep the game going by exacerbating the cold war.

V. IMPACT

Because we are dealing here with elusive and imponderable phenomena, such as attitudes and opinion, it is impossible to measure objectively and with precision the impact of this massive, long-sustained propaganda effort of big business. One can only deduce a generalized, tentative estimate of its effect by observing the course of public policy in the areas sought to be influenced. If public policy, in its entirety and overtime, has operated to favor the concentration of economic power, then one may reasonably conclude that this propaganda has made a significant, albeit incommensurable, contribution to the observed trend.

One may start from a solid base provided by big business itself. These masters of power, these men who live by and for power, certainly believe that propaganda is a necessary and indispensable tool for the concentration and maintenance of economic power. Otherwise, as rational beings, they would not devote such lavish outlays to it. Like true professionals they play the percentages, scattering their seeds of propaganda broadside in perfect confidence that some will fall on fertile ground and bear fruit. If they believe in the efficacy of their own handiwork, as they obviously do, they may safely be taken at their own valuation.

A solid basis also exists for appraising the effectiveness of the purely defensive propaganda of big business, which comprises a large part of the total. During the last quarter century, little headway has been made against concentrated economic power. While it is true that some local skirmishes have been won, some monopolistic aggressions checked, and some power grabs frustrated, these sporadic and episodic victories have been minor incidents of a prolonged rear guard action. The public interest has been continuously on the defensive; the main citadels of corporate power stand unbreached; there has been no significant antimonopoly legislation, no major shift in the tide of battle. Public opinion, during these years, has been indifferent, quiescent, and lethargic. Political leaders, sensing this mood and lacking strong public support, have hesitated to challenge corporate power or to act aggressively against it. On this record, the conclusion is unavoidable that the defensive propaganda of big business has been successful.

It is somewhat more difficult to appraise the effect of propaganda designed to further the aggrandizement of economic power—i.e., offensive propaganda. Here, the struggle for the minds of men hangs in the balance and final judgment must be deferred. It can be said, however, on the basis of experience to date, that this offensive propaganda has been successful on two fronts. First, it has yielded rich dividends in the form of special privileges, which have enhanced already concentrated power. Among these are tax reductions and tax loopholes, a great variety of subsidies and guarantees, grants of privilege in the public domain, giveaway of public property, patent rights on publicly financed research, protection and favors from regulatory commissions, preferential treatment in foreign aid and in international trade and investment, partnership arrangements, immunity from antitrust, and subsidized participation in new developments such as atomic energy and the communications satellite. This lavish use of special privilege as an instrument of public policy has ushered in what some critics label the "New Age of Mercantilism." These lush favors could scarcely have been extorted from a reluctant and cautious government without massive propaganda and intense political activity. The fact that no substantial public opposition arose to challenge these grants of privilege indicates that the propagandists had done their work well at the grassroots level. The people did not rise against the aggressor bent on despoiling them.

Second, it has been a decisive factor in the organization of the big business—military—science—political combination, which now dominates national defense policy, and through that controls indirectly our domestic and international economic policies. It is inconceivable that this greatest, most artificial and most dangerous concentration of power in our history could have emerged, and maintained itself for over 15 years, had not public opinion been reduced to a state of abject, fear-ridden submission by a massive propaganda effort. Big business alone, and relying solely on its own resources, could never have achieved such general acquiescence; it was the combination of corporate economic power with governmental political power that made it possible. Even today, when the essential facts are widely known and criticism is quite general, the combination remains invulnerable to attack. This leads some critics, such as C. Wright Mills and Fred J. Cook, to the pessimistic conclusion that we have attained a permanent corporative, Fascist state in which private and public power will remain unified indefinitely. They assume that public opinion is so debased and confused by the arts of propaganda that it neither can or will act to effect a separation of economic from political power.

VI. REMEDIES

Although public relations activity has been a large-scale going concern for some 40 years, and has become one of the main supports of corporate collectivism, little attention has been given to the problem of how to deal with it. It is an ironic commentary on our lack of realism that in the extensive literature of antimonopoly policy few have thought it necessary to concern themselves with this important institutional foundation of monopoly power. I shall conclude with a few observations on possible remedies.

It would seem that, as a very minimum, Government might appropriately intervene, in those areas where it has original jurisdiction, to protect the people, as consumers and taxpayers, from being compelled to pay for the brainwashing to which they are now subjected. Three areas of original jurisdiction invite such remedial action: income taxation, the regulated industries, and procurement. In the first—income taxation—all outlays by big business for public relations should be disallowed as costs of doing business on the ground that they are not legitimate costs and have no necessary, functional relation to production. In the second—the regulated industries—all outlays for public relations should be excluded from the cost basis on which rates are computed. In the third—procurement—no compensation should be paid, whether on competitive, negotiated or cost-plus contracts, for any public relations expenditures by suppliers.

Obviously, these minimal measures would not prohibit public relations expenditures, but they would get them off the backs of consumers and taxpayers, and shift them to corporate equity holders, where they properly belong. The withdrawal of the present subsidization, which gives propaganda a free ride at the expense of its victims, would almost certainly reduce total outlays for this purpose. Furthermore, it would get the Federal Government out of its present untenable position of perverting its sovereign powers to the promotion of monopoly and to the exploitation of the people.

If we expect to solve the problem, however, we shall need to go beyond these limited remedial measures and challenge the basic right of corporations to engage in propaganda activities. Whence comes this so-called right? Historically, it derives, I suggest, from an error of constitutional interpretation—the extension to corporations of those inalienable rights guaranteed to natural persons by the Bill of Rights, specifically the rights of free speech and petition. The ancient law recognized no such rights; corporations were unnatural, artificial institutions created by privilege; their rights, powers, and freedoms were limited strictly to their functional economic necessities; actions that transcended these bounds were ultra vires. In the United States, however, we disregarded this traditional wisdom and allowed our charter-mongering States, operating under the 10th amendment, to spawn corporations under charters little better than letters of marque entitling them to prey on interstate commerce. Under these lax charters, and equally lax judicial sanctions, corporations have arrogated natural, or political, rights; they now claim the right to emit propaganda, to lobby, and to engage in political activity as an exercise of those inalienable rights guaranteed to natural persons by the Constitution. If we acquiesce in this pretension we shall never be able to control corporate power, because our concession provides it with the means to subvert the democratic process by which we hope to control it.

Notwithstanding current usage and traditional opposition to any limitation on free speech, even where it is abused, the suggestion that Government curb the propaganda activities of giant corporations is not as radical as may appear at first sight. The case for doing so is strong. This freedom is an instrument of monopoly power, not of economic production; outlays for propaganda contribute nothing to production and from the social point of view are a pure waste. It is an illegitimate freedom of recent vintage based upon a distorted interpretation of the Constitution; it is corruptive of the democratic process, a menace to free competition and other free institutions, and socially disastrous in its ultimate consequences. Government, recognizing these potential evils, already interferes with corporate freedom of speech, albeit halfheartedly and ineffectively, in a variety of ways: Lobbying, political contributions, labor organization, and collective bargaining, security flotations, trade practices and advertising. Since the principle of restricting corporate freedom of speech is already well established we should extend it to other areas where the public interest is adversely affected. The Federal Government has ample powers to do so through its control over interstate commerce, the regulated industries, communications, the postal service, international relations, federally financed research, and antitrust policy.

A simpler and more expeditious procedure, however, would be to require a national charter for all corporations engaged in interstate commerce, and in these charters to prohibit, under severe sanctions, all outlays for propaganda and political activity. This action would restore the modern corporation to its original status as a strictly economic institution, endowed with sufficient power and freedom of action to perform the economic function for which it is chartered, but prohibited from engaging in any activity designed to influence public opinion or shape public policy. It would put a stop to the dangerous trend toward the unification of economic and political power under the aegis of corporate collectivism. It would restore democracy to its proper status as master in its own house. Since power over public opinion is the ultimate institutional foundation of modern monopoly, a surgical operation to excise the source of this power is required to correct the situation. This is a radical solution in the strict sense of the word—it gets at the root of the evil.

Laws for Lawbreakers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., has recently printed an excellent editorial entitled "Laws for Lawbreakers." This editorial is concerned with the unlawful and disorderly Negro demonstrations which have been taking place in various parts of the country. Mr President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial as printed in the News and Courier, of Charleston, S.C., on July 6, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAWS FOR LAWBREAKERS

President Kennedy, in presenting his new civil rights legislative package to Congress on June 19, made it clear that he was doing so under coercion and fear of mass lawbreaking.

"The result of continued Federal legislative inaction will be continued, if not increased, racial strife—causing the leadership on both sides to pass from the hands of reasonable and responsible men to the purveyors of hate and violence, endangering the domestic tranquility, retarding our Nation's economic and social progress and weakening the respect with which the rest of the world regards us," the President said.

If Congress fails to act positively on his legislation, the President added, Negroes "can be expected to continue increasingly to seek the vindication of these rights through organized direct action, with all its potentially explosive consequences."

Negro leaders have been delighted to verify the President's fears. Mass demonstrations have continued. A late summer march on Washington is threatened by Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference and James Farmer's Congress of Racial Equality (CORE). Ultimatums have been issued to business chains demanding desegregation of lunch counters and employment by July 4 on threat of sit-ins, picketing, boycott and street demonstrations.

The goal of these and other direct-action Negro leaders is simple: Full integration—now. Whitney Young, head of the Urban League, has said: "We must now discriminate in favor of Negroes."

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, (Democrat, of New York), who claims to have had a big hand in shaping the President's civil rights message, has boasted: "The white man is afraid * * * so now is the time to keep him on the run."

This, then, is the environment surrounding congressional consideration of a hastily designed legislative bundle with which the

Kennedy administration hopes to pacify militant Negroes.

The three main objectives are: (1) Desegregation of public accommodations, (2) power for the attorney general to initiate school desegregation suits, and (3) standardization of voter registration tests and establishment of sixth-grade education as proof of literacy.

The last two sections were requested by the President in February, but without great enthusiasm. Now he says they are imperative, with the addition of the public accommodations provision.

To obtain any or all of the recommended laws—which amount to virtual dictatorship—the President's civil rights package must be subjected to congressional hearings. Senator **James Eastand**, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, is not expected to let such a bill reach the floor through his hands. So a different route is being followed. Hearings are underway in the House Judiciary Committee, headed by **Emanuel Celler**, Democrat, of New York. If the bill can be brought to the House floor, approval is anticipated, which will send it to the Senate without passage through Senator **Eastland's** committee. The next move will be a filibuster, mounted by Southern Democrats. Only if more than 20 Republican Senators join liberal Democrats can a two-thirds majority be mustered for a cloture vote to halt the filibuster.

No one knows exactly what will happen in Congress during the long, hot wearisome summer. But there are probabilities.

First, the House bill will be a watered-down version of the Kennedy proposal. Attorney General Robert Kennedy, in testifying on the measure, already has conceded the administration will accept a compromise. He also has been forced to admit that the desegregation of public accommodations—hotels, motels, restaurants, and the like—should not affect smaller businesses, particularly such places as boarding houses. He still faces the pertinent issue of private property rights in all business establishments, whatever their size. **Adam Powell** also has confessed that the Negroes won't get all they're hoping for.

If a House bill is approved and sent to the Senate, the filibuster is inevitable. The administration even now is saying that Republicans will be to blame for the predictable failure to vote cloture, but the fact remains that southern Democrats will be splitting their party in overt opposition against their own administrative leader. Whether a filibuster will prevent eventual passage of some small portion of the civil rights bill is now uncertain. But there's a fair chance it will.

Should the Negroes and their leaders then carry out their threats, both State and Federal Governments may be faced by actual insurrection.

Negro organizations have warned that if they don't get the laws they want, they'll break existing laws.

This is the paradox. Congress is being blackmailed by threat of violence and mass revolt. The foundations of constitutional government are being shaken. The rights of private property owners are being put in jeopardy by an administration which is concerned principally with placating Negroes and keeping a sizable vote bloc on its side. The danger is that the continued and reasonable progress being made in raising Negroes to full equality, under the law, will be halted abruptly by widespread racial tension or outright violence.

This is not a nation given to writing laws to conform with lawlessness, but because there is fear—as **Adam Powell** and President Kennedy have said in different phrases—that is what the militant group of Negroes is now demanding.

Washington Post Joins Chorus of Protest to Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying indeed that the Washington Post, one of our country's great newspapers, has added its editorial voice to the chorus of protest against the so-called quality stabilization legislation. The Post's cogent editorial of July 8, 1963, forcefully sets forth its dangers.

The editorial follows:

Quality Stabilization

One must marvel at the energy and ingenuity of those who are determined to eliminate competition in retail distribution and saddle consumers with price increases that could cost them more than $1 billion annually. First they persuaded many States to enact fair trade or resale-price maintenance legislation. But 27 States and the District of Columbia have either invalidated or refused to enact such legislation, and now a well-heeled lobby, spearheaded by retail druggists, is attempting to accomplish that end through Federal legislation. Since the term "fair trade" has been thoroughly discredited, they are now backing a quality stabilization bill (H.R. 3669) in an effort to gull the public with a euphemism that is as transparent as a picture window.

H.R. 3669, which has just been pushed through the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by Chairman **Oren Harris**, would grant manufacturers absolute power to fix the prices on branded or trademarked articles at every stage of the distribution process without fear of Government intervention. Why this legislation should be supported by small businessmen, who would be bereft of any vestige of bargaining power, is something of a mystery. But there is nothing mysterious about other aspects of this bill which is opposed by virtually every agency of the Federal Government—the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Justice and the Federal Trade Commission—and by interests so divergent as those represented by the AFL–CIO, the American Bar Association and the Wall Street Journal.

Alfred R. Oxenfeldt, a professor of marketing at Columbia University, succinctly summarized the objections to the so-called Quality Stabilization Act when he testified that "the bill's ultimate effect would be to require highly efficient distributors to charge substantially more than their costs would require. Consequently, it would weaken, and possibly eliminate, the chief attraction that new types of retailers have offered throughout American history to win a place for themselves in the market place. In short, the Quality Stabilization Act would help us to transform U.S. retailing into the unprogressive type that prevails in much of Europe."

A Senate version of this act is embodied in a resolution (S. 774) sponsored by Senator **Hubert H. Humphrey**. The Senator was once a druggist, and it is perhaps significant that his version of the bill makes no provision for exempting prescription drugs.

Seasoned observers believe that this thoroughly reprehensible piece of legislation, the essence of which has already been rejected in 27 States, stands a good chance of passing the Congress. In that event we would urge President Kennedy to respond with a stinging veto.

Young GOP Convention Shocked Ex-Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an interesting interview was published in the Minneapolis Tribune of July 7. Leonard Nadasdy, former national chairman of the Young Republican Federation, reported on the recent Young Republican Convention in San Francisco.

The tactics of those identified by Mr. Nadasdy as "members of the John Birch Society and the radical right" have no place in a responsible political party, either in the junior or senior division. According to the article, these members showed intolerance for the views of others and contempt for the democratic procedures essential to a responsible political organization.

Mr. Nadasdy's comparison of these tactics with those pursued by the Communists is valid. In Minnesota many years ago we experienced these same tactics from a group in our own political party, that time from the left, and successfully defeated them.

It is unfortunate that Senator **Goldwater** should apear to be the beneficiary of the activity of these extremists. They offer nothing constructive on the American scene, and are evidently embracing the tactics of those whom they profess to oppose.

Complacency will not suffice to meet the threat posed by these extremists. I wish to commend Mr. Nadasdy for his expressed determination to alert the people to the dangers of the Birch Society and the radical right.

The interview follows:

Mob Rule Tactics Cited—Young GOP Convention Shocked Ex-Leader

(By Mercer Cross)

Leonard Nadasdy said Saturday he is "still in a state of shock" because of the Young Republican National Federation convention in San Francisco, Calif.

"The whole thing has been very disillusioning for me," said the immediate past president of the 500,000-member federation.

Narrowly elected to succeed Nadasdy for the next 2 years was Donald Lukens, 32, Washington, D.C., who campaigned as a supporter of Senator **Barry Goldwater**, Republican, of Arizona, for President.

Defeated was Charles McDevitt, 30, Boise, Idaho, who took no stand on a GOP presidential candidate. McDevitt had the unanimous support of the 15-member Minnesota delegation.

McDevitt had the edge going into the Young GOP convention, said Nadasdy, 32, a General Mills public relations man who lives in Plymouth.

But, he said, Lukens' supporters "used the old Communist technique of causing a lot of dissension and a lot of furor, at which they were eminently successful."

Their purpose, said Nadasdy, "was to completely ensnarl the convention and confuse everyone. All this was accomplished by screaming and hollering."

At the center of the confusion were members of the John Birch Society and the radical right, Nadasdy said.

Two years ago the Minnesotan was elected chairman as a member of the Young Republicans' moderate faction. As convention chairman this year, he said:

Rightwing delegates shouted at him to "go back to Russia."

"They made a couple of rushes at the podium to take the gavel away from me.

"There were fistfights on the floor."

At one point the national anthem had to be played to make the delegates sit down, and police were summoned to keep order.

Radicals distributed scurrilous printed matter attacking Nadasdy.

McDevitt's hotel room was broken into and campaign literature, two typewriters, and some briefcases were stolen.

"I've never seen such violence at a Young Republican affair," said Nadasdy. "It was like a nightmare to be there."

Goldwater appeared at a rally the first night of the convention.

Nadasdy said he appealed to the Senator to help restore order. Goldwater said he would try to calm down the delegates and would say he supported no candidate for Young GOP chairman, Nadasdy reported.

"He apparently forget what he said to me," said Nadasdy. "All this did was to pour gasoline on the flames."

The Minnesotan made this prediction concerning Goldwater:

"Unless the Senator starts getting some sane, conservative people around him, he's going to have a very difficult time getting the nomination and being elected."

Nadasdy said he has set out on this personal mission:

"During the coming year I want to try to alert the people, and especially the Republicans, as to the real objective of the John Birch Society and the radical right, which is to subvert the Republican Party and to seize control, rather than just nominate a presidential candidate."

Particularly in Minnesota, where Birchers are scarce, said Nadasdy, "It really worries me. I'm just afraid people aren't going to see the danger. I think we're complacent."

The radicals are "not reasonable," he said. "They know what they're doing. They know where they're going. They're extremely dangerous. They're after power for power's sake."

And the significance to the senior party?

"The significance," said Nadasdy, "is a word of warning that the national convention in San Francisco next year is going to be one of the toughest ones the party's ever had."

Far-righters spent much time and money to elect their man to lead the Young Republicans, said Nadasdy, and they'll spend 10 times as much to take over the senior party.

"It's a question whether the party's going to allow mob rule or whether they're going to see an orderly conducted convention."

As for Lukens, the new Young Republican chairman, "He is not a Bircher, but he certainly began to say everything they wanted him to say," said Nadasdy.

Lukens campaigned for abolition of the Federal income tax, U.S. withdrawal from the United Nations and a "court of the union" higher than the U.S. Supreme Court.

"I'm very concerned about what's going to happen to the organization," said Nadasdy. "Only time will tell. I just want to see if Lukens can stand up to the people who elected him."

John Birchers at the Young Republican convention were mostly from California, Illinois, and Iowa, with a scattering from other States, Nadasdy said.

"These people are a minority. They don't even represent one-fourth of the people in our party," he added.

"This radical element are just like the Communists. They drive the good people away."

The Late Judge John H. Morris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, when any of us loses an old friend, we naturally like to use the most superlative words we can think of to describe that friend. Last week I lost a friend in the unexpected passing of Judge John H. Morris, of New Castle, Ind. Because the editorial from the New Castle, Ind., Courier-Times best describes some of Judge Morris' wonderful qualities, under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the Record:

JUDGE MORRIS SET EXAMPLE OF DUTY FOR GOOD CITIZEN—HIS PASSING REMINDS US OF OBLIGATION WE OWE TO OTHERS

The death of Judge John H. Morris reminds us of the obligation which all of us have to the many people who have built our community, and particularly to certain people whose contribution is outstanding. What these people do is important, but in the building of a good community nothing is more important than character. Judge Morris' service on the bench, long and distinguished though it was, was not greater than the example he set as a good citizen.

Law and order are the first rule of civilization, and the competence which Judge Morris brought to the bench was extraordinary. It has been said that he was qualified by temperament, education, and experience. That his father had been judge of the court before him was both a part of his experience and perhaps an influence upon his temperament—at least in his regard for the role of the jurist in our society. In 26 years a judge hears a lot of testimony, and knows a lot of things about people and the law that most of us do not know. Judge Morris once commented to us that when witnesses were asked about how many drinks they had had, they almost invariably said, "just a couple." None seem ever to have had one, or three, or four.

How well he served is common knowledge in the many cases that were venued to the court here. In his first 19 years as judge, only two of his decisions were reversed, and while we do not have the record for his latter years on the bench it is reasonable to presume that reversals were—if possible—even fewer.

Nobody gives such service to his community and his country without a profound sense of duty, and his own sense of duty is probably best reflected in a word of appreciation spoken by him to the jurors who served the last day he presided as judge:

"I want to use you as representatives of the hundreds of jurors who have appeared in this court during my term of office. Jurors play an important part in our system of law, and are not given the recognition they deserve. Each one serves at inconvenience to himself, lays aside his personal affairs for the time served, and suffers financial loss. While in the case you have just decided a man's liberty was involved—the most serious case in which you may render a decision—in every case you disappoint someone at least. You perform such service wholly as a duty."

Surveillance of Communications Satellite Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on a recent visit to Minnesota my attention was called to an excellent article in the Minneapolis Star regarding the Communications Satellite Act and the American image. The story was taken from remarks by a University of Minnesota journalism instructor, Mr. Robert Lindsay, made before the American Council for Better Broadcasts. I think that Mr. Lindsay spoke for many of us in expressing his concern over the Communications Satellite Act and his hope that the Federal Communications Commission will accept fully and energetically its heavy responsibilities under the act. I, too, am convinced that the American people are still very much concerned with our uniquely mixed public-private effort in space communications and will demand that the public interest be paramount in all operations conducted under the act. I ask that the article by Mr. Lindsay carried in the Minneapolis Star of June 18 be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

We say of the communication satellites that, used wisely, they should prove of great value in achieving world understanding. I am not entirely certain what is meant by "world understanding." I suspect it means something different to each of us.

I do know that for several decades there have existed channels of communication which, if they but carried the appropriate messages, could have achieved this desirable, if loosely construed, state. The problem seems to be that we have yet to determine what communication, what messages, should go into the channels.

Obviously, I believe that the Communications Satellite Act should be subjected to thorough examination and discussion. I submit that, as a legislative solution to a new and uncharted dimension of the space age, it is of highly questionable validity.

In signing the act on that fateful day in 1962, President Kennedy declared, "In this way, the vigor of our competitive free enterprise system will be effectively used in a challenging new activity on the frontier of space."

I wish I were not so uneasy on hearing what seems to be a faithful echo of the President's words in this passage from a public relations blurb of the Bell System:

"Above all else, Project Telstar is a tribute to the American free enterprise system. Through its own initiative, spending millions of dollars of its own money, the Bell System is exploring new voiceways in space to help bring better communications to the Nation and the world."

The question must be asked: "Whose new voiceways are being explored? And is the better communications for the common carriers benefited by the corporation necessarily what is best for the national interest?"

It has long been my understanding that articulation, if not implementation, of foreign policy is a responsibility of the President of the United States, not of a broadcasting network (which isn't so much as licensed to operate by the Government). I simply do not comprehend why the Government should hand over to profitseeking program producers the job of influencing minds and, to use that unfortunate expression, "projecting the American image."

If it must be, then let "The Beverly Hillbillies" ride around the world on microwaves awash with detergent commercials. But let us, also, have the best of our educational programing, and the best of our USIA programing, bouncing up to the satellites and into the villages and cities of all countries.

It is to be hoped that the Federal Communications Commission, in particular, will address itself to the responsibilities stipulated for it, although in broad terms, in the Communications Satellite Act. Nondiscriminatory use of and access to the system, effective competition, ratemaking appropriate to the services—these are among satellite communications responsibilities of the FCC.

It will be interesting to observe how assiduously the FCC concerns itself with them. Let us hope that this policy will be guided by men of wisdom and vision.

Those Who Think Differently

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a copy of the commencement address presented June 13, 1963, to the South Pasadena, Calif., High School by Andrew J. Van Horn.

Mr. Van Horn, who resides in the congressional district it is my privilege to represent, was the valedictorian of South Pasadena High School this year. An excellent student, he has received a scholarship to the Harvey Mudd Institute of the Claremont Colleges in California. His commencement address contains a message on the importance of individuality which I believe will be of interest to Members of Congress.

The address follows:

THOSE WHO THINK DIFFERENTLY

(Commencement address, by Andrew Van Horn, South Pasadena High School, June 13, 1963)

Dr. Thompson, fellow classmates, and friends, when we survey our lives and endeavors, we soon observe that our thoughts, actions, and material possessions are affected by others. In order to retain his individuality the man of today must seek a new balance between the one and the many.

In recent years the rugged individualism which has characterized our society in the past seems to have been replaced by a passion for security and anonymity. This silent surrender to economic security has been followed by the suppression of personal self-expression and the development of mass culture. Security seems to have become the opium of the people.

It is true that the individual today is faced with many forces of conformity. He is faced with mass democracy and a drift toward collectivism brought on by the ever-increasing encroachments of big Government, big business, and big labor. Education, although certainly not in South Pasadena, has likewise followed the trend by attempting to create the well-adjusted person. The philosopher Nietzshche was referring to this type of education when he said: "The surest way to corrupt a youth is to instruct him to hold in higher esteem those who think alike than those who think differently."

The rolls of the welfare boards and the unemployment bureau are filled with the names of citizens who are irresponsible and dependent upon others. In those who choose as much idleness as possible as a way of life this pursuit of security and mass culture has not brought about boldness or dedication or even responsible citizenship. Rather it has resulted in what sociologists commonly term as lost leadership, wasted lives, and moral decay. Further, this analysis leads me to the conclusion that when any citizen accepts Government paternalism, democracy itself inevitably decays.

Ultimately, however, what can affect the individual most deeply is not the physical organization of his life, but the spiritual view he has of himself. The forces which supposedly rule man's fate—history and science—look to a third force—the deity. The very Judeo-Christian tradition of Western man asserts the worth of the individual, and God and the individual are at the core of our American philosophy. For example, we recognize that only to the individual is a soul given, and undeniably, birth and death are experienced only by individuals. I consider Christ Himself as a true individualist.

In today's world the safeguard against oppression is not faceless conformity but the presence of many individuals who refuse to either serve or submit. There are in all societies three groups: the individuals, the conformists, and those who could become either. The relative numbers of each group determine the type of society—from the individualist to the totalitarian, and the great civilizations have been the former.

There is, however, a distinction between mere nonconformity and individuality. Since all individuals have a duty to society, they must recognize the value of laws and moral codes, but individual dignity is not lost by choosing to follow the ethics of society. It is lost when we fail to choose and conform blindly. Difference for the sake of difference does not make individuality, but difference is one integral facet of individuality.

The French say, "Vive la difference," although in a different sense, and it is difference which has distinguished America. The highest aspirations of the American people are served by those who are different, not by those who conform without thinking. Albert Einstein said, "Only the individual can think, and thereby create new values for society." Although not everyone is capable of being an Abraham Lincoln or a Theodore Roosevelt or an Albert Einstein, every person is capable of thinking for himself and seeking his own relationship between the one and the many.

I believe that as individuals we can restore to our culture the ideals we seem to be losing by starting with the present reality of the organization world and making it and ourselves free—through integrity, imagination, and intelligence. We must realize that progress, even in group operations, results in direct proportion to the intellectual freedom of action given to the men on the team. We must also realize that the true individual never ceases his education, because he knows that even though his formal education may be over, individual fulfillment requires growth and learning at every age. Finally, if the American concept of democracy in action is analogous to a team made up of free-thinking individuals, then in order for democracy in the United States to maintain its present worth, we must act to return to the precepts of God and the individual as the centers of today's society.

Albert Schweitzer said, "We need a society, a faith, and a church that respect the individual and call to life all the ethical thinking and reverence that dwells in him." He also said of the way to make life meaningful, "There is no other way to that, than that each one individually settles accounts with himself and that we all * * * ponder how our will to act and will to progress can be evolved from the meaning that we give to our own lives and life around us." In these lines Dr. Schweitzer was referring to the balance which each of us must seek between thoughtless conformity and complete individuality.

The cultivation of individuality and integrity is a goal within the reach of everyone, and in our society we now have a choice as to how far we should conform and to what causes we shall give ourselves. I believe that each of us as individuals must use this choice, or one day we shall awaken to find that it is gone.

Seat Belt Standards Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, last weekend over 530 lives were lost on the highways of the United States. Year after year, we have watched the carnage grow and yet only recently have we begun to make serious efforts to prevent some of that loss of life.

One tested and proved method of saving lives is the addition of seat belts to automobiles. We know that "the wearing of seat belts materially reduces the number of serious and fatal automobile injuries."

In recent years, therefore, many people and organizations, like the Greater Minneapolis Safety Council, concerned with automotive safety have encouraged greater use of seat belts and the American public has increasingly accepted the wisdom and safety of using the belts.

Unfortunately, seat belts of substandard quality have found their way on to the market. Today, by voting for H.R. 134, we have the opportunity of assuring every person who buys a belt, sold or shipped in interstate commerce, that the belts are at least up to minimum standards which do, in fact, protect their lives.

It is, as the President and the committee report say, "the right of consumers to be protected against the marketing of goods which are hazardous to health and life."

It is simply too late to explain to the accident victim of an inadequate seat belt that he should have bought a better belt. Let us take the sensible way, as we have done in other hazardous areas, and permit the minimum standards of safety for seat belts to be promulgated by the proper agency of Government.

Then those who heed the call of good sense and safety, those who purchase seat belts, will not be given false security in place of real hope in case of accident. Let us vote "yes" to save lives.

Spearhead Technology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I submit herewith an editorial from the June 10, 1963, issue of Aviation Week and Space Technology.

This editorial points up the rapid strides the French are making in aviation and I believe it will be of interest to all my colleagues.

Spearhead Technology

(By Robert Kotz)

The 25th international airshow, which will soar to its climax at Le Bourget this week, provides a major opportunity to sense just how the major nations are faring in the spearhead technologies that constitute the aerospace industry. Of all the nations that are seriously working in the aerospace field, only the Soviet Union, with its introverted, molelike attitude, will not be represented by products truly indicative of its current state-of-the-art developments. For the many thousands of Frenchmen who will jam Le Bourget on the flying weekends, the Paris airshow is an exhilarating exhibition of flying, from the solo performances of the aerobatic aces to the precision formation maneuvers of the various national military teams. But for the thousands of aerospace technicians from all over the world, who thread their way slowly through the static technical exhibits and talk business in the company chalets, it is a rare opportunity to determine which way the technical winds are blowing and how the fortunes of individual companies and nations are changing as a result.

In the 20th century, the aerospace industry has not only been a major measure of national military power, but has also served as a significant gage of national positions in the highly competitive technologies that pace modern industrial development across the entire spectrum of the economy. In the postwar era, the development of national aerospace power, with supersonic aircraft and intercontinental ballistic missiles, has largely overshadowed the economic importance of a vigorous, technically alert aerospace industry to each national economy involved. In the modern world the fortunes of a nation's economy inexorably depend on the progress of its technology. The aerospace industry has made a habit of pushing hardest on most of the new technologies that are the true measure of technical progress, such as electronics, nucleonics, advanced metallurgy and materials development and the ever-expanding speed range of aerodynamics into the hypervelocities of missiles and reentry from outer space.

EARLY BRITISH LEAD

It is the nations that make the basic investment to push their national representatives hardest in these spearhead technologies that are bound to play the major roles in international affairs, as they are the keys to modern power as well as a significant economic force. The British got off to a strong start in this postwar competition, largely as a result of their wartime work on the gas turbine engine. The technological foundations they laid during the first postwar decade reached a period of maximum return in the late 1950's when British aeronautical exports ran at a level of over $400 million annually for 4 years from 1958 to 1961, before beginning a decline in 1962 that is expected to continue for the foreseeable future. Over half of the British 10-year export total of $3.3 billion in the 1952-62 decade resulted from their initial dominance of the gas turbine engine technology. During this period British aviation exports passed up such traditional leaders as scotch whisky, automobiles and textiles as the prime source of foreign exchange. The current decline is the direct result of a period of false economy, brought about by government leaders who refused to make the investments in research and development required to keep up the hot pace of the supersonic and space era. Ironically, the significance of these crippling economies were lost on the treasury types who inflicted them, because they failed to understand that the peak levels of exports that then prevailed could be supported for the future only through adequate investment in research and development.

In contrast, the French aviation industry rose like a phoenix from its wartime ashes to a point where at the 1957 Paris air show we were able to write, "there is little doubt that the French are becoming the dominant force in European aviation" (June 10, 1957, p. 21). In the last 4 years the French economy has reaped a good harvest—almost a billion dollars in export business—from those technical developments that were just sprouting in 1957. French aviation exports have grown to the point where they are now just a shade behind the British total, have taken several of the key British markets away and will challenge the British severely for European leadership in the future.

FRENCH DRIVE CONTINUES

The French are still pursuing these spearhead technologies wherever they lead, regardless of how high the initial cost must appear at times. They are continuing their own development of nuclear weapons and their supersonic delivery systems, they are pushing technically sophisticated electronics and propulsion developments and they are determined to develop their own space technology. The current French Government is sufficiently realistic to recognize that whether the weapons these technologies develop are ever used or not, the industrial techniques that fall out into the general economy from this weapons research and development are absolutely essential to the maintenance of a first-class modern nation.

It is interesting to note that the United States has exported $10.6 billion in aeronautical products during the last decade with the largest annual volumes—averaging about $1.3 billion annually—during the 1960–62 period when U.S.-manufactured jet transports were swelling the international airline fleets of the world.

The Anglo-French Concorde supersonic transport project has the capability of challenging the U.S. lead in the lucrative jet transport market of the future, although this race is far from run. But the figures cited above are a reminder to shortsighted politicians that the real question in maintaining a superior aerospace industry is not whether a nation can afford it but whether a nation can truly afford not to have it.

"But if Ye Turn Away"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Dr. R. Archie Ellis, one of the most able, articulate, and respected ministers in the Southern Baptist Convention, presented to the membership of the First Baptist Church of Columbia, S.C., on June 23, 1963, one of the best sermons I have ever read on the importance of keeping our Nation close to God. This sermon is particularly concerned with the recent Supreme Court decisions against prayers in schools and also against a State requiring its public officeholders to express a belief in God.

I commend this eloquent sermon to my colleagues and, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the sermon was orderd to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"But if Ye Turn Away"

The one prayer that should characterize the devotional life of every Christian in this time of crisis should be: "Lord, teach me to pray and teach me to pray aright."

One of the most dramatic Bible stories tells how Jerusalem, the city of God, was beseiged by an Assyrian host. Already the armies of Sennacherib had swept over the villages of Judah. The forces of evil seemed invincible. It seemed only a matter of time before the holy citys' walls would be breached and the enemy would pour through like a flood.

Then the enemy overreached himself. One of Sennacherib's generals taunted the Israelites on the wall, shouting that their God was too weak to protect them. The word came to King Hezekiah. He did the only thing he could do—with hope. Rending his clothes and putting on the sackcloth of repentance, he went into the house of God and laid the matter out before the Lord.

You know what happened. Lord Byron captured the spirit of it in his familiar poem which starts:

"The Assyrian came down like a wolf on the fold,
And his cohorts were gleaming in purple and gold."[1]

Then he tells how the Angel of Death spread his wings on the blast, smote the might of the Gentile and melted his host like the snow. The Bible record says 185,000 Assyrians died that night. The King James Version sums it up quaintly by saying, "And when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses."[2] And the remnant of the foe slunk away home to Assyria. Israel had been saved by the direct intervention of God.

Now what I am going to say this morning could be summed up in a four-word prayer: "Lord, do it again."

Of course we have an external foe from whose threats we need deliverance. But much more important is our need to be saved from ourselves.

Two years ago this month the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that it is unconstitutional to require public officeholders to believe in God.

Last June the same high Court banned a simple public school prayer which had been composed by the New York State Board of Education (or regents) in an effort to have a daily devotional exercise acceptable to all.

Now comes a third decision. Last week all but one of the Justices ruled that the States no longer can require Bible reading and use of the Lord's Prayer in public school classrooms.

This is the third in a series of annual sermons, each of them growing out of a feeling of tremendous concern over one or more of these court cases.

Taken singly, by themselves, these rulings may not seem too alarming. Few atheists

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

run for office—now. I for one hold no special brief for the regents' prayer. Nor am I greatly concerned about the question whether States have the authority to order school devotional periods, because I am informed that South Carolina has no such laws; therefore, the Supreme Court rulings do not strike down any of our State laws.

But when the three rulings are viewed together, as a cumulative series, and when that series is projected to its logical conclusion, then the outlook is terrifying. When this trend is placed alongside other trends in American life, the situation adds up to a clear and present danger to the life of the Republic.

America is in grave danger of being secularized to such an extent that God will have to judge us to be true to Himself.

The frightening thing about these decisions of the Court is not so much their substance. It is rather the precedents that are being set. If the Court can do these things for the reasons stated, then it can do a lot of other things.

In the course of doing these other things, the Court may sweep away the last trace of public acknowledgement of God as the author of our liberties and the source of our moral principles.

The point in that these rulings were based primarily on the first amendment to our national Constitution, which says simply that the Congress shall not make any laws respecting the establishment of religion nor prohibiting the free exercise thereof. Then this general principle was applied to the States by virtue of the 14th amendment's directive that the States cannot abridge the rights of citizens.

Now I think all Baptists agree with the general principle of the separation of church and state, as guaranteed by the first amendment. But the amendment is meant simply to forbid the growth of a state-supported church. It has nothing to do with a religious people's right to acknowledge God in their public life and to install nonsectarian religious exercises in their public schools.

In the Columbia Record of June 19, this point is well stated in a quotation from Joseph Story, a noted legal commentator. Story said, and I quote:

"Probably at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and of the amendment to it now under consideration, the general if not the universal sentiment in America was, that christianity ought to receive encouragement from the state so far as was not incompatible with the private rights of conscience and the freedom of religious worship. An attempt to level all religions, and to make it a matter of state policy to hold all in utter indifference, would have created universal disapprobation, if not universal indignation." The State newspaper this week asked significantly what the ban against Bible reading and prayer does to that other part of the first amendment which forbids Congress from prohibting the free exercise of religion.

Leaving aside the question of a State's right to require Bible reading and prayer, the thing that concerns me is this: Do the people of this country have the right, in the free exercise of religion, to have Bible reading and prayer in their schools? Should not schools be so operated that an atmosphere of prayer will be expected—a few atheists to the contrary notwithstanding.

There is no doubt but that this most recent decision will greatly discourage Bible reading and prayer in the classrooms, whether or not it is lawful for such practices to take place voluntarily and spontaneously at the local level. Indeed, the Court's ruling will make school officials and teachers hesitant to sponsor any sort of religious exercises. This will lead inevitably to more widespread secularization of our whole society.

A question needs to be raised in another direction. If the courts can forbid this sort of religious exercises, what about the public school people who are teaching things that tend to wipe out religious faith? How about the rights of those who don't want that sort of indoctrination? Is materialism or atheism or naturalistic evolution to have rights that are denied to historic Christianity?

Now, if you feel that I am trying to overdraw the picture let me give you excerpts from the letter written by a college freshman in one of our universities in answer to her father's plea that she remain true to Christ and His church. This young lady was reared in a Christian home and in a spiritual atmosphere and she writes as follows:

"As for church, I have no use for it. I cannot conceive of Jesus, a proletarian carpenter, and His 12 disciples, sponsoring a society of cutthroat competition—and subhuman living conditions for the masses. It's no wonder Karl Marx called religion the opiate of the masses. I am quite sure that I am no nearer damnation and hellfire, if I am, then I prefer it."[3]

However, this matter of indoctrination in our school system is not confined to the State universities, but in one State, as has been reported, children of fourth, fifth, and sixth grades are required to read books which, in dealing with the origin of the world, omit God entirely and accept the whole evolutionary scheme of things. Is it any wonder that children taught they are only accidental creatures of chance, descendants of the lower animals, grow up eager to follow brute lusts and ready to reject God?[4]

Some will say that it is healthy to return all religious and moral instruction to the church and the home. But what about the millions of youngsters who get no home training and never see the inside of a church? Twenty years ago Dr. Walter Maier, preacher on "The Lutheran Hour," said there were 17 million youngsters from ages 4 to 14 who received no religious training. There must be several millions more of them now. Dr. Maier said that, unless Heaven's mercy intervened, these millions of religious illiterates would be a source of unspeakable disaster, a germ of immeasurable crime. The rising tide of juvenile delinquency witnesses the soundness of his foresight. If the schools fail to install some moral principles in these youngsters, many of them will join the schools of crime and shame.

At this point it is good to remind ourselves once more of J. Edgar Hoover's answer to the question, "Should I force my child to go to Sunday school and church?"

"Yes," he said flatly, "and with no further discussion about the matter."

Junior does not get by with rebellion against going to school or taking his bath or his medicine, the FBI Chief explained.

There should be no worry, either, that junior will rebel against church later on if he is forced to go now, Hoover said. Rather, parents who are firm at this point and who set a good example can furnish a bridge over which youthful rebellion can travel into rich and satisfying religious living.

Last week's school devotions case was brought by an atheist who said she wanted her children to grow up before being confronted with religious ideas, so they can make their own choice. Walter Maier slams hard at that idea with this question: "If you had a victory garden this year, did you let the ground decide what it would produce? No, you chose the seeds and planted them. Nor was that all. You cultivated, weeded, watered, because you knew that, left to itself, the garden would be overrun with weeds. * * * Is it different in principle with the thought seeds sown in a child's mind? Why do some of you parents keep the soul-ennobling, cultivating influence of Christ's creed (truth) away from your sons and daughters, but at the same time permit the noxious weed of unbelief and doubt to flourish?"[5]

A young person's slant toward the whole question of God and the schools was published in the State last Sunday. It was a high school salutatory address given by Patricia Peeples, of Scotia. Patricia said she wanted God in her graduation, because otherwise she did not understand the world, or its people, or herself. She added that she wanted to be in God as she graduated, and she longed to reach out and touch the greatness of His garment and say, "Because Thou art, I am. Make me worthy of that which has been given me. * * * Mold me, make me, bind me, break me, but use me, O God, to the glory of Thy name." The world would be safer if there were more Patricias.

Getting back for a moment to the larger issues facing our Nation, there is a greater danger than the handful of atheists who are trying to restrict the free exercise of religion of the American people as a whole. The larger peril is the American Civil Liberties Union which is organizing a systematic and powerful campaign to erase religious distinctives from American life. Now it is the phrase "one nation under God" in the pledge to the flag. Tomorrow it may be the Christmas holidays or the chaplaincies in the armed services or the Bible in the courtroom.

So, with the Supreme Court's aid, the opponents of the free exercise of religion keep chipping away. Where it will end nobody knows. And all this is going on at a time when our Nation needs every possible moral and religious help, support, and strength.

It shouldn't be necessary to point out the danger signs in our public and private lives—the growing crimewave, the widespread materialism, the moral decay in high and low places, the worship of sex and pleasure.

Another danger sign is the decaying fabric of freedom, marked by the choice of security instead of God-given liberty. Adm. Ben Moreell, in a recent speech digested in Christianity Today magazine, declared that America's Founding Fathers raised " 'a standard to which the wise and honest can repair,' a standard which retains its integrity because it is rooted deeply in religious faith and eternal principles."

The elements of this standard, or way of life, Admiral Moreell said, are:

"First, man derives directly from the Creator his rights to life, to the liberty, and to the unhampered use of his honestly-acquired property * * *. Second, to protect his rights he joins with others to establish a government, whose powers are carefully limited and clearly defined, and third, for man to grow in wisdom and worldly possessions, he must have freedom of choice, a free exchange for ideas as well as for material goods."[6]

All of this is threatened today, the admiral warns.

Add up everything I have said and I believe you will agree that this is a time in American life for the same sort of attitude that led to the Mayflower Pact, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. In all of these priceless formulations of the original American way God is at the center as the ruler of the universe to whose protecting hand we look for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Other Christian civilizations have become soft or have turned in upon themselves and become corrupt—and they have fallen. Such was north Africa, once a shining chain of vigorous Christian churches, now an almost

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

unbroken chain of Mohammedan culture. Such was Russia, once known as "Holy Russia" because of the church that pervaded her whole life. But that church failed to keep herself pure and her priests became the servants of the tyrants who ruled their land. When the crisis came in 1917, there was no strength in the social fabric to resist the Communist takeover and now the world is in mortal danger—because a church failed.

History has told a different story a few times, when God has intervened to bring revival to a people and lift them above the tragedy that was coming their way. This happened to England just before the French Revolution. Creeping unbelief and galloping immorality had invaded the land, along with social unrest. Violent revolution was almost inevitable. Then came the Wesleyan revival. The common people thronged the Gospel meetings in the fields and the coal pits. Tears of repentance washed down many a miner's face. Then came hundreds and thousands of small group meetings for prayer and instruction in Godly living. A nation received a fresh start. Lord, do it again.

This morning, as we have looked at the growing threat of secularism to America, you may ask, "Well, preacher, what can I do?" There is one thing you can do. It may lead to some other things. But first there is the one thing.

Back in the Old Testament, after the dedication of Solomon's great temple, the Lord appeared unto Solomon in a dream and told him how the people of God could regain His blessings if they ever strayed away. The Lord said:

"If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sins, and will heal their land." [7]

That promise still holds true today. It is the only way we can work out of the dilemma that faces us.

You will note that the key to this promise is prayer. But it is the prayer of a humbled heart, the prayer of a man on his face before God for his sins and the sins of his people. It is the prayer of a seeking and repentant heart—a heart that turns away from sin and makes God's will the central aim of life.

All through the Bible you will find the very best people, the people closest to God, praying like this. Listen to Nehemiah and Daniel and you hear them say, I and my father's house have sinned. "Listen to Paul the aged, the greatest missionary of all time, and you hear, "I am the chief of sinners." Look at John the beloved apostle and you find him on his face before his Lord.

Brethren, God is not going to intervene and save us as long as our necks are stiff and our hearts hard. You know your sins; I know mine. Let us humbly confess them before God, really getting down to sackcloth and ashes before Him. Let us seek His face and turn from our wicked ways. Then, perhaps, we will be part of the saving remnant that will mean survival for America in these troubled 1960's. Lord, do it again. Come and save Thy people. Start with me.

---

[1] "The Destruction of Sennacherib," Lord Byron.

[2] II Kings 19: 35.

[3] Maier, Walter A. "America, Turn to Christ"; Concordia Publishing House (St. Louis, 1944), p. 25.

[4] Ibid., p. 26.

[5] Ibid., p. 178.

[6] Admiral Ben Moreell, "The Illusory Promise of Security"; Christianity Today, vol. VII, No. 19 (June 21, 1963), pp. 15, 16.

[7] II Chronicles 7: 14.

The Leader and Specialist Programs of the U.S. Department of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Carol V. Harford, acting cultural affairs officer, U.S. Embassy, Manila.

THE LEADER AND SPECIALIST PROGRAMS OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

(By Carol V. Harford)

(NOTE.—Miss Harford is acting cultural affairs officer of USIS in Manila. She graduated from UCLA and has previously had USIS assignments in Australia, Indonesia, and Singapore.)

Not too long ago I had returned to Washington, D.C., following an assignment in Australia, and was preparing to depart for the Philippines. One morning I happened to be seated on a bus behind three girls who were talking in very excited tones about the assignments which they had just received as newcomers to the U.S. Foreign Service. One girl said she was going to Bangkok. The second girl asked, "Where's that?" The third girl closed the conversation, saying, "Don't you know? Why, that's the capital of Dutch Indochina." Of course, she should have known that Bangkok is the capital of Thailand, and that there never has been a country named Dutch Indochina.

This kind of misconception regarding other nations and other cultures is all too common, both in the United States and in other countries around the world. In an attempt to alleviate misinformation and to encourage accurate concepts of other lands and other people, the Government of the United States established an educational and cultural exchange program. This program is designed to further mutual understanding between people of the world.

In recent years every nation—large or small—has been caught in the economic and political tensions of this era. Events on the international scene produce ripples and counter ripples which effect the daily lives of people everywhere. As the breadth of international involvements increases both in size and complexity, so does the scope of international diplomacy.

In the past, diplomacy has had the very traditional role of representing the government of one country to the government of another. In recent years, the functions of official diplomatic relations have been enlarged to include many additional facets. One aspects of diplomacy's "new look" is that of cultural diplomacy. Predicated upon the belief that mutual understanding is the foundation for permanent peace, cultural diplomacy endeavors to strengthen cultural ties with the people of other lands through a program of cultural exchange. Based primarily upon an exchange of persons, this program promotes a sharing of knowledge and skills, circumstances and situations, ideas, and attitudes.

The practical realization of this philosophy of cultural exchange has expressed itself through an exchange program now united under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, better known as the Fulbright-Hays Act. Passed by the Congress of the United States, this public law embraces a program of worldwide dimensions, which may vary from one country to another, dependent upon specific agreements between the United States and the country concerned.

The Philippines and America enjoy a variety of mutual activity in the cultural and educational spheres. Since another article in this anniversary issue of Exchange News treats specifics of the Fulbright aspects of the program, these remarks will be directed toward the leader and specialist programs administered by the Department of State.

Foreign leader and foreign specialist grants are by invitation. The foreign leader grant is designed for persons who are recognized professional, occupational, cultural, and civic leaders. The grant is tailored to enable the recipient to observe activities in the United States in his—or her—particular profession or field of interest and provides for discussion and consultation with American leaders in that particular field. It also allows for personal contact and visits to points of interest.

The usual length of a foreign leader grant is 60 days from date of departure to return. This grant provides direct international fare from the grantee's home to Washington, D.C., and return, transportation within the United States and per diem while there.

A partial leader grant provides a short-term program for persons of foreign leader qualifications. No international fare is involved. This must be provided by the individual, either personally or through support which he or she is able to arrange. The length of a partial grant varies; it can be from a few days to 3 or 4 weeks in duration. Usually partial grants offer per diem and a sum for transportation within the United States.

The foreign specialist grant is designed for persons of recognized professional competence in informational and cultural media fields, education, youth leadership, public administration, economics, social welfare and related fields. The program is designed to provide the participant with a working knowledge of his specialty in the United States, personal acquaintance with leaders in his field, and an understanding of contemporary American life.

The programs are of two general types, those for individuals and those for groups. For example, a group journalist project would combine journalists from as many as 20 different countries in a program of academic training, and assignment for specified periods on at least two different newspapers in the United States. The grants for individuals are tailored to the person's particular interests within his field, and may or may not include academic training. Grants usually average 4 months and include a period of orientation in Washington, D.C., individual work assignments, travel in the United States, and, in some cases, a final evaluation conference. Round-trip international fare on a direct route from the grantee's home to a specified point in the United States is included, as is transportation within the United States and per diem.

There are also partial specialist grants, providing a short-term grant for persons with foreign specialist qualifications. No international fare is involved, and as is true with partial leader grants, the length of the grant may vary, but usually provides per diem and some funds for transportation within the United States.

Selection responsibilities for foreign leaders and foreign specialists devolve upon the Embassy nominating committee. This group is composed of representatives from the various elements of the U.S. mission in the Philippines. The committee usually meets early in each new fiscal year to determine the areas in which grants will be awarded.

Following the Embassy's receipt from the Department of State of the allocation of the various types of grants for a given year—i.e. foreign leader, foreign specialist—the committee arranges a priority list of candidates for the predetermined fields. A principal and alternate candidate is selected for each grant to be awarded. The cultural affairs section of the Embassy then forwards these recommendations to Washington, D.C., which retains the prerogative of final selection. If the recommendations are approved, the actual grant is then sent to the Embassy for processing.

The broad scope of the exchange program is evidenced by the inclusion of an adjunct to the leader and specialist programs, known as facilitative assistance. This programing is available to persons with foreign leader or foreign specialist qualifications. There is no grant of funds accompanying facilitative assistance, rather it is a service provided for these persons while they are in the United States under their own auspices. Upon request from the Embassy, the Department of State will arrange for professional contacts in the person's interest area. Voluntary organizations and interested individuals then will be asked to assist outstanding political, cultural, informational, educational, and other leaders in arranging itineraries and in making contacts with individuals and organizations in the United States in their particular fields of interest.

In addition to inviting Filipinos to the United States, or facilitating their private vists, the exchange program also provdes annually for a select group of American specialists to come to the Philippines. These are persons who represent a wide variety of academic, professional, and cultural fields. Their visits can include such activities as—

1. Undertaking specific assignments at the request of local groups and institutions to advise or work with them on their organization, or programs or techniques in specific fields, such as youth leadership, government affairs, radio, labor, higher education, community development, journalism, athletics.

2. Giving lectures or conducting workshops, seminars or clinics in fields such as American literature, poetry, history, the theater, architecture, sculpture, painting, music, athletic activities, economics and related interest areas.

These activities are arranged in conjunction with local sponsors who have expressed an interest in having an American specialist in these fields. These cooperative plans result in a visit by a full-time American specialist who comes to the Philippines for a period of approximately 2 months, or by a regional pool specialist, who may be here for a few days or a few weeks.

In any case, the American specialist is selected by the Department of State, either as the result of a request from field posts or on grants initiated by the Department and concurred in by the Embassy. The Embassy must receive an indication from local interests that an American specialist would be welcome before the person is invited to come to the Philippines.

Because of the vast import of the cultural area of international relations, there are privately sponsored opportunities under the exchange visitor visa program in addition to U.S. Government supported exchange programs. In addition, private foundations also offer opportunities in a variety of fields.

As international problems become increasingly complex, it is more essential than ever that the peoples of one nation understand the life, attitudes, and values of the peoples of their fellow nations. An educational and cultural exchange program appears to be a major means of achieving this understanding.

The U.S. exchange program represents one nation's belief in the worth of cultural diplomacy. The combined energies of the American Government, American private enterprise, and individual American citizens are striving to create through cultural diplomacy an ever-increasing worldwide level of understanding and friendship.

Mutual of New York To Build 30-Story Office Building in Syracuse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it gave me a great deal of pleasure this week to read in the Syracuse Post-Standard that Mutual of New York will build a 30-story office building in our city. Part of the building will be used by MONY for a data processing center.

This action, by the Nation's oldest insurance company, will be mutually beneficial, I am sure. Some 650 to 800 new jobs will be created in downtown Syracuse.

I think this building will be a tribute to a growing, dynamic city and to the long range careful planning of MONY.

I am pleased to share this marvelous story of achievement with my colleagues. Following is an editorial from the Post-Standard:

GREAT DAY FOR SYRACUSE, MONY PLAZA FULFILLS DREAMS

History was made for Syracuse in 1937 when it was announced that Carrier Corp. would establish its principal manufacturing facility and home office here.

History was made for Syracuse in 1942 when it was announced that General Electric would build its great Electronics Park here, to become within a few years the largest industrial employer in this area.

Equally important history was made for Syracuse yesterday when it was disclosed that Mutual of New York, the Nation's oldest, ninth largest, and one of the best known life insurance companies, would erect a 30-story office building directly east of Hotel Syracuse and would create from 650 to 800 new jobs in downtown Syracuse.

With all its important ramifications and urban renewal commitments by the city, the MONY Plaza development may well prove to be the most important bonanza of the three, as far as rejuvenation of the downtown core area of the city is concerned.

Redevelopment of the entire 4-acre square block bounded by South Warren, Harrison, Montgomery, and Madison Streets, as described in detail in our news columns today, will be a tremendous "shot in the arm" for all Syracuse, but particularly for the south end of the main business area.

SIGNED AND SEALED

This is not just another announcement of plans for a "paper building," which so many promoters have sketched and scuttled in the past 20 years. This is a real "signed, sealed, and delivered" real estate deal of the first magnitude, with the directors of MONY already having agreed to erect the 30-story MONY Tower with company funds.

MONY will be the principal user of the whole project, occupying at first about one-third of the 370,000-square-foot, 30-story tower, for its data processing center, which will move to Syracuse from New York City. A 10-story motor hotel will be built at once immediately adjacent on the Madison Street side of the block, and space will be provided for an eventual twin tower at the Montgomery-Madison corner.

CITY BUILDS ALSO

Under terms of an agreement made by Mayor Walsh for the city 18 months ago, the city of Syracuse will construct a 700-car garage on the south side of the square block, along Harrison Street.

The city will apply for Urban Renewal Federal and State approval of redevelopment of the entire southern half of the block, and will receive credit for the cost of the garage toward its one-sixth share of the total cost of redevolpment. Thus the garage can be acquired without adding to city indebtedness beyond the commitment for one-sixth of the urban renewal expense.

With the present parking lots between Hotel Syracuse and the War Memorial already accommodating some 600 cars, there will be an immediate market for all the space in the new garage, and it is expected that the stimulated business in the area will also fill the so-called Strand garage, owned by the city a block west.

A 36-foot-wide covered mall, or galleria, will connect Hotel Syracuse and the War Memorial, heated in winter and air conditioned in summer, with small shops and other facilities, according to present plans.

This will be connected to the hotel and to the memorial by either overhead or underground passageways, enabling hotel guests to walk directly to the convention hall without going out of doors.

Thus will be developed one of the most striking and beautiful downtown blocks in the entire Nation, to be built as one unit, with uniform design and featuring the tallest building in the State outside of metropolitan New York.

It will be in direct line with the new community plaza, already under construction, the New York State Medical Center, and the revamped Syracuse University campus area for which $76 million is now being raised.

This exciting and imaginative scheme will make Syracuse truly outstanding among cities of its size and will greatly stimulate business of all kinds in this area.

REALTOR IS MOVING FORCE

Eagan Real Estate is the moving force behind this latest redevelopment plan, and we agree with Mayor Walsh that Leo T. Eagan and his associates deserve full credit for a magnificent achievement.

This is indeed a prime example of a community pulling itself up by its own bootstraps.

Here private initiative, private capital, private enterprise and confident salesmanship cooperated 100 percent with government at all levels to achieve a superb result which will benefit every Syracusan.

The boost in employment, the increase in retail trade, the gain in the tax rolls, the superior facilities, all these and many more benefits will flow from this historic undertaking.

Syracuse welcomes MONY as one of its principal citizens, and we thank the Eagans and the city administration for all they have done to hasten this day.

Resolution Would Freeze All Cuban Government Assets on Deposit in All OAS Member Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the recent actions by the U.S. Government to freeze Cuban funds on deposit in U.S. financial institutions comes as good news. It is the first new step this Government has taken against Communist Cuba for some weeks now, and while the amount of funds affected will not topple the Castro economy, it is an act which places the United States in a position of leading the rest of the free nations of this hemisphere to follow suit.

I have proposed in House Concurrent Resolution 146 that the United States offer a five-point plan of action to the Organization of American States for adoption by the nations of this hemisphere. The plan includes the freezing of all Cuban Government assets now on deposit in the financial institutions of all OAS member nations, which of course includes the United States.

Now that the United States has complied with this portion of the recommendations, I am hopeful that the U.S. Government will now press this new example upon the other nations of this hemisphere to follow suit for the isolation of Communist Cuba.

Foreign Assistance for the United Arab Republic?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 5, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, there is pending before this House a foreign assistance bill containing funds for the United Arab Republic. I wish to invite the attention of my colleagues to the latest report on the shocking use of poison gas by the military forces of Egypt, the nation that American taxpayers are asked to support. In his reported brutal use of poison gas against the civilians of Yemen, United Arab Republic President Nasser has emulated the tactics of Mussolini against the Ethiopians in the 1930's.

I do not feel that the American taxpayer should subsidize the United Arab Republic by a single cent, in view of its brutal and aggressive policies. The authoritative British report, conveyed by the Associated Press, describes the poison gas bombs used by the United Arab Republic against Yemeni(s) civilians and states that—

> Since the Russian bloc supplies all military equipment for Egypt, it is likely that the bomb was manufactured in Russia or Czechoslovakia.

There is pending before the Congress an amendment to the foreign assistance bill offered by myself, identical with one offered by Senator KEATING in the Senate, and supported by many Members of both bodies. This amendment would sever American assistance to the United Arab Republic if that country, or any other, diverted its own resources to purchase Communist poison gas bombs as Nasser has already done.

I fervently appeal for the approval of this amendment.

> EGYPTIANS' USE OF GAS IN YEMEN WAR CLAIMED
>
> LONDON, July 8.—British newspaper correspondent charged today that Egyptian forces in Yemen are using poison gas against remote mountain villages still loyal to the royalist cause.
>
> Richard Beeston of the London Daily Telegraph asserted that seven died in the northern Yemeni village of Al Kawma from a gas attack and 25 others—gravely disfigured—faced a lingering death.
>
> "President Nasser can now claim the distinction of being the first person to employ chemical warfare since Mussolini used mustard gas on Ethiopian tribesmen during the 1930s," said Mr. Beeston in an acocunt of a 3-day trek by donkey and on foot to Al Kawma from Saudi Arabia.
>
> HEARD CEASELESS COUGHING
>
> Mr. Beeston charged that Egyptian aircraft deployed in the Yemeni civil war dropped a gas bomb on Al Kawma early last month.
>
> "I approached the village late at night. From more than 100 yards away, I could hear the coughing of the gassed villagers which went on ceaselessly.
>
> "In the morning, villagers crowded me, pleading with me to send medicines and doctors to cure their coughs and blisters. The face of one woman had turned a vivid yellow.
>
> "Another woman was blinded by rubbing her eyes with contaminated fingers. One of the worst affected villagers I saw, Mohammed Nasser, 12, who had a perpetual cough and deep, open wounds on his body, the size of a half crown (about the size of a 50-cent piece) from gas blisters."
>
> The British newsman said he was shown the remains of what villagers claimed had been the gas bomb.
>
> "It was obviously a complicated piece of machinery, probably beyond the engineering capabilities of the Egyptians. Since the Russian bloc supplies all military equipment for Egypt, it is likely that the bomb was manufactured in Russia or Czechoslovakia," Mr. Beeston deduced.
>
> The correspondent said medical supplies had been sent to the villagers from the royalist headquarters of the Iman (king) Mohammed Al-Badr—but they consisted of little more than iodine and aspirin.
>
> "There is little doubt that there have been at least three or four other poison gas attacks during the past month," Mr. Beeston reported. "In my journey to Al Kawma, Egyptian Ilyushin bombers were constantly over, bombing and strafing the surrounding villages."

Catholic War Veterans Commend Peter Rodino III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, much national attention and approval has been directed toward the little-people-to-little-people program initiated by Peter W. Rodino III, son of our distinguished colleague from New Jersey, the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, JR.

The most recent recognition of young Peter's efforts at fostering international understanding and cooperation came on June 23 when the National Board of Officers of the Catholic War Veterans, at its quarterly meeting held in New York City, adopted a resolution commending young Peter Rodino and urging all young people to participate in the program.

The resolution was submitted by Attorney Cresenzi W. Castaldo, national judge advocate of the Catholic War Veterans, on behalf of the New Jersey State Department which had adopted the resolution at its June 7 convention.

I commend the attention of my colleagues to this citation of Peter Rodino III and his little-people-to-little-people program:

> Whereas Peter W. Rodino III, of Newark, the son of PETER W. RODINO, JR., a Member of Congress from the 10th Congressional District of New Jersey, has displayed unusual and inspirational interest in the cause of world peace and international goodwill; and
>
> Whereas this distinguished young American has conceived and created a program among all children of the world to promote peace among nations; and
>
> Whereas the formation of the nongovernmental little-people-to-little-people program is designed to promote greater understanding and harmony among all nations through the voices of children who speak with utmost sincerity in this great cause: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved,* That the Catholic War Veterans, Department of New Jersey, in convention assembled this 7th day of June 1963, urge all our citizens, especially our young people, to participate in this program in order that world peace and international goodwill may be attained; and, be it further
>
> *Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the National Department of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America for its consideration and approval.

National Anthem Day in Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable J. Millard Tawes, Governor of the Free State of Maryland, has proclaimed September 14, the anniversary of "The Star-Spangled Banner," as National Anthem Day in Maryland. It would be most appropriate if all Americans were to pause in observance of a day commemorating the national anthem. Music has long been a part of the American tradition. "The Star-Spangled Banner" epitomizes in music the indomitable will of the American people and deserves a place of reverence in the lives of all Americans. I call this National Anthem Day proclamation to the attention of the Congress so that we might consider making the commemoration of the birth date of "The Star-Spangled Banner" truly national in observance:

> THE STATE OF MARYLAND—EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT
>
> GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION—NATIONAL ANTHEM DAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1963
>
> Whereas, on the 14th day of September, in the year 1814, Francis Scott Key, after a night of vigil while detained by the British invaders planning the capture of Baltimore, saw "by the dawn's early light" that our flag was still waving over the ramparts of Fort McHenry, and was then inspired to write his song of victory, "The Star-Spangled Banner"; and

Whereas the song expresses the patriotism and devotion to freedom of those who established and preserved our Nation, and has been officially adopted as the national anthem of the United States; and

Whereas the Frederick chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, has initiated a patriotic movement to promulgate the significance of our national anthem, and has suggested that the 14th day of September be designated as National Anthem Day: Now, therefore, I. J. Millard Tawes, Governor of the State of Maryland, do hereby proclaim September 14, 1963, as National Anthem Day.

And I urge the public schools and other educational institutions, civic and patriotic organizations, and the citizens of this State to commemorate this anniversary of the writing of "The Star-Spangled Banner" by Francis Scott Key as a day of dedication to our priceless heritage as American citizens for keeping alive the spirit of the Founding Fathers in grateful appreciation for the services which they rendered to our State and Nation.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Maryland, at the city of Annapolis, this 12th day of June, in the year of our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Sixty-three.

By the Governor: J. Millard Tawes.

LLOYD L. SIMPKINS,
Secretary of State.

The Shoemaker Should Stick to His Last

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Christian Economics which is published fortnightly from September through June by Christian Freedom Foundation, Inc., consistently publishes some of the soundest and most interesting articles that I have ever had the pleasure of reading. In its July 9, 1963, issue, Christian Economics has republished an excerpt from an address by Justice Millard F. Caldwell of the Florida Supreme Court before the Public Servants Prayer Breakfast, Tampa, Fla., on April 16, 1963. The title of this address is "The Shoemaker Should Stick to His Last."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this excerpt from the address of this able, outstanding, and dedicated public servant be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SHOEMAKER SHOULD STICK TO HIS LAST

(By Justice Millard F. Caldwell, Florida Supreme Court)

In view of what has happened to more than half the people living on earth, the right to pray is not to be taken for granted. The mayor of Moscow and the minions of the Kremlin could not attend a prayer breakfast—they cannot admit the efficacy of prayer nor the existence of a God. They've not only had to deny Him thrice—they probably have to deny Him thrice daily. But to say that we are thankful that those conditions, if they must exist, are 6,000 miles away is to overlook the fact they also exist 90 miles from the shores of Florida; that, figuratively at least, they exist in the schools of the State of New York and, before the summer is ended, will exist in the schools of Florida and of the Nation. If the Supreme Court of the United States continues serenely on its way, prayers in Congress and religious services in the Armed Forces will be abolished; the oath of the President, Members of the Congress and the Supreme Court will be neutralized by striking all reference to Deity; the National Anthem will be repealed and your dollar will no longer proclaim, "In God We Trust."

So I suggest, that while you are praying, you be not only thankful for the privileges you temporarily enjoy but that you beseech God's help in your effort to perpetuate that right—that is, if you are interested in retaining it and if you are willing to do anything about it. You might, also, as a postscript add to your prayer a plea for the parents in Brooklyn, N.Y., who filed suit in Federal Court for permission to resume voluntary prayers in the kindergartens. Those children seek the right to express voluntarily these simple, childish words:

"God is great; God is good; and we thank Him for our food.

"Thank You for the world so sweet; thank You for the food we eat.

"Thank You for the birds that sing; thank You God for everything."

Unless your intercession can turn the tide, the Supreme Court, when that case is called, will deny the petition. In my mind's eye, I can read the opinion of the Court finding the proposal both sinister and individiously discriminatory and holding that to permit the children to repeat such words of praise would work great emotional hardship and psychological trauma upon those who are opposed to God—that the tender sensibilities of the little atheists must not be bruised by uncouth customs of the majority. Ridiculous you say? Don't be foolish—it not only can happen—in all probability it will happen here.

The spread of Christianity is dependent upon the maintenance of what we loosely term the free world. And, make no mistake, the continued existence of a free world is dependent upon what happens in the United States of America—we must provide the leadership, the initiative, the material wealth and the driving force necessary to that end.

We are charged with the heavy responsibility of maintaining a strong Government dedicated to the freedom of our own people and the preservation of civilization. That responsibility rests upon the shoulders of the individual citizens of this country—not the public officeholders, not the judiciary. Those who temporarily occupy those high places are the creatures of the people and reflect their zeal or indifference, their desires and their ambitions.

I am not sure you can reverse the current trend although we have the precedent of the early 1930's, and we made a complete about face and junked the principles and policies which had theretofore guided the Nation to its destiny of greatness. Your conceptions touching public and private economy are quite unlike those of your forebears. Your parents believed in private enterprise but in the 1930's you began to acquiesce in what was considered to be an emergency need for governmental interference and assistance. Your parents believed in earning by the sweat of their brows the money with which to pay the grocer, while now we look for a subsidy or a dole. Your parents had a dollar worth 100 cents as compared with our one-third of a dollar. Your parents owed a national debt of 15 or 20 billions of dollars and expected to pay it. We owe more than 300 billions and know, in all probability, it will never be paid. Your parents expected the President to appoint good lawyers to the United States Supreme Court—we expect and get lay sociologists. Your forefathers believed in independence and personal responsibility while we blandly accept group domination and feel we must conform to a common pattern.

Since we have abandoned the stubborn individualism which made America great and have found the consequence wanting, it's time to reevaluate our position, to take stock of our loose thinking and consider the remedy. And, let's begin by being honest with ourselves and admit that, instead of living under a constitutional government, we are now endangered by vacillation abroad and subservient to a judicial overlordship at home.

Without detailing the many ways in which the sovereignty of the States is being absorbed by the Central Government, just let me say that the philosophy which prompted those usurpations can, with equal ease, circumscribe the activities of the churches. Religion and totalitarianism are incompatible—wherever communistic ideologies have manifested themselves, the principle of free religious worship has gone out the window.

Our greatest weakness is our passive acceptance of encroachments upon our rights. When we remember that the Communists' plan is to soften up the people of America, to divide us into opposing camps, to foster distrust, to encourage us to spend and tax ourselves into bankruptcy and to generally condition us to the loss of our freedom of action, we must know it is time to take a stand.

Since the Supreme Court of the United States has thrown its protective arm around the subversives we can no longer say who is and who is not a Communist. But, without question, we can point out those who are lending aid and comfort to the Communists—identify them as those who contribute to the centralization of power, the destruction of the guarantees of the Constitution, the creation of strife and ill feeling; as those who urge us to seek an understanding with the murderers of Hungary, to engage in free trade and make contracts with the enemy.

Let's not delude ourselves, the Communists are not inept bunglers. We are not dealing with dimwits—they know what they are doing. They know how to get their people in the middle of otherwise good organizations and how to infiltrate the high offices of the land. They know how to adopt causes and join movements which appeal to the do-gooders, to the so-called little man and to the minorities. They are devoting every effort to create an American populace habituated to control and dulled of wit and will—they want us preconditioned to their purpose.

They are masters of organization, experts in long-range planning and patient of execution. And they have enjoyed and are enjoying rewarding results. They have taken the satellite countries behind the Iron Curtain and have penetrated the hearts of the free world, including the United States and other Western Hemisphere nations. They are working under cover and in secrecy, making polices for certain American groups—they have confused and demoralized the State Department and influenced our international and domestic policies.

The Communists have never expected nor even hoped to gain the approval of the majority of the American people—all they need and all they want are a few of the leading liberals—a small hard core working in the dark, plus the slothful indifference of the great substantial middle class.

The authors ofthe United States Constitution, recognizing human limitations, never assumed the Supreme Court would be endowed with supernatural and universal knowledge—they merely hoped the judges would have the capacity to discharge the limited duties incident to the judicial function and assumed they would avoid meddling in affairs over which they had not constitutional jurisdiction.

The Founding Fathers wisely left such problems as the conduct of the schools, State elections, and the preservation of the peace to the States. But, the Supreme Court, taking advantage of the indifference of the public, has usurped the authority of the States, rewritten the Constitution, and enacted its own law. In doing so, it has cultivated a cleavage of distrust between the States and the Federal Government and it has encouraged those who would destroy us.

Religion can thrive only under freedom; freedom exists only on this side of the Iron Curtain and here only because the strength of this Nation has limited Communist advance. But if the liberties and the freedom guaranteed by the Constitution are lost and our domestic tranquillity is torn by dissension, unrest, and suspicion, that strength which has saved us in the past, will be sapped of its vitality. The free world will no longer be free and religion will have to be bootlegged as it is in Russia today.

Unless the Supreme Court can be persuaded to stop circumscribing our liberties, stop coddling the Communists and stop its unwarranted meddling in matters over which it has no Constitutional jurisdiction, the churches and the right of its members to attend a public prayer breakfast are in trouble.

The lesson we should learn again from all these mistakes is that the shoemaker should stick to his last. Most of the animosities and distrusts will disappear if we will just stop meddling and leave administration to the Executive, law to the Judicial, and policymaking to the legislative branch of Government; leave State functions to the State and Federal functions to the Federal Government.

But, and make no mistake about this: As your church, as such, is kept out of politics, be sure that the individual members are in politics up to their ears. It is their task, as individuals, to see that the pinks are unseated and the Communists are defeated; that the freedoms of the Constitution are recaptured and this country made safe for religion.

As Walter Judd has said: The best way for churches to bring religious principles into government is by persuading religious persons to become interested in politics—he said, and wisely, I am against political action by the churches but I am for political action by the members. About two centuries ago the great English historian, Lord Macaulay, made a painstaking study of the American Government and reached this conclusion: "Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor. Either Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your Republic will be fearfully plundered and laid waste by the barbarians in the 20th century as the Roman Empire was in the 5th—with the difference that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without and your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions."

I conclude by saying to you as Edmund Burke said nearly 200 years ago: "The only thing necesary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing."

Test Ban Negotiations—International Confidence Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the American Security Council publishes twice each month a Washington Report which is concerned with national and international developments affecting the Nation's security. In the July 1, 1963, issue, the ASC's Washington Report carries an outstanding article entitled "Test Ban Negotiations—International Confidence Game." This issue of the Washington Report was written by Mr. Duane Thorin who is a retired veteran of 22 years of naval service. Mr. Thorin was captured by the Communists during the Korean war and while in captivity, he so distinguished himself by his courageous actions that he was later awarded the Silver Star medal. Upon his release from the Communist prison camp, he wrote a book entitled "A Ride to Panmunjom," a novelized report of his experiences and observations while in Communist captivity. He has written and lectured extensively on psychological and political warfare and Communist tactics. He testified before the Senate Armed Services Special Preparedness Subcommittee in 1962, at the hearings on military cold war education policies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEST BAN NEGOTIATIONS—INTERNATIONAL CONFIDENCE GAME

"If we don't get an agreement * * * now, I would think generally that the genie is out of the bottle and we will never get him back in." President J. F. Kennedy, May 8, 1963.

"Chairman Khrushchev, Prime Minister Macmillan and I have agreed that high-level discussions will shortly begin in Moscow looking toward early agreement on a comprehensive test ban treaty," President J. F. Kennedy, June 10, 1963.

Why are U.S. policymakers now placing such special emphasis on a test ban treaty—more than most other elements of their disarmament plans? None of the reasons usually given to the public seem to explain the now-or-never attitude displayed by Mr. Kennedy. Neither do they justify the concessions which U.S. negotiators have offered and seem ready to offer in Moscow, in their efforts to entice the Soviets into immediate agreement. In fact, some of the more widely publicized reasons turn out to be simply promotional propaganda, rather than an actual consideration in policy planning.

For example, one major theme of test ban propaganda has been the claim (now disproved) that continued testing would create great hazards from radioactive fallout. However, in testimony given to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 11, 1963, Secretary of State Rusk discounted this factor as a primary consideration in our policy, except for its usefulness in promoting the idea. Mr. Rusk said that the problem of radioactive fallout was of "secondary importance, but nevertheless significant * * * in large part because of real or assumed dangers from fallout * * *," which he said has caused nuclear testing to become a "key political issue in a great many countries."

Executive policymakers are not interested in a test ban treaty primarily for any value which it might have in itself. To them, it is a "confidence building" measure; that is, policymakers see it as a first step along the road toward further objectives which they have laid out for this Nation under the label of "disarmament." President Kennedy referred to the test ban treaty as one of the "first-step measures of arms control," in the June 10 address wherein he announced the coming high-level negotiations in Moscow. Secretary Rusk, in his March 11 statement to the Senate committee, called it a necessary first step. He explained as follows:

"What we need are arrangements on which confidence can be built as a matter wholly separate from the question of whether the Russians will trust us or we can trust the Russians, because the very arrangements, themselves provide a basis for growing confidence."

This confidence-building function of a test ban treaty in the overall plan for our Nation's disarmament was set forth even more clearly by a U.S. participant in the Sixth Pugwash Conference (Moscow, November-December 1960). Mr. Richard Leghorn said at that meeting:

"Of overwhelming importance will be the completion and rapid implementation of a treaty banning nuclear tests. This treaty will be of more value as a confidence-building measure than as a measure of real disarmament * * *. Its successful completion is an absolute must for progress toward the disarmament treaty."

Walter W. Rostow, chairman of the State Department Policy Planning Council, also a participant in the 1960 Pugwash conference, endorsed and reaffirmed the Leghorn idea on confidence-building. Thus were the Soviets informed as early as 1960 that, from the official U.S. viewpoint, the principal purpose of a test ban was to "build confidence." Americans, meanwhile, long subjected to diverse propaganda on the "need" for a test ban for other reasons, are only now being gradually let in on the real purpose it is intended to serve. As to whose confidence needs building—in announcing unilateral suspension of testing by the United States on June 10, President Kennedy said he was doing so to "make clear our good faith"; as if it were the United States rather than the U.S.S.R., who has proved unworthy of trust.

Possible to build confidence in the minds of Americans, Mr. Rusk and others have claimed that a test ban treaty now would be to the military advantage of the United States, because it would arrest nuclear weapons development in both camps at their present levels. This claim presumes a present U.S. superiority which is not at all certain in several key elements of strategic capability and which, according to U.S. weapons experts, cannot be made certain without further atmospheric testing. Opposition by military chiefs to Mr. Kennedy's unilateral test suspension is reportedly due largely to this consideration. Moreover, both Secretary Rusk (on March 11) and President Kennedy (on June 10) have acknowledged that the Soviet Union cannot be relied upon to abide by a treaty, except insofar as it might be in their own interests to do so. As an offset to this recognized Soviet duplicity, Mr. Rusk said the treaty must be designed so that "the scope of any violation which might escape detection" could not be so extensive as to "substantially affect the military balance." Additionally, he noted that we should keep ourselves prepared to resume testing in short order (a feat of preparedness which Mr. Kennedy called "impossible of execution", in March of 1962).

In view of the real purpose which U.S. policymakers see for a treaty, could the U.S. public ever be confident that their own officials would tell them of any clandestine Soviet testing? Or would those officials overlook such Soviet duplicity in order not to jeopardize the further goals which they have set for us in the name of disarmament? Finally, is there any basis for American confidence in that ultimate disarmament goal?

Although U.S. policy spokesmen are generally quite candid about their ultimate objective in statements to the public, its most significant aspect is often obscured by high-sounding talk of "world peace—peaceful coexistence and competition of different systems—solving the world's economic and social problems—etc." A relatively new theme appeared in Mr. Kennedy's June 10 address wherein he said, "if we cannot now end our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity." At the 1960 Pugwash Conference, Mr. Rostow spoke similarly of making the world "safe for ideological differences." (A rather preposterous notion when dealing with an ideology which is dedicated to the extinction of diversity.)

When the emotional appeals are put aside, the ultimate goal may well be that expressed by Mr. Rostow in his book, "The United States in the World Arena," in which he says:

"It is a legitimate American national objective to see removed from all nations—including the United States—the right to use substantial military force to pursue their own interests. Since this residual right is the right of national sovereignty and the basis for the existence of an international arena of power, it is, therefore, an American interest to see an end of nationhood as it has been historically defined."

This would seem to be borne out in the U.S. proposal for "Complete and General Disarmament" (September 1961) and further evidence is contained in Rostow's closing statement to Soviet and other participants in the 1960 Pugwash conference in which he stated:

"The maximum objective is a new system of relations among states based on general and complete disarmament with strict international control.

"If this grand conception is to come to life there is need to create a clearly marked turning point. * * * First, a completion of the test-ban negotiations which should build confidence and open the way to the step beyond.

"I think we all understand now that the work done in the United States on the short run is not designed to frustrate long run and more ambitious objectives.

"I hope that the remarkable channel of communication which the Pugwash movement has opened will be kept open and rapidly enlarged. * * * I hope our working papers will flow steadily back and forth. Some problems we face can only be negotiated. But some of them require that scientists work together not as negotiators but as professional colleagues.

"The transition to disarmament and the world of disarmament are, if I may use the phrase, a New Frontier."

This is a double jeopardy to freedom's cause in present U.S. policy. Our unilateral suspension of testing, plus other self-imposed restraints, while trying to woo the Soviets into a test ban agreement, leaves the way open for them to gain a decisive advantage in some key element of strategic power. The alternate possibility—subordination of our national military power to an international authority formed in coalition with the Communists—is but another route to the worldwide totalitarian system prescribed by Karl Marx.

The way of peace between nations and human freedom within them is through the proper exercise of national sovereignties, including military power. Only when there has been a clear return to that premise in our policy planning will the American people have any reason for confidence in the security of their Nation and their freedom.

DUANE THORIN.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

It Is Heartbreaking To See a Great Nation Dying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1963, Dr. Archie Ellis, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Columbia, S.C., and an outstanding leader of the Southern Baptist Convention, delivered a most inspiring and thought-provoking message entitled: "It Is Heartbreaking To See a Great Nation Dying," which I should like to share with my colleagues.

His concern should be caught by all Americans who are shocked by the decision of the Supreme Court on June 17 upholding the desire of a handful of atheists to mock God as against the overwhelming number of most Americans to honor Him both in public and privately.

We need more citizens, clergy and laymen alike, who will stand up and speak out for the preservation of "the edifice of constitutional liberty."

The sermon follows:

IT'S HEARTBREAKING TO SEE A GREAT NATION DYING

(By Dr. R. Archie Ellis)

For more than 10 years I have been classified as an alarmist, because of the deep conviction I have concerning the trends in our American Government. However, I come again on this weekend prior to the observance of the 187th anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, to deliver my soul to you. And convinced of this I am, that this is not alarm, but realism. And, as I do, I urge you as citizens of the Kingdom of God, first, and then, as citizens of this beloved land to do certain things which are spelled out in God's Word.

Why the urgency? Ten years ago, approximately, the Camden News carried an editorial under the caption which I have chosen as my subject, "It's Heartbreaking To See a Great Nation Dying."

"'It's heartbreaking to see a great nation dying when you know that it could have been saved.'

"That statement was made to the editor of the Camden News just last week by a man of national prominence, who has a thorough grasp of the situation which exists in this country today.

"He had no sooner made the remark than he checked himself and asked that, because of his far-flung connections, his name not be used if we quoted him.

"But there was no mistaking his feelings. He spoke in solemn tone and the quiver in his voice indicated that he meant what he said and that he felt it very deeply.

"He said that this was the saddest New Year of his life. He felt that progress had been made last year by those seeking to destroy a free America and make it a regimented state—and that they will make even greater headway in the year which lies ahead."

Then the editors of the newspaper in our neighboring city continued:

"And so the leak in the dam gets bigger and bigger and unless something happens quickly to awaken the masses from their lethargy and to unite those of us, who want to save this as a free America, into a band of steel, it is but a question of time until the dam breaks. Let us hope and pray that this 'something' may happen before it is everlastingly too late.

The editorial ends with this quotation from Daniel Webster:

"Other misfortunes may be borne or their effects overcome. If disastrous war should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhausts our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolates and lays waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation they will grow green again and ripen to future harvests.

"It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt.

"But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government?

"Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty?

"Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites National sovereignty with States rights, individual security, and public prosperity?

"No, if these columns fall they will not be raised again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be consigned to a mournful and melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them than were shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional liberty."

Let me cite you further an editorial from the South Carolina Christian Advocate which was carried by the Columbia State recently. The editor of this Methodist journal, Dr. McCay Brabham, writes:

"From our reading of history of the past and present centuries, we recall some steps which have been taken effectively to bring an end to freedom and expedite the control of the people by governments in power."

Then he lists seven of these steps. I cite you the last four:

"4. The abolition of property rights, which thereby removes the ability to sustain life without recourse to handouts from governmental authority.

"5. Control of the educational process by the same authority.

"6. The exercise by the central government of police power above and beyond the necessities of military defense and necessity.

"7. The depreciation of religion and the relegation of its practice to areas outside of the areas of conflict and involvement in daily life.

"Which of these steps have already been taken, and which are now proposed for our Nation, each of us may see for himself.

"Regardless of the reasons for taking these steps, whether it be in freedom's name or as outright steps toward the achievement of dictatorship, when these things have been accomplished in a nation's life, then 'government of the people, by the people, and for the people has perished from that portion of the earth.'"

Last Sunday morning I tried to pinpoint the specific trends which give me great fear, to the neglect of pointing out a more specific course of action. In pleading for prayer, humble, repentant prayer, I suggested that this one thing may lead to other things which we could do; let us pursue this for a moment.

Too often, I fear, our whole concept of prayer is somewhat distorted. We conceive of it as a means to capture the ear of God with our complaints and our wishes. However, if we come to the place of prayer and leave that place and do nothing about it, perhaps it would have been better not to have gone. However, as we examine the prayer life of Jesus, invariably positive action followed His periods of prayer.

You will observe that on one occasion He spent the whole night in prayer and returned to find hundreds of people who needed healing—physical and spiritual. Again, observe Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane as he prays for God's complete will to be done. He leaves the garden to do the will of His Father, even though it meant death on the Cross.

I. I suggest that we as Christians, mount an offensive in this matter and be done with a defensive role in the face of a handful of atheists.

1. Why have we not done so in the past?

A. Could it be that we long to be inoffensive, assuring our personal popularity?

B. Or are we afraid that someone will accuse us of playing politics?

2. We must, with every means at a Christian's disposal, fight for that which we believe to be right. How many people in Washington know of our attitudes? Our recourse must be to the Congress. Several of the Members of Congress from our State have introduced legislation to return to us the religious freedom which we cherish and the right of free exercise in religion. Do they know of our approval and approbation?

II. We must set our houses in order.

1. The Church—II Chronicles 29: 15.

Hezekiah, the God-fearing son of a God-hating father, had no sooner come into power than he resolved to help bring back his people to Jehovah, cleanse the Temple and destroy the hideous idols his father had built. It took courage for Hezekiah to oppose the practices of his own father, just as it required bravery and determination for Luther to battle against the errors of his forefathers. Fearlessness and faith are going to be required in our times if we are going to set our house in order. But the church of Jesus Christ must be cleansed and it must begin here with you and me. Cleansed from what?

WORLDLINESS

Where is the line of demarcation that in former times separated the godless throngs from the Godly company of those who worshiped our Christ? People can join thousands of churches in the United States without making a profession of faith in Christ as Saviour and Lord. But what is even worse, they can remain members in good standing even though their whole wanton, wicked conduct shrieks its protest against the Word of God.

George Sokolsky published a syndicated column in some of the newspapers of America for years and in one of these columns he had the following to say: "We seem to have grown accustomed to all sorts of social honors, and what is more, even the clergy, whose business is faith and morals, say nothing these days in condemnation of the lack of family responsibility. They condone misconduct by tacit acquiescence. They seem too busy to have time for the less popular job of fighting downright sin."

SPIRITUAL INERTIA OR SLEEPINESS

If ever there was urgency needed in sounding the alarm-clock shout of the Apostle Paul—'tis now. "It is high time to awake out of sleep."[1]

EMPTY RITUALISM

The error that substitutes ceremonies for the saving grace of our Lord—form before faith. And I remind you this is not confined to the liturgical churches, but you and I can be guilty of empty ritualism at this moment. History shows that when pageantry and procession overshadow trust and obedience—the night of religious decay has fallen.

OPPOSITION TO BIBLE TRUTH

The deepest sin of American Christendom is that it has to a great extent turned from the Book which has made it great and denied Jesus whose Gospel brought the Founding Fathers to our shores. Such churches and preachers are awarded with widespread applause. In this crisis hour when the churches should call the people to repentance and faith, when our theological seminaries should be graduating young preachers who are saturated with the truth, some in our pulpits are piddling around with pet themes which can never lead men to the Lord.

Such calls for a 20th century reformation. Today churches are wavering when they should stand, denying when they should affirm, upholding men when they should exalt Christ. Too, this calls not only for men in the clergy with a faith and courage like unto Martin Luther, but valiant defenders of the faith among our lay people, men and women who have followed Hezekiah and "sanctified themselves to cleanse the House of the Lord."

CONCLUSION

It is no wonder that this 20th Century Society for the Promotion of Atheism is gaining such headway. In 3 successive years they have had favorable rulings by the Supreme Court, each decision eroding a little more of our religious liberty and freedom. As I indicated last Sunday, already a suit has been filed in a California superior court by the American Civil Liberties Union challenging the constitutionality of including the reference to God in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States. As I said 1 year ago this Sunday, Justice Douglas invited these ever-increasing court tests by his concurring opinion, denoting in the footnotes how he felt about every area of our national life which still has any references to God.

Now, in the face of this where are the people of God?—out rationalizing. Where were they when the cases were argued before the Supreme Court? Where are they now since the decisions have been rendered? Listen: "There seems to be little to be gained by discussing the matter and reacting to the decision." Baptist Courier Editorial[2] "A group of prominent educators, lawyers, editors, and religious leaders representing diverse religious commitments and reflecting varied reactions to the Supreme Court ruling, met in New York 2 days after the ruling was issued. They agreed that the Court's principle of "wholesome neutrality" is not only cognizant of religious liberty, but aware that American institutions presuppose a Supreme Being and looks favorably upon the chaplaincy, congressional prayers and other national practices."[3]

Who is standing with Justice Potter Stewart as he consistently and stalwartly dissents with the majority of the Court. He says in his dissenting opinion: "I cannot agree with what seems to me the insensitive definition of the 'establishment clause' contained in the Court's opinion. There is involved in these cases a substantial free exercise claim on the part of those who affirmatively desire to have their children's school day open with the reading of the passages from the Bible * * *. If religious exercises are held to be an impermissible activity in schools, religion is placed at an artificial and 'state created,'[4] disadvantage." He continues by asserting that "according to the decision of the majority, the Government is supporting a religion of secularism and further supporting the beliefs of those who think that religious exercises should be conducted only in private."

Now, I come again to say the need is for the churches of our Lord to be so cleansed, purified, energized, and empowered that we can stand with this man and all who are seeking to protect our liberty and not with an atheist who is quoted as saying "I'm a troublemaker at heart and don't give a damn what people think. I would turn every church into a sanitorium, a hospital, or a school so it would accomplish some good."[5]

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Romans 13: 11.

[2] The Baptist Courier, vol. 95, No. 25 (June 27, 1963), p. 3.

[3] Christianity To-Day, vol. VII, No. 20, July 5, 1963, p. 30.

[4] Emphasis by the author.

[5] Ibid., p. 30.

Address by Hon. Carl Albert, of Oklahoma, Before the 50th National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a very informative and effective speech made by the majority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], to the delegates and members attending the 50th National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress that took place at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C., on June 7, 1963. There is no more dedicated Member of Congress in all fields of legislative activity than the distinguished majority leader.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. CARL ALBERT OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. President, and ladies and gentlemen of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, first of all, I would like to bring a word of greeting from my colleagues in the House of Representatives all of whom are aware of the importance of the leadership which this organization has given to the development of our natural resources and particularly our water resources. Second, I would like to advise that the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN McCORMACK, would personally have been here to extend a word of greeting and to deliver an address which he had prepared had it not been for illness in his family which required his return to Boston last night. All the Members of the Congress are aware of the impact which the work of this great organization has had upon the development of this country, because it has been during the lifetime of this organization that water conservation and resource conservation generally has become an important and ever-increasingly important fact in American life.

Today the impetus to proceed as quickly as we can with the development of our rivers and harbors in all aspects is proceeding. This means flood control, navigation, improved harbors, power, soil conservation, recreation and wildlife. All these things, of course, add to the strength and to the opportunities of our American people. I congratulate, personally, this organization upon its work, upon the quality and character of its membership which reaches to every section of the United States and includes among its numbers high-ranking officials of government, State, National and local, and leaders in every walk of life.

In Oklahoma, we have become, as few other States, I think, water conscious. This has been due to several things. First, to the realization that we cannot any longer rely upon a tenant-farmer agricultural economy. Second, to the great leadership that the late Senator Kerr gave to this movement in our State and to the Nation. Bob Kerr, when he died, had reached a position of eminence in Government shared by few other men, in many areas, but the one which was nearest and dearest to his heart was that of the development of water resources, and it is largely because of the impact of his life that the great strides are being made now in my State and in my section of the country.

I am personally devoted to the ideals of this organization. I extend my thanks to you, as a Member of Congress, and my best wishes to you for this conference and for a successful year ahead. Thank you very much.

Cuban Assets Frozen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Did Someone Goof?" published in the New York Herald Tribune recently.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DID SOMEONE GOOF?

Yesterday's announcement that the Treasury Department has frozen Cuban assets in this country, estimated at $33 million, raises disturbing questions.

The first is: Why has the action come so late, at 12:01 a.m., on July 8, 1963, after Castro and his Communist regime presumably had months and even years in which to withdraw much larger sums than the $20 million they now have in this country? (The rest of the $33 million apparently was left here by individual Cubans for safekeeping.

Is this a case of locking the stable after the horse has escaped?

The State Department relates the freeze to the recent resolution by the Organization of American States, designed to contain Communist subversion emanating from Cuba. At the same time it recognizes that our action is a unilateral one. This raises the question: Is the OAS to serve as a cover for unilateral goofing by someone in Washington?

Finally, if the administration is serious about blocking Cuban transfer of funds to be used for subversive purposes, what can it do about Canadian, British, Swiss and other European banks which are doing business with Castro and are in a position to circumvent the belated action by Washington?

If the answer is nothing, then Castro is unlikely to feel much of a squeeze as a result of the freeze.

English as a Second Language

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, teachers and school administrators of our Nation have never hesitated to experiment when new needs confront students. If we were able to look into every classroom of the United States during an ordinary schoolday, we would find instructors finding lively ways to present new facts or old truths. They must be as least as concerned with basic values as they are with a changing technology. They must think of students as individuals whose merits should be developed. Too often, however, disadvantage must be fought before merit can be discovered.

In West New York, N.J., school authorities and teachers decided last October that they had to do something about one such disadvantage—a language barrier that prevented Puerto Rican and Cuban youngsters from participating in school and community life to the full.

To combat social isolation and to develop the talents and interests of these students, teachers developed new techniques, including a telephone communication system, other audiovisual aids, bilingual texts, and joint meetings with parents. West New York now even has a bilingual PTA bulletin.

Mr. President, the West New York experiment has already helped 194 children, and there has not been a single problem of delinquency or segregation. To help other communities learn from this experience, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of an article from the Hudson Dispatch of last October and an excellent summary of results by John J. White, Jr., superintendent of schools in West New York.

There being no objection, the article and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO GEAR NEW WEST NEW YORK PROGRAM FOR SPANISH PUPILS

West New York Board of Education last night began a program to help Spanish-speaking students in the school system learn American customs and manner of conversation.

John White, school superintendent, said that there are 149 Spanish-speaking students in West New York schools. Most of them are between the ages of 8 and 15 and study in classes in the 3d and 8th grade levels.

In the past, they have received special tutoring after school hours by two West New York teachers. But the marked increase in Spanish-speaking students has resulted in the new program.

Superintendent White's plan is to assign three teachers, adept at the Spanish language and customs, to devote full time to the English-language education of the 149 youngsters.

The board agreed to the plan and advised White to begin action immediately.

He will begin screening the township teachers roster today to select the trio who will aid the Latin element of the community.

White explained that there has been a marked increase in Spanish-speaking students and, the present educational system must be revised to aid these children.

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

In the town of West New York, N.J. located within the greater metropolitan area where there has been a tremendous influx of Puerto Rican and Cuban famillities within the past 2 years the adjustment and orientation of the non-English speaking child is showing notable results in a current experimental school program.

The local school authorities acting on the knowledge that educational and sociological problems are the natural products of the inability to communicate, resolved to deal with the situation at once.

Two regular grade teachers, Mrs. Miriam Goldstein and Mrs. Audrey Lebow, who have a working knowledge of Spanish were assigned to study the problem full time. A month's survey of general conditions in the metropolitan area, attendance at full day conferences of the Puerto Rican Commonwealth in Columbia University and New York University, meetings with the committee of the New York City Board of Education for the Puerto Rican study, observation of classes in English as a second language, all revealed the fact that time was of the essence and that the improvement of a teacher-parent-child-community relationship finds its best solution in bringing to a minimum the language barrier.

A program to achieve this was established in October of 1962. Children remained in the classrooms to which they had been assigned so that they might share in such subjects as music, art, physical education, home economics and woodshop and thus become well integrated within their own age group. But for an hour daily they have been attending a special subject known as English as a second language. This course is being given by the two teachers who made the original survey and who are continuing their education in this field after hours. Because there was great diversity of intelligence, social background and intellect, the criterion for grouping was age level. (In the case of the Cuban children many had been withdrawn from the schools in Cuba rather than have them submit to Communist indoctrination. In some cases they had been deprived of almost 2 years of school.) Four groups daily are handled by each of the teachers in different schools.

The course favors the aural oral approach which is the manner in which young people learn their native language. However the older group (ages 15 to 17) progressed to the writing of masterful compositions.

Materials used were a battery of bilingual texts, English as a second language series, source references from the Puerto Rican study, musical instruments, pictures, tape recorders, a complete telephone communication system set up by the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. and other audiovisual aids all directed to giving knowledge and confidence in the use of English. Although speech patterns and linguistics are the principal business of each period a considerable amount of time is given to social adjustment.

Children and their teachers are encouraged to use the non-English department as a means of communication with the family. Parents write notes to say that they are eager for information about homework, discipline, health and safety habits. They attend meetings of the PTA whose bulletin is now bilingual and whose meetings are equipped to meet with those who cannot speak English. There is set aside a period each day when students may come for special guidance and questions. Some of the families are Negro. There appears to be complete acceptance and unquestioned integration among the children in school and at the general meetings.

One hundred ninety-four children received this help. It has been possible within 10 months to make many worthwhile adjustments. Twenty-seven of these children are graduating and considered well prepared to enter the local high school. Seventy-two others have, during the course of the term, been gradually elevated to their own age grade level. Of the remaining 95 there has been considerable improvement and further adjustments are anticipated next fall.

To continue their summer training, book lists have been provided on the law reading high interest level. Field trips to the local library, instruction in the Dewey decimal system and a knowledge of privilege and responsibility have been provided and a very large number of these children are now regular borrowers.

There is not a single problem of delinquency or segregation. Each period opens with the national anthem and the salute to the flag and these are met with pleasant alacrity. It appears that the town of West New York may set an example in understanding to the Nation.

JOHN J. WHITE, JR.,
Superintendent of Schools.

JUNE 1963.

Reserve Officers Serving in the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, all of us are aware that sitting with us in this body is a large number of our colleagues who have served in the armed services, some of them wearing decorations for extraordinary valor in combat, and all of them committed and dedicated to additional service in the uniform of their country should the necessity arise.

The Nation honors those who have served in time of peril. All of us recognize that they, alongside millions of their fellow citizens, have done their part to preserve our freedoms.

Members of Congress are drawn from all walks of life. In our Nation, the broad base of our citizenry also is the broad base of our military service.

There is no element in our citizenry, nor any favored group which is exempt from military service in time of mobilization.

Significant service is being rendered today by Members of Congress who also maintain their positions, and their proficiency, in the Reserve Forces.

These Members of Congress, in the event of a national emergency, are subject to call to take their places in the armed services.

We would regret to see them leave this body, even temporarily, but we would honor them for so doing, as we honor them today for their voluntary commitment to do so.

The Reserve Officers Association of the United States, at its recent national convention, took note of these facts, and adopted a resolution to place in the National "Minute Man" Memorial Building, a congressional hall in the ROA Building that will be constructed here in the District of Columbia. This patriotic resolution enunciates principles I am sure we can all embrace.

The Reserve Officers Association is to be commended for calling public attention to congressional service in the Armed Forces Reserves, and in planning to establish permanent recognition of this dedicate group of citizen-reservists of the United States.

The Reserve Officers Association resolution follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 3—RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

CONGRESSIONAL HALL, ROA MEMORIAL BUILDING

Whereas the national defense system of the United States throughout its history has been based upon the principle that every citizen was committed to meet the obligations to service of the Nation when enemy hostilities threatened; and

Whereas Reserve Forces laws of today were enacted in order to maintain this citizen-reservist concept, embracing as it does the will of the United States and her citizenry to resist any threat to the Nation's freedom and democratic way of life; and

Whereas in the noblest spirit of the citizen-reservist tradition the Members of the Congress provided through their lawmaking authority for new and unprecedented obligations for training upon many thousands of men and women of the Reserve Forces of the Nation; and

Whereas the service in the Reserve Forces of Members of the Congress, in the same manner as men and women from every other walk of life in the Nation serve, has been an inspiration to other reservists, a stimulus to the Reserve Forces programs, and an incentive to voluntary service in the Reserves; and

Whereas service in the Reserve Forces requires a high sense of dedication and a genuine personal sacrifice on the part of Members of Congress, as it does every other reservist whose service in the Reserves requires time, energy and talent beyond his civil life calling: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That Members of the National House of Representatives and the Senate, who also serve in the Reserve Forces, are deserving of the gratitude of every citizen; and be it further

Resolved, That, in recognition of the tradition their service exalts, and in praise of their example that no select part of the Nation's citizenry is exempt from an obligation to military service, that we perpetuate a tribute to the citizen-soldier Members of the Congress of the United States by establishing in the Memorial Building a Congressional Hall.

Adopted by the national convention June 14, 1963.

Attest

JOHN T. CARLTON,
Executive Director.

"The Price of Freedom," Discussed by Dr. A. A. Grusendorf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in an address to the Rotary Club in New Braunfels, Tex., on May 22, 1963, Prof. Arthur A. Grusendorf of the Division of Social Sciences of Southwest Texas State College, at San Marcos, Tex., delivered a stirring address on human rights and freedoms which members of his audience have called to my attention.

Dr. Grusendorf's address was entitled "The Price of Freedom." The speech by this Texas educator is timely, so clearly stated and so well directed toward the great struggle for human liberty in which so many of our people are currently engaged, that I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRICE OF FREEDOM

(By Arthur A. Grusendorf)

Human society is a vast stream of experience involving a complex pattern of human relations. The question of the position and role of the individual in this stream has been given a great deal of thought since ancient times. The focal point in this question concerns itself with considerations of independence versus dependence, of rights of the individual and the limitations imposed upon them by society, and, ultimately, of individual human freedom. The answer to the question of the relation of individual to society has been stated in a variety of ways in different societies at different times since the beginning of history. It is not the purpose of this talk to review the history of thought which embodies the answers to the question raised. It is the purpose, rather, to restate the answer to this question which the founders of this Nation formulated—the answer which has through the years since the beginning of this Nation provided the foundation for the American dream. This is the dream which has been spelled out as the "American Creed," which derives its substance from the Declaration of Independence and the preamble to the Constitution of the United States. In the Declaration of Independence it is stated, among other things, that—

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such forms, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

In the preamble to the Constitution it is stated that—

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Thus, we have before us, in simplest terms, the answer to the question of human freedom—the blessings of liberty—and the way by which it is to be secured, namely, by government, duly constituted, in accordance with the will of the people themselves.

The title of this talk is "The Price of Freedom." This expression implies that freedom is not something that is either naturally assured to all men or automatically maintained in human society. The creation of a nation of free men, who proposed to provide the consent for the establishment of government and its continued operation, required the best that men could give in thought and effort. So, also, will freedom, and the other values cherished by free men, endure only as a result of continued thought and effort. Freedom cannot ever be taken for granted, as there are always those who would destroy it for others in order to secure for themselves the powers by which they would subjugate the will of other men to their own—to usurp for themselves the power to deny the full exercise of constitutional rights and freedom to others. This is a constant threat, and it is posed not only by external powers but also by special interest groups within this Nation which would destroy human freedom through subversion or force. Those are the groups which always represent the fringes, either on the extreme left or the extreme right. Those are the groups which place themselves outside the limits of that great concourse of dedicated Americans of good will whose lives exemplify the American Creed in action and the hope of the future of this Nation.

With this brief statement of the philosophy of human freedom and how it was intended to be secured for the people of the United States, and with a reminder that freedom is not self-perpetuating, but is ever in danger of being destroyed by forces from without and from within, I shall now turn briefly to a consideration of the basic means at hand for making certain that we shall continue to enjoy the freedom we know and cherish, and which is the rightful heritage of all the people of the United States.

The first of these means, I am convinced, is education, of which public education is the corner stone. Free people are educated people—that is, people who understand (1) the nature and meaning of their social and political philosphy and (2) the forms that the enemies of freedom take, whether they are external or internal. We hear a great deal today of the need for more and better trained technicians, e.g., scientists and engineers. Perhaps we shall all agree concerning this need. But I know of no area of human affairs in relation to which we need to do a more realistic job of educating than the area of human relations. Education which fosters the growth of human freedom and the concept of human dignity has to do with bringing an understanding and an appreciation of the very principles of the inalienable rights of man and human freedom within the framework or organized society. In short, we need to educate the generations as they come and go to understand and appreciate the values that are basic to the life purposes of free men. If we are fortunate enough to live out the normal life span, we should understand the human values that made our lives worthwhile. If we are to die for our country, as hundreds of thousands have done, we must make sure that we understand why we give our lives. We must make sure that we know that the values we are asked to defend with our very lives are the values that are within reach of all Americans, regardless of race, creed, or former nationality. Needless to say, men have been required to make the supreme sacrifice for something less than that.

There is another aspect of the fundamental education of freemen who propose to remain free. I refer here to the need for understanding the techniques that are employed by external forces; e.g., world communism, on the one hand, and on the other hand those that are empolyed by the various special groups which are organized, often secretly, ostensibly for the purpose of advancing "true Americanism," when in reality they are working, through various means of propaganda, to undermine the confidence of unsuspecting citizens in their government, especially the Federal Government of the United States. Our education for freedom must include a knowledge of the purposes held and techniques employed by all such groups, and the insight and the courage to recognize them for what they are in the light of what they do.

The second means whereby we can strengthen freedom in this country is to cooperate with others of good will in the task of extending to all Americans the same rights and freedoms which we may have enjoyed, almost as a matter of course. There are yet several million Americans, representing a variety of so-called minority groups, for whom the dream of full partnership in the enjoyment of human freedom still awaits fulfillment. I need not go into great detail here, as everyone in this presence knows quite well the bitter struggle that so many Americans are still carrying on against an almost unsurmountable wall of resistance which has been built through long established traditions. The questions to which those people await favorable answers are, When will it be that every American of voting age may freely participate in elections? When will it be that the children of all American citizens will have equal access to the total program of public schools in this Nation? When will it be that the doors of essential economic opportunity will be open to every American citizen on the basis of his personal merits and capabilities? When will it be, in short, that the inspiring sentiments which are embodied in the American creed, enunciated in the Declaration of Independence, the preamble to the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitution itself, including the amendments that together stand as the Bill of Rights, will take on true meaning for every American?

The answers to those questions will not come easily, as there are many Americans—good people—who have never really awakened to the fact that the very freedoms they cherish can really be made secure for the generations yet to come only as those freedoms can be extended to all those who have the right to know themselves as Americans. There are serious difficulties involved in the extension of human rights and a realization of human freedom by all the people of this Nation, but let us not be deterred in our efforts, through constitutionally ordained institutions, to extend those values to the people throughout the length and breadth of our country. By these institutions we mean our governments, local, State, and Federal. The efforts to extend to all Americans the possibility of the exercise of the inalienable rights and the enjoyment of the blessings of liberty, which are blatantly characterized by some as "Communist inspired," are completely justified by the American creed and the fundamental law of this land.

This, then, I submit, is a part of the price that is endlessly required to keep America free. We are constrained to reiterate here the dictum that "Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom." It is up to this generation to make certain that its vigilance is guided by intelligence and a renewed dedication to those values which alone can ennoble the spirits of all men.

Education, Not Violence, Is Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Congress an article by James A. Hood which appeared in the July 3 issue of the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer. James Hood is one of the two Negro students admitted to the University of Alabama last month. This article was first published in the Crimson-White, the student newspaper at the university. It represents his reflections upon the problem of racial unrest and his first days at Tuscaloosa.

The comments in this article represent a thoughtful voice of moderation which fulfills a genuine public need at a time when responsible leadership is required in both the Negro and white communities of the North and the South.

The article is as follows:

EDUCATION, NOT VIOLENCE, IS ANSWER

(By James A. Hood)

As a result of recent experiences in my life, I have taken a careful look at racial relations and have concluded that the protest movements have resulted in, literally, a big, unnecesary mess.

With our Nation on the brink of racial violence, there is a firm need for a solution which will not only meet the demands of the Negro, but will also make him meet the demands of society. In order for one to be accepted in a society he must meet certain standards in accordance with that society in which he is seeking a position. He must not only seek to get into that society but also he must have something to offer it. He must upgrade the status of that society in becoming a part of it.

My point is this: Basically, I think the whole idea of protests has gotten off course. I think it has become a matter of excitement rather than conviction for most Negroes.

Why doesn't the Negro wake up and go about this thing in a more intelligent way? The answer to that comes with these questions: Who benefits from the conflict, the Negro masses or the Negro leaders? Who would lose prestige and money if another way were chosen?

There must be some more positive way of achieving first-class citizenship, a way without violence or protests. I think there is.

It is the same method employed to increase the standards of a community; the same system which assures one of implantation of ideas. By now you have guessed the answer: Education.

The protest movement should be centered on educational objectives rather than immediate social and economic objectives such as sit-ins and swim-ins, and so forth. It is my belief that through education, the sit-ins and swim-ins will be unnecessary. There must be more time spent in the classrooms and less time wasted on picket lines.

My solution to the problem is a long-range one, but I am confident it will resolve the individual differences of both races, and stabilize relations between opposing forces. Inasmuch as I propose a solution, frowned on by a majority of my race, I feel that many people will consider my ideas weird. My position will make me unpopular with the masses of my people, but that has no relevance with what I believe and how I feel.

But education itself will not and cannot occur overnight. It demands the tough of the toughest, and the concern of the concerned.

It is not a one-way affair but a two-way street on which both parties must travel at the same rate of speed in pursuit of the same destination, if there is to be harmony at the traffic light.

The Protestant Desegregation Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Shreveport Times of Shreveport, La., has printed in its June 30, 1963, issue a comprehensive and penetrating editorial containing excerpts from a news release by the National Council of Churches on its efforts to desegregate America. This editorial is entitled, "The Protestant Desegregation Drive." In view of the information contained in this editorial, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROTESTANT DESEGREGATION DRIVE

The National Council of Churches, comprising the national organizational bodies of 31 American Protestant denominations with 40 million members, has launched a campaign to completely desegregate the entire American way of life.

The NCC says it will seek joint action with Roman Catholic and Jewish leadership forces, thus trying to throw leadership of all God-believing religion in the United States into an effort to integrate what it calls the "segregated pattern of American life" in all of its phases. This presumably would mean social as well as economic and educational desegregation.

The NCC General Board has organized and will finance a 28-member emergency Commission on Race and Religion, with a professional staff, which will carry on what the New York Times describes as the biggest effort of the National Council since its organization in 1950.

The NCC publicity releases state that the emergency commission will turn to "direct action" and organize "demonstrations" in a program intended to bring complete capitulation on the entire segregation front in every American community and every part of American life instead of centering—as in the past—on bringing about compliance with Federal court orders.

The wording of the publicity releases raises the question of whether the biggest Protestant church organization in the world is moving toward full support of future Negro demonstrations of the type which in the past have brought violence, including knifings and beatings by and of both races, and which have been accompanied by three murders; demonstrations which have taken place violently or peacefully in more than 20 nonsouthern communities as well as some 2 dozen in the South.

PUTS CHURCHES BEHIND NEGRO STREET ACTION

In its announcements, the NCC does not use the word "street" in its statement that it will organize demonstrations whenever they are considered to be needed. But no one can think of demonstrations in support of the "do it right now" activities and demands of national Negro organizations these days without assuming that street demonstrations are meant.

The NCC also announces that its big drive will cooperate with the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). This is a rather new Negro youth organization which supposedly furthers Negro registration but which actually has been a spearhead in taking desegregation out of the courts and into the streets, where violence has erupted repeatedly.

The SNCC and the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) call their transfer of race issues from the courts to the streets "direct action"—the phrase the NCC now uses along with demonstrations.

Thus, the NCC, whether by intent or not, has tied itself into future organization and furtherance of demonstrations and direct action, and into support of the SNCC, all of which currently means street demonstrations which up to now repeatedly have brought violence.

No one in the world ever would accuse the NCC or anyone connected with it or any other church group—Protestant or otherwise—of taking any step with intent to incite racial violence. But the implications of what has been announced officially by the National Council of Churches' General Board and its new Commission on Race and Religion, certainly are far from the teachings of Christianity and cannot be interpreted otherwise.

MARTIN LUTHER KING FEATURED BY NCC

The NCC publicity release announcing formation of the commission emphasized in its second paragraph that Martin Luther King, president of the Negro Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), had attended meetings for formation of the commission and would be a member of it. The Southern Christian Leadership Conference has joined with the SNCC and CORE in moving race issues from the courts to the streets in opposition to the long-established policy of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). The latter has insisted throughout the years that all such issues must be settled in accordance with law and order—in the courts.

CORE, SNCC, and SCLC are the advocates of "everything now" and "unconditional surrender" on the entire American segregation front, and it is in the phraseology of these organizations that the National Council of Churches has couched announcement of its own plans.

The new emergency commission on race and religion has the Right Reverend Arthur Lichtenberger, presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, as chairman, but it is understood that he is a sick man and will not be able to direct the work actively. Active direction will be chiefly under a vice chairman, Rev. Dr. Eugene Carson Blake of Philadelphia, Stated Clerk (highest church office) of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. With him as co-vice-chairman will be Rt. Rev. Julian B. Smith of Chicago, ranking bishop of the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church, and Mrs. J. Fount Tillman of Lewisburg, Tenn., president of the woman's division of the Methodist Church. Bishop Smith and Mrs. Tillman are vice presidents of the National Council and Dr. Blake is a past president of it.

NCC LEADER ASKS FOR DIRECT ACTION

Dr. Blake, acting as spokesman for the commission and seemingly for the board, also in the first publicity announcements said that the "direct action" (his words) which the board specifically demanded in setting up the Commission, would include "demonstrations" and that this meant "being on the receiving end of a firehose." (Dr. Blake's words.)

Being on the receiving end of a firehose in street demonstrations these days means moving against or refusing to obey law enforcement officers and directly implies violation of laws, or of authority created by law.

Thus the NCC launches its drive for complete desegregation of American life with official boast that it is ready to flout law and order—in the streets of every major city in the Nation if need be to gain its ends.

An NCC publicity release had this to say about the general board's action in setting up the emergency commission:

"The commission is authorized to call for 'demonstrations' in 'every major city in the United States' to be organized by local councils of churches, churchwomen and churchmen in order to witness our determination that the church shall be fully involved in a continuing effort to change the segregated pattern of American life."

Dr. Blake further said—using his own words—"we must mobilize in all communities in all the strength we can muster for immediate steps to desegregate the segregated pattern of American life. Further, we must face the fact that this may be costly to the churches, but we are pledged to put our strength on the line."

The NCC has made the Reverend Dr. Jon L. Regier Chief of Staff of the new commission. Dr. Regier appointed Carl Zeitlow of New York, director of the National Student Christian Federation's Ecumenical Voluntary Service, as full time youth director for the commission, with the announcement that the NSCF is "the national council's organization of Christian college students and is also related to the YMCA and YWCA movements." The 10 million high school age members of the NCC-related United Christian Youth Movement will work under Dr. Zietlow, it was said.

YOUTH ON THE MARCH GET NCC APPROVAL

Dr. Regier, in the NCC announcements is quoted as saying: "The day of goldfish swallowing and joining 'phony' organizations is past. The young people involved in the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee have taught American citizens the true meaning of commitment."

The NCC announcement goes on to say that Dr. Zietlow warned that "adults must not be frightened of youth on the march," and that "lethary, moderation, and fear on the part of adults create nothing but frustration for the youth of the Nation."

In another NCC publicity release, J. Irwin Miller of Columbus, Ind., layman president of the National Council of Churches, called on all Protestant churches to "commit all funds that can be useful" to the cause of complete American desegregation. He urged "all church members to engage in negotiations, demonstrations and direct action, if needed, in situations of racial tension"—Mr. Miller's own words.

NOTE.—All factual data as to the National Council of Churches and all words or phrases attributed to individuals in the above are taken from official NCC publicity releases 60GA June 6, 1963, 64GA June 17, 1963, and 67GA June 19, 1963, or from the text of the NCC general board's statement.

Charles A. "Nick" Swain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, "service" is a single word that best describes Kiwanis International, and it is the word most applicable to the new president of Kiwanis, Charles A. "Nick" Swain, of Cape May, N.J.

His election a few days ago as president gave all New Jerseyites good reason to be proud, but the most hearty expression of pride came from a front-page editorial in the Cape May Star and Wave on July 4. This excellent weekly newspaper offered more than congratulations; it also gave a good description of the many good works "Nick" Swain has performed for Kiwanis and his community, and it helps us understand the high standards of service that Kiwanis expects from its leaders and its members. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLES A. "NICK" SWAIN

During its long and storied history Cape May has had more than its share of outstanding citizens, those who by dint of their initiative, foresight, determination, and potential have achieved an uncommon recognition and prominence, a standing which reflects the standing and prestige they have deservedly reached. Standing in the forefront of those, past and present, who have realized their fullest potential, is Charles A. Swain, president of Kiwanis International. "Nick," as he is known to his legion of friends, has demonstrated a success story which, in our opinion, is one of epic proportions, and a saga of accomplishment worthy of the highest praise and commendation.

Nick Swain, to those of us who have been privileged to know him, who have witnessed his constant alertness to opportunities for community service, is a person of great sincerity and devotion to his ideals. It is through these qualities which he has exemplified during his lifetime, that yesterday climaxed in his being installed to the highest position possible in a great, worldwide service organization.

It is difficult to pay just tribute to "Nick" for his monumental accomplishment. To recount his almost incredible number of Kiwanis activities which span more than 35 years, which have witnessed his assuming practically every known committee chairmanship and office on a local, area, State, National, and international level, is nearly impossible, although we have attempted in a news feature in this edition to illustrate his past and present contributions to Kiwanis.

Simplicity itself might in some way define the matchless Kiwanis record of Nick Swain in a word—"service." This service he has rendered in a dynamic, public-interested way in a highly diversified area of endeaver.

Identified with the progress of Cape May all his life, where he was born and raised, he has distinguished himself not only in Kiwanis, where he has successfully and deservedly scaled the peak, but in the business life in which he has been and is a driving and successful force. From his work in the church, to a hospital's board of governors, to Baysea District Boy Scout activity, to a continuing and ever-widening sphere of civic, fraternal, educational, youth, and religious activities, Swain has personified and made his name and reputation with service synonymous.

An ability to get along with people and a tremendous enthusiasm for whatever he is doing at the moment are undoubtedly other factors which led to this crowning achievement, but in the final analysis, we feel that it was the sum total of his personality, his capacity for work, his driving zeal, and his great ability to rise to a challenge that has brought him his distinguished position.

In attaining a milestone of such magnitude, Swain has brought honor and distinction to himself, his family, his many friends, to the community where he has served so well, and to his fellow Kiwanians everywhere.

Cape May has much to be proud of in its history. One of its proudest possessions is its people, and those, more particularly, who have progressed to great heights, those who have by their competence and capacity reached heights of distinction well beyond the average. Such a person is Nick Swain, one whose goal was realized, who strove mightily in the finest tradition of the American success story of a smalltown fellow who achieved the pinnacle in his chosen service.

All of us, individually and collectively, are extremely proud of him. We share in his good fortune and his memorable elevation to the Kiwanis International presidency. His distinguished records in one of the world's most highly respected service organizations has been deservedly recognized.

To "Nick" we offer our heartiest, sincere congratulations and wish for him many more years of community service, with the full realization that he will guide Kiwanis International during the next year along the paths of continued progress and forthright leadership.

Memorial Day Address of Daniel Edward Lampert, Commander Daniel E. Geagan Post No. 98, the American Legion, Brewer, Maine, Given at the Annual Memorial Day Luncheon Program of the Bangor-Brewer Lions Club, Bangor House, Bangor, Maine, on Wednesday, May 29, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD a Memorial Day address delivered by Daniel E. Lambert. Mr. Lambert is commander of Daniel E. Geagan Post No. 98, the American Legion. He is a veteran of the famed Darby Rangers of World War II—and he is an ardent present-day patriot.

Mr. Lambert's presentation is timely, touching on some vital challenges and problems that presently confront our free America.

I comend Mr. Lambert's address and his keen observations to the attention of my colleagues:

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS OF DANIEL EDWARD LAMBERT, COMMANDER DANIEL E. GEAGAN POST NO. 98, THE AMERICAN LEGION, BREWER, MAINE, GIVEN AT THE ANNUAL MEMORIAL DAY LUNCHEON PROGRAM OF THE BANGOR-BREWER LIONS CLUB, BANGOR HOUSE, BANGOR, MAINE, ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 29, 1963

My friends, we gather today to pay tribute to the fallen heroes of this Nation, the Nation which now stands before all the world as a beacon of life and liberty—to the free and the enslaved nations.

This Memorial Day, the observance of which is a sacred trust to all citizens of the Nation, is so important in the life of our America for we believe we must know our past in order that we might fully appreciate the blessings that have accrued to us as a free nation. From that knowledge may we draw the new courage to face the challenges of the present and new determination to meet fearlessly and with confidence, any challenge which tomorrow may bring.

We believe that the observance of Memorial Day assumes new significance with the passing of years. Today a new generation of America stands at the threshold of maturity. From their numbers will come the leaders of America of tomorrow—those to whom we shall soon surrender the held of the ship of state. We have learned from experience that the march of time obliterates many memories, and we know that this rising generation has no firsthand knowledge of the horror of war. For this, we are eternally thankful to our God, and our fervent prayer is that such a fate never shall befall our youth.

Yet we believe it to be the solemn obligation of those who have lived through our Nation's wars to take this and every other occasion which is made available to us, to remind this Nation—youth and adult alike—of the sacrifices that has been required to kin and preserve the priceless heritage which we share this day. They must know that the blood of every generation of the history of our Nation has been shed to preserve this precious freedom which is ours.

It is a sad commentary and cruel indictment of our democratic way of life that the fact remains that only in death are most men found to be equal. Those who pause today to honor the dead of all wars of our Nation come to honor them not as white, colored, yellow—Catholic, Protestant, Jew—Irish, Polish, Italian, or even Indian—but rather as equal citizens in death for a noble cause—freedom and liberty for all.

Those who pause today at the Tombs of the Unknowns in Washington, and throughout the world in our military cemeteries do so out of a respect for the dead—with prayerful wish that their souls may be united with the Father of all mankind—no distinction is made here either with race, creed or color.

Yet on the American scene this Memorial Day, the streets of some of our southern cities and towns run red with the blood of both white and colored citizens—locked in combat, riot, and street fighting over the problems of civil rights now being denied to our colored citizens—and worst riots are yet to come.

Unless we realize that our honored dead fought and died to give liberty to all, the denial of rights to some of our citizens continues to mock the sacrifice of the patriots of our Nation, we cannot call ourselves Americans, and yet deny to our fellow Americans, rights, opportunities, and freedom to pursue their own destiny and to seek the full benefits of citizenship under our Constitution. Some may have us believe that freedom is only for the few; the same people would deny liberty to all, if the opportunity presented itself; we fall prey to the petty dictators in our Nation when we listen to the siren song of bias and prejudices.

The children and youth of our Nation must recoil in horror when after reading the stirring story contained in the book "The Diary of Ann Frank" to look up and see on the American scene this Memorial Day, a group of strutting young Nazis—American Nazis—who wear the uniform and insignia the same contained in that memorable book. How long must we in this Nation engage ourselves with the idea that liberty is license to do as one pleases? How long are we to permit these groups who seek to subvert and destroy our great Nation to roam about doing the work of the devil? How long are we to have a double standard of denial of rights to some citizens because of color and yet the full and free exercise of democracy to others who seek to destroy us?

There are others on the American scene this Memorial Day who seek to create national, racial, or religious groups for the sole purpose of dividing our Nation, destroying the free exercise of religious freedom and tearing down the democratic process of our Government. They seek to remove God from the people, and cynics that they are, they convince themselves and others that they are operating under the constitutional rights of free citizens, and others join the parade hoodwinked into believing this false idea of subversion through deception.

Anyone or group who seeks to divide our Nation by racial, religious, or color barrier—anyone who seeks to promote one group above another at the price of freedom or national unity—seeks to destroy the Nation and should not be allowed to operate under the guise of American. We have outlawed the Communist conspiracy in our Nation. Is it not time to call a spade, a spade, with some of our other crackpot groups?

We cannot continue to battle for freedom and liberty at the frontline of world opinion and yet have division and destruction to our bulwarks of freedom here at home. We cannot allow groups to destroy the Nation and our love of God, flag, and country under the false doctrine of "We can do anything that we like to do." We cannot win the battle against communism in Africa and South America by denying to our colored fellow citizens the precious rights of full citizenship and opportunity here at home.

Let us honor our gallant dead of all wars of the Nation and indeed this Memorial Day let us include the recent dead of the U.S.S. *Thresher* (submarine) calling upon Almighty God to bless our land and continue to guide us and let us build in our hearts and minds a living memorial by our dedication to the promotion of citizenship for all Americans equal opportunity to all with the fellowship and common good of all Americans in our hearts. Let us make this blessed land of America a shrine of freedom for all who believe in freedom, justice, and democracy.

But above all let us guard our freedom and preserve our Nation by halting the spread of communism at home and all other "isms" that seek to subvert or destroy our America "the land of the free and the home of the brave."

"Lord God of hosts—Be with us yet—lest we forget."

"Lest we forget." We do not dare forget this Memorial Day.

Thank you and may God bless you.

The Clan Macleay Pipe Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to pay tribute to the dedicated public service of the Clan Macleay Bagpipe Band of Portland, Oreg. This band, founded in 1927 and associated with Clan Macleay, a Scottish fraternal group organized in 1894, participates in many public functions including fund-raising drives for worthy charitable organizations.

The band's pipe major, Mr. Newton Muir, has led his colorful organization along the parade route of Portland's famed Rose Festival, as well as the annual revival of the Highland Games in in British Columbia.

The unique strains of the pipers have been heard on summer evenings during the park bureau's festival in the wooded amphitheater of Washington Park.

In connection with this reawakening of interest in Scotland and Scottish activities, I ask consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of July 2, 1963, by Suzanne Richards entitled "Scots Don Kilts for Highland Games."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCOTS DON KILTS FOR HIGHLAND GAMES

(By Suzanne Richards)

A bit of Scotland will invade the Lewis and Clark College campus Saturday for the 11th annual Scottish Highland Games. Bagpipers will parade, athletes will compete in the hammer throw and the tug of war and dancers will don their best kilts and perform the Highland fling.

The games may be a once-a-year event but the practice that goes into them consumes many an hour. This is especially true of the dancers, who will number 100 this year.

Competition is standardized and stiff. Dancers not only must know the steps and movements but must be costumed appropriately. Originally dances and costumes were handed down from generation to generation in a Scottish family. Time has changed much of this. Young Scots living in America today learn their dances from teachers and buy their costumes ready made.

Perhaps the best known of the dances to be performed Saturday is the Highland fling. Many of its steps and positions are taken from the sword dance which dates to the year 1000. A strenuous and exciting dance, it is only in the past 4 years that girls have costumes different from the boys when executing the fling.

They wear the bright kilts which are remnants of the clan system when men wore tartans to identify them with their clan. With the kilt the girls wear a white blouse under a simple jacket which picks up a predominant color in the kilt. Knee hose and soft leather dancing slippers complete the costume.

The boys' outfits consist of the kilt, the plaid (worn over the shoulder), a simplified jacket, feathered bonnet, and sporran (the Scotsman's purse) worn around the waist.

Among the other Scotch dances to be performed are the Strathspey and Highland reel, with four dancers competing against another group of four. "The Flora McDanal's Fancy" portrays in dance the story of a patriotic Scots woman who became a national heroine when she helped Bonnie Prince Charlie escape his would-be assassins.

Variety won't be lacking in the Gaelic dance, Sean Truibhas; the English, sailor's hornpipe; or the Irish jig. For the "Fancy" dancers wear dirndl-type tartan skirts with velveteen bodices similar to those worn by Scots women. Canadian or British sailor blues are worn for the hornpipe and, naturally enough, "something green" for the Irish jig.

But perhaps the greatest problem of costuming is finding a kilt for the Scottish dances. Since it is a little difficult to walk into a downtown store and ask to see a selection of kilts, most of them are ordered from Scotland. However, for the past 2 years, Portland Scotsmen have been exceptionally fortunate in having Kiltmaker Betty Simpson.

Miss Simpson came to Oregon 2 years ago "just because I wanted to see it." She has been living with a cousin on his farm, which logically enough is named "Heatherbrae." Although she does tailoring for an Oregon City store, she has found time to make more than 20 kilts for her Scottish friends. A tailor in Scotland for 12 years before coming here, Miss Simpson served a 6-year tailoring apprenticeship before she ever made a kilt. It took another 6 months of concentrated work and study to learn the art.

All of her material comes from Scotland and she can whip 4 yards of plaid into a kilt in a day and a half—no minor task, considering that most of the kilts take from 25 to 33 individually matched pleats. The plaids, which must be matched exactly, vary in size and, according to Miss Simpson, the larger the plaid, the harder it is to work with.

But she says her efforts are rewarded by the high praise she receives from the dancers, many of whom will be wearing one of her kilts for the Saturday competition.

Sylacauga, Ala., Famous for White Marble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ted Bryant, a most able reporter for the Birmingham (Ala.) Post-Herald, has written an article about the marble industry in Sylacauga, Ala., which is a part of my old Fourth District. This article appeared in the issue of June 26, 1963. Since Alabama marble is used in our Capitol, the Supreme Court Building, and is also being used in our Rayburn House Office Building, I would like to insert Mr. Bryant's article in the RECORD at this point:

SYLACAUGA FAMOUS FOR WHITE MARBLE

(By Ted Bryant)

SYLACAUGA, June 25.—All over the United States and in many parts of the world, Sylacauga is represented by the pure white marble the earth yields near here.

And in many items eaten or used in the household every day, Sylacauga is represented by a byproduct of the marble—calcium carbonate.

The marble industry here dates back to the turn of the century and promises to be around at the turn of the next couple of centuries.

Along with textiles, marble has helped provide the economic stronghold for this area.

SAYS FUTURE BRIGHT

Curtis Liles, president of the chamber of commerce, described marble as "a very substantial industry in the past and has a bright future for a continued growth."

Naming a few places where Sylacauga structural marble has been used, Liles listed the Supreme Court Building and the Washington Monument in Washington, D.C.; Al Jolson's shrine, Los Angeles; a step in the flagstone walk at the Little White House in Warm Springs, Ga., and the Woolworth Building in Texas.

Calcium carbonate, ground marble in this case, is used in food as a bone builder, paint to fortify its wearing characteristics, tile, phonograph records, chewing gum, rubber products, plastics, putty, calking compound and a long list of other products.

However, calcium carbonate also comes from a number of other sources such as limestone fields, oyster beds or from any source of white stone that is high in calcium carbon.

HIGH QUALITY

The marble byproduct from here, however, is of high quality because of its whiteness and can be used in some cases—white paints, for instance—where a darker shade could not be used.

Operating currently are three marble companies that employ an estimated 300 persons.

Moretti-Harrah Marble Co. and Georgia Marble Co., which recently merged with Alabama Marble Co., produce both structural marble and calcium carbonate, while Thompson Weinman & Co. quarries only the byproduct.

The chief competition with the local product is from foreign countries, particularly Italy, according to J. S. Wilkins, official of the Moretti-Harrah Co. Marble can be quarried cheaper in other countries than locally.

Although the marble companies began producing calcium carbonate in the 1930's, and it is used extensively, structural marble still makes up the biggest portion of Moretti-Harrah's business, Wilkins said.

STAIRSTEP PATTERN

Structural marble is quarried by cutting 15- to 30-ton blocks in a stairstep pattern down into the quarry. These are hauled to the surface by huge cranes and sold by the cubic foot. On marble slabs that are less than 2 inches thick, the price is set by the number of square feet.

Moretti-Harrah has been digging in the same quarry for 55 years, Wilkins said. In places, the quarry now is 175 feet deep and the marble goes down for at least another 200 feet.

Wilkins said the company already has mapped out the marble it plans to quarry within the next 100 years.

One of the partners that started the Moretti-Harrah Co. was Giuseppe Moretti, a foremost sculptor of his day, who became interested in Sylacauga marble while he was in Birmingham to supervise the casting of the Vulcan statue.

Wilkins pointed out a small, wooden shack in which Moretti would spend days at a time carving marble. During these days, Moretti would receive food and water through a small opening beside the shack's door.

Today, the building, perched at the edge of a deep quarry, is used as a storage house by the company.

Payments-Deficit Problem and Gold Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Financial Blind Spot," by Henry J. Taylor, published in the Washington Daily News on July 8.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINANCIAL BLIND SPOT

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The biggest single tip President Kennedy gave worried Western statesmen abroad stayed out of our headlines entirely.

The underground alarm has spread out of the Adenauer meeting in Bonn and a gratuitous statement by Mr. Kennedy to the West German press.

He informed the Chancellor that the United States is preparing another new plan asking Europe's aid in our payments-deficit problem and gold crisis.

The first dismay arose from an apparent failure to realize, or at least to recognize, that were it not for the aid already given by Europe's central banks the New Frontier performance would already have forced the United States off the gold standard.

Mr. Kennedy stated in Bonn: "If the monetary problems are not solved they are going to master us." He is a good deal more right than when he stated in a campaign speech in October 1960, "our balance of payments will be strong and we can cease to worry about the outflow of gold."

Our gold crisis is as much a problem of confidence as a problem in payments. So long as Mr. Kennedy insists on the overspending he calls "planned deficits," our creditors abroad know that, if he does not reverse this, no matter what he or anyone else says that policy is heading us smack toward the devaluation of the dollar. In fact, just Chancellor Adenauer and President de Gaulle could pull the plug on the New Frontier tomorrow morning.

Solvency is more a matter of attitude than income. If a man, woman, or enterprise's attitude toward money and debt is unsound or irresponsible it makes no difference how much income is received. They never have enough—and never will. Many a debt-ridden husband has learned this from a spend-spend wife the hard way.

Last year the administration collected $102,466,252,087 in taxes. Of this amount $65,377,533,010 came from citizens. And of that figure, $48,891,395,741 was withheld, and never even seen by the earners who worked for the colossal sum. In addition, corporations collected $21,846,608,441 for Washington.

Yet no matter what the taxpayers' sacrifices are or what the total tax take, the red ink grows and splashes and deepens. This is fact that concerns Europe's central banks as it would any other creditor.

Apparently Mr. Kennedy has an absolute blind spot about money: Where it comes from, how you must save to have any for your security and your family's safety, how people must do without many things to meet their taxes—all these hard lessons are completely outside his lifetime experience. This is no reflection; merely a fact.

As one result, the President neither counts costs carefully and clearly nor shows a noticeable grief for those who have to foot the bills. Otherwise he would not say, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country," and then sanction the most lavish administration in the history of the United States—which becomes more lush and lavish all the time.

Allan Sproul Urges Action on Deficit in Balance of Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the large and persistent deficit in our balance of payments is attracting widespread public interest and is a cause of mounting concern both here and abroad. An article in the June 29 edition of Business Week, for example, reports that Allan Sproul, former President of the Federal Reserve Board of New York, has stated that "top national priority" should be given to attempts to correct the balance-of-payments deficit.

Mr. Sproul who is de facto spokesman for the Business Advisory Council on balance-of-payment problems, is convinced that capital flows must bear the "immediate burden" in removing the deficit, although he rejects the idea of capital issues control. Instead, he suggests a three-pronged approach to the problem, involving monetary policy, fiscal policy, and cost-price policy as well as tightening our foreign and military aid.

Because of my own interest in this problem, I was gratified to note Mr. Sproul's analysis and the fact that it appears to accord with my own approach to eliminating the deficit. I especially agree that the problem should receive top national priority. Senator Javits and I have introduced identical resolutions in the Congress calling for a more vigorous attack on the problem and urging a strengthening of the world monetary system through the International Monetary Fund.

In view of the importance of the issue, under unanimous consent I include this Business Week article in the Record:

Sproul Urges Deficit Attack: Former New York Fed Chief Asks Top Priority on Lag in Balance of Payments

Allan Sproul, former President of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and now an elder stateman of American finance, has called for greater urgency in the Kennedy administration's attack on the persistent deficit in the U.S. balance of payments.

"Top national priority," said Sproul in a speech this month to the American Petroleum Institute, "should be given to its correction. * * * It should not be treated as something wholly subordinate to our international political policies and military programs nor to the demands of the domestic economy. * * * There is a limit to financing the deficit."

Sproul commands national attention when he chooses to speak on financial affairs. In this case he assumes added importance as de facto spokesman for a top level committee of the Business Advisory Council on the balance of payments. The committee has met with Kennedy on the problem, but until now it has not made its views public.

THREE-PRONGED ATTACK

Sproul lays out a tripartite approach involving monetary policy, fiscal policy, and cost-price policy—plus "severe tightening in our foreign military and economic aid." Taxes, says Sproul, should be cut, which would allow the "relatively flexible instrument" of monetary policy to temper the excesses which may be born of fiscal relaxation. Finally, he advocates "mastery of cost-price relationships * * * [as] the third leg of a three-legged stool."

Sproul is convinced that capital flows must bear the immediate burden in adjusting the deficit, but he rejects the notion of capital issues control, whether by legal restriction or moral suasion.

Likewise, Sproul is dubious about the possibility of export expansion. "We shall probably need to do everything we can to promote our exports and to persuade foreign nations to reduce hidden subsidies to their exporters, even to maintain our present position."

Hon. Bob Sikes

SPEECH

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues from Florida in paying tribute to the dean of our delegation, the Honorable Bob Sikes. I have known this great American since we were classmates at the University of Florida in 1929. It is interesting to note that of the 12 Members of the House from Florida, 7 of us are alumni of the University of Florida, and both of our Senators from Florida are likewise alumni of this great institution.

I believe during the days when the Honorable Bob Sikes and I were attending the University of Florida, that there was perhaps no other institution in America whose sons and daughters entered more fully into public life than the alumni of that great institution.

I knew Bob Sikes later as a leader in the field of agriculture. I had the pleasure of being the assistant State 4–H Club director in Florida for a number of years, and in that capacity it was my responsibility to direct our summer camps. For several summers, I visited with the rural youth in their summer camps in west Florida, and on several occasions we had the pleasure of hearing Congressman Sikes give us inspiritional talks. I can well remember on one of these occasions that I had the pleasure of introducing him, and I could not help but think how wonderful it would be if someday I could, likewise, be a Congressman and be so highly considered by the youth of my district as the rural youth honored Congressman Sikes.

I, of course, have known this great American best as a Member of Congress. Upon coming to this great body in 1953, I found Bob Sikes to be constantly helpful in all of the many problems that confronted a freshman Congressman. It is easy for him to be helpful, because he likes people. He has indefatigable energy. He is one of the most cooperative men I have ever known and he extends service to those who call upon him which is truly outstanding, and is a service beyond the call of duty.

We are very proud in Florida of Bob Sikes, and I want to congratulate the the people of his district for sending him here for so many years. I think all of us realize that with more seniority, a good Congressman's opportunities for service are always enhanced. Certainly the gentleman we are honoring today is a good and great Congressman, and I predict his people will continue sending him here as long as he desires to come. All of us devoutly hope that he will never have any other ambition than to be a Congressman, because we, the Members of the delegation, need him here. Florida needs him here. America needs him here.

I should like to extend my congratulations to Bob Sikes and his charming wife, Inez, and to say to our colleague, the Honorable DON FUQUA, how much I appreciate his arranging this opportunity for us to pay tribute to the dean of our delegation.

Braceros

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent article by Victor Riesel on the subject of Braceros.

VEGETABLE GROWERS PAY MIGRATORY WORKERS UP TO $800 A WEEK—BUT LABOR DEPARTMENT REFUSES TO OK BRACEROS

(By Victor Riesel)

In the West the other day I ran into ranchers who raise cantaloupes and vegetables, not cattle, who warned it will cost us back East lots more to eat because they are paying some of the itinerant fruit workers $800, $900, and even $1,000 a week during the season.

I have some average weekly wages for a season of some 7 weeks. The ranchers who supply this payroll data are quite bitter over the spectacular rates forced by labor scarcity at the height of the crops' ripening.

But this bitterness is a soft sigh in a tornado, compared with their anger over the compressional refusal to permit scores of thousands of Mexican nationals to come across the river after December 31 to help pick the fruits and vegetables for the packing and loading sheds. The ranchers say that the cost of hand picking now will rocket to the blazing sun just as did the cost of packing, loading, lidding, and trucking over the years as men were needed all at once for intense and speedy work.

From a California rancher comes the startling news that during the '62 cantaloupe season the average weekly wage came to $337.02 for loaders. For the packers, the average came to $242.75 a week. And for the truckers, $228.11.

I repeat, this is for the short season for the so-called "fruit tramps." So high is this seasonal pay that at least one rancher knows of a chiropractor who has shut his office for a month to work as a melon packer in Yuma, Ariz., during the past 10 years. There are students and school teachers, too.

The outsiders go back to their professions and pursuits. But what of the men—and their families—whose only work is handling the produce? The state of California is good to them. They can receive $55 a week for 39 weeks during the nonharvesting season in unemployment insurance.

Now, say the ranchers to the folks back East, there will be increased costs because the U.S. Government will not permit the some 60,000 to 80,000 braceros needed last year to come in from Mexico to work in the fields. Those in the House of Representatives who pushed through the antibracero vote believed the Mexicans were being exploited and forced into undignified "stoop labor."

The ranchers now ask where the field help will come from. They were thousands short last year. If no domestic farm labor turns up, who will harvest the lettuce, the tomatoes and other vegetables for the tables of the land?

What happens now? Some U.S. growers already are operating in Mexico. Soon there will be runaway ranchers. Below the border, a rancher finds many takers for stoop labor at a dollar a day. At this rate the grower can pack his produce, pay the U.S. tariff and still make money.

But what of those who want to continue ranching in their own country? Some of them simply go out of business. Many of the remaining houses have abandoned the hand-wrap packing system. They've gone to bulk fill—instead of individually wrapping each tomato, the vegetable is poured into a container.

Other growers are doing what comes naturally. You can automate a field as well as a factory.

Now special machines are being developed. In a decade these machines will displace considerable hand labor—a process which is being speeded by the difficulty of obtaining field hands. There must be dignity for labor, and a decent wage, and far more than just tolerable places to live. But with all this must also come an understanding of the economic forces.

Perhaps a committee of Congressmen should go out into the Western sun for a while and talk to all sides right amid those fields which feed a land. It should make a welcome change from Washington and for more justice for both sides.

Religious Freedom in America and the Supreme Court Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most disturbing decisions of the Supreme Court have been those pertaining to prayer and Bible reading in the public schools.

Mrs. Lucile Hosmer, Americanism chairman of the National Federation of Republican Women, recently prepared a report entitled, "Religious Freedom in America and the Supreme Court Decisions," which I am pleased to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mrs. Hosmer's report follows:

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN AMERICA AND THE SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

(By Lucile Hosmer)

Our roots are in the past. We live in the present. What we do, today will determine the future.

Background and documentation relating to the first amendment and the historical foundation upon which this Republic of ours was established will be presented in this report. In the process, also, the intent of the writers of the Constitution will be discussed on the basis of documented material. Please remember that the information related is not personal opinion but facts accumulated as the result of considerable research not only in the early histories but also in contemporary writings on the subject.

Obviously, the decision of the Supreme Court Justices indicate that either these men are woefully ignorant of the fundamental principles upon which this Nation was established or else they are willfully ignoring them because they are devotees of the philosophy of "sociological jurisprudence." This concept of law completely disregards the intent, the motive or the purpose of the writers of the Constitution.

"Sociological jurisprudence" is the attitude that law is the means by which society solves all of its conflicts. This attitude is predicated on the belief that the Constitution is out-dated and out-moded because it was written in a different period than our present one. This belief refuses to acknowledge the fact that in our present period, man is the same as when the Constitution was written: man is motivated in the same way: and man's relationships with other men are the same as when the Constitution was written. These facts, to many students of history and government do not justify the approach in this concept of law as advocated by "sociological jurisprudence" since man, himself has not changed.

Let us look at the facts concerning the Constitution's being as applicable today as when it was written because or since man, (himself as man has not changed.) The Constitution enunciates certain fundamental principles which were designed to protect the "sanctity of the individual": to protect him from the "tyranny of government": to defend or to "secure" (keep from being lost) man's "unalienable rights, given to him by his Creater," to life, to liberty and to property." These protections were to be for all posterity and they are just as valid and just as important, today as they were when the Constitution was written.

The preamble to our Constitution states "We, the people, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." They were not contracting nor stipulating with each other as is sometimes claimed by modern sociologists. They were establishing and ordaining (instituting or setting) a Constitution—a permanent form of government where the powers once given are irrevocable and cannot be resumed or withdrawn at pleasure—a Constitution, though originating in consent, becomes when ratified, obligatory as "fundamental ordinance or law."

(Joseph Story "Commentaries on the Constitution": A constitutional classic, equalled only by the "Federalist.") Story, also says, "Our law is justly deemed certain and founded on permanent principles and not dependent upon the caprice or will of particular judges: a more alarming doctrine could not be promulgated by any American court than that it was at liberty to disregard all former rules and decisions and decide for itself without reference to the settled course of antecedent principles." During the last 187 years since the signing of our Declaration of Independence, "all former rules and decisions, all antecedent principles of the courts have maintained that we are a religious people, whose institutions presuppose the existence of a Supreme Being" (U.S. Supreme Court Decision, 1892).

In October 1789, George Washington had this to say: "The liberty by the people of these States of worshiping Almighty God agreeable to their consciences is not only among their choicest blessings, but also their right. While men perform their social duties faithfully, they do all that society or the State can with propriety demand or expect and remain responsible to their Maker, for the religion or modes of faith which they may prefer to profess."

"The relationship of church and state in the United States secures full liberty of religious thought, speech, and action within the limits of the public peace and order. It makes persecution impossible. Religion and liberty are inseparable," Philip Schaaff, a distinguished historian, author of "Church and State in the United States," 1888.

He continues: "True liberty is a positive force regulated by law; false liberty is a negative force, a release from restraint. True liberty is the moral power of self-government: the liberty of infidels and anarchists carnal licentiousness. The American separation of church and state rests upon respect for the church: the infidel's (today's atheist) separation, on indifference and hatred of religion and the church, itself. * * * The American system grants freedom also to irreligious and infidelity but only within the limits of the order and safety of society. The destruction of religion would be the destruction of morality and the ruin of the State. Religious liberty is not an empty sound but an orderly exercise of religious duties and enjoyments of all its privileges. It is freedom in religion not from religion: as true civil liberty is freedom in law not freedom from law."

He further states: "Republican institutions in the hands of a virtuous and God-fearing nation are the very best in the world, but in the hands of a corrupt and irreligious people, they are the very worst, and the most effective weapons of destruction. An indignant people may rise in rebellion against a cruel tyrant; but who will rise against the tyranny of the people in possession of the ballot box and the whole machinery of government? Here lies our great danger and it is increasing every year. Destroy our churches, close our Sunday schools, abolish the Lord's Day and our Republic would become an empty shell and our people would tend to heathenism and barbarianism" (Washington, p. 212).

George Washington in his "Farewell Address," says the following concerning religion: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion, and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness—these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason, and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

Let me quote from an address by Dean Erwin M. Griswold of the Harvard School of Law, in his address at the University of Utah, in February of 1963. In discussing the "interpretation and application of the first amendment", relating to the New York Prayer Case. He says: "First as to long tradition. Is it not a clear matter of historical fact that this was a Christian nation? Of the immigrants who came to previously British North America, by the time of the adoption of the Constitution, virtually all were Christians, in all degrees and types of persuasion which come within that term. Are the Mayflower Compact, Ann Hutchinson, Cotton Mather, Jonathon Edwards, William Penn and many others no part of our history? It is true that we were a rather remarkable Christian nation, having for various historical and philosophical reasons, developed a tolerance in matters of religion which was at once virtually unique and a tribute to the men of the 17th and 18th centuries who developed the type of thought which came to prevail here. But this was not a purely humanistic type of thought, nor did it deny the importance and significance of religion. It is perfectly true and highly salutary that the first amendment forbade Congress to pass any law 'respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' These are great provisions of great sweep and basic importance. But to say that they require that all trace of religion be kept out of any public activity is sheer invention. Our history is full of these traces: Chaplains in Congress and in the Armed Forces; chapels in prisons; 'In God we trust' on our money; to mention only a few. God is referred to in our national anthem and in 'America' and in many others which may be called our national songs. What about Sunday? What about Christmas? Must we deny our whole heritage, our culture, the things of the spirit and soul which have sustained us in the past and helped bind us together in times of good and bad? Does our deepseated tolerance of all religion—or to the same extent of no religion—require that we give up all religious observance in public activities? Why should it? It certainly never occured to the Founders that it would."

Let us review what some of the Founders, the architects of the Constitution had to say. In April 1789, George Washington said, "It would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act my fervent application to that Almighty Being who rules the universe, who preside in the councils of nations and whose providential aids can supply every human defect, that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States a government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes, and may enable every instrument employed in its administration to execute with success the functions allotted to His charge. In tendering this homage to the Great Author of every public and private good, I assure myself that it expresses your sentiments not less than my own, nor those of my fellow citizens at large than either. No people can be found to acknowledge and adore the Invisible Hand which conducts the affairs more than those of the United States."

On March 4, 1797, President John Adams said: "And may that Being who is supreme over all, Patron of Order, the Fountain of Justice, and the Protector in all ages of the world of virtuous liberty, continue his blessings upon this Nation and Government and give it all possible success and duration consistent with the ends of His providence."

On March 4, 1805, President Thomas Jefferson said: "I shall need too, the favor of the Being in whose hands we are, who led our fathers, as Israel of old, from their native land and planted them in a country flowing with all the necessities and comforts of life, who has covered our infancy with His providence and our riper years with His wisdom and power and to whose goodness I ask you to join in supplication with me that He will so enlighten the minds of your servants, guide their councils and prosper their measures, that whatsoever they shall do shall result in your good and shall secure to you the peace, friendship and approbation of all nations."

Statements of all the other Presidents follow the same line of thought. Historically, it can be proven by the early documents of the Founding Father generation that from the time of the signing of the Mayflower Compact in 1620 (when for the first time in history, men wrote their own laws and agreed to live in obedience to them) "under the guidance of Almighty God" and "by the Grace of God." All during the trials of the Pilgrims in the founding of the Plymouth Plantation (as recorded in Bradford's History); then down to the writing of the first American Constitution in 1638 known as the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut (Old South Leaflet No. 8) every move, every meeting; every decision was based on the hope that "it has pleased Almighty God by the wise disposition of His Divine Prudence * * * for the word of God requires that to maintain the peace and union of such a people there should be an orderly and decent government established according to God." (Old South Leaflet No. 8.)

Also the First Continental Congress appropriated funds to purchase 20,000 Bibles as the "political textbook for America" to be distributed throughout the 13 States (vol. 8, "Journals of the Continental Congress").

This Nation was Bible based and Bible integrated. The architects of our Constitution were Christians. However they embodied in our Bill of Rights the Christian principle which gave to each individual the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. Their intent was not to deprive anyone of his right to worship God, in his own way.

Dean Griswold confirms this in his same address presented to the University of Utah in February of 1963. I quote: "This is a country of religious toleration; this I venture to say again has been and is a Christian country in origin, history, tradition, and cultude. It was out of Christian doctrine and ethics; I think it can be said that it developed its notion of toleration. No one in this country can be required to have any particular form of religious beliefs and no one can suffer legal discrimination because he has or does not have any particular religious belief but does the fact that we have officially adopted toleration as our standard mean that we must give up our history and our tradition?"

Joseph Story a member of the U.S. Supreme Court, appointed by James Madison has this to say in his "Commentaries on the Constitution" (which was used in our schools as late as the 1900's and is still studied in our law schools). "The first amendment was designed to "disestablish the state church" to prohibit any State from forcing citizens to pay taxes to support any particular church or sect as was done in so many States at that time; and to prohibit the National Government from favoring any one sect at any time. In his own words "it was not done to prostrate Christianity but only to exclude all rivalry between the Christian sects." Also these same men who wrote the Bill of Rights and the first amendment showed their intent very clearly when they also wrote the Ordinance of 1787 which states, "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged." Also the question was asked during that same period: "How can the religious liberty of a person who has no religion be endangered?" and "If God is removed from the classroom or the Government what else remains but atheism?"

As late as 1957, the chief justice of the New York Supreme Court stated "The first amendment of the Constitution does not grant disbelievers preference over believers.

This present Supreme Court evidently feel more deeply for the disbelievers than the believers.

Daniel Webster sums it up so well: "If we and our posterity reject religious instruction and authority, violate the rules of eternal justice, trifle with the injunction of morality and recklessly destroy the political Constitution which holds us together; no man can tell how sudden a catastrophe may overwhelm us that shall bring all our glory in profound obscurity."

Crime Figures Decline Sharply in St. Louis Housing Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, every city in the Nation has been experiencing a shocking amount of crime, and almost every neighborhood of every city has been the scene of serious crimes. This has been a matter of the deepest concern to every Member of Congress as well as to the general public, and we have been trying to develop a variety of weapons with which to combat both juvenile delinquency and adult crime.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I have frequently heard public housing attacked as being a breeding ground of crime, as if the mere fact of helping people from slum areas to have decent homes in which to live automatically made criminals out of them. Of course, I do not, and cannot, follow that kind of reasoning, but it is a fact that some public housing projects have had high incidences of crime.

In St. Louis, we set out to find out why we were experiencing serious crimes in some projects, and to do something about it. And I am happy to report, Mr. Speaker, that our efforts so far have been extremely encouraging and amazingly successful.

When you uproot thousands of people, as has happened in all of our cities as a result of urban renewal and new highway construction and other improvements, and when you then create new communities composed of people with diverse backgrounds, having in common, to begin with, only low income and the common experience also of having come from substandard housing, and then expect them to live in complete harmony together as if they had always lived in modern, high-rise apartment buildings—well, Mr. Speaker, I think you would be disregarding many of the facts of sociology.

CRIME RATE CUT IN HALF SINCE JANUARY 1960

Three and a half years ago, the St. Louis Housing Authority set out to meet and solve the crime problem in three of our biggest high-rise apartment public housing projects, Pruitt, Igoe and Vaughn. Even though the crime rate in those three projects was at that time already substantially below the citywide average, and less than half the comparable rate in the entire fourth police district, in which the projects are located, the rate was still far too high. And so effective countermeasures were taken by the local housing authority, in cooperation with the St. Louis Police Department and with the support and assistance of the residents of the projects.

Since that time, crime has been cut in half in the three projects, both crimes against persons and crimes against property. The three projects' 12-month rate of crimes per 100,000 persons, which was 26 percent below the city average in 1959, is now 60 percent lower than the city average, and is about 83 percent lower than the average for comparable crimes in the fourth police district as a whole. I think this is a great achievement, and one for which the housing authority, the mayor, the police department, and the residents all deserve congratulations.

POST-DISPATCH EDITORIAL LISTS STEPS TAKEN

These are among the steps which were taken to meet the challenge of crime in the Pruitt, Igoe and Vaughn apartments, as described in an editorial earlier this year in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

> The St. Louis Housing Authority set up a crime prevention program. Tenants in the three projects formed a parents association with a subsidiary youth organization. Mayor Tucker appointed a four-man task force from the mayor's citizens committee on public housing and social services to consult and advise with the tenants' group.
>
> Cleanup campaigns and annual festivities with music and parades were staged to foster a sense of community participation and pride. A round-the-clock private watchman service was instituted. The police department screened all applicants to weed out undesirable characters.
>
> Every one of these measures has paid off and together they have paid off handsomely. The tenants at Pruitt, Igoe and Vaughn, constituting a population as large as that of a good-sized town, have every reason to be proud of what they have done to make their community a better place to live in.

GLOBE-DEMOCRAT SAYS PROGRAM PAYS OFF

An article in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, describing the results of the 3½-year-old crime prevention program at the housing projects, used the same phrase in its headline that the Post-Dispatch used in the editorial I have just quoted—the phrase that the crime prevention program pays off.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the efforts being made by my community to make public housing not only a modern place in which to live but a pleasant and safe place, too. There is no reason in the world why every city cannot use these same techniques. It is not the fault of public housing that we have crime; instead, crime is so widespread in our cities that public housing projects are not immune. So, special steps must be taken—and can be taken—by the local housing authorities to make the projects what Congress wants them to be, and what the residents of the projects have a right to expect.

REPORT BY COLONEL LONG

Mr. Speaker, our former chairman of the St. Louis Board of Police Commissioners, Col. I. A. Long, as chairman of the St. Louis Housing Authority, was able to report earlier this year that—

> We have no major crime problem in the Pruitt, Igoe, or Vaughn apartments, in which approximately 15,000 people live.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many communities of 15,000 people—all of them from low-income families and all of them with a background of having lived in substandard housing in slum areas in crime-ridden American big cities—could boast as good a record in combating crime as Colonel Long's report reflects.

I submit as part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, a press release issued by the Housing Authority earlier this year giving Colonel Long's report on the crime prevention drive in the three projects, as follows:

> Figures compiled by the St. Louis Police Department and reported today by the St. Louis Housing Authority show a steadily decreasing crime trend in the Pruitt, Igoe, and Vaughn apartments. According to the figures, the crime rate in these low-rent housing developments last year was 52 percent less than the citywide crime rate and 81 percent less than the crime rate in the fourth police district in which the three developments, bounded by Cass and Jefferson Avenues, 18th and Carr Streets, are located.
>
> Commenting on today's report, Col. I. A. Long, chairman of the St. Louis Housing Authority, said, "We now have no major crime problem in the Pruitt, Igoe or Vaughn apartments, in which approximately 15,000 people live."
>
> Col. Long, former chairman of the St. Louis Board of Police Commissioners, pointed out that since January 1960, when the authority's present crime prevention program was initiated, the number of crimes occurring at Pruitt-Igoe-Vaughn has been cut in half.
>
> In comparing crime rates, the authority discounted commercial crimes because the developments have virtually no commercial facilities.
>
> Three factors were cited by Col. Long as being of major importance in reducing the Pruitt-Igoe-Vaughn crime rate. They are:
>
> 1. The residents of the Pruitt, Igoe, and Vaughn apartments, who individually and through the efforts of their tenant councils, have cooperated with the housing authority, the watchman service and metropolitan police in reporting crimes, identifying arrested offenders and giving notice of suspicious persons and activities in the developments.
> 2. The Whelan Security & Plant Protection Service which provides 24-hour, 7-day-a-week protection in all St. Louis low-rent housing developments.
> 3. The cooperation of the St. Louis Police Department in providing information regarding arrests and convictions, if any, on all members, aged 17 or older, of any family applying for any of the authority's eight low-rent housing developments. An adverse report can make the family ineligible for low-rent housing. The police department releases the information only with the signed permission of each family member being checked.
>
> The Pruitt, Igoe, and Vaughn developments also recorded a significant reduction in the rate of crimes against persons last year, falling 15 percent under the citywide rate in that category, which includes murder, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault.
>
> In crimes against persons, the Pruitt, Igoe, and Vaughn developments had a rate of 4.8 such crimes per 1,000 people while the citywide rate was 5.6 per 1,000 people.
>
> In total crimes, not including commercial offenses, the developments had a rate of 11 crimes per 1,000 people, while the city as a whole recorded a rate of 23 per 1,000 people.
>
> Col. Long stated that the police department compiles crime figures only for Pruitt, Igoe, and Vaughn developments because the housing authority has never had a significant crime problem in developments located in other parts of the city.
>
> Col. Long added, "The authority will continue to keep close scrutiny on its crime prevention program and will continue to make periodic reports on its progress.
>
> "I would like to congratulate and thank all parties concerned for so effectively reducing crime and creating truly safe homes in the Pruitt, Igoe, and Vaughn developments", Colonel Long concluded.

Comparison of index crimes for the years of 1959, 1960, 1961, and 1962 in Pruitt-Igoe-Vaughn, citywide and 4th district

	Pruitt-Igoe-Vaughn (population 15,000)				Citywide (population 750,000)				4th district (population 45,000)			
	1959	1960	1961	1962	1959	1960	1961	1962	1959	1960	1961	1962
Murder	2	1	0	2	102	67	77	69	19	8	7	15
Rape (forcible)	15	12	9	5	244	269	217	266	35	42	34	46
Robbery:												
Highway	33	20	35	21	1,390	1,409	1,361	1,412	214	211	203	250
Business	0	2	1	2	509	554	477	310	60	50	27	27
Miscellaneous	42	29	24	18	197	194	160	203	69	63	47	51
Aggravated assault	74	56	20	24	2,450	2,128	978	1,955	451	421	152	372
Burglary:												
Residence:												
Day	41	65	49	23	2,759	2,606	2,373	2,634	208	201	189	233
Night	19	24	23	15	2,621	2,573	2,288	2,911	141	150	162	178
Other:												
Day	7	1	1	1	926	1,272	1,118	966	160	226	156	174
Night	21	1	10	1	3,492	4,172	4,596	4,110	546	660	616	545
Larceny, over $50	33	16	15	6	4,325	4,146	3,390	3,455	729	830	790	753
Auto theft	52	43	63	51	4,150	3,959	3,522	4,327	627	552	528	673
Total	339	270	250	169	23,174	23,349	20,557	22,618	3,259	3,414	2,911	3,317
Crimes against persons	166	120	89	72	4,892	4,621	3,270	4,215	848	795	470	761
Crimes against property	173	150	161	97	18,282	18,728	17,287	18,403	2,411	2,619	2,441	2,556
12-month rate per 100,000	2,271	1,809	1,675	1,127	3,090	3,113	2,741	3,016	7,235	7,579	6,463	7,364
12-month rate per 100,000, omitting business robbery and burglary, others	2,084	1,782	1,595	1,101	2,433	2,313	1,915	2,296	5,534	5,501	4,689	5,708

ST. LOUIS NEWSPAPERS DISCUSS CHANGES

Mr. Speaker, following are the articles referred to from the Globe-Democrat and the Post Dispatch:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Mar. 7, 1963]

CRIME DROPS IN PUBLIC HOUSING AREAS

Figures compiled by the St. Louis Police Department showed Wednesday the crime rate in the Pruitt, Igoe and Vaughn public housing areas last year was 52 percent less than the citywide crime rate.

In crime against persons, including murder, rape, robbery and aggravated assault, the three low-rent projects fell 15 percent below the city average for 1962.

EIGHTY-ONE PERCENT LESS

The rate of total crimes in the project areas, bounded by Cass and Jefferson Avenues and 18th and Carr Streets, was reported as 81 percent less than the overall rate in the central police district, in which they are located.

Chairman I. A. Long of the St. Louis Housing Authority, in reporting the figures, said, "we now have no major crime problem in the Pruitt, Igoe or Vaughn apartments, in which approximately 15,000 people live."

Mr. Long, former chairman of the board of police commissioners, said the number of crimes occurring in the three projects has been cut in half since the Authority initiated a crime prevention program in the area a little over 3 years ago.

At that time the Authority began screening all applicants to prevent undesirable persons from moving into the public housing projects. The Whelan Security and Plant Protection Service was hired to provide protection for the developments 24 hours daily 7 days a week.

Mr. Long attributed the improvement to the police department, the Whelan firm, and to residents of the projects. The residents have cooperated, he said, "in reporting crimes, identifying arrested offenders and giving notice of suspicious persons and activities in the developments."

"I would like to congratulate and thank all parties concerned for so effectively reducing crime and creating truly safe homes in the Pruitt, Igoe and Vaughn developments," Mr. Long said.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 11, 1963]

IMPROVING A HOUSING COMMUNITY

The continuing reduction of the crime rate at the Pruitt, Igoe, and Vaughn public housing projects, which has been cut in half in the past 3 years and now stands at 52 percent less than the rate for the city as a whole, is a credit to all concerned in this most worthwhile effort.

This facility of 18,000-tenant capacity in the Jefferson-Cass area has come a long way from the distressing situation of 1960, when unruly crowds gathered, rocks and bottles were thrown, and policemen were manhandled on entering the area to make investigations or arrests.

In the process the reform has disproved the 1959 circuit court grand jury's condemnation of the high-rise type of construction used in these projects as "particularly conducive to the commission of crimes against the person."

Pruitt, Igoe, and Vaughn were even then the only high rise public housing projects in the city where a serious crime problem existed, and even so the rate was lower than in the surrounding slums.

Crimes against the person—murder, rape, robbery, and assault—have dropped there in these 3 years from two and a half times the rate for the city as a whole to 15 percent below the citywide rate—truly a remarkable accomplishment.

The improvement has come from a combination of efforts. The St. Louis Housing Authority set up a crime prevention program. Tenants in the three projects formed a parents association with a subsidiary youth organization. Mayor Tucker appointed a four-man task force from the mayor's citizens committee on public housing and social services to consult and advise with the tenants' group.

Cleanup campaigns and annual festivities with music and parades were staged to foster a sense of community participation and pride. A round-the-clock private watchman service was instituted. The police department screened all applicants to weed out undesirable characters.

Every one of these measures has paid off and together they have paid off handsomely. The tenants at Pruitt, Igoe, and Vaughn, constituting a population as large as that of a good-sized town, have every reason to be proud of what they have done to make their community a better place to live in.

OK Communism Study in Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like today to call attention to an effort which is being made in the State of Illinois by the superintendent of public instruction, the Honorable Ray Page. It is a program which I believe deserves recognition and emulation.

Operating on the premise that the present Communist challenge can only be met by a nation whose people have a deep and objective understanding of the nature of the ideology, coupled with a similar knowledge of the principles of democracy, Mr. Page is seeking to encourage the teaching in our secondary schools of a sound curriculum which will present both disciplines in a responsible manner.

Difficulties have arisen in such an effort, the greatest being the lack of sufficiently prepared instructors. The well known and naturally recognized Institute for American Strategy under the direction of Clarence Perry Oaks, has analyzed past efforts in this direction. The State of Illinois is taking advantage of these studies in an attempt to avoid the problems which have been encountered by those States which have sought to incorporate such teaching in public education.

I submit for the interest of the Members the following article on this subject from Chicago's American of June 30, 1963:

OK COMMUNISM STUDY IN SCHOOLS

(By Wesley Hartzell)

A major effort is underway to persuade Illinois public schools to include some instruction about communism in their social study classes.

The program has been launched by Ray Page, Illinois superintendent of public instruction. Page said he hopes that many schools will start the instruction next fall. He added:

"The courses, analyzing communism and comparing it with our democratic form of government, are being drafted as one phase of a broad and much-needed revision of the entire social studies program in the State's high schools."

MANY STATES ACTING

Page's office, with the help of materials supplied by the Institute for American Strategy and its operating director, Clarence Perry Oakes, has analyzed similar efforts being made in many States. Page said:

"Some legislatures have passed laws requiring schools to include instruction about communism. Others are attempting to get their schools voluntarily to include such courses. We favor the latter route."

Dr. James B. Holderman, social studies consultant to Page, said a suggested curriculum for the course on communism will possibly be ready by September for use by a small number of schools during the 1963–64 academic year.

AMERICAN URGED IT

The importance of educating children to the dangers and pitfalls of the communistic system was emphasized last winter in an exclusive series of articles in Chicago's American.

Page said his office has sent a questionnaire to all high schools in the State asking if they give any instruction about communism, and, if not, would they like to start a pilot curriculum, and would they have teachers qualified to teach it. Said Page:

"The response to this questionnaire has been unprecedented. It seems that every high school in the State wants such a program. Several schools in the Chicago area—Evanston and other suburban high schools—have had such instruction for some time. Chicago schools have a pilot program in the works."

LEGISLATURE OK'S IT

A State legislature resolution, passed last week, indorsed the program begun by Page's office.

In addition to the publication of a suggested curriculum—to be drawn up by a special committee—Page's office will offer lists of approved textbooks, and try to get colleges and universities to offer training to prospective teachers in instruction about communism.

"Many States," said Page, "have sent educators to study our plans."

These include Florida, which a few years ago passed a law requiring schools to offer instruction about communism.

TIED TO OTHER STUDIES

Unlike Florida and some other States, Page says, the instruction about communism in Illinois will not be a separate entity. It will be an essential part of courses on history, government, economics, and geography. Said Page:

"Communism is a challenge to our way of life. Youngsters must learn all they can about it."

The Need for More Accurate Unemployment Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the difficulties faced in solving unemployment is obtaining a realistic and precise definiton of the problem. For some time I have had questions in my mind about how realistic a picture of the unemployment problem is given by these estimates. Therefore, I was pleased to see an editorial in the Wall Street Journal of June 28 which discusses a recent series of articles by Samuel Lubell on unemployment statistics. Based upon extensive interviews, the articles concluded that, "the unemployment statistics are no longer a valid or accurate indicator of the health of the economy." Our employment statistics often create quite misleading pictures of the human hardships involved and the jobless picture in general.

In order to be of value as a guide to policy, the unemployment statistics must be further developed and refined. In the meantime, we must take into consideration the limitations of our current statistics when making policies to combat unemployment. Under unanimous consent I include this editorial from the Wall Street Journal in the RECORD at this point:

A PROBLEM IN NEED OF DEFINITION

"The unemployment statistics are no longer a valid or accurate indicator of the health of the economy." That is one of the conclusions in a series of articles by political analyst Samuel Lubell, based on interviews with jobless workers in 23 different cities.

The findings should be of interest to Washington, which uses the official estimates as a chief argument for broad public programs designed either to cope with unemployment specifically or expand economic activity generally. For if, in Mr. Lubell's words, the statistics themselves create quite misleading pictures of both the extent of the jobless problem and the human hardship involved, then the proposed Federal remedies are bound to be open to serious question.

Surely there is hardship enough, among those who need work and can't find any, without figures that tend to exaggerate the problem as a whole. In a great many cases, people listed as jobless do not represent any of the personal hardships or economic malaise conjured up by the term unemployment.

To begin with, nearly 6 out of 10 of those interviewed expected to be back working soon; construction workers, for example, who have finished one project and are awaiting another. Then there are retired people looking for only part-time work, and people who choose to quit their jobs for various personal reasons. Such people should hardly be lumped together with breadwinners involuntarily out of work.

And it certainly makes a difference to a family, and the economy, whether or not any member is earning money; in Mr. Lubell's survey, roughly 40 percent of unemployed married persons had a husband or wife working. Moreover, nearly 10 percent of the total interviewed admitted they could get jobs if they were willing to take less money.

The truth is that most American workers enjoy a high degree of employment security. The bulk of real, chronic, hard-to-cure joblessness is found, as Mr. Lubell puts it, outside the mainstream of the Nation's economic life.

Those hardest hit by genuine unemployment are the older workers who have been pushed out of the economy and the younger ones, both white and Negro, "who have never been able to scale the walls of seniority rights and union membership." One youth said he would like to be an electrician, "but you've got to be the first-born son of a union member to get a union card."

It might be added that unions have also, in many fields, forced pay rates so high that they have literally forced people out of work or closed job opportunities that would otherwise be open. These union attitudes, restrictions and discriminations do indeed deserve to be corrected.

But you do not correct them, or much else, with the typical Government remedy. It doesn't help the would-be young electrician become an electrician for the Government to send him off to the forest under a conservation program borrowed from the thirties. Nor is anything of lasting value accomplished for other individuals simply by having the Federal Government hand out funds to "depressed areas." That is a dole, but not a solution to unemployment.

Apart from the question of union restrictions, there is much the Government could do, if it were disposed, to foster the creation of more job opportunities.

A more rational and less punitive system of taxation based on lower Federal spending; less bias against investment and capital formation; far fewer controls and restrictions on all kinds of private economic activity—these are the plain paths to greater economic activity and more jobs. In their absence, grandiose Government spending programs may only, as Mr. Lubell suggests, make matters worse.

Whatever is done, it would seem essential to begin with an understanding of the scope and nature of the problem. Yet this elementary requirement is forfeited by the Government's uncritical analysis of estimates that make no distinction between the chronic and the momentarily unemployed, between those who need work and those who don't, between those who are willing to work and those who aren't.

At least the Nation should not expect to solve unemployment until it is able to devise a realistic definition of the problem. It could do more to help those who really need help if it would make the effort to separate them from the statistical chaff.

No Place for Judicial Robes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, all of us, I am sure, are deeply concerned over the possibility of a nationwide rail strike and the effects this might have on our economy.

In my humble opinion this country can ill afford and most certainly cannot tolerate such an eventuality.

If the situation was not so serious the circumstances which have brought this about and the manner in which the President now proposes to deal with this weighty problem might take on an aura of comedy.

To say the least it does point out the inconsistency of what Mr. Kennedy was saying when he ran for the office of President of these United States and what he does when problems call for action.

During the campaign he unequivocally stated he was opposed to compulsory arbitration, now he not only advocates the use of an arbitrator but I question whether or not his suggestion that this arbitrator should come from the judiciary is wise.

I do not question the ability or integrity of Justice Goldberg but I do not believe this is the issue involved. I am wondering if it is either wise or fair to ask a member of the Supreme Court to take on this responsibility.

An editorial from the Wall Street Journal bears out my concern and states very well my thoughts on the matter. This editorial follows and I recommend to my colleagues the thoughts therein contained.

NO PLACE FOR JUDICIAL ROBES

Whatever may be involved in the railroad dispute, now threatening us with a nationwide strike, it is not a dispute at law.

As in many other labor conflicts there is no contract the terms of which could be adjudicated in court. Nor do the matters in dispute involve legal questions which can be decided dispassionately by studying the law or judicial precedents.

It is, instead, an economic and political dispute in the literal sense of those terms. The railroad managements want certain things as the price of a contract with their employees. The railroad unions want certain other things as their terms for agreement. This is an economic issue in exactly the same way as when you ask one price to sell your house and a prospective buyer offers a different price. In this case there is a political issue, in part because the whole Nation is involved, but also because the forces being arrayed on both sides to pressure the other are political forces.

Therefore, since the two parties have not found economic grounds for an agreement, an outside decision will have to be political, not judicial. An arbitrator will have to say, "I side with this side on that point, with that side on another point," and be arbitrary in his decisions. Then the decision, if it is to be enforced, will have to be enforced by the political forces of society.

Given the circumstances, we can understand the President's desire to have an arbitrator and put at his disposal the political forces he commands with his office. But we do not think this is any place to put a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States who ought not to wear a political mantle beneath his judicial robes.

Person-to-Person Peace Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as important as any governmental action taken toward international understanding are individual actions taken by private citizens. Such actions encourage meaningful dialog between individuals of different nation states.

An opportunity to do just this took place at the international workshop in human relations held recently at Douglass College in New Brunswick, N.J. It is the first workshop of its kind to be conducted in the State, and it was named in honor of the late Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mr. President, an interesting and informative report of the program has been reported by Gunter David of the Newark News. I ask, therefore, for unanimous consent to have Mr. David's article of June 30, 1963, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.N. WORKSHOP—PERSON-TO-PERSON PEACE PROJECT

(By Gunter David)

"Americans are very materialistic."

"Foreigners are very nationalistic."

"Americans are ignorant about other countries."

"Foreigners know Americans only through movies."

These points and counterpoints of view are expressed often by Americans visiting other countries and by visitors to this country from abroad. They have had all too few chances for facing each other and seeking understanding.

An unusual opportunity to do so is being presented to 60 men and women at the international workshop in human relations, today through next Saturday at Douglass College. It is the first workshop of its kind to be conducted in the State and is named in honor of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

Among the countries represented are the United States, India, Nationalist China, South Korea, Japan, Iran, Nigeria, and from behind the Iron Curtain, Poland.

Representatives, all over 21, come from various walks of life. Some are students, others are researchers and business persons. Among the Americans are a sociologist, a building contractor, a real estate agent, an insurance company employee, a junior chamber of commerce representative, and a housewife, as well as some students.

For the next 5 days they will hear lectures on such subjects as prejudice, misunderstanding, misconception. More important, perhaps, will be the discussion groups, in which, it is hoped, East and West, North and South, black and white, will drop their guard and speak what is really in their hearts.

A free exchange of ideas, experiences and cultural expressions is the main purpose of this workshop. It is being sponsored by the American Association for the United Nations and its Newark chapter; the New Jersey Region of the National Conference of Christians and Jews; and Rutgers University, which has placed Woodbury Dormitory on the Douglass campus at the disposal of the workshop.

Says Mrs. Sylvia Josephson, the vice chairman of the workshop and its originator: "The world is getting so small that the only hope for peace is by people getting to know each other."

Adds Balbir S. Brar, of India, a graduate student in dairy science at Rutgers: "It is in the good interests of our two countries that better understanding be brought about."

Dean C. Willard Heckel, of Rutgers Law School, chairman of the workshop, and Dr. Harold Lett and Roy McCorkel, codirectors, readily concede that the problems that plague this globe will not be solved by 60 persons of various nationalities getting together. But they consider this person-to-person method a step in the right direction, rather than leaving the future of mankind entirely to governments.

In this, the organizers of the workshop are backed by labor, business and civic groups which are financing its $6,000 budget. All hope that it will become an annual event.

On a recent sunny morning, Mr. Brar was describing, humorously and without rancor, the ignorance of Americans concerning his country. In the turban and beard of his Sikh religion, he presented a striking picture as he stood in front of the modern brick and glass structure of Woodbury Hall.

"Some people ask me do we have houses in India and do children go to school," he said with a smile. "And next to women wearing saris, someone like myself with a turban is always an object of curiosity."

At the same time, Mr. Brar admits that his knowledge of America, prior to his arrival here last year, was influenced through movies. "I expected to find Hollywood luxury everywhere," he says.

To this, Dr. Lett adds: "The amount of misconception abroad about our country is amazing. I've been asked whether our skyscrapers have been built with slave labor."

And on the steps of the United Nations, where she is a guide, Miss Margaret Linn, born and raised in China but a resident of South Korea before coming here, said sadly: "Korea is known only as a poor and dirty country because your people came to know it only during war. Nothing is known about the wonderful culture of Korea."

Miss Linn and a fellow guide and friend, Miss Kyo Kikuoka, of Japan, are living examples of the kind of brotherhood transcending manmade boundaries, which the International Workshop is aiming for.

Asked if traditional enmity between China and Japan ever formed a barrier to their friendship, Miss Linn turned to Miss Kikuoka and said: "I couldn't care less about it. Do you?"

"I don't care at all either," Miss Kikuoka said laughingly.

At Manhattan's International House on Riverside Drive, which serves as a home away from home for students from all over the world, Patrick Uriese of Nigeria, a student at the Columbia University School of Journalism, had a different complaint.

"As an African, I have been invited to many homes of Americans but never to homes of American Negroes. I have tried every way of securing such an invitation but I have failed."

The relationship between the American Negro and his African brethren will surely be explored at the workshop. Dr. Lett explains it this way: "The African Negro, newly emerging on the scene, looks down upon the American Negro and accuses him of not fighting hard enough for his rights. The American Negro, in turn, has not quite formulated his attitude toward the new African, and somehow doesn't trust him."

On the other hand, Malcolm Ellington, a psychologist with the Newark Housing Authority, says of foreign nationals: "They are very conscious of racial problems we have in this country but at the same time tend to gloss over their own, like the Indian I met who tried to minimize the situation between the Hindus and Moslems in his country. At the same time, we Americans might tend to be somewhat oversensitive about our problems and how others react to them."

And from Hisao Sasaki of Japan, a Fullbright scholar studying television programing at New York University, came this observation: "I see so many old people, their faces blank, sitting on benches. I wonder what kind of family relations there are in this country."

In addition to exchanging ideas at discussions following lectures, participants in the workshop will get to know each other through special evening programs of song, dance and games.

"There is nothing like music and dancing to beak down barriers between people," says Mrs. Ruth Lotz of Princeton, in charge of special programs. "Singing in the evening, standing around a piano, or singing to the accompaniment of a guitar, that's the time of sharing songs our fathers and forefathers have sung. Singing is an expression of how and what we feel.

"Interestingly, almost identical plots and twists can be found in folk songs of many different countries.

"And dance. Why, people who would never have thought of doing more than nodding to each other find themselves holding hands and trying to figure out together which foot should be put forward.

"Games. It's amazing how adults love to play games of their childhood, before the world had come upon them and separated them from each other."

The workshop is a dream come true for Mrs. Josephson, founder and past president of the Newark AAUN. She first conceived the idea several years ago, as a veteran participant in human relations workshops conducted annually at Rutgers on a local level.

She enlisted the aid of Dean Heckel, also a former president of the Newark AAUN, and

Dr. Lett, director of the Rutgers workshop. They, together with Mrs. Belle Rosenberg of Newark, launched their program early this year, after receiving the blessing of the national AAUN and UNESCO. Other officers of the workshop are S. Guernsey Jones, senior vice president of the National Newark & Essex Bank, who is treasurer, and Mrs. Isabel Pearlman of Maplewood, executive secretary.

Mr. McCorkle, co-director, is associated with the American Friends Service Committee.

Among participants in the workshop will be two graduate horticulture students at Rutgers who come from Poland. They are Marian Kepka and Richard Szafranek, who have been in this country for nearly two years.

Both have been guests in numerous American homes, and the report they will take home about America will be that its people are intent on business and comfortable living.

"But there is also something else important," says Mr. Szafranek. "I have learned that your people are very much like our people. They all want peace."

Significance of Independence Day to South Carolinians—Paper by Prof. Robert D. Bass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, Prof. Robert D. Bass, of the department of English of Limestone College, in Gaffney, S.C., has prepared a most interesting and well documented paper on the significance of Independence Day to South Carolinians.

This historic document explains in detail what the first Fourth of July meant to our forefathers in South Carolina, who at the time were celebrating one of the major victories of the American Revolution. July 4 is truly a glorious occasion for all Americans. However, upon studying the history of this event it becomes evident that South Carolinians won their freedom to observe it with blood and tears. As Professor Bass says in his paper, "and for independence none gave more freely of these than did South Carolinians."

Mr. Bass is a well-known, outstanding author, having written "The Green Dragon," "Swamp Fox," and "Gamecock." May his study of this phase of our State history be a constant reminder to those who take for granted our independence and liberty and who so often are oblivious to the sacrifices of their forebears.

This paper is a worthy salute to the bravery and courage of South Carolinians who gave their lives for our independence, and it should be read by all. Mr. President, I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the CONGESSIONAL RECORD, together with my remarks.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH CAROLINA'S FIRST FOURTH OF JULY

(By Robert D. Bass, Department of English, Limestone College)

Independence Day has special significance for South Carolinians.

On July 4, 1776, Congress declared the Thirteen States independent of British rule. On that first glorious Fourth our Carolina forefathers were celebrating one of the major victories of the American Revolution.

Their victory ended a long-awaited action. After the opening skirmish at Lexington, the Revolution had dragged along for more than a year. Meanwhile British ministers had settled on a policy of winning back the southern colonies. Because of ties in blood, culture, and economy, they had decided to make the first attempt upon South Carolina.

These British policymakers had decided to begin their drive with both conciliation and gunfire. While their diplomats talked, their military strategists mounted a two-pronged offensive. One prong was to consist in an amphibious descent upon Charleston. The other was to consist in an Indian attack on the frontiersmen along the Blue Ridge Mountains.

In preparation for the movement against Charleston, during the autumn of 1775 Lord Cornwallis, with the rank of lieutenant general, assembled a powerful expeditionary force in the ports of southern England. After he had his troops embarked, the transports sailed for a rendezvous at Cork, Ireland. There Cornwallis met Commodore Sir Peter Parker, commander of a squadron of warships assigned to escort the troopships. On February 12, 1776, Cornwallis and Parker went aboard the flagship *Bristol*, and the armada hoisted sail for America.

And among the junior officers on the expedition was Banastre Tarleton, fresh from Oxford and the study of law in the Middle Temple and now a cornet "absent by King's leave" from the First Regiment of Dragoon Guards.

In early May, escorts and transports dropped anchor in Cape Fear River. Here Sir Henry Clinton, second in the British command in America, joined the expedition. After refreshing his troops, Sir Henry reembarked them and turned the armada southward. On June 4 the fleet appeared off the harbor bar at Charleston.

Meanwhile British strategists had been preparing the second prong of their attack. While Cornwallis had been collecting troops, John Stuart, British Indian agent in the South, had been stirring up the Indians. Under his incitement the Cherokee war chiefs had spent the winter and spring preparing and deploying their warriors along the warpaths in the Blue Ridge.

Upon learning that the British fleet had reached the vicinity of Charleston, the Cherokees raised the war-whoop from Georgia to Virginia. Murdering, plundering, and burning, they struck the frontier in upper South Carolina. Colonel Andrew Williamson called out the militia in 96th District. Among those responding was Capt. Andrew Pickens, a fearless Indian fighter from the settlement on Long Canes Creek.

During these months South Carolinians had exerted themselves in preparing to defend their State. Governor John Rutledge had concentrated the regular troops in and around Charleston. At his direction Colonel William Moultrie had built a small fort of palmetto logs and sand on the southern end of Sullivan's Island, its bristling cannon guarding the channel leading into Charleston Bay.

Moultrie garrisoned his fort with the Second Regiment of South Carolina. Upon the approach of the British vessels, Rutledge sent Moultrie a reinforcement of troops of the Continental Line. And he placed the command of all the troops in the hands of Maj. Gen. Charles Lee, second in command to Gen. George Washington.

Moultrie put Francis Marion, a little Huguenot from lower Santee and major of the Second Regiment, in command of one wing of the palmetto fort. And just behind the fort, with orders to repel any landing of British troops on Sullivan's, General Lee placed a regiment of riflemen under the command of Lt. Col. Thomas Sumter.

These defenders did not have to wait long. As soon as Sir Henry learned that his Indian allies had pinned down the back-country militia, he opened his campaign for the Southern Colonies. He ordered Sir Peter to force a passage into Charleston Bay.

On June 28, 1776, Sir Peter sent his warships into action. At about 11 o'clock the *Thunder* began lobbing shells into the palmetto log fort guarding the channel. Soon the *Bristol*, the *Experiment*, and the *Soleby* joined in the cannonading. Moving up to within 400 yards of the fort, the *Active* began pouring in solid shot. But the metal sank harmlessly into the spongey palmetto logs.

Slowly, deliberately, the Carolinians answered with their cannon. Paced by Major Marion, their gunners wrought havoc in the ships, killing some 200 hundred sailors, including two captains. They even wounded Commodore Parker and Lord Cornwallis.

During the hottest of the fighting a ball cut away the staff of the Second Regiment's blue flag with a silver crescent. "Colonel, don't let us fight without our flag," cried Sergeant William Jasper, springing over the rampart to recover the bunting. Tying the flag to a sponge staff, he hoisted it again over the palmetto fort.

All afternoon Sir Peter continued to fight. Unable to silence the fort and unwilling to leave it behind to attack his troopships, he ordered the frigates *Acteon, Sphynx*, and *Syren* to move forward, round Sullivan's, and enfilade the Americans from the rear. But under the strain of battle the pilots missed the channel and grounded the vessels.

By sunset the British captains began admitting defeat. Silently they slipped their cables and stood away toward Five Fathom Hole. Tradition says that the last shot at the retreating enemy was fired by Major Francis Marion.

Sir Henry failed to renew the battle. A few days later he ordered his armada to sail for New York. From their sorry little fort the Carolinians had defeated and driven off a powerful fleet of battleships. They had ruined Sir Henry's campaign. And as a result the British had to change their entire strategy for winning back the colonies.

Carolinians were jubilant. One June 30, Colonel Moultrie paraded his victorious troops before General Lee. On the afternoon of July 4, he held another in honor of Governor Rutledge.

As Rutledge passed Sergeant Jasper, he presented his own sword to the sergeant for his heroism and gallantry in rescuing the flag of the Second Regiment.

Thus our first Fourth of July was glorious. It was also symbolic. The battle for Fort Moultrie had been a miniature forecast of the course of the Revolution.

Here were first joined in battle the men whose deeds would change the destiny of a continent. On the British side were Sir Henry Clinton, Lord Cornwallis, and Banastre Tarleton. On the American were Rutledge, Sumter, and Marion, with Pickens on the frontier. Outnumbered, outgunned, and outmaneuvered, the patriots had fought on to victory.

Five years later the partisans Marion, Sumter, and Pickens would fight on to final victory. By their exploits they would bring about the defeat of Colonel Tarleton and prepare the way for the surrender of Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown.

For Carolinians these were to be tragic years. To the devastation of war was added the fratricidal horror of civil war. Even in victory there would be heartbreak.

A brother of Andrew Pickens was burned to death by Indians. Gabriel, favorite nephew of Francis Marion, was murdered by Tories. And to his grave Thomas Sumter bore scars left by seven bullet wounds.

Sergeant William Jasper, decorated for bravery on our first Fourth, was killed in the battle for Savannah. At the moment a sharpshooter struck him down as he was charging toward Spring Hill Redoubt proudly waving the blue flag with a silver crescent.

The Fourth of July is glorious. Our freedom to observe it was won with blood and tears. And for independence none gave more freely of these than did South Carolinians.

People Want Sweepstakes To Ease Tax Burden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert in the Appendix of this Record an editorial which appeared in the July 1963 issue of the Murray Hill News, a nonpolitical, nonsectarian monthly newspaper published in New York City.

I hope the Members of this House will take time out to read this editorial endorsement of my bill to establish a national lottery in the United States:

People Want Sweepstakes To Ease Tax Burden

Without fear of contradiction, this newspaper can state flatly that the people of New York are in favor of a sweepstakes bill or national lottery in the United States. This is based on conversations with people throughout the State of New York.

The sweepstakes bill is opposed by a small minority on the grounds that it is immoral. Since we seem to be drifting toward liberalization in many ways, even in forbidding prayers in schools, then what would be so immoral about having the Government or the State take over income, through lottery, that they always claim they need? People who want to buy lottery tickets would buy them. No one is compelled to buy them or gamble if he doesn't want to. But those who do should be permitted, under proper supervision, to do so.

You have only to look at Nevada to see what a prosperous State it is—all because people follow their natural inclinations toward gambling.

Our people are unorganized but they have a good leader to sponsor a bill. This voluntary taxation is certainly preferred to involuntary taxation, such as the sales tax, tax on food, on clothes, tax on cigarettes, tax on telephone calls, tax on gasoline, taxes of any kind.

Let people who want to gamble, gamble. Whether or not permitted to do so, people who want to gamble will find a way.

Representative from the Bronx, Hon. Paul A. Fino, has been sponsoring the legislation to relieve people from tax hardships. The people should get solidly behind him. It certainly is hypocrisy to permit bingo games for churches and other organizations and blind out eyes with the fact that it is gambling—but what is the justification to discriminate against people who want to play bingo—but not in a church. If the church makes the money for itself it doesn't ease the tax burden, but if the State would get the money then the tax burden would be eased. Congressman Fino pointed out that permitting revenue from the racetrack at the racetrack is legal and OK. It doesn't make sense to thinking people. Mr. Fino estimated that the State of New York would get a net profit of $500 million. Are the American people getting so stupid not to see that we permit gambling at the racetrack, that the winnings are untapped money and the beneficiaries are the racketeers? Are we protecting tax evaders by permitting gambling for dishonest citizens and not permit it for honorable citizens?

Let's wake up and get behind Congressman Paul Fino so that we can enjoy the fruits of our labor by getting something from our work by easing the excessive tax abuse that has become intolerable.

Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I was most impressed with resolutions passed by the recent Annual Conference of the members of the eastern Pennsylvania region of Hadassah. These resolutions, forwarded to me by the Honesdale-Hawley Chapter of Hadassah, deal with the dangerous situation in the Middle East, and with the problem of human rights. As both questions are of vital concern to us all, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution on Current Developments in the Middle East

The members of the eastern Pennsylvania region of Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, meeting at their annual conference, have been following with keen anxiety current developments in the Middle East which threatens the stability of the area, threaten Israel's survival, and threaten peace itself.

We call attention to these factors:

1. The avowed and formally declared intention of Arab leaders now federating in military alliance to destroy Israel.

2. The continued supply of bombers, fighters, submarines, tanks, torpedo boats, and missiles by the Soviet Union to the Arab states.

3. The assistance being given to the United Arab Republic by German scientists in the production of ground-to-ground missiles.

4. The unconditional economic assistance given by Western governments to Arab states, despite their war preparations and their refusal to meet Israel in direct peace negotiations.

We therefore urge the President of the United States and the Congress to take measures toward—

1. A firm security guarantee by the United States committing our Government to move swiftly to deter and prevent any aggression.

2. The grant of arms to Israel to insure an arms balance and to enable Israel to defend herself and deter attack. This is imperative until such time as the Arab States halt their arms acquisitions.

3. A firm policy, clearly announced and vigorously pursued for an Arab-Israel peace.

We are convinced that it is in the best interest of the United States and essential for the security of Israel to assure that Israel will get the help it needs in the event that efforts to maintain the delicate military balance in the Middle East are unsuccessful. We urge our Government to exercise moral leadership in the attainment of an Arab-Israel peace.

Resolution on Human Rights

The 15,000 members of the eastern Pennsylvania region of Hadassah express their apprehension and concern over the recent evidences of failure to respect and observe those human rights and fundamental freedom for all, without discrimination as to race, color, or creed, that are guaranteed in the Constitution of the United States.

The delegates at the conference of the eastern Pennslvania region of Hadassah urge the Government of the United States to exert its prestige and influence to assure the acceptance by all its citizens of those principles of justice, equality, and freedom subscribed to by the American people.

We, the members of the Honesdale-Hawley chapter, must add that we hope that the Congress of the United States, which has been given the opportunity this week to show that it stands for human rights, will adopt the measures proposed by the President. We would hope that the Members of Congress will take the long-term view—the only one that can preserve domestic harmony, as well as continued international respect.

Weak-Kneed Policy Endangers U.S. Position in Canal Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Wilkes-Barre, Pa., Record has reprinted an excellent editorial from Pan American Headlines, published by the Committee on Pan American Policy, calling on Congress to reassert U.S. sovereignty over the Panama Canal Zone.

The editorial refers to House Concurrent Resolution 105, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Cannon, expressing the sense of Congress that the United States will not surrender its sovereignty or control over the Canal Zone or the Panama Canal. A concurrent resolution I have introduced—House Concurrent Resolution 101—expresses the sense of Congress that any variation in the traditional interpretation of treaties between the United States and the Republic of Panama relating to the sovereignty question shall be made only pursuant to treaty.

Mr. Speaker, Congress ought to make its position known on this vital issue, for there are forces at work which would further erode our position in the Canal Zone. Unless the United States stands firm, the inevitable result will be either international or Panamanian control of the Canal.

Following is the editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record:

American Position Being Eroded: Panama Canal Future Is Endangered as Weak U.S. Leadership Aids Panama Nationalists

If Congress adjourns without passing the Cannon resolution, reasserting U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone, we may look for further dangerous erosion of the American position on the Panama Canal.

In line with its general weak-kneed policy in Latin America, the State Department is showing unmistakable signs of willingness to make further surrenders on the sovereignty issue. The goal of the Panama politicians is plain. It was voiced by Gilberto Arias, until recently Secretary of Finance in President Chiari's cabinet:

"In the future, with God's help, we will achieve our objective: that the Panama Canal be the property of Panamanians, under full and absolute jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama, maintained by Panamanians, operated by Panamanians, sanitated by Panamanians, and protected by Panamanians."

Since the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty with Great Britain of 1903, which gave Panama its independence from Colombia, gave the United States "perpetual" sovereignty over the Canal Zone, the juridical basis for Mr. Arias' demand is puzzling.

CRISIS IS MOUNTING

In the face of the mounting crisis, the United States finds itself with its weakest representation in Panama in years. The Kennedy-appointed Governor of the Canal Zone, Robert J. Fleming, Jr., is proving himself a pitifully weak reed when events call for him to take a strong stand against the exactions of Republic of Panama officials. In a recent speech before the American Society of Civil Engineers in Panama, Fleming championed "the social revolution of today" and called for the slaughter of the "sacred cows of the 19th and early 20th centuries." He scoffed at "conservatism" and "silly resistance to change."

When Fleming weakly yielded to Republic of Panama politicians and displayed the Panama flag in the Zone on a par with the U.S. flag, Gerald Doyle, chief architect of the Panama Canal Co., filed a suit against Fleming and Secretary of the Army Vance to halt the flying of the Panama flag in the Zone which, he claimed, was in direct violation of U.S. law.

Doyle, a man of high reputation, seems to have the moral support in his action of most of the 3,793 American citizens who are employed by the Canal Co. and the Canal Government.

VOTE ON FLAG DISREGARDED

However, the pliant State Department policy on the sovereignty issue antedates Kennedy. In the Eisenhower administration, when the situation began to get ugly in Panama, the State Department took an equivocal stand on the Panama flag issue. To forestall a retreat, the House of Representatives, on February 2, 1960, adopted a resolution, by the overwhelming margin of 380 to 12, urging that the Panama flag should not be flown in Canal Zone. Disregarding this vote, the State Department waited until Congress adjourned on September 17, 1960. An Executive order was then issued, and was proclaimed in Panama by U.S. Ambassador Joseph S. Farland, directing that the Panama flag be flown daily in the Zone with the stars and stripes.

This exhibition of American weakness, in the face of the demands of irresponsible Panama City mobs, has led to a sharp decline in American prestige. It was an open invitation to Panama Nationalist demagogues to make further unjustified demands.

Providing a gloomy background to the situation is the frank acceptance, by important figures in the Kennedy administration of the thesis that international control of the Canal is inevitable.

U.N. Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, on a 1961 visit to Panama, declared that "the logical future of the Canal may be some form of internationalization."

DAN FLOOD IS DETERMINED

That influential State Department people would not be adverse to such a surrender is seen in the visit to Panama in January of Abdel Hamid Abubakr, Secretary General of the Suez Canal Authority. Mr. Abubakr, who carried out the nationalization of the Suez Canal for Nasser, was invited to Panama under the State Department's "Foreign Leader" program and was the guest of the Canal. While in Panama, Abubakr was photographed with Governor Fleming and lectured audiences on the Nasser snatch of the Suez Canal from its legal owners.

In the House, a determined group of Representatives, spearheaded by DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat of Pennsylvania, and H. R. GROSS, Republican of Iowa, are mobilizing sentiment behind House Concurrent Resolution 105, introduced by Representative CLARENCE A. CANNON, Democrat of Missouri, urging that the United States "should not, in any wise, surrender to any other government or authority, its jurisdiction over, and control of the Canal Zone, and its ownership, control, management, maintenance, operation, and protection of the Panama Canal." If this resolution reaches the floor, chances for its passage, by another huge majority, are bright. Readers supporting this resolution should rush their letters to the President, and to their Congressmen and Senators.—From Pan American Headlines, published by the Committee on Pan American Policy.

Evans Ward, Outstanding Citizen of Westchester County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, Westchester County will long feel the loss of one of its most outstanding citizens, Evans Ward. The grief of his family is shared by his many friends and neighbors for good reason.

Rarely does a man give so much of himself for the well-being of his fellow citizens. With unbending principles, Evans Ward strove to insure the continued progress and development of Westchester County. He served as the unsalaried head of the Westchester County Park Commission. He was vice chairman of the Taconic State Park Commission. He chaired the Westchester Parkway Authority.

Evans Ward's contributions to his home community of Port Chester and the town of Rye are innumerable. He worked for and gave his full support to almost every conceivable local institution or cause. He was a trustee of the United Hospital. He was a founder and a most liberal backer of the Port Chester Community Chest, of war bond drives, of the Red Cross and of the various youth-serving and charitable agencies, regardless of creed. He would never allow a good cause to fail in Port Chester, and he never denied his personal friendship to anyone who needed or merited it.

This man's leadership abilities were equally well applied in the business world. He was board chairman and chief executive officer of Russell, Burdsall & Ward Bolt & Nut Co., The firm, in which he held every principal office, is a major supplier of fastening devices to the manufacturers of automobiles and other high-quality machinery and to the retail hardware trade in this and other countries. For a number of years, he was a director of the New York Telephone Co., and of the Kensico Cemetery Corp. Mr. Ward held the friendship and confidence of many of the country's foremost industrialists.

Evans Ward was active in politics. He served ably as treasurer of the Republican County Committee for many years up until the time of his death. Yet, though he was always a loyal and active member of the Republican Party, he never allowed partisanship to influence park commision work while he was at its head.

No man will easily take Evans Ward's place in our community. In fact, no man will ever really be able to do all the good for his neighbors that Evans Ward did in but one lifetime.

[From the White Plains Reporter Dispatch, July 1, 1963]

Evans Ward, 76, Dies—Industry, Civic Leader

PORT CHESTER.—Evans Ward, board chairman and chief executive officer of the Russell, Burdsall & Ward Bolt & Nut Co. of Port Chester and for 25 years president of the Westchester Park Commission until his resignation from that post 2 years ago, died last evening at his home on King Street.

He was in his 77th year and had been in ill health for many months.

The funeral service will be held at 2:30 p.m. Wednesday at St. Peter's Episcopal Church, Port Chester, where he was a member and former vestryman. Interment will be private. Visiting hours will be from 3 to 5 and from 7 to 9 p.m. tomorrow at Craft Memorial Home, Port Chester.

Mr. Ward was born in Port Chester on September 12, 1886, the son of William L. and Madge Leland Ward. His father was for many years the Republican leader of Westchester County and one of the most distinguished figures in his party in New York State and the Nation.

Shortly after his graduation from Sheffield Scientific School of Yale University in 1907, Mr. Ward joined the Russell, Burdsall & Ward Co. of which his grandfather was one of the founders more than a century ago. In the 50 years that followed, he led the company to worldwide preeminence in the fastener industry, with plants in Rock Falls, Ill., Coraopolis, Pa., and Los Angeles, Calif., in addition to the main factory in Port Chester.

The firm in which he had held every principal office, is a principal supplier of fastening devices to the manufacturers of automobiles and other high-quality machinery and to the retail hardware trade in this and other countries. As a result, Mr. Ward had long held the friendship as well as the business confidence of many of the country's foremost industrialists. He was for a number of years a director of the New York Telephone Co. and of the Kensico Cemetery Corp.

From his father, Evans Ward had inherited a tireless dedication to the progress and development of Westchester, a dedication which he expressed through long and active service as the unsalaried head of the County Park Commission and as vice chairman of the Taconic State Park Commission.

He had served also for many years as treasurer of the Westchester Republican County Committee, a post he held at his death, but again like his father, who served one term as a Member of Congress in 1897 and 1898, he had sought, and won, elective office only once—a term as a justice of the peace and therefore, under the law as it then stood, as a member of the Town Board of the Town of Rye.

It was while Mr. Ward was park commission president that the county added and built the following park and recreation spots: Saxon Woods Pool in Scarsdale, the Dunwoodie golf course in Yonkers and George's Island Park in Crugers. Before his retirement the county also developed its policy and plans for the acquisition of 10,000 more acres of park land for the future.

Probably the greatest service by Mr. Ward, say those with whom he was associated on the park commission, was his resistance to pressures to, in effect, dismember the park system. The pressures were greatest during the depression and war years but Mr. Ward had the long-range future of the county in mind and the system remained intact.

GENTLE BUT STRONG

Though a gentle, instinctively reserved man, Mr. Ward held strong convictions and was not averse to fighting to uphold them. On more than one occasion, on matters involving the parks and parkways, he broke with the administration of County Executive Edwin G. Michaelian. He induced his park commission colleagues, for example, to reject an administration proposal to create a sportsmen's center in the Ward Pound Ridge Reservation, because he was convinced the plan was not compatible with the commission's conception of future public uses of the largest of the county's parks.

Again, while serving as chairman of the Westchester Parkway Authority, an agency created in 1958 to take over operation and reconstruction of 26 miles of the parkway system, he refused to accept administration diction on engineering and shelved the plans.

RESIGNED PARK POST

Finally, when the Michaelian administration moved to abolish the semiautonomous park commission and replace it with a departmental agency responsible to the county executive, Mr. Ward and his long-time fellow commissioner, Col. John C. Stilwell of Yonkers, outspokenly opposed the change and resigned soon after it had been approved by the board of supervisors.

At the time, Mr. Ward made no secret of the fact he regarded abolition of the commission as foreshadowing a departure from the rigidly nonpolitical administration of the parks and parkways upon which he and his associates always had insisted. It was a point of principle with him that, though he always had been a loyal and active member of the Republican Party, he never had allowed partisanship to influence park system policies or practices.

DEVOTED TO HOMETOWN

An Evans Ward characteristic which had endeared him, throughout his life, to all who knew him was his complete and generous devotion to everything which involved the well-being of his home community, Port Chester and the town of Rye. Over the years he had worked for and given warmhearted support to almost every conceivable local institution or cause—he had served for years as a trustee of the United Hospital, had been one of the founders and most liberal backers of the Port Chester Community Chest, of war bond drives, of the Red Cross and of the various youth-serving and charitable agencies, regardless of creed. It was a tradition, to which he unassumingly dedicated himself, that no good cause should fail in Port Chester—and that no one who needed or merited his personal friendship should be denied it.

Mr. Ward was a member of the Apawamis Club and the American Yacht Club at Rye, the Westchester Country Club in Harrison, the Duquesne Club in Pittsburgh, and the Yale and University Clubs in New York City.

Surviving are his wife, the former Edna R. Freeman; two daughters, Mrs. Price Berrien and Mrs. John P. Ranson; a son, William E. Ward, president and general manager of the Russell, Burdsall & Ward Co.; two sisters, the Misses Dorothy and Winifred Ward, and 10 grandchildren.

Civil Rights in Domestic Policy and Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have entered in the RECORD a speech made by the director of Operations Crossroads Africa, Dr. James H. Robinson, made at the commencement exercises at Dartmouth College. The Crossroads Africa program antedated and inspired the idea for the Peace Corps. It differs from the Peace Corps in that it emphasizes manual labor, side by side with Africans as a means of fostering better understanding, rather than emphasizing a program centering on trained technical advisers. It also differs from the Peace Corps in that it is based in the private rather than the governmental sector of the society and hence can be truly person to person in operation.

Dr. Robinson is in a unique position among American Negro spokesmen in that the nature of the program which he directs gives him substantial direct contact with the emerging nations of the underdeveloped world. His views, therefore, are not only of interest, but of great value. He notes with accuracy that the divisive nature of American life saps the national energy, not only in the field of domestic employment, where the plight of the Negro is an acute example of the problem of workers untrained for employment in our increasingly technical economy, but also in the field of foreign relations, where the need for a united nation not merely superficially but in reality, is a necessity if we are to retain our present stature in the eyes of the world.

In addition to these general theses, he makes many interesting and significant remarks on the goals and aspirations of the Negro at the present time, and on the role that should be played by our churches and schools in fostering a reverence for the law, and a respect for the equality of men. I commend this speech to my colleagues as a perceptive analysis of many of the reasons behind the current trends in our domestic life and the influence of these trends not only on our domestic policy, but also in our foreign affairs:

TIME AND HISTORY WILL NOT WAIT—CROSSROADS AFRICA DIRECTOR GIVES GRADUATION ADDRESS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Following is the text of the commencement address by Dr. James H. Robinson, Director of Operation Crossroads Africa, Inc., former pastor of the Church of the Master in New York City.)

The redemptive work begun by Lincoln's Proclamation of Emancipation has accomplished some significant achievements in human decency, race relations and the march toward freedom of Negroes from chattel slavery. However, a new emancipation—to which I shortly invite your attention, is urgently needed to complete the good work it so nobly began, because the lag between initiation and fulfillment has created a dangerous vacuum. If the present progress, which the first Emancipation initiated is measured by the status and conditions existing at the time of its proclamation, the achievement looms large on the horizon of human relations in both America and the world.

But this is not the real test, for the progress attained after a hundred years should not be measured or compared with the situation of the Negro in 1863, but rather compared by and with the total progress of America and the peoples of the world since that time until the present. The progress being made by the nations of the world in terms of the tremendous movements for freedom which are sweeping Asia and Africa, makes ours look even more puny. When judged by these standards, our Nation has fallen far short in many aspects of its racial progress and in some aspects, it has even retrogressed.

It is indeed tragic that in this centennial year of the Proclamation of Emancipation, America should face its gravest racial crisis.

A hundred years to achieve the measure of racial progress we have attained is too long, too little, but fortunately not yet too late. We have little cause to rejoice over our rate of progress when nearly 50 nations became independent within a decade, and when Jomo Kenyatta, who less than a decade ago was in jail, has now become Prime Minister of a soon-to-be independent Kenya. Nor is such little progress good enough for that nation—our Nation—to whom history, time and God have given a greater responsibility for world leadership than to any other nation or people in the history of the world.

Time and history will not wait for another hundred years, either for the implementation of the first emancipation or for the fulfillment of the next urgently needed emancipation. Nor will the world wait for us to assume the leadership of that freedom at home we boast so loftly about abroad. Recent events initiated by Negro citizens have served notice in every section of our Republic that they will not wait any longer for the achievement of the fruits and the responsibilities of freedom and democracy. They want nothing more and they will settle for nothing less. Unhappily, their frustration has almost outrun their hope. But they have not yet given up methods of persuasion. The new strategy of mass sitins and picketing is but another but more hazardous form of persuasion because the police and the State troopers are white and white police are often more interested in preserving the old image of the Negro, and such a confrontation risks violence.

America has come face to face with its most dangerous domestic crisis since 1865. The racial situation in our country is far more dangerous than most citizens are ready to admit or to face. There can be no turning back on the part of the Negro; the opposition to their struggle is tougher, and will become for a while even more determined. The liberals are not yet as courageous nor as free from prejudice as they thought they were; the moderates—and their number is considerable—are more frightened than ever; and waiting in the wings to take advantage of the situation are the racists—black and white, but more white than black.

Both President Kennedy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk have sounded the alarm that we stand at the crossroads of an urgent decision for action which can lead to greater national glories or to the most devastating and widespread racial turmoil and conflict we have yet faced—one which may very well have an even more devastating effect upon our world relationships outside this country than within the nation.

No section of the nation is immune from the potential danger of violence and conflict. Sectional denials of freedom and equality are not a difference of kind of degree, and some areas of the East, North, Midwest, the Prairies and the Far West are most vicious—through more subtly covered with the mantle of respectability and self-rightousness than much of our South. Birmingham, Jackson and Lexington are only the strident opening bars to a prelude to what can and will happen not only in Birmingham and Jackson but in every city of this country unless we conffont the problem honestly with forthright actions and with something greatly more rapid than "all deliberate speed." Today is the time for action—not tomorrow—for tomorrow is today.

It is not an overdramatic statement that the second emanicipation will, in large measure, help to determine both our national future and our survival. The present state of the American race problem mutes our voice in world politics, it stymies our leadership of the forces of freedom, it embarrasses our friends and allies, it encourages our enemies and it confuses those who have not made up their minds as to which side of the ideological struggle they will join, and it drives some of them away from us in revulsion. Indeed it affects every aspect of American foreign policy.

United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson recently stated in the General Assembly that "Racial incidents at home are as damaging to the United States as Communist advances abroad," and he went on to add, "this country must exert the same moral leadership at home as it does abroad if its words are to have any moral leadership and influence abroad." We never can be more abroad than we are at home.

Furthermore, discrimination, segregation, denial of full education and training and use of the Negro's talent and skills, are a great waste of the ability, energy, intelligence and manpower to the Nation; this is a waste which America cannot afford because of the other perplexing problems we face at home, the serious challenges to our very survival from our enemies who have brought the threat of war and destruction to our very doorstep and the serious problems we have with many of our allies.

We need the total energies of a united people, unfettered with internal problems, the best intelligence of an enlightened and educated citizenry, each of whom, regardless of race, can place his full share of strength, wisdom, and ability at the Nation's disposal and release it from the destructive ambivalence of trying to project an image to the world which we are unable to achieve at home. Secretary of State Dean Rusk underscored this fact when he told the delegates to the State Department Conference on non-Government Agencies, "The successful meeting and handling of our racial dilemma is the greatest asset our foreign policy can have."

The first emancipation was an act of conscience, morality and decency, made law. The second emancipation must be an achievement of the respect and the support of the law, the moral code of religion and democracy and the achievement of the ultimate worth and equality of opportunity and treatment of Negroes as persons of dignity, by the will, desire and action of the majority of the citizens of this land. We can legislate laws to guarantee rights and establish grievance machinery whenever rights are violated.

But the law is not and never has been enough by itself alone, important as it is. The second emancipation must be an act of conscience, voluntarily on the part of individual citizens, groups, churches, labor unions, educators, politicians, and business concerns to make the race problem their problem and the Nation's problem, not just the Negroes' problem.

The almost hysterical reactions of a distinguished white judge, college president, business executive, society leader or ordinary citizen who finds that a Negro desires to move into the neighborhood, eat in a restaurant, join a club, get a job or position, attend a school or church, or ask for the right to equally sacrifice his life for the country in every branch of the armed services is just as disconcerting to Negroes and as damaging to America's honor, integrity ,and prestige as Little Rock or Greenwood, Oxford or Jackson. There can be no release from the collective discriminations until individuals attain a release for the tyrant from his fears. And what Negro has not witnessed, with anger mixed with pity, the panic in even intelligent white people when they find that the last seat on the plane is beside him.

The next emancipation will of necessity be an emancipation with a dual aspect, but its end must be freedom of Negroes from separation by whites and freedom of whites from their fears of granting the freedom they demand for themselves to American Negroes.

It must break the bonds of economic, social, political, and cultural discrimination as effectively as the first one broke the bonds of involuntary servitude of Negroes, and make it possible for Negroes to develop their full capacities and pour them into this Commonwealth as an everlasting blessing to all its people.

This next emancipation must also release the white citizens by breaking the chain of hatred born of false assumptions of white superiority, the chain of fear of acceptance of the Negro as a child of God and an equal man. The genial, genderless "Uncle Tom" figure of American popular fiction is no longer—but when will the white American male accept his Negro counterpart as an individual who has long since transcended that image? The chains of the schismatic personality he has developed as a result of trying to love God while despising some of God's less fortunate children, of shouting democracy to the world from Telstar and denouncing and denying it by attitude and action at home, and from the refusal to more than deplore, but to get out and lead the struggle for decency; what a force for democracy would be exerted if whites would work as dramatically as Negroes for freedom here and as courageously as they did in the case of Hungarians and Cuban refugees.

It was a naive asumption that the Proclamation of Emancipation would be a one-time act in history which would remove the darkest stain that ever blotted the fair pages of our history and set 4 million of God's darker children on the course to full and complete human dignity, freedom, and equality within the framework of this Republic and in a reasonably short time. The sad truth, however, is that emancipation was only the beginning of a long, painful, and tedious process. The enthusiasm and pride released by the Supreme Court decision of 1954 to break down the barriers to the education of Negro children, led to a reduplication of the same naive assumption on the part of the people of our generation, which the people of Abraham Lincoln's time experienced, in their hope that the noble and heroic step taken would immediately be followed by a chastened, sincere, and democratic citizenry, who would set to work diligently to fulfill the obligations necessary to bring the steps taken to a final conclusion within the framework of their intentions.

In the joy which overwhelmed us at a significant forward thrust in human, democratic, and racial progress, we forgot that all men are sinful, capable of both the noblest sentiments and acts of decency and at the same time also capable of violence and degradation, and that some men are mean and despicable; we forgot that guilt is a dual-edged psychological force, for it can harden the heart of the convicted as readily as it can soften it to accept redemption, and we forgot that white people, like all other people (Negroes included) have a hard time living with other white people and often find it difficult to live with themselves.

We forgot the depths of the attempt to dehumanize the Negro in this country, and we also forgot that the defeated harbor deep, simmering passions of hatred against the forces and the people who caused their defeat, and direct their worst venom against those of their own group who wish to be charitable, honest, fair, and ameliorative. They stew in their hatred until they are driven to brutal and irrational resistance to law and justice.

After the emancipation order was signed by President Lincoln, it had to be won by fire and sword—finalized by the most convulsive internal struggle perhaps any country in the world has ever passed through; sealed with the lifeblood of thousands of young men, and washed with the tears of their loved ones who survived them, to whom fell the task of binding up the Nation's wounds and carrying out the objectives of the Proclamation and helping to secure the full freedom it promised all citizens.

But the hopes born with the signing of the Proclamation of Emancipation and the decision of the Supreme Court on education never came to full blossom, and almost withered on the vine. It was necessary that a long, bitter struggle, punctuated with battles every step of the way, would ensue in order that the hard-won objectives might first be preserved and defended before they could be expanded. In like manner, the begrudging tokenism, delaying tactics, refusal to heed the Supreme Court decision, interpositions and, in extreme cases, the closing of public schools, as in Prince Edward County, offer an equally long, hard struggle.

For perhaps the first time, within very recent years, Negroes have come to full acceptance of themselves and are beginning to evolve a secure image of themselves. Thanks to the rapid emergence of Africa, most Negroes are no longer ashamed of their color or their hair, their race or their heritage. He has no apologies for who he is or what he is, for he knows he is part of America, that he helped to build it, that he died for its preservation and survival in every war the country has fought, including the Revolutionary War, and that he is entitled to its fullest blessing and protection. He will no longer beg—he is demanding his rightful share. You can nail humanity to a cross but you can't keep it there.

For decades after the first emancipation, Negroes needed to be emancipated also from the fear of reprisal—from the fear of asserting themselves and standing up boldly, courageously and individually for their rights; from the fear which cowed them psychologically until today they have achieved a new pride in being, a new feeling of security and human dignity which does not not depend upon the gratuities handed down in condescension by a majority of the citizenry. They have stopped saying "I never go where I'm not wanted" and they have begun to say "I go where I have a right to go as a respected citizen."

The emancipation has brought a new day. The old days will never return. The new and younger generation of present-day high school and college students have set themselves on a course to follow the winds of change which are blowing all over the world. These are the winds of faith-in-action which have filled the sails of the hopes of people everywhere for full and complete dignity, for equality, liberty, justice and brotherly responsibility to help obtain and enlarge the rights of people everywhere.

One of the more hopeful signs is a large number of young white people, especially college students—North and South—who have joined them in this struggle, and for whom the very act of joining and participation often brings a breach with family, friends, associates, classmates, churches and sometimes mortgages their future. Nevertheless, an increasing number of young white people, North and South, are standing firm and are willing also to pay their share of the purchase price for the freedom and rights of Negroes, for a better America and a finer tomorrow. Their efforts have received very little support and encouragement from their institutions and their administrations; they have done it almost alone.

One wishes that the elders of these youths—and especially their pastors, educators, parents, community and social leaders—would be as courageous, as forthright, and as willing to run risks and accept penalties for the sake of fulfilling the obligations of their pledge of allegiance and the faith they profess. In terms of interest and ability to stand up for causes, without question young Americans stand first, American women are second and American men are a very, very poor third. In their despair of youth, many elders seek refuge in the womb of indifference, fear, bigotry, and hypocrisy.

There is much insistence from many white people about the menace and danger of the Black Muslims. However, the Nation has itself to blame to a very large degree. Black Muslims are an outgrowth of the Negro's bitterness over the limitation of his democratic rights in America. Black Muslims would have neither the reason nor the ability to exist if we adhered more completely to the ideals and principles we proclaim to be at the heart and soul of America.

The rise of Black Muslims is a result of America's failure to take the aspirations and the loyalty of Negroes seriously and its failure to understand and react as constructively to the urgency of our domestic problems as they do to our international problems.

Many Negroes, who do not accept either the Black Muslim religious tenets or strategy, praise the movement because they say it frightens white people and they thereby conclude that it serves a useful purpose. This is a highly hazardous assumption, for the first reactions to fear are usually first defensive and secondly aggression. Fear as a method has some positive, but on the whole, very limited uses. Moreover, a frightened man or group is entirely unpredictable. Something more than fear is needed to make progress and to secure racial justice, equality and to persuade and to get people to accept progress and change. It is not fear but release from fear which is far more therapeutic.

The overwhelming majority of American Negroes are neither Muslims nor among those who believe in separation—another form of segregation and discrimination which Negroes equally despise. Negroes are determined to obtain their full share of the fruits of America's heritage by democratic means. They will not be misled by false prophets—nor will they be swallowed up by the hate they have fought against so long—a hatred which eventually consumes every man who indulges in it. History will be validated, in the case of Black Muslim separatism, as effectively as it was in the case of Marcus Garvey's "Back to Africa" movement in the twenties. Although most white Americans never realized it, one of the great unheralded victories over communism was won by Negroes right here in America back in the thirties when we rejected not only Communist ideology but their ideas of "Self-determination in the Black Belt"—a Communist version of the Black Muslim separation and methodology. If we are met with anything approaching our own present spirit, America's dilemma will be resolved and the whole Nation and the entire world will benefit.

The next emancipation must help to free white people from the paralyzing fear of developing normal relationships with Negroes—a fear which warps their minds, gnaws constantly at their peace of mind and drives some of them to acts unworthy of a free, religiously motivated, democratic people. It must release them from that unfounded fear of the reprisals they believe they will suffer when Negroes gain equality or obtain equal status.

Whether anyone likes it or not, the Negroes and whites of this Republic are inexorably bound in the bundle of life as the psalmist suggests. Neither the white segregationist—flagellate himself though he will, nor the black segregationist—delude himself though he will, can ever break the bond or sever the relationship permanently. We cannot escape one another. We have arrived at the point where we have the choice of bringing our problem to a just and democratic solution soon, in order that we may face our world adversaries with our maximum strength or, of weakening ourselves from within until we are so torn that we could not hold off an insidious ideology from without. The choice is ours and the time is now.

"Shouldn't President Kennedy be doing more" and "Shouldn't he lead Negroes personally into the University of Alabama" are very popular questions. The first is valid, provided we ask the corollary question: What must we—each of us—be doing; but the second is absurd on the face of it. This is not the role of a President. Furthermore, despite any dissatisfaction some of us may have about President Kennedy, he has nevertheless taken a more forthright, open and courageous stand on the right side of the racial question than any other President, Abraham Lincoln (though I venerate him) excepted. But he needs and must do more. He should go directly to the people, on television and radio; he should call not one but a series of White House conferences of governors, businessmen, educators, mayors, clergymen and police officers, to draw them into action behind a national movement of responsible leaders.

Above all, he should not allow political considerations to make a football of human rights insofar as he can help it. The suggestion of James Reston, Washington Columnist of the New York Times, that the President travel through the South and crucial cities of the North to help mobilize citizens to assist in finding the best methods to reach the solution, is an excellent one. While the President would stir up some opposition, I, for one, believe he would find more support and rally and encourage more citizens to take the lead than any of us ever dreamed.

This is a time for bold action with strength and wisdom in which every citizen has a stake and every citizen a responsibility. Educational and religious institutions, perhaps more than others, have a great opportunity to help the Nation through the crisis. To them falls most of the burden of the painful, tedious and patient education of the mind and conscience, of changing attitudes and of helping people to be ready for change and to accept change, of inculcating respect for persons and obedience to the law, and even the redemption of the opponents to free and equal justice for all, and the responsibility to fill the vacuum of white leadership. Up to the present, the impact of education and religion have not amounted to as much as they ought, because the schools and the churches have not been in the forefront of the struggle and have escaped a little too easily and certainly too disgracefully, from their share of the responsibility.

It is worth reiterating that our domestic crisis lays a heavy burden on every single one of us. The courts are doing their job well—although they must do more, but the basic failure of racial adjustment and improvement is at the grass roots level, in the neighborhood, the local school, shop, store, union, restaurant, etc. This is a time of testing both our ideals and our souls—Negro and white alike—and it is also a time for maturity and confidence.

Our destinies are one, for our destinies are America; and America, in the juncture of history where its whole future may very well depend upon the outcome of the next emancipation, desperately needs the fullest developed capacities of all its people, if it is to merit the good will, cooperation and support of the awakened and rising masses in Africa and Asia—and of Europe and South America as well—if it is to continue to make progress and survive. But if our purpose of improvement is to impress the world, it will only be successful if we do it because it is altogether right to do so. Most nations have been defeated and destroyed not by enemies from without but by weaknesses from within—not by defeat on the battlefield but by defeat in the souls, and the loss of ideals and goals of its citizens.

Only this next emancipation of both white and Negro citizens can make for "one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all" and make it a reality instead of a noble expression of unfulfilled hope which has become a trite platitude. The future belongs only to the free.

The Chinese formed the word "crisis" by putting two characters together: "danger" and "opportunity." Although this is a time of grave danger, it is also a time of America's greatest opportunity. The graduates of the middle sixties and their children may one day in the years to come, reflect back upon our trying time and be proud that we met the challenge of our time of crisis with courage, intelligence and success, and left them a legacy of such complete freedom that they, from the advantage of a finer and happier day we bequeathed them, would find it difficult to improve upon.

Hon. Robert L. F. Sikes

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I too wish to join in the eloquent and most deserving tributes to the distinguished gentleman from the First District of Florida. Today we are acknowledging in formal terms what the voters of Florida have recognized in BOB SIKES for 23 years. The good people of Florida recognize and appreciate integrity and devoted service, and BOB SIKES stands as the finest example of the people's Congressman. While he has always served his district with diligence and devotion, there are many throughout America that know of BOB SIKES' numerous and outstanding contributions to the strength and well-being of the Nation.

As Speaker I have the greatest confidence and respect in BOB SIKES. His vision and ability rank him as one of the outstanding Members of this House, and it is with a sense of real pride that I recall my many years of service with him. I congratulate him on this splendid achievement and commend the people of Florida for sending to Congress a man who commands the respect of this House and the Nation. Today I salute Bob Sikes and wish him 23 more constructive and happy years in this House.

Arrogance Unlimited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include an editorial from the Danville Register, of Danville, Va., dated July 3, 1963. The editorial is as follows:

ARROGANCE UNLIMITED

Somebody in the Department of Justice isn't doing his homework.

The Department, in the name of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, filed a brief in the U.S. Court for the Western District of Virginia yesterday that was as shoddy as it was inaccurate.

Specifically, the brief asked that charges of criminal contempt against more than 100 Negro demonstrators be transferred from the corporation court of Danville to the Federal court. The brief was filed with Judge Thomas Michie.

The Attorney General has made allegations against the corporation court of Danville and its presiding judge, Archibald M. Aiken, that are a reflection upon the maker rather than upon the distinguished judge.

Imagine a man who has tried but one law case in his career making unsupported allegations of bias and unethical conduct against a jurist who has practiced law with distinction for more years than his critic has lived.

Judge Aiken is widely regarded as one of the ablest judges in Virginia, a State where distinction is required to those who mount the bench to preside over the dispensation of justice.

The Kennedy brief charged that Judge Aiken "packs a pistol" and who in effect "has found defendants guilty before their trials."

Such charges by the Attorney General of the United States are a manifestation of sheer arrogance and complete untruth.

Judge Aiken has defended himself in a statement. He does carry a pistol on his person in going from his home to his office, but never has carried it in court. And he carries it only at the insistence of the police department, after threats.

The alleged pre-trial conviction turns out to be nothing more than a typed statement of the law concerning bail. It had nothing to do with guilt or innocence.

Then there was the charge that Judge Aiken personally undertook to disperse a mob of demonstrators. This, the Attorney General would have known had he bothered to look up the law, was required of a State court judge before restraining the demonstrators from their illegal actions.

In the guise of helping the Negro lawyers, the Attorney General has made unfounded and unjustified attacks upon the character and integrity of a man who has devoted a long life to bar and bench and has earned the esteem of all who believe in the rule of law.

Bobby Kennedy, instead of seeking and ascertaining fact and law in the local situation, has stooped to parroting the careless mouthings of Len Holt, the leftwing Lawyers Guild counsel for the demonstrators and himself one of the worst to invade Danville.

Such is the image of the Attorney General in Danville. His unlimited arrogance is impotent in its attack upon the solid legal and judicial record of Judge A. M. Aiken.

The Kennedy Deficits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the Record an editorial from the Arizona Republic of July 2, 1963 entitled, "The Kennedy Defiicits," which is deserving of the attention of Congress and the American people. The editorial follows:

THE KENNEDY DEFICITS

President Kennedy assumed his high office half way through the 1961 fiscal year. There obviously was little he could do about the budget he had inherited from President Eisenhower. When the year ended on June 30, 1961, the budget was $3.8 billion in the red.

Because budgetmaking takes many months, the administration's hands were at least partly tied in the preparation of the budget for fiscal 1962. Most of the spade work had been done by the previous administration. At year's end, on June 30, 1962, the budget was $6.3 billion in the red.

When it came to the budget for fiscal 1963, however, the responsibility rested squarely with the Kennedy administration. The President recognized this fact, and boldly proclaimed on October 29, 1961, that the 1963 budget would be "strictly in balance." He still apparently felt the same way when he submitted the fiscal 1963 budget to Congress in January 1962, it showed a modest surplus of $500 million. But when fiscal 1963 ended on Sunday night, the Kennedy administration had kept its record immaculate. The budget was again unbalanced, this time by a whopping $7 to $8 billion.

The record is clear enough. Whether it inherited budgets or strated from scratch, the Kennedy administration has gone into the red by annually larger amount for three successive years. For the current year, ending June 30, 1964, it estimates the defiicit at about $12 billion. Taking a gander at the future, the Treasury experts don't see a balanced budget until 1967. And if the past is any key to the future, the New Frontiersmen will undoubtedly find excuses to continue spending more than they take in even beyound the 1967 cut-off date. Unless, of course, the voters should rise in their wrath and make John F. Kennedy a one-term President.

No one should be particularly surprised at the President's unconcern with fiscal responsibilities. In his famous Yale University speech he said the administrative budget "in relation to the great problems of Federal fiscal policy, is not simply irrelevant; it can be actively misleading." He discussed "fiscal myths" at some length, and laid the groundwork for budgetary deficits stretching far into the Nation's fiscal future.

Although Congress holds the Nation's purse strings, the President's control over fiscal policy is vast. It is exceeded, we might say, only by the taxpayer's control over the election results. Until the taxpayer exerts his control, we can expect continued fiscal irresponsibility in the White House and on Capitol Hill.

Congress on Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I never cease to marvel at the brilliance of the editorial staff of the Washington Post and the ease with which they are able to take both sides of a question and argue both with the same intense vehemence.

To be able to do this, one must have an affinity for duplicity and a dogged devotion to demagoguery not given to most mortals.

For months now, the Post has campaigned for the rights of the minority group, the Negro, with a fixation comparable only to that of Malcolm X and his brother X's.

Now, with equal fervor, they use the same adjectives and adverbs to campaign against another minority group, the Congress.

From their lofty vantage point in the clouds above us, the Post has decided that we are a deficient group "not well equipped to function as a policymaking body of a leading democracy."

In view of this judgment, I think the only decent thing for us to do is resign en masse.

This Post proclamation appeared in all its pompous glory, in the June 28 edition. Such deathless prose must be preserved for future generations to enjoy, so under unanimous consent I include it here in the Record:

CONGRESS ON TRIAL

A Senate rules subcommittee will begin examining today one of the most important problems of our time—the organization of Congress. There is almost unanimous agreement that Congress is functioning poorly in an age when momentous issues of policy must be decided. Much has been done to improve the machinery of the executive branch, and the courts are operating with a high degree of effectiveness, but Congress jogs along with a singularly negative response to the changing world about it.

The central fact that will confront the subcommittee is that Congress is not well equipped to function as the policymaking body of a leading democracy. Its deficiencies have been plainly illuminated by the experiences of the current session. Last January, President Kennedy laid before Congress a vital tax reduction bill designed to provide a broad stimulus to the national economy. It is still languishing in the House Ways and Means Committee. Recently the President has sent to Capitol Hill the most sweeping civil rights legislation since the aftermath of the Civil War. The whole country is worried by the danger that it may be shelved by the House Rules Committee, that it may never emerge from the Senate Judiciary Committee or that a filibuster may prevent it from reaching a vote on the Senate floor.

Public confidence in Congress is therefore at a low ebb. There is much evidence that the public would favor a systematic scheduling of legislation in both Houses, improvement of the committee structure, strengthening of the leadership and special arrangements to make certain that any major administration bill could be brought to a vote in both Houses. It is readily apparent that Congress must tackle these problems if it is to hold its place in our three-dimensional constitutional system.

The best approach undoubtedly lies in the Commission on Congressional Reorganization proposed by Senators CASE, CLARK, and KEATING or in the proposed joint congressional committee which would have the same task. The ablest experts in and out of Congress ought to be focusing on ways and means to make it responsive to the demands of the times. The pay of Congressmen, the workload, the terms of House Members and conflicts of interest are important, but overshadowing all else is the question of translating the national will into workable policies without endless delays, frustrations and obstruction from minority groups.

The response of Congress to this rising demand for more efficient legislative machinery will have a profound effect upon the national welfare in the years ahead.

A Distinguished Virginia Judge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent on the floor of the House of Representatives the Fifth Congressional District of Virginia of which the city of Danville is a part. For the past several weeks, Danville has been one of the plague spots of the Nation. A group of relentless agitators from the outside representing evil and flagitious forces have invaded the city for the purpose of implanting and inculcating into the hearts and minds of the lawless and criminal elements of Negroes in Danville a hatred and a distrust of the white people who have been their friends for generations. These offensive malcontents and troublemakers have sought to incite the Negroes to riot and to violence and to the violation of the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

I am informed that during much of the strife a number of persons representing themselves as agents of the U.S. Department of Justice have appeared in the city. I am also advised that some of these agents of the Justice Department have counseled with these lawless demonstrators and have by their very conduct and presence harassed and impeded the forces of law and order in that beleaguered city.

Even the able and distinguished Judge of the Corporation Court of the city of Danville, the Honorable A. M. Aiken has not escaped the poisoned darts and the wrath and the fury of these turbulent forces.

The Bar Association of Danville informs me that serious and defamatory charges against the official conduct of Judge Aiken have been made by representatives of these Negroes and that the Justice Department has filed a petition joining in with them.

I deprecate and deplore such an attack upon so able and upright a judge as the Honorable A. M. Aiken.

I have known Judge Aiken for more than 40 years. He comes from a distinguished Virginia family. His father presided over the corporation court of Danville around the turn of the century and was highly respected and beloved by the people of Southside Virginia.

The present Judge Aiken, against whom these unwarranted attacks have been made by the Negroes and by the U.S. Department of Justice, is a man of impeccable character who enjoys in an unusually high degree the confidence and the esteem of all who know him. He has a statewide reputation for fairness, for virtue, and impartiality. He is a learned judge of long experience and possesses judicial temperament, a quality of mind and heart so necessary and indispensable in a good judge.

Judge Aiken became a judge of the circuit court of the counties of Henry, Patrick, Pittsylvania, and the cities of Martinsville and Danville more than 40 years ago. He held that position for only a short time and returned to the private practice of law in the city of Danville. He was generally recognized as one of the leading lawyers of that city at the time that he was appointed to become judge of the corporation court of the city of Danville nearly 20 years ago. His conduct as a judge has been of such a character as to enhance the already high standing of our Virginia judiciary.

I have received a telegram from the Honorable George B. Anderson, president of the Danville Bar Association, dated July 3, 1963, giving an expression of the bar association on this subject. Under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the telegram which is as follows:

DANVILLE, VA.,
July 3, 1963.

Hon. WILLIAM M. TUCK,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

The Danville Bar Association at a special session on July 3, 1963, met and reviewed statements contained in a Justice Department brief filed in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Virginia and in an AP press release under dateline "Washington, D.C., July 2, 1963," attributing to the Attorney General of the United States, Robert F. Kennedy, and to the Justice Department serious and unwarranted charges against the Honorable A. M. Aiken, judge of the corporation court of Danville, Va.

These charges state that the Honorable A. M. Aiken: operates his court in an atmosphere of rancor and suspicion; denies defendants equal civil rights under the law; tries cases in a prejudicial manner and setting; prejudges defendants; is guilty of racial antagonism; and so conducts his court that defendants are intimidated and cannot secure equal protection of the laws or a fair trial.

The Danville Bar Association states that such charges are false, without basis in fact, or misleading. It is the judgment of this association that such irresponsible charges degrade the dignity of the Justice Department as well as the dignity of the State courts of this Commonwealth of Virginia and that such charges constitute an unwarranted and irresponsible interference with the administration of justice in the corporation court of Danville, Va.

The Danville Bar Association expressed its unqualified confidence and support of Judge A. M. Aiken as a distinguished jurist and confirms that at all times Judge A. M. Aiken has conducted his court and administered justice in Danville in a fair, impartial, and judicious manner, without regard to race, religion, color, or creed.

The following resolution was thereupon unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the Danville Bar Association has taken due note of a widely published press release dated July 2, 1963, over AP wire from Washington, D.C., which contains statements attributed to the Attorney General of the United States and others contained in a brief filed by the Department of Justice in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Virginia, which statements constitute an unwarranted, irresponsible, and unjust attack on the Honorable A. M. Aiken and on his conduct of the corporation court of the city of Danville, Va.; and

"Whereas such statements are false, without basis in fact, or misleading to such an extent that a wholly false impression has been conveyed to the public of the administration of justice in Danville; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That this association does here record its strong resentment and unqualified disapproval of the aforementioned statements, and does hereby censure any representatives of the Department of Justice, including the Attorney General of the United States, who may be responsible for formulating, issuing or giving circulation to such statements, to the discredit of the legal profession of which they are a part; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That this association does hereby affirm its support and admiration of the Honorable A. M. Aiken and of the extremely able and judicious manner in which he conducts his court, thus assuring a fair and impartial trial to every defendant, regardless of race, color, or creed."

GEORGE B. ANDERSON,
President, Danville Bar Association.

Economy in the Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics or the House Space Committee, it was quite encouraging to read a recent editorial appearing in our hometown paper, the Kansas City Times, of Monday, July 8, 1963.

While the entire content is set out below, it seemed to some of us on the committee that the editorial staff might have been reading our collective minds because the committee did devote its efforts to doing exactly what the editorial suggested—that is "eliminating duplications and deferring some long-range projects that seem poorly defined by the agency."

The reference to the elimination of the 15th Ranger shot and the elimination of a Surveyor Orbiter satellite, together with a second Mariner flight, referred to in the editorial were all projects eliminated by the Space Sciences Subcommittee of which the Congressman that represents the Fourth Missouri District serves as a member.

The implied commendation of the committee action by the editorial is pointed up by use of such expressions as "sound economy" and the "close examination of the space budget is welcomed." The editorial is also noteworthy in that it points out that a trend toward economy in the space program is by no means a reversal of this Nation's goal to place a man on the moon in the 1970's, and that the strict congressional control of space expenditures does not thereby indicate that we have lost our enthusiasm for the space effort, or that this attention to economy should be construed that Members of Congress now regard the moon project as adolescent competition with the Soviet Union.

The editorial proceeds to point out that while the Congress may not have a public mandate to reverse the President's decision to place a man on the moon, it does have a continuing mandate to tighten the agency's budget as much as possible. The well-thought-out editorial is as follows:

Yes, Spacemen, There Is a Congress

It is entirely proper that the space agency should no longer be a sacred cow on Capitol Hill. The close examination of the space budget is to be welcomed. It would be another thing if Congress should decide to prevent this particular cow from jumping over the moon—in due time. But for all the debate on the value of a man on the moon, that does not seem to be the congressional purpose. So far, the House Science and Astronautics Committee has devoted itself to eliminating what it regards as duplications, and deferring some long-range projects that seem poorly defined by the agency.

Let us say that we have not lost our enthusiasm for the space effort. We do not regard the moon project as an adolescent competition with the Soviet Union. Yet we cannot argue that with 5 Ranger failures already recorded a 15th shot will be necessary. Nine Ranger moon experiments have already been authorized but the House group pulled the plug on the 15th, thereby saving $10 million. Rather a sound economy, we would say.

The Representatives also decided that it was not necessary to orbit a Surveyor satellite around the moon, a performance that in their view would duplicate other studies already in the planning stage. This was a $28,200,000 cutback. Similarly, the committee vetoed a second Mariner flight to Venus, on the theory that it could hardly add to the information gained by the Mariner that successfully made the journey. Another $15 million saved.

So far the space program, proceeding through the Capitol Hill coffee grinder, has lost about $400 million. More may be cut later on. But what has been done so far is by no means a reversal of the Nation's goal of placing a man on the moon in the 1970's. That major policy decision was made 2 years ago by President Kennedy with the concurrence of the lawmakers. We do not see that Congress has any public mandate to reverse the decision. It does have a mandate to tighten every agency's budget as much as possible. And in the process, to inform the agencies that there is a Congress and that it, in the end, controls the Treasury's purse strings.

Area Redevelopment Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, after the Area Redevelopment Administration bill was defeated in the House, many news articles appeared over the country on both sides of the question. An article in the Berkshire (Mass.) Eagle on July 6 outlines many of the objections which those who voted against the bill tried to bring out in the House debate. It is gratifying to see the independence and judgment of one of our colleagues in the face of the type of pressures mentioned.

I commend this article to my colleagues and under unanimous consent include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Critics of Conte for Vote Against ARA Bill Studiously Ignore Its Pork Barrel Aspects

(By A. A. Michelson)

The "blank check" approach to the appropriation of public funds, a practice that has resulted in public works, waterways, and metropolitan district commission scandals in Massachusetts, appears to be the chinning bar on which Republican Congressmen from this State will continue to vote against the Kennedy administration's $445.5 million aid to distressed area legislation.

In the first round, the House beat it 209 to 204 in early June. But it was revived by the Senate 3 weeks later with such overwhelming support that it is coming up for another go in the House. It is an issue of some importance to this State because the five Massachusetts Republicans were recorded in opposition, and pressures are mounting in their respective districts to prevail on them to switch.

An outstanding example of this pressure is on grand display in the western part of the State, where Congressman SILVIO O. CONTE, of Pittsfield, is being denounced by Democrats as the villain who is taking the bread out of children's mouths. Three weeks ago the Democratic State committee staged a unity dinner in Springfield for Democrats of the four western counties, but the only real display of unison was the willingness of just about every speaker to whack CONTE for failure to vote in favor of the Kennedy ARA bill.

Governor Peabody, Presidential Aid Larry O'Brien, and District Attorney Matthew J. Ryan, Jr., all took turns pointing fingers at CONTE. Ryan went so far as to threaten that if the Democrats of the Berkshires couldn't get up an adequate opponent for the Pittsfield Republican, "we will take matters into our own hands and run Mossy Donahue." The latter is Maurice A. Donahue, of Holyoke, floorleader of the State senate.

Senator TED KENNEDY didn't join that punch fest, but got in a few licks a week later at a conference on northern Berkshire economic problems in North Adams June 25. He urged some 200 business and political leaders to pressure CONTE to give the ARA measure more support than he has given it in the past.

But CONTE, who has always been mindful of voter sentiment, is not about to beat a strategic withdrawal in the face of this offensive. He has already, for instance, advised Governor Peabody to worry more about his own chances of winning the Democratic nomination for reelection than about CONTE's voting record. He has told District Attorney Ryan that he should attend to questionable racetrack operators in his district rather than wait for the Republican attorney general to step in and do the job. He is waiting to hear from Larry O'Brien who calls early, and often with great success, for CONTE support of the President's foreign aid and civil rights programs. And from TED KENNEDY, CONTE would like a detailed explanation of how Government participation in the construction of motels and hotels in rural areas of Oklahoma and Southern States will relieve chronic unemployment in hard-core distressed areas.

As to the merits of the ARA measure itself, CONTE maintains that it is a far cry from the thoughtfull piece of legislation first proposed by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois. He maintains it has been taken over by artful legislators more interested in pushing local favorities than in the creation of new job opportunities in areas of substantial and long-term unemployment. He maintains that for pure pork barrelism, the administration of the 1961 ARA Act makes the Corps of Engineers look like a pack of Boy Scouts playing in rivers and harbors. And he also maintains that if technical assistance, including manpower training and retraining, were the feature of the program rather than a tolerated appendage, the idea would make sense.

Massachusetts' greatest asset, he notes, is its supply of skilled workers. Therefore something should be done about training the unskilled for adaptation to the age of automation. But of $379 million appropriated for ARA 2 years ago, only about $7.5 million had been spent for technical assistance up to June 1 of this year. And out of the whole boodle, he notes that only $1,239,000 has been approved for Massachusetts projects and $2,170,000 worth of work is awaiting approval.

"The fact that Massachusetts taxpayers have to come up with about $14.7 million as their share of the cost of the 1961 act is disturbing," CONTE says, "but I'd be glad to go along with it if only I could be shown something more concrete for the distressed areas of Massachusetts and my district."

CONTE cites as the most disturbing example of maladministration of the 1961 act the ARA deliverance of a prominent shoe manufacturer to a site in southern Indiana by means of a $474,000 loan, a $130,000 grant, a $105,000 water and sewer project, and a $64,272 retraining program.

"In one fell swoop," CONTE obesrves, "the ARA made itself a party to the promotion of cut throat competition, to the creation of additional unemployment in a depressed industry, to the lowering of industry wage levels, to the encouragement of antiunion activity, and to the subsidy of racial discrimination in employment. My information comes not from diehard conservatives who oppose any or all measures of the Kennedy administration, but from responsible spokesmen of the United Shoe Workers, AFL–CIO. I have one shoe factory left in my district and that kind of pirating, even without the aid of taxpayer money, is always like a sword hanging over our heads."

CONTE cites other questionable ARA operations.

Item: A $418,000 loan to the Tomahawk, Wis., Paper Co., for the manufacture of household tissue even though the industry now produces 400,000 tons more a year than consumers demand and even though Wisconsin is the home of Kleenex.

Item: Of the $9.8 million loaned out all over the country in the past fiscal year for public facilities, one-third was for a single project—a convention auditorium in Duluth, Minn., which would create 22 permanent jobs in an area that has broad-scale unemployment caused by chronic ailments in iron mining.

Item: An $8.5 million loan and a $983,000 grant to the Oklahoma Lake Development

Authority Tourist Center which includes a manmade lake, de luxe cabins, two main lodges each of which will "nestle like a pearl in its own 2,500-acre park, and each with its own convention halls, swimming pools, gift shops, tennis courts, golf course, boat docks, and marina." CONTE directs the attention of Governor Peabody and the unemployed in such hard-core distress areas of northern Berkshire, Lawrence, Haverhill, Fall River, and Lowell to this project.

Item: A $75,000 grant, not a loan, to help modernize the Hawthorne, Nev., Municipal Airport. Hawthorne has a population of 2,828, up 52 percent from 1950, indicating that it's certainly growing. Hawthorne also has a gambling casino.

Item: ARA assistance to Southern States where municipalities can attract industry from the North through the construction of tax-financed plants. Borg-Warner was lured from Muskegon, Mich., to a Greenwood, Ark., municipal factory to which there is piped ARA-financed water and sewer facilities. A municipal plant in Gassville, Ark., was given similar ARA help to attract a shirt manufacturer.

Item: Many motels and hotels in the South are getting loans and grants from ARA even though Negroes won't be allowed to eat or sleep in them.

Item: ARA technical assistance funds were used to buy services from another Federal agency—the U.S. Bureau of the Census. Similarly, ARA has had printed 81,300 four-color posters, 22 by 38 inches in size, to publicize its program in post offices and on the panels of post office trucks.

Item: ARA funds were used to train machine tool operators for the Mack Truck Co. in Hagerstown, Md., after it had vacated an old plant in Plainfield, N.J., where it had employed 2,000 workers.

Poison Gas Against Civilians in Yemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 5, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I called attention to the Congress to reports of the use of poison gas by Egyptians in Yemen against civilians. I stressed the irony and repugnance that the American taxpayer is indirectly financing this action and other atrocities committed by Dictator Nasser through continued American assistance to the United Arab Republic. As cosponsor of the so-called Keating-Halpern amendment to sever aid to nations who divert their funds for the purchase of offensive Soviet arms, I urged the adoption of this amendment and for its implementation by the executive branch—an appeal which I fervently repeat today.

This afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House a new instance that emphasizes the need for this amendment. Today's news brings us word that the United Arab Republic has made an entirely new arms deal with the Soviet Union which may include aid to build up missile production and weapons of a more sophisticated nature than previously provided. The arms deal is believed partly financed in a loan of $44.4 million recently granted by Russia to the United Arab Republic disguised as a loan for "development of industrial products."

I have requested permission to print at this point the report in reference from the Washington Post:

RED-UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC ARMS DEAL REPORTED

(By Arch Parsons)

The Soviet Union has made another major sale of arms to the United Arab Republic, reliable sources here report.

The arms deal, it is reported, was included in a loan of $44.4 million the Soviet Union made recently to the United Arab Republic. Announcement of this loan was made on June 20, but the only reference to the purpose of the loan at the time said that it would be used for the "development of industrial products."

Sources reporting the arms deal said they did not have details yet on the specific weapons involved, but they speculated that it was most likely that the deal concerned one or more of three areas:

Replacement of arms lost by the United Arab Republic Army in its campaign in Yemen.

Aid to build up missile production within the United Arab Republic.

Weapons of a more sophisticated nature than those the Soviet Union has provided in previous arms sales to the United Arab Republic.

RUMORS ADMITTED

U.S. officials said yesterday they have heard rumors that the United Arab Republic may have received weapons to replace its losses in Yemen, but they added that they had no confirmation of such rumors.

But one nongovernment observer who follows United Arab Republic military affairs closely put it this way:

"It is a fair assumption that the government of President Gamal Abdel Nasser is doing everything it can to keep its weapons supply up to date."

The official announcement of the industrial development loan came at the end of a 2-week visit to Moscow by a United Arab Republic delegation headed by Field Marshal Abdel Hakim Amer, commander in chief of Nasser's armed forces. The delegation is reported to have included the heads of the United Arab Republic air and naval forces and the director of that government's armed forces and management (ordnance) section.

SIGNED BY MALINOVSKY

Observers also regard it as significant that the loan agreement was signed on behalf of the Soviet Union by its Defense Minister, Harshal Rodion Malinovsky.

The arms purchase is regarded as the fourth major deal of its kind between the two countries since the Soviet Union began selling weapons to the United Arab Republic in 1955. The last deal, concluded late in 1960, reportedly marked the first time that the Soviet Union offered to the United Arab Republic weapons of the same level as those used by the Red army, although only conventional weapons were involved.

That agreement provided for delivery of weapons over a 3-year period, it is believed, but it has been reported that the deliveries were speeded up and the quality of arms improved during that period as a result of the United Arab Republic's Yemen campaign.

An estimated 4 to 5 squadrons (about 20 planes each) of Mig-19's were involved, for instance, but the latter part of the delivery provided the more sophisticated Mig-21.

INCLUDED ILYUSHINS

Similarly, the original consignment included Ilyushin 28's, jet bombers with an approximate range of 750 miles and bomb load of 4 tons. Later in the deal, TU-16's were provided. These have an estimated range of 1,800 miles and a 10-ton bomb load.

Finally, that deal included W class submarines (oceangoing, as opposed to shore patrolling), Stalin Mark III heavy tanks and several types of missiles.

Slightly more than a week before the announcement of the new agreement was made the United States and Israel concluded a pact for an Israeli purchase of a battalion of Hawk antiaircraft missiles—the exact number is classified—valued at about $25 million. But it was public knowledge that the negotiation of this agreement had been underway since last summer.

The sale was licensed under a policy recently reiterated by the Defense Department, under which the United States has stated that because the Soviet Union is giving military aid to some nations in the Middle East in hope of enhancing its influence in that area, the United States will furnish limited amounts of defensive military equipment to other nations in the Near East.

Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, next week is Captive Nations Week and the annual observance is growing each year as more Americans realize the significance of its message.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer, in an editorial of July 5, calls attention to one of the many practical reasons for the continued observance of Captive Nations Week despite the obvious reluctance of the President and the State Department to encourage observances of Captive Nations Week. This editorial, in my opinion, reflects the thinking of the American public on this subject. Under unanimous consent I insert it into the RECORD at this point:

CAPTIVE NATIONS

If the North Atlantic Treaty Organization signs a nonaggression pact with the Warsaw Treaty states, our solicitude for the captive nations will fly out the window.

Such a pact, demanded by Soviet Premier Khrushchev as the price for a nuclear test ban treaty, would imply acceptance of the regimes in power in the Soviet satellite states. The captive nations would be assigned to permanent captivity.

We have long since abandoned any thought of trying to free the captive nations by force. That issue was settled when we failed to help the Hungarians throw off the Moscow yoke in 1956. But we have maintained a friendly interest in the plight of those who were promised self-determination but never got it and we have held aloft the torch of freedom to strengthen the hope that some day they will be liberated.

Our interest was manifested by Congress in 1959 when it proclaimed the 3d week in in July as "Captive Nations Week." This so infuriated Khrushchev that he administered a public bawling out to Vice President Nixon, who arrived in Moscow shortly after Congress passed the resolution and who later participated in the celebrated "kitchen debate" with the Soviet Premier.

Since then Khrushchev has been trying to persuade the United States to abolish Captive Nations Week. A recent issue of the

New Times, Soviet propaganda weekly, asked: "Is it not time to discontinue the Captive Nations Week in the United States? That is just as much a dead horse as the Hungarian question."

Our answer is that we should continue to observe Captive Nations Week as long as the Soviet Union continues to renege on its pledge to hold free elections in the nations it has enslaved.

The Police State—Right Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include an editorial from the Danville Register, of Danville, Va., for Tuesday, July 2, 1963. The editorial is as follows:

The Police State—Right Now?

The Negroes once—and we hope still do—sang with zest a wonderful spiritual that contained this line:

"Everybody talk about heaven ain't gwine there."

Whatever the line lacked in grammar it more than made up in wisdom. Good sense is good, however expressed.

The talkers-about-heaven are the liberals who join in demanding all forms of "racial balance" as the demonstrators call for it, right now.

The very people who insist that they want more freedom and democracy in this country for all individuals are the first and the most ardent to join the Kennedy brothers and their cohorts in demanding immediate passage of a so-called civil rights bill that would not expand liberties for a few but would impose a totalitarian police state upon all the people. And the policeman, who would lack the gaudy uniform of a Himmler but not lack for many of Himmler's powers, would be no less a personage than Robert F. Kennedy, the power-hungry Attorney General of the United States.

Bobby wants the power to do what he would like to do—tell every man and woman in business in the United States what they must do, when he orders them to do it, or face the consequences of Federal might.

All in the name of enforcing equal treatment, police state boss Bobby would be empowered, under the bill now in the Congress for which he has been the first witness in advocacy, to bring an action that would force any person operating a business in such fields as hotels, motels, rooming houses, retail shops, department stores, novelty or variety stores, markets, drugstores, gasoline stations, restaurants, lunch counters, soda fountains and other eating places to serve all comers. Any person who believes or suspects he was denied accommodations or service because of his race could go to a Federal court for an order directed against the proprietor of such establishment. Or, should he prefer, he could call upon the Attorney General to take up his complaint and conduct his action against the proprietor.

Bobby Kennedy is dissatisfied with the role of the Federal Bureau of Investigation as an investigating rather than enforcement arm of the Department of Justice and the whole Federal structure. Report in Washington is that Bobby and his big brother want to retire J. Edgar Hoover as FBI Director and bring in a young man who eagerly will turn the respected agency into an enforcement arm—ready to enforce Bobby's orders—everywhere.

Rather than kick Hoover out, the Kennedy's are seeking to obtain the civil rights legislative package so that it will give the Attorney General such powers and use the FBI in a manner that Mr. Hoover's wishes or his presence or absence will not matter to them.

Under the police state civil rights measure, the Attorney General could take up, on complaint of any family of a nonwhite child who sought to enter any all-white school, and wage the case to force such admission, at Federal expense.

Under the make-Bobby-boss bill, the Federal Government would be empowered to withhold Federal aid of any kind or character to any State wherever and whenever an instance of discrimination on account of race turns up. The Federal aid withheld could be a direct grant, loan, bonus, insurance or other form. A bank that denied a loan to a Negro could lose its Federal Deposit Insurance protection.

Not listed but just as likely, would be to withhold use of the mails to a person, partnership or corporation where some nonwhite alleged discrimination in employment or seniority advancement.

Then, probably worst of all, the police state powers asked for the Attorney General by the President would empower that official to go to the Federal court with a request that referees be appointed to supervise State elections for Federal offices and these agents of the Attorney General who are to be called referees would be directed by statute to assume that any person who reached the sixth grade in schooling would be eligible to vote—no matter what else.

Passage of this bill, which the NAACP spokesmen say must be enacted at this session of the Congress, would so alter the nature of our Government that it could no longer truthfully be called a representative republic. Such a regime as would result from the Kennedy civil rights power grab would convert our form of government into a police state—just as hateful when called a democracy or republic as when called by any other name for the imposition of raw power to force the people into servitude to the all-powerful state.

That a people, or the representatives of a free people, willingly would give up such basic rights of the people and vest them in a power-hungry politician is beyond reason.

Let the Members of the Congress and the people of the United States remember that behind the wall of abomination a police state is called a people's republic when, in truth, it is not a republic nor is it controlled by the people.

President Kennedy, in speaking of rights for people in Central Europe, recently shouted to the world from the edge of the wall of abomination: "Ask Berlin."

Let us ask ourselves—and our Congressmen. Once they bow to the power-grab pressures, our civil liberties will be lost for all Americans rather than expanded for a few among us.

Viewing the Vatican as a State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. C. L. Sulzberger of the New York Times wrote an excellent analysis of the formal relations between the United States and the Vatican.

In his column, which appeared in the New York Times of June 3, 1963, Mr. Sulzberger raised a whole series of extremely provocative questions. It would be my judgment that students of the international scene should ponder both the problems which Mr. Sulzberger raises and the conclusions which he draws.

There is considerable merit to his observation that the United States exchanges envoys with tiny states throughout the world of considerably less importance than Vatican City.

It is my judgment that establishing a closer liaison between the United States and the Vatican is a subject which deserves the widest possible discussion in the United States. This is particularly true in view of the universal acceptance which the late Pope John's encyclical "Pacem in Terris" met throughout the world.

It is gratifying to note that Pope Paul VI has assured the world of his earnest desire to carry on the inspiring principles laid down by his immediate predecessor. These two outstanding religious leaders have brought to the Vatican a new dimension of world understanding. Surely the Vatican today stands as one of the world's impressive forums for the exchange of views and ideas in man's unyielding search for peace and understanding.

In the light of these most recent developments in the Vatican, so enthusiastically hailed by people of all religious faiths and, yes, those of no religious faith, throughout the world, it is entirely possible that the American people today may want to review the fundamental question of restoring a closer liaison with Vatican City.

Mr. Sulzberger's provocative article, in my judgment, provides an excellent basis for a discussion of this entire subject. It is for this reason that I am today calling it to the attention of my colleagues by inserting it in the Congressional Record for their further contemplation.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sulzberger's article follows:

Foreign Affairs: Viewing the Vatican as a State

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

For illogical and emotional reasons, partly rooted in bias and suspicion, the United States has chosen officially to ignore the role of the Papacy as a political factor in the material world. We have never accorded the Vatican diplomatic recognition, although for one relatively brief period the White House sent a personal ambassador to the Pope.

This is a foolish lacuna in world contacts. We exchange envoys with tiny states of considerably less importance than Vatican City. We have even, as in the former Imamate of Yemen, accredited diplomats to what was tantamount to a theocracy. Cynics like Napoleon have measured papal strength in bleakly unreligious military equivalents, and wholly non-Catholic lands like Japan keep missions at the Vatican; yet we choose to avoid such a step.

It is only, as today, when moments of high crisis grip St. Peter's that we are officially reminded of the importance of its minuetely circumscribed government in which the chief symbol of a huge religion also casts a long shadow of influence over domains that owe him no spiritual allegiance.

The very methods of the Vatican as a lay government have been imitated by other states. Faced by disparate contenders for ascendancy in feudal Italy, medieval Popes evolved that "balance of power" formula, later adopted by Cardinal Wolsey, which became a precept of British foreign policy.

After Italian unification and constriction of its mundane authority within a small enclave, the Vatican continued to display interest in politics, both within and without the Catholic world. Pius XII was keenly informed not only about local Italian party maneuvers but also about those Christian-Democratic movements that developed in European countries with large Catholic populations.

John XXIII audiciously sought to extend moral influence beyond the limits of the Roman creed, to impress upon all humans—Catholic, non-Catholic and unbeliever—the essential need for peace. He tried to encourage harmony in the broader realm of Christendom and continued the consistent if inadequately dramatized Vatican battle against racial intolerance.

CONVOCATION APPROVED

In 1959 President Eisenhower, who avoided the needlessly awkward problem of dispatching an envoy to the Vatican, heartily approved Pope John's convocation of Catholic prelates to contemplate revolutionary challenges to the spiritual world.

He suggested to a friend the need for some "ringing declaration" recognizing "the ascendancy of spiritual values" and a reminder "that free men always stand ready, individually and collectively, to defend them, support them and advance them." He wrote: "Such a declaration, I believe, would do much to alert us to the threat posed by Communist imperialism, and to unite us better in the search for peace."

Pope John began a search in this direction through his Ecumenical Council. He went still further by expressing his concepts of social reform in the encyclical Mater et Magistra, and his nonsectarian plea for universal peace, Pacem in Terris. In each case he addressed himself to an even more catholic world than that for which the church speaks.

In Catholic lands, of course, the Vatican has an evident influence that transcends pure theology. This can be discerned, for example, in the simple fact that Catholicism's political image, Christian democracy, has a powerful hold in all six countries of the European Common Market. And in the Communist orbit those lands where an independent spirit is most marked are often those with large Catholic populations.

Americans sometimes forget that the Pope functions not only as head of a theological hierarchy but also as chief of a state, dealing with others who owe him no allegiance and, in some instances, profess no belief in divinty. His diplomacy is far-reaching and his sources of information are widespread.

It is time that Washington acknowledge the need for formal contacts with the papal government. Diplomatic recognition is not the same thing as a religious concordat; it is a material matter. We should discard the blinkers that have hitherto inhibited us from exchanging practical political courtesies with the Vatican on the same basis as with other, more conventional, states. This has nothing to do with national religious practices; it is simply a fact of international life of which Pope John's imminent death may remind us.

Sibal Seeks Scientific Counsel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut, Ab Sibal, has proposed a far-reaching bill which would give Congress the necessary scientific tools to maintain its essential role in government in this age of elaborate science and technology. Since Congressman Sibal introduced H.R. 6866, his proposal has quickened a sympathetic response among everyone concerned with the preservation of truly representative government. The response has been so favorable and widespread that Congressman Friedel, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration, is going to hold public hearings in the near future. An excellent summary of the Sibal congressional science staffs bill is given in the following article by Mr. Carey Cronan, correspondent for the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post-Telegram. For the benefit of the House, I offer the article for the Record.

Sibal Seeks Scientific Counsel

(By Carey Cronan)

Although his name may never grace the final piece of legislation, since he is a Republican, Representative Abner W. Sibal in his bill for independent scientific staffs for Congress has generated thought and comment that may eventually blossom into legislative reality.

It has been obvious to many and especially to the Representatives and Senators concerned that their technical and scientific knowledge is hardly commensurate with their responsibilities to judge budgetary requests, question the proponents of agency spending, frame proper legislation and vote with any degree of understanding. Congress has had to rely, and is still relying upon scientists, engineers, etc., employed by the Executive department, to explain and justify the aims and policies of the very Administration which is seeking authority and funds.

The House and Senate must each in turn render final opinions on situations and subjects dealing with matters that are far beyond the training and experience of most if not all lawmakers on Capitol Hill.

It is a problem of the space age that must be solved if legislators are to act efficiently and fairly, not only toward the agencies involved but also toward the taxpayers who must pay the bills.

DEPENDENCE DECRIED

Representative Sibal, who has been mulling over the question for some time, believes there is a serious gap in the legislative process and his bill, H.R. 6866, would, he believes, remove the present dependence upon experts from the Executive branch. Democratic Representative Samuel Friedel, of New York, chairman of the House Administration Subcommittee on Accounts, has said that his group will hold hearings either in late July or early August on the Sibal bill and this step alone is a bit of a triumph for a member of the minority since any piece of legislation deemed worthy and possible to pass is usually rephrased and given a majority author before a hearing is slated. The Sibal bill admits that it is becoming increasingly difficult for Members of Congress to question programs sent down from the executive side, such as the billions contemplated for the moon race.

Representative Sibal's bill would establish a permanent scientific staff in both the House and in the Senate headed by three scientists representing the fields of physics, biology, and chemistry, and who would serve for 6 years at salaries of $21,500 each with associates getting $20,000 and temporary personnel placed on a per diem basis. Representative Sibal says Congressmen could then ask for advice in all fields whether they dealt with space, insects, plant viruses, uses of coal, atomic energy, cancer research, or whatever. The scientific staff would help Congress keep an effective eye on science spending by the administration seeking to hold down waste and duplication while at the same time suggesting new avenues of research and development.

Typical comments: Representative Sibal has received many oral commendations praising his purpose but some of the support has come in the mails. For instance, Paul W. Bachman, chairman of the NAM research committee, wrote that "Our committee agrees with you wholeheartedly * * * and has been concerned with this problem for some time * * * we have discussed the matter with several Members of Congress from both parties, each of whom expressed much the same thoughts as you." Mr. Bachman offered to submit names of men experienced in research in private industry who could be called upon at anytime to comment on proposed legislation in the scientific field, and these experts could be made available immediately without enabling legislation.

William Kloepfer, Jr., of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, wrote that the Sibal proposal should be adopted and thus serve as an impartial bridge to the entire scientific community.

Milton D. Rosenau, Jr., of Weston Road, Georgetown, Conn., called the proposal valuable and said that its intention should at least be carried out.

Rustum Roy, professor of geochemistry, Pennsylvania State University, said the Sibal bill may be "one of the most far-reaching decisions which could be made by the Congress this year" because scientists "really want to communicate rather than confuse."

Representative Sibal has at least spurred discussion not only in Congress and throughout the Government, but throughout the country on the need to find—and find quickly—a solution to perplexities faced by the House and Senate, perplexities that expand almost daily as the space age whirls on.

Federal Government Pressures Private Business To Favor Negroes Revealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1963

Mr HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for an investigation by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House and the Senate Commerce Committee of pressures being exerted on the Louisville & Nashville Railroad by officials of the Federal Government to force the favoritism of certain Negro applicants for new jobs and promotions. Threats to withhold mail and Tennessee Valley Authority coal hauling contracts if the company did not comply with the Government's requests have been made, according to the enclosed letter of Mr. O. G. Gentry, general chairman, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, Nashville, Tenn. The letter was written on June 21, 1963, and was sent to other Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen lodges and locals following a meeting between company and union officials.

The threats to withhold contracts, which are generally awarded as a result of competitive bidding, are a matter of grave concern. If the officials who made the threats can make good on them, then serious questions as to the basic fairness and justness of the administration of these laws are raised.

I believe that all the Members will be interested in seeing this letter of Mr. O. G. Gentry which I insert herewith:

JUNE 21, 1963.

Local Chairman and Secretaries, Lodges 215, 648, 720, 774, and 922, L. & N. Railroad.

DEAR SIRS AND BROTHERS: All the general chairman on the L. & N. Railroad were called to the director of personnel's office on June 20, 1963, for a conference. We did not know for what purpose we were called but we were informed soon after arriving that the reason was the Negro problem that is facing everyone today.

The U.S. Government called the L. & N. Railroad and told them to have a representative in Washington on a certain date to discuss discrimination among the Negro employees on the railroad. A Negro porter from Etowah, Tenn. and a Negro laborer from Louisville shops wrote Washington that they were being discriminated against. The officials in Washington told them in no uncertain terms that mail contracts, TVA coal contracts, or any other business that the Government had a hand in would be withdrawn from the railroads that did not comply with the Government's wishes in this matter.

The railroad officials stated the Government representatives were very positive in their statements that there was not to be any discrimination shown to any employees. If there is an opening for 10 switchmen, the Negro organizations would send 10 of the best qualified college graduates to take the examination for these jobs, and maybe 30 white men applied for them too, the 10 men making the highest score would be employed, and chances are the company would have to hire all 10 Negroes and no whites. If a position comes up bid and a Negro wants to try and qualify for it, even if he holds no seniority in this particular craft, he must be given a chance to qualify for it and the company must post on bulletin boards at all places so it will be seen by the employees.

The Government told the railroad to sign an agreement with the unions, and tell the unions that they would be expected to show no discrimination. The railroads told them that they did not tell the unions what to do and that the Government answered you tell them anyway and we will take it from there. The railroads stated that they had to go by the Railway Labor Act in dealing with the unions, and the Government advised them that had no bearing on this case and that they would change anything that did not conform to this Negro program.

They told the railroads to promote the Negro firemen on the Pensacola division, and to promote all other Negro employees that stood for promotion in any craft, if he made application for it. It will work like this: If a Negro porter in Louisville makes application for a switchman in Atlanta, and passes the examination with the higher score, he must be employed in this capacity. If a Negro is not employed after he has qualified for a job, a very detailed reason must be given and, if a good reason is not given, then somebody is in trouble. The director of personnel made the statement that in the lodges if a Negro is to be taken in and a vote comes to take him in, and a black ball is dropped, it will have to be a hole bored in it and an explanation on paper put in this hole in the black ball as to why he is not being taken in the lodge.

Brothers, this is a very serious thing that is facing us now. It is not the hiring of the Negroes, but the way the Government is going about it. They have not mentioned taking our seniority and giving it to the Negro yet, but this could be in the near future, the way things are going at the moment. The railroad is required to make 90-day reports on this to show what progress is being made in the hiring of Negro employees. The L. & N. is the first railroad to be subjected to this, but this was brought about by these two employees making a protest to Washington. The Government has a meeting called for next month in St. Louis and has invited all railroads and some labor leaders to discuss this problem in detail.

The Government stated all facilities such as washrooms, drinking fountains, eating places or any facility must not be segregated in any way. All seniority rosters must not show whether colored or white and, anything that shows a distinction between white or colored must be eliminated. Mr. Scholl made the statement that in the past he had been on one side of the bargaining table and union representatives on the other. But it looks like it is coming to where union and company will be together on one side of the table and the U.S. Government on the other side. I hope, after you have read this, all of you will realize what is facing you in your working conditions in the future, and I am afraid this is only the beginning. I trust each of you will think this over and not try to do anything that will cause trouble, because the Government is backing them and will continue to do so in the future, and they have the advantage as long as the present situation exists.

Fraternally yours,

O. G. GENTRY,
General chairman.

Need To Eliminate Payments Deficit Grows Pressing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, evidence is mounting that the United States must take more vigorous and effective action to eliminate its persistent balance-of-payments deficit. In order to further this objective I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 192 in the House last Friday. My Joint Economic Committee colleague in the Senate, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, is introducing the same resolution in the Senate.

This resolution expresses the sense of Congress that achievement of balance-of-payments equilibrium should receive the highest priority in the formulation of national economic policy, that the maintenance of equilibrium should be a major and continuing goal of U.S. economic policy and that the United States should take the initiative in calling together a conference within the framework of the International Monetary Fund to devise improvements in the world-payments system.

In testimony July 8 before the Joint Economic Committee, Secretary Dillon admitted that there is not "much more time to waste as far as the present size of our deficits are concerned." He added that it would be necessary for the United States to make substantial progress in eliminating the deficit in a year or two or face the prospect of a very uncomfortable international situation.

The Bank for International Settlements in its annual report, published June 10, 1963, expressed the rising concern and impatience of our European creditors by pointing to the evident need for more vigorous and basic action to cut the deficit than has been taken to date by the administration.

Finally, in today's New York Times, a report appears which says that a group of experts of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development considers the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit the most important economic problem confronting the Atlantic nations. The confidential report says there is no sign of improvement in the U.S. payments position and that new action is required by the United States or the European countries or both. Rumors say that one step which may be taken is a reform in the international monetary system.

Mr. Speaker, in view of these expressions of opinion by various financial leaders and experts both here and abroad, I think there is a clear and pressing need for action by the administration. I believe that the Congress can most effectively make its intent known in this matter by approval of House Concurrent Resolution 192.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the New York Times to which I referred be included in the RECORD at this point, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 10, 1963]

ATLANTIC ECONOMIC GROUP FACES PROBLEM OF U.S. PAYMENTS LAG—REPORT OF EXPERTS TERMS DEFICIT THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE BEFORE MEMBERS

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

PARIS, July 9.—The deficit in U.S. international payments is the most important economic problem confronting the Atlantic countries, in the view of the experts of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

This assessment is expected to be a dominating element in talks tomorrow and Thursday among the top economic officials of the 20 OECD member countries. Walter W. Heller, chairman of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers, will head the delegation from the United States.

The confidential report prepared for the meeting, one of three held each year, is understood to be optimistic on the business situation in Europe and North America for the rest of this year.

But it sees no sign of improvement in the U.S. deficit, and is reported to consider that the main policy question confronting the group is the necessity of new action by the United States or the European countries or both.

So far, despite various rumors, there is no reliable indication that a further step is contemplated—either new devices to cope with the U.S. deficit or a reform in the international monetary system.

The report, citing a worsening of the payments deficit in the first quarter of this year, is reported to say that this would not be a problem if there were an underlying long-term trend toward reduction and eventual elimination of the deficit.

But, according to the report, this is not the case, and there are no foreseeable changes in the various elements of the deficit that would be likely to reduce it.

In particular, the staff is understood to agree with most European students of the problem that there is unlikely to be any significant improvement in the U.S. surplus of exports over imports. This trade surplus is more than offset by large deficits in such categories as foreign aid, military spending abroad, private foreign lending and tourism.

The staff report is also reported to raise a question that has only begun to emerge in Europe—whether West Germany may be moving back into surplus in payments after having achieved a near equilibrium last year. There are signs that the German export surplus may be growing after a sharp reduction last year.

On the business outlook, the report is said to confirm the analysis about Europe frequently made in various quarters. This is that a slowdown in business investment, possibly brought about by a profits squeeze, is the only serious weak spot in an otherwise booming economy.

Another problem is the rapid rise in wages, and—to a lesser extent—prices, in most European countries.

The report is believed to predict an overall economic growth in Europe this year about as great as last year's, although growth will probably be less in France, Germany, and Italy.

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Roosevelt became the first lady of the world. Her place is secure in the affections of men and women everywhere. We mourn her passing and take pride in her achievments.

She was voted the world's most admired woman in international polls time and time again. When she entered the halls of the United Nations, representatives from all countries rose to honor her. She had become not only the wife and widow of an eminent President, but a noble personality in her own right.

She fulfilled all her many roles with energy, a fine intelligence, dedication, faith, and a boundless sympathy and concern for people and their troubles. She was the niece of a President, the wife of a President, a mother, a teacher, a politician, an author, an international stateswoman, a journalist, and a humanitarian who cared about people with a warmth and a willingness to fight for their rights that made her whole life a mission in the cause of human welfare.

As the first lady during the long and difficult years of the depression and the Second World War she was the President's eyes and ears, a source of strength and sympathy, and a constant striver for the betterment of the lot of Americans who had been deprived or forgotten. During her 12 years in the White House she was often criticized for her manifold activities by her husband's political opponents, but in the end she became the object of universal respect.

She was recognized by millions as their personal champion. She was a symbol of the new role that women were to play in the world.

She awakened enthusiasm wherever she went. A typical example was her visit to Luxembourg in 1950. While she was paying a visit to the Grand Duchess in the palace, thousands of Luxembourgers stood outside for hours in a steady rain, waiting for a glimpse of her, and calling her name. Thousands more turned out later throughout the tiny country in villages gay with flowers and happy faces. In her distinctive way she thanked as many as she could.

President Truman named Mrs. Roosevelt a delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1945. Her lofty objectives were regarded by some so-called realists as being impossible of attainment. But such criticism had never stopped her when she fought for her causes from the White House, and it did not stop her in the United Nations.

In 1946 she was elected chairman of the Commission on Human Rights of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. She brought a rare combination of toughness, idealism, and practicality to the U.N. In her first appearance at the United Nations at the London meeting in 1948, Mrs. Roosevelt was successful in overcoming a certain reserve that many delegates had shown toward the presence of women in the U.N.

She won the respect and cooperation of two members of the American representation before the U.N. whose influence was strong indeed, the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg, and the late John Foster Dulles. She played a critically important role in drafting the covenant on human rights, designed to establish basic civil rights for people throughout the world.

President Eisenhower congratulated Mrs. Roosevelt on her work in the United Nations, thanking her for her "since concern for the less fortunate, and skill in the discharge of unique and important duties."

She received many honors in a long and productive life. She held honorary degrees from several colleges, was an honorary member of Phi Beta Kappa, received the 1939 Award of Humanitarians, the Churchman's Award, the first annual Nation Award, the first annual Franklin Delano Roosevelt Brotherhood Award in 1946, the Award of Merit of the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs in 1948, the Four Freedoms Award, the Prince Carl Medal of Sweden, and the Irving Geist Foundation Award, all in 1950.

When she died she was honored for her character and her deeds throughout the world. Here at home President Kennedy said:

> One of the great ladies in the history of this country has passed from the scene. Her loss will be deeply felt by all those who admired her tireless idealism, or benefited from her good works and wise counsel. Since the day I entered this office, she has been both an inspiration and a friend.

The world has lost one of its greatest women, and we have all lost a friend.

Civil Rights: Peaceful Change or Social Revolution?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the Record the text of an address I delivered last Friday, July 5, 1963, at an installation of officers meeting of Local 614, Boilermakers Union, New London, Conn. My remarks were devoted primarily to a discussion of the civil rights problems, and my views in dealing with this problem.

The address was as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS: PEACEFUL CHANGE OR SOCIAL REVOLUTION?

(Address by Congressman WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, of Connecticut, before the Boilermakers Union, Local 614, Friday, July 5, 1963, St. Bernard's High School, New London, Conn.)

If any of you think you have problems, I suggest that you consider for a moment the difficulties with which we are faced in Washington, problems on the international scene involving world peace and the security of our Nation, and problems at home which are no less serious. We have a difficult unemployment problem, inadequate housing, an economy that is held back by an outmoded tax structure, substandard educational facilities in many areas, rising hospital costs that worry our 18 million elderly citizens who need the security of medical care, water pollution and air pollution, and many others. But the most difficult of all problems with which we are confronted now is civil rights. I shall come back to that subject in a moment.

We cannot close our eyes and say these problems don't exist. We cannot ignore them and wish they would somehow disappear. We must meet them—and I think we are making sincere efforts to deal with them.

Our Government is making basic efforts to cut into the hard core of unemployment which, as you well know, now totals around 4 million persons. Already our economy is picking up, and I am hopeful that before very long we shall succeed in reducing the number of unemployed.

I would like to see early passage of a tax reduction bill in Congress which should be a great boon to our economy. It will encourage consumers to create new markets. It will encourage business to expand. All of this should help create more jobs.

I would like to see Congress approve the medicare bill to provide a program of health insurance under social security for our senior citizens. They are for the most part people of limited income, severely pressed by the high cost of living and the high cost of medical care. We must help them maintain a decent and dignified way of life in their declining years.

I would like to see the adoption of legislation to eliminate the classroom shortage in our schools, to pay our teachers more adequate salaries, to assist our colleges in accommodating the growing number of students, and to boost the number of doctors and dentists to provide better health care for our population.

I would like to see the continuation and expansion of our programs which make it possible for more people to own homes, for elderly people to have decent housing, for employees who are displaced by automation to be retrained for other skills, for workers to have a higher minimum wage, for areas eroded by poverty to receive help in rebuilding their economies, for a concentrated attack on air and water pollution, for protection of the American public against harmful drugs, and other programs of direct benefit to the people.

We must recognize that times change. We must also recognize that new problems will raise new challenges, and that new challenges demand new solutions. This great Nation of ours has been characterized throughout its history by its ability to adjust to changes and to meet whatever challenge arises. I am confident that we still have that ability.

Right now we are faced with a tremendous challenge in the field of civil rights. We cannot ignore the fact that we are in the throes of a great social change, some even refer to it as a social revolution.

Just 100 years ago, in 1863, Abraham Lincoln issued his Emancipation Proclamation assuring freedom and equality to all Americans. Now, a century later, some of our citizens are still deprived of these rights. In the South, as well as in other parts of the country, we have seen evidence in recent months of the impatience of the Negro people who are the victims of discrimination and racism. This impatience is expressed in the form of demonstrations, sitins, protests, appeals. As yet it has been of a nonviolent character, with a few exceptions. Let us hope it will remain so, for it will indeed be a dark and sad day for America if impatience gives way to riots and bloodshed.

Negro leaders themselves are showing signs of becoming seriously concerned over such developments. Only a few days ago, James Farmer, the national director of CORE—Congress of Racial Equality—one of the leading Negro organizations in the country, stated at the annual convention of the organization: "No one can stop the demonstrations. The question is: Can we keep them orderly and nonviolent?"

This is a matter to which Negro leaders should give much thought. Demonstrations can sometimes get out of control, and the consequences would then be most tragic for all concerned, Negro and white. Not only could it lead to loss of life and destruction of property, but it would alienate the sympathy of millions of white people throughout the country who support civil rights; it would bring much harm to the very cause for which Negroes are fighting and would set that cause back; and it would do irreparable harm to our Nation's prestige abroad. These are factors which should be seriously considered by Negro leaders in their efforts to keep the demonstrations from becoming destructive and violent. This is a responsibility which they must assume.

At the same time, the white people must realize that the Negro is tired of excuses and endless debates. He is alarmed, and even angry at times, when he sees that 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation he is still far from obtaining rights of citizenship. He is still struggling for elemental justice, for the right to vote, the right to give his children an education, the right to decent housing, and equal opportunities for advancement in employment. White people, too, must assume their share of responsibility under such circumstances by showing understanding, by avoiding provocation, and by cooperating in the effort to attain civil rights for all Americans.

Let me make one point clear, however. We must recognize the right of Negroes for equal opportunities for obtaining a job, an education, proper housing, and so forth. Denying this right to them is indefensible. But granting a man a job merely because he is a Negro is also indefensible. Merit and ability should be the determining factors, and not the color of a man's skin, or his religious beliefs, or his national origin. All that we ask—and I am sure all that the Negroes themselves ask—is that they be given an equal opportunity, that the same yardstick that is applied to whites in employment, housing, education, public accommodations, and the like, should also be applied to them. That is a fair and just request.

At all levels of Government, Federal, State, county and municipal, we must work to find a peaceful solution to this problem which is without a doubt the overriding moral issue of our day. Americans must realize that the time for excuses and explanations has passed, and that the time for action is here. We must reexamine our sense of moral values and moral objectives. We cannot afford in good conscience to let the struggle of the Negro for true emancipation take place within a nation that seems to have forgotten its own moral values. President Kennedy, in his recent program to Congress on civil rights, has outlined the guidelines for a solution to this problem. Failure to accept this program will weaken the fabric of our Nation at a crucial time in human events when we need our full strength to cope with other domestic and international problems.

As I reflect over the struggle for civil rights, the thought comes to mind: Why this intolerance in this great country of ours toward the member of a minority group, toward the person who belongs to a different race or faith? Did we not all contribute of our brain and brawn to make the United States what it is today? Do we not all seek the security of our country, the welfare of our Nation? I think of the children born in our country today, who in their formative years know neither prejudice nor hatred of their playmates. They are given by Almighty God inalienable rights of freedom and equality, which neither man nor law can take away from them or deny to them.

A nation that lives up to these rights and provides all of its citizens with the opportunity to enjoy them, is a happy and prosperous nation. A civilization or society that assumes the responsibility that what is granted to one will be granted to all, should have no fear that it cannot survive the onslaught of communism. It cannot be vanquished because its people have something to live by and to fight for.

To me, it stands to reason that in this crucial era for all of humanity this is certainly a time for all men of good will to unite, to set aside their petty bickering, to rise above partisan and geographical lines, and to go forward together in their efforts to achieve security and peace. Unfortunately, the civil rights issue serves to divide us, to weaken us, to arouse sectional strife, and to detract our attention from the real problems and dangers facing our country today. This is exactly what Khrushchev and his comrades in Moscow want—division in our ranks, chaos in our land, and our attention diverted to other matters, while they go about gobbling up nation after nation until we are ready to fall prey to their schemes. We fail to treat a deadly cancer, but worry over a cut on our finger.

This is a time that calls for balanced minds and clear vision to understand the human values behind the struggle for civil rights. It must be clearly understood that second-class citizenship for any segment of our population is no longer feasible or desirable. We have outlived those concepts. The world will no longer tolerate them. If there are any among us who doubt it, I urge you to look at developments in Asia and Africa where many new and independent nations have recently arisen. Just as colonialism is a thing of the past, so discrimination and second-class citizenship status are things of the past.

The sooner we realize this, the better for us. The longer we cling to outmoded concepts, the more we stand to lose.

It was one of your great labor leaders, Samuel Gompers, the founder and first president of the American Federation of Labor, who said:

"America is not merely a name. It is not merely a land. It is not merely a country, nor is it merely a continent. America is a symbol; it is an ideal; the hopes of the world can be expressed in the ideal—America."

That has been true all through our history. That is the image in which mankind has always regarded our Nation—the symbol, the ideal, the hope of humanity. The story of America over the past two centuries is the story of a growing and expanding nation where new opportunities have been opened up to more and more of its citizens, so that they can participate as equal partners in a free society—free also from discrimination. Instead of freedom from discrimination, some sections of our citizenry are suffering from an infection of discrimination which is sapping our strength, stunting our economic growth, and destroying our national unity.

Consider, for example, what discrimination in housing is doing to our cities, the decay it is causing both in human lives and in property. In a book by Howard Moody, called "The City: Metropolis or New Jerusalem?" published just a few months ago—we read as follows:

"A city is dying when it has an eye for real estate value, but has lost its heart for personal values; when it has an understanding of traffic flow, but little concern about the flow of human beings; when we have increasing competence in building, but less and less time for housing and ethical codes; when human values are absent at the heart of the city's decisionmaking, planning, and the execution of its plans * * * then the city dies and all that is left, humanly, is decay."

Unfortunately, this is the situation in many of our cities today, large and small, where Negroes and others are subject to discrimination in housing and to other indignities. I am opposed to such practices. I am opposed to treating Americans as second-class citizens by denying them basic rights enjoyed by all others. We must not recognize any caste system in the United States or the supremacy of one race over another. Such practices can never be justified in the light of our moral and democratic principles, because there is no moral justification for racial or religious discrimination.

This country is comprised of people from all corners of the earth, all races, religions, and nationality groups. All of them have made important contributions toward the growth of our country and the shaping of its destiny. To abuse our civil rights, to continue discriminatory practices against our fellow citizens, is most injurious to our way of life and to everything that this Nation has stood for and fought for in the last 2 centuries. It is intolerable at all times, it is morally wrong under any circumstances.

Somewhere recently I came across these lines by an American poet:

"Give us wide walls to build our temple of liberty, O God.
The North shall be built of love, to stand against the winds of fate;
The South of tolerance, that we may, in building, outreach hate;
The East our faith, that rises clear and new each day;
The West our hope, that even dies a glorious way.
The Threshold 'neath our feet will be humility;
The roof—the very sky itself—infinity.
God, give us wide walls to build this great temple of American liberty."

My friends, for the sake of our great Nation and its future, we must build with love and tolerance; with faith in our country that it will remain the ideal and the hope of mankind, as visualized by Samuel Gompers; and with the firm belief in human brotherhood, freedom, and true understanding among the nations of the world. We cannot be wrong if we are on the side of God and man.

The Situation in Englewood, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1963

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues have made inquiries concerning the apparent racial disturbances in Engelwood, N.J., a suburban community in my district. These questions have been the natural outgrowth of the nationwide press coverage being given the question of "de facto segregation" in one of the elementary schools located in this community.

A report of the Engelwood situation appeared in the Evening Star of Washington, D.C., on Tuesday, June 3, 1963, which provided a complete and objective presentation of the problem and I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ENGLEWOOD IS A SYMBOL IN INTEGRATION DRIVE

(By Paul Hope)

ENGLEWOOD, N.J., June 3.—Suburban Englewood—quiet, tree-lined, wealthy and northern—is becoming, like Birmingham, a symbol of the Negro's stepped-up integration movement.

While there hasn't been the violence that has attended the southern demonstrations, the Englewood movement has been a long and intense one.

It has been marked by Negro sit-ins at a predominantly white school, an unsuccessful attempt to boycott downtown stores, a sit-in at the school superintendent's office, picketing of the Governor's office in Trenton by Englewood sympathizers, and periodic rallies featuring well-known Negroes.

START SCHOOL SIT-IN

The latest demonstration started 3 weeks ago when some 30 Negro students from a predominantly Negro elementary school began sitting in classes at a predominantly white school. School authorities have refused to register them but have let them sit in rather than provoke possible violence by keeping them out.

The Negroes are considered interlopers at the white school and largely are being ignored by teachers. Parents have been fined for violating a State law requiring children to attend school.

The cases have been appealed. And the sit-ins go on while the Negro parents picket outside and police keep a watchful eye.

The struggle in Englewood is not the same as in Birmingham, but it could have great significance in the Negro's fight for more integration in the North.

Here, the Negro is not fighting for minimum legal integration. He already has that and more. Here, he is fighting to break out of a containment brought about by housing paterns, tradition, economics and resistance from the white community.

As one Negro leader put it, they are fighting for "respect, equality and a full share of community life."

Many of the white leaders think the Negroes want more than equality, that they want favored, special treatment. Some of them think Englewood will begin to slide downhill if the Negro demands are met.

And though some whites, perhaps a large number, are in sympathy with the objectives of the Negroes, the white community seems to be nearly unanimous in condemning the tactics being used.

Nor is the Negro community completely united behind the protest demonstrations which have kept the community stirred up for more than a year.

FOCAL POINT

The Negro president of the school board, who has been called "Uncle Tom" by leaders of the sit-in movement, said he believes Englewood has been picked and is being "used by somebody as a sort of guinea pig." He didn't identify the somebody.

The sore spot with the Negroes is the Lincoln School, ostensibly desegregated but in fact nearly 99 percent Negro.

The reason for this de facto segregation is that elementary schools are set up on a neighborhood basis and the Lincoln School is in the heart of a Negro residential area.

The Negro demonstration leaders claim, and their contention is supported by the superintendent of schools, that segregated schools, de facto or otherwise, are detrimental to the students attending them.

The Negro leaders have not laid out a plan they want the city to follow but they want something done to correct what they call the racial imbalance in the schools.

TESTING GROUND

They look upon Englewood as a testing ground in the fight to break down de facto segregation in the North.

"Lincoln School is just the manifestation of the problem in the North," said Paul B. Zuber, a Negro attorney from New York who has been a leader in the direct-action movement. "We're looking for dignity, a new approach, a new respect. Englewood has forced itself to become the symbol of what is wrong with racial relations in the North."

Mr. Zuber was attorney for a group of Negroes who won a court decision forcing New Rochelle, N.Y., school authorities to allow the transfer of students from a predominantly Negro school. In that case, however, the court found an obvious gerrymandering of school boundaries to maintain maximum segregation, a situation which has not been shown in Englewood.

"This is the battleground of the northern suburbs," said Vincente Tibbs, the lone Negro on the Englewood City Council. "We have here the subtle (segregation) line. It's in housing, employment, government. There are people here who won't even admit there's a problem."

Englewood, lying just across the Hudson River from New York, has been primarily a commuter town for many decades.

Even before the advent of the auto, it developed as the bedroom community for a wealthy class from New York who could commute to their offices by rail and ferry. The first Negroes were mostly domestics employed by the wealthy whites.

The Negroes at first lived with white neighbors in what is known as the fourth ward. As the Negro population grew, the whites moved out of the section and the fourth ward became almost entirely Negro.

GROWS RAPIDLY

The Negro population has grown rapidly since 1920 and now accounts for 27.3 percent of the city's 26,000 population. During the decade of the 1950's there was almost no change in the number of white residents, but the Negro figure jumped from 4,172 to 7,000.

Englewood schools were desegregated before the 1954 Supreme Court decision. But since, there have been protests, off and on, from the Negroes about segregation brought about by school district lines. The school population is about 37 percent Negro.

The city eliminated its predominantly Negro junior high school about 6 years ago and now has one junior high which is about 40 percent Negro.

It has only one senior high school, which is about 26 percent Negro.

SEVERAL BLOCKS APART

There are five elementary schools: Lincoln, almost 99 percent Negro; Liberty, 63 percent Negro; Roosevelt, about 12 percent Negro; Quarles, about 5 percent Negro and Cleveland, less than 1 percent Negro.

It is at the Cleveland School that the Negroes are sitting in. The sit-in demonstartors are boycotting the Lincoln School, which is several blocks away.

White officials claim there is no intentional segregation in the elementary schools.

Mayor Austin N. Volk, an insurance broker in New York, says the Negroes leading the demonstration are asking for "special treatment" not accorded other pupils.

Under a 1955 ruling of the New Jersey Department of Education, students are to be assigned by local school boards on a neighborhood basis. They are not allowed to transfer outside their district.

Mayor Volk said the Negroes are asking for something the white students are not allowed.

POINTS TO TESTS

Negro leaders attempt to bolster their case by pointing to tests which show the level of achievement by pupils at Lincoln School to be 2 years behind that at other city schools.

Their claims that pupils of Lincoln are at a disadvantage are upheld by a committee appointed by the State commissioner of education to study the Englewood situation. The committee said in a report last fall that it could find "no supportable evidence that school authorities have maintained segregation by design," but it said committee members had a "strong feeling that the Negro child is at a psychological disadvantage" because of de facto segregation.

City Superintendent Mark Shedd and former Superintendent Harry L. Stearnes, who retired last year, also take the position that schools which are almost entirely Negro lead to attitudes among students that affect learning.

OBJECTS TO TACTICS

Dr. Shedd said, however, that he strenuously objects to the tactics being used by the demonstrators. He and the school board issued a statement saying:

"Since orderly channels for hearing grievances exist and time after time have proven effective, the board cannot condone meththods and approaches for obtaining changes that circumvent the law, and which attempt to gain their ends by techniques of intimidation and disruption."

Mayor Volk claims the low achievement of pupils at Lincoln School is not the fault of the school but largely of parents "who don't give a damn." He also said there has been an influx of Negroes from southern areas which has tended to pull down the average achievement level at Lincoln School.

"HAVE FACT SHEET"

The mayor and city council have put out a fact sheet, declaring that Englewood "is one of the most fully integrated communities in the Nation."

The mayor claims the demonstrations are not supported by the Negro community but are the result of "resentment by a small group of people." He said outsiders like Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL and other national Negro leaders are brought in periodically "to keep up interest in the movement."

They note there are Negroes on the school board, the city council and other boards and commissions and that the fire and police departments, city parks, churches, civic organizations, restaurants, and stores are integrated.

Negro Councilman Tibbs says, however, that this is mostly for show and that the Negroes have very little voice in city government.

John H. Perry, Negro president of the school board, agrees with Mayor Volk that the tactics being used by the sit-in demonstrators are supported by "a minority of the Negro community."

"All the Negroes want a fuller, better, richer life," said Mr. Perry, who teaches school in New York. But he said he believes in using "regular channels and regular procedures" to achieve the goals.

CALLED TOOL OF WHITES

The demonstration leaders say this takes too long and is subject to too many obstructionist tactics by patronizing whites. They say Mr. Perry is a tool of white officials.

Byron Baer, a leader of the recently organized Bergen County Congress of Racial Equality, which is active in the sit-in movement, said Mr. Perry is doing a disservice to his race. Mr. Baer, a 33-year-old white man, was arrested in Mississippi as a freedom rider and said he served 45 days in the Mississippi penitentiary.

There is some evidence that the leaders of the sit-in movement have not been able to muster as much support as they would like. They recently announced plans to conduct sit-ins at the two other predominantly white schools but failed to carry it out.

RESULTS ARE SEEN

But there is strong evidence that the demonstrations and the turmoil they have engendered are producing results.

State Commissioner of Education Frederick M. Raubinger handed down a ruling about 3 weeks ago in an Orange, N.J. case in which he held that a situation similar to that in Englewood should be corrected. Mr. Raubinger said that a 99-percent Negro school in Orange "constitutes * * * a deprivation of education opportunity for the pupils compelled to attend the school."

Most Englewood officials expect a similar ruling to be handed down shortly for that city.

ORGANIZE COMMITTEE

White residents who have organized a Committee To Save Neighborhood Schools may try to upset the commissioner's ruling through appeals to the State board of education or the courts.

Mrs. Louis Pugach, a spokesman for the committee, said the group will "fight with all legal means" to keep the neighborhood school system.

One of the solutions proposed by the school board was to set up a single school for fifth and sixth graders. It was expected this would be the first step toward gradually eliminating Lincoln School and distributing the remaining pupils among the other schools.

The city council turned down a request for funds to set up the so-called intermediate school. The plan also was soundly rejected in an advisory referendum held last fall.

One of the fears of some white leaders is that a breakdown in the neighborhood school system will mean white families will begin to move to other areas.

"This is a situation in which nobody can really win," said August J. Weisner, Jr., vice president and editor of the city's only newspaper, the weekly Press Journal. "If the Negroes appear to win, there will be an outmigration of white residents. If the whites appear to win, the demonstrations will continue."

Kennedy Handling of Civil Rights Has Encouraged Mob Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the complete inability of President Kennedy to understand people and the functioning of a free society has never been more clearly demonstrated than his mishandling of the issue of civil rights.

The administration attempt to make political hay of the fight for equality under the law through appeals to racial feelings has led only to mob action and disrespect for law enforcement agencies to the point where the world press is now writing of revolution in America.

Unless this issue is settled in compliance with established procedures and by means of law rather than violence, all of our people will be the victims and the Negroes equally the losers.

In this connection I would like to include two editorials from the Dallas Morning News of July 7. The first, "Machiavellian" points out the responsibility the President must bear for the present breakdown in law and order. The second, "Preserving Law and Order" by News editorial writer, Dick West, shows the negative results of Supreme Court decisions affecting the responsibilities of local law enforcement agencies.

MACHIAVELLIAN

If you remember Middle European history, Niccolo Machiavelli (1469–1527) was an Italian statesman and writer who gave politicians after his time this advice, though not in these words: The end justifies the means. His burning desire to save Italy was sincere but he advocated the practical approach of achieving an objective, with only secondary regard to morals or virtue.

Today, politically, "Machiavellian" means to do anything to win. At its worst, it is ruthless. Accepted rules are ignored, friends stepped on, ideals shoved into the gutter.

What is sought must be gained—at any cost.

The Negro drive for "equal rights" is Machiavellian, to the extent that its leadership has disregarded appeals by the President of the United States for reasonableness and threatens violence to gain its end.

Mr. Kennedy appealed to Negroes to take it easy while the Congress is considering his civil rights bill.

Replied James Farmer, national director of CORE: "We don't intend to call off demonstrations, and we wouldn't if we could."

A powerful official with NAACP warned there would be mass demonstrations in New York if that city's administration did not respond to demands for an end to job discrimination.

In Keuka Park, N.Y., the Reverend Martin Luther King predicted "a season of terror and violence" unless the civil rights program becomes law.

Other Negro leaders in New York, demanding greater school integration, threatened a program of civil disobedience this fall.

On the day the President appealed for racial peace, Negroes in Danville, Va., defied an injunction and local ordinance by parading and shouting in the streets.

The leader of one Negro group justifies such action this way: "We cannot in good conscience ask American citizens who have been denied their rights for 300 years to refrain from voicing their demands in any way they choose."

But this is un-American because it is mob law. The alleged injustices committed by whites against blacks are now to be repaid by black injustices against whites.

The mob is to gain civil rights by inflicting civil wrongs. A minority will use disobedience to force obedience by the majority, the law be damned.

Mr. Kennedy can take part of the blame.

The President is in a bind. Originally he offered the moral support of his powerful office to these demonstrations that sought "justice" outside the law. Now he has asked Congress to pass a law which he thinks will lessen the dangers erupting from the demonstrations.

In a sense, this is Machiavellian. To gain an objective (civil rights bill), trouble is fomented in the streets; to stop the trouble, pass the bill.

We hope Congress is not intimidated by the Negro threats. It will be a sad day in the history of our republic if legislation this important is enacted under duress that amounts to blackmail.

PRESERVING LAW AND ORDER

(By Dick West)

If the police of Dallas see 1,000 Negroes forming on Deep Elm to march downtown—and if the police through their operatives have good reason to believe that a disastrous riot will erupt by the time the 1,000 marchers get to the Tower Theater—what, in your opinion, should the police do?

Your answer, if you believe in law and order: Break it up.

But what if the police have been told, through reading decisions of the Supreme Court, that they can't break up the march until the riot occurs?

Heretofore those men in uniform who protect you and your property have been taught that their job not only is to preserve order but also to prevent disorder.

If they can prevent a crime before it happens, shouldn't they do it?

Believe it or not, the Supreme Court isn't sure. Its rulings of late on racial matters are ridiculous; worse still, they tend to break down what we know as local police power.

With Negroes demonstrating all over the country and threatening to lie down on airport strips and squat in the halls of Congress and to defy policemen who interfere, this matter of keeping law and order in a community assumes major importance.

If the Supreme Court is going to handcuff the police, what protection does the citizen have? We'll be specific now.

Two years ago 200 Negro students assembled at the Zion Church in Columbia, S.C., and marched to the State capitol grounds. The South Carolina Legislature was in session, and the march was to protest discrimination by that State against the Negro race.

The local police let them march. They let them assemble on the grounds. They let them demonstrate and sing. But suddenly a crowd of whites came on the scene, and the police saw some local characters that they knew would cause trouble.

The Negroes hoisted signs reading, "You may jail our bodies but not our souls." And they shouted and sang, "Down with segregation."

Traffic was impeded. The situation became tense. The crowd swelled to 500, and the city manager of Columbia came to the scene and decided that danger to safety and peace was imminent.

Even then he didn't order arrests, but went to the Negro leaders and asked them quietly to disperse within 15 minutes before serious trouble broke out.

The Negro leaders, instead of complying, became defiant and moved among the students delivering a harangue which, according to testimony, "aroused them to a fever pitch causing this boisterousness, this singing, this stomping."

The whites became restless, too. And at this stage the city manager instructed police to arrest the Negroes for disturbing the peace.

Two years later, in March of this year, the Supreme Court reversed convictions for disturbing the peace and said that police authority of Columbia had not acted according to the Constitution of the United States.

The Court, sitting far away from Columbia, ruled there wasn't enough evidence of disorder, or threat of violence, to warrant the arrests.

Maybe in Butte, Mont., or in Salt Lake City no trouble would have occurred under similar conditions. But what about Columbia, S.C., or Clarksdale, Miss.?

Furthermore, the Court said that the privilege of free speech—in this connection, the freedom of Negroes to chant and sing and harrangue—is a broad freedom.

A function of free speech, the Court ruled, is to invite dispute. Eight Justices—Tom Clark of Dallas disagreed—ruled that free speech may best serve its high purpose when it causes unrest and stirs people to anger.

Certainly all of us want to guard the freedom to talk and to demonstrate. But in the process, we don't want to tear somebody limb from limb, or be torn limb from limb.

Where does the right of free speech end—and the necessity to keep law and order begin?

But the important point in this decision, with racial unrest everywhere, is this: Eight Justices sitting in Washington, with very little knowledge of conditions in Columbia, S.C., did not trust the judgment of that city's top executive officer—the city manager—who feared danger was imminent and tried to prevent a public brawl.

"It is my belief," Tom Clark ruled in dissenting from the other eight Justices, "that anyone conversant with the spontaneous combustion in some southern communities in such a situation will agree that the city manager's action may well have averted a major catastrophe."

Trouble is, a majority on the Supreme Court are prejudiced against southern communities—even their police who are trying to prevent bloodshed. If police must wait until a riot occurs before they can act, we'd all better head for the woods.

ARA: Kennedy Slush Fund?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, in the House of Representatives the Area Redevelopment Administration is known here in Washington as one of the largest political footballs ever devised. Since its defeat in the House by a five-vote margin, newspapers across the country has been criticizing strongly Members who voted against the Kennedy program. It seems, however, that after the papers have had a chance to look into the program a bit further and study the ARA in greater detail, they are now in large measure realizing that those Members who voted against the bill were not, as they had charged, callously forgetting the unemployed of the country, but indeed they were remembering that the foundation of our prosperity as well as its future potential, lie in the private enterprise section of the economy.

With this in mind, I would like to enter into the RECORD at this point an editorial from a recent Massachusetts newspaper entitled "ARA: Kennedy Slush Fund?"

[From the North Adams (Mass.) Transcript]

ARA: KENNEDY SLUSH FUND?

Before Berkshire County voters hang Congressman SILVIO O. CONTE to the nearest apple tree for his vote against the Kennedy Area Redevelopment Act expansion, they should take a close, hard look at ARA, and see if they really like the way it is working.

Originally conceived as an economic shot in the arm for depressed areas, the idea of a Federal program to encourage area redevelopment efforts is basically sound. But 2 years of experience with the program indicate that, so far at least, it has been something less than a whopping success as an attack on unemployment. It hasn't, for example, yet created a single job in this supposedly distressed area of northern Berkshire, and critics assert ARA has had no significant effect on unemployment anywhere in the country.

Also, there is mounting evidence—and it can be seen locally—of partisan influence in approval of local plans. Instead of presenting projects strictly on their merits through official ARA channels, local applicants for ARA assistance apparently must clear them through political channels. In the case of Northern Berkshire the entree seems to be through an individual who holds no elective or appointive office but who seemingly does have the ear of Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, the President's brother, as well as that of Congressman BOLAND, of Springfield, an influential member of the political machine President Kennedy's relatives and associates seem to have created. There are also allegations of the use of announcements of loans and grants as political capital. As is almost inevitable under these circumstances, the wisdom and soundness of some of the loans and grants that have been made are being questioned—particularly the fact that hotels, motels and tourist facilities seem to have figured rather extravagantly in the total outlays.

There is also the fact that, while it is asking Congress for an additional $455.5 million for the program, ARA had by May 31 of this year succeeded in disbursing only $113 million of the $394 million it was given to spend in 1961. And of this, only a little more than a million dollars, representing aid to seven approved projects, had been allocated to Massachusetts.

In spite of these eyebrow raising figures and the strong political and partisan odor that now surrounds ARA, the basic concept of area redevelopment appears to be sound. In that respect, it is much like foreign aid. Few people question the validity of foreign aid—but long and sad experience has shown that it is extremely vulnerable to mismanagement, political stupidity, and even corruption. These weaknesses were pinpointed in the popular novel, "The Ugly American." No one has yet written a comparable tome about ARA—it might be titled "The Ugly Administration"—but ARA is already being referred to by Washington cynics as the "Administration Reelection Agency."

It is to be hoped that the failure of Congressman CONTE and other responsible northern legislators, including Senator SALTONSTALL, to go along with the expanded and costly ARA proposals will result in correction of these weaknesses. A bill that would include safeguards against the kind of political adulteration that has limited the value and effectiveness of the ARA program so far might win their support. This could occur if the House would pass its own sound ARA bill and then work out a compromise with the Senate.

Kennedy cohorts might not like this, for it would deprive them of a multimillion-dollar political slush fund. But a strictly nonpartisan, nonpolitical, businesslike ARA administration might just do what ARA has failed to do so far—create new jobs in substantial numbers by extending legitimate aid to sound and worthy applicants.

In the meantime, Senator KENNEDY's appeal to Berkshire County leaders to burn Mr. CONTE at the stake if he doesn't switch his ARA vote sounded an extremely sour note at Governor Peabody's regional development conference here last week. The political overtones of that particular talkfest were emphasized by the absence of Congressman CONTE who through the years has demonstrated time and time again his deep and sincere interest in improving the economy and strengthening the prosperity of this area. Mr. CONTE's interest is continuing and substantial, and not shown fleetingly and superficially in an occasional opportunistic bid for political support, as seems to be the case with Senator KENNEDY.

In short, as presently run, the ARA resembles nothing more than a payout window for the Kennedy political machine, to be used when and where it will be politically profitable. If Congressman CONTE and Senator SALTONSTALL oppose its multimillion-dollar expansion, they do so as a matter of principle. Berkshire County voters know both men too well to believe that they would oppose any program they felt would be of genuine and legitimate value to Massachusetts and Berkshire County.

The Challenge To Our Nation's Defense Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address which I delivered at the annual eastern regional convention of Submarine Veterans of World War II on Saturday evening, June 29, 1963. Several hundred delegates representing posts in States from Maine to Florida attended the convention which was held in New London, Conn., in my district. In my address I discussed two subjects: the role of the submariner in our national defense, and the challenge to our Nation's defense today.

It reads as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, AT THE EASTERN REGIONAL CONVENTION, SUBMARINE VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II, MOHICAN HOTEL, NEW LONDON, CONN., SATURDAY, JUNE 29, 1963

Mr. Chairman, delegates to the convention, friends, I am extremely pleased to be here with you this evening and to extend a hearty welcome to all of you. I understand there are delegates here from Maine all the way down to Florida. As the Congressman from this district, I want to tell you that you could not have picked a nicer place for your convention at this time of the year than this fair city of New London. We are very happy to have you.

In my remarks here today I want to discuss with you two subjects. One, the role of the submariner in our national defense. Two, the challenge to our Nation's defense today. I shall be brief on both of these subjects.

During World War I, submarines were used primarily for defensive purposes, such as coastal patrol, attacks on German U-boats to keep shipping lanes open, etc. Although the First World War demonstrated the strategic effectiveness of the submarine, the United States did not start a major submarine building program until 1933 when the Roosevelt administration came into power. By December 1941—at the time of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor—we had 111 submarines in commission and 73 under construction. We had 51 active boats in the Pacific, against 83 submarines in the Japanese fleet.

The first attack by an American submarine against a Japanese ship was by the *Swordfish* in the South China Sea on December 9—2 days after Pearl Harbor. While it was never verified the *Swordfish* hit its target, our first real success came 5 days later when the same *Swordfish* sank an enemy ship. In fact, this was the first time in history that an American submarine torpedoed a ship.

During the first year of the war in the Pacific our small but growing fleet of submarines carried out many special missions, such as reconnaissance, evacuation of civilians, running supplies, and transporting commando raiders. No doubt some of you folks present here today participated in such missions.

Only eight of our boats were on full-time anti-shipping duty; consequently, we had only limited success in sinking enemy ships. In that first year our boats sank 600,000 tons of enemy shipping—which is a considerable amount—but the total Japanese merchant fleet was estimated at over 6 million tons. As our submarine fleet grew larger, Japanese shipping losses also grew larger and reached a critical stage. Our submarines turned their attention also on Japanese warships, particularly destroyers, a chief enemy of submarines.

It is a fact that more enemy destroyers were sunk by our submarines than by any other means. In all, we know that American submarines destroyed two-thirds of the enemy merchant fleet and one-third of his navy. Let me say at this point, in tribute to the gallant men in our submarine service during World War II, that theirs was an extremely hazardous service with a death rate of about one out of every five men. This is the kind of bravery and heroism for which our Nation is eternally grateful—and in this spirit of appreciation I salute you today.

In World War II we used the submarine in much the same manner as it was used by the Germans in World War I; namely, to cripple the enemy's lifelines on the seas. Since the end of World War II the role of the submarine has changed. Great developments have taken place in submarine technology. There has also been a change in the potential threat in the development of a large Soviet submarine fleet. This has resulted in an effort to make the submarine an important aspect of anti-submarine warfare. The change or reorientation of our submarine mission began in 1949, when we first realized that the Soviet Union is vastly increasing its submarine fleet and that it constitutes a potential threat to our naval power and sea communications around the world.

That change has been going forward since then. I am sure I am not disclosing any secrets when I tell you that every attack submarine in our Navy today has anti-submarine warfare as a primary mission. These are mainly nuclear-powered ships; they are fast; they are maneuverable; and they have new advanced underwater sensing devices.

There is another role performed by the submarine—a role unheard of even in 1949, less than 15 years ago. I refer to the role of the submarine as a sea-based strategic missile system. The latest in submarine technology, combined with the most advanced missile development, produced the Polaris-firing nuclear-powered fleet ballistic missile submarine. We now have 12 such submarines in commission, and 23 under construction or authorized for construction—a total of 35 of these submarines. May I add that these figures were given me by the Navy Department and they are not classified. Thus you can see that we are gradually building up most formidable offensive second strike deterrent weapons in existence.

And these is another change to be noted here—a change that is no less important. I refer to the life and the role of the submariner today which has also changed greatly. Although there is the same informality among the officers and men, the same esprit de corps as in the past, living conditions have improved and the technical demands on the crew are much higher. Being constantly submerged for 60 days is the standard patrol of the Polaris submarines. The old submarines designed in the 1920's and used in World War II could stay submerged under the most favorable conditions for 24 hours. They were noisy, poorly ventilated, cramped for space, and always in need of repair. On modern submarines space is still at a premium, but much more attention has been given to comfort and surroundings, and the air is purer.

Even though it is peacetime and underwater patrols are much longer than before, we have more men who volunteer for submarine service than we can accept. The training is much more rigorous today. The enlisted man on the ballistic missile submarine requires about 6 months duty both ashore and at sea before he can attain qualification status. The officer requires a whole year. Engineering personnel get an additional 13 months of schooling. These men are highly trained technicians in a perpetual training process to master their jobs and the ever-changing equipment.

There must be something to a service which can arouse so much interest and devotion, so much loyalty and heroism, both in time of war and in time of peace, as the submarine service. You men who have been in it, and those who followed you, deserve recognition for the sacrifice and the patriotism you have demonstrated. Yours is not the patriotism of merely marching behind a band or lighting fireworks one day in the year. It is much more than that. It is the very defense of the flag and the Nation, of which you are a part; it is the spirit of the people who unselfishly devoted themselves to the cause of freedom. Your patriotism is the love for your country, the respect for its traditions, the honor of its people. Your patriotism was standing tall and unafraid against all enemies, ready to sacrifice oneself, if need be.

So much for the role of the submarine and submariner. Now, let us turn to our second topic, the challenge to our Nation's defenses today.

Several days ago, we passed in the House of Representatives the defense appropriation bill which provided $47 billion for our Nation's defenses in the coming year. I must admit that when my name was called and I voted "yea" for the bill, I felt a certain degree of excitement. After all, I am voting to spend a tremendous amount of the taxpayers' money. This is no small sum—$47 billion is just about half of the country's entire budget. And that in itself shows you how much of our expenditures is used for defense purposes. This is one need where we cannot and dare not economize, because the security of the Nation is most important to us all.

This is the legislation which enables the United States to maintain its position of military superiority over the Soviet Union. I can assure you that the military strength of the United States has reached an all time high—it is greater today than ever before. True, military strength in itself will not necessarily insure peace, but insofar as such strength can serve to avert and deter war, our country has what it takes. And that should be an encouraging factor to all of us here and to peace-loving people all over the world.

The primary object of our defense program is to deter war and to support all efforts for peace. There will undoubtedly be small-scale, limited wars, and perhaps even somewhat larger general wars in one part of the world or another. This is something we must learn to live with in the modern world. We cannot rule them out, but we can and definitely will exert every effort to make sure that they do not spread into a new world conflagration. Both sides are keenly aware that a global war would mean suicide for the whole human race. While both have developed weapons of total destruction, we pray that reason will prevail and the world will remain at peace.

But we cannot afford to sit idly back and to wait for events to take shape, and then merely react to them. We cannot close our eyes to the deception, the conspiracies and the subversion practiced by communism all over the world, including 90 miles from our shores in Cuba. In the light of such Communist tactics and activities everywhere, we must ask ourselves: Is the world any calmer today than it was a year or two ago? Is there less chance for Communist aggression against the free world today? I don't think so. I do not believe that they have changed their aims one iota—they are still out to conquer the world. They may differ on tactics, but the goal remains the same.

This is the challenge that we, as a Nation, face today on a global scale. In dealing with this challenge, we have begun to reorient our strategy and our tactics during the past two and a half years under the Kennedy administration, so as to correspond with the hard facts of international developments. We are doing it in three ways, or perhaps more correctly on three fronts.

First is our atomic power. We must continue to rely on nuclear weapons, even if it is for the purpose of convincing a would-be aggressor that he could not emerge victorious in a war of his own instigation. We do not want any miscalculation in this respect. Any potential adversary of the United States should know that we have such weapons, that we have them in large supply, and that we are keeping them up to date. We want the rest of the world to know, however, that we will not use our atomic power, except in certain emergencies and under certain circumstances. We shall use such power only as a last resort, after all human logic and reason will have been exhausted or flagrantly ignored by a cocky aggressor.

Second is our conventional power. We must retain this power. Although conventional weapons play a less dominant role in the modern world, we cannot allow such power to diminish. On the contrary, we are continuing to strengthen our conventional weapons and to increase our Ready Reserve of trained manpower. If we do not have this power, we may someday be faced with a nightmarish choice: Either resort to the use of all-out nuclear retaliation, or retreat. I hope we are never confronted with such a choice.

The growth in our conventional strength is also important for the small-scale, sagebrush wars which break out from time to time in various countries at the instigation of the Communists. We cannot, nor do we wish to, use nuclear weapons in such instances. For many of the smaller nations associated with us in the struggle against international communism, the fact that we are increasing our conventional forces should be encouraging news. It will assure effective support in dealing with Communist subversion, provocation, and conspiracies.

Third is the power provided by our guerrilla forces. These forces are not only growing in number and steadily improving their counterinsurgency tactics, but I can tell you that this is becoming a most important factor in our defense picture. In the last 2 years the United States has tripled its antiguerrilla forces, and I can assure you that they will be further increased in the coming years. This, too, is an effort in the direction of preventing or confining limited wars and acts of subversion, and as such it will help strengthen and improve the military defense of our friends abroad in accordance with their needs.

These, then, are three fronts on which we are active today in reorienting our military strategy and tactics. These three types of power—atomic, conventional, and guerrilla—provide the leaders of our Nation with a flexibility of decision as to when to use any of these forces, and also which of these forces should be applied to deal with a particular situation or challenge.

We are not a nation to start a war, but we want to be sure that we shall have all possible power needed for any emergency. I feel confident that in a test of strength, we would ultimately prevail and emerge victorious. But this should not stop us from seeking a peaceful solution to international problems and the attainment of genuine peace for all mankind. Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell L. Gilpatric stated our position very clear when he said about a year ago: "Those who would impose a totalitarian world order and deny men and nations the right to pursue their own destinies should understand one point very clearly. The United States does not seek to resolve disputes by violence. But if forceful interference with our rights and obligations shall lead to violent conflict—as it well might—the United States does not intend to be defeated."

All of us are deeply concerned about the security of our country, the security of the whole free world. We want our Nation to remain strong and free and united in order to be able to meet any challenge or any threat to destroy us. The nations of the world look to us for guidance and leadership in this crucial period of human affairs. We must give it to them. We must provide the strength, the ideas, the unity, and the action in the struggle against communism. We must have faith in our Nation and faith in ourselves. We must have leadership by men of strong faith and vision to look ahead.

"Where there is no vision, the people perish," the Bible tells us. Let us remember that admonition. The future of our Nation is at stake.

I want to conclude with the following by an unknown author:

"I asked God for strength, that I might achieve;
I was made weak, that I might learn humbly to obey.
I asked for health, that I might do greater things;
I was given infirmity, that I might do better things.

I asked for riches, that I might be happy;
I was given poverty, that I might be wise.

I asked for power, that I might have the praise of men;
I was given weakness, that I might feel the need of God.

I asked for all things, that I might enjoy life;
I was given life that I might enjoy all things.

I got nothing that I asked for, but everything I had hoped for;
Almost despite myself, my unspoken prayers were answered.

I am, among all men, most richly blessed."

My friends, we too in this country can truthfully say that our prayers were answered, that among all men and all nations we are most richly blessed. We have been endowed by our Creator with a wonderful people, a beautiful land, great resources, and the best example in all history of a just government by law. Let's make sure that we keep it that way.

Kennedy Machine Stalled Through Lack of Know-How

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the much publicized Kennedy machine touted as so efficient in the 1960 campaign has come to a complete stop because of the lack of knowledge and incompetence of its operators. The theorists have found that their impractical ideas cannot stand the test of a practical world with the result that our national policies, foreign and domestic, are a shambles resulting in confusion among our own people and a continuing decline in U.S. prestige abroad.

To what a low estate the administration failures have brought us is outlined in the following column from the Washington Daily News by William F. Buckley, Jr., an analysis quite accurate as many see it.

The Kennedy Image: As Seen From the Right-Field Bleachers

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

A recent public opinion poll discloses that Mr. Kennedy's popularity has slipped precipitously. If this finding is correct, it is the most exhilatrating datum since Plato's proof that even an illiterate slave boy could be taught to understand his complicated theorem of Pythagoras. There is apparently hope for the human race after all.

I intend no personal slight to our leader, for whom I wish a long and happy life. But I do feel it is high testimony to democratic perspicacity that the feeling should finally obtrude into the consciousness of the public that notwithstanding the gentleman's personal virtues and his devout enjoyment of the prequisites of high office, the simple fact is he has no apparent qualifications for it.

A few weeks ago a British magazine published a devastating full page cartoon showing a monster machine bursting with technological gargoyles, pipes, valves, spouts, indicators, bells, keyboards, switches, each named after some emblematic human sore—"The Negro Problem," "The Vietnam Problem," "The Berlin Wall," "Castro Cuba," "Gold Flow," etc., and across the whole apparatus the license plate: "The Kennedy Machine." "It's wonderful," an awed spectator remarks, "but what does it do?"

The word is indeed getting about: The fabulous Kennedy machine, designed to cope with all the problems that beset mankind, is stalled. The delirious self assurance, all that youthful energy, all those teeming Harvard brains with which the machine has throbbed away now for nearly 3 years, has done what? Nothing, but nothing important, has been accomplished. And the reason is this: Mr. Kennedy has no grip on reality, no communicable vision of the purposes of his administration. The grandoise rhetoric with which he reasures his constituents every time one of the meters on the machine registers a complaint, is beginning to fall flat as the people discern the gruesome truth; that this efficient and likeable young man hasn't the least idea how to maneuver through the greatest crisis in world history.

The concrete indictment of Mr. Kennedy is painfully easy to make.

It was he who flunked the challenge of the Bay of Pigs.

He stood by while the wall was raised in Berlin.

He concluded the unworkable arrangements in Laos.

He is the prisoner of monopoly labor unions.

He fails to stanch the flow of gold from our bleeding Republic.

He sits by acquiescently while the central bureaucracy leeches more and more of the power and freedom of the individual.

However, I suspect it is not the concrete failures that have caused the diminution in his popularity. It is something else. There is a cloying slickness about his total performance—or rather, lack of performance.

I believe that any man who would confess to his public his temporary incapacity to deal with the Nation's problems, citing great historical obstructions outside his power to cope with, would earn the peoples' sympathy. But that is not Mr. Kennedy's mode.

He is surrounded by vain sycophants who seek to transmute his dismaying record into one great, endless, triumphal parade. The word is "rodomontade": A vain, blustering self-righteousness.

If Mr. Kennedy were to give the impression that he is genuinely and even obsessively concerned with the great lesions on the commonweal, we might show him the patience due to a faltering, but determined doctor. Instead, the patient grows worse, while the doctor gambols about the world proclaiming the soundness of his patient's health, and his own magical curative powers.

This is a tough world. Anyone who wanted a serene life, Trotsky reminded us, picked the wrong century to be born in. There are no instant solutions to any problem. But Mr. Kennedy's failure is to admit to their seriousness.

The problem of a Communist state encysted in the womb of our hemisphere is, let us admit it, a grave one; yet Mr. Kennedy has no solution for it, whatsoever.

The problem of the overhead of life in a technological society burdened down by monopoly unions and hedonistic state welfarism is a problem—but its existence never crosses his complacent lips.

Our President emerges as the ultimate man in the gray flannel suit: The great accommodator, a weather vane on perfect ball bearings—soul-free, immune from the frictions of reality, the image of total composure—at least for so long as the people continue in their drugged state.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the July 5 issue of the Beloit, Wis., Daily News, expresses clearly and concisely the meaning and importance of the observance of Captive Nations Week. I commend the editor of the Beloit Daily News, and under unanimous consent, do offer the editorial for publication in the Appendix of the RECORD in order that all Members of the Congress and others to whom the RECORD is available may read this timely message.

The editorial follows:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

America's fifth annual observance of Captive Nations Week (July 14–20) comes at a time when illusions about any relaxing in the cold war are fading. In Asia, Moscow is openly supporting Communist aggression in Laos; in Latin America, the Kremlin continues to use Cuba as a base of aggression and subversion; in Europe, Italian Communists are threatening violence in order to foster Soviet plans.

This unabating Soviet drive for world domination refutes the illusions of those in the West who see Khrushchev as a champion of peaceful coexistence and see Captive Nations Week as a mere rhetorical exercise or an obstacle to the relaxation of tensions. Instead, it is more evident this year than ever that the Captive Nations Week can be one of the greatest assets of the freedom loving peoples on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

The Soviets are well aware of this asset and are doing their utmost to remove it. The Soviets are today exercising an open pressure, mixing threats and blandishments, for the abolition of Captive Nations Week in the United States of America. The Soviet propaganda weekly the New Times, for instance, asked in its January 23, 1963, issue: "Is it not high time to discontinue the Captive Nations Week in the United States? That is just as much a dead horse as the Hungarian question."

By thus openly pressuring the United States for the abolition of Captive Nations Week the Soviets are in fact expressing their confidence that they can compel the American people and their Government to renounce any commitment the Soviets do not like, and to transform into a dead horse any principle to which Americans claim allegiance. This Soviet arrogance deserves a resounding rebuke by the American people and their elected representaitves in the form of an active rededication to the ideas of Captive Nations Week.

The importance of an anti-Communist East-Central Europe as a deterrent to Soviet aggression has long been acknowledged by top Western political and military strategists. This importance was dramatically underscored during Khrushchev's attempts to smuggle missiles into Cuba last year. If we permit apathy and disillusionment to replace the spirit of resistance of the captive peoples, the troublemaking capacity of the Soviets would greatly increase, not only in Europe but on all fronts. As a consequence, the free world would come closer to the brink of nuclear war or surrender.

Captive Nations Week provides the American people with a chance to show the peoples of Eastern Europe that they are not forgotten. It provides our Government with a chance to capitalize on Soviet weakness by taking the initiative in the cold war. It can do so by (1) retaining the issue of Hungary on the agenda of the United Nations, (2) raising the question of Soviet treaty pledges to hold free elections in Eastern Europe in all negotiations with the Kremlin, (3) placing the question of the denial of the right of self-determination to the peoples of East-Central Europe on the agenda of every session of the United Nations.

In short, Captive Nations Week is an excellent way to tell the Communists that we refuse both burials, the fast one a la Mao and the slow one a la Khrushchev; that we shall not compromise our innermost principles; that we intend to preserve peace and insure the victory of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, this year's Captive Nations Week proclamation by the President left much to be desired in terms of any indication that there is a determined effort on the part of his administration to effectively combat the efforts of the world Communist conspiracy to enslave the world. Perhaps that is why the President's proclamation slipped by the reading public with a mere whisper of publicity. It was issued on Friday, July 5. One would think that a Presidential proclamation would be important enough to be given the widest possible distribution. Yet, it was only after a request was made from my office that I received a copy of the proclamation on Wednesday, July 10. The fact that the proclamation lacked the courage of the conviction the American people have in this vital matter—a courage Americans have the right to expect from the leadership of the world's foremost bastion of freedom, and the fact that it was not widely disseminated or prominently publicized, is a matter for serious regret. If a Presidential proclamation is to mean anything, it should be important enough to bring to the attention not only of the people of America but of the people of the world and especially those who are enslaved, whose only hope for freedom is in positive, effective action by the United States. To pay mere lipservice to the great issues before the free people of the world is a great disservice to the common cause of freedom. Words must have the substance of conviction and must be backed up by determination and deed if they are to serve any useful purpose. It seems to me that a logical sequence to the President's eloquent statements made in Berlin would be a proclamation in depth clearly setting forth to the world this Nation's determination to lift the cloud of colonialism from the people in those areas engulfed by Communist dictatorships, so that they will be able to see the bright sunlight of freedom and with it to have the right of self-determination—to choose their governments and to depose their self-proclaimed masters.

Only as we effectively wage the cold war can we expect to avoid either abject surrender or a nuclear holocaust.

With this in mind, it is with regret that the legislation I introduced, House Resolution 105, and similar legislaton by Democrats and Republcans alike, providing for the establishment of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations, apparently is meeting the same fate as the Captive Nations Committee legislation did in the 87th Congress—that of being pigeonholed because of the pressures against it brought to bear by the State Department and the Foreign Affairs Committee.

No amount of effort on the part of Congressman FLOOD and DERWINSKI and others of us has been successful in dislodging this legislation out of committee and onto the floor of the House where it can be debated and acted upon.

A Committee on the Captive Nations would conduct inquiries into and studies of all satellite countries and captive non-Russian nations, including those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with a view to assisting such captive peoples by peaceful means in their aspirations and efforts to regain their national and individual freedoms. What is the good of talking freedom if we do not take some positive steps such as the establishment of a Committee on the Captive Nations to implement our professions of desire to help the oppressed of the world?

Letter From Msgr. William N. Wall to Clarence T. Lundquist, Department of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, on June 13, 1963, at page A3804 of the RECORD, I reported to you on a controversy between the Very Reverend William N. Wall, director of the Mount Carmel Center and Hospital for Alcoholics at Paterson, N.J., and the U.S. Department of Labor.

As part of my remarks, I included correspondence between Monsignor Wall and officials of the Department, including Secretary Willard N. Wirtz. The controversy revolves around the Department's insistence on investigating the charitable institution to determine whether it is violating the Fair Labor Standards Act.

At that time, I reported that Monsignor Wall had scheduled a conference with Department officials; that he would report to me on the results, and that I would report further in the RECORD.

My report, at this point, takes the form of a self-explanatory letter from Monsignor Wall to Mr. Clarence T. Lundquist, Administrator of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division of the Department of Labor. If and when there are further developments, I will report them to the House.

The text of Monsignor Wall's letter to Mr. Lundquist follows:

MOUNT CARMEL CENTER
AND HOSPITAL FOR ALCOHOLICS,
Paterson, N.J., July 9, 1963.

Mr. CLARENCE T. LUNDQUIST,
Administrator, U.S. Department of Labor, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LUNDQUIST: Our meeting in Washington was conducted very courteously.

If the New Frontier put out as much wisdom and human service as it does courtesy or, indeed, coordinated their work with the word of Almighty God we would worry less about communism and Cuba.

If the meeting was pleasant, it was not persuasive. We went to Washington with a point of view that differs from yours. We returned with our point of view unchanged—but fortified with the zeal of deeper conviction that we must vigorously present our thinking to every area of Congress, all its committees, other Government departments, and to as many people as possible.

Not to do so would be a moral offense to the alcoholic—who, although a citizen, has little representation in Washington. Not to do so would be an effense against my priesthood.

An agenda for this letter is needed. First, we define our policy; second, the problem is outlined; third, our point of view on alcoholic rehabilitation is advanced.

Let's take the first point, policy.

The Mount Carmel Center for Alcoholism operates under God's law but renders unto Caesar, that which is Caesar's. But Caesar gets confused.

God said that "we must love our neighbor." He did not say that we must love those neighbors who come under Federal interstate commerce acts and who are therefore covered under many federalized actions which confuse, bewilder, contradict, inhibit, harm, and guarantee a reactionary, nonsensical attitude that will assure this Nation a skid row in every city from New York's Bowery to San Francisco's Market Street.

Our policy is to cooperate with Caesar. But when Caesar is wrong, we try to get him squared away with humanitarian thinking. We try to eliminate government harassment with logic. Our policy is to deal with the souls of alcoholics, their health and their life and the 25 million Americans who love alcoholics as fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters. In the process, if necessary, we scrap with interpretations of laws which ignore the needs of the sick.

Our policy is to approach these 25 millon people as souls—not voters.

Mount Carmel is an American institution, law abiding and honest. It is also a house of God with moral responsibilities.

Now lets deal with the second point: the problem.

The Congress of the United States passed labor laws many years ago to protect the American worker from exploitation. The labor laws are subject to enforcement where the Federal Government has jurisdiction—established in terms of interstate commerce. Congress enabled an interpretative procedure in the administration of these wage and hour laws. The law currently reads that all employed people, covered by the act, are to receive minimum wages ($1.15 thence to $1.25) in September.

But some people are handicapped—that is to say, the blind, the lame, the halt—unable now, or in the future, to compete with able-bodied men. In this instance, dealing with the handicapped—legless, armless, speechless, etc.—some institutions can be given a waiver from the laws by accepting the definition for their institutions as being a "sheltered workshop for handicapped people."

The law provides for administrative interpretation and yields discretionary powers to the Labor Department to decide which institution meets these requirements.

Thus we have the law, the intent of Congress—and we have the administrative interpretations of the law, the product of bureaucracy.

The law makes no mention of alcoholism in either case. The law pretends no medical knowledge of alcoholism, nor speaks of any authority or experience in alcoholic rehabilitation. The interpretors of the law, however, use their discretionary powers to lump all unclassifiable rehabilitation centers into the catch all group of "sheltered workshops for handicapped people."

This procedure may be expedient and administratively efficient—but it is guaranteed to maintain the role of the social outcast for addicted alcoholics. These interpretations offer no love, no compassion or no understanding to the millions of families who are subject to alcoholism's tragedy of broken homes, divorces, welfare abuses—and worse, lost souls.

The problem, most succinctly presented, is simple: The Government insists that Mount Carmel submit to the classification of "sheltered workshop for handicapped people." The Government makes this demand without the authoritative experience of medical people, alcoholic authorities, judicial authorities, and without alcoholic rehabilitation motives.

This is a capricious decision that will guarantee the environment of alcoholism that destroys men, crushes families. It is an impersonal, uncompassionate, ill considered opinion that ignores contemporary knowledge of this disease. It is an administrative interpretation that typifies the massive power of Caesar's wish to control all people leaving no leeway for God's admonition to "seek and ye shall receive My help."

This interpretation is legalistic nonsense—not governmental service. This is a farce, not an aid to labor—to law—to government nor to the alcoholic.

This is totally Caesar's law—and none of God's law.

This is bureaucracy at its worst—not an intent of Congress.

This is administrative interpretation that ignores contemporary medical knowledge.

This is a contest between governmental bureaucracy, we repeat, and Christian charity.

Not to challenge the Government's thinking is to condone retrogressive, reactionary harrassment that represents the evil of massive government—not knowledge.

This cannot be ignored or condoned. We challenge it.

We feel this is less a matter of our defying the laws—more a problem of the Labor Department defying the intent of Congress.

Of course this could be compromised. We could save time by coming to Washington with our best Rotarian manners and seek a compromise. Literally hundreds of big business men have asked how they can help—explaining that they have high-placed friends in Washington and have volunteered to make their services available. Of course we could "arrange" a solution that lets you save face—and we save face.

But, when are we Americans going to realize that we can't compromise basic principles?

We compromised with Castro and we have communism 90 miles from the United States—and more there now than we did when we last elected a President. We compromise ideas on tax returns and breed a new generation of men who can't distinguish income tax cheating from moral principle. We compromised with principle and have 20,000,000 Negroes demanding their rights with demonstrations, marches, riots and wild shootings in every State in the Union. We've been compromising the Negro's moral rights for generations to the shame and scandal of America.

We won't compromise this—it's a matter of principle.

Either we are totally right or totally wrong.

Either the alcoholic can be saved and returned from a life of hell to a life of use with the aid of contemporary medicine, good rehabilitative thinking and the benevolent grace of Almighty God—or he can't.

Either the Government helps or hinders—or, best, lets us alone.

That's the problem.

Now let's take the third point: our point of view.

We do not pretend that we pay our men a minimum wage according to wages-and-hours laws. We cannot take advantage of (or apply for) the loophole of the law that would avoid this discussion, the "sheltered workshop for the handicapped people," because to do so would be performing a major disservice to our alcoholic friends. Alcoholics are neither handicapped, nor do they simply need shelter. We are not a workshop.

This is, we insist, a house of God, saving men's souls. To save their souls we must first get them sober.

Seeking compliance defies our principles—avoids the issue. We will tell you informally, herewith, what we pay our men—but this is information submitted with pride—not submitted as seeking compliance with your codes.

We are being cooperative with your departments—but deliberately not asking your help—your governmental handouts nor your pious platitudes.

We will give you any and all information that you want—but not formally. To offer this information formally would prejudice our rights to argue the cause of alcoholism.

So let's see how close we come to meeting fair wages and hours (but, mind you, this is not our objective).

First we define your jurisdiction—interstate commerce.

We are salvage supported—and we live as a community. That is to say some men drive trucks, others make beds, scrub floors, maintain the place, serve as orderlies in the hospital, help in the kitchen or take care of the chapel.

But, as you suggest, your interest is confined to those men who are engaged in interstate commerce. Frankly, we don't separate the men—they are all alcoholics; all get the same therapy, the same medical attention regardless of their Federal status. All men get full coverage under God's law of brotherly love—not partial coverage under Caesar's laws of interstate commerce. All Americans, all human—and all with souls. We think a man flopping a mop in the dining room (and incidentally singing a tune) is as deserving of all our attention, all of our aids, as is a man flopping a mop in the bailing department. The third floor mop flopper is not in interstate commerce—but the first floor mop flopper is.

That is what we mean when we say Caesar gets confused.

One easy way out is to take our first floor mop flopper out of interstate commerce and have him keep records for the Government—which would be administrative work and not interstate commerce. If we did this all over the place we could have 20 men keeping records for the Government and no one to support the other 100 men. We wouldn't need records then because the interstate commerce department is closed so we'll leave these men to sit around.

Poor Caesar—he'll take to drink if this keeps up.

But let's not try to separate the men who, by interpretative coincidence, come under Federal law from those who come under no Federal law. We'll work with the superior law that says all men are equal. They are, in Mount Carmel, all Americans, all drunks, all getting the same aid, all deserving the same recourse to happy sobriety—all God's children.

This is what happens to them:

First they come to us asking our help—from alcoholism. We deal only with alcoholics because they are a breed apart. They need specialized therapy. If a man comes to us down on his luck—or physically handicapped—we refer him to other facilities. The reason for this is simple: nonalcoholics can take a beer and enjoy drinking it without harm. But the alcoholics in our shop must not be set with that temptation till they have security in sobriety.

The very first thing we do is give the man a bath, a bunk and something to eat.

The second thing we do is to give the man a few dollars. Why the couple of dollars? That's hardly a living wage. Our purpose is twofold: (a) his decision to stop drinking is not as valid when he is broke as it is when he has a few dollars in his pocket to get drunk if he so elects; (b) to keep him in cigarettes and spending money and eliminate the need of panhandling.

His first therapeutic work program is meaningless to us—but important to his recovery. Depending on age, health, inclination, trade, he tends to select his own work schedule. But when indecisive, and many are, we slide him into various assignments directed to his needs, not our wants. This in the introduction period. Later with health improved, we organize men to fit our needs and their rehabilitation.

It may be days before fog becomes daylight. Then a new assignment may be indicated.

There are three requirements for admission: (1) He must be a self-professed alcoholic; (2) he must be sincere in his quest for sobriety; (3) he must agree that there is no drinking—inside or out—while he is here.

No other questions are asked—unless there is a repeator history which we have found by experience to be almost a wait list for candidates. Many men have been in and out a dozen times and finally made it.

We try to adopt some of the normal competitions and normal motivations of society in our community. We have an escalator allowance scale. We have dormitories, private rooms and large private rooms. We have work assignments that differ. But former trades are recognized and work assignments are designed to sharpen talents.

Our allowances range from $3 weekly to $60 weekly. Few are at the top—many in the middle—few at the bottom—just like society.

But we assure you the decisions on the better jobs, the better rooms, the better allowances cannot and will not be dictated by law—they must be dictated by a most sensitive appraisal of the man's progress toward sobriety. To manipulate these men's allowances by law—not by applied, experienced, judgment is bureaucracy not rehabilitation. To say that these men's allowances and job assignments can be manipulated by an act of Congress is to say that we can raise our children by statute—teach religion—by IBM computer—eradicate disease by bureaucracy. Sheer Washingtonian nonsense:

His allowance is regulary adjusted—as he grows, so grows his benefits. If the allowance formula is to be determined by Caesar's law, Caesar will increase our rate of dropouts (drunks) by several hundred percent. Careful, experienced, professional judgment on sincerity, honesty, spiritual progress is necessary to determine which man might get payday rich and overconfident, and go blow it all or which man is maturing in sobriety. The scale is based on our judgment of the man's ability to absorb prosperity, absorb the other therapy that forecasts the degree of his recovery.

You will have to make your own judgment: Are we trying to take advantage of these men—or help them?

Now let us see the facilities—the services.

We have a master dormitory, and rooms in various sizes and locations in the facility. Just as cities have small houses, big houses and suburbs—we too, try to duplicate these normal incentives in our room allocations. If a man earns and deserves (or will be improved with) better facilities, he gets them.

Clothes: All men get all they need. Work clothes, dress clothes, inside and out, shoes, hats, overcoats—they look like working men when they are working and gentlemen when they are at leisure—just as you and I.

Meals: The best. The nutritional damage to alcoholics is great. The only way to get them physically back is through good food over a long period of time. We try to serve meat twice a day—observing only traditional fast days—but always plenty of vegetables, milk, fruit, desserts. No marine station serves better meals, than we do—ask any of the former marines who are our guests. All they want to eat—as many times around the counter as they desire.

The dining room is immaculate. I would not be ashamed to have the President of the United States here for any meal.

Medical: If the man needs medical attention to get off a drunk—a licensed hospital with doctors and nurses is right on the premises. He gets all the professional care indicated. If he becomes sick, he is cared for. We have one man in the hospital for almost 2 years—diabetes, then gangrene and, unfortunately, amputation. He is still here recovering. He is not in interstate commerce, so we cannot ask Caesar for a wage formula for him.

Two men are going home to Ireland this fall, for a visit—with the money they saved in residence here.

Other facilities are interesting and expensive.

We have a recreation area that costs a lot of money to maintain. Too, we have an auditorium that seats 500 men who return frequently to fill it up at standing-room-only AA meetings. Maintaining this is expensive.

In your acts of Congress—administratively interpreted—we can charge all these colateral services gainst the men and comply with the wages and hours acts.

For instance: The Treasury Department—part of Caesar's might—concedes (for men working in hotels etc.), that this room and board is equivalent to $35 per week. Let's just reason that we give the men the equivalent of $3 a week in clothing (they couldn't buy their clothes the like of which we give them for $156 annually). So that brings us up to $38 weekly according to your allowance formula.

The law also provides for our taking credit for hospitalization costs. Is $3 a week uncontestable? It costs much more than this—but we don't have a bookkeeper for cost accounting—we keep our bookkeepers busy on Government records. That's $41 a week.

But how about charging off some of the administrative costs—or the costs of maintaining reading rooms, or the AA auditorium. How about the booklets and pamphlets. How much do you think it costs to maintain a mortgage in excess of half a million dollars. How about the overhead—you fellows know more about building budgets than we do. But we'll forget all this and stay with the $41 a week—and mind you, these are your allowances. They are prescribed by law in other areas of Caesar's wonderworld.

To this $41—by law approved—we add to some men $3 cash allowance and to others $60 cash allowance. The average is well in excess of $15.

But as we know in American law, a violation of one man's rights is just as serious as violating a thousand men's rights. In his first few weeks we allow some men only $3. When he is in the process of getting defogged this is. With his allowances he gets only a gross of $44. But the law says $1.15 per hour—40 hours—or $46. (What a farce is Caesar when he gets so big he loses sight of human values.)

We regret, sincerely, that we are breaking the laws of the land if, indeed, we are. We regret that this complicated society in which we are living, finds us in the ridiculous role of being lawbreakers when all we are doing is to try to return hithertofore homeless alcoholics to a useful society—return them to their families, to God, and yes, to the useful service of their country.

Or perhaps, all rehabilitation institutions should volunteer a $2 head tax (that's how much we are short per man).

This will raise revenue for the Government. Then the Government can create a budget to help alcoholics with the $2 head tax. Then the Government can give grants—under some medicare plan to alcoholic rehabilitation institutions. By the way the present tax formula works—for each $2 head tax, we could probably get back a 19-cent grant—the rest being charged up to governmental and bureaucratic administrative costs.

Caesar's gone nuts. He's off on a new frontier drunk.

But wait. This is Caesar's law we broke. Have we broken God's law? Help us make that decision.

If we've broken one, but not the other—which one dominates. Is there moral justification for breaking one law (Caesar's) and maintaining compliance with another (God's)?

A quandry to ponder—where are we going in this country when we have to get down to such fool regulations as this.

We can comply with Caesar's law in two ways:

First: We can pay the man, not $3, but $5—and chance his getting "a drunks richness" and leaving our place before we've been able to defog him. In other words we can comply with Caesar's law by violating our responsibility to get this man sober.

What a quandry—what a situation.

I think it would be easier for me to close this place, take the $5 and go out and get drunk.

But there is another way—the sheltered workshop for handicapped people.

We won't reexplain our position on shelter. Jails are shelters—mental institutions are shelters—flophouses are shelters, and I'll leave it to your good judgment to decide how much of a dent these shelters have made in the problem of alcoholism. Alcoholics need not shelter—but hope; not shelter, but compassion; not shelter but love and understanding. They need to know the nature of their illness. They need new work habits. More important, they need God in their lives—a God they will find when sober—a God they will find in AA.

Not shelter, Mr. Administrator, but care. These are medically sick people; they need therapy designed to make them well.

But the more valid reason for not seeking this loophole is the Government's insistence that these men are handicapped.

We have a friend who makes more than $25,000 annually on one of America's leading magazines; is he handicapped? He is an alcoholic but not handicapped. His 10 children don't mind your calling him an alcoholic, but don't let them hear you call him a handicapped person. And this magazine has another half-dozen alcoholics on its staff.

We have another friend, a doctor doing very fine work in a delicate specialty.

Handicapped, no; alcoholic, yes.

The law courts are filled with men, in front of and behind the bench, as defendants, practicing attorneys and judges. When you call them handicapped, and you open a new phase of jurisprudence, appeals based on the incompetence that your word "handicapped" implies will clog the courts for 100 years.

Persist in the use of the word "handicapped" in your legal definitions, and you'll be contesting the rigorous physical standards of the Federal Aviation Agency that has given physical fitness certificates to pilots who fly jets from one end of the world to the other.

Alcoholic? **Yes.** Handicapped? No.

Take your choice of terms; play them for whatever merit there is. One simple fact cannot be escaped. These labor laws were written in the 1930's. This was a period in which society, medical professional groups, welfare agencies, and Government people were totally perplexed with this problem. Today the knowledge is vast, the hope is high, the answer just around the corner.

Yet you persist in using archaic definitions of "handicapped" despite present broad knowledge of the subject, despite the weight of evidence to the contrary.

Today we have the authority of the American Medical Association, the World Health Organization, and, if you please, the Catholic Church and many other religious organizations, which accept with written definition that the alcoholic is a sick person. Yet by legal standards—and your office is a major part of this—the law insists in identifying him as a handicapped person.

I cannot, on moral grounds, have any part of it.

So this is my dilemma. I cannot meet your minimum wage interpretation. I cannot seek the status of being a sheltered workshop for for handicapped people. Alas, I am a law breaker.

Suggested solution: Let's sit down in one room, at one time, with those men, or that man, who can listen to our orderly appeal and make a decision then and there. Please don't make me run around the mulberry bush, distracting me from the work I want to do—help the souls of alcoholically addicted Americans who can be returned to their families, their God, and their country.

This matter will be pursued to the point of getting a new classification of this type of facility, or until I can convince all America that there is a conflict between God's law and Caesar's.

The might of the Government does not make it right. Right makes might.

This remains: The might of the U.S. Government versus the right of Christian charity.

My health is good.
My zeal is great.
My cause is just.
I welcome the debate—the challenge.

Cordially,

MSGR. WILLIAM N. WALL.

Invitation to Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, throughout history, the most serious diseases which threatened the lives of the people could not always be diagnosed by physicians. Effective means of preventing the contagion from spreading were often extremely difficult to prescribe.

Much the same danger threatens the freedom and vital interests of the American people today because it is not easily diagnosed and because our common enemy takes many uncommon shapes.

Recognizing the threat to our security, we have stockpiled reserves of nuclear weapons; we have spared no expense in our efforts to be first in the conquest of space and related technology; we have contributed more than $100 billion in aid to 98 countries and territories over the past 15 years to strengthen our barriers against Communist aggression.

And yet, there are many who believe we are no safer or nearer our goal which is the preservation of life in peace and justice for ourselves and all the world.

Why this feeling of uneasiness and insecurity? Because, in our determination not to be the first power to unleash the hurricane winds of nuclear war, many are not always able to recognize the strategy of those who announce openly, "We shall bury you."

There are very few people in the world today who have as thorough a knoweldge of enemy strategy than Zbigniew Stypulkowski, author of an excellent book titled, "Invitation to Moscow" who presently is visiting the United States.

Mr. Stypulkowski, once a prominent lawyer in Warsaw and the youngest Member ever elected to Poland's Parliament, rose to be one of the national leaders of Poland in her fight against the invasions of Hitler and Stalin during World War II. In March 1945, with 15 other members of the Polish underground government, he was invited by Stalin to come to Moscow for negotiations concerning future relations between the Polish people and the Soviets based on the newly signed Yalta Agreement.

When the Western governments learned of this invitation, they urged that it be accepted because they saw in it the salvation of Poland and a token of good will on the part of the Soviet Government. It was all, however, a typical Stalin fraud. The Polish leaders including Mr. Stypulkowski, were kidnapped to Moscow and jailed in the infamous Lubianka prison.

Stypulkowski was submitted to 141 interrogations in the course of 70 days and nights and then sentenced by the Military Collegeum of the Supreme Court of the U.S.S.R. He never broke down and never admitted "guilt." Rudenko, the present Soviet Attorney General, told him at the conclusion of the investigation:

> It will be the first time since the Soviet revolution that a defendant tried in the Supreme Court of Justice of the U.S.S.R. has not pleaded guilty. Do you think you are acting wisely?

Eventually, Stypulkowski regained his freedom and is now in the West. He rendered a great service not only to his country but also to the cause of the defense of the free world when, in 1951, he published his book, "Invitation to Moscow." This book, now translated in many languages, based not on theory but on personal, practical experience gives a masterful description of the nature and the effects of the Stalin brainwashing technique.

"Invitation to Moscow" is now being quoted in scientific, political, sociological and medical literature throughout the world. When it was published in 1951, Newsweek wrote about it as follows:

> Throws an amazingly vivid light upon modern Russia. * * * So enlightening as to be almost essential for an understanding of the modern world.

The noted British statesman, Richard H. S. Crossman, wrote in "New Statesman and Nation";

> One of the most remarkable documents I have ever read. * * * Makes Koestler's "Darkness at Noon" sound like a clever pastiche.

I will also quote John Connell from London Evening News:

> I hail his courage, his honesty, his humility and his quenchless faith; and I urge everyone to read this book. * * *

In 1954 the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, appointed by the House of Representatives, had a long interview with Mr. Stypulkowski in London. His evidence aroused a most vivid interest among the members of the committee. I quote some of their opinions from the official record of the meeting:

> Congressman Fred E. Busbey of Illinois. I personally think that your testimony today is without a doubt probably the best testimony on this particular subject * * * that has been brought to the attention not only of the congressional committee but also of the entire free world.
>
> Congressman RAY MADDEN of Indiana. I think, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Stypulkowski's testimony is so valuable that * * * it could be used very advantageously by this committee and by our Government.
>
> Congressman Thaddeus Machrowicz of Michigan. Most of the testimony he [Mr. Stypulkowski] has given today is contained in a splendid book which he has written, "Invitation to Moscow," and I think it would be well if we were to make it compulsory reading for anyone who accepts, or is offered, an invitation to Geneva, Berlin, or anywhere else to deal with the Communists."
>
> Congressman THOMAS DODD of Connecticut. It, this book, certainly ought to be a valuable contribution to everyone's understanding about the situation.
>
> The CHAIRMAN (Congressman KERSTEN). Mr. Stypulkowski * * * you have made a great contribution, and I particularly think that you underlined a feature which is most important for us to consider.

A few months ago, there appeared a new edition of the book "Invitation to Moscow," published by Walker & Co. This gave me the opportunity to re-read it and to review its meaning. I am following the advice of those whose statements I have quoted, and I call upon every thinking American to become acquainted with the contents of this book. I recommend our educational institutions, armed services, information services, make the book "Invitation to Moscow" accessible to all Americans, as well as those foreign societies toward which Communist "brainwashing" is mainly directed.

In support of my opinion, may I be permitted to recall that two outstanding Members of Congress in 1951–52, introduced for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recommendation regarding "Invitation to Moscow." They were: President Kennedy and former Vice President Richard M. Nixon.

I would hope that our military leaders would heed the wise counsel of President Kennedy and former Vice President Nixon by making "Invitation to Moscow" required reading for all of our troops.

For, if we refrain from exposing and critically examining the published techniques of Communist strategy and if we neglect to instill the virtues of patriotism, religious feeling, and a deep-rooted sense of honor in our people we will not achieve the peace and justice for which we yearn and which we owe to future generations.

Congressional Reorganization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALPHONZO BELL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, continuing reorganization of Government for reasons other than accommodation of power rivals is a necessity in democratic societies. Popular compromise legislation inevitably creates inefficient laws and procedures. Can a democratic government reorganize itself at anything like the speed with which it disorganizes itself? Our future depends on an affirmative answer. To take initiative in this field and to deserve the right to make meaningful demands on the executive and judicial branches, Congress must begin with its own administration. Following is a bibliography which I have obtained from the Library of Congress dealing with books and articles dealing with this subject:

Congressional Reorganization, Selected Bibliography

BOOKS

Acheson, Dean G., "A Citizen Looks at Congress." New York: Harper, 1956. 124 pp. JK 1061 .A64.

American Political Science Association. Committee on Congress. "The Reorganization of Congress." Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1945. 89 pp. JK 1096 .As.

American Political Science Association. Committee on Political Parties. "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System"; a report. New York: Rinehart, 1950. 99 pp. JK 2265 .A7.

Bailey, Stephen K., and Howard D. Samuel. "Congress at Work." New York: Holt, 1952. 502 pp. JK 1061 .B3.

Burdette, Franklin L., "Filibustering in the Senate." Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940. 252 pp. JK 1274 .B87.

Burnham, James, "Congress and the American Tradition." Chicago: Regnery, 1959. 363 pp. JK 1061 .B78.

Burns, James MacGregor, "Congress on Trial: The Legislative Process and the Administrative State." New York: Harper, 1949. 224 pp. JK 1061 .B8.

Burns, James MacGregor, "The Deadlock of Democracy; Four-Party Politics in America." Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963. 388 pp. E 183 .B96.

Dangerfield, Royden James, "In Defense of the Senate; A Study in Treatymaking." Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1933. 365 pp. JK 1170 .D3.

Galloway, George B., "Congress and Democracy; a Lecture Delivered at the Ohio State University, February 27, 1950" (Walter J. Shepard Foundation lectures).

Galloway, George B., "Congress and Parliament: Their Organization and Operation in the U.S. and the U.K." Washington: National Planning Association, 1955. 105 pp. JK 1021 .G3 (or) HC 101.N352 No. 93.

Galoway, George B., "Congress at the Crossroads." New York: Crowell, 1946. JK 1061 .G3.

Galloway, George B., "Congressional Reorganization Revisited." College Park: Bureau of Governmental Research, University of Maryland, 1956. 26 pp. JK 1061 .G314.

Galloway, George B., "Congressional Reorganization: Unfinished Business." In Earl Latham (Ed.), the philosophy and politics of Woodrow Wilson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958. pp. 214–27. E 767 .L3.

Galloway, George B., "History of the House of Representatives." New York: Crowell, 1962. 334 pp. JK 1316 .G2.

Galloway, George B., "The Legislative Process in Congress." New York: Crowell, 1953. 689 pp. JK 1061. G32.

Galloway, George B., "Next Steps in Congressional Reform." Urbana: University of Illinois, Institute of Government and Public Affairs, 1952. 32 pp. JK 1061 .G33.

Griffith, Ernest S., "Congress: Its Contemporary Role." 3rd edition New York: New York University Press, 1961. 244 pp. JK 1061 .G7 1961.

Gross, Bertram M., "The Legislative Struggle, a Study in Social Combat." New York: McGraw-Hill, 1953. 472 pp. JK 1096 .G7.

Harris, Joseph P., "The Advice and Consent of the Senate." Berkeley: University of California Press, 1953. 457 pp. JK 1274 .H3.

Hazlitt, Henry, "A New Constitution Now." New York: McGraw-Hill, 1942. 297 pp. JK 268 .H36.

Heubel, Edward J., "Reorganization and Reform of Congressional Investigations, 1945–55." Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1956. Microfilm AC–1 no. 15, 930.

Holcombe, Arthur N., "Our More Perfect Union; From Eighteenth-Century Principles To Twentieth-Century Practice." Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950. 460 pp. JK 31 .H7.

Horn, Stephen, "The Cabinet and Congress." New York: Columbia University Press, 1960. JK 616 .H6.

Hyneman, Charles S., "Bureaucracy in a Democracy." New York: Harper, 1950. 586 pp. JK 421 .H8.

Jewell, Malcolm E., "Senatorial Politics and Foreign Policy." Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1962. 214 pp. E 744 .J4.

Kammerer, Gladys M., "Congressional Committee Staffing Since 1946." Lexington: Bureau of Government Research, University of Kentucky, 1951. 65 pp. JK 1029 .K3.

Kefauver, Estes, and Jack Levin. "A Twentieth-Century Congress." New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1947. 236 pp. JK 1081 .K4.

Kofmehl, Kenneth T., "Professional Staffs of Congress." West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University [Studies: Humanities Series], 1962. 282 pp. JK 1083 .K6.

McNeil, Neil, "Forge of Democracy: The House of Representatives." New York: McKay, 1963. 496 pp. JK 1331 .M2.

Millspaugh, Arthur C., "Toward Efficient Democracy; the Question of Governmental Organization." Washington: Brookings, 1949. 307 pp. JK 271 .M5.

Monroney, A. S. Mike, et al. "The Strengthening of American Political Institutions." Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1949. 134 pp. JK 271 .S893.

Ogul, Morris S., "Reforming Executive-Legislative Relations in the Conduct of American Foreign Policy: The Executive-Legislative Council as a Proposed Solution." Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1958. [Thesis, University of Michigan] 1921.

Kraines, Oscar, "Congress and the Challenge of Big Government." New York: Bookman Associates, 1958. 129 pp. JK 643 .B87K7.

Riddick, Floyd M., "The United States Congress; Organization and Procedure." Manassas, Va.: National Capitol Publishers, 1949. 449 pp. JK 1096 .R54.

Robinson, James A., "Congress and Foreign Policy-Making: A Study in Legislative Influence and Initiative." Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1962. 262 pp. JK 1081 .R6.

Truman, David B., "The Governmental Process; Political Interests and Public Opinion." New York: Knopf, 1953. 544 pp. JK 1118 .T7.

U.S. Congress, Senate. Committee on Rules and Administration. "Rules of Procedure for Senate Investigating Committees." Hearings before the Subcommittee on Rules, 83d Cong., 2d sess. 10 parts. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1954. 10 pts., 663 pp. JK 1274 .A4 1954.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Rules and Administration. "Rules of Procedure for Senate Investigating Committees." Report of the Committee on Rules and Administration, 84th Cong., 1st sess. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1955. 43 pp. JK 1274 .A4 1955.

Wallace, Robert A., "Congressional Control of Federal Spending." Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1960. 188 pp. HJ 2052 .W3.

Willoughby, William F., "Principles of Legislative Organization and Administration." Washington: Brookings Institution, 1934, 657 pp. JK 1061 .W7.

Wilson, H. Hubert, "Congress; Corruption and Compromise." New York: Rinehart, 1951. 337 pp. JK 1061 .W72.

Young, Roland, "The American Congress." New York: Harper, 1958. 333 pp. JK 1061 .Y59.

ARTICLES

Baker, Russell W., "Paralysis on the Hill: The Declining Prestige and Power of Congress Stem From Its Inability and Unwillingness To Meet Its Responsibilities Toward National Issues." Johns Hopkins Magazine, 14: 4–5 plus (January 1963).

Bendiner, Robert, "Just How Bad is Congress"? Commentary 13: 135–41 (February, 1952).

Broughton, Philip S., "Congress is Far From Reorganized." New York Times Magazine. May 18, 1947, p. 7 plus.

Broughton, Philip S., "For a Stronger Congress." New York: Public Affairs Committee, 1946. 32 p.

Carter, Hodding, "Speaking Out: Let's Keep the Filibuster." Saturday Evening Post, 235: 10 plus (June 16, 1962).

Celler, Emanuel, "The Seniority Rule in Congress." Western Political Quarterly, 14, pt. 1: 160–67 (March 1961).

Chamberlain, Lawrence H., "Congress, Diagnosis and Prescription." Political Science Quarterly. 60: 437–45 (September 1945).

Clark, Joseph S., "Hesitant Senate." Atlantic, 209: 55–60 (March 1962). Reply: Barry Goldwater, 209: 36 plus (May 1962).

Congressional Quarterly Almanac (Annual) Washington: Congressional Quarterly Service. 194—Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report. Washington: Congressional Quarterly Service.

"Congressman: For 2 Years, or 4?" Senior Scholastic, 73: 8–9, 28 (September 19, 1958).

Coyle, David Cushman, "Reorganizing Congress." Virginia Quarterly Review, 24: 13–26 (Winter, 1948).

Daniels, Jonathan, "What Truman Would Do To Congress." Colliers, April 14, 1951: pp. 13–15, 54–55.

Drummond, Roscoe, "Speaking Out: Congress Must Reform." Saturday Evening Post, 238: 8 plus (February 9, 1963).

"The Filibuster Debate: Barrier Against Steamrollers," by Lindsay Rogers; "The Public Business Must Go Forward," by Jacob K. Javits. Reporter, 20: 21–25 (January 8, 1959).

Fulbright, J. William, "American Foreign Policy in the 20th Century Under an 18th Century Constitution." Cornell Law Quarterly, (Fall 1961).

Galloway, George B., "The Operation of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946." American Policital Science Review, 45: 41–68 (March 1951).

Galloway, George B., "To Break the Congress Long-Jam." New York Times Magazine (July 26, 1953).

Gallup, George H., "Editors for Congress: Single Term Proposed to Attract Outstanding Citizens." National Municipal Review, 47: 210–15 (May 1958).

Goodwin, George Jr., "The Seniority System in Congress." American Political Science Review, 53: 41-36 (June 1959). (Also as Bobbs-Merrill Reprint in the Social Sciences, PS–107.)

Goodwin, George, Jr., "Subcommittees: The Miniature Legislatures of Congress." American Political Science Review, 56: 596-604 (September 1962).

Greenberg, D. S., "Science and Congress: Machinery Is Out of Date for Handling $12 Billion in Research Programs." Science, October 19, 1962, pp. 417-418.

HUMPHREY, HUBERT H., "Modernizing Congress—Pressure Forcing Congress To Consider Modernizing Its Ways for the First Time in 17 Years." American Federationist, 70: 1-4 (April 1963).

HUMPHREY, HUBERT H., "The Senate on Trial." American Political Science Review, 44: 650-660 (September 1950).

HUMPHREY, HUBERT H., "To Move Congress Out of Its Ruts." New York Times Magazine, p. 39 plus, April 7, 1963.

Hyman, Sidney, "Inquiry Into the 'Decline' of Congress," New York Times Magazine, January 3, 1960, pp. 5, 38-41.

"Is Congress Doing Its Job"? With editorial comment. Business Week, 48-57, 92 (January 5, 1963).

Jones, Charles O., "The Role of the Congressional Subcommittee." Midwest Journal of Political Science, 6: 327-44 (November 1962).

KEFAUVER, ESTES, "Congressional Reorganization." Journal of Politics. 9: 96-107 (February 1947).

KEFAUVER, ESTES, "Did We Modernize Congress?" National Municipal Review. 36: 552-57 (November 1947).

KEFAUVER, ESTES, "What's To Be Done About Congress." New York Times Magazine. September 11, 1949; pp. 9-10 plus.

Kennedy, John F., "Congressional Lobbies: A Chronic Problem Reexamined." Georgetown Law Journal 45: 535-67 (Summer, 1957).

Kolodziej, E. A., "Minority Rule as a Rule." New Republic, 148: 8-10 (January 12, 1963).

Kristol, Irving, "Democracy and Babel." "There has not been a 'great debate' on any public question since 1920", not in the mass media, certainly not in Congress, says the author. Columbia University Forum, 3: 15-19 (Fall 1960).

Latest efforts to change U.S. Senate's cloture rule 22. Congressional Digest (entire issue) (December 1958).

"Liberals seek short-cut through Congress." Nation's Business, November, 1962, pp. 36-37, 78.

Lyon, Carl V., and William H. Stamhagen, "Lobbying, Liberty, and the Legislative Process: An Appraisal of the Proposed Legislative Activities Disclosure Act." George Washington Law Review 26: 391-417 (March 1958).

McCartney, J., "Senate Establishment; Concerning - Senator CLARK's Remarkable Speech." Nation, 196: 219-21 (March 16, 1963).

MCCLELLAN, JOHN L., "A New Watchdog Agency for Congress." [Tax Foundation] Tax Review, 18: 55-18 (December 1957).

Mantel, Howard N., "The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: Fact or Fiction of the Legislative Process?" Western Political Quarterly, 12: 981-95 (December 1955).

Morley, Felix, "Deliberate Pace in Congress Safeguards Your Rights." Nation's Business, 51: 27-28 (March 1963).

Morley, Felix, "Too Much Legislative Reform is as Dangerous as Too Little." Nation's Business (July 1962, pp. 25-26).

Needler, Martin, "On the Dangers of Copying From the British." Political Science Quarterly, 77: 379-96 (September 1962).

Neuberger, Richard L., "Who Polices the Policemen (Congress)"? New York Times Magazine, February 23, 1958: 18, 79-80, 82.

Parkins, Ivan W., "Let's Disassemble the House." South Atlantic Quarterly. 59: 226-38 (Spring, 1960).

Partain, Eugene G., "The Use of Broadcast Media in Congressional, Legislative, and Quasi-Judicial Proceedings." Journal of Broadcasting, 4: 123-39 (Spring, 1960).

Perlmutter, O. W., "Acheson vs. Congress." Review of Politics, 22: 5-44 (January 1960).

Riker, William H., "The Paradox of Voting and Congressional Rules for Voting on Amendments." American Political Science Review, 52: 349-66 (June 1958). (Also as Bobbs-Merrill Reprint in the Social Sciences, PS 239).

Robinson, James A., "The Role of the Rules Committee in Arranging the Program of the U.S. House of Representatives." Western Political Quarterly, 12: 653-69 (September 1959). (Also as Bobbs-Merrill Reprint in the Social Sciences, PS 241).

Rogers, Lindsay, and JACOB K. JAVITS, "The Filibuster Debate." Reporter, 20: 21-23 (January 8, 1959).

Schattsschneider, E. E., "Congress in Conflict." Yale Review 41: 181-93 (Winter, 1952).

Scher, Seymour, "Congressional Committee Members as Independent Agency, Overseers: A Case Study." American Political Science Review, 54: 911-20 (December 1960).

Shannon, William V., "Liberal Hopes and Congress Realities." Commentary, 27: 405-12 (May 1959).

Shuman, Howard E., "Senate Rules and the Civil Rights Bill." American Political Science Review, 51: 955-75 (December 1957).

Shuman, Howard E., "What's the Matter With Congress?" New Republic (April 1, 1957, pp. 14-16).

"That 'Streamlined' Congress: One Reform of Our Legislative Machinery Wasn't Enough. So Let's Try Again." (Editorial) Life 23: 30 (July 28, 1947).

Udall, Stewart L., "A Congressman Defends the House." New York Times Magazine, January 12, 1958: 14, 69, 72..

"Uncreative, Negative, Smug; Is This Today's U.S. Congress?" Newsweek, 61: 22-24 (January 28, 1963).

U.S. Senate. Committee on Rules and Administration. Subcommittee on Standing Rules of the Senate. Proposed amendments to the standing rules of the Senate. Hearing, June 16, 1961, on Senate Resolution 9 [and other resolutions] and Senate Resolution 10 and Senate Resolution 14, proposed amendments to the Legislative reorganization act of 1946. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1961. 50 pp. [87th Cong., 1st sess.]

U.S. Senate. Committee on Rules and Administration. Adjournment of Congress: Hearing, August 2, 1961, on Senate Concurrent Resolution 6, providing for annual adjournments of Congress and Senate Concurrent Resolution 16, to establish a date for adjournment of Congress. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1961. 26 pp. [87th Cong., 1st sess.]

Vardys, V. Stanley, "Select committees of the House of representatives—their establishment, constitution, and purposes." Midwest Journal of Political Science, 6: 247-65 (August 1962).

Wallace, Robert A., "Congressional Control of the Budget." Midwest Journal of Political Science, 3: 151-67 (May 1959) (Also as Bobbs-Merrill Reprint in the Social Sciences, PS -293).

"What's wrong with Congress?" U.S. News & World Report. 49: 56-77 (September 12, 1960).

White, Gorning, "To the Rescue of Congress." National Review, 5: 206-07 (March 1, 1958).

White, William S., "In Defense of Congressional Investigations." Harper's, 220: p. 94 plus (April 1960).

Wicker, Tom. "Again That Roadblock in Congress." New York Times Magazine. August 7, 1960. pp. 14, 64, 68-9.

Young, Stephen M., "Washington's Conflict of Interest Mess." Coronet. 46: 76-83 (September 1959).

Mr. Speaker, one of the bills which has my support as part of a long-range congressional reform program is the following bill which is currently being considered in committee:

H.R. 1947

A bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of the Congress

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established a Commission on the Organization of the Congress (hereinafter referred to as the Commission) to be composed of seven Members of the Senate (not more than four of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the President of the Senate, seven Members of the House of Representatives (not more than four of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and two members with distinguished records of interest in public affairt so be appointed by the President of the United States without regard to political affiliation. The Commission shall select a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members. No recommendation shall be made by the Commission except upon a majority vote of the members representing each House, taken separately.

SEC. 2. The Commission shall make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying and expediting its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. This study shall include, but shall not be limited to, the organization and operation of each House of the Congress; the relationship between the two Houses; the relationships between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of officers and employees of the respective Houses and officers and employees of the committees and Members of Congress; the structure of, and the relationships between, the various standing, special, select, and conference committees of the Congress, the rules, parliamentary procedure practices, and/or precedents of either House, the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House, and the consolidations and reorganization of committees and committee jurisdictions.

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

(b) The Commission is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

(c) The expenses of the Commission which shall not exceed $, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(d) The Commission shall report from time to time to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its study, together with its recommendations, the first report being made not later than four months after the Commission is established. If the Senate, the House of Representatives, or both, are in recess or have adjourned, the report shall be made to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be. All reports and findings of the Commission shall, when received, be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the Committee on Government Operations of the House.

Speech of Lawrence H. Rogers II, Before Better Business Bureau of Birmingham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the great problems facing our country in the years ahead is how to deal with the conditions created by automation. These are problems to which even the great computers cannot give all the answers. We will have to make our own solutions.

The problems should be engaging the very best minds we have. Recently, in Birmingham, the Better Business Bureau of that city heard the following address by Mr. Lawrence H. Rogers II, executive vice president of the Taft Broadcasting Co., dealing with the problems. His speech, entitled, "The Age of Cybernetics," was delivered on June 21, 1963. I think that many Members of the House will be interested in reading this address by a thoughtful business executive:

THE AGE OF CYBERNETICS

The most impressive part of this speech is its title, "Cybernetics." In the event you've never heard of cybernetics, one can hardly blame you since the word has only recently been invented from a couple of Greek roots.

Webster now defines cybernetics to mean "comparative study of the control system formed by the nervous system and brain and mechanical-electrical communications systems, such as computing machines." Cybernation, therefore, is the logical outgrowth word invented to cover the whole area of the control of human activities by the emergence of automation in general and the computer in particular. While I don't intend to talk about this abstruse subject in any detail because I don't know that much about it, I do intend to share with you a few random observations on the meanings and the impact of technological change in our society and what we are to do about it if we are to avoid becoming digits in the machinery of cybernetics.

Economists and geopoliticians and other experts tell us that the problems we are facing today cannot be solved by the application of oldfashioned principles because they are entirely new problems. I don't ask you to believe this, but I do ask you to believe that we are faced with an ever-increasing adherence to this theory. The main reasons they give for the claim that our problems are entirely new are basically two: first of all, the size of the population; and, second, the threshold of awareness of that population to the forces which drive it. Let's take only the United States. In 1975, scarcely more than a decade away, the population is reliably predicted to be 245 million people. I remember vividly in grade school having to be instantly ready with the answer that the population of the United States was 121 million, less than half of what it will be in a mere twinkling, as time is reckoned these days. Thus, the population problems facing us now will be increased by a minimum of 33⅓ percent in the short space of another 10 years. Since our basic problem in this country has never been one of insufficient food production, and since the rate of technological advancement in food production is so astonishing, I don't think anyone is seriously concerned about the ability of the United States to feed a population of 245 million. One cannot be so hopeful about the rest of the world. We may even achieve some breakthroughs in the area of finding a useful existence for this many people. But one thing the cybernationists tell us, if I may coin another word, is that we cannot hope to achieve a public awareness, on the part of the bulk of this immense exploding population, of the nature of the forces shaping society.

In other words, there is a growing body of economic and political thinking which takes the view that the increasing rate of technological change, the increasing degree to which the computer takes over the functions of the man, and the increasing rate of the population all relegate man to the position of a mere object to be manipulated. Unhappily, there are already too many signs around us that this may be true to some degree.

Consider, if you will, three factors which have to be acknowledged as facts. First, computers have reached such a state of sophistication that there are already in existence machines which can think as well as most people in the everyday employment decisions they are faced with. Now this is not to say a computer can ever take over the decisions which all of us are faced with daily in the business community * * * based upon judgment and ethics. A computer, after all, has no ethics whatever, and can only act upon the information fed into it. But in the workaday world of the key punch operator, the file clerk, or the common laborer, the ordinary decisions of which key to press, which folder to open, or which clod to turn can just as easily be made by a computer and, in many instances, better and faster.

Point No. 2: In the United States today approximately one-third of the entire work force is women and almost 70 percent of the work this one-third of the work force does is paperwork * * * paperwork of such a routine nature that all of it could be replaced by computer-directed operations and the probability is that most of it will be absorbed by automation. If this does nothing else, it gives rise to serious speculation as to the place of women in the future work force and, of course, focuses even greater attention on a bill just passed by Congress to establish by Federal law equal wage rates for men and women. This combination of forces could go far toward elimination of large scale female employment.

3. The rationalization of human activities by computers has become an everyday task on a national scale. One immediate effect is that private enterprise is consistently losing out in the race for highly-skilled manpower and natural resources to the Federal Government under the guise of furthering the national interest. This is again a direct result of the increasingly larger population, with growing welfare problems, and the unique ability of federal bureaus with unlimited resources wrung from the taxpayers, and unlimited access to giant computers to deal with such problems in such a way as to confound the local community or State government. Now this mere scratching of the surface of the true intent and meaning of cybernetics leads to a fourth point which is really a culmination of the other three, and which in a free society is the most important point of all, namely, the relationship between the individual voter and the policymaker.

Decisions made by professionals and computers, and in this area I would classify such a decision as the highly controversial TFX aircraft contract award, such decisions, and the part played in them by the computer organism, are only dimly apprehended by any substantial segment of the public or even the Congress. The programing of a giant computer is in itself such a highly specialized and complicated business that it is unlikely that anyone in this room has a very thorough understanding of it. As more and more arms of the Federal Government conduct more and more of their operations by computer automation, we are faced with the frightening problem of how to preserve the public's ability to influence public policy. The time was, in Biblical days, that the mob threw stones at the publicans, the hired tax collectors. But today, how do you influence tax policy when the Internal Revenue Service has babies tattooed at birth, feeds into a giant machine every one of our taxpayer identification numbers, together with such other information as it wants from every corner of the Nation, so that no one could conceivably escape being identified, tabulated, and billed, even before he as an individual copes with the problem of how much he might owe Uncle Sam. This is only one minor example of the manipulation I referred to at the outset. It's difficult enough at the college graduate level to evaluate properly just what a computer does without trying to extend this to the entire broad base of the population.

I am sure you can see at a glance what I am driving at. As the capacity of machines and the relatively small crew of highly skilled experts who own the machines increases to the point where it can absorb a major share of the governmental policy decisionmaking process, the public, and even the public's representatives in the Legislatures and the Congress, find themselves out in the cold; their every action and reaction being evaluated and acted upon by a sort of permanent intellectual elite guard, capable in the first instance of electing its leader by using a computer to determine the ideal candidate, then perpetuating itself by automating every function of public policymaking.

This is hardly a pretty picture, is it?

I started with this side of the coin because I am basically an optimist and would prefer to paint the black side of the picture first before looking around behind the clouds for a few silver linings.

Now, first of all, do I really believe that computers and automation have reached this stage of development? Yes, I do.

Secondly, do I really believe that this pseudoscience of cybernetics actually poses the threat I have just outlined? Again, I most certainly do.

There are today in this country, and throughout the world, a combination of forces which make such technological development absolutely inevitable. In our own country the desire of the American people to preserve their high standard of living and to project it to an even higher plane makes the further development of automation and technological change a certainty. It's my personal opinion that the technological revolution in which we are engaged at this very moment is more far reaching in its effect than was the industrial revolution that was unleashed at the end of the 18th century by the development of the steam engine. But, like any unknown and not fully understood force, the forces of automation and technological change are inclined to be evaluated by most people emotionally and, therefore, they aren't really believed. Fear is almost always the result of lack of knowledge and people tend to view the unknown future effects of automation and technological changes as a threat to security. Whether it's a threat or a blessing depends entirely upon how we approach it, and control it.

Not too many years ago a majority of the U.S. population lived on the farm. Today the figure is less than 9 percent. What happened?

Among the most important factors have been the mechanization of our farms, the attraction of high industrial wage rates in the cities, and the communications revolution that has changed our country into a homogeneous unit with its enormous size shrunken by television and the jet airplane. The result is a new 91-percent majority urban population of the United States which includes among others a steadily increasing number of semiliterate, unskilled, or illiterate Negroes from the Southland who've migrated to the great urban centers of the North, notably Chicago, Detroit, Washington, and New York. But not all the disemployed or the unemployables are former Negro sharecroppers from Dixie, or excoal miners from the Appalachians.

Consider, if you will, the case of the airframe industry. Airframe, by the way, refers to the standard method of construction of a propeller-driven airplane in that ancient industry that was scarcely a generation old before it became nearly obsolete.

Until Sputnik I electrified the world by orbiting the earth on the business end of a Russian rocket, the U.S. airframe industry employed nearly a third of a million people with huge concentrations of them in San Diego, Calif., and Seattle, Wash. Since sputnik, the entire thrust of aeronautical manufacturing has been toward the rocket, the missile, and the spaceship. In the process, almost a quarter of a million highly skilled people have been disemployed. While they are not all permanently unemployable, most of them are and will remain unemployed until an entire new industrial development is able to absorb them. Dwelling on the same example for a moment, the time was when a large office building, housing thousands of aeronautical engineers and draftsmen, would be devoted to the development and design of a military bomber or a commercial transport airplane. Today this same project, to design an entirely different kind of aircraft or a sophisticated outer-space missile, can be accomplished by a computer. The design of a supersonic airplane involves telling a computer the required characteristics. This may take a small band of highly skilled engineers and scientists a number of months to accomplish, but once they have accomplished it without so much as operating a slide rule or putting a pencil to paper, they need only punch the proper button on the computer and it spits out the design of the airplane for them. All of you, I'm sure, are familiar with simple applications of the same principle, now employed on a gigantic scale.

What are the results?

One result is an increasingly complex industrial society in which fewer and fewer people are required to perform more and more specialized functions. The task of management in attempting to encompass the very nature of the problems it's faced with becomes almost insurmountable. The problem of the average employee in performing his daily work becomes relatively much easier and more comfortable. The threefold results are a leadership echelon in government, business, industry, and education who are worked beyond capacity; a middle echelon of clerical, white-collar, and any surviving blue-collar workers with a higher living standard and more leisure time than they have ever had before; and an increasing number at the bottom of the scale with nothing to do because they are not qualified to do it.

This is a pretty dismal picture.

Of course, it's not that simple. The very fact that an entire new class of Americans will become a leisure class that has never had such leisure before, will be the basis for an entire new economy of leisure-time equipment, gadgets, locations, activities, training schools, etc.

There probably isn't any solution for the overworked executive because nobody's sorry for him anyway, except maybe his wife.

But the serious problem is the ever-growing army of presently unemployable, unskilled people, largely concentrated in the major urban centers; largely the wards of the State; with increasing pressure for them to become wards of the Nation.

To me the one most obvious answer to this dilemma of the age of cybernation is education. It's easy to say but not quite so easy of accomplishment.

Even if we could solve the present problem by ignoring it and look only to the future, we must recognize that our entire educational system must undergo an enormous change in order to gear itself to the problems of technological change. People must be trained for specific skills that may be needed in the foreseeable future; and in addition, workers of all ages and skills must undergo continuous educational retraining There is crying need for more technical schools and for more short courses to supplement the curricula of our established schools and colleges. We should reappraise the value of cooperative education at both the high school and college level; and we need to give our cooperative colleges and their graduates a standing in the educational community that they have lacked in the past.

I have always believed that we must fully recognize the differing abilities and the differing characteristics and capabilities to learn of different students. This painful decision must be made; and then we will have to demand more levels of training within our entire educational system. I disagree with the cybernationists that human beings are mere economic units. Therefore, an education must treat the whole person; but we can no longer ignore individuality and capacity in a pell-mell effort to give every American citizen a high school certificate and a college degree. The result of this policy in the past has been to degrade American public education to the point of education by the lowest common denominator.

The technological revolution will force us to recognize this folly of the past. We must adopt higher standards below the high school level; we must teach many subjects several years below their present places in the curriculum; and we must recognize earlier than at present those students who do not or cannot plan to enter college to provide them with new opportunities.

We must do everything possible to eliminate the stigma of vocational training. One way would be to build up the values of technical training, perhaps by selling the concept as "career education," a mere semantical shift from vocational education. We must eliminate the duplication in our school programs and above all the emphasis on nonsense from baton twirling to semiprofessional athletics. In all probability we must go to a 12-month year in order to make the fullest use of our existing educational facilities.

It would be difficult * * * perhaps even inexcusable * * * to try to deal with this subject in the city of Birmingham today without making some important mention of the racial disturbances which afflict the Nation. Indeed this subject has become the No. 1 preoccupation of the Nation's press and the various forces of government.

That it is appropriate to the subject cannot be denied since a vast percentage of our unemployed are the unskilled and semiliterate Negroes who have migrated to the North in search of the utopian land of wealth and opportunity. Their disillusionment and frustration is in large measure responsible for the increased tempo of racial disturbances.

Regardless of any our personal views on this tragic situation, one thing seems perfectly apparent: that the bulk of our Negro citizens must be better educated and better employed before we can hope for a major solution to the problem. It's my opinion that the problem will be well on the way toward solution in Alabama and throughout the whole South long before it's been solved in the North. The fact is * * * present trends indicate a far worse crisis ahead in the major cities of the North than has ever been true of the Southland.

The rate of influx of migrating Negroes, the high rate of proliferation of Negro families, and the flight to the suburbs of most economically independent whites promises a situation in the very near future of predominant Negro populations in many of our major urban centers. This includes, in addition to Washington, Detroit, and Chicago, my own home city of Cincinnati where the population is reliably predicted to be better than 50 percent Negro by 1980. I suspect in the absence of a major annexation program it will also be true of Birmingham.

Now if such a predictable situation is to result in anything but chaos, then our educational system is not the only machinery that's due for drastic change. In addition to a radical overhaul of education, I believe we are long overdue for an agonizing reappraisal of our entire approach to unemployment compensation, unemployment relief, aid to dependent children, and the whole rickety patchwork framework of doles for the needy that have sprung up across the Nation.

The recent fracas over birth control in Illinois is a glaring case in point. There a relief bounty on illegitimate children has had exactly the effect that any reasonable person could predict. It tends to promote and perpetuate loose living by unemployed men and women to the extent that they proliferate themselves with a consequent increase in income to the indigent mother depending upon her rate of baby production. The accidental tragedy is that most of these people are Negroes.

The even more tragic long-term consequence of such a fallacious policy is that it creates an entire segment of population increasing in size every year as permanent wards of the State condemned to a permanently unemployable condition. This segment of population is preconditioned to a valueless existence supported by their productive fellow members of society.

There is little doubt that these enormous problems will not solve themselves. There is equally no doubt that the solutions will be undertaken by the Federal Government in the absence of a drastic change in the willingness of the people at the community and State level to undertake more initiative.

What I'm saying is that unless the people of the communities, the counties, and the States are insistent upon taxing themselves at higher rates to provide newer and better programs designed to train and educate all their people, then such programs are going to be crammed down their throats by the Federal establishment. The ultimate results are very likely to be that which I outlined at the beginning: a situation in which the average citizen is completely unable to cope with the overpowering forces of government.

And on the hopeful side I'd like to remind you of a recent dissenting opinion to a U.S. Supreme Court decision in a school integration case delivered by Associate Justice John Marshall Harlan. Justice Harlan sees the recent Court ruling on the southern sit-in arrests as a clash betwen equality and liberty and he, alone, dissented from the Court's findings in five recent cases. This is what he wrote: "Freedom of the individual to choose his associates or his neighbors, to use and dispose of his property as he sees fit, to be irrational, arbitrary, capricious, even unjust in his personal relations are things all entitled to a large measure of protection from governmental interference. This liberty would be overridden in the name of equality if the strictures of the 14th amendment were applied to governmental and private action without distinction. There are areas of private rights upon which Federal power should not lay a heavy hand." It's necessary for us to remember that Justice Harlan was out-voted 8 to 1.

The unpleasant facts of cybernetics which I've outlined to you today, the sociological upheavals which afflict the Nation, and the attitude of our Federal Government in its determination to shape our lives, bring us face to face with this basic question: Is man merely an animate object to be manipulated?

The time is growing very short for us to prevent a realization of George Orwell's nightmare 20 years ahead of 1984.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Appendix

Wise Spending for Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, 2 years ago the Weather Bureau and the Forest Service completed joint development of a soundly based national fire weather plan. It was hoped at the time that completion of the plan would mark the beginning of a long-range program to provide better protection for our valuable forest resources through improved fire weather services.

The Congress in 1961 appropriated a sum of $200,000 for the program for fiscal year 1962. This was expected to be the first installment in an increasing investment in the national fire weather plan, which eventually would operate with annual appropriations of $1,350,000. An appropriation of $350,000—a $150,000 increase over fiscal 1962—was made for 1963, bringing the level of funds to about one-fourth of what is considered necessary to do the job that must be done in fire weather services.

I was surprised and distressed to learn this year that the administration's budget requests for the next fiscal year do not include an increase over the 1963 appropriations for the program. I understand an additional sum of $200,000 is needed to bring the level of funds up to $550,000 for fiscal 1964 and keep the program on schedule.

Such an increase would be consistent with the guidelines set down 2 years ago when it was assumed that annual appropriations would be brought to the $1,350,000 level over a 7-year period. I cannot overemphasized the importance of keeping this program on schedule. Our Nation—particularly those areas with extensive forest resources—cannot afford a slowdown in this vital program.

I am told the program already has brought substantial progress in fire weather services. The program has provided 32 new type radio transceivers and 18 camper-type mobile fire weather units. New fire weather offices with one fire weather meteorologist in each have been established at Montgomery, Ala.; Anchorage, Alaska; Phoenix, Ariz.; Sacramento, Fresno, and Eureka, Calif.; St. Louis, Mo.; Albuquerque, N. Mex., and Medford, Oreg. Additional fire weather meteorologists have been hired to strengthen fire weather efforts at Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Redding, Calif.; Talahassee, Fla.; Boise, Idaho; Chicago, Ill.; Missoula, Mont.; Asheville, N.C.; Pendleton, Portland, and Salem, Oreg.; and Olympia and Seattle, Wash.

As Mr. H. R. Glascock, Jr., forest counsel of the Western Forestry & Conservation Association, recently pointed out in a letter to me:

> The potential for the development of fire weather service as a conservation tool has started to be unlocked and shows great promise in helping to save forest resources from fire. This seems a poor time to allow the program to founder.

Mr. President, I agree with Mr. Glascock. We must do a better job in fire weather services if we are to be successful in reducing the millions of dollars worth of damage that fire does to our forests each year. I am hopeful that the Congress will appropriate for fiscal year 1964 an additional $200,000 to bring the figure up to the full $550,000 needed to keep this important program on schedule.

In March of this year, Mr. Glascock presented a paper at the 1963 Western Fire Weather Meteorologists Conference in Portland, Oreg. The paper was entitled "What's Happened to Fire Weather Research?" Two years earlier, Mr. Glascock had presented a paper on the same subject at the 1961 conference, also in Portland. The 1961 paper was entitled "Fire Weather Service—the Underdeveloped Conservation Tool."

Mr. President, I commend Mr. Glascock's remarks to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I also ask that the editorial "Wise Spending for Conservation," from the May 1, 1963, issue of the Oregon Journal be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S HAPPENED TO FIRE WEATHER RESEARCH?

(By H. R. Glascock, Jr.)

Two years ago "Fire Weather Service—The Underdeveloped Conservation Tool" was the subject of my remarks to the Western Fire Weather Conference here in Portland. It was the kickoff of Western Forestry and Conservation Association's efforts to gain support and financing for the then new national plan for improved fire weather service. For the association's policy statement urges "a strengthened fire weather program in Western North America developed in cooperation with governmental weather agencies, forest protective organizations and private landowners."

It is pleasant to recall that the plan did get under way with appropriations of $200,000 for fiscal year 1962 and an additional $150,000 for fiscal year 1963, thanks especially to the interest taken by several western Senators.

NEW PROGRAM FALTERS

After agreeing to speak on "What's Happened to Fire Weather Research?" at this conference, I discovered that the national plan so auspiciously launched in 1961 is faltering after receiving only about one-fourth of the planned program. We found in Washington last week that the President's budget for fiscal year 1964 does not include any increase for fire weather. So the plan, already behind its 7-year schedule, is starting to founder. Perhaps then I should be talking this morning about how to save the ship, rather than how to improve its engine and rudder.

You have just heard Assistant Chief of the Weather Bureau Russ Grubb describe the progress that has been made in implementing an expanded and stronger fire weather service. You know that the highest priorities are still being given in the West and Southeast; that new mobile units and radio equipment have been purchased; that fire weather service has been started this year at Eureka, Calif., and strengthened at Sacramento, Fresno, and Redding, as well as several points in the East.

Let me, then, repeat what I said to you in 1961: if we cannot move forward with this sorely needed conservation program to protect all of our forest resources from devastation by fire, we are guilty of poor economics, of being pennywise and pound foolish. This is underscored here in the Northwest now by the heavy expanse of slash from the horrendous storm of Columbus Day last—fuel on the ground waiting for the right fire weather to take us by surprise during the next few fire seasons—to compound our already staggering losses.

But we must get in some licks on research too. I must answer my own question "What's Happened to Fire Weather Research?" with a resounding "Nothing." Research and development funds in the Weather Bureau are now separate from operations funds. The latter cannot be transferred to the former. Without question, the Bureau believes in research to back up operations. This is shown dramatically in such examples as the satellite program where research precedes each and every new advance.

FIRE WEATHER RESEARCH ECLIPSED

Unfortunately it seems the satellites and aviation are eclipsing fire weather almost completely in the competition for research funds. Out of a current total of some $11½ million for research and development—one-fifth of the total Weather Bureau budget not counting its satellite program—a microscopic amount of less than $50,000 is being spent nationally on fire weather research. This permits one full-time fire weather researcher here in Portland and one part-time fire weather researcher in Washington, D.C. Except for a full-time researcher in California, paid for from funds transferred from the U.S. Forest Service, that is the extent of the Weather Bureau's budgeted fire weather research program at this time.

Of course, it must be remembered that a certain amount of the research done in other fields of weather is of value in fire weather. In addition, it is known that some of the operations work in fire weather constitutes research of one kind or another. Nor are these remarks meant to imply that there is not now under way a valuable program of forest-fire-behavior research on the part of protection agencies.

RESEARCH BACKING ESSENTIAL

Let us remind ourselves, however, of the important place which intensified fire-weather research and development itself is given in the National Plan for an improved fire-weather service. The plan boldly declares that "expansion of the fire-weather service needs to be solidly backed by a vigorous program of research. This is particularly important because of the unique nature of fire-weather forecasting and the small amount of work done in this field."

The plan goes on to say:

"The fire-weather program needs to achieve and maintain a high level of forecast accuracy in predicting such weather factors as wind speed, relative humidity, thunderstorm occurrence, and others, sometimes in detail, and usually for wild mountainous country. A research program is needed that will keep the fire-weather service abreast of developments in meteorology and equip it to satisfy the needs of the increasingly dynamic fire-control organizations throughout the United States.

"Research needed for fire-weather forecasting is distinct from the meteorological research fire protection agencies can be expected to do as part of forest-fire-behavior research. Fire-behavior research is concentrated primarily on identification and measurement of weather factors and their combinations that influence the behavior of fire. Forecasting research must be concentrated on finding ways to improve localized forecasts of these weather factors."

The national plan for fire-weather service went on to state the areas of greatest need in research and to outline responsibilities in the program under guidance of the Weather Bureau's Office of Meteorological Research and coordination of a Fire-Weather Research Supervisor.

WORTH FIGHTING FOR

This critically needed backing for an improved fire-weather service has not gotten off the ground. Not a penny has gone into it in the first 2 years in which the national plan has had operational financing. Thus the axiom that research must precede or go hand in hand with advances in any technical field such as fire weather is being reversed.

Above all, I do not want to leave the impression that our organization, representing both public and private forest agencies in the West, is satisfied with or resigned to this state of affairs. We have been fighting for better protection of our forest resources since 1909. There have been plenty of discouragements along the way. And while a realistic program for forecasting fire weather has been particularly hard to come by, it is especially worth fighting for.

LEAST KNOWN FIRE FACTOR

Of the three ingredients of a forest fire—fuel, oxygen, and heat—weather influences each one. It determines if and how a fire will burn. And yet, of all the factors influencing forest fire, weather is the one we know the least about. This is a protection weakness which accounts for many of our failures in fire prevention, detection and suppression and in using fire as a protection tool.

BUDGETING NEEDED

Informed sources in the Weather Bureau feel that a fire weather research and development program financed at $175,000 per year would realistically fulfill this part of the national plan now underway. We earnestly hope that this item will be included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1965, along with funds to get the operational phase back on schedule. It is understandable why Congress has been reluctant to appropriate funds for an agency or administration which does not request them.

EARTH PROGRAMS IMPORTANT TOO

Now that the initial breakthrough has come in improving the fire weather service, it is clearly time to push ahead in this neglected field of conservation. Fire losses to forest resources are still unconscionably high. It is no depreciation of the value of launching satellites and rockets into outer space—and doing it sooner rather than later—to suggest that we can also strengthen ourselves by seizing the more immediate, if less exciting, opportunities to extend the resources on the surface of this planet. In dividing up our tax moneys to keep this Nation strong and free and happy, one wonders if we should not figure on being a couple seconds slower in reaching the moon in order to finance making the earth a better place on which to live.

Fire Weather Service—The Underdeveloped Conservation Tool

(By H. R. Glascock, Jr.)

One hundred million dollars a year on forest fire control and less than one-half of 1 percent of that amount on fire-weather service. These rough estimates of total national effort illustrate the inconspicuous relative position to which fire-weather endeavor in the United States is relegated. If the hard-to-estimate but huge value of forest fire losses nationwide were added to fire control costs and compared to these fire weather expenditures, the latter would then indeed appear insignificant.

From this the layman might conclude that weather and man's knowledge of it have but a small part to play in forest fire control. But, of course, the opposite is true. Weather teams up with fuel and topography to determine the origin and behavior of any wildfire. Knowledge of fire weather is the key tool in both forest fire prevention and control.

Why then this disparity of attention? Is it that somehow adequate fire-weather research and service come cheap? Unfortunately not. It is rather than fire-weather service lags well behind its potential, is indeed an underdeveloped conservation tool.

Is this good economics? What would improved fire weather service, properly used, have done in the recent bad fire years in the West to reduce fire losses, including losses of forest resources and human life? What would it have done to cut fire fighting costs and production and wage losses from woods closures? No one can say, but neither can anyone deny a considerable probable effect. This state of affairs obviously is poor economics, a case of being penny wise and pound foolish.

How do we explain this deficiency, continuing as it has long after various attempts to remedy it have been tried and have failed? I think we must first state what is not the cause of the problem. We must affirm the fact that the relatively few personnel now engaged in or associated with fire weather research and forecasting are as competent and dedicated a group of professional men as can be found anywhere. In fact, it may become a considerable problem to find men of equal training and ability with whom to strengthen the fire weather program.

Instead, the basic reason for insufficient emphasis on fire weather service of recent years to protect the fast-growing multiple-use values of the forest would seem to be the faster growing values of commercial aviation and overwhelming competition from that and other sources for Weather Bureau services. It doesn't take many plane crashes with their attendant losses of life in this day of heavy air travel to create strong public and governmental interest in strengthened programs to improve air safety, programs which involve weather service among other things. How much value in forest resources, one might ask, would have to be destroyed by fire with how much attendant loss of life and cost of control efforts to create as much or even proportional amounts of public and governmental interest in remedial action? Would the great fire losses in California in 1960 do it, where the firefighting costs alone on two of the largest fires were over $1½ million apiece[1] and where nine men's lives were lost on firefighting duty? While the U.S. Weather Bureau's service to aviation has justifiably increased tremendously in the last few years, the same old problem of fire weather has become proportionally an even smaller part of the total Bureau effort with inadequate funds available for all programs.

Of course, there are other factors contributing to the underdevelopment of fire-weather service as a tool. The aircraft industry has no doubt worked harder for improved forecasts than have forest land managers. And foresters surely have needed to make better use of fire-weather forecasts on all fires. The very nature of the fire-weather problem calls for the closest cooperation and communication among many people busy with many other things: Governmental weather agencies, forest protection organizations, and private and public land managers. There is room for improvement in these areas. Nor can it be said that interest or progress has been lacking on the part of governmental weather agencies in improving the fire-weather service. There are several areas of improvement in the last few years which offer encouragement: The establishment of successful cooperative forecasting units in the State forestry headquarters in Oregon and Washington; the planning and installation of the first mountain-top weather radar unit on a peak in Montana to detect and track lightning storms; the maintenance of the position of Western Fire-Weather Coordinator; the invited participation of forestry representatives in the annual western fire weather conferences; significant progress in some phases of fire-weather research and equipment development.

But the needs are great and greater every year for a strengthened program of fire-weather service. As Mr. Loren A. Tucker, supervisor, division of forest fire control, Washington State Department of Natural Resources, told the Western Forest Fire Research Committee Meeting last December: "The land manager is called upon to make decisions, based on weather information, involving thousands of dollars of his employer's money and millions of acres of public and private forests * * * forecasters still admit that it is very risky burning ahead of a forecasted rain * * *" and the American Meteorological Society still "holds that issuance of detailed day-by-day weather forecasts for more than 2 or 3 days in advance is misleading and not justified by present meteorological knowledge."

Mr. Tucker concluded: "Then, if this is the situation, meteorology, as applied to fire weather, is not advancing fast enough to keep pace with the need in land management. Forest land managers should see to it that the fire-weather forecasting service is getting its share of the research pie, so our forecasters can have more knowledge at their disposal. We can then have forecasts in detail good for 5 days or more. Were this accomplished the benefits in increased profits, because of reduced operating costs to all agencies depending on weather would compensate manyfold the added cost of research necessary to accomplish this."

In addition it must be recalled that 61 percent of all commercial forest land in the West is federally owned or managed, a major area of Federal responsibility in forest resource protection. And there is much feeling that basic research in conservation matters is also a prime responsibility of the Government since its values accrue to the whole Nation.

Realizing these facts, the last two Western Forestry Conferences, representing both the public and private forestry agencies of the western United States and Canada, have resolved "to support and promote a strengthened fire-weather program" which "should be developed in cooperation with governmental weather agencies, forest protection organizations and private landowners." Mentioned was formulation of a detailed program that includes:

---

[1] Donner Ridge and Forest Hill fires.

(a) Improved and more detailed local fire-weather forecasts.

(b) Better long-range forecasting facilities on a regional basis.

(c) Expanded research in fire-weather forecasting.

It is pleasant to relate that a committee of the U.S. Weather Bureau and the U.S. Forest Service in Washington have recently developed a new national plan for fire-weather service. This plan, as finally revised after comment of many local agencies affected, would add fire-weather service at 33 additional offices around the Nation and strengthen services at the existing 15 offices. This, plus supporting area forecast centers would extend fire-weather forecasting to those portions of the country which do not now have such service and where protecting forests, range and other watershed land from fire is an important activity. The plan would also provide for intensification of existing services with emphasis on close contact between fire-weather personnel and user. Goal: a vigorous, first-class forecasting service, adequately staffed by competent meteorologists with special training in fire-weather and fire control matters supported by an aggressive research program.

This ambitious step forward in fire-weather forecasting in the United States has much indeed to recommend it. It would establish many new fire-weather service offices in the West where they are needed, such as: Riverside, Fresno, Sacramento and Eureka, Calif.; Medford and Pendleton, Oreg.; Spokane, Wash.; Billings, Mont.; Casper or Cheyenne, Wyo.; Rapid City, S. Dak.; Denver, Colo.; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Salt Lake City, Utah; Reno, Nev.; Phoenix, Ariz.; Juneau and Fairbanks, Alaska.

One big mission, however, would seem to be that the plan, while providing for training of fire-weather meteorologists, does not provide for training of fire control personnel to insure that optimum use is made of forecasts and weather information provided. Neither is there provision for training of the temporary fire-weather observers, the seasonal lookouts, fire guards and others who take and report fire-weather observations.

There may be other deficiencies and possibly some excessive development devoted to areas not in sufficient need of it. However, on balance, this is a most constructive and solid plan for progress and achievement in fire-weather service. If it is budgeted for and approved as part of the administration's budget, and I trust it will be, it should be amply supported in the Appropriations Committees of House and Senate by those who realize this great opportunity. An opportunity, that is, for a real breakthrough in fire-weather service, the underdeveloped forest conservation tool.

[From the Oregon Journal, May 1, 1963]

WISE SPENDING FOR CONSERVATION

More than half the forest fires in Oregon each summer are started by lightning. Forest protection agencies have made some real progress in teaching men to be careful with fire in the woods, although they have by no means solved this problem.

But they can't stop the lightning strikes which in a single storm may set hundreds of fires, any one of which might blow up into a big one.

In Missoula, Mont., a fire research laboratory operated jointly by the U.S. Forest Service and the Weather Bureau tracks thunderstorms by radar. It can spot them 200 miles away. Cloud seeding over these storms, on an experimental basis, has brought a significant reduction in lightning strikes over timber.

This is but one example of how knowledge of the weather can strengthen fire control. Experts in this field have said that such knowledge is a "key tool" in both prevention and control.

In recent years, a committee of the Weather Bureau and Forest Service developed a new national plan for a strengthened fire weather forecasting service, which would include adequate staffing by meteorologists trained in fire weather and fire control matters, supported by an aggressive research program.

This plan started falteringly with appropriations of $200,000 for fiscal year 1962 and $150,000 for fiscal 1963, but this is woefully inadequate and the President's budget for fiscal 1964 does not include any increase for fire weather. Nothing is being done to strengthen research.

H.R. Glascock, Jr., of the Western Forestry and Conservation Association estimates that roughly $100 million a year is spent on total national fire control efforts and less than one-half of 1 percent on fire weather services. The comparison does not even take into account the huge annual fire losses in both public and private forests.

This organization, which has for years been working to strengthen forest protection in all areas, contends that thousands of dollars spent in improving fire weather services can save millions.

Since 61 percent of all commercial forest land is federally owned or managed, the responsibility of the Federal Government in this matter is clear. Spending to conserve our resources is not wasteful. It can be some of the wisest investing we do.

Iowa Legislature Urges Congress To Adopt Corn Tassel as the National Floral Emblem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Iowa Legislature has adopted House Concurrent Resolution No. 16 which urges the Congress of the United States to adopt the corn tassel as the national floral emblem.

Because I personally feel that there is a historic basis as well as a sound patriotic basis for making the corn tassel the floral emblem of this country, I commend this resolution to the attention of my colleagues with the hope that it will influence the final decision when a floral emblem is chosen. The resolution follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 16

Whereas in recognition of the importance of corn to our Nation's Founding Fathers, present citizens and future generations; and

Whereas in gratitude for nature's gift of this versatile and vital, lifegiving plant; and

Whereas in view of the fact that this native plant of the United States grows in all 50 of the United States; and

Whereas in realization that this plain, homespun, simple and tough-of-fiber plant with its earthiness and unaffected genuineness will give the United States a truly unique floral symbol; and

Whereas in view of the fortunate geographical position of Iowa as heart of the Nation's great Corn Belt: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That the 60th General Assembly of the State of Iowa urges the Congress of the United States to adopt the corn tassel as the national floral emblem; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the chief clerk of the house to the President of the United States, and to each Member of the Iowa Delegation of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

ROBERT W. NADEN,
Speaker of the House.
WILLIAM R. KENDRICK,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Supreme Court Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the Supreme Court of the United States has finished another term. Its decisions have received both loud praise and severe criticism depending upon the case and the outlook of the commentator.

In my opinion, the overall record of the Court during its October 1962 term was an excellent one. The Court continued to meet its responsibilities as the "Guardian of Liberty." I would like to pay special tribute to our great Chief Justice who has served the American people so well. Chief Justice Earl Warren and all the members of the Supreme Court are to be commended for their courage and their dedication to the Constitution of the United States and the American people.

The Christian Science Monitor recently carried an interesting article on the Supreme Court written by Mr. Richard L. Strout. I ask unanimous consent the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 21, 1963]

SUPREME COURT PICTURE

(By Richard L. Strout)

"In Salt Lake City," a returned Senator told this reporter, "they have just put up two big billboards, 'Impeach Earl Warren.'"

By "they," he referred rather incredulously to a well-known rightwing political organization.

Inside the Supreme Court chamber the crowd waits for the man the billboards want impeached, and the other members of the High Court. It is a little past 10 and the buzzing turns into deep silence, much like the President's press conference just before Mr. Kennedy appears.

It is an impressive setting where architect and decorator have somehow combined to make a huge chamber cosy. I don't quite know how they do it, and wonder at it whenever I enter. There are 24 huge, veined mable columns, and rich, red curtains that loop down 30 feet, as thick as bed quilts, and drawn aside at the bottom as though they were tents waiting for Ivanhoe to enter.

The indirect lighting gives a warm, mellow glow, and the loud speaker system is discretly camouflaged.

In three alcoves on the side sit a couple of dozen reporters, fenced off by the marble columns that are cool and delicious to the hand.

The crier gives a smart crack and announces the Court with another touch of medievalism, "Oyez, oyez, oyez," and the nine justices pop in between the triangular entrances of the curtains. There is the customary introduction of new lawyers. Then, because this is the last day of the 9-months' term, the decision reading promptly begins.

There are a couple of 5 to 4 decisions with the majority ruling in one that because a naturalized American once belonged to the Communist Party a good many years ago he may not necessarily be deported. He is a grandfather, it develops, as Mr. Justice Goldberg recites the facts orally. When he went over the border for a few hours the Immigration Service wouldn't let him come back again. No doubt it is cases like that that cause the patriotic group in Utah to want to impeach the Chief Justice.

The majority of the Court argues that an alien has to be proved to have been a Communist "in a meaningful manner" (i.e., understood what it was all about). Like other Justices, Mr. Goldberg speaks in a simple, conversational style, referring to other members of the Court as "my brothers."

"We don't think people ought to be deported on an 'inference,' " he says. "Deportation is a drastic sanction that can disrupt families and destroy lives."

Now Mr. Justice Brennan says why the Court won't let Philadelphia's second and third largest banks merge. "As so often happened," he says at one point, "Congress followed its 'unfortunate habit' of not making its meaning 'too plain.' "

Mr. Justice Harlan and Mr. Justice Stewart dissent from this one; the former calls the majority's reasoning a "tour de force." Mr. Justice Goldberg goes along with "my brothers, Harlan and Stewart" part way.

The "skyline" of the Justices' heads differs from year to year, and older ones move closer to the Chief Justice at the center. His white head towers above them all. Justices Black and Brennan have lower chairs which rock slightly, so that their heads move a trifle like objects undulating idly with the tide. Neither is as short as the former Justice Felix Frankfurter, however, whose head had the disconcerting habit of disappearing or appeared only in part with his bright eyes seemingly peeping from ambush.

There is a patent case on sewing machines, and now Mr. Justice Tom Clark is reading the celebrated school prayer decision. A rustle of interest goes over the audience. He speaks in a folksy, rather nasal Texas voice, as he moves over the difficult subject. In the elaborateness of his explanation of the 8-to-1 opinion, one senses a desire of the majority to have its view understood. Mr. Justice Brennan wants this so much that he has written a 77-page concurrent opinion which he admits rather ruefully may be too long.

It is surprising how human it all is, here at what a former great Justice called the quiet at the center of the hurricane.

Kennedy Performance: Much Talk, No Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is most refreshing, amidst all the adulation of the Kennedy press, to read a decisive estimate from a critic who gets to the heart of the issue and expresses himself so well.

In yesterday's Washington Daily News, William F. Buckley, Jr., unmasks the Kennedy image:

THE KENNEDY IMAGE—AS SEEN FROM THE RIGHTFIELD BLEACHERS

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

A recent public opinion poll discloses that Mr. Kennedy's popularity has slipped precipitously. If this finding is correct, it is the most exhilarating datum since Plato's proof that even an illiterate slave boy could be taught to understand his complicated theorem of Pythagoras. There is apparently hope for the human race after all.

I intend no personal slight to our leader, for whom I wish a long and happly life. But I do feel it is high testimony to democratic perspicacity that the feeling should finally obtrude into the consciousness of the public that notwithstanding the gentleman's personal virtues and his devout enjoyment of the perquisites of high office, the simple fact is he has no apparent qualifications for it.

A few weeks ago a British magazine published a devastating full page cartoon showing a monster machine bursting with technological gargoyles, pipes, valves, spouts, indicators, bells, keyboards, switches, each named after some emblematic human sore—"The Negro Problem," "The Vietnam Problem," "The Berlin Wall," "Castro Cuba," "Gold Flow," etc., and across the whole apparatus the license plate: "The Kennedy Machine." "It's wonderful," and awed spectator remarks, "but what does it do?"

The word is indeed getting about: The fabulous Kennedy machine, designed to cope with all the problems that beset mankind, is stalled. The delirious self-assurance, all that youthful energy, all those teeming Harvard brains with which the machine has throbbed away now for nearly 3 years, has done what? Nothing, but nothing important, has been accomplished. And the reason is this: Mr. Kennedy has no grip on reality, no communicable vision of the purposes of his administration. The grandiose rhetoric with which he reassures his constituents every time one of the meters on the machine registers a complaint, is beginning to fall flat as the people discern the gruesome truth; that this efficient and likeable young man hasn't the least idea how to maneuver through the greatest crisis in world history.

The concrete indictment of Mr. Kennedy is painfully easy to make.

It was he who flunked the challenge of the Bay of Pigs.

He stood by while the wall was raised in Berlin.

He concluded the unworkable arrangements in Laos.

He is the prisoner of monopoly labor unions.

He fails to stanch the flow of gold from our bleeding Republic.

He sits by acquiescently while the central bureaucracy leeches more and more of the power and freedom of the individual.

However, I suspect it is not the concrete failures that have caused the diminution in his popularity. It is something else. There is a cloying slickness about his total performance—or rather, lack of performance.

I believe that any man who would confess to his public his temporary incapacity to deal with the Nation's problems, citing great historical obstructions outside his power to cope with, would earn the people's sympathy. But that is not Mr. Kennedy's mode.

He is surrounded by vain sycophants who seek to transmute his dismaying record into one great, endless, triumphal parade. The word is "rodomontade": a vain, blustering self-righteousness.

If Mr. Kennedy were to give the impression that he is genuinely and even obsessively concerned with the great lesions on the commonweal, we might show him the patience due to a faltering, but determined doctor. Instead, the patient grows worse, while the doctor gambols about the world proclaiming the soundness of his patient's health, and his own magical curative powers.

This is a tough world. Anyone who wanted a serene life, Trotsky reminded us, picked the wrong century to be born in. There are no instant solutions to any problem. But Mr. Kennedy's failure is to admit to their seriousness.

The problem of a Communist state encysted in the womb of our hemisphere is, let us admit it, a grave one; yet Mr. Kennedy has no solution for it whatsoever.

The problem of the overhead of life in a technological society burdened down by monopoly unions and hedonistic state welfarism is a problem—but its existence never crosses his complacent lips.

Our President emerges as the ultimate man in the gray flannel suit: The great accommodator, a weather vane on perfect ball bearings—soul-free, immune from the frictions of reality, the image of total composure—at least for so long as the people continue in their drugged state.

Hardy County, W. Va., Named After Youthful Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a recent article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail relates the history of Hardy County, W. Va., which was named in honor of Sam Hardy, a member of the Continental Congress at the age of 25.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

HARDY COUNTY, W. VA., NAMED AFTER YOUTHFUL PATRIOT

In 1786 the population west of the Blue Ridge was on the increase and in that year by an act of the Virginia General Assembly a county was formed from the southern end of Hampshire County and named Hardy after Sam Hardy, a distinguished Virginian, who had died the previous year at the age of 27 and who when he was 25 served his State as a member of the Continental Congress.

The town of Moorefield, which is located at the confluence of the Moorefield River with the South Branch of the Potomac, became the county seat and has remained such to the present time.

The county contains three rivers—the South Branch of the Potomac, the South Fork or Moorefield River, and a river, the southern end of which is known as Lost River and the northern end as Capon River. About midway of the county Lost River sinks into the ground and disappears and several miles farther north on the opposite side of a mountain it reappears and is called Capon.

In the early days of the country there were many Indians in the vicinity. The South Branch Valley was apparently a part of the battleground between the Shawnees and the Catawbas, the Cherokees and the Senecas.

During the period of the French and Indian War four forts were built in Hardy County—Fort Pleasant, about 5 miles north of Moorefield; Town Fort, northeast of Moorefield; Fort Buttermilk, south of the town; and Fort Riddle, near Lost River.

The earliest settlers of the county were mostly of Scotch, Irish, German, English, and Dutch ancestry. Many direct descendants of these first settlers still live in Hardy County.

The county from its earliest days has been primarily an agricultural county and some of the best farming land of the east is located along the South Branch of the Potomac.

The county is noted for its fine beef cattle and in recent years has gone rather extensively into dairy farming. Poultry is also one of the major products of the county.

From the beginning Hardy County has had several small manufacturing plants which include tanneries, lumber and woodworking mills, poultry processing plants, and in the early days several iron foundries.

During the Civil War 15 minor engagements were fought in Hardy County. Nine of them were at Moorefield; however, Moorefield and Hardy County remained stanch supporters of the South. The county was sixth in the number of slaves among the counties which were to form West Virginia in 1863. In 1866 the western portion of Hardy County was made into a new county named Grant, cutting the original area of the county about in half. The area has enjoyed a rather level economic condition and is not one of "boom and bust."

Politically, Hardy County has voted strongly Democratic and, with two or three exceptions, on local elections officials have been of that political party since the Civil War.

The hunting and fishing in Hardy County is unsurpassed by any county in the State and in the summer the county is crowded with tourists and vacationers.

ROBERT M. GAMBLE.

One Road to Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate some very strong and pertinent editorial comments on the move in the country toward dictatorial government. An editorial entitled "One Road to Dictatorship" was printed in the July 7, 1963, issue of the State and Columbia Record, of Columbia, S.C. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE ROAD TO DICTATORSHIP

Dictatorships sometimes are justified by the contention that strong executive action is needed to restore law and order in areas of civil strife.

But incipient dictators have been known to stir up civil strife deliberately in order to create the occasion for a subsequent show of force.

The Japanese, for example, effectively used the tactic in their expansion throughout the Far East at the outset of World War II. Having defeated opposing military forces, the Japanese would sit back while domestic chaos developed in defenseless civilian communities. Then, as community leaders pleaded for help in restoring police, health, fire, an other protection, the Japanese would move in—virtually by invitation—in the interests of law and order.

With cold-blooded efficency, the Kennedy administration now is taking a page out of the same guidebook for dictatorship. The most recent device to promote racial strife is the Defense Department's directive that soldiers will be allowed to take part in antisegregation demonstrations during their off-duty hours and when in civilian clothes.

This is a deliberate step to foster trouble. It will have the accompanying result of imposing an impossible task upon military comanders who have tried, with commendable success, to keep their soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines out of the cross-currents of racial strife. The job of the military is national defense, not social reform, and it is despicable to use the Armed Forces—either on duty or off duty—to promote a race-mixing complex which has become an obsession with the Kennedys.

But these Kennedys are clever. They piously warn of trouble and bloodshed ahead, holding up their hands in pretended horror over the very thought. Yet, in doing so, they show premeditation by obliquely suggesting the very courses of action they ostensibly deplore.

The American people are not such fools as to be misled by their represensibe strategy. And even southern white men will agree with this estimate voiced by a great favorite of the Kennedy administration, the Reverend Dr. Martin L. King:

"If the law-enforcement agencies continue to predict violence—as they do in so many cases—this will turn out to be an unconscious invitation to violence."

Quite true. But in the case of the Kennedys, the invitation is not "unconscious." It is part of a pattern designed to put pressure on the American people and the American Congress—all leading to the further entrenchment of the Kennedy dynasty.

GOP and Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it has been with considerable annoyance and some resentment that Republicans have witnessed attempts by the promoters of civil rights legislation to charge the members of the minority party in the Congress with the fate of the administration's proposals in this field.

Those who view with some dismay the divided Democrat Party are naturally looking for a scapegoat to whom can be shifted the wrath of the proponents of civil rights in the event the legislation bogs down in either House. Certainly, it is the height of fantasy for the administration to try to absolve itself of all responsibility for the actions of members of the southern contingent of the party in the light of its willingness to accept their support in the presidential election of 1960. Accepting the 81 electoral votes of seven southern States in that crucial election denies to the White House the privilege of now disavowing the Congressmen who came to Washington with those electors.

One of the leading newspapers of my district, the Lancaster New Era has editorialized on this brazen attempt of the Democrat Party to evade its clear responsibility in this matter and I am pleased to include this realistic analysis as a part of these remarks:

GOP AND CIVIL RIGHTS

A clever new line flowing out of Washington is a prime example of how civil rights is being used for political advantage in an effort to smear the Republican Party.

It goes something like this:

Unless the Republicans in Congress supply the administration's equal rights bill with enough votes to overcome Democratic opposition to the public accommodations section, their party will be established as The White Man's Party.

The line has been picked up by extremist Negro leaders who are distorting the GOP position and attempting to tag the party as anti-Negro.

It's a brazen attempt to shift the responsibility from the Democrats to the Republicans for any watering down of the rights bill that might come.

It's a line that shows a complete disregard of the fact that there are 67 Senate Democrats and only 33 Republicans, which gives the Democrats as a party just the two-thirds needed to impose closure on debate.

Therefore, if the public accommodations section of the Democratic administration's bill is defeated because of the lack of the two-thirds required for closure, Democratic defections will be primarily responsible.

The record should be set straight on this latest move by the administration. For unless the Republican stand is viewed clearly, the bigots will succeed in smearing the Republican Party.

The Republican Party leadership, headed by Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, strongly questions the legality of the proposed expansion of the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution.

This expansion would prohibit private owners of facilities of public accommodation from discriminating among applicants for these facilities.

DIRKSEN has long been a political friend of the Negro, but his conviction that the Kennedy civil rights bill is in part an unconstitutional invasion of the rights of private property has brought him into disfavor with Negro leaders and some of his liberal fellow Senate Republicans.

It doesn't matter that DIRKSEN and his moderate followers are prepared to accept every other section in the civil rights bill.

The Senator is being attacked unfairly because he won't take the whole Kennedy package down to the last comma.

If the extremists cannot win over the careful and patient men on this single issue in quiet calm debate, then they will try to win by threats and hysteria and by presenting the moderates to the country as reactionaries.

The issue is one that involves constitutional questions of deep concern. It should be debated carefully in a setting of mutual respect.

It is wrong to demand that legislators give up their convictions, constitutional and otherwise, and submit to pressures and false accusations of radicals who preach equality, but practice intolerance.

Progress toward the goal of effective national civil rights can most soundly be made through a positive show of understanding and good faith. We cannot quote the Constitution as our guide in one breath, and attempt to pervert it in the next.

Honest moderation must prevail. Those who call for tolerance must practice it as well. The extremists who shout for equality, and who will use any means they can command, whether it is unmoral, illegal or unconstitutional, must not be allowed to poison the public's mind against others who seek to bring about equality, by legal and constitutional means in this land of government by law.

Property Owners' Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the President's recommendations on so-called civil rights has created consternation throughout all sections of our great common country. It has become apparent to people in all segments of our society that the politically motivated movement will bring about the deprivation of rights of other minorities as well as the majority of the people under the guise of giving rights to the Negro minority.

One of the groups of our citizens which might be termed a minority group; to wit, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, is muchly concerned about its own rights which would be infringed upon by the enactment of the President's proposals. Accordingly they have prepared and circulated a pamphlet entitled, "Property Owners' Bill of Rights," which follows:

In 1789, the people of America were fearful that government might restrict their freedom. The first Congress of the United States, in that year, proposed a Bill of Rights.

The Bill of Rights, essentially, tells the Government what it cannot do. The statements comprise the first 10 amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

The Bill of Rights has had a profound impact upon the history of the world.

Forty million immigrants gave up much to come to this land, seeking something promised here—and only here. Many countries have abundant natural resources, vast vacant lands, and climate as good as America.

They came here for the promise of security—the promise of freedom—for the precious right to live as freemen with equal opportunity for all.

In July of 1868, a new guarantee of freedom was ratified. Its purpose was to guard against human slavery. Its guarantees were for the equal protection of all.

This new guarantee of freedom is the 14th amendment. It reads, in part, as follows:

"No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

The vital importance of these Federal laws was reemphasized in a recent statement of the Chief Justice of the United States in which he urged the retention of "government of laws in preference to a government of men."

Today, the rights and freedoms of the individual American property owner are being eroded. This endangers the rights and freedom of all Americans. Therefore, a Bill of Rights to protect the American property owner is needed.

It is self-evident that the erosion of these freedoms will destroy the free enterprising, individual American.

It is our solemn belief that the individual American property owner, regardless of race, color, or creed, must be allowed, under law, to retain—

1. The right of privacy.
2. The right to choose his own friends.
3. The right to own and enjoy property according to his own dictates.
4. The right to occupy and dispose of property without governmental interference in accordance with the dictates of his conscience.
5. The right of all equally to enjoy property without interference by laws giving special privilege to any group or groups.
6. The right to maintain what, in his opinion, are congenial surroundings for tenants.
7. The right to contract with a real estate broker or other representative of his choice and to authorize him to act for him according to his instructions.
8. The right to determine the acceptability and desirability of any prospective buyer or tenant of his property.
9. The right of every American to choose who in his opinion are congenial tenants in any property he owns—to maintain the stability and security of his income.
10. The right to enjoy the freedom to accept, reject, negotiate, or not negotiate with others.

Loss of these rights diminishes personal freedom and creates a springboard for further erosion of liberty.

What's in a Name: Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest two editorials that appeared in the Angler's Almanac and Data Book for 1963, edited by Mr. Don Barry, Buffalo, N.Y.

I wish to bring these to the attention of my colleagues and anglers all over the country. The editorials follow:

WHAT'S IN A NAME: CONFUSION

Angling is at once the most popular and most confused of sports.

Not the least of the many reasons for the chaos is the vast array of popular names that may be applied to any given species. Misnomers flourish even where influential agencies have tried to narrow the field of names to within reason.

A single species—like the white crappie, just for example—may be known in various parts of North America by as many as 40 different common usage names.

"I caught a bachelor," says angler No. 1.

"I caught a calico bass," says Angler No. 2.

And a chorus of other anglers declares the catch of goggle-eye, speckled perch, ad infinitum.

The pity of it all is that they all have caught the exact same kind of fish, the white crappie—which, incidentally, is not a bass or a perch as some of the names might imply, but a sunfish.

The American Fisheries Society has approved the common name "Permit" for the "Trachinotus" falcatus, while the Outdoor Writers Association of America has approved the name "Palometa" for the same species. Meanwhile, the AFS prefers to call the Trachinotus glaucus Palometa and the OWAA prefers to call the Trachinotus goodei Permit, So who's on first?

If your name is Tom, Dick, or Harry, your friends do not call you John, Joe, or Jack. And if you are a human being, you are not usually referred to as a monkey. Yet, in angling, that is the name confusion which prevails. A blue pike is not a member of the pike family; it is a member of the perch family. A smallmouth bass is not a member of the bass family; it is a member of the sunfish family. A starfish is not a fish at all. One dolphin is a fish. Another dolphin is a mammal.

It is true that a rose by any other name would smell as sweet, and a fish by any other name would be just as much fun to catch. Mankind agrees, however, that a rose is a rose is a rose. Isn't it about time mankind agreed that a fish is a fish is a fish—and what kind?

The AFS and the OWAA have made valiant—and partially successful—attempts to standardize the names of fishes. But much remains to be done to raze the Tower of Babel constructed fish by fish over the years, with confusion as mortar.

It is time—now—for the U.S. Government to name a commission of interested parties, scientists, commercial fishermen, and sportsmen alike, to compile once and for all a single directory of common fish names. The appropriation entailed would be small, the rewards great.

Warning bells have been ringing more frequently of late about the threat of water pollution and insecticides to wipe out our fish population—the very fish population on which millions of dollars are spent annually for propagation. Last year piscicide by pollution took 15 million lives.

Meanwhile, the boom in angling has been well heralded, with the Outdoor Recreation Review Commission predicting there will be about 63 million anglers by the year 2000.

The question is this: At what point on the graph will the lines of fish death and angling growth cross? At existing rates, it appears the 63 million anglers will be battling to catch an extinct animal: The game fish.

U.S. legislators who will depend on the votes of those 63 million anglers would do well—now—to stop fish-killing pollution and start planning in earnest to provide adequate angling facilities which, one would think, should include fish.

Iowa Group Denounces Hike in European Poultry Tariff, Urges Retaliatory Measures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the board of directors of the Iowa Turkey Federation has adopted unanimously a resolution, denouncing the action of the European Economic Community in raising still further the Common Market tariff on U.S. poultry and calling on the Federal Government to take retaliatory action for the protection of American agriculture.

The board is to be commended for the stand it has taken on this vital issue.

The text of the resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the Iowa Turkey Federation expresses itself as being highly incensed by the 30th of May 1963, action of the council of Ministers of the European Economic Community in raising the already exorbitant levies of the Common Market against American poultry, and we urge as strongly as possible, that our Government move immediately to institute retaliatory measures for the protection of the American poultry industry and American agriculture. We further move that this resolution be given wide-spread communication within and without the industry, and urge the membership to express themselves locally as individuals on this critical issue.

Servant, Not Master

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a column by Mr. George Todt which appeared in the July 3, 1963, issue of the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner.

Set forth in the column is a letter written by a Los Angeles resident, Mrs. Ina Maxwell, who discusses with great feeling the significance to her of displaying the American flag. I believe she conveys a very fine message which will be of interest to many:

SERVANT, NOT MASTER

(By George Todt)

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all," James B. Upham and Francis Bellamy—pledge to the flag.

Not long ago my friend George Ross, chief of the department of civic responsibility at Coast Federal Savings, turned over to me a marvelous patriotic letter he had received from Mrs. Ina Maxwell, 4122 Griffin Street, Los Angeles.

Every thoughtful American citizen who loves our country ought to see it, too.

"Recently I was in your office," commenced Mrs. Maxwell, "and picked up a pamphlet called 'What Can I Do To Promote Americanism?' One of the listed items was 'Display and fly the American flag—at least every Sunday. If possible, fly it daily.'

"This was interesting to me as my husband and I came here from Canada. We want to do as Americans do for we hope to become citizens of the United States as soon as possible.

THIS A HOLIDAY?

"I used to put the Stars and Stripes out proudly on weekends. It never failed but that someone passing by our home would ask 'What holiday is it for which you have your flag flying?' After awhile, different people passed it off by saying simply, 'they are foreigners.'

"Comments such as these have caused us to display the American flag only on holidays now. Even then I feel I have done a terrible wrong until I see somebody else displaying the national colors. And there are not too many others, even on those holidays when the American flag is supposed to be flown.

"What is an American? I believe that being born in the United States does not of itself make you an American. Legally as a citizen, yes—but in the true sense of believing in and holding dear the values that made the United States the great Nation it is, definitely not.

"Most natural-born American citizens do not known what their flag stands for nor what their country offers them that others would not. For generations they have enjoyed the blessings of freedom without thinking about, appreciating or doing their just share to see that the freedom they enjoy becomes the inheritance of future generations.

THIS BY CHOICE

"I am proud to fly the American flag. Though not a citizen, I do hope to be. This is by choice, not by the accident of having been born here. I display the flag because is by choice, not by the accident of having and maintaining those ideals which alone can create true greatness.

"Those ideals are a belief in, recognition of, and reliance on a Supreme Being, the worth and responsibilitiy of each individual, that government is the servant rather than the master of the people, and freedom of individual choice.

NO BETTER REASON

"These are the ideals I am commemorating when I fly the flag. I can think of no better reasons for displaying the symbol of this country—and what it means to be an American."

Thank you, Mrs. Maxwell, for sharing your beautiful and worthwhile concept of true Americanism with my readers and me. What you have expressed so well is really deeply engraved in the hearts of most of us—whenever we pause to think seriously about it.

Tomorrow the Independence Day Observance Committee of the Sons of the American Revolution recommends that we all fly the flag of our country at home or our place of business. Let's show our patriotism now.

Flood-Free Industrial Sites Limit Growth of Ohio Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, West Virginia is one of the six States the industry of which has expanded along the Ohio River Valley. One important limiting factor in this expansion is the flooding habits of the Ohio River.

In its issue of June 16, 1963, the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail tells how improved flood control methods and modernization of the lock and dam system on the Ohio are helping to shape the industrial future of this region.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

OHIO VALLEY'S FUTURE SEEN IN HANDS OF "OLE MAN RIVER"

In mid-March the mighty Ohio River gave dramatic answers to the question: "What's in the future for the Ohio Valley?"

Swollen by heavy rains and melting snow, murky waters surged from the Monongahela, the Little and Big Kanawha, Guyandotte and Big Sandy rivers. Flood marks were topped in valley cities stretching from Wheeling to Cincinnati.

"The only limiting factor in the future of the Ohio Valley," commented Carlton D. Weaver, executive assistant for Ashland Oil and Refining Co. at the time, "is the availability of plant sites above flood stage." Weaver is president of the Central Ohio Valley Industrial Council, a nonprofit group pledged to push future development of the valley.

Weaver and other authorities agree that the major objectives are flood control and modernization of the antiquated lock and dam system.

The Ohio waterway—together with the availability of raw materials, ample electric power and markets—are factors cited as responsible for the tremendous postwar boom in the six States through which the river passes.

An estimated $17 billion has been spent on capital investments, principally new and expanded chemical plants and electric powerplants along the Ohio Valley and its major tributaries since World War II. West Virginia, which owns 378 miles of this navigable river complex, was the direct beneficiary of $2,077 million in industrial expansion between 1950 and 1961.

Among the major entries to West Virginia's industrial role during this period were:

Allied Chemical Corp., Solvay Division, and National Aniline Division plants at Moundsville; Mountaineer Carbon Co. at Cresap; Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.'s Chemical Division at Natrium; Mobay Chemical at New Martinsville; and Marbon Chemical Division at Parkersburg.

In addition, such familiar firms as Union Carbide Corp., Du Pont de Nemours, FMC Corp., Celanese, Goodyear, and Goodrich-Gulf have established new or expanded operations in the Ohio and Kanawha River Valleys.

The most notable recent industrial development was the startup last year of Novamont Corp.'s $10 million polypropylene plant at Neal, south of Kenova on the Big Sandy River.

The future of the Ohio Valley hinges largely on the expansion of these present facilities. The reason is that few choice building sites exist along the water route until projected flood-control measures are completed.

Experts say that any duplication of the postwar surge in new plants cannot logically be expected until two major programs are completed by the U.S. Corps of Engineers: (1) a billion-dollar modernization of the Ohio's system of locks and dams to catch up with present river traffic; and (2) completion of a far-ranging system of flood-control dams at the headwaters of the river's major tributaries.

During 1960 about 17.7 billion ton-miles of freight were moved on the Ohio River. From Pittsburgh to the Mississippi at Cairo, Ill., the waterway flows a distance of 981 miles. The tonnage moved represents almost 15 percent of the total hauled on inland waterways, or 1½ times that moved through the Panama Canal.

Western Reserve University Prof. Marvin J. Barloon, in a recent study of inland traffic, observed:

"This continuous artery may be characterized as the Main Street of the Nation's inland waterway system. Pittsburgh's corridor to the Mississippi is the Ohio River. It is a constricted corridor. * * * The old facilities are outmoded and becoming progressively more congested. Unless they are replaced expeditiously, traffic cannot grow much more."

As if responding to this entreaty, the Corps of Engineers opened 2 of the 19 new locks proposed on the Ohio River last year. Barloon called the New Cumberland and Greenup Dams "massive landmarks in the turning point now at hand in the long growth career of the Ohio."

It costs from $50 to $100 an hour to hold a tow in waiting for lock access. Using an average figure of $75, the cost of waiting for lock access at lock No. 20, below Parkersburg, amounted to an average of 0.86 mill per ton-mile of freight transmitting the 10.3-mile pool during the year 1959.

Dr. Joseph R. Hartley, of Indiana University, said that a representative cost of carrying freight on the Ohio River runs about 4 mills per ton-mile. Using this figure, the cost of congestion at one of the old Ohio River locks amounts to more than 21 percent of the total barging cost today.

"On a good many marginal movements," said Hartley, "this differential would be large enough to keep them off the river." At the projected rate of traffic growth in the lock No. 20 pool, the cost of congestion will mount to more than 3 mills per ton-mile by 1965 and to nearly 4 mills by 1967, doubling the cost of river transportation.

When this happens, the Ohio Valley's barge access will no longer be an important factor in plant location.

The Ohio River transportation system actually starts at Fairmont, W. Va. Major projects on the Monongahela River flowing northward to Pittsburgh include the Opekiska locks and dams. The two projects will be completed in 1965 at a total cost of $56 million.

Remaining major projects under study or construction on the Ohio River bordering West Virginia include the Pike Island ($61 million), Hannibal ($56 million), Willow Island ($66 million), Belleville ($61 million), and Racine ($77 million).

Overall, 19 projected superlocks will replace 46 existing locks and dams along the entire length of the Ohio River.

Of equal importance to the Ohio Valley's future growth is flood control.

Completion of the Summersville Reservoir in November of 1964 and opening of the Sutton Reservoir last year mark a major step toward relieving fast runoffs from the steel Appalachians. Other West Virginia projects which have been deferred for restudy by Congress include: Birch Reservoir, Burnsville Reservoir, West Fork Reservoir, and Steer Creek Reservoir.

In supporting the Corps of Engineers' costly program of navigation and flood control, the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, headquartered in Cincinnati, stated:

"Recent floods in Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky as well as disastrous floods (in 1961) in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana and those of 3 years ago in southeastern Kentucky and southern West Virginia emphasize the inadequacies of the (Ohio) Basin's defense against the ravages of floods and underscore the necessity for accelerating the authorized comprehensive flood control plans for the Ohio River Basin."

"'Peace Force' and Disarmament"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, two developing situations call our attention to the ultimate objectives of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. One is the departure this week of Averell Harriman to resume nuclear test ban discussions with Moscow. The other is the growing rift in the Sino-Soviet bloc. Both of these developments could increase tempo of disarmament negotiations. With that fact in mind, I offer for my colleagues' consideration the following editorial from the Carthage, Mo., Press entitled "'Peace Force' and Disarmament."

"'PEACE FORCE' AND DISARMAMENT"

Buried in the governmental labyrinth that is Washington is a Federal office which is planning to disarm us, disband our miltiary forces and deliver us to a Soviet general.

You think this sounds fantastic? You're right. It does, but it's true. The office is the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the plan is a Federal publication known as "Blueprint for the Peace Race," available to any citizen for 30 cents from the Superintendent of Documents in Washington. It's subtitled "Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World."

This is an official solution to today's world tensions, and has been offered in all seriouness at Geneva by the Kennedy administration.

Boiled down to bare facts, what it does is propose a three-phase disarmament program which in the end would transfer a portion of each national military establishment to a new "U.N. Peace Force." A token force would be retained in each country to maintain internal order, and the balance would be discharged.

All weapons would be scrapped or diverted to peaceful uses. All military bases would be closed. All manufacture of armaments would be halted. All development programs on advanced weapons systems would be scuttled.

While this is going on the U.N. "Peace Force" would be built up until it is strong enough to ensure its ability to crush any nation or coalition of nations that might cheallenge its authority.

And who's commander in chief of this single remaining military power? A Russian Communist, of course.

The U.N. CinC, by charter, is the assistant secretary-general for Security Council affairs. That office is held by the Soviet Union. Six Russians have held the post, succeeding one another since the United Nations was organized. This, despite the secretary-general's power to appoint any nationality he wishes.

Why only Russians? Because in 1946 the Big Five were horse traded out of it in an informal deal by Andrei Vishinski. The American delegation, which included the infamous Alger Hiss and was headed by the late Edward Stettinius, agreed to it. And that's the way it is.

Even worse, the United States holds that international treaties override the Constitution. This means you may have no choice in the matter. The late John Foster Dulles made this clear in a speech to the American Bar Association in 1952. In 1920, 43 years ago, the U.S. Supreme Court said in such a conflict of interest, it must be resolved in favor of the treaty. Then in 1942 that principle was extended to include executive agreements.

In effect, this means the President could sign an agreement with a foreign power or powers, bypassing Congress, the constitutional guarantees of individual freedom and the desires of the American people, and deliver up the nation to foreign control.

So, if the Communists at Geneva should decide to sign this proposed "Blueprint", what could happen?

We'd be disarmed and the U.N. Peace Force built up until it could crush the United States with ease. U.N. observers and troops would occupy strategic bases in the continental United States. Occupation troops (which is all they'd be) would be commanded by a non-American, in all probability, and most of the personnel would be of other nationalities. In any dispute between these occupation troops and the citizenry, the issue would be decided in favor of the troops. Remember—treaty law overrides the Constitution.

Not only that, he might not even be tried in a U.S. court. Instead, he could be arrested and tried by the "International Court of Justice", which can hold secret trials at its own discretion. There are no provisions for trial by jury, no precedents to bother with, and no provision for defense counsel. We as a nation might protest in the U.N. General Assembly, but there our vote counts for no more than Cuba's, remember.

What does this mean? It means the U.N. would rule the world. And it seems highly likely that the Communists would rule the U.N.

This is a blueprint for peace? It sounds to us more like a blueprint for surrender and slavery.

It seems inconceivable that a responsible U.S. Government could take such action. But it has happened. The offer has been made, and all we can do is pray the Reds don't take us up on it.

H.R. 134: Safety Standards for Automobile Seat Belts

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 134) to provide that seat belts sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use in motor vehicles shall meet certain safety standards.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my support of the bill, H.R. 134, concerning automobile seat belts.

I understand the purpose of this bill is to protect the public by providing minimum standards for automobile seat belts sold or shipped in interstate commerce. This would be accomplished by requiring the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe and publish minimum safety requirements for seat belts used in motor vehicles.

I believe we are all aware of the considerable research which has been conducted over the past few years dealing with the efficacy of automobile seat belts. The results of this research clearly evidence the contribution to motoring safety of seat belts for two basic reasons: First, you are safer inside a car than if thrown out of it; and second, you are less likely to be dashed against the interior of your own car.

A majority of the several States deserve great credit for their actions regarding seat belts. According to information I have received from the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances, there are now 28 States which have adopted one or more requirements affecting seat belts.

I am particularly proud of the record of New York State. As of June 30, 1962, it was required that all new cars sold in the State be equipped with suitable anchorages for seat belts. Under a more recently enacted statute, New York State will require that all new cars sold in the State after June 30, 1964, also have seat belts installed in them. New York State also was among the very first States to regulate the sale of automobile seat belts by requiring the maintenance of minimum safety standards.

Mr. Chairman, you can see that it is not the State of New York for which I urge the benefits of this legislation. The requirements there are entirely satisfactory.

However, for those areas of the country where no such State legislation exists, I believe Congress has both an opportunity and an obligation to protect the general welfare through the passage of this bill.

A national standard for the minimum safety requirements of automobile seat belts is much to be desired. A seat belt whose webbing breaks, catch fails, or pulls, or pulls loose from its anchorage is just as dangerous as no seat belt at all. In fact, it is potentially more dangerous for the false security it gives its unsuspecting wearer.

Train More Doctors, State Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on April 24 of this year the House passed H.R. 12, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963. At this moment, the legislation is still pending before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. The bill deserves prompt Senate action, in my opinion, as the proposed grants for the construction of medical, dental, and other health teaching facilities are sorely needed by many of our leading universities. Provisions for direct loans to students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy would work at the individual level to encourage more young people to enter these professions relating to public health.

A recent lead editorial in the July 8 issue of the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier-Express graphically illustrates the magnitude of the problem in western New York and elsewhere:

TRAIN MORE DOCTORS, STATE URGED

A report issued by the New York State Committee on Medical Education appears bound to have considerable impact on the training of doctors and other in related professions of the health field becaues it not only stresses the need and ways of increasing the number of doctors, dentists, and nurses but implies criticism of medical education and practice.

As a result of a study begun in 1961, the committee found that at least 42 percent more physicians must be trained by 1980. It said the State government should establish two new medical schools and encourage other measures which will offset shortages of physicians, dentists, nurses, and others trained in health care. A downward trend in the proportion of active practicing physicians—from 191 for each 100,000 of the population in 1940 to 183 in 1960.

Expansion of enrollment at the State University at Buffalo medical and dental schools already is being planned, it was revealed. A minimum of 50 medical students would be added and the capacity of the dental school would be approximately doubled under these plans.

Specialization in medical training, the report said, has tended to make physicians "more disease-oriented and less patient-oriented." The State was urged to pioneer in a medical curriculum oriented to "comprehensive medical care." The report defined this as "the kind of compassionate, personalized birth-to-death attention—preventive, advisory, and rehabilitative—that the ideal family physician used to give (and sometimes still gives) within the limits of his knowledge and facilities."

One change that was urged was a shift from the pattern of a medical school attached to a hospital to one on a university campus to furnish "the greatest freedom of environment and diversity of resources" for experiment.

The findings very well may become subjects of controversy but they lend substance to often-voiced popular complaints that the patient-oriented physician is all to rare in these days of specialization. The committee seems to have put the blame mainly on the medical educators and asks the State to step into the medical-education field more fully not only to train more persons in the health-care professions, but to guide the training of men and women to preventive, advisory, and rehabilitative ends.

Crisis Time for Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the problem of two-price cotton continues to threaten the economic future of the American cotton textile industry and the cotton farmer. Since early this year, continuing efforts for legislation have succeeded in bringing the critical problem to the general attention of the Congress and the country. We are now encountering the frustrating spectacle of agreement that legislation is required and disagreement on what its provisions should be.

In the meantime, an ominous cloud hangs over a great industry as well as the hundreds of communities it supports throughout the Nation. I wish to call to the attention of the Congress an editorial from the June 26, 1963, issue of the Daily Independent, of Kannapolis, N.C., which discusses thoughtfully the urgent need to finding the right answer to this problem and finding it without further delay:

CRISIS TIME FOR COTTON

How Congress acts on a problem now before it could affect almost every one in the Rowan-Cabarrus area.

This is the problem of attaining a competitive price for cotton. It is important to all of us because it's impossible to divorce cotton from our general economy.

The cotton farmer's woes, as his markets dry up, cause a chain reaction. The impact shakes not only ginners, merchants, and those immediately concerned but also fertilizer dealers, banks, machinery manufacturers, and all in the far-flung complex supplying the cotton farmer with goods and services.

Over the past 2 years, and mostly because of its price, cotton has suffered a loss of almost a million and a half bales to rayon and other synthetics. A Government program saved the export market at least temporarily. But the difference in the cost of cotton in the United States and abroad created serious problems in our domestic markets.

The cotton industry is urging immediate action to eliminate the raw cotton cost disadvantage suffered by U.S. mills, and to provide the improvement in cotton's competitive position that is desperately needed in the domestic market.

It's also calling for a vastly stepped-up research program to reduce production costs so that farmers can meet price competition without relying on subsidies.

Many people besides cotton farmers are vitally concerned with finding the right answer and finding it quickly. Among them are thousands who work in textile plants that turn raw cotton into useful goods. As in Kannapolis and the surrounding territory, for instance.

Wrong News Stress on NAACP Meet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Monday, July 8, 1963, edition of the Peoria Journal Star and call the attention of my colleagues to its import. The article follows:

WRONG NEWS STRESS ON NAACP MEET

Never has an NAACP convention received such wide public attention as the one just concluded in Chicago.

In this bright spotlight of public attention, the things that loomed up were things which would have been insignificant in other circumstances, and these incidents blanked out the real work of the session.

For example, the most dramatic incident was that brought about by the judgment of Mayor Daley, who abandoned the rostrum when he was booed by a faction.

What faction? An estimated 100 youngsters egged on by one disgruntled leader with a bone to pick with the Daley administration. This took place in a park containing tens of thousands of people who had no part, whatever, in the demonstration.

Mayor Daley made it big by letting such an incident needlessly drive him from the platform.

One wonders why.

Diversions occur in bakers' conventions, political conventions, and conventions of any sort. In this case, these diversions made the news and the sober conduct of tens of thousands participating has been overlooked by most of us.

However, something else did bother us. That is the proposal to decree a synthetic "racial balance" in the Nation's schools. The proposal is specifically modeled after a recent rule in New York where tiny tots are to be hauled long distances across district borders to provide a suitable color scheme in classrooms.

We fully appreciate that the principle of equal access has been used as a pretense and a fraud in some cities in the North and district lines throughout the South have been trickily redrawn to create de facto segregation.

It is against this practice that the proposal is intended to strike. However, we do not think one fraud can be cured by another—and we believe that any approach that sets aside the principle of free access is a form of fraud.

We are frankly horrified at the prospect of classifying small children by some kind of official race formula, and making such classification the overriding basis for deciding what school they have access to.

Assignment in such a formula, on the basis of race, is, to us, just another form of segregation.

Integration has to mean access on the basis of the individual without regard to race, and anything else we regard as a pretense and a fraud. You can't have real integration based on separateness.

The attack must be on the existing fraud, where it is practiced. District lines must not reflect dishonesty.

We believe the tide is running, however, and the problem of discrimination will be solved. It will not be solved by white leadership nor black leadership. It will not be solved by segregated leadership meeting together.

It will be solved by human beings adhering to the reality that man's spirit is vastly more important in measuring each man than is the color of his skin.

What the President Did Not Learn at the London School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, our country has at its helm today someone who does not understand economics—at least the kind of economics that will make the United States a healthier Nation.

Henry J. Taylor, in the July 8 edition of the Washington Daily News, explains the President's "financial blind spot."

FINANCIAL BLIND SPOT

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The biggest single tip President Kennedy gave worried Western statesmen abroad stayed out of our headlines entirely.

The underground alarm has spread out of the Adenauer meeting in Bonn and a gratuitous statement by Mr. Kennedy to the West German press.

He informed the Chancellor that the United States is preparing another new plan asking Europe's aid in our payments-deficit problem and gold crisis.

The first dismay arose from an apparent failure to realize, or at least to recognize, that were it not for the aid already given by Europe's central banks the New Frontier performance would already have forced the United States off the gold standard.

Mr. Kennedy stated in Bonn: "If the monetary problems are not solved they are going to master us." He is a good deal more right than when he stated in a campaign speech in October 1960, "our balance of payments will be strong and we can cease to worry about the outflow of gold."

Our gold crisis is as much a problem of confidence as a problem in payments. So long as Mr. Kennedy insists on the overspending he calls planned deficits, our creditors abroad know that, if he does not reverse this, no matter what he or anyone else says that policy is heading us smack toward the devaluation of the dollar. In fact, just Chancellor Adenauer and President de Gaulle could pull the plug on the New Frontier tomorrow morning.

Solvency is more a matter of attitude than income. If a man, woman, or enterprise's attitude toward money and debt is unsound or irresponsible it makes no difference how much income is received. They never have enough—and never will. Many a debt-ridden husband has learned this from a spend-spend wife the hard way.

Last year the administration collected $102,466,252,087 in taxes. Of this amount $65,377,533,010 came from citizens. And of that figure, $48,891,395,741 was withheld, and never even seen by the earners who worked for the colossal sum. In addition, corporations collected $21,846,608,441 for Washington.

Yet no matter what the taxpayers' sacrifices are or what the total tax take, the red ink grows and splashes and deepens. This is fact that concerns Europe's central banks as it would any other creditor.

Apparently Mr. Kennedy has an absolute blind spot about money: Where it comes from, how you must save to have any for your security and your family's safety, how people must do without many things to meet their taxes—all these hard lessons are completely outside his lifetime experience. This is no reflection; merely a fact.

As one result, the President neither counts costs carefully and clearly nor shows a noticeable grief for those who have to foot the bills. Otherwise he would not say, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country," and then sanction the most lavish administration in the history of the United States—which becomes more lush and lavish all the time.

The Floral Emblem of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the July 10 edition of the Christian Science Monitor carried a rather unusual advertisement on the floral emblem of the United States. The substance of this advertisement is the beautiful prose of Julia Proctor White. I urge my colleagues to read it. It is a strong testimony for the selection of the corn tassel as our national floral emblem. The text of the advertisement follows:

THE FLORAL EMBLEM OF THE UNITED STATES

A floral emblem is a living, growing thing which exists in relation to the growth of a nation. For our great United States there already is a floral emblem, present from the beginning of our history, waiting only to be acknowledged—the plant corn.

Nowhere is the miracle and majesty of creation more wonderfully exemplified than in the growing corn with the tassel and ear, the two halves that make a whole—neither superior to the other, each futile without the other.

The corn tassel, flowering at the top of the tall stalk, is a symbol of the whole plant at its highest productive moment. The secret of creation lifted up in a single stalk of corn revealed only to those who approach in reverence.

JULIA PROCTOR WHITE.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Old Indian Trails in West Virginia Became Paths of the Pioneers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the wilderness that was West Virginia before the coming of the white man was broken only by narrow trails made by Indian hunters and warriors. The story of how warpaths became pioneering tracks is told in a recent article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

HUNTING AND WAR TRAILS OF INDIANS WERE EARLIEST ROUTES OF SETTLEMENT

Fertile soils, millions of acres of woodlands, many minerals, abundant wildlife, man's curiosity to explore the unknown, natural avenues of transportation, desire to find religious freedom, searches for riches—these are, certainly, significant facets in the development of West Virginia.

But there is another often overlooked character in the State's advance and that is the Indian.

On the eve of its settlement by white men, the territory of western Virginia was the hunting ground of tribes of Delaware, Shawnee and Mingo Indians whose permanent settlements or villages were located in Pennsylvania near the confluence of the Monongahela and the Allegheny.

Since 1713 they had occupied the region as tenants of the Iroquois of New York who claimed the ownership. From the valley of Virginia to the Ohio River they used various trails which later served as the earliest paths of the pioneers.

One of the most eastern trails was the the Virginia Warriors Path which became a traders and explorers route ascending the Shenandoah Valley to the head of Clinch, then passing through Cumberland Gap via the site of Crab Orchard and Danville, Ky., to the falls of the Ohio at Louisville.

Several trails connecting with the region drained by the Monongahela were distinctly marked. Westward from the Virginia and Maryland routes of travel which converged on the Potomac at Wills Creek was a trail which crossed upper Youghiogheny at Great Meadows and the main Youghiogheny at Connellsville and then down to the site of Pittsburgh.

Another was the old Catawba warpath between New York and the Holston River leading also through the Carolinas. This path crossed the Cheat at the mouth of Grassy Run near the Monongalia-Preston boundary line and farther south passed up the Tygart Valley.

Two other important trails were the Warrior branch, which passed up Dunkard Creek and via Fish Creek to southern Ohio and Kentucky, and the eastern trail from Ohio via Fish Creek and Indian Creek and White Day Creek through Preston County (near what is now the site of Masontown and Reedsville and crossing Cheat at Dunkard Bottom) to the South Branch of the Potomac—a route much used by the Ohio Indians in their attacks on white settlements.

A branch starting between Masontown and Reedsville passed southward between Independence and Newburg via York's Run and south of Evansville to Ice's Mill on Big Sandy Creek where it met the northwest trail from Maryland via the bridge at Deakin's on Cheat. Another trail led from Maryland via Big Sandy near Bruceton, Preston County, and via Cheat to the vicinity of Morgantown.

A trail which played an important part in the development of the middle Ohio Valley was the Scioto-Monongahela. Starting in the Muskingum Valley near Roxbury, Ohio, it went to the mouth of the little Kanawha at Belpre over to Ewing's station on the B. & O. Railroad, above Eaton's tunnel, then through Dry Ridge to Doddridge County and east of West Union tunnel to the head of Middle Island Creek, then into Harrison County and down Ten Mile Creek into the Monongahela Valley.

The trails leading from the Ohio east were well known to the early settlers who often posted scouts on them near the Ohio to report the approach of Indian war parties.

Indian trail and buffalo trace pointed the easiest way for fur trader and pioneer settler across mountain barriers into the unbroken wilderness drained by the Mononahela.

The country gradually became known by reports of hunters and traders who crossed from very early times.

Nemacolin's Path, following in part an old buffalo trail across the mountains, furnished a packhorse route for traders who had already reached the Ohio before 1750.

The blazing of this old Indian trail by Nemacolin and other Indians under direction of Cresap, acting for the Virginia gentlemen who had received 100,000 acres of land drained by the Ohio, precipitated a decisive war over western forests.

This path was later widened into a wagon road by George Washington and Braddock and became an important highway to the lower Monongahela.

Farther south, crossing a wilderness mountain region over which no roads were constructed for a century after the early era of settlement of the region drained by the upper Monongahela, were four other trails of no less importance for settlers of the region drained by the upper tributaries of the Monongahela.

The McCulloch's traders' trail led from Moorefield via Patterson's Creek and Greenland Gap across a spur of the Allegheniès to the North Branch to the upper Youghiogheny via Bruceton Mills to the Cheat near the Pennsylvania line.

The North Branch trail, over which came the larger number of the early settlers on upper Cheat and many on the Buckhannon River continued from Fairfax Stone across Backbone Mountain and down Lead Mine Run and Horse Shoe Run to Cheat River. It connected here with an up-priver branch to the vicinity of Parsons and via the head of Leading Creek to the Seneca Trail at Elkins and to the settlements of the Tygart Valley, at the head of which it connected with trails to the Little Kanawha, the Elk and the Greenbrier.

The trail to Greenbrier passed through Mingo Flats and west of the present Marlinton pike and crossed the mountain—dividing at the top of Middle Mountain into two branches, one of which continued to Old Field Fork and the other to Clover Lick.

The Shawnee, or Seneca Trail, although the chief highway between the South Branch and Tygart Valley, traveled westward yearly by packhorses laden with salt, iron and other merchandise and later by many droves of cattle driven to the eastern market, ascended the South Branch, followed the North Fork and Seneca Creek, crossed the Alleghenies 20 miles south of the North Branch trail, and the branches of Cheat above the mouth of Horse Camp Creek, and passed near Elkins and Beverly to the vicinity of Huttonsville in Randolph County.

Another path, connecting with the old Shawnee trail from Pennsylvania and Maryland from the head of North Fork and following the general course of the later Staunton and Parkersburg turnpike, passed up the South Branch to the mouth of North Fork in Grant County which it followed to the mouth of Dry Run in Pendleton County.

It then followed Laurel Creek to the site of the later crossing of the Staunton and Parkersburg pike, then turned westward, crossed the Alleghenies 30 miles south of the Seneca trail, followed the East Fork of the Greenbrier to the main river, crossed Shaver's mountain to the Shaver's Fork of the Cheat, then crossing Cheat Mountain to Tygart Valley, intersecting the Shawnee trail near Huttonsville and crossing to the head of the Little Kanawha which it followed to the Ohio.

Two other trails may be noticed. One led from the headwaters of the South Branch via the Sinks of Gandy, to Shaver's Fork of Cheat River at the mouth of Fishing-Hawk, and across Cheat Mountain via the heads of Files Creek to Valley Bend above Beverly.

Another led from the Great Kanawha up the Elk and Valley Fork and down Elk to Tygart Valley—a meeting place of many trails and probably a favorite hunting ground of the Indians.

An old well-known Indian trail, originally a buffalo trail and later used by settlers until 1786, passed from the Kanawha up Kelley's Creek, down Bell Creek and down Twenty Mile to its mouth (now Belva), up Gauley to a point more than a mile north of Rich Creek, up which it meandered and passed over Gauley Mountain through the site of Ansted and across the branches of Meadow Creek to the upper waters of Muddy, an affluent of the Greenbrier.

Over this serpentine trail the earliest settlers twisted their way. It was used for the outward trip of Lewis' army in 1774 and was followed by the Indian invaders who attacked Donnally's fort in 1778.

The Gauley River route farther northeast also led to the heads of the Greenbrier.

The chief trail of the Indians and early settlers from Lewisburg to the Ohio ran along the ridges at the heads of the tributaries of the Great Kanawha, crossing Paint Creek near its source.

It was a mere passageway for foot travel through the wilderness—although over much of it one could ride horseback. It was used considerably for early travel.

The western Indian trail around the narrows of the Great Kanawha led from the Kanawha up Paint Creek, thence via the site of Beckley, over the northeast extension of Flat Top Mountain and across the New River above the mouth of the Bluestone.

Among other trails was one via Horse Pen Creek to the head of Clear Fork, down Tug, to the mouth of Four Pole, thence across the ridge between the Sandy and Guyandotte.

An early hunters' trail from the Greenbrier-New River section to Kentucky passed up East River via Bluefield, the Bluestone-Clinch Divide, and the Clinch and Powell Rivers.

Over these and many other Indian trails the pioneers swarmed into what is now West Virginia—building farms, setting up trading posts, discovering mineral and timber resources—and then using these same trails to extend the white man's penetration into the frontier.

The expansion was by no means easy, but thanks in large part to what the Indian had already done, the task was made simpler and faster.

Phil Cornelius Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the best known personalities in the Washington State dairy industry was Phil A. Cornelius, manager of Skagit County Dairymen's Association. Although, he has retired after serving for 36 years, I am confident he will continue to contribute his talents both to the dairy industry and to his community.

His record of accomplishments, Mr. Speaker, is contained in an article that appeared July 1 in the Skagit Valley Herald, which is published in Mount Vernon, Wash. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article in the RECORD.

CORNELIUS STEPS DOWN AFTER 36 YEARS IN JOB

One of the Northwest's leading dairy industry officials retired today after serving in his post for 36 years, one of the longest records in any industry.

He is Phil A. Cornelius, who today stepped down as manager of Darigold in the Skagit Valley after 36 years. During his career, Cornelius saw Darigold grow into one of the Nation's leading buyers and distributors of dairy products.

Cornelius' successor will be Leslie E. Jenne, who has been associated for some time with the dairy industry. Graduated from Washington State College in 1942 with a degree in dairy manufacturing, Jenne has served as a county milk sanitarian, as a State milk plant supervisor, and as sales and service official with a dairy machinery firm.

TO MAKE HOME

Jenne, his wife Marjorie, and their daughter, Jan, 14, will make their home in the Skagit Valley.

In taking the Darigold post Jenne said he saw a bright future ahead for the dairy cooperative and for the Skagit Valley. "With the Skagit River as one of the Nation's great underdeveloped sources of pure available water," Jenne added, "the Skagit area most certainly will grow economically and increase in population."

Both Cornelius and Jenne have something in common. Each is quite familiar with the southwest Washington town of Chewelah. Cornelius was principal of the high school there for 2 years after his graduation from the University of Washington. Jenne, who was born 2 years after Cornelius had served as principal, was raised on a dairy farm in the Chewelah area.

During his long career, Cornelius has been active in Skagit Valley civic life. He served as chairman of the committee which established the Northwest Washington Experiment Station at Mount Vernon. His other activities included chairmanship of a steering committee for Skagit Valley College and a directorship with the Land Title Co. of Mount Vernon. He is a member of the Eagles and the Shrine.

ONCE A CHEMIST

Before coming to Darigold in 1927, Cornelius was a chemist with the John B. Agen Co.

In turning management of Skagit Darigold over to Jenne, Cornelius said he saw "nothing but a bright future for Darigold in this area" under the new official's guidance. He added:

"In the 36 years that I have been in Skagit County, we have seen the brand name Darigold grow in stature and consumer acceptance to the extent that our trademark, in placement and volume, has grown to a dominant position in the marketplace and often outshadowed national brands. This certainly is a tribute to our farmer producers who have developed a national reputation for the production of premium quality milk and also due the rigid quality control program exercised to insure that only the best is marketed under our brand."

The Railroad Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has temporarily averted a crippling railroad strike, but the issues are not yet resolved, and the walkout has merely been postponed. The railroad industry is one of our country's most important, and I have always done all I could to aid in and to insure its growth and prosperity.

However, the current dispute touches many problems, but so far has tackled none of them. For example, we hear of featherbedding in only one context, that of the operating employees; in my opinion, featherbedding in the industry is nowhere more obvious than in the executive management echelons of the major American railroads.

I cannot overemphasize that, on the basis of my own experience with some of our eastern railroads, the companies seem actually to be discouraging passenger travel. One needs only to take a train trip from Buffalo to Washington, featuring curtailed schedules and outmoded equipment, to prove my point. By contrast, I recently had the opportunity to visit Chicago, where I saw some of the trains leaving for western cities. The equipment on those trains rolling west made our eastern railroads look like scenes from an old-time movie.

In the present dispute over working conditions of operating employees of American railroads, I believe that the following points should be brought to the attention of the House:

First. Actual bargaining started only in the latter half of May of this year after the Rosenman Board reported its findings. Previously, the now repudiated report of the earlier Commission had paralyzed bargaining.

Second. The Rosenman Board report is not self-executing; it furnished a general guide to the parties. Progress in bargaining out an agreement consistent with the Rosenman Board report has been made on every single issue in the short time that actual bargaining has taken place. There is no issue which presents a hopeless deadlock.

Third. The working conditions which the carriers are threatening to impose on Thursday were rejected by the Presidential Railroad Commission, by the Rosenman Board, by Secretary Wirtz in his own recommendations and, at all time, by the operating employees.

Fourth. Mediation efforts in this dispute are far from exhausted. The parties have given every indication of being highly receptive to third-party mediatory proposals on the merits going beyond what either side might be willing to propose itself. Third-party proposals that would bridge the gap remaining between the parties have not been attempted for any but one issue; in that one issue a promising lead developed which has not been followed up.

Fifth. The financial position of the railroads was found to be surprisingly good by the Rosenman Board and the high productivity of their working force was hailed by that Board. There is no warrant for railroad haste to impose wage cuts and manning changes without regard to safety, efficiency or burden of work—changes rejected not only by the employees but also by every governmental body that concerned itself with this matter and even abandoned by the carriers in collective bargaining.

Sixth. The situation calls for intensified mediation and not for the cessation of mediation, for more vigor, initiative, and determination to have this dispute settled equitably and peacefully by free collective bargaining.

Bracero Loss Means a Crop Loss in San Mateo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, there are many Members of the House who are not in sympathy with the continuation of the bracero program and so voted, but I am sure they do not realize the economic loss which the discontinuance of this program will bring about in California.

The following article from the San Mateo Times of July 5 will illustrate how the lack of braceros in our county will affect our agriculture:

BRACERO LOSS MEANS A CROP LOSS IN SAN MATEO

San Mateo County's growers, big and small, are going to be faced with a possible 50 percent loss of crops next year if the Mexican bracero program dies December 31. This is the concensus of local growers.

The U.S. House of Representatives tentatively has decided not to renew the law which would allow U.S. agriculture to import the braceros from Mexico. There's talk that it still may be extended in deference to U.S. farmers' pleas for a gradual phaseout of Mexican nationals, but nothing definite yet.

But even with its comparatively small number of braceros, San Mateo County agriculture is looking for its lumps next year if the Mexican workers can't come back.

County growers have been employing only about 500–600 a year, not very many compared to the Salinas Valley's 13,500 at peaks. California, where farm wages are highest ($1.33 top, $1.10 an hour in San Mateo County), is the largest customer for bracero labor, taking on as many as 72,900 at the height of the harvests.

NOT ENOUGH WORKERS

The problem for farmers is not whether they have to pay higher wages to domestic workers but whether they can get enough workers at all to harvest the crops.

Labor and religious groups are harping that use of the braceros cuts wage scales and takes jobs from domestics, particularly the nearly 6 million now unemployed.

Not so, say San Mateo County agriculturalists.

First off, a condition of hiring braceros is that they must be a last resort—any grower hiring braceros also must hire any domestic that comes along—that's the law.

Second, most of the homegrown unemployed simply can't or won't do the type of work called for in harvesting brussels sprouts, artichokes, lettuce, beets, etc. This is "stoop" labor, something the average Mexican farmer has done all his life but which automation and lanky frames have left the Norteamericano unequipped for mentally or physically.

Third, the growers are caught in a price-wage squeeze. Half Moon Bay grower, Aldo Giusti, of the Bortolucci and Giusti Growers, estimates that a 25-cent wage increase without a corresponding price rise would put the county's agricultural enterprise out of business.

SUPPLY AND DEMAND

"But we can't adjust prices to take care of these things like manufacturers can," Giusti said. "We have to operate on a supply and demand basis and take what we can get for our produce."

Bortolucci and Giusti are among the county's biggest bracero hirers—and therefore boosters. The quiet, simple, homesick bracero has earned the highest regards of growers everywhere he's gone for his industry and diligence. This county's growers are no exception, whether they hire 70 in season, as do Bortolucci and Giusti, or just 1 or 2, as many small growers do.

Even at that, San Mateo County, with most of its agriculture now strung along the west side of the peninsula, is better off for domestic help by being near the population centers of San Francisco and Oakland.

But the growers still find themselves recruiting help from as far way as Texas—an expensive proposition not only in transportation costs but with the transient type of people not always staying as long as hoped.

EIGHTY DOLLARS A DAY

Mrs. Dolores Pompati, secretary of the Half Moon Bay Growers Association, said that "locals" never have had trouble finding work, if they want to work. A dollar a hamper for brussels sprouts to a good picker can mean $70 or $80 a day in season—but not this year because of the rains.

She went on to note that 98 percent of the braceros are used in the winter harvesting of brussels sprouts, San Mateo County's main staple food crop. Flowers rank first agriculturally, but aren't in need of bracero care.

September through January will be brussels sprouts harvest season this year, a month late because of the rain this spring, Mrs. Pompati said.

Giusti stated that he was very optimistic about Congress reconsidering and passing the bracero extension law introduced this week that would give the growers another 2- or 3-year period to use the Mexicans.

DOMESTIC WORKERS

"I would rather have domestic workers," he said, "because they're easier to get, but I have to bring the crop in, too, and need the people."

Braceros generally work a 10- to 12-hour day, 6 or 7 days a week, rain or shine. The consideration is to get the crop in before it's too late. There's time to rest when it's in.

The State makes sure that the braceros are housed, fed, and well cared for. The expense of this to the growers is a major minus to their use.

Alternatives to using bracero labor, as the growers see it, are going broke or going to Mexico.

There's no shortage of bracero labor or restrictions against it there, of course, and most California crops do grow well there. With little tariff on Mexican produce, moving south is looked upon as a very possible solution to the squeeze.

For this county and the State in general, of course, it means loss of a lucrative tax base, Mrs. Pompati insisted, as loss of any income-producing industry will.

The grower verdict is that if the braceros go, after having been an important economic factor in local agriculture since the Korean war, growers are going to be hard put, with no adequate solutions left open to them.

Our Founding Fathers Recognized Bible Teaching as a Must in the Educational Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD portions of a letter received from Cecil C. Hayes, of Elm Springs, S. Dak., which is worthy of the consideration of everyone.

In his letter, Mr. Hayes points out the five reasons for the decline and fall of the Roman Empire, the fifth being "the decay of religion."

He also points out that in September of 1777, the Continental Congress voted an expenditure of $300,000 to buy Bibles to be distributed throughout the Thirteen Colonies, this at a time when the Nation could hardly afford such an expenditure, but he points out that our Founding Fathers realized the need of Christian principles as the foundation for the educational system of that time, and that Bible teaching was recognized as a must in the educational program.

Mr. Hayes then quoted the following men:

Andrew Jackson: "That Book, the Bible is the rock on which this Republic rests."

William Penn: "Men who are not governed by God will be governed by tyrants."

Horace Greeley: "It is impossible to mentally or socially enslave a Bible-reading people."

Ulysses S. Grant: "The Bible is the sheet-anchor of our liberties."

Woodrow Wilson: "Our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually."

Mr. Hayes then asks the question, "Where do we stand today in regard to these things? Do we measure up?"

A Free Society Needs No Walls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable HENRY GONZALEZ, did me the honor recently of placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a newsletter I had written, entitled "Fright for Sale." In that newsletter I took note of some of the hysteria being generated in our country by individuals and organizations having a vested interest in frightening their fellow Americans.

Two weeks ago in my hometown of Tucson, Ariz., I saw what this hysteria can do to a community. It happened that Tucson had been chosen as one of the cities to be visited by two different groups of foreign citizens, one of United Nations delegates and one of accredited United Nations correspondents.

What kind of greeting do you imagine these visitors received to our city? One daily newspaper chose the day of their arrival to fill its editorial page with letters denouncing them and protesting their coming. The chamber of commerce was inundated by phone calls from other persons objecting to the presence in our city of these "un-American" strangers.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this appalling rudeness was not typical of the great majority of Tucson's citizens. It was the work of an angry, militant and badly misinformed segment of the community, many of whose members are the authors of the letters which were the subject of my recent report. Tucson is a friendly, courteous and, in many ways, remarkable community of which I am most proud. But I feel only shame for those citizens who were unable to see the good that could come from showing our foreign guests what freedom and democracy can do.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, there is one strong voice in Tucson which has spoken out and met this attack head on. It is that of William R. Mathews, editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star. On Friday, June 28, Mr. Mathews published the following editorial which I commend to the attention of all my colleagues:

LET TUCSON BUILD NO WALLS

By sheer coincidence three events in the current news provide a moral, rather than a political question for the residents of Tucson to answer.

On the same day that Tucsonans learned that two different groups of foreign citizens, one made up of United Nations delegates, the other of accredited correspondents at the U.N. from the various countries having delegates there, President Kennedy stood in West Germany and stared in silent disbelief at the wall erected by the Communist east.

What connections do these incidents have?

The answer lies in the number of calls and letters received by newspaper editors and the officers of the chamber of commerce, protesting the welcoming of such visitors here because some of the members represent countries behind the Iron Curtain.

In other words, some of our people, with all the good and patriotic intentions in the world, were building a mental wall, similar in its intent to that constructed by the East German Communists. While the German wall was erected to keep its people from escaping to freedom, the mental Tucson wall was being constructed to keep outsiders from seeing how we, a free people in a free city, work and live.

It is unfortunate that this should happen. We have nothing to hide. We have much to be proud of, even while we know that we have faults which must be corrected. But we also know they will be corrected by education, experience, and a desire for understanding each other.

In fact, Tucson should feel a certain pride that the Governmental Affairs Institute, financed by the Ford Foundation, and the Hospitality Committee of the United Nations, each placed the city on its itinerary. It indicates that Tucson is looked upon as an example of how nearly 300,000 American people of numerous races and religions, live and work together.

Those who would build a barrier against visitors, simply because of their origin, should think again before they take such a stand.

A city of a nation which, in the past 17 years has sent to less fortunate peoples $66,615,200,000 in economic aid, and another $708 million in military aid, most certainly need not fear showing outsiders, wherever they may come from, the manner in which we live.

Let them see our schools, public and private; let them see our homes, big and small; let them see and visit our churches, representing a wide range of religious beliefs and let them visit and speak with our working people, who, some of them have been told, are kept in practical slavery.

Of course, some of the accounts they send to their homes may be distorted, but some of them will not be colored. In no case has Tucson anything to hide—nor does Tucson, like East Berlin, have to build a wall, either mental or material, to keep its people from seeking freedom elsewhere.

To these visitors within our gates we should say welcome. We do not have to adopt their beliefs, but we most certainly do not have to worry about exposing them to our own philosophies.

Let Tucson build no walls.

If J.F.K. Had Tried To Alienate Public He Could Not Beat Tax Muddle To Do It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the 5th of July an editorial appeared in the Denver Post. It is particularly incisive, succinct, and accurate. Under leave to extend my remarks I include this editorial titled "If J.F.K. Tried To Alienate Public He Could Not Beat Tax Muddle To Do It":

[From the Denver Post, July 5, 1963]

IF J.F.K. HAD TRIED TO ALIENATE PUBLIC HE COULDN'T BEAT TAX MUDDLE TO DO IT

In its attempts to alter the tax structure for the benefit of the Nation's economy, the Kennedy administration has succeeded only in creating the most profound confusion.

The net result is so bad that if Mr. Kennedy had hired someone deliberately to dismay and alienate the public, this person couldn't have done a much better job of it than what has been done by a bunch of well-intentioned experts.

Let's go back over the depressing sequence of events:

The trouble began with the enactment in 1962 by Congress of legislation enabling the Internal Revenue Service to begin a crackdown on highly publicized expense-account abuses—the yacht parties, the plus hunting lodges, the party-girl evenings.

But as the administration's Internal Revenue Chief, Mortimer Caplin, began to reveal how the agency intended to interpret its congressional authorization, it became clear that this was to be a crackdown on more than abuses, it was to be a crackdown on virtually the whole idea of expense accounts. And this in turn, although the administration may not have intended it that way, took on the aspects of an assault on business operation itself.

Throughout the latter part of 1962 and the early part of 1963, the expense rules hearings, the talk, the endless warnings of tighter and tighter restrictions to come, succeeded in spooking the business community. Even before new regulations went into effect, business at hotels, restaurants and in travel and entertainment facilities began to drop off sharply.

In the midst of this troubled business climate, the President in his state of the Union message made an urgent plea for tax relief to spur business and stimulate the economy.

But no sooner had an uneasy business community grasped hopefully at this presidential gesture (Mr. Kennedy's proposal to cut the burdensome tax rates gained for him the unaccustomed support of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce among others) when the Chief Executive followed up in a few days with the explanation that the tax relief would have to be part of a package of "reforms" which included some surprises when examined closely.

One of the surprises was the fact that at least for a couple of years, business taxes would actually be increased rather than reduced. As for after that * * * well, what business was going to make its expenditure plans on a promise which had already been badly tarnished?

But the confusion was only beginning. In a meeting with a business group, the President said he wouldn't mind foregoing the "reform" (meaning the tax increases) part of the package if he could get the tax cuts. Before that could be absorbed, however, a statement came from a "high administration source" that the President regretted saying what he had said—that it was an unfortunate slip of the tongue.

For weeks the "yes he did mean it," and "no he didn't" speculation poured out of Washington. Reports had it that administration advisers were split on the matter—and that Mr. Kennedy was trying to placate Chairman WILBUR MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, of the House Ways and Means Committee, who wanted reform.

When MILLS' committee finally got to work on the package, the general taxpayer began to get a better idea of what the "reform" would mean—reduced deductions (amounting to taxation on taxes) for him and gentler treatment for interest groups geared to protect themselves by lobbying.

But the people are not as unwary of what's been happening as Washington may think. In fact, throughout the country there is evidence of a growing wariness, a growing consciousness of tax and money problems that is inhibiting spending. Take one local example, which we cite because it involves a cross section of the public: At three Colorado dog-racing tracks attendance is up as usual—but, for the first time in years, betting is down.

The Kennedy administration may have its mind first and foremost on foreign problems and nuclear bombs, and next on domestic racial problems, but it shouldn't forget that the tax problem will hit the average citizen more directly than even these momentous matters.

There are a great many of our 189 million people who may not have direct contact with points of racial friction, and there are fewer who feel they can do something specific about the great foreign policy issues. But there is hardly a man or woman in America who doesn't feel the tax and money squeeze or notice the firm hand of the Government in his wallet pocket.

It is this practical reality that we have been trying to point out—fruitlessly, to date—to the big thinkers in Washington.

Stonewall Jackson's Career Started in Lewis County, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, according to an article in a recent issue of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail, the public career of Gen. "Stonewall" Jackson began in Lewis County, now West Virginia, when he was appointed constable at the age of 18. His service to Lewis County contributed to his subsequently being sent to West Point.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

STONEWALL JACKSON'S CAREER STARTED IN LEWIS COUNTY, W. VA.

Almost a century and a half ago, in 1816 to be exact, a new county was formed from the southern part of Harrison County. This county was named for Col. Charles Lewis, famous fighter, and was bounded on the north by Harrison, on the east, by Randolph, on the south by Greenbrier and Kanawha and on the west by Wood. It had an area of 1,754 square miles. Besides the present territory it included nearly all of the present counties of Upshur, Gilmer, and Braxton and parts of Barbour, Webster, Doddridge, Ritchie, and Calhoun.

As was customary in acts providing for the creation of new counties, no town was designated as the county seat. At this time the act designated a commission consisting of Edward Jackson, Elias Lowther, John McCoy, Lewis Maxwell and Daniel Stringer to decide upon the location of the county seat.

The farm of Henry Flesher was selected for the location of the courthouse—the decision was wise because it was centrally located and easily reached from great distances. Although the Flesher farm was selected the county court continued to meet at Westfield, a little community a short distance from Weston.

At this time the circuit court for Lewis County was held—the first court being held in April 1817 with Daniel Smith presiding. The first session for the county court was held in June 1817.

Lewis County is rich in history—the famous general, Thomas J. (Stonewall) Jackson lived and was a part of the county history, attended school, and served as a constable in the county at 18. He showed his ability by his careful and accurate records that he kept while acting in that capacity. It showed that he took his oath of office seriously and was determined to do a good job. This careful and thorough work probably gave his friends an insight on his character and was the beginning of their plans to send him to West Point.

Here, too, the great Alexander Scott Withers, author of "Border Warfare," spent many years, teaching and being a highly respected citizen in the community.

Rev. John Mitchell, founder of the Methodist Protestant Church, settled in Hackers Creek District and held many meetings.

The county has the world's largest hand-cut stone building, the Weston State Hospital—or the Trans-Alleghany Lunatic Asylum as it was first called. In 1860 the assembly appropriated $50,000 for the construction and work was begun immediately. During the Civil War work was halted from time to time and the main building was not completd for 10 years.

In 1820 the population of Lewis County was 4,347 and now it has a population of over 19,000. The county consists of five districts—Collins Settlement, Skin Creek, Court House, Hacker Creek, and Freemans Creek.

MARY K. HOLT.

The St. Kilian Boychoir

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make known to my colleagues in the House of Representatives information about the St. Kilian Boychoir.

Who are the youngsters who make up this superb group? They are schoolboys from 8 to 15 years of age from St. Kilian Parish in nearby Farmingdale. Under the masterful direction of Arpad Darazs they devote up to 10 hours each week to arduous rehearsal—a dedication that is reflected in their perfect choral concerts.

The Boychoir—the unique spelling belongs to this group alone—has made appearances on television and participated in radio programs and cut several outstanding records. Their extensive repertoire ranges from elaborate liturgical renditions to lively waltzes, from madrigals to cowboy songs.

It has been said by some that we live in an age of creeping mediocrity and that frequently our cities and suburbs are cultural deserts.

I, for one, do not concur in this analysis of the American scene; and as partial proof, I would offer you the musical accomplishments of the St. Kilian's Boychoir of the St. Kilian's Roman Catholic Church in Farmingdale, Long Island. Father Schoof and Mr. Arpad Darazs, choir director, have blended together a choir of consummate skill. They have taken the boys of the parish and through diligent training and example have forged them into a choir that is truly one of the outstanding musical aggregations in the country. These boys have been in demand by organizations throughout the State of New York and the Eastern United States. It is my hope that ultimately every segment of the Nation will have an opportunity of hearing this product of Long Island suburbia.

We hear much today about the musical groups that travel to the United States from the four corners of the earth, and we give them just recognition. I also believe that it is important that organizations of our own, composed of the sons and daughters of our own citizenry who have been trained in the musical accomplishments of both the Old and New World, should receive recognition.

Upon the completion of this boy's choir's most recent triumphant public concert, I wish to praise them and to call to the attention of this honorable body the considerable success of this group of brilliant young performers.

Red Subversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, the headlines which have recently spotlighted our domestic problems of civil rights and the rail strike and the international atomic test ban talks have diverted attention from one of the most pressing problems—Cuba.

While the Kennedy administration studiously avoids bringing the topic of Cuba before the people, the Communists are consolidating their position, using the island as a base for spreading subversion to other Latin American countries, and intensifying our problems for the future.

Just today there was a disturbing report on the wire that Cuban underground leaders had observed an influx of foreigners to Cuba, feverish construction activities, and a clandestine operation on the northern tip of the island which has been closed off to the Cuban people.

Past recent history has shown us that the Russians want Cuba as a military outpost in our hemisphere. It is logical to assume that the influx of what the President likes to call "technicians" and isolation from Cubans themselves of certain areas indicates more Communist military activity.

I regret that there appears to be a brainwashing job being done on the American people. When John F. Kennedy ran for office in 1960, he ran on the premise that a Communist Cuba just 90 miles off our shores was intolerable. He pledged to do something about it. Now he is peddling the idea that we are extremely fortunate that he was able to head off a military attack on the United States from Cuba, and that we should learn to live with a Soviet-occupied satellite "just 90 miles from our shores."

Every day poses a more serious problem. Every day of peace purchased by permissive tolerance of communism in Cuba means more bloodshed and sacrifice by Americans when the day comes that we must have a showdown, or accept a Communist-dominated Latin America. Such development would pose clear military danger to the United States.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a column by John Chamberlain, and an editorial, both from the Galesburg (Ill.) Register-Mail of July 9, 1963. These articles point out that the Communists are taking a more direct anti-U.S. position throughout Latin America, and are stepping up their activities. It also points out the weak-kneed protest we have made and the dropoff of our prestige in the eyes of Latin America.

SUBVERVISION BY REDS INCREASING

An increase in Fidel Castro's export of Communist subversion to the rest of the hemisphere is taking a mounting toll of U.S. properties. There is obvious New Frontier reluctance to admit that this increase exists, but the U.S. Government and its citizens are being humiliated more and more.

The record shows consistent failure of our foreign service to perform its duty of protecting the rights of American citizens and property overseas, while both are attacked almost daily by Castro-trained terrorists and Marx-oriented government officials throughout Latin America. Our State Department seldom utters so much as a mild protest.

A chronology of such events by the Cuban Information Service includes the following, just since March 1:

March 2—Two Communist bands captured after attacks on hospital in Maracaibo and bank in Cuidad Ojeda; large quantities of arms, munitions, and anti-American literature siezed. March 8—Five Communists arrested; police capture anti-American documents and arms after attempt to set fire to Goodyear Rubber Co. March 11–12—Red terrorists blow up U.S.-owned Creole Petroleum Co. pipeline between Maracaibo and coast, destroy 15,000 barrels of oil. March 14—Communists threaten to pirate tanker *Esso Maracaibo* of Creole Oil Co. March 20—Reds raid General Motors office in Puente Anauco, steal keys and keymaking machinery. March 27—Communists bomb Creole Petroleum installation in Lake Maracaibo, wounding two workers.

April 3—Creole pipeline blown up, repaired. April 8—Creole pipeline again blown up. April 9—Three Venezuelan police cars bombed with "Molotov cocktails" as Reds burn U.S.-owned Adams Chiclet Co., in Caracas. April 26—U.S.-owned cordage mill in Caracas burned.

May 24—Red raiding party chased off after one is killed in attack on La Carlota Airport, Caracas, where U.S. military planes are hangared.

June 5—After first notifying a Caracas newspaper they would do so, eight Castroite gunmen overpower Venezuelan guards at headquarters of U.S. military mission in Caracas, force six U.S. Army officers to strip, then insult and gag them, set building afire with gasoline and flee with uniforms and valuables. June 15—Communists force way into home of U.S. Embassy Consular Edward T. Long, bind and gag Mrs. Long and maid, paint anti-American slogans on walls and flee. June 20—Communists raid Memphill American School, tie up women employees, raise Communist flag and escape. June 22—Communists blow up American-owned pipeline of Venezuela Transmission Corp., cutting off service to large sections of Caracas.

Perhaps to North Americans some of these occurrences may seem relatively unimportant. Prestige of the United States in Latin America, however, does happen to be very important, as is pointed out in John Chamberlain's column on this page today. Citizens of the United States have a right to expect, and insist on, a more positive degree of protection by our Government in these areas.

CASTRO'S BRAVADO CAPTIVATES MANY LATINS

(By John Chamberlain)

When I was in Puerto Rico some years ago a member of the Serralles rum-distilling clan tried to explain to me the Latin concept of "dignidad." To translate it as simple "dignity" was not quite right; apparently the concept also included something about honor and inviolability. It was a two-way proposition: dignidad meant that one should be respected, but also that one must have reason to demand respect. The Serralles clan, at the time, was insistent that it be regarded as first-class Spaniards, not as third-class Americans; dignidad was very much on its mind.

Thinking about the business of temporizing with Castro in Cuba, I have more than once recalled that conversation about dignidad in the hot Caribbean coastal town of Ponce. The trouble with the United States in relation to the Castro question is that it has had no dignidad. In putting up with Fidel Castro's diatribes and insults, we do not respect ourselves. And it follows, as the night follows the day, that no dignidad-loving Latin American from the Rio Grande all the way south to Patagonia can respect us.

Confirmation of this suspicion comes from Mexico, in a new Mexican-American bulletin put out by Hugo Salinas Price at Apartado Postal No. 15049 Mexico 15, D.F., which is hereby recommended to the so-called Fourth Floor of the U.S. State Department. Full of dignidad himself, Hugo Salinas Price minces no words on the subject of Castro. "In the eyes of our people," he says, "the fact that Castro is strong, and that he acts decisively and fearlessly, and the fact that the U.S. is impotent, is an overwhelming argument in favor of Castro. Outwardly, some of our people may not be sympathetic to Castro and communism. But inwardly, they admire his valor, his decision, his will to attain a given goal, even over dead bodies."

This is laying it on the line. Stressing the "honor" component of dignidad, Hugo Salinas Price points out that honor, in Mexican eyes, is bound up with "machismo," which is to be translated as "male-ism." The male Latin American cares very little for speeches on human rights, for, "in the Latin mentality, a man has a perfect right to kill with his hands, with a knife, or with a gun, anyone who dares to humiliate him."

Well, Castro and his sarcastic speechmaking Minister of Economics, the Argentinean "Che" Guevara, have seized every possible occasion to humiliate the United States. And so the Mexicans feel only "hate and contempt" for a nation that allows itself to be so humiliated. "Mexicans," so Hugo Salinas Price continues, "do not care to be allied with a power that has been humiliated, and that tries to buy respect * * *. The Mexican is fiercely proud, in the midst of poverty. The Alliance for Progress completely ignores the fact that the Mexican is clearly aware of U.S. humiliation and degradation by Castro-communism, and is still waiting for "Tio Sam" to roll up his sleeves. The Mexican does not care a fig for propaganda about 'radical social reforms' because he has been hearing all this for 50 years, and it goes in one ear and out the other. What would powerfully impress him would be to see the United States pin Castro's ears back and eject communism from Cuba."

"Honor," so Hugo Salinas Price concludes, is a word that is respected far more than peace or tolerance in Mexico. "Each year," he says, "many people kill and are killed for its sake. That is the issue in the minds of Mexicans; an old-fashioned, unsophisticated issue which has not been grasped in Washington."

To be perfectly fair, some people do grasp the issue in Washington. Republican Senator GORDON ALLOTT, of Colorado, would restore Uncle—or "Tio"—Sam's "dignidad" by creating a Cuban government-in-exile and letting it set up its provisional capital on the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo. This would be throwing something right in Fidel Castro's face. The Mexican Government, along with the Brazilian Government, might officially object to the infringement of the concept of self-determination implied in backing a Cuban government-in-exile with the guns of a foreign naval base. But, as Hugo Salinas Price insists, the Latin American respects dignidad more than he does finicking over nice shades of legality.

So get going, "Tio" Sam. You have nothing to lose but your loss of face.

Getting Through Customs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the editor of Changing Times, the Kiplinger magazine, has written an excellent column which is designed to answer questions and to acquaint a U.S. tourist with general customs requirements and has consented to its insertion in the RECORD.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

GETTING THROUGH CUSTOMS—A QUICK GUIDE FOR FOLKS RETURNING FROM ABROAD

For those lucky people who plan to travel abroad this summer, here's some advice that may save time, money, and a possible tangle with the law.

There's a customs inspector waiting for you at the dock, airport, or border point where you return to this country. His job is to see that you comply with a set of rather complicated regulations. The best way to prepare for that rendezvous is to learn those regulations now, before you leave. Listed below are the key points you should know about.

Declarations: When you reenter the United States, you must disclose to the customs authorities all the purchases you made abroad, including any clothing, watches, or jewelry you may be wearing at the time, goods being carried in your luggage and articles that you are having sent home for your own use. (Packages sent to others do not have to be declared; see section on gifts.)

The airline or ship steward will usually distribute forms on which to enumerate the items and their costs. If not, you give the details to the inspector orally. He will then check through part or all of your luggage. There are two steps you can take to speed up these formalities: (1) Keep all your receipts in one, quickly accessible place. This will make it easier to fill out the form and to verify a price if the inspector questions it. (2) Pack your purchases together in one or two suitcases. That way he won't be forced to look through every bit of your luggage.

Exemptions: Most products imported into the United States are subject to tariffs. As a tourist, though, you are entitled to bring back a certain amount duty free—without having to make a tariff payment—if—

You have been out of this United States for at least 48 hours.

The merchandise is for personal rather than business use.

You haven't claimed an exemption on another trip within the previous 31 days.

At one time, tourists were allowed $500 duty free. The amount was temporarily reduced to $100. This new limit was scheduled to expire July 1, but Congress is working on a bill to continue it. Check with customs officials at the airport, seaport, or border point where you depart, for the amount in effect at the time you leave.

The exemption applies to every U.S. resident whether he's an adult or a babe in arms. Members of a family traveling together are allowed to pool their exemptions. A husband, wife, and two children, consequently, are permitted combined duty-free imports of $400. Remember, too, that the exemption is based on the wholesale value of the items, unless they were made to order for you. The Customs Bureau figures the wholesale value at 40 percent under the store's full retail price, so $100 of exemptions really works out to about $166 in retail purchases.

When you bring in more than your exemption, you have to pay tariffs on the surplus, again on the product's wholesale value. Duties vary from product to product. The inspector will tell you which articles carry the highest rates. You can then claim as many of those as possible under the exemption and pay the tariffs on the rest.

Virgin Islands: If you're returning from the Virgin Islands (those that are a territory of the United States, not the islands administered by Britain), you get a $200 exemption. But only half of the $200 can consist of goods bought outside the islands. The rule that you must be out of the United States for 48 hours to qualify for an exemption does not apply to goods bought in the islands.

Mexico and Canada: The 48-hour limit also does not apply to Mexico. It does, however, to Canada, and this can raise problems for travelers who swing back and forth over the border on a car trip. You can always bring back $10 per person duty free, no matter how short a time you've been out of the country. If you're over that amount and haven't fulfilled the 48-hour requirement, consult the border customs officer. You may be permitted to leave your purchases at the customs office the first time you reenter the United States and then pick them up on the next leg of your trip, after having spent the necessary 48 hours in Canada.

Liquor and cigars: Each $100 exemption can't include more than 100 cigars and 1 gallon of alcoholic beverages. But, again, families can combine exemptions. Thus, a family of, say, 4 can bring in 400 cigars and 4 gallons of liquor.

Try to carry any alcoholic beverages you buy—wine, brandy, or whatever—along with you. U.S. law prohibits shipments by mail, and if you sent the bottles by freight, you could run afoul of State laws. The Customs Bureau will not release shipments that may violate the law of the State to which the shipment is to be made. When you take it with you, there is less likelihood of becoming enmeshed in these complications.

To-follow: Tourists have been allowed to use their exemptions for "to-follow" shipments—articles they arranged to have sent home. The Treasury Department has asked Congress to revoke this right and limit the exemption to merchandise travelers have with them. When you check on the size of the current exemption, also find out how things stand with this clause of the law.

Gifts: Personal gifts carried as part of your baggage are treated the same way as other merchandise bought in a foreign country. However, while abroad you can send as many gifts as you like to people at home without any tariff payment provided you must meet these conditions:

Each package does not contain goods valued at more than $10.

No liquor, tobacco products, or perfumes priced at more than $1 are included.

The same person does not receive more than one gift from you in 1 day.

Make sure to write "Gift Enclosed" and the price of the article on the outside of the package. Otherwise, the recipient will be forced to pay a tariff on the present. These gifts do not have to be declared to the customs inspector when you arrive.

Cars: There is a 6½ percent tariff on cars bought abroad. If the car was used abroad, customs will deduct for depreciation and the 6½ percent will be calculated on the net value. You can reduce the tariff cost by applying all or part of your exemption and those of any members of your family traveling with you. A family of four, for example, could lower a $1,500 car to $1,100 and thereby reduce the duty from $97.50 to $71.50.

Should Congress eliminate the to-follow privilege, you would not be permitted to take the exemption that way unless you returned on the same boat carrying the car. In any case, before you exhaust your exemption on a car, ask the inspector for the tariff rates on the other goods you are bringing home. The 6½-percent car duty is relatively low. It might be best to conserve the exemption for higher tariff items.

Trademarked products: Companies that make brand-name products can request the Customs Bureau to stop or limit imports of these items by tourists. In many instances, travelers are allowed to import a small amount if the articles are carried in their luggage and not sent home by mail. A number of perfumes, toilet preparations, cameras, binoculars and musical instruments are subject to these restrictions. If you plan to buy any merchandise of this kind, obtain a copy of "Tourists Trademark Information," a Customs Bureau booklet that lists the trademarks and the import rules.

Suppose, now, that you already own a foreign-made camera and want to use it on your trip. It may be a model subject to a trademark restriction when you return. The answer is to take along a receipt, repair slip or anything else that can serve as evidence that you owned the camera before you left. Alternatively, you can register the camera with customs when you leave by filling in a simple, one-page form.

The trademark controls can be bypassed completely by obliterating or removing the brand name from the product before you declare it. With a bottle of perfume, for example, you can tear off the label. If the trademark is molded into the glass, though, you might be required to transfer the contents to another container.

Banned goods: Let's assume a store offers you an unmounted jade stone at an irresistibly low price. Don't buy it unless you first take the legal steps necessary to get it through customs. Jade is one of many items that cannot be imported without a special license or a certification that they were not originally produced in Communist China or

North Korea. The ban is designed to prevent Americans from purchasing any goods from those two countries.

Tourists are most likely to encounter this problem in Hong Kong, the bargain center of the Far East. Fortunately, the Hong Kong and U.S. Governments have established a system to help travelers through the intricate regulations. On arrival, you will probably be given a booklet explaining the rules and listing the stores that issue the proper certificates. The booklet can also be obtained from the U.S. consulate there.

Agricultural products: The Government carefully screens tourists' imports in this field to keep out injurious insects and animal diseases. The rules for hams, bacon, sausages, and other cured or cooked meats are so complex that you would be better off not even trying to bring any back into the country.

An advance import permit is required for most plants, bulbs, and cuttings. The detailed regulations and permit application forms are available from the Import and Permit Unit, Plant Quarantine Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 209 River Street, Hoboken, N.J.

In Praise of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the citizens of my district, Mr. J. B. McLean of Mobeetie, Tex., has sent to me a poem of his own composition in praise of that great American military leader, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

In order that our colleagues also may have the benefit of this stirring and patriotic expression, I submit Mr. McLean's poem together with the fine preface he prepared for it:

REMINISCENT OF LAST DAYS IN THE YEAR 1941 AND BEGINNING 1942

The last days of December rolled around that year in 1941. People were stirring into a panorama of activity. Even grandmothers went to work in some form of employment, helping in the essential cause.

Amidst all this activity, such as: tangled transportation; seeking scarce items; wheels of industry gearing for promotion to the war effort; our attitude changed from complacency, to that of vigor and purpose.

News came in announcing occupation of territories, by the enemy, far from their homeland. Looking at the war map of the South Pacific, it revealed they were bypassing the Philippines at this time. This was a note of interest and inspired me to write a poem in tribute to a great patriot of our time; a man, who by valor and integrity, represented the United States of America in so vast an area, as to include, the whole oriental sphere of influence. And, to those people, he is comparable to a legend.

Now, if you will, let us turn back a page of time, go with me to that last day in 1941 and pause a minute in history, with "That Man in the Philippines."

THAT MAN IN THE PHILIPPINES

While war clouds hover
From shore to shore;
From the straits of Dover
To Singapore.
When the world at peace
Is no more it seems,
Think of that man in the Philippines.

When the map of the world
You have begun to scan,
The sealanes of the enemy
To new conquered land,
You will see a detour
Around Bataan.
You may wonder, well!
What does that mean?
It is because of that man in the Philippines.

The man in the ranks
Fights and dies
Verifying the decision
That implies.
Facing the foe
And the shrapnel's sting,
Backing that man in the Philippines.

The guns at the forts
When the bombers come o'er
Belch defiance from Corregidor.
Returning to their base
With damaged wings,
Expressed due respect
For that man in the Philippines.

His determination to defend
Caused the enemy to be wary,
The failure to be crushed,
An act of hara-kiri.
Leaving the earthly battle
For a spiritual scene,
The ranking foe
Gave up his regime, with a wealth
Of admiration for that man in the Philippines.

What the future holds, all depends,
Our cooperation let us send.
Our wealth and resources let us spend;
Of our time and talent, there is no end.
You men in the forces, I can see you grin.
For it makes no difference where or when,
You meet the enemy you are determined to win,
And follow the scheme, of that man in the Philippines.

While battlegrounds are forming
And bullets began to sing,
The nations needed a man
For commander supreme.
So it was nothing
But a natural thing,
To send for that man in the Philippines.

When war clouds are gone
And bombs no more rain,
You will see an honored portrait
In the hall of fame.
If now you don't know,
Do not bother,
For than man is none other than
Gen. Douglas MacArthur!

—BERT MCLEAN.

A Bill for an Independent Tax Commission To Interpret Intent of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, a bill which I am introducing today would set up an independent tax commission to act as interpreter of the will of Congress in tax matters.

In present practice, the Treasury Department serves as the rulemaking body for interpretation of acts of Congress in the tax sphere. It was through exercise of this interpretive power that the Internal Revenue Service expense account rulings this year led businessmen and individual taxpayers into the "bewilderness."

The establishment of this commission will cut out many steps previously necessary in promulgating interpretive rules and regulations and will save the taxpayer many steps in his efforts to get a true interpretation of the law. A commission will provide an independent, unbiased body to pass on the law. It will prevent any possibility of one man acting as the judge and jury in tax matters. The agency which enforces the tax law should be separate from the agency which interprets the tax law. The commission may seek advice from the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee.

This bill calls for a commission of five members appointed by the President. No more than three would be of the same political party, and terms would be 15 years to insure independence and the benefit of experience in a complex field. The first commissioners would be appointed with staggered terms of from 3 to 15 years. The commission is authorized to require attendance of witnesses and to order books, records, and documents to be brought before it at any hearing.

I believe that the public will have much more respect for the rules and regulations set forth by this body. In effect, the bill will restore to the Internal Revenue Service its position as collector of the taxes, removing the responsibility for interpreting the intention of the legislative branch of government which it has had to assume over the years.

This reform is needed because of the many possibilities for abuses of interpretation under the present system. The establishment of a regulatory body in a field of tax law is long past due, and I feel strongly that we must have such a regulatory body serving much as the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and other bodies fill needs in their specific fields.

Ozark Rivers Gain Wider Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the Kansas City Times recently published an editorial pointing out clearly the need for congressional action on S. 16 to establish the Ozark National Rivers. This proposal would place a portion of two free-flowing streams in Missouri under the control of the National Park Service to preserve their natural beauty. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OZARK RIVERS GAIN WIDER SUPPORT

The chances seem excellent that the U.S. Senate this summer will pass legislation to create the Ozark National Rivers project. The aim is to preserve 94,000 acres along the banks of the Current and Jack's Fork in southeast Missouri. Because of the expected tieup over civil rights, the prospects are only about 50–50 that the House of Representatives will approve the plan before the session ends.

However, nothing will be lost if the House defers action until 1964. Already the project has received the full endorsement of the National Park Service, which would administer it. Stewart Udall, the Interior Secretary, has called it a priority measure. The Secretary has also said that he would push for approval of the equally important Prairie National Park in Kansas.

Certainly persons already familiar with the beautiful Ozark Rivers need no convincing. The Current and Jacks Fork flow through some of the most picturesque river country that remains in the United States. Essentially it is a wilderness, with few intrusions by man. However, this rustic condition will not long be preserved, if Congress does not act to save the riverbanks from hodgepodge development.

The Ozark Rivers and the three national seashores that were established last year mark a major departure for the park service. Until recently its efforts had been essentially aimed in three directions:

To set aside the vast, natural phenomena—Yosemite, the Yellowstone, Crater Lake.

To save smaller areas as national monuments—the Arches, Walnut Canyon, and Muir Woods.

To preserve landmarks of our national history—Fort Laramie, the Custis-Lee Mansion and the Edison laboratory.

Under the Kennedy administration, there is a new trend. The national seashores projects will save some of the world's loveliest coastline on Cape Cod, Padre Island, Tex., and Point Reyes, Calif. The Ozark Rivers would extend the concept to free-flowing streams. Surely, these beautiful rivers of the Ozarks belong to the Nation. Those who have seen them will know that Congress can't act a day too soon.

Cabell County Once Scene of Civil War Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, some interesting facts about the history of Cabell County, W. Va., are brought to light in a recent article in the Charlestown (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

KANAWHA SHAVED TO FORM CABELL

(By Virginia Lee)

The mouth of the Guyandotte, on the upper side, in the middle of a field was the site of the first courthouse in Cabell County.

The location, in the center of the community of Guyandotte, was selected by a commission created by an act authorizing the forming of a new county from part of Kanawha. Named for William H. Cabell, Governor of Virginia from 1805 to 1809, the county government was set up in 1809.

Guyandotte, which was incorporated as a town in the next year, remained the county seat until 1814 when the courthouse was moved to Barboursville. In 1863 the county court certified that it was impossible to hold court in Barboursville because of "marauding incursions of rebels" and the courthouse was brought back to Guyandotte. After the war it was returned to Barboursville where it remained until 1887 when it found a permanent home in Huntington.

The history and the economy of Cabell are in two distinct phases separated by the Civil War and the years immediately after.

From the time of the first white settlers, probably shortly after the Revolution, to the 1870's it was predominantly agricultural; since then it has been largely industrial and in recent years has become more and more urban.

In the early years rich bottom lands along the rivers, access to the Ohio River, a main artery of commerce, and later a junction at Guyandotte of the river traffic and a daily stage coach from Washington and Richmond created a prosperous economy. While plantations probably did not compare in size with those of eastern Virginia, there were many productive farms on which were built large and substantial homes, some of which still remain.

Few records exist to show the number of slaves in the county but apparently the number was not large. A number of landowners were apparently troubled by the existence of slavery as there is a number of court records dealing with the problems of emancipated Negroes.

As a border county, Cabell suffered from internal strife during the Civil War and after. Many leading citizens and property owners were pro-Southern, if not secessionist; some left the county to join Confederate forces. However, the county voted by a substantial majority against the ordinance of secession. The actual political opinion is difficult to assess because of the absence of records and the fact that Federal forces were, from the beginning of hostilities, in control of the county government.

There were numerous skirmishes between occupying Union forces and groups of southern soldiers who carried on a guerrilla warfare. On November 11, 1861, after a raid by Border Rangers, a large part of Guyandotte was burned.

The bitterness continued after the war, somewhat lessened by an overwhelming vote for ratification of the Flick amendment which restored voting rights to those who had participated in the rebellion.

Former differences were almost completely forgotten in the midst of dramatic changes which began soon. In the late 1860's Collis P. Huntington began to option lands east of the Guyandotte River for a site for an eastern terminus for the Cheaspeake and Ohio Railway. The coming of the railway with its repair shops brought in thousands of new residents who, in turn, brought more business and industry.

Huntington was incorporated in 1871 and soon became the center of population, business, and government. The city grew rapidly and for many years before the 1960 census it was the largest city in West Virginia.

In the midst of an industrial and urban community there remains at least one institution from the earlier era. Residents, headed by John Laidley, founded Marshall Academy for the education of their children. In 1937, as Marshall College, the institution celebrated its own centennial. Today, as Marshall University, it is continuing to serve the region and is looking forward to greater expansion as West Virginia moves into its second century.

Rights-of-Way for Electric Transmission Lines Over Federal Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, many Members have received letters in the last several weeks referring to the recently issued rights-of-way regulations of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture dealing with electric transmission lines crossing Federal lands. Therefore, for the information of all Members, I am including in the RECORD a recent speech by Hon. Kenneth Holum, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, which explains these regulations and answers many of the questions which have been raised.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY KENNETH HOLUM, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR FOR WATER AND POWER, AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MOUNTAIN-PACIFIC STATES CONFERENCE OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSIONS, SANTA FE., N. MEX., JUNE 25, 1963

It is a real pleasure to be here today to discuss matters of mutual concern regarding electric power. It isn't necessary, I know, to remind this audience of the basic role that electric power plays in supporting our overall economy and providing the conveniences of modern-day living. And as time goes on, its importance grows. We cannot ignore the fact that we must have a growing, efficient, and reliable power system to sustain future economic expansion.

It will require the full cooperation of the entire industry to do a complete and thorough job. I am referring not only to the power companies, cooperatives, municipal and State utilities, but also to manufacturers of production equipment, transmission facilities, fuels, electric appliances, and many other subsidiary industries, not to mention such groups as public utility commissions and governmental agencies.

Like so many other typically American institutions, the power industry is characterized by the word "diversity." As a nation we have diverse political, educational, and religious organizations. We are a people of varying national and ethnic backgrounds. Our business communities thrive upon the difference between competing manufactured products. The fabric of American life is strengthened by the threads of diversity, and competition.

Each segment of the industry has a specific function to perform. Each Government agency related to the power industry has responsibilities it must discharge. Sometimes the decisions that we make are distorted, misinterpreted, and misunderstood.

For this reason I believed it important that I accept your invitation to discuss with you today an important matter of mutual interest and concern. I am referring to the recently issued rights-of-way regulations of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture dealing with electric transmission lines crossing Government lands.

Before discussing the regulations in detail, and the criticisms that have been leveled at them, I would like to outline the operations of the Department of the Interior in the power field and the responsibilities of the two Federal Departments in connection with public lands.

The Department of the Interior is charged with the responsibility of marketing power from all multipurpose dams constructed by the Federal Government other than those built by TVA. Power dams for which the Department has marketing responsibility are constructed either by the Bureau of Reclamation or the Corps of Engineers. Federally produced power is marketed by four agencies of the Department of the Interior—the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Southeastern Power Administration. The basic policies under which these agencies market power have been established by various acts of the Congress.

One of the most important of these is the Flood Control Act of 1944. It empowers the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of electric power, surplus to the needs of a project, in such a manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest practicable rates to consumers, consistent with sound business principles and giving preference to public bodies and cooperatives.

In carrying out these responsibilities, the Department has constructed transmission lines of its own or alternatively has utilized the transmission facilities of others. In every area where Federal power is sold, the Department relies upon wheeling arrangements with power companies, REA-financed cooperatives, and other agencies to some extent for the delivery of power to preference customers. In the area of the Southeastern Power Administration, all the power is delivered and sold in this manner. In no area has it been found practical, economical, or desirable for the Government to deliver power to preference customers solely by means of Federal transmission lines.

For this reason, an important part of the Federal power marketing program has been the need to have adequate and equitable wheeling arrangements with others. Experience has demonstrated over and over again, however, that such arrangements are seldom forthcoming unless there is the possibility of construction of transmission lines by the Government or some other inducement.

Population growth, the mobility of the people, and the very rapid increase in the mileage of electric transmission lines present us with an immediate problem that will grow with time.

As the custodian of millions of acres of publicly owned lands, the Federal Government has the responsibility to conserve these resources to the best of its ability. If tomorrow's generations are properly to benefit from these resources, we must establish today the basic principle that two transmission lines should not cross Government lands and forests if one can do the same job. Our responsibilities are such that this factor must be given consideration now if we are to avoid a chaotic situation in the years ahead.

Contrary to much that you read and hear, the recently issued regulations are not completely new. Similar regulations were in effect during the period 1948 to 1954. However, they covered lands only under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management of the Interior Department. But the objectives then were the same as now—namely, to manage better the Government lands and to encourage appropriate electric power wheeling arrangements.

In 1954, the wheeling regulations were rescinded at the request of certain power companies. Congressional hearings in 1956 show clearly that the rescission was a matter of administrative judgment on the part of Department of the Interior officials, and not the result of any question of legality or constitutionality or of a showing that utility systems had suffered because of the regulations.

It is clearly evident from these public hearings that power companies believed they should be granted rights-of-way across Government lands without any consideration of Federal power needs or requirements whatsoever.

Now, what do the newly issued regulations cover?

1. The regulations are applicable to rights-of-way for the construction of transmission lines of 33 kilovolt or above crossing Forest Service lands and lands under control of the Bureau of Land Management.

2. The Department of the Interior may withhold granting a right-of-way if the proposed facility is in conflict with the power marketing program of the United States.

3. The Department may request changes be made in routing or design or capacity of the facility in order to eliminate conflicts with the Federal power marketing program. If such changes involve additional investments or costs on the part of the applicant, the Department will enter into an equitable compensatory contract.

4. As a condition of obtaining a right-of-way across Federal lands, the applicant will give the Department of the Interior a reservation for the use of surplus capacity in the facility.

5. Reservation of capacity may or may not be used by the Government. If the Government decides to use the reservation, it will request the holder to certify the quantity of surplus capacity that is then available. If this quantity is insufficient for the Department's purposes, it may request backup information and make its own determination of the surplus quantity. If the parties disagree as to the amount, it will be referred to arbitration for settlement.

6. The holder may recapture surplus capacity made available to the Government by giving the Government 36 months' notice.

7. The Government may, at its own expense, increase the capacity available to it by making additional interconnections or installing other facilities. If it does so, the capacity thus made available is not subject to withdrawal by the holder.

8. When the Department uses surplus capacity in a transmission facility built over Government lands and designed and built to serve the needs of the owner, it will pay an equitable share of the total monthly cost in proportion to the kilowatts transmitted by the Department over the facility, as compared with the total kilowatts transmitted. The Department pays only during those months when it uses the facility.

9. The provisions of the regulation may be superseded by contractual arrangements between the parties.

Prior to putting the new regulations into effect, comments were solicited by publication in the Federal Register. The original 30 days allowed for comments was extended so that all segments of the industry had a full opportunity to present their side of the story. Voluminous letters and briefs were submitted to us and received our thorough consideration. In addition, a meeting was held with representatives of the power companies and another meeting was held with representatives of public utilities and consumer organizations. The meeting with the power company representatives made it clear that they would be satisfied only with the complete rescission of the new regulations. No suggestions were made for modifications in the proposed orders.

Judging by the tone and context of articles and statements opposing factions have made to the new regulations in the past two months, we can only conclude that the bulk of the opposition is based upon misunderstandings of what the regulations provide, and a misconception of the manner in which they will be carried out. For example, the charge has been made that the Department of the Interior would be usurping the activities of State regulatory agencies. I must state categorically that in our judgment no such usurpation will take place. Furthermore, if these regulations were rescinded tomorrow it would still not relieve the Secretary of the Interior of the responsibility of evaluating applications for transmission line rights-of-way over public lands on the same basis as set forth in the regulations.

Of course, I am not implying that the regulations will not affect the work of State regulatory agencies. Another factor will be introduced in an already complicated situation. But let us keep clearly in mind the distinction between the introduction of complications and the usurpation of authority. Although analogies are never perfect, I believe that in the operation of the regulations and their relations to State commissions, the analogy of a revised National Electric Safety Code is appropriate. Such action has an impact on the activities of State commissions, but could not be construed as usurpation.

In applying the regulations, we do not intend to judge the designs and capacities of proposed transmission lines as they relate to the applicant's purposes—except as they affect our management of public lands and the wheeling of Federal power. It is not our purpose to use the right to withhold approval of an application because of conflict with the Federal power marketing program as a device to become involved in matters extraneous to these purposes. As an example, the procedures being set up to carry out the new regulations will provide for no review by the Department of the Interior of transmission lines crossing public lands in those States where the Department has no marketing program at this time. We will, however, except to reserve wheeling rights in the event that the Department may have occasion to use the facility during the 50-year life of the easement.

Much has been said about the provision that permits the Department to withhold approval because of potential conflict with the Federal power marketing program. This is implicit in the existing laws and would be the case whether the regulations specifically dealt with it or not.

As a matter of fact, during the period between 1954 and the present, when the wheeling arrangements were not in effect, the previous administration actually withheld approval of rights-of-way across Federal lands in Arizona for the construction of power lines by the Arizona Public Service Co. It did so because the Department at that time was concerned with the possibility that construction of a particular line across Government lands might affect the decision of the Congress regarding the type of transmission system to be built to deliver Colorado River storage power.

This provision was included to make it clear that the Department does not intend to find itself in the anomalous position of granting right-of-way across Government lands to utility systems that may be bent on thwarting the will of, or forcing the hand of Congress.

Nor is there anything mysterious about the "power marketing program of the United States." It encompasses the Department's responsibilities in marketing electric power from Federal multipurpose hydroelectric developments. The policies are based upon appropriate Federal laws and a half a century of power marketing activities.

Another charge is that the Department will be expropriating capacity in transmission lines belonging to others. With increasing interconnection of utility systems, arrangements whereby one utility makes use of another's surplus capacity is a common procedure today. With the need for detailed studies looking to the immediate future—5, 10, and even 20 years ahead—utility systems can, without undue difficulty, determine their needs for particular facilities 3 years in the future. So that any utility system giving this notice would be in a position to recapture whatever surplus capacity was being used by the Federal Government.

Let me make it clear that in determining the amount of surplus capacity that may exist in a given line over a 3-year period, it will be necessary to take into consideration the needed reserves of the applicant during this period. It is our view that the full capacity of transmission lines built by others will be available to the owner irrespective of temporary use by the Department, therefore there should be no additional costs to the applicant as a result of these regulations. On the contrary, by taking advantage of joint use of facilities, costs should be reduced.

The 36-month notice period is to give the Department an opportunity to provide alternate means of delivery in the event that the necessary surplus capacity is being recaptured by the owner. The regulations also provide that the Department may heavy up the facility so that it may continue to make deliveries to Government customers. Some concern has been expressed that the Department would, under these circumstances, usurp or expropriate the low-cost surplus capacity built in by the applicant. You may recall the regulations provide that they may be superseded by contractual arrangements. In the kind of situation I am referring to here, I am certain the Department would prefer to work out an equitable arrangement dealing with the specific circumstances, taking into account the fact that the applicant has built in such low-cost surplus capacity.

We recognize the advantage of separate contracts in individual cases and it will be the policy of the Department to negotiate such contracts wherever the applicant is willing to do so. In the event, however, that agreeable contracts cannot be worked out, we shall have to rely on the regulations to carry out our responsibilities.

Finally, the claim has been made that the regulations place the Department in an unfair competitive position in relation to the applicant, since it permits the Department to use the applicant's facilities to serve his customers. In actuality, the regulations protect the holder to the extent of not requiring him to permit Government use of the facility to serve customers, other than preference customers, already being served by the utility. The requirement that the Department be permitted to serve preference customers—if they so choose—stems, of course, from its responsibilities under the preference provisions of the various power marketing acts of Congress. The major purpose of wheeling arrangements that the Department's power marketing agencies have with other utility systems is the delivery of Federal power to preference customers. Although the regulations do not provide protection to the holder regarding new loads of a nonpreference nature, experience indicates clearly that preference customers soon require all the available power the Government has for sale and that the Government is not in a position to serve other customers for any extended period.

Because we have dealt mainly with objections raised to the regulations, we should not lose sight of the fact that large numbers of publicly owned, consumer-owned, and other types of consumer organizations, were very much in favor of the issuance of the regulations. They agree with us that the regulations will facilitate the delivery of Federal power to preference customers and would have a salutary effect on consumers over the country.

The Department believes the promulgation of these regulations is an important forward step in resource conservation. It is important that America make the fullest possible use of its resources. The new regulations are consistent with this principle. They are based upon sound management concepts. We shall carry out our day-to-day responsibilities in handling this matter equitably and fairly—as we do all programs—keeping in mind the total interests of the Nation as a whole.

Prayer and Bible Reading in the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Edward G. Dubay, of Van Buren, Maine, in my district, wrote me a letter expressing his views on the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States pertaining to prayer and Bible reading in the public schools. In order to provide greater readership of his thought-provoking letter, I am pleased to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The letter follows:

VAN BUREN, MAINE, *July 8, 1963*.

Hon. CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Now that our U.S. Supreme Court in filled with advocates who do the devil's work and who cringe and are set a-trembling at the very mention of the name of God, it seems evident that the present incumbents of this high office have outlived their usefulness as far as the exact performance of the duties for which they were appointed is concerned.

The founders of this country were men of vision who loved freedom as a God-given right, and who envisioned a glorious Utopia, where, in the amalgamation of all peoples, races, and colors, a wonderful and strong country would exist where unity, freedom, and justice would be enjoyed by all. To bring this about they relied, not on their strength alone, but on the guidance and protection of divine providence—the Ruler and Protector of all mankind.

Under this new system our country has prospered, and has welcomed to our shores millions and millions of peoples from all parts of the world; and here they have found freedom, peace, prosperity, and equality which they were denied in their native lands.

The founders of our country were men of wisdom, who knew and understood human frailty, so they provided for the protection of the rights of all under one of the greatest documents ever devised by man—the Constitution, its preamble, and its amendments—and by the establishment of the Supreme Court to safeguard the freedom of all citizens of this glorious country. It is indeed sad to see that, of late years, appointment to this high office has become rather a political plum than a badge of merit, and that present incumbents fear God so much that they would deny to our children the privilege to know, love, and pray the Giver of knowledge, strength, and justice to guide them ever to give the best that they have of strength, energy, and devotion to their wonderful country.

In the life of all humans there come times when prayers to the Designer Infinite is our greatest source of strength, so why deny to a great segment of our people knowledge of the source of power and courage when human ability fails?

When those appointed to protect our rights use their high office to deny that which they have sworn to cherish and defend, it is time to sit up and take notice, as it is not so much the atom bomb which could destroy our noble country, as disregard of a proper moral code, and disregard of divine providence.

Our Supreme Court would deny to our schools the use of prayers and the teaching of religion even though our Constitution guarantees freedom of worship. In order to worship one must know God and how to serve Him. Our Founding Fathers knew God, loved Him, and served Him and were guided by His teachings. What glorious heritage they have left their descendants. Are we to let this heritage be destroyed by keeping from our children knowledge of the one who can lead them to greater achievements and honor and to eternal happiness in paradise?

Do support any and all bills which may tend to stop this abominable bigotry and injustice to some of the most devoted and respectable citizens of this country, its leaders of tomorrow, our millions of happy and carefree children. Teach them the name of God and His justice and you will build for tomorrow a nation which will carry with glory Longfellow's immortal banner, "Excelsior." Do this and our country will find new life, new paths to honor and new vitality in the guidance of mankind to its eventual happiness—an eternity of bliss in the Kingdom of God.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD G. DUBAY.

President Kennedy Awards Medal of Freedom to Mrs. Annie Wauneka

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, on Independence Day, President Kennedy awarded the highest civil honor to a most deserving Arizonian. The Presidential Medal of Freedom was awarded to Mrs. Annie Wauneka, of Klagetoh. This valuable member of the Navajo Tribe has long been acclaimed by her fellow Navajos and Arizonians, and we are now glad that her fame is being formally recognized throughout the United States. I wish to share the following news item from the Navajo Times with all my colleagues so that they may learn more about this outstanding lady:

ANNIE WAUNEKA GETS PRESIDENTIAL COMMENDATION

President John F. Kennedy today announced the award of the Presidential Medal of Freedom to Annie Wauneka, longtime councilwoman from Klagetoh. The Nation's highest civil honor in peacetime was announced in a personal telegram from President Kennedy to Mrs. Wauneka received at Window Rock. The importance and great honor given to Annie Wauneka is illustrated by the fact that only 31 Americans out of the entire population of over 180 million are singled out for this award.

The Presidential Medal of Freedom is awarded to persons who have made outstanding contributions to the security or national interest of the United States, world peace, cultural or other significant public or private endeavor.

Annie Wauneka upon receiving President Kennedy's telegram informing her of this award expressed deep pleasure and humble appreciation for this very high honor.

Navajo Tribal Chairman Raymond Nakai congratulated Mrs. Wauneka on behalf of the Navajo Tribe and said, "The different phases mentioned in the telegram are a recognition of the outstanding services which Mrs. Wauneka has devoted in time and effort as a member of the Navajo Tribe and a leader of the tribe. The chairman hopes she will continue these valuable services which she has contributed and so ably demonstrated over the years."

The text of President Kennedy's telegram was as follows:

"To Mrs. ANNIE WAUNEKA:

"I am happy to inform you of my intention to award you on July 4, the Presidential Medal of Freedom. This is the highest civil honor conferred by the President of the United States for service in peacetime. By Executive order signed earlier this year, the criteria for the award were expanded so as to include especially meritorious contribution to the security of national interest of the United States, world peace, cultural or other significant public or private endeavor. The award will henceforth be announced once each year on July 4. The presentation of the medal to the 31 recipients for this year will take place in September.

"With warm best wishes and congratulations,

"JOHN F. KENNEDY,
"President of the United States."

Rex M. Whitton Is Winning Praise as Head of Federal Roadbuilding Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress a story that appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on July 7, 1963.

The story tells of the steps taken by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads since Rex M. Whitton became Federal Highway Administrator to keep the Federal-aid highway program free of wrongdoings. In view of the fact the Federal Government contributes 90 percent of the cost of the Interstate Highway System, the efforts Mr. Whitton is making to safeguard Federal funds and at the same time speed up construction of the 41,000-mile system should be of interest to everyone.

My own State of New Jersey, which will have 376 miles of the Interstate System within its borders, is very much interested in the progress of this huge undertaking.

The story follows:

MISSOURIAN REX M. WHITTON IS WINNING PRAISE AS HEAD OF FEDERAL ROADBUILDING PROGRAMS: HE IS PLEDGED TO FINISH ENTIRE SYSTEM BY 1972

(By Thomas W. Ottenad)

WASHINGTON, July 6.—A Missourian who is winning praise for his work as chief of the Nation's roadbuilding program has pledged that half of the country's new, 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System will be open by the end of next year.

"And," said Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton, "we're going to meet our deadine of having the entire system finished by 1972."

Whitton, who came to Washington from Jefferson City, where he was chief engineer of the Missouri State Highway Commission, directs the spending of more than $3 billion a year in Federal aid to the States for highway construction. In the two and a half years he has been here, he has put special emphasis on jogging up work on the Interstate System, which was started in its present form in 1956.

He has also devoted much of its attention to providing tougher policing measures in an effort to head off more scandals of the type that have plagued the highway construction program in the past. Another major concern has been a preliminary start on long-range planning, including research into the kind of transportation the Nation may need 50 years from now.

Speeding up the Interstate is the biggest job Whitton has faced since President John F. Kennedy tapped him for the top Federal road post in the New Frontier in December 1960.

Congress had approved plans for an interstate network linking 90 percent of the Nation's major cities in 1944. Some work was started shortly thereafter, but it was not until 1956 that full-scale construction was begun. The Federal Government finances 90 percent of the cost; the States bear the rest. Eventual cost is estimated at $41 billion.

The goal of finishing half the work by the end of next year was set by Whitton. While he expressed confidence that it will be achieved, the task is difficult. For although the Federal Government provides most of the money and exercises a veto over the program, the responsibility for initiating the projects and building the roads rests with State governments.

Whitton's power to accelerate the program thus is largely one of persuasion. He has been using it whenever possible. Through trips to States where work has lagged he has sought to speed up the job, to resolve conflicts and improve liaison.

Prospects are regarded as good that the halfway goal will be reached by the end of 1964. Experts in the Bureau of Public Roads say, however, that the achievement will be possible only because a number of States will have completed substantially more than 50 percent of the work within their boundaries. Others probably will fail to reach the halfway mark, it was said.

The latest figures show that by last March 31, slightly more than 14,500 miles, or 36 percent of the total Interstate System, were open. In addition, work had started on 16,100 miles. Of the estimated $41 billion cost of the system, $15.6 billion had been committed. The Federal Government's share came to $13.7 billion.

Missouri was slightly ahead of the national average, with 44 percent of its portion of the Interstate System already open. Of 1,105 miles of the system to be built in Missouri, 487 had been completed and 617 were underway. Only 1 mile of the entire Missouri portion of the system had not yet been started.

Whitton has made a substantial effort to cope with the scandals and irregularities that have been disclosed from time to time in the national highway program. He has set up a number of new procedures or strengthened old ones in an effort to uncover any wrongdoing.

Among the most important are: Creation of a new Office of Audits and Investigations with top-level rank and headed by a former Federal Bureau of Investigation agent, unannounced sampling nearly every month of materials used in highway construction jobs, more emphasis on inspection in depth with detailed field examinations and audits of about 12 projects a year, investigation by Bureau personnel of procedures used in both State highway departments and the Bureau's regional offices and letters and conferences with State officials urging them to improve operations of their highway departments.

These efforts have won a solid measure of praise. A source close to a special subcommittee of the House that has exposed a number of highway scandals and has been critical of some aspects of the program remarked:

"Most of the irregularities that have been uncovered occurred before Whitton took office. He has taken a number of fine corrective measures."

Most of the subcommittee's disclosures involved State officials, although it criticized the Bureau of Public Roads for lax inspection and control procedures.

Whitton's general handling of the Federal aid highway program, as well as his corrective measures, has been commended highly. Informed sources said members of both the special House subcommittee and its parent, the House Public Works Committee, are impressed with his performance. He also has captured the liking and respect of employees under his direction at the Bureau of Public Roads.

Looking to the future, he sees no end to construction of limited-access, dual-lane highways when the present Interstate System is completed in 1972.

"Additional mileage will be needed to serve cities not included in the present system," he stated. "The States already have proposed adding 15,000 miles to the system. In addition, the highways we are building now will have to be expanded by adding lanes if we are to cope with increasing traffic."

Whitton is moving now to prepare for the Nation's future needs. He has begun to gather personnel for a preliminary start on a study of highway requirements after 1972. Beyond this relatively short-range planning, he is looking even further into the future.

"Our research people are beginning to study the kinds of transportation services that will be needed 50 years or more from now," he remarked. "Perhaps something radically different from anything we know today will be required."

Although highway builders frequently are at odds with advocates of mass transportation systems, Whitton said he welcomes rapid transit.

"There is a definite need for it in large metropolitan areas," he said. "Buses running on expressways constitute a very effective system of rapid transportation. If it takes rails or subways, let's have them."

Nonetheless, as might be expected, the Missourian is a strong defender of modern freeways. He differs completely with critics who believe that giant expressways are ugly destroyers of esthetic values that will, in the end, only aggravate, rather than lessen, traffic congestion.

"The Interstate System's proposed circumferential routes and belt loops to disperse traffic in urban areas have not been completed yet in a single metropolitan area," he stated. "When they are, I'm confident we will find traffic being diffused, with congestion substantially reduced. I see no signs that we won't be able to handle the traffic volumes we will have in the future."

Whitton is a sharp variation from the New Frontier pattern of bright and young, but frequently inexperienced, officials who work hard but whose frenetic manner sometimes seems to make their task unnecessarily difficult and complex. Whitton, who will be 65 in August although he looks much younger, has the unruffled calm and assurance that come with experience.

The Oldest Railroadman Lived in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am reminded by a recent article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail that the "oldest railroadman in the world" lived out the second half of his life in West Virginia after building the first railroad in my State. This was Ralph Swinburn, the engineer on the first successful locomotive built by the father of the steam railroad, George Stephenson, in England in 1814.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST RAILROAD—ENGLISH IMMIGRANT BUILT STATE'S FIRST LINE IN KANAWHA COUNTY

(By Phil Conley)

The first steam locomotive was built in England by George Stephenson. It made a successful trial run on July 25, 1814, between a coal mine and a port 9 miles distant. After that, the railroad began carrying passengers and freight on September 25, 1825. Prior to this, throughout the centuries, the most rapid means of transportation was by horses or sailboats.

It was a red-letter day in the history of travel when the first locomotive proved to be successful. The engineer on this locomotive was Ralph Swinburn. This man later lived in West Virginia for 40 years. After the death of George Stephenson, Swinburn came to the United States and arrived in New Orleans in January 1851. From here he traveled to Cincinnati. At this place he met one of the owners of the Winifrede coal mines on Fields Creek, about 12 miles east of Charleston. After a discussion of his experiences with the first railroad in England, he was employed to come to West Virginia and build a railroad from the Winifrede mines to the Kanawha River. This was 20 years before the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad was built through the Kanawha Valley to the Ohio River.

This was the first railroad built in southern West Virginia. In fact, it may be claimed the first completed railroad in the entire State. The Baltimore & Ohio entered West Virginia in 1838. It was completed to Wheeling on Christmas Eve, 1852, and the first through train from the Atlantic Ocean to the Ohio River reached Wheeling on January 1, 1853.

Before a steam locomotive was secured, the Fields Creek Railroad was operated by oxen that pulled the cars up the hill and after they were loaded they were lowered to the river by gravity. Later a locomotive was built and was brought to Fields Creek on a river barge.

After a few years Swinburn tired of railroad construction and operation and bought a farm in 1856 on Davis Creek, about 6 miles from Charleston. He lived there until his death in 1895. He was ordained as a minister of the Baptist Church and engaged in religious work. He built and operated a small waterpower grist mill on his farm.

In 1893, 2 years before Ralph Swinburn died at the age of 90, George W. Summers, editor and publisher of the Charleston Gazette, interviewed him.

In Mr. Swinbur's interview he recalled that the early locomotive had two upright cylinders with a crosshead over the boiler and two rods from the crossheads to the wristpins. It pulled from 16 to 20 cars, holding two and a half tons of coal each. He said the great difficulty was in making steam fast enough.

When he resigned from his position as engineer of the railroad in England, his workmen presented him with a gold watch and chain. On the back of it the inscription was engraved: "Presented to Ralph Swinburn by the plate (track) layers and others under his charge, on the Manchester & Leeds Railway, as a token of respect and esteem, October 9, 1847."

In the interview given to the Gazette in May 1893, is the following statement: "The fact that the oldest railroadman in the world lives within a few miles of Charleston may not be known to many readers of the Gazette, but such is the case. * * * Rev. Ralph Swinburn was associated with George Stephenson, who constructed the first successful locomotive and operated the first locomotive railroad. Mr. Swinburn actually ran Stephenson's first locomotive as engineer and was superintendent of the railroad upon which a locomotive was first successfully run."

The Oppenheimer Security Case of 1954 and the Oppenheimer Fermi Award of 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there are disturbing indications that steps might be taken to restore to Dr. Robert Oppenheimer the security clearance stripped from him in 1954. There is even speculation that he may be in line for appointment to a sensitive post in the Government which does not require Senate confirmation.

Dr. Oppenheimer has been selected to receive the 1963 Enrico Fermi Award. This award is made by the Atomic Energy Commission on the recommendation of its general advisory committee and with the approval of the President. It carries with it a suitable medal, and a $50,000 tax free cash award from the U.S. Treasury, as well as tremendous prestige.

The six previous winners of the award were the following: 1957, Dr. Ernest O. Laurence—cyclotron; 1958, Dr. Eugene Wigner—computers; 1959, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg—plutonium; 1960, no award made; 1961, Dr. Hans A. Bethe—theoretical physics; 1962, Dr. Edward Teller—thermonuclear processes.

Customarily the Enrico Fermi award is presented to the recipient by the President at a White House ceremony late in November or December. As far as is known, no presentation ceremony date for Dr. Oppenheimer has yet been set.

It may readily been seen that it could be a matter of some embarrassment to the President of the United States personally to confer an award carrying this prestige and importance upon a man who is not the beneficiary of a security clearance.

To avoid this embarrassment, two alternatives could be considered: First, give the man back his security clearance and proceed with the ceremony, or second, simply put the medal and the $50,000 check in a package and send it to him by registered mail. Inasmuch as Dr. Oppenheimer already has been a guest of President Kennedy at the White House, it seems unlikely that the second alternative will be adopted.

Dr. Oppenheimer, now at the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N.J., was recommended for the Fermi Award largely on the basis of his contributions to nuclear energy made during the development of the first atomic bomb at Los Alamos, N. Mex. Undoubtedly, Dr. Oppenheimer is a brilliant nuclear physicist. There is little question that his remarkable contributions to nuclear science make him an outstanding candidate for the Fermi Award insofar as the purpose and the award is to recognize such contributions.

However, the purpose of this award, and the reason for these substantial allocation of public funds to a private individual which it involves, is a dual one. First, it is a means of expressing the gratitude of the Nation to one whose intellectual gifts have enabled him to make an unusual and substantial contribution to his fellow citizens. Second, and of equal importance, the Fermi Award is an important means to inspire other gifted men of brilliance to emulate those who have received it.

Dr. Oppenheimer's character defects revealed during the 1954 security hearings strongly disqualified him for the Fermi Award insofar as its second purpose is concerned. But, the nature and extent of his scientific work strongly qualified him for it insofar as its first purpose is concerned. Undoubtedly the decision to select Dr. Oppenheimer was a delicate balance of judgment between his qualifications and his disqualifications. Recognizing this, those who might otherwise have voiced objections when the award was announced on April 5 remained silent.

Their silence should be understood in precisely that context and none other. Neither explicitly nor implicitly does it constitute a condonation or vindication of Dr. Oppenheimer's past actions. It should not be misinterpreted as acquiescense to manuevers to avoid presidential embarrassment or the occasion of the presentation of the award. Nor should it be mistaken for the absence of very vigorous opposition to the restoration of Dr. Oppenheimer's security clearance on any other pretext.

It would constitute a most grievous miscalculation to assume any attempt to place him back in a position of Government responsibility would be tolerated by even a small minority of American people.

On the contrary, the restraint of those who have patiently refrained from voicing their misgivings over this selection for the Fermi Award should be recognized as having very definite limits which already have been reached. These limits are based on the bald facts revealed at the time Dr. Oppenheimer lost his clearance.

Revocation of that security clearance was first recommended by a special three-man panel headed by the esteemed educator, Dr. Gordon Gray. Its 2 to 1 recommendation based on a 922-page record of testimony was upheld by a 4 to 1 vote of the Atomic Energy Commission itself. Among the particulars influencing this verdict were revelations:

First. That Oppenheimer contributed money to the Communist Party through the period of the Hitler-Stalin pact up until sometime in 1942.

Second. That his wife had been a member of the Communist Party.

Third. That his brother Frank had joined the Communist Party in 1936 or 1937 for a period of approximately 4 years.

Fourth. That his intimate friend, Jean Tatlock, was a member of the Communist Party.

Fifth. That he frequently consorted with a fellow traveler named Haakon Chevalier.

Sixth. That Steve Nelson, a well-known Communist, was a frequent guest in Oppenheimer's home.

Seventh. That Oppenheimer lied either to a military intelligence agent, or the Gray Board itself, concerning an attempt by Chevalier to obtain information about the atomic bomb.

Eighth. That he had recommended an identified Communist, Giovanni Rossi Lomanitz, for work in the atomic project during World War II.

Canvassing these and other facts, the Gray Board came to the following conclusions:

> 1. We find that Dr. Oppenheimer's continuing conduct and associations have reflected a serious disregard for the requirements of the security program.
>
> 2. We have found a susceptibility to influence which could have serious implications for the security interests of the country.
>
> 3. We find his conduct in the hydrogen bomb program (Oppenheimer fought the development of the H-bomb) sufficiently disturbing as to raise a doubt as to whether his future participation, if characterized by the same attitudes in a government program relating to the national defense, would be clearly consistent with the best interests of security.
>
> 4. We have regretfully concluded that Dr. Oppenheimer has been less than candid in several instances in his testimony before this Board.

When Oppenheimer appealed this judgment to the full Atomic Energy Commission, that body came to the following verdict:

> We find Dr. Oppenheimer is not entitled to the continued confidence of the Government and of this commission because of the proof of fundamental defects in his "character" * * * The record shows that Dr. Oppenheimer has consistently placed himself outside the rules which govern others. He has falsified in matters wherein he was charged with grave responsibilities in the national interest.

And—

> The work of the military intelligence, the FBI, and the AEC—all, at one time or another, have felt the effect of his falsehoods, evasions and misrepresentations. Dr. Oppenheimer's willful disregard for the obligations of security is evidenced by his obstruction of inquiries of security officials.

And—

> We find that his associations with persons known by him to be Communists have extended far beyond the tolerable limits of prudence and self-restraint. * * * These associations have lasted too long to be justified as merely the intermittent and accidental revival of earlier friendships.

In light of the foregoing, I suggest that President Kennedy has an obligation to bear whatever personal embarrassment may be occasioned when the award is presented and to make certain matters very clear and definite at the time he presents the Enrico Fermi Award to Dr. Oppenheimer. Amongst these are the following:

First. That the award does not condone the recipient's actions which lost him his security clearance.

Second. That the President does not condone the recipient's action which lost him his security clearance.

Third. That the award does not in any manner relieve Dr. Oppenheimer of the opprobrium of the 1954 security case.

Fourth. That the award does not in any way indicate a relaxation of security vigilance on the part of the United States.

Fifth. That the award in this instance has the single purpose of recognizing past scientific contributions and constitutes the one and only exception wherein the dual-purpose nature of the award is ever to be ignored.

Sixth. That Dr. Oppenheimer shall not be considered eligible for government employment of any kind.

Steps Toward Elimination of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the South Carolina Methodist Advocate, of June 27, 1963, has printed an outstanding editorial which outlines concisely steps that are being taken toward eliminating freedom in America. The editorial, written by Rev. A. McKay Brabham, Jr., is appropriately entitled "Steps Toward Freedom's End." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> VIEWS AND REVIEW: STEPS TOWARD FREEDOM'S END
>
> From our reading of history of the past and present centuries, we recall some steps which have been taken effectively to bring an end to freedom and expedite the control of the people by governments in power.
>
> They are:
>
> 1. Devaluation of the currency, either through inflation or by direct government action. This has the effect of wiping out personal savings, and increases the necessity for dependence upon government patronage of the needy. This in turn affects the vote of those hesitant to endanger their personal economic security.
>
> 2. Loss of confidence in the integrity of government, which in turn helps condition a nation to accept the "strong-man" theory. France has illustrated this in recent years.
>
> 3. Control of the polls by a central government, with qualifications for voting determined by the same.
>
> 4. The abolition of property rights, which thereby removes the ability to sustain life without recourse to handouts from governmental authority.
>
> 5. Control of the educational process by the same authority.
>
> 6. The exercise by the central government of police power above and beyond the necessities of military defense and necessity.
>
> 7. The depreciation of religion, and the relegation of its practice to areas outside of the areas of conflict and involvement in daily life.
>
> Which of these steps have already been taken, and which are now proposed for our Nation, each of us may see for himself.
>
> Regardless of the reasons for taking these steps; whether it be in freedom's name, or as outright steps toward the achievement of dictatorship, when these things have been accomplished in a nation's life, then "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" has perished from that portion of the earth.
>
> It may well be one of the ironies which history so often records that 100 years after a war which abolished slavery, that the racial descendants of those same slaves will be used to help bring about the entire enslavement of an entire nation of all races.
>
> We are now on one of history's borderlines. Perhaps only the Negro can answer the question which history is asking—is he politically, socially, spiritually, mature enough to refrain from taking by force that which a different course will grant him through moral and spiritual persuasion? If not, then we can see him used for political purposes by those who will help the walls of freedom for all to come tottering down as he battles for his rights.
>
> In the meantime, we can wish that all of our countrymen might take a week off in which to read and reflect upon "The Coming Fury" by Bruce Catton.

Hospital Insurance Under Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the debate over the merits of the bill for hospital insurance under social security continues. I attribute this to the wide support which this proposal has found with the American people.

In the debate two questions often arise: First, What is the present status of the OASI trust funds? and, second, How do the costs of administration of different types of health insurance compare?

We have received an excellent reply to these two questions from the Honorable Ivan Nestingen, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. His letter of June 28, 1963, sets out this information with such clarity that I ask unanimous consent that the letter be inserted in the RECORD. The letter follows:

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, June 28, 1963.

Hon. DONALD M. FRASER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FRASER: This is in reply to your recent inquiry about the nature and assets of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance trust funds. In order to fully answer your questions, it is necessary to provide a somewhat detailed explanation of the way the social security program is financed.

The program is designed to be self-supporting and is completely financed by the special social security taxes paid by employees, their employers, and the self-employed. All of these taxes are automatically put into two trust funds, one for the old-age and survivors insurance part of the program and one for the disability insurance part.

The money in the two trust funds is kept separate and doesn't get involved with the general funds of the Treasury. Under the law the money can be used only to pay benefits and administrative expenses of the program. Any other use of it is illegal. The money not currently needed for these purposes is invested in interest-earning securities issued by the Federal Government. The interest received on these investments helps support the program.

The total income of the social security system from 1937, when the program began, to the end of 1962 was $114.7 billion. About $7.7 billion of this total was interest from the trust funds. The remainder was from social security taxes.

By the end of 1962, $94 billion had been paid out in this fashion: $90.1 billion for benefits; $1.4 billion transferred to the railroad retirement system; and $2.5 billion for administration costs. On January 1, 1963, the balance in the trust funds was $20.7 billion.

Securities held by the trust funds are not IOU's issued by the Government to itself. In investing their receipts in Government securities the trust funds are lenders, and the U.S. Treasury is the borrower. These Government obligations are assets of the funds and they are liabilities of the U.S. Government.

The debt obligations held by the trust funds are shown in Treasury reports as a part of the Federal debt, and interest payments on these obligations are regularly made by the Treasury to the trust funds.

In substance, the investments of the trust funds are similar to, and perform the same function as a private insurance company's investment of current premium receipts not needed for payments or operating expenses. In both cases, earnings on these investments make possible a lower rate of contributions or premiums than would otherwise be required.

You also asked me about the costs involved in the administration of different types of health insurance programs for the aged in comparison to these costs for the administration's proposed hospital insurance program for the aged. The President's program could be administered at a net additional cost of 3 percent while the cost of administering private health insurance programs sometimes runs as high as 50 percent of premium income.

Individual commercial health insurance (rather than group insurance) has substantially higher overhead costs than group insurance, whether the group insurance is provided by a private company or by the Government through a social insurance program such as is recommended by the President. Group commercial insurance is generally designed for employee groups and the retired aged generally have no choice but to buy health insurance on an individual basis.

Just how vast a difference there is between the administrative expenses of group and individual insurance is clearly reflected in their average loss ratios—the ratio of benefits paid out to premiums received. As the enclosed table, published in Medical Economics, June 4, 1962, indicates, group insurance plans paid out in benefits about 90 percent of premium income, while individual insurance plans paid out in benefits only 52.9 percent of premium income in 1960. This table also gives the percent of premiums paid out in benefits by four of the major individual health insurance carriers. As you will note, the ratio of benefits to premiums for these companies ranges from 46.2 to 60.9 percent.

It is true, of course, that the percent of premium income retained by the carrier does not represent only administrative costs. However, administrative costs account for by far the major portion of the amount retained—generally about 30 and 40 percent of premium income in the case of individual insurance.

Further information on individual health insurance costs may be found in the annual sales and survey number of the Health Insurance Review, or the annual edition of the Argus Chart of Health Insurance, both of which are publications of the National Underwriter Co.

The difference in administrative costs between group and individual insurance results basically from the fact that under group insurance promotion and selling efforts are concentrated at one point rather than at many individuals, and premium collection is handled efficiently by the employer. Commissions under group insurance are low per unit of insurance; premiums for thousands of insured persons are collected from one person (the employer deducting the employees' share from their pay as under the social insurance programs); other expenses, including those of policywriting (the employer has a master contract, the employees brief certificates), are reduced to a minimum.

Under a social insurance program, which is essentially group insurance, there is an even further reduction in costs over that incurred by private group insurance carriers since there would be no selling or promotion costs.

We have estimated, in determining the financial requirements of a social security hospital insurance program for the aged, that the use of the existing old-age, survivors, and disability insurance administrative machinery would make it possible to carry out the administration's proposed plan with additional operating costs of about 3 percent of the benefit costs.

This is so because, in addition to the fact that social insurance is group insurance, the proposed program would add little if any new cost to collecting the taxes, keeping earnings records, processing claims for eligibility for benefits, and many of the other necessary functions.

Thus, adequate health insurance protection could be provided for the aged more economically through social security than under any other mechanism.

Sincerely,

IVAN A. NESTINGEN.

Hon. Robert L. F. Sikes

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to note that our distinguished colleague, BOB SIKES, has now served in the Congress longer than any previous Representative of his great State of Florida. This distinction is well merited and reflects the dedicated nature of his service. He is an able and articulate legislator, an outstanding officer in the Army and above all, a man of sound character. I value greatly his friendship and join most enthusiastically in this well-deserved tribute. Such men as BOB SIKES reflect credit on this body and strengthen the Nation.

Making Democracy Work Better

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, among the excellent essays submitted in the McGee Senate Internship contest were thoughtful compositions by honorable mention winners Kristy Kay Smith of Newcastle, Wyo., and Roselind Lindau of Cheyenne East High School.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two essays by these young ladies be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK BETTER

(By Kristy Kay Smith, Newcastle, Wyo.)

American, you are faced with a challenge—the challenge of democracy. In John Hallowell's "Moral Foundation of Democracy" is this warning: "No government is more easily susceptible to disintegration into anarchy than a democracy, and in no government does the choice between order and anarchy depend so largely upon the thoughts, actions, and decisions of individuals. If democracy fails the fault lies clearly with the people themselves. This is their government; this is their opportunity and this is their responsibility." This is a statement of the challenge to every citizen of the United States.

Democracy cannot be defined as a tangible object or as a material value; instead it must be defined as the spirit of the people which has created an attitude. The American attitude is based on the ideal of equality and the ideal of freedom. This attitude not only gives us a form of government but also a way of life.

Every man has goals he has set to reach, and democracy has given him the foundation for these goals. The aims of democracy include liberty, justice, self-government, peace, opportunity, prosperity, and a great measure of economic security for all. One can readily see that striving for these goals and succeeding will make the man's life a success. The success of a nation is dependent upon the measure of attainment of its individuals.

The man living in a democracy may count himself lucky, and yet the fact that he is a free man in society will not in itself keep the nation strong. Each American must accept the challenge of democracy and assume the responsibility for its success.

Our national tendency is to regard nations who do not have democracy as inferior and then to rush to them with broad glittering generalities inviting them to accept our way of life. The other nation quietly inspects the United States for an example of all that has been promised by democracy. In actuality, these nations have no background for a democratic type of government; moreover, many of these same nations do not share our belief that our way of life is successful. As Americans, our first concern may well be: How is a democracy working in the United States?

In a recent poll taken in seven midwestern States, the people could not name their State senator 63 percent of the time. They could not name their Representatives 71 percent of the time. And when asked about the political affiliations of these men, the percentage that could not answer was even greater, 83 percent. This in itself points to a serious weakness in our awareness of governmental procedures, but the fact most terrifying was that these people actually did not care. "What difference does it make to me who is in Washington?"

Americans are failing themselves and their Government by not accepting the responsibility of citizenship. The title of this essay can give a clue to the solution if the word "word" is put into action. If Americans are failing, they must be educated to their challenge. In years past the people have risen to every challenge presented. The fact that we are failing now could very well mean that the American has lost sight of the challenge and the goals he is to attain.

The solution is simple on paper: Give the American the stimulus to accept his responsibility, teach him our democratic heritage, and instill the love of his country more deeply into his everyday life.

In practice many problems arise, but my plan to make democracy work better is—

1. Teach democracy in the schools.
2. Teach democracy in the homes.
3. Teach democracy in everyday life.

The duty of the school would be one of giving the student a background of our country and to make him feel as close to the Government as possible. It should give him knowledge of actual situations where democracy has worked for the benefit of all mankind.

At home one must learn that democracy can be practiced on all levels. A child cannot be expected to learn something unless he sees it in action and actually has a part in the action himself. Patriotic holidays can be observed as a family, not just a vacation but as a meaningful day in the child's life. It must be meaningful to him, or the act of celebration is merely hypocritical.

The common belief that patriotism is for sissies and old women must be eliminated. When the father or mother fails to be patriotic or openly derides patriotic ideas, the child naturally does too.

Day to day living is the most important step of education. Here the results show, and the value of the lessons learned can be appreciated. The child must have the interest in democracy kept alive and never for one moment permitted to believe it is only a way of thinking.

The schools must present the challenge, the homes must keep the challenge alive, and everyday living must give the opportunity to meet the challenge of democracy.

Adults must be reeducated also. This is more difficult because they have had the foundation, but the spirit of democracy has momentarily died. It must be rekindled to an ever-burning fire to meet our greatest challenge.

The adult must be interested in government to keep democracy safeguarded. Our word democracy can again be defined from its origin, demos the Greek for "the people" and kratein, Greek meaning "to rule." The adult must realize this and fulfill his duty by caring openly about his Government.

A democracy respects the dignity of an individual. It respects the intelligence of the people and gives them the responsibility to make their own decisions. This way of life is not for weaklings—it is for Americans. Americans who realize that the challenge of democracy is not only to remain democratic, but to live by the ideals of equality and freedom, can make the United States a working democracy.

The words of Thomas Jefferson give us the method for democracy to become our only way of life.

"Be generous in practicing liberty.

"Value all human beings.

"Find in equality the solution to the problem of a free society.

"Cherish solidarity.

"Be reasonable and moderate."

Go out and live today, keeping in mind that "without God's help you cannot succeed; with it you cannot fail." With this philosophy, you, John Q. Citizen, will meet the challenge of democracy.

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK BETTER

(By Roselind Lindau)

To arrive at methods of making our Government work better, it might be helpful to examine the origin of the world democracy. It is derived from the Greek demos, meaning people, plus kratein, to rule; thus, the literal translation is rule of the people. Democracy began in Athens in pure or absolute form. That is, each citizen cast a vote for issues facing the city. For example, if funds were needed for civic improvement, all voters gave their opinions—in the form of ballots.

This type of democracy seems ideal, but actually, it has two major weaknesses. The first, and most apparent frailty is inability to act quickly. When an enemy attacked the city, each citizen was given the choice of resisting or surrendering. Although such action is democratic, it is highly impractical, since the enemy could gain a victory while all the free men argued over strategy. As the population (of Athens) increased, the Government became more and more unwieldy.

In spite of its shortcoming, we still regard the Greek democracy as our model, ignoring an important fact. Even though all voters expressed themselves directly, there remained a question in the definition of a voter. The slaves who supported Athen's economy had no voice, nor did the women. Only a select group was given the privilege of participating in self-rule.

America's Founding Fathers recognized, as had been recognized now for hundreds of years, that a representative democracy, in which people elected others to speak for them, was more practical. However, highly educated men, such as Washintgon, Jefferson, Madison, and Adams, did not have quite enough confidence in the larger part of the population to allow each person a real vote. Instead they established the electoral college to put a curb on the power of the (uneducated) masses. In addition, they denied voting rights to slaves and to women, as had the Greeks.

Although women were legally granted the right to vote after salves were freed, the latter has had a greater struggle in being allowed to use his rights. From our vantage points in the North, we find it easy to righteously condemn southerners for their lack of tolerance. Actually, we aren't asking them to tolerate Negroes, but are demanding that they like and accept all Negroes. This is certainly an unreasonable request, since it is impossible to like all the members of one race. (We don't like al white people; yet we admonish southerners because they are not friendly with all colored people.) What we must impress upon residents of Southern States is that personal opinion should have no bearing on civil rights, and that when they bar Negroes from the polls, they are endangering their own voting privileges.

Privilege is indeed an apt word to use in reference to voting, for it is just that to be able to elect our own officials. Nevertheless, people who can vote, frequently don't, either because of laziness, disinterest, or lack of self-confidence. Voting leagues and "get-out and vote" campaigns help alleviate the situation somewhat. Still, it is rather tragic that the greatest democracy in the world has one of the lowest percentages of voters taking part in national elections.

The persons who do vote mistakenly believe that their responsibility has ended when they drop their ballot in the box. On the contrary, their job has just begun. The person who learned about current issues in order to judge the qualifications of a candidate, must continue to learn, in order to make sure that the candidate is carrying out his duties and keeping (or trying to keep) campaign promises. We tend to place the load of furthering our interests solely on the shoulders of our Congressmen, sending them off to Washington with all sorts of good wishes, and then forgetting about them.

We elect men to the Senate and House of Representatives to represent our best interests, but we don't always tell them just what we regard as our best interests. Also, but we seldom hear anymore the plaintive call of the irate citizen, demanding the recall of his Congressman. If we were to ask a random voter if he had recently written, or even had considered writing to his Senator, we might expect the following reply: "I thought about it, but one letter wouldn't make any difference anyway." Such a statement reflects the lack of self-confidence or confidence in the individual, which was mentioned earlier. Of course, one letter alone doesn't carry much weight, but hundreds or thousands of "one's" add up to a lot of influence.

Although, according to the Constitution, we are governed by the majority, we have let minorities rule. Labor organizations, big business, and many other groups wield a tremendous amount of power. There is nothing wrong with this, as long as we remember that organizations are composed of individuals, and shouldn't be considered merely as collections of anonymous people. The motto, "United we stand, divided we fall," is fine, but let's not get so carried away with organizing that we forget to think independently.

Because Americans are no longer willing to assume responsibility for their mistakes, they have created a scapegoat: the Federal Government. Today the words Federal Government conjure an image of some kind of monster that is leading everyone toward socialism. We ignore the fact that our representatives in Washington are speaking for us and trying to pass laws we want. In effect, we are the Federal Government. If unfavorable programs are undertaken, it is because the voters gave them approval, either by ballot or by actions. When we sit back and criticize Congress without doing anything, we convey the impression that we really don't care. By taking an active part in our Government and by keeping ourselves informed, we can make democracy work better. We must put the demos (people) back into democracy.

Foolhardy Practices of Federal Bureaucracy Seen in Area Redevelopment Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include the following editorial, "Expansive, Expensive, and Expendable," from the July 11 issue of the Wall Street Journal. It points out the failure of the Area Redevelopment Administration and clearly demonstrates why the program should be abolished:

EXPANSIVE, EXPENSIVE, AND EXPENDABLE

Before the House is tempted to reverse itself on the question of expanding the Area Redevelopment Administration, it could profitably review that agency's sorry record as it was unfolded in the House itself.

Last month the House refused to endorse a bill to grant the ARA an additional $455 million, atop the $380 million it already has. The Senate, however, has now passed an almost identical bill, so the House soon may be given another look at this program of so-called aid to distressed areas.

But debate during its previous look last month showed that the ARA operation had been poorly administered and funds often ill used. It did little to decrease unemployment. In some areas, it actually created additional unemployment when it encouraged industries to relocate, leaving behind former employees unable to find new work. It also provided federally subsidized competition with industries which already were laying off workers.

Not only that, but more than half of ARA funds have been going into rural areas, instead of those regions of hardcore unemployment the plan supposedly was designed to help. For instance, the largest single ARA project undertaken was a recreation program in Oklahoma, and a full fourth of its loans and grants have been for hotel and motel construction.

On its face, ARA theory of siphoning funds into questionable make-work enterprises is hard to defend. On the record, a reasonable defense is hardly possible. If the whole thing were not a political boodoggle calculated to entice Congressmen, this expansive proposal would doom itself.

Private Property and Personal Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there is nothing more dear to a liberty loving people than freedom of association and the right to have and hold private property and to make whatever use of it they wish.

The right to private property is so much a part of the personal liberty enjoyed by the people of the United States that it must be kept inviolate. Deny man the right "to do as he will with his own" and he is no longer free.

An excellent commentary on this subject, which I found exceedingly appropriate in times like these when it would appear that the Federal Government, instead of endeavoring to protect our liberties, is bent on destroying them, will be broadcast July 12 on the "Life Line" program from Washington.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of this broadcast be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

RIGHT OF PRIVATE PROPERTY

This is Life Line, James Dobbs from Washington.

Personal rights are the very foundation of the American way of life. They are written into our Constitution, taught in our schools and colleges, guarded by law and due process of law, and held up as an example to the world. The United States of America became an independent nation to secure the personal rights of every American, and that is still the noblest purpose of our Nation.

Let's take a close, hard look at the personal right we are in the greatest danger of losing in our time. And let us try to understand why we must keep that right if any of our personal rights are to survive in the long run.

Let's look at the right of private property.

The right of private property was always included in the primary list of basic personal rights by the great political thinkers of earlier times who built up the case for freedom. John Locke, who has been called the father of the American Revolution and of our Constitution because his ideas showed the way for both, spoke often of the fundamental rights of life, liberty and property. Thomas Jefferson, when he prepared his draft of the Declaration of Independence—the best-known statement of the American idea of personal rights—changed "property" to the more poetic "pursuit of happiness." By this change Jefferson probably meant to include an even greater range of human freedom than was covered by the term "property." He certainly did not mean to downgrade property as a personal right.

Still later, the 14th amendment to the Constitution declared that no State shall deprive any of its citizens of the basic rights of life, liberty or property "without due process of law."

Actually, as Jefferson's use of the term "pursuit of happiness" makes especially clear, the three right cannot be separated; each is necessary to both of the others. Obviously we must begin with the right to life. But it was the firm conviction of every man who fought in the American Revolution that life without liberty was not worth having. So the right to life could only be given meaning when it stood side by side with the right to liberty.

But what is liberty? It is each person's freedom to act, to live and to work as he alone may choose, independent of any restraint, except on rare occasions by the courts through full legal process. A right to liberty without the chance to use it would be as valueless as a right to life without the liberty to live it. And the active use of liberty, for the vast majority of men, means the earning and owning of property as a result of their freely chosen personal work. Their property may be of many different kinds and held in widely varying amounts. But the right to personal property honestly earned and owned is absolutely necessary if the rights to life and liberty are not to become a hollow sham.

Now in recent years we have all heard a great deal about human rights as somehow opposed to property rights. We are told that we must often make a choice between the two, in favor of one and against the other, especially when applying the powers of centralized government against the citizen. Men tell us they are proud to stand for human rights at the expense of property rights, that human rights are good but property rights are so dangerous that they must be limited drastically. A favorite device for undermining property rights and putting them in a bad light is to say or imply that only the very wealthy are concerned about them.

But the right of private property is of the most vital importance to every man who owns anything at all. If you own a home or a car or a plot of land, if you have an income of your own or can even lay claim to the clothes on your back, you have a stake in maintaining the right of private property, a stake that is just as big for you as a whole business empire may be for the man who owns it. There is not a breadwinner in America whose personal freedom is not threatened by attacks on the right of private property.

As for the talk of human rights versus property rights—there is no more striking example of twisted and mistaken thinking than this. For the right to earn and own property is, always was and always will be a natural human right, a human and personal right that must be preserved if any of our other rights are to be worth having. If we cannot use our liberty to earn and own, then there is no real liberty; and where there is no real liberty, there is no productive and meaningful life. Suppose for a moment that the mistaken were correct, and private property wasn't a basic human right. If not a right, then it can only be a privilege, and a privilege, by definition, is something which can be denied at any time for no good reason. For example: I have a right to walk across my own land; but I have only a privilege to walk across my neighbor's land, which he can deny me at any time he may wish.

If private property is not a right, but only a privilege, then it can be restricted or completely abolished at any time by any force strong enough to do so. Any man's property may be seized, and any man's chance to earn and own sharply limited. And there is this to remember about property. Unlike life or liberty, it is transferable. When property is taken from one man or a group of men, it must pass to another man or group of men. And so we can't help wondering, could it be that some of those who talk most loudly about the unimportance of property rights are just possibly more than a little interested in getting control of other people's property for themselves? * * * the Communist nations have found that they cannot yet take all private property away from their citizens, because most of them simply will not work without it. But those who live under communism are left with the barest minimum of property, and new experiments are constantly being tried in a search for ways to wean the people away from their stubborn devotion to private property. The Chinese communes were a particularly horrible experiment of this kind.

Here in America today we tend to feel that if we give the Government power to take (without due process of law) only parts of large property holdings, there is no danger and the results will be good. But once the right of private property is violated anywhere, for any reason, it becomes that much easier to violate that right again, and again, and again whenever it may be convenient for the Government to do so. The only safe ways to permit any man's property to be taken against his will are through the carefully safeguarded procedures of our courts, or with full compensation for its value, or by taxation specifically voted by elected legislators. The discretion of bureaucrats unchecked by law has no place in this area. Private property as a basic human right cannot be allowed to depend for its preservation on any man's whim.

The right of private property has been described in the simplest possible terms as each man's right "to do as he will with his own." This means that if a man owns a house he may rightfully decide who is to live in it; if he owns a business he may rightfully decide who is to work in it; if he has a profession he may rightfully decide whom to accept as clients; if he has written a book he may rightfully decide who will be permitted to print it; if he owns farmland he may rightfully decide what crops to grow and how much to grow upon it. The Constitution does give Congress the power to regulate trade, the buying and selling of goods, the exchange of property. But before a man takes his goods to market, while they are still entirely his property, his right to have them and use them should be absolute.

But today that right is far from absolute, and its denial is the source of grave danger. The danger is obvious when we see how closely the right of private property touches the right of personal liberty, when we speak of what a man does in privacy with his own. One of the best examples is that of the ranch owner who grew feed grains on a small part of his ranch solely for the use of his own livestock. He neither bought nor sold grain; it never left the land which was his property. Yet the Federal Department of Agriculture moved in to tell him that he could not grow grain on his own property for his own use; that they had the power and the right to regulate what he grew, even for this purpose. This action violated both the basic human rights of liberty and property.

If we look very closely, we can begin to see in the campaign against property rights, and the attempts to isolate them from other rights and downgrade their importance, a particularly clever divide-and-conquer tactic of the mistaken enemies of freedom. The mistaken know they can never persuade free Americans to give up all their personal rights at once. But, by singling out the right of private property for special treatment, by mixed appeals to noble if naive motives of charity and to base motives of envy, the mistaken have brought the right of private property into real jeopardy today. People are listening to their teaching that property is a lesser right than life and liberty. If this campaign succeeds, the next step is clear, a similar attack on the idea of liberty, as "selfish" and "not public spirited," as ruling out supposedly necessary sacrifices to the State. Beyond that remains only the right to life, as a slave; and that is the ultimate goal of the mistaken in their divide-and-conquer attack on personal rights.

Until we meet again, remember freedom is indivisible. It cannot be weighed and measured in parts, or cut into pieces. We cannot give up a little now and expect to get more back later. Freedom stands or falls as a whole.

Unmasking German Plans in Egypt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, the papers have been full of stories regarding German rocket scientists and technicians in Egypt. This situation is most dangerous to the peace of the Middle East and therefore should be of concern to all security minded Americans. In this connection, the latest issue to Prevent World War III—No. 62, summer 1963—published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., a nonprofit educational organization, 24 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., has printed an important exposé on this problem entitled "Unmasking German Plans in Egypt." I therefore commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

UNMASKING GERMAN PLANS IN EGYPT

In the previous issue of Prevent World War III (No. 61) we published a study (German-Egyptian Rocketry) dealing with the activities of German rocket scientists and technicians in Egypt. The subject has now become a front page story and its repercussions have been felt from Cairo and Tel Aviv to Bonn and Washington.

Many people were surprised to learn that Egypt was harboring Germans with the scientific know-how for the development of weapons of mass destruction. However, to readers of Prevent World War III this should come as no surprise at all. Ten years ago, Prevent World War III published a detailed exposé concerning German penetration in the Middle East, entitled "Berlin-Baghdad Again." For those who may not recall this analysis or who are unfamiliar with its contents, we should like to recapitulate some of its essential points.

BACKGROUND FACTS

The article was written a few months following the overthrow of King Farouk in Egypt. In that connection Newsweek (Aug. 25, 1952) reported that General Naguib who was the nominal leader of the coup, was being guided by German military brass. This is what Newsweek said: "There is no evidence that the Germans initiated the coup. It is however known that the young officers who did the actual planning consulted the German advisers as to 'tactics.' The Cairo reports attribute the smoothness of the operation to German advice. Also, the young officers are reported to have chosen General Naguib as their leader on German advice. Later, Naguib publicly praised the work of the German advisory group thus giving it an official stamp."

The leading adviser to Naguib was the German Gen. Wilhelm Fahrmbacher. General Fahrmbacher had been corps commander in the Nazi army during World War II and had, at one time, been held by the French as a war criminal. Among his associates was Maj. Gen. Oscar Munzel who was considered a great favorite in the German officer caste. Another member of the German military who played an important role in the Egyptian Army, was Gerhard Mertins. He was a veteran of the Nazi air invasion of Crete. In 1945, Mertins served as a battalion commander during the Nazi offensive in Western Europe. His assignment in Egypt was to teach specially selected Egyptian units the art of parachute jumping and attack.

The article pointed out that, while the number of German military officers was a closely guarded secret, "it is known that the Egyptians had set up an office in Germany to recruit German specialists who served under Field Marshal Gen. Erwin Rommel in the North African campaign of World War II." It was also indicated that Naguib's German military advisers possessed valid West German passports and traveled freely between Egypt and Germany.

The article noted that the German military influence in Cairo was followed by an influx of important German industrialists. Thus, Albert Degener became responsible for the operations of the German-Egyptian Chamber of Commerce in Cairo. Degener had headed a similar organization in the United States up to the outbreak of war between Nazi Germany and our country. While in the United States, Degener proved to be an active propagandist and apologist for Nazi Germany. As late as May 16, 1940, he worked assiduously to organize German war relief among German-Americans while the Nazis were attacking France and Great Britain. Walter Rohland, another influential German industrialist, helped to direct the building of a German steel plant in Egypt. As one of Germany's industrial war lords, Rohland was a key figure in the German steel industry which had profited greatly from Hitler's wars of aggression.

Besides military and economic penetration, the Germans mounted a "cultural" offensive. The aim was to inculcate among the Egyptians appreciation for German cultural works. German professors were brought to the University of Alexandria, and it was proposed that the German language should be made compulsory in Egyptian schools.

MORE FACTS

Three years after we had carried this initial article, Prevent World War III published another piece on the same subject, entitled "Middle East Caldron." Additional data was supplied concerning the large numbers of German militarists and war criminals who had gained key posts in the Egyptian military setup. It was brought out that there were at least 600 German technicians working in various fields, particularly in the military. In this connection reference was made to Dr. Wilhelm Voss who had once been a prominent leader in the war economy of Hitler's Third Reich. On the recommendation of the West German Government in February 1951, Voss was appointed by the Egyptian Government as head of the central planning board. In that capacity he served as the chief adviser to the War Ministry in Egypt. The reliable German weekly Der Spiegel (Oct. 26, 1955) reported that under Voss command "were employed more than 50 German military and armament experts." Der Spiegel revealed that Dr. Voss maintained intimate contacts not only with Chancellor Adenauer's chief diplomatic aids, Blankenhorn and Hallstein, "but also with the highest officers in * * * the Bonn War Ministry."

One year later, Prevent World War III (No. 49) carried an article which examined the nature of Egyptian propaganda. It was brought out that "Prof. Johann van Leers, a former top Nazi propagandist, was * * * masterminding Egypt's propaganda campaign." Van Leers, this article observed, was head of a "corps of Nazis reputedly numbering 200 in the service of President Nasser." In his youth, van Leers was a member of the notorious Freicorps, one of the precursors of the Nazi movement. As early as 1929, he joined the Nazi Party. He was also an official of the German foreign office. In 1936, he was accepted as a member of the German general staff with the rank of major. Van Leers' main talent lay in the field of propaganda. Thus, he served Goebbels and was the chief editor of Goebbels' journal Wille und Weg (the Will and the Way).

In the No. 50 issue of Prevent World War III we continued to examine the Nazi influence in Egyptian propaganda. We published an article showing how Hitler's "Mein Kampf" had become a bestseller among Egyptian officers. Another article in this same issue revealed how former German Nazis had taken control of Nasser's punitive forces. This element was responsible for the ruthless elimination of all opposition to Nasser and for the setting up of concentration camps.

In the next issue of Prevent World War III (No. 51), we ran a full length article dealing with the role played by Nasser and his associates in working for the German General Staff during World War II. This information was culled from a book written by one of President Nasser's closest colleagues, Col. Anwar el Sadat. In his book, "Revolt on the Nile," Sadat recounts the story of how Nasser and a group of young Egyptian officers collaborated with the forces of the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis against the Allied Powers. With regard to the services rendered to the

Fascist axis by Nasser and his friends, Colonel Sadat wrote: "We made contact with the German headquarters in Libya and we acted in complete harmony with them."

Sadat is candid enough to tell us that Nasser and his cohorts were resolved "to fight side by side with the Axis." Even after the war Sadat expressed his sympathies for the Axis. Thus, when asked in 1951 by an Egyptian magazine how he would appraise Hitler's activities 8 years after his death and what advice he would give the Fuehrer, should he appear again, Sadat replied: "Dear Hitler, I welcome you back with all my heart. You have been defeated, but in fact one should regard you as the real victor: There will be no place in the world until Germany again takes first place. Your main mistake was in opening too many fronts, but everything has been forgiven, for you are a shining example of belief in one's fatherland and people. You are eternal, and we shall not be surprised if we see you again, or a second Hitler, back in Germany." This is the man who is one of the foremost figures in the Egyptian Government today.

GERMAN AID

This brief review of what Prevent World War III wrote in the past, provides the background for what is now occurring in Egypt. It is not by chance that German technicians and scientists are working for the Egyptian military establishment. Actually, this cooperation is the result of official agreements between the West German Government and Egypt. Indeed, one of these agreements reached in 1960, provided that the Germans would "help the UAR in the development of its atomic research for nuclear development."

However, this is only one facet of the collaboration which has been going on for a number of years. Thus, during the last 4 years, it has been reliably reported, that West German economic aid to Egypt has been larger than either Soviet or American assistance. Since 1959, the Germans have set up 76 plants in Egypt whereas the Russians have built 53 and the United States 28. The number of German scientists and technicians runs into the thousands. It is difficult to arrive at a firm figure because many of the Germans have taken on Arabic names and have married Egyptian women. Nevertheless, it is estimated that of these thousands there are at least 300 German scientists and technicians who are specialists in nuclear armaments. Some of these Germans have boasted that part of the program of German-Egyptian collaboration is financed by the hundreds of millions of dollars given to the Nasser government by the Soviet Union and the United States. While these Germans work assiduously in Egypt, scores of Egyptian students have been sent to the West, particularly to West Germany where they are trained.

The building up of the Egyptian Air Force, according to the noted British correspondent Sefton Delmer, is now under the direction of "Hitler's ace designer, Prof. Willy Messerschmidt" (Sunday Telegraph, Mar. 31, 1963). Shortly after the end of the war, Messerschmidt showed up in Spain, where, under the benevolent protection of Franco, he worked on new designs for fighter aircraft. Having completed his "tour of duty" in Spain, Messerschmidt moved to Cairo to take over direction of the 300 German aircraft technicians working there.

Messerschmidt told Delmer that these German experts were building a powerful jet fighter for President Nasser "in two vast factory complexes on the Nile." This aircraft, Delmer reports, "is designed as a powerful weapon of attack." Messerschmidt informed Delmer that as much as £100 million (approximately $300 million) have gone into the project so far. The funds, Delmer reports, come from the revenues which Nasser obtains from the Suez Canal. Here is another source of aid for Nasser's military buildup which comes primarily from the West.

ALARM AND RESPONSE

It is, of course, understandable that the Government of Israel is deeply alarmed over this situation. Israel's Foreign Minister, Mrs. Golda Meir, made it clear that the West German Government could not claim that it had no responsibility for this situation. Following her speech, the Parliament of Israel unanimously adopted a resolution declaring that it was "the duty" of the German Government to put "an immediate end to this dangerous activity of its citizens * * *" The resolution also stated that, "the German people cannot exempt themselves of the responsibility for the continuation of this vile work."

The initial reaction of the West German Government to these charges was evasive. Anonymous spokesmen for the West German Government declared that Bonn had no legal means to prevent German scientists from working in Egypt. Another unnamed government source declared that legislative action to control the movement of West German citizens abroad or to limit their activities "was out of the question." The Federal Republic, according to his view, "is a nation of law" and the freedom of movement of its citizens is guaranteed (New York Times, Mar. 22, 1963). Guenther von Hase, the official spokesman for the German Government, told reporters that there was no proof that the Germans in Egypt were actually working on aggressive weapons. Apparently, Von Hase did not check with the West German foreign ministry whose spokesman had admitted that, "a maximum of 11 German experts are working in Egyptian rocket production" (Reuters, Mar. 22, 1963).

However, these alibis and denials failed to dissipate the mounting alarm expressed in many circles in Europe and in the United States. Consequently, on March 25, 1963, a West German Government spokesman announced that, "there are a number of measures that might be taken." Chancellor Adenauer who was vacationing in Italy, ordered that a report be sent to him concerning the investigations which the Germans would conduct on this matter. Two days later, Von Hase said that the problem was complex and that it was difficult to say when legislation could be drawn up to remedy the situation. In an exchange with one reporter at a press conference, Von Hase agreed with his interrogator who alleged that there was no work in West Germany for missile scientists and that is why they go abroad. Von Hase immediately took the cue and replied, "This just goes to prove our loyalty to international agreements."

THE TRUTH COMES OUT

While the West German authorities thought up all sorts of excuses and pretended that they were in the dark and would investigate the real situation obtaining in Egypt, the German scientists in Cairo were not so silent. Ferdinand Brandner, a top German technician, a former Nazi stormtrooper, and now a key adviser to Nasser, boasted: "We have obtained all the equipment and material for laboratories, workshops, and test stands from West Germany, Austria, Switzerland, and the United States" (London Daily Express, Apr. 8, 1963). This same Brandner charged that the attacks against the German scientists in Egypt were "intended to defame us and force the German Government to take measures against our activity" (Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 3, 1963). In this connection, another German technician complained: "We are worried about the Jewish terror * * * but why doesn't our government in Bonn give us support? They know why we are here and what we are doing" (London Daily Express, Apr. 8, 1963).

The reports concerning the activities of the German scientists in Egypt indicate that they have been working not only on missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads, but they are also experimenting on poison gas as well as on radiological and bacteriological weapons. The German Government has denied all of this. Inspired reports appeared in the press declaring that it would be illogical for the Germans to use Egypt as a secret development ground for new weapons since they were receiving far more sophisticated weapons directly from the United States. But this line falls flat in the face of a letter written to a correspondent by Adolph Karch, the lawyer for one of the top German scientists, Eugen Saenger. In that letter Karch made the sensational admission that "the Egyptian Government undertook to put at the full disposal of the German Federal Republic all the results of the (rocket) development works and, as the occasion arises, they also put at German disposal the Egyptian ground installations and launchings pads for such German experiments as could not be carried out in the Federal Republic."

Here is the key to the whole deal. It creates much doubt as to the official assurances issued by the West German Government that the world has no cause for concern. The so-called investigations which the West German Government promised to undertake, can go on indefinitely unless world public opinion insists on prompt results. There is no question but that our Government, if it wishes, can do much in this matter. After all, the United States is not only involved through treaties with West Germany relating to the development of weapons for mass destruction, but we have also provided ample opportunities for the West German Government, its scientists and technicians, to acquire vital information in the field of rocket technology and atomic arms. Indeed, U.S. help has been decisive in the continuing buildup of West Germany's military power. We cannot wash our hands of that responsibility. Yet, the response of our Government to the protests concerning the German scientists in Egypt, has been most disappointing, to say the least.

EVASION

When the story first broke, the State Department said it was "contemplating" what steps it might take, "if any," with regard to the charges that the Germans were working on bacteriological and chemical warheads in Egypt (New York Post, Mar. 26, 1963). The snowballing protests, however, had to be answered more directly and this was undertaken by Under Secretary for Political Affairs, Averell Harriman in a reply to Congressman LEONARD FARBSTEIN. In a leading editorial, the Washington Post (Apr. 13, 1963) described Mr. Harriman's letter as "curious" and that, instead of coming to grips with the issues involved, it retreated "into lifeless platitudes."

What were the essential points in Mr. Harriman's reply? After assuring Congressman FARBSTEIN of the State Department's "continued interest" in the security of all Middle East States, he expressed the view that, if these German scientists were recalled, they might be "replaced by Soviet bloc personnel equally qualified in such work, again forcing the United Arab Republic into greater reliance on the U.S.S.R." To this argument the Washington Post retorted: "This comes close to arguing that we should be grateful for the Soviet forces in Cuba because otherwise there might be a Chinese Army in the Caribbean." With a touch of sarcasm the Post editorial noted that "it is of small comfort to Israel that these may be good, non-Communist missiles developed with the help of Germans so thoroughly anti-Russian that some of them worked for Hitler."

The Post editorial made mincemeat of Mr. Harriman's arguments. Nevertheless, it is of the greatest importance to challenge Mr. Harriman's implication that the German activities in Egypt are of an episodic character. Actually, as has already been shown in this article, the German role in the Middle East in general and in Egypt specifically, has deep roots, going back to more than 10 years at least. German scientists and technicians did not appear in Cairo "all of a sudden." Nor is there any intention that they will leave "all of a sudden." In short, the German move in Egypt has basically nothing to do with the question of Soviet activities in that country.

POSTWAR STRATEGY

The Germans were in Egypt years before the Russians came in 1955. As the world knows, the Soviets, since 1955, have provided Nasser's armies with vast amounts of military hardware while the United States has given hundreds of millions of dollars which enables the Egyptian economy to sustain this vast military buildup. During this entire period and before, the German scientists and technicians continued their work.

Mr. Harriman's reply also reflects how devastatingly effective Nasser's blackmail policies have been and continue to be. The idea that, if the West does not provide Nasser with weapons of mass destruction, the Soviets will, is part and parcel of the same argument which has obliged us to continue to underwrite Nasser's imperialistic moves.

One other major implication in the Harriman note which must be challenged, is the notion that the matter of German scientists in Egypt is part of the continued conflict between Israel and Cairo and that this is a local affair of no direct concern to the United States. This attitude, if we may say so, smacks of the same approach that certain statesmen in Britain took when Hitler claimed his pound of flesh from Austria and later Czechoslovakia. If this is indeed the State Department's view, then the irresponsibility of our policymakers is greater than we had first thought.

The society wishes to go on record in stating that this is not a local matter but one which directly touches on the national interests of the United States and world security. We also wish to go on record in charging that the German presence in Egypt is an intrinsic element in the postwar plans of the German general staff to rebuild Germany's war potential by evading and violating the obligations she assumed following her surrender.

The society has published a number of articles dealing with the German general staff's postwar plans. We now charge that here in Egypt as well as in Spain, the Germans, shortly after the end of the war, were able to continue and to expand their work in all military spheres for the day when they could once again confront the world with an ultimatum. To some of our readers this may sound unduly alarmist and melodramatic. In that case, let them ponder the following statement: "Nazi Party members, German industrialists and the German military, realizing that victory can no longer be attained, are now developing postwar commercial projects, are endeavoring to renew and cement friendships in foreign commercial circles and are planning for renewals of prewar cartel agreements. * * * German technicians, cultural experts, and undercover agents have well-laid plans to infiltrate foreign countries with the object of developing economic, cultural and political ties. German technicians and scientific research experts will be made available at low cost to industrial firms and technical schools in foreign countries. German capital and plans for the construction of ultramodern technical schools and research laboratories will be offered at extremely favorable terms since they will afford the Germans an excellent opportunity to design and perfect new weapons. This Government is now in possession of photostatic copies of several volumes of German plans on this subject." This statement is excerpted from a State Department declaration dated March 30, 1945.

The society solemnly declares that it is the duty of our Government together with our Allies to conduct a full scale investigation of all of the ramifications in connection with the German presence in Egypt and present its findings to the world. To equivocate or to pretend that this matter has been unduly inflated is to literally gamble with the security of the United States and our Allies.

Emphasis on Individualism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the July 8, 1963, issue of U.S. News & World Report contains an important editorial on the importance of placing more emphasis in this country on individualism than trying to make our people conform to a common level in the name of equality. This editorial is entitled "Happiness?" I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record. Also, I ask unanimous consent to have printed with the editorial the text of my newsletter for this week, which is on the same general subject. It is entitled "CommOnism and Conformity."

There being no objection, the editorial and newsletter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Happiness?

(By David Lawrence)

As we read the headlines day by day in a troubled world, as we observe the tides of discontent inside and outside our own country, we wonder, fancifully, if perhaps a trip to the moon might be worthwhile. The alluring thought crosses our minds that maybe on some other planet there's a human race which has found the key to happiness.

But the more we search for an alibi, the more we discover that unhappiness on earth is man made. Our key weakness is that we have not solved the problem of self-governmement. Whether it be in areas of large population—like China, India, or the Soviet Union—or in the smaller countries of Africa or Latin America or even in the sophisticated United States, the quest for national contentment is plagued by friction, disorder, and violence. The perennial struggle is between the autocracy of ambitious masters seeking arbitrarily to impose their will and the inalienable right of the citizen to enjoy the satisfactions of his individual achievement without undue interference by government.

We seem reluctant to accept the truism that all human beings are not alike and that intelligence cannot be bestowed by government.

In the United States, for instance, we proclaim that "all men are created equal" and are, therefore, deserving of all the benefits of human society, irrespective of whether they have earned them. Communism at least is forthright in championing its concept of an "equality" which negates individualism.

Yet we hear, inside our own society, spokesmen for so-called liberal thought denouncing communism but nevertheless accepting much of its basic philosophy. We are told that economic inequality must be abolished by executive decrees or by the coercion of statutory law.

Many in our midst approve of an all-powerful autocratic state in which the government arbitrarily and inequitably dictates the amount of income a citizen may retain, or the kind of business in which he may engage, or the customers he may serve, or the number of employees of each race or religion or other classification he may employ.

We observe within our country today harassments by Government that tend to blunt the initiative of our successful and competent citizens and thus destroy the capitalistic system. It is as if we were helping to fulfill Nikita Khrushchev's fateful prophecy that communism will eventually "bury us."

We seem to accept the intellectual aphorisms of those who say that each age is better than its predecessor and that to follow the "spirit" of our times is more important than to adhere to a written Constitution. We are told that the framers of our Constitution didn't know the demands of modern morality or equity because they never saw an airplane or lived under the threat of a nuclear bomb.

We hesitate to suggest that the same kind of human beings lived 50 or 100 or 2,000 years ago, and that Socrates perhaps had as good a brain as some of our Supreme Court Justices.

Are the Ten Commandments, for example, outmoded because they are old? Are they the reactionary doctrines of a bygone day? We are now forbidden even to teach them in public schools. An oligarchy—the highest Court of our land—decrees that, if we wish to teach morality regularly in the classroom, we must not quote the written words of the Bible itself. Plainly, we must accept the vacuum of secularism.

Now come also restrictions on initiative, the burdens of an artificial equality and the new legislative experiments outlawing discrimination. The competent are to be told to make room for the incompetent. The successful men in business are ordered to obey the Government, which at a moment's notice can destroy their ventures into capitalism. For private enterprise now has been superseded by a public enterprise system.

Thus, in the year 1963, the Government proposes that every business enterprise shall no longer be considered private but public and that, irrespective of an owner's judgment or wishes as to the customers he would select, he must obey the dictates of Government. The mob, encouraged by Government, stands at the threshold of our legislative halls demanding such laws. O communism, where is thy sting?

Is this the road to human happiness? Shall we abandon the Republic and, acceding to the demonstrations and violence in the streets of our cities—North and South, East and West—become a mobocracy?

There can never be human happiness in a society that imposes a rule of equality which disregards merit and rewards incompetence.

As the incentive of individualism is gradually destroyed, free enterprise is abolished. This is not the road to happiness, but to the same disasters that befell autocracies in past centuries. Free men of intelligence have risen before to quell the intolerance and tyrannies of majorities or minorities. They will in time do so again.

CommOnism and Conformity

The age of individualism, when America forged its claim to greatness largely because of the independence and initiative of the individual, is gradually but significantly slipping from the scene. Individualism and independence have been replaced in large part with commOnism and conformity, as a result of a determined effort to level all men and nation-states to a common plane in life.

Individualism is the belief in the importance of the individual. Jesus Christ ordained the preeminence of the individual in his teachings, and the Founding Fathers of this country wrote this idea into the Constitution, principally into the Bill of Rights which set out specific guarantees of protection for the individual against the power of the Central Government. The founders realized that the individual would not last long in the New World they had settled, unless the ruling authorities were tied down, as Jefferson suggested, by the "chains of the Constitution."

Early in the 19th century, the wretched and depraved mind of Karl Marx stole a few economic and social theories and merged them together, to give birth to a new "ism" called commUnism. According to Marx, his aim was to establish an ideal world, in which each would "give according to his ability and receive according to his needs." It would, of course, be necessary to first establish a world dictatorship to bring about this worthy goal. Once established, however, this would evolve into an age called the millenium, when governmental authority would wither away and all the commoners would work together without discipline or authority, to share the wealth of the world.

A dispute then developed within the ranks of communism as to how this end should be attained. Some demanded revolution; others wanted to adopt the tactics of the Roman general Fabius Maximus, who supposedly conceived the military tactic of gradualism in wearing down the enemy. The gradualists, or fabians, as they have become known, have been particularly successful in commonizing the British Empire during this century, playing a significant part in the decline of this once-great empire. Unfortunately for America, the germ of commOnism spread from Britain to America, with particular vigor, within the past few decades.

The idea of commOnism is particularly noticeable today in American Government, with its paternalistic programs of aid and control. This paternalistic attitude has encouraged Negro leaders to make statements that they are seeking "a compensatory preferential highway" and that "the word 'equality' has to be broadened." They are even making such rash and bold statements as: "America has to change its entire posture. I think it is an inevitable move toward some kind of socialism."

Today Americans will conform to central dictation not only because of the use of mass means of propaganda techniques and the habit which conformity breeds, but also because of the club of coercion which accompanies each "gimmie" from the group or government. Nowhere is the air of conformity felt stronger than in party and power politics in Washington. At the center of government, there is little room for individualism or independence, and there is much power available to buy off or club down too many acts of independent action on the part of the individual public servant.

The day of the individualist is passing, and unfortunately, it is fading fast in the Halls of Congress, where it ought to last longest if independence is to be preserved for every individual American. Unwarranted criticism by many Members of Congress, of their own institution, is adding to this downgrading of the legislative branch. Official Washington, influenced by its own propaganda, is under the false impression that the American people desire commUnism, even with its features of conformity and control, rather than their right to be an individual and independent of unnecessary regulation and control.

By and large, the American people still agree with the Jeffersonian idea "that government is best, which governs least."

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND.

Why Europe Went Wild Over Kennedy—An Analysis by Robert Healy, Political Editor of the Boston Globe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the most perceptive analyses of the success of President Kennedy's recent tour of Europe, and the reasoning behind this success, was printed in the Boston Sunday Globe of July 7, 1963, and was written by the Globe's political editor, Mr. Robert Healy. A former member of the Washington national press corps, Mr. Healy's views are widely respected in New England and in the Nation's Capital. Under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks, Mr. Healy's article, entitled "He Looked Like Lochinvar—Why Europe Went Wild Over Kennedy":

HE LOOKED LIKE LOCHINVAR—WHY EUROPE WENT WILD OVER KENNEDY

(By Robert Healy)

If he had listened to all the prophets, he would not have gone, for they said it would end in failure.

But in the streets of Berlin, Bonn, Frankfurt, in Dublin and Cork and then in Naples, the crowds greeted him as though they needed him.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was crushed with affection in Europe. His trip turned out to be an unparalleled triumph both at home and abroad. Not even Hitler pulled such crowds in Berlin.

There was never a question about Ireland. He was going home. And the Irish opened their arms to him, at times, with enthusiasm that was frightening but that was reserved for one of their own.

But was it all a show?

If it was, President Charles de Gaulle, of France, didn't think so.

DE GAULLE STEPS IN

The President's jet had hardly taken off from the runways at Naples before De Gaulle was in West Germany selling not only French farm products to the Germans, but selling his side of the NATO story.

It was in Frankfurt that President Kennedy took on, with great boldness, the French President. In effect, he said, the free world could no longer stand backsliding in the NATO alliance.

De Gaulle had nursed the weed of disunity in the Alliance. Now, President Kennedy was prepared to mow it down.

De Gaulle said the United States might some day turn its back on Europe and pull out. Thus, France, at least, must develop a separate national or nuclear deterrent.

To this, Mr. Kennedy's finger darted out and he said: "The United States will risk its cities to defend yours, because we need your freedom to protect ours."

To De Gaulle he said directly: "Those who would doubt our pledge or deny this indivisibility, those who would separate Europe from America or split one ally from another—would only give aid and comfort to the men who make themselves our adversaries and welcome any Western disarray."

RECEPTIVE EARS

This was the President's answer to De Gaulle and, from all appearances in West Germany, this is what the people wanted to hear.

And politicians are politicians the world over. The good ones have great sensitivity to what the people want.

Certainly the West German response to President Kennedy was intensely watched by De Gaulle.

To this extent the trip will have lasting effect on world politics.

President Kennedy, of course, had something going for him from the start. He is young, he is wealthy, and he has great power, which he knows how to use. Europeans, especially the Germans, like the combination, for it spells success.

The Italians have been changing Premiers like shirts; the British have been looking at Macmillan with his patched suits and starchy attitude for 6 years, and Konrad Adenauer is 87 years old.

Kennedy just looked like Lochinvar to most of Europe.

Their reception of him was from their hearts and he made an appeal to their intellect.

His very presence in West Berlin, surrounded by a Red rim and a high wall, was reassuring to the people there. To the citizens of this divided city he said: "All freemen, wherever they are, are citizens of Berlin.

"Therefore, as a freeman, I take pride in saying 'ich ben eim Berliner' (I am a Berliner)."

CRY OF ADULATION

Wilfrid Rodgers, the Globe's Washington correspondent with the President, wrote that they cried out one word—"Kennedy"—until that was all that could be heard. It was a cry of adulation and affection reserved for someone they liked. They liked this leader of the new generation.

For Adenauer, the man who has led them since the end of World War II, these same people have the greatest respect. But for Kennedy they had great affection.

In Ireland the ground rules were different, but the results were very much the same.

Ireland, too, has grown old with the leadership of such men as President Eamon de Valera for whom the Irish have great respect.

But here was the young man from America coming home. They drank to his health, as only the Irish can, and they nearly pulled him out of the presidential car as it wound through the streets of Cork choked with a crowd of some 80,000.

They never would have pulled De Valera from the car. But neither would they think of playing touch football with the Irish President.

To the new generation there was an association with President Kennedy.

This is what Europe liked about the President's visit.

Fifth Texas District Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the results of the annual questionnaire sent to the people of the Fifth District of Texas.

I am always more than gratified at the excellent response to this questionnaire by the people of Dallas County. The return is usually between 10 and 12 percent and this year was no exception with an approximately 10-percent return. With a wide cross section of the district represented in the answers received, I can report the people of my district still support constitutional-limited government and would rather depend on local and individual initiative in the fields of human endeavor instead of looking to the Federal Government to solve each and every problem.

I would like to thank the people of Dallas County for their cooperation in helping me to be a better Representative in Congress by sharing with me their views on the more pertinent issues we face.

The questionnaire and the results follow:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
FOREIGN AFFAIRS			
1. Do you approve of the current U.S. policy with regard to—			
(a) Cuba?	7	92	1
(b) Berlin?	32	57	11
(c) Laos?	9	79	12
(d) The Congo?	9	76	15
2. Do you favor continuance of our foreign aid program at its present $4,000,000,000 annual rate?	4	94	2
SOCIAL			
1. Do you favor medical care for the aged by—			
(a) Increasing social security taxes to finance such care?	5	93	2
(b) Expanding the present Federal-State (Kerr-Mills) legislation?	10	88	2
(c) Promoting a low-cost Blue Cross type plan whereby the Federal Government would assume full financial responsibility only for persons below a certain income level?	13	85	2
(d) Or do you favor private, voluntary medical plans with no Federal participation?	70	28	2
2. Do you favor a proposed Federal bill to authorize a 3-year matching grant program costing $500,000,000 to help local communities solve their urban mass transportation problem re railroad and bus transportation?	7	89	4
3. Do you favor the establishment of a federally financed Youth Conservation Corps to provide outdoor employment for young men, as a means of alleviating unemployment in this age group?	19	78	3
4. Do you favor the establishment of a Domestic Peace Corps?	12	83	5
5. Do you approve the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs at the Cabinet level to handle housing and other predominantly city problems?	6	90	4
EDUCATION			
1. Should the Federal Government provide—			
(a) Tax allowances for parents paying the expenses of children in college?	49	47	4
(b) Tax allowances for students working their way through college?	55	41	4
(c) Or should all Federal influence be removed and individuals determine and pay for college educations for themselves or their children?	52	41	7
2. Should Federal Government funds for college student loans and scholarships be—			
(a) Increased?	14	74	12
(b) Decreased?	7	81	12
(c) Kept at existing levels?	20	68	12
(d) Eliminated?	47	41	12
3. For construction purposes should the Federal Government provide colleges and universities with—			
(a) Loans?	30	64	6
(b) Outright grants?	2	92	6
(c) Combination of both?	8	86	6
4. Do you favor a proposal of grants amounting to some $75,000,000 for construction of teaching facilities for medical, dental, and public health schools?	13	76	1
5. Do you favor Federal financial grants for assistance to elementary and secondary schools for—			
(a) School construction?	10	88	2
(b) Teachers' salaries?	6	92	2

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
FISCAL			
1. Do you believe the Federal Government should operate within a balanced budget?	94	4	2
2. Within a balanced budget would you approve of setting aside a certain percent of the budget receipts each fiscal year for the sole purpose of reducing the Federal debt?	94	3	3
3. Do you believe we should institute new programs and new public works at a time of deficit financing and borrow money to pay for such projects?	3	94	3
TAXES			
1. Would you favor a personal and corporate tax reduction—			
(a) Without tax reform which would mean that the Government would suffer a large net loss of income?	6	84	10
(b) Only if accompanied by compensatory tax reform and a cut in Federal spending?	80	12	8
(c) With no reform, but with a substantial cut in Federal spending?	56	26	12
(d) No reduction at this time?	46	29	25
2. Should tax reduction emphasis be in the area of—			
(a) Personal tax?	25	61	14
(b) Corporate tax?	12	74	14
. As a basic principle, do you believe we should have a flat percentage tax rather than the present graduated income tax based on ability to pay (Alger bill, H.R. 737)?	62	30	8
4. I have also introduced a bill (H.R. 739) to repeal the withholding tax so that each person would pay his own tax. Would you favor this bill?	62	32	6
LABOR			
1. Would you favor tougher emergency strike provisions granting the President more flexibility in handling national emergency strikes by providing for back-to-work injunctions and compulsory arbitration machinery?	61	32	7
2. Would you favor new labor laws which would prevent the Federal Government from interfering with or influencing collective bargaining?	54	35	11
3. Would you approve of applying antitrust statutes to unions to break up industrywide bargaining?	85	9	6
4. Would you approve of setting Federal standards under the unemployment compensation law for State jobless benefits?	16	58	26
UNITED NATIONS			
1. Would you favor withdrawal of U.S. membership in the United Nations and creating stronger alliances with nations of the free world?	56	38	6
2. Would you favor action by the United Nations to force member nations to live up to the charter, pay their full obligations or be expelled?	94	5	1
3. Do you approve the building up and strengthening of Communist nations through U.N. member organizations such as UNESCO, WHO, and the U.N. Special Fund?	2	97	1

Harriman Fits the Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are many Members of Congress and concerned citizens throughout the United States who are appalled at the President's selection of Averell Harriman as his representative to the disarmament conference that is about to commence in Moscow.

Mr. Harriman's personal record leaves much to be desired in this field, and when coupled with the apparent appeasement policy of the administration, naturally gives cause for concern.

The Knoxville Journal, in an editorial of July 5, clearly points out the dangers in sending Harriman on this mission to Moscow. I insert it into the RECORD as an example of nationwide concern, mistrust and anxiety on this subject.

The editorial follows:

[From the Knoxville Journal, July 5, 1963]

HARRIMAN FITS THE ROLE

It looks as if Premier Khrushchev of Russia believes there is some propaganda juice left in the nuclear test ban issue, despite the fact that President Kennedy has done everything but offer a complete unilateral disarmament of this country in order to get one.

In a speech in East Germany this week, the wily Russian in the vaguest terms called for a ban on nuclear explosions in the atmosphere and also for a nonaggression pact between the NATO countries and the Communist satellite group.

The Associated Press asserts Mr. Kennedy is now faced with a decision as to whether to treat Khrushchev's speech in East Germany as propaganda or as a real opening toward an East-West accord.

Most of us will feel that this is a decision any 12-year-old schoolboy in the country could make without giving the matter more than a passing thought. Khrushchev will no doubt be willing to sign a test ban treaty at any time, so long as it is on a strictly "word of honor" basis. Such an arrangement would enable the Russians to go on testing at will while our own scientists would be compelled, as they are now under Kennedy's self-imposed ban, to bring their experiments to a standstill. If this is the kind of deal that Mr. Kennedy wants, or will fall for, he won't have any trouble getting it.

Fortunately he is sending to Moscow on July 15 a man ideally fitted by experience to work out a boobytrap arrangement with the Russians. Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman, who was the architect of the arrangement in Laos that is in the process of blowing up in our faces, had been previously designated to discuss a test ban treaty with Khrushchev. If he handles this assignment as disastrously as he did the Laotian arrangement, we may really get hurt.

Congressman's Impressions of His Trip Through Ireland With President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Massachusetts and my very close personal and good friend, Congressman Boland, was with President Kennedy on his fabulous and sentimental tour through Ireland recently. On his return to his home city of Springfield, Congressman Boland was interviewed by Dick Severns of the Springfield Daily News on July 5. Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Severns' well-written and interesting story on Congressman Boland's impressions of Ireland gained while with President Kennedy:

A movement toward a more industrialized economy has replaced historic anti-English sentiments as the chief focus of Ireland's concern, U.S. Representative Edward P. Boland, Springfield Democrat, said today.

Fresh from a 5-day tour of the Emerald Isle, the Congressman, who represents the Second Congressional District, indicated that this was one of the main impressions he received on his trip.

"The feeling (against England) has generally died out," said Representative Boland. "In fact, most of the young people who leave migrate to England—more than to the United States."

MIGRATION THEME

Migration, of course, has been one of the most prominent themes of Ireland's history for the past 100 years. Representative Boland noted that from a population of 8 million some 50 years ago, the number of Irish living on the native isle has decreased to 2½ million in the 26 southern counties, and 1½ million in the 6 northern counties, a 50 percent decline.

He said, however, that the population has now leveled off and is remaining stable. "They're being born as fast as they leave," he commented.

"Young people migrate now," he said, "because of the present lack of job opportunities in Ireland, still primarily agricultural." He noted, however, that the Irish "are making a real effort" to industrialize, provide more jobs and keep money at home.

"They're building their own food processing plants now," he said. "They used to send food out of the country for processing." He added that West German investment in the Irish economy has been increasing, and that other foreign capital is being attracted.

"One of the main reasons for the fading away of sentiment against England," he said, "was a land reform program instituted about a generation ago which broke up large estates held by some Irish 'but mostly English' landlords."

COMMON SIGHT

A common sight now, he said, is many small plots of land throughout the island owned by farmer-families to whom the property was distributed.

Thus, England is no longer the main problem in Ireland, he indicated.

Representative Boland traveled with the President in a helicopter on visits to Dublin, Cork, Galway, Limerick, New Ross, and Dunganstown.

"You can see why it's called the Emerald Isle—especially from a helicopter," the Congressman said. "The fields are a brilliant green—the rains keep them green. It rains more often there, but it doesn't seem to bother them as much as it does us."

One of the stops that received publicity was President Kennedy's visit to his ancestral home in Dunganstown, County Wexford.

VISIT TO FAHAN

But equally meaningful for Representative Boland was his visit to his father's home town of Fahan (pronounced Fawn) in County Kerry, from which most of Springfield's Irish immigrants came.

The Congressman remained in Ireland—2 days after President Kennedy departed—to visit his own ancestral home. He found it "very difficult" to count the number of Bolands in Fahan. The same held true, he said, for the Cavanaughs, the Carneys, and the Sullivans.

A Carney family now occupies the house where Representative Boland's father once lived.

County Kerry, said the Congressman, is a "tough, rugged area—hilly and mountainous." The fact that the land is so difficult to farm was one reason many Irishmen from this area migrated abroad. Conditions became especially bad during the potato famine in the mid-1800's.

Kerry, he noted, is an area where Gaelic is taught and encouraged. The reestablishment of Gaelic as the national tongue is a pet project of Ireland's President, Eamon de Valera.

ENGLISH FLAWLESS

"But all of them speak English," he said. "Their English is rather flawless and has a beautiful ring."

While the landscape of Kerry matches the beauty of the language spoken there, the Irish of Kerry are as rugged as the terrain, the Congressman's remarks indicated.

"They're well fed, well clothed, and well housed," he said. "The houses are old, but comfortable—even though some of them have no heat. The children are beautiful—well fed and healthy.

"One of my relations in Kenmare (a town in Kerry) walked 5 miles to church and back. He does that a couple of times a week," Representative Boland noted. He declared that any one of them could easily accomplish "Bob Kennedy's 50-mile hikes."

Representative Boland also visited the Ring of Killarney in Kerry, comprised of the bays of Dingle, Bantry, and Kenmare.

Prior to his personal visit, Representative Boland accompanied President Kennedy along with Presidential Aide Lawrence O'Brien of this city to Cork, County of Kerry, where the Springfield Congressman said President Kennedy received "the most tumultuous reception" of the trip.

CAME FROM MILES

"People would come from miles around," he said, "to see the Nation's Chief Executive. Many came by bus from 35 and 40 miles away."

Representative Boland said the Irish are "delighted and proud" of the fact that one of their own in this country has advanced to the Presidency. "In their minds, he reflects all things an Irishman thinks a leader should be."

Representative Boland was asked what Irishmen think leaders should be. "He respects himself, his family, and his church," the Congressman answered. "He's a good family man. That's very important."

Representative Boland said the main international concern of the Irish is the issue of peace or war, adding they are definitely pro-Western. (Ireland does not belong to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. One reason is that the country still maintains territorial claim to the six northern counties under the rule of the United Kingdom, a NATO member.)

Representative Boland recalled President Kennedy's address to a joint session of the Irish Parliament, termed the Dail (pronounced doll).

IMPORTANT ROLE

The President told the delegates that Ireland, like other small nations, had an important part to play in the struggle for international peace throughout the world.

Representative Boland noted, finally, the warm reception Americans of Irish descent receive in Ireland. "The Irish are the nicest people," he said, "especially the waiters and waitresses."

He attributed this partly to the fact that "jobs are very hard to come by. In the hotel industry there, they have to serve a 4-year apprenticeship. Consequently they are very well trained," he said.

Representative Francis E. Walter: A Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the Independence Day issue of the Brooklyn Tablet contained a tribute to our late distinguished colleague, Hon. Francis E. "Tad" Walter, by Most Rev. Edward E. Swanstrom, who knew Congressman Walter since World War II and is personally interested in immigration and naturalization legislation as executive director, Catholic Relief Services, NCWC.

Bishop Swanstrom reviews the work of Mr. Walter and the legislative developments in the immigration and naturalization field, characterizing his efforts as "devotion and loyalty to the security and freedom of our great country."

I believe, Mr. Speaker, each Member will find this excellent article very informative, both as an analysis of the legislative past of our immigration laws and the substantial contribution of our late colleague, and I am pleased to include it in the Appendix of the Record, as follows:

[From the Brooklyn Tablet, July 4, 1963]

REPRESENTATIVE FRANCIS E. WALTER: A GREAT AMERICAN

(By Most Rev. Edward E. Swanstrom, executive director, Catholic Relief Services, NCWC)

Knowing how widely the Tablet is read throughout the United States, I would like to have the privilege of using your columns to pay a well-deserved tribute to the late Congressman Francis E. Walter. As you know, he was referred to more affectionately as "Tad" by those of us who were fortunate enough to have won his friendship and affection, all of whom held him in the same high regard.

I came to know Congressman Walter quite well during the critical years since the end of World War II, and I was among those who dropped in at Georgetown Hospital in Washington now and then during his last long illness to offer him a word of consolation and cheer.

I felt privileged, too, to be among those who were at his burial service when his mortal remains were laid to rest in Arlington Cemetery a few weeks ago. We prayed that his might be a merciful judgment as he appeared before the Eternal Judge, as all of us must one day.

In view of President Kennedy's announcement that he will ask the Congress for a change in the basic structure of our immigration and naturalization laws, and the fact that the Senate has already scheduled hearings on Senator HART's forward-looking bill, which is a measure designed to accomplish this same end, a number of things are already being said publicly, and other things will undoubtedly be said later, which may not give a fair and true picture of legislative developments in the field of immigration during the past decade and a half, and reflect unjustly on Mr. Walter and others. It might be well for all of us to keep a few facts in mind.

The fact that our code of immigration law is more commonly known today as the McCarran-Walter Act often tends to cast a shadow on the legislative records of these two great gentlemen whose actions in Congress, at least to my mind, were motivated more than by anything else by their devotion and loyalty to the security and freedom of our great country.

In Mr. Walter's case this is brought out even more dramatically by his dynamic chairmanship of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

It must be remembered that the McCarran-Walter Act was primarily a recodification of the multitude of immigration and naturalization acts which had been placed on the statute books since the turn of the century. It will be recalled that, at that time, both were quite adamant in their insistence that they did not mean it to be nor wish it to be anything more than just that, even though they did endorse and include some very desirable amendments in the final act.

They were not the authors of our national origins quota system. From personal conversation with both of them at the time, I recall that their refusal to change this basic fallacy in our law was because of their personal fear, justified or unjustified as it might have been, that it would open the Nation's doors to many undesirable and subversive aliens.

As I look back on it now, I am sure that they felt that the Congress and the people of the United States were not yet educated nor prepared to accept a change in our basic immigration policy.

HIS VIEWS JUSTIFIED

Mr. Walter was convinced that under the law as written and with the help of emergency legislation a very substantial number of citizens could find a home and freedom in our country. The facts seem to justify his conviction.

In the 10 years since the McCarran-Walter bill became law, up to June 30, 1962, 2,509,342 refugees and immigrants have been admitted to the United States. It is of some significance that of this number, 1,664,750 were admitted as nonquota immigrants whereas only 934,509 arrived under our regular quotas.

Those of us who strove to urge Congress to pass a law that would make it possible for the United States to accept a fair share of the hundreds of thousands of persons who found themselves displaced in the countries of Europe after the last great world upheaval, with no hope of return to their countries of origin, remember well the barriers that had to be hurdled and the grassroots educational program that had to be initiated and promulgated before the citizens of our country were moved to ask their Representatives for such action.

The first Displaced Persons Act of 1948, with its amendments in the years that followed, helped 405,000 displaced persons and orphans to find a haven and a new life of freedom and security in our country. It was of necessity an era of emergency legislation, and it was principally under Mr. Walter's leadership that additional men, women, and children were offered citizenship in the United States on that basis.

These totals were as follows: A second special orphan act, 960 orphans; the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, 191,000 persons (which incidentially included 57,000 persons of Italian origin); Hungarian Parole of 1956-57, 36,000 persons; and Walter-Pastore Act of 1957, citizens of Portugal and the Netherlands, 21,000 persons; various acts of 1957 as amended, 29,000 refugees and 24,000 family reunion benefitees.

A REALISTIC VIEW

It was under Mr. Walter's leadership also that the so-called Fair Share Act was enacted in 1960 and extended and made a permanent part of our legislation in 1962, under which the United States has accepted and will continue to accept a quota of refugees in a given ration to those acepted by other countries.

Nobody liked the so-called piecemeal character of this emergency immigration legislation less than I did myself. But when one looks at the temper of the Congress and the people of the United States of the late 40's and 50's, and is willing to be realistic about the situation, he must conclude that it was the only basis upon which, during those years, victims of the war's dislocation and of demographic inequalities could have been brought into our country in additional numbers.

It seems to me that the enlightenment and understanding regarding our present undesirable basic immigration policy—a heritage of the 20's—that have come to our Nation have made us ripe for a change more in keeping with our traditional sense of fair play and justice. I believe Mr. Walter realized this, and I would like to believe that if he were alive today he would be in the forefront of leadership for change—change that the next decade will inevitably produce.

It is regrettable in a way that these prospects for change were not more propitious in the last few years of his life. I have heard it said by those closest to him that Mr. Walter was thinking of authoring just such a change. That is not really very important now. What is important is that in fairness to his honored memory, to paraphrase another great American, "we keep the record straight."

Those of us who have been in the forefront of postwar resettlement programs will always be conscious of the great debt our country and we ourselves owe to his understanding and leadership.

Petition Calling for Fiscal Sanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I submit a petition of Claude Strickland, president of the Organization of the Jeffersonians of Florida, St. Petersburg, Fla., expressing the organization's concern over this administration's increased Federal deficit spending policies, our cumulative national debt and international commitments, and sounding a warning of the future destruction of our free enterprise system, the Congress itself and the very Nation it represents, if we do not reverse this trend of economically unsound and totally irresponsible fiscal policies:

ORGANIZATION OF THE
JEFFERSONIANS OF FLORIDA,
St. Petersburg, Fla., July 4, 1963.

To the CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
House-Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Momentous and grave questions receive naught but mute answers from our political leadership, from the local level to the marble halls of the Congress. Why? What impels the several legislative bodies to tax from the mouth of labor the very bread that it has earned? Have these people found a magic fountain, to be refurbished by the American taxpayer, whereby this Government can continue to borrow from the future, to live in the present, without paying for the past and maintain in luxury every hobo government on the face of the earth?

No gentlemen. The time for sober reflection is now—not next month nor next year. Either the gross giveaways and handouts will cease abruptly or we shall become unwilling spectators to the complete destruction of the free enterprise system, the Congress itself and the very Nation that it represents. Of course these are harsh words of warning. We know of no other way to couch or manipulate them to reduce their sharpness.

With sober reflection and considered opinion, like another American before us "we have no way to judge the future except by the past." And, most certainly, time is rapidly closing upon the day when the citizen, the soldier and the statesman alike will be called upon to serve without compensation. This we clearly visualize as if written by the finger of Orion upon the vault of night. Again, in the end, as in the beginning, only those motivated by the highest sense of civic duty and patriotism will volunteer their service.

In conclusion, perhaps you fail to hear the deep rumblings and distress, following the wake of confiscatory taxation, but both are present and growing. The cumulative national debt and international commitments, together with current, proposed and ill-advised legislation, are destined to wield a thunderous impact upon our citizenry akin to a catastrophic rout of our combined armed forces upon a major battlefield. But, with untold suffering of its people this Nation, under God, will survive, come what may.

With prayerful wishes for our beloved country, we are the Jeffersonians of Florida.

Most sincerely,

CLAUDE STRICKLAND,
President.

Editorial by Arthur W. Arundel, President, WAVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Mr. Arthur W. Arundel, president of radio station WAVA of Arlington, Va. I am personally acquainted with Mr. Arundel and know him to be a temperate man, not given to extreme positions or hasty, emotional decisions. I find his observations as expressed in this editorial highly significant and believe he expresses the unvoiced convictions of millons of Amercans all over the United States.

The editorial follows:

EDITORIAL BY ARTHUR W. ARUNDEL, PRESIDENT, WAVA

Few issues in this century have been more difficult to speak upon than the racial troubles now besetting the country. This station has not to date commented on the matter, not because of the nature of the controversy, but because almost anything positive said publicly tends to further inflame emotions in the perspective of the last few months. Now, this is the way it shapes up.

We are passing through, of course, a social revolution. Fundamentally segregation on publicly owned property is wrong. The denial of any American's constitutional rights, notably voting, is wrong. American Negroes must be given their full constitutional rights. Our society must at the same time defend the right of every man to practice in his private life whatever prejudice he may feel—political, religious, racial or otherwise—to be intolerant of what or whom he pleases.

Everyone is not equal. We were born equal, we have equal opportunity and it is still there for all those individuals who possess the enterprise and determination in private life to earn it, but there equality in a free society ends. Racist leaders insist that under the Constitution, every American is entitled to have a decent job, to live in a house fit for habitation. This is utter nonsense. No citizen of this country, white or colored, has any such right.

Colored American citizens do not deserve privileged rights any more than do Polish immigrants or Episcopal ministers in our many-faceted society. Equal right to earn a better way of life is there for every American. And yet through sheer brute fear, fear of investigation, fear of what others will say, fear of and coercion by the Kennedy administration, a fear that has never before penetrated the internal machinery of the Nation, special privileges are being granted to pressure groups.

The issue is whether all Americans are to continue equal under the law, or whether one class is for the first time in our history to be given sanction to flaunt the law. This is anarchy—the aim of breaking down law enforcement. This is beyond the pale of toleration. This country is dealing with private, not public prejudice—prejudice which can be most perfectly resolved in the conscience of each American individual and family—not by legislation at gunpoint.

The loud talk of political demagogs, white and Negro alike, booming the cause of right is not helping solve the problem; further it is inflaming racist violence and worst of all it is inflaming a private family intolerance of fear and suspicion which never before existed among the American people. And the more talk there is about race riots and dynamite kegs, the greater the chance of violence.

It is not easy to say these things. Yet it would be the less the part of our responsibility not to say them. For they are things in the heart of moderates, the overwhelming majority of Americans of all creeds, races, and national origin—the people who possess the great quiet power and will to resolve this social revolution by themselves.

Vocational Training Bill Gains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, a thoughtful analysis of the vocational education legislation now before Congress is contained in an excellent article written by George W. Oakes and published in the July 7, 1963, issue of the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Oakes' article follows:

[From the Washington Sunday Star, July 7, 1963]

VOCATIONAL TRAINING BILL GAINS

(By George W. Oakes)

Congress is likely to enact in this session the first major revision and important expansion in federally aided vocational education in 17 years. On June 18, the House Committee on Education and Labor reported the Perkins bill, whose objectives have bipartisan support, and Senate hearings will resume early in August.

As President Kennedy stressed in his June 19 civil rights message, improved and enlarged vocational education programs are essential to open up more job opportunities for Negro workers and thus reduce racial conflict.

More widespread vocational training is also vital in attacking the serious problems of unemployment, juvenile delinquency, and school dropouts.

THE JOBSEEKERS

Labor Department officials point out that during the next 2½ years about 5 million new young workers who will not enter college will be looking for jobs—3 out of every 4 who will enter the labor force. Last year, one out of every four nonwhite teenagers was unemployed in comparison to one out of eight white teenagers.

Twenty-five percent of young Negroes between 16 and 21 who are not in school are unemployed. Commenting on these facts, Representative EDITH GREEN of the House Education and Labor Committee said: "Good vocational education in our large cities is the best possible way to help teenage kids find useful employment and reduce juvenile delinquency."

Sixty-seven percent of vocational graduates get employment and another 17 percent go on to further schooling.

The rising tide of college-bound high school students has obscured the fact that about half do not continue their education beyond the 12th grade. Yet only one-fifth of these 5 million high school students who will not seek higher education are enrolled in a federally aided vocational training program. (Less than two-thirds of the Nation's high schools offer such courses.) Another 2 million adults and out-of-school youth participate in part-time or evening classes. Many students, however, take business or commercial courses that are not federally assisted.

IT BEGAN UNDER WILSON

Vocational education has been supported by Federal funds ever since 1917 when Woodrow Wilson signed the Smith-Hughes Act to train workers in agriculture, trade, industry, and home economics.

Congress has currently appropriated $57 million for the program which States and local communities have matched more than five times. Nearly all Federal money is used for payment of salaries and training for 37,600 teachers and supervisors in vocational education, of whom 1,247 are in Virginia, 44 in Maryland, and 51 in the District of Columbia.

For several years the Federal Government's vocational education program has been severely criticized because it is geared too much to an economy that has radically altered since its inception and so is not directed enough to the present job market. In 1961, Mr. Kennedy appointed a panel of consultants to examine the program. Its report, published in May has formed much of the basis for the new proposals.

A NEED TO RESHAPE FARM PROGRAM

Twenty-one percent of vocationally oriented high school students (463,000 in 1961) take courses in agriculture even though less than half of these graduates actually enter farming. This program, particularly popular in the Southern States where half of all farmers are located, has been operating largely on the assumption that the small farm can pay. However, Department of Agriculture officials take the view that the marked trend of workers from the farm to the cities, where wages are more than doubled, proves the need to reshape this activity.

Agriculture officials claim that only 15,000 additional youths are needed annually on farms that are commercially profitable—those with a $10,000 gross income per year. They would like to redirect the agricultural program to discourage uneconomic farming, but train more workers in food processing, marketing, and distribution where there are expanding job openings.

By far the largest number of high school vocational education students—more than half of the total—take home economics and one-fifth of Federal vocational funds are used for this purpose. This program of teaching homemaking, budgeting, clothes making, and home nursing to girls is so popular that States and local communities have matched Federal funds 8 to 1. In fact, those who criticize the high proportion of Federal money for this program argue without much opposition that State and local support would probably be available without any Federal aid.

TOO MUCH AID TO HOUSEWIVES?

Many—including women Members of Congress who specialize in education—are convinced that the Federal Government has placed too much emphasis on this activity in relation to more job-oriented training courses. However, Labor Department officials point out that, since women comprise such a large proportion of the work force, it is essential to teach them efficient methods of budgeting, use of low-cost foods, clothesmaking, etc.

Only 10 percent of all high schools in the Nation offer courses in skilled or semi-skilled crafts or trades. Most of the 950,000 who take this training are adults. Trade and industry training consumes 25 percent of all Federal funds but only 16 percent of Government-aided schools have it. Its inadequacy is also shown by the fact that only 11

States, for example, offer federally aided training for jobs in electric appliance repair or dry-cleaning, where a demand for labor exists.

In the distributive occupations like wholesaling, retailing, warehousing, and export-import trade, students must be already employed before they can enroll in federally financed courses. Therefore, Government funds cannot help prepare workers for the many employment opportunities in these fields.

One of the most serious deficiencies in the present Federal program is that no funds can be used to train workers for the rapidly expanding area of office occupations in which 15 percent of the work force is now employed. As two-thirds of these workers are women, many of whom stop work for a while after marriage, there is a considerable turnover and therefore need for much more training among clerical and office personnel.

The Perkins bill marks an important step forward not only by adding $45 million in the first year, but also by removing many of the restrictions. As Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, Democrat, of Indiana, a member of the committee, put it, "It makes vocational education much more oriented to job opportunities."

By permitting the transfer of funds from one caegory to another, it would give needed flexibility to the present program. Business and office occupations would be added and agricultural training would be broadened to include food processing and farm machinery, for example. One fourth of home economics funds would have to be allocated to activities directly related to employment. Girls would be trained as workers in public housing developments and day centers for children or taught institutional cooking or making garments for sale in retail stores. An important innovation is that a quarter of the new funds would be used for construction and equipment of schools that enroll students from an entire city or several neighboring school districts.

The Perkins bill would continue, though with broadened interpretation, the present vocational programs. Political factors, especially the powerful vocational educational education lobby and the acceptance the current program enjoys throughout the States, make this necessary to obtain Congressional approval of the new recommendations.

As a result of the President's message emphasizing vocational education's role in preparing Negro youth for useful employment, the administration is requesting $108 million of new money for the first year—more than twice that recommended in the House bill, but the same as that originally proposed by Representative PERKINS. Of this amount 40 percent would be used for construction of area vocational schools. Another $10.8 million would be devoted to developing special vocational programs for the benefit of Negro youth in large cities where unemployment and school dropouts are high. Another $15 million would establish residential vocational facilities for teenagers in big city school systems.

PROSPECTS FOR PERKINS BILL

Neither the new administration proposals nor the Perkins bill would require matching funds from States and local communities, except for construction.

Although officials concerned with vocational education regard the administration proposals as an important step forward, they privately agree that a massive attack is really required to meet the problem. The President's panel of consultants recommended an expenditure of $400 million in the first year.

House leaders believe that the House will pass the Perkins bill, but none larger. The Senate, which in recent years has supported education legislation more generously, seems likely to approve a larger program. The best hope for increasing vocational educational funds in line with the President's request would seem then to depend on a compromise between the House and Senate bills.

Milwaukee's Good-Will Ambassador of Song

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, as one who has long believed in the efficacy of people-to-people contacts as a way of fostering international understanding and cooperation, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the activities of Wally L. Meyer, Milwaukee's good-will ambassador of song.

Believing that singing is an excellent method of promoting friendship among peoples, Mr. Meyer has dedicated his life to bringing songs and good cheer to thousands around the globe.

This modern day troubadour only rarely works through official government agencies. He finds that people are more receptive to him as a private individual than as a paid representative of the United States. His activities truly are a fine example of people-to-people contact.

Mr. Meyer's accomplishments are the subject of an article appearing in the July issue of Eagle magazine, the national publication of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. I ask permission to include this article and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

EAGLE AMBASSADOR OF SONG: MILWAUKEE MAN TRAVELS AROUND THE WORLD WITH A POCKET FULL OF SONGS

Fifteen years ago Wally L. Meyer was asked to teach "The Star Spangled Banner" to a class of immigrants seeking their naturalization papers in New York City. Wally, who was then studying for his doctor's degree in adult education at Columbia University, had no idea that this simple request would lead him into a career that would take him from Puerto Rico to Korea and gain for him an international reputation as a good-will ambassador of song.

This one-man peace corps, who is a member of Milwaukee, Wis., Aerie, has visited 59 countries during the past 15 years, appearing everywhere from leper colonies and orphanages to international festivals and swank officers' clubs.

"Everyone loves to sing," says Wally. "Singing is an automatic bridge to international understanding and friendship. The trick is simply a matter of bringing folks out of their shell, and into the spirit of things."

It's a trick that Wally has mastered well during his years of travel. Language presents no barrier, as Wally has a repertoire of songs in 21 languages, most of them involving the participation of the audience in a pantomimelike performance of gestures.

When Wally arrives in a new country he immediately buys a handful of newspapers and begins to look for festivals, programs, or gatherings which might be able to use his services as a song leader. "I rarely work through embassies or official government agencies," he says. "I feel I have more freedom and I find the people are more receptive if they know I am there just because I want to be, not because I have been commissioned and paid by the government to entertain them."

A lack of money will rarely stop Wally from putting on a program either. If a group indicates it is unable to pay his modest fee, Wally cheerfully accepts a dinner, a night's lodging, or, upon occasion, a friendly handshake and a smile as his payment.

He travels as inexpensively as possible. One 8-month tour, which took him to Wales, Scotland, England, Iceland, Germany, Italy, France, Malta, Libya, Monaco, San Marino, and the Isle of Sark, cost him less than $2,000, including transportation.

Wally's song-leading talents remained just a hobby for sometime after his initial experience. He performed for Boy Scouts, YMCA groups, schools, hospitals, and churches for awhile in this country. On a trip to England, where he was studying at the University of Nottingham, he began teaching American folk songs to British groups, and in turn, learned English songs to take back to this country.

He soon found that instead of teaching, he could bring more joy to people—and have more fun at the same time—by leading groups of singers.

When not off on a tour to some remote section of the world, Wally makes his home in Milwaukee, Wis. He has helped make many an aerie party in Milwaukee more lively with his songs, and has recently entertained Eagle bowlers from around the country at Saturday night shindigs at the aerie clubhouse.

Wally has a portfolio of newspaper clippings from just about every country and in every language imaginable. He, himself, speaks Spanish, German, and a little French, so rarely has difficulty making himself understood wherever he goes. At one time he even led a school of deaf children in a songfest, and with his animated gestures and lively technique, soon had the youngsters laughing and gaily following him.

"Children are the easiest to get to participate," Wally says. "They have fewer inhibitions and are not so concerned with looking silly."

The Indians and Arabs, on the other hand, are the most difficult nationalities to reach, Wally said. By their nature they are more reserved and tend to be suspicious of anything they are not accustomed to.

Wally's most recent tour took him to the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Dominican Republic. In the Republic he led a Girl and Boy Scout "singalong" in the former home of the assassinated dictator, Trujillo, which has been converted into a school.

Wally hopes to visit South America this summer and is already planning a long-awaited trip to Australia and New Zealand for next year.

One thing is sure. Wherever this 20th century minstrel roams, he will leave behind him a happy contingent of fans, whose impression of Americans is greatly enhanced because of the memory of Wally L. Meyer and his songs.

Uncle Tom's Cabin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am tremendously impressed with the following letter to the editor by the Reverend Davis L. Barker, Vicar of St. Bride's Episcopal Church, Oregon, Ill., which was printed in the Republican-Reporter of that community.

Mr. Speaker, I commend it to the attention of our colleagues here in the House. I am confident they will find it as interesting and informative as I have found it to be.

The article follows:

UNCLE TOM'S CABIN

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article came to this paper as a "letter to the editor." Although we do not feel qualified to agree or disagree with its content, it appears to contain a sincere and unbiased interpretation of the integration problem which casts a shadow upon the lives of every citizen in the United States regardless of color and creed.)

The South, today, is facing the most agonizing struggle it has known since the Civil War.

That agony is to find a new place for the Negro in the South's economy and social structure. And this is a task not easily or simply done, despite the sweeping assurances of northern orators on the subject.

I speak here as one having some personal knowledge of the problem, for I lived 10 years in the South, and while disclaiming the role of expert, I can view both sides of the issue with at least some understanding and sympathy.

Whatn orthern demagogs fail to recognize is that the roots of what is called the Negro problem in the South, lie as much in and with the Negro community as they do the white community.

Culturally and educationally, the Southern Negro is 50 to 100 years behind the white community, and with rare exception, almost totally unprepared for equality, either socially or economically, with the white community. This is in part the fault of the white community, but it is equally due to the very fabric of the southern agrarian culture. For this culture, before and after the Civil War, has rested upon the existence of a large, cheap labor source for agriculture and industry, and the managership of a small, elite aristocracy, whose lineaments still prevail in the South.

Probably the majority of southern Negroes, even today, would be relatively happy with life under a paternalistic aristocracy. Relatively few of them have desired radical change in what has been a happy and comfortable relationship with the whites, and those who found the system oppressive moved to northern or western cities.

Because this is true, the typical southern Negro was in no position to do what his present leaders are demanding: to emerge as the equal and competitor of the whites in a new classless society.

The southern Negro has not wanted to compete; he has wanted to be cared for. He did not want equality with the white; he wanted security from the white landowner. What is more, in large part he got what he wanted and was, until lately, content with his lot.

But in the meanwhile, the Old South was changing.

Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that the Old South has been revolutionized. For one thing, the South has witnessed the migration of northern industry in an unprecedented flow of factories and mills. At the same time, modern farming methods and farm machinery have made the old Negro hand increasingly obsolete scent.

This radical change of the South over the past 25 years has all but destroyed the old agrarian paternalism and, in large part, has forced the Negro either to compete with the white for a job on farm or factory, or has driven him into the ranks of the unemployed as a seasonally employed relief recipient.

Behind the furor of soda fountains and seats on buses, it is because of this that the Negro is revolting. The revolutionary social and economic change of the South has destroyed his old security and place. Today, the Negro must find a new place in society * * * and in the modern economic order of the South, that place is as a competitor and equal of the white.

In truth, the problem is no less acute for the white than it is for the Negro. In Norfolk, Va., for instance, while I lived there, the Negro community, representing half of the urban population, contributed only 10 percent of the city's revenues, while requiring 80 percent of the expenditures for public welfare. For Norfolk and every Southern city, this is an intolerable fiscal burden and drain.

And the cost of maintaining thousands of depressed and dependent Negroes robbed Norfolk of funds for general civic improvement and community progress * * * a situation which can not be tolerated if the Southern culture is to advance.

The only solution for it—in the end—is to raise the Negro culturally and economically until he is truly self-supporting and able to contribute as much to the society as he takes from it.

But this is more easily said than done.

For North as well as South, it means a most formidable undertaking in the mass education of the Negro, who by and large is supinely indifferent to education.

More immediately, it means job-retraining for Negroes in industries which already have a white surplus * * * or as has been suggested, a vast Federal program to locate and aid industries which can absorb the Negro.

And more immediately yet, it requires us as white, as white Christians, to give the Negro the position, respect and opportunity he seeks * * * and must have * * * for our sake as well as his.

All of these are extremely difficult steps. All of them require radical changes in America's life. Some of them will be both difficult and agonizing for the South, and will take time, patience and understanding on the part of all of us.

What, then, are we in our community to do about this?

First, I think, as rational men we must realize that this crisis is not being made by Dr. Martin Luther King. He is but an accident of the times. The crisis is being provoked by an industiral revolution in the South, which has completely changed both urban and rural life in that area.

Segregation of races or peoples is simply not possible in a modern industrial society, and the Negro, as he demands equality, is as much as anything else simply responding to economic and social pressures which are already present fact in both North and South.

Secondly, our sympathy and prayers must be with the Negro as he struggles against not merely white prejudice, but his own crippling cultural lag which holds him back, in Chicago as well as in Atlanta. We must give our aid to the effort which much be made by both white and Negro to raise the Negro culturally and educationally to the point where he can compete on something of an equal footing in a modern, industrial and urban society.

This, I might add, is going to be a long slow process, requiring the maximum of patience and tolerance on the part of both races.

Finally, our sympathy and understanding must, too, be with the southern white as he faces the agonizing truth that the old way in the South, is now past, and that his whole culture must change.

We, living here, litle realize how difficult and how painful a process this is. But we must recognize it and have patience with the slow and ponderous way a culture changes.

This cannot be done overnight, and here I must add that the difficulties—not even the outrages of Birmingham—should not blind us to the fact that remarkable progress has been made in large sections of the South. Neither should headlines cause us to overlook that, basically, there is as much a Negro problem in Chicago as there is in Mississippi.

Uncle Tom's Cabin has been razed to the ground, and it is now our Christian duty to find for Uncle Tom a new way, as well as a new place to live. This is one of the most formidable undertakings the United States has ever faced, and it shall require the best we can summon in toleration, and in patience and in effort.

The Reverend DAVIS L. BARKER,
Vicar, St. Bride's Episcopal Church,
Oregon-Mount Morris, Ill.

Kennedy Policies May Be Bringing United States to the End of the Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the failure of the Kennedy administration to deal realistically with the problems we face may be bringing the United States very close to the end of the road—financial disaster.

Our balance-of-payments situation steadily worsens. Increased spending and demands for more Federal welfare programs continue to add inflationary pressures almost to the breaking point.

There is only one sensible approach to get us back on the road to a strong and healthy economy, cut Federal spending, balance the budget, and cut taxes all across the board. To continue the course upon which President Kennedy is determined to follow will hasten the day when we reach the end of the road.

The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal, July 11, "The End of the Road," points up the danger of Kennedy policies:

THE END OF THE ROAD

Progress toward ending this Nation's balance-of-payments deficit has been disappointingly slow," Treasury Secretary Dillon declared this week. As a result, he promised Congress, the administration is planning a new "action program" to solve the problem.

To say that progress has been slow is putting it mildly. For most of the past decade the Nation, and particularly the Government, has been unable to equate its international income with its international outgo. Only by drawing down our gold supply and by persuading foreigners to be patient creditors have we been able to live with these chronic balance-of-payments deficits.

How long can this go on?

As Allan Sproul said in a recent speech, "There is a limit to financing the deficit in this way" and "we are approaching that limit." In the view of the former president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, the time has come to place "top national priority" on correcting our balance-of-payments deficit; "it should not be treated as something wholly subordinate to our international political policies and military programs nor to other demands of the domestic economy."

To be sure, some of the steps taken by the Government in this area have helped keep the problem from getting worse than it is. By arranging currency swaps and loans abroad, we have been able to ease the shocks of our payments deficits. But these moves have only brought us time and, in Mr. Sproul's words, when we borrow funds abroad we "have dug deeper the hole out of which we must eventually climb."

Some of our efforts to climb out of that hole, furthermore, are at best misguided. There is, for example, the Government's campaign to stimulate exports. More exports would be fine, but our surplus of exports over imports is already the strongest factor in the balance of payments. With Europe rapidly catching up with us in technology, and with Europe and Japan more eager than ever for exports of their own, the Government's best export-boosting schemes by themselves probably can do little more than keep the trade surplus as large as it is.

Moreover, little help can be expected from such moves as discouraging foreign borrowing in the United States, and American investments abroad. Besides running counter to our long-standing policy of encouraging the free flow of capital, these steps are likely to be self-defeating. The fact is that these borrowings and investments produce a return flow of income that even now about equals outgo and may do even better in the long run. Beyond that, if capital-outflow curbs were applied firmly enough to have much effect, foreigners might well become so frightened about the dollar's future that they would start a real run on our gold.

What, then, can be done?

For one thing, it would help if we relied a bit less on the supposed magic of easy money as a domestic economic stimulant. For nearly 3 years now, through recession and recovery, money has been kept relatively cheap and easily available—without producing the hoped-for rate of economic growth. What this policy has done, instead, is to worsen our balance-of-payments problem, both by inducing more foreigners to borrow here and by leading both American and foreign investors to prefer the higher interest rates available in other countries.

In addition to a more responsible monetary policy, we need what Mr. Sproul labels a more energetic cost-price policy. By this he does not mean wage and price guidelines, or exhortations and threats to producers to keep prices down. A far more realistic approach calls for Government to stop coddling inefficient producers in agriculture and industry, and for industry to speed adoption of new technology. Though many unions profess not to see it, automation will both improve our international competitive position and spur the domestic economy—and thus provide more, not fewer, jobs.

The same ends will be served by a tax cut which makes it both possible and prudent to step up spending on more efficient machines. But this must be a tax cut coupled with substantial reductions in Federal spending. Citing one area for deep cuts that would greatly improve our balance-of-payments position, Mr. Sproul says: "It is past time * * * for a severe tightening up in our foreign military and economic aid."

It should be evident that much of our economic aid is wasteful and unavailing. As for military aid, in Mr. Sproul's words, "it has seemed increasingly clear * * * that our associates in the free world will respond to the limits of their responsibility, capacity, and interest only if we cut down on our own contributions."

Mr. Dillon has not yet spelled out what he means by a new "action program," but there is no mystery about what a new approach should be or any doubt about the urgency. By now everyone should be able to see the frightening end of the road the Government still insists on traveling.

Japan's Opening Door: Problems and Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry and Japan's United States-Japan Trade Council recently sponsored a conference on agricultural trade with Japan. Mr. Alexis Johnson, a U.S. Deputy Under Secretary of State, spoke at that conference.

> We can see clearly—

He said—

> that the matters of greatest concern to us, to the British, and to the European Economic Community, also concern the Pacific area, and notably Japan.

Mr. Johnson continued:

> The enlargement of worldwide, nondiscriminatory, competitive trade (through removal of tariff and other obstacles) will give to Japan, whose survival depends on expanding commerce, new possibilities for growth. It will create a world economic environment, favorable to an increasing volume of American exports. In this lies the primary answer to our balance-of-payments problems. Trade binds all together—East and West, North and South.

Secretary Johnson's words are well chosen. The economic prosperity of the United States and Japan and the strength and progress of the free world in general will be served by the removal of unnecessary trade barriers between our nations and the increased flow of commerce that will result. These matters have long been concerns of mine. My trip to Japan in late 1962 was in part concerned with discovering what opportunities for U.S. exporters were opening up in that country. I am particularly aware of the contribution Alaska could make to such trade: fishery, wood, and petroleum products certainly represent items which we could profitably export to an open Japanese market.

I also was present at the hearings which the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] conducted for the Commerce Committee in San Francisco this past May. These hearings, as well as the hearings and investigations recently carried out by the Joint Economic Committee, pointed up the existence of sizable overall differentials between shipping rates charged U.S. exporters and those paid by exporters in other countries. In my statement before the Joint Economic Committee on June 20, I pointed out that these rate differentials might well be having a detrimental effect on our Pacific export trade. And I further showed that some of the most striking differentials apply precisely to items on which Japan has recently lowered restrictions and which Americans are, therefore, exporting in unprecedented quantities.

To those of us who are particularly concerned with the opportunities and problems posed by the prospects of increased United States-Japanese trade, a major item of interest has been the Japanese movement toward trade liberalization. Realizing her need for capital, investment, and trade expansion, Japan has moved toward the lowering of an increasing number of barriers to trade and foreign investment. These trends have been further encouraged by changing patterns in Japan's domestic economic structure.

American exporters and investors rightly perceive that developments in Japan promise them manifold opportunities. But the story of Japanese liberalization in the areas of foreign trade and investment is not a simple one; powerful traditional forces in government, banking, and business are moving in directions which may in part counteract liberalizing developments. Louis Banks, in the July 1963 issue of Fortune, has written an article which ably discusses these trends—the opportunities they portend and the problems they pose. The article at points reflects a rather uncritical adherence to certain traditional ideals of the American business community. But in the main it is a well-written, informative, balanced piece of work, and one which persons interested in the future of Japanese-American trade and business relations will do well to examine. I ask that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, I have been informed by the Public Printer of the U.S. Government Printing Office, that the cost for printing will be $382.50. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the cost the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAPAN: THE OPEN DOOR WITH A CATCH

(By Louis Banks)

"The new black-ship invasion," the diehards and the cynics call it, and thereby conjure up a vision of that epochal day in Japanese history when Commodore Perry anchored his warships off Tokyo Bay and opened up United States-Japanese trade at cannon point. Fortunately, the diehards and the cynics are remarkably few in modern Japan, but they have their history in correct perspective. Not at cannon point, but under the guns of logical political and economic development, Japan within the next year or 18 months will be opening up to the Western world economically and psychologically to an extent it has never really done before in its long history.

In broad outline, the opening door is Japan's part of the implied international bargain called world trade. As an island nation it lives by exports. As a rapidly developing industrial nation it needs widening markets for manufactured goods. Since Japan itself is a widening market for both goods and capital, it cannot very well step up its competitive selling overseas without dismantling some of the barriers that have protected its lusty new industries from competition at home. In this acknowledged quid pro quo lies new opportunity for U.S. businessmen. As a veteran American business adviser in Tokyo puts it: "Japan has been here for a long time, and lots of Americans have found it. But I would say that this is the time when everybody who's even midly interested should have a fresh look at the situation."

The new situation is far more than the sum of its specific parts, and there are plenty of parts. Under the prodding of the International Monetary Fund, which has adjudged prosperous Japan to be a fully developed "article eight" nation, the Japanese have already begun to dismantle their restrictions on foreign exchange. They have officially modified their stiff rules on foreign investments so that foreigners can hold controlling interests in Japanese corporations. They intend to abandon—in principle, at least—quantitative restrictions on imports, in time to make a convincing report of achievement at the IMF's annual meeting in September 1964—which, as it happens, probably will take place in Tokyo. The Japanese have also applied for, and shortly expect, full-fledged membership in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), and are knocking at the door of the Bank for International Settlements.

Meanwhile, they have determined to complete a massive public construction program by October 1964, when the Olympic Games begin in a new stadium at the end of a new double-deck highway and subway line in Tokyo's Meiji Park. Hotels still unbuilt are already booked to capacity and managers are scouring the countryside for staffs to handle the anticipated flood of strangers from all over the world. Before the end of this year the Government is expected to lift foreign travel restrictions for its own citizens, and the newly prosperous (and always curious) Japanese will surge across the oceans in record numbers. It is difficult to appreciate the total impact that this newly open door is bound to have on this industrious, insular, and introverted people.

So thoroughgoing are the impending changes that they have been the subject of intense debate for months. The threat of new competition inevitably has caused varying degrees of misgiving and skepticism—not to mention a crop of artfully fashioned escape clauses and plans for "temporary" protection of key industries. In some of its aspects the opening up has brought Japan face to face with basic decisions about the future structure of its own economic system. Nonetheless, the responsible people of Government and business see the new developments as essential to Japan's growth as a trading nation, and indeed essential to the kind of international stature that the Japanese claim as a reward for their phenomenally successful postwar economic development.

The nation's economic progress since the early 1950's long ago replaced the "German miracle" in the hearts of macro-economists and growth chartists, and they are impressed all over again by today's prospects for Japan. Two years ago the Government abruptly put monetary brakes on the boom when the "overheated" growth rate surged to 15 percent and heavy imports caused a dangerous run on foreign exchange. Under pressure, the payments balance was reversed in Japan's favor within 6 months, and now the country is confidently marching out of its induced recession—apparently the wiser for the experience. Prime Minister Hayato Ikeda's breathtaking 10-year "doubling income plan," intended to raise the gross national product from $40.7 billion to $81 billion by 1970, is still well ahead of the anticipated 7.8 percent annual growth rate, and may well be fulfilled in 7 or 8 years. The stock market is rebounding. Bottlenecks in housing and transport are being shattered by heavy public spending; cross-country highways are slicing through unspoiled mountains and across suburban rice paddies while an arrow-straight new railroad is cutting across the 320 miles between Tokyo and Osaka, designed to supplement existing 60-mile-an-hour trains with 120-mile-an-hour expresses by next year.

Steel, shipping, textiles, and heavy machinery are still lagging in recovery, but their corporate executives are scraping around for money for modernization or expansion. New plants are building along every major highway and rail line. The shrewd, polished Japanese bankers betray just a hint of excitement as they lunch at their clubs. Established U.S. and European businessmen find they are in demand for long afternoon conferences, or lavish evening sessions in geisha houses; often they emerge with their eyes dancing to route their oversea bosses out of bed for long, costly transoceanic phone conversations. Business tourists, on the prowl for deals, throng Tokyo and Osaka hotel lobbies, some with prearranged appointments with Japanese opposite numbers—the Tokyo office of the First National City Bank alone handles 2,500 referrals a year from stateside offices, and some rushing to the bruising ordeal of assaulting, cold, both the Japanese language and the barricades of highly formalized Japanese business. "They can't even pronounce Cohen," said a New York odd-lot textile dealer sadly, after he had failed to get beyond a reception desk.

Small wonder that Westerners catch the fever. An American businessman, once he overcomes the strangeness of the surroundings, finds himself with the curious feeling that he is living his life over again and has a chance to make up for all his bad guesses of the past 20 years. He quickly recognizes that Japan is going through the same production and expansion phase that the United States went through in the early 1950's. He senses the potential of a rapidly ripening new consumer market, with wages rising, money in small bank accounts, and the apple of installment credit still on the tree.

THE THREE-SIDED STRUGGLE FOR THE FUTURE

No heaven-bound growth statistics, however, can measure the depth of the quiet struggle that is going on about the fundamental nature of the future Japanese business system. The key word in all debates is liberalization—adopted literally into Japanese—and in this word the Japanese wrap up all the new foreign competitive forces that they expect to bear down upon them when trade and investment are liberalized and barriers come down. In its formative postwar years the Japanese economy has thrived in the best of all possible worlds: governmental protection for its manufacturers in the domestic market, and profitable, competitive selling in other people's markets. Now liberalization, with its influx of foreign goods, foreign capital, and foreign know-how, threatens to spoil some very good things at home. Therefore the debates concentrate on what Japan should do to its own economy to insure that it will weather the coming increase of competition from outside. Not forgotten, of course, is the relation between the internal economic structure and Japan's ability to increase its exports.

Roughly speaking, there are not two but three sides to this debate. Virtually nobody is for instantaneous, wide-open free trade, and nobody is for keeping the door tightly sealed. But between these extremes the differing viewpoints have considerable importance in the context of Japanese history. One force is little more than a corporal's guard of intrepid industrialists, the up-from-the-workbench Henry Ford types. These are rugged individualists who escaped the smothering embrace of the big, fatherly Japanese corporations to set up their own companies. They usually started with a single line of products, plowing back their capital until they became attractive credit risks, exporting in what the old established firms sniffed at as "an uncoordinated manner," and wading into the domestic market in a show of excessive competition. These are generally light industry firms, riding on new technologies and creating new markets. A few are now corporate giants but most are medium size companies that got their chance while the MacArthur occupation was breaking up the old zaibatsu monopolies. Enterprises such as these would like to see Japanese business put to the test of open competition, domestic and foreign—give or take a couple of years for adjustments. Their principle has the backing and support of that far-sighted group of younger generation managers in the Keizai Doyukai, the Japanese equivalent of the Committee for Economic Development, and two or three influential economic journals.

The second position in the debate is personified by Prime Minister Ikeda, a competent economist by training who has learned the hard way to be a skillful political leader of the Liberal-Democratic majority. Ikeda is pledged, as he told Fortune, to a "free market" and a removal "of the old restrictive measures * * * provided that the influx of foreign capital will not endanger the maintenance of Japanese industry," and he is leading the country into the terra incognito of liberalization with a show of confidence and responsibility. But his government is by no means in favor of open competition as the final arbiter of the domestic market; rather it is pressing for mergers and realinements of unsturdy competitive companies and would be pleased to see an allocation of markets. A key piece of legislation in the Diet is the government-sponsored Specified Industries Protection Act, which mocks liberalization by erecting new walls of protection around automobiles, ferroallays, petrochemicals, tires, and some lesser industries. A similar protective measure has just gone into effect for Japan's fledgling oil industry; it puts all investment, production, imports, sales, and pricing of oil under the thumb of a government bureau. The Japanese bureaucracy, it should be noted, is an independent and important influence on policy. It is enlightened about the principles of liberalization but arrogantly confident that it alone is the true custodian of the national soul, and motivated, as one local observer puts it, "by a mishmash of anticolonialism, nationalism, and a brand of authoritarian reasoning." Like bureaucrats the world over, Tokyo's are determined to hang on to the power to make the daily economic decisions that influence the course of events.

The increasingly powerful third force comprises the old established industrial and commercial interests with their interlocking connections and their durable loyalties. They are moved by an ancient urge to face the pressures of liberalization by downgrading both bureaucracy and domestic competition. If they had their way, they would run the country like one giant cooperative family, nicely dividing markets by cartel agreements and more or less opening up to foreigners who have technology to offer, or want to invest or operate on polite family terms. These interests revolve around the four biggest zaibatsu groupings: Mitsui, Mitsubishi, Sumitomo, and Yasuda. Under their influence, not only has the word "zaibatsu" (literally, "money cliques") long since recovered from the opprobrium of occupation days, but zaibatsu connections are flaunted as a sign of special strentgh. It is fair to say that the traditionalists who run Japanese big business see the lowering of governmental barriers against imports as a sure sign that Japan will need their family-style type of business organization more than ever before. Liberalization to them is an excuse and/or reason for reestablishing the old order and strengthening it by extending their influence to all the new technological areas developed in the postwar period.

The traditionalists are abetted in this endeavor by the central fact about the structure of the Japanese economy. Japan is a nation heavily in hock to its bankers. Its principal bankers, in turn, are either the key men in the existing zaibatsu groupings or would like to be the key men in new groupings of the nonalined. The Bank of Japan (the central bank) estimates that the typical major Japanese corporation has a capital structure that is 70 percent bank loans and 30 percent equity—and more likely than not its principal creditor banks are also the listed owners of the largest blocks of stock.

The major banks are precariously overloaned, sometimes as high as 115 percent of their deposits and capital. Usually they have large numbers of eggs in a few big corporate baskets. Rigorous industrial competition might topple a badly run, overextended corporation, and that, in turn, could prompt a run on its principal bank—and even, in theory at least, a shakeup of the whole Japanese credit structure. So just at the point where market disciplines should make themselves felt, the Japanese bankers fight shy of letting competitive forces have full play. The principal banker of a faltering corporation sits down with his fellow bankers "for the common good" and they work out an arrangement that keeps the ailing company afloat—perhaps by switching business to it, by refinancing, by pressing it to merge with a competitor, or by reshuffling management. Right now the bankers are carefully computing the probable effects of liberalization on their favorite customers and are busily engaged in engineering a series of mergers, refinancings, and management switches, all calculated to strengthen the economy—in a family way.

A strong trend toward cartelization is the catch to the opening door. In justification, the Japanese like to explain that such arrangements are common in Europe, and that cartels can be a reasonably efficient way of economic life if they are forced to compete with one another in the world market. U.S. investors, taking the narrow view, might find it more profitable and less risky to invest in one of the wide-ranging zaibatsu trading companies than in any Japanese mutual fund, because they would be buying not only wide diversification but irresistible banking and political influence. But in a broader perspective, the important fact is that the Japanese have arrived at a point where they deserve far better than the old way, where a new way would not only sustain the surge of energy that is everywhere apparent, but might well release a surge of individual enterprise that could propel Japan toward an important leading—instead of a perpetually following—role among industrial democracies.

TOWARD CORPORATE PURPOSE

Individualism has never really been tapped as a source of creativity in Japan, principally because generation after generation of youngsters—with the notable and pregnant exception of the postwar crop—has been schooled to ignore private urges and impulses on pain of shame or even sudden death. As legions of Western sociologists and social psychologists are eager to attest, the urge to maintain proper public "face" is more important than personal achievement or profit. Leaving aside the psychology of it all, Japanese face in business terms is a pride in keeping in line—and a fierce resentment against anyone who gets out of line or pushes anyone else out of line. Since an American gains face by appearing to be out of line even when he's in, this difference in approach is more or less at the bottom of differing views of business ethics, personal behavior, and indeed of the central values of life.

Unlike Western economic systems, Japan's did not evolve from any upward struggle of individual entrepreneurs against a political aristocracy. Instead it was virtually established by imperial decree. Because the Emperor Meiji was persuaded that national survival depended on achievement of industrial, military, and technological strength, commercial life sprang full grown from centuries of the world's most thoroughgoing feudalism—and only a hundred years ago at that. It is far less surprising that Japanese business absorbed some feudalistic elements than it is that the Japanese aristocrats turned out to be such competent economic planners.

Their job was to beg, borrow, or develop enough plant and know-how to create a trading nation, and for this specific task government-directed capitalism probably was a lot more efficient than the trial-and-error variety. In any case, competition came to be regarded as both wasteful and antisocial, and there were few individual voices to speak up and say "Nay." Trade being Japan's only way of getting the machines and raw materials it needed, a few far-ranging trading companies developed to provide credit and orderly marketing for small Japanese producers. These evolved into some of the most powerful of the zaibatsu groupings.

Centralization of authority made the economy vulnerable to Army control as the military clique built toward war during the 1930's. Then in war's aftermath the discipline turned into an asset as Japan started all over again to develop a new industrial economy. Months before the war ended, a group of farseeing economists in government had laid down the principal guidelines for reconstruction, and it has been along these guidelines that the postwar economy, propelled here and there by liberal U.S. aid and unexpected breaks, has climbed steeply to new peaks.

PRESSURES FOR AGREEMENTS

The planners saw the need for Japanese exports to move up the scale of technological development, climbing from a main dependence on textiles toward light-industry output, and finally from there toward heavy industry. It was their conclusion that Japan must erase the prewar reputation for shoddy, copied goods and emphasize quality control. While they regarded the low-wage labor force as their principal starting asset in world competition, they foresaw a rising standard of living and the eventual need for laborsaving machinery. They set out once again to absorb the latest know-how from the West, either by licensing or by screened admission of foreign producers.

Though the planners were careful to leave broad areas to the initiative of business, the pressures worked in favor of industry-wide associations and allocations of markets—e.g., a determination to prevent cheap textiles from flooding the American market required the establishment of, and constant patrolling of, an industrywide export quality-control and quota system. It was a simple matter to move from foreign allocations to a discussion of problems of the home market, and then to a suggestion of mergers or agreements as a polite way out of competition. Well before 1960 big business had come to consider the Occupation-inspired antimonopoly law about as useful to Japanese life as the street signs the Americans had carefully posted in joyfully confused Tokyo.

The traditionalists viewed the prospect of increased foreign competition as proof of the need for more cartelization. But they might well have been surprised at the amount of disagreement with such orthodoxy. There was remarkable vigor in the free-market argument because the same changes that were lifting Japan to the ranks of modern industrial nations were also making clear that things could never again be quite the way they were before.

TALENT SCOUTS AT THE JUNIOR HIGH

A dependable, low-wage labor force has long been as much a part of the Japanese landscape as Mount Fuji. It still is—but with a difference. Last spring Tokyo newspapers carried the story of a small Yokohama manufacturer of automobile accessories. His normal work crew was 15 men, but within 3 or 4 weeks five of his skilled workers had fallen victim, in various degrees of injury, to the savage urban auto traffic. He could not find replacements, so he had to close down his shop. People who think loosely of Japan as a country of teeming millions may be taking aback by this small story.

By Japanese standards there is a growing labor shortage. This single fact is perhaps working more change in the hallowed Japanese socioeconomic structure than any other. The shortage is due partly to the simple mathematics of a rapidly expanding economy and a relatively stable population (Japan's annual net increase has been slowed to less than 1 percent as a result of widespread birth control education and legalized abortions). Another factor is the growing determination of parents to send their children, especially boys, beyond the legally prescribed junior high school to high school, thus taking a big percentage of potential recruits off the market for 3 or 4 years. On the demand side the need is growing for adaptable youngsters to man the new complex machinery of the modern age.

Big corporations send scouts deep into outlying farm country in search of likely junior high recruits; it is not unusual for a junior high graduate to have three big companies bidding for his services. "Bidding" may be too strong a word, because the starting wage level is fairly rigid, but the recruiters plug the fame and prestige of the corporation and dazzle farm parents with descriptions of the paternal corporate care and elaborate fringe benefits.

The big, established corporations still get their man—or their girl (and in the competition low-rated foreign corporations usually get the lemons of the year's crop). But the real effects of the shortages are showing at the margins. They are important margins:

As youngsters leave the farms for the factories, farm labor has become so expensive that farmers are mechanizing. Before long, Japan's centuries-old structure of small farms will surely give way to more efficient units.

In the thousands of small home industries, the lowest tier of the nation's famed "dual structure," it is becoming more and more difficult to recruit apprentices. This is bound to lead to a number of mergers in the little industries and, at some distant point, the probable breakup of the dual structure, with government grants and loans tiding the hard-squeezed little men through the major transition.

In the big, modern plants the youngsters with responsibility for new machinery are starting to demand pay on a job-classification basis, which is a blow to the whole hallowed concept of deference to seniority.

On up the scale is perhaps the most revolutionary development of all: the increasing mobility of labor. The rank and file of Japanese workers stay with the same company, through thick or thin, until retirement (usually at 55). But under pressure of shortages, the strong tradition against job hopping is beginning to crack. Today raiding begins around the level of garage mechanics and moves up the skills. Mobility of labor exists for such as engineers (especially English-speaking), economic consultants and market-research specialists, foreign language experts, aggressive salesmen and sales managers, technical-training teachers, advertising men, and journalists. Raiding of talented corporate junior executives is just over the next hill. The younger generation of white-collar workers is growing exceedingly restive with the escalator system of promotion, which rewards longevity rather than merit. The problem is accentuated because there is such a big difference in outlook between the midwar generation and the prewar bosses.

Government planners recognize that the old Japanese labor patterns have to change, simply because the old ways are inefficient and put Japan at a disadvantage competitively. They are accordingly pushing for a more liberal public social security system. Once social security supplants or supplements corporate welfare responsibilities, the practice of switching jobs will surely be widely accepted. Right now Government is sometimes suspected of helping old corporations around the costs of deadwood in a very deft way: companies under competitive fire are ençouraged to spin off new ventures making new lines of products; for these subsidiaries they can pick their brightest and most energetic men and build up a young work force.

Wages are rising about 5 percent a year, largely as a result of the labor shortage, although unions claim most of the credit. Actually, unions are relatively weak in the total labor picture because they are organized on a company by company basis—and in a showdown a Japanese employee's heart usually belongs to his corporate daddy. Every spring unions call workers out on muscle-flexing, 24-hour wage-up strikes, but union leaders are well aware that they have yet to build the power, the finances, and the following to pull off long strikes. But even without strong union influence, Japan's wages are expected to rise to the level of Western Europe's in about 5 years. All of which intensifies anxiety about the problem of foreign competition, because there is no doubt that Japan's pricing edge on such items as cameras, transistors, and watches depends heavily on the wage differential.

POLYSTYRENE IN PENNSYLVANIA

The postwar success stories of some corporate mavericks have provided another challenge to business orthodoxy. In fact, the names of some of the come-lately enterprises are better known to the outside world than those of old-line companies. Konosuke Matsushita has made the cover of Time, and the study of his beginnings as a rebellious inventor of electric plugs and his rise to the top of the consumer electric-appliance market is international business legend. While the old, established Toshiba's and Hitachi's move decorously through their international connections, Matsushita has moved fast with the most thoroughgoing salesmanship seen in Japan since old Mikimoto, the cultured-pearl king, made the oyster his world.

Although about one-seventh the size of Matsushita in sales, Sony Corp. (1962 sales: $63 million) is a study in the highly effective use of limited capital. Taking off from a hunch about using transistors in consumer goods, President Masaru Ibuka, a physicist, piloted the company into miniaturization of the first transistor radios and TV sets. As Sony's share of the domestic market for transistor radios was battered down by Matsushita, Toshiba, Hitachi, and the other big manufatcurers, the company gambled heavily on the American market, surmounting a 12.5-percent tariff to outdistance Japanese competitiors and unnerve mighty American companies, which had seriously underrated the sales appeal of small radio and TV sets. Sony not only violated Japanese orthodoxy by shunning the big Japanese trading companies and opening up its own sales organizations in the United States, but it took an even bolder step by going to the New York Stock Exchange with a $3,500,000 stock offering in 1961 to take advantage of cheaper capital; it repeated the process to the tune of $5 million this spring.

The Matsushita and Sony stories of independence have their equivalents in motorcycles, sewing machines, cameras, plastics, rubber tires, and a number of other areas of light industry. Japanese journals are currently fascinated by the intrepid operation of Sekisui Chemical Co. of Osaka, which has just opened a branch plastics plant in Hazelton, Pa. Sekisui (pronounced "sexy") is the first Japanese manufacturer to compete from a U.S. base. The Hazelton plant will produce Sekisui's specialty, polystyrene paper, for packaging and insulation, and hopes eventually to recruit and finance a string of U.S. molding companies. Sekisui found that savings on freight and capital costs more than overbalanced the higher costs of U.S. construction and labor (labor is three times higher than in Japan, but the plant plans to operate with only two-thirds of the personnel it would use for similar operations at home). "We are quite happy," says President Jiroh Ueno with a tone of sincerity that has to be heard to be believed, "to contribute to the solution of the American unemployment problem."

INEVITABLE CONCENTRATION OF CAPITAL

In heavy industry the old-line interests are dominant, and while they are far less interested in adventurous independent operation than the mavericks, they are far more influential in modernizing the Nation's basic plant and equipment. In steel, shipbuilding, petrochemicals, light machinery, machine tools, turbines, etc., the Japanese are upending world price structures with new plant, new capacity, and rising productivity.

Since most heavy industries are backed by the zaibatsu banks, there is very little temptation for the rivals to battle it out in the domestic market. Nearly every day, newspapers tell of some friendly reallocation of markets, or a pending merger of competitors, or some request for special protection. "If we compete within the domestic market," Prime Minister Ikeda explains, "then we will lose our international competitive ability. Therefore it is nevtable that some concentration of capital take place." Shrewd observers of the Japanese scene believe that the so-called Specified Industries Protection Act is really a smokescreen for a drastic revision of the antimonopoly law, in response to pressure from big industry for a cartelized economy.

COMPETITION GETS THE BLAME

If Japan is now in a position where vertical trusts and cartelization look like the only way out, it is large the fault of the bank-oriented Japanese financial system. Commercial banking consists of some 70 separate "ordinary" banks, scattered around the country, with total assets of about $53 billion. Of these the 12 biggest banks of Tokyo and Osaka list assets of $32.5 billion and because of their connections and influence virtually control the Nation's capital market. The big 12 are known as the "city banks," and there is ever widening agreement that their domination of the capital market is a force for inefficiency and instability in the Japanese economy.

The banks came to their position of power honorably enough. In occupation days Joseph M. Dodge, the Detroit banker who was assigned the job of replacing inflationary chaos with a sound fiscal and monetary system, laid down the principle that the government budget must always be balanced. The principle has stuck. Tremendous funds were, of course, needed for reconstruction, and since deficit-financed government spending was excluded, the burden of providing credit for rebuilding industry fell on banks. The city banks loaned up to and well beyond their assets, borrowing in turn from the central bank, the Bank of Japan. In 1951 the city-bank loan rate averaged 124 percent—i.e., 24 percent over all deposits, debenture issues, and capital. So heady was the resulting growth rate that the banks, industry, and the Bank of Japan kept right on going as reconstruction phased into the "Japanese miracle" of development. The 1961 city-bank loan ratio averaged 102, with effective interest rates hovering around 10 percent.

Some foreign economists have praised this system lavishly for building an efficient economic structure by limiting growth to the potentially profitable, i.e., efficient, firms that could afford to pay the interest rates. In theory there's much to be said for financing industrial growth with bank credit rather than deficit-financed government spending. But Japan just never works like a textbook model; it got massive inefficiency instead. Each big zaibatsu bank, and most of the would-be zaibatsu banks, had its own stable of industries. So, in effect, each urged its own allies or customers to plunge into fashionable new fields of heavy industry—"like sheep," as a Japanese economist declares. If Mitsui was building a petrochemical complex, Sumitomo, Mitsubishi, and each of the various other central interests had to get going on its own petrochemical complex too. There was virtually no limit to credit, no patrol of either corporate or bank statements by impartial auditors, no supply-and-demand effect in the money market to slow down investment. Government, for its part, was so happy with the success of its growth policies that it hardly raised a finger to stop things. There was nobody to say no. Not only were the banks precariously overloaned on the books, but one competent foreign banking expert estimates that around the end of 1961 the city banks had outstanding about $3 million in secret loans to industry, which never appeared on statements because they were "temporarily paid off" by checks at financial-statement time; the checks were returned uncashed after statements were drawn.

The great surge of capital expenditure on plant and equipment caused the dangerous imbalance of foreign-exchange payments in 1961 and the "overheating" that resulted in drastic central-bank monetary restraints. One advantage of such a credit system is that restraints quickly take hold; the foreign-exchange drain was reversed within months, and while the bankers held their collective breaths, the economy turned around. Nonetheless, the "efficient" credit system led the nation into a serious overexpansion in heavy industry, a heavy load of debt servicing built into all major operations, and an economy more than ever in hock to the bankers.

Naturally, none of the big industries was allowed to fail. In a number of distress cases, though, competitive bankers got together, top management was discreetly changed, lines of business rearranged, friendly foreign bankers were tapped for loans. "If you borrow enough," said a Japanese economist wryly, "you're safe." In an odd but important twist of logic, "excessive competition" was blamed for the trouble, and it was the principle of competition—not the undisciplined, noncompetitive, sheeplike duplicators of investment—that became the villain in the public mind.

THE BICYCLE ECONOMY

The bankers' hold on business is multiplied in many ways. Bankers influence management in daily decisions; they not only have a seat on the boards of heavy debtor companies, but they ease their retired officers into corporate executive positions. Bankers, under terms of most big loans, insist on the right to approve the issue of new shares. Moreover, banks hold the biggest blocks of stock in many large corporations (although they are limited by law to 10 percent).

Nothing works in the banks' favor more than the customs that inhibit the raising of equity capital. To begin with, custom decrees that corporations should pay out most of their profits (less reserves and bonuses) in dividends, which makes it difficult for them to finance expansion internally. If they decide to issue new shares, custom rules that holders of existing shares have preemptive rights to buy an equivalent number of new shares at par (not market) value. Of all the new issues offered on all Japanese stock exchanges last year, only eight-tenths of 1 percent was offered for public subscription; the rest went to holders of old shares at par value. This weird financing practice makes it exceedingly difficult for corporations to raise capital on their own. So they must borrow from banks.

It is this total overloaned, overborrowed situation that prompts cynics to call the Japanese economy "the bicycle economy' because "if it stops it falls over." To some extent all credit-financed modern industrial countries share this gyroscopic characteristic. But Japan's is more of a highwire performance because it operates dizzily above world credit disciplines. Fortunately, the new turn of events has brought into question Japan's ability to compete at home and abroad, and many Japanese are coming to understand that their economy cannot operate competitively if it is beyond the disciplines of the capital market.

The bankers themselves, a highly intelligent group, have been among the first to see this. ("Bankers," says a sympathetic American in Tokyo, "are beginning to act like bankers.") Some say they were shocked into an awareness of the total danger during the modest credit squeeze of early 1962. Reforms are underway from various directions. Masamichi Yamagiwa, governor of the Bank of Japan, lectures the city bankers like a Dutch uncle on the theme that "the sound functioning of interest rates" is the "basic requisite for establishing the foundations of a free society." The Bank of Japan is working on specific steps to broaden the capital market. A government-sponsored Monetary System Research Council is drawing up a list of proposed changes. The burgeoning Japanese securities companies, which act as underwriters and investment bankers as well as brokers, are stepping up sales of Japanese securities in foreign market. The World Bank is importantly at work at the consumer end of the credit machine. It has refused additional loans to some of its numerous Japanese corporate borrowers until they normalize their capital structure, e.g., hungry Yawata Iron & Steel, 20th on Fortune's list of the 100 largest foreign corporations, was bluntly told to postpone further expansion and attain a 50–50 ratio (now 62 to 38) within 4 years.

To oversimplify a highly complex situation, Japan must develop an active public bond market (and many authorities believe that the flotation of Government bonds is a good starting place), and must find a new way of marketing securities so they really raise equity capital and don't just provide a stock-option windfall to old shareholders. The Japanese are more reluctant to admit the next essential; they must truly let down their various bureaucratic restraints on foreign capital to bring down their own excessively high interest rates and provide the equity base that the economy needs to function normally and competitively.

LET'S SHAKE HANDS AND MAKE MONEY

Foreigners who learned to make their way in the labyrinthine Japanese business world when the going was tough believe that the speed of Japan's door-opening depends largely on the bureaucracy. These foreigners spend most of their lives wrestling with the bureaucrats, and expect that they will hang on to their restrictive powers in a thousand subtle ways. "Don't expect the leopard to change his spots," warns an American branch manager. Thus in the same week that the Government announced that foreign investment in Japanese corporations could go above the 50-percent level, the Ministry of International Trade and Industry (all-powerful MITI) scaled down one agreement between prospective United States and Japanese partners from 36-percent U.S. ownership to 30 percent, without explanation. (The same MITI recently refused a Japanese plastics company permission to give Australians more than 50-percent ownership in an Australian subsidiary.) Even as the Government opens the gates to competition, MITI still requires "foreign associated companies" to file a sworn agreement that if their activities disrupt the market or damage Japanese competitors they will accept the direction of MITI on pricing policy.

Yet the old Japan hands think that the bureaucracy is more committed to opening up Japan than are the monopolists, and that it will ultimately relax controls in its own bureaucratic way. They note happily that, as of April 1, current yen earnings could be converted to dollars, and they eagerly swap rumors that the Government will soon allow accumulated blocked yen to be repatriated in easy installments. They recall that all foreign investments used to get a close going-over at MITI, but now those below the $25,000 level are usually waved through automatically. MITI is supposed to be on the verge of approving a 50–50 alliance of Caterpillar Tractor and Shin-Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd., to produce giant Caterpillar bulldozers in competition with a couple of well-entrenched domestic companies (one of which immediately decided to redesign its product around the Cummins diesel engine).

It must be said that Americans who settle for business more or less on Japanese terms have found it not an unpleasant way to operate. They have long since given up trying to probe the Japanese psyche. They have instead, learned to relax and bear with the circumlocutions and the indefinite arrangements, to enjoy the deep bows, the refreshing hot towels and the bowls of hot tea before conferences. They have even grown accustomed to sitting for hours cross-legged at teahouse dinners while the samisens twang up and down the 12-tone scale—until the liberal flow of sake helps to bring out the individualism that allows for some shrewd bargaining and hard dealing. Americans usually admit nostalgically, after they return to duty in the States, that Japan is the loveliest place in the world to do business.

If it hurts American pride to be forced into minority interest (and it should), Americans have, at any rate, found their majority partners to be very helpful members of the firm. As a rule, the Japanese managers can deal better with government. They know the pressure points in the intricate Japanese business world. They know the proper retired banker or government official to hire to best advantage. They also have more prestige in recruiting higher-caliber employees from schools and colleges.

Sometimes the most successful Japanese-American contracts are the ones that curl the hair of U.S. corporation lawyers. "The Japanese are not fine-print people," explains Tom Blakemore, a Tokyo University law graduate and senior partner in the prosperous Tokyo firm of Blakemore & Mitsuki. "To them a contract is a current agreement on terms as they exist at the present time. They believe nobody can read the future, so they deliberately leave room for details to work themselves out as conditions change. Their philosophy is, 'Let's just shake hands and go ahead and make money, and we'll negotiate on future problems as they come along.' "

A CHOICE OF DANGERS

Much of Japanese business behavior stems from a thorough-going national inferiority complex about dealing with Western capital. The Japanese have the normal fear of foreign ownership of their vital interests (and have especially limited foreign stock ownership of public utilities and other basic industries). They fear, too, that a massive influx of foreign capital might someday be followed by a massive outflow, leaving them high and dry in a situation they could do very little about. (The Japanese note proudly that not even in the most precarious times has there ever been a flight of Japanese capital from Japan.) Perhaps the most talked-about fear is that the lopsided capital structure of corporations would give foreign raiders a chance to gain a major stake in the interlocked Japanese economy with a relatively small transfer of shares.

Yet it is approximately at this point that the Japanese are confronted with the choice of accepting some risks of foreign capital or living with the inherently more serious danger of their capital structure. Some of the best Bank of Japan brain-trusters are preaching the paramount need of an open capital market. So do some bankers. In its excellent report on the Japanese economy, the Committee for Economic Development pointed out that, in truth, it is the investing nation that is running the risks, not the receiving nation, because the investors put up their capital as a hostage to local economic and political pressures. The considered tone of the CED report won it a good press in Japan. And the Keizai Doyukai, its Japansese counterpart, reciprocated with equally sound logic: "In pursuit of a continued rapid economic growth of Japan, we must proceed along the line of eliminating the various controls over the inflow of capital from abroad."

INDIVIDUALISM VERSUS RIGIDITY

In the larger frame, then, as the Japanese economy strains to ready the country for all the big events of 1964, the situation can be summed up as prosperous and promising, with business and government moving with considerable enlightenment to make it more so. But there is a certain pathos involved in the apparently relentless regression to a zaibatsu economy so far as the Japanese themselves are concerned. Coming at modern capitalism from a totally different direction from that of the Western nations, they have much to offer in the practice of mutual social and economic responsibility by government, business, and labor. With this behind them, there could be reason to hope that their economy could evolve—in precisely opposite sequence to European and U.S. evolution—into individual enterprise, with historic and dynamic results. One has only to think of the exemplary contributions of the sons and daughters of poor Japanese immigrants to Hawaii and the U.S mainland to see the potential in a nation that would combine Japanese traditionalism with encouragement of individual enterprise.

As we have seen, some basic changes are afoot in Japan that could lead positively toward a revaluation of individual worth. But a rare moment of opportunity will be lost if the new forces are imprisoned in the benevolent rigidity of monopoly capital. Ultimately Japan will choose its form of economy as it see fit, and none can blame the Japanese for strengthening their industries in preparation for the open door. It would, however, be a tragic kind of strengthening that denied the people the energizing effects of domestic competition and the far-reaching intelectual, political, and cultural rewards of developing individualism.

It goes almost without saying that the Western nations have at once a great opportunity and moral responsibility to accord Japan the same open-door treatment that they are pressing on it. There is great growth potential for all industrial capitalist nations in an integration of Japan into the free-world economic system. And the system itself will be importantly fortified if Japan, its principal outpost in Asia, prospers for all to see.

Cadmium "Mess" Opens Another Government Pandora's Box

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the manner in which the agencies of the Federal Government occasionally tangle themselves completely in their own redtape has been a source of wonderment to many of us in Washington for a number of years.

One of the most flagrant "goofs" occurred in the Government's attempts to dispose of surplus stocks of cadmium. Rather than alleviating a shortage, the Government actually drove up the price of this valuable metal through faulty procedures.

I introduced legislation to release 2 million pounds of surplus cadmium earlier this year in an effort to relieve an acute shortage in private industry. Now I find that mismanagement by the Federal Government has made this release all but meaningless. Therefore, I have introduced H.R. 7278 for the release of an additional 5 million pounds with firmer guidelines on how this metal should be sold. Unless the Federal agencies involved succeed in straightening out this mess of their own creation, I think this additional amount of cadmium should be released.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial which appeared in Plating Management magazine by Mr. A. T. Leonard, chairman, Strategic and Critical Materials Committee, National Association of Metal Finishers. I think the situation as outlined by Mr. Leonard is one which should be noted carefully by the Congress:

CADMIUM MESS OPENS ANOTHER PANDORA'S BOX

The failure of the Government thus far to get cadmium into the hands of those who need it most illustrates vividly bureaucracy at its worst.

Domestic use of cadmium for the past several years has exceeded production by approximately 1 million pounds a year, resulting in a critical shortage. During the same period, our Government had admittedly stockpiled over 10 million pounds in excess of its requirements.

At the insistence of angry metal finishers, the Government finally agreed to release 2 million pounds this year.

Our Government elected to establish a market price by offering a small initial quantity (150,000 pounds) to a starving market with no restriction as to buyers. Foreign buyers and speculators bid the price up to $2.3615 a pound, and the Government now refuses to sell at less than that figure.

In effect, this situation is analogous to offering one steak to a starving city. In such a situation, money becomes no object and the price could go up to thousands of dollars. This is exactly what happened when this insignificant amount of cadmium was offered during a serious shortage.

The price of cadmium skyrocketed overnight. Bureaucrats are doubtless proud of the fact that they have enabled the Government to realize a handsome profit by gouging its citizens. At the outset, it is apparent that neither producers nor users are happy with the situation.

At the turn of the century, it was common for speculators to create vast fortunes by cornering the market on a particular stock or commodity. By thus controlling the supply, prices jumped drastically. The Government finally stepped in, however, and put a halt to such malpractices. Now who is to stop the Government when it seeks to profiteer as a result of a shortage which it helped to create? By similar manipulations, taxpayers' money can be used to control most effectively the price of every item in the marketplace.

It is disgraceful that the Government would choose to exploit its citizens at a time of need; and it is unreconcilable that steps have not yet been taken to insure that cadmium would get into the hands of those who need it most. (Regular bidding procedures do not guarantee this.)

We recommend that a special set-aside of cadmium be authorized immediately for users, particularly for those who are still unable to obtain cadmium even with defense-rated orders. Further, we urge that steps be taken to prevent the recurrence of practices by the Government which have resulted in the inflationary spiral in the price of cadmium.

A. T. LEONARD,
Chairman, NAMF Strategic and Critical Materials Committee.

Rev. Martin Luther King Writes From Birmingham City Jail—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, a truly inspired and remarkable letter has been brought to my attention. The letter is written by one of the great men of our time, Rev. Martin Luther King. Reverend King wrote this letter on April 16, 1963, while confined in the Birmingham, Ala., city jail.

I believe that this letter reflects the great courage and dedication of those fighting for freedom. Because of its length, I am including, under leave to extend my remarks, the first part of the letter. At a later time I shall call my colleagues' attention to the second part.

BIRMINGHAM CITY JAIL,
April 16, 1963.

Bishop C. C. J. CARPENTER.
Bishop JOSEPH A. DURICK.
Rabbi MILTON L. GRAFMAN.
Bishop PAUL HARDIN.
Bishop NOLAN B. HARMON.
The Reverend GEORGE M. MURRAY.
The Reverend EDWARD V. RAMAGE.
The Reverend EARL STALLINGS.

MY DEAR FELLOW CLERGYMEN: While confined here in the Birmingham city jail, I came across your recent statement calling our present activities "unwise and untimely" Seldom, if ever, do I pause to answer criticism of my work and ideas. If I sought to answer all of the criticisms that cross my desk, my secretaries would be engaged in little else in the course of the day and I would have no time for constructive work. But since I feel that you are men of genuine goodwill and your criticisms are sincerely set forth, I would like to answer your statement in what I hope will be patient and reasonable terms.

I think I should give the reason for my being in Birmingham, since you have been influenced by the argument of "outsiders coming in." I have the honor of serving as president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, an organization operating in every Southern State with headquarters in Atlanta, Ga. We have some 85 affiliate organizations all across the South—one being the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights. Whenever necessary and possible we share staff, educational, and financial resources with our affiliates. Several months ago our local affiliate here in Birmingham invited us to be on call to engage in a nonviolent direct action program if such were deemed necessary. We readily consented and when the hour came we lived up to our promises. So I am here, along with several members of my staff, because we were invited here. I am here because I have basic organizational ties here. Beyond this, I am in Birmingham because injustice is here. Just as the eighth century prophets left their little villages and carried their "thus saith the Lord" far beyond the boundaries of their hometown, and just as the Apostle Paul left his little village of Tarsus, and carried the gospel of Jesus Christ to practically every hamlet and city of the Graeco-Roman world, I too am compelled to carry the gospel of freedom beyond my particular hometown. Like Paul, I must constantly respond to the Macedonian call for aid.

Moreover, I am cognizant of the interrelatedness of all communities and states. I cannot sit idly by in Atlanta and not be concerned about what happens in Birmingham. Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly affects all indirectly. Never again can we afford to live with the narrow, provincial "outside agitator" idea. Anyone who lives inside the United States can never be considered an outsider anywhere in this country.

You deplore the demonstrations that are presently taking place in Birmingham. But I am sorry that your statement did not express a similar concern for the conditions that brought the demonstrations into being. I am sure that each of you would want to go beyond the superficial social analyst who looks merely at effects, and does not grapple with underlying causes. I would not hesitate to say that it is unfortunate that so-called demonstrations are taking place in Birmingham at this time, but I would say in more emphatic terms that it is even more unfortunate that the white power structure of this city left the Negro community with no other alternative.

In any nonviolent campaign there are four basic steps: (1) collection of the facts to determine whether injustices are alive; (2) negotiation; (3) self-purification; and (4) direct action. We have gone through all of these steps in Birmingham. There can be no gainsaying of the fact that racial injustice engulfs this community. Birmingham is probably the most thoroughly segregated city in the United States. Its ugly record of police brutality is known in every section of this country. Its unjust treatment of Negroes in the courts is a notorious reality. There have been more unsolved bombings of Negro homes and churches in Birmingham than any city in this Nation. These are the hard, brutal, and unbelievable facts. On the basis of these conditions Negro leaders sought to negotiate with the city fathers. But the political leaders consistently refused to engage in good faith negotiation.

Then came the opportunity last September to talk with some of the leaders of the economic community. In these negotiating sessions certain promises were made by the merchants—such as the promise to remove the humiliating racial signs from the stores. One the basis of these promises Reverend Shuttlesworth and the leaders of the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights agreed to call a moratorium on any type of demonstrations. As the weeks and months unfolded we realized that we were the victims of a broken promise. The signs remained. As in so many experiences of the past we were confronted with blasted hopes, and the dark shadow of a deep disappointment settled upon us. So we had no alternative except that of preparing for direct action, whereby we would present our very bodies as a means of laying our case before the conscience of the local and national community. We were not unmindful of the difficulties involved. So we decided to go through a process of self-purification. We started having workshops on nonviolence and repeatedly asked ourselves the questions, "Are you able to accept blows without retaliating?" "Are you able to endure the ordeals of jail?"

We decided to set our direct action program around the Easter season, realizing that with the exception of Christmas, this was the largest shopping period of the year. Knowing that a strong economic withdrawal program would be the byproduct of direct action, we felt that this was the best time to bring pressure on the merchants for the needed changes. Then it occured to us that the March election was ahead, and so we speedily decided to postpone action until after election day. When we discovered that Mr. Connor was in the runoff, we decided again to postpone action so that the demonstrations could not be used to cloud the issues. At this time we agreed to begin our nonviolent witness the day after the runoff.

This reveals that we did not move irresponsibly into direct action. We too wanted to see Mr. Connor defeated; so we went through postponement after postponement to aid in this community need. After this we felt that direct action could be delayed no longer.

You may well ask, "Why direct action? Why sit-ins, marches, etc.? Isn't negotiation a better path?" You are exactly right in your call for negotiation. Indeed, this is the purpose of direct action. Nonviolent direct action seeks to create such a crisis and establish such creative tension that a community that has constantly refused to negotiate is forced to confront the issue. It seeks so to dramatize the issue that it can no longer be ignored. I just referred to the creation of tension as a part of the work of the nonviolent resister. This may sound rather shocking. But I must confess that I am not afraid of the word tension. I have earnestly worked and preached against violent tension, but there is a type of constructive nonviolent tension that is necessary for growth. Just as Socrates felt that it was necessary to create a tension in the mind so that individuals could rise from the bondage of myths and half-truths to the unfettered realm of creative analysis and objective appraisal, we must see the need of having nonviolent gadflies to create the kind of tension in society that will help men rise from the dark depths of prejudice and racism to the majestic heights of understanding and brotherhood. So the purpose of the direct action is to create a situation so crisis-packed that it will inevitably open the door to negotiation. We, therefore, concur with you in your call for negotiation. Too long has our beloved Southland been bogged down in the tragic attempt to live in monolog rather than dialog.

One of the basic points in your statement is that our acts are untimely. Some have asked, "Why didn't you give the new administration time to act?" The only answer that I can give to this inquiry is that the new administration must be prodded about as much as the outgoing one before it acts. We will be sadly mistaken if we feel that the election of Mr. Boutwell will bring the millennium to Birmingham. While Mr. Boutwell is much more articulate and gentle than Mr. Connor, they are both segregationists dedicated to the task of maintaining the status quo. The hope I see in Mr. Boutwell is that he will be reasonable enough to see the futility of massive resistance to desegregation. But he will not see this without pressure from the devotees of civil rights. My friends, I must say to you that we have not made a single gain in civil rights without determined legal and nonviolent pressure. History is the long and tragic story of the fact that privileged groups seldom give up their privileges voluntarily. Individuals may see the moral light and voluntarily give up their unjust posture; but as Reinhold Niebuhr has reminded us, groups are more immoral than individuals.

We know through painful experience that freedom is never voluntarily given by the oppressor; it must be demanded by the oppressed. Frankly I have never yet engaged in a direct action movement that was "well timed," according to the timetable of those who have not suffered unduly from the disease of segregation. For years now I have heard the word "Wait." It rings in the ear of every Negro with a piercing familiarity. This "wait" has almost always meant "never." It has been a tranquilizing thalidomide, relieving the emotional stress for a moment, only to give birth to an ill-formed infant of frustration. We must come to see with the distinguished jurist of yesterday that "justice too long delayed is justice denied." We have waited for more than 340 years for our constitutional and God-given rights. The nations of Asia and Africa are moving with jetlike speed toward the goal of political independence, and we still creep at horse and buggy pace toward the gaining of a cup of coffee at a lunch counter.

I guess it is easy for those who have never felt the stinging darts of segregation to say wait. But when you have seen vicious mobs lynch your mothers and fathers at will and drown your sisters and brothers at whim; when you have seen hate-filled policemen curse, kick, brutalize, and even kill your black brothers and sisters with impunity; when you see the vast majority of your 20 million Negro brothers smothering in an air-tight cage of poverty in the midst of an affluent society; when you suddenly find your tongue twisted and your speech stammering as you seek to explain to your 6-year-old daughter why she can't go to the public amusement park that has just been advertised on television, and see tears welling up in her little eyes when she is told that Funtown is closed to colored children, and see the depressing clouds of inferiority begin to form in her little mental sky, and see her begin to distort her little personality by unconsciously developing a bitterness toward white people; when you have to concoct an answer for a 5-year-old son asking in agonizing pathos: "Daddy, why do white people treat colored people so mean?"; when you take a cross-country drive and find it necessary to sleep night after night in the uncomfortable corners of your automobile because no motel will accept you; when you are humiliated day in and day out by nagging signs reading "white" men and "colored"; when your first name becomes "nigger" and your middle name becomes "boy" (however old you are) and your last name becomes "John," and when your wife and mother are never given the respected title "Mrs."; when you are harried by day and haunted by night by the fact that you are a Negro, living constantly at tip-toe stance never quite knowing what to expect next, and plagued with inner fears and outer resentments; when you are forever fighting a degenerating sense of "nobodiness"; then you will understand why we find it difficult to wait. There comes a time when the cup of endurance runs over, and men are no longer willing to be plunged into an abyss of injustice where they experience the bleakness of corroding despair. I hope, sirs, you can understand our legitimate and unavoidable impatience.

You express a great deal of anxiety over our willingness to break laws. This is certainly a legitimate concern. Since we so diligently urge people to obey the Supreme Court's decision of 1954 outlawing segregation in the public schools, it is rather strange and paradoxical to find us consciously breaking laws. One may well ask, "How can you advocate breaking some laws and obeying others?" The answer is found in the fact that there are two types of laws: There are just laws and there are unjust laws. I would be the first to advocate obeying just laws. One has not only a legal but moral responsibility to obey just laws. Conversely, one has a moral responsibility to disobey unjust laws. I would agree with Saint Augustine that "An unjust law is no law at all."

Now what is the difference between the two? How does one determine when a law is just or unjust? A just law is a manmade code that squares with the moral law or the law of God. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law. To put it in the terms of Saint Thomas Aquinas, an unjust law is a human law that is not rooted in eternal and natural law. Any law that uplifts human personality is just. Any law that degrades human personality is unjust. All segregation statutes are unjust because segregation distorts the soul and damages the personality. It gives the segregator a false sense of superiority and the segregated a false sense of inferiority. To use the words of Martin Buber, the great Jewish philosopher, segregation substitutes an "I-it" relationship for the "I-thou" relationship, and ends up relegating persons to the status of things. So segregation is not only politically, economically, and sociologically unsound, but it is morally wrong and sinful. Paul Tillich has said that sin is separation. Isn't segregation an existential expression of man's tragic separation, an expression of his awful estrangement, his terrible sinfulness? So I can urge men to obey the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court because it is morally right, and I can urge them to disobey segregation ordinances because they are morally wrong.

Let us turn to a more concrete example of just and unjust laws. An unjust law is a code that a majority inflicts on a minority that is not binding on itself. This is difference made legal. On the other hand a just law is a code that a majority compels a minority to follow that it is willing to follow itself. This is sameness made legal.

Let me give another explanation. An unjust law is a code inflicted upon a minority which that minority has no part in enacting or creating because they did not have the unhampered right to vote. Who can say the legislature of Alabama which set up the segregation laws was democratically elected? Throughout the State of Alabama all types of conniving methods are used to prevent Negroes for becoming registered voters and there are some counties without a single Negro registered to vote despite the fact that the Negro constitutes a majority of the population. Can any law set up in such a State be considered democratically structured?

These are just a few examples of unjust and just laws. There are some instances when a law is just on its face but unjust in its application. For instance, I was arrested Friday on a charge of parading without a permit. Now there is nothing wrong with an ordinance which requires a permit for a parade, but when the ordinance is used to preserve segregation and to deny citizens the first amendment privilege of peaceful assembly and peaceful protest, then it becomes unjust.

I hope you can see the distinction I am trying to point out. In no sense do I advocate evading or defying the law as the rabid segregationist would do. This would lead to anarchy. One who breaks an unjust law must do it openly, lovingly (not hatefully as the white mothers did in New Orleans when they were seen on television screaming "nigger, nigger, nigger") and with a willingness to accept the penalty. I submit that an individual who breaks a law that conscience tells him is unjust, and willingly accepts the penalty by staying in jail to arouse the conscience of the community over its injustice, is in reality expressing the very highest respect for law.

Of course there is nothing new about this kind of civil disobedience. It was seen sublimely in the refusal of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego to obey the laws of Nebuchadnezzar because a higher moral law was involved. It was practiced superbly by the early Christians who were willing to face hungry lions and the excruciating pain of chopping blocks, before submitting to certain unjust laws of the Roman Empire. To a degree academic freedom is a reality today because Socrates practiced civil disobedience.

We can never forget that everything Hitler did in Germany was "legal" and everything the Hungarian freedom fighters did in Hungary was "illegal." It was "illegal." to aid and comfort a Jew in Hitler's Germany. But I am sure that, if I had lived in Germany during that time, I would have aided and comforted my Jewish brothers even though it was illegal. If I lived in a Communist country today where certain principles dear to the Christian faith are suppressed, I believe I would openly advocate disobeying these antireligious laws.

* * * * *

MARTIN LUTHER KING, Jr.

Church Leaders Ask Civil Rights Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, increasingly, the voices of religious leaders throughout our country have been raised in behalf of extending civil rights to all Americans. While we here pursue the necessary legislation to make civil rights a fact for all, clergymen are working to effect the necessary moral climate for the laws to function properly. In Minnesota recently, 20 religious leaders of all faiths sent an open letter to the remaining clergy of the entire State inviting their assistance in "the struggle for freedom and justice for all people." It is a concise and thoughtful statement representing the best of our American traditions and religious heritage.

The statement follows with the list of signatories:

Our American concept of individual human worth and dignity, an ideal which has emerged from our rich religious heritage, can allow for no discrimination of peoples on the basis of race. The present racial crisis, involving our basic understanding of freedom and justice, is not limited to the South. The entire religious community is inescapably obligated to participate in remedial action that will help our Nation to realize the basic human rights and freedom guaranteed to all by the Constitution of the United States of America.

In these days, no man can be unaware or unmoved by the struggle taking place to make these fundamental principles a living reality. We call upon all religious leaders of our State to enter the struggle for human freedom and justice with renewed conviction and effort. We urge you first, to recognize clearly the moral issue at stake in the racial crisis; second, to support legislation for the protection of basic human and civil rights; and, third, to realize the inescapable religious responsibility of participating in those practical activities that will lead to the fulfillment of our common spiritual ideal of human brotherhood.

In the struggle for freedom and justice for all people, let us seek to establish a pattern of human relationships that will lead the world to understanding and peace.

LIST OF SIGNERS

The Reverend James R. Holloway, president, Minnesota Convention of National Baptist Churches; Dr. Clifford F. Perron, executive secretary, Minnesota Convention, American Baptist Churches; the Reverend John G. Johnson, executive secretary, Minnesota Baptist Conference; Dr. M. James Hollowood, executive secretary, Minnesota Baptist Convention; Bishop Leonard P. Cowley, auxiliary bishop, St. Paul Archdiocese, Roman Catholic Church; the Reverend Elmer E. Larson, superintendent and executive secretary, Northwest Conference, Evangelical Covenant Church of America; the Reverend Lloyd J. Allen, executive secretary-director, Christian Churches of Minnesota and North and South Dakota; Bishop Hamilton H. Kellogg, bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Minnesota; Dr. Arnold T. Olson, president, Evangelical Free Church of America; Bishop H. R. Heininger, bishop, northwestern area, Evangelical United Brethren Church; Dr. Fredrik A. Schiotz, president, American Lutheran Church; Dr. Leonard Kendall, president, Minnesota Synod, Lutheran Church in America; Dr. Max A. Shapiro, president, Minnesota Rabbinical Association; Bishop T. Otto Nall, Minnesota area, the Methodist Church; the Reverend Joseph G. Vasiliou, president, Eastern Orthodox Clergymen's Association of Minnesota; Lt. Col. Thomas V. Gates, northern division commander, Salvation Army; Dr. Carl A. Hansen, conference minister and executive secretary, Minnesota conference, United Church of Christ; the Reverend Robert A. Caine, executive, Presbyterian Synod of Minnesota, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.; the Reverend Harold DeVries, president, upper Midwest region, National Association of Evangelicals; Dr. Hayden L. Stright, executive secretary, Minnesota Council of Churches.

Trotters Shoals Would Destroy Job Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Federal Government projects will not and cannot get the economy moving. Business needs the green light to expand and create more jobs.

Here is a classic example in my own congressional district of how business could create job opportunity if not harassed by continuous agitation for unnecessary Government projects.

The following timely article is from the July issue of Nation's Business. It warrants the attention of every Member of Congress.

U.S. UNDERCUTS OWN JOB-MAKING GOAL—WATER PROJECT POINTS UP CONFLICT IN POLICIES

The New Frontier, in its efforts to move ahead with vigor on many fronts, sometimes gives the impression that its left hand is unaware of what its right hand is doing.

A current example is arousing increasing attention in Congress and heated debate in two southeastern States.

The Department of the Interior wants to build a $79 million Federal dam at Trotters Shoals on the Savannah River, which forms the boundary between South Carolina and Georgia.

Opponents contend that the dam would prevent $500 million in private industry from locating along the river, bringing with it jobs, payrolls, and tax revenue vitally needed in an area which includes more than nine counties classified as depressed by the Area Redevelopment Administration.

Citing the proposed dam, Republican Representative WILLIAM H. HARSHA of Ohio, a member of the House Committee on Public Works, says:

"One of the Nation's most pressing problems is unemployment. More than 4 million people are unemployed. The administration wants to spend more money, establish more corps, build more public works make more loans, establish more Federal agencies, add to the Federal payroll—all in the hope of cutting the unemployment rate. Everyone shares in that hope.

"But much of the New Frontier's program will not create lasting jobs because it ignores the basic process by which jobs are made. When the New Frontier pushes some programs, you wonder about the sincerity of its efforts to cut unemployment."

Trotters Shoals, which would stem the Savannah River about 55 miles above Augusta, Ga., is part of an 11-dam plan approved by Congress in 1944 for Federal development of the river. Two of the dams have been built. The Clark Hill Dam and Reservoir lie at the southern end of the disputed 29-mile stretch of river, Hartwell Dam and Reservoir at the northern end. The reservoir formed by Trotters Shoals would flood 24,000 acres to bridge the gap, creating a string of three lakes linked together by dams.

This remaining stretch of river between the two existing reservoirs is described as "the finest industrial area in the entire southeastern United States" by Charles E. Daniel, board chairman of the Daniel Construction Co., an international industrial contracting firm located in Greenville, S.C.

"We have located eight major sites here suitable for large processing plants, and behind these plants would grow up supporting plants," Mr. Daniel says. "This area is blessed with a tremendous amount of free flowing water. One of the largest natural gas lines in America crosses it. Equally large liquid petroleum lines cross it. There are two railroads and truck and air transportation. More important there are many thousands of people on both sides of the river who desperately need jobs.

"My firm has 47 industrial prospects that want to build new plants in the southeast. Every year it becomes more difficult to find sites such as this for plants which require a great amount of water. I confidently believe that we can have more than $500 million worth of industry along this stretch of river and in the supporting areas within the next 10 to 15 years.

"But if the Trotters Shoals Dam is built, it will knock out the possibility of the primary plants along the river and their satellite plants."

Gov. Donald S. Russell, of South Carolina, has spoken out in opposition to Trotters Shoals, and Georgia Gov. Carl E. Sanders says that he might alter his earlier approval of the dam if private development is an immediate probability. Congressional delegations from the two States are split.

In the light of growing opposition from the region involved and the apparent inconsistency with the administration's professed aims of boosting employment and encouraging industrial development of depressed areas, why is the Interior Department pushing for congressional authorization of Trotters Shoals?

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall says:

"The Southeast is one of the few areas where clean, fresh water is still available in substantial supply. In our judgment, the only prudent course is to develop and conserve these great water resources expeditiously and judiciously.

"This is a project with substantial power potential in an area where the preference customers need more power.

"Located between the Clark Hill and Hartwell projects, the three contiguous lakes will form a recreation complex of national significance.

"In addition, since this is developing into one of the great industrial areas of our Nation, abundant clean, fresh water will be available for municipal and industrial use."

WHAT ADVOCATES SAY

Supporters of the Trotters Shoals project contend that it would create jobs and strengthen the economy of the region by enhancing its recreational facilities and by attracting industry to the reservoir's water supply. Local business and civic leaders, however, point to the Clark Hill and Hartwell installations as evidence that this just doesn't happen.

"We judge the future by the past. The building of the Clark Hill and Hartwell projects has formed industrial deserts with thousands of acres of water down the middle," declares E. H. Agnew, of Starr, S.C., former president of the South Carolina Farm Bureau Federation and a trustee of Anderson County School District No. 3.

"What we need is not more recreational facilities, but more jobs and more tax income for an expanding educational economic opportunity. It's the damage that Trotters Shoals would bring to the industrial and agricultural future of our area that really hurts. It hurts because it clouds the chances for economic progress and educational advancement. Our youth must be well trained. Training includes better schools. Better schools cost more money, and Trotters Shoals offers no money. Private industry does—it pays taxes."

The counties on both the South Carolina and Georgia sides of the Clark Hill Reservoir are listed as depressed, as are all of the Georgia counties extending up to the Hartwell Reservoir. These and other adjoining counties are suffering a constant loss of population as their residents, particularly young people, go elsewhere looking for jobs. Industrial development has not taken up the slack in employment created by the region's declining agriculture.

"My experience has been that water-using industries won't locate on a Federal reservoir," says Walter W. Harper, director of the South Carolina State Development Board. "No industrial development has resulted from either the Hartwell or Clark Hill projects. The proposed Trotters Shoals project cost the area at least one substantial industrial prospect because of the threat of a Federal dam."

McCormick County, which adjoins the Clark Hill reservoir, is the single South Carolina county in this area listed as depressed. Frank E. Harrison, a McCormick attorney says:

"Clark Hill has created tremendous problems that those of us who are trying to attract industry have spent a great deal of time attempting to overcome in the past 10 years. We fear that another reservoir will undo what progress we have made. When a corporation finds that it must get Federal approval to locate on the reservoir, it just moves on. The town of McCormick had to get a special act of Congress in order to buy water from Clark Hill.

"The recreational facilities offered by the reservoir haven't produced any jobs, either. The people that come to Clark Hill may spend a little money for gasoline, bait or food, but most of them come from less than 100 miles away and bring it with them."

THE VIEW FROM GEORGIA

On the Georgia side of the Clark Hill reservoir, the picture is much the same. Harry C. Stewart, mayor of Lincolnton and an automobile dealer, describes it this way:

"Most of our timberland in Lincoln County was flooded by the lake. Our population is decreasing and per capita income is less than $900 a year, among the lowest in the State. The only commercial establishment produced in our county by Clark Hill is a fishing camp on the lake. It was built for $100,000 and has been sold three times, the last time for $40,000."

The situation at the more recently completed Hartwell project offers no more encouragement. No new industry can be cited which came because of the reservoir. In fact, one factory which was located there before the dam was built—the Utica-Mohawk plant of J. P. Stevens & Co.—is currently trying to recover damages estimated at $1.5 million as a result of the Federal installation.

James M. Stepp, a professor of agricultural economics at Clemson College who made a study of the Trotters Shoals project for the South Carolina State Development Board, offers this analysis:

"The most important test of any proposed resource development project is simply this: Will the net long-run effect of the project be more and better jobs or fewer and poorer jobs for the people of the area? I am convinced that the net effect of the Trotters Shoals project would be to reduce both the quantity and quality of employment opportunities in South Carolina and Georgia.

"The proposed project would severely restrict and perhaps destroy the ability of the area near the reservoir to compete for the large group of industries known as wet-process industries.

Professor Stepp lists these factors: Existing sites would be flooded by the reservoir; industrial effluent must receive more costly treatment if discharged into a reservoir instead of a flowing stream; large water-using industries ordinarily provide their own water supply facilities and prefer riverbank sites where water rights are included in real estate property rights; uncertainty would result from the reservoir's control by a Federal agency which has no responsibility for local industiral development and is governed by policies and political pressures originating far from the area.

"Since World War II," Professor Stepp adds, "about 30 new wet-process plants have been built on the free-flowing portions of South Carolina's rivers, whereas only 1 has been built adjacent to a reservoir—and that reservoir is owned by the county in which the plant is located."

He points out that there are strong reasons for doubting claims that federally owned reservoirs on the middle Savannah River would form the basis for a tourist industry that would provide sizable employment. This could happen only if large numbers of tourists from other areas were persuaded to vacation there.

REA HAS A HAND

Because of the prospect of more Federal hydroelectric power from the dam for preference customers—Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives and municipal power facilities—a significant part of the support for Trotters Shoals has come from REA cooperatives. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., staff engineer and counsel of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, says:

"Power generated at Trotters Shoals would be marketed by the Southeastern Power Administration in Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina with priority to preference customers. REA-financed systems in those States now obtain wholesale power from Government dams, via the Southeastern Power Administration, and from investor-owned utility companies. The major portion of the energy purchased by the cooperatives comes from investor-owned utilities.

"Federal Power Commission estimates show that loads are doubling each 14 years in the area to be served by Trotters Shoals. If Federal power is to remain a significant factor in regulating wholesale rates in that area, it must continue to constitute an effective fraction of total capacity. This means new multiple-purpose reservoirs, and Trotters Shoals is among the best yet remaining undeveloped."

Local residents point out, however, that expanding power needs will be met by private enterprise if the obstacle of the proposed Federal dam is resolved. Duke Power Co. of Charlotte, N.C., which supplies power to the region, owns a site on the river 8 miles below the Hartwell Dam and has long planned to build a large steam-generated powerplant there.

Congressional approval is needed for Duke to build a small dam to provide cooling water for the plant. A bill authorizing this construction died in the past session of Congress, and Duke was forced to change its plans and build new facilities in North Carolina to supply the pressing power needs of its customers.

"We still want to build a steam plant on the Savannah River," says William B. McGuire, president of Duke Power. "Since the postponement of the plant we have been making studies to determine when it will be possible for Duke again to include it in our plans. It now appears that Duke can economically use generation from the Savannah River plant beginning sometime during the period 1970–75."

Mr. McGuire adds, however, that the proposed Trotters Shoals Dam would flood the location of the small dam which Duke must build in connection with its plant. To surmount this problem, he says, "the practical and economic considerations would be so great that, as best we can now determine, we would not build the dam."

WHAT COMPARISONS SHOW

An interesting comparison of the relative merits of buying power from Duke or from REA cooperatives is provided by Mr. McGuire. In 1961 the average charge to residential customers of South Carolina REA cooperatives was 2.42 cents per kilowatt-hour; Duke's average charge was 1.95 cents.

The $210 million steamplant which Duke hopes to build on the Savannah would generate 11.4 billion kilowatt-hours of power annually in comparison with 471.4 million for Trotters Shoals Dam. Duke would pay annual taxes of $7.4 million to the Federal Government and $5.95 million to State and local governments, while Trotters Shoals would pay none. Yearly operating and payroll expenditures would be $3 million for Duke and $483,000 for the Federal installation. In addition, Duke would buy $24 million worth of coal each year from mines in West Virginia, Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee, States which also contain depressed areas. Trotters Shoals, being hydroelectric, would not require fuel.

Another major corporation which owns a plant site on the disputed section of the Savannah River is the Mead Corp. of Dayton, Ohio, a manufacturer of paper and paper products with operations in 17 States. In 1956 Mead bought a 1,000-acre site on the river near Calhoun Falls. Since then it has invested $1 million in nearby timberlands and committed itself to an additional $2 million.

If Trotters Shoals is built, it would flood most of the Mead site and eliminate the free-flowing water needed for treatment of the effluent from the proposed plant.

"This would make an industrial development such as ours impossible," says Ford T. Shepherd, a Mead vice president. "We intend to use the site for the purpose for which it was purchased when economic conditions justify the huge investment involved. However, this important decision can't be made until we are assured of our water supply and a flowing river for adequate treatment of our effluent. If Trotters Shoals is built we are dead.

"If we knew that Trotters Shoals was not in the picture, I think the only barrier would be economic conditions. Our planning indicates that we need additional capacity within 5 years."

The papermill which Mead contemplates building would cost nearly $40 million and employ from 600 to 650 people with an annual payroll of about $5 million. The mill would require about $8 million worth of pulpwood each year, produced by 2,500 men working on the farms and forest lands outside the plant. It would pay Federal, State and local taxes of nearly $4 million.

A papermill would give the local economy an unusually strong boost. Unlike many manufacturing industries found in farm communities, a papermill makes use of a local natural resource. Cotton has declined sharply as a factor in economy of the region, and much of the land has been planted in timber. Without a nearby mill, however, the pulpwood market has become increasingly depressed as the large coastal mills have come to depend largely on timber producers closer to them.

PRICE DEPRESSION THREATENS

"Unless a market in the form of a pulpwood consuming mill is soon provided, upper South Carolina faces a serious oversupply of pulpwood and this will lead to a depression of prices, farm income, commerce and land values," according to J. Wesley Hughes, manager of the Abbeville County (S.C.) Development Board.

Holcombe M. Verdery, Jr., a lumber dealer in nearby Harlem, Ga., says:

"A papermill would provide a market for timber, jobs for people required to harvest wood, and jobs for manufacturing personnel. It would stimulate the economy and provide a healthy business community, able and capable of paying more taxes. More taxes would provide better schools. Residents would be able to find work within commuting distance for their homes. Young people would have job opportunities. At the present time they have to look for work in distant cities."

Federal officials have questioned whether the plant proposed by Mead would be able to treat its effluent satisfactorily so that it would not contaminate the Clark Hill Reservoir downstream. Mr. Shepherd has assured Congressmen that it can do so.

Supporters of Trotters Shoals also have contended that the Federal project would not be incompatible with the Duke steamplant. However, as Governor Russell points out:

"The difficulty is that, while the Corps of Engineers asserts that its proposal is compatible with the Duke plant's construction, Duke has not concurred in this conclusion. Duke cannot be compelled to accept the judgment of the Corps of Engineers."

In the same manner, a significant number of government, business and civic leaders in South Carolina and Georgia feel that they cannot be compelled to accept the judgment of the Federal Government that the Trotters Shoals project will be good for their States or for the country.

Jim Farley's in the Pink at 75

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I am pleased to include the following interesting article from the Milwaukee Journal of May 28, 1963 written by Mr. Ernest Cuneo on the eve of the 75th birthday of Mr. Democrat, the Honorable James A. Farley of New York:

JIM FARLEY'S IN THE PINK AT 75—ON THE EVE OF ANOTHER BIRTHDAY, MR. DEMOCRAT GIVES HIS VIEWS ON PEAS, PITCHERS, AND PRESIDENTS

(By Ernest Cuneo)

It's May on Madison Avenue, and as everyone knows, May brings on the blossoms and Jim Farley's birthday. Deciding to drop in on Mr. Democrat, I went up to the 18th floor, from whence chairman Jim directs the foreign operations of Coca-Cola.

Past the receptionist, a spacious corridor leads to his office. The broad aisle is a gallery of paintings of citizens of many nations happily drinking you know what. From their expressions you wouldn't think anything was wrong anywhere in the world.

Jim's office has more pictures than the czar had ikons, Popes, premiers, cardinals and generals are in vast and benign conclave. Places of honor are reserved for the American presidents; opposite him is a large picture of F.D.R. with an affectionate inscription.

Presidents Truman, Hoover and Eisenhower have places of distinction; but second only to F.D.R. in prominence is a large color picture of the President and Mrs. Kennedy. It is inscribed by the President to "a great American," Jim sits with his back to 52d Street, clear evidence that he prefers looking at his legion of friends to pondering the New York skyline.

"Happy birthday, Jim," I said.

"It's not until Thursday," said Jim precisely, don't crowd me."

"It's 75, isn't it?" I asked.

"Yes," he said agreeably, "a respectable age—and a respectable half score."

His massive frame in dark blues and blacks and his subdued ties, setting off his pinkness, are as much a part of Jim Farley as his green ink signature.

And his head has a certain arresting quality. It is as if Leonardo started out to sketch the head of a Roman Emperor from the acqueline nose up to the dome, and then, puckishly, decided to append to it the mouth of one of those charming Florentine cherubs.

"What are you going to do about your birthday?" I asked.

"What can anyone do about his birthday?" he countered. "Nothing. Of course, my children are bringing all their children, so the whole family will be together."

"How many does that make?"

"Three children and ten grandchildren."

"Jim," I said, "you're almost as much identified with American sports as you are with politics. Who is the greatest fighter you ever saw?"

He sprang from his chair and paced the room. It was plain that he was in his element.

"Greatest fighter at any weight?" he asked almost tensely.

"Yes," I said, taking on some of the excitement, "single greatest fighter at any weight."

"Dempsey," he said with driving conviction, "the greatest single fighter at any weight was Dempsey."

"You've seen some other terrific ringmen," I observed.

"I'll say," said Jim. "Mickey Walker, Sugar Ray, Gene Tunney, Benny Leonard, and Johnny Dundee were great. But Dempsey was the greatest."

"The greatest ballplayer?" I asked. "Ruth," said Jim, "the Babe was a superman."

"Pitchers?" I asked. "Walter Johnson, right-hander, Warren Spahn, left-hander, Mathewson, Grover Cleveland Alexander, Dizzy Dean, and Lefty Grove were up there. But I give Johnson and Spahn the edge."

"Catcher?"

"It's a tossup between Bill Dickey and Mickey Cochrane, but I'll give the edge to Dickey."

"Jim," I said, "you played first base. How did you bat?"

"I batted and threw right handed," he said.

"Jim," I continued, "you're the iron man of the banquet league. How many public dinners did you attend this year?"

"In the United States?" he asked carefully. "One has to be accurate in these things. Other people have averages, too, and they are quick to point out errors."

"Yes," I said, "exclusive of traveling."

"One hundred and three," he said.

"And luncheons?"

"Seventy-five," he said. "Of course, I was out of the country a lot. I traveled 50,000 miles, 45,000 by air. In fact, I went around the world in 22 days."

"What's your favorite dinner?"

"Tomato soup, roast beef, and asparagus. I also like peas, especially French peas, but you'll find more of them in France.

"I might add," he said thoughtfully, "American celery is the best in the world."

HE WOULD LIKE TO SEE MORE FRICASSEE

"What food do you like least?"

"A half dozen fried chicken dinners in a row. Now mind you," he said, his statesmanship beginning to take a hand, "I have nothing against chicken. But I do wish, from time to time, someone could think of a fricassee. Fricassees are wonderful."

It occurred to me that this quiet contribution on the inner space of the banquet orbit could make thousands as grateful to F.D.R.'s postmaster general as they are to Major Cooper for his pioneering work in orbit.

"Your favorite dessert?"

"Apple pie a la mode."

I uttered a word of caution: "Trainers say that apple pie will put you out of the leagues faster than whisky."

"I don't drink," said Jim, "and my weight has been 205 for years—just right for my 6 2½."

"Jim, Charley Michelson once told me that you sent out 22,000 letters of thanks after the 1932 campaign. Is that right?"

"Twenty one thousand in 1932 and 27,000 in 1936," said Jim. "It took me a couple of months."

"Remarkable," I said. "No," said Jim, "the number isn't remarkable; but I am proud of the fact that I knew every one of those 27,000 by his first name."

"How many letters do you write now?"

"About 125 a day. I dictate to three regular secretaries, and have two in reserve for peakloads."

"Tell me, Jim," I said, "one more thing. Who is the greatest all-American politician?"

"F.D.R.," he said unhesitatingly, "unquestionably F.D.R." I expected that, though there are some who think Jim himself, has some claims on that distinction.

"Of course," Jim grinned, "we disagreed on the principle of the third term. But that has nothing to do with him being a great politician. He was the greatest."

KENNEDY COULD BE THE GREATEST

"How do you rate Kennedy?" I asked as I moved toward the door, and added a second question, "Does the President remind you of any famous athlete?"

Jim answered them both. "He's more than an athlete," he said, "the President has grace, strength, speed, and class. He reminds me of Dempsey before Toledo."

"He reminds me of Jack Delaney," I offered, "especially his quickness and his sharp righthand gestures. Watch the next press conference, Jim, and notice the similarity."

Jim thought a moment. "Absolutely," he said, "the Bridgeport champion had a very fast right cross. But he was a light-heavy, Ernie, and the President has a heavyweight's power. His style is like Delaney's all right, but his punch in the second term is going to be like Dempsey's. He's boxing easily now, rating himself smoothly, but you mark my words, he's coming out of his corner in the late rounds with a rush, like Dempsey at Toledo."

"Holy smoke, Jim," I said incredulously, "you don't mean it. I think the President is first class, and all that, but so were Citation and Count Fleet—but few people would classify them with Man o' War. You mean it?"

"I sure do," said Jim earnestly, "Kennedy could be the greatest." He considered for a moment, and thoughtfully repeated himself. "Yes, I mean it. The President could turn out to be the greatest—the Dempsey of the American Presidents."

Off-Campus Speakers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, from time to time throughout the country there are various reports of college campus controversies concerning public speakers on the campus.

The board of regents of the University of California have recently issued a courageous statement on this matter and I am pleased to incorporate this policy decision in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as it is taken from President Clark Kerr's report of July 5, 1963. This clearly demonstrates democracy in action:

The regents of the Universtiy of California have confidence in the students of the university and in their judgment in properly evaluating any and all beliefs and ideologies that may be expressed in university facilities by off-campus speakers. This is in the best American tradition. Therefore, the regents approve the following policy for off-campus speakers: "Any off-campus speaker may be allowed to speak on a campus of the university in accordance with the policies set forth in the university regulation on the 'Use of University Facilities.'" Whenever the respective chancellor considers it appropriate in furtherance of educational objectives, he may require any or all of the following: (1) that the meeting be chaired by a tenure member of the faculty; (2) that the speaker be subject to questions from the audience; and (3) that the speaker be appropriately balanced in debate with a person of contrary opinions.

Arms Control and Disarmament Act Needs Larger Authorization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations.

Several identical bills are pending before the Foreign Affairs Committee, as is the bill recently passed by the Senate. The Senate bill is not as favorable to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency as some of us had hoped. The Agency intends to ask for an appropriation of $15 million for fiscal 1964, and the Senate bill set a ceiling of $20 million for 1964, and 1965 combined.

The year-and-a-half-old Agency has been the voice of the United States at the Geneva nuclear test ban talks, and the 18 nation disarmament conference. Subjects of its research include detection of underground explosions, the future effect of arms control on the electronics industry in the United States, and the development of international law.

The Agency's work will back up Under-Secretary of State Averell Harriman, in his talks with the British, and Russians in Moscow, starting July 15.

It has been argued that the Agency is still young, and that its growth should be slow. I do not think we can afford this leisure. If we are to find workable plans of arms control and disarmament, and if our negotiators are to be equipped to bargain in such a way as to increase our national security, we need a tremendous amount of research.

Fifteen million dollars a year is a tiny amount compared to our total defense expenditures, and yet the work of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is one of the most important parts of our defense program.

Beyond the question of dollar amounts, the Agency has asked for an elimination of the appropriation ceiling. The appropriations process would still take place each year, with a thorough review of the Agency's activities. This ceiling elimination would take away any doubt that the Agency's status is permanent, and would therefore be an important expression of this country's intention to persist in seeking carefully considered arms agreements.

Poor Monetary Habits Must Be Changed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, this week, the Joint Economic Committee, in cooperation with the House and Senate Banking Committees, has taken up the very significant subject of international balance of payments.

In an article by Harold B. Dorsey, it is pointed out that our allies have not changed their old habits of financing their development activities at the New York capital market—even though they hold far larger external reserves than they know what to do with.

I hope that this subject will be studied very carefully by the legislative committees involved in these hearings, and that appropriate steps will be taken to solve this anomaly.

The article follows:

POOR MONETARY HABITS MUST BE CHANGED

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

During his recent visit to Europe, President Kennedy said: "The great free nations of the world must take hold of our monetary problems if those problems are not to control us."

This remark symbolizes a judgment that is being expressed by international monetary authorities, with sharply increasing emphasis. Circumstances have reached the point where a solution must be found for the problem, and it must be found quickly.

Fortunately, there is a broader recognition of the fact that the solution is not to be found in the old-fashioned process of merely raising the price of gold, either unilaterally or multilaterally. It is not logical to contend that the U.S. dollar should be devalued; that is, that we should raise our price for gold. Such a contention implies that the dollar is overvalued. This can scarcely be the fact when our prices in world markets permit us to export more goods than we are importing.

Hence, if we devalue the dollar, the other nations would have to devalue their currencies almost simultaneously and commensurately. This would leave the international price and currency relationships just about unchanged from their present status. So nothing constructive would result from a move that would cause a great deal of confusion, uncertainty and injustice.

The international balance of payments problem centers around three distinct subjects. First, there is the matter of our trade balance, where relative prices, qualities, and salesmanship are the primary determinants. This balance is in our favor and has been so for many years. Furthermore, since prices and costs abroad are now rising more rapidly than our own, there is some promise that this balance will increase in the years immediately ahead—if we continue to restrain our costs and prices.

Second, there is the matter of U.S. Government expenditures abroad for our foreign military establishments, for military assistance to our allies and for foreign economic aid. These expenditures have been contributing to our balance of payments deficit. The size of these foreign expenditures depends on Government policy. It is not dictated by relative prices, or relative interest rates, or relative currency values.

Third, there is the matter of international capital flows which have also been contributing to our balance of payments deficit. Here again, this item is not directly influenced by relative prices and relative exchange rates. But it is directly influenced by relative interest rates and relative credit availability.

As the London Financial Times recently expressed it: "One of the silliest aspects of the international financial scene at the moment is that continental countries, with far larger external reserves than they know what to do with, are regularly going to the New York capital market for funds to finance their development activities. They are thereby adding to the stresses on the U.S. balance of payments to such an extent that they are having to be asked to put normal dollar convertible arrangements in indefinite suspense—this so that the United States can borrow from them on short-term the funds it needs to sustain its long-term capital exports to them."

Silly as this condition may be, and although the European countries are becoming more aware of the anomaly, the fact remains that it is going to take time for them to break down the habits and customs of generations that stand as barriers to better organized capital markets. Meanwhile, the much better organized American capital markets remain an attractive source of capital for them.

Numerous European countries which now hold large dollar claims express the strong opinion that the United States should increase its interest rate structure as part of the effort to discourage a capital outflow and encourage an inflow. Policymaking U.S. representatives in their international conferences must be exposed to this opinion, which has the strength of a creditor's prerogative to advise the debtor on methods that might improve his deficit position.

All of this is part of the background for an extensive public discussion of the international balance of payments problem, which will be renewed today when the Joint Economic Committee opens its hearings on the subject. It is rumored that President Kennedy may make a major policy speech on the matter in the near future.

Council of City and County of Honolulu Support President Kennedy's Civil Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the Council of the City and County of Honolulu has adopted a resolution expressing its fullest support of President Kennedy's civil rights program. The council's action, I believe I can safely state, represents the sentiment of the people throughout the State of Hawaii which has been singled out by anthropologists, sociologists, political observers, and others as the showcaes of American democracy.

When President Kennedy visited Hawaii to deliver his now-famous civil rights address in Honolulu last month, he told Hawaii's citizens that he had chosen to speak there because he thought Hawaii to be the ideal platform for a speech on human rights. Hawaii, he said, represented what America was striving to be.

Under unanimous consent I include the following resolution in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

Whereas the United States of America was founded on the principles of liberty, equality, and justice for all, regardless of race, color, or creed; and

Whereas the eyes of the world, especially of the new nations of Africa and of the nations of the Communist world, are trained on us to see how truly we believe in our own founding principles; and

Whereas our President has implemented these principles by sending to Congress a comprehensive bill intended to end discrimination in accommodations, employment, social intercourse, education, and other particulars; and

Whereas the people of Hawaii wholeheartedly join our President in saying, "The time has come for the Congress of the United States to join with the executive and judicial branches in making it clear to all that race has no place in American life or law." Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City and County of Honolulu, That the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America be, and he is, hereby commended for his forceful program on civil rights; and be it further

Resolved by the Council of the City and County of Honolulu, That the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States be, and he is, hereby assured of the fullest support of the people of the city and county of Honolulu in his civil rights program; and be it finally

Resolved, That the clerk be, and he is, hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, and to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America.

Introduced by: Ernest N. Heen, Herman G. P. Lemke, Clesson Y. Chikasuye, Yoshiro Nakamura, Matsuo Takabuki, Masato Doi, William K. Amona, Ben F. Kaito, and Richard M. Kageyama, councilmen.

Date of introduction: July 2, 1963, Honolulu, Hawaii.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of original Resolution No. 206 (1963) on file and of record in the office of the city clerk. I further certify that the resolution was adopted by the Council of the City and County of Honolulu on July 2, 1963.

Given under my hand and the seal of the city and county of Honolulu this 5th day of July 1963.

EMPEROR A. HANAPI,
City Clerk.

Why Go to the Moon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am calling to the attention of the U.S. Congress and the American people by CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of an interesting article which appears in the VFW magazine for July 1963. From my experience on space matter, I believe that this is such an excellent article that it should be called especially to notice.

Congressman RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, author of this timely article on the U.S. space program, is well schooled in his subject. He is a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, and the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight. He served as commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, 1957–58, and is now a member of the VFW National Legislative Committee, and the Indiana Department of Veterans Affairs Committee.

The article follows:

WHY GO TO THE MOON?

(By RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, U.S. Representative, Indiana)

If we in the United States desire to abandon all of the traditions and ideals which made this Nation great, and content ourselves with the role of a second-rate power, we could choose no more certain course than to surender outer space to the Soviet Union. And being second to a power determined to destory our way of life would leave us no power at all. It would be tantamount to committing political and national suicide.

It is well, therefore, to remind ourselves occasionally, that while we have touched the edge of space, we still have a long way to go. Almost 2 years after Russian Cosmonaut Gherman Titov orbited the earth for a day, we had yet to accomplish this feat ourselves, and we still did not have an operational space booster with the power and reliability of those the Russians had used repeatedly.

Since then, we have continued to advance our space capabilities, as shown by the sensational 22-orbit flight last May of Air Force Major L. Gordon Cooper. But Cooper's 34 hours in orbit still fell short of a mark set in August of last year by two Russian cosmonauts who attempted a rendezvous of their crafts in space. All previous endurance marks, of course, were shattered by the June orbits of the Russians, Lt. Col. Valery Bykovsky and Valentina Tereshkova, first woman cosmonaut.

But Cooper's feat would seem to indicate we are closing the gap with Russia in space technology. Our new Saturn rocket engine, now being made operational, is said to be the most powerful ever developed in the world. Russian secrecy prevents us from knowing for sure.

As far bask as 1958, when the first sputnik gave us startling evidence of a new Soviet capability, President Eisensower's Science Advisory Committee recognized that we were in a race with the Russians for preeminence in space.

"The be strong and bold in space technology will enhance the prestige of the United States among the peoples of the world and create added confidence in our scientific, technological, industrial, and military strength," President Eisenhower's Science Advisory Committee stated.

Futher, this Committee's statement said, "There is the defense objective for the development of space technology. We wish to be sure that space is not used to endanger our security. If space is used for military purposes, we must be prepared to use space to defend ourselves."

These assertions, put forth by President Eisenhower in 1958, are as valid today as they were then. The United States must assume leadership in exploring the moon for reasons identical with those which prompted us, 5 years ago, to undertake a major national space program. Although the reasons are identical, they have even more urgency today.

Military experts tell us it is naive to think of the space program as a scientific luxury—

a "Buck Rogers" toy that we can play with at our economic leisure. They stress that rapid development of our capabilities in space is vital to our Nation's political sovereignty—perhaps to its very existence. Spaceraft, they say, in the near future, will be as necessary to our defense posture as airplanes are now. And without them, we would be helpless. It is not a matter of economy, said one, but of necessity.

Some have questioned the wisdom of selecting the moon as the focal point of our early efforts to achieve superiority in space flight.

Whether this decision was wise can best be answered by asking if the Russians, themselves, are striving to reach the moon, and if in our own drive for preeminence, we are overlooking a more desirable alternative.

To evaluate Soviet intentions, one might turn to the Soviet magazine Red Star of April 12, 1963, to find all the challenge a patriotic American should need. In an interview, Soviet Cosmonaut Yuri Gagarin was asked about international space competition. He replied:

"Not so long ago, it seemed impossible that man would break loose from the bonds of Mother Earth. Yet man, Soviet man, has not only succeeded in tearing away from this cradle, but has made many orbits around it.

"What awaits us? Not the stars yet. Probably the moon is first * * *. All my space friends strongly hope that the road to the natural satellite of the earth will be laid by people from our valiant socialist system."

We Americans have a very real stake in making certain that Gagarin's hopes are not realized. We cannot afford to lose a technological and ideological contest which could cost us all that so many Americans have given their lives to defend.

Furthermore, it would make no sense to bypass the moon and concentrate instead on some more difficult, distant and costly space destination, such as Mars. This would seemingly leave, then, only the choice of some less demanding goal, such as a manned, earth-orbiting laboratory in space.

As a part of our lunar exploration program, we will have such laboratories—although on a limited scale—in our 2-man Gemini spacecraft and our 3-man Apollo spacecraft, designed to orbit the earth for two months. These will give us needed experience in rendezvous and docking techniques—the bringing together and coupling in space of two separately launched vehicles—which we shall need for manned exploration of the moon and for overall competence in space.

We can hardly expect to achieve preeminence in space—a goal overwhelmingly approved by a bipartisan vote in the Congress—if we content ourselves merely with experiments in the near-space regions around the Earth while the Russians proceed, full steam ahead, to the Moon and beyond.

In a sense, the continued existence of representative government and the free enterprise system depends upon the organization and extension of our space program. In this era of revolutionary scientific changes and expanding technology, we are faced with a crucial contest for political survival.

As Space Administrator James E. Webb said recently: "In a contest with an adversary whose true strength largely remains an unknown factor because of the secrecy of their operations, we cannot ask ourselves how little we can do and still win.

"We must ask ourselves how much we can prudently do to insure success within the limits of our available resources and in full consideration of our other pressing national obligations and needs."

Although we are in a space competition, the Appollo program is not merely a technological exercise undertaken for the sake of competition alone. Inherent in the program are scientific and technological benefits that are an essential part of our total space effort and which cannot be achieved by using unmanned automatic equipment.

This fact was underlined last summer by a group of the Nation's leading scientists, meeting for 2 months at Iowa State University under sponsorship of the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences. Their report stated:

"It is recognized that man in a sensing and control loop can provide judgment, adaptability, improvisation, and selectivity to a degree which cannot be matched now, or in the foreseeable future, by adaptive machines which only report the results of their observations, experiments, and actions, to man.

"Manned exploration of space promises great scientific return and Apollo can be a fruitful first step in this effort. Although the mission itself is first an engineering enterprise aimed at insuring that man reach the moon and return safely, it is also the first step in the manned scientific study of the moon and the planets."

The 1961 national decision that our country accomplish the manned lunar exploration goal within this decade was based, at least in part, on a report issued earlier that year by the National Academy of Sciences.

The report stated:

"Scientific exploration of the moon and the planets should be clearly stated as the ultimate objective of the U.S. space program. From a scientific standpoint, there seems little room for dissent that man's participation in the explorations of the moon and the planets will be essential. Man can contribute critical elements of scientific judgment and discrimination in conducting the scientific exploration of those bodies which can never be fully supplied by his instruments, however complex and sophisticated they may become."

Exploration of the moon appeals to scientists because its uneroded landscape may reveal information about the origins of the universe which has long since been erased from the surface of our earth. The moon offers unique opportunities for research in geology, geophysics, astronomy, and space biology. The far side of the moon may provide an ideal site for a radio-astronomy station. Such installations would be shielded from earth background electronic "noise" and so could investigate the crucial long-wave length region of the universe obscured by the earth's ionosphere.

Another important reason for selecting the moon as the focal point of our current, manned space efforts, is that it will require a degree of greatly expanded, overall competence in space, which we can develop on a timetable competitive with that of the Soviet Union. This competence will be available for any purpose—civilian or military—which may be required.

We are well advanced on the "road to the moon." We have had repeatedly successful test firings of the giant Saturn rocket which will carry our American astronauts to the moon. In fact, I was privileged to see the latest test firing at Cape Canaveral of this large booster.

We are constructing, on a site adjoining the present Cape Canaveral complex, a new Spaceport, U.S.A. It will include the world's tallest 1-story building, to rise 525 feet above the ground. The door alone will be an astounding 456 feet high.

This new facility, the Vertical Assembly Building, to be used for Saturn, will have enough room inside it to contain the Empire State Building.

Such mammoth ground-support equipment is necessary because our advanced Saturn rocket, when assembled, will stand almost as tall as the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City.

Our astronaut training program is moving forward satisfactorily. We have recruited additional astronauts. Our scientists and technicians are working night and day on solving the myriad problems presented by space flight and the effects on man of this unknown and largely hostile environment.

Leadership in space will not come cheaply. The American people are spending 20 cents a week per person on our national space program. At the same time, we are spending each year, more than four times our space budget on golf, fishing, movies and other recreation. And we are spending much more than the space program costs on cosmetics, beverages, smoking, and the like. I am not suggesting that we give up our pleasures. They make existence more livable in the troubled times we have inherited. I simply want to point ou that for a fraction of what we spend to indulge ourselves, we may well be able to win surcease from the threat of another great power dominating this planet indefinitely by means of space supremacy.

If we can afford to amuse ourselves, we can certainly afford to help insure our liberties in tomorrow's world so we can continue to amuse ourselves.

Dr. Detlev Bronk, one of our country's most respected scientists, recently said that actually landing astronauts on the moon is a secondary factor in the total picture of space accomplishment.

I think the effort to get there—the human adventure of endeavoring to get there; the effort of people to understand something they have never been able to understand think this is the most important thing. before: the vitality we get as a nation out of being engaged in a great adventure—I think this is the most important thing.

Perhaps it is the most important thing. But the most important immediate objective in the total space picture is for us to reach the moon before the Soviet Union does—to prove convincingly the free world's uncurtained scientific and technological thrust is can certainly afford to help insure our liber- superior to the secretive efforts of the Communists.

An Unprincipled Policy on Angola

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish at this point to insert in the Record an article from the Charleston, S.C., News and Courier on Portuguese Angola. I feel that it is a reasonable story and that it will interest my colleagues in the House.

An Unprincipled Policy on Angola

(By John Chamberlain)

The U.S. Government seems committed to keeping exiles from Castro's Cuba from carrying on counterrevolutionary work against a dictator who has become a complete pawn of a distant European power. What this does to make a mockery of the Monroe Doctrine is obvious.

But what is not so well appreciated is the fact that our suppression of anti-Castro activity is not even consistent with U.S. policy elsewhere in the world.

There is the little matter of our stance in regard to Portuguese Angola, for example.

Back in 1960, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a resolution calling for the independence of all colonial people.

As a general rule, the right of a people to self-determination cannot be gainsaid.

But there is the question of individual rights, too—and premature national independence that is quickly followed by chaos, bloodshed, and the emergence of a repressive one-party dictatorship, is no bargain for any population that cares more for the rights of man than it does for the rights of that high-level abstraction, the nation-state.

The question about Angola is: what would follow if it were to be liberated from Portugal tomorrow? I don't know, for I have never been to Angola, which is deep in sub-Saharan Africa.

But the history of the agitation for Angolan freedom is not reassuring. Nor, for that matter, is the official Washington relation to it.

The U.N. having taken its stand in support of abstract freedom for colonial people has, from time to time, censured Portugal for refusing to grant "immediate recognition" of the right of Angola to independence. Meanwhile, the U.N. which stands behind the Cyrille Adoula Congolese government, has permitted the organization on Congo soil of terrorist bands which have made forays across the border into Angola.

The liberation group, run by Holden Roberto, a non-Portuguese-speaking Angolan who has hardly ever lived in his own country, is called the Angolan People's Union, or the UPA.

Holden Roberto maintains a training center for his group some miles out of Léopoldville, the capital of the Congo. From this military seat of a "government in exile" Holden Roberto's UPA stirs up continuous trouble for the Portuguese. And, with the apparent approval of both the Congo and the U.N. other training camps for Angolan terrorists are in course of being set up on Congo soil.

Whether the UPA represents the "legitimate" aspirations of a majority of Angolans is something that cannot be determined short of a plebiscite.

The attitude of the Portuguese is that the freedom movement in Angola is mostly a figment of Holden Roberto's imagination. The Portuguese, who have never followed a policy of race consciousness or race discrimination in any of their colonies, claim that Angola is part of "great Portugal," a league of citizens of all colors who have equal individual rights and equal claims to protection under the law.

Since the huge South American nation of Brazil, which was originally colonized by the Portuguese, has no legal race discrimination today (the social reality may not be as idealistic as the law), the assertion by the Portuguese Government in Lisbon that it makes "merit," not "color," the basis for its Angolan policies carries with it a good deal of conviction.

It is not my purpose here, however, to judge between the Angolan liberation movement and the Portuguese.

What concerns me is our own pretense to honesty and consistency in foreign policy. The United States contributed more than its share to the U.N. operations in the Congo that kept Katanga from seceding, and it still channels a good deal of economic aid to the central Léopoldville Government.

Having denied the right of the Katangans under Moise Tshombe to "self-determination," we are indirectly helping to sustain Holden Roberto's training camps, which propose to bring self-determination to Angola.

We could stop the Holden Roberto buildup in the Congo at a moment's notice merely by threatening to cut off aid to Cyrille Adoula's Congolese state.

Maybe Holden Roberto has a case that is worthy of support. Or maybe he is nothing more than an adventurist fake as a "democrat."

But if the United States is to support Holden Roberto's forays into Angola with its left hand while, with its right, it makes things increasingly difficult for Cuban exiles to attack Castro from unidentified points in the Caribbean, then it looks like a pretty unprincipled way of conducting a foreign policy.

Tribute to the Late Congressman Francis E. Walter by Most Rev. Bishop Edward E. Swanstrom, Executive Director, Catholic Relief Services—NCWC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, it is my privilege to include herewith the following very interesting article entitled "Representative Francis E. Walter: A Great American" written by Most Rev. Bishop Edward E. Swanstrom, executive director, Catholic Relief Services—NCWC and published in the Brooklyn Tablet on Thursday, July 4, 1963, as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE FRANCIS E. WALTER—A GREAT AMERICAN

(By Most Rev. Edward E. Swanstrom, executive director, Catholic Relief Services—NCWC)

Knowing how widely the Tablet is read throughout the United States, I would like to have the privilege of using your columns to pay a well-deserved tribute to the late Congressman Francis E. Walter. As you know, he was referred to more affectionately as "Tad" by those of us who were fortunate enough to have won his friendship and affection, all of whom held him in the same high regard.

I came to know Congressman Walter quite well during the critical years since the end of World War II, and I was among those who dropped in at Georgetown Hospital in Washington now and then during his last long illness to offer him a word of consolation and cheer.

I felt privileged, too, to be among those who were at his burial service when his mortal remains were laid to rest in Arlington Cemetery a few weeks ago. We prayed that his might be a merciful judgment as he appeared before the Eternal Judge, as all of us must one day.

In view of President Kennedy's announcement that he will ask the Congress for a change in the basic structure of our immigration and naturalization laws, and the fact that the Senate has already scheduled hearings on Senator HART's forward-looking bill, which is a measure designed to accomplish this same end, a number of things are already being said publicly, and other things will undoubtedly be said later, which may not give a fair and true picture of legislative developments in the field of immigration during the past decade and a half and reflect unjustly on Mr. Walter and others. It might be well for all of us to keep a few facts in mind.

The fact that our code of immigration law is more commonly known today as the McCarran-Walter Act often tends to cast a shadow on the legislative records of these two great gentlemen whose actions in Congress, at least to my mind, were motivated more than by anything else by their devotion and loyalty to the security and freedom of our great country.

In Mr. Walter's case this is brought out even more dramatically by his dynamic chairmanship of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

It must be remembered that the McCarran-Walter Act was primarily a recodification of the multitude of immigration and naturalization acts which had been placed on the statute books since the turn of the century. It will be recalled that, at that time, both were quite adamant in their insistence that they did not mean it to be nor wish it to be anything more than just that, even though they did endorse and include some very desirable amendments in the final act.

They were not the authors of our "national origins quota system." From personal conversation with both of them at the time, I recall that their refusal to change this basic fallacy in our law was because of their personal fear, justified or unjustified as it might have been, that it would open the Nation's doors to many undesirable and subversive aliens.

As I look back on it now, I am sure that they felt that the Congress and the people of the United States were not yet educated nor prepared to accept a change in our basic immigration policy.

HIS VIEWS JUSTIFIED

Mr. Walter was convinced that under the law as written and with the help of emergency legislation a very substantial number of citizens could find a home and freedom in our country. The facts seem to justify his conviction.

In the 10 years since the McCarran-Walter bill became law, up to June 30, 1962, 2,509,342 refugees and immigrants have been admitted to the United States. It is of some significance that of this number, 1,664,750 were admitted as nonquota immigrants whereas only 934,509 arrived under our regular quotas.

Those of us who strove to urge Congress to pass a law that would make it possible for the United States to accept a fair share of the hundreds of thousands of persons who found themselves displaced in the countries of Europe after the last great world upheaval, with no hope of return to their countries of origin, remember well the barriers that had to be hurdled and the grassroots educational program that had to be initiated and promulgated before the citizens of our country were moved to ask their representatives for such action.

The first Displaced Persons Act of 1948, with its amendments in the years that followed, helped 405,000 displaced persons and orphans to find a haven and a new life of freedom and security in our country. It was of necessity an era of emergency legislation, and it was principally under Mr. Walter's leadership that additional men, women, and children were offered citizenship in the United States on that basis.

These totals were as follows: A second special orphan act, 960 orphans; the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, 191,000 persons (which incidentally included 57,000 persons of Italian origin); Hungarian Parole of 1956–57, 36,000 persons; the Walter-Pastore Act of 1957, citizens of Portugal and the Netherlands, 21,000 persons; various acts of 1957 as amended, 29,000 refugees and 24,000 family reunion benefitees.

A REALISTIC VIEW

It was under Mr. Walter's leadership also that the so-called Fair Share Act was enacted in 1960 and extended and made a permanent part of our legislation in 1962, under which the United States has accepted and will continue to accept a quota of refugees in a given ratio to those accepted by other countries. Nobody liked the so-called piecemeal character of this emergency immigration legislation less than I did myself. But when one looks at the temper of the Congress and the people of the United States of the late 1940's and 1950's, and is willing to be realistic about the situation, he must conclude that it was the only basis upon which, during those years, victims of the war's dislocation and of demographic inequalities could have been brought into our country in additional numbers.

It seems to me that the enlightenment and understanding regarding our present undesirable basic immigration policy—a heritage of the 1920's—that have come to our Nation have made us ripe for a change more in keeping with our traditional sense of fairplay and justice. I believe Mr. Walter realized this, and I would like to believe that if he were alive today he would be in the forefront of leadership for change—change that the next decade will inevitably produce.

It is regrettable in a way that these prospects for change were not more propitious in the last few years of his life. I have heard it said by those closest to him that Mr. Walter was thinking of authoring just such a change. That is not really very important now. What is important is that in fairness to his honored memory, to paraphrase another great American, "we keep the record straight."

Those of us who have been in the forefront of postwar resettlement programs will always be conscious of the great debt our country and we ourselves owe to his understanding and leadership.

The Capitol Hill Seminar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues may be interested to learn about an educational program, the Capitol Hill seminar, which has been successfully carried on these past 2 years for congressional staff members by the American Foundation for Continuing Education.

The American Foundation for Continuing Education is a not-for-profit educational foundation which, since its inception in 1947, has devoted its efforts to supporting and extending the liberal education of adults wherever it is appropriate in American life. The main office of the foundation is located at 19 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

During the spring of 1962, the American Foundation prepared and conducted an experimental program of 12 2-hour seminar discussions for a bipartisan group of 12 legislative and administrative assistants from both Houses of Congress.

Based on the success of that pilot program, the foundation again offered the Capitol Hill seminar this current winter and spring to another bipartisan group of 31 congressional staffers.

It is important to note that the Capitol Hill seminar has developed out of the expressed needs and interests of our professional staff and is, in a very real sense, their program. A series of interviews conducted by the American in the fall and winter of 1961–62 with congressional staff personnel brought forth a statement of concern that the very busy, day-to-day schedule and workload of congressional staffers gave them little opportunity to stand back from the immediacy of their work and examine, in depth and with objectivity, fundamental public policy questions which confront our country.

Out of these initial discussions evolved the idea of developing a study-discussion seminar program which would critically explore pressing social, political and economic issues whose dimensions extended far beyond their immediate currency. This analysis, the American Foundation felt, should take place within a framework of a discussion of the basic values, premises and goals of American democracy.

The American Foundation agreed to develop a series of readings and conduct a test program. Several interested congressional staffers offered to organize a pilot group of 12 participants drawn from both House and Senate offices on a bipartisan basis.

In the spring of 1962, 2-hour seminars were held each week, every Friday evening and Saturday morning, for 6 weeks under the leadership of American Foundation senior staff members. The participants contributed $35 each to cover costs of books. The American Foundation absorbed the considerable costs of developing and teaching the program.

The results of this pilot program, according to the comments of the participants, were most gratifying. It led the American Foundation to draw the conclusion that this was an important area of educational need which warranted a carefully expanded program the next year.

Because of the inability of congressional staff members to bear the full costs of such a program out of their own pockets, the American Foundation decided to seek funds which would help support the continued expansion of the Capitol Hill seminar. The American Foundation is an operating rather than a grant-giving foundation and could not afford itself to continue to underwrite the considerable costs of developing and conducting a seminar program of high quality. Fortunately, the Old Dominion Foundation agreed to entertain a proposal to provide funds for the Capitol Hill seminar; and this past winter made a grant available to the American Foundation to offer an expanded and revised seminar this year. The original participants in the test group offered the American Foundation their continued assistance, suggesting new topics for the discussion and helping to recruit this year's participants from among their staff colleagues. A three-volume set of readings, "Readings for Capitol Hill," was designed, edited and printed by the American Foundation. The program was expanded to 14 2-hour seminar sessions. Beginning this past March, 31 hard-working members of the professional staff on the Hill joined the program. One group has been meeting every Tuesday evening, the second every Wednesday evening, for 2 hours in a conference room in the New Senate Office Building made available by the Senate Public Works Committee. The participants in this year's program paid a fee of $25 to help defray the costs of the readings.

The objectives of the Capitol Hill seminar have emerged from this apparent educational need of our staffers to develop more sense of the whole picture, to stand back from the politics of immediate issues and examine the larger dimensions, implicit assumptions, and long-range implications of fundamental issues which are of concern to the whole society. These objectives are not easy to accomplish, especially when the participants come from various regions of the country, from both rural and urban areas, from a variety of backgrounds and experiences, and daily are involved in the practical, partisan tasks of the Democratic and Republican offices for which they work.

Thus, the American Foundation set the task of providing an educational framework within which the participants would be encouraged to develop, first, deeper understanding of the values, premises, and goals of American democracy; second, increased knowledge and understanding of current issues and their interrelationships; third, deeper understanding of the philosophic questions underlying public policy issues; and fourth, greater understanding of their own values, of the implications and assumptions of their own positions.

The American Foundation does not, therefore, attempt to have the participants develop any consensus on these issues and problems under discussion. Often the sessions find individual participants in fundamental disagreement with each other. But such disagreements, in fact, form part of a continuing dialog in the seminar whereby the position taken by any one participant is subjected to the careful scrutiny of the other participants, so that all are forced to analyze the problems and develop their own thinking on the basis of the soundest and most rigorous argument of which they are capable.

To promote such an inquiry, the American Foundation has developed for the seminars a series of readings which represent a variety of different and often-conflicting interpretations of the crucial issues of our day. Each session averages 40 pages of material selected to provide a balanced range of analysis and opinion drawn from the writings or speeches of persons of knowledge and concern: social scientists, philosophers, statesmen, experts, both past and present.

The 14 sessions for this year's Capitol Hill seminar consisted of the following topics:

1. National Goals and Purposes.
2. Freedom and Equality: Social and Educational Aspects.
3. Excellence and Mass Democracy.
4. Urbanization: Problems and Prospects.
5. Work, Abundance and Leisure.
6. American Economic Growth: Why and How?
7. Who Shall Govern?—I: Political Leadership, Public Opinion and the Public Interest.
8. Who Shall Govern?—II: Political Parties and Private Governments.
9. Who Shall Govern?—III: The Executive, Congress and the Right To Know.

10. America and the World—I: Goals of Foreign Policy.
11. America and the World—II: Aid to the Emerging Nations.
12. America and the World—III: Arms or Disarmament?
13. Science and Society—I.
14. Science and Society—II.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it goes without saying that we should congratulate the members of our congressional staff who have taken the time and effort, with their extremely full schedules, to participate in the Capitol Hill Seminar and thus continue their own education in ways which are highly relevant to the continued development of the professional character and status of their work on the Hill. The American Foundation for Continuing Education is to be applauded and encouraged in this work of providing a seminar program which affords our staffers the opportunity to develop and refine their understanding about and judgment of major questions of a public policy nature. The Old Dominion Foundation, in helping to underwrite the costs of the second year of this program, has contributed importantly to an educational effort which I hope may be continued and expanded in future years.

In addition to 16 staff members from the Senate, 27 House staff members have participated. They include 18 from Democratic offices, 6 from Republican offices and three committee staffers. My own executive assistant, John T. Calkins, was a participant. On behalf of the Members on whose staffs these participants in the seminar are employed, I take this opportunity to express our support and encouragement to them for their willingness to expend extra time and effort in their continuing education.

Shotgun Marriage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, much has been written concerning the latest efforts on the part of certain Arab States to unite. However, when one examines the forces behind this drive for Arab unity, it becomes clear that the influence of Nasser and his aggressive policies predominates. Under those circumstances, unity based on genuine equality can hardly be expected. Moreover, a unity based on the dominance of Egypt in the Middle East can have the most unsettling effect and increase tensions in that area. A very penetrating analysis of this problem was recently published in the latest issue of Prevent World War III—No. 62, summer 1963—under the title "Shotgun Marriage." Some of the details in this article have been changed since the article was written because of the speed with which the situation in the Middle East has altered. However, the heart of the article, which deals with the danger of Egypt dominating the Middle East, is still of great concern and, therefore, should merit the attention of all security-minded Americans. I commend this article to the attention of our colleagues. Prevent World War III is published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., a nonprofit educational organization, 24 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.:

SHOTGUN MARRIAGE

In modern times the unity of a people has been accomplished through diverse ways and means. Essentially, however, the roads to unity have either followed the American or the Prussian pattern. The United States grew out of a common experience at the grassroots level and was fundamentally the product of the peoples' will in contrast, modern Germany is the creature of Prussian ruthlessness which bore down on the political sovereignty of neighboring Germanic states. The people had virtually no role in the process. On the contrary, they were faced by a fait accompli and were obliged to accept the structure which had been fashioned by Prussia's military might. The offspring of Bismarck's unification policy bore all of the birthmarks of its Prussian parent. It, too, made militarism its patron saint while the foreign policy of the united Germany was an extension of Prussia's ambitions.

KEY QUESTION

It is well to bear these facts in mind when assessing the significance of the refurbished United Arab Republic. There are those who believe that the unity among Iraq and Syria is a good omen. The theory behind this view is that, if the Arabs are united, there will be greater opportunities for internal progress and general stability throughout the Middle East. It is an attractive theory but when it is subjected to the test of the actual conditions under which the United Arab Republic was established, it takes on a different coloration and meaning.

The key question that must be answered in evaluating the new United Arab Republic is this: Did it come about as the result of the overwhelming sentiment of the Arab masses in the above mentioned countries? To put it another way: Did the broad masses of people in these countries actually participate in setting up this "new" political structure? This question cannot be satisfactorily answered by generalizations. It can only be tackled by a concrete examination of what actually occurred over the past half year. If we permit ourselves to be misled by superficial appearances, then it will be well-nigh impossible to deal with the new situation in realistic terms.

OVERTHROW IN IRAQ

The overthrow of the Kassem regime in Iraq did not come about by a national mass uprising of the people. It was accomplished by the changing of the palace guard. The overwhelming majority of the Iraqi people were certainly not consulted, nor were they involved in any profound way. The clique that eliminated the Kassem dictatorship, did not carry on its banner the slogan of liberty, fraternity, and equality. Instead, it clamped down on the people its own bloody dictatorship. The strictest kind of censorship was immediately installed. Every independent avenue for public expression was sealed tight. Instead, there was not even the pretense of consulting the people.

From all reports concerning those hectic days in February it is clear that civil war in Iraq was incipient. It was only through the most thorough-going terror that the new regime was able to maintain power. The Kassem dictatorship had many enemies. But this is not to say that the opposition was united or that it supported the group of Iraqi officers who seized power. The ruthlessness with which these officers silenced all opponents, is indicative of the fact that, like the Kassem dictatorship, they, too, did not enjoy mass support.

Furthermore, an examination of the composition of the new rules of Iraq shows quite clearly that the revolt merely substituted one kind of dictatorship for another. One of the key personalities in the new regime is Col. Abdel Salam Arif. Colonel Arif is a notorious Nasser agent. At one time he had been imprisoned by Kassem and condemned to death on the charge that he was plotting to betray Iraqi's interests on behalf of the Cairo government. The Premier of the new Cabinet is Maj. Gen. Ahmed Massam Bakr. He, too, is a Nasserite of long standing. The Deputy Premier Saleh Saadi is also a trusted proponent of Nasser's policies. It is not an oversimplification to say that the dominant members of the ruling clique are fanatical devotees to Nasser.

Upon receiving President Nasser's congratulatory statement in connection with the murder of Kassem, Colonel Arif exclaimed: "We pray to God that he (Nasser) will lead us to fulfillment of the aspirations of the Arab nations." Nasser, of course, always regarded the Kassem regime as an enemy. Egyptian propaganda poured out a steady stream of incitement against the Kassem rule. Time and again, radio Cairo offered all-out Egyptian aid to those who would get rid of Kassem. On February 5, the political commentator of Cairo's "Voice of the Arabs" declared: "Egypt won't hesitate to help the Iraqi people to revolt against the Kassem regime." It called Kassem a "dictator" and warned that he "would follow the fate of Nuri Said." Three days late, i.e., on February 8, Kassem was killed. Needless to say, the Nasser government was jubilant. On that very day, Nassers' Voice of the Arabs boasted to its listeners: "We expected this day."

The Egyptian Government officially congratulated Iraqi officers who, having been protected by Egypt, had secretly returned to Iraq to take part in the blood bath. In praising these Iraqi officers, Nasser said: "I was pleased * * * on the occasion of your return to Iraq. To me, the latter means that the long dark night which shrouded Iraq * * * had ended. You performed your role in the attempt to deliver Iraq."

SYRIA'S TURN

The Syrian story has a somewhat different twist. It will be recalled that last year Syria broke with Nasser on the grounds that under the cover of unity Cairo had sought to convert Syria into an Egyptian satellite. The terror, corruption and bribery perpetrated by Nasser's stooges in Syria, had been just too much to tolerate any longer. The commander in chief of the Syrian Army described Egypt's concept of unity in these words: "They (the Egyptians) viewed it (the Syrian-Egyptian union) as a unity between master and slave, strong and weak and one by the big and small. From this point their rule over the country was one of terror."

Under these circumstances, the Syrians took the only step that was available to them in order to preserve their self-respect and sovereignty. They officially broke with the Cairo Government. The new Syrian Government immediately revealed to the world the shocking story of Egypt's imperialistic policies. The Syrians were resolved to make this record public so as to alert the whole Arab world as to the real designs of the Egyptian Government.

Syria was able to maintain this position of independence until the overthrow of Kassem in Iraq. The fact that Iraq had now come under the control of the Nasserites made it clear to the Syrians that they would now be subjected to tremendous pressures. They were aware that, as in Iraq, their country, too, would become the target of subversion and all sorts of criminal plots.

That Nasser was determined to undo the embarrassing rebuff he suffered when the Syrians withdrew from the United Arab Republic, was unmistakable. Thus, throughout the months of 1962, Cairo propaganda conducted a frenzied campaign of slander and abuse against Syria. This propaganda had one constant theme, namely, that the Syrian Government was ruled by a handful of traitors to the cause of Arabdom. In January of this year, Cairo began to circulate reports of alleged revolts by the Syrian Army. These manufactured rumors were turned out weekly, up to the very eve of the overthrow of the Syrian Government.

Meanwhile, during this entire period, the Syrian authorities sought desperately to expose the brazen interference of Cairo. At a special meeting of the Arab League last August, the now deposed Syrian Government complained that the Egyptians were interfering in the internal affairs of Syria with a view toward subverting the legitimate government. With characteristic arrogance, the Cairo Government instructed its delegate at this meeting to ignore the Syrian charges and to walk out of the meeting. Cairo even threatened to do away with the Arab League which has been under its effective control, if it dared to take seriously Syria's grievances.

THE CLIMAX

Thus, the crisis confronting the Syrian Government in early March was not surprising to those who had followed developments. It had been building up over a period of months, and with the February revolt in Iraq the climax had been reached. Although the majority of the Syrians were not eager to submit, the more opportunistic and weaker elements in the Syrian leadership were ready to hoist up the white flag. Apparently, these elements were hoping that by supporting a coup d'état they might be able to prevent a complete takeover by Cairo. Hence, on March 8, a group of Syrian officers staged what was described as a "lightening coup" and "claimed firm control of the turbulent nation." This same dispatch reported that the overthrow came as "no surprise to Cairo."

The key figures in the revolt had been Nassers' agents for years. Thus, the officer who was placed in charge of internal security was Col. Abdullah Jabrini. He had been the righthand man of Nasser's former proconsul in Syria, Lt. Col. Abdul Hamid Serraj. The Defense Minister, Lt. Gen. Mohammed el-Soufi, and the deputy chief of the general staff, Gen. Rashed Katinin, are also devoted supporters of Nasser. The chief of Syria's general staff is Lt. Gen. Louay Attassi. He had participated in a pro-Nasser mutiny in Aleppo last year. Attassi had been arrested for his role in that episode and was for a while imprisoned in Damascus.

Besides the Nasserite officers in the new setup, there are the leaders of the Syrian Baath Party. It appears that they had joined in the belief that in this way they would be able to stem the tide of pro-Nasser sentiment. Their opportunistic approach is indicated by the fact that the Premier of the new regime is the Baathist leader Salah Bitar who had been a stanch supporter of Syrian independence when the first break with the United Arab Republic had taken place. Opportunists such as Bitar are fully aware of Nasser's insatiable appetite. However, since they like the limelight and the emoluments of office, they find it tempting to do business with Nasser.

HELP FROM CAIRO

The moment the Syrian Government was overthrown, Cairo promptly recognized the new regime. Indeed, Egypt went further than that by announcing that it had placed its own armed forces on the alert to "protect" the Syrian "revolution." Cairo's Minister of State, Abdel Kader Hatem, declared that "the United Arab Republic considers any outside aggression against Syria as aggression against the United Arab Republic." Nasser himself cabled the Syrian ruling clique that his support "has no limits." He then informed the new regime: "We await your instructions." Obviously, all of this stage play was designed to make it clear that the coup d'etat must not be waylaid or aborted by unforeseen developments. As if they had taken his cue, the rebels replied to Nasser's generosity: "We are in control. There is no need for action on your part."

As in Iraq, so in Syria did the new regime make short shrift of all opposition. The role of the people remained outside the arena where the decisive events were taking place. The new regime with one hand ruthlessly beat down all opposition while with the other began to make all sorts of promises for a bright future. Above all, the Government tried to reawaken the idea of "Arabdom" which in Nasser's vocabulary refers to his dream of empire stretching from the Persian Gulf to the Atlantic. It was on this theme that the real ruler of Syria, General Attassi, declared that the Arab movement would "expand * * * until it becomes one of the great powers on this earth."

Meanwhile, Iraq's Deputy Premier Salah Saadi lost no time in conveying Nasser's wishes to the new Syrian Government. Three days after the coup, he showed up in Damascus and was greeted by "hundreds of demonstrators * * * chanting pro-Nasser slogans." Saadi spoke as though he were Nasser's pro-consul in Syria. He boasted that there would be a new unity of the Arabs and that he knew whereof he was speaking since he had just come from Cairo where he had had private talks with President Nasser.

MANEUVERS

The first flush of triumph began to pale within days after Saadi returned to his own bailiwick. Between the middle of March and early April the momentum of the unity movement began to slow down as the Baathist elements in Syria and other groupings showed a distinct cautiousness as to how the three countries should be organized as one. Apparently, there was even a serious split in the Syrian Cabinet (and this is borne out by subsequent events) as to how far Syria should submit to Egypt. During this crucial period, top Baathist officials, including Premier Bitar and Michel Aflaq, conferred with Nasser in Cairo. However, these talks were getting nowhere so far as Nasser was concerned. The "revolution" was losing its steam. This had been precisely Nasser's nightmare all along. Something had to be done.

On March 31, an all-out propaganda attack was launched against the Baathist leaders of Syria. This onslaught was orchestrated by the editor of one of Cairo's leading newspapers Al Ahram. The editor, Muhammad Haykal is one of Nasser's closest advisers. Obviously, his blast was the echo of his master's voice. In summary, Haykal warned the Syrian Baathists "to behave in such a way as to put things in a true perspective before it is too late." Within 24 hours after Haykal had spoken, Damascus had become the scene of bloody rioting. A state of emergency was declared and the Government imposed an 18-hour curfew in the capital. The riots, as reported by the noted New York Times correspondent Dana Adam Schmidt, "seem to have been signaled" by Haykal's attack.

The riots incited by Nasser's agents, paralyzed Damascus and created turmoil throughout the country. The Baathists were among the chief targets of this maneuver. As one press report put it, they were now confronted with "the pressure from the street." This same report noted that "observers here (Washington) saw evidence that trained Nasserite agitators were organizing the street crowds." It is as though the whole demonstration was organized by those who learned the "tricks of the street" when the Nazis were murdering their way to power.

The riots continued for 3 days. The Baathists in the Cabinet had submitted their resignations, but this was not what Nasser wanted. He preferred to maintain the fiction of civilian rule if his own followers could hold the substance of power. Thus, instead of accepting the offers of resignation, General Attassi ordered "that administrative papers, which formerly went to the Cabinet, now be diverted to his newly created 'Military Bureau of the Presidency' for screening before being passed down to the Cabinet." The turmoil and rioting had done their work. By the middle of April, the Baathist element in the Cabinet became more amenable to Nasser's desires. On April 10, Egypt's Vice President Aly Sabry announced that Iraq and Syria had agreed to join Egypt's United Arab Republic. He declared that Cairo would be the capital of the new state, that the flag would be the United Arab Republic's and that the new president would "probably" be Mr. Nasser. As if to give the United Arab Republic a democratic baptism, Sabry told reporters that the new constitution would be submitted for approval by popular referendum among the peoples in the new state. Thus, the new United Arab Republic was born.

FITTING IT TOGETHER

Sabry did not tell reporters how this new unity of equals would be achieved between 27 million Egyptians on the one hand and 7 million Iraqis and 5 million Syrians on the other. Nor did he touch on the economics of this grandiose design in which a land-hungry Egypt whose economy manages to stay afloat thanks to the handouts of the West and the Communist bloc, will fit in with the enormous oil resources of Iraq or the far more viable Syrian economy. Obviously, these are matters which Cairo must hope to deal with in due time; i.e., once the iron chains of unity are fastened securely on Egypt's neighbors.

Yet, Cairo needs that unity much more desperately than their neighbors and the reasons for it may also tell us what Egypt's neighbors may expect after the United Arab Republic becomes official. Ten years ago, a spokesman for Egypt's ideas of "Arabdom," Abdul Rahman Azzam, made a very candid statement as to what this concept meant to Egypt. Azzam was then Secretary General of the Arab League and wrote an article in the Cairo weekly al-Musawwar entitled "Who Are We: Pharaohs or Arabs?" It has been noted that the frankness of Azzam's statement may be attributed to the fact that it was made before Nasser clamped down full control over the press. Here is what he wrote: "Do the Arab countries need Egypt today more than we need them? The fact is that we need them more than they need us. As an Egyptian I declare that our future depends on our utilizing them rather than letting them utilize us. We bring into the world every year some 400,000 souls, which means that in 10 years Egyptian births will equal the entire population of Iraq or Syria * * * while we Egyptians live in a very narrow valley * * * I am convinced that all the talk of conquering the desert will prove in time a mere mirage."

Azzam then stressed that Egypt's future depended upon the expansion of her industries which must be the basis of military power. In this connection he wrote: "Such industrial development requires lebensraum. This will be afforded by our brothers who understand our aims and prefer us over all others. From an economic point of view we need the Arab countries, countries which have proven to be the wealthiest in natural resources in the world, for our future industry as well as for our future markets."

As regards Egypt's security in relation to other Arab States, he said: "I must challenge all those who are experts in military affairs, to state that Egypt could defend herself without having Syria as a full ally or that she could defend herself if Syria should make an alliance with Egypt's enemy. We cannot afford to let Syria act as she pleases, for the natural strategy of the situation demands that Syria must be within our lebensraum; moreover, we must make sure that Syria is not included in any defense framework except in the one that we want for Egypt."

As noted above, the process of unity had been guided with care. The ceaseless propaganda attacks, the staged demonstrations, the rioting, the assassination, and the ever-present subversive borings of Nasser's agents have been synchronized. By December of last year, Cairo was able to announce that its labors were about to yield fruitful results. Thus, on New Year's Eve a leading Egyptian newspaper, Akhbar Al-Yawm, assured its readers that 1963 "will bring the imminent fall of a number of governments around us. The new year will witness the establishment of national governments in Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Syria, Iraq, and elsewhere. * * * This is not mere prediction. It is logical, mathematical calculation." Nasser and his cohorts were by this time supremely confident that their terror tactics had sapped the resistance of those who still had a spark of independence.

From the foregoing it is clear that the new edition of the United Arab Republic is not the product of a popular consensus among the Arab masses. They were not consulted, nor did their representatives participate in the secret conferences in Cairo. The great decisions of the day were not made by them. Already, there are more splits in the Syrian regime between those who are fanatically attached to Cairo and those who know full well that unity with Egypt means the submergence of Syria's identity and the loss of her sovereign rights. The outcome of the split in Syria and its ultimate effect on the future of Nasser's United Arab Republic cannot be determined at this writing. However, one thing is certain, the United Arab Republic is the creature of Nasser's "blood and iron" policy which encourages disorder, confusion, and treachery and then moves in for the kill. Thus, if it manages to hold together, it will bear the indelible stamp of Nasser's militarism, just as united Germany became the military instrument of Prussia.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

West Virginia Centennial Stamp Accorded Public Acclaim—Wall Street Journal Prints Unjustified Critical Editorial—Senator Randolph Replies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in connection with the observance of West Virginia's centennial year, 1963, the U.S. Post Office Department has issued an attractive and colorful postage stamp. One hundred and ten million of the commemorative stamps have been printed, and their reception on the part of the general public has been gratifying.

However, on July 9, the Wall Street Journal carried an editorial which severely criticizes the design of the West Virginia stamp, calling it not only tasteless, banal, and commonplace, but also just plain ugly.

Mr. President, I take issue with this sweeping and questionable condemnation by the Journal editorial writer, and point out the following: the West Virginia commemorative stamp was selected from among numerous entries by the Post Office Department; the proposed design was approved by responsible State officials; Post Office reports indicate that public response has been favorable. Additionally, I have personally been contacted by a respected and experienced philatelist in the Washington, D.C., area, who commended West Virginia on the beauty and symbolic significance of its centennial stamp. He indicated that stamp collectors in all parts of the world would be eager to obtain a copy of our commemorative issue.

Mr. President, I am not alone in differing with the Wall Street Journal's assessment of the West Virginia centennial stamp. The Charleston Daily Mail printed an editorial reply in its issue of July 10. The Mail indicated the effort in arranging for the stamp's printing, and the fact that this is an auspicious event for West Virginians—a centennial stamp is rare. I heartily endorse the Daily Mail editorial when it states, "The Wall Street Journal to the contrary, we're lucky to have a centennial stamp."

Mr. President, the Post Office Department is conscientious in its efforts to secure the most effective designs possible for use as U.S. postage stamps. Considerable thought and and planning is required in obtaining sketches and drafts which are then screened for artistic value and appropriateness. The finished product is nearly always a stamp which conveys a sense of the history, principle, and heritage of this Nation. We believe that the West Virginia centennial stamp is in accordance with this commendable tradition, and we are grateful to Postmaster General J. Edward Day for his part in making its issuance possible.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter of July 15, and the Wall Street Journal editorial, "West Virginia Should Sue," July 9, 1963, be printed in the Appendix. Additionally, I also ask that parts of the editorial, "The Wall Street Journal to the Contrary, We're Lucky To Have a Centennial Stamp," in the July 10 Charleston Daily Mail be reprinted.

There being no objection, the letter and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 9, 1963]

WEST VIRGINIA SHOULD SUE

Maybe August Heckscher, the recently resigned White House special consultant on the arts, had an advance peek at the U.S. stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of West Virginia's entry into the Union.

For in a report issued as he left his post, Mr. Heckscher wrote: Many of Government's activities are related to the arts indirectly in that they consist of a normal part of its operations which may be done with a sense of beauty and fitness, or may be done tastelessly * * *. Too often, the Government communicates with its citizens on a banal and commonplace level."

Among other examples, he mentioned the general artistic inferiority of U.S. postage stamps. It must be said in all candor that the West Virginia commemorative is not only tasteless, banal, and commonplace, but also just plain ugly.

On a background of nauseous green is imprinted, outlined in red, the shape of the State of West Virginia. Impaled on the southwest corner is the numeral 5 followed by the words "United States Postage," visible only to persons with 20–20 vision or better.

In the lower right-hand corner is a black and white rendition of a domed edifice which, under a magnifying glass, turns out to be the West Virginia capitol building and not, as the naked eye suggests, the U.S. Capitol.

The citizens of the proud State of West Virginia might well bring suit against the U.S. Post Office. And if this is an example of how Washington wants to stimulate a cultural renaissance in the Nation, heaven save the arts from the bureaucrats.

U.S. SENATE,
July 15, 1963.

EDITOR, WALL STREET JOURNAL,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: In your issue of Tuesday, July 9, I noted with considerable dismay and disappointment an editorial, "West Virginia Should Sue," which is devoted in part to scathing criticism of the West Virginial Centennial postage stamp.

Recognizing that divergence of opinion is a fact of life in the world of art, I nonetheless fail to see in our stamp the slightest justification for your statement that "* * * the West Virginia commemorative is not only tasteless, banal, and commonplace, but also just plain ugly." Such sweeping and questionable condemnation is quite unexpected.

The design for the West Virginia Centennial stamp was selected from among numerous entries, and was chosen for its appropriate nature, originality and symbolism. Additionally, I am informed that the Post Office Department has received an impressive volume of favorable comment regarding the stamp. The green background, which your editorial writer found nauseous could well signify the verdant hills which are so numerous in the Mountain State. And could not the Capitol's black recall the fact that coal has long been the backbone of our economy and a boon to the Nation? The inclusion of this impressive edifice on the stamp can hardly be suspect since it is widely acclaimed as among the most beautiful State government structures in the land. Designed by Cass Gilbert, it is one of the world's finest examples of Italian renaissance architecture.

As to the artistic value of stamps issued by the Post Office Department, I draw your attention to the conscientious effort made by responsible officials to obtain for that purpose the most effective and suitable designs. Your staff members might care to investigate the process by which a design is adopted. The research might prove enlightening.

Permit me to observe that if the resignation of Mr. Heckscher as White House special consultant on the arts was due in part to disgust at the lack of artistry found in U.S. postage stamps, as you infer, he has responded in a most singular manner. Would it not be more reasonable to attempt to eliminate the artistic failings rather than to step aside while uttering criticisms? I prefer to believe that a gentleman of his stature was motivated by higher considerations that a mere glimpse at an advance issue of our commemorative stamp.

West Virginians plan no suit against the Post Office Department. We are pleased with our centennial stamp, which conveys the honest and strength of our people; we are happy that we can be hosts to the millions of Americans who will visit our State during Centennial 1963; and we are gratified that the general public response does not indicate agreement with your remarks. You will wish to read the copy of an editorial in the Charleston Daily Mail of July 11, in which the editor concluded: "* * * we feel quite fortunate that we even have a centennial stamp—with or without the Wall Street Journal's stamp of approval."

Perhaps others, too, feel that your comments did not attain the standards of discriminating taste normally ascribed to the Wall Street Journal.

With kind regards, I am.

Very truly,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senator.

[From the Charleston Daily Mail, July 10, 1963]

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL TO THE CONTRARY, WE'RE LUCKY TO HAVE A CENTENNIAL STAMP

Perhaps it's because we all have been in a festive centennial mood and somewhat tipsy with all the celebration and the recognition that West Virginia has been receiving. Or perhaps, we have become so accustomed to receiving the back of the hand that we have become inured to it.

But an editorial writer for the Wall Street Journal believes that we have been made the brunt of a malicious joke in the issuance of our centennial stamp.

* * * * *

What the Journal writer probably isn't aware of is the difficulty the State had in getting a centennial stamp design. A nationwide competition for design of the stamp was held and was won by Prof. Dwight O. Mutchler of the Ohio University Allied Arts Department. He received $500 for his prize-winning entry.

But on a visit here in January, Postmaster General James Edward Day denied any knowledge of a stamp contest and said the winning design would not be printed. This led some to the belief that there would not be a centennial stamp. But later, Day clarified that the Post Office Department had rejected the Mutchler design, but had created a West Virginia centennial stamp of its own incorporating some of the Mutchler ideas.

The stamp was printed—some 110 million of them—and it turned out to be the green and red number which carries a strong connotation of Christmas. But after the licking we took, we feel quite fortunate that we even have a centennial stamp—with or without the Wall Street Journal's stamp of approval.

"Living With the Federal Budget," an Address by Kermit Gordon, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, April 19, 1963, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an extremely useful analysis of the Federal budget by the distinguished director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Honorable Kermit Gordon.

This address was delivered before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, D.C., on April 19, 1963.

The address follows:

LIVING WITH THE FEDERAL BUDGET

(Address by Kermit Gordon, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Washington, D.C.)

It takes a certain foolhardiness for a new Budget Director to stand up before a room full of newspaper editors less than 4 months after his appointment and only 4 days after his listeners have mailed off their income tax returns. For, if all the newspaper editorials assailing the Federal Budget were gathered together in one place, they would fill the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—as indeed they have. When my distinguished predecessor as Budget Director moved over to the Agency for International Development, a Washington columnist said that he had been promoted from the least glamorous job in Washington to the most unpopular—but I have had frequent occasion in the last 4 months to wonder whether the job he vacated does not merit both of those distinctions.

It was not many years ago that the mere mention of the Federal Budget could be counted on to produce a deep soporific effect on any audience. But times have changed; there exists today—to put it mildly—a lively interest in the subject. I propose to capitalize on this new attentiveness by communicating the reflections of a new Budget Director on the chastely bound gray volume which has been put in his charge.

The Federal Budget is a formidable document. Compounded of Arabic numerals and latinized prose, it reflects the needs, hopes, and fears of a complex, growing, and increasingly wealthy society. It is the point of convergence of forces as diverse as an outbreak of hog cholera, a Chinese attack on India, floods in eastern Kentucky, juvenile delinquency on our city streets, a successful Venus probe, and an easing of mortgage money. But all of these vital and diverse forces must, of necessity, be transformed through the budgetary process into the cold common denominator of dollars. So it is dollars we must talk about.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The President's administrative budget for fiscal 1964 calls for expenditures of $98.8 billion. Let's look at this number from two points of view: First, what are we buying with it? Second, are we spending too much?

Of each dollar of expenditures in the administrative budget, 55 cents goes for national defense. For this expenditure we are buying a defensive shield, a retaliatory force, and a research and development program which is the principal bulwark of world peace. We have greatly strengthen both our conventional forces and our nuclear capacity since President Kennedy took office. Our national defense rests today on a foundation of 2,700,000 men under arms, an increase of about 200,000 since the end of 1960. We now have 16 combat ready divisions—up 5 over January 1961; 210 intercontinental ballistic missiles in place—up 200 over January 1961; 10 Polaris submarines—7 more than 2 years ago; 21 Air Force tactical air wings—5 more than 2 years ago; and a naval fleet of 836 ships—up 40 over January 1961. And we are steadily increasing the efficiency with which we are spending our defense dollars.

Four cents of every dollar goes for our space program. This is the minimum rate of spending which is necessary to achieve the goal of a manned lunar landing in the decade of the 1960's. With this 4 cents we are buying a mobilization of science and technology to make the United States first in space and to unlock the secrets of a vast and mysterious scientific frontier.

Ten cents of every dollar goes to pay interest on the national debt—80 percent of which was incurred during the two World Wars and the Korean conflict. These interest payments go directly or indirectly to every person who owns a Government bond, an insurance policy, or a bank account—which means that they go to nearly everybody.

VETERANS' BENEFITS

Six cents of every dollar goes for veterans' medical care, disability compensation, pensions, and other benefits to veterans and their survivors.

Four cents of every dollar goes to strengthen the military security and spur the economic growth of other nations whose stability and progress are important to the security of the United States.

These programs together account for 79 cents of every dollar. The other 21 cents goes for what are loosely referred to as domestic welfare programs. With this 21 cents we buy every other service and function which is included in the administrative budget. Among the services we buy for this 21 cents are heart and cancer research, air safety, abatement of water pollution, hospital construction and modernization, maintenance of our national parks and forests, the redevelopment of depressed areas, the retraining of the unemployed, school lunches for our children, water supplies for water-short areas, meat inspection, college dormitories, flood control, urban renewal, weather forecasts, and protection against harmful cosmetics and drugs. And these are only a few.

Of this 21 cents the Federal Government uses 14 cents to finance its own activities and turns over the remaining 7 cents to States and localities to help them provide better public services. Looking at the same 21 cents another way, 16 cents goes for current outlays, while the remaining 5 cents is used to acquire physical and financial assets—hospitals, airports, hydroelectric dams, mortgages, etc.

SPENDING TOO MUCH?

This, very briefly, is what we buy with the $98.8 billion we spend. Now let me turn to the question are we spending too much?

It is a certifiable fact that Federal spending has been increasing steadily. As President Kennedy said last year:

"It is true that in recent history each new administration has spent much more money than its predecessor. Thus, President Roosevelt outspent President Hoover, and with allowances for the special case of the Second World War, President Truman outspent President Roosevelt. Just to prove that this was not a partisan matter, President Eisenhower outspent President Truman by the handsome figure of $182 billion. It is even possible something of this trend may continue."

But to ask whether we are spending too much implies a comparison with something. Simply to compare dollar expenditures in 1963 with expenditures in 1923, or 1953, or even 1962, overlooks the fact that we are today a different Nation than we were in any of those years. Our needs are constantly changing, our resources are constantly changing, and even the unit of measurement has changed from earlier years.

This fundamental point was put effectively by President Eisenhower when he said in his 1960 budget message, "inescapable demands resulting from new technology and the growth of our Nation, and new requirements resulting from the changing nature of our society, will generate Federal expenditures in future years. * * * We must not forget that a rapidly growing population creates virtually automatic increases in many Federal responsibilities."

Here are some examples: Between the fiscal years 1962 and 1964 the number of tax returns will rise 2.5 percent; the volume of mail will grow 6.4 percent; visitors to our national parks will increase by 7 percent; the number of veterans or survivors receiving pensions will rise by 10 percent; aircraft landings and takeoffs at airports with Federal towers will go up by 11 percent; beneficiaries under the old-age and survivors insurance program will increase by 16 percent; the number of patents granted will rise by 20 percent; and passports issued will increase by 25 percent.

POPULATION GROWTH

Consider what has been happening to our population. We are now debating the 1964 budget. By the end of that fiscal year, there will be 10 million more Americans than there were the day President Kennedy took office. This means that we will add to the United States in this short period a number of people which is more than half the population of Canada. And since 1939 we have added to our population a number of people substantially greater than the present population of France.

Consider, also, the growth in our output of goods and services—our gross national product. Measured in the same current dollars we use to count Federal expenditures, our gross national product has increased more than fivefold since 1939. It has increased 57 percent in the last decade.

Finally, each Federal expenditure dollar buys less today than it did in earlier years. Though we have had relative price stability for the last 5 years, our price level has more than doubled since 1939 and is about 10 percent above its level a decade ago.

The single most important fact about the trend of Federal expenditures over recent decades is the vast expansion of our national defense program. Who in 1939 even dreamed of atomic energy, of missiles, of space flights, of a cold war with 2,700,000 servicemen in uniform during peacetime and defense research budgets of $9 billion? Our defense budget in 1939 was 1 percent of gross national product, in 1949, 5 percent and in 1963, 9 percent.

EXPENDITURES CONTAINED

But apart from national defense, Federal budget expenditures have been tightly contained in recent years. As a proportion of gross national product, they are substantially lower today (at 7 percent) than they were before the war in 1939 (at 9 percent) or after the war in 1949 (at 10 percent). Even including national defense, Federal budget expenditures in recent years have been remarkably stable as a proportion of gross national product; during the latter 1950's, they averaged about 16½ percent of gross national product, and that is where they are today.

Nor do the statistics give much comfort to the common view that the Federal Government is eclipsing and eroding the State and local governments. A quarter of a century ago, nondefense expenditures in the Federal budget were just about equal to total State and local expenditures; today, these Federal expenditures are about 60 percent of State and local expenditures. Of the more than 9 million civilian employees of governments in the United States today, about 7 million are employed by State and local governments, and 2,500,000 by the Federal Government. Since 1948 State and local employment has risen by 81 percent, while Federal civilian employment has risen by 22 percent—or by less than the rate of growth in the population as a whole.

In 1952 we had 1.6 Federal civilian employees for each 100 people in the population. By 1957 the figure was down to 1.4. Today we have 1.3 Federal employees to serve every hundred people.

Let me add that, of these 2,500,000 Federal civilian employees, 1 million are employed by the Defense Department, about 600,000 by the Post Office Department, and about 200,000 by the Veterans' Administration. Everything else that the Federal Government does is accomplished by 650,000 employees, and this number is substantially smaller than total employment in the telephone industry.

WHERE ARE INCREASES?

But what about the trend of expenditures in the budgets of the Kennedy administration? The 1964 administrative budget calls for a $4.5-billion increase in expenditures over 1963. The whole of this increase—indeed, more than the whole of the increase—is accounted for by expenditures for national defense, space, and interest. All other expenditures, taken together, will actually decline from 1963 to 1964.

If all three Kennedy budgets—1962 through 1964—are looked at together, they tell essentially the same story. The great bulk of the increase—actually 70 percent of it—has been in the defense, space, and interest category. Over the 3-year period from 1961 to 1964, budget expenditures for all other purposes taken together will increase by $4.5 billion. This compares with an increase of $5 billion in the same category over the preceding 3 fiscal years.

These figures lend little support to the asertion that the budget is "out of control." On the contrary—and I am free to say this because I joined the Budget Bureau too late to have a part in the process—the achievement of reducing 1964 expenditures below the 1963 level for all activities other than defense, space, and interest, seems to me a noteworthy accomplishment in budgetary discipline.

But what of the future?

EXPANDED ECONOMY AND FULL EMPLOYMENT

The President's program for tax reduction and reform—designed to spur the expansion of our economy and the achievement of full employment—has major implications for our future budgetary policy. The President has pledged that, as the tax cut becomes fully effective and the economy climbs toward full employment, a substantial part of the increased revenues generated by economic expansion will be applied to the reduction of the deficit. This declaration commits the administration to a policy of sustained expenditure restraint. Our work on the 1965 budget, which is already underway, is moving along lines consistent with this policy.

This does not mean a freeze on new programs—a moratorium on prudent planning by the Federal Government to respond to the changing needs of a growing country. It does mean—and it means emphatically—that vigorous efforts will be made to find economies in existing Government programs, in order that the net impact of new activities on the Federal budget will be held to a minimum.

We have only begun to appreciate the enormous contribution which improved efficiency in Government operations can make to budgetary control. Better management and cost reduction can make a major contribution toward resolving the conflict between expanding public needs and the need to limit total expenditures.

Any doubts as to the great potential of management improvement should be resolved by the spectacular accomplishments—realized and prospective—of the Defense Department's procurement and logistics cost reduction program. The program was announced last year by Secretary McNamara. It will produce nearly $2 billion of identifiable savings in this fiscal year. Savings are estimated at $2.7 billion in fiscal year 1964 and $3.5 billion in fiscal year 1965. The program is not a vague estimate of future economies; it is fully in effect today, and it is reshaping procurement and management practices in the Department of Defense.

COMPARATIVE COSTS

The magnitude of the Defense economy program can be grasped more readily if it is compared with the future costs of the legislative proposals in the President's current legislative program. For example:

Closer calculations of procurement needs and fuller use of excess inventory in place of new procurement will save more in the next 2 fiscal years than the cost in these years of the proposed increase in the pay of our Armed Forces.

The shift from noncompetitive to competitive procurement, and the shift from cost plus fixed fee to fixed or incentive price contracts will save more in 1964 and 1965 than the total cost of the President's omnibus education program—including aid to school construction and teachers' salaries, college facilities, library and graduate school grants, student loans and fellowships, and adult and vocational education.

The elimination of "gold plating" in procurement specifications—that is, redesigning items which are fancier or more capable than they need to be to do their job—will save more in 1964 and 1965 than the cost of the President's youth employment opportunities program.

Improved equipment maintenance through better management will save as much in these 2 years as the entire cost of the President's mass transit program.

The closing or reduction of unnecessary installations in the Defense Department will save more than the total cost in 1964 and 1965 of the President's program for hospital construction and aid to medical education.

To put the comparison in its most striking form, Secretary McNamara's cost reduction program will realize savings in the next 2 fiscal years which will exceed the total cost of the legislative program which the President has proposed to the Congress this year.

BETTER MANAGEMENT

The drive for better management in the Federal Government extends far beyond the limits of the Department of Defense. Efficiency in Government is not an issue between the parties. Many management gains were accomplished by the last administration and this administration has sought to maintain and accelerate the momentum. Let me describe briefly some of the major efforts which are underway today to get the public business done more efficiently, more speedily, and more economically.

The U.S. Government was the first user of automatic data processing equipment and is today the largest user in the world of electronic computers. If you buy a postal money order, the transaction will be recorded on the automatic data processing equipment. If you carry Veterans' Administration life insurance, your account will be serviced by automatic data processing equipment. If you apply for a driver's license in any 1 of 46 States, your application may be processed by an electronic computer in the Bureau of Public Roads to determine whether you have even been denied a license in another State for drunken driving or involvement in a fatal accident. If you inquire about the status of your social security account, the information will be supplied speedily by an automatic data processing system. If you answer a census questionnaire, the information will be processed by automatic data processing.

These are just a few of the many uses of electronic data processing systems in the Federal Government which have provided better service for the taxpayer and saved him money. For example, each employee of the insurance service of the Veterans' Administration service about 350 policies in 1950, 1,500 policies in 1960, and 1,700 today. Over this period, the Veterans' Administration has reduced the number of employees required to handle its 6 million policies from 17,000 to 3,000.

EMPLOYEES' SUGGESTIONS

The Federal Government has one of the most extensive and productive employee suggestion systems in the country. Last year, Federal agencies adopted more than 100,000 suggestions submitted by employees. These suggestions yielded measurable savings of nearly $65 million, for which employees received cash awards of nearly $3 million. For example, an engineer in the Navy's Bureau of Ships saved the Navy over $5 million by devising an ingenious method to enable drydocks to accommodate vessels of deeper draft—thus eliminating the need to excavate the floor of the drydock. Another engineer—this one in the Corps of Engineers—redesigned certain turbines used in hydroelectric power projects, improving the efficiency of the units and thus allowing smaller units to be utilized. Savings realized from this improvement aggregate $21 million so far.

Substantial savings can be realized simply through better organization and management of the Government's activities. In July of 1961 the Federal Power Commission had a backlog of 116 natural gas pipeline rate cases, some dating back to 1954, which involved potential refunds to consumers of $1 billion. The Federal Power Commission instituted a new settlement program, emphasizing the disposition of cases through conference rather than in lengthy formal proceedings. By January of this year the backlog, including new cases, had been reduced to 48, and the Federal Power Commission had ordered refunds to consumers of $350 million and reduced rates by $62 million a year.

NO EUPHORIA

I do not wish to leave the impression that the administration is suspended in a state of euphoria with respect to the outlook for efficiency in public management. Utopia is not that close. I will freely confess that I know of management situations in the Federal Government which need correction—though I am not going to name them. My point is that we have made encouraging progress, and that we have proved that the Federal Government can face up to change and take the route of cost reduction without any sacrifice in the quality of the work it does. You are going to hear a lot more about cost reduction efforts in the Federal Government. We will not let up in pursuing opportunities to modernize and improve Government operations, to save manpower, to lower overhead, to take some risks if necessary in trying out new ideas and practices, to shake up systems and procedures that have long been taken for granted, and to search out and bring into question longstanding programs or services that may no longer rate the priority they deserved when they were initiated.

There is, of course, an alluring shortcut to economy in Government which simply bypasses these difficult matters of detail. It is a method often urged—the method of indiscriminate, across-the-board cuts. But I believe the record shows that this method has not in the past made a lasting contribution to the cause of Government economy—nor would I expect it to do so in the future.

The harder road, but in the last analysis the more rewarding one, is to weigh each public program and expenditure category on its own merits and against the merits of others; to decide what must be done now and what can wait; to pursue cost-reduction, assess user charges more broadly on those who benefit from special Government services and privileges, cut out unneeded installations even though it may cause some pain and recrimination, and keep at it. This, I submit, is the responsible road to Government economy. It has the further merit that it works, and it is this framework within which the budgets of this administration will be shaped.

Tax-Free Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Star of June 29, which comments favorably on the efforts of our colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] to secure some rational policy with respect to the tax exemption now given, unjustifiably, to some extremist propaganda organizations.

As the editorial notes, abuses of tax-exemption status are increasing, and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] in my opinion, deserves commendation for calling attention to this matter, and for her courage in not hesitating to raise the question with respect to an organization which has enjoyed a somewhat sacrosanct position for many years.

If we are to enforce the law equitably and systematically, then the honest and proper thing is to take a close look at all possibilities regardless of the risk of invoking the displeasure of organizations which have long enjoyed exemption. It is characteristic of the Senator from Oregon that she did not hesitate to let the "chips fall where they may."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 29, 1963]

TAX-FREE PROPAGANDA

Senator NEUBERGER's complaint that too many tax-exempt organizations are riding a free-propaganda wagon deserves more than a sidelong glance by Congress and the Internal Revenue Service. Because she ventured into a kind of No Man's Land—that ruled by the Daughters of the American Revolution—Mrs. NEUBERGER at least managed to attract some attention to an obscure, but growing, problem.

Owing to its patriotic and educational work, much of which Mrs. NEUBERGER agrees is splendid, the DAR enjoys the boom of nontaxation. In addition, for 64 years the taxpayers, by consent of the Senate, have paid to publish parts of the DAR annual report. Now, what makes the Senator from Oregon unhappy is that this report, as she sees it, is loaded with right-wing propaganda shots at the administration, Congress, the Federal courts, and the United Nations. And she also is offended by the "doctrinaire restatement of the John Birch Society's conspiratorial view of recent American history."

As for the DAR's side of it, Mrs. Robert V. H. Duncan, the president general, stoutly upheld its claim as a congressionally-chartered patriotic organization and offered to cooperate in any investigation of its tax-exempt status.

Basically, of course, Senator NEUBERGER is not so much concerned about the DAR's activities as with "the proliferation of tax-exempt organizations whose sole apparent function is to funnel the funds of right-wing business, free of taxation, into right-wing propaganda mills." And Mrs. NEUBERGER was quick to add that the same sort of thing undoubtedly goes on in the left wing, too.

The Senator, we think, is justified in asking Internal Revenue Commission Caplin to keep an eye peeled for organizations abusing the tax-exemption privilege. Congress, too, might well lend her some support even though she, like her colleagues, refrained from blocking the DAR's annual report money.

As to the latter, it is possible a vote to block would have been less satisfying than the reason given for desisting. "The political view of the DAR, however distorted," observed Mrs. NEUBERGER, "do not bear great currency in the American marketplace of ideas."

Just try to imagine a man saying that.

Slow Motion for Sound Reasons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal, of July 15, 1963:

SLOW MOTION FOR SOUND REASONS

In all the criticism of Congress—"the slow-motion Congress of all time"—it seems to us a rather important point is being missed.

The slow motion is not the result of laziness or even of the strained relations between the Democratic President and the Democratic majority. It is the result also, maybe even mainly, of the nature of the proposals that dominate this session.

By now, of course, these have boiled down to two, civil rights and taxes. Both are far-reaching in import; on both there is deep uneasiness and division in the country. Congress could hardly help reflecting such feelings.

To the surprise of some politicians, it has become clear that many people are not favorably disposed to the Administration's tax proposals. Almost everyone would welcome cuts in taxes that are far to high, if that were all there was to it. But it isn't.

We are offered reductions coupled with so-called reforms, and the upshot could well be actual increases for some taxpayers. More disquieting than that prospect is the setting in which the tax program occurs. It is a setting of rapidly rising Federal expenditures calculated to produce the largest planned deficit in American history this fiscal year, and a public debt of vast and growing dimensions.

No amount of purported economic sophistication is able to convince considerable numbers of the citizenry that cutting taxes in such circumstances is sensible or even moral. Their uneasiness is only heightened by the abundant evidence that the spending will continue its upward course, the deficits go on, as far ahead as trends can be discerned.

In a quite similar way, most Americans believe Negroes should not be kept from eating at a lunch counter because of race—if that were the whole of the public accommodations part of the civil rights bill. What disturbs people are other questions.

One question, as with taxes, concerns the setting; this measure would not have been sent to Congress at all except for the pressure of mobs and demonstrations. Another is the formulation of the section dealing with privately owned public accommodations; it has been called both foggy and drastic.

Certainly the obscurities were revealed in some of the congressional hearings. According to the bill, discrimination would be prohibited for any business with customers who included a substantial portion of interstate travelers or with merchandise that included a substantial portion of goods moved in interstate commerce.

Asked to define "substantial," Attorney General Kennedy replied, "More than minimal." Presented with the hypothetical case of exclusion of a man who was a Negro but also had grease all over his clothes, Mr. Kennedy seemed to imply that the man could be excluded so long as he was not being turned down because of race.

Such dialog is kind of comical for the seriousness of the situation. But there is nothing comical about sweeping legislation based on indefinable terms. Indeed, the vagueness illustrates the extreme difficulty of effecting legislation that tries to deal not only with private decisions but with unspoken motivations.

Beyond that, many legal experts believe that the justification for the public-accommodations section is a violent wrench of the Constitution's interstate commerce clause. At any rate, it is easy to see that if the administration's interpretation is accepted, there is hardly any stopping place.

If the Federal Government can control a business' service policy, it can control other things about that business by the same excuse. And it can use the precedent to move into completely private areas.

Congress, it seems to us, is well advised to go slow on proposals that offer almost limitless opportunities for Federal encroachment, and on tax recommendations in the context of a distorted economic policy. There is something worse than no legislation, and that is legislation that may do serious and lasting injury.

A Republic's Endurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I call my colleagues attention to the following editorial from the Neosho, Mo., Miner-Mechanic & Graphic entitled "A Republic's Endurance":

A REPUBLIC'S ENDURANCE: AN AMERICAN POET SUPPLIED THE ANSWER

Many years ago, James Russell Lowell, the American poet, was in Paris talking to Guizot, the French statesman and noted historian.

In their discussion of the rise and fall of great empires, kingdoms, and dynasties, Guizot turned to Lowell and asked, "How long do you expect that Republic of yours to last?"

After a moment's thought, Lowell replied, "Our Republic will last as long as the ideals of the Founders are observed."

The ideals envisioned for our Republic by the Founding Fathers were lofty and challenging ones indeed, but they were practical and attainable. The Founding Fathers were influenced in their choice of ideals by events of the past. Everyone has marveled at their wisdom in setting the United States upon a course which is still practical, valid, and expedient today.

Many contemporary observers believe that we are losing hold on some of the ideals which have enabled this country to become the world's leading power. They point out that unless we rededicate ourselves to these ideals, this Nation is doomed to obscurity along with the other great powers of the past which lost sight of national purpose.

The forefathers dreamed of building a society in America which would be strong, prosperous, free, and devoid of discrimination against the individual. They cherished the heritage of freedom which has been handed down by others. They wanted to preserve the right and liberties set forth in the Magna Carta, the Petition of Rights, and the English Bill of Rights.

They were fully acquainted with the divine right of kings which had been the rule in Europe. According to this theory, kings contended that their power to rule came directly from God and that they were answerable only to God.

This theory was not compatible with the dream which our forefathers had for America, so they rejected it. They argued that the true function of government was to protect and preserve God-given rights. Their ideal first required obedience to God and then obedience to rulers.

The declaration states:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

In the preamble to the Constitution, our forefathers spelled out the ideal purposes of the Government which they were establishing:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Every freedom-loving American is thrilled by words such as liberty, justice, rights and general welfare. These words proclaim the ideals of government which the founders of our Nation promoted.

To go along with these lofty words, the founders employed others suggesting action. They planned to do something to make the American dream a reality. Note that the preamble contains such words as establish, secure, insure, and promote. If our Republic is to continue along the lines envisioned by its founders, there must be maintenance of the ideals and purposes which they so clearly set forth, plus a dedicated program of action on the part of every American.

Insurance Company of North America Receives "E" for Export Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, recently the President's "E" for Export Award was presented to the Insurance Co. of North America for its distinguished contribution to the U.S. national export expansion program.

INA, which operates in my district, is the first marine insurance company to receive this symbol of our Government's recognition of private assistance in the campaign for increased American foreign trade. The company and its employees are to be congratulated for their efforts and this recognition. Below is the text of the award announcement released by the Export-Import Bank of Washington:

INSURANCE CO. OF NORTH AMERICA RECEIVES "E" FOR EXPORT AWARD

The President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, Harold F. Linder, today presented President Kennedy's "E" for Export Award to the Insurance Co. of North America for distinguished contribution to the U.S. national export expansion program.

The award was made at Bank headquarters in Washington and was received by Henry W. Farnum, vice president of INA which has its home office in Philadelphia.

INA was this country's first marine insurer, founded in 1792. It was selected to receive the big "E" by Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges after evaluation by an Awards Committee representing the Departments of Commerce, Labor, Interior, and Agriculture, the Small Business Administration, and other Government agencies.

Speaking for the Government in recognizing INA's achievements in the field of foreign trade, Mr. Linder complimented the company on its venerable 170-year history and its outstanding service. He called special attention to the fact that INA was one of the original companies founding the Foreign Credit Insurance Association which together with Eximbank offers export credit insurance to the Nation's exporters. It also was underscored that INA positively contributes to the U.S. balance of international payments position by selling marine insurance in substantial amounts to foreign buyers of U.S. goods.

In addition, INA has been foremost among marine insurers in recognizing and promoting the role of marine insurers in the Nation's export drive. It has conducted educational programs directed at foreign traders, banks, and insurance agents and brokers to delineate constructive uses and methods of marine insurance. It has consistently made its professional personnel available to prospective exporters at counseling meetings and seminars aimed to stimulate export activity. All offices of INA in major mercantile nations of the free world and in 42 locations in the United States have been active in these promotional and educational efforts as well as furnishing talent to serve on high level export expansion committees. The company also has disseminated to best advantage information on foreign trade and marine insurance through motion pictures and a wide variety of trade journals and publications.

E Awards are given in two categories: companies which manufacture products for export; and companies, individuals, organizations, and institutions which work in support of increased exports. INA is the first marine insurance company to receive the E pennant, symbol of the Government's recognition of private assistance in the campaign for more American foreign trade.

Mineral Springs Abound in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, bathing in mineral springs is a time-honored means of seeking relief from many human ailments. My State of West Virginia fortunately has a great abundance of mineral springs, including White Sulphur Springs.

A list of mineral springs in West Virginia and a description of their curative properties are given in a recent article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

STATE SPRINGS HELD VALUABLE RESOURCE

(By Phil Conley)

There are many medicinal springs in West Virginia. They constitute one of the State's most valuable natural resources.

White Sulphur Springs, 140 miles east of Charleston, is the greatest inland watering place on the North American Continent. The acreage comprising this resort was patented by Nathan Carpenter in 1774. But prior to that time Indians, as well as white people, had bathed and drunk the medicinal waters found there. Many of this country's most noted people have visited White Sulphur, among them Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Webster, Calhoun, and Patrick Henry. Gen. Robert E. Lee once had a cottage there, where he lived part of the summer. People from all over the world have visited this noted spa.

Berkeley Springs is about 3 miles from the Potomac River in Morgan County. This place was first known as Warm Springs, then Bath, and later the present name. Washington wrote in his Journal on March 18, 1747, that he had visited the "famed Warm Springs." These springs were in the large tract of land owned by Lord Fairfax who gave the property to the Colony of Virginia so that the waters might be free to the public. When West Virginia became a separate State, she came into possession of the springs.

After the Revolution, Washington built a cottage there and his brother Lawrence spent nearly a year there on account of his health. The springs have a capacity of 2,000 gallons a minute, with a uniform temperature of 74 degrees. The State has a 5-acre park which surrounds the springs. It also maintains a sanatorium there.

Pence Springs are located 12 miles east of Hinton. The waters have curative properties for kidney, stomach, and liver disorders. Some years ago a commercial company began bottling the water and shipping it to distant markets. The old hotel was acquired by the State and is now a female penal institution.

Webster Springs was discovered by J. E. Hall before the Civil War. The town is the county seat of Webster County and is 63 miles southwest of Elkins on the Elk River. It is 2,000 feet above sea level and has long been known as a health resort.

Old Sweet Springs is in Monroe County. James Moss built the first house there in 1760. The first patent for the land was granted to William Lewis, brother of Gen. Andrew Lewis for whom Lewisburg was named. The springs flow from the base of Potts Mountain. The water has a temperature of 72 to 76 degrees and is described as "of a tonic character, mildly cathartic and alterative, valuable in cases of debility and in many forms of dyspepsia and functional diseases of the stomach and bowels." At one time this place was visited by prominent people from this country and abroad. Some years ago, during the administration of Gov. M. M. Neely, the State acquired the hotel and converted it into an old folks' home.

Salt Sulphur Springs is on Indian Creek in Monroe County, about 14 miles from Fort Springs.

Red Sulphur Springs is also on Indian Creek in Monroe County, about 12 miles from Lowell.

Capon Springs is on the east side of Cacapon River in Hampshire County. Indians called it "Kakapon-se-pe," meaning "a river of medicine waters."

Shannondale Springs are about 5 miles east of Charles Town in Jefferson County.

Green Sulphur Springs are in Summers County. Blue Sulphur Springs are in Greenbrier County.

There are a number of other springs in West Virginia which are not as well known as the ones listed here.

Tne springs may be classified as alum springs, iron springs, magnesia springs, salt springs, sulphur springs, and lime springs.

Address by Hon. Louis L. Goldstein, State Comptroller of Maryland, at Frederick (Md.) Shopping Center Merchants Association, July 3, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, it was with great pride and pleasure that I attended the commemoration of Independence Day in my hometown of Frederick, Md. The program opened with a concert by the Harmony Band, a salute by a military color guard, and the national anthem sung by Miss Dorothy Handley, vice principal of the Elm Street School. Master of ceremonies was Morton M. Siegal. Invocation was offered by Rabbi Morris Kosman, of the Beth Sholom Congregation, and a word of welcome was extended by Mayor E. Paul Magaha. Capt. David Tate, chaplain at Fort Detrick, delivered a memorial prayer prior to the delivery of the featured address by the Honorable Louis L. Goldstein, State Comptroller of Maryland. The tolling of the historic old bell of the former Mountain Hope School in McKaig, Md., in a salute to the Fourth of July in line with the revival of the bell-ringing custom climaxed the patriotic program.

Mr. Goldstein's knowledgeable summary of American history in the Revolutionary period is so interesting and valuable that I am appending it for the information of the Congress.

The address follows:

It is a great honor and a sincere privilege for me to be here this evening in Frederick City, Frederick County, created 1748, for these wonderful ceremonies which commemorate the celebration of our Nation's independence, 187 years ago, July 4, 1776. Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Congratulations to you all for sponsoring such an outstanding event.

Tonight we are filled with patriotic pride in our State and our Nation.

Together we are demonstrating to the entire world that we shall never forget the courage, sacrifice, and the bloodshed which preceded the war of independence.

The people of Frederick County and other sections of western Maryland suffered greatly during this period (entire section then Frederick County).

For 10 years, between 1756 and 1766, the general assembly did not vote a journal of accounts to pay off the public debts, according to the book by Prof. Charles Albro Barker entitled "The Background of the Revolution in Maryland."

The currency deficiency held up the payment of western Maryland militiamen who needed the money very badly at the time.

Quoting from Professor Barker's book, "Accordingly 450 subscribing inhabitants of Frederick County addressed Governor Sharpe in a plea for action and for the release of long overdue public money. Action on this matter was withheld until 1766."

A sharp depression fell upon western Maryland and the Maryland Gazette of Annapolis printed: "The great scarcity of money, low markets abroad for the produce of the plantation, the heavy restraints and impositions the colonies are laid under are sufficient to strike a damp note into the most serene minds."

The citizens of Frederick and their neighbors in other sections of Maryland were subjected to extreme hardships by the British Government; as were the citizens in all other American colonies.

A series of incidents preceded armed conflict.

Among the most significant of these incidents was the tea tax which had been imposed by England.

As you all know, Maryland was one of the first to rebel against this tax. Marylanders from many communities including Frederick went to Annapolis and helped to burn the brig *Peggy Stewart*.

Two tons of tea went to the bottom of the Bay of Annapolis, but the ship's captain, Anthony Stewart, and his crew were spared by the gallant men of Frederick under the leadership of John Hanson, who became one of the outstanding heroes of the Revolution.

History tells us, John Hanson, of Frederick, Md., in 1781 was elected first President of the United States in Congress assembled.

Many other great leaders came out of Frederick during those eventful Revolutionary War days, including Abraham Faw, Richard Potts, Thomas Sim Lee, and Thomas Johnson who nominated George Washington for Commander in Chief of the American military forces, and who later was elected first Governor of Maryland. He also presided at the Maryland convention in Annapolis which ratified the Federal Constitution in April 1788.

Frederick citizens were part of the vast military forces from Maryland which participated in this Nation's first major armed conflict.

In the early days of the war, a company of 130 men from Maryland commanded by Capt. Michael Cresap were the first soldiers from a southern colony to arrive at Boston to join the fighting.

The first big battle of the Revolutionary War was fought on Long Island up in New York, and General Washington fell into a British trap—the only time he did so during the entire Revolutionary War.

The only hope he had of saving his army was to have a small number of men fight the British and hold them back while Washington retreated with the main army.

Four hundred Maryland men were chosen by Washington for this vital role. They were commanded by Maj. Mordecai Gist—later a colonel—and by Capt. Samuel Smith—who eventually became a general.

They did the job. In fact, six times the small band of Maryland men actually charged the British, forcing them to fall back a little.

Of course, the British had an overwhelming advantage in numbers, and the Maryland men eventually had to give way. More than half of our men were killed, and only 20 escaped injury—but they held the British for more than an hour while Washington led the rest of the army to a safer position.

The Maryland men saved the day, and their valor and effectiveness caused George Washington to single out the Maryland troops of the line for special praise, giving us out nickname of the Old Line State.

That wasn't the only nickname Maryland troops won. In the battles that followed shortly after, at Harlem Heights, White

Plains, Trenton, and Princeton, the Maryland line again did honorable service.

There were 7 Maryland regiments in action at that time—out of only 43 regiments in the entire American Army.

Mordecai Gist's troops covered Washington's retreat from Long Island so well, and performed so splendidly in the succeeding battles, that they were called "the bayonets of the revolution." That's a nickname to be proud of.

There were many other occasions during the Revolutionary War when Maryland troops fought so well they earned special praise. At Fort Mifflin, for instance, Maryland men under Col. Samuel Smith held the fort until its walls were literally battered to pieces by English cannon.

At Monmouth, all of the Maryland men under Col. Nathaniel Ramsey were either killed, wounded, or captured, but they did the job that General Washington had asked them to do. He had told them, "If you can stop the British for 10 minutes, I can save the army." Colonel Ramsey's Maryland troops held up the British troops for 30 minutes and did not stop fighting until the last man among them had dropped before superior enemy forces.

That's the kind of courage and sacrifice that resulted in our Nation's independence; and that is why we are gathered here this evening.

We are here to pay tribute to Thomas Jefferson and our Founding Fathers who gave us our Declaration of Independence. Maryland signers were Charles Carroll of Carrollton, Samuel Chase, Thomas Spence, and William Paca.

This outstanding document was no compromise, but a banner to which men everywhere responded. Why should this be so? Why did a declaration of independence (also called a declaration of human rights) signed by 53 men on a rude and distant shore stir the world? Was the appeal of the Declaration of Independence that of rhetoric, and its effect due simply to the felicity of its phrasing?

Surely not. Good phrasing there was, of course, but what counted was the substance, the idea. "We hold these truths to be self-evident," the Foumding Fathers said: "That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed * * *." The Declaration is what it is and moved men as it did because it expressed high purpose and noble convictions, backed to the utmost by its signers with the pledge of "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

There you have it, the American proclamation of freedom: the equality of all men; rights given not by the state but by our Creator; the just powers of government deriving only from the consent of the governed. Are these American beliefs which stirred men here and all over the world pious statements which are now irrelevant to our present situation? We insist they are not. Granted, to create policy for today and tomorrow in the light of these principles is not easy; in some situations a lack of power to change events may prevent us from doing what we would like to do. But the American idea and the American tradition must be the touchstones for policy, for there in the very reasons for our Nation's being, is America's strength.

My friends, on Monday, July 1, I attended the Civil War Centennial at Gettysburg representing Governor Tawes and the Free State of Maryland. At the Eternal Light Peace Memorial I heard Gov. William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania, address over 3,000 persons who gathered there to hear his stirring address. He noted that it was just such weather as this 100 years ago when the gallant men of that historic struggle fought and died to preserve the American beliefs and principles under which this great Nation of ours is founded. The impact of their courage, the fierceness of the battles were in the minds of all those present. The majesty of Lincoln's Gettysburg address was in the hearts of all those present on Monday. No one could stand on that hallowed ground and not be aware of the significance of the occasion. It was inspiring and it was indeed unforgettable. Just as we stand here today in commemoration of our Nation's independence we must be ever mindful that we are standing at the opening of a new and promising era. We are the most powerful nation in all the world. We are a nation recognized as blessed beyond measure with the most enlightened form of government in the world. Our gallant soldiers who fought in the Revolutionary and Civil Wars and through World Wars I and II and the Korean war, are even today fighting to defend the right of freemen in Berlin, in Laos, in Vietnam, and in a score of other vital points on every continent around this globe so that we can retain our acknowledged position as the defenders of liberty, freedom, and justice. We are now moving through one of the greatest crisis periods in the history of this Nation and the world. The battle is joined for survival betwen two ways of life—one free, the other slave—and I am convinced that the fate of civilization now lies in the hands of those who clearly recognize that faith, not fear, and patriotism not patronage, must prevail.

CONCLUSION

My friends, it has been an honor as well as a privilege and a pleasure for me to be here this evening at the Frederick Shopping Center to participate in these wonderful ceremonies which commemorate the celebration of our Nation's independence.

There is a destiny that makes us all brothers and sisters—none makes his or her way alone—all that we send into the lives of others, comes back into our own. What we are is God's gift to us—what we make of ourselves, is our gift to God. Thanks to you, God, for the privilege of seeing you, by seeing others.

Thank you for inviting me, and now until we meet again, may God bless you all real good.

Seat Belts

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 134) to provide that seat belts sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use in motor vehicles shall meet certain safety standards.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Chairman, last week this body passed and sent to the Senate the Honorable KENNETH ROBERTS' bill H.R. 134, to establish seat belt standards. During the course of the debate on this legislation he indicated that if seat belts saved one life it was well worth the effort and time of the Congress.

Yesterday he received a letter from an individual from Chicago, Ill., telling him of the lifesaving aspects of the seat belts as demonstrated in an automobile accident in which the individual was personally involved. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter he received as I believe it is a tribute to his initiative in the passage of the bill and the foresight of the users of the seat belts. His prediction has been realized.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
July 11, 1963.

Hon. KENNETH A. ROBERTS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The enclosed article about your bill regarding auto seat belts appeared in the Chicago Tribune today.

It caught my interest especially because seat belts gave Chicago a no-traffic-death record over the recent 4-day holiday. They also saved our lives.

Our family of two adults and three children were riding in our automobile when it was struck by a speeding car. Our two small sons were belted in their seats in the back; both suffered head injuries. My husband was belted in the driver's seat; he was thrown against the steering wheel. I was belted in the right front seat; I was thrown forward with enough impact to cause a dent in the steel door frame where my head struck. My daughter, seated between us in the front but not wearing a seat belt, was thrown to the floor. She is too small to have hit the dash or to have gone through the windshield, which certainly would have been the case with an adult who had been sitting in that seat.

The two cars were demolished. I am certain that I would have been thrown from the car and probably my husband would have suffered severe, if not fatal injuries from the impact of the steering wheel; the boys in the rear would have been thrown to the front; had we not been protected by seat belts. Tangible evidence in support of this theory is the fact that the only one of the five to be thrown from the seat was not wearing a belt, and only her small size kept her in the car.

We were all injured but we are all alive. Seat belts alone are responsible. Congratulations on your important safety bill—and thank you for bringing this idea to public attention.

Sincerely,

PHOEBE MEDOW.

Janesville Gazette Supports Proxmire Resolution To Slash Spending on Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Janesville Gazette has as sharply honed an eye for waste in Government as any paper in the country.

In a recent editorial, the Gazette discussed the enormous waste of taxpayer money involved in the present congressional method of approving annual multimillion-dollar reclamation projects.

The Gazette supports my resolution which would provide a realistic basis for calculating costs and benefits of these immensely expensive projects. The Proxmire resolution would eliminate projects that cost more than their benefit—and thereby, over the years, save literally billions of dollars.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Proxmire on Reclamation

Outside of the areas where the money is actually spent, citizens constantly ask themselves why Federal funds in millions go for reclamation of desert lands and the creation of new farming acreage. These big-time spending ventures go on year after year while other millions are being spent out of the pockets of the same taxpayers to minimize the effects of overproduction of farm commodities.

This incongruity in Government is now officially questioned in a Senate resolution introduced this week by Senator William Proxmire. His proposal takes a new approach—it would not outlaw such developments but would impose upon the Bureau of Reclamation and other Federal officials a realistic basis for calculating costs and benefits.

What the Proxmire bill would do is to impose more sensible time and interest standards. At present reclamation projects are figured to have a life of 100 years, and this is used in calculation of benefits. At the same time, as Proxmire puts it, "the value of these future benefits is not discounted at the 4 percent it costs the Government to borrow the money to pay for them, but at a rate of 2.5 percent to give their present worth."

The effect of calculating 100 years of usefulness along with the fictitiously low financing cost is to make the projects look far more sensible than they really are.

In introducing his resolution, Senator Proxmire noted that "hundreds of millions of Federal dollars are being spent on reclamation projects on the basis of gross overestimations of their worth. This overestimate is aside from the fact that vast benefits are ascribed to reclamation projects that irrigate and bring tens of thousands of acres of newly productive farmland into operation at a time when we already have a vast surplus of farm production and are spending hundreds of millions of dollars to take land out of production. The alleged benefits are a burden."

Who is to disagree with this?

We Hold These Truths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to include an article by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, entitled "We Hold These Truths." This is one of a series of "Spires of the Spirit" which have been appearing in the Evening Star.

I make no comment of my own, but do know that everyone who reads this will hang his head in shame over the eroding moral principles adhered to in the United Nations and supported by our own United States.

The article follows:

Spires of the Spirit—We Hold These Truths

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris)

In the mission recently ended the President of the United States has been seen and heard across free Europe. To wild throngs of cheering Europeans his premise was that liberty is indivisible. His promise was that at any risk to ourselves we would hurl the full force of our might against any fresh aggression by totalitarianism to enslave more people with its fetters of the mind and body.

But is there any ray of hope for the captives of a diabolical conspiracy whose shackles bind more people than the President saw on his trip across the free frontiers of the Continent? What word has America in answer to the agonizing pleading of Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Hungary, and the Ukraine, deep in the Soviet land mass? If upon the high heavens could be written the ghastly tale of liquidation, martyrdoms, sudden deportations to the frozen steppes, the genocidal destruction of national roots which the conquest of each of these subdued nations involved in all their sadistic details, it would suggest a chamber of horrors to make devils gleeful and angels weep.

Should comfortable America ever forget all this and acquiesce in admitting the bloodstained culprits to the realms of decency, such forgetting would but register the lowering of our own Republic's moral sensitivity and the dulling of its conscience. The one sure criterion of the reality of our own commitment to freedom is the agony we feel for those who are under a foreign taskmaster's lash. That is why America insists on uncovering the damning truth in Captive Nations Week. It is the accursed spot which will not out that the bandits desire the world to dismiss with "Oh, let bygones be bygones," as knocking on the door of moral integrity they now seek the recognition of respectability. There is no more essential proposition now before the Congress than House Resolution 14. The passage of this bill would run up to the masthead of our own ship of state a flag of aggravating remembrance and defiance against the pirates who now seek an approved harbor with their ship laden with all the plunder secured by shocking inhumanity, misery, and murder. Such action by the Congress of the United States would tell the world that with us liberty is not a dead fossil but a living thing incarnated in the 50 United States.

Nothing is more vital than our assurance to the whole world that we still hold certain unalienable truths—yea, that they hold us! What is this eternal truth we hold? It is that rights are given, not by any State but by the Creator, and that the just powers of government are derived only by the consent of the governed. Let us look at perhaps the most blatant betrayal of this principle—that of the crucifixion of Hungary. Ever since the brave freedom fighters were mowed down by the thousands by Soviet tanks in the streets of Budapest, we have insisted on keeping unveiled the hideous scenes of the vile slaughter on that day of Red infamy and the vengeance-motivated atrocities that followed. We have treated the hammer and sickle prepetrators as the moral lepers they have proved themselves to be.

But, now in this year of our Lord, the United States stands condemned by the blind and blatant reversal of our policy of protesting any thought of the present Hungarian regime being given diplomatic recognition by the United Nations. Because of propaganda statements, dripping with whitewash, crediting the dictatorship in Hungary with some relaxation of oppression, and the softening of restrictions on religion, there is in the United Nations councils a silence heard in heaven as this land of liberty at last is persuaded to abstain from registering her disagreement. That base reversal must seem to the coerced Hungarian people as great a betrayal as was the kiss of Judas 2,000 years ago.

No wonder a great newspaper sensing the deal at the United Nations, under the black headline of deceit summarizes the action, or the inaction so far as our vote is concerned, regarding the Kremlin's Hungarian puppet, as "washing our hands of the victims of tyranny."

One of the reasons advanced for granting recognition to the Hungarian jailers is that they have been granting amnesty to freedom fighters whose one crime is that they believe in government only with the consent of the governed. The recognition of the present Hungarian Government further weakens the United Nations, as Russian tank experts are added to the already heavily Soviet-loaded world organization.

God forgive us as the United States stands aside to favor the outrageous scheme of allowing the Kremlin, who robbed and murdered those who resisted, to take a place with those who are supposed to have a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. Indignant letters from aroused citizens of America ought to flood the State Department and Congress. No one, however high in our official life, can possibly sincerely believe in recognizing Red Hungary and at the same time believe in government by consent of the governed.

James Russell Lowell, this day America has need of thee—somebody to represent us in the U.N. who, with you, would exhort—

"Is true freedom but to break fetters for our own dear sake, and, with leathern hearts forget that we owe mankind a debt? They are slaves who fear to speak for the fallen and the weak; No. True freedom is to share all the chains our brothers wear, and, with heart and hand, to be earnest to make others free."

Government by consent of the governed—we hold this truth. But, do we?

Shepherdstown, W. Va., Chartered Over 200 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, although my State of West Virginia is celebrating its first centennial this year, the history of organized towns in the Mountain State goes back over 200 years. According to an article in a recent issue of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail, Shepherdstown, in Jefferson County, was chartered in 1762.

The article gives some interesting background on this historic town, which was one of the sites considered for the National Capitol. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the Record, as follows:

Jefferson County Role in State History Great

The Shenandoah and Potomac Rivers made their junction at Harpers Ferry. They also presented a gap through the tall mountains to allow early migration to western Virginia.

Permanent settlements existed in the early 18th century along the Potomac. The oldest chartered town in West Virginia, Shepherdstown, was chartered in 1762. George Washington first saw the land west of the Blue Ridge in 1748, when he was 16.

In 1796, President Washington selected Harpers Ferry as the site of the second Federal armory. It became a thriving industrial community. Shepherdstown was considered for the national capitol, finally established down the Potomac.

The county that bears the name of Thomas Jefferson continued to grow. With John Brown's dramatic raid on the Federal arsenal the events were set in motion that would lead to West Virginia's gaining its independence from Virginia.

Union and Confederate forces took turns winning and yielding Jefferson County between 1861 and 1865. Commemorating these encounters are 25 battle markers; and Harpers Ferry National Monument is being developed.

The county celebrated its 150th anniversary in 1951. Today it has a diversity of interests, including extensive orchards, beef and dairy cattle, limestone quarries, food, processing, manufacturing and services businesses.

Communism, Our Great Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, untold billions of words have been spoken and written about communism. So many, in fact, that a person who seeks a clear, concise analysis of the menace—and practical suggestions on how to meet it—could wander for days in a wasteland of fuzzy rhetoric and still not find the answers.

That is the reason I was so much impressed by a sermon I would like to offer for the RECORD. It was delivered October 21, 1962, by Dr. Thomas A. Fry, Jr., pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Dallas. Briefly, but with great perception, it analyzes the attraction communism holds for some segments of the world's population, and provides specific, down-to-earth suggestions on how we can respond to its challenge. I commend it to my colleagues.

COMMUNISM, OUR GREAT OPPORTUNITY

(A sermon by Dr. Thomas A. Fry, Jr.)

Communism is our arch enemy. Our Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, has said, "No one has to convince us that the contest between Communist imperialism and freedom is for keeps, and nobody has to convince us that when Khrushchev said he would bury us, he was claiming not just an alleged historical inevitability, but an objective toward which Communists work relentlessly."

If communism were only a national enemy, the situation would be serious enough. But it is also an ideological and spiritual enemy. History has proven that it has no concept of justice, no place for individual freedom, no desire for peace, no sense of responsibility to moral standards, no respect for God.

That communism is an ideology need not be debated; that it takes the place of a religion has been indicated with clarity by its actions; that it can never be associated with early Christian charity or with Utopian concepts no longer needs to be argued. We see communism as the enemy of religion, of justice, of democracy, of freedom, of God; and therefore the enemy of man's highest and noblest life and ambition.

This being so, it seems strange that an ideology which had not national following less than 50 years ago should now control over a billion people on this earth, and that it should be viewed sympathetically by millions of others in Latin America, Africa, Asia, Europe, and even in the United States.

While it is true that communism has never been voted into power by a majority vote in a single nation, we must never forget that its appeal has been so strong as to cause one citizen of our own country to say, "The Soviet Union is the only fatherland of the workers and toilers the world over; whose major international task is to seek the defeat of the enemies of the Soviet Union." Nor was it with a gun at his back that a leader of Latin America said, "The people of Chile will never fight against the Soviet Union, the bulwark of peace and democracy, defender of the oppressed and dependent peoples."

Communism could never have enlisted such support without some form of appeal. If we are going to win in our ideological warfare we must understand something of that appeal.

It has directed its chief appeal toward the dispossessed workers and farmers. Even today the American Communist Party views the years of the great depression as their golden era. Men who are willing to work but who cannot find a job become emotionally aware of the weaknesses of the system under which they are living, and are open-minded to propaganda concerning any system which claims that it can solve the problems of the economy.

Surely this constitutes communism's great appeal in Latin America. Farmers there have worked for generations for starvation wages. They see what little they have being wiped out by inflation and famine. Their governments and economy have been supported by American politics and American economic power. They are ready to try a new system. Communism seems to be the only alternative.

History, thus far, has been on the side of the Communists. Its rise to power is so recent that the world has not yet seen clearly what it does to the worker or the farmer. Not knowing any better, they rally to the call, "Workers of the world, unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains."

Communism has sold millions on the disinherited minority groups in our country and abroad. Much of its energy has been spent in trying to influence the colored people of our world.

Its approach to them has emphasized the theme that in communism there is no racial barrier. Its avowed aim was to unite all the disinherited, white and black, yellow and brown, against their oppressors. The enemy is pictured as being the capitalistic system. The true brotherhood is pictured as the Communist Party. They have failed in the United States because, as one Negro puts it, "We want more democracy, not less."

The wisdom of the average American Negro has not prevailed throughout the world. In other parts of the globe incidents such as the one at the University of Mississippi drive the wedge deeper between the colored peoples and the democracies, and push them closer to the Red orbit.

Communism has made its appeal to the disillusioned idealist. Some of the world's moral and intellectual dreamers have found it impossible to work against vested interests that support injustices, police state methods, and inequities in their society.

In desperation the idealists have become advocates of revolution.

Then there is the appeal to the dismayed peacemakers.

Communism has sold millions on the thesis that it offers peace to our world. Khrushchev's sword rattling has been directed toward the United States. To the rest of the world he has held out the olive branch of peace.

This has appealed to nations that feared atomic warfare, particularly in Latin America. Young men whose vocations might have been curtailed by service in a Latin American army, mothers and widows who fear for their loved ones, those who feel that the tax burden is too heavy, these have rallied behind Khrushchev's calls to peace. These emotions run particularly high in those nations that have been made to feel that there is no purpose in any of this but, "to pull the chestnuts of the United States out of the fire."

It is to the dispossessed workers and farmers, the disinherited minority groups, the disillusioned idealist, the dismayed peacemakers, that communism has made its greatest appeal. Of course they have gathered to themselves also the disgruntled neurotics and disloyal opportunist. But these do not represent the dynamic appeal of communism.

The aims of communism within the free world are equally clear. First of all they would foment agitation. They are not interested in finding solutions to the problems of labor, race, or war. Rather, it is their purpose to create ill will, distrust, and disillusionment. They would weaken us by internal strife.

A second objective is to create distrust in our institutions and leadership. Any time they can create distrust in our Government or in a government in another part of the world, any time they can invent reasons to distrust Wall Street or of our civic leadership, they have struck a telling blow at democracy and the free enterprise system.

Any time we leave ourselves open to criticism we have given them an opportunity to discredit our system. One has only to listen to radio Moscow to learn how the Communists seek to distort our system. They play up our recessions, saying that we are on the verge of economic collapse; that every city has long bread lines. They imply that racial strife is constant in all of our cities. They would make the people of the world think that we are still living in the days of the sweatshop, of police cruelty, of wanton immorality, and of child labor.

In the museum of Chapultepec in Mexico City hangs a mural depicting the struggle of the Mexican people with the Roman Catholic Church. The priests are pictured as having claws instead of hands and fangs instead of teeth. The Roman Catholic Church may not have lived up to its ideals in Latin America, but its evil is distorted beyond recognition by this mural. The viewer is not surprised to find that this mural was painted by a Communist. One of the ways that we use to destroy our enemy is to distort his weaknesses and to magnify them.

Communism also aims at indoctrination of the world. This indoctrination is not education, for by our standards education is seeking for truth. The Communists would rewrite history and then would publicize their peculiar interpretations. Through pamphlets, movies, entertainment, they would win mankind.

Their ultimate aim is to foster and aid revolution.

Those who would doubt this need look no further than Cuba. Our papers tell us of their aim at revolution in other countries. Khrushchev has expressed it when he said that their aim was to bury us.

I have in my library a book entitled "The Communists Can Be Trusted." They can be trusted to work for their ultimate aim, a revolution that will destroy the free world and make of the world one Communist state.

To accomplish these purposes the Communists have used four techniques.

First of all, they have sought to infiltrate every important phase of life. They have sought to get their workers in key positions in labor unions, government, education, radio, television, entertainment, organizations of minorities like the NAACP, and the churches.

In the book, "What We Must Know About Communism" we are told how these enemies succeed for a while in controlling from 12 to 15 of the 40 international CIO unions. J. Edgar Hoover, in "Masters of Deceit," tells of how the unions and the NAACP thwarted their efforts at control.

By getting workers in key positions they could create disturbances and distrust, incite riots, distort, propagandize, and undermine our religion and morals.

They have also sought to accomplish their aims by front groups. These have been created to slow down our defense effort, to seek aid for Communist countries, to emphasize difficulties in our own Nation.

Never have these front groups sought to solve problems. They magnify and publicize them. These groups have been endorsed by well-meaning citizens who, through misguided zeal and misunderstood idealism, have helped the Communists.

We need not mention again that they have sought to accomplish their aims by direct propaganda. This has been handled by personal contact, pamphlets, and every other possible means of communication. Nor do we need to dwell on the technique of open insurrection and revolution which has been the only means by which they have fulfilled their mission in any single country they have taken over.

Communism offers us our great challenge. How can we meet this challenge?

First of all I must remind you that I am speaking as your pastor and spiritual guide. I do not consider it to be my present task to advise our President or the officials in Washington as to how to deal with the Communist menace.

Nor do I feel that I am called upon to take part in any underground military organization. I have been invited to assume a position in an underground group that would be armed with sidearms and machineguns. I refused to take up this challenge for two reasons. First of all, I firmly believe that there is enough wisdom in the Federal Bureau of Investigation and enough power in the Army of the United States to prevent any attempt to overthrow our Government by military means.

I refrain from taking this course for a second reason. Our basic battle is not one of guns but of the spirit. Any victory in arms would be completely unavailing if it is not preceded by, accompanied by, and followed by a victory for God and truth.

It is therefore not to the political and military, but to them oral and spiritual that I would dedicate mystelf.

First of all I would dedicate myself to the church, its message, its institutions, and its program. Surveys point to the appalling decrease in church attendance in our country during the past several years. If ever there was a time when we needed to get behind the worship, educational, and mission programs of the church, now is that time.

The event of sputnik revolutionized our schools. All the courses have been enriched and homework has become a necessity. This increased demand on our students has resulted in fewer young people and families attending Bible studies in churches.

During this same time the Supreme Court of our land has made it almost impossible to teach moral and spiritual values in our public schools.

All of this has come at a time when we need to give to our youth the moral and spiritual guidance that only the faith can give to them.

In this day of growing secularization of our society, are you seeing to it that your family learns the Bible as well as biology? Are you zealous that your young people learn and practice the Ten Commandments with the same thoroughness that they apply to the multiplication table? Is your family part of the problem of the devaluation of the fundamental values; or is it a part of the growing knowledge of the Christian faith?

This problem of increased secularization can be solved only on an individual and family basis. If we are to meet the challenge of communism we must rededicate ourselves to the spiritual truths of life.

How does your giving to the church, its local and worldwide programs stack up when compared to our challenge? One of our officers called me to talk about the number of our men who are still giving $200 and $300 a year to the work of the church when they live as though their income were in the $10,000-a-year-or-above bracket. Can we honestly say that we are doing our part to meet the challenge?

Need I remind you of the words of Kagawa when 30 years ago he asked that we send missionaries to Japan? He warned us that unless we sent missionaries we would send soldiers. We did not send the missionaries and so we sent the soldiers. I would say that in this day, if we do not send the Bible to the world, we will be sending our bombs.

Second, I would rededicate myself to making democracy and free enterprise work. If Washington seems corrupt it is because of the men we send there. If our State capitol seems to represent a lack of ideals it is because some voting districts send men of small character as representatives.

We play into the Communist hands every time there is an unnecessary strike, every time a business fails, every time we elect a stupid or unethical political leader.

To defeat communism we must make democracy and free enterprise work. Do you honestly investigate the candidates running for office? Do you work for the men who will best enable us to meet the challenge of our day? If not, how can you justify your existence in a free society in these trying times?

Finally, I would dedicate myself to Christianity and to Christ's highest ideals.

If you were to listen to the Communists, you would think that it is they and not we who worship the Prince of Peace. You would think that the Communists are more concerned with the moral and spiritual values than we are, that Communists preach justice and the worth of the individual. To listen to some of the Communists you would think that Karl Marx uttered the words, "Proclaim liberty throughout the land," Leviticus 25:10, RSV.

The challenge is ours. As soon as we begin to live our faith the world will see our good works and give glory to God who is in heaven.

Again I am reminded of the words of Patrick Henry, "Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God. I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death." It was Andre Gide who said, "I consider that on account of its compromises Christianity is bankrupt. I have written and I firmly believe that if Christianity had really prevailed and if it had really fulfilled the teachings of Christ there would today be no question of communism; there would indeed be no social problem at all."

Our world is divided into two warring camps. The decision does not seem to have been reached. Total war may be avoided. The power of communism can be met only by a power greater than its own; by an ethic broader than the Communist ethic; by a devotion that goes deeper than the Communist's devotion to his party.

The way is not yet completely black before us. The church still holds a flickering lamp. God help us if we fail in this, our hour of greatest opportunity.

Milwaukee's Fourth of July Circus Parade a Smash Hit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on the Fourth of July Milwaukee witnessed one of the most spectacular celebrations in its history. An estimated 425,000 people lined the 3½ miles of streets and jammed the lower floors and roofs of nearby buildings to witness an authentic circus parade. Even the weatherman cooperated, supplying a bright sun and temperatures in the midseventies, to make this Independence Day a colossal success.

The "Day in Old Milwaukee" was sponsored by the Schlitz Brewing Co., and after the parade it was announced that this magnificent spectacle will become an annual affair.

The parade had something to please every spectator. Marching bands that the music man never dreamed of played such tunes as "Yankee Doodle" and "On Wisconsin" as the crowd cheered Horse lovers stood in admiration of the giant Clydesdales, Percherons, and Belgians that pulled the old circus wagons along the streets, while the Indians rode atop the many different breeds of ponies. Clowns of all types in gaily colored costumes amused the crowd with their tricks, and elephants, lions, and tigers, some of them fiercely snarling at the crowd and others lying quietly and surveying the audience with disdain, provided the elements of a real oldtime circus. It was a fitting and proper festival for a State that was mother to more than 90 circuses.

All in all, 2,500 people contributed to make the "Day in Old Milwaukee" an unforgettable success.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Milwaukee Sentinel of Friday, July 5, entitled "What a Day," and one from the Milwaukee Journal of the same day entitled "Congratulations, All," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel, July 5, 1963]

WHAT A DAY

It was the greatest.

More people and more animals in Milwaukee than on any day in history. More wide-eyed kids. More grownups remembering the past and enjoying the present. More litter to be cleaned up after the circus parade was over.

The crowds were the biggest and happiest. Even the weatherman cooperated.

Schlitz did it again. For the second time it made Milwaukee famous, this time in a single day. With its parade and fireworks it teamed up perfectly with the traditional public programs in the parks. It was a happy partnership between public and private enterprise (something we need more of).

The "Day in Old Milwaukee" had plenty of everything—except superlatives to describe it.

Let's have one every year.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, July 5, 1963]

Congratulations, All

Whee. That was a Fourth of July in Milwaukee.

On the day after, it calls for nothing but congratulations and community thanks to all hands. It was so good that, even after the Schlitz company and its president, Robert Uihlein, Jr., had put so much money and planning into their contribution of the great circus parade and the tremendous fireworks show, their own reaction was just the same as everybody else's, "Isn't this fun?"

The things people worry about in advance of an affair like this did not happen. Crowd conduct was all but exemplary. The park programs were more smashing successes than ever. The parade moved along remarkably well for its size. Police efforts at directing the crowds and keeping traffic moving succeeded remarkably in the circumstances.

We didn't happen to hear any citizen saying a direct thank you to a representative of the police force, but we hope some did. Bear in mind that not a single Milwaukee officer was able to enjoy the holiday himself with his own family. The day would not have been the success it was without the department's smart planning and fine execution, the almost unfailing patience and courtesy of the men on duty.

Another special commendation belongs to the city and county forces that had the cleanup duty. The litter was inevitably immense. Its speedy, efficient disappearance by Friday morning seemed almost miraculous.

One big lesson is that, as it turned out, adding the circus parade spectacle and super fireworks show in the harbor took nothing away from traditional events and doings. Enthusiasm for the scattered park activities sponsored by the Fourth of July commission diminished not at all. Even the zoo attracted a typical Sunday crowd. There were plenty of residents and visitors to absorb more of everything.

The Schlitz contribution is now formally announced to be annual. This establishes that the Fourth of July in Milwaukee will now be known nationwide as one of the premiere events on the fun calendar. The heavens may not always be as benign as they were Thursday, but that is the only cloud on the horizon.

Religion in School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the recent decision of the Supreme Court prohibiting required reading of the Bible and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer in public schools, has brought about much uniform concern throughout the country, and substantial controversy. It has provoked a great deal of discussion among our people and we have observed the widely circulated news reports, discussions of column writers and newspaper editorials.

Our people are rightly concerned over the freedom of religion, the right to worship God as we choose, and the separation of church and state a principle preeminent throughout the history of our Nation.

Our people are also concerned that this Nation will continue under the divine guidance and belief in God as the Supreme Ruler of the universe and that our children be strengthened through opportunities attained only through the reading of the scriptures and prayer. There should be no conflict with these two great principles in the life of America.

The Arkansas Baptist, a news magazine of our State of Arkansas had an editorial on this subject commenting on the Supreme Court decision. It is brief, to the point, and explicit in its position. I am sure it would be of interest to the Members of Congress and the innumerable readers of the Congressional Record and I include it in the Record for the attention of our colleagues and all those who may have an interest in this editorial on religion in school:

Religion in School

The latest ruling of the Supreme Court, overruling required reading of the Bible and compulsory recitation of the Lord's Prayer in public schools, is in line with the Court's previous ruling against the use of a prescribed prayer in public schools. The prayer involved in this instance is one from the Scriptures, but the principle is the same.

In the case just ruled upon by the Court, the evidence indicated the laws of the State of Maryland had required the reading of Scripture passages and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer, for the daily opening exercises of the public schools.

We call the United States of America a Christian Nation. But here are found people of many religious faiths, including those which are not Christian. If a religious exercise is to be required by law for a public institution, what religion shall it be?

Religion is by its very nature individual and voluntary. It cannot be prescribed or superimposed by forces outside individual persons. Compulsory reading of the Bible and forced recitation of prayer do not constitute religious experience.

In ruling against required Bible reading and recitation of prayer in public schools, the Supreme Court has acted in harmony with the spirit of our Constitution and in the best interest of the spiritual life of our Nation.

E.L.M.

Resolutions Adopted by the Illinois Federation of Republican Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois Federation of Republican Women at a recent statewide meeting, passed several resolutions relative to disarmament and the Monroe Doctrine, which I would like to have reprinted at this point in the Record.

Surreptitious Disarmament

Whereas the official U.S. State Department publication 7277 entitled "Freedom From War: the United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World," which is essentially the same as Khrushchev's own disarmament proposal of 1959, proposes to abolish U.S. Armed Forces and nuclear weapons in three stages and subject us to a U.N. Peace Force; and

Whereas while Americans are lulled into a false sense of security by the largest peacetime military budget in history and the calling up of the reserves, unilateral disarmament is actually already being carried out by the cancellation of the Skybolt missile which would enable our planes to bomb enemy territory without flying over enemy soil; by the cancellation of the RS–70 reconnaissance strike bomber; by the halting of production of the B–58 supersonic medium bomber; by our failure to conduct nuclear tests which are adequate to keep us first in the nuclear missile race; by the disastrous concessions the United States has made to persuade the Soviet Union to sign a test ban agreement; by the dismantling of our 45 missile bases in Turkey and Italy; by the failure to put the successfully tested Nike-Zeus antimissile system into production; by the cutback in the attack submarine program; by our failure to match Soviet capability in chemical and biological weapons; by our unilateral renunciation of any effort to use outer space for military purposes; and by the reduction of striking power of the U.S. Strategic Air Command;

Resolved, That the Illinois Federation of Republican Women urge Congress to repeal the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Act (Public Law 87–297, passed in 1961), and take all necessary steps to insure that America's military defense is superior to that of our enemies; and be it further

Resolved, That the Illinois Federation of Republican Women urge Congress to investigate the growing evidence that the Senate's constitutional treaty power is being bypassed by secret deals between the executive branch of our Government and the Soviet Union which are even more damaging to American interests than the Democrat sellouts of Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE

Whereas Eleanor Roosevelt said the Monroe Doctrine is "out of date," and Khrushchev said, "Now the remains of this doctrine should best be buried as every dead body is, so that it does not poison the air by its decay;" and

Whereas in October 1962, President Kennedy gave Khrushchev "assurance against any invasion of Cuba," and, in fulfillment of this illegal promise, the Kennedy administration is using U.S. military forces to stop the Cuban freedom fighters in their efforts to liberate their homeland from Castro; and

Whereas the slogan that Cuba is armed only with defensive weapons is a fiction designed to obscure the fact that Cuba has Soviet troops, Migs, missiles, and bombers, and is the headquarters for subversion and espionage throughout Latin America; and

Whereas the Monroe Doctrine never precipitated war, but for 140 years brought peace to the Western Hemisphere by its clear statement of American policy; and

Whereas if we permit Khrushchev to bury the Monroe Doctrine by retaining his Red missile base 90 miles off our coast, then his boast "we will bury you" may be close to realization;

Resolved, That the Illinois Federation of Republican Women urge the U.S. Congress to reestablish the Monroe Doctrine by taking all necessary steps to eliminate Communist tyranny from Cuba.

Passed May 7, 1963.

Springfield, Ill.

First Explorers Entered Gilmer County, West Virginia, in 1772

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the first white explorers to enter Gilmer County, W. Va., came in 1772, although a land claim exists which dates back to 1766, according to a historical article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail of June 16, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST GILMER LAND GRANT DATED IN 1766

It is written that William Lowther and Jesse and Elias Hughes were the first white people to enter Gilmer County. In 1772 they came down the Little Kanawha River, naming tributaries as they journeyed. James Workman's land claim dating from 1766 was validated in 1781. It lay on the Little Kanawha in present Gilmer County, the most of which was then in the bounds of Monongalia. Workman or his agent must have built a cabin or planted a crop or marked trees on which to base his claim.

The first settlers came in the early 1800's. After the War of 1812 several families came from the Cheat River area, near St. George, then in Randolph County. One of them was William Stalnaker who acquired many acres. He built two brick dwellings, one of which remains. It is not the first courthouse. His son Salathiel occupied the other until it had to be razed just before 1880. Dekalb was the first village. William Stalnaker had it laid out in 1840 at the mouth of Mill Seat Run, ready to become the seat of a new county.

Samuel L. Hays also lived in a brick house, near the mouth of Stewart's Creek (now Hays City). As a delegate in the Virginia General Assembly he presented petitions Jan. 3, 1845, for the creation of a new county from parts of Lewis and Kanawha. In 30 days Gilmer County was a reality.

The act provided that the 15 justices should meet at the residence of Salathiel Stalnaker to organize the county. In the election to choose a permanent county seat "The Ford" won. Before the court met to canvass the ballots, Glenville was laid out by S. L. Hays on land belonging to William H. Ball and a deed or gift of a lot for public buildings was ready.

Excitement was high in the winter and spring of 1861. People quickly took sides on public issues. Business slackened and county offices became vacant. Men went off to conventions. C. I. Conrad was an elected delegate to the Richmond convention which decided for secession. Conrad voted nay. Henry H. Withers of Troy was a delegate to the Second Wheeling Convention which reorganized the government of Virginia and took steps to form a new State. W. W. Warder of Troy was a member of the convention which made a constitution for West Virginia.

Early in 1862 Capt. James Moore Ewing recruited Company G 10th West Virginia Federal Infantry. It became a part of the regiment commanded by Gen. Thomas Maley Harris who had been practicing medicine at Glenville when the war began.

A company of 75 home guards was organized in the spring of 1864 with William T. Wiant as captain. "They built a fort of square timber, 30 by 30, on a hill overlooking Glenville, and there kept their arms, provisions, etc. until its evacuation in December 1864, a few days after which it was burned by the Confederates." It was called Fort Moore in honor of Captain Ewing.

One night some local Confederates, with Side and Ben Campbell as leaders, came galloping down the river road toward the fort, shooting and making enough noise to indicate that a large troop was approaching. The fort was evacuated immediately.

About 360 men joined the Union armies. Probably as many enrolled with the Confederates.

Glenville had 398 inhabitants in 1860. Ten years later it had 174. "The late war spread destruction through Gilmer County," wrote Louisa Linn about 1877. "The Southern Methodist Church, Baptist Hall, which was partly used for a school, jail, and a number of other buildings were destroyed. Some of the best citizens moved away. The town soon became a desolate looking place."

The population of the county in 1860 was 3759, 52 of whom were slaves and 22 were free Negro. The peak of 12,046 was reached in 1940. In 1960 it was only 8,050. They went away to jobs in industrial plants and to teach school.

Glenville State College in the fall of 1962 had 796 full-time students, 102 being graduates of Gilmer County high schools.

Gilmer is among the six top counties in the production of oil and gas. The mining of coal, auger, strip, and underground, is a major business.

The West Virginia State Folk Festival Inc. and the Gilmer County Historical Society Inc. labor to keep alive an interest in our past.

BESSIE BOYD BELL.

Interior Committee Review of Coal Research Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, because I support the program of coal research which is authorized by Congress and is now being conducted in the Department of the Interior, I was gratified to see that the conference committee in reporting the adjustments of its differences on the Interior Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1964—H.R. 5279—has provided the funds necessary to permit the coal research program to proceed without interruption. But, because I support the program I rise at this time to provide assurances to the Members concerning the direction and supervision of coal research.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am proud to be chairman, reported favorably the legislation which established the Office of Coal Research. The committee, however, was very much concerned—just as I know most Members are concerned—as to how the money appropriated for research projects is spent. Accordingly, we have maintained close surveillance over the Secretary of the Interior and his staff.

Earlier this year, when we learned that the Secretary of the Interior had definitive proposals for multimillion-dollar contracts, the Mines and Mining Subcommittee under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], immediately scheduled hearings to examine and review the direction in which the program was oriented. The review that was conducted was, I think, truly comprehensive and exhaustive with bipartisan support for which I thank both the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member, the gentleman form Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] who, as we all know, represents one of the great coal producing areas of the country.

The subcommittee heard testimony from the Department of the Interior and also from the President's science adviser, Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, and leading representatives of industry and labor including Mr. Stephen F. Dunn, president of the National Coal Association and Mr. W. A. Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers of America. In addition, we had one phase examined in detail by the Comptroller General and received comments from one of the prospective contractors.

When Members vote on the Interior Department Appropriation Act this week, they may feel assured that the committee having legislative jurisdiction will maintain its scrutiny over the program. This was guaranteed when the Managers on the part of the House at the conference included in the statement on the conference report the proviso that, in connection with the money appropriated for coal research, "The projects shall be subject to the provisions of the resolution of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, dated June 10, 1963." Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate at this time to make public that resolution of the Mines and Mining Subcommittee so that all Members, as well as the public, may know precisely the basis on which the conferees have acted.

As part of the background of this resolution the House is advised that the one thing that the committee found to give it concern in connection with a coal research program as a lack of standardization for consultation with the technical advisory committee or committees which were to be established pursuant to the Act of July 7, 1960 (74 Stat. 336) which established the Office of Coal Research. We recognize that ultimate responsibility is vested in the Secretary of the Interior; it should not and cannot be placed elsewhere. However, the subcommittee is unanimously united on the proposition that there must be close and continuing consultation with the advisory committee and this is provided for in the resolution referred to by the conferees on the Appropriation Act.

Under permission previously granted, I include as part of my remarks the full text of the resolution adopted by the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, June 10, 1963:

RESOLUTION BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Whereas the act of July 7, 1960 (74 Stat. 336) established in the Department of the Interior an Office of Coal Research for the encouragement and stimulation of production and conservation of coal in the United States through contract research and development; and

Whereas said act established a Technical Advisory Committee of recognized experts from various aspects of coal research to assist the examination and evaluation of research proposals and contracts; and

Whereas certain proposals under consideration by the Office of Coal Research will involve the construction and operation of pilot plants if work preliminary thereto indicates the technical desirability and feasibility of such pilot plant construction and operation; and

Whereas the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives recognizes the need for advance appropriation of funds in order to permit research to proceed on a timely schedule; and

Whereas, the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, found no reason at this time to object to proceeding with developmental work on the projects now under consideration for appropriation in the Office of Coal Research; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives hereby advises the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives that it has no objection to the inclusion of funds in H.R. 5279, 88th Congress, the fiscal year 1964, Department of the Interior and related agencies Appropriation Act, in the following amounts and for the following purposes upon the conditions set forth in this resolution:

1. $2,000,000 for a proposed research contract with the Consolidation Coal Co., also known as "Project Gasoline," for a research project involving the manufacture of gasoline from coal.
2. $200,000 for a proposed research contract with the Northern American Coal Co. for a research project on extraction of alumina from shale and clay mined with coal.
3. $375,000 for a proposed research contract with the Institute of Gas Technology or another qualified organization for a research proposal involving production of gas from lignite.
4. $1,000,000 for the development of a pilot plant or plants necessary in connection with the coal gasification projects of the Office of Coal Research involved in contracts or proposed contracts with the General Electric Co., also known as "Project Bootstrap," and with such firms as may be selected for research contracts under what is referred to as the "gasification program" in the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior, submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on February 21, 1963, by Executive Communication No. 464; and be it further

Resolved, That the subcommittee advises the House Committee on Appropriations that it has no objection to contracts for the aforesaid purposes being entered into by the Secretary if:

1. The process proposed for research is examined and evaluated by the Technical Advisory Committee and the minutes of such meeting reflect the judgment of each member participating in the examination and evaluation in accordance with the act of July 7, 1960.
2. The Technical Advisory Committee reviews the progress of preliminary research and reevaluates each project before the initiation of construction of the pilot plant prior to award for construction of the plant itself.
3. The Secretary determines, after consultations with the Technical Advisory Committee, in connection with the proposed pilot plant for the production of gas from lignite, that the work cannot be undertaken at the Bureau of Mines' Grand Fork, N. Dak., laboratory, and that the award of the proposed contract will not be a duplication of work being carried on at Grand Forks or other facilities of the Bureau of Mines; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the recommendation of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that the Secretary of the Interior in each case will choose the location of the pilot plant based on scientific and economic considerations after consultation with the Technical Advisory Committee; and be it further

Resolved, That the subcommittee respectfully suggests to the conferees on behalf of the House of Representatives on H.R. 5279, 88th Congress, that the House insist on the views set forth in this resolution as a condition for including those funds that are in dispute between the House and the Senate in connection with appropriations for the Office of Coal Research and that the legislative history includes specific reference to this resolution.

ED EDMONDSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Adopted this 10th day of June 1963.

Clay County, W. Va., Settled by Hunters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, according to a recent article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail, Clay County, W. Va., was originally settled by hunters. Located in the very center of the Mountain State, and once entirely covered by a virgin forest, Clay County subsequently produced great quantities of fine timber, and later, coal, oil, and gas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

CLAY COUNTY, W. VA., SETTLED BY HUNTERS

Clay County was established from parts of Braxton and Nicholas Counties by an act of the Virginia Assembly on March 29, 1858. The county was named Clay in honor of Henry Clay, the Kentucky statesman, a political favorite of western Virginians, and who had been born in Hanover County, Va., April 12, 1777.

This area laid out for Clay County contained 346.61 square miles, and was drained by Elk River, except a portion of the southern part drained by Twenty Mile and Bell Creek, tributaries of Gauley River.

The county seat was named Marshall, and was located on the McCalgin farm on Elk River across from the mouth of Buffalo Creek.

The first county court was held in a farm house on July 12, 1858. The county was divided into five magisterial districts, Buffalo, Henry, Otter, Pleasant, and Union.

The courthouse (a small one-story building), was built near the upper corner of what is now the courthouse square, with a porch running along with Main Street. A jail located on the terrace back of the courthouse was built of logs. Both buildings were used by the county for 45 years, when they were replaced by the present courthouse built in 1902.

The first circuit court was held October 21, 1858, with Judge E. B. Bailey presiding.

By an act of the first State legislature of the new State of West Virginia on October 10, 1863, the name of the county seat was changed from Marshall to Henry.

While the county seat was officially named Henry, and was incorporated as Henry in 1895, it was generally referred to as Clay Court House until 1927 when it was officially shortened to Clay to conform with the name of the post office.

The people who had settled in what is now Clay County were largely a hunting class who drifted in from other parts of Nicholas County, some of whom had settled in Buffalo District as early as 1830. The Irishman McCalgin, who settled at the site of Clay, was one of the early 1830 settlers.

The entire region was covered with virgin timber. The early lumber industry was carried on along Elk River which had good facilities for rafting. The rafting industry did not begin until after the close of the Civil War. It grew to be a great industry with its millions of feet of logs, lumber, staves and crossties. The early Clay County forest condition can be known by a study of the virgin timber areas (as per the State geological survey of 1917). A boundary of 15,000 acres was found to contain 100 million feet board measure of such species of timber as white oak, poplar, hemlock, chestnut and other species.

This industry had been carried on for 30 years before the coal industry became prominent, and oil and gas were found to be important resources. A railroad called the Charleston, Clendenin & Sutton was built up Elk River in 1895 and reached Clay Court House December 10, 1895. In 1903, Henry G. Davis purchased this railroad and changed its name to the Coal & Coke; then in the spring of 1918, it was taken over by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.

Among the first coal companies to begin operation in the county were: In 1903 the Elliott-Splint located at Pisgah, a part of Clay Court House, and in 1904, the Elk River Coal & Lumber Co. located in Dundon at the mouth of Buffalo Creek. In 1910, J. G. Bradley built 20 miles of railroad up Buffalo Creek through his tract of virgin timber to Widen where he opened up his mines and worked about 800 men. This railroad was named the Buffalo Creek & Gauley Railroad. The mining town was named Widen and soon became Clay County's largest town, with a population of 1,200. The first coal loaded at Widen was in 1911.

From 1916 to 1952 the mines on Middle Creek were in operation with main office, the Hartland Colliery Co., located at Hartland on the Coal & Coke Railroad. A 5-mile railroad, called the Middle Creek Railroad Co., was built to supply such well-known coal companies as the Middle Creek Coal, the Le Moyne Coal, the Reedland Coal, the French Colliery, Leatherwood Colliery, Jones & Winifrede Coal, Mid Lothian-Jewell Coal and the Elk Ridge Coal Co. All the mines combined worked about 1,000 men.

The Clay County Bank was built in 1902 and has gradually grown with the century of progress. The late S. H. McLane was its cashier for over a half century. It started with capital less than $10,000 and total resources less than $200,000. In 1930 it had grown to $50,000 capital and $593,743 total deposits.

In 1960, with W. M. Smith, cashier, the old two-story brick building was replaced by a beautiful modern building, and with total capital, $255,340.41, and total deposits of $2,186,777.58.

Population of Clay County has grow from 700 in 1858 to 14,961 in 1959.

Clay County High School was built in 1913. The building consisted of six classrooms, a full basement, a library, an auditorium with a stage, and principal's office.

In 1930 an addition was built to include large gymnasium, a home economics kitchen and sewing room and four other classrooms. In 1942 a gray stone addition was built and is used for vocational agriculture and industrial arts, and the upper floor is for the band class. In 1959 the Standard Bryant Annex was built and houses the freshman classes, chemistry and physics, and school cafeteria. The school has grown from 125 enrollment in 1916 to 1,200 students in 1962. The one-room schools have been consolidated and schoolbuses haul children to and from schools. All schools have hot lunch programs.

JESSIE L. KEITH.

Easterner Is Happy in West Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers and television are crammed each day with stories with a strong anti-South flavor. Antisouthernism, because of this constant "brainwashington," is rapidly becoming a fad in the North; a dangerous and hateful thing to happen to this country.

Trying to tell the true story of the South in the face of this "jamming" is almost an impossibility. The northern and eastern newspapers deliberately close down their news columns to any favorable report, but occasionally, a columnist writes something complimentary and it is allowed to pass censorship.

Such a story appeared in the Golden Years column of Mr. Thomas Collins, which ran in the Washington Evening Star on June 27.

It is coincidental that the city described so glowingly in that column happens to be in the congressional district I have the honor to represent. What is said of Shreveport, La., applies equally to a number of other cities and towns of not only my district, but the other seven districts as well.

For the benefit of those of my fellow Members who may never have read a pleasant word about the South in their newspapers, I commend the following story:

EASTERNER IS HAPPY IN WEST LOUISIANA

(By Thomas Collins)

An easterner, Samuel Palmer, has found a new retirement paradise—and a midwesterner, Mrs. Bouri Flesch, is looking for one.

Mr. Palmer discovered western Louisiana.

"After I retired in the East on a modest income, I spent a couple of years looking for an ideal place to live," he says. "I finally settled on the Red River Valley in Louisiana, in the town of Shreveport. It has about 200,000 people, is located near the Texas border, and has a mild climate. There's snow every winter, but not enough to bother. And midsummer is no warmer than Baltimore because there is always a cool breeze from the Gulf of Mexico, 175 miles to the south. It is the cleanest city, morally and physically, I have ever seen."

The Palmers bought in Shreveport a six-room, two-bath home on a 75-by-175 lot for $15,000. Total taxes on it are $120 a year. "There is a State sales tax of 2 percent," Mr. Palmer relates, "but no State income tax for couples with incomes under $6,000. There is no property tax on automobiles, and the license tag costs $3 a year."

Homes, food, and clothing cost about the same in Shreveport as in Maryland or Pennsylvania, the Palmers find. But there are savings on other things, especially on fuel since they are in the center of the natural gas country. "I have found," says Mr. Palmer, "that living on the same scale as in the East, our costs run about 20 percent lower."

He describes the country as a land of rolling hills covered with cattle ranches, dairy farms and gas wells, and with lakes, good fishing and boating, friendly people, sunny skies, good hospitals and fine churches. "And whether you get $250 or $2,500 a month you will like it here."

Mrs. Flesch may be showing up in Shreveport any day now.

"My husband retired a year ago last December," she says, "and we moved out to a Wisconsin farm I had owned for 10 years. It had an old farmhouse, and we looked forward with enthusiasm to remodeling it.

"We tore out walls, paneled over old plaster, changed windows, and tiled floors. It was hard work. Moreover it was endless. As we modernized one thing another would look old, and we'd have to remodel that.

There were porches at the rear and front of the house. They sacrificed those to enlarge the living room. Then they found they had nowhere to sit to enjoy the fresh country air. So they built another porch. Then, since they liked to barbecue, they built a fireplace on the porch. "This gave it such a nice, homey touch that we glazed it in so we would use it all winter. Now we'll have to build another porch."

The remodeling has been expensive, Mrs. Flesch says, because they have had to hire outside labor. "Workers are slow and overcharge us, and it's almost impossible to get carpenters in the country. Then there was the night when my amateur husband had an accident with the power saw, and it was stormy and sleeting, and 22 miles to the hospital.

"Through the late winter and early spring we covered the entire upstairs floor of the house with young tomato plants which we were carefully nursing for an early start. The sun turned warm one day, and we thought spring had arrived. We moved the plants outdoors. That night it froze."

The Flesches felt dutybound to utilize the fine soil on their 2½ acres to grow vegetables. So they planted with enthusiasm. "The upshot of this was that we couldn't keep things weeded, and about August the grasshoppers and crickets took over."

The first winter was one of continuous snow and they spent much of their time digging out. This last winter, a severe one everywhere, the Flesches thought they were having a heat wave when the thermometer got up to zero.

"We have been heating the house with oil, gas, wood, and electricity," Mrs. Flesch says, "and in the mornings during the winter our house looked like a Gary steel mill, with four chimneys belching smoke * * * and still we were freezing inside. There was nothing to stop the wind sweeping across the prairie and right through our expensively insulated walls."

Mrs. Flesch says they like their farm—"we think."

"That is, we might, if we ever had time to stop and enjoy it."

And then, "By the way, do you know any renters or buyers? We're moving south next winter."

Urban Redevelopment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the high hopes we all share for the great American cities of tomorrow can be fulfilled only through the farsightedness of the urban renewal programs of today. Urban redevelopment is a complex problem, one of special interest to Members such as myself who represent center city areas in Congress. I feel that urban renewal is not merely a responsibility of government; all residents of metropolitan communities should be heard and mobilized in the effort to create, or recreate, attractive and functional center cities.

An article by Raymond A. Andersen, former Urban Renewal Administration field representative, in the July 8 issue of Realtor's Headlines suggests how one community called upon its realtors, other private professional personnel, and interested citizens to initiate and to implement a local urban renewal program. There is a lesson for all parties concerned with urban renewal in Mr. Andersen's experience as head of the Evansville (Ind.) Redevelopment Commission:

Across the country today, cities with active urban renewal programs are faced with the problems of having a greater and greater supply of cleared, fully improved land available for varied uses with, in many cases, no ready or apparent developers in sight.

One need only glance at the "Listing of Project Land Available for Private Development," published by the Federal Urban Renewal Administration, to obtain an indication of the scope of the problem. That publication recently indicated that there will be over 208 million square feet of residential land, 81.3 million square feet of commercial land (much of this downtown) and more than 136 million square feet of industrial land ready to be marketed by various local urban renewal agencies across the country by July 1, 1963.

Even though the primary purpose of the urban renewal program is the elimination of slums and blight, and not simply getting property back on the tax rolls, some Members of Congress, as well as members of local governing bodies, have become concerned about this inventory of cleared land and the carrying charges, both direct and indirect (almost all of this cleared land is tax exempt while owned by a local public agency and the urban renewal project pays interest on the loans that are used to finance the undertaking of such projects—loans that are repaid, in part, out of the proceeds from the sale of this land) that are attached thereto.

Given our national trends of population growth and movement, any improved land made available for development in urban areas will eventually sell. The question of how soon the present inventory of vacant land will sell is dependent upon many factors such as the well-being of the national and local economies, that are outside of the scope of control of the local urban renewal agency. However, if land is made available in soundly conceived, well-planned urban renewal projects, the quickness with which such land will sell depends, I believe, to a great extent upon the role which the local real estate board and realtors play in the planning and sales program.

Much has been written about the role of the realtor in urban renewal. The purpose of writing this article is to relate a portion of this total role that realtor's have played in the Evansville urban renewal program, a portion which I feel will become more important and necessary as the effort to renew blighted areas continues to grow.

In the spring of 1962, as the new executive-secretary of the Evansville Redevelopment Commission, I was faced with the following problem: the city of Evansville and the Federal Government had invested almost $1,800,000 in a 36-acre slum clearance project. This project made available 21 acres, known as the Mid-Town Industrial Park, of cleared, fully improved land, 4 blocks from the county court house and 7 blocks from the 100 percent corner for light industrial and commercial purposes. And yet, in the 15 months that this property had been on the market, only 3 acres had been sold and 2½ acres of this was to adjacent and remaining business for off-street parking and loading facilities.

A look at the record showed that a widely-advertised public offering of this property had been made and that the property had since been periodically advertised. In addition, during the course of the project it had received considerable publicity. Why, then, hadn't this land been selling rapidly?

The first consideration was the question of price. However, a meeting with H. B. McCoy and Donald Raeber, local realtors who had prepared the reuse appraisals for this property, quickly dispelled any thought I had that the area might not be priced realistically. Not only did they feel that this property was realistically priced, but it was, in their opinion, some of the best, centrally-located property available for light industrial uses in the city.

Contact was made with Stan C. Heugel, then president of the Evansville Board of Realtors, who suggested and arranged a meeting with O. W. Kattman and Curtis E. Huber, both of whom are realtors dealing in commercial and industrial property in the city. This meeting proved to be the turning (or perhaps starting would be the better word) point in the sale of land in the Mid-Town Industrial Park.

At this meeting all facets of the problem were discussed. It was agreed that this property was desirable, properly priced and had been actively promoted. It was also their opinion that while the city had been classified by the Department of Commerce as an economically depressed area (a classification which we have since lost due to a tremendous communitywide effort) that the local economy was definitely on the upswing and that this area should capture its share of those local industries and busineses that were expanding. They also were of the opinion that the first substantial sale of property in the interior of this project would in turn spark the development of the whole area. How then to capture that first sale and ignite that spark?

It was finally suggested that perhaps this property wasn't selling because the local urban renewal agency had not established a definite policy with regard to the payment of a commission to licensed real estate brokers if they participate in a sale. It was further pointed out that in planning for their expansion, local businesses and industries normally contacted and utilized local realtors to assist them in site location, acquisition, and other related matters.

After discussion, it was decided that a policy statement on the payment of commissions to realtors who act as brokers in the sale of project land would be prepared and presented to the local urban renewal agency.

This policy statement, as presented and adopted, stated, in part, that: (1) active interest on the part of realtors in the sale of project land is to be solicited and encouraged; (2) a commission of 6 percent of the gross sale price will be paid to any licensed real estate broker who originates and participates in negotiations that result in a consummated sale; (3) in passing upon the acceptability of offers to purchase, the fact that a commission may be payable if the offer is accepted and the sale consummated, will not be taken into consideration by the local urban renewal agency.

Upon adoption of this policy statement, "For Sale" signs in the project were revised to the effect that interested persons could contact their realtor with regard to information about this property. Newspaper and direct mail advertising was also changed to indicate that offers to purchase could be submitted through a realtor and that commissions would be paid on consummated sales by the local urban renewal agency. All realtors were furnished with up-to-date maps and brochures pertaining to the property and notice of adoption of such a policy was given by the local board to all of their members.

The policy was adopted in April 1962, and resulted in the sale of 209,000 square feet of land before the end of the year. Included in this was the sale of 95,000 square feet to the Central Glass Co. for the construction of a 38,000-square-foot building. This is a development which will yield more in local property taxes annually than the whole project area did prior to the start of renewal activities. Mr. Huber, of Huber Realty and Insurance Co., the realtor responsible for this sale, when presented with his commission check of $2,866.40, at a meeting of the Evansville Board of Realtors, stated:

"As realtors we serve our customers, our communities, and our own business interest when we sell land in redevelopment projects. We serve our customers by making them aware of the qualities and facilities of sites in such projects. We serve the community by helping to get redevelopment land into hands that will improve the land and thus add taxable property to the tax rolls. And, we serve ourselves by earning commissions through such sales."

So far in 1963, an offer to purchase 94,000 square feet and construct a 32,000-square-foot office building (with eventual expansion to 50,000 square feet) by a national finance company and an offer to purchase 40,000 square feet for the construction of a 20,000-square-foot headquarters building for a regional refrigeration service and supply company have been accepted by the local urban renewal agency. In addition, at the present time negotiations are underway with prospective redevelopers whose land requirements total in excess of 750,000 square feet, while only 480,000 square feet remain available for sale. The prospect of selling the remaining land and closing out this project by the end of 1963 is, needless to say, very bright.

This increase in the sale of this property can be directly traced to the active participation by local realtors, as well as increased sales effort by the urban renewal agency's staff, with sales split almost evenly between realtors and staff. However, some of the sales handled without participation by real estate brokers were due, in part, to a changed attitude concerning this property by local realtors.

The use of brokers to sell land made available through the renewal process did not, of course, originate with Evansville, nor will it end there. An NAREB research report, "Urban Renewal Land Disposition—Policy and Practice," reveals that 39 percent of the local urban renewal agencies surveyed were utilizing real estate brokers to assist them in the disposition of project land.

If these agencies have been as successful in the use of real estate brokers, as we here in Evansville, I am sure that they, too, will utilize brokers as a first, and not as a last, resort. Furthermore, I am confident that as time goes on, more and more of the local urban renewal agencies will turn to their local real estate brokers and boards for assistance in carrying out a meaningful urban renewal program.

Thoughts for Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Religious Herald of July 4, 1963, entitled "Thoughts for Independence Day."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOUGHTS FOR INDEPENDENCE DAY

In its recent ruling again compulsory Bible reading and prayer in free public schools the U.S. Supreme Court acted according to predictions. That likely accounts for the relatively mild comments that greeted the decision. This temperate response did not lessen the importance of the far-reaching pronouncements by the Court when it reaffirmed the doctrine of human rights as set forth in the Constitution. Many observations about the action of the Court have been shallow and misleading. Of this nature was a remark by Richard Cardinal Cushing who complained what a tragedy it is "that the greatest book ever published and a constant best seller cannot be read in the public school system of education." And of similar kind was the statement by Archbishop Robert E. Lucey: "Now that God has been banished from our public schools, I fear that the Declaration of Independence is in jeopardy."

Possibly the best reply to outbursts of this nature is the first sentence in the Virginia Statute on religious freedom as written by the author of the Declaration of Independence: "Be it therefore enacted by the general assembly, that no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever." Furthermore Jefferson, in writing about this historic bill in his "Notes on Virginia," had this to say: "Instead, therefore, of putting the Bible and Testament into the hands of children at an age when their judgments are not sufficiently matured for religious inquiries, their memories may be stored here with the most useful facts from Grecian, Roman, European, and American history." Concerning the nature of human rights and a proper regard for these rights under democratic government, we offer these words from the "Memorial and Remonstrance Against the General Assessment" by James Madison: "Either then we must say, that the will of the legislature is the only measure of authority; and that, in the plentitude of this authority, they may sweep away all our fundamental rights; or, that they are bound to leave this particular right untouched and sacred."

Strangely enough multitudes of citizens persist in holding that democracy is rule by a majority without regard for "inalienable rights" as set forth in the Declaration of Independence; that the United States is a Christian nation in spite of obvious evidence to the contrary, and that theocratic government in colonial America is a proper pattern for church-State relations without regard for the Constitution as drawn in 1787. They overlook the fact that the American Revolution was indeed a revolution.

Mexico Sees Both Sides Hurting if Bracero Agreement Is Ended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, quite a number of news items from Mexico City indicate the uneasiness felt in that neighboring country over the failure of the House of Representatives to approve an extension of Public Law 78, the Mexican labor law. These news articles emphasize the significance of the program economically to the Republic of Mexico in that some $35 million goes into that country in money that the bracero worker saves and make available to his family and to the community from which he comes. Also, consternation is felt that great numbers of bracero workers will pour across the border to seek gainful employment on American farms.

Emil Zubryn wrote an article which appeared in the Cotton Trade Journal, June 14, 1963, on this subject, and I would like to bring it to the attention of my colleagues. The article is as follows:

MEXICO SEES BOTH SIDES HURTING IF BRACERO AGREEMENT IS ENDED

(By Emil Zubryn)

MEXICO CITY, June 8.—Now that the Mexican cotton industry and officialdom has had time to digest news of a possible ending of the bracero agreement at the end of the year, the overall feeling is that the ban will neither benefit Mexico nor the United States.

Secretary of Foreign Relations Manuel Tello said that if pact is not renewed, the United States will be "morally responsible for the return of illegal traffic of braceros (wetbacks) to American ranches."

WETBACKS WORRY INDUSTRY

Most of the industry concurs in this viewpoint. With unemployment (officially not acknowledged by the administration) a growing headache, especially in field of rural labor, law enforcement agencies are already worried about a recurrence of wetback incidents and possible tension as an outcome of this.

Secretary Tello categorically stated that it will be difficult to contain a wetback problem since "it is the American ranchers themselves who will incite Mexican workers to cross the frontier illegally."

However, Tello added that due to the complexity of American political life, it cannot be held for certain yet that the decision of the House of Representatives to ban bracero is "the final word."

AGREEMENT SATISFACTORY

Secretary Tello added that "agreements for the contracting of rural migrant labor has always been a satisfactory arrangement for both nations."

"I want to make one point very clear," he said, "and that is this: should the ban prove official, both Mexico and the United States will have to join forces in a coordinated effort to avoid illegal movement of braceros north of the border. And I believe that the principal responsibility should lie with the United States."

Calhoun County, W. Va., Named After South Carolinian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Calhoun County is one of several West Virginia counties which honored a statesman from a neighboring States when choosing a name. According to an article in the June 16, 1963, issue of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail, Calhoun County, W. Va., was named after John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

CALHOUN COUNTY, W. VA., NAMED AFTER SOUTH CAROLINIAN

Calhoun County was created in 1856 from Gilmer County, and named for John C. Calhoun, eminent statesman of South Carolina.

Calhoun County was created by an act of the General Assembly of Virginia on March 5, 1856. This act of the general assembly also designated three places from which the county seat would be selected by a majority vote of the people concerned. Bigbend, Arnoldsburg, and Grantsville were the three places so designated and for several years sectional disputed placed the county seat in first one place and then another. In August 1857, the county seat dispute was so involved that two county court sessions were going on at the same time, one at Arnoldsburg and one at the home of Collins Betts, on the Little Kanawha, about 3 miles below Grantsville. The bickering over the location of the county seat and the erection of a courthouse lasted for many years.

The first country courthouse in Grantsville was completed about 1870, but burned to the ground before it was occupied. Another was erected on the same grounds and was occupied until 1880 when a brick building was erected at a cost of $8,400. In 1940 a new courthouse and jail was started and completed at a cost of approximately $170,000.

Calhoun County is one of the few counties in the State without a railroad and this greatly hindered its economic development. Merchandise, equipment, and wares, before the coming of the steamboat, the automobile, and good roads had to be transported on the river in canoes or rafts or across country by foot, horseback, and vehicles drawn by horses or oxen. Later pushboats were used to haul goods and heavy equipment between Creston, the head of slack-water navigation on the Little Kanawha River, to Grantsville and beyond.

The advent of the gasoline boat was a great boon to all of the Little Kanawha Valley. These boats, at certain times of the year, could ply their trade between Creston and Glenville. These boats hauled carbon black, manufactured by Godfrey L. Cabot, at his plant near Grantsville (at that time this was said to be the largest carbon black factory in the world), on the way to market, and on their way back carried goods, wares, and merchandise to be delivered to merchants and consumers all along the valley.

During the days of the early gas and oil development of the Little Kanawha Valley these boats delivered vast amounts of casing, machinery, and heavy oil field equipment. This would have been virtually impossible via previous transportation methods.

Calhoun County has always been an agricultural county. Farming or grazing, oil and gas has been and is our greatest source of income. We have had for the past 9 years a fabricating plant, the Rubber Fabricators, Inc., which is located near Grantsville and has added greatly to the economic stability of Calhoun County.

The Little Kanawha River which winds its way from one end of the county to the other is no longer used for transportation, but does still offer some of the best bass and pike fishing in the State. This stream has, for many years, been the favorite fishing stream of thousands of fishermen and, with the help of the State conservation commission, we are attempting to make it the favorite vacation spot for thousands more.

Three dams are being contemplated for the Little Kanawha Valley. One on the West Fork of the Little Kanawha River, one on Steer Creek, near the Calhoun-Gilmer County line; and one above Burnsville, on the upper reaches of the Little Kanawha River. These dams will provide flood control for the Little Kanawha and Ohio River Valleys and will provide recreational facilities for numerous thousands of tourists and residents as well.

West Virginia 16 bisects the county from north to south. West Virginia 5 and U.S. 33 and U.S. 19 cross the county from east to west and provide many and interesting side trips for the visiting tourist.

Calhoun County has an area of 280.20 square miles; a population (1960) 7,948; has 5 magisterial districts and 17 voting precincts, and total assessed valuation of property, all classes (1960) $15,534,373.

Bishop of Alexandria, La., Writes His Impressions of the Late Pope John

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the Most Reverend Charles P. Greco, D.D., Bishop of Alexandria, La., has written expressly for the Alexandria Daily Town Talk a report of his impressions of the late Pope John XXIII. Bishop Greco, one of the most distinguished church leaders of Louisiana, was close to Pope John and has rendered a real public service by sharing with us the impressions made on him by the pontiff.

The editors of the Alexandria Town Talk also printed on June 4 an editorial titled "Pope John XXIII," which I would like to share with my colleagues and other admirers of the late Pope.

Louisiana papers have carried throughout the week stories how other church groups, Protestants, Episcopalians, and Jewish, who have conducted memorial services for the late Pope in the spirit of religious brotherhood.

The articles follow:

EPISCOPALIANS SET REQUIEM FOR POPE

A special memorial service in thanksgiving for Pope John XXIII and his contribution to Christian unity and world peace will be held at St. James Episcopal Church today at 6 p.m.

A requiem Eucharist will be offered expressing the gratitude of all Christians for the labors of a spiritual leader whose interests and influence went beyond his own church, said Rev. Robert E. Ratelle, rector of St. James.

"The entire community is invited to the service which honors a Christian pontiff whose impact on the entire Christian and non-Christian world is unequaled in the 20th Century," he said.

It is hoped that all men of good will will come to give thanks for a ministry dedicated to peace and Christian unity, the rector said.

POPE JOHN XXIII

Peasant-born Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli, who became Pope John XXIII, was despite his short reign, an inspiration to Catholics and non-Catholics alike.

He made a lasting impression on the great and the near-great of all creeds and nationalities to whom he gave audience, not only because he mirrored a great appreciation of the problems confronting today's world but because he had such a human and philosophical opinion on all issues.

The world will do well to preserve and take note occasionally of some of his observations.

On communism: "Towers of Babel such as this are being built even today but they will assuredly end like the first one." On Khrushchev: "He really isn't strong, he really isn't solid."

On business: "Combinations * * * can succeed with a splendid effect if they are guided by faith and Christian principles."

On colonialism: "We have the duty to aid the peaceful evolution of peoples who recognize the rights of others, even when this brings personal limitations and renunciations."

On nuclear power: "We cannot believe that the terrific energy now under the control of man will be released for the world's destruction."

On weapons: "Why should not the resources and the ingenuity of man and the riches of the peoples, used frequently to prepare arms—pernicious instruments of death and destruction—be used to increase the well-being of all classes of citizens, particularly the needy?"

On war: "The world has no need of victorious wars and defeated peoples, but of the renewed strength of salvation and of the fruitfulness and calm of peace."

On peace: "Men thirst for peace but will find it only through God."

On journalists: "You know that Christ was also a journalist, because he asked so many questions of everyone."

On the ecumenical council, which will be the greatest and most enduring memorial to him: "The greatest concern of the council is this: That the sacred deposit of Christian doctrine should be guarded and taught more efficaciously."

On himself: "I content myself with the sound doctrine which teaches that everything comes from God."

BISHOP GRECO, WHO WAS CLOSE TO POPE JOHN, CITES IMPRESSIONS MADE ON HIM BY PONTIFF

(By Most Rev. Charles P. Greco, D.D., Bishop of Alexandria)

"This pope will do great good for the church, even more by his goodness than by his knowledge."

These words were written to me by a high Vatican official not more than a month after the election of Pope John XXIII. My experiences and encounters with the Holy Father during the next 5 years proved them prophetic.

Those who encountered Pope John personally were struck most by the gentleness and humility that always marked his dealings with others and his references to himself. His exalted position never diminished his sense of humor.

I remember, for example, a particular instance during the meetings of my preparatory commission shortly before the opening of the ecumenical council.

It was stipulated that these sessions would be conducted in Latin. However, as the discourses progressed speakers would sometimes revert to their native language for emphasis or clarity.

We were told one day that the Holy Father would attend the next day's session. All of us present resolved that we would speak only in Latin, come what may.

When Pope John arrived he bade us to continue our discussions and pay no attention to him. He just wanted to listen.

I remember how pleased I was to see that the time was running out before I would be called upon to speak.

What a surprise it was then when a French archbishop finished his talk and the moderator, with a change in the scheduled order, turned to me and asked if I would present some points that I had made in an earlier session.

"Boy," I said to myself, "nothing but Latin." And for the next 8 minutes I made my way in Latin without my customary slips into French and Italian.

I was pleased to see the nods of agreement among my confreres and the interest and intent look on the face of the Holy Father.

When I finished, the Holy Father took up the thread of my thought and went on for about 2 minutes in Latin. Then it seemed that the word he wanted just would not come in Latin. And he lapsed into his native Italian.

At this point something seemed to break and we all laughed. He laughed with us.

Raising his hand, he said, "Yes, you laugh at the Holy Father because he cannot speak Latin as well as you. If I were a professor in a university or a seminary as some of you, I would not get stuck."

Continuing in Latin, he reached another impasse, and this time slipped into French which he spoke fluently.

When he finished we applauded him loudly. After greeting all of us personally, he left the chamber, then we applauded ourselves for sticking by Latin so faithfully.

There was never any effort on the part of Pope John to picture himself in exalted and pretentious terms.

His thoughtfulness and consideration were unlimited.

I remember that in preparing for the Inter-American Congress of the Confraternity of the Christian Doctrine in Dallas 2 years ago, I asked the Holy Father to send us a personal representative.

I was astounded when he announced that he was sending none less than (Amleto) Cardinal Cicognani, the papal secretary of state. No such congress in the history of the church had ever been honored with the presence of the Pope's secretary of state officially representing the Holy See.

On my next trip to Rome, I called on the Holy Father to express my deep appreciation for the honor that he had given to the American church and for the prestige that he had given to the confraternity in sending Cardinal Cicognani.

It was during this audience I recall that the Pope began to reminisce with me about his earlier years as a young priest and as a diplomat.

He remarked that a guiding principle of his life had been a concern to do the will of God. "Never expect anything," he said, "and if you do not get what you want, you will not be disappointed. If you do get it, so much the better.

"But just look," he said, "here I am the son of a sharecropper and God makes me the Pope. Why, I do not know.

"But if God knew that He was going to make me Pope, why didn't He make me better looking?" he asked.

This delightful conversation is one of my most treasured memories. But I remember getting uneasy when I realized that the time usually allotted for private audiences such as mine had elapsed.

Three times the Holy Father's secretary in the adjoining room had opened the door slightly to remind his Holiness that others were waiting. And each time the Pope waved his hand in a gesture that said, "all right, in a little while."

It came as a surprise to me as I was leaving 40 minutes later to see two cardinals waiting in the next room. Understandably enough, they looked at me somewhat askance. And I made my apologies to both for having caused them to wait.

HIS FEELINGS FOR THE UNITED STATES

The Holy Father's feelings for the United States and for American Catholics were beautifully expressed in a talk given to the American bishops during the first session of the Vatican council last December.

At that time he praised in highest terms the sterling catholicity of this country and paid tribute to the unbounded charity shown by Americans toward the entire world.

A month or so ago when I met the Holy Father for what was to be the last time I found him looking fairly well. There was much concern, however, about the state of his health. And when he clasped both my hands between his, I asked him, "Holy Father, how do you feel?"

He answered, "Non c'e male (not so bad)."

His grip was firm and his manner reassuring. But in view of all that was being said, I had a definite feeling that this would be the last time I would see him alive.

Those of us who had the privilege of knowing and conversing with him personally know that we have lost not only a great spiritual leader for the church but a spiritual father and a close personal friend.

Two Future Presidents Fought in Crucial Civil War Battle in Nicholas County, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Nicholas County, W. Va., was the site of a crucial Civil War battle, known as the Battle of Carnifex Ferry. Two young men who fought on the side of the Union in this battle and who later became President of the United States were Rutherford B. Hayes and William McKinley.

A historical account of Nicholas County is given in a recent issue of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

TWO FUTURE PRESIDENTS FOUGHT IN CRUCIAL CIVIL WAR BATTLE IN NICHOLAS COUNTY, W. VA.

Nicholas County was formed January 29, 1818, from the Old Dominion. It was named for Wilson Carey Nicholas, a former governor of Virginia who owned land on Birch River and assisted in the formation of the new county. It was organized at the residence of John Hamilton at Cross Lanes.

Summersville was designated as the county seat after much wrangling as to whether it should be located there, at Muddlety or at Cross Lanes.

The court had broad jurisdiction, many responsibilities and the members offered many personal sacrifices. They received no salary or even mileage and necessary expenses until 1861.

The counties of Kanawha, Fayette, Nicholas, and Clay has a common corner on Bell Creek, which is named from the legend that marauding Indians took bells from cows and hung them on branches of trees to lure the settlers into an ambush when the bells sounded.

It has been told that a person could milk a cow in Fayette while she was chewing her cud in Kanawha County and switching flies in Clay and Nicholas.

Transportation was the chief difficulty encountered by the first settlers of Nicholas County. What roads there were followed animal trails or Indian paths.

By 1880, daily mail service was begun between Gauley Bridge and Summersville. Mail was carried by horseback.

By 1890, the volume of mail had increasaed so much that a buckboard and team was used and limited passenger service was included in carrying the mail.

The trip from Summersville to Gauley Bridge took a full day and two carriages were used. One left Summersville in the morning and the other started from Gauley Bridge. They met at the "Half-way Place," now Lyonsville, at noon for rest and food and then returned.

Two battles of the Civil War were fought in the county: the Battle of Cross Lanes and the Battle of Carnifex Ferry.

The Battle of Carnifex Ferry helped decide the separate statehood of West Virginia and is considered a turning point of the war.

Two young men who fought in this battle on the side of the Union, and later became President of the United States, were Rutherford B. Hayes and William McKinley.

The whole county is cut up by numerous streams flowing to Gauley and Elk rivers.

The principal river is the Gauley which drains about 82 percent of its surface.

We, of Nicholas County, have had lean years; but we do not give up easily. We have seen our population decline—the young folk going to other places to get work because machines had taken their jobs.

But who knows? We may turn this land of ours into a vacation wonderland. We have the breathtaking beauty, the streams for fishing, our share of wild game for hunting, the best water and the purest air this side of heaven.

The Summersville Dam, which will probably be the largest earth-filled dam in the United States, should be a sports resort of renown.

And Richwood, in the April, 1955, copy of Ford Times, proclaimed itself to be the "Ramp Capital" of the world. To prove it, Jim Comstock, editor of the Richwood News Leader, once published a special ramp issue, printed with ramp-scented ink. It was the smell "scent" 'round the world.

With the new scenic highway soon to be started just outside Richwood and ending at Gormania, Tucker County, tourists are bound to come this way and if they are properly cared for and treated kindly, they will come again.

Richwood is within a 50-mile radius of Droop Mountain and Carnifex Ferry Battlegrounds, Sutton Dam, and only a few miles from Summit Lake and Cranberry River, the fishermen's, picnickers', and swimmers' paradise of this area.

Richwood could be the stopping-off place for tourists wishing to visit the beautiful Hill Creek Falls, which is scheduled to be opened and accessible this spring.

The "Hillbilly" will repeat the sponsoring of conducted tours through Cranberry Glades, a project that was started last year and met with great success.

Altogether, Nicholas County has much to look forward to.

When the centennial visitors arrive, we hope to have many attractions to show them and make their visit with us so pleasant and worthwhile that they will come back.

SPURGEON HINKLE.

American Individualism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the history of our great country has been analyzed and discussed during our recent Fourth of July celebration of the Declaration of Independence in 1776. In almost every community, village, town or city, speakers have tried to tell the story of America and its beginnings, and have tried to relate it to our present-day America. Inevitably, this relates America to other nations of the world as well.

Some years ago, I was given a small booklet, entitled "American Individualism," written by one of our foremost citizens at the height of his service to our country. This booklet—in actuality an essay—was the means of reinspiring my love and country and my hope for the future of America. In it the writer clearly expressed his deep and abiding faith in this country, and his deep and abiding faith in the institutions under which we operate as a government. He does not deny our faults, but counteracts their recital by pointing out the virtues of our American dream. He warns against many things which would clearly subvert that dream.

Herbert Hoover, at that time, had not yet attained to the Presidency of the United States. He had, however, lived through a terrible period in the history of the world and had seen first-hand what the ideology of socialism and communism had done to Europe. He did not wish that to take place in America.

Mr. Hoover is not only a dreamer, in the best sense of the word, but a thinker, a planner, and most of all, a doer. We know now how much he has given to this country in personal service. We know he suffered a great many wrongs at the hands of many of his countrymen who misjudged the motives and actions of this great man. Likewise, with the passage of time, we all know how greatly his countrymen came to admire him, respect him, and love him for his true dedication to his native country. In his golden senior years this man—now our oldest former-President, has at last reaped a tremendous harvest of love, affection and respect from his countrymen.

Just the other day, when struck down by a serious illness, Mr. Hoover's main concern seemed to be an impatience to be up and doing. According to a family spokesman, "he says he has a lot of unfinished work to do."

What an inspiration Mr. Hoover has been to our country. If ever there was a shining example of true American individualism and enterprise, Herbert Hoover is that example.

In rereading his "Book Individualism," I gained reinspiration and added faith for our country and what it could be. I remembered what it had been and the sacrifice and courage of many who believed in our American way of life. For those who have not read the book—and those who, like myself, had forgotten it—I felt it would be good to insert each day in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, one of the six chapters which comprise this essay.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include the first chapter of "American Individualism" with my remarks, and each following legislative day, the remaining chapters until the story is complete:

AMERICAN INDIVIDUALISM

(By Herbert Hoover)

We have witnessed in this last 8 years the spread of revolution over one-third of the world. The causes of these explosions lie at far greater depths than the failure of governments in war. There war itself in its last stages was a conflict of social philosophies—but beyond this the causes of social explosion lay in the great inequalities and injustices of centuries flogged beyond endurance by the conflict and freed from restraint by the destruction of war. The urgent forces which drive human society have been plunged into a terrible furnace. Great theories spun by dreams to remedy the pressing human ills have come to the front of men's minds. Great formulas came into life that promised to dissolve all troubles. Great masses of people have flocked to their banners in hopes born of misery and suffering. Nor has this great social ferment been confined to those nations that have burned with revolutions.

Now, as the storm of war, of revolution, and of emotion subsidies there is left even with us of the United States much unrest, much discontent with the surer forces of human advancement. To all of us, out of this crucible of actual, poitnant, individual experience has come a deal of new understanding, and it is for all of us to ponder these new currents if we are to shape our future with intelligence.

Even those parts of the world that suffered less from the war have been partly infected by these ideas. Beyond this, however, many have had high hopes of civilization suddenly purified and ennobled by the sacrifices and services of the war; they had thought the fine unity of purpose gained in war would be carried into great unity of action in remedy of the faults of civilization in peace. But from concentration of every spiritual and material energy upon the single purpose of war the scene changed to the immense complexity and the many purposes of peace.

Thus there loom up certain definite underlying forces in our national life that need to be stripped of the imaginary—the transitory—and a definition should be given to the actual permanent and persistent motivation of our civilization. In contemplation of these questions we must go far deeper than the superficials of our political and economic structure, for these are but the products of our social philosophy—the machinery of our social system.

Nor is it ever amiss to review the political, economic, and spiritual principles through which our country has steadily grown in usefulness and greatness, not only to preserve them from being fouled by false notions, but more importantly that we may guide ourselves in the road of progress.

Five or six great social philosophies are at struggle in the world for ascendency. There is the individualism of America. There is the individualism of the more democratic states of Europe with its careful reservations of castes and classes. There are communism, socialism, syndicalism, capitalism, and finally there is autocracy—whether by birth, by possessions, militarism, or divine right of kings. Even the divine right still lingers on although our lifetime has seen fully two-thirds of the earth's population, including Germany, Austria, Russia, and China, arrive at a state of angry disgust with this type of social motive power and throw it on the scrap heap.

All these thoughts are in ferment today in every country in the world. They fluctuate in ascendency with times and places. They compromise with each other in daily reaction on governments and peoples. Some of these ideas are perhaps more adapted to one race than another. Some are false, some are true. What we are interested in is their challenge to the physical and spiritual forces of America.

The partisans of some of these other brands of social schemes challenge us to comparison; and some of their partisans even among our own people are increasing in their agitation that we adopt one or another or parts of their devices in place of our tried individualism. They insist that our social foundations are exhausted, that like feudalism and autocracy America's plan has served its purpose—that it must be abandoned.

There are those who have been left in sober doubt of our institutions or are confounded by bewildering catchwords of vivid phrases. For in this welter of discussions there is much attempt to glorify or defame social and economic forces with phrases. Nor indeed should we disregard the potency of some of these phrases in their stir to action. "The dictatorship of the Proletariat," "Capitalistic nations," "Germany over all," and a score of others. We need only to review those that have jumped to horseback during the last 10 years in order that we may be properly awed by the great social and political havoc that can be worked where the bestial instincts of hate, murder, and destruction are clothed by the demagogue in the fine terms of political idealism.

For myself, let me say at the very outset that my faith in the essential truth, strength, and vitality of the developing creed by which we have hitherto lived in this country of ours has been confirmed and deepened by the searching experiences of 7 years of service in the backwash and misery of war. Seven years of contending with economic degeneration, with social disintegration, with incessant political dislocation, with all of its seething and ferment of individual and class conflict, could but impress me with the primary motivation of social forces, and the necessity for broader thought upon their great issues to humanity. And from it all I emerge an individualist—an unashamed individualist. But let me say also that I am an American individualist. For America has been steadily developing the ideals that constitute progressive individualism.

No doubt, individualism run riot, with no tempering principle, would provide a long category of inequalities, of tyrannies, dominations, and injustices. America, however, has tempered the whole conception of individualism by the injection of a definite principle, and from this principle it follows that attempts at domination, whether in government or in the processes of industry and commerce, are under an insistent curb. If we would have the values of individualism, their stimulation to initiative, to the development of hand and intellect, to the high development of thought and spirituality, they must be tempered with that firm and fixed ideal of American individualism—an equality of opportunity. If we would have these values we must soften its hardness and stimulate progress through that sense of service that lies in our people.

Therefore, it is not the individualism of other countries for which I would speak, but the individualism of America. Our individualism differs from all others because it embraces these great ideals: that while we build our society upon the attainment of the individual, we shall safeguard to every individual an equality of opportunity to take that position in the community to which his intelligence, character, ability, and ambition entitled him; that we keep the social solution free from frozen strata of classes; that we shall stimulate effort of each individual to achievement; that through an enlarging sense of responsibility and understanding we shall assist him to this attainment; while he in turn must stand up to the energy wheel of competition.

Individualism cannot be maintained as the foundation of a society if it looks to only legalistic justice based upon contracts, property, and political equality. Such legalistic safeguards are themselves not enough. In our individualism we have long since abandoned the laissez faire of the 18th century—the notion that it is "every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost." We abandoned that when we adopted the ideal of equality of opportunity—the fair chance of Abraham Lincoln. We have confirmed its abandonment in terms of legislation, of social and economic justice—in part because we have learned that it is the hindmost who throws the bricks at our social edifice, in part because we have learned that the foremost are not always the best nor the hindmost the worst—and in part because we have learned that social injustice is the destruction of justice itself. We have learned that the impulse to production can only be maintained at a high pitch if there is a fair division of the product. We have also learned that fair division can only be obtained by certain restrictions on the strong and the dominant. We have indeed gone even further in the 20th century with the embracement of the necessity of a greater and broader sense of service and responsibility to others as a part of individualism.

Whatever may be the case with regard to Old World individualism (and we have given more back to Europe than we received from her) the truth that is important for us to grasp today is that there is a world of difference between the principles and spirit of Old World individualism and that which we have developed in our own country.

We have, in fact, a special social system of our own. We have made it ourselves from materials brought in revolt from conditions in Europe. We have lived it; we constantly improve it; we have seldom tried to define it. It abhors autocracy and does not argue with it, but fights it. It is not capitalism, or socialism, or syndicalism, nor a crossbreed of them. Like most Americans, I refuse to be damned by anybody's word-classification of it, such as "capitalism," "plutocracy," "proletariat" or "middle class," or any other, or to any kind of compartment that is based on the assumption of some group dominating somebody else.

The social force in which I am interested is far higher and far more precious a thing than all these. It springs from something infinitely more enduring; it springs from the one source of human progress—that each individual shall be given the chance and stimulation for development of the best with which he has been endowed in heart and mind; it is the sole source of progress; it is American individualism.

The rightfulness of our individualism can rest either on philosophic, political, economic, or spiritual grounds. It can rest on the ground of being the only safe avenue to further human progress.

Black Butte Arrives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, last week the Black Butte project, a composite flood, irrigation, and recreation project was dedicated in the north central valley of California. The project was 19 years under study and construction by the Corps of Engineers and brings a further measure of security from drought and flood water to the greatest agricultural valley ever created.

I commend my colleagues HAROLD T. JOHNSON and JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR., who represented this district during critical times in bringing this project to fruition.

Appropriate remarks of dedication were made by Brig. Gen. Arthur H. Frye, Jr., division engineer, South Pacific Division, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, as follows:

BLACK BUTTE ARRIVES

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, the physical features of this project, its benefits and purpose, have been well publicized incidental to the news coverage of this dedication. I wish to thank all the news media people for their interest, as it will permit me to emphasize at this time some other features. Principally, to my mind, these features would be those of local cooperation and the way this dam fits into the overall scheme of water resources development in the State of California. In this respect, Black Butte Dam and Reservoir is a splendid example.

The concept of a dam at this location was endorsed in the 1944 Flood Control Act. That was indeed the beginning, but as time rolled on, many of you may well recall it also appeared to be the end. Why interested local enthusiasm suddenly drops is a phenomenon of human nature not yet fully understood.

It is appropriate in our democratic form of government that all aspects of a public undertaking be subject to critical review. At some point along the line there is a meeting of minds, and the project either goes forward or is lost indefinitely in the limbo of plans and reports. And, in a land of rapidly growing economy, delays can be costly.

A common hazard to all delays is that continuing growth in a State such as California may make the physical changes required by dams and related works too expensive, whereas, at the time a project was planned, the concept was entirely feasible. The irony of it is that the scattered development of various California areas can die on the vine, unless arrangements are made for coordinated water resources development which controls and utilizes all available water during both flood season and dry season. In other words, every flood control or multipurpose project we build must fit into or supplement the larger scheme of development.

In the Army Engineers program alone, we have built or substantially completed, since 1947, 13 projects in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valleys with a combined storage capacity of some 3,400,000 acre feet. Add to this the three congressionally authorized projects—New Melones, on the Stanislaus; Hidden, on the Fresno, and Buchanan on the Chowchilla Rivers—and the total storage increases to 6 million acre-feet. This is all controlled storage beneficial to the needs of California. And, I think it is significant that the smaller dams such as Black Butte, dispersed over this same wide area, contribute one-fourth of this total controlled capacity to the system.

The smallest of these are designed only to stop floods, but all of them by their very nature contribute a controlled supply of water locally or eventually in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. All of these completed smaller projects, that have been in operation for a few years, have already or almost paid for themselves in the prevention of flood damage. Thus, a bonus over the many years of economic life built into these projects will accumulate and become a substantial credit to the overall solution of California's water control and development program. Projects such as these, illustrated here today by the completion of Black Butte, not only meet a local need but become an essential part of a basin development concept.

Black Butte Dam is well suited to fit into the overall California water pattern. It does not have a big reservoir, but its gross pool capacity of 160,000 acre-feet cannot be classified as small. Compared to Shasta, Oroville, Folsom, or Pine Flat the project, naturally, doesn't attract commanding attention. But its benefits cannot be overlooked. And one benefit I know you all fully appreciate is its contribution to the agricultural economy.

With Black Butte Dam now a reality, this area is in a splendid position to take on the production of agricultural products that can no longer be produced on other lands being acquired for industry and urbanization. Our population must be fed. You, here, will be able to fill a portion of that need. Fortunately, the changing land pattern was recognized early. It was, perhaps, the spark that stirred your enthusiasm and got the Black Butte project off dead center. Many of the people here today were involved. There is no honor roll, as such, but the files of your closest newspaper shows leadership supplied by many men who were either here on the ground, in Sacramento, or in Washington. Thumbing through this chronological history from 1950 through 1960—a 10-year effort—these names often appear: Marshall Lane, George Otterson, Clair Hill, George Lodi, John Luther, William Vereschagin, Goodwin J. Knight, William Knowland, Arnold Zimmerman, A. E. McCollum, Frank Kochis, Amalio Gomez, Ralph Tudor, William F. Cassidy, W. H. Halsey, Charles Michael, Chester Walker, Gov. Edmund G. Brown, Bill Warne, Rolin Coffman, George Lindauer, Frank Morgan, Lloyd Lowrey, James Mills, Thomas Kuchel, Clair Engle, Harold "Bizz" Johnson, Alfred Tisch, Harvey Banks, Walter Schultz, Charles Haines, Herbert N. Turner, Pat Dugan, Palmer Foster, and of course, Don Keene, from whose files their names emerge. Some of these names have a familiar ring because of their positions, but I speak of them today simply as men who, as individuals, expended their talent and service. And we salute them for the service they did so well provide.

The final product of their efforts was the support of the U.S. Congress when the State of California agreed to underwrite the reimbursable features of the project—namely, the cost of additional water that could be supplied from this site over and above the cost of reducing flood damage. The Army Engineers can supply the planning, the design, and the supervision of construction, but the effort in the field of local, State, and Federal cooperation is the must ingredient of a publically supported project. Black Butte Dam is a substantial monument to that part of the job.

Black Butte points up another concept—recreation—now strongly supported by the Federal Government. Recreational use of the pool and reservoir lands has always been recognized, but only as an incidental byproduct. Here at Black Butte we have an early example of our now being able to include, as a part of the initial construction cost, the development of sites especially for that purpose. A finishing touch to this job will include three picnic areas, one campground, and two concrete boat launching ramps. All the sites will have a water supply, fireplaces, electric power, and sanitary facilities. There is no need to dwell on the obvious requirement to help meet the outdoor recreational demand of a heavily populated State. What seems important to me is that by this little extra effort we can return a tangible benefit to the ordinary citizen who helped to finance an improvement that is hard to measure, even though it is there, to the individual taxpayer.

I am therefore privileged, through assignment by the local committee that made today's event possible, to dedicate Black Butte Dam and Reservoir to the service of this area, to the State of California, and to the people of the United States.

World's Greatest Gas Well Was Drilled in Tyler County, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a recent article in the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail brings to mind the fact that the world's greatest gas well was drilled in Tyler County, W. Va., in 1894, producing 1 million cubic feet of gas per day. The history of Tyler County, named after a distinguished Virginia family, is told in the Gazette-Mail's article.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD'S GREATEST GAS WELL WAS DRILLED IN TYLER COUNTY, W. VA.

(By Arthur Spencer)

Tyler County is located in the northwestern section of the State of West Virginia, the Ohio River forming its western boundary. Wetzel County adjoins it on the north, Doddridge on the east, and Pleasants and Ritchie on the south. The land area of the county is 260.12 square miles and the population is 10,026, according to the 1960 census. Middle Island Creek, the principal water course, flows through the central part of the county and empties into the Ohio River at St. Marys, Pleasants County.

Created from Ohio County, by an act of the General Assembly of Virginia passed December 3, 1814, the county government of Tyler County was organized at the home of Charles Wells (then called Ziggleton) just below the present site of Sistersville. The first county court was held at the Wells home. On petition the county seat was removed to McKay's which was called Next Post Office and soon thereafter was moved to Middlebourne. Tyler County was the only county created in what was later to become West Virginia, during the period of the second war with Great Britain.

Tyler County was named in honor and memory of John Tyler, 8th Governor of Virginia, and father of John Tyler, 10th President of the United States. The name of Tyler is one that is distinguished in the annals of Virginia.

Tyler County lies in the oil and gas producing section of the State and its production was very large for many years. The world's greatest gas well, "Big Moses," was drilled in the county in 1894, and produced 100 million cubic feet of gas per day. The production of petroleum and natural gas is still important in Tyler County and with the coming of chemical plants to the Ohio Valley, the county has a bright future industrially.

Other leading industries are glass, glassware, chinaware, pottery. Agricultural products include dairying and poultry.

Middlebourne, the county seat, was so named because it was approximately halfway between Pennsylvania and the old salt wells on the Kanawha River. The town was established by legislative enactment on January 27, 1813, on the lands of Robert Gorrell and was incorporated on February 3, 1871. It is located near the center of the county on the waters of Middle Island Creek. The "Jug Handle" nationally known tourist attraction on Middle Island Creek is located near Middlebourne. Population, 711 according to the 1960 census.

Sistersville, named in honor of Sarah and Delilah Wells and located on land bequeathed to them by their father, Charles Wells, was established in 1815, but incorporated February 2, 1839. Charles Wells from Baltimore County, Md., settled at Wells Landing on the Ohio River below the present site of Sistersville, about the first of the 19th century. Wells, twice married, was the father of 26 children; sixteen of whom were still living (including the sisters for whom the town was named) at that time. A ferry was established at Sistersville in 1818. Sistersville had a population of 2,331 in 1960.

Paden City, also located on the Ohio River, is partly in Tyler and partly in Wetzel Counties. It was named after Obediah Paden, an early settler and was incorporated in 1916. The 1960 population, 3,137.

Friendly, incorporated in 1898, named for Friend Cochrane Williamson, grandson of Thomas Williamson, one of the earliest settlers on the Ohio River at the present site of the town, has a population of 195 according to the 1960 census.

Tyler County is divided into six magisterial districts: Centerville, Ellsworth, Lincoln, Meade, McElroy and Union, and there are 19 voting precincts.

Total valuation of all kinds of property in Tyler County, is $20,369,250.

Banks in the county are as follows:

Tyler County Bank, Middlebourne; First-Tyler Bank & Trust Co., Sistersville; Union National Bank, Sistersville; First Federal Savings and Loan Association, Sistersville.

Reduce Government Expenditures—Eliminate Deficit Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of talk recently concerning an apparent falling off of congressional mail. It is my belief that the taxpayers have not abandoned their interest in the reduction of governmental expenditures and the elimination of deficit spending and they feel that when they once express their feelings it is not necessary to do so repeatedly. I have just recently received the following letter from a constituent of mine in Laramie, Wyo., confirming that belief:

BUNN-SENCABAUGH AGENCY,
Laramie, Wyo., July 9, 1963.

Representative WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARRISON: I have just been reading the latest Congressional Action Legislative Bulletin and I note therein an indication that an "increasing number of Congressmen and Senators among the pro-economy forces are puzzled by a recent decrease in the quantity of letters reflecting interest and concern about the need to right the slant toward greater deficit spending." May I assure you that I am still very much opposed to all our deficit spending programs—most especially such ridiculous items as Area Redevelopment Administration which only takes jobs from a prosperous area and transfers them to a depressed area and evolves itself into a political tool with vastly unfavorable consequences. In the same category the mass transit, youth employment, and public works proposals are all deserving of a resounding defeat.

Please advise any of your fellow Members of the House, and most especially those on committees directly connected with spending bills of all kinds. that many of us believe the time has come to halt the trend toward socialism and it's attendant ills. We must act strongly and courageously to defeat those who would "bury us" not only without but also within our country.

I see no reason that anyone should be puzzled by the decrease in quantity of letters as I am positive that many of us feel it necessary to express our opinion on the matter only once and that this opinion should then stand.

Please rest assured that I do appreciate the fact that you are opposed to these ridiculous spending proposals and have evidenced this opposition by your vote. Thank you for your attempts at sound government.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD W. BUNN.

Let's get rid of back door spending.

Battle Against Waste in Defense Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, you and I and many others in this body have for years been concerned at the waste in our defense programs which deprive us of necessary defense, preempt funds needed for other purposes, needlessly increase our debt, debase our currency, and imbalance our trade, and precipitate the outflow of gold from this country.

Based upon the size of the military supply and service systems and the amount of waste as reflected in almost limitless reports, I have been of the opinion that several billions of dollars could be saved annually if the defense agencies were properly organized and managed. It was for this reason and the need for much more effectiveness in the DOD that I favored the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Security Act so that the Secretary of Defense would have ample authority to properly manage supply and service activities that are not of the major combatant type.

Secretary McNamara has tackled this problem with vigor and reported to the Subcommittee on Defense Procurement of the Joint Economic Committee recently that savings of $3.4 billion annually would be saved by end fiscal year 1965.

The well-known Columnist Sylvia Porter had an interesting article on the subject of "Waste and Duplication on Defense Spending" which appeared in the Washington Star of June 18, 1963. Under permission to extend my remarks, I am including the article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WASTE AND DUPLICATION ON DEFENSE SPENDING

(By Sylvia Porter)

Can our ever-swelling, record-size defense budgets be reduced without endangering our military power or undermining our economic strength? Of course they can.

Before the 1964 budget even went to Congress, Secretary of Defense McNamara had pared it by billions. The Defense Department has initiated a program of cost-cutting which already is producing annual savings of $1.9 billion and is designed to increase the rate of savings to over $3.4 billion per year by fiscal 1965. Budget-cutting enthusiasm in the House is the highest in years and Representative LAIRD, Republican, of Wisconsin, who is a member of the House Defense Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee says, "We are going over everything with a fine-tooth comb. We are asking basic questions and examining basic issues." Billions can be cut in defense costs—all in the area of waste, duplication, excesses.

The 1964 defense appropriations bill is scheduled to reach the House floor next week. The Senate is expected to have a bill on the floor by August 15. Hearings have been taking place in so many different committees of the House on different aspects of the bill—space, civil defense, appropriations, procurement, etc.—that even the Congressmen involved have lost track of all the pieces.

WASTE IS EXTENSIVE

But the legislation is now approaching the critical stages and, this year, the significance of the size of the defense budget to all of us goes beyond the obvious. How much and when Congress votes tax cuts for individuals and corporations to stimulate our economy and create jobs and paychecks well may depend on how much it also votes for defense.

That waste, duplication, excesses exit in the Defense Departments is indisputable. A few days ago, Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Procurement, released the hearings his committee held this spring on the defense budget. Among those testifying was U.S. Controller Gen. Joseph Campbell who reported on over 200 reports made since 1960 by the General Accounting Office on Defense Department activities. A sampling.

The Air Force bought $365,000 of new trucks while the Army had new trucks as surplus available for transfer. In 1960, the Air Force bought $6.7 million of excess replacement equipment.

The Marines in Japan ordered $1.2 million of spare parts for planes no longer in use in Japan.

The GAO examined 4,409 items of excess property, found 405 instances where available excess and surplus property valued at $3.1 million was not claimed and used by the military services although needed by them. The GAO estimates that in 1961 alone, $65 million of excess and surplus property should have been claimed and used by the services.

The Army Corps of Engineers disposed of 25 10-ton crane shovels costing $541,200 which were new or in economically reparable condition while planning to spend 12 million to replace them with similar crane shovels.

The Defense Department spent $13 million to transport personnel and baggage overseas on commercial flights while scheduled military planes to the identical destinations had room for most of these passengers. Unused MATS capacity to the same places amounted to 9 times the passenger load spent on commercial lines and 20 times the baggage load.

Due to noncompetitive bidding on contracts, one missile component subcontract for $1.5 million included a 58-percent profit. On another contract for 272,000 fillister head screws at $1 each, $500,000 was wasted before it was discovered that the competitive price was 55 cents.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE

At one point the Navy was maintaining $6.8 million of emergency vehicles at an annual cost of $550,000, despite the fact that manufacturers were set to supply the vehicles immediately, if needed.

Under Mr. McNamara, the Defense Department is making impressive progress on economizing and this story will be reported tomorrow. But the examples of waste, duplication, excess, pile one on top of the other.

Almost daily, the Controller General makes a new report on needless and poor buying. The Defense Department is trying hard to recoup on its sales of surplus property but in 1962, its sales of $4.1 billion brought in less than 4 cents on each dollars originally spent. The Department has $8 billion in inventories in its military stock funds—but it has yet to determine what items should be in the stock funds.

Nebraska Joins List of States Participating in Kerr-Mills Program—Now 95 Percent of Persons Over 65 Live in States Participating in Kerr-Mills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that Nebraska has joined the long list of States which are now participating in the Kerr-Mills program, authorized by Congress in 1960.

The Nebraska Legislature, only unicameral in the Nation, gave final approval to the State participation in the program by a vote of 35 to 3.

It is interesting to me to note that as a result of actions this year by State legislatures, nearly 95 percent of persons over 65 live in States in which the Kerr-Mills program is in operation.

This to me certainly gives us reason to question the need for any new program which in itself is limited as to the persons who would be covered.

For all who are interested in the matter of medical care—complete medical care—for persons over 65 whose resources are too limited to provide such care for themselves, I include an article from the Omaha World-Herald concerning the action by the Nebraska Legislature. I would point out that the Nebraska program is inclusive, not limited to one phase of medical or hospital treatment.

The article follows:

ELDERLY CARE FOR NEBRASKA PASSES, 35 TO 3—STATE APPROPRIATION ESTIMATE $1,750,000

(By Don Shasteen)

A bill adopting the Federal Kerr-Mills program of medical care for elderly Nebraskans was passed by the legislature Thursday.

LB 100 won final approval by a vote of 35 to 3.

It makes medical assistance available to persons over 65 not receiving old-age assistance and who cannot afford to pay their own hospital and doctor bills.

The bill will require an appropriation of an estimated $1,750,000 in State funds for the 2-year period beginning July 1. The Federal Government will contribute about $2 million.

FIRST $65

Persons eligible for benefits will have to pay the first $65 dollars in hospital bills and the first $35 in nursing, doctor and drug bills in any 6-month period before they can receive State-Federal assistance.

Services rendered by physicians, dentists, osteopaths, chiropractors, podiatrists, and optometrists will be covered.

To be eligible, a person must be a resident of the State and must have no parent, child or spouse residing in the State who is able financially to pay the applicants' medical expenses.

If an applicant is eligible in all other respects, the county welfare board must pay assistance for a period up to 60 days while the ability of such a relative to furnish support is being investigated.

UP TO 15 HUNDRED

If living alone, the applicant may have annual income up to $1,500 and if living with a husband or wife, the combined income may go as high as $2,100.

Readily available resources may not exceed a combined cash value of $750 if the applicant lives alone or $1,500 for a couple. The home occupied by the applicant is not included.

Pertinent Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Port Huron Times Herald, Port Huron, Mich., daily newspaper, carried a meaningful editorial in its June 26, 1963, edition entitled "Threats Reveal Government Power." I hope that all Members will read the editorial, which follows, as it points out real dangers to all segments of our citizenry:

THREATS REVEAL GOVERNMENT POWER

President Kennedy's Executive order enabling government agencies to cut off Federal funds from any federally assisted construction project where discrimination against Negroes is practiced says more about big government than it does about civil rights.

And so does his recommendation to the Department of Defense that it shut down military bases in localities where race discrimination is widespread.

No one can argue but that racial discrimination is reprehensible. But neither can anyone in good conscience contend that arbitrary or dictatorial means of combating it is justified—any more than it can be contended that government should have the arbitrary power to set right whatever else in the Nation it might think is wrong.

It is a sad commentary on the state of our Nation today that we have reached the point, economically and politically, where the Federal Government has amassed such wealth and power that it can threaten to destroy the livelihood of a segment of its citizens.

This is exactly what President Kennedy—regardless of his righteous intent—is threatening to do when he says the Federal Government will cut off Federal financial aid to any project where racial discrimination exists.

Or, perhaps, it should be worded "presumed to exist" or even "alleged to exist." For some Government official must make a decision on that score, deciding whether alleged discrimination is really discrimination or not. Beyond that, there is no provision in Mr. Kennedy's order to determine—once discrimination is alleged—to prove it exists. Neither is there any room, apparently, for penalizing the party or parties guilty of discrimination; all are punished alike—the various contractors, the various workers, the community, the area, the State—by withholding Federal funds.

This is not the first instance of economic threats against people and localities and States whose actions displease the administration. We have been brazenly told that if we "vote right"—if we elect administration supporters—we will stand to gain more Federal contracts. We have been led to assume, through the abominable practice of permitting politicians to announce defense contracts, that pro-administration Congressmen are able to obtain more defense business for a district or a State than administration opponents in Congress.

Perhaps we are becoming so accustomed to being bribed with our own money—and threatened with being deprived of it—that we no longer can muster the righteous indignation against the practice that it deserves.

For years and years our States and our communities have turned increasingly to Washington to get the money they have sent there. Many people still insist that Federal "aid"—that is, Federal taxation for State and local use—does not mean Federal control.

President Kennedy's threats with regard to the civil rights issue should dispel all arguments on that score.

Remarks by V. J. Skutt Upon Receipt of Brotherhood Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that many in this Nation are at this time reexamining their beliefs, their prejudices, their hopes, and their actions toward others. Some who have been very active in the realm of human relations are fortunately giving us the benefits of their thinking.

In this vein, I would like to include remarks made by Mr. V. J. Skutt, a prominent Omaha businessman and president of Mutual of Omaha Insurance Co. For his work in the field of human relations he recently received the brotherhood award from the National Conference of Christians and Jews, one of the outstanding groups interested in and working for better relations among all Americans and all groups.

Mr. Skutt's remarks on that occasion were interesting to me, and I believe they will be of interest to the readers of the RECORD.

REMARKS BY V. J. SKUTT

May I first thank all of you who have come here tonight to share this happy occasion.

This award will be deeply cherished by my family and me, because of its significance, because of that for which it stands.

The tempestuous tensions and penetrating pressures of the world in which we live tend to produce distrust and dissension among people. These deplorable divisive factors feed on prejudices .

Our own and many other nations are working toward bringing about some degree of unison in international relations. This is all to the good. In fact, it is a must if civilization is to be preserved.

But I am one who believe that unity—like charity—should begin at home.

Speaking in a provincial sense of our home, Angie and I have endeavored to be broad gauged toward our community and fellow man. I hoped that the same attitude would be entertained toward us, and reared our children in that atmosphere. Not to be narrow, never to be too much impressed with superficial veneer, nor to be persuaded by sophisticated sophistry. But, rather, to look to the character, the principles, the purposes, and the performance of people. Certainly not to what, if any, religion they espouse.

Finding comfort and strength in our own religion, we share the happiness of others in theirs.

But there is nothing novel about this attitude. It is as ancient as the old and the new Testaments. Without invading the province of the clergy, may I suggest that in both of these Biblical works there is repeated emphasis on brotherhood—and admonitions to "love our neighbor." This philosophy is rooted in the American way of life through the foresight of our Founding Fathers. There we find in the jurisprudence of our Nation an emphasis on human rights, the dignity of the individual, his self-respect, his privileges, and his obligations.

I repeat—obligations.

Usually it is not difficult to creat interest in people about privileges and rights. But obligations or responsibilities are sometimes another story. Even in business we find acceptance of privileges with remarkable unanimity and amazing alacrity. But now and then it is a slow process to engender enthusiasm for responsibiilties and obligations.

Such is life, and such is human nature. We need reminders.

Perhaps the greatest need in the world today is to remind individuals and nations of their need for a deeper sense of responsibility: A knowledge among nations that they must do things for themselves and not expect another to do everything for them—and individuals the same.

Now it is in this area that the National Conference of Christians and Jews plays an important role. Its objectives remind us as individuals of our responsibilities of citizenship. Not to exploit prejudices because if there is anything worse than prejudice itself, it probably is exploitation or use of such for commercial or personal advantage. But it is vital that we be reminded of our obligations to our fellow man as American citizens. The importance of this work of the National Conference is greater today than ever before. And we should help.

As we gain in maturity we appreciate all the more the importance of human relations and of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

In this day, when it is suggested that young people and the Government should do so much more for older persons, perhaps we—who are older—could do something for the younger, and for our country.

We could stimulate their thinking on the importance of proper human relations—the understanding of other people's problems. This is based to a great extent on our own "growing up." Because these things are learned, not from books alone, but from years and even decades of association with other people.

I am reminded in this connection of a statement appearing in the preface of the autobiography of one of the great elder statesmen of our time. He had made his first fortune at the age of 35 and made many more in later years. But what is far more important, he recognized an obligation to his country and fellowman to help make this a better world in which to live. He served as the confidante and advisor of some seven Presidents of the United States and of both major political parties.

I refer, of course, to Bernard Baruch. In the short preface of his own story, he says: "If there was any key to this process of my 'growing up,' it lay in the systematic efforts I made to subject myself to critical self-appraisal. And as I came to know myself, I acquired a better understanding of other people."

This simple statement by a great man expresses what I mean, good friends, in the saying that unity begins at home. It begins in our homeland—in our home city—in our family home with our loved ones—but most important of all it begins with each of us.

Humbly and appreciatively, I accept this award and hope to be a better citizen for it. Thank you again for the honor you have shown us tonight.

Remarks by Assistant Secretary of the Interior John A. Carver, Jr., at Gettysburg Centennial Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on the 1st of July of this year at Gettysburg, Pa., a most impressive observance of the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg was held at Gettysburg National Military Park. At that observance a brief but eloquent address was delivered by Assistant Secretary of the Interior John A. Carver, Jr. Mr. Carver was formerly the administrative assistant of my colleague and seatmate, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Mr. Carver's remarks may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR JOHN A. CARVER, JR., AT THE GETTYSBURG CENTENNIAL OBSERVANCE, GETTYSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK, PA.

If there were ever an occasion and a place where a listed speaker should be tempted to stand mute, this would most certainly qualify. What was said here nearly a century ago in consecrating this hallowed ground seems destined to endure beyond man's memory of the deeds that were done here. And yet, despite our admitted incompetence to vie with Lincoln's felicitous phrase or to match his somber eloquence, it is good that we return to Gettysburg—to the turning point of national history, to the place where national unity was saved, where the ideals expressed by the Emancipator became possible of realization.

For Lincoln, the task was that of dedicating a resting place for the honored dead of his generation. For us, that period and its events—even its significance—must seem remote, almost contrived in the relative simplicity of the issues behind the awful struggle that took place here. We look at Gettysburg—and at Lincoln's expression of its meaning—with the perspective of a century. Having lived through a generation of depression, war, and a peace that gives no peace, we tend to regard the events of early July 1863 as a piece of the past that is walled off from present reality.

And yet, to reread Lincoln's message at Gettysburg is to be reenforced in our recollection of what was at stake on this field of honor and of sorrow. We see the issues of 1863 stripped of the partisan distractions and the heroic folklore constructed through the years. Lincoln compressed a decade of strife and 2 years of war into one declaration of faith: That the Nation dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal should not perish from the earth.

That nation has not perished from the earth—but neither have its ideals, so eloquently expressed, been fully implemented. That task remains for our generation to fulfill. For a hundred years, the equality defined on this field has been withheld from millions of our fellow citizens. What they once patiently awaited, they now demand as a matter of right. Unrest is at large over the Nation—and over nothing that was not basically at issue here a century ago.

We search for peaceful solution to the civil rights issues of 1963. Peaceful solutions have been found in many areas of this subject, principally through the high principles, the vision and the dedication to constitutional guarantees enunciated by an enlightened judiciary and by far-ranging executive action to assure that these guarantees are not denied, through artifice or legalistic sleight of hand. The President has now called for a new dedication to the equality under law which Lincoln defined as the purpose behind a bloody struggle a century ago. It is time for the Congress to respond—to give positive expression to the ideals for which men fought in the past. National honor, not the threat of civil strife, must be the motivating force by which all our citizens are accorded, ungrudgingly, the equal opportunity for which our system stands.

Thus Gettysburg is more than a historical reminder, important as that is. It is just as important that Abraham Lincoln gave voice to what must be a national objective for our generation. It is therefore fitting that we should meet here to mark the further perfection of this shrine to man's highest ideals as well as heroic deeds.

I am honored by the privilege of accepting the public-spirited donation of key tracts of land which will help round out this national historical park. I commend the two organizations which are responsible for making this event possible. They represent the finest aspects of the spirit that motivates preservation of our national heritage. The Military Order of the Loyal Legion has an illustrious history of patriotic devotion derived from the forebears of its membership, union officers who served with distinction on these fields. The roots of the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association also reach deep into the soil of this valley and the study of its history. In the finest traditions of the conservation movement, its members have excited the concern of Americans everywhere to protect these battlefields for public use and inspiration.

To these organizations, therefore, and to the many private donors of large and small amounts, I extend the sincere thanks of the American public. On behalf of President Kennedy and Secretary Udall, I accept these lands and pledge to the donors that they will be conserved and dedicated solely to the purposes for which they have been tendered.

Prehistoric People Inhabited Fayette County, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a recent issue of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail tells of the prehistoric people who once inhabited Fayette County, W. Va.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

FAYETTE "FOUNDERS" OLD

Long before the red men who preceded the whites to Fayette County, there were others.

No one knows just what they called themselves, or exactly when they arrived. But human inhabitance of the area began long, long ago.

It appears conservative enough, in the light of recent archeological findings, to say the county had inhabitants at least 2,000 years ago. The modern people who delve into the past call their cultures Hopewell, Fort Ancient, and other names the peoples themselves never used.

Their marks are many places, but especially on Armstrong Mountain, where the great walls were built, and in the valley at Mount Carbon, where a prehistoric village was unearthed.

These early mountaineers were free. Fayette later was named for a champion of freedom, the Marquis Gilbert Motier de LaFayette, who offered his wealth and his sword to the struggling American Colonies as they threw off the hated British yoke.

Coal, the heart of West Virginia's economy through much of its first century, was equally vital to Fayette, long one of the Nation's leading coal counties. Also important to the county after its creation in 1831 were lumber and the railroad. Today, ferroalloys are a major factor in the county's economy.

Education is one of the county's attributes today—and basketball may have done as much as its solid curriculum to make the name of West Virginia Institute of Technology known far beyond Montgomery.

The county also is known to many today for its two charming State parks—Babcock, and much-visited Hawk's Nest. More tourist spots may follow soon to maintain Fayette as a leading county for recreation.

Resolutions Oppose North Cascades Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, sportsmen and farmers of Washington State, through their representative organizations, have expressed opposition to the concept of a national park in the North Cascades.

Recently, the Washington State Sportsmen's Council, which represents more than 16,000 sportsmen of the State, and the Washington State Grange, with a membership of approximately 52,000, adopted resolutions at their annual meetings in opposition to the proposed North Cascades National Park.

The Sportsmen's Council argues aaginst the proposal because hunting would be limited if a park is established in the North Cascades area. Members of the Washington State Grange point out that income from the existing national forests pays most expenses and part is shared with county governments, but national park expenses would be paid by taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include both resolutions in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE DELEGATE BODY, WASHINGTON STATE GRANGE IN ANNUAL SESSION AT PORT ANGELES, WASH., JUNE 10–14, 1963

Whereas there has been a portion of three national forests within the North Cascade Mountains of Washington State of approximately 2,044 square miles proposed as a national park; and

Whereas the area included contains some very fine timber and mineral resources; and

Whereas these resources provide work and income for several thousand people; and

Whereas the Forest Service returns several hundred thousands of dollars from these resources, in lieu of taxes, to the counties within the forest boundaries; and

Whereas the Forest Service builds and maintains access roads from resources income; and

Whereas the National Park Service derives nearly all of its operating finances from taxes: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Washington State Grange go on record opposing the creation of the proposed North Cascades National Park; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the North Cascades Conservation Council, Secretary of the Interior Udall, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Senator Henry M. Jackson, Congressman Jack Westland, Gov. Albert D. Rosellini, State Senator Gordon Sandison, State Representative James L. McFadden, Paul H. Conner, and Charles R. Savage, and Director of Natural Resources Bert Cole.

A. LARS NELSON,
Master.
PAULINE COLLINS,
Secretary.

EMERGENCY RESOLUTION NO. 1 ADOPTED JUNE 9, 1963, BY THE WASHINGTON STATE SPORTSMEN'S COUNCIL IN CONVENTION ASSEMBLED AT YAKIMA, WASH.

Whereas the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture with the President's approval have authorized a study of the North Cascades area for subsequent determination of the best use of its resources; and

Whereas without waiting for results of the aforementioned study, the North Cascades Conservation Council has issued a confidential prospectus including a prepared bill to create the new North Cascades National Park of 1,308,186 acres, extending virtually from the Canadian border to Stevens Pass with roughly 600,000 acres on the west slope of the Cascades and 700,000 on the east slope, which includes a very high percentage of the High Cascades deer area and much of the Chelan-Okanogan mule deer range; and

Whereas under a provision in the bill, the Secretary of the Interior may, at his discretion and under his regulations, permit hunting for game animals only in 269,521 acres situated in Chelan and Okanogan Counties, but is under no legal obligation to ever establish any open seasons; and

Whereas creation of a national park will remove the entire 1,308,000-acre area from the jurisdiction and management of the State game department both as to fish and game and further curtail the department's revenue from license sales; and

Whereas the Washington State Sportsmen's Council is now on record in favor of the wilderness concept for management of the North Cascades area, which concept permits all the benefits for preservation of its scenic advantages without the detriments of closing the area to public hunting and surrendering its other recreational assets and controls to Federal bureaucracy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Washington State Sportsmen's Council in convention assembled this ninth day of June, 1963, at Yakima, Wash., reaffirm its stand of favoring the wilderness concept for administration of the North Cascades area and at the same time oppose the creation of a proposed North Cascades National Park; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President, the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, and to the Washington State congressional delegation.

Nisei Editor Has Advice for Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to another point of view on the racial problem:

[From the Ventura County Star-Free Press, July 6, 1963]

NISEI EDITOR HAS ADVICE FOR NEGROES

The Japanese-American newspaper Hokubei Mainichi, in an English language editorial on Nisei association with Negros in San Francisco advises Negroes, in this time of national racial tensions, to do a little soul searching.

"Do not say, impatiently, there is no time. Life is long, and America will be here for centuries and centuries after we are gone," the editorial advised San Francisco Negroes. "This is the time for soul saerching for all Americans—from President Kennedy down. And America is doing it today. Negroes should be a part of it too."

Written by the editor of the paper's English language section, Howard M. Imazeki, the editorial began with a review of the plight of Japanese-Americans during World War II.

NISEI MISTREATED

"We then thought the Nisei were terribly mistreated; losing property and citizenship, it is also true, Nisei, were refused service at some hotels and eateries but even with this unpleasant background and discriminatory experience, the Nisei are not equipped to fathom the mental suffering and emotional agony of their colored brethren of today.

"It is only in the past 10 years we have had any sort of communication with them living togther in the same neighborhoods. We have come to know them better; their aspirations, their habits, their problems.

"We have * * *, met * * * outstanding Negro leaders.

"We confess we have had more occasions to come in contact with lesser Negroes who make a great number of our people afraid to come out to Nihonmachi (Japanese district) at night.

"They will tell you the reason there is a large number of crimes being committed by Negroes is because (they) are not equally treated (they say) there are more Negro dropouts from high school because the colored children are not given opportunity to follow the kind of work they want. They blame society for illegitimate children and living on welfare checks: They blame society for petty thefts and rapes being perpetrated by their menfolk in Nihonmachi.

LEARN PATIENCE

"We have yet to hear any Negro blaming himself for his social maladjustment.

"We have no intention at all of expecting the Negro children to be long suffering for education like the Oriental children—who are impressed with the virtues of long-suffering—for this may be considered feudalistic and anachronistic in this age of pragmatic living.

"We have no intention at all of telling the Negro community leaders, brazenly, to soften their fight for integration and for equal opportunity—for that is our fight too.

"But we believe there is a crying need on the part of the Negro community as a whole to make a concentrated effort sincerely to better themsleves. And this effort should be made hand in hand with their effort to break down the social and economic barriers."

The Sands of Time Are Gracious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding editorial from the Landrum Leader which is published weekly in Landrum, S.C. The editorial is entitled "The Sands of Time Are Gracious" and it brings out some important points about the intentions of our founding fathers in establishing a form of government as contrasted with the irresponsible manner in which the reins of Government have been conducted in recent years.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial from the July 11, 1963, issue of the Landrum Leader be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SANDS OF TIME ARE GRACIOUS

Almost 200 years ago when our country was being taxed and persecuted beyond endurance and some other fainthearted Americans were crying peace at any price, a Virginia patriot named Patrick Henry arose and said:

"They tell us, Sir, that we are weak—unable to cope with so formidable an adversary. But when shall we be stronger? Will it be next week or the next year? Will it be when we are totally disarmed, and when a British guard shall be stationed in every house? Shall we gather strength by irresolution and inaction? Shall we acquire the means of effectual resistance by living supinely on our backs and hugging the elusive phanton of hope, until our enemies shall have bound us hand and foot? Sir, we are not weak, if we make a proper use of these means which the God of nature hath placed in our power.

"Three million of people, armed in the holy cause of liberty and in such a country as that which we possess, are invincible by any force which our enemies can send against us. Besides, Sir, we shall not fight our battle alone. There is a just God who presides over the destinies of nations. The battle, sir, is not to strong alone; it is to be vigilant, the active, the brave. Besides, Sir, we have not election. If we were base enough to desire it, it is now too late to retire from the contest. There is no retreat but in submission and slavery. Our chains are forged. Their clanking may be heard on the plains of Boston. The war is inevitable: and let it come. I repeat, Sir, let it come.

"It is in vain, Sir, to extenuate that matter. Gentlemen may cry, peace, peace—but there is no peace. The war is actually begun. The next gale that sweeps from the North will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms. Our brethern are already in the field. Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it. Almighty God. I know not what course others may take, but as for me give me liberty or give me death!"

When the extremists who wrote the Declaration of Independence assembled in Philadelphia from over the 13 Colonies, the first thing to greet them was an anonymous note found on the Speaker's table: "Take care. A plot is framed for your destruction and all of you shall be destroyed."

When the final vote was taken in Independence Hall in Philadelphia on July 4, every man who signed the Declaration took his life in his own hands. If Washington's ragged outnumbered army could not repulse the British, every signer would be tried for treason to the British Crown. Their signatures could win or lose, mean that their homes could be burned. If Washington lost, their wives, children, and farms would be lost.

Have you ever wondered what ever happened to the 56 men who signed the Declaration of Independence, pledging their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor that this Nation, under God, would not perish from the earth? Five were captured and tortured by the British. Nine fought and died from wounds or hardships of war. Twelve had their homes pillaged and burned. Two lost their sons in battle. Another had two sons captured.

John Hart was driven from his wife's bedside as she lay dying. Their 13 children fled for their lives. His mill and fields were laid to waste. For more than a year he lived in forests and caves. He returned home to find his wife dead and his children vanished. A few weeks later he died from exhaustion and heartbreak. Norris and Livingstone suffered similar fates. Carter Braxton of Virginia, a wealthy planter and trader, saw his ships swept from the seas by the British Navy. He sold his home and properties to pay his debts and died destitute. Vandals and soldiers looted the properties of Ellery Clymer, Hall, Walton, Gwinnett, Heyward, Rutledge, and Middleton.

At the Battle of Yorktown, Thomas Nelson, Jr., urged General Washington to open fire on Nelson's home, which had been taken over by British General Cornwallis for his headquarters. The home was destroyed and Nelson died broke.

Francis Lewis' home was destroyed and his wife jailed. She died a few months later.

Who were these "superpatriots"? Twenty-four were lawyers and judges. Eleven were merchants. Nine were farmers. They all signed the Declaration of Independence knowing that the penalty would be death if they were captured.

Did these men make such sacrifices to establish a government that, 200 years later—

Would spend recklessly, not mindful of its debts?

Would default on its pledge to the Monroe Doctrine?

Would usurp State rights with Federal troops to gain a block vote?

Aye, the sands of time are gracious unto those patriots, in letting their eyes rest in eternal sleep, lest they puke their hearts out in disgust and shame.

People-to-People Aid to Other Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, every day we hear how much good the aid programs of our Government are doing for other countries; but we hear less about what the American people are doing for the people of other countries, except as it is done through the Government.

One of the striking examples of people-to-people aid will be found in the experience of the good ship *Hope*. In the current issue of the magazine Today's Health is an article which relates the experience of the good ship *Hope* in carrying medical aid and health aid to the people of other countries. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIP OF "HOPE" OFFERS HEALTH OPPORTUNITY FOR PEOPLE EVERYWHERE

(By Raymond L. White, M.D.)

An American ship, the hospital ship *Hope*, is becoming one of this Nation's most convincing emissaries of good will. Try as they might, Communist factions have not been able to nullify the powerful impact she and her volunteer medical crew leave on the fortuneless people they ably serve.

Making friends naturally follows from the performance of *Hope*'s first order of business. For, unlike the majestic "White Fleet" armed for a show of strength by President Theodore Roosevelt and dispatched around the world some 50 years ago to gain new respect for the United States, this "great white ship" is armed with the people and machinery of medicine to wage a full-scale battle against the disease and pestilence which plague many underdeveloped and underprivileged nations around the globe.

What conditions does she encounter as she steams into a new port? Her recently completed mission in Peru, where she spent a full year, furnishes many typical examples.

With some 13 million people, about 70 percent of whom are illiterate, Peru is South America's third largest country. Bounded on the west by the Pacific, on the east by the jungles of Brazil's Amazon country, and divided north and south by the rugged Andes Mountains, it is overrun by disease and poverty. In Peru there is only 1 physician for every 10,000 persons. The death rate is more than 10 times as high as that in the United States and the people die from such diseases as influenza, pneumonia, and whooping cough—diseases which are well under control in this country.

I had the opportunity to view the remarkable operation of the S.S. *Hope* in this setting when, as an observer for the American Medical Association, I visited the ship as it lay at anchor off Salaverry on the northern coast of Peru, which was the second port of call. Trujillo, Peru's third largest city, 6 miles from Salaverry, was the base for land operations. Most of the patients treated aboard ship came from the barriadas, which are squatter communities of indigent natives who migrated from the mountains seeking jobs and better living conditions. Barriada shelters, if they can be considered such, are built of sticks and straw walls not unlike egg crating and are without roofs, water supply, sewage systems, or other facilities. In time, mud bricks replace the straw and a sense of permanency then exists.

WITHIN A MONTH, THE "YANQUI NO," SIGNS DISAPPEARED—SO DID THE CASTRO BEARDS

The barriadas are characterized by overcrowding (a barriada with some 6,000 to 8,000 people can spring up overnight), poverty, and rampant contagious disease, such as tuberculosis, which is the No. 1 killer in Peru. Of more than 1,000 children born, only 800 survive the first 12 months of life. Adults with unrepaired cleft palates and harelips are not uncommon sights, as are uncorrected clubfeet.

Is it any wonder that the American medical team on board were at first overwhelmed at the enormity of the task which lay ahead? But they wasted little time in getting down to the work at hand. Shortly after *Hope* arrived in May 1962, Peru's sick and infirm boarded the vessel, and facilities were operating to full capacity. Soon the wards were filled with a grateful people on the mend.

One 7-year-old patient could not express her gratitude in so many words. Indeed, during the first week no one could get her to speak at all. Rosalia's left hip and arm were severely contracted from untreated scalding. But despite her initial apprehension and dismay, she became a model patient. Several operations were required to relieve the contractures, and intensive physical therapy followed.

By the second week the attending physicians and nurses knew that they had gained her complete confidence. Not only had she found her tongue, but they could not stop her talking. Even more gratifying, she was sent home walking.

Accidents like Rosalia's are a common occurrence among the children of Peru. Hundreds of infants and children also fall or stumble into open fires which burn continuously wherever a family huddles about. Untreated poliomyelitis cripples hundreds more.

Petite 12-year-old Teresita Sju was luckier than most young polio victims. She had contracted the disease 7 months before the ship anchored in Salaverry, and was completely paralyzed when brought aboard. For the entire year, doctors, nurses, and therapists worked to restore some function to her ravaged muscles. By the time she was released from the ship she could sit up, feed, and dress herself—no small accomplishment for this spunky little girl. Her chances of ever walking again, even with the aid of crutches, depend upon whether she has the opportunity to continue treatment.

Thousands of Peruvian children will be spared the tragic consequences of disease because of the *Hope* visit. A comprehensive immunization program was initiated on board and carried out into the surrounding areas. More than 100,000 immunizations were administered against polio, diphtheria, tetanus, typhoid, and whooping cough.

Peruvian children quickly won the hearts of all with whom they came in contact. Five-year-old Marco Uretecho, a victim of Hodgkin's disease, was no exception. Visitors to his ward would go out of their way just to catch one of his warming smiles.

Marco's condition was typical of many advanced conditions which we rarely, if ever, see in this country. The protruding mass on the side of his neck was almost as large as his head. It took him several days to become accustomed to the new upright position of his head following radical neck dissection for the complete removal of the menacing localized growth.

The Peruvian patients, adult and children are alike, constantly amazed their medical attendants. Much discussion ensued over their capacity to endure severe pain with no visible indication of distress. Lying perfectly still for hours, even days, at a time, they seemed to be able to project themselves into a near-unconscious state. Most had to be asked before they would admit any discomfort.

A charming woman in her late thirties, Maria Loyola Guzman was one such model patient. One can only wonder at her innermost thoughts as she stoically—even serenely—submitted to examination and treatment. Completely paralyzed on her right side, she was feared to be suffering from a malignant brain tumor. Fortunately, such was not the case. Tuberculoma of the brain was discovered upon exploration and was successfully excised in surgery. It was a far more expressive Maria Guzman who rejoined her three small children 3 weeks later, freed from the disabling paralysis.

Suzana Reano was not one of the quiet ones—but a remarkable patient nonetheless. A woman of 40 or thereabouts, and the mother of a teenage daughter, she complained of excruciating pain in her right chest, and not without sufficient cause. A dermoid cyst, big as an inflated football, invaded her right chest cavity, collapsing the lung and pushing all organs to the side in its advance. To the astonishment of the surgical team, the lung inflated instantly after the removal of the cyst and the affected organs readily shifted back into place.

Suzana's recovery was not so dramatic as Maria's. She was convinced she was going to die, and for several days it looked as if she would make good her prediction. Then an incredible change came over the ailing Suzana. Jolted at the sight of death next to her, she became just as certain that she would live after all. Nothing could stop her after that. Jubilantly, if not defiantly, she stomped off the ship 2 weeks later, the picture of health.

One of the most rewarding experiences for all concerned came when a patient made significant progress against an illness which had long been neglected, often since childhood. When Alejandro Navarro was admitted, he could walk only with the greatest difficulty. To talk at all he had to force his mouth open with his fingers. Within 3 days after surgery was performed on his brain, a delicate operation on the thalamus, he could hold and drink a glass of milk without help for the first time in his 39 years. The marked rigidity, the involuntary spasms, and trembling which afflicted him subsided and he talked well.

The SS *Hope* is a hospital in every sense of the term, an efficient medical facility patterned closely after the modern hospitals found in our local communities which provide the broadest range of medical service. The 230 hospital beds aboard are the principal limiting factor in inpatient care, but they serve very well in conjunction with the laboratories, surgeries, and X-ray departments. *Hope* is staffed with a corps of experienced medical men in every specialty of medicine and dentistry. Skilled nurses and technicians round out the ship's competent medical team.

Equally important, the SS *Hope* is primarily a teaching hospital. For every American specialist and generalist, there was a Peruvian colleague working side by side. For every nurse, there was her Peruvian counterpart. In this manner, the work of the *Hope* is assured continuity as Peruvian participants put into practice at home much of what they saw and learned. Regularly scheduled classes and seminars were eagerly attended, as were the closed circuit television sessions. The education program was planned to provide instruction in the new methods and techniques of medical care for all hospital personnel, including cooks and laundry workers.

Another aspect of *Hope*'s teaching program was found in the clinics at the 526-bed Belem hospital in Trujillo. Working side by side with native physicians at the request of the Peruvian Medical Association, the ship's medical team saw literally thousands of patients in these clinics. Eventually, the Americans were provided with hospital surgical facilities where operations could proceed along American standards of asepsis and controlled operating room discipline.

In the barriadas themselves the Americans established clinics. Here again, training of native personnel was stressed.

Coming from every section of the United States, the majority of American physicians and dentists served on the project on a rotation basis, volunteering from 2 to 6 months without pay. Nurses and all other personnel serve a full year at a minimum salary.

Welfare activities of the *Hope* were necessarily limited. One activity, however, which always created a stir was the distribution of milk. In fact, near-riots took place every time the approaching milk truck was sighted.

Milk was actually produced on the ship, reconstituted from prepared milk substances which were added to the purified water obtained from the heavily contaminated sea water of the anchorage. The ingenious machine which was responsible for this feat was donated by its manufacturer, the Ex-Cello Corp., and dubbed respectfully by the crew as the "iron cow."

My visit aboard the *Hope* luckily coincided with that of Mr. William B. Walsh, who is largely responsible for the organization and operation of the program. While still a Naval medical officer during World War II, this Washington, D.C., cardiologist conceived the basic concepts embodied in the organization known today as Project Hope, which he heads as president.

What more persuasive an instrument of peace could we deploy, he reasoned, than a hospital ship which would project throughout the world the true image of American friendship and concern for less fortunate people who struggle to help themselves? It was important to Dr. Walsh that the Project Hope also be a demonstration of our free enterprise system; that it be supported entirely through contributions of the public and industry.

In 1958, his ambitious plan began to take form when, with the support of President Eisenhower, he enlisted the aid of industry and personal friends to establish the People-to-People Health Foundation, by which name Project Hope is more formally known. President Eisenhower promised him the loan of a mothballed Navy hospital ship if Dr. Walsh could raise the necessary operating funds.

This accomplished, Dr. Walsh got his ship—the SS *Consolation*, which saw service in World War II and the Korean conflict. Renovated for its peacetime mission and duly rechristened the SS *Hope*, this "great white ship" set out on its misison to bring health opportunity to people everywhere. It began to log an impressive record from the very first days of its original mission to Indonesia in 1960.

The response in Peru to *Hope* has been most gratifying. Patient and public gratitude, the professional respect, the humanitarianism of the American, particularly the volunteer, is fully apparent, not only in Trujillo, but throughout Peru. At least one infant has been named after the *Hope*—Leoncio Tomas Hope Rodriguez. The son of a young Peruvian doctor who participated in the program, he was Rh baby. Yellow from jaundice, he was rushed to the ship for the necessary exchange blood transfusions.

Interestingly enough, Trujillo was a hotbed of communism prior to the ship's arrival. *Hope* is credited with having driven them out. Within a month, all the "Yanqui No" signs disappeared along with the Castro-style beards. The American flag, flown over the De Turistas Hotel in Trujillo during our stay in honor of a visit of acting U.S. Ambassador Donald Henderson, was not stoned for the first time in 15 years. The last insult to the flag was as recent as 2 years ago.

Work of the SS *Hope* goes on in Peru. Encouraged by what they saw aboard ship, some of Trujillo's more prosperous citizens agreed to establish a much-needed rehabilitation clinic.

In addition, Project Hope has entered into a 3-year agreement to staff a new 300-bed hospital which has been turned over to Trujillo's new medical school. Once again, volunteer American physicians will work closely with Peruvian counterparts—this time with the young medical fledglings as they graduate from the school.

Trujillo would seem to have the opportunity of providing itself with the finest hospital in Peru as these young graduates are introduced to American medical procedures and disciplines. And Project Hope will have a continuing education program in depth which, with good results, could set a pattern for future international health efforts. The hospital will also open a nursing school which will be operated according to American standards.

Where to next?

When she is ready—she is being refitted and restaffed now in New York—Dr. Walsh expects to take the SS *Hope* to Ecuador next autumn. "I was spat on in Ecuador," he revealed recently, "* * * must be some anti-Americanism there too."

But before she can sail anywhere, Dr. Walsh and his organization must raise the $3 to $5 million necessary to cover operating costs for such a mission. Project Hope deserves our utmost support.

Self-Help, Not Help Yourself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, since I have been a member of the Foreign

Affairs Committee, I have come to know few men, if any, who have a greater understanding of international affairs than a former member of our committee, now Ambassador designate to India, the Honorable Chester Bowles. Not only is Ambassador Bowles a learned man, he is a truly dedicated American who has served competently and faithfully in many high positions in Government.

Ambassador Bowles recently wrote a penetrating article on foreign aid which was published in the Saturday Evening Post. I think in view of the coming debate on the foreign aid bill that it will provide a greater understanding to the many problems that Congress will be called upon to legislate. I am, accordingly, including the article, "Self-Help, Not Help Yourself" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SELF-HELP, NOT HELP YOURSELF

(By Chester Bowles)

Foreign aid is neither an outrageous waste of the taxpayers' money, as some critics suggest, nor a magical device which will enable us to shape the world to our liking, as its more visionary supporters seem to think.

In spite of past mistakes in both planning and execution, however, it is an essential tool of U.S. foreign policy. Although a recent Gallup poll indicated that a substantial majority of Americans favored foreign aid in principle, it also revealed deep misconceptions about the size and purposes of the program.

An example of this confusion is the description of foreign aid as a hundred-billion-dollar boondoggle, and indeed the total for all U.S. assistance from 1946 through 1962 comes close to that sum.

However, this figure has little relevance to our present-day efforts in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Nearly one-third of the 97-odd billions went to rebuild wartorn Europe, and another sixth was provided for Europe's military defense. Any objective person who compares the critical situation in Western Europe in the immediate postwar period with the present vigorously democratic, dynamically prosperous Europe of today must agree that this was one of the most profitable political investments of all time.

One-sixth of our total aid expenditures went to equip and train anti-Communist military forces in Asia and elsewhere. This, too, has paid major dividends.

Almost one-sixth was provided through Export-Import Bank loans, payable in dollars to help finance the exports of American manufacturers, and surplus wheat, rice, cotton, and other commodities.

Only slightly more than one-sixth was spent on development loans, grants and technical assistance to help the free nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America create societies which their people will consider worth defending. The current foreign aid discussion deals with the administration's recommendation to Congress that this limited development program to help emergent nations be continued at approximately the current rate.

Putting the size of the program in its proper perspective leaves the question of foreign aid's objectives. These can be more easily understood in the light of what this program will not do. It will not enable the United States to run the world. It will not enable the United States to control the U.N. votes of countries who receive our aid. It will not insure us first place in a global popularity contest.

The reasons foreign aid will not accomplish these things are obvious. Proud Asian and African nations that have only recently broken their colonial ties with Europe are not going to jump through political hoops to please any other nation, however rich or right it may be.

Since the 4 percent of the Federal budget that goes each year for foreign aid does not buy allies, friends or gratitude, why not drop the entire aid attempt and leave the emergent lands to shift for themselves? However, if the United States refuses to help these people to bring about social, economic and political change by orderly democratic means, they will have only two alternatives.

They may strive by savage police-state methods to squeeze the necessary development capital out of their already impoverished people. Although no nation has within its own borders the necessary natural resources to justify an attempt similar to that undertaken by the Soviet Union under Stalin, this doesn't mean that such methods won't be tried.

Unable to help themselves and unable to get adequate assistance from the developed non-Communist nations, a new nation may turn in despair to the Communist bloc for the necessary capital and technical help as quid pro quo for political support for the bloc's objectives.

In either event, our great and rich country, which we like to describe as "leader of the free world," would be left on the sidelines watching a fresh crop of Red Chinas and Red Cubas take shape in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The affirmative course is a wisely administered U.S. aid program which can help create nations increasingly able to meet the economic and social needs of their people, increasingly prepared to defend their independence against totalitarian enemies—external or internal, overt or covert—and increasingly willing to work with the United States as partners on common projects which may lead the world a little closer to peace.

We cannot achieve this objective by backing reactionary governments that refuse to help themselves, or by panicking in the face of every blackmail threat to "go to Moscow," or by roaming all over the world with our moneybags held open, trying to buy "friends" who will agree to take directions from us.

By and large, our loans, grants, and technical assistance will enable us to achieve our purposes only if the governments on the receiving end are competent to use our aid effectively, only if they are courageous enough to tax their own well-to-do people in proportion to their ability to pay, and even then only if they are wise enough to recognize and respect the aspirations of their own ordinary citizens.

JUSTICE OR UPHEAVAL

Experience shows that exclusive emphasis on increasing the physical output of goods and services is inadequate. Unless these material gains are achieved through the kind of community participation that produces a sense of individual belonging and leads to greater justice and dignity, they may actually increase the embittering differences between rich and poor, and eventually lead to a political upheaval. While physical growth is important in nation building, what happens to people caught up in the process of such growth is decisive.

This suggests some specific questions we should ask before deciding which nation can most effectively use our loans, grants, and technical assistance.

1. Is the present national income of the country adequate to provide reasonable minimum living standards and a satisfactory rate of capital savings and investment—if it were distributed more broadly?

2. Does the country have a competent government sufficiently backed by the people and sensitive to their aspirations and needs, with the ability to maintain order and to carry out a comprehensive economic and social program? Are officials relatively honest and efficient?

3. Has the country prepared a well-conceived long-range economic development plan for the effective and realistic allocation of its national resources and foreign assistance? Does its planning recognize the preponderance of people in the rural areas? Does it include realistic schemes to insure wider distribution of land ownership?

4. Is the tax burden distributed in reasonable relation to the capacity of each family to pay? Does it provide sufficient revenue to meet the requirements for internal financing? Does it provide incentives for increased investment of private capital, both domestic and foreign?

5. Has the government provided for development of integrated rural organizations involving agricultural education, road building, health services, extension services, cooperative marketing arrangements and readily available credit?

6. Does the government maintain effective controls over the expenditure of foreign exchange for luxury imports, and does it appear determined to stop the export of domestic capital?

No nation, not even our own, could satisfactorily answer all of these questions. Nor will they provide dependable guidelines for every situation. Used with discretion, however, these questions can provide a set of standards against which we can more wisely judge the abilities of developing nations to use our assistance. In very general terms, they can help us to divide these nations into three categories.

In the first category, for instance, we may place those underdeveloped non-Communist nations which, judging from their performance in relation to our questions, are demonstrating both competence and courage in mustering their own resources for more rapid economic and social progress. Such nations should be given the highest priority in allocating loans, grants, and technical assistance.

Perhaps the best example of a nation entitled to such treatment is India. In the last 10 years, with generous assistance from the United States and other foreign sources, India increased its food production by nearly 50 percent, doubled its industrial output, largely eliminated malaria and provided educational facilities for some 50 million boys and girls.

At the same time, India has maintained a government that has survived three democratic elections; assured freedom of speech, the press and assembly; provided a system of justice under law that draws heavily from our own Constitution, and generated a sense of national purpose and patriotic commitment that is expressing itself in the acceptance of huge new tax burdens and a rush of Indians enlisting for service against Chinese aggression.

India is only one example of the effectiveness of U.S. development assistance in a favorable framework of local sacrifice, initiative and planning. Equally impressive are the records of Pakistan, Formosa, Israel, and Greece, where economic and political progress was made possible in substantial degree by wisely administered U.S. assistance. In Nigeria, Tunisia, Colombia, Costa Rica, and El Salvador, and several other countries, we can now see the promise of similar success.

In a second category are those underdeveloped countries which could answer affirmatively to some but not all of our basic questions concerning self-help.

For example, in a particular country, tax and budgetary policy may be soundly administered, and the government may be making the most of its meager capital resources. Yet further progress may be obstructed by the fact that much of the farmland is still controlled by a handful of landlords, while the bulk of the rural population ekes out a marginal existence as underpaid laborers or tenant farmers.

In Latin America as a whole, it is estimated that 1½ percent of the population owns half of all agricultural land. Many landlords have allocated most of their vast holdings to crops sold abroad for cash and have allowed much of the rest to lie fallow.

In such situations we should use our considerable influence to encourage a more balanced economic, social, and political development. As a lever to promote the spread of economic and social justice, our economic assistance may be increased for those nations that improve their performance in critical areas of development and reduced where the performance lags.

In the third category we can place those underdeveloped nations which at present lack the competence, organization or will that is essential to the effective use of our development loans or grants.

In these cases I believe that we should limit our aid to modest technical assistance and to Peace Corps and food-surplus programs. These would underscore our genuine desire to assist and at the same time help lay the basis for an administrative and economic structure that at some future stage will enable these countries effectively to use development funds.

Although many of the conditions that I have set down here are covered in the recent Clay committee report on foreign aid, some of the report strikes me as defensive and negative. We are not, as the report implies, a tired old nation striving to hold off the future with dollars but rather a vital democratic power working to create a viable and peaceful world.

Similarly, I do not agree with the committee that we should condition our aid on the willingness of a recipient government to accept our own views on capitalism. The means by which economic development can best be achieved is not a moral question but a practical one requiring a large degree of pragmatism. The timetable of social and economic change will necessarily vary from country to country, and so will the instruments of change.

It would have been a grave mistake to refuse Marshall plan aid to Britain in 1948 simply because its government believed—wrongly, in my opinion—that the steel industry would be run more efficiently by public managers. And it would be a mistake now to refuse U.S. aid for similar reasons to other nations.

Finally, I disagree that aid to the new nations of Africa should be left increasingly to the ex-colonial powers—Britain, France, and Belgium. Although their present contribution is in fact roughly three times our own, a substantial U.S. assistance program will continue to be needed, not only to speed economic development but also to give these new nations a greater sense of independence from their former colonial ties.

Although these exceptions, in my view, are important, I heartily concur with a major thesis of the Clay report: that the countries receiving our aid must do their part to merit further help.

There are, of course, certain political risks in insisting upon more effective self-help from the aided nations. In some instances, courageous adherence to the standards which I suggest may lead us to refuse aid to friendly governments which have assumed that their unquestioning support of our political views in the United Nations would assure willy-nilly a continuing flow of U.S. development dollars—even though their persistent failure to put their domestic houses in order means that we are in fact pouring U.S. funds down a rathole.

But if the economic development effort in Asia, Africa and Latin America is to succeed, and if our aid program is to maintain the essential support of the American people and of their Congress, we must insist as a general rule on the necessary domestic reforms as a precondition of continuing U.S. Government assistance. Recipient nations can no longer look to U.S. aid as a substitute for their own efforts.

There is nothing in what I have said, however, that requires us to be foolhardy. Specific situations may occasionally cause us to throw away the book, to exercise our own ad hoc judgment and temporarily to relax our pressures for reform.

As for the inevitable charges of "Yankee interference in our domestic affairs," we should take them in stride. Whatever we do in regard to economic aid—whether we give it or withhold it—constitutes "interference" of one kind or another.

Although the future hangs in the balance, no people has ever been so well qualified as we, by tradition, training and resources, for a task which cynics have always judged impossible—the establishment of the conditions of global freedom, stability and peace.

Report on Proposed Federal Legislation To Suspend Equal Broadcasting Time Requirements for the 1964 Presidential Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, even though the House has passed the resolution authorizing the waiver of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 so far as the Presidential and Vice Presidential offices are concerned in the 1964 election, I nevertheless feel that the following report on the proposed Federal legislation issued by the Committee on Federal Legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York should be made a part of the RECORD:

REPORT ON PROPOSED FEDERAL LEGISLATION TO SUSPEND EQUAL BROADCASTING TIME REQUIREMENTS FOR THE 1964 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

Section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, requires each radio or television station that permits a legally qualified candidate for public office to use the station to afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office.[1] The consequence of this provision is that each minority party and independent candidate for election to a given public office must be given an equal amount of free time if any one is given free time (other than free references on exempted news reports or news commentaries or interviews) by a broadcaster. This equal time requirement relates only to the appearances of candidates themselves and not to the appearances of their supporters. *Felix* v. *Westinghouse Radio Stations,* 186 F. 2d. 1 (3 cir., 1950), cert. denied, 341 U.S. 909 (1961); "Public Notice 63585 of Federal Communications Commission," dated Oct. 1, 1958, Appendix to House Report No. 802, 86th Cong. 1st session. p. 20. (1959).

In the context of a developing public interest in having the 1960 Republican and Democratic candidates for the presidency in a debate confrontation on television, the Congress suspended the equal time provisions of section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to the 1960 campaign for President and Vice President only. Public Law 86–677, 74 Stat. 554 (1960).[2] The Senate Joint Resolution 207 which became Public Law 86–677 was designed to make possible such a confrontation without requiring the broadcasting industry to make available an equivalent amount of time to each of the 14 other known presidential candidates. As we all know, Resolution 207 resulted in the use of 4 hours[3] by almost all Nation's radio and television stations to present "the great debate." Resolution 207, by its terms, cautioned the broadcasters that the equal time suspension did not relieve them from their obligations to act in the public interest in reporting the campaign and in making time available. This obligation the Federal Communitions Commission has construed to mean that when a licensee permits use of its facilities for discussions of controversial issues of public importance, he is under an obligation to afford reasonable opportunity for the broadcasting of opposing viewpoints. (Report of FCC to Congress, Mar. 1, 1961, pursuant to S.J. Res. 207, 86th Cong. (1960), Hearings, Communications Subcommittee, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 87th Cong., 1st sess., at 106 (1961)). As a consequence each TV network made some time available to the presidential candidates of other parties, e.g., Socialist Workers, Socialist Labor, Prohibition, American Vegetarian, American Beat Consensus, and Conservative Parties. The networks contributed 2 hours and 25 minutes of sustaining time, either in the early afternoon or late evenings to these candidates which were carried by from 43 to 74 stations. (FCC, Survey of Political Broadcasting, April 1961, Additional Materials to Reports to Congress, March 1, 1961, supra.) In contrast, the Democratic and Republican candidates for President and Vice President appeared on the CBS network for 16¼ hours (hearings, supra, at 36) and on the NBC network for 10½ hours (Id. at 68).

Despite the time contributed by the TV networks, of which the 4 hours of "great debates" constituted a significant part, the political parties in all the 1960 campaign spent $14,195,278 for TV and radio time as contrasted with $9,818,342 in 1956 (Tables 1, 2, and 3 of FCC Survey, supra). Thus, the equal time suspension does not appear to have lessened the ever increasing pressure on campaign finances. Although network TV and radio time charges went down in the 4 years by 7.5 percent (primarily because of a 75 percent drop in network radio charges which dropped to less than $80,000) local station time charges for both TV and radio went up enormously, local station TV time up to 92.3 percent to $7,125,087 and local station radio time up 42 percent to over $4 million. (FCC Survey, supra. Table 3.) To consider the real enormity of the expense one must recognize the additional expenses, after time charges are paid, necessary to mounting even the simplest TV show.

NBC estimated that the value of the TV time charges and program expense contributed by it in 1960 to candidates was nearly $1,700,000 or two-thirds more than the amount spent by political parties for NBC TV network time in 1960 (Hearings at 68); and CBS estimated the value of the uncompensated CBS radio and TV time used at over $2 million (Hearings at 36). It must be remembered, however, that some of these values relate to programs such as Person to Person, the Jack Paar Show, and the Today Show where some if not more than all the expense was borne by sponsors. Despite these expansive statistics, it is apparent that free network time was not fully utilized. NBC reported that each of the candidates refused various additional opportunities to appear (Hearings, supra at 36, 68). Dr. Frank Stan-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

ton testified that additional time worth $700,000 was offered but not accepted (Hearings, supra at 36). However, these offers were circumscribed by restrictions as to the type of program to be put on. The networks were interested almost solely in the debate pattern. Thus, of the $703,750 worth of additional time offered by CBS, $633,000 was the value of a proposed additional four hours of debates and $15,000 was the value of a half hour of Captain Kangaroo time which was withdrawn when only Senator Kennedy accepted the invitation.

A considerable measure of the expanded TV and radio coverage of the 1960 campaign arose out of the 1959 amendment exempting news and news commentary programs from the equal time provisions. This exemption seems to have been far more effective in expanding the news coverage of the 1960 election than the suspension of all equal time provisions with respect to the presidential and vice presidential races. These provisions exempting news and news commentary programs remain in effect and give promise of generally increasing interest and participation in the nation's elections.

The major consequence of the suspension of the equal time provisions was the 4 hours of great debates. There has been considerable dispute over the desirability of such debates in the format used in 1960. Proponents of such debates claim that the debates, as such (as contrasted with increased TV and radio news and news commentary coverage of the campaigns) brought about an asserted increased in the vote from 60.4 percent of eligible voters in 1956 to 64.5 percent in 1960 (hearings p. 39). However, there are opponents of the debate format who fear that voters will be led astray by the glib rather than the reasoned response, will be swayed more by debate technique than by meritorious argument, by surface charm rather than by solidity of character. Indeed, the 1 hour TV debate of 1960, with its spotty coverage of issues and its limited explorations of any one may well mark the end of debate as traditionally conceived, i.e., the examination of a question by the presentation and consideration of the arguments on both sides. The TV debate, in the form seen in 1960, may, at best, be little more than a test of forensic ability and not a test of presidential energy and judgment. The debate program may nevertheless be informative and probably makes it easier for a less well known person to become better known, especially if, as in 1960, almost all competing programs are eliminated for the hour of debate.

S. 251, 88th Congress, 1st session (1963), now before the Congress, would, for the 1964 campaign for President and Vice President, again suspend the equal time provisions. S. 251 would also require somewhat more reporting to the FCC and by the FCC to the Congress than was provided for during the 1960 campaign. It would remain, as in 1960, up to broadcasters to determine what, if any, time is made available to the major party presidential and vice presidential candidates and the freedom with which the respective candidates may use the time. In the face of enormous campaign budgets, $165 to $175 million for all political campaigns in 1960 (Report of the President's Commission on Campaign Costs April 1962, p. 13), anything that will permit, with low cost to the parties, broad dissemination of political information with respect to presidential candidates is desirable. However, there is serious doubt that the broadcasters should control and limit, as they, in 1960, did in fact do, the manner in which the offered time was used.

It is to be questioned whether, as a condition to obtaining free TV and radio time, a presidential candidate should be compelled to engage in such type of program whether in a debate format or otherwise, as the network or radio station may choose. Indeed, if the 1960 practice were permitted to continue, free time would, at best, be made available to a presidential candidate of the Republican Party only if he could obtain an agreement from the candidate of the Democratic Party on how the two will jointly use it. This would seem to give either candidate an undesirable power to limit the availability to the other of free television and radio time, as in fact occurred in 1960 when inability of both the Republican and Democratic candidates to agree on how to use offered time (for the limited purposes made available by the networks) caused each, in essence, to deprive the other of valuable national TV network time.

There would seem little question that the voting public will benefit from becoming better acquainted through television exposure of the presidential and vice presidential candidates of the major political parties. It is, therefore, in the public interest to encourage the use of television by the candidates, to an even greater extent than the political parties can afford. Thus, it is desirable that the broadcasters contribute time to the more important candidates with only limited concern about demands for equal time by minor candidates. It would seem equally desirable and equally beneficial to the public that part of such contributed time be made available to each candidate with joint or separate use of any such time and the nature of such use being left to the judgment of the presidential (and vice-presidential) candidates and not to the broadcasters.

One or both major candidates for President in 1964 may be wholly unwilling to engage in anything like the 1960 debate. He may regard the campaign as a needed opportunity to educate the electorate for long-range purposes by a series of coordinated talks. He may regard the campaign as an opportunity so to commit other candidates to particular policies as to make them unavailable as opponents in later campaigns, as did Lincoln in his debates with Douglas.

In view of the fact, therefore, that there may be basic differences between candidates with respect to the best way to use broadcast time, some thought should be given to limitations on the right of the broadcaster to control the method of use of any time it makes available under the proposed equal time suspension. In 1960, in effect, if the candidates had not participated in a confrontation, little would have come of the equal time suspension.

In the 86th Congress, nearly half the Senate supported S. 3171 which required broadcasters to allocate without cost to the presidential nominees of the major parties for their personal use 1 hour a week for the months of September and October. However, strong opposition of the broadcasting industry resulted in adoption of only the apparently innocuous waiver of the equal-time provision—a waiver which left control of the use of the time and, therefore, even its very availability in the hands of the broadcasters.

The refusal by both candidates in 1960 of additional debate time, their subsequent use of paid television and radio time and the above cited costs of 1960 TV and radio time demonstrate that the equal-time waiver of 1960 did not significantly ease the economic burdens nor provide a medium for real communication to the electorate. Techniques of use of TV and radio media are still quite new and developing, and it seems quite inappropriate for the broadcasters to control this development as against having that control in the next President and his staff. The candidates and the parties, as well as the broadcasters, should participate in the judgment as to the method of use and any legislation adopted with respect to 1964 should mandate this. The legislation might properly declare that it is not in the public interest for broadcasters to place limitations as to format and on joint or separate appearances with respect to any time made available without cost to any candidate or candidates. An exception might be made for regularly scheduled programs, e.g., year-round news and interview programs where the candidate may be required to submit to the usual format. Of course, if the candidates wish them, the time can be used for debates.

The suspension of the equal-time provisions should, moreover, be limited to free time and should be expressly made not applicable to paid time. Thus broadcasters would be required to afford equal opportunity with respect to any paid time used by candidates.

The usefulness of the media in campaigns is apparent and use should be encouraged by making more broadcast time available to presidential and vice-presidential candidates with less drain on political budgets. An equal-time suspension concept is, therefore, approved subject to the comments here expressed. Experimentation is necessary, however, and only short-term legislation expiring with the end of the 1964 campaigns should be enacted.

Respectfully submitted.

Committee on Federal Legislation: Edwin L. Gasperini, Chairman, Howard J. Aibel, Sidney H. Asch, George H. Cain, Joseph Calderon, Donald J. Cohn, Louis A. Craco, Benjamin F. Crane, Nanette Dembitz, William G. Fennell, Barry H. Garfinkel, Richard A. Givens, Elliott H. Goodwin, Sedgwick W. Green, H. Melville Hicks, Jr., Robert M. Kaufman, Lawrence W. Keepnews, Robert A. Koch, George Minkin, Peter G. Schmidt, Telford Taylor, Everett I. Willis.

---

[1] Since 1959, there has been exempted from this requirement of equal opportunity broadcast time devoted to appearances of candidates on bona fide newscasts when the appearances of the candidate are incidental to the presentation of the news. Public Law 86–274, sec. 1, 73 Stat. 557 (1959), 86th Cong.

[2] The provisions of sec. 315(a) which were so suspended are as follows:

"SEC. 15(a). If any licensee shall permit any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station, he shall afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station: *Provided*, That such licensee shall have no power of censorship over the material broadcast under the provisions of this section. No obligation is imposed upon any license to allow the use of its station by any such candidate."

Public Law 86-677 simply provided as follows:

"That that part of section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, which requires any licensee of a broadcast station who permits any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station to afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station, is suspended for the period of the 1960 presidential and vice-presidential campaigns with respect to nominees for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States. Nothing in the foregoing shall be construed as relieving broadcasters from the obligation imposed upon them under this Act to operate in the public interest."

Public Law 86-677 also contained a requirement that the Federal Communications Commission report to the Congress as to the manner in which the suspension operated.

[3] Some stations by rerunning the tapes devoted more time to the debates than the time required to broadcast them.

Tiny West Virginia Town Was Site of First Heavyweight Championship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, an article in a recent issue of the Weirton, W. Va., Daily Times has brought to light a fact which is important in the sporting world. The article recalls that memorable day in 1880 when Paddy Ryan and Joe Goss fought 87 rounds in what is generally believed to be the first world heavyweight championship prize fight, in the little Brooke County town of Colliers, W. Va.

Compared with contemporary prize fights, the Colliers match was a marathon of endurance and raw courage, fought with bare knuckles in broad daylight. Each knockdown constituted one round, with a 30-second rest between rounds. It took Ryan 1 hour and 27 minutes to subdue his rival and gain the winner-take-all prize of $2,000, half of which he had put up.

Two newspaper reporters who were present recorded for posterity a round-by-round account of this historic battle. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

COLLIERS SAW FIRST HEAVYWEIGHT CHAMPIONSHIP BOUT GO 87 ROUNDS

Paddy Ryan and Joe Goss were boxers. But their world was so different from that of Sonny Liston and Floyd Patterson that it defies comparison.

Back in 1880 Ryan and Goss brought fame to the town of Colliers, and that city will always be remembered as the site of the world's first heavyweight championship bout.

Since the sport of boxing was illegal, it was decided to stage the fight in Colliers so that if the need arose the contestants could easily escape the police into either Ohio or Pennsylvania.

The two warriors went at each other with bare knuckles for 87 rounds, until Goss' seconds became too tired to lift him off the ground to continue fighting.

Reprinted from the March 1943 issue of the West Virginia Review, the following article describes the background of the fight and gives a blow by blow account of the action.

PADDY WAS A CHAMPION

Up in the northern panhandle of West Virginia, oldtimers still talk about the big fight between Paddy Ryan and Joe Goss. That was a long time ago, June 1, 1880, and even those who were babes in arms at the time are now graybeards. But the story has been repeated so many times that even men who were not yet born have heard the story so often that they have come to believe that they, with their own eyes, saw Paddy Ryan, battered, bruised, bleeding, and almost blind, but still on his feet, throw back his head and crow.

It was a feeble crow more like the voice of a croupy, rain bedraggled bantam than that of a heavyweight champion of the world. The wonder is that he had a voice at all. He had just won his title after 87 rounds of grueling battle, lasting 87 minutes. He stood in the center of the ring, the victor, the first American to win the undisputed bare knuckled, heavyweight championship of the world. In the soft breeze of that June morning his colors stirred and fluttered from the post in his corner. He was king of the heavies. And, even more important, modern ring history and the championship succession dates from that Goss-Ryan bout.

Someday someone will get around to building a towering monument at Colliers, a small town in the northeastern section of Brooke County, to mark the site of that international event. And also to commemorate the start of an industry, business, or profession, the exact nature of the calling is hard to define that has yielded millions upon millions of dollars. It is the prize fight industry.

Colliers is rated in the current Rand McNally Commercial Atlas as an unincorporated town of 700. In 1880, then known as Colliers (1943) Station, its population was even smaller, but for one whole day it was the sporting capital of the world, and as long as men write about the prize ring, that town will have a place in the annals, however inaccurate the stories generally are. But on one point there is agreement * * * whatever confusion there was in the order of prize ring champs, the line is drawn after the "mill" at Colliers Station, and after the Goss-Ryan fight, the record is carried straight down with little or no confusion.

Along in the 1870's, prize fighting in America fell into a sad state of repair. The manly sport was outlawed in all the States and such fights as were staged were put on under a cloak of secrecy that calls for a brass band and much breast thumping. The other alternative was to find a section where the law enforcement officers would find it convenient to be elsewhere on the day of the fights. As carried on then, prize fighting was a bloody, brutal business. Nothing less than a finish fight satisfied the fans, and more often than not, the loser was carried out of the ring more dead than alive. Indeed in a few instances the losers were carried out by undertakers.

In those days, the fighters agreed to fight for a side bet of $1,000 each, winner take all. It took Ryan 87 grueling rounds to win a thousand dollars. Some 40 years later, in the lush days of the middle 1920's, Jack Dempsey was fighting before crowds that had paid as much as two and a half million dollars to see the show.

The Goss-Ryan fight was fought under the old London rules, bare knuckles in a dirt ring, each fall to mark the end of a round, and with an allowance of 30 seconds for rest between rounds.

Since prize fights were forbidden in each State, the officials were on the lookout for the two men, who it was rumored, were to have a bout on May 30. Both men headed for the Pittsburgh Railways and were on their way west toward Colliers which was near the Ohio State line and the Pennsylvania State line. In case they were caught fighting they could head for another State and they would not be prosecuted.

On the day before the bout Goss arrived in Steubenville where he crossed the Ohio River in a skiff and was taken by carriage to the farm home of a Mr. Snyder, two miles from Colliers Station, where he had taken quarters for the night. All during the night, men kept dropping into the town, each freight train bringing a dozen or more. The newcomers were rowdy and boisterous and created a disturbance by "high handed" refusal to pay for eatable procured at the station hotel.

This fight was held in the Martin Connors hollow close to where William Brown's home stands. The men drove in stakes and wrapped ropes around them and that was their ring. Ryan shook hands with his opponent, wished him a pleasant "Good morning," then flung his hat into the ring, waited for it to land near the center, then slipped through the ropes. Both men began to dress for the fight, a simple process of stripping off all heavy outer clothing down to long drawers, high stockings, and low stout shoes.

By that time a crowd of about 300 had gathered around the ring. Bets were offered and taken. Now the fight was on. Two reporters were on the scene, one from the Wheeling Intelligencer and the other was from the Pittsburgh Telegraph. From their combined efforts we have a blow by blow record of the fight.

The first round opened with a bit of sparring, each man feeling out the other's strength and tactics. Then Ryan opened with a blow at Goss' head. Goss parried, returned it with interest, and, after a brief skirmish, Ryan went down to avoid a clinch. That marked the end of the first round. In bare knuckle fighting, the matter of time was inconsequential, a round might last several minutes or only a few seconds. It was terminated when one of the contestants went down, even to his knees. Second round coming up. Goss forced Ryan into his corner, clinched and fell, Ryan on top. It was the same thing in the third round, though Ryan jolted Goss a bad one on the neck before he fell. The fourth round was short and sharp, ending in another dogfall.

Ryan's forehead showed a scratch in the fifth, and Goss claimed first blood. Goss lost that round, but in the sixth he landed a punch that sent Ryan sprawling, on the grass. The 7th to 12th rounds were short, sharp interchanges, Goss going down each time, either knocked off his feet or dropping to his knees to avoid a clinch. The tide turned in the thirteenth when Ryan, forcing the fighting, was knocked flat. The next five rounds were fought at close quarters, both men getting mad and taking about equal punishment.

The 19th opened slowly, but Ryan caught Goss around the neck and held him up while he delivered two telling blows under the chin.

But in the 20th, Ryan almost knocked himself out when he tossed a haymaker at his opponent, who neatly evaded it, and went to earth heavily from the force of his effort. He recovered quickly and carried the next five rounds. From the 26th to the 37th rounds the interchanges of blows were about even, though Goss went down at the end of each round to escape punishment. The hard blows were beginning to tell on Ryan. Both men were tardy in coming up for the thirty-seventh. In the 42nd round, Ryan threw himself at Goss, who evaded him, and Ryan fell heavily, for the first time he was carried to his corner. Goss claimed a foul again in the 43d. After working about 50–50 for several rounds, Goss pasted Ryan a hard one in the eye, which closed it for the rest of the fight.

From the 48th to the 61st rounds there was little variation in the fighting. In the 61st first Ryan caught his opponent, held him up and planted two powerful blows on his neck. After that round it was evident Goss did not have a chance. The fight went on. Ryan, at the call of time, would walk boldly up to Goss's corner and lash out a blow as soon as his beaten opponent was on his feet. Goss, in dropping, would almost seat himself in the chair from which he had just arisen. Goss could no longer direct his blows.

In the 80th, Goss staggered helplessly from his corner, only to meet a powerful blow which stretched him out flat. Seven more rounds were fought, Goss's seconds kept lifting him to his feet until they were tired. Goss, after striking out blindly, would sink to the ground. Ryan, badly punished and nearly blind, still walked back and forth from his corner to meet the old champion, dealing blows more remarkable for his misdirection that power.

A foul was claimed in the 87th round, and when Ryan came out at the call of time for the next round there was no one there to meet him. He stood alone in the center of the ring. Paddy Ryan was the winner, the winner of the fight and the purse of $2,000 half of which he put up—winner of the heavyweight championship of the world which was fought right here at Colliers. It was then that he tried to give the victors crow. He was cock of the walk and king of the heavies within half an hour after the fight had ended, the ring had been dismantled and the entire crowd dispersed. The battle lasting 1 hour and 27 minutes, had ended in time for the spectators to catch the early morning train back to Pittsburgh and points East. Colliers Station was left alone with the memory of its great day.

The only known person left at Colliers who saw the fight was Mrs. Flora Wright. Amen to a great day.

Copied from "The West Virginia Review" March 1943.

Letter From Birmingham City Jail by Martin Luther King, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

Letter From Birmingham City Jail

(By Martin Luther King, Jr.)

For more than 300 years the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers) has been deeply concerned about human freedom. Quaker demonstrations in the 17th century for the right of peaceful association, for the freedom of all men to worship according to their consciences and against the injustices of tyranny brought them into conflict with the established order. Some, like George Fox, were led by conscience to practice civil disobedience as a witness to the supremacy of God's commands over the dictates of men. Many were imprisoned. Their actions seemed disruptive, their demands unreasonable. But today many of the freedoms for which they stood are bulwarks of our society.

Reforms are by their very nature often unwise and untimely because they are the birthpangs of change. Many people of good will have resisted reform until their consciences overwhelmed what appeared to be their interests.

From Birmingham jail, where he was imprisoned as a participant in nonviolent demonstrations against segregation, Martin Luther King, Jr., has written the letter which follows. It was a response to a public statement of concern and caution issued by eight white religious leaders. The letter speaks powerfully of one of the great freedoms—freedom from racial discrimination—which is rooted in our religious faith and which our Nation has stood for in principle but has not yet established in practice. It is an eloquent expression of the nonviolent approach to the restructuring of our social order.

There is today an urgent need for honest, mature communication between Americans who, though they differ in color, seek relationships among all men which reflect a common belief in a God of love. In furtherance of such communication, the American Friends Service Committee publishes this letter from Martin Luther King, Jr., and the public statement which occasioned it.

Colin W. Bell,
Executive Secretary, American Friends Service Committee.

Following is a verbatim copy of the public statement directed to Martin Luther King, Jr., by eight Alabama clergymen, which occasioned his reply.

April 12, 1963.

We the undersigned clergymen are among those who, in January, issued "An Appeal for Law and Order and Common Sense," in dealing with racial problems in Alabama. We expressed understanding that honest convictions in racial matters could properly be pursued in the courts, but urged that decisions of those courts should in the meantime be peacefully obeyed.

Since that time there had been some evidence of increased forbearance and a willingness to face facts. Responsible citizens have undertaken to work on various problems which cause racial friction and unrest. In Birmingham, recent public events have given indication that we all have opportunity for a new constructive and realistic approach to racial problems.

However, we are now confronted by a series of demonstrations by some of our Negro citizens, directed and led in part by outsiders. We recognize the natural impatience of people who feel that their hopes are slow in being realized. But we are convinced that these demonstrations are unwise and untimely.

We agree rather with certain local Negro leadership which has called for honest and open negotiation of racial issues in our area. And we believe this kind of facing of issues can best be accomplished by citizens of our own metropolitan area, white and Negro, meeting with their knowledge and experience of the local situation. All of us need to face that responsibility and find proper channels for its accomplishment.

Just as we formerly pointed out that "hatred and violence have no sanction in our religious and political traditions," we also point out that such actions as incite to hatred and violence, however technically peaceful those actions may be, have not contributed to the resolution of our local problems. We do not believe that these days of new hope are days when extreme measures are justified in Birmingham.

We commend the community as a whole, and the local news media and law enforcement officials in particular, on the calm manner in which these demonstrations have been handled. We urge the public to continue to show restraint should the demonstrations continue, and the law enforcement officials to remain calm and continue to protect our city from violence.

We further strongly urge our own Negro community to withdraw support from these demonstrations, and to unite locally in working peacefully for a better Birmingham. When rights are consistently denied, a cause should be pressed in the courts and in negotiations among local leaders, and not in the streets. We appeal to both our white and Negro citizenry to observe the principles of law and order and commonsense.

Signed by: C. C. J. Carpenter, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Alabama; Joseph A. Durick, D.D., Auxiliary Bishop, Diocese of Mobile-Birmingham; Rabbi Milton L. Grafman, Temple Emanu-El, Birmingham, Ala.; Bishop Paul Hardin, Bishop of the Alabama-West Florida Conference of the Methodist Church; Bishop Nolan B. Harmon, Bishop of the North Alabama Conference of the Methodist Church; George M. Murray, D.D., LL.D., Bishop Coadjutor, Episcopal Diocese of Alabama; Edward V. Ramage, Moderator, Synod of the Alabama Presbyterian Church in the United States; and Earl Stallings, Pastor, First Baptist Church, Birmingham, Ala.

Birmingham City Jail,
April 16, 1963.

Bishop C. C. J. Carpenter.
Bishop Joseph A. Durick.
Rabbi Milton L. Grafman.
Bishop Paul Hardin.
Bishop Nolan B. Harmon.
The Reverend George M. Murray.
The Reverend Edward V. Ramage.
The Reverend Earl Stallings.

My Dear Fellow Clergymen: While confined here in the Birmingham city jail, I came across your recent statement calling our present activities "unwise and untimely." Seldom, if ever, do I pause to answer criticism of my work and ideas. If I sought to answer all of the criticisms that cross my desk, my secretaries would be engaged in little else in the course of the day and I would have no time for constructive work. But since I feel that you are men of genuine goodwill and your criticisms are sincerely set forth, I would like to answer your statement in what I hope will be patient and reasonable terms.

I think I should give the reason for my being in Birmingham, since you have been influenced by the argument of "outsiders coming in." I have the honor of serving as president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, an organization operating in every Southern State with headquarters in Atlanta, Ga. We have some 85 affiliate organizations all across the South—one being the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights. Whenever necessary and possible we share staff, educational, and financial resources with our affiliates. Several months ago our local affiliate here in Birmingham invited us to be on call to engage in a nonviolent direct action program if such were deemed necessary. We readily consented and when the hour came we lived up to our promises. So I am here, along with several members of my staff, because we were invited here. I am here because I have basic organizational ties here. Beyond this, I am in Birmingham because injustice is here. Just as the eighth century prophets left their little villages and carried their "thus saith the Lord" far beyond the boundaries of their hometown, and just as the Apostle Paul left his little village of Tarsus and carried the gospel of Jesus Christ to practically every hamlet and city of the Graeco-Roman world, I, too, am compelled to carry the gospel of freedom beyond my particular hometown. Like Paul, I must constantly respond to the Macedonian call for aid.

Moreover, I am cognizant of the interrelatedness of all communities and states. I cannot sit idly by in Atlanta and not be concerned about what happens in Birmingham. Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly affects all indirectly. Never again can we afford to live with the narrow, provincial "outside agitator" idea. Anyone who lives inside the United States can never be considered an outsider anywhere in this country.

You deplore the demonstrations that are presently taking place in Birmingham. But I am sorry that your statement did not express a similar concern for the conditions that brought the demonstrations into being. I am sure that each of you would want to go beyond the superficial social analyst who looks merely at effects, and does not grapple with underlying causes. I would not hesitate to say that it is unfortunate that so-called demonstrations are taking place in Birmingham at this time, but I would say in more emphatic terms that it is even more unfortunate that the white power structure of this city left the Negro community with no other alternative.

In any nonviolent campaign there are four basic steps: (1) collection of the facts to determine whether injustices are alive; (2) negotiation; (3) self-purification; and (4) direct action. We have gone through all of these steps in Birmingham. There can be no gainsaying of the fact that racial injustice engulfs this community. Birmingham is probably the most thoroughly segregated city in the United States. Its ugly record of police brutality is known in every section of this country. Its unjust treatment of Negroes in the courts is a notorious reality. There have been more unsolved bombings of Negro homes and churches in Birmingham than any city in this Nation. These are the hard, brutal, and unbelievable facts. On the basis of these conditions Negro leaders sought to negotiate with the city fathers. But the political leaders consistently refused to engage in good-faith negotiation.

Then came the opportunity last September to talk with some of the leaders of the economic community. In these negotiating sessions certain promises were made by the merchants—such as the promise to remove the humiliating racial signs from the stores. On the basis of these promises Reverend Shuttlesworth and the leaders of the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights agreed to call a moratorium on any type of demonstrations. As the weeks and months unfolded we realized that we were the victims of a broken promise. The signs remained. As in so many experiences of the past we were confronted with blasted hopes, and the dark shadow of a deep disappointment settled upon us. So we had no alternative except that of preparing for direct action whereby we would present our very bodies as a means of laying our case before the conscience of the local and national community. We were not unmindful of the difficulties involved. So we decided to go through a process of self-purification. We started having workshops on nonviolence and repeatedly asked ourselves the questions, "Are you able to accept blows without retaliating?" "Are you able to endure the ordeals of jail?"

We decided to set our direct action program around the Easter season, realizing that with the exception of Christmas, this was the largest shopping period of the year. Knowing that a strong economic withdrawal program would be the by-product of direct action, we felt that this was the best time to bring pressure on the merchants for the needed changes. Then it occurred to us that the March election was ahead, and so we speedily decided to postpone action until after election day. When we discovered that Mr. Connor was in the runoff, we decided again to postpone action so that the demonstrations could not be used to cloud the issues. At this time we agreed to begin our nonviolent witness the day after the runoff.

This reveals that we did not move irresponsibly into direct action. We too wanted to see Mr. Connor defeated; so we went through postponement after postponement to aid in this community need. After this we felt that direct action could be delayed no longer.

You may well ask, "Why direct action? Why sit-ins, marches, etc.? Isn't negotiation a better path?" You are exactly right in your call for negotiation. Indeed, this is the purpose of direct action. Nonviolent direct action seeks to create such a crisis and establish such creative tension that a community that has constantly refused to negotiate is forced to confront the issue. It seeks so to dramatize the issue that it can no longer be ignored. I just referred to the creation of tension as a part of the work of the nonviolent resister. This may sound rather shocking. But I must confess that I am not afraid of the word tension. I have earnestly worked and preached against violent tension, but there is a type of constructive nonviolent tension that is necessary for growth. Just as Socrates felt that it was necessary to create a tension in the mind so that individuals could rise from the bondage of myths and half-truths to the unfettered realm of creative analysis and objective appraisal, we must see the need of having nonviolent gadflies to create the kind of tension in society that will help men rise from the dark depths of prejudice and racism to the majestic heights of understanding and brotherhood. So the purpose of the direct action is to create a situation so crisis-packed that it will inevitably open the door to negotiation. We, therefore, concur with you in your call for negotiation. Too long has our beloved Southland been bogged down in the tragic attempt to live in monologue rather than dialogue.

One of the basic points in your statement is that our acts are untimely. Some have asked, "Why didn't you give the new administration time to act?" The only answer that I can give to this inquiry is that the new administration must be prodded about as much as the outgoing one before it acts. We will be sadly mistaken if we feel that the election of Mr. Boutwell will bring the millennium to Birmingham. While Mr. Boutwell is much more articulate and gentle than Mr. Connor, they are both segregationists dedicated to the task of maintaining the status quo. The hope I see in Mr. Boutwell is that he will be reasonable enough to see the futility of massive resistance to desegregation. But he will not see this without pressure from the devotees of civil rights. My friends, I must say to you that we have not made a single gain in civil rights without determined legal and nonviolent pressure. History is the long and tragic story of the fact that privileged groups seldom give up their privileges voluntarily. Individuals may see the moral light and voluntarily give up their unjust posture; but as Reinhold Niebuhr has reminded us, groups are more immoral than individuals.

We know through painful experience that freedom is never voluntarily given by the oppressor; it must be demanded by the oppressed. Frankly I have never yet engaged in a direct action movement that was "well timed," according to the timetable of those who have not suffered unduly from the disease of segregation. For years now I have heard the word "wait." It rings in the ear of every Negro with a piercing familiarity. This "wait" has almost always meant never. It has been a tranquilizing thalidomide, relieving the emotional stress for a moment, only to give birth to an ill-formed infant of frustration. We must come to see with the distinguished jurist of yesterday that "justice too long delayed is justice denied." We have waited for more than 340 years for our constitutional and God-given rights. The nations of Asia and Africa are moving with jetlike speed toward the goal of political independence, and we still creep at horse-and-buggy pace toward the gaining of a cup of coffee at a lunch counter.

I guess it is easy for those who have never felt the stinging darts of segregation to say wait. But when you have seen vicious mobs lynch your mothers and fathers at will and drown your sisters and brothers at whim; when you have seen hate-filled policemen curse, kick, brutalize, and even kill your black brothers and sisters with impunity; when you see the vast majority of your 20 million Negro brothers smothering in an airtight cage of poverty in the midst of an affluent society; when you suddenly find your tongue twisted and your speech stammering as you seek to explain to your 6-year-old daughter why she can't go to the public amusement park that has just been advertised on television, and see tears welling up in her little eyes when she is told that Funtown is closed to colored children, and see the depressing clouds of inferiority begin to form in her little mental sky, and see her begin to distort her little personality by unconsciously developing a bitterness toward white people; when you have to concoct an answer for a 5-year-old son asking in agonizing pathos: "Daddy, why do white people treat colored people so mean?"; when you take a cross-country drive and find it necessary to sleep night after night in the uncomfortable corners of your automobile because no motel will accept you; when you are humiliated day in and day out by nagging signs reading "white" men and "colored"; when your first name becomes "nigger" and your middle name becomes "boy" (however old you are) and your last name becomes "John," and when your wife and mother are never given the respected title "Mrs."; when you are harried by day and haunted by night by the fact that you are a Negro, living constantly at tiptoe stance never quite knowing what to expect next, and plagued with inner fears and outer resentments; when you are forever fighting a degenerating sense of "nobodiness"—then you will understand why we find it difficult to wait. There comes a time when the cup of endurance runs over, and men are no longer willing to be plunged into an abyss of injustice where they experience the bleakness of corroding despair. I hope, sirs, you can understand our legitimate and unavoidable impatience.

You express a great deal of anxiety over our willingness to break laws. This is certainly a legitimate concern. Since we so diligently urge people to obey the Supreme Court's decision of 1954 outlawing segregation in the public schools, it is rather strange and paradoxical to find us consciously breaking laws. One may well ask, "How can you advocate breaking some laws and obeying others?" The answer is found in the fact that there are two types of laws: There are just laws and there are unjust laws. I would be the first to advocate obeying just laws. One has not only a legal but moral responsibility to obey just laws. Conversely, one has a moral responsibility to disobey unjust laws. I would agree with Saint Augustine that "An unjust law is no law at all."

Now what is the difference between the two? How does one determine when a law is just or unjust? A just law is a man-made code that squares with the moral law or the law of God. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law. To put it in the terms of Saint Thomas Aquinas, an unjust law is a human law that is not rooted in eternal and natural law. Any law that uplifts human personality is just. Any law that degrades human personality is unjust. All segregation statutes are unjust because segregation distorts the soul and damages the personality. It gives the segregator a false sense of superiority and the segregated a false sense of inferiority. To use the words of Martin Buber, the great Jewish philosopher, segregation substitutes an "I-it" relationship for the "I-thou" relationship, and ends up relegating persons to the status of things. So segregation is not only politically, economically, and sociologically unsound, but it is morally wrong and sinful. Paul Tillich has said that sin is separation. Isn't segregation an existential expression of man's tragic separation, an expression of his awful estrangement, his terrible sinfulness? So I can urge men to obey the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court because it is morally right, and I can urge them to disobey segregation ordinances because they are morally wrong.

Let us turn to a more concrete example of just and unjust laws. An unjust law is a code that a majority inflicts on a minority that is not binding on itself. This is difference made legal. On the other hand, a just law is a code that a majority compels a minority to follow that it is willing to follow itself. This is sameness made legal.

Let me give another explanation. An unjust law is a code inflicted upon a minority which that minority had no part in enacting or creating, because they did not have the unhampered right to vote. Who can say the Legislature of Alabama which set up the segregation laws was democratically elected? Throughout the State of Alabama all types of conniving methods are used to prevent Negroes from becoming registered voters, and there are some counties without a single Negro registered to vote despite the fact that the Negro constitutes a majority of the population. Can any law set up in such a State be considered democratically structured?

These are just a few examples of unjust and just laws. There are some instances when a law is just on its face but unjust in its application. For instances, I was arrested Friday on a charge of parading without a permit. Now there is nothing wrong with an ordinance which requires a permit for a parade, but when the ordinance is used to preserve segregation and to deny citizens the first amendment privilege of peaceful assembly and peaceful protest, then it becomes unjust.

I hope you can see the distinction I am trying to point out. In no sense do I advocate evading or defying the law as the rabid segregationist would do. This would lead to anarchy. One who breaks an unjust law must do it openly, lovingly (not hatefully as the white mothers did in New Orleans when they were seen on television screaming "Nigger, nigger, nigger"), and with a willingness to accept the penalty. I submit that an individual who breaks a law that conscience tells him is unjust, and willingly accepts the penalty by staying in jail to arouse the conscience of the community over its injustice, is in reality expressing the very highest respect for law.

Of course there is nothing new about this kind of civil disobedience. It was seen sublimely in the refusal of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego to obey the laws of Nebuchadnezzar because a higher moral law was involved. It was practiced superbly by the early Christians who were willing to face hungry lions and the excruciating pain of chopping blocks, before submitting to certain unjust laws of the Roman Empire. To a degree academic freedom is a reality today because Socrates practiced civil disobedience.

We can never forget that everything Hitler did in Germany was "legal" and everything the Hungarian freedom fighters did in Hungary was "illegal." It was "illegal" to aid and comfort a Jew in Hitler's Germany. But I am sure that, if I had lived in Germany during that time, I would have aided and comforted my Jewish brothers even though it was illegal. If I lived in a Communist country today where certain principles dear to the Christian faith are suppressed, I believe I would openly advocate disobeying these antireligious laws.

I must make two honest confessions to you, my Christian and Jewish brothers. First, I must confess that over the last few years I have been gravely disappointed with the white moderate. I have almost reached the regrettable conclusion that the Negroes' great stumbling block in the stride toward freedom is not the White Citizens' "Counciler" or the Ku Klux Klanner, but the white moderate who is more devoted to "order" than to justice; who prefers a negative peace which is the absence of tension to a positive peace which is the presence of justice; who constantly says, "I agree with you in the goal you seek, but I can not agree with your methods of direct action"; who paternalistically feels that he can set the timetable for another man's freedom; who lives by the myth of time and who constantly advises the Negro to wait until a "more convenient season." Shallow understanding from people of good will is more frustrating than absolute misunderstanding from people of ill will. Lukewarm acceptance is much more bewildering than outright rejection.

I had hoped that the white moderate would understand that law and order exist for the purpose of establishing justice, and that when they fail to do this they become the dangerously structured dams that block the flow of social progress. I had hoped that the white moderate would understand that the present tension in the South is merely a necessary phase of the transition from an obnoxious negative peace, where the Negro passively accepted his unjust plight, to a substance-filled positive peace, where all men will respect the dignity and worth of human personality. Actually, we who engage in nonviolent direct action are not the creators of tension. We merely bring to the surface the hidden tension that is already alive. We bring it out in the open where it can be seen and dealt with. Like a boil that can never be cured as long as it is covered up but must be opened with all its pus-flowing ugliness to the natural medicines of air and light, injustice must likewise be exposed, with all of the tension its exposing creates, to the light of human conscience and the air of national opinion before it can be cured.

In your statement you asserted that our actions, even though peaceful, must be condemned because they precipitate violence. But can this assertion be logically made? Isn't this like condemning the robbed man because his possession of money precipitated the evil act of robbery? Isn't this like condemning Socrates because his unswerving commitment to truth and his philosophical delvings precipitated the misguided popular mind to make him drink the hemlock? Isn't this like condemning Jesus because His unique God consciousness and never-ceasing devotion to His will precipitated the evil act of crucifixion? We must come to see, as Federal courts have consistently affirmed, that it is immoral to urge an individual to withdraw his efforts to gain his basic constitutional rights because the quest precipitates violence. Society must protect the robbed and punish the robber.

I had also hoped that the white moderate would reject the myth of time. I received a letter this morning from a white brother in Texas which said: "All Christians know that the colored people will receive equal rights eventually, but is it possible that you are in too great of a religious hurry? It has taken Christianity almost 2,000 years to accomplish what it has. The teachings of Christ take time to come to earth." All that is said here grows out of a tragic misconception of time. It is the strangely irrational notion that there is something in the very flow of time that will inevitably cure all ills. Actually time is neutral. It can be used either destructively or constructively. I am coming to feel that the people of ill will have used time much more effectively than the people of good will. We will have to repent in this generation not merely for the vitriolic words and actions of the bad people, but for the appalling silence of the good people. We must come to see that human progress never rolls in on wheels of inevitability. It comes through the tireless efforts and persistent work of men willing to be coworkers with God, and without this hard work time itself becomes an ally of the forces of social stagnation.

We must use time creatively, and forever realize that the time is always ripe to do right. Now is the time to make real the promise of democracy, and transform our pending national elegy into a creative psalm of brotherhood. Now is the time to lift our national policy from the quicksand of racial injustice to the solid rock of human dignity.

You spoke of our activity in Birmingham as extreme. At first I was rather disappointed that fellow clergymen would see my nonviolent efforts as those of the extremist. I started thinking about the fact that I stand in the middle of two opposing forces in the Negro community. One is a force of complacency made up of Negroes who, as a result of long years of oppression, have been so completely drained of self-respect and a sense of "somebodiness" that they have adjusted to segregation, and of a few Negroes in the middle class who, because of a degree of academic and economic security, and because at points they profit by segregation, have unconsciously become insensitive to the problems of the masses. The other force is one of bitterness and hatred and comes perilously close to advocating violence. It is expressed in the various black nationalist groups that are springing up over the Nation, the largest and best known being Elijah Muhammad's Muslim movement. This movement is nourished by the contemporary frustration over the continued existence of racial discrimination. It is made up of people who have lost faith in America, who have absolutely repudiated Christianity, and who have concluded that the white man is an incurable "devil." I have tried to stand between these two forces saying that we need not follow the "do-nothingism" of the complacent or the hatred and despair of the black nationalist. There is the more excellent way of love and nonviolent protest. I'm grateful to God that, through the Negro church, the dimension of nonviolence entered our struggle. If this philosophy had not emerged I am convinced that by now many streets of the South would be flowing with floods of blood. And I am further convinced that if our white brothers dismiss us as "rabble rousers" and "outside agitators"—those of us who are working through the channels of nonviolent direct action—and refuse to support our nonviolent efforts, millions of Negroes, out of frustration and despair, will seek solace and security in black nationalist ideologies, a development that will lead inevitably to a frightening racial nightmare.

Oppressed people cannot remain oppressed forever. The urge for freedom will eventually come. This is what has happened to the American Negro. Something within has reminded him of his birthright of freedom; something without has reminded him that he can gain it. Consciously and unconsciously, he has been swept in by what the Germans call the Zeitgeist, and with his black brothers of Africa, and his brown and yellow brothers of Asia, South America, and the Caribbean, he is moving with a sense of cosmic urgency toward the promised land of racial justice. Recognizing this vital urge that has engulfed the Negro community, one should readily understand public demonstrations. The Negro has many pent-up resentments and latent frustrations. He has to get them out. So let him march sometime; let him have his prayer pilgrimages to the city hall; understand why he must have sit-ins and freedom rides. If his repressed emotions do not come out in these nonviolent ways, they will come out in ominous expressions of violence. This is not a threat; it is a fact of history. So I have not said to my people, "Get rid of your discontent." But I have tried to say that this normal and healthy discontent can be channeled through the creative outlet of nonviolent direct action. Now this approach is being dismissed as extremist. I must admit that I was initially disappointed in being so categorized.

But as I continued to think about the matter I gradually gained a bit of satisfaction from being considered an extremist. Was not Jesus an extremist in love? "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, pray for them that despitefully use you." Was not Amos an extremist for justice—"Let justice roll down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream." Was not Paul an extremist for the gospel of Jesus Christ—"I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus." Was not Martin Luther an extremist—"Here I stand; I can do none other than so help me God." Was not John Bunyan an extremist—"I will stay in jail to the end of my days before I make a butchery of my conscience." Was not Abraham Lincoln an extremist—"This nation cannot survive half slave and half free." Was not Thomas Jefferson an extremist—"We hold these truths to be self evident that all men are created equal." So the question is not whether we will be extremist but what kind of extremist will we be. Will we be extremists for hate or will we be extremists for love? Will we be extremists for the preservation of injustice—or will we be extremists for the cause of justice? In that dramatic scene on Calvary's hill three men were crucified. We must never forget that all three were crucified for the same crime—the crime of extremism. Two were extremists for immorality, and thus fell below their environment. The other, Jesus Christ, was an extremist for love, truth, and goodness, and thereby rose above His environment. So, after all, maybe the South, the Nation, and the world are in dire need of creative extremists.

I had hoped that the white moderate would see this. Maybe I was too optimistic. Maybe I expected too much. I guess I should have realized that few members of a race that has oppressed another race can understand or appreciate the deep groans and passionate yearnings of those that have been oppressed, and still fewer have the vision to see that injustice must be rooted out by strong, persistent, and determined action. I am thankful, however, that some of our white brothers have grasped the meaning of this social revolution and committed themselves to it. They are still all too small in quantity, but they are big in quality. Some like Ralph McGill, Lillian Smith, Harry Golden, and James Dabbs have written about our struggle in eloquent, prophetic, and understanding terms. Others have marched with us down nameless streets of the South. They have languished in filthy, roach-infested jails, suffering the abuse and brutality of angry policemen who see them as "dirty nigger lovers." They, unlike so many of their moderate brothers and sisters, have recognized the urgency of the moment and sensed the need for powerful action antidotes to combat the disease of segregation.

Let me rush on to mention my other disappointment. I have been so greatly disappointed with the white church and its leadership. Of course there are some notable exceptions. I am not unmindful of the fact that each of you has taken some significant stands on this issue. I commend you, Reverend Stallings, for your Christian stand on this past Sunday, in welcoming Negroes to your worship service on a nonsegregated basis. I commend the Catholic leaders of this State for integrating Springhill College several years ago.

But despite these notable exceptions I must honestly reiterate that I have been disappointed with the church. I do not say that as one of those negative critics who can always find something wrong with the church. I say it as a minister of the gospel, who loves the church; who was nurtured in its bosom; who has been sustained by its spiritual blessings and who will remain true to it as long as the cord of life shall lengthen.

I had the strange feeling when I was suddenly catapulted into the leadership of the bus protest in Montgomery several years ago that we would have the support of the white church. I felt that the white ministers, priests, and rabbis of the South would be some of our strongest allies. Instead, some have been outright opponents, refusing to understand the freedom movement and misrepresenting its leaders; all too many others have been more cautious than courageous and have remained silent behind the anesthetizing security of stained glass windows.

In spite of my shattered dreams of the past, I came to Birmingham with the hope that the white religious leadership of this community would see the justice of our cause and, with deep moral concern, serve as the channel through which our just grievances could get to the power structure. I had hoped that each of you would understand. But again I have been disappointed.

I have heard numerous religious leaders of the South call upon their worshippers to comply with a desegregation decision because it is the law, but I have longed to hear white ministers say follow this decree because integration is morally right and the Negro is your brother. In the midst of blatant injustices inflicted upon the Negro, I have watched white churches stand on the sideline and merely mouth pious irrelevancies and sanctimonious trivialities. In the midst of a mighty struggle to rid our Nation of racial and economic injustice, I have heard so many ministers say, "Those are social issues with which the gospel has no real concern," and I have watched so many churches commit themselves to a completely otherworldly religion which made a strange distinction between body and soul, the sacred and the secular.

So here we are moving toward the exit of the 20th century with a religious community largely adjusted to the status quo, standing as a taillight behind other community agencies rather than a headlight leading men to higher levels of justice.

I have traveled the length and breadth of Alabama, Mississippi, and all the other Southern States. On sweltering summer days and crisp autumn mornings I have looked at her beautiful churches with their spires pointing heavenward. I have beheld the impressive outlay of her massive religious education buildings. Over and over again I have found myself asking: "Who worships here? Who is their God? Where were their voices when the lips of Governor Barnett dripped with words of interposition and nullification? Where were they when Governor Wallace gave the clarion call for defiance and hatred? Where were their voices of support when tired, bruised, and weary Negro men and women decided to rise from the dark dungeons of complacency to the bright hills of creative protests"?

Yes, these questions are still in my mind. In deep disappointment, I have wept over the laxity of the church. But be assured that my tears have been tears of love. There can be no deep disappointment where there is not deep love. Yes, I love the church; I love her sacred walls. How could I do otherwise? I am in the rather unique position of being the son, the grandson, and the great grandson of preachers. Yes, I see the church as the body of Christ. But, oh how we have blemished and scarred that body through social neglect and fear of being nonconformist.

There was a time when the church was very powerful. It was during that period when the early Christians rejoiced when they were deemed worthy to suffer for what they believed. In those days the church was not merely a thermometer that recorded the ideas and principles of popular opinion; it was a thermostat that transformed the mores of society. Wherever the early Christians entered a town the power structure got disturbed and immediately sought to convict them for being "disturbers of the peace" and "outside agitators." But they went on with the conviction that they were a "colony of heaven" and had to obey God rather than man. They were small in number but big in commitment. They were too God-intoxicated to be "astronomically intimidated." They brought an end to such ancient evils as infanticide and gladiatorial contest.

Things are different now. The contemporary church is so often a weak, ineffectual voice with an uncertain sound. It is so often the arch-supporter of the status quo. Far from being disturbed by the presence of the church, the power structure of the average community is consoled by the church's silent and often vocal sanction of things as they are.

But the judgment of God is upon the church as never before. If the church of today does not recapture the sacrificial spirt of the early church, it will lose its authentic ring, forfeit the loyalty of millions, and be dismissed as an irrelevant social club with no meaning for the 20th century. I am meeting young people every day whose disappointment with the church has risen to outright disgust.

Maybe again I have been too optimistic. Is organized religion too inextricably bound to the status quo to save our Nation and the world? Maybe I must turn my faith to the inner spiritual church, the church within the church, as the true ecclesia and the hope of the world. But again I am thankful to God that some noble souls from the ranks or organized religion have broken loose from the paralyzing chains of conformity and joined us as active partners in the struggle for freedom. They have left their secure congregations and walked the streets of Albany, Ga., with us. They have gone through the highways of the South on tortuous rides for freedom. Yes, they have gone to jail with us. Some have been kicked out of their churches and lost the support of their bishops and fellow ministers. But they have gone with the faith that right defeated is stronger than evil triumphant. These men have been the leaven in the lump of the race. Their witness has been the spiritual salt that has preserved the true meaning of the Gospel in these troubled times. They have carved a tunnel of hope through the dark mountain of disappointment.

I hope the church as a whole will meet the challenge of this decisive hour. But even if the church does not come to the aid of justice, I have no despair about the future. I have no fear about the outcome of our struggle in Birmingham, even if our motives are presently misunderstood. We will reach the goal of freedom in Birmingham and all over the Nation, because the goal of America is freedom. Abused and scorned though we may be, our destiny is tied up with the destiny of America. Before the pilgrims landed at Plymouth, we were here. Before the pen of Jefferson etched across the pages of history the majestic words of the Declaration of Independence, we were here. For more than 2 centuries our foreparents labored in this country without wages; they made cotton "king"; and they built the homes of their masters in the midst of brutal injustice and shameful humiliation—and yet out of a bottomless vitality they continued to thrive and develop. If the inexpressible cruelties of slavery could not stop us, the opposition we now face will surely fail. We will win our freedom because the sacred heritage of our Nation and the eternal will of God are embodied in our echoing demands.

I must close now. But before closing I am impelled to mention one other point in your statement that troubled me profoundly. You warmly commended the Birminigham police force for keeping "order" and "preventing violence." I don't believe you would have so warmly commended the police force if you had seen its angry violent dogs literally biting six unarmed, nonviolent Negroes. I don't believe you would so quickly commend the policemen if you would observe their ugly and inhuman treatment of Negroes here in the city jail; if you would watch them push and curse old Negro women and young Negro girls; if you would see them slap and kick old Negro men and young Negro boys; if you will observe them, as they did on two occasions, refuse to give us food because we wanted to sing our grace together. I'm sorry that I can't join you in your praise for the police department.

It is true that they have been rather disciplined in their public handling of the demonstrators. In this sense they have been rather publicly "nonviolent." But for what purpose? To preserve the evil system of segregation. Over the last few years I have consistently preached that nonviolence demands that the means we use must be as pure as the ends we seek. So I have tried to make it clear that it is wrong to use immoral means to attain moral ends. But now I must affirm that it is just as wrong, or even more so, to use moral means to preserve immoral ends. Maybe Mr. Connor and his policement have been rather publicly nonviolent, as Chief Prichett was in Albany, Ga., but they have used the moral means of nonviolence to maintain the immoral end of flagrant racial injustice. T. S. Eliot has said that there is no greater treason than to do the right deed for the wrong reason.

I wish you had commended the Negro sitinners and demonstrators of Birmingham for their sublime courage, their willingness to suffer, and their amazing discipline in the midst of the most inhuman provocation. One day the South will recognize its real heroes. They will be the James Merediths, courageously and with a majestic sense of purpose, facing jeering and hostile mobs and the agonizing loneliness that characterizes the life of the pioneer. They will be old, oppressed, battered Negro women, symbolized in a 72-year-old woman of Montgomery, Ala., who rose up with a sense of dignity and with her people decided not to ride the segregated buses, and responded to one who inquired about her tiredness with ungrammatical profundity: "My feets is tired, but my soul is rested." They will be young high school and college students, young ministers of the gospel and a host of the elders, courageously and nonviolently sitting in at lunch counters and willingly going to jail for conscience sake. One day the South will know that when these disinherited children of God sat down at lunch counters they were in reality standing up for the best in the American dream and the most sacred values in our Judeo-Christian heritage, and thus carrying our whole Nation back to great wells of democracy which were dug deep by the Founding Fathers in the formulation of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.

Never before have I written a letter this long (or should I say a book?). I'm afraid that it is much too long to take your precious time. I can assure you that it would have been much shorter if I had been writing from a comfortable desk, but what else is there to do when you are alone for days in the dull monotony of a narrow jail cell other than write long letters, think strange thoughts, and pray long prayers?

If I have said anything in this letter that is an overstatement of the truth and is indicative of an unreasonable impatience, I beg you to forgive me. If I have said anything in this letter that is an understatement of the truth and is indicative of my having a patience that makes me patient with anything less than brotherhood, I beg God to forgive me.

I hope this letter finds you strong in the faith. I also hope that circumstances will soon make it possible for me to meet each of you, not as an integrationist or a civil rights leader, but as a fellow clergyman and a Christian brother. Let us all hope that the dark clouds of racial prejudice will soon pass away and the deep fog of misunderstanding will be lifted from our fear-drenched communities and in some not too distant tomorrow the radiant stars of love and brotherhood will shine over our great Nation with all of their scintillating beauty.

Yours for the cause of peace and brotherhood.

MARTIN LUTHER KING, Jr.

Duty of the Supreme Court: Maintenance of God's Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the attached sermon of the Reverend Walter M. Haushalter, LL.D., rector, St. Luke and the Epiphany entitled "Duty of the Supreme Court: Maintenance of God's Religion."

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DUTY OF THE SUPREME COURT: MAINTENANCE OF GOD'S RELIGION

(By the Reverend Walter M. Haushalter, LL.D., rector, Episcopal Church of St. Luke and the Epiphany, June 1963, Philadelphia)

"Behold with what folly and how little wisdom the world is governed." These words, rightly attributed to several astute statesmen including Dean Inge, Richelieu, Lord Chatham, come originally from Pope Julius Third. Once visited by his old friend, Frater John of the novitiate days, the Pope conducted him from the throne room to his private quarters. They reminisced over the merriment hours of the old monastery when they relieved the austerities of the day with song and laughter. "Come, John, let us make merry again. From what a Pope can know of monarchs and cardinals let us laugh and behold with what folly and how little wisdom the world is governed."

Regarding recent decisions of the Supreme Court as to prayer in public schools, neutrality of the American Government to the affairs of God, and secularization of our national culture, we fall back on the timeless words of Julius III, as did Dean Inge and Richelieu when sore beset—"Behold with what folly and how little wisdom the world is governed." What superior insights enable the present Supreme Court to see in the Constitution what Marshall, Taney, Chase, and 170 years of wise judges never saw? Justice Owen J. Roberts was a lifetime communicant of St. Luke and the Epiphany. As his rector for some years I never heard him pronounce for secularism and neutrality in the affairs of God. He and the judges of 170 years of our history would be horrified at the present Supreme Court reading into the Constitution what they were never able to discipher there. Most of the writers and interpreters of the Constitution for 170 years were solid churchmen whose basic assumption was that American culture and government were religious, not secular, and that America belongs to God.

Anyone who believes in God and the beauties of religion for our education and national affairs had best prepare to meet head-on the contention that the former Supreme Court Judges and the framers of the Constitution lived in the shabby horse-and-buggy days and their opinions are an impertinence in the present. Along with Moses and the Ten Commandments the liberal secularists will dismiss you to the dim shadows, prenatal to the birth of our age of glory, of peace and security perpetual, as built by the sheer power of secular man with no help from God. We who believe in God, the vast number of American Jews, Catholics, and Protestants, must be prepared to parry the thrusts of clever but shallow and decadent secularism, come out of our corners fighting, and set up sanity and religion as did our forefathers. The stakes in the struggle are high, the very survival of the Nation.

When the law-giver Moses, with sweat, blood, and tears, led his people out of Egyptian slavery he found himself at the head of one vast problem. His people were not a cohesive nation but a mere aggregation. For 30 years he beat time in the wilderness, and in those 30 bitter years he welded them into a nation by them power of religion, hardship, and an age-old remedy called suffering. When the giant came down from the terrifying experience of Sinai he carried 10 principles or articles of a national constitution graven on stone. He believed if he could get those Ten Commandments graven into the souls of his wanderlust people he could weld them into a nation able to survive in a hostile world and win immortality. If the crude iron was not able to take on the heat and the hammering into this kind of religious-tempered steel they would go down like a thousand others into the limbo of the historically forgotten. The first four articles of his national constitution dealt with God. They were to have one God and no playing around with the liberalism of many gods. They were not to worship graven images, the fruits of culture, which is the deadly road to secularism. They were not to flourish God's name in an empty fashion but really meant it when they said it. They were to set apart one day from sundown to sundown for God and his affairs. And lest they forget before the next Sabbath they were to tie these precepts on the lintels of the doorpost and the nation was to be one vast daily school of religious education. And after the angry old Moses had made an end to 20,000 worshipping a golden calf it became obvious he would permit no court to set aside his mandates.

Many of the peoples and tribes of antiquity went down, floundered, even flourished for a day, and were no more. Those nations that endured and made any contribution worth looking at, were based on rigid adherence to the Gods. The culture, art, government of Babylon were based on the worship of Bel-Merodach and Babylon lasted 2,600. The Egyptian civilization, built on the cult of Isis-Osiris-Amen lasted 3,000 years. The Greeks were deeply religious as Paul remarked on Mars Hill where the government of Pericles expelled as enemies of the state irreverent playwrights. Rome, in both Eastern and Western empires exiled or dealt death to the sacrilegious. There were no secular states in the world of antiquity, and no secular state will endure in our present raging whirlpool.

Those who witnessed the coronation of the beautiful Elizabeth II to the throne of England saw the heart of the religious state as it prevailed in Europe, France, Germany, Spain, England in all Christendom for more than a 1,000 years. The Queen knelt for the anointing, then the holy communion, then the crown to rule for the Lord until He come. The vast services of England to the modern world flow from this religious nature of government. The Pax Britannica, the untold spread of Anglo-Saxon benefits of science, art, law, the vast elevation of backward nations by missionary colonialism to China, Japan, India, Africa and the islands of the sea, these and more are the direct outflow not of sterile, decadent secularism, but of a deeply planted religion in the soul and the government of England.

One hundred million Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant believers in God affirm that the intended genius of our American Government is not secular but religious. The foundation for our faith is not merely the religious nature of the Founding Fathers, not that rulers swear hand-on-Bible to defend us, not merely a slogan "In God we trust" on our 40-cent dollar, nor the compulsion to chapel attendance at our Army, Navy, and Air Academies. The final proof of the intended religious genius of our Government is exemption of religious institutions from taxation. Seventeen decades of tax exemption mean that the propagation of religion has been subsidized by billions and billions of dollars by Government.

Why does the Supreme Court suddenly appear to upset 170 years of religious tradition and practice of government? It comes at a critical juncture of the battle of Western civilization against the anti-God of communism. It comes at the very time when Mr. J. Edgar Hoover pleads for more religious education to halt the increase in crime and subversion. The most gloomy feature of their action is that law is used to impose the will of a tiny minority of infidels on a vast majority of believers in God. Ryskind names the word "minority" the dirtiest word in the language. Virulent minorities are now on rampages in America to force compulsory congeniality on long-suffering majorities. Why not provide cotton for atheists to stuff their ears while the vast majority worship God in our public education. Thomas Jefferson saw into the future a Supreme Court that might develop into "an oligarchy of despotism," but such could happen only if the checks and balance of judicial, executive, and legislative broke down.

The intent of this article is not to provoke contempt for the Supreme Court, but rather to invite prayers and deep concern for all departments of government and our chosen leaders. The members of the Supreme Court are honorable men caught in the vast ordeal that fronts all Western civilization. Thus honorable men are unwittingly drawn to the defense of secularism which is the most decadent philosophy that ever gnawed at the vitals of a nation. Secularism is society and culture without God, moral nihilism with no staple values to save us from equating good and evil. Secularism hopes for the peaceful coexistence of God and Satan where we may snuggle down into the softness of material joys. Its deepest antagonism to Christianity is a tolerant pacifism that takes no sides for roses against weeds, lambs against wolves and ends up with frenzied hates against only their self-chosen enemies. That the Supreme Court should play into the hands of secularism calls not for derision, but pathos and prayers. When every school daily teaches children about God, the Bible, prayer, sings the national hymn and pledges allegiance you will see and know that America has recovered her destiny.

Following the coronation of George VI as King of England George Bernard Shaw was asked, "What do you think of the King?" "I do not think of the King," said Shaw. "It is the business of the King to think of me. That's what he is paid for." More seriously, we feel sure that the King, the President, the courts and legislators do not wish to bear alone the heavy burden of thinking. They will welcome our thinking of them, our prayers for them as together we work for the "maintenance of God's religion" in our fair and troubled America.

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Letter From Birmingham City Jail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call attention to the recent letter written in prison by the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., in reply to a public statement by eight Alabama clergymen. To place the issue in clear perspective. I include both the statement and answer. However, I wish to associate myself with the eloquent views expressed by Dr. King. This Congress will do well to move swiftly in implementing his message of peace and brotherhood by adopting meaningful civil rights legislation.

Dr. King's letter follows, succeeded by the public statement of the eight Alabama clergymen which occasioned Dr. King's reply.

Birmingham City Jail,
April 16, 1963.

Bishop C. C. J. Carpenter.
Bishop Joseph A. Durick.
Rabbi Milton L. Grafman.
Bishop Paul Hardin.
Bishop Nolan B. Harmon.
Rev. George M. Murray.
Rev. Edward V. Ramage.
Rev. Earl Stallings.

My Dear Fellow Clergymen: While confined here in the Birmingham city jail, I came across your recent statement calling our present activities unwise and untimely. Seldom, if ever, do I pause to answer criticism of my work and ideas. If I sought to answer all of the criticisms that cross my desk, my secretaries would be engaged in little else in the course of the day and I would have no time for constructive work. But since I feel that you are men of genuine good will and your criticisms are sincerely set forth, I would like to answer your statement in what I hope will be patient and reasonable terms.

I think I should give the reason for my being in Birmingham, since you have been influenced by the argument of outsiders coming in. I have the honor of serving as president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, an organization operating in every Southern State with headquarters in Atlanta, Ga. We have some 85 affiliate organizations all across the South—one being the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights. Whenever necessary and possible we share staff, educational, and financial resources with our affiliates. Several months ago our local affiliate here in Birmingham invited us to be on call to engage in a nonviolent direct action program if such were deemed necessary. We readily consented and when the hour came we lived up to our promises. So I am here, along with several members of my staff, because we were invited here. I am here because I have basic organizational ties here. Beyond this, I am in Birmingham because injustice is here. Just as the eighth century prophets left their little villages and carried their "thus saith the Lord" far beyond the boundaries of their hometown, and just as the Apostle Paul left his little village of Tarsus and carried the gospel of Jesus Christ to practically every hamlet and city of the Graeco-Roman world, I, too, am compelled to carry the gospel of freedom beyond my particular hometown. Like Paul, I must constantly respond to the Macedonian call for aid.

Moreover, I am cognizant of the interrelatedness of all communities and States. I cannot sit idly by in Atlanta and not be concerned about what happens in Birmingham. Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly affects all indirectly. Never again can we afford to live with the narrow, provincial outside agitator idea. Anyone who lives inside the United States can never be considered an outsider anywhere in this country.

You deplore the demonstrations that are presently taking place in Birmingham. But I am sorry that your statement did not express a similar concern for the conditions that brought the demonstrations into being. I am sure that each of you would want to go beyond the superficial social analyst who looks merely at effects, and does not grapple with underlying causes. I would not hesitate to say that it is unfortunate that so-called demonstrations are taking place in Birmingham at this time, but I would say in more emphatic terms that it is even more unfortunate that the white power structure of this city left the Negro community with no other alternative.

In any nonviolent campaign there are four basic steps: (1) collection of the facts to determine whether injustices are alive; (2) negotiation; (3) self-purification; and (4) direct action. We have gone through all of these steps in Birmingham. There can be no gainsaying of the fact that racial injustice engulfs this community. Birmingham is probably the most thoroughly segregated city in the United States. Its ugly record of police brutality is known in every section of this country. Its unjust treatment of Negroes in the courts is a notorious reality. There have been more unsolved bombings of Negro homes and churches in Birmingham than any city in this Nation. These are the hard, brutal, and unbelievable facts. On the basis of these conditions Negro leaders sought to negotiate with the city fathers. But the political leaders consistently refused to engage in good faith negotiation.

Then came the opportunity last September to talk with some of the leaders of the economic community. In these negotiating sessions certain promises were made by the merchants—such as the promise to remove the humiliating racial signs from the stores. On the basis of these promises Reverend Shuttlesworth and the leaders of the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights agreed to call a moratorium on any type of demonstrations. As the weeks and months unfolded we realized that we were the victims of a broken promise. The signs remained. As in so many experiences of the past we were confronted with blasted hopes, and the dark shadow of a deep disappointment settled upon us. So we had no alternative except that of preparing for direct action, whereby we would present our very bodies as a means of laying our case before the conscience of the local and national community. We were not unmindful of the difficulties involved. So we decided to go through a process of self-purification. We started having workshops on nonviolence and repeatedly asked ourselves the questions, "Are you able to accept blows without retaliating?" Are you able to endure the ordeals of jail?"

We decided to set our direct action program around the Easter season, realizing that with the exception of Christmas, this was the largest shopping period of the year. Knowing that a strong economic withdrawal program would be the byproduct of direct action, we felt that this was the best time to bring pressure on the merchants for the needed changes. Then it occurred to us that the March election was ahead, and so we speedily decided to postpone action until after election day. When we discovered that Mr. Connor was in the runoff, we decided again to postpone action so that the demonstrations could not be used to cloud the issues. At this time we agreed to begin our nonviolent witness the day after the runoff.

This reveals that we did not move irresponsibly into direct action. We too wanted to see Mr. Connor defeated; so we went through postponement after postponement to aid in this community need. After this we felt that direct action could be delayed no longer.

You may well ask, "Why direct action? Why sitins, marches, et cetera? Isn't negotiation a better path?" You are exactly right in your call for negotiation. Indeed, this is the purpose of direct action. Nonviolent direct action seeks to create such a crisis and establish such creative tension that a community that has constantly refused to negotiate is forced to confront the issue. It seeks so to dramatize the issue that it can no longer be ignored. I just referred to the creation of tension as a part of the work of the nonviolent resister. This may sound rather shocking. But I must confess that I am not afraid of the word "tension." I have earnestly worked and preached against violent tension, but there is a type of constructive nonviolent tension that is necessary for growth. Just as Socrates felt that it was necessary to create a tension in the mind so that individuals could rise from the bondage of myths and half-truths to the unfettered realm of creative analysis and objective appraisal, we must see the need of having nonviolent gadflies to create the kind of tension in society that will help men rise from the dark depths of prejudice and racism to the majestic heights of understanding and brotherhood. So the purpose of the direct action is to create a situation so crisis packed that it will inevitably open the door to negotiation. We, therefore, concur with you in your call for negotiation. Too long has our beloved Southland been bogged down in the tragic attempt to live in monolog rather than dialog.

One of the basic points in your statement is that our acts are untimely. Some have asked, "Why didn't you give the new administration time to act?" The only answer that I can give to this inquiry is that the new administration must be prodded about as much as the outgoing one before it acts. We will be sadly mistaken if we feel that the election of Mr. Boutwell will bring the millennium to Birmingham. While Mr. Boutwell is much more articulate and gentle than Mr. Connor, they are both segregationists dedicated to the task of maintaining the status quo. The hope I see in Mr. Boutwell is that he will be reasonable enough to see the futility of massive resistance to desegregation. But he will not see this without pressure from the devotees of civil rights. My friends, I must say to you that we have not made a single gain in civil rights without determined legal and nonviolent pressure. History is the long and tragic story of the fact that privileged groups seldom give up their privileges voluntarily. Individuals may see the moral light and voluntarily give up their unjust posture; but as Reinhold Niebuhr has reminded us, groups are more immoral than individuals.

We know through painful experience that freedom is never voluntarily given by the oppressor; it must be demanded by the oppressed. Frankly I have never yet engaged in a direct action movement that was "well timed," according to the timetable of those who have not suffered unduly from the disease of segregation. For years now I have heard the word "wait." It rings in the ear of every Negro with a piercing familiarity. This "wait" has almost always meant never. It has been a tranquilizing thalidomide, relieving the emotional stress for a moment, only to give birth to an ill-formed infant of frustration. We must come to see with the distinguished jurist of yesterday that "justice too long delayed is justice denied." We have waited for more than 340 years for our constitutional and God-given rights. The nations of Asia and Africa are moving with jet-like speed toward the goal of political independence, and we still creep at horse and buggy pace toward the gaining of a cup of coffee at a lunch counter.

I guess it is easy for those who have never felt the stinging darts of segregation to say "Wait." But when you have seen vicious mobs lynch your mothers and fathers at will and drown your sisters and brothers at whim; when you have seen hate-filled policemen curse, kick, brutalize, and even kill your black brothers and sisters with impunity; when you see the vast majority of your 20 million Negro brothers smothering in an airtight cage of poverty in the midst of an affluent society; when you suddenly find your tongue twisted and your speech stammering as you seek to explain to your 6-year-old daughter why she can't go to the public amusement park that has just been advertised on television, and see tears welling up in her little eyes when she is told that Funtown is closed to colored children, and see the depressing clouds of inferiority begin to form in her little mental sky, and see her begin to distort her little personality by unconsciously developing a bitterness toward white people; when you have to concoct an answer for a 5-year-old son asking in agonizing pathos: "Daddy, why do white people treat colored people so mean?"; when you take a cross-country drive and find it necessary to sleep night after night in the uncomfortable corners of your automobile because no motel will accept you; when you are humiliated day in and day out by nagging signs reading "white" men and "colored"; when your first name becomes "nigger" and your middle name becomes "boy" (however old you are) and your last name becomes "John," and when your wife and mother are never given the respected title "Mrs."; when you are harried by day and haunted by night by the fact that you are a Negro, living constantly at tip-toe stance never quite knowing what to expect next, and plagued with inner fears and outer resentmenst; when you are forever fighting a degenerating sense of "nobodiness"; then you will understand why we find it difficult to wait. There comes a time when the cup of endurance runs over, and men are no longer willing to be plunged into an abyss of injustice where they experience the bleakness of corroding despair. I hope, sirs, you can understand our legitimate and unavoidable impatience.

You express a great deal of anxiety over our willingness to break laws. This is certainly a legitimate concern. Since we so diligently urge people to obey the Supreme Court's decision of 1954 outlawing segregation in the public schools, it is rather strange and paradoxical to find us consciously breaking laws. One may well ask, "How can you advocate breaking some laws and obeying others?" The answer is found in the fact that there are two types of laws: There are just laws and there are unjust laws. I would be the first to advocate obeyiñg just laws. One has not only a legal but moral responsibility to obey just laws. Conversely, one has a moral responsibility to disobey unjust laws. I would agree with St. Augustine that "An unjust law is no law at all."

Now what is the difference between the two? How does one determine when a law is just or unjust? A just law is a man-made code that squares with the moral law or the law of God. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law. To put it in the terms of St. Thomas Aquinas, an unjust law is a human law that is not rooted in eternal and natural law. Any law that uplifts human personality is just. Any law that degrades human personality is unjust. All segregation statutes are unjust because segregation distorts the soul and damages the personality. It gives the segregator a false sense of superiority and the segregated a false sense of inferiority. To use the words of Martin Buber, the great Jewish philosopher, segregation substitutes an "I-it" relationship for the "I-thou" relationship, and ends up relegating persons to the status of things. So segregation is not only politically, economically, and sociologically unsound, but it is morally wrong and sinful. Paul Tillich has said that sin is separation. Isn't segregation an existential expression of man's tragic separation, an expression of his awful estrangement, his terrible sinfulness? So I can urge men to obey the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court because it is morally right, and I can urge them to disobey segregation ordinances because they are morally wrong.

Let us turn to a more concrete example of just and unjust laws. An unjust law is a code that a majority inflicts on a minority that is not binding on itself. This is difference made legal. On the other hand a just law is a code that a majority compels a minority to follow that it is willing to follow itself. This is sameness made legal.

Let me give another explanation. An unjust law is a code inflicted upon a minority which that minority had no part in enacting or creating because they did not have the unhampered right to vote. Who can say the Legislature of Alabama which set up the segregation laws was democratically elected? Throughout the State of Alabama all types of conniving methods are used to prevent Negroes from becoming registered voters and there are some counties without a single Negro registered to vote despite the fact that the Negro constitutes a majority of the population. Can any law set up in such a State be considered democratically structured?

These are just a few examples of unjust and just laws. There are some instances when a law is just on its face but unjust in its application. For instance, I was arrested Friday on a charge of parading without a permit. Now there is nothing wrong with an ordinance which requires a permit for a parade, but when the ordinance is used to preserve segregation and to deny citizens the first amendment privilege of peaceful assembly and peaceful protest, then it becomes unjust.

I hope you can see the distinction I am trying to point out. In no sense do I advocate evading or defying the law as the rabid segregationist would do. This would lead to anarchy. One who breaks an unjust law must do it openly, lovingly (not hatefully as the white mothers did in New Orleans when they were seen on television screaming "nigger, nigger, nigger") and with a willingness to accept the penalty. I submit that an individual who breaks a law that conscience tells him is unjust, and willingly accepts the penalty by staying in jail to arouse the conscience of the community over its injustice, is in reality expressing the very highest respect for law.

Of course there is nothing new about this kind of civil disobedience. It was seen sublimely in the refusal of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego to obey the laws of Nebuchadnezzar because a higher moral law was involved. It was practiced superbly by the early Christians who were willing to face hungry lions and the excruciating pain of chopping blocks, before submitting to certain unjust laws of the Roman Empire. To a degree academic freedom is a reality today because Socrates practiced civil disobedience.

We can never forget that everything Hitler did in Germany was legal and everything the Hungarian freedom fighters did in Hungary was illegal. It was illegal to aid and comfort a Jew in Hitler's Germany. But I am sure that, if I had lived in Germany during that time, I would have aided and comforted my Jewish brothers even though it was illegal. If I lived in a Communist country today where certain principles dear to the Christian faith are suppressed, I believe I would openly advocate disobeying these antireligious laws.

I must make two honest confessions to you, my Christian and Jewish brothers. First I must confess that over the last few years I have been gravely disappointed with the white moderate. I have almost reached the regrettable conclusion that the Negroe's great stumbling block in the stride toward freedom is not the white citizens' counciler or the Ku Klux Klanner, but the white moderate who is more devoted to order than to justice; who prefers a negative peace which is the absence of tension to a positive peace which is the presence of justice; who constantly says "I agree with you in the goal you seek, but I can't agree with your methods of direct action"; who paternalistically feels that he can set the timetable for another man's freedom; who lives by the myth of time and who constantly advises the Negro to wait until a more convenient season. Shallow understanding from people of good will is more frustrating than absolute misunderstanding from people of ill will. Lukewarm acceptance is much more bewildering than outright rejection.

I had hoped that the white moderate would understand that law and order exist, for the purpose of establishing justice, and that when they fail to do this they become the dangerously structured dams that block the flow of social progress. I had hoped that the white moderate would understand that the present tension in the South is merely a necessary phase of the transition from an obnoxious negative peace, where the Negro passively accepted his unjust plight, to a substance-filled positive peace, where all men will respect the dignity and worth of human personality. Actually, we who engage in nonviolent direct action are not the creators of tension. We merely bring to the surface the hidden tension that is already alive. We bring it out in the open where it can be seen and dealt with. Like a boil that can never be cured as long as it is covered up but must be opened with all its pus-flowing ugliness to the natural medicines of air and light, injustice must likewise be exposed, with all of the tension its exposing creates, to the light of human conscience and the air of national opinion before it can be cured.

In your statement you asserted that our actions, even though peaceful, must be condemned because they precipitate violence. But can this assertion be logically made? Isn't this like condemning the robbed man because his possession of money precipitated the evil act of robbery? Isn't this like condemning Socrates because his unswerving commitment to truth and his philosophical delvings precipitated the misguided popular mind to make him drink the hemlock? Isn't this like condemning Jesus because His unique God consciousness and never-ceasing devotion to His will precipitated the evil act of crucifixion? We must come to see, as Federal courts have consistently affirmed, that it is immoral to urge an individual to withdraw his efforts to gain his basic constitutional rights because the quest precipitates violence. Society must protect the robbed and punish the robber.

I had also hoped that the white moderate would reject the myth of time. I received a letter this morning from a white brother in Texas which said: "All Christians know that the colored people will receive equal rights eventually, but is it possible that you are in too great of a religious hurry? It has taken Christianity almost 2,000 years to accomplish what it has. The teachings of Christ take time to come to earth." All that is said here grows out of a tragic misconception of time. It is the strangely irrational notion that there is something in the very flow of time that will inevitably cure all ills. Actually time is neutral. It can be used either destructively or constructively. I am coming to feel that the people of ill will have used time much more effectively than the people of good will. We will have to repent in this generation not merely for the vitriolic words and actions of the bad people, but for the appalling silence of the good people. We must come to see that human progress never rolls in on wheels of inevitability. It comes through the tireless efforts and persistent work of men willing to be coworkers with God, and without this hard work time itself becomes an ally of the forces of social stagnation.

We must use time creatively, and forever realize that the time is always ripe to do right. Now is the time to make real the promise of democracy, and transform our pending national elegy into a creative psalm of brotherhood. Now is the time to lift our national policy from the quicksand of racial injustice to the solid rock of human dignity.

You spoke of our activity in Birmingham as extreme. At first I was rather disappointed that fellow clergymen would see my nonviolent efforts as those of the extremist. I started thinking about the fact that I stand in the middle of two opposing forces in the Negro community. One is a force of complacency made up of Negroes who, as a result of long years of oppression, have been so completely drained of self-respect and a sense of "somebodiness" that they have adjusted to segregation, and of a few Negroes in the middle class who, because of a degree of academic and economic security, and because at points the profit by segregation, have unconsciously become insensitive to the problems of the masses. The other force is one of bitterness and hatred and comes perilously close to advocating violence. It is expressed in the various black nationalist groups that are springing up over the Nation, the largest and best known being Elijah Muhammad's Muslim movement. This movement is nourished by the contemporary frustration over the continued existence of racial discrimination. It is made up of people who have lost faith in America, who have absolutely repudiated Christianity, and who have concluded that the white man is an incurable devil. I have tried to stand between these two forces saying that we need not follow the do-nothingism of the complacent or the hatred and despair of the black nationalist. There is the more excellent way of love and nonviolent protest. I'm grateful to God that, through the Negro church, the dimension of nonviolence entered our struggle. If this philosophy had not emerged I am convinced that by now many streets of the South would be flowing with floods of blood. And I am further convinced that if our white brothers dismiss us as "rabble rousers" and "outside agitators"—those of us who are working through the channels of nonviolent direct action—and refuse to support our nonviolent efforts, millions of Negroes, out of frustration and despair, will seek solace and security in black nationalist ideologies, a development that will lead inevitably to a frightening racial nightmare.

Oppressed people cannot remain oppressed forever. The urge for freedom will eventually come. This is what has happened to the American Negro. Something within has reminded him of his birthright of freedom; something without has reminded him that he can gain it. Consciously and unconsciously, he has been swept in by what the Germans call the Zeitgeist, and with his black brothers of Africa, and his brown and yellow brothers of Asia, South America, and the Caribbean, he is moving with a sense of cosmic urgency toward the promised land of racial justice. Recognizing this vital urge that has engulfed the Negro community, one should readily understand public demonstrations. The Negro has many pent-up resentments and latent frustrations. He has to get them out. So let him march sometime; let him have his prayer pilgrimages to the city hall; understand why he must have sit-ins and freedom rides. If his repressed emotions do not come out in these nonviolent ways, they will come out in ominous expressions of violence. This is not a threat; it is a fact of history. So I have not said to my people, "Get rid of your discontent." But I have tried to say that this normal and healthy discontent can be channeled through the creative outlet of nonviolent direct action. Now this approach is being dismissed as extremist. I must admit that I was initially disappointed in being so categorized.

But as I continued to think about the matter I gradually gained a bit of satisfaction from being considered an extremist. Was not Jesus an extremist in love? "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, pray for them that despitefully use you." Was not Amos an extremist for justice—"Let justice roll down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream." Was not Paul an extremist for the gospel of Jesus Christ—"I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus." Was not Martin Luther an extremist—"Here I stand; I can do none other so help me God." Was not John Bunyan an extremist—"I will stay in jail to the end of my days before I make a butchery of my conscience." Was not Abraham Lincoln an extremist—"This Nation cannot survive half slave and half free." Was not Thomas Jefferson an extremist—"We hold these truths to be self evident that all men are created equal." So the question is not whether we will be extremist but what kind of extremist will we be. Will we be extremists for hate or will we be extremists for love? Will we be extremists for the preservation of injustice—or will we be extremists for the cause of justice? In that dramatic scene on Calvary's hill three men were crucified. We must never forget that all three were crucified for the same crime—the crime of extremism. Two were extremists for immorality, and thus fell below their environment. The other, Jesus Christ, was an extremist for love, truth, and goodness, and thereby rose above His environment. So, after all, maybe the South, the Nation, and the world are in dire need of creative extremists.

I had hoped that the white moderate would see this. Maybe I was too optimistic. Maybe I expected too much. I guess I should have realized that few members of a race that has oppressed another race can understand or appreciate the deep groans and passionate yearnings of those that have been oppressed, and still fewer have the vision to see that injustice must be rooted out by strong, persistent, and determined action. I am thankful, however, that some of our white brothers have grasped the meaning of this social revolution and committed themselves to it. They are still all too small in quantity, but they are big in quality. Some like Ralph McGill, Lillian Smith, Harry Golden, and James Dabbs have written about our struggle in eloquent, prophetic, and understanding terms. Others have marched with us down nameless streets of the South. They have languished in filthy, roach-infested jails, suffering the abuse and brutality of angry policemen who see them as "dirty nigger lovers." They, unlike so many of their moderate brothers and sisters, have recognized the urgency of the moment and sensed the need for powerful action antidotes to combat the disease of segregation.

Let me rush on to mention my other disappointment. I have been so greatly disappointed with the white church and its leadership. Of course there are some notable exceptions. I am not unmindful of the fact that each of you has taken some significant stands on this issue. I commend you, Reverend Stallings, for your Christian stand on this past Sunday, in welcoming Negroes to your worship service on an nonsegregated basis. I commend the Catholic leaders of this State for integrating Springhill College several years ago.

But despite these notable exceptions I must honestly reiterate that I have been disappointed with the church. I do not say that as one of those negative critics who can always find something wrong with the church. I say it as a minister of the Gospel, who loves the church; who was nurtured in its bosom; who has been sustained by its spiritual blessings and who will remain true to it as long as the cord of life shall lengthen.

I had the strange feeling when I was suddenly catapulted into the leadership of the bus protest in Montgomery several years ago that we would have the support of the white church. I felt that the white ministers, priests, and rabbis of the South would be some of our strongest allies. Instead, some have been outright opponents, refusing to understand the freedom movement and misrepresenting its leaders; all too many others have been more cautious than courageous and have remained silent behind the anesthetizing security of stained glass windows.

In spite of my shattered dreams of the past, I came to Birmingham with the hope that the white religious leadership of this community would see the justice of our cause and, with deep moral concern, serve as the channel through which our just grievances could get to the power structure. I had hoped that each of you would understand. But again I have been disappointed.

I have heard numerous religious leaders of the South call upon their worshipers to comply with a desegregation decision because it is the law, but I have longed to hear white ministers say follow this decree because integration is morally right and the Negro is your brother. In the midst of blatant injustices inflicted upon the Negro, I have watched white churches stand on the sideline and merely mouth pious irrelevancies and sanctimonious trivialities. In the midst of a mighty struggle to rid our Nation of racial and economic injustice, I have heard so many ministers say, "Those are social issues with which the Gospel has no real concern," and I have watched so many churches commit themselves to a completely other-worldly religion which made a strange distinction between body and soul, the sacred and the secular.

So here we are moving toward the exit of the 20th century with a religious community largely adjusted to the status quo, standing as a taillight behind other community agencies rather than a headlight leading men to higher levels of justice.

I have traveled the length and breadth of Alabama, Mississippi, and all the other Southern States. On sweltering summer days and crisp autumn mornings I have looked at her beautiful churches with their spires pointing heavenward. I have beheld the impressive outlay of her massive religious education buildings. Over and over again I have found myself asking: "Who worships here? Who is their God? Where were their voices when the lips of Governor Barnett dripped with words of interposition and nullification? Where were they when Governor Wallace gave the clarion call for defiance and hatred? Where were their voices of support when tired, bruised, and weary Negro men and women decided to rise from the dark dungeons of complacency to the bright hills of creative protest?"

Yes, these questions are still in my mind. In deep disappointment, I have wept over the laxity of the church. But be assured that my tears have been tears of love. There can be no deep disappointment where there is not deep love. Yes, I love the church; I love her sacred walls. How could I do otherwise? I am in the rather unique position of being the son, the grandson, and the great grandson of preachers. Yes, I see the church as the body of Christ. But, oh, how we have blemished and scarred that body through social neglect and fear of being nonconformist.

There was a time when the church was very powerful. It was during that period when the early Christians rejoiced when they were deemed worthy to suffer for what they believed. In those days the church was not merely a thermometer that recorded the ideas and principles of popular opinion; it was a thermostat that transformed the mores of society. Wherever the early Christians entered a town the power structure got disturbed and immediately sought to convict them for being "disturbers of the peace" and "outside agitators." But they went on with the conviction that they were a colony of heaven and had to obey God rather than man. They were small in number but big in commitment. They were too God-intoxicated to be astronomically intimidated. They brought an end to such ancient evils as infanticide and gladiatorial contest.

Things are different now. The contemporary church is so often a weak, ineffectual voice with an uncertain sound. It is so often the arch-supporter of the status quo. Far from being disturbed by the presence of the church, the power structure of the average community is consoled by the church's silent and often vocal sanction of things as they are.

But the judgment of God is upon the church as never before. If the church of today does not recapture the sacrificial spirit of the early church, it will lose its authentic ring, forfeit the loyalty of millions, and be dismissed as an irrelevant social club with no meaning for the twentieth century. I am meeting young people every day whose disappointment with the church has risen to outright disgust.

Maybe again I have been too optimistic. Is organized religion too inextricably bound to the status quo to save our Nation and the world? Maybe I must turn my faith to the inner spiritual church, the church within the church, as the ecclesia and the hope of the world. But again I am thankful to God that some noble souls from the ranks of organized religion have broken loose from the paralyzing chains of conformity and joined us as active partners in the struggle for freedom. They have left their secure congregations and walked the streets of Albany, Georgia, with us. They have gone through the highways of the South on torturous rides for freedom. Yes, they have gone to jail with us. Some have been kicked out of their churches and lost the support of their bishops and fellow ministers. But they have gone with the faith that right defeated is stronger than evil triumphant. These men have been the leaven in the lump of the race. Their witness has been the spiritual salt that has preserved the true meaning of the Gospel in these troubled times. They have carved a tunnel of hope through the dark mountain of disappointment.

I hope the church as a whole will meet the challenge of this decisive hour. But even if the church does not come to the aid of justice, I have no despair about the future. I have no fear about the outcome of our struggle in Birmingham, even if our motives are presently misunderstood. We will reach the goal of freedom in Birmingham and all over the Nation, because the goal of America is freedom. Abused and scorned though we may be, our destiny is tied up with the destiny of America. Before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth, we were here. Before the pen of Jefferson etched across the pages of history the majestic words of the Declaration of Independence, we were here. For more than two centuries our foreparents labored in this country without wages; they made cotton "king"; and they built the homes of their masters in the midst of brutal injustice and shameful humiliation—and yet out of the bottomless vitality they continued to thrive and develop. If the inexpressible cruelties of slavery could not stop us, the opposition we now face will surely fail. We will win our freedom because the sacred heritage of our Nation and the eternal will of God are embodied in our echoing demands.

I must close now. But before closing I am impelled to mention one other point in your statement that troubled me profoundly. You warmly commended the Birmingham police force for keeping order and preventing violence. I don't believe you would have so warmly commended the police force if you had seen its angry violent dogs literally biting six unarmed, nonviolent Negroes. I don't believe you would so quickly commend the policemen if you would observe their ugly and inhuman treatment of Negroes here in the city jail; if you would watch them push and curse old Negro women and young Negro girls; if you would see them slap and kick old Negro men and young Negro boys; if you will observe them, as they did on two occasions, refuse to give us food because we wanted to sing our grace together. I'm sorry that I can't join you in your praise for the police department.

It is true that they have been rather disciplined in their public handling of the demonstrators. In this sense they have been rather publicly nonviolent. But for what purpose? To preserve the evil system of segregation. Over the last few years I have consistently preached that nonviolence demands that the means we use must be as pure as the ends we seek. So I have tried to make it clear that it is wrong to use immoral means to attain moral ends. But now I must affirm that it is just as wrong, or even moreso, to use moral means to preserve immoral ends. Maybe Mr. Connor and his policemen have been rather publicly nonviolent, as Chief Prichett was in Albany, Ga., but they have used the moral means of nonviolence to maintain the immoral end of flagrant racial injustice. T. S. Eliot has said that there is no greater treason than to do the right deed for the wrong reason.

I wish you had commended the Negro sit-inners and demonstrators of Birmingham for their sublime courage, their willingness to suffer, and their amazing discipline in the midst of the most inhuman provocation. One day the South will recognize its real heroes. They will be the James Merediths, courageously and with a majestic sense of purpose, facing jeering and hostile mobs and the agonizing loneliness that characterizes the life of the pioneer. They will be old, oppressed, battered Negro women, symbolized in a 72-year-old woman of Montgomery, Ala., who rose up with a sense of dignity and with her people decided not to ride the segregated buses, and responded to one who inquired about her tiredness with ungrammatical profundity: "My feets is tired, but my soul is rested." They will be young high school and college students, young ministers of the gospel and a host of the elders, courageously and nonviolently sitting in at lunch counters and willingly going to jail for conscience sake. One day the South will know that when these disinherited children of God sat down at lunch counters they were in reality standing up for the best in the American dream and the most sacred values in our Judeo-Christian heritage, and thus carrying our whole Nation back to great wells of democracy which were dug deep by the Founding Fathers in the formulation of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.

Never before have I written a letter this long (or should I say a book?). I'm afraid that it is much too long to take your precious time. I can assure you that it would have been much shorter if I had been writing from a comfortable desk, but what else is there to do when you are alone for days in the dull monotony of a narrow jail cell other than write long letters, think strange thoughts, and pray long prayers?

If I had said anything in this letter that is an overstatement of the truth and is indicative of an unreasonable impatience, I beg you to forgive me. If I have said anything in this letter that is an understatement of the truth and is indicative of my having a patience that makes me patient with anything less than brotherhood, I beg God to forgive me.

I hope this letter finds you strong in the faith. I also hope that circumstances will soon make it possible for me to meet each of you, not as an integrationist or a civil rights leader, but as a fellow clerygman and a Christian brother. Let us all hope that the dark clouds of racial prejudice will soon pass away and the deep fog of misunderstanding will be lifted from our fear-drenched communities and in some not too distant tomorrow the radiant stars of love and brotherhood will shine over our great Nation with all of their scintillating beauty.

Yours for the cause of peace and brotherhood.

MARTIN LUTHER KING, Jr.

APRIL 12, 1963.

We the undersigned clergymen are among those who, in January, issued "An Appeal for Law and Order and Commonsense," in dealing with racial problems in Alabama. We expressed understanding that honest convictions in racial matters could properly be pursued in the courts, but urged that decisions of those courts should in the meantime be peacefully obeyed.

Since that time there had been some evidence of increased forbearance and a willingness to face facts. Responsible citizens have undertaken to work on various problems which cause racial friction and unrest. In Birmingham, recent public events have given indication that we all have opportunity for a new constructive and realistic approach to racial problems.

However, we are now confronted by a series of demonstrations by some of our Negro citizens, directed and led in part by outsiders. We recognize the natural impatience of people who feel that their hopes are slow in being realized. But we are convinced that these demonstrations are unwise and untimely.

We agree rather with certain local Negro leadership which has called for honest and open negotiation of racial issues in our area. And we believe this kind of facing of issues can best be accomplished by citizens of our own metropolitan area, white and Negro, meeting with their knowledge and experience of the local situation. All of us need to face that responsibility and find proper channels for its accomplishment.

Just as we formerly pointed out that "hatred and violence have no sanction in our religious and political traditions," we also point out that such actions as incite to hatred and violence, however technically peaceful those actions may be, have not contributed to the resolution of our local problems. We do not believe that these days of new hope are days when extreme measures are justified in Birmingham.

We commend the community as a whole, and the local news media and law enforcement officials in particular, on the calm manner in which these demonstrations have been handled. We urge the public to continue to show restraint should the demonstrations continue, and the law enforcement officials to remain calm and continue to protect our city from violence.

We further strongly urge our own Negro community to withdraw support from these demonstrations, and to unite locally in working peacefully for a better Birmingham. When rights are consistently denied, a cause should be pressed in the courts and in negotiations among local leaders, and not in the streets. We appeal to both our white and Negro citizenry to observe the principles of law and order and commonsense.

Signed by: C. C. J. Carpenter, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Alabama; Joseph A. Durick, D.D., Auxiliary Bishop, Diocese of Mobile-Birmingham; Rabbi Milton L. Grafman, Temple Emanu-El, Birmingham, Ala.; Bishop Paul Hardin, Bishop of the Alabama-West Florida Conference of the Methodist Church; Bishop Nolan B. Harmon, Bishop of the North Alabama Conference of the Methodist Church; George M. Murray, D.D., LL.D., Bishop Coadjutor, Episcopal Diocese of Alabama; Edward V. Ramage, Moderator, Synod of the Alabama Presbyterian Church in the United States; Earl Stallings, Pastor, First Baptist Church, Birmingham, Ala.

Rev. Martin Luther King Writes From Birmingham City Jail—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on July 11, 1963, I brought to the attention of my colleagues the first part of an inspirational letter written on April 16, 1963, by Rev. Martin Luther King when he was confined to the Birmingham, Ala., jail.

I am now including, under leave to extend my remarks, the second part of this letter which provides great insight into the character and courage of this great leader:

BIRMINGHAM CITY JAIL,
April 13, 1963.

Bishop C. C. J. CARPENTER.
Bishop JOSEPH A. DURICK.
Rabbi MILTON L. GRAFMAN.
Bishop PAUL HARDIN.
Bishop NOLAN B. HARMON.
The Reverend GEORGE M. MURRAY.
The Reverend EDWARD V. RAMAGE.
The Reverend EARL STALLINGS.

MY DEAR FELLOW CLERGYMEN:

* * * * *

I must make two honest confessions to you, my Christian and Jewish brothers. First, I must confess that over the last few years I have been gravely disappointed with the white moderate. I have almost reached the regrettable conclusion that the Negroes' great stumbling block in the stride toward freedom is not the white citizens "counciler" or the Ku Klux Klanner, but the white moderate who is more devoted to order than to justice; who prefers a negative peace which is the absence of tension to a positive peace which is the presence of justice; who constantly says, "I agree with you in the goal you seek, but I can't agree with your methods of direct action"; who paternalistically feels that he can set the timetable for another man's freedom; who lives by the myth of time and who constantly advises the Negro to wait until a more convenient season. Shallow understanding from people of good will is more frustrating than absolute misunderstanding from people of ill will. Lukewarm acceptance is much more bewildering than outright rejection.

I had hoped that the white moderate would understand that law and order exist for the purpose of establishing justice, and that when they fail to do this they become the dangerously structured dams that block the flow of social progress. I had hoped that the white moderate would understand that the present tension in the South is merely a necessary phase of the transition from an obnoxious negative peace, where the Negro passively accepted his unjust plight, to a substance-filled positive peace, where all men will respect the dignity and worth of human personality. Actually, we who engage in nonviolent direct action are not the creators of tension. We merely bring to the surface the hidden tension that is already alive. We bring it out in the open where it can be seen and dealt with. Like a boil that can never be cured as long as it is covered up but must be opened with all its pus-flowing ugliness to the natural medicines of air and light, injustice must likewise be exposed, with all of the tension its exposing creates, to the light of human conscience and the air of national opinion before it can be cured.

In your statement you asserted that our actions, even though peaceful, must be condemned because they precipitate violence. But can this assertion be logically made? Isn't this like condemning the robbed man because his possession of money precipitated the evil act of robbery? Isn't this like condemning Socrates because his unswerving commitment to truth and his philosophical delvings precipitated the misguided popular mind to make him drink the hemlock? Isn't this like condemning Jesus because His unique God consciousness and never-ceasing devotion to His will precipitated the evil act of crucifixion? We must come to see, as Federal courts have consistently affirmed, that it is immoral to urge an individual to withdraw his efforts to gain his basic constitutional rights because the quest precipitates violence. Society must protect the robbed and punish the robber.

I had also hoped that the white moderate would reject the myth of time. I received a letter this morning from a white brother in Texas which said: "All Christians know that the colored people will receive equal rights eventually, but is it possible that you are in too great of a religious hurry? It has taken Christianity almost 2,000 years to accomplish what it has. The teachings of Christ take time to come to earth." All that is said here grows out of a tragic misconception of time. It is the strangely irrational notion that there is something in the very flow of time that will inevitably cure all ills. Actually time is neutral. It can be used either destructively or constructively. I am coming to feel that the people of ill will have used time much more effectively than the people of good will. We will have to repent in this generation not merely for the vitriolic words and actions of the bad people, but for the appalling silence of the good people. We must come to see that human progress never rolls in on wheels of inevitability. It comes through the tireless efforts and persistent work of men willing to be coworkers with God, and without this hard work time itself becomes an ally of the forces of social stagnation.

We must use time creatively, and forever realize that the time is always ripe to do right. Now is the time to make real the promise of democracy, and transform our pending national elegy into a creative psalm of brotherhood. Now is the time to lift our national policy from the quicksand of racial injustice to the solid rock of human dignity.

You spoke of our activity in Birmingham as extreme. At first I was rather disappointed that fellow clergymen would see my nonviolent efforts as those of the extremist. I started thinking about the fact that I stand in the middle of two opposing forces in the Negro community. One is a force of complacency made up of Negroes who, as a result of long years of oppression, have been so completely drained of self-respect and a sense of "somebodiness" that they have adjusted to segregation, and of a few Negroes in the middle class who, because of a degree of academic and economic security, and because at points they profit by segregation, have unconsciously become insensitive to the problems of the masses. The other force is one of bitterness and hatred and comes perilously close to advocating violence. It is expressed in the various black nationalist groups that are springing up over the Nation, the largest and best known being Elijah Muhammad's Muslim movement. This movement is nourished by the contemporary frustration over the continued existence of racial discrimination. It is made up of people who have lost faith in America, who have absolutely repudiated Christianity, and who have concluded that the white man is an incurable devil. I have tried to stand between these two forces saying that we need not follow the donothingism of the complacent or the hatred and despair of the black nationalist. There is the more excellent way of love and nonviolent protest. I'm grateful to God that, through the Negro church, the dimension of nonviolence entered our struggle. If this philosophy had not emerged I am convinced that by now many streets of the South would be flowing with floods of blood. And I am further convinced that if our white brothers dismiss us as rabble rousers and outside agitators—those of us who are working through the channels of nonviolent direct action—and refuse to support our nonviolent efforts, millions of Negroes, out of frustration and despair, will seek solace and security in black nationalist ideologies, a development that will lead inevitably to a frightening racial nightmare.

Oppressed people cannot remain oppressed forever. The urge for freedom will eventually come. This is what has happened to the American Negro. Something within has reminded him of his birthright of freedom; something without has reminded him that he can gain it. Consciously and unconsciously, he has been swept in by what the Germans call the Zeitgeist, and with his black brothers of Africa, and his brown and yellow brothers of Asia, South America, and the Caribbean, he is moving with a sense of cosmic urgency toward the promised land of racial justice. Recognizing this vital urge that has engulfed the Negro community, one should readily understand public demonstrations. The Negro has many pent-up resentments and latent frustrations. He has to get them out. So let him march sometime; let him have his prayer pilgrimages to the city hall; understand why he must have sit-ins and freedom rides. If his repressed emotions do not come out in these nonviolent ways, they will come out in ominous expressions of violence. This is not a threat; it is a fact of history. So I have not said to my people, "Get rid of your discontent." But I have tried to say that this normal and healthy discontent can be channeled through the creative outlet of nonviolent direct action. Now this approach is being dismissed as extremist. I must admit that I was initially disappointed in being so categorized.

But as I continued to think about the matter I gradually gained a bit of satisfaction from being considered an extremist. Was not Jesus an extremist in love? "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, pray for them that despitefully use you." Was not Amos an extremist for justice—"Let justice roll down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream." Was not Paul an extremist for the gospel of Jesus Christ—"I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus." Was not Martin Luther an extremist—"Here I stand; I can do none other so help me God." Was not John Bunyan an extremist—"I will stay in jail to the end of my days before I make a butchery of my conscience." Was not Abraham Lincoln an extremist—"This Nation cannot survive half slave and half free." Was not Thomas Jefferson an extremist—"We hold these truths to be self evident that all men are created equal." So the question is not whether we will be extremist but what kind of extremist will we be. Will we be extremists for hate or will we be extremists for love? Will we be extremists for the preservation of injustice—or will we be extremists for the cause of justice? In that dramatic scene on Calvary's hill three men were crucified. We must never forget that all three were crucified for the same crime—the crime of extremism. Two were extremists for immorality, and thus fell below their environment. The other, Jesus Christ, was an extremist for love, truth, and goodness, and thereby rose above His environment. So after all, maybe the South, the Nation, and the world are in dire need of creative extremists.

I had hoped that the white moderate would see this. Maybe I was too optimistic. Maybe I expected too much. I guess I should have realized that few members of a race that has oppressed another race can understand or appreciate the deep groans and passionate yearnings of those that have been oppressed, and still fewer have the vision to see that injustice must be rooted out by strong, persistent, and determined action. I am thankful, however, that some of our white brothers have grasped the meaning of this social revolution and committed themselves to it. They are still all too small in quantity, but they are big in quality. Some like Ralph McGill, Lillian Smith, Harry Golden, and James Dabbs have written about our struggle in eloquent, prophetic, and understanding terms. Others have marched with us down nameless streets of the South. They have languished in filthy, roach-infested jails, suffering the abuse and brutality of angry policemen who see them as "dirty nigger lovers." They, unlike so many of their moderate brothers and sisters, have recognized the urgency of the moment and sensed the need for powerful action antidotes to combat the disease of segregation.

Let me rush on to mention my other disappointment. I have been so greatly disappointed with the white church and its leadership. Of course there are some notable exceptions. I am not unmindful of the fact that each of you has taken some significant stands on this issue. I commend you, Reverend Stallings, for your Christian stand on this past Sunday, in welcoming Negroes to your worship service on a nonsegregated basis. I commend the Catholic leaders of this State for integrating Springhill College several years ago.

But despite these notable exceptions I must honestly reiterate that I have been disappointed with the church. I do not say that as one of those negative critics who can always find something wrong with the church. I say it as a minister of the Gospel, who loves the church; who was nurtured in its bosom; who has been sustained by its spiritual blessings and who will remain true to it as long as the cord of life shall lengthen.

I had the strange feeling when I was suddenly catapulted into the leadership of the bus protest in Montgomery several years ago that we would have the support of the white church. I felt that the white ministers, priests, and rabbis of the South would be some of our strongest allies. Instead, some have been outright opponents, refusing to understand the freedom movement and misrepresenting its leaders; all too many others have been more cautious than courageous and have remained silent behind the anesthetizing security of stained glass windows.

In spite of my shattered dreams of the past, I came to Birmingham with the hope that the white religious leadership of this community would see the justice of our cause and, with deep moral concern, serve as the channel through which our just grievances could get to the power structure. I had hoped that each of you would understand. But again I have been disappointed.

I have heard numerous religious leaders of the South call upon their worshipers to comply with a desegregation decision because it is the law, but I have longed to hear white ministers say follow this decree because integration is morally right and the Negro is your brother. In the midst of blatant injustices inflicted upon the Negro, I have watched white churches stand on the sideline and merely mouth pious irrelevancies and sanctimonious trivialities. In the midst of a mighty struggle to rid our Nation of racial and economic injustice, I have heard so many ministers say, "Those are social issues with which the Gospel has no real concern," and I have watched so many churches commit themselves to a completely other-worldly religion which made a strange distinction bebetween body and coul, the sacred and the secular.

So here we are moving toward the exit of the 20th century with a religious community largely adjusted to the status quo, standing as a taillight behind other community agencies rather than a headlight leading men to higher levels of justice.

I have traveled the length and breadth of Alabama, Mississippi, and all the other Southern States. On sweltering summer days and crisp autumn mornings I have looked at her beautiful churches with their spires pointing heavenward. I have beheld the impressive outlay of her massive religious education buildings. Over and over again I have found myself asking: "Who worships here? Who is their God? Where were their voices when the lips of Governor Barnett dripped with words of interposition and nullification? Where were they when Governor Wallace gave the clarion call for defiance and hatred? Where were their voices of support when tired, bruised, and weary Negro men and women decided to rise from the dark dungeons of complacency to the bright hills of creative protest?"

Yes, these questions are still in my mind. In deep disappointment, I have wept over the laxity of the church. But be assured that my tears have been tears of love. There can be no deep disappointment where there is not deep love. Yes, I love the church; I love her sacred walls. How could I do otherwise? I am in the rather unique position of being the son, the grandson, and the great-grandson of preachers. Yes, I see the church as the body of Christ. But, oh, how we have blemished and scarred that body through social neglect and fear of being nonconformist.

There was a time when the church was very powerful. It was during that period when the early Christians rejoiced when they were deemed worthy to suffer for what they believed. In those days the church was not merely a thermometer that recorded the ideas and principles of popular opinion; it was a thermostat that transformed the mores of society. Wherever the early Christians entered a town the power structure got disturbed and immediately sought to convict them for being "disturbers of the peace" and "outside agitators." But they went on with the conviction that they were a "colony of heaven" and had to obey God rather than man. They were small in number but big in commitment. They were too God-intoxicated to be "astronomically intimidated." They brought an end to such ancient evils as infanticide and gladiatorial contest.

Things are different now. The contemporary church is so often a weak, ineffectual voice with an uncertain sound. It is so often the archsupporter of the status quo. Far from being disturbed by the presence of the church, the power structure of the average community is consoled by the church's silent and often vocal sanction of things as they are.

But the judgment of God is upon the church as never before. If the church of today does not recapture the sacrificial spirit of the early church, it will lose its authentic ring, forfeit the loyalty of millions, and be dismissed as an irrelevant social club with no meaning for the 20th century. I am meeting young people every day whose disappointment with the church has risen to outright disgust.

Maybe again I have been too optimistic. Is organized religion too inextricably bound to the status quo to save our Nation and the world? Maybe I must turn my faith to the inner spiritual church, the church within the church, as the true ecclesia and the hope of the world. But again I am thankful to God that some noble souls from the ranks of organized religion have broken loose from the paralyzing chains of conformity and joined us as active partners in the struggle for freedom. They have left their secure congregations and walked the streets of Albany, Ga., with us. They have gone through the highways of the South on torturous rides for freedom. Yes, they have gone to jail with us. Some have been kicked out of their churches and lost the support of their bishops and fellow ministers. But they have gone with the faith that right defeated is stronger than evil triumphant. These men have been the leaven in the lump of the race. Their witness has been the spiritual salt that has preserved the true meaning of the Gospel in these troubled times. They have carved a tunnel of hope through the dark mountain of disappointment. I hope the church as a whole will meet the challenge of this decisive hour. But even if the church does not come to the aid of justice, I have no despair about the future. I have no fear about the outcome of our struggle in Birmingham, even if our motives are presently misunderstood. We will reach the goal of freedom in Birmingham and all over the Nation, because the goal of America is freedom. Abused and scorned though we may be, our destiny is tied up with the destiny of America. Before the pilgrims landed at Plymouth, we were here. Before the pen of Jefferson etched across the pages of history the majestic words of the Declaration of Independence, we were here. For more than two centuries our foreparents labored in this country without wages; they made cotton "king"; and they built the homes of their masters in the midst of brutal injustice and shameful humiliation—and yet out of a bottomless vitality they continued to thrive and develop. If the inexpressible cruelties of slavery could not stop us, the opposition we now face will surely fail. We will win our freedom because the sacred heritage of our Nation and the eternal will of God are embodied in our echoing demands.

I must close now. But before closing I am impelled to mention one other point in your statement that troubled me profoundly. You warmly commended the Birmingham police force for keeping "order" and "preventing violence." I don't believe you would have so warmly commended the police force if you had seen its angry violent dogs literally biting six unarmed, nonviolent Negroes. I don't believe you would so quickly commend the policemen if you would observe their ugly and inhuman treatment of Negroes here in the city jail; if you would watch them push and curse old Negro women and young Negro girls; if you would see them slap and kick old Negro men and young Negro boys; if you will observe them, as they did on two occasions, refuse to give us food because we wanted to sing our grace together. I'm sorry that I can't join you in your praise for the police department.

It is true that they have been rather disciplined in their public handling of the demonstrators. In this sense they have been rather publicly "nonviolent." But for what purpose? To preserve the evil system of segregation. Over the last few years I have consistently preached that nonviolence demands that the means we use must be as pure as the ends we seek. So I have tried to make it clear that it is wrong to use immoral means to attain moral ends. But now I must affirm that it is just as wrong, or even more so, to use moral means to preserve immoral ends. Maybe Mr. Connor and his policemen have been rather publicly nonviolent, as Chief Prichett was in Albany, Ga., but they have used the moral means of nonviolence to maintain the immoral end of flagrant racial injustice. T. S. Eliot has said that there is no greater treason than to do the right deed for the wrong reason.

I wish you had commended the Negro sit-inners and demonstrators of Birmingham for their sublime courage, their willingness to suffer, and their amazing discipline in the midst of the most inhuman provocation. One day the South will recognize its real heroes. They will be the James Merediths, courageously and with a majestic sense of purpose, facing jeering and hostile mobs and the agonizing loneliness that characterizes the life of the pioneer. They will be old, oppressed, battered Negro women, symbolized in a 72-year-old woman of Montgomery, Ala., who rose up with a sense of dignity and with her people decided not to ride the segregated buses, and responded to one who inquired about her tiredness with ungrammatical profundity: "My feets is tired, but my soul is rested." They will be young high school and college students, young ministers of the Gospel and a host of the elders, courageously and nonviolently sitting in at lunch counters and willingly going to jail for conscience sake. One day the South will know that when these disinherited children of God sat down at lunch counters they were in reality standing up for the best in the American dream and the most sacred values of our Judeo-Christian heritage, and thus carrying our whole Nation back to great wells of democracy which were dug deep by the Founding Fathers in the formulation of the Consitution and the Declaration of Independence.

Never before have I written a letter this long (or should I say a book?). I'm afraid that it is much too long to take your precious time. I can assure you that it would have been much shorter if I had been writing from a comfortable desk, but what else is there to do when you are alone for days in the dull monotony of a narrow jail cell other than write long letters, think strange thoughts, and pray long prayers?

If I have said anything in this letter that is an overstatement of the truth and is indicative of an unreasonable impatience, I beg you to forgive me. If I have said anything in this letter that is an understatement of the truth and is indicative of my having a patience that makes me patient with anything less than brotherhood, I beg God to forgive me.

I hope this letter finds you strong in the faith. I also hope that circumstances will soon make it possible for me to meet each of you, not as an integrationist or a civil rights leader, but as a fellow clergyman and a Christian brother. Let us all hope that the dark clouds of racial prejudice will soon pass away and the deep fog of misunderstanding will be lifted from our fear-drenched communities and in some not-too-distant tomorrow the radiant stars of love and brotherhood will shine over our great Nation with all of their scintillating beauty.

Yours for the cause of peace and brotherhood.

MARTIN LUTHER KING, Jr.

"By Any Other Name"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a perceptive editorial appearing in the Baltimore Evening Sun of June 17, 1963, entitled "By Any Other Name" referring to the quality stabilization bill, a measure which is nothing more or less than price fixing aimed at gouging the consumers, raising prices, and impairing the right of the little businessman to price his products and to conduct his business affairs in the manner he sees fit and best in his own economic interest.

This measure deserves the strong opposition of all right thinking men:

BY ANY OTHER NAME

The phrase "quality stabilizer" has a nice ring, suggesting that anybody who favors a bill with such a title probably wants to help the consumer get a decent break. The facts are quite different. The "quality stabilization" bill now before a House committee is in fact nothing other than a fair trade measure. Fair trade is another phrase that had a certain amount of appeal until consumers found out that it really meant "price-fixing."

The "quality stabilization" bill would do three things: Outlaw "bait" advertising (offering a limited supply of brand-name goods at an extraordinary low price simply to attract customers to the store); give the manufacturer the right to revoke sales rights of retailers if their advertising were misrepresentative or deceitful; and permit the manufacturer to set the retail prices of his products. The first two provisions are little more than window dressing. Irresponsible bait practices can in many cases be dealt with under existing laws; so can misrepresentative or deceitful advertising, which the Federal Trade Commission, the Better Business Bureaus and the newspapers and periodicals constantly creak down on.

The heart of the measure is the price-fixing feature. Under this provision, the owner of a brand name or trademark would be permitted to cut off any retailers who sold his product at less than the listed price. If passed and enforced vigorously it would mean the end of discount houses, of the 59-cent tube of toothpaste sold at 47 cents, of the real price competition the consumer is entitled to.

"Fair-trading" in recent years has been subject to a number of successful attacks. Only 3 years ago the Supreme Court ruled that although the manufacturer could be permitted to cut off supplies to a discounting retailer, he could not enlist the aid of wholesalers and other retailers in the effort. In the last 10 years the courts in 21 States have upset one aspect or another of State fair trade laws. The present bill is opposed by the Federal Trade Commission, the American Bar Association, the Justice Department, the American Farm Bureau Federation and the Consumers League. The opponents are absolutely right in feeling that this is no time to turn back the clock to more stringent price-fixing.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of July 13, 1963:

Washington Report

Results of questionnaire

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
FOREIGN AFFAIRS			
1. Do you approve of the current U.S. policy with regard to—			
(a) Cuba?	7	92	1
(b) Berlin?	32	57	11
(c) Laos?	9	79	12
(d) The Congo?	9	76	15
2. Do you favor continuance of our foreign aid program at its present $4,000,000,000 annual rate?	4	94	2
SOCIAL			
1. Do you favor medical care for the aged by—			
(a) Increasing social security taxes to finance such care?	5	93	2
(b) Expanding the present Federal-State (Kerr-Mills) legislation?	10	88	2
(c) Promoting a low-cost Blue Cross type plan whereby the Federal Government would assume full financial responsibility only for persons below a certain income level?	13	85	2
(d) Or do you favor private, voluntary medical plans with no Federal participation?	70	28	2
2. Do you favor a proposed Federal bill to authorize a 3-year matching grant program costing $500,000,000 to help local communities solve their urban mass transportation problem re railroad and bus transportation?	7	89	4
3. Do you favor the establishment of a federally financed Youth Conservation Corps to provide outdoor employment for young men, as a means of alleviating unemployment in this age group?	19	78	3
4. Do you favor the establishment of a Domestic-Peace Corps?	12	83	5
5. Do you approve the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs at the Cabinet level to handle housing and other predominantly city problems?	6	90	4
EDUCATION			
1. Should the Federal Government provide—			
(a) Tax allowances for parents paying the expenses of children in college?	49	47	4
(b) Tax allowances for students working their way through college?	55	41	4
(c) Or should all Federal influence be removed and individuals determine and pay for college educations for themselves or their children?	52	41	7
2. Should Federal Government funds for college student loans and scholarships be—			
(a) Increased?	14	74	12
(b) Decreased?	7	81	12
(c) Kept at existing levels?	20	68	12
(d) Eliminated?	47	41	12
3. For construction purposes should the Federal Government provide colleges and universities with—			
(a) Loans?	30	64	6
(b) Outright grants?	2	92	6
(c) Combination of both?	8	86	6
4. Do you favor a proposal of grants amounting to some $75,000,000 for construction of teaching facilities for medical, dental, and public health schools?	13	76	1
5. Do you favor Federal financial grants for assistance to elementary and secondary schools for—			
(a) School construction?	10	88	2
(b) Teachers' salaries?	6	92	2
FISCAL			
1. Do you believe the Federal Government should operate within a balanced budget?	94	4	2
2. Within a balanced budget would you approve of setting aside a certain percent of the budget receipts each fiscal year for the sole purpose of reducing the Federal debt?	94	3	3
3. Do you believe we should institute new programs and new public works at a time of deficit financing and borrow money to pay for such projects?	3	94	3
TAXES			
1. Would you favor a personal and corporate tax reduction—			
(a) Without tax reform which would mean that the Government would suffer a large net loss of income?	6	84	10
(b) Only if accompanied by compensatory tax reform and a cut in Federal spending?	80	12	8
(c) With no reform, but with a substantial cut in Federal spending?	56	26	12
(d) No reduction at this time?	46	29	25
2. Should tax reduction emphasis be in the area of—			
(a) Personal tax?	25	61	14
(b) Corporate tax?	12	74	14
3. As a basic principle, do you believe we should have a flat percentage tax rather than the present graduated income tax based on ability to pay (Alger bill, H.R. 737)?	62	30	8
4. I have also introduced a bill (H.R. 739) to repeal the withholding tax so that each person would pay his own tax. Would you favor this bill?	62	32	6
LABOR			
1. Would you favor tougher emergency strike provisions granting the President more flexibility in handling national emergency strikes by providing for back-to-work injunctions and compulsory arbitration machinery?	61	32	7
2. Would you favor new labor laws which would prevent the Federal Government from interfering with or influencing collective bargaining?	54	35	11
3. Would you approve of applying antitrust statutes to unions to break up industrywide bargaining?	35	9	6
4. Would you approve of setting Federal standards under the unemployment compensation law for State jobless benefits?	16	58	26
UNITED NATIONS			
1. Would you favor withdrawal of U.S. membership in the United Nations and creating stronger alliances with nations of the free world?	56	38	6
2. Would you favor action by the United Nations to force member nations to live up to the charter, pay their full obligations or be expelled?	94	5	1
3. Do you approve the building up and strengthening of Communist nations through U.N. member organizations such as UNESCO, WHO, and the U.N. Special Fund?	2	97	1

The people of Dallas County continue to support constitutional-limited government and believe in private and local initiative. Proof of this attitude is seen in the results of the answers to my annual questionnaire which have just been tabulated. Approximately 10 percent of those receiving the questionnaires returned them, giving me a good cross section of the thinking of the people of the Fifth District. A careful study of the returns show clearly that a majority are against increasing federally supported programs and would, instead, prefer to run their own lives and take care of their own problems at the local level.

In only one area is there evidence that the people have accepted some of the Federal propaganda that Federal support is acceptable. On the question of education, section 2, while the majority said they wanted no increase, 41 percent do not want Federal funds for college student loans eliminated, while at the time of original passage of this legislation the almost unanimous feeling in Dallas was against it. This calls for a thorough study of our thinking, it seems to me: Once we are plumped down in an ocean and want to save ourselves, the only way possible is to swim in the right direction—for shore. In trying to save our free enterprise system, we must move in the right direction, the gradual elimination of all federally supported programs.

The value of the questionnaire is demonstrated again in the opportunity it gives us to determine where most of our people agree or disagree and in helping us to evaluate our thinking in these important areas. I want to express my deep appreciation to all those who took the time and trouble to answer the questions and thus give me the benefit of their thinking.

H.R. 3846. "To establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the State and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people," was discussed in the Ways and Means Committee this week. The stated purposes of the bill are "to strengthen the health and vitality of the Nation by assuring the availability and accessibility of land and water based outdoor recreation opportunities of such quality and quantity as are necessary and desirable for the benefit and enjoyment of the people." Of course, we are all for recreation; in fact, my position in urging all our people to get more physical exercise is well known and has been the subject of comment in the House. Few oppose motorboat fuel taxes now being transferred to a fund to pay for existing waterways rather than to use for this purpose highway funds earmarked for highway construction. In approving the transfer of the motorboat fuels tax to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, I do not agree that they should be used to support a program in which the Federal Government constitutionally should have no interest. I disagree with the Federal Government embarking on a real estate purchase program—I believe it is unconstitutional. Maintaining or "strengthening health and vitality" through recreation is not the province of the Federal Government. Recreation is individual and local. At the most such activity, especially in the future development of parklands, should be a State matter. It occurs to me, that if our forefathers had depended upon the Federal Government to provide recreation and to strengthen health and vitality, the formation and development of this great land would never have been accomplished.

H.R. 3386, was also before Ways and Means. This bill would "amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through plans for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation." Certainly a worthy objective. What was not recognized in the hearings, although admitted by witnesses, is that there is a greater degree of mental retardation among illegitimate children and present Government policy encourages an increase in illegitimacy. In a pamphlet issued by HEW, titled "Unmarried Persons—a Guide to Development of Supervision in Public Welfare," we find these amazing recommendations: (1) Set up procedures to find new cases; (2) make welfare assistance easier; (3) abolish residency requirements nationwide; (4) set up social welfare lobbies to get new welfare legislation; (5) eliminate all road blocks to certifying new cases; (6) adulterers are to be known as "new partners"; (7) nowhere is religious theory used or mentioned; (8) the taxpayers' interest in saving money is "moralistic"; (9) forcing adulterers to marry is wrong; (10) need alone shall be the sole qualification for relief (need, not poverty. Need means—income minus expense); (11) every citizen has a right to welfare; (12) do not require a male adulterer to assist if he does not want to, or if it will disrupt his life; (13 eliminate illegitimate paternity as a criminal offense; (14) treat each client carefully in order that he or she will recommend others for welfare. In view of this Department policy, we should go very slowly in putting the Federal Government further into the welfare field where it should, at lest, be the minority influence.

Welcome to Bloomfield, Mr. Berman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, communities all over the Nation have come to realize that their citizens need and call for increased services. The quality of those services often is a major factor in a community's being chosen by people moving into an area.

I should like to cite some significant activity in the field of recreation in Bloomfield, N.J., where recently a highly qualified gentleman, Mr. Michael B. Berman, was appointed assistant recreation director. Recreation is not geared primarily for young people but is programed so that people of all ages may participate. The national interest, automation and the longer life span are factors which make a broad-scale recreation program in each community extremely important.

I am proud that a town in my congressional district recognizes this importance. And I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD a profile of Mr. Berman appearing in the current edition of the Bloomfield newspaper, the Independent Press:

> A face that will become familiar in the months to come, especially around the town's playgrounds, is that of the new assistant recreation director, Michael B. Berman, whose build reveals his past as lineman on his college football team.
>
> Mr. Berman, who sports a crewcut and laughing brown eyes, assumed his position as assistant to Charles A. Venner, Jr., director of recreation, on July 1, and has nothing but praise for the people with whom he is working. He noted that both Mr. Venner and the program of recreation in Bloomfield have not just good reputations, but excellent ones among the recreation officials in and out of the State.
>
> Interviewed during his first week on the job, Mr. Berman explained that his main task in the department right now is to come up to the board's and Mr. Venner's "expectations of me," noting that "just learning how things are done here is a big task."
>
> A native of Philadelphia, the new assistant director was graduated from West Chester, Pa., State College in 1957 with a bachelor of science degree in elementary education. In addition to his gridiron duties, he was on the wrestling team.
>
> In 1962, Mr. Berman received his M.S. in recreation from Temple University.
>
> Having taught fifth grade for 6 years at Whitpain Township School in Blue Bell, Pa., and worked in the field of recreation during his summers, Mr. Berman decided last winter to seek full-time employment in recreation.
>
> Bloomfield, with its excellent program and facilities, its very friendly staff, and its location in New Jersey, a very progressive State in the field, presented an ideal employment opportunity for Mr. Berman.
>
> In the field of recreation in general, Mr. Berman suggested that greater emphasis might be placed on lead-up activities such as tennis and golf, which can be played throughout a person's life, providing the older citizen with sufficient exercise and little strain.
>
> In reference to the emphasis placed by President Kennedy recently on the importance of physical fitness, the new town employee recalled the tendency of people to be very science minded right after the launching of the first sputnik. He suggested that a balance of physical and mental activities in the schools might be better than the pressure movement method of correcting educational shortcomings.
>
> Mr. Berman moved into his new home at 1 Patton Drive on the weekend of June 28 with his wife and two children, Andy, 3, and Amy, 7 months.

Premature Termination of Bracero Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the campaign to defeat Public Law 78 employed two major arguments which simply cannot be supported by facts, the Council of California Growers has recently revealed. The arguments that, first, the hiring of braceros has depressed farm wages generally; and second, braceros are displacing American workers, are simply not truthful when applied to California.

The Council of California Growers recently stated as follows:

> Figures compiled on a regular basis by the Statistical Reporting Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture was cited by the council to show that farm wages have risen steadily ever since the inception of the bracero program.
>
> The same source was quoted to show that California, the largest user of the imported Mexican fieldhands, pays the highest farm wages in the Nation, the average composite wage being $1.33 an hour in this State. Many fieldworkers in California earn up to $2.50 and $3 per hour.
>
> Records of the California Department of Employment were used to disprove the argument that braceros are displacing Americans in agricultural employment.
>
> These records show that during the past 6 years the employment of braceros in California has declined sharply while the employment of hired domestic workers has remained almost constant.
>
> As a percentage of the total California work force, braceros dropped from 15 percent in 1957 to 10 percent in 1962. During the same years, temporary hired domestic workers increased from 28 to 32 percent as a portion of the total work force, and year-round hired domestic workers from 27 to 29 percent.

So, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that those who relied upon this erroneous information and voted against extending Public Law 78 will see fit to reconsider. As I have pointed out over the past few weeks, the adverse impact of prematurely terminating the bracero program will start a chain reaction that will fall most heavily on members of organized labor in allied industries and the small businessman.

Two Sides to the Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, to read today's headlines, to listen to the charges of "slavery in America" by some of the leaders of the mobs which are rioting in many areas of the country, one would be led to believe that the American Negro is wholly lacking in opportunity or a chance for survival.

Granted there are inequities and injustices that must be corrected, I think it is time some voices were raised to point out some of the advantages Negroes have won under our form of government. I think we too often forget the great strides which have been made in correcting some of the inequities. Mob leaders refuse to allow their people to recognize the positive side of the Negroes lot in America. The facts are that we have made great progress in job opportunities, in raising the standard of living, in providing better education and greater hope for Negroes here than in any country in the world. We can and will do better, but it would not be because of mob action and it would not happen at all if those who are now bent on using race passions for political gains succeed only in destroying our private enterprise system and its freedoms for all people.

The following article from the July 22 issue of U.S. News & World Report shows how far we have come in creating better opportunities for the colored people of America. In all fairness, even the most militant should recognize these facts.

JUST HOW WELL OFF IS THE AMERICAN NEGRO?

At a time when the U.S. Negro's complaints get wide publicity here and abroad, how well is he actually doing?

Official Census Bureau figures help answer that question. Those figures show that the rise in Negro well-being since the 1930's probably is unprecedented for any people at any time.

Charts on these pages help tell the story of Negro progress.

Thirty years ago, or even 20 years ago, a large proportion of Negroes were farmworkers in the cotton economy of the South. Great numbers of these were tenant farmers or sharecroppers largely outside the Nation's money economy.

In cities and towns, Negroes held mostly the unskilled jobs—as common laborers and domestics—which pay the least money.

Three out of four employed Negro men, in 1930, were farmworkers or in unskilled jobs. Today, the number is only 1 in 3.

About 20 percent of male Negro workers are in skilled-job areas—as professional and technical workers, nonfarm managers, officials, proprietors, and craftsmen.

In 1940, only 7.5 percent of America's male Negro workers had such jobs. In 22 years, the percentage of Negroes in better-paying jobs has gone up more than twice as fast as the percentage among whites.

Wage and salary income among Negroes, as the accompany charts show, also has gone up faster than for whites. The gap between the two races, while still considerable, is being narrowed steadily as more and more Negroes move into good jobs. Median income of Negro males has risen 555 percent since 1939—as against 375 percent for whites.

Negroes' wages still below whites', but rising faster

	1939 median wage-salary income	1961 median wage-salary income	Change
Negro men in the United States	$460	$3,015	Up 555 percent.
White men in the United States	1,112	5,287	Up 375 percent.

NOTE.—Median income is the midpoint between the highest and lowest income. Half the workers had incomes above this point, half had incomes below this point.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

THE BIG SHIFT IN NEGROES' JOBS

Thirty years ago, 72 percent of employed Negro men in the United States—nearly three out of four—worked on farms or in unskilled jobs. Most of those on farms were almost completely outside of the money economy, living as sharecroppers or subsistence farmers.

Now, only 32 percent of employed Negro men—less than one out of three—are in unskilled jobs or on farms.

WHERE NEGROES WORK NOW

Almost 40 percent of employed Negro men now are in semiskilled or service trades. As truckdrivers, janitors, waiters, laundrymen, other types of workers, they get money wages.

About 10 percent are skilled workers and foremen—double the percentage holding such jobs in 1930.

Among the others, 6 percent are clerks and salesmen; 3 percent are professional men and technicians; 2 percent are proprietors, managers, and officials.

MORE NEGRO HOME BUYERS

In homeownership, too, Negro gains are outstripping those of whites. In 1940, only 23.9 percent of Negroes owned or were paying for their own homes. That figure, now, is about 40 percent. And contrary to popular impressions often held here and abroad, increasing numbers of Negroes are buying "quality" homes in good residential areas—homes costing from $20,000 on up.

When you start comparing the U.S. Negro's lot with that of citizens in other lands his gains become clear. In only five other nations—Canada, Sweden, Switzerland, New Zealand and Australia—do people have a higher income per capita than Neggroes enjoy in America.

Negro income per capita here comes to $1,100 a year. That is equal to the figure for the people of Great Britain. Per capita income of Negroes in the United States exceeds that found in Denmark, West Germany and France, to name just a few advanced countries of Europe.

It is nearly 40 percent higher than the per capita income reported from the Soviet Union, which presents itself as a "workers' paradise." It is triple the figure in booming Japan.

INCOME GAP OF OTHER NATIONS

Among the underdeveloped nations of Asia and Africa, which seldom lose a chance to castigate the United States for its handling of the race problem, income per capita lags even further behind that of U.S. Negroes.

Ghana has a per capita income which is less than a fifth of that to be found among Negroes in America. India's millions, per capita, earn $60 a year—less than 6 percent of the annual income per capita of U.S. Negroes.

What the official figures show, then, is this:

The Negro still is in the process of catching up with whites in jobs and income. But he is narrowing the gap constantly. Meantime, he is doing far better in income than people in nearly any other country of the world.

California Agriculture Moving to Mexico?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK MINOR MARTIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from the general sales manager of the Container Corp. of America, should provide a real jolt to my esteemed colleagues who recently voted against the extension of the Mexican braceros program. Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Clinton Eastwood's letter of June 24, 1963 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MY DEAR MR. MARTIN: We have just completed an analysis of the apparent effect of the recent decision by the House of Representatives, regarding the importation of Mexican laborers, known as braceros, will have on agriculture in California.

Just looking at the strawberry farmer situation in one little town of Gilroy, Calif., which has a population of approximately 6,000 people, the effect will be quite drastic. They have in the past, during a short bulge in the season equalled to approximately 3 months, had as many as 3,400 to 3,500 braceros. If this labor is to be excluded and it were possible to replace them with American labor, it would mean that some 3,200 families would have to move into the Gilroy area, which would suddenly flood the town of Gilroy with approximately 9,000 people, which is of course, 50 percent more than the existing population. These 9,000 new people would have an income only during the harvest of strawberries; the rest of the year they would be on relief.

It is certainly the desire of all to eliminate unemployment in this country but not completely at the expense of upsetting our economy and moving large numbers of families into certain specific areas, thereby throwing them all on relief during the major portion of the year.

In addition to the above and looking at the State of California in its entirety, the strawberry industry alone is contributing to business the following:

Local field labor, over $5½ million.

Cartons and shipping crates, over $5 million.

Railway Express charges, over $7½ million.

Nursery plants, over $1½ million.

Fertilizers, over $3½ million.

Containers for freezing, over $2 million.

Sugar for freezing, over $2 million.

Inplant labor, over $1½ million.

It is estimated that if the bracero-type laborer is not available for the short picking season, which is 3 to 5 months (depending on the area) the above economic advantages to our State in this one growing area will be practically cut in half, as it will put the California strawberry growers and shippers in an undesirable competitive situation with the rest of the country. It is expected that half of the California acreage would be plowed under. The results to an industry of this nature, I am sure would not be the desire of forward thinking representatives of our Government. A whole economy can be wrecked by careless Government moves. A solution should be found first for gradual transition to mechanisms before local labor should be employed, rather than a sudden shock that would cut this particular industry in half.

We have noted that some of the growers have already made moves into cooperative group organizations into Mexico. I am sure it is not your intention to move California agriculture down the coast—across the border into Mexico—but this is what you will be accomplishing if you allow this sudden decision to stand.

We here in the industry in California certainly are against any such proposal and hope that you will, as our representative, cooperate to obtain an extension to Public Law 78, and solicit all the possible votes that you can from other areas. There are really only about 3 States that are affected, which makes 47 States that don't care and if the economy of California is hurt—that's fine with them—their business will increase which will allow them to undercut us.

This is not so catastrophic to our company as we have a Mexican affiliated company and if our California growers decide to move to Mexico, we can certainly follow them. As a matter of fact, some have already asked us to send specifications for our product, which is shipping containers, to our Mexican plant, so that we will be in a position to supply this material in that area. Although it would help our Mexican plant, we are "American first" and would like to fight any move that drives citizens out of the country in order to continue being progressive in their own particular fields.

Please study this situation on behalf of all of us in the industry and do all possible to obtain an extension.

Thank you for your efforts in our behalf.

Respectfully yours,

CLINTON EASTWOOD.

P.S.—This same situation applies to many other California farm products.

Russia Cannot Be Trusted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's soft-headed policy toward Russia, especially on the test ban negotiations, is fraught with danger. If anyone doubts it, let him read the following article by Marguerite Higgins in today's New York Herald Tribune, wherein she recounts various breaches of faith by the Communist tyrant:

THE TEST BAN MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Marguerite Higgins)

"We know enough now about broken negotiations, secret preparations, and the (Soviet) advantage gained from a long test series never to offer again an uninspected moratorium."—President Kennedy, March 2, 1962, in a television address.

WASHINGTON.—The bleak story of East-West negotiations to ban nuclear testing begins with the deep fears—stimulated by men of good will and ill will—of the effect of radioactive fallout on the milk used daily by children everywhere.

There is no scientific proof—despite all the theories and arguments—that the degree of fallout generated by nuclear tests to date will genetically damage anyone.

Until the massive Soviet test series in 1961, the amount of radiation added to the atmosphere by testing had been compared to the difference in living in a brick house rather than a framehouse (brick gives out more radiation than wood). Even now, the amount of radiation in the atmosphere is far from the maximum permissible dose, as the officials put it.

The effects of radiation were not a real concern of the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles on the fateful day in the spring of 1958, when he sent President Eisenhower the recommendation that the United States accept an uninspected temporary moratorium on nuclear testing. He made the recommendation provided that Russia did the same and provided that the Soviet Union entered in good faith on negotiations for a cheat-proof, internationally verified ban on testing.

But in light of the clamor about fallout, the Secretary feared that a totally negative attitude on the part of the United States might do serious damage to America's position in the United Nations and to its propaganda position with neutral and underdeveloped nations.

As Secretary Dulles told this writer not long before his death, he had never for one moment thought that the Russians were seriously interested in a test ban. But he calculated that Russia's true intentions would be brought to light with reasonable speed in negotiations—and that the United States would have justification for resuming tests.

But the Secretary of State reckoned without full awareness of either the scientific complexities of the subject or the Soviet skill in offering fresh, if insubstantial, bait every time the Americans were ready to pack up and go home.

At the time (winter of 1958–59), Mr. Dulles already was wondering whether the agreement to an uninspected moratorium on testing would prove to be my greatest mistake.

But the international pressures were great for a test ban, and the American public, with its preference for horror stories, was more engrossed in the thrill-filled predictions of doom than the simple official reassurances from Washington, exaggeration was no one's monopoly.

Prime Minister Nehru of India (who said comparatively little in 1961, when the Soviets broke the moratorium and staged the most massive—in terms of fallout—tests in history) was on record as calling for an end to nuclear tests to prevent the extinction of mankind. The Bandung Conference had sent out loud alarms.

In more measured terms, Adlai E. Stevenson had come out for a unilateral end to testing. So had Pope Pius XII, although the Pontiff made the point that international agreement to end tests must be based on international inspections.

And now, 4 years, many concessions and many nuclear shots after the Dulles decision of 1958, the Soviet Union and the West are still quarreling about the issue that divided them in the first place: adequate verification and inspection of a test ban.

President Kennedy's decision to inaugurate another uninspected moratorium on atmospheric tests (underground tests are exempted) is creating political fallout among those who believe America was taken for a dangerous and nearly catastrophic ride the first time by the U.S.S.R.

The controversy is likely to increase this summer. New East-West talks begin tomorrow in Moscow and will focus attention on arguments pro and con. These arguments center on whether a nuclear test ban is a trap to prevent America's nuclear development, while the Russian push secretly ahead, or whether it is a step at controlling the nuclear genie.

The key elements of the test-ban chronology began in the spring of 1958.

March-April 1958: The Supreme Soviet adopts a resolution abolishing future nuclear test and Great Britain and the United States are invited to do likewise.

April-May 1958: President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev agree to appoint scientific experts to determine whether it is possible to devise a cheat-proof inspection system.

August 1958: The East-West scientists announce agreement that it is possible to work out an inspection system of partial effectivenes under certain limitations; the press concentrates on the agreement and overlooks the fine print concerning the limits at which inspection can be effective.

August 1958: President Eisenhower offers to suspend nuclear tests of all kinds for a year beyond October 31 (the date of completion of a long planned U.S. test series) provided the Soviet Union does so.

September 1958: The Soviet Parliament's earlier abolition of nuclear testing is scuttled by two nuclear tests in the U.S.S.R.

October 1958: The United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union begin talks on a nuclear test ban at Geneva.

April 1959: President Eisenhower, under pressure of warnings that the Russians may be both stalling and cheating on a test ban, suggests that Russia and the United States ban tests in the atmosphere ending fallout but go ahead with underground testing until some agreed system can be found for verifying and identifying thes smaller tests. By now, scientists have established that underground nuclear tests of low yield are virtually undetectable.

April 1959: Premier Khrushchev rejects President Eisenhower's suggestion. He counters with suggestion of a yearly quota for on-site inspections and specifies that "they must not of course be numerous."

November-December 1959: Atomic Energy Commissioner John McCone warns that Russia may be testing in secret and says that the voluntary moratorium should be put on a week-to-week basis. This is done at the end of December.

March-May 1960: Premier Khrushchev revives almost moribund Western hopes for a test ban by appearing to agree to a treaty under which the small-yield underground tests would be exempted until scientists could find a way of checking up on them; but these hopes are dashed when Ambassador Semyon Tsarapkin at Geneva repudiates the concept.

March 1961: President Kennedy sends his experts to Geneva for a "last try" at a test ban. They present a package studded with seven important concessions but are rebuffed by the Russians.

September 1961: The reasons for the rebuff become clear when Russia resumes testing despite the fact that its representatives are still negotiating at Geneva.

November 1961: Russia publicly repudiates every single test ban detail negotiated since 1958 and rejects the idea of any inspection whatsoever in connection with a test ban.

March 1962: President Kennedy announces intention to resume testing in April unless Russians agree to sign treaty by then.

December 1962: Premier Khrushchev, again reversing himself, says the Soviet Union will accept inspection after all, if it is limited to three on-site inspections per year.

January-February 1963: In secret talks with the Russians, the United States makes a number of concessions, but insists on at least seven on-site inspections. Russians break off these talks, which are transferred to Geneva.

Edward Teller, father of the H-bomb, warns Congress that U.S. concessions have so weakened the test-ban proposal that it would be "virtually unpoliced" and would "endanger our security and help the Soviet Union in its plan to conquer the world." Top officials, including all members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, declare that Soviets took advantage of moratorium to catch up and in some ways surpass the United States in nuclear development. Joint Chiefs insist that America needs to test in atmosphere to catch up in turn with the Soviet Union on the anti-missile missile.

June 1963: President Kennedy announces that the United States will once again place a moratorium on atmospheric tests. He will send Averell Harriman to Moscow in midsummer for still another last-ditch try to achieve agreement. Top Senators warn that the test-ban treaty has been so watered down that it doesn't have any chance of passage in that body.

LETHAL LEXICON

Kiloton—designating a thousand tons and said of an atomic bomb which has the blast of a thousand tons of TNT.

Megaton—designating a million tons.

Black box—any scientific device whose interior cannot be changed or altered. In nuclear testing, it refers to a seismograph which automatically records earthquakes.

Seismic—referring to earthquakes, from the Greek word seismos. Thus, seisometer is an earthquake meter; seismograph an earthquake recorder.

Signature—a characteristic seismograph of an underground nuclear test. Some scientists believe they can tell the difference between some earthquakes and some nuclear tests this way.

Compression wave—a traveling energy pulse which compresses rock in the earth.

Rarefaction wave—a traveling energy pulse which expands rock as it travels.

Earthquake wave—a series of compression and rarefaction waves.

Array—a number of seismometers spread over the countryside permitting more accurate determination of strength, direction, and distance of an earthquake wave.

First Reverse Freedom Rider Overcomes White Citizens' Bigotry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following story from the Jersey Journal, of Jersey City, N.J. I believe this story will be of interest to all of my colleagues since it shows how easily people of two races can live and work together in complete peace and harmony:

ERNEST BOYD: SOLID JERSEY CITY RESIDENT—FIRST REVERSE FREEDOM RIDER OVERCOMES WHITE CITIZENS' BIGOTRY

(By Judson Hand)

Louis Ernest Boyd scored against bigotry by becoming a solid Jersey City citizen.

A year ago, Boyd was internationally known as the first reverse freedom rider.

The White Citizens Council of New Orleans had sent him north with a one-way bus ticket and $50 pocket money.

A council representative, on hand at the New Orleans bus depot, explained why:

"We hope to show the Negroes who their real friends are," he said. "We'll see what those persons up North who have been maligning the South do for them."

The 42-year-old Boyd had worked for 20 years as a New Orleans longshoreman. In 1959 he contracted pneumonia and, when he left the hospital, he found that automation had wiped out his old job.

With no work open to him and few skills to offer, Boyd went on relief. He was hard pressed to feed his wife and eight children.

A little over a year ago, Louisiana cut off his relief payments, saying he was fit to work. Boyd said his doctor had told him he could perform only light duties.

Suddenly, by way of television, an opportunity came. The white citizens council offered to provide free bus trips North to any Negro who was unhappy in the South. Boyd jumped at the chance—and into a national spotlight.

Roy Wilkins, president of the NAACP, described the freedom trip as "a pretty cheap stunt." Senator JACOB JAVITS, Republican, of New York called it shameful. Bigots everywhere believed Boyd could not make a new life.

First Louis Ernest Boyd found a $100-a-week job as a truck driver and handyman in Jersey City. This job fell through, and he was crushed for a time.

Boyd's courage did not falter. Jersey City ministers, businessmen, the NAACP, the Urban League and others rallied behind him.

Louis Ernest Boyd found another job, this one with a rolling steel mill in Jersey City.

Some months ago he moved to a modern five-bedroom apartment in the A. Harry Moore housing project, just across the street from Lincoln Park. His neighbors represent many ethnic groups.

"Believe me, they are a fine family. It's a privilege to serve them," says Conrad Vuocolo, head of tenant relations for Jersey City housing.

Boyd's eight children are doing well at School 39. The family are parishioners at St. John's Episcopal Church on Summit Avenue, where it is reported the children are among the best behaved at the Sunday School.

Not that Louis Ernest Boyd has an easy life supporting a family of 10, but he once told a Jersey Journal reporter, "All I want is to settle down and work like any other man."

And that's exactly what he has done in Jersey City. He is doing very well on his own in the North now.

The citizens council apparently did him a favor.

Limiting Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 16, the House of Representatives will consider H.R. 4897, to extend the operation of the Wartime Sedition Statute to oversea areas.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that this bill will be defeated. Its passage, it seems to me, would be a further encroachment on our constitutional right of free speech.

The following editorial appeared in the Washington Post today, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

LIMITING SPEECH

The House Judiciary Committee has favorably reported, and the House is scheduled to consider on Tuesday, a bill to amend the so-called Wartime Sedition Statute by making it applicable to violations committed by Americans abroad. The theory behind this statute, enacted in 1917, is that, despite the prohibition of the first amendment, speech may be abridged in time of war as a means of safeguarding security. Whatever the merit of this, the plain fact is that the United States is not now at war. The statute was brought into effect when President Truman proclaimed a national emergency in 1950 and will remain in effect until 6 months after that emergency is terminated.

Sedition is a frightening term. Essentially, however, it involves nothing more than speech. The Sedition Statute makes it a crime punishable by 20 years in prison willfully to make "false statements with intent to interfere with the operations or success of the military or naval forces of the United States" or to "attempt to cause insubordination * * * or to obstruct the recruiting or enlistment" of these forces. In a compelling dissent from the Judiciary Committee Report on the pending bill, Representative ROBERT KASTENMEIER pointed out some of the pitfalls of these provisions:

"Under the law in force today, a person could conceivably be convicted for criticizing the administration's policy toward Cuba. If he were to say that offensive missiles still exist in Cuba, he could be fined $10,000 and imprisoned 20 years under this statute for willfully making a false statement (i.e., one which conflicts with the information put forth by the Government—this was the standard used in the World War I cases) with intent to interfere with the operation of the U.S. military forces * * *. Similarly, one who objected to the use of Federal troops in Mississippi or Alabama could be convicted under this statute for interfering with enlistment."

The United States does not need this kind of protection even in wartime, let alone when it is at peace. It can rely confidently, as its founders did, upon healthy ideas to refute unhealthy ones. Extension of the statute to offenses committed abroad seems silly as well as needless, for extradition would be impossible for persons accused under it, sedition being a political offense not covered by any extradition treaty. If Congress wants to do something useful about sedition, let it erase this law entirely from the statute books and return to the reliance on free speech set forth by the first amendment.

"Just How Safe Is Your Drinking Water?" A Survey of the Detergent Pollution Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the July 15 issue of the U.S. News & World Report contains a valuable article drawing attention to the need for action to assure safe, pure drinking water for our growing population. The article focuses on the serious detergent pollution problem which I hope we shall solve through the passage of H.R. 4571 to ban the manufacture of "hard" detergents after June 30, 1965. I include the article to further acquaint the House with the detergent problem:

Here's something new to start worrying about. This time it is the quality and safety of your drinking water.

To most Americans, the thought that tap water in their homes has been used in other homes and discharged as sewage is repugnant.

Yet, for millions of people in the United States, that has become a fact of life. Their tap water smells and tastes of chemicals used to kill bacteria. Or it foams from the residue of modern detergents.

Today, an estimated 40 percent of the U.S. population is using water that has been used at least once before for domestic or industrial purposes. In some cities, water flowing from taps has been used as many as five times by other human beings.

In this situation, concern over water pollution is deepening. That concern is strongly reflected in Washington.

Congress is considering a number of bills that would crack down hard on practices that pollute water. Among them are at least two bills to ban detergents that do not decompose when treated.

Two congressional committees are holding extensive hearings on water pollution. They have been told that the reuse of water in the United States today is nothing compared to what it will be in the future as an exploding population crowds increasingly into urban areas.

A LIMITED SUPPLY

One expert has warned: "Without a breakthrough—not now in sight—in desalting of sea water, the basic supply of water in this country will remain the same. You can't escape from the fact that the water we have will need to be used, reused, and used again. That is going to require sewage-treatment methods that we do not presently have in most places."

At the moment, pollution by modern detergents is drawing the most attention. Cause of the trouble is a chemical known as ABS—alkyl benzine sulfonate. It comes from petroleum and is basic in most of these detergents.

ABS doesn't decompose, as soap does, through the action of bacteria in sewage treatment facilities. In a river, ABS can travel downstream more than 100 miles and still be less than one-third decomposed. When the water is reused by a downstream city, another batch of ABS is added, and the double dose passes downriver to still another city.

In areas where homes discharge sewage into septic tanks, the chemical seeps down into the underground water and then is pumped up from wells.

Tests have shown that ABS persists in underground water for years, and the concentration is building up rapidly.

EFFECT ON HEALTH

Says the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Anthony J. Celebrezze:

"The potential health hazard presented by these detergents is still under investigation. Chemical tests have indicated that these wastes are acutely toxic to fish and wildlife when present in water in large accumulations. We do not as yet know the adverse effects, if any, of these wastes on human health when ingested over a long period in the minute quantities in which they may be present in the public water supply."

The foaming of detergent residue in drinking water has been reported thus far only in supplies drawn from wells in areas where septic tanks are used.

This warning, however, comes from Representative Henry S. Reuss, Democrat, of Wisconsin, who is sponsoring a bill to prohibit the manufacture and importation of present detergents: "We may look forward to foam in municipal water unless we take timely preventive action."

ACTION ABROAD

Mr. Reuss points to the fact that detergent foam has become a widespread problem in the cities of Germany, where modern detergents have been in use since World War I.

In West Germany, some waterways are so saturated with detergent residue that billowing suds interfere with navigation. Foam frequently is picked up by the wind and splattered on windshields of nearby autos.

The problem in West Germany became so bad that a law recently was passed to ban sale of the present so-called "hard" detergents starting in October of next year. German manufacturers are reported to be ready with a "soft" detergent—one that will decompose in sewage-treatment facilities.

That the problem in the United States is rivaling that in Europe is seen in complaints pouring in on Congress.

WHAT IRKS PEOPLE

Tests in Wisconsin have shown that some of the underground water in 64 of the State's 71 counties is polluted by ABS.

A man in Carlisle, Mass., spent $3,500 sinking wells at various depths all over his property without finding a supply unpolluted by ABS.

At Oregon, Ill., last winter, a pile of suds 40 feet high accumulated in front of ice that had jammed up in the Rock River just below a dam.

The Indians of Isleta Pueblo, below Albuquerque, avoid irrigating on Wednesday because by then the heavy discharge of laundry detergents used by housewives of Albuquerque on Monday reaches their irrigation inlets.

Operators of sand and gravel pits at Phoenix, Ariz., complain that detergent has found its way into the pits, and as a result, the aggregate they sell makes "lousy concrete."

Sewage-treatment plants are fighting a losing battle against detergent suds. The foam covers machinery, makes catwalks slimy, cuts off the oxygen and light necessary for the treatment process.

Suds 20 feet high built up at the sewage-treatment plant in Lafayette, La., until a water-spray system was installed. Now the detergent runs off into Vermilion Bayou, and fishermen have to steer around huge floats of suds that look like icebergs.

As a result of this widespread trouble, pressure is mounting for laws to bring the detergent problem under control.

WHAT STATES ARE DOING

Legislatures in Connecticut, Pennsylvania, California, Wisconsin, and Nebraska are considering bills to ban detergents. In New York and Maryland, State commissions are investigating the problem.

Meanwhile, U.S. manufacturers are racing to get a "soft" detergent on the market. The Soap and Detergent Association, to which most of the manufacturers belong, says member companies will have the new detergent ready by the end of 1965. Some companies state that they will have it before that time.

Experts on water pollution are looking beyond the detergent dilemma at other problems that will have to be solved as the Nation turns increasingly to reusing water. Research on these problems by the U.S. Public Health Service centers at the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati.

Dr. Leon W. Weinberger, who is in charge of this research, says that detergent pollution is only one of many problems that must be solved. He states: "We face the job of removing all sorts of contaminants from our waste water, regardless of source—municipal, industrial, or simply land drainage."

Dr. Weinberger says the Government is spending around $750,000 a year on advanced waste treatment research in cooperation with industry. Aim is to find improved ways of treating sewage so that it will be possible to reuse water again and again with safety.

A number of projects involving reuse of water are underway. One, the Santee project, is in the heavily populated San Diego area of southern California. There, water from a sewage treatment plant is discharged into an artificial lake that now is being used in noncontact water sports, mainly boating.

COST: $2 BILLION

Secretary Celebrezze of HEW estimates that there is a backlog of $2 billion of construction needed for communities with inadequate sewage treatment facilities, or no such facilities at all.

Summing up, Mr. Celebrezze says: "America's waters are not clean; nor will they ever be unless we increase our effort, our expenditures, and our dedication. As our population expands and our national product grows, the problems of water supply and pollution control, which must be considered against the reality of a fixed amount of water, will become ever greater."

President Gambles With Our Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in today's New York Mirror Edgar Mowrer tells us about President Kennedy's gamble with our safety. The same newspaper's editorial also warns us of treachery in the test ban President Kennedy seems so anxious to get, without adequate inspection:

J.F.K. Repeating F.D.R.'s Soviet Gamble?

(By Edgar Mowrer)

President Kennedy, you will remember, got elected on the promise to get the country moving again. Domestically, he has not gone very far very fast.

It is becoming apparent that in the name of "greater flexibility," he has returned to the foreign policy gamble of F.D.R. This was to seek the friendship of the U.S.S.R. by giving Stalin everything he wanted.

As Roosevelt remarked to son Elliott at the time:

"Maybe the Russians will get strong in Europe. Whether that's bad depends on a lot of factors."

So he went ahead and allowed Stalin to take East Europe and give nothing in return. The result was the spread of communism there and to China, North Vietnam, Cuba, etc.; the Korean war; the quasi-loss of Laos and the need for U.S. military intervention in South Vietnam. Roosevelt's policy of seeking the Soviet Union's friendship was the most disastrous ever practiced by an American President.

Now in the opinion of observers in Washington, Kennedy and his "pug-washed" advisers, are repeating F.D.R.'s disastrous gamble.

This may not yet be fully apparent to the American people. It has always been Moscow's dream.

It is also worthy of note that in his increasing eagerness to "relax tensions," President Kennedy has the support of the same groups who backed Roosevelt in his fatal gamble—the doctrinaire liberals who can see no resemblances between communism and fascism; the pacifists; the incurable innocents and inevitably the American Communist Party whose Secretary General has issued a ten-thousand-word hymn to Kennedy and the Democratic Party.

It is in this light, I feel obliged to state, that we should envisage the present test ban negotiations in Moscow. As a single undertaking intended to minimize the risk of nuclear war, they may or may not be useful. Expert opinions differ sharply. But as the key step in a whole policy of denying peace, these negotiations could turn out to be as disastrous as Roosevelt's trust in Stalin.

Furthermore, the assumption of such a Kennedy policy explains a whole series of otherwise incomprehensible things. Among these are the President's Inaugural reference to the Communists not as "enemies" (which they obviously are) but as "those who choose to consider themselves our enemies." It gives consistency, if not sense, to his retreats at the Bay of Pigs and the Berlin Wall, his effort to neturalize rather than to save Laos, his letting Khrushchev off the missile hook in Cuba, his constant epistolary exchange with Mr. K. (Imagine such an exchange with Hitler.) And finally, his current attempt to seek as much relaxation of tensions as possible at Moscow.

In any case, this is the way Moscow is interpreting it. No matter that the United States is economically, scientifically, and militarily stronger than the U.S.S.R. and with West Europe, overwhelmingly so. No matter, therefore that we can stand an arms race infinitely better than Russia. These things do not count so long as the Russians have the stronger nerves. Already Soviet spokesmen are outlining some of the items in the price they hope to exact for a test ban.

Washington says today that none of these is acceptable. But the Administration has steadily shown increased eagerness to "relax tensions" and what it refuses today it may well accept in a week or a month.

TREACHEROUS TERRITORY

Against a backdrop of Soviet and Red Chinese propaganda bombs bursting in air, representatives of the United States, Britain, and Russia begin today in Moscow the umpteenth effort to arrive at some sort of nuclear test-ban agreement.

W. Averell Harriman, a skilled hand at diplomatic poker-playing with the Kremlin, has no illusions about his latest mission to Moscow.

But even so able a diplomat as Harriman will be skating on dubious ice if, as expected, the Soviets are agreeable to only a partial ban—that is, one covering all but underground tests. This would rest on the assumption that underground tests, while difficult or impossible to detect, aren't really too important.

But that's not necessarily so. In fact, the Joint Chiefs of Staff are extremely wary on that score. Their objection reportedly is based on the belief that Russia has greater need of underground tests than the United States does.

In other words, this could be a loophole enabling Russia to overtake us in nuclear weapon development—followed by a Soviet violation of the atmospheric ban on any old pretext when Soviet military considerations made this desirable.

If Russia were truly interested in banning nuclear tests, she would have no objection to an all-inclusive treaty.

But this would entail the self-enforcing machinery of on-site inspections—a condition previously rejected by Russia except for a vague offer from Khrushchev some months ago to permit two or three inspections a year. And that is much too little for foolproof inspection, which is to say it is much too little for the security requirements of the free world.

This is the sort of swampy, treacherous territory Harriman is wading into—to determine, on the one hand, if Russia has anything new and positive to offer and to make sure, on the other, that Russia isn't using her "ideological dispute" with Peking to play us for suckers.

Henry Ford Recommends Only Sensible Approach to Tax Cuts—Cut Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, this week the Ways and Means Committee begins studying the first draft language of part of the tax bill. At this time we cannot say what the final bill will contain, but we can be certain that any tax cuts proposed will be meaningless unless they are accompanied by corresponding cuts in Federal spending.

The theory that we can continue to increase spending, plan bigger deficits and still cut taxes is ridiculous and only the most dream-befuddled economists can seriously suggest such a tax program.

The hard course which must be set by the administration and the American people, if we are to maintain and strengthen our economy, was outlined in a recent speech in Little Rock by Henry Ford II. The following editorial from the Dallas Times Herald, "A Tax Cut Plan—But" commenting on Mr. Ford's remarks is well worth reading:

A TAX CUT PLAN—BUT

Henry Ford, II, has made a levelheaded statement supporting a general cut in income taxes which is remarkable for its sanity and fairness.

Speaking in Little Rock Monday, the auto manufacturer said we need to improve the rate of business investment in order to meet the need for new jobs. "If the economy does not create job opportunities for our growing work force, we shall face increasing pressure for featherbedding, spread-the-work measures, and restrictions on the introduction of new and more efficient technology."

That is why a "prompt, substantial, across-the-board" cut in income tax rates is needed: to eliminate problems of lagging growth, lagging investment, and lagging employment.

"Every day we delay the cut puts off our hope of reaching the kind of economic performance everyone wants," Mr. Ford stated, and even went so far as to say a tax cut should be put into effect by January 1, 1964, for at least $10 billion.

The Treasury Department reports, he says, we could have such a cut and still come out with less of a 1964 deficit than was forecast by the President in his January budget message—before taking any proposed cut into account.

The basic national economic problem is not one of recession or inflation but lack of growth, Mr. Ford believes. "The way to get more growth is to reduce Government actions that interfere with growth," he says, specifying "tax rates that discriminate less against buying, investing, and earning; less Government intervention in wage-price matters; fewer spending programs designed to benefit local community and political interests."

He recommends a flat ceiling to limit Government expenditures in 1964 to the 1963 level. He adds the necessity of making "some hard choices. Our only hope of getting all of what we want in the future is to forego some of what we want right now."

Mr. Ford's plan is worthy—but it asks a lot of Government and the people, namely: restraint. Like a man on a diet, when a special hunger pang hits Uncle Sam, he can convince himself very quickly that the morsel he desires has no calories.

So far as the future is concerned, we'd be willing to bet that the last year the Government spent less than this year—will always be last year.

Top "Kremlinologist" at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, at 3 p.m., today talks began in Moscow on which may depend the future of our entire civilization.

As a sponsor of the legislation which led to establishment of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and as a congressional observed at the Geneva test ban talks, I am hopeful that the meeting now convened, and attended by representatives of the United States, Great Britain and Russia will prove fruitful.

Certainly, America is most ably represented at this all-important meeting. While in all our previous discussions in Geneva, we have been blessed with capable and dedicated men at all levels, a "certain something" extra attaches to our present envoy, the Honorable W. Averell Harriman.

While most of us are familiar with the distinguished public career of this man of many accomplishments, I believe that a better appreciation of him will come from reading an article which appeared in the New York Times magazine, yesterday the 14th.

The article was written by Mr. Cabell Phillips, the eminent member of the New York Times Washington Bureau, who has observed Secretary Harriman's career for close to 20 years:

TOP "KREMLINOLOGIST" AT WORK

There is something very special about a bureaucrat who can tell a senior Member of Congress, "Senator, you don't know what you're talking about; I do," and come out of the encounter unscathed.

The something is a blend of bountiful experience, sure-footed confidence, and the calm independence of spirit that only years and a sizable fortune—can bring a man. It is the possession of these qualities that permitted W. Averell Harriman to put Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE in his place at a meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee some time ago. But, more importantly, it has won him a peculiar kind of distinction in the top layer of the Kennedy administration.

In an executive establishment largely populated by whiz kids half his age and less, Harriman, no kid, but unmistakably a whiz, is a standout performer whose amazing second wind has put him, once again, at the top of his profession of public servant. As evidence of this, he will be in Moscow tomorrow to begin talks aimed at trying to seek ways of breaking the nuclear-test stalemate with the Russians. This is an important undertaking that carries implications for all of mankind. If such a job is down any man's alley, it is Harriman's.

"Durable Ave," as they sometimes call him in Foggy Bottom, is the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, the Nation's third-ranking diplomatic officer. He is 71 years old, lithe and tough as a piece of weathered hemp rope, and he treads his way around the occupational pitfalls that haunt the dreams of younger journeymen in his craft with the casual skill of an old pro.

"He never looks over his shoulder to see who's watching," one of them said admiringly the other day. "He couldn't care less."

In this current chapter of his life, Mr. Harriman has risen through the ranks, in a manner of speaking, from the ambiguous obscurity of Ambassador at Large, to which President Kennedy appointed him early in 1961; through the rank of Assistant Secretary of Far Eastern Affairs; to his present position, which he accepted 3 months ago. Experience has shown it to be one of the most difficult to fill in the Department of State.

The Kennedys are believed by some to have given Harriman his appointment in the first place chiefly for reasons of sentiment and political obligation. "We've got to find a spot for Ave," Robert Kennedy, the President's brother and chief recruiter, is reported to have said. He had been a prominent figure in the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. Governor of New York, a candidate (but not a very convincing one) for the presidential nomination in 1956, and he had lent a helping hand in the Kennedy campaign of 1960. If he seemed a little passé for the hustle and bustle of the New Frontier (he is of the New Deal generation of Joe Kennedy, the President's father), he at least had a lot of experience, it was reasoned, which would come in handy.

That experience now adds up of course, to establish Averell Harriman as the leading "Kremlinologist" of this administration. He has spent more time in direct consultation with Stalin, Khrushchev, and other leaders of Communist Russia, living and dead, than any other American official. He was U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union from 1943 to 1946, a period that briged the end of a hot war and the onset of the cold war. He accompanied President Roosevelt to the conferences with Churchill and Stalin at Teheran and Yalta, and went with President Truman to Potsdam. He helped to nurse the United Nations into being and he was European field manager for the Marshall plan, the most successful roadblock that was ever erected against Communist imperialism.

"Mr. Harriman provides the living continuity with events that most of us today know only from the documents and the textbooks," a member of the policy planning staff said the other day. "He actually took part in most of those stratagems and negotiations, from 1941 all the way through 1952, when the seeds of the very crises we are living with today were put into the ground. When he says, 'Stalin told me,' or 'Mao Tse-tung believes thus and so,' or 'Churchill wanted to try it this way,' you feel you are getting it right from the horse's mouth."

Thus, in his current mission to Moscow, Mr. Harriman will be engaging in a familiar routine, one that goes back to a journey there with Prime Minister Churchill in 1941. He has participated with the President and Secretary of State Rusk in the formulation of the policy position he will expound. He will have stopped off in London to check out this position with the Foreign Office and to pick up his opposite number, Lord Hailsham, for the hop to Moscow. He will get a cordial greeting at the Kremlin from the ebullient but crafty Khrushchev and others of the Soviet high command. And then they will all sit down around a baize-covered table in a large, plain room in which nothing much has changed, including the atmosphere. ("There are the same pictures on the wall as in Stalin's day.'), since Averell Harriman was first received there more than 20 years ago.

Before he left on this assignment, I asked the Under Secretary what prospects he foresaw for getting any sort of workable agreement from Khrushchev on nuclear disarmament. After all, I said, the question has been under almost constant discussion for more than 5 years, and it does not appear that the two sides are any closer together than they were at the start.

For sound, diplomatic reasons he would not commit himself precisely on his expectations. But he did reveal some of the philosophy that sustains the experienced diplomat through the frustrations of seemingly hopeless negotiation.

"I haven't any hope," he said, "that we and the Communists will get together on the fundamental political differences between us. Our ideas of freedom and the integrity of the individual are just too far apart for that—now, anyway."

We were sitting in the drawing room of his old Georgetown house on a hot Sunday morning. It is a room of casual elegance such as befits his millionaire's temperament; with several fine paintings on the wall—Van Gogh's magnificent "White Roses" occupies the place of honor, and there are a couple of Cezanne's and a Derain—as well as a cabinet filled with rare Persian bronzes and a leaky air conditioner pumping fretfully away in the window. In bathrobe and pajamas, the Under Secretary draped his lanky figure in the corner of a sofa with an open dispatch case beside him and papers scattered about the coffee table and on the floor around his feet. His dark hair is only lightly touched with gray; his face is relatively unlined; his speech is firm and easy-flowing, with just a hint of urgency that his listener fully comprehend what he is saying. He wears his age well, and his distinction with grace.

"But," he went on in answer to my question, "there are certain areas of common interest that exist between the Communists and ourselves; things that both of us want. We must never cease to explore those areas and try for agreement, because every time we succeed we will have reduced the tensions between us, and advanced the cause of peace, by just that much.

"Now, one of those areas is a mutual desire to avoid a nuclear war. I believe that Khrushchev and his people are just as anxious about that as we are. They can destroy us; we can destroy them. A part of avoiding war is a nuclear-test ban, and I think the Russians sincerely want an arms-limitation agreement—on their own terms. They want it not only as a means of avoiding war, but to relieve the tremendous economic pressures of their armament program."

Khrushchev, he said, is heavily committed to improving the industrial potential of his country, and to lifting the standard of living of his people. "And not only that," he added with emphasis, "Khrushchev is committed to exporting the material benefactions of the Communist way of life, as well as its ideology, to the satellites and to the underdeveloped countries of Asia and Africa. The armaments program is costing the Soviets about 20 percent of their gross national product—approximately twice what ours costs. He wants desperately to cut that down.

"Well, we do too. He wants to do it on his terms, and we want to do it on ours. We have a common area of interest there; the problem is to find a common ground for agreement. That's why you go on negotiating, negotiating and negotiating, because one day you may hit on a formula that both can accept." He added cautiously that the Premier's East Berlin speech of July 2 may—"just may"—indicate an even greater readiness to come to terms than in the past. But, he said, we don't know yet all that will be written on the price tag.

What about the problem of negotiating with the Russians today as compared with a decade or so ago?

I recalled to Mr. Harriman that in the critical years at the end of, and immediately following, the Second World War, his had been one of the few voices high in the Government warning that the Russians could not be counted on as "partners in peace." During 1945 and 1946, particularly, there was a prevailing attitude, fostered by many in the last Roosevelt administration and carried over for a time into that of Truman that the cooperative spirit which the Russians had displayed as military allies could, with tact and forbearance, be translated into political cooperation after the war.

From his vantage point in Moscow, Harriman had taken a decidedly skeptical view of this altruistic policy (as had Churchill, among some others). In many cables to the President and the Secretary of State he had warned that the Russians were embarked on a selfish and cynical course of exploitation in Europe that threatened the Continent with "another barbarian invasion." In the strongest terms, he urged a policy of cold pragmatic realism in dealing with the Kremlin leaders.

Had his opinion changed substantially about this in the intervening years? I asked. Was Khrushchev any easier to get along with than Stalin had been?

"The short answer is, No," he replied promptly. "It is a change wthout a difference, because both men are firm, dogmatic Marxists—true believers.

"Stalin though of himself in the role of a great Marxist prophet and interpreter, on the level of Lenin. He once told me that Communism would thrive 'in the cesspools of capitalism.' He saw the spoilage of Europe in the wake of the war as the historic opportunity for Communism's final thrust westward. And he confidently expected that the United States would crumble in time under the weight of its economic sins, according to the Marxian gospel.

"Khrushchev, on the other hand," he went on, "regards himself as a disciple rather than a prophet. He doesn't try to add to the dogma, as Stalin did, but to modify it and adapt it to his needs. Thus, while he believes as implicitly as Stalin did in the inevitability of world domination, he has abandoned the idea of reaching it by force of violence, but rather by what he calls coexistence, which is force of another kind.

"Stalin said communism would conquer the capitalistic world when the condition of the workers became intolerable. Khrushchev says communism will come into its own by proving to the workers that it is a superior system. But both say they intend to drive capitalism out, and that only communism will survive.

"So, the answer to your question is that there has been some change in the conditions of Russian intransigency but not much in the substance."

Not all of Mr. Harriman's young associates in the Department of State agree with his assessment of the Russian posture today. They think a good deal more softening in the attitude has taken place than he is willing to concede. His frame of reference, they say, is dated and does not take sufficiently into account the political pressures recently bearing down on the Kremlin from Peking, Belgrade, and other points of the compass. But they are just about unanimous in admiring his confidence in this viewpoint and his laconic style in acting upon it.

"He knows what he knows, and he doesn't bother checking out the answers with 10 other people," one of them said recently. "It's the expertise of the 'old hand' who's past caring about impressing anybody, but just wants to get on with a job he knows how to do.

"He has a refreshing sort of irreverence toward the rituals and taboos you run into this business," this source continued. "Harriman hates staff meetings and long-winded briefings and going through channels and doing things a certain way because that's the way they've always been done. When he went off to the ANZUS conference in Australia not long ago, for example, he took only three people with him. The usual delegation for a conference of that sort would be 15 or 20. But Harriman said to hell with it, he didn't want to bother with that many bodies."

There is a similar respect on Capitol Hill for the veteran diplomat and trouble shooter, whose Government service antedates that of any member of the Foreign Relations Committee with which he most frequently has to deal. They admire him not alone for his great store of experience, but for such unexpected examples of his professionalism as startled Chairman J. W. FULBRIGHT not long ago.

Harriman was sitting across the chairman's desk one day engaging him on a matter then pending before the committee. The conversation was interrupted briefly while FULBRIGHT took a telephone call. When the call was completed, Harriman pointed to a letter lying before the Senator and bluntly asked:

"BILL, why on earth are you wasting your time with that crowd on the ——— question?" mentioning an obscure foreign policy matter then under dispute.

"How do you know what's in that letter?" FULBRIGHT asked in amazement.

"Oh, I can read upside down," Harriman answered casually. "Learned to do it years ago. I always read everything on the desk of the people I went to see in Moscow, London, Paris and places like that. I found it quite useful."

Behind The Iron Curtain: I Won't Tell Them About Supreme Court, They Think We're a Christian Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK MINOR MARTIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Speaker, the following article, written by one of my constituents, ran on the front page of the Imperial Valley Press, Imperial, Calif., on the Fourth of July 1963. It should cause the State Department to check its sources of information about liberty under the Communists; it should also cause each Member of this Congress to pause before casting a vote authorizing continuing aid to any nation ruled by the Communists; at the very least, it calls for corrective legislation to permit Bible reading on a noncompulsory basis in public schools. Under unanimous consent I include Mary Dold's article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN: I WON'T TELL THEM ABOUT SUPREME COURT, THEY THINK WE'RE A CHRISTIAN NATION

(By Mary Ann Dold)

In March I made a short visit to Prague, Czechoslovakia. From my experiences in a country where Communists rule and individual freedoms do not exist, I developed a deep sense of pride for my country. Today, in view of Americans' attitude of complacency, I regard my country with shame and pity.

During my visit behind the Iron Curtain, I met with the youth of the Baptist Church in Prague. I witnessed people whose freedom of religion was being thwarted. These people were persecuted for their belief in God. I met students who had been expelled from the Charles University. I met children whose fathers were in prison. I met young girls who worked long hours in factories. Other jobs were not available to them because one Sunday last December these young boys and girls stood up before their congregation in the presence of Communist officials and announced their belief in God.

I joined hands and prayed with these people. We prayed that the Iron Curtain might some day be lifted and they could join us in America. We thanked God for their freedom to worship Christ in their hearts.

The youth in Czechoslovakia taught me a lot about my country. America is their dream.

"America," they said, "is a country based on a Christian heritage. It is a nation under God. The words 'In God We Trust' are written on every coin. The phrase 'under God' is included in the flag salute. The people stand together in public and sing 'God Bless America.' Most important of all, the students can read about God in the classrooms.

"You know," they explained to me, "most of the students in our country have never even heard of God."

I correspond with two boys from the church. I'm not going to write them about the Supreme Court's recent decision to ban Bibles from the classroom. Perhaps they will read about it in their paper—for news like that is always welcomed by the Communists. If they should hear about it, I know they won't understand. They would say it is a lie, produced by the Communists.

"Surely," they will argue, "the Christians will use their freedom of speech and unite in a protest against such a decision. After all, what do American Christians have to lose? There are no Communists to put the fathers in prison, to send the children to factories and keep the students out of the universities. No, the idea of Americans letting their great 'nation under God' lose its Christian foundation, is too absurd."

I'll just send them a newspaper clipping of us Americans at our big Fourth of July celebrations.

Kennedy's Two-Faced Cuban Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, when will the American people be told the truth—when it is too late?

In the July 10 issue of the Long Island Press, Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott tell about the incredible "Kennedy Policy" on Cuba:

KENNEDY'S CUBA POLICY A TWO-FACED THING?

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy's Cuban policy has an increasing resemblance to Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.

While State Department spokesmen are publicly proclaiming the administration's firm intention to continue to isolate the Red-ruled island, the President's inner council of policy advisers is privately pursuing an exactly opposite course.

Without a single protest, these White House authorities are permitting large quantities of oil from Western and Communist countries to flow into Cuba to keep Castro's sagging economy operating and his Soviet-equipped and dominated military machine running.

The President's assistants are even proceeding with a closely guarded plan to resume diplomatic relations with Castro by sending a charge d'affaires to Havana.

The carefully masked face of the administration's Cuban policy is clearly reflected in Navy reports on the steadily increasing volume of Western and Communist shipping to Cuba, surveys by the Maritime Administration, and high significant discussions among top administration officials.

Naval Intelligence's latest reports disclose that 429 Russian-satellite and 205 Western vessels arrived in Cuba in the first 6 months of 1963. The Maritime Administration, which lacks certain clandestine information available to the Navy, states that "at least 167 free world ships docked in Cuba since January 1, 1963."

According to the Navy's unpublished estimate, 96 of the Russian-satellite vessels were tankers carrying vital supplies of oil, kerosene, and aviation gasoline to Soviet and Castro military forces.

Both of these official reports also reveal the disturbing fact that in the past 3 months an increasing number of ships flying free-world flags have been showing up in Cuban ports, under contract to Soviet bloc countries.

Most of these ships (39 in April, 42 in May, and 53 in June) are of British registry, although many actually are owned by nationals of Greece, Italy, and Norway.

THE OIL TRAFFIC

Of the Western ships plying the Cuban trade, 21 are tankers, 13 of them flying the British flag. Three other tankers are Greek, three Norwegian, and two Italian.

In overall tonnage, these tankers represent nearly one-fourth of the 1,031,517 tons of Western shipping now serving Cuba.

These Western tankers averaged two trips to Cuba in the first 6 months, according to the Navy, indicating the vessels are regularly assigned to transporting Western oil there.

As administration policy is to blacklist only individual ships and not the entire fleet of an owner, these foreign operators find it highly profitable—and safe—to assign certain vessels to the Cuban trade.

This glaring loophole makes utterly meaningless the loudly ballyhooed blacklist the only concrete measure so far taken to curb Western shipping.

Repeated efforts by congressional leaders to put teeth into the administration's shipping blacklist have been disregarded by the President and his policy advisers. They claim stiffer measures would lead to vehement objections by U.S. allies, particularly Britain.

Significantly, these potent White House lieutenants are suppressing a Defense Intelligence Agency report indicating that considerable quantities of strategic lubricating oil, processed in the United States and used in ground-to-air missile systems, have turned up in Cuba after being transshipped from another country.

This same report also reveals that Venezuelan oil is finding its way to Cuba by transshipment through European and Latin American firms.

SHIFTING POLICY

As reported in this column on June 19, President Kennedy is seriously considering a State Department proposal to resume diplomatic ties with Castro.

As a first step, the President is contemplating reopening the U.S. Embassy in Havana by sending a charge d'affaires there. Under the plan, this would take place in September. At present, the Swiss are handling U.S. affairs in Cuba.

The closely guarded move to "normalize" relations with Communist puppet Dictator Castro is linked directly with the President's elaborate maneuvers to ease tensions with Russia.

If the resumption of diplomatic ties with Castro can be brought off, the President then contemplates a gradual relaxation of the trade ban on Cuba. The administration's decision to drop plans to ask the Organization of American States to declare a sweeping economic embargo against Cuba is a direct result of these new policy considerations.

BEHIND THE NEWS

Chicago newspapers owe their interviews with Benjamin J. Davis, national secretary of the U.S. Communist Party, during the NAACP convention, to an FBI tip, giving his hotel and room number. The G-men wanted to alert the public to the Communists' secret scheme to move in to take over demonstrations and sessions.

Another Yalta appears to be in the wind, with the same authors telling us why:

RUSSIA-UNITED STATES NONAGGRESSION PACT IN THE WIND

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev already have reached an understanding "in principle" to ban nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere and underwater and on a compromise tie between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

The later is to consist of an exchange of military missions between the Western and Soviet bloc alliances.

Establishment of this relationship would be the first step in an overall plan under which, sometime in the future, a nonaggression treaty would be negotiated between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

If and when such a nonaggression accord is reached, it will expressly exclude recognition of East Germany.

At the adamant demand of Chancellor Adenauer, Kennedy insisted on this and Khrushchev has tentatively agreed to it.

With the exception of France, all the other NATO members have approved the proposal to exchange East-West military missions. President de Gaulle so far has taken no stand on this; he has said neither yes nor no.

Other high French authorities are indicating he will not oppose it, and eventually will probably agree to it.

This closely guarded Kennedy-Khrushchev "understanding in principle," which is now beginning to unfold in public, is the culmination of many months of involved and circuitous parleying and maneuvering through: first, the 30-odd personal letters exchanged between the President and the Soviet ruler; second, the former's recent junket to Europe; third, Belgian Foreign Minister Paul Henri Spaak's talks in Kiev with Khrushchev this week; and fourth, Under Secretary Averell Harriman's trip to Moscow next week to discuss the proposed limited nuclear test ban.

Spaak's widely fanfared trip to Kiev was preceded by another equally significant but unpublicized journey made by the former NATO Secretary General and Assistant Defense Secretary Paul Nitze.

They made the rounds of all the NATO powers to sound them out on Kennedy's compromise proposal to exchange military missions between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

This was the President's answer to Khrushchev's demand for a nonaggression treaty between the two alliances. He offered exchanging military missions as "a first step," with a treaty to follow at some future date.

It was the President's contention this evolutionary process is necessary to "create the required public atmosphere" in the West.

While in Germany, the President personally outlined his plan to Chancellor Adenauer. The soon-to-retire aged leader agreed to go along on one condition—that recognition of East Germany be expressly excluded from a nonaggression pact, if and when there ever is one.

Armed with this almost unanimous NATO backing—France excepted—Spaak flew to Russia and put Kennedy's compromise up to Khrushchev.

The Kremlin ruler accepted it—pending the outcome of the test ban deliberations. But he vigorously stressed to Spaak that "sooner or later the West will have to come to terms with East Germany"; that this is one demand Russia will insist be faced.

Khrushchev also told Spaak he is prepared to go along on a nuclear test ban limited to the atmosphere and underwater.

It is the President's theory this will clear the way for an eventual ban on underground testing subject to some form of effective inspection. Only time will tell whether there is any basis for his optimism.

Under Secretary Harriman is not expected to work out the actual details of a ban agreement. His primary mission is to formulate the general basis of such an accord. The specific provisions will be drafted by specialists later; probably at the Geneva Disarmament Conference now in recess.

Signing of a final agreement will probably take place at the United Nations. Khrushchev has indicated willingness to go there for this purpose.

The President and Prime Minister Macmillan also would attend. Their presence almost certainly would lead to a summit conference which might deal with other major East-West tensions and problems—such as Soviet troops in Cuba, strife-torn Laos, West Berlin.

All these grandiose plans and objectives are still highly "iffy."

The high unpredictable tiger the President is riding is clearly spelled out in a National Security Council "position paper" circulating in top administration quarters. One especially significant portion is as follows:

"East Germany is a problem of particular moment. To indicate that we regard the division of Germany as permanent would be to shake West German confidence in the West and thus jeopardize effective German participation in the European and Atlantic Communities.

"On the other hand, it will probably not be possible to insulate ourselves from dealings with the East German regime over the long term. Such dealings need not preclude ultimate reunification and might, if effectively conducted, accelerate the process.

"In line with this assessment, we should adopt a middle of the road policy. We should be prepared to do business with the East German regime, as the need arises, on a technical level—much as the West Germans do. We should encourage the West Germans to take a more forthcoming and confident view of such relations between the United States and East Germany, and to expand rather than contract their own contacts with East Germans.

"We should not, however, agree to official recognition to East Germany, nor expect the West Germans to do so at this time."

Honor Students Discuss Challenge of Space Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the 34th annual commencement of the Wilson High School at West Lawn, Pa., seven honor students made excellent addresses which reflect the thinking of our youth about the challenges of the space age.

The principal commencement address was delivered by Dr. Eugene M. Emme, a historian of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The awards to the honor student swere presented by Mr. Clayton D. Rehrer, secondary principal.

Wilson High School is in the suburban area near Reading. It has the distinction of being an outstanding school.

Every year the senior class comes to Washington to get an inside look at their Congress and to visit historic national shrines.

The addresses given by the seven honor students and the quality of its graduating students reflect the devotion of a talented and dedicated faculty at Wilson High headed by Supervising Principal William C. Kutz.

The award winners were Dale E. Witiver, Lee A. Miller, Wilbert J. Matz, Jr., Frederic R. Barth, John S. Saylor III, H. Theodore Stump, and Christopher Craig.

Mr. Speaker, those among us who look to the future with fear and pessimism may take some comfort in knowing that in growing numbers, our Nation's youth are thinking and preparing to meet the challenge of the space age.

Their interest in health education, character development, cultural understanding, intelligent use of leisure time, vocational preparation, and good citizenship as reflected in the following essays is a good omen for our Nation's future.

GREETINGS AND INTRODUCTION

(By Dale E. Witwer)

Fellow classmates, faculty, parents, and friends of the class, it gives me great pleasure to initiate the commencement program of the class of 1963. The theme "Education for the Space Age" is certainly a most appropriate one.

Our recent space efforts can be liked to the first flights at Kitty Hawk. They, too, were first unmanned but were followed by manned flights, completely preplanned and of a few seconds' duration. Their experiments were, again, power limited, but they soon progressed beyond that point. Space exploration is now at that same stage of development.

In the process of conquering space, a common, but very important, factor cannot be overlooked. This factor is the individual. The enigma of the individual in the space age is a major problem in the world today; we dare not become mere mechanical machines. Our school systems are the natural places for the preparation of the individual. Here, along with the emphasis placed on the sciences and mathematics, other values are stressed. Among these are character, citizenship, health, leisure, vocations, and cultural understanding—our six topics for tonight.

Our guest speaker, Dr. Eugene M. Emme, NASA historian, is going to present the challenges of space exploration. However, the present developments are only the beginning; as the key to one horizon of scientific achievement is found, a door to another and far more complex horizon is opened. There are an infinite number of horizons, keys, and doors. Who can foresee what the future will hold for coming generations?

Time will not permit my six classmates to go into detail on any of the phases of education that will be discussed. But they do hope that they will impress upon you the importance of keeping our educational program in line with the progress of science and space exploration, for the development of the individual is an increasingly vital factor in today's world.

HEALTH EDUCATION

(By Lee A. Miller)

At a time when the world is full of dangers for America, when a new frontier, space, must be conquered, the strength of this Nation as a leader for freedom-loving nations lies with the collective well-being of our people. The adults and youth of America need to develop a level of physical, mental, moral, and spiritual fitness which no other group of people in this world can match.

The vital drive which propels all life has brought America to the point of a cosmic awareness that her people must conquer the obstacles of space and communism if the kind of life we lead is to continue. To accomplish this task, the health and physical fitness of America must be such that each individual has the gift of quick recovery from the stress of a day's work, the ability and energy to carry a heavy schedule of studies, the strength to control his emotions in time of crisis such as the cold war areas of Cuba, Vietnam, Berlin, and the Congo, and the ability to compete both physically and profesionally with the other Communist nations of the world. If Americans can do all this, they will make their mark in the world.

The minds and bodies of the American people must show superb abilities, excellent physically shape, brilliant intellect, high ideals, and hopes to meet the unique stress and environmental conditions which are found in the space age.

The question arises, How do we prepare our people? In answering this question we look to education to teach youth how to develop strength, flexibility, and agility. We must expand our health services, health education, and our physical education programs. We must devote more time to physical activity and to participation in sports. Coordination between the schools and community, between parents and educators is needed to promote a resourceful, vigorous program that will stir the mind of youth to build the strength and energy that is their American heritage.

Somewhere in this hectic life of cars, elevators, escalators, trains, and mechanical gadgets which minimize our physical exertion in our daily work, there still lies a great nation of people full of courage, decency, and vitality, with both purpose and achievement which, in the end, shall preserve this great Republic of ours.

Let us, then, the future generation, assume our duty to be strong enough physically and mentally to meet and defeat any adversary at any place and at any time, whether it be in this old world of ours or in the new world of space.

Character Development

(By Wilbert J. Matz, Jr.)

The evaluation of the total character, whether of an individual or a nation, as yet eludes scientific analysis. The dictionary defines character as a trait or characteristic, or moral excellence. Let us trace this quality in man's development.

From antiquity we have the story of a people whose individual and national character was at a very low ebb. The Creator designated one man who was to survive by building a boat to withstand a flood of waters which annihilated the then known peoples of the earth. When that episode passed, Noah and his family repopulated the earth.

A segment of that society, we are told, migrated and selected to live on a plain. Character was again placed in jeopardy because selfishness prompted the people to say, "Let us build a monument which will reach into outer space toward the heavens so that we shall be remembered for posterity." But this ediface was to glorify man, not God. Looking upon it, then, God decided it was not good and cast upon the builders a confusion of tongues. The monument built amid this confusion of tongues was known as the Tower of Babel, and it finally collapsed. Man had been interested primarily in its significance as a symbol of his material prosperity and of his own superiority.

Now, after many millenniums, we are again reaching into outer space. We hope that this time God will look with favor upon the venture. The approach today is very realistic. By means of locomotion, man now leaves the surface of the earth, releasing himself from the gravitational pull, orbits around the earth and again returns to the earth.

The apparent motive is to probe the depths of nature's laws and to use our knowledge of these laws in our space endeavors. But in seeking the scientific and mechanical know-how required to accomplish this unusual feat, we have perhaps come a little closer to finding the quality of perfection.

Consider the selection of the men who carry out the optimum effort. Physical and emotional reactions are given a thorough check, such thoroughness arising from the humane desire to preserve the life of the individual. However, more significant in the study of character is the fact that the thousands of individuals participating in this space project have proved their sincerity of effort, or we might say their integrity, which is an unbroken faith in an ideal. Sincerity, then, would seem to be a keystone of character.

Let us look specifically at Maj. Gordon Cooper, the most recent astronaut, whose life in the space capsule was similar to living in a glass fishbowl. We could see him through television, and we could hear his voice; the technicians could measure his brain waves, blood pressure, heartbeat; and finally we had a firsthand look at the results of character. Through the close scrutiny of Cooper in his glass bowl, we may say we have seen character in action.

The Philosopher Spinoza once said, in effect, "Man who has the attribute of reason does not fear." No one watching Major Cooper can doubt that he used the attribute of reason to the utmost.

Since example is more powerful than precept, need we ask for further definition or analysis of character? It is sufficient to say that not only in our space efforts but in our everyday living on this planet, we need courage and composure, sincerity and integrity, intelligent use of knowledge and reason, and above all, faith in the divine power man has recognized over the centuries.

And if we, as individuals, are armed with these qualities, shall we have the national character needed to continue our advance into outer space? Shall we be getting nearer to God, the infinite source? If we reach other planets and if we encounter a lower or a higher source of life, what will be the outcome?

Cultural Understanding

(By Frederic Barth)

It is quite evident that the threat of danger or a spectacular rift in foreign relations brings the people of a nation into close communion. The struggle before them has an effect of uniting their differences and overcoming their weaknesses as a people. The space age has initiated similar feelings of unity within our own country, feelings almost visible in the tense atmosphere surrounding a sidewalk television. Men and women who have never met converse freely, exchanging their emotions as they await word on their orbiting neighbor. Here is a brotherhood, a closeness which develops from man's regard for man. This closeness produces in everyone a sense of well-being unlike any other.

Our Nation's scientific progress is entirely a product of unity. The contributions of Einstein—a German, Bohr—a Dane, and Fermi—an Italian, helped us achieve our position in the space age. And yet, why must such powerful and productive unity be limited to scientific achievements? With such insight into the awesome creativity of scientists working together, it staggers the imagination to consider the possibilities before a unified world.

A single note played on any musical instrument can hardly be called beautiful in itself. Rather, it takes the myriad tones of many instruments to produce a moving symphony. Each of these tones is important to the harmony of the whole, and the loss of any one would find the composition incomplete.

In a like manner, all men must be conditioned to respond to beauty and greatness, to band together in quest of goals beneficial to all, forgetting the selfish interests of a divided world. Culturally, our world has always been emphasizing its differences. Man has always been a mocker of things strange to him. His lack of understanding has caused him to ridicule religions, customs, and moral values of any number of cultures. Such attacks have never succeeded in building up any people or their society; instead it seems that man has strangely enough, been building a yolk of burden for himself each time he has opposed one of his own kind. If the need to resolve these problems is recognized in this very age, it is obvious that intolerance and lack of understanding should not be a part of our otherwise bright future.

The dedicated mind must now center its efforts on improving human relationships, which have been impaired by self-interest.

Every man must recognize the folly of his own selfishness and turn to aid his neighbor in establishing a world community.

Use of Leisure Time

(By John Saylor III)

Leisure—is it a problem? Why bother even to think about it, much less speak on so insignificant a topic? The answer is that leisure is fast becoming a major concern of our Government, and it is not an unimportant and easily ignored problem. Today's average workingman labors a little over half as long as his counterpart of 50 years ago, while the workweek continues to shrink. Retirement age is now a compulsory 65, and even the hours children spend in school have been shortened. Leisure is big business. Sporting goods suppliers, publishing houses, and the multimillion dollar television industry all thrive and have as their lifeblood the leisure of America.

All right—we have leisure. Does this necessarily constitute a problem? For many, leisure is a pleasure and a blessing, and for some it is a curse. The curse of loneliness and boredom which fosters juvenile delinquency, alcoholism, crime, gambling, and ultimately insanity. People are intelligent and because of this ability to reason they must have a focus for their thoughts. A feeling of accomplishing something, of having some effect, good or bad, on society is needed by every human being. If no productive outlet is available, men invariably turn to the destructive to satiate their lust for importance.

Therefore society must provide some way of dispersing all this surplus animal energy. This may not be accomplished as in George Orwells' "1984" by coercing people into accepting what the Government thinks right. The only feasible method of helping the human beings cope with leisure time is to provide them with varied opportunities while they are still in school. After 40 years of working as an engineer, a retired man may remember how much he enjoyed acting in a class play during his schooldays and therefore join a local dramatic group. A recent high school graduate who had learned to like photography in school could use his free Saturday to develop his own darkroom and become more interested in his hobby instead of ending up in the local bar.

Educators can encourage interests in graphic arts, reading, dramatics, music, metalshop and other fields to help people occupy themselves. The community, too, educates and it can help by sponsoring clubs for groups of people with common interests and by providing recreational facilities for young and for old. Another necessity of every person is something higher and something better than himself to cling to and trust in. A sincere faith in God is to be cherished and strived for.

All these things provide a way of making each individual feel that he is needed to make our world complete * * * and each person is needed. If we can all learn to help others and ourselves while using our leisure time in an enjoyable way, the world will have come much closer to attaining that happiness it seeks.

Growth in Citizenship

(By H. Theodore Stump)

What does citizenship mean today in an era when vast new reservoirs of knowledge are constantly being opened to man? Is it more difficult for a person to be a worthy member of our society than it was 10 or 20 years ago? These questions must certainly be answered if we are to define citizenship.

Today's citizen—not as a mere name in a census book, but rather as a man devoted to a troubled world and loyal to his own country—has many obstacles with which to cope if he hopes to be an asset to his fellowman. It seems a great many generation will pass before man will be ready to live for such common goals as the conquering of the universe or the elimination of poverty.

As a start he must learn to have faith and trust in himself; only then will he be ready to trust others. The community is the next hurdle in this race for not simply peaceful coexistence but for peaceful existence. How can we attempt to end a cold world war while our faces are still being seared by the heat of a smaller but hotter local conflict between decency and vice, gambling, murder, corruption, and the rest of this list which has become the constitution of our fair community. Perhaps this document could be obliterated if we, as citizens, exerted a bit of effort.

The extinguishing of such local conflagrations would lead the attack on our more numerous national problems. In my opinion, no man can be considered a true citizen of his country if he harbors feelings of complacency toward corrupt politics or racial prejudice. The latter of these problems—the rift between the Negro and the white is indubitably one of the gravest ever encountered by our Nation. Complete integration and the elimination of prejudice are the only conceivable solutions to this issue. In the past hundred years we have traveled only a short distance toward the necessary goal, but at least we are progressing toward the answers to this and many other problems.

Now try to visualize the seemingly infinite number of world difficulties, among which the cold war, poverty, and illiteracy are most distressing. A solution to these seems unattainable unless the 3 billion inhabitants of this earth join to form one immense citizenry with a common ideal. Such a force would assure man of success in any endeavor.

Since, however, a utopia like this is at best only visionary, the question remains: Are we ready to becomes citizens of the universe if we seem unable to be successful citizens of our own communities, nations, and world? Possibly, space and its exploration hold the solutions to our problems. Might not the desire to conquer the mysteries of that endless void force humanity to combine its efforts? This result is not impossible; however, that such desires might lead instead to greater problems is just as believable. With us lies the answer to the ultimate question: Are we, humanity, ready to accept citizenship in the age of space?

Vocational Preparation

(By Christopher Craig)

For 12 long years we have traveled what at times seemed the rocky road of education. Looking back, those 12 years seem now to be not so long. In some future day, they may seem all too short. What have we been doing during those 12 years? It is hoped that we have been getting an education. And what is that education for? It is for many things—among them, to train us for a vocation; to train us so that we can lead a useful life, and do some small act, some small accomplishment to leave this earth a better place.

For some of us, the job is done. We are ready now to go forth in our chosen field. For others, education will continue for 2, 4, even 8 or 10 more years. This time will be spent preparing us for our vocation.

But that is not the sole purpose of an education. Not only does it train us for an occupation; it trains us for choosing an occupation. We have been gaining information in occupations; we have been gaining information on occupations. And we have been gaining the wisdom to choose that occupation which best suits our temperament.

For work need not be some loathesome task we would rather not do. Our occupations should be what we are happiest doing, and if we would rather be doing something else, we had best do something else. That is part of the purpose of education; to prevent us from making such a mistake, so that we do choose the field in which we will be most content. That profession we choose must be chosen with care, for we will be in it for life.

Or will we? The time we live in is one of rapid change. Some occupations become obsolete; others take precedence. The occupation we choose today may, in 10 years, be relatively useless. "The old order changeth, yielding place to new * * *." We must be ready for that change when it comes, whether it is a complete change of occupation, or a change within our chosen occupations.

We are now in the midst of an explosion of the aggregate knowledge available to mankind. It is variously estimated that present knowledge has a half-life of 10 years; that is, half of what we know today will be useless in 10 years. The other half will be knowledge not even glimpsed today. We must be constantly aware of these changes going on—aware of the new, and knowledgeable in it.

That is a third purpose of education, to make us better able to learn new things, and there are many new things we will have to learn, constantly, to keep pace with the times. When we stop learning, we start vegetating. We become less and less useful in our chosen field. Education is a continuous process. By mere dint of being in industry approximately three times longer than in school, that is where most of our learning will be. In school, we have learned to learn.

So, in the last 12 years we have been learning vocations, we have been learning to choose a vocation, and we have been educated in the learning processes. We must now choose our vocations, and choose with care, for our vocation is our education.

Public Power Uses Tax Dollars for Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include the following column, "Taxpayers Foot Public Power Project Costs," written by William A. Doyle and appearing in the Houston Post. The facts contained in this article should make interesting reading for those who are under the impression that public power is a gift from a beneficent government:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, July 9, 1963]

The Daily Investor: Taxpayers Foot Public Power Project Costs

(By William A. Doyle)

Question. I am disturbed by all the propaganda being spread around by so-called public power organizations. Those socialists are financed by the Federal Government. I am very unhappy about this because I own stock in some investor-owned public utility companies. These investments are intended to provide me income and also to help put my grandson through college.

I was really shocked to see an advertisement in a national magazine claiming that America's rural electric systems are following in Daniel Boone's footsteps. Who pays for this propaganda?

Answer. You do. I do. And so does every other taxpayer in these United States.. It's as simple as that.

The so-called public power people are living high these days, thanks to their patsies in government. Socialistic power systems (and that's a much more honest description) are springing up and expanding like crazy.

And, frankly, the whole thing is just that—crazy.

A socialistic power organization (whether it be a Tennessee Valley Authority or a rural electric system or a municipally-owned system or anything else of that ilk) can only survive because it lives on the taxpayers' dollars.

If any of those outfits had to go out and raise money (for construction, improvements, etc.) without Government subsidies taxes, as investor-owned companies must, the bureaucrats who are getting fat running and promoting them would drop dead.

I am well aware that this column is certain to bring in a dogmatic, organized letter-writing campaign from public power people and their patsies. For them, I have the following reply.

Get your nose out of the public trough and try earning your living.

Question. I am 72. My wife is 65. For years we have accumulated Pacific Power & Light Co. common stock. We don't want to worry unnecessarily but we are concerned about the published stories that Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall is trying to "build an empire and strangle private industry" by spending billions of taxpayers' dollars on powerlines and similar projects.

We fear that the Government may take over Pacific Power & Light. Is there any danger of this?

Answer. Rest easy. Any danger of that (in the immediate future or even in your lifetime) seems more than remote—just about impossible.

There's no getting around the fact that Udall has been pushing socialistic power projects—to the detriment of investor-owned utility companies and at the cost of all the Nation's taxpayers.

You should realize that Udall is a member of President Kennedy's Cabinet. What Udall does reflects the policies of the New Frontier.

Where electric utility companies are concerned, those policies are far out—in left field.

But, from the mailbag, it's easy to spot the growing resentment of those Udall-Kennedy policies. That's a hopeful sign. There are millions of utility company stockholders in this country. It's about time that politicians began to show some concern for those stockholders and voters.

The New Jersey Military Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important segments in the vital

Armed Forces Reserve of our Nation is the National Guard.

While not denigrating the Guards of other States, we from New Jersey are especially proud of our National Guard.

One of the many reasons for the continuing excellence of New Jersey's Guard is the careful selection and training of its officers.

The New Jersey Military Academy at Sea Girt is the major source of officer replacements. The academy was established in 1957 on the orders of Maj. Gen. James F. Cantwell, the distinguished and effective chief of staff of the New Jersey Department of Defense. And it has been a success from its very start.

Since my colleagues are all concerned with the subject of our national defense, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD an article about the academy which was written by Mr. Warren Kennet and appeared in the Newark Sunday News yesterday:

NEW JERSEY MILITARY ACADEMY TOUGH: 133 OF 177 OFFICER TRAINEES LEFT IN GUARD CLASS

(By Warren Kennet)

SEA GIRT.—Through the New Jersey Military Academy, founded here in 1957, the National Guard is producing its own officers.

Students are trained under a formula set up by the Army Infantry School at Fort Benning, Ga. To date 457 candidates have been graduated.

Today State officer candidate schools are about the only way the Guard can get replacement officers for those who must leave the service under the provisions of the Reserve Officers' Personnel Act and those who leave the Guard voluntarily or through retirement.

New Jersey was one of the first States to organize an officers candidate school. It was instituted on orders of Maj. Gen. James F. Cantwell, chief of staff of the New Jersey Department of Defense. He was one of the first Guard leaders in the country to recognize the need for supplying qualified, trained officers if the Guard was to retain its position as the first line of defense behind the Active Army.

Maj. Gen. Edward O. Wolf, commander of the 50th Armored Division of the Army Guard is superintendent of the academy. Col. William R. Sharp, head of the operations and training division of the Defense Department, who has had years of experience as a combat officer, is commandant.

Standards are so high for admission and training that the school has been dubbed the "Little West Point." Army Secretary Cyrus R. Vance visited the school a week ago. It was his first visit to any officers candidate school and he said: "I'm glad this was the first because I'm sure I'm not going to see any better."

Every effort is made to encourage young men in the Guard to apply for admission to the academy but not all get by the board of officers who screen the candidates and some of those accepted are not able to complete the program.

The present class, seventh of the school, completed 2 weeks of field training here today. A total of 177 men applied for admission but only 146 were approved by the board. Since then the class has been reduced to 133. And, because of the rigid course of instruction more may drop out or be dropped before graduation time.

The school stresses adequate motivation of the candidates. They must have the capacity to absorb a vast amount of instruction in a short time and they must be in top physical condition.

Of the present class, which will take a full year's training on weekends and serve another 2-week period at the academy next year before graduation, 80 percent are college trained and 40 percent are college graduates. The remainder have the required high school level of education. The average age of the candidates is 24.5 years.

Besides publishing the program of instruction, the Infantry School provides lesson plans and necessary student materials, suggestions for training aids, and references. It also writes all examinations and grades the papers. Candidates failing to maintain an average of 70 are required to appear before a board of officers for a review of their records. The commandant gets the board's recommendation in each case.

Instructors are drawn from the various units of the Army National Guard and the same high standards that prevail in the selection of candidates are applied in the assignment of officers and enlisted men to the staff and faculty. Advisers to the Army National Guard are also used as members of the staff and faculty.

The program contains 269 hours of instruction, 180 mandatory and 89 optional. However, 22 hours of optional subjects must be selected and programed by the State officer candidate school. Thus the candidates complete the 202 hours of instruction which is required for Federal recognition as a second lieutenant.

While at summer field training the course is particularly tough since the students get a large amount of tactical training in addition to classroom work. Physical fitness and leadership are considered the two most important essentials in the school.

The school, which has been a model for others in many States, is strictly a New Jersey product. Although some Federal funds were provided, the greater part of the cost of remodeling and rehabilitation of various buildings used here by the academy, were paid for by the State of New Jersey. In the 6 years the school has been in existence an estimated $172,000 has been appropriated by the State for capital improvements and operation.

Russian Action Against Jews a Violation of U.N. Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the following articles by the well-known columnist, Roscoe Drummond, and excerpts from a report by Dr. Richard C. Hertz, chairman of the Committee on Jews in the Soviet Orbit for the Central Conference of American Rabbis, present tragic evidence of virulent anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. Mr. Drummond describes the mass Soviet show trials against "economic parasites," the real purpose of which is to encourage anti-Jewish prejudice among the Soviet population. Dr. Hertz speaks of the Soviet type of anti-Semitism as "cultural genocide"—a deliberate attempt on the part of the Soviet Government to destroy Jewish culture, learning, religion.

Soviet discrimination toward the Jews, I submit, is a blatant violation of the obligations to promote human rights which the Soviet Union assumed when it signed and ratified the United Nations Charter. One of the purposes of the United Nations, as set forth in article 1, paragraph 3, is to promote and encourage "respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." Article 56 contains a pledge whereby members engage themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the United Nations to promote "universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedom for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." The Soviet Union has not lived up to its solemn promise in article 56.

Furthermore, on December 9, 1948, the United Nations General Assembly unanimously adopted a Convention on Genocide which confirmed that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, was a crime under international law which the contracting parties undertook to prevent and to punish. The convention defined genocide as "any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group as such: (a) Killing members of the group; (b) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) forcibly transferring children of the group to another group." The Soviet Union signed the Convention on December 16, 1949 and ratified it on May 3, 1954. It appears that Soviet discrimination toward its Jewry has reached the point where it is violating the UN Convention on Genocide. Is it by accident, that, as Mr. Drummond points out, of the more than 140 death sentences handed down in the economic crimes trails, at least 83 of the condemned have been Jews? Or are the Soviet show trials a deliberate genocide campaign parading under the mask of a war against "economic parasites"?

A better indication of the Soviet attitude toward human rights than its signature of the Genocide Convention is probably its refusal to suport the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the General Assembly on December 10, 1948. Eight members of the United Nations abstained in the vote on the declaration, six of them Soviet bloc countries, including the Soviet Union. The declaration states that all human beings are free and equal; that no one shall be subjected to inhuman punishment; that all are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law; and that everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion and of peaceful assembly. In stating his objections to the declaration, the Soviet delegate argued that it was directed against national sovereignty. Thus, the true Soviet position on human rights was revealed: the state is above the human person. The following articles by Mr. Drummond and Dr. Hertz confirm these conclusions:

[From the Bulletin of Temple Beth El, May 31, 1963]

Jews and Judaism in the Soviet Orbit

(By Dr. Richard C. Hertz)

(Note.—Dr. Richard C. Hertz is chairman of the Committee on Jews in the Soviet Orbit for the Central Conference of American Rabbis. His report, recently published in the newest Yearbook of the CCAR, summarizes the general situation of Jews and Judaism behind the Iron Curtain. Because it is of interest to more than rabbis, a portion is excerpted here.)

Nearly 3 million Jews in the U.S.S.R. are being slowly strangled spiritually by the Soviet policy of forcible assimilation. Jewish identification is insisted upon by the Government but allowed to have no real content. Cultural and religious discrimination against the Jewish minority is widely practiced. Jewish synagogues are gradually being closed, their leaders arrested and disappearing in a mysterious manner reminiscent of Stalinism. No Jewish education can be given to the young. No Jewish schools and Jewish organizations are allowed. No Jewish religious books are published. No voluntary associations of Jews are permitted to meet. No contact with other Jewish congregations or with the outside Jewish world is tolerated. No young people are to be found in the synagogues still operating—just old people whom the Kremlin allows to let die off along with their withering Judaism and their faded, tattered Taleisim. The young people seem to have little spiritual or moral determination to resist the drying up of the Jewish stream. Many have intermarried or surrendered to the Communist pounding that religion is "the opiate of the masses." Many have swallowed the Lenin-Stalin line about religion and today are largely antireligious, atheistic, law-abiding Russian citizens.

Meanwhile discrimination against the Jews is widely practiced, especially in the military and diplomatic and higher echelons of education and government. Anti-Jewish feeling in Russia, so deeply rooted since the days of the czars, is still rampant despite Soviet protestations to the contrary. Jews must carry on their internal identification card the stamp "Jew" and thereby subject themselves to discrimination subtle or overt. Though Jews have minority status, they are permitted none of the rights or privileges of that status, such as having cultural autonomy with their own press or language or gathering place. Jews are not permitted to be reunited with their families who have emigrated to other parts of the world. Their mail is censored. Jews are not permitted to engage in any of the national cultural exchange. Every effort to arrange such an exchange has thus far failed to be approved by the Soviet authorities.

Thus, Soviet Jews appear to be Jews without leadership, without faith, without organization, without commitment, even without the will to survive as Jews. As one college student visiting Russian Jewry wrote home to his parents last summer, "Just as Catholicism in Poland, Judaism grows stronger in the basements and catacombs of refuge than in a synagogue. As for now, the Jews in Russia remain a chosen people—chosen for economic discrimination and cultural extinction."

Although Mr. Khrushchev has expounded at great length on the sins of Stalin, he has completely glided over and bypassed the sins of Stalin against the Jews in his black years. The Jews of Russia are silent. They cannot speak out, and their spirit is in chains of fear lest the Stalinist methods return.

The real danger of the U.S.S.R.'s type of anti-Semitism is the discriminatory policy militating against the survival of Jews as a national and religious minority. It is a policy of cultural genocide. Soviet anti-Semitism is not just an official policy against its Jewish citizens. It is much more subtle. It is again Jewish culture, Jewish learning, Jewish religion. It is against the men who perpetuate those values—the rabbis, the teachers, the writers, the journalists, the poets, and others who are identified with a distinctly Jewish culture. By way of contrast, Soviet anti-Semitism is different from czarist pogroms. Then it was the destruction of Jews that was determined, but Judaism survived. Now, Jews manage to make a living in the U.S.S.R., but the destruction of Judaism is the target.

The battle for Jewish survival runs low in the U.S.S.R. Time is on the side of the Kremlin. After 45 years of communism, Khrushchev does not have to make the same mistake as Hitler. He can patiently wait out the deaths of those over sixty, who remember the days of their youth. Time in slowly de-Judaizing the young Russian Jews who have lost their synagogues, their Yeshivas, their rabbis, their prayerbooks, their Bibles, their Talmuds, their Hebrew language. Only folk memories remain as a nostalgic leftover of the once proud and virile Russian Jewry.

Still, as dark as the picture looks, there are a few—the saving remnant—who have retained an unshaken loyalty to Judaism and a historic attachment to the Jewish people. They dare not be vocal yet, but they are there, strong, unmistakable, anxious to have contact with Jews outside of their prison walls, famished for some bread of the spirit. As long as they carry on, the time has not yet come to write off 3 million Jews in Russia.

U.S.S.R. AND THE STATE OF ISRAEL

What about the U.S.S.R.'s relations with Israel this year? Only as recently as 1948, when Israel declared its independence, the U.S.S.R. rushed to recognize the new Jewish state at once. But Russia's diplomatic support of Israel was not motivated by any love for Jews or for Zionism. Self-interest and self-advantage dictated Soviet moves as in all Soviet diplomatic maneuvering. Russia was anxious to discredit Britain and expose the malfeasance and chaos which British imperialism had brought in its wake. This was effective Communist propaganda. However, since 1948, the U.S.S.R. has steadily and openly set upon a course of infiltration into the Middle East, wooing the Arabs and trying to establish there a sphere of interest. This past year showed that Soviet power is not as influential as the Kremlin might hope. Signs that Nasser is weakening his ties with Moscow came to light. Disappointed with its lack of success in the Middle East, the Kremlin initiated an even stronger propaganda drive against Israel. Arab realists, both in Egypt and in Syria, are beginning to realize that the vast supply of arms and economic aid from Moscow is not motivated by altruistic reasons but has been a purely political maneuver in the cold war. Russia has brought fierce charges against "the Zionists who always use imperialism to consolidate their position in the Middle East."

A new low in anti-Zionist denunciation was reached this year in Moscow broadcasts. Zionist leaders were accused of "maintaining links with German revenge-seekers, with Portuguese butchers, with Franco and even with the extremists in Algeria." The Zionists, the broadcasts alleged, were prepared to aid "everyone they thought might be useful with arms, espionage, information and everything else."

Even the Israeli diplomats of the Israel Embassy in Moscow, always trailed by Soviet plainclothesmen, were ordered to sit in a separate section of the Moscow Central Synagogue when they attended Sabbath services. This would segregate them by a corde sanitaire and prevent them from having conversation or contact with Moscow Jews.

The new Soviet drive against Israel this year, therefore, seems like an additional link in the pattern of the anti-Jewish, anti-foreign, anti-Western program of the Kremlin. It could only be construed as a fresh attempt to prevent a settling down of relations in the Middle East, where news of Israeli progress and prosperity was already reaching Arab ears. Exploiting anti-Israel sentiment in the United Nations, as well as in the Middle East, seems motivated by the traditional Russian technique of fomenting suspicion and insecurity, two elements which suit Russia's aims and have long been associated with her tactics for winning the world for the Communist conspiracy.

Jews Being Purged by Russian Courts

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Washington.—A vast and many-sided campaign against "economic parasites" is being carried out in the Soviet Union today—with ominous overtones.

Its declared objective is understandable. It is to eradicate widespread economic crime in which large numbers of Soviet citizens apparently engage in one degree or another.

Three powerful instruments of the state are being used in this concerted operation. They are: mass show trials, a mounting number of death sentences, and a nationwide propaganda drive in the Soviet press.

In dozens of Soviet cities people are being mobilized to witness the trials and to endorse the convictions (which always come out the same way: guilty). The crimes are described as embezzlement of public funds and property, currency speculation and bribery. In groups of 8 to 60, the accused are tried and sentenced—without right of appeal and generally to long imprisonment.

Steadily the toll has mounted of those sentenced to death by shooting. It has reached more than 140.

While world attention has been riveted on the death sentences, there is another aspect of this campaign which is even more ominous—that in the show trials, in the death sentences, in the press propaganda, Soviet Jews are being uniquely singled out for attack, for calumny, and for death. Most of the mass trials have been anti-Jewish in character and of the more than 140 sentenced to death, at least 83 have been Jews.

I have examined full translations of reports of many of these cases. They reveal an unmistakable pattern of hostility to Jews. In many the religious affiliation of the accused is explicit. But even when the word "Jew" is not used, the Jewish names of the accused are prominently featured.

The campaign plays many variations on one central theme: the Jew is antihero in the Soviet Union. It pulls out all the stops on the traditional anti-Jewish stereotypes. The Jew is described as having "an insatiable thirst for money and skill at its acquisition." Jews are portrayed as "conniving," "lying" and "bribing." Again and again they are depicted as the initiators and masterminds of criminal gains. The suggestion is repeatedly made that there would be no economic crime among non-Jews if the Jews didn't put them up to it.

It is a careful statement to say that this campaign conjures up a version of the traditional anti-Semitic fantasy of an international Jewish financial conspiracy.

The result and, one cannot doubt, the purpose are to encourage and perpetuate the deep-rooted anti-Semitic prejudices that are widespread among large segments of the Soviet population—and to implant them where they do not already exist.

Jews Are Target of Campaign

(By Roscoe Drummond)

A vast and many-sided campaign against "economic parasites" is being carried out in the Soviet Union today—with ominous overtones.

Its declared objective is understandable. It is to eradicate widespread economic crime in which large numbers of Soviet citizens apparently engage in one degree or another.

Three powerful instruments of the state are being used in this concerted operation. They are: Mass show trials, a mounting number of death sentences, and a nationwide propaganda drive in the Soviet press.

In dozens of Soviet cities people are being mobilized to witness the trials and to endorse the convictions (which always come out the same way: "Guilty"). The crimes are described as embezzlement of public funds and property, currency speculation, and bribery. In groups of 8 to 60, the accused are tried and sentenced—without right of appeal and generally to long imprisonment.

Steadily the toll has mounted of those sentenced to death by shooting. It has reached more than 140. This stark fact of meting out capital punishment for economic offenses is beginning to shock humane opinion and stir protests even from friends of the U.S.S.R.

While world attention has been riveted on the death sentences, there is another aspect of this campaign which is even more ominous. This most ominous fact is that in the show trials, in the death sentences, in the press propaganda, Soviet Jews are being uniquely singled out for attack, for calumny, and for death. Most of the mass trials have been anti-Jewish in character and of the more than 140 sentenced to death, at least 83 have been Jews.

Many thousands of spectators witness the trials, but it is the official Soviet press coverage which magnifies the audience to millions. This is the audience at which the anti-Semitic campaign is directed. What is this audience being told?

I have examined full translations of many of these articles. They reveal an unmistakable pattern of hostility to Jews. In many of them the religious affiliation of the accused is explicit. But even the word "Jew" is not used, the Jewish names of the accused are prominently featured.

The campaign plays many variations on one central theme: The Jew is anti-hero in the Soviet Union. It pulls out all the stops on the traditional anti-Jewish stereotypes. The Jew is described as having "an insatiable thirst for money and skill at its acquisition." Jews are portrayed as "conniving," "lying," and "bribing." Again and again they are depicted as "the initiators and masterminds of criminal gains." The suggestion is repeatedly made that there would be no economic crime among non-Jews if the Jews didn't put them up to it.

It is a careful statement to say that this campaign conjures up a version of the traditional anti-Semitic fantasy of an international Jewish financial conspiracy. It does so in the most offensive and prejudicial terms. The tone of the Soviet press toward Jews is bitter, spiteful, contemptuous. It heaps upon Jewry blanket condemnation, ridicule, insult, and shame.

The result, and one cannot doubt, the purposes are to encourage and perpetuate the deep-rooted anti-Semitic prejudices that are widespread among large segments of the Soviet population—and to implant them where they do not already exist.

The significance of this campaign is clear, especially since so much of it appears in the same Soviet papers which feature false and degrading images of the Jewish religion. It informs the conditioned Soviet reader that their government believes that the tiny community of Soviet Jews—1 percent of the population—is responsible for 60 percent, in some cases 90 percent, and even 100 percent, of the economic offenses warranting the death sentence.

It is, of course, quite reasonable that Soviet officials should be anxious to reduce the mounting economic crimes in Soviet society, but it evokes a painful memory of Nazi Germany to see Jews again used as the scapegoat.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Captive Nations Week, 1963

SPEECH
OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we are gathered here to focus the light from freedom's torch on the captive nations of the world—nations which have struggled for decades under Soviet Communist domination.

President Kennedy urged that we do this. In a recent proclamation he urged that we Americans "give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty." He then proclaimed Captive Nations Week for 1963.

By spotlighting these nations during Captive Nations Week every year we accomplish several things:

First, we show that we have not forgotten them. We give them hope that some day they too can live free and independent lives.

Then too, by calling attention to these nations during this week, we are showing the world what happens when Russian imperialism runs rampant.

And lastly, during Captive Nations Week, we remind ourselves of how fortunate we are to be living in a free land. We remind ourselves of friends and loved ones overseas who are not so fortunate as ourselves. And we remember our responsibility to offer them spiritual strength and faith that some day the grip of Soviet tyranny will loosen.

For our ultimate goal for the captive nations of the world is emancipation—emancipation achieved not by external force but primarily by the appeal of freedom to the minds of men.

Our weapons are not military—military action would make a nuclear battleground of the captive lands—our weapons are ideological, psychological, political, economic and diplomatic.

These instruments of policy may be slower than weapons of modern warfare but in the long run they are the best way to free the captive millions.

The rollcall of the captive nations echoes in the Far East, southeast Asia, and in Europe.

Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were independent nations until two decades ago when Soviet troops occupied them and carried out farcial elections which resulted in their incorporation into the Soviet Union.

In Rumania and Czechoslovakia political minorities took power with the help of Soviet troops.

Russian troops occupied Poland, withdrew, and then threatened her borders again when the Poles demanded more liberties.

Bayonets and tanks were used on the East Germans and Hungarians when they tried to free themselves from the Soviet grip.

And so the rollcall reads—nation after nation—forced to the ground by the military power of the Soviet Union.

The people of these captive nations are not free to travel. They are not permitted to publish criticism of those in power. They are not able to take part in free elections, but must vote on one-party ballots. And they even find it difficult to listen to what is going on outside the Iron Curtain because outside radio stations are usually jammed.

This is what it means to be living in a nation which is held captive by the Soviet Union.

However, the latest reports from behind the Iron Curtain offer some encouragement. Confusion and disarray in the Communist bloc are more apparent today than at any time for the last 8 years.

The cracks in the wall that appeared after the death of Joseph Stalin have enlarged.

The split between the Soviet Union and Communist China brought new fears to Moscow and helped to bring China's so-called "great leap forward" to a screeching halt.

Up until a year or so ago you could analyze the Communist camp by dividing them into those who were pro-Soviet and those who were anti-Soviet or pro-Chinese.

Now the experts say that there are even more political and ideological divisions among the nations in the Communist world.

And besides these new splits generated by the Chinese-Soviet break, there are other encouraging signs for the people living in the captive nations.

The Communists are moving farther and farther from the Revolution of 1917. Their leaders are aging and the new ones are not so willing to accept dogma and automatic Moscow rule as were those who fought with Lenin and Stalin.

This means that ideology will not be followed so blindly and that more diversity within the bloc may occur.

So there is some reason for hope for our friends who are still under the Russian yoke.

However, we must not forget—these nations are still Communist dictatorships and the people will not be free until they can write, speak, and vote freely. It is to these just aspirations of all people that we should give our renewed devotion.

We must determine ways to exploit the growing weakness in Communist unity. We must encourage diversity inside the Communist bloc without bringing on a nuclear war and without encouraging activities that will force Soviet military intervention.

These are difficult tasks. Unfortunately there is no magic formula, no patent medicine that will cause the Soviet Union to disappear, freeing those now under its domination.

What we can do is to have a policy that is flexible enough so that when opportunities arise we can attract these nations away from Russia. That means we must be able to use trade as a method to draw smaller nations away from the economic domination of the Soviet Union.

We can also encourage those nations who are Eastern European captives to identify with the Western European community. They have been a part of Europe's culture, history, and economy for centuries, and we should do what we can to encourage travel, trade, and participation in intellectual and cultural exchanges across the Iron Curtain.

And we can stimulate thought in these nations by broadcasting into their homes. This can help make them more thoughtful about their governments and remind them that the United States is concerned for their welfare.

In Poland, for example, the United States is able to carry on a significant information program. The Voice of America, a source of truth and inspiration to the people of the captive nations, is not jammed in Poland. Many Americans, both as individuals and as members of private groups, have been able to establish contacts with relatives or other private citizens in Poland. Special action by Congress has made it possible to build a privately-sponsored children's hospital in Poland as a gift from the American people.

These initiatives should be continued and expanded. The magic of radio can vault the Iron Curtain and reach into private homes in all the countries in Eastern Europe. Broadcasts by the Voice of America and such private organizations as Radio Free Europe remind these people of their links with the West. These windows have not been bricked over. Let us be sure that we do all we can to keep them open.

These approaches I have mentioned require dedication and patience. There is no simple solution, but history is on the side of captive peoples. History proves that those who desire freedom will not be denied.

We Americans were once a captive people, but we were not denied our aspirations to be free. We were the first to free ourselves from colonial domination. This prompted a history of struggles for national independence.

And it was an American Woodrow Wilson, who proclaimed the revolutionary doctrine of self-determination—the right of a captive people to decide for themselves what national status they will occupy.

These two American contributions today provide the spirit and the justification for the aspirations of all captive peoples.

Let us remind the Communists, and ourselves, that we are the real revolutionaries of the 20th century. We Americans are the ones who have provided the spirit and the justification for movements of national liberation.

And we are the ones who every year must rekindle the spirit of the captive nations of the world so that some day they will reach their just aspirations and be free from Communist control.

Violence in the Streets and Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Atlanta Junior Chamber of Commerce in a recently adopted statement of policy has asserted its strong belief in the rights of free citizens to conduct their private businesses and affairs in accordance with the constitutional guarantees of freedom of association.

I am in wholehearted agreement with this splendid statement, and recommend it to the Members of the Senate. Ours is a Government of laws, not of men; and when mobs take to the streets and incite violence, with absolute disregard for law and order and the property of others, the ominous threat of anarchy is raised.

This is what is happening in Savannah, Ga. This is what is happening in Cambridge, Md. This is what is happening throughout the Nation in an attempt to intimidate the Congress into enacting legislation against the best interests of the people of this country. I submit that law-abiding citizens want this mob rule ended and peace returned to our streets.

Particularly referring to the irresponsible actions of so-called demonstrators in Savannah, the Atlanta Journal in an editorial expressed the hope that those who are pushing for passage of ill-advised civil-rights legislation will see what is happening and will act according to the national interest, not according to the dictates of a mob or in acquiescence to expediency.

In another fine editorial, the Journal urged that all aspects of the so-called civil-rights legislation now pending before Congress be closely examined, lest private enterprise lose more of its independence and the States lose more of their rights.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this statement and the two editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the statement and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT

The Atlanta Junior Chamber of Commerce, recognizing its duties and obligations to the city and the people of Atlanta, declares its position in all matters affecting the general welfare of our community and our Nation.

The introduction of H.R. 7152 before the Congress of the United States was preceded and accompanied by demonstrations and violence that hardly make a proper background for the calm deliberation that sound and significant legislation demands.

The Atlanta Junior Chamber of Commerce has supported and will continue to support all justified demands for equal opportunities for all of our citizens. However, we will not support, but on the contrary, will strenuously oppose, any demands that are politically motivated and that would have the effect of denying the constitutional rights of other groups of our citizens.

Civil rights, as defined by Webster and as used in its legal meaning, relates to the private rights of individuals in a community and to the legal proceedings in connection with them. Civil rights are and should be distinguished from political rights.

H.R. 7152 would provide injunctive relief against discriminations in accommodations. This provision restricts unduly and is an impairment of the civil rights of the private owners of property. It would deny and negate the fundamental principle of free enterprise that allows a businessman to choose his customers and to select the economic and social groups that he will cater to and do business with. The question whether a business should discriminate upon color, race, social or, indeed for any other reason, is peculiarly one of good business and moral judgment to be decided by the individual businessman.

The other provisions of H.R. 7152 are objectionable inasmuch as they do not afford a satisfactory solution to the problem they seek to remedy. These provisions are designed to curtail the initiative of the private businessman and his community to solve these problems on a local level. If legislation is desired in this area, it should be locally originated and locally enforced. The answer certainly does not lie in hastily passed statutes, enacted under force and duress.

The Atlanta Junior Chamber of Commerce is opposed to H.R. 7152 in its entirety.

EXAMINE THE FULL PACKAGE

While the public accommodations part of the civil rights package the President is urging upon Congress is getting its share of attention, there are other proposals in the bundle that ought to receive cautious examination, too.

There's a danger that the politicians and the public may become so consumed in discussing threats to private property that they'll pass over the rest of the legislation ever so lightly.

It's also possible that in the course of the fight to get new civil rights legislation on the books, the public accommodations proposal might be sacrificed in a trade to assure passage of the remainder of the package.

Therefore, it's important that all aspects of this program be studied thoughtfully and that the public be made thoroughly familiar with what the administration has in mind.

The civil rights package, for instance, provides that no Federal program "shall be construed to require assistance under any circumstances in which there is discrimination in either participation in, or receipt of benefits from, the program."

This seems to violate the proposition, so often expressed in these parts, that Federal aid should come with no strings attached.

There also is a provision that would require complete equality of opportunity in employment within the Federal Government and by Government contractors. That would give the Federal Government a tighter hold on industry and business.

While the Negro obviously faces discrimination and is in need of greater employment opportunities, this is not the entire trouble.

Unemployment of the unskilled and of those deskilled by the new technology knows no color line.

The social and political problems created by unemployment are serious and when compounded with discrimination, are explosive.

But we need jobs before we need hiring formulas and until we got them, the situation is not going to get much better.

OFF THE STREETS, PLEASE

Action provokes reaction. The stupidity, the idiocy, and the irresponsibility of the Negro demonstrators on the streets of Savannah must result only in a stiffening of resistance to their cause there and the loss of the support of the moderates and those of tolerance and good will everywhere.

With rights go responsibility. The sensational lack of the latter in Savannah has impressed the world, possibly including even the White House and the Office of the Attorney General.

Certainly it has impressed responsible and intelligent Negro leadership. The NAACP, particularly, has reacted with commonsense and the long view.

James Alexander, a State vice president of the organization, has deplored the tactical error of mass demonstrations, pointing out that they do not obtain results and have jeopardized everything we have won by years of hard work.

Quite right. More leadership of this quality and less of the kind which thinks the question can be settled in the streets, and the situation peacefully will resolve itself.

This is a question which requires patience, tact, tolerance, and good manners on both sides.

Once these qualities are exhausted, the racial question becomes a simple matter of mathematics.

The provocations of Savannah come dangerously close to reducing it to mathematics.

The hope is that the idiocies of street demonstrations will become so self-evident that they will result in a denial of the kind of leadership which sponsors them.

There is a faint hope, too, that they will have a sobering effect on the administration in Washington, and that for once, perhaps, the national interest may be considered before political expediency.

Savings Banking: Years of Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, among the long-established thrift institutions in New Jersey is the Howard Savings Institution. For more than a century this mutual savings bank has been rendering outstanding service to the metropolitan area of Newark.

Its highly capable president is Mr. John W. Kress, a constituent of mine who in May completed a year of service as president of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. At the an-

nual meeting of this trade association, held in Washington, D.C., in that month, Mr. Kress delivered an important address that has been called to my attention.

While we may or may not agree with Mr. Kress' presentation or conclusions, his address is recommended as required reading for all of those interested in the future of the thrift industry in the United States. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby place Mr. Kress' address in the RECORD:

SAVINGS BANKING: YEARS OF DECISION

(By John W. Kress)

It is not by chance that we are assembled in Washington for our most important meeting of the year. Nor was it accidental that I found myself here more than a dozen times during the past 12 months.

Washington, after all, is headquarters of the world's most important corporation, the executive branch of the U.S. Government, which employs more people than the Nation's 50 largest industrial companies combined. It is here that the Federal corporation's Board of Directors, the Congress of the United States, convenes. And it is here that decisions of far-reaching importance are made concerning the destinies of all the Nation's industries—including our own.

Like it or not, this is the age of big government. Today we make casual use of words and phrases which had no meaning a few short years ago. For example, we say that ours is a mixed economy. We occupy part of the private sector of that economy. It is our duty to protect, preserve, and if possible expand that sector—to make our industry strong, dynamic, and effective in the public interest. This is the way in which we help to strengthen the principle of individual enterprise, freedom of economic choice, and freedom as we know it in the world today. We need to keep reminding ourselves of this obligation.

Let us then take stock of the position of our industry in the competitive economy of today. Our recent record is an impressive one. You will get its full measure when our latest annual report is analyzed and summarized by our able executive vice president, Dr. Grover Ensley, on Wednesday.

Meanwhile here are a few highlights attesting to the vitality which the mutual savings banks have shown since the year of the magic fives, in 1959. Getting up off the floor from that catastrophe, we began to make our way back to recovery in 1961. Then came the Federal Reserve Board's amendment to regulation Q, permitting the commercial banks to pay higher rates on time and savings deposits. For a time it seemed that our recovery would be short lived indeed.

But here is where the experts were caught with their predictions down. From May 1962, gains in savings bank deposits set new monthly highs for the balance of the year. For all of 1962 we registered an unprecedented total increase of $3.1 billion. This was 58 percent greater than our gain in 1961. By contrast, the savings and loan associations posted a 9-percent rise in savings growth; the commercial banks only a 5-percent improvement in savings deposit increases, along with a more substantial rise in other time deposit gains; and the credit unions actually sustained a decline in the volume of savings inflow.

Another index of competitive vigor is operating efficiency. The operating expense of the mutual savings banks as a ratio of assets has been relatively low and stable. In 1961 it was 0.67 percent compared with 1.20 percent for savings and loan associations and 2.10 percent for commercial banks. Still another indication is growth in total operating units. It is true that the total number of savings banks has declined slightly in recent years and now stands at 512. However, the number of savings bank branches has increased from 383 5 years ago to 587 today.

It is noteworthy, too, that our ability to attract deposits has exceeded our opportunities for investment in local mortgage areas. This, however, has not deterred our growth. Instead we have become a significant factor in the national mortgage market. In fact, savings banks now hold $8.5 billion in mortgage loans involving 750,000 families in non-savings bank States.

All in all, our industry has given a good account of itself in the competitive picture today. On the basis of our gains so far this year, I foresee another record increase in savings banks deposits for 1963. It could approach $4 billion, but whether it does or not, it seems clear that 1963 will be a significantly better year than 1962. The final results, of course, will be affected by the public's pattern of spending and saving from now to the end of the year.

With so many favorable factors before us, we might almost be tempted to call a sort of industrywide holiday for celebration and self-congratulation—or at least tranksgiving. But we know better than to drink too deeply of the heady wine of success. We dare not pause for more than a moment of relaxation—until such time, perhaps, as the commercial banks abandon their effort to saddle us with excessive taxation and join us in support of legislation for Federal chartering of mutual savings banks.

The price of competitive progress must forever be an unending drive to improve, to innovate, to expand. That is why, all during this year, I have gone from State to State urging attention to what I call the "four guideposts to growth" for savings banking. I realize that this tireless campaign may have made me seem something like a perpetually galloping Paul Revere who never quite reins in his horse. But I ask your patience while I again define, briefly and for the last time, the four guideposts along the way to new horizons for our industry:

1. Intensified and unrelenting efforts to increase branch banking.
2. Accelerated programs of executive selection, training and development.
3. Extension of savings bank services.
4. The greatest goal on the far horizon—Federal chartering of mutual savings banks.

The first three of these lie within the range of our own initiative. It is up to us to exert imagination, ingenuity, and determination in branching, in executive development, and in the extension of services. With respect to Federal chartering, of course, there are forces at work beyond our own control which may vitally affect the outcome.

The winds of change are blowing hard over the national financial scene today. It is hard to pick up a newspaper without reading about the struggle over duality of banking systems—and over the regulatory powers governing them. And this is only part of a deep seated, longstanding controversy over taxes and tax policy, the sale of securities, and the relative powers of the various governmental fiscal agencies.

There is no real need for us to take cards in these jurisdictional struggles. It is only necessary for us to notice the reasons for them. One reason is that the national economy is embarking on a new period of great growth and that our private banking facilities—as presently constituted—may not prove equal to all the needs of the future. There is also the perfectly natural tendency of entrenched institutions to resist change, particularly those changes which sharpen competition. Yet change will come. In a dynamic economy it is inevitable. There are years of decision ahead for the whole national banking structure.

It is in the light of this fact that we need to take a new, hard look at the future of the mutual savings banks.

Ours is a 150-year-old industry with a proud record of successful public service. Let us go back to first principles for a moment. Let us examine our own origins and determine wherein we resemble and wherein we differ from other banking systems.

Mutual savings banks are thrift institutions. Consider, first, the very meaning of the word "thrift." It derives from "thrive," which has connoted growth, health, and self-betterment in the minds of millions of people for generations. The primary definition of "thrift" in most dictionaries will resemble this one (taken from Webster's New International): "A thriving condition; prosperity, good fortune." Or take (from the same source) this definition of "thrifty" which is: "Thriving by industry and frugality; increasing in wealth."

The mutual savings banks were founded by people who sought, in a spirit of confidence and cooperation, to better the condition of small wage earners—not in the hope of commercial gain for themselves. The mutual savings banks have always been quasi-public institutions with a special mission to perform by encouraging the independence and self-reliance of the individual. Congress has twice recognized the quasi-public character of the savings banks in its approach to tax legislation, most recently in 1962. The concept also rests on decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, which have stood for decades. And the law rests on historical fact.

We have faithfully kept safe the savings of the people, in good times and bad, and we have helped them to prosper. We have maintained and increased the flow of private funds needed to meet the Nation's housing needs. We have the reserves, the asset structure, the experience, and above all, the public confidence which characterize an established, effective, and thoroughly valid banking system. And we stand at the threshold of a period of national economic growth when the need for our type of service will exceed anything that has heretofore been visualized.

Yet we are hemmed in by the banking laws of 18 States, fettered by antiquated restrictions within those States, and forbidden to move beyond their borders. How, then, do we grow? How do we move toward the fulfillment of our larger destiny? This is our dilemma.

Now the solution offered by the commercial banks is akin to that offered by the spider to the fly—or by the wolf to Little Red Ridinghood. Commercial banks oppose Federal chartering of mutual savings banks. They favor governmental action to place us and other thrift institutions on a basis of tax equality—as they call it. They have said that they will press relentlessly toward this goal until it is achieved. With the adoption of new Federal tax provisions for thrift institutions only last year, the tax issue would seem to be resolved for the time being. However, we have to consider what our course of action would be if we were to find ourselves saddled by a crushing new tax burden.

We must be absolutely realistic in our appraisal of this possibility. Speaking realistically, I feel bound to say that if thrift institutions are forced to pay increasingly oppressive taxes under the guise of "tax equality" with commercial banks, then they will have to operate on the same basis as commercial banks, with the same powers, the same privileges, the same restrictions, and the same functions. To put it as starkly as possible, thrift institutions will simply become commercial banks. I have been a savings banker all my life, deeply steeped in its traditions and deeply happy in following a calling of which I have always been proud. But, given the condition of oppressive taxation, I see no alternative but to assume the full array of commercial bank functions.

This eventuality, however, is far from inevitable. To me, in fact, it is not even likely. As we consider the future of our industry, we must examine some of the other forces which will be working to alter and adapt the Nation's banking structure to the needs of the future in the years of decision which lie ahead.

At the center of the stage just now is the contention concerning the "duality" of banking systems. But, looking behind it I find another very fundamental question. Basically, there is a profound functional, historical, and practical difference between the commercial banks, as such, and the thrift institutions as such. And in the category of thrift institutions I include, of course, savings and loan associations.

In general, commercial banks serve the needs of corporations and organizations while thrift institutions serve the needs of individuals and families. That is a sweeping oversimplification, I admit. But if, as I believe, there will be a continuing upsurge in the demand for thrift services in this country, that demand will be delivered at the doorsteps of the institutions best qualified to meet it. And the job is one which the commercial banks, by their very nature oriented toward the short-term credit needs of the economy, cannot be expected to do well.

As the inherent differences between the commercial banks and the thrift institutions become more apparent, so the inherent similarities of the savings banks and the savings and loan associations become more pronounced. One similarity is the growing trend toward asset compositions and investment patterns of the same nature. Since World War II, savings banks have channeled 95 cents out of every investable dollar into mortgage loans, even surpassing the savings and loan associations in this respect.

The thrift institutions have a common interest in broader and more flexible investment powers and both savings banks and savings and loan associations have stood shoulder to shoulder in their fight against excessive taxation. I believe that both share the same vision of the future national need for a thrift system which at once energizes and stabilizes the economy and acts as a natural counterpart to the commercial banking system.

For all these reasons, I foresee the possibility of the formation of a unified thrift industry in this country. It will be a development as logical and inevitable as the fusion of two rivers rising in similar headwaters and moving toward the same delta. It is not something that you or I or anyone else can consciously create or prevent—and I was glad to see that Frank B. Yeilding, president of the U.S. Savings & Loan League, announced his own recognition of this trend in a talk in Jacksonville, Fla., just over a week ago.

The formation of a unified thrift industry will not be the work of a day. The process will be partly evolutionary and it may move slowly. We must not relax for one moment in our efforts to expand our present operations by every means at hand. We must continue to press, and press hard, for Federal chartering of mutual savings banks in all 50 States.

As the evolution of a unified thrift industry proceeds, there will be problems and difficulties of many sorts. But I am talking principle today, not procedure. I suggest that a good idea can always be made to work by good will and determination on both sides. It was a wise man who said that "The biggest problem on earth could have been solved when it was small." There should be no sticking over such questions as the number of swans in one flock and the geese in the other. In a proper union, the best elements of both will be combined.

As I conclude my presidency, I wish to thank you for an honor which I shall treasure all my days. I thank my fellow officers and directors and the able staff of the National association, as well as the fine leaders of the State organizations, for helping to make this a notable year. I commend to you my very able successor, confident that he will share the spirit of cooperation and confidence which has meant so much to me.

With equal confidence I view the coming years of our work together as custodians of a public trust, as guardians of an important sector of American enterprise, and as exponents of a precious principle by which both we and the Nation will thrive. In these years of decision I know we will follow the right light toward the right goal. My faith in our future was never so great.

Making Democracy Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, because of the interest expressed in the essays written by this year's contestants in the McGee Senate Internship Contest I have been pleased to place those written by honorable mention winners in the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that two of these essays, written by Shirley Ann Koritnik, of Rock Springs, Wyo., and Rusty Hagar, of Cheyenne, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK BETTER

(By Rusty Hagar, Cheyenne, Wyo., Central High School, April 1963)

Before one begins to relate theories and ideas on how to improve democracy, he should have in mind some idea of what he is talking about. He should ask himself, "What is democracy, and what does it mean to me?" Once this question has been answered, a steady foundation on which to build his theories has been laid.

Democracy can be viewed as a form of government and/or a state of mind. Viewed as a form of government, its most important ingredient is freedom. When this ingredient is missing, democracy cannot exist. Freedom is that concept which allows an individual to live and think as he sees fit with as little restraint as possible. Included in this concept is the right to choose—to believe or not to believe, to agree or disagree. One must, however, accept, along with a certain amount of responsibility to society, a reasonable amount of restraint which safeguards the liberty of others. As a form of government, democracy can be identified by two criteria: (1) Democracy puts into effect the distinction between state and community; and (2) democracy depends on the free operation of conflicting opinions. In the United States, it is government by the people through elected representatives of the people.

Today, there are many threats to our democratic concepts and ideals. Perhaps the ugliest and most dangerous is intolerance, whether it be racial, social, or political. In some areas of our country, the unalienable rights of citizens, as expressed in the Constitution, are being infringed upon and even denied because of racial and social prejudice. Should a man's color determine whether or not he should have the right to vote? Intolerance in the form of extremism has become a major problem in the world of politics, and, in some cases, has jeopardized an essential tenet of democracy, the voice of dissent. Regard for others requires regard for oneself; the intolerant lower themselves in the estimation of others.

Another threat, which is in close connection with the one above, is public irresponsibility. This can be apathy, ignorance, or active intolerance. A person who contributes nothing to his community and is indifferent to everything around him is as irresponsible as one who practices prejudice, extremism, or hate.

A major factor of bigotry and apathy, for that matter, is ignorance. Ignorance may be simply a lack of education, but too many times it is an abundance of misinformation and an unwillingness to recognize the truth.

Legislators who have narrow concepts or limited interests can be agents in the deterioration of the democratic ideal of majority rule. Sometimes a Senator or Representative thinks only of his State and possibly the surrounding region, and disregards the needs of the many in other areas of the country. In the same light, such a public servant may have bigoted social and political concepts which would influence his thought on a piece of legislation. An example to illustrate this point is the controversy over medical care for the aged. In their objections to medicare, many politicians argue with apithets and slogans (i.e., "Creeping Socialism," "Welfare State," etc.). If a free society is based in part on dissent, then the obligation to dissent must be based on rational, evidential dissent designed to illuminate, not to destroy.

When many members of our society fail to utilize the tools of government afforded to them and to advocate the type of government which they want, special interests and pressure groups do the job for them. Pressure groups play an important role in our democracy. Oftentimes, they awaken the public to many pressing problems in our society, and also contribute to the solving of these problems. But when wealthy and powerful organizations are able to manipulate our political system, the importance of the individual declines. Farsighted men once set aside vast natural resource reserves as a precautionary measure. But through pressure legislation many of these reserves no longer exist. They have been converted into active profit-gainers by mammoth corporations. Responsibility requires knowledge and foresight, and actions such as this by self-interested factions is a neglect of this responsibility.

These threats to our democratic ideals make up only a minor portion of our society, however, and should not blind us to the fact that never before in history has a government done so much for so many. A man can measure his freedom by how much he is able to criticize aspects of his society and attempt to reform and correct those which he disagrees with or dislikes. In the United States, there are few restraints placed on man's critical nature except those with which he manacles himself (conformism, ignorance, and intolerance).

But since this essay deals with ways of making our democracy work better, we must concern ourselves with its defects in order to try to eliminate them.

Perhaps our most important and effective weapon against these threats to our democratic concepts is education. When one is well informed and aware of what is happening about him, he is less likely to become lost in the fog of irresponsibility. By knowing the facts, he may become extensionally oriented; that is, cognizant of his surrounding world as it is, not as it seems or as he would like it to be. This is an important step especially in the elimination of intolerance. When a person is tempted to speak fearfully of a Jew as a seeker of economic dominance or a Negro as a seeker of black racial supremacy, he should ask himself the question, "Is this true for all Jews and all Negroes?" Do the maps, "seeker of economic dominance," "seeker of racial supremacy," actually fit the territory they are supposed to represent, "Jew," "Negro"? In many cases, people fear and become intolerant of that which they don't understand. Education gives them the understanding with which to conquer their fear. With knowledge, one can be a conscientious contributor to the solutions of many of our problems. Education is part of the solution of the problem of having an enlightened electorate. It exposes the voters to a wide variety of ideas, ideals, and concepts from which they may choose and add to their political, social, and economic views. The public, having this background, would then be prepared to assert its will through the election of certain officials or ideas which represent its desires.

As a servant of the people, the Government should give aid to the education of the people where it is needed to keep our society well informed and to contribute to the progress and perfection of democracy.

Another way of improving democracy is to lessen some of the economic hardships in our communities. If necessary, legislation should be passed to aid in the relief of these hardships. This legislation may be in the form of medical care to the aged for those senior citizens strapped with medical expenses, or it may be some sort of occupational retraining act for that part of our labor force out of work because of replacement by automation. When a man no longer has to suffer economic hardship with little hope of relief, he can be a greater benefit to democracy in America as a taxpayer and voter.

An effective weapon against conformity is the stimulation of one's critical nature. One should not attempt to destroy through cynicism, but to improve through constructive criticism. The development of a critical nature is mainly a task for the individual, himself. It can't be done by someone else for him, but it can be helped by outside sources. Books, teachers, politicians, philosophers, and many other influences all add to the formation of an individual's critical nature. With this mental attitude, one is less likely to be affected, led astray, or fooled by others who wish to control free thought.

Improvement of a democracy is the exercise of its enlightened members; enlightenment is the exercise of the individual in a free society.

Making Democracy Work Better

(By Shirley Ann Koritnik, Rock Springs, Wyo.)

Today—perhaps at this very moment—children in thousands of classrooms throughout this mighty Nation will rise to recite the stirring words of the pledge of allegiance before the flag of these United States of America—the red, white, and blue banner that is the "badge of our Nation's greatness and the emblem of its destiny." They will repeat the patriotic pledge that has passed the lips of countless Americans through the decades. In unison, their piping voices will make the words ring out—loud and clear—across the majesty of lofty mountains and the grandeur of endless plains that together are America. But long after they have finished, the words will echo and reecho in the hearts and minds of men everywhere, "One Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." These few words are alive with deep patriotic feeling and pride, for they are the embodiment of liberty today and the living promise of freedom for the future. These are words of pride and love, because they are the spoken expression of the beautiful heritage of freedom through democracy that was so bravely fought for and granted us by the Founding Fathers of our Nation.

But are not the rights and freedoms as granted us by this heritage of democracy being threatened today? On every side we hear of the godless Communist regime in its effort to bury America. We hear of its craftiness and subterfuge. But does not the real enemy lie within? Does not the real threat reside in the hearts and minds of those who would grasp the fruits of freedom greedily and yet who would do nothing to preserve that freedom? Our Government is based on the people—on the individual; it must be in the individual that democracy finds its strength. This precious heritage was gained only through endless years of blood, toil, and tears. We have been given much, and "to whom much is given, much is also required." Our freedom as a nation was placed in our hands through struggle and sacrifice, but freedom is not free—can never be permanently secured. Each generation must defend it anew with faith, vigilance, valor, and sacrifice. How, then, can we make democracy work better? How might we strengthen our freedom in the face of threat?

We as individuals must defend this heritage of democracy with faith. We must defend it with a firm faith in our American way of life, in our Constitution, in our form of government. We must possess a stanch belief in the ideal of freedom—a belief so intense that we as individuals, we as integral parts of America, will defend the priceless legacy of our forefathers.

What of vigilance? We must be also an alert nation of individuals. It will do us little good to have a firm faith in freedom if we are totally unaware of or unconcerned about the flagrant misuse of human life by those who would oppress entire nations in the name of their own brand of freedom. Thus we must be aware of each slap in the face liberty must be made to endure and take that blow as a personal affront. For when freedom is challenged in other areas of the world, it is challenged at home as much, if not more. Furthermore, in threatening America, these evils are threatening all of humanity. Today, then, the fate of civilization depends on the strength implied in the words "The United States of America," and vigilance is the key factor of that strength.

Just as vigilance is the key factor of our strength, so must valor be its embodiment. We must not be afraid or cowardly in the face of threat, whether as a nation or as individuals. Countless men and women have given their lives in bloody wars to defend the right of freedom by a government for the people, by the people. We as individuals must continue their struggle so that our posterity, too, may inherit the cherished democracy which we possess today.

Sacrifice must be made too. We have been given much indeed: this beautiful land of ours, our American way of life, our democratic system of government. Now we must give in return. If necessary we must sacrifice much to pay our debt. Each of us must give freely when asked and indeed even when unbidden. Was there ever a sacrifice made in the name of a greater cause than that of freedom?

Bloody wars were necessary for the birth and growth of our system of government. From its inception, it has had to bend with the weight of challenge and changing times. But today it still stands, unscathed, embodied in the heritage which gave it life. Our Government breathes in the free people when it serves and pulsates in the heart of the individual where democracy will find its strength. We are the people; we are the Government. Ours is a democracy to cherish and uphold forever.

The Merit System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the House will shortly be called upon to act on the independent offices appropriation bill which will contain appropriations for the Civil Service Commission. The Appropriations Committee, I understand, has not as yet reported this bill to the House. However, the administration made a request in its budget for some $22,180,000 for salaries and operational expenses of the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I question the necessity for this appropriation if action is to be taken as proposed and promulgated by Executive Order 10925. This order, among other things, established the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity and directed Federal agencies to take steps to eliminate any discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, I was informed that the Labor Department had sent Mr. Robert N. Merchant, Special Assistant to the Director of Personnel to Birmingham in conjunction with recruiting activities. I was further informed that Mr. Merchant had stated that he was there for the express purpose of hiring a Negro for an apprenticeship and training representative vacancy.

Subsequently, I was advised by the Secretary of Labor that this was an apparent misunderstanding and that he does not intend that civil service rules and regulations be circumvented. This, Mr. Speaker, is all well and good. However, other situations have arisen as a result of the Executive Order 10925 which I believe obviates the necessity for the Commission if the intent of the Executive order is followed.

For example, the Civil Service Commission has informed me that special efforts are now being made to let members of minority groups know that they can compete for Federal positions for which they are qualified and that special safeguards have been introduced by some agencies to assure that their selecting officials consider Negro candidates fairly. I have no argument with this as I believe that all should be treated fairly in accord with their qualifications. However, I have also been informed by the Civil Service Commission that a recent editorial implied that civil service requirements were not observed in the recent promotion to supervisory jobs of three Negroes in the Dallas post office, Dallas, Tex. The Commission attempts to justify the promotions on the basis that these candidates were fully qualified and had passed the supervisory examination over a year ago. The Commission goes on to say that the fact that 53 names were numerically scored higher in the eligibility list is not a primary index of qualification. I submit, Mr. Speaker, if this is true, then the Commission is not performing the function it was established to do by the Congress and as outlined in the U.S. Government Organizational Manual 1963–64—namely, to provide for examinations to test the fitness of applicants for positions in the competitive service, and to establish qualifications standards as a basis for reinstatement, promotion, and transfer of Federal employees. In addition, the Commission is charged with providing, in response to requests from appointing officers in the various Federal agencies, the best qualified available personnel to fill positions in those agencies.

Under the Post Office Department's merit program, the Commission states, other factors, which in my opinion should have been considered by the Commission under its authority are now considered by the Post Office Department.

In addition, it is stated by the Commission that the Post Office Department is now applying flexibility to the rules and regulations in order to rectify past inequities which, if they previously existed, was a result of inept action on the part of the Commission.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the Commission, in discussing the positions in the Dallas Post Office, states that the three Negroes selected to fill the supervisory vacancies had good performance records. This may be true, but I repeat, they should not have been moved over those individuals who were higher on the civil service register. The mere fact that the Commission apparently has not done the job assigned in the past cannot be condoned nor do I believe that retroactive action can accomplish harmonious employee relations.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that if the Commission is to function in accordance with its authority then the entire employment responsibiilty should be assumed by it and that the disruption of the merit system which will result in the type of action being taken by the Post Office Department under the Executive Order 10925 should be discontinued and the responsibility for equal opportunity should be vested solely in the Commission at this time.

To attempt to make up for mistakes of years gone by disregarding the merit system as previously established will obviate the need for the Civil Service Commission and we will be expending Federal funds without purpose.

Conflicts of Opinion in the Department of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON ALLOTT

OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in connection with the many controversies which have occurred in the Department of Defense during the last few months and, in fact, the last few years—and I think particularly of the B–70 controversy, the TFX controversy, and many others—many of us have wondered just what goes on in the Department of Defense and why we encounter these extreme conflicts of interest there.

Recently I came across an article, published in the July issue of the Armed Forces Management, entitled "Mr. Secretary, Your Staff Is in Revolt."

The article states, among other things:

> When you refute with generalities the technical recommendations of military officers, who ultimately, are going to have to use the equipment they ask for, it is extremely risky business, Mr. Secretary—no matter what the management motives.

Then they go on to tell why the lack of recognition, not only of the abilities but also the accomplishments, of the staff of the Secretary of Defense have contributed to the great flasco over many of these issues in the Department. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. SECRETARY, YOUR STAFF IS IN REVOLT

Ordinarily, we ought properly to devote this page to the tougher problems of command and control, those which demand more opinionating than is ordinarily permitted in the issue's fact-based feature material.

On principle, McNamara's efforts here and elsewhere generally are, as we've often said before and will continue to say, virtually incontestable.

But in command and control or anything else, the execution and implementation of principles, practices and procedures is done by people. Without them, nothing is going to come of anything. Without them, you will find, as Forrestal before you, that admirable plans will be smothered under the weight of your own suddenly oppressive organization. And, in essence, Mr. Secretary, your staff is in revolt.

This slapped Armed Forces Management across the face like a wet towel last month. Under less nerve jangling circumstances than those which exist in Washington right now, our June editorial theme would probably have been taken for what it was intended to be—and had been accepted as on two different occasions in other years, i.e. a defense of working level intelligence, initiative, and dedication; and a plea that those talents be permitted to function.

In the morale mess that rattles through Pentagon corridors today we were instead briefed, begged and blasted to "Tell the old man his organization has me boxed in." The case on why there is anger in the ranks is complex but not unfathomable.

Item: Military executives have been ordered to learn more of the economic cost-effectiveness, diplomatic and political nuances that influence not only what they will be required to do but what types of hardware and organizations they should form;

Item: The brainy civil servants are urged to stay in Government, turn out even more work than they have in the past;

Item: Political appointees—until 1961—came into the top policy approving positions appreciating (1) that they didn't necessarily have an edge over the regulars on brainpower, particularly in defense matters, and therefore had much to learn; (2) that elected administrations come and go but Government must progress regardless of who's in political power and only career military and civilian people are in a competent position to continue that work.

Fine. Why then is a talented man like McNamara, who arrived in the Pentagon sharing the same philosophies and motivations as those career people, suddenly in the soup?

Very simply, there are contradictions between principle and practice. The contradictions:

For the high level civil servants: Long valued by the thinking military officers for and proud in their own right of providing the staff continuity, the economic and political inputs mentioned above, to Defense activities, they feel sandbagged today. Credit for thier staff work, respect for their talent, promotions, plaudits, pay raises, are going to young political appointees whose main claim to fame is a Harvard diploma, a Democratic Party "in," not an arm-long list of Government successes.

When 15-, 18-, and 20-year veterans in key spots can no longer find out "what is going on and who, if anyone, should I coordinate with," you are in trouble, Mr. Secretary. Run a head count on top career people, particularly in the departments, who have left, or are about to, and you'll see how much trouble.

For the military: One reason the civil servants feel shut out is because officers are holding staff activities close to their vests, don't want anyone taking the play away from them. (They are having enough trouble staying up with the politicians as it is.) When you refute with generalities the technical recommendations of military officers who, ultimately, are going to have to use the equipment they ask for, it is extremely risky business, Mr. Secretary—no matter what the management motives.

For the political appointees—Many years ago, my grandfather advised me to "Always remember, no matter how successful you become, for every big potato on top of the heap, there are an awful lot of small potatoes holding him up there."

Where is the gain when you, the party faithful in high Defense places, pressure the career cadre to buy $100-a-plate tickets to Democratic rallies, make it clear their careers are in trouble after they don't? How much do you accomplish when you announce that "71 percent of our goals in enhancing career Government work have been accomplished" and the career pros know that most, if not all, of that 71 percent has been appointment or promotion for politically selected or attractive personnel?

What do you accomplish in your own organization when you exclaim, or let the word leak at least, that you are running the show, doing the significant work? Inexperienced and unaccepted staff people with executive authority? No wonder we're in trouble.

A major general passed us some advice, recently, from the writings of noted British scientist-author Sir Charles Snow. Said he, in part:

"I can't help thinking of the Venetian Republic in their last half-century. Like us, they had once been fabulously lucky. They had become rich, as we did, by accident. They had acquired immense political skill, just as we have. A good many of them were tough-minded, realistic, patriotic men * * *."

"Many of them gave their minds to working out ways to keep going. It would have meant breaking the pattern into which they had crystallized. They were fond of the pattern, just as we are fond of ours. They never found the will to break it."

We should hate to see historians encapsulate today's Defense activities under a Republican Secretary and a Democratic President (which should quiet any sour grapes about our comments being politically inspired) with: "They showed a great deal of promise but failed because they were unable to rally the needed support among people who thought up most of the new ideas in the first place and would have been responsible for carrying all of them out in the second."

BILL BORKLUND.

"American Individualism," Part II, by Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the second portion of the essay on "American Individualism," by Herbert Hoover, deals with the paragraph entitled "Philosophic Grounds." The more one reads through the little booklet, the more one respects the intellectual power of this famous and beloved American citizen. Any further comments on my part would be redundant. I simply commend it to the reading and contemplation of the Members of Congress, and the public.

AMERICAN INDIVIDUALISM—(PHILOSOPHIC GROUNDS)

On the philosophic side we can agree at once that intelligence, character, courage, and the divine spark of the human soul are alone the property of individuals. These do not lie in agreements, in organizations, in institutions, in masses, or in groups. They abide alone in the individual mind and heart.

Production both of mind and hand rests upon impulses in each individual. These impulses are made of the varied forces of original instincts, motives, and acquired desires. Many of these are destructive and must be restrained through moral leadership and authority of the law and be eliminated finally by education. All are modified by a vast fund of experience and a vast plant and equipment of civilization which we pass on with increments to each succeeding generation.

The inherited instincts of self-preservation, acquisitiveness, fear, kindness, hate, curiosity, desire for self-expression, for power, for adulation, that we carry over from a thousand of generations must, for good or evil, be comprehended in a workable system embracing our accumulation of experiences and equipment. They may modify themselves with time—but in terms of generations. They differ in their urge upon different individuals. The dominant ones are selfish. But no civilization could be built or can endure solely upon the groundwork of unrestrained and unintelligent self-interest. The problem of the world is to restrain the destructive instincts while strengthening and enlarging those of altruistic character and constructive impulse—for thus we build for the future.

From the instincts of kindness, pity, fealty to family and race; the love of liberty; the mystical yearnings for spiritual things; the desire for fuller expression of the creative faculties; the impulses of service to community and Nation, are molded the ideals of our people. And the most potent force in society is its ideals. If one were to attempt to delimit the potency of instinct and ideals, it would be found that while instinct dominates in our preservation, yet the great propeling force of progress is right ideals. It is true we do not realize the ideal; not even a single person personifies that realization. It is, therefore, not surprising that society, a collection of persons, a necessary maze of compromises, cannot realize it. But that it has ideals, that they revolve in a system that makes for steady advance of them is the first thing. Yet true as this is, the day has not arrived when any economic or social system will function and last if founded upon altruism alone.

With the growth of ideals through education, with the higher realization of freedom, of justice, of humanity, of service, the selfish impulses becomes less and less dominant, and if we ever reach the millenium, they will disappear in the aspirations and satisfactions of pure altruism. But for the next several generations we dare not abandon self-interest as a motive force to leadership and to production, lest we die.

The will-o'-the-wisp of all breeds of socialism is that they contemplate a motivation of human animals by altruism alone. It necessitates a bureaucracy of the entire population, in which, having obliterated the economic stimulation of each member, the fine gradations of character and ability are to be arranged in relative authority by ballot, or more likely by a Tammany Hall, or a Bolshevist party, or some other form of tyranny. The proof of the futility of these ideas as a stimulation to the development and activity of the individual does not lie alone in the ghastly failure of Russia, but it also lies in our own failure in attempts at nationalized industry.

Likewise the basic foundations of autocracy, whether it be class government or capitalism in the sense that a few men through unrestrained control of property determine the welfare of great numbers, is as far apart from the rightful expression of American individualism as the two poles. The will-o'-the-wisp of autocracy in any form is that it supposes that the good Lord endowed a special few with all the divine attributes. It contemplates one human animal dealing to the other human animals his just share of earth, of glory, and of immortality. The proof of the futility of these ideas in the development of the world does not lie alone in the grim failure of Germany, but it lies in the damage to our moral and social fabric from those who have sought economic domination in America, whether employer or employee.

We in America have had too much experience of life to fool ourselves into pretending that all men are equal in ability, in character, in intelligence, in ambition. That was part of the claptrap of the French Revolution. We have grown to understand that all we can hope to assure to the individual through government is liberty, justice, intellectual welfare, equality of opportunity, and stimulation to service.

It is in maintenance of a society fluid to these human qualities that our individualism departs from the individualism of Europe. There can be no rise for the individual through the frozen strata of classes, or of castes, and no stratification can take place in a mass livened by the free stir of its particles. This guarding of our individualism against stratification insists not only in preserving in the social solution an equal opportunity for the able and ambitious to rise from the bottom; it also insists that the sons of the successful shall not by any mere right of birth or favor continue to occupy their fathers' places of power against the rise of a new generation in the process of coming up from the bottom. The pioneers of our American individualism had the good sense not to reward Washington and Jefferson and Hamilton with hereditary dukedoms and fixtures in landed estates, as Great Britain rewarded Marlborough and Nelson. Otherwise our American fields of opportunity would have been clogged with long generations inheriting their fathers' privileges without their fathers' capacity for service.

That our system has avoided the establishment and domination of class has a significant proof in the present administration in Washington. Of the 12 men comprising the President, Vice President, and Cabinet, 9 have earned their own way in life without economic inheritance, and 8 of them started with manual labor.

If we examine the impulses that carry us forward, none is too potent for progress as the yearning for individual self-expression, the desire for creation of something. Perhaps the greatest human happiness flows from personal achievement. Here lies the great urge of the constructive instinct of mankind. But it can only thrive in a society where the individual has liberty and stimulation to achievement. Nor does the community progress except through its participation in these multitudes of achievements.

Furthermore, the maintenance of productivity and the advancement of the things of the spirit depend upon the ever-renewed supply from the mass of those who can rise to leadership. Our social, economic, and intellectual progress is almost solely dependent upon the creative minds of those individuals with imaginative and administrative intelligence who create or who carry discoveries to widespread application. No race possesses more than a small percentage of these minds in a single generation. But little thought has ever been given to our racial dependency upon them. Now that our progress is in so large a measure due to the fact that with our increased means of communication these rare individuals are today able to spread their influence over so enlarged a number of lesser capable minds as to have increased their potency a millionfold. In truth, the vastly greater productivity of the world with actually less physical labor is due to the wider spread of their influence through the discovery of these facilities. And they can arise solely through the selection that comes from the free-running mills of competition. They must be free to rise from the mass; they must be given the attraction of premiums to effort.

Leadership is a quality of the individual. It is the individual alone who can function in the world of intellect and in the field of leadership. If democracy is to secure its authorities in morals, religion, and statesmanship, it must stimulate leadership from its own mass. Human leadership cannot be replenished by selection like queen bees, by divine right or bureaucracies, but by the free rise of ability, character, and intelligence.

Even so, leadership cannot, no matter how brilliant, carry progress far ahead of the average of the mass of individual units. Progress of the Nation is the sum of progress in its individuals. Acts and ideas that lead to progress are born out of the womb of the individual mind, not out of the mind of the crowd. The crowd only feels; it has no mind of its own which can plan. The crowd is credulous, it destroys, it consumes, it hates, and it dreams—but it never builds. It is one of the most profound and important of exact psychological truths that man in the mass does not think but only feels. The mob functions only in a world of emotion. The demagog feeds on mob emotions and his leadership is the leadership of emotion, not the leadership of intellect and progress. Popular desires are no criteria to the real need; they can be determined only by deliberative consideration, by education, by constructive leadership.

Land Between the Lakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is welcome news that the Tennessee Valley Authority has taken on the task of developing a new facility that will offer recreation to millions of Americans, particularly those who live in the Midsouth.

This is in the area known as the Land Between the Lakes, the lakes behind that behind Kentucky Dam and the one formed by the impoundment of waters behind the new Barkley Dam, in the western sections of Tennessee and Kentucky.

An interesting editorial about the colorful history of this area and describing the great potential of the new park appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal on June 16. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Land Between the Lakes

During the 1920's and early 1930's it was known as the land between the rivers. Hardly anyone went there, for there was little to see or do.

It was a wilderness between the Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers and there were no bridges across those streams. Those who had reason to travel from one section of the States to the other passed through this wilderness by means of ferries that spanned both streams as the need arose.

The dense thickets hid many a moonshine still in the prohibition era and later, too. The illicit liquor interests of Chicago and Detroit, pressed by the revenue agents at home, often came to this area to hide out until things cooled off at home. Some of them organized the wilderness moonshiners into a commercial enterprise. They hauled cases of the moonshine out on flatboats and sometimes hijacked freight trains to carry their illegal loads out of the area, oldtimers will recall.

As the TVA and the U.S. Engineers moved into the area, the bottomlands grew more corn and there were attempts to develop a more diversified agriculture. But most of the soil is sandy and not adapted to the growing of row crops or even good pastures. Trees, bushes, and low-quality grasses thrive, though, and the area still remains much a wilderness remote from the rest of civilization even though bridges now span the streams.

The milewide lake that fans out behind Kentucky Dam, the terminal of the vast TVA system, is being matched now by the Cumberland River impoundment formed by the Barkley Dam, just a long stone's throw to the east of Kentucky Dam.

And between these lakes now will be the "Land Between the Lakes"—a 170,000-acre area in Kentucky and Tennessee where the TVA will develop recreation facilities that will accommodate 20,000 overnight campers and fishing, hunting, and educational projects that will provide relaxation for thousands more.

This is an ambitious project, but one that will serve a useful purpose. It will, of course, be welcomed by many residents of the Midsouth who live close by its shores. But it will be a boon, too, to those who live in St. Louis, Chicago, Louisville, Ky., Indianapolis, Detroit, Cincinnati, and scores of other large cities which are within an easy day's drive of this area.

The TVA and State parks facilities on the Tennessee River already have demonstrated the popularity of this type of facility. Visitors to these spots now come from places thousands of miles distant. As the cities become more and more crowded, the need for the "Land Between the Lakes" will be become more and more evident.

Managed News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON ALLOTT

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in recent months much has been said about managed news. Members of Congress are constantly running into areas and incidents of managed news. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] about a month ago made a very significant speech on the question of managed news and how it affects this country. Since this is a democracy and since we are supposed to act as free and independent citizens, it stands to reason that we must have complete access to news, we must have access to news as it occurs, and we must have access to news which is not interpreted or managed, or we cannot make an intelligent decision.

I have in my hand an editorial entitled "The Real Menace of Managed News," under "Air Power in the News," published in the July issue of the Air Force magazine. The concluding paragraph states:

> In view of the pattern set by the administration's handling of public disclosure of the Russian overflights of our carriers at sea, is there any reason to assume that it will not similarly withhold information if it learns that the Russians have made a major technological breakthrough and have achieved a menacing operational capability in new weaponry, undersea warfare, or military space competence?
>
> Until there is satisfactory assurance on this subject, managed news looms as a Trojan horse that can conceal within itself the doom of freemen.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Real Menace of Managed News

Let us start with a short case history.

At a press conference last February 28 Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara announced that four long-range reconnaissance aircraft, flying out of Russian bases, had overflown the U.S. aircraft carrier *Forrestal* southeast of the Azores. The date of the incident was February 22. The Secretary said the planes, which were Bears, were spotted and followed by U.S. Air Force interceptors from a point east of Iceland to and from the *Forrestal*. The Red aircraft, which showed no hostile intent, also were monitored by pilots from the carrier. Mr. McNamara left the announcement at this point and said he was ready to answer questions.

The transcript of the conference shows that out of 52 questions fielded by the Secretary in the next half hour, 34 of them, a comfortable majority, were centered on the Russian overflight. This was a subject introduced by the Secretary with no advance warning. It was news to the reporters as well as to the public, and the news conference was fairly productive.

By persistence, the reporters brought out a number of pertinent facts not mentioned by Mr. McNamara in his statement. There had been scores of overflights in 1962 by Russian medium- and short-range reconnaissance planes. Long-range planes had made several overflights of U.S. Navy forces in 1963 both in the Atlantic and Pacific but no anouncement had been made earlier because "information has been coming in gradually * * * we have been examining the protographs and other information and have decided to make it available to you, thinking it was in the interest of the public to be informed of it."

Later, he was asked again about his "intentions" and, "Why was the announcement safe for you to make at this time instead of being issued in the routine way?" Mr. McNamara's reply:

"The major reason was that I was planning a press conference today, and I didn't wish this to come out routinely a few hours or a day after I had the conference and then be asked the next time why I [didn't] announce this."

The situation behind this statement was clear within a few hours. A party of newspaper representatives was on board the *Forrestal* when the overflight took place, and the newsmen were due in Norfolk within 48 hours. One member of the party told this reporter the newsmen were told they could not file stories about the overflights from the carrier, at least pending clearance from the Defense Department. They also were cautioned against mentioning the incident in letters or on the ship-to-shore telephone. By the time the first members of the party were stateside, flown in from the *Forrestal*, Mr. McNamara had made his announcement, insuring that the news would not "come out routinely."

Somehow, the significance of how the news was managed in this instance seems to have escaped public discussion. Secretary McNamara undoubtedly was correct in his evaluation of the overflight as "routine reconnaissance," that they were entirely legal and did not differ from flights made over Soviet ships by U.S. aircraft. Yet the fact remains that the Defense Department had information of intense interest to the American people and had it for many months before the paper curtain was burned by a group of Navy guests at sea.

It also is a technological truth in this era that the Secretary and the administration have sensory equipment at their disposal that could disclose far more terrifying and significant progress than the overflight of carriers by long-range jets. Obvious examples are in the areas of weaponry, undersea warfare, and space. No guests ever will be present if this sensory equipment detects undeniable evidence of a Russian major advance in the technology and operational capability that makes these areas a menace to our security and world freedom.

There is a legitimate question that might justifiably have been asked at Mr. McNamara's February 28 press conference. Here is the question:

"In view of the pattern set by the administration's handling of public disclosure of the Russian overflights of our carriers at sea, is there any reason to assume that it will not similarly withhold information if it learns that the Russians have made a major technological breakthrough and have achieved a menacing operational capability in new weaponry, undersea warfare, or military space competence?"

Until there is satisfactory assurance on this subject, managed news looms as a Trojan horse that can conceal within itself the doom of freemen.

Individual Incentive Needed To Build America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the July 13 issue of Human Events. The article is written by Deane N. Malott, president emeritus of Cornell University. President Malott's ideas are thoughtful, but more important they are thought provoking.

Mr. Speaker, we are rapidly approaching the triumph of mediocrity. Once that arrives our days as a world power will end. We will have been "weighed in the balance and found wanting."

The article follows:

INDIVIDUAL INCENTIVE NEEDED TO BUILD AMERICA

(By Deane W. Malott)

"Government * * * grows and grows, feeding upon our substances, commandeering funds which should be used for the development of free-enterprise ventures and tending ever toward the dead level of mediocrity in our every effort."

The human race learns slowly. In the long history of civilization, freedom has more often been lost by carelessness and selfishness than by the force of conquering armies. Strongholds of free men have gone down more often by the erosion of indifference, tracing the way from the individual initiative out of which free societies are born to the bread and circuses which they demand as a public right in the last stages of their decline.

Our Government is run by elected officers beholden to the citizens; they continue in office only as long as they satisfy the electorate. Therefore, if we do not constantly articulately make known our beliefs, our desires, our concerns, we have abdicated our citizenship more surely than by not voting at all.

We have an interesting opportunity for observation, for in the last two decades we have lived under both Democratic and Republican leadership; the trends of government have scarcely been distinguishable between the two. Each comes in under the blandishments of cutting costs, increasing efficiency, reducing taxes, lessening the impact of centralization of government. But nothing of the kind happens.

The Government costs increase, deficits mount and the ghost of Parkinson lurks through the corridors of government everywhere.

The Federal budget this present year is a thumping $93-billion affair, approaching the greatest annual cost during World War II, and nearly three times the cost during the postwar low in 1948. The estimated budget expenditures are up some $11 billion over the figure of 2 years ago. The public debt at $295 billion is half of the estimated gross national product for 1963.

Salaries and wages in the Federal Trade Commission were $6,700,000 in 1961; this year $9,610,000. Probably this is for the further harassment of the business community.

SPENDING JUSTIFIED?

The newly created Commission on Civil Rights requires $995,000, while the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations had a budget of $144,000 in 1961 and $375,000 at present. The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission has gone from $546,000 2 years ago to $730,000 at present. Up and up and up. The Commission of Fine Arts to advise the President on matters of architecture, sculpture, and painting cost us $22,000 in 1956; $69,000 in 1961; $80,000 in 1963. And the cost of the judiciary division of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands has doubled in the last 7 years. Is there a reasonable justification? One wonders.

The Government's program to stimulate travel to the United States cost the taxpayer $517,000 in 1961; nearly $900,000 in 1963. Yet blocked currency impedes the travel from most countries.

We are spending over $1 million a year in salaries for White House Police, and the expenses of the National Park Service have gone up nearly $20 million in 2 years.

Federal aid to education, a governmental function which some of us in education hold of dubious validity, has gone from $91 million in 1953 to $2,400 million in 1963, without the American people or the Congress ever having acted on the specific policy proposal at all.

BORROWING ON TOMORROW

Total expenditures for Federal research and development programs of all sorts now total $11,500 million, up nearly $3 billion in 2 years.

Nor is this indicative of the whole, sad story; it was Maurice H. Stans, then Director of the Federal budget, speaking 3 years ago, who pointed out that the national debt is not all that we owe. Accrued and accruing liabilities or previous expenditure authorizations in many an area amounted to, even then, if added to the exposed debt, the gargantuan figure of $750 billion—an unbelievable c.o.d. against the American people of tomorrow.

And to top off our fiscal incompetence and irersponsibility, the President of the United States now proposes to the Congress a Federal operating budget for fiscal 1964 just under $100 billion, which will probably prove in fact to be much higher—largest budget in the history of the Nation, and a planned increase of $4.5 billion over the current one.

Into this fantastic situation is thrust the ideology of a tax cut; very simply state, we cut taxes, increase the gargantuan debt, and proceed to borrow from the taxpayer the loss in revenue thus sustained. It simply will not work. Economy lies down the road of cutting costs, at which point a tax reduction may be feasible, if we are content not to reduce our Federal debt, and to continue to pay the huge and continuing interest charges on the existing indebtedness of nearly $300 billion.

Turning briefly to the field of labor, we find inexcusable featherbedding and obsolete and disastrous labor contracts are continued with political connivance or at least passive acceptance, while the whole apparatus of Federal Government again and again causes labor settlements which wink at practices detrimental to the free enterprise system and to the American stockholders upon whom the burden of waste and extravagance falls. Automation is impeded, the cost-price squeeze is accentuated and the fiber of the American workingman is demoralized and undermined.

LABOR REFORMS NEEDED

Look at the railroads. A basic day in railroading continues to be 100 miles of travel; all else is overtime. Yet 100 miles can be accomplished in as little as 90 minutes. Surplus manpower lolls throughout industry under long-outmoded union contracts. The Congress of the United States is unwilling or unable to pay the political price of intelligent overhauling of labor laws and of holding labor unions accountable as responsible units in our society.

This problem of the rising power of labor unions and rising labor costs, is a drain upon American enterprise as debilitating as inordinate taxes, and is merely another evidence of the compounding profligacy of a government which we somehow are not holding accountable.

Another field of negligence lies in the vast field of international expenditures, largely under the Agency for International Development, where we find fastened upon us, as a continuing way of life, vast expenditures for lugging along nearly every Nation on earth.

On this policy for nearly two decades we have lavished billions across the globe, and yet America's reputation has never been lower around the globe than at this very moment. Still we continue the idea that emerging nations, inexperienced and often inept, can be shored up by a golden stream of American dollars and that communism will retreat under the impact of American money.

But we are capricious about it. American servicemen are dying in far-off Vietnam under some vague policy of containing communism, but we fail to curb a dangerous buildup in Cuba, only 90 miles off our shores and in ready access of all the struggling and often volatile governments in Latin America.

In October our Federal administration discovered that national and world sentiment was far ahead of the cautious and uncertain Washington bureaucracy, but after a single forthright action we slipped again into notewriting, explanations and justifications, to the uncertainty and embarrassment of the American people. The inspections we demanded in October have somehow been quietly allowed to lapse, circumvented by the wily old fox in the Kremlin.

We are deluded perhaps by the indifference of our prosperity. Mr. Paul Miller, president of the Associated Press, speaking of the late Justice Brandeis who, out of the wealth of a lifetime of critical observations, pointed out:

"Experience should teach us to be more on our guard to protect liberty when the Government's purposes are beneficient. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning, but without understanding."

These words are ageless in their warning to the American people, through all the decades of our democracy.

But, you will say, surely I intend to do more than to complain—one of the most indolent and profitless pursuits known to man. I do indeed. I have specific suggestions for you in the world of affairs, and for us in higher education.

For your part, you should be about the task of formulating government policy by all the tools available to American citizens. You should be enlisting, each one of you, scores of people to keep in persistent touch with your elected representatives in the Congress, and all others in places of responsibility where contact may be obtained. Business, labor, and government need intercommunication.

If even 25 percent of the business leaders would undertake active involvement in the political and civic affairs throughout the Nation, what a difference it would make.

The business entrepreneur is a man of decision, a realist in the analysis of facts, forthright in his ability to make judgments based upon them. He is used to hard decisions; he cannot survive on equivocal ones. The country is not obtaining the advantages of these qualities in sufficient quantities to influence the course of national events.

DEAD LEVEL OF MEDIOCRITY

And I submit that the lethargy of the business community, in participating in political affairs and in the formulation of political principles, is a form of corruption as great as that engaged in by the most overt of self-seeking politicians.

To create a literate citizenry, broadly educated to command the tolerance, the selflessness, the clear thinking, the dedication needed to help guide the Republic, is our greatest challenge.

I have often maintained that our civilization will never fall because of lack of trained scientists, or of a shortage of trained engineers, or of skilled biologists and physicians; we leap ahead of the frontiers of knowledge almost continuously in these areas.

We lag, however, in the management of our Government as it grows and grows, feeding upon our substance, commandeering funds which should be used for the development of free enterprise ventures, and tending ever toward the dead level of mediocrity in our every effort.

It was Benjamin Franklin who predicted, at the close of the Constitutional Convention, that the Federal Union "can only end in despotism, as other forms have done before it, when the people shall become so corrupt as to need despotic government, being incapable of any other."

Facts or Muzzles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, we are all greatly concerned these days about the free dissemination of information, particularly that which has its origin in the various departments of government. The Columbia City (Ind.), Commercial-Mail recently had a brief, though pungent, editorial upon this subject, which I include herewith:

FACTS OR MUZZLES

Much has been said and written in recent weeks about the withholding of news and information from the press and public by Government officers. The recent controversy arose from the tight-mouthed bureau officers in international situations like that in Cuba. The reason given by the Washington officers was that national security was at stake.

Censorship in time of war has been recognized as necessary, but in time of peace the American public has a right to know facts in all possible public matters and policies. Fear of criticism is no justification for keeping the people ignorant of facts. The American Republic must not be denied all possible information in governmental affairs if we are to remain a vigorous people, and support the demands for funds and vigorous support to worthy enterprise.

The right to know applies not only to public matters in Washington, but also in State, county, city, and school affairs. They are all supported by the taxes and moral backing of the American citizens. Giving the people the facts and figures will create hearty support instead of suspicion of misadministration. In America, support should arise from sincere effort rather than from action forced upon citizens by a military or police government as in nations behind the Iron Curtain or the Bamboo Curtain of the present day.

The Negro Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the current issue of Ebony magazine:

THE NEGRO REVOLUTION

As President John F. Kennedy presses his bold and controversial civil-rights program on Congress, more than 50 American cities are experiencing racial strife and mass demonstrations. The drumbeat of a new Negro militancy gives urgency to the President's warning of a "rising tide of discontent. It is time to take heed of this warning." In truth, Mr. Kennedy has given voice to our national conscience, which demands that Negroes be allowed to pass beyond the written and unwritten "white only" signs in the Nation's stores, restaurants, hotels, and hiring halls. Beyond this, our Nation is challenged to accept a new image of the American Negro, to accept the fact that the Negro community is aroused and will resort to as much force as is necessary to win the full privileges of citizenship. "Revolution" is a harsh word. It means upheaval and bloodshed. And it means a confession of failure. It means that the rule of law has failed, that the voices of reason have not been heard. And yet revolution is the word that is beginning to apply to the Negro demonstrations, not only in Birmingham and Jackson, but also in New York City, Chicago, Detroit, and the other ghettos of the North. Black forces are drawn up in a battle line that confronts the white man wherever he stands on the principles and practices of segregation. It is the responsibility of the Nation to accommodate the legitimate aims of this Negro revolution with as little violence and damage to our society as possible.

The seat of initiative for dealing with the most critical domestic problem of the century should be our Nation's Capital. Bill Davidson's report on the mess in Washington is a study in irony. The "Government" of Washington remains willfully blind to the points that the President made in laying out his civil-rights program. Mr. Kennedy demand inaction, yet the capital remains a showcase of inaction in a time of domestic crisis. The attitudes that obstruct progress in Washington are typical of the forces that have disfranchised and frustrated the Negro throughout our society.

President Kennedy has attempted to respond to the increasingly grave dilemma by putting before Congress the most comprehensive civil-rights bill in the past century. It would guarantee Negroes equal rights in all major commercial institutions, such as hotels, restaurants, theaters, and department stores. It would speed the desegregation of public education by allowing the Attorney General to file suits against any segregated schools. And since much of the Negro problem involves the chronic unemployment of unskilled Negro workers, the President's bill would allocate $400 million to retrain and educate Negro laborers.

This program will not placate the militant Negro and it will not please the white segregationists, but it seems a moderate and minimal program to the reasonable observer. After all, it has been almost a century since the Constitution guaranteed equal voting rights, but only one quarter of qualified Southern Negroes are allowed to vote. It has been almost 10 years since the Supreme Court ordered schools desegregated "with all deliberate speed," but less than 8 percent of Southern Schools are desegregated. In the States of Alabama and Mississippi not one public school district has been integrated. Yet the Southern Senators plan to kill or at least modify President Kennedy's civil-rights bill by the most senseless of strategies, the filibuster. And from the Negroes there are threats that a Southern filibuster will be met by massive demonstrations in Washington. The President has challenged both sides "to do their utmost to lesson tensions and to exercise self-restraint. The Congress should have an opportunity to freely work its will."

The indications are that a compromise will finally pass Congress—but it is likely that neither side will heed the President's appeal for moderation. The ardent segregationists will stage their futile filibuster; the zealous integrationists will stage their dangerous and equally futile demonstrations. And America will be the worse for it.

The Negro revolution will not be put down by a compromise bill; it has gone beyond this point. As a Nation we must use all of our resourcefulness and courage to answer the yearnings of 20 million Negroes. If honorable demands for equality and justice are not met, leadership will pass into the hands of irresponsible men. The question is not how much time is left. There is very little time. The question is: What do we do with these few remaining hours?

Captive Nations—Evasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, akin to damning with faint praise is the practice of condemning by failure to vigorously support. Such has been the case with the administration's weak pronouncement in behalf of the captive nations, as required by congressional mandate. The weakness of the New Frontier attitude is made all the more noticeable when compared with the forceful and forthright proclamations issued by President Eisenhower in 1959 and 1961 when he condemned Communist imperialism and called for the liberation of these enslaved peoples.

The vigor with which this administration opposes colonialism under certain circumstances has been emphasized by the pressure exerted to force Belgium out of the Congo, to compel the Dutch to give up Indonesia, to advise Britain to withdraw from British Guiana, and more recently to openly snub Salazar of Portugal because of his insistence in holding on to Angola. On the other hand, when it comes to Communist colonialism we must not utter a word that might enrage the Soviets or interfere in any way with another nonaggression treaty that will not be worth the paper it is written on.

And in our current obsession with the idea that we can woo communism from preoccupation with its basic designs to bury us we forget how our President got his fingers burned in the promise to neutralize Laos—an agreement that was broken almost as soon as it was made. No; we seem determined to rush into some new arrangement with an adversary who has told us in advance that he will concede nothing, while we continue to turn our backs on enslaved masses who are quite accurately called the captive nations, and showing our utter indifference toward the plight of people whose only offense was that they loved liberty and lived next door to a colossus that denies it.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of this Congress who does not want to get along with the Russians nor is there a member of either party who would not be willing to make almost any realistic concession necessary to the achievement of an honest nonaggression pact. The first test of sincerity, however, must be the attitude toward these captive populations who ask only to be allowed to work out their destiny without outside interference. And we make a mockery of our profession of equality for all races, at home and abroad, when we fail to endorse the bid for freedom for those who once enjoyed it but who are now prostate. We can only hope that the citizens of these nations in captivity, as well as their compatriots among us, will realize that there are still some of us who want to help them.

Is Congress Hexed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 15, the Chicago Tribune contained an editorial comment relative to this year's foreign aid bill, which is now being processed in both the House and Senate Foreign Affairs Committees.

This editorial is extremely timely. I place it in the record in the hope that its clarity will have an effect on our pending deliberation.

IS CONGRESS HEXED?

The House Foreign Affairs Committee has balked at the suggestion that it cut a half billion dollars from Mr. Kennedy's foreign aid bill and contented itself with snipping out a mere $330 million. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee meanwhile continues to wallow in indecision in spite of testimony by retired Gen. Lucius D. Clay, that foreign aid spending could be held to $4 billion without affecting our security. This is $900 million less than Mr. Kennedy's original request.

We can't understand why Congress remains so skittish about cutting down on foreign aid when so many Congressmen profess to recognize both the urgent need for economy and the colossal unproductiveness of foreign aid.

General Clay has been an adviser to four Presidents on matters concerning aid abroad and his experience leaves little doubt that he knows what he is talking about. He has been a supoprter of foreign aid, on the whole, and wouldn't be suggesting that the handouts can be cut if he thought it would do any harm.

Yet Congress seems to have been so hexed by the foreign aid lobby, or so conditioned by years of docile acquiescence, that it is unable to think for itself. Congressmen will make impassioned speeches about their determination to trim unnecessary spending. They will pretend to understand the seriousness of our balance-of-payments problem (the Treasury lost another $50 million in gold last week). They will listen to repeated evidence of waste and mishandling of foreign aid.

But when they have a chance to make a substantial cut in foreign aid and thus demonstrate their sincerity, the Members meekly confine themselves to a few token snips, like a surgeon who is afraid to break the patient's skin. They listen to foreign aid lobbyists whose testimony is manifestly self-serving, and to nonexperts like George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, who can declaim eloquently on the Communist menace or on unemployment, but is only vaguely familiar with the specifics of foreign aid. They close their ears to General Clay and other qualified witnesses who advocate even more drastic cuts than he does.

Once they have bravely wielded the nail scissors, we can expect to find them back on the soapboxes, viewing with alarm the deficit and the gold loss and the inefficiency of foreign aid.

Court's Decision Reassuring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I include therein a notable editorial from the Word and Way on a recent decision of the Supreme Court as follows:

COURT'S DECISION REASSURING

In a momentous decision handed down Monday, June 17, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the required reading of the Bible and recitation of the Lord's Prayer in public schools are unconstitutional, because they violate the prohibitions of the first amendment.

In an 8 to 1 decision the Court said that the Government has no business invading the religious life of the people. It said that the home, the church, and the individual heart and mind are an "inviolable citadel" of religion. "We have come to recognize through bitter experience," the Court said, "that it is not within the power of Government to invade that citadel, whether its purpose or effect be to aid or oppose, to advance or retard. In the relationship between man and religion, the State is firmly committed to a position of neutrality."

Only Justice Potter Stewart dissented. He said that the cases before the Court had not presented enough evidence for a decision and that the issues were so complicated that he would have remanded them back to the lower courts.

In reaching its decision the Court went out of its way to say that its action is not hostile to religion and that it was not ruling out teaching about religion in public schools. It emphasized that the Constitution demands neutrality in matters of religion and that its action does not constitute an establishment of "a religion of secularism."

As in the celebrated decision in the New York Regents' Prayer case, handed down on June 25, last year, the Court's main objection was directed at the "State-required" factors. In the New York case the Court objected to a State-composed prayer, the recitation of which was required daily in all New York public schools.

Supporters of the bill who argued before the Court contended that the reading of the Scriptures and the reciting of the Lord's Prayer are effective means of teaching morality.

Opponents of the law argued that religion is a personal matter between the individual and his God, if any, and that the State has no business invading that sacred area.

Now all concerned are having their say about the decision. There are the usual cries that this ruling further entrenches atheism and secularism in the public schools. One metroplitan paper carried a feature editorial with the title, "Outlawing God From Schools." The editorial expressed the thought that "the Creator" and "divine providence" of the Declaration of Independence—the "author of liberty" of "America"—the "one nation under God" of the Gettysburg Address have been woven into the warp and woof of American life.

Certainly those who know something about what history reveals concerning the state-dominated church are gratified at this ruling of the Court. They believe that this further guarantees individual freedom in worship.

If the State has the authority to require the reading of 10 verses of Scripture and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer in the public schools, then it has authority to add other requirements. Conceivably, this might be extended to the point that the State would dominate completely the religious life of the people.

Almost without exception Baptists who have expressed themselves publicly commend the decision. With a long history of a stanch defense of the principle of separation of church and state, they are reassured by this latest pronouncement of the Supreme Court.

This ruling does not "remove every vestige of our religious heritage from public life." It does not eliminate the Bibles from the courtrooms. It does not deny chaplains for our Armed Force; it does not take Thanksgiving away from the calendar.

If a pupil or a teacher desires to pray, there is nothing in this decision that would prevent him from doing so. There is nothing there that prevents the pupils from even agreeing to pray together, but they must not be "ordered" to pray.

It does not mean that "The Star Spangled Banner" will have to be rewritten or that "In God we trust" will have to disappear from our money. Congress still opens each day with a prayer, and the blessings of God are still besought for the Supreme Court. This is as it should be.

The study of the Bible was not thrown out of the schools by the Court's decision. In fact, the Court said, "It might be well said that one's education is not complete without a study of comparative religion and the history of religion and its relationship to the advancement of civilization. It certainly may be said that the Bible is worthy of study for its literary and historical qualities. Nothing we have said here indicates that such study of the Bible or religion, when presented objectively as a part of a secular program of education, may not be effective consistent with the first amendment."

The Court then further said, "It is no part of the business of government to compose official prayers for any group of American people to recite as a part of a religious program carried on by government." It applies this same principle to the required reading of the Scriptures and recitation of the Lord's Prayer.

In the long run the Court decision has the effect of renewing emphasis on the homes and the churches in the religious upbringing of our children. There may have been some who have regarded the Bible or prayer in the school as a replacement for old-fashioned spiritual training by parents. Now the responsibility of the church and home cannot be shrugged off so easily.

The Court by this action may have helped to emphasize this responsibility, but it definitely did not cast a thunderbolt at the church or at religion. The United States remains a Nation under God. We hope that it will ever be thus.

Government-Run Lotteries of Haiti, India, Jamaica, and Trinidad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House the government-run lotteries in four more foreign countries. Haiti, India, Jamaica, and Trinidad are included among the 77 foreign nations which recognize the wisdom of a lottery.

Haiti, as we all know, is a tiny and poverty-ridden republic in the Caribbean. Revenue sources are few and the Haitian Government is thus well aware of the fiscal merits of a national lottery. In 1962, the gross receipts came almost to $3 million. The total annual net income to the Government was about $600,000. The proceeds are intended for social welfare and assistance work. The interesting part about the Haitian lottery is that the winner of the first prizes are expected to contribute 5 percent to charity.

India does not conduct a national lottery but rather operates a "prize bond" scheme. It is patterned after the British "premium bond lottery" which revolves around the issuance of Government bonds where instead of bearing interest, the buyer is offered a chance to win a prize. In 1962, the gross receipts from the sale of prize bonds came to almost $7 million. The benefit of the "prize bond" idea was that Government bonds were made more appealing through the presentation of an opportunity to win large cash prizes. India realizes that a recognition of the gambling urge can be a great help in handling the Nation's finances.

Jamaica is another Latin American country which utilizes a government lottery not only as a compromise with the gambling problem but as a revenue-raising device as well. The total gross annual receipts from running the lottery for the year 1962 came to over $850,000. The total annual net income to the Government was almost $180,000 which went to Jamaican hospitals.

Trinidad recognizes the success that may be had in bringing gambling under supervision and control of the Government. The total gross receipts from the sale of sweepstakes tickets for 1962 was about $1 million. The total net income to the government was almost $200,000. Most of the funds go into the general revenue accounts with a part going to charities.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that we here in the United States could benefit from the use of lottery money on behalf of similar goals. A national lottery in this country could raise over $10 billion a year in additional revenue which could be used to cut our personal income taxes and reduce our big and ever-growing national debt.

Mr. Speaker, why can we not profit from the example of our foreign friends? Why can we not show the same kind of wisdom as the State of New Hampshire? Why should we continue to blind ourselves to this tremendous revenue which can help our taxpayers from the heavy tax load? Why all of this reluctance and stubbornness? What are we afraid of?

Outgrowing the Ghetto Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the current issue of Ebony magazine:

OUTGROWING THE GHETTO MIND

There is a joke going the rounds about a telephone conversation between Martin Luther King and John F. Kennedy. Says the President: "Yes, Dr. King. I know, Dr. King. I understand, Dr. King. But Dr. King—it has always been known as the White House."

If this little yarn carries a moral, it also serves a notice. The Negro is not concerned about the color of the White House, of course, but he does want to know if qualified Negroes will be employed the next time it is painted and when will open occupancy come to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

There was a time, a very long time, when the Negro questioned the nonemployment of Negroes on skilled jobs, but did not demand that they be hired. There was a time, a very long time, when he deplored racial ghettos but did not insist upon integrated housing. There was a time, a very, very long time, when the Negro conditioned himself to accept racial segregation and discrimination instead of fighting for his equal rights.

Waiting for promised improvements his frustrations increased, his anger mounted. Rebellion was as inevitable as it was surprising to those who thought the Negro incapable of impatience and afraid to defy his oppressors, but the current storm of protests proves that he has outgrown ghetto mentality which lulled him into believing that a black man could not survive in a white man's world if he challenged the racial status quo.

ADJUSTING TO SEGREGATION

Ghetto thinking, the result of years of ghetto living is the avoidance of action or degrading oneself to be permitted to survive, according to Dr. Bruno Bettelheim. This kind of reasoning, he says, was largely responsible for the extermination of millons of Jews by the Nazis. The eminent University of Chicago psychologist told the American Council for Judaism that although a few thousand Jews in Warsaw did resist, "hundreds of thousands meekly accepted their fate and cooperated with their exterminators." He was astonished at the number who felt it would be possible to live with Hitler, though they had to submit to degradation to do so.

The counterpart of the Jewish ghetto mentality is what Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., calls the complacency of Negroes who, "as a result of long years of oppression, have been so completely drained of self-respect and a sense of 'somebodiness' that they have adjusted to segregation."

Not unlike those Jews who actively helped their exterminators, are the Uncle Toms who collaborate with white racists by playing the roles of apologist and informer. Many middle and upper class Negroes have also aided white supremacists by disassociating themselves from the problem.

Such duplicity and complacency, coupled with the old custom of adjusting to a position of inferiority rather than insisting upon his constitutional rights, would have led the Negro to his Buchenwald, had he not learned the prudence—and the power—of positive resistance.

LONG WAY TO GO

Undoubtedly the meek shall one day inherit the earth, but it could be a long wait until the demise of the strong and the reading of a will that could leave the meek more weak than wealthy. The old Negro may be willing to wait for equality in his Father's kingdom, but hopes of a milk-and-honey hereafter do not assuage the hunger pangs of his sons and daughters now.

In this 100th year of de jure freedom, today's Negro is not too impressed with how far he has come from bondage. He is, however, depressed by how far he has yet to go before obtaining first-class citizenship. "In two decades," says Dr. Leo K. Bishop, "the Jews and the Roman Catholics have moved into the open society of the United States, and," adds the Jewish leader, "Negroes will make it, too."

The big question is, When? Just as the old separate-but-equal Supreme Court decision of 1896 spelled never, so could the gradualism of its 1954 decision take forever. And forever is a very long time.

In Montgomery, Ala., not-so-meek Negroes turned the death-watch on eternity into a walking boycott that ended segregated buses. Eight years later in Birmingham, the walk became a triumphant march that left no doubt that inaction had been replaced by positive resistance and the pace toward victory quickened. Birmingham also marked the passing of the initiative in the Negro's fight for civil rights, from white hands to black.

The "head of black steam," as Columnist Erick Severeid calls it, had begun to build. The Negro, at last, had come into his own. When Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL declared that Negro organizations should be headed by Negroes, he provoked more than the usual storm of protests that accompany most of his pronouncements, but in a matter of weeks, spokesmen of both races were agreed that the time had come for the white liberal to assume a secondary role.

"There is abundant evidence that from this point forward the burden of the struggle will be carried by the Negroes themselves," says Writer Max Freedman.

OTHER VOICES

The fear which once made the Negro submissive, has passed on to his intimidators, who, not understanding the change from meekness to militancy, refuse to acknowledge its existence. In losing his fear, the Negro has gained new faith in himself and a unity of purpose heretofore unknown. For the first time, upper class Negroes, those who are as socially and economically secure as nonwhites can be in a segregated society, have been brought together in a common cause.

Entertainers who make their livelihood performing before white audiences, are leading Negros demonstrations in the South or holding vast benefits in the North for organizations fighting racial bigotry. The executive secretary of the conservative NAACP has been bailed out of a Mississippi jail, and some of the most comely colored coeds in the Southland are doing their homework in paddy wagons. Even the shrill voices of elementary school children sing out from barbed wire stockades as they lend their numbers to the crusade for freedom.

The voices of Essayist James Baldwin and Sociologist Kenneth Clark and black Supremist Malcolm X and Actor Sammy Davis and Author Louis Lomas and Gospel Singer Mahalia Jackson and Comic Dick Gregory and Actress Lena Horne—to name a few—are joined in a common plea for equality. Long divorced from the ghetto complex, these, like countless other Negro celebrities and intellectuals, have found a new identity with the unsung and uneducated Negro. They have also found a new pride in their race as well as a working formula for gaining the equality all Negroes seek.

REMOVING THE MASK

With the shedding of the ghetto mentality and upper class complacency, the Negro is through with wearing the mask of ambivalence; he is done with survivor's doubletalk, for he is beginning to think like a man and act like a man and what is most important, to be treated as one. His progress, however, is paltry compared with that of over 200 million of his African counsins who evolved from colonialism to independence in 10 dramatic years. He still lags far behind the Roman Catholic and the Jew in acceptance into the open society of the United States. But thanks to his own determined efforts, he is moving faster toward his goal now than ever before. When he reaches it, he will rid democracy of a blot white Americans were either unable or unwilling to erase.

In the meantime, there is still that matter of employment outside of the White House and tenancy within.

Growth in Disguise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal, July 16, 1963:

GROWTH IN DISGUISE

Is a little inflation the inescapable price of economic growth?

According to the economic fashion of the moment, the answer is yes, even though inflation is not always called by its right name. Certainly the view of Government economists appears to be that only inflationary fuel can sufficiently activate the economy. Otherwise they would hardly be advocating, as simultaneous policies, larger Federal spending, bigger deficits, monetary ease, and tax cuts.

Now a strong dissent is entered to this whole notion that a certain amount of inflation must be tolerated in order to achieve greater growth. The argument comes from Raymond J. Saulnier, chief economist under President Eisenhower, in a series of lectures collected in book form and published by Fordham University Press as "The Strategy of Economic Policy."

Plainly an inflation can produce symptoms of growth, or at least of frenetic activity. But as Dr. Saulnier makes clear, these manifestations are all too likely to be illusory and to lead to the opposite of real growth. Stable purchasing power, far from being somehow incompatible with growth, is a condition prerequisite to the attainment of vigorous and sustainable growth.

The key words are vigorous and sustainable, taken together. If no one cares what kind of growth is being brought about, just so long as it is something which can be called growth, then we are engaged in an exercise so self-deceptive it should not commend itself to adult minds.

For what inflation designed to produce make-believe growth actually does is not only rob the people of purchasing power, with the penalties falling most heavily on those least able to protect themselves. That is bad enough. It also causes a whole train of economic distortions which can grow increasingly violent.

Even the expectation of inflation, Mr. Saulnier notes, may impel businesses to expand buying beyond current requirements and normal needs. This has the appearance of growth for a while, but when the inventory accumulation significantly exceeds sales requirements, the danger of recession arises.

In the same way, anticipated price increases may cause consumers to step up their immediate buying. Again the appearance of growth for a time, but again an economic depressant when the artificially stimulated demands finally slacken.

The distortions can get much worse. Under a deliberately inflationary policy, Mr. Saulnier observes, "a speculative fever may affect financial markets, as people seek to 'hedge' against inflation. But like a business inventory buildup or anticipatory buying, a speculative movement in financial markets contains within itself the seeds of its own eventual reversal. And the more widespread and rapid the movement, the greater the retreat and retrenchment that must follow in the corrective phase."

Whether or when the dismal process might be played out in reality depends on a number of circumstances, including how unrestrained Government policy is permitted to become. The arrival of inflation cannot be precisely predicted even when policy seems geared to its creation.

What is beyond doubt is that it is risky to play around with. In Mr. Saulnier's words, "It is a fact that all the world's experience with inflation, and all the dialogue on the subject, has failed as yet to show that a broad and persisting decline in the value of money is a good thing, even when it happens inadvertently."

Government policies designed to preserve purchasing power are essential for genuine growth without dangerous distortions. Inflation cannot qualify, however it is justified or disguised. It is not the price of growth but an exorbitant price exacted for political indicipline.

The Tax Program of the Kennedy Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as we know the President has submitted to the Congress detailed recommendations which would effect a reduction in the rates now assessed upon personal and corporate income. The Ways and Means Committee has had these recommendations under consideration these several weeks past. Meanwhile, a debate of considerable proportion has arisen concerning the President's proposals. I think it pertinent, therefore, to place before the House the views of 414 professional economists as expressed in the following communication. You will note the signatories endorse the communication as individuals and not as representatives of the several institutions with which they are associated. Considering the enormous range of knowledge represented, I regard this expression a rather remarkable endorsement of the President's proposals.

The communication follows:

THE TAX PROGRAM OF THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

As professional economists, we welcome the administration's clear recognition of the role which Federal fiscal policy can and should play in maintaining and expanding the level of economic activity. While some of us disagree with one or another specific feature of the tax program now before the Congress, we all, without exception, subscribe to the following propositions:

1. There is now a substantial deficiency of aggregate demand in the American economy, with the result that the level of unemployment is significantly higher than it need be—and, in our opinion, higher than it should be.

2. While there are significant "structural" problems which make it difficult to find jobs for the more disadvantaged of the unemployed, the first need is to achieve a higher overall level of economic activity. If this is done, efforts to retrain and relocate displaced workers will be more effective.

3. We subscribe to the belief, as recently expressed by Walter Heller, that an "increase in aggregate demand is most appropriately brought about in a predominantly private enterprise economy such as ours by means of monetary or fiscal measures."

4. It is generally agreed that, in the present situation, monetary policy by itself cannot bring about the necessary expansion of economic activity—in part, because of the restraint imposed by the present balance-of-payments situation. Hence the primary reliance must be on fiscal policy.

5. While we welcome the improvement in economic conditions which has occurred in the last few months, we believe that "natural forces" alone will not eliminate excess unemployment this year or even next year.

6. It therefore follows that, in the months ahead, substantial use should be made of fiscal policy as a means of stimulating aggregate demand and raising the level of employment. This can be done by reducing tax revenues, by increasing Government expenditures, or by some combination of the two.

7. We believe that the increase in the Federal deficit proposed by the administra-

tion is not too large, given the objective being sought. We are confident that both the shortrun and longrun effects of the tax reduction will be beneficial. Indeed, insofar as there is a difference of opinion among us, it is that some of us believe that a larger tax cut should have been proposed.

8. On the whole, we believe that the administration's program, as originally submitted to the Congress, represents a reasonable compromise. It provides tax reductions for both individuals and corporations. It should provide a significant stimulus to consumer's spending, and it should have a beneficial effect on private investment. Virtually all of us believe that substantial tax reform is badly needed, but we also believe that arguments as to the details and timing of tax reform should not delay the prompt approval of a substantial across-the-board reduction in Federal income tax rates.

9. We should like to assure the American people that a Federal deficit of the magnitude proposed, given the extent to which capital and labor are not now being fully utilized, carries no danger of accelerated inflation. Nor does such a deficit in any manner or degree threaten the solvency of the Federal Government. This country's outstanding record of economic growth during the last century and a half or more has been associated with increases in debt representing mobilization of the people's savings by business and government. It should be noted, also, that the size of the deficit will automatically decline as rising incomes generate increased tax revenues at the lower rates.

10. We should also like to affirm—and we do so with complete confidence—that there is nothing to fear from the present size of the Federal debt. Nor is there anything to fear from the moderate increase in the debt that will result from the deficits envisaged in the next few years. Indeed, measured as a fraction of the gross national product, the Federal debt today is much smaller relatively than it was 15 years ago. And interest payments on the debt absorb a significantly smaller fraction of the national income than they did at the end of World War II.

In the realm of economic policy—as in all social and political action—there are as many versions of what is "best" as there are people who are likely to be affected by any proposed line of action. To insist on a "perfect" tax program is to insure that nothing will be done. The administration's program is a significant step in the right direction.

We subscribe to the propositions included in the statement on the tax program of the Kennedy administration. Each of us signs as an individual economist and not as a representative of an institution.

Amherst College: Ralph E. Beres, Arnold Collery, Irwin Kleinberg, Heinz Kohler, Willard L. Thorp, Colston E. Warne, James R. Wilson.

Bowdoin College: Albert Abrahamson, Paul G. Darling, Giulio Pontecorvo, William D. Shipman, James A. Storer.

Brandeis University: Richard I. Weckstein, P. J. D. Wiles.

Brookings Institution: Barbara R. Berman, Edward F. Denison, Gary Fromm, Bert G. Hickman, Joseph A. Pechman, Merton J. Peck, Alice M. Rivlin, Walter S. Salant.

California, University of, Berkeley: Joseph S. Bain, George T. Break, Eugene W. Burgess, Norman R. Collins, J. M. Culbertson, Malcolm M. Davisson, Kenneth B. Farrel, Hugh Folk, V. Fuller, Theodore J. Goering, R. A. Gordon, E. T. Grether, Gregory Grossman, Saul H. Hymans, Sydney Hoos, Van D. Kennedy, Ivan M. Lee, John M. Letiche, Choh Ming Li, Sherman J. Maisil, Julius Margolis, Hyman P. Minsky, David Olbe, Andreas G. Papandreou, Ray Radner, Earl R. Ralph, David A. Revzan, Henry Rosovsky, Arthur M. Ross, Bernard Saffran, Tibor Scitovsky, Lloyd Ulman, Dow Votaw, Frank A. Waring, Sidney G. Winter, Jr.

California, University of, Davis: Oscar R. Burt, Frank C. Child, Bruce Glassburner, Warren S. Gramm, Curtis C. Harris, Jr., Trimble R. Hedges, Gordon A. King, Martin P. Oettinger, J. Herbert Snyder, Stephen H. Sosnick, J. M. Tinley.

California, University of, Santa Barbara: Mortimer Andrew, J. F. Halterman, Jerry F. Karer, William J. Kennedy, Walter J. Mead.

California, Universtiy of, Los Angeles: H. Robert Bartell, Jr., E. F. Brighen, C. J. Huizinga, R. J. Jessen, Erwin L. Kelly, Jr., Buruhan T. Campbell, H. Lawrence Miller, Jr., Harold P. Moody, Frank E. Norton, George E. S. Murphy, J. Fred Weston, Robert M. Williams.

Carnegie Institute of Technology: G. L. Bach.

Chicago, University of: B. M. Fleisher, Harry G. Johnson, Dale W. Jorgenson, Arnold Harberger, Marshall D. Ketchum, Lloyd A. Metzler, Merton H. Miller, Albert Rees, T. W. Schultz.

Columbia University: Harold Barger, Arthur R. Burns, Alexander Erlich, Carter Goodrich, Albert O. Hirschman, Robert Lekachman, David E. Novack, Julius Rubin.

Connecticut, University of: David G. Edens, Dorothy C. Goodwin, James C. Loughlin, Morris Singer, William P. Snavely, Paul N. Taylor, Philip E. Taylor, H. John Thorkelson, Paul Weiner, Imanuel Wexler.

Cornell University: William D. Carmichael, Douglas F. Dowd, John A. Henning, George H. Hildebrand, Alfred E. Kahn, Chandler Morse, George J. Staller.

Dartmouth College: William A. Carter, M. O. Clement, James F. Cusick, Clyde E. Dankert, Thomas J. Finn, Jr., Herbert Goertz, Martin L. Lindahl, Kenneth J. Rothwell, Martin Segal, Ian A. Stewart.

Duke University: William Porfohe.

Harvard University: Abram Bergson, Richard E. Caves, Robert Dorfman, John T. Dunlop, James Duesenberry, Otto Eckstein, Alexander Gerschenkron, Seymour Harris, R. B. Heflebower, Richard O. Mallon, Edward S. Mason, Rhod J. Ohyme, Gustave F. Papanel, T. Schelling, Wolfgang F. Stolper.

Illinois, University of: V. Lewis Bassie, Ruth A. Birdzell, John D. Bowman, Sanford Cohen, Milton Derbe, John F. Due, Robert Ferber, Marvin Frankel, Donald W. Paden.

Indiana, University of: Robert W. Campbell, Troy J. Conley, Irvin Grossack, Taubman A. Miller, Henry M. Oliver, Lloyd D. Orr, Ross M. Robertson, Nicolas Spulber, Ted Witney, E. R. Wicker.

Iowa, University of: Raymond R. Beruke, Eugene A. Brady, Harold W. Dewey, Hirschel Harper, Earl O. Heady, Bob R. Holden, Sydney James, Lee Kolmer, Francis A. Kutish, Stanley S. Long, Dudley G. Luckett, Charles Meyer, John W. Rowe, Jr., J. T. Scott, Erik Thorbreke, Karl A. Totz, John F. Truemont, Don Winkelmann.

Johns Hopkins University: Z. Adel, G. Heberton Evans, Jr., James K. Kindahl, Kelvin J. Lancaster, Edwin S. Mills, R. T. Sparrow.

Maryland, University of: John H. Cumberland, Dudley Dillard, Norton T. Dodge, Lyle E. Gramley, Robert E. L. Knight, Philip C. Packard, Melville J. Ulmer, Paul Wonnacott.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Albert Ando, Francis Bator, E. Cary Brown, Paul H. Cootner, Rischard S. Eckaus, Everett E. Hagen, Daniel M. Holland, Edwin Kuh, Louis Lefeber, Max F. Millikan, Paul A. Samuelson, Robert M. Solow, Charles P. Kindleberger.

Michigan State University: Abba P. Lerner.

Minnesota, University of: John Buttick, E. Coen, Edward Foster, Lowell Gallany, Ralph H. Hofmeister, Leonid Hurwicz, A. O. Krueger, Jim Schwinden, Harlan M. Smith, John G. Trumbull.

New York University: Clifford D. Clark, Lawrence S. Ritter, Arnold W. Sarnet, Harvey H. Sezal.

North Carolina, University of: Paul N. Guthrie, Leopold B. Koriebroski, David T. Lapkin, Henry A. Latane, R. S. Winslow, Marice Whee.

Pennsylvania, University of: Irving B. Kravis, Wilfred Malrubaum, Robert Summers, C. R. Whittlesey, Willis J. Winn.

Pennsylvania State University: Edward Budd, William M. Hench, Philip A. Klein, Will E. Mason, Arthur H. Reede, Randall S. Stout, Robert J. Trusk.

Pittsburgh, University of: Benjamin Chuntz, A. T. Eapen, R. D. Entenberg, Alan E. Fechter, Shinkyung Kim, Charles L. Levin, Daniel McFadden, William C. Pendleton, Robert J. A. Pratt, Merrill J. Roberts, Edward Sussia, C. Edward Weber.

Princeton University: William Baumol, Arthur Benavie, William G. Bowen, Ansley J. Coale, Warren W. Eason, F. Aldrich Finegan, Peggy Heim, Edward J. Kane, Klaus Knorr, Richard A. Lester, David McFarland, R. A. Musgrave, Gardner Patterson, Richard E. Quandt, Frederic C. Shorter, John Williamson, Burton A. Weisbrod, Lester V. Chandler.

Rice University: S. N. Afriat, John H. Auten, Dwight S. Brothers, Edgar O. Edwards, Hans Jurgen Jalesch, Gaston V. Remlinger.

Rochester, University of: Marcus Alexis, William E. Dunkman, Robert R. France, Myron J. Gordon, Ronald W. Jones, Lionel McKenzie, Rudolph G. Penner, Richard T. Rostoff, Edward Zabel.

Southern Methodist University: Leo T. Bakomy, Paul T. Hornan, Attiat A. Farag, Richard B. Johnson, W. J. Lovejoy, Daniel J. Ott, J. H. Pratt.

Stanford University: Kenneth Arrow, Richard Attrych, Paul David, Emile Despres, John G. Gurley, Bernard F. Haley, Paul Hartman, James Howell, Theodore J. Kreps, Alan S. Manne, Ronald McKinnon, Mel Reder, Louie Tarshis, Dale Yoder.

Tufts University: V. E. Andric, John Cornwall, Franklyn D. Holzman.

Utah, University of: Sigmund Krauthauser.

Vanderbilt University: Rudolph C. Blitz, John A. Brittain, Reynold E. Carlson, Reulias Fels, E. J. Eberling, Leo J. Raskind, Ewing P. Shabor, George W. Stocking, Fred U. Wertfield, Jeffrey G. Williamson, James S. Worley.

Virginia, University of: George R. Hall, Almarin Phillips, James R. Schlesinger, Rutledge Vining.

Washington, University of: Henry T. Buechel, J. A. Crutchfield, Barney Dowdle, J. P. Gillingham, William S. Hopkins, W. D. Morris, Vernon A. Mund, Judith Thornton, Charles M. Tribout, D. A. Worcester, Jr.

Wesleyan University: Clyde Olin Fisher, Burton C. Hallowell, Lawrence C. Jones, Stanley Lebergott, Melvin Lurie, Gerald M. Meier, Richard A. Miller, Edward J. Nell, Vladimir L. Stoikov.

Williams College: Henry J. Bruton, Paul G. Clark, Robinson G. Hollister, Jr., Joseph A. Kershaw, Robert Miki, Frederick S. O'Brien, William G. Rhoads, Norman Schneider, John Sheehan.

Wisconsin, University of: Benjamin Bridges, Jr., Martin H. Daid, James S. Earley, Arthur S. Goldberger, Edward Greenbey, Farsham Hall, Kathleen Haygood, Edward B. Jakubauskas, David B. Johnson, John Korbel, Roger F. Miller, Guy H. Orcutt, Robert Ozanne, Gerald G. Somers, James Stern, G. E. Swingay, William Russell, Hans O. Schmitt, Ernst W. Stromsdorfer, Leonard W. Weiss.

Yale University: John Arena, Bela Balassu, Sylvester E. Berki, Ronald G. Bodkin, William Brandio, William T. Bruns, Jr., Duncan R. Campbell, Mariam Chamberlain, Neil W. Chamberlain, John Davis, F. Trenery Dolbear, Jr., Eeme Draudabej, Stanley Engerman, John Fei, James W. Frieda, Reginald H. Green, Joseph Grunewald, Donald A. Hester, John W. Hoofer, Shane J. Hunt, Zoran Horfert, Lawrence B. Krause, Michael

C. Lowell, Peter Mieszkowski, Harry A. Miskimin, *Arthur M. Oken, Hugh D. Patrick, Richard C. Porter, Raymond Powell, Gustave Ranis, Lloyd C. Reynolds, Leonard Schifrin, Peter Schran, Adolph Strumthel, James Tobin, Harold W. Watts, Menuhin Yaari.

Humane Treatment of Animals Used in Experiments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, since introduction of S. 533, the bill to provide for the humane treatment of animals used in medical and scientific experiments, there has been extensive newspaper comment about provisions of the legislation. These editorials from newspapers in widely scattered areas throughout the Nation indicate public interest and concern about this serious problem. Newspaper editorials which have commented favorably on S. 533, have reflected my own belief that the pursuit of scientific knowledge does not require barbaric methods in handling the animals used in experiments.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record with my remarks and editorial from the San Francisco News Call Bulletin of June 12, 1963, entitled "When Animals Suffer," and an editorial from the Springfield, Mass., Daily News of June 25, 1963, entitled "Cruelty to Animals."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the San Francisco News Call Bulletin, June 12, 1963]

WHEN ANIMALS SUFFER

The Congress is considering bills to eliminate needless cruelty to animals used in research in projects where Federal money is involved.

Strong evidence brought out in hearings and spread on the Congressional Record indicates dogs, cats, monkeys, rabbits, and other animals have been subjected to needless suffering, not only in some poorly run research projects, but more especially among the dealers who provide the animals.

The charges are by no means a blanket indictment, but they do cite numerous instances of callous and inhumane treatment.

A bill sponsored by Senators Clark, Neuberger, and Young would minimize the suffering of the subject animals.

There is no intent to hinder the legitimate research upon which medical progress depends.

The purpose of scientific investigation is to better humanity. It should not be carried forward in an inhumane manner.

Congress in the past has muffed opportunities to approve anticruelty legislation. We hope it will grasp the present opportunity and act with dispatch.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News June 25, 1963]

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS

Many instances of cruelty to animals were eliminated as horses were replaced by internal combustion engines, and as movie makers found camera techniques to suggest violence instead of actually creating it.

The next target was the slaughterhouse, and proponents of humane treatment of animals there won the cooperation of some meat packers and of some weapon manufacturers. Federal legislation which is realistic and enforceable extended and standardized these reforms.

The remaining problem which challenges advocates of humane treatment of animals concerns medical research laboratories. Many eminent doctors whose names identify some of the great modern miracles of medicine have given credit to research conducted on animals. Salk vaccine is only one of many lifesaving, health-assuring protections made possible by experiments on animals. On the other hand, there are those who argue that it is morally wrong for man to impose the risks of new surgical techniques and drugs on animals in order to make them safe for human use.

Between the antivivisectionists who oppose all research surgery on living animals, and those who fear that any more controls will hamper or prevent necessary medical research, are advocates of a humane system which would protect the animals from unnecessary suffering, but still permit laboratory experimentation on surgical and drug treatments to save human lives. Such a system is not unattainable. In fact, one has been in use in Great Britain for almost 90 years. Just last year, the Animal Welfare Institute in New York noted in one of its reports: "The British Act of 1876 stands as the most just and humane law on animal experimentation ever enacted."

Six bills concerning medical research on animals are now before the Congress, and even many of those who admit that reforms are needed in some laboratories argue that these can be effected voluntarily, by self-policing. Proponents of legislation are too familiar with similar proposals from some meatpackers who succeeded in delaying adequate slaughterhouse legislation, and the proponents will therefore regard any such proposal as merely a delaying tactic.

The need for reform is generally recognized. The way to reform has already been charted, and long tested, by the British. The United States should adopt a law which will not retard the progress of medical research, will establish humane standards of animal care and use, and will provide for effective enforcement.

Cream Imports Invade U.S. Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, foreign cream shipments into the United States are being spread over an increased number of domestic markets. First there were shipments from New Zealand into the San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Philadelphia areas. More recently, 20,900 pounds were landed in Seattle and 395,000 pounds in Charleston, S.C. More than 3.4 million pounds have been imported since January 1, 1963.

These cream imports from New Zealand have added a $1.1 million burden to the price support program, because the imports force domestic producers to accept lower prices. The Commodity Credit Corporation is saddled with the additional price supports.

Mr. Speaker, the Whatcom County Dairymen's Association adopted a resolution at its annual meeting relative to import quotas on cream, butterfat and solid nonfats. This resolution supports legislation which would give effective controls on imports. I have introduced H.R. 7082, which would do just this, and urge the Ways and Means Committee to consider hearings in the near future.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include the resolution adopted by the Whatcom County Dairymen's Association in the Record:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the importation of cream from New Zealand which has recently occurred with receipts at San Francisco, Los Angeles and Philadelphia poses a threat to U.S. markets and places an additional burden on the dairy price support program; and

Whereas section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act provides the Secretary of Agriculture with authority to impose quotas to prevent imports from impairing agricultural support programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Whatcom County Dairymen's Association request the Congressional delegates of the States represented, to urgently press the Secretary of Agriculture to impose quotas on further imports of cream; and that the Whatcom County Dairymen's Association through the various Congressional delegations lend every possible support to legislation providing for more effective future controls of imports through total limits placed on butterfat and solids not fat, without regard to the products or form in which imported.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to have this opportunity to participate in Captive Nations Week.

As a sponsor of legislation to establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations, my concern is a matter of record, and I speak for the people of Nebraska who have always supported me in these efforts.

There are many of us who are disturbed about the situation in the captive nations. We do not agree with the apparent aim of the administration to move increasingly toward more normal relations with governments in some of the captive nations for these are Communist governments, and steps which increase their world trade and benefit the Communist governments can hardly be beneficial to this country.

An action such as that taken this year in the United Nations, when we abandoned the principle on which we have stood since the 1956 uprisings, is to many of us a symptom of the fuzzy thinking which is leading us in a direction which the people of the country do not want to go. We gave up on principle, as I said, because we did not have the votes to win. That is what the State Department explanation is. I can imagine what abuse would be hurled at a Congressman if he should abandon principle for the expedient.

A move to increase trade between this country and Poland is another symptom of the belief that somehow this country will benefit from the steps which obviously benefit the Communist governments

So we in Congress and the people of the country are faced with this attitude that our national policy should be to get along with the people who are running these formerly free nations. In some way this is supposed to benefit the people of the nations, when actually it would reinforce the hold over these same people which these Communist governments now have.

Turning to the most recent of the captive nations, Cuba, we find a government policy which discourages trade. This contradiction in policy does not seem to bother some, but to me and I would imagine to many foreign governments, it looks like a strange inconsistency. Our Government says not to trade with Cuba, yet our policy is to increase trade with the Communist satellite nations such as Czechoslovakia which are supplying Cuba. They must wonder if we are sincere about Cuba.

I have never been able to understand the State Department opposition to a Special House Committee on Captive Nations, although it frequently seems to be similar to the opposition to a Freedom Academy—they didn't think of it first. I would hope there are more substantial reasons, but those I have seen to date are not impressive.

I see no reason, anyway, why the House of Representatives needs any guidance from the State Department as to what committees it is going to set up. There is sufficient evidence that the administration sets up various agencies and operations without authority of Congress, so I think it high time we make a few decisions for ourselves.

The heart of the matter of a special committee and of these annual Captive Nations Weeks is the fact that Russia today is the largest and very nearly the only colonial power left in this world. The wave of nationalism which spread across the world following World War II wiped out the remains of the vast colonial empires of yesteryear.

Except for the Russian colonial empire. That today stands as the greatest example of the failure of communism, for the empire is held together—as was amply demonstrated in Hungary in 1956—by the armed might of the Soviet Union. To those who tell us that the puppet governments are mellowing because of a few concessions, I say you are sadly mistaken. When the Berlin wall comes down, when free elections are held, when the Soviet troops are withdrawn and with them the secret police—then will there be some concessions worthy of noting.

Until then I think it is imperative that we continue at every opportunity to call to the attention of the world that the Russian colonial empire is the midcentury's biggest example of individual and national subjugation.

The Republican Party and the Civil Rights Revolution—A Speech by Hon. Robert Taft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], recently delivered an important speech on civil rights in Newark, N.J. In his speech the gentleman from Ohio, BOB TAFT, boldly sets forth the role of the Republican Party on this vital question and traces the notable contribution which our party has made since the Presidency of Lincoln. In calling attention to the early and responsible Republican legislative proposals in the 88th Congress, he serves a timely warning to those who are under the impression that the message and legislation submitted by the President are the only proposals which have been put forward to deal with the ever-intensifying crisis in race relations which has gripped our Nation.

I am pleased to bring this address to the attention of my colleagues.

The text of the address follows:

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND THE CIVIL RIGHTS REVOLUTION

(By Hon. ROBERT TAFT, JR., of Ohio)

The civil rights revolution which is in process in this country presents all Americans and, particularly, the leadership of each of our political parties with a challenge of utmost importance. While it is still possible that the action and approach taken by Congress in attempting to deal with these problems may be a bipartisan one, this seems less likely as each day passes. The question is whether the leadership of the Democratic Party, divided for a century by an ever-deepening rift on the question of civil rights, is now attempting to find and cultivate company in its misery by claiming a split, or embarrassment, in the Republican Party on the same issues? If so, we Republicans must not allow it. With the help of pseudo-liberal columnists and big-Federal-Government advocates, we see daily charges of division among Republicans as to just how the Congress and the Nation should face up to the problems of racial discrimination that still exists in many parts of American life.

As on most issues, there is a basic unity within the Republican Party as to the principles which should guide us in dealing with these problems. In the spirit of Abraham Lincoln, the Republican Party has always stood, and will continue to stand, for true equality of opportunity for all citizens regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin. In accordance with this doctrine, the Republican Party has backed, and will continue to back, a legislative approach to the civil rights problems in a direct and forthright way. Claims that the Republican Party is catering to the South on the segregation issue are wholly baseless. No segregationist belongs on a Republican ticket or even in the party. The Democrats cannot say this, and won't say this. Perhaps the attacks show an attempt to explain away the final awakening of the South to the necessity of a two-party system for its well-being and a final recognition there that its best interests, along with those of the country, lie in the direction of a responsible fiscal policy and protection for, rather than a surrender to government of the individual liberty and equality of all citizens.

Accordingly, it is not surprising that most Republicans in Congress will support most of the proposals in President Kennedy's civil rights message and in the administration's bill, H.R. 7152, introduced as a result of that message. Particularly this is not surprising since most of the recommendations and provisions in the program were already included in the legislative proposals dealing with civil rights introduced by many Republican Members of Congress. For instance, before the President's message, there were already pending in the Congress (and with Democrat support there could have been enacted) Republican proposals dealing with the following areas:

1. In the field of voting rights, the President's proposal has now shifted to the approach already taken by the Cooper-Dodd bill, a far more realistic and legally sound approach toward literacy tests than had previously been backed by the administration as an irrebuttable presumption of literacy on a proof of 6 years of schooling. It still contains no provision requiring that votes be counted properly, a safeguard Republican measures seek for all Americans.

2. A specific authorization for suits by the Attorney General to enforce school desegregation had been backed by the Republican members of the Judiciary Committee as early as January. It has finally been endorsed by the administration.

3. Permanent status for the Civil Rights Commission had been backed, and is still backed, by the Republicans on the Judiciary Committee. The administration's proposal was, and apparently still is, one for a limited extension of life.

4. Republican proposals had suggested an equal employment opportunity commission to serve as a watchdog against discrimination on Government contracts or by Government agencies and, particularly, to check on labor practices in this connection. A similar proposal has now been backed by the administration.

5. Injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations had been backed by many Republicans before the President's message, but it is based on the sounder approach of protection of equal rights under the 14th amendment, rather than on an unlimited extension of Federal power under the Interstate Commerce clause.

6. Federally assisted programs in education and other fields have, in many cases, used Federal money to assist and aid programs which discriminated on account of race. Unfortunately, even today this is still true, although the President by Executive order could ban it in many programs, such as motels built with ARA help. Republican attempts to attach amendments to such legislation have been beaten down a considerable number of times by the Democratic Party in a coalition of northern urban Democrats and southern Democrats opposing such limitation. The payoff has been liberal grants and loans in southern congressional districts.

Certainly the Republicans claim no monopoly on these proposals for tackling the difficult problems of discrimination. But these examples should suffice to show that the Republican Party is sincere and active in its approach to the problem and that Republican support can, therefore, be expected for many of the provisions of the civil rights measures now finally receiving support from the administration. In view of the general backing that civil rights legislation seems sure to receive from the Republican side of the aisle, how do we account for the concentrated attempt to play up any disagreements or questions raised by Republican Members of Congress as to any facets of the program? The only answer is politics.

Before getting into any such criticisms or what the policies of the Republican Party should be, it might be well to examine at least three areas in the administration's civil rights proposals which raise serious questions as to the sincerity of the high-sounding pleas for a bipartisan approach to these problems.

The first provision of the President's civil rights proposal we might discuss is the section 601 provision. We will be hearing much on this in coming weeks. Section 601 of H.R. 7152 proposes that in lieu of specific mandatory provision prohibiting discrimination in programs granting Federal aid, we should enact a very general provision stating that no Federal aid law shall be interpreted as requiring that financial assistance shall be furnished in circumstances under which there is discrimination. It should be noted that this is merely a permissive provision under which the President, or the administrator of the particular program, may decide either to withhold Federal funds where there is discrimination, or to grant Federal funds notwithstanding the fact that there is discrimination. In other words, it is a license to the administrator of any Federal program to use Federal funds in a way that may well carry on or even promote discrimination. As compared to this approach, Republican members have been advocating specific prohibitions put into selected Federal aid bills and, particularly, into all Federal aid bills dealing with the various federally aided education programs, prohibiting the use of Federal funds under any such circumstances, unless it can be shown that the school or program in question is moving with all deliberate speed toward desegregation and elimination of discrimination. In testimony before the subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. Quigley, the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, this week specifically objected to any such mandatory provisions in the Gill bill, H.R. 6938, a measure proposed not only by all of the Republican members of the Education and Labor Committee, but also by many of the Democrat members of that committee. Moreover, in his testimony Mr. Quigley, for all practical purposes, admitted that he had not cut off Federal aid in spite of such discrimination and that this has not been done because he feels that the federally assisted programs were intended by Congress to be financed even if there was discrimination. On the basis of performance to date, with the powers already in the President and the administrators, it seems very doubtful whether discretionary power of this sort would be used unless there is included in the legislation a mandatory direction to use it. The language of the administration's proposal and the President's message would not override the directions to spend Federal moneys in specific programs. Nor are they intended to do so.

A second aspect of the administration's proposal that should be examined is the primary reliance put upon the interstate commerce power in the title II provisions seeking to eliminate discrimination in public accommodations. The inherent extension of Federal power not limited to the area of civil rights, which is implicit in reliances on the commerce power, seems certain to make it unacceptable to many Republican Members of Congress, and also to many Democrats, who would accept reliance on the 14th amendment, which deals with equal rights and would not be a precedent for extending Federal power over almost every aspect of private life by Federal governmental regulation. Likewise, the failure in the public accommodation section of the bill to prescribe some reasonable minimum limitation on size for application of the act seems designed to raise objections and to jeopardize the chance of its successful passage. This approach raises the question whether it is really desired by the administration to enact such a provision or whether they seek a political issue, or excuse of some sort, instead.

Finally, the attitude of the administration toward a fair employment practices bill is interesting. Apparently at the last moment the President decided to at least give lip service to the passage of a bill of this type such as is now pending before the Education and Labor Committee. This is interesting because apparently it was not included in earlier drafts of the civil rights message. It is also interesting in view of the fact that the Secretary of Labor and others speaking for the administration had earlier indicated that they did not advocate the passage of this legislation. Furthermore, the administration's civil rights bill itself makes absolutely no mention of fair employment practices and, apparently, is willing to leave the fate of this proposal to the Congress without any particular comments or instruction. I believe that I can say, however, that we do expect to ask the administration to comment on this measure and to state its position before the committee acts. This does not mean that we should ignore this problem of discrimination in employment, which is the most troublesome discrimination of all in our country today. Rather, working along with the other members of our Education and Labor Committee we hope to come out and propose to the Congress a reasonable and workable provision for the establishment of a fair employment practices commission and then to ask and expect support from the Democratic Party in backing such a proposal. Here, as elsewhere, it is important, through proper procedural requirements, to see that the rights of all citizens are properly protected and that State programs already making good progress in this area are not interfered with or supplanted.

In these three areas of federally assisted programs, public accommodations, and fair employment practices, one cannot help but wonder whether the administration is not still seeking to appease and play footsie with Southern Democrats in the hope of keeping them in line on other legislative proposals and in the 1964 elections. If a bipartisan approach to the civil rights problem in this country can work, and I believe that it can, then the President and other members of his administration will have to stop dodging the tough questions and indicate to the leadership of their party in the Congress and to the country generally what they believe a proper bipartisan approach should be. On these ticklish problems which I have outlined, they have not done so yet. Their failure is likely to create major difficulties for the enactment of sound laws facing up to these problems. These difficulties could result in defeat for much of the civil rights program. If it does so, regardless of the protestations, the responsibility will be the administration's.

Views on the Racial Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a very fine article by one of our great Methodist ministers who has set forth some of his views and experiences in dealing with the racial crisis.

The article is by Dr. Denson Franklin and was published in the June issue of Concern, a publication of the Methodist Church. Dr. Franklin was for many years pastor of the First Methodist Church of Gadsden, Ala., my hometown, and is now pastor of the First Methodist Church of Birmingham. He is one of the finest Christians I have ever known, an able and dedicated minister who is both loved and respected by thousands of people in Alabama and in other parts of the country.

I believe that this article reveals the thinking of many of our clergymen and the problems which they are encountering in these trying times. Following is Dr. Franklin's article:

Views on the Racial Crisis

(By Dr. Denson N. Franklin, Minister, First Methodist Church, Gadsden, Ala.)

Birmingham, Ala.—Recently during the racial crisis, I had a most helpful experience.

Our city, behind in facing up to her local race problems, was suddenly confronted with racial demonstrations. The chamber of commerce, the Greater Birmingham Ministerial Association, and other religious and civic organizations had only recently faced up to the fact that we had too long buried our heads in the sand, refusing to recognize our problems. A city election had just been held. Moderation had won. The next day the demonstrations began.

As the tide mounted, the reaction set in. Some of our churches which had planned to open their doors to men of good will of every race found themselves beset with internal strife and temporary changes in policy. Others which opened their doors for two or three Sundays, changed from the open sanctuary to restricted areas in the balcony or closed their doors to the demonstrators. Internal strife prevailed to a greater or lesser degree in the churches which wrestled with this problem.

Demonstrators reported to the newspapers, radio, and television the names of the churches they planned to visit. Equipment was set up in advance and movies were made of the acceptance or rejection of Negroes. In most cases there was rejection. The names of these churches were flashed across America.

Letters poured in from other sections. Every letter was one of condemnation. Ministers were condemned for being un-Christian, ungodly, and not worthy to wear the cloth. They were urged to turn in their credentials and give up the Christian ministry.

In the meantime a few local people were calling and writing. They said the ministers were trying to integrate the churches. They accused them of being unpatriotic, unsouthern and un-Christian. What an impossible position for a man whose church was not opened. On the one hand he was a grand rascal and an imposter to his brethren of other sections. On the other, to some of his people at home, he was a traitor and turncoat.

In the midst of all of this came a telegram from two Illinois ministers, L. J. Sailor and R. A. Chrisman. They said, "We who are not without sin share your anguished concern in the present tense situation. You will continue to be in our prayers and affection. Kindly convey this to our brethren. Your colleagues." I sat at my desk for a moment and wept.

"Thank God," I said, "for somebody who is praying for us and loving us in our dilemma and in our struggle. Two brothers of the Methodist Church are praying for us and are suffering with us."

One of our great problems in the 20th century is the problem of name calling and villification. Most of us have more problems in our own backyards than we can solve. I have spoken all across America, and everywhere I go my minister brethren share with me their feelings of guilt about situations in their own communities and churches. I have so many of my own that I cannot condemn them, only share with them as we confess our sins together.

Sometimes I find that our own trumpeting and shouting about the other fellow's sins are defense mechanisms to keep our minds off our own.

When we write letters expressing our deep convictions, we should first inquire what the situation is. Our brother who is being condemned by us may be fighting a battle for his life. Who knows but that he is making a far greater sacrifice in the battle he is quietly waging than those of us who pass judgment on him. In the midst of his struggle he finds enemies in front and to the rear. He walks alone through the valley of misunderstanding at home and abroad. He wonders if his people at home care for him and if his brothers abroad still love him. He comes to understand the meaning of the spiritual, "Jesus walked this lonesome valley."

Each individual may not have all the answers to the perplexing problems that baffle us in this day, but there is one thing each of us can do. He can leave judgment to God and pray for his brothers.

During these days we Methodists can band together across America to pray earnestly for each other. We cannot always agree on every issue. We cannot possibly understand just what struggles our brothers face or what burdens they bear in every particular situation. But we can pray for them. We can ask God to give them courage to stand in the tempest, wisdom to be good shepherds to their flocks, and love to penetrate the cesspools of hate. We can pray for each other. Prayer changes things. Prayer changes men. Let us pray more and criticize less.

A Plan To Fight the Communist Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a plan to fight the Communist conspiracy submitted by Mr. Wallace B. Truslow. I do this without personal comment, but in the hope that it may produce helpful suggestions from those who examine it.

To all loyal Americans, before you read further in this report, please do not think that I am unaware that the problem of what to do about the Communist threat has crossed your mind. I'm sure that you have given the problem constant thought and attention.

However, being only a layman, perhaps the following plan which came to my mind may not have occurred to you. Possibly the program which I am advocating may not be the answer, but if we are ever to defeat the Communists in the long run, some plan similar to this will have to be adopted.

My purpose in the presentation of this plan is twofold:

1. To illustrate briefly how an outside ideology (proven so greatly inferior to our own in producing goods for the greatest number of people) has the audacity to claim that our system is decadent and inferior to theirs.

2. To present a plan that may give this country and the remaining free world a positive direction in which to go if we are to continue to remain free from the yoke of communism.

In Russia today; indeed in Albania, China, and all the satellite nations under Communist control, the standard of living of the average man is at a near starvation level.

(a) A Russian in the streets of Moscow will try to buy the shoes off of any American tourist.

(b) Ten people will live in two small rooms.

(c) Department stores have flowing displays but no merchandise to sell.

(d) People wear steel teeth because dental science is 50 years behind our own.

(e) Dogs and cats are nonexistent because they have long since been consumed for food.

(f) Agricultural systems under "collectivism" cannot provide enough basic food crops for even a minimum daily health requirement.

(g) Mistresses are now provided for 2,300 top military and government people by the state.

Yet a system with these evils and shortcomings dares to tell us (with the highest living standard in the world) that:

1. It is wrong for our industrialists to make a profit.
2. It is wrong for a landlord to collect rent.
3. That we are exploiting our workers.
4. That the state should own everything, control everything, and extinguish all individual freedoms.

Still, the trend in our legislation is to slowly communize and socialize ourselves and the remaining free world. We must stop helping them take over our country. We cannot undo past mistakes but we can profit from them. As the Communists have stated their goals, so must we set up our goals in opposition to theirs, and to describe the methods we must use to obtain them.

If the Communists believe that a state of war exists (as they surely do) and that they are not going to stop until they own the world, then we can do not less. We must recognize that we are at war.

Therefore, I propose the following four steps that we must take:

1. The creation of a Cabinet post. I ask the creation of a permanent post in the Cabinet for a chief of the cold war. This acknowledges that we give official recognition to the fact that a taste of cold war exists between us and the Communist world. It announces to the world that we know we are being attacked and that we accept the challenge to fight back. The citizens and yes, the governments of the free world will take heart at this announcement of stating already known facts. Theirs will be an encouraging display of unanimity of the free peoples left in the world.

(a) Department of psychological warfare. Let the chief create subposts which encompass psychological warfare, subversive tactics, religious warfare, and anything else the combined minds of military and naval strategists, leaders of industry and the sciences can envision.

(b) Department of guerilla warfare. The chief must also create a department that can recruit men from the free nations of the world and under the flag of no nation in the world (in effect responsible to no nation). These men in turn can be used as a raider force or, in other words as a supplement to action by the forces of the United Nations.

As long as the United Nations' forces have only been called on to restore order to the country being attacked at the moment by Communist forces, then we should create and support an independent force to attack the countries already enslaved by Communist forces. Under such a plan no single nation can be blamed.

Is it not time to offer a ray of hope to the enslaved people of the world? Must we stand by forever and pretend that they do not exist?

Keep faith in the United Nations if we must, but let us go outside its framework to retrieve the lost nations of the world. How else can these enslaved peoples ever form free nations again?

(c) Department of military government. As the plan progresses, it will be necessary to set up a department of military government, much like what was used by this country after World War II. This temporary government would have a time limit of 5 years. Its purpose would be to keep order while assisting the people of the newly liberated country to set up the type of government desired by the greatest majority. Authority would then be transferred gradually to the new government.

2. The free world manifesto. Since the days of the dark ages, mankind has made a concerted effort to break away from the shackles of slavery which have bound him in many of the countries of the world.

The efforts of the would-be slave masters have become ever more cunning as more and more peoples have been able to break free.

The world is now in the grip of the greatest plot of all (the Communist threat) to completely subvert the entire globe.

Accordingly, it has evolved so that we now have three courses of action open to us:

(a) We can proceed on our present course of action and continue to be swallowed an inch at a time.

(b) We can blow up the aggressor nation (as we now have the nuclear power to do) but we cannot collectively bring ourselves to this decision.

(c) We can force the aggressor back to the confinement of his own borders.

Therefore, let the Chief be responsible for the creation of a free-world manifesto. This document should state the following:

A. It is our intention to force the Russian Armed Forces back to the confinement of their own borders.

B. We intend to free the enslaved countries from the control of the Russian Government.

C. We will provide a temporary military government (with the 5 year time limit) until the people of a newly freed country can choose the type of government they desire and provide for the gradual and orderly transition of authority to the newly created body. It should be clearly understood that during this 5 year period, the people shall have as complete freedom as possible. The Communists must be made to renounce their goal of worldwide domination by seeing that it is completely impossible to attain.

3. The battle plan. Nikita Khrushchev once made a statement declaring that communism will seek to expand through nasty little undeclared "wars of national liberation."

What he failed to say was that Russia would supply the weapons, other Communist countries would supply the soldiers and Russia would continue on, blameless to the end.

Our Defense Department, taking note of this strategy, has ordered a policy by all the services tailored to helping the threatened nations to combat the political tactics of terror, extortion, assassination and quasi-military action.

The unfortunate part is that, in order to stop any fighting, we have generally agreed to a coalition government with the Communist forces having the loudest voice.

At best, this fails completely at placing the government back in the hands of the previous officials and leaves the way open for complete infiltration of all government offices by Communist politicians.

Isn't it time we started to turn the tables and use some of the Communist devised methods to our own advantage?

Should not the chief of the cold war create a plan where we employ, not our own armed forces to fight these little "wars of national liberation," but a force of volunteers under the flag of no nation in the world?

As long as Russia originated the rules of using the manpower of other countries to fight her wars, we should therefore be safely able to adopt the same rules.

In addition, such a force (possibly staffed by men allowed to resign from the Armed Forces of any nation in the free world and supplied by the free world countries) could take the initiative and begin creating rebellion and unrest in the Communist satellite countries. Within these, undoubtedly there is a large segment of the population that would rebel against the Russian forces occupying their land if they were given any encouragement.

This could put Russia on the defensive and eventually lead to her retreating to within her own borders. In the meantime, we would be as blameless as Russia because we were not using our own forces. Certainly we would not be attacked by her, because we would continue to have our nuclear weapons aimed straight at the heart of Russia. Our defense budget could remain the same by reducing our Armed Forces by the amount that we contribute to the "raider forces."

This battle plan would have to be created by the chief of the cold war in cooperation with the rest of the nations of the non-Communist world.

4. The vote. Submit the plan created to a vote of the American people, and to the people of the free world. No general can fight a war unless his soldiers are willing and eager for the fray.

Every adult American citizen should be asked to "sign a pledge" (vote) that he or she knows that we are engaged in a war "to the finish of all intelligent beings," and that the creation of a "state of slavery" would be the result if the Communists were to win.

An affirmative vote would give the President the "declared authority" or a "mandate from the people" to conduct a war and win, by using the plans the chief of the cold war and the nations of the free world have devised.

In the United States, the request for a vote could be submitted to the Governors of the 50 States. Each State could then vote on each of the three issues, after a period of informing them as to what the issues are and what they encompass: (a) The creation of a Cabinet post; (b) the free world manifesto; (c) the battle plan.

If the majority of the American people voted "no," we would be bound to lose the war and would continue to be swallowed "an inch at a time" by the Communist world.

I am confident that the American public and the people of the free world, if given the full and complete facts, will vote "yes" when a free world manifesto and a world wide plan of action is presented and discussed openly.

May God help our posterity if we fail in our duty.

Dedication of Memphis, Tenn., Metropolitan Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of the great statesmen of the world is Mr. Adlai E. Stevenson, the U.S. representative to the United Nations. We of Tennessee are always delighted when he visits our State, for he always brings with him those gems of wit and wisdom for which he is so well known and respected.

Such an occasion was the dedication of the Memphis Metropolitan Airport on June 5. Ambassador Stevenson delivered the principal address and, as usual, it was a fine one. In it, he called upon Americans of today to exercise what he called the audacity of our ancestors—the audacity, as he put it, "to do what we know is right."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Ambassador Stevenson's remarks, as published in the Memphis Commercial Appeal, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"WIN THE TRUST OF NEW WORLD," ADLAI SAYS

(Address by Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. representative to the United Nations, dedicating the Memphis Metropolitan Airport)

I congratulate you for this fine new airport and I am proud to be here to participate in this dedication ceremony. Looking over the splendid long runway, I think of the actor who was stopped by a motorcycle cop and ordered to get out of his car.

"Now," said the officer, pointing, "walk that straight line along the road," and the actor said right back, "Not unless you put a net under it."

Also, I am reminded of the service of Senator Gore, as a delegate to the last session of the United Nations General Assembly. Sometimes members of the executive branch of our Government are not wholly enthusiastic about Senators, but I for one have never shared the views of President Theodore Roosevelt on this subject.

When he was President he had a running fight with the Senate. One time he asked a famous big game hunter to bring back a couple of lions from Africa to be turned loose in the Senate. "But," said the hunter, "aren't you afraid they might make a mistake?"

"No," said Teddy, "not if they stay there long enough."

Well, at the United Nations, we don't feel that way about Albert Gore. We wish he could stay with us permanently. He has made many friends for America by his recent service there, and we owe him a great debt for his wise counsel and his powerful advocacy of the policies of the United States.

I take the theme of my remarks to you today from a very generous letter of invitation I received from Mr. James Irwin, the chairman of the Shelby County Democratic Executive Committee. Well—as you know—I am a Democrat, too. But I wish your famous Senator Estes Kefauver was standing here, too, for we have stood together on about every platform in America.

In his letter, Mr. Irwin wrote that the opening of this airport reflected not only a shortening of travel time throughout the world, but it signified "a further step that brings this community closer to other world communities. This closeness demonstrates that we are, in fact, our brother's keeper."

It does, indeed. And the world is shrinking faster than the mind can grasp, as Senator Thruston Morton so eloquently reminded us at lunch.

It took Andrew Jackson and his Tennessee friends 30 days to go from his beloved Hermitage to take the oath as President—and Washington hasn't been the same since.

Sam Houston and Davy Crockett traveled many weeks in the wilderness to get to Texas—and Texas hasn't been the same since.

From this airport many men and women of Memphis and the Midsouth go to many parts of the world daily. And neither we nor the world will ever be the same again.

And with this fine new airport, the world will shrink even more, here in Memphis, every time a plane lands or takes off—every time an ocean-going vessel touches at your famed Mississippi port, every time you ship your lumber products to the far corners of the earth, every time more cotton is sold here at the world's largest inland cotton market. Memphis is one of the great cities of America, and the more than a million people who live in and around it have the responsibilities of greatness to live with.

So the opening of your airport is an event that today and in the years to come will play a major role in spreading an image, a picture, an impression of America and its aspirations for beyond our shores. I think, therefore, it would be well for us to consider what the image is, for it is a matter of national concern.

Unhappily the picture of America that others have is not always the same as ours: too often their picture is of money, affluence and egotism—in a hungry world; too often our public dialog is of weapons, missiles, and war—in a world that yearns for peace.

We know that there is no more compassionate, generous and peaceful society anywhere on earth than ours, and to keep precisely that impression before the world is the job of every American. Not only our present security but our future influence depends on how well we succeed in keeping alive our great propositions of freedom and equality—propositions that the United States nearly two centuries ago launched into to inner space that is the heart of man. It would be treason to our deepest convictions were we to fail.

Daily, I meet people from all lands. They come, they see, they judge. And I can tell you what we say has little impact compared to what we do. In short, this glorious, free America has little impact if what we righteously tell others to do in their lands is not what we do in ours.

We are in grim competition to win the trust and confidence of the New World now stirring in Africa and Asia and Latin America. In this 20th century, we are living through a historical experience that, like a great wave, is sweeping away forever the inequities of old—of race, class, region or nationality. We in America should understand it better than most because the wave started rolling from our own shores two centuries ago.

From the moment of its birth, our Founding Fathers implanted a universality in our country's soul that set us apart as a government of laws, not men, and dedicated to the proposition that life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are inalienable rights of every citizen, not just of some.

For the quality of liberty is not divisible. When we deny its privileges to another, we place our own in jeopardy.

As I say, in this age of freedom, there is a new world waiting to be won or lost—a world of men and nations, of many creeds and colors, but all alike—sensitive, proud, and independent.

We must prove that our democracy and the liberties it offers make up a society that can remain free, human creative, even when it is under heavy and ruthless fire and pressure; that it can combat poverty, injustice, intolerance, in its own midst, even while it resists despotism from without; that it can give men a glimpse of serenity and hope even while calling on them for sacrifice.

This is a revered truth—shaped by the words of the Apostle Paul reminding his flock in Galatia that, in their Christian fellowship, "There is neither Jew nor Greek." And today we could add Baptist, or Methodist, Negro or white.

This is what we must prove—that the ideals which gave life and greatness to our land are still the ideals of our thrice-blessed America.

Ours is an open society that builds airports and opens windows for all the world to see the truth. And while at times perhaps we would wish others not to see our quarrels and our problems, it is the test of the open society that it remains open not merely for the serenity of agreement but for the turmoil of disagreement.

The rulers of the Soviet, however, have made their country into a darkened theater from which events of the outside world are shut out, and all the play of light and music and action is controlled by the director. And I thank God that, no matter what our problems, we welcome everyone to our shores and let them see every aspect of our life, the bad as well as the good.

I would liken it, in a way, to the issue of inspection of nuclear tests and disarmament. We have no fears or reservations about inspection. The Soviet Union does. And now it would limit the indispensable peacekeeping operations of the United Nations by extending a financial veto over all such operations.

But a precondition of progress toward a peaceful, disarmed world is not the abandonment, but rather the greater development of the techniques for peaceful settlement and the control of violence.

In an age when any violence anywhere can quickly expand to nuclear war, the collective security of all and hence the United Nations, becomes daily more imperative. Moreover, in the present divided world, if it didn't already exist, it would probably be impossible to create it now.

And there is no substitute for that unique experiment in self-control and the rule of reason which transcends the divergent interest of states and sets above those divergent interests the common interest of all the states in the maintenance of peace. Military alliances, I might remind you, may deter war; but military alliances are not likely to develop means of peaceful settlement or the containment of differences.

Just as the United States is the symbol of the open society on a national scale, the United Nations is the symbol of the open society on the international level. To those Americans, therefore, who ascribe to the United Nations not benefit but danger to our country, I would ask if they also question the principles of our Declaration of Independence and Constitution. For the principles of the United Nations derive from our own tradition, from our belief in equality before God and before the law. What was once a western ethic, even a white man's ethic, has now spread until it has become universal, and therin lies one of the great dramas of the 20th Century.

The Soviet Union has cast 100 vetos in the Security Council, but the organization has not been strangled by the veto. It boycotted the United Nations in 1950, but quickly returned after the Security Council acted on Korea.

And when last year it tried to extend its veto to the Secretary General by the device of the trokia, it once again bowed to the will of the majority. And now it is attempting to impose a financial veto on the peacekeeping activities of the U.N.—and again it will fail.

(Taking note of the pickets in front of the platform.)

Sometimes I wonder if you dear friends know what you are doing. Nothing would serve Communist purposes better than if we were to give heed to these voices in our country which would have us lessen support for the United Nations and reduce it to impotent debate—for this is precisely what they are trying to do.

Moreover, what this insurance for peace cost us last year, including everything, was less than one-half of 1 percent of what we spent in preparation for war. And for 17 years the United Nations has cost us approximately 75 cents a year per capital. I consider that a pretty good bargain.

But we must build even better institutions on these foundations for the peaceable settlement of our conflicts. We can—if we do not panic and concede the victory to those with little faith in man's capacity for self-control—if we Americans can re-create the magnificent audacity of 1776.

I would commend this thought to you, for that is precisely what we need today—the audacity to do what we know is right. Our ancestors had that audacity, and because they did, their limited means did not prevent them from attaining unlimited goals. Today, our means are the greatest of any people in the history of the world. Surely, then, we can attain a goal that already is almost within our grasp.

So doing, we shall justify the hopes of the world in this great, peaceable, open, free country which is not terrified by things new and strange—which can disagree without coming to blows, because its deepest beliefs are tempered by humility, even as Socrates, who said he was the wisest man in Athens because only he, among all the Athenians, knew the depth of his own ignorance.

The outcome of these issues—national and international—will condition our lives for many more years that this airport will survive. And it will condition no less our voice and vision in the search for peace, which can be achieved only by peace in our own land and in the hearts of men everywhere—a peace of the spirit that will nurture the fragile, precious flower that is the dignity of man.

Now I wish to dedicate this airport formally and a little ceremony is necessary and it calls for a count down 10–9–8–7–6–5–4–3–2–1—fire.

Gen. Henry C. Hodges, Jr., 103, Oldest West Point Alumnus, Dies—Outlived All Other Graduates in History of the Academy—Rounded Up Comanches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened to report the death yesterday of Maj. Gen. Henry C. Hodges, Jr., of Stamford, Conn., who, at the age of 103, was the oldest living graduate of West Point. His warm personality and high character were an inspiration to all who knew him. General Hodges graduated from West Point in 1881, exactly 30 years after the graduation of his father who, in his time, also lived to be the oldest graduate of West Point. This, then, is a remarkable family of American leaders. General Hodge's career is outlined in the following article from the New York Times. I offer it for the RECORD as a tribute to the memory of this outstanding officer and gentleman. My deepest sympathy goes to the members of his family and to the corps which has lost a valiant comrade in arms:

GEN. HENRY C. HODGES, JR., 103, OLDEST WEST POINT ALUMNUS, DIES—OUTLIVED ALL OTHER GRADUATES IN HISTORY OF ACADEMY—ROUNDED UP COMANCHES

STAMFORD, CONN., July 15.—Maj. Gen. Henry Clay Hodges, Jr., the oldest living graduate of the U.S. Military Academy, died today. He was 103 years old and lived at 65 Prospect Street.

General Hodges not only outlived all members of the class of 1881, but also lived longer than any other graduate in history.

Traditionally, General Hodges represented the alumni of all classes in laying a wreath at the base of the Colonel Thayer monument during June Week. He made this visit to West Point each year, including this year.

In 1962 he was personally greeted by President Kennedy. The general was seated in a wheelchair on the edge of the parade ground when the President walked over to him and shook hands.

APPOINTED BY GRANT

General Hodge's military career spanned the years 1877, when he entered the U.S. Military Academy, until his retirement from active duty in 1920.

He was appointed to the Academy by President Ulysses S. Grant, who had been a close friend of Mr. Hodge's father during the Civil War. The elder Hodges was a graduate of the Academy, class of 1851. He was on duty at Fort Vancouver, Washington Territory, when his son was born there on April 20, 1860.

The elder Hodges lived to be the oldest surviving member of his class. He was a captain, serving as adjutant of the 4th Infantry when Mrs. Hodges, the former Annie Abernethy, daughter of the first elected Governor of the Oregon Territory, gave birth to their son.

The younger Hodges received his early education at a series of Army posts and in private schools from Philadelphia to San Francisco. After entering the Academy he earned a reputation for his even disposition and ability to organize student functions. He graduated 23d in his class of 53.

After being commissioned as a second lieutenant he was stationed at Fort Clark, Tex., with the 22d Infantry. In later years General Hodges chuckled as he retold a story of one of his earliest duties as an officer.

VOTED BEST DANCER

He was ordered to Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio, to act as personal escort to a party of young women visiting the post. He was voted by them the outstanding dancer of the garrison.

His next assignment was helping to round up a party of Comanche Indians that had left their reservation near the Pecos River. The Indians were returned without bloodshed.

After serving at a series of outposts on the frontier he was ordered back to the Academy at West Point as an instructor in mathematics. He later said that frontier service had rusted his logarithms and he was barely able to keep ahead of his classes.

Assigned once again to the frontier, General Hodges, a nonsmoker, suffered numerous encounters with Indian peace pipes until he hit upon a device the Indian chiefs accepted.

At meetings he would share a cigarette with the negotiators, explaning that the gesture was binding and that the smoking would not last so long.

From 1892 to 1896 he served as an instructor at the Groton School in Massachusetts and at the New Hampshire College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts (Now the University of New Hampshire).

FOUGHT IN PHILIPPINES

During the Spanish-American War he was stationed at Fort Crook, Nebr. He was later assigned to the Philippines and participated in 11 battles with the Moro insurrectionists.

Subsequent service took him to Hawaii, Alaska and a tour of duty as secretary in the office of the Chief of Staff.

At the outbreak of World War I he was ordered to the command of the 39th Division at Camp Beauregard in Louisiana. He took the division to France, but did not see combat. Near the end of the war his command was broken up to provide replacements for other units.

After the war he commanded Camp Beauregard and the 17th Infantry Division. After 40 years of service he retired in 1920 with the rank of brigadier general.

He was designated major general, retired, by an act of Congress in June 1930.

In 1891 General Hodges married Netta Haines, a daughter of Jefferson Haines, who was graduated from West Point in 1849. They had two daughters, Miss Evelyn Hodges of Stamford, with whom he lived, and Mrs. James L. Crenshaw of Bryn Mawr, Pa., and a son, Parke Hodges. His children survive him.

His wife died in 1919. A year later he married Mrs. Carrie Jones, who died in 1949.

Comments on Secretary Freeman's Trip to Russia To Study Communist Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, today I received a copy of a letter which one of my constituents mailed to the Secretary of Agriculture in regard to the trip which he made to the Soviet Union. It seems to me that this letter quite aptly sets forth a point of view which many Americans today believe. So that other Members of Congress might have the benefit of my constituent's thought on Mr. Freeman's trip, the letter follows:

> Mr. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
> *Secretary of Agriculture,*
> *Department of Agriculture,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> SIR: Your trip to Russia to study Communist agriculture with your coterie of "experts" is, of course not the first time our money has been used for such nonsense. A few years ago, even farmers from Kentucky went to Russia for this same kind of incredible "study."
>
> Since it is public knowledge that only a short time ago the Russians were reduced to eating horsemeat; since it is public knowledge that the Communist system in Russia has never produced an adequate food supply and Khrushchev has, according to the American press, berated his farmers for their crucial shortages only recently:
>
> Since American agriculture produces such enormous surpluses with a fraction of the manpower used in Russia that we are actually embarrassed with surpluses and must spend huge amounts for storage, what reason and/or excuse can you possibly give for wanton waste of the taxpayers' money?
>
> What do you and your "experts" expect to learn from an economic system based on slavery that is years behind the accomplishments of our free enterprise system?
>
> Sincerely yours,
> LOUISE W. LOVE.

Prayer in Our Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from a longtime friend and one of the most respected teachers in my hometown of Findlay, Ohio, and one who enjoys a statewide reputation as a school administrator. I take the liberty of inserting portions of it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because it represents the thinking of one who spent a lifetime in the classroom with the dedicated purpose of developing character as well as intellect. After reading her letter, I find it impossible to disagree with her conclusion that:

> Certainly it was not the intent of Thomas Jefferson and the other makers of our Constitution to rule God out of our schools. I spent 45 years of my life putting the teachings of the Bible into Findlay schools and to me it is unthinkable that all that opportunity is gone.

Sometimes the experts, whether they be constitutional authorities or social reformers, are unable to understand the impact of their ideas beyond the limits of their own narrow interests. Sometimes, instead of listening to the theorists, we should respect the views of those with actual experience.

This letter in a few brief sentences and with telling force, reveals the experience of a schoolteacher with prayer and Bible reading in the classroom, something the experts apparently overlooked. I recommend these observations from the letter as follows:

> Parents told us how, as a result of children's saying grace at noon lunch periods, they started the custom at home. And, I wish you could see with my eyes the magnificient and touching sight of 200 little folks with heads bowed while 1 of their number asked the blessing at noon lunch time. * * * There are so many incidents I could relate but here is one in which you will be interested, I know. A man came to my door one Sunday afternoon since I retired from Findlay schools and challenged me to recognize him. * * * He came, he said, for one purpose and that was to tell me what a power for good our chapels were in his life and that of his family. He has eight children and said he, "I came from a home where we never thought of church or Sunday school. When I came to Glenwood and under the influence of the programs and the Christian teachers, I joined a church. Every Sunday you will find all 10 of us in Sunday school and church thanks to the influence of Glenwood School." I suppose such cases are legion for a large percentage of school boys and girls never go to church. What your views are I won't even ask but I'm telling you mine: Keep Bible reading and prayer in the public schools. * * * There is no known case of Bible reading hurting anyone and we all know the power of prayer in the lives of individuals.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

> MAY 31, 1963.
>
> Re House Resolutions 14 and 15, bills To Establish Captive Nations Committee.
>
> Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Congress of the United States,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: We wish to commend you for introducing this above bill. No doubt there are many elected of-

ficials in Congress who recognize the need for the establishment of a Captive Nations Committee in these days of "cold war" throughout the world. We are happy to realize that you had the foresight and courage to introduce this bill and we will in every way help you to continue your good work.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD JAFFARION.

RACINE, WIS.,
May 29, 1963.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The Racine Chapter of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation informs you that a resolution has been passed by our unit supporting passage of House Resolution 14, submitted by you, which calls for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Recent developments worldwide and in Washington make the formation of such a committee imperative to the security and welfare of the United States, and will bring added hope to the tyrannized people of the once free nations today in Soviet bondage.

We are in addition to this letter, contacting our Congressman as well as Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, head of the Rules Committee, urging him to release your resolution to the House floor for quick debate and passage.

May I take this opportunity to commend you for your stand in this regard, and to assure you of our every support of your measure.

Sincerely,

EDWARD SHAMSHOIAN.

HAVERHILL MASS.,
June 3, 1963.

Re House Resolution 14–15.
Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I would like to thank you for your House resolution which calls for a committee on captive nations; I add my support for such a bill.

May it be released soon to the floor and speedily passed by the House.

Very truly yours,

DIANA M. HANOIAN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1963.

Mr. WALTER TUSTANIWSKY,
Chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., 3407 Carpenter St., Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. TUSTANIWSKY: Thank you very much for your letter of May 25, 1963, in which you ask that I sponsor a resolution calling for the creation of a Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives.

I am pleased to inform you that I have introduced House Resolution 354, a copy of which I enclose, which would accomplish that purpose. You may be assured that I shall do all I can to obtain favorable action in this matter.

With best wishes, I am.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN LESINSKI,
Member of Congress.

OMAHA, NEBR.,
June 9, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am sending you a copy of my letter to the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives.

I also wrote to Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM asking to submit a resolution to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Thank you for your efforts and work to liberate enslaved people from the tyranny of Russia.

Sincerely yours,

J. NAVAHAS.

OMAHA, NEBR.,
June 9, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The unhappy captive nations living under Moscow tyranny know that only the United States can ease their present situation and bring liberation nearer. The rulers of Russia and her puppets are very touchy to any mention of the captive nations in the Congress of the United States and fear our efforts to expose the Soviet imperialist colonial system. I would appreciate your efforts very much in establishing a Special Commitee on Captions Nations in the House of Representatives. At this time I request your quick action on House Resolution 14 to establish such a committee.

With warm personal regards, I remain.

Sincerely yours,

G. NAVAKAS.

Academy for Criminologists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the need for professional and specialized training in all services dealing with delinquency and criminality is not yet being met by the programs presently under consideration. Higher standards, better informational services on developments in the social and biological disciplines, and other aids to those who work in the field are necessary.

A novel proposal to meet some of these objectives in the form of a West Point Academy of Criminal Justice to be set up under Federal Government auspices has been presented by Dr. Sheldon Glueck, Roscoe Pound Professor of Law at Harvard Law School in a recent address. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from his speech entitled, "Law and the Stuff of Life," given at the Annual Law School-Graduate Schools Alumni Day luncheon, Harvard University, June 12.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I speak here as a law-oriented student of social problems; and I should like, now, to present for your consideration two suggestions for improving the processes of the law. The first deals, generally, with the question whether it is not possible to make the collaboration of the law with the social and biologic disciplines more systematic and more effective in the pursuit of justice than it now is. The second is concerned, more specially, with a proposal to improve the education of the personnel of criminal justice.

In respect to the first suggestion, I remind you of the words of Holmes about the interrelationship of all branches of knowledge and ask you to recall, also, how the relevant nonlegal disciplines were skillfully marshaled in the Brandeis brief to infuse light and life into a basic constitutional issue. But how can the participation of the extralegal disciplines in law-making and law-interpreting be made more systematic and less biased?

I suggest that under the auspices of several distinguished law schools and particularly our own, there be established a legal interdisciplinary institute with the following objectives: First, the assembling of authoritative materials in such fields, among others, as business organization and function, labor problems, racial relations, family life, crime and correction; secondly, the working over of such materials by creative law professors, aided by sound specialists in various extralegal areas, with the aim of anticipating their probable relevancy to major fields of future legislative and judicial concern; thirdly, the dissemination of reports of such materials to judges, legislative reference bureaus, Federal and State policy framers, law school libraries and those of other pertinent university departments.

The aim of such an enterprise would be to keep law-makers and law-interpreters continuously informed of the progress of thought and experience in those fields of human endeavor with which legislators, judges and administrators would probably have to deal in the not too distant future. At present, the reading by judges and other lawmakers in the fields of economics, sociology, political science, biology and psychiatry is sporadic and meager. About the only way in which significant research results on issues of business and labor, marriage and divorce, protection of children, relation of normal and morbid psychology to questions of criminal responsibility and many other problems get into the judicial mind is through the occasional exceptional briefs of counsel. But this has the disadvantage, compared with the proposal made, of being drawn upon only as the occasion for litigation arises; it is not anticipatory of problems about to arise. Further, briefs are constructed in the heat of litigation. They are therefore likely to be less thorough, certainly more partisan, than analyses of objective researches motivated, not by particular law suits, but solely by the search for the facts and their possible implications for future legislation and judicial decision.

Each proposed Legal Interdisciplinary Institute would require a small central organization of full-time workers, comprising a Director and several technical assistants. The materials selected and prepared by the permanent staff of the Institute would be forwarded to the appropriate consultants for their comments and suggestions. They would then be subjected to further scrutiny by the full-time staff, with a view to determining which are likely to have a relatively direct and immediate bearing on problems of legislation and legal decision. Finally, succinct monographs would be prepared, summarizing the extralegal data and indicating the fields of decision and legislation upon which the topics analyzed are likely to have a bearing.

I come now to the second proposal, a suggestion for professionalizing administrators of criminal justice. I will not bore you with the sickly recitals of corruption and inefficiency in public affairs of which we have evidence in almost every day's newspapers. All that need be said is that the time is long overdue for the sytematic professionalization of all services dealing with delinquency, criminalism, and related fields of maladjustment. Professionalization means not only relevent education and training but dedication to an ideal of service beyond the pressing task of earning a livelihood.

It is highly regrettable that some of our States seem to be unable to cope with widespread inefficiency and questionable practices in the administration of the criminal law and related branches. In 1936 I published a book called "Crime and Justice," which analyzed the state of criminal justice in America from the points of view of inadequate personnel, inefficiency, corrupt practices and the general sluggish climate of public opinion in which such undesirable conditions are permitted to flourish. Because the book was rather widely read and reviewed, I was in great hopes that it would stimulate much needed reforms. Yet, although ending it on an optimistic note, it is regrettable that were I to write a new book to be entitled "Crime and Justice Revisited," it would have to be a very pessimistic jeremiad.

Today I am impelled to the conviction that some sort of fundamental, and symbolically striking, Federal intervention is called for. I suggest that there is a crying need in our country of a "West Point" for administrators of criminal justice. While normally opposed to federalization of services that ought better to be performed locally or through voluntary efforts instead of by the Central Government, I believe that here is an area in which matters have become so desperate as to call for heroic measures.

If the Federal Government were to establish an educational and training institution dedicated to raising the standards and vision of police administrators, prosecutors, judges, correctional administrators and others concerned with criminal justice, then I believe earnest and dedicated young men and women would eagerly apply for places just as youths have long competed for appointments to West Point, Annapolis and the Air Force Academy.

Such a center need not, indeed should not, be located in some isolated spot apart from a great university in a large urban community. In a pardonable blend of pride and prejudice I suggest that the West Point of criminal justice be established at Harvard, its core and guiding center at the Harvard Law School. Harvard has long had a tradition of research in the administration of criminal justice, beginning with the famous Cleveland Crime Survey, under the direction of Dean Pound and Professor Frankfurter, and carried forward in the numerous investigations of delinquency, crime and criminal justice conducted over the years by my wife and myself. Harvard has excellent facilities not only in law but in the medical, psychologic, anthropologic and sociologic fields; and by facilities I mean not only laboratories and libraries but, most important of all, creative scholars.

The urgent need of the proposed Federal educational institution for administrators of criminal justice has recently been dramatized not only by the increasing requirement of counsel in juvenile courts, but by the Supreme Court's decision in the case of *Gideon* v. *Wainwright*. This pronounces, as indispensable to due process of law, that a State must furnish counsel to indigent defendants in the general run of criminal cases, not merely in such serious charges as murder, robbery or rape. It took a long time for the Supreme Court to climb the slippery slope of fair play in its varying interpretations of the Constitution's guarantee of the right of counsel; but, like Old Mother Hubbard's trek to the historic closet "to get her poor dog a bone" only to find the closet bare "when she got there," the Supreme Court, when it finally "got there," found the closet of justice devoid of a lawyer to aid the indigent defendant.

But of course the graduates of the West Point of Criminal Justice would not confine their activities to defense of the poor. I envisage their taking turns in the staffing of leadership at all stages and in all major activities of criminal justice. They would be employed in police departments, in prosecutors' offices, as specialized juvenile court, family court and criminal court judges, as correctional administrators, as members of boards of parole. In brief, the time has arrived for developing a specialist criminal lawyer—or rather, a specialist concerned with problems of law involving persons more than property—who will dedicate himself to the public service both in and out of office and whose range of interest will cover all stages of the administration of criminal law and related problems.

The West Point of criminal justice would train not only future Federal officials, but also State and municipal. It is to be anticipated that these young cadets of justice will develop an esprit de corps analagous to the professional pride and warm cameraderie of the graduates of the academies for officers of the armed services.

This is of course not the occasion to go into detail; the various implications of the proposal require careful consideration. But certain principles occur on even preliminary reflection:

First, as to numbers, it seems wise to start modestly, with a student body of not more than a hundred or less. Even a few well-trained and dedicated young men and women in any community could raise the entire tone of criminal justice.

Secondly, it might be advisable to include in the project facilities for admitting a small group of graduate students (those already possessing a degree in law) as well as some younger practicing lawyers. These would be afforded the opportunity of one or two years of graduate study designed to give them interdisciplinary perspective, clinical contacts and guided experience.

Thirdly, one envisages an interwoven legal and extralegal curriculum, with not only the behavioral sciences but the humanities permeatively involved in the essentially legal course. To cite a few examples, the extralegal courses and seminars might include such topics as criminology and penology, relevant biologic sciences, theories of personality, behavior problems of childhood, puberty and adolescence, psychology of motivation, the socialization process in varied family structures, clinical problems of psychiatry, punishment in the light of the views of the systems of ethics. Simultaneously with consideration of such topics there would be the fundamental courses in law, especially criminal law and constitutional law. Experimentation with various curricular patterns would aid in the selection and interweaving of relevant courses and seminars.

Fourthly, it would seem advisable to require students to pledge themselves to practice in the fields of criminal law, family law and juvenile delinquency law—preferably, though not exclusively, in the public office—for a period at least equivalent to the time spent in obtaining their free education at the West Point of criminal justice.

Fifthly, while the Government should underwrite a minimal annual budget, there should also be provision allowing the educational institution to obtain funds from various private sources, including foundations.

Finally, it ought to go without saying that neither the Government nor private sources of subsidy should in any way dictate the curriculum or the manner of instruction.

Dallas Editors Concerned About Lawlessness in Civil Rights Actions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing concern among thinking people, of all races, across the land at what is happening on the streets of our cities under the guise of securing civil rights for Negroes.

What is taking place is a complete breakdown of the forces of law and order; a growing disrespect for law enforcement agencies, and civil disobedience to the point of a shooting rebellion. This activity will not solve the problem of injustice where it exists, nor will it preserve the freedoms already won by both black and white citizens. The ugly pictures of hate now seen daily on television and in the newspapers are giving world communism a field day. Disrespect for the law, once made respectable, will only result in defiance of the law by the degenerates and criminals who will seize upon the race issue as a cover for their crimes and atrocities and, in this, all law-abiding citizens will be the victims.

There must be a return to sanity in this situation. Congress must be allowed to coolly deliberate and bring forth a legislative remedy for existing inequities and injustices. The President must assume leadership of the Nation instead of encouraging continued and increased violence by remaining silent and thus giving tacit approval of the present course of events.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to include two editorials expressing the deep seated concern of those who view the scene far removed from the heat and passion of Washington politics.

The first, "Moral Issue" is from the Dallas Morning News of July 14 and the second, "And Who Is Being Hurt?" from the Dallas Times Herald of the same date.

The editorials follow:

[From The Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, July 14, 1963]

MORAL ISSUE

The President continues to insist that, in the Nation's racial crisis, "we are confronted primarily with a moral issue." He has not ebaborated, as the plaintiff in a legal case should, so he lays himself open to questions.

It is risky to mix the moral with the political—but he has done it, so it is fitting that he be put on the stand for cross-examination on the morality of other issues in Government.

For instance:

Is it moral to follow the Communist line, which is an atheistic, godless line? (The American Communist Party long has advocated what Mr. Kennedy now asks the Congress to approve as civil rights bills.)

Is it moral to lend indirect support to the forces of disorder and violence—many of which forces have Communist-front affiliations?

Is is moral to take a man's income tax and, without his permission, spend it abroad as "foreign aid" in countries which deny the existence of a Supreme Creator and imprison those who want to worship as they please?

Is it moral to "manage" news, when the American people have a right to the truth?

Is it moral to foster inflationary policies which reduce the value of insurance and annuities that people invested in for their security? Is this any different from stealing out of their pockets?

Is it moral to protect statutes that encourage women to bear children out of wedlock?

Is it moral to permit laggards and the indolent to loaf half the year on unemployment compensation, while the conscientious continue to work for a living?

Is it moral to prosecute a farmer whose only offense is raising a little wheat to feed his own livestock?

If these questions seem ridiculous, then so is the insistence that a political potato like civil rights be baked and served with a "moral" wrapping.

Truth is, nearly every problem in this country can be interpreted as a "moral issue." The racial struggle is no more entitled to this exclusive designation than aid to Communist Tito or compulsory unionism.

The civil rights struggle is like so many others in statecraft: It has the elements of prejudice, selfishness, greed, sincerity, sectionalism and votes. It even has the element of morality—but it isn't "primarily" so.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times Herald July 14, 1963]

AND WHO IS BEING HURT?

Any thoughtful person, black or white, in the United States at this moment must feel concern and alarm at the heartsickening turn of events in the national racial crisis.

Blame can be put, perhaps, on both white and Negro leaders, in the long perspective of history. But right now the only fact visible is that the situation has gotten out of hand—and that wipes out history.

The Negroes, right or wrong, are going at it in the wrong way. A century of discredit is motivation enough for the emotional explosion evident in many demonstrations, but it does not excuse or mitigate the dangers of mob violence and disregard for law and convention. Demonstrating against a bad law or in favor of a denied right is one thing, but arrogant unreasonableness is another. The inflamed imagination of many Negro leaders seems to have carried them into a land of fantasy where dreams of revenge and avarice have gained control over their thinking processes.

A good many white persons could demonstrate with as much legitimate complaint for many of the things the Negroes are now agitating for on the basis that they are denied them.

Who is the worst hurt in all this? Not the redneck whose open hatred for the Negro is traditional and unreasoning in itself. No, that person is actually confirmed in his hatred. "This is what we've been telling you would happen all the time," he can say, pointing to the flames of riot over the Nation.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has very basely, in our opinion, sold out its responsibility for a mess of intraracial political pottage and is now being as carelessly used as a loaded shotgun in the ahnds of a baby, with rampant selfseeking the rule. But it won't be hurt.

The white sociopolitical extremists who have egged this dangerous season into being out of their own peculiar kind of selfhatered—they won't lose a thing. They will be given hero laurels within the group from which they seek approval, and they couldn't care less about what it costs the Nation as a people.

No, this is who is being hurt; those who have genuinely wanted to help the Negro through the years; who felt the white man's blame for his plight; the quiet but convicted southern humanitarian, the people all over the Nation who have simply felt that equality was a matter of mankind's creation and not of laws or color or religion.

And it is hurting even more the Negro who sees, for the first time in American history, the unbelievably beautiful land of full freedom, of acceptance and participation in living which have been denied him.

The riotous segments are blotting out this rosy picture and repainting it with black hate.

The Irish Brigade at Gettysburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on July 8 of this year the Senate of the State of Pennsylvania passed a resolution recognizing the service of men of Irish descent in American military units. This resolution was sponsored by the distinguished State senator of my district, Israel Stiefel.

Under unanimous consent, I insert a copy of this resolution, entitled "The Irish Brigade at Gettysburg," in today's RECORD for the benefit of the Members of the House:

THE IRISH BRIGADE AT GETTYSBURG

Whereas the sons of Ireland in the United States and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania had an important part in the great struggle to preserve the American Union and to save it from secession and disunion; and

Whereas according to an official report in 1869, no less than 144,221 natives of Ireland served in the Union Army during the Civil War, considerably more than a proportionate number of the Irish-American population; and of these, 17,418 Irishmen served from Pennsylvania, more than from any other State with the exception of New York; and

Whereas among the military units of Pennsylvania which were largely Irish were the 24th Infantry Regiment, reorganized as the 69th Pennsylvania, which distinguished itself at Gettysburg; the 2d Philadelphia Regiment of militia, consisting almost entirely of Irish-Americans, which entered the Union service in 1861; and the 116th Pennsylvania, commanded by Col. Dennis Heenan, which was brigaded with three New York regiments and one Massachusetts regiment to form the Irish Brigade from 1862 to 1864, each regiment of the brigade carrying a green flag in addition to the national colors; and

Whereas the 116th Pennsylvania Regiment fought bravely at Fredericksburg, where it lost nearly half its men; had an important part in the first day of the Battle of Gettysburg; and participated actively in the Richmond campaigns to the end of the war. Its second commander, St. Clair A. Mulholland, who succeeded Colonel Heenan after he was seriously wounded at Fredericksburg, received many promotions and was mustered out as a major general in 1865, to become chief of police in Philadelphia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby pays tribute to the many sons of Ireland who contributed so bravely and nobly to the cause of freedom and of the American Union in Pennsylvania regiments during the Civil War.

Railroad Mergers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the following is an interesting speech by Mr. Harold C. Crotty, president of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, which he delivered on June 22, 1963, at the meeting of the Association of Utilities Commissioners of the Northeastern States:

RAILROAD MERGERS FROM LABOR'S VIEWPOINT

(Remarks by President Harold C. Crotty of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees before the meeting of the Association of Utilities Commissioners of the Northeastern States at the Greenbrier, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., Saturday, June 22, 1963)

Let me make one fundamental point absolutely clear at the very outset of my remarks. Railroad labor does not oppose all and every kind of railroad merger. We believe that certain kinds of mergers different from any now proposed might, in some cases, be helpful to the industry. The record shows that we have supported certain mergers in the past which we have felt were in the public interest because they resulted in improved and better railroad service. We undoubtedly will support other such mergers in the future, provided the present epidemic of the wrong kind of railroad merger is halted before it puts the entire industry into bankruptcy and eventual Government control.

It is true that the RLEA, on principle, is actively opposing nearly all merger proposals presently pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission. This does not contradict our basic philosophy. We are convinced that, almost without exception, the pending consolidation proposals run counter to the basic public interest. They promise only less railroad plant, less maintenance and care, and poorer service to the public. Most of the industry seems to be acting only out of self-interest and without even minimal concern for the public need for good rail service. In such circumstances, mergers which otherwise might serve the public interest have only become part of the present overall merger anarchy which is destroying essential railroad service in this country.

Labor has a great stake in the future of the American railroads. First and foremost as loyal citizens we don't want to see foolish planning by railroad managements, railroad bankers, and financiers, or anyone else, ruin this most vital industry.

Without the railroads our vast territory from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Canadian border to Mexico would never have been welded into one great national economic and cultural entity. Europe is now trying to achieve the kind of common market that the railroads made operational in the United States a century ago.

We needed the railroads then. We need the railroads now. In time of emergency they are the first line of defense, the only sure fast transportation network capable of moving vast numbers of men and quantities of supplies with dispatch.

In time of peace the railroads are still the most economical and efficient method of moving vast quantities fast, over long distance. They are most essential to the national economy.

We, who work on the railroads, have a second stake in preserving railroad service. Jobs, you say? Yes, jobs. And why not? Employment is important to the stability of our Nation. We can't have full employment in the United States if a major industry like the railroads falls out of step, and cuts back, as other industries expand.

The current headlong rush of many railroads to make quick financial killings by mergers is a glaring example of railroad management's failure to meet those obligations which result from the fact that the railroads are basically a public service industry.

Railroads in this country are, of course, still a private enterprise and, as such, they are entitled to reasonable earnings and profits for their investors. But the fact that, in every other country of the world, railroads continue to exist only as Government operations should be a warning that the national need for railroad service must always be placed first whenever there is a conflict between adequate railroad services to the public and higher profits. That is why railroad mergers must be tested on far broader grounds than merely whether or not they are just good for the railroads trying to merge and their stockholders. Railroad mergers worthy of approval must be good for all of us, our country, the communities served by the merging systems, shippers, consumers, and, of course, the men who work on the railroads.

Measured on that scale every one of the mergers currently under consideration by the ICC falls far short and recent mergers have proved they do not meet this test. Look at the Erie-Lackawanna, or the M. & St. L. after it was merger into the Chicago & North Western. Their state after merger is much worse than before. It that good for anybody, including the security holders?

The whole premise behind the national policy in the Transportation Act of 1940 to encourage certain kinds of rail mergers was that ideal mergers of railroad properties would join strong lines with the weak to preserve existing tracks and equipment which is both needed now and is indispensable in military emergencies. Are the proposals now before the Commission seeking that goal? You and I know that they are not.

Take the case of the New York Central which is about to be absorbed by the Pennsylvania. Will that add strength to the American railroad system? Quite the contrary, it would only result eventually in ripping up tracks wholesale where the two systems roughly are parallel. This merger would build a devastating monopoly, threatening the survival of all the small railroads now serving Pennsylvania, New York, and New England.

As an experienced railroader I tell you here and now that those roads cannot survive if the ICC permits the wedding of these two giants. In a real sense approval of a NYC-Pennsylvania merger by the ICC would create a Frankenstein monster which would peril all other railroad systems in the eastern territory.

The proposed merger of two other wealthy, solvent, competing railroads, the Seaboard Airline and the Atlantic Coastline, is no better. In some respects it is much worse and is an affront to commonsense and social responsibility. Despite the perilous Cuban situation these two systems have the effrontery to advocate tearing up over 1,000 miles of track on the most direct route from the industrial northeast to the Caribbean. The railroads have admitted that they were taxed to the utmost to move men and materials to Florida ports during the crisis last fall. But they now propose to rip up tracks instead of laying new ones to meet the vital defense needs of our Nation. A band of Communist commandos could hardly deal a more devastating blow to our national security than would be the elimination of the railroad service in Florida which the ACL and SAL merger application proposes at this time.

This whole piecemeal case-by-case approach to the merger problem which the ICC is following is all wrong. Railroad mergers are, at the very least, a regional problem, but mostly their impact really has national consequences. The public interest cannot be protected when mergers are considered one by one without reference to the effect first on the Nation as a whole and then upon the communities an dthe other rail systems in the territory served by the lines desiring to merge.

Many things are wrong with the Interstate Commerce Commission's present handling of merger applications. Basic is the Commission's lack of criteria adequate to protect the public interest.

Just a year ago I emphasized this lack of criteria in testifying before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Senator KEFAUVER, who is on this panel today, chaired the hearing.

I called attention then to the ICC staff study "Railroad Consolidations and the Public Interest: A Preliminary Examination." At my request Senator KEFAUVER made that study a part of the record of the hearings.

This study, undertaken by the ICC itself, reviews the history of railroad mergers before the Interstate Commerce Commission and emphasizes the need for a critical review of the criteria heretofore applied by the Commission in consolidation proceedings. The study suggests possible modifications of, or additions to, the criteria presently used to determine the public interest in rail consolidation cases. It also suggests additional public interest criteria which heretofore have not been given effective consideration by the Commission, such as local and regional impact, national defense, and intermodal competition and the long-range development of railroad services.

I understand the ICC is working on these matters, but I haven't seen any evidence of results. Good intentions aren't enough. I think it is high time the Congress took a hand. Criteria for the public interest should be set now, not next year, or whenever the slow-moving wheels of bureaucracy get around to it. Congress should see to it, through legislation, that within the ICC a Bureau is set up as in other regulatory agencies, that will represent the public interest in all these merger proceedings. Now presentation of evidence in the public is dependent almost solely upon the special interests of interveners, opposing railroads, shippers and the Railway Labor Executives' Association.

Because intervening is expensive in time and money, organizations like ours cannot always intervene where our immediate interests are not involved. As coustodians of the funds (dues) of our members we are not able to put aside self-interest entirely.

There should be no need for dependence upon us and others to represent the whole public. That is the duty of the ICC. It is high time the Commission stopped acting like a court in an adversary proceeding and discharged its duty to protect the public.

Lest you think I am giving you a one-sided labor view of the present merger situation let me quote an authority on mergers, a college professor who has long been perhaps the foremost advocate of rail mergers. But, he now is strenuously opposed to the present type of rail consolidations. I refer to Prof. William N. Leonard, of Hofstra College, Hempstead, N.Y. Here is what Professor Leonard wrote in "Challenge, the Magazine of Economic Affairs," published by New York University:

"Today's befogged approach toward consolidation stands in sharp contrast to the careful consideration Congress gave mergers in the Transportation Act of 1920. At that time Congress was concerned with the plight of weak railroads and the disparity of earnings among rail companies under the prevailing system of uniform rates. To remedy the situation, Congress permitted the consolidation of railroads into a limited number of systems possessing approximately equal competitive strength and resources. The ICC was assigned the job of drawing up a comprehensive, although advisory, consolidation plan. The railroads were in no way bound to abide by it."

Professor Leonard makes two other statements in that same article. Both are so important that I will quote them without comment.

"The stakes are high in the current rail mergers. This is all the more reason for Congress to review the effects of the vast merger movements on competition, monopoly, employment and the communities served by the railroads. There is real danger that mergers undertaken to reduce expenditures will force the abandonment of important services rendered the public and pare the railroad plant below the level to adequately meet normal or emergency needs in the future.

"A great industrial nation like the United States runs a serious risk when it permits an irrational and haphazard consolidation of its vital railroad system. The fleeting self-interest of individual railroads does not provide assurances that the vast merger movement will serve the needs of our entire Nation."

There is one aspect of the current U.S. railroad situation that I can personally speak about with some direct knowledge and authority. As president of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees I have direct knowledge of the sorry state of repair of much railroad trackage. Pennywise and pound foolish, the railroads have been economizing—I prefer a stronger word "penny-pinching"—on maintenance of the right of way. It is a short-sighted policy and in the long run a most extravagant way of running a railroad. Stretching out the periods between reworking worn ties and rails, can be costly. Can be, did I say? It is costly. One derailment, even a minor wreck is very expensive. In the long run it is cheaper, as well as safer for workers and passengers, to keep tracks, as well as the railroad plant and equipment in general, in prime condition. There is no justification possible for cutting corners where safety is concerned.

Do the railroad merger proposals now pending suggest means of coping with the railroads' present overwhelming problem of deferred maintenance of tracks, roadbed, rolling stock and other equipment? You know the answer. Instead of resulting in new and expanded repair facilities, practically every merger application proposes to eliminate shops and repair crews and to abolish jobs of skilled workers needed to do this work.

In the various merger, consolidation, acquisition and abandonment proceedings, the proponents speak glibly of the employee protection agreements. They imply that these agreements are ample protection for all railroad employees whose jobs are to be abolished upon consummation of the proposals.

If we were in a period of rising employment, not only in the railroad industry but throughout the Nation's economy, there might be some validity to those claims. Railroad employment, as we all know, is declining faster than the rest of the economy.

Technological improvements are steadily reducing the number of available jobs everywhere.

Under present conditions, the so-called Washington, Burlington, Oklahoma, and New Orleans conditions are a sham and a delusion. They are palliatives simply imposing at their best a few years of delay before a skilled railroad worker is entirely without work.

The railroad industry has an obligation far beyond those so-called protective agreements to the workers who have devoted their lives to railroading. Their high productivity has made in great part these technological improvements possible. They should not be discarded and shunted to the scrap heap like a broken rail or wornout engine.

We in the RLEA have a solution. We advocate attrition as a fair and just means of meeting the problem of railroad unemployment, whether it results from merger, acquisition or improved machines. I appeal to the railroads' self-interest. Attrition in the long run will cost less and improve worker morale. Of course, the best cure would be for our railroads to stop cutting back service and to go out and get the business to grow again.

Railroads, I am well aware, say they are too "poor," too "unprofitable" to meet minimum standards of maintenance and service.

This is what you State railroad commissioners and those of us in railroad labor have come to know as the myth of railroad "poverty." Danger of immediate insolvency of one or the other, or both, of the applicants is advanced as the reason for most of the present crop of merger cases.

The railroads of this country with a few minor exceptions are not insolvent nor in immediate danger of bankruptcy. According to their own figures most of them made money last year, and so far, this year is even better. Even with all the bookkeeping shennigans they resort to, the profits of the railroads couldn't be hidden. In general, railroad earnings go up and down with the rest of the economy, but, aided and abetted by their Madison Avenue hirelings the railroads today often cry the loudest when they are the least hurt.

Here are some figures from the railroads' own reports for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962.

In the 10 years from 1951 through 1961: Shareholders' equity in U.S. railroads rose from $16,602,472,000 in 1951 to $18,462,947,000 in 1961; capital surplus spurted from $287,805,000 to $1,909,967,000; retained income was up from $7,257,250,000 to $9,981,052,000; and dividends—amounts paid out annually—increased by $11 millions, from $373,574,000 to $385,017,000. The average rate of 5.7 percent remained steady during the period.

I submit there is no railroad poverty. There is only a myth to that effect, created on Madison Avenue, which has almost succeeded in brainwashing the newspapers, the public, the Congress, and even many railroad employees. It's time Congress took over from a faltering ICC and searched out the truth about railroad ownership and railroad finances.

For that reason, railroad labor is strongly supporting Senate Resolution 136, introduced by Senator HARTKE and 20 other Senators of both political parties. This would set up a select committee to study railroad financing, ownership and control so that Congress could learn the truth about the railroads' economic condition. We believe that such a study is long overdue, and that it is essential that this knowledge should be in the hands of the public before Congress acts to revise our national transportation policies. Certainly, since the railroads use the plea of "poverty" as practically their only argument to support the move toward railroad monopoly through mergers, the work of this committee should be completed before future action is taken by the ICC on pending railroad merger applications. Railroad labor, accordingly also strongly supports the bills S. 942, introduced by Senator KEFAUVER and 11 cosponsors, S. 1138 by Senators MAGNUSON and JACKSON, and House Joint Resolution 305 by Congressman JOHN B. BENNETT, all of which would temporarily halt railroad mergers while Congress studies and enacts new legislation to protect the public interest.

The High Court and the Court on High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the liberty of inserting herewith, an article published in the Light, and written by a great and learned man, Dr. Jonas Simon, chairman, the Jewish Institute of Research.

Two weeks ago, Dr. Simon called me on the phone at my home on Long Island and discussed my intention to present a discharge petition to bring to the floor of the House a constitutional amendment to permit prayer in public schools. He was all for this and said he would like to meet and talk to me about conditions in the country. He also sent to me the enclosed article, one of many he has written.

Last Sunday, July 14, I was on Long Island and I decided to call Dr. Simon, who spends the summer months at Arverne, near Rockaway Beach, N.Y. I drove down to see him and spent almost 2 hours in discussion. Dr. Simon is 86 years of age. Part of his education was at the University of Heidelberg, Germany. He is a very alert, intelligent man with a fine sense of humor.

We were in total agreement that steps had to be taken to halt the moral deterioration within our country and reverse the trend. To restore the right to pray in all public schools and public places—on a voluntary and nondenominational basis—to preserve "In God We Trust" on our coins and currency, "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance and our chaplains in our armed services, is of vital necessity. I commend this article to you. I hope to cooperate with Dr. Jonas Simon in views that he has expressed to me for the good of our country.

The article follows:

THE HIGH COURT AND THE COURT ON HIGH

(By Dr. Jonas Simon, chairman, the Jewish Institute of Research)

(Dr. Jonas Simon is an educator, writer, and lecturer. He was delegate to the First International Peace Conference after World War I at Berne, Switzerland; invited to conferences on educational and religious problems by the late President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard University; champion in the fight against calendar reform; interviewing on this matter the foreign delegations of the United Nations in 1945 at San Francisco. He is chairman of the Jewish Institute of Research, Inc.)

The existence of the Creator, proclaims the believer, is the supreme truth. His word the law of all laws, His will the constitution of constitutions. The constitutionality, therefore, of man-made constitutions is subject to its congruency with the constitution of mankind, the advice of the Creator, who behind the scene of all human turmoil is directing the fate of mortal man.

If "separation of church and state" does not fall into line, if it will or can be abused as a separation from religion, it has to be cleared legally without vacillations and self-contradictions and, if necessary, to be adjusted by amendments.

Apparently, it was never meant to be a tool in the hand of atheists or any irreligious groups to undermine and to control the masses of believers in these United States. Therefore, we witness now the widespread commotion against the recent decision of the Supreme Court. Even the wisdom of America, the schools of higher learning in this country have grown on the fundamental basis of outspoken religious institutions.

Also from a political angle the recent Supreme Court decision and its timing was to many a source of deep regret and disappointment. This is a time when our citizenry is sorrowfully concerned about the possible cleavage of its unity through the appearance of the Birch Society on the American scene. It should not have been burdened with additional perils of a dividing character.

It is also a time, when wise and well informed men of vision weigh gravely the spreading moral decline in all strata of society with no end in sight. The tremendous endeavors for the uplift of American life of an energetic, youthful and industrious president through domestic and foreign devising were not in a position to change this tragic state of affairs. Evidently, entirely different systems are to be applied to cure this cancerous malady.

In this fatal period, the Jews of the old historical traditions will set the example for their Jewish brothers to respect and to give preference to the rights of the majority of their co-Americans. They, on their part, will take on their shoulders as they have done through the centuries, all the sacrifices required to give their children an education of excellence in their own way. Such is the nobleness of the Jewish genius and the expression of its responsibility.

Nutmeg State Potentate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to note the election of Harold C. Close as imperial potentate of the National Order of the Mystic Shrine.

Although he is no longer technically a resident of my district, he did reside there for many years and was well and favorably known as an outstanding citizen in our area.

He still is a resident of Connecticut. All his friends and all citizens of the State will be proud of the recognition which has come to him after his long years of service in this great national American, charitable, and fraternal organization. I am sure that all these good people will join me in wishing Harold Close every success and great achievement during his tenure as imperial potentate.

America's Pioneer Spirit Still Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, Aztec, N. Mex., has been invited to participate in the All-American City Award competition and I am pleased to bring to the attention of Congress an article by Mr. Curn C. Harvey, of Aztec, entitled "The Citizens of Aztec Wanted a Road," which will be used in the material submitted to Look magazine and the National Municipal League, sponsors of this competition.

This Nation was built by a spirit of voluntary cooperation called the pioneer spirit by historians. Today we have as much need of this spirit as did our forefathers who did so much to make America great. A project carried on by citizens of one locality of my State is an admirable exemplification of the spirit of voluntary cooperation—a modern application of the pioneer spirit:

THE CITIZENS OF AZTEC WANTED A ROAD

(By Curn C. Harvey)

The citizens of Aztec have written a new chapter in the long and colorful history of the Four Corners country by building a two-lane highway to the Navajo Dam 18 miles from the city. What is unusual about the highway is that it was built entirely with private contributions and volunteered labor.

When the dam was finished in September 1963, traffic and access to it had to go a very roundabout way. The people of Aztec wanted a highway which would make a direct route to it.

They thought it might be years, if ever, before they could expect the State or Federal Government to provide the road. How the people of Aztec united in a spirit of voluntary cooperation and built the road they wanted recalls the way American pioneers worked together under leaders to open trails into the wilderness.

The people organized the Navajo Dam Recreation Road Association and launched a private roadbuilding project which attracted national attention. Many thought at first that it couldn't be done. Those who had at some time helped build company roads to oil fields in the San Juan Basin or had seen uranium miners make private roads to their diggings around the Colorado Plateau knew better.

Then, too, the Four Corners country—the only point in the Nation where four States have a common boundary—still has much of that pioneer spirit which is the key to American history. Not long ago this region was one of the most isolated and unknown parts of the country.

Archeologists have found ruins and artifacts which prove the region was at one time as thickly populated as any part of North America. Today the area which makes up the corners of Arizona, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico is beginning to fill up with people again.

By December 20, 1962, the right-of-way had been acquired from property owners, engineers had surveyed the route, and men were clearing it ready for the bulldozers. January 6, the groundbreaking ceremony was held. Governor Jack Campbell was one of the chief speakers. The Governor and many other prominent visitors congratulated the people of Aztec for their forward-looking attitude and their faith in progress. This gave a big impetus to the undertaking.

At the groundbreaking, it was announced that the people of Aztec hoped to have the road finished in a year. But by April 21, the project was finished, and over 4,000 people attended the road dedication program on that date.

Said the Farmington Times: "The project was a marvelous display of what can be accomplished through private initiative and resourcefulness, through voluntary cooperation at the grassroots level."

The Lovington Leader commented: "At the community level, which is the heart of America, there is a peculiar need for people to engage in such a project. If people throughout the country could experience the satisfaction of having a part in such an undertaking, there would be a renewal of faith in America and a revival of the pioneer spirit which did so much to make our country great."

Practically everyone living in Aztec had a part in the building of the Navajo Dam Road. Also much support came from neighboring towns and communities including Farmington, Bloomfield, Blanco, Cedar Point, and Durango, Colo. "Perhaps never in the annals of the Aztec community have so many people from every walk of life rallied to the cause. It was a display of the sort of all-out unity that can provide progress, pride and stature to any community," to again quote the Farmington Times.

From the schoolchildren who presented plays to raise money for the road fund to the oldtimers like George Blancett, 82, Manuel Fisher, 85, Roy Current, 75, just about everyone shared in the enterprise.

The food committee played a major part in boosting morale of the workers and keeping the activity moving forward. It is a good illustration of the support the project received. The list of food contributors includes about 30 businesses, almost all Aztec clubs, and hundreds of individuals. The group, spearheaded by Mrs. Bonnie Walls, served lunches and coffee to workers every day in fair weather and foul while the project was underway. Volunteers were always on the job to serve the meals. Even when it was snowing and the food served from the station wagon, lunchtime was funtime. A visitor from Albuquerque remarked that the meals were served in the true pioneer style when house raisings and other activities gave people an opportunity to spread a feast and combine pleasure with work.

Mrs. Walls was honored for her work with the food committee by the first roadside park site on the Navajo Dam Road being named for her. "'Bonnie Rock," raising majestically skyward high on a point overlooking the road, is one of the scenic attractions.

A few leaders in Aztec whose dedication to the project was indispensable to its success were Al Williams, Emery Arnold, Kenneth Fogle, Ray Atchison. There were many others.

When the road was finished, it was turned over to San Juan County which in turn presented it to the New Mexico State Road Commission.

The most difficult obstacle to overcome in the entire undertaking, it was reported, was acquiring the right-of-way. At one stage in the task, it was necessary to solicit the cooperation of the police department in a California city in contacting one of the landowners.

That people had fun building the road and found it a very satisfying experience is evident by some of the stories they tell which may become Aztec folklore. These are a few:

In January while the men were having lunch during a snowstorm, a group of California tourists stopped. One of the group asked if it was not just a little bit crazy to be having a picnic in a blizzard. When told by the workers that they were building the "Dam Road," the Californians seemed a bit impressed but more confused and left shaking their heads.

A man and his wife arrived from Santa Fe, and the man said he'd read about the "do-it-yourself" roadbuilding job but just didn't believe it. So, he said, he and his wife had "jumped into the car" to come over and see for themselves.

A Nevada man read about the project, and then proceeded to load his welding machine onto his car along with his wife and takeoff for New Mexico to offer his services. He did help, too, and is now employed in Farmington.

From Loco Hills, near Artesia, a gentleman arrived to partake of the noontime hospitality and, as a matter of course, to do his share of the work.

A civil defense official from a large city paid his respects, and offered this comment: "If you ever need bomb shelters around here, you'll know how to get them."

A carload of young ladies came by while on a trip to a bowling tournament at Farmington. They raised some inquisitive eyebrows over the sign, "Dam Road."

Visitors from more than a dozen States seemed highly impressed with such an unheard-of-undertaking as the building of an 18-mile long two-lane highway without public funds. Many visitors complimented Joe McKinney, road foreman, for his hospitality and for the enthusiasm and morale of the workers.

Children answering the telephone in Aztec: "Mom is making a cake for the Dam Road." "Dad is working on the Dam Road," "He hasn't come back from the Dam Road," etc.

The "get-up-and-go" attitude of Aztec citizens in building the Navajo Dam Road has inspired countless stories about good old American initiative and private enterprise, about this Nation being built on the spirit of voluntary cooperation, about the pioneer spirit being the key to American history and still being with us. It has earned for Aztec a somewhat unique title, "Do-it-yourself-city."

One of the high points of the dedication program for the Navajo Dam Road was the reading of poems by speakers written by three Aztec fifth-grade children—Billy Noland, Judy Dunning, and Timmy Lane. The poems seemed to be in tune with the spirit of the occasion and to catch the imagination of the audience. Here is the one written by Billy Noland which was read at the ceremony by Lt. Gov. Mack Easley:

"THE AZTEC-NAVAJO ROAD

"They didn't use State money.
  They didn't use State time.
The people got together
  And started in the line.

"On every car and window
  You'd see a sign or two:
'Give to the Dam Road,
  For it's coming through.'

"The dozer started working.
  The noise was loud and clear.
The road would be finished
  In less than a year.

"Now the road is finished
  And will be dedicated too.
We're proud of the people who built it—
  That means you and you and you."

Arizona Girl Heads F.H.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, we in the Third Congressional District of Arizona, indeed in all Arizona, are particularly proud of Miss Diana Leonard of Kingman who was recently elected President of the Future Homemakers of America during the national meeting of that great organization in Kansas City. Miss Leonard truly typifies the type of teenager who is raised and educated in my native State of Arizona.

I commend to my colleagues the following editorial written by Dick Waters, widely known editor-publisher of the Mohave County Miner:

An Outstanding Honor

The election yesteday of a Kingman girl to the national presidency of the Future Homemakers of America at their annual convention in Kansas City is a great honor, not only for the girl and her family, but for the community as well.

Miss Diana Leonard, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. N. J. Leonard of Kingman, was elected to the chairmanship of an organization that has in its membership thousands of high school age girls who are interested in preparing for careers as homemakers.

Miss Leonard is a worthy representation of a highly respected family here and her election has caused a good deal of elation among all those people who know the Leonards.

The national recognition given to her is a wonderful thing.

The community shares her pride and offers its heartiest congratulations and best wishes for an outstanding term of office.

There Goes Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Donald I. Rogers, business and financial editor of the New York Herald Tribune, addressed a meeting of the Peninsula Manufacturers Association at the Hilton Inn in the 11th Congressional District of California.

In view of the fact that Mr. Rogers covered a number of subjects concerning problems now being considered by the Congress, it seems to me that his advice and testimony is worthy of every Congressman's attention.

His address, entitled "There Goes Free Enterprise," delivered on June 27, follows:

There Goes Free Enterprise

(Text of speech delivered by Donald I. Rogers, business and financial editor, New York Herald Tribune, before Peninsula Manufacturers Association membership forum at the Hilton Inn, San Francisco Airport, June 27, 1963)

One of the greatest fallacies ever perpetrated by my profession is the rediculous reiteration that all newspapermen are supposed to be impartial. I refuse to stand before you as a drab, camouflaged, opinionless neutral who records with words the events of history being made around us and merely channels them along to the reader without seasoning or flavor.

I am a prejudiced man. I am partial. I am a partisan. I make no apologies for it, but rather would feel I owed you an apology if I were devoid of these characteristics.

I'm not sure it will come as news to you but I must state that I am a conservative in the classical sense of the word. By this I mean that I believe the private, capitalistic, free enterprise system has done a pretty good job for us and I resist, instinctively and intellectually, efforts to tamper with or retard that system.

If what I have to say offends some of your political sensibilities or detracts from public figures you hold in esteem, please remember that under the ethics of the game I'm in, I'm not allowed to be either a Republican or a Democrat, merely a carping and sometimes bitter critic, but by heaven, I'm a critic with prejudices.

As a conservative I am naturally disturbed about some of the things that are being planned for our economy and some of the things that are being said about it. Don't think that I am an unreconciled Nixon voter. I have recovered fully from the election which, I must say, is more than I can say for some of you folks out there.

But about the things that disturb me, not as a Republican, but as a conservative. I realize fully that John Kenneth Galbraith and Walter Heller cannot put into effect some of the programs they have in mind unless the public lacks confidence in the economy.

For political perpetuation it is necessary those days to destroy the public's confidence in the economy and caues it to redirect its faith into the hands of a small band of Government officials.

This, I agree, is politically expedient, politically necessary. But I grieve at the way it's being done.

Make no mistake about it, John F. Kennedy is a politician. He has surrounded himself with associates ranging from the far left to the far right. An example of the former is his top adviser, Arthur Schlesinger who, in 1947, writing in the Partisan Review, described the most favorable ways for achieving democratic socialism and emphasized the desirability of Government ownership of "all significant means of production." I'll give you another quotation from Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., written in the Partisan Review in 1947:

"The American business community continues to resist the radical democracy, like a drowning man thrashing out at his rescuer. In so doing, it may destroy the possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism."

These words he wrote. These words endure. These are the words of the fairest of the fair-haired boys around the White House.

Mr. Kennedy presides, then, over a policy without conviction. The administration knows it can't be antibusiness, but it wants to keep the political influence of business from getting too strong. Hence the investigations, the witchhunting on Wall Street, the massive antitrust attacks.

Without leadership definitely oriented toward the capitalistic system our people tend to move away from it, both in their thinking and in their voting, for the sad truth is, most people do not understand profits or the profit system.

It is obvious to me as a politically noncommitted reporter that a great many Americans, voters all—perhaps a majority of our voters—believe that the Government should take a strong hand in providing for individual security and even for individual comfort.

I think it is quite fair to say that a coal miner who is unemployed because the coal has run out in his district and we are using more oil and electricity and less coal today, feels that he has less responsibility about getting himself another job than you and I have. He has told us, through his local officials and through his interviews in the press and most importantly, through his voting record, that he sincerely believes that we—you and I—through a central government, with its privileges of centralized taxation, must step in and take over the responsibility for his employment and for his future. If he has a skill that no longer has a market, he believes we owe it to him to teach him another skill.

Perhaps we should, I am no expert in social matters. I shall not point out the moral made by the ancient Greek, Solon, that democracy embodies the seeds of its own destruction because its practitioners, seeking security and having the privilege of voting for this security, will vote away their freedoms.

I know the President is a moral man. I believe that he has become possessed of more morality since he took office and appreciated, for the first time, the enormity of his responsibility. Because I believe he is a moral man, I persist in the expectation that one day, when the foreign crises have ceased to occupy the front page and command the convincing cliches of the honeyed hacks of television, he will admit to us in business and finance that the major economic problem facing this Nation is not whether we are going to have another recession, but whether we are going to be able to afford as a nation the big public spending programs. I'd rather think that than believe that he doesn't give a damn one way or the other, which is the alternative.

We are on the brink of an economic revolution. It could become an economic disaster and hence a social and political tragedy. It could become, and probably will become, an economic disaster during this decade of the 1960's.

Now don't get me wrong. I'm not predicting another stock market crash or another great depression. We seem to regard a market crash and a depression as the worst things that could happen to us outside of a global war.

This is not so. There are a number of worse things.

The worst thing that could happen to us, I suggest, is the loss of our unique enterprise system, the system that permits us to invest risk capital, and to manufacture goods or perform services at a profit.

If you enjoy America's system of profitmaking, of profit incentives, then I should like to have you consider the startling fact that we are now in imminent danger of losing that system. Consider also the fact that once lost, it is irretrievable.

The horrifying truth is that our very prosperity is what will lose it for us. Not depression where we turn to the Government for help with make-work, make-votes programs—but prosperity itself is our greatest danger. You remember the old slogan on Cracker-Jack, "the more you eat, the more you want." It's the same with prosperity. We have become as a people insatiable, not content with mere good times, but hellbent on overwhelming wealth and over-burdening power.

This is true not only of business, but of labor, too; of Government; of the communications media. Of almost every subdivided group in our complex society.

For this, ultimately, we'll give up our freedom. But before we do, we'll lose the prosperity itself. We'll begin to lose it in this decade of the 1960's.

I don't believe the 1960's will see a mere continuation of the happy and wholesome business conditions of the 1950's under Eisenhower. Neither do I believe that we will see a return to the conditions that prevailed in the depressed 1930's or the wartime 1940's.

If we like prosperity in this Nation and if we think we would like to see it continue for awhile, then we had better face up to our problems. No one in Government seems to have done it yet. Not in any preceding administration and certainly not in this.

We are going to have at least three major economic problems in the 1960's and it behooves us to start recognizing them for what they are.

The first is the threat of a continuously rising trend in prices due to a continuously rising trend in unit labor costs, higher and higher production costs, with the result that we will be unable to maintain a high level of sales, and this in turn, will mean we will be unable to maintain a high level of employment and a high level of economic activity and economic growth. What I am saying bluntly is this, if labor costs continue to rise in the 1960's the way they have in the last 20 years, we will be unable to maintain our prosperity, no matter what the featherheaded economists tell you. We will have less, not more employment.

The second problem will be posed by the growing economic strength of the other industrial nations of the world. We will have stiffening competition with these other industrial nations not only abroad, in world markets, but right here in America.

The picnic is over.

We have been able to escape these inevitable problems in the past because of a world shortage of goods which minimized the effects on our economy of high unit costs. We were able to sell goods anyway because we were there firstest with the mostest.

When it came to expansion of our producing facilities inflation allowed us to finance our growth at the expense of creditors by diminishing the value of their claims. In addition, other nations, recovering from war damage had to service their own needs before they could amount to much in the world market.

But long before our steel strike, Dusseldorf steel was making a serious impact in some areas of the American steel industry, right here in the States.

At this very moment consumer resistance to price increases is mounting. When you get that kind of reaction, you will find that when prices go up, production and employment go down as a direct result.

Another thing, the so-called tight money policy that evolved in the last days of the Eisenhower administration was not so much a direct policy of the Federal Reserve or the Treasury as it was the fact that lenders, tired of having their good dollars repaid with puny ones, are clamping down on corporate loans.

Meanwhile, Germany, Italy, Japan, France and a host of other once-prostrate nations are producing good exports cheaply.

And Russia hasn't begun to pay attention to the consumer goods field. Once she does, and she likely will during the sixties, hold your hats.

Russian factories, all state-owned, are not obliged to operate at a profit. Sometime during the sixties the Russians will decide that it's less expensive to ruin us economically than it is to beat us with military supremacy. All they'll have to do is produce goods as good as ours are and sell them at a lower price in all world markets except ours. They can clobber us industry by industry.

I don't like to bore you with figures, but we must consider two simple ones.

America's rate of growth in 1959 was just a bit above 2 percent. Last year it was 7 percent.

Russia's rate of growth in 1959 was something above 6 percent. Last year it was 11 percent.

Thirty percent of Russia's gross national product is going into capital investment. Germany is investing 23 percent; Italy 21 percent; France, 18 percent.

In the United States, supposedly the leading capitalistic nation, we invest 15 percent, half of the Russian figure, and less than in any but the most backward nations.

Why is this? Why is the richest nation growing slower than the rest of them?

I don't care how many task forces study the problem. They'll come up with only one answer if they have the economic sense of high school sophomores. It's because of our tax laws, the weakening, debilitating enemy within our nation, created and decreed by a politically motivated Congress. There is no other truth about this lack of economic growth.

Strangely, this problem of growth that received so much attention during the political campaigns has been given very little notice since the elections.

We cannot grow by spending tax money to create jobs. When you take your wallet out of the right hand pocket of your pants and transfer it to the left side pocket, you aren't a penny richer, and if you hire someone to move the wallet from one pocket to the other for you and let him keep 10 percent of whatever is in it, you most certainly aren't any richer, if you think the Government can tax you and then spend your tax money to "help" you without wasting a lot of your money for administrative costs, you haven't been paying attention to the Federal budget.

Growth in a capitalistic society can come only from capital investment. Our great central planners are not allowing for capital investment and therein lies our problem. I don't like to bore you with figures, but I must recite two simple ones.

In 1950, corporate profits were $22 billion. In 1960, corporate profits were $22 billion. They hadn't increased by a dime in a whole decade. Meanwhile, individual income had increased by nearly 75 percent during that period.

It is, I submit, easier to start a brand new business today than it is to expand and old and established one.

And that is why American isn't growing as fast as Russia, or as fast as West Germany where there is a more realistic understanding of taxes and the requirements of labor.

But I'll tell you what disturbs me most about the months ahead. It's not so much inflation as it is deception. We're deceiving ourselves, about our economy and our economic potential, led along the primrose path of complacency by the pied pipers who write the learned economic theories that get bandied around with idiotic sophistication from Palm Beach to Hyannis Port.

I keep hearing the theory that the bumper crop of babies and the swelling population will automatically insure prosperity. Now I'll admit that babies are consumers, that new marriage formations cause expenditures for homes and furnishings, and insurance. But bulk of population in itself is no guarantee of prosperity.

In 1932 when more babies were born than in any other year in that decade, we reached the bottom of our great depression. More homes were destroyed by fire that year than were built. This, I submit, is not prosperity. Yet population was at a peak and so were births.

There is no guarantee that population and more population will keep everyone's pocketbooks full and everyone's bank balances bulging.

Another way we deceive ourselves, and this is linked with our reliance on the marriage bed to produce our prosperity, is our bland acceptance that in America, the consumer is king. They say that if we continue to spend and spend, and buy and buy, we'll have the most prosperous period in mankind's history.

Well, so we will, but believe me, the consumer is no longer king. He's been dethroned.

It's true that if we spend and spend and buy and buy there will be prosperity, but most of it will cling to the producers of the goods and services you are urged to purchase.

Most of the producers plan to raise prices this coming year. They will be forced to do it because of rising costs of operations. The huge volume of sales they predict for themselves will not in most cases prevent upward price adjustments to some degree.

Since the recession's end corporate earnings have been shooting up at a startling rate. There's the threat in Congress to put across some kind of price policing. The records show that in the "poorest" year in a long time, the automobile industry raised prices. So did the steel industry. So did many steel-using industries. Now most Congressmen aren't smart enough to realize that prices had to rise because operating costs rose and operating costs rose because of benefits and concessions in the wage contracts, so this Congress is going to have a considerable amount to say about prices.

Senator KEFAUVER, head of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, is being prodded by the committee's chief economist, Dr. John M. Blair, a man of peculiar economic philosophies, to lay all the blame for inflation on "administered prices"—that is, prices which are fixed by the producers and do not fluctuate from week to week or from trade to trade.

So we'll get more of this. More delusion and deception to add to the already confused economic thinking of the Nation.

All I'm saying is this: Don't let them kid you about how you, as the consumer, are the king, and that you hold the key in your hand. You are not king. You do not hold the key. Unless perhaps to a limited monarchy, limited by the politicians and by the labor unions.

We fail to learn lessons from our recessions. The last one should have taught us that consumers, given the inducement, will continue to spend most of their money in good times and bad. When they get scared they put their money into savings banks and ask the experts to handle it for them. When they're not scared, they put it into the stock market and fend for themselves.

Consumers spent as much as they could all during the recession. This, more than anything else, hastened the recession's end, as it will hasten the end of any dips which occur in any future economic circumstances.

Everyone seems to know this except the President. He wants standby authority to spend billions to bolster employment in case signs of a recession appear on the horizon.

Mr. Kennedy calls it discretionary authority to help stabilize the economy.

I cannot quarrel with the proposal which would give the President authority to extend unemployment compensation benefits for 13 weeks when, during a recession period exhaustion of benefit rights mounts to unusually high levels. I do not agree with the President, however, that this should be automatic and go into effect when unemployment reaches 5 percent.

The President says he wants standby authority to increase Federal expenditures on capital improvements up to as much as $2 billion. This is altogether too vague, it seems to me, and experience shows us that it is not needed and that it is unlikely that it will effective as an antirecession measure. Nevertheless, the doctrine of spend and spend seems to be the predominant theme in Washington these days.

Ever since the first term of Franklin Roosevelt we have observed that such increases in capital expenditures on the part of Government to counter a recession, normally do not become effective until well after a recovery is underway. Could it be that this is just another excuse for padding the tax rolls, for making an increasing number of voters dependent on this administration? I don't know, but sometimes I'm suspicious of motives when history in this area is so well defined.

I think that we in the business world must then ask ourselves a few simple questions:

First, is this just a simple difference of opinion as to how best to arrive at a mutually sought goal? Is business advocating one approach to that goal and the administration advocating a different approach? Or is the administration keening—leaning—striving toward a different goal entirely, a goal that is antipathetic to the best interests of the American economy as we have known it? What do you think?

Don't you honestly think that this administration wants a different kind of America, an economy that is run from Washington?

Perhaps we should pay closer attention to the things these folks in the administration say and write. I'll give you an example:

Walter Heller, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, the man who, as a hothouse economist drew up a postwar plan for Western Germany only to have the German people repudiate it, and in so doing, became the most spectacularly successful nation in the whole world, now holds the most influential and important economic advisory post in our American Government.

Recently, appearing on a television show conducted by Howard K. Smith on the American Broadcasting Co. network, this man, this man who sets economic policy for this nation said:

"The budget balance rule—the rule that we must have a balanced Federal budget—is a terrible rule * * * the consequences of trying to keep any Federal budget in balance would be that, over the next 10 years we would see recessions which are much deeper and much longer and more painful than the ones we had during the 1950's, and if there are increased demands on the economy for defense spending, we will see periods of price inflation."

TV Commentator Smith asked Heller a direct question: "Should the budget be balanced all of the time or most of the time?"

Replied Heller: "No."

He followed it up with this statement: "We're running about a $7 billion deficit this year, which is not causing a single ripple of inflation. Why? Well, because of the force of that budget deficit which means, after all, that the Government is putting more money into the economy than it is taking out."

Imagine the naivete of the Government's top economist when he believes that the Government can put more money into the economy than it takes out, its only source of money is from the economy, the economy is you and me and our businesses.

We keep hearing from this administration that business needs to be "stimulated."

Business doesn't need to be stimulated, it doesn't want to be stimulated, it just wants to grow and prosper as its managements think best, and not be pushed and pulled by Government into making unwise investments without regard to market forces.

Everything this administration has advocated for the good of the public or the good of business involves, implies or points to Government control.

The administration's tax bill dictates what a business may or may not spend its own money for.

President Kennedy has said repeatedly that the Government doesn't want to fix prices, but of course, in steel the Government did exactly that.

The President has assured business that the Government will manipulate the money market to make more capital available cheaper. What is this if not Government control—and who said that business wants an inflationary cheap money policy with more Government agencies lending tax money to selected businesses which either are politically favored—as the enterprises of Billie Sol Estes, or which fit in with the administration's plans for the economy.

An administration which uses the antitrust laws to coerce businesses and intimidate companies, such as the threat to dismember General Electric unless it signed a decree agreeing not to charge unreasonably low prices, cannot say that it is friendly toward the business community.

Nor can an administration which urges the impaneling of a grand jury to intimidate steel when it raised prices call itself a friend of business.

Nor can such be said of an administration which wants to federalize unemployment compensation, which wants to levy additional taxes on employers to support medical care for aged persons who have already retired from the productive scene, or which wants to have a law requiring prenotification of mergers; or which wants to change the law to bypass the courts on Federal Trade Commission in cease and desist orders.

What can be said about this administration, what should be said about this administration, is that it is engaged in a carefully planned series of moves to gain for the executive branch of Government an effective working control over the whole economy.

There is only one end result of this kind of political maneuver. You can call it statism or centralism if you want, but its true name is socialism.

Socialism—it is hovering over our shoulders. It is as close as tomorrow.

Just a bit more apathy on the part of the voters and their representatives, just a bit more featherheadery on the part of the Washington correspondents and television glamour boys, and we will have it—socialism in its splendor. The President thinks it would be good for us; so do most of his intimate friends and advisers. We should recognize that truth.

If this were not a socialistically inclined government why would it continue to insist upon the continued existence of the Rural Electrification Administration? Insist upon—this administration wants to expand it.

With 98 percent of all farms in America served by either public or private power, and some, indeed, by their own private generating plants, the REA is seeking more money, and receiving a most sympathetic ear in the White House.

REA cooperatives are engaged in a frank and open struggle with the private power companies of America. They are receiving the glowing blessings of the Washington socializers as they gleefully use 2-percent money we give them plus other subsidies, to lure industry right out of the urban areas, mostly served by private utilities, and into rural areas served by REA co-ops, and then, of course, they require Uncle Sam to build new superhighways to the new plants, using your tax money.

I think one of the grandest ideas of all time came from Clyde T. Ellis, REA chief, when he suggested that the REA co-ops take their cash on hand, much of it borrowed from the U.S. Treasury at 2 percent, and buy U.S. Treasury notes and bonds selling at better than 4 percent. That's better than a chain letter for getting rich quick.

For years all of the hillbillies have been electrified. More than 90 percent of the farms were fully electric 15 years ago. The bulk of the electricity REA generates never gets to the hills at all but is used to increase capacity, a sort of ridiculous free ride for the farmers.

And I must say, this certainly proves who the real rubes are.

If you believe the experts, among them the reporters on my staff, we're in for a whale of a consumer's spree after the first of the year. The auto industry, they say, has solved its problem of the sports-car-versus-standard car, and expect sales to be brisk if not record setting. In New York where the largest industry, the garment industry is recovering from its poorest period in a long while, expectations are high. The semimale females and the semifemale males who design women's dresses have finally realized that men like their women to look like women and not like scrawny little boys, and have come up with some feminine type fashions which should sell better. It's this way throughout the economy, new models to tempt wallet-bound dollars, new refrigerators to make better martinis, new vacuum cleaners that do everything but pay your taxes.

And this is America's consumer economy. Now growing, it's a replacement economy. An economy based on obsolescence.

Even so, it gives us a form of prosperity. When there is not prosperity the downturn is cushioned by the social benefits built into our economy so that recessions are short.

What's so bad about all this? It's a fairly pleasant prospect until our foreign competitors catch up with us, but sufficient unto the day, we'll worry about that when it happens.

The hitch is this: We are not considering the major hot war of our time, the hot war between the two economic giants of our land, giant labor and giant capital.

These two great monoliths, engaged in their titanic struggle for supremacy, pose the greatest danger to our economy in our time, greater by far than the threat of imperialistic communism, for together they have created a monitor, a referee, giant government, now more powerful than any other force in the American society. And giant government must always play the numbers game, always seek to appease those who are in numerical superiority, else it cannot perpetuate itself, and it feeds and thrives on the incorrect premise that a majority is always right. A majority is right only now and then. It was a majority of Germans who elected Hitler. Don't forget Hitler was elected. It was a majority of Italians that elected Mussolini. Don't forget Mussolini was elected.

It was a minority of Americans that decided to revolt against the Crown in 1776. It became a majority of Americans only after more than a year had passed. No, what we have today claiming to be a majority is a collection of minorities merged by common fears and cowardice into what seems to be a majority but which is only a vocal vote getting unrepresentative segment of our society.

Out of idealism we created the two warring Goliaths, labor on one side, corporations on the other, and an unbridgable chasm between them.

Nationwide industrywide labor unions with responsibility to no one have so distorted the philosophy of labor that few laboring men have any loyalty to a company or even to an industry, but loyalty only to their union.

What happens as a result of labor's growing tyranny? To stand against the ever-increasing power, the ever-insatiable demands of the nationwide giant labor cartels, corporations themselves must become giants of equal size, acquiring, merging, swelling, until the corporate world towers on the other side of the economic no man's land virtually as formidable as the sprawling unions.

Big corporations, big business of any kind frightens the unions and frightens the vast segment of the populace that is easily muddled and easily led. It makes no difference that unions in America today have almost unlimited economic power. What frightens is a corporation that has power to hire or fire a man, for man is a scared rabbity animal, really not worthy of his own custodianship.

Therefore it is politically expedient for big government to move in and protect big labor against big business. Unions may bargain for a whole industry, but no corporation is allowed to have any dominance over any industry.

Sometimes it is true, an oligopoly emerges, where one corporation controls a whole industry.

There is this one difference. We employ in Washington a whole army of legal experts in the antitrust division of the Justice Department to evoke constant harassment against the corporations to prevent any one of them from getting too big a hunk of the market and to prevent any and all of them from getting together to set prices.

Now I ask you what difference it makes. What is the difference between unions getting together on an industrywide nationwide basis to bargain for wages, or all of the corporations getting together to set prices? There is only a difference in degree. For wages constitute 85 percent of the cost of most manufactured items. Prices constitute, of course, 100 percent of the cost to the consumer. Thus, we have a whole array of legal talent to police 15 percent of the cost of an item, while we ignore those who are responsible for 85 percent of that cost.

I must say, merely as a consumer and a casual and pitifully small investor that the antitrust laws are now the most puzzling laws in the land. Bobby Kennedy and Lee Loevenger have taken action against a company because its prices were higher than a competitor's; they have taken action against another company because its prices were lower than another's; they have taken action against a company because it had prices the same as a competitor and, believe it or not, they have even taken action against a company because it had prices so low a competitor complained it couldn't compete. All of this was done on the basis of protecting the little fellow who is the defenseless consumer.

Ah, the defenseless consumer, pitted against the corporate ogre and the thieves of Wall Street.

On the other side of no man's land, our corporate world, with its own peculiar brand of corporate gutlessness, is not doing much more to protect the free enterprise system than is the industrywide labor union.

Under the extreme and extraordinary pressures by the union, many corporations cannot remain competitive. Every time one collapses at the bottom of the industrial heap it runs to Washington and makes out a case of necessity.

As a result we are subsidizing in one way or another nearly every manufacturing and producing industry in America.

And then we wonder why we are not able to compete in the world markets.

I submit, in time, we will find our manufacturing processes as mired in Government help as is our agricultural industry.

And there goes our free enterprise.

I state these facts deliberately to scare you, for I feel it my mission to arouse the thinking businessmen of this Nation. Our free enterprise system is slipping away from us faster than most of us realize.

If private corporations do not operate our manufacturing and producing facilities, the Government will be forced to do it; and then, those who work for a living will no longer be free to choose careers or individual companies or geographical locations in which to pursue their labors, for they will be indentured workers of the Government.

Starting with first things first, it is my opinion that the great peril lies with the industrywide nationwide labor unions.

Perhaps they should be prohibited by law, I don't know. But if they are not prohibited by law, then the existing laws which discriminate against private enterprise must be revised.

Either way we must find, somewhere, politicians with courage enough to equalize the fight between capital and labor else we will all perish in the battle.

Big government—bigger than either labor or capital—is not the answer to our problem. Otherwise free enterprise will disappear from our land.

This concerns us not alone as patriots, but as husbands, as wives, as fathers, as mothers, and as individual humans, for it is this system which makes us free.

Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, on June 12 of this year I introduced on the floor of the House of Representatives a bill (H.R. 7008) which would make Columbus Day a legal holiday. This is but small recognition for the tremendous contributions which our great Italian community has made to this Nation. Our Italian citizens are prominent in the fields of science, education, politics, and practically every other field where significant public service is rendered. It gives me great pleasure to include in my remarks at this point Senate Resolution 66, which was passed by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on the 1st day of July, 1963. This resolution reflects the deep gratitude of the citizens of my State for the invaluable role which the Italian community plays in our society, by memorializing the Congress of the United States to support and enact into legislation provisions to designate the celebration of Columbus Day, October 12, of each year as a legal public holiday. I sincerely hope that my colleagues will examine the appended resolution, and reflect the appreciation of the Nation by acting favorably on the legislation called for therein.

SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA RESOLUTION

We recognize the innumerable contributions made to civilization by the Italian people and many of our endeavors bear the stamp of Italy's genius.

Columbus is but the greatest of a long list of Italians who, in the service of the western nation, sailed into the unknown and uncharted distant seas.

Each year we turn with a keen sense of gratitude and admiration to Columbus by whom a new continent beyond the ocean was sought and found.

The celebration of Columbus Day as a legal public holiday would fill the hearts of the citizens of this great Nation with justifiable dignity and pride: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to support and enact into legislation provisions to make October 12, being the day celebrated and known as Columbus Day, a legal public holiday; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Presiding Officer of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of senate resolution serial No. 66, introduced by Senators Paul W. Mahady, Thomas J. Kalman, William G. Sesler, John H. Devlin, Anthony J. Di Silvestro, Robert P. Casey, Gus Yatron, Robert D. Fleming, James S. Berger, Martin L. Murray, and Charles R. Weiner, and adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania the 1st day of July, 1963.

MARK GRUELL, Jr.,
Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania.

Independence Day and God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following remarks which were made by my sister, Marjorie Baring, who is an ordained minister, in a speech at the Reno Unity Center on June 30, 1963.

In these days of strife and uncertainty I feel it is well to take a moment to weigh and cogitate just what independence means to us, and to realize that for an individual, or Nation to be independent there must be a dependency upon God.

The remarks follow:

INDEPENDENCE DAY AND GOD

This week we are going to celebrate a national holiday—a very special holiday—Independence Day, or the Fourth of July. This year it should hold more meaning for us than it ever has before, because there probably has never been a time in history when the matter of our freedom could be of more importance to us. Before considering our present-day situation, however, let us return in our imagination for a moment to the year 1776, to the meeting of the Declaration Committee composed of Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Robert R. Livingston, John Adams, and Roger Sherman. This five-member committee performed a function of such vast importance and significance that for 187 years, our country has been allowed to reach the exalted position it now holds in the world of nations.

In June 1776, the Second Continental Congress was assembled in Philadelphia. The battles of Lexington and Concord had been fought, and the Colonies were actually at war with Great Britain. On June 7 Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia, moved Congress that "these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States—absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown." John Adams seconded the motion, and the resolution was adopted on July 2.

In the meantime, Congress appointed a committee to prepare a statement justifying the action which was about to be taken. The report of the five-man committee (Franklin, Jefferson, Livingston, Adams, and Sherman) was largely the work of Thomas Jefferson. After it was vigorously debated in Congress, it was adopted in a somewhat altered form on July 4. This was our Declaration of Independence, although Richard Henry Lee's motion, 2 days earlier, really marked the beginning of the independence of the United States.

The 55 courageous men who met in General Congress assembled, affixed their signature to the Declaration, knowing full well the seriousness and the danger which it involved. Realizing that they took their very lives in their hands, they made very clear their identities, taking every precaution not to implicate or to involve any persons other than themselves. One signer of the Declaration, Charles Carroll, even went so far as to add to his signature, "of Carrollton," in order to prevent the possibility of confusing his name with that of someone else. This was a grave and serious step which our forefathers were taking, but they were moved by a spirit of freedom which beat so wildly in their breasts, that they were willing to risk their lives and their security in order to defend the liberties which they cherished.

and which they believed were bestowed upon them by God. It was a mighty and tremendous decision to stand up and defy the British Crown, but this they did—because they were men who believed in God. I never fail to thrill and to become filled with emotion when I read the closing words of the Declaration of Independence: "And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

By way of comparison, I wonder how many Americans today prize freedom so highly that they would be willing to make the same sacrifices? The early colonists, burdened and oppressed by taxation without representation, and subjected to numerous abuses perpetuated under an absolute despotism, resolved to throw off these acts of tyranny. Today, how many Americans would say with Patrick Henry, "Give me liberty, or give me death"? Our forebears, with a dependence upon God, declared these truths to be self-evident: "That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Then they proved their convictions by rising up to protect their God-given rights as free men. Out of their vision, their courage, and their sacrifice emerged the greatest Government on earth—a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Most important of all, it was a Government established under God.

A very important lesson that all of us must learn is that in order for an individual, or a nation, to be independent, there must be a dependency upon God. Actually, our freedom is dependent upon God, because there is no true freedom apart from God. We gain our independence through our dependence upon God. The person who is wholly dependent upon God, is independent, indeed.

A belief in God has always been a fundamental principle of our American form of Government. Our founding fathers made no secret of their dependence upon God. Not only did they believe in God, but they possessed the courage of their convictions. The Declaration of Independence was an open declaration of their faith in God, evidenced in the words, "with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Province, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." The governmental structure upon which our country was founded was Divinely inspired, and its principles were spiritually conceived. There will always be an America, as long as God is on our side. However, God will be on our side only as long as we are on His side.

Our Nation, founded upon the principles of God, has a spiritual destiny to fulfill—a heritage of freedom. It will only be fulfilled, however, if our people keep their trust in God. Great civilizations have been destroyed—wiped out—when they became spiritually neglectful and morally impoverished. The less spiritual minded a nation becomes, and the more material minded it comes to be, the faster it is headed for destruction. Biblical history shows that this has happened again and again. Today, once more, we are standing upon the threshold of either utter downfall and collapse, through turning our vision away from God—or upon one of the greatest eras of achievement that the world has ever known, providing that our Nation keeps its trust with God.

Political or national freedom comes only after individuals have found freedom through a realization of God. Complete dependence upon God is our only assurance of independence from slavery. In its deeper sense, freedom actually is not something that can be bestowed upon individuals by any form of government. True freedom is a state of being which God intended us to enjoy. We enter into freedom through an awareness of this truth, and a complete dependence upon God. It is the very nature of the spirit of man to be free. Anything which tends to limit, bind, thwart or hamper the free expression of this spirit (which is of God) is a form of slavery. Our freedom is the most priceless possession we have, and it is a gift from God. The only way that it can be preserved, is by being extremely conscious of this God-bestowed gift. When this truth is compromised in any way, or when we concede to any man-made form of restriction, we violate a sacred law of God, which law is freedom of expression. (In other words, we are to be free in our expression of His Spirit.) Therefore, it is necessary for us to be extremely conscious of our God-given heritage of freedom.

Today we hear a lot about radicals and extremists. In fact, the word, extremist, has been so greatly misused that there is what amounts to almost a stigma attached to it. This is really unfortunate, because it is a sad state of affairs when a person who loves his country to a great degree is called an extremist. Personally, I think that it is highly important for all of us to be extreme in our love for God and for our country. As long as it is founded upon the principles of God, we should love our country extremely. In my opinion, there could be nothing worse than a lukewarm attitude toward God and country. I believe that Jesus Christ meant that we should be extreme in our love for God when He said, "Thou shalt love the Lord they God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength." He also said, to the church of the Laodiceans, "I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou were cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth."

There are all too many lukewarm Christians, and all too many lukewarm Americans today. They have become so concerned with the material things of life, and trying to get something for nothing, that they have conceded more and more things of the spirit to the things of the material world. They forget that a people dependent upon the Government is a people deprived of their freedom. For the last several decades there has been a growing tendency on the part of the American people to relinquish more and more of their personal freedoms to the Government. Our Founding Fathers never intended it that way. Their aim was not a strong and powerful Government, but rather one which, through a system of checks and balances, was designed to vest the greater power in the people. Modern-day Americans seem to have lost sight, also, of what it says in the Bible: "The government shall be upon His shoulders"—meaning God's shoulders. When we turn our backs upon the principles of God, we suffer the loss of our freedom.

Getting back to the matter of so-called extremists. I think that it is high time for thinking Americans to reevaluate this word. There are forces at work in our country today who would like to have us diminish our patriotic fervor. They would attempt to destroy our national pride and devotion, as well as to break down our allegiance to God and to country. So insidious are the methods which they use to try to silence us, that even "the elect" are liable to be deceived. Under the misleading guise of "one worldism," they attempt to promote a false doctrine of brotherhood, whereby an appeal is made to unsuspecting Christian people.

Now, I want to make myself perfectly clear. I am not speaking here of brotherhood in its true and spiritual sense. Certainly, every one of us, as Christians, would welcome the idea of one world under God, but the prospect of one world under godless atheism is something entirely different. So that there will be no misunderstanding, I want to make this differentiation very plain. A true brotherhood under the fatherhood of God, should, I believe, be the goal and the hope of every dedicated Christian. However, there can be no true Christian brotherhood when it is obtained at the cost of freedom. A brotherhood of vanquished people is a brotherhood of slaves. A people brought under the domination of a one-world godless regime is a brotherhood enslaved to godlessness and atheistic practices. Communism is atheism.

The forces which would attempt to stamp out our nationalistic ideals, in an effort to have us embrace a false theory of one worldism, are making a concentrated drive to break down our traditional and patriotic love for country. Every day true American patriots, who believe in the tenets set forth in the U.S. Constitution, are branded as "extremists" belonging to the "lunatic fringe." In spite of this, I have faith to believe that there are millions of true and courageous American patriots today who share the sentiments contained in the words, "Breathes there a man with soul so dead, who never to himself has said, this is my own, my native land?"

Our own John Glenn, following his successful venture into space, openly professed his faith in God, and publicly declared his love for country. I am sure that he endeared himself to millions of patriotic Americans when he said that he still gets a thrill when he sees the American flag passing by. It is neither old-fashioned nor unsophisticated to pay tribute to Old Glory. Our flag is not just something to display on holidays, or to view in a passing parade. It is a symbol of all that America means. It signifies our faith in God, our belief in freedom, and our right to the pursuit of happiness. It is a most sacred emblem.

Gordon Cooper, in his speech before the joint session of Congress, ended with the prayer, "that we may shape our lives so that we may be better Christians." I could not help but think, after hearing both of these splendid American astronauts, that as long as our Nation has men such as these, the country is in good hands.

The Government which our Founding Fathers created is inseparably linked with a belief in God. Likewise, the motto, "In God we trust," is the very essence of our way of life, and the reason for America's greatness. To retain this greatness, however, simply to give lipservice to a belief in God is not enough. There are many people who say that they believe in God. The question is, "How many individuals have actually found Him?" To believe in God, and to know God, are two vastly different things. The richest experience that can come to an individual is to know God, as an actuality. To have the experience of God in one's life is the beginning of personal freedom.

As long as we are dependent upon persons, upon things or upon any manmade form of government, we are actually not free. We may think that certain individuals, or wealth, or a particular government may make us free, but this is really not so. There are many millionaires who are not free. There are people living under a free system of government who certainly are not free—free from worry, fear, or troubles. Spiritual freedom is that peace that passes understanding, and it is not dependent on anything in the outer world. It is dependent on only one thing—our relationship with God. When this becomes real to us, it becomes the most important thing in our lives. Then we find ourselves living in two worlds—the inner world, which is the real one, and the outer world, which becomes relatively unimportant. We know then that the outer world is dependent upon the inner one. As God becomes a reality to us, and we become consciously one with Him, He guides every step of our way. He protects us, He supplies us and He draws to us everything that is necessary for our spiritual welfare. Only God can deliver mankind from the problems which are confronting the world today. What He can do for the individual, He can do for humanity, at large. Only God can make us free. Jesus Christ said, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." If the world had known the truth, past civilizations would not have perished. Our present civilization, even though it appears to be on the brink of disaster, need not follow the way of destruction. There is a way of deliverance.

Two thousand years ago, Jesus Christ announced, "I am the way, the truth, and the life." Down through the ages the light has been kept alive in the world by the few who have discovered the truth that makes men free. In fact, spiritual truth was not given to the masses, at large, until the last three-quarters of a century. Up until that time the inner truth was more or less guarded by philosophers, priests, and rabbis. Religious knowledge on the part of the masses was generally confined to ceremonies, forms, rituals, and creeds. Even the multitudes whom Jesus reached with the truth, composed a very small part of the masses. However, during the past fourscore years a spiritual change has been taking place in the world, wherein many individuals have awakened to the fact that it is possible for mankind in general to reach conscious oneness with God. We have come to know that this God-experience is not confined to the priesthood or to the ministry, alone. This God-consciousness is the one bright hope on today's horizon, and it is the only way of solving the world's dilemma. It is possible for a consciousness of God to pervade and to control the entire consciousness of the world, influencing our world leaders and our international relationships.

Let us, therefore, not only look well to the faith of our forefathers, and their dependence upon God, but let us work toward that greater freedom which comes from a conscious union with Father within—using as our pattern the words of Jesus, "The Father within me, He doeth the works."

As each one of us finds that inner freedom, we will know the meaning of true independence, and every day will be independence day—with God.

Governor Brown's Message to Special Session of California State Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month Gov. Edmund G. Brown, of California, called the California State Legislature into special session for action in the Governor's words "on additional State aid to local school districts, on substantial augmentation of the inadequate budget now in effect, and on revenue measures to finance the necessary new fiscal commitments."

This message by Gov. "Pat" Brown is a forceful forthright statement. It deals with problems and issues which are of concern to us all. It is the action of a responsible, able, and dedicated public servant, and I commend it to our colleagues for their attention:

MESSAGE TO THE CALIFORNIA STATE LEGISLATURE BY EDMUND G. BROWN, GOVERNOR

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, members of the legislature, my fellow Californians: This is, in all respects, an extraordinary session of the 1963 legislature. Its origins are unusual. Its purposes are compelling and its outcome will be decisive for the modern history of California.

We are here because it is my constitutional duty to call you into special session whenever I believe the welfare of the people of California makes such action necessary. I stand before you to carry out a second constitutional obligation—to set forth the specific problems which I regard as of such urgency and importance as to require your immediate attention.

I will recommend solutions to the problems before us, doing so in the full knowledge that you also have constitutional responsibilities and that yours are both distinct and different.

It is my duty to propose. It is yours to dispose.

This difference alone invariably leads to conflict between the executive an dthe legislative process. But where this conflict is based on issues and not on abstract partisanship, it has always provided a crucible in which ideas are tested and tempered.

It is my hope that this session will prove to be such a crucible of issues and that we will work together with as little partisanship as possible. I ask only mutual understanding and tolerance, and a mutual acceptance of the highest duty imposed on each of us—to act for the well-being of nearly 18 million Californians.

It was recently said—and mistakenly—that I have insufficient regard for the legislative process. I have great respect both for the process and for those involved in it. But my respect for the legislative process is in no way incompatible with my conviction that a Governor has a duty to lead. Moreover, he has a responsibility to exercise all the powers of his office to secure affirmative action on proposals he believes to be crucial to the welfare of his State.

I will continue to press for what I believe to be right.

I will also continue to respect your privilege to arrive at your own decisions according to your collective conscience.

Let us, then, approach this session in the same spirit of collaboration which has produced such great achievements in service to our people in the past 4 years.

I will now turn to the specific issues before us.

In my proclamation, I call for action on additional State aid to local school districts, on substantial augmentation of the inadequate budget now in effect, and on revenue measures to finance the necessary new fiscal commitments.

Each of these issues was before you at the regular session and we were close to agreement on all of them when time ran out.

A compromise report of your conference committee, calling for additional school aid of $40 million this year and $60 million next year, was ready for action by both the senate and assembly if supporting revenue had meen available.

A compromise budget from your conference committee also was apparently acceptable—both to you and to me—if the revenues to finance it had been available through enactment of my recommendations for revenue reform.

Unlike the skeleton, emergency budget which finally came to my desk, the compromise budget was a realistic and sincere effort to cope with the State's most urgent requirements.

The revenue reform proposals themselves had the support of a majority of both the senate and the assembly. Only the special privilege requiring that certain changes in our bank and corporation franchise tax laws must have a two-thirds majority forces us to have this extraordinary session at all. I might point out at this time that, by contrast, a change in tax laws covering individuals and consumers needs only a simple majority.

Were it not for the special privilege accorded banks and corporations, we would now have an adequate budget. We would now have adequate assistance to local school districts. And, perhaps most important of all, we would now have adequate revenues to finance State services not only through this year but at a minimum through next year as well.

To sum it up, a handful of votes against inclusion of banks and corporations in a pay-as-you-go revenue collection plan was all that kept the 1963 legislature from capping a session of great achievement with a sound approach to California's fiscal future.

I will take up with you first the question of revenue which—because of its impact on public education this year and next—must be the keystone of all progress at this special session.

In the general session, I came before you with a series of revenue reforms which would fund our current requirements from current income. They would meet our peoples' needs without recourse to new or higher taxes and would bring our collection procedures into line with the more modern practices of other States and the Federal Government.

I have, since the adjournment of that session, reexamined my recommendations both in the light of general principle and of specific provisions. I still believe the principle is correct and the provisions are fair.

But in weighing alternatives to my recommendations, I was limited to two suggestions which have been brought forth in the interim between sessions.

The first is that we "learn to live" with the skeleton—budget now in effect—that we mark time for a year to gage the exact detriment to our State which would result from underfinancing.

The second is that we impose new or higher taxes at this special session.

Neither alternative seems satisfactory to me nor, I am certain, to most of you.

Apart from the obvious injustice to many millions of our citizens—ranging from the child in school to the retired teacher living on $70 a month—underfinancing of State government can only set off a chain reaction that will damage California for long years into the future.

A State whose population grows by 600,000 a year can no more stand still than it can retreat. It must accept its new obligations. It must give its people not pauper government but the best possible government.

As for the suggestion that we raise taxes or expand the tax base at this session, that also fails to recognize the obvious fiscal realities.

There is absolutely no need for new or higher taxes.

But there is a need for more efficient collection of the taxes we now levy. If, as I propose, we bring tax payments more current with the services they finance, this—in combination with our expanding economy—will enable us to hold the tax line for at least 2 years and perhaps as long as 4 years.

I would still wish that my original recommendations might come to my desk in the form of legislation. But I recognize that present circumstances indicate certain changes in approach may be helpful.

I am ready to take this initiative in altering certain provisions of my original program.

I am also ready—as I have been in the past—to accept any workable alternative which you may devise in your deliberations.

I am still convinced that the revenue needs of California can be met for the present without new or higher taxes, but meeting those needs is more important than the methods we employ.

If the legislature can work out a different—but fair and equitable—method of meeting the needs of California, it will not concern me that it differs from my own recommendations.

Like most Californians, I want above all to see the job done.

My revenue recommendations are these:

1. Approve the insurance acceleration tax as it was amended in the senate in the general session.

2. Approve a revised bank and corporation tax measure which ends the installment payment privilege and provides for future pay-as-you-go features.

The legislation I presented to you has been amended.

In its new form, it will require only a simple majority in both houses and will provide a new set of procedures, including a 3-year transition period to a system of fully current payments. The net revenue effect would be the same in 1963–64 as my original proposal but would vary in succeeding years.

3. Approve a set of revised personal income tax bills which would:

(a) End the present system of installment payments for individuals.

(b) Put personal income taxes on a pay-as-you-go basis on January 1, 1965, with a 50-percent forgiveness of the 1964 taxes due April 15, 1965.

(c) Exempt from income tax liability all single persons whose tax would be less than $5 and all couples whose tax would be less than $10.

This pay-as-you-go plan for personal income taxes would mean absolutely no windfall to the state and would result in no additional revenue for the next 2 fiscal years, but it would provide substantial continuing revenues for State services thereafter. Beginning in 1965–66, we would achieve this larger return of more than $50 million a year by eliminating tax evasion, which now costs us many millions a year, and by bringing our revenues current with our incomes and our fiscal obligations to schools and other service programs.

Under this new proposal, taxpayers would begin paying taxes in current installments on January 1, 1965, for that year. On April 15, 1965—when his 1964 tax came due—the taxpayer would be forgiven half of the amount—that is, the equivalent of 6 months' taxes.

Having paid installments for only 6 months, he would actually be 3 months ahead. By July 1, 1965, he would be exactly even and paying on a current basis, with no penalty at all in the transition.

Financing of the issues before you during the next year is not contingent on approval of the pay-as-you-go plan. We can complete our business in this special session without it. Let me caution you, however, that I believe you could make no greater mistake than to defer action.

If you approve this plan, we have a chance of holding the line on taxes in 1965–66. If you do not, there can be no question that we will face new revenue requirements in that year.

The pay-as-you-go plan payment of tax collection is good, sound business. We should and will come to it eventually. The Federal Government has it. New York has it under Republican Governor Rockefeller. Oregon has it under Republican Governor Hatfield. And both have told me it is popular both with employees and employers who would not go back to the old system if they could.

Consider, too, that 27 of the 32 States with a general personal income tax already collect it in this manner and all have found it a great improvement over the old system.

Objections to current payment of taxes in California have been both partisan and groundless, and are raised by the same forces of reaction which oppose almost everything most of you believe in.

Support for the plan, on the other hand, has come from nearly every organization and group which helped elect the majority of members in both houses of the legislature.

The self-serving use of the issue of withholding by the State chamber of commerce and by the banks and corporations which set policy for the chamber has been a deep disappointment to me.

During the past 4 years, I have worked closely with these corporate interests under the impression that we shared a concern for the future of California and the needs of its people. I was persuaded that their approach was one of enlightened self-interest. I thought they saw the advantage to themselves and to their customers in public investments in schools, scholarships, mental health programs, and humane, progressive government.

I now find that they are willing to forgo those programs if it means they must join everybody else in California in a program which requires a pay-as-you-earn approach to taxation.

Let us examine some of the needs which cannot be met with the skeleton budget now in effect but which can be met if favorable action is given to my revenue recommendations.

Of overriding importance, of course, is the necessity to provide more assistance to local school districts. This will at once improve the quality of public education in California and ease the heavy burden that now falls on all local property taxpayers.

I base my recommendations for school aid legislation on the report of your conference committee. It would increase State aid by $40 million in fiscal 1963–64, and by $60 million in fiscal 1964–65.

It would also impose new and useful standards for expenditure and a formula for equalizing the property taxes for school purposes on a countywide basis.

The school aid recommendation contains one major new feature, however. It provides that the second-year program will not take effect unless the special session provides adequate revenues for the entire 2-year span of the legislation.

Although additional assistance to local schools is the most important matter before you, it is also urgent that we remedy other deficiencies in the temporary budget under which we are now operating.

In general, I propose that you follow the lines of the budget report prepared by your conference committee just prior to the failure of the revenue reforms at the general session. I also propose that you add other important items.

I believe you should restore the original budget amounts for care of crippled children. Without additional funds, this all-important program of hospitalization and rehabilitation will falter before the year is out. The Department of Public Health estimates that 6,000 youngsters will be turned away from clinics around this State because the funds are exhausted. These are youngsters for whom help must be given now or never.

This program better than any other sets the terms of the choice which has brought us back to Sacramento:

Do we save the children or do we save the money?

I attach high priority also to an appropriation for more books for local libraries. And we must, to keep faith, restore funds for 760 scholarships already awarded to outstanding students in our State.

These are scholars with special ability—young men and women we count on to lead the State forward in the next generation. Each of them made plans for entering school on the basis of scholarships the State of California officially awarded early this year. For most, the withdrawal of the scholarship means drifting for a year because it is too late now to make other plans for the fall semester.

I believe, too, that you should augment the budget with funds for minimal salary increases for many of our State employees. There is already too great a gap between State salaries and those in private industry and competing public jurisdictions.

This inequity is resulting not only in large-scale resignations from State service, among such professional classes as engineers and auditors, but is making it increasingly difficult to recruit replacements.

Finally, I would place special emphasis on an appropriation for additional Fair Employment Practices Commission staff to administer our new Fair Housing Law.

This important legislation, which places California in the forefront of States striving toward equal human rights, is without real force or effect if we fail to provide funds for its proper administration.

I am also asking $125,000 for an executive tax study. Among the items of legislation which failed at the last moment because of the revenue problem was a bill creating a Tax Study Commission; a measure which had bipartisan support. The task of appraising the local-state tax relationship is an urgent one. Under the constitution, the Governor has a mandate to propose a budget with detailed revenue proposals to support it. Without this tax study, that mandate cannot be properly fulfilled.

I have also included in this budget those items which I struck because they committed the State to projects which were out of place in a skeleton budget; or because they committed us to long-term expenditures without any revenues in sight to support them.

Approval of the revenue program would clearly justify them as augmentations.

Certain persons have ascribed political motives to my actions in further reducing the skeleton budget. To them, I would say this:

Four and one-half years ago, I stood before a legislature as Governor for the first time. I spelled out the facts of a fiscal crisis, handed over to me by an administration which had not been able to persuade members of its own party to meet its obligations.

On that day, I asked for new taxes. Men of conscience of both parties displayed great political courage in meeting the challenge and in voting to approve new taxes.

It was their courage that put California in the black; that enabled us to proceed with six new State colleges and three new University of California campuses; that enabled California once again to become the most progressive and prosperous State in the Nation.

Many of them are here today, and I salute them once more.

I salute them because they rejected the easy expedient of voting tens of millions of dollars for worthy projects in their districts and then voting against the new taxes needed to pay for those projects.

I can respect the honest conservative who votes against both taxes and appropriations or the honest newspaper which fights both.

But I cannot respect people who ask for public money for public purposes—and usually good public purposes—but who refuse to help pay for them or support those who do help.

They did not help build this country and they do not help build California.

The California Legislature is now back in session.

Approach the task before you with confidence in the future of our great State and confidence in our people to sustain a system of government that looks to the future and not to the past.

Accept my pledge that this administration will continue to exercise all possible economies in the administration of the funds you appropriate. We came to the end of the fiscal year just 8 days ago with a $30 million surplus in our treasury, despite the greatest demands for services in the long history of our State. I will continue to demand new economies of the departments in the year ahead.

In weighing dollars against human needs, consider also that our economy is moving toward new high ground. Employment is shattering all records. Per capita income and sales are constantly rising. And corporate profits, too, are at an all-time high.

All indications point to the most profitable year for business since World War II. And California, which leads the Nation in so many other respects, is also leading in the expansion of its economic base—the bedrock on which your fiscal deliberations must rest.

One cannot look at California today without hope—without certainty that here we are building the best of all human societies.

This surge toward the future, which you and I have the responsibility of directing, requires of us courage, not timidity—the broad view of statemanship, not the narrow view of partisanship.

Chief Justice Earl Warren says it well. Speaking of California last week, he said:

"It's a State that has guts. People back there go out and do things. They don't stand still. That's what makes California great. Whenever there is a chance for improvement—whenever something new or modern is needed, people back there aren't afraid to spend. They get the job done—and it has always paid off. They're terrific."

I agree and I know you agree.

Let's get the job done.

Now, for J.F.K.—Four Jets, Two Yachts, Big Cars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, during the Eisenhower administration, Ike, from time to time, would come under fire from the opposition for "spending too much time away from the White House" and that he made far too many additions to the White House transportation fleet. The then Senator Kennedy during the presidential campaign of 1960 further attempted to reflect adversely on Ike by indicating that he would be a "full-time" President, always on the job instead of on a golf course.

Recent reports have shown the statement of the campaigning Kennedy to be a farce in that President Kennedy has spent more time away from the White House than did Ike and that J.F.K. has the "transport pool" to insure the pace of frequent departures to distant places.

The July 22, 1963, issue of U.S. News & World Report has a detailed account indicating that no previous President or foreign potentate ever has had such a "transport pool" at his disposal. Just think, Mr. Speaker, this even includes King Saud and his entire harem. This report will certainly open one's eyes to the pleasure-seeking habits of the Kennedys and their clan, and I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues and the citizens of this country.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article at this point:

[From U.S. News & World Report, July 22, 1963]

NOW FOR J.F.K.—FOUR JETS, TWO YACHTS, BIG CARS

Additions are on order for the White House air fleet, which already has grown to record size. The jet-engine helicopters are only part of it. Add them to the jetliners, two yachts, special limousines, and a railroad car—it mounts up to quite an impressive "transport pool" that is on call for President Kennedy and his staff.

Now President Kennedy is getting two more twin-jet helicopters.

At a cost of $1,125,000 each, the new machines will replace the two remaining single-engine helicopters in the White House whirlybird fleet, which, since President Kennedy took office, has grown from 4 to 10.

Mr. Kennedy, in a personal letter, requested congressional approval of the purchase of the additional jet-powered "choppers."

Representative GEORGE H. MAHON, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, announced on July 9 that the subcommittee had given its approval. Committee decisions are made behind closed doors—but there were indications that some members of the subcommittee opposed the purchase. Other members, however, adhered to the congressional tradition that such a personal request of the President should be regarded favorably.

Disclosure of the latest additions to the White House helicopter squadron is drawing attention, once again, to the vast array of transportation facilities available to the President.

It also points up the rapid growth in the fleet of Presidential copters since their regular use was pioneered by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1957.

In that year, two helicopters, costing about $60,000 each, were acquired for the White House. They were four-seaters. One carried the President, the pilot and a Secret Service man. The other carried three more Secret Service agents.

All of the twin-jet copters now used by the White House are 10-seaters. They are maintained by the Army and Marine Corps for transportation of the President, his family, and his top aids on short hops. There are landing pads on the White House grounds, at the Presidential retreat at Camp David, Md., and at Hyannis Port, Mass. The new home of the President and Mrs. Kennedy on Rattlesnake Mountain, in Virginia about 45 miles from Washington, will be just a 20-minute helicopter hop from the White House.

Officially, the President's helicopter fleet is justified as a defense expenditure on the ground that such transportation might be needed to whisk high officials of the Government to safe and secret command posts if the Capital came under enemy missile attack.

In actual practice, however, it enables the Kennedys to call for a helicopter as casually as earlier residents of the White House called for a car—or still earlier ones for a carriage. Four helicopters are always ready to go on a moment's notice, the White House says.

Use of helicopters by the President and top officials of his administration is so widespread that a $4.3 million heliport is being planned. Probable location: Fort Myer, Va., just a couple of miles—as the whirlybird flies—from the White House. It would be an operating base complete with refueling, servicing, and storage facilities. At present, the White House copters are based at more distant installations.

The 10 White House helicopters, representing an investment of over $15 million—with maintenance costing at least half a million dollars a year—are only a small part of the air, land, and sea armada that is available to President Kennedy.

MOST EXPENSIVE ITEM

The costliest vehicle for Presidential travel is *Air Force No. 1*, the blue, white, and gold jetliner used by the President on his recent trip to Europe. This fan-jet Boeing 707-320B airplane cost U.S. taxpayers upward of $8 million. Three other Boeing 707's are assigned by the Air Force to "special mission" White House duty. For flights to airports which cannot handle jet planes, Mr. Kennedy uses an Air Force Douglas DC-6B, which, like *Air Force No. 1*, is luxurously equipped.

One dramatic demonstration of how jet-powered transportation enables the President to keep a tight schedule while covering enormous distances came last month. On the night of June 9, Mr. Kennedy left Honolulu after delivering an address there. Next morning, he delivered another address at American University in Washington—nearly 5,000 miles from Honolulu.

The Air Force also keeps in readiness a "flying command post" equipped with communications devices which would enable the President and military chiefs to direct U.S. defense and counterattack forces anywhere in the world. This plane, a modified KC-135 stratotanker—military forerunner to the 707—could stay aloft for days with aerial refueling.

THE FLYING PRESIDENTS

The late Franklin D. Roosevelt was the first President to travel extensively by air. The name *Sacred Cow* was given to a plane used by FDR, which had a special elevator to enable him to board and deplane without being removed from his wheel chair. Harry S. Truman, with his presidential aircraft, perpetuated the *Sacred Cow* nomenclature. President Eisenhower used a succession of planes named *Columbine* for the State flower of Colorado. President Kennedy's air fleet, of course, far eclipses those of his predecessors.

AUTOS FOR WHITE HOUSE USE

The first U.S. President to ride in an automobile was William McKinley. The first to approve an official auto fleet for the White House was William Howard Taft. Those Presidents, however, probably could not have dreamed of a motor vehicle with the features and accessories boasted by the 21-foot presidential Continental which is used by Mr. Kennedy on ceremonial occasions in Washington or other places to which the car is sent in advance by air.

Built by the Ford Motor Co. and leased to the White House for a nominal sum, the huge car has a rear seat that can be raised and lowered automatically, retractable foot stands for Secret Service men, and a pair of two-way radio telephones. The President can ride under a metal roof, a transparent plastic "bubble top" or a convertible top. Three other White House cars are for the exclusive use of the President and members of his family. The Secret Service maintains an automobile fleet of its own, including two touring cars especially designed at a cost of $65,000 each.

IDLE RAILROAD CAR

A special railroad car is made available to Mr. Kennedy when he wishes to travel by rail. In the jet age, this doesn't happen often. The last time the President used this means of transportation was on his return to Washington from the Army-Navy football game in Philadelphia last year. He had flown to Philadelphia.

A NAUTICAL INCLINATION

As a former naval officer with a lifelong love of the sea, Mr. Kennedy makes frequent use of the two presidential yachts, the *Honey Fitz* and the *Patrick J.* The vessels were renamed by him in honor of his grandfathers, John ("Honey Fitz") Fitzgerald and Patrick J. Kennedy.

The 92-foot *Honey Fitz,* which cost $140,000 to recondition during the Eisenhower administration, is kept at Palm Beach, Fla., during the winter and at Hyannis Port in the summertime. The 60-foot *Patrick J.* is berthed at Washington. Replacement cost of the two yachts, at today's prices, would exceed $500,000. Mr. Kennedy also, on occasion, has used the Navy's 104-foot yacht *Sequoia* to cruise on the Potomac River. And, on vacation, he has sailed the 62-foot racing yawl *Manitou,* owned by the Coast Guard.

The Navy says maintenance of the *Honey Fitz* and the *Patrick J.* costs about $20,000 a year. This, of course, is in addition to the pay drawn by the 25 naval officers and enlisted men assigned to the two yachts.

Besides the actual operating costs, the Federal Government spends hundreds of thousands of dollars every year to maintain and guard the White House fleet of helicopters, airplanes, automobiles and yachts.

No other U.S. President—and, for that matter, no foreign potentate—ever has had at his disposal such a varied array of transport for journeys long or short, swift or slow, on land or sea or in the air, for business or pleasure.

Interest Rates and Balance of Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, both the Senate and the House individually, and in joint hearings, are showing a proper and well-deserved concern over the balance-of-payment situation in the United States. A strong sentiment has been expressed in all the hearings relative to this subject, for an increase in interest rates as an effective device to stem the outflow of cash from the United States to other countries which might have, at a given moment, a more lucrative short-term interest rate. The argument has some semblance of plausibility and emanates from sources carrying a high degree of respectability.

However, as in most decisions made in these complex days, it is of the greatest importance that we analyze most critically such a suggestion on the basis of whether it will, in fact, get for us the results promised, and, on the basis of whether it carries a price tag we can afford to pay.

On the first of these questions, it is interesting that the Associated Press, on July 15 of this year, carried a story out of New York, from which I quote:

> There is no systematic relationships between interest rates on the availability of credit in the United States and the flow of money overseas, a study by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York concluded Wednesday.
>
> Evidence regarding the question of whether international capital and gold flows tend to be interest induced is becoming more abundant and more confusing, the survey found.

It had already occurred to some of us that the so readily accepted relationships between capital and gold outflow and interest rates might be subject to serious doubts. Contributing to this dubious attitude was the observation that a goodly number of European countries, which had interest rates substantially below those now current in the United States, were not experiencing any problem in balance of payments.

Now, about the price tag on to readily accepting the suggestion of increase in interest rates as a solution to our international money problems. Let us see how this would in fact work. The Federal Reserve Board, which has control of such matters, would authorize an increase in interest rates on short-term Government securities. This would in turn, immediately be reflected in all other fields of credit. I quote from the Wall Street Journal of June 26, 1963, to emphasize the point.

> Short-term interest rates rose on several fronts in the money market. Several big sales finance firms and commercial paper dealers increased rates by one-eighth of a percentage point on some maturities of paper. And dealers in bankers' acceptances announced a similar rise in all maturities. The increase followed a continuing upward trend in yields on Treasury bills, which tend to set the pattern for short-term rates.

What would the contemplated rise do to our domestic economy? Already, debt service load domestically is rather high. At present interest levels, over $10 billion is required just to pay the interest on the national debt, and this represents over 10 percent of the 1963 budget. For the average consumer the story is also not bright. Payments on installment paper and personal loans will amount to over $54 billion in 1963, which is a record high of 13.6 percent of all disposable income for the year. These figures are from the May 1963 issue of the Federal Reserve Bulletin. A previous issue points out that in 1962 individual income from interest was at $34 billion, and this does not reflect the interest income of corporate bodies.

There are two very important aspects of this interest load picture. One is that interest income represents a very significant shift of economic wealth in our economy. The other is that interest income siphons off dollar volume from more dynamic economic activity where dollar velocity plays such an important role in economic growth and expansion. Higher interest will endanger the economic advance. Finally, we could legitimately question the arbitrary increase in interest rates as a tool for international monetary control, when it is so contrary to the domestic economic facts. There is no shortage of lending funds. In fact, saving institutions have been hard pressed to find sound and remunerative investments for the funds now in hand. There is no possible incentive in such a situation for inflation. Quite to the contrary, with high savings, high unemployment, unused productive capacity, and a drive on to reduce Government spending all the factors to dictate an opposite move in the domestic scene are at work.

It is not demonstrated technically, by expert opinion, or ordinarily, by commonsense, that an increase in interest rates is either wise or necessary as a control move for international monetary balance for the United States.

What are some of the commonsense aspects of our gold outflow position? At the risk of over simplifying and stating the obvious, could we point out two:

First. We started out in the post World War II era with the giant share of the gold. By dint of being in the position of world banker during the war, and with a productive capacity which was never impaired by bombers or buzz bombs, the United States ended the war period with a substantial part of the world's gold.

It also is rather common knowledge that the output of gold from all the available sources in the world has only been a fraction of the requirements to back up a worldwide currency growth which could match the prewar growth in gross national production of all the nations. From 1950 to 1960, this growth of production which called for expansion of both credit and currency, was explosive. Naturally the heavy demand would be felt most where the gold was, that is, in the United States.

Second. At the risk of seeming disrespectful I think a little analogy to Las Vegas would be helpful. The housemen will tell you in a casino the money goes where the action is. That is you find a craptable with a crowd pressing to get in close enough to place a bet, and you will find one or more hot rollers, persons who are holding the dice for a period of time and rolling lots of numbers. This gives the evident possibility for bets which pay off—whether you are playing it close with the six-eight combinations, betting the line—the come—the field—or any craps. There is action for all and possible return commensurate with the odds. What we have been witnessing in international economics is not unlike the rush at the casino craptable. The action has been in West Germany, Italy, and France, and the Benelux countries. The action there has promised a wide variety of opportunity for returns and the money has gone with the action. It could only go from where it was to where it could get this action. And, we know where it was—in the vaults of Fort Knox.

We should realize from this that our best approach to the balance-of-payments problem is to increase the economic activity in the United States. An increase in interest will not do that. A reduction in taxes properly balanced between forces for consumption and forces for production could. Increase in support and encouragement for exports could.

We do have some limitations. We will have to maintain a leadership in technology. We will have to develop a flexibility in international credit which will take up the slack created by the continuing lag in gold production. Most burdensome of all, we have to continue to support and protect the dollar as the most popular medium of international exchange.

Government Stockpiles a Natural Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, much has been said recently and much more will be said in the days ahead concerning the stockpiling of strategic and critical materials and particularly so-called surpluses of such materials.

As part of the background for the discussion of our stockpiles I think it would be well for all Members to refresh their memories concerning the origin of the stockpile and some of the dangers involved in indiscriminate disposals. It is for this reason that I call the attention of the House to an article on the subject by Mr. Jess Larson, a man who has had as much experience as any other single individual in the Government's procurement of defense materials.

Following World War II service, Mr. Larson became general counsel of the War Assets Administration in 1946 and head of the agency in 1947. In 1949 President Truman appointed him administrator of the Federal Works Agency and later the same year he became first head of the new General Services Administration, a post he filled until February 1953. From 1951–53, he was also chief of the Defense Materials Procurement Agency with primary responsibility for the expansion of minerals production during the Korean War. A major general in the Air Force Reserve, Mr. Larson currently practices law in Washington, D.C.

Under leave previously granted I include with my remarks the article by Mr. Larson, titled "Government Stockpiles: A National Asset," which appears in volume 28, No. 7, 1963 issue of Inco magazine published by the International Nickel Co., Inc.:

GOVERNMENT STOCKPILES: A NATIONAL ASSET

For the past 15 months, the U.S. Government has been actively reexamining its policies on stockpiling of strategic and critical materials as a safeguard against possible shortages during war or other national emergency. This reappraisal is due primarily to the efforts of my friend and colleague in the Truman administration, Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri.

Senator SYMINGTON, who shared with me the tribulations of the production emergency during the Korean War, had long felt that the veil of secrecy which surrounded Government stockpile holdings as late as January 1962 was no longer justified. He therefore urged President Kennedy to release all stockpile data and to begin a full-scale review of stockpiling policies. Senator SYMINGTON himself began a lengthy Senate investigation into all phases of stockpiling; for the first time disclosing details on the extent of U.S. holdings and the nature of U.S. materials requirements. It was my pleasure to testify before the Symington Subcommittee on the operation of the Defense Materials Procurement Agency during my stewardship. I did not then attempt to comment in detail on the current stockpiling situation. But in view of the fact that attention is now shifting from past history to the policy implications, I am pleased to take the opportunity now to state the views which I have derived from my experience in this field both in and out of Government.

At the outset, let me say that release to the public of detailed information on the stockpiling programs was long overdue. Once we achieved our stockpiling goals, secrecy added little to our national security, but served to create unnecessary doubts about operation of the program. My experience in Government taught me that it is always best to conduct the public's business with maximum disclosure and full accountability. Senator SYMINGTON deserves general approbation for spreading the facts on the public record.

The United States currently holds 95 items ranging alphabetically from aluminum to zirconium ore in three stockpiles—the National Stockpile, the Defense Production Act Inventory, and the Supplemental Stockpile. U.S. holdings of these materials are worth approximately $7.6 billion at current market prices. Of this amount, approximately $3.3 billion is classified as surplus to present U.S. strategic requirements. Acquisition of these materials cost nearly $8.7 billion. Although some materials—nickel, for example——are worth more on the average than when they were purchased, others have lost considerable apparent value due to the depressed state of the minerals industry and other factors such as new technology.

Nearly three-fourths of the $7.6 billion total is in the National Stockpile, established by Congress under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act of 1946. The National Stockpile is a bank of war-essential materials intended to be withdrawn only during grave national emergency. The stockpile was accumulated under the supervision of Congress through its appropriations Committees, which in every case reviewed proposed expenditures for the purchase of strategic materials. Materials and amounts to be stockpiled were determined by calculation of the probable difference between (1) U.S. strategic needs in wartime and (2) the anticipated supply of materials from dependable sources. By their nature, these calculations are only educated guesses, which have varied sharply from time to time due to changing assumptions. For example, a 1958 decision to plan for a 3-year emergency instead of a 5-year emergency automatically lowered stockpile objectives 40 percent. This single change created most of the present "surplus." Another decision could abolish the surplus—even start the Government buying again. Indeed, over the past decade purchase goals for most materials have gone up and down like a roller coaster.

Congress has always maintained strict control over disposals from the National Stockpile, considering it strictly an emergency reserve and recognizing that indiscriminate sales would drastically affect the minerals market. The 1946 act requires 6 months' notice and express approval by both Houses of Congress for any disposal from the National Stockpile, except for war use or rotation or because of obsolescence.

The second of the stockpiles, the Defense Production Act Inventory, contains slightly less than one-eighth of the Government's holdings of strategic materials. Except in a few special situations, these materials were not accumulated for stockpiling purposes. In the main, they represent purchases made under the Defense Production Act of 1950 to encourage expansion of basic production capacity to meet the requirements of the military services in the Korean conflict and to satisfy growing demands of the domestic economy. Stockpiling needs figured in this program only to the extent that they influenced the setting of expansion goals.

Because of the forced-draft effort involved in the DPA program, mining companies were requested by the Government to expand their mines, smelters, and refineries far beyond anticipated civilian market needs and thus to risk substantial overcapacity in the years ahead. DPA contracts obligated the Government to acquire only those materials which could not be sold on the open market. Congress adopted the purchase contract method as a preferred approach on the advice of those of us who knew what the Government had lost in selling the war plants it built during World War I and World War II. Everyone understood that the Government would have to pay more, on the average, for materials it purchased than the same commodities would bring on the open market. The objective was to bring additional facilities into production—and this necessarily meant, within reasonable limits, an element of subsidy or incentive. Moreover, Congress decided it would be cheaper in the long run to encourage private industry to expand than it would be for the Government to build additional facilities which would later have to be sold at a substantial loss. Stockpiling was merely a byproduct of this public policy decision.

Disposals from the DPA Inventory do not require congressional approval, but they may not be made at less than the current domestic market price. The history of the program suggests that, in asking the mining industry to raise its production targets, Congress undertook a moral commitment not to allow the inventory to be resold in such a way as to undermine the structure of the minerals market. To contend otherwise is to argue that Congress contemplated the destruction at a future date of the very production capacity it was seeking to create.

A third stockpile, the supplemental stockpile, containing about one-seventh of the Government's holdings, has been built up primarily as a result of barter transactions in which surpluses of perishable farm goods were exchanged for foreign strategic and critical materials. These materials cost less to store than farm surpluses and are virtually imperishable. As it affects the supplemental stockpile, the barter program is strictly a budgetary convenience, not a stockpiling program. In fiscal 1962, it cost $12.4 million (less than one-fifth of 1 percent of the purchase price) to store all strategic and critical materials; the cost for storing and handling the farm surplus was $391.2 million (8 percent of the purchase price). While it is probably sound public policy to exchange some of our excess food for more durable materials, it would be manifestly unfair to the minerals industry if metals obtained in the trade were later dumped on the market. For this reason, the law provides that materials may not be released from the supplemental stockpile without express approval of Congress.

Despite the careful limits which Congress has seen fit to impose on stockpile disposals, some persons have recently argued that the Government should begin to sell its surplus materials as swiftly as possible in order to convert its holdings into cash and lower the national debt. Like everyone else, I recently completed my yearly accounting to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and I am therefore even more sympathetic than usual to efforts to relieve the taxpayer's burdens.

But we ought not to lose sight of one preeminent fact; the Government's stockpiles are an asset—not a liability. They provide us now and for the future with a ready reserve of irreplaceable raw materials. In event of war or other emergency, these materials are acknowledged to be critical to our national safety. But they are equally essential to our national economic life and to our status as a world power.

RISING METALS REQUIREMENTS

U.S. industry is an incredible maw. As pointed out recently in the monumental study, "Resources in America's Future," U.S. requirements for most of the major metals are expected to rise much faster than population between now and the end of the century. "It is probable that in the future the United States will become more dependent on foreign sources of supply," the study reports. "Rising economic development throughout the world will increase demand for minerals in other countries. This may tend to limit the amounts available to the United States, raise costs, or both. It also introduces greater uncertainty and injects yet less precise factors into a picture already full of uncertainties." Of the materials for which there are stockpiling objectives, the United States is self-sufficient in only three—magnesium, molybdenum, and vanadium. For a third of the commodities in the stockpile, we are completely or almost completely dependent on oversea sources. In such circumstances, it would be the height of improvidence to dissipate stocks already above ground and in the Government's possession.

If we do this foolish thing, we may regret it later—not least because the shifting currents of the cold war mean we cannot be confident that existing foreign sources will always be accessible. It is sobering to realize that Cuba was counted among nearby countries whose supplies were regarded as safely available even in time of war. To compound the difficulty occasioned by Cuba's changed status, supplies from that source have now fallen into the hands of the other side in the cold war. As this experience has shown, a coup d'etat in a major minerals-producing country can cause a number of apparent surpluses to vanish in a flash.

Even more is involved, however, than the possible squandering of scarce resources. Disposal of these materials would also do an injustice to the minerals industry, which by and large during a period of vital national need responded warmly to the urgent request of the U.S. Government for increased production. In some cases industry leaders felt strongly that a slower pace of development would have been better for the long-range health of the minerals economy. Yet they swallowed their reservations and they produced.

I do not believe that the mining industry's performance during this emergency should be measured by a narrow interpretation of so-called corporate profits. While, personally, I hold no brief for any man whose pocketbook in time of national emergency looms larger than his country's need, we should be most careful before judging a particular level of profit in a particular contract. Many factors must be considered. Mining is a business in which there are more strikeouts than strikes. Substantial profits on the winners are needed to recoup on the losers. The overwhelming majority of companies received no more than reasonable rates of return on their contracts and did their level best to deliver all the Government wanted on the Government's timetable. For this service in time of crisis, it would be a poor sort of thanks to open the stockpile sluice gates into markets which are in many cases already overburdened with supplies.

DISPOSAL DANGERS

Indiscriminate disposal could wreck the market for certain price-volatile minerals. Among those that would be most seriously affected are many commodities on which the underdeveloped countries of Latin America, Africa, and the Far East depend so heavily for already inadequate foreign exchange earnings. A substantial drop in the price of any of these basic metals would do more damage to the Alliance for Progress than could possibly be repaired on current foreign assistance budgets.

Such disposals would also do great damage to the U.S. mining industry at a time when we can ill afford further slowdown in the domestic economy. At such a cost, reduction in the national debt would be one of those false economies which in the end exact a heavy toll of dollars and misery.

Those urging disposal assert that it would be handled so as to avert market disruption, but recent experience has not been reassuring. For example: (1) Despite administrative regulations providing for consultation with industry in the development of disposal plans, industry views have not always been solicited, nor has industry always been kept informed about the Government's intentions. (2) Despite assurances to the contrary, disposal planning has normally been on a piecemeal rather than a long-term basis. (3) Plans have been adopted which clearly violate the spirit if not quite the letter of the law. Under these plans, a contractor agrees to receive payment for goods or services in surplus materials, which he must necessarily sell at a discount in order to realize his money. Thus the contractor must do what the Government is forbidden to do—sell below the established market price. Yet, the Government is able to claim that it observed the rules.

With such a record to look upon, is it any wonder that the very possibility of disposal action is sufficient to cause a palpitation in the market?

In counseling against disposal of stockpile surpluses, I am not raising any objection to rotation of materials which deteriorate. Nor am I opposed to disposal, under careful controls, of materials which are obsolescent or otherwise unsuited to emergency use. These steps are necessary for the maintenance of a quality stockpile. Disposal of surpluses might also be permitted in periods of rising prices and short supply so as to relieve pressures on domestic industry.

With these exceptions, however, sound public policy in my judgment calls for indefinite retention of all materials currently held in the three stockpiles.

MITIGATING ECONOMIC RISKS

The decision of course, rests with Congress and the executive branch. They may not be persuaded that the risks to the mining industry or the needs of the future justify retention of stocks in excess of strict emergency needs. If the U.S. Government, in its wisdom, should override all misgivings and decide in favor of disposal, I would urge as strongly as possible that the following minimum conditions be rigorously observed—in fact and not merely in from:

1. Disposal should take place only on the basis of long-range plans, developed in full consultation with representatives of the affected industry. Piecemeal disposals should be completely avoided. This would permit the industry to plan production and marketing with some degree of assurance regarding the Government's future market role.

2. Because of the overriding need to avoid market disruption, disposal legislation should require sales by the Government to be made through normal channels of trade whenever possible. It would be a dangerous mistake to employ disposal for rearranging existing market patterns. Yet, at the insistence of the Justice Department, the Government has recently refused offers by major producers in certain minerals industries to buy back any surplus which the Government is seeking to sell and to dispose of this material without profit. The Justice Department's objections were on antitrust grounds. If an antitrust problem exists, it should be settled in court. We cannot have a disposal program which both promises to avoid market disruption and which also sets out deliberately to create it. Accordingly, Congress should explicitly authorize liquidation through the producers for resale without profit if an industry is prepared to make such a proposal.

3. All disposal plans (except those involving rotation or obsolescence), including plans for the DPA inventory, should be submitted to Congress 30 days before they are proposed to go into effect. No disposals should in fact be permitted until Congress has approved the plan by affirmative vote of both houses. This procedure is vital since the mining industry and other affected parties cannot otherwise be certain that their views will be adequately considered. Administrative guarantees about consultation have proved illusory in the past, and there is no reason to believe they will be any more meaningful in the future. The chief complaint made against procedures requiring congressional approval is that they are time-consuming and will sometimes deprive the Government of an opportunity to make a spot sale. Reliance on long-range plans will partly overcome this problem, since sufficient flexibility will presumably be allowed within the broad limits of a long-range disposal plan for adjustment to changing market conditions. A 30-day "hold" on individual plans (as contrasted to the present 6 months "hold" on disposals from the strategic stockpile) would also ease this problem. In addition, Congress might consider a procedure under which a proposed disposal plan could be brought directly to a vote if not acted on in committee at the end of 60 to 90 days.

4. A flat ban should be imposed on disposals requiring Government contractors to take surplus materials as payment for procurement orders or as payment-in-kind for the upgrading of dissimilar materials—e.g., payment in aluminum or nickel for upgrading maganese or columbium. Since the contractor will normally be compelled to sell at a discount in order to realize his money, market disruption is implicit in any such transaction.

Observance of these conditions would mitigate many of the economic risks involved in disposal. It would not, however, render disposal any less undesirable in my judgment from the standpoint of the Nation's future best interests. I hope Congress and the executive branch will not be stampeded into an unwise action on this issue.

Goldwater Holds Key Trump

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the following editorial which emphasizes one of GOLDWATER's strongest points: frankness. It is certainly refreshing to read this type of journalism.

The article follows:

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, July 14, 1963]

GOLDWATER'S TRUMP CARD: FRANKNESS

Four months ago, if anyone had suggested that Senator BARRY GOLDWATER had a chance of being a candidate for President—much less elected—he'd have been hooted at by all the "pros."

Yet, today, the GOP has some very savvy politicians trying to develop a "Stop GOLDWATER" campaign, and the professional political observers are sharpening their pencils and doing some State-by-State calculations suggesting that GOLDWATER might win.

Some of the statisticians are saying that on the basis of these calculations he's about the only candidate who might win over the incumbent President in 1964. (The records of history indicate that a President has a tremendous advantage toward reelection to the second term.)

What has happened? How is this possible?

Haven't we been told for years that a candidate, to win, must appeal to the "independent voter," and to do this he must be a middle-of-the-roader? A "conservative" hasn't a chance?

The "experts" are beginning to discover that the American people do not submit to their rules. Especially, they do not submit to such dogma becoming permanent.

Unquestionably, the nature of GOLDWATER's appeal that has moved him from narrow waters into the broad stream of the Nation's attention is his frankness.

For years the man has said things unpopular as well as popular without checking the opinion polls first or trying to get the votes of this bloc or that bloc.

And the American people, in sizable numbers, have a natural respect for a politician with conviction and an honesty of purpose.

Eisenhower's tremendous appeal, unmatched as the cold figures show in this generation, was without a doubt the impression that, right or wrong, he believed in what he did and was not trying to play political tricks on the public.

Meanwhile, the very fact that the professionals have come to recognize it so reluctantly is the best evidence that BARRY GOLDWATER has become a very large figure on the national stage.

If he continues to function in a forthright manner, and doesn't start trying to please everybody, he may get bigger.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Second World War caused misery and misfortune to untold millions of people in many parts of the world, but perhaps no one group of people suffered and sacrificed as much as those in eastern and central Europe. The most ferocious fighting of the war took place there, the worst atrocities of the war were committed in these countries, the people there bore the heaviest brunt of the war for more than 5 years, and their homelands during those years were among the most ravaged parts of the Eurasian continent. But these people, numbering some 100 million and including the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians in the Baltic area, Bulgarians and Rumanians in the Balkans, the Poles, Hungarians and Czechoslovaks, suffered and lived with the hope that at the end of that world struggle they would be rewarded their freedom and liberty. With that single and overriding goal in mind they fought their oppressors, struggled for their freedom and gave their lives by the millions. At the end of the war, however, instead of being rewarded with freedom they all were saddled with the worst type of tyranny imposed upon them by the Government of the Soviet Union.

Today these countries form the Soviet satellite countries, the captive nations of Europe, imprisoned and totally isolated from the free world by the Iron Curtain that separates them from the West.

Since the end of the war the fate of these helpless and unfortunate peoples have been among the principal concerns of the Government of this country. Our leaders have done their utmost to bring about their freedom through peaceful means and diplomatic negotiations, but thus far all their efforts have failed to produce the desired result. But the U.S. continues to hope, and believe, in the eventual freedom of the satellite peoples. As evidence of our good intentions, the Congress enacted legislation in 1959 whereby the President is empowered to proclaim the third week of July of each year as Captive Nations Week, designating such a week as one of national observance and commemoration. As a Member of Congress I am proud of this legislation, and proud to reassert today our continuing faith that freedom will eventually triumph over totalitarian communism.

Rev. James L. Vizzard of National Catholic Rural Life Conference Views President Kennedy's Proposed National Service Corps as Sharing of Talent and Abundance at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Special Subcommittee on Labor, chaired by our distinguished colleague from New Jersey, Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, has been conducting hearings on President Kennedy's proposal for the establishment of a National Service Corps, more commonly referred to as the domestic peace corps. I hope that this legislation soon reaches the floor for debate. There is a tremendous need for such a domestic peace corps, and to quote President Kennedy:

> We shall be judged more by what we do at home than by what we preach abroad.

The National Service Corps would be able to overcome local apathy and handicaps. Working in conjunction with the rest of the Government agencies and being a part of the Federal Government, the Corps would have by birthright a certain kind of perspective on national needs. Its projects and its purposes, because part of a national endeavor, would automatically be the object of a certain kind of curiosity and publicity. And persons, young and old, unsure about how to involve themselves in meaningful volunteer commitment, would have no trouble in contacting such a centralized and highly publicized group. The Corps should always operate on a local invitation basis because only in this way can we be assured that it will be helping those communities who genuinely want help.

Mr. Speaker, as a proponent of the National Service Corps, I include, under unanimous consent, in the Appendix with my remarks the following very interesting and illuminating article on the proposed National Service Corps by Rev. James L. Vizzard, entitled "Sharing Talent and Abundance at Home," and published in the July 7 edition of Our Sunday Visitor, the National Catholic Action Weekly. Father Vizzard is the director of the Washington office of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference:

SHARING TALENT AND ABUNDANCE AT HOME

(By Rev. James L. Vizzard)

Today in America millions live in poverty, ignorance, and disease in the midst of the general prosperity of this affluent Nation.

Who are these people? Where are they? They are migrant workers, slum dwellers, residents of depressed or isolated rural areas, trapped in the vicious circle of inadequate education and lack of opportunity. They are the mentally ill and retarded, shut away in understaffed, overcrowded institutions, who have no hope of cure or rehabilitation because there are simply not enough people to take care of them.

These Americans need person-to-person help: instructions, inspiration, someone to show the way.

President John F. Kennedy's appeal for a "domestic Peace Corps" is a challenge to Americans to do something about this situation. The Nation, and particularly Catholic citizens, must not fail to answer.

It is a challenge to build new bridges of human concern between people who need help and people who have the desire to give help, to bring the spirit of the Peace Corps overseas to community service programs at home.

The Peace Corps, when first proposed, was considered to be an idealistic dream that would soon turn into a nightmare. The fact is that the Corps is now proclaimed an outstanding succes even by many of those who first opposed the idea.

If nothing else, the Peace Corps resoundingly proved the readines and capacity of the young and the youthful spirited of this country to give generously of themselves in the service of people in need. It is now felt that this same generous spirit should be challenged by the urgent needs of millions of our own fellow citizens.

WIDE CATHOLIC SUPPORT

Leaders in the field of social service and human welfare recognized the pressing need for improved and expanded service programs throughout the country. Plans for President Kennedy's program—officially named the National Service Corps—have already won enthusiastic support from any number of Catholic organizations: The National Catholic Welfare Conference, the National Conference of Catholic Charities, the Bishops' Committee for Migrant Workers, the Bishops' Committee for the Spanish Speaking, the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, the National Council of Catholic Men, the National Council of Catholic Women, the National Federation of Catholic College Students. Dozens of other organizations and distinguished individuals of other faiths have likewise endorsed the idea.

But the most eloquent testimony for the need of such a program comes from the millions of Americans who do not know, hence have not experienced or enjoyed the better way of living which is common to the majority of our citizens.

Each group has different problems, but they share one common plight: They are becoming increasingly isolated from the rest of society. They are out of sight and often forgotten.

The migrant laborer and his family are typical: this wandering worker is vitally important to the great crop growers of the farm belts. With all its mechanical advance, science has found no substitute for his labor, for the job he does with his hands. Yet he has no home in the communities where he gathers in the crops, his education and health are neglected.

Nobody knows with any accuracy how many migrant workers there are. The ironic fact is that more money is spent in counting and tracing migratory birds than migratory citizens. But our citizen migratory labor force, numbering at least up in the high hundreds of thousands, moves each year from town to town and State to State, following the sun and the harvest. These people have an average annual individual income of less than $1,000. Hundreds of thousands of the children migrate with their parents. Almost all of the children are retarded educationally from 1 to 4 years. The average adult migrant worker achieves only a fifth-grade education.

IMMEDIATE HELP

A National Service Corps can bring immediate help and hope to these people, in the form of human assistance to attack individual problems. But the work of the corps will have a more important, long-range effect.

It will focus greater State and community attention on the plight of the workers, pave the way for the establishment of new community service programs to benefit the migrants, and arouse enough citizen interest in the problems to promote better Federal and State migrant welfare programs.

A Cabinet-level committee was appointed by President Kennedy last November to determine the areas of greatest need, how the corps could help, what kind of help communities might ask for, and to gage the interest of States and communities in having the corps come to work on local problems.

Among the migrants, the corpsmen could expand the educational services for children, teach adult classes, act as guidance directors, provide recreational facilities and direct the migrants and their families to already existing community services.

Mutual distrust and misunderstanding between the two groups often lead to the community's lack of interest in improving the migrants' condition. By encouraging the migrants to carry out self-improvement projects and by encouraging local residents to sponsor youth clubs, recreation projects and other joint programs, the corpsmen could bring residents and migrants closer together in a new realization of the whole community's needs.

The tasks outlined for National Service Corpsmen in migrant labor camps, as well as in other areas of need, are difficult ones; the jobs lack the glamour of Peace Corps assignments in foreign lands. Yet these jobs must be done—they represent a new chance for 33 million people to achieve a better life.

What kinds of people will the corps need to do the hard work at home? Basic qualifications are: a minimum of 18 years of age, and sufficient skill and maturity to perform needed services.

In many cases, corpsmen will benefit from having a special skill, such as carpentry, or specialized training, such as nursing. But in general, a background of liberal arts will be a good qualification, although a college degree is not necessary. Corpsmen will receive 4 to 6 weeks of training before going on assignment. The training period will acquaint the corpsman with the nature of his assignment and provide him with special skills he will need. Corpsmen will serve for 1 year without pay, but with a modest subsistence allowance and termination payment.

This period of service will inspire many young people to choose life-long careers in the helping professions—the ministry, teaching, nursing, medicine, social work—all in desperate need of thousands more members.

HEARINGS IN PROCESS

Hearings on this worthwhile program are now being conducted by Congress. The National Service Corps proposal has aroused controversy, just as the idea of the Peace Corps drew objections 2 years ago.

Critics of the program say the corps constitutes Federal intrusion into problems of State and local concern. But the corps would take on a project only where it was invited to work, only when a community asked for help from the outside. When the community furnished enough local volunteers to take over a project, the corpsmen would move on.

Other critics say the program would cost too much; that it is not needed, especially in the year of a proposed tax cut.

Not needed? Is that the answer this country will continue to give to one-sixth of her people? The program is modest in scope and cost. It will be limited to a maximum of 5,000 corpsmen. Cost is estimated at $5 million for the first year. Surely this is a small answer. It amounts to less than the price of a cup of coffee per year for each U.S. citizen.

But it is an all-important beginning, a first step we must take now toward bettering our community service programs and toward bettering the lives of those who need our help.

To religiously motivated people, such as I am sure American Catholics are, the call for a domestic Service Corps can rightly be considered a renewal in a very practical and immediate way of the injunction of Christ, our Lord, to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, to come to the aid of the afflicted for "whatsover you do to the least of these my brethren, you do it unto Me."

Hugh J. Addonizio, Champion of Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, for 14 years while he was amongst us as a colleague, the present mayor of my hometown always acted with courage and determination in his advocacy of civil rights for all Americans.

It is, therefore, no surprise to see Hugh Addonizio leading Newark in its enlightened attempt to assure equal rights and opportunities without regard for race, color, religion or national origin.

The calm, forthright, prompt action by Mayor Addonizio and others in Newark stand in contrast to some of the evasive or violent action taken in other parts of our Nation.

I hope that Hugh Addonizio and Newark will serve as an example to other leaders and communities. And, so that my colleagues can see the reaction to the mayor's program, I would like at this point to insert an editorial which appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger on July 12.

Mayor Addonizio, in handling the controversy over alleged discrimination among construction crews at the new Barringer High School in Newark, has outlined a possible pattern to work out this dispute, as well as similar ones which may arise in the future.

It would be well for all parties concerned to keep in mind that the city of Newark, including the Addonizio administration, is anxious to resolve such controversies in full justice to everyone concerned.

This is not a fight in which officialdom is out to set up every roadblock and obstacle to the realization of full civil rights for all citizens. On the contrary, there is deep concern that violation of civil rights be dealt with sternly, expeditiously and in complete fairness.

This is in contrast to the civil rights struggle in some parts of the South where local officials have no sympathy for the cause being waged by the Negroes. There is no similar lack of sympathy in Newark, or in the rest of New Jersey.

There is, instead, the frank admission that the cause is just and that steps must be taken without delay to try and assure equal rights and opportunities without regard for race.

There certainly was no stubborn opposition on the part of Newark officials to the realization of these aims. The attitude, rather, has been one of willingness to tackle the problem. There also has been a keen awareness of the impatience for action by the victims of discrimination.

There has been no attempt to obfuscate, evade or delay the institution of a realistic and meaningful program to provide tangible results. There has been the conviction that such results could be obtained through negotiation in good faith by men of good will.

This still offers the most effective and most expeditious way to attain the desired results.

The agreement reached by Mayor Addonizio and the Essex County Building Trades Council should provide the framework in which the Barringer controversies can be resolved in this spirit. And it could provide a pattern for resolving other controversies.

The essence of the agreement is the declaration "to sit down immediately with responsible members of the Negro community to establish a workable program to prevent job discrimination in any form whatsoever."

This is a clear and unequivocal statement.

If it is followed up by a determined and sincere effort by all parties to the controversy, it could mean a giant step forward.

The Great Indiana Port Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, the great port debate has commanded the attention of Hoosiers for many years. Fortunately the port is closer to reality than it has ever been.

In the June 1963 issue of Indiana Business and Industry, Joseph R. Hartley, professor of transportation, Indiana University, has submitted an excellent article on the very question of the Indiana port. Mr. Hartley has been a student of the feasibility of the port for many years and I believe his conclusions are to be respected. He did his original study on the Indiana deep water port for

Gov. Harold W. Handley. Mr. Hartley has also testified and advised for Governor Handley, Governor Welsh, the Port Commission and the General Assembly of Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Hartley's article in today's RECORD, as follows:

The Great Indiana Port Issue

(By Joseph R. Hartley, professor of transportation, Indiana University)

Few public investment decisions have been more heatedly and dramatically debated than the controversy over the proposed harbor near Burns Ditch between Gary and Michigan City. Indeed, the issue has become so intense that many businessmen have been confused by the exaggerations, charges, and countercharges. This article will attempt to clear the air with respect to the economic aspects of the port question but the political considerations must be handled by someone more expert than the author in that realm.

ECONOMIES OF WATER TRANSPORTATION

No one can intelligently discuss the Indiana port without some familiarity with the inherent advantages of water transportation; fortunately one need not be an "old salt" to know about the business aspect of ship operation. Water transportation provides the most efficient means known for the movement of low-value commodities in bulk. Costs via large ocean vessels and lake boats run as low as 1 to 2 mills per ton-mile (1 ton moved 1 mile). This contrasts with typical costs for bulk goods moved via railroad of approximately 1 cent per ton-mile although new integrated trains promise dramatic new efficencies where sufficent volume exists to use the capacity. Truck costs for long-hauls of bulk goods exceed those of railroads while inland river bargelines usually incur costs ranging from 3 to 6 mills per ton-mile .

The economies of Great Lakes shipping obviously are tremendous and one need not accept the testimony of economists on this score. He need only observe the effects of the lakes on Milwaukee, Chicago, Gary, Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, Buffalo, and Toronto. Water transportation has historically been one of the greatest industiral colonizers in the Western World.

Indeed, only four cities in the United States with populations exceeding 500,000 are not located on navigable water.

THE SEAWAY PROJECT—LAST STEP TO THE PORT

For the last 130 years North Americans have steadily been widening, deepening, and building locks at the various connecting channels between the Great Lakes where the water level drops. The lake ports were developed and deepened accordingly with most of them, including Lake Calument of Chicago, providing 21 feet of water for vessels. Many smaller ones had depths of 15 to 18 feet—enough for only small, inefficient ships by today's standards.

Completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway in 1959 was a dramatic event for Indiana and the rest of the Nation. In one stroke it transformed the lakes for economic purposes into an inland ocean and provided much deeper depths of 27 feet. But this change suddenly outmoded virtually all the port facilities on the lakes in terms of depths, types of cargo handling equipment, and capacity. Anticipating the seaway's completion, the government of Indiana started an active program to plan for a truly deepwater port that would be compatible with seaway requirements and potentialities.

DO WE NEED THE PORT?

There can be no question that the economic savings in transportation cost from construciton of the port will exceed the investment many times over. The author estimates that the annual economic savings may well average 10 times the annual cost. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' feasibility study published in January 1962, estimates a somewhat lower benefit/cost of 6.8 to 1 but their projections do not include the enormous tonnage that will be generated by the proposed Bethlehem Steel facility. That firm had not made a public commitment to build the plant when the study was being conducted. The corps estimates tonnages on page 17 of its report as follows in annual averages during the 50-year amortization life of the port:

[In tons]

Steel plant	Receipts	Shipments
Coal	3,000,000	
Iron ore	5,800,000	
Limestone	900,000	
Residual fuel oil	200,000	
Rolled steel bands	100,000	
Transshipped cargo:		
Coal		5,000,000
General cargo	60,000	180,000
Grain		470,000
Total	10,060,000	5,650,000

The steel plant refers only to the Midwest Steel facility being built by National Steel. Completion of an integrated mill by Bethlehem Steel Corp. eventually could add another 10 million tons to the potential traffic of the port for a total of about 25 million tons per year. This is clearly sufficient volume to justify a port.

ARE OTHER SITES SUPERIOR TO BURNS DITCH?

Few questions have been quite as confused as the one about the best site for the port. Those who wish to preserve all of the sand dunes for a park seem convinced that any other site is preferable economically. Chicago interest and some of the Indiana communities to the west believe that they should have the port where the cargo is.

Both views miss the point. The prime justification for this port is not from existing freight but the potential of 10 to 20 million tons of cargo from two entirely new steel plants and from the firms that will be attracted to the port. Fortunately the same facility that carries this new traffic can also carry considerable coal, grain, and general cargo more efficiently than by existing routes. Construction of breakwaters in the vicinity of the Illinois-Indiana border could not effectively meet the needs of the new firms. Furthermore, there is little room in the area west of Gary for the construction of great new heavy industries and the resultant urbanization. The present site affords almost unlimited land to the south for new factories using bulk freight, port shoreside facilities, rail backup yards, uncongested access to the Interstate Highway System via the Indiana toll road, and an entire new community.

WILL THE PORT STIMULATE NEW ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT?

Yes. The port would be a marginal economic investment without the steel mills being planned so the economic effects of the port and the mills should be analyzed together. The two steel firms alone will apparently invest about $1.5 billion or more in new facilities. Jaded as American are by billion dollar figures, we must not lose sight of the fact that this is a prodigious sum of new business investment, especially in an average-size State like Indiana. Most communities are elated to attract one new $15 million plant. Cheap steel and access to low-cost water transportation are powerful industrial colonizers. Ancillary steel fabricating firms and other industries will undoubtedly invest another billion dollars or more in the next 30 years. Investment by service trades and in residential construction can be expected to approach the investment in the manufacturing sector.

A new economic base providing manufacturing employment for 30,000 persons would be a conservative expectation. This in turn typically provides employment for at least an equal number employed in the support and service trades. Therefore, a total long-run employment of 60,000 persons can be realistically anticipated. Total family population would run two to three times that. If such projections seem mere pie in the sky, look a few miles to the west at one of the newest large cities in the Midwest. Gary developed out of waste sand and swamp land early in this century as a result of the giant United States Steel plant and substantial port development.

WILL THE PORT INJURE NEARBY ECONOMIES?

Any new business and transportation investment intensifies competive pressures for someone, some communities, somewhere. However, improved operations by the injured firms and growth of the national market soon mitigate the negative impacts. Certainly the converse of the above statement would be a fatal formula for Indiana or any other State: i.e., to reduce adjustments caused by tough competition, we should stop new business and transport investment.

In any case the port will attract well over half of its traffic by generating new sources rather than diverting it from existing routes or firms. Certainly the new economic complex around the port will eliminate some jobs in surrounding communities and probably in other steel firms. But for every job eliminated, multiple jobs will be created. Otherwise chambers of commerce and labor unions should battle valiantly against new plants which wish to move to their communities.

BENEFITS TO THE STATE

Southern Indiana coal will be more competitive in the Great Lakes coal market. Illinois and Indana grain can move more cheaply into export markets. The tax base of the State will be enlarged. Indiana firms and consumers in general will have more rapid and efficient access to overseas markets and to certain imported goods. Not the least of the effects will be the creation of a new, dynamic metropolitan market for many Indiana businesses and farmers.

Only a fool would expect that such economic growth will not cause problems. Mere discussion of the port already has raised difficulties and tempers. But the problems of growth are not new to Americans and most of us would agree that they are less sobering then problems of decline and decay. Certainly they are more fun to solve. Out of the smoke and debris of the great port debate must eventually come the clear vision that the proposed public port is an economic challenge and an opportunity for the State of Indiana and her business community.

Harrison Appoints Group To Study River Fish Deaths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Washington, D.C., Post of Tuesday, July 16, 1963, advising of another massive fish kill in the Potomac River "at least 25 times as bad as the worst we have seen before," in the language of one of the officials who studied the situation.

The probable cause, an extremely high level of nutrients—mostly phosphorus and nitrogen—resulted in a toxic algae bloom which depletes oxygen and so destroys the fish resources of the river.

This is a situation which we can anticipate will occur with increasing regularity even with the highest level of treatment possible under today's technology.

This is just another argument for increased vigor and enforcement by the Public Health Service, something which has been visibly lacking of late.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 16, 1963]

HARRISON APPOINTS GROUP TO STUDY RIVER FISH DEATHS

RICHMOND, July 15.—Gov. Albertis S. Harrison appointed a special committee today to investigate a massive fish kill in the potomac River and recommend ways to ward off a recurrence.

The committee was named following an afternoon-long discussion on the recent fish kill, which a Westmoreland County official called "at least 25 times as bad as the worst we've seen before."

Experts attending the meeting at the State capital agreed that the cause of the fish kill is known, but none professed to know what to do about it.

"I don't like to drop the matter after this meeting * * * I would like to see some-concerted action," Harrison said.

He said the problem is serious enough so that all Virginia agencies, along with the Potomac River Commission, Maryland and the Federal Government, ought to do everything possible to solve it.

William T. Hargis, director of the Virginia Institute of Marine Science; A. H. Paessler, secretary of the State water control board; Eugene C. Meredith, chief of the State health department's engineering division, and Milton T. Hickman, chairman of the Virginia Fisheries Commission, spoke on the problem.

They also were named to the committee which is to report in 30 days.

They described the probable cause of the kill.

The level of nutrient (mostly phosphorus and nitrogen) from treated sewage flowing into the Potomac from the Washington area has become sufficiently high that when the proper natural conditions occur from low water flow, high water temperature and sufficient sunlight, the growth of minute plants (algae or plankton) develops at an explosive rate, they said.

This highly concentrated algae so depletes the oxygen in the water that the fish suffocate, they added.

Maryland officials last week gave a similar explanation.

"This problem is going to be with us a good many years, until we get some kind of breakthrough in removing these nutrients from treated sewage," Paessler said.

Harrison asked the special committee to meet with Maryland and Washington officials to explore what could be done.

Is the Trip Worth $40 Billion?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Edgerton (Minn.) Enterprise expresses the same doubt which is in the minds of many people—is it worth $40 billion to put a man on the moon by 1970? The editorial by Carroll W. Fey, editor of the Enterprise, states the case so well that I request its inclusion in the RECORD:

IS THE TRIP WORTH $40 BILLION?

As 1963 wears on and more and more reflection and study of the U.S. Appollo Project is undertaken, it becomes increasingly apparent that we have entered upon a project that could well be a failure.

The reader will recall our rocket failures a few years ago were publicity boomrangs for the United States. President John F. Kennedy has now committed us to a race to the Moon, and we are on record as to our goal of landing a man on the Moon before 1970.

What does this entail? It entails almost entirely new achievements in 42 different actions. First, we will use—according to the present plan—five rocket engines with a million and a half pounds of thrust each to lift the two other rocket boosters and a 44-ton spaceship into the sky.

We have not used any rocket booster this powerful yet. Nor have we used the second-stage million-pound booster, which is called for in the Apollo shot. The third rocket engine will burn for a while, shut down, and burn again. This one is supposed to start three men, in the spaceship, on their flight to the Moon.

If it does, and if the men get there without mishap, their dangers and problems really begin. The ship has three sections, all of which must function perfectly in the Moon atmosphere. Using equipment not yet invented, they are to guide the spaceship into orbit around the Moon. Two of the three astronauts then get in one section of the spaceship known as the bug and detach themselves and try a descent on the Moon's surface.

If they succeed in landing without destroying the "bug," they have a day to look at who knows what and then they will have the task of firing off their bug by rocket, and rejoining the other part of the spaceship in orbit around the Moon. If they can join up again, which might not be easy, they then crawl back into the main spaceship and detach the bug forever, to orbit the Moon indefinitely, and then they must fire rockets to try to return to the Earth. If these rockets don't work successfully, they are stuck in lunar orbit for the rest of their living days, which would not be too many.

If they do fire these rockets successfully and the spaceship starts back to the Earth they will have to control its speed carefully to prevent it from burning up from friction heat caused by speed. If they succeed in that, they must land in the ocean at the right spot, and be picked up.

Some 42 different complex operations must succeed if this effort succeeds. It may be asking too much. It certainly is an ambitious program to say the very least, and after the two men have spent a day on the Moon, if they accomplish it, will the results have been worth the $40 billions this project is costing?

The Republican Summer Student Seminars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week the Republican National Committee inaugurated a series of programs for college students of every political persuasion working in the Nation's Capital. These presentations, in contrast to last year's White House efforts at public relations, are designed to present divergent views on the issues of the day, and allow for student participation through questioning. They are open to all. To provide for programs and speakers of interest to the students themselves, the committee works directly with an advisory group of students. Plans call for participation by members of both political parties, and members of the press and the academic community.

By this effort, a void created by the refusal of the White House to accept any constructive suggestions for its summer program, will be filled. Significantly enough, the same day this series started, the White House announced its own program, although barely a week earlier it seemed impossible to find anyone who could or would say what the program would be this summer or when it would start. According to newspaper and other sources, the White House plans to invite a few Republican Congressmen to participate, and to open meetings to other than the executive branch and the Democratic National Committee as was the case last year. This paucity of efforts to be constructive only illustrates the reluctance on the part of those in charge of the program to give up a favorite political plaything.

The Republican program this past week dealt with the future plans and prospects of the Republican Party in 1964, and had as contributing panelists Senator Thruston B. Morton of Kentucky, Congressman Charles McC. Mathias, Jr. of Maryland, Dr. William B. Prendergast of the Republican National Committee and myself. Neal Pierce, political editor of the Congressional Quarterly, contributed questions and comments. Questions from some of the several hundred students in attendance, a feature which the organizers of the series hope to expand in the weeks to come, concluded the program.

A great deal of the credit for this experiment in good government must go to Dr. Prendergast, as research director for the Republican National Committee, and his assistant, Charles Mack. Similar credit should go to the students themselves, particularly those comprising the advisory committee. They are: Mr. Wayne Kidwell, of the University of Idaho, who chaired the program on Monday; Miss Judith Hale of Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania; Miss Donna Herbst of Bradley University, Peoria, Ill.; Mr. Jimmie R. Hutchens of the University of North Carolina; Miss Jane Oegerle of the University of Kansas; Miss Ann Proctor of the University of California (Berkeley); Miss Harriette Rost of Washburn College, Kansas; and Mr. Lowell Willinger of Cornell University, New York.

As information to those interested in the development of this program and previous efforts made to interest the White House in a similar approach, I include the substance of my remarks introducing the program on Monday, July 15, as follows:

Statement by Congressman William B. Widnall, Republican, of New Jersey, July 15, 1963, Before the Republican Summer Intern Program

I have been asked to give a brief explanation of the genesis of this program, since I have been directly involved in its development. Some of you may recall that last year, a series of White House seminars were held, featuring such speakers as the Budget Director, the majority leadership in Congress and the President himself, addressing crowds of 3,000 to 6,000 students. While these appearances of public figures were of interest, they still left something to be desired in the way of adequate programing.

For one thing, no divergent views were offered and no Republican appeared on any program. For another, admitttance was limited to those students working in the Executive branch, some students at the Democratic National Committee and the AFL–CIO, and in one instance, the interns in the National Center for Education in Politics program. A number of students felt that they were talked down to, and the subject matter made no attempt to present various sides of major issues, or to be educational.

With this in mind, I suggested, in December of last year, that the American Political Science Association offer its services to work with the White House in developing a program of substance and merit. As I said in my letter to the association, the White House program "lacked both political balance and the advantages of smaller group sessions directly concerned with the intellectual involvement of those participating." I also suggested that an early start in the program would provide coordination of speakers and dates with other seminar and intern projects, to avoid what last week the student newspaper here on the Hill, the Quorum, referred to as mounting "chaos."

The Political Science Association made a determined effort to interest the White House in joint cooperation. It was not, however, until the day after the story broke in the newspapers of possible political patronage control of summer jobs by the White House, that a White House spokesman became available for discussion of the ASPA proposal. The White House, in the latter part of February, asked for and received from the association a detailed program for the summer, featuring a coordination office, a bipartisan advisory committee and suggested small seminar sessions in fields of interest to particular students.

On April 8, the Civil Service Commission was forced to crack down on summer job hirings following a series of events which included memorandums from the White House to departmental personnel officers requesting names, colleges, et cetera of all prospective summer help, and instructions from the Young Democrats to chapters on college campuses to submit individual form 57's through the White House for summer jobs. In writing to Civil Service Chairman John Macy on this subject, I called his attention to the Political Science Association plan, and he requested a copy. I am quite certain that someone within Civil Service brought this up with the White House, but no action was taken. In fact, no White House program was announced until today and the Political Science Association has never received a direct rejection or affirmation of their plan. I would only note in passing on this fact, that when Chairman Macy testified before a House subcommittee back in March, he said it was his understanding that the White House only wanted the names of student interns to arrange another series of meetings with Federal officials.

This program today then was not developed until it became apparent, in June, that the White House had no intention of making use of the Political Science Association program. This program is an attempt to present issues, and more than one side of the issues, and is open to all summer student employees. With the cooperation of the academic and journalistic communities, and members of the Democratic Party, this program can achieve its goal.

I, myself, have every intention of seeking a coordinated, bipartisan program again next year. The latest White House move does not meet this test. Perhaps the most logical solution, now that Civil Service intends to use merit tests for hiring in the executive branch next summer, would be to have the Political Science Association and other like organizations work directly with the Office of Career Development. As Congressman William E. Miller of New York, the chairman of the Republican National Committee wrote to me last January, a Republican seminar might not be necessary if a proopsal such as I have outlined gained acceptance.

In the meantime, I believe you will find this series of programs to be profitable and interesting, and I am sure that Mr. Kidwell and the other members of the student advisory group will welcome your constructive suggestions as to future programs and speakers.

Prime Minister Balewa Reports to People of Nigeria on Addis Ababa Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of the African Summit Conference at Addis Ababa in Ethiopia, I am extending my remarks to include the address of Prime Minister Alhaji Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa of Nigeria, reporting on the results and significance of the Conference in a nationwide broadcast to the Nigerian people.

The address follows:

For the first time in African history, representatives of 31 independent states, north and south of the Sahara, met in the capital of the ancient Kingdom of Ethiopia. From the moment that the main conference was declared open on Wednesday, May 22, till the closing session on Saturday, the 25th an atmosphere of brotherhood and interdependence pervaded the conference and it was not long before everyone realized that even though our methods of approach may differ, our primary objectives remained the same. There was unanimity in our determination to take all practicable measures to insure the liberation of the remaining countries of Africa from colonialism. We all realized that for as long as parts of Africa suffered under the humiliating yoke of colonialism and apartheid, our freedom and independence would not be complete. It was therefore not surprising that the conference took far-reaching decisions on how to assist our fellow Africans who are now fighting in Angola, Mozambique, and South Africa and other parts of the continent to regain their lost freedom. This was the dominant theme of the conference.

The conference appointed the 25th of May, the day the charter of African unity was signed, as Africa Liberation Day. This will be an annual occasion to remind us of our responsibility to our African brothers who are yet not free. Moreover as an earnest of our intention it was decided that a delegation from the conference should speak on their behalf at the next meeting of the United Nations Security Council, and that this year's celebration of Africa Liberation Day should take place on the day on which the General Assembly meets in September.

The most important achievement of the conference was the adoption of the charter of the organization of African unity. This charter which we signed has two main characteristics. First, it defines Africa to include all the continental African states, Madagascar and all the islands surrounding Africa. Secondly it lays down that it is the inalienable right of all Africans to control their own destiny and recognizes their aspirations for brotherhood and solidarity in a large unity transcending ethnic and national differences.

Just as we in Nigeria have been laying down one stone after another in the process of nation-building, thus insuring that a solid foundation is laid; just as we are determined to preserve our unity in diversity; so the Addis Ababa conference concentrated in those fields where the links between our states can be reinforced and strengthened and where new links can be forged while recognizing the fact that unity should not be tantamount to uniformity.

Africans throughout the continent can now speak with one voice, that is, the complete liberation of Africa and the harnessing of their natural and human resources for the total advancement of our peoples in all spheres of human endeavor. This is a great accomplishment not only for Africa. It is also a significant contribution to world peace and stability. For the world cannot be at peace unless there is development of communications, industrial techniques and so forth, which in the end can lead to the development of continental economies. What Africa needs is economic development as a means of transforming the nature of its economies so precariously balanced on the uncertainties of international trade in primary products.

The conference considered the changing pattern of world trade and the need for an internal market large enough to absorb the products of growing industries and this need points toward international cooperation and harmonization of African economies.

In my address to the conference I developed this theme on the economic development of the African continent. Because we have not the necessary capital, the necessary equipment or the necessary know-how for the development of our continent, we find it absolutely necessary to rely on outsiders for the development of the African territories. But I warned the conference that we must take every care to know whom we invite to assist in the development of our resources if we are not to have colonialism in a different form. I emphasized that just as we had fought political domination, it was also important that we fight against economic domination by other countries.

AFRICAN COMMON MARKET

Another aspect of the theme on the economic development of the continent which I dwelt on is the proposal to establish an African Common Market. I suggested that what is more practical is that we should have an African Common Market based on certain groupings—a North African grouping, which will include the Sudan; a West African grouping which will extend to the River Congo; an East African grouping, which will include almost all the Central African countries. There would, of course, be coordination between the various groupings and in this way I suggested that we would arrive at a successful African Common Market which should increase the interstate trade on this continent. * * * The conference welcomed the proposed establishment of an African Development Bank, details of which will soon be worked out when the Ministers of Finance of different countries of Africa meet in Khartoum. It also welcomed the forthcoming World Conference on Trade and Development which is to examine international trade problems in relation to the economic development of emerging countries. The conference finally decided to appoint a preparatory economic committee to study in collaboration with governments and in consultation with the Economic Commission for Africa the various economic African problems and to submit their findings to member states.

A matter which received the specific attention of the conference is the establishment of a technical arm for the Organization which can insure our industrial progress. The Commission for Technical Cooperation in Africa already has the resources and the conference decided to maintain the CTCA and to bring it within the scope of the Organization as an instrument for technical, scientific, and cultural cooperation

AFRICAN REPRESENTATION IN U.N.

The conference expressed its desire to strengthen and support the United Nations but regretted that Africa as a region is not equitably represented in the principal organs of the United Nations. It demanded that Africa as a geographic region should be represented not only in the Security Council but also in the United Nations Economic and Social Council and its specialized agencies. I have always maintained that the United Nations is a sure guarantee of the independent sovereignty of our African States. In my address to the conference I stated that we in Nigeria hate the idea of blocs because we cannot close our eyes to the wider issues of world problems. But, as a continent which has suffered for so long I suggested and it was accepted that we should set up a permanent secretariat with a small full-time staff for an African committee or group representing member states who can take more effective action on matters affecting African interest at the United Nations.

I also informed the conference that we cannot isolate ourselves from the rest of the world; that we belong to one human society; and that we believe in human personality, be the color yellow, brown, white, or green. I added that we must be careful not to give the impression that the African has a different personality and that we should see to the development of the human personality in Africa. The conference was unanimous on the need for education to be accorded a high place in member countries so that illiteracy may be wiped out and our peoples helped to realize the opportunities being made available to them to develop their economic, social, and moral obligations.

But there is a lingering fear expressed at the conference that the advancement of our peoples and the advancement of their legitimate aspirations might be impeded by the present arms race particularly in nuclear weapons. If there is war, we in Africa will be directly involved. It was therefore the concern of the conference that there should be peace in the world and that there should To this end a resolution was passed in the be understanding among the great powers. form of an appeal to the great powers to use their best endeavors to put an end to the arms race.

THE ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY

I have purposely dealt with other matters before coming to the provisions of the charter of the organization of African unity. * * * The charter provides for an assembly of heads of state and government to discuss matters of common concern to all member states with a view to coordinating and harmonizing the general policy of the organization. It also provides for a Council of Ministers which will be responsible to the assembly, prepare conferences for the assembly and coordinate inter-African cooperation in accordance with the instructions of the assembly. There are to be an Administrative Secretary General of the organization and Assistant Secretaries General who will be responsible for the administration of the Secretariat. Pending their appointment, however, it was decided that a Provisional Secretariat should be established immediately to examine the various resolutions passed by the conference and to submit their recommendations to the Council of Ministers which is meeting in Dakar as soon as possible. I am glad to say that Nigeria is one of the countries whose representation will serve in the Provisional Secretariat in Addis Ababa.

The charter also provides for a Commission of Mediation, Conciliation, and Arbitration, and member states pledged to settle all disputes among themselves by peaceful means. The charter finally provides for specialized commissions including an economic and social commission, an educational and cultural commission, a health and nutrition commission, a defense commission and a scientific, technical and research commission.

The conference unanimously decided that there should be no delay in the implementation of the provisions of the charter. To this end they decided that all heads of state and government should meet at least once a year and that extraordinary sessions be held as and when necessary.

From this brief account of the proceedings of the conference you will see firstly that all the decisions reached accord with the policies of the Federal (Nigerian) Government. And I am happy that our stand has been vindicated.

Secondly, I return from the conference full of hopes for the future because all the heads of state and government who attended the conference were dedicated to the unity, the progress and the happiness of the entire people of the African Continent and were determined to carry out the international obligations to which each member state is committed.

CHARTER TO BE RATIFIED SOON

Thirdly, although the charter was signed by every state represented at the conference, and I signed on Nigeria's behalf, it will not come into force until it has been ratified by two-thirds of the member states all of whom are expected to ratify it before the end of September. I therefore intend to submit the charter to Parliament when it meets at the end of July.

Finally, you will all notice that there are definite obligations in the charter to which Nigeria is committed. It is my earnest hope that the people of Nigeria will agree to enter into these commitments in order to consolidate our hard-won independence and in the interest of the advancement of the African peoples.

Fight for the Intertie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, as one of the sponsors of legislation to protect power users in the Pacific Northwest in the event of a power intertie to the southwest, I have been extremely concerned over the implications of an amendment approved by the Interior Committee last week. The lead editorial of the Portland Oregonian on Sunday, June 30, states the dangers inherent in the Westland amendment very well, and I know my colleagues wil find it very informative. Under unanimous consent I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FIGHT FOR THE INTERTIE

The California Power Pool, made up of the four big private utilities of that State, has turned on the lobbying heat in its effort to prevent construction of a Federal, extra-high voltage transmission line between the Pacific Northwest and California.

The amendment of Representative JACK WESTLAND, Republican, of Washington, to the Bonneville Marketing Area bill, is one result. Another is the decision of the city of Los Angeles, which operates its own municipal system, to sign up with California Power Pool and to resist, at this time, a Federal transmission line.

Opponents of a Federal tieline, who want to limit transmission to private utility lines, do not have a very good case but they have lots of muscle. The public should understand that the Northwest-California power exchange will eventually require not only one line but several. Bonneville Power Administration and its parent Department of Interior are not opposing a line to interconnect with California's Pacific Gas & Electric Co. But they want, as well, a Federal or other nonprivate utility line on a direct-current basis to move surplus Columbia River power to the California markets, both public and private.

The Northwest-California interconnection is inextricably bound up with the United States-Canada negotiations for implementation of the treaty and construction of storage dams in Canada. The Ottawa and British Columbia Governments now are agreed that Canada's half of the 2,600,000 kilowatts of energy which will be generated at U.S. dams as a benefit of Canadian storage shall be sold in the United States. The earliest market for that, depending on price, will be in California. Federal financing would hold down the cost of transmission line construction and make the California price competitive.

The Westland amendment would throw another roadblock in the way of interconnection, which Mr. Westland previously urged. It would require specific congressional approval, in a separate bill, before the Federal appropriation to start a tie-line could be approved. If the House accepts the "Northwest preference bill," which allows sale of surplus power only, to California, including the Westland amendment, the Senate probably will not accept the amendment to its bill. What may come out of a conference committee is problematical.

The city of Los Angeles reportedly has advised key committee chairmen in Congress that it now favors the California Power Pool's proposal for private interconnection. Los Angeles would receive Columbia River power from the pool under a wheeling arrangement, if the Department of Interior agrees, at a transmission rate of about $5.50 a kilowatt year. Out of about a million kilowatts the private utilities' line would carry, Los Angeles would take 300,000 kilowatts and would have an option on additional power if available from another private line. A strong inducement reportedly was the promise of the California pool to back up its commitment with power from its own systems.

A major goal of the Pacific Northwest in opening the California market to sale of all the surplus power now going to waste and available in the future is to restore the Bonneville Power Administration's earnings position. Annual deficits will force an increase in the Bonneville wholesale rate to all utilities and to industries served directly. The aluminum industry, for example, will be in a more serious competitive situation with producers in other parts of the country and abroad if rates go up. The cost of shipping aluminum to eastern and midwestern markets now is barely balanced by low power rates. The smaller the power rate increase the better for the Northwest.

We do know why Representative Westland has allied himself with the California private utilities seeking to block Federal or other nonprivate interconnection. We do think he is going against the best interests of the Pacific Northwest including its private utilities.

Fair Trade in Disguise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the Congressional Record an article appearing in the St. Petersburg, Fla., Evening Independent of June 26, 1963 entitled "Fair Trade in Disguise."

This excellent editorial warning of the evils of House Resolution 3669, the so-called quality brand stabilization bill, should cause grave concern to each Member of Congress and certainly make abundantly plain the reasons why this legislation should be summarily rejected by the Congress.

In the unhappy event that the Congress should enact this legislation it will result in destruction of small business after small business all across the country, raising of prices, gouging of consumers and, in the words of the Department of Justice, pro tanto repealing of the antitrust laws.

The article follows:

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Evening Independent, June 20, 1963]

FAIR TRADE IN DISGUISE

The American public has become pretty well educated to the fact that "fair trade" is a sweet-sounding euphemism for price-fixing—and they want none of it.

So it is hardly surprising that the fair traders have dropped the term for another, and even more misleading one. In a bill (House Resolution 3669) pending in Congress, price-fixing now masquerades as "quality stabilization."

But as the Consumers' Information Bureau in New York points out, it is still the same old "fair trade" proposal, mislabeled in an effort to confuse the public into thinking it has something to do with stabilizing the quality of national brand products. It hasn't.

The head of the Department of Justice Antitrust Division, testifying against the bill before a House subcommittee, said: "This is price-fixing legislation and as such is detrimental to the consuming public. The title, 'Quality Stabilization Act' is a misnomer for a bill whose real purpose is to make legal, on a nationwide basis, price fixing at the retail and wholesale levels."

Under House Resolution 3669 prices would be fixed on all articles which have trademarks or labels.

Dr. Alfred Oxenfeldt, professor of marketing at the Columbia University Graduate School of Business, said in testimony before the House committee:

"The 'fair trade' concept is a step backward in marketing practices. It is an attempt to undo and reverse the present trend toward efficient mass marketing and return retailing to the cartelized, regulated market practices associated with the ingrown European economy of the first half of this century."

Another economist estimated that price fixing under this type of legislation would cost consumers about $5 billion a year in higher retail prices.

Defeat of this bill is of particular importance to Pinellas County's large population of retired people living on fixed incomes. Both the American Association of Retired People and the National Council of Senior Citizens testified against it at House hearings.

But the consumer's voice is historically weak in the halls of legislative bodies. It might be well if the people of Pinellas County let their Congressman—Representative William C. Cramer—know how they feel about price fixing, whether under the label of "fair trade" or "quality stabilization."

Another Worthy People-to-People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the peace of the world depends on many complex factors. However, in our quest for peace, it has always been my belief that greater direct contact amongst the peoples of the world helps accelerate understanding and breaks down barriers. For example, my son's project, "Little People to Little People," has given a way of promoting friendship and understanding between the children of the United States and those of other countries by letter writing.

In relation to these grassroots efforts toward greater world understanding, I was pleased to notice and I am honored to commend a family in my district, the Armbrusters of 44 Hamilton Road, Glen Ridge, N.J., who, for the month of August, will welcome to their home a 19-year-old German girl, Miss Petra Ruhnau, of the American Zone in Berlin.

A total of 12 German youths will be hosted by families in the Essex County area. The young people have already arrived in this country and have been in Putney, Vt., yesterday and today for orientation at the headquarters of "Experiment in International Living," which is sponsoring the program. After 2 weeks at the campus of the University of Maine, they will visit Washington and arrive in their American homes on the 5th of August.

I certainly hope that we shall have an opportunity to see these young men and women when they come to Washington. And I know that they and their hosts, and both their communities and nations will draw much satisfaction and benefit from this heartwarming experience in international understanding.

Withhold Federal Aid From Schools Which Discriminate Between Students by Reason of Their Race, Color, Religion, Ancestry, or National Origin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the Congressional Record my statement to the Select Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Education and Labor, concerning my bill, H.R. 625, when the bill was under consideration. The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Education and Labor, in January of this year, I reintroduced my bill to withhold Federal aid from schools which discriminate between students by reason of their race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin: H.R. 625. This bill, and a number of others pertaining to this subject are now before your committee for consideration.

I am gratified to have this opportunity to speak in favor of this legislation, which would be effective in reaching our goal, to assure equal educational opportunities for all Americans regardless of their color, race, religion, or national origin.

Your committee has heard testimony by representatives of the Department of Justice and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; facts and figures have been given you. Our Federal Government is heavily involved in educational programs; the extent of Federal involvement is seen at a glance by these figures—Federal funds are expended on more than 150 programs costing $2 billion; programs include aid for impacted areas, school lunches, vocational education, adult education, grants under the National Defense Education Act, the Second Morrill Act, the National Science Foundation and various other research grants and contracts. There is legislation pending before various congressional committees now which would greatly increase Federal aid to education, and under present conditions, Negroes and other minority groups would be further cheated out of their rightful share of such benefits.

In a report sent me last year by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare concerning my bill, it was stated: "There remain a number of States in which there is only token compliance with the U.S. Supreme Court decision, *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, in a few school districts, and there are three States in which no action of any kind has been taken by a public school agency. Today there are approximately 2,000 school districts in which the public schools are conducted on a completely segregated basis." Conditions remain the same today; these school districts continue to receive the benefits of Federal aid.

It is admitted that some progress is being made to end segregation and discrimination in the schools of our Nation. However, Negroes and members of other minority groups have become sick and tired of the procrastinations and the general disregard of their rights, and entitlement to education is one of them. As a result, a revolution is under way in our Nation; the Negro is demanding his rights and he wants them now; the revolution will continue until he has achieved the equal status as an American citizen which has been denied him for a hundred years. The Negro will not be satisfied, now, with long drawn out desegregation suits. He wants his children to have the same educational opportunities afforded white children at this time, not 3 or 10 years from now. Generations of Negroes have been denied full educational benefits and their progress has been halted in vocational trades, in industry, and in the professions. Millions of Negro children today are being denied the kind of education which should be the birthright of every American child. Recently, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz stated: "Excessive Negro unemployment is due to three things: unequal education, training, and racial discrimination. The disparity has been getting worse instead of better."

The President, in his message on civil rights on June 19, 1963, said that simple justice requires that public funds to which all taxpayers of all races contribute, should not be spent in any fashion which encourages, entrenches, subsidizes or results in racial discrimination. Direct discrimination by Federal, State or local governments is prohibited by the Constitution. The proposed administration bill on civil rights provides that the United States is not required to furnish financial assistance "to any program or activity in which racial discrimination occurs."

I believe that if Federal aid is withheld from schools which discriminate between students by reason of their race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin, we shall hasten action on the part of States which are now reluctant to desegregate their schools and grant Negroes equal educational opportunities.

The Congress must lose no opportunity to show that it recognizes the present crisis and that the full weight of the Federal Government must be thrown on the side of adaptation of civil rights legislation to the end that the destructive and vicious evils of discrimination based on race, color, religion, will be eliminated wherever they are found in our country. For these reasons, I urge your committee to take favorable action on the legislation before you.

Lewis M. Stevens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to inform the Members of the House of the death of the Honorable Lewis M. Stevens, of Philadelphia. I had the good fortune to have him as the chairman of my personal campaign committee when I was a candidate for reelection to the 87th and 88th Congresses.

He was an outstanding lawyer in our city and known throughout the country. He had experience in public office on city, State, and National levels. He served as Chief Counsel for the U.S. Senate Banking and Currency Subcommittee investigating operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania he was secretary of highways in the administration of Gov. George M. Leader. In Philadelphia he was a councilman-at-large in the first council under the new city charter.

In the 1956 National Democratic Convention in Chicago, I was on the convention floor the last day and observed him in his efforts to obtain votes for John F. Kennedy as a candidate for Vice President.

He was an intimate colleague of my sponsor, the late Councilman Charles M. Finley, in the City Council of Philadelphia. He served as trustee of the Charles M. Finley Playground Fund, which supports many public activities in the playground, which is one of the most attractive in the city of Philadelphia and is located in the 50th ward.

The following is an excerpt from a lengthy article on Lew Stevens in the Evening Bulletin for July 15:

Mr. Stevens was born in Meriden, Conn., on July 11, 1898. He was graduated from Princeton in 1920, and was a Phi Beta Kappa. In 1923 he was graduated from Harvard Law School, and was admitted to the Philadelphia bar the same year. He was a member of the firm of Stradley, Ronon, Stevens & Young.

He was a member of the Philedelphia, Pennsylvania, and American Bar Associations.

Mr. Stevens was president of the board of trustees of Lincoln University, president of the board of directors of the Samuel S. Fels Fund, and a member of the board of trustees of the Presbyterian Hospital. He was moderator of the Presbytery of Philadelphia in 1949.

He was a member of the distribution committee of the Philadelphia Foundation, a director of the Blue Cross of Philadlphia, director, member of the executive committee and counsel of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, and a director of the White-Williams Foundation.

He also had served as a director of the Community Chest of Philadelphia. During World War II, he was chairman of the USO Council of Philadelphia and chairman of the budget committee, United War Chest.

Outcome of the Wheat Referendum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, recently, I had the privilege of receiving a transcript of a radio broadcast by John F. Lewis. This "Washington Report" was produced and recorded for the National Association of Educational Broadcasters in early June 1963. Mr. Lewis deals with the wheat referendum in which farmers voted on May 21, 1963. He is concerned partly with the background of the referendum, but mainly with the results. I think it would be wise to share the transcript with our colleagues and am inserting it into the RECORD at this time.

TRANSCRIPT OF A RADIO BROADCAST OF "WASHINGTON REPORT"

(By John F. Lewis)

Since the national wheat referendum on May 21, the American public has been subjected to a peculiar demonstration of political petulance and reportorial floundering. This may prove only that by and large neither politicians nor reporters and/or editors, have any real understanding of farmers or the business of agriculture. It may also prove that there are a lot of hard losers in and around Washington. An earlier Washington report sought to analyze some of the issues at stake in the referendum. At this time this reporter would like to try to clarify the interpretations of the results.

The producers of wheat—and there are about one and one-half million of them in America—have been living with Government programs since about 1938. During World War II they were guaranteed a high price suport on their crops in an effort to feed the free world. This stimulus to excessive production was supposed to end at the conclusion of the war under a gradual adjustment program back to something like normalcy under the law of supply and demand in the free market. But the Congress is always adverse to applying the meaning of temporary programs literally, as the saying in Washington goes: "Nothing in life is quite so permanent as a temporary Government program."

So the high supports remained in force. Until the early 1950's there were practically no controls on production. The wheat farmer was politically encouraged to go on much as he had done in the prosperous years of the war.

Efforts to discontinue high support levels—historically an incentive to production—failed through the fifties, though some acreage controls tightened. But the controls only applied to the traditional wheat growers of the western plains, and they could plant a little bit more and put on a little more fertilizer per acre and make up the difference. Producers of less than 15 acres of wheat were allowed to continue without Government intervention, and most of them used the wheat for feeding livestock on farms in the East, South, and Southwest. Obviously, every bushel of wheat grown under the 15-acre provision, reduced the market opportunities for the commercial Wheat Belt farmers to sell to anyone except the Government's Commodity Credit Corporation. And the CCC had the choice of giving the wheat away under a variety of foreign aid programs to help feed the postwar world or to store it.

The principle was a good one as far as the world was concerned, as long as our dumping of wheat did not depress world markets for commercial interests in other wheat exporting countries, and as long as the world was in short supply of a commodity we had in plentiful quantity. But the world has become steadily more affluent, better able to feed itself, and producers of wheat in Canada stepped up their production sufficiently to match the United States quite favorably in world market outlets. At the same time, with the growing affluence of the international society, diets switched from the staple of bread to meat, and wheat demand has maintained at best a static market only because the population has grown. There has been practically no increase in wheat consumption for 10 years.

During the Eisenhower years, the Republicans were unable to change the laws because Democrats controlled the Congress and because Republican lawmakers on Capitol Hill were afraid they might lose some Wheat Belt votes. A coalition of some Democrats and some Republicans tried but failed to bring sense back to farm programs.

One of those Democrats was John F. Kennedy, until the then Massachusetts Senator was bitten by the presidential bug and was told by the party high command it would be the better part of political wisdom to favor continued high price supports for farmers in the Middle West.

The fact that Mr. Kennedy carried no farm States of any significance in his bid for the Presidency did not damper his enthusiasm for his conversion to the high support formula. He promptly named Minnesota ex-Gov. Orville Freeman as Secretary of Agriculture, and Mr. Freeman came up with something called supply management, under which he proposed that all agriculture should come under Government supervision and control in exchange for a check from the U.S. Treasury. The Congress refused to go along with most of the Freeman program. But they did agree to submit his supply management plans for two commodities—turkeys and wheat—in a referendum. In the turkey referendum, the turkey farmers overwhelmingly rejected the proposal. By mutual agreement with the administration in regard to wheat, it was decided that all farmers, including those 15-acre operators previously exempt from such programs, might participate in the election. But Secretary Freeman and the President decided that if all were to vote, the choice should be this: First, the administration program of continued high supports in exchange for a 10-percent added cut in the acreage allowed for production, plus marketing certificates that would restrict wheat producers to sell, in effect, to Uncle Sam first and to a free market last. Or, second, low price supports which might spell financial disaster and limited controls on production.

It was made rather clear by the Secretary of Agriculture that if choice No. 2 was made, the Government would feel no obligation to hold back the 1.3 billion bushels surplus from the marketplace—thus making it almost impossible for producers to sell their products. The surplus is sufficient to meet the needs of the Nation for about 2 years without growing another grain of wheat.

Fortunately, under the prodding of Senator Hubert Humphrey, of Minnesota, Secretary Freeman has, since the referendum, promised not to dump Government-held wheat. Opponents to the administration's wheat plan made it clear to most growers that Congress would and could write a better law—one that would be more palatable—if the farmers voted down the program May 21. Secretary Freeman and President Kennedy, assuming an executive usurpation of congressional powers not heretofore granted by the Constitution, said flatly that Congress would do no such thing. And this statement has been reiterated by the executive branch of Government since the referendum.

It was a shotgun wedding invitation on which wheat farmers were asked to vote. Either accept the Government as your absolute master in production and marketing of wheat or face financial ruin. Unlike most shotgun weddings, the wheat farmers felt previously faulty Government programs fathered that unwanted child—the wheat surplus, yet they were being told to relinquish their freedom to live with yet another Government program produced by the same masterminds who conceived the earlier mistakes.

Secretary Freeman and the President said the farmers would vote their pocketbooks. The administration was quite confident they would receive the 66⅔-vote needed to approve the wheat plan. It thus came as a real shock when the wheat farmers turned out in record numbers, and of 1¼ million participating, turned in a 52-percent negative vote. Not a single wheat State in the commercial belt supported the administration by the necessary two-thirds. Only 32 farms in Maine—and only 24 of them actually—presumably thinking support of the wheat program might enable them to get a so far denied administration backing for a potato program, plus 5 tobacco belt States in the South, upheld President Kennedy and his Secretary of Agriculture. The Carolinas, Georgia, Tennessee, and Kentucky are used to tight Government regulations of tobacco, peanuts, and cotton. It was no conflict of conscience for them to vote the same program for wheat.

Among those close to farmers, the odds were the administration would lose the referendum, but by a narrow margin in which a minority in excess of one-third would defeat the plan. Certainly, the administration spared no expense or effort in trying to convince farmers they should vote yes. Similarly, the American Farm Bureau Federation and numerous livestock organizations spared neither expense nor effort in opposition. The administration did enlist the active support of the National Farmers Union, the strongest of farm groups in the Wheat Belt; the National Grange, which today lives largely on its once, but long since abandoned, proud reputation as a conservative farm organization; the National Farmers Organization; the Missouri Farmers Association and several wheat groups in the Middle West. The wheat vote demonstrated two things that many Washington columnists and New Frontiersmen refused to admit. No. 1, that wheat farmers want a new and more sensible adjustment program from the Congress and no more of the supply-management approach of Secretary Freeman and his aids; and No. 2, the Farm Bureau is unquestionably the one truly national farm organization that speaks for farmers and can outvote in any farm showdown all other farm organizations put together. Congress, in the days of post mortem since the referendum, is showing an inclination to accept both these facts. The White House and the Department of Agriculture have yet to do so. The American people will now see whether or not the Congress is still able to exercise its legislative power against the disappointed and angered executiev branch of government in our Republic. And, as a reporter who has covered agricultural affairs in this Nation for 20 years, it would be very helpful to public understanding of such things as the wheat referendum, if the post election pundits would do their homework instead of offering such inaccurate conclusions as that top commercial network commentator who said the vote was a victory of rich farmers over poor farmers, of that prominent Washington woman columnist who said Washington was caught off guard by the outcome, when in reality she meant she had been caught off guard and of that editorial writer for one of the Nation's more respected newspapers who suggested the wheat farmers were ingrates for turning down such a wonderful Government program; plus the national wire service that kept repeating on election night that the administration lost the election despite the fact it carried the wheat States of the Great Plains. There is no way to tell how any individual voted, but a look at returns from the Wheat Belt indicates that few of the so-called rich farmers voted against the administration while 70 to 80 percent of the small and presumably poorer producers east of the Mississippi very definitely did vote in the negative.

The rich-farmer label comes from city-oriented writers who obviously cannot count. There are less than 200,000 farmers of all commodities in this country who make a net income greater than $25,000 a year, and most of them do not grow wheat—they are cattlemen by and large. Even if they did, how does one explain the other 400,000 who turned in the big no vote for the Kennedy administration and, as a final effort to put the record straight, I must repeat that not a single wheat State gave the administration the 66⅔-percent vote necessary for approval.

Americans Concerned About Civil Rights Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, many of our citizens in all parts of the country are concerned about the administration's civil rights proposals. It is apparent that the administration has given in to pressures on the part of rioters and terrorists. It is to be hoped that the Congress will not concur in this action.

I think that many of the Members will be interested in reading the following editorial comments from the Manchester (N.H.) Union-Leader, which expressed the view of many thoughtful and concerned Americans. I insert the editorial herewith:

SURRENDER TO TERROR

The Kennedy administration stands terror-stricken in front of a few bad Negroes who are responsible for the rioting in the South, in the North and in the West. This cowardly and craven performance by the administration in domestic affairs has been likened to the same cowardly retreat which this administration is conducting throughout the entire world.

The mobs at home and the Communists and other international wrongdoers abroad quickly sense, of course, the funk our administration very evidently is in. So they become bolder day by day.

The behavior of the Kennedy administration is literally encouraging international anarchy, on the one hand, and domestic riot and revolution, on the other. In the estimation of this newspaper, the Kennedys have completely lost control of this situation. They are apparently able to threaten Governor Barnett, of Mississippi, or Governor Wallace, of Alabama, or James Hoffa, of the Teamsters Union, but when it comes to standing up against Negroes whom they think control a large block of votes, or against the Communists abroad, they retreat in abject terror. It is the most disgusting sight that any American has ever seen during the history of our great Nation since 1776.

It is no wonder Adam Clayton Powell, the Negro Congressman, dares stand up in Englewood, N.J., and scream that "the white man is frightened. We have the white man on the run and we're going to keep him there."

This is fantastic nonsense. The Negroes in the United States, in the 1960 census amount to only about 10½ percent of our total population. On top of that, the actual rioters and troublemakers among the Negroes are a tiny fraction of the entire 10 percent.

Why in heaven's name should the administration stand in apparent terror of these few black thugs, hold panicky conferences and make public apologies on the radio, as the Attorney General did the other morning, saying that we hadn't done enough for them? It's a perfectly incredible sight. However, it is merely the domestic version of what has been going on in our foreign affairs for some time.

We crawl on our bellies to Yugoslavia and ask Tito, pretty please to take some more aid from us. We fawn over the Communist thugs in Poland. We entertain the friend of the Communists, Sukarno, who shouldn't be allowed in the back door of any respectable home. Finally, and most important, we lie down and let the Communists take over Cuba, 90 miles from our mainland.

The whole world looks at this inability to keep domestic order, the inability of the United States to handle the Cuban situation and thus the world can have nothing but contempt for such a cowardly, spineless, inept and stupid administration.

The great shame of it is that the great mass of American people are not like this. The situation in which this Nation now finds itself is serious enough, but if we continue this type of cowardly leadership which retreats before the Communists in Cuba and throughout the world abroad, and before the

Negro mobs at home, it is going to be more than serious. It is going to be fatal for this Nation and for all of us.

Town Meeting of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, an important use of Telstar became apparent in the initial "Town Meeting of the World" broadcast July 10 by CBS. This linking of ideas, faces and conversation on a transatlantic basis underscores the point often made that the members of NATO—the Atlantic Community—are actually closer in communication than were the Original Thirteen States when the U.S. Federal Union was formed.

It was significant and hopeful that part of the discussion during this first Town Meeting centered on the proposed political federation of NATO. The former British Prime Minister, Anthony Eden, responding to a question from a Denver, Colo., professor, came out flatly for this proposal.

Here is the Washington Post's editorial comment:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 11, 1963]

World's Town Meeting

The first use of Telstar for a "Town Meeting of the World," with Dwight D. Eisenhower, Anthony Eden, Jean Monnet, and Heinrich von Brentano participating, disclosed the exciting possibilities of this device for the formation of world opinion and at the same time demonstrated the invincibility and inevitability of the idea of Atlantic Union.

The former British Prime Minister gave the first and most eloquent expression to the aspirations of the West for some kind of association or union much more ambitious than the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. He discussed this goal of Western policy in terms of historic parallel with the formation of the American Federal Union which occurred, as he said, when the individual States were, in travel time, farther apart than the nations of the West are from each other now.

Jean Monnet, that incorrigibly and irrepressibly optimistic "Mr. Europe," characteristically construed all difficulties in the path to European Union and an Atlantic Alliance, as opportunities and challenges rather than insurmountable obstacles.

The former President of the United States exhibited that impulse toward Western accord which has been the most creditable and distinguishing political policy of his public career and gave voice to an eloquent exposition on this country's genuine wish for cooperation with Europe as distinguished from domination of Europe.

The German Foreign Minister exhibited an identity of view with that of Mr. Monnet in his appraisal of the Franco-German treaty and his construction of the celebrated preamble to that treaty which reconciles the pact with the ends of Atlantic Alliance.

It was on the disposition of thermonuclear power that the "town meeting" debaters fell out. Here, Jean Monnet expressed his impatience with the very idea of an independent nuclear deterrent as distinguished from a multilateral European deterrent linked to the American deterrent, and Lord Avon defended the British aims for an independent force that would be merged with a NATO force but susceptible of independent withdrawal in a national emergency. The disagreement on this major detail was as useful as the general accord on the larger ends of policy. It is to be hoped that there may be another "town meeting" that will dwell exclusively on this thorny problem.

The "town meeting" lacked the power of actual decision which invests real New England town meetings with a vital spark, but it possessed other virtues that recommend its frequent repetition in a world that needs to hear dispassionate and friendly discussion of the problems of greater Western unity. It is too bad that the voices of these citizens of the free world were not heard in France because of that country's decision to foreclose the program's reception.

Sooner or later, the voices and the forces making for the diminution of absolute national sovereignty will be heard and the West surely will move toward the larger unity that long has been the goal of Jean Monnet and that was acknowledged as the ultimate objective of free world policy by his colleagues on the Columbia Broadcasting System's pioneering "Town Meeting of the World."

The Problem of the School Dropout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, much has been done about identifying the problem of the school dropout. In my city of Pittsburgh, for example, the Health and Welfare Association has made an excellent study in depth involving one of the high schools. Another study of vocational education in the Pittsburgh public schools has recently been completed and created healthy discussion in the community.

In view of such progress, I attempted to make some contribution by making available to the Pittsburgh schools, PTA's and neighborhood centers, an award winning film issued by the Department of Labor called "When I'm Old Enough, Goodbye." My purpose in showing this was to encourage potential dropouts to stay in school as long as possible and practicable to prepare themselves for a changing labor market. In my introduction to the film, I stressed that desire for a job and willingness to "work hard" or "do anything" can no longer guarantee even a secure living wage.

Recently, I received a letter from Mr. O. J. Schwarm, assistant superintendent, pupil services, Pittsburgh public schools. Mr. Schwarm indicates the film was shown in 17 secondary schools with approximately 7,000 students participating. The response, he said, "was excellent." In a number of instances pupils were asked to write brief comments and Mr. Schwarm indicates pupils were impressed with the difficulty in finding and keeping a job on the part of a young person who had not finished high school.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following letter and the text of my opening and closing of the youth dropout film:

Pittsburgh Public Schools,
Pittsburgh, Pa., May 27, 1963.

Hon. William S. Moorhead,
New Federal Building, Room 718,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Dear Mr. Moorhead: By way of insured parcel post we are returning the film, "When I'm Seventeen, Goodbye," which you made available to us for showing in our schools. The response was excellent.

The film was shown in 17 Pittsburgh public secondary schools with approximately 7,000 students participating. In a number of cases, pupils were asked to write brief comments or to evaluate the picture. Their reactions were mature and, in some cases, most enlightening. Generally, pupils were impressed with the difficulty in finding and keeping a job on the part of a young person who had not finished high school. One student stated "nothing could be as bad as the picture made it out to be." This, of course, indicated to counselors that the student was giving considerable thought to dropping out of school, and that he was in need of immediate attention.

You will be interested in knowing, too, that during the period in which we had the film, it was also shown at the Anna B. Heldman Community Center, and at the downtown YMCA.

Please accept our sincere thanks for providing us with an excellent film that has a most important story to tell.

Sincerely yours,

O. J. Schwarm,
Assistant Superintendent, Pupil Services.

Opening—Dropout Film

Hi there, this is your Congressman, Bill Moorhead. I'm very concerned that during the 1960's, over 7 million young adults, most of them perfectly capable of finishing high school, will probably leave before earning their diplomas. Each of these dropouts will contribute to one of the most disturbing problems of the U.S. economy—the growth of the unskilled and unemployable.

A young person without complete high school training lacks the basic education needed to learn specialized trades in today's and tomorrow's world. Desire for a job and willingness to work hard or do anything can no longer guarantee even a secure living wage.

The film you are about to see is a dramatic and vivid presentation which won second place in the San Francisco film festival. It is the story of Doug, a bright, ambitious, likeable young man, who quits school and takes a job. Perhaps some of you are about to take this step. I hope you will pay careful attention in the next few minutes.

Closing—Dropout Film

I'm sure that the film did not answer all your questions or cover each specific problem. But, at least, I hope that it planted a seed of doubt in the decision to leave school, that it added some weight to the other side. I know that your principal or counselor is quite concerned over any such decision and would welcome the chance to talk this over with you.

Bloomfield Library Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, school, college, and community libraries all over the country are under great stress to meet the demands of students and general readers. The burgeoning population combined with the increasing numbers of citizens attending colleges and universities make for general readers as well as specialized readers to tax the services of libraries and their professional staffs.

Very often we take our library services for granted and we tend to forget those dedicated librarians who are working with great diligence to meet the demands on their facilities and who are also working to expand community interest in library services.

In this connection, I was extremely pleased to see that Kenneth McPherson, director of the Public Library in Bloomfield, N.J. was paid a great honor yesterday at the American Library Association's convention in Chicago, when the Bloomfield Library's 1962 Annual Report was selected as the best in the entire country.

When you consider that Bloomfield is a town of about 50,000, competing against more the 8,200 other communities, including all the great cities of our Nation, you will, I am sure, be as impressed as I by this award. Mr. McPherson, his assistant, Mrs. Rachel Diamond, and everyone connected with the preparation of the report can indeed be proud of their accomplishment.

And I know Mayor Conte and all the citizens of Bloomfield will join with me in congratulating Mr. McPherson and his associates.

What is Happening in the World Without Firm U.S. Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

M. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration has developed no firm foreign policy for the United States. As a result the free world is without leadership and confusion is becoming global which, in turn, strengthens the Communists and further weakens our own security.

For just a thumbnail sketch of what is happening because of the United States, under President Kennedy, failing to lead is seen in the Worldgram page from the U.S. News & World Report of July 22. I include the page, herein, as a part of these remarks:

While the United States goes prospecting in Moscow for a deal with Khrushchev—

Friends and neighbors of the United States are getting out of line here and there.

Britain has allowed Castro to use British territory as a steppingstone for sneaking subversive agents into Central America.

Britain, in addition, has alarmed Washington by its failure to clear up the confusion in British Guiana, where a second Castro seems to be emerging.

The neighbors in Latin America are getting out of line, too.

Neighbors who cheered firm United States stand on Cuba in October are having second thoughts. Peru, once strong for anti-Castro action, now leans the other way. Argentina's front-runner for presidency also prefers nonintervention.

So, when you now count noses, you find less and less support for the U.S. policy of isolating Castro. List of Latin-American governments almost sure to oppose effective action to isolate Castro now reads as follows: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Haiti, Mexico, Peru. Pro-U.S. majority is fading fast.

To add to United States concern: Mexico permits Cubana Airlines to fly passengers from Havana to Mexico City. Canada gives stopover privileges to Red planes en route to Havana from Europe. Spain operates flights to and from Cuba.

Result: Castro's agents can still move around without too much difficulty.

Remember how the United States urged its allies to get out of the colonial business?

Things aren't working out too well. Maybe it's time for second thoughts.

Look at British Guiana. Here Britain is trying to get out of the colonial business as fast as it can. United States, this time, is pressuring it to stay.

Or look at South Vietnam, once part of French Indochina. Feud between President Diem and Buddhists threatens to split the country. Massive U.S. aid, if split comes about, will go down the drain. So will the war effort.

Take Indonesia, for another example. United States prodded Dutch to get out. Now Indonesia is about as close to economic chaos as a nation can get and keep going. U.S. aid of about $700 million dollars hasn't solved the problem. There are attempts to get Dutch capital and experts to return to clean up the mess.

Then there's the Congo. Three years after independence it is still a shambles, looking to returning Belgians to put the place back together again.

From the looks of Léopoldville, they have their work cut out for them. The city has swollen from 400,000 to more than 1 million population.

But, one-third are without jobs. Food prices have shot up 50 percent in 6 months. Eggs, soap, matches are hard to find. Garbage goes uncollected. The handsome boulevards are full of holes. Bandits roam freely at night.

If United Nations troops leave at yearend, as scheduled, diplomats in Leopoldville say there's no telling what will happen.

Yet the Congo basically is a rich country. Difficulty is that Congolese, so far, have been unable to organize the Congo to take advantage of its wealth.

For United States, policy of pushing its friends out of the colonial business has turned out to be quite expensive. United States urging independence, has naturally been invited to pick up the check. As a result, pains of independence are being felt not only by Asians and Africans, but by U.S. taxpayers as well. And it's still an open question how many of the new nations can govern themselves.

Special problem confronting any U.S. diplomat in Asia is to figure out just where President Sukarno of Indonesia stands at any given moment.

Latest switch finds Sukarno turning against Russia to work with Red China.

Now Sukarno and Mao Tse-tung are revealed as partners in a drive to push Russia out of Asia and Africa. Afro-Asian journalists, politicians, and trade unions are to be organized to compete with Soviet-supported groups.

The Sukarno-Mao "line" emphasizes the racial alinement, adds the point that most Afro-Asian countries are poor. But Russia is white and relatively rich. Moscow, accordingly, can't join this new Peiping-Jakarta club.

What's Sukarno up to? He is playing ball with Red China in hopes Mao will help him dislodge India's Nehru as the big name in the Afro-Asian world.

Sukarno assumes he can work with Red China without being swallowed. Old hands in Asia wonder how long it will be before Sukarno shifts course again.

Farmer Explains the Wheat Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, ever since the outcome of the wheat referendum on May 21 of this year, I have heard one question raised time and time again by many of our colleagues. That question is, "Exactly what were the farmers voting for and what kind of a program do they want?" A few weeks ago, I received a letter from a farmer in my district. The letter was such a concise explanation of the thinking of so many farmers throughout the First District of Minnesota, and I believe throughout the entire Nation, that I want to share it with our colleagues at this time. Mr. Ed Hale of Stewartville, Minn., has struck at the heart of the so-called farm question today, and I am inserting it into the RECORD at this time for the benefit of all Members of the House.

JUNE 21, 1963.

Since the wheat referendum a month ago there have been many theories and reasons given for the outcome of the vote.

I am convinced that the reason Fillmore County farmers turned it down was their dislike for strict Government controls. I can assure you that there are farmers in Fillmore County who would resist controls such as the wheat program contained most vigorously.

They were not so much concerned with the wheat because wheat is only a sideline crop here. They were very much concerned that approval of the wheat program would lead to the same kind of program for other crops and livestock. And this they don't want.

They did resent the fact that they were being misled by being told that it was a matter of $2 wheat or $1 wheat when the fact was that they would not have gotten $2 and nobody knows what wheat will be now. They were simply willing to take a chance on the price of wheat rather than accept controls. The referendum of course gave them no real choice of programs. It was a take it or leave it proposition.

Fillmore County farmers will cooperate with any reasonable Government farm program and expect to make some concessions but will insist that the program be voluntary and not whip all farmers in line by dumping Government-stored grain on the market such as has been done the past 2 years with feed grain.

It is very plain to see that the way the program has been handled the past 2 years gives the greatest benefit to the large cash grain farmer and the big commercial feeding operations. I'm sure that it isn't necessary for me to explain to you how that works.

I have favored a program that would allow the free market to operate with the least possible restraint. I think that the Farm Bureau program that sets prices by past market history is preferable to one that uses parity as a base for setting supports. I believe also that to avoid production quotas and controls supports must be low enough not to stimulate unnecessary production and supports should not be looked on as the price of a product.

Since the wheat referendum I have heard several farmers say that if we cannot have a rather simple program of land retirement coupled with reasonable supports with limited controls and done on a voluntary basis, that they would rather the Government would get completely out of farming.

I have reason to believe that they mean it.

I hope that something can be worked out as I feel that the Congress should not refuse to consider a farm program just because farmers voted "No" on a program that they just could not accept.

Yours sincerely,

EDWARD E. HALE.

STEWARTVILLE, MINN.

All-African Nigeria's Policy Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the highlights of Nigeria's policy statement given by Nigerian Prime Minister Alhaji Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa in his address to the plenary session of the conference of heads of African states and government in Addis Ababa in Ethiopia as follows:

I feel that the mere presence of all the heads of African states and governments here shows the success of the conference.* * * I am pleased to say that, from now on, there will be no question of the so-called Monrovia and Casablanca blocs. We all belong to Africa.

There have been quite a lot of views on what we mean by African unity. Some of us have suggested that African unity should be achieved by political fusion of the different states in Africa; some of us feel that African unity could be achieved by taking practical steps in economic, educational, scientific and cultural cooperation and by trying first to get the Africans to understand themselves before embarking on the more complicated and more difficult arrangement of political union.

My country stands for the practical approach to the unity of the African Continent. We feel that, if this unity is to last, we must start from the beginning. Nigeria's stand is that if we want this unity in Africa we must first agree to certain essential things: The first is that African states must respect one another. There must be acceptance of equality by all the states. No matter whether they are big or small, they are all sovereign and their sovereignty is sovereignty. The size of a state, its population or its wealth should not be the criterion.

It has been pointed out many times that the smaller states in Africa have no right to exist because they are too small. We in Nigeria do not agree with this view. It was unfortunate that the African states have been broken up into different groups by the colonial powers. In some cases, a single tribe has been broken up into four different states. You might find a section in Guinea, a section in Mali, a section in Sierra Leone and perhaps a section in Liberia. That was not our fault because, for over 60 years, these different units have been existing, and any attempt, on the part of any African country to disregard this fact might bring trouble to this continent. This is the thing we want to avoid and, for this reason, Nigeria recognizes all the existing boundaries in Africa, and recognizes the existence of all the countries in Africa. This I think, sir, is the basis of the unity which we in Nigeria pray for on our continent.

As I have said, we have to start from the beginning. I have listened to speeches in this conference, and there have been only a very few members who spoke on the desirability of having a political union. Almost all the speeches indicate that a more practical approach is much preferred by the majority of the delegations. I am glad to say that the stand we have taken right from the beginning is the stand of nearly almost all the countries in this conference. It appears from the speeches as if we were just sitting idle and doing nothing toward the achievement of this unity.

For our part, in Nigeria, we are already cooperating with some of our neighbors. For example, the other day, my friend, the President of Malagasy, said he could not contact Lagos by telephone from Cotonou. This is no longer the case. Now he can speak direct. What we are trying to do is to link up with all our neighbors by means of telecommunications and by exchanging more postal facilities; and we are already entering into bilateral agreements with many of our neighbors. We are discussing this matter with the Republic of the Cameroon, with Dahomey, and also we have a direct link with Togo.

We hope to continue in this work because we feel that, if we are to unite, it is important that our communications system should be excellent and transport facilities should be such that it would enable us to move freely around, to move not only ourselves but to move our goods to different parts of the continent. Also, we have been trying in Nigeria to join other states in trying to discuss common problems—educational and scientific problems.

WARNING AGAINST SUBVERSION

Now, Mr. President, the Honorable President of Sudan, I think, when he spoke, told us that we should be frank. I think it was the President of Malagasy who said that we in Africa do not want to speak the truth. We have a saying in Nigeria which is: "Truth is bitter." Mr. President, I want to be frank; I want to tell the bitter truth. To my mind we cannot achieve this African unity as long as some African countries continue to carry on subversive activities in other African countries.

Sir, many of the members have spoken very strongly on the decolonization of the continent. I want to say that we in Nigeria are prepared to do anything to secure the freedom of the continent of Africa. There has been a suggestion that we should pull our resources together, that we should make arrangements if necessary, to help the nationalists in different countries in Africa, which are still dependent, to fight their way to independence. We in Nigeria are prepared to do anything toward the liberation of all African countries.

I have observed that, when we give assistance to another country which is fighting for its independence, some of us are in the habit of imposing obligations on these states. That is wrong. If we give assistance to African people in any dependent territory, we should not ask for any obligation on their part; because that would come almost to the same point that many of the speakers have made that they would only accept foreign aid without any strings attached. I do not believe that any aid, no matter from where it comes, is without strings attached to it. Let us not fall into the same trap. If we assist any dependent territory in Africa, we must see to it that we do not attach conditions to our assistance. This is very, very important if we want to establish the solidarity of the continent of Africa, to make sure that any form of assistance we give is free.

I think we will arrive at a very successful establishment of an African Common Market, because I think it is good for the trade of Africa. For example, the interstate trade is 10 percent, and 90 percent is done with countries outside Africa. There is no reason why we should not increase the interstate trade on this continent. I think, sir, that if we are able to establish an African Common Market, we shall overcome many difficulties and we shall be in a position to stand on our own in relation to the other parts of the world. My fear of being colonized will disappear if we are able to establish this African Common Market.

A suggestion was also made that we should come together as a bloc in the United Nations. Well, that is a very good idea; but * * * if we can find some kind of name for it, such as African Committee * * * it will be much better, because the whole idea of blocs is revolting. * * * May I suggest to the conference that it is time now that we find a permanent small secretariat for such an African committee in New York? * * * I think we have to do everything to get our proper position in the United Nations Organization. Some of us have suggested that we should seek greater representation in the Security Council and also in all the bodies of the United Nations Organization. Well, this has been our stand all the years we have been independent. * * * It is absolutely essential that the African continent must have more appropriate representation in the Security Council and all the bodies of the United Nations. * * * That world organization, I have always maintained, is a sure guarantee of the independent sovereignty of our African States.

NIGERIAN DELEGATION AT ADDIS ABABA CONFERENCE

The Nigerian delegation at the African Summit Conference consisted of: The Honorable Alhaji Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, Prime Minister of the Federation of Nigeria; the Honorable Jaja Anucha Wachuku, Foreign Minister; the Honorable Dr. T. O. Elias, Attorney General and Minister of Justice; the Honorable T. O. S. Benson, Minister of Information and Broadcasting; the Honorable Alhaji Senator Nuhu Bamali, Minister of State, and the Honorable Dr. K. O. Mbadiwe, Minister of State.

Officials of the delegation were: Mr. S. O. Wey, Secretary to the Prime Minister; Mr. Francis C. Nwokedi, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Mr. E. O. Ogbu, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Finance; Messrs. A. Haastrup, Alhaji Isa Wali, Alhaji M. A. Sanusi, C. C. Chukwura, M. O. Awoyinfa, and S. O. Uaboi.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Tax Reduction in the Framework of a Balanced Budget Will Aid Long-Term Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the July 10 edition of the Wall Street Journal makes some useful observations on the kind of tax reduction and reform program that would be appropriate in view of the recent upturn in economic activity. Most importantly, the editorial points out that we must be critical of policies that will deepen the Federal budget deficit which, even without tax cuts, will be the largest ever deliberately planned by the Government.

I was pleased to note that the Journal believes, as I do, that tax reductions can make a significant contribution to long-term growth only when made within the framework of a balanced budget and lower Federal spending. Tax cuts leading to large budget deficits in a period of expanding business activity are indefensible and potentially of great economic danger.

Although the administration claims that its tax package is designed to promote long-term growth, rather than just to fight a recession, the Journal points out that an effective long-range program should place more emphasis on stimulating investment and production than do the proposals which the administration has submitted to Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that this article from the Wall Street Journal be included in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 10, 1963]

TOO MUCH FOR KEYNES

The general business improvement in recent months is one of the circumstances dimming the prospects for tax reduction any time soon. But that improvement also throws into still more questionable light some of the Government's related economic programs and policies.

As for taxes, the administration economists contend that the current state of business is not particularly relevant. The whole package of reduction and reform, they say, is not an antirecession program but an effort to achieve increased economic growth in the years ahead.

Yet if that is what is wanted, it would seem the proposals would have to put more emphasis than they do on stimulating investment and production. Though they envisage a reduction in corporate as well as personal income rates, the corporate cuts are modest and protracted in their application. Many of the so-called reforms, moreover, serve mainly to add new confusions and uncertainties to the problems of making business decisions.

Whatever else may be said of the tax proposals, they would certainly deepen a Federal deficit which is bound to be heavy this fiscal year in any event. The Government's rationalization for deficit financing used to be the need to combat recessions; surpluses were supposed to be produced in good years and thus a balance struck "over the business cycle."

Apparently that theory, customarily honored in the breach anyway, is now consigned to the ash can. For here is the economy perking along very nicely indeed, and not a hint from Washington of any intention of drastically curtailing the prospective deficit, which, with or without tax cuts, is to be the largest ever deliberately planned by Government.

If a budget can't be balanced in a time of high prosperity, when will it be? The answer, plainly enough, is that it won't be so long as the present thinking prevails. Officialdom is more than half in love with deficits, and there are at least three reasons for this unlikely passion.

One is a belief that deficits are a stimulus to the economy. They may be in some circumstances, but as a steady diet they are far more likely to distort the economy, through the increased nonproductive Federal spending they permit, the loose fiscal practice they reflect, and the threat of inflation they raise.

The second reason concerns that threat; the official economists no longer fear, if they ever did, that deficits are certain to cause serious inflation, or perhaps they don't care if that is the outcome. As the President put it in a famous speech about economic myths, "sizable budget surpluses after the war did not prevent inflation, and persistent deficits for the last several years have not upset our basic price stability."

There is a bit of confusion here. For one thing, the Government has scarcely had a surplus in more than 30 years. For another, the postwar inflation was not the result of any skimpy surplus then but of the heavy deficits of the thirties and forties. For still another, prices in recent years haven't been all that stable, and the more grievous inflationary effects of those persistent deficits may show up later on rather than immediately.

Finally, because deficits do permit increased spending, they have, like tax cuts, a high political content. Our own suspicion, though, is that people are more sophisticated than politicians sometimes think. Certainly they have not reacted ecstatically to the tax proposals, and a great many are thoroughly disturbed about the policies of unlimited spending and perpetual deficits.

Tax reductions in the framework of lower spending and balanced budgets could make a significant contribution to long-term growth, whatever the condition of business at the moment. The existing spending and deficit policies, however, look more like a recipe for trouble. If they can ever be justified, it can hardly be in a period of business expansion. That course would make even Lord Keynes turn in his grave.

New Hampshire's Governor Tells Why "I'm Not Ashamed of Our Lottery"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, as an advocate of a national lottery in the United States, I am happy to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article written by Gov. John W. King, of New Hampshire, entitled "I'm Not Ashamed of Our Lottery." This frank explanation of how New Hampshire set up the country's first legalized lottery since 1894 should be read by every Member of Congress, more particularly those who have moral scruples about gambling. The article follows:

[From This Week Magazine, July 14, 1963]

NEW HAMPSHIRE'S GOVERNOR TELLS WHY "I'M NOT ASHAMED OF OUR LOTTERY"

(By Gov. John W. King, of New Hampshire)

I'm not a gambling man. I don't shoot dice or play cards, and only rarely bet on the horses. I've never bought a sweepstakes ticket—from Ireland or anywhere else.

However, I am the man who recently signed into effect a law which will set up, in my State of New Hampshire, this country's first legalized lottery since 1894. Our sweepstakes will go into operation in a year. We hope to have two races a year with purses totaling $200,000. The tickets will cost $3 each and the prize money will depend on the number of tickets sold. The proceeds will go to our cities and towns for educational purposes.

CORRUPTING MORALS?

One of the results of my signing the bill was the frequent and often bitter charge that I will be responsible for corrupting the morals of our citizens. I beg to differ with my critics. As I said, I'm not a gambler. I don't smoke. Oh, I'll take a drink now and then. But the point is, I don't think gambling, smoking, and drinking are necessarily immoral.

Although it might surprise quite a few of the antilottery group, I'm not the first person in history to look upon gambling in this way. In Colonial times my alma maters—Harvard and Columbia—used the lottery as a device to raise money. The Continental Congress tried to finance the Revolution by a lottery. They failed—not because of any immorality involved, but because the rampaging inflation of the time slashed the value of the prizes before the drawings could be made. In fact, two eminent Episcopal ministers in my State have pointed out that only recently has gambling been considered immoral.

A lot of the uproar over our sweepstakes stems from our heritage. In this part of the country there are still many groups whose beliefs hark back to the Puritanical past. They are fond of describing our beer taxes, racetrack revenues, liquor and tobacco taxes as "sin taxes." The plain truth is that we could not run New Hampshire without these so-called "sin taxes." They pay the State's bills. They also introduce an element of choice into taxation. No ordinary person can escape a sales tax or an income tax. But he can choose not to smoke, drink, or play the horses, and thereby avoid the taxes on these activities.

WHERE DOES SIN BEGIN?

Without getting into a full-scale discussion of what is and what isn't a sin, I'd like to say that in my mind a sweepstakes ticket, a cold bottle of beer on a hot afternoon, and a good cigar are all within the limits of nonsin. You start sinning when you start indulging excessively.

Certainly gambling becomes immoral when a man loses his weekly paycheck at the racetrack, hurting his family. I believe in moderation. That may seem no more risky for a politician than respect for motherhood. But, while nearly all of us now recognize that the use of liquor in moderation is not sinful, the idea of gambling in moderation still seems to rouse violent passions.

Yet I feel that the disastrous "experiment" of prohibition should have proven, once and for all, that we cannot legislate morals. None of us is qualified to force his views of morality on others. The prevailing standards of moral conduct are arrived at through a consensus of social opinion, and they change as the times change. Any man who tries to set himself up as the judge of what is right and wrong for others is not only risking certain failure; he is a danger to society. If I personally felt that gambling was wrong and if the people of New Hampshire felt otherwise, I as a duly elected representative of the people should heed their wishes.

The attacks of the professional "do-gooders" don't bother me. What does worry me is that the real moral issues of our time go unattacked. I worry about the rising divorce rate. I worry about the breakdown of respect in the home. I worry about the kind of immorality involved when one group of people deny rights to another group because their skin happens to be of a different color. Can we be proud of a society in which officials of some of our largest corporations are sent to jail for conspiring to fix prices? Or when labor leaders and employers collude to cheat workers and stockholders out of their fair share of a business' earnings?

TO SIGN OR NOT TO SIGN

It is easy to be against sin. But I find it difficult not to become angry at men who waste their lives attacking paper tigers like drinking and gambling when there are so many more obvious and more dangerous evils to be fought. I can only conclude that these self-appointed spokesmen for moral rectitude are insincere, or lazy, or both.

When the sweepstakes bill reached my desk I already had given it a great deal of thought. Then, for the next 5 days, in which I had to make the final decision of whether to sign or veto it, I considered it in the light of the heavy pressures which were brought to bear on both sides. Until the last minute, my closest associates had no idea of what my action would be. I didn't even tell my wife what I planned to do. I realized that the decision I made would have an impact not just on the State of New Hampshire, but possibly across the Nation. In many ways it was an agonizing period. Some levelheaded arguments had been made against it, and I had to be sure in my own mind about the wisdom of signing.

NO SCANDAL IN SIGHT

The first worry of many people was the threat of organized crime taking over the sweepstakes. I decided that this was an unwarranted worry. We have had many years of scandal-free control of horse racing in our State. In the last analysis, clean operation of the sweepstakes depends on the type of men who serve on the commission which will operate it. Our experience with our racing and liquor commissions convinced me that we will be able to find men of the integrity demanded by the job. The fact that the tickets will be sold through the State-operated liquor stores adds a further element of control. Our State liquor store system has run for 30 years with never a hint of the scandals which have plagued less fortunate States.

Then there was a lot of talk that the sweepstakes would take money mainly from the "little people." This is an irritating argument which betrays a lack of understanding of the nature of the compulsive gambler and underrates the intelligence of the "little people." I have always respected the commonsense and intelligence of the average man. I felt—and I believed the average man would realize—that the odds are so long against any one ticket winning, that it wouldn't make sense to make weekly trips to the liquor store to pick up more lottery tickets. It wouldn't improve one's chances enough.

As for the compulsive gambler—that sad figure who keeps the bookies rich and spends hours exercising his right arm at the slot machines—he wouldn't buy our sweepstakes tickets anyway. The odds are too long and the action isn't fast enough. He can only thrive in an atmosphere of quick payoff, which keeps alive the forlorn hope that someday he will break even.

NEW HAMPSHIRE NEEDS IT

On the positive side, there were good reasons for signing the bill. Our cities and towns certainly need the money. Our per capita income is below the national average. In many families, both husband and wife must work to make ends meet. Our statisticians showed that if we passed a sales tax, it would cost each family roughly $48 a year. This is almost a week's take-home pay for a man who makes only $65 or $70 a week.

A State income tax is not practical at this time, because New Hampshire's constitution prohibits a progressive tax. A flat-rate income tax would be just as unfair to the people least able to afford it as a sales tax, and public sentiment is strongly opposed to it.

MONEY FOR THE SCHOOLS

Our schools are in precarious financial condition. State aid to education runs only about $2.4 million a year. Our schools are supported mainly by extremely high property taxes in the town and villages. When you come right down to it, we just don't have the money. It is my belief that the sweepstakes will help to provide the answer to this problem.

No one really knows just how much money it will produce. Estimates have ranged from nothing to $11 million. I would quote neither extreme, but I am sure that the sum will be substantial and that it will provide real relief to the financial problems of our local communities.

Finally, there was no doubt that the people wanted the sweepstakes. With a population just over 630,000, we have the largest legislature in the Nation. Its 424 members represent every shade of political opinion. The smallest town in New Hampshire—with a total population of three in the 1960 census—proudly sends its own member to the House of Representatives once every 10 years. And incidentally, although I am the first Democrat to become Governor of New Hampshire since 1922, the Republicans hold heavy majorities in both houses of the legislature. Any measure as controversial as the sweepstakes which passes this body must have overwhelming support from all sections of the State.

PEOPLE ARE FOR IT

In any case, I have had personal evidence. I see between 40 and 50 people in my office every day. Nearly every evening, and most weekends, I am invited to attend meetings, dinners, and ceremonies all over the State. By now, I have been able to meet personally a majority of the people of New Hampshire. With this kind of opportunity, I could take my own political poll on whether they wanted the sweepstakes.

It's true that while the bill was working its way through the legislature, my mail was divided about equally, for and against. But many of the opposition letters showed unmistakable signs of being part of a well-organized campaign. Since the bill became law the letters have been running 10 to 1 in favor of my decision.

Who will buy the tickets? Obviously, New Hampshiremen will buy them. Since tourism is one of our major industries, and judging by the interest aroused all over the country, it seems reasonable to expect that many of the tickets will be sold to visitors. We estimate that 40 percent of the liquor sales in our State-run liquor stores come from out-of-staters. It is not unlikely that a similar percentage of the sweepstakes tickets will be bought by the same people.

TOUGH TAXES VERSUS LOTTERY

New Hampshire has entered into an experiment. There are no guidelines laid down for us. We know that other States are watching the results, because our financial problems are by no means unique. We were faced with a choice between compulsory taxation through the proven, but harsh, method of a sales tax, and voluntary taxation through the sweepstakes. We feel sure that the sweepstakes will produce the revenue we need; that it can be run without the encroachment of racketeers and without encouraging the violation of any laws; and that it will not corrupt our morals.

We have not chosen an easy way out. Our sweepstakes will require administration of the highest quality. However, I am confident that in a couple of years or so, when the results begin to come in, I will still be saying what I say now—that, far from being ashamed of our sweepstakes, I am proud of it, and of the effect it will have on education in our State.

Bonneville's Multimillion-Dollar Annual Losses and Areas of Substantial and Persistent Unemployment Not Wanted in Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, when an all-powerful Federal bureaucracy attempts by Executive fiat to extend its power without regard to constitutional or congressional authority or the welfare of the area concerned, it is high time something is done about it.

The unilateral action of the Secretary of the Interior on May 21, 1963, to extend the Bonneville Power Administration power marketing area into southern Idaho and parts of Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada is a case in point. On July 8, 1963, I introduced a resolution, House Resolution 430, relative to this high-handed and unwarranted action of the Secretary of the Interior.

This resolution should be supported by every Congressman in protest against this untenable action of the Kennedy administration to unilaterally extend its bureaucratic powers. House Resolution 430 reads as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 430

Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the extension of the Bonneville power marketing area in southern Idaho and parts of Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior, on May 21, 1963, by unilateral action extended the Bonneville Power Administration power marketing area into southern Idaho and parts of Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada; and

Whereas the Bonneville Power Administration will take over Bureau of Reclamation hydroelectric generating facilities which were authorized by Congress; and

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation found it necessary to charge an average of 5.26 mills for wholesale power to meet project repayment obligations established by Congress, it is proposed that wholesale power rates be reduced to the Bonneville Power Administration's wholesale rate of 3.10 mills; and

Whereas the Bonneville Power Administration is now operating at a substantial deficit and has been for the past 5 years; and

Whereas this extension of Bonneville's power marketing area will require the construction of an $80 million high-voltage transmission line at the taxpayers' expense; and

Whereas there seems to be substantial opposition among the people of southern Idaho to this unilateral administrative move by the Secretary of the Interior: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of the Interior and the Bonneville Power Administrator refrain from taking any action to implement the order of May 21, 1963, extending the Bonneville Power Administration marketing area into southern Idaho and parts of Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada unless and until the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been supplied with detailed feasibility studies of the proposed extension, a full public hearing has been held by this committee where all interested parties may have the opportunity to submit their views, and positive approval of the policy of extending the Bonneville Power Administration's marketing area has been expressed by a resolution of the committee and the approval of the House of Representatives.

Back in April of this year I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of articles entitled "Bonneville Now Losing Millions Annually—Wants Larger Area To Lose More In." These articles pointed up the incongruity of spending some $80 million of the taxpayers' money to supply Federal electric power at less than cost to an area now amply served by taxpaying utilities at rates well below the national average.

Since the Secretary of the Interior's action of May 21, 1963, I have received numerous statements, articles, and editorials from southern Idaho, protesting the Secretary's unwarranted action. Starting today I am instituting a new series of articles for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pointing out why the thinking people of Idaho object to the Federal Government's invasion of a market area now amply served by responsible taxpaying utilities at reasonable rates. I do this because I believe the majority of the Members of Congress and the people of the Nation are entitled to and want to know the facts in this matter.

Incidentally, the Bonneville Power Administration told the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on May 15, 1963:

A carefully defined service area is essential to good management of any utility system. Only by reference to a specific marketing area can load growth accurately be forecast and the installation of efficient generating and transmission facilities to meet that load growth be properly planned.

I heartily agree with such a policy standard, but it is hypocrisy in the extreme for the Secretary of the Interior 6 days later to issue an order that specifically provides for Bonneville's invasion of the service area of private utilities that have an enviable record of service to the area wherein they have long operated.

As the initial presentation in my series of articles on why southern Idaho does not want Bonneville, I have selected the following satirical editorial from the Payette Lakes Star of McCall, Idaho:

[From the Payette Lakes Star, McCall, Idaho, June 6, 1963]

BONNEVILLE POWER OPPOSITION

It's hard to imagine the reasoning behind the widespread opposition to Bonneville Power's invasion of southern Idaho.

In the first place, the public power advocates guarantee prosperity. The mere fact that the Portland area and sections of north Idaho, both served by the BPA, are chronically in a state of economic distress shouldn't bother us. After a few years of such prosperity we can qualify for a huge disaster loan from the Government and be as well off as they are.

The claim that opponents of Federal power make that cheap Federal power is not actually cheap should not be allowed to disturb us either. Actually Federal power isn't cheap; it's free. As long as Federal projects operate at a loss, which they seem to be amazingly successful at doing, the deficit can be added to the national debt, and as there seems to be absolutely no intention to pay off the debt this Federal power won't cost us a penny. As to what our grandchildren will face, that's their problem.

Some nit-pickers have pointed out that the BPA has no transmission lines into the area, and that a transmission line from Lewiston to Soda Springs would be expensive. This is no problem. As pointed out above the lines could be built for nothing, but in this case there is a better, quicker method. A private utility company does have lines through this area. The 1961 steel price crisis should serve to convince the private utility that it is to their best interests to cooperate with the Government in every way possible.

Troublemakers in the phosphate industry, one of the principal users of BPA power, have pointed out that not all processes use vast quantities of power in their manufacturing processes, and that the planned arrangements amount to a subsidy to certain producers. The obvious course for the producer not using an electrical process is to shut down his operation and turn to the manufacture of aluminum; it does require a lot of power, and a Federal loan will be available to make the conversion.

Dissident irrigation interests have expressed misgiving about the future of reclamation projects under the new arrangements. This is ridiculous, since we are assured that part of the surplus profits from the annual multimillion-dollar BPA operating deficit will be used to finance Idaho irrigation projects.

The final objection to the BPA extension is that it will decrease the tax base of the private utility companies. This, again, is no problem. Experience shows that no matter how much the base is decreased the Government is willing and able to raise the tax rate enough to more than make up the difference.

In summary, there is absolutely nothing to be feared from this action. After all, look at England. The Government has handled all electrical generation and distribution for years—and they get along very well with natural gas.

Loren Loomis, of Enid, Okla., Writes to His Grandson About the National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAGE BELCHER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following copy of a letter from a constituent of mine, Loren Loomis, of Enid, Okla., which he sent to his grandson:

ENID, OKLA.,
July 9, 1963.

DEAR GRANDSON: Congratulations, you are having another birthday soon, I believe your 16th. About a gift, sonny boy, you have one coming up from all us grandpas and believe me, it's a dilly. It's one you will remember all your life, and your children won't forget it either.

It probably won't please you to know that we granddaddies, helped by yours and other dads, will be turning over to you in a very few years our national debt. And it's $305 billion. You don't know how much money that is, and neither do I. All I know is that we couldn't make it any smaller so you better take it before it gets larger.

In fact it's so fantastic that if you add up the total indebtedness of all the nations in the world besides ours, we still have 'em all beat—we owe $25 billion more than all of 'em put together, and we're still giving them your money that we don't have.

What did we do with the money? Well boy, I really don't know. A few men in Russia a few years ago decided they didn't like our way of doing things so they enforced their ideas on some other nations with bullets. We thought we could stop 'em with dollars, and so far it hasn't worked. Their most recent addition was Cuba, and they're still at it.

We invented a game called boondoggling. It's lots of fun while you're playing, but the headache you get from it can't be stopped with aspirin. Only more dollars will do it, and then not for long.

My grandfather was a better planner than yours. He came down into this Indian territory, Oklahoma, in the 1890's. There wasn't a social security office nor an employment center anywhere. But the Government was kind to him. They bet him a little bit of wild prairie against $25 that he couldn't live here for 2 years without starving.

He stuck it out because he had to. There wasn't a relief agency in the whole country, and that band of Indians in the next valley were not interested in giving him a job. They were more interested in his scalp.

Anyhow, he and grandmaw hadn't heard of a 40-hour week and their darn rooster kept crowing around 4:30 every morning, so he just had to get up and start planting. He didn't get the Allotment Board's permission either. He just figured if he couldn't eat what he raised, there would still be hungry people somewhere, and I guess that's true today.

Anyhow, he built a pretty good Nation; and he did it practically without debt. If he needed a new barn, or house, he didn't write to Washington. The local banker helped him over the hump. If he wanted a new road, he didn't ask the Great White Father. He just built 'em. If he and his neighbors had to raise money with a bond issue, they did just that, and then paid it off.

Going into debt was kinda like not going to church. If you did either or both long enough, you went to Hell. And if you think living in a bankrupt nation isn't Hell, ask your history teacher to show you some examples.

We still boondoggle quite a bit trying to buy friends. Just recently the papers gave a glowing account of how we had spent $21,000 studying the love life of toads in South America, $103,000 for film on Eskimo culture; and the more we spend, the greater the Communist menace.

We grandpas evidently don't know the answer. Seems we haven't been able to figure out how our grandfathers were able to get along from 1776 'till about 1930 and give us this great big beautiful country practically free of debt and encumbering alliances with others. Perhaps you will wonder what we did that cost so much. Well, so do we.

Well, anyhow, it's your birthday; and when you come of age, you're going to have this big $300 billion in debt from us grandpas. Happy birthday, and good luck with it.

Oh, by the way, I mailed you a box today, something I expect you might enjoy as a birthday gift. It cost about 5 bucks and $1.20 postage. At first I thought I would charge it to you, but I didn't though. By golly, I paid cash.

Love, and write soon.

Grandpa.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—Congressional Record, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the Record:

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Times, June 5, 1963]

WANTS COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

To the Editor of the Standard-Times:

Last January 9, Congressman Daniel J. Flood of Pennsylvania introduced in the House of Representatives H.R. 14, which calls for the establishment of a special House Committee on the Captive Nations. The Public Law 86–90 of 1959 enumerates 22 captive nations under communism, such as: Ukraine, Armenia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, Estonia, Georgia, and others. The proposed committee will handle all the matters concerning the captive nations and recommend peaceful means by which the United States can assist these nations to regain freedom.

More than 30 Congressmen introduced similar resolutions; others indicated their support for the passage of H.R. 14, including Massachusetts Congressmen John W. McCormack, Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., James A. Burke, Silvio O. Conte, Philip J. Philbin, and F. Bradford Morse.

Presently H.R. 14 is pending before the House Rules Committee. As with any other piece of legislation, the passage of the Flood resolution needs the widest public support.

Each of us can help the captive nations by writing letters to:

1. His Congressman, urging him to vote for the passage of H.R. 14 and,
2. Congressman Howard W. Smith, chairman of the House Rules Committee, urging him to spur action on the proposed legislation.

The Flood resolution injects a powerful tool into our fight with communism. The proposed committee will bring to full light the true nature of the new Soviet colonialism.

Please write a letter today to your Congressman Hastings Keith, House of Representatives, Washington 25, D.C., and to Howard W. Smith, chairman of the House Rules Committee, House of Representatives, Washington. Urge them to vote for the passage of H.R. 14.

O. Szczudluk,
Director of Public Relations, Ukranian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Boston Branch.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Sunday Herald, June 9, 1963]

CAPTIVE NATIONS BILL NEEDS SUPPORT

To the Editor of the Herald:

Last January 9 Congressman Daniel J. Flood of Pennsylvania introduced in the House of Representatives H.R. 14, which calls for the establishment of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations, to handle all matters concerning these nations and to recommend means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful means to regain freedom.

Over 30 Congressmen introduced similar resolutions; others indicated their support for H.R. 14, including Congressmen John McCormack, Thomas O'Neill, James Burke, Silvio Conte, Philip Philbin and Bradford Morse.

Please write a letter today to your Congressman and to Hon. Howard W. Smith, chairman of the House Rules Committee, urging them to vote for H.R. 14.

O. Szczudluk,
Director, Public Relations, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Boston Branch.

ARF Apovian Committee,
May 28, 1963.

Congressman Daniel J. Flood,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Congressman: The Hollywood Apovian Committee of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation informs you that a resolution has been passed by our unit supporting passage of House Resolutions 14 and 15, submitted by you, which call for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Recent developments worldwide and Washington make the formation of such a committee imperative to the security and welfare of the United States, and will bring added hope to the tyrannized peoples of the once free nations today in Soviet bondage.

We are, in addition to this letter, contacting our Congressman as well as Congressman Howard W. Smith, head of the Rules Committee, urging him to release your resolution to the House floor for quick debate and passage.

May we take this opportunity to commend you for your stand in this regard, and to assure you of our every support of your measure.

Sincerely,

Artoosh Satoorian,
Secretary, Hollywood Apovian Committee, ARF, Van Nuys, Calif.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1963.

Mr. Walter Tustaniwsky,
Chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Hamtramck and North Eastern Detroit Branch, Detroit, Mich.

Dear Mr. Tustaniwsky: Thank you for your communication of May 25 in regard to House Resolution 14.

I am pleased to advise you I am the sponsor of identical legislation to establish a special committee on the captive nations. A copy of my bill, House Resolution 196, is enclosed for your information.

You may be assured I shall continue to do all I can to have early and favorable consideration given this legislation.

With every good wish,

Sincerely yours,

John D. Dingell,
Member of Congress.

Ukrianian Congress
Committee of America,
Troy, N. Y., June 8, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: The United States cannot afford to ignore the many nations enslaved by the Russian Communist tyranny, since these constitute a major weakness of the Soviet empire.

On behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, branch in Troy, we urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) before your committee and give it your support.

A special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a valuable source of information to our Government, especially in carrying out its foreign policy.

We therefore urge you, Congressman Smith, to give the Flood resolution your careful consideration in your Rules Committee and support it.

Respectfully yours,
William Kutzer,
Chairman of UCC of America, Branch in Troy, N.Y.
Iwan Durbak,
Secretary of UCCA Branch in Troy, N.Y.

Youth Opportunities Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following letter and resolution received from the U.S. Conference of Mayors made clear the urgency which the mayors of the United States attach to the passage of youth opportunities legislation:

U.S. Conference of Mayors,
Washington, D.C., July 9, 1963.

Hon. Richard Bolling,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman: At the 30th annual conference of the U.S. Conference of Mayors in Honolulu in June, the assembled mayors and other officials representing the Nation's cities with populations of 30,000 or more overwhelmingly approved resolutions dealing with important programs before the Congress this year.

Among the policy statements considered and endorsed was one covering youth opportunities in which the Conference of Mayors clearly stated the significance it attaches to passage of legislation contained in the President's proposed youth package.

The resolution dealing with youth opportunities noted that the young people of our Nation constitute this country's most valuable national resource, and that the future greatness of this country is dependent upon the qualifications which our youth possess for the responsibilities which will be theirs when they become adults. It also took cognizance of the statistics which show a distressing rise in school dropouts, youth unemployment and juvenile delinquency. The conference concluded that full cooperation and assistance of all levels of government is needed to solve these problems.

Finally, in the belief that the legislation currently before the Congress offers the best hope of coming to grips with this critical situation and would further the partnership of responsibility which must exist if these problems are to be met, the resolution endorsed an extension of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, the establishment of a youth conservation and home town service corps, and the enactment of legislation for a national service corps, as well as a youth employment act. The text of the resolution is attached for your information and consideration.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors places high priority on the passage of these bills, all of which are related to and are substantial parts of an entire program of Federal-State-city cooperation that will stem the tide of what is a major national problem.

Only one of these bills, the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act, is existing law, and it alone specifically deals with the problem of putting our youth on the path of good citizenship. It is the forerunner of the measures which must follow its lead, in order that the accomplishments made in this area are not wasted by the defeat of those correlative programs which will provide job training, profitable employment, civic training and expanded vocational opportunities for young people to become mature, responsible citizens who will have a useful place in society.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors sincerely hopes that the Congress will help the cities and States in meeting responsibilities to the young people of the country by enactment of these essential programs.

Sincerely yours,
John J. Gunther,
Executive Director.

Resolution on Youth Opportunities

Whereas the young people of our Nation constitute our most valuable national resource; and

Whereas the future strength and vitality of this country depends upon the qualifications and fitness of our youth to successfully cope with the responsibilities of life; and

Whereas the number of young people under the age of majority is increasing yearly at a greater rate than the population as a whole; and

Whereas extraordinarily heavy demands have been placed upon the resources of our cities in an effort to meet the needs of our youthful citizens; and

Whereas a constant and distressing rise in school dropouts, youth unemployment and juvenile delinquency compels the cooperation and assistance of all levels of government to find solutions for these problems; and

Whereas these problems cost the Nation billions of dollars annually which could be saved with concerted attacks on the causes of the problems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. Conference of Mayors support public and private programs designed to stop the spread of juvenile delinquency and explore new approaches and resources in facilitating the educational, vocational, and civic training needed by our youth; be it further

Resolved, That the conference, in pursuing these aims, support (1) establishment nationally of a Youth Conservation Corps, Home Town Youth Corps, and National Service Corps; (2) enactment of a Youth Employment Act; and (3) extension of the Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1961.

Pensions for Veterans of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BYRNE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have always been a persistent supporter of legislation to provide pensions for World War I veterans. I am glad that the Senate of Pennsylvania passed a resolution on July 1, 1963, in support of H.R. 2332, which will provide pensions for World War I veterans.

I include a copy of this Pennsylvania Senate resolution so that the Members of Congress can read it:

Resolution of the Senate of Pennsylvania

Whereas Congressman Denton has introduced House Resolution 2332 which would provide a pension for World War I veterans whose income is under $2,400 annually, if they are single, and $3,600 annually, if they have dependents; and

Whereas one of the principal domestic problems in all areas of the Nation is the care of the aged, the importance of which is emphasized by the fact that there are now approximately 16 million men and women over the age of 65 years; and

Whereas of this number, about 2 million are those who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during the First World War, and whose present circumstances are below the average for the Nation, which fact may be traced in part to the service rendered their country during that war; and

Whereas these veterans have not enjoyed the extensive benefits accorded their younger brethren who served during World War II and who were given the opportunity for training at Government expense and assistance in securing home and business loans; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has not given any general pension to the veterans of World War I: Therefore be it

Resolved (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is urged to enact House Resolution 2332 to alleviate the dire conditions in which those who made the sacrifices for this country, in their youth, now find themselves; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Congressman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

July Newsletter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the power preference bill has been reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and soon will be considered on the floor of the House of Representatives. Because of the importance of this legislation to the State of Washington and my congressional district, I have made it the subject of my July newsletter.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the newsletter, which contains a paragraph entitled "As I See It" as well as an explanation of the bill, in the Record.

Power Preference

Although Congress is proceeding down the legislative trail at a snail's pace, there is some progress being made in the committees which doesn't make front-page news very often, but which can affect you considerably. One area of progress is the Pacific Northwest power preference legislation.

The power preference bill, as it is called, was introduced by Senator Henry Jackson, Congresswoman Julia Butler Hansen, and myself. The Senate passed the bill and just last week the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, reported the bill to the House.

You might ask how this legislation could affect you. Well, it could affect your pocketbook. Second, it could affect the industrial future of the State of Washington.

As things stand now, Bonneville Power Administration, which markets all federally produced power in the Pacific Northwest, is falling behind in its repayment contracts at a rate of about $15 million a year. This has been going on for several years. Not too long ago, BPA had a $70 million surplus in the repayment kitty. Although Bonneville is still ahead $20 million on its payments to the Treasury, power rates will have to be raised unless something is done soon. Otherwise Bonneville will use up the kitty and fall behind in its payments. Any rate increase to meet this situation could seriously affect the industrial future of the State and damage our economy.

Had BPA been able to market surplus power in past years, it would have been operating in the black instead of the red. Advances in transmission techniques, however, now make it possible to wheel this power economically all the way from the Columbia River to Los Angeles.

Under the present law, a municipal or public body gets first call on power produced at federally constructed powerplants. If a line were constructed between Bonneville and southern California, it would be quite possible for Los Angeles to demand firm power from Bonneville, which it would be compelled to deliver even if it had to take the power away from industry in the State of Washington.

My bill says, in essence, that customers in the Pacific Northwest would get first call on this power over any customer outside the area. Well, I've been accused of "building a Chinese wall," of "Balkanising" and a lot of other things that aren't so nice. But, I got the bill through the committee nevertheless. I expect the bill to come before the House in 2 or 3 weeks where it will face a tough battle.

I also was able to put in an amendment which says in effect that the Secretary of Interior must get authorization from the Congress before he can build transmission lines from Bonneville to points outside the Pacific Northwest, under terms of this act.

Such a project might cost anywhere from $125 to $250 million, so it seems to me only right that the Secretary should come to Congress to justify his request for that much money. After all, they're your dollars. Also, Congress is supposed to control the purse strings. The Interior Committee supported my amendment 23 to 9. Yet, I've been accused of being "anti-Northwest," "anti-Southwest," and "antipublic interest."

What I'm really anti about is the spending of millions of dollars without congressional authorization. I hope you feel the same way.

Sincerely yours,
Congressman JACK WESTLAND.

AS I SEE IT

(By Helen Westland)

Have you ever wondered what sort of a conversation you might carry on if you found yourself sitting next to the Secretary of Defense of the United States of America? Imagine the broad range of subjects, such as the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, our astronauts, or our space program. Well, it happened to me the other night at a dinner. I was sitting to the right of Secretary McNamara. After giving it a little thought, I chose a subject I knew something about. Since he formerly was president of the Ford Motor Co., I asked him if he had ever heard of a Thunderbird mooing? I might just as well have asked him if he knew an atomic bomb was going to be dropped on Washington. He looked speechless, but reacted quickly by asking just exactly what I meant. I told him our car, when it was new a couple of years ago, made a noise that sounded just like a cow mooing. We finally found out it was the result of a faulty plastic bushing. He looked relieved to know the answer, and I had a rather satisfying feeling that I was better informed on one little thing than our Secretary of Defense.

Kennedy's Popularity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, at such times as we are now passing through and with the apparent inactivity of the Congress, I think it is well for us to study the analysis of the situation of the United States and the executive department in connection with our national and international problems in an effort to evaluate our inactivity and place the responsibility.

William F. Buckley, in his column published in the San Francisco Examiner on July 15, 1963, certainly points out some of the fundamental reasons for our lack of achievement.

The column follows:

KENNEDY'S POPULARITY

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

A recent public opinion poll discloses that Mr. Kennedy's popularity has slipped precipitously. If the finding is correct, it is the most exhilarating datum since Plato's proof that even an illiterate slave boy could be taught to understand his complicated theorem of Pythagoras.

I intend no personal slight to our leader, for whom I wish a long and happy life. But I do feel it is high testimony to democratic perspicacity that the feeling should finally obtrude into the consciousness of the public that notwithstanding the gentleman's personal virtues and his devout enjoyment of the perquisites of high office, the simple fact is he has no apparent qualifications for an office the successful discharge of which has everything to do with your and my hopes, dreams, and ambitions, for ourselves and our children.

The word is indeed getting about: The fabulous Kennedy machine, designed to cope with all the problems that beset mankind, is stalled. The delirious self-assurance, all that youthful energy, all those teeming Harvard brains have fueled it, and it has throbbed away now for 3 years, nearly; yet nothing, but nothing important, has been accomplished. And the reason why is this: Mr. Kennedy has no grip on reality, no communicable vision of the purposes of his administration.

The grandiose rhetoric with which he reassures and galvanizes his constituents every time one of the meters on the machine registers a complaint is beginning to fall flat as the people discern the gruesome truth, that this efficient and likable young man hasn't the least idea how to maneuver through the greatest crisis in world history.

The concrete indictment of Mr. Kennedy is painfully easy to make. It was he who funked the challenge of the Bay of Pigs, who stood by while the Wall was raised in Berlin, who concluded the unworkable arrangements in Laos, who is the prisoner of monopoly labor unions, who fails to stanch the flow of gold from our bleeding Republic, who sits by acquiescently while the central bureaucracy leeches more and more of the power and freedom of the individual.

But I suspect it is not the concrete failures that have caused the diminution in his popularity. It is something else. There is something about the slickness of his total performance that is cloying. The months go by and the problems are not solved, and yet one has the feeling of radiant self-satisfaction within the White House.

I believe that any man who would address the public and confess his temporary incapacity to deal with the Nation's problems, citing great historical obstructions outside his power to cope with, would earn the patience of the people. But that is not Mr. Kennedy's mode. He is surrounded by vain sycophants who seek to transmute his dismaying record into one great, endless, triumphal parade.

The word is "rodomontade": A vain, blustering self-righteousness. Lean on it too hard, and you will collapse on the rigidities of reality—for so long, at least, as self-government works. If Mr. Kennedy were to give the impression that he is genuinely and even obsessively concerned with the great lesions on the commonweal, we might show him the patience due to a faltering, but determined doctor. Instead, though the patient grows worse, the doctor gambols about the world proclaiming the soundness of his patient's health, and his own magical curative powers.

This is a tough world. Anyone who wanted a serene life, Trotsky reminded us, picked the wrong century to be born in. There are no instant solutions to any prolem. But Mr. Kennedy's failure is to admit to the seriousness of these problems. The problem of a Communist state encysted in the womb of our hemisphere is, let us admit it, a problem; yet Mr. Kennedy has no solution for it whatsoever. The problem of the overhead of life in a technological society burdened down by monopoly unions and hedonistic state welfarism is a problem—but its existence never crosses the complacent lips of President Kennedy.

Our President emerges as the ultimate man in the gray flannel suit: The great accommodator, the weather vane on the perfect ball bearings—soul free, immune from any of the frictions of reality.

Status of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following item from the Washington Post of July 2, 1963:

STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

I was amazed at the misstatement in Walter Lippman's article, "Free and Associated Puerto Rico," in your issue of June 18, that "Puerto Ricans * * * do not vote in elections outside of Puerto Rico."

Puerto Ricans coming to the mainland can and do vote in any State of the Union where they establish legal residence. They can then vote for all local, State, and National officials, including the President and Vice Preisdent of the United States. Thousands have done it in New York and elsewhere.

The article contains other errors. "Federal legislation," writes Mr. Lippmann, "apart from tax legislation may be, but need not be, applied to Puerto Rico. This includes Federal grants-in-aid, though usually Congress does make them applicable."

All Federal legislation applies to Puerto Rico except the tax laws. Uncle Sam has generously relieved Puerto Rico of all Federal taxes and even the customs receipts are covered into the Puerto Rican Treasury. Only one modification in the uniform applicability of all other Federal legislation took place in the administrative procedure of the minimum wage law.

As for the grants-in-aid, the unvarying custom to date has been to include with the States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, although Congress could, of course, change that in any given piece of legislation.

Nor is it correct to say, as Mr. Lippmann does, that if "a compact of permanent union is authorized by Congress and is ratified by a referendum of the Puerto Rican people, it will establish a union which neither country can unilaterally dissolve."

Granted that there might be and could be a moral obligation for Congress to adhere to such an arrangement if once authorized, no Congress can bind its successors, and there would be no constitutional authority for such a commitment. Only a constitutional amendment would establish "such a union which neither country could unilaterally dissolve."

ERNEST GRUENING,
Senator from Alaska.

WASHINGTON.

A Government of Coercion and Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, appearing in the Monday, July 8, 1963, edition of the Tallahassee Democrat were the editorial remarks of the Honorable Ben A. Meginniss. Judge Meginniss is a former outstanding jurist of my district who is now retired and who has given wonderful service during his tenure of office serving the public and position he held. His remarks concerning a present day trend in our government were of particular interest to me and are words which I think are notable coming from a former jurist with distinguished service. The editorial follows:

Reading of the elaborate plans for the celebration of the Fourth of July, one remembers that in our childhood, so-called Independence Day was only that day on the calendar which comes between the third and fifth of July.

We remember our astonishment when young friends who had lately removed from Michigan proposed that we celebrate with fireworks. Our fireworks were reserved for Christmas, as incongruous as that may seem to many. We were the fringe of that generation known as "unreconstructed rebels" and our immediate forebears could not see any "independence" in the conditions under which they lived. Having just emerged from a mighty struggle in which they were overpowered but not convinced, they had had to live under a government of intimidation, coercion and force, administered by alien officers who were cruel and, in most instances, corrupt.

They fought and regained control of their own government, and the bitterness gradually subsided and patriotism revived. It reached a peak at the time of the Spanish-American War (1898) and has since been fanned into a great flame by succeeding wars and events.

However, the specter of government by coercion and force is again raising its ugly head, a Supreme Court of the United States is legislating rather than construing, and patriotism and loyalty has to be an abstract force, despising the trend toward autocracy.

Why Commemorate the Civil War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, commemorative Civil War programs have been held in various parts of the country in recent months. Capt. Eugene H. Breitenberg, troop information officer, Military District of Washington, delivered an outstanding address on the subject of "Why Commemorate the Civil War?" His remarks were presented to his listening audiences with recording facilities as well as the use of film. Because of the historical significance of this splendid speech, I would like to incorporate its full text in the Appendix of the RECORD. The address follows:

WHY COMMEMORATE THE CIVIL WAR?

Many people have asked this question, "Why commemorate the Civil War?" This is a fair question and the objective of this talk is to help you understand why we have every reason to commemorate a period in American history that called for courageous living.

In the comparatively brief history of our country, Americans have been called upon to display courage and character in these formative years. Americans have marched and died in eight major wars. Many of you have marched, sacrificed, and have lost friends and loved ones. One hundred years ago Americans marched in the Civil War—labeled by Sir Winston Churchill as "The noblest and least avoidable of all great mass conflicts." Known by many names, one may find information in history books and other material relative to this war under various headings such as the "War Between the States," "War of Rebellion," "War of Secession," and "War for Southern Independence."

Through the courtesy of the U.S. Army Band, we may listen to their recording on tape, "Tramp, Tramp, Tramp—the Boys Are Marching," a favorite military number of long ago. As you listen, think of those men who have marched for freedom and the sacred principles which characterize all free men. (Recording.)

In 1957, Congress, by unanimous vote, passed Public Law 85–305, to establish a commission of 25 prominent Americans to coordinate commemorative events during the 100th anniversary of the Civil War. This public law expressed the convictions of our Representatives in Congress that the far reaching events of the Civil War established that the United States would remain permanently one Nation. They described this war as the greatest internal crisis through which this Nation passed, and expressed the conviction that it forged the unity of America.

In later years, the sons of our united country, both the North and South, fought together side by side for human freedom, justice, and the dignity of the individual throughout the world.

How can we Americans ever forget the words of Thomas Paine, written on a drumhead by campfire in 1776 and read to troops of General Washington's Army: "These are the times that try men's souls." As souls were tried then and again in 1861, so are souls tried today in Berlin, in Cuba, in the Republic of Vietnam, and even in our own beloved land.

I invite you to go back to the years 1861–65, to a time of soul testing unparalleled in American history. There is so much to say about, and so much to learn, from the Civil War period of our history, especially now during the centennial years, that could bring all Americans to a more profound appreciation of the "Oneness" of our Nation and the need for all Americans to apply our energies in a renewed effort to revitalize character so sorely needed today. As Bruce Catton, Civil War historian, so well stated: "The Civil War did not divide us, we were already divided. It united us into one great country."

Over 6,000 engagements were fought during the Civil War and over 600,000 deaths resulted. Many times, boys were pitted against boys, for in the Union forces alone, there were more than 200,000 boys, no older than 16 years of age. More than 2,000 of these lads were less than 14 years of age. Many never lived to know a sweetheart or live a normal life such as you and I. They found comfort in the beautiful song we may now hear on tape, sung by the U.S. Army Chorus: "Just Before the Battle, Mother" (recording).

For approximately 2 years it was my great privilege and honor to work with such devoted citizens as Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant III, USA(Ret) and the late Karl S. Betts, to help carry out the objectives of the National and State Commissions. I was privileged to serve as Department of Defense Civil War Centennial Liaison Officer to the National Civil War Centennial Commission and I became imbued with the spirit of the public law.

A proclamation signed by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower in December 1960, called upon all Americans to plan and carry out their own appropriate Centennial observances during the years 1961–65; thereby enriching their knowledge and understanding of this momentous chapter in our Nation's history and of making this memorable period truly a centennial for all Americans. The President further stated: "It was a demonstration of heroism and sacrifice by men and women of both sides who valued principle above life itself and whose devotion to duty is a part of our Nation's noblest tradition."

The Civil War, with all its hardships and bloodshed, was a singing war, and produced many songs, as all wars do; however, no other war in our history, nor any other event for that matter, ever inspired so much music and musical activity.

Walter Kittridge's song, "Tenting Tonight—Tenting on the Old Camp Ground," epitomized the campfire loneliness of countless thousands of Civil War soldiers on both sides.

Many Americans have aswed, "Is it wise to commemorate the American Civil War?" Consistent with our free way of life, this is a matter of opinion. Congress, by unanimous agreement, speaking for the majority, believes it wise and just; former President Eisenhower issued a proclamation to this end, and centennial events staged periodically throughout our land attest to acclaim for such events. Forty-six States and the District of Columbia have established centennial commissions to carry out appropriate observances.

History reveals that the Civil War had its roots in such complex political, economic, social, and psychological elements that historians still do not agree as to its basic cause. Thus, whether characterized in the words of William H. Seward, as the "irrepressible conflict," or by others as "a needless war," let us agree that there existed a situation which, rightly or wrongly, had come to be regarded by men of that day as insoluble by peaceful means.

I had no relatives in the Civil War. My people came to this country in 1903. I thank God for the privilege of American citizenship and the honor of wearing a military uniform of my country. I thank God, too, for the knowledge gained as Civil War liaison officer to justify my respect and admiration for Americans, both North and South, who were willing to die for their sacred principles.

In the summer of 1862, morale was low; discouragement had set in and more men were needed. George F. Root, the greatest of the northern songwriters, one day was inspired to write the "Battle Cry of Freedom." It became a favorite song throughout the Union and was a morale booster at home and in the Army camps as well. At the end of the war, a southern officer recalled how amazed he had been when, during the fierce fighting in the Wilderness Campaign, the Union forces had been beaten back time and again, and yet, after 6 days of fighting, they reformed for battle, singing for all they were worth, "Rally Round the Flag, Boys, Rally Once Again" (recording).

As the war went into the third and fourth years, and the sacrifices and hardships increased, the lonely soldier thought of home, and those at home thought of him and they both sang. The southern boy sought to lift his spirits with "Lorena" or "Bonnie Eloise," while the northern boy found solace in "Annie Laurie" or "Kathleen Mavourneen" (recording).

Did you know that "Dixie"—a northern walk-around, was written by a northerner, Daniel Emmett, a native of Ohio? Did you know that this post popular of all southern songs was a favorite of President Abraham Lincoln? Did you know that shortly before his untimely death, when he was serenaded by a military band, Lincoln said that "Dixie" was again Federal property and asked the band to play it? And so ever since, it has been the common property of all the people. Let us now, as Americans, listen to "Dixie" (recording).

It would be wise if all of us, especially during these times, heeded the advice of one of America's great generals, Robert E. Lee, who, after the Civil War, when he was president of Washington College, advised a southern lady as to the rearing of her children. "Madam," he said, "Don't bring up your sons to detest the U.S. Government. Recollect that we form one country now. Abandon your local animosities and make your sons Americans."

It may be that divine providence has willed it so, that the centennial should come at the time in our history when we are confronted by communism, the greatest threat to our existence as a free people. Former President Eisenhower expressed it this way: "I would urge * * * in all our commemorations of the Civil War centennial, that we look on this great struggle not merely as a set of military operations, but, as a period in our history in which the times called for extraordinary degrees of patriotism and heroism on the part of the men and women of both the North and the South. In this context we may derive inspiration from their deeds to renew our dedication to the task which yet confronts us—the furtherance, together with other free nations of the world, of the freedom and dignity of man and the building of a just and lasting peace."

The story of the deeds and battles of generals and their men, is also recorded for history in photographs taken by the country's first combat photographer, Matthew Brady. Preserved for all Americans, are some scenes of peoples, places, and events of bygone days, in pictures taken by Mr. Brady which we are now privileged to view.

One of America's great and inspiring songs, "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" was written by a northerner, Julie Ward Howe, with music composed by a southerner, William Steffe. We are reminded as we listen, that this Civil War centennial relates to a period in our history when American was pitted against American—at times, father against son, brother against brother—all fighting for a principle.

Ladies and gentlemen, as you leave, you may take with you a special issue of the Army Information Digest, "The Lesson and the Legacy," which contains articles paying homage to men of character.

Unfinished Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include a very thought-provoking editorial entitled "Unfinished Business," which is taken from one of the daily papers published in my district and in my hometown of Greensboro, N.C., the Greensboro Record.

This editorial appeared in the July 4 issue of the paper and I believe carries a message which should be carefully considered not only by the youth of our great country but also by every citizen who is privileged to live, move, and have his being in the United States of America.

In these perilous times in which we are living, nothing is more important than an evocation of our heritage and tradition of free institutions for freemen and of the preservation of that freedom against license exercised in the name of liberty. Not only on our Independence Day, July 4, but on every day of our lives we should hark back in memory to the American patriots who founded this country, to the American ideals which they generated, and to the heritage which they left us in succeeding generations to foster and preserve.

As the editorial cogently points out, real patriotism is unfinished business; it is not static; it must be channeled into action and profession of faith if it is indeed to flourish. There is no place in the exercise and affirmation of patriotism for cynicism, and if patriotism has indeed "outlived its usefulness," as the editorial quotes a New England high school student as writing in an assigned paper, then we might as well pack up our bags and go home and let this great country return to the wilderness from which it was originally wrested. The editorial follows:

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There are those, we know, who think, or at least say, that it's corny to talk about patriotism—even on the Fourth of July.

The other night, for example, we read about the New England high school girl who wrote in her student paper that "one must be a blindly stupid individual" to be patriotic. Furthermore, she wrote, patriotism made a person "arrogant, selfish, self-centered and filled with potential hate." She had concluded that patriotism "has outlived its usefulness."

If some of our young people are cynical, they are not alone in trying to downgrade the meaning of life in the United States. An editorial contemporary has said that the present generation of adults is 'in general, the least possessed of American virtues of any in our history." That is harsh judgment. We would like to believe it to be untrue and unwarranted. However, we are not sure but that it is close to fact.

We should be sobered by even the suggestion that as a people we are "the least possessed of American virtues of any (generation) in our history." Who, even among the cynical, can sensibly argue that our country is not in danger when the values, dreams and finest achievements in our heritage are not known and respected by us? And how can there be genuine respect for the qualities and attributes of our heritage if we do not have knowledge of them? Maybe, the trouble is more indifference than ignorance. Certainly, most of us have been taught much about our country's history and what went into the realization of the dream of those hardy men whose vision, courage and faith set the course of freedom and democracy in a wilderness land.

Borrowing the high school student's words, we suggest that the "blindly stupid individual" is really the one who speaks against patriotism. And we hasten to explain that we are speaking of patriotism in its broadest, deepest and most spiritual sense—genuine love for country and unhesitating acceptance of the responsibilities which go with privileges and rights.

Indeed, true patriotism has not outlived its usefulness or yielded one inch in the urgency of its being. To say that it has would be to deny the grim realities of our times. These, surely, are days calling for the finest and highest form of patriotism—the kind that is grounded in real understanding of the American ideal. This kind of patriotism embraces dedication to and belief in the principles of freedom we profess, and is firmly fixed in determination to perpetuate our Nation's heritage at all cost.

Today, we look back—187 years—to an important milestone in man's struggling progress on freedom's road. We are reminded that this milestone—the proclaiming of our independence—was not a terminal point, but rather a fresh starting line for the human race in its never-ending efforts to be free. The signing of the Declaration of Independence was not a completed event, but part of a continuing process.

And while we enjoy the fruits of freedom, we are nevertheless aware that protecting and perpetuating our ideals and principles must be a ceaseless undertaking. This is impossible without the practice and teaching of true patriotism.

The flags, martial music and the gayety of this day are reminders that real patriotism is unfinished business.

Attorney John H. Bigelow, of Hazleton, Pa., Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the dean of the Luzerne County Bar Association, Attorney John H. Bigelow, of Hazleton, Pa., was recently tendered a testimonial dinner by his many colleagues and friends. Attorney Bigelow, who has practiced law for 66 of his 88 years, has had a most distinguished career in the legal profession and as a public figure. The Wilkes-Barre Times Leader in its edition of Saturday, July 13, 1963, paid editorial tribute to Attorney Bigelow and as part of my remarks today I include this editorial]:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader, July 13, 1963]

TESTIMONIAL FOR JOHN H. BIGELOW

The testimonial dinner for Attorney John H. Bigelow, of Hazleton, at the Valley Country Club in Conyngham was an impressive tribute to the dean of the Luzerne County Bar Association who has practiced law for 66 of his 88 years.

Justice Benjamin R. Jones of the State supreme court and President Judge Frank Pinola of the Luzerne County Court of Common Pleas voiced the sentiments of the distinguished assemblage when the former referred to the guest of honor as "a student of the law" and the latter described him as "without question the ablest lawyer at the bar." And there were no dissenting opinions from associates on the bench or exceptions by other members of the legal profession to these words of high praise for this self-made man at the pinnacle of a noted career.

Born at Beaver Meadow, a son of English immigrants, he went to work for the Lehigh Valley Railroad at 15 after a public school education in Hazleton. For the next 7 years, he earned a livelihood and studied law in the office of Judge Troutman until he was admitted to the bar in 1897. The following year, he quit his railroad job and launched a practice that was to become one of the most extensive in the area.

Attorney Bigelow ranged over a wide field as counsel for corporations, utilities, and banks. Not only was he an authority on corporate and municipal law, but he figured in some of the most important cases to be tried in the Luzerne County courts. He acquired a well deserved reputation as a jury pleader and consultant. For 4 years, he was district attorney of Luzerne County and for 42 years he was solicitor for the city of Hazleton. He also served on the board of law examiners and the committee on court rules.

A Democrat, he was State chairman of his party for 2 years. As a delegate to the 1916 convention in St. Louis, he seconded the nomination of Woodrow Wilson for President. In 1920, he placed Attorney General Mitchell Palmer in nomination for President, such was the stature he acquired.

A brother of Attorney Richard Bigelow and an uncle of Judge Richard Bigelow and Attorney John L. Bigelow, he has illuminated the family escutcheon, not only through his eminence in the law and politics, but through his integrity, courage, and character. It is not just the length of his service at the bar that matters, but the quality.

West Point's Oldest Alumnus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to have known Maj. Gen. Henry C. Hodges, Jr., since 1950 when I participated in a ceremony honoring the deceased members of the West Point alumni. Under leave to extend my remarks I enclose the article published in the New York Times, Tuesday, July 16, which describes in detail his colorful life and great contribution to this country:

GEN. HENRY C. HODGES, JR., 103, OLDEST WEST POINT ALUMNUS, DIES; OUTLIVED ALL OTHER GRADUATES IN HISTORY OF THE ACADEMY—ROUNDED UP COMANCHES

STAMFORD, CONN., July 15.—Maj. Gen. Henry Clay Hodges, Jr., the oldest living graduate of the U.S. Military Academy, died today. He was 103 years old, and lived at 65 Prospect Street.

General Hodges not only outlived all members of the class of 1881, but also lived longer than any other graduate in history.

Traditionally, General Hodges represented the alumni of all classes in laying a wreath at the base of the Colonel Thayer monument during June Week. He made this visit to West Point each year, including this year.

In 1962 he was personally greeted by President Kennedy. The general was seated in a wheelchair on the edge of the parade ground when the President walked over to him and shook hands.

APPOINTED BY GRANT

General Hodges' military career spanned the years 1877, when he entered the U.S. Military Academy, until his retirement from active duty in 1920.

He was appointed to the Academy by President Ulysses S. Grant, who had been a close friend of Mr. Hodges' father during the Civil War. The elder Hodges was a graduate of the Academy, class of 1851. He was on duty at Fort Vancouver, Washington Territory, when his son was born there on April 20, 1860.

The elder Hodges lived to be the oldest surviving member of his class. He was a captain, serving as adjutant of the 4th Infantry when Mrs. Hodges, the former Annie Abernethy, daughter of the first elected Governor of the Oregon Territory, gave birth to their son.

The younger Hodges reecived his early education at a series of Army posts and in private schools from Philadelphia to San Francisco. After entering the Academy he earned a reputation for his even disposition and ability to organize student functions. He graduated 23d in his class of 53.

After being commissioned as a second lieutenant he was stationed at Fort Clark, Tex., with the 22d Infantry. In later years General Hodges chuckled as he retold a story of one of his earliest duties as an officer.

VOTED BEST DANCER

He was ordered to Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio, to act as personal escort to a party of young women visiting the post. He was voted by them the outstanding dancer of the garrison.

His next assignment was helping to round up a party of Comanche Indians that had left their reservation near the Pecos River. The Indians were returned without bloodshed.

After serving at a series of outposts on the frontier he was ordered back to the Academy at West Point as an instructor in mathematics. He later said that frontier service has rusted his logarithms and he was barely able to keep ahead of his classes.

Assigned once again to the frontier, General Hodges, a nonsmoker, suffered numerous encounters with Indian peace pipes until he hit upon a device the Indian chiefs accepted.

At meetings he would share a cigarette with the negotiators, explaining that the gesture was binding and that the smoking would not last so long.

From 1892 to 1896 he served as an instructor at the Groton School in Massachusetts and at the New Hampshire College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts (now the University of New Hampshire).

FOUGHT IN PHILIPPINES

During the Spanish-American War he was stationed at Fort Crook, Nebr. He was later assigned to the Philippines and participated in 11 battles with the Moro insurrectionists.

Subsequent service took him to Hawaii, Alaska and a tour of duty as secretary in the office of the Chief of Staff.

At the outbreak of World War I he was ordered to the command of the 39th Division at Camp Beauregard in Louisiana. He took the division to France, but did not see combat. Near the end of the war his command was broken up to provide replacements for other units.

After the war he commanded Camp Beauregard and the 17th Infantry Division. After 40 years of service he retired in 1920 with the rank of brigadier general.

He was designated major general, retired, by an act of Congress in June 1930.

In 1891 General Hodges married Netta Haines, a daughter of Jefferson Haines, who was graduated from West Point in 1849. They had two daughters, Miss Evelyn Hodges of Stamford, with whom he lived, and Mrs. James L. Crenshaw of Bryn Mawr, Pa., and a son, Parke Hodges. His children survive him.

His wife died in 1919. A year later he married Mrs. Carrie Jones, who died in 1949.

Sit-ins, Truth, and Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the following editorial on the subject of civil rights which appeared in the Peoria Journal Star on Monday, July 15, 1963:

SIT-INS, TRUTH, AND RESPONSIBILITY

We are saddened by recent events in Peoria in the struggle against discrimination.

We are sad not because of the events, themselves, so much—for they are really minor. It is the tone of one group in this struggle, and the more than minor reactions to it that hurts.

We are sad to see people with strong feelings on equal rights drawing back. People ready to break with the past and move in practical ways on this question have been seen to falter and (temporarily, we hope) hold back.

They seem to feel that the "price of membership" in this effort is going up, and they are not prepared to accept John Gwynn, or the State head of the NAACP, as an unofficial judge and jury ruling on the actions and the motives of everybody, white or black, and every institution in this city, and then enforcing that judgment by coercive actions.

They are shaken when the question of responsibility is raised and the answer to the question is a rhetorical question flung out in a rally of 300 people. The shout of these 300 does not establish responsibility, and such a method of "settling the question" actually raises doubt.

The night in jail did not have the desired effect, either. When people insist on spending a night in jail, although they are invited to walk out, the martyrdom lacks something. The whole thing is cheapened. It seems rigged, like play-acting at best. Like a fake, at worst.

This atmosphere of arranged, planned, labored effort to build emotions by lashing out at any and every target in sight has hurt a very serious and very important cause.

Some of the "help" at the rally, provided by white participants, was not very helpful in this cause, either.

You don't fight prejudice by making appeals to some other prejudice. That's not a fit tool. Yet a white clergyman attacked the mayor of the city, ridiculed him, and misquoted him in order to do so. He ridiculed "leadership" and "management" in a bald appeal to economic prejudice without any distinction or justice. Certainly, without any measure of understanding or tolerance of those functions. This broad blast makes many who have a record that is good, and certainly have tried hard say, "What's the use?"

The mayor's statement about racial tension in Peoria as compared to other cities represented at the meeting he had attended was undoubtedly truthful and accurate. The mayor did follow it with a program that seems to stretch to the limit of the city government's powers. We believe some of this machinery might work very well in this year of 1963—if used.

For this effort, he has been slapped in the face, ridiculed and misrepresented. Does that encourage others to try to help?

If the "price of membership" in this cause is 1,000 percent support of the NAACP, a lot of potent, practical aid in positions of influence is going to be kicked out the door.

We believe that these problems will be solved by truth, the discovery of truth, and the death of "superstitions" held about Negroes (and held about whites, too, for that matter).

We suspect that the Negroes have faced these barriers so long they do not see or realize the extent of the opportunity and its nature in this community now.

We believe these Negro children demonstrating will certainly have equal opportunities, but it concerns us deeply whether these tactics are planting seeds of a new prejudice barrier for the future or helping to tear down the old one of the past.

This eagerness for "tension," if it has to be fabricated, seems based on the theory that we will integrate easier if we develop fears, uncertainties, and animosities than if we get rid of them. Are we "marking" our children, just at the time when we have such an opportunity to wipe the slate clean instead?

We don't think there is any place in this situation for poetic license such as the same clergyman used when he described Peoria as in the "national spotlight" on this issue. Compare that with Mayor Day's statement as to truth and accuracy.

We believe "The truth will set you free."

We will seek it in that good cause * * * and hope it will work in spite of factions and in spite of flareups.

Space Law and Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to inform my colleagues of the publication next month by Appleton-Century-Crofts of a most important book, "Space Law and Government," by Andrew G. Haley.

I have known Mr. Haley for many years, having served with him in the military during the Second World War. He is an author, scientist, and lawyer. He is outstanding in the field of communications law and possesses the finest of credentials to offer what is to my knowledge the first comprehensive study on space law and Government.

"Space Law and Government" examines the role of intergovernmental and nongovernmental agencies in focusing attention on scientific and legal aspects of space exploration, and proposes guides for their future contribution.

I have had the privilege of reading part of Mr. Haley's manuscript for "Space Law and Government." In the accurate words of his publisher, Mr. Haley's scientific and legal points are "deftly made, thoroughly authenticated, and represent a panoramic synthesis of the clearest thinking on space law, Government, and the relationship that should exist between the two."

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that "Space Law and Government" will be a major contribution to our emerging space age. Mr. Haley has devoted to the preparation of this work a matchless integrity and years of research and exhaustive study of the legal and sociological aspects of space flight.

I am personally awaiting the publication of "Space Law and Government" with great anticipation, and I commend this work to my colleagues with confidence.

Hon. Carl Vinson

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the floor when our colleagues paid tribute to my good friend, CARL VINSON. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to associate myself with my colleagues in their tributes to this outstanding American, Hon. CARL VINSON, of Georgia.

Affable, able, hard-working, a gentleman always, CARL VINSON has not only served longer in the House of Representatives than any other Member, but in that time has become perhaps the most influential Member we have.

In debate he is without peer. In his handling of his committee he is unsurpassed. In his imprint on the Nation, none will have a stronger or deeper mark.

Truly, in these troubled times we must look to our veteran Members to turn the tide of disastrous turmoil, with attendant mobs, to the high principles of orderly government which was intended by the Founders of our beloved Republic.

Panama Canal: Organizational Step in the Right Direction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, since the congressional inquiry, in 1949–50, into the operations of the Panama Canal and the ensuing report of the Director of the Budget—House Document No. 460, 81st Congress—forwarded by the President to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on January 31, 1950, the organizational modernization of the Panama Canal has been a matter of increasing interest in the Congress and in maritime industries that use the canal. This interest led to the enactment of Public Law 841, 81st Congress, which brought about the first reorganization of the Panama Canal since 1914 and is broad enough to permit the remaining necessary changes by Executive order without legislation.

One of the key points emphasized in the indicated inquiry and report concerns adoption of a policy that would permit the selection for high canal positions of the most highly qualified personnel available, which was never put into effect. It was, therefore, with the keenest interest that I read in the May 25, 1963 issue of the Star & Herald of Panama, R.P., of the appointment of a civilian, Capt. Ernest B. Rainer, as Captain of the Port, Cristobal, the Panama Canal's first civilian Port Captain, who was formerly a Panama Canal pilot.

Mr. Speaker, this appointment is a step in the right direction, but only a step. The major part of the program envisioned in House Document No. 460, 81st Congress, remains to be implemented. This would include the transfer of responsibility for supervision of the Panama Canal from the Secretary of the Army to the Secretary of Commerce, who has the staff facilities required for the proper supervision of this nonregulatory agency.

The indicated news story follows:

FORMER PC PILOT NAMED CRISTOBAL PORT CAPTAIN

Capt. Ernest B. Ranier, who has been Port Captain in Cristobal on a temporary basis since December 1962, became the Panama Canal's first civilian port captain this week when he received a permanent appointment to this position.

The papers announcing his permanent appointment were delivered to Captain Ranier Thursday noon by Acting Governor David S. Parker during an informal ceremony held in the Port Captain's Office in Cristobal.

A former Panama Canal pilot, Captain Ranier had served as Assistant Port Captain in Cristobal since 1955. He has been Port Captain in Cristobal on a temporary basis since Capt. Eli D. Ring, USN, came to the Pacific side as Chief of the Navigation Division and Balboa Port Captain.

He joined the Panama Canal pilot force in 1939 after more than 12 years of service at sea with the Colombian Steamship Co. and the Panama Line.

Since 1914, when the Panama Canal first opened to traffic, the positions of Port Captain in Balboa and Cristobal have been filled by U.S. Navy officers assigned to the Panama Canal. The positions of Marine Director and Chief Navigation will continue to be occupied by Navy officers.

At the same time that Captain Ranier received his appointment, it was announced that Capt. Andrew S. Stohrer had been made permanent Senior Assistant Port Captain and that Capt. Kenneth S. Roscoe had been appointed Assistant Port Captain in Cristobal. Both are former Panama Canal pilots.

Hon. Carl Vinson

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I think upon occasion each of us has a touch of depression when we feel that age is catching up with us and that perhaps time is treating us unfairly. These moods pass and we know that we are as vigorous as ever and fully able to take on the manifold chores and diversions of the busy times in which we live. We, who serve in this great House, are more immune than most from brooding upon the ageing process for we have the built-in example and inspiration of our distinguished colleague whom we honor today as he, without loss of vigor or vitality, surpasses all previous records of service in the Congress.

It has been the highest honor and privilege to me to have served as a colleague of CARL VINSON of Georgia, the great and distinguished Chairman of the Armed Services Committee. I am proud to join with the many, many others of his colleagues in paying tribute to him on this occasion which bespeaks so eloquently his outstanding service to his district and his country.

When I came to Washington in 1924 as secretary to the distinguished former Member of Congress from my district in North Carolina, Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, CARL VINSON was a veteran with 10 years of seniority. Long before I came to Congress as a Member his wisdom and example provided valuable lessons in my education. Over the ensuing years his friendship has been among the most meaningful that I have enjoyed and profited from in this body where I have been privileged to know and develop warm friendships with many of the greatest Americans of this century.

I shall not repeat what has been so well said by others about "Admiral" VINSON's tremendous, unmeasurable contributions to the security of our country in all of its facets. I agree with all who have said it in the same or other ways that the scope and sureness of his knowledge and instinct of military and naval affairs have been the salvation of this country in times of its greatest peril.

Speaking as Chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, it has always been a comfort to me to know that CARL VINSON fully and intimately knows the lessons of the history of sea power, upon which nations have risen and fallen depending upon their appreciation of the complementary roles of a strong Navy and a strong Merchant Marine. His support has always been firm on matters that have come to the floor of the House involving the maintenance of an adequate American Flag Merchant Marine as a continuing element with his beloved Navy, and the Army and the Air Force as bastions of our strength as a world power.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished life of the man whose splendid achievements we take time out to recognize today is indeed inspirational. America will grow in stature with each day of his continued service.

God bless you, CARL.

Foreign Aid That Really Aids

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the visit of President Nyerere of Tanganyika it is appropriate that we note the valuable contribution which our foreign aid program is making to the development of this nation.

The benefits of foreign aid are often overlooked by its critics. This program plays a vital role in our efforts to create a strong and free world. For this reason, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the Los Angeles Times of June 28, 1963, which points out one of the ways in which foreign aid assists African nations in meeting the problems which they face:

FOREIGN AID THAT REALLY AIDS

The United States has just approved a $780,000 foreign aid grant to the east African nation of Tanganyika for a teachers' training college at Dar-es-Salaam.

This is the sort of practical assistance that will pay continuing dividends. There is reason to doubt that other foreign aid can properly meet the needs of an underdeveloped area until an effective educational program has been set up.

Certainly political maturity will be speeded by a public school system. The illiterate in a backward nation are pretty much controlled by the handful of educated men in the country. They are dependent, and are not truly their own men politically.

Literacy means progress in improved living standards, all along the line.

The simplest sanitation and public health measures must now be explained verbally and demonstrated to reach non-reading villagers. This costs far more, and fewer are reached.

It has been estimated that if 50 percent of India's illiterate peasants could read the directions on seed packages, that huge nation's problem of producing enough food would disappear. It would simplify the vast job of teaching more efficient farming methods to those now chronically underfed.

The U.S. grant of funds for teachers' training must stand near the top of any list of undesirable foreign aid projects for underdeveloped nations. Dollar for dollar, it is about the best investment we can make.

Part III—American Individualism, by Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the third chapter of Herbert Hoover's booklet, "American Individualism," is entitled "Spiritual Phases." In rereading this chapter, I could not help but relate it to the two Supreme Court decisions regarding prayer and Bible readings in public schools, since this is a current issue of interest in the United States. I believe this chapter is worth thoughtful and careful reading by every Member of Congress, the executive, and the judicial branches of our Federal Government.

AMERICAN INDIVIDUALISM

SPIRITUAL PHASES

Our social and economic system cannot march toward better days unless it is inspired by things of the spirit. It is here that the higher purposes of individualism must find their sustenance. Men do not live by bread alone. Nor is individualism merely a stimulus to production and the road to liberty; it alone admits the universal divine inspiration of every human soul. I may repeat that the divine spark does not lie in agreements, in organizations, in institutions, in masses, or in groups. Spirituality with its faith, its hope, its charity, can be increased by each individual's own effort. And in proportion as each individual increases his own store of spirituality, in that proportion increases the idealism of democracy.

For centuries, the human race believed that divine inspiration rested in a few. The result was blind faith in religious hierarchies, the divine right of kings. The world has been disillusioned of this belief that divinity rests in any special group or class whether it be through a creed, a tyranny of kings, or a proletariat. Our individualism insists upon the divine in each human being. It rests upon the firm faith that the divine spark can be awakened in every heart. It was the refusal to compromise these things that led to the migration of those religious groups who so largely composed our forefathers. Our diversified religious faiths are the apotheosis of spiritual individualism.

The vast multiplication of voluntary organizations for altruistic purposes are themselves proof of the ferment of spirituality, service, and mutual responsibility. These associations for advancement of public welfare, improvement, morals, charity, public opinion, health, and the clubs and societies for recreation and intellectual advancement, represent something moving at a far greater depth than "joining." They represent the widespread aspiration for mutual advancement, self-expression, and neighborly helpfulness. Moreover, today when we rehearse our own individual memories of success, we find that none gives us such comfort as memory of service given. Do we not refer to our veterans as servicemen? Do not our merchants and businessmen pride themselves in something of service given beyond the price of their goods? When we traverse the glorious deeds of our fathers, we today never enumerate those acts that were not rooted in the soil of service. Those whom we revere are those who triumphed in service, for from them comes the uplift of the human heart and the uplift of the human mind.

While there are forces in the growth of our individualism which must be curbed with vigilance, yet there are no less glorious spiritual forces growing within that promise for the future. There is developing in our people a new valuation of individuals and of groups and of nations. It is a rising vision of service. Indeed if I were to select the social force that above all others has advanced sharply during these past years of suffering, it is that of service—service to those with whom we come in contact, service to the Nation, and service to the world itself. If we examine the great mystical forces of the past 7 years we find this great spiritual force poured out by our people as never before in the history of the world—the ideal of service.

Just now we are weakened by the feeling of failure of immediate realization of the great ideas and hopes that arose through the exaltation of war. War by its very nature sets loose chaotic forces of which the resultants cannot be foretold or anticipated. The insentiveness to the brutalities of physical violence, and all the spiritual dislocations of war, have left us, at the moment, poorer. The amount of serenity and content in the world is smaller.

The spiritual reaction after the war has been in part the fruit of some illusions during those 5 years. In the presence of unity of purpose and the mystic emotions of war, many men came to believe that salvation lay in mass and group action. They have seen the spiritual material mobilization of nations, of classes, and groups, for sacrifice and service; they have conceived that real human progress can be achieved by working on the psychology of the people—by the mass mind; they yielded to leadership without reservation; they conceived that this leadership could continue without tyranny; they have forgotten that permanent spiritual progress lies with the individual.

Aloha to Bob Sikes

SPEECH

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my congratulations to the dean of the Florida delegation, the Honorable Bob Sikes, now in his 12th term as a Member of this great body. Bob Sikes has attained the distinction of having served his district and his country as a Member of Congress longer than any other Congressman in the history of Florida. This fact alone is an indication of the recognition on the part of his people that Bob Sikes has made great contributions to his State and his Nation.

Congressman Sikes has authored much of the important legislation which in recent years has shaped the course of our country's destiny. He is particularly noted for his work in national defense and in the stimulation of waterways projects.

As a new Member of the House, I have had occasion to seek the counsel of Bob Sikes. In every instance he willingly and generously shared his valuable time and experienced knowledge. What I consider to be a major decision in the course of my life since my arrival in Washington was made principally on the advice of Bob Sikes. In him I have found a friend as well as a fellow worker.

I congratulate him on this occasion and extend to him Hawaii's warm aloha.

Eisenhowers Hailed in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Iowans feel as enthusiastic about former President and Mrs. Eisenhower now as they did in 1952 and 1956. Throughout the last couple of years hundreds of men and women in Iowa have told me how much they missed President Eisenhower's leadership. And one of the evidences of this was the genuine heartfelt welcome given to the Eisenhowers when they visited our State last week. There have been many articles which have described in detail the individual personal greetings extended to the Eisenhowers during their short Iowa visit.

I would like to join the people of the First Congressional District of Iowa, which I have the honor to represent, and others throughout the State in saying to the Eisenhowers: "You can't come back too soon to Iowa—we enjoyed having you, but we certainly would like to see you again very soon."

The Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette of Thursday, January 11, gives a good account of the visit of Ike and Mamie in Iowa and the reception they received there:

Ike and Mamie Greeted by Many Admirers at Boone

Boone.—Admirers, young and old, crowded around former President Dwight Eisenhower as he arrived with Mrs. Eisenhower for a visit with her relatives Thursday.

Eisenhower stood in the sun signing autographs for about 20 minutes on the lawn at the home of Mrs. Eisenhower's uncle, Joel Carlson. He invited others in the crowd to write to him at his Gettysburg, Pa. farm.

The Eisenhower party arrived in Des Moines early Thursday by special Rock Island railroad car, then drove to Boone.

In Des Moines earlier, relaxed but rather pale former President Eisenhower said President Kennedy was perfectly correct in arranging a postponement of the threatened nationwide railroad strike.

"It was a good thing to postpone it so everyone could make second thoughts," Eisenhower said in a brief, impromptu news conference beside his private railroad car on a siding in Des Moines.

SLEEP LATE

The Republican former President said both railroad management and the unions "need to take a good, hard look (at their dispute) before they do anything radical."

Eisenhower and his wife, Mamie, slept late Thursday morning after their private cars were shunted onto a siding about 1:30 a.m. They had breakfast aboard the cars before climbing into a limousine driven by a Federal Bureau of Investigation agent for a trip to Mrs. Eisenhower's hometown, Boone, 45 miles northwest of here.

After a few hours visit with Mrs. Eisenhower's elderly uncle, Joel Carlson, they were to return to their railroad cars for dinner and then retire. The cars will be hooked onto another Rock Island train about 1:45 a.m. Friday bound for Chicago.

Carlson, who lives alone, is a brother of Mrs. Eisenhower's mother, the late Mrs. John S. Doud of Denver, Colo. The Doud family lived in Boone when Mrs. Eisenhower was born in 1896. Carlson said he received a telephone call from Mrs. Eisenhower earlier this week advising him of their plans to stop for a brief visit.

"She said they were concerned about me," the former First Lady's elderly uncle said.

Mrs. Eisenhower slipped almost unnoticed from the railroad car to the waiting limousine while her husband talked rapidly with newsmen and signed a few autographs. Only about 15 persons were on hand when he stepped down from the railroad car.

Two other cars carrying FBI agents accompanied the Eisenhowers to Boone.

There was no reception committee or demonstration when the Eisenhowers arrived early Thursday morning. No public appearances were scheduled during their brief stay in Iowa.

The Eisenhowers have been on an extended tour of western States abroad their special railroad cars. Aides said no other stops were planned as the former President and first lady are now homeward bound to their farm near Gettysburg, Pa.

Brig. Gen. Robert Schulz, U.S. Army (Ret.), who has been Eisenhower's military aide for 17 years, stepped down from the railroad car just ahead of the former President.

Also traveling with the Eisenhowers were Mr. and Mrs. George Allen, Washington, D.C., long-time friends. They did not make the Boone trip.

PRESIDENTIAL RACE

Eisenhower, clad in a light sports jacket and slacks, attempted to sidestep political questions but when pressed for comment on the 1964 presidential race, he said, "I'll put it this way. I'm certainly going to support the Republicans."

He said he was "certainly interested" in the outcome and was confident the GOP would win. "I'm sure they can."

The former President refused to mention any names but said there were "about 15" good potential candidates who had not come to the public's attention.

He expressed the opinion that these "awfully good people" should be sought out by "publicity media" in the interests of making them better known to the people.

He said he did not know what part he might play in the presidential campaign. "I don't know just what they (the Republican Party leaders) may want me to do."

Hon. Carl Vinson

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, on November 3, 1914, almost 49 years ago, the citizens of the then 10th District of Georgia made a fateful choice—a choice whose wisdom would be reenforced with succeeding decades. It was on that day, Mr. Speaker, that CARL VINSON, then in his 31st year was elected to serve in this body.

Today, the distinguished dean of our delegation passes a milestone of service, and achieves the distinction of serving longer in the House of Representatives than any other American.

The world of today is vastly different from that world of 1914—altered and tempered by two World Wars, a great depression, and worldwide social upheaval. CARL VINSON has occupied a place of authority and leadership through it all. Notwithstanding the significant part that he has played in shaping the past, his thoughts, talents, and unbounded energies have ever been dedicated to the future.

Georgia, and the Nation, remain the beneficiary of the wisdom shown in that election so many years ago. It is with a deep sense of pride that I, as a new member of the Georgia delegation, pay tribute to the dean of the House on this significant occasion.

Imagination and Desire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished former ambassador to Belgium, J. Clifford Folger, delivered a particularly lucid and refreshing commencement address last month at Washington State University at Pullman, Wash. Mr. Folger's talk, I feel, embodies such wise counsel for college students and their elders that I thought it should be inserted in the RECORD so that it can be shared with others.

Mr. Folger's commencement address follows:

IMAGINATION AND DESIRE

(Commencement address of John Clifford Folger, Washington State University, Pullman, Wash., June 2, 1963)

Mr. President, members of the board of regents, members of the faculty, members of the graduating class, ladies and gentlemen, every commencement speaker is tempted to tell his captives to do things which he, in a long, and perhaps, misspent life, never did himself.

Your President said, "Be practical. Stick to what you know. Students are smarter than when you went to college."

All right, I'll be practical. But, first, just a word about things of the heart. Once I saw a play in which all human emotions were drawn through a knothole. Things finally quieted down. In the last scene an elderly librarian, speaking softly to another, was made to say:

"In a long and happy life, two things I've learned: The truth of one's imgination and the holiness of one's heart's desire."

All of which means, dream great dreams because they will come true. Whatever desire is deep in your heart, there is a holiness about it which cannot be denied. Yes, dream great dreams. They will come true.

It is a joy to be back here where I attended both high school and college, where my parents lived for 50 years and now rest on a nearby hill. They felt, and I feel, the call of this western country. My father called it God's country.

Why live in the West? For one thing, it gives you something to talk about when you go East. You can sing that song, "Anything you can do, I can do better." In the West people are making new money. In the East they just quarrel over money already made. Here the impulse to action is strong. Our forebears fought the Indians and the forest fires. They loved to pit their strength against the elements. Make no mistake, it is the pioneer spirit that has made our country great. What would we do without the "New Frontier"—the "great open spaces?" How often it is said, "I like to hear what a man from the West has to say. Maybe he is wrong, but he has ideas and he is a 'doer'."

But I mustn't forget to be practical. Here are the parents, proud as Punch, weeping happily. Maybe your mother did without a hat so you could come to school. Sometimes I think we celebrate the wrong things for the wrong people at the wrong time. Perhaps your mother should be in the first row today. But here you are in the front row wondering if you're going to get a good job. Behind you, the undergraduates are saying to themselves, "There is still a little time to have some fun." Now as to the faculty, I really don't know what is on their minds. I've often wondered. Confidentially, there is an element of envy and antagonism in me. You see, teaching school is one of my unfulfilled desires. Now that I have my medal, perhaps Dr. French will give me a job.

Once I attended a graduation of Naval Cadets. An admiral stood before them and said, "You are now officers in the U.S. Navy. Furthermore, young men, you are gentlemen, whether you like it or not."

I say to you, you are scholars—whether you like it or not. Someday you will return and seek out your favorite professor. He will not ask you, "How much money do you have in the bank?" He will ask, "What books have you read lately? What have you written? Did you take your Doctor's degree, as we talked about? What do you think of the Government's attitude toward Timbuktu?"

As you answer, you will realize whether or not you have retained that precious habit of reading. You will know whether or not you really should give your diploma back. Perhaps we should be obliged to have our diplomas renewed every year, like a driver's license.

But, returning again to the practical, how often have I heard successful men—yes, even men who rose to be President, say, "Being nice to people has been the margin of my success." Not everyone will be nice back to you. Don't worry. The world will level them off. What was it Leo Durocher, manager of the New York Giants, once said—"Nice guys finish last." He was dead wrong.

Soon people will start asking you what you do for a living. It took me 2½ years after graduation to get anything that looked like a steady job. In those days that was about par for the course. I would remind you of the legend about an old general who had a fabulous reputation for winning all his battles. "How does it happen," someone asked, "that you win every battle?" The general replied, "Because I lost the battles of my youth." Well, this suggests that you may need a little elasticity in the next year or two. But feel sorry for the one who, when he holds out his hand, always has someone put something in it. When this stops, he won't know what to do. Above all, get set for the unexpected. That's what makes life interesting. Few of us end up along the road on which we started.

People in the East say to me, "If you are so in love with the West, how does it happen you left God's country to live in the East?" The answer is simple. I went East in search of a job, just as some of you will do.

Events took me abroad as an American Ambassador. Believe me, I didn't leave here with that in mind. But I do come back now from Europe with certain definite impression. Overshadowing every experience of mine abroad, overshadowing every lifetime problem before you, is the impact of the East-West struggle, which I saw across the waters.

It is easy to say, but there is a very real danger for all of us in that impact. I urge everyone in this graduating class to visit Berlin some day. It is scarcely more than an hour away from almost any point in Europe. In Berlin you will find on one side of the street our way of life. You might think you were in Spokane or Seattle. You will see parks and playgrounds and alert, well dressed people driving automobiles, women with children going in and out of smart stores. Everything is neat, well-ordered and prosperous.

Across the street in the Russian Zone you will see enormous piles of rubble, horrible relics of the late war which are still part of the Soviet Area in Berlin. True, you will find there a feeble effort at trade, a facade of stores, but it is like a movie set. When it comes to the standard of living, the Russian Zone plods along at about 25 percent of the living standards of West Berlin.

In East Berlin people always seem to be moving away from you into the mist. Their clothes are poor, their bodies droop. There is no sign of individual freedom. Face to face, people are sad and dispirited. No wonder a thousand or more a day risked everything they had in the world to flee into the Western Zone to regain their freedom.

Ladies and gentlemen, Berlin is the greatest showcase for freedom in the world. Peer behind the Iron Curtain there. When you return to our shores and see the Statue of Liberty, you will fully realize the meaning of the lines:

> "Breathes there the man, with soul so dead
> Who never to himself hath said,
> 'This is my own, my native land.' "

And I hope you can journey one day deep into Russia. See their great cities. Visit the wheat country in the Ukraine near Kiev, much like our Palouse country. Don't try to convince anyone that our way is best. A member of the Politburo laughingly told a friend of mine he had been in jail five times—Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev at least a dozen times. Why in the world they were let loose to cause so much trouble, the Russian couldn't understand. Under communism it is simple, you go along or you are dead.

In one of the art galleries in Russia I saw a picture of Ivan the Terrible doing penance in a monastery. On his knees was a book in which were written the names of those whose lives he had taken. Ladies and gentlemen, it would take the college library to hold the names of all the people the Communists have destroyed—mind you, their own flesh and blood.

The most holy building in Leningrad has been turned into an anti-Christ museum. For a fee you can see instruments of torture represented as now in use in the Western World. Churches have been turned into stables for horses and cows.

One Sunday I was taken to one of the few churches now open in the Soviet. I said to our guide, an attractive 20-year-old girl who spoke perfect English, "Rita, won't you go in with us?" She said, "No, I wouldn't think of it." I said, "Don't you want to be married in a church? Don't you want your children baptized?" She said, "Certainly not. Churches are against the people. They hold us back." She meant it. That is communism.

This attitude convinces me communism cannot succeed. Its materialism leaves out things of the spirit. Religious faith makes men more than mere animals.

In the Soviet you are never invited to a home. There is no pride in the house, the garden, or the apartment. Leaving Russia, we were met at Helsinki by the American Ambassador who said, "Could you tell it when you left the Soviet Union?" I asked how in the world could you tell. He said, "In Finland the barns are painted."

I have heard Khrushchev speak. He is the most resourceful, wily, self-controlled human being I ever saw. His fits of anger are play acting. He came up in the toughest possible school—the school of kill or be killed. He knows the score every second. He saw tens and tens of thousands of his neighbors, wheat farmers in the Ukraine, sent to Siberia in boxcars in the winter to freeze because they were unwilling to give up their small farms. I came away from the Soviet with the feeling those powerful Russian people, pleasant as some of them may be as individuals, are totally committed. Never forget it. The Lord is plucking at our ear and saying, "Keep strong, keep strong."

Now if Dr. French shows signs of getting nervous, it is because he is afraid I am about to drift over into the realm of politics and kick a hole in the bass drum. If I could just drop a thought about politics, it would be this: Work for the two-party system.

I happened to be in France just before De Gaulle came to power. In France there were 15 splinter parties. There was no responsible government. I feared that beautiful country might fall apart. We have seen our Canadian friends having difficulty trying to get a majority government because they had several parties, rather than just two strong parties. Pick one party. Work within it. It is no fun going to the University of Washington game unless you are wild to have one team win over the other. Do the same thing about politics. You will have a ball and our country will be the better for it.

I have just spoken of France before De Gaulle came into power. I left France within this very week. I remind you, there is always much rivalry between political leaders in every country and between countries but let's not forget that De Gaulle saved France. Moreover, he did what no one man in a thousand thought possible. He is carrying out a dream that has guided his life and is now guiding his beloved France. People may agree or disagree whether his dream is best for us. But there it is—a reality we must consider.

I feel very strongly we must play ever closer with our Western European allies. They believe in the things we believe. Our good relationship with them is the hope of the Western World.

My time is up. I must close. In the days ahead it will be a good thing for each of you, every now and then, to walk slowly back into your life, say for 4 years, then slowly retrace your steps up to the present, just as you are doing at this very hour.

I tell you, the years ahead will be better than the years through which you have just now passed.

Finally, let me say once again, dream great dreams and they will come true. You are stronger and wiser than you think you are.

For each of you, I wish you your heart's desire.

Does Washington State Need Another National Park?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, most every day I receive letters from constituents who oppose the establishment of another national park in Washington State. They point out that two parks exist now, and that our National Forest Service adequately supervises the six national forests in the State.

My own district, for example, has three national forests and a national park. Each has its purpose, and is administered well. However, there is concern that the multiple-use concept as applied in national forests will be replaced by the single-use concept which would apply in the proposed national park.

Mr. Ralph E. Harbeck, of Mount Vernon, Wash., has written to me in protest against such a single-use of the taxpayers' lands. His letter included an article published in the Washington State Game Bulletin by the director of the Washington State Game Department, John A. Biggs, which points out many reasons why our national forests in Washington State are more advantageous than the establishment of another national park.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Biggs' article in the RECORD.

NORTH CASCADES NATIONAL PARK?

(By John A. Biggs)

Should the State of Washington be the first State to have within its borders three large national parks?

Pointing a finger at the rugged and scenic North Cascade section of the State, small but extremely vocal groups of ultraconservationists residing both within and outside of the State very vigorously say that the State of Washington should enjoy this distinction, and that the place for the park is in the North Cascades. Other equally vigorous groups of forest users and practical conservationists, also pointing at the North Cascades, say with certainty that this State should not lock up and remove from public use this great economic and recreational important area. There are two large national parks now in the State, they add, and we simply cannot afford a third.

The proponents of the park are principally dedicated individuals and groups whose leadership is drawn from the Sierra Club. This club, in the words of its executive director, David Brower, "is composed of some 10,500 members, most of whom reside in the State of California." Under this leadership, support for their proposal has been engendered from a number of western outdoor groups, and organizations of ultraconservationists residing in the Eastern States. Such people firmly and devoutly believe that unless such areas as the North Cascades are embraced within the national park system that their future is uncertain and that their value as great primitive areas will almost certainly be lost as a result of inroads by logging, mining, grazing, excessive water use, and hunting.

The idea of a system of national parks was conceived more than a century ago, resulting in our present parks which occur throughout the United States and most abundantly in the Western States. Their operation is based upon the philosophy that large land areas which embrace natural wonders and great scenic beauty should be retained and managed in their primitive state to the greatest extent possible. Limited fishing is permitted in the parks, hunting is prohibited, construction of roads is held to a minimum, and logging, grazing, and mining are prohibited. Undeniably this system of parks constitutes a great national heritage and their scenic beauties and natural wonders are annually enjoyed by many millions of people.

Equally, undeniable, there are located within the park boundaries tremendously valuable natural resources going completely unused at a time when the value and wise use of natural resources has never been more apparent to the people of the Nation.

Generally, the argument over the establishment of new parks resolves itself into this: One side contends that the present system of national parks serves a very valuable purpose but is adequate for the country's needs, and in some cases far more than adequate; the other side argues that the interest of present and future generations demands an expansion of the present system of parks, and that only in this manner can these natural resources be positively and permanently maintained.

A look at our group of States is interesting. Washington contains 68,192 square miles—it is the smallest state west of Iowa. Our neighbor, Oregon, is approximately half again as large as the State of Washington and has one national park. The State of Idaho has one park, Montana has one, Wyoming has two. California, with 158,693 square miles, has nine; Nevada contains 110,540 square miles and has no national parks. It is well known that each of the Western States possesses unique areas of great natural beauty. Considering this, one wonders why, if national parks are needed, they might not more properly be placed in some of the largest western states which are either completely devoid of them or have only one or two such areas.

It is estimated that there are close to 24 million acres of forest land in the State of Washington. A very considerable portion of this acreage is already on an extremely limited public-use basis. The Olympic National Park contains 888,558 acres, and Rainier National Park contains 241,571. Various proposals advanced for the North Cascades park range from 500,000 to 2 million acres—the figure most generally talked about is slightly over 1,500,000 acres. Were the North Cascades park to be created, there would thus be over 2,600,000 acres of land in the State devoted to national park use—exclusively.

These national park lands, undeniably unique in their scenic beauty and topography, equally undeniably are possessed of unique hunting and fishing opportunities—essentially all of which have been lost in the Olympic and Rainier Parks. The loss would be even greater in a North Cascades Park.

The ordinary concept is that national parks are areas which teem with wildlife, yet the facts contrast this. The Olympic National Park, in years past, provided one of the State's best elk hunting areas. Elk herds in what is now the park area had been built up under a system of sound State management and yearly provided pleasurable elk hunting for many people. But since the creation of the park, elk herds have dwindled and the park elk are enjoyed only by an insignificant number of people.

No less an authority than Mrs. Lena Fletcher, a long-time resident of the Hoh River country, and herself a descendent of pioneers of that area, has declared that the Olympic Park has never achieved, or brought with it, the great values which it was said to possess at the time of its creation. Mrs. Fletcher has stated that 95 percent of the people who are counted as visitors to the park view less than 5 percent of the park area, and that in actuality the economy of the developing Olympic Peninsula has deteriorated rather than progressed since the creation of the park.

In fact, as a result of the zeal of park enthusiasts, the very fine hunting formerly enjoyed by several thousand people has been irrevocably denied to the people of the State; and the other great resources of the park area are being utilized by relatively few people.

Contrast this with the situation existing in the foothills and Cascade area of Yakima and Kittitas Counties where is located the Yakima-Kittitas elk herd. This herd was established a little over 30 years ago with the stocking of less than 200 animals. Since that time, under a system of conservative and well-determined wildlife management, an extensive herd of elk has been developed which now is maintained as a population of approximately 8,000 animals. More striking, however, is the fact that during the past 20 years, open seasons have been annually held for elk hunting and more than 30,000 elk have been harvested from this herd by the hunters of the State.

Elk hunting in the Yakima area is annually enjoyed by more than 10,000 Washington hunters—a striking demonstration of what can be done under a modern system of wildlife management which combines proper and well applied conservation and a system of orderly harvest.

One might ask what application this might have to the North Cascades area, and the answer is that it is the State's most scenic and attractive deer hunting area. Biologists estimate that over 4,000 deer are harvested annually from areas within the proposed park boundary. Bear in excess of 1,000 animals and 80 mountain goats are also provided every year. The hunting of these animals provides an unparalleled recreational opportunity for several thousand residents of the State—an estimated 81,000 man-days of hunting.

Of late years, this recreational opportunity has been enhanced by a high mountain deer season, occurring during the month of September and limited to the area of the high Cascade Mountains. This hunt gives a chance to camp out in the alpine beauty of the high Cascades at a time of year when scenery is at its best, and, at the same time, to wholesomely engage in the sport of deer hunting. This privilege would be denied with the creation of a park, and use of the area would be restricted to the relatively few people who care to view the country as hikers or campers.

There is an even more potent and far reaching reason why the creation of a North Cascades park would strike a severe blow to fishing and hunting in the State. The State now has more than its share of lands which are denied the use of the general public for fishing and hunting. In Yakima and Benton Counties, nearly 400,000 acres of land belongs to the Atomic Energy Commission—off limits to the public. The Indian reservations of the State closed a big game hunting exceed 1,115,000 acres. The city of Seattle alone has made unavailable for use more than 130,000 acres of forest land as a result of its system of watershed protection. And there are nearly 55,000 acres of State park land upon which no hunting is allowed. Add all these together, and consider the North Cascades park established, and you see that over 5,500,000 acres would be withdrawn from hunting lands.

It would appear undeniable that from the standpoint of maintaining and developing the State's recreationally and economically important wildlife program, one participated in and enjoyed by more than 600,000 people of the State, we cannot afford the creation of a North Cascades National Park. In effect the park would constitute a permanent, severe, and costly blow to good fishing and hunting in the State of Washington.

Multiple use of the State's natural resources is of great importance to every man, woman, and child residing in Washington. It is the foundation of the State's economy. Equally, it is the foundation of the State's great recreational industry and opportunities. Our unparalleled resources of this type have served as a magnet which presently attracts the interest and attention of hundreds of thousands of people and will increasingly attract them in the future.

Can it, therefore, be said that it is logical or even good thinking for the future to lock up the great North Cascades region in a third national park in the State of Washington?

The scenic beauties of the area can, and undoubtedly will, be retained under present or proposed systems of wilderness preservation. And the record shows that its tremendous wildlife values have been capably managed in the past, and can be equally well managed in the future.

It is for these reasons that it can be flatly stated that, considering full and wise use of the State's wildlife resources, the people of the State of Washington cannot afford the creation of a third national park in the North Cascades region.

CommOnism and Conformity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, there are very few men in the United States today for whom I have greater admiration than Senator STROM THURMOND of South Carolina.

He is, I believe, one of the great men of our time.

In a recent newsletter to his constituents, the Senator, with a bare 500 words or so, incisively cut to the heart of the major decision facing, not only the Congress, but each individual in the Nation: do we, as a nation, choose commonness and conformity or do we choose, as we have traditionally chosen, the right to remain individuals.

All other questions before us waste to nothingness in comparison to this one. The answer we give will effect us for yet a thousand years. We are standing on the razor's edge of time. I cannot tell if the hour is midnight or if it is already Zero-Zero-Zero-One.

If there is still precious time left for us to make our own decision, I urge all my colleagues to read first the masterful summation in Senator THURMOND's newsletter before making that decision:

COMMONISM AND CONFORMITY

The age of individualism, when America forged its claim to greatness largely because of the independence and initiative of the individual, is gradually but significantly slipping from the scene. Individualism and independence have been replaced in large part with commOnism and conformity, as a result of a determined effort to level all men and nation-states to a common plane in life.

Individualism is the belief in the importance of the individual. Jesus Christ ordained the preeminence of the individual in his teachings, and the Founding Fathers of this country wrote this idea into the Constitution, principally into the Bill of Rights which set out specific guarantees of protection for the individual against the power of the central government. The founders realized that the individual would not last long in the new world they had settled, unless the ruling authorities were tied down, as Jefferson suggested, by the "chains of the Constitution."

Early in the 19th century, the wretched and depraved mind of Karl Marx stole a few economic and social theories and merged them together, to give birth to a new "ism" called commUnism. According to Marx, his aim was to establish an ideal world, in which each would "give according to his ability and receive according to his needs." It would, of course, be necessary to first establish a world dictatorship to bring about this worthy goal. Once established, however, this would evolve into an age called the millenium, when governmental authority would wither away and all the commoners would work together without discipline or authority, to share the wealth of the world.

A dispute then developed within the ranks of communism as to how this end should be attained. Some demanded revolution; others wanted to adopt the tactics of the Roman general Fabius Maximus, who supposedly conceived the military tactic of gradualism in wearing down the enemy. The gradualists, or fabians, as they have become known, have been particularly successful in commonizing the British Empire during this century, playing a significant part in the decline of this once-great empire. Unfortunately for America, the germ of commOnism spread from Britain to America, with particular vigor, within the past few decades.

The idea of "commOnism" is particularly noticeable today in American Government, with its paternalistic programs of aid and control. This paternalistic attitude has encouraged Negro leaders to make statements that they are seeking "a compensatory preferential highway" and that "the word equality has to be broadened." They are even making such rash and bold statements as: "America has to change its entire posture. I think it is an inevitable move toward some kind of socialism."

Today Americans will conform to central dictation not only because of the use of mass means of propaganda techniques and the habit which conformity breeds, but also because of the club of coercion which accompanies each "gimme" from the group or Government. Nowhere is the air of conformity felt stronger than in party and power politics in Washington. At the center of Government, there is little room for individualism or independence, and there is much power available to buy off or club down too many acts of independent action on the part of the individual public servant.

The day of the individualist is passing, and unfortunately, it is fading fast in the Halls of the Congress, where it ought to last longest if independence is to be preserved for every individual American. Unwarranted criticism by many Members of Congress, of their own institution, is adding to this downgrading of the legislative branch. Official Washington, influenced by its own propaganda, is under the false impression that the American people desire "commOnism" even with its features of conformity and control, rather than their right to be an individual and independent of unnecessary regulation and control.

By and large, the American people still agree with the Jeffersonian idea "that Government is best, which governs least."

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond.

The Gordian Knot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, much has been written in the press and much said by news commentators and others regarding the so-called Prince Edward, Va., situation.

At present, no public schools are being operated in Prince Edward County. The white people of Prince Edward County, through their own initiative, are educating the white children of their county in private schools. They are doing a splendid job and have schools second to none in Virginia. These same white people have offered on numerous occasions to make available to the Negro children of Prince Edward County, with the help of the Negro citizens, the same educational opportunity. This offer has been turned down because certain organizations have prevented the Negro people from taking advantage of this offer of assistance.

The white people of Prince Edward County are serious and honest in their determination to have settled by the appropriate courts the many legal questions concerning their school problems. Until these questions have been legally determined, I am convinced that the people of Prince Edward County are not going to voluntarily reopen the public schools in the county. Several organizations pretending to be interested in the Prince Edward problem have intimated their desire to help provide educational opportunities for the Negro children of the county. I am confident that, if the offer is sincerely made in an honest attempt to provide educational opportunities to the Negroes, the white people of Prince Edward County will cooperate in every reasonable manner consistent with their convictions.

I desire here and now to call to the attention of those in the National Government as well as those outside the Government who profess an interest in securing educational opportunities for the Negro children of Prince Edward County a splendid editorial that appeared in the Farmville Herald on Friday, July 12, 1963, dealing with this problem. The editor of the Farmville Herald knows as well as any person the sentiments of the people of Prince Edward County. He is familiar with the problem and in this editorial points out cogently what can be done to provide proper educational opportunities now for the Negro children of Prince Edward County. If there are organizations that are sincerely interested in this problem, they have a way pointed out to them and they can proceed to follow through in developing the necessary program of education for the Negro children.

The editorial entitled "The Gordian Knot" is as follows:

THE GORDIAN KNOT

Dr. J. Rupert Picott, executive secretary of Virginia Teachers Association, has announced that he is "confident the National Education Association will contribute at least $25,000 toward classroom instruction of Prince Edward County Negro children for the coming session." The NEA contribution with $15,000 in VTA funds would make it possible for approximately half of the county's 1,500 Negro children to attend schools in other localities throughout the State.

It is reassuring that the VTA secretary is making these arrangements.

We could suggest that the VTA give consideration to making education possible for all of the Negro children of the county next year and allow them to live in their own homes. With the approval of the VTA, teachers could be had for schools in Prince Edward County. Up until this time efforts by private individuals have been thwarted by NAACP advice to the Negroes not to accept local aid, and stymied by inability to secure teachers, Dr. Picott's approval would remove the latter.

We are quite sure that the people of Prince Edward would raise a fund to supplement the contributions from the NEA and the VTA, possibly in sufficient amounts to provide classroom instruction. Certainly such an effort would be made in all sincerity and effectiveness by the people in the county. We feel sure it would have been done and could have been done during the past 4 years had the approval of the VTA and the NAACP been given to offers already made.

If the U.S. Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, with the aproval of Judge Oren Lewis, would stay his order enjoining the treasurer of the State of Virginia, and the treasurer of the county of Prince Edward County from paying, and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Prince Edward County superintendent of schools from processing scholarship payments to parents in Prince Edward under chapter 448, acts of the Virginia Assembly of 1960, we believe education could be established for every child in Prince Edward County. This would relieve the unnecessary loss of formal education for many children and the extra financial burden for many parents, both white and Negro.

These steps can be taken without prejudice to the litigants in the Prince Edward case now resting undecided in the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia and the U.S. Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals.

The courts could decide the legal questions in a judicial atmosphere without pressure; all of the children would receive classroom instruction at home; the Justice Department could rest easier; and the misunderstanding of Prince Edward in the north and west could be corrected.

Dr. Picott could depend upon the cooperation of all people of good will in Prince Edward County. Like Alexander the Great, he could cut the Gordian knot.

The Honorable Carl Vinson

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a high honor to have this opportunity to add my congratulations to the many others offered here today to one of the greatest men who has ever served in this body, the Honorable Carl Vinson, of Georgia. Carl is now the dean of all this House and I am indeed proud and happy to have been privileged to serve with such a great and dedicated American for almost 20 years.

For 46 years our able chairman of the Armed Services Committee of this House of Representatives has shouldered the heavy responsibilities of assisting in having our U.S. defenses adequately prepared for action. It has been a most difficult task to keep our defenses strong in a world of ever changing and developing of new and modern weapons. Chairman Vinson has fulfilled his responsibilities with the ability and intelligence of one who knows more about our Nation's defense program than any other single person.

I am glad to be able to call Carl Vinson my friend and to have the privilege of paying tribute to him. He is a truly great legislator, an outstanding American who has served his district and the Nation longer than any other Member in the long history of the House of Reprsentatives. May Carl continue to break his own record for many, many more years to come.

Will United States Rerecognize Cuba?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, many of us in the House have for some time been worried over the signs that point to coexistence with communism in Cuba.

The Tampa Tribune of July 13, 1963, raises this prospect as well and confirms what many of us have been concerned about for some time—persistent reports—and signs through action by the New Frontier to confirm these reports—that the rerecognition of the Communist government is being considered.

The editorial follows:

WILL UNITED STATES RERECOGNIZE CASTRO?

American citizens, as well as Cuban refugees, should be concerned by persistent reports that the Kennedy administration is considering a resumption of diplomatic relations with Castro Cuba.

Earlier this week the Cuban Revolutionary Council demanded of Secretary of State Dean Rusk a precise and categorical denial of these rumors.

It would seem that the belated freezing of Cuban assets in this country serves as an indication that the United States is not yet prepared to reestablish relations with the Castro regime. But strange things happen at the State Department. And it is entirely possible a softer policy toward Castro is under consideration as a means of reaching an accommodation with Moscow.

After all, it was the United States which assisted Castro to power over Fulgencio Batista, although the State Department had clear knowledge of the Castro brothers' Red background. It was the United States which approved the poorly formulated Bay of Pigs landing to overthrow Castro. It was the United States—President Kennedy took the blame—which withheld vital air support at that landing and guaranteed its failure. It was the United States which last fall had an opportunity to separate Castro from Moscow via a showdown at sea, and failed to follow through. It is the United States which protects Castro from anti-Communist raiders.

Considering this record of contradiction and ineptitude, anything is possible. And it might well develop that in the depths of foggy bottom some plan for resuming diplomatic relations with Cuba is being drawn.

If this is not the case, then Secretary Rusk should say so in clear terms. Otherwise, silence will be to suggest to many that the rumors are accurate.

The Cuban economy is today at its lowest ebb. The cost of keeping Castro in power is constantly increasing with Russia footing the bill. Refugees who have left the island report morale sinking and dissatisfaction with the Castro government and resentment of the Russians on the rise. Word that the United States is considering resuming diplomatic relations would immediately cancel any move to oust Castro. "Things are going to get better," would be the natural reaction.

Shortly after Castro took over Cuba a joke, which isn't so funny anymore, was making the rounds. Castro and his advisers, it seems, were sitting at a conference table discussing means of meeting their economic difficulties. "Che" Guevara suddenly had an inspiration.

"I've got it," he exclaimed, "we declare war on the United States. They defeat us and come in and rebuild the country."

"But," wavered Castro, "suppose we win?"

In a sense, that's Castro's headache today. With the aid of Soviet Russia, he has been winning. The United States has failed to unseat him and Cuba's problems are more complicated than ever. Since we have been unable to defeat Communist Cuba, logic suggests that we permit Castro to go on "winning" a little longer until he is totally bankrupt or overthrown.

President Kennedy has said that he would not permit Cuba to become another "Hungary." If an internal uprising equal to that of the Hungarian revolution should develop in Cuba, the United States would support it.

Mr. Kennedy has said many things, and only time and events can prove whether he was sincere or indulging in rhetoric in this instance. But if the Cuban people should unite against their Communist bosses and attack them, the United States would have good reason to go to their assistance, Russia or no Russia.

But if we recognize the Castro regime, we surrender this right and surely will discourage any remaining anti-Communists in Latin America.

Vinson of Georgia

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate Mr. VINSON on his great honor which has come to no other American in history. I congratulate the wonderful people of Georgia for having the good judgment to permit Mr. VINSON to remain in Congress where he could serve with such patriotism and devotion. I thank the people of Georgia for sharing with us his genius and leadership. The entire Nation and the whole free world are grateful to the people of Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, when the textile industry and its employees were threatened, as never before, from a flood of unfair foreign imports, Mr. VINSON accepted the chairmanship of our informal Textile House Committee.

Mr. VINSON kindly consented to lead our group in addition to his other overwhelming burdens and responsibilties. I sat with Mr. VINSON through many conferences with the President, the Textile Cabinet Committee, and those leaders representing the textile industry and its employees. Without Mr. VINSON's leadership, our voice would never have been heard. As a direct result of Mr. VINSON's untiring efforts, the Geneva agreement limiting imports was signed and became effective last fall. The textile industry, its employees, and the cotton farmer will be eternally grateful for Mr. VINSON's outstanding and successful championship of their cause.

Mrs. Dorn, the children, and my staff join me in wishing for Mr. VINSON many more years of magnificent service, success, and every happiness.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Illinois who have been the leaders in this observation of Captive Nation's Week.

As many of you know, I believe that we can do more and we should do more to make known our sympathy and spiritual union with those behind the Iron Curtain who yearn for the restoration of their freedom and independence.

I have suggested and House Concurrent Resolution 8 would provide for a proclamation as a special day of observance the independence day or national holiday of the various unfortunate peoples who have fallen victim to Communist colonial imperialism. I ask leave that the text of House Concurrent Resolution 8 be included with my remarks.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the United States of America is dedicated to the restoration of liberty and self-determination for eight hundred million people enslaved by Communist imperialism; and

Whereas there exists in the hearts and minds of Americans a deep sympathy and understanding for the hopes and aspirations of the captive peoples; and

Whereas it is appropriate for Americans to keep alive the traditions of liberty symbolized by the historic national holidays of the captive nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the President of the United States proclaim the following historic dates as days of observance by the people of the United States in their spiritual union with the victims of Communist imperialism and colonialism: January 22 as Ukrainian Day; February 16 as Lithuanian Day; February 24 as Estonian Day; March 3 as Bulgarian Day; March 14 as Slovakian Day; March 15 as Hungarian Day; March 25 as White Ruthenian Day; May 3 as Polish Day; May 10 as Rumanian Day; May 26 as Georgian Day; May 28 as Armenian and Azerbaijan Day; June 17 as East German Day; August 15 as Korean Day; October 10 as Chinese Day; October 26 as Vietnamese Day; October 28 as Czech Day; November 18 at Latvian Day; November 28 at Albanian Day; December 13 as Turkestan Day.

Castro Killed 10,700 Cubans—85,000 Political Prisoners in Jail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, little is said about the brutal treatment Castro's Communist regime in Cuba metes out to his political enemies—or anyone suspected of being anti-Communist.

The thousands—estimated at 81,706—Cubans in prison are being largely treated inhumanly, being thrown in rat-infested prisons, beaten, disrobed, denied water and food, and herded around like cattle. This is confirmed by the most recent OAS report on Cuban prisoners. But this has been ignored.

The Copley News Services recently researched the figures on the numbers of Cubans that have been murdered—and I think that is a more appropriate term than killed—by Castro's Communists.

Already, since the January 1, 1959, takeover by Castro, the blood baths has claimed the lives of 10,700 Cubans.

It is a tragedy that the United States permits such inhumanity, such slaughter, such domination to continue under Communist auspices only 90 miles from our shores.

I insert the article that appeared in some papers entitled "Castro's Kill Rate Climbing" for the information of the Members.

CASTRO KILL RATE CLIMBING

MIAMI.—If Fidel Castro's Government goes on slaughtering Cuban anti-Communists at the same rate the next 3 years that it did the first 3, it will kill off more people than Castro says were eliminated under the dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista.

Since January 1, 1959, when Batista fled, opening the way for Castro's assumption of power, Cuban exile sources estimate "conservatively" that the Communists have killed or executed around 10,700 persons.

Exiles say that: Revolutionary tribunals ordered the deaths of 2,875. Another 4,245 were executed without benefit of a trial. Killed in action against Castro forces number 2,962. Missing, after falling into the hands of the Reds, 613.

This 3-year total compares with the reliable estimate of slightly more than 900 persons killed under Batista in the 6 years between March 10, 1952, when he ousted President Carlos Prio Socarras, and December 31, 1958, when he prepared to flee Cuba.

The authoritative Cuban weekly Bohemia printed a list of names of the victims of the Batista regime shortly after Batista fled. "Most of the slain were saboteurs and terrorists of the Fidel Castro forces, with the inevitable innocent bystanders making up the difference."

The contrast between the situation after Batista and that existing now under Castro's Communist tyranny is appalling.

In addition to the 10,700 Cubans whose lives have been taken by the Communists, there are 81,706 political prisoners in Cuba. Underground sources estimate that 63,440 men, women and teenagers are being held in fortresses, jails and prisons. Another 16,120 are reported in concentration camps, and 2,146 are detained in G2 compounds and other agencies of repression.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, this year as we mark Captive Nations Week there is an aura of excitement and expectancy—tentative though it is—that stimulates our observance. One dare not call it hope, for that is too precious a word for those whose right to freedom and self-determination has been so long curtailed that only those with power to help should proffer hope. Yet there is an element of hope for all the captive nations in the stirring of a new mood in Eastern European countries.

This stirring has most recently made itself manifest in Rumania, where defiance of Moscow has been couched in terms of friendliness to Communist China during the open dispute between these two would-be leaders of the world into the Communist camp. Rumania has also made known directly its opposition to the Soviet Union proposal for its role in the economic plan for Eastern Europe.

In other Iron Curtain countries rumblings seem to be developing into the expression of definite views of their own, disapproving the way the Soviet Union is trying to run the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance—COMECON. In country after country, subject to prolonged austerity and very meager prospects of improvement in economic conditions, questions are beginning to be raised as to the right of the Soviet Government to dictate the nature and method of economic activity. They are not satisfied to contribute as colonies to the wealth of the U.S.S.R. to their own detriment, to be held back to agricultural pursuits for the benefit of industrial development elsewhere. It is their desire to build up industries for themselves to better their own and sorely needed sources of wealth.

These are but economic manifestations of the latent nationalism which characterizes all of the captive nations. For many of them these attempts as Russification and exploitation are all too familiar renewals of old tsarist policies intensified under the Soviet Union. The U.S.S.R., knowing that nationalism and democracy go hand in hand in modern times, is well aware of the truth of the great historian Toynbee's statement that "the introduction of democratic principles in the Soviet Union would immediately disintegrate the Red Russian empire and its whole sphere of influence." We believe, however, that democracy and nationalism cannot forever be defied.

Colmer Predicts Hard Fight on President's Civil Rights Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR WINSTEAD

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, when the President sent his new civil rights proposals to the Congress, the dean of my State's delegation, Hon. William M. Colmer, issued a statement predicting a long, hot summer on Capitol Hill.

My colleague, who has served with four Presidents in the course of his more than 30 years in the Congress, knows whereof he speaks. He is a wise and seasoned legislator and an able one.

In order to share his thoughts on these drastic proposals with the other Members of this body, I include below Mr. Colmer's statement:

Congressman William M. Colmer, dean of the Mississippi congressional delegation, today predicted a long summer, extending possibly to Thanksgiving Day, on the President's new proposal for civil rights. He said:

"I am confident that most Members of both the North and the South, Democrats and Republicans, would prefer to have no part of it. But the power of the Presidency, the Justice Department and the Negro bloc-vote appeal are powerful weapons.

"The administration has created a Frankenstein and is now hollering, 'wolf.' In fact, those responsible for the present racial unrest are even appealing to their pet whipping boy, the South, and their traditional enemy, the Republicans, to bail them out.

"We are told that we are faced with a revolution. What politicians, do-gooders and radical Negro leaders refuse to recognize is that the racial problem is one of evolution and not of revolution.

"The Negro race has made the greatest progress in this country that any race has ever made in a similar period of time. This has been accomplished under the guiding and helping hand of his white brother, particularly his southern white brother. He cannot be brought up overnight on a plane with the white race which has had the benefit of civilization, Christianity, and education for more than 2,000 years. He must trod the same slow path which has characterized the advancement of the white race.

"There are already ample and adequate laws on the books to protect the rights of all minority groups. No amount of appeasement, no law or no court decree can or will solve the problem.

"The President's proposals are more far-reaching than his stated objective of equal rights for Negroes. The racial angle is but one facet of the evils proposed. These new civil wrongs advocated by the administration strike at the very foundation stones of our system of constitutional Government.

"The enactment of the President's recommendations can only result in:

"1. The further tragic breakdown of good relations between the races.

"2. A step-up in more and more demands by the Negro agitators.

"3. More regimentation of the American people by a strong centralized Federal Government, with the resultant deprivations of the liberties of all American citizens.

"4. A further significant, if not fatal, assault upon the free enterprise system and the death knell of State sovereignty.

"5. The end of the one-party system in the South.

"These unwise and unconstitutional requests, with all of their dangerous implications, should be recognized by all Americans for what they are. They are purely political and should be treated as such. They are reminiscent of reconstruction days when the prostrated people of the South were governed by the carpetbaggers and the bayonet.

"While this is a national problem, our Southern Representatives in both the House and the Senate should take the lead in opposing these new and drastic assaults upon constitutional Government as envisioned by the Founding Fathers. Because of recent incidents in other sections of the country, it is possible that help may come from these sources. The South is historically the defender of States rights and sovereignty. It is also the greatest potential political minority in the country. Its Representatives in the Congress must make this final effort to close the ranks and, oblivious to party alinement and self-aggrandizement, say like the Spartans of old, 'They shall not pass.'"

An Affront to World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, increasingly flagrant disregard by the United Arab Republic for international law and peaceful relations has caused deep concern, not only to the citizens of Israel but also to the majority of the United Nations members. President Nasser has not only threatened the existence of Israel with his massive arms buildup but has perpetrated heinous crimes against the unfortunate and unprotected Saudi Arabian people. His current destructive activities have arisen over the internal Yemen conflict, one which, if unchecked, may spread into an international holocaust.

The United Arab Republic's support of the revolutionary Republican command in Yemen has enabled President Nasser to send over 30,000 troops to crush the royalist supporters of the deposed Imam. The Saudi Arabian Government, on the other hand, has abetted Imam Badr, not with troops, but with weapons and ammunition, supplies, and money. Fearing that this local war would soon sweep over the borders into the neighboring states, President Kennedy sent Ellsworth Bunker to mediate and attempt to end both Egyptian and Saudi participation. This successful negotiations led to an agreement on April 29 of this year whereby the Saudi Arabian Government would end their support of the royalist Yemeni forces and the United Arab Republic would withdraw its troops from Yemen's soil, at the same time, refraining from warlike activities on Saudi territory by Egyptian forces.

A token force of several thousand Egyptian soldiers returned to the United Arab Republic, but the majority remained in Yemen, battling the Imam. It was then agreed that a United Nations contingent be sent to patrol the borders and supervise Egyptian troop evacuation. This observation unit is now operating in the field.

Has President Nasser lived up to his commitments to the United Nations and the United States? No, he has not. On May 21, he vowed that he would retain his forces in Yemen until Royalist opposition was completely defeated. Then, agreeing to withdraw them when the United Nations contingent arrived, he began rotating his soldiers, returning to Yemen as many as had been withdrawn.

What is more horrendous is his flagrant attacks on Saudi Arabian towns, on the helpless citizens who cannot fight against bombs and machinegun fire. His attack on Jizan, June 9, is a good example of his crimes, in which his planes caused much damage to the city and left 35 dead in its ruins.

These continued violations by the United Arab Republic reveal the true conquering spirt of President Nasser. His missile buildup, his recent arms deal with the Soviet Union, rotation of his troops in Yemen to inure them to actual combat conditions, and even the reported use of gas, draws one to conclude that Nasser has no peaceful intentions in the Middle East.

Since the role of the United Arab Republic on the international scene is of vital importance to our own national interests and to the peace and security of the world, I wish to commend to the attention of the Members of this House an eyewitness account of the devastating tactics used by Gamal Abdul-Nasser against the Saudi and Yemeni people. I also wish to call to the attention of the House and again urge its support for the amendment Senator KEATING and I have cosponsored which would bar U.S. economic assistance to any nation, such as the United Arab Republic, which uses its resources to carry out such reprehensible acts:

EYEWITNESS REPORT FROM BEHIND THE LINES: BAREFOOT YEMENIS BATTLE TANKS, PLANES

(NOTE.—The author of the following dispatch, Newsweek's Middle East correspondent, recently spent several weeks inside royalist-held Yemen and along the Saudi Arabian border.)

(By Joe Alex Morris, Jr.)

BEIRUT, LEBANON.—The dawn broke steamy and calm in Jizan, a squalid little Red Sea port near the southern border of Saudi Arabia.

As the sun's first rays lighted up the ancient Turkish fort on the Jebel overlooking the town, the first of its 30,000 inhabitants rose to face another day in a life dominated by the harsh sun, isolation, and boredom.

At the public water trough down by the pier, the first barefoot and veiled Arab women and Somali laborers were drawing water in 5-gallon gasoline tins and carrying it to their thatched huts. One was a slender brown youth named Mohammed ibn Hamid Farraj, 14.

Suddenly, out of the still dark western sky came the whine of jet engines.

Looking up, Mohammed saw them coming in straight for the town—three twin-jet Ilyushin-18 bombers, with two sweptwing silvery Mig fighters hovering over them.

The planes were Egyptian, and at 4,000 feet, they couldn't miss.

The first stick of bombs hit squarely in the center of town. It killed Mohammed's father, Hamid, a customs agent, and all five other members of his family.

When Mohammed got back to the house, it was only rubble, broken bedsteads, and the walls of neighbors trapped in the debris. Eleven others were killed by that same stick of bombs.

The Egyptians had a field day. Back and forth they wove, bombing other parts of the city, knocking out its electric supply, and badly damaging the hospital, even as the first wounded were brought in.

"It looked as if they were deliberately trying for the hospital," said Pakistani Dr. Mohammed Ashod Khan, despite a large crescent on the roof. Repeatedly the Egyptians tried to knock out the new concrete runway at Jizan's Airport, not knowing it was so poorly constructed that Saudi pilots were refusing to land on it and were still using the dirt strip.

When the planes disappeared 90 minutes later, 32 Saudi Arabs lay dead. Another 25 were in the hospital—3 of them to die later. A hundred suffered less serious injuries. Parts of the town were in shambles.

To the people of Jizan, the raid was only the culmination of a series of harassments by Egyptian planes.

During the raid, hundreds rushed out into the streets, where they were hit by shrapnel. Others ran into the water and stood neck deep in it.

When the planes had left, they fled—as many as possible jammed onto graceful dhows which took them out to nearby islands.

Others went into the waterless desert by foot, donkey, or truck, some as far as 70 kilometers.

By nightfall, Jizan was a dead city.

SIGN OF FRUSTRATION

Although this was the worst, it was by no means the first time the Egyptians had bombed Saudi Arabia. It was no case of simple navigational error. Jizan is 70 kilometers from the Yemen border. Like other recent air attacks, it was a measure of Egypt's frustration in the Yemen civil war.

The Egyptians are committed to a Republican victory in Yemen, and have sent more than 70,000 troops to the land once ruled by the Queen of Sheba.

The trouble is, the old Royalists refuse to be impressed. Unable to beat the tough mountain tribesmen on their own grounds, the Egyptians have been striking out blindly against the Saudis who have run enough supplies across the unmarked border to assure the Yemeni Royalists will not be subdued through lack of arms.

After 8 months of civil war, it is the Egyptians, not the Royalists, who are on the defensive, their troops demoralized and fighting in a strange country for a cause they don't understand.

As was true in Algeria, and is currently true in the Kurdish uprising in Iraq, armies equipped with aircraft, tanks, and the most modern equipment have proved ineffective against tribesmen fighting for their own craggy and inhospitable country.

The Egyptians have retaliated with the only means they have: they control the skies, and they are bombing everything that moves in the rugged mountains and deserts of northern and eastern Yemen which are now in Royalist hands.

They are using high explosives, napalm and—say the Royalists—poison gas.

The Royalists also say the Egyptians have resorted to the classic Yemeni trick of taking hostages—20 women and 4 children of the royal family have been taken to Egypt. An attempt to remove 70 others from Sanaa was foiled by angry crowds who surrounded a palace after a servant spread the alarm from a rooftop.

Egyptian repressions have helped the Zeidi tribes—about 40 percent of Yemen's population but always its dominant group—draw together and forget their differences.

So have the free arms the Royalists are handing out.

The Royalists, in addition, through their hidden radio, have been partially successful in portraying the struggle as one against Egyptian colonialism.

"The Egyptians are doing all the fighting," says blackbearded Imam Badr, the titular leader of the Royalists who was swept from power by the Republican coup last year. "They want to make the Yemen a new colony," he says.

It is a savage war fought by barefoot tribesmen with 303 rifles against Soviet tanks and jet fighters. But the incredibly rugged terrain and vitual absence of roads more than evens out the odds.

Egyptian tanks get stuck on boulder-strewn mountain tracks and cannot bring guns to bear on tribesmen—some of them bearless youths not bigger than the rifles they carry—who pop out from behind rocks.

They jump on tanks, roll grenades down gun barrels stuff turbans in exhaust pipes, then wait for crews to emerge. When they do, they shoot them down or cut off their ears and noses and send them back to Egyptian lines as a lesson to their comrade. They don't take many prisoners—perhaps 50 in all have been repatriated through Saudi Arabia.

The Egyptians hold the steamy coastal area where roads exists and land is flat and the Shafaa population resents the pro-Iman Zeidi highlanders who dominated them for so long. They also hold the major cities of Sanaa and Taiz plus Saadat in the north and half a dozen isolated garrisons in the hinterland.

The only modern road in Yemen, which was built by the Chinese from the port of Hodeida up to Sanaa, is still in Republican hands, but the Beni Mattar and Al Helma tribes along the road recently came over to the Imam, the Royalists say, and have been armed.

CITY UPRISING PLANNED

The Royalists are now a bare 25 kilometers from the capital of Sanaa and say their supporters inside the city will rise when they launch their attack. The Republican radio last week reported an unsuccessful coup in Sanaa.

Many tribes who had been fence-sitting are now coming over to the Royalists. In the past month, the Royalists say, they've distributed 6,000 rifles, each with 200 bullets.

I saw dozens of camel trains loaded down with ammunition, rifles, and other supplies under straw camouflage—some with the crossed hands emblem of U.S. aid—working their way up the mountains by night and hiding by day in rocky gorges.

Imam Badr is the focus of Royalist resistance. Not himself personally, but the office of the Imamate, since most tribal leaders consider Badr a foolish young man who flirted dangerously with both Nasser and the Communists and then saw himself deposed by his trusted sidekick Abdullah Sallal a bare 7 days after he assumed office last year.

Badr's headquarters are a split-level cave near the crest of a 7,000-foot mountain named El Qora. He is truly one of the world's most inaccessible leaders: It takes 24 hours by truck, donkey, and foot to reach his cave from the Saudi border. The route takes you up two precipitous mountain ranges with terraced fields and stone age villages dominated by round forts.

Badr rarely appears before sundown but the tribes begin gathering when the sun starts down and the danger from Egyptian planes recedes. When I was there 3,000 tribesmen were on hand and more arriving. They chanted war whoops as their sheikhs whipped them up to a fever pitch, crying "No Nasser, No Sallal."

They brandished their jambiyahs and shot rifles into the air.

GREETS SHEIKHS IN CAVE

Inside the cave—you crawl across oriental carpets through a 4-foot high tunnel to get in—Badr received sheikhs coming to pledge allegiance and pick up arms.

Outside, scrawny chickens scratched the dirt and a camel caravan was unloading ammunition. Stone masons worked feverishly to build a protective front across the cave just in case the Egyptians got any more accurate on their 14th bombing raid.

Badr was indignant that the United Nations had failed to consult him before deciding to send a peace-keeping mission. "The Yemenis, not the U.N., will decide this war," he said.

Despite Egyptian, Soviet, and Algerian intervention, he said, the world either ignored or failed to understand the war.

"The world is more interested in Russian dogs circling the earth than in those circling over our homeland," he said.

Badr is a figurehead, albeit an important one, for rallying the tribes. The real Royalist driving force comes from a dozen young princes, some still in their teens. They don't want a restoration of the old feudal system—many had their fathers killed by old Inmam Ahmed. But at the same time they refuse to knuckle under to Sallal's paper republicanism and Nasser's occupation of their country.

The most important of these princes is 25-year-old Amir Abdullah Bin Hussein, commander in the vital Jouf region where the Royalists won a crucial battle earlier this month. They fought and won from the Egyptians on open ground for the first time, and captured two Soviet artillery pieces to add to the two they already had.

But despite all their brave words and victory claims, the Royalists have little chance to win this war so long as the Egyptians remain in Yemen.

On the other hand the Egyptians cannot dislodge them. So the result is a stalemate.

Maj. Gen. Joseph D. "Smokey" Caldara: America's Good Will Ambassador to Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. Joseph D. Caldara, chief of the Joint Military Assistance Group in Spain, can well be called our ambassador of good will to our Spanish friends.

Their great government recently showed their esteem and affection for "Smokey" Caldara by bestowing upon him the city of Madrid's Gold Medal—a rare and distinguished award.

"Smokey" Caldara has brought a great honor upon America through receiving this token of friendship. In my opinion, this dedicated officer represents the feelings of all people of my acquaintance to the friendly, cordial and great people of Spain.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to insert a letter from a Spanish friend and newspaper clippings which describe the feelings the Spanish people hold for "Smokey" Caldara:

MADRID, SPAIN, *July 11, 1963.*

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE L. MENDEL RIVERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR AND "AMIGO": Because I remember your interest in Spain and the Spanish-American relations, I take great pleasure in sending you two paper clippings from Madrid's leading daily "ABC" as well as a summarized translation on the awarding of the city of Madrid's Gold Medal to our much loved former Chief, Maj. Gen. Joseph D. Caldara, by our Mayor, the Count of Mayadle.

If ever a foreign personality deserved such a distinguished and rare award, it was certainly "Smokey" Caldara, for seldom has a foreigner done so much—not mentioning Ambassador Lodge—for the relations between two countries as different in habits and customs as the United States and Spain.

I have worked in three different activities in my life, but never have I met or worked for a better "boss" than General Caldara.

Among his many qualities he has one largely appreciated by Spaniards: he is always ready to listen to you and is always willing to do whatever is in his hand when asked for any kind of help. During the 1 year I have had the privilege of working for him, I have not once heard him say "no" to whatever might have been asked from him, being, at the same time, a strict and stern chief.

I sincerely wish this man, as well as his charming wife Chris, all he deserves and all the blessings God may send him.

Hoping to see you soon around here some time, I remain

Yours very sincerely,
JAVIER MILANS DEL BOSCH.

THE MAYOR OF MADRID PINS THE GOLD MEDAL OF THE CITY ON U.S. AIR FORCE MAJOR GENERAL CALDARA

The Gold Medal of Madrid was offered yesterday to General Caldara, Chief of the American Military Mission in Spain. All members of the city hall were present at the ceremony together with U.S. Ambassador and Mrs. James F. Woodward, high ranking personalities from the American Embassy and members of the American Military Mission.

The secretary of the city hall read the agreement that was reached on behalf of the proposal presented by the mayor and highly praised the cooperation of the U.S. Armed Forces with the people of Madrid. The mayor then spoke and pointed out that this ceremony was a source of great satisfacion for city hall and for the friends of General Caldara, who, he added, has shown he is a good and generous friend of Spain. He has always made all U.S. forces means available to the people of Madrid. Medicines were brought to Madrid on many occasions, saving the lives of many Madrilenians. Medical and surgical material was brought for our university and its specialized services. "I wish to point out very especially," the mayor continued, "that the greatest cordiality has always prevailed in the relationship between the North American forces and the people of Madrid. This demonstrates that our two countries love, understand, and respect each other. In view of General Caldara's exceptional merits, Madrid's city officials have awarded him the Gold Medal of the city, which I am now going to pin on him."

Amid applause, the mayor pinned the medal on General Caldara, who with great emotion, expressed his gratitude to the Count of Mayalde and to city hall. He adds that this honor was to be equally shared with those who cooperated with him under his command. "This medal," he finally said, "will serve as an eternal reminder of my unforgettable stay in Madrid. Thank you."

The Minister of Air, Lieutenant General Lacalle, received General Caldara yesterday morning in his office. Because of his impending return to the United States, having completed his tour as Chief JUSMG/MAAG, General Caldara paid his last official call on the Minister of Air. An air of cordiality prevailed throughout the farewell interview.

On a previous occasion, General Lacalle pinned the Spanish Wings on General Caldara's uniform.

Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, there are more than 100 million people in Europe who are kept in captivity behind the iron curtain of Communist totalitarianism. A wall in Berlin stands in silent testimony to the Soviet policy of inhumane slavery and of complete subjugation of mind and body to the state. The Communists are sadly mistaken if they feel, like the ostrich with his head in the sand, that the free world can be shielded from the facts of Red oppression by an iron curtain or a brick wall.

An effective American foreign policy should include discussions of Soviet colonialism in the United Nations. Just as Premier Khrushchev was not reluctant to bank his shoe at the United Nations, the United States should not be afraid to hammer the truth about captive nations in the General Assembly. Secondly, the United States must continue and expand our worldwide information programs to expose Communist desecration of human rights and liberties. Thirdly, Congress should establish a special Committee on Captive Nations which would give special attention to the moral and legal status of Communist control over nations and peoples. The Committee would devote its energies toward finding means by which the United States might assist these nations by peaceful processes. The gathering of facts about Communist tyranny would serve as a hard-hitting weapon to explode the myths of Communist unity and Soviet humanitarianism.

The captive peoples of the world properly look to the United States for help and guidance. The aim of this three-pronged program is to give heart to the brave people held in captivity, in the broadest sense of the word, in countries such as Poland, Armenia, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, and Hungary. The heroic uprisings against the Communist terrorists in Poland, East Germany, and Hungary are proof that the spirit of freedom cannot be chained and confined for long.

Who's Vanishing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been apprehensive that our mass media of communication—press, radio, television, and magazines—can be monopolistically controlled. We read about the power of the radio networks. We read about newspapers merging and the development of one-newspaper communities.

These observations, which may be partially valid, ignore the ever-more important role of the weekly press operating in our growing, suburban communities. An editorial in the current edition of the Belleville Times-News, published in my constituency, makes the point that "the capable and effective newspapermen who run this Nation's country press are not vanishing."

A free and vital press is an essential element in our democratic society. Recognizing this, in the words of one of the leading weeklies in my congressional district "we can thank our stars" that the weeklies are not vanishing. I hope that my colleagues share my good fortune in having strong, independent weeklies in their districts. And, to show the feeling of the editors of the Belleville Times-News, I would like to insert the complete editorial at this point of the Record.

The American Broadcasting Co.'s national network recently presented a program called "A Vanishing Breed: Portrait of a County Editor." During the presentation the statement was made that "There are only 2,000 country newspapers left in America."

The American Press magazine, taking exception to these figures, counted the newspapers listed in the latest edition of "N. W. Ayer Directory of Periodicals" and reports there are "newspapers which might conceivably be classified as 'suburban' instead of 'country.'

"That still leaves 6,819 nondaily newspapers which, so far as we can determine, could fit nowhere except in the 'country newspaper' category. Also a majority of the 1,200 dailies published in towns of under 25,000 population would fit into the same classification.

The American Press observes that "Perhaps the TV boys were miffed because, as they reported, Landon Wills of Calhoun, Ky., who was picked as their example of 'the vanishing breed,' doesn't believe in television and doesn't even have a TV set."

The capable and effective newspapermen who run this Nation's country press are not vanishing. And since our freedom depends on a concerned and well informed citizenry, we can thank our stars that they are not. They provide written records of opinions and world events which remain for consideration and are not gone in the wink of an eye.

Congressman Miller on Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am calling to the attention of the Congress and the American people, the excellent comments of the gentleman from California, Congressman Miller, on the development of the U.S. space programs under two administrations. It is a great credit to the gentleman from California, Congressman George Miller's leadership, that as far as the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress is concerned, there are as yet no politics in space. The 1964 authorization bill has been reported unanimously, I repeat unanimously, by the entire House Committee on Science and Astronautics of 31 members, after exhaustive hearings, personal checks at space installations and 3,000 pages of testimony and careful questioning.

The comments follow:

Address of the Honorable George P. Miller, Chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives, to the National Rocket Club, Washington, D.C., on July 16, 1963.

I am pleased indeed to be with you today. It is always a pleasure for me to speak before the National Rocket Club, because in a true sense, we meet here as members of our national space team. We are all trying to contribute in some measure directly or indirectly to the great surging human effort we have committed to achieving success in peacefully exploring space. I think we share also a sense of dedication to a national purpose that exemplifies to the world as never before what this country is and what it stands for.

In looking back over the years since 1958, we have seen in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration an agency that, to put it mildly, has experienced a rate of growth which has truly been unprecendented in our history. Beginning with a budget of something more than $300 million and 8,000 employees transferred from the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, today, 5 years later it will be budgeted with considerably more than $5 billion and have 30,000 employees.

And this growth has been justified beyond question by the more than 100 unmanned satellites we have orbited, by the flights of the astronauts and by the great impetus almost every aspect of our national society has received. We have had the opportunity, through such programs as Tiros, Telstar, and Relay to demonstrate the promise in these early years of the tremendous benefits from space exploration that can help in no small measure the attainment of a peaceful world.

I know you have heard the same convictions expressed by many different people and in many different ways. But the choice of semantics does not make these convictions any less the unchangeable articles of faith under which we have taken the first infant steps to explore the universe that surrounds us.

I have reiterated these beliefs if only to underscore the realization that we have reached with the conclusion of Project Mercury and the undertaking of the Gemini program the first rung, if you will, of the spaceladder.

We have reached the point where congressional assessment of our space program is beginning to assume new perspectives. We have arrived at a level of experience which can give a clearer and more cogent evaluation of the resources that will be needed to carry forward NASA programs, particularly with regard to manned space flight.

As no doubt most of you already know, my committee concluded only a few days ago months of intense and exhaustive deliberations on the authorization of NASA's fiscal year 1964 budget. Actually, the committee and its subcommittees held more than 75 open and closed hearings. They heard from more than 100 witnesses, both military and civilian, which resulted in more than 3,000 pages of printed testimony, and they traveled the length and breadth of the country to determine at firsthand NASA's needs.

In all my experience in the House of Representatives, I know of no other committee whose members have expended more effort, often at personal expense, inconvenience, and often discomfort, than have those of my committee, in the evaluation of this year's space budget. And the results bear this out.

I should point out that the action of the committee was voted unanimously. But unanimity was not achieved without honest disagreement, not without soul-searching, and certainly not without a willingness of the members to adjust and compromise their views. I also want the record to show that at no time did partisanship or party interests play any part in influencing committee decision. Of that fact I am very proud.

I would suppose that the actions taken by my committee would provide some measure of satisfaction to the somewhat vocal critics in and out of government who have attacked the tempo of and indeed the need for the space program, or who have said that only the military has a role to play in space.

I would say that these critics suffer from a form of myopia that has resulted from an inability to raise their eyes from the road immediately ahead which prevents the recognition of facts and truth beyond the limits of their blurred vision.

First of all, the resources we are assigning to our national space program are well within our capacity to provide. We are not paying anywhere near the price for space exploration that is being paid by the average Soviet citizen to orbit Sputniks and Vostoks.

He is paying in terms of more bread on his table, better shoes on his feet, and less expensive clothes on his back.

I know of no evidence today that technological innovations developed by the Soviet space program is being fed back directly into Russia's economy to make life a little easier for her citizens.

Here, as you well know, it's a completely different story. Apart from the immediate value of the space program to the Nation and to the industrial community, it would be well for us at this time to review and to remind ourselves of the indirect but no less important benefits we are reaping.

To me, the most important indirect benefit we are gaining is probably the least tangible, the least measurable, and yet the most far reaching in effect insofar as our future national growth is concerned. I am referring to the impact our space program is having upon our educational programs and institutions. The fact that NASA places demands upon and draws from almost every academic discipline has produced a stimulus in universities and colleges that is unprecedented in peacetime.

In terms of dollars, my committee has authorized the expenditure of $18 million for facilities grants, $25 million for training grants, and $12 million for research grants—a total of $55 million. This is in addition to the direct contracts for research, development and design NASA will make with institutions of advanced learning throughout the country.

Can you think of any other investment that will have as far reaching and as beneficial an effect? I don't think you can.

In this age of international technological competition, our very survival in the years to come will depend literally upon the quality and the scholastic achievement of men and women we are training now. If our space program can materially contribute to our continued strength and leadership, then surely that can be a major justification for every cent Congress will appropriate for this effort.

Let us consider NASA's program for the dissemination of information, which, by the way, is a statutory requirement in the space act of 1958. I don't have to describe in detail to you what this program has done for our international prestige, especially in the scientific communities around the world.

I can speak from firsthand knowledge gained from personal contact with scientific and technical leaders both here and in Europe that world respect for American technology, as a direct result of our space program, has been enhanced many times over.

I am sure you recall the shock of Sputnik I and the effect it had upon our technical leadership in the eyes of people everywhere. Further, no one would question the fact that our political leadership of the Western World is based upon recognition and acceptance of our technological superiority.

Sputnik I was a very severe threat to that leadership. NASA's information program has been a major factor in reaffirming that leadership over the past 5 years. Believe me, it has been an investment that has paid off for us many times over.

The technological advances that have evolved from NASA research and development activities have implications to American industry and economy that are really beyond accurate evaluation. The indirect benefits that have already come and those of the future, however, have a real meaning for all of us.

It is important to realize that the United States is in international competition today with countries whose industries, especially those of Japan, France, and Germany, were either destroyed by the Allies, or were stripped to the bone by the Nazi war machine. The rebuilding of these nations, largely financed by us, has resulted in industrial complexes that are, for the most part, relatively new, based upon new plants, new equipment, and new processes.

It is obvious, therefore, that these factors, coupled with a much lower wage level than ours, could seriously affect our ability to compete for world markets, especially when our industrial base could not be renovated.

However, the evolution of our space industry, made possible by work already done in rocketry by the Armed Forces, demanded a response from industry that has resulted in a resurgence of technical inqenuity. Our space industry is our new industry, if you will. It is providing a new base from which, through achievements in research and development, we can compete with newer and better products.

This is an indirect benefit of major significance that is growing in dimension and impact on the general level. The specific benefits, too, are being pinpointed by NASA's office of industrial applications. The translation of NASA discoveries or innovations into useful economic tools is benefiting our people of almost every walk of life.

I can't think of any other aspect of our space program that could better justify our space expenditures to the average taxpayer than industrial applications. Here is the tangible evidence that he is getting something in return for his investment. His return will be a wide variety of new or better products, at reasonable cost, which in turn will give rise to greater consumer demand and economic stimulus.

I am not going to dwell upon the obvious import to our national economy that the $5 billion NASA budget represents. The fact that 90 percent of the money appropriated will be expended through contracts with private industry speaks for itself.

What is important to understand is that scientific research and development is for the first time in our peacetime history being organized within one agency to accomplish a national goal. The achievements of our immediate space objectives are, of course, of paramount importance. But, I have little patience with the critics who cry out that our tax money is being thrown away in the exploration of space, or that going to the moon will result in the neglect of our problems here on earth.

It should be obvious to those critics, if they take the time for a short historical review, that many years of experience have shown that the indirect payoff in human terms for technical innovation is many times more valuable than the original investment.

If our efforts in the biastronautics disciplines result in the improvement of the health of our people through greater knowledge of human anatomy, that alone could provide a major justification for our space expenditures.

If, by diverting national energies into the peaceful exploration of space, the nations of the world could avoid a cataclysmic war, then that alone is worth many times the cost.

If, by sending men into space, we can discover new and far reaching facts that can contribute to the elimination of hunger and abject poverty from the less favored portions of our globe, then that alone is worth the price that we, along with others, are paying.

It is not possible to review for you all of the indirect benefits we are garnering from our space program. I am sure that many of you here could probably cite in much more intimate detail than I can many instances of space technology that have been translated into daily use in business and industry.

The point is this: We are a highly integrated people. Any national effort we undertake, such as our space program, will affect directly every aspect of our national community, and will have to some degree an impact on every individual.

Our space program is in the hands of men of outstanding ability and patriotism, whose driving motivation is to bend every effort possible to fulfill the guiding principle of the 1958 Space Act, "that activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind."

I think the record shows that we have been true to our ideals. And you, and I, and our children will live in a better, more secure world because we have done so.

Uncle Carl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I respectfully include therein an editorial in the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, July 17, 1963.

This editorial epitomizes CARL VINSON. Those of us who know this great American do not try to understand him all of the time. This we know: CARL VINSON wears no man's collar. His interest is America. Americans have accepted CARL VINSON because he has done more than anybody in our lifetime to make this country the safest on the face of the earth. Yes, Mr. Speaker, all of us accept CARL VINSON as the gospel because he is dedicated to his country.

UNCLE CARL

Shortly after Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat of Georgia, came to Washington 48 years, 8 months, and 14 days ago, an influential Georgian sent him a stack of private bills he wanted introduced.

Representative VINSON—then the youngest Member of the House—sent them back by return mail.

"I wear no man's collar," he said.

Today—officially having served longer than any other Representative in the Nation's history—Uncle CARL at 79 is still collarless. As far back as most of us can recollect he has presided over the defense of this country through the chairmanship of the House Naval Affairs and then the House Armed Services Committees. We have not always agreed with the old boy—and Uncle CARL would scorn us if we had—but we have respected him. And he has been right far more often than he has been wrong.

Yesterday, CARL VINSON sat in embarrassed silence while his colleagues heaped praise and plaudits on him. On a similar occasion a few years back he was moved to remark:

"I disclaim all these gentlemen say, but I hope everybody else accepts it as gospel."

We do, Uncle CARL, we do.

Hon. Carl Vinson

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, one of my cherished memories as a Representative of the House of Representatives is to have known and served with the Honorable CARL VINSON. I am sure he will be recorded in history as one of the "great" legislators of the Congress, one who steered our ship of state through the "rough and stormy seas" of these tumultuous years.

Our colleague has reached another milestone in his distinguished career. He has now served in the House of Representatives for a longer period of time than any other person. Elected 25 times, Chairman VINSON has had continuous service of 46 years, 8 months, and 13 days.

As chairman of the Committee on Armed Services he, perhaps more than any other individual, has been responsible for our military posture. He was one of those primarily responsible for the United States having a two ocean Navy, and our development of airpower.

The people of the United States are indebted to CARL VINSON and on this notable day in his life I, on behalf of the people I represent and myself, wish him continued health so that he may continue his important work.

He Lives in Filth—He's Sick—He's on Dope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, today and tomorrow I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a two-part series that appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun on June 17 and 18 on the subject of youthful dope addiction. The reporter, Woody Klein, has a great knowledge of the problems of substandard housing, inadequate education, insufficient recreational facilities, and other problems of congested city living that bring about group tensions, crime and delinquency, and narcotics.

Dope addiction is one of the results of conditions of this kind. Woody Klein is a crusading reporter who has fought against slum-standard conditions of living as long as he has been writing. In this two-part series, Woody Klein tells us of his firsthand inquiries into the subject of dope addiction. This is the tragic story of one youth told in his own words, tape recorded by the reporter. The scene is one of New York City's worst blocks.

HE LIVES IN FILTH—HE'S SICK—HE'S ON DOPE

(By Woody Klein)

I found him lying down, his face buried in a filthy mattress on the tenement cellar floor.

He was breathing heavily. His eyes were glazed, fixed in a blank stare. He was unshaven and in need of a haircut. His clothes were tattered. His shoes were worn through. In this dark, dank basement I saw a mouldy bed, a battered armchair, a dim light bulb hanging from the ceiling by an exposed wire, a few pictures of Christ and two water color scenes of New York buildings hanging from the stone walls.

This hovel was the only home this boy knew. I asked him how long he had been an addict.

"On and off since I was 13. I'm 21 now. I grew up with junkies," he replied. "After hanging around with them, they says, 'Come on, you can get high if you want to.' I wanted to see what it was, you know.

"I wanted to get a kick. When I got my first skin pop I shouted, 'Man, this ain't doing nothing for me.' But then it hit me fast.

"When you first use drugs, the first shot, you get real sick. I got sick * * * threw up * * * I was high * * * I went home and went to sleep. I stayed away from them for about 2 months, but I liked it.

"I tried to get with them again * * * tried to get some money * * * it costs $3 a pop. I need an eighth of an ounce every day * * * costs me $22 a day * * * you got to steal for it. You got to rob, man, you got to rob.

"The first time I got caught I was 16 * * * for burglary. They sent me to Elmira. After a while I was on parole and I started using drugs again. They arrested me again and gave me a year * * * then I got arrested four times after that * * *.

"I been in jail more than I been out since I was 16 * * * I tried to shake it in prison but they don't give me no help, they don't pay no attention to me.

"JUST A LITTLE POP

"When I got out last year, I met my friend and he says, 'Come on, let's get high.' We went up to the roof and he put out the set of works, you know, the needle, the eyedropper, two bags, the works. I told him, 'Man, I just came home, I'm clean, I don't want to mess around.' He says, 'Don't worry, just take a little pop.'

"I just took a little, but I kept on using it. Once I shot it, I kept liking it, and I got the habit * * * now I don't really like it no more. It's no fun. I use it because I need it."

He sat up for the first time and shook his head.

"I'm tired of it, I tell you, I'm tired, man. I just sit down here and I'm disgusted. When I started using drugs I stopped going out with girls. I look at girls all the time, but when they see I'm a junkie they don't want to bother with me.

"TIRED OF LIVING

"I feel bad. I'm tired of living around here * * * the same thing every day, nothing changes * * * people don't show me no respect no more * * * they talk about me. They say I steal from them but it's a lie.

"I tell you the truth, I steal but I don't steal around here * * * sometimes I wish I could take an overdose and just die * * * because I'm tired of it all."

I asked him why he didn't stop taking dope.

"I got the habit, that's all.

"I use heroin. I could kick the habit, but I can't do it by myself. I want to kick it. It don't do nothing for me any more. I feel nothing.

"If I could just take the pains out of my stomach and my back and stop sweating. I just use it for my cure. It helps me feel straight. I don't take it because I like it * * * I'm tired of living. I'm tired of my life.

"MARRIAGE WISH

"I wish I could get married and have some kids. That's what I really want. Some day I want to have a family. I love kids. I wish I had my own. I could have a girl now and have sex with her and have kids but I don't want that.

"I can't give the kid nothing and I can't give a girl nothing. I don't want to put myself in that position, see? I would just make them suffer * * * all I live for is my next fix. That's all I ever think about.

"But it wasn't aways that way * * * when I was a kid this street was much better. You needed a key to come in through the front door of this house. The neighborhood was clean. The yards were clean. I lived in this block my whole life. I seen it get bad. Now the whole block is a mess. It's filthy. It's full of garbage that people throw out the window.

"THEY DON'T CARE

"They don't care. Girls, old people out there. People always fighting. I never seen this when I was younger. As I say, when I was about 13 I seen the first addicts. That's when it all began.

"Now the block it like Korea. Everybody always fighting. Junkies. A whole lot of them, hanging around the halls, the roofs * * * bums around here * * * drunks right in the streets. It was our fault * * * the addicts. A lot of addicts started hanging around * * * I blame myself. * * *

"I was born right in this apartment house. My father was out * * * he was in the yard and he didn't hear when my mother was giving birth of me * * * she couldn't do nothing * * * she was lying in bed and she had me right there. * * * That was it.

"AMBULANCE LATE

"The ambulance came. It was too late. My mother told me they took her over and she was all right. We lived in this house on the second floor * * * there were 11 in the family * * * we had four rooms."

The boy got up and began pacing back and forth.

"My family left for the Bronx 2 months ago. They just picked up and left. My father was super here * * * he's always drunk, always cursing at me, telling me I'm a bum, a junkie, a no good, he says 'get out of the house.'

"ROBS FATHER

"I don't blame him. I rob him all the time for drugs. I sell the covers off the furniture to get money * * * he hit me, he cursed me * * * I tell him, 'Don't hit me, I'm no baby no more and he just says, 'Get out of the house, you don't pay no rent here, you just come here to rob.'

"He's right, but I hauled off and slugged him * * * I didn't mean to * * * he's my father * * * he's Irish * * * my mother is Puerto Rican * * * I just argue with her. I don't hit her * * * my family don't show me no love the way they brought me up.

"I was a shoe-shine * * * I bought my own clothes and all that * * * they never gave me nothing. They never shown me that they loved me and I really didn't love them because they didn't show me no love."

Jim Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on May 30, 1963, the Corpus Christi Times printed an editorial which paid tribute to the Honorable James A. Farley.

Jim Farley is well known to many and loved by many. One of Jim's outstanding qualities is the fact that he remembers everyone he meets; your name is not enough to recall, but he also remembers where he met you, what you do, and in other words he has the mind of a walking encyclopedia. This is truly one reason for his great success.

I am sure all will enjoy the text of the following editorial:

JIM FARLEY

"A sincere conviction in your own cause (whether you are selling Coca-Cola, building materials, motor trucks or a candidate)," James A. Farley once wrote, "leads you to value each person you talk to, and that value helps identify him to you."

Farley was explaining his peculiar and famous knack of remembering names and using them. He was also revealing more of himself than he may have realized.

For Jim Farley in politics was a salesman, and an enormously successful one. He knew his product and his market with almost encyclopedic thoroughness. His famous prediction in 1936 that Alf Landon would carry only Maine and Vermont was based on a sound network of political intelligence. He recalls in his book, "Jim Farley's Story": "When, at 3:36 a.m. (of the morning after the election), I got the information from John L. Sullivan of Manchester, N.H., that Roosevelt had pulled ahead in that city, I knew that my prediction would stand up."

Observing his 75th birthday anniversary today, Jim Farley is a kind of Democratic right bower. He has no political organization as such, but his political influence is not inconsequential. He shuns the role of older statesman, preferring like that other Democratic septuagenarian, Harry S. Truman, the honest title of "politician."

Farley also is a Democrat of Democrats. As the political analyst Frank R. Kent, no Farley enthusiast, once put it: "His party regularity is without flaw." His reaction in 1960 was typical.

Right after the election found him defending John F. Kennedy's victory, saying that anybody questioning the President-elect's mandate because of the narrow margin was "perilously close to irresponsible mischief-making."

Himself a moderate conservative, Farley has been able to serve the New Deal without mental reservation, and to support the Fair Deal and the New Frontier. This is not to say that the wily politician is not a man of principle and independence. He was able to join reformers like former Senator Herbert H. Lehman and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1961 to fight New York political regulars for the renomination of Mayor Robert F. Wagner of New York City. He served on the Hoover Commission and strongly urged its Government reforms.

Jim Farley's own account of the 1940 Democratic convention in Chicago, where he was put in nomination for the Presidency by Senator Carter Glass, Democrat, of Virginia, ends with these proud words: "As I went through the hall there were cheers on every hand. The crowd knew they were cheering a loser, but they approved my courage to stand up for what I believed in."

Retirement from active politics brought fortune to F.D.R.'s Postmaster General as chairman of the board of Coca-Cola Export Co. and honorary degrees and decorations from foreign governments and all kinds of kudos. But one suspects that even at the age of 75, the old pro occasionally yearns to come back to the political arena for one last hurrah.

Pollution Slaughters Roanoke River Rockfish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the Congressional Record an article appearing in the Sports Fishing Institute Bulletin published by the Sports Fishing Institute, an organization dedicated to perpetuating and protecting sport and recreational fishing and fishery resources.

The article appearing in the July 1963 issue entitled "Pollution Slaughters Roanoke River Rockfish," gives additional reason why H.R. 7067, legislation sponsored by me to authorize the Department of the Interior to initiate civil actions for damages and injunctive relief in instances where pollution destroys and injures fish and wildlife resources should be enacted at an early time.

This is but one of hundreds of examples of large fish kills which take place all across the United States involving millions of fish and which destroy fishery resources not just for weeks but for years.

Without legislation of this kind it would appear that continued destruction of fishery resources by careless and willful polluters is a probability not only to be feared but to be expected.

The article follows:

POLLUTION SLAUGHTERS ROANOKE RIVER ROCKFISH

An extensive kill of sea-run striped bass spawning stocks, channel catfish, and a variety of other species of fishes, occurred in the Roanoke River, starting at Weldon, N.C., and proceeding a distance of 115 river miles downstream below Jamesville, during the 1-week period April 21 through 28, 1963. Early notification of the kill was given by sport fishermen who first observed distress among the rockfish at about 3 a.m., Sunday morning, April 21, at the height of the "rock" fishing season. Fishery biologists of the Wildlife Resources Commission soon eliminated oxygen deficiency as the cause, leaving pollution as the probable cause.

Starting April 22, the News & Observer (Raleigh) carried almost daily accounts of the progress of the slug of toxic water downstream, and the progressive devastating kills of striped bass and other fishes, and findings through May 8. In addition, the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission has issued a detailed multilithed report of seven pages, with illustrations and observed and estimated kill data for the various species, prepared by fishery biologists William B. Smith and Jack Bayless. It adds up to a grisly tale, especially so since it comes during the height of striped bass spawning and of the sport fishing season.

As nearly as could be determined at the outset, a large slug of poisonous material was dumped into the Roanoke River somewhere between the dam at Roanoke Rapids and Weldon late Saturday night, April 20. Near Weldon the polluted area was about a half mile in length. It proceeded downstream taking a deadly toll until it passed below Jamesville about 115 miles downstream when it had increased in length to more than 11 miles and became diluted below toxic strength. The poisonous slug of water moved downstream at an average rate of about 15 miles per day. Where up to around 300 people fishing for striped bass are customarily counted daily in the Weldon area of the river during the peak of the season, all fishing had ceased.

Governor Sanford called for "complete and thorough investigation" by State wildlife, pollution, health, and water resource officials, and for "recommendations of such action as may be indicated, including possible legal action." He explained (in part): "The fact that the current pollution of the Roanoke River is killing fish is bad, because fishing is one of the chief attractions in North Carolina's third largest money producing industries, the travel industry."

The biological study report prepared by the Wildlife Resources Commission fishery biologists following their week-long investigation confirmed early reports by anglers and extended the details. The number of striped bass known through direct observation to be dead was set at 6,721. Additional striped bass killed but not counted due to removal by people and scavengers and failure to rise to the surface or trapped in marginal snags below the water surface were estimated to be fully twice as numerous as those actually counted. The total estimate of striped bass killed was placed between 18,000 and 22,000, collectively weighing between 37 and 45 tons. Average weight was a bit under 4 pounds, with many females (nearly 16 percent of the total killed and averaging about 8 pounds), some weighing up in the 10- to 35-pound range, apparently killed in the act of spawning.

In addition, some 25,000 to 30,000 channel catfish aggregating some 10,000 pounds were killed at the same time. Other fishes killed probably totaled 5,000 pounds or more in all.

According to David Cooper, reporter for The News and Observer (May 5, 1963), the "mysterious" poison which killed these thousands of prize rockfish in the Roanoke River marked the second big fish kill there in less than a year. He stated that between 15,000 and 20,000 striped bass were also killed last August during a similar event. Cooper credited State officials with saying later that the Halifax Paper Co., located at Roanoke Rapids and since renamed the Albemarle Paper Co., was responsible for the 1962 fish kill. In another article, on the front page of The News and Observer (Raleigh) for May 8, Cooper reported that it had finally been determined that the Albemarle Paper Co. of Roanoke Rapids was also responsible for the latest big rockfish kill (meat value alone being estimated at $50,000; with potential sport fishing business values possibly threefold that figure).

In a report to the State Stream Sanitation Committee, Executive Secretary Earle C. Hubbard said the lethal poison came from an accidental spillage from a large tank on the paper company's property. His report said that analysis of samples taken from the river revealed the presence of lethal quantities of resin acid soaps, and that the pulp and paper mills of Albemarle Papers, Inc., is the only source of resin acid soaps in the Roanoke Rapids area. The report also stated that it was definitely established that an accidental spill of wastes containing such soaps occurred when the "black liquor feed tank" spilled over for 8 minutes from about 1:45 a.m. to about 1:53 a.m. on Sunday, April 21. The overflow, estimated to be from 10,000 to 15,000 gallons, ran down a ditch and into the river.

About the only significant recourse presently available is for the committee to issue an order to the firm to prevent future spillages. Alternatively, it could file criminal charges carrying a maximum fine of $500. Consequently, legislation has been drafted by the committee that would require polluters to pay for the replacement value of fish they kill. This kind of law prevails in California, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, perhaps other States as well. One polluter in Virginia tried to overturn the Virginia law in a court case, but the State's supreme court ruled that it was constitutional, and a big payment (about $35,000) was made in that instance. Obviously, this is what is needed in North Carolina, and the wildlife resources commission has adopted a resolution backing the proposed new law.

We suggest that Albemarle Paper Co. offer to make restitution insofar as possible by voluntarily paying over to the wildlife resources commission such sum as the latter may determine to be the replacement value of about 80,000 four-pound striped bass and 30,000 three-tenths-pound channel catfish and panfish. In this way, the company could establish its good faith in the matter beyond question. In our view, the meat value (about $52,000) would be the rockbottom basis for calculating replacement value. To raise these fishes in hatchery and rearing facilities—a more realistic basis of calculation—would probably require expenditure of more than a million dollars.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Washington, D.C., International Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record, a statement which I have prepared on the Washington, D.C., International Race, the "Jewel of the International Crown," for "Horse of the World" honors, held on Veterans' Day at the Laurel, Md., racetrack.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Washington, D.C., International Race a Global "People-to-People" Sports Event

On November 11, Veterans' Day in the United States, the unique Washington, D.C. International Race will be presented to the sporting people of the world for the 12th time. As each year becomes history, global interest shows a decided increase, not only among the peoples of the world who breed, own and race thoroughbreds, but also by racing's millions who thoroughly enjoy keen competition everywhere. Perhaps Vice President Lyndon Johnson best expressed the thought in a congratulatory telegram to Laurel president John D. Schapiro, in which he said: "You may well be proud of this people-to-people sports event for its role in furthering understanding among nations of the world. Best wishes for success in the years to come."

From its beginning 11 years ago, the Washington, D.C., International held at Laurel Md., has captured the imagination of racegoers from the four corners of the globe. It has blended together a sound sporting idea with modern air travel to form an international spectacle ranking with the best worldwide contests. From Dublin to Rome, from Melbourne to Malta, from New York to Los Angeles, the International is a topic of conversation among sporting people.

The Washington, D.C., International was conceived by John D. Schapiro, president of Laurel Race Course, with the idea in mind that the best horses of each country, meeting on the turf (which is the natural footing for thoroughbreds), and at the classic distance of a mile and a half, should have the opportunity to compete for the world championship, as in other sports. This event is an invitational affair, with both foreign and American contenders handpicked by an international committee. The entrants must be winners of important races and possess outstanding records.

It is significant to note that Laurel Race Course was host to the first International Jockey Club Seminar, held in 1957 in Washington, D.C. Heads of jockey clubs from all over the world attended and were received at the White House by President Eisenhower.

No greater tribute could be given the Washington, D.C., International on the occasion of its 10th anniversary than the congratulatory messages received by Mr. Schapiro from ambassadors of the 15 countries who had then been represented in this classic race. I quote a few:

Herve Alphand, the Ambassador of France: "I have always been keenly interested in the Washington, D.C., International. And that is not only because French horses won in 1953 and 1956 and because I am hoping for a new French success. Whoever wins, it is always a great and fascinating event in which I am happy to see French participation."

Sir David Ormsby Gore, the Ambassador of Great Britain: "We are proud to have been represented by Britain's leading thoroughbreds in Laurel's great International race; and pleased, of course, to have carried off the first victory in 1952. Recognition of the caliber of this classic can be seen, I believe, in the fact that both Her Majesty the Queen and Sir Winston Churchill have sent their horses to compete. Congratulations on an event that follows the 'Olympic' pattern of sports competition among nations."

Anatoly Dobrynin, the Ambassador of U.S.S.R.: "There are so many things which the peoples of the world have in common; and one of them is the love of good sport. For this reason, the Washington, D.C., International plays a part in strengthening the bonds of friendship and cooperation among nations. We of the Soviet Union are most proud to have had our thoroughbreds participate in the past four runnings of this great classic."

The 11th running of the Washington, D.C., International marked the first appearance of a Japanese thoroughbred in the race. However, hands-across-the-sea between Japan and Laurel Race Course are not limited to the international race alone, for each year during Laurel's spring meeting, a Mikimoto pearl-encrusted horseshoe trophy is presented to the winner of the Laurel "Cherry Blossom Purse."

In addition to enlarging the roster of international participating nations with Japan, the 11th running was also notable for the spectacular victory of the French champion Match II, who won over a stellar international field, including Kelso, the U.S. horse of the year, and Carry Back, who had been this country's 3-year-old of the year in 1961. Sports Illustrated magazine had this to say about the race: "Match's victory now gives foreign horses an edge of 6 to 5 in the international and earns for Match the title of 'Horse of the World.' "

Another international facet at Laurel Race Course was the commissioning last year by Laurel President John D. Schapiro of a mural by Argentine Artist Vincente Forte. This mural was unveiled by Argentine Ambassador Roberts Alemann, and is now on display in the clubhouse at Laurel. Entitled "The Finish," it captures the color and excitement of the international race. Mr. Forte is recognized as one of South America's foremost contemporary artists. A Forte painting was recently presented by the Argentine Government to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, in a White House ceremony.

Still further indication of the regard with which the Washington, D.C., International is held throughout the world are the honors bestowed upon Laurel executives. In 1956, France presented Laurel president John D. Schapiro with the Merite d'Acricole, one of the few occasions it has gone to someone outside France. In 1962, Joseph T. Cascarella, executive vice president of Laurel, was invited by the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Agriculture to tour Russia's thoroughbred racing and breeding facilities. He was the first American racing executive honored by such an invitation.

It is interesting to note that this race is now attracting visitors from abroad as part of the "Visit U.S.A." program sponsored by the U.S. Travel Agency, a division of the Department of Commerce. Tours have already been arranged for groups from England and Canada; and plans are being completed with other groups on the European continent.

We in Maryland are proud of the global popularity of this great thoroughbred classic. Racing in the U.S.A. crowns its best 3-year-old thoroughbreds through the Triple Crown. Now, the world crowns its best horse via the International Crown, comprised by the King George IV and Queen Elizabeth Stakes at Ascot, England; the Prix de L'Arc de Triomphe at Longchamp, France, and the final jewel, the Washington, D.C., International at Laurel. Yes, this race is Maryland's own, being staged by Marylanders on Maryland soil. It carries the name of Maryland all over the world, something no other sporting event in the State does, because racing, unlike other American sports, is known far and wide. And the Washington, D.C., International, by its very name, is of prime importance to the vast amount of people all over the globe who have a strong affinity for the sport of horse racing.

The Negro Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

The Negro Revolution

As President John F. Kennedy presses his bold and controversial civil-rights program on Congress, more than 50 American cities are experiencing racial strife and mass demonstrations. The drumbeat of a new Negro militancy gives urgency to the President's warning of a "rising tide of discontent. It is time to take heed of this warning." In truth, Mr. Kennedy has given voice to our national conscience, which demands that Negroes be allowed to pass beyond the written and unwritten "white only" signs in the Nation's stores, restaurants, hotels, and hiring halls. Beyond this, our Nation is challenged to accept a new image of the American Negro, to accept the fact that the Negro community is aroused and will resort to as much force as is necessary to win the full privileges of citizenship. "Revolution" is a harsh word. It means upheaval and bloodshed. And it means a confession of failure. It means that the rule of law has failed, that the voices of reason have not been heard. And yet revolution is the word that is beginning to apply to the Negro demonstrations, not only in Birmingham and Jackson, but also in New York City, Chicago, Detroit, and the other ghettos of the North. Black forces are drawn up in a battleline that confronts the white man wherever he stands on the principles and practices of segregation. It is the responsibility of the Nation to accommodate the legitimate aims of this Negro revolution with as little violence and damage to our society as possible.

The seat of initiative for dealing with the most critical domestic problem of the century should be our Nation's Capital. Bill Davidson's report on the mess in Washington is a study in irony. The "Government" of Washington remains willfully blind to the points that the President made in laying out his civil-rights program. Mr. Kennedy demand inaction, yet the capital remains a showcase of inaction in a time of domestic crisis. The attitudes that obstruct progress in Washington are typical of the forces that have disfranchised and frustrated the Negro throughout our society.

President Kennedy has attempted to respond to the increasingly grave dilemma by putting before Congress the most comprehensive civil-rights bill in the past century. It would guarantee Negroes equal rights in all major commercial institutions, such as hotels, restaurants, theaters, and department stores. It would speed the desegregation of public education by allowing the Attorney General to file suits against any segregated schools. And since much of the Negro problem involves the chronic unemployment of unskilled Negro workers, the President's bill would allocate $400 million to retrain and educate Negro laborers.

This program will not placate the militant Negro and it will not please the white segregationists, but it seems a moderate and minimal program to the reasonable observer. After all, it has been almost a century since the Constitution guaranteed equal voting rights, but only one quarter of qualified southern Negroes are allowed to vote. It has been almost 10 years since the Supreme Court ordered schools desegregated "with all deliberate speed," but less than 8 percent of southern schools are desegregated. In the States of Alabama and Mississippi not one public school district has been integrated. Yet the southern Senators plan to kill or at least modify President Kennedy's civil-rights bill by the most senseless of strategies, the filibuster. And from the Negroes there are threats that a southern filibuster will be met by massive demonstrations in Washington. The President has challenged both sides "to do their utmost to lesson tensions and to exercise self-restraint. The Congress should have an opportunity to freely work its will."

The indications are that a compromise will finally pass Congress—but it is likely that neither side will heed the President's appeal for moderation. The ardent segregationists will stage their futile filibuster; the zealous integrationists will stage their dangerous and equally futile demonstrations. And America will be the worse for it.

The Negro revolution will not be put down by a compromise bill; it has gone beyond this point. As a Nation we must use all of our resourcefulness and courage to answer the yearnings of 20 million Negroes. If honorable demands for equality and justice are not met, leadership will pass into the hands of irresponsible men. The question is not how much time is left. There is very little time. The question is: What do we do with these few remaining hours?

The Twilight of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Members of both Houses of Congress should be concerned with the continual diminution of power on Capitol Hill. The legislative power is being usurped by the executive and judicial branches, and this has been eloquently pointed up in an editorial in the State of Columbia, S.C., dated July 10, 1963, and entitled "The Twilight of Congress."

Mr. President, this editorial is directed to the Members of Congress, and a very important question is posed in the last paragraph. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, July 10, 1963]

THE TWILIGHT OF CONGRESS

All legislative power, says the Constitution of the United States, shall be vested in a Congress consisting of Senators and Representatives elected by the people.

That provision lies at the very heart of representative government. It is the essence of modern democracy, for it provides the means by which the people of this country can control their own political destiny. It is part and parcel of the American concept that the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of Government shall be independent of one another under a system of checks and balances.

Yet today we are witnessing the decline of the legislative branch of our Government. We see the Congress more and more yielding to the executive and judicial branches, abdicating legislative authority in the face of power grabs from both other branches.

Members of the Federal judiciary, appointed for life and immune from public reaction, constantly extend their power over the people by nullifying legislative enactments and substituting their own concept of what the law should be. Week by week, we see increasing evidence of Thomas Jefferson's wisdom in this warning:

"The judiciary of the United States is the subtle corps of sappers and miners constantly working underground to undermine the foundations of our confederated fabric. They are construing our Constitution from a coordination of general and special government to a general and supreme one alone. * * * To consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions is a very dangerous doctrine indeed, and one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy."

But if the Federal judges are moving us toward an oligarchy, the executive branch is hastening toward autocracy. By Executive order, by Presidential directive, by bland assumption of powers not heretofore exercised by circumspect Presidents, John F. Kennedy is enlarging the sphere and the authority of the Presidency beyond anything contemplated by the Founding Fathers.

Through political pressure, administrative manipulation, and party machinery, the President has come to be not only the Nation's chief executive officer but, in very large measure, its chief legislator. He has moved boldly and brazenly into the fields of education, of housing, of defense, of private economy—wherever he has felt the need for strengthening his political power structure.

It is easy to understand his greed for personal power, recalling Lord Acton's words: "All power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

What is harder to understand is why the Congressmen of these United States, supposedly representative of their individual constituencies and their States, should bend their knees to Presidential usurpation of authority.

Never has the United States stood more in need of congressional courage. Seldom has representative government faced a greater trial in America. And at no time has the Constitution of the United States been in greater danger of internal collapse.

Congress has the right, the responsibility, the duty, and the opportunity to save itself, the Constitution and the country. But does Congress have the guts?

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CITIZENS' ACTION COMMITTEE,
Nassau-Suffolk Counties, N.Y.,
June 12, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: The executive board of the Citizens' Action Committee voted unanimously in favor of House Resolution 14. It is to be hoped that speedy action will be taken upon it and that it will be passed in the House of Representatives.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter sent to Representative **Howard Smith** urging his favorable consideration of House Resolution 14.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

Mrs. Joseph Moosbrugger,
Chairman.

P.S.—We would appreciate having our letters inserted into the Congressional Record.

Citizens' Action Committee,
Nassau-Suffolk Counties, N.Y., June 12, 1963.

Hon. Howard Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: We of the Citizens' Action Committee deplore the sad plight of the captive nations. They have seemingly been abandoned to the tyrannical rule of their Communist masters. The bloody regime of Hungary is now being cleansed and absolved and readied for recognition by the United States. How shameful.

Representative **Daniel Flood** has introduced House Resolution 14 calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations. This committee is long overdue and vitally needed. It would study and prepare concrete recommendations for an effective U.S. policy toward these forgotten countries behind the Iron Curtain. We urge you to submit House Resolution 14 to a vote by your committee and to give it your favorable consideration so that it may be released to the floor of the House and voted upon.

It is imperative that we do all in our power to help these poor, neglected people who are enslaved under the Communist yoke.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Joseph Moosbrugger,
Chairman.

May 31, 1963.

Re House Resolutions 14 and 15, to establish Captive Nations Committee.

Congressman Daniel J. Flood,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Flood: Your diligent efforts in advocating the establishment of a Committee on Captive Nations are not unnoticed by the people of the United States. We are proud and honored that you realize the need for such a committee and have made a concrete effort in this direction by introducing the above bill. Do not be discouraged by the present status of the bill. We are certain that others will follow your able leadership.

Sincerely yours,

Garobed Danielian.

June 4, 1963.

Re passage of House Resolutions 14 and 15, Captive Nations Committee establishment.

Congressman Daniel J. Flood,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Flood: As a first generation American of Armenian ancestry, I am writing to you to let you know how much I am in favor of the above bill submitted by you sometime in 1960.

Although it is very encouraging to know that some measure of relief is planned by men in your position to bring to view the grasping and tyrannical hand of the Soviet Union with regard to certain nations such as Armenia, it is very discouraging to have this bill bottled up by the Rules Committee. At this time, I am also writing to the Rules Committee urging the release of this bill to the House floor.

I know you will continue to maintain your stand on behalf of the passage of this bill.

Very truly yours,

Miss Rose Mooralian.

Congressman Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
House of Representatives Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Congressman: Congressman Flood submitted House Resolution 14 to the House Rules Committee. As to date this resolution is still in the committee on a shelf. Would you please give your support and put this resolution on the floor for debate as it would help all the captive nations under the Communist domain to gain their freedom.

Being of Armenian descent we know what our parents are going through living under such regime.

Please give this matter a consideration as it means a lot to people who have relatives living in the captive nations.

Sincerely yours,

Jud W. Joffouciv.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1963.

Mrs. Marie Podoorska,
Secretary,
Mr. Walter Tustaniqsky,
Chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Detroit, Mich.

Dear Friends: Thank you for your letter urging my support of House Resolution 14—to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

At the present time this bill is pending before the House Committee on Rules with no action scheduled.

Let me assure you this measure has my support and I will continue to do all I can to see that it is enacted.

Sincerely yours,

Martha W. Griffiths,
Member of Congress.

Wayne County, W. Va., Named After Revolutionary War General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a recent article in the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail gives the history of Wayne County, W. Va., which was named after the famous Revolutionary War soldier, Gen. Anthony Wayne. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the Record, as follows:

Wayne County, W. Va., Named After Revolutionary War General

Wayne County is the most western county in the State of West Virginia and was named for Gen. Anthony Wayne, an American Revolution warrior. It is located in the Ohio Valley and the Allegheny Plateau. It contains 281,600 acres or 400 square miles. Elevation ranges from 480 feet at Kenova to 1,500 feet in the southern section.

On January 18, 1842, a bill was passed by the General Assembly of Virginia entitled "an act to establish the county of Wayne from part of Cabell County."

In 1842 when Wayne County was formed from Cabell County the lines were as follows: "Beginning at the mouth of Four Pole Creek on the Ohio River, thence direct to the mouth of Long Branch, so as to include the farm of Asa Booton in the new county, thence along the ridge between Long Branch and Beech Fork to the mouth of Raccoon Creek, thence crossing Raccoon Creek to the ridge between Beech Fork and Guyandotte River, thence along said ridge to the Logan-Cabell line, thence with the Logan line to the mouth of Marrowbone Creek on the Tug Fork of Sandy River, thence down Tug Fork and main Sandy River to the Ohio River, thence up the river to the beginning."

In 1868 the lines between Wayne and Logan were changed to include in Wayne County the farm of Lewis Brewer at Kermit. A part of Lincoln County was formed from Wayne in 1868 and 1869. However, all the territory added to Lincoln County in 1869 was restored to Wayne County in 1872. As late as 1955 the legislature ratified the boundary between Wayne County and Lincoln County as presently accepted by the citizens of both counties as the true boundary.

The fourth section of the act establishing Wayne County fixed the place of holding the county court by declaring "the permanent place for holding court in the County of Wayne shall be on the lands of Abraham Trout, Sr., on Twelve Pole Creek at or near his present residence now in the county of Cabell. The county court for the County of Wayne shall provide a lot or lots of land at said place, not exceeding 2 acres upon which to erect a courthouse and other public building and fixtures as the convenience of the county requires. Abraham Trout owned the land around the town of Wayne, then known as Trouts Hill. If he ever made the county court a deed for the lot on which the courthouse now stands, the deed cannot be found.

Another section required the governor to appoint a commission of 13 justices of the peace in and for said county, who "after having qualified as the law directs were to meet at the house of Abraham Trout, Sr., on the second Monday in June next, and a majority of them being present, should proceed to appoint a clerk of said court. Nominate to the governor a suitable person to be commissioned as sheriff and coroner. The 13 justices were John Wellman, Hiram Chadwick, Milton Ferguson, John Plymale, Levi McCormack, William Ratcliff, Walter Queen, Joseph Newman, Frederick Moore, Thomas Copley, William Morris and Samuel Webb.

On the morning of April 11, 1842, the first court ever held in Wayne County convened at Trout's home. He resided on a tract of land where the town of Wayne now stands. The following justices of the peace attended: Wellman, McCormack, Plymale, Webb, Copley and Queen. The first action was the election of the clerk of the court. The names of Hugh Bowen and Milton J. Spurlock were placed in nomination. Hugh Bowen was elected for a term of 7 years. He gave bond with Addition Bowen, John Plymale, Milton Ferguson, Levi McCormack and Jeremiah Wellman as sureties. Bond was set at $3,000. John Laidley was elected commonwealth attorney. Hiram Chadwick was elected commissioner of revenue (assecssor). Samuel Wellman was named surveyor. The first circuit court convened on May 6, 1843, Judge Lewis Summers presiding. William Morris was the first sheriff.

The Ohio River forms the northwestern boundary of Wayne County. When the Ohio River was first discovered by the French it was known as La Belle River or the Beautiful

River. The word Ohio comes from Indian origin and means white foaming river or river of white caps.

The Big Sandy River flows into the Ohio at Kenova and forms the boundary line between West Virginia and Kentucky up to Fort Gay. The Big Sandy forks at Fort Gay forming the Tug River and Louisa River. It is 27 miles from the junction with the Ohio to the forks at Fort Gay. Big Sandy was called "Chataroi River" by the Indians. The Tug Fork of Big Sandy has its source in Tazewell County, Va., and flows in a northwestern direction through McDowell County and Mingo County. It forms the boundary between West Virginia and Kentucky above Fort Gay. It is 126 miles long. It was the "Roughs of Tugg" in the Andrew Lewis expedition that gave this stream its name.

Twelve Pole Creek takes its name from the Savage Grant. This grant starts at the mouth of Big Sandy River and runs up the Ohio River crossing a stream "12 poles wide at its mouth." Twelve Pole has its source at the base of Guyan Mountain in Mingo County and empties into the Ohio River near Ceredo. It is the only large stream having its source within the Ohio Valley section. From the mouth to the forks it is 31 miles long. The east fork or left fork flows in a northwestern direction, 11½ miles through Mingo County and 1½ miles in Lincoln County and 22 miles in Wayne County. The entire length is 35 miles. The west fork or right fork has its source in Mingo County and flows 15 miles across that county, passes a corner of Lincoln County and flows for 36 miles through Wayne County. It is 5½ miles long from the forks.

Beech Fork has its source in Stonewall District and flows in a general northerly direction to Winslow where it turns and flows to Twelve Pole Creek at Lavalette, or a length of 28½ miles.

Extension of Public Law 78

SPEECH

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry yesterday approved a 1-year extension of Public Law 78, the Mexican labor law. While the enactment of a 1-year program would be heartening to many farmers, ranchmen, Mexican workers, and the general consuming public, authority for more than 1 crop year should be enacted into law. The nonpartisan approach of a 3-year phase out introduced by my colleague, Representative Teague of California, as well as many other Members of the House, including myself, is the more feasible approach and should be enacted speedily into law. The large number of employees of the Department of Labor who are engaged in administering this program want to know what the future holds for them. They are entitled to an answer so that they may know where they will be stationed for another year. The children of these compliance officers ought to be considered as well, as September school opening approaches.

Emil Zubryn, staff correspondent for the Cotton Trade Journal wrote an article entitled, "Failure To Extend Program for Braceros Brings Divergent Reactions in Mexico." This article appeared in the Cotton Trade Journal on June 7, 1963 and is worthy of the attention and consideration of this House.

The article is as follows:

FAILURE TO EXTEND PROGRAM FOR BRACEROS BRINGS DIVERGENT REACTIONS IN MEXICO

(By Emil Zubryn)

Mexico City, June 1.—The refusal of the U.S. Congress to renew the bracero agreement beyond the end of this year has brought divergent reactions here.

On the one hand, the Mexican Department of Interior said the action will not seriously affect the Mexican economy or cause serious unemployment. Displaced workers can be absorbed by Mexican industry, a spokesman said.

In any case, according to the Department of State, hiring of braceros has been on the decline since 1961, when the total came to 296,225 workers. Last year this dropped to 198,322 and this year's total may plunge below 150,000.

OPPOSED EXODUS

Francisco Hernandez y Hernandez, formerly head of the National Farmers Federation, said this organization has always opposed the exodus of Mexican farmworkers who he said are needed here. Senator Alberto Medina Munoz, of Nayarit, expressed a similar stand.

Secretary of State Gustavo Diaz Ordaz said that if the bracero movement is stopped it also will create "problems" for the United States.

He said that any extension will only be considered by Mexico if certain basic requisites are met: improved salaries, living conditions, food, transport, medical service, etc.

ADVERSE EFFECTS

Mexico, however, will have some adverse effects if the bracero program is definitely ended. Officials estimate that around $35 million was earned by braceros last year, with an average of around this in the past 3 years.

It could also create employment problems. There is already talk of creating regional labor banks to siphon off excess Mexican farm labor into needed areas, or into industry.

As for the bracero himself, he was stunned by the news and by the loss of an opportunity to work in the United States from 6 weeks to 3 or 4 months.

PROBLEM AGGRAVATED

Many take the attitude that "nobody gives us work here and in rural areas the best lands are for influential well financed farmers, or for the favored few who have political backing."

The problem is aggravated further by the fact that in Mexico firms are hesitant to hire anyone over 35 years of age. Many braceros are in the 40-to-50-year age group.

Some political leaders view the entire situation with alarm, feel that it could lead to trouble in agricultural communities.

In general, the hope is that American authorities will reconsider and that the bracero agreement will be extended for at least 2 additional years.

Disunity Amendments Branded Unwise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is encouraging to note that responsible groups throughout the Nation are now speaking out in opposition to the three "disunity" or "silent" amendments to the Constitution which a few months ago were being approved, largely without notice by the public, by a number of the State legislatures. At its recent Honolulu meeting, for example, the U.S. Conference of Mayors called the amendments "threats to the strength and well-being of the Nation, the States and the citizens thereof." These amendments would permit State legislators representing less than a fifth of the Nation's population to alter the Constitution, place the apportionment of unrepresentative State legislatures beyond the reach of the U.S. Constitution, and create a new 50-man super supreme court. The principal sponsor of the resolution adopted by the Conference, which represents 500 U.S. cities, was Mayor Herman W. Golden of St. Petersburg, Fla.

Very important opposition to these amendments was stated just 2 weeks ago by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. This group, which the Congress created in 1959, is representative of all levels of government in the United States. One of its members, State Senator Graham S. Newell of Vermont, offered a strong statement of warning which was adopted without dissent. This statement deserves the attention of all Americans, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that an account of the Advisory Commission's action, which appeared in the Machinist of July 11, along with a list of the members of the Commission, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Machinist, July 11, 1963]

DISUNITY AMENDMENTS BRANDED SUBVERSIVE

(Note.—The strongest warning yet against three proposed disunity amendments to the U.S. Constitution was issued at Washington, D.C., last week. The warning came from the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, a national commission made up of Cabinet officers, Governors, Members of Congress, mayors, State legislators, and county officials. The three disunity amendments, approved at Chicago last December by delegates to the so-called General Assembly of the States, would (1) bypass Congress in amending the U.S. Constitution, (2) place the apportionment of seats in State legislatures beyond the reach of the U.S. Constitution, and (3) establish a supercourt with power to overrule the U.S. Supreme Court. So far, one, two, or all three of the proposals have passed one or both legislative bodies in 26 States. The proposals are pending before several other State legislatures. State Senator Grahame S. Newell, of Vermont, a member of the Advisory Commission, vigorously opposed approval of the disunity amendments within the General Assembly of the States last December. At the Advisory Commission meeting last week, the following statement by Senator Newell was adopted, without dissent, as expressing the sense of the commission with respect to the three amendments.)

I consider these proposals insidious in that they would change and subvert our American structure of government. This movement, I feel, is the most concentrated, well-planned internal assault on the Federal Union in a century.

Since the Chicago meeting (of the General Assembly of the States), I have become increasingly shocked at the ease with which these proposals have been adopted in some States. If the accomplishment to date foretells a continuing acceptance by additional legislatures, then those of us who fear for the future status of our Federal Union must sound the tocsin call at every chance. I am convinced that most Americans are not now alert to the subtle dangers inherent in these proposals.

The first proposal would, in effect, set us back into the Government under the Articles of Confederation by its elimination of a constitutionally required action of the national legislature in the amending process. It denies to the American people as Americans, not New Yorkers or Virginians or Hawaiians, a national forum at which to debate proposed constitutional change. In other words, singly and separately, State after State—up to the required 34 needed to propose an amendment and then the 38 necessary to ratify—could whittle away at basic freedoms without any consideration by the people's representatives on the national level.

Proponents obviously wish us Americans to forget that we are national citizens also in addition to being State citizens and many times, as our history reveals, State citizens have been guaranteed their rights as free men only by virtue of that national citizenship.

The politicial philosophy behind this first proposal falsely considers that the American people exist only as 50 different segments and that a national interest, if it does exist, can and ought find expression only through the separate action of 50 geographical political units.

All three proposals repudiate the balances and checks of federalism and smack too much of the old and unsuccesful Articles of Confederation. Taken for what in reality all these proposals are, they destroy the basic premises of the American system adopted by the 1787 Constitutional Convention, confirmed by successive generations after bitter conflict in the Halls of Congress and, finally, after the bitterest of all conflicts, on the battlefields of a century ago.

By creating a 20th century American confederation, they would disrupt our present constitutional balances so as to put in jeopardy our fundamental civil liberties.

This commission should not stop at expressing opposition to these proposals but should, at every opportunity, unequivocably reaffirm our confidence and our faith in the American federal system.

MEMBERS

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations was created by Congress in 1959 as "a permanent, bipartisan body of 26 members, to give continuing study to the relationships among local, State, and National levels of government."

Of the 26 members of the Advisory Commission, 9 represent the National Government, 14 represent State and local governments and 3 the public at large.

Current members of the commission, serving 2-year terms, are:

U.S. Senators: SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., of North Carolina, KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota and EDMUND S. MUSKIE of Maine.

U.S. Representatives: FLORENCE P. DWYER of New Jersey, L. H. FOUNTAIN of North Carolina and EUGENE J. KEOGH of New York.

Executive branch of the Federal Government: C. Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury; Anthony Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and Robert C. Weaver, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Governors: John Anderson, Jr., of Kansas, Robert E. Smylie of Colorado, Carl E. Sanders of Georgia, and Terry Sanford of North Carolina.

State legislators: John E. Powers, president, Massachusetts State Senate; State Senator Graham S. Newell of Vermont; and Harry King Lowman, speaker, Kentucky House of Representatives.

County officials: Supervisor Edward Connor, Wayne County, Mich.; Supervisor Clair Donnenwirth, Plumas County, Calif.; and Commissioner Barbara A. Wilcox, Washington County, Oreg.

Mayors: Neal S. Blaisdell, Honolulu; Arthur Naftalin, Minneapolis; and Raymond R. Tucker, St. Louis. (A fourth mayor's seat is currently vacant.)

Public members: Frank Bane, former executive director of the Council of State Governments, Advisory Commission Chairman; Don Hummel, former mayor of Tucson, Ariz., Advisory Commission vice chairman; and Howard R. Bowen, dean of Grinnell College, Iowa.

The Import Problem Confronting Our Domestic Woolen Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the letter which follows was received from the general manager of a large woolen mill in my congressional district and is an excellent statement of the import problem which confronts the woolen industry in this country at the present time. It would seem essential that the executive branch, and the Tariff Commission in particular, concern itself more seriously with this deteriorating position of our domestic woolen industry, and call to the attention of Mr. Herter, our Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, that this industry be given every consideration in his present discussions abroad.

I am sure that many Members of Congress having woolen manufacturers in their districts concur with this statement as well as the facts presented in the letter from Mr. Roswell Brayton, general manager of the Woolrich Woolen Mills, Woolrich, Pa.:

WOOLRICH WOOLEN MILLS,
Woolrich, Pa., July 12, 1963.

Mr. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HERM: We have been following closely the results of the various conferences, discussions and committees looking into the subject of protecting the woolen industry of this country from imports of countries such as Japan and Italy with a wage scale only a fraction of ours. It has been most discouraging because absolutely nothing has been done in spite of assurances from the administration dating back to May 1961, to the contrary. In the meantime, woolen mill after woolen mill has been forced to close its doors and go out of business. In the last year alone the woolen spinning spindles decreased 9 percent according to the Census Bureau Report, and 21 percent since 1957. There is scarcely a month that goes by without another plant being liquidated.

The import of woolen goods has been increasing rapidly overy year. In 1961 it was 85 million square yards; 1962, 151 million square yards, and at the rate of present imports it will be 200 million square yards for 1963. Several subterfuges have been found to avoid the import duty. One has been to add a braid trimming to the edge of the cloth so that it can be brought in under a different category. Another has been to ship the cloth to the Virgin Islands and apply some minor process such as a waterproofing solution to avoid the regular duty.

It seems that the State Department with its program of increasing world trade has not been willing to give any consideration to the woolen and worsted industry of this country. We feel the time is long overdue for action to restrict the amount of woolen goods imported or there will not be any industry left to speak of in the country.

Our company has been in business since 1830 and is making every effort to keep abreast with modernization and efficient operation. It has been our firm purpose to give steady employment with increased benefits whenever possible. Our present rate of employment is considerably higher than it was several years ago. However, we have found our normal outlet of woolen fabrics greatly reduced and are dependent on contracts for Government blankets to keep in operation. At the moment this letter is being typed, we have no assurance whether we will be able to keep our normal operation going a month from now. All of us in this concern have been doing our utmost to make our firm one of the most progressive woolen mills in the country. No matter what measures we take, they will not offset cheap imports from Japan with a wage scale of less than 20 cents an hour. It is imperative for the wooolen industry which is essential to national defense, that measures be adopted to put a limitation on these imports.

Yours very truly,

ROSWELL BRAYTON,
General Manager.

The Passamaquoddy Project To Harness the Tides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 1 I warned that the plans of Secretary of Interior, Stewart Udall, for connecting all Western Federal power lines into one gigantic "grid of grief" constituted a "Kilowatt Kremlin" for the United States. Now I see where he has recommended the expenditure of $800 million of the taxpayers' money on the Passamaquoddy project in Maine to harness the tides.

This project would only be in use for some 800 hours per year, which constitutes a cost of some $1 million per hour. If this project was feasible, it would be another matter. Yet countless recommendations, the last in 1961, have declared the project unfeasible. Canada has refused to participate in the entire project—but Udall has brought them in through the backdoor by saying that we will build it and they will have to buy the power generated from the operation.

It would seem that politics has entered into what should be dispassionate consideration of projects on their own merit. Since a Democratic Senator is up for reelection in Maine next year, the taxpayers must pay for a nearly $1 billion boondoggle because of Secretary Udall's zealous activity to ride roughshod over private interests and spread Government control through both power plays and land grabs.

This power project has been suggested by Mr. Udall along with Federal landgrabs ranging from the Sleeping Bear Dunes in Michigan to Assateague Island in Maryland which would dispossess thousands of private businessmen, landowners and homeowners with little or no justification. The only justification for such projects has been Mr. Udall's statements that we must think big and act big. To me all this means is that Americans must pay big—for projects using the people's money to build a political empire and to compete with private power companies and our free enterprise system. One thing Secretary Udall did not learn in Russia was to let "sleeping bears" lie.

Red Anti-Semitism Assailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, this country has been concerning itself in the past few weeks with the injustices that many of our citizens have had to endure and, I might add, continue to endure. I am ashamed that such injustices exist in this fine country of ours; however, I am proud that we have made our task for the immediate future the correction of these errors. I am equally proud of the fact that we are living under a system in which these problems can be brought to light and dealt with in the open. A great portion of the Nation, Mr. President, is concerned with the problems suffered by our ethnic minorities and is determined to find some way to solve them.

But the United States is not the only country that is suffering from such problems. There are many countries in which blatant discrimination exists, but where the expression of these injustices is not allowed, and in which no effort is made for the correction of these problems. I had specifically in mind the Soviet Union. The totalitarian government of the Soviet Union goes to great lengths to cover up the discrimination that exists in that country. Yet even with these determined efforts to hide the facts, we continue to learn of the persecution of the Jewish population in the Soviet Union. Surely these problems must be great, if the full force of the Soviet Government is unable to hide them.

I invite the attention of Senators to the July 4 editorial published in the Jewish News, a weekly newspaper published weekly for the Jewish Community Council of Essex County, N.J. By elucidating some of the problems in the Soviet Union, the editorial reminds us that we cannot forget the evils of persecution in another quarter of the world. I ask the unanimous consent to have this excellent editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED ANTI-SEMITISM ASSAILED

A United Nations agency has again served as a forum for critics of the Soviet Union's treatment of its Jewish minority to voice their objections, thus focusing the world's attention on a deplorable situation.

For the second time this year, such criticism has been expressed at Geneva, the latest occasion being a conference of the International Labor Organization (ILO).

Last week, the U.S. delegate, Bert Seidman, said the Soviet practice of "listing * * * ethnic extraction in any document required for employment * * * is * * * incompatible with the principle of nondiscrimination in employment and occupation."

Seidman went on to charge the U.S.S.R. with a "conscious and determined policy of holding Jews up to pubilc opprobrium and of denying Jews both the opportunity for religious expression and for equal treatment in education and employment."

Another indictment, in more elaborate and explicit terms, was voiced in Geneva in April when delegates to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights raked the Soviet Union over the coals.

The Soviet reply to Seidman was typically denunciatory. "An invention, a falsehood, and an irresponsible statement," the Russian delegate said.

He was joined by a Bulgarian who said, "The true bastions against anti-Semitism and discrimination of every kind are the socialist countries and particularly the Soviet Union."

With respect to the U.S.S.R., in the face of an increasingly growing body of evidence to the contrary, this argument is as devoid of credibility as is the legalistic argument, hoary with Communist repetition, that discrimination is barred by the Soviet Constitution.

Reports emanating from the Soviet Union indicate that it is becoming highly sensitive to the West's scrutiny of its anti-Semitic practices. Recently the Government newspaper Izvestia printed letters from Soviet Jews denying the existence of anti-Semitism. It also refused to publish a letter in which British philosopher Bertrand Russell appealed for an end to discrimination against Jews.

It is to be hoped that the ILO will look further into the employment and occupational disabilities imposed upon Russian Jews.

Aid for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Syracuse Post-Standard recently commented on my bill, H.R. 6866, to provide permanent scientific staffs for the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, I offer the editorial for the RECORD:

[From the Post-Standard, June 21, 1963]

AID FOR CONGRESS

A Congressman today needs a scientific background to understand what is involved in space and other projects for which he is required to approve funds.

But few Members of either House of Congress are qualified for the task. They must depend on scientists from the executive branch who naturally defend their programs in seeking appropriations.

Representative ABNER W. SIBAL, Connecticut Republican, would correct this by legislation providing the Senate and House with three independent scientists each in the fields of physics, biology and chemistry. Consultants would be hired for specific projects.

The lawmakers should have the benefit of such service in weighing various programs. That is, if politics can be kept out of the appointments. SIBAL suggests the majority party in each House designate two of the three scientists and the minority party the third.

Congress votes millions of dollars for scientific and technical developments. Members should have a better comprehension of what they are doing. At present in most cases they must take the word of executive branch scientists.

Part IV—"American Individualism," by Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, part IV of "American Individualism," by that great American, Herbert Hoover, is entitled "Economic Phases." I offer it as a kind of memorial to the faith Mr. Hoover has in our American way of life. I believe the thoughtfulness so apparent in his writing arose from his own personal struggle and growth as an individual in this land of opportunity. It is more than worthy reading for all of us, in the present climate of considering tax reform, civil rights legislation, and the urging upon us of a larger and larger complex of Federal bureaucracies:

AMERICAN INDIVIDUALISM

ECONOMIC PHASES

That high and increasing standards of living and comfort should be the first of considerations in public mind and in government needs no apology. We have long since realized that the basis of an advancing civilization must be a high and growing standard of living for all the people, not for a single class; that education, food, clothing, housing, and the spreading use of what we so often term nonessentials, are the real fertilizers of the soil from which spring the finer flowers of life. The economic development of the past 50 years has lifted the general standard of comfort far beyond the dreams of our forefathers. The only road to further advance in the standard of living is by great invention, greater elimination of waste, greater production, and better distribution of commodities and services, for by increasing their ratio to our numbers and dividing them justly we each will have more of them.

The superlative value of individualism through its impulse to production, its stimulation to invention, has, so far as I know, never been denied. Criticism of it has lain in its wastes but more importantly in its failures of equitable sharing of the product. In our country these contentions are mainly over the division to each of his share of the comforts and luxuries, for none of us is either hungry or cold or without a place to lay his head—and we have much besides. In less than four decades we have added electric lights, plumbing, telephones, gramophones, automobiles, and whatnot in wide diffusion to our standards of living. Each in turn began as a luxury, each in turn has become so commonplace that 70 or 80 percent of our people participate in them.

To all practical souls there is little use in quarreling over the share of each of us until we have something to divide. So long as we maintain our individualism we will have increasing quantities to share and we shall have time and leisure and taxes with which to fight our proper sharing of the surplus. The income tax returns show that this surplus is a minor part of our total production after taxes are paid. Some of this surplus must be set aside for rewards to saving for stimulation of proper effort to skill, to leadership, and invention—therefore the dispute is in reality over much less than the total of such surplus. While there should be no minimizing of a certain fringe of injustices in sharing the results of production or in the wasteful use made by some of their share, yet there is vastly wider field for gains to all of us through cheapening the costs of production and distribution through the eliminating of their wastes, from increasing the volume of product by each and everyone doing his utmost, than will ever come to us even if we can think out a method of abstract justice in sharing which did not stifle production of the total product.

It is a certainty we are confronted with a population in such numbers as can only exist by production attuned to a pitch in which the slightest reduction of the impulse to produce will at once create misery and want. If we throttle the fundamental impulses of man our production will decay. The world in this hour is witnessing the most overshadowing tragedy of 10 centuries in the heartbreaking, life-and-death struggle with starvation by a nation with a hundred and fifty millions of people. In Russia under the new tyranny a group, in pursuit of social theories, have destroyed the primary self-interest impulse of the individual to production.

Although socialism in a nationwide application has now proved itself with rivers of blood and inconceivable misery to be an economic and spiritual fallacy and has wrecked itself finally upon the rocks of destroyed production and moral degeneracy, I believe it to have been necessary for the world to have had this demonstration. Great theoretic and emotional ideas have arisen before in the world's history and have in more than mere material bankruptcy deluged the world with fearful losses of life. A purely philosophical view might be that in the long run humanity has to try every way, even precipices, in finding the road to betterment.

But those are utterly wrong who say that individualism has as its only end the acquisition and preservation of private property—the selfish snatching and hoarding of the common product. Our American individualism, indeed, is only in part an economic creed. It aims to provide opportunity for self-expression, not merely economically, but spiritually as well. Private property is not a fetish in America. The crushing of the liquor trade without a cent of compensation, with scarcely even a discussion of it, does not bear out the notion that we give property rights any headway over human rights. Our development of individualism shows an increasing tendency to regard right of property not as an object in itself, but in the light of a useful and necessary instrument in stimulation of initiative to the individual; not only stimulation to him that he may gain personal comfort, security in life, protection to his family, but also because individual accumulation and ownership is a basis of selection to leadership in administration of the tools of industry and commerce. It is where dominant private property is assembled in the hands of the groups who control the state that the individual begins to feel capital as an oppressor. Our American demand for equality of opportunity is a constant militant check upon capital becoming a thing to be feared. Out of fear we sometimes even go too far and stifle the reproductive use of capital by crushing the initiative that makes for its creation.

Some discussion of the legal limitations we have placed upon economic domination is given later on, but it is desirable to mention here certain potent forces in our economic life that are themselves providing their own correction to domination.

The domination by arbitrary individual ownership is disappearing because the works of today are steadily growing more and more beyond the resources of any one individual, and steadily taxation will reduce relatively excessive individual accumulations. The number of persons in partnership through division of ownership among many stockholders is steadily increasing—thus 100,000 to 200,000 partners in a single concern are not uncommon. The overwhelmingly largest portion of our mobile capital is that of our banks, insurance companies, building and loan associations, and the vast majority of all this is the aggregated small savings of our people. Thus large capital is steadily becoming more and more a mobilization of the savings of the small holder—the actual people themselves—and its administration becomes at once more sensitive to the moral opinions of the people in order to attract their support. The directors and managers of large concerns, themselves employees of these great groups of individual stockholders, or policyholders, reflect a spirit of community responsibility.

Large masses of capital can only find their market for service or production to great numbers of the same kind of people that they employ and they must therefore maintain confidence in their public responsibilities in order to retain their customers. In times when the products of manufacture were mostly luxuries to the average of the people, the condition of their employees was of no such interest to their customers as when they cater to employees in general. Of this latter, no greater proofs need exist than the efforts of many large concerns directly dependent upon public good will to restrain prices in scarcity—and the very general desire to yield a measure of service with the goods sold. Another phase of this same development in administration of capital is the growth of a sort of institutional sense in many large business enterprises. The encouragement of solidarity in all grades of their employees in the common service and common success, the sense of mutuality with the prosperity of the community are both vital developments in individualism.

There has been in the last 30 years an extraordinary growth of organizations for advancement of ideas in the community for mutual cooperation and economic objectives—the chambers of commerce, trade associations, labor unions, bankers, farmers, propaganda associations, and what not. These are indeed variable mixtures of altruism and self-interest. Nevertheless, in these groups the individual finds an opportunity for self-expression and participation in the molding of ideas, a field for training and the stepping stones for leadership.

The number of leaders in local and national life whose opportunity to service and leadership came through these associations has become now of more importance than those through the direct lines of political and religious organization.

At times these groups come into sharp conflict and often enough charge each other with crimes against public interest. They do contain faults; if they develop into warring interests, if they dominate legislators and intimidate public officials, if they are to be a new setting of tyranny, then they will destroy the foundation of individualism. Our Government will then drift into the hands of timorous mediocrities dominated by groups until we shall become a giant syndicalist nation on a gigantic scale. On the other hand, each group is a realization of greater mutuality of interest, each contains some element of public service and each is a school of public responsibility. In the main, the same forces that permeate the Nation at large eventually permeate these groups. The sense of service, a growing sense of responsibility, and the sense of constructive opposition to domination, constantly recall in them their responsibilities as well as their privileges. In the end, no group can dominate the Nation and a few successes in imposing the will of any group is its sure death warrant.

Today business organization is moving strongly toward cooperation. There are in the cooperative great hopes that we can even gain in individuality, equality of opportunity, and an enlarged field for the initiative, and at the same time reduce many of the great wastes of overreckless competition in production and distribution. Those who either congratulate themselves or those who fear that cooperation is an advance toward socialism need neither rejoice nor worry. Cooperation in its current economic sense represents the initiative of self-interest blended with a sense of service, for nobody belongs to a cooperative who is not striving to sell his products or services for more or striving to buy from others for less or striving to make his income more secure. Their members are furnishing the capital for extension of their activities just as effectively as if they did it in corporate form and they are simply transferring the profit principle from joint return to individual return. Their only success lies where they eliminate waste either in production or distribution—and they can do neither if they destroy individual initiative. Indeed this phase of development of our individualism promises to become the dominant note of its 20th century expansion. But it will thrive only insofar as it can construct leadership and a sense of service, and so long as it preserves the initiative and safeguards the individuality of its members.

The economic system which is the result of our individualism is not a frozen organism. It moves rapidly in its form of organization under the impulse of initiative of our citizens, of growing science, of larger production, and of constantly cheapening distribution.

A great test of the soundness of a social system must be its ability to evolve within itself those orderly shifts in its administration that enable it to apply to new tools of social, economic, and intellectual progress, and to eliminate the malign forces that may grow in the application of these tools. When we were almost wholly an agricultural people our form of organization and administration, both in the governmental and economic fields, could be simple. With the enormous shift in growth to industry and commerce we have erected organisms that each generation has denounced as Frankensteins, yet the succeeding generation proves them to be controllable and useful. The growth of corporate organizations, of our banking systems, of our railways, of our electrical power, of our farm cooperatives, of our trade unions, of our trade associations, and of a hundred others indeed develops both beneficent and malign forces. The timid become frightened. But our basic social ideas march through the new things in the end. Our demagogs, of both radical and standpat breed, thrive on demands for the destruction of one or another of these organizations as the only solution for their defects, yet progress requires only a guardianship of the vital principles of our individualism with its safeguard of true equality of opportunity in them.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues here will recall successful Captive Nations Weeks of earlier years. Data surrounding these events indicated that the U.S.S.R. feared the possibility that Captive Nations Day observance might become traditional with the United States and that the effects of the observance would probably one day dictate U.S. action and policy.

I am happy to lend my voice to the cause of Captive Nations Week because I sincerely believe that we must never let the world forget the hope these captive nations hold for ultimate freedom.

But I would also be among the first to acknowledge that constant congressional highlighting of the Captive Nations Week has not firmed up U.S. policy toward communism one iota.

Here is why: At the time I made a statement similar to this 2 years ago, communism had yet to gained a foothold in the Western Hemisphere. Since then, however, Cuba has openly succumbed to the hammer and sickle. And, if we can believe our news sources, other Latin American or South American Republics may follow suit.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the reason communism continues to make inroads into the Western Republics, instead of being halted by our Captive Nations Week observance, is because of our present official policy of accommodation. Only this week a national publication has indicated that our Department of State can hardly wait for Congress to adjourn because it intends to pursue such policy with Cuba as soon as Congress is out of the way. According to this magazine, our Department of State is of the opinion that by establishing diplomatic relations with Red Cuba, the United States will lessen tension in the Caribbean.

In addition, I would like to point out that we have dispatched an Under Secretary to Russia as an agent of the President. This agent will engage in special negotiations with the Soviet. Yet the American public is still to be informed on what is to take place. Again national publications speculate the deal may involve nuclear testing, Cuba, Berlin, and the future of the U.S. policy in East Europe. And they add that it may take place against a background of our accommodation to the present Soviet status.

This is most disturbing news and I would like to direct my colleagues' attention to it. In addition, I would suggest a much firmer stand against any sort of compromise with communism and to that, add that unless we ultimately assume a position that firm, we are going to find that we, too, are among the captive nations with only the winds to mourn our passing.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, this fifth observance of Captive Nations Week by the American people comes at a most fateful moment in our national history. No nation conceived in adversity under such concepts as ours could know a more intense and passionate identification with every peoples of the world who hold the rights of self-determination, individual freedom, dignity, and equality under law of inalienable God-foreordained inheritance. Throughout the history of this Nation, we have asserted and history has confirmed the deathless truth that the oppression of peoples under a doctrine counter to the concepts of freedom and dignity of man cannot endure. The human spirit can no more survive the alien status of subjugation than the human body can survive without air and food and water. And before death under these conditions, the dignity of man asserts itself in a phenomenal inspired strength which inevitably breaks the binding tyranny.

Today we reaffirm these truths and our commitment of heart and action to the captive peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and to captive peoples of the world wherever they are. We say to them we are more than involved in the life and death struggle for national independence, the life and death struggle for freedom that grips and circles the world—in Europe, in Africa, in Asia, in the United States, in East and West and North and South. We say the destiny of the principles on which we stand as a nation are linked and bound in your fate.

The gravity of that truth makes them our solemn reaffirmations to the captive nations of the world on this commemoration deeply critical, for within the boundaries of our own nation the struggles for freedom of an oppressed, yes captive, people has grown into fierce crisis, holding the eyes of the world. To the captive nations and all people of the world struggling for freedom, we will affirm our commitments of heart and our commitment to action as we take firm and unrelenting steps to unloose the shackles of tyranny existing in our own homeland and make available to all men the choices and rights and opportunities of freedom.

Even as we do this, I join my colleagues in urging the establishment of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations to study the ways in which we can help set the world free in peace, for our commitments can only be total.

Accent on Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, in my home community of Rochester, N.Y., the Rochester-Monroe County Youth Board has undertaken a project aimed at improving racial relations. Known as "Accent on Understanding," the project seeks to create a more wholesome climate for good interracial relationships in the community through the basic process of promoting better knowledge, understanding, and communication between white and Negro people.

The youth board was officially established in 1960 by action of the Rochester City Council and the Monroe County Board of Supervisors. It is composed of 28 official and citizen members representing both major political parties and a broad cross-section of community life. The youth board has the responsibility of coordinating and supplementing the activities of public, private, and religious agencies devoted in whole or in part to the welfare and protection of youth.

Great credit is due the youth board for the research, education, and community organization which has gone into devising programs aimed at preventing, controlling, or treating delinquency and neglect among youth. Clarence M. Gifford, the youth board chairman, William J. Bub, Jr., executive director, and the members and staff of the youth board are performing a noble service in behalf of their fellow man.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include with my remarks a description of the youth board's "accent on understanding" project. In light of the racial problems facing communities throughout our Nation today, this program seems to be particularly timely. I hope the additional publication of this descriptive information will evoke the interest of my colleagues representing other communities where such a project could contribute to better race relations.

Also, I am including a copy of an editorial from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle of May 26, 1963. In this newspaper article, Clifford E. Carpenter, editor, has set forth a convincing case for the desirability of such a project and has commended the youth board for its implementation.

The material follows:

ACCENT OF UNDERSTANDING

"Accent on Understanding" is a program, planned by a committee of white and Negro Monroe County residents, to be conducted by the Rochester-Monroe Joint City-County Youth Board. The simple objective for which the program is designed is to improve race relations through the basic process of promoting better knowledge, understanding, and communication between white and Negro people. It is the feeling of the Youth Board that a program to accomplish these ends is fundamental to creating a more wholesome climate for good interracial relationships in the community, and if accomplished, will greatly reduce the problems involved in such tension ridden areas as education, housing, employment, etc.

The underlying assumption in the program is that racial conflict, and its many ramifications, result largely from either a lack of understanding of the Negro by the white, and of the white by the Negro, or from erroneous impressions based on inaccurate or distorted protrayals, hearsay, or limited observations. It is further assumed that this lack of understanding and/or these erroneous impressions are due, in large part, to the inability of both races to become well acquainted with the other.

To accomplish this end the Youth Board, during the summer of 1963 will implement a pilot project, "Accent on Understanding." The program will consist simply of placing approximately 16 Negro and white boys and girls ages 9, 10, and 11 as house guests, for a 1-month period, of families of the opposite race. The hypotneses is that this intimate relationship will provide an opportunity for the families involved to become really acquainted with a family of the opposite ethnic group, and that from this relationship will emerge the many positive factors discussed above. It is further expected that the benefits of the program will not be limited to the families involved, but will be spread by and through them to their friends, acquaintances, and neighborhoods.

Host families have volunteered in response to appeals in the form of newspaper articles, editorial comments, and from verbal requests from various clergymen and interested citizens. Boys and girls will be provided primarily by two Rochester settlement houses.

In operation, the settlement houses will provide the names of children who have indicated a desire to be participants in the program, and who are known by the staff members of those agencies as children who would be good candidates for the program. They will be children who are functioning well in their own current environments and who, in most respects, would be similar in terms of their interests, activities, likes, and dislikes to counterpart children in selected host families.

On or about the 1st of July, staff members from the settlements will meet with the psychologist, employed by the Youth Board as the professional who will direct this program, and furnish the names of the children and their families, together with as much information about them as they may have. Willingness to participate in the program on the parts of these children and their families will have been established prior to this by the settlement staff persons. The Youth Board worker will then interview these children and their families in order to determine the nature and extent of their feelings, attitudes, wishes, interests, ability to participate in the program comfortably and productively. The total information he derives from these interviews will form the base for "matching" children with host families and the age-mate children in them.

During the months of June and July the worker has been and will be interviewing those families who have made a written request to the Youth Board to be interviewed as possible participants. An extensive schedule is used for this interview which is directed to determine the attitudes, interests, opinions, ability to comfortably and productively participate in the program. On the basis of this interview, it will be determined, as with the guest children, whether or not a given family should participate. The total picture thus derived will also be used to "match" the family with a guest child.

It is believed that the ages of 9, 10 and 11 will be optimal for the purposes of the program. This will preclude the necessity of having to handle problems which are normally viewed as peculiar to teenagers, and will reduce considerably the amount of risk which may be attendant upon placing younger children away from their families for a month. No matter how casual and gratifying the placement may be or how much reciprocity may be involved in the families visiting each other during this time, it is anticipated that some degree of anxiety will exist in most children, even those who express a very positive attitude in the situation.

At the point where a child and host family have been "matched," the worker will arrange a meeting between the two families on an informal basis. Any problems which may become obvious at that time will be given whatever attention and treatment that may be required. When the entire group of children and families have been "matched," an informal get-together of all families and all children, prior to the beginning of the actual visiting period in August, is anticipated.

During the "groundwork" period of July, and the actual visiting period of August, the professional engaged to conduct this project will devote his full time and energies to the program. Scheduled weekly visits to each host family and guest child will be made during August, and the worker will be on continuous call to them during that time, as well. His work will be to provide whatever assistance he can by phone or in person, and he will be immediately responsible for the resolution of problems as they arise. A qualified social caseworker will be available to consult with him on any matter. The worker will also be involved in ongoing evaluation of each family situation, and will keep appropriate records to be used at the close of the program for research purposes. He will also contribute to the final evaluation and report of the program.

Visits between the host family and the family of the guest child will be strongly encouraged, as will short visits of the guest child and his host peer in the home of the guest child. It is hoped that much social intercourse between the two families will begin during the period of the visit, and continue thereafter.

Although precedent indicates that this type of a visit is not damaging to the visiting child, much care will be taken to insure against this eventuality. All that can be known about the child's disposition, character, interests, habits, likes, dislikes, emotional stability, etc., will be taken into account in the matching process, following a firm determination that the child wishes to be a part of the program, and, in the opinion of the professional staff persons involved, he or she is secure enough in his or her feelings about himself and family to be able to take part. At any time there should appear evidence that the child may be uncomfortably placed away from his family the child will be returned to his own home.

An evaluation is built into the program in order to determine its effect on the children, families and neighborhoods involved. On the basis of this evaluation, a decision will be made as to whether or not this program attains its objectives, and if it should be continued and expanded.

THE PROPER RACIAL APPROACH: ACCENT ON UNDERSTANDING

(By Clifford E. Carpenter)

A wide-eyed newspaperman—let's confess it, the editor of this newspaper—while on a recent assignment to Latin America, remarked to the U.S. Ambassador to a particular Latin nation that there was a remarkable lack of any sort of discrimination among blacks and whites.

"True," said the Ambassador gently, "but discrimination wears more than one shirt. You are right that there is no color discrimination here * * * but unless a person happens to be born in this country, he can never vote, and he can never hold a government job."

This footnote on discrimination, which exists in many forms everywhere on earth, is interesting to think about when one looks beyond the immediate trouble in Birmingham. However violent, the current trouble will be settled, for the forces of moderation and the businessmen in those communities will no longer permit the visible extremes of segregation which have existed there.

What then? Then come the subtle, the debatable forms of discrimination. Here the Negro, just as the white, will encounter discrimination by different levels of education, discrimination by business or civil stature discrimination by conduct, discrimination because of the size of the bankroll, discrimination in private club membership.

The struggle against discrimination cannot end because it is a never-ending process of sorting out and correcting patently unfair discriminatory practices on the one hand, and keeping hands off private discriminatory practices which involve only the persons directly affected.

These reflections funnel attention on a little pilot project in Rochester which, in its long-range impact, may be of more significance than Birmingham.

This is the practical—and highly sensitive—youth board plan to run a program called "Accent on Understanding," involving perhaps no more than 16 Negro and white youngsters.

The program assumes—and this is the essence of simplicity—that not even open housing and equal job opportunities are the fundamental problems in white and nonwhite relationship. The basic problem, from which all others stem, is lack of mutual understanding. We just don't know each other.

This is the plan. Working with churches, the youth board will match up groups of white and nonwhite youngsters as closely as possible. That is, they will try to pair them off in comparable economic levels.

Then white youngsters will live with Negro families for a while this summer. And Negro youngsters will stay with white families for a while.

What does the youth board hope to achieve?

"Not just an exchange program," says Executive Director William J. Bub, Jr., "not a program to get the Negro out of the slums; not a program to solve all cultural differences; simply a program in orientation and in understanding."

If at the end of this experiment, a white youngster can go to his parents and say "Why does Jim have to live in that neighborhood?" * * * and the Negro boy can go to his parents and say, "We aren't the only ones with problems," then this will be defined as establishing understanding, and that's all the experiment seeks to start. Bub is confident it will blossom into families visiting families.

So far this little pilot project sounds easy.

But look further. Switching homes is not expected to be difficult to accomplish because there are enough individuals of conscience to volunteer for the project.

But what about the entire neighborhood? What will the all-white neighborhood think when the Johnsons play host to a Negro youngster and ask that he be accepted into neighborhood activities? What will the all-Negro neighborhood think when the reverse situation develops?

So this pilot project will be a success or a flop not in proportion to the few youngsters or families directly participating, but on a basis of neighborhood acceptance and understanding. It is going to be up to not 16 families or 16 Negro and white youngsters to see if an adventure in understanding is successful. It is going to be up to the hundreds of neighbors in each case to look into their consciences and see if they will help, in whatever small ways are suggested, even as humble as a backyard barbecue or driving to church together.

This program will begin in a few weeks.

It is a drop in the bucket, but a proper drop in the proper bucket, not a waste of time and effort. The youth board will be pleased to hear from any families wanting to cooperate.

This "Accent on Understanding" is so vitally promising it deserves interest and help from all persons and organizations.

In its functional practicality, it is a relief from the activities of groups which seem to think that the issuance of a statement or a position paper or a petition will solve human problems; and who seem to be trying to emulate the gunmen of the Old West and see who can perform the fastest draw getting a statement on and off the typewriter.

School Principal Remarks on School Prayer Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, appearing in a recent edition of the Jasper News, Jasper, Fla., under the column "You and Your School," was an excellent article by Mr. M. L. Powell, principal of the high school of that town, concerning the recent decision handed down by the U.S. Supreme Court on the reading of the Bible and reciting of the Lord's Prayer in our public schools. I have read this with interest since it is the comments of a school principal and it is for this reason that I am bringing it to your attention. Mr. Powell's article reads as follows:

Since the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in which the required reading of the Bible and a required public prayer in public schools were declared to be unconstitutional, several people have asked what would be the status of this matter in our schools of Jasper when schools open for the fall term. As far as we are concerned the status will be unchanged and we will continue to operate as we always have until forbidden to do so by some local level of higher authority than we. To us this whole matter hinges on the single word "required." To us it seems that the Supreme Court was saying in effect that no State, county, or city board of public instruction could require that the classroom teachers in its system to read or have read the Bible or to pray or to have prayer said in the respective classrooms. Even in our school we shall in all likelihood not specifically require that teachers do this but we shall very strongly recommend that this be done on a voluntarily basis. We shall very likely never recommend the dismissal of a teacher for the failure to do this, for a teacher failing to do this other grounds for dismissal might well be explored.

Let's go back and look at this word "required" again. If the schools and the classroom teachers of Florida and the other States of the Union were reading the Bible and saying prayers simply and only because it was a legal requirement then this activity was nothing more than sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. But such we do not think was the case.

We believe that the vast majority of teachers in the classrooms of America are men and women dedicated and consecrated to the full and complete development of every student who comes within our care. In this development they have in mind the mental, the physical, the social, and the moral and the spiritual development of the child. We believe that these teachers are dedicated and consecrated to the preservation of the religious principles of the Founding Fathers of this great Nation who had an abounding faith in an Almighty God. There was no solace or comfort for the athesist in the national life then and there should be none now. Surely, it's the tragic freedom of an individual man to be an athesist if he so desires but simply because he does is no reason why the vast majority of teachers and schoolchildren should be denied the privilege and the right of reading the Bible and praying in their classrooms as often as they may desire. It is our humble and considered opinion that the matter of the legality of reading the Bible and praying in the schoolrooms of America should not enter the picture frôm either side. It should not be legally required nor should it be legally denied. There are some problems that cannot be solved through legalistic procedure. The development of moral and spiritual values within the hearts and minds of schoolchildren is one of them. This must be left to the recruitment procedures of the administrative leaders of our respective schools.

We do not believe in nor ascribe to narrow minded bigotry in the selection of school personnel. We always ask a prospective candidate about his church affiliation. All other qualifications being in order we would give favorable consideration to a candidate be he Catholic, Jew, or Protestant. One thing we would demand that he be a man of faith with a belief in God. As a general rule, we do belive it to be a good recruitment practice to employ those who come nearest to blending in with a harmonious atmosphere with the majority of a people in a community in matters of social custom and religion. This does not rule out the possibility of one of the minority faith being employed if he meet other conditions of employment. It seems to us that this matter of the Supreme Court denying the States the right to require the schools to require Bible reading and prayer in the public schools of the respective States is just another phase of diminishing the rights of the sovereign States to govern themselves. With things going as they now are it seems that this matter of States Rights will soon be a thing that has gone with the wind. As long as the tone of the Court remains as it is today, with just a little study and judgment one can predict with almost unerring accuracy what the decision will be in any given case. Cases seem to be prejudged rather than being tried on their merits. There seems to be a great governmental need for taking a close look and making a close study in regards to the Supreme Court.

It is the least check and balances of any of our major governmental agencies of our Nation. It is no more sacred or free from possible error than is the legislative or the executive branch of the Government. It should not necessarily have the last and final words, in matters, law and Government. The Court has done with the Constitution what many people have done with the Bible—they have made it mean anything that they wanted it to mean and that is seemed to be expedient for it to mean at the moment. It is a superfluous decision and a stretch of the imagination for the Court to say that for the States to require the reading of the Bible and prayer in the public schools were tantamount to the establishment of a religion.

Honesty Needed on Store Shelves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the chorus of voices in support of S. 387, the truth-in-packaging bill sponsored by the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], has grown loud and clear. I think the evidence is overwhelming that the vast majority of the American people want this legislation to protect the consumer and businessman from the minority of manufacturers and processors who have engaged in deceptive packaging.

The Lapeer County Press, the Nation's largest rural weekly newspaper, recently endorsed S. 387 in an editorial headlined, "Honesty Needed on Store Shelves." I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

HONESTY NEEDED ON STORE SHELVES

The truth-in-packaging bill is getting the same tough sledding in Congress as earlier attempts to put a plain label on interest.

In the packaging bill Senator HART wants to bring nothing more than a little plain honesty to store shelves. He would—

1. Put the net weight on the front panel of the package.
2. Establish resonable standards of weight. The use of such odd sizes as 13¾ ounces would be outlawed.
3. Prohibit cents-off legends as an integral part of a package's label.
4. Prohibit quantity descriptive words such as "big gallon" or "jumbo quart."
5. Establish standards for quantity declarations such as a meaning for "serving."
6. Give information about ingredients.

What it boils down to is that a package shall not bear false witness.

The food industry fights it with the charge that is is "unnecessary interference."

We don't think it is when the industry has shown plainly that it is unwilling or unable to police itself. When the price of a can of coffee remains the same but the manufacturer puts "15 cents Off" on the lid, it's cheating. When a can of cherries is full of juice but only half full of cherries, the consumer deserves a little protection.

Industry spokesmen say they are forced into it through competition. If the other guy does it, they say they have to do it.

The spectacle of some of the country's largest corporations caught in competitive pickpocket activities is not a pretty one. They should be glad that Congress offers them a way out of the mess through a law that would make deception dishonest for all.

The Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HOWARD EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. President, based on conversations with hundreds of people in Oklahoma and correspondence I receive every day in my office, I doubt there are many subjects of more importance to the American people than this Nation's space program.

Perhaps Oklahomans are a bit more interested in space because of our various associations—past, present, and future—with this great program.

For example, Oklahoma is one of the few States that claims two astronauts—Maj. L. Gordon Cooper of Shawnee and Capt. Tom Stafford of Weatherford. The first National Conference on Peaceful Uses of Space, now an annual national event, was held in Tulsa. The late Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, was chairman of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee at the time of his death and I am proud to have been chosen to succeed him as a member of that distinguished group. Then, of course, we in Oklahoma claim Mr. James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Senator Kerr used to say Mr. Webb is the most distinguished Oklahoman that North Carolina ever produced.

Because of this interest, then, I know my fellow Oklahomans were as pleased as I was to read the series of articles on the space program recently published in the Daily Oklahoman at Oklahoma City.

Written by Allan Cromley, the Oklahoman's Washington correspondent, these articles give insight into the complexities of the space program which I have not seen in any other publication and I see a good many newspapers and magazines.

To my knowledge, Mr. Cromley does not fancy himself a science writer. But, he has the experience of having covered all the manned spacecraft launchings from Cape Canaveral, has spent hours upon hours in Senate Space Committee hearings, and has other credentials as a basis for writing these articles.

Mr. President, I congratulate Mr. Cromley for his craftmanship, commend the Daily Oklahoman for publishing this series, and ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEY TARGET DATE IN U.S. SPACE PROGRAM: M (MOON) DAY, 1969: LUNAR TRIP IN PLANNING STAGE

(By Allan Cromley)

WASHINGTON.—It's M (Moon) day in 1969, and 3 astronauts are ready in their 45-ton Apollo spacecraft atop their Saturn V booster about 350 feet above the palmetto-covered flats of Cape Canaveral.

After Government expenditures of at least $10 million a day for the last 6 years, their 6-million-pound 3-stage system is fueled and ready.

It blasts off with the most thunderous roar ever heard as five 1.5-million-pound-thrust engines ignite kerosene and liquid oxygen.

About 30 miles up the first stage burns out, jettisons, and the second stage comes on with a 1-million-pound push. It burns liquid hydrogen at 429° below zero.

A third stage puts the Apollo spacecraft into orbit, then shuts down while they coast around the earth.

Computors calculate the exact instant to fire the third stage again and thus shove Apollo toward the moon—239,000 miles away—at an escape velocity of 25,000 miles an hour.

The astronauts take 2½ days to reach the vicinity of the moon, while its gravity gradually takes over from the pull of the earth.

Using equipment not yet invented, the astronauts guide their three-part Apollo into a moon orbit. Then two of them descend from it to the moon in their LEM—a buglike lunar excursion module.

They hold their breath while touching down on a lunar surface which they are not sure of. They get out and explore the vicinity, then return to their LEM.

They and their computors have to make calculations even more intricate than required by the Mercury program way back in 1962 and 1963.

They join up with their command ship, hopefully ignite their return rockets (otherwise they're stuck forever in lunar orbit) and after 2½ days begin reentry into the earth's atmosphere.

They're going 25,000 miles an hour, and their heat shield will have to take 10 times the heat of Astronaut Gordon Cooper's *Faith–7*.

Finally they land in the ocean and are recovered like the Mercury astronauts.

That, in a tiny, tiny capsule, is America's space goal for the 1960's over which controversy is looming.

Does it sound like an impossible assignment? Perhaps, but many never dreamed of man sending a small machine into orbit until Sputnik came beeping over the horizon in 1957.

EXPERTS DIFFER OVER HOW SOON MANNED MOON SHOT SHOULD BE ATTEMPTED

(By Allan Cromley)

WASHINGTON.—Like motherhood, America's space program is here to stay.

To challenge its sanctity is to invite denunciation from visionaries as well as those who benefit commercially from the billions the Government is spending.

And when you talk about the space program, you are really talking about putting a man on the moon, because that is where most of the money is going.

Thus, despite the emphasis which National Aeronautics and Space Administrator James E. Webb attempts to put on automated scientific space probes and satellites, more than $3.7 billion of the agency's $5.7 billion budget this year is for manned spaceflight.

Although virtually no one in the scientific community challenges the ultimate goal of a lunar landing, there are mutterings that we are attempting to get there too soon.

And in Congress not so long ago the Republican minority policy committee issued a study which asked, "Is it more important to have a man on the moon than to conquer cancer, free ourselves from the tragic chains of mental illness, feed the 17 million Americans who, we are told, go to bed hungry each night?"

That triggered Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, chairman of the Space Committee, into a full-dress reply. He asked, "Can we be sure that some of those in public life who would slash billions from the space program would not then vote against social welfare legislation?"

Although there may be a few small cuts in the budget, the House and Senate Space Committees show little inclination to put on the brakes.

Their members are generally gung-ho, particularly after each announcement of a Russian space achievement.

Recently, after the front pages blossomed with big headlines about new Soviet records, including the adventure of Valentina Tereshkova, first woman in space, ANDERSON irritably asked Robert C. Seamans, Jr., Associate NASA Administrator, why the United States has no astronette program.

"Valentina apparently does not have the kind of background that we could feel important in our program. She is not a pilot," replied Seamans.

Said ANDERSON, "Aren't we being a little bit stiff-necked in our attitude? It is like saying nobody can drive an auto except race-track drivers."

Seamans said NASA has given the matter consideration.

"Have you? Is that a statement of fact?" asked Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri.

After a few such exchanges between Congress and NASA it becomes apparent that so far as our lawmakers are concerned, the sky is indeed the limit for our man (and woman) in space program.

SPACE CRITIC SAYS MOON CONTAINS UNKNOWN PERILS

(By Allan Cromley)

WASHINGTON.—"The moon is at our back door, and its exploration a generation from now will seem a simple matter."

That's one scientist's enthusiastic assessment of the U.S. effort to put Americans on the moon by 1970.

But another scientist says, "I don't see anything magic about doing it this decade. The moon has been there a long time and will continue to be there a long time."

Between those two views is a wide range of opinion, and it's being expressed with increasing volume and frequency these days.

Not often, however, do you hear an out-and-out "devil's advocate"—someone who's willing to publicly question the wisdom of a program that will cost a $10,000-a-year man enough in taxes by 1970 to buy a new automobile.

Considered from that angle, President Kennedy was not overstating the case 2 years ago when he announced an all-out, $20 to $40 billion effort to put Americans on the moon and bring them back safely in the 1960's.

Kennedy said, "I am asking Congress and the country to accept a firm commitment to a new course of action—a course which will last for many years and carry very heavy costs."

The most outspoken scientific critic of our moon program is Philip H. Abelson, director of the Carnegie Institution's geophysical laboratory and editor of Science magazine.

He said he sees nothing magic about doing it this decade. He also sees tremendous pitfalls ahead.

"One respectable scientist has said the moon is covered with a dust layer that is unable to support weight, sort of a quicksand.

"If the lunar landing vehicle lands on the moon it would sink right down into this surface.

"Someone else suggested that if one touched the surface of the moon it would explode.

"Someone else I heard suggests that if the equipment landed on the moon, the surface would stick to the equipment so that when a man tried to take off again it would be sort of like a sticky mud.

"How can an engineer design for all these possible catastrophies ahead of time?" Dr. Abelson asked.

His point is that NASA is not sufficiently exploring the moon with unmanned, automated devices before it begins designing huge man-carrying equipment.

He cites a puzzling failure of NASA to land equipment on the moon, despite its brilliant and presumably much more difficult probe of Venus with Mariner II, more than 100 million miles away.

Abelson's theory is that NASA simply hasn't put the care and preparation into its moon probes that it has in its 100 percent successful manned spaceflight Mercury program.

Critics See Little Scientific Yield in Hurried Moon Voyage

(By Allan Cromley)

WASHINGTON.—Like a rich and free-spending uncle, the Nation's space program has its critics as well as sycophants.

The critics are apt to be outsiders, and the unqualified supporters are apt to be beneficiaries, in one way or another, of the huge Government sums needed to finance our trip to the moon.

Scientists—at least those who venture out of their laboratories onto the public stage—generally seem to approve Uncle Sam's stupendous effort to conquer space with manned vehicles.

This series will report their attitudes, but first a few words from a couple of dissenters.

Polykarp Kusch, chairman of the physics department at Columbia University, New York City, says the scientific objectives of the program are limited and "I foresee no yield of major new scientific knowledge."

He objects to "a certain flamboyance, a mood of haste, which is attached to the program. To my mind this is not the mark of first-class scientific research.

"I doubt the results will be worth the investment of men * * * and national emotion and drive."

He would direct part of our space energies to such problems as the lowering water table in the West, air and water pollution, mental illness, and harnessing solar energy.

To the argument that our venture into space is analogous to Christopher Columbus' trip across the Atlantic, Philip H. Abelson, director of the Carnegie Institution's geophysical laboratory, emphatically objects.

"Columbus was seeking economic returns. He wished to bring back wealth of the Indies. He had no way of knowing that the Americas lay in his pathway," Ableson said.

"We are in a different position, for with out great telescopes and astrophysical measurements we can look at space and make an estimate of what is there * * * something that Columbis could not do."

He thinks the United States is in competition with the Russians "on a thousand different fronts" and that the race to the moon is just one of them.

"If we get preeminence in only 1 and lose out on the other 999, it just doesn't make sense."

Obviously, Ableson is out of step with most of his colleagues, and their overwhelming support of the space program will be taken up in a subsequent article.

American Scientists Intrigued by Challenge of Space Exploration

(By Allan Cromley)

WASHINGTON.—There's something about space exploration that stirs the lyricism of otherwise cold, factual scientists.

They temporarily discard empirical formulas and become experts in the fields of philosophy and sociology.

Just listen to the rhapsodizing of physicists, chemists and biologists who were recently asked by the Senate Space Committee to comment on the U.S. effort to put men on the Moon and return them safely during the 1960's.

Said Prof. Colin S. Pittendrich, head of the biology department, Princeton University: "I feel the real justification for the program is that in an Elizabethan sense it confronts society with an immense challenge which I cannot really see we are free to turn away from.

"Not since Darwin, and before him Copernicus, has science had the opportunity or so great an impact on our overall view of nature. * * *

"At stake is the chance to get a new perspective on what Thomas Huxley called pattern of search and migration that has motivated man throughout his history.

"It will not be long before the Moon seems as close as man's place in nature."

Said Dr. Frederick Seitz, President of the National Academy of Sciences: "* * * it is a continuation of the Antarctic. The Moon is at our back door, and its exploration a generation from now will seem a simple matter."

Said Lloyd V. Berkner, president of the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest: "There is a motivation in space exploration which cannot be ignored. It is the aspiration of men to reach out to the stars, to accomplish what men have not accomplished before.

"A great program must have goals. Without such goals, our efforts would be haphazard, spasmodic, and wasteful."

Said Lee A. DuBridge, president of the California Institute of Technology: "An adventure into the unknown has always been the great challenge to human beings * * * that is the thing that sets men apart from animals—the spirit of adventure."

He said that men don't know how to cure cancer or abolish hunger throughout the world, "but we do know how to go into space, and in this real and practical world we'd better go ahead."

"A renaissance of the pioneering spirit," said Martin M. Schwarzchild, head of the astronomy department, Princeton University.

Security Depends on Space Prestige

(By Allan Cromley)

WASHINGTON.—Curling around the fringes of the man-in-space debate is a wisp of smoke from inextinguishable embers.

Never answered, but seemingly always present, is the question: what relevance does the civilian space program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) have to our national security?

At least one influential Congressman, Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the House subcommittee which authorizes the man-in-space budget, thinks the lunar exploration program can only be justified on military grounds.

"It's imperative to our national security that we dominate space," he said. "The moon is incidental. It's the technology we develop in getting to the moon that is important."

He favors plunging ahead on development of an orbiting space station.

"The only way we can contribute to peaceful uses of space is to be there first with men and equipment."

Although the instinct of many bureaucrats is to build an empire, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara told a House Appropriations Subcommittee:

"I think there is no clear requirement for military purposes for manned operations in space as we look at the future today.

"But should one develop it could come so suddenly in a field in which the leadtime for development is so long that I believe we must anticipate that possibility by carrying out work associated with putting a man in space for military purposes."

What could be a vendetta between McNamara and James E. Webb, head of NASA, for control of our space program, was stifled last January 21, when they signed a sort of nonaggression pact.

It provided for a joint planning board to insure that the Defense Department had a say in Gemini, a project designed to put two men in orbit late next year.

Despite McNamara's equanimity, Air Force Generals are said to be champing at the bit, jealous of NASA's authority in the space field.

Even so, the Department of Defense budget devoted to space operations next year is not exactly peanuts—$1.7 billion for 29 projects.

Add that to NASA's request for $5.7 billion, and we have a $7.4 billion program.

Space Has Its Pork Barrel

(By Allan Cromley)

WASHINGTON.—As casually as a farmer might talk about a new barn door, a space official detailed plans recently for Cape Canaveral building nearly as tall as the Washington monument and with 5 acres of uncluttered floor space and 450 feet of unobstructed headroom.

George M. Low, Director of NASA spacecraft and flight missions, said they would need a door 45 stories high, in order to move huge moon rockets in and out of the assembly structure.

He was seeking to justify part of the $800 million which NASA is asking for construction of facilities next year. The agency's total proposed outlay is $5.7 billion.

James E. Webb, NASA Administrator, was brought up short by Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, Democrat, of Florida, who wanted to know where each dollar was to be spent.

HOLLAND wanted a complete geographical breakdown, "so we can intelligently tell our people what is to be done in their areas."

Webb explained that the information was available in four volumes compiled by NASA for the benefit of the committee. He added that a private firm had reproduced the material and was selling it to industry at $40 a volume.

HOLLAND was not satisfied. He wanted it chapter and verse, and the NASA material was cluttered with strange terminology.

"I'd like to have a clear picture of just what you propose to do in Florida next year," he told Webb.

"A good many States are not involved in this construction program," Webb said.

Senator KENNETH KEATING, Republican, of New York, joined HOLLAND in the demand for home area information. "I'm putting in a formal request, here and now," he said.

A wag at the press table drew a picture of a barrel and labeled it, "An Orbiting Pork Barrel:" The paper was circulated with grins through the audience.

HOLLAND was adamant, however, and Chairman CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, slowed the testimony down to a snail's pace, while each installation was dug out of the records for the benefit of committee members.

There wasn't much of the space program explained to Congress that day, but several Senators obtained material for newsletters to the homefolks.

In a way, however, it was reassuring to know that the space program is not above close—albeit covetous—scrutiny by the people's representatives on Capitol Hill.

MOON A STEPPINGSTONE TO MARS

(By Allan Cromley)

WASHINGTON.—The military benefits are doubtful, the cost is astronomical, and many other problems face the Nation.

Why, then, spend somewhere between $20 billion and $40 billion during the next 6 or 7 years to put two men on the moon for a few fleeting hours?

After perusing reams of literature on the subject and listening to congressional testimony, you find no pat answers but reach a few conclusions.

You have to agree with even the most skeptical scientists that man is going to do it someday. It's just a matter of when and who—us or the Russians.

You also vividly remember the statement of Dr. Frederick Seitz, president of the National Academy of Sciences, that "it is unthinkable that our society, particularly Western society, can ignore this challenge."

But most of all you are impressed by the plea of Prof. Colin S. Pittendrich, head of the biology department of Princeton University.

Exploration of the moon is only a steppingstone to exploration of Mars, and with that should come answers to the most intriguing question of all time—the origin of life.

Pittendrich cited scientific theory "that the development of life itself was only one chapter in the natural history of the earth.

"Chemical systems capable of reproducing themselves had their origin in the sequence of chemical changes that were part of the planet's early history."

He said there are recent estimates that the number of star systems in the universe with planets comparable to our own total "10 to the 18th." That's 10 times 10 times 10 and so forth 18 times—"a number so staggering as to be essentially meaningless for most of us," said Pittendrich, "then we shall have an enlightening answer to our question of the improbability and uniqueness in the origin of life as a whole.

"Arising twice in a single planetary system, it is almost certain to occur abundantly elsewhere in the staggering number of comparable planetary systems throughout the universe."

It's difficult to avoid the conclusion that the United States will put men on the moon someday.

It's just a subsidiary—but increasingly controversial—matter of when.

Equal Employment Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a timely and inspiring message from a businessman in my area, Mr. Charles J. Futterman, president of Shoppers Markets, Inc. In these days of stressed human relations, it is encouraging to find our business leaders supporting efforts to promote fair employment and human dignity.

Mr. Futterman's statement, from Shoppers Talk for June 1963, follows:

FROM THE PRESIDENT

As a child, I was brought up in the great American tradition that all people were created equal, and that in the United States of America it doesn't make any difference what your race, color, or religion is. When I became a young man and went out into the world, I soon found out differently.

Now—our country is at the crossroads, and the Negro people are asking for that which every American child is taught in school is their inalienable right. The right of equal opportunity, the right to live like an American, with dignity, wherever he chooses.

And isn't it about time.

For the benefit of all fellow employees of this company, I want to make our position very clear.

"The hiring and promotion for all positions shall be on the basis of qualifications, irrespective of race, religion, or nationality."

I don't know how to make it any plainer than that but, just in case there are any doubts, I will explain it by saying that "there shall be no hiring practice that will discriminate against Negroes in any department, or in any one of our stores, wherever it may be. And that on the basis of merit (one human being against another), no Negro will be denied promotion because of the color of his skin, when I say promotion I mean all the way.

CHARLES J. FUTTERMAN.

Legend of John Henry Born in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the legend of John Henry, the hero of popular folk ballads, sprang from the construction of a railroad tunnel near Hinton, W. Va., as told in a recent article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail. The article tells how the real John Henry, a hand-driller literally killed himself trying to compete with a steam drill.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

A STEEL-DRIVING MAN

John Henry, a folklore character as important in American literature as Paul Bunyan, was born in West Virginia. His fame has spread throughout the world. John Henry is a symbol of the struggle between human labor and the increasingly important machine. Many guitar-picking Mountaineers sing the ballad which bears his name.

The legend of John Henry sprang from the construction of Big Bend Tunnel on the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad near Hinton in 1873 (another was built in 1934). There was a real John Henry, a muscular Negro, who worked on the Big Bend Tunnel. He "drove steel," that is, he used a great sledge to drive a steel drill into rock, the resulting hole later being packed with explosives for blasting.

John Henry, himself, or his foreman, according to legend, made a bet that he could drive more steel than a steam drill which had been brought to the site. With a 20-pound hammer in each hand, John Henry drilled two holes 7 feet deep in 35 minutes. The steam drill made only one hole 9 feet deep. But John Henry paid for his victory, bursting a blood vessel and falling dead.

The real John Henry possibly died under a rock fall in the tunnel. But his legend lives on, a bit of West Virginia folklore which has enriched the national cultural heritage.

Remember the Captive States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the following editorial on the subject of captive states which appeared in the Rock Island Argus on Monday, July 15, 1963:

REMEMBER THE CAPTIVE STATES

The greatest international crime is being perpetrated today in Eastern Europe. It is the Soviet subjugation of the Baltic States, of Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia. Yet very little is heard about it because the Communists manage to keep the world in a white heat of indignation over the white man's wrongs in Africa and the United States, where actually there has been steady progress toward freedom and prosperity.

To overcome this situation, Captive Nations Week was created by resolution of Congress 4 years ago and proclaimed by President Eisenhower. Its 1963 observance begins tomorrow and will continue through July 26.

President Kennedy issued a proclamation about it, but with little fanfare. In fact, U.S. observance of it is cramped by the presence of the American delegation in Moscow for the United States-British-Russian talks on a nuclear test ban. But before that, the State Department created a poor setting for the week by sounding out congressional sentiment on the question of whether the United States should waive objections to the Kadar regime in Hungary. The response was not very conciliatory.

Every one of the captive states was enslaved in violation of a specific wartime agreement, signed and sealed and still in existence, and not subject to vague interpretation, pledging free elections to determine the political wishes of their people. The Communists tried the elections only in Hungary, where they lost twice; then they came down with the iron heel. Czechoslovakia was seized by a revolutionary coup.

While it is true that the chance of freeing any of these states is not great at the moment, much is to be gained by keeping the world aware of the Communist perfidy and terror which brought about their enslavement.

The world needs a frequent reminder of the way the Communists operate and their regard for their pledged word. The people in the captive lands need to be shown that they aren't forgotten. If the truth can arrest the advance of communism, it can eventually liberate the victims. We need the support of these people in event of hostilities between Russia and the Western World. They would be a thorn in the Russian flesh from the beginning. Indeed, knowledge of the trouble they could expect in captive lands is one of the leading deterrents to Soviet aggression in Western Europe.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the history of tyranny holds no greater story of oppression, for size, extent and cruelty, than that of the peoples we designate as captive nations. No colonial power or combination of powers has ever touched the scale of enslavement like that by which the harsh hand of colonial communism directly grasps the lives of nearly half the world and threatens the peace and welfare of the other half.

The brutal Communist suppression of human rights is the central political and moral fact in the world today. It is this fact which underlies all the basic tensions suffered by the world and pervades and hobbles all international efforts to seek peace. It is my conviction that peace will be impossible until this dark influence is overcome and once-free peoples can breath free air again, in charge of their own distinies. At this time in history, we should be wary of Soviet ventures into friendliness with us. We know they are driven by fear of the divisions in their own camp. We ought to proceed with caution lest we be entrapped by the cordiality of the Russian bear; and lest we find we have bartered away the cause of the captive nations and gravely compromised our own.

It is well that we observe Captive Nations Week as a reminder that is both sorrowful and chilling. We, in this House of free institutions, should make every effort to keep this event high in the minds of our negotiators who are at this moment, in the midst of Captive Nations Week, engaged in cordial meetings with the Soviets in Moscow itself. The ever-growing list of captive nations should serve to show what the friendly Soviets really have in mind for us. Each of these names is associated with a great national history and with the eternal battle for human freedom: Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, the Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba.

This is a tragic catalog, Mr. Speaker. Let us never forget what it means.

"Law of the Land," a Book Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a brief review of a book written by Warren Jefferson Davis, entitled "Law of the Land." This review, which appeared in the American Bar Association Journal of June 27, 1963, was prepared by Mr. Loyd Wright, former president of the American Bar and a practicing attorney in the city of Los Angeles, Calif. It is my hope that after reading this review Americans who are interested in constitutional government will examine the book in full.

The review follows:

Mr. Davis, one of the West's more distinguished and better-known constitutional lawyers, has written an interesting and provocative book in which he reviews the present drift of American Government. It is a book that every lawyer should read. He has done a tremendous amount of research, and while some view what has been going on emotionally, and consequently accept the invasion of personal rights and departure from law as proper, the book nevertheless will point up the demise of stare decisis and the dangers interent in a "free-wheeling government".

The first chapter deals with the Federal encroachment on States' rights, which is permitted by current Supreme Court decisions. Mr. Davis cannot understand how the Court can so brazenly overlook the 9th and 10th amendments of the Constitution and utilize the 14th amendment, which has never been adopted, as a wheelbarrow to spread the ideologies of foreigners, in contrast to fundamental American concepts.

He points out the sage observation of Montesquieu: "The deterioration of a government begins with the decay of the principles on which it was founded."

The author advocates a brake on the "free-wheeling" Supreme Court. He suggests a conference of the Governors.

He also suggests the doctrine of interposition, but with political attorneys general who are so adept at watching the Gallup Poll such a proposal, in my opinion, is hopeless.

Under the chapter headed "Shackles for Liberty," the author sets forth many illustrations of unwarranted and obviously unconstitutional actions which have been practiced upon an unsuspecting public over the last 30 years. As you review these breaches of judicial ethics and governmental powers, you cannot help contemplating the extent to which our people, through their complacency, have permitted our servants (in all three branches of our Government) to ignore constitutional tenets, the observance of which made our Nation strong.

Jeff, as the author is addressed by his friends in California, gives so many detailed instances of the avaricious encroachment of departments of government and of the Court upon the fundamental principles contained in the Constitution and adhered to until some 30 years ago that one contemplates whether the Fabian termites have not been successful in their efforts to destroy our republican form of government and institute a socialistic form of government which our forefathers so wisely avoided.

By implication, by way of example he poses the question as to what the moral character of the American people would have been if the affluent European nations had decided that the pioneers who came to our shores were not properly housed; that their standard of living was sub par; that their educational facilities were so crude that they could not possibly grow and expand and compete with the civilizations then current; and if, in order to make life better for the people who fled to America seeking individual freedom and religious opportunity of choice, they had spread their beneficence so that all could have had a free ride.

The book is well documented and all lawyers should read it, for it will recall to their minds the fundamental training of our profession that principle is not the subject of barter; that integrity is not an instrumentality of traffic for personal advancement; that fear is a poor substitute for courage; and that in his capacities as citizen and lawyer, has a special duty to perform.

LOYD WRIGHT.

The Racial Situation in Danville

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, American Legion Post 1097, Danville, Va., on July 16, 1963, passed a resolution with respect to the racial strife in Danville. The crisis which arose in this heretofore peaceful and tranquil community where the races have lived in harmony for centuries was precipitated by lawless agitators from out of our State who came there for no purpose on earth except to foment discord and strife, and to violate the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia. These malcontents succeeded in agitating the criminal element of our Negroes to such an extent that demonstrations and violations of law have been carried on for weeks.

I am informed that this public mischief and flaunting of the law could have and would have been suppressed long ago but for agents of the Justice Department who came to Danville and associated themselves and counseled with these irresponsible elements. They sought to harass and impede the local law enforcement agencies and even made an attack upon the honor and integrity of the Honorable A. M. Aiken, the distinguished, beloved, and highly respected judge of the corporation court of Danville. It is astonishing and shocking to learn that the very agency of our Government set up to enforce law and to establish justice would conduct itself in any such fashion and thus demean and denigrate this highly important agency of our Government. In this crisis the least the Federal Government can do is to avoid hindering the States and the localities, and allow them to enforce the law with a firm hand and a resolute will. If it is claimed that civil rights have or will be violated, the agencies of the Federal Government may later come in and take such action as may be appropriate in the proper forum.

I commend and call attention to the resolution of the American Legion of Danville in the hope that my colleagues in the Congress, as well as the subscribers to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, may read it and better understand the situation. As everyone knows, the American Legion is a nonpartisan, nonprofit, patriotic, and responsible organization.

I am sure it will be of interest to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to know that Hon. W. C. "Dan" Daniel, past National Commander of the American Legion, is a member of the post which adopted the resolution referred to.

Under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the resolution which is as follows:

A RESOLUTION BY THE AMERICAN LEGION OF DANVILLE, VA.

PREAMBLE

On May 31, 1963, members of the minority race in Danville commenced a series of demonstrations which degenerated into lawlessness. These manifestations of discontent have fluctuated between a handful in number to more than 150. Frequently they have been encouraged and/or supported by outside agitators, many of them with subversive connections, the U.S. Department of Justice and the one-sided metropolitan press. They have resulted in extreme tensions, violence and the violations of the civil rights of the vast majority of the citizens of the community.

We are sympathetic to the legitimate aspirations of responsible people to improve their lot in life. At the same time, we submit that alinement with criminal and subversive elements, the violation of law and order, the trampling on the civil rights of the majority can do nothing toward bringing to fruition those aspirations, but can only retard progress.

Crisis sometimes bring to the fore the best in men. This axiom can be applied in the current situation to those in our city in positions of responsibility and trust.

Resolved, That, we highly commend Mayor Julian R. Stinson, City Manager T. Edward Temple, and their associates. We consider highly exemplary the conduct of the city and State police, the local FBI agents and the fire department in their efforts to maintain law and order. We call especial attention to the remarkable restraint they have exercised in the face of unwarranted and defenseless provocation.

We support the Danville Bar Association in its praise and defense of Judge A. M. Aiken.

Local industry and business deserve the support of the community for the use of sound judgment and maintenance of stability in the face of provocative harassment, threats and picketing.

It is our judgment that the local ministers who have today publicly expressed an interest in the subject, could strengthen their position and better serve the interest of "religious principles" by encouraging the members of the minority race to divest themselves of subversive elements dedicated to the destruction of Christianity.

We consider as unwise, unbecoming and unhelpful the intrusion of the U.S. Department of Justice in the affairs of our city. On the other hand, the intelligent and scholarly efforts of Commonwealth's Attorney Eugene Link, City Attorney James A. H. Ferguson and Special Counsel John Carter are a credit to orderly judicial procedure, calculated to result in equal application of the law.

We condemn the reporting of the metropolitan press and Columbia Broadcasting System Television as a travesty on the industry's code of fairness and an insult to the intelligence of the American people. We call upon the appropriate committee of Congress and the Federal regulatory agencies to conduct fact-finding investigation.

We view the reporting of the local press as fair and objective; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to City Manager T. Edward Temple, Congressman WILLIAM M. TUCK, for appropriate distribution and action, and to the press.

ROTC Commissioning Exercise at Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on June 7, 1963, Washington and Lee University at Lexington, Va., was fortunate to have Maj. Gen. Stephen R. Hanmer, Chief of Personnel Operations of the Department of the Army, deliver the principal address at commissioning exercises of the ROTC cadets in this year's graduating class. Because of the applicability of General Hanmer's advice to young men everywhere, I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESSES BY MAJ. GEN. STEPHEN R. HANMER, CHIEF OF PERSONNEL OPERATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, ROTC COMMISSIONING EXERCISE, WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY, JUNE 7, 1963

President Cole, Colonel Burch, distinguished guests, cadets, ladies and gentlemen, it is my great privilege to participate in the commissioning exercise this morning—one which transmutes ROTC cadets into fullfledged officers of our Armed Forces—Army, Navy, and Marines.

It is also my pleasure to be here on this spring morning in the great State of Virginia and at this fine University, the virtues of which are widely known.

Speaking of the virtues of Washington and Lee University reminds me of a speaker who, during a long and boring address, was extolling the virtues of his alma mater, Yale. He stated that the very spelling of Yale was important:

Y—stands for you.
A—stands for ability.
L—stands for loyalty.
E—stands for enterprise.

He then proceeded to elaborate on each virtue in detail. Finally one of his listeners groaned and said audibly: "Thank goodness he didn't go to Washington and Lee University."

Speaking seriously, however, I can't tell you how much I am impressed with the history, honored traditions, growth and progress, and hopes and aspirations of Washington and Lee and the high accomplishments of its graduates. Generally familiar with these things, I took special interest in steeping myself (before coming to be with you today) in last year's report of your President of Washington and Lee in its 212th and 213th years, in its third century, and in various other literature furnished me by Colonel Burch. What a record you have to be proud of since George Washington adopted and endowed the institution, and General Lee transformed the old, classical college into an institution of a modern type. I note that General Lee modified the courses of study to meet the changed educational needs of the time; introduced courses in law, engineering, commerce, and journalism, the last two being the first of their kind in the United States; and by enthroning the honor system among the students fixed the traditions of chivalry, courtesy, and personal honor which have become distinguishing characteristics of Washington and Lee. Carrying on in this tradition, successive administrations have modified the curriculum to meet changes in social conditions and educational needs, and have kept the institution in an advanced position.

Thirty-two years ago (less 4 days), I sat in a group such as yours and listened to a commissioning address giving sage advice on the opportunities and responsibilities of my generation. I thought, as many of you may be thinking now, unless youth has radically changed (but I am sure it hasn't), that this was one of the necessary burdens of this busy and pleasant week which is the milestone of 4 years of effort culminating in the accomplishment of two long-sought objectives—a degree and a military commission.

Thus, taking a tip from the past, I will do away quickly with the formal part of my address on the world you live in and the opportunities and responsibilities that are yours.

We often read or hear these days that your generation faces problems and perils greater than any ever known. There are plenty of people who say that civilization is hanging by a thread if not hopelessly doomed, and that coexistence with the Kremlin is a fate next to death. This reminds me of the cowboy who went to a psychiatrist in a depressed state of mind and was asked what was his problem. "I've been home, home on the range, where the deer and the antelope play," the Westerner said. "And all I hear out there is discouraging words."

Such a philosophy of doom not only breeds misery but is fatalistic and contrary to the American tradition to overcome obstacles. Yours is by no means the only generation over whom gloomy prophets have wrung their hands. If we read mankind's records from antiquity in the perspective of experience, we realize that each great people has had problems to face and that these problems loomed terrifying to the pessimists. History has proved the prophets of doom to be wrong and, I believe, they are wrong now and will always be wrong as long as there are young men and women with the courage and confidence and energy to stand up boldly to the responsibilities of their times.

Your generation undoubtedly faces serious problems, but it also has unprecedented advantages. You live in a world infinitely more aware than ever before of the danger of destructive and oppressive forces and better organized to control them. You live among fellow citizens better educated for effective citizenship than any large group of citizens has ever been. The national economy is still strong, and responsible officials are continuously studying the means whereby we may continue and increase that strength. The national security is better heeded, the Armed Forces are far stronger, the military defenses are in better shape, the Government and the people are more prepared and alert, than in any other peacetime period in our history. You as individuals have greater assurance of prosperous lives and fruitful careers than any generation of young people has ever known at any time. Taken all in all, our modern technology—which, despite the headlines, brings out a hundred blessings for every danger—is a technology that holds far more promise than it does threat. No generation has been as well equipped as yours with means to work out your problems.

These advantages are yours to use; they will not operate to secure your future automatically if you are passive. The decisive elements of your individual and collective futures must, as always, come from within yourselves.

On that note, I now want to talk about you as individual officers in the service of your choice or, for that matter, in whatever your future line of endeavor may be.

In a few minutes, 47 of you will receive commissions in the Army, 1 in the Navy, and 3 in the Marines—the majority to serve your mandatory active duty to be prepared for any future emergency, and others to further your education before so serving. Since so many of you are about to become members of the military family, I feel privileged to give you a few fatherly "pearls of wisdom" on personal attributes which will help lead to success in your proximate military and eventual civilian pursuits—I feel so privileged since, in a sense, I am the father, personnelwise, of the majority of the officers of our Army.

Under the recent Army reorganization, I have been placed in charge of the newly formed Office of Personnel Operations charged with the assignment and career management of about 90,000 officers and some 868,000 enlisted personnel. In this job, as well as in previous personnel assignments, I am continually concerned with the evaluation of officers' records to determine what kind of assignments they should have for their career development, for optimum utilization of their individual abilities and experience, and, to the maximum extent possible, in furtherance of their own hopes and aspirations. This has given me considerable insight into those qualities which enable some men to rise to the top and cause others to fall by the wayside.

Many of these principles are so self-evident and simple that I am surprised that they are so often ignored—but they are, I assure you. This is probably due to the fact that youth will listen to advice and then make their own decisions, and that many can learn only from their own experience. I will run this risk and presume to give you a few fatherly words of advice since all fathers are deeply interested in the success of their sons. However, to avoid the pitfall of my speaker from Yale, I will limit myself to only three of the personal attributes which I feel help lead to success.

The first of these is a sense of responsibility. Many feel that unless specific instructions are given or detailed spheres of responsibility are assigned, there is no obligation to do more than the minimum. The successful man sees what needs to be done and does it without being told. He has initiative. He sees that everything is anticipated and leaves nothing to chance.

Next I refer to right attitudes—up, down, and with your equals.

Watch that you are not so impressed with the rightness of your own way that you find it difficult to give loyal and willing support to your commander's (or superior's) decisions.

Watch with your men that you don't confuse intolerance of shortcomings with the discipline that comes from strict and equitable treatment—tempered with an understanding of the human weaknesses that all men have. There are times to be stern and times to be lenient. There are times to be exacting and times to be tolerant. This quality, instinctive in some, lacking in others, can be developed. This human understanding of each person as an important entity will stand you in good stead.

With your equals, remember that all should have a common objective—the success of the military team or of your business. But each, understandably, wants to further his own job. Thus, cooperation and reasonable concession are essential. I don't mean not to tilt at some "windmills," but I do mean when you enter a battle with someone be sure it is one really important to win. Don't waste your strength and good relations on minor skirmishes.

And third, I mention example. Set the example for your men—they will reflect your character as truly as a mirror reflects your image—and you will be successful only as they are. In the tangible sense, this applies to such things as appearance (if you are neat, they'll be neat; if you are courteous, they'll be courteous; if you are profane, they'll be profane) and physical fitness—the stamina to carry on when the going is rough. But deeper still are those elements of character such as truth, integrity, sacrifice, and self-control. I need not elaborate upon truth and integrity, since I know that these have been instilled in Washington and Lee graduates since the days of General Lee.

With respect to sacrifice, the officer who sees that on a cold, wet night his men are fed and bedded down before he takes care of himself—who puts the welfare of his men before his own—and who never calls upon his men for more than he will do himself, will have men who will follow him to the ends of the earth.

And, finally, if you control yourself as to anger, fear, and appetite you can control your men. There is an old proverb: "Master yourself and you can master anything."

SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY, RIGHT ATTITUDES, EXAMPLE

It is truly tragic to see fine men fail for failure to recognize these principles and the lack of them in themselves.

Incidentally (and here, enthused with my subject and violating my self-imposed limitation, I am constrained to mention one more characteristic), in all that you do be enthusiastic and cheerful and learn how to sell your ideas and yourself. Many fine technical and professional men get nowhere for lack of this characteristic. This is the spark of leadership that infuses your men with spirit and carries them along with you.

I notice that the clock is ticking inexorably along, and that it is almost time for you to take your oath of office as a commissioned officer in the Armed Forces of the United States.

As a preamble to this oath, which has changed only slightly since 1789 and has been taken by dedicated military men since those early days, I would like to remind you of the Centennial Poem of your institution founded in 1749 in the same century:

"Ye will not walk ignoble ways;
Ye dare not seek unworthy aims;
Ye cannot do a deed that shames
These heroes of our holiest days.
Your oath a Roman oath must be,
Sworn with a faith that will not yield—
Sworn on the doubly sacred shield of
Washington and Lee."

In keeping with your fidelity to the traditions of Washington and Lee, it is now fitting that you dedicate yourself to the service of your country as an officer of her Armed Forces. I have often noticed that when an oath is taken en masse the chanting intonation of many voices obscures its deep significance, and it is so soon over that the parties thereto little reflect as to what it actually means. For this reason I would like to briefly expand upon what this oath actually entails.

"I, John Jones, having been appointed an officer"—

The fact that you have been appointed an officer recognizes substantial achievement. You have mastered the instructional material which has been presented to you in the classroom and in the field. In the words of your commission "You have earned special trust and confidence in your patriotism, valor, fidelity, and ability. And along with this special trust and confidence you have been given the responsibilities of an officer."

"I swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same."

It is the primary duty of the members of the Armed Forces of the United States to uphold the Constitution of the United States—under the bidding of the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, who bears the ultimate responsibility of guarding us from all enemies. In fidelity to our obligations lies our hope for survival of all that our ancestors fought and died for.

"I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion."

It is well that you understand that you are incurring a tremendous obligation: To the men whom you will have serving under you; to the superiors who must have your unfailing support; to your country and to all those who look to the members of the Armed Forces to make them safe in these perilous times. A democracy can survive only if those in positions of responsibility accept their responsibilities voluntarily with true intent to serve their fellow men and not just themselves.

And finally:

"I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office upon which I am about to enter."

For one of you today accepting a Regular commission, this ceremony marks the beginning of a lifetime career of military service. For the rest of you, it means a period of mandatory active service, preparing you to join the ranks of our great Reserve forces—so essential to defense readiness. As a soldier, it is my hope many of you too will eventually join our Regular ranks.

WE NEED MEN LIKE YOU

All assembled today, your parents, relatives, friends, families, and military and civilian instructors are justifiably proud of you and your accomplishments to date. For the future, serve your country well. Faithfully discharge your duties. If you serve to the best of your ability, when your tour of duty is finished, no matter how long or how short, you will then realize how well you have been served.

Gentlemen, I welcome you into the Armed Forces of the United States.

Cooking a Goose on a Grid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress I have viewed with increasing alarm the day-by-day spread of the Federal Government into our daily lives.

We have seen the slow but sure erosion of our individual freedom and how Government more and more puts itself into direct competition with private enterprise.

Earlier in the session I pointed out how swiftly it is moving toward an all-out power takeover. Events in the past few days apparently substantiate what I have been saying.

An article in yesterday's Wall Street Journal, July 17, 1963, makes mention of this subject and, under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the RECORD:

COOKING A GOOSE ON A GRID

If anybody had any lingering doubts about the direction the Government's policy on electric power is taking, events of recent weeks ought to dispel them.

First there were rules quietly adopted by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior denying rights-of-way for private utility powerlines across Federal lands. The effect of this is to reserve public lands for Federal powerlines, built at the taxpayer's expense, and to compel private companies to run their lines around public lands circuitously at their customers expense.

Now most power lines strung across public lands are used to connect one power system with another so that, in emergencies and in periods of peak demand, power can be shifted quickly from one point to another. It's not hard to see that the Federal agencies rule foreshadows Government control of major power connecting links.

And then there is the bill, previously voted by the Senate and just approved by the House Interior Committee, which would allow the Government to sell Pacific Northwest power in California.

How come the Government wants to sell Northwest power in California? Simply because its power producing Bonneville Power Administration facilities in the Northwest area are under pressure to find more customers to buy power and thus help reduce Bonneville's operating deficits.

To be sure, if the Government wants to sell this power in California, somehow it has to get it there. So the bill would permit the Government, after congressional authorization, to build thousand-mile transmission lines from Washington and Oregon to California.

Indeed, Interior Secretary Udall already has asked Congress for $23 million to meet preliminary construction expenses on lines which eventually could cost as much as $350 million. This in spite of the fact that four California private utilities are planning, on their own, to build lines into the State from the Northwest.

If the Federal project is approved—and it's expected to pass handily—the Government will become the No. 1 transmitter of Pacific Northwest power into California and some other Western States.

The Government long has been complaining that private companies have lagged in establishing what it calls a "coordinated national electric system." But if there's going to be unlimited expansion of the Federal power grid, it is plain whose goose gets cooked on it.

Realization of Ideals of Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Gov. Otto Kerner of Illinois, in a recent address to the convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in Chicago, announced his now much-praised proposal to use the Federal-State relief funds which are ultimately spent for the rental of housing for individuals in slum areas to bring about improvements in substandard housing. In Chicago alone it is estimated that $50 to $60 million a year in relief funds is spent for housing in substandard areas. Governor Kerner pointed out that if arrangements could be made to induce landlords receiving this money to improve the housing and bring it up to code standards, not only would the housing be improved and slum conditions reduced, but jobs would be created as well as opportunities to provide skills and education to many disadvantaged minority youths and adults who are now unemployed.

This proposal deserves careful study and it is characteristic of Governor Kerner to take the lead in making such a constructive and original proposal. The remainder of Governor Kerner's speech also deserves close attention, for it is a sound and vigorous statement not only of his belief in equal opportunity and justice for all, but of the enlightened policies of Illinois distinguished chief executive. I ask unanimous consent that Governor Kerner's speech of July 1 be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD along with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF GOV. OTTO KERNER DELIVERED AT NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE, MONDAY, JULY 1, 1963, PROGRESSIVE BAPTIST CHURCH, CHICAGO, ILL.

We are living in a revolution—a revolution in the minds, in the manners, and, we hope, in the hearts of men. This revolution is worldwide in extent. It has deep historic roots. It is fraught with most momentous consequences. It is the continuation, and in many ways, the fulfillment of the ideals of the American Revolution and the ideas expressed in the Declaration of Independence.

The principles of the declaration—the natural freedom and equality of man, the right to the pursuit of happiness—have been the real strength of this country. To the extent they have been realized they have been like the Statue of Liberty—a beacon to the enslaved, the oppressed, and the downtrodden.

To the extent that we have failed to embody the ideals of the declaration in the lives of any of us we have betrayed the mission of America. In betraying that mission we betray ourselves and the spiritual heritage which alone makes us great, which alone gives this Nation and all of us a purpose. Without that purpose we lose the respect of mankind, our children, and ourselves.

Lincoln saw in the realization of the ideals of the declaration the true destiny of America. Their realization in his day was the occasion of both a great, good, and a national disaster. The bitter fruit of violence is with us yet. The great good of emancipation is still only imperfectly realized.

In the revolution of our time, in the renewed struggle to embody the ideals of the declaration in the life of our country, we must use all our courage, all our charity, and all our wisdom to keep this revolution peaceful and constructive.

You know and I know the sad history of great social changes begun in high hope of achieving great good that have degenerated into violence and bitterness. You and I and all men of good will are engaged in a mighty test of the wisdom of our people and the capacity of our institutions to bring about justice and orderly change. In this effort success or failure will depend on our ability to enlist the opinions and support of moderate America.

How difficult this is when passions have been aroused, when patience, wisdom, and commonsense are portrayed as cowardice, complacency or treachery you well know. But this is an undertaking in which we must not fail. Moderate men of good will must guide the powerful forces now at work into channels of effective, constructive, rapid action to remedy the ancient injustices that too long have oppressed so many in a land whose proud boast is to be free.

The great historic right of Americans has been the right to make their way across the railroad tracks. Far more even than our westward trek this constant upward movement in our society of those who entered at the bottom to the place in our society that their brains and brawn could win has been the driving force of our economy and the talisman that has drawn the talented, the ambitious, and the disinherited and the oppressed to our shores. The very real chance for most to better their condition by use of their own abilities without insurmountable artificial barriers has biven reality to the pursuit of happiness. Equality has meant equality of opportunity, an equal opportunity to rise or fall by one's own exertions or lack of them.

With whatever limitations—and there have been and still are many—our overriding ideal has been a fair field and no favorites. This is why we, as a country, so early and so massively provided for free public education. And with all its limitations, and there still are many, we as a country still provide, the most massive, the most extensive and the most free systems of public education in the world.

In general, the American melting pot has worked well. With whatever cost in insult and in anguish the waves of immigrants that have scrambled up the shores of America's coast have scrambled up the social ladder as well. In the process they have been fused by the melting pot into the run-of-the-mine American scarcely distinguishable, despite his background of nationality, race or religion, from any of his fellows.

I am told a local sociology professor hereabouts takes his life in his hands with his students in order to make them understand the prevasiveness of this social process. He tells them: "If any group in your city accounted for 20 percent of the population but 65 percent of those on relief, if further that group accounted for 85 percent of the crime, wouldn't you want to send them back where they came from?" Then he says to them: "I can tell by the gleam in your eye you think I'm talking about the Negroes, but I'm not, I'm talking about the Irish in 1850."

I might add those same Irish are now providing the mayor of this city and the President of these United States. At one time there was scarcely a stigma that now attaches to any oppressed minority in this country that was not attached to the Irish.

But the successful climb of the Irish from the bottom of the social heap is cold comfort to our two most ancient minorities. One the rightful owner of the country itself, the American Indian, the other the American Negro, dragged here in chains and forced to contribute his labor without bettering himself, have been here longer and at least as long as the Irish. For them tragically the famed American melting pot has failed to melt and the American dream of moving up to full participation and acceptance in our society has become a bitter nightmare.

Hope deferred maketh the heart sick and here hope has been unconscionably deferred.

We dare not agree with those who say let nature take its course. The course of nature can produce volcanic eruptions as well as beneficence. Here selfish individual action has produced and is producing a common disaster rather than the common good. Cooperative, dedicated, vigorous common action is needed to overcome a giant evil that threatens us all—white and black alike. If we are to preserve the society we both cherish we must unite to make it free.

Now, concretely, what can we do? I say "we" because this must be a joint effort. Further what is needed cannot be granted by anybody; it must be achieved by the work of all of us on the problems we—each in our own way—are best able to handle.

As I see it, there are four main things that need doing. They are in many way interelated. First, we need to make sure that every citizen receives his full legal rights and is accorded the equal protection of the laws. Justice ought to be the same for all. Justice ought, as has been well said, to be color blind. No citizen or group of citizens should be given either the need or the slightest excuse to resort to the streets to make good their legal rights.

As the chief magistrate of the State of Illinois I intend to use all my legal and moral authority to see to it that this shall be the case. I am calling a conference of mayors and city managers to advise with me and the other elected State officers concerned with the rights of the citizen as to how we may work together to see that the "Land of Lincoln" is true to Lincoln in deeds as well as words and that all our citizens enjoy their legal rights equally and impartially.

Here we are favoring nobody. We are giving each man his due as a man. In this we move to what must be our great objective that all persons should be treated on their individual merits, and their demerits, as persons.

The second, and in my mind absolutely paramount, objective must be jobs. What we need above all in this country is a surging, expanding economy that in its search for hands and brains will wash away every dike of prejudice and fully employ all our people. We need so insistent a force of demand playing upon industry that it will employ, upgrade and train those now rejected as marginal and unfit. It is the saddest commentary that only in a war of man against man can we fully make use of man. It is a bitter reflection on our inhumanity that we as yet have found no way to fully employ man in fighting the giant evils that beset him.

Clearly an adequate national growth rate must be a prime objective of all of us and we must press for such public policies as are most conducive to its attainment. With jobs every problem that besets us—race relations, relief, unemployment, the high costs of government—all become easier of solution, without them all become more difficult and threatening.

As the man at the bottom of the heap along with other disadvantaged minorities, the Negro is peculiarly handicapped. The labor market is slack. Employers can pick and choose selecting only the most highly skilled and educated. Whereas all other minorities in our history made their way in a market characterized by a heavy and growing demand for unskilled labor, today's minorities are the victims of a radical change in the labor market. The uneducated and the unskilled are the unwanted doomed to casual employment at best, dependency and crime at worst.

We cannot sit idly by and let nature take its course. The cost in human misery, in economic loss and in crime and violence is prohibitive. While nationally we must rouse ourselves to get the economy moving, there is no excuse for local inaction.

We in Illinois have conducted a major survey of the magnitude and characteristics of our unemployed. We now know a great deal about them and this knowledge we intend to put into vigorous action. Matching our study of the characteristics of the unemployed we are now undertaking, in cooperation with the Federal Government, a study of the magnitude and characteristics of job vacancies in the State.

In addition to our knowledge of the jobless we will then for the first time have something like adequate knowledge of the jobs available. This will permit the Illinois State Employment Service to begin to do a really efficient job of matching people with jobs. It will also begin to make possible a realistic program of a job counseling. And with this knowledge we can start the vitally needed overhauling of our system of vocational education.

We badly need to bridge the wide gap that has grown between the world of education and the world of work. This is especially true at the secondary level but is of well-nigh equal concern at the junior college and technical institute level.

For many of our disadvantaged youth, education to be meaningful and provide motivation must bear a clear relation to a job down the road. The present lack of that manifest connection leads to ineffectiveness at the high school and even the elementary level. Our failure to develop an adequate system of junior colleges and technical institutes is costing our youth jobs and our industry badly needed technically trained manpower.

These things I have been talking about will bear fruit in the near future. I am, in addition, concerned with the immediate present. How can we get as many jobs to as many people as quickly as possible? I have been giving the matter a lot of thought and while I have not checked it from every angle, I believe there are a number of things that are worth giving a good hard try.

It seems to me that the State of Illinois and the Federal Government between them are, through recipients of relief, in effect renting somewhere around 90,000 dwelling units in the city of Chicago. Checking the census figures it seems likely that these units constitute the bulk of the so-called slum rentals in the city. Many, if not most of these units, are in violation of the city building code. Given the huge rental demand of the State and Federal Government—some $60 million a year—it should be possible to work out arrangements that would persuade and make it possible for landlords to bring these units up to code standards.

In the event the landlord could not himself do this in all probably he could be induced to let the State do it in lieu of rents. Bringing the bulk of substandard rental units up to code in a city the size of Chicago would generate a lot of work. I am confident that the unions would welcome the opportunity both to make a major contribution in eliminating the slums of the city and in the process to provide skills and education to many of the disadvantaged minority youths and adults now unemployed.

I believe a major program to bring substandard rental units up to code standards could be the means of providing jobs as apprentices and perhaps journeymen to many now unemployed. I believe further it would be a source of pride to those employed that they were making the neighborhoods in which many of them now live better places in which to live.

Along with the massive lever of the millions now spent in rentals in the central city I am sure architects, engineers, planners, and businessmen would contribute to what might be called "project upgrade," designed to bring the whole city up to building code standards.

What would provide a major assist to city betterment and employment in Chicago would be feasible in every major city in the country. I am going to urge my fellow governors at our annual conference at Miami Beach to request the cooperation of the President and the Federal departments and organized labor in studying the feasibility of what I am here suggesting. It seems to me to make sense and be urgently needed.

The growing edge of jobs in our economy is in services. Most of the large industry labor force will in all probability remain stable or even decline as the process of automation continues. However, as incomes have expanded more and more people are prepared to pay for services and here there are unfilled jobs that are going begging. These jobs, unlike many in the other growth areas of the economy, do not place a heavy demand on prior education and training.

I think we need to make a major effort to mobilize the unfilled job potential in the service areas and bring it to bear on relieving our unemployed who lack education and skills. This is a job in which the State and Federal employment services, industry and the schools can play a vital role.

Lastly, I think we can make better use of government employment as an assist to solving our problem. While we have emphasized our discontent with our modest role in the procurement plans of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Defense—and rightly since we want our scientists and engineers to at least have the chance of being employed here—this is not the only area of Federal employment in which we are interested. The U.S. Post Office has played an honorable and largely unsung role in providing a major source of minority employment. The State of Illinois is lacking in comparable Federal employment. There are other Federal operations similar to the Post Office in their requirements that could be located in Illinois and provide useful avenues for the employment of many of the disadvantaged who are now unemployed.

I would also urge Illinois industry to raid the post office for talent. Many persons educated far beyond their job requirements could be moved from Government service into private industry with gain to themselves and industry. Their removal would create new opportunities all along the line. This but illustrates the fundamental truth that the way to help the marginal unemployed worker is to upgrade those in the entrance jobs of industry. Here is where you create jobs for those whose lack of education and skills now keep them out of the labor market.

We need a vast talent hunt to see where our unused manpower resources are, to bring them to light and to get them fully and properly utilized.

There is much that I would like to say about education, but I have already talked longer than I should and some of it can be said in connection with housing.

I think education is our most important investment. It is the most important job of State and local government. Two things seems to me urgently necessary. We must see to it that our secondary and higher education make effective strides in expanding the ranks of an educated, fully trained Negro leadership. All leadership ranks in this country are thin but you know how desperately important this problem is for the minorities.

Equally important and quantitatively far more important we need a crash program to get the three B's effectively to the great and growing body of unemployed illiterates that our society is producing and that are becoming a festering, alienated sore in our midst. There is no greater problem in American education today than how effectively to cope with the growing number of dropouts and educational failures that are being processed into unemployment by educational failure. This is a job that cannot wait.

We in Illinois have been mobilizing our college youth and adult volunteers to attack the alarming problem of dropouts and illiteracy. I cannot stress too strongly the need to bring to bear every resource in our power to see to it that we contain and force back the spread of illiteracy. In the modern labor market it can spell only one thing—unemployment, relief rolls, delinquency, and crime—tragedy for the individual and tragedy for the society.

Finally, I would like to say this about education. I think we must have the courage and the good sense to treat it not in terms of demagogic slogans but in terms of what is best for the children and the community.

Policies which lead to a public school population 80 percent Negro as in Washington are neither in the interest of the Negro nor the white community. We want to upgrade, not downgrade, our schools. Negro parents are as much interested in schools with wholesome environments and high educational standards as whites. Negroes have as much concern with protecting their children from rowdyism, gangs and destructive influences as whites. And we all have a common interest in alleviating the concentrated evil forces of the slum that breed the behaviors wrongly associated with race. Our problem in all honesty is the ghetto.

Now to bring this overlong talk to a close I must say a few words about housing. The white community is in bondage to a grievous misconception. It confuses a class problem with a race problem. It sees in the color of a man's skin an indication of his likely behavior. Because the Negro is statistically the most impoverished, the most deprived and becoming, in all probability, the most embittered segment of American life, whites fear as a matter of race what we know is a matter of poverty. They do not understand that the Negro ghetto far from protecting cities destroys them. They do not know that by walling people in and preventing their natural assimilation to the rest of the society they create the very conditions of bitterness and despair that produce the crime and violence they fear.

They do not know that the only way to destroy the cancer they fear is to destroy the ghetto. They do not know that the way to assimilate the impoverished and the disadvantaged is not to concentrate and segregate them. They do not know, but they must be made to know, that the destruction of the ghetto is the way to avoid the destruction of our cities and our way of life. They must be made to learn that dispersion is the only way to make possible the assimilation and upgrading we all desire. The walled-in bitterness we are now creating can destroy us. An open society free to all on their merits is our salvation, black and white.

Finally, the surest method to travel the road to this salvation is for us jointly to tear down the "Berlin wall" of prejudice and fear that separates us. What we need urgently and above all is for the leaders of the Negro and white communities to begin the too-long-delayed process of getting to know each other—know each other as men. Once we do this the bitter fruit we inherit from our joint history will be replaced by a new and better realization of the ideals of our common country.

I can assure you the land of Lincoln will be no laggard in the continuing cause of man's emancipation.

Hon. John S. Monagan Honored by the Association of Captive European Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday during the annual banquet commemorating the observance of the Captive Nations Week, the Assembly of the Captive European Nations honored our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, Representative John S. Monagan, with a citation expressing the assembly's "sincere gratitude for his steadfast furtherance of the freedom aspirations of the captive nations."

In presenting the citation, Dr. George M. Dimitrov, chairman, Assembly of the Captive European Nations, made these remarks which I would like to commend to the attention of the membership of the House:

The honorable John S. Monagan was first elected to the 86th Congress in 1958 and was soon after assigned to the Foreign Affairs Committee. There the former mayor and attorney, of Waterbury, Conn., established within a very short period of time a most enviable record of accomplishments.

Last summer Representative Edna F. Kelly, chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe, requested him to preside over hearings on the Captive European Nations. He discharged this mission with great distinction. Under his chairmanship the subcommittee produced a remarkably straightforward report. Its basic finding was refreshingly clearcut, and I quote:

"The people of the captive nations, as distinguished from the regimes governing them, constitute a tremendous reservoir of good will for the United States. Their desire to be oriented toward the West, and their hope of eventually regaining their national independence, serve as a powerful brake upon the Soviet Union's freedom of action and capability to extend the Communist empire in Europe through intimidation or overt aggression.

"Its recommendations were equally clearcut. The subcommittee called for 'prompt, continuous and energetic steps to make clear to the rest of the world that the United States continues to support the policy of refusing to accept the status quo in Eastern Europe and the right of self-determination of the peoples of the captive nations.'

"Specifically it called for exposure of Soviet colonialism, for pressing the Hungarian question before the United Nations, for invigorating broadcasts to east central Europe, for establishing a special permanent subcommittee on captive nations.

"We must always remember," concluded the report, "that our support for the legitimate objectives of liberty and self-determination for these friendly peoples may exploit a woefully weak spot in the Soviet system."

Our award to Representative Monagan is at once an expression of gratitude for his personal endeavors on behalf of our nations and a token of appreciation of the statesman like work accomplished by the Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

The citation reads as follows:

To John S. Monagan, U.S. Representative from Connecticut in sincere gratitude for the steadfast furtherance of the freedom aspirations of the captive nations.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the membership of the House is fully aware of the fine work done by our colleague, Mr. Monagan, in chairing the hearings on the captive European nations held by the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in keeping the membership of the House apprised of developments in that area through periodic reports. I know that we all wish him well in the fine work which he is doing and are delighted with the recognition which he received from the Assembly of Captive European Nations.

Early West Virginia War Correspondent Recorded Funeral of Napoleon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a recent article in the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail draws attention to the fact that one of the earliest American war correspondents to achieve fame was David Hunter Strother, born in Martinsburg, W. Va., in 1816.

According to this article, Strother became famous as a Civil War illustrator and reporter, writing under the name of "Porte Crayon." But the most dramatic of his early writings was his account of the reburial of the Emperor Napoleon in Paris in 1840.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Gazette-Mail article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the Record, as follows:

EARLY WEST VIRGINIA WAR CORRESPONDENT RECORDED FUNERAL OF NAPOLEON

David Hunter Strother, a Martinsburg native who was better known under his pen name of "Porte Crayon," attained fame as an illustrator for Harper's magazine during the Civil War.

Assigned to the staff of at least four Union generals at different times, he was in 30 battles and was frequently promoted until he resigned in September 1864. After the war, he was breveted as a brigadier general.

In addition to his striking ability to draw on-the-scene sketches of the war, Strother did very well with words.

He had a slow moving, picturesque way of writing, best described as the Irving tradition.

Not many people had heard of David Hunter Strother, much less Porte Crayon, before the war. A series of stories he wrote for publication in the Martinsburg Gazette in 1841–43 didn't attract much attention. At that time he was 25 to 27 years old. His fame was to come 18 or more years later.

Cecil D. Eby, writing in the West Virginia History magazine, says that the most dramatic word sketch among the early writings of Strother was his account of the funeral of Napoleon I.

The French Emperor died in 1821, but his remains were brought from St. Helena to Paris for reburial in 1840. There was a procession of 120,000 soldiers in brilliant attire, and the roar of a cannon announced that the body was being brought into the city. Strother wrote:

"The dust of him whose name once shook the world was now before me. I did not breathe: the pageantry waxed dim before my eyes. I saw nothing but the coffin of Napoleon.

"Several persons addressed remarks to me at the time, but the words made no impression. I was lost—absorbed in the feeling for which there is no language. * * * The last act of the tremendous drama was closed, and the curtain has drawn forever."

Strother was consul-general at Mexico City from 1879 to 1888. He died in Charles Town in 1888 at the age of 72.

Decency Will Prevail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, as an indication of the mounting enthusiasm and dedication with which the President's civil rights bill is being supported by distinguished Americans, I offer for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this feature story which appeared in the July 11, 1963 edition of the Washington Post. It discusses the impressive background of Patricia Roberts Harris, prominent Negro woman attorney, who is leaving her position as associate dean of students at Howard University and will become cochairman with Mildred McAfee Horton, of the President's Committee to coordinate for his civil rights bill among American women.

This article discusses Mrs. Harris' belief, which I am certain is shared by most Americans, that peaceful demonstrations combined with the democratic process will allow Negroes to attain the rights which belong to them.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 11, 1963]

DECENCY WILL PREVAIL—CAPITALITE CO-CHAIRMAN HAS FAITH

(By Roberta Brown)

Patricia Roberts Harris, prominent Negro woman attorney who had just submitted her resignation as associate dean of students at Howard University, was named yesterday as co-Chairman with Mildred McAfee Horton of the President's Committee to marshall 50 million American women to the support of his civil rights bill.

Mrs. Harris had intended to leave her administrative post at the university on August 31 to join her husband, William Beasley Harris, in law practice in Washington. Now that will be secondary to the discharge of an unpaid job she feels she "cannot refuse."

In the comfortable living room of her seven-room home at 2804 13th Street NW., a few hours after her appointment last night, she said she met Mrs. Horton, former president of Wellesley College and wartime head of the Waves, for the first time at the meeting convened by the President at the White House on Tuesday afternoon.

Her own name was proposed at the follow-up meeting which the women held later the same evening in the interdepartmental auditorium.

"Both meetings," she said, "gave evidence of great enthusiasm and a great drive to get on with this.

"A good deal of critical thinking has got to go into this effort," Mrs. Harris said. "Women have an enormous power to effect action when they decide to use it. But, the Committee, as I see it, will be a symbolic thing, a clearinghouse for sharing of information, and will not necessarily have a great deal of ongoing activity."

Committed to "civil order" and a belief that peaceful demonstrations and democratic processes will function to allow Negroes "the rights that belong to them," Mrs. Harris said, "I just have such faith that decency will prevail.

"With the President's leadership, it is inconceivable to me that some southerners will not be patriots enough to bring us through this."

Although less militant than some Negro leaders, Mrs. Harris has demonstrated her belief in action.

Twenty years ago, she said, when she was NAACP vice chairman of a student chapter, she took part in one of the earliest sit-ins at the northeast corner of 14th and U Streets with fellow students at Howard University.

"There was a white lunchroom there right in the middle of what was the main street in an all-colored district of segregated Washington.

"We had been to the Booker T. Theater and simply went in and sat down until the proprietor closed the place at 1 in the afternoon.

"We picketed the place for a few days until it was opened to Negroes. I wish I could say it stayed that way, but it didn't," she added.

But, even in its segregated days, Washington was a good city for Negroes, according to Mrs. Harris. "The police were wonderful. They watched, but didn't intervene as long as everything was orderly."

It is for that reason, Mrs. Harris said, that she has faith that demonstrations will be orderly in behalf of the President's bill, based on the interstate commerce provisions of Federal law, and that it will be passed.

"It's clear that we can't have civil disorder. The Negro movement has historically been one of nonviolence but no one on earth can predict what might happen if it is frustrated," she said.

National Service Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this body to the statement made yesterday by the President at his news conference regarding the proposed National Service Corps. The question asked has been raised on this floor, as well as the floor of the other body, by some opposed to legislation designed to implement this service corps. It was that critics of the plan charge the corps would duplicate the work already being done by existing agencies. We should all pay attention to the President's answer.

He first compared this criticism to the kind of criticism leveled at the oversea Peace Corps while legislation to create it was being considered. And he pointed to the great success that wonderful group of dedicated Americans has made. The President pointed out that much of the poverty here at home is geographically isolated; it is not seen by many people, and hence disregarded. As an example he referred to our institutions for mentally retarded children, all of which could use corpsmen volunteers badly. He mentioned the pitiful state of our Indian reservations, and the urban slum with its plethora of dropouts. He reminded us that these, our poor, have little or no voice to make themselves and their pleas heard.

And, Mr. Speaker, he spoke of our people's propensity for helping their brothers:

> I think these young men and women would be proud to give a year of their lives to the service of their country. They are willing to go abroad. I think they would be more willing to stay home. Their example, I think, can be a catalyst. We have millions of people who work in the various agencies. I think they do a wonderful job. We want to supplement their work. Most of those who work in the field say more can be done. * * * What we want to do is to make it possible for people in this country to give a year of their lives without compensation, but with enough to live on to serve in these various areas where people do not enjoy the prosperity which so much of our country experience live. I think those opposed to it are wrong. I think the program is a good idea.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the national service program bill now before this body is the embodiment of another phrase of the President's:

> We shall be judged more by what we do at home than what we preach abroad.

The Honorable Carl Vinson Nears a Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting and inspiring articles that I have seen in connection with the setting of a new record for service in the House of Representatives by our distinguished colleague, Hon. CARL VINSON, appeared in the Atlanta Journal of Sunday, July 7, 1963. It was written by an outstanding journalist, Frank Eleazer, who has so ably covered the proceedings of this House for United Press International for a number of years. I commend this article to my colleagues, both as a story of a great Congressman who has served his country so long and so well, and as an example of distinguished journalism.

The article follows:

[From the Atlanta Journal, June 26, 1963]

Uncle Carl Nears a Record—Vinson in Congress Since 1914

(By Frank Eleazer)

Washington, July 6—An alltime record for House service will be established shortly by a 79-year-old country boy from Milledgeville, Ga., who says the way to stave off old age is to keep looking forward, not backward.

"You've got to stay busy and stay abreast of the times," explained Representative Carl Vinson as he approached the latest of many milestones in a colorful House career that may never be matched. "Times move ahead. There's nothin' to be gained sittin' back reminiscing."

It is just this philosophy that has thrown Uncle Carl Vinson, dean of the House and leader of a so-called moderate bloc from the South, into recurrent conflict with some of Dixie's more conservative members.

And there is little doubt, as he says, that this outlook also has played a part in helping him bull his way unscarred through the battles of almost half a century of hard work in the House.

Vinson came to Congress in 1914 at age 30, the youngest Member of Congress. On July 16 he will have served continuously 48 years, 8 months, and 13 days, breaking the record set by another House titan, the late Speaker Sam Rayburn, and setting a new one that can't be equaled anytime soon and could stand indefinitely.

On November 18, Vinson will be 80. Next year he will complete his 50th year in the House. Nobody is betting that he won't be around for at least a few more.

Millions have read about the tired old men of Congress, usually identified only as octogenarians, who are supposed to be dragging their feet and impeding the legislative machinery. Put it down that these complaints, emanating mostly from political science professors and columnists but also sometimes from Members of Congress are not directed at Uncle Carl.

As chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Vinson still runs his empire just the way he always has and as any emperor would. He enjoys all his faculties, and nobody tries to outsmart him.

He drives his subcommittees to get on with their work, but a subcommittee chairman as often as not will find that Vinson has studied the problem and worked out the solution before ever handing over the job.

"Now heahs what let's do, and I'm gonna hep you," is a stock opening gambit with Vinson.

When Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara was born, Vinson was already a seasoned House Member. Now McNamara, with a pretty sizable empire of his own, includes Vinson among the very few people with whom he finds it expedient to clear in advance some of his more controversial actions.

If the Defense Secretary phones Vinson's Capitol office at, say, 7:30 a.m., very likely it will be Vinson himself who answers. Vinson's staff, lucky people, can snooze as late as they want, just so long as they get to the office by 8.

Vinson has been boss of the Armed Services Committee for more than 12 years and was chairman of its predecessor Naval Affairs Committee for 16 years before that. Nobody can recall any other Member who was a committee chairman that long. And there have been mighty few chairmen who held, for any shorter period, anything like Vinson's unchallenged sway.

Vinson, as a member of a 1925 commission set up by President Calvin Coolidge, played a key role in committing this country to development of both commerical and defense aviation. It was Vinson to whom President Franklin D. Roosevelt looked for help in prodding Congress into construction of a two-ocean Navy. And it was Vinson who practically ordered the Navy to build its own vast strength in the air.

It also was Vinson who told the battleship admirals finally to get him a picture of one of their vessels, so he could hang it on the wall of his office. The day of the battleship, he told them firmly, was over.

Vinson has served with and known well eight Presidents starting with Woodrow Wilson. He is and has been a Democrat, without any excuses. He has called President Kennedy one of the greatest, and sticks to that view despite the current civil rights squabble.

On that, of course, he thinks the President is wrong, and he will vote with the rest of the South against the Kennedy civil rights bill. But he has helped Kennedy repeatedly to muster needed Southern votes on other critical issues, and, as he says, "I'll be heppin' him again in the future."

Vinson is keenly aware of the recent critical talk about oldsters in Congress, and actually he tends to agree with some of it. But as for himself, he isn't old. His hearing, vision, and energy are all unimpaired. So is his savvy.

He eats whatever he sees that looks good. He had his last drink of whiskey 30 years ago. He smokes seven or eight cigars daily, the kind he can buy for 10 cents in the House restaurant. He claims to have quit chewing tobacco. Possibly at 79 he feared this was becoming a habit.

"I feel like I'm just beginnin' to hit my stride," he said the other day to a friend, not much more than half his age, who finally has had to give up as too strenuous walking with Vinson back and forth through the Capitol corridors. "I don't feel like an old man. I don't even think I look 80. I think I look about 60."

He gets around like he thought he was younger than that.

He is up with the birds, reads the Washington Post, is driven to work by an aide with whose family he has lived since the death of his wife in 1950. At the Capitol he reads the Wall Street Journal, looks at the mail, and talks to anybody with the foresight to get to his office that early.

Most mornings his committee meets until noon, when he ambles at a fast pace through the tunnel to the House Chamber. With his seniority, Vinson can have anything he wants in the Capitol, and sometimes special benefits are pressed on him he would just as soon weren't.

Lately he has acquired a handy suite just off the House floor, where he was supposed to hide out and rest between votes. Actually, its value is mostly sentimental. The suite is one occupied long ago by the Naval Affairs Committee, where he started his climb up the ladder.

The furnishings include a red leather couch ideal for an afternoon nap. But unless somebody else has been sneaking in nights, it has never been slept on.

Vinson likes to leave for home not later than 4, and two or three times a week walks a measured 2 miles before dinner. He reads the Evening Star and hits the sack early.

Vinson's countrified looks, big nose, and low-riding spectacles are part of the congressional legend. So is his undiluted Milledgeville drawl. So are his highhanded ways and his hilarious wit.

He is one of the few real characters on the congressional scene, and has been for so long it is hard for other Members to imagine what it would be like without him.

So they hope there is no truth to rumors that, with a half century's service behind him, Vinson won't run for a 26th term. But when asked the question directly, he looks over his glasses and says:

"I never take off my socks until I get to the creek."

Adm. William Veazie Pratt, U.S. Navy, 1869–1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a statement to the House in the Appendix of the Congressional Record of June 26, 1963, I quoted the chapter in Wilbur D. Spenser's interesting book, "Maine Immortals," that summarized the career of John Frank Stevens, 1853–1943, of West Gardiner, Maine. Another distinguished son of that State was William V. Pratt, 1869–1957, of Belfast, Maine.

The active careers of these two leaders were nearly contemporaneous, Stevens as an engineer and Pratt as a naval officer. Stevens, as chief engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission, 1905–7, attained great stature as the basic architect of the Panama Canal, and rose to high position in the engineering profession. Pratt, in 1914 had a part in the earliest combat operations of naval aviation and rose to the high position of Chief of Naval Operations, 1930–33.

Because Admiral Pratt never published a book, he is not remembered today by the general public as a naval leader of his achievements should be. Fortunately, a comprehensive biographical sketch of him by Rear Adm. John D. Hayes was published in the June–July issue of Shipmate, the magazine of the U.S. Naval Academy Alumni Association.

In order that this summary of Admiral Pratt's career may be recorded in the permanent annals of the Congress, I quote it as part of my remarks and commend this excellent summary of his life and achievements to all our reading public, especially to the youth of the Nation.

The article follows:

William Veazie Pratt, 1869–1957

(By John D. Hayes)

The years between World Wars I and II were, for the U.S. Navy, among the most critical in her history. The Nation in 1921, abdicated its position as the first naval power. A few years later its political leaders were advocating "abolishing war as an instrument of policy" at the very time when such idealism, with its blind disregard for the lessons of history, was creating problems which in the end could only be resolved by arms. Naval leaders of this period did their best to maintain a fleet, strong, ready and alert, and they had to discharge this responsibility in the face of a hostile people, without hope of glory, or even of honor. But there were giants in the Navy of those days. Among them was William Veazie Pratt, 1889.

Before World War I, Pratt had helped create the modern U.S. destroyer force. During that war he practically singlehandedly ran the Washington side of the naval effort. He had a large part in both the Washington and London Disarmament Conferences of 1921 and 1930. For 6 years from 1927 to 1933 he held the top posts in the Navy and during this period gave carrier operations its start and instituted the task force-type command method of fleet organization. During

World War II as a retired officer and member of the staff of the magazine Newsweek, he ably performed the task of interpreting and explaining to the American people, the seapower which was then advancing their country to the foremost position in the world.

It was, however, the fate of this man to serve his country as a naval officer in time of peace. He was born, perhaps, a decade before his time. So today he is forgotten by the people he served and all but by the profession of which he was a part.

William Veazie Pratt was born February 28, 1869, the son of Nichols Pratt, a seafarer and Civil War naval officer. His father, a native of Massachusetts, entered the Navy in August 1862 as a master's mate, then a grade between commissioned and enlisted rank. He was appointed acting ensign in November 1863 and acting master (lieutenant, junior grade) April 1865. His record in the war was such that he might have become one of the few volunteer officers selected for the regular Navy. Instead he chose to marry Abie Veazie of Belfast, Maine, whose parents did not believe his Navy salary adequate to support a wife. Nichols Pratt eventually became a well-known sea captain in the Far East.

As a baby William V. was taken by his parents to China but he later returned and entered the Naval Academy from Maine. He graduated sixth in 1889, a class of 35. His first ship was the then new cruiser *Atlanta*. Like all officers he served in many ships during the next 20 years, ending up this period as executive officer of the armored cruiser *California*, later renamed *San Diego*.

PRATT AND SIMS

Pratt began the fruitful second half of his naval career by attending the Naval War College from 1911 to 1913. Following this, he became Chief of Staff to William S. Sims, 1880, then commanding the destroyer flotilla of the Atlantic Fleet. He also served as commanding officer of the flagship, the scout cruiser *Birmingham*. Sims' biographer writes of Pratt: "For the success of the flotilla in those years, this able man deserves much credit. Sims and he worked together in the harmony that is built upon professional respect and personal affection."[1]

Command of the *Birmingham* gave Pratt the opportunity to have a part in the earliest combat operations of naval aviation. Eugene Ely had flown the first airplane from the deck of that ship in November 1910 and during the Vera Cruz incident in 1914 the *Birmingham* carried onboard three aircraft in which John Towers, 1906, Godfrey deC. Chevalier, 1910 and Lt. B. L. Smith, USMC all made reconnaissance flights over Mexican territory.

Becoming captain in 1915, Pratt went to duty the next year in Panama where he worked with Army personnel on the problems of the defense of the recently completed Panama Canal. From there he went to duty on the faculty of the Army War College. These two assignments were the roots of Pratt's lifelong appreciation of the joint nature of all warfare. In Frebruary 1917, he was called to the office of the Chief of Naval Operations, W. S. Benson, 1877.

Pratt's role in World War I has been ably described by Prof. William R. Braisted of the University of Texas, an authority on the naval history of the period and a son of Frank A. Braisted, 1909:

"As Assistant Chief of Naval Operations during World War I, Pratt was one of the most active agitators in favor of more vigorous prosecution of hostilities. I feel that he more than any other individual was responsible for preserving working relations between Sims and the Navy Department and for preventing the explosion in the service until after the war was safely won. Benson and Sims, of course, were far from close, but Pratt worked earnestly to secure what Sims wanted while remaining absolutely loyal to his superiors in Washington. When Sims wanted the Navy to concentrate on antisubmarine warfare, Pratt was largely responsible for getting the Navy's building program shifted from battleships to destroyers. He accomplished this despite the opposition of conservatives in the Navy Department who opposed any slowing of the 1916 program. Again when Sims asked that a division of battleships be sent to England, Pratt opposed those in Washington who wanted to keep all American battleships at home prepared for some later war."[2]

Sims disliked Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels. After the war the naval officer managed to expand a Senate investigation of the Secretary's unusual awards of decorations into a post-mortem on the conduct of the naval war. Here Pratt was caught in the feud between his friend and his wartime superiors. Braisted again writes:

"The Senate investigation at the close of World War I must have been a bitter disappointment to Pratt. He had done his utmost to meet Sims' demands, and he apparently mistook Sims' outburst as criticism of his own efficiency in the Office of Operations. At any rate Pratt and Sims never again corresponded freely and cordially."

Braisted's appraisal of Pratt is borne out by T. B. Kitterage, apologist for Sims who understandably shared his subject's dislike for the Secretary. In his "Naval Lessons of the World War," Kitterage admitted that Pratt's criticism of Sims was limited to the latter's contention that all power of decision should have been turned over to him in London.

Pratt accompanied President Wilson to the Peace Conference at Versailles as a technical adviser. From January 1919 to October 1920, he had command of the battleship *New York* and during this tour of duty took Secretary Daniels, his wife and two sons in that ship for a visit to Pearl Harbor. From October 1920 to July 1921 he had command of the Destroyer Force, Pacific Fleet, and after that for the next 2 years was a member of the influential general board.

THE WASHINGTON CONFERENCE ON THE LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS

It was in this assignment that Pratt became closely connected with the controversial Washington Conference which met late in 1921. President Harding had entered the White House that year with a public commitment to the American people, disillusioned by World War I, to take early steps toward the limitation of naval armaments. The task was assigned to Secretary of State Hughes. Great Britain, whose era as first naval power would be over with the completion of the large U.S. 1916 building program, was anxious to cooperate but Japan had to be forced through the tremendous bargaining power that 16 post-Jutland battleships, built or building, gave to the United States.

The disarmament proposals would have to come from this country. Two recommendations by the Navy's general board were unsatisfactory to Secretary Hughes, and so the work of framing the one made was, according to Harold and Margaret Sprout, the work of four men, Hughes, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., the then Chief of Naval Operations, Robert E. Coontz, 1885, and Pratt.[3] Braisted claims that Pratt personally typed the draft which was locked in Hughes' safe, until the opening session, on November 12, 1921, 2 days later.

The reason for this secrecy was that the success of the conference depended on what the U.S. had to offer. The proposal was a 5–5–3 ratio between the three major powers with capital ship tonnage limited to 600,000. This meant scrapping all U.S. ships except two battleships building and two battle cruisers to be converted into aircraft carriers. The reluctant Japanese, who believed that their security depended on a Navy at least two-thirds the size of that of the United States, agreed to the ratio only with U.S. acceptance of the status quo for its Far East bases. Naval officers resented this concession more than the loss of the battleships. In the end agreement on limitation was reached only for capital ships where the U.S. would make the big sacrifice. Cruisers were limited in size to 10,000 tons and 8-inch guns but no agreement was reached on limiting the number of this or any other type.

Pratt's was the only service voice raised in the defense of the treaty. Coontz regretted his part and most naval officers held the opinion of Frank H. Simonds, who in an article in the Washington Star some years later wrote that the conference was disastrous because at a certain moment Mr. Hughes had to choose between facing the political consequences of failure or agreeing to what was clearly a bad bargain.

Pratt stated his case for the treaty in the North American Review of May 1922 and in Current History, April 1923. He admitted that the country had made unquestionably the greatest sacrifice but this would be worth it provided a strong balanced fleet were maintained, but this did not happen. He heralded the establishment of the balance of power between the two English-speaking nations as one of the accomplishments of the century but the treaty actually worsened British-American relations for the next decade. The American people had demanded a disarmament treaty but they deserved a better one.

Following this eventful tour, Pratt went to sea in 1923 as Commander Battleship Division Four of the Pacific Fleet, composed of the *New Mexico, Idaho,* and *Mississippi*. While in this command the fatal flareback of the right gun took place in turret two of the *Mississippi*, on June 12, 1924 off San Pedro, Calif. This accident cost the lives of 3 officers and 44 men. At an impressive funeral ceremony on June 17, attended by hundreds of officers and 4,000 men, Pratt gave a funeral address full of feeling and the traditional spirit of the service that stands as a classic of naval literature.

In September 1925 Pratt assumed the duty of President of the Naval War College. While there he carried out a staff organization which insured proper emphasis on operations, foreign relations, and the interservice aspects of modern warfare while at the same time continuing the estimate of the situation and the game board which had been the major work of the college.

In 1927 Pratt began 6 years in major naval commands, 3 in top posts in the fleet and 3 as Chief of Naval Operations. While Commander Battle Fleet, he made a major contribution to the development of naval aviation when he allowed the revolutionary concept of an independent carrier task force to be tested during the fleet problem in 1929. The plan of Commander Aircraft, Battle Fleet, Joseph M. Reeves, 1894, was for the air group of the *Saratoga* to make an unsupported strike on the Panama Canal. This first real opportunity for carrier aircraft was a huge success and from then on the fleet carrier task force had a place in all fleet exercises and war plans.

As CNO, Pratt had to resist the pressure of the Army Air Force to take over naval air stations. He did this by integrating land based air units into the U.S. fleet. He also incorporated the task force type command concept of organization into the two main divisions of the fleet, then called the battle force in the Pacific and the scouting force in the Atlantic. Some in the Navy believed he had not gone far enough, notably Joseph K. Taussig, 1899, who wanted this concept expanded to task fleets stationed at Hampton Roads, Panama, and the Hawaiian Islands.

---

[1] E. E. Morison, "Admiral Sims and the Modern American Navy" (1942), p. 293.

[2] Personal letter to the author, Sept. 4, 1962.

[3] H. and M. Sprout, "Toward a New Order in Sea Power" (1943), p. 146.

THE LONDON NAVAL CONFERENCE OF 1930

Pratt's tour as CNO is most notable for the role he played in the London Naval Conference of 1930 which succeeded in extending limitation of armaments to other types after the failure at Geneva in 1927. As at the Washington Conference of 1921, no naval officers were appointed as delegates. Hilary P. Jones, 1884, a strong advocate of the 8-inch gun cruiser, had been a delegate to the Geneva Conference and this was connected in the public mind with its failure. At London in 1930, Jones was only an adviser. Moreover, Pratt, the cooperator at the 1921 conference, was selected to be chief adviser by the administration civilian leaders, according to McGeorge Bundy, biographer of Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of State and chief American delegate. When Stimson with Pratt's concurrence, agreed to accept 18 of the 8-inch gun cruisers instead of 21 and take the tonnage in 6-inch ships, H. P. Jones came home.

Experience in World War II was to prove the 6-inch-gun ship with its high volume of fire a superior vessel, especially for the close-in night actions that characterized that war. This could not be forseen in 1930 but it must be admitted that naval officers almost the world over made a fetish of the 8-inch, 10,000-ton "treaty" cruiser. This attitude was carried into World War II when 6-inch ships were hardly given the chance to show their worth until the 8-inch type had taken heavy losses.

One U.S. naval officer at London did dissent from the generally held naval viewpoint. Captain A. H. Van Keuren, 1903, the only naval constructor among the advisers, considered the 8-inch-gun ship, a monstrosity. There is no indication in Pratt's later writings, however, that he was influenced by Van Keuren. Rather it appears that he considered having a treaty was better than not having one, provided the United States would build up to the limit.

After the Washington Conference of 1921, Pratt had expressed the hope that the United States after taking the reduction in capital ships would build up the other types to achieve a balanced fleet. This did not happen. Between 1921 and 1930, Great Britain and Japan each laid down 15 heavy cruisers while the United States laid down only 8. President Franklin Roosevelt after he came into office in 1933 endeavored to correct this but did not get far with his shipbuilding program against the isolation and economy attitudes of the American people until they and their Representatives in Congress discovered during the depression that 90 percent of the cost of a warship goes into labor. By then it was too late and the U.S. Navy with a two-ocean responsibility entered World War II inferior to the Japanese in all major types except battleships. Fortunately the losses at Pearl Harbor were mostly in that class. The United States was saved by a people at last aroused and by the strategic stupidity of the Japanese.

PRATT AND NEWSWEEK

These future events marked Pratt's two attempts at naval statesmanship as failures. In 1933 he returned to Belfast, Maine and what appeared to be the oblivion of a permanent retirement as a new order took over the destiny of the country and the Navy. However, the war in Europe gave him the opportunity in retirement to leave an impact greater than any officer has been able to do except Stephen B. Luce. In January 1941 Pratt became a naval commentator for Newsweek magazine and took over the task of interpreting for its readers the seapower he had helped to create and the naval warfare for which he had prepared the U.S. Navy. This work stands well up among his contributions as a public servant. For 6 years he produced a weekly column of about 1,500 words which became the most popular feature in the magazine. He outlasted three military commentators, the last being the British authority, J. A. C. Fuller. He must have been the delight of armchair strategists and the frequent references to his work in the editors' column showed the respect and affection in which they held him.

For 6 months in 1941 he preformed two jobs. In January he was ordered to active duty to expedite the development of the small carrier which he had advocated for ASW and transport work. During this period he did not miss a column.

His prediction of the trend of action in 1940 and 1941 showed uncanny accuracy based on the facts of geography and sound strategy which he explained to his readers in simple, understandable terms. During our own war years he was, of course, subject to the pressure of events but his comments on almost every engagement included its strategic significance or lack of it. The decisive actions of the war, he considered to be the air battle of Britain, El Alamein, and Midway.

Even during the darkest days of the war, Pratt's articles like his nature were optimistic. In May 1944 he gave a remarkable appraisal of MacArthur, West Point 1903, who had been Chief of Staff of the Army when he was CNO. In another article entitled "Who Is This Man Nimitz?" He wrote that the CinC, Pacific had the facility to cooperate with anybody and then continued: "When the Japs were defeated at Midway, a battle which meant more to the security of America and the success of our Pacific advance than the occupation of Luzon, little was heard of Nimitz though he was in full charge. * * * Evidently he preferred to remain in the background, as most naval leaders do, and let the praise go to those serving under him."

No animosity against the Japanese or Germans appeared in his column. In fact before the outbreak of hostilities in the Pacific he took occasion to praise the abilities of Admirals Nomura and Nagano and his warm friendship for the former survived the war.

Pratt was no narrow protagonist or "battleship admiral," whatever that means. He pointed out that it was air power that had bridged the gap that previously existed between sea and landpower. This, he reasoned, was why there was no great naval battles in the classical sense. Instead, amphibious operations across the entire Pacific had made it one great front, far more extensive than the fronts in Russia or France. He did not hesitate to take to task critics of the heavy losses at Iwo Jima and the slow progress on Okinawa.

Always a man of moderation, he had taken issue as early as 1926 with the thesis of strategic bombing, claiming then that aircraft used in war must be bound by the laws of war. Twenty years later he took the same stand toward the military uses of atomic energy, holding that:

(1) The bombing of Hiroshima without warning laid America open to the charge of adopting Hitler's strategy.

(2) We missed a great opportunity for taking a leading position in the world at the time our moral influence was enormous when we failed to renounce the use of atomic energy as an instrument of war.

In December 1945 Pratt finally missed two weekly columns while he evidently took his first vacation in 6 years. He continued to write intermittently until April 1946 when he quit and returned to the home he was born in and one of the prettiest rose gardens in the State of Maine. Newsweek editors humorously portrayed his final return to Belfast after more than 60 years:

"Been away, Willie?" asked a townsman.

"A spell."

Even in this late retirement he refused to isolate himself from the world scene and write his memoirs. Newsweek continued to carry his name on the masthead and throughout the Korean war he kept in close touch with the editors.

The admiral died on November 25, 1957 at Chelsea Naval Hospital, 3 months before his 89th birthday. "Well done" wrote the editors of Newsweek.

Mrs. Pratt still lives in Belfast. The couple had one son. Two nephews followed him in the Navy, W. V. Pratt II, 1933 and R. R. Pratt, 1936, recently selected for flag rank. This year, R. R. Jr. received his commission as an ensign, 100 years after his great grandfather, Nichols Pratt, received his.

No account of Admiral Pratt would be complete without mention of his perennial flag lieutenant, Charles William Anthony Campbell known throughout the Navy as "Jimmie." Campbell first enlisted in the Navy in 1899 and was promoted from chief gunner to lieutenant during World War I. He was serving in the *New York* when Pratt took command in 1919. When Pratt was promoted to flag rank the next year he took Campbell as personal aide and so he remained for the next 13 years. Jimmie himself retired in 1934 but came back during the war and was advanced to captain on the retired list, his last duty being command of the Receiving Station, Washington, D.C. He died in 1962 at the age of 79.

PRATT AS AN ESSAYIST

Had Admiral Pratt published one book, he would be far better known today than he is. His writing for Newsweek amounted to the equivalent of three volumes. He did considerable other writing but like most naval officers preferred to offer his thoughts in short essays. Nine are in the Proceedings of the U.S. Naval Institute, one of which won him the Institute's essay contest while he was CNO. Two of his articles on "Naval Policy," in November 1922 and July 1932, are apologias for his actions at the disarmament conferences. His "Disarmament and the National Defense," September 1925, is an expression of the professional philosophy to which he adhered through a lifetime. Perhaps even more significant than his articles are his addresses to the Naval War College, several of which can be found in the College Library. One entitled "Naval Command and Administration," given first in December 1925 and revised February 1927, stresses the distinction between these two methods of control and warns of the danger of the latter usurping the powers of the former. Another outstanding lecture given in August 1930 while he was CinC, U.S. Fleet has the title "The Aspects of Higher Command." In it he outlined the differences in Army and Navy viewpoints and listed the strength and weakness factors in each.

His final article in the Proceedings is his best. "Leadership" published in August 1934, a year after his retirement, and his address at the funeral of the *Mississippi* dead, both deserve prominent places in American military literature.

No appraisal of William Veazie Pratt's full life can be attempted in a sketch like this. His professional philosophy, however, may be safely interpreted as that of cooperation and accommodation. He expressed himself forcefully on the former when he appeared before a board studying a reorganization of the Navy Department that would give more statutory power to CNO which he did not think necessary: "I would rather sit around a table with a group of men, every one of them perfectly independent and king in his own domain, and to get a man to work with you rather than to tell him what to do. I have found that all I have to do is make a suggestion to them and they will complete the job. If you cannot get men who will do that, get somebody else."[4]

Regarding his philosophy of accommodation, he was more guarded but he may have revealed it when he once told a younger officer, rather sharply: "You always see the ultimate objective and want to take it on the first assault. You've got to learn to take minor objectives one at a time and to hold them until the big one falls in your lap. Otherwise you will never get any place in this Navy."[5]

On one principle, he was very firm and it is good to call it to mind today. That is that the distinction between command and administration in naval affairs requires that the CNO have direct access to the President. "He and he alone commands," Pratt told a War College audience. "Under normal conditions it makes little difference to the forces in the field how directives come or the source from which they issue, so long as they have the stamp of authorized responsibility. When, however, the question at issue is one of grave state importance or involves vital decisions which might affect the outcome of the campaign or the war, then supreme authority must be invoked. This is true because the responsibility for the direction of the war is vested in the Commander in Chief and the responsibility for its execution rests with him and with the military executive at the scene of action."

---

[4] E. J. King and W. M. Whitehill, "Fleet Admiral King, A Naval Record," (1952), p. 262.

[5] E. E. Wilson, "Slipstream" (1950), p. 152.

Historic Charter Oak Still Standing In Pocahontas County, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, when the region that is now Pocahontas County, W. Va., was surveyed by Andrew Lewis in 1751, a Charter Oak figured in the survey, according to a recent article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail. Today the trunk of that Charter Oak is still standing in Marlinton, and is treasured as a link between the proud past and the promising future of Pocahontas County.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORIC CHARTER OAK STILL STANDING IN POCAHONTAS COUNTY, W. VA.

Pocahontas County, named for the famous Indian princess, was formed in 1821 from the counties of Bath, Randolph and Pendleton. Before the white settler came, Pocahontas was the hunting ground of the Shawnee Indians whose home was in Ohio. The Indian trail, known as the Warriors Road, established by the Iroquois along the mountains from northern New York to Georgia, went through the county and may be seen at several points still today. The Seneca Trail, U.S. 219, generally follows this road.

Jacob Marlin and Stephen Sewall came to what is now Marlinton in 1749, the first white settlers west of the Alleghenies, and were found here by Andrew Lewis as he surveyed in 1751, marking as a corner of his survey the Charter Oak, the trunk of which still stands in Marlinton. By the time Lewis came, Sewall and Marlin had had differences about "relagian" and Marlin was living in the cabin while Sewall made his abode in a hollow sycamore, later moving to a cave 7 miles south and then on to Greenbrier County where he was killed by the Indians.

Fort Greenbrier, of French and Indian War days, stood near where the courthouse stands today in Marlinton. Other community protection forts were at Jacob Warwick's, Clover Lick, Thomas Drinnen's, Edray, Fort Cackley (Keckley), Mill Point, and Fort Warwick on Deer Creek. The last Indian raid was in 1786 when Henry Baker, the first schoolteacher, was killed and scalped above the fairgrounds and two Bridger brothers were killed above Mill Point as they came to help.

Many of our settlers were the hardy Scotch-Irish, who came in the big migrations of the middle 18th century to form a living wall beyond the blue ridge. The population in 1800 was about 153, these for the most part being members of the first families that had permanent homesteads, namely John McNeel, Thomas McNeill, Moses Moore, Peter Lightner, James Ewing, Henry Harper, John Moore, Felix Grimes, Samuel Waugh, James Waugh, John Buckley, Aaron Moore, Robert Moore, Timothy McCarty, Robert Gay, Jeremiah Friel, Jacob Warwick, John Slaven, John Warwick, Sampson Mathews, Josiah Brown, John Sharp, William Sharp, William Poage, John Baxter, Levi Moore, and John Bradshaw.

Probably the first church in the county was the White Pole Church built by John McNeel in the Little Levels.

Huntersville was a place where hunters and traders met and it became a flourishing place of business. It was here the county was organized and it remained the county seat until 1891, when it was voted to move the seat of government to Marlinton, formerly Marlin's Bottom, which then began to grow with the promise of the coming of the railroad.

Three academies were established in the county about 1842: at Academy (Hillsboro), Huntersville and Green Bank (Carrie Stultting, mother of Pearl Buck, taught here). These were preparatory schools for the University of Virginia.

In 1838 the Warm Springs-Huntersville Turnpike was completed; about 1841 the Staunton-Parkersburg Pike, planned by the famous Crozet, one of Napoleon's engineers, was built through the northern part of the county, and on this road was the well-known Travelers Repose, still standing at Bartow. From 1854 to 1856 the Huttonsville-Marlinton Road, the covered bridge at Marlinton, and the Lewisburg Road were built.

The year 1861 saw fighting in the northern part of the county. After their defeats at Philippi and Rich Mountain, the Confederates moved to Bartow and later to Top of Allegheny Mountain and the Union forces to Cheat Mountain and in the Tygarts Valley. For about 2 months in the fall of 1861 Gen. Robert E. Lee was in command of the Confederates in the county. Battles were fought on Cheat Mountain, at Bartow (2) and on Allegheny Mountain from September to December. After this Pocahontas County was quiet until 1863. The Federals under Gen. W. W. Averell and the Confederates under Maj. John Echols met at the Battle of Droop Mountain on November 6, engaging over 9,000 troops, more than in any other battle in West Virginia. The Southern Army was forced to retreat but escaped south into Monroe County. Later in 1863 General Averell returned from a raid at Salem, Va., through this county.

The virgin forests of white pine were harvested in the late 1800's and early 1900's, with big arks being floated down on the floods of the Greenbrier until the completion of the railroad up the Greenbrier in 1901.

The timber industry and the tanneries at Durbin (1903) and Marlinton (1906) swelled the county's population which peaked about 1915, was 15,002 in 1920, and has been declining since.

A big change took place in the county in the 1920's and 1930's when the Government began buying land for the Monongahela National Forest and the State began setting up parks and forests. Many CCC camps in the county worked at reforestation and built roads which saved our forests from the scourges of fire. Today our county has the largest hardwood area of any county in the State. More than half of the county's 603,270 acres are publicly owned.

Varying from 2,000 to 4,842 feet (Bald Knob) above sea level, Pocahontas has an average altitude exceeding that of any county east of the Rockies. Known as the "Birthplace of Rivers," from its highlands flow many rivers, and not one drop of water drains into the county. Its natural beauty is unsurpassed.

The quietness of the mountain-rimmed Deer Creek Valley brought to Green Bank in 1957 the National Radio Astronomy Observatory.

So we look back—and then forward to give a good account of our years.

A Last Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Circulating Pines, Circle Pines, Minn., of July 11, 1963:

A LAST TRIBUTE

We'd like to pay a final tribute to our former Congressman, Roy Wier. Roy died as quietly and humbly as he lived. Never the darling of the metropolitan press, Roy always had the most perfunctory coverage.

We could sum up our feelings in one short sentence. "We never expect to have a better representative in Washington." But that doesn't explain that Roy was a laboring man who cared profoundly for the ordinary citizen. He always voted for the little man with no influence. It doesn't explain how courageous he was. He was the lone Congressman to vote against an appropriation to the House Un-American Activities Committee at a time when it took more courage to displease that committee than it does even today. And it doesn't explain how wise he was. When you'd shake hands with him at a picnic, he would always say, "What can I do for you?" He was used to hearing requests of all kinds. Then if you said, "Just tell me what's going on in Washington." He'd tell you more in 10 minutes than you could get from reading the metropolitan papers regularly. One of the things that bothered him most was the encroachment of the military. We're going to lose everything we're fighting for if we aren't careful, he would say. He always voted against extending the draft. This was several years ago. Now other folks are waking up. But Roy was one of the first.

There aren't many Roy Wiers in Washington. The political charmer whose window dressing of fine democratic words hides his alliance with the rich and powerful, is a much more common product. But it's the occasional Roy Wier who keeps hope alive in representative democratic government.

Progress in Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that there is room for improvement in the American educational system. One of the bright spots of American education in recent years has been an expanding network of community colleges.

An article in the Junior College Journal of April 1963, entitled "Progress in Maryland," points out the success of the junior college concept.

The goal of the State-supported surge of junior colleges and community colleges in Maryland is to make these centers of learning as easily accessible and available as the nearest library. The text of the article by Robert T. Novak and Frank B. Pesci describing this effort follows:

PROGRESS IN MARYLAND

(By Robert T. Novak and Frank B. Pesci)

Maryland is one of the States advancing toward the goal of locating a community college within reach of nearly every citizen. This trend, which is changing the entire picture of higher education in the State, is the result of leadership provided by the State department of education, gubernatorial commissions, and the efforts of local civic groups and boards of education.

The story of Maryland's community colleges began in 1939 when the State legislature, recognizing a trend toward education beyond the high school, created the Maryland State School Survey Commission. In its report the commission encouraged the expansion in Baltimore City of "one or more of the secondary schools to include the junior college years."

In 1945 the Maryland Commission on Higher Education, created by legislative enactment, contracted with the American Council on Education to conduct a survey of higher education including a special study of the junior college situation. Establishment of a statewide system of locally controlled junior college units was first on the list of recommendations made by the so-called Marbury Commission which was submitted to Governor O'Conor early in 1947.

Meanwhile, the return of veterans seeking the advantages of higher education following World War II brought about the establishment of two locally controlled institutions in 1946, Montgomery Junior College and Hagerstown Junior College.

Baltimore Junior College was begun in 1947 as an extension of the Veterans' Institute, which was a temporary organization to provide high school courses for World War II veterans.

In 1955 the Governor's Commission To Study the Needs of Higher Education in Maryland recommended that the establishment of community colleges be the first step in "meeting the demands that cannot be met by expanding existing institutions."

Four community colleges were established in 1957: Catonsville Community College and Essex Community College in Baltimore County, Frederick Community College, and Harford Junior College. Prince Georges Community College and Charles County Junior College were begun the following year.

The State department of education, at the request of the Allegany County delegation to the 1957 general assembly, conducted a study of the needs of higher education in western Maryland and recommended the establishment of a community college at Cumberland. As a result of the survey, Allegany Community College began operation in 1961. In the same year Anne Arundel Community College also came into existence.

In 1959 the department, at the request of officials in a four-county area on the Eastern Shore, prepared a study on the feasibility of establishing a community college to service the area. It was recommended that two community colleges, at Easton and Cambridge, be established. No action has been taken on the recommendation.

Finally, in 1961, the general assembly adopted a resolution authorizing the appointment of a commission by Governor Tawes, who charged it with the task of formulating a plan of organization for the entire system of public higher education in Maryland. (Recommendations of this commission pertaining to community colleges are discussed in this article under the heading of "Prospects.")

LEGISLATION

An examination of the laws of the State of Maryland by Koos and DeCicco for authority to establish and maintain junior colleges found no specific reference to them by name. There was, however, a section providing for "a general program of continuing education" which was interpreted as giving this authority to local boards of education.

Although not passing any specific legislation, the General Assembly in 1947 included in the public school budget $60,000 annually for community colleges. In 1949, again without legislative action, the General Assembly increased its appropriation to community colleges to $100 per equivalent full-time student per year, or $116,000. Subsequently, the amount of State aid to community colleges was increased to $125, $150, and $175 per equivalent full-time student.

After over a decade of operating community colleges on the strength of a law providing for a program of continuing education, the General Assembly passed two significant pieces of legislation in 1961. One statute legalized the establishment of community colleges by specifically authorizing the board of education of any county and the Board of School Commissioners of Baltimore City to establish these institutions to be financed one-third by the State, one-third by the sponsoring political subdivision, and one-third by student fees.

The second law authorized the Board of Public Works to issue the General Public Junior or Community College Construction Loan of 1961, totaling $5 million. In 1962, the General Assembly provided an additional $5 million for construction, to be matched by the local school systems.

The authorization by the General Assembly to create a $10 million debt for community college construction has given great impetus to local boards of trustees for planning separate college facilities. Today only four of the eleven community colleges in Maryland are operating in separate facilities. Of the remaining seven, five are operating in local high schools and two have single separate units while continuing most of their operation in secondary schools.

Plans for separate facilities, however, are underway for these seven institutions. A recent survey conducted by the authors revealed that three of the community colleges have purchased land and are in the plant planning stage, and four are comtemplating land purchases in the near future. The survey further indicated that all of the colleges now in operation, but not in separate facilities, expect to have separate campuses by 1966.

During the fall of 1962 semester, Maryland's 11 public community colleges enrolled 7,874 full- and part-time students. A total of 2,940 were first-time students.

The degree programs offered in Mayland's community colleges are designed for college transfer and terminal education. In the newer colleges, four basic transfer curriculums are offered: arts and sciences, business administration, engineering, and teacher education. The older institutions also offer transfer programs in agriculture, art, home economics, music, physical education, and communications.

The terminal curriculums offered at the community colleges vary considerably. Local needs are the primary basis for establishing these programs. Some examples of these terminal curriculums, taken from 1962–63 catalogs, are business and industrial supervision, business management, dental assisting, electronic data processing, chemical technology, electronics technology, junior construction engineering, medical technology, mechanical technology, medical secretary, radiation technology, and secretarial science.

It is significant to note that all but one of the community colleges offer at least one terminal curriculum. As these institutions move into separate facilities, and as community surveys are conducted, the number and kind of terminal programs undoubtedly will increase.

PROSPECTS

Plans in various stages of development are underway for the establishment of several new community colleges in Maryland. Eleven sites have been identified by the State department of education as having enrollment potential, with five of these in counties already having community college programs.

The 1963 commission recommended that a division of higher education within the State department of education be established so that the department could better exercise its responsibilities to community colleges. Furthermore, the commission encouraged the continuance of the community college program under local control, but with continuing financial assistance from the State.

The prospect for continued development of Maryland's public community colleges is indeed bright. The recommendations for more locally controlled junior colleges and the action of local boards of education, in cooperation with the State department of education, attest to this bright future. Indeed, the general assembly, the State department of education, the State board of education, and local boards of education all favor and firmly believe in public community college education. With this impetus and the continued support of the people, the public community college movement in Maryland can do nothing less than flourish.

Concern With Nobler Things

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a rebirth and rededication of our accepted constitutional principles were conveyed to the American people in the eloquent and enlightened address given by our Vice President, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, at Independence Hall in Philadelphia on July 4.

He stressed that while we believe in these principles in spirit, we have not, in fact, practiced them in granting the rights to all Americans regardless of race, color or creed to live equally in the daily pursuits of life, liberty and happiness without the shadow of intolerance and bigotry. We can all take a lesson from the admonishment of the Vice President, an accomplished and polished gentleman, who has stressed and practices the constitutional rights and privileges which have been legally interpreted by our Federal Courts to establish that all men in these 50 United States have been created to be free and equal. That is a God-given right, which has merely been reestablished in our Constitution. For the reason that more of us will have the benefit of the Vice President's remarks on this occasion, I now request to insert in the RECORD a fine editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on Saturday, July 6, 1963, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, July 6, 1963]

CONCERN WITH NOBLER THINGS

Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, speaking at Independence Hall on Independence Day, struck what seems to us exactly the most pertinent point of the whole civil rights movement when he said:

"If we as a Nation are to stand up to our full height in the world we must be concerned with nobler things than denying one another the simple right to sit down in public places."

Too many, in this summer of our discontent, are too likely to forget—if they have ever considered—the nobler things for which this Nation stands in the world. Two other Fourth of July incidents amply demonstrate.

Outside Baltimore at an amusement park, 283 persons were arrested, including Dr. Eugene Carson Blake of Philadelphia, stated clerk of the general assembly of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., and other religious leaders of all three faiths, for demonstrating against segregation and against the Maryland trespass law. Of that law itself, we can only echo Finley Peter Dunne's "Mr. Dooley," that "if the law says that, then the law is a idjit." But the reaction of bystanders was almost equally idiotic, including admonitions to police to "Drop him on his head," and "cherry bomb" salutes tossed into the midst of the demonstrators.

On the other side of the coin, the extreme discourtesy to Mayor Daley at the NAACP convention in Chicago—which was disowned but not stopped by the NAACP—and the threat of physical injury by extremists against the Rev. J. H. Jackson, head of the National Baptist Convention, indicates plainly enough the dangers of thoughtless, hotheaded impetuosity by those who passionately want the world to be set right instantly regardless of all civilized behavior.

Police dogs, firehoses, and rioting in the streets have produced reams of bad publicity about this country in the recent past, and photographs that lend themselves admirably to world publication by the Communsts. It is dubious, at best, that they have advanced the cause of evenhanded justice one inch.

Vice President JOHNSON, in his statesmanlike address here, touched on many points—including the vital necessity of providing jobs for everybody, regardless of pigmentation or other irrelevant factors—but nothing could be plainer than his distaste and aversion for the mean quibbling over exact terms in the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the 13th and 14th amendments. He accurately held this to be picayune and even childish behavior in view of the challenge we face.

We have proclaimed a faith in freedom and equality for 187 years. The hour has struck to live that faith. Violence and extremism from either side can only distract us from the task at hand. Let's get on with it—without losing our balance in the process.

Taxes: Exempt and Otherwise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the tax cut issue is high on the agenda at this time for congressional action. Some notes of interest have a top priority in the arguments for and against.

The problem, as I see it, is not one of lack of jobs and income producing opportunities but rather one of bad distribution. We seem to be getting into a situation in less than 200 years that it took European countries centuries to achieve.

We are gradually putting all our wealth into the hands of a few families who in turn are now actively seeking full political as well as complete economic control over the whole U.S. economy. In fact, there is a growing suspicion that their aims go further and the full control of world economy between top U.S. inherited wealth and prestige is lining up their counterparts in other countries under the slogans and doubletalk of "world peace," "brotherhood," "humanitarianism," "free trade," "aid to the underprivileged," and so forth.

Now understand this clearly, I believe all of us—good or bad, low or high—are interested in these aims, all of us in the main want to be good, friendly, and helpful to those in need.

However, some of us do these things and promote our aims from a viewpoint of Christian principles while others doubletalk, doublecross and alibi.

The world's welfare revolves on an economic axis and until we can get all peoples to realize that work of some kind must be performed by all of us in order to serve the common good, these aims will only serve to make paupers out of some and princes out of others.

For instance, here in the United States we have 1 percent of all U.S. adults owning 28 percent of all the personal wealth in the Nation. This same 1 percent of our adults actually represent only about one-half of 1 percent of our total population and yet they hold 76 percent of all corporation stocks and 100 percent of all State and local tax exempt bonds.

This means that all the billions of dollars of local and State personal income producing obligations are scot free of all taxes. For instance, a person having $50,000 income earned would pay about $23,000 in income taxes but by buying tax exempts he apys nothing. The same person putting his money into savings and investments that are taxable would pay $12,500 taxes.

You can see why the 1 percent of heads of families in the United States own all the tax-exempt bonds while the workingmen and lower income bracket earners of $10,000 or less pay taxes on 90 percent of their earnings at the highest rate of taxation.

In fact, although the law calls for a 91 percent tax on a million dollar income, the average paid is only 28 percent because of loopholes, exemptions, and so forth.

In 1960, out of the entire national income, after taxes, 20 percent of the richest people got 44 percent while 80 percent or the rest of all the people got 56 percent.

It is not a socialist plan or even a radical plan to have all citizens pay their share of taxes. When we have gimmicks the only thing that happens is that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

Only 2 percent of total U.S. income was received by 7 million families while 3½ million families received 23 percent of total income. These facts are sobering to those amongst us who are worried about chronic unemployment and the situation as outlined by Leon Keyserling, chief economic adviser under Truman, whose studies show 40 percent of all Americans living in poverty and deprivation.

It is true that this poverty group is hidden because it is scattered over our 50 States but it is there, and here, even if we cannot see it. According to Keyserling and a report made recently to the President by a special group studying our economy, we may have more underprivileged than some nations we are pouring aid into.

Another false, double talk propaganda line, by the well-heeled lobby for the privileged taxpayers is that if greater tax breaks are given to high, upper-bracket incomes it will stimulate investments and in turn create more employment.

How silly can we get, all of us—those who promote such tripe and those of us who believe it?

How can any sound argument be made for such a silly economic fallacy when we now have over 17 percent of our production capacity idle and millions unemployed? The answer is not production at this stage, but rather income and consumption.

Automation can be a blessing but when it is used to cut out labor, produce surplus, and increase the top profit brackets and incomes, it is a curse on the body politic.

It causes more unemployment, higher taxes on the poor people, lessens consumption, for as one economist said:

> I've never seen an automat get its shirt cleaned, get a shave, have a lawyer, see a doctor, or sit down to eat the produce of our farms.

We have reached a crossroad in our economy and a decision must be made. Either we put people to work producing goods and services, create purchasing power in the hands of the masses or we develop into a two-class society, those who are lucky enough to inherit wealth and prestige and the rest of us who will live in a restricted income economy like the millions of peasants all over the world in those nations where the inheritor of wealth and prestige have lived in luxury while the main body of the populace lived in hand-to-mouth existence.

My parents and millions more ran away from the closed societies of the old countries and if this generation of their offspring allows this to happen here in the greatest land of opportunity ever created by man, then their hopes for peace, friendship and brotherly consideration amongst the peoples of all nations will be as dead as the proverbial dodo bird.

Even in the so-called broad based taxes such as excise, sales and use taxes, the little fellow carries the load.

Those amongst us in the lower brackets spent 92 to 94 cents of our income on goods and services while those in the upper brackets spent less than 25 cents out of a dollar.

This means that a 5-percent sales tax is about 4½-percent effective on the lower income group while it is only about a 1½-percent tax upon the high incomes.

The truth of the matter is that instead of spreading our income in a fashion that would insure the greatest possible market basket distribution we are gradually but surely wiping out the leveling in our society provided by the middle income earner, a phenomena peculiar to the U.S. economy and most responsible for our economic, civic, and political growth.

Every year sees less and less workers climbing out of the ditch, becoming self-employed and employers in their own right. The day of the self-made man and unlimited horizons appears to have been trampled underfoot by the inheritors of exorbitant tax-exempt wealth.

No single business can be saved if one of our large monopolistic-type industries, chain stores or fabricators wants to take it over. Antitrust antimonopoly laws become useless in our domestic economy because of the internationalization of our large corporations, producers, importers, exporters and processors who must, of a necessity, if they seek survival in world markets, become part of the foreign cartels and combines, syndicates and state-controlled production and distribution systems.

Recently we witnessed the takeover of U.S. foreign-based investments in many countries. Some, like in Cuba, were taken over without compensation, others in Brazil were supposed to be paid for while many are just being taxed out of U.S. control.

The latest country to show its economic fangs to the profiteering U.S. companies who have subsidiaries in foreign countries for many reasons not the least of which is cheap labor, foreign tax concessions and a haven away from U.S. income taxes, is our neighbor, Canada.

I quote from the U.S. News, June 24, 1963:

> Tax penalties are to be applied to U.S. corporations that operate subsidiaries in Canada. Canada's new budget calls definitely for a "Canada first" policy in industry.
>
> Here are the highlights:
>
> A "takeover tax" of 30 percent is to apply to future sales of Canadian stocks and assets to foreigners. This amounts to a hefty sales tax on transactions that transfer control from Canadians to United States and other outside firms. Tax is effective immediately for companies listed on Canadian stock exchange.
>
> A tax cut is offered to companies that are 25 percent owned by Canadians. Withholding tax on dividends to nonresidents in these firms drops from 15 to 10 persons, immediately.
>
> A tax boost is scheduled on dividends paid by companies that are less than 25 percent owned by Canadians. Rate goes from 15 to 20 percent on January 1, 1965.
>
> A 15-percent withholding tax is levied on management fees paid by Canadian firms to nonresidents.
>
> Accelerated depreciation rates will be available only to companies with a minimum of 25 percent Canadian ownership. This runs to 50 percent on new machinery and equipment.
>
> Tax refunds from the 20-percent levy will be made if, by January 1967, the foreign-controlled firms become 25 percent Canadian-owned.

To add insult to injury the Canadians are going to drive U.S. investors out of control of companies in Canada while at the same time they will coax U.S. investors to buy bonds and debt issues of Canadian companies where these investments are purely investment paper without voting rights.

Another quote from U.S. News:

> The budget also contains a device to attract U.S. purchases of bonds and other debt issues of Canadian companies. Tax-exempt organizations in the United States such as pension trusts and foundations, will be given tax-free privileges in Canada.
>
> Major aim of Canada's new liberal Government is to reduce U.S. influence in Canada's industrial operations. Nonresidents, most of them from the United States, are said to control 57 percent of Canada's manufacturing, 61 percent of mining and smelting, 75 percent of oil and gas.
>
> Some large U.S. companies are to be affected by Canada's new tax laws. Examples: Ford Motor Co. of Canada; General Motors of Canada; Canadian International Paper, a subsidiary of International Paper, Canadian General Electric, DuPont of Canada, Coca-Cola, Ltd. All of these Canadian companies are more than 75 percent owned by U.S. firms.
>
> Canada wants U.S. capital in the future to be in the form of bonds and debt issues, rather than common stocks.

This program is not new nor is it an isolated case of foreign objection to U.S. control. It is a common occurrence and will become even more the rule as days go by and these foreign countries have their industries in production with the U.S. market handed to them by our idiotic trade deals.

Again, I quote from the U.S. News:

> American investments in Europe's Common Market are to get a critical study by the Market's executive commission.
>
> Finance ministers of the six Common Market countries agreed on June 11 that the study should be made. It is to be an industry-by-industry inquiry.
>
> France, which has been critical of growing U.S. investments in Europe, initiated the study. The French Government criticized the recent acquisition of Simca, the French automobile manufacturer, by Chrysler. France also has expressed concern over growing American investments in food processing and in the oil industry.
>
> One French fear is that expanding American investments in France may interfere with that country's economic planning.

As you can see, the whole world is commercially minded when it comes to trade. Every nation must look out for its peoples, its institutions, first, and still give to all others whatever does not deny its peoples of their rights, their opportunities and, above all, their means of earning a livelihood.

Most of us realize the need for employment, but few of us have the answers or perhaps the position of power to put our proposals into action.

Time alone will tell whether we can continue to have unemployment, increased automation, surplus, subsidies and free trade all at the same time without breaking our banks or our collective economic needs.

Madison County, Ill., Bar Association Debate Results in Rejection of "Disunity Amendments" by Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am pleased to note that the members of the Madison County, Ill., Bar Association who attended the recent Edwardsville debate on the "disunity amendments" voted overwhelmingly to oppose them. This debate, which took place on June 27, was the first major public debate to be held in the Nation on this important matter. The Madison County Bar Association deserves nationwide recognition for its fine and public-spirited sponsorship of this debate, which, it is hoped, will lead to even more widespread public discussion of these amendment proposals.

The debate took place before the county bar association and invited observes, and had as participants Florida State Supreme Court Justice Millard F. Caldwell, who took the affirmative, and St. Louis Attorney Arthur J. Freund, who argued the negative side.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an account of the debate, written by B. J. Wander, Jr., and summaries of the general arguments presented by both debaters, all of which were published in the Edwardsville Intelligencer of June 27, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS DEBATE IN NATION IS HELD—LAWYERS AT MEETING VOTE DOWN ALL THE AMENDMENTS

(By B. J. Wander, Jr.)

About 150 persons at the Edwardsville Holiday Inn listened last night to the first national debate concerning three proposed

U.S. constitutional amendments which could change the basic tenets of the American form of government.

What they heard was a debate which touched on the most basic issues in this country's political makeup. Florida's Supreme Court Justice Millard Caldwell bitterly attacked the Supreme Court which he charged is "no longer * * * even paying lip service to the Constitution." St. Louis Attorney Arthur Freund, opposing the amendments, described the issue as "the survival of the Union and the Supreme Court."

The topic of the debate was three amendments proposed by the Council of State Governments to the Federal Constitution.

The first would change the way in which the U.S. Constitution could be amended. It would allow two-thirds of the States to, in effect, pass an amendment without any intervention from any Federal governmental body.

The second would bar Federal courts from any jurisdiction in cases involving State legislative apportionment.

The third would establish a "Court of the Union" composed of the State supreme court justices who could overrule the U.S. Supreme Court in cases involving State-Federal relationships.

Following the debate, the members of the Madison County Bar Association present at the debate voted 40 to 13 to oppose the first two amendments, and 43 to 10 to oppose the third. The debate was sponsored by the county bar association.

Freund and Caldwell differed sharply on the role of the U.S. Supreme Court in the Government of this country. They touched on the basic intentions of the Constitution makers and talked about many of the same issues which were brought up when the Constitution was first written.

GENERAL ARGUMENTS

Caldwell, favoring the amendments, described the basic problems involved by asking three questions: (1) "Which do you prefer, the Constitution as written or as being amended by the Supreme Court of the United States?" (2) "Which do you prefer: dual sovereignty or Government centralized in the Supreme Court?" (3) If the Constitution does need changing, "Which method should be used: As provided in the Constitution or as provided by the Supreme Court?"

He charged that the High Court is practicing a "pseudo-omnipotence," and that "the Federal Government is swallowing up the State governments." Caldwell also urged the popular election of all judges so that they would be answerable to the people. He called the court "power hungry."

Attorney Freund, on the other hand, described the basic issue as the "survival of the Union and the Supreme Court." He described the Constitution as a "flexible" document, and said that the High Court of the land is the proper agency to interpret the Constitution in terms of changing situations in this country. Freund said that, if the amendments are adopted, it would put the country on the "ruinous road to a confederacy." He said he believes the basic intent of the amendments is to shatter the country into separate political entities.

Freund issued a plea to recognize that the United States is a "unitary nation," and that the Supreme Court is the proper place to decide national questions. He charged that those critical of the Court have some particular interests at heart rather than a consideration of basic issues. Freund said attacks have come from sectional interests (segregationists), from those seeking to perpetuate inequal reapportionment in State legislatures (rural interests) and from groups opposing recent school prayer decisions (church groups).

Summing up his arguments, Freund stated that the Constitution is law and, like all law, final judgment must rest in a national court. Freund also said, "It is amazing that these proposals have found support among conservatives, because they are radical in the extreme."

NEW AMENDING PROCEDURE

In regard to changing the way the Federal Constitution can be amended, Caldwell charged that the Supreme Court, through its judicial rulings, is actually the body now changing basic laws in the Constitution. He stated: "Thirty-eight States ought to have as much power as the Supreme Court has." Noting an objection by Freund that States representing only 40 percent of the people could adopt an amendment, Caldwell stated "The choice is between 40 percent of the people or five Justices." At another point he called the Supreme Court Justices "political appointees, answerable to no one, elected by no one, and appointed for life."

Freund countered that to adopt the amendment proposal would be a shocking thing. He deplored the fact that the National Government, which represents the people as a whole, would have no voice at all in the amending of the document which controls their National Government. Freund said the amendment would "nullify all of the wisdom we have gained at great price."

REAPPORTIONMENT

Borrowing a phrase from former Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, Caldwell said that the High Court must stay out of the "political thicket." He charged that the Court has no business deciding cases involving a State legislature's apportionment, and added that the Supreme Court is determining the rights of the people rather than the legislature. He said the Federal Court is swallowing up the State governments.

Freund, however, said that to pass the amendment denying Federal courts jurisdiction in State reapportionment cases would constitute the first diminution of liberty, justice, and equality in this country. "It would deny equal protection under the law," he said. Freund pointed out that if this amendment passed, reversing the Supreme Court's *Baker* v. *Carr* ruling on apportionment, then other amendments would surely follow upsetting court rulings which sectional interests are opposing.

COURT OF THE UNION

"I look with favor on the proposal," commented Caldwell, in reference to the amendment setting up a "super" supreme court. He said, "I would rather trust 50 State judges than nine political appointees." He urged those at the meeting to "join in combat * * * in an all-out effort to recapture constitutional government for the people."

Freund cited three reasons why the court of the union idea would not be effective. 1. The judges could meet only very infrequently. 2. State judges are not experts in Federal constitutional law. 3. State judges are subject to State legislative pressures. He added that the American people are committed to the idea that the Constitution is law, and that this law can be upheld only by a strong Federal court.

GUESTS

Attending the meeting were presidents of bar associations in Missouri, Illinois, and the St. Louis area. The dean of the Washington University Law School also attended. The three Madison County circuit judges were present, along with national, State, and local news media representatives.

A question and answer period followed the debate, followed later by the balloting when the three proposals were overwhelmingly turned down.

FREUND

GENERAL ARGUMENTS

The argument about this question cannot be an emotional one, or it is no more than straws in the wind. This debate is being held in answer to Chief Justice Warren's call for a national discussion of the amendments. The Constitution is amended under the provisions of article V, and few provisions give as much flexibility to Government as does this article.

Efforts to curb the Court are as old as the Union. They have differed according to the time and the circumstances. But the real issue is the survival of the Union and the Supreme Court. There must be first of all an understanding of the role and mission of the Court, and there must then be a dispassionate level of genuine understanding to properly evaluate the arguments about the question.

Too often attacks on the Supreme Court have come from groups with a particular interest at heart rather than from arguments based on broad issues. Some of these groups are segregationists, rural interests, and church groups objecting to recent prayer rulings. These groups are not objective, and consequently their arguments are emotional and nonobjective.

The Constitution endures, because it responds to the needs of successive generations. It is not and should not be immutable. Recent cases cited as usurpations of power by the Court are not drastic reversals and changes, but are the result of a long history of interpretation and gradual change. The Constitution should be able to change in this way, through interpretation.

The constitutional authority of Congress and of the separate States is much greater now than it has ever been. State taxation is one obvious example. The Supreme Court must also, therefore, be more insistent and this is the way it should be. The Court must be a counterpoise to the extensive expression of legislative power. The Court must also maintain a balance of power as a corollary of this expanding public (legislative) power. The question of reapportionment is actually in the same sphere as questions of the basic freedoms of religion, race, speech, and press. The Court has not set up an absolute standard of reapportionment, so this is not the question. The question is much more basic.

It is true that nobody loves an umpire. The Court is, indeed, like an umpire because it does not measure its success by popular acclaim. But the Court must keep its role of an umpire because we are a unitary nation. Major issues should be decided through national courts.

It is amazing that these proposals have found support among conservatives because they are radical in the extreme. This is one more attempt, so late in the day, to advocate a confederation. If adopted, these amendments would put the country on the ruinous road to a confederacy. The Constitution is law, and like all law, final judgment must rest in a national court.

AMENDMENT PROPOSAL

To adopt a proposal that the Constitution be amended without any intervention of the Federal Government is shocking. It expresses the idea that the American people are not citizens of a nation.

Presently, amendments must get national approval through both the Senate and House. These offices do represent the people as a nation. The proposal uses no assent by a body representing the Nation, even though a simple act of Congress needs such assent. Thirteen States could reject an amendment. States representing only 40 percent of the people could approve one. The number of people needed to pass an amendment would be no greater than the number who voted for Alfred Landon. It nullifies all of the wisdom we have gained at great price.

REAPPORTIONMENT

To pass this amendment would constitute the first elimination of liberty, justice and equality. It would deny equal protection under the law. It does much more than just bar Federal courts from deciding cases involving the question of reapportionment of State legislatures.

It would set a dangerous precedent which touches on the delicate questions of race relations and similar questions. Other Supreme Court decisions could be amended to conform to sectional interests. It would prevent the Congress from unholding the guarantees of the Constitution. Legislative reapportionment, can be a self-perpetuating State inequality. If the Federal courts do not have the power to remedy these inequalities, there could be no other agency to guarantee this basic right to the people.

SUPERCOURT

The "court of the union" would have three basic problems which make it an unfeasible idea: 1. At best, it could only meet sporadically, (2) State judges are not experts in constitutional law, a prime requisite of Supreme Court judges, (3) State judges are subject to pressures from State legislatures.

The American people are committed to the idea that the Constitution is law. This law can be upheld only by a strong Federal court. The people are represented in the selection of this court through the Offices of the President and the Senate.

CALDWELL

GENERAL ARGUMENTS

The choice in adopting these amendments is between basing law on the Constitution as it was originally written or as it is being amended by the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court is amending the Constitution—changing the basic law of the land—in rendering decisions like one it has recently handed down.

Dual sovereignty must be preserved. The other alternative is government centralized in the Supreme Court. There is also the question of what method should be used in changing the laws as written into the Constitution. The Supreme Court is not interpreting, but exhorting. "If you change the rules of the game in the middle of the game, do it by the rules of the game." The "rules" should be changed by the process of amending the Constitution, which is itself a built-in "rule." To have the laws changed by a "private conference" of Supreme Court Justices is not in accordance with the "rules."

The drafters of the Constitution, including Madison, "That earnest, hardworking, and not overly bright moderate," had in mind the principle of dual sovereignty and keeping the Federal Government out of State affairs. The Supreme Court is going against this intention in recent rulings, including the *Baker* v. *Carr* apportionment case and the very recent ruling involving a water right dispute between California and Arizona.

The U.S. Government is swallowing up the State governments and the Supreme Court is swallowing up the liberties of the people. "The Congress and the [Supreme] Court no longer * * * even pay lipservice to the Constitution." The Supreme Court is power hungry and has no regard for the Constitution. Indications of this are found in statements by Justice Douglas: "The Court could fashion a body of Federal law," and Justice Learned Hand: "It [the Court] assumes the role of a third legislative house." There should be a recognition of the difference between what the Constitution says and what the Supreme Court says.

"There has been a change in the basic role of the U.S. Supreme Court." Why has not the Congress curbed the Court? Because Congressmen are federalists, and have "forgotten all about the States." What can the people do about it? The only way left is to amend the Constitution.

Judges should be elected, so they are answerable to the people. Conclusions should not be read into Supreme Court decisions when these meanings are not properly there. The Constitution should not be changed by the Supreme Court.

AMENDMENT PROPOSAL

Congress now proposes amendments. Under the proposed change, the States could more easily propose amendments. "Thirty-eight of the States ought to have as much power as the Supreme Court has." The Supreme Court is answerable to no one, elected by no one, and appointed for life.

There is now one way that the States can propose amendments, by calling a constitution convention, but the system is vague and has never been defined, so that the system, for all practical purposes, might as well not exist.

REAPPORTIONMENT

This amendment is proposed because the Supreme Court has entered the issue through its Baker vs. Carr decision. Justice Frankfurter dissented to the ruling for the very reason that the Federal Government should stay out of what is basically a State political problem.

The people cease to be their own rulers if the Supreme Court determines the rights of the people. This country should and must save the principle of dual sovereignty and bar the Federal courts from entering a political thicket.

Chief Justice Warren himself resented Federal interference when he was Governor. But when he got to Washington as a Supreme Court Justice, he got unlimited power without the need of approval from the ballot box. It is this unlimited power which has led to abuses by the Court.

SUPERCOURT

"I look with favor on the proposal" because it would be better to trust 50 State judges than 9 political appointees responsible to no one and appointed for life. The complaint that State justices are interested parties can be answered by saying that the "Federal judges can be tarred with the same stick."

There is a noted indifference of the American bar to the growing centralization of power in the Supreme Court. Political writers use harpsichord prose. Their intention is not to inform, but to exhort. The American people, and the bar in particular, should "join in combat * * * in an all-out to recapture constitutional government for the American people."

Do All the People Have Rights?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the following editorial, "Where Rights Collide," from the Dallas Times Herald of July 15. In this time of crisis when all the emphasis is being put on the rights of the Negroes, I think it is well to consider carefully the words of Judge Schreckinger, of New York, that "One man's rights end where another's begin."

The editorial follows:

WHERE RIGHTS COLLIDE

New York Judge Irving I. Schreckinger has pinpointed an issue at the heart of the current racial storm—and too often overlooked:

"One man's rights end where another's begin."

Judge Schreckinger, addressing himself to five civil rights demonstrators appearing in his court for interfering with a construction project, said, "Other people have rights, too. You can't interfere with them."

The judge warned demonstrators that they can't operate on a mob basis. They had been trying to bar trucks from entering a construction project in an effort to obtain more jobs for Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

The Negroes have rights, but so do the workers on that building project. Efforts to bring Negro rights to the attention of the job contractors must not block other workers' rights to earn a living. To subtract one right in order to add another is poor equality mathematics and doesn't even work out to be a swap.

The fact that the words came from a New York judge and not a southerner, while not altering the aspects of the rights which might be involved, does add to the notion that this matter of rights versus rights is of grave concern to everyone in the Nation.

Most of the debased political systems of the world have defended their overt acts by pointing to the goal as an excuse for the means. But true freedom operates under an opposite rule, and even a worthy goal is no justification for unworthy means of achieving it.

Bracero Fact Sheet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the King City, Calif., Jaycees are widely recognized for their active participation in local, State, and National affairs. They have a splendid record for major contributions to their community and to junior chamber of commerce activities.

For this reason, I am especially impressed with the following analyzation of the cancellation of the bracero program on business as well as farms, upon residents of California as well as King City, upon employers as well as employees, upon Mexican citizens as well as U.S. citizens.

The evaluation of these young men and the scope of their concern are inspiring to me:

BRACERO FACT SHEET

WHY THE BRACERO?

Pure and simple, the reason the farmers need the bracero is that with them they can depend on getting their crops harvested. Many crops must be harvested within a 2- or 3-day period or be lost. To harvest most of California's crops requires "stoop labor." This work is just not attractive to domestic workers. Of 4,468 domestic farmworkers referred by the California Department of Employment only 6 percent stayed on the job a month or more, 27 percent worked less than 7 days and 25 percent worked less than 3 days. Could you run your business this way?

Here then is what the end of Public Law 78 will mean to all of us:

LOSS OF BUSINESS AND JOBS

California ranks No. 1 in the Nation's agricultural production. One out of every three jobs in the State is dependent upon agriculture. These are not farm jobs. These are jobs in cities, jobs providing goods and services and jobs processing crops. This means business all over California. Agriculture is the oil industry's biggest customer in California.

When the House failed to extend Public Law 78 a Santa Clara County firm serving agriculture canceled orders for $30,000 in equipment and $100,000 in raw materials. Monterey County alone expects a $30 million loss in wholesale and retail trade. These are examples of lost business that will be felt by people who have never even seen a bracero.

California is the leading tomato producing State and uses about 80 percent braceros for harvest. Without them production will be cut by two-thirds next year. Let's see what this will do to business. The 1962 tomato pack used tin cans that cost $70,359,076, bottles and glass containers that cost $11,090,560, cartons that cost $12,616,204 and labels that cost $6,274,532. It cost $12,872,000 to truck the raw product to plants and $32,744,142 to ship the finished goods. Fifty thousand workers were on tomato cannery payrolls. These figures meant jobs and business all over California.

Farmers can grow crops that do not require so much labor. Can the rest of the economy find new jobs and customers?

HIGHER CONSUMER PRICES

Braceros are mainly used to harvest specialty crops such as lettuce and strawberries. The University of California reports that in Los Angeles County, a leading producer of early strawberries, it requires 3,770 man-hours to produce one acre of berries. To continue to produce specialty crops like this there must be willing and able labor. Otherwise, farmers must cut production or turn to other crops. Either way this can only raise prices. The demand will so far exceed the supply the farmer can produce without adequate labor that prices will skyrocket.

WON'T HELP FARM WAGES

California uses more braceros than any other State. Still California pays the highest farm wages in the Nation, 47 percent higher than the 1960 national average. Braceros bring wages up because they must receive the highest prevailing wage as determined by the Department of Labor. Florida has the highest number of imported workers, which are workers from the West Indies and Bahamas. Florida pays the highest wages in the Southeast. Connecticut uses these same imported workers and pays the highest wages in the Northeast.

HIGHER TAXES

Farming is a seasonal business; the average farm worker worked only 135 days last year. For the domestic worker this means long periods of unemployment. Farmworkers brought in from the South, or areas of unemployment to fill the void left by the bracero will have the same problem. It can only mean added costs for schools, welfare, delinquency and all the problems which go with unemployment. Higher taxes will be the result.

These problems do not exist with the bracero, as he may only stay in the United States 6 months and may not bring his family. He can only be hired if the Department of Labor determines there are no domestic workers available. Farmers hiring braceros must hire any domestic workers who later apply, even if it means replacing a bracero. The bracero can not draw unemployment or relief payments.

LOSS OF DYNAMIC FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

The bracero program is one of our most successful foreign aid programs. It amounts to the second largest dollar income for Mexico. The bracero program places more than four times as much money into the hands of individual Mexican citizens than the Alliance for Progress with its $700 million price tag. And it is paid for by agriculture not the taxpayer.

More important, the money goes directly to the people. It is worked for; it is not a gift. These people, the braceros, are forming a middle class in Mexico. This new middle class, having seen first hand democracy and capitalism at work, provides one of the best countermeasures against communism in Mexico.

If you have any questions or want more facts write the King City Jaycees.

As they suggest, "if you have any questions, write them." They know the true answers.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, this being the fifth annual observance of Captive Nations Week, with appropriate ceremonies held throughout the Nation, America's newspapers have given stanch support to this important week. In my congressional district, the Wilkes-Barre Record was among those who gave editorial support to this observance and in its edition of Tuesday, July 16, 1963, its lead editorial recognized the role that the captive nations play in the cold war and in the interest of our own national security. As part of my remarks today, I would like to include that thoughtful editorial.

The editorial follows:

Captive Nations Week

America's fifth annual observance of Captive Nations Week is now underway as a cold war exercise intended to show this Nation's continuing commitment to the principles of national self-determination.

It is aimed, of course, at Communist rule in 2 dozen nations including Poland, North Korea, North Vietnam, Tibet, and even the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., such as Armenia, Ukraine, and Georgia.

Congress set forth this list, plus Red China, in a 1959 resolution which calls upon the President to issue a Captive Nations Week proclamation annually. When President Eisenhower issued the first of these on the eve of Vice President Nixon's 1959 visit to Moscow, Soviet Premier Khrushchev went into a rage and the Soviet press thundered its protests.

President Kennedy in 1962 delayed the required proclamation until 2 days before the start of the week, and the Soviets ignored the action altogether. The National Captive Nations Committee, with headquarters in Washington, charged that the late issuance gave the impression that "our Government seeks to play down the week for fear of how Khrushchev and his puppets would react."

This year the President drew the committee's praise for issuing the proclamation early, on July 5, and it has become more evident than ever before that the Captive Nations Week can be one of the greatest assets of the freedom-loving peoples on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

It provides the American people with a chance to show the peoples of Eastern Europe that they are not forgotten. It provides our Government with a chance to capitalize on Soviet weakness by taking the initiative in the cold war. It can do so by retaining the issue of Hungary on the agenda of the United Nations, raising the question of Soviet treaty pledges to hold free elections in Eastern Europe in all negotiations with the Kremlin, and placing the question of the denial of the right of self-determination to the peoples of East-Central Europe on the agenda of every session of the United Nations.

In short, Captive Nations Week is an excellent way to tell the Communists that we shall not compromise our innermost principles and that we intend to preserve peace and ensure the victory of freedom all over the world.

Red Web Around the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since this year's observance of Captive Nations Week has seen the participation of more Americans than in any previous commemoration, I continue to call to the attention of the House the significance of these commemorations. I am especially urging Members of the House to give their support to the creation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. Our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood]. and I requested hearings on the various resolutions calling for creation of this special committee from the Committee on Rules. It is hope that these requests will soon be granted.

In order to demonstrate the nationwide interest in Captive Nations Week, I include in the Record at this point as part of my remarks an article which will appear in the July 21 issue of Our Sunday Visitor, the national Catholic Action weekly, entitled "Red Web Around the World," written by Louis Francis Budenz:

Red Web Around the World

(By Louis Francis Budenz)

During July these last several years, the United States has commemorated Captive Nations Week. By resolution of the Congress and by proclamation of the President, the Soviet-ruled peoples of Eastern Europe have been assured that some day they will be free.

As a member of the committee which helped to formulate this commemoration, I am dutybound to report that in this July 1963, "some day" appears to be more in the future than ever before. Nikita Khrushchev is succeeding in establishing an iron chain of political, economic, and industrial interlock from the Russian oil fields to East Berlin that is making a single complex of these nations. What is even more poignant is that we need to ask ourselves if Americans have not done and are not doing much to strengthen this Soviet power.

For men who believe in God there is the sad reality that millions of such believers are turned over to the untender mercies of those who have as their great objective the abolition of the Deity.

The same Kremlin that is weaving this unbreakable web across Eastern Europe is simultaneously teaching its followers throughout the world that "Nature is its own cause." Through the "Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism," which every active Communist must read and study carefully, it is said as a summation of the materialistic philosophy of the Communists: "That materialist formula signifies that Nature is in no need of a Creator standing above it, that Nature itself possesses the attributes of infinity and eternity which the theologians falsely ascribe to God. By proving the uncreatedness, eternity, and infinity of Nature, the Marxist materialist philosophy provides a firm basis for atheism." (English edition, Moscow, p. 39).

CHURCH IS RED TARGET

We can understand that accordingly this directive textbook of the world Communists aims its main fire at the church as its target for destruction. The comrades are told that, throughout history, "the church threatened with the wrath of God and torment in hell those who dared rise against the divinely established rule of the exploiters."

It is in the background of this deep-seated antigod philosophy, which makes any Kremlin smiles at the church or its leadership a mere tactic, that we have to view what Soviet Russia is now doing. We could learn something of this from the New York Times (May 26), which ran an extensive story finally confessing that the Soviet pipeline was a big threat to the West. Discussed was the 2,500-mile Friendship Pipeline, which will link the big oil fields near the Volga with refineries in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and East Germany. Of this pipeline it is said: "This line is projected to meet much of the needs of the satellites, especially the big chemical industry under construction in East Germany."

But the concept behind the Soviet consolidation of absolute power over the captive nations is much greater than that. In the first place, Red Yugoslavia is to be drawn into the economic and industrial network by its recent arrangements with Red Rumania for great joint works across their respective borders. Beyond that, the Socialist countries are to be used for spreading sedition in the "colonial" nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America. They are likewise to be used as battering rams against the United States and the European Common Market.

In the May number of the World Marxist Review, this is made clear in the leading article by Santiago Carrillo, secretary-general of the Communist Party of Spain. He declares emphatically in what is a Moscow-directed piece: "The revolutionary working people of the capitalist countries hail every new achievement in science and technology, every improvement in the well-being of the people in the Soviet Union and the other Socialist countries as a victory for themselves." With this he binds up the thought that the "Soviet Union and the other Socialist countries" will by their strength not only arouse the backward nations to move toward socialism and communism, but also curb "the imperialist aggressors."

WORLDWIDE TIE-IN

Such a plan was unfolded by Nikita Khrushchev himself in the September 1962 World Marxist Review. He made cooperation by all Communists with the building of this "cooperative of nations" across Eastern Europe a main feature of the current Communist line. Then he stated that the success of this plan would forecast the "future collaboration of Socialist nations" throughout the world. Pointedly he emphasized that Lenin in 1918 had predicted such "a worldwide cooperative of the nations" under Communist rule.

The Soviet leader envisioned planned production, not only based on the union of Russian oil with German chemicals but also of natural gas with the iron and steel industry, of free exchange of raw materials with industrial centers in other "Socialist countries," and finally a single economic unit from Vladivostok to East Berlin. In support of this scheme he declared: "The Socialist world system is not just a sociopolitical union of countries, it is a world economic system."

Then it was that Khrushchev proceeded to show—and this we must particularly note—that the iron grip of the Soviets over the captive nations would lead to two results. The first—"any encroachments on the part of the imperialists" will be halted for good. In plainer words, the United States will be defeated in all future contests. The second—"the aid of the Socialist camp," strengthened by these economic bonds, would enable "the newly developing national states" in Africa, Asia, and Latin America "to get rid of their dependence on the imperialist powers." They would then take the way "on to the highway leading to socialism."

We Americans can ask ourselves: What is our Nation actually doing to help these captive peoples? When will we throw off the indifference that has marked our course since the end of World War II, when we acquiesced in Soviet rule over these countries?

It is true that we have participated in the NATO embargo of pipeline material to Soviet Russia, which has slowed down the development across Eastern Europe. West Germany has joined wholeheartedly in this procedure, but it must be noted that Great Britain has demurred at these rules. It wishes to sell pipeline to Soviet Russia no matter what the consequence.

We shall have to admit that the British have been encouraged in this position by our own campaigns within America to restore favored trade treatment to Red Poland and Red Yugoslavia. Both of these countries had received such consideration until the indignation of Congress stopped that for a time. On April 24, the Washington Post began a new drive to gain such treatment for these Red-ruled nations, and the New York Times followed the next day. It was less than a month, on May 20, that the Times had to cry out in anguish at "Polish sabotage in Laos." It complained that the work of the International Control Commission in that southeastern nation was being blocked by the Red Polish representative. It even said that the United States had warned Red Poland that this conduct would prevent official Washington from lifting the barriers against favored-nation trade treatment.

It is most significant that in the September 1962 directive to push the consolidation of control over captive nations Nikita Khrushchev acclaimed "the central committee of the Polish United Workers' Party (Polish Communist Party)," for having initiated the meeting of the Socialist countries which has decided on this step. That was in his very first paragraph. And then he proceeded to hail this same Polish Communist Party for having brought forward the proposals that the role of the Soviet-ruled Council of Economic Aid be enhanced—for the defeat of the United States and the Common Market countries.

WE AID COMMON ENEMY

We can record further that, in the March 1963 World Marxist Review, Stefan Jendrychowski, prominent member of the Politburo of this Polish Communist Party, proceeds to comment on what is being done to strengthen the economy of the nations under Soviet dictatorship. As an instance, he says that, for chemicals largely employed in the textile industry, the production of these agents will be distributed among East Germany, Red Poland, Red Czechoslovakia, and Red Hungary.

And thus it is that the drive which is being made to get favored trade consideration here for Red Poland as well as Red Yugoslavia, together with increased aid, cannot be considered in any other light than helping those regimes most active in weakening American power.

We must remember that the directive for this great effort to bring about eventual economic as well as political unity from Vladivostok to East Berlin is spread through the Communist Parties of 90 countries and in all the leading languages of the world. It appears not only in the pages of the publications to which I have referred but also right down to date in International Affairs and New Times from Moscow. It rings throughout the Communist camp.

The latest turn by official Washington in favor of the regime imposed on Hungary also deserves our consideration and our challenge. Senator Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut, has not hesitated to oppose the attempt to establish normal relations with Red Hungary, since it has treated with utmost contempt world opinion, the United Nations decision to investigate the upheaval there, and the United States. When it was disclosed that the United Nations with American consent had agreed to abolish the office of U.N. representative of Red Hungary, the New Times of January 23 filled its columns with sarcasm. It declared that "at long last commonsense has prevailed." It added: "Is it not high time to discontinue 'Captive Nations Week' in the United States? This is just as much a dead horse as the Hungarian question."

So today, when a large section of our general press is trying to say that we should deal on new terms with Red Hungary because it has been "liberalized," the New Times of November 21, 1962, proceeds to say:

"The Western press has latterly favored us with a good deal of attention and has been talking about 'the liberalization of the regime' or 'the Kadar regime's milder line.' Some columnists have even cheered us on, football-fan style: Let's have more of the same. They think that what they couldn't bring off in October 1956 will now be born of 'liberalization.' The best answer to this wishful thinking will perhaps be the proverb that the hungry pig dreams of acorns."

This was the expression of Gyula Kallay, secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' (Communist) Party. Does it not teach us that every concession to Soviet power in the captive nations is leading to the spread of contempt for us by the Communists, which registered an added one million votes for them in the Italian elections? It does eem that the time has arrived when the United States should cease building up those regimes which aim at its ruin.

Mr. Speaker, I also include in the Record at this point as part of my remarks a statement issued by the Czechoslovak National Council of America on the subject of Soviet colonialism, which is extremely important, as it is related to the commemoration of Captive Nations Week as well as to the naive hopes for coexistence fostered by many officials in our State Department.

Soviet Colonialism

The Czechoslovak National Council of America, representing Americans of Czechoslovak descent organized in branches, national organizations, and societies throughout the United States, respectfully submits to your attention the tragedy of Czechoslovakia and the other captive nations of Central and Eastern Europe.

At a time when other nations on other continents have already gained their independence, the Soviet Union continues to hold these once-free European nations in economic, political, and national subjugation. Under the Soviet form of colonialism, a ruthless exploitation is imposed by power through force. Furthermore, Soviet colonialism in Europe is a constant threat to world peace.

There can be no denying the fact that this forcible control by the Soviet Union constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights (Resolution 1514–XV–1960 and Resolution 1654–XVI–1961) and is, therefore, contrary to the Declaration on Human Rights and to the very Charter of the United Nations.

This fact was recognized by the President of the United States in his address to the General Assembly of the United Nations in the winter session of 1961: "There is no ignoring the fact that the tide of self-determination has not yet reached the Communist empire, where a population far larger than the officially termed "dependent" lives under governments installed by foreign troops instead of free institutions—under a system which knows only one party and one belief—which suppressed free debate, free elections, free newspapers, free books, and free trade unions—and which builds a wall to keep truth a stranger and its own citizens prisoners. Let us debate colonialism in full—and apply the principle of free choice and the practice of free plebiscites in every corner of the globe."

Therefore, the Czechoslovak National Council of America urgently requests that earnest attention be given to these aspects of Soviet colonialism in Central and Eastern Europe at the United Nations and that a thorough investigation be undertaken, followed by proper action in achieving the purposes of the Universal Declaration on Human rights and the U.N. Charter itself.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to redouble their efforts in support of the creation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. I would hope the Congress would exercise its role of independence and leadership in this field and take this long-overdue step.

Responsibilities of the Food and Drug Administration and the Medical Profession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, we in Tennessee were honored to have George P. Larrick, Commissioner of Food and Drugs, to deliver the commencement address at the University of Tennessee Medical School at Memphis on June 9.

Mr. Larrick makes a splendid analysis of the Kefauver-Harris drug law which was passed last October. He points out among other things the importance of the safe-guards in the testing of drugs before placed on the market and concludes that as a result we will have better and more effective research in this country.

I ask unanimous consent that this interesting speech be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Responsibility We Share

(By George P. Larrick)

It is indeed a pleasure to be with you today on an occasion that is so significant to you who are graduating and to your parents and friends. Your graduation is equally significant to this great State of Tennessee and to the Nation which sorely needs your talents for safeguarding the public health.

In the early days of our country we had but few physicians, dentists, pharmacists and nurses. There were no pharmaceutical manufacturers. The physician carried the drugs he used in his bag, and he frequently compounded the patient's medication right at the bedside. Very few of the agents then available to him could be relied upon for a specific or even a predictable effect. We now know, in fact, that many had no therapeutic effect. Some, such as aconite, were not only useless by present standards but also were toxic.

The pharmacist did his own manufacturing. Occasionally, he gathered botanicals for use in preparation of the extensively used fluid extracts and tinctures. And he rolled out the pills—two at a time. Standardization of potency was empirical.

Some of the more progressive physicians and pharmacists saw the need for central manufacturing facilities which could do a better job of drug manufacturing than the individual pharmacist. They started establishments which have grown to the great pharmaceutical industry of today.

A discovery in 1909 started a revolutionary change in the theory and practice of drug therapy. Paul Ehrlich discovered Salvarsan and the age of chemotherapy was ushered in. The few synthetic drugs employed before then were useful and alleviated the discomfort of the patient, but did not attack the cause of his disease.

You are familiar with the spectacular developments that followed. Insulin came in the 1920's, sulfonamides in the 1930's, and antibiotics in the 1940's. The decade immediately past, 1950–60, was a period of rapid progress in many areas. Industrial productivity increased, the economy expanded, science and technology flowered, and the material wants of the American people were met to a greater extent than in any prior decade.

In that brief period, science and technology importantly transformed man's concept of the universe, of his place in it, and of his own physiological and psychological systems. Man's mastery over nature was most significantly extended, including his capacity to cope with diseases and other threats to human life and health.

In the fields of medicine and dentistry, the Nation developed in the past 20 years an entirely new and more efficient battery of instruments, drugs, and techniques. National expenditures for health and medical services have more than tripled in terms of constant dollars. It is commonplace now to have drugs, such as the steroids and the antituberculosis agents, tailored specifically to meet a particular need. But the end is not in sight.

The present decade, 1960–70, will see even greater expansions of medical, dental, and pharmaceutical research. It will see the application of new, more efficient techniques to deal with chronic as well as infectious processes. It is especially important for all of us concerned with health, to recognize certain factors upon which continuing progress depend.

As newer medical products, devices, and techniques come into being, we must be able to utilize them with confidence—confidence that they have been properly manufactured, that they have been properly tested, and that they have been truthfully promoted. The patient must have confidence also, not only that his doctor, dentist, pharmacist, and nurse are well trained, competent individuals, but also that the tools and drugs which they use are safe. It is here that the medical professions and the Food and Drug Administration have their closest relationship. We are dependent upon each other.

You depend upon the Food and Drug Administration through its administration of the national pure food and drug laws to see that the products you use are suitable. Under present law, we can offer you this assurance with respect to drugs. They must be proved safe and effective before they are shipped from one State to another. We are attempting to get the law strengthened so that we can offer the same assurance with respec to therapeutic devices, ranging all the way from the most complex instruments that you will employ to plastic materials for surgical repair as well as to simple instruments that may be used by the layman in the home.

You also rely upon the Food and Drug Act to insure truthful labeling of these products. Medical quackery has undergone dramatic changes in the past generation. We are confronted today to a decreasing extent with the kind of quackery that used to be peddled from the back of a covered wagon. We are confronted with sophisticate types of misrepresentation which involve subtle, apparently scientific presentations designed to mislead informed consumers as well as members of the medical professions. To the extent possible the Food and Drug Administration attempts to deal with these problems. But to cope with them successfully, we need continued strong support from the medical professions. Your advice to us about extravagant promotions and about ineffective products will make it possible for us to serve you and the general public more effectively.

When Congress enacted the Kefauver-Harris Drug Amendments to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act last October, it placed us in a position to be of greater service to you. These amendments, which were so ably sponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from this State, Mr. Estes Kefauver, and by Congressman Oren Harris from across the river in Arkansas, represent the most comprehensive modernization of the national drug laws in a generation. The amendments will without doubt be a model for drug legislation in much of the world.

Two great and fundamental objectives are advanced by this legislation. First, it is designed to insure the quality and reliability of the drugs you will prescribe or administer. Second, it is designed to improve the communication of necessary information concerning these drugs, their side effects and contraindications, as well as their advantages. Specifically, these two related objectives are advanced by provisions which require new drugs to be proved effective before marketing. All drugs to be manufactured under adequate control. Government certification of the safety and effectiveness of all antibiotics for human use. Prompt reporting by manufacturers to the Government of adverse reactions attributed to their new drugs and antibiotics; truthful statements in prescription drug advertisements concerning the effectiveness, side effects and contraindications of the advertised drugs.

Further, the new law authorizes the Food and Drug Administration to establish official names for drugs in the interest of usefulness and simplicity; to withdraw approvals of new drugs when substantial doubt arises to their safety and effectiveness; to assist the Patent Office, upon request, on technical matters in patent applications for drugs; to exercise greater controls over shipment of investigational drugs for testing in man.

In addition to other far-reaching benefits, each of these improvements offers substantial opportunity for mutually beneficial cooperation between the health professions and the Food and Drug Administration. The improved controls over investigational drugs deserve particular mention because of their immediate and far-reaching benefits.

Formerly, relatively loose controls were exercised over drugs for testing on man. Thus, some promoters of such drugs could and did stimulate so-called research that was neither well conceived nor controlled. A few firms even promoted comercial use of drugs not yet cleared for safety. The new law and regulations under it now require that before a drug promoter may sponsor a clinical investigation of a new drug, he must be sure tests on man are justified. Among other things, he does this by determining that adequate preclinical tests have been made on animals and in the test tube; developing an adequate plan of investigation; securing competent investigators to test the products; and making a proper report to the Government before the drug is administered to humans.

If the reports do not justify use of the new material on man, we may require appropriate improvements or in extreme cases require discontinuance of the tests.

These controls are a desirable safeguard for patients. They also offer protection to those engaged in medical research by assuring them that adequate studies have been made as a prelude to clinical investigation of new drugs. As a result, it may reasonably be predicted that we will have better and more effective drug research in this country.

As you well know, the most careful premarket testing cannot be expected to reveal as much about a drug as does widespread use of the product in general practice.

Sometimes previously unknown beneficial effects are discovered in general use. Quite often adverse effects or contraindications show up only when a new product reaches wide distribution through the general practitioner. It is to permit early detection of undesirable effects, and their early correction that the Kefauver-Harris Drug Amendments now require manufacturers to advise the Government promptly of adverse drug reactions which come to their attention. But manufacturers may not receive reports of very significant observations on a new drug. You doctors, dentists, pharmacists, and nurses can render both public service and service to your professions by taking the time to report significant adverse effects or unusual effects of drugs and devices to your professional associations and to the Food and Drug Administration. Your reports will be investigated promptly so that necessary corrections can be effected.

As our contribution to better communication, we are developing a system that will increase the flow of information from the Food and Drug Administration to the medical professions. This will be accomplished through your professional journals, through releases which we issue, and upon occasion through letters mailed direct to medical scientists. We expect in the future to advise you more fully than we have in the past of significant developments in our area.

Truly, we share great responsibility on the medical front which changes so rapidly and dramatically today. We pledge to you and other members of our great health professions the full support of the Food and Drug Administration. And we solicit your advice and support in our efforts to assure the integrity of the drugs and devices you use.

We salute each of you as you enter your professions and carry forward to new horizons their great traditions of service to mankind.

Out of Bounds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, for once I find myself in accord with an editorial of the Washington Post.

It is shocking to me that any responsible military official would countenance or condone the participation by a member or members of the Armed Forces in demonstrations against the laws of a locality, a State, or the Nation, whether it be in connection with racial strife or otherwise. The action of the Air Force Secretary in encouraging this participation is reprehensible. The action of Secretary of Defense McNamara in partially curtailing such participation is not sufficient. He must go further, as pointed out in the editorial appearing in today's—Thursday, July 18, 1963—Washington Post entitled "Out of Bounds."

It all goes back to whether or not this administration is encouraging and agitating the demonstrations that are taking place throughout the width and breadth of our land which have practically developed into armed insurrection. I say frankly that if the white people of the South were doing such, the military might of the Nation would have been thrown against them. It is surprising that the white people who are in the vast majority countenance such action. It is very doubtful if they will continue long to tolerate such.

I take this means of calling to the attention of the Secretary of Defense the editorial which points out cogently what should be done regarding the participation of military personnel in these demonstrations. It remains to be seen whether or not the Secretary follows through, as it is clearly his duty to do.

The editorial entitled "Out of Bounds" is as follows:

OUT OF BOUNDS

It should not have been necessary for Secretary of Defense McNamara to issue an order curtailing the participation of military personnel in racial demonstrations. The nature of a soldier's duty makes it highly inappropriate for him to take part in political campaigns or public controversies of any sort. Like a judge and a policeman, he must necessarily forego his right to exert an influence on the policy-making process so long as he remains under military discipline.

The Air Force had permitted its personnel to demonstrate either for or against civil rights if they were off duty and not in uniform and if there was no danger to themselves or damage to Government property. Although Secretary McNamara has not flatly reversed this policy, he has shifted the emphasis from permission to demonstrate to the serviceman's responsibility to avoid any even off-duty connection with demonstrations that could lead to violence. The Secretary has left the door slightly ajar so far as wholly peaceful and lawful demonstrations are concerned, but who can tell in advance when violence is likely to result from a show of strength in an emotionally charged atmosphere?

We think the Secretary would have been on sounder ground if he had declared racial demonstrations to be out of bounds for military personnel in all circumstances. Soldiers who may be called upon to enforce the law should not be under the handicap of having joined in a public outcry for or against it. The only reasonable question that may be raised about the Secretary's order, therefore, is whether it goes far enough.

Modern Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLETON J. KING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared recently in the Troy Record newspaper, Troy, N.Y. The article by Mr. Dwight Marvin, former editor of the Troy Record is recommended as required reading for those interested in the declining popularity of the present administration.

I believe Mr. Marvin's article is thought provoking and I am pleased to call it to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

MODERN DEMOCRACY

(By Dwight Marvin)

In a modern democracy good looks, charm, personality and money are the effective influences. It is a far cry from the ideals of Thomas Jefferson. He preached the certainty that, if the people ruled, they would always pick their best, most trustworthy men to represent them.

Perhaps that was true in Jefferson's day. It hasn't been true for a good many years. It certainly is not true today. If we had any way of ascertaining what the voters deeply desired—not what they emotionally support—perhaps the Jeffersonian doctrine would persist. But there is no way this can be done.

Elections are massive stage plays, dramas put forward by organized parties, with no interest whatever in the capacity of their representatives. The only principle is to nominate the most attractive candidates and then tout them with millions of money, thousands of lies, and hundreds of appeals to political loyalties.

It is practically impossible to show the average American that the four closest advisers of the President today are all former ADA men, an organization once considered a body of fellow travelers. It is difficult to arouse public sentiment against such men as Chester Bowles and half a dozen men of his ilk—although they represent nothing the average American considers endurable. It is an impossibility to stem admiration for Bobby Kennedy, the Attorney General, who holds the top legal position in Government—although admittedly he has never practiced law, has never tried a case, has never written so much as an appellate brief. He is merely a delightful political henchman and promoter—and a Kennedy.

Anyone who studies the present Government carefully is amazed at the substantial number of intense leftists, many of them branded in other days as conspirators working with Communists and others of their sort. The whole trend of the moment is toward a welfare state; and the Kennedy program is largely based upon that objective—whether he knows it or not.

The Role of the University of Wisconsin in Planning Reforms for Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the folowing recent article by Loren H. Osman in the Milwaukee Journal:

Through a nerve center in stately Agricultural hall of the University of Wisconsin, brain power to achieve agricultural reforms in Latin America may be developing.

Just past its first birthday, the land tenure center here shows signs of becoming a significant force in the trouble ridden countries south of the border. Many of the problems there, it is generally agreed, arise from a poorly organized agriculture.

The center is seeking answers to questions such as these: What is a country's land ownership structure? What is being done to reform it? Are there new land settlement projects? How does land redistribution affect production?

It is too early for the answers to be coming in. Findings will appear as research papers. But even before their publication, results may be seen as subtle influences in Latin American policy. This is because the project involves Latins themselves, both as trainees and researchers. And since U.S. money is involved, results also should filter into foreign policies of this country.

AID PAYS MOST OF COST

The University of Wisconsin stepped into international land problems after long experience in the field here. One of its early economists, Richard T. Ely, was interested in land tenure back in 1893. In 1951, the university was host to a world meeting on land tenure in which 40 countries were represented. Thirty participants stayed to study a year.

"We have been interested because, if there is any development, there must be increased food production," explained Raymond Penn, University of Wisconsin campus coordinator of the center. "We feel that the way the Latin people control their land governs the incentives of the individual and is a most important factor in improving the level of living."

For political and financial reasons, the University of Wisconsin needed help as it broadened its scope. That came when a 3-year contract was signed in May 1962, with the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID).

The agreement was for the University of Wisconsin and AID jointly to set up a program of research and training in economic, social, political, legal, and administrative aspects of land matters in Latin America. The budget was set at $1,393,275, of which AID was to furnish $1,250,000. In the first year $167,222 was spent. This will increase as the program gathers steam.

About 50 persons have been sent to Latin America, and 25 are now there. Some were students but most were staff members—not only from the University of Wisconsin, but also from other universities where professional workers expressed an interest.

Research fellowships have been offered. The center can hire local persons to do fieldwork and if its is satisfactory, they can be brought in for graduate work. A strong part of the program, it was emphasized, is the training of Latin Americans who can provide future leadership.

GROUPS IN FIVE COUNTRIES

Research groups are at work in Costa Rica, Colombia, Brazil, Bolivia, and Chile. The work may be expanded into the Dominican Republic, Venezuela, Mexico, and Central American countries, but this would take money.

These arrangements have been worked out:

At the National University of Colombia two persons are working with the sociology faculty. There also is a working relationship with a public corporation operating in the Cauca Valley.

Three University of Wisconsin staffers are going to the National University of Chile in the next 2 years.

An arrangement has been worked out with the University of Rio Grande do Sul in southern Brazil.

At the University of Costa Rica the center is cooperating with the Council of Central American Universities and the Inter-American Institute for Agricultural Sciences, an agency of the Organization of American States.

The center is cooperating with the Commitee for Inter-American Development of Agriculture in a survey of the land tenure situation. Two University of Wisconsin technicians are in Brazil working on the project. One will help write the final report.

In selecting research subjects, ideas are threshed out in seminars that range over many fields. Land tenure, the staff points out, is not solely a matter of economics. AID also indicated that the aspects of sociology and government must be included, so other university departments than agricultural economics are participating.

The program, of course, has not been without its critics. A "Committee for Wisconsin Money for Wisconsin People" has questioned in a mimeographed letter why State citizens are asked to finance centers that extend "all the way to South America."

Penn's reply: "A great university has to do research in other countries, or it is not worthy of its position. We can't run from that responsibility."

Some observers have been concerned that the University of Wisconsin has not been as active in the foreign field as other land grant colleges, which have operated university-to-university contracts.

The land tenure center is serving as a prelude to great University of Wisconsin efforts on the international scene. Recently the position of associate director for international agriculture programs was created. After study, including a South American tour by University of Wisconsin staffers, that program also will begin to take shape.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the fifth annual observance of Captive Nations Week, and I am happy to join my distinguished colleagues in commemorating this significant event.

Seven years have passed since the dramatic upheavals in Eastern Europe during 1956 focused public attention on the plight of the 100 million people behind the Iron Curtain. For us in the free world the events of 1956 proved to be an extremely painful experience, for we had to stand by helpless as the freedom fighters of Poznan, Budapest and elsewhere struggled against great odds to throw off the yoke of a hated oppresser—the Soviet Union. We could do nothing to prevent the Red Army from brutally suppressing these revolts. Nor could we encourage more widespread anti-Soviet revolutions in the captive nations knowing that bloody reprisals would be forthcoming. We were caught in a dilemma: We wanted to help the captive peoples in their struggle for independence and liberty, yet we were unable to give effective assistance for fear of triggering world war III.

Today we still face this dilemma, although it is not posed in such stark terms as during the uprising of 1956. Developments in the Communist satellites since then have brought us to realize that the eventual liberation of these captive peoples will probably result from evolution instead of revolution. It must be our task to further this process by constantly voicing our concern for their fate and by encouraging greater autonomy from the Kremlin. Above all, we must maintain our steadfast dedication to the goal expressed in President Kennedy's Captive Nations Week proclamation—the fulfillment of "the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty."

Text of Address by Congressman John Brademas, Captive Nations Week Dinner, July 17, 1963, National Press Club, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include in the RECORD a speech by our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, JOHN BRADEMAS, which was delivered at the Captive Nations dinner, July 17, 1963, here in Washington.

Indiana was pointed out by the Assembly of Captive Nations by an award because of its activities in behalf of the people of the Captive Nations of the world. The remarks by our colleague were delivered as he accepted the award on behalf of the State of Indiana:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS, CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK DINNER, JULY 17, 1963, NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C.

It is a great pleasure for me to accept this award on behalf of Gov. Matthew Welsh and the people of Indiana.

The citizens of my State are proud that, because of the actions of our delegation in Congress, of our Governor and State legislature, of the press and many community organizations, Indiana has been chosen to receive this honor from the Assembly of Captive European Nations.

I must say, however, that support for the oppressed peoples of the world seems to me less a cause for special commendation than a natural duty of all freedom-loving men and women.

I want to salute the Assembly of Captive European Nations for its continuing and dedicated leadership in dramatizing the plight of the millions throughout the world, in Eastern Europe and elsewhere, who live their lives under the tyranny of Communist rule.

I have the honor to represent in Congress many thousands of persons whose origins are in the nations now captive in Eastern Europe. Indeed, only last fall I had an opportunity to visit two of these countries, Poland and Czechoslovakia.

In the grey mist of the ancient city of Prague, I saw the grim and deadening effect of Stalinism. Even the street lights of Prague were dim and flickering as if to reflect the despair of a people without freedom.

In Warsaw and Krakow and Czestochowa, I felt, in conversations with writers and teachers and students, the intense desire of the Polish people to speak their minds without fear of the informer or the knock on the door.

Happily, that desire is permitted to burn more brightly in Poland than elsewhere in Eastern Europe, but even now the Gomulka government is, with the dampening hand of conformity, seeking to snuff out the dangerous fires of free thought.

I have seen as well in Moscow and Leningrad and Kiev the trappings of the modern Communist state and observed what it does to narrow and confine and distort the lives of human beings.

And I have seen, as many of you have seen, and as President Kennedy saw last month, the wall of shame that divides the great city of Berlin.

As President Kennedy told that vast outpouring of peoples: "There are many people in the world who really don't understand, or say they don't, what is the great issue between the free world and the Communist world. Let them come to Berlin."

It is with some feeling therefore that I would venture one proposition to you tonight. It is this—that the case of the Captive Nations must never be conceived as a problem apart from the mainstream of Free World policy.

GLOBAL STRUGGLE

For we are engaged in a global struggle involving the fundamentals of our faith as a free people, and the fate of the tens of millions of peoples now living under Communist dictatorships is a crucial factor in that struggle.

Therefore, even as Averell Harriman, a tried and tested and tough expert in dealing with the Soviets, talks with them in Moscow about the prospects of a nuclear test ban, we must maintain our commitment to a powerful military defense and to a foreign policy that will seize every opportunity to press for freedom for the peoples now living under Communist dictatorship.

Let us be soberly aware of the threat of nuclear destruction. To fail in this awareness would be the height of irresponsibility. Yet let us be equally aware that the task of achieving freedom for all peoples is no less significant or compelling.

We must then never agree with the Communist World that the situation in Eastern Europe is to be forever frozen. Our policy toward the captive nations must not be based on an acceptance of the status quo.

Our commitment is now and must continue to be aimed at the ultimate and complete freedom of the peoples caged behind the Iron Curtain.

Yet no man has an easy prescription for resolving the extraordinary and complex problems we face in seeking to expand the horizons of freedom. I believe, however, that in Eastern Europe, one of the most critical areas in the struggle for freedom, there are conditions of change which are hopeful.

For as President Kennedy said last month in his great speech at the Free University of Berlin. "The people of Eastern Europe, even after 18 years of oppression, are not immune to change. The truth never dies, the desire for liberty can never be fully suppressed."

What are some of these signs of change to which the President referred?

First, we are now witnessing the deepening and savage warfare between Moscow and Peking for authority over the Communist world. To suggest that this bitter division is mere shadow play would be to ignore the obvious. Of course, to suggest that the Sino-Soviet split solves all our problems would be foolish.

Second, there are many signs of troubles within the Captive Nations.

Gomulka has postponed the Polish Party Congress for a year or more for fear it might bring the struggles between warring factions in that country to an uncontrollable boil.

The Rumanian regime continues to resist the Moscow-conceived plans for the Soviet economic orbit.

Clearly readable distress signals are coming out of Czechoslovakia, the longest holdout against even slight deviations from Stalinist rigidity.

FALTERING COMMUNIST ECONOMY

Third, we are witnessing the increasing contrast between a faltering Communist economic system in Eastern Europe and a growing, vigorous economy in Western Europe. We may be legitimately concerned about the step-by-step advance of the new European economic community and about American relations with it. But we surely cannot view free Europe alongside totalitarian Europe without concluding that the future belongs to the free.

And finally, our hope can reside as firmly as ever in that most constant force for freedom, the peoples of Eastern Europe and their spirit of resistance to Communist oppression—a spirit of courage and quiet determination so well known that I need not dwell on it here.

Clearly, the Communist ship in Eastern Europe is floating on a sea of troubles.

We should therefore lose no opportunity for imaginatively exploiting these troubles to press the Communists for a greater degree of freedom for the peoples of the captive nations wherever and whenever there is a prudent and reasonable expectation that our efforts to do so can be effective.

EISENHOWER AND KENNEDY

For example, there is increasing talk of opening lines of trade between West and East. Provided that such lines of trade are managed on the free world side with careful selectivity and a clear sense of political purpose, they can be—as both Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy have recognized—valuable weapons with which to weaken Soviet influence in East Europe.

Trade agreements aimed at those faltering areas of the Eastern European economies where Soviet master planning has failed could be a means of undermining the systems of rigid economic control by which the Communist regimes try to fortify their grip on the peoples' lives.

I need hardly add that, unmanaged or left to Soviet initiative, a rise in East-West trade could have an opposite and damaging effect.

Should we not therefore consider meeting with our Western European partners to devise a concerted system of control that will transform this question of trade into a weapon for freedom?

I offer this thought only as one example of the range of possibilities which merit serious consideration if we are to carry the struggle for freedom into the captive nations. In doing so, I reiterate that in no way does this suggestion mean nor do I mean that our policy toward captive nations should be based on an acceptance of the status quo.

PEIPING-MOSCOW SPLIT

Let me add one other observation which is perhaps appropriate at a time when the Peiping-Moscow split is on one side of the front page and the nuclear test ban talks are on the other.

There are those in this country and elsewhere in the West who seem to agree with, indeed, enthusiastically, to accept the thesis of the Peiping Communists that war—which of course would be a nuclear war—between East and West is either inevitable or essential or both. I disagree with this view. For we would be making mockery of the cause of human freedom if we were not to exercise all our energies and resources toward achieving the kind of world in which men can be both alive and free.

I am confident, as I know you are or you would not be here, that out of mankind's long, dark night of tyranny there will finally shine the light of freedom—for the peoples of the captive nations and for all men everywhere.

It is our responsibility, yours and mine, to strive to shorten the dark night and make the bright morning come soon.

So I say to you, as President Kennedy said to the people of West Berlin, "There is work to be done and there are obligations to be met—obligations to truth, justice, and liberty."

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, this year as in the past, during the third week of July, it is my privilege to pause with my colleagues in observation of Captive Nations Week. It is during this week, that we as a nation again symbolically express our determination that those peoples in the bondage of Communist tyranny behind the Iron Curtain, shall be free peoples.

Captive Nations Week is for us a reaffirmation of our belief in and our dedication to freedom—freedom for all persons throughout the world, and freedom especially to those to whom this precious right has long been denied.

It is fitting in this month of July, the month of birth of our freedom, that our thoughts center on the brave and dedicated people who bear the weight of Communist oppression. It is fitting that we think back to the streets of Budapest where the blood of freedom once flowed. We should think, too, of the great Ukrainian people, who for 40 years have suffered the monstrous tyranny of Soviet imperialism. And also, we should cast our thoughts on the people of Poland, and of Lithuiania, who have cherished the ideal of national freedom despite years of tyranny, oppression, and partition.

Yes, it is to these and the other many millions of captive people that we extend our hope, and above all, our most diligent efforts, that they, too, might share the blessings of freedom.

In an effort to direct as much attention as possible to the plight of the world's captive nations, I have, earlier this session, introduced a resolution calling for the creation within this body, of a Select Committee on Captive Nations. This committee will, I believe, be a symbol to the captive peoples of Europe, Asia, and of the entire world, that this Congress is firmly dedicated to establishing their freedom.

I am still hopeful that that legislation will be approved.

Whatever may be the outcome of any agreements with the Soviet Union, we can never abandon our leadership in the fight for freedom and our pledge to speed the freedom of all people who cannot adhere to the great American principle of self-determination.

No President can fail to seek any reasonable and enforceable means of preventing all-out nuclear war. But we can never coexist with the Communist philosophy of government, we can never acquiesce in the slavery of peoples.

Mayor Shelley Makes Statement to Citizens on Racial Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I note a statement from Mayor Joseph A. Shelley, of St. Augustine, which appeared in the St. Augustine Record, of Sunday, July 7, 1963. It is such a practical, down to earth communication that I hasten to call it to the attention of my colleagues. Dr. Shelley has issued a logical, consistent, commonsense statement to the citizens of his city. What a great pity more people don't use equal reason in dealing with the racial problem.

The statement follows:

MAYOR SHELLEY MAKES STATEMENT TO CITIZENS ON RACIAL RELATIONS

To the Citizens of St. Augustine:

As mayor of St. Augustine, I feel that it is incumbent on me to issue a statement on a matter of some concern to our city and to our Nation. Anyone who listens to the radio or reads the paper is aware of the mounting racial tension throughout our country.

The causes of this are many. Hotheads in both the white and Negro races are doing nothing to help the situation. But of even more importance has been the failure of the leaders of our Nation to speak out in a proper manner on this subject. In an effort to build political power to maintain themselves in office, politicians have resorted to the old political trick of using a minority group to accomplish their objectives. In effect, such politicians seek the minority vote by calling the majority names. "If you don't vote for me, those other people will misuse you." Not once have I heard a single leader, either on a National or State level, say to our Negro citizens that along with equal rights go equal responsibilities. Freedom of association is as inalienably a part of our Bill of Rights as is freedom of speech, freedom of religion and the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness.

I would remind our citizens that justice demands a fair consideration of the rights of all our people. In recent years the words "civil rights" and "equality" have been misused and abused until their true meaning has become lost. There is no such thing in this world as two "equal" people. From the moment of birth, infants show individual differences. Some are physically stronger than others. Some develop more rapidly. Others show defects both mental and physical as they age. Some are born with natural talents; God-given talents, if you wish, of beautiful voices with which to sing. How many Negro boys are "equal" to a "Willie Mays" on a baseball field. How many white boys are "equal" to "Stan Musial" at the plate? How many "Einsteins" or "Admiral Rickovers" are there among us? No, even in God's eyes we are not equal. We do have "equal" opportunities to prove our goodness or badness before God.

Equal employment opportunity has been a sore spot with Negro leaders in this allout drive for equal rights. However, they apparently fail to recognize that the key to this problem is education. The dropout rate in our public school system is the bottleneck to our educational problem and hence our employment problems, and this problem is not peculiar to the Negro race only. The dropout rate in the white race is entirely too high. In this day of automation and high technological requirements these uneducated youths, both Negro and white, present a baffling problem and are often unemployable except as common laborers. But here again leaders of both races have failed to attack this problem vigorously. Integration of our public schools has not solved this problem. Witness the shameful mess in which the public schools in Washington, D.C., now find themselves. They have been fully integrated for many years and are a national disgrace at this time. The finest educators in this country seem unable to solve this problem.

Therefore, I say to you that personal responsibility for his actions is each man's lot in this life. Laws are made in Washington but implementation of these laws to a great extent must come from within each man's heart. I admonish both our Negro and white citizens to beware the radical fringe in both races. Use prudence and reason so that we may avoid the pitfalls that can destroy the respect and friendships which are the foundation of the good race relations that exist in our community.

The city commission of St. Augustine recognizes the tensions in the present situation. Many cities are appointing a bi-racial committee in an effort to find solutions to some of these problems. However, this is regarded in some quarters as passing the buck. No decision by a committee of this type can be binding on a city commission because of the legal implications involved. The city commission is responsible to all the citizens and can only accept recommendations from any committee which would protect the city from possible law suits by having bona fide legal status. Furthermore, a biracial committee defeats the very purpose for which it was formed. It polarizes the white race and the Negro race and begins with the assumption that there is a racial difference. Therefore, the city commission of St. Augustine reiterates its stand that it is responsible for only municipally owned facilities. The city commission has no legal or moral right to tell any merchant how to operate his business. The procedure for any citizen to follow in order to appear before the commission has been set forth in previous statements.

Race relations in St. Augustine have been excellent through the years. Some individuals in this community are bent on making trouble and have made inflammatory statements to that effect. Parents of teenage children in both races should know where their children are at all times and should not permit them to be pushed into situations which can lead to trouble. It is the responsibility of parents to see that their children are home at an early hour and to know whom they are associating with at all times.

One of the basic ingredients of good citizenship is respect for law and order.

I urge all citizens to report any incident which might lead to trouble to either the police, sheriff, or Florida Highway Patrol immediately. These departments can function efficiently only if all citizens give them perfect cooperation.

In conclusion let me urge all our citizens to show restraint and good judgment so that in the end progress, peace, and prosperity, tempered with justice for all will prevail in St. Augustine.

JOSEPH A. SHELLEY, M.D.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in further observance of Captive Nations Week, I wish to place in the RECORD for study by the Members some editorial comment demonstrating the growing national interest in the issue of the captive nations of communism. The first editorial is from the July 13 edition of the Richmond News Leader and is a most timely discussion of the conflict between present foreign policy and the spirit of Captive Nations Week. The second editorial is from the July 12 edition of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat and includes a timely comment on the nature of this year's Presidential proclamation:

[From the Richmond News Leader, July 13, 1963]

THE CAPTIVE PRESIDENT

Captive Nations Week opens tomorrow, and it is sad to say that it is once more a farce. Ordinarily we don't go in much for the weak idea of "weeks," but this one was a magnificent propaganda gesture until it was deliberately sabotaged by the President and the Secretary of State. Captive Nations Week was authorized by a resolution of the 86th Congress in 1959, and endorsed by a broadly based committee of liberals and conservatives. At that time the world assumed that the United States would encourage peace and freedom.

Last year, the State Department strenuously objected to Captive Nations Week as an "unnecessary provocation." The President issued the proclamation because the resolution of Congress demanded it, but he waited until the last minute and eliminated the fanfare. Strangely enough, the 1962 proclamation never mentioned who it was that held millions of people captive; the President merely mumbled something about "the just aspirations of all people."

A few weeks ago, Mr. Kennedy made it clear that the United States intended to support the aspirations of all regimes, even Communist and Socialist. He guaranteed "a world safe for diversity." No Communist regime has ever been imposed except by force, and the much-touted liberalization has taken place mainly in the mind of the State Department. By any definition, the millions are still captive. Yet the President guaranteed the safety of the captors.

As to be expected, the President was put in rather trying circumstances between his experts and his Congress. Although United Nations Week, which is a bone in the throat of many Americans, got the full treatment and the big buildup, Captive Nations Week is once more played down.

The leftwing Socialist magazine, the Nation say that President Kennedy's trouble is that he is surrounded by conservative advisers. And, if we take the warped definition which says that a conservative is someone who is timid, weak, and unprincipled then, we must agree with the Nation's startling analysis. We should be celebrating Captive Presidents Week.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, July 12, 1963]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mayor Raymond R. Tucker has proclaimed July 14–29 Captive Nations Week in St. Louis, urging residents to "recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and freedom."

Every American should take this pledge or renew it.

Yet, regrettably, this year, the White House seems to be following the pattern set in 1962, waiting until the last moment before issuing the Captive Nations proclamation. This makes American support of the captive states seem almost an afterthought, and does little to reflect the common cause of freedom most Americans share with the enslaved Europeans.

It is the United States that bears the greatest material burdens in waging this war for global freedom. But it is the captive states of Eastern Europe that have paid for early Western naivete and Western defeats with their freedom.

To the European states enslaved by the Soviet armies during the war have been added new peoples in North Vietnam, Cuba, Tibet, and Czechoslovakia. Not one has been returned to freedom.

Is it not the height of hypocrisy to demand louder and louder that freedom and independence go at once to the backward colonies of Africa and then remain silent over the denial of that same freedom and independence to the once proud peoples of Eastern Europe.

Thousands and thousands of Americans have relatives living in these occupied lands. Until they are all free, the cold war is not won and we cannot put down our arms or the same fate will be ours.

Captive Nations Week Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure last night to attend the Captive Nations Week dinner at the National Press Club. Very timely introductory remarks were delivered by Dr. George Dimitrov, chairman of the Assembly of Captive European Nations. Our colleague in the Congress, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, presided with honor and distinction. Awards were received, and excellent addresses were delivered by our colleagues, Senator Kenneth B. Keating, John S. Monagan, John Brademas, and by the great columnist, Roscoe Drummond; Mr. Edgar A. Mowrer received an award and made an address which warrants the attention of the entire Congress.

Mr. Speaker, when studying the following address, please bear in mind that Mr. Mowrer spent much of his life in this area of the world now behind the Iron Curtain and is extremely well qualified to speak on this subject:

I am triply grateful to receive this award tonight. I deeply appreciate it as an honor. I have known and appreciated your countries in happier days, and I grasp the opportunity you have given me to say as an American citizen one thing which I wish the American administration had said.

I believe that the United States has a duty to proclaim your liberation as a major policy, not liberation in some remote future when economic development will have softened the hard Communist hearts of your captors, but liberation in a relatively near future as the result of relentless American pressure, short of a major war, and as the price of peace. The United States has, in my judgment, the means. It has lacked the will.

Please note that this is not a partisan charge. The policy of nonliberation has, in varying degree, been pursued since 1945 by Republicans and Democrats alike. President Eisenhower talked liberation; but when the long-suffering peoples of East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary took him at his word, he found discretion to be the better part of valor. Now the present administration is moving as quietly as possible toward the resumption of full diplomatic relations with stooge Hungary after 7 years of boycott, an act that has caused Democratic Congressman JOHN O. MARSH to remind the administration that President Wilson would never have recognized a government of butchers.

One does not need to have attended Harvard or MIT to recognize the absurdity of demanding self-determination for stone age peoples while making no effort to restore it to East European peoples who have contributed heavily to modern civilization—or does our belief in freedom vary inversely with the power of the captors?

Sometimes it seems as if this is so, because in the eight points of agreement with our European allies which President Kennedy outlined in his Naples speech, you will search in vain for any mention of the common will to liberate the captive peoples. Instead, he expressed the noble hope that one day all humanity will be united as a "single sheepfold, under God."

All decent men share this hope, but the survival chances of a sheepfold that welcomes the wolves and bears while chaining up and muzzling the shepherd dogs are anything but brilliant.

In short, President Kennedy seems to have postponed liberation until he has achieved the millennium—captive peoples may not, as matters are now progressing, wish to wait so long.

Nonetheless, I am personally optimistic, for I have faith in the courage and commonsense of the American people to demand a change in a policy that is neither wise nor basically American. Khrushchev has solemnly undertaken to defend all Communist regimes that come under attack; therefore, how can we safely disregard the Monroe Doctrine? Khrushchev and Mao, whatever their differences, agree on a policy of fomenting further "little wars of liberation." How long can an American President hesitate at the thought of supporting uprising against communism in East Europe or on the Chinese mainland provided the circumstances are favorable? Given a choice between the risk of further appeasement and that of meeting communism's challenge with all means short of major war, the American people, I feel sure, will prefer the latter. And so, I am convinced, after further inevitable disappointments, that this will be done by this or some other American administration, for the future can belong only to freedom. This is what I thank you for letting me say.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is Captive Nations Week. It is a time when we turn to consider the sad plight of the people in this world who are living under Communist subjugation. At this very moment, more than 100 million people in the countries of Eastern Europe are without their freedom and their rights and are forced to submit to the tyranny of Communist regimes. These captive peoples share a fate which is surely one of the most conspicuous and enduring shames of the 20th century.

Not so very long ago, Europe was the scene of a world war. The war was bravely fought and won by men and women who were sustained by the belief that they were fighting to protect the rights and freedoms of the weak and oppressed and to preserve the democratic institutions cherished by the free world. But the tragic paradox is that at the end of the great war freedom was lost more completely than ever for many people in Eastern Europe. For them the great destruction and enormous human sacrifices was to be largely in vain. As the dust and the debris of the war began to settle, the armies of the Soviet Union swept into the countries of Eastern Europe. Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Albania, and other countries were occupied by Communist forces and added to the list of countries for which there was to be no new era of hope and freedom. Free at last from a grim and agonizing war, the people of the captive nations found themselves firmly locked in the iron grip of communism.

It is almost 20 years that have passed since the people of the captive nations of Eastern Europe fell victims to the treacherous tactics of the Soviet Union. These oppressed peoples still live in a state of subservience and inner misery that is unmatched almost anywhere else on the face of the globe. It is a sad commentary on the progress of justice in the world today that so many people have been compelled to submit for so long to such intolerable conditions of life.

There have been noble moments of resistance to the Communist tyranny by the captive peoples. In East Germany, in Poland, and in Hungary the passion for freedom and the rights of the individual surged up and burst into the open, momentarily breaking the cruel chains of communism. It is sad that these brave men and women protesting the injustices and the humiliation of many years of subservience were eventually crushed under the heavy heel of the Communist military machine. But the spirit of freedom can never completely be destroyed; it will always rise up to do battle with tyranny and the forces of oppression.

The fight for freedom in our world today is the responsibility of all people, not just of those who are struggling to escape from the tyranny of Communist regimes. It calls for vigilance and sacrifice on the part of those fortunate enough to already be free. For the United States the future course is clear and unmistakable. We must never give the impression that we are no longer aroused by the subjugation and oppression of the captive peoples in Eastern Europe. Day after day and night after night the United States must condemn with unrelenting vigor the injustice and abuse that is being done. The United States must keep before the conscience of the world the grim picture of the collective enslavement of the peoples in Eastern Europe. The force and intensity of our assault upon the injustices of Communist totalitarian rule must be so great that the captive peoples themselves will be aware of our support and will gain strength to sustain them in their fight for freedom.

This is Captive Nations Week. In the United States, where we have long enjoyed the benefits and blessings of freedom and democracy, these few solemn days serve to focus special attention upon the misfortune of those in bondage. It is only right and proper that the United States, as the leader of the free world, should solemnly observe Captive Nations Week. It must be remembered, of course, that the problem of the captive peoples is not of a single week's duration. It is a problem and concern from 1 day to the next and from 1 year to another. There can be no rest on the part of the free world until there is freedom in every country and for all peoples.

Congratulations to U.S.S. "Barb"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the U.S.S. *Barb*, our 18th attack type nuclear submarine, has successfully completed all tests, including full power operation, both surface and submerged.

Hearty congratulations to the skilled officers and brave crew of the U.S.S. *Barb*, to Admiral Rickover for his many successes, and to the Ingalls Shipbuilding Co. We are proud of your accomplishments and this strong addition to the defense of America and the security of the people of the United States.

At sea, Gulf of Mexico,
July 16, 1963.

The Honorable James G. Fulton,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Fulton: We are returning from the first sea trials of the U.S.S. *Barb*, our 18th attack-type nuclear submarine. The ship successfully completed all tests, including full power operation, both surface and submerged.

The *Barb* was built by the Ingalls Shipbuilding Co. at Pascagoula, Miss., on the gulf coast.

In addition to the 18 attack nuclear submarines, we also have 13 Polaris-type submarines, making a total of 31 nuclear submarines in operation. When all nuclear submarines in programs authorized by Congress are completed, the United States will have 41 Polaris and 47 attack submarines.

Respectfully,

H. G. Rickover.

Reductions in Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Time To Start Questioning." The editorial was published in the Wallowa County Chieftain of July 4, 1963, and it is quite typical of the majority of the editorials appearing these days in my State and supporting my position in calling for a drastic reduction of the foreign aid bill. Therefore, I ask that the editorial be printed in the Record as a typical editorial sustaining my position on the foreign aid bill controversy.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wallowa County Chieftain, July 4, 1963]

Time To Start Questioning

Senator Wayne Morse, speaking recently in the U.S. Senate on the foreign aid bill, particularly with reference to the part dealing with our contributions to the support of NATO, took a strong stand against continuing to pay out billions of dollars annually on this program. We think he deserves great credit for challenging the assumption in many quarters that the security of the United States calls for unquestioning support for all requests from the President and the Defense Department for appropriations.

Morse pointed out that since NATO was conceived in 1949 the advent of the nuclear and missile age has raised the likelihood that the United States and not Europe will bear the brunt of any aggression by the Russians. A missile war may well be fought over the heads of the Europeans directly between this country and the Soviet Union. And, if this happens, it is highly doubtful whether the United States can count on a nickle's worth of support from its NATO allies.

The United States is now giving military aid to 83 countries. There is hardly a single spot in the world which the Pentagon does not say is vital to the security of the United States—from Cuba to Europe to Africa to India to Iran, Vietnam, and Korea. Our commitments in all of these countries costs us billions of dollars a year, but our so-called Allies of Western Europe are not assuming any such commitments to defend themselves or us against communism. As Senator Morse pointed out, France has abandoned her commitments in south Asia leaving the job of carrying on against communism to us in South Vietnam and in Laos, and the same thing has happened in the Middle East. India no longer looks to Britain for help but to the United States. We are pouring out our billions of dollars but the rest of the free world is going along for the ride.

If our so-called European Allies thought that any of these countries which are getting aid from us were vital to their security they would be helping pay part of the cost.

Military aid for 1963 from the United States included $28 million to Beligium, $22 million to Denmark, $14 million to France, $62 million to Greece, $70 million to Italy, $16 million to the Netherlands, $38.7 million to Norway, $11 million to Portugal, $135.7 million to Turkey, $11 million to Britain, and so on and on. In addition we are paying out billions for troops, bases, and military operations in dozens of these foreign countries. What it costs to keep 400,000 troops in Europe we do not know, but it is not peanuts.

Many of our so-called Allies in Europe are now wealthy enough to be able to pay their proportionate share of the cost of NATO and of aid to underdeveloped nations. If they really thought Russia was a menace they would be doing it.

Actually NATO has degenerated into a United States-German alliance and very little else. It is no wonder, therefore, that the Germans, who hope to get into control, or at least joint control with us, of nuclear weapons, are clinging to the United States with the utmost enthusiasm. Every hope they have is tied to support from this country. But, when the chips are down, and we are in a life and death struggle with Russia, Germany may be watching from the sidelines too if the attack is not made through their country.

This country is bleeding itself white to keep up a $50 billion or so defense budget. It is time that somebody started doing some serious questioning about it. We need defense, but defense appropriations are not sacred, and there is nothing unpatriotic or un-American about questioning the soundness of some of these billions which are coming out of the sweat and the toil of the American taxpayers.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the fifth annual observance of Captive Nations Week. At this time we solemnly renew our pledge to keep alive the ideals of freedom and independence which persist among those peoples crushed by the weight of the Iron Curtain.

Since the beginning of the Second World War, communism has made marked advances throughout the world.

Yet Communist expansionism is not a phenomenon confined to the past two decades. Ever since 1917, international Communist leadership has pursued an unscrupulous policy of aggrandizement. The first Soviet Commissar of Nationalities was Joseph V. Stalin, and under his direction such newly independent states as Armenia and Georgia were, by treachery and by force, incorporated into the Soviet empire.

And so it has continued for more than 40 years. The events of succeeding decades have been but further embroidery upon this web of aggression, aggression supposedly justified by "the inevitable march of history." Since 1940, over 100 million people in Eastern Europe have been sucked into the Communist vortex. In not one instance has a Communist regime been established through the free and willing consent of a democratic majority. The techniques have been numerous: Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania—outright invasion; Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Rumania—political subversion; Albania—guerrilla warfare; Bulgaria and Hungary—occupation by so-called Russian liberation armies. Such were the methods by which apocryphal people's governments have been established. Surely the inevitable course of history has something better to offer than this record.

Through the vigorous policies of President Truman and his successors, we have checked the brutal swing of the Red sickle in Europe. But now the Communist tide flows to the south and to the east. In China there has arisen a monster which even its creators cannot control. Yet we must not interpret this growing split within the Communist camp as an ebbing of the tide. Whether it be the nuclear tactics of a Mao or the subversive tactics of a Khrushchev, the ultimate aim is still the same: to spread the shadow of darkness over the face of the earth.

Mr. Speaker, as we have demonstrated in the past 15 years, our Nation is irrevocably committed to stemming the wave of Sino-Soviet expansionism. But this is not sufficient—nor can it be, as long as 22 nations are bowed beneath the Communist yoke. The desire for freedom among these captive peoples remains great, as evidenced by the courageous uprising in Poland and Hungary in 1956, or the continuing exodus from East Germany, in spite of nearly insurmountable obstacles. It is to their liberation that we must further commit ourselves.

For almost 200 years, the United States has led the struggle for freedom and self-determination. The Declaration of Independence, the Monroe Doctrine, the Truman Doctrine—such documents attest to our continuing resolve to sustain the ideals of democracy. By observing Captive Nations Week, we reaffirm to the world that we still hold forth the beacon of liberty to all those who desire it. And until that day comes when those who draw the yoke of tyranny shall be free, let this week serve as a proclamation, that we do not forget.

Congress Owes a Debt of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I know it is not news to any Member of the Congress that the letter carriers are in town. Fifteen hundred leaders of the National Association of Letter Carriers, from almost every constituency in the United States, have been exercising their constitutional privilege of petition among those who represent them here in Washington.

Those of us who have any experience with the National Association of Letter Carriers know that this outstanding labor union conducts many excellent legislative conferences in the Nation's Capital. Whenever their leaders from the field come to Washington to see us, they come with good reason. As always, they have conducted themselves like gentlemen. They have been well-informed, persuasive, and effective.

But, above all, they have been right.

As they have so ably reminded us, the Congress of the United States made a commitment of comparable pay rates to the postal and Federal employees of the Nation. When the Congress passed the Pay Reform Act of 1962, only 3 Members of the other body voted against it, and only 20 Members of the House of Representatives voted against it. Two of the House Members casting negative votes are no longer with us.

The Pay Reform Act of 1962 established the principle that, whenever the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the President of the United States determined that the pay of postal and Federal employees had lagged significantly behind the average pay of workers in comparable jobs in private industry, the President would recommend that the Congress increase the wages of Government workers to achieve comparability with workers in the private sector.

It was the sense of Congress that legislative action would follow swiftly to bring postal and Federal employees equal to the economic advances of the average U.S. workers.

On April 29, 1963, President Kennedy made such a recommendation to the Congress. The recommendation lay unheeded until the National Association of Letter Carriers came here to remind the Congress of its obligation. Immediately, legislation was introduced and, it is sincerely hoped, that hearings will be held soon in the committee and that the legislation will be reported out swiftly for action on the floor.

When we passed this legislation, we made a moral commitment to give postal and Federal employees comparability. It is now time for us to live up to that commitment.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, at this time I introduce into the Record the statement which the legislative Conference of the National Association of Letter Carriers adopted unanimously at the meeting on Tuesday, July 16. It tells the entire story of why we must take affirmative action on this matter as quickly as possible:

FEDERAL PAY REFORM LEGISLATION PASSED BY THE CONGRESS IN 1962 REQUIRES COMPARABILITY PAY INCREASES NOW—STATEMENT ADOPTED BY THE LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS, JULY 16, 1963

In October 1962 Congress passed Federal pay reform legislation which was an important part of Public Law 87–793. Only 3 Members of the Senate, and only 20 Members of the House voted against this proposal.

As a result of this action, the Congress is honor-bound to act toward adjusting Federal pay schedules, on a comparability basis, whenever the President, on the basis of appropriate annual surveys conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, finds that the level of Federal pay has lagged significantly behind the level of pay for comparable jobs in private industry.

On April 29, 1963, the President has recommended such comparability pay increases for Federal employees, to become effective January 1, 1964.

Despite this recommendation, no legislation has been introduced to implement the President's recommendation, and, of course, no hearings have been held.

Naturally, this disturbs the membership of the National Association of Letter Carriers very much. It also disturbs all other postal and Federal workers.

We feel strongly that the Congress should now live up to its obligation of last year. If the Congress does not live up to its obligation, then the valuable and extremely important principle of comparability will very probably be lost forever.

WHY COMPARABILITY IS IMPORTANT

Our studies of postal and Federal pay conditions clearly indicate that the reason Government employees' salaries lag so far behind wages in private industry is that increases in Federal pay come too infrequently. Pay in private industry, in many cases, is increased on an annual basis. These increases are often written into the union contracts and are accomplished automatically without any great fanfare. Last year the average wage increase in private industry was about 3 percent.

Federal pay increases, on the other hand, come far more infrequently. Too, often they are achieved after a long and strenuous campaign accompanied by the maximum publicity. This process is inefficient, expensive, uncertain and time-consuming. Usually, by the time the President signs a new pay bill into law, the level of Federal and postal wages has already fallen behind wages in outside industry.

Comparability, as outlined in the Federal pay reform provisions of Public Law 87–793, would alleviate most of these evils.

In passing this legislation, Congress committed itself to more frequent reviews of the Federal pay structure on an annual basis.

This makes great good sense from a budgetary point of view.

It makes great good sense from the point of view of the Congress.

It makes great sense from the point of view of the Post Office and other Federal departments who are constantly plagued with the problem of recruiting and retaining able employees.

And, above all, it makes great sense for the employees themselves.

EVEN WITH COMPARABILITY, THERE IS A LAG

Even if the Congress does act favorably on the President's recommendations (and we are confident it will), the proposed increases will not achieve current comparability for postal and Federal employees.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics makes its survey at the end of the year, covering conditions existing during the 12 months just concluded. The President's recommendations would take effect at the end of the following year. So, by the time the employees would be getting their pay increases they would be lagging two years behind true comparability with outside industry.

EVERYBODY IS FOR A COMPARABILITY PAY INCREASE

President Kennedy has recommended a comparability pay increase.

The Bureau of the Budget supports a comparability pay increase.

The Civil Service Commission supports a comparability pay increase.

We are certain that a vast majority of the Members of both Houses of Congress are in favor of a comparability pay increase.

Comparability pay increases represent a debt of honor that the Congress owes the Postal and Federal employees of the country. Once enacted, it will put postal and Federal pay on a scientific, orderly basis rather than the guess-and-by-gosh basis it has been on for the past 187 years.

The National Association of Letter Carriers seeks the support of Congress now to enact President Kenndy's pay recommendations into law.

Eisenhower College of Seneca Falls, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in this day when increasing attention is being focused on the importance of higher education for our American young people, and when the proper role of the Federal Government in promoting a wider development of higher educational facilities is being more vigorously debated than ever before, the birth of a new college, and especially a new college based on private rather than public financial aid is a very great event indeed.

I am hterefore most happy to advise my colleagues in the Congress of the recent birth in my congressional district of a new private college, Eisenhower College, in the village of Seneca Falls, N.Y., on the banks of beautifiul Cayuga Lake, one of New York State's most beautiful Finger Lakes. Eisenhower College will be a coeducational, liberal arts college, sponsored by the Presbyterian Synod of the State of New York, but open to men and women regardless of denomination.

Mr. Speaker, this college, which is still in the developmental stage, has been the child of a group of dedicated and inspired citizens of Seneca Falls, headed by Mr. John C. Rosenkrans and Dr. Scott W. Skinner. I salute these fine citizens, and I look forward eagerly to the day, not too far distant, when this great new center of learning will open its doors in my district, and will begin to share the burden of educating men and women in New York State for the heavy but challenging responsibilities of citizenship which face the people of our great Nation today.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include two newspaper articles describing this new college, named for the distinguished former President of the United States. One article is from the Rochester Times Union of June 20, 1963, and the other is from the Seneca Falls Reveille of July 10, 1963.

The articles follow:

[From the Rochester Times-Union, June 20, 1963]

CHURCH SYNOD OK's COLLEGE

SENECA FALLS.—Two major steps have been taken toward establishing a Presbyterian-affiliated liberal arts college at Seneca Falls.

The 3-year, coeducational college, to be named after former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, is expected to open in September 1965.

At a meeting last night in Clinton, a spokesman for the Presbyterian Synod of New York announced that an anonymous woman donor had pledged $1 million toward the college, bringing pledges to $1.2 million.

Also, delegates to the synod's 106th annual meeting authorized appointment of a development committee to confer with the Geneva-Lyons Presbytery, where the campus would be located.

The college will be built on the shore of Lake Cayuga, on Cayuga Lake Boulevard, southeast of Seneca Falls.

The synod approved plans for the college by a vote of 104 to 50. A spokesman said several delegates objected on the grounds that a new college would compete with other Presbyterian campus work in the State and that the synod should give financial priority to existing Presbyterian concerns.

Some delegates also questioned whether the synod could pay for a library and faculty "up to the denomination's academic standards," according to Rev. Humphrey Walz, the spokesman.

Plans for the college were presented by John C. Rosenkrans, a Seneca Falls insurance broker who is president of the Committee for the Promotion of a New Liberal Arts College, Inc.

Dr. Scott W. Skinner, a local physician who, with Rosenkrans, led the movement for the college, said it was unusual for a nondelegate to be allowed to address the synod from the floor. The synod had allowed 30 minutes for discussion of the college issue, Dr. Skinner said, but the debate ran over 3 hours. After the vote, Rosenkrans was given a standing ovation, Dr. Skinner said.

Dr. Skinner said the promotion committee was tremendously pleased by the synod's action. The committee will meet soon, probably this weekend, to discuss plans for hiring a professional fundraiser, Dr. Skinner said. More than $10 million must be raised.

The college, which will have a nonsectarian curriculum, will operate on a trimester system. Students will attend classes 42 weeks a year, making it possible to obtain a degree in 3 years rather than the traditional 4.

The campus will be built in four stages. The first phase calls for a classroom and laboratory building, two dormitories, and a dining hall.

Supervisor Michael Gladis, of Seneca Falls, hailed the synod's action as progressive and said the town board would assist the promotion committee, if asked.

The idea for a new college here was conceived in late 1961, and fundraising began a year later.

Dr. Earl J. McGrath, executive officer of the Institute of Higher Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, has been named educational consultant to the college. McGrath served as U.S. Commissioner of Education in the Eisenhower administration.

[From the Seneca Falls Reveille, July 10, 1963]

EISENHOWER COLLEGE—TARGET DATE SET FOR GROUND BREAKING

With the target date of the spring of 1964 for ground breaking, Elmer J. Porter, Lodi, owner of Porter & Wright Lumber Co., has been named chairman of the college building committee of the proposed Eisenhower College.

The announcement followed a meeting of the Committee for the Promotion of a New Liberal Arts College, Inc., held here recently.

According to Dr. Scott W. Skinner, vice president of the college corporation, the newly formed building committee is a most important responsibility at this time. Just recently officials of the college committee gained the endorsement of the New York Presbyterian Synod for the founding of Eisenhower College in Seneca Falls.

Named to the committee with Porter is Philip J. Olmstead, a director of the incorporated nonprofit college committee. The building committee will have the overall responsibility for the physical plant and equipment of the 1,200-student, coeducational, liberal arts college.

Working with the architectural firm of Beardsley & Beardsley of Auburn, the building committee will be concerned with the type of construction, equipment, building costs, and scheduling of the college.

The first students are expected to enroll in September of 1965.

Albert Towers, treasurer of the college committee, announced that a professional fundraising firm will be engaged in the near future. As part of the services of this firm, a nationwide survey will be conducted to ascertain the appropriate approach to raising the estimated $7 million needed for the entire college construction program.

The selection of a college president and a board of trustees for Eisenhower College is well underway, reported Nelson B. Delavan, secretary for the committee. Delavan told fellow committee members that other college trustee systems have been surveyed and evaluated. Delavan is working with Dr. Earl J. McGrath, educational consultant for Eisenhower College.

Dr. McGrath said, "the board of trustees of Eisenhower College will be unemcumbered by old system traditions. Their duties and responsibilities will be to build an institution of unexcelled academic excellence." For this reason, we expect there will be many qualified people eager to serve as trustees of Eisenhower College.

At the meeting, the group also named Dr. Charles E. Hall as chairman of a synod liaison committee to work closely with the Presbyterian Synod concerning the type of affiliation to be arranged with the synod. The New York State Synod is the statewide governing body of the Presbyterian Church.

Serving with Dr. Hall are the Reverend Richard Haynes of Shortsville and the Reverend Robert Loyer of Penn Yan.

A statewide list of people interested in the development of Eisenhower College will be compiled by the Reverend Kenneth C. Holmstrup, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church. Serving on this committee with the Reverend Holmstrup will be the Reverend Max House of Phelps and the Reverend David Ayers of Canandaigua.

Community and Area Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the June 1963 issue of the Monthly Review of the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis contains an excellent summary of community and area development activities in the Ninth Federal Reserve District. The district encompasses parts of the States of Michigan and Wisconsin and all of Montana, Minnesota, and North and South Dakota.

The article outlines in general terms local, State, regional and Federal programs for community and area development in the Ninth District. As the author points out, there are four general ways in which the Federal Government has assisted in such development. The four programs are area redevelopment, manpower development and training, accelerated public works, and rural area development.

The objective of these four programs—to stimulate economic growth by creating employment opportunities—is, as the article says, the same as programs in the Ninth District sponsored by municipalities, States and the Upper Midwest Development Council.

In summarizing his article, the author points out that the "primary objective of community and area development and redevelopment programs is to minimize the effects of the dislocations resulting from the rapid progress in our economy. Efforts are made to open new opportunities for employment to offset those disappearing due to rapid changes in both production and distribution by encouraging sound expansion of old firms and establishment of new ones."

I am pleased that the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis has called attention to the various community and area development programs at work in the Ninth District.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the article will require two and three-quarter pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $247.50. Notwithstanding this estimate of cost, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY AND AREA DEVELOPMENT

The impetus for community and area development has emerged out of a growing awareness of the deleterious effects accompanying the dynamic shifts which are an integral part of the private enterprise system. Programs have been developed in an attempt to relieve the major dislocations occurring in production, employment, and income, affecting industries and even whole geographic regions.

A review of the progress that has taken place in the nature of development programs since their inception immediately following World War I provides a much needed long-term perspective. A number of successful procedures have emerged in community and area efforts to stimulate economic expansion. These methods will be described in general terms as they must be adapted to meet the needs of a specific community or area.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

As the term "private enterprise" implies, one of the important characteristics of such an economy is the strong reliance placed on individual decisions. These decisions, through competition and the interrelated price system in relatively free markets, result in the efficient use of the Nation's human and natural resources. Although governmental policy often limits or modifies individual action, on the whole the American people pursue their economic goals through individual choices.

The private enterprise system, in conjunction with our great historic abundance of natural resources, has provided a high standard of living to the people in the United States; well over 80 percent of the people live substantially above the level of poverty. This system is, indeed, among the greatest achievements of man.

On the other hand, there is a price paid for this competitive system. Both production and distribution involve a constant effort to increase efficiency and reduce costs, and this often leads to major and serious dislocations. When better natural resources are discovered in other areas, older producing regions experience detrimental competition from the new sources as has recently been illustrated in iron ore mining. Technological change often reduces the number of jobs in industries that have grown up around natural resources; this has been the situation in both farming and mining in the ninth district. The effort to increase efficiency and reduce costs has also lead to progressively more automation. In manufacturing, automation has reached the stage where the total number of workers employed is declining, while at the same time output is expanding.

As there is an awareness of the disadvantages attending rapid economic progress, an increasing effort is being made to minimize their effect on workers, on owners of businesses and on municipalities by attempting to create new employment opportunities as old ones disappear.

STAGES OF COMMUNITY AND AREA DEVELOPMENT

Prior to World War I, community leaders put forth little to mitigate the effects of major economic dislocations. The concept of development through community initiative had its origin in the twenties, during the readjustment period following the war. The activity in this field expanded rapidly after World War II. Some 14,000 economic development programs were in existence in the United States in 1957–58, according to a survey made by the Committee for Economic Development, and the number increased still more sharply following the Federal Government's entry into the field in 1961.

Following World War I, community leaders began to observe the need for economic growth to create new employment opportunities when the managements of firms contracted their operations or closed down. As a result, local chambers of commerce or other civic groups usually embarked upon promotional campaigns consisting of the purchase of expensive advertisements in leading business periodicals or of the development of colorful brochures to extol the economic and social advantages of the community.

Such campaigns proved to be effective for some communities, but as more and more adopted this promotional technique, it became increasingly ineffective for any one community. Advantages depicted for a particular community applied to many others; for example, almost any urban center is "in the heart of" or "the gateway to" some region or market.

Following World War II, some communities continued with advertisements and brochures, but an increasing number began to consider the more technical aspects of industrial development. Local groups acquired suitable industrial sites which were sold to prospective manufacturers when the opportunity arose. In large metropolitan centers, this type of promotion led to the development of industrial parks with easy access to the different types of transportation and with utilities installed and streets constructed.

Some local promotion groups ventured a step further and constructed a general purpose industrial building to be leased or sold, often at a nominal figure, to a prospective manufacturer. Some embarked upon this venture with a specific manufacturer in view while others had no definite prospects. That a suitable building was available, they thought, would—and in some cases did—attract a manufacturer.

In addition to the physical facilities, some local groups also accumulated pools of capital for the purpose of providing industrialists with long-term capital through the purchase of stocks or bonds or the granting of long-term credit. Often tax concessions were granted.

In the decade of the 1950's, new criteria developed in the evaluation of development programs. It became increasingly evident that industrial plants were not located solely on the basis of favorable sites, facilities, or credit made available in specific communities. The attitude of citizens and local government leaders toward accepting responsibilities entailed by new firms was relevant. For instance, were citizens prepared to have the local government authorities expand public services as they were required by the new firms? Equally important, how efficient was the local government, since this had a bearing on local tax rates? As more workers entered industry with a high school or college education, they demanded better facilities and a higher level of cultural opportunity in the communities housing their firms.

There also was an increasing awareness of the limited number of firms seeking sites in new communities and, consequently, attention was focused more on the possibility of encouraging expansion of local firms. It has been estimated that, of the total expansion in the United States, about 80 percent in recent years has stemmed from local firms and only about 20 percent from outside firms attracted to a community.[1] As a result of these observations, local development programs were enlarged from the narrow scope of preparing industrial parks to the improvement of the entire community atmosphere, such as city zoning and the upgrading of public services.

Community development is a more complex undertaking than industrial promotion. It generally involves a comprehensive study of the entire range of public facilities and services, which then is used as a basis for a community improvement program. In some large metropolitan centers, this development has led to extensive urban renewal programs such as are underway in the downtown areas of both Minneapolis and St. Paul.

The support of the citizenry is required to carry to completion such an improvement plan. Even with a Federal grant to cover part of the cost, programs frequently have been turned down where bond issues for proposed improvements were submitted at the polls when citizens support had not been obtained.

---

[1] U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

STATE PROGRAMS

Major economic dislocations frequently result in excessive unemployment over wide areas. In ninth district States, as in other regions, declining employment opportunities in major industries such as agriculture and mining also have created serious problems indirectly for small town business proprietors and for municipalities, through a steady shrinking of the tax base. Furthermore, the complexity of community development programs dealing with this problem has required expert counsel. Consequently, the search for a solution has led to a springing up of development programs on the State level.

A department of business or industrial development has been established in each of the ninth district States. In some States, in addition, public funds have been authorized for economic development. As far back as 1936, the State of Mississippi adopted its balance-agriculture-with-industry program and provided for the financing of new industrial capital requirements with municipal revenue bonds. About 17 States have adopted similar legislation, among them Michigan, North Dakota, and Wisconsin in this Federal Reserve district.

A general function of State departments of economic development has been the furnishing of essential techniques and guidance to community leaders interested in improving the attractiveness of their cities for their own citizens as well as for prospective industrialists and their key employees. As a result, such programs have been better conceived and designed. Nevertheless, the combined local and State development plans, whether financed by private or public funds, have had limited success in solving the problems, especially in the smaller communities. The number of communities seeking business firms, especially manufacturing plants, to secure the prize of a payroll exceeds many times the number of business managements seeking new locations for firms.

UPPER MIDWEST RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

An experimental approach is now being made to the problem of slow economic growth on a district basis. The Upper Midwest Research and Development Council was organized in 1958 as a nonpolitical and nonprofit corporation to pioneer in areawide economic development.

Economic growth in the ninth district since the end of World War II has lagged behind that of more industrialized sections of the United States. Technological change, with few exceptions, has reduced the number of jobs in industries that have grown up around natural resources; this has been the situation especially in district farming, timber, and perhaps mining. Although employment opportunities have expanded substantially in manufacturing and service industries, the expansion has not been sufficient to absorb the labor available.

As a result, in spite of progress made in industrial and community development, employment opportunities have lagged. In most of the States, the total population rose in the decade from 1950 to 1960, but far less than the natural growth of excess births over deaths. The district lost approximately 500,000 people through outmigration as individuals found better opportunities for employment in other regions. These persons, largely in the age bracket from 25 to 40 years, tend to be the most productive and, therefore, a decided asset to this region.

The program of the Upper Midwest Research and Development Council was organized into two major phases: the Upper Midwest Economic Study and an action program based on facts developed by the study.

The economic study consists of numerous research projects divided into three major parts: first, an accumulation of factual information depicting the region's current economic position; second, an analysis of how this position is likely to change; and third, the identification of alternative actions essential to accelerate regional growth and to meet problems associated with change.

A substantial number of the research projects have been completed. Upon completion of the entire study, the research director will submit a report giving the basic facts determined by the study, analyzing their significance and indicating possible directions for future growth in the region. This report is to be followed by one from the council members, based on facts developed by the study and the paths of economic progress indicated. This information then will be used by the council with the assistance of its regional advisory committees, consisting of some 250 leaders from all parts of the 6-State area, to propose an action program. The objective is to stimulate economic growth throughout the area by creating more and better jobs.

FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

There are four general ways in which the Federal Government has assisted in community and area development. Although Federal programs are restricted to areas of chronic unemployment or underemployment, the general objective is identical to those sponsored by municipalities, States and the Upper Midwest Research and Development Council, namely, to stimulate economic growth by creating employment opportunities.

1. AREA REDEVELOPMENT

The U.S. Government entered the field of local economic development with the enactment of the Federal Area Redevelopment Act on May 1, 1961. This legislation was designed to assist people residing in areas subjected to chronic unemployment for many months and in some cases for many years. It is a long-range program for economic redevelopment of chronically depressed areas as distinct from a short-term, antirecessionary program.

An area is designated for assistance under the act by the Area Redevelopment Administrator on the basis that "there has existed substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time." The levels of unemployment are defined in terms of the unemployment estimates compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. For urban areas with fairly large labor markets, the current rate of unemployment must be 6 percent or more, excluding that due primarily to seasonal and temporary factors; and the annual average rate of unemployment must have been above the national average by 50 percent in 3 of the preceding 4 calendar years, by 75 percent in 2 of the preceding 3 calendar years, or by 100 percent in 1 of the preceding 2 calendar years.

Rural areas and small labor markets may qualify on the basis of low income or underemployment rather than unemployment. More specifically, this includes areas with low farm income (one-fourth of the national median), with low family income (one-third of the national median), and Indian reservations with serious unemployment or underemployment problems.

By mid-February 1963, in a period of 21 months following the passage of the act, 996 areas and 51 Indian reservations with a total population of 36.5 million, 19.4 percent of the Nation's total, were designated eligible for assistance. The areas designated in the ninth district are listed on the accompanying map. They are concentrated in the mining and former timber regions. All of Upper Michigan, 15 counties in northern Wisconsin, 19 counties in northern Minnesota, and 10 counties in Montana have been included. All of the Indian reservations in the district States are included in the act.

The procedure designed for providing Federal assistance places the major responsibility on local initiative. After a community or county is designated a redevelopment area, local leaders must develop an overall economic development plan for the area, to be approved by the State in which the area is located, before it is submitted to the Area Redevelopment Administration in Washington, D.C. After approval of the overall plan, local community leaders can then solicit specific commercial and industrial projects consistent with the plan, secure the endorsement of the State organization, and submit the specific projects to the Administration in Washington for final approval.

The overall economic development plan for a specific area serves a unique purpose. It forces local leaders to assemble information on the natural resources and on the training and skills of its labor force, and then to identify or develop possible alternative solutions to the chronic unemployment or underemployment problem. Specific projects undertaken must fit into the overall program and contribute to a permanent addition of employment opportunities. The object is to create new employment opportunities by developing and expanding new and existing facilities and resources rather than by merely transferring jobs from one area of the United States to another.

By mid-February 1963, overall economic development plans had been submitted by 77 percent of the areas designated, and 67.6 percent of the plans had been approved. In the ninth district, plans had been submitted and approved for all but four of the designated areas and in these, plans were in process.

The Area Redevelopment Administration had approved a total of 648 projects by mid-February 1963. Funds extended in the form of grants and loans aggregated $92,105,380 involving 32,887 direct jobs and 16,952 worker-trainees. A total of 125 industrial loans had been approved, totaling $37,156,939 and involving 14,285 jobs.

In the ninth district, the economic expansion anticipated from industrial projects is small. Ten projects had been approved with the Federal Government extending loans aggregating $1,163,450. Applicants for these loans estimated that these projects will create 286 new jobs, a small number in comparison with the unemployed in the chronically depressed areas. Such projects are presented to the Area Redevelopment Administration only when they have been appraised as marginal by financial institutions in the respective communities.

The Area Redevelopment Administration has extended both loans and grants for the construction of public facilities. In this district, funds have been made available for a ski resort, a convention auditorium, a sewer system in one city, and a sewer, water and storm drainage system in another. The applicants for these projects estimated that about 520 jobs were created.

The Administration may have its greatest effect on economic growth in the field of technical assistance and research. In the district, for example, the information gained from studying new timber processing facilities, testing new methods of processing low-grade nonmagnetic iron ore, exploring the potential for recreation and tourist business, and many others may open up new profitable business ventures. By mid-February in ninth district States, approval had been given to 15 projects for the study of a wide range of resource utilization. Most of the grants made were small, totaling slightly over a million dollars.

The training and subsistence program is another important type of work undertaken in the chronic unemployed or underemployed areas. In all States, the Employment Service has reported openings of specific types of jobs and an insufficient number of applicants with either the required academic background or the vocational training needed to fill them. The Area Redevelopment Administration in the brief period of its existence, from May 1, 1961, to mid-February 1963, has enrolled 2,771 persons in a wide range of trade courses in the States wholly or partly in this district. The subsidy paid has aggregated $1.3 million. As the enrollment is limited to the openings in the labor market, employment is practically assured; the program has already made a noted contribution in the employment field.

2. MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING

The Manpower Development and Training Act was enacted in March 1962 to delve deeper into the problem of unused manpower, in an effort to find a solution. Essentially, the training of unemployed persons under the Area Redevelopment Administration has been extended from critical areas to all labor markets in the Nation.

Two developments have increased the seriousness of the unemployment problem. First, an increasing number of young people are entering the labor force. In 1963, 1 million more youths will reach the age of 16 than in 1962. The rapidly growing supply of labor is seen even more dramatically when a wider age range and a longer period of time are considered. During the decade of the 1950's, the labor force between the ages of 14 and 24 increased only by about 400,000. In the decade of the 1960's, the same group will increase by about 6 million. The increase in the number of these young workers in the 1960's will be about 15 times greater than in the 1950's. Second, the more rapid rate of automation in the economy is eliminating substantially the number of unskilled job opportunities. An attempt to break this vicious circle of an increasing number of youth entering the labor market while automation is reducing the number of jobs is being made under the Manpower Act.

The problem is approached in this manner. Present and future manpower shortages are estimated on the basis of current information and most probable future trends. Persons who have the ability and interest to fill these vacancies through education and training are being selected for specific training. The training program is now proceeding at 50,000 to 60,000 per year.

Thus far, most of those finishing training programs have been placed in jobs. In this district, such training programs have been initiated by State employment departments in the larger cities.

3. PUBLIC WORKS

The accelerated public works program was enacted by the U.S. Congress in September 1962, as another measure to alleviate the unemployment or underemployment in the chronically depressed areas of the United States. The objectives are to provide immediate, useful work for individuals in such communities and, at the same time, to assist these communities, through the improvement of their public facilities, in becoming more conducive to industrial development and better places in which to reside.

Areas eligible for assistance under this act are those which have been designated as eligible for assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, and those whoch the Secretary of Labor determines to have suffered from substantial unemployment for at least 9 of the preceding 12 months. In this district, a few areas in addition to those eligible for the area redevelopment program are eligible for the accelerated public works program.

The qualifying projects are of two general types: Federal projects that are already authorized by Congress under the supervision of Federal departments or agencies in eligible areas, for example, public buildings, flood control, river and harbor projects of various kinds, roads and trails, reforestation and range improvements on public lands; and State and local government projects with Federal financial assistance, for example, airports, hospitals, waste treatment systems, and community facilities. Assistance is given to newly initiated projects and to the acceleration of existing ones.

Certain restrictions are placed on the projects authorized. They are limited to those that will meet an essential public need consistent with locally approved comprehensive plans for the specific area. They must contribute significantly to the reduction of local unemployment, with schedules initiated or accelerated within a reasonably short period of time, so that a substantial portion of the projects can be completed within 12 months from the time of initiation or acceleration. School construction is specifically excluded; funds cannot be made available for the planning or construction of any school or other educational facility.

A specific requirement made on State or local projects is that they represent a net increase in total expenditures made by governmental units for capital expenditures. This provision assures that the extra effort made by the Federal Government to create useful employment is matched by a comparable effort from the State or local governments.

Federal grants-in-aid on State and local projects can be made up to 50 percent of the cost of construction, without regard to previous laws limiting Federal financial assistance to less than this percentage. Where a State or local government does not have sufficient economic or financial resources to assume the additional cost, the Federal grant can be increased to 75 percent of the total.

Provisions in the act provide a formula for the distribution of funds among States and among large and small communities. Not more than 10 percent of the funds authorized can be made available for public works projects in any State, and not less than $300 million of the $900 million authorized to be appropriated under the act must be allocated to generally rural areas or small communities suffering from chronic unemployment or underemployment.

This legislation has accelerated public works in the United States. In the brief period of 7 months, over $16.5 million of Federal funds and nearly $2 million of local government funds were authorized for projects in Ninth District States. The depletion of the original Federal appropriation made it necessary to postpone additional projects. The principal type of projects authorized includes public and institutional buildings, highways, sewer and water systems, and conservation and development projects.

As this program is limited to the chronic unemployment areas, the projects authorized in this district are restricted to Upper Michigan, northwestern Wisconsin, northeastern Minnesota and western Wisconsin, northern Minnesota and western Montana (see table below). A few projects have been authorized on Indian reservations in both North and South Dakota.

4. RURAL AREA DEVELOPMENT

The preceeding Federal programs were designed primarily for urban areas. A similar program has been designed for rural areas, administered on a State level. The Rural Areas Development had its origin in 1955, when President Eisenhower urged that action be taken by appropriate agencies to alleviate the situation of low income rural families. At first, the program was limited to those counties with substantial problems due primarily to low income farms. In 1960, the program was expanded to include any county or area faced with problems of adjustment, whether rapid growth or persistent decline. Agricultural extension specialists and others now assist local leaders (1) in developing organizational procedure, (2) in the formulation of an economic development program which serves to identify the problems and to develop alternative solutions, and (3) in helping to carry out appropriate action programs.

Accelerated public works projects in 9th District States, Mar. 1, 1963

[Dollars in thousands]

Broad classification	Number of projects	Accelerated Public Works Administration	Source of funds			Estimated on-site man-months
			Other Federal funds	Local matching	Total	
Nonresidential:						
Hospital and institutional	7	$825	$287	$829	$1,941	1,721
Administrative and service	2	477			477	317
Other nonresidential	78	3,966		42	4,008	4,581
Highways	57	4,246		19	4,265	5,824
Sewer and water systems	29	2,090	79	966	3,135	2,456
Conservation and development	58	4,363		73	4,436	8,441
All other public projects	3	423			423	466
Total	234	16,390	366	1,929	18,685	23,806

Source: "Accelerated Public Works Program Directory of Approved Projects," as of Mar. 1, 1963, U.S. Department of Commerce, Area Redevelopment Administration.

CONCEPTS IN COMMUNITY AND AREA DEVELOPMENT

A community improvement program, not one limited to industrial development, benefits the people already in the community. In most communities, economic growth stems largely from the expansion of existing firms or the establishment of new ones by local people rather than from the attraction of outsiders to a center. Well-planned urban centers encourage an expansion in business activity.

An essential part of the preliminary work of initiating a community improvement program is the drawing up of an overall economic development program. When this work is properly organized, it serves several purposes. First, the working panel for this task, by constituting a cross section of the people in a designated area, will insure wide representation. Second, the assembling of the information on the available resources, both natural and human, and the formation of an economic plan on this basis will tend to eliminate unsound solutions. Finally, the panel developing the plan will promote general support among the electorate.

The technological transition in the Ninth District economy is so far reaching that merely developing a plan will not guarantee the restoration of all urban centers. Since the end of World War II, the population in large metropolitan centers has grown rapidly; in medium-sized centers it has remained stable or has increased slowly. But in the small centers it has declined. The large and medium-sized urban centers will survive, their rate of growth depending, in some measure, on effective leadership. Many small towns will continue to decline as the function they served largely disappears. As the population on farms declines, the population in urban centers serving farm regions also decreases and some of these municipalities face the possibility of disappearing altogether.

Nevertheless, some small towns are needed. For instance, even in this age of rapid transportation, a farmer cannot afford to drive a hundred miles for a new fan belt on his tractor nor can his wife drive such a distance to buy the groceries. The solution may be a consolidation of the facilities in several towns into an efficient municipality that can provide the ordinary product distribution and services required today. This concept has been developed at Kansas State College. The faculty is providing leadership to citizens in small centers who are interested in this kind of a solution.

In summary, the primary objective of community and area development and redevelopment programs is to minimize the effects of the dislocations resulting from the rapid progress in our economy. Efforts are made to open new opportunities for employment to offset those disappearing due to rapid changes in both production and distribution by encouraging sound expansion of old firms and establishment of new ones.

Oscar F. Litterer.

American Bankers Urge Balance of Payments Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on July 14 the American Bankers Association made an important contribution to the growing public discussion of the chronic U.S. balance-of-payments deficit. Among the 12 recommendations of the ABA was one urging that restoration of equilibrium in the balance of payments be elevated to the highest order of national priority.

This recommendation is in complete accord with House Concurrent Resolution 192, which I introduced on July 5. This resolution expresses the sense of Congress that restoration of balance-of-payments equilibrium should receive highest priority in the formation of national economic policy, that maintenance of balance-of-payments equilibrium should be a major and continuing goal of policy, and that the United States should initiate discussion within the International Monetary Fund looking to a strengthening of the world's payments system. Senator Jacob K. Javits and Senator Jack Miller, two of my colleagues on the Joint Economic Committee, have introduced a similar resolution in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a summary of the 12 recommendations of the ABA in the Record at this point:

Summary of Recommendations

At a time when the need for improvement in the balance of payments is imperative, little change in the size of the underlying deficit is being recorded. In view of the absence of current progress, and of its implications for international confidence in the dollar and international monetary stability, we consider it of the utmost importance that the Nation's policies for restoration of a sustainable payments position be strengthened and enlarged.

The initiation of stronger measures at this time may not produce immediate and dramatic improvement in the balance of payments, but it will strengthen international confidence in the steps being taken to achieve a correction of the deficit and assure sufficient time for the completion of orderly adjustments. Consequently, highest official reaffirmation of our determination to intensify the attack on the payments problem, coupled with concrete evidence that existing policies to restore payments equilibrium are being strengthened and enlarged, is urgently needed.

We have every confidence that the Nation can, through prompt and effective measures, overcome the dangers which would be presented by inadequate action or undue delay in dealing with its international financial difficulties. Accordingly, we offer the following recommendations:

1. The restoration of equilibrium in the balance of payments must be elevated to the highest order of national priority.

2. Public policy should be directed firmly toward preserving the existing gold parity of the dollar. Devaluation or the adoption of floating exchange rates would do irreparable damage to the international monetary system, and to the economic, military, and political strength of the entire free world.

3. We recommend the enactment, in this session of Congress of an across-the-board reduction in personal and corporate tax rates designed to improve the climate for direct business investment in this country, stengthen the prospects for cost-price stability, and restrain the large outflow of private long-term capital.

4. We recommend that the monetary authorities permit less credit ease and some firming of interest rates. Such a move would restrain the outflow of short-term funds to oversea markets, arrest the trend toward deterioration in the quality of credit, and avoid an excessive buildup of liquidity which could jeopardize cost-price stability in the future.

5. To preserve international confidence in the dollar and to safeguard stability in costs and prices, we urge that Federal spending be held at present levels during the transition to lower tax rates. This will require sharp reductions in new obligational authority voted by the Congress.

6. Further progress in reducing the foreign-exchange costs of the Nation's Defense Establishment is imperative. Such progress should begin with—but cannot be confined to—an intensification of efforts to obtain a more equitable distribution of the costs of maintaining the military strength of the free world.

7. Reductions in the foreign-exchange costs of the foreign aid program are urgently needed. These reductions can best be accomplished through maximum tying of aid to U.S. exports and through the assumption of a larger part of the responsibility for aid by our prosperous allies. Barring success in these efforts, we see no alternative to a net reduction in the flow of free world aid to developing nations.

8. We urge public officials to marshal all of the Nation's international bargaining strength, which is great, in carrying out its trade and tariff negotiations with the Common Market and in pushing for removal of existing discriminations against dollar goods.

9. We endorse the efforts of Government officials in encouraging the freeing and enlargement of European capital markets. Success in these efforts, coupled with more aggressive efforts to promote foreign purchases of securities issued in the United States, should produce reductions in the outflow of private capital.

10. Government leadership in the field of export promotion has been constructive and should be continued. In the private sector of the economy, increased aggressiveness in exploring and developing export opportunities is called for.

11. Resort to the imposition of direct controls over international capital movements, or other forms of foreign exchange control, must be avoided. We endorse the rejection of such controls by responsible Government officials.

12. The creation of a supranational credit-creating institution which might facilitate the financing of the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments is neither necessary nor desirable. Impressions that the United States is seeking an escape from balance-of-payments disciplines through expansions in international liquidity could seriously strain international confidence in the dollar.

Captive Nations Week Address by Dr. George M. Dimitrov

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include a copy of an address by Dr. George M. Dimitrov, chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations, given at the Captive Nations Week dinner at the National Press Club on July 17.

As the sponsor of one of the resolutions introduced in this Congress on behalf of the captive nations, I believe Dr. Dimitrov's remarks are most inspiring, and I am pleased to call this excellent address to the attention of my colleagues.

The address is as follows:

Address by Dr. George M. Dimitrov, Chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations, at the Captive Nations Week Dinner, National Press Club, Washington, D.C., July 17, 1963

It is a great honor for me to greet you here tonight in the name of the Assembly of Captive European Nations. We are gathered to observe, for the fifth time, Captive Nations Week, which the U.S. Congress established as a token of the moral and political commitment of America to the goal of independence and freedom for the nations submerged by the only colonialist flood of our times.

Our first duty is to give voice to our abiding gratitude to the Congress of the United States for its action in 1959 and for its never faltering interest and support for our good cause. It is particularly gratifying that so many distinguished Members of the Congress chose to be with us tonight. Their presence here is a stimulating message to the people of our homelands.

Our thoughts of sincere appreciation also go to the President of the United States, the Honorable John F. Kennedy, for proclaiming Captive Nations Week, 1963 and thus helping to consolidate the tradition of an annual period of dedication to one of the unfinished tasks of all freedom-loving men and nations.

We are privileged to have with us tonight the Ambassador of China, diplomatic representatives of Germany, and Vietnam—the forcibly divided nations—as well as of Lithuania and Latvia. Their presence here symbolizes the will to recover freedom and the solidarity of all captive nations—be they entirely or only partly submerged by the Communist imperial tide; be they located in Europe, in Asia, or in the Western Hemisphere; be they nominally independent or formally incorporated in the Soviet Union proper.

We are furthermore honored to have amongst us the heads of the institutions, one governmental, the other private, broadcasting to our homelands, as well as many journalists, among them men and women who have earned both our respect and our gratitude. We thank them for being with us tonight.

My principal task tonight is to present tokens of recognition to proven friends of our cause. But the occasion imposes another duty upon the spokesman of nine captive nations. It calls for a brief but candid expression of our views on current trends in Western thinking and policies about East Central Europe.

To put it briefly, both in Western Europe and in the United States the prevailing impression seems to be that a wind of change is sweeping over our homelands. Domestically the regimes are supposed to be evolving toward more freedom—liberalization is the usual word—while internationally they are viewed as taking an increasingly independent posture toward the Soviet Union. These trends, it is said, provide the only hope of change for the better. They must be furthered, and can only be furthered to the extent the Western Powers place themselves in a position to exercise a more effective influence upon developments in this area. This—it is added—can only be accomplished by expanding, on every possible level, contact with the Communist regimes in East Central Europe.

Let us look first at the premises of these propositions.

What is usually described as liberalization is nothing but a relaxation of repression, a lessening of irrational and unnecessarily brutal terror. The only country where this relaxation has resulted in a limited departure from totalitarian dogmatism is Poland. And there it was a tactical retreat in the face of menacing internal pressures in an international context unfavorable to Moscow. In all other captive countries the more rational reign of terror was the consequence of increased confidence among the ruling Communists. This Communist confidence is based on two main reasons. The Communists no longer fear any effective action on the part of the West to bring about freely elected governments. They believe that their opponents are so discouraged by Western passivity that draconic criminal legislation, control over everybody's livelihood and a more efficient repressive apparatus are enough to keep them inactive.

The arbitrary and lawless police regime is still ruling in East Central Europe. The subordination to Moscow in all essentials is still a fact. The four pillars of totalitarian rule—the monopoly by the Communist Party of coercion, communication, education, and economic control and exploitation—are intact. So long as they prevail, to speak about liberalization is to add insult to the countless injuries our nations were forced to suffer in the post-World War II years.

As to the alleged inclination of the satellite rulers to stand up to Moscow, much has been made lately of the opposition of the Rumanian Communist regime to the integration plans of Comecom. The truth is that efforts at integration collided from the very inception of the Comecom with the wish of every satellite to become self-sufficient—on the approved Soviet pattern. What is really new in this case is the fact that the story about the Rumanian opposition was deliberately leaked out in Bucharest to Western diplomats and journalists. The only question is whether this was done in defiance of Moscow, or with its knowledge and blessing.

We maintain that Moscow knew of and approved the leakages. We have good reasons to believe that the whole maneuver aims at preparing the climate for Western aid and loans to Rumania first, to other satellites later. Unable to supply the heavy machinery and industrial installations required for the fulfillment of development plans in Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary, Nikita Khrushchev himself advised the respective regimes to follow the example of Gomulka and Tito in seeking loans and aid in the West. He furthermore gave permission to the satellites to prepare the ground for such loans by projecting themselves in a new posture of indèpendence vis-a-vis Moscow.

This strategy to accelerate the industrial buildup of the Soviet Empire with the aid of the Western Powers is now unfolding. It bespeaks the conviction of Soviet policymakers that the economic and political advantages to be gained from portraying the captive nations as increasingly independent by far outweighs the dangers involved in fostering the image of a crisis-ridden Soviet bloc.

I have gone to some length in exposing the way the Communists try to exploit the hope, widely held in the West, that the Communist regimes can be weaned away from Moscow by increased trade and even aid. It is our contention that more internal freedom and less dependence on the Soviet Union will never be the outcome of friendliness or helpfulness toward the Communist regimes. They will have to be wrested by steady pressures from within and from without. The internal pressures are obviously contingent upon the strength of the fighting spirit of our Nation. This, in turn, reflects their hopes and their faith in the West. The spirit of our Nation is then the key to their future deliverance, as it is today, by its deterring effects, an increasingly significant element of Western security. This is why we were most gratified that in his address in Frankfurt, on June 26, President Kennedy recognized among the tasks devolving upon the United States and its Allies "to strengthen the spirit of those Europeans who are not now free."

It is our conviction that it is in the power of the West to bolster the spirit of our conutrymen and their faith in the West. There are two ways to accomplish this end: First, to demonstrate to them by deeds that the West is strong, united and determined to win; second, to show them, by meaningful political and diplomatic actions, that their independence and freedom is an objective of Western and, above all, United States policy, and not merely an object of occasional oratory.

The spirit of our countrymen is undermined, not strengthened, every time you, in the free world, fail to distinguish between the oppressed and the oppressors; every time you lend respectability to their unchosen rulers; everytime you appear to recognize their bondage as final and their deliverance beyond the realm of practicability.

Few recent trends are more disturbing, to those who haven't drawn their education on communism from books alone, than the tendency to consider Marxism-Leninism as just another social-economic-political system. More and more seldom is moral judgment passed on communism. We are not told that the criminal is less despicable than his crime; or that the movement, the party, has greatly improved on the erroneous doctrine from which it springs. No wonder that moral distinction has become blurred and that, calling communism an evil is viewed as bad taste.

To people who have gone and still go through unspeakable suffering and moral degradation these are not stimulating developments. What will they think and feel, for instance, in my own country, Bulgaria, or in Romania, in seeing the man in charge of American agriculture in the midst of the brutes who have reduced our proud peasants to the status of medieval serfs? Let it be remembered that the peasants still form the overwhelming majority of the population in these two countries. Military campaigns—spread over 18 years—were required to overcome them and their continued defiance of communism is shown by the catastrophic state of East European agriculture. It shouldn't be hard to imagine how these men will feel in seeing that their butchers are being bestowed high international respectability.

But disappointments nothwithstanding, we exiles have not lost faith in the ultimate victory of freedom. We know that communism is waging the cold war by all means short of major wars, on all continents, day in and day out. We know that for them coexistence does not mean live and let live. It means the immunity of their own territory to Western political action and complete freedom for themselves to conduct unlimited political warfare in the non-Communist lands. That the Communists prepare for large-scale offensives is indicated, for example, by a dispatch in yesterday's papers announcing the creation in Moscow of a Committee of cultural relations with people of Soviet extraction abroad. This comes in the wake of similar efforts among East Central European emigres.

We are confident that all this will persuade the Western powers that tyranny cannot be weakened when it is helped to overcome the consequences of its crimes, blunders and failures; of its contempt for human nature and dignity. It will, I am confident, induce them to take advantage of the obvious troubles the Soviet empire is beset with by pressing for a comprehensive European settlement based on the principle of self-determination. It will, I hope, prompt them to take up the challenge the Soviet rulers have flung to them in their recent letter to the Secretary General of the United Nations. They called in this letter for the final liquidation of colonialism in 1965, during the so-called international year of cooperation. This means, of course, bringing up at long last the issue of Soviet colonialism before the United Nations, and maintaining the Hungarian question on the agenda—both as a matter of principle and regardless of the voting prospects.

Khrushchev has unambiguously declared, the other day, that his strategy will soon lead to the worldwide victory of communism. It is our belief that by every token the Western Powers are entitled to speak and act with even more confidence. It is our unshakable conviction that freedom will prevail.

"Federal Aid to Education—Present State of the Question," by Hon. James J. Delaney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the RECORD a clear, concise statement by a distinguished colleague, Hon. JAMES J. DELANEY, on "Federal Aid to Education"—a subject with which he is fully acquainted. Congressman DELANEY's knowledge and sound reasoning produced the "GI Bill for Junior" which I and seven other Members have cosponsored. This legislation presents a constructive approach to the problem of Federal aid to education.

Mr. Delaney's article was printed in the annual education issue of the Brooklyn Tablet on May 16, 1963, and states cogent and irrefutable reasons for his position.

I am sure all Members who read this statement will agree that we have at hand an equitable solution to meet the pressing need in the educational field.

The statement follows:

Federal Aid to Education—Present State of the Question, by Hon. James J. Delaney, Representative, Ninth Congressional District of New York

In July of 1961, I voted, in the Rules Committee, against a Federal aid to education bill which had been prepared by the NEA on two grounds:

1. The bill made no provision for some 7 million American children attending independent schools, thereby discriminating against them in violation of the equal protection clause of the Constitution.

2. This bill was part of a plan by NEA to set up a monolithic educational system controlled by the Federal Government and based on the atheistic concept of man. At that time I called the attention of the American public to a brochure inspired by the NEA entitled "A Federal Education Agency for the Future" which fully supported my charge.

At that time I stated: "I shall not vote for legislative discrimination." I also stated "diversity is the quintessence of democracy. Uniformity is the hallmark of totalitarianism". On these principles I still stand.

Early in 1962 in the 87th Congress I introduced a bill based on the freedom of choice and parental rights principles. This bill has been reintroduced in the 88th Congress by me and bears number H.R. 320. Identical bills have also been introduced by Congressmen Carey and Halpern, of New York, and Hawkins, of California, and are now before the House Committee on Education and Labor. My bill recognizes the natural, civil, and constitutional right of parents to choose the education of their children. This basic right of parents has been held to be a constitutional right by the U.S. Supreme Court in the cases of *Society of Sisters* v. *Pierce*, 263 U.S. 510 and *Meyer* v. *Nebraska*, 262 U.S. 390. The universal declaration of human rights proclaimed by the United Nations also includes this right in subdivision 3 of article 26: "Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children." It is interesting to note that the most recent encyclical of Pope John XXIII also proclaimed the principles of freedom of choice and the prior rights of parents to direct the education of their children. Pope John said:

"By the natural law every human being has the right to respect for his person. To his good reputation. The right to freedom in searching for truth and in expressing and communicating this opinion, and in pursuit of art, within the limits laid down by the moral order and the common good. And he has the right to be informed truthfully about public events.

"The natural law also gives man the right to share in the benefits of culture, and therefore the right to a basic education and to technical and professional training in keping with the stage of educational development in the country to which he belongs. Every effort should be made to insure that persons be enabled, on the basis of merit, to go on to higher studies, so that, as far as possible, they may occupy posts and take on responsibilities in human society in accordance with their natural gifts and the skills they have acquired."

Pope John also said:

"Parents, however, have a prior right in the support and education of their children."

My bill is modeled on the GI bill of rights, whose provisions are generally well known to the American public. I stated at the time when I first introduced this bill "the bill merely follows the approach of the GI bill of rights and the page boys bill, both of which have worked successfully and without criticism. It is the commonsense solution to this problem."

Two years ago there was a lack of clear understanding on the question of the constitutionality of aid to students attending nonpublic schools insofar as the public consensus was concerned. The public dialog, which has occurred within the past 2 years has dissipated the fog of doubt which existed. During that time the public has learned that the Federal Government, even before the adoption of the Constitution, in the Northwest Ordinance, made provisions for aid to all educational institutions including theological seminaries. Since the Northwest Ordinance the Federal Government has made grants of land to all of the land-grant colleges, which included church-related colleges and even theological seminaries. Immediately after the Civil War, the Federal Government set up Howard University in Washington, D.C., and has supported it from that day to this. Howard University maintains a theological seminary although under the Federal law, which has been on the statute books for three-quarters of a century, no portion of the moneys granted by the Congress goes to support the theological seminary.

It is interesting to note that the State of New York, at the same time that the Northwest Ordinance was enacted, also set up a similar plan known as the Gospel Lots or Gospel Funds which provided that in the distribution of public lands in upstate New York that a certain portion be set aside for the Gospel and school. These Gospel Lots and Gospel Funds are still perpetuated in the education law of the State of New York and many upstate communities are still receiving benefits from them.

It is also interesting to note that in New York, St. Peter's Roman Catholic School on Barclay Street received aid from the State of New York in 1806, and further that Governor Seward in 1840, in his annual message to the legislature, recommended State aid to church-related schools.

At the present time there are a large number of educational programs on the college level, where the Federal Government makes grants, either direct to the institution, or to students attending private and church-related colleges. In addition, the Federal Government maintains a military educational program, known at the ROTC in which all church-related colleges are eligible to participate. It is interesting to note that the ROTC program also extends to secondary, or high schools. The GI bill of rights is probably the best known Federal aid to education program. This treats all persons alike and there is no discrimination or attempt to control the educational system. It is not generally known but the GI bill of rights is also applicable to GI's attending either primary or secondary schools of their choice. Throughout the country many GI's attended primary and secondary schools of their choice and their tuition was paid for by the Government under the GI bill of rights. Under the various junior ROTC programs all secondary schools, whether church related or not may participate and receive benefits from the Federal Government. The page boys bill, which provides that the Federal Government shall pay the tuition for the education of page boys of the Supreme Court and the Congress also applies to primary, secondary, and college education.

It is not necessary to be a constitutional lawyer to realize that the church-related schools were here first and that the Federal Government, from its inception, has, down to, and including the present time, made provisions for students attending independent or church-related schools. In fact, in the present bill before the Congress, H.R. 3000, the provisions thereof which deal with higher education are not discriminatory and make fair and equal provision for all students and all educational institutions. In H.R. 3000, it is section IV which fails to follow the principles of the other provisions of the bill and undertakes, on the secondary and primary level, to make provisions only for State managed schools and makes no provision for independent schools privately managed.

The Aid to Medical Schools Act, which passed the House of Representatives within the past few weeks, also makes equal provisions for church-related medical schools.

In the last 2 years innumerable constitutional authorities and law review articles, throughout the country, have pointed out clearly that there is no constitutional bar on the Federal level for giving aid to all children attending all schools. The "constitutional issue" is similar to the constitutional issue raised in many circles before 1960 as to the eligibility of a Catholic to be President of the United States. Such a constitutional question may sound strange today but only 3 years ago it was seriously debated.

There is no better way of guaranteeing freedom and democracy in education than by allowing each child, or his parent, to choose his school. This is the educational policy of practically all of the countries of the free world excepting our own. Of course in totalitarian countries there is only one system of education and that is controlled by the State as a monopoly. Some of our secularists would like to have a similar system in the United States. They do not realize that secular education is limited education. Although we have compulsory education in the United States, the requirements of the compulsory education laws are satisfied by students attending independent schools privately managed. In other words, the independent schools serve the same public function as the State managed schools. All of these schools meet the educational standards set up by the compulsory education laws of our States. They are part of the American educational system. However, the independent schools are not limited and usually add other subjects to their curriculum. It might be significant to note that during the First World War, when synthetic rubber was the Nation's greatest need, that synthetic rubber was not developed in a secular, or public university, but rather was developed in Notre Dame University.

There are some who object to students attending independent schools receiving any public aid because they contend that the curriculum in these schools is permeated with a theology. A careful examination of the Declaration of Independence will also reveal that the Declaration of Independence is in substance, a small summary of theology. Does this mean that the Declaration of Independence cannot be read or taught in schools which receive public aid?

At the present time the largest single item in every State budget and in the budget of every local community in the United States is the provision for education. Large as these provisions are they are bound to progressively increase in the near future. This is due to three factors. One, increased costs of all items that go into education. Two, the large increase in population which started in 1942 and three, the need for more education for more children in order to meet the threat of world communism.

At the present time it costs, in the State of New York, approximately $600 per student, per annum, for elementary education and $800 per student, per annum, for secondary education. Roughly speaking the cost of education in the State of New York is distributed between the local community and the State. The State's share is reflected in income taxes and the local share is imposed upon real estate, which includes homes. My bill, which would give $20 per student to every student, including those attending independent and private schools, would be a great incentive for more independent and private schools and would to that extent relieve the taxpayers of a tremendous financial burden. It is sound public policy to encourage private and independent groups, including religious groups, to support schools which meet the requirements of the compulsory education law and which save a considerable portion of the cost of educating American children.

Physician's Dream of Hospital for Eye Patients Coming True in Birmingham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, there is today in my home city of Birmingham being completed a new hospital for the treatment of eye diseases and injuries. Less than 15 years ago it was just a dream in the mind of Dr. Alston Callahan. Today, because of Dr. Callahan's efforts over the years and the contributions of public-spirited citizens of Birmingham the attractive new Eye Foundation Hospital is being added to Birmingham's already impressive Medical Center.

I think that many of the Members will be interested in the following article from the New York Times of Sunday, July 7, 1963, which details the development of the Eye Foundation Hospital. I insert the article herewith:

BIRMINGHAM ADDS AN EYE HOSPITAL: $1.5 MILLION CENTER STARTED BY GIRL'S RICH GRANDFATHER

(By Foster Hayley)

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., July 6.—Because of the malajusted eyes of a little girl with a wealthy grandfather, Birmingham and Alabama are soon to have a $1,500,000 eye hospital as modern as any in the land.

The 55-bed Eye Foundation Hospital is now in the final stages of constructon in the western sector of the Birmingham Medical Center. A staff is being recruited and it should be receiving its first patients in November.

The hospital will be equipped with the most recent clinical instruments, such as a light coagulator, an operating microscope and a Zeiss fungus camera. It will have two modern operating theaters, in each of which two operations can be performed simultaneously, and an outpatient clinic to handle cases that do not require complete hospital care.

The hospital was only a gleam 13 years ago in the eye of Dr. Alston Callahan, a Birmingham eye surgeon, when the late Robert I. Ingalls, patriarch of the Ingalls Ironworks and a shipbuilding empire, brought his teenaged granddaughter to him as a patient.

DOCTOR OUTLINES PLANS

Dr. Callahan accepted Miss Ingalls as a patient and treated her for a year. He kept putting off sending Mr. Ingalls a bill. Finally, one day, Mr. Ingalls insisted on a settlement. What he wanted as payment, Dr. Callahan told him, was money to start a nonprofit hospital exclusively for eye patients. He outlined his plans and gave Mr. Ingalls an estimate of the cost—$1 million.

As Dr. Callahan recalls it, Mr. Ingalls immediately telephoned his lawyer, James A. Simpson, and told him to draw up incorporation papers for a foundation. He would contribute the first $25,000, Mr. Ingalls said.

Through the years to that original contribution $175,000 has been added by the Ingalls Foundation and from other members of the Ingalls family. There have been contributions of $430,000 more from other foundations, $128,000 from the Hill-Burton State Board of Health, and smaller amounts from individuals to provide the needed $1,500,000 for building and equipment. (The original estimate of 1950 had increased by 30 percent.)

The hospital is a two-story poured-concrete structure. At Dr. Callahan's insistance, Albion Knight, the Birmingham architect, who designed it, has made it more than just a functional building. A fountain will play in the covered walkway at the entrance. A large mural, lighted at night, will adorn the entryway. Adjustable louvers, on the three sides of the second story, will not only adjust the light in patients rooms but also add a distinguished architectural touch.

NO SEGREGATION

There will be no segregation in the Eye Foundation Hospital. It will accept patients of all races strictly on the basis of need.

The Lions Clubs of Alabama, which have been paying the bills for indigent eye patients for the last 15 years at other hospitals, are expected to continue that practice at Eye Foundation. Other civic groups have promised support.

The Medical Center lies to the south of the main business district, in the shadow of Red Mountain. It has been built in what was once one of the slum areas of the city. It now spreads over 26 acres and is constantly expanding.

The Medical Center contains not only the Medical and Dental Schools of the University of Alabama and the 600-bed university hospital, but also a 500-bed Veterans' Administration hospital, a Federal Public Health Building, a research center, and children's hospital. There is also the Crippled Children's Hospital built and maintained by the Shriners and the privately endowed Smolian Psychiatric clinic.

A rehabilitation center is now under construction. It is designed to function here as does the Institute of Rehabilitation and Physical Medicine in the New York University-Bellevue Hospital complex in New York City.

Booby Traps in Test-Ban Talks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the following article by Mr. Richard Wilson which appeared in the Washington Evening Star. I believe it contains sober and sage advice that the policymen in the administration should take to heart as they proceed to attempt to negotiate with the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union, because of its past perfidy is certainly amenable to the charge of perhaps being less than wholly sincere in its desire for accommodation with the West. The climate of today is somewhat reminiscent of the climate that prevailed at the end of World War II, when we were basking in the warm glow of our wartime association with the U.S.S.R. and refused to open our eyes to their treacherous designs on the countries of Eastern Europe. The Berlin blockade served as a rude awakening to the reality of Soviet intentions, and the cold war was on in earnest.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

BOOBY TRAPS IN TEST-BAN TALKS: NEED FOR CAUTION CALLED NEVER GREATER THAN CURRENT "FLIRTATION WITH MOSCOW"

(By Richard Wilson)

Never was greater caution called for than in the new negotiations opened by Premier Khrushchev's speech in East Berlin and his extensive secret correspondence with President Kennedy.

Booby traps and ambuscades line the way. Nevertheless, in spite of all bitter lessons to the contrary, the Kennedy administration continues it "flirtation with Moscow," so named in disapproval by former Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

The tendency here in Washington is to read only part of what Mr. Khrushchev said in East Berlin, to ignore the rest, or to place an unjustifiably favorable construction on it. When the speech is read in full, it is found that Mr. Khrushchev is condemning President Kennedy for poisoning the atmosphere, for reneging on his American University speech, and for blocking a nuclear test-ban agreement.

Then at the end of his speech, Mr. Khrushchev made a proposal, which, if it means anything at all, would undermine a bipartisan American policy on Germany which has been in existence for 18 years. President Kennedy went to Europe to reaffirm that policy. Under the stimulus of crowd hysteria in Berlin, he may have gone a little further in reaffirming this policy than he intended.

Mr. Khrushchev proposed an uncontrolled, uninspected suspension of nuclear testing in the atmosphere to take effect simultaneously with a nonaggression treaty between the NATO and Warsaw Pact powers. If a nonaggression pact means anything at all, it means the de facto recognition of East Germany and acceptance as a fact that Germany will never be reunited. All the bravura sentiments recently expressed by Mr. Kennedy under conditions of mob hysteria in West Berlin would thus be meaningless.

The key word in Mr. Khrushchev's proposal was simultaneously. (No de facto recognition of East Germany, no nuclear test ban.)

Even if there were to be a nuclear test-ban treaty growing out of the present discussions by Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman in Moscow, the one factor which makes the test ban so attractive has already been lost. This is the factor of onsite inspections, which the Eisenhower administration persisted in and which the Kennedy administration is retreating from.

Inspections inside Russia were never so important in themselves as for the principle involved. The inspections would have opened the door for the first time to the possibility that some international arrangements might someday be made for a safe program of disarmament. Mr. Khrushchev will have none of this. He is more determined than ever to keep the NATO spies out of his country.

So what is left? An unenforceable three-way agreement between the United States, Russia, and England (and not including Red China and France) to stop nuclear testing in the atmosphere, under water, and in outer space. In exchange for this, a nonaggression treaty with the Warsaw powers which would have to be meaningless to be acceptable, and which in any case would weaken our resolve for a free and united Germany. All this lacks plausibility. Mr. Khrushchev, of course, does not conceal his resolve to destroy capitalism in West Germany and unite the whole country under communism.

Fortunately there are some balancing factors against the emotionalists who place a test ban ahead of everything else. In a long career, Mr. Harriman has not made many mistakes in dealing with the Russians. He warned Roosevelt that Stalin would break the Yalta agreements.

Nor is Secretary of State Rusk to be found among those who find much to cheer about in Mr. Khrushchev's recent maneuvers. The skepticism of those two men is a valuable asset in the present atmosphere of rising hopes and expectations.

In the end, of course, Congress will have the last word, for Mr. Kennedy does not dare enter into a treaty with the Soviet Union by executive action. For some months, Members of Congress have been making a strong record against a test-ban agreement on the grounds that we are being ambushed again.

A Sorry Episode

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Arizona Republic of July 10, 1963, entitled "A Sorry Episode." It clearly defines the series of errors we have made in the Cuban debacle, and although our losses are immeasurable, perhaps we can now profit from that very costly lesson by implementing a more realistic and positive foreign policy.

The editorial follows:

A SORRY EPISODE

A curtain of shame was rung down recently on one of the sorriest chapters in U.S. diplomatic history: The paying of blackmail to a Communist nation.

The blackmail deal was once more pushed onto the Nation's front pages when the final installments of $53 million in cargo were delivered in Havana. The merchandise, largely food and medical supplies, was paid for the release from prison of 1,137 anti-Castro Cubans who were captured when the administration withdrew promised air support during the abortive invasion at the Bay of Pigs in April 1961.

The most tragic aspect of the entire ransom deal was the sight of the powerful United States paying blackmail to a petty dictator who has slapped Uncle Sam in the face at each opportunity. But it was not the only sickening aspect.

Almost as bad was the manner in which the administration—because it understandably did not want to become involved officially with the shameful transaction, after the Nation earlier registered its disgust at such a move—allowed negotiations to be conducted by a private U.S. citizen, in violation of U.S. law. Then, as a final slap at even the rudiments of fair play, the administration encouraged that same private citizen, New York lawyer James B. Donovan, to run for the Senate from New York. (Thankfully, New Yorkers had about all they could stand of the deal by that time, and the ubiquitous Mr. Donovan was soundly beaten at the polls.)

But even that didn't end the appalling aspects of the ransom deal. Once Donovan and Castro agreed on a settlement, the Justice Department, led personally by Attorney General Robert Kennedy, twisted the arms of numerous American manufacturers, "persuading" them to "donate" supplies and medicines for Castro.

Caught between the Justice Department's already-aggressive antibusiness attitude and the knowledge that the Attorney General's brother concurred with their father's judgment that all businessmen were SOB's, the manufacturers were left with little choice but to capitulate.

Then the Treasury Department ruled that the "donations" were tax deductible, meaning that Mr. and Mrs. U.S.A. would be given the good fortune of helping to finance the illegal and immoral ransom transaction.

If there is a lesson to be learned from that disgraceful episode, it is the moral the U.S. seemingly has forgotten these past few decades: Namely; that it is impossible to discharge an obligation by running from it. A small invasion force could have toppled Castro and communism at a relatively insignificant cost 2 years ago. Today's toll in human lives probably would be staggering, for Castro and communism are now more solidly entrenched than ever before.

And prospects of removing them grow dimmer and dimmer as the administration succeeds in convincing enough Americans that paying ransom is a worthwhile substitute for an honorable foreign policy.

Foreign Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, America has welcomed many foreign visitors to its shores throughout its history. In recent years we witness an increased number of students coming to study at the colleges and universities of the United States, especially from the newly emerged nations of the world.

As in our formative years when Americans who had studied at the educational institutions of Europe returned and helped shape this Nation, these young men and women, after their experiences at American institutions of higher learning, will contribute what they have learned to the development of their own native lands. It is with pride that we should find ourselves in the position of teacher. Let us undertake to fulfill the highest expectations of these young people.

In an editorial appearing in yesterday's edition, the Newark Evening News comments on this pleasant fact, and I would like to bring some interesting figures to the attention of my colleagues:

The growing number of foreigners who come to the United States every year to study in our colleges and universities is eloquent testimony to the position this country occupies in the educational world. It also reflects the importance which our Government and the governments of other nations, by helping to finance the program, place on educational exchange as an essential international activity.

In 1962–63, the Institute of International Education reports, 64,000 students from 152 foreign countries were enrolled in American institutions of higher learning, a rise of 11 percent over the previous year and almost double the number who studied here a decade ago. As in the past, the largest group came from the Far East. But it is significant that Africa, for the fourth consecutive year, showed the greatest proportionate increase.

It should be gratifying to Americans that the new nations send their youth here in quest of the knowledge that will bring progress to their people. By finding room for them in our crowded colleges, we are in a sense recognizing the debt which the United States, in its 188th year, owes to the older nations which have contributed so much to our own physical and cultural development.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for the fifth time, the Congress of the United States is observing Captive Nations Week, a week to which Americans all over our Nation are giving increasing recognition. President Kennedy has proclaimed Captive Nations Week to remind all the world that the spirit of liberty and national independence is alive in Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Ukraine, the Baltic States, Armenia, Georgia, and Rumania. This focuses attention on our recognition of their captivity and our hope that their release from bondage is very near.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs held hearings on the captive nations in 1962 in which attention was focused on the control by the Russian Communists over the political, economic, and military life of nations behind the Iron Curtain. This control is accompanied by wholesale nationalization of industry, transportation and trade, forced collectivism of agriculture. Repression of individual liberties, suppression of religion, eradication of every vestige of religious education, Communist indoctrination of youth, systematic campaigns to destroy family loyalties and to replace them with blind obedience to the state; and a concerted effort to extend Communist orientation to every field of human endeavor; these are facts of everyday life in captive nations.

The first to fall victim to Russian Communist imperialism was the Ukraine. To wipe out all sense of national unity, its people were deported to Siberia while the country was colonized by Russian Communists. National language and culture were suppressed. Every technician of oppression and suppression was used to wipe out any vestige of national identity and make of it just a Russian province.

The same procedure was followed throughout other nations annexed to the Russian empire. Some states have been completely closed to Western observers. The result is that actual conditions can only be surmised. As Russian provinces they are governed directly from Moscow through political appointees and the Russian Army.

Poland, the first captive nation to gain some autonomy, is undergoing another change, a reversal of rights wrung as a result of the 1956 crisis. Although Warsaw conveys the picture of a modern metropolis, it is misleading. Recent demonstrations over the rise in the prices of coal and electricity have resulted in suppression of the workers; while journalists, poets and playwrights have suffered severe censorship. This tightening of controls is an attempt by the Polish Government to obviate any revolutionary plots which may arise. Suppression is further proof of the economic ills which are current.

Hungary, a small country of beautiful landscapes with a history of national struggle reaching back almost a thousand years, still bears the scars and sad memories of the 1956 Revolution. This dramatic revolt against Soviet colonialism, with its suppression by guns and tanks told a story of defiance of Soviet might which gave the lie to the fabricated legend about the support by subject peoples of the Communist regimes.

The surprising move of the Rumanian Government, not to adhere to the strict economic dicta of the Soviet Union and to play a leverage role in the ideological struggle between Red China and the Soviet Union has cheered the Western World and brought hope to the people of the free world that yet another crack has appeared in the Eastern encampment. The development of rich oil fields has enabled Rumania to become independent from the Soviet bloc trade organization (CEMA) and to build a respectable trade balance with Western Europe. Prevented by Russia from industrialization, the Government has asked West Germany, Great Britain, France, and Italy to construct steel centers, oil-refining plants and other manufacturing industries in Rumania.

For all its signs of independent action, controls remain rigid. Agricultural output is low due to collectivism in all the Balkan countries.

Albania, governed by Strongman Ever Hoxha, continues as the most poverty-stricken nation in Europe with disease and malnutrition rampant. Although an important pawn in the ideological struggle between the Communist powers, forsaken by the Soviet Union and adopted by Red China, the situation of the people is unchanged; controlled by a strongly entrenched Communist regime isolated, it must rely for its existence on doles from Red China.

At a recent congress in Czechoslovakia, Czech writers and intellectuals demanded that a policy of de-Stalinization be inaugurated and that certain condemned writers and political figures, such as Benes and Masaryk, be rehabilitated. Demonstrations and demands from the Slovaks for increased autonomy for their nations show further signs of unrest. Novotony found himself obliged to give ground, to relinquish somewhat his suffocating grip. Nevertheless, life in Czechoslovakia remains drab. Consumer goods are scarce; the standard of living, low.

In East Germany, despite the fact that Russia is alleged to have poured vast amounts of capital into the country, to have converted it into the Eastern bloc's biggest industrial workshop, the wall stands as an attempt, not to keep other Europeans out but to keep the "contented" workers in.

Despite all the propaganda of assurance that these workers' paradises are a source of joy and satisfaction to the working people who strive for the highest possible profit for society, cracks continue to show in the Iron Curtain. Soviet propaganda continues to hammer on imperialism and colonialism while their own colonies which through suppression and oppression they have attempted to weld into a Communist empire continue to exhibit unrest. The cracks are showing; may they never grow less.

During the week of July 14 we extend the hand of friendship and sympathy to the captive nations, and we stand before the world as the continuing champion of the right of all nations to self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, I support and strongly urge the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. We cannot withhold any effort within our power to restore to the captive millions of men, women, and children the blessings of free government under which they may pass their days in contentment and dignity and in worship of the God and Creator of us all.

Nationwide Observance of Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which provides that October 12 of each year be recognized as a legal holiday for the whole Nation, to be known as Columbus Day.

In proposing that we observe October 12 as a national holiday I am not suggesting the establishment of merely another occasion or excuse to celebrate. I believe that Columbus Day should be observed as a day of rededication of the American people to strive for the kind of a world envisioned by Columbus, a world of peace and justice. It should be a day on which the life of the great discoverer and his achievements in the face of dire circumstances should be related to young and old as an inspiration and a source of confidence in the destiny of our own Nation. It should also be a day of prayer for world peace and justice so that mankind may enter the new world to tomorrow.

Columbus Day is already being observed as a State holiday in 37 States throughout the Nation. They are: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. It is also observed in the District of Columbia. Several States, notably Indiana, North Dakota, and Ohio, call it Discovery Day; in Arkansas, Iowa, and Wisconsin it is known as Landing Day.

The 13 States which do not observe Columbus Day are: Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, Maine, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Carolina Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, and Wyoming. Thus the overwhelming majority of the States—in fact, nearly three-fourths of them—observe the discovery of America. Under the circumstances, I believe the time has come for us to make this a national holiday and to pay nationwide tribute to Christopher Columbus.

Nearly 5 centuries have passed since Columbus made his historic discovery and inaugurated a new era in human affairs. From that day on civilization has made great strides forward on the road to freedom and human achievement. Since the time of Columbus the world has experienced periods of war and peace, upheavals, and revolutions, events that shook the world to its very foundations, tremendous scientific progress, the liberation of many nations and the oppression of others.

We, in our day, still ponder the future of mankind just as was done nearly 5 centuries ago in the days of Columbus. Mankind is still searching for new horizons and still cherishing new hopes for a better tomorrow. As we look at the unrest and tension of the world of our day, the question comes to mind: Is this the kind of a world envisioned by Columbus? We know of the many difficulties he encountered during his great journeys of discovery. We know that these journeys would never have succeeded were it not for his indomitable spirit, his steadfast faith in divine guidance to help him pursue his chosen course. We know that he wanted to prove that the world is round and that trade routes could be established with Asia.

Columbus was known as the great dreamer in his day. Surely, he must have been dreaming much beyond the globular shape of the world and the possibility of trade routes to India. Undoubtedly, he was also dreaming of a world at peace, of a happy mankind, of justice, and human dignity for all. He was a man who possessed the same kind of vision and faith which sustained the early settlers of our country, which inspired the Founding Fathers of our Nation.

This is the kind of vision and faith which are so desperately needed in the world today. Despite all the progress we have made since the days of Columbus, we still have a long way to go before we can attain genuine peace, justice, and human dignity for all. We have not only the problems of today to consider, but we must also think of the world of tomorrow in which our children are destined to live and we must be prepared to meet the problems and the unknown dangers of the future.

In the perspective of history, we think of Columbus as a dedicated man who inspired countless generations, and will continue to inspire other generations to come, as long as America remains the symbol of liberty and the moral leader of the free world. The observance of Columbus Day as a national holiday, as a day of rededication and prayer, would serve as a reminder and an inspiration to the American people and to the whole free world. It would be a reminder of the difficulties he encountered and how he met them with great fortitude and determination. It would be an inspiration of his great faith and his achievements which exemplify the American spirit for greater achievements, the discovery of new horizons, and the successful solution of the problems of our times.

Mr. Speaker, may I also add that the observance of Columbus Day as a national holiday would be a well-deserved recognition to the great Italian-American community in this country for the wonderful contributions it has made to our Nation throughout its history, particularly in the fields of art, science, education, religion, politics, and many others. We, in Connecticut, are particularly proud of the invaluable role which Americans of Italian descent have played in the growth and development of our State. They are highly esteemed and are regarded everywhere as an industrious and patriotic group.

A Tombstone for the OAS?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Miami Herald of July 15, 1963 is worthy of the attention of all the members of the House of Representatives. I hope all members will take time to read this article which points up the necessity of the United States assuming its fearless leadership role of years past:

IT NEEDS LEADERSHIP TO LIVE—A TOMBSTONE FOR THE OAS?

Should the Organization of American States succumb to subversion, its tombstone might well read: "Born despite Communist terrorists April 30, 1948; assassinated by the same.—"

Will the death date of the OAS be in this year of 1963? We are beginning to fear so. It appears likely unless the United States quickly resumes the fearless leadership which rescued the OAS from prenatal murder 15 years ago.

The 21 republics of the Western Hemisphere had learned a lesson from World War II. They had seen Nazi fifth-columnists worm their way into nations chosen as victims to sap their will to resist. They had seen governments in Europe, Asia and Africa fall one by one to Fascist invaders for lack of help from their neighbors.

Soon after that war ended, the nations of the New World sent delegates to Rio de Janeiro. They signed a treaty of reciprocal assistance which says in part:

If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American state should be affected by an aggression which is not an armed attack or by an extra-continental or intra-continental conflict, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the Organ of Consultation shall meet immediately in order to agree on the measures which must be taken in case of aggression to assist the victim of the aggression or, in any case, the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the continent.

Seven months later, a meeting was called in Bogotá, Colombia, to create the machinery for carrying out the Rio pact.

An international gang of thugs converged on Bogotá. Among them were Fidel Castro and Blas Roca, both now among the Communist slavemasters of Cuba. Money, guns and ammunition also poured into Colombia. Riots, killings, pillage and arson raged for a week. The gangsters were trying to break up the inter-American meeting. They failed. U.S. delegates stood like a rock. The charter of the OAS was signed on schedule.

But the terrorists did not give up. In the 15 years since the "Bogotazo," they have conquered Cuba. Using that island as a fortress, they are sending agents, money, guns and ammunition into the rest of the Americas. Their infiltration has succeeded far beyond their deserts.

We shall speak frankly. Opportunists in a number of American nations have accepted help from the new fifth-columnists. Timorous politicians have made deals with them. Our own country, of late, has shied from taking a firm stand against the terrorists and from encouraging others to do so.

So what do we see? Five American nations still maintain diplomatic ties wth Red Cuba and mouth "nonintervention" as an alibi for dong nothing to rescue Cuba.

It will take heroic measures to revivify the OAS. They can be inspired only by the United States, acknowledged leader of the free world and the hemisphere.

Town Meeting of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on July 10, the CBS Television Network conducted the "Town Meeting of the World," the first international live broadcast via Telstar II.

The participants were former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, from Denver, former British Prime Minister Anthony Eden, from London, Jean Monnet, "father of the European Common Market," from Brussels, and Heinrich von Brentano, former Foreign Minister for West Germany and present majority leader of the West German Bundestag, from Bonn.

Because of its historic nature, I feel this broadcast should be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The transcript of the broadcast follows:

TOWN MEETING OF THE WORLD

(Broadcast live via Telstar II on the CBS Television Network, Wednesday, July 10, 1963, 12:20–1:25 p.m., e.d.t., rebroadcast by video-tape recording at 7:30–8:30 p.m.)

Participants: Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Denver; former British Prime Minister Anthony Eden, London; Jean Monnet, "father of the European Common Market," Brussels; Heinrich von Brentano, former Foreign Minister for West Germany and present majority leader of the West German Bundestag, Bonn.

Anchor man: CBS News correspondent Walter Cronkite, New York.

Executive producer: Fred W. Friendly, studio control, America, New York.

Producer: Arthur D. Morse, studio control, Europe, Brussels.

Directors: Vern Diamond, studio control, America, New York; Av Westin, studio control, Europe, Brussels.

Mr. CRONKITE. July 10, 1963, Town Meeting of the World with Telstar II, 7,000 miles in space, experimenting in long-range communications as the Columbia Broadcasting System with the cooperation of the European Broadcasting Union tries its luck with a four-way bridge across the Atlantic, a live freewheeling discussion between four statemen of the world.

I am Walter Cronkite of CBS News, and my role here in New York is as a, well sort of combination test conductor and long distance switcher.

Now, may I call in our first station. From Denver, Colo., in the American Rockies, the 34th President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower. Good morning, Mr. President.

Mr. EISENHOWER. Good morning, Walter. You and I have often been together on television, but I think this is the first time we have seen each other by bouncing off of Telstar.

Mr. CRONKITE. I think so, indeed, and it is a thrilling experience, isn't it, sir. I don't know what with communications these days—this business of time reference is a little difficult. I said, "Good morning" to you. Perhaps I'd better just make it hello. It is 9 a.m. out there. It is lunchtime here in New York, and for our European folks it is dinner time already.

President Eisenhower is in studio A of station KLZ with the Denver audience which later in the broadcast will have the opportunity to ask questions of President Eisenhower and of our other guests overseas.

Now, President Eisenhower, we hope that here from London will be the man with whom you worked for so very long, Sir Anthony Eden, the former Foreign Minister and former Prime Minister of Great Britain, and the Wets voice of conscience during the days of Munich in 1938. Now, I hope that that position has been achieved by Telstar, and, indeed, it has. There is Lord Avon. Lord Avon, if you would like to greet President Eisenhower.

Lord AVON. Would I not? How are you, my friend?

Mr. EISENHOWER. Anthony, it is good to see you.

Lord Avon. That was unfair. You can see us but we can't see you. What about that.

Mr. Eisenhower. I hear you are going to do it by tape because of some technical difficulty.

Lord Avon. Yes.

Mr. Eisenhower. You look to me like you have just come from some kind of a ceremonial exercise.

Lord Avon. Isn't it alarming? Sure thing. You know why I got up like this. You know this country well and there's a state visit on. I rush from here to the theater where I happen to be the president of the Shakespeare company to greet my Queen and the visiting Greek royalty and so I have to be dressed up like this.

Mr. Eisenhower. That will be very important but this will be more fun.

Mr. Cronkite. I think we should explain and to you, President Eisenhower, I think you know that we have indeed hoped that through hot switching, as call it in this new phase of electronic journalism, we would all indeed be able to see each other simultaneously.

Lord Avon. I know.

Mr. Cronkite. But because of some difficulty with the French Government they denied the use of their receiving facility in France from Telstar and we are only able to do this one way at the moment. However, this is being recorded and perhaps on the very next pass of Telstar this afternoon or certainly soon the tape will be relayed back to Europe to, fortunately, your facilities in Britain at Goonhilly Down and you will have the full program back there then.

Now then, Lord Avon, I should explain, is in our BBC studio in case you haven't guessed, in London, where an audience of the English speaking union will join our live questioning later on.

Lord Avon, Mr. President, now, if we may move across the English Channel to Brussels, the capital of the Common Market and indeed the technical center of European Broadcasting Union and there you see the man who is frequently called Mr. Europe himself, Jean Monnet.

Mr. President, you once said that Mr. Monnet should win the Nobel Peace Prize. I wonder if you would like to introduce Mr. Monnet to our audience?

Mr. Eisenhower. Well, Jean Monnet needs no introduction in Europe, that is certain, but there are possibly a few people in the United States who have not known of his work. He is truly Mr. Europe because he has worked so hard for the unification of Europe in order to bring to it, through unity, the power that is needed, economic power and military power, to assure the security of that area and to assist so materially in the producing of security for the free world everywhere. He is an old friend and I am delighted he is on this program.

Jean Monnet. Well, Mr. President, I am delighted to meet you in the air. I have met you in North Africa and Paris and Washington. So we will exchange some views, I hope, that will agree; I am sure they will agree.

Mr. Cronkite. We hope they don't agree too much, Mr. Monnet. It is the spirit of controversy which makes these international discussions, sir, but now from Brussels we move east to the Rhine and to Bonn and our fourth participant, Heinrich von Brentano, for many years the foreign minister under Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and today the leader of the Christian Democratic Party.

Dr. von Brentano, I want to thank you particularly for being with us today and for the first time before an audience anywhere conducting a full interview in the English language. We do appreciate your making that effort for us, sir.

Would you like to say hello, Dr. von Brentano, to your colleagues in the other capitals.

Dr. von Brentano. It's a great pleasure for me to have the opportunity by Telstar to talk with former President Eisenhower with whom I've had a lot of very good political talks in his capacity as President, with Lord Avon who I met often and last but not least with my old good friend, Mr. Europe, Jean Monnet.

Mr. Cronkite. Thank you Dr. von Brentano, and now, gentlemen, if we might open our discussion, we'll cover two or three of the main points that I'm sure everyone wants to hear about from you statesmen before we ask our audience to participate later in the questioning. I wonder if we might get started with a quick opinion from each of you. Some 15 to 17 years after the cold war began as to how we in the West are doing in this cold war. I wonder if we might start in London with you, Lord Avon.

Lord Avon. Well, as to how it is doing on the other side of the Iron Curtain, that is always very difficult, isn't it, for us to foretell, but as to how we are doing among ourselves, which is perhaps the more important business, I think we all feel that perhaps our agreement which General Eisenhower did so much to fortify is creaking a bit, and I wonder whether now we have got this Telstar, it hasn't got something of a message for us, whether we oughtn't to try and make still more of NATO. After all, we are so mixed up now, not only physically, but, also, in this way on the air, and, also, in trade, commerce, a thousand and one ways. Oughtn't we to draw the conclusion, not an immediate one, but one to work for, that the only future really deserving of our efforts and our idealism is some form of Atlantic union.

To my American friends, I'd only add this: It was you, about 200 years ago, that had the courage and vision among us then far apart in the days of the ox wagon to form the first federation. I just wonder whether we oughtn't to set our sights high again and work for something of that kind rather than nations wedged in the Atlantic and perhaps even beyond. What do you think of that, Mr. President?

Mr. Eisenhower. Well, Anthony, you have stated the final objective beautifully and eloquently. We must concern ourselves, of course, with those things that come between and the realization of that objective which one day will insure the, really, the peace of this world. We haven't done too badly, I think, in the cold war. But it has not been an unbroken series of victories. There have been ups and downs, but when we go back to some of the critical days of 1950 when the Korean war broke out and a number of crises that hit us in different places—Formosa, Vietnam, Iran, Trieste—there have been a lot of things done that are good. We right now have a very unfortunate situation, as you know, off our coast, but I believe that as the western nations get closer together through voluntary cooperation and through mutual understanding and acting like true partners and without any attempt to make one the dominating factor, I think we can go somewhere, and I believe this Telstar will help us to come into closer understanding among ourselves. This is terribly important.

Mr. Monnet. You said, we will stand in a better position in the cold war from start to finish. I think we do. I think there is no comparison between the Europe of today—some of the difficulties we may have together with the United States—with Europe of 10 years ago. The improvement in conditions generally in France, it is tremendous. That is bound to impress everybody. And, also, the fact that your American Government has shown the determination and the moderation that it showed in the Cuban crisis to me is a capital factor in answering your question, and if you add to that the fact which is deplored by many people, but which I think is good, the fact that the decolonization has given the West its proper figure—the West in the past has dominated—it is a very fundamental attitude which in my opinion affects directly the question which you put.

Mr. Cronkite. Dr. von Brentano, your view of how we are doing in the cold war.

Dr. von Brentano. Well, I think since the establishment of NATO in 1948 the plans of the Soviet Union against the free world has come to a standstill. Within the framework of NATO the free world has grown more closely together. This military strength must be borne by its common political will. It seems to me that we should increase political cooperation in NATO so that we may be able to arrive at common positions in all questions of common policy. An effective military defense is only possible on the basis of German political and moral solidarity, and I want to stress what Lord Avon has said. I remember the speech which President Kennedy made on the occasion of the meeting with Germany. He developed a convincing program of cooperation between the United States and Europe. The foundations for such cooperation were laid by President Eisenhower, my partner of today, and President Truman, and we are ready and resolved to follow the U.S. Government and its reliable allies; good friends along the road.

Mr. Cronkite. Well, gentlemen, the view of how we are doing in the cold war seems to be a rather optimistic one from all four points, but there was the admission from Lord Avon, and, I think you would all agree on that there are strains in the Alliance at the moment, in NATO, the Common Market problems, and for you, Mr. Monnet, there have been suggestions by some observers that your dream for a United States of Europe is fading. I am wondering what are the causes of these strains in your views and what the hopes are for putting us back on the course for Alliance, for mutual benefit through alliance. Mr. Monnet, please.

Mr. Monnet. I think that there is no question about the Common Market going on. It isn't on the Common Market that the difficulties lie. The Common Market—and I would like to explain very quickly—is based and is the result of two things: One, the acceptance by the people of Europe and the countries of Europe that their problems are common so as to deal with them as they are common institutions. So they are not dealing any more with national problems. They are dealing with common problems. At the same time they have done that because they have realized since the end of the war that no one of us could solve the problem by themselves, that we needed the strength of all, but the strength of the organized institution and trade interests, call it institutions, and the interest is today in Europe, so that it cannot be retracted. It is irreversible. So the Common Market in my opinion is out of the question. There is the situation you have right here in Brussels, as I am talking to you. You have a meeting of the Ministers of the six countries who are discussing how they are going to continue the Common Market. Of course they quarrel, there are differences, but they don't amount to differences for the fundamental reason that there is a common interest, and that common interest would also survive. In fact, the negotiations which are now begun between the various countries in the Common Market and the United States—that is not the difficulty. The difficulty comes from the political consequences of the conference, the press conference of General DeGaulle in January, and the difficulties are essentially whether England would come into Europe as she belongs, whether we are going to go on building Euprope in adopting the method of delegation from national to common European institutions that we have followed in the past, and, lastly, whether there is going to be a partnership between Europe and the United States.

Now, those are the difficulties now. I think it is a very grave mistake to think that difficulties can be solved just at the moment when they present themselves. Difficulties are the essence of life, and to surmount them, the conditions and circumstances have changed and they are changing.

What happened? This treaty between France and Germany to my mind is a good thing. Ten years ago we had one preoccupation, and Mr. von Brentano knows that very well, because we worked together for all those years, one preoccupation, to eliminate what remained of the dissension between France and Germany and coal and steel, the Common Market has been judged by that among other preoccupations, naturally, increasing the standard of life but we've had in mind constantly to eliminate the differences of France and Germany. It has been done.

Now, this treaty has been a sign. In itself it is a good thing, but in itself it is a good thing also and especially because the German Bundestag and the German Government have adopted a preamble with the treaty that sets the German policy—the German policy today. And that counts in this world. This policy is a continuation of what has been done with the community, the East European institution, England, the hope of England coming into the community, partnership with the United States and military integration.

Now, this is a factor of very great importance. Then you have the visit of President Kennedy. President Kennedy has reassured, I want to say that again, has reassured Europe that in case of difficulty and trouble the United States would defend Europe as if it would defend themselves. No one can doubt this word any more. Those are tremendous political factors. The German position, Mr. Kennedy's assurance. This begins to change the conditions of the world and dispels a lot of doubts that people have in their minds.

Now, where do we go from here? I could not tell you exactly, but I know one thing from past experience that difficulties are nothing. Difficulties are there not only to be surmounted but to open, to find the way, to help you find the way which otherwise you wouldn't find and that I think is the case in this instance, and who can tell us that in the next month or year things, psychological, many people are not going to change, even the psychology, if I may say so, of the British Government. The British Government speaks today of national deterrent. I think there is no such thing (sound lost as Mr. Monnet continues to speak and then Lord Avon commences to speak also).

Lord Avon. Shadowed by wars or fears of wars between Teuton and Gaul, nothing will give more pleasure, I am sure, to every section of the British people than to see the French and German nations hand in hand. There will never be the slightest part of jealously, rivalry, or anything of that kind in our mind and I am sure Mr. Monnet will accept that. As heartily as he speaks about that, so heartily am I speaking.

Mr. Eisenhower. I want to tell you, Anthony, the United States will be there too. Now, we may have been late twice but we have got our forces in Europe right now that insure that we will be there if you people ever get in trouble, you know that.

Lord Avon. You are well on time now, that's sure. I want to say one further statement about Mr. Monnet's observations. I think we have got to look a little bit to the difficulties and however great our confidence that they will be resolved because if we don't frankly look at them we shall likely not perhaps solve them very well.

One of the main difficulties that I think is bedeviling international relations, now, is the agricultural problem. Quite apart from whether anybody wanting to get in the Common Market or doesn't want to get in, it is a problem, even within the Common Market now, between the Common Market and the United States, it's a problem for all of us.

Now, Mr. President, I would just like to say a word or two about this, as it seems to me it is a problem we just have got to face between us if we are not going to let it bedevil our international relations. The truth is what is happening is that all the countries, all of them, are improving our agricultural production out of all knowledge and the surpluses which exist now are going to go on growing. Well now, what are we going to do about it. You say to Europe, "Please take our chickens." Our French friends say to us, "Please take more of our foodstuffs." We can't do that just by cutting somebody else out. Now, what shall we do? Now, what I would like to see us do, because it seems so strange to me, so exotic, with the world hungry, the richer nations should be bullying each other to take more of their food production and I would like us to sit down together, half a dozen of the more prosperous nations try to estimate what our food surplus is going to be of our own production over the next few years, decide where we can channel it most usefully for ourselves, most productively for the people who will receive it. Make a plan like that, get the international banks' help and try and syphon these surpluses off. Otherwise, as sure as I have ever been in international affairs this agricultural problem is going to give us an awful lot of trouble, every one of us.

Mr. Cronkite. Gentlemen, as difficult as the problems are facing our various Western alliances, they are having similar problems or worse ones, perhaps, on the other side of the Iron Curtain. I wonder if we could quickly get an assessment from you, gentlemen, as to the seriousness and perhaps the duration, whether it is a permanent split this ideological battle between Moscow and Peking.

Mr. Eisenhower, Sir?

Mr. Eisenhower. Well, there has been one comforting thing about the history of dictatorships. The people that are power hungry begin to fall out among themselves. So here I think we have one example. We have Communist power becoming sort of polarized. It is now centered both in Peking and in the Kremlin, and naturally jealousies develop and if these jealousies can extend not only to the military and political world but also into the economic, then we would hope that this rift is not only noticeable and, let's say, important but it will grow. But along with this development between these two communist giants we have got to remember this, there are a number of people that are held in subjugation in the world that are themselves unhappy about these things. It isn't the people themselves that are communist and are embracing communist doctrines but you go over, I was in Czechoslovakia for example, just before the takeover in that country. Well, there was no question about the dedication of the mass of the people to freedom.

This holds, I think, for all the eastern nations. They really want to be free and to pursue their own independent courses. Well, they are now held down by communist military power and that will continue for some time because certainly we are not going to start an aggressive war to break up this thing. But, within Communist areas themselves there is constantly an enlightenment that must go along with the scientific development that we see is so marked in the Communist nations today.

There is bound to become a better understanding of freedom and what it means in West Germany as opposed to East Germany, in the Western nations as opposed to the Iron Curtain countries. You just cannot bring in to a whole population a knowledge and a practice of great and sophisticated scientific techniques without bringing in also information, an understanding that is now denied them.

So I think that while sometimes it may become very disappointing that time has to be depended upon, the whole history of dictatorship is sooner or later they do destroy themselves.

Now, in the meantime I think we ought to encourage every kind of dissension, both internal and between the Chinese and the Russians and do everything we can to show the power and the determination of the free nations to be dedicated to those basic principles of human dignity and freedom and liberty that are truly the unifying influences among those democratic and self-governing nations.

Mr. Cronkite. Dr. von Brentano, you have a border on the Iron Curtain. What is your view of this problem?

Dr. von Brentano. I would like first to say a few words on the question of the European politics. I would like to address President Monnet.. The Common Market, the union of six continental European states, has become political reality. Nobody should be surprised to find that certain difficulties crop up while this great idea is carried into effect. However, the Coal and Steel Communities and the Common Market are and remain the nucleus of European cooperation paving the road toward political union. Today there are six states taking part in this development, but it is the aim and wish of German policy also to include Great Britain, Norway, and Denmark in this community and to conclude association agreements with the other European states taking into account their particular political objectives so that in the end a European union covering a vast area will be achieved.

I have no doubt that we shall succeed in attaining this great political goal if all the governments concerned manifest the political determination which is just as indispensible if national boundaries which have become too narrow are to be overcome in the economic and political fields; but it seems to me, and I fully agree with President Monnett, it seems to me more than a matter of taking up again the negotiations that broke down in Brussels. There is strong support in public opinion in Europe for a strong politically united Europe. We want that side by side with the United States we can protect peace and keep the Atlantic partnership a reality. So we should consider how to mobilize this democratic opinion in the member states, for I am convinced that the European people want more progress toward unity than the hesitating governments have yet been ready to achieve.

This is why I believe we should all repeatedly call for elections for a European parliament. The existing European authorities can only fulfill their parts and foster European integration if they are under democratic parliamentary control.

And I heard with great pleasure what Mr. Monnet also said about the Franco-German treaty. To me the way to judge this treaty is to see it in perspective. You must consider it against the background of 400 years of French-German hostility. It can only be good for the peace of the world if the treaties are the way to receive official attention in the heart of Europe. If anybody still thinks that in some ways the French-German pact weakens the Atlantic community, there is a clear answer. The answer is in the preamble, mentioned also by President Monnet, attached to the treaty by the German Parliament. This preamble clearly affirms Germany's commitment both to the Atlantic alliance and to increased European integration.

What concerns the Russian attitude of the moment, I think we will have an answer in the near future in the discussions which will begin in the next days in Moscow. The Federal Republic has followed the negotiations on the nuclear test ban with great interest. She hopes and wishes that final arrangements may be arrived which will at the same time work as the basis for talks of general control of armaments. The most recent statements by members of the Soviet Government, however, do not justify any optimism with regard to the forthcoming talks in Moscow. As long as the Soviet Union opposes any effective control there will be justified doubt as to its readiness to contribute to a genuine relaxation of tension.

Mr. Cronkite. Thank you, Dr. von Brentano. I think we won't pursue that Moscow-Peking problem any further now because we do want to get to the true meaning of "Town Meeting of the World."

Lord Avon. I have one question only because I forgot it, and it won't take me 2 minutes. M. Monnet kindly asked about the deterrent and I didn't pick up what his question was—the independent deterrent. Of course, I am not qualified to speak for the British Government but, as I understand it, the position there is that though we have an independent deterrent, we have made that deterrent, handed it over to NATO, just as the United States has made its deterrent or a large part of it, also available to NATO. It is available, so in that sense it isn't——

Mr. Monnet. Yes, but my understanding is that the British Government has a national deterrent, certainly has turned it over to NATO, but can withdraw it and have it a national deterrent. And I say, and I want to make it very clear, that I do not believe that any national action, deterrent or otherwise, is possible today. The deterrent should be European in participation, partnership with the United States, and should not be at the will of one government as is the case with the British Government, become again a national deterrent, as would be the case.

Lord Avon. No, I don't accept that, I am afraid, because our position is exactly the same as that of the United States, except that we have put, I think, our whole national deterrent, which is very small, at the disposal of NATO, whereas the United States, which has much more power, of course, has placed part of her deterrent power at the disposal of NATO. Our position is exactly the same, naturally so because we are the only two powers at the moment who have the nuclear deterrent.

Mr. Monnet. Let me ask a question. If at a certain moment the British Government decides to withdraw from NATO its national deterrent, will it not become a national British deterrent irrespective of the United States or anybody else?

Lord Avon. The United States has exactly the same power. We both have that power. It is only in an emergency of the gravest kind we are entitled to do that and so is the United States. Why should we not have the same right?

Mr. Monnet. Well, my dear Lord Avon, you haven't got the same possibilities.

Lord Avon. But even with the possibilities may you not have the same rights?

Mr. Eisenhower. It gets to be a matter of principle around here.

Mr. Monnet. The right that the British Government should have is the right the French Government should have, is the right that all European governments should have. It is to have a European deterrent in partnership with the United States, not a national deterrent.

Lord Avon. Ours is exactly in partnership. It couldn't be closer. We do the whole work with the United States, the whole exploration from the beginning of time, as my friend General Eisenhower knows. From the war, we have pooled our resources in respect to the nuclear and we shall always pool them. We are not going to go off on our own, you know that perfectly well.

Mr. Monnet. I believe that, but just the same, and I don't want to press you in this argument, but just the same——

Lord Avon. You are pressing.

Mr. Monnet. Just the same, the British Government can withdraw their deterrent and it becomes a national deterrent.

Lord Avon. So can the United States. Our position is exactly the same.

Mr. Monnet. You cannot compare.

Lord Avon. Well, I'm sorry. We've both got independent deterrents, so they are comparable. Nobody else has it. You become sorry when both are international——

Mr. Eisenhower. I think I have to go along with Anthony on that argument. I really believe I have, as you have, been allied with the British before and you know they will do what they say. I just don't believe that we have to worry about the British holding out in whatever the whole of Western Europe is threatened all of us are going to be there, and I think that the presence of our forces in Europe show that when the time comes everything we have will be there, including all of our types of weapons, and I don't believe this particular worry, Jean, is justified, truly don't.

Mr. Monnet. I am sorry, President Eisenhower, but I do not agree with you in this thing.

Mr. Cronkite. Mr. Monnet, is not your desire for the nuclear deterrent to be placed in the hands of a united Europe merely a means or principally a means toward the end of a united Europe as you have so long dreamed and worked for in the belief that with a common nuclear deterrent this would force a common policymaking and a common political approach?

Mr. Monnet. I would like to broaden your question. I am convinced that no nation in Europe has the resources or the possibility of solving alone any one of its problems. Union, collective action is necessary, and collective action of Europe is necessary, and then a partnership between Europe and the United States is necessary, and in so doing, I think we will convince the world of where we stand, where the free world stands, not nationally, but the European nations collectively in partnership with the United States.

Mr. Cronkite. And I am sure that some of our audience would like to ask some more questions about that very same thing. It is dear to the hearts of all of them, I am sure. So let's go to our "Town Meeting of the World" at this moment to London for the first question. In London, is there a questioner?

Question. Yes, Mr. Cronkite, and this is really good stuff. May I, through you, direct a question, as Maurice Barr, a journalist of London, to General Eisenhower. Sir, we can hear that America has a great interest in the Atlantic partnership, but why is it that from time to time, at least, we get the impression that the United States wants to dominate Europe?

Mr. Eisenhower. I really want to answer that question. This is a matter that has concerned me deeply for a number of years. I have been involved in war and in peace with this effort to make the United States and Western Europe jointly strong and secure for many years. Now, this charge that one nation, the United States, although it is rich and strong, is trying to dominate is bad for two reasons: First, it is baseless. There is no ground for this kind of accusation.

And, secondly, if we did try to do this, it would be fatal for us. We want a sturdy partner. We'd like to see a united Europe. As a matter of fact, I came to your city of London in 1951 and did my utmost to express my conviction that Western Europe must unite so that it can be strong along with the United States and as a partner make certain that the dictatorship and the Soviet Communist dictatorship cannot make any further inroads on us. Now, if the United States had wanted to dominate, why should we have gone to so much trouble in helping through the Marshall plan, through the Truman doctrine in Greece and Turkey, through the joining so strongly in the NATO alliance, sending our troops over there. We have wanted to see Europe prosper, to become strong, and a worthy and an equal partner, and if they can't do it unifiedly, then let's do it on whatever basis we can, through NATO—and let's don't give up on NATO—if we go back 12 years, let's think, just see how weak we were then. Now we've had this Steel and Coal Community, largely because of the efforts of Mr. Monnet and others. We've had Euratom. Now we have got the Common Market. We always knew that the unity of Europe was coming about step by step, and we have had a number of them. Let us not try to say that the United States in its efforts to help and to make sure that Europe is just as safe as we are, and vice versa, that we are trying to dominate.

I just assure you I have been in this business a long time, and I am quite certain—while I can't speak for anybody since I left the White House—I do know this—the United States does not want a weak Europe; they want a strong Europe, and they don't want to dominate, they want to be a partner.

Mr. Cronkite. And now may we have the next question from Denver?

Allen Brecht (professor of history at the University of Denver and vice president of the English Speaking Union, Denver Branch). I have a question I would like to ask of all three of our European cousins if I might. We study a great deal of European history in the United States, and we do it because we think it offers certain object lessons. One of those lessons, I think, is that Europe has always been concerned basically with Europe, in setting the European house in order all the time from the Congress of Vienna perhaps to the present moment. Now, we Americans are interested in a very broad world. We see Islam rising, we see people in India, Africa, South America. Now, this is going to be a better world, and you have said that over and over again. My question is how genuinely new will this better world be.

Mr. Cronkite. May we have the answer perhaps from Lord Avon first.

Lord Avon. I'd like to say first, if I may, to you, General Eisenhower; that I thought you made your case completely, if I may say so. I don't believe people in my country think that the United States wants to dominate Europe, nor does anybody else.

As regards your question, sir, about the future, in some sense we are like you in this island, because our interest also stretches over the ocean to Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, with whom, we remember, we were alone in 1940 for a whole year. So in that sense our feeling is the same. I would hope that we could, in association with our European partners with whom we want to stand, and in close intimacy with the United States, and the Commonwealth, go on building this kind of world. I agree with General Eisenhower that it can be done, and, obviously, it must take time. But the tendency should be there. If we can be outward-looking in the sense of thinking of a newly emergent nation and in the sense of doing all we can to avoid what I think is the greatest economic danger today, that the richer nations will get richer, the poorer nations get poorer, that is what we have got to set our policies and hearts against, and the United States is generously doing and as we all must do, not only by aid and money but by directing our trade policy to try and get that result.

Mr. Cronkite. Monsieur Monnet.

Mr. Monnet. I think that the best way to help the underdeveloped countries—some steps have already been taken, as I said in the beginning of this broadcast by the decolonization that, therefore, this country's responsibility is essential to action, and then by uniting the countries of Europe and in partnership with the United States and together acting and helping the underdeveloped nations which I don't think you can help except by acting together. That is one of the reasons why I think that the partnership between a united Europe, including England, and the underdeveloped nation is absolutely essential.

Mr. Cronkite. Dr. von Brentano.

Dr. Von Brentano. Let me first come back to the question posed by the journalist in London. I did not understand his name. We in Germany, we have never the impression that the United States has the intention to dominate our country; on the contrary, they did all to help us. We think that the United States are the largest and most powerful country of the free world. It is them who have made Germany and European recovery at all possible. We recognize the United States leadership in the free world, and more than that, I am convinced that the free world can only perform its mission if the United States fulfills their task of leadership. In the last question, I would stress what Mr. Monnet said. It is our common task to cooperate in the field of helping the underdeveloped countries in the whole world. We must use the OECD in Paris, but we can do it also by bilateral and multilateral treaties, and I think we did something in this field. Of course, we must strengthen our common efforts, because it's a worldwide problem, and perhaps the future of the whole world depends on the results of our common efforts.

Mr. Cronkite. And now may we have a question from Brussels, please?

Question. Mr. Cronkite, I should like to put a question to Lord Avon—if we could have some of the economic details of his plan for disposing of surplus agricultural produce is he suggesting that the European countries should continue paying subsidies to European farmers, in order to get rid of goods which are needed in Europe, and what is the scheme to be adopted for disposing of these goods in the countries which need them?

Lord Avon. I will try to answer that. I was not trying to tell the European countries how they should manage their economies in respect to agriculture. I cannot imagine anything more calculated to give everybody a bad headache than to attempt a thing of that kind. I was only suggesting that we face the consequence of the policies, which is that there are great and will be increasing surpluses not only in our country but in the United States, Canada, Australia, and other great food-producing areas. I was suggesting we face that now before it gets in the way of machinery and that a method would be that we should sit down together and work out, which can be done, what these surpluses are likely to be over a term of years, where we could most usefully channel them to help the countries which need them, and having determined that, there will remain the difficult question of finance, which is not insoluble, and which the International Bank maybe could help us with.

What seems to me so strange is that in a world where there is great need of food, an increasing need, I fear, of foodstuffs in many countries, we should be, the richer countries, trying to push more food on to each other. It doesn't seem to make much sense.

Mr. Cronkite. And now may we go to the London audience for another question, please?

Bill Blair (a member of the Electrical Trades Union Executive Council). I would like to ask General Eisenhower if he can ever conceive the NATO organization coming under the control of the United Nations organization.

Mr. Eisenhower. Well, I think that that is conceivable, of course. As of now, let us not forget this, that the NATO Treaty is drawn within the meaning of the United Nations Charter, and has been drawn up because of the authority given by that charter. If you could conceive, though, of NATO going now under the United Nations, then you are asking NATO, which was drawn up to assure the security of Western Europe and the United States and the free world, you are asking it to go under the veto of the Soviet Union, and for that I have no use whatever, I assure you.

Now, if there is a contrary view on that matter among all my associates that are participating in this little town meeting this morning, I would like to hear it, because I would like to see the day come when there would be no need for NATO, because the United Nations would become so successful and the cooperation among the nations of the world would be so good that humanity could really look forward to an era of universal peace with justice. That is a long way ahead, and in the meantime I say we'd better keep our powder dry, and that means keep making sure that we are going to be secure and safe.

Now, I do not for 1 minute believe that the free nations will ever be belligerent or aggressive. It is truly defensive only that we seek this military strength, and as Monnet, as the announcer spoke of a little while ago, he said: "We must have a moral and spiritual and economic strength to support the military strength, and, indeed, without those three factors, you couldn't possibly have a military strength of any kind." So I say NATO is necessary today; maybe one day it won't be.

Mr. Cronkite. In Denver, is there another question?

Question. Thank you. My name is Harper. I am in Denver, Colo. In connection with this last question from London, and also in connection with what both M. Monnet and Herr von Brentano have said, I would like to direct a question to Lord Avon, if I may. Lord Avon, do you not believe, or do you believe that an actual political federation of the NATO countries would create really only two governmental agencies, a union defense force and a union customs-free economy, is actually easier to achieve now than some of the so-called intermediate steps that are proposed but which do not achieve it? It seems to me that both the problem of nuclear arms, the trade problems which are trying to be handled now by means that seem very difficult would be satisfactorily handled to all the powers if we had this actual political federation. Of course, you would have two or three other little things, union citizenship, union currency, and now this union, new wonderful medium of communication, but one that would create really only two actual governmental agencies, a union defense force and a union customs-free economy, is easier to achieve now than the intermediate steps that are proposed. What is your conviction on that matter?

Lord Avon. I don't—I want to be sure I understood you right. You mean on the Atlantic basis or a NATO basis?

Mr. Harper. Yes, the Atlantic community. I am sorry. I meant a political federation of the Atlantic community, yes, thank you.

Lord Avon. Well, personally I agree with you, in this sense. I have felt, and I still feel that there is a certain danger of NATO resolving itself into two large power blocs, shall we say, the European power bloc and the American power bloc. I wouldn't like to see that, because I think you might then find yourself back in some of the difficulties we've had—balance of power in the years gone by. I quite realize the immense difficulties that confront Atlantic federation, but the important thing is to set the goal, and I would very much like that to be acknowledged as our goal, and then we can work for it by stages as we agree. So, therefore, sir, I think you and I are in complete agreement.

Mr. Harper. Thank you.

Mr. Cronkite. I believe there is a young lady in the London audience with a question.

Mrs. Wheeler (housewife). May I, through you, ask General Eisenhower the following question. It is sometimes felt that Americans do not fully understand the multiracial cooperative nature of the British Commonwealth. Has it a part to play in international affairs, and if so, how would be the best way to present it to an American audience?

Mr. Eisenhower. I didn't quite understand the last part of that question when you said is there some way of letting us understand. The last part of the question, would you please repeat it?

Mrs. Wheeler. Is there—have we some part to play in international affairs, and, if so, how would it best be presented to an American audience?

Mr. Eisenhower. Well, now, I think I would be the first to admit on the part of all Americans that we don't know everything, and I think there is nothing quite so important in this whole world as that the people of the several nations understand each other better, their histories, their traditions, their ideals, everything about them, their education systems.

Now, I think that, of course, every nation in the world has a very great part to play in making others understand the basic issues of our time and how we are going to approach them because while one country may be very strong in economic and military affairs and politically very influential, the fact is that in the moral field every nation is the equal of every other if they want to take the same, proper standards. I don't see any reasons why little Luxembourg cannot give us a voice and a comprehension of our moral problems in the world just as well as can the United States or anybody else. I think what we have to do is to make ourselves receptive to the views of others, and I mean through people to people, individuals, schoolmates with schoolmates and professors with professors and cities with cities, and when we finally achieve the kind of mutual understanding we should have, then I will tell you most of the problems of the world if they will not be solved, they will now begin to be approached with intelligence rather than with prejudice and without, you might say, jealousy.

Mr. Cronkite. To all of you gentlemen might I say thank you and I might say, incidentally, Mrs. Eisenhower is looking very well this morning, Mr. Eisenhower. We just had a picture of her on the screen.

Mr. Eisenhower. Thank you.

Mr. Cronkite. Good morning, Mrs. Eisenhower.

I want to say to all of you gentlemen that if you wish to add comments on these questions, even though they are directed to a single individual, don't hesitate to do so.

We only have a couple of minutes left but let's go to Denver now for another question.

Question. I would like to ask Sir Anthony Eden whether our two countries should continue to hold out for on-sight inspection in resolving the dilemma of nuclear disarmament.

Lord Avon. That is an immensely difficult technical question. I'm bound to say I am not up to date on these things and I would drop that answer to General Eisenhower but as the question is asked to me I think I should say some measure of inspection I think seems to me indispensable and I would hope we would get it for more reasons than the nuclear. Once we can get the Russians and others to accept the habit of international inspection, it will be an extremely good thing for the growth of confidence between the nations. If they find it isn't such a terrible thing after all, then we may have it and it may add confidence enormously. Therefore, I hope we shall get a measure of international inspection.

Mr. EISENHOWER. Well, Anthony, you are raising up that old question of a closed society against an open society.

Lord AVON. Yes.

Mr. EISENHOWER. We believe our strength is that of an open society, let anyone come and inspect us.

Lord AVON. That's it.

Mr. EISENHOWER. On the other side they believe their strength is keep out every unwanted thing, don't listen to contrary views and, as a matter of fact, ideas may be a lot worse sometimes than bombs, so I agree with you. You cannot today just accept someone's word, "We are going to have no testing," We did that for a while, you know. We had an interval which we said, "All right, we will not do this until we see what the other fellow is doing."

Lord AVON. That's right.

Mr. EISENHOWER. All right, he came out of the clear sky with 48, I think, brand new and very extraordinary experiments and I just for one will never agree that we can have a decent treaty until there is some type of inspection that is approved by our scientists as being acceptable.

Lord AVON. Good, I agree.

Mr. CRONKITE. Gentlemen, the wonderful little Telstar is fast disappearing in the east. We have time, perhaps, for one quick question and a quick answer from Brussels.

QUESTION. I would like to put a question to Mr. Monnet. I hope you will forgive me if it is a highly specialized question.

A lot has been said about the Chinese-Russian quarrel and its effect upon the relationship between Russia and the West or, rather the relationship between Russia and the Eastern European countries is also changing. Especially they are developing a more independent policy. Do you think that this opens up new avenues or new means to bridge the gap between Eastern Europe and the Western European community as a whole even though there may not be any revolution in the economic or political section of Europe?

Mr. MONNET. I think that the most important thing is not so much to pay attention to what happens with Russians but what happens with us. I think if we give full attention to ourselves, mainly, if we finish and complete this unity of Europe with England and establish a partnership between this part of the world and the United States, then many of the problems which are now raised are going to be solved by themselves. It is what we do because of ourselves in strengthening ourselves that has effect on the others, not what we do because of others. I suggest that that's the way to go about it.

Mr. CRONKITE. Mr. Monnet, thank you so much. Lord Avon, good night to you sir, in London.

Lord AVON. Good night.

Mr. CRONKITE. Dr. Von Brentano, good night to you in Bonn.

Dr. VON BRENTANO. Good night.

Mr. CRONKITE. Mr. Monnet, in Brussels, and to you, President Eisenhower in Denver.

Mr. EISENHOWER. Well, good night to all of you. It has been a pleasant experience. It's good to see so many old friends.

Mr. CRONKITE. Thank you, gentlemen. Thus ends this experiment in communications, the first Town Meeting of the World. We want to say that our reception in the United States was marvelous. All the pictures of all of you talking to the other, and I only wish that the French had permitted us to transmit these pictures back to you at the same time.

We hope that what we have done here today at the Columbia Broadcasting System with the cooperation of the European Broadcasting Union and that marvelous little Telstar 7,000 miles out there in space will be the forerunner of many face-to-face meetings of the world statesmen. We hope to have another one soon on CBS but not just for discussion of our problems, for public elucidation, but perhaps eventually for settlement of our problems for the public's welfare in what may well be, thanks to electronics, a new age of diplomacy. Thank you, gentlemen, and good day.

Fiscal Nonsense From the Reader's Digest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Reader's Digest is supposedly read by 13 million people every month. If this is true than 13 million people were misled by an article which appeared in the May 1963, edition of this magazine entitled "The Real Truth About the Federal Budget."

The following analysis of the article was made by the Democratic National Committee and refutes this so-called real truth:

AN ANALYSIS OF AN ARTICLE ENTITLED "THE REAL TRUTH ABOUT THE FEDERAL BUDGET," PRINTED IN THE MAY 1963 ISSUE OF READER'S DIGEST

The charge: The budget is higher than any previous President has "dared" to propose.

The truth: Our economy is larger and our population greater than under any President. By the end of 1964, there will be 10 million more Americans than there were the day President Kennedy took office. An increasing Federal workload is therefore inevitable and necessary.

The charge: Our national debt has "swollen" to more than $300 billion.

The truth: Eighty percent of the public debt was incurred during wartime. In addition, Federal debt since the end of World War II has grown very modestly—only 18 percent—compared with the 400 percent State and local net debt, the 204 percent corporate net debt, and the 382 percent personal net debt.

The charge: Nondefense spending has "soared" under the present administration.

The truth: Federal nondefense spending in the administrative budget is a smaller proportion of gross national product than it was in 1939 and 1949, and is the same proportion of gross national product as it was in 1959.

The charge: President Kennedy has not kept his word to hold nondefense spending for fiscal 1964 below fiscal 1963 levels.

The truth: The President has kept his word. He promised to hold the line on spending for all purposes other than defense, space, and interest on the debt. Apart from these three categories, budget expenses will increase less between 1961 and 1964 than they did between 1958 and 1961. Furthermore, defense, space, and interest account for more than 70 percent of the increased expenditures since 1961. The article falsely included space and interest in the nondefense category.

The charge: Federal budget deficits have eroded more than half the pre-World War II value of money, savings and social security.

The truth: There is no direct relationship between Federal administrative budget deficits and a drop in the value of the dollar. There have been deficits in 5 of the past 6 fiscal years; and yet wholesale prices are now lower than they were in 1958, while consumer prices have risen less than any comparable period since World War II.

The charge: The budget does not disclose the full scope of Government spending.

The truth: The Kennedy administration has disclosed in great detail the public enterprise fund expenditures. It has not concealed the fact that it proposes to speed up the sale of Government assets, such as mortgages and other loans. And it has given more emphasis to trust fund expenditures than ever before in American budget history.

The charge: The budget does not tell the whole story, because the Government will commit itself this year for certain spending in future years.

The truth: Budget expenditures and new obligational authority are not the same thing. They are quite different. Their sums cannot be added, and the amounts of each, in any one year, have no direct relationship. Furthermore, Congress must approve any future spending to which a Government agency obligates itself.

The charge: So-called back-door spending is deceitful, and a policy of fiscal insanity for bypassing Congress.

The truth: Back-door spending does not bypass Congress. It is mainly a question of which committees in Congress handle certain spending proposals, and it was started by the Hoover administration in 1932. All back-door spending legislation must be approved twice by the full House and the full Senate.

The All-time Record

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I seek the privilege of joining with my colleagues in congratulating the Honorable CARL VINSON on his matchless record of service to this House.

Almost 50 years of continuous service to the Nation—no Member has held a seat in this Chamber so long. Almost 30 years as chairman of a major committee of the House of Representatives—no Member has held a chairmanship so long. This is a record, Mr. Speaker, that may never be surpassed.

The residents of the Sixth Congressional District of the State of Georgia chose wisely and well when they first elected young CARL VINSON in the year 1914. They could not, of course, see into the future. They could not foresee the long and historic service that lay ahead, but they did choose a Representative that was qualified and able to serve his district, his State, and the Nation in whatever capacity the needs of the times would dictate.

Chairman VINSON has been honored by the leadership from both sides of the aisle this past week, but the greatest honor has been done to him by his own constituents. Twenty-five times they have reaffirmed their confidence in him, and this perhaps is the greatest honor of all.

When one thinks back over the events of the past half-century he is staggered by the onrush of great historical achievements. America was a second-class power when CARL VINSON first came to Washington—today we stand first in power and first in prestige. It has taken two world wars and a scientific and technological revolution to bring this change about, and CARL VINSON has played a major role in shaping events.

The America of 1914 seems a far and distant place to us now. The raw frontier of the West was still not finally tamed—our Nation still lived by the principles of McGuffey's Reader and the stories of Horatio Alger. Young CARL VINSON was a product of that America and it lives within him still.

He represents all that is best in the American tradition. The rugged, pioneering spirit, and the strong streak of independence. The realistic mind that judges other men on what they can do, and not on what others say. These traits are characteristic of the America of 50 years ago, and we are the losers as we move away from that point in time. I wish we could capture that youthful exuberance again.

If the honorable chairman of our Armed Services Committee was to retire today his place in our history books would be secure. Fortunately, we can expect to have his experience and talent with us for a long time to come. Mr. Speaker, it is right and proper that we pause this week to pay him the homage he has so richly earned.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to supplement my earlier remarks on the occasion of Captive Nations Week by including editorials on the subject which appeared in recent issues of two leading newspapers in Union County, N.J.

On July 12, the Daily Journal of Elizabeth published an editorial entitled, "The Need for Captive Nations Week," and on July 15, the Courier-News of Plainfield published one entitled, "Captive Nations Remembered," both of which I am sure our colleagues will find interesting and constructive.

The editorials follow:

THE NEED FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Observance of Captive Nations Week, designated for July 14–20, reminds Americans of the plight of the liberty-starved millions in other lands and the continuing menace of aggressive communism to any people who do not resist every moment. This is the 5th year for this encouraging observance, which was established by Federal legislation and is reactivated each year by Presidential and other proclamations.

Captive Nations Week has an impact on the other side of the Iron Curtain. A Russian voice recently asked why the United States persists in this observance and said that the cause is "as much a dead horse as the Hungarian question."

Nevertheless in those words there is abundant purpose in persisting. The Hungarian question will not die, unless the free people of the world permit the Communists to erase it from the United Nations agenda, cease to warn that another Hungary is possible wherever vigilance is relaxed, and to press for retribution.

To make Captive Nations Week expressive, free people here and in other countries must keep alive the Hungarian question; must insist on fulfillment of Russian pledges of elections in Eastern European countries under Kremlin domination, and inclusion of the right of self-determination for them on the United Nations calendar.

These objectives cannot be accomplished overnight or in a year, but perseverance and the weight of public sentiment in the free world can be effective. Captive Nations Week is dedicated to that accomplishment.

CAPTIVE NATIONS REMEMBERED

The observance of Captive Nations Week, July 14–20, was started 4 years ago following the unanimous passage of a joint congressional resolution which has now become public law, adopted by Congress in July, 1959. The law provides that each year this Nation shall renew its pledge and continue its efforts "until such times as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

The enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by the Communists makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between the peoples of the United States and other peoples.

When the spokesmen for Soviet Russia make ridiculous charges of colonialism against nations of the free world, the United States and others are aware of the subjugation of nations behind the Iron Curtain in Eastern Europe and in Asia. We are aware of the wall in Berlin, the denial of freedom in East Germany, and the aggressive acts of communism in Cuba, Latin America, and Africa.

These submerged nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedoms.

Captive Nations Week provides the American people with a chance to show the peoples of Eastern Europe that they are not forgotten. It provides our Government with a chance to capitalize on Soviet weakness by taking the initiative in the cold war.

It can do so by (1) retaining the issue of Hungary on the agenda of the United Nations, (2) raising the question of Soviet treaty pledges to hold free elections in Eastern Europe in all negotiations with the Kremlin, (3) placing the question of the denial of the right of self-determination to the peoples of East-Central Europe on the agenda of every session of the United Nations.

In short, Captive Nations Week is an excellent way to tell the Communists that we refuse to be buried and that we shall not compromise our innermost principles; that we intend to preserve peace and finally to attain the victory of freedom for all people.

Stiletto Is Key to an Addict's Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am today inserting in the Appendix the second article in a two-part series that appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun on June 17 and June 18 on the subject of youthful dope addiction. The reporter, Woody Klein, is one of the most knowledgeable men in the United States on the subject of the pressures of city living. He is an expert on housing and the conditions that result when housing is substandard, when education facilities are inadequate, and when job opportunities are scarce. One of the byproducts of this kind of slum-standard living conditions is dope addiction.

This is a story told to Woody Klein in person by a young dope addict in New York:

STILETTO IS KEY TO AN ADDICT'S SURVIVAL

(By Woody Klein)

An outcast in his own block, he imprisons himself during daylight in a basement cell at the bottom of the tenement.

The stiletto he carries is his key to survival as a dope addict. With it, he can steal and get his fix. Without it, he would be even more desperate.

While I was talking with him, he sprawled out on a dirty, sagging mattress. He mumbled:

"The cops look for us. They curse at us. They call us all kinds of names. They hate addicts. They know who the addicts are. Like I been here all my life. They know me. Every time they see me they want to pick me up."

WANTED TO BE COP

"They always bother me. I tell you something—I wanted to be a narco (narcotics) cop once. I had that in mind when I left school in the ninth grade * * * but I never went back to school.

I didn't have no habit at the time, but I wanted the habit so I could brag about it to my friends * * * but now I hate to get arrested. When I first got arrested, they hit me a while. I'd be crying and they'd throw cold water at me and they kick me and smack the —— out of me.

"They didn't care. They say, 'Shut up, you junkie.' You know what it is to try and kick the habit when they be hitting you? * * *"

EAST SIDE PICKINGS

His dark face showed the pain he was recalling. He looked 10 years older than his age. I asked him where and how he robbed.

"All over, mostly 67th Street in the East Side, around York," he replied. "I go into the new buildings to score. I go through the fire escapes at night and open the windows. The people down there, they keep their windows open.

"I been spotted, though, and I been shot at, too. The cops chased me. Sure I'm frightened when I rob, but I know I'm sick and I got to get money * * * people don't help me so I got to take a chance * * *.

A few times I almost fell off the roofs. In the nighttime I'd be running and I don't know * * * I think there's another roof there * * * I had to jump and I've been lucky that I landed on the other roof. It's far away and I had to jump it. Like it's from here * * * to here." (He got up and walked from his mattress about 8 feet to the doorway.)

JEWELRY AND CASH

"When I go out, I go for jewelry. When I see a hi-fi or a portable radio and a TV, I don't touch it. I am only good for jewelry and money. I carry this stiletto. I use it to jimmy open windows.

"I use it on the junkies, too. I tried to get some stuff off them, once. I went to a pusher and got stuff without paying. I just pulled out the knife and told him I ain't got no money. He give it to me. I make it.

"There was another time I was gang-busting. I stabbed this guy. They called it attempted homicide. We stabbed these guys—Dragons. We were using drugs in the street. I stabbed him in the stomach with a stiletto."

STABBED HIM TWICE

"I stabbed him twice * * * me and my friends. I joined when I was 15. I was bopping with the Viceroys against the Dragons. I am an old Viceroy. I get a lot of respect from the kids around here because I belonged. They do not try and mess with me.

"I take the jewelry and stuff to this guy, a racketeer. I know him when I see him. He give me the right money for it. I know jewelry. I am good at jewelry. He gives me up to $600 for one ring. He comes around every day. He goes to the bar.

"He drives up in a big Cadillac. You gotta do business with him because you can't count on your friends for a fix, you know. They got their own habit. My kid brother doesn't steal, though. He counts on me. He's 14 years old and I get the stuff for him."

MANY PUSHERS

"But I don't offer no other youngsters a fix. I can get into trouble for being a pusher. I ain't no pusher. There are a lot of pushers around here, you know, and some of them are women. There are about eight of them. Three push dope. The other five of them hustle. They try and beat the men for their money.

"While they lay in bed with them they try and take their money. Some get $10 to $50 as a regular charge. But most of the time they charge $5 or $3 * * * whatever they can get. I used to go to one of those girls. She got no lower than $3 * * *.

"There is a lot of gambling on this block, too. Cards, shooting dice. Everybody's trying to cut each other's throat around here. Always trying to make money. Everybody wants money in this block. They robbing each other and everything * * * these pushers, they make the dough."

NEXT TIME

"They get a half a load from uptown, and they bring it down here and sell it for $3 a bag. I cop three bags. It lasts about 20 minutes. It don't last too long. When I use it I got to be thinking about another fix every time. I use my money and I'm thinking about the next time."

As we talked, I pointed to the watercolor paintings he had crookedly hung on the wall. He seemed almost embarrassed.

"I do a little bit of art," he said haltingly. "I do my painting—not too tough, but I try. I learned to paint in prison but I haven't got no paint left. I'd like to paint again but I don't think about it much. I think about my next fix, don't even eat much. I'm not even hungry. Maybe soda—I drink soda.

"Do I feel sorry for myself? Yeah, I feel sorry for myself but I don't want nobody else feeling sorry for me because I know what I'm doing. I'm not a baby no more. I'm using drugs because I want to, that's all. Nobody ain't putting that dope in my arm or that needle."

LONG WALKS

"I walk back and forth all day trying to figure out how to get $3, trying to get two bags, always trying to steal something, always trying to get some money. I don't even know what day it is sometimes—Friday, Thursday, or Sunday. We drug addicts don't worry about what's going on in this town or anywhere else. We just worry about dope.

"Some day I'll stop. It could be a year from now, 3 years from now; it could be tomorrow, next week, but I'll stop, I know I will. I'm just waiting. I got to kick this habit. I got to get away from it. The stuff don't do nothing for me. It's killing me."

The addict's name is Joe. A few days after this interview, he was arrested again for unlawful possession of narcotics and criminally receiving stolen property. He was taken to the 23d precinct nearby, booked, and haled into felony court. He's now serving 90 days in the Rikers Island workhouse.

Tragically, this is an old story for Joe. He's been through it before—and probably will go through it many times again.

Who Are the Unemployed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most difficult things to find out is just who are the unemployed. Time and time again, when the Ways and Means Committee held hearings on unemployment compensation, I tried to get a straightforward answer from administration spokesmen as to just who make up the list of unemployed. They just do not know. The figure does include, however, part-time workers, students, in fact, everyone over 14 years of age who has ever asked for a job.

I believe it is important, Mr. Speaker, if we are to deal effectively with the problem of unemployment in any of its phases that we have accurate information as to exactly how many bona fide workers there are, men and women who actually want and need jobs and are eligible for employment.

In this connection I would like to include, as a part of these remarks, the following editorial, "Figures Don't Lie, But—" from the Dallas Morning News of July 16:

FIGURES DON'T LIE, BUT—

One of our worst domestic problems, according to many people, is unemployment. Government statistics claim that 5.7 percent of the total work force in this country is unemployed.

The unemployment problem is not as bad as these statistics make it sound. The imporportance of these statistics has been much exaggerated by those who use them to frighten us into acknowledging the necessity of bigger Government programs designed to relieve the plight of the jobless. They are also used as the basis for justifying union demands for a shorter workweek to spread employment around.

How bad is the unemployment problem? What do the statistics really mean?

A year ago the Labor Department completed a series of studies based on a survey of persons who were jobless for 5 weeks or more in 1961. These studies showed conclusively that the unemployment picture is not as black as it has been painted.

More than half of the jobless surveyed were not heads of households upon whom others depended for support. Of these who were, in one-third of the cases the wife or some other member of the family had a job when the head of the household became unemployed.

More than one-third of those out of work were wives, children, or other relatives who were being provided for by an employed husband or father.

Less than half of those surveyed could be termed "permanent" members of the labor force. A majority had not been working or looking for work consistently during the past 5 years. Of the women surveyed, almost three-fourths had been in and out of the labor market from time to time and did not require a full-time, steady job.

Only 1 worker in 500 left the labor force because there was no work available. Many people simply did not want to take the kind of jobs that were available.

If the unemployed have been desperate, they have not indicated it by their efforts to find new jobs. Only 40 percent of the jobless bothered to try the help-wanted ads. Only 25 percent wrote letters. A mere 12 percent tried to get jobs through their unions or private employment agencies. And in only 12 percent of the cases where the head of the household lost his job did another member of his family start looking for work.

The average jobless person is unwilling to relocate to get a job. A majority of those who were without work for more than 6 months would not even consider moving to another area.

Among the longtime unemployed, more than one-fourth were jobless for noneconomic reasons. Many were out of work because of ill health. Others were waiting for the resumption of seasonal jobs.

Certainly there are many jobless people who could and should be helped. But they are not so numerous as Government statistics would indicate. Those who do not need help, those who do not want help, and those who would not be helped by increased Government activity make up a large percentage of the so-called unemployed. They should be eliminated as a factor in considering the scope of the unemployment problem and how to deal with it.

Address by Charles H. Silver, President, International Synagogue, June 23, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address by Charles H. Silver, president of the International Synagogue, upon the dedication of the synagogue at Idlewild International Airport in New York. Mr. Silver—who is executive assistant for education and industrial development to the Mayor of New York City—is a man dedicated to all mankind generally and especially to his faith. His inspiring message should be read by all.

The International Synagogue will contain a museum of objects sacred to the Jewish people and a library of the literature of the Jewish faith for the use of world travelers.

Mr. Silver's address follows:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL SYNAGOGUE, AT GROUNDBREAKING CEREMONIES, JUNE 23, 1963

A few days ago we mourned the passing of a great man of peace.

A few minutes ago we made it possible for the three principal faiths of our time to erect their tabernacles on this ground hallowed to the glory of God.

Here, at the very crossroads of civilization, we are fulfilling one of mankind's oldest dreams, we are proving the power of eternal truth, we are declaring the unity of faith.

The synagogue which will rise here—with its museum and library—was the inspiration of simple men and women who believe in the furthering of our ancient concepts of knowledge, morality, and justice. They were moved to shelter the dignity of our Jewish way of life and the depth of our gratitude to the Creator of all things, in an edifice worthy of its exalted purpose.

Theirs was an inspiration of ideas, of noble objectives—certainly not so much of dollars as of imperishable human values. And these values are enhanced by the fact that we are emphasizing them in concert with the dreamers and believers and builders among our Catholic and Protestant brothers.

This land is young, and our faith is old, but the precepts on which our three great religions are founded cannot be measured by years. They are ageless. Like the Torah and the Commandments and the durable wisdom of the prophets, these things are timeless.

The synagogue has been the central cohesive force which has held us together as a people. It is the magic ingredient which preserved this small chosen handful through all the horror of endless wandering, anguish and rejection.

The synagogue has been the cornerstone of our ethical and moral way of life throughout a long tormented history. From its altar has been generated the lifegiving force of the Torah, the sustaining principles of our philosophy, the words of fire that have made ours a religion of literature.

This is a day of blessing and dedication—of renewed avowal that we are in the hands of the Almighty and shall strive to be worthy of His keeping.

The site on which we will construct our synagogue, in the very heart of civilization's largest community, has become the gateway to the New World with its promise of freedom, liberty, and equality. Symbolically, it will stand as a citadel of mankind's better self, proclaiming our pact with God across the skyways of the world.

Like the torch of liberty that blazed a welcoming light of hope over New York Harbor when our fathers sought refuge on these shores * * * so bright will be the flame to burn eternally before our Ark of the Covenant.

Moving and memorable are the words inscribed below "The Lady With the Lamp" who thrilled the eyes and hearts of voyages approaching our shores: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free * * *" But we will carve a new credo on our foundation stone for those who come and go from every land:

"Rest here and read the sacred scroll
Whose flaming words of faith will never fade
While we preserve the Torah in our soul
Rest here and pray * * * then journey unafraid."

And we are not alone in this.

We can take pride that our expression of faith is linked with that of the other great religions in a threefold demonstration of strength and inspiration for those who seek solace, hope, and the serenity of spirit that comes from a closeness with our Creator.

Our times have witnessed not only a turbulence in the affairs of nations, but a terrible uncertainty and growing fear that our material civilization—despite the benefits of scientific achievement—or, perhaps because of them—is doomed to disaster.

Again this, we here and now join in this triple hymn of thanksgiving to express in stone and steel our faith in the future. That is what we are forging here today—a thing that would be possible in few other parts of the world—a shield against distrust and dismay to protect freedom and human decency.

It is our answer to the hate breeders, the fear makers and the warmongers.

In this House of God will burn the eternal light of Israel. Within its walls will be heard the thundering voices of wisdom—and in its keeping, as at the altars of the other great faiths represented here, will be guarded the conscience of humanity.

This is God's will and we are doing God's work as we break ground for His House.

Some of you may have wondered—and may still wonder—as I reach the close of my remarks—why I chose to underline the mutual participation of the two other great faiths by making reference to the recent passing of Pope John.

It is not merely that he is in our hearts because of the efforts he made to protect the Jews of Hungary from the Nazi terror. It is not only because he sought to expunge from Christian doctrine the invidious references to the Jews. It is not just that we remember the simple, cordial way in which he greeted a delegation from the United Jewish Appeal in 1960 with the words: "I am Joseph, your brother," nor the sympathetic attitude he always showed toward Israel and all that is being done there.

I speak of him, as we prayed for him in many of our temples, not as a member of another faith, but as a notable representative of the human race and of the finer things to which it can aspire.

In doing so, I break tradition—as he broke tradition—to cross any narrow boundaries of creed and confirm the fact that the basic premise of all faiths is similar and that we seek the same God on our separate paths.

Our Holy Word teaches us that "What a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." In this International Synagogue each man will be able to share the thoughts of his heart in a close communion with the Almighty.

Within these walls he will find his personal God. He will call upon Him with all his heart and with all his soul and with all his might and will find answer in the inner strength to meet the challenges of today.

This is the tribute and the testament we lift to immortalize our way of life. Beside the throb of motors and the roar of traffic, where man has learned to diminish time and space, our synagogue will stretch to the far reaches of Heaven and touch the earth with the wings of tomorrow.

Here, we shall build with faith in mankind's forever. We shall build with firm conviction that a just God will preserve us as a people and safeguard the future of our children.

We shall build a tabernacle whose walls will be strong as love is strong, as unity is strong, as democracy is strong—and the strength we find in these things, and in ourselves, is the strength we receive from the Almighty.

We lift our hearts in prayer to the King of the Universe as we lift a new throne for His dominion over the air and the land and the sea.

Humbly beseeching His blessing, we break this sacred ground to build for the glory of God.

It is our prayer as we prepare to raise our new house of worship, a shrine for the word of God, a refuge in the world of men, another Zion, lighting the way for those who travel on the wings of the future.

To them we say: "Rest here and pray, then journey—unafraid."

Southern Idaho's New Slogan, "Bonneville—Please Include Us Out"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the second of a series of articles on why "Bonneville's multimillion-dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho."

Editorial after editorial and article after article in the press of southern Idaho discloses a widespread opposition to Interior Secretary Udall's unwarranted and untenable action in extending the Boneville power marketing area into southern Idaho.

Mr. T. E. Roach, the president of the Idaho Power Co., which now serves most of the southern Idaho area, has issued a timely and factual statement relative to the Secretary's unsound action.

If the southern Idaho area were ill served and at high rates, there might be some excuse for bringing in low-priced subsidized Bonneville power. This is not the case, however. Idaho Power Co. has long been a pioneer in areawide coverage at rates well below the national average. The precentage load growth on the Idaho Power Co. system has for many years exceeded that on the Bonneville system. The invasion of the territory of such an outstanding electric company by a tax-free subsidized Federal power system that is now losing $18 million annually is totally unwarranted.

The following article taken from the Idaho Daily Statesman of Boise, Idaho, on June 10, 1963, included Mr. Roach's statement:

ROACH ANSWERS CHURCH ON BONNEVILLE POWER

T. E. Roach, Idaho Power Co. president, Sunday issued the following statement in replying to recent comments by U.S. Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat of Idaho, on the expansion of Bonneville Power Administration into southern Idaho:

"My attention has been called to the last Washington news letter from the office of Senator FRANK CHURCH which devotes itself almost entirely to an endorsement of and an attempted justification for the inclusion of southern Idaho in the Bonneville Power Administration marketing area.

LOWER RATE DISCUSSED

"The opening paragraphs of that letter make much of a proposed reduction in wholesale rates to a very small number of public power distributors, now customers of the Bureau of Reclamation, and who serve a mere handful of the total electric customers in southern Idaho. The Senator describes this as a 'dramatic beginning' of what Bonneville's invasion may mean to southern Idaho. Strangely enough, he fails to explain by what Federal bookkeeping magic the substitution of Bonneville as the marketing agent for the power heretofore produced and sold by the Bureau of Reclamation can suddenly produce a reduction in the cost of that power by 40 percent. It will be the self-same power now produced in the same Bureau plants, manned by the same Bureau employees whose wages, I am sure, will not be reduced, and delivered to the wholesale customers over the same facilities as has been the case for 20 years. The costs of generating and delivering that power are not going to be one penny less under Bonneville than it was under the Bureau of Reclamation. If anything, it will be higher in cost because Bonneville always does things in a more grandiose way than does the more mature Bureau of Reclamation. Certainly the Senator will not say that Bonneville will make up out of its treasury the difference between cost and this proposed new selling price because Bonneville freely admits it is now losing $18 million a year and that deficit certainly provides no source of funds to satisfy the payout obligations of the Bureau of Reclamation. It will be interesting indeed to learn by what process of Washington bookkeeping this miraculous accomplishment is to be achieved. It must be alchemy of a new and different type.

AGREES ON DAMS COST

"The letter also contains another very interesting and even more startling statement in attempting to justify this new Bonneville move when the Senator observes that our Snake River provides over one-fourth of the annual flow at the big Government dams on the lower Columbia and that 'our tax money has helped build these mighty dams.' Heretofore, not only the Senator but every public power advocate has urged most strenuously that Federal power dams are always self-supporting and cause no drain whatsoever on the taxpayers of Idaho and of the Nation. Today, however, the Senator says our tax money has helped build these mighty dams. Nothing could be truer but this is the first time that we have had a public admission from a responsible source of something which every intelligent taxpayer has always known.

"As has always been the case with the ardent advocates of public power, documented facts and experience are glossed over as wholly unimportant. An example of this is found in the Senator's letter when he lauds the superior equalities of Federal electric power as the creator of industry, payrolls, and new wealth and implies thereby that those areas of north Idaho, Oregon, and Washington within the orbit of Bonneville power have enjoyed greater economic prosperity than has southern Idaho. I am sure that the Senator has seen and read the documented evidence we have prepared and published which completely destroys any possible justification for a claim of that character."

REVIEWS PHOSPHATE HISTORY

"In another area of attempted justification for the Bonneville invasion much space is devoted to the promise it holds for the phosphate industry. In a recent letter to Assistant Interior Secretary Holum, I made the observation that our many years of experience in serving the phosphate industry of eastern Idaho and the part we played in initially introducing that industry to Idaho gave us a background of experience in that field which I was sure was not possessed by anybody in either the Department of the Interior or the Bonneville Power Administration, upon which evidently Senator Church relies for his information. The only experience either of those departments has had in the field of phosphate production has been in supplying the Victor Chemical Co. at Silver Bow, Mont., and in contrast with the development and accomplishments of the industry in southern Idaho that at Silver Bow has been a complete failure despite the availability of Bonneville power. Yet in spite of that Silver Bow experience, not only these departments but now the Senator continue to evangelize on the virtues of Bonneville power as though their experience at Silver Bow had been anything but a failure when it comes to assuring growth and expansion."

CITES SIMPLOT PROTEST

"Only a few days ago I received a copy of a letter addressed to the Senator by the vice president and general manager of the J. R. Simplot Co. at Pocatello—the originator, and father of the phosphate business in southern Idaho—who pointed out to him the complete fallacy of the Bonneville line of reasoning, which the Senator evidently has adopted, as to the beneficial effect of Bonneville power on that industry. This same man of long practical experience and responsibility likewise ridiculed the claimed potential job and payroll increase which the totally inexperienced Interior and Bonneville personnel preach as gospel."

WANTS "RECORD STRAIGHT"

"I am not indulging here in 'bitter recriminations' but making simple, plain statements of fact in an endeavor to keep the record straight. I want to be sure that the taxpayers of the State and the public generally have something tangible by which to measure the accuracy and truthfulness of these grandiose but unsupported claims of superiority of the public power advocates which come from only thin air. These are but a few examples of the shallow and irresponsible type of thinking in Federal agencies in Washington and elsewhere used as the excuse for programs such as this Bonneville invasion of southern Idaho.

"If BPA is allowed to invade southern Idaho, the taxpayers would end up holding the bag. The taxpayers would pay the bill, just as Senator Church finally admits these same taxpayers are not only paying the bill for the capital cost of the dams on the Columbia River but also for Bonneville's annual losses. Moreover, the same taxpayers would pay for the wholesale rate reduction of which Senator Church is so proud, because no amount of bookkeeping magic can lower production costs, and Bonneville operations are too deeply in the red to make up the difference," Roach concluded.

Space Age Cave Dweller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, A. N. Brunson, president of the Brunson Instrument Co., of Kansas City, is a constituent of whom I am truly proud. He has on his own built one of the finest precision optical instrument factories in the world.

Also on his own, while three administrations, the Congress, and State and local governments have discussed the shelter problem over the years, Mr. Brunson proceeded to build one of the few underground manufacturing facilities in the United States and indeed the world. He did this with no assistance or encouragement from the Federal Government. He did it in the face of derisive remarks about "Brunson's Folly." The plant is the sole American source of supply for many of the precision optical instruments so essential to our national security in the space age. "Brunson's Folly" has now become "Brunson's landmark of progress," not only in the field of precision instrument manufacture, but also in the civil defense program. His factory is not only a fallout shelter, but is also blast-resistant.

He has proven that industry can and will take protective measures against nuclear attack. He stands as an example to the Nation. It is for these reasons I have asked that his statement before Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Armed Services Committee, relating to H.R. 3516, be placed in the Congressional Record, as follows:

My name is A. N. Brunson, president of the Brunson Instrument Co., Kansas City, Mo. I am here in general support of H.R. 3516, the O. C. D. Shelter program, which you have before you. I am here, not as one who has a vague belief in protection against the hazards of the nuclear age, but as one who in a small way has done something about it.

Brunson Instrument Co., Kansas City, Mo., has already made extensive research and plans toward providing adequate shelter, not only for our own employees and our business, but for many additional persons in the case of nuclear attack.

We have developed a complete manufacturing plant in an underground excavation specifically designed and developed to meet our manufacturing needs. This plant consists of 140,000 square feet which has been blasted out of the side of a limestone bluff. It is so located and constructed that it is relatively safe from flood, tornado, earthquake, or nuclear bomb (except through a direct hit).

As for flood, it is situated so high on the bluff above the Blue River that flood waters could not possibly touch any part of it.

While tornadoes are frequent in this area we have no fear of damage from such a disturbance.

Kansas City has had a few earthquakes over the years, the latest on Christmas morning 1961. Others have been felt in Kansas City in 1948, 1939, 1931, and 1895.

As for bombing, the description of the plant which follows will explain the steps taken to make this one of the few plant sites in the world which would be relatively safe, except from a direct bomb hit.

Several main thoroughfares afford reasonably good access to the plant at the present time. Under construction, but not complete, is a six-lane highway which will serve as an expressway for the city. This will come within one block of the plant, with a turnoff at the plant.

Our own engineering staff, together with Mr. James Dickson, consulting engineer, conducted the evaluation and made preliminary design studies. Construction of the plant was started in 1954.

The general configuration of the plant consists of six east and west tunnels and seven north and south tunnels, with columns 15 by 65 feet between tunnels. A sheer cliff approximately 67 feet high extends from the floor of the plant to the top of the front face. Rock and shale formation starts 24 feet below the floor and goes to the surface.

It was originally intended that the ceiling height should be 11 feet, however, during the blasting operations a seam was located in the Bethany Falls limestone which puts the ceiling height at something over 12 feet, before the concrete floor is laid. This seam resulted in a very smooth ceiling surface. And, not a single roof bolt was required.

The factory concrete floor is sealed with a concrete sealer to prevent dust. The walls and ceilings are natural rock, sealed with Latex. Where necessary for a straight wall we have installed concrete blocks. In some cases these walls are only 5 feet high, and in others they extend to the ceiling. The entire area is painted white and all surfaces in both plant and offices can be washed with water or vacuum cleaned.

In the office, which consists of 7,750 square feet plus 1,000 square feet of equipment area, the floors are concrete with asphalt tile. The suspended acoustical ceiling is hung from the rock above, with approximately 3 feet of airspace between. The ceiling high partitions are joined to the acoustical ceiling. All partitions, except in the President's office which is walnut paneled, are movable and are composed of gypsum board set in aluminum channeling and painted with Coroflake paint. The lobby is finished in Tennessee Orchard Sandstone, and the front entrance is so arranged that the sandstone provides a barrier against shock waves caused by bombing.

This plant, to our knowledge, is the only underground facility in the United States constructed specifically for that purpose and entirely without Government financing or aid.

The equipment required to air condition an underground area for use as storage, manufacturing facility, or office space does not differ materially from that required for structures above ground. The application and design of the equipment is vastly affected, however, by the surrounding temperature conditions and other factors that are favorable in underground areas but not found in above ground installations.

All air is filtered regardless of whether it is fresh air from the outside or recirculated air from the factory. Galvanized iron ductwork carries the conditioned air throughout the areas. And, because of the manner in which the plant was excavated, all of the tunnels form natural air flow ducts so that we have a constant air flow to all parts of the plant, without any dead spots.

The sewers are connected directly to the city sewers and our water supply is furnished by the city. All sewer pipes are graded for drainage and are in the rock under the plant floor. Water pipes are also buried in the rock beneath the concrete floor. Due to the high location of the plant we should have no difficulty with sewer drainage, even if the entire Kansas City sewer system were destroyed due to hostilities or other causes.

The plant is now supplied by 300 kilovolt-ampere 13.8 by 208 120/four-wire electrical-distribution systems. Three 100-kilovolt-ampere transformers are located above ground approximately over the center of the plant to allow for a minimum requirement of copper for distribution of the electrical energy.

Factory type flourescent lighting fixtures are suspended below the channels in the factory area. In the offices all lighting is recessed in the acoustical ceilings. Lights in the office area have low brightness, nonglaring lens.

While the above is a general description of our plant and the pictures herein will give you a general idea of its appearance it is only in seeing it that one can realize how satisfactory such a plant can be. I would like therefore to invite each and every one of you to make us a visit at any time it is convenient for you. We are more than happy to have the opportunity to show our plant and explain its various features.

A few things remain to be done to make our plant completely habitable and relatively safe in the event of nuclear fallout. However, it is now stocked as a fallout shelter for 3,340 people with—

464 cartons biscuit (16,704 pounds).
668 drums for water storage.
680 polyethylene bag liners.
67 sanitation kits.
2 medical kits (A).
10 medical kits (C).
1 Geiger counter (0–50 mr/hr).
1 Survey meter (0–50 r/hr).
1 Dosimeter (0–20 r).
1 Dosimeter (0–100 r).
1 Dosimeter charger.

For a shelter which is adequate to protect approximately 7,000 people we still require an auxiliary electrical unit to function in case of failure of commercial power, which would be required to keep the air circulating throughout the plant; an auxiliary gas supply and auxiliary water supply, both of which could be obtained on our own property by drilling the necessary wells. The water supply would be highly desirable to obtain water to furnish a water curtain in our intake air tunnel. Also, the openings need further reinforcement if blast protection is required.

We would need a total of 500 tons of refrigeration whereas we have 50 tons at present, to house 7,000 people. A proportionate increase in refrigeration would be required to house the 3,340 people now slated to be housed here under the present program (200 tons approximately). This is an estimate for very light usage, assuming that this is for a condition of more or less hibernation, not working conditions, for a period of protection during heavy fallout.

We should have 500 kilowatts of electricity, which should be installed in 100-kilowatt increments so that if one unit were lost we would still have some service, whereas if only one unit were used we would be completely out of business should it be lost.

We question our responsibility as a private industry to be required to furnish these facilities for the general public. If they were furnished we would be pleased to keep them in good operating condition.

These services would not only be required to make our plant habitable in the case of a nuclear attack, but would be required to get it back into immediate operation after its usage as a shelter was no longer required, when the very life of the Nation would be at stake.

These generators would be more than adequate to operate the plant after the emergency, until commercial power became available.

Some of the reasons we feel the Federal Government should want Brunson Instrument Co. to get into operation as soon as possible after an attack are:

(a) Brunson Instrument Co. is a manufacturer of precision instruments used extensively by the armed services and by the missile and space industry and construction. These instruments require a highly stable, vibration-free factory, with fully controlled humidity and temperature. It was to obtain these factors that our underground facility was planned. The location we had at the time of this decision was subject to a great deal of vibration, dust, and noise, which an underground plant would overcome.

(b) Brunson Instrument Co. was the first to develop a system of application of optical alinement equipment to provide coordinate measurement and linear measurement to accuracies heretofore never obtained.

(c) We are constantly in the process of developing new instruments in our laboratories for special usage by the Government and private industries.

(d) We are the first contractor to be licensed by AEC for the application of tritium for Army Compasses.

(e) We have designed and developed a number of instruments for the armed services. In the early stages of developing the internal reading theodolites we redesigned and made the instruments far more accurate than the original design.

There is considerable requirement for theodolites and like equipment, which the armed services are presently procuring from a foreign source.

American manufacturers have been handicapped in bidding on this requirement due to the fact that the specifications call out the foreign instrument and it is not feasible to expect an American manufacturer to compete pricewise, at the price they have to pay for labor and material, with an instrument which the foreign concern has already developed. And, even this foreign instrument does not meet the exact needs of the military and the missile and space industry.

Brunson Instrument Company is presently under an agreement with the U.S. Army Engineer District, New York, of the Corps of Engineers, and the St. Louis District U.S. Army Engineers, to produce such an instrument in the case of an emergency. It is urgent therefore that such an instrument be developed under American standards which will fulfill the requirement of the armed services is a more complete and satisfactory manner than the instrument which is presently being procured under European specifications.

Our military has elected to buy what they thought was a very precise instrument. It is, in the terms of surveying, but not in the terms of alinement.

Brunson Instrument Co. is one of the leaders in the world in accurate alinement instruments. These instruments have been developed with our own capital and initiative.

Finally, after contacting our military, we were able to convince sufficient numbers of these agencies that we might be able to make a theodolite and we have recently been awarded a contract to make a theodolite (to the foreign specifications). But, in order to get the award we were forced to bid extremely low because of the exchange setup between buying American and foreign sources.

This is the first production order of theodolites ever granted to an American manufacturer.

We are eliminating some of the areas in our instrument that have given inaccuracies in the European instrument. If we could be allowed to redesign an instrument for American use in our space and missile program that would incorporate some of the features of the European surveying instrument and our own American industrial alinement instruments, we are sure that a far better instrument could be developed to meet the needs of the space and missile industries.

For much of the work being done in the missile and space field, a short focus instrument is required. This is not available under the present specifications but would be available in an instrument of American design.

There are also two other instruments that are being procured from European sources only, which need to be developed by an American source to conform to American type of manufacturing and to build these instruments greater accuracies than are at present available from the European source.

With the above instruments, and the specialized industrial alinement instruments that we have developed for use on the various space, missile, and aircraft programs, we believe our plant would be one of the most essential plants in the country for rebuilding a nation that had suffered such a disaster as a nuclear attack. With adequate standby electrical power, gas and water, this plant could operate without the usual public utilities.

You can therefore see that the work in which we are engaged is extremely important to the national security since we are one of the few, if not the only, American sources of certain essential instruments needed by our Defense Establishment and by research for the age of space. We are glad that we feel more secure in being able to deliver these essential products due to the protective measures which we have taken.

We are planning for the succession of management of our company, which we believe is very necessary in an emergency, and expect to be ready to submit the plans to our board of directors in the immediate future.

Finally, and most important, I firmly believe that most American businessmen and industrialists who are aware of the dangers of the nuclear age will take the necessary protective steps voluntarily, provided they have the necessary information made available to them and provided that they receive encouragement from the Federal Government through some sort of incentive program.

I believe that in the past there has been far too great an amount of confusion, misinformation and lack of a really coordinated educational effort on the part of the Government to make both industry and the public aware of the problem and what they can do about it. This, I believe, is the most essential role of the Federal Government. I do not believe anyone expects the Federal Government to finance an entire shelter program for industry and the public, but I do believe that with the large amount of new construction each year, both industrial and individual, that structures could be built from the ground up with the necessary protective features and at little additional cost. In this connection, I believe that you gentlemen of the committee should take some steps to protect yourselves. This Government is based on civilian control, upon the elected representatives of the people, and I think it is quite inconsistent that we expend great sums to protect the military end of our Government while little if anything has been done to protect the elected representatives of the people. As an individual citizen who votes, I believe that you owe us that duty. Protect yourselves as well as the military so that no matter what happens we will be able to maintain our representative, constitutional form of government.

Army Cites Chaplain Schillon of Kearny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in recent months there has been concern over the possible impact of several Supreme Court decisions on the spiritual well-being of our Nation. Thus, today I was pleased to note that proper recognition of God and religion is still being preserved in our armed services. I speak of a recent honor bestowed by the Army on 1st Lt. Simon A. Schillon, a Catholic chaplain from Kearny, in my district in New Jersey, and a longtime dear friend of mine.

I am inserting in the Record the account of Father Schillon's citation which appeared in the Observer, a weekly newspaper published in Kearny. I am sure that all my colleagues will join with me in praising the admirable work that Chaplain Schillon has done serving God, his country and his comrades in the Army:

> A Kearny man who served in World War II as an infantry sergeant, was discharged from service, became an ordained Catholic priest of the Franciscan Order, and reenlisted in the Army 19 months ago, has been awarded a Certificate of Achievement for his work as chaplain.
>
> First Lt. Simon A. Schillon, son of retired Kearny Police Lt. and Mrs. Charles Schillon of 4 Hillcrest road, was graduated from Kearny High School and enlisted in the Army, serving several months overseas. Discharged, he enrolled at and was graduated from St. Peter's College, Jersey City, and in 1958 was ordained a priest of the Franciscan Order after graduating from Holy Name College, Washington, D.C.
>
> A teacher of American history in Timon Catholic High School, Buffalo, 3 years before volunteering for Army chaplain duty. Father Schillon was assigned to Fort Polk, La.
>
> At ceremonies attended by his parents last week, Father Schillon was presented the following Certificate of Achievement by Maj. Gen. Philip C. Wehle, commanding officer at Fort Polk:
>
> "Chaplain Schillon's exceptional initiative, foresight and understanding resulted in outstanding improvements in organizing a religious program for the regiment. This improvement helped build the morale among the trainees and his example was inspiring."
>
> Father Schillon, Sunday, enrolled at the Franciscan Chaplain School, Fort Hamilton, N.Y., for further training before assuming his new 3-year assignment with the U.S. Army in Germany.

Alabama Court Stops Unnecessary REA Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the circuit court of Montgomery, Ala., last week handed down an important decision which will have a beneficial effect on all taxpayers. This decision denied the implementation of a $20,350,000 generation and transmission loan from the Rural Electrification Administration to the Alabama Electric Cooperative, Inc. The case was brought before the circuit court by the Alabama Power Co. on the basis that the loan would permit construction of facilities that were unnecessary and duplicating existing facilities and would be contrary to the public interest.

Circuit Judge Charles Ball based his decision on some fundamental facts which all of us should keep foremost in our minds when we consider this or any other REA generation and transmission loan approval. Judge Ball said:

> The evidence is undisputed that the cooperative seeks consent to borrow $20,350,000 of Federal funds at 2 percent interest, and that the Federal Government must pay at least 4 percent interest for such long-term money. This difference can be made up from only one source—the taxpayers. The cooperative, however, pays no Federal or State income tax. It is also undisputed that this multimillion-dollar expenditure of Federal funds by AEC is not designed to deliver central station electric service to persons in rural areas who are not already receiving central station service or have it available on application.
>
> The present and proposed facilities of Alabama Power Co. are fully capable of affording at less cost what the Cooperative proposes to procure by the loan. This unnecessary duplication of facilities at the expense of the public users is not in the public interest, nor does it serve a public need under Alabama law. The purpose of this loan is to enable the cooperative to duplicate and to compete with the power companies in areas and for customers which they are already serving. It is not the purpose of the Federal law nor the Alabama law to foster or encourage this subsidized competition under these circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, using the Alabama co-op loan as an example, the justification should be clearly recognized for the House Appropriations Committee suggesting new and important procedures for the REA administrator to follow in the future before granting any generation and transmission loans. Because of the importance of this Alabama circuit court decision, I ask unanimous consent to insert the decision in the Record at this point with the sincere suggestion that every Member of this body read it carefully and remember its conclusions.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY, ALA., No. 3519

ALABAMA POWER CO., A CORPORATION, PETITION, *v.* ALABAMA ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC., A CORPORATION, AND SEYMORE TRAMMELL, AS DIRECTOR OF FINANCE OF THE STATE OF ALABAMA, DEFENDANTS

This cause coming on to be heard, was submitted on the petition for certiorari filed by Alabama Power Co. seeking review of an order entered January 9, 1963 by Finance Director Maurice Patterson; and the answers filed by Alabama Electric Cooperative, Inc. and the successor Director of Finance Seymore Trammell, which answers join issue with the averments of the petition for certiorari. Alabama Electric Cooperatives, Inc. filed its petition seeking consent of Finance Director Patterson under title 55, section 155, Alabama Code 1940, to the execution of a note or notes by the Cooperative in the amount of $20,350,000 evidencing a loan in that amount from Rural Electrification Administration. With the proceeds of the loan the Cooperative proposed to build a steam generating plant at Jackson, Ala., and over 700 miles of transmission lines and related facilities in the southern part of the State. Alabama Power Co. and Gulf Power Co. intervened in those proceedings, and at the public hearing voluminous testimony and exhibits were introduced. The order of Finance Director Patterson made no specific or detailed findings of fact, but using the language of the statute, found "that said plan or program of petitioner serves some public need and is in the public interest."

This case involves not only the interests of the parties to the litigation, but is also a matter of great public interest and concern affecting the rights of all the citizens of the State of Alabama. It was argued orally for 2 full days, and lengthy briefs have been submitted. The Court has carefully studied the facts and applicable law as well as the arguments and briefs.

As the Court understands the decisions of the Supreme Court of Alabama, certain matters have already been settled. Alabama Power Co. and Gulf Power Co. were correctly permitted to intervene in the proceedings before the Finance Director since each has a right to protect its own interests as well as those of the public. Similarly Alabama Power Co. has standing under Alabama law to file a petition for certiorari seeking to protect those interests, and Gulf Power Co. has a right to intervene herein.

The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Alabama Power Co.* v. *Ickes*, 302 U.S. 464, 82 L. Ed. 374, related solely to the question of standing to sue in a Federal District Court. It did not involve a construction of the Federal REA law, nor the right of a State court to hear a case such as this nor its right to interpret or construe the meaning of the Federal REA law. 7 U.S.C.A., sections 901 et seq. The arguments of the Cooperative on this point are not in accordance with settled Alabama law.

This is not a trial de novo, nor is it an appeal. It is a petition for writ of certiorari, and the test is whether there is in the record sufficient competent evidence to justify the order of the Finance Director. After careful study and deliberation, the Court is of the opinion that there is not. However narrow the scope of review may be, it must be broad enough to enable the Court viewing the legal and competent evidence most favorably to the Cooperative to ascertain that the Federal statute and the decisions of the Supreme Court of Alabama construing and applying Alabama law have been complied with; otherwise, judicial review would be meaningless.

The evidence is undisputed that the Cooperative seeks consent to borrow $20,350,000 of Federal funds at 2 percent interest, and that the Federal Government must pay at least 4 percent interest for such long term money. This difference can be made up from only one source—the taxpayers. The Cooperative, however, pays no Federal or State income tax. It is also undisputed that this multimillion-dollar expenditure of Federal funds by AEC is not designed to deliver central station electric service to persons in rural areas who are not already receiving central station service or have it available on application.

The present and proposed facilities of Alabama Power Co. are fully capable of affording at less cost what the Cooperative proposes to procure by the loan. This unnecessary duplication of facilities at the expense of the public users is not in the public interest, nor does it serve a public need under Alabama law. The purpose of this loan is to enable the Cooperative to duplicate and to compete with the power companies in areas and for customers which they are already serving. It is not the purpose of the Federal law nor the Alabama law to foster or encourage this subsidized competition under these circumstances.

It is therefore considered, ordered and adjudged that—

1. The motion to quash or dismiss, the motion to strike, and the demurrer heretofore filed by Alabama Electric Cooperative, Inc., be and the same are hereby denied and overruled respectively.

2. The petition for certiorari and the relief prayed for therein be and the same is hereby granted; and the order of Finance Director Patterson entered January 9, 1963, is hereby quashed and held for naught and the cause is remanded to the Director of Finance of the State of Alabama with directions to enter an order denying said application of Alabama Electric Cooperative, Inc. without prejudice to its right to file another petition should it be so advised.

Done this the 9th day of July 1963.

CHARLES BALL,
Circuit Judge.

Illegality of a Proposed REA Loan to Colorado-Ute Electric Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the hearings and in floor debate earlier this session on the Agriculture appropriation bill, I and a number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle expressed concern over the manner in which the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, is being administered. The House report clearly reflects this concern and provides for action by the REA administrator to prevent the reoccurrence of some violations. However, I am sure additional legislation and court action will be needed to rectify the deficiencies in the REA program.

The Rural Electrification Administration has truly been a "sacred cow" since 1936 as very little attention has been given to the program through the years. However, in the last 2 or 3 years, Mr. Speaker, I have noted a definite movement on the part of the Congress and the courts to pioneer a study into the empire-building plans of REA and NRECA. As a matter of fact, the circuit court of Montgomery County, Ala., on July 9 wrote a decision which is of great public interest and therefore, under unanimous consent, I include the court opinion at this point, as follows:

DECISION

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY, ALA., NO. 3519

Alabama Power Co., a corporation, petitioner, versus Alabama Electric Cooperative, Inc., a corporation, and Seymore Trammell, as director of finance of the State of Alabama, defendants

This cause coming on to be heard, was submitted on the petition for certiorari filed by Alabama Power Co. seeking review of an order entered January 9, 1963 by Finance Director Maurice Patterson; and the answers filed by Alabama Electric Cooperative, Inc., and the successor Director of Finance Seymore Trammell, which answers join issue with the averments of the petition for certiorari. Alabama Electric Cooperative, Inc., filed its petition seeking consent of Finance Director Patterson under title 55, section 155, Alabama Code 1940, to the execution of a note or notes by the cooperative in the amount of $20,350,000 evidencing a loan in that amount from Rural Electrification Administration. With the proceeds of the loan the cooperative proposed to build a steam generating plant at Jackson, Ala., and over 700 miles of transmission lines and related facilities in the southern part of the State. Alabama Power Co. and Gulf Power Co. intervened in those proceedings, and at the public hearing voluminous testimony and exhibits were introduced. The order of Finance Director Patterson made no specific or detailed findings of fact, but using the language of the statute, found "(t)hat said plan or program of petitioner serves some public need and is in the public interest."

This case involves not only the interests of the parties to the litigation, but is also a matter of great public interest and concern affecting the rights of all the citizens of the State of Alabama. It was argued orally for 2 full days, and lengthy briefs have been submitted. The court has carefully studied the facts and applicable law as well as the arguments and briefs.

As the court understands the decisions of the Supreme Court of Alabama, certain matters have already been settled. Alabama Power Co. and Gulf Power Co. were correctly permitted to intervene in the proceedings before the finance director since each has a right to protect its own interests as well as those of the public. Similarly Alabama Power Co. has standing under Alabama law to file a petition for certiorari seeking to protect those interests, and Gulf Power Co. has a right to intervene herein.

The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Alabama Power Co.* v. *Ickes*, 302 U.S. 464, 82 L. Ed. 374, related solely to the question of standing to sue in a Federal district court. It did not involve a construction of the Federal REA law, nor the right of a State court to hear a case such as this nor its right to interpret or construe the meaning of the Federal REA law—7 U.S.C.A., sections 901 et seq. The arguments of the cooperative on this point are not in accordance with settled Alabama law.

This is not a trial de novo, nor is it an appeal. It is a petition for writ of certiorari, and the test is whether there is in the record sufficient competent evidence to justify the order of the finance director. After careful study and deliberation, the court is of the opinion that there is not. However narrow the scope of review may be, it must be broad enough to enable the court viewing the legal and competent evidence most favorably to the cooperative to ascertain that the Federal statute and the decisions of the Supreme Court of Alabama construing and applying Alabama law have been complied with; otherwise, judicial review would be meaningless.

The evidence is undisputed that the cooperative seeks consent to borrow $20,350,000 of Federal funds at 2 percent interest, and that the Federal Government must pay at least 4 percent interest for such long-term money. This difference can be made up from only one source—the taxpayers. The cooperative, however, pays no Federal or State income tax. It is also undisputed that this multimillion-dollar expenditure of Federal funds by AEC is not designed to deliver central station electric service to persons in rural areas who are not already receiving central station service or have it available on application.

The present and proposed facilities of Alabama Power Co. are fully capable of affording at less cost what the cooperative proposes to procure by the loan. This unnecessary duplication of facilities at the expense of the public users is not in the public interest, nor does it serve a public need under Alabama law. The purpose of this loan is to enable the cooperative to duplicate and to compete with the power companies in areas and for customers which they are already serving. It is not the purpose of the Federal law nor the Alabama law to foster or encourage this subsidized competition under these circumstances.

It is therefore considered, ordered, and adjudged that:

(1) The motion to quash or dismiss, the motion to strike, and the demurrer heretofore filed by Alabama Electric Cooperative, Inc., be and the same are hereby denied and overruled respectively.

(2) The petition for certiorari and the relief prayed for therein be and the same is hereby granted; and the order of Finance Director Patterson entered January 9, 1963, is hereby quashed and held for naught and the cause is remanded to the director of finance of the State of Alabama with directions to enter an order denying said application of Alabama Electric Cooperative, Inc., without prejudice to its right to file another petition should it be so advised.

Done this the 9th day of July 1963.

(S) CHARLES BALL,
Circuit Judge.

Mr. Speaker, a similar case is still pending before the Colorado courts concerning an REA loan to Colorado-Ute. This loan was specifically discussed during the course of the House hearings. Mr. Clyde Ellis and Mr. Robert Partridge of the NRECA testified to the effect that construction funds for Colorado-Ute or any similar project would merely pass through the borrower to those presenting bills for labor or materials for construction work. We see that the disposition of funds in the Colorado-Ute case is a gross departure from the Ellis-Partridge testimony.

In addition to the aforementioned conflict within the ranks of REA on Colorado-Ute, I received two letters from one of the directors of the Colorado-Ute Electric Association. These letters, from the co-op's own director, show the unorthodox and improper manipulations that have been involved in this project from beginning to end. It is always a pleasure to include the remarks of those associated with REA so the charge of special interest group pressure cannot be levied. Under unanimous consent, the letters from Mr. Ora K. Harris of June 10 and July 15, in that order, are inserted at this point, as follows:

HARRIS & SONS LUMBER CO.,
Craig, Colo., June 10, 1963.

The Honorable ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am a director of the Yampa Valley Electric Association of Steamboat Springs, Colo., as well as a director of the Colorado-Ute Electric Association of Montrose, Colo. I have been a director on the local REA Association for 12 years and until recently had the belief that I was performing a public service on the board of an association whose primary purpose was to furnish reasonably priced power for the people of northwestern Colorado.

During about the last year when the matter of the Hayden Steam Generation Plant has been under consideration, I have become increasingly doubtful of the importance of a director's efforts and of the aims and objectives of the Rural Electrification Administration.

My objections and inquiries have been in the interests of the taxpayers and consumers. They have, in my opinion, been completely disregarded in this crash program, formulated, promoted and pressured by powerful groups in their self-interest. I am writing to you in the hope that you may cause the whole matter to be looked into.

I cannot discuss many details in a letter of reasonable length, but will try in a general way to mention the reasons for my concern.

The Hayden Steam Generating Plant did not come about as the result of any spontaneous need of consumers in western Colorado. Very little planning was done by or even with the knowledge of the Colorado-Ute directors. The manager, Mr. John Bugas, seemed to develop and promote the plan with more than wholehearted encouragement from the Bureau of Reclamation, REA officials in Washington, the Salt River project in Arizona, and persons interested in the coal industry.

It is apparent that the Bureau of Reclamation wants steam plants spotted around the country to serve their purposes. By promoting their construction by REA, they not only bypass Congress, but get financing at low REA rates. The Department of the Interior has been a potent force in the Hayden Plant matter. While its advisability was under consideration by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Colorado, the Secretary of the Interior made strong public statements in an obvious attempt to influence the decision of the State utilities commission.

Another invaluable service to the project rendered by the Bureau of Reclamation concerned the availability of power from the Bureau. To sell the plan it was necessary to make it appear that sufficient power for local consumption could not be expected from the Bureau of Reclamation. For example, within a few days after, but not until the plant was approved by the State public utilities commission, the Bureau of Reclamation offered a long-term power contract adequate for its needs to the Yampa Valley Electric Association.

The Colorado REA co-ops have some valuable preference rights to Bureau power under the provisions of the upper Colorado River storage compact. These involve no plant investment by the co-ops. By entering into the steam generating plan they remove themselves from the market for Bureau power. The upper basin preference rights will then go by default to others. This may serve a purpose of the Bureau of Reclamation, but hardly seems to be in the best interests of either the consumers or taxpayers.

Another disturbing feature of the Hayden steamplant plan is that the Salt River project, which is not an REA co-op, will take about two-thirds of the output of the plant at a most favorable rate and without sharing the uncertainties and hazards assumed by the REA member co-ops. It seems that the large power needs of Salt River contributed the element of feasibility in exchange for REA cash. I cannot understand why the taxpayers and REA consumers should provide the Salt River project and the Bureau of Reclamation with a steam generating plant.

Most if not all REA co-ops have full-time managers who are professionals, and boards of directors who are laymen. Colorado-Ute is no exception. It has proved unthinkable that the lay directors would question the recommendations of their manager. An ambitious manager has little or no restraint imposed upon him. The generation of power by the REA presents new horizons for empire building.

I understand that on the very day the Colorado court denied a restraining order to postpone construction of the Hayden plant, the REA advanced funds to commence the plant. What is the rush? If further litigation, which is pending, should prove unfavorable to the project who will stand the waste occasioned by haste? There is no private capital being risked and the REA is apparently rushing to reach a point of no return at the risk of either the consumers or the taxpayers.

I have personally contacted Mr. Clapp, the REA Administrator, several times, have expressed my concern and pointed out suspicious and doubtful details. So far as I can tell I have either been disregarded or treated as a meddlesome troublemaker. I no longer consider that the Rural Electric Administration in Washington is performing any function of independent review concerning such schemes as the Hayden steam generating plant.

Very truly yours,

ORA K. HARRIS.

HARRIS & SONS LUMBER CO.,
Craig, Colo., July 15, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your reply to my letter of June 10, 1963, regarding the circumstances surrounding the development of the Colorado-Ute Electric Association and the Hayden steam plant here in northwestern Colorado.

In my capacity as a director of Colorado-Ute and for many years as a director of the local Yampa Valley Electric Association, which is now a member of the Colorado-Ute Electric Association, I believe it was and still is my duty to communicate my concern to people such as yourself who are in a position to look into this matter. I feel it my responsibility to do everything in my power to assure that the customers served by Yampa Valley have available to them a dependable source of electrical energy at the lowest possible cost.

Although in my opinion a strong aroma of unorthodox and improper behind-the-scenes manipulating has permeated the entire project, reflecting, perhaps, the ambitious objectives of the people and officials involved, and although I believe there has been a high degree of incompetency in the engineering and operating aspects of the project, I should not be too concerned if the end results were advantageous to the member customers I represented as a director.

In this regard, NEA officials have made a great point about the engineering and economic justification for the project. I have in my possession all of the engineering studies presented to the Colorado-Ute board. Of my own knowledge, absolutely no economic feasibility studies have been made of the effects of the project on the Yampa Valley Electric Association compared with Yampa Valley's existing opportunities for the continued and expanded purchase of cheap Federal power from the Bureau of Reclamation. Further, I believe that no such studies have been made on behalf of the other member associations in northwestern Colorado and southern Wyoming. The reason is quite obvious. Should such studies be made they would indicate that present power resources of the area, supplemented by purchased hydroelectric power from the Colorado River storage project, are more than adequate to supply the future power needs of the area at a lower cost than will result from the Colorado-Ute steamplant scheme.

To summarize, I would like to make these two points:

(1) Yampa Valley Electric Association enjoys a preference right to cheap Federal hydroelectric power.

(2) Instead of availing itself of the cheapest power available anywhere, to which it is without question entitled, Yampa Valley is participating in a coal-fired steam plant project which will generate relative high-cost electric power that requires a very substantial taxpayer subsidized investment and an enormous obligation on the part of the members of Colorado-Ute.

I am not at all knowledgable about the electric power industry or the political implications that may be involved here, but on the face of it this is an incomprehensible situation.

I appreciate very much your courtesy in replying to my earlier letter and hope this letter will help to explain my concern. Please feel free to use this or my previous letter in any manner that you wish.

Very truly yours,

ORA K. HARRIS.

The Useful Ambassadors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the story of the Peace Corps in the modern world is the story of America; a story which tells of our concern for our fellow man and particularly for those people who need the training and useful knowledge that our technology can supply. Surely the Corps deserves and should receive the thanks of all of our citizens for bringing us a little bit closer to those we must help to help themselves if we are to fulfill our responsibilities to ourselves.

The following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of July 8, 1963, is commended to the attention of our colleagues as one expression of the high regard in which the Peace Corps is held:

[From the New York Herald-Tribune, July 8, 1963]

Onward Peaceful Soldiers

The first battalions of the Peace Corps are returning from their respective fronts after 2 years of service overseas. There are no great parades, no waving of flags, not even any audible cheers. Yet these battalions have scored some of the most notable victories in the peacetime history of the Republic.

They have gone into some of the most backward areas of Africa, Asia and Latin America to teach young and old how to read and write; to apply the scientific knowledge of the west to the unyielding agricultural soils of the south and the east; to organize community groups to clear slums, build houses, construct roads.

They have won the envy and the enmity of the Communists; and the admiration and affection of the 47 countries in which the 6,869 Peace Corps men have been stationed. Day after day, more countries call for more corpsmen.

Could there be a better recommendation to Congress for the increased budget which Director Sargent Shriver has asked for the Corps?

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Sleeping Bear Dunes National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 4, a hearing was held at Frankfort, Mich., on plans for development of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Park. Conducting the hearing were members of the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands.

From the newspaper accounts of the hearing, I would gather that opponents of this sound conservation proposal were well represented. But, as the Ann Arbor News has pointed out editorially, this does not place the opponents in a majority.

The proposal for creation of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Park has touched off quite a controversy in my State of Michigan. I was delighted to read recently the calm, well-reasoned editorial in the Ann Arbor News. The News has grasped the significance of this proposal and has put it in its proper perspective.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the News editorial represents an important contribution to the discussion of the dunes proposal. Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial, "Arguments Against Dunes Park Still Unconvincing," in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

ARGUMENTS AGAINST DUNES PARK STILL UNCONVINCING

Members of the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands should be able to draw one firm conclusion from the hearing they conducted last Thursday on the plans for a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Park.

Some opponents of the park bills sponsored by Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, and Representative ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Republican, are louder and more emotional than those who want to see the park established. But this does not make the opponents right or place them in a majority.

At the hearing, conducted in Frankfort, Mich., the opponents presented petitions reportedly bearing 18,000 signatures of persons who want no national park of any size in the dunes area. Spokesmen for the Michigan Parks Association, who have carefully studied the Midwest's needs for more park land, spoke for the dunes park proposals on behalf of organizations with approximately 750,000 members.

Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, Republican, of Wyoming, a member of the subcommittee, drew loud cheers from the opponents by saying he opposes both the Hart and Griffin bills. SIMPSON was elected last fall as a conservative opposed to most activities by the Federal Government. But he is apparently not opposed to the continued existence of Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks, or to the Interior Department's restoration of historic Fort Laramie in eastern Wyoming. These Federal activities bring a great deal of tourist money into Simpson's State each summer.

It appears that some local opponents of the Hart and Griffin bills might change their minds if convinced that a Sleeping Bear National Park would attract tourists as successfully as some of the western parks. Ove F. Jensen, president of the Sleeping Bear Dunes Citizens Council, said at the Frankfort hearing that he does not believe a national park in that area would do any better than Isle Royale National Park, which draws only about 6,000 visitors annually.

This is not a valid comparison. Isle Royale is nearly 50 miles out in northern Lake Superior, and is open to tourists only from mid-June to early September. Getting there requires a long drive out on the Keweenaw Peninsula followed by a long boat ride. There are no auto roads on Isle Royale, meaning that it attracts primarily tourists willing to carry all their camping equipment on their backs.

The Sleeping Bear area is about 75 miles from the I-75 freeway, and within 6 hours drive from such population centers as Detroit and Chicago. Facilities for a year-round park could be developed there. But the State conservation department simply does not have the money for such projects.

A major goal of the U.S. Interior Department in recent years has been to develop national parks close to the midwestern and eastern population centers. After several bad starts, efforts are now being made to do this in a manner that will protect local property owners in the face of rising numbers of tourists.

Some opponents of HART's park bill call it a "socialistic land grab" because it would include fruit orchards and private cottages around the inland lakes just east of the dunes. Actually, the purpose in this is to give those areas more effective protection from land speculators than they can get from township zoning ordinances. If a park is established excluding those areas, local residents will find their township zoning ordinances challenged in court, probably successfully, by persons interested in building motels and roadside zoos.

There is still room for compromise on the total area of the park; as HART's bill now stands it calls for 77,000 acres. But the economy of the dunes area will suffer if Congress does not end the suspense about the park proposal during its current session. Congress should make a decision in favor of conservation, which is quite a different thing from the do-nothing approach advocated by Senator SIMPSON.

Eugene T. Kinnaly

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the wealth that man accumulates is not in the gold that is mined from the earth, but in the gold that is in the friendships engendered by his words of gentleness and sympathetic understanding, his deeds of helpfulness, his spirit of humility and humanness. By this measure Gene Kinnaly is one of the richest men on Capitol Hill.

In the 45 years he has been a part of the life of the House he has made new friends every day and never lost an old one. I join with my colleagues in a salute of admiration, affection, congratulations, and good wishes to Gene Kinnaly.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we have just completed another Captive Nations Week. It is a sad fact of our lives in the middle of the 20th century that, despite our enormous advances in technology and communications, 26 nations of this earth are held in some form of political captivity. Nine of these countries are in Europe, under total domination by the Communists.

As a result of this policy of enforced bondage, about one-third of Europe's land area and more than one-fourth of its inhabitants have seen their personal liberties denied during all the 17 years since the end of World War II.

Among the captive nations of Europe, Poland—with its population of 30 million—is the largest. Yet the fate of all these nations, large and small, behind the Iron Curtain is one and the same. All of them are denied the freedom they long for; and we are all sadly familiar with the results of their attempts to free themselves.

We in the Western Hemisphere, particularly in the United States, have been especially concerned with giving these people our encouragement and moral assistance in their efforts to become self-determining nations once more. Our efforts have not always been illuminated by immediate success, but thankfully, we do have reason to believe that our messages of hope are being received and understood.

As an example of the freedom of thought which somehow manages to survive behind the Iron Curtain, I would like to include a recent newspaper account of the courage of a young Polish Air Force officer who escaped from Communist-dominated Poland within the past few days with his wife and two small sons to the freedom of West Berlin. This young pilot, Maj. Richard Obacz, after flying his small propeller-driven plane across the frontier of Poland and East Germany, declared that he was fleeing the oppressive and stifling restrictions placed on him in present-day Poland.

He is looking for a better life for his children and, to find it, he risked his own life and the lives of his family in a heroic escape.

The newspaper article follows:

POLE FED UP, JAMS FAMILY IN PLANE AND FLIES TO HAVEN IN WEST BERLIN

BERLIN, July 10.—A Polish air force pilot took a two-seat military plane this afternoon and with his wife and two children flew to freedom in West Berlin.

Maj. Richard Obacz circled Tempelhof Airdrome in West Berlin twice after his 1-hour flight across Communist Poland and East Germany.

After the plane taxied to a stop, the jet test pilot dashed into the arms of an astonished U.S. Air Force captain sobbing happily. He asked for political asylum.

As the 34-year-old pilot told of his escape, his wife, Mary, 27, and his sons, Lestow, 9, and Kristofer, 5, climbed from the rear cockpit. The boys had been tucked beneath the dashboard.

Obacz said he flew dangerously low—never above 150 feet—the entire distance to escape detection by Polish and East German watchtowers, observation posts, and radar.

He told a news conference that he planned the flight for weeks. He kept his plans so secret, he said, that his wife and boys thought the family was heading for a visit to relatives in Stettin when they took off from an air base at Nadarzyce, Poland.

He charted the flight to Stettin and told his air force superiors he was using the plane, which usually served as a courier craft, for the family flight. They brought only the clothes they wore.

The plane is expected to be returned if the Poles ask for it.

Obacz was in full uniform as he dashed up to Air Force Capt. Lionel Paternaud. His attractive wife wore gray slacks, a blue blouse, and a gray sweater. The boys wore shorts, sweaters, and tennis shoes.

Within 4 hours the major faced a news conference. By putting Obacz immediately before the press, the West undoubtedly gained a propaganda victory.

Obacz said he was fed up and that a majority of the officers he knew in Poland wanted to do just what he had done but they had few opportunities to flee. He said most people in Poland want to come to the free West.

The major made it clear that his knowledge of terrain and Communist defenses were of great help. He was challenged only once, by an East German installation. He disregarded the call, kept his plane low, and flew on.

Mr. Speaker, in 1959 this House of Representatives adopted a resolution empowering the President to proclaim the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week. Since that time, this Nation has observed the occasion annually and we shall continue to observe it solemnly, as long as there are people who are denied their fundamental rights to live in the dignity which their neighbors in free societies take as a matter of course.

During this week, we reaffirm our beliefs in the universal worth of each separate individual on this earth; we venerate those gallant souls who have given their lives in the unending quest for freedom; and we give thanks for the miracle of democracy which shields each of us in this country from tyranny and oppression.

Khrushchev Tells Red China That His Success in Taking Over Cuba Without War Proves That the Best Way To Bury the United States Is So-Called Peaceful Coexistence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, less than 1 year ago Mr. Khrushchev was caught redhanded sneaking atomic rockets into Cuba. The fact he promised to take them away was and is billed as a great triumph of the administration by the administration. Unfortunately, there really is no hard evidence the promise was ever fully carried out. There is, however, hard and uncontrovertible evidence that out of the affair the Soviet Union acquired a base and staging area for the taking over of numerous other American countries. This was and is a real win for communism. Khrushchev gained mightily out of the affair. The United States lost heavily. However, little is said about that in administration press releases. Nonetheless, Mr. Khrushchev is saying a lot about it in his arguments with the Red Chinese regarding the most efficient way to achieve the Communist goal of world domination. It is to be noted that these intra-Communist arguments are not revolving about whether to bury the United States and the rest of the free world. They simply have no argument about the objective. Rather, the argument is about when and how to do it. On July 16 the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram newspaper rather cleverly discussed in the following editorial how Khrushchev uses the Cuba case to bolster his arguments:

A QUESTION OF STRATEGY

If the Red Chinese would just sit still and listen, they could learn something from the Russians.

The Russians are trying to tell them that violence against the United States is not necessary, since the aims of the Communists are being achieved by talk and trick.

To illustrate his case, Premier Khrushchev points to Cuba.

In his open letter to the Chinese Communist Party, Khrushchev notes that the Red Chinese considered his withdrawal of missiles from Cuba to be an act of capitulation. Actually, he says, it was an example of productive East-West negotiation—peaceful coexistence in action.

Russia moved her missiles into the island to protect the Communist revolution there, he explains. The subsequent agreement between Russia and the United States preserved the peace and the revolution.

What was that agreement? Clearly he means the understanding that if the Russians withdrew their missiles, there would be no invasion by the United States or with U.S. sanction.

Thus, Khrushchev is telling his Red Chinese comrades, the net result of the Cuban adventure was an assurance that the Communist revolution on the island would be free to follow its course.

In truth, this has been exactly the result. The United States not only has refrained from carrying out an action on its own, but also has prevented Cuban exiles from going on missions of more harassment.

Khrushchev might well point to one other fact on his side of the argument. The American "no invasion" pledge was subject to verification by the United Nations of the withdrawal of the Soviet missiles. However, there has never been a single on-site inspection, therefore no verification. Whether the Soviets removed as many missiles as they installed in the first place has never been determined.

So the Soviets are now trying to get it through the heads of the Red Chinese that: One, there's no point in doing by violence what you can do by agreement through threat of violence; two, agreement is not necessarily bad if it is one-sided.

"These Chinese comrades regard as the main criterion of revolutionary spirit the recognition of an armed uprising as always, in everything, everywhere," says Khrushchev. "Thereby the Chinese comrades actually deny the possibility of using peaceful forms of struggle for the victory of the Socialist revolution, whereas Marxism-Leninism teaches that the Communists must master all forms of revolutionary class struggle—both violent and nonviolent."

In other words, comrades, don't use the ax until you've tried the stiletto.

On this fine point of strategy centers the struggle between Red China and the Soviet Union for the leadership of the Communist movement. It is not the kind of struggle from which the West can take much comfort.

Some persons profess to see a new era of harmony and peace between Russia and the United States developing from the Soviet-Chinese split. If Cuba is supposed to be an example of what that new era will be like, we cannot look forward to it with any great relish.

Soviet Bloc Sustains Setbacks in Algeria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent Associated Press dispatch which describes how "the Soviet bloc is suffering setbacks in its efforts to establish a solid foothold in independent Algeria."

The article, published in the July 11, 1963, issue of the Washington Post follows:

SOVIET BLOC SUSTAINS SETBACKS IN ALGERIA

(By Andrew Borowiec)

ALGIERS, July 10.—The Soviet bloc is suffering setbacks in its efforts to establish a solid foothold in independent Algeria.

The Algerian Government's ban on the Communist Party and its strong nonalinement course have provoked a wait-and-see policy in the Soviet bloc. The bloc's aid program appears to be withering away.

However, Soviet bloc military assistance continues. Several hundred Algerian officers are training in the Soviet Union and Bulgaria. And Communist technicians are continuing to remove French-laid mines along Algeria's frontiers.

In general the attitude of Algeria appears to be a disappointment to the Eastern bloc, which aided the 7-year nationalist revolt against French rule.

The advent of independence last year was followed by a rush of Soviet bloc diplomats to Algiers—banned to them under French rule—and token shipments of aid.

The Russians sent two shiploads of wheat and five army helicopters. They also shipped in sardines—to a country where fish is abundant.

The Chinese sent several shiploads of wire rolls, although Algeria inherited stocks of barbed wire from the departing French, and dispatched small quantities of steel rods. These shipments puzzled Algerian officials.

The most practical effort came in the form of medical personnel, particularly from Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. There are still some 350 Communist doctors and nurses in Algeria, although Bulgaria recently withdrew 25 doctors.

The effort of Yugoslavia stands out. Yugoslavia has given Algeria 500 tractors and technicians to maintain them in repair and contributed a number of doctors and other medical personnel.

Some Algerian officials openly express admiration for Yugoslavia's political, economic and diplomatic systems.

Pension for World War I Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit for the information of Members of Congress, two resolutions which were recently introduced in the State senate of Pennsylvania:

RESOLUTION IN THE SENATE, MARCH 25, 1963

"Whereas Congressman DENTON has introduced House Resolution 2332 which would provide a pension for World War I veterans whose income is under $2,400 annually, if they are single, and $3,600 annually, if they have dependents; and

"Whereas one of the principal domestic problems in all areas of the Nation is the care of the aged, the importance of which is emphasized by the fact that there are now approximately 16 million men and women over the age of 65 years; and

"Whereas of this number, about 2 million are those who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during the first World War, and whose present circumstances are below the average for the Nation, which fact may be traced in part to the service rendered their country during that war; and

"Whereas these veterans have not enjoyed the extensive benefits accorded their younger brethren who served during World War II and who were given the opportunity for training at Government expense and assistance in securing home and business loans; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States has not given any general pension to the veterans of World War I: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved* (*the house of representatives concurring*), That the Congress of the United States is urged to enact House Resolution 2332 to alleviate the dire conditions in which those who made the sacrifices for this country, in their youth, now find themselves; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Congressman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania."

We hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Senate Resolution 116, introduced by Senators John H. Devlin, Zehnder H. Confair and Martin Silvert, adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania the 4th day of June, 1963, and concurred in by the House of Representatives on the 1st day of July, 1963.

RAYMOND P. SHAFER,
President of the Senate.
MARK GRUELL,
Secretary of the Senate.
W. STUART HEBER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
R. N. STIMMEL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

RESOLUTION IN THE SENATE, JULY 1, 1963

"We recognize the innumerable contributions made to civilization by the Italian people and many of our endeavors bear the stamp of Italy's genius.

"Columbus is but the greatest of a long list of Italians who, in the service of the western nation, sailed into the unknown and uncharted distant seas.

"Each year we turn with a keen sense of gratitude and admiration to Columbus by whom a new continent beyond the ocean was sought and found.

"The celebration of Columbus Day as a legal public holiday would fill the hearts of the citizens of this great Nation with justifiable dignity and pride: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to support and enact into legislation provisions to make October 12, being the day celebrated and known as Columbus Day, a legal public holiday; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officer of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States."

I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Senate Resolution 66, introduced by Senators Paul W. Mahady, Thomas J. Kalman, William G. Sesler, John H. Devlin, Anthony J. Di Silvestro, Robert P. Casey, Gus Yatron, Robert D. Fleming, James S. Berger, Martin L. Murray and Charles R. Weiner and adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania the 1st day of July 1963.

MARK GRUELL, Jr.,
Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania.

Tribute to Eugene Kinnaly

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure and privilege for me to offer my most sincere and heartfelt congratulations to your administrative assistant, Eugene T. Kinnaly, upon the completion of his 45th year of service here in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Gene has long been a very dear friend of mine. A tireless worker and an outstanding administrator, Gene Kinnaly is also a very warm and understanding person whose close friendship and timely advice I deeply value. Knowing him is one of the pleasant experiences you enjoy here in Washington.

I can only hope and fervently pray that God will continue to shower His blessings on Gene and that happiness and good fortune will follow him all the days of his life.

Hon. Carl Vinson

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the youngest man in this body, in spirit and in the drive of dedicated public service, today becomes the oldest in continuous tenure in all the long history of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. I feel, with my colleagues, the thrill of being participants when history is being written. It is unlikely that ever again will a member of this body complete 48 years 8 months and 13 days of service in this Chamber.

CARL VINSON is one of the great Americans of all times. When the test of battle came, on sea, on land and in the air, the vision and the planning of CARL VINSON were reflected in the victories that came to the cause of freedom. When the challenges and the tensions of the cold war enveloped us, and the dangers in a nuclear age could not be fathomed, the knowledge and the determined leadership of CARL VINSON were vital factors in safeguarding our security.

After all of us are gone, and other generations have come and been replaced by later generations, the name and fame of this unassuming man of giant stature in ability and in patriotic devotion will live, a vibrant part of the history of this land of our CARL VINSON so magnificently helped to guide in safety through the most perilous of times.

To have known him as a friend, to have worked with him as a colleague, has been to every Member of the House a treasured enrichment.

Mr. Speaker, for myself, for my constituents and for Lt. Gen. Charles G. Dodge, his officers and enlisted personnel of the 5th Army, headquartered in the district I have the honor to represent, I extend to the distinguished and beloved son of Georgia, the chairman of the great Committee on Armed Services, the champion and the friend of all who serve with the Armed Forces, the peerless statesman and patriot who has established a tenure record that is unlikely ever to be broken, the Honorable CARL VINSON, I extend warmest congratulations and sincerest wishes for continuing good health and brilliant accomplishment for God and country for many, many years to come.

A Statement From the United Presbyterian Church on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a significant letter with respect to civil rights legislation which I am sure all Members of Congress have received from the leading officials of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

The text of the letter follows:

THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
Philadelphia, Pa., July 15, 1963.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The deepening moral crisis in all dimensions of our common life due to the exclusion of Negroes and other minority persons from full participation has erupted into a full-scale social revolution. This is a crucial hour for the U.S. Congress, as for all other institutions in our land.

The time for deploring, for placing blame, for temporizing, for seeking credit, has passed. If every segment of our national life does not now assume its full responsibility for ending the discrimination and segregation affecting American citizens of color, we may find that history has left us in its dust.

Recently, the major religious bodies have gone beyond pronouncements. They have allocated proportionately large sums of money and appointed special commissions with staff and budget to bring their own institutional practices in line with their public utterances. They have recognized that only a massive assault on segregation and discrimination within their own inner structure is equal to the urgent demands of God and the events of the times.

As we seek to correct our own failures, we appeal to the legislative branch of our Government in these extraordinary circumstances to accept its crucial role in rectifying the injustices of three centuries.

We do not claim to be political statesmen. But we do believe the American people are politically sophisticated enough to recognize the temptation of both political parties to try to derive political advantage from the civil rights struggle. While this temptation is understandable as normal to the noble art of politics, it is obvious that our situation is not normal. It has changed drastically. There is no time for "politics as usual."

Neither party can pass effective civil rights legislation by itself. Therefore neither should attempt to claim credit if the effort is successful. But elements in either party can effectually block a major step in the solution of our Nation's most vital domestic problem. If meaningful and effective civil rights legislation is not enacted by this session of Congress in time to permit it to go on and deal with other vital issues, or if systematic efforts to make one party look good and the other bad are indulged in, irreparable damage will be done.

In times of overriding national crisis in the past both our legislative and executive branches of Government have been able to put country above party. The moral dimensions of our present crisis are sharp and clear and the consequences of failure are unmistakable. We have confidence that the vast majority of our legislators can rise to the demands of the present occasion.

The hour for greatness is upon the Congress of the United States, as it is upon all of us. We pray that you will do everything in your power to enable the Congress to be equal to that hour, and to enact promptly a program of Civil rights that is both effectual and enforceable.

Yours sincerely,

EUGENE CARSON BLAKE,
Stated Clerk of the General Assembly.
THEOPHILUS M. TAYLOR,
Secretary of the General Council.
JOHN COVENTRY SMITH,
General Secretary, Commission on Ecumenical Mission and Relations.
KENNETH G. NEIGH,
General Secretary, Board of National Missions.
WILLIAM A. MORRISON,
General Secretary, Board of Christian Education.

President's Solicitude for Communist Russia Hard To Understand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the bland and listless statement of President Kennedy in issuing a proclamation for Captive Nations Week is causing great concern among the people of the United States.

The American people are not afraid of Soviet Russia. The American people want no appeasement of the Communists. The American people demand a strong stand on the side of freedom. But, somewhere, the President has lost touch with the people of his country and his main concern seems to be the feelings of Khrushchev. Why?

Is it not time Congress and the people demand leadership from the White House? Is it not time to demand that President Kennedy explain his full purpose in seeming to abandon all principle in his eagerness to please Communist Russia? To continue the course he has followed in placating Khrushchev, in backing down at every Russian demand, in almost pleading with Khrushchev to make a deal on a test ban without any guarantee that it will be honored if signed, can lead only to ultimate defeat for the United States and the free world.

The President of the United States is sworn to protect this Nation and our people and President Kennedy should tell us now if he is incapable of discharging his full duty as chief executive to protect the sovereignty and security of the United States.

The following editorial from the Dallas Morning News of July 17, "Captive Nations," indicates the feeling of the people in my section of the country regarding the President's reluctance to criticize the Soviet Union:

CAPTIVE NATIONS

The proclamation by President Kennedy on Captive Nations Week is so inoffensive to the Iron Curtain slave masters that it has enlisted a barrage of strong protests from anti-Communists here at home.

What makes these people particularly angry is that the President has made it clear that he was not at all enthusiastic about issuing even a mildly worded proclamation and that he would not have issued one at all if Congress did not require that he go through the formalities.

In 1959 both Houses of Congress adopted a unanimous, joint resolution calling on the President to set aside Captive Nations Week every year. The resolution specifically called for a strong condemnation of communism.

It pledged that the United States would dedicate its efforts to liberating the people of the captive nations, to assisting slaves behind the Iron Curtain in the overthrow of their masters. It went so far as to single out those oppressors by name.

Twice President Eisenhower carried out the spirit of this resolution by issuing strongly worded proclamations which caused the Kremlin considerable embarrassment and reportedly sent Premier Khrushchev into a rage.

But Mr. Kennedy doesn't like to do that sort of thing. His three proclamations have been mildly worded, inoffensive statements which Representative THOMAS M. PELLY, Republican of Washington, has described as "dry, brittle recitals of the facts of existence of captive nations."

In none of Mr. Kennedy's proclamations has there been any direct mention of who the oppressors of the captive nations are. No reference to communism. Not a word about the Soviet Union, Red China, or Cuba.

If Mr. Kennedy has issued such an inoffensive (to the Reds) statement only once, it might be passed off lightly as a miscalculation. But three times he has issued such a statement, and each time over the strong protest of numerous groups which have called for tougher statements.

There can be only one conclusion: Mr. Kennedy's proclamations have been conscious, studied efforts to avoid offending the Soviets and their cohorts.

This year, almost as if he wanted to rub salt into the wounds, Mr. Kennedy took the occasion of Independence Day weekend to send a message to Premier Khrushchev pledging his efforts to continue cooperating "toward the solution of the problems which divide us." This message was sent out at almost the same time that the President's Captive Nations Proclamation was released. The message to Khrushchev was given far greater fanfare by the White House and in the Nation's press.

It is difficult to understand these actions if the President and this Nation are truly dedicated to the preservation and extension of freedom. How continued efforts to placate and avoid condemning the enemy can promote that goal is hard to understand. The President, or someone else, should explain.

Tribute to a Great American: Carl Vinson

SPEECH

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply honored to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the dean of deans of the House of Representatives, the distinguished chairman of the committee on which I have the privilege to serve, and a great American, the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia.

CARL VINSON has served 48 years, 8 months, and 19 days in the House, thus eclipsing the record set by the late, great Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn. He has served as chairman of the Armed Services Committee and its predecessor, the Naval Affairs Committee, for 29 years—a record for a committee chairman. The members of his constituency have expressed their faith in him and in his judgment 25 times and he has wisely and consistently justified their decision.

But years by themselves are not important, and this is especially true with CARL VINSON. As chairman of the Armed Services Committee he has been a guiding light in building the strongest defense any nation of the world has known. It has been my honor and privilege, since being elected to Congress, to serve on that committee; to reap the benefit of Chairman VINSON's vast wisdom and knowledge; to appreciate his dedication and enormous abilities. At the same time his concern with our national defense has not diminished the attention he pays to the needs of his constituency or his commitment to the total health and welfare of our country.

Mr. Speaker, our country has indeed been fortunate to have had this remarkable man in his position of great responsibility for so many years, and I know that I echo my colleagues' wishes in the thought that he continue to serve with honor and distinction for many years to come.

Mandatory Dealth Penalty for First Degree Murder Repealed in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have urged the abolition of the death penalty in the United States as an unnecessary survival of barbarism that has no place in a civilized society. Each new step toward that goal is to be applauded and I am happy to commend to the attention of our colleagues today the fact that New York State's ban on the mandatory death penalty for first degree murder convictions has now gone into effect. The following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of July 5, 1963, rightly points out that the next step should be the complete abolition of capital punishment.

In that connection I would like to point out that I have introduced H.R. 545 to abolish this extreme punishment from all Federal jurisdictions except for treason and except under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

The Herald Tribune editorial follows:

OUT OF THE JUNGLE

New York State moved one more step out of the jungle when the new law abolishing the mandatory death penalty for premeditated murder took effect. Now, after conviction, the judge can either set a sentence of life imprisonment or refer the question of sentencing back to the jury for separate consideration. The death penalty can be imposed only if unanimously recommended by the jury.

This is a big advance in civilizing the processes of justice. The mandatory death sentence was not only barbaric in itself; it also made it harder to get first degree murder convictions. The taking of life is nothing to be so arbitrary about. The next step should now be abolition of the death penalty altogether. The few times it actually is carried out hardly justify its moral cost to society.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, although the third week in July was established as Captive Nations Week several years ago, I think our observance this week is especially timely, for not only do we wish to reaffirm our support of these people enslaved behind the Iron Curtain but because we should also alert ourselves to the dangers of becoming complacent about their plight.

Frequently of late we have been hearing reports about the easing of tensions between the Communist and the free world; about the rifts between the Chinese and the Russian Communists; about the easing of conditions of those who live in the captive nations. It is reported that a most cordial reception is being accorded our Ambassador, Mr. Harriman, and the others who are in Moscow consulting with the Russian Communists on a nuclear test ban treaty.

I hear these reports, and I would like to believe that true and lasting peace may be on its way, but when I look at the record, I have my doubts.

We all know the old saying that a leopard cannot change his spots. I find it difficult to believe that the man who is known as the Butcher of the Ukraine, the man who sent the tanks into Budapest to crush the bodies of the freedom fighters, the man whose record is stained with blood, the man who has sworn to bury us, can at this late date change his spots. Remember that Lenin in his Communist manifesto specifically said that any means should be used to push communism, whether it be breaking treaties, lying, or whatever, so long as their objective of world domination was achieved.

The history of dealing with the Russians is filled with examples of broken promises and doublecrosses; and I hope our treaty representatives will keep that record in mind during the conferences.

Based on the record, I cannot put much faith in the words of the Communists. If they are sincere in their professed desire to live in peace with the rest of the world, they can take a positive step to show they mean what they say. They can let the over 100 million people in the captive nations hold free elections to choose the governments of their choice. Let the Russian Communists restore freedom to those nations, then perhaps the rest of the free world can afford to give some credence to their words.

The AFL-CIO on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we are once again approaching the annual battle over foreign aid. This year there will be a new factor in the battle—a call for a cut of more than 10 percent in the President's foreign aid budget which was recommended by a Presidential Committee. Public reaction to the Clay committee has not been unfavorable, and great weight has been given to its budgetcutting recommendations. But in my judgment, and in the judgment of many experts and administrators in this field, the Clay committee report put an unfortunate slant on the need and usefulness of foreign aid. Not only were the cuts the committee recommended imprudent, but there was also the idea that many gleaned from the report that foreign aid can be successfully put on a bargain basement basis.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert one of the most intelligent and invaluable critiques of the Clay committee report, given by the distinguished president of the AFL-CIO, George Meany. I was most impressed by his dissent to the majority report of the Clay committee, and I believe the following newspaper article from the July 16 AFL-CIO News gives a good capsule view of President Meany's forthright stand in support of the administration's foreign requests. I commend the AFL-CIO and its president for their support of a realistic foreign aid program:

MEANY HITS PROPOSED AID SLASHES

(By John M. Barry)

The AFL-CIO's opposition to drastic cuts in the U.S. foreign-aid program was firmly restated by Federation President George Meany in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In fact, Meany suggested, recent develpments in Latin America indicate the need for greater U.S. assistance through the Alliance for Progress program in the coming year rather than less.

"In the final analysis," the AAFL-CIO president declared, "our measuring rod must be what contribution the foreign-aid program can make to our national objectives."

His views were in sharp contrast with those of Gen. Lucius D. Clay, wh appeared before the Foreign Relations unit earlier in the day as chairman of a presidential advisory group group which had recommended major cutbacks in the aid program.

Meany, as a member of the advisory committee, had filed a strong dissent to the recommendations of the Clay majority, declaring that "the need for foreign aid has not diminished. * * * No decisive victory has yet been won in the battle between liberty and slavery."

Clay had advised the Senate committee that President Kennedy's request for $4.5 billion in aid funds could be trimmed by $500 million without endangering the program, and that $300 million of this could be cut from the Alliance for Progress appropriations.

Meany's appeal for expanded use of U.S. funds in helping the Latin American countries to develop their economies drew support from Senator Wayne Morse, Democrat, of Oregon.

An avowed opponent of many parts of the President's aid program, Morse nevertheless said he completely agreed with Meany that if the nations of Central and South America put into effect the principles set forth at the Punta del Este and Bogotá Conferences, and thus establish fertile ground for the growth of democracy, the United States should be ready to contribute more seed in aid funds.

Meany filed with the Senate grup a copy of an AFL–CIO Department International Affairs pamphlet, "Foreign Aid for Peace and Freedom," which carries the text of his dissent from the Clay committee report; guidelines for a program, also given the Clay group; and his testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Meany said he was not suggesting an increase in funds for every specific item in the President's aid bill, and he agreed that efforts should be made to eliminate waste where there is waste.

But he attacked what he called the dollar-and-cents business approach of the Clay Committee majority and its failure to give proper attention to the role of free institutions such as trade unions in the development of free societies in other nations.

He was prepared to accept reductions in aid "when they are indicated by specific situations," but could not accept the idea of "a flat cut of so much per year," Meany declared.

He pointed out that the great bulk of U.S. aid to other countries is in the form of military assistance vital to our own national security, and that "this is the only thing that keeps the Communists from stepping across the line and taking over" in many parts of the world, especially Berlin.

He also criticized the Clay Committee report for its failure to reflect the "willingness of the American people" to support the foreign aid program, as evidenced by the "tens of millions" of dollars they contribute annually through private organizations, such as Care, to relieve suffering overseas.

He expressed strong disagreement with the suggestion in the Clay report that no new aid programs be established unless a termination date is set, and asked whether the United States could have set a terminal date in 1947 on its support of West Berlin.

"The time the Communists are willing to wait to take over the world is infinity," he declared.

Meany particularly stressed the need for technical assistance to the developing countries "to teach people to do things for themselves." That, he said, is what the trade union movement is trying to do in the American Institute for Free Trade Union Development.

He urged that U.S. aid be channeled not only through governments, but through "private enterprise projects, such as the housing cooperatives being developed by organized labor in many nations.

He agreed with Morse that European countries that were helped onto their feet by the Marshall plan, "and which now have booming economies," have a "moral obligation" and "an obligation as NATO allies" to pay their share of defenses in nations like Greece and Turkey.

But the persuasion, he suggested, should be done through the State Department and in a way that does not endanger the NATO alliance.

Associated Industries of Kentucky Asks for Investigation of NLRB

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the Associated Industries of Kentucky, acting by and through its board of directors, is asking for an investigation of the National Labor Relations Board. The charges made in the resolution adopted by AIK justify the requested inquiry. For the consideration of the House, I submit herewith the resolution adopted by AIK and request that said investigation be conducted:

INVESTIGATION OF NLRB ASKED BY ASSOCIATED INDUSTRIES OF KENTUCKY BOARD

The board of directors of Associated Industries of Kentucky believes in the American concept of government by law, and not of men. It therefore views with growing concern the manner in which the National Labor Relations Board has administered the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act during the past 18 months.

The board has noted with particular concern what appears to be a systematic reversal of long-established precedents, substituting its own policies for those of the Congress as expressed in the Taft-Hartley Act and the Landrum Griffin Act.

This constitutes, in effect, the rule of men for the rule of law in the labor-management relations field. This has been evidenced in decisions that vitally affect the employer's right to manage, including but not limited to the right to cease doing business and to subcontract for economic reasons without first bargaining with unions.

The new board majority has, through its decisions relative to secondary boycott, diluted the actions of Congress. Its decisions with respect to organizational and recognition picketing would seem to justify the statement of Congressman Griffin to the House of Representatives when he said:

"The pattern of recent decisions by the National Labor Relations Board gives rise to serious concern that policies laid down by Congress * * * are being distorted and frustrated to say the very least."

The substitution of individual philosophy of members of the NLRB for the judgment of Congress is serious in its own right as a matter of principle. On the practical side, the many changes in rules have brought about confusion and made more difficult the task of bringing about labor-management understanding.

Instances have been brought to our attention in Kentucky wherein agents of the NLRB, in unofficial conversation with representatives of management involved in union elections, have positively stated their devotion to the union side of the case when they are supposed to maintain a status of impartiality.

The board submits that such conditions are contrary to the purpose for which legislation has been enacted, that such surreptitious disregard of the law should be stopped, and that distortions of the law by the NLRB itself is manifestly unfair and the effects thereof far-reaching.

The board of directors of Associated Industries of Kentucky therefore respectfully requests the Kentucky Delegation in the National Congress to utilize their influence individually and collectively to the end that an appropriate committee be authorized to examine the operations of the NLRB for the purpose of correcting the present trend, assuring that the written law is followed, and the intent of Congress adhered to.

Hal H. Thurmond,
President.
Rayburn Watkins,
Executive Vice President.

Space Age Suits Are Her Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it is increasingly appartent that in this technological age our Nation must make full use of the talent and ability possessed by our citizens, whatever their family background, whatever their sex or color of their skin.

I have high hopes, Mr. President, that the need for people of exceptional ability created, for example, by the space program will continue to bring to the fore persons of the caliber of Ruth E. Harris, a Negro business executive working with the International Latex Corp., who I am proud to say comes from the State of New Jersey.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article describing her achievements published by the Washington Post on July 14.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SPACE AGE SUITS ARE HER BUSINESS

(By Dorothy McCardle)

The first American astronaut to set foot on the moon will owe much to a bright and attractive young Negro business woman if his moon suit is OK.

Ruth E. Harris, as a junior executive with the International Latex Corp., is very much involved with Government contracts for space age survival equipment.

She is administrative assistant in the Washington office of the corporation. Her boss, Irving Ferman, vice president and director of Government relations for latex, says she's tops.

Mrs. Harris' boss travels widely about the country, and she takes full charge in his absence of preparing basic materials, drafting memorandums and coordinating information for the defense contracts handled by the firm. The firm is the subcontractor for Project Apollo and is now working on a suitable space suit for that first U.S. man on the moon.

Mrs. Harris admits that she felt a bit unsure of herself the first day she went to work for the corporation in 1960. She discovered she was the only Negro going up and down the elevators to work.

"People looked at me oddly," she recalls. "Then I decided that, maybe, I was just being supersensitive. The executives here and the secretarial staff welcomed me, and I forgot the rest of the people in the building."

Mrs. Harris has worked very hard ever since she left commercial high school 22 years ago in Atlantic City.

There have been many slights along the way, she admits, but these have not made her bitter. She has always tried to see the funny side of her situation.

"Without a sense of humor, a Negro would just disintegrate," she says.

She cites her first job in Washington when she became the first Negro stenographer in the old Railroad Retirement Building in 1941. Later two other Negro stenographers joined her. All three found it tough going.

The trouble was with their boss, a lady from New York, she says.

"She kept down-grading us until she had us working down in the basement," says Mrs. Harris. "We merely stuffed envelopes on the night shift."

The threesome took their grievances around the building, but nobody was interested until their New York supervisor was replaced by a lady from Nashville, Tenn.

"You learn a lot of funny things about geography," recalls Mrs. Harris. "We took our problems to our new boss from Tennessee, and in a week she had us back upstairs at our regular jobs in the stenographic pool, working daytime hours."

The irony of the attitude of the lady from the "more liberal North" in comparison with the justice of the lady from the "more racially prejudiced" South still has Mrs. Harris chuckling.

Mrs. Harris feels that she has been unusually lucky. She has risen steadily from one good job to another. But the average Negro girl finds herself "virtually excluded from jobs in private industry, especially in those firms that handle defense contracts," she says.

"There is an adequate supply of Negro girls with training for these jobs, but they never get called," she adds.

She attributes her own philosophy about the racial situation to her father, the late Theodore Sawyer, of Washington, who became the first Negro prize fight referee here and managed several boxers.

She agrees with President Kennedy that the great hope for the future of the Negro lies in better education.

She is giving the best education possible to her 12-year-old daughter Lisa. The child graduated from Green Acres School, a private school in Bethesda, and wound up her first year at Backus Junior High with a straight A average this year. She has passed all tests for entrance into the National Cathedral School for Girls. And her mother, who didn't make college herself, fully expects that Lisa will.

Mrs. Harris deplores one fact of American education for whites as well as Negroes.

"The schools teach only that the Negroes were freed as slaves," she says. "They don't teach anything about what the Negro has contributed to this country. They will have to start to do this so that the Negro can take pride in his race and want to add more to that achievement."

The Honorable Carl Vinson

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this occasion pass without joining with my colleagues in paying my respects to the venerable and respected senior Member and dean of the House of Representatives, the beloved, admired, and respected CARL VINSON.

As the late Speaker Rayburn used to remind us, it is a high honor and responsibility to be elected once to this House—CARL VINSON has been sent here 25 successive times by his constituents of the Sixth District of Georgia. This record speaks eloquently for itself.

Among all the distinguished individuals who have served in this body I know of no one whose contributions to the public interest and the Nation's defenses have been greater than those of CARL VINSON. He towers like a mighty oak. His legislative achievements span a half century, and cover a multitude of subjects, because his interests have been as broad as our great Nation.

I sincerely want to say that during the entire course of my service in the House of Representatives I have never seen Chairman VINSON unprepared on any piece of legislation. We have all learned from his high example. We have tried to follow the pattern he has set.

I extend to you my most heartfelt respects and congratulations on this memorable occasion.

Freeman Tours Wrong Area or "If You Can't Win One Way, Try Another," by Orville

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, if Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman wants a break from his legislative and administrative chores, he could take a listening trip through America's farmlands rather than visiting the Soviet Union.

"No Mail From the Fans," a timely and worthwhile editorial from the July 7 issue of the Chicago Tribune, is given here:

NO MAIL FROM THE FANS

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman finally emerged from the retreat where he has been licking his wounds from the wheat referendum to say there is little evidence that farmers want a new wheat program. With an air of studied innocence, he said the farmers haven't been writing either to him or to Members of Congress since the wheat vote, which blasted administration efforts to put them under tight controls.

Moreover, said the Secretary, Congress is in no mood to waste any more time on wheat legislation. He indicated he has no plans for such legislation, although his Department has been studying possible alternatives to the defeated program that might be applied under present law.

This is an interesting change of attitude from the one Mr. Freeman displayed last year when he didn't wait for mail from the country before forcing Congress to authorize the controversial wheat program. Instead, he personally led a covey of high-pressure salesmen from his Department and the White House to Capitol Hill to blackjack recalcitrant Democrats and some Republicans into voting for the proposal farmers subsequently rejected.

Since the referendum, three major bills to authorize a new wheat program have been introduced by Senators and Representatives who, presumably, are acting on behalf of their rural constituents. One bears the endorsement of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which represents several hundred thousand wheat growers among its 1.6 million member families. Mr. Freeman, of course, doesn't want any of these measures, because they all propose voluntary and fewer controls on agriculture instead of the compulsory restrictions he favors.

What the administration really wants, if it thought it could get away with it, is to avoid any new legislation and let wheat prices drop substantially on the 1964 crop. Then, according to this strategy, the administration will answer cries of economic distress by holding another referendum so farmers can approve the discredited control program they have just turned down.

This strategy fits in with the month-long trip to Russia and four Eastern European Communist countries the Secretary is starting July 13. That leaves little time for him to help work any new legislation through Congress before the trip and little time afterward before Congress adjourns, preoccupied as it is with civil rights and other matters.

Mr. Freeman could spend that month to better advantage on a trip through the rural areas of this country talking with American farmers. That is, unless the purpose of the Russian junket is to find out how the Soviets manage to keep their own farmers from jumping over the traces.

Ocean Shipping and the Lumber Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, competitive disadvantages are imposed on a segment of the Oregon lumber industry by requirements of the Jones Act which forbid use of foreign vessels in our intercoastal trade. Canadian competitors can trim shipping costs by about one-third by using foreign bottoms to ship lumber from British Columbia to our east coast markets.

A constituent, Mr. Robert F. Dwyer, of Portland, discussed the effect of the Jones Act on west coast lumber operations at a recent transportation and management conference under auspices of the Graduate School of Stanford University. Mr. Dwyer, a lumber manufacturer, is a knowledgeable spokesman for the industry and has devoted much time and energy to analysis of lumber industry problems. I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix, an excerpt from his recent address.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSPORTATION AND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

(An address by Robert Francis Dwyer, vice president, Dwyer Lumber & Plywood Co., Portland, Oreg., delivered to the Graduate School of Stanford University)

I was asked to come here today to discuss some of the problems of our Northwest lumber industry that are concerned with transportation. And I will.

Let me first tell you of an incident that happened to me while I was in the Soviet Union only a few weeks ago. I was there unofficially; but as a member of the President's National Export Expansion Council, I was working hard at discovering new avenues of trade and at balancing our export position, mentally, with what we will be up against in the years ahead from the Iron Curtain countries and the other export nations of the world.

We were taken there to see some Russian schoolchildren.

They were lined up in front of us and told to sing. The song loosely translated, told of the glories of Russia, how they would go on and grow bigger and stronger in the world, how they had the finest place to live * * * and * * * how they would all work for the future of their communism.

These children were 4 and 5 years old; but the message being drummed into their heads was one that I felt we could duplicate in our own terms, not only to the children of our grade schools but to everyone concerned with the economic and financial welfare of this country.

As a lumberman, my first real brush with the inadequacies of our transportation system when matched against the rest of the world, began in 1959 and 1960 when I noticed the big cargo mills in Portland, Oreg., along the shores of Washington, down the banks of the Columbia River, going out of business one after another.

The reason then given, was simple, "Canadian competition." But when we looked, we found it was not Canadian competition at all that had shut down more than 200 sawmills in the Pacific Northwest; the loss of some 13,800 mill jobs in a little more than 2 years. It was the inability of our intercoastal merchant marine, protected and nursed by the antiquated Jones Act, to compete with the foreign bottoms of international shipping.

Let me explain what is happening. Cargo mills, those that still survive, must pay $36 a thousand to water ship their lumber to the Atlantic coast markets.

Canadian cargo mills, shipping the same product to the same American lumber buyers in the East can ship their lumber for $22, at most $24 per 1,000 board feet. The spread is anywhere from $12 to $14 on a product, where if you make a $2 a thousand profit, you are doing well. The result of this transportation disparity has been the loss of 500 million feet of our market each and every year since the Canadians took over, beginning in 1960; it has meant a price structure that we cannot hope to compete with. It has resulted in the closures of all but a few of our cargo market mills, and the shift of others from cargo or ocean shipping to rail shipping.

Most of you transportation people are aware that American mills must ship in American bottoms in the intercoastal trade as required by the Jones Act. Efforts of our industry to repeal the Jones Act or to modify it have met with the sternest opposition from the maritime industry and the labor interests.

Recently, in Washington, I joined with some other lumber industry representatives to discuss the issue with representatives of the maritime industry on the basis that both their industry, which has dwindled to a mere 12 or 14 antique ships in intercoastal trade, and ours, reduced almost daily by the low-cost Canadian product, are dying, have in fact died almost beyond repair.

Our domestic, intercoastal fleet is made up of World War II Liberty ships, wartime built and 20 or more years old, ships never designed for the economic loading and unloading of bulk lumber cargoes. The useful life of a ship is 20, at most, 25 years.

The result is that our loading and discharging costs are as much as $7 to $9 per 1,000 board feet greater than what our competitors can do with the foreign-built, especially designed bulk cargo carriers that are hauling their products to our east coast. This alone is one major part of that $12 to $14 price spread I mentioned earlier.

Our maritime friends state bluntly that if they had such ships as the foreigners have in service from Canada's west coast, a foreign port, to our east coast, then they could at least equal the Canadian's loading and discharging costs.

But the American merchant marine industry is required to build their ships in American shipyards so that a fine, 15,000-ton bulk carrier costing the Swedes or the British or the Greeks $5 million in a Japanese yard, would cost our fleet at least $10 million in an American yard.

There is a hope that we may some day get back into this horserace with a piece of legislation currently coming before Congress under the guidance of the shipping industry. It seeks either permission to have our ships built abroad or a subsidy from the Federal Government on shipbuilding that would make up the cost differential between building in an American yard and the lowest foreign costs available.

The merchant marine is also seeking to have lumber classed as a bulk commodity before the Interstate Commerce Commission, exempt from the ICC regulations.

The merchant marine spokesmen were blunt in their contention to us that they feel ICC regulations, more than any other one item, has led the demise of the American intercoastal merchant fleet. Picking up the cry of our northwest lumber industry, they said to us: "We ask only the opportunity of being able to compete on an equal basis. If we must compete, allow us to compete with the same types of ships, purchased at the same capital investment; allow us to compete without the ICC regulations on our backs as the foreign bottoms do from Canada to the east coast, and now from American ports to Puerto Rico."

A Bill To Close U.S. Seaports to Foreign-Flag Vessels Engaged in Commerce With Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would in effect close U.S. seaports to foreign-flag vessels of nations which allow their ships to be used in commerce with Cuba.

This legislation would prohibit any article from being transported in interstate or foreign commerce by such vessels, ana would also prohibit the shipment of any article which has been transported by any such vessels.

The continuing ship traffic of vessels flying the flags of our allies to and from Cuba has been steady since the communization of Cuba. Although the United States has tried to discourage this traffic, these efforts have not resulted in ending the assistance which our allies provide Communist Cuba through use of their ocean shipping capacity.

Cuba being an island makes water transportation the most economical means of supply for that nation. To end allied shipping to Cuba would put a serious kink in the Moscow-to-Havana pipeline.

I am hopeful that the Congress will realize the urgency of this situation, and enact this legislation as rapidly as possible.

Southern Idaho's New Slogan: "Bonneville, Please Include Us Out"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the third of a series of articles on why "Bonneville's multimillion-dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho."

Editorial after editorial, and statement after statement of various individuals and civic organizations give ample testimony to the far-reaching opposition in southern Idaho to Secretary Udall's unwarranted action.

On July 8, 1963, I introduced House Resolution 430 relative to the unwarranted unilateral action of the Secretary of the Interior to extend the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho and parts of Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada. My resolution provided for an expression from the House of Representatives that the Secretary refrain from implementing his order extending the Bonneville marketing area until proper investigations, public hearings, and congressional approval were had.

On July 8, 1963, the same day I introduced House Resolution 430 asking for a holdup on implementing the Secretary's order, we find Bonneville executing a new contract with the Raft River REA wherein the power bill for that utility will be cut in half. This action verifies the heading of my prior series of statements on the subject, "Bonneville Now Losing Millions Annually—Wants Larger Area To Lose More In." There can be no other conclusion when power that was being sold at cost by the Bureau of Reclamation is now being sold by Bonneville at one-half the cost.

What psychic powers impelled Bonneville to execute its first contract implementing Secretary Udall's order extending the Bonneville marketing area on the same day I introduced the resolution to hold up such action? It could be that Bonneville is trying to present a "fait accompli" before any action could be taken to prevent the implementation of the Secretary's order.

The Times-News of Twin Falls, Idaho, questions by what magic can "Bonneville—with the same facilities, same employees, and same costs—manage to cut the price of power in half." Its editorial, "Just Plain Magic," follows:

[From the Times-News, Twin Falls, Idaho, July 10, 1963]

Just Plain Magic

So the Great White Father who runs the Bonneville Power Administration waves his magic wand and presto, power bills for the Raft River REA are cut in half. This seemingly difficult feat is accomplished merely by signing up the Raft River REA with Bonneville. No, nothing else has changed, just the amount of the bill.

It's the same power, generated at the same facilities where the same people are employed. Costs? Yes, they remain the same, too.

That's where the magic comes in Presumably the Bureau of Reclamation was peddling power to the Raft River REA at cost before the facilities were taken over by Bonneville. So how can Bonneville—with the same facilities, same employees, and same costs—manage to cut the price of power in half?

It's quite simple. Bonneville doesn't pay much attention to the costs of generating electricity and it's crystal clear there doesn't have to be any relationship between Bonneville's costs and rates. Otherwise, Bonneville could manage somehow to operate in the black. But Bonneville goes on operating in the red year after year, and without having to dig up a red cent for taxes, either. It might be pointed out that taxes take approximately one-third of every dollar of income from private utilties.

So what it boils down to is that taxpayers all over the Nation are helping pay the bill for generating that power the Raft River REA is getting at half price now.

When you get backstage and look at the props used by the magician, somehow his act doesn't look quite the same.

As soon as the Raft River REA gets all squared around and sets its new rates, it would be interesting to publicize those rates and compare them to comparable charges to the Idaho Power Co.

For instance, it isn't common knowledge the Raft River REA has been charging its customers more than adjacent users pay to Idaho Power. And even with Bonneville's magic bookkeeping, there's a good chance they'll still be paying more. The last published farm residence rate for Raft River users was 2.09 cents per kilowatt-hour in 1961. Idaho Power was charging similar users only 1.576 cents per kilowatt-hour at the same time. Since then, Idaho Power's rate has been increased to about 1.69 cents per kilowatt-hour.

The power rate for irrigators charged by Raft River in 1961 was 1.20 cents per kilowatt-hour, compared to Idaho Power's 0.85 and its present rate of about 0.92 cents per kilowatt-hour.

And the average charge for farm residence of the four REA's serving the north Idaho area is 1.74 cents per kilowatt-hour.

That's an example of low-cost public power. And keep in mind the REA's pay only a token 3½ percent of their gross in lieu of taxes.

Americans for Constitutional Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago several of my colleagues took the floor of this House to attempt to discredit the Americans for Constitutional Action, believing that guilt by association was the proper way to discredit this organization. This is a tactic liberals generally call McCarthyism. It was indicated that several members of the board of directors of Americans for Constitutional Action may have some connection with the John Birch Society and even went so far as to infer that the background of one of the directors might be in question because he had formerly been associated with Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge. It is interesting to note that the proposed director of the President's Domestic Peace Corps operation is also a former officer of that organization. I would hasten to add, however, that from what I know of the Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge, it is a topnotch patriotic organization and, quite frankly, I am convinced at this stage of the game ACA is in that same category.

I do not question the fact that some of the leadership of ACA may have some sort of connection with the John Birch Society, but I do question the propriety of equating the ACA with extremism because of this. In my congressional district I know several who are alleged to be members of the John Birch Society who are also members of the bar association, but that does not make the bar association other than a good organization. I know several who are alleged to be members of the Birch Society who are members of the Rotary Club, and I would ask: "Should we impugn the motives of the Rotary Club because of this?"

I could go on and give other such instances since the local press in my hometown have devoted quite a bit of space to "exposing" Birch members. Some are members of the Baptist, Presbyterian, Catholic, and other churches. Would my liberal colleagues condemn these religious faiths?

As a matter of fact, the following article which appeared in a National Review bulletin recently would indicate that the source of information of the various attacks on Americans for Constitutional Action is Group Research, Inc. It would seem to me that one could probably do equally as good a job on Group Research, Inc., and its advocates as was done on Americans for Constitutional Action and the advocates of that organization. The National Review article is as follows:

> Two weeks ago this column discussed the emergence of a new liberal organization called Group Research, Inc. GRI's stock-in-trade is tracing obscure, and sometimes remote, connections among various elements of what it calls the right wing. This information is used by labor unions and other forces on the left in their current drive to head off the conservative movement.
>
> It is ironic that GRI's specialty is the study of interlocking connections; it has a few of its own. Operating head of GRI is Wesley McCune, former assistant to one-time Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan (author of the ADA-favored Brannan Plan), and former employee of the National Farmers Union, the ADA of the agricultural world (Farmers Union Chief James Patton is a leader in ADA). One of the incorporators of GRI is James Heller, Secretary of the Washington chapter of the ACLU.
>
> GRI is incorporated as a nonprofit organization. Its statement of purpose says "the objects of the corporation are exclusively educational and no other." Yet it becomes aparent that GRI is closely involved in a political campaign of guilt by association—a tactic liberals professed to abhor when allegedly practiced by Senator McCarthy. In point of fact, the group is far less an educational venture than many of the conservative groups it calls extremist. Its findings are being clearly put to political uses.
>
> The first verifiable public airing of GRI's researches was a speech delivered October 4, 1962 by Liberal Senator Gale McGee, Democrat, of Wyoming. McGee attacked the Washington newsletter, Human Events, and the Americans for Constitutional Action. His dissertation followed, from point to point, the research previously turned out by GRI. In some places, the wording was almost identical. For example, on July 20, 1962 GRI produced a special report on ACA. It says of ACA's staff: "ACA's first organizer appears to have been John Underhill, of Washington, D.C. Soon after the opening of the Washington office, Kenneth Ingwalson, who had been on the staff of the American Farm Bureau Federation, became executive director of ACA. He served until early 1961 and is currently assistant publisher of Human Events, which collaborates with ACA. He was replaced as executive director of ACA by Charles A. McManus, Jr., who had been with the ACA staff since 1959."
>
> McGee's version reads as follows: "The first paid organizer apears to have been a John Underhill of Washington, D.C. However, soon after the opening of the office here, Keneth W. Ingwalson took over as executive director. Mr. Ingwalson, as has ben noted earlier, had been on the staff of the American Farm Bureau Federation, where he was director of their special education program. He served with ACA until last year, and, as I have mentioned, is now at Human Events. Mr. Ingwalson has been replaced as ACA's Executive Director by Charles A. McManus Jr., who has been with the organization since August 1959."
>
> McGee's fidelity to the GRI materials includes reliance upon some of its errors. GRI lists, as a contributor to ACA, one "Harold Rousburg." In point of fact (GRI please note for future use), the gentleman's name in Ransburg. Evidentally McGee took the material GRI supplied, made a few changes in phraseology, and stuck the result in the Congressional Record as part of a bitter partisan attack on conservatives. Quite an exercise in education.
>
> GRI materials have also been popping up in the publications of the unions. In August 1962, the Labor Beacon published a long write-up on H. L. Hunt's "Life Line" radio program. An editor's note preceding the article accuses Hunt of "spreading poison," and says: "Group Research, Inc., has made a study of these organizations and men. Each month we will print the history of an organization and the men behind it so you can get an idea of the insidious forces working and writing to undermine you." UAW's Solidarity, house organ of Walter Reuther, has just run off a four-part series entitled "That Other Subversive Network," a blanket smear of conservatives ("Some very rich men would like to do away with our democracy"). Hunt is again a major target, and Reuther's indebtedness to GRI can be observed in such things as quotes from Hunt with precisely the same phrases retained, precisely the same ellipses indicating omissions.
>
> Most recent exponent of GRI "research" has been freshman Representative Ronald Brooks Cameron, Democrat of California, who took to the floor of the House May 20 to renew the attack on ACA. Cameron described ACA as "a political leech," which "is doing the Devil's work in American politics." Having thus established his own moderation, Cameron proceeded to parrot the GRI material for the benefit of his House colleagues. Like McGee, he lapsed into the phraseology of GRI, neglecting to put the matter in his

own words. Both GRI and CAMERON remark that a group known as "the Campaign for the 48 States" was the "ancestor" of ACA. GRI says: "Its chairman was Robert B. Snowden, who was initially the finance chairman of ACA and is more recently an endorser of the John Birch Society." CAMERON says:

"The chairman of the Campaign for the 48 States was Robert B. Snowden, who was initially the finance chairman of ACA and is more recently an endorser of the John Birch Society."

When CAMERON had finished, Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, Democrat of Indiana, stood up to join the attack, reading into the RECORD the GRI material on ACA's finances. In none of these congressional onslaughts, going back to Senator MCGEE, was credit given to the "exclusively educational" services of GRI.

M. STANTON EVANS.

The San Diego Union article of May 19 by Edith K. Roosevelt also gave us a little more background on Group Research, Inc., and when we equate the information in this news story with what has been said about the Americans for Constitutional Action, I would say that the extremism which is allegedly involved in the thinking of ACA is not nearly as extreme as some of the rabble-rousing phrases which appeared on the chart in GRI's office. Edith K. Roosevelt's article is as follows:

HUSH-HUSH FIRM LISTS ANTI-REDS

(By Edith K. Roosevelt)

The name "Group Research, Inc." sounded intriguing. I decided to look into it. I have been a reporter for more than a decade but this gave me a new experience.

Wesley McCune, head of the three-room office, was out. While awaiting his return, I noticed a wall chart. When I began taking notes, the staff of three girls leaped up suspiciously and a young man came from an outer office. The scene ended with my being ordered to leave.

Next day, I tried again, and met McCune. He gave me a velvety welcome which turned to harsh negatives when I began to ask questions.

Group Research, Inc., has been quietly operating for more than a year. Only last month, a syndicated newspaper dispatch said the organization was investigating where and how rightwing groups got their financial backing. An informant told me it specialized in accumulating dossiers on anti-Communists and so-called rightists. When anti-Communists do this, it is called a blacklist.

My decision to do some researching into Group Research, Inc., was hastened when I was told that its headquarters at Room 422, 1404 New York Avenue NW., was crammed with filing cabinets—one of which contained a card about Edith Kermit Roosevelt.

I wondered why the dossier on me included such details as that I had "discussed the folly of shipping foreign aid to India."

Why should this go into a record in an office listing itself as nonprofit and educational?

I was in eminent company. Also listed are writers, educators and scholars of world renown. Dr. Wilhelm Roepke, who helped guide West Germany's miraculous postwar economic recovery is one. Why? Also anyone who was a sponsor of groups like Young Americans for Freedom, or is listed on the masthead of publications such as Modern Age. This academic-type quarterly features contributions of many extremists.

Who compiles this "educational" information? McCune was assistant to Charles F. Brennan when he was Secretary of Agriculture, and later was public information officer of the National Farmers Union.

The chart in this office listed a dozen organizations opposed to communism, such as the Farm Bureau Federation, the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Freedoms Foundation and Young Americans for Freedom.

Above these names were colored balloons bearing the labels, "racism," "bookburners," "bogey of inflation—the balanced budget," "promilitary," "anti-Cuban extremists," "anti-UNICEF," "anti-Semitic," "antimedicare," "States rights primitives," "censorship," and "anti-Federal aid to education."

One of the questions I naturally asked McCune was: "For whom are you compiling these names and data?" "That's my business," he said.

"Who are the people behind your group?" "That's my business," he said.

This secretiveness and the smear labels on the chart raised many questions. I thought of the curiously synchronized campaign alleging the wealth of anti-Communist groups, broadly implying that aniti-Red leaders were raking in huge profits. These smears are false but they dried up many contributions, forcing serious cutbacks in the work of these anti-Communist groups.

A final question: "Who pays for Group Research?" I asked McCune. He said: "That's my business."

I think it is my business—and that of the public.

Study of Communist Aggression in Cuba and the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the editors of the VFW monthly publication, VFW, rendered the Nation a real service in calling attention to the valuable study of Communist aggression in Cuba and the Americas by the Stennis subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief article appearing in the July issue of VFW by Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, in which he lists five outstanding accomplishments of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services so ably chaired by our distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VFW AND NATIONAL SECURITY

(By Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps (retired))

Apparently many persons in our country expected the Soviet Union to slow its development of Cuba as a base for pushing Communist aggression in the Americas following the crisis last year. They have been engaging in the flimsiest kind of wishful dreaming.

This, in essence, is the only conclusion possible after reading evidence set forth in the brief, remarkably frank report of the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee headed by Mississippi's straight thinking Senator JOHN STENNIS.

Notable, also, is the fact this recent report received the unanimous approval of Democrat and Republican subcommittee members.

On the basis of its long, thorough and impartial investigation, the subcommittee came to some fundamental, eye-opening conclusions. Here are a few:

1. No one in the United States knows how many Russians are in Cuba. The much-talked about figure of 17,500 troops appears to be a minimum estimate.

2. There is no evidence that any of the combat troops of the four Russian, mobile-armored groups have been withdrawn from Cuba.

3. Accusations that there was a "photographic gap" in our military flight surveillance of Cuba are unfounded.

4. U.S. intelligence "freely concedes that, in terms of absolutes, it is possible that despite our surveillance program, we were misled and deceived" as to whether strategic missiles and bombers were removed from Cuba.

5. The "evidence is overwhelming" that Castro is energetically furthering Communist revolution and subversive movements throughout the Americas, and this is "a grave and ominous threat to the peace and security of the Americas."

The subcommittee made a very thorough investigation and analysis of U.S. intelligence collection and evaluation processes in connection with the Cuban crisis. The results were not encouraging.

The subcommittee reported "a predisposition of the intelligence community" to the belief that the U.S.S.R. would not put strategic missiles in Cuba. This means our intelligence evaluators allowed their conclusions to be clouded by wishful thinking. The history of warfare undisputedly demonstrates that any nation permitting its intelligence evaluations to be governed by wishful thinking, rather than cold logic, is buying a one-way ticket to disaster.

The Stennis subcommittee has been of historic service to our Nation through its penetrating and frank report, "The Cuban Military Buildup." This report should be the basis for a reexamination of our entire intelligence network—and especially of the techniques used in evaluating intelligence information. The report should be required reading for every American citizen.

"Letter to a Member of Congress," and Editorial in the Mennonite, July 9, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thoughtful editorials I have seen with respect to the issue of civil rights legislation was published in the July 9, 1963 issue of The Mennonite, a publication of the Mennonite Church.

The editorial, written by Maynard Shelly, editor of the journal, follows:

EDITORIAL: LETTER TO A MEMBER OF CONGRESS

This will be a long hard summer for you. I can see it coming. Besides all your other duties in the swamps of the District of Columbia, you now face the matter of civil rights of our citizens. I guess we all knew that it couldn't be put off forever. It had to happen sometime. But what?

A number of summers ago another group of Americans put together a document. It talked about "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." What has been happening since then? We all know that there is a big gap between the ideal and the real. We face it in our own lives. We are certainly not the people we know we should be. But we could be if we wanted to be.

This hasn't been the country we wanted it to be. We always knew it. Unfortunately, the rest of the world now knows it too. The people in Africa and Asia are watching us. They are looking to see what you down in foggy bottoms of Washington are going to do. And, I suppose, you are wondering what the rest of us in the plains and hills and woods are going to say if you act, don't act, or muddle through the middle.

I can't speak for everyone. I do want to speak for myself and I hope for many other Christians. We hope that you will have the courage to do what your conscience says is the right thing to do. We elected you because we thought you knew more about the law than we did. We still agree that you do. But we want you to be more concerned about future generations than about the next election. We believe that President Kennedy has shown some fresh new courage in his profile by asking for new legislation on civil rights. You may disagree, but I think the Supreme Court has been showing considerable courage during the last 9 years. Somehow I don't get the same wavelength when I tune in on Congress. It could be that I am missing some things that you and your colleagues have been doing behind the scenes. But I would wish that this summer Congress could give itself a bit more of the courage image by passing some positive civil rights laws.

Yes, I know that President Kennedy's popularity has been slipping since his civil rights talk, but then we elected him to be President, not popular. This applies to other public servants, too, I feel.

Just now it looks as if there is going to be a lot of discussion about property rights. Does a businessman have a right to keep certain customers out of his shop and off his property? There are many good arguments to support this action. You know the law better than I do. But I would feel that human rights come before property rights. I could find quite a few texts in the Bible to help me here. Being a politican, I'm sure you would also find a quotation from the 1960 Republican platform of interest. It says, "Equality under law promises more than the equal right to vote and transcends mere relief from discrimination by Government. It becomes a reality only when all persons have equal opportunity, without distinction of race, religion, color or national origin, to acquire the essentials of life—housing, education, and employment." I am glad that the Republican Party, in agreement with President Kennedy, doesn't ask for human rights "except when in conflict with property rights." It does say that "this Nation was created to give expression, validity, and purpose to our spiritual heritage—the supreme worth of the individual." By the time you come home next fall, I hope that we will have made a new effort in this direction.

It is fair for you to ask what the church is doing in this area. I admit that here also there is a gap between the ideal and the real. We aren't doing as good as we know. But we are involved in these problems in many ways. We have worked with the needs of people in Asia, Africa, and many other places. Yes, these are far away. But these experiences have made us aware of the needs in our own hometowns. We are working on them. That's really one of the reasons I am writing.

Higher Interest: Conventional Pill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is one aspect of the administration's efforts to redress the balance-of-payments deficit which runs counter to the efforts to keep the country moving forward—the raise in the discount rate from 3 to 3½ percent.

The purpose of proposed tax legislation now under consideration is to promote a healthy, growing, and expanding economy—a dynamic economy which will show marked increases in the gross national product. The rise in the discount rate, however, can only have the opposite effect. An increase in interest rates will, in part at least, negate the benefits to be derived from a program of tax reduction.

Mr. Speaker, the country cannot go in two directions at once. Although it is important to improve the balance-of-payments situation and secure confidence in the dollar, we will have accomplished nothing if the economy lags. A vital expanding economy, with consistent increases in the gross national product is the best method of attracting dollars back into the United States.

I think the Members will be interested in the following article by Marquis Childs which appeared in the Washington Post on Friday, July 19, 1963. He details some of the viewpoints expressed thus far on a rise in the discount rate at this time:

HIGHER INTEREST: CONVENTIONAL PILL

(By Marquis Childs)

Behind what to most of us must seem the mysterious workings of finance, interest rates, the international money market, and the balance of payments are the bread and butter of daily living. To what extent these realities entered into the debate leading up to administration proposals for checking the drain on America's gold and dollar reserve must be surmise, since that debate was behind closed doors.

But the human realities will be reflected for good or ill in the headlines in coming months. One thing certain is that both within the administration and on the outside—notably in Congress—there are deeply opposing views.

Many will say that the administration measures stop short of an effective remedy. Others insist that raising interest rates, as the Federal Reserve Board has done in full collaboration with the Treasury, is bound to have a depressing effect on the economy at a point when the rate of recovery from the last recession is already far too slow.

At one extreme is Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, whose angry criticism of the Fed's latest move is discounted because he is rated a cheap money man. Often he sounds like William Jennings Bryan crying out against the moneyed interests and Wall Street in an era when this sort of emotional protest finds little response.

But the informed criticism of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, cannot be brushed aside, since DOUGLAS is widely recognized to have as much understanding and knowledge of fiscal and economic policy as anyone in the Capital. Nor, unlike PATMAN, has he conducted a running personal encounter with William McChesney Martin, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. DOUGLAS has challenged the "conventional wisdom" of the banking community that conventional methods are sufficient to cure the dollar drain and lift the level of the economy.

Another challenger who has been firing broadside after broadside is Leon Keyserling, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Truman and now an economic consultant in Washington.

It is hardly a secret that highly placed economists in the Government lean to his views. In the interest of harmony they have gone along with the Treasury. Federal Reserve view, although with the private qualification that more drastic measures are likely to be necessary in the not-too-distant future.

Keyserling's latest broadside fired by his Conference on Economic Progress challenges the adequacy of administration proposals to cure chronic unemployment. He contends that if part-time unemployment and the failure of many even to look for jobs or register as unemployed, because the search is hopeless, are taken into account, the unemployed rate should be 9.4 percent seasonally adjusted. The rate of unemployment among teenagers is 18 percent, according to the Keyserling computation.

"The human consequences of conveying to these young people the impresison that our economic system can make no utilization of them are incalculable," the report states. "These consequences go to the very root of delinquency, crime and low morale among the young."

Likewise, it is at the root of rising racial tensions. In many areas the Negro unemployment rate is nearly twice that of the whites. A fear contributing to racial conflict—in an economy that is not expanding rapidly enough—is that a job given to a Negro will be taken from a white.

The President is in a sense a prisoner of the divergent forces centering on the problems of the economy. The challengers ardently support his initial proposal for a tax cut even though it deliberately invites a Federal deficit. But the conventional wisdom—a balanced budget, pay-as-you-go—is deeply enshrined in the Congress among perhaps a majority of Democrats and Republicans alike. The Keynesian prescription for Government intervention to raise the levels of private spending and increase public spending on needed services, such as education and housing, is stoutly resisted.

How long the conventional wisdom will prevail will be determined by how acute the human problem becomes. If rising interest rates do check economic growth then it will be necessary to take far more drastic means, such as a broad international monetary pol with central controls, to curb the money flow. Waiting to see is in itself a major risk.

Right of Private Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 22, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to call to your attention and that of my colleagues an outstanding radio broadcast by "Life Line," a program which is heard over hundreds of radio stations across the country 6 days each week. The title of this program is "Right of Private Property," and it examines with clear analytical insight the proposed legislation now pending before the Commerce Committee to permit the Federal Government to dictate to businessmen to whom they must sell and serve on their private property. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this radio transcript be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHT OF PRIVATE PROPERTY

Personal rights are the very foundation of the American way of life. They are written into our Constitution, taught in our schools and colleges, guarded by law and due process of law, and held up as an example to the world. The United States of America became an independent nation to secure the personal rights of every American, and that is still the noblest purpose of our Nation.

Let's take a close, hard look at the personal right we are in the greatest danger of losing in our time. And let us try to understand why we must keep that right if any of our personal rights are to survive in the long run.

Let's look at the right of private property.

The right of private property was always included in the primary list of basic personal rights by the great political thinkers of earlier times who built up the case for freedom. John Locke, who has been called the father of the American Revolution and of our Constitution because his ideas showed the way for both, spoke often of the fundamental rights of life, liberty, and property. Thomas Jefferson, when he prepared his draft of the Declaration of Independence—the best known statement of the American idea of personal rights—changed "property" to the more poetic "pursuit of happiness." By this change Jefferson probably meant to include an even greater range of human freedom than was covered by the term "property." He certainly did not mean to downgrade property as a personal right.

Still later, the 14th amendment to the Constitution declared that no State shall deprive any of its citizens of the basic rights of life, liberty, or property "without due process of law."

Actually, as Jefferson's use of the term "pursuit of happiness" makes especially clear, the three rights cannot be separated; each is necessary to both of the others. Obviously we must begin with the right to life. But it was the firm conviction of every man who fought in the American Revolution that life without liberty was not worth having. So the right to life could only be given meaning when it stood side by side with the right to liberty.

But what is liberty? It is each person's freedom to act, to live, and to work as he alone may choose, independent of any restraint, except on rare occasions by the courts through full legal process. A right to liberty without the chance to use it would be as valueless as a right to life without the liberty to live it. And the active use of liberty, for the vast majority of men, means the earning and owning of property as a result of their freely chosen personal work. Their property may be of many different kinds and held in widely varying amounts. But the right to personal property honestly earned and owned is absolutely necessary if the rights to life and liberty are not to become a hollow sham.

Now in recent years we have all heard a great deal about human rights as somehow opposed to property rights. We are told that we must often make a choice between the two, in favor of one and against the other, especially when applying the powers of centralized government against the citizen. Men tell us they are proud to stand for human rights at the expense of property rights, that human rights are good but property rights are so dangerous that they must be limited drastically. A favorite device for undermining property rights and putting them in a bad light is to say or imply that only the very wealthy are concerned about them.

But the right of private property is of the most vital importance to every man who owns anything at all. If you own a home or a car or a plot of land, if you have an income of your own or can even lay claim to the clothes on your back, you have a stake in maintaining the right of private property, a stake that is just as big for you as a whole business empire may be for the man who owns it. There is not a breadwinner in America whose personal freedom is not threatened by attacks on the right of private property.

As for the talk of human rights versus property rights—there is no more striking example of twisted and mistaken thinking than this. For the right to earn and own property is, always was, and always will be a natural human right, a human and personal right that must be preserved if any of our other rights are to be worth having. If we cannot use our liberty to earn and own, then there is no real liberty; and where there is no real liberty, there is no productive and meaningful life. Suppose for a moment that the mistaken were correct, and private property wasn't a basic human right. If not a right, then it can only be a privilege, and a privilege, by definition, is something which can be denied at any time for no good reason. For example: I have a right to walk across my own land; but I have only a privilege to walk across my neighbor's land, which he can deny me at any time he may wish.

If private property is not a right, but only a privilege, then it can be restricted or completely abolished at any time by any force strong enough to do so. Any man's property may be seized, and any man's chance to earn and own sharply limited. And there is this to remember about property. Unlike life or liberty, it is transferable. When property is taken from one man or a group of men, it must pass to another man or group of men. And so we can't help wondering, could it be that some of those who talk most loudly about the unimportance of property rights are just possibly more than a little interested in getting control of other people's property for themselves?

If a man were to claim the right to take the life of another, without due process of law, we would see him as a murderer. If he claimed the right to take the liberty of another, without due process of law, we would see him as an enslaver. So, when a man claims the right to take the property of another, without due process of law, there is at least some reason to see him as a thief.

Now what happens in countries where private property has ceased to be a right or has never been thought of as a right and so has remained no better than a privilege? In such countries a man's property belongs to the state whenever the state may choose to take it, without compensation. Even the Communist nations have found that they cannot yet take all private property away from their citizens, because most of them simply will not work without it. But those who live under communism are left with the barest minimum of property, and new experiments are constantly being tried in a search for ways to wean the people away from their stubborn devotion to private property. The Chinese communes were a particularly horrible experiment of this kind.

Here in America today we tend to feel that if we give the Government power to take (without due process of law) only parts of large property holdings, there is no danger and the results will be good. But once the right of private property is violated anywhere for any reason, it becomes that much easier to violate the right again, and again, and again whenever it may be convenient for the Government to do so. The only safe ways to permit any man's property to be taken against his will are through the carefully safeguarded procedures of our courts, or with full compensation for its value, or by taxation specifically voted by elected legislators. The discretion of bureaucrats unchecked by law has no place in this area. Private property as a basic human right cannot be allowed to depend for its preservation on any man's whim.

The right of private property has been described in the simplest possible terms as each man's right "to do as he will with his own." This means that if a man owns a house he may rightfully decide who is to live in it; if he owns a business he may rightfully decide who is to work in it; if he has a profession he may rightfully decide whom to accept as clients; if he has written a book he may rightfully decide who will be permitted to print it; if he owns farmland he may rightfully decide what crops to grow and how much to grow upon it. The Constitution does give Congress the power to regulate trade, the buying and selling of goods, the exchange of property. But before a man takes his goods to market, while they are still entirely his property, his right to have them and use them should be absolute.

But today that right is far from absolute, and its denial is the source of grave danger. The danger is obvious when we see how closely the right of private property touches the right of personal liberty, when we speak of what a man does in privacy with his own. One of the best examples is that of the ranch owner who grew feed grains on a small part of his ranch solely for the use of his own livestock. He neither bought nor sold grain; it never left the land which was his property. Yet the Federal Department of Agriculture moved in to tell him that he could not grow grain on his own property for his own use; that they had the power and the right to regulate what he grew, even for this purpose. This action violated both the basic human rights of liberty and property.

If we look very closely, we can begin to see in the campaign against property rights, and the attempts to isolate them from other rights and downgrade their importance, a particularly clever divide-and-conquer tactic of the mistaken enemies of freedom. The mistaken know they can never persuade free Americans to give up all their personal rights at once. But, by singling out the right of private property for special treatment, by mixed appeals to noble if naive motives of charity and to base motives of envy, the mistaken have brought the right of private property into real jeopardy today. People are listening to their teaching that property is a lesser right than life and liberty. If this campaign succeeds, the next step is clear, a similar attack on the idea of liberty, as selfish and not public-spirited, as ruling out supposedly necessary sacrifies to the State. Beyond that remains only the right to life, as a slave; and that is the ultimate goal of the mistaken in their divide-and-conquer attack on personal rights.

Diamonds in Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22, 1963

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a heavy rain fell at Murfreesboro, Ark., on the morning of June 19, 1963. After the rain stopped, Art A. Rogers, of Pine Bluff, and his 14-month-old daughter began searching through the rocks washed loose from the ground of the Arkansas Diamond Mine. The little girl handed a rock she had been playing with to Rogers who decided that the rock was just too big to be a diamond. However, he took it to the mine operator, James R. Johnston. Mr. Johnston offered him $5,000 on the spot. Mr. Rogers' daughter had found an 11.92 carat diamond which will be worth at least $8,000 after cutting.

The Rogers' experience is not an isolated one. In excess of 60,000 diamonds have been found and produced from the Arkansas Diamond Mine at Murfreesboro, Ark. Upon the payment of a daily hunting fee, visitors are allowed to search for precious stones in a 49-acre area of the mine. They may keep any diamonds they find regardless of their size. Since March 1, from 5 to 15 diamonds have been found every day at the mine. On March 23, Mr. Fred Wood found a 10.40 carat diamond. Mr. Jack Floyd found a 11.23 carat diamond on May 20.

Mr. President, the presence of diamonds in Murfreesboro, is only one of the many varied and unusual tourist attractions in Arkansas. We in Arkansas extend an invitation to those who would like to experience the excitement of a real and successful diamond hunt. There are surely thousands more diamonds waiting to be found. Come and visit us.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Little Ole 'Rock' Was 11 Carat Find," published in the Arkansas Democrat on June 20, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AT ARKANSAS DIAMOND MINE: LITTLE OLE 'ROCK' WAS 11 CARAT FIND

(By Claude Walbert)

A heavy rain fell at Murfreesboro yesterday. The sun and the diamond hunters came out together and began searching through the rocks washed loose from the sticky blue ground.

At 9:30 a.m. Art A. Rogers, of Pine Bluff, was busier trying to keep rocks out of his 14-month-old daughter's mouth than hunting diamonds.

Rogers, a 68-year-old turnaround diesel locomotive electrician, has made a successful hobby of diamond hunting for 4 years. Yesterday he took his wife and daughter to the 48-acre-Arkansas diamond mine.

The little girl handed over one of the rocks she'd been playing with. Rogers said later the rock was just too big to be a diamond, but he took it to mine operator James R. Johnston, a gemologist.

"It sure is." Johnston said, and offered him $5,000 for the brownish gem on the spot.

The weight of the diamond was found to be 11 carats and 92 points. A carat is made up of 100 points. When cut the diamond will be around 5 carats.

Johnston said it would cost about $2,500 to have the diamond cut, and it will be worth at least $8,000. After cutting the stone will have a rosy tint.

It was quite a beginning in diamond finding by Rogers' daughter, Mary Elizabeth. But another daughter, 8-year-old Sybil Joyce, has found eight diamonds and two other daughters have each found two.

Rogers himself found a diamond Sunday of 1 carat and 61 points. It is worth around $300 uncut and will be worth $800 when cut. In 4 years of diamond hunting, the Rogers family has found 24 diamonds.

Johnston said that since March 1 from 5 to 15 diamonds have been found every day at the mines. Since the mine was first opened over 60,000 diamonds have been found.

On March 23, Fred Wood found a 10.40 carat diamond. Jack Floyd found an 11.23 carat diamond on May 20.

Rogers' diamond was about 25 carats at one time, according to Johnston. The crystal was split in the middle on the cleavage line. There is no record of the other half having been found.

"It looks like I still have something to look for," Rogers said.

He wants to name the one he found the Star of the Cotton Belt, with the permission of Paul Bunting and Walter Hemil, director and assistant of personnel of the Cotton Belt Route division of the Southern Pacific Lines.

Rogers will have lots of company when he goes looking for the other half of his diamond. It's finders keepers at the mine, and there's no tax to pay unless the diamond is sold.

It's Time To Repeal the Nuisance Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, ever since World War II ended bills have been introduced to repeal the excise taxes that were imposed during the war on so-called luxury items—transportation, cosmetics, telephone service, the cabaret tax, and so forth. At that time it was stated by the Government that these taxes would be removed as soon as the emergency situation created by the war was over.

The war ended 18 years ago. The taxes are still being collected. I have introduced H.R. 513 to repeal these taxes and it has been referred to the Ways and Means Committee. The following article from the New York Journal-American of June 20, 1963, expresses the feminine point of view on these taxes. More and more articles of this nature have been appearing in women's magazines and in newspapers that have columns written by women. If we do not get busy and pass H.R. 513 we may find ourselves in more hot water with the fairer sex than usual.

The article follows:

WAR TAXES GO MARCHING ON

(By Phyllis Battelle)

You go along from day to day, minding your own business and letting the U.S. Government mind theirs, and then one day you get mad. You know you'll get over it—tomorrow you'll be your sweet, amiable self again—but this particular day you say to yourself, and you've said on many days throughout many years.

"How can the Government get by with it? If they're going to be dishonest with the taxpayer, how can they expect the taxpayer to be honest with them?"

What tees you off is that you've chosen this day to replace a frazzled handbag, a depleted lipstick, or a kaput compact—and you've seen the price, such a nice neat price, soar dramatically as the salesgirl adds those taxes. City tax. State tax. OK, relatively nominal, and besides they're keeping the home fires burning. But when they heap on that appalling, always annoying 10-percent Federal excise ("luxury"—and indeed it is) tax—Grrrrrrrfffff!

It is not the money that burns you.

It is the principle of the thing that turns your stomach.

Twenty-two years ago our Government quite rightly put a wartime tax on any commodity that could be used for the war effort. There was nary a nag, of course, from the American woman, who was told that brass cartridges could better hold bullets than lipsticks, and handbag leather was more needed for GI boots.

But the premise and promise was that these luxury taxes would be lifted 6 months after the war.

Well, the promise was ignored. For more than a dozen years, dozens of bills for repeal of the excise tax have come before Congress—currently there are 13 of them being largely ignored—and nothing has been done.

The bills are now before the Ways and Means Committee. What we'd like to ask Congress is: What kind of ways and means are these? We were brought up to believe that the ways and means of honest behavior were to honor pledges, once you made them.

Of course the American drug, handbag, jewelry and fur industries have been complaining about this injustice to their trade for a long time, but apparently the fight left them too spent to exert the necessary influence that would Congress keep its promise—18 years later.

It's up to women to make their protests felt at last (lift that voice, tote that petition!) if ever we are to be beautiful, at an honest price, again. We must convince Congress—which already knows, we're certain, that lipstick and a handbag are no more luxuries than a man's shaving cream or pants pockets—that it's time they lived up to the original bargain—that you can't expect honest taxpayers as long as you have dishonest taxes.

For a decade, complainers about the continued excise tax have pointed out that it is discriminatory against women. Women are, as we say, accustomed. What is important is that this bill discriminates against families of modest means. The $60-a-week file clerk has to pay proportionately the same tax bite for her most necessary plastic purse as the millionaire's wife pays for her fifth mink coat.

Although the revenue from the excise taxes in question comes to only two-tenths of 1 percent of the total U.S. taxes, and although almost every man, woman and child in the United States recognizes that it is in peacetime a discriminatory and unjust and outmoded form of raising revenue—the bills to repeal these imposts continually get bottled up in good old Ways and Means.

Why?

Ask your Congressman. Or the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman of House Ways and Means. There must be an answer, but it may be as hard to swallow as that annual tax lump on your luxurious necessities of life.

Tax Reduction and Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, at his recent press conference, the President again pointed out the urgency of tax revision and tax reductions as a means of stimulating our rate of economic growth.

As time goes on, it becomes more and more apparent that such a stimulus is essential if we are to reverse the trend of unemployment in the United States. For more than 5 years, nationwide unemployment has exceed 5 percent of the work force. It has been estimated that we need over 3 million more jobs at this time to achieve a level of reasonably full employment. Moreover, during this decade some 1.3 million new jobs are needed each year if we are to keep pace with population increase and expansion of the labor force.

The July issue of the AFL–CIO American Federationist magazine contains an article which discusses the relationship between tax reductions and the creation of new jobs. I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix with my remarks the text of the article, "Needed: Tax Cuts To Create Jobs."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: TAX CUTS TO CREATE JOBS

Helping jobless Americans get work is the only valid reason for a tax cut in 1963. The right kind of tax cut—one that will quickly stimulate demand, production and job growth by concentrating its benefits among the millions of moderate and low-income taxpayers of the Nation—can do more, faster, than any other type of Federal action designed to help resolve the Nation's most critical economic problem—unemployment.

A tax cut flowing mostly to the 43 million tax-paying families with incomes of less than $10,000 will be quickly spent. As this new purchasing power spreads rapidly and widely throughout the economy, everyone will benefit. Production and employment will go up. Business profits will rise. When existing productive capacity is more fully utilized, a sound basis for sustained investment in new plants and equipment will be generated.

A $10 billion tax cut concentrated among moderate and low-income families probably will add about $20 to $30 billion to total national output as its chain reaction effect stimulates the entire economy. Furthermore, as national income rises, Government tax receipts will go up, too.

Organized labor is deeply concerned, however, by the possibility that a tax cut will be enacted that will not effectively spur production and job growth. If this goal is compromised—and congressional action up to this point is not reassuring—the tax cut will not be worthy of its cost.

A massive and soundly conceived effort to put jobless Americans to work is long overdue.

For more than 5 years the unemployment rate has remained over 5 percent, even when new production peaks were being reached. Right now the Nation needs over 3 million more jobs just to achieve a level of reasonably full employment. But this is not enough—this year and every year during the 1960's, 1.3 million additional jobs are needed just to provide work for the rapid increase in the labor force resulting from the growing number of youngsters pouring out of school. What is more, each year the economy must create about 2.5 million additional jobs just to accommodate people displaced by technological change who otherwise will be unemployed. Between 1963 and 1970, 80,000 new job opportunities must be created every week if America's growing employment needs are going to be met.

A long time has passed since the AFL–CIO first urged a substantial tax cut concentrated among moderate and low-income families as one of several special measures to help put jobseekers and idle production capacity to work. Slowly support for a tax cut has grown and now a broad consensus has been achieved. Today influential business leaders, high-ranking Members of the Congress, eminent economists and the President all declare that lower taxes are needed to spur production and job growth.

Unfortunately, there is no consensus among the growing group of tax-reduction advocates about how a $10 billion cut should be allocated to achieve this goal.

Spokesmen for big business, spearheaded by the Ford Committee of 300 top industrial and financial leaders and by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, demand a major tax-cut share for upper-income-bracket families and for corporations. At the same time they are giving no support to the proposed loophole-closing reforms of the President, designed to end some of the special tax privileges enjoyed by corporations and wealthy individuals.

If tax cuts at the top would assure permanent jobs for Americans who need them, the AFL–CIO also would support such a program. But the proposals of these business leaders cannot achieve this goal.

Those who demand large tax cuts concentrated at the top insist that more cash to finance expanded business investment is the priority national need. Higher after-tax incomes for corporations and well-to-do savers will make capital expansion boom and vast new job opportunities will be created, they declare.

But there is no evidence whatsoever that investment is now being frustrated by a shortage of funds to meet new plant and equipment costs. On the contrary, corporate and individual savings available for capital expansion are at an alltime peak.

RECORD GAINS FOR CORPORATIONS

Last year the aftertax profits of corporations—$26.3 billion—reached a record high despite the fact that 17 percent of industrial capacity was idle.

Last year dividend payouts to stockholders—$15.9 billion—reached a record high, a substantial reward for savers and investors.

Most importantly, last year the cash flow to corporations—cash that is set aside from depreciation allowances and from undistributed profits—all of it available to finance new investment, also reached a record high. As a matter of fact, last year this cash flow to nonfinancial corporations reached an alltime peak of $37 billion, after all taxes and dividends were paid. This cash set-aside came about because of the generous innew plant and investment by $5 billion in 1962, a year that set a new investment high.

What is more, corporations were granted tax relief of over $2 billion in 1962—equal to a tax rate cut of about 10 percent. This came about because of the generous investment tax credit and a further speedup of depreciation writeoffs approved last year.

This year, corporate net profits, dividend payouts and the corporate cash flow available for new investment will again reach new highs, assisted by the tax relief granted in 1962.

Furthermore, vast sums available to finance new investment also have been building up in banks, insurance companies, pension funds and in other savings institutions. In fact, in the first 3 months of this year alone Americans put a record $7.2 billion into savings of this sort—more new savings than in any quarter since World War II. Yet the sums internally accumulated by many corporations now are so large, help from conventional lending institutions or from new investors to finance capital expansion is no longer needed.

Recently the Wall Street Journal declared: "American corporations, many of them bulging with money of their own, are growing increasingly independent of the Nation's security markets. Business managers raised less money through new stock issues in 1962 than in any year in the post-World War II era. They raised less in corporate bond issues than in 1957, when the economy was three-quarters its present size. And the pattern is continuing, reports indicate."

What is more: "The (corporate) self-sufficiency occurs when the public's saving hoard—funds that could be plowed into new security issues—is at a record level, up more than 25 percent in just 3 years."

There have been times in the history of the country when lack of funds for capital investment retarded production and job growth. But this hardly seems to be the case today.

Yet the administration's tax program calls for another cut for corporations amounting to $2.6 billion—mostly by reducing the top tax rate from 52 percent to 47 percent. Moreover, 65 percent of this tax saving would go to the 4,000 largest and wealthiest companies of the Nation that clearly need it least. What is more, perhaps a billion dollars of this corporate tax saving—perhaps more—would simply be passed out in higher dividends every year, according to testimony of Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon. This is indeed official confirmation that the major beneficiaries of yet another corporate tax cut actually don't need it to meet capital investment costs.

Evidence is overwhelming that further tax reduction for corporations will further enrich stockholders, but it will hardly help guarantee jobs for the unemployed.

TAX CUTS AT TOP CANNOT CREATE JOBS

With industry now operating at only 85 percent of its present capacity to produce and a 4-percent rise in this capacity scheduled for this year, rapidly expanding sales are today's priority national need. Tax cuts aimed at a further pileup of individual and corporate savings, when a spur to consumption is the major need, just cannot serve the job-creation goals of 1963.

As the AFL–CIO Executive Council recently declared: "The need of the American economy—and the long-run need of business as well—is rapidly-growing markets for the sale of the increasing volume of goods and services that can be produced. It is growing markets that create jobs. And it is rising sales that provide the incentive for a sustained increase of business investment in new plants and machines."

Unfortunately, just as the proposed $2.6 billion tax cut for corporations would generate little new investment—since ample funds for this purpose already are available—the administration's proposed tax cut of over $3 billion for the already best-off 15 percent of taxpayers at the top would be least likely to generate production and job growth since the consumption needs of these families already are largely met.

As AFL–CIO President George Meany recently pointed out to the House Ways and Means Committee after observing that half of the administration's proposed net $10.3 billion tax reduction—after loophole closing—would go to families with income of over

$10,000 and to corporations—this money is "far more apt to be saved than spent."

According to reports emanating from the Ways and Means Committee, the administration's tax proposal is not being strengthened in order to improve its aid to job growth; it is being further weakened.

The President originally proposed a total tax-rate cut of $13.6 billion—$11 billion for individuals and the $2.6 billion cut for corporations. However, it also was planned that $3.3 billion of this cost would be offset by structural changes and reforms, mostly by closing loopholes long enjoyed by special interests. As a consequence, the actual outlay for the $13.6 billion total rate cut would be reduced to a net cost of $10.3 billion.

It now appears, however, that the $3.3 billion to be recouped by loophole-closing is turning into a mirage; one after another, many of the major administration proposals to end existing tax-avoidance schemes so long enjoyed by upper-income taxpayers and corporations have been watered down or totally rejected. Because of this fact, the final sum to be authorized for tax-rate cutting may be pared down to hardly more than $10 billion.

If the big business campaign for a cut in corporate rates from 52 percent to 47 percent and for substantial cuts for upper bracket individuals succeeds, what remains for allocation to the 85 percent of all taxpayers with incomes of less than $10,000 will be even further reduced. The millions of moderate and low-income families—who still bear a near-wartime tax burden and enjoy no tax loopholes—would receive even less tax reduction than the President originally proposed. On the other hand, corporations and the well-to-do would enjoy all, or nearly all, of the too generous tax savings originally planned for them.

What is more, the aggregate increase in after-tax take-home pay of the 43 million moderate and low-income families would not be enough to generate significant production and job growth. The generous tax savings allocated to the wealthiest 15 percent of our taxpayers at the top of the income pile and to our largest and wealthiest corporations would, indeed, further enrich the already well off, but they would do little to help alleviate the plight of the jobless.

THE SHRIKING TAX CUT AT THE BOTTOM

The President's program for an $11 billion cut in taxes for individuals carried with it the proposal that present rates, which range from 20 percent to 91 percent, be reduced to 14 percent at the bottom and 65 percent at the top. As the total available for tax cuts for individuals goes down, however, even less of a reduction will be allocated to moderate and low-income taxpayers.

Clearly, to provide the largest possible tax relief for moderate and low-income families—who need it most and whose spending will quickly stimulate production and job growth—cuts for corporations should now be given the lowest priority. At the same time, if the Congress fails to adequately close loopholes, tax-rate cuts for the upper brackets should be drastically curtailed. The wealthy long have tried to justify their special tax avoidance opportunities on the ground that they are necessary to escape high tax rates. To now cut these rates without effectively closing the loopholes would simply add to the inequity which already characterizes the tax system.

Back in 1954, when the last important tax reduction measure was enacted, the major benefits were conferred on corporations and upper income families. Despite high expectations, this trickle-down tax formula did not work well. After a brief investment boom which could not be sustained because of lack of consumer demand, the upward momentum died and inadequate job growth has plagued the economy ever since.

In 1963, the American people require tax reduction of a different kind. Both the Nation's job-creation goal and the need for greater tax equity demand it.

Recently, the AFL–CIO Executive Council stated its view in this way: "Any tax reduction policy that fails to concentrate its benefits among low- and middle-income taxpayers—that fails to focus on creating jobs and reducing unemployment—will be opposed by organized labor."

What is more, even the right kind of tax cut to spur production and job growth may be nullified if the traditional opponents of Federal spending for essential civilian public service needs have their way.

Even before a tax-reduction bill is enacted, these people are loudly insisting that Federal spending must be throttled to recoup the tax-cut revenue loss and some of the big business advocates of tax reduction are among them.

It should be evident, however, that if Federal dollars are taken out of the spending stream as a tax cut puts them in, the economic impact of tax reduction will be nullified. This self-defeating process would not only jeopardize the prospect of job growth, it would deprive the Nation of vitally needed public services as well.

An even more unfortunate prospect would confront the country if those obsessed with budget balancing succeed in throttling Federal programs for education, mass transport, and public works as the price to be paid for tax-reduction program that neither effectively spurs job growth nor increases the equity of the tax system.

What the American economy needs in 1963 is a $10 billion tax cut, concentrated among low- and middle-income families and supplemented by increased Federal expenditures for public works—to create jobs and reduce unemployment.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my newsletter of July 20, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS, JULY 20, 1963

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

The Presidential message on balance, that is, imbalance, of payments once again shows the President's misunderstanding of problem and solution to the problem. Because of Government programs and controls our Nation yearly must pay others more than they pay us. Further, others can collect by demanding our gold for their dollars while we hold foreign I.O.U.'s. While our foreign assets (according to the President) exceed our debts by $27 billion we are, because of our Government's policies, in danger of losing all our gold and devaluing the dollar. So the stage is set for our economic collapse. Because of our Government's fiscal policies, the world can demand $24 billion in gold and we have less than $4 billion with which to pay off, before dipping into the approximately $12 billion of gold which backs up and gives our dollar its value. All our gold now equals only $15.6 billion. So what does the President do? He imposes more financial straitjacketing. He seeks to cure the results of Federal controls and dictates by more Federal regulation and control, a 15-percent tax called "interest equalization tax" on the purchase by Americans of new or outstanding foreign securities—a tax on the free flow of money, a wall to prevent the financial activities we have always encouraged in the past.

The President, despite the lengthy analysis, skirted the basic problems at the heart of the situation. Capitalism, the private enterprise system, thrives on freedom, not Federal intervention. The tax he proposes on the flow of money is no solution. Why doesn't the President and his advisers turn instead to fiscal responsibility? The President and his deficit financing advisers have forgotten the reasons for and the need for a federally balanced budget, reduction of debt, and straightforward reduction of taxes including tax rate reduction, instead of the fuzzy tortuous Presidential tax reform recommendations. If the President really wants to reduce the imbalance of payments why doesn't he not stop giving our money away. While we have the greatest debt in the world we continue to continue to give foreign aid all over the world. Even our increased exports are recognized to be the result largely of our own subsidy. We give foreign nations money and they buy from us. This is artificial growth. Further, that money remaining in foreign hands can be converted into our gold at their discretion. Is it any wonder that foreign nations have built up such dollar reserves, callable in gold? Indeed,. in many instances foreign nations have refused to lower their tariffs after agreeing to do so to match our reduction because they have pleaded dollar shortage. Our foreign giveaway and disproportionate support of the U.N. are instances of our inability to live within our means and exercise financial self-discipline. It is high time the New Frontiersmen and other new Socialists including our President, Schlesinger, Heller, Galbraith, and others realize the imbalance of payments result from the big spending policies, deficit financing, Government in business and the increasing regulation and control of our society by Federal Government, under the liberal-radical Democrats.

Besides foreign aid gifts of our money, as an example of the liberal Democrats failing to see the answer, look at their political charges in the past of the need for low interest rates and criticism of increasing interest rates. Democrats demand low interest rates; as a result United States capital flows abroad to get higher rates. If the interest rates were higher at home the money would stay here. So instead of recognizing the need for raising the interest rates, the President seeks to prevent the outflow by taxing the money sent overseas.

DANGER IN TEST BAN NEGOTIATIONS

Most important development this week was the beginning of talks on a nuclear test ban agreement with the Soviet Union. The danger is that the people of the United States could lose World War III without ever knowing that it had begun. Besides the cruel facts of history showing that the Soviet Union never honors its agreements, and that they ruthlessly broke the last test ban moratorium when it suited their purpose, my concern over the present negotiations is even greater because of a talk by Dr. Edward Teller, recognized as one of the world's greatest scientists, Dr. Teller's warnings should make us consider the implications of entering into agreements with the Russians on test bans. Here are some thoughts he gives us to ponder. "It is my conviction that today the Russians are ahead of us in nuclear weapons. I cannot prove this statement, but I will say to you categorically that no one can prove its opposite." With even the slightest indication that Russia is leading the United States in the development of nuclear explosives, how can anyone in this country be optimistic about a test ban agreement which will bind us because we honor our agreements but will have no effect upon the activities of the Soviet Union because history proves they do not.

Dr. Teller also points out that he believes the Russians may be close to developing an anti-missile missile. If they succeed, or if they can make us believe they are about to succeed and we have not developed such a weapon, then we have no defenses. Dr. Teller says: "In order to develop missile defenses one needs to test in the atmosphere, but one does not need big tests. No one, in or out of the disarmament agency has claimed that nuclear explosives under 1 kiloton, in the atmosphere can be detected. With experiments using small explosives, missile advances can be conducted. These small explosions made by the Russians, may seal our doom."

There are two conclusions here that should be apparent to even the most naive and certainly should be clear to the President, (1) we cannot detect their testing and, (2) we must continue our testing.

IN THE HOUSE THIS WEEK

Comic relief came in the guise of "boiled peanuts" and any laughter relieves tension on the floor. Yet if laughter seemed hollow it was because of the realization that this plea to remove boiled peanut acreage from Government control leaves other peanut and additional crop growers still under Federal Government dictation.

Grief came in the sudden death of Hjalmar Nygaard (a relative newcomer and younger Member in his second term) of a heart attack during debate on the ADP bill, and reminds us of our tensions. I was privileged to visit Hjalmar in his district and to know him. Once again the flags at half mast were an unwelcome sight at morning going to work.

Automatic Data Processing equipment (ADP) comprises the electronic brain computing machines now widely used by many agencies of the Government. In an effort to streamline Government, increase efficiency, and eliminate cost at an estimated savings of $100 million yearly, a bill (H.R. 5171) was presented to place the coordination of their joint use under the GSA (General Services Administration). Eight Government agencies disapproved, yet the Comptroller General recommended this program. Even though generally not well understood, the bill passed. (ALGER for.) Charges embodying economy and false economy were exchanged. I believe this effort to be sound and can succeed without transgression on each agency's jurisdiction and peculiar needs.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Re House Resolutions Nos. 14 and 15.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: We, as a family of Armenian descent would like to thank you for submitting House Resolution No. 14 for formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations. It is about time. Something has to be done to bring this matter to the public's attention. We will support you in any way we can to bring this matter to the public eye.

I am also writing to our Congressman and Congressman SMITH in regard to the above matter.

Our support goes with you.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE HALASHAM.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, BINGHAMTON, N.Y.,
BRANCH,
June 8, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Enclosed are the copies of our letters to Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH and Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON in which we are asking them for support of your resolution calling for establishment of a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

We take this opportunity to thank you for your continuous endeavors on behalf of the captive nations under the Communist domination, and congratulate you on your boldness and wisdom of introducing such a resolution. We also wish you full success in your action.

Wishing you the best of health, we remain
Respectfully yours,
WOLODYMYR FEDANKIW,
Chairman.
WILLIAM IVANONKO,
Secretary.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, BINGHAMTON, N.Y.,
BRANCH,
June 8, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: We kindly ask you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee, and give it your favorable support.

The resolution calls for the establishment of a permanent committee on the captive nations in the House of Representatives. Those captive and enslaved nations are eager and wanting to escape Soviet-Russian despotism, and therefore constitute perennial weaknesses for the Soviet Union.

The Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of "national liberation" in Africa and Asia while we, as a nation, are not doing much to help the enslaved and captive nations.

We are fully convinced that a committee on the captive nations in the House of Representatives is vitally important not only for those captive nations but also for the American people and U.S. Government. Such a committee would fill in the existing deficiency in evaluating the situation in the Soviet Union, and would become a source of information for our people and Government on the state of affairs in the Soviet Union.

We strongly urge you, Congress SMITH, to consider favorably the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee.

Respectfully yours,
WOLODYMYR FEDANKIW,
Chairman.
WILLIAM IVANONKO,
Secretary.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, BRANCH BINGHAMTON, N.Y.,
June 8, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON,
New Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROBISON: Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD introduced a resolution in which he calls for the establishment of a permanent committee on the captive nations in the House of Representatives.

Such a committee is vitally important both for our Government and the American people. It would become a reservoir of true and unbiased knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations. Those nations are eager and wanting to escape Soviet Russian despotism, and therefore constitute perennial weaknesses of the Soviet Union.

The committee would also disprove Communist Russia's claim that only she is championing the cause of "national liberation" especially in Africa and Asia, while she is the most terrible oppressor of captive and enslaved nations.

The Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) is still in the House Rules Committee. We ask you, Congressman ROBISON, to support House Resolution 14, and to introduce a similar resolution of your own. Thank you very much.

Respectfully yours,
WILLIAM IVANONKO, *Secretary.*
WOLODYMYR FEDANKIW, *Chairman.*

RACINE, WIS., *May 29, 1963.*

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The Racine Chapter of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation informs you that a resolution has been passed by our unit supporting passage of

House Resolution 14, submitted by you, which calls for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Recent developments worldwide and in Washington make the formation of such a committee imperative to the security and welfare of the United States, and will bring added hope to the tyrannized peoples of the once free nations today in Soviet bondage.

We are in addition to this letter, contacting our Congressman as well as Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, head of the Rules Committee, urging him to release your resolution to the House floor for quick debate and passage.

May we take this opportunity to commend you for your stand in this regard, and to assure you of our every support of your measure?

Sincerely,

JOHN BUCHAKLIN.

JUNE 12, 1963.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: As an American of Armenian ancestry I am very much interested in your bill, House Resolution 14–15, for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Please continue your good work in behalf of this bill. I am sure it will please you to know that there are many other Armenian-Americans who admire your determination regarding this bill.

Sincerely,

MARSOOB ANDONIAN.

DENVER, COLO., *June 3, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I would like to ask your support for establishment of Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives (the Flood bill, H. Res. 14).

I have proof that any action in the United States of America, on behalf of the nations behind the Iron Curtain gives those people a reason to hope and to struggle for their freedom, on one side, and, on the other one, keeps the Kremlin government from more aggression, even a war against the United States.

Any strong action to help those by Russians enslaved nations does help our own country, as well.

Yours very truly,

IVAN IWACHIW.

Testimony for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today Mr. Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, testified before the Senate Commerce Committee on the public accomodations section of the proposed civil rights legislation—title II, S. 1731. With simple language and concise thought Mr. Wilkins has produced a moving and eloquent testimony for the cause of civil rights. I commend it to the reading and contemplation of all who respect human dignity.

My name is Roy Wilkins. I live in New York City and I am executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, an organization formed in 1909 for the specific purpose of securing the constitutional rights, then and now widely denied or abridged, of Negro citizens of the United States.

I wish first of all to thank the chairman and members of this subcommittee for the invitation to appear and state my views of our association on title II, S. 1731, the public accommodation section of the proposed civil rights legislation now being considered by you. These views are those of the N.A.A.C.P., since there was not time to secure formal endorsement of them by member organizations of the leadership conference on civil rights. I expect, however, that a goodly number of members organizations, to which copies have been sent for inspection, will notify the committee of their stand on this text.

The public accommodations section seeks to invoke protective legislative action in a most sensitive area where great numbers of citizens suffer daily—almost hourly—humiliation and denial simply because of their skin color. These people are citizens of the United States, not merely citizens of the States wherein they reside. As such, they are entitled to the protection of the Congress of the United States against the infringement of their rights under color of any local or State law or custom.

As is the case with so many aspects of the vast minority rights question in our country, the tendency in debate has been to treat the complaints in a detached laboratory manner. Hypothetical questions are posed. Hairline delineations are set forth. Labyrinthine technicalities are pursued. Precedents, often bordering on the chicken versus egg level, are solemnly intoned. Expediency, usually on a rarified political level but festooned with fine and flowing phrases, is held forth as morality or as reason, or, worse still, as "practicality."

The truth is that the affronts and denials that this section, if enacted, would correct are intensely human and personal. Very often they harm the physical body, but always they strike at the root of the human spirit, at the very core of human dignity.

It must be remembered that while we talk here today, while we talked last week, and while the Congress will be debating in the next weeks Negro Americans throughout our country will be bruised in nearly every waking hour by differential treatment in, or exclusion from, public accommodations of every description. From the time they leave home in the morning, en route to school or to work, to shopping or to visiting, until they return home at night, humilation stalks them. Public transportation, eating establishments, hotels, lodging houses, theaters and motels, arenas, stadiums, retail stores, markets, and various other places and services catering to the general public offer them either differentiated service or none at all.

For millions of Americans this is vacation time. Swarms of families load their automobiles and trek across country. I invite the members of this subcommittee to imagine themselves darker in color and to plan an auto trip from Norfolk, Va., to the gulf coast of Mississippi, say to Biloxi. Or one from Terre Haute, Ind., to Charleston, S.C., or from Jacksonville, Fla., to Tyler, Tex.

How far do your drive each day? Where, and under what conditions can you and your family eat? Where can they use a rest room? Can you stop driving after a reasonable day behind the wheel or must you drive until you reach a city where relatives or friends will accommodate you and yours for the night? Will your children be denied a soft drink or an ice cream cone because they are not white?

The players in this drama of frustration and indignity are not commas or semicolons in a legislative thesis; they are people, human beings, citizens of the United States of America. This is their country. They were born here, as were their fathers and grandfathers before them. And their great-grandfathers. They have done everything for their country taht has been asked of them, even to standing back and waiting patiently, under pressure and persecution, for that which they should have had at the very beginning of their citizenship.

They are in a mood to wait no longer, at least not to wait patiently and silently and inactively. One of the four Negro college students who sat-in at a lunch counter in Greensboro, N.C., February 1, 1960, was an Air Force veteran and an officer of the A. & T. college chapter of the NAACP. In an interview he said he was born and raised in North Carolina and returned there after his time in the Air Force to study to be a physician.

The fact that he, a veteran in his country's nonsegregated Air Force, after service overseas to spread and preserve democracy, could be refused a cup of coffee and a piece of pie in his home State seemed suddenly in the 1960's, to be something he just could not take any longer. He engaged in direct action to make known his views. The fact that such action has swept the country, in the North as well as in the South, is testimony enough, for those who can read the signs of the times, that this veteran's reaction accurately mirrors the reaction of millions of his fellow citizens of both races.

Indifference to this widespread feeling and to the ugly gap such indifference perpetuates between our Nation's promise and performance in the area of citizenship equality will serve to prolong and intensify the eruptions of protest now underway throughout the country.

In a very real sense, it was the indifference toward, and outright defiance of, the U.S. Supreme Court decision of 1954 in *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka, Kans.*, which helped substantially to build the basis for today's demonstrations. The notorious defiance of Brown, concurred in and encouraged by such documents as the Southern Manifesto, capped the disillusionment of millions of Negro citizens and convinced many of them that little or no faith could be placed in the usual processes for prompt redress of demonstrable grievances.

It convinced them, further, that even when they have fought their way, tortuously and painfully, to the highest court in the Nation and won there, after observing all the rules and amenities, their victory can be nullified by defiance, collusion, trickery, violence, legislative and administrative shenanigans and by assassination.

They are not to be dissuaded, then, by talk that they are "hurting their cause" through demonstrations. No one noticed their cause except to lamabast or subvert it, during the years they waited for the Nation to act positively in support of the Supreme Court decision. How can a cause which has been betrayed by every possible device, beaten back in the crudest and most overt fashion and distorted in high-sounding misrepresentation by the suave kinfolk of the mob—how can a cause in such condition be hurt by the crying out of those who suffer and by their determination to alter the pattern of persecution?

Nor are the demonstrators and their sympathizers and supporters impressed with the contention that the Congress ought not legislate in this field. It is contended that such legislation as is here proposed—that U.S. citizens be protected from humiliating racial discrimination in public places and services in their own country—is an invasion of "property rights."

It is strange to find this argument, in connection with the fortunes of this particular class of citizens, made in 1963. This was the argument of slavery time. If the United States were to free human slaves, it would be invading property rights. Today, 100 years later, if the U.S. legislates to secure nondiscriminatory treatment for the descendants of the slaves, it will be invading property rights. It is ironical that a proponent of this argument should be a representative of the State of Abraham Lincoln.

What rights are thus being defended? Legal human slavery is gone, but its evil heritage lives on, damaging both the descendants of the slaves and the descendants of those who owned them—or those who have identified themselves with that class. Is not the "property rigths" argument but an extension of the slave ownership argument? The disclaimers would be loud and indignant if it were suggested that any Senator approved human slavery; but how fine is the line between approval of slavery and acquiescence in a major derivative of the slave system?

The answer has to be that our Nation cannot permit racial differentiation in the conduct of places of public accommodation, open to the public and with public patronage invited and solicited. While such establishments may be privately owned, they owe their life and their prosperity not to the personal friends and relatives of the proprietors, but to the American public, which includes today, as it has for generations, all kinds of Americans. The proprietors of small establishments, including tourist homes and gasoline filling stations, are no less obligated to render nondiscriminatory public service than are the proprietors of huge emporiums or hostelries.

The supporters of this legislation are again not greatly impressed with the time-worn admonition that this is an area which the Congress should leave to whimsy, to that great variable, men's hearts, to State and local sentiment or to that champion among the reluctants, voluntary action.

The Negro American has been waiting upon voluntary action since 1876. He has found what other Americans have discovered: voluntary action has to be sparked by something stronger than prayers, patience and lamentations. If the Thirteen Colonies had waited for voluntary action by England, this land today would be a part of the British Commonwealth.

In the welding of this Nation, the Congress has not depended upon voluntary action. It has not elevated States rights above the national interest. Minnesota, my adopted State, does not own the Mississippi River simply because the mighty stream originates there. We have divided the waters of the Colorado between California and other States. We have raised up dams and blotted out villages and towns in the national interest. A hundred other examples will come to the minds of members of this committee.

Shall we now continue to assert, in the world of the 1960's, that a State shall be permitted to mistreat U.S. citizens who live within its borders, simply because they are not white? Shall these States be free, as they once pleaded to be free in the staging of lynchings, to abridge or deny constitutional rights as though there were no U.S. Constitution? Shall they be permitted to continue "standing in the doorway," although everyone recognizes this as a mere exercise, albeit a vindictive one?

Shall the racially restrictive ordinance or the law of an illegally constituted lily-white city council or State legislature supersede the U.S. Constitution? Shall a police chief or a sheriff or a constable continue to be the arbiter of the rights of U.S. citizens?

One spokesman, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia (and except in the human rights field he is distinguished) has declared the civil rights bills submitted to the Congress by President Kennedy to be "unpalatable." We submit that the daily diet of racial discrimination force-fed to Negro citizens is the real "unpalatable" element in the present crisis. If the Senator from Georgia had to swallow our treatment for 24 hours, he would be on a picket in the next following 20 minutes.

The Congress has legislated for the health and welfare of livestock. Why does it balk at legislating for the welfare of its 20 million loyal Negro citizens? Railroads or other carriers are prohibited by 45 U.S. Code, 71–74, from confining livestock for more than 28 hours without unloading them into pens for at least 5 hours for rest, water, and feeding.

Are cows, hogs, and sheep more valuable than human beings? Is their rest, water, and feeding a proper subject for congressional legislative action, but the rest and feeding of Negro Americans in hotels, restaurants, and other public places an improper subject for congressional action?

President Kennedy has sent a moderate, but comprehensive program of civil rights bills to the Congress. The section before this committee is one part of that program. It was quickly labeled "the most controversial" section and debate has been building around it.

Usually where there is no controversy there is no great problem and no pressing need. Undeniably the need is here. Evidences of it abound on every side. Our communications media are full of the doings of people on this need.

Contrary to a notion which some defenders of the racial status quo have advanced, the doings of the people on this issue are not subversive. On the contrary, they are thoroughly American. When Americans are stepped upon or pushed around, they protest and they demand corrective action. They protested the tax on tea. They protested their lack of representation in the English Parliament, just as Negroes today protest their lack of representation in the Mississippi or South Carolina Legislatures.

Americans protested restrictions on freedom of the press. They protested and paraded and pamphleteered and legislated against slavery. They demonstrated again and again against the denial of suffrage to women. They protested child labor and campaigned for safety in factories. They fought sweatshops. They demonstrated against the Kaiser and Hitler and finally went to war. They are today parading and feeling strongly about nuclear warfare.

Wherein is a demonstration against police brutality, against discrimination in employment, against exclusion from voting booths, lunch counters and public recreation facili- judged to be un-American or subversive?

In truth, the resolute determination and action of our Negro citizens upon the civil rights issue constitute exemplary American conduct. If we desire to kill off such conduct and to fashion a nation of cautious crawlers, we should cease the teaching of American history.

It is no secret that despite our military might and our industrial genius, our faltering fealty to the great ideal of "all men," set down in our Declaration of Independence, has shaken the confidence of the millions of mankind who seek freedom and peace. Do we mean "all men" or do we just say so? Is our Nation the leader of the free world or of the white world? Are we for democracy in southeast Asia, but for Jim Crow at home?

Insofar as the Negro citizen and his allies renew and strengthen our fidelity to the founding purpose of our Nation, they put in their debt all those who maintain hope today, and all those who shall come after.

Insofar as the Congress responds, favorably and decisively, to the deeply-seated yearnings sought to be realized in the pending legislation, it will be discharging its high duty, not to a clique or a race or a region, but to our beloved America and to its people, of all races and sections of our fair land.

In Whom Do We Trust Anyhow?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of Harllee Branch, Jr., president of the Southern Co. of Atlanta, Ga., at a luncheon of the Atlanta Kiwanis Club on July 2, 1963 entitled "In Whom Do We Trust Anyhow?"

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN WHOM DO WE TRUST ANYHOW?

(By Harllee Branch, Jr.)

On Thursday we shall celebrate the 187th anniversary of our Nation's birth.

The event, as usual, will be marked by parades, picnics, and pageantry. Politicians will seize the opportunity to advance their standings; hucksters to promote their sales. There will be roistering in the taverns and, if previous records and the predictions of highway patrols are matched, there will be slaughter on the highways.

Too few Americans will bother to ask: "What is there about America, its institutions and traditions, that is of especial significance to mankind? What are the foundation principles of this Nation? Do these foundation principles still have validity and, if so, what are we doing to preserve them?"

The determination of our forefathers to throw off the yoke of foreign tyranny and to establish on this continent a nation, uniquely conceived and uniquely dedicated, was first formally declared in the Declaration of Independence. That document marked the birth of the great American dream although it took a long war and years of struggle to confirm it.

The Declaration was first approved on July 2, 1776, when representatives of 12 of the 13 original colonies voted for it. In a sense, therefore, today—July 2—is really our Nation's birthday although July 4 has been historically and officially designated as our date of independence because the tardy concurrence of New York on that date made the vote for the revolutionary resolution unanimous.

The Declaration of Independence was a unique document in many respects. But the salient, the brand-spanking new thing about that document was that it marked the first time that a people had ever dared to declare that their "right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" rested upon natural and divine law; that these rights were the gift of the Creator, not the object of concession by begrudging monarchs; and that governments existed only to protect and secure, not to abolish or to alter these unalienable rights.

This was not a new theory. As Secretary of State Rusk has pointed out, the principle of divine law was "older than the earth itself." It is a universal, unchanging truth "arising out of a discourse on the nature and purpose of man which began in Greece nearly 2,000 years ago." But until 1776, only Locke and a few other political philosophers and religionists had ever talked much about it. Never before had a whole people dared to stake their lives and their futures on the truth of this assertion.

I hope you will not consider it inappropriate for a businessman, who makes no pretense of piety, to suggest that the really significant thing about this Nation is that its laws and institutions, its hopes and dreams, have been made to depend on faith in a Divine Creator. This is a fact that needs reiteration—constant and determined reiteration—in a time when the highest court in the land, with an unmatched judicial absolutism parading under the beguiling label of "neutralism," seems to me determined to eliminate God and religion from the curricula of our public educational institutions.

"Religion and morality are our indispensable supports," the Founding Fathers declared, and they added: whoever shall subvert these great pillars of human happiness shall not be entitled to claim the tribute of patriotism."

George Washington, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson—all of them—acknowledged that only religion can establish the principles upon which freedom and popular government must stand. "The liberties of a nation cannot be thought secure," they said, "if we remove the only firm basis—a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are the gift of God."

Benjamin Franklin—the oldest, and in many ways the wisest, of the men who formulated our Declaration of Independence and our national Consitution, put it this way when he arose in the Philadelphia convention to counsel his younger colleagues:

"I have lived, sirs, a long time and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. If a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, sirs, in the sacred writing, that 'except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.' I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel. We shall be divided by our little partial local interests; our projects will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and by-word to future ages. And what is worse, mankind may hereafter, from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing governments by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war, and conquest."

Mind you, Dr. Franklin was not a religionist, not even a churchman in the usual sense of the word.

It is no longer fashionable to talk in words such as those used by Franklin, and Adams and Washington and Jefferson. Virtue and faith and commitment to principle—even patriotism itself—are scoffed at in many quarters. We have become soft and smug and self-satisfied. We speak of ours as an age of sophistication. We are beguiled by politicians and professors who exhort us to abandon the cliches of our political, social and economic pasts, forgetting that sophistication is frequently the product of conceit, cynicism and shallowness; and that a new a cliche may be even more dangerous than an older one.

Fortunately, our forefathers were not afraid cliches nor were they afraid to be called unsophisticated. They were completely willing to embrace change where change was warranted—indeed, they risked their lives in one of the most dramatic assaults on the status quo the world has ever witnessed. But they never sneered at the tried and the true merely because it was old.

We moderns are vastly more knowledgeable than the Founding Fathers, even the most educated of them. Indeed, the sum total of man's knowledge has doubled in the last 10 years alone, and it is estimated that it will double again in the next 5. But knowledge is not wisdom, and one of the greatest threats to our way of life is that we may rely for leadership upon politicians and judges who know more than they understand. Knowledge—mere factual knowledge, unleavened by spiritual truths—can be a snare and a delusion.

Today, the great threat to our way of life is posed by atheistic and materialistic men, symbolized by the Communistic hordes of the East and typified by the first Soviet cosmonaut, Titov, who declared on his return to earth from space: "Some people say there is a God out there but, in my travels around the earth all day long, I looked around and did not see him. I saw no God or angels—I do not believe in God. I believe in man, his strength, his possibilities and his reason."

How silly can man get? Who ever suggested that God was such an entity as could be seen by an earthling like Titov?

But, we must not become bemused by the idea that the Titovs of this world are men of ignorance. They are as knowledgeable as we in purely physical aspects of the Universe and, in some areas, their technology is believed to exceed our own. The one—the only—resource we have that the Soviet man does not possess is the resource of spiritual strength which is derived from our recognition of the fatherhood and supremacy of God and our dependence upon Him. Abandon this resource, allow it to become tarnished by sophistication and by conceit over our own assumed prowess, and we shall lose our individual freedoms and our individual dignity as surely as have the slaves of the Soviet superstate.

"Know the Truth," said the lowly Nazarene, "and the truth will make you free." Not facts, not scientific formula, not physical abstractions, not beguiling political theories—but the truth as revealed by God.

This was the truth to which the Founding Fathers repaired in their time of national and individual crisis—this was the source of the principles upon which they founded this Nation—notwithstanding the sneers of those who in that day called themselves "rationalists."

Now again the rationalists and the atheists and the materialists are clamoring for acceptance—in America and elsewhere. Only a few weeks ago, a prominent American scholar suggested that, since science has reduced the area of the unknown and since technology has increased our ability to use our environment, the relationship between God and man no longer applies. This is sheer philosophical poppycock, the sort of poppycock that is responsible for much of the sickness of our times.

For mankind, with all his knowledge, has not replaced God, nor will he do so. The greatest of our scientific discoveries, properly correlated and evaluated, confirm rather than deny the existence of a Divine Order and man's dependence upon it.

Those who founded this Republic sought, with God's guidance, to create here a governmental system built on confidence in Divine law and the principles of individual freedom, dignity, and responsibility which depend upon that law and not upon human actions and assurances.

It is a tragic thing, I repeat, that their progeny, if enrolled in a public school, may no longer invoke, even in voluntary classroom prayer, the guidance and blessings of the very God upon whom the founders of the Nation so singularly relied. Religious freedom is a cherished heritage of all Americans, but it does seem strange that the principle of separation of church and state should now be tortured into a separation of the state from God—for the two principles are certainly not the same. What we need to do is bring God more vividly into our school exercises, and into our governmental and private affairs as well for, as Justice Frankfurter in a scholarly opinion observed: "The ultimate foundation of a free society is the binding tie of cohesive sentiment. Such a sentiment is fostered by all those agencies of the mind and spirit which may serve to gather up the traditions of a people, transmit them from generation to generation, and thereby create that continuity of a treasured common life which constitutes a civilization."

It is not enough to say that our Supreme Court has still left the individual the right to pray in private and outside the precincts of his State-supported institutions. The individual has that right in Russia, too. But religion cannot be just personal. If it is real, it must be present in all we do in public and in private, and if we take God from our public institutions, we are left with no foundation upon which to build.

We may produce as many and as excellent gadgets as we will (automobiles, missiles, telephones, radios, television sets, electronic computers, and what have you) but, America and the Western world will not survive unless it also develops excellent men—men of faith, of humility, of truth, of moral stature, of strength and resourcefulness of mind (of pregnant ideas), of courtesy, of universal sympathy and friendship and love. Men such as these cannot be produced in a laboratory. They are produced only in good homes, good churches, good schools where the presence of God is ever apparent.

In closing, I would like to pass on to you a word of kindly caution from one who, although not a native of the Western world, has shown an extra-ordinary regard for its institutions. He is Dr. Charles Malik, distinguished teacher and philosopher and former Lebanese Minister to the United States. Dr. Malik has warned that: "If the West thinks that it is going to win or even hold its own without the living God who made it and has sustained its excellence, it is simply mistaken * * *. Not by cleverness, nor by humanism, nor by sentimentalism, nor by the manipulation of force, nor by reliance on reason and genius, nor by the supplying of loaves and the giving of machines—not by any or all of these things alone—is the West going to succeed in defending and extending truth and light and freedom, but by the humble return to the living source of all truth, all light, and all freedom."

Discrimination Must Not Work To Protect Lawbreakers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, Saturday a news article told of an almost unbelievably violent gang attack on a mother of five by a group of Negroes. This incident took place in a public housing development here in Washington. The police even had difficulty restoring order. The mother was threatened with a pick ax and saw her apartment furnishings completely destroyed and her family endangered when the gang broke in.

This did not happen in an uncivilized nation. This was in Washington. This flouting of law and order makes a mockery of individual safety on the street or in one's home. This attack shows once again the crime and violence in public housing developments.

Most of all, this crime was done solely by Negroes. To make a comparison, suppose these were white people? What would the public conscience have expressed? Is there a double standard that protects Negroes from criticism on the one hand and then encourages Negro leaders to lament discrimination against Negroes.

It is becoming clear to some by now, that equal rights imposes corresponding responsibilties. Wild animals like this gang and their fellow Negroes everywhere must conduct themselves in a manner to deserve equal rights. Nor should criminals who are Negro be excused from their crimes. Discrimination must not work to protect lawbreakers because of color.

Finally, this incident is but one of many acts of violence in the city where the President is encouraging the massed hundreds of thousands to protest by demonstration. What can we sensibly expect as to law and order in view of today's Washington Negro crimes?

The news account July 20, 1963 Washington Evening Star follows:

Gang on Wild Foray Rips Up Southeast Apartment

(By Walter Gold)

A southeast family was chased from a bus stop into their apartment last night by a gang of brick-throwing youths who threatened a mother of five with a pickax before demolishing nearly all of her household furnishings.

A Metropolitan Police Department official termed the attack "one of the most vicious cases of wanton destruction" ever known in the Nation's Capital.

Police said the youths were searching for a boy who allegedly had stabbed a friend.

After the mob ransacked the apartment at 3133 Robinson Street SE., the howling youths were joined by nearly 100 others who pelted police with bricks and stones. At the height of the attack, a flying wedge of six policemen with drawn guns charged into the brickthrowing mob, scattering them throughout a public housing apartment development.

DISPERSED BY DOGS

Police finally used Cainine Corps teams to disperse the brawlers. All participants are Negroes.

Eight persons have been arrested but only one has been charged with ransacking of the apartment.

Only two persons were injured in the 30-minute melee which began about 11 p.m.

Eleventh precinct police said the outbreak reportedly started when three or four youths jumped a 17-year-old boy at Stanton road and Alabama Avenue SE.

The boy, identified as Melvin Mathis of the 3100 block of Stanton Road SE., was cut on the left leg with a sharp object, according to Sgt. James E. Chambers. Mathis was admitted to District General Hospital. His condition is satisfactory.

Within minutes, a crowd of about a dozen youths gathered at the intersection.

WAITING FOR BUS

Two 11th precinct police privates who handled the call said the youths then got into a car, saying they would find a boy they identified as "Joe Harris." The youths claimed Harris was one of three who jumped Mathis, police said.

A block away, at Stanton Road and Congress Place SE., the youths spotted Mrs. Florrie Hursey, 23, occupant of the Robinson Street apartment, who was waiting for a bus with a brother and sister. Pointing to Mrs. Hursey, one of the youths yelled, "She's Joe's sister," according to police.

The youths then abandoned the car and chased Mrs. Hursey and her family toward their apartment.

Mrs. Hursey's brothers, Percy Harris, 19, of 135 P Street NW., said the gang may have mistaken him for his 16-year-old brother, Joseph Harris, who had been visiting in the neighborhood earlier in the evening.

Mrs. Hursey gave this description of what followed:

"We ran like hell * * * they were throwing bricks and things at us all the way home. * * * We didn't know why they were mad at us, but we ran just the same."

In near hysteria, Mrs. Hursey said she was nearly exhausted after the 2½-block run from the bus stop when she reached her apartment door and saw a youth running after her with a pickax in his hands.

"He yelled that he was going to cut my head off," Mrs. Hursey exclaimed.

"He swung the pick but missed me * * * somehow, my brother, sister, and I all got into the apartment without being hurt or hit," she said.

The family barricaded themselves inside the ground floor two-story five-room apartment. All five of Mrs. Hursey's children were asleep upstairs along with two other children of another sister, Mrs. Carolyn Harris, 16, of Baltimore, who was babysitting with all seven children.

"The gang threw bricks through the apartment windows," Mrs. Hursey said. "We all ran upstairs, took the children out of their beds and hid them in closets."

SMASH INTO HOUSE

"They broke in the front door, back door and kitchen window all about the same time," she said. The youths used a large tree limb to splinter the kitchen window frames. They then used bricks to break nearly every windowpane on both floors of the apartment, police said. Mrs. Harris was slightly injured by flying glass.

In the kitchen, the gang overturned the icebox, threw groceries and milk on the floor and broke nearly every dish and glass by sweeping them off the shelves and out of cabinets onto the floor.

Chairs, appliances and furniture were smashed and piled into the kitchen sink.

The living room also was ransacked. Religious pictures and fixtures on the walls were twisted out of place.

When Pvts. Wade D. Gulledge and Louis E. Padgett arrived they saw the shambles in the apartment and went back outside to call for additional assistance.

A police patrol wagon with Pvts. George R. Wesley and Horace A. Parker arrived from the 11th precinct at this point.

POLICE BOMBARDED

"Suddenly, bricks were flying at us from everywhere it seemed," Private Gulledge said. The officer said he used the patrol wagon's two-way radio to put in a call for help.

Two more 11th precinct officers arrived, driving through "a hail of bricks and stones," they said. Pvts. Charles A. Sullivan and Edward Kreilis huddled with the other four policemen behind the protective side of the patrol wagon for about 3 minutes, then all six officers drew their service revolvers and charged out into the 3100 block of Robinson Street.

"We yelled as we ran towards the other side of the street where the main attack was being launched," Pvt. Gulledge said.

"We almost froze in our tracks when we saw we faced about 100 youths," he added.

Seven youths who were rounded up by police in the neighborhood were charged with disorderly conduct.

An eighth suspect, identified as John H. Gray, 19, of the 3100 block of Robinson Street SE., was charged with housebreaking.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Let's Stop Sending U.S. Dollars To Aid Our Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. L. PILCHER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Congressional Record a significant article written by Charles Stevenson and appearing in the August 1963 issue of the Reader's Digest. I feel that Mr. Stevenson's article, "Let's Stop Sending U.S. Dollars To Aid Our Enemies," is timely, and should be of interest to all Members of Congress. The August issue of the Reader's Digest will reach the general public today, July 23, 1963:

LET'S STOP SENDING U.S. DOLLARS TO AID OUR ENEMIES

(By Charles Stevenson)

Once more the annual battle over foreign-aid appropriations is stirring passions in Congress. Amid the strongest criticisms yet from taxpayers, amid repeated allegations of waste and misuse of funds, our legislators are being prodded to cut deeply into the $4.5 billion which President Kennedy insists they must vote to see the Agency for International Development (AID) through another year.

But it's time to face up to an important fact: Simply reducing appropriations won't cure what's wrong with an aid organization which is in more trouble than ever after going through 10 different administrators,, 5 major reorganizations and more than 100 billion tax dollars.

"The United States has yet to develop an intelligible theory of foreign aid," says Dr. Hans Morgenthau, who heads Chicago University's renowned Center for the Study of American Foreign Policy. "None of our objectives has been achieved," says Eugene Black, recently retired president of the World Bank. "Soviet influence remains at high tide. Our dispensations of money have won us neither gratitude nor affection, but more often grumbling dissatisfaction."

Chairman Otto E. Passman, of the House Appropriations Committee, who is closest to the woe, sums it all up after a thousand hours of official hearings. "The trouble," says Passman, "is that too much of our foreign aid has deteriorated into a subsidy of Communist takeover. And the spenders are so power hungry, they so withhold the truth from the public, they are so beyond the normal controls of Congress, that there seems no way to confine assistance to helping people help themselves unless we kill the entire operation and begin over."

The record carries its own proof. Senator Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, looked at the Government's books to discover that even in the face of yearly budget-trimming by Congress, the authorities haven't been able to spend as much aid money as they've been given in any year since 1958. Yet, crying poverty, they quietly accumulate funds from several different appropriations, of which the current request represents just a part. Then they earmark this money as "obligations" for future spending. Senator Byrd has discovered that the unexpended balances from previous appropriations have soared from $11,787 million in 1958 to $21,273 million in June 1963—enough to keep the aid administrators going for many more years even if they never get another cent from Congress.

In dishing out aid money, the spenders give slight heed to Congress or even to their own handpicked advisers. An example is Gen. Lucius D. Clay's pro-aid group which President Kennedy named to advise about reforms. The committee reported to the President: "The United States should not aid a foreign government in establishing Government-owned industries which compete with existing private endeavors. We should not extend aid which is inconsistent with our beliefs, democratic tradition and knowledge of economic organization and consequences."

The committee opposed any such ideas as having the United States advance $512 million to start building a $1,883,766,000 government-owned steel plant for India. We already are handing over up to $775 million a year—some $3 billion since 1960—to keep India's socialistic experimentations afloat, while that country's healthy private enterprises mark time waiting for a bureaucracy to grant permits for their every expansion scheme. As for this steel plant, 150 technicians, appointed by AID to investigate in India, reported back that they had been unable to prove that the venture is feasible.

Nevertheless, President Kennedy announced his support for the Government plant; retired Ambassador to India, Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith, had said that "by this procedure we will not arouse suspicions that we seek to mold Indian economic policy to our own image."

Even more disturbing is our aiders' persistence in siphoning subsidies into Poland and Yugoslavia.

"When we help a Communist form of government we are undermining the security of our own country," Senator Frank J. Lausche, of Ohio, protested last year on the Senate floor. Others agreed. Over administration objections, Congress last August forbade sending more than food to any country that is part of the Communist conspiracy.

Yet, 3 months later, we extended Marshal Tito $136,700,000 in aid—just about as much as he received in the previous year. "Oh, but most of this was food for peace," I was told at AID headquarters in Washington. "And it wasn't assistance. Tito paid for that food."

The trouble is, such "purchases" lack reality. For example, over the past 9 years, we've given Tito cotton, oils and wheat, which cost us $901 million. Most of this is not U.S.-owned surplus: a broker buys the grain the Yugoslavs want on the Chicago exchange when they want it and we pay for it. We then pay the freight to seaboard. There we pay for storage. Then in most cases we pay shipping costs to Yugoslavia, where Tito markets the wheat for his own Government's profit.

Tito "pays" the United States only in part, and then by crediting to us some Yugoslav paper dinars. We can't take these dinars out of Yugoslavia. By agreement we pass 90 percent of the money back to the Yugoslav Government, either as gifts or as "loans" repayable only in more blocked dinars, for Tito to spend on developing his country's airports, highways, mines, paper mills, railroads and canals. We may use the remaining 10 percent to maintain our Belgrade Embassay. About all we get out of the arrangement is the privilege of keeping a U.S. Information Agency reading room in Belgrade.

Tito tells his people—and we don't contradict him—that he receives nothing free from the United States; he pays for what he gets. As our bounty has flowed in to bolster his sagging economy, he has assailed the United States for seeking international controls of atomic blasting when Russia is in a testing mood. He has supported Russia's policy on Berlin. He votes with the Communist bloc at the U.N. He spearheads anti-Western movements among African and Asian nations.

It's much the same with Poland. We sent Ambassador Jacob Beam to woo Poland away from Moscow with gifts. And although Beam reported back to the State Department that the Poles had "perhaps fallen into the habit of considering our economic cooperation as a matter of right" and returned here almost 2 years ago to admit failure, our Government has refused to stop funneling aid to Polish communism. It has answered Congress' growing anger at this policy by supplementing $61 million in cash aid in the last 7 years with $672 million worth of agricultural surplus commodities, $81 million of it in the last 12 months.

Our diplomats in Warsaw say that except for our food there would be Polish breadlines. Indeed, not only has food-for-peace prevented a possible explosion in Poland; a House committee has now found that receipt of our agricultural commodities by Poland allows it to export food to other bloc members, thus helping the Soviet conspiracy to solve its most awesome internal problem. What we do has so eased the pressures on Russia to feed its dependent states that it is able now to use its own wheat to spearhead its infiltration of Latin America.

Meanwhile, our help to the Poles has enabled them to send $13-million worth of aid to Castro's Cuba and $15-million worth to North Vietnam, reportedly including arms useful in guerrilla operations against our own soldiers in South Vietnam. It enables the Poles to aid East Germany, whose economy is in a shambles because its largest industries have been meshed with Soviet and Czech endeavors in turning out rockets and nuclear arms. In last year's Berlin crisis Poland showed her gratitude to us by mobilizing her armed forces to support Soviet threats.

In country after country, the record shows, our officials have encouraged aid which helps communism more than it helps us. A report by the House Committee on Government Operations tells how "the U.S. team in Cambodia made a deliberate determination to finance and construct two radio stations which when completed became an adjunct to a Chinese-Communist gift to the Cambodian Government of a radio broadcasting complex." When a subordinate passed along his discovery that U.S.-financed materials were being used in the construction of a Russian-built hospital in Cambodia, the report states, an AID superior caused the man to be transferred, given an unsatisfactory efficiency rating, and ultimately fired.

In June 1959 the Government of Burma wanted help from the United States to build a road linking Rangoon with Mandalay.

Engineering firms sent to investigate reported back that the kind of road the Burmese wanted was economically unfeasible. No agreement was reached.

Then, in March 1962, General Ne Win took over Burma, established a military dictatorship and jailed his predecessor.

He kicked out the Ford Foundation and the Asia Foundation because they represented private enterprise, in spite of the fact that they were spending $12 million of private funds on the most effective agricultural and educational development program in the country. He is nationalizing the economy. He denounced capitalism as "the pernicious economic system in which man exploits man." He canceled extensive English teaching programs which had been sponsored for years by American and British in a land where English was the language of educated people. He prohibited Burmese from coming to America as Fulbright scholars. He has also invited in Chinese Communist technicians, management, and assistance projects.

Now, with Ne Win's transition complete, we are giving him military equipment at a rate of $10 million a year, although this doesn't show on any aid books. And last spring, on top of another $21 million of assorted assistance for 1963, AID announced it was going ahead with the first 42-mile leg of the Rangoon-Mandalay highway, although no agreement has yet been reached on the feasibility of the rest of the road.

Congressional alarm is also mounting over assistance given to countries which expropriate private property. Last summer our legislators stipulated by law that assistance must be cut off from any country which seized U.S. investments. But by late fall so little was being done that Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa, charged that "specific instructions had gone out from the State Department to our representatives abroad to soft-pedal this amendment." Not until 6 months after enactment of the amendment (and a week beyond the congressional deadline for required enforcement) did the State Department finally get around to suspending AID projects that cost us $25 million in Ceylon, which had seized American oil properties without compensation so they could be used to market Soviet petroleum products. Food-for-peace shipments to Ceylon still continue—with most "payments" returned to the Ceylon Government to be used for further economic development.

The United States solved the problem of Brazil's seizure of an American-owned telephone company by dangling the prospect of more millions if she paid for the property. Then with the new aid flowing in—$398 million over the next 21 months—Brazil has been able not only to pay for the seized properties but to nationalize still more, and enter into a trade pact with Russia.

Congress is on record as opposing aid to countries which "live on our aid while they channel their own resources into arms from Russia." Yet this is exactly what is happening in the case of the United Arab Republic. Ever since 1956, Col. Gamel Abdel Nasser has been mortgaging the better part of his exportable cotton crop to the Soviet bloc as payment in kind for more than $100 million in arms and other assistance. The purpose: an incessant war of subversion and violence aimed at taking over the 90 million inhabitants of the Arab world and alienating them from the United States and the "imperialist" Western nations. He has confiscated Egypt's industries and taken over virtually everything in the country which represented foreign private investment.

What have we done about this?. Why, we have continued to pay Nasser every year. In the last 5 years our aid has doubled, tripled, quadrupled. The effect has been to subsidize Nasser, to keep his economy going so he could hand over some of the chief resources of his country to the Soviets for their arms and help in agitating against us and independent Arabs.

Our 1962 direct economic assistance to Nasser—$224,100,000—outdistanced anything we did for anyone in the world except India, Pakistan and, because of earthquake reconstruction, Chile. We treated him better than Turkey, our desperately poor fighting partner. We gave him far more than we gave all the friendly Arab nations put together. In addition, in just the first 6 months of fiscal 1963, we agreed to have him "buy" another $546 million worth of food-for-peace commodities with Egyptian currency. This is more than anybody else in the world received, and it brings Nasser's food-for-peace assistance alone to more than $1 billion.

These commodities are sold on the Egyptian market for currency, which when "paid" to us is mostly turned back to Nasser to meet his budget deficits and build more state-owned factories. Our aid enabled him in a single gesture to distribute a $43-million "dividend" to 1,500,000 factory and Government workers as "profit shares and bonuses" so as to convince the people that his state ownership did indeed provide them with more prosperity than "imperialistic" private investments from abroad.

The Egyptian people know nothing about our assistance. "Assistance? What assistance?" Nasser says, " I pay you for what I get, don't I?"

Last year, when news of our latest aid filtered around the Mediterranean, other Arab leaders reacted with such apoplectic amazement that our Ambassador to the UAR, John S. Badeau, had to race around by plane in an attempt to placate them.

"But we are your allies," they said. "You are underwriting the Egyptian-Soviet conquest of the Middle East. Now Nasser will have more resources than ever with which to undermine us."

Our officials said such fears were groundless. Yet within weeks the first of 40 new Mig fighting planes arrived in Egypt from Russia. Our aid enabled Nasser to go into a Yemen war with 18,000 troops, then 20,000, then 28,000 by daily air-lifts in Russian-supplied planes. Our aid means funds which enable his Voice of Cairo radio to goad the officers, soldiers and students of Saudi Arabia and Jordan to overthrow Saud and Hussein, the chiefs of those two countries. "How long are you going to tolerate them?" the Voice shouts. "Overthrow these lackeys who have sold their honor and dignity and who cooperate with the arch enemies of the Arabs—the English, the Americans, the Jews."

"These are the words that we are subsidizing," Senator Ernest Gruening, of Alaska recently told the Senate. "What kind of policy is that for the people of the United States who are dedicated to promoting peace in the world?"

But still the aid flows in.

Small wonder then that Algeria's Premier Ahmed Ben Bella, whom Nasser eggs on, can fly directly to Cuba after talking aid terms in Washington, and there demand that we abandon our Guantanamo naval base. Small wonder that on arriving home Ben Bella can say: "Algeria will have a socialism a la Castro. No power in the world can prevent our country's advance on this road." Small wonder, indeed. Our aid to him—$91,800,000 in the past year—makes it possible.

The same sort of appeasement adds to our woe in Indonesia, the world's fifth most populous nation. We were responsible for the formation of Indonesia; after World War II we threatened to deny Marshall plan aid to the Dutch unless they gave up their control of these East Indies. But Indonesia's President Sukarno also coveted grandeur and Dutch West New Guinea, a primitive land of Negroid Papuans, 1,800 miles from his own capital but adjacent to Australian territory. So while he has neglected his economy and poured the wealth from his tin mines and rubber plantations into Russia to pay for Mig fighters, long-range bombers, guided missiles, and submarines, we have pumped $787,300,000 in gifts into the country. We've trained doctors and dentists for a population which suffers for lack of medical care, only to see Sukarno draft them so he could have a standing army of 250,000. When his emerging industries slowed to 20 percent of normal production for want of exchange with which to import repair and maintenance parts, we advanced emergency millions so he could buy these parts from abroad.

"Sukarno's no Communist," I was told both in Washington and Djakarta. "He only wants to bring West New Guinea into Indonesia, and he must. Otherwise his revolution is incomplete."

Have our efforts strengthened our position in Asia? Already dispatches indicate worries that Sukarno is setting up in West New Guinea the same sort of outpost against adjacent Australian-held territories as Castro has established against us in Cuba. He has threatened to use his military force, the most potent in southeast Asia, if independent Malaya, Singapore, and the British dependencies on British Borneo carry out their announced plan to join in an anti-Communist federation come August 31. In the presence of the titular head of the Chinese Communist state, he has signed a manifesto calling for enforcement of Red China's major policies in Asia; the Chinese in return have vowed to support Sukarno's cause against Malaysia.

Because of this strange compulsion of our officials to pour fuel on burning problems, instead of trying to put out the fires, we have exported more dollars than our private enterprise can bring back from oversea investments and trade. Faith in our currency has declined due to our increasing deficits at home and abroad. Our gold supply has dwindled dangerously.

This is admitted by our Commerce Department. Our Government is so worried that it has sent Ambassadors literally begging past and present foreign beneficiaries of our charity to help us out—to at least let us sell to American tourists there a small part of the currency we have acquired in exchange for food for peace. But what was the answer? No. And this from Burma, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Poland, and Yugoslavia.

Seeking some way to stop the run on gold, the Commerce Department is now discouraging European investments by American private enterprise. "We have put up a caution light on investment in the developed countries," says Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, "because of our balance-of-payment difficulties."

Yet the administration, in the face of all this, wants a bigger aid appropriation this year; and Secretary of State Dean Rusk says that anyone who tries to cut the requested amounts will be cooperating with Communist global strategy.

Is it not time to ask ourselves why?

Is it not time to consider the advice of Chairman George Champion of New York's Chase Manhattan Bank? He would have us and the other friendly capital-supplying nations coordinate our aid through an independent banking type organization staffed by professionals from the world of banking and private enterprise. Such a multinational approach has also been proposed by experts like retired World Bank President Black and Herbert V. Prochnow, former Deputy Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

The means for getting for getting such an operation underway already exists within the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, in which most Western nations and Japan participate. All that's needed is for Congress not to be content with cutting aid appropriations, but to order a phaseout of our current aid operations and establish a special joint congressional committee which can at last start working toward a new order.

James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from an editorial which appeared in the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of July 8, 1963.

Jim Farley has always been a devoted servant of his party and his country, and this Republican newspaper bestows deserved praise on an outstanding Democrat.

JIM FARLEY, MASTER POLITICIAN, HAS A MESSAGE FOR AMERICA

You can't say that James A. Farley ever has been away from the American scene since he entered politics so many, many years ago. But since he celebrated his 75th birthday a little more than a month ago he seems to be all over the place.

The diamond anniversary of his birth was an occasion for an outpouring of praise for the grand old man of Democratic politics. Hale, hearty, and active as chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Co., Mr. Farley has been rediscovered by new generations as a sage of American life and politics. In almost every mail we get some new material on Jim Farley—and it's good reading, eevry word of it.

With more than 50 years of political experience behind him, Mr. Farley is in a position to speak with authority.

The secret is that Mr. Farley has always been an American first and a Democrat second, as evidenced by some of the wise words he has spoken in this, his 75th year on earth.

A high mark of the Farley utterances on America and the world came in an address before the Executives' Club of Chicago in March. So great was this talk it has been reprinted everywhere from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the Readers Digest (the latter in condensed form, of course.)

Space demands that we also abstract Mr. Farley's remarks.

We quote:

"Night and day its (the Kremlin's) propaganda is directed toward breaking the will of the American people to resist. And, very unfortunately, there are well-meaning Americans who unwittingly assist them. They argue that this is a time of greatest danger, and therefore great care must be taken. This is certainly true, but there is a vast difference between taking care, and taking to the woods in the face of an armed enemy. No one wants a fight—but if there is going to be one, the surest way to lose is to start running away from it. It is my belief that the first line of defense is to arm every American heart—with the truth. The cold, hard truth is that there is grave danger of a devastating world war. The risk is great, but it will not become less by denying that it exists. On the contrary, it will become greater.

"But even as those of faint heart note that this is a dangerous century—I wonder if they would, sometimes, be kind enough to mention a century that wasn't. Do you think there was much safety in Philadelphia on July 4, 1776, when John Hancock scrawled his name to the Declaration of Independence? Do you think they rang the Liberty Bell as an alarm signal for Americans to flee for their lives—or as a call to arms—to stand up and fight for their country?

"This has been a century of marvelous inventions; but no man yet has found a substitute for a truth by which millions of Americans have lived, and hundreds of thousands have died. That fundamental truth is the rock upon which this Republic was founded, and by which it continues to live. That basic conviction is that we are determined to lift up our heads as free people though the price of freedom is to risk our necks.

"There is nothing startingly original about this American sentence. I assume Patrick Henry meant it when he said, 'Give me liberty or give me death.' I certainly mean it now, and I have tried to bring up my grandchildren to repeat it after me. It's just that plain and simple, and the truth of it is marked by a half million gravestones from Bunker Hill to Tarawa. In blunt terms, to stand as an American you must be prepared to fall as one."

Anyway, we are glad that Jim Farley again has moved into the national spotlight in which he lived so long as head of the Democratic Party. The greatest practicing politician of his or any other time is proving that politics really is the art of making government work and of preserving a social and governmental order which the majority approves because it is right and gives the freedom-loving man what he must have to live.

Southern Idaho's New Slogan: "Bonneville—Please Include Us Out"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth of a series of articles on why "Bonneville's multimillion-dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho."

It presents further evidence of the widespread opposition to the unwarranted and untenable action of the Secretary of the Interior to expand his Federal electric power empire at the expense of the taxpayers of the Nation.

The Kennedy administration continues to show a callous disregard for the rights and desires of the people in its program of expanding Federal bureaucracy through Executive fiat. The extension of the Bonneville Power Administration marketing area into southern Idaho is a prime example of the wanton disregard of the rights and wishes of the people of the area affected.

The Idaho Farm Bureau Federation with a membership of nearly 12,000 farm families strongly opposes Secretary Udall's order extending the Bonneville Power marketing area into southern Idaho. On June 25, 1963, the Idaho Farm Bureau Federation advised the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate of this opposition in these words:

The Idaho Farm Bureau strongly opposes the order of Secretary Udall proclaiming southern Idaho a part of the Bonneville Power marketing area for the following reasons:

1. The order extending BPA into southern Idaho was issued without congressional consideration based on a feasibility study that was not made public.
2. BPA is opposite to President Kennedy's announced policy of not sponsoring projects which private taxpaying industry is able and willing to undertake.
3. Southern Idaho has ample eletcric power as shown by past and planned future development.
4. The grassroot opposition is apparently being ignored. Such opposition is tremendous.
5. A $20 million phosphat industry with a $10 million expansion in process at Pocatello will be doomed to failure by the extension of BPA, according to a statement issued by their vice president and general manager of the Pocatello plant.
6. BPA freely admits it is now losing $18 million a year.
7. Expand Federal domination of Idaho's land and water resources and curtail the future of Idaho reclamation.
8. Idaho would lose enormous tax revenues for schools and local governments and the economy would suffer.
9. Private power has in the past and can in the future, more than adequately service southern Idaho in quantity and price.
10. Idaho Public Utilities Commission questions some of the statements and material presented by the feasibility study and connected reports.
11. Idaho State Reclamation Association is opposed to BPA.
12. The U.S. Department of Labor, March 1962, lists 36 areas of substantial unemployment in the Northwest. Of these, 14 are in Oregon, including Portland, and 16 are in Washington. Only six are in Idaho. The six Idaho areas are all presently in Bonneville's marketing area. All 36 areas are in Bonnevilles' marketing area. There is not a single area in southern Idaho listed. The same Government report shows 26 areas of substantial and persistent unemployment. Every single one is in Bonneville's marketing area. Not one is in southern Idaho.
13. The Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor, April 14, 1962, shows Idaho with an insured unemployment rate of 4.3 percent, Oregon 5.9 percent, and Washington 5.5 percent. Of these States only Idaho is below the national average of 4.6 percent.

Thus, the record shows that substantial unemployment, persistent unemployment and insured unemployment are all much greater in the present Bonneville Power marketing area than in the area which is not included.

We sincerely urge that you investigate more thoroughly studies made, and provide opportunity for full hearings before appropriations are considered for this project expansion.

Very truly yours,

LLOYD D. BROWNING,
Executive Secretary.

The Idaho Farm Bureau Federation followed up this letter with the following letter on June 11, 1963 to certain members of those committees:

The Idaho Farm Bureau Federation with a membership of 12,000 farm families, adopted the following resolution at the 1962 annual convention in Boise.

"We stand in favor of independent power and feel that the Bonneville Power should not be brought into southern Idaho."

Nearly three-fourths of the membership is in the area which would be included in the extension of Bonneville Power.

The leading newspapers and many leading independent farm papers in southern Idaho have voiced exceeding opposition to the extension of Bonneville Power.

We urge all possible be done to prevent an appropriation for the construction of transmission lines for BPA into southern Idaho. We also ask that if any other budgets for BPA are appropriated that they be used for their intended purpose and not shifted for the use of extending BPA transmission lines into southern Idaho.

Thank you for your kindnesses on this very important issue.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS F. LEPPER,
Director of Legislation and Research.

In addition the Idaho Farm Bureau News for June 1963 contained an article by L. B. Martin, its president, which points out that "The punishing side effects of these socialistic-type beneficial programs are blandly ignored by their stanch supporters."

Mr. Martin's article follows:

[From the Idaho Farm Bureau News, June 1963]

FARM BUREAU TODAY

(By L. B. Martin, president, Idaho Farm Bureau Federation)

My sincere thanks and congratulations to the many Farm Bureau workers and others who helped defeat the strict control program on wheat at the May 21 wheat referendum. I am satisfied that the overwhelming defeat by the wheat farmers of Idaho and the Nation will give a clear indication that we want and need a change in policy on farm programs.

Another problem has slipped into our midst however. Secretary of Interior Udall signed a proclamation opening southern Idaho to the marketing of Bonneville Power. You will recall we have policy concerning this that states: "We stand in favor of independent power and feel that the Bonneville Power should not be brought into southern Idaho."

A recent article in the Public Service magazine entitled "Property Taxes" points up a number of the follies in such programs: I'd like to summarize it briefly:

In many States (Idaho included), a sharp increase in property taxes has brought sharp cries of anguish and protest. For property taxes, unlike withheld income taxes, cannot be concealed.

The average wage earner does not mind the income tax so much because he never sees the money that is withheld from each paycheck. If, when he files his income tax return, he has managed to work it out so that he has a small refund coming, he feels as though the Internal Revenue Service has paid him a small bonus just for being a good boy. Property taxes are different. They must be paid in cash and in lump sums and when they are increased, the taxpayer knows he has been hurt.

We might ask * * * what causes tax increases? Primarily, two things. The first of these is increased cost of government at the State and local level, that is, increased spending for various State and local programs and services.

The second cause is more subtle. It arises from the withdrawal from the tax rolls of property which is either taken over by some agency of the Government, or which is protected from increased rates by special legislation. When land, building, or both are taken to build a new highway or freeway, date Federal dams, this property is removed from the tax rolls and no longer contributes its proportionate share of taxes to pay the cost of local and State government. When land is so withdrawn and removed from the tax rolls, the revenues of the taxing district or a new Government building, or acquired by the Federal Government to become part of national parks or forests, or to accommodo not automatically decline. The taxes which might have been paid by the land so withdrawn are merely shifted to the remaining property in the taxing district still subject to taxes.

How is this done? One or two methods are used. The remaining property subject to tax in the taxing district is revaluated and the tax levied on the new valuation. This is one means which is used to shift the burden of lost property. The other means, also used if the taxing district is required to raise still more money, is to increase the mill rate (tax rate) on the old or new valuations.

The extension of Bonneville power into southern Idaho, while it will lower power rates to preferential customers, will likewise place a heavy tax burden on the rest of us. Cheap electricity sounds good, but who is going to pay the bill? We are indeed a strange people. Quite a lot of us will literally bust our shoestrings supporting Federal power systems in pursuit of cheap electrcity, and then scream when our taxes rise 30 to 50 percent. The punishing side effects of these socialistic type beneficial programs are blandly ignored by their stanch supporters.

A. M. Piper, Iowa Republican, Solid Baptist, Recent Groom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for 22 years in a row the Capitol has had a tall, gentle visitor every spring, usually at the time of the annual conclave of the American Society of Newspaper Editors when it has been held in Washington.

His name is A. M. Piper, editor of the Council Bluffs (Iowa) Nonpareil, and a lifetime student of governmental business and all it entails. Scores of Members of this body and of the other Chamber have been called upon by him in his diligent rounds of those in high public office.

Mr. Piper became a newspaper reporter during the first year of this century, and he is still going strong as editor of one of the influential newsdailies of the Missouri River Basin.

I could go on and on about the many character traits possessed by this fine man, but a gifted writer-colleague of his, Harry Mauck, Jr., managing editor of the Nonpareil, has done a superb job of capturing this noble gentleman's true distinction. I direct the attention of all to this stirring story.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include herein the piece about Mr. Piper written by Mr. Mauck for the July 1 bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors:

A. M. PIPER: IOWA REPUBLICAN, SOLID BAPTIST, RECENT GROOM

(By Harry Mauck, Jr.)

At 83, Alvin Meade Piper has made one concession to age. No longer will he drive an automobile.

For the balance of modern life, count him in.

On a Thursday, this last mid-May, the willowy, gray-thatched gentleman who has directed the editorial page of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil for more than a quarter of a century announced he planned to marry on Sunday. Mr. Piper had been a widower for 13 years.

His lovely bride, Susan Brinsmaid of San Francisco—formerly of Des Moines—and her late husband had been friends of the Pipers for 35 years.

Would we help with some of the details?

Had he arranged for blood tests, required by Iowa law? Taken care of, he replied. The minister? All set.

How about the marriage license? He'd get it tomorrow.

He was reminded that Iowa law requires a 3-day waiting period between application and issuance—and he was bucking a courthouse that closed on Saturday. He thought for a moment.

"I guess they've fixed it so I can't be impetuous."

He was married on Monday.

This is a man of many facets, but impetuousity is not one of them. This is a man of inherent integrity and built-in dignity. He can, and does, change. He is firm, but not immovable.

For years he was an ardent prohibitionist. Yet he was one of the State's first editors to call for Iowa to legalize liquor by the drink, a job the legislature finally accomplished in 1963.

"Prohibition just didn't work," he will tell you. "Bootlegging and illegal tavern sales were worse than regulated saloons."

His friends at ASNE are responsible for his first drink of liquor, at age 63.

"We walked into the cocktail lounge at the Willard at the close of an afternoon session. Someone ordered martinis. I'd never even seen one before. I must have drunk it too fast. When I got up my feet didn't operate properly."

Mr. Piper has been an ardent Republican since the days of McKinley.

"I became a Republican when I was 16. That was in 1896 when William Jennings Bryan ran against McKinley. I just didn't like Bryan's platform of free silver. My family were all Democrats but I wasn't and I'm still not sorry I changed family horses before I was old enough to vote."

Yet he has been known to editorially support a Democrat at the local level. And he voted for Woodrow Wilson for President in 1912.

Many of his friends in government are Democratic. He renews these acquaintances each year in Washington, usually for a week after ASNE meetings.

"This year I told Senator HUMPHREY the ways things were going I had better enlarge my Democratic acquaintances because I have a feeling there are going to fewer and fewer Republicans."

Some years ago (long before GOLDWATER), Mr. Piper wrote:

"The more I read of history the more I think Harry Truman will be more highly regarded in the future than when he was President. He had to make many great decisions. They weren't all right ones, but he made them."

Stalwart Republican that he is, he believes the Nation's strength lies in a strong two-party political system. To this, he says, you must couple a people with strong religious convictions.

A solid Baptist (they part on the liquor issue), he's the best source in the office for a needed Biblical quote. If he doesn't remember it verbatim, he knows in what book to find it. And the same goes for American history.

Each Sunday his lead editorial deals with religion as a philosophy of life. Time and again he has rallied faltering southwest Iowa Democrats to support their cause. To this free-enterpriser, competition in politics is as essential as competition in business.

He is proud of his friendships on Capitol Hill. the great and near-great, which span such political chasms as former President Hoover, Senator Taft, Richard Nixon, Vice President Johnson, and Senator Harry Byrd.

"The last time I saw Senator BYRD I told him one of my greatest regrets is that I never had the opportunity to vote for him for President.

"Before Nixon was nominated for President I told him I had two words of advice for him in his campaign. The words were, 'Be yourself.' If he had been himself I believe he would have been elected.

"I also told Senator Bill Knowland before he retired that I believed the near future of the Republican Party might depend on California, and I hoped the party leaders in that State wouldn't get into a hassle among themselves. He didn't answer, but began to talk about other matters. His candidacy for Governor later upset the party applecart."

Great Presidents?

"Washington and Lincoln, and maybe Andrew Jackson, Theodore Roosevelt, Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt."

You understand the importance of the political scene in Mr. Piper's life when you learn that twice it has been instrumental in separating him from a job. And twice it has returned him to work.

At 20 he left Iowa Wesleyan College at Mount Pleasant, near his birthplace, to become a reporter for the Iowa State Register at Des Moines.

A year later, the opposition Des Moines Leader printed an editorial on the death of McKinley. It drew warm praise over the State.

Acting on a tip, Mr. Piper did a bit of research.

"It was practically word-for-word parts of of Beecher's famous oration on the death of Lincoln. The Leader editor had substituted McKinley's name for Lincoln, and Ohio for Illinois.

"I called this to the attention of my editor. He had me do a story, and we printed it along with the Leader's editorial and Beecher on Lincoln side by side. It created quite a stir.

"Later, when the papers were combined, the editor of the Leader was made city editor and assigned the task of reorganizing the staff. He knew I had handled the story about his editorial and when the names of the new staff were posted I wasn't surprised to find I was not on the list."

Des Moines was the home of People's Popular Monthly, a family magazine circulated throughout the Nation. Mr. Piper joined the staff, soon became editor, and later business manager.

"We had no trouble getting subscriptions, it was 50 cents a year. But we lost money on each subscriber. Our problem was advertising—the lack of it. We went along for over 20 years, making some money one year and losing it the next. Depression spelled death in 1931."

It was a time to do some thinking. He had saved some money, so the family headed for its favorite vacation spot, Estes Park, Colo. In a short time he joined the Boulder, Colo., News-Herald, a Republican paper. Later he was to play a part in its merger with the Boulder Camera, Democrat.

"It was a situation not unlike Des Moines. Both papers were getting along, but neither making much money. The Camera name prevailed, and I was retained as a Republican columnist."

The bank holiday closed two of Boulder's institutions. From Washington came an edict they could not reopen without merging and increasing the capital stock by $100,000.

"Getting the money was slow. I had an idea I could get the job done if I could be temporarily relieved of my newspaper duties. My publisher agreed to let me try.

"I had just one sales talk. I told depositors their money was tied up and they wouldn't get it unless we could get a new charter. I urged them to take 10 percent of their deposits and buy bank stock.

"We raised the money, at the rate of $10 a share, and ended up with 5,800 stockholders in the new bank."

Boulder congratulated him on a civic job well done.

"Then, to my amazement, I found I was through at the Camera. The Camera was becoming even stronger Democratic, and I was told that as a Republican I was becoming too well known."

The Republicanism that had cost him two jobs now brought a new one. He went to work for the GOP in Colorado, and later for the national committee, touring Nebraska, Kansas, and Colorado.

After this job ended he learned the Nonpareil was seeking an editor, a man with Republican "proclivities." He joined the paper in 1937.

Prolific, his agile mind produces about a thousand editorials a year. While politics is his true love, Mr. Piper's interests are broad; economics, history, the fine arts. He loves music and the theater. Living in the Nation's fifth largest railroad center, he is an oft-quoted authority on the problems that beset this industry.

Whatever the subject, his basic philosophy is best summed in his Freedom Foundation award editorial of 1960, the last sentence of which reads:

"The United States will be a great and prosperous nation only so long as the state is the servant of its citizens, not the master of its subjects."

On May 2, 1857, in volume 1, No. 1, the Nonpareil's first editorial stated:

"In politics the Nonpareil partakes of the Republican cast—that party being nearest representative of our political proclivities. Yet we do not wish to be understood as committing ourselves totally to the policies of that organization, but reserve the right to adopt whatever coincides with our views, and to condemn what we cannot reconcile with our beliefs, in an independent way, dealing plainly but kindly with all."

This is our man.

One-Minute Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which recently appeared in the Knoxville News Sentinel.

I thought the Members of the House would enjoy reading the "One-Minute Speech":

ONE-MINUTE SPEECH

When a Texas Republican got up in the House of Representatives and asked unanimous consent to make a 1-minute speech, Representative WAYNE L. HAYS, Democrat, of Ohio, arose and spoke as follows:

"Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I made the same request last week and it was objected to on the Republican side, as was my first request in 15 years for a special order. It was my purpose to object to all 1-minute speeches but I shall not, pending my next request for a 1-minute speech. But if it is objected to on the Republican side, I shall object to every request for a 1-minute speech from then on from that side of the aisle."

Proving there is more than one way to get in a 1-minute speech.

Morals and the Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, when the average homeowner begins to allocate his income between mortgage payments, living expenses, insurance, medical bills, and so forth, it does not relieve the strain on the family pocketbook to discover that after all these payments total less than they were in the previous year. Yet that seems to be a new line of fiscal thinking in the Federal Government. At least the President seems to find solace in the fact that his administration's current deficit is not as bad as last January's estimate.

Columnist David Lawrence points this up in his article "Morals and Deficit," which I call to the attention of my colleagues:

MORALS AND THE DEFICIT—ALL IDEAS SEEM TO HAVE BEEN SCUTTLED FOR CURTAILING FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

(By David Lawrence)

In these days when spokesmen for the administration are piously stressing reminders of conscience and moral issues in the equal rights crusade, it may be wondered why those symbols of national behavior don't seem to apply also to the fiscal policy of the Government.

It might be assumed that it's all right to spend the total revenues taken from the citizens during the year and then to borrow still more and spend it, thus increasing an already recordbreaking debt. If the citizen were to conduct his affairs by that code, could he, too, plead that just a few years ago somebody else spent as much, if not more, and never paid off a dollar of debt?

In the parlance of the day, it has become a fad to denounce anyone who wants to balance the budget as some kind of reactionary or rightwinger. If the argument is offered that a conservative is a fellow who wants to conserve his savings and his property, the retort usually is that this is the obsolete and unsophisticated doctrine of a past generation.

If fears are expressed, moreover, about the future value of the dollar—that it may buy less when it is taken out of the savings banks than when it was put in there, the answer given is that the national welfare demands such confiscation.

In the face of such euphemistic arguments, it is in the public interest for attention to be called to some salient facts which President Kennedy failed to make clear in his recent summary of the Nation's finances for the fiscal year which ended June 30.

The President said that last January his budget experts estimated that the fiscal year 1963 would show a deficit of $8.8 billion, but he added that it now is only $6.2 billion. This drop of $2.6 billion is supposed to bring sighs of relief, since it is pointed out that $1.7 billion of this decrease has been made possible by a cut in Federal spending and that $900 million more than expected came in from tax receipts, sales of assets and other payments to the Government since the January estimate was made.

Now $900 million isn't the only increase in revenues. For, actually, the total receipts of the Government in the fiscal year 1963 went up $5 billion above the 1962 figure. Of this sum $3 billion was contributed by tax money. But all of this was eaten up in Government spending just the same, and the budget was still left unbalanced with a deficit of $6.2 billion.

How can any institution remain in good health, fiscally speaking, if it uses up all of its increased receipts each year to pay current expenses and incurs also even a bigger deficit which requires the borrowing of still more money? Any thought of reducing the public debt, moreover, seems to have been abandoned altogether.

Yet this dilemma, which has gone unresolved for many years, doesn't appear to bother most of the politicians in Washington. They point out that it must be all right because in the peacetime years since World War II there has been a deficit every year with few exceptions and there is still enough unborrowed billions to send a man to the moon.

But the important fact to bear in mind is that fiscal unsoundness doesn't always reach its climax overnight and that, when the climax does come, it is too late to restore confidence.

The President, after surveying his own figures—showing that the current deficit isn't as bad as last January's estimate—finds comfort in a budget of $92.6 billion because it isn't as high as the $94.3 billion estimated last January. Yet the Federal budget was $87.8 billion just 12 months ago—in the fiscal year 1962. Why couldn't the U.S. Government have gotten along in 1963 with that big budget of $87.8 billion? How can a reduction in tax rates now be considered sound finance? Even if business is stimulated and tax receipts should grow in volume next year, why should the Government's expenses go up just the same?

These are the simple questions that are left unanswered today in the moral atmosphere of the National Capital where the preachers of equal rights and equal protection of the law show no signs of becoming conscience-stricken over the age-old principle that it's wrong to rob Peter to pay Paul.

Hon. Carl Vinson

SPEECH

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the gentleman from Georgia on the occasion of his becoming the only man in history to serve longer in the House of Representatives than the late beloved Sam Rayburn. I became a member of the Armed Services Committee during this session of Congress totally briefed on the legendary CARL VINSON. My senior colleagues described colorfully and in detail this great personality.

I looked forward to service on that committee with eagerness and anticipation. There was no disappointment. After a few sessions, it was clear why the people of his district chose to keep him here longer than any other Member in the history of the United States.

I can now bear witness to his incredible depth of perception and understanding; to his incomparable wealth of background; to his magnetic charm and wit; to his devotion to his country; to his affection for his fellow man; to his skillful handling of legislation; and to his complete fairness and inspiring sense of justice.

I am honored and proud to be a Member of this body as a colleague of the Honorable CARL VINSON.

Government Lotteries of Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, and Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House the government-run lotteries in more of the European countries. Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, and Rumania are among the 77 foreign nations which utilize government lotteries to raise revenue.

Hungary, in 1962, took in over $73 million in gross receipts. After payment of prizes, the net income to the Government was almost $40 million. The Government devotes a considerable part of the lottery income to housing construction and for development of sports, including construction of sports installations.

Iceland has lotteries which are of a private nature. The resultant income to the Government is derived from duties levied if the prize is an imported one and taxes on the prizes won. One lottery is conducted under the auspices of the University of Iceland. Last year, total gross receipts amounted to over $950,000. The other lottery which was initiated in 1953 provides for the distribution of material rewards such as cars, houses, furnishings, and so forth, to individual ticket holders. The profits from this lottery have been used exclusively for the purchase and maintenance of a domicile for elderly indigent seamen.

Italy operates several lotteries and thus realizes very important revenues. The four Government-operated national lotteries last year took in $4,409,000. The net profit of $2⅓ million was distributed for hospitals, orphanages, educational institutions and various charities. The big lottery took in over $75 million and after payment of prizes, almost $41 million went to the Italian treasury.

Luxembourg is our smallest NATO partner. In 1962, the total gross annual receipts amounted to almost $1½ million. The total annual net income came to almost $400,000 which was used for charitable and welfare programs and for the benefit of numerous medical organizations.

Rumania, although a Communist country, knows the benefits of government-run lotteries. Lottery information from this country is neither published nor made available to foreign officials except that prizes also include automobiles and household appliances.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, gambling in this country is a $50-billion-a-year industry which is the financial mainstay of organized crime.

Why can we not establish a national lottery in the United States and divert these many billions of dollars into the coffers of the Government where they may work for the public good? Why must we remain blind to the fact that gambling is part of human nature?

A national lottery in this country can easily pump into our own Treasury over $10 billion a year in additional income which can be used to cut our high taxes and reduce our gigantic national debt.

Mass Transportation Demonstration Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Housing Act of 1961, sponsored by U.S. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., of New Jersey, provided funds for testing and demonstrating new ideas and methods for improved mass transportation systems and services.

This commuter "park and ride" station on the outskirts of New Brunswick, N.J., is the first such demonstration project in the State of New Jersey.

Several Federal and State officials participated in the groundbreaking ceremony recently, including Gov. Richard J. Hughes, Senator Williams, Lester Eisner, Jr., of the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency, Dwight R. G. Palmer, State commissioner of highways in New Jersey, State senator John A. Lynch, assemblyman Norman Tanzman and Walter Patchell, vice president of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

I wish also to commend Mr. John Kohl, Assistant Administrator for Transportation of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, who was instrumental in coordinating the program.

As Senator WILLIAMS pointed out, from Boston to San Francisco, one after another, the traffic-strangled cities of the country are looking to the transportation research and planning experts to pull them out of the vexing traffic situation in which they find themselves today.

An excellent article in the New Brunswick Daily Home News on July 17, 1963, covered the historic project and I include the contents in the Appendix of the Record:

New Day Dawning for Those Weary Train Commuters

Gov. Richard J. Hughes and U.S. Senator Harrison A. Williams broke ground yesterday for New Brunswick's Park and Ride Station—an experiment they hope holds the key to freedom for the Nation's traffic-shackled commuters.

The ceremonies took place on the Jersey Avenue site of the project between How Lane and Van Dyke Avenue where the Millstone Branch of the Pennsylvania Railroad joins the main line.

INTOLERABLE BURDEN

A select group of Federal, State, county, and municipal officials and transporation men heard Hughes hail the experiment as one destined to relieve the intolerable burdent of traffic on the State's highways.

The Governor said it will also free commuters across the country from parking and traffic aggravations and help maintain New Jersey as a first State in industrial development.

Industrial growth, he noted, occurs in areas serviced by adequate mass transportation systems. He saw the park and ride station as a boon to transportation by relieving highway congestion while stimulating use of the railroads.

He declared: "I have learned that a breakdown of mass transportation systems in a State eclipses that State as an industrial giant in the country.

"New Jersey is an industrial giant," he said, "and through such happy projects as these we can remain one."

CITES BOND PROPOSAL

He concluded with a plea that his fellow citizens take an honest look at his proposed $750-million turnpike bond issue to be voted on in November. He said the proposal is needed to finance immediate expansion of industrial and education facilities in the State.

Williams was introduced as the man who made it all possible by sponsoring the Federal Housing Act of 1961 which finances two-thirds of the $256,185 project. He termed the project a bold, hopeful, new step in meeting the crushing crisis of our time—inadequate mass transportation facilities.

He described the officials of the Tri-State Transportation Committee, the State highway department, and the Pennsylvania Railroad, sponsors of the project, as men of imagination and courage for undertaking the experiment.

But we warned, "We are going to have to face the fact that revitalizing rail and bus transit services will not be easy or inexpensive. Strong leadership will be necessary at all levels of government. We have that leadership in New Jersey with Governor Hughes and Highway Commissioner Dwight Palmer."

Lester Eisner, Jr., of the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency envisioned the experiment as resulting in a solution to transportation problems in Chicago, Boston, and other places across the country.

OFFICIAL OPTIMISTIC

Walter Patchell, vice president of the Pennsylvania Railroad was equally optimistic about the results of the test station. He predicted it will prove a great benefit to the area, the State, and the mass suburban transportation systems.

Palmer described the project as the best evidence of cooperation on the part of the Federal Government, the State government, and private enterprise in meeting a common problem.

He predicted the result would be beneficial not only to New Jersey but to the country as a whole.

The station, which will be operated for 18 months on an experimental basis, will test whether adequate parking will encourage use of the railroads by commuters.

A chief complaint of rail commuters is the lack of adequate parking space near downtown railroad stations.

According to tristate surveys, more than 2,000 persons pass through the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. station here each working day. Many reach the station in private cars and use available adjacent parking.

CONGESTION RESULTS

This results in traffic jams in the city during rush hours and limits the availability of parking space for downtown shoppers.

The new suburban station outside the city limits will have parking spaces for 300 cars, a small, heated waiting room for commuters and a ticket office. There will be no restrictions on the parking at the site and train service there will be the same as that available in the downtown station. Forty-four trains to and from New York will stop at the station each work day.

While the station is in operation, tristate officials will make regular marketing surveys and traffic counts and compare these with similar analyses conducted in the downtown station.

From these results it will attempt to determine:

Whether easy access to railroad service outside a suburban city center will generate additional use of the railroads.

Whether the project will divert passengers from a central city station and thereby relieve traffic congestion within the city.

And whether the test station will divert travelers from other modes of travel.

The Rule Construction Co., of New Brunswick, has been awarded an $81,499 contract by the Pennsylvania Railroad to construct the station.

The Student: His Courage, Imagination, and Intelligence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the Congressional Record the following remarks which were made in a valedictorian address given by Marie Evelyn Freeman, one of Sparks (Nev.) High School's most outstanding graduates this year. I feel that this excellent speech truly emphasizes the urgency of getting an education in the world of today:

The Student: His Courage, Imagination, and Intelligence

To create a better world, a better life, and a better man—these are the basic goals of education today and have been the ultimate aims for centuries past. A bit idealistic? Too abstract to suit the routine of a common man's everyday existence? Perhaps the concept of bettering mankind and the world presents a prodigious problem which is almost more than our untrained minds can conceive, much less hope to solve. But you notice I said almost more than we can realize. Each one of us knows that absolute human perfection is an impossibility, but this realization has never arrested our attempts to seek further improvement. Tonight we have been given a glimpse into the comprehensive, new high school with its amazing compact efficiency. We have examined impressive qualifications of the instructors and administrators—the very lifestream of a school—and we have found that a high school education or, in some cases, even 4 years of college preparation will no longer suffice to properly equip a man or woman to teach others. In keeping with the age of mechanical genius, the teacher must also be a specialist, an expert in one field, or more preferably, in a variety of fields. The subjects he must teach will no longer be the basic courses of mathematics, English, and general science of 10 years ago. Organization, specialization—these are now the educational bywords. For what reason have these revolutionary changes in education taken place? Leaders in the field have tried to meet the challenge of a rapidly transforming world by automating school systems into smooth-running machines. They realize that special, yet very personal training is necessary to develop students who will be capable of accepting their responsibilities in society. We see, therefore, that education must take the major role in creating better men and a better existence. Never, in the course of progress, however, should education lose perspective of its sole purpose, that of cultivation of the courage, imagination, and intelligence of the student.

In America, we profess that all men are created equal, yet we know that this is not entirely true. All men should be equal before the law, and there should be equal opportunity for those who have the talent, personality, and desire to take advantage of that opportunity. We begin equally before God, our neighbor, and before law, but we do not remain that way for long. Early in the schooling process differences are noted between students. A vaguely understood quality called intelligence begins to present itself and draw lines of division. An increasing amount of attention is being focused upon the bright student for a number of reasons: first, an overwhelming need has come about for people with intelligence and proper training to perform the myriad of highly skilled jobs in our complex 20th century society. Secondly, the abilities of each person must be developed to their maximum if he is to find self-satisfaction. The richest resource a nation can possess is a vital, educated people. The measure of the country's strength is the measure of its ability to develop the talents of all its citizens. Thus, the already complex purpose of education is further complicated. All must be trained, those of average and below average intelligence as well as the intellectually gifted. Laborers, skilled mechanics, and businessmen in today's world cannot rely upon the chance stroke of luck to earn a living. The all-too-real existence of competition has forced them also into greater preparation. Realizing this, schools have placed additional burdens of decisions upon the students at a younger age. Vocational decisions are now encouraged in the once carefree junior high school years. Subjects once reserved for college level learning have now been introduced early in high school. Because of the unbelievable number of extracurricular activities which are offer in both junior and senior high schools, a student is again placed in the position to decide. Which of these activities will he most enjoy, and from which will he most profit? These attempts at cultivation of his intelligence and the placement of so many decisions upon today's students cause him to take a more serious and perhaps sometimes a more adult outlook upon his education than did his parents.

Men may live longer lives today, but they also begin living sooner.

Each one of us is a small part of the great living stream of humanity, and we each rely upon one another more and more as time goes on. The danger of losing individual creativity becomes acute in such a condition. Creativity must come from the imagination of an individual. It cannot come through group effort. To encourage the imagination, schooling has become more liberal in its approach. Ideas and concepts are now presented along with the time-honored rigorous rules methods to challenge the mind and awaken new ideas. We are told to think for ourselves, use our imaginations, be individuals. Everyone is constantly being reminded about individuality and its virtues, but how often, if ever, do we seriously consider being ourselves and thinking ourselves? Oh, that takes effort and responsibility, so why bother? But if you are not you, who are you? What are you? Absolutely nothing. Conformity, itself, does not mean a person is not an individual as long as he uses independent judgment.

It takes courage as well as imagination and intelligence to make an individual. Courage comes through self-confidence, self-reliance, and strength in personal convictions. These in turn can come partially by acquiring sound basic knowledge through education, by continuing in a search for truth, and by developing a strong ethical code.

To create better men, a better life, and a better world * * * how well is the progressive new era of education accomplishing these age-old purposes? We have attempted to show you tonight the tremendous changes that education has undergone to keep pace with a streamlined world. The compact, modern plant which houses a student body of several thousand along with a well trained faculty of specialists is the administrator's dream, but all is not being accomplished that should be. We shall not know the success of how we have been taught or the value of what we have learned until we have proven their worth in our own lives. Schools and teachers will evaluate themselves by evaluating us.

We, the graduates, have responsibilities too as we sit smugly, naively in our chairs. We should continue throughout our lives to improve our own courage, our own imaginations and our own intelligence. Tonight, this graduation is merely 12 years and counting.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ARMENIAN REVOLUTIONARY FEDERATION,
LOS ANGELES NJDEH COMMITTEE.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
*House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The Los Angeles Njdeh Committee of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation informs you that a resolution has been passed by our unit supporting passage of House Resolution 14, submitted by you, which calls for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Recent developments worldwide and in Washington make the formation of such a committee imperative to the security and welfare of the United States, and will bring added hope to the tyrannised peoples of the once free nations today in Soviet bondage.

We are, in addition to this letter, contacting our Congressman as well as Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, head of the Rules Committee, urging him to release your resolution to the House floor for quick debate and passage.

May we take this opportunity to commend you for your stand in this regard, and to assure you of our every support of your measure.

Sincerely,
GEORGE FRAIAN,
Secretary.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

WEST ROXBURY, MASS.,
May 7, 1963.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
*House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN: On behalf of the Boston Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., I am very pleased to express our appreciation for your excellent comments on Ukrainian Independence Day observances on January 24, 1963.

We also welcome your resolution to establish a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. The Boston branch of UCCA is fully supporting you, as well as Congressmen Flood, Derwinski and others, in your endeavor to create a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

We are preparing plans to observe the Captive Nations Week in July. I am sure you will agree with me that this year's observances would be greatly enhanced by the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

I have written to all Congressmen from Massachusetts asking them to:

1. Introduce similar resolutions, and
2. to use their influence in the House Rules Committee and especially with Chairman HOWARD W. SMITH to initiate action on the proposed legislation (H. Res. 14 and H. Res. 15) and start public hearings.

Members of our organization have also written letters to Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH.

I trust that we can continue to count on your support in this matter, so important to all of us.

Sincerely yours,
UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC., BOSTON BRANCH,
CREST SZCZUDLUK, *Public Relations.*

RACINE, WIS.,
May 29, 1963.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
*House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The Racine Chapter of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation informs you that a resolution has been passed by our unit supporting passage of House Resolution 14, submitted by you, which calls for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Recent developments worldwide and in Washington make the formation of such a committee imperative to the security and welfare of the United States, and will bring added hope to the tyranized peoples of the once free nations today in Soviet bondage.

We are in addition to this letter, contacting our Congressman as well as Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, head of the Rules Committee, urging him to release your resolution to the House floor for quick debate and passage.

May we take this opportunity to commend you for your stand in this regard, and to assure you of our every support of your measure?

Sincerely,
BASSOM KALOUSTION.

HAVERHILL CHAPTER, ARMENIAN REVOLUTIONARY FEDERATION,
HAVERHILL, Mass.,
June 10, 1963.

Re: Passage of House Resolutions 14 and 15, Captive Nations Committee Establishment.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
*House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The Haverhill Chapter of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation commends you for the introduction of your bill on captive nations. It is our fondest hope that our people may once again enjoy their independence and that Armenia may resume its rightful place among the free nations of the world.

We feel the formation of a special committee has proposed in your bill will not only give added hope and determination to these enslaved people, but in addition, will bring to light the tyrannical acts of the Soviet Union in the subjection of the Independent Republic of Armenia.

We are grateful for your efforts in behalf of our people and pledge our complete support for your bill.

Our Congressman, WILLIAM H. BATES, has been informed of our position and his support has been requested. We have also forwarded a letter to Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH expressing our deep concern as to the delay in getting your bill out of committee.

In conclusion, we applaud your selection as the recipient of the Freedom Award.

Very truly yours,
YEGUZAR ANTARARNIAN,
President.
HEMAGAG VOSYERICHIAN,
Secretary.

JUNE 4, 1963.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The time is approaching when it will again be your privilege and duty as President of our great Nation to proclaim Captive Nations Week, in accordance with the resolution passed by the 84th Congress. This proclamation is more than an empty gesture. It announces to those who intend to enslave the whole world and to their miserable captives behind the Iron Curtain that America is still true to her great heritage and determined "that freedom shall not perish from the earth."

Those who cringe before the shame of our betrayal of Cuba and Hungary—by allowing the Hungarian question to be dropped from the U.N. agenda, may once again raise their heads with pride as America announces to the world that she is still alined with the forces of freedom.

America, "the land of the free and the home of the brave," looks to you, her chosen leader, to proclaim Captive Nations Week.

Sincerely,

AGNES F. DANIEL.

They Won't Grow Tomatoes Next Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, on May 29, 1963, the House defeated a 2-year extension of the Mexican labor program by a vote of 158 to 174. The detrimental effects of this decision are being editorialized from Mexico to Seattle. The serious impact of depleting this labor force is well illustrated in the following article from the front page of the Independent-Herald of Yuba City, Calif., on July 10, 1963. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit this article for consideration of this House:

MEXICAN CREWS FOR FARM JOBS CUT FROM 1962

Not less than 1,750 and possibly 2,100 braceros will be brought to Sutter and Yuba Counties this year to harvest about 7,000 acres of tomatoes, according to Ed Dennis, manager of the Yuba City office of the Northern California Growers Association.

This represents a substantial drop from the 3,200 braceros used locally last year. Dennis attributes this to mechanization in crops other than tomatoes.

Mechanization has been tried in harvesting tomatoes. But machines rip out the entire plant without regard for the ripeness of individual tomatoes, Dennis notes. The result is crop waste with lower tonnage and profit for the grower—and increased prices for the consumer.

So tomatoes continue to be harvested by hand, and domestic laborers are difficult to recruit. Dennis, in charge of locating field help for association members, tells why:

"The tomato harvest coincides in part with the peach, pear, prune, and nut harvests. Domestics would rather pick those crops than tomatoes, which require stoop labor. And when the other harvests pull from the domestic labor pool there are not enough workers left to bring in the tomato crop."

The alternative for tomato growers is to call for braceros. They supplement—not supplant—domestic labor used to harvest the 140,000 tons of tomatoes expected to be taken from fields in Sutter and Yuba Counties.

Dennis explains how the association recruits workers:

"First we contact the California Department of Employment office over in Marysville. It supplies us with all the qualified—and by that I mean physically able—persons willing to do stoop labor. We subtract those persons from the number needed to harvest the crop and then send to El Centro for the remainder that we need."

El Centro is the scene of the U.S. Labor Department's bracero reception center. There Mexican nationals who have applied to work in the United States under the bracero program, Public Law 78, complete screening by the Immigration Service and await assignment to field work.

Reception center officials will receive word from Dennis telling how many and what kind of laborers he needs. He will not want men who are tall or fat.

"Stoop labor is the hardest kind of work," he says. "Men who are tall or fat usually have a hard time ahead in the fields, where they must work bent almost double under a hot sun."

The Immigration Service qualifies braceros in other ways. Its officers search their backgrounds and reject those with criminal records. And its doctors reject others found to have communicable diseases.

Upon being approved, braceros are sent by bus to their destination—but not before certain costs are paid in advance by their prospective employers.

The grower must pay a $15 contracting fee to the Department of Labor for each bracero that it provides, Dennis points out. Then he must pay round-trip fare from El Centro—about $22—and two meals en route. In all, the grower has about $40 tied up in each bracero before the man puts a foot in the field—and it can't be deducted from the bracero's wages.

But the incidental expenses don't end there. The grower must have adequate housing ready for the bracero and must provide safe transportation to and from the fields.

"We inspect our members' trucks," Dennis says, "and affix a windshield sticker to those that we certify safe to carry workers."

Almost all of the workers brought to this area are destined for the tomato fields. It's one of the few kinds of work which the Labor Department permits braceros to do in California. This is to avoid competition between them and domestic labor.

Braceros are allowed to hoe and to thin sugarbeets—a job in which 350 of them are currently employed locally—but this too is back-tiring work—moving up and down rows while weeding with a short-handled hoe. The other harvest in which they are used extensively is strawberry picking. Again—stoop labor.

This does not mean that growers prefer to use no one but Mexican nationals for this type of work, Dennis emphasizes.

"I do not know of a single member of this association who would not be willing to use qualified domestic help. But I stress the word 'qualified.' Our members must be reasonably sure that their workers can be depended upon to get the job done. They don't want to see their tomatoes rot in the field."

To support his statement he points out that the association hires from 1,500 to 2,000 domestic laborers annually. But many of these are skilled or semiskilled workers. The jobs they fill are as irrigators, foremen and tractor drivers; seldom are they employed in stoop labor.

"It's not the money," Dennis says. "We paid $2,155,000 to braceros last year not because we preferred them, but because no one else was willing to do that kind of work."

Asked what he thought tomato growers might do if Congress does not repeal or modify its decision to end the bracero program this year, Dennis replied:

"Simple. They won't grow tomatoes next year."

Adequate Minority Staffing for a More Effective Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, recently our colleague from Iowa, the Honorable FRED SCHWENGEL, spoke before the newly formed Republican Women of Capitol Hill organization on the subject of adequate minority staffing. In view of the importance of this subject and its bearing on the effectiveness of Congress, I have asked to include the excellent report of this speech by Isabelle Shelton, which appeared in the June 27, 1963, issue of the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star.

The above-mentioned article follows:

MINORITY ADDING TO STAFF AIDS

(By Isabelle Shelton)

Republicans are making progress in their campaign to require more minority party members on congressional committee staffs, Representative FRED SCHWENGEL reported last night.

Mr. SCHWENGEL, an Iowa Republican, addressed the Republican Women of Capitol Hill, an organization of women who work in both House and Senate for Republicans. The Iowan was the first speaker to address the new group, which has just organized. It met in the Caucus Room in the Old House Office Building.

Mr. SCHWENGEL said the House Republican Conference Subcommittee on Increased Minority Staffing, of which he is a member, "is now diligently at work in the fields of research, public relations, and the documentation of facts."

Representative GERALD FORD, new chairman this year of the House Republican Conference Committee, who has been a leader in the crusade for a more adequate ration of Republican staff members, appointed the committee early this year.

Mr. SCHWENGEL said he and Senator PROUTY of Vermont have resolutions pending which would provide that the minority party (right now the Republicans) provide up to 40 percent of the professional staff of each committee. The ratio is one below that now.

Congress needs more minority staff members, the Iowan said, because at present the minority "cannot possibly fulfill the prime mission that is ours as the minority—that of presenting an articulate and effective opposition."

One result of this defaulting by the minority is that it has encouraged "poor draftsmanship"' of many bills—"and oldtimers say our draftsmanship is lower than it's been in years," Mr. SCHWENGEL said.

Another unhappy result of the present system, the speaker suggested, is that it mutes the voice of the "loyal opposition" whose function "always has been to criticize constructively, and propose sound alternatives."

Since Republicans cannot prepare well-thought-out legislative proposals without the requisite staff, there has been a growing tendency in recent years to depend more and more on "the President's legislative program than our own," Mr. SCHWENGEL said.

Finally, the speaker said, "lack of a minority staff has kept the Republican Party politically weak."

Last night's meeting was presided over by Geraldine B. Sheldon, president of the new group.

Survival of a Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, we have in the Second Congressional District of Kentucky one of the most remarkable families in the Commonwealth.

The head of this family, Samuel Rosenblatt, was born in Rumania in 1861. Recognizing the absence of opportunity and freedom which was the situation in his country then as now, upon reaching manhood, young Samuel migrated to the United States, leaving behind his wife and children until he could become established in the new land. For his own protection and that of his family, the name Rosenblatt was assumed in place of Braun. After initial stops at Baltimore and Oklahoma, the family traveled to Hancock County, Ky., having been told that it was "God's country."

After one or two business ventures outside of Hawesville, the county seat, Mr. Rosenblatt returned to that community where today, the building which he purchased and the business which he established, stand as a continuing memorial to this man of vision, courage, and tremendous energy. The original store dealt in clothing and groceries and later developed an extensive tobacco business. Through the years Sam Rosenblatt, as he was known and loved, proved his devotion and loyalty to his adopted home and when he died in May 1927 he left a lasting heritage built on faith in and love for his fellow man.

With the change of times the Rosenblatt store now specializes in clothing for the entire family and through the years, this firm has not only furnished its customers quality merchandise but it has provided quality in the truest definition of business ethics. It is now a third generation business carried on by son, Leo, and grandson, Nathan. In a few short years Nathan's son, Samuel, II, will doubtlessly take his place in this business which has stood firm through depression and prosperity and, on more than one occasion, serious floods. Starting with its founder, the Rosenblatt store is today one of the few small businesses which has survived the onslaught of time and changing conditions by virtue of having been established and continued by men of tireless energy, unquestioned integrity and determination, dedicated to the betterment of their community.

In recent years a floodwall was built to protect this community and now a new bridge is to be erected across the Ohio River at Hawesville, Ky., and Cannelton, Ind. In addition, a new lock and dam is under construction by the U.S. Corps of Engineers at Hawesville and Cannelton. These accomplishments, together with the anticipated new industry which will locate in Hancock County in the future, will bring better times to the citizens in that area and will justify the faith and belief that Leo Rosenblatt, his father and all of his family have had in Hawesville and Hancock County.

Mr. Speaker, as you well know, there are not many small merchants left and those who have diligently struggled for survival against countless odds and accepted the good with the bad and are now an integral part of their community, are to be commended. I, therefore, want to salute Leo Rosenblatt, his son, Nathan, and all the members of their families for their never-ending display of good citizenship, courage, and loyalty to their community.

Mr. Speaker, in Hawesville, Ky., we have an outstanding weekly newspaper, the Hancock Clarion. On July 18, 1963, this newspaper also paid tribute to this remarkable family.

West Virginian in Vietnam Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to include the following article from the Morgantown (W. Va.) Post, concerning the appointment of William W. Parriott to a position with the Agency for International Development.

W. W. PARRIOTT GETS VIETNAM POST

William W. Parriott, a former Morgantown resident and graduate of the university, who has been a criminal investigator for 20 years in the United States and Asia, has accepted a position in Vietnam with the Agency for International Development, which administers the U.S. foreign assistance program.

With headquarters in Saigon, Mr. Parriott will advise provincial police chiefs in improving methods of public safety and help develop training programs for Vietnamese law enforcement personnel.

Mr. Parriott was born in Newburg, attending Monongalia County schools and graduated from Morgantown High School. He received his degree from the university in 1933, where he starred in football and was a pole vaulter on the track team.

He served as sports editor of the Morgantown Post from 1934 to 1936, and was later a reporter for the Washington Evening Star.

A captain in the U.S. Marine Corps during World War II, he served 2 years in the Pacific theater, and was awarded the Order of the Purple Heart.

Before joining the Agency for International Development, Mr. Parriott was a criminal investigator for the security division of the Army Material Command in Washington. He also served in Washington as assistant chief of the investigation division of the U.S. Army Ordnance Provost Marshal's Office and as a consultant to the National Security Training Commision. He spent 2 years with the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

In Foreign Service, he was a security officer for the American Embassies in London and Manila and served for 2 years with the Far East Command of the Army as supervisory criminal investigator.

Mr. Parriott, who had been living at 1111 Arlington Boulevard in Arlington, Va., will leave for Vietnam following orientation in Washington.

A Purported Conversation Between Khrushchev and the Chinese Delegation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I have read the Weekly Review published in London by Mr. deCourcy. The issue of June 19 is most interesting in that it contains a purported conversation between Mr. Khrushchev and the Chinese Communist delegation. The first four pages of the Weekly Review follow:

FACING THE FACTS

We have reason to think that in talks with the Chinese—supposed to have been highly secret—Mr. Khrushchev has said this:

"In 1945, Russia had a chance—slender, but real—of setting up a Communist government in France. If that had come off, there could have been no NATO. The prospects of a very rapid Communist advance would have been substantial. However, it did not work out like that. The West gained time, and, as stories of Communist action in East Europe spread, strong conservative forces and the British Labor Party awoke. NATO was created.

"From that day to this, Russia has had to choose between an advance by stealth or world war. The latter would have involved immense risks. The former was a certain winner.

"If the Chinese view were adopted, the first result would be the rise to power in both America and Britain of the anti-Communist fanatics. Russia would no longer be able to advance by stealth. Every move would be resisted.

"The alternative—war—cannot be thought of unless and until Russia has gained complete superiority in antimissile missiles or some other device.

"GLOWING PROSPECTS

"As a result of Russian wisdom—and Stalin would have adopted just the same policy—some 40 or more private letters have been exchanged between myself (Khrushchev) and Mr. Kennedy. I am on close terms with Mr. Macmillan, who now believes me and thinks we are evolving. We have communized Cuba and have an important military base within 90 miles of the American shore. Our slight tactical retreat in 1962 amounted to nothing important. Nearly all Latin America is ripe for revolution.

"American finance is being poured out to assist Communist projects in many places. All the northern half of Africa is in chaos and will shortly conform to our plans. In Laos, our methods have stopped American intervention and have almost handed the country over to China. We have given you great help.

"In the Middle East, we control the arms supply. In India, while we have opposed your more blatant moves, we are making great progress—all in your interests, as we do not aspire to control India for Russia. Above all, we have organized an immense Negro upheaval in America which, given good luck, will wreck that country. We are within sight of a pro-Communist Party in the heart of America which has an excellent chance of gaining control of five large cities. The American whites are running away from those cities.

"Italy is moving leftward. Portugal is in dire straits about Africa. We are still blocked in Berlin, but that will not last.

"It would be madness to adopt the policy you suggest and thus awaken every dormant instinct in America and Britain."

That, we believe, is what Mr. Khrushchev has said. We gather that the Chinese have not found it easy to reply, because their real objectives are based on jealousy of Russia and not on sincere doctrinal anxieties. They see well enough that Russia is planning to outmatch China, and this is not liked.

THE ANGLO-AMERICAN VIEW

Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Macmillan are bent on a deal with Russia. They say that Russia is becoming European and that the time has come to bring her within the family. Anti-communism is outdated and absurd.

Nothing will induce either Mr. Kennedy or Mr. Macmillan to believe that Russia has not the remotest intention of switching from communism to a new form of American or British socialism. That Russia's real attitude is just as Mr. Khrushchev has put it to the Chinese, neither Mr. Kennedy nor Mr. Macmillan will believe.

This service therefore thinks that, as there is to be no resistance by America or Britain at present, we can make up our minds that more ground will be conceded before public opinion says, stop.

It would seem that the most immediate danger lies inside America, where racial strife is to be fanned to the extreme. So dangerous and important is this, that we have had a special survey prepared, which will be published in the August issue of Intelligence Digest. It has been put together by experts in 11 American cities for the exclusive use of Intelligence Digest.

We want every subscriber to order 10 extra copies of the August issue of Intelligence Digest. Please write in now, so that we can arrange the printing. The report is shattering and is documented beyond all possibility of dispute.

AMERICA FACES THE BIGGEST OFFENSIVE

The fact is that America herself now faces the biggest direct Communist offensive ever planned since the Russian Revolution itself. Unless public opinion awakens to this at once, the consequences will be extremely costly.

It is almost incredible that while Mr. Khrushchev is working on this, an Anglo-American delegation is in Moscow trying to organize still further concessions—and ones which could prove fatal. If Russia is ahead with antimissile missiles—or could get ahead—then for America to stop before she has an effective weapon is suicidal.

Naturally, a test ban is politically popular and nothing is more physically urgent—but not at the cost of giving Russia total superiority.

HONEST ADVICE NEEDED

We can only pray that the technical advisers of the American and British Governments will have the courage to give honest advice and will tell the political chiefs that if it is not followed they will resign. We hope so. Or is the extent of muddle so great that no one quite knows what is safe and what is not?

Is the political motive which guides Mr. Macmillan overriding technical considerations? Is Mr. Kennedy overwhelmed by the advice of pro-Soviet groups who do not look objectively at technical facts?

Why have so many efforts been made to silence critics? What has the British Government, in particular, to fear? What further errors is it trying to hide?

We fear that Mr. Macmillan has politically committed himself to a test ban which technicians secretly know to be premature and dangerous.

AN ANSWER WANTED

It may be that Russia herself wants to go on testing. If so, the West would gain time. But would we use it? Have we used the time we have had, or have we postponed really serious anti-missile-missile work in the hope that appeasement would prove successful?

This service is far from happy. We would like definite assurances from technicians whose integrity cannot be questioned. At present, the technical evidence is all against the Anglo-American plan, as presented in Moscow. Maybe there is an answer. We would like to see it given without equivocation by persons with no political motives.

THE ANTIMISSILE MISSILE

Robert Morris writes from Washington:

There are events that break into the news from time to time which focus attention on the underlying posture of Washington and cause some healthful agitation. Such an event was the statement of Dr. Edward Teller, who told a hundred Members of the House of Representatives, headed by STEPHEN B. DEROUNIAN, Republican, of New York, that the Soviet Union is now ahead of us in the field of nuclear explosives and "might be the first to develop an effective defense against missiles".

Dr. Teller, according to news dispatches, went on to urge the testing of nuclear defense weapons. This testing would not have to be of big weapons, he said. This recommendation goes against the grain of our policy planners, whose principal preoccupation today seems to be with disarmament and the cessation of nuclear testing.

AT KHRUSHCHEV'S MERCY

The underlying situation that serious people have been trying to bring to the surface is grave indeed. If the Soviets can develop an effective antimissile missile, they will be able to blunt our whole missile system.

Our present military plans call for the withdrawal of most of our foreign bases, our B-47's, our B-52's, and the attack bombers, and for reliance instead on Polaris submarines and home-continent-based ICBM's. We thus seem to be moving into the waiting trap.

For if the Soviets can develop (and I am told that they now have the weapon at some stage of production) an effective antimissile missile, we will be at the mercy of the pitiless Khrushchev. That is the fact.

THE ORDER SHOULD BE "FULL STEAM AHEAD"

In response to this situation, it is most extraordinary that our Defense Department is deliberately not developing our only practicable antimissile missile, the Nike-Zeus. Secretary McNamara has decided against this for reasons that I and many other people cannot determine and instead talks, even vaguely, about the Nike-X which cannot be developed until 1969—long after the Soviets may have developed their dread weapon.

It would certainly seem that the orders should be "full steam ahead" on this vital weapon.

In 1958, when we had clear superiority over the Communists in nuclear power, we unilaterally suspended testing. Khrushchev, true to form, tested and in many respects caught up to us. Instead of learning from this act of folly, we are virtually doing the same thing all over again.

Unless we go ahead and develop an antimissile missile, we may probably not have another chance, because we will be in a position to be the object of nuclear blackmail. This seems to be the elemental meaning of what Dr. Teller is telling us and the meaning of the course of retreat that the President's nuclear advisers are now steering.

In his reported statement, Dr. Teller said that if the Soviets obtain this weapon, "we may be only a few years away from total destruction."

A FORMULA LEADING TO DESTRUCTION

Dr. Teller told the Congressmen that the situation that exists can be described by a parable. The United States is learning swordsmanship by reading a book while the Communists are out practising—with swords.

To accentuate the folly of our present tactic of building up popular confidence in the Soviets, preliminary to a test ban agreement and disarmament, the news of the Teller statement broke on the same day as the news of the arrest of Col. Stig Wennerstrom, Swedish disarmament adviser at Geneva and formerly air attaché in Washington. The announcement carried the news that Dr. Wennerstrom has been, through all his high assignments, with access to Western secrets, including our own, a confirmed spy for the Soviets.

We have been giving and giving. The Soviets have been taking and taking. This formula is inexorably leading us to our destruction.

Loyalty Day Program Conducted by Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 2768, Gadsden, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for the RECORD the Loyalty Day program conducted this year by Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 2768, Gadsden, Ala.

The program was arranged by Mr. Benny Dean, chairman of the VFW National Loyalty Day Committee, and a number of church and school officials as well as students participated in this event.

Following is the transcript of the programs which were held on May 1 in Gadsden, Ala.:

LOYALTY DAY PROGRAM: EMMA SANSOM HIGH SCHOOL—MAY 1, 1963

(NOTE.—Loyalty Day programs, sponsored by VFW Post 2760, Gadsden, Ala:, Etowah County Loyalty Committee. On May 1, 1963, programs were held, Emma Sansom High School, Gadsden High School, Alabama School of Trades, Gadsden. Invocations were given by: Rev. John B. Collier, Alabama City Methodist Church; Rev. Herman Cobb, 12th Street Baptist Church; Father Harry Kavanagh, St. James Catholic Church. Program master of ceremonies: Mr. W. O. Briscoe, principal of Emma Sansom High School; Dr. I. J. Browder, superintendent of city school, Gadsden; and Mr. E. L. Darden, director, Alabama School of Trades, Gadsden. Musical units taking part in the program were: Golden Tone Choir, Emma Sansom High School; Emma Sansom Band, Emma Sansom High School; Velvetone Choir, Gadsdent High School; and Gadsden High Band, Gadsden High School.)

The invocation was given by Rev. John B. Collier of the Alabama City Methodist Church.

Mr. W. O. Briscoe, principal of Emma Sansom High School, introduced Mr. Benny Dean, chairman, VFW National Loyalty Day Committee.

Benny Dean. Thank you Mr. Briscoe. Distinguished mayor, distinguished guests, faculty, and wonderful student body, it is a great pleasure and a great honor to be able to stand before this group in a free land called America today; because tomorrow America may be threatened from the outside by this great tool of power called communism.

In viewing the truth, we see that the Soviet Union, Castro, and Khrushchev stand arm and arm so that they might conquer the free world. Our answer to that is a program similar to the one being conducted today. It is our way of standing up for America, and today this program that we have will be put in the Congressional Record in Washington, D.C. for people throughout this land to view. This is an important program; this is an important occasion for all of us, and we believe that we can show these young people and their great leaders and moderator, Dr. Sprouse, that we are proud of what they are doing for their fight in the free world. Our sponsors started preparing for this program on Loyalty Day—a day when we can stand up and be counted as strong loving Americans—because men have died on the battlefield for the American cause.

This morning our program is the kind of program that we feel is the best to show our young people the way of democracy. This morning when we leave we are going to Gadsden High School and then tomorrow we are going to the Alabama School of Trades, and also at this very hour a similar type of program is going on at Carver High School. This shows that Gadsden is awake; that Gadsden knows what to do.

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I stand here before you in this great America and say these words to these young people who are observing this program.

Now I would like to introduce Dr. A. Tillman Sprouse, superintendent, Methodist district, who will in turn introduce the members of the panel.

Dr. Sprouse. Most of us, I think, recognize that communism menaces freedom all over the world today. We use the term "cold war"; we talk about the battle for men's minds. We speak of the fight for freedom; and say two ways of life are in conflict.

Our newspapers are filled with reports from trouble spots throughout the world. Communism moves to our doorstep in Cuba and threatens freedom half a world away in small countries such as Laos and cities such as West Berlin.

We appropriate billions of dollars to strengthen the economy in the armed forces of other countries and additional billions to develop and build Polaris submarines, intercontinental ballistic missiles, and other weapons of modern warfare. Recognition of the threat of communism has not come easy, because we want to live in peace; we would like to believe that leaders of all nations have a similar goal, but events since World War II have shattered our illusions. During the conflict, we gave war materials and other assistance to the Soviet Union and hoped that following the war we could achieve understanding with Communist leaders.

Now many crises, many conferences, and many broken treaties later, we are confronted with hard, unpleasant facts. We are engaged in a battle for our survival. Most Americans find it difficult to understand why the Communists relentlessly attack us, why this hatred and hostility, why the Communists seek to destroy us? Some people attempt to dismiss the Communist challenge as merely Russian nationalism. They say that the leaders of Russia have always wanted to expand their empire and that the present actions of the Soviet Union are just a continuation of this policy. But undoubtedly Russian nationalism plays a part in the present conflict, but the threat of communism is much more serious than the threat of Russian nationalism. This threat is deeply rooted in the basic nature of communism, its goal, its tactics, and its strategy.

Imperial Russia wanted to expand into adjacent areas, but modern Communists attack all over the world. It is international in character and its goal is world conquest and world domination. The threat of communism comes from three interrelated aspects.

Communism is a doctrine, an ideology. It includes the theories and ideas about history and about the organization, the operation and future development of society which serves to motivate them and enable them to justify their actions. This ideology is a threat because it motivates discipline to party members operating under the direction of the Soviet Union and Red China.

Communism is also the social order existing in Russia and China, which is rooted in this ideology. Although leaders in both countries modify details in the doctrine as they see fit, they want control and seek world domination and are building up their industrial and military power to achieve this goal.

Communism is the international Communist apparatus. It is a threat because it uses all manners of subversion and infiltration to promote the drive for power of the Soviet Union and Red China.

Today the Communist attacks on a wide front and with a variety of weapons. They use propaganda, infiltration, and subversion. They use the threat of major wars, the threat of limited wars and various forms of diplomatic blackmail to keep the nations of the free world off balance. They work persistently to penetrate the underdeveloped areas of Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America. They strive ceaselessly to drive wedges between the member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and add to their propaganda campaign. On the inevitability of communism and their propaganda campaign nests the invincibility of communism.

Basic in all of this, the beginning of the entire Communist movement is in the Helgian Philosophy called Dialectic Materialism. It is this materialistic philosophy, these dialectics, that we are to begin this discussion with today, and Mike Akins of Gadsden High School will discuss "Dialectic Materialism and Helgian Philosophy."

Mike Akins. The party theory plays a vital role in the life of each party member. The theory of Marx and Engel are complex, but there are certain basic concepts that can be isolated, examined, and explained.

The Law of Dialectics is one of the main party theories. The entire system and doctrine of communism is based on these laws. Dialectics stems from the Greek word meaning the art of discourse, reasoning, and debate. Socrates used this method in teaching his pupils.

Hegal, a German philosopher, attempted to explain the universe through the Laws of Dialectics. The Laws of Dialectics are composed of three elements: The thesis, a positive concept or idea, anthithesis, an opposing or opposite concept or idea, and a synthesis, a new idea which consists of combining the two qualities of the opposites and containing the best qualities of the opposites and containing the best qualities of each.

The Laws of Dialectics are a never-ending process. The struggle of opposites, for example; white, a positive concept or idea, and its opposite, black, when combined give you a conflict and/or a synthesis.

By these laws, the Communists attempt to explain history, progress, cosmology of the world, and almost anything that can be applied to anything. Thus in explaining history that started with slavery, you had an opposition, a clash between the slaveowners and the slaves, and out of this thesis grew a synthesis, the feudal system. The feudal system, being the thesis, came into conflict with the antithesis, the industrial revolution, and out of this grew the synthesis, capitalism.

According to the Communists, there is a clash or conflict between the workers and owners, and the capitalists of today, and out of this will grow the synthesis, communism.

Communism is the ultimate goal. History, according to the Communists, can be determined by the dialectical process. The dialectical process is never ending and sometime, something must replace communism. The Communists make no effort nor attempt to explain what in the future will replace communism.

Marx took Hegal's dialectical method and combined it with his theory of materialism. Materialism is the basic concept of the Communist ideology. Everything, according to the Communists, can be explained by the dynamic manner that is self-sufficient, self-deviating, and self-perpetuating. Religion is a fantasy. They have a ready answer when the question is asked: If religion is a farce, then why has religion had such a profound effect on man since the dawn of time? They explain that the primtive man invented the God or Supreme Being to explain that which he could not understand or explain himself. They also say that the ruling class promotes religion, religious codes, because it teaches such concepts as submission, meekness, and brotherly love. Through these teachings, the ruling class (bourgeoisie) was about to retain its rank—its privilege rand in society—while the poor and depressed remained passive in the face of exploitation.

Marx labeled religion the "Opium of the people." Engel, working with Marx, worked to develop a theory of dialectical materialism, the combination of the laws of dialectics and Marx' theory of imperialism. With the laws of dialectics they attempt to explain the past, the present, and even foresee the future.

The fallacy in the Laws of Dialectics lies in the Laws of Dialectics itself. That is, that it is a never ending struggle between opposite conflicts. If this is so, then sometime if communism is to replace capitalism, a better form of government to grow out of capitalism sometime in the future, it must be replaced by itself. Part of the process stops although it is never ending, it stops with communism, because Communists know that communism is the ultimate form of government.

Dr. Sprouse. Thank you, Mike, for such a fine discussion. Now we will have a discussion on "Communist Manifesto" by Aurelia Glosser from Gadsden High School.

Aurelia Glosser. The word "communism" was first used by Karl Marx in the Communist Manifesto in 1848. He got the word from the French Socialists who took it from the Latin Communist meaning "owned by all."

Communist Manifesto was written almost a century ago by a German exile in 1848. He was commissioned to do this work by the Communist League, a group of exiles living in London at the time. They recognized Marx and Engel, a friend of Marx who helped in the composition of the Communist Manifesto, because each lacked passion. In 1847 Marx and Engel were asked to draw up a program league wanted to turn this book into propaganda.

It was Marx who formulated the doctrine of communism; common ownership in the hands of a Socialist government, of all material goods as well as the facilities for producing them.

Marx also put forward the theory of class warfare. According to Marx, a state of war exists between the people who own property (factories, machinery, land) which he called the class of the bourgeoisie, and the people who work for wages, which he named the proletariat.

"The first step in the revolution by the working class," Marx wrote, "is to raise the proletariat to the position of a ruling class * * *. The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the State * * *. The Communists * * * openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing conditions."

Marx held that matter was supreme, that, the universe, and life within it, came into existence by the accidental interplay of matter. This "material concept of the world's creation," denying the existence of God as Creator, is what Communists mean by materialism (different from our use of the word, to mean the putting of great emphasis on material goods).

However, the theory of communism is not the product of a single mind. Marx took his ideas from many different sources. Most of these ideas had been presented by other men but had received scant attention. Marx was important as a synthesizer, one who wove to get many ideas into a new system. This is where Marx's originality comes in, for he saw the interrelatedness of sociology, economics, and political theory, which he unified under a philosophical system.

Marx made many predictions in the Communist Manifesto. I would like to point out these predictions and how they have failed to come true.

1. Capitalism is supposed to breed vast and concentrated wealth in the hands of the few, and an increasing misery for even larger masses of exploited workers. In other words, the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

Under capitalism, the workers' conditions and wages have steadily improved instead of getting worse.

2. Marx predicted that, since profit is the soul of capitalism, capitalists would strive for even larger profits and in doing so would kill off larger numbers, so that the middle class would become smaller and smaller.

This is refuted by the historical fact that competition has not cut down the size of the middle class. On the contrary, instead of shrinking, the middle class has steadily increased.

3. Marx predicted that as economic competition between capitalists became more intense, the rate of profit would drop lower and lower, and that eventually the entire system would collapse as a result of its own internal weaknesses.

Capitalism has not collapsed but has become stronger and more productive of profit, so much so, in fact, that it has produced the highest standard of living ever known in human history.

4. Marx predicted that in order to increase profit, the capitalist would decrease wages, lengthen the working day and speed up production lines.

This is refuted by the historical fact that wages have increased, the working day has been greatly shortened, and that union organizations protect workers from speedups on assembly lines.

5. Marx predicted that the workers under capitalism would become more and more embittered and revolutionary, and that the class struggle between them would grow in sharpness and tempo.

The working classes under capitalism have shown less and less inclination to support a revolution and that their relations with capitalist management have evolved along the lines of orderly bargaining.

6. Marx predicted that the dictatorship of the proletariat which would result from the Communist revolution would gradually wither away, and that the end result would be a classless, stateless society.

The Soviet Government in Russia shows no signs of withering away. Instead it has led to a loss of civil liberties. Instead of increasing human freedom, it has decreased it; instead of creating a classless society, it has created a new class that rules Russia, the class of the Communist Party members, engineers, and technicians.

7. Marx predicted that the Communist revolution could occur only in a highly developed industrial society where the "internal contradictions" of capitalism would make its success inevitable.

This is refuted by the historical fact that, Russia, which was the first nation to succumb to communism was in 1917 the most backward of all the great nations in Europe. It had the most poorly developed industrial economy and the smallest class of industrial workers.

8. Marx predicted that the Communist revolution would be organized and led by the urban proletariat, who, in his view, were the only possible leaders.

The Russian proletariat was small and not well organized under one leadership. The actual leadership of the 1917 revolution came from a small group of professional revolutionaries, who were not members of the working class.

The backbone and real manpower of the 1917 revolution was found in the Russian peasant soldier, who had nothing at all to do with the industrial proletariat.

Therefore, Marx theory has as many air holes as a piece of Swiss cheese. His theories have fallen through his lace of foresight into the fact that a Christian country such as the United States could correct many of its evils and work together under free enterprise for the betterment of all.

Dr. SPROUSE. Thank you, Aurelia. Now Kathy Hoffman from Gadsden High School will discuss "Modern Communism Versus Marxism Today."

KATHY HOFFMAN. Marxism is based mainly on four theories: historical materialism, dialectical materialism, surplus value, and class struggle.

As Mike has already told you, his idea of historical materialism is divided into five parts which are: primitive, which is no class, no property holders, and no states; slaves which were considered as property; feudalism which is the landholding class; capitalism developed out of economical changes which ended feudalism. According to Marx, capitalism creates the seed of its own destruction and contains its own internal contradiction which is the philosophy, communism which was said to be classless and godless.

Hegal told Marx to back up this theory with facts, but he could only find one example of society that went from primitive to communistic society and even at that he had to play up certain facts and play down others that did not fit his plan. He could not explain how and what society had gone through in its different stages.

Surplus value lies in the fact that labor is the sole creator of value and wages are less than the total value it creates.

The value created by labor in excess of its wages is appropriated by the capitalist who exploits labor. And what this means is, laborers manufacture a commodity worth more than the salaries they receive. The employers receive the extra money or profits. This makes them better than the laborers and, therefore, the employers dictate over their employees, the laborers.

Marx didn't allow for automation and modern methods of manufacturing. Individual laborers are paid less than their product's value; but collectively the laborers receive more than the value of their products.

Marx says in every society the oppressed revolt will overthrow oppressors. This revolution will eventually lead to communism. Marx's system would be worked out step by step with the Communist Party, but Lenin's system would not. He went through day by day combining his ideas with socialism. This theory is divided into two parts which are Marxism and Leninism. Marx did not work out the step-by-step organization of the party as Lenin did.

The party according to Lenin must be a small, tightly knit group that lives, eats, breathes, and dreams revolution and who is ready to lie, cheat, and murder for the party.

Lenin said that communism will be developed through two basic stages: First or lower stage will be socialism. It is the stage which follows immediately after the revolution. The organs of the state police, army, etc., are necessary and are exercised by the dictatorship of the proletariat, thereby crushing the bourgeoisie. The main principle of this stage is "from each according to his ability to each according to his work."

The second stage is the highest final stage which will be communism. That is stateless, classless, godless property held in common. The human activities will conform to the principle which is "from each according to his abilities to each according to his needs."

This brings us to modern communism. Lenin inaugurated the scientific socialism that Khrushchev is working under now. Stalin, who headed the Communist Party after Lenin, did not solve any problems. He merely closed the doors on them by carrying out a ruthless program which served his purposes throughout his own life. No successor could continue with Stalin's program. So Khrushchev has had the problems that confronted Lenin and guided the party through the continuation of scientific socialism.

Dr. SPROUSE. Thank you, Kathy. Now we will have a discussion on "The Economy of the Soviet Union" by Susan Smith from Emma Sansom High School.

SUSAN SMITH. To most Americans, communism seems to mean a kind of loathsome beast preparing to overrun and subjugate the world.

Attempts made by Russia to dominate the people of the hungry world collide with four stubborn economic barriers. Russia has not been able to reckon adequately with its population explosion. Ideas were released last year that Russian people would soon outrun their food supplies. Russian intellectuals, however, branded this as completely incorrect. Yet, all available statistical evidence points to a gap which is fast widening.

This raises a most interesting question. Assuming that Russia makes considerable headway with its appeals as set forth above, how long can they supply the breadlines of their dependents—especially when it is having considerable trouble in its own breadlines? We all know that starving dependents do not make good sales talk.

Communists often call their system socialism. But under socialism the government controls only the principal means of production. Under communism, the government usually owns and manages all productive property in agriculture, industry, and transportation. For example, the government owns farmlands, factories, and the railroads. The individual may own personal property such as clothing, books, and household furniture. In some cases, if he is very lucky, he may own land and his home. But he must depend entirely on the government for his means of earning a living.

In a Communist country, even professional people such as doctors, architects, and musicians are on a government payroll. Composers are paid only if their songs are played by government orchestras. Authors can earn a living only if their books are published by a government-owned publishing firm. If writers criticize or disagree with the government or the Communist theory, they may be punished. In the 1950's the

Russian Government refused to publish a novel by Boris Pasternak, a Russian author. Russian leaders said the book completely criticized the Communist beliefs and, therefore, the government refused to let Pasternak accept the Nobel Prize for literature for his work.

According to Communist theory, it is wrong for individuals to take profit from the works of others. No person may employ another person in any type of business. The only exceptions are domestic servants, who create no profit for their employers.

The Communist economy lacks the three basic freedoms of the free enterprise system: (1) Free choice of jobs; (2) free labor unions; (3) free choice of goods to buy.

Choice of jobs: A Communist government decides what is to be produced. Some groups, including factory managers and executives, receive special privileges and rewards. But if they fail at their jobs, they may face severe punishment. The penalty could be imprisonment or even execution as a saboteur or an enemy of the people.

Labor unions: Under democracy, the labor unions defend the interests of the workers against the employer. Under communism, the labor unions defend the interests of the employer—the government—against the worker. Labor unions in a democracy try to get for the workers as large a share as possible of what he produces. Under communism, unions try to persuade the worker to produce as much as possible for the government.

Choice of goods: In a Communist economy, the government decides how much of every product shall be produced. The free-economy principle of supply and demand does not exist in a communistic government. He can buy only what the government says may be produced or imported. Goods made under government supervision by government order are sold by government-owned stores.

Generally, the manpower problem in the Soviet Union has been a shortage of workers. World War II left the Soviet Union with a shortage of 20 million men.

The insufficient use of manpower is indicated by the fact that the larger population of the Soviet Union turns out less than half the amount of goods produced in the United States.

Dr. Sprouse. Thank you, Susan. Carolyn Bynum from Emma Sansom High School will now discuss "Russian Education Under Communism."

Carolyn Bynum. Russian schools are used to indoctrinate students with the principles and beliefs of communism. Education is free, and all children are required to attend school.

The Communist party exercises an overall direction over education and about 30 percent of the teachers belong to the Communist Party.

A Russian child goes to school 6 days a week, usually from 9 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. For the first 2 or 3 years in common school, he wears the uniform of the Young Octobiests, a Communist Party organizer. When he is 9 years old, the child receives the red kerchief of the Young Pioneer. This kerchief may be taken away from the youngster as a means of punishment.

Each common school has a pioneer room with a portrait or statue of Lenin, the father of Communist Russia.

Education is considered so important that some schools have a third shift. Only a few are well equipped. Education is recognized as a major force in building the new Russia.

After a Russian child completes the 8-year common school, he takes a series of exams that determine the future course of his education. He may be enrolled in one of several types of secondary schools.

The 3-year schools emphasize general academic subjects. The technical and special schools are for 3- to 5-year terms and are open to students who are to train in a special skill.

The Soviet Union has about 800 schools of higher learning, including 40 universities. The largest of these is the University of Moscow. Only about one out of every seven applicants is accepted at the University of Moscow.

University students pay no tuition, and 85 percent of the full-time students receive government funds to help pay their living expenses. These grants range from the equivalent of $24 to $74 a month.

These grants are made because the goal of public education in the Soviet Union is to produce educated citizens who will contribute most to the development of their country.

Education is so greatly dominated that even the amount of homework is fixed by the Republic Ministries of Education. Daily assignments are made, varying from grade to grade and by the number of lessons, and require from 1 to 4 hours to complete. Schools are kept open until 10 p.m., some 11 p.m.; so students may come back to study if they so choose.

Reach and overreach Americanism; this is a Communist slogan. The Communist people believe that education is a means of gaining world supremacy, or world acceptance of Communist ideology.

In order to cope with this major threat to our free world our education systems have to be improved. Our young people have to be better educated and taught the importance of being patriotic, devoted citizens.

Dr. Sprouse. Thank you, Carolyn. Now Danny Johnson from Emma Sansom High School will discuss "Communism Versus Democracy."

Danny Johnson. As I am sure, the other speakers have already pointed out in each one of their topics, that you can see the difference between communism and democracy. I guess to start off with, the best thing to do is to define the two terms democracy and communism.

As we know, Lincoln so put it that we could never forget the Gettysburg Address that he gave us. Democracy is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Of course, we know that communism is an ideology or more or less a definition of the vital overthrow of the world. For Communist ideas are basic actually to us as we understand it, one definite idea or plan to overthrow the world.

The great Kipling once made the statement, "What is standing when freedom falls?" Freedom falls inch by inch and Communists will take that inch and possibly increase it a mile. Today, as we think about the world situation, we also have to think about the Communists as they are trying to get over to the side of the country that will further their economy, make the living standards rise, and increase their country's general wealth. Actually, they are looking for a free ride; communism is just one big bandwagon.

We have the world divided into three sections: the free world, the Communist world, and the neutrals. As we think of comparing the difference of communism and democracy, we must think about the historical backgrounds of each. As far as history goes back, the people of Russia have never actually experienced a democracy. It does not seek to be a democracy. They say that only real democracy is communism, and we do not truly have a democracy, which in one sense of the word is correct. But if communism were exactly what they said it was, we would have no worries. It is impossible to have a utopia. But they feel that communism is the ideal; the ideal way of life, the good life. The historical background has always been based upon the control of either the dictators, rulers, or czars, actually the people of Russia do not know what a democracy is like, they do not know wht communism is today as a government.

We know that our Government is founded upon the Constitution, the way we receive this constitution, and our democracy of individual rights. People came to the United States of America to defend this great Nation founded upon actual rights, individual rights, and principles.

The Communist manifesto is the idea that everybody can work a little bit and get along in the Communist Party. We have different representatives in our cities and local governments but the Communists are controlled by a small minority of men which rule the lives of the people in Russia. So basic rights in the United States are the one big difference between communism and democracy. What is the difference in people? As we know, the people of Russia have never experienced a democracy.

We have to realize that the only education they have is what the Communist want them to hear. They only believe what the Communist want them to believe. Without this, the Communist world and their leaders would fall.

There are many aspects that we have mentioned already in the other part of our program. We have to think that Communists work upon this system. You work according to your ability, and you are rewarded according to your needs. It has been pointed out to me in one of the books on, "What We Should Know About Communism in Russia," that a Russian will have to work a week before he can buy a pair of shoes. They earn an average of $21.65 a week. The average American makes $81 a week. Imagine an American working a week to buy one pair of shoes.

We know that throughout Russia the economical system is poor. They have to pay many times what we do for products which are just common to us. The economical difference is not only in the value of money but in their religion. That is something that is an important part of our everyday life. We are fortunate enough to have the right to go to church on Sunday and to have religious freedom. We sometimes forget that these things are free, that churches are right down the street, all you have to do is to walk in. But now in Russia there is only a small light of religion. People are grasping anything they can to hold on. Communism is crushing our minds in different aspects, but not in religious ideas. Communists say that religion is false. Religious ideas are converting the people from what they should know about communism, Russians say that we do not need religion. We know that they are a materialistic country. What they can reach out and touch is what they believe in. They do not believe in God, the only churches left in Russia are Baptist, Roman Catholic, and Protestants, but they are completely controlled by the Communists.

It has already been pointed out that schools are an important part of communism. You take a small first grade child and teach him the ideas and principles of communism, and he can never be a Protestant. Lenin made the statement, "If you give me 4 years with the children, I will plant a seed that can never be eluded." Rearing a child in the ideas of democracy gives each one of us individual rights and freedom, but this is not so in Russia.

Now the basic difference, as I am sure each one of you have already seen, is the basis of right and wrong. We can look at communism and see what it stands for, and we as Americans can see that it is only a passing fancy, because communism is gaining. We give an inch as far as democracy is concerned, and the Communists will take it. I think the great Voltaire made this statement: "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it." The Communists do this.

I believe it is up to each and everyone of us, as high school seniors, as we become the venturers of tomorrow to stand up and show the world the difference between communism and democracy. We can do it if we use the indifferent leaders to serve as our guide.

Dr. SPROUSE. We are extremely proud of this panel for the fine way in which they have presented this program on communism to us this morning. We wish to express our appreciation to Mr. Dean and to the teachers who have so graciously contributed to making this program a great success.

May I say, in this summary, that communism is a great force throughout the world. It will take a great force of people to erase what Communists have already planted into the minds of people all over the world. There is such a force of people in this world—the Americans. The Americans are proud of their way of life, they want others to enjoy the American freedoms. Americans are very proud of their young people. They know these young people will be the leaders of tomorrow; that in their hands lie the fate of democracy. They know, also, that these strong-minded young Americans will not let the traditions, customs, and freedoms of America down.

Thank you for your wonderful attention.

Congressman Carl Vinson

SPEECH

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, all Georgians and all Americans are proud of the service rendered to his country by Congressman CARL VINSON.

Besides the sterling representation that he has given his own district—being returned to office by them a total of 25 times—Chairman VINSON has been an architect of the defense setup for our entire country.

Chairman VINSON has the respect of this body and of the entire Nation for his role in shaping our American supremacy in the world today. Our military superiority has seldom been seriously questioned, and he has always had the vision and courage which have helped make this possible.

The seniority system used here in Congress has been criticized from time to time, but when it allows a man of Chairman VINSON's caliber to render such service to his country, the seniority system is functioning at its finest.

The people of the First District of Georgia are grateful for the leadership of this great American citizen. I personally am grateful for the many courtesies and kindnesses which he has shown me as the Representative of the people in the First District. And all America is grateful that he has had such a vital role in the defense of the Nation through World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, numerous police actions, and the present cold war.

I commend Chairman VINSON for his patriotic devotion to duty, and I commend the people of his own Sixth District of Georgia for the excellent judgment they have shown in 25 elections.

Part V—American Individualism, by Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, part V of "American Individualism," by Herbert Hoover, is entitled "Political Phases." In these times, it has become all to clear that there is a definite dividing line between political philosophies, not only in the United States of America, but all over the world. Our American individualism is being compared to Soviet communism, and socialism as practiced in many countries. Our political parties in this country appear to be gradually dividing themselves somewhat along the same lines. It is well to consider our form of government coldly and objectively, to determine whether or not our American individualism can be retained—or whether we shall go the way of dependence upon centralized government. I commend the continued reading of this chapter of "American Individualism," by that honorable and honored former President, Herbert Hoover:

AMERICAN INDIVIDUALISM—POLITICAL PHASES

It is not the primary purpose of this essay to discuss our political organization. Democracy is merely the mechanism which individualism invented as a device that would carry on the necessary political work of its social organization. Democracy arises out of individualism and prospers through it alone.

Without question, there exists, almost all over the world, unprecedented disquietude at the functioning of Government itself. It is in part the dreamy social ferment of war emotion. It is in part the aftermath of a period when the Government was everything and the individual nothing, from which there is much stimulation to two schools of thought: one that all human ills can be cured by governmental regulation, and the other that all regulation is a sin.

During the war, the mobilization of every effort, the destruction of the normal demand and the normal avenues of distribution, required a vast excursion over the deadline of individualism in order that we might secure immediate results. Its continuation would have destroyed the initiative of our people and undermined all real progress. We are slowly getting back, but many still aspire to these supposed shortcuts to the millenium.

Much of our discontent takes the form of resentment against the inequalities in the distribution of the sacrifices of war. Both silently and vocally there is complaint that while some died, others ran no risk, and yet others profited. For these complaints there is adequate justification. The facts are patent. However, no conceivable human intelligence would be able to manage the conduct of war so as to see that all sacrifices and burdens should be distributed equitably. War is destruction, and we should blame war for its injustices, not a social system whose object is construction. The submergence of the individual, however, in the struggle of the race could be but temporary—its continuance through the crushing of individual action and its inequities would, if for no other reason, destroy the foundations of our civilization.

Looked at as the umpire in our social system, our Government has maintained an equality before the law and a development of legal justice and an authority in restraint of evil instincts that support this social system and its ideals so far as the imperfections of developing human institutions permit. It has gone the greatest distance of any government toward maintaining an equality of franchise; an equality of entrance to public office, and government by the majority. It has succeeded far beyond all others in those safeguards of equality of opportunity through education, public information, and the open channels of free speech and free press. It is, however, much easier to chart the course of progress to government in dealing with the abstract problems of order, political liberty, and stimulation to intellectual and moral advancement than it is to chart its relations to the economic seas. These seas are new and only partly discovered or explored.

Our Government's greatest troubles and failures are in the economic field. Forty years ago the contact of the individual with the Government had its largest expression in the sheriff or policeman, and in debates over political equality. In those happy days the Government offered but small interference with the economic life of the citizen. But with the vast development of industry and the train of regulating functions of the national and municipal government that followed from it; with the recent vast increase in taxation due to the war—the Government has become through its relations to economic life the most potent force for maintenance or destruction of our American individualism.

The entrance of the Government began strongly three decades ago, when our industrial organization began to move powerfully in the direction of consolidation of enterprise. We found in the course of this development that equality of opportunity and its corollary, individual initiative, was being throttled by the concentration of control of industry and service, and thus an economic domination of groups builded over the Nation. At this time, particularly, we were threatened with a form of autocracy of economic power. Our mass of regulation of public utilities and our legislation against restraint of trade is the monument to our intent to preserve an equality of opportunity. This regulation is itself proof that we have gone a long way toward the abandonment of the capitalism of Adam Smith.

Day by day we learn more as to the practical application of restrictions against economic and political domination. We sometimes lag behind in the correction of those forces that would override liberty, justice, and equality of opportunity, but the principle is so strong within us that domination of the few will not be tolerated. These restraints must keep pace with the growing complexity of our economic organization, but they need tuning to our social system if they would not take us into great dangers. As we build up our powers of production through the advancing application of science we create new forces with which men may dominate—railway, power, oil, and what not. They may produce temporary blockades upon equality of opportunity.

To curb the forces in business which would destroy equality of opportunity and yet to maintain the initiative and creative faculties of our people are the twin objects we must attain. To preserve the former we must regulate that type of activity that would dominate. To preserve the latter, the Government must keep out of production and distribution of commodities and services. This is the deadline between our system and socialism. Regulation to prevent domination and unfair practices, yet preserving rightful initiative, are in keeping with our social foundations. Nationalization of industry or business is their negation.

When we come to the practical problems of government in relation to these economic questions the test lies in two directions: Does this act safeguard an equality of opportunity? Does it maintain the initiative of our people? For in the first must lie the deadline against domination and in the second the deadline in preservation of individualism against socialism. Excluding the temporary measures of the war, the period of regulation has now been long enough with us to begin to take stock of its effect upon our social system. It has been highly beneficial, but it has also developed weaknesses in the throttling of proper initiative that require some revision. We have already granted relief to labor organizations and to agriculture from some forms of regulation. There is, however, a large field of cooperative possibilities far outside agriculture that are needlessly hampered.

The most important of considerations in any attempt to pass judgment upon social systems is whether we maintain within them permanent and continuous motivation toward progress. These forces must be of two orders, one spiritual and the other economic.

We may discover the situation in our own social system either by an analysis of the forces that are today in motion or by noting the strides of progress over the century or over the last 10 years. By a consideration of the forces that move us we can see whether our system shows signs of decay, whether its virility is maintained; and by the touchstone of time we can find out whether these forces have been powerful enough to overcome the malign influences that would lessen the well-being of our system.

If we should survey the fundamentals of our civilization from the point of view of its progress by the test of time, we can find much for satisfaction and assurance. It is unnecessary to recount the values of economic individualism in stimulation to invention; large constructive vision; intensity in production with decreased physical effort; our increased standards of living and comfort. It is of course easy to enumerate our great economic progress, but the progress of the social forces that will sustain economic progress is infinitely more important—for upon them depends the real future of our people. Education in its many phases has made much advance. The actual equipment, the character of instruction, the numbers reached, period of instruction—show improvement with every decade. Public opinion has become of steadily increasing potency and reliability in its reaction. The great strides in development of processes and equipment for production and distribution are being followed by increasing devotion to the human factors in their execution. Moral standards of business and commerce are improving; vicious city governments are less in number; invisible government has greatly diminished; public conscience is penetrating deeper and deeper; the rooting up of wrong grows more vigorous; the agencies for their exposure and remedy grow more numerous, and above all is the growing sense of service. Many people confuse the exposure of wrongs which were below the surface with degeneration; their very exposure is progress. Some accredit the exposures of failure in our Government and business as evidence of standards of lower order than in some other nations. A considerable experience leads me to the conviction that while we do wash our dirty linen in public most others never wash it.

It is easy to arraign any existing institution. Men can rightly be critical because things have happened that never ought to happen. That our social system contains faults no one disputes. One can recite the faulty results of our system at great length; the spirit of lawlessness; the uncertainty of employment in some callings; the deadening effect of certain repetitive processes of manufacture; the 12-hour day in a few industries; unequal voice in bargaining for wages in some employment; arrogant domination by some employers and some labor leaders; child labor in some States; inadequate instruction in some areas; unfair competition in some industries; some fortunes excessive far beyond the needs of stimulation to initiative; survivals of religious intolerance; political debauchery of some cities; weaknesses in our governmental structure. Most of these occur locally in certain regions and certain industries and must cause every thinking person to regret and to endeavor. But they are becoming steadily more local. That they are recognized and condemned is a long way on the road to progress.

One of the difficulties in social thought is to find the balance of perspective. A single crime does not mean a criminal community. It is easy to point out undernourished, overworked, undereducated children, children barred from the equality of opportunity that our ideals stand for. It is easy to point out the luxurious petted and spoiled children with favored opportunity in every community. But if we take the whole 35 million children of the United States, it would be a gross exaggeration to say that a million of them suffer from any of these injustices. This is, indeed, a million too many, but it is the 34 million that tests the system with the additional touchstone of whether there are forces in motivation which are insistently and carefully working for the amelioration of the 1 million. Its byproducts of endowed loafers, or hoodlums, at respective ends of the economic scale, are indeed spectacular faults. Yet any analysis of the 105 million of us would show that we harbor less than a million of either rich or impecunious loafers. If we measure our people by scales of other civilized peoples, we also find consolation. We have a distaste for the very expression of "class," but if we would use European scales of classes we would find that above their scale of lower classes we have in equivalent comfort, morality, understanding, and intelligence fully 80 percent of our native-born whites. No European state will lay claim to 30 percent of this order. Does this not mean that we have been gaining something?

I do not conceive that any man, or body of men, could ever be capable of drafting a plan that would solve these multiple difficulties in advance. Moreover, if we continue to advance we will find new difficulties and weaknesses as the byproduct of progress—but to be overcome.

Public Law 78

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, among the arguments we have heard in defense of Public Law 78 is that it has solved the wetback problem; that is, it has cut down on the number of illegal entrants into this country from Mexico. In other words, we have managed to solve the wetback problem by legalizing the wetback.

We are told that termination of Public Law 78 would mean a return of the wetback problem. I submit that this is more of a threat than an argument. According to this logic, any significant reduction in the number of braceros would mean a corresponding increase in the number of wetbacks. During the past few years the number of braceros has been reduced sharply—in 1962 the number of braceros was less than half of the 1956 total. Yet there has been no great increase in the number of illegal entrants into this country. Why not? Because the United States has improved its enforcement of the immigration laws. I submit that we could eliminate the whole bracero program and still not have a great wetback problem. All we would need to do is see that the law is enforced.

Supply of One Type Wheat Nearly Depleted at Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, for many years the delegation from Ohio has asked the Congress to exempt from acreage and marketing controls the Soft Red Winter wheat which is grown in our State and which has never contributed significantly to the surplus wheat problem. Instead, it is always much in demand.

Under leave, I include with my remarks a clipping from the Wall Street Journal of July 19, sent to me by C. O. Brumbaugh, who farms near North Canton, Ohio. The news story indicates that there is real danger of a shortage of Soft Red Winter wheat, which would place a hardship upon American families by reducing the supply and increasing the price of cakes, cookies, and crackers, a high price to pay for inept Government meddling in the production of farm commodities:

SUPPLY OF ONE TYPE WHEAT NEARLY DEPLETED AT CHICAGO

CHICAGO.—Although the Nation's elevators are bulging with wheat, supplies of one important type were almost depleted this week at Chicago.

The Government said the supply of wheat used to make flour for cakes, cookies, and crackers is at the lowest point at Chicago since records have been kept.

Chicago supplies of this wheat, the Soft Red Winter variety, slid to 1,000 bushels as of June 14, down from 4.2 million bushels a year earlier and the current season's high of 11.8 million.

The Government has forecast that supplies of this type of wheat in the Nation will only be 5 million bushels when the season ends June 30. However, the country's total wheat stock as of that date will be more than 1 billion bushels, according to Government estimates.

One major baker said it won't be affected immediately by a shortage because it has bought enough to last until the new wheat crop begins coming to market in a few weeks. "But we could be pinched later on if the crop is short again," a spokesman said. If rains halt the harvest in the Midwest and the Ohio Valley, it could mean trouble for some of the bakers, another source said.

"Emergency" Still in Effect and Congressman Fears It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following article from the July 21 issue of the Columbus Dispatch indicates one of the dangers which confront the Nation as a result of the continuation of the state of emergency proclaimed in 1950 during the Korean war.

As the article indicates, the Labor Department examined the extraordinary powers available to the Executive under this state of emergency proclamation in connection with the current railroad dispute. It, found, however, that no special powers accrued in this case as a result of the state of emergency.

But as the article points out, there are dozens of special powers in effect because neither the Executive nor Congress has yet terminated the Korean war state of emergency despite the fact that the war ended 10 years ago. I would suggest that it is time to consider ending this state of emergency. My bill H.R. 7408 proposes to do just that.

"EMERGENCY" STILL IN EFFECT AND CONGRESSMAN FEARS IT

(By Carl DeBloom)

WASHINGTON.—With the controversy over the increasing powers of the executive branch of Government growing in Congress daily, a four-term Congressman from Nebraska brings up an interesting suggestion—terminate the national emergency which gives the President extraordinary powers.

You might ask "what emergency?" In case you didn't know, it started back in 1950 and Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM thinks it is high time Congress takes action to end something that had its beginning in the Korean "war."

On December 1, 1950, former President Truman issued a proclamation "proclaiming the existence of a national emergency." In one section he said:

"I summon our farmers, our workers in industry, and our businessmen to make a mighty production effort to meet the defense requirements of the Nation and to this end to eliminate all waste and inefficiency and to subordinate all lesser interests to the common good."

When Truman issued his proclamation, he was concerned with the Korean conflict which never got around to being a "real" war despite the tremendous loss of American lives.

While it may seem ridiculous to worry about a proclamation that is more than a decade old, it is still in effect. Some sections have expired due to limitations written into the law.

However, some bureaucrats were not asleep at the switch when the featherbedding question involving the railroads became an emergency situation. They saw the possibility President Kennedy could decide the only way to avoid a crippling nationwide strike would be to seize the railroads.

They remembered the national emergency declared back in 1950. Labor Department spokesmen admit this was checked. They discovered these powers had expired.

The White House never said it had any thoughts of trying to seize the railroads under the old national emergency, but the possibility was not overlooked.

A number of Congressmen who could also see the possibility the Executive would suggest taking over the railroads to avoid a strike, also did some checking.

To their surprise, they discovered the Nation was still under a national emergency which carries broad powers for the Executive.

CUNNINGHAM was not surprised to "learn" the emergency was still in effect. He has known it for several years and has urged in Congress and through correspondence with the White House that action be taken to end the "emergency."

He introduced a bill less than 2 weeks ago—not his first one—asking the emergency be "hereby terminated" by Congress.

And while the railroads may not be involved in the "national emergency" provisions still in effect, the Library of Congress has come up with a special study of 38 pages. Most of the pages are devoted to the special provisions which can be used by the President until the "emergency" is terminated.

The study was ordered by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

The many provisions still listed as under the powers of the President as the result of the "emergency" range from control over reserve officers and certain facilities needed in time of war to the number of hours certain persons may work to keep inventions secret and withhold patents.

Eaton's Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein an editorial from the Halifax Chronicle Herald, entitled "Eaton's Role."

[From the Halifax Chronicle Herald, July 17, 1963]

EATON'S ROLE

In its issue of July 14, Parade, a weekly magazine insert which is distributed all over the United States by 71 prominent American metropolitan newspapers, credits Nova Scotian-born industrialist, Cyrus Eaton, with being a major influence in bringing about the current relaxation in East-West relations.

The periodical, which reaches a cumulative circulation figure of about 11 million, asserts categorically that "A high State Department source swears to Parade that Eaton used his influence to bring about the present East-West thaw."

The article further credits the Cleveland industrialist with the distinction implied in the statement, "No other American has such ready access to Khrushchev and the Kremlin." And, in support of this claim, it designates Eaton as the key figure in securing the release of U-2 pilot Francis Gary Powers from possible death or lifetime imprisonment.

While tempers were flaming over the U-2 incident and a troubled world was anxiously watching the Paris summit conference of 1960, Tass, the official Soviet news agency, described Eaton as "a public figure whose activity is an example of public service to the lofty idea of the peaceful coexistence between peoples."

It is especially gratifying to observe the cordial note on which present test ban talks have been initiated, a warmth of attitude anticipated by President Kennedy in an address delivered on June 10 at the commencement assembly at American University in Washington. "However fixed our likes and dislikes may seem," said the President, "the tide of time and events will often bring surprising changes in the relations between nations and neighbors."

It now is apparent that we are in the midst of such a change and, as the responsibility for its advent is assessed, it is evident that part of the credit belongs to Cyrus Eaton who for so long and despite abuse and vilification stood almost alone as a bridge between East and West.

Beginning with a flat assertion of Eaton's crucial role as peacemaker, the Parade article concludes with a question which might well be pondered, "What other good deeds has Cyrus Eaton, the maverick mogul, accomplished through his contacts in the Kremlin?"

It is an extraordinary friendship which exists between the leader of communism and the exemplification of capitalism. That it has been propitious for peace of the world is increasingly recognized.

A Sense of Justice Is All Required

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, California has 200,000 more Negro citizens than does Mississippi. We also have many rural areas who find it difficult to understand urban areas need to cope with the challenge of providing an equal opportunity to all its inhabitants.

In spite of the typical conservatism of rural areas, Ken Leake, of the Woodland Daily Democrat, a rural daily, has once again shown a keen perspective of the problem:

AS WE SEE IT: SENSE OF JUSTICE

"I ask you to look into your hearts, not in search of charity—for the Negro neither wants nor needs condescension—but for the one plain, proud, and priceless quality that unites us all as Americans: a sense of justice."

The words of President Kennedy in offering Congress a new civil rights program illuminate that moral crisis with which, the President has recognized, the race issue confronts the Nation. The program now depends upon how Congress understands the crisis.

Each of the President's five basic proposals represents an act of justice, not of charity. Each is an attempt to guarantee to all citizens the kind of fair treatment which most citizens so easily take for granted.

He proposes to prohibit racial discrimination in hotels, restaurants, theaters, stores, and sports arenas because local action has been inadequate and waiting for local uniformity of treatment would mean another generation of delay.

He proposes to let the Attorney General initiate school desegregation suits rather than to leave individual Negroes with the disheartening and expensive job of seeking rights guaranteed them by the Government.

He seeks to add $400 million to programs for manpower training and expanded job opportunities because this is one field in which Negroes should be expected to help themselves, but only strong Federal action can afford the opportunities.

As the President said, the civil rights issue is not sectional, and it is not partisan. No doubt a majority of Senators of both parties will agree to that. The question is whether a two-thirds majority can be found to stop a filibuster and permit a decision. The answer depends upon a quality the President ascribes to Americans: a sense of justice.

Can Kennedy Be Taken?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star on July 21, 1963. This is an objective and factual résumé showing that the New Frontier is becoming more vulnerable each day:

CAN KENNEDY BE TAKEN?

One group of Republicans has formulated an elaborate electoral analysis whereby Senator GOLDWATER will be President in 1965. Another, no doubt about it, is working on a plan to do the same for Governor Rockefeller. A realistic view of the enormous power of an incumbent President, however, suggests that the proper question at this time is not whether one candidate or another can do the job better, but whether the job can be done at all. Can Kennedy be defeated?

The intense activity of Goldwater and Rockefeller supporters suggests that large numbers of Republicans now think it's possible. This is a change. Not too long ago most Republicans assumed that 1964 would be a throwaway year for the GOP. The only problem was talking someone into being the throwaway candidate. Not too long ago there was speculation in the eastern wing that 1964, lost anyway, might be a good time to let the conservatives have their fling, to march to defeat behind a "real Republican." Such talk is heard no more. Both wings of the Republican Party obviously believe that the 1964 nomination represents a real chance at the presidency.

Why should they? The last President to fail of reelection was Herbert Hoover and there has been no single, monumental catastrophe remotely comparable to the great depression. Is there any reason to take seriously the possibility that this energetic and popular young incumbent can be displaced?

There are, in fact, two reasons.

The first is the civil rights drive, and the peculiar relation of the administration thereto. The other is that, as a result of this drive, the rest of the President's domestic program has almost no chance of seeing the light of day.

It is hard to picture Mr. Kennedy's gaining as a result of the rights crisis, whatever happens during the next year. If this revolutionary movement should finally get out of hand, resulting in a violent racial explosion, he will surely be held responsible by millions of voters. But let us assume the best—that a blowup is averted, and a reasonable civil rights bill is passed. The President is bound, in any event, to lose support among Southern and other conservative elements of his party, people who believe he has encouraged the pressure and the demonstrations.

On the other hand, judging by their reaction so far, he seems unlikely to pick up popularity among Negroes and white liberals over his handling of this issue. This is not just a matter of his inability to deliver "everything now." There is, we gather, a feeling on the articulate left that in a sense the President asked for this crisis. In the 1960 campaign he spoke with spirit of civil rights laws and actions. Negro leadership took it seriously, and by this year had got fed up waiting. And here we are.

And now, as to the rest of the New Frontier program: If the impending bitter civil rights battle in Congress means that nothing else can be accomplished, what then will be the reaction of the big city voters on whom this administration depends?

The original prospectus of the New Frontier laid out such principal areas of promise as medical care for the aged, aid for the public schools, and tax reform. We are not concerned, at the moment, with the merits of such proposals—only with the score. The score is zero, and seems likely to remain so now that the southern wing of the party has been thoroughly alienated. In the entire field of new legislation proposed, passed, and put into action, the New Frontier's high point to date has been the Peace Corps. Will that be high enough to satisfy the elements which composed Mr. Kennedy's slim majority in 1960?

Much can happen during the next year, of course. Perhaps new developments in the foreign field will radically affect the picture.

And certainly none of the foregoing means that disenchanted Democrats will rush to the polls to vote, say, for BARRY GOLDWATER.

It does, however, suggest an opportunity for the Republicans in 1964. It suggests that the New Frontier, barring enormous change, may be more vulnerable than has been thought.

Bonus for Seat Belts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, since I have been constantly preaching that the use of seat belts in automobiles will save lives over a period of years, I am happy to say that through the cooperation of all interested parties seat belts are becoming widely used.

Mr. Speaker, I was most happy to read in the Washington Post of July 19, 1963, an article which stated that Nationwide Insurance announced that it will provide 50 percent extra medical coverage at no extra cost to policyholders using seat belts in their motor vehicles. I wish to commend the company for their action and hope that all other companies will follow suit for certainly this is an incentive for more motorists to use seat belts.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert the article referred to in the RECORD at this point:

BONUS FOR SEAT BELTS

COLUMBUS, OHIO, July 18.—Nationwide Insurance announced today it will provide 50 percent extra medical coverage at no extra cost to policyholders using seat belts in their motor vehicles.

Howard Hutchinson, senior vice president for insurance operations, said the innovation was designed to encourage more drivers to use seat belts. Under the provision drivers and passengers would receive the added benefits if they were receiving belts at the time of the crash.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the observance of Captive Nations Week, we should concern ourselves with the tragic plight of these subjugated peoples. We must also ask ourselves how we can help them. One billion people in 23 countries suffer under Communist tyranny. They have been deprived of the most fundamental rights of man, including the right of self-determination; but they have not lost hope.

Their spirit of passive resistance represents a crumbling keystone in the Communist arch. We have seen growing nationalism in Poland and open revolt in Hungary and East Berlin. The unreliability of captive armies tempers Soviet urges of aggression. The free spirit of captive peoples must not be taken for granted. Unless the West encourages captive peoples, they will lapse into despair and resignation. We must show them that America adheres to the principle of self-determination and does not consider a free Europe an illusion.

A solemn reiteration of American concern during this week revives the hope of oppressed peoples. But just as religion deserves more than 1 hour a week, captive nations demand more than 1 week a year. Therefore, I call for a Committee on Captive Nations. This year, many Members of this body, including myself, introduced resolutions to create such a committee which would make studies and inquiries concerning conditions in captive nations. The committee would give particular attention to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over nations and to peaceful means of assisting them in their present aspirations to regain national and individual freedoms. The facts of Communist domination should be promulgated at this important and respected level if we wish to explode the myths about the Soviet economy and Soviet unity.

Unfortunately, these resolutions have not been reported and so I again urge a solid expression of support for the proposal. By so doing, we will demonstrate our belief in the power of freemen to prevail and overcome the forces of totalitarianism.

Lateral Pass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT McCLORY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of my colleagues, I wish to extend for their thoughtful consideration the leading editorial in today's Chicago Tribune. Entitled "Lateral Pass," the editorial deals with the critical issue of a nationwide railroad strike which threatens us:

LATERAL PASS

President Kennedy's solution of the threat of a nationwide railroad strike over work rules is to dodge the issue. As in the family sport of touch football, the trick is to chuck the ball to somebody else before you can be tagged. Mr. Kennedy wants to unload the bothersome business on the Interstate Commerce Commission.

He seeks the authorization of Congress to send the impasse between the carriers and rail unions to the ICC for study. It is indicated in the President's message that the study can be prolonged for as much as 2 years, which would get Mr. Kennedy past the 1964 presidential election.

The ICC then would submit findings on the controversy which would be binding on the disputants. This is a disguised kind of compulsory arbitration, however called, and relieves Mr. Kennedy personally of having to assume responsibility for invoking a distasteful process. Moreover, any blame that might attach to the ICC's eventual determination of rights and wrongs would be kept one step removed from the White House.

While Mr. Kennedy recommends that any changes in work rules during the next 2 years on which agreement cannot be had are to be referred to the ICC for decision, he professes to encourage the roads and unions to continue collective bargaining. Any agreements voluntarily reached by them would have precedence over rulings by the ICC on the disputed issues.

"This method," Mr. Kennedy says, "would preserve and prefer collective bargaining and give precedence to its solutions."

Of course, there is a fat chance of any agreements being reached through collective bargaining, as the refusal of the unions to budge an inch thus far has demonstrated. Nevertheless, Mr. Kennedy has thus rationalized his reluctance to come to grips with the problem.

The administration's device may be credited with a certain ingenuity. The strike which was threatened for July 29 will be indefinitely deferred if Congress approves the scheme. The operating unions will have no complaint, for they can keep present featherbedding practices in being for an indefinite period. Thus the unions will not be alienated during the interim, and a political commission might very well rule in their favor in the end.

To convert a purely regulatory agency, such as the ICC, into a labor-management court takes some doing. The Commission has always been concerned with rates and regulation. Now, it is to transform itself into a tribunal, vested with powers never contemplated since its creation.

The formula bears the imprint of the usual Kennedy slickness and the political motive is, as ever, transparent. The merits of the controversy over work rules and pay structure in the industry have been reviewed by two Presidential boards and, in the last 2 weeks, by a special board composed of six members of the President's Labor-Management Advisory Committee.

This last board merely defined the issues in dispute, leaving unchallenged the recommendations of the two previous boards, which had proposed a gradual reduction in the work force of unproductive firemen in freight and yard diesels and revisions in the pay structure which would take into account both time and miles on duty. What else is there for the ICC to study?

Yet when the time had come for the administration to meet the problem head on, it ducked again and tossed a lateral pass to the Commission. Nothing is settled, even though Congress lets the President have his way, and the dispute is as far from resolution as it was 4 years ago when it was first brought into the open.

Rumanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in light of the tribute paid to the captive nations of the world last week, I thought it apropos to bring to the attention of my colleagues a New York Times editorial that appeared recently.

The editorial discussed the splintering of the once monolithic Comunist bloc as evidenced by the recent displays of Rumanian independence. The Rumanian Government has shown a considerable amount of resistance toward Premier Khrushchev's plans for an economic integration of the Soviet bloc. They have refused to sacrifice their own national economic goals in order to achieve greater overall production for the other member nations in the Soviet bloc. Further resistance to Communist domination is indicated by the Rumanian neutrality in the Sino-Soviet dispute.

This silence and their opposition against the Soviet economic policy are evidence of a new attitude which will perhaps encourage other captive nations in East Europe to voice their independent national desires. It is the hope of all Americans that the other nations behind the Iron Curtain will follow the path of the Rumanians. I am proud to include this editorial from the New York Times of July 17.

RUMANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

The disarray in the once monolithic Communist bloc is vividly indicated by Rumania's course. That country is still ruled by a Communist dictatorship and is a member of the Soviet bloc's two key organizations, the Warsaw Pact and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. But the Rumanian press has printed a summary of the now-famed Chinese Communist letter which Moscow has tried to suppress, and no Rumanian representative was present at the recent high level Soviet and Eastern European Conference held in East Berlin. Moreover, recent Western visitors to Rumania have returned with word that that country is eager to increase its economic relations with the West.

Evidence indicates that the Rumanians are trying to steer an independent line among Communist countries, even going so far as to maintain an ostentatious neutrality in the Soviet-Chinese dispute. At the root of this conduct is Bucharest's resistance to Premier Khrushchev's plans for economic integration of the Soviet bloc. The Rumanians refuse to sacrifice their national economic goals for the sake of greater overall production and efficiency of all the nations belonging to the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance.

In the old days such an open display of independence and economic nationalism would have brought down thunder and lightning. But now Moscow steps softly, attempting to iron out differences by persuasion, while hiding from the Soviet people the serious differences that have sprung up. This attitude, together with triumphant Rumanian nationalism, will surely encourage the nationalist currents existing elsewhere in Eastern Europe.

Pending Railroad Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, with the threat of a railroad strike hanging over us, I am sure that in the days to follow we shall be very much concerned with that concept known as the "national interest." Let us be sure, however, that we do not invoke this concept indiscreetly. In deciding what truly is the national interest in this situation, it is important that we bear in mind not only the effects of a railroad strike upon the economy, but also the effect that compulsory arbitration of this dispute might have upon the entire fabric of labor-management relations. In connection with this whole question, I recommend the following editorial from the July 19 issue of the New York Times. This editorial, I think, does much to place the issue in its proper perspective:

FACING A RAIL STRIKE

With no sign of any break in the lengthy deadlock over featherbedding, the administration must soon decide on its future course of action.

Its choices are limited. It can reluctantly request Congress for power to compel final and binding arbitration, either immediately or after one more effort at mediation between the rail unions and management. Or, even more reluctantly, it can stand on the sidelines when management puts its new work rules into effect and the brotherhoods retaliate with a walkout.

The breakdown of collective bargaining has been obvious for a long time in the railroad industry. The union leaders, refusing to agree to the voluntary displacement of any large number of workers, are resorting to a strike threat in order to compel the administration to use its coercive power to force a settlement by arbitration that will relieve them of responsibility for the acceptance of change.

There is method in this intransigence. The union leadership feels that the administration my go beyond the very generous provisions already recommended by the impartial boards appointed by the White House. This is not mere wishful thinking on their part. In almost every labor dispute in which it has intervened, the administration has been willing to pay a high price for peace. The rail unions have every reason to hope that they will do at least as well as the east coast longshoremen, whose settlement last winter made a mockery of the President's wage-price guidelines.

The President will doubtless seek to limit the use of compulsory arbitration to this one specific issue, but the dangerous thing about it is that it sets a precedent of undermining the collective bargaining process. Increasing reliance on governmentally imposed arbitration could atrophy important segments of the labor union movement; it could result in intolerable delays and blockages in the achievement of industrial progress.

These dangers call for consideration of the alternative, which is to allow the strike to occur. The brotherhoods have often threatened to strike, yet their bluff has never been called because of the fears of what a rail stoppage would do to the economy. A generation ago it might have throttled business, but the railroads no longer have this life-and-death power. Today they carry less than 45 percent of the Nation's freight and a steadily diminishing volume of passengers. Unquestionably, a strike would create hardships and disrupt economic activity in many areas, but there would not be a national catastrophe unless it were permitted to continue indefinitely.

An actual walkout over the featherbedding issue would be so manifestly indefensible and at the same time cause so many layoffs in other industries that it could conceivably bring sufficient pressure from the rest of labor as well as the public to end it. If, however, it did go on long enough seriously to threaten the economy, the Government would always have the ultimate—if highly distasteful—power of seizure, followed by unilateral imposition of the work rules as suggested by the impartial members of two Presidential boards.

Under such circumstances, the Government would be intervening literally as a last resort and not as the intended consequence of a premeditated failure of phony collective bargaining.

Prayer in the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, the City Council of the City of East Orange, N.J., at the regular meeting of July 15, 1963, passed a resolution with respect to the Supreme Court decision relating to prayer in the public schools. I know the esteemed council's views on this controversial issue will be of interest to the membership, and under unanimous consent I accordingly include the resolution at this point:

Whereas the U.S. Supreme Court has held that the conducting of religious services or exercises in the public schools is an infringement of the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas it is the view of the members of this governing body that the conducting of nonsectarian exercises, recognizing the existence of a Supreme Being, is proper and appropriate in the public schools; and

Whereas the conduct of such non-sectarian religious observances would, under the decision in *School District of Abington Township, Pa.* v. *Schempp*, require an amendment to the U.S. Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the governing body of the city of East Orange that the Congress of the United States be and the same is hereby petitioned to act promptly and favorably on an amendment to the U.S. Constitution which would permit religious observances of nonsectarian nature in the public schools: and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE, Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH, Hon. PETER W. RODINO, and Hon. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER.

A Citizen's Protest Against Attacks on Foundation of Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from one of the highly respected citizens of my district expressing his grave concern over increasing pressure of minority groups while the average citizen sits on the side line permitting such groups to influence public opinion.

My communication is from Mr. J. Russell Hughes, a prominent Michigan attorney living in Harrisville. Mr. Hughes has served in public office, is a war veteran, recently lost a son in the Air Force during the Cuban crisis, and takes patriotism and love of this Nation seriously.

His letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CEDERBERG: This morning I shaved my face with an American imitation of a Japanese imitation of a Holland-made razor, and while thinking about those facts I became disturbed by the recent news releases which indicate forces in motion with strenuous objection to the inclusion in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of "under God." Please read this letter throughout, and give it some consideration, for though I know you are busy, this is so fundamental that I am making time off from my work and devoting my time to writing this letter, trying to compose it carefully, because it is so important to everyone in these United States.

The deletion of the phrase "under God" recalls very vividly a group of people who came many years ago to lobby in the legislature of the State of Michigan for the purpose of the repealing and obliteration of the teacher's oath of allegiance to the Government. At that time, fortunately, there were a sizeable group of us who were alerted and came before a committee of the legislature and upheld the sense and propriety of the teacher's oath. We pointed out then that even a notary public was required to make such an oath, and we could see no repugnancy and no actual objection to such an oath, and that anyone who did was basing his entire contention purely on frivolity and a dogmaticism which was shielding a banner of intellectual "cuteness." I am protesting with controlled range these inroads in what has been the fundamental foundation of the liberties of this country, under which we have all prospered and been physically and mentally healthy individuals, as have been our forebearers and, as we pray, will be our heirs.

Even the atheists, as they so smugly call themselves, have a god, which they undoubtedly spell with a little "g," but nevertheless, they worship their atheism, therefore, that practice of atheism becomes their god, in spite of the fact that they say there is no God; and it little serves our purpose to analyze and try to find a proper name for whatever it is that they worship, but since what they worship is something that is mental in conception, and which impells them to speak out, is really their little god.

History shows very clearly that it is the little inroads made persistently and constantly by the organized minority that eventually create the crumbling collapse of a cultured majority. If we do not now stand on our feet and loudly and emphatically proclaim the value of our traditions and the wisdom of them, then sooner or later these little inroads will continue until we have nothing left to hold or defend. You may say that I am losing faith in American heritage and in American people. On the contrary, it is on that faith and on that heritage that I am crying out and speaking of now. If we permit this little minority to repeal the phrase "under God" as was permitted the bridling of religious teachings, and I fully appreciate the argument presented by those people who accomplished the Supreme Court decision, then you are permitting the inroads that will eventually put the hole in the dyke, which even the little boy's finger cannot hold back, and eventually the dyke will go and we will be swept by the onrushing of the Red Sea overflow.

Oh, that I were skillful enough to write this letter of protest in such a way that it would attract an audience that would hear, eyes that would see, and inspire bodies that would act, so that we would again restore that feeling of national dignity from which we have all thrived and prospered. Even the lowest beggar on the street in seeking his alms does not hesitate to revere the privilege of his right to beg that exists in this country, and under this civilization. As a lawyer, I find an understanding of the legal reasoning and philosophy of the Supreme Court in the recent decision as to religious teachings in the public school, and I am inclined to say that I find great difficulty in not following the dogma of the several honored Justices who rendered their several opinions; nevertheless, I would wish that the loquacious objectors to the very doctrine that has been abolished would have been persons who could have substituted something in its place or something better. Since I can find no such substitution, since I can find no replacement, I am convinced that these people are destructors and destroyers, and in their unknowing way are "haters," and haters need nothing but that passion of hate to destroy and to demolish.

Now, does that mean we must say that all haters should be isolated? On the contrary, no—let them have their soapboxes, but by the same token, let others speak out by manners of making news so that the news' media will disseminate the opposition in equal if not greater forces, which will answer the persons that I strongly suspect sit back and surreptitiously inspire these little haters. The hidden leaders of this organized minority can and should be informed that, by heavens, the wrath of the ordinary citizens shall be felt if these little inroads on our culture are not stopped.

I am one single individual backed by no organization, tutored and trained by no skillful schemer, but I am speaking for a voice, a "crying in the wilderness" for the ordinary citizens who are now being hushed into the background so that the organized minority may shout out, inflict their will on the unorganized majority, and receive the plaudits of the news' media.

Accordingly, it follows that I am seeking your assistance and the assistance of all others, to reach out and speak for the ordinary little man, of which I may be the smallest yet. Even so, I charge that I am one of the proudest of little people because I am an American citizen, under God.

Respectfully,

J. RUSSELL HUGHES.

Northwest Will Lose by Intertie Hobble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the next few weeks the House will consider S. 1007, a bill to establish ground rules for the exchange of electric power between the Bonneville Power Administration and the Pacific Southwest. As approved by the House Interior Committee this bill contains an amendment which would negate much of the benefit of this important legislation. An editorial in the Sacramento Bee on July 10 ably discusses this issue and is well worth reading. I ask that the editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

[From the Sacramento Bee, July 10, 1963]

NORTHWEST WOULD LOSE BY INTERTIE HOBBLE

It is difficult to understand how a Congressman from the State of Washington should be the one to sponsor an amendment to the Pacific Northwest power preference legislation requiring specific congressional approval before a Federal transmission intertie can be built to transport Bonneville electricity into California.

This is exactly what the privately owned utilities wanted, for they can feel reasonably sure the House Interior Committee which adopted this antipublic power amendment likewise would turn down authorization of a Federal intertie.

It is one thing for Congressman JACK WESTLAND, the sponsor of the restrictive amendment, to play the game of the privately owned utilities but quite another for him to foster a gambit which could be costly both to his own territory, the Pacific Northwest, and to California.

The Pacific Northwest has a very large surplus of power and the situation will become even more acute when the treaty between Canada and the United States inevitably is negotiated whereby Canadian electricity will be moved into this country.

Unless an outlet can be found for surplus Bonneville power it will be necessary to increase the rates in order to repay the Federal Government for the investment in dams and generating facilities. That is certain.

This not only would raise the charges to existing customers but would discourage industries from moving to the Northwest. If industries cannot be attracted now with power rates which are just about the lowest in the United States they could not be attracted if the rates were higher.

Proposed private transmission facilities would not take care of the situation; several lines including the public intertie are necessary. So if WESTLAND's amendment is kept in the pending bill the Bonneville kilowatts in effect will be rotting on the transmission lines.

The Northwest would be penalized; California which can use the additional electricity for the State's water plan and in other areas, would be penalized.

For the House of Representatives to approve the bill as it stands would be a disservice to the West. And if the House is minded to play the tune of the privately owned utilities, the Senate, which already has passed a preference bill without this amendment, should refuse to concur.

Address by Justice Arthur J. Goldberg, April 30, 1963, Before the Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following address by Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg to the attention of our colleagues. Justice Goldberg spoke at the Law Day dinner of the Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut, on April 30, 1963, about the rights we enjoy as free citizens and the meaning of a government under law.

His address follows:

LAW DAY ADDRESS

(By Arthur J. Goldberg, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States)

Tonight, throughout the country groups like this will be celebrating Law Day.

It will be a rare speaker who will not on an occasion such as this pay due homage to the fact that we are a government of laws and not of men.

Yet that principle or slogan, if you will, like all sweeping generalizations is not wholly true nor can it ever be even as an ultimate goal.

For it is plainly evident that we have always been a government of law and men, and on occasions in our history more of men than of law.

Since the role of man is inescapable in government, it would be better if we were to define our aspirations in terms of government under law or, more precisely, democratic government under law.

For this more nearly defines the aims of that remarkable group of men who wrote our Constitution.

The heart of the democratic faith they expressed is government by the consent of the governed—but under law.

Professor Bickel in a recent book has properly recognized that this ideal—democratic government under law—pulls in what may be termed two opposed directions.

The people are to rule but under law; majority rule is to apply but the rights of minorities are to be respected—the majority is to be checked.

The Executive, the legislature, the judges, the electorate at large are all to perform their great roles but under the law—no one above it.

I do not have to tell this audience how deep-rooted is this principle upon which our Western democracies rest.

Its full implications were certainly not fully understood by the feudal barons who wrung Magna Carta from King John in 1215. But Sir Winston Churchill was surely right when he said:

"The leaders of the barons in 1215 groped in the dim light toward a fundamental principle. Government must henceforward mean something more than the arbitrary rule of any man. And * * * the law must stand even above the King. It was this idea perhaps only half understood that gave unity and force to the barons' opposition and made the charter which they now demanded imperishable."

On this continent the struggle against the British was essentially a struggle for a government of laws.

Our great documents reflect this, starting with the forerunner of the Declaration of Independence, the Letter to the People of Quebec, approved by Congress on October 26, 1774. The first grand right—the Letter says, is representative government, making people "ruled by laws, which they themselves approve, not by edicts of men over whom they have no control.

The next great right is trial by jury—the guarantee that life, liberty and property will not be taken without a fair, public trial before a jury from the neighborhood.

Then comes the right to habeas corpus—the procedure whereby a court can quickly inquire into the legality of a man's imprisonment.

The fourth right is the free ownership of land, farm laborers being paid for their work, not rendering service by reason of subservience to some overlord.

The last right is freedom of the press—in broad terms designed not only for dissemination of political ideas and the criticism of government, but also for the advancement of truth, science, morality and the arts in general.

And by this document and the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, our goal of democratic government under law was proclaimed.

We gather today to reflect upon the fundamentals of our society—of what we mean by government under law and how we can preserve and perfect it.

In part we mean that government should serve our immediate material needs, but also, and more importantly, fundamental and enduring values. These values include, in the imperishable words, the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

And what to Mr. Justice Brandeis was the supreme right: "the right to be let alone—the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men."

And foremost in our democratic creed, the right to speak and to write freely; the right to worship God as one chooses; the sanctity of the conscience; and the dependency of government on the consent of the governed.

We meet today also to remind ourselves that concerned as we are about ultimate ends our way of life is equally concerned with method and means. The history of man's struggle to be free is in large degree a struggle to be free of oppressive procedures—the right to be free from test oaths and legislative attainder; the right to trial by jury; the right to confront the accuser face to face; the right to know the charge and to have a fair opportunity to defend.

Dr. Johnson aptly told Boswell: "The habeas corpus is the single advantage our Government has over that of other countries."

We cannot help note that both the procedure which we offer for the protection of the rights of man and the rights themselves are denied in the Soviet scheme of things and, sadly, in some other countries, both old and new, which profess adherence to the democratic faith. This gives the American ideal great advantages in the world market of ideas—if we will only be true to it.

How true are we to these principles?

How truly are we a democratic government under law?

You will, I am sure, recall the circulation a few years ago by a newspaper of a petition incorporating the Bill of Rights and the refusal of most of those solicited to subscribe to the petition.

Perhaps this can be explained away by the reluctance of people during that troubled era to become involved by signing anything, but what cannot be explained away is the lack of familiarity by many of those approached with our basic document.

You will recall also the fears expressed by Irving Dilliard, the respected journalist, that today were the Bill of Rights proposed for ratification it would be rejected.

Perhaps this reflected an overstatement, but notwithstanding it is properly a matter of deep concern.

But there are other more immediate manifestations of our failure to achieve our goal of government under law.

The extent of lawlessness in our society is reflected in our statistics and is an overriding problem in every community.

Today is not the occasion to elaborate on this obvious and menacing fact or to analyze in detail the reasons for the ever growing crime rate. But that we are in fact a government of men as well as law lies at the root of the problem. For it is men both in and out of government who have failed to prevent unemployment, to rid the cities of slums, to eradicate illiteracy, to abolish discrimination in education and employment, to provide for proper mental health programs, to deal with school dropouts, to provide a proper home and family environment, and in countless other ways to help bring about the good society which will be inhospitable to crime and delinquency.

And, of course, as every judge in America knows, we are a government of men and not of law when law enforcement officials do not observe the law. We cannot have respect for the law, if those sworn to uphold it flout or violate it—notwithstanding they do so in the name or under the guise of law enforcement.

And equally we are not true to our fundamental principles when great private groups protected and benefited by our constitutional safeguards fail to recognize that these rights impose obligations basic to the preservation of our democratic society.

A rcent case in point is the New York newspaper strike. It is not proper in my present office nor am I armed with the facts to appraise the merits of this dispute. But it is appropriate for me to observe that the newspaper industry, and that includes both publishers and unions, enjoy a unique constitutional status—freedom of the press is protected by the 1st and 14th amendments from abridgment. And whether it is called a preferred or a fundamental right, or by some other label, a free press is indispensable to the preservation of democracy under law.

Yet if I may say so, I do not believe that either publishers or unions in the newspaper industry fully comprehend the duty implicit in their constitutional right to publish. That duty which, I emphasize, is moral, and not legal, is voluntarily to agree upon means by which they can discharge their necessary function to publish—to be a free press—without interruption.

I am confident that those means can be found without abridging management or workers' rights—if both parties approach the task in a spirit of constitutional dedication.

Lawyers will soon be tested as to their fidelity to constitutional principles.

Our court a few weeks ago ruled that the 14th amendment requires that an indigent charged with crime be afforded the right of counsel.

This decision has been almost universally acclaimed as a step toward our goal of equal justice under law.

Today I ask you to reflect upon the responsibility which this constitutional principle imposes on the bar and also to ask yourselves whether the bar is ready to assume it.

Until both in the Federal and State jurisdictions adequate public defender systems are established, the bar will have to assume what will be a very great burden and it will be a measure of the fidelity of lawyers to the Constitution how they discharge it. Surely, it is not too much to ask of lawyers what doctors have traditionally done, and that is to devote the equivalent of a few hours of their professional day to protecting the legal rights of indigents.

One final word—Judge Learned Hand in eloquent words voiced great doubt as to whether courts could save a society which by preachment and practice did not in its very soul commit itself to the spirit of liberty, and, indeed, whether judicial review did not do more harm than good. You remember what he said:

"I do not think that anyone can say what will be left of those (fundamental principles of equity and fair play which our Constitution enshrines); I do not know whether they will serve only as counsels; but this much I think I do know—that a society so riven that the spirit of moderation is gone, no court can save; that a society where that spirit flourishes, no court need save; that in a society which evades its responsibility by thrusting upon the courts the nurture of that spirit, that spirit in the end will perish."

Perhaps because I am a new judge, I do not fully share his skepticism as to the judicial role in our society. I should like to believe and I do believe that by asserting defining, enunciating, applying, educating, if you will, judges do play a significant part as pronouncers and guardians of the enduring values of our democracy under law, and that in so doing, judges nurture rather than diminish the spirit of liberty.

But I do agree with the thought underlying Judge Hand's statement that:

Abiding dedication to government under law by all—governors and governed—is indispensable to the preservation of liberty.

On Law Day, therefore, let us rededicate ourselves to government under law.

Tribute to Congressman Hjalmar Nygaard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join the Members of the House in paying tribute to Hjalmar Nygaard, one of our most respected, able, and beloved colleagues.

Hjalmar Nygaard had established himself as one of the soundest and most dedicated Members of the House. His devotion to our Nation's principles, his interest and support of sound legislative acts was recognized by all of us who associated with him.

He came to Congress with a great record as a State legislator in his home State of North Dakota, and in the period he served in Washington he became recognized as a sound, progressive dedicated legislator—an example for all to follow.

Hjalmar Nygaard served his home communities, his State, and his country with devotion and effectiveness, and left an imprint upon those who were associated with him that will be lasting.

His early training and vocation as a teacher was apparent in the thorough and scholarly fashion in which he analyzed and faced the problems of his constituents, and the spirit of his early vocation was always evident in the concern he showed for individuals, and his willingness to help all of us by passing on to us the knowledge he had obtained in a long and varied career.

I extend my deep sympathy to Mrs. Nygaard and her family, realizing the great loss and sorrow that is theirs. However, the inspiration Hjalmar provided throughout his life remains with us. We are all better because of our friendship and association with him. We share with his family and the people of North Dakota the loss of a conscientious and dedicated public servant.

Check and Countercheck in Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting editorial appeared in Richmond News Leader of Friday, July 12, 1963. The editorial makes mention of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable Daniel J. Flood, and refers to the unanimous support given by the House of Representatives to Congressman Flood's resolution with reference to the situation in Panama.

Under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include the editorial hereinabove referred to, which is as follows:

CHECK AND COUNTERCHECK IN PANAMA

The encirclement of the United States by Communist power is certainly an intricate chess game. But the way that the State Department has been playing the game in Panama makes it appear that the real opponents of U.S. diplomacy are to be found in the U.S. House of Representatives. The Panama Canal is a prime target of Castro's subversion and propaganda. The game already has reached the final moves—but the State Department is trying to check Congressman who want to save the Canal for the United States.

The United States took perpetual sovereignty over the Canal Zone in 1903 under the Hay-Pauncefort Treaty. Last January, as we pointed out some time ago, the State Department announced agreement on five of Panamanian President Chiari's demands for sovereignty over the Canal Zone. One of these involved giving the canal company's Atlantic shipping piers to the Republic of Panama; another was the symbolic issue of flying the Panamanian flag in U.S. territory. Here's how the State Department played the last couple of moves:

Check. On July 8, the U.S. House of Representatives, under prodding by Congressman Dan Flood, unanimously passed legislation to prevent the Panama Canal Company from divesting itself of any property including the piers without congressional approval. Although this bill sailed through the House, it faces some rocky shoals in the Senate. Panamanian control of the Atlantic piers would open the zone to easy Cuban subversion.

Countercheck. On July 9, the Federal court in Panama dismissed an American's suit to bar the flying of the Panamanian flag on the zone. The background of this suit goes back to February of 1960 when the House of Representatives passed a resolution against display of the Panamanian flag. But when the House adjourned in September, the State Department arranged for an Executive order to fly the flag. The suit just dismissed represented an effort to have the House's resolution enforced.

The State Department's obvious policy is to concede as much as possible to the Republic of Panama. The Governor of the Canal Zone, Robert J. Fleming, Jr., has publicly ridiculed the 1903 treaty, and welcomed Abdul Hamid Abu Bakr to the zone for public lectures on the seizure of the Suez Canal. Bakr is secretary of the Suez Canal authority. The State Department is not only trying to check every move to save the Panama Canal; it is even teaching the Panamanian subversives the fine points of the game.

President Kennedy Did Nothing To Reassure Captive Peoples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's weak and ineffective proclamation for Captive Nation's Week did nothing to reassure those peoples enslaved by Communist Russia that they could hope for freedom. Until such assurance is given and those who wish to be free can once again look to the United States as a beacon of hope, the cold war will continue and the danger of a hot, nuclear war will increase. A strong and free America willing to accept world leadership and to hold out the hand of friendship to those who desire freedom instead of pursuing the sniveling course of accommodation of the Soviet Union advocated by the Kennedy administration is the best guarantee for peace in the world.

Our present course must ultimately lead to either all-out nuclear war or enslavement by the Communists without a shot being fired to defend our freedom.

In this connection, I would like to include as a part of these remarks an editorial written by Frank Langston, news analyst of the Dallas Times Herald. Mr. Langston's editorial, "Captive Nations Need Reassurance," follows:

CAPTIVE NATIONS NEED REASSURANCE

(By Frank Langston)

We may talk about the Berlin wall and why it is standing there.

We may discuss the merits and the dangers of halting nuclear weapons tests or working for disarmament. We may speculate upon the rift between the Soviet Union and Red China.

These things concern relations between the free world and communism—even the future of the world itself.

But there is one group of people that ponders all these questions and one more besides: When—and how—will they be free?

These people number many millions within the captive nations of the world whose liberty vanished as a result of the "imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism" that have "resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world."

America this week—the third week in July—is holding its fifth annual observance of Captive Nations Week, an observance authorized under Public Law 86-90, adopted in July 1955 by the 86th Congress.

UNTIL FREEDOM IS ACHIEVED

The resolution calls upon the President to issue a proclamation of the observance, to help keep alive the desire for liberty and independence of the peoples of conquered nations and authorizes and requests him to "issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

What are these nations?

The resolution lists these: Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Uhal, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, and North Vietnam. Cuba, and others now could be added.

Many of the people in these countries still hope and pray for peace. Some, unfortunately, have died as patriots, fighting for their liberty. And some have simply ceased to struggle and joined the cause of their Communist masters.

Some have never known real freedom as we know it.

But many of them are men and women who love freedom and hate oppression, who want to live their own lives, to choose their own government and their own way of living, to worship God as they see fit, to rear their children free from fear of dictatorship.

They need the hope and reassurance that they have not been forgotten by the West.

Has the West forgotten them?

Instead of fully identifying ourselves with the freedom aspirations of the captive peoples, Western countries have shifted their policies somewhat toward an accommodation with the Communist regimes in East-Central Europe.

RECOGNITION AND TRADE HELP REDS

One reason for this is the hope of a more rapid liberalization in the captive countries through increased trade and contacts. But such trade and recognition of the Red puppet governments relieve them of economic and political pressures that could force them to grant some concessions to the people.

As a result, captive populations are less confident in the West and less inclined to resist their oppressors and Communist regimes, with added prestige, are going about their task of final communization with new confidence.

Apathy toward the submerged nations and their people would bring the free world closer to either the brink of nuclear war or surrender.

Captive Nations Week offers the American people an opportunity to reassure the people whose countries have been overrun by communism that they have not forgotten. Our Government can—and should—take the initiative in the cold war.

It can do so by these actions:

Keeping the issue of Hungary on the agenda of the United Nations.

Raising the question of Soviet treaty pledges to hold free elections in Eastern Europe in all negotiations with the Kremlin.

Placing the question of denial of the right of self-determination to the peoples of east-central Europe on the agenda of every United Nations session.

This week is an excellent time to emphasize as firmly as possible as we can that we refuse either a fast burial by Mao or a slow one by Khrushchev, that we will not compromise on principles and that we intend to preserve peace and insure the victory of freedom.

Ideas for Peace and Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, on June 24, 1963, I had the rare privilege of being a guest at the annual banquet of the National Youth Governors' Conference. Nearly all States of the Union were represented by young men and women who had been elected as "youth governors" for their respective States under a program designed to acquaint our youngsters in their late teens with the workings of our democratic system of government. Hawaii was represented by Mark Toshiyuki Yamamura of Kaimuki High School in Honolulu. This worthy and commendable project was jointly sponsored by the Young Men's Christian Association and the Reader's Digest Foundation.

The principal address at the function was delivered by Mr. Sterling Fisher, executive director of the Reader's Digest Foundation. While his address was directed at our future National and State political leaders, Mr. Fisher presented food for thought which could well be digested by our leaders in government today. I therefore offer Mr. Fisher's speech in its entirety as follows:

REMARKS BY STERLING FISHER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, READER'S DIGEST FOUNDATION, AT THE YMCA YOUTH-IN-GOVERNMENT CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 24, 1963

Last week at a meeting held by the American Heritage Foundation in Williamsburg, Va., a Reader's Digest editor mentioned that as a small boy he had shaken, with awe, the hand of a man who in his youth had shaken the hand of George Washington.

What a graphic expression of how young our country actually is. We belong to generations which, in a sense, bestride our national history like some giant colossus. With one hand we are able to reach back and all but literally touch those men who founded this Nation. With the other hand we can reach forward a few generations to help create an era when our children's children may repeat the acts of our forefathers in founding a new nation. But they may establish their new nation on another planet, or perhaps even in another solar system.

Between the two poles of past and future, we ourselves live in a present that is unparalleled as a time of technical development. We live with the challenge of enormous potential development—and with the risk of enormous destruction.

The direction in which we go will depend to a considerable degree on the attitudes and activities of you youth governors and thousands of young leaders who, like you, have demonstrated early in life that they have an affinity for and an eager interest in government. Lest you think this point is invalid, I ask you to stop for a moment and consider these facts: John Smith established the first permanent English settlement in the United States at Jamestown when he was 27 years of age. When Alexander Hamilton became a member of the Continental Congress he was 25, and when he became Secretary of the Treasury a ripe old 33. Patrick Henry fired the Virginia House of Burgesses with his famous address with the challenge, "If this be treason make the most of it!" at the age of 29. Ben Franklin began publishing

"Poor Richard's Almanac" at 26. And George Washington himself was commander of all Virginia's armed forces at the age of 23.

(Incidentally, if you will pardon a small commercial at this point, I cannot resist mentioning that De Witt Wallace, who is editor and publisher of the Reader's Digest, founded that magazine when he was but 32.)

Today we have come full cycle, it seems to me. During the past few days you have been meeting and talking with men and women just a few short years older than yourselves, who have upon them the burden of government at perhaps the most challenging and most perilous time of our history. It won't be long before that burden passes to you.

It was recognition of the tremendous responsibility that young people are assuming—at earlier ages than any other time in history, save that of the founding of our Nation—which led the Reader's Digest Foundation to undertake the financial sponsorship of the conference a year ago. It was our feeling, heartily concurred in by your YMCA leaders, that the opportunity to come to Washington and to see and question the operations of Government at first hand was among the most significant experiences we could possibly help you get. I hope that at the close of your sessions tomorrow, you will agree.

I might add here that you are part of a vast family of young men and women, numbering well into the millions, who belong to young organizations with which the Digest Foundation collaborates on projects such as this one. Among others are the Boys' Clubs "Boy of the Year" competition and the Girls' Clubs "Career Key" contest, the Boy Boy Scouts "Report to the Nation" and Girl Scouts "Community Service" awards, creative writing contests among our Nation's colleges, an annual College Editor Conference which brings to New York 250 of our leading campus newsmen and women, and the World Press Institute, in which 12 outstanding foreign journalists are brought to the United States for a 1-year program of work, study and travel. In addition, the foundation makes grants to more than 120 American colleges for scholarship and travel purposes. The latest foundation project, which begins just 1 month from now, will be a 2-week Citizenship Laboratory for members of 4-H Clubs from 10 States. They'll stay at the 4-H center here in Washington and explore in much the way you are doing, the workings of our Government.

In each of these projects, the underlying theme is the gathering of ideas and information. For the struggle we are engaged in today is primarily one of ideas, make no mistake about it. Here again a major share of responsibility will come to you in very short order. The fresh idea, the vigorous new approach to an old subject, these will be as important in the long run as men landed on the moon and even beyond.

John Gardner in his fine writings on the subject of "Excellence" makes the point that the mechanic who tightens nuts and bolts on one of our astronaut's missile assemblies is as important to the success of the operation as the astronaut himself. I would extend the point and say that neither of these two excellent people would be in business at all if someone along before them had not had an idea.

Vice President JOHNSON said a short time ago: "We live in a world that has narrowed into a neighborhood before it has broadened into a brotherhood."

Nothing I have heard better expressed the paradox of our time. We have been more than equal to our technological challenges, but we have yet to meet adequately our social responsibilities. We have perfected means to destroy our world before we have learned fully to live in it. The technologists have done their job with a high degree of excelence, and I do not in any sense denigrate their work when I suggest that in the long run, it is the men and women with ideas who will find for us a way to live peacefully in the marvelous world our scientists have created.

A Time To Speak of Many Things

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Herb, of Plymouth, Mich., in a column in the Plymouth Mail, last week made the following remarks with which I think most thoughtful people will agree:

> I wonder, if our friends the walrus were around today, if he would find the time to speak of many things. A philosophy professor of mine once remarked that man's greatest fear was to find himself alone. And, I might ask, how long has it been since you found a comfortable chair, leaned back and allowed that remarkable gift, your mind, to wonder about many things? Oh, tis sad, but I'm afraid that most of us would be forced to answer "not very often." For the uncomfortable truth is that we are the paralyzed victims of a disease known as mass media communication. I can remember the day—and I'm really not that old—when people sat around and, of all things, just talked. Ideas were tossed about, opinions formed and communicated to others. Recently, at lunch a group of us talked about the racial problem in the United States. Now, I'm sure that none of us at that table left converted to another's views—but, the important thing is that we talked.
>
> It seems ironical that, while we loudly proclaim the principle of freedom of speech, we have allowed ourselves to become intellectual mutes, unwilling or unable to communicate our thoughts, to others. We are content to allow our elected officials, labor leaders, newspapers, television programs, etc., to do our thinking for us. Even our educators are roundly criticized if they attempt to throw some intellectual meat to their students to chew on.
>
> And, where are the great letter writers, those people who were not afraid to put their thoughts on paper for others to read. Personally, I am a great believer in dropping people a line and letting them know if I agree or disagree with them. I'm sure that, on many occasions, people have thought I'm some kind of a nut—but, at least I ceased to be an anonymous nut. But, don't write just when you disagree. Because all of us love the kind word, the thoughtful act. In our democracy, people often talk about the power of the vote and the ability of people to change their representatives. But, very often by the time the change is made, the damage has been done. Damage which could have been avoided, or a courageous man justified, if enough people would have taken the time to write. Only when you do write, don't be "Mr. Anonymous"—I'm always skeptical of ideas expressed by people who do not have the courage to sign their name.
>
> Perhaps our friend the walrus talked nonsense—but, at least he talked and he made people laugh. And, somehow, I'm just naive enough to believe that when people use those two distinct God-given gifts of laughter and conversation, even big problems can be solved. At least it's worth a try—and who knows, in the course of your conversation you might even find out—"why the sea is boiling hot and whether pigs have wings."

Interest Rates and Balance of Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Dillon and the Treasury Department, in their recent presentations to Congress and their recent actions on interest rates, gave a classic example of the man who jumps astraddle a single horse and rides off in two different directions. No one has more vigorously pumped for the President's proposed tax reduction reforms measure; no authority has pleaded more effectively for the need for energizing and enlivening our economy. No person's predictions portraying the persistent specter of recession has been more persuasive than has Mr. Dillon's. Yet, this same Secretary, this same Department, has in the last few days taken steps to tighten credit. Such a move has characteristically and promptly put the brakes on the domestic economy. When used as a counteroffensive for inflation it has been a reasonable and effective tool. Now it appears that the tool has a double cutting edge. The administration is intrigued with its potential as a possible deterrent to the outflow of short-term investment capital. Moving up interest rates on short-term investments at home, it is reasoned, will induce the outflow to stay in the United States. Aside from the fact that available information gives less than comforting assurance that such results will follow, the contradictions implicit in this move vis-a-vis the tax reduction are potentially apparent.

We cannot accept the quieting assurance of Mr. Roosa that the 0.5-percent increase in the Federal Reserve System discount rate will not effect the "whole interest rate structure." Such an observation is about as accurate as saying water will not run downhill.

Increase in the discount rate represents an additional cost of doing business for the banks. Who do you suppose is going to pay this cost? Why, the banks' customers naturally, the borrowers. And, who are these borrowers? Consumers, other financial leaders, and commercial credit sources, of course. The ultimate payer of this cost will be John Q. Public, the consumer, regardless of what avenue of financing be pursued. For those sources not tied directly to the banks for a portion of their funding the usual competitive factors of the marketplace will assure their advance. We feel that a present accurate prediction can be made that the Department's encouragement to the Federal Reserve bank to increase discount rates to the bankers of the United States, will very shortly reflect an observable increase in the "whole short-term interest rate structure," within the domestic economy. Such an increase will represent an additional curb on an already seriously hampered economic growth situation.

The real "cat out of the bag" exposure of the inconsistency in the Treasury position is illuminated by the candid quotation contained in the Wall Street Journal story of July 10 of this year. Quoting the Secretary, the Journal states:

> The possibility of this kind of interest rate action having little effect on the economy is hinged on the tax bill.

Now we take this to mean that the Secretary here could be admitting the validity of Chairman Martin's position that the "heaviest cloud over the economy at present is the balance-of-payment problem." It would appear that the administration is now willing to gamble off a portion of the tax increase effect for economic expansion in another skirmish in the battle for a better balance-of-payment position. However, we may lose sight of the fact that by prearranging a portion of the tax cut benefits by this indirect earmarking of a portion of the tax cut money for the lending segment of the economy, in effect, there is a preempting of the decision of Congress as to what "mix" of benefits in the tax reform would best serve the national interests.

No informed person should be unmindful of the perplexing complexities and the built-in frustrations that our present fiscal position in international affairs holds. Nor should we be unmindful of the paradoxes posed by the superimposition of our domestic economic challenges. However, we respectfully submit that the program set forth in the President's recent message contains a proliferation of temporary plugs for a continuing perforated dike which stands between the United States and the outflow of its gold.

We must acknowledge the ingenuity and inventiveness of the staff of both the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board in manipulating the inhouse materials to jerry-build a defense against the continued outflow of capital funds. To the administration's credit they fully recognize this fact as reflected in the final paragraphs of the President's message of July 17, 1963.

Obviously, the limited expansion of the world's gold reserve and the unlimited future expansion of the world's economy and trade poses the real and fundamental problem. The pressures of competition for the existing gold supply will not cease because of the temporary measures currently being taken. The ingenuity and sophistications of the capital control centers are far too resourceful. The growing demand for the means to support the productivity and industrialization of the nations of the world will stimulate that resourcefulness. It can be predicted now that we are only at the beginning of a jerry-built structure answering to the new threats just around the corner, unless some more flexible, fluid, and effective international monetary structure, with real velocity propensity, is provided. We have the boys with their fingers in the leaks at the old dike but what we should like to know is that the architects and engineers are working at the real solution to be found only in the new structure.

Dollar Goes Down Under Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, as is the case with many other subjects, our President apparently knows nothing of sound finance or sound economics. His recent move to put up the "Kennedy Wall" by taxing American investments in foreign securities is a complete reversal of the foreign trade policy which he espoused with a Madison Avenue campaign when the Foreign Trade Act of 1962 was being considered.

Yesterday's Wall Street Journal gives insight into this strange change of direction:

DRAMATIZING THE DOLLAR'S DISTRESS

"I want to make it clear that, in solving its international payments problem, this Nation will continue to adhere to its historic advocacy of freer trade and capital movements."

That's what President Kennedy said last week. Then he proceeded to propose a 15-percent tax on investments in foreign securities. Whatever else may be said about it, this is a restriction on free capital movements.

And whatever the President may have intended, this and other proposals surely spotlight the depths of the dollar's troubles. They also leave the impression that the administration really does not understand why America, in 12 of the past 13 years, has been able to balance its international income and outgo only by dipping into the gold that backs up our dollar.

A major factor—if not the major factor—in this chronic payments deficit is the Government's own huge spending abroad. A lot of this spending goes for foreign aid, and there's growing agreement that much of this aid is misdirected and unavailing. Yet the President proposes no real cutback in aid outlays; he merely would force foreigners to spend somewhat more of their aid dollars in the United States. Whatever modest help this may be to our balance of payments, it hardly squares with our "historic advocacy of freer trade."

Most of the rest of the Government's oversea outlay is military spending, and Mr. Kennedy does say that this spending will be trimmed a bit over the next couple of years. But it seems certain the reduction could materialize sooner and go a good deal deeper if our allies would assume their fair share of the burden of the West's defenses. And it should be obvious by now that they will do so only when Uncle Sam stops picking up their part of the tab.

Still another reason for the payments deficit has been the persistent policy of keeping money plentiful and cheap, both in recession and recovery. The idea is that when business is bad easy money will turn things around, and when business is good easy money will make it get even better. It didn't work out that way in the depression thirties, and in the past couple of years it hasn't produced the rate of growth the administration is seeking.

What it has done has been to encourage both Americans and foreigners to invest relatively more abroad, where higher interest rates are available. The Government seems well aware of this, and yet it still shrinks from strong countermoves, still clings to easy money as an economic stimulant.

It's true that the Federal Reserve raised the discount rate last week, indicating that short-term interest rates may head slightly higher. The proposed investment tax also would force foreigners to offer higher long-term rates if they want to borrow in the American market. But the President, in arguing for the tax, emphasized that there's to be no such interest rate rise for domestic borrowers. In other words, we're going to try the treacherous trick of tightening money for foreigners while we have even more easy money at home.

However much misunderstanding there may be about all of this in Washington, foreigners understand these things all too well.

They can see, for instance, that the investment tax may well be self-defeating. For U.S. investments in foreign securities produce a return flow of income, a flow that has been rising sharply. Last year it came to $800 million, not far from the $1.1 billion that Americans invested in new foreign securities. In the long run the income almost surely would surpass new investment.

Foreigners, furthermore, recognize flags of distress when they see them; they've flown them for their own currencies often enough. Like a bank that's in trouble, the United States proposes to limit withdrawals. In such circumstances, what will a German, an Englishman or anyone else think about the safety of investment he has made here? Or about the wisdom of investing any more funds in the United States? And will his confidence be inflated by the knowledge that America, for the very first time, plans to borrow from the International Monetary Fund?

Even so, these moves might accomplish something if the Government would accompany them with steps toward fiscal and monetary responsibility. Specifically, by making more meaningful cuts in its own spending and by abandoning its easy notions about easy money. But time will run out if the Government instead relies mainly on gimmicks that dramatize the dollar's distress.

Boy Scout World Jamboree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Boy Scouts World Jamboree will take place August 1 through 11. Over 12,000 Boy Scouts and leaders from 76 free nations will gather on the historic plain of Marathon, Greece, for the 11th World Jamboree—the free world's largest nonpolitical youth event.

The American contingent is made up of 629 Boy Scouts and on July 19 it was my pleasure to greet those fine young men who are the delegates from Nassau County, N.Y. They are: Richard D. Barr, Eagle Scout, of 14 Locust Lane, Glen Head, N.Y.; William M. Dunn, Life Scout, of 27 Red Maple Drive North, Wantagh, N.Y.; George Frooke, Eagle Scout, of 21 Central Drive, Plandome, N.Y.; Arthur W. Gruhn, 1st class Scout, of 480 Windsor Place, Oceanside, N.Y.; William K. Norton, Life Scout, of 66 Andrew Road, Manhasset, N.Y.; and Ralph L. Searles, Eagle Scout, of 76 Park Avenue, Port Washington, N.Y.

The American contingent has been organized into 16 troops. A 17th American troop from the transatlantic council, Boy Scouts of America, which makes Scouting possible for American military and other families stationed in European and Mediterranean areas, will join the contingent at Marathon.

In keeping with Scouting self-reliance, the cost of the trip for each delegate—$990—was earned by the Scouts themselves through a great variety of afterschool and summer jobs. Some local scholarships helped but only partially. In Scouting a young man learns to pay his own way and stand on his own feet.

It is refreshing and reinvigorating to observe the activities of this wonderful organization of Boy Scouts and its world jamboree comes at a most significant time.

Carl Vinson's Great Record on Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Kansas City Star of Tuesday, July 16, 1963:

Carl Vinson's Great Record on Capitol Hill

For more than one-fourth of the life of this Republic, Representative Carl Vinson, Democrat, of Georgia, has been "heppin" run the country. "Heppin" is in the colorful Vinson vernacular. Today this extraordinarily powerful, long-time chairman of the House Armed Services Committee will have served continuously in Congress for 48 years, 8 months and 13 days. He thus takes over the House record held by the late Speaker Sam Rayburn. (Senator Carl Hayden, Democrat, of Arizona, is the all-time congressional champion for seniority with service of more than 51 years.)

Shrewd and homespun are words often used to describe Carl Vinson. His comfortable old-shoe style presides over the tautest legislative ship in Washington. In formal session, even the more senior members of the large committee speak only when they have the word from the throne—Uncle Carl's throne.

Somehow the old gentleman, who will be 80 in November, manages to be both high-handed and lovable. The love he inspires is based on his quaint, foxy grandpa manner and his absolutely incorruptible integrity. He is a practical man, still spry and agile in the give-and-take of politics, but he sticks to the firm governing principles of the Founding Fathers who would have recognized Carl Vinson as one of their own kind.

Over the last half century, no one has had more to do with fashioning the shield of the United States. With no background of military service, Vinson has specialized in defense legislation since shortly after he entered Congress in 1914. He has struck terror in many a gold-braided and bestarred committee witness.

While putting the Nation's strength first always Vinson is renowned for his large number of military installations in his home district and in the State of Georgia. A daring general is once alleged to have remarked within the hearing of the doughty chairman that one more defense base in Georgia would sink the State. Undoubtedly the Armed Forces have found the native clime of Vinson unusually well suited to their training and operations.

This same clime has produced one of the most useful and dedicated lawmakers of the 20th century. Carl Vinson's personal philosophy is that, "You've got to stay busy and keep abreast of the times." The most senior Member of the House is trundling along on his record-setting day as though he has a lot of priceless service to the Republic still ahead of him.

A Signal Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, residents in Connecticut and, in particular, the Fifth Congressional District, are very happy to know of the appointment of Dr. S. Dillon Ripley of Litchfield as executive head of the Smithsonian Institution. As a Litchfield resident and as director of the Peabody Museum at Yale University, Connecticut residents have long known of Dr. Ripley's work and have been proud of his accomplishments.

We all look forward to a period of fruitful achievement for the Smithsonian Institution under his direction.

The Waterbury-Republican of July 16, 1963 rightfully termed Dr. Ripley's appointment "A Signal Honor." The editorial of this title and date follows herewith:

A Signal Honor

The appointment of Dr. S. Dillon Ripley as executive head of the Smithsonian Institution brings honor to our State.

Litchfield can be justly proud of this native son who has been selected to head one of our justly famous and important museums—the Smithsonian Institution. Anyone who has visited the Smithsonian has always come away impressed with the broad coverage of its operation. A day spent there in anybody's life, young or old, is a day well spent. It is a fascinating experience. To what seems to amount to the curatorship of this great collection Dr. Ripley will bring his vast wealth of knowledge, as well as the inquisitive mind which first caused him to study the habits of wildlife at close hand.

Research has always been espoused by the Smithsonian Institution. Its new director will certainly take advantage of this for Dr. Ripley has spent a good deal of his working life in and out of the most inaccessible places digging out information on rare species of birds. In the field of ornithology he is probably one of our best-informed men today. If you postpone your next visit to the Smithsonian to 1964, it can be enjoyed all the better by the knowledge that its intimate affairs are being managed by a man from back home.

This American institution which came into existence through the generosity of an Englishman, James Smithson, who never set foot on the soil of the United States, serves a very fine purpose in this field of research and furthermore it does not selfishly withhold such information it may come into possession of, but shares it with the rest of the world. We feel sure that Dr. Ripley will more than live up to its rich tradition along these lines and will contribute materially to its work through his own individual efforts in research.

Constitutional Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to report the people of the Third District of Kentucky overwhelmingly support constitutional government and would rather solve problems with local individual initiative instead of looking to the Federal Government as a cure-all.

I thank the people of Louisville and Jefferson County for their cooperation in helping me to be a better Representative in Congress by giving me their opinion and views on some of the major issues we face.

Mr. Speaker, based on over 16,000 replies, the results of my questionnaire follow:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Should a Federal old-age medical care program be instituted with social security taxes?	31.0	62.3	6.7
2. Do you believe the Federal budget should be kept in balance during peacetime years?	82.5	7.3	10.2
3. Do you favor the admission of Red China into the United Nations?	11.4	81.6	7.0
4. Do you have confidence in President Kennedy's ability to handle our foreign policy?	44.1	39.1	16.8
5. Do you approve of the policy of selling military equipment to Communist-controlled countries?	3.0	91.8	5.2
6. Should the Committee on Un-American Activities be abolished?	11.5	71.1	17.4
7. Do you support President Kennedy's proposal for a Domestic Peace Corps?	39.3	48.7	12.0
8. Do you favor an income tax cut which would result in a bigger national debt—that is, without a reduction in spending?	13.8	80.4	6.3
9. Do you favor President Kennedy's proposal for Federal aid to the transportation industry?	17.4	59.0	23.6
10. Do you think that labor unions should be subject to the antitrust laws to the same extent as industry?	83.8	8.6	7.6

Former President Perez Jimenez

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, only a few more days remain before Secretary of State Rusk must hand down his decision whether or not former President Perez Jimenez is to be extradited back to Venezuela, to be delivered into the hands of the Betancourt leftist government. Despite the unctuous protestations that he will be given a fair trial, you and I know that, if he is sent back, he goes to almost certain death at the hands of his political enemies.

I would like to think that the administration has an open mind on this extremely controversial case. When we are dealing with an ex-President, it has always been the custom of our Government to assume that his alleged offenses, while in office, were political, and hence not extraditable under our extradition treaties. In the whole history of our Nation, we have never yet delivered a Latin American ex-President, who came to us asking political asylum, into the hands of his political enemies for liquidation. Why this is now proposed in the case of former President Perez Jimenez is one of the occult mysteries of the New Frontier. Can it be that the turning over of Perez Jimenez was the price which crypto-Communist President Romulo Betancourt demanded of President Kennedy at their closed-door meeting last November?

That the mind of the administration has already been made up was indicated by an interview with Attorney General Robert Kennedy, published in El Diario—New York—a few weeks ago. In this interview, Attorney General Kennedy is reported by El Diario to have said:

> We will be able to deliver him (Perez Jimenez) to the Venezuelan authorities in a very short time.

At the time the Attorney General made this statement, the extradition case was still in the courts.

The fact is, there has been something smelly about this Perez Jimenez case from the beginning. Perhaps the most unwholesome thing about the case is the fact that, from the outset, Attorney General Kennedy has permitted the law firm of Covington & Burling, the senior member of which is the President's adviser, Dean Acheson, to prosecute the case in the Federal courts. Could it be that the spectacle of the law firm of the President's intimate, Mr. Acheson, acting as Betancourt's counsel in the case, has heavily weighted the scales against former President Perez Jimenez?

The Attorney General's report on the administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1962 indicates that, for 1961, Covington & Burling received from the Betancourt government the amount of $180,843.87. At this rate, if receipts for 1962 and 1963 were available, the total would mount to a formidable figure.

Fortunately, there is a vast public in the United States which does not believe that U.S. foreign policy must be tailored to please political chameleons like Romulo Betancourt. A different view on the extradition of Perez Jimenez was voiced by the Miami News, May 14, 1963:

> A decision by the U.S. Supreme Court yesterday brings the day closer when the Secretary of State must decide whether or not to ship the former dictator, Marcos Perez Jimenez, back to Venezuela.
>
> It is our opinion that there is more at stake in this case than the future welfare of one man. At issue is whether the United States, having granted a man political asylum, is now ready to withdraw this asylum. If our country does this, it would seem to be a precedent-setting reversal of policy.
>
> The time to decide whether or not the United States is going to extend its hospitality and protection to repudiated dictators like Perez Jimenez is when they first ask permission to enter the country, not when their political opponents ask for their return. This is something the State and Justice Departments should keep in mind when the situation arises again, as it very well might.

Another voice which might well be heeded by Secretary Rusk is the voice of Judge Robert Morris, president of the Defenders of American Liberties and former general counsel for the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security. Certainly, if any living American sees through the doubletalk and the masquerades of hard-bitten Communists who pretend to be liberals, it is Judge Morris. He says:

> MAY 21, 1963.
>
> Re Gen. Marcos Perez Jimenez.
> Hon. DEAN RUSK,
> *Department of State,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SIR: I write this for the Defenders of American Liberties on behalf of the right of asylum and its bearing on the status of former head of state for Venezuela, Gen. Marcos Perez Jimenez.
>
> In 1948 the current President of Venezuela, Romulo Betancourt, was overthrown by a group led by General Jimenez. In 1954, General Jimenez was in turn overthrown by President Betancourt. Each of the two has been highly praised by U.S. Presidents while in office. President Kennedy has recently praised President Betancourt in very lavish terms on the occasion of his visit to the United States.
>
> In 1954, General Jimenez was—according to reports—awarded the highest rank of Commander in Chief of the Legion of Merit by the United States for his "sound investmetn policies." He was also praised by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.
>
> The right of asylum is a very precious asset in these troubled times when Communists and other despots overthrow governments with violence and terror. It is a right that should be preserved by our example and by practice. If it should fall into desuetude as a result of our noninvocation in such cases as General Jimenez', some of the heads of state, now our allies, may well be the losers in the years ahead.
>
> Distinctions such as that between right and left, which unfortunately characterizes the difference between General Jimenez and President Betancourt pale into insignificance by the solemnity of the right of asylum itself which should be preserved.
>
> General Jimenez has been, until his recent apprehension, residing in Miami Beach with his wife and four daughters. He recently said: "It is my hope and desire that the U.S. Government will continue to allow me to live peacefully and quietly here with my family, as I have done the last 3 years, in order that my daughters may continue their American education, and that my wife and I may be part of this community."
>
> It is hoped that the United States will honor the tradition of asylum in this case and keep alive this important ingredient of international law.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> ROBERT MORRIS.

Mr. Speaker, there is more to this Perez Jimenez extradition case than the more legalistic fulfillment of our extradition treaty. Venezuela under the weak administration of Romulo Betancourt, stands today upon the very crater edge of communism. Betancourt, despite all the abject aid which he has been given by the State Department, had made no serious effort to wipe out the Communists who are ready to take over Venezuela. When Prof. Philip Taylor, of Johns Hopkins University, visited Caracas on May 14, 1963, at the invitation of the American Embassy, to participate in a seminar, he was so shocked by the half-heartedness of Betancourt's handling of the Communists that he issued a public statement urging Betancourt to arrest Gustavo Machado and Eduardo Machado, the two official leaders of the Venezuelan Communist Party. What happened? Professor Taylor, by order of Betancourt's Minister of Internal Affairs, was expelled from the country. And so invertebrate is the State Department and the Caracas Embassy in its dealings with Betancourt that, to date, no official protest has been made against this outrage against an American scholar.

To send the former President Perez Jimenez in chains into this explosive situation would be the greatest contribution which the United States could make to Venezuelan communism. It would be a public sign that the United States was not following a sincere anti-Communist policy in Venezuela. It would be a weak admission of American neutrality in the struggle between the Communists and the anti-Communists in Venezuela.

I am making no judgment as to his past activities. The fact is that what he has done or has not done is beside the point in the issue at stake. Like him or not, former President Perez Jimenez is today the symbol of anti-communism in Venezuela. He is the only public figure who has strength enough to be a rallying point for the scattered Venezuelan anti-Communists. Because this is true, he is hated and feared by the leftist groups which now rule Venezuela. Is the United States now to be a party to the liquidating of this symbol? I cannot believe that even the State Department can stoop to such a decision. The United States must honor its commitment made to Perez Jimenez when he was granted political asylum.

Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I support President Kennedy's request to Congress for effective civil rights legislation. I admire the firmness of his determination to carry out his commitments to remove barriers to equality and justice which some of our American citizens still face today, a hundred years after the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation.

My bill, H.R. 7224, contains the President's proposals, Mr. Speaker, and with permission to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to insert my testimony before the House Judiciary Committee on July 17, 1963:

Testimony of Congressman James C. Healey, of New York, Before the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to present to you and members of your distinguished committee my views on H.R. 7152, your omnibus civil rights bill and my own bill, H.R. 7224, containing the President's civil rights proposals. As you know, my bill, H.R. 7224, is identical to your bill, Mr. Chairman. I am here to testify in favor of these proposals and to urge approval by your committee.

As you know, I was one of the sponsors of the anti-poll-tax legislation passed in the 87th Congress, which when approved by three-fourths of the State legislatures, will become the 24th amendment to the Constitution.

You also have before your committee my bill, H.R. 2095, to eliminate unreasonable literacy requirements for voting; and my bill, H.R. 6639, to extend the Civil Rights Commission and to broaden the scope of its duties. These proposals are both incorporated in our omnibus civil rights bill.

Mr. Chairman, 100 years ago Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation assuring freedom and equality to all Americans. One hundred years later, some of our people are still deprived of these rights. Across our Nation we are seeing evidence of impatience of some of our American citizens who are victims of discrimination. And the rest of the world watches while we preach to them about freedom.

There should be no partisan politics here; we must support our President. Congress must enact legislation to lay the guidelines for solutions to the various phases of this problem. Failure to do so will weaken the fabric of this Nation at a time when it needs its full strength.

It is my hope that 1963 will go down in annals of memory as the year in which the U.S. legislative conscience came to grips with that perennial splotch on American morality—racial discrimination—and took the lead in providing substance to the promise of emancipation made a 100 years ago.

Under the aegis of the commerce clause and the 14th and 15th amendments to our Constitution, the U.S. Congress must transform its concern over a troubled and anguished situation into positive remedial action.

What is desperately needed is legislation providing effective, not piecemeal, legal tools, with which our citizens who are victims of discrimination will be able to prosecute against the daily abuses that are heaped upon them.

The erupting civil rights crisis has injected a sense of urgency into this session of Congress and our adjournment date should not be set until action is taken on this problem. Congressional inertia in this area of our national life would be tragic. As our President has put it so adroitly:

"In short, the result of continued Federal legislative inaction will be continued, if not increased, racial strife, causing the leadership on both sides to pass from the hands of responsible and reasonable men to purveyors of hate and violence, endangering domestic tranquility, retarding our Nation's economic and social progress, and weakening the respect with which the rest of the world regards us."

The President's proposals, which we have presented in our bills, Mr. Chairman, are the most sweeping of any President on civil rights since the Emancipation. His program incorporated in our omnibus bill, is an admirable attempt to remove the barriers which some of our citizens have faced the past 100 years—barriers which will stand in the way of enjoyment of full citizenship, to which every American is entitled, and which is guaranteed in his birthright.

There are those who regard the President's proposals as too much, too soon, as too ambitious an undertaking, especially in terms of success. I think not. They offer the Congress a set of solutions that should be acceptable to all men and women of good will. They are not designed because of mere economic, social, or diplomatic considerations. They were designed out of the knowledge that to insure the blessings of liberty to all is the primary prerequisite in a democracy, in a government, of and by, and for the people.

Our basic commitments as a nation and a people, our conscience, our sense of decency and human dignity, demand that we try to eliminate discrimination due to race, color, religion. To eliminate it is (1) not to practice it, and (2) not to tolerate it on the part of others. If we are successful in eliminating discrimination in our great country, other countries will look to us for having given substance to the dream of freedom and equality. If we do not, then we have lost our dignity and leadership both at home and abroad.

Our civil rights bill demands urgent and effective action by Congress to assure justice and equality for all of our citizens. The struggle is not that of the Negro alone. No American should be denied his basic rights to work, eat, vote, to learn, and to live where he chooses. A century after the Emancipation Proclamation, no American should have to demonstrate for his right to admission to a dining room, a school, or a theater.

Legislative relief is needed in the areas of voting, education, employment, and public accommodations. It has been in these spheres of activities that the American Negro's struggle for full equality has been a frustrating one.

Legislation cannot change a person's prejudices. If color discrimination were to disappear overnight, the Negro's low economic status would still handicap him. But legislation can work to eliminate conditions that handicap the Negro. And this is where we have a responsibility in the U.S. Congress.

Limitation of the exercise of that right to vote according to race serves no other purpose than to put into doubt the rendition of justice to the Negro citizen and the protection of his rights. A government not electorally responsible to one segment of our national citizenry, seriously jeopardizes the very essence of our representative democracy and the political life of the Nation as a whole.

Under the provisions of our civil rights bill, Mr. Chairman, voting protection in Federal elections would be strengthened by providing for the apportionment of temporary voting referees, and by speeding up voting suits. For States having the literacy test, a presumption of qualification to vote would be created by "the completion of the sixth grade by any applicant." The constitutionality of such a provision is beyond reproach; Congress has within its purview of constitutional powers the power to regulate the manner of holding Federal elections.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the elimination of unreasonable literacy requirements for voting, I would like to quote from my testimony before your committee in the 87th Congress: "It is a known fact that unreasonable literacy tests have been used unjustly to deny the right to vote. Education is a reliable gage of literacy, but how much education? At what point should the standard be set? My bill establishes the minimum line at the completion of the sixth grade in schools * * * this a reasonable demarcation point, and I believe the most effective device is the one in my bill." It consists of establishing an objective standard by which an individual's literacy may be judged. This eliminates the intrusion of bias or prejudice * * * it requires the determination of fact, rather than a judgment or an interpretation."

Title I under our omnibus civil rights proposal would further require that if a literacy test is used as a qualification for voting in Federal elections, it shall be written and the applicant shall be furnished, upon request, with a certified copy of the test and the answers he has given.

The Civil Rights Act of 1957 provided for the Attorney General's power to bring civil action in the Federal courts where there are reasonable grounds to believe discrimination was being practiced at the polls. A 1963 Civil Rights Act should enlarge upon this and empower the Attorney General to initiate civil proceedings when asked to do so by a complainant financially unable to sue to "further the orderly progress of desegregation in public education." This provision would go a long way in ridding the path of progress of mala fide desegregation. It would be more in keeping with the proposition articulated by the highest tribunal of the land, that integration via the "all deliberate speed" formula doesn't mean that it should take forever. President Kennedy observed in his TV-radio talk to the Nation: "Too many Negro children entering segregated grade schools at the time the Supreme Court handed down its decision 9 years ago will enter segregated high schools this fall having suffered a loss which can never be restored."

A second look at some of the language in the 1954 decision of *Brown* v. *Board of Education* serves as a reminder of the urgent need for this particular provision. The Supreme Court said that attendant with segregation as practiced in public schools there runs the pernicious likelihood of saturating the Negro child psychology with a "feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone." Constituting a denial of equality of opportunity to learn, the maintenance of segregated school houses was held to be a violation of the guarantee of the "equal protection of the laws" in the 14th amendment.

Title II of our bill proscribes discrimination in public establishments such as hotels and motels engaged in furnishing lodging for guests traveling interstate; movie theaters and other public places of entertainment which present forms of amusement which move in interstate commerce traffic; and restaurants and stores that extend food services, facilities and the like, the substantial portion of which has moved in interstate commerce, for sale or hire to a substantial degree of interstate travelers. Arbitrary practices guided by racist considerations in this area create nothing but unjust hardships and inconveniences for the Negro citizen. He is forced to stay at hotels of inferior quality, and travel great distances to obtain any kind of satisfactory accommodations or food service. He is limited in his complete enjoyment of the free flow of commerce. I feel that when a private owner appeals to the public for patronage, he has no right to draw the color line.

Discrimination in the field of public accommodations should find no quarter of sympathy or tolerance in our National Legislature. As it contributes to an artificial restriction of interstate commerce, it can best be removed by congressional action invoked under the commerce clause. In addition, legislative action can be justified by the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment: as these particular vehicles of private enterprise are licensed by the appropriate State authorities to engage in their particular activity, discriminatory practices found therein take on the character of State action and therefore fall within the limits of the 14th amendment.

Today Americans travel widely; millions travel each year, from place to place, State to State, and are often subjected to discrimination. Organizations—fraternal and professional—holding conventions face racial embarrassment. In our increasingly urbanized society, brought closer together by modern communications and transportation, Federal economic and social legislation—unthinkable possibly in the 18th century—has become essential today. These provide a legal basis in the clause of the Constitution giving Congress power "to regulate commerce, among the several States."

Critics of the public accommodations section level the charge that legislation of this kind would amount to an unconstitutional hindrance to property rights. The soundness of this argument is tenuous to say the least, for when was the right to property considered to be absolute? President Kennedy answered his critics by saying that: "The argument that such measures constitute an unconstitutional interference with property rights has consistently been rejected by the courts in upholding laws on zoning, collective bargaining, minimum wages, smoke control, and countless other measures designed to make certain that the use of private property is consistent with the public interest * * * indeed, there is an age-old saying that 'property has its duties as well as its rights'; no property owner who holds those premises for the purpose of serving at a profit the American public at large, can claim any inherent right to exclude a part of that public on grounds of race or color."

The commerce clause, in the light of today's social and economic structure, demands a uniform national "rules of access to public accommodations."

Mr. Chairman, a further provision of the bill—title IV—provides for the establishment of a Community Relations Service, the duties of which would be to work with regional, State and local bi-racial committees to alleviate racial tension. The value of such a service cannot be emphasized enough. Lacking the power of subpena, it would advise and assist local officials in improving the communication and cooperation between the races. By so doing, the Service would go a long way in helping to preclude recurrences of racial crises.

I have already mentioned the Civil Rights Commission; Title V will extend and broaden its powers. With regard to title VI, our Federal Government provides financial assistance or backing for many programs and activities administered by local and State governments, and by private enterprises. As a Member of the U.S. Congress, it is my privilege and responsibility to vote on these proposals and I feel the activities and benefits of such programs should be available to eligible recipients without regard to race or color. This should also apply to the employment practices of the organizations involved, public or private. Title VII authorizes the President to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, to prevent discrimination against employees or applicants for employment because of race, color or religion or national origin, by Government contractors and subcontractors, and by contractors and subcontractors participating in programs or activities in which direct or indirect financial assistance is provided by the Federal Government.

Unemployment falls with special cruelty on minority groups, and creates an atmosphere of resentment and unrest; the results are delinquency, vandalism, disease, slums, and the high cost of providing public welfare and of combating crime. I support the President's requests for more vocational education and training for our illiterate and unskilled. It is programs such as the manpower development and training program which assist in reducing unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, our President has spoken out; he has followed through on his promises and commitments. He has called on us here in Congress to enact sound and effective legislaton to provide justice and equality for all Americans. We have never been faced with such a challenge in terms of moral integrity. We should not hesitate, but act swiftly, to take the battle for civil rights out of the streets, and enact legislation which will eliminate the necessity for segments of our citizenry to march in groups to demand equality.

The primary reason racial discrimination in America must be ended is not because of a clause in our Constitution, or as we sometimes hear, because of Communist challenge, but because racial prejudice and discrimination are fundamentally wrong. Our Judeo-Christian heritage, our sense of how man should treat his brother, our democratic ethics—our basic commitments as a nation and a people—should make us want to eliminate a practice not compatible with the great ideals to which our democratic society is dedicated.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for letting me appear before your committee. I urge prompt and favorable action by the Judiciary Committee, and pledge my support when the civil rights bill comes to the floor of the House of Representatives.

Tax Reliefs and the Burden of College Costs—An Analysis by Allan M. Cartter, Vice President, American Council on Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, because of the interest of many Members of Congress in a variety of proposals providing tax relief for the cost of college education, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article on this subject by Dr. Allan M. Cartter, vice president of the American Council on Education.

Dr. Cartter is himself a distinguished economist and was, before assuming his present position with the American Council of Education, dean of the Graduate School at Duke University.

Dr. Cartter's article will appear in the Educational Record in October 1963 but because of the interest of Members of Congress in the financing of college education, I believe it should be made available at this time.

The American Council on Education, which is the chief spokesman for colleges and universities in the United States, neither favors nor opposes tax reliefs but the officers of the council do feel the pro's and con's of this issue should be the subject of public discussion.

Dr. Cartter's article follows:

TAX RELIEFS AND THE BURDEN OF COLLEGE COSTS

(By Allan M. Cartter)

Thirty years ago the cost of college education was a matter of direct concern to a relatively small fraction of the Nation's families. Today, however, the quiet revolution which has swept the educational scene is becoming more and more apparent as an increasingly significant proportion of the population must face the problem of financing college education. Whereas a generation ago only one out of seven young men and women entered college, today nearly one-half of this group are entering, and the percentage continues to rise.

Charges for tuition and fees have risen rapidly in the same 30-year period as the colleges and universities have attempted to cope with rising instructional and nonacademic costs in a time of expanding enrollments. A representative sample of 50 well-known private colleges and universities indicates an increase in tuition from $250 in 1930 to nearly $1,200 today ($375 to $1,575 for the Ivy League schools). Although tuition is substantially lower in public institutions, the rate of increase has been equally rapid. No relief is yet in sight, for it is estimated that tuition will rise by another 50 percent in both private and public institutions over the next decade.

The concern over high college costs is shared alike by those who have to shoulder the financial burden and by the colleges and universities themselves, who fear that rising tuition charges may turn away the type of student they most wish to attract. The political reaction to these concerns has been reflected in the growing popularity of bills to give tax relief to the parents of college students through increased exemptions, deductions, or outright tax credits.

TAX RELIEF FOR PARENTS

About 10 years ago when the current rash of tax-relief proposals for parents of college students began, most observers assumed that these were home-consumption bills designed to impress a Congressman's constituents. By introducing such a bill, he could show that their representative had attempted to do something about the burden of college costs, while at the same time not endangering the public exchequer since there was no likelihood that such a measure would even get a hearing in committee. In the last session of Congress, however, perhaps related to the failure to pass legislation aiding higher education, about 100 bills for such tax relief were introduced over the 2 years. In the first 8 weeks of the present 88th session more than 90 bills were read and sent to committee; as of June 15 the total had risen to 114 (96 originating in the House, and 18 in the Senate). The rash is approaching epidemic stage, and the rough treatment received by the administration's omnibus education bill and the general tax reduction bill in committee hearings somewhat increases the likelihood that tax proposals to ease the burden of college costs may get a real hearing this year.

There is an aura of illusion surrounding most of the college-cost/tax-reduction proposals, and considerable confusion as to their real effect. To some people this is a means of granting Federal aid without expanding Government spending programs, to others it is a way of making the pricing system more effective in the realm of education; to some it is a way of giving preferential treatment to the parents of students in private (and parochial) schools and colleges, to others it is a sensible means of broadly sharing the costs of training skilled manpower from which all of society benefits; to some it is a fair and equitable means of aiding parents who are already making a great personal sacrifice, to others it is a nefarious scheme to aid the rich and overlook the poor.

VARIETY OF VIEWPOINTS

If one questions at random one's friends and acquaintances, those with children in or approaching college almost invariably are in favor of such a tax reduction, and those who are unmarried or who have grown children are frequently opposed. Those with high incomes tend to favor the time-tested deduction theme, and those with middle incomes lean toward democratic across-the-board tax credits. Parents with children in low-tuition public institutions usually favor plans which cover all educational expenses, those with children in private institutions come down on the side of tuition plans. Catholics and white southerners tend to favor inclusion of all levels of education (for quite different reasons), while those in regions with strong public school traditions tend to favor limiting such a program to the college level.

These conflicting views are not surprising, and are in keeping with the diversity of interest-groups which makes a democratic process reasonable and viable in its resolution of conflicting preferences. A fair judgment of such proposals can be made, however, only if one has a clear view of alternatives, their implications, and their relative cost. Most public discussions of college-cost/tax-reduction proposals have avoided the subject of cost, and have overemphasized the benefits received.

A SUMMARY OF CURRENT PROPOSALS

Proposals fall into two main categories: Those favoring a deduction from adjusted gross income before calculating tax liability, and those proposing a deduction of some fraction of costs directly from one's regular tax liability. In the former case there are two subcategories: Those proposals to raise the standard exemptions, and those allowing the deduction of actual educational cost from adjusted gross income.

Although there are a wide variety of proposals in each category, for purposes of illustraton it is simplest to take the most typical plans affecting only the college level:

I. Deductions from adjust gross income

A. Increased exemptions: The most typical proposal is to increase the exemption allowed the parent of a college student to $1,200 through an enlarged or added exemption. This provides a tax reduction ranging from $120 a year for those paying at the 20-percent marginal tax rate to $546 for those in the 91-percent bracket.

B. Deduction of actual educational cost: These proposals permit the deduction of actual cost (either tuition and fees only, as in the case of about a dozen proposals, or all educational expenses including board and room as proposed in nearly 20 bills). The resulting tax reductions vary widely depending upon the level of actual cost and the marginal tax rate.

II. Tax credit plans

The representative plan would permit a deduction of 30 percent of the actual cost of tuition, fees and books directly from one's tax liability. With actual costs ranging from perhaps a low of $200 a year in some public institutions to about $1,600 in leading private colleges, tax reductions would range from $60 to $480.

At some intermediate income level a taxpayer would be relatively indifferent as to which of these three plans were in effect, since the benefits would be about equal. High income families (above the 30-percent tax bracket) gain most from proposals in category IB, low-middle-income families in the 20-percent tax bracket gain most from II (if their children are in a high tuition institution) or from IA (if their children are in an institution where tuition, fees and books amount to less than $400). Families with no tax liability, resulting from some combination of low parental income and/or many dependents, receive no benefit from any of these plans.

COMPARISON OF FOUR FAMILIES

To see more clearly the benefits under various conditions, take the case of four families, each with two children and each having other deductions equal to about 10 percent of their total income. The families in the table are approximately those in the 25th, 50th, 75th, and 90th percentiles (from the bottom) in the distribution of family personal income.

A comparison of benefits from tax relief proposals

	Family 1	Family 2	Family 3	Family 4
Total personal income	$3,500	$6,000	$12,000	$25,000
Taxable income	750	3,000	8,400	20,100
Normal income tax	150	600	1,784	5,318
IA—Tax saving from added $600 exemption	120	120	148	208
IB—Tax saving from deduction of actual college cost:				
(a) Tuition only, $1,500 example	150	300	346	514
(b) Tuition only, $300 example	60	60	78	106
(a) All costs, $2,500 example	150	500	568	854
(b) All costs, $1,000 example	150	200	236	344
II—Tax saving from tax credit:				
(a) Tuition only, $1,600 example	150	480	480	480
(b) Tuition only, $300 example	90	90	90	90

If two dependent children were attending college at the same time the tax savings would be correspondingly larger for all except family 1, which exhausts all or most of its saving on the first child.

NATIONAL COST OF VARIOUS PROGRAMS

In 1954, when the resolutions committee of the tax section of the American Bar Association issued a proposal for a 30-percent tax credit plan, it was estimated that the cost to the Federal Government in lost tax revenues would be approximately $120 million. Since 1954, however, the number of students enrolled in college has increased by about 2 million, college tuition rates have increased nearly 100 percent, and the increase in per capita incomes has pushed most taxpayers into higher tax brackets. If the same 1954 tax credit plan were put into effect in 1964 it is estimated that its current cost would be nearly $500 million. The projected increases in enrollment, tuition charges, and incomes would raise the figure to approximately $800 million by 1970.

Of the representative proposals described above, IA would cost in the neighborhood of $450 to $500 million, IB would cost $475 to $525 million if limited to tuition, fees and books, or $700 to $800 million if all educational expenses were included.

THE IOWA PLAN

Representative SCHWENGEL, Republican, of Iowa, introduced a novel Iowa plan bill in January designed to create savings funds in anticipation of college costs. Under his (and TOLLEFSON'S, Republican, of Washington, companion) bill, each year until a child reaches 18 a parent could purchase an approved educational investment certificate from his local bank, savings and loan association, or insurance company for $50, and deduct the full cost from his income tax payment. At the end of 18 years the value of these certificates, including accumulated interest, would be about $1,400, which could then be redeemed only as the student-beneficiary incurred costs at an institution of higher education. Any funds not used because of death of a child, nonattendance at college, or failure to complete 4 years of college work in good standing, would revert to the Treasury. Congressman SCHWENGEL also proposes a $100 per year tax credit for the parent while the dependent child is in college.

If enacted, the Iowa plan would encourage the growth of a sizable savings fund over the ensuing 18 years. (He suggests also the creation of State boards to authorize the lending of these funds to needy students or to educational institutions.) If the parents of 50 percent of the Nation's children participated in the savings plan—and there would be no incentive not to participate since the Federal Government would be bearing the entire cost through lost tax revenues—total annual contributions to the funds would be about $1.7 billion. The total fund would grow to about $30 billion in 18 years, then rise or diminish as the ratio of the under-18 population to the college-age population rose or declined. The total cost of the Iowa plan (investment certificates and tax credits) to the Government would be about $2 billion per year immediately, rising to about $3 billion by 1980.

The Iowa plan has one major appeal—the encouragement for parents to plan far ahead for their children's education—but it has a number of serious drawbacks. It is by far the costliest of all the proposed tax schemes, and it does little to alleviate the current cost burden on parents since its full benefits would not be felt until about 1982. At a time when the Nation is attempting to stimulate investment and consumer spending in the interests of economic growth, this proposal would represent a drag on the economy by substantially raising the rate of savings. If the Federal Government were to increase its deficit by an added $2 to $3 billion this savings effect would be neutralized, but one doubts that the Republican Congressmen from Iowa and Washington intended this as a corollary to their proposal. "Will the cure exaggerate the disease?"

HIGHER TUITION

Although tuition charges have advanced rapidly over the last decade, the increasing real burden on the parents of college students has been a retarding factor. A tax reduction program which shifts part of the burden from the parent taxpayer to the Federal Government is therefore likely to result in a more rapid increase in tuition charges. In contrast to the direct aid to colleges and universities proposed in the administration's education bill in this and the previous session of Congress, the only way that institutions will be helped in their critical needs by a tax credit or tax deduction program is through an immediate increase in tuition charges. Many educators who advocate tax reliefs do so explicitly with the aim of raising tuition levels. This, they believe, is a more practical way of aiding private institutions without embroiling Congress in endless debates over the public/private and church/state issues.

Thus, what the parent who bears the burden of college costs views as a partial "cure" may turn out to be quite illusory, and in fact the disease may be worsened for those who would not be substantially helped by such tax reductions.

In recent years increasing concern has been expressed over the wastage of talent in the United States. No other country in the world has more than about 12 percent of its collegeage youth enrolled in higher education, yet the United States of America has managed to provide this opportunity for 40 percent of its youth today. While we can take pride in having raised the percentage attending college from 15 percent in prewar days to 25 percent in 1950 and to 40 percent today, it is by no means certain that the right 40 percent are attending. Much has been written about dropouts in the last few years, yet dropouts (strictly defined as those students who fail to complete a broad schooling unit such as high school, or undergraduate college) are a less serious problem than the nonentrants (i.e. those who graduate from high school but do not ever enter college). A high college dropout rate must be expected in a higher educational system where approximately 30 percent of the college entrants come from the bottom half of their high school class. A large number of dropouts are not lost to college education, for many of them shift to another institution better suited to their needs and interests and complete their degree studies.

FAILURE TO ENTER COLLEGE

A more disturbing fact is that about 30 percent of the top quarter of high school students never enter college. Failure to enter is more closely correlated with economic position of the family than is dropping out in midschool (where noneconomic factors appear to play a decisive role).

Illustrative of attrition at various levels are the 1960 census data. If we divide the Nation's college age youth into three approximately equal groups by level of family income, we find the following. In the lowest income third, out of every 100 youth, approximately 66 reach the senior year of high school, 56 graduate, and 10 enter college. For the middle income families, out of 100 youth 90 reach the senior year of high school, 79 graduate, and 34 enter college. For the top third of families 83 out of 100 reach the senior year, 78 graduate, and 55 enter college. Expressed in another way, about two-thirds of high school graduates in high-income families enter college, about one-half in the middle income class, and less than one-fifth from the lowest income group.

These figures suggest that the greatest loss of potential talent is in the lower income group, and this is precisely the group which will be least aided by income tax reliefs. This does not necessarily argue against tax reliefs, but it indicates that only a part of the problem can be tackled in this manner, and a larger scholarship program for the talented but needy student will be necessary if greater inequities are not to be created.

THE ALTERNATIVE OF SHIFTING THE BURDEN FORWARD

All of the proposals discussed above take for granted that the major burden of college costs should be upon the parent. They propose that the Government share the current cost through tax reliefs, or by a pay-now-go-later, layaway variant. In recent years, however, we have come to view higher education as an investment in human capital, an investment which over the last century may have been as responsible for economic growth as capital investment in plant and equipment.

A number of proposals have been suggested to spread the costs of college over the recipient's future earning span, rather than back to the parent, although a broad plan of this nature has not been put before the Congress. Some proposals call for long-term, low-interest Government loans, repayable over 15 or 20 years. It is not possible for a commercial lender to offer as favorable terms, or to finance what might be a $10 or $20 billion loan fund. Collection problems would be difficult for individual States because of the mobility of college graduates. The Federal Government is the only agency which could finance such a program, and repayments might be administratively handled along with annual income tax returns.

Another type of proposal would provide funds for the student while in college, and then impose a small income tax surcharge on future earnings. For example a student might be permitted to borrow $2,000 over 4 college years on the condition that he agree to add to his income tax payments an amount equal to 1 percent of his taxable income until age 65. For the average college graduate this would mean payments of only about $50 a year immediately after graduation, rising to $150 or more in later years. The risks of earning a small or large income in later life would be shared by all participants, and the program would be self-sustaining—although the Government would have to provide loan funds in the early years before repayments were sufficient to cover current student needs.

IMMEDIATE BENEFITS

Unlike the Iowa plan where funds would be set aside immediately and full benefits reaped only two decades later, immediate benefits would accrue from the above type of education installment credit. Such a proposal would be in keeping with current Federal policy to increase spending as a stimulant to the economy, and insofar as it resulted in more talented persons getting an advanced education it would be an effective national investment for furthering economic development.

Tax relief proposals to ease the burden of college costs may come to nought again this year, but if there was ever a time when they had a good chance of a fair hearing in Congress, 1963 is the year. If major education bills again run afoul of the church-state shoals, and if the administration's tax bill flounders on the reform issue, such a measure may be thrown in as a temporary life preserver. If it should once reach the floor of Congress it is likely to receive wide bipartisan support, for like motherhood and the home few would wish to oppose it on the record. The administration has made a strong case this year for both aid to higher education and for tax cuts to spur economic growth, thus the public is in an expectant mood. A general tax reduction bill with a deduction or credit for college costs appended to it would hardly be one the President could veto.

The major advantage of a tax deduction or tax credit proposal is that it is a means of aiding higher education without direct Government payments; thus it avoids the possible charge of Federal interference and skirts the church-state issue. It aids the colleges and universities, however, only if they increase their tuition charges correspondingly, in which case the taxpayer will find his benefit illusory. Although many educators favor such tax reliefs, they are aware that they will be in the uncomfortable position (analogous to the steel industry in 1962) of having to raise their prices to get any real benefit from such a measure.

In addition to the problem of illusory gains for taxpayers, other criticisms have been made of such proposals. The Treasury Department sees this as another attempt to erode the tax base, creating a poor precedent for other special (and perhaps equally worthy) interest groups. The administration is convinced that economic growth can best be stimulated by lowering tax rates and thus stimulating personal incentive; added deductions or outright tax credits would reduce revenues without achieving lower marginal tax rates. If deductions or credits are tied to tuition payments some critics will charge that this favors the high-tuition private institutions; total college costs appear to be a fairer index of the burden on the parent. Unless a substantial scholarship program is mounted simultaneously, a large number of the most needy students would not only be no better off, they would be worse off as tuition charges rose. Critics will also make much of the fact that under the provisions of almost every tax reduction proposal except the Minnesota plan half or more of the benefits would go to the highest income 20 percent of families. The highly progressive benefits result from the high proportion of children in these families who attend college, and their choice of high-tuition colleges. In the case of tax deduction proposals (but not tax credits) the benefits are even more skewed in favor of upper income groups because of their high marginal tax rates.

THE ALTERNATIVE

The alternative of shifting the burden of college costs forward to the student in his later earning years avoids most of the criticisms above, but does not seem to have the same appeal to Congress. The loan provisions under the National Defense Education Act are quite limited in amount and are intended primarily for persons interested in teaching as a career. One might hope that a serious study would be made by Congress of various proposals for shifting the burden forward-in-time before giving consideration to the more costly tax relief measures.

The mixed bag of tax proposals now before Congress needs a careful public sorting and weighing which it has not adequately received. It would be a great mistake to view such proposals as cure-all substitutes for any other Federal action in the realm of higher education, for the task facing higher education in the decades ahead in providing expanded opportunities for a college-age population two or three times as large as today's is vastly greater than these measures can possibly solve. Educators, lawmakers and parents should give serious consideration to the proposals under review, analyzing their implications and weighing the alternatives, for 1963 may be the year in which they will be put to the vote.

One Nation Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, on July 4, in my hometown of Gadsden, Ala., was held an outstanding celebration on the birthday of our Nation. It was a patriotic and religious service sponsored by the Episcopal Church of the Holy Comforter.

The program was under the direction of one of our most outstanding ministers, the Reverend John T. Speaks, the rector of the Church of the Holy Comforter of Gadsden.

On this occasion, I had the honor and privilege of presenting my highly esteemed colleague from Alabama, the Honorable Armistead Selden, as the featured speaker.

Congressman Selden's address on the subject, "One Nation Under God," is a gem and I think should be read by every Member of the Congress, the executive and the judicial, as well as all liberty loving citizens of our country:

One Nation Under God

Today we commemorate the birth of the spirit of our Nation. The key to understanding the greatness of America lies in our celebration of July 4—rather than October 19—as our national holiday.

For on July 4, 1776—187 years ago today—a spiritual force came to life with the adoption of the Declaration of Independence by the Continental Congress. Consider the fact that what occurred that day did nothing to alter the material balance of power between the colonies and the King. As a result of the adoption of the Declaration, the Colonies did not in fact become independent of the King—only in spirit.

It took 5 long and arduous years of struggle and sacrifice for Americans to win their independence in fact. On October 19, 1781, Lord Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown—and only then was the Nation born. Yet we commemorate, as our national holiday, not the military victory at Yorktown—but the spiritual victory at Philadelphia.

It would be well for us and for all Americans to reflect today, on this 187th anniversary of the Declaration, on the reasons why July 4, and not October 19, is our national holiday. There is more to this question than simple historic accident, as a reading of the Declaration itself will reveal.

The Declaration begins with the acknowledgment that mankind's inalienable rights are determined by "the laws of nature and of nature's God"—that they are rights endowed by our Creator. The Declaration ends with an appeal to the Supreme Judge of the world and "with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence."

Thus was the "Spirit of '76"—the spiritual force that has since altered world history—firmly based on a belief in the transcendent Spirit of a Divine Creator. Our observance of July 4 as the American national holiday acknowledges this spiritual heritage.

Today Americans everywhere pay homage to the victory at Philadelphia. Yet there are those among us who seem to have forgotten—and would have future generations of Americans forget—the spiritual origin and meaning of this holiday.

American independence—our right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—was finally sustained at Yorktown. But the cannon at Yorktown did not give Americans their independence—any more than the rockets of today give us our way of life. Our freedom and our system are the gifts—the endowment—of nature's God. and our preservation of these gifts, from Yorktown to the present, stems from our "firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence."

Without this reliance, there would have been no military victory at Yorktown in 1781. For what sustained our revolutionary fathers was not firepower, of which they had little compared to their adversaries—but faith. And although today, 187 years later, American firepower is second to none in the world, only our faith can truly preserve our freedom and our system for future generations of Americans.

Today, then, we mark the birth of an ideal, the products of a generation which had faith—faith in God and in the God-given rights of man. Those who believe that the benefits of this ideal—Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness—can exist for Americans without this faith do not truly understand the spirit of '76. Their materialistic ideology, left unchecked, could achieve what tyrants from George the Third to Nikita Khrushchev have failed to do—destroy our freedom and our system.

This is the same materialistic philosophy that holds love of country, like faith in God, to be an outmoded sentiment. The materialist who cannot recognize America's spiritual tradition ultimately spurns the concept of patriotism itself. For American patriotism—our love of country—is forever linked to the concept of divine providence. The spirit of America could not have come to life without this faith. It cannot survive without it.

In 1776, Americans were short on firepower but long on faith and love of country. Their cause prevailed, despite overwhelming odds. Today, July 4, 1963, the same cause is threatened by the most massive, formidable tyranny in world history. Compared to the aggressive 20th-century threat of Communist tyranny, the 18th-century tyranny of George the Third was petty. In potential firepower, however, we face our Communist enemy on terms which our forefathers would have envied. America is physically strong—the mightiest Nation in the world. If we lose then, the judgment of history must be that while our cause was right—and our firepower great—our faith was not up to the challenge of the time.

Without faith it is said, the people are blind. And if our faith is not up to the challenge of the times, our vision of the dangers confronting us becomes blurred. The ultimate evil of communism is its materialistic ideology. But if America itself falls victim to materialistic ideology, how are we to come to grips with this evil?

It is one thing to separate state from church. It is another to attempt to separate state from God. Our form of government is founded on separation of state from church. But we separate state from God to our peril and to the peril of our country.

One hundred and eighty-seven years after the spiritual triumph of Philadelphia, we Americans face a godless enemy—but an enemy, nevertheless, dedicated in its purpose.

That purpose is simply stated. It is to bury us—to bury the United States as a country—to bury the American system as a way of life—to bury Americans as a free and independent people—and to bury the God-given spirit of '76, replacing it throughout the world with the materialistic spirit of Marxist-Leninism.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I am especially aware of the dangers of the Communist effort to bury freedom in our neighboring Latin American countries.

Khrushchev knows that if he succeeds in stifling the spirit of liberty among our Latin neighbors, then the United States—the bastion of the Western Hemisphere and the free world—becomes more vulnerable.

In the time of the American Revolution, Paul Revere rode the countryside to warn patriots that the forces of tyranny were on the march—"The Redcoats are coming."

Today the enemies of American liberty do not come to battle in bright red coats, to the roll of drums, Communist techniques are undercover and subversive—and it is more difficult to arouse our people to their dangers. The aggressors of 1776 with their red coats and muskets were repelled by alert and courageous Americans. The subversive Communist aggressors of the 1960's can only be repelled by firm action taken by an alert and courageous American leadership.

The framers of the Declaration of Independence knew that freemen cannot do business with tyrants. So long as tyranny has power to challenge the rights of freemen, peaceful coexistence—whether it be with a George III or a Nikita Khrushchev—is a false illusion.

In 1776, the tyranny of the Crown could not be bought off or repelled by wishful thinking. Nor can the Red tyranny of 1963. And, like Patrick Henry, we must also recognize that although there are those who cry "Peace, peace—there is no peace," there can be no true peace for Americans until, like their forebears, they face up to the tyranny of the times.

Americans of 1963 must also be alert to the devisive forces within our own country which seek to destroy our institutions by resort to mob and community disorder. The street demonstrations which have spread throughout the country recently—and have taken place in our State and in your community—threaten to lead Americans into a different form of tyranny—to the odious tyranny of the mob.

In standing guard against the tyranny of totalitarian communism we must take care not to fall victim to mob tyranny. Mobocracy is the enemy of all Americans—regardless of race, religion or creed. And those Americans who advocate or encourage mob action to attain their narrow political ends are undermining the foundations of our Republic.

Nor can there be any doubt that these demonstrations—by dividing the American people and diverting our national energies at this cirtical time—serve the ultimate purpose of our Communist enemies.

In 1776, the ideals at stake between the Colonies and the King were universal—but the field of combat was limited. Today both the stakes and the arena are universal. Had the Colonies lost their struggle against the King, there still might have been hope that their ideal of human freedom would survive—to rise again another year. But if we spiritual inheritors of the Declaration of Independence were to submit to the Communist tyrant which threatens us today—then, indeed, a Dark Age—the darkest age in human history—would descend upon mankind.

We, therefore, are the champions of freedom not only for our own cause—but for the cause of all freemen. And if we fail—if our faith weakens and our reliance in divine providence falters—we will have been guilty of the greatest moral irresponsibility in history.

"If we study the history of Rome and Carthage," said our fellow American, Winston Churchill, who today stands as the symbol of the bond between modern-day England and America, "we can understand what happened and why. It is not difficult to form an intelligent view about the three Punic Wars; but if a mortal castastrophe should overtake the British nation and the British Empire, historians a thousand years hence will still be baffled by the mystery of our affairs."

"They will never understand," Churchill warned his countrymen in 1938, "how it was that a victorious nation, with everything in hand, suffered themselves to be brought low and to cast away all they had gained by measureless sacrifice and absolute victories—gone with the wind."

When these words were spoken a quarter-century ago, the British Empire stood at the pinnacle of power and prestige throughout the world. The words proved prophetic for Churchill's Britain in 1938. Their meaning can still be prophetic for Churchill's America in 1963.

"Now is the time," declared Churchill, "at last to rouse the Nation. Perhaps it is the last time it can be roused with a chance of preventing war, or with a chance of coming through to victory should our efforts to prevent war fail. We should lay aside every hindrance and endeavor by uniting the whole force and spirit of our people to raise again a great * * * nation standing up before all the world, for such a nation, rising in its ancient vigor, can even at this hour save civilization."

It is ironic, but yet fitting, to paraphrase the words of a man who, like Jefferson, is both a great Englishman and a great American—the only person since colonial days to share these two national titles—in summing up the 1963 challenge and opportunity facing us, the heirs of Jefferson and the Spirit of '76.

Now indeed is the time to rouse the Nation, to lay aside every hindrance, and by uniting the whole force and spirit of our people to rise again in the vigor of the men at Philadelphia and at Yorktown. For such a nation, and only such a nation, can at this hour save civilization.

Kennedy Confusion Hits New Low in Latest Tax Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of each day I become more and more fearful that the United States cannot survive for too much longer the failures, mistakes, confusions, and contradictions of President Kennedy and his thoroughly befuddled economic advisers.

The completely inept solution suggested in his recent message on balance of payments and the series of conflicting orders which followed within the next several days should prove to the American people that with the Kennedy administration in the White House the Nation is completely without able or effective leadership. In such a tragic circumstance it is up to Congress to exert its full legislative responsibility under the Constitution without giving any additional powers to the President so that the Nation may be preserved. It is only the strength of our system which has enabled us to prevent complete collapse under the bungling of the President for the past 3 years. Our only hope is to prevent him from taking the kind of rash action which would wreck the country until the people have a chance to remove him next year.

The recklessness and the ignorance of the administration in trying the easy way out of the balance-of-payments crisis is clearly shown in the following editorial, "Going Off Halfcocked" in today's issue of the Wall Street Journal.

GOING OFF HALF-COCKED

When somebody in the administration, a week or so ago, came up with the bright suggestion for a special tax on Americans who buy foreign securities, it apparently looked like a nice, simple idea.

After all, we do have a balance-of-payments problem, due to the fact that too many dollars are going abroad. And after all, one part of the problem is the fact that some Americans buy foreign securities.

True, the dollar loss from the purchase of foreign securities is tiny compared to the Government's huge foreign spending (which we are constantly reminded is an "investment") or compared to the withdrawal of foreign funds frightened from this country. Also, investment abroad brings returns here. Still, wouldn't it be helpful to reduce what foreign security buying there is?

And what better way to do it than with a little tax on such transactions? It's a much more moderate measure than a gold embargo, or devaluation, or direct prohibitions on the transfer of funds abroad, all of which had been broached in council. An "interest equalization tax" (nice phrase, that) would not have the same violent effects as these other measures, and it would be fairly simple to administer.

Well, that's the way it seemed when the idea was adopted, sold to the President and hurriedly presented to Congress. But since then, things have been happening.

One of the first things that happened, last Thursday afternoon, was a query from knowledgeable people in the New York securities markets. How, pray, were the stock exchanges going to open any of their foreign securities, many of which have been traded in this country for years, come Friday morning?

Nobody had thought of that. And apparently nobody in Washington had thought either of the possible effects on the stock exchanges of a situation in which these foreign securities, a number of them really blue chip stocks, were paralyzed. There was a very real risk that the demoralization would spread to the rest of the market.

So there was much rushing around, and by nightfall Thursday the Treasury had issued an emergency amendment to the President's emergency proposal. There'd be a 30-day "grace period" for securities on listed exchanges.

This, of course, immediately created an anomaly—discriminatory treatment for all the other issues not listed on the big exchanges—and confounded confusion. And the confusion was quickly felt abroad.

In London, in Amsterdam, in Toronto, in Tokyo—in all the complicated and interrelated machinery of the international financial market system—there were immediate repercussions. The Tokyo market plummeted in the sharpest drop it has experienced since World War II. In Canada the repercussions were felt all the way to the highest government officers.

Nobody had thought of that either. Treasury officials concede that they were surprised by the severity of the reaction among our Canadian neighbors; surprised, but in a mood to dismiss it. As late as Friday afternoon they had no intention of changing anything.

By the weekend, however, they changed their minds again. This simple and trivial little tax had brought to Washington the Governor of the Bank of Canada, the Deputy Minister of Finance and the Canadian Under Secretary of State. From this hurried meeting came another amendment to the proposal—the foreign securities purchase tax won't apply to "new" Canadian issues.

Immediately, another quirk in the crazy quilt. If you buy an existing foreign security from an American, no tax. Buy it from a foreigner, a 15 percent tax. Buy a "new" Canadian security, from an American or a Canadian, no tax. Buy a new issue from some other country, pay the tax. Or, anyway, that's the way it was up to a moment ago. Probably be different tomorrow.

The irony of all this is that all these shocks to the world security markets, all this confusion, all these political blows delivered to our friends, will at the most have but a small effect on the balance of payments. Even on the basis of very crude guesses, the security purchase tax will affect only $150 million out of a deficit running at more than $3 billion a year.

This alone makes it a very reckless proposal. But what is truly staggering about it is the plain evidence of the record that it was put forward without any real awareness of its possible complications and repercussions.

The world's money markets, where in the final analysis the fate of the U.S. dollar will be decided, are delicate and complex. They are no place for men to go charging about halfcocked.

United States Should Ask Itself: "What Does Russia Want?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Chicago Tribune, Walter Trohan discusses in a most timely, factual, and penetrating article the question of Russian intentions in present test ban negotiations.

In view of the naive and dangerous statements emanating from administration sources, Mr. Trohan provides a great public service in calling our attention to possible Russian motivations in these discussions:

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

(By Walter Trohan)

UNITED STATES SHOULD ASK ITSELF: "WHAT DOES RUSSIA WANT?"

WASHINGTON, July 21.—In view of the long record of Communist perfidy on treaties and agreements, it would seem essential that the United States look into the mouths of the herd of gift horses Russia is offering on a nuclear test ban, disarmament proposals, a nonaggression treaty, and troop inspection.

When Nikita S. Khrushchev is jovial in public, it is wise to wonder whether he is not laughing in private over Western eagerness to conclude a ban. Maxim Litvinov was jovial at the White House in 1933 when he was negotiating with Franklin D. Roosevelt for recognition of Russia, but laughed in private over his promises to negotiate Russian debts of World War I and grant religious freedom.

The proper approach in any negotiations on a test ban would seem to make it imperative that President Kennedy ask himself and his top advisers what Russia wants when she indicates she now favors such a ban. Obviously, Russia has completed her tests, so that she is willing to accept a moratorium as she did in 1958. It would not seem she is being stampeded into more cordial relations with the West because of the ideological rift with Red China.

The 1958 moratorium lasted 3 years and was broken when Russia began tests September 1, 1961. In the 3-year recess, the United States held a lead over Russia in the quality, diversity, and quantity of its nuclear arsenal. Russia resumed tests to catch up. The

United States was forced to join the race to protect is superiority.

The question now is whether Russia is ahead in nuclear weapons or up to a level in quality and diversity which would satisfy the leaders of the Kremlin sufficiently to take another pause. They may want to end the race to concentrate on rebuilding Communist fences in China and in the captive nations.

Antimissile defense may be a factor

What is more important, the Kremlin may be trying to get the United States to abandon or delay its development of antimissile missiles. The Nation that can knock out nuclear weapons in the sky or as they are fired could rule the world. Russia could be hoping to forestall American development while pressing her own.

In the 3-year moratorium the United States was never sure that Russia wasn't testing secretly underground. It would seem that from the nature of the bombs she tested that Russia was working to catch up to America in the moratorium.

Khrushchev made much of offering to permit foreign inspectors to take up stations at Rusian air fields, railroad stations, highways, and ports to prevent secret concentrations of troops for attack. Actually this offer was not new. It was made in 1958. Khrushchev revived the scheme in a speech in the Kremlin at a Hungarian friendship meeting, without reference to the fact that the friendship, such as it is, was won with the murder of patriots by planes, tanks, and guns.

Khrushchev may revive old plan

No doubt Khrushchev will jockey to get disarmament on Russia's terms by making a concession of Russian agreement to a nuclear test ban. He will revive plans, such as foreign inspectors at air fields, railroad stations, and the like, although everyone knows that if nuclear war comes it will not be detected by troop concentrations in such areas.

In the past, western powers have rejected various Russian schemes because it was felt Russian leaders were not really interested in ending nuclear tests or concerned with the risk of war. Now the climate has changed with the New Frontier's striving desperately to show some accomplishment in foreign policy, so that American leaders might grasp at straws.

The danger is that the United States might be mousetrapped into unilateral disarmament, while Russia makes herself invincible.

Arthur Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, for a few weeks the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have not had the benefit of Art Hoppe's columns except for a few which have appeared in the local press.

I am, therefore, inserting three of his recent articles which I believe will be of interest:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, June 27, 1963]

ONE UNITED NATIONS—ON THE ROCKS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

NEW YORK.—The reason I rushed up to New York, of course, is that I heard the United Nations was going broke and I thought maybe I could help out. I happen to be an expert in that field and frankly I have a little soft spot in my heart for the U.N. Mainly because I think it's the only hope the world's got.

So you can imagine my concern to read where Mr. U Thant has $100 million worth of unpaid bills tucked away in his desk drawer, primarily due to the fact the Communists won't cough up their share for the U.N.'s peacekeeping work in the Congo and in the Middle East.

Oh, I could visualize the sorry scene that undoubtedly awaited me: The mob of angry creditors banging on the glass doors, all that nice furniture repossessed, the lights and gas turned off and Mr. Thant sneaking out the back door to duck the process servers.

And I figured he could use some good, solid, American advice like: "Give them a little on account and promise them the rest a week from Tuesday."

But it wasn't that way at all. The flags were still flying bravely and there wasn't a crack in the plaster nor a frayed cuff to be seen. True, the U.N. does have a stack of unpaid bills this high. But, like most of us in such circumstances, it's putting up an awfully good front.

Not that there aren't signs visible to the trained observer that the U.N. is desperately trying to raise money. There are such signs, for example, in the delegates' lounge where we ace newsmen ferret out stories. The price of a martini has gone up from 65 to 75 cents. But I'm not complaining. What's a dime, I say, if it leads to world peace.

Indeed, I was sitting there sipping my contribution when I got to chatting with a U.N. financial expert who seemed awfully happy. Soberly happy, and I asked him why.

"Well," he said, "I think we've turned the corner in this financial crisis. The Communist bloc's held out solidly against paying their assessments for the Congo and the Middle East, claiming the whole thing was a plot by the West.

"But the United States has wisely kept pretty quiet. And now the pressure's being put on Russia by the Latin Americans and the Afro-Asian bloc. You'll notice that the resolutions favoring payment of assessments are being introduced and passed ovehwhelmingly by all the small nations. They've become genuinely worried. And if the Communists want to keep any friends in Africa, Asia, and South America, they're eventually going to have to go along. Right now, they're in a very tight bind."

Well, this cautious optimism is what most people around the U.N. seem to be exuding these days. And while I don't understand high finances or the ins and outs of U.N. politics, I think they're right. I think what they're really saying, complexities aside, is that the United Nations will endure because the little people of the world want it to endure. And I have implicit faith in that.

Of course, I will meanwhile do what I can to help. In fact, I'm proud to report, I now have only 999,999,999 martinis to go to achieve a lasting peace. It's a perfect crusade. If I'm wrong about the U.N. and the world blows up, at least I'll die happy.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, July 1, 1963]

OUR POLITICIANS NEED A CODE OF ETHNICS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

NEW YORK.—Mr. Kennedy is certainly having a well-rounded European tour: dramatics in Berlin, chuckles in Ireland, pageantry in Rome, and in England these days, who knows?

Personally, I thought the Berlin scene was the most moving. That is, I thought it moved Mr. Kennedy the most. In fact, for a minute there I thought it was going to move him clean across Europe at the head of our friends, the Germans.

There he was, a million Berliners shouting his name. And he gives a great speech, sweeping himself upward and upward and upward to ever greater heights until, all carried away, he cries: "Ich bin ein Berliner." Which, freely translated, means, "It just happens I'm a Berliner myself."

This news was a surprise to me and at first I thought it was merely what the poets call political license. You know how politicians are about being really Irish, Italian or Israeli at heart, depending on the blood lines of their audience.

But Mr. Kennedy backed this up by telling the Germans: "The United States will risk its cities to defend yours." And this is certainly a reasonable statement. If you happen to be a Berliner.

When the Berliners learned that Mr. Kennedy was really a Berliner, too, they went right out of their minds with adulation. For they understandably make a very emotional audience. And for a breathless instant there I was frightfully worried what Mr. Kennedy, the Berliner, would say next. Because like any good politician he's great at identifying with crowds, especially adulatory ones.

"Speaking for us Berliners," I could hear him saying, "all we ask is a place in the sun."

"Hooray," says the crowd, in German.

"A little Lebensraum," cries Mr. Kennedy.

"Huzzah," roars the crowd, in German.

"Ach du lieber," shouts Mr. Kennedy.

"Vaterland uber alles," screams the crowd, in German.

"And I promise you as fellow members of our anschluss," sums up Mr. Kennedy, pointing sweepingly westward, "that France will fall to our Panzer divisions in 29 days."

You can see what a close thing it must have been: Mr. Kennedy, the Berliner, furious with the supercilious French anyway, a screaming crowd at his feet. I admire his restraint.

Of course, ever since Mr. LYNDON JOHNSON went to Berlin and pledged "our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor" to defend our fellow Berliners, I've admired any of our politicians who got out of Berlin without starting world war III. It's a very emotional place.

And frankly, I wish our politicians, being the way they are, would stay out of there. It's too touchy an issue for emotionalism. Indeed, look how rational Mr. Kennedy's been elsewhere. In Ireland, he could say he was Irish; in England, he's an English-speaking people; and in the Vatican he's also on safe ground.

No sir, I know our politicians have to identify ethnically and culturally with the crowd they're addressing. But if Mr. Kennedy wishes to be that dramatic, I think he ought to try visiting some place like Ghana. What the heck, he's lost the South anyway.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, July 4, 1963]

JUST PLAIN JACK WINS YOU FRIENDS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Good morning, friends in televisionland. It's time once again for another visit with Just Plain Jack, the heart-clutching story of one young man's struggle to make this old world a better place. For his family.

As we join them today, Just Plain Jack, a band-aid on his forehead and a nasty mouse under one eye, is limping into the big White House on Pennsylvania Avenue, a suitcase in each hand. The Beautiful Society Girl he married greets him warmly.

BEAUTIFUL SOCIETY GIRL. Oh, hi there, Bunny. Did you have a lovely trip? I hear Europe's simply mobbed this season.

JACK. I sure was. Oh, my aching back.

BEAUTIFUL SOCIETY GIRL. You didn't plant a tree of peace and friendship again, did you? You know what the doctor said.

Jack. No, I think it was in Dublin. I was standing up in this moving car and a fellow shook my hand. Only he wouldn't let go. I think he wanted to keep me as a souvenir. But anything to create good will, I say. And then in Italy.

(The door opens and Portly Pierre, the faithful family retainer, staggers in clutching his stomach.)

Portly Pierre. Sorry we got separated, Chief. Those lousy Italian cops.

Jack. So you got kicked a little, Pierre. Consider it a wound of valor, won in the war to create good will. Which reminds me. Whatever happened to Sis Eunice?

(In crawls Sis Eunice, bandaged and disheveled.)

Eunice. Those lousy cops.

Jack. Now, now. Let's think of ourselves as the walking wounded in the battle for good will. Come on, Eunice, I'm sure you can walk if you try. That's better. Besides, we've got a lot of work to do.

Portly Pierre (groaning). Not pushups. I quit.

Jack. No, but we must write our bread-and-butter notes to all the good friends we made abroad. First, to our good friend, the Premier of Italy.

Portly Pierre. Hold it, Chief. The letter will take 2 days to get there and you know Italian politics.

Jack. Just address it: "To whom it may concern." Now then, they've been good enough to show us the real typical Italy. And so we owe them.

Portly Pierre. I'll say we do.

Jack. So, to pay them back, let's invite them over here to see the real, typical America at work and play.

Eunice (rubbing her hands). How about touch football? Boy, if I could catch that one carabinieri going downfield with his back turned, I could really pay him back.

Jack. Too obvious. No, we'll invite them to real, typical American events, like the Washington's Birthday sale at Garfinkel's; an attempt to desegregate a Birmingham lunch counter; and perhaps a nice HUAC riot in San Francisco. Tell them to bring their drip-dry suits.

Pierre and Eunice (together). Hot-diggety-dog.

Jack. Creating good will is a two-way street. And, say, while you're at it, route their motorcade the wrong way. Through the Hoboken Tunnel. Those lousy Italian cops.

Will the Premier of Italy enjoy his U.S. tour? Whoever he is? Or will better mutual understanding lead, as usual, to war?

Tune in to our next episode, folks. And meanwhile, as you go down the byways of life, remember: If you want to make friends at home or abroad, don't send them anything but Just Plain Jack.

President Kennedy's Immigration Proposals Will Eliminate Harsh National Origins Quota System and Take Humane Approach for Selection of Immigrants—Benefits Relatives of American Citizens in Portugal, Italy, and Greece With Aim Toward Reuniting Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased that legislation was filed today by our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from New York, Congressman Celler, to implement President Kennedy's sweeping new immigration proposals outlined in his message of today.

Ever since coming to Congress in January 1953, I have sponsored similar legislation to liberalize the national origins quota system which has worked inhumane hardships on the relatives of American citizens who remained behind in the Mediterranean-southern European countries, particularly in Portugal, Italy, and Greece. Under our present law, these quotas are based on the number of Americans who migrated from the old country and had gained citizenship before the 1920 census. Naturally, this worked a hardship on the Portuguese, Italians, and Greeks, because they were in the latter waves of migration to this country just before and after World War II. This system did not adversely affect the peoples from northern European countries.

President Kennedy's proposed changes in the law will eliminate the national origins quota system by 20 percent per year over a 5-year period, and thereafter will place all quota numbers in one pool. Therefore, unused quota numbers from northern European countries will benefit the split families of American citizens who remained behind in these—the split families of American citizens who have been forced by our present restrictive immigration law to remain behind in southern European countries.

Also, President Kennedy's proposals include the elimination of preference quota for the mothers and fathers of American citizens. This phase of the Kennedy proposal can mean the almost immediate migration of some 3,500 southern European parents to these shores to be reunited with their loved ones who are now American citizens, subject, of course, to enactment of these proposals by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, some quick calculations and analysis of this Kennedy immigration proposal would indicate that as many as 100,000 more people can be admitted to the United States annually over and above the present quotas based solely on national origin. This, I think, is the humane approach to select immigrants for the United States, based on the need for uniting families or the compelling need for seeking new opportunities in America, rather than the distasteful national-origin basis which has been a cornerstone of our immigration laws for 40 years. I hope that early hearings will be held on President Kennedy's proposals with a view toward enacting the new immigration changes this year.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week is not a week of celebration with festivity and gladness, but one to be commemorated solemnly with an expression of our long-felt sympathy for the more than 100 million people who are captives of totalitarian communism. In Europe alone there are eight of these nations, with one-fourth of its area and nearly an equal percentage of its population. These nations include Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, in the Baltic area; Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland in central and Eastern Europe; and Bulgaria and Rumania in the Balkan Peninsula. Nor can we exclude East Germany and Albania.

Today all of these countries suffer under dictatorial rule. Their fate has been a constant concern of the people and the Government of this country. Although nothing short of a nuclear war could bring these nations their freedom at this juncture in history, Congress has enacted legislation providing national observance of our continuing sympathy and concern during Captive Nations Week each year. For the fifth time the Presidential proclamation is in effect this week, and we observe Captive Nations Week this year as an expression of our faith in the inherent right to freedom possessed by our relatives and fellow human beings in the captive nations.

"Hail to the Chief," Used as Signoff by 160 Radio Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am including with my remarks an editorial broadcast by radio station WFAH in Alliance, Ohio, which comments upon the boast of a society band leader that his recording of "Hail to the Chief" is being used as signoff music by 160 radio stations, in place of the "Star Spangled Banner." I think the editorial comment is well done.

I feel certain that this practice is not growing as a result of any suggestions from the White House, for I believe the President would abhor a development so reminiscent of what the Russians call the cult of the personality. I feel confident he will wish to discourage the practice when it is called to his attention.

Much as we honor the office of the Presidency, it is contrary to every tradition of this Republic to make either the office or the incumbent of that office a symbol of our devotion to the United States of America:

> President Kennedy has his favorite orchestra leader, Lester Lanin, who plays at many White House functions. Recently Lanin recorded an arrangement of "Hail to the Chief," the 150-year-old presidential salute. Lanin says that more than 160 radio stations are playing his version of "Hail to the Chief" instead of "The Star Spangled Banner," our national anthem.
>
> One hundred and sixty stations represent only a small percentage of the more than 5,000 radio stations on the air, and it seems rather insignificant and unimportant. But

it is significant; it is important. It is one more piece fitted into place in the giant puzzle of what's happening to the United States of America.

Suppose "Hail to the Chief" were substituted for the national anthem at patriotic rallies, at public gatherings of all kinds, including baseball and football games. Soon the high office of the Presidency becomes even more important than the country itself.

Certainly "Hail to the Chief" should be played at all public appearances of the President, but let us not substitute a salute to our No. 1 public servant in place of our national anthem.

Robbing Our Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Keynesian Socialists advising the President apparently are not concerned with the fact that the American citizen is being robbed, in effect, by unsound principles of financing the Federal Government, the hallmark of the Kennedy administration.

Yesterday's New York Herald Tribune carried David Lawrence's article on the subject:

MORAL ISSUES IN THE NATIONAL DEBT

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—In these days when spokesmen for the administration are piously stressing "reminders of conscience" and "moral issues" in the equal rights crusade, it may be wondered why those symbols of national behavior don't seem to apply also to the fiscal policy of the Government.

It might be assumed that it's all right to spend the total revenues taken from the citizens during the year and then to borrow still more and spend it, thus increasing an already recordbreaking debt. If the citizen were to conduct his affairs by that code, could he, too, plead that just a few years ago somebody else spent as much, if not more, and never paid off a dollar of debt?

In the parlance of the day, it has become a fad to denounce anyone who wants to balance the budget as some kind of reactionary or right winger. If the argument is offered that a conservative is a fellow who wants to conserve his savings and his property, the retort usually is that this is the obsolete and unsophisticated doctrine of a past generation. If fears are expressed, moreover, about the future value of the dollar—that it may buy less when it is taken out of the savings banks than when it was put in there, the answer given is that the national welfare demands such confiscation.

In the face of such euphemistic arguments, it is in the public interest for attention to be called to some salient facts which President Kennedy failed to make clear in his recent summary of the Nation's finances for the fiscal year which ended June 30.

The President said that last January his budget experts estimated that the fiscal year 1963 would show a deficit of $8.8 billion, but he added that it now is only $6.2 billion. This drop of $2.6 billion is supposed to bring sighs of relief, since it is pointed out that $1.7 billion of this decrease has been made possible by a cut in Federal spending and that $900 million more than expected came in from tax receipts, sales of assets and other payments to the Government since the January estimate was made.

Now $900 million isn't the only increase in revenues. For, actually, the total receipts of the Government in the fiscal year 1963 went up $5 billion above the 1962 figure. Of this sum $3 billion was contributed by tax money. But all of this was eaten up in Government spending just the same, and the budget was still left unbalanced with a deficit of $6.2 billion.

How can any institution remain in good health, fiscally speaking, if it uses up all of its increased receipts each year to pay current expenses and incurs also even a bigger deficit which requires the borrowing of still more money? Any thought of reducing the public debt, moreover, seems to have been abandoned altogether.

Yet this dilemma, which has gone unresolved for many years, doesn't appear to bother most of the politicians in Washington. They point out that it must be all right because in the peacetime years since World War II there has been a deficit every year with few exceptions and there is still enough unborrowed billions to send a man to the moon.

But the important fact to bear in mind is that fiscal unsoundness doesn't always reach its climax overnight and that, when the climax does come, it is too late to restore confidence.

The President, after surveying his own figures—showing that the current deficit isn't as bad as last January's estimate—finds comfort in a budget of $92.6 billion because it isn't as high as the $94.3 billion estimated last January. Yet the Federal budget was $87.8 billion just 12 months ago—in the fiscal year 1962. Why couldn't the U.S. Government have gotten along in 1963 with that big budget of $87.8 billion? How can a reduction in tax rates now be considered sound finance? Even if business is stimulated and tax receipts should grow in volume next year, why should the Government's expenses go up just the same?

These are the simple questions that are left unanswered today in the moral atmosphere of the National Capital where the preachers of "equal rights" and "equal protection of the law" show no signs of becoming conscience-stricken over the age-old principle that it's wrong "to rob Peter to pay Paul."

Freedom Now, But What Then?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert an article by Loren Miller, a distinguished Los Angeles civil rights attorney, appearing in the June 29, 1963, issue of the Nation, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This profound and challenging statement by one of America's best minds should be read by all Americans regardless of viewpoint. It points the way to a practical solution of many present difficulties.

Let us hope we move ahead responsibly as the article suggests to seize the opportunities that are so clearly delineated.

The article follows:

FREEDOM NOW, BUT WHAT THEN?

(By Loren Miller)

Within the foreseeable future, 18 million Negroes will burst the bonds of almost two centuries of isolation and surge into the mainstream of American life. Talents and energies now siphoned off into an all-consuming struggle against racial restrictions will be freed for application to man's fundamental problems. Moreover, the coming of that good day will end the enormous expenditures of human and economic resources long frittered away in the futile effort to preserve the segregation system. They, too, will become available for useful social purposes. However, it would be a mistake to assume that these profound changes will automatically usher in a society that will make full and effective use of these new potentials for social progress. We know better. Once before, almost a hundred years ago, a similar promise lighted up the American scene and was snuffed out after a decade of uncertain flickering.

In retrospect, it is apparent that one of the contributing factors to the failure of reconstruction to sustain a hastily improvised political democracy in the South was lack of foresight and absence of planning for what lay beyond emancipation. There were no guidelines for those who undertook the task of constructing a new social order to replace the old, which was swept away when 2½ million former slaves and a half-million disadvantaged free Negroes were incorporated into the American body politic. Everybody hoped for the best; nobody planned for it.

Abolitionists had glued their eyes on the destruction of slavery as an end in itself and, immersed as they were in the doctrine of the natural rights of man, they pitched their hopes for the best on a vague belief that individual merit would triumph in a society of free and freed men. Slaveholders had caught no vision because they could not admit the possibility that their peculiar institution could ever pass away; confronted with the reality, they were more than content to replace the old stratified order with another. Bedazzled by the glitter of white supremacy, poor whites were blind to the opportunities to make common cause with Negroes for an assault on common problems.

The Republican Party stumbled into civil war with no design for emancipation and consequently no blueprint for the problems inherent in victory. In an effort to supply Republican deficiency, Charles Sumner and Thaddeus Stevens prodded their party into enactment of the 14th and 15th amendments, but it fell under corporate leadership which quickly swapped the shaky democracy that had been created for the privilege of pursuing its own selfish ends. A new social order based on total exclusion of the Negro from political affairs, and his pursuant isolation, grew Topsy-like out of confusion. The history of race relations since that time has been the story of efforts to conserve and implement the Negro's isolation by the myriad devices of the segregation system and the complementary struggle of the Negro to batter down the walls of his Jim Crow prison.

The walls are tumbling down now and it is disturbing to find that we are ill prepared for the new reconstruction that must be undertaken when—no longer if—the segregation system topples and the Nation again faces the task of incorporating Negroes, 18 millions of them this time, into an American body politic in all ways infinitely more complicated than that of 1865. It may seem to the outsider that the segregation system is a peculiarly southern institution. Negroes know better. Its overt northern manifestations are seen in the massive ghettos of northern urban complexes and in the segregated public facilities they spawn. But there is more to segregation than that. Its spirit is all pervasive and where it does not separate, it isolates to breed frustration, hopelessness, despair, and hostility. Today's unpreparedness, akin to that of a hundred years ago, stems from the fact that intensive preoccupation with immediate and galling racial problems has minimized, almost precluded, consideration of what lies beyond victory. Attainment of civil rights, like emancipation, has become almost an end in itself.

Like their abolitionist forebears, civil rights proponents, traditionally led by the NAACP which now shares leadership with Martin Luther King, CORE, and the student movements, have been single minded in outlook: Destruction of the Jim Crow system is their one aim. Segregationist heirs of the slaveholders cannot, or will not, admit that their order is done for; they content themselves with yelling "never" at the top of their voices. Liberals gave their hearts to gradualism a decade ago and implicitly decided then that their notion of the future was the incorporation of the Negro in an evolving society on a pragmatic, step-by-step basis. The Democratic Party which, by a strange and ironic reversal of roles, has fumbled its way into whatever there is of party leadership of the liberation movement, cannot blueprint an integrated commonwealth because its composition compels it to deny that it envisages such a development. Lying at the back of everybody's mind has been the tacit assumption that there was plenty of time to plan for the future. Nobody had foreseen the explosion of the past few years.

Birmingham brought the revolution to sudden climax. Why, nobody knows. Maybe it was the dogs, maybe singing school children trooping into Bull Connor's paddy wagons, or maybe the completely symbolic picture of the white cop with his foot on a Negro woman's neck. Anyhow, in the expressive Negro idiom, we have run fresh out of time. The future is upon us. And with victory in sight and inevitable, we are confronted with the searching question of where we go from here. In essence, the inquiry is whether civil rights victory is an end in itself or only a beginning, a means to an end. At the moment, Negroes, whose answer is all important and perhaps decisive, seem to regard it as an end. The slogans under which they march are limited in scope. The freedom now concept contemplates putting the submerged southern Negro or the trapped northern ghetto dweller on a parity with his culturally deprived and disadvantaged white prototype. Fair housing and fair employment laws are designed to give the Negro equal access to existent supplies of housing and jobs, but fall short of coming to grips with the fact that vast reforms are necessary to provide an adequate supply of housing, and to stay the ravages of automation in those very categories in which Negroes must seek employment. The examples could be extended. This appraisal does not disparage Negro demands; they are valid and necessary tactical weapons in the struggle for equality. But as Whitney Young, National Urban League director, points out: "There are forces at work such as automation, urbanization and a host of others that, on the surface, are indifferent to race, which unless identified and remedial steps taken will find the masses of Negroes 5 years from today with a mouthful of rights living in hovels with empty stomachs."

White Americans also tend to regard attainment of civil rights as an end in itself when they talk about denials of such rights as being harmful to our international image, or by what they say about equalitarian housing and employment legislation, or even when they argue, as President Kennedy did recently, that Negroes should be secure in their constitutional privileges because it is morally right that they should enjoy them. Again, these views are valid as far as they go, but they neglect the fact that when the prisoner is freed, the jailer is given his liberty. Both may put their newly found freedom to good use by tackling the problem that made one of them prisoner and the other jailer in the first place. A quick glance will demonstrate how the denial of civil rights has affected, and still affects, the national welfare.

There are no ifs in history and we can never know who would have been elected to the presidency, to State legislatures or to Congress in the past three-quarters of a century if the Negro had not been deprived of the ballot. We do know that isolation of Negroes bred the one-party system of the South and that, in turn, it isolated that section from the rest of the Nation to the detriment of poor whites. Coincidentally, the one-party system aggrandized southern congressional power and gave southerners their present life-and-death control over Federal legislation. President Kennedy has complained that he is immobilized by southern control of the House Rules Committee. Critical urban problems, Federal aid to education, and housing issues, to pick a few examples, go unattended by Congress because their resolution will not fit a formula acceptable to the white South. We also know that labor organizations, agrarian-reform movements, trade and professional organizations, even service clubs, and the whole vast array of voluntary groups which play such a vital role in public affairs, have had to tailor their programs to suit the irrational demands of the segregation system.

The nub of the matter is that the existence of an unassimilated, and by definition unassimilable, racial group has had, and still has, telling consequences for the Nation. Americans have lived with this fragmentation so long, and it seems so natural to them, that they assume its permanence and reckon that if they extend full civil rights to the Negro component, and stop right there, they will have settled the issue. On this reckoning rests the widely held assumption that civil rights is an end in itself.

Of course, attainment of civil rights and the wiping out of all racial disabilities would produce immense satisfaction among Negroes and, by the same token, would exert a considerable influence on national life. The Negro bloc would at once become a powerful pressure group, demanding and getting concessions on all sides. Negroes would attend better schools. The Negro relief recipient would get his fair share of the dole. The Negro market for gray flannel suits would be enhanced. Jobs would be shared and in time the Negro unemployment rate would be lowered to that of the national average. An elite would be created within the Negro pressure group to seek its own ends, sometimes at the expense of other Negroes. Something of that kind has already happened in the comparatively free northern cities, with not a few middle-class Negroes staking out vested interests in the ghettos and retiring from the civil-rights fight with the feeling that all is well. In any event, the Negro racial bloc is going to persist for a long time to come and will inevitably function as a pressure center. The temptation to preserve and enhance that function will be great, with the conservatives of the middle class pulling in that direction; they are experts in the art of pressure and can be expected to hold fast to a familiar tactic. The gaping wounds of racial conflict can be healed within that context and Negroes have been forced to think in terms of race so long that it will be hard for them to lift their sights.

If, however, civil rights victory is regarded as only a beginning and a means, and the end envisaged is that of reforms that will cure the social, economic and political malfunctioning in our society that results in poverty, old-age insecurity, disemployment, lack of educational opportunity and other social plagues, the long-term yield to Negroes will be enlarged—provided, of course, that those ends can be attained. Freedom now will be a more desirable prize if the model's freedom approaches completeness. Fair housing and fair employment laws will become more meaningful if housing is in complete supply and within common economic reach, and if there is job security for all. In short, the enrichment of American life promises added rewards to all who are permitted to share in it. The Negro's quest for civil rights has always been two-pronged. The human desire to be treated as a man and the economic drive to get his fair share of what the Nation has had to offer.

There is a ferment at work within the Negro community, North as well as South, which pretty well precludes the possibility that Negroes will stop short with civil rights victory. The new militants who are emergent in terms of leadership are in revolt against the old in the Negro community as well as the old in white society. They are equalitarian in outlook and philosophy and where they now, correctly, see race as the prime inhibiting factor, they will learn soon enough that their civil rights victory will not be complete without lowering of other barriers that produce inequities and inequalities. And as in the case of Alexander, the young always yearn for new worlds to conquer.

Perception on the part of Negroes that attainment of civil rights must be regarded as a means rather than an end will not solve the problem that confronts the Nation. Whites must grasp and apply that lesson as well, but they must do it with their eyes wide open to the fact that Negroes have had their bellies full of paternalism and will have no more of it and that the Negro takeover of the civil rights movement, no matter what shape it assumes, is permanent and will not be relinquished. However, whites must take the initiative in an offer of alliance and must have more to offer than is presently visible. At the moment, the American scene is singularly devoid of movements calculated to quicken the pulse of the bold and imaginative youngsters who triggered the national upheaval against racial discrimination and pulled the props from under the segregation system. Communism is a deservedly dead letter. BARRY GOLDWATER's invitation for a retreat to the 1920's holds no allure and the cautious pragmatism of the New Frontier smacks of too much of an application of gradualism to be attractive. The bogged-down labor movement has lost the verve that set Negroes flocking to its standard in the New Deal ear. Who then shall sound the certain trumpet? The answer is that nobody knows. What is certain is that civil rights victory will release a determined band of restless and eager Negro youth whose energies ought to be channeled constructively.

That constructive purpose can best be served by a broad political movement, in the widest sense of that term, comprehensive of pressing domestic and international issues. Whether such a movement can function within the formalism of our present two-party system is not clear. That will have to be determined on a trial-and-error basis. Negro militants who must be enlisted if such a movement is to succeed are understandably chary about political action at the moment. Their success has been won outside of politics and they are cynical about political action in light of the manner in which civil rights has been used as a football by both parties. But time itself will drive home the lesson that problems entailed in incorporating Negroes into our tremendously complicated social and economic structure are political in nature and will propel the new militants into political action. There is no other road to reform in a political democracy.

Obviously, the Nation can, and should, use the imagination that conceived the sit-ins, the pray-ins, the wade-ins, and the freedom rides for application to other social purposes. And it needs to conserve and utilize the boldness and courage that led to the confrontations in hostile southern cities. We can ill afford to waste these talents at a time when we desperately need new and creative approaches to both domestic and international issues. Incorporated and utilized to the fullest in a political movement of broad scope and purpose, they can hasten needed reforms; isolated in a racial pressure bloc, they may only broaden old schisms. That the Nation needs to make full and effective use of these new potentials for social progress is not open to debate.

We are back where we began. The Nation has been given a second chance to solve the problem that Abraham Lincoln proclaimed with Emancipation a hundred years ago; that of constructing a social order to replace an old one swept away when Negroes burst out of isolation and sought admission to the American body politic. We muffed the first chance and consigned Negroes to a new, and in some ways more galling, isolation, and in the process shackled the Nation to the hobbled Negro. That first failure has haunted us ever since. Its consequences have become intolerable. We will achieve only half success this time if we settle back and accept civil rights victory as an end in itself. Foresight and planning can transmute that victory into a means for construction of a commonwealth as good as imperfect humans can build.

Let Actions Speak More Loudly Than Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, so many false statements are made in an effort to defeat the bracero program that it is difficult to find time to refute them all. Some are so patently false that one would ordinarily assume they would not be believed by anyone. But apparently, sometimes a false statement is so often repeated that it becomes believed by some who do not analyze the facts or the statement.

One such false statement is that farm jobs are so few and far between that there are hundreds of thousands of unemployed farmworkers in the United States. The fact is that there is none. Any farmworker—or nonfarmworker, also please note—who wants to work in the row-crop vegetable industry—average wage about a $1.40 per hour—can work today in California. Such jobs are going begging right now.

Whenever there is a bracero in the United States, there is a job for a domestic in the United States—in fact and by law.

The employment of a single bracero in my district has the same effect as hoisting a green flag to the top of the employment office. The employment of the first bracero is advertised widely by the State department of employment, the department of labor, by employment agencies, and among farmworkers and industrial workers. Each year with the first bracero, swarms of derelicts, alcoholics, and unemployed from the big cities of San Francisco, Oakland, Stockton, and Sacramento are brought or sent to the Salinas Valley. If they can present themselves and stand during a brief interview, they are referred or taken to a field and the grower is required to hire him and pay him promptly no matter how many hours he stays in the field. He may do no constructive work; in fact, he may—and often does—damage the crops; but nevertheless the bracero law requires that he must be paid immediately when he wants to quit.

Preposterous? I once thought so. But ask any farm placement worker or anyone who has actually been in the fields. It is true. Our laws protect the worker well. The point is, anybody can get a job in agriculture during harvest seasons. He can work for 1 hour or 6 months, whatever he prefers. If he prefers to work 1 hour—and some do—he will earn at least $1 and on the average about $1.40. This, of course, brings the average days a farmworker works per year down considerably. It also lowers the average yearly income of the farmworker considerably.

Anybody can find a row-crop vegetable harvesting job during the summer at a wage higher than he can earn in any other industry. Anyone who thinks he can disprove this statement may do so simply by producing a single, unemployed, able-bodied man or woman, with sight, above 18 years of age in the Salinas Valley. If opponents of Public Law 78 cannot produce such an unemployed person, I think they should no longer shout so loudly. Actions should speak more loudly and more persuasively than naked words in congressional hearings or records.

Speech by Dr. Enrique Llaca, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD a speech given at the "draft Goldwater rally" at the National Guard Armory in Washington, D.C., on the evening of July 4, 1963, by Dr. Enrique Llaca, Jr. Dr. Llaca is well equipped to speak on the subject of Cuban freedom, as his biography indicates.

A native of Havana, Cuba, 27 years old, Enrique Llaca received an A.B. degree from De La Salle College, a B.S. in economics, and a Ph. D. in law from Villanova University, Havana. He attended postgraduate courses at Madrid, Spain. He was admitted to practice law before the Cuban Supreme Court at the age of 22, and is the author of a study on the ecenomic development of Cuba.

Very early in 1959, Dr. Llaca denounced the Castro regime in a series of articles which obtained national resonance. He was arrested by Castro's G-2 in June 1959, and forced to seek diplomatic asylum in the Embassy of Chile. He became the first political exile of the Castro regime who had formerly opposed Batista's dictatorship.

Dr. Llaca held outstanding positions within the Cuban exiles organization which planned, in coordination with the Government of the United States, the Bay of Pigs invasion. Because of his fluent oratory and his knowledge of communism and world affairs, he conducted anti-Castro propaganda during 1960 throughout the Western Hemisphere, meeting with high government officials from several countries. Among them, Jorge Alessandri, President of Chile; Pedro Beltran, Prime Minister of Peru; and Julio C. Turbay, Ayala, Chancellor of Colombia.

In February 1961, Dr. Llaca joined a brigade of Assault 2506, the military force which landed at the Bay of Pigs on April 17, 1961. He participated in the invasion as transport quartermaster on the SS *Houston*, the ship sunk at the Bay of Pigs by Communist aviation.

After spending 20 months in Communist prisons, Dr. Llaca returned to the United States on December 24, 1962, as a result of the ransom deal sponsored by the U.S. Government.

Dr. Llaca's speech follows:

SPEECH BY DR. ENRIQUE LLACA, JR., CUBAN FREEDOM FIGHTER, VETERAN OF THE BAY OF PIGS, FOR DELIVERY AT THE NATIONAL ARMORY, WASHINGTON, D.C., ON THE EVENING OF JULY 4, 1963, AT THE DRAFT GOLDWATER RALLY

As Mr. O'Donnell has told you, I am not an American citizen. I am a Cuban. You may ask, "Why are you here before an American rally for a man who is being asked to seek the Presidency of the United States?"

I believe with all my heart that the future freedom of my fellow Cubans, as well as the millions of people behind the Iron Curtain, depends on the kind of leadership which will be provided by the man you elect as President in 1964.

More than that, I believe the future freedom of the people of the United States is in jeopardy. I want to testify from personal experience how easy it is to lose freedom and how difficult it is to regain. Truly, one blow to save freedom is better than a million to win it back.

I know these things from bitter experience. I saw Cuba ravished by communism, when I was sure it couldn't happen in my country. Communism reaches its evil goals by deceiving the people into thinking they are going to live in Utopia.

Americans, please be on guard! When we lost our freedom in Cuba, I vowed to fight to regain it, and I joined the Cuban freedom fighters. With the promise of support from the U.S. Government, we landed at the Bay of Pigs. At the crucial hour the air cover we were promised was withdrawn and we were betrayed.

As a result of that betrayal, many of my comrades in arms died, and the rest of us were thrown in a Communist prison. I was released because of ransom paid to Castro by the U.S. Government. But mark this well, there will be no one left to pay your ransom, no one left to come to your rescue. There will be no second chance for Americans.

American is the last hope for freemen. Should America fail, freedom fails everywhere.

The years of struggle which brought so much suffering will not be in vain if the United States learns it must provide leadership that will not vacillate, that will not equivocate, that will not accommodate our sworn enemy.

To the defense of the traditions and values Americans cherish we Cubans are completely committed. One of the great tragedies of the free world is the fact that our struggle for a free Cuba is laboring under conditions that greatly benefit the Communists. While Khrushchev sends Castro tons of modern weapons and economic aid to keep his regime going, the Kennedy administration clamped down on the Cuban freedom fighters.

Instead of blocking the stream of Soviet arms which continue to flow into Cuba and the Western Hemisphere in defiance of the Monroe Doctrine and the inter-American treaties, your present administration established a new blockade to protect the enemy and persecute our freedom forces in international waters.

If the leaders of the West are preparing a new Munich without taking into consideration the Cuban peoples' right to freedom; if the present leaders of the free world are secretly negotiating a false, precarious peace, implemented by enemy propaganda, let them know they will only swell to giant proportions the heroic resistance of my people and the freedom loving people throughout the Americas.

Fortunately we are not alone in this struggle. There are still leaders like Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, who has from the beginning stood by Cubans in their struggle to liberate our country from Communist oppression. Before, during, and after the humiliating Bay of Pigs invasion, BARRY GOLDWATER has stood resolutely on his belief that a man does not deserve freedom for himself unless he is willing to fight for the freedom of others.

BARRY GOLDWATER knows that the struggle to liberate Cuba is inseparable from the struggle for a free America, and he knows that to restrict any man's fight to regain his freedom is a blow against freedom everywhere.

Let all Americans remember on the Independence Day that the liberation of Cuba means a vital step toward fulfillment of the God-given destiny of your great Nation, to help all peoples of the world to obtain and preserve the ideals of independence, the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

I repeat, should America fall, there will be no one left to come to the rescue, no one to give the free world a second chance. What you do in the next year can make the difference.

Salute to Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Anthony A. Forlenza, public relations officer, Anthracite Counties Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Pittston, Pa., wrote a very thoughtful article on the meaning and the background of the U.S. flag. The Wilkes-Barre Record and the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Thursday, June 13, 1963, the day preceding the annual observance of Flag Day, each published Mr. Forlenza's article in their respective letters to the editor column, and as part of my remarks today I would like to include the aforementioned article:

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader, June 13, 1963]

SALUTE TO OUR FLAG

EDITOR, TIMES-LEADER NEWS:

The flag of our country is of tremendous patriotic importance to all of us. It is the one and only official emblem representing American heritage. The flag is the symbol of all our cherished ideals and of our national character and progress through the ages—yesterday, today, and tomorrow. Furthermore, the flag pays tribute to the million American men who have fought and died for all freedoms since the very beginning of our history.

One of the early American writers—Henry Ward Beecher—declared with emphasis that the flag of our country is not a painted rag. It is the whole history. It is the Constitution. It is the Government. It is a free people that stands in the Government and the Constitution.

Yes, the flag is truly a living entity. It is a vital part of every man, woman, and child who sees and who loves its colorful array of 13 red and white stripes and the 50 stars assembled upon the tranquil field of blue.

Our flag has led American soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen to victory in many struggles against the enemies of American freedom. Those national heroes have followed the flag and have given their lives for all that it symbolizes in the Spanish-American War, in two World Wars and in the Korean conflict, around the world on foreign soils, and the seven seas.

The flag also expresses joy and hope. It is carried proudly by those who march in cadence with gay music. It holds the honored position at the political rally and at the graduation exercise, and at the assembly of citizens.

The flag graces the churches of our land where spiritual leaders and their followers are fully aware that freedom of worship is theirs only because the Constitution of our land guarantees that privilege—and that the flag speaks for the Constitution.

Displaying Old Glory is the only answer to the challenge of worldwide communism.

If you don't have a flag, buy one. If you fly that flag, it will suggest to friends and neighbors to fly theirs.

Be a patriotic American and show your appreciation of the American way of life by unfurling Old Glory on Friday, June 14.

ANTHONY A. FORLENZA,
Public Relations Officer, Anthracite Council, VFW.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Record, June 13, 1963]

VFW OFFICIAL REMINDS READER THE FLAG IS A LIVING ENTITY

EDITOR OF THE RECORD:

Since tomorrow is the birthday of the American flag, I thought the following comments and remarks would be newsworthy and of interest to your readers.

The flag of our country is of tremendous patriotic importance to all of us. It is the one and only official emblem representing American heritage. The flag is the symbol of all our cherished ideals and of our national character and progress through the ages—yesterday, today, and tomorrow. Furthermore, the flag of our country pays tribute to the million American men who have fought and died for all freedoms since the very beginning of our history.

WOODROW WILSON'S WORDS

We can go back through our history and quote many who have expressed words of praise for the flag of the United States. Whatever has been said in the past applies equally well today. For example, what President Woodrow Wilson said about the Stars and Stripes flag more than a half century ago can be our description of it today. He declared: "This flag, which we honor and under which we serve, is the emblem of our unity, our power, our thought, and our purpose as a nation. It has no other character than that which we give it from generation to generation. The choice is ours. It floats in majestic silence above the hosts that execute those choices, whether in peace or in war."

One of the early American writers—Henry Ward Beecher—declared with even more emphasis that the flag of our country is not a painted rag. It is the whole history. It is the Constitution. It is the Government. It is the free people that stands in the Government and the Constitution.

Yes the flag of our country is truly a living entity. It is a vital part of every man, woman, and child who sees and who loves its colorful array of 13 red and white stripes and the 50 stars assembled upon the tranquil field of blue.

Our flag has led American soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen to victory in many struggles against the enemies of American freedom. Those national heroes have followed the flag and given their lives for all that it symbolizes—in the Spanish-American War, in two World Wars, and in the Korean conflict—around the world on foreign soils and the seven seas.

UNFURL "OLD GLORY"

In behalf of those honored dead the Stars and Stripes says as clearly as a human voice would speak—these were my honored defenders. Their loyalty, their courage, their achievements, and their sacrifices should be your inspiration forever.

The flag of our country also expresses joy and hope. It is carried proudly by those who march in cadence with gay music. It holds the honored position at the political rally and at the graduation exercise and at the assembly of citizens who are gathered for free discussion of ideas and differences of opinions.

Also the flag graces the churches of our land where spiritual leaders and their followers are fully aware that freedom of worship is theirs only because the Constitution of our land guarantees that privilege—and that the flag speaks for the Constitution.

Displaying "Old Glory" is the only answer to the challenge of worldwide communism. If you don't have a flag, be sure to buy one. If you fly the flag, it will encourage your friends and neighbors to do likewise.

Be a patriotic American and show your appreciation of the American way of life by unfurling "Old Glory" tomorrow.

ANTHONY A. FORLENZA,
Public Relations Officer, Anthracite Counties Council, VFW.

Most Areas Get Exciting View of Sun Spectacular

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, Maine was treated to the spectacle of a total eclipse last Saturday.

An article appearing in the July 21 issue of the Portland Sunday Telegram gives a good account of this event, and I insert it into the RECORD:

MOST AREAS GET EXCITING VIEW OF SUN SPECTACULAR

(By John F. O'Brien)

BAR HARBOR, MAINE.—The shadow of the Moon streaked across central Maine Saturday in a total eclipse of the Sun viewed clearly by thousands gathered in this seaside resort.

Skies over central Maine cleared just before the shadow swept out of the northwest, through Canada to Maine and out to the Atlantic Ocean. The time of total eclipse was 5:44 p.m. e.d.t.

SHADOW RACES

About 1,000 persons perched atop this area's best vantage point, 1,532-foot-high Cadillac Mountain, first saw the gray shadow in the distance as it approached over the rugged central Maine mountains.

Then, at the moment of totality, the mountaintop was plunged into darkness, one of nature's rarest spectacles.

The eclipse itself provided a breathtaking view. At the moment of totality where the Sun had been there was only a cold gray white light. Stars were perfectly visible in the sky.

Observers on the mountaintop were almost speechless. One man said, "It was fantastic. It's a sight I'd wait years to see."

The faint light that was visible just before and just after totality was cold and eerie. A chill swept across the mountaintop as the temperature dropped in 25 minutes from 76° to 68°.

BOOM IN SKY

Just as totality ended there was a sharp boom in the sky which startled observers. Scientists said it may have been an Air Force jet fighter, racing through the sky with the eclipse, had cracked the sound barrier.

Thousands of visitors vied with scientists and each other for vantage points to watch the phenomena that turns day into night.

The 60-mile-wide belt of pitch blackness—totality—extended from Japan and across Alaska, Canada and central Maine.

The moment of totality here was 5:42 p.m. e.d.t.

Cadillac Mountain, highest Atlantic seaboard elevation in the United States, swarmed with scientists and sightseers. Telescopes, cameras, spectrophotometers, and other sensitive equipment poked snouts skyward.

SKY IS LIMIT

The sky was the limit for the once-in-a-lifetime thrill of watching the rare celestial show which the prophets once said signaled the end of the world.

An estimated 100,000 tourists jammed coastal and central Maine. The State figured they paid nearly $10 million in extra highway tolls, sales taxes, and food and lodging to watch the sky spectacular.

While various groups of scientists gazed up at the heavens, others were watching the effects of the eclipse on fish, insects, and wildlife.

Astronomers hoped to fathom some of the mysteries of nature and eventually to apply that knowledge to life in the space age.

Scientists were particularly curious about the shimmering Bailey's Beads, visible only a few minutes before, during, and immediately after totality. These are flashes of sunlight shining through the Moon's mountains and valleys.

HEAVY GEAR

Other scientists lugged heavy equipment up the mountain to study the Sun's corona or halo and to measure airglow.

Each expedition was allocated a roped-off area on the mountain patrolled by 42 uniformed rangers. A 6-mile road goes to the plateau-like summit covered with scrub growth.

Senator Goldwater's Reckless Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, this may be hard for my colleagues to believe, but there are just a few Arizonians who do not subscribe to all the well-publicized views of our junior Senator, Mr. GOLDWATER. One Arizonian who thinks for himself is William R. Mathews, editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star in Tucson. Last Tuesday, July 16, Mr. Mathews took issue with Senator GOLDWATER's recent pronouncements on the subject of foreign policy. I believe my colleagues will find it of interest. The editorial follows:

SENATOR GOLDWATER'S RECKLESS FOREIGN POLICY

When Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, before a nationwide conservative meeting in Washington, criticized President Kennedy because he has determined definitely to live in coexistence with the Soviet Union, GOLDWATER went way off base into a field of reckless foreign policy.

Since the Soviet Union was founded in 1917 we have been living in coexistence with it. It is the period since 1945 that has seen the political power of the world polarize into the two poles of the Soviet Union and the United States. Whereas, before 1945 political power had been dispersed widely among the former great powers of Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United States, and the Soviet Union, both political and military power today is concentrated in the hands of the two giants.

They live in coexistence. Those Americans who oppose such a situation, and insist it should be ended, in effect demand that we Americans destroy the Soviet Union, which can only be done by a gigantic nuclear war. They assume also that Americans would win this war, although it would mean the loss maybe of one-third to one-half of our population. They also assume that should we be victorious, that peace and security would come, which is not necessarily true. To assume that the destruction of the Soviet Union would destroy communism is just about as mistaken as to say that the Roman conquest of Jerusalem, and its destruction in 92 A.D., destroyed Christianity.

Moreover, even if their country is badly destroyed, the Russians will recover. They are an unusually sturdy people, who since 1914 have survived all kinds of destruction, only to rise again. So it would be again. The Soviet Union, or a strictly Russian Government, would rise again, and become strong.

We Americans should not forget that for more than a century the British and French—in later years Germany also—sought to curb Russian imperialism in its attempt to move south. Today we have that job, as our 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean indicates. It is there for just one purpose: to contain Soviet imperialism, and so we can live in coexistence with the Soviet Union.

That is what all of our other armaments are about. They have only one main objective: to enable us to live in coexistence with the Soviet Union. They have been built up, because, after we nearly disarmed after World War II, the Russians took advantage of such military weakness to establish themselves in what are today their eastern satellites. They tried to take over Turkey, Greece, Iran, and Korea. They tried to squeeze us out of Berlin. Not until we reluctantly fought back, were such moves stopped, although what they have done in Cuba is significant.

The policy of coexistence has paid off, when it was backed by both force and political determination to contain the spread of Soviet Communist imperialism. When it was not backed by those two factors, the Soviets moved in as they did in Cuba.

President Eisenhower, a Republican, established that blindly stupid Cuban policy. President Kennedy inherited it. Eventually we will have to get the Soviets out of Cuba, even though it will take force. But when it is done, it will not bring on a worldwide nuclear war.

Senator GOLDWATER has overlooked too many of these factors that have made coexistence a successful diplomatic policy. The only alternative to it, assuming we back it with all our might and power so as to prevent further encroachments, is preventive war, in which we strike the first blow in a gigantic surprise attack on the Soviet Union.

Are the Republicans going to nominate and elect a President who favors such a reckless war policy?

Senator GOLDWATER is being most unjust to identify that policy with conservatism. It is hard to believe that conservatives throughout the country will endorse it.

A Foreign Service Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to insert a letter written by one of my constituents expressing his views on a Foreign Service Academy:

DETROIT, MICH.,
July 12, 1963.

Hon. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GRIFFITHS: I have several misgivings about the superficially desirable proposal for a Foreign Service Academy. In the first place, the proposed academy is conceived of as an agency for manufacturing specially trained people rather than as an institution of education. This is the same philosophy that makes the presently operating academies—notably the military academies—unacademic and largely antiacademic. Narrow training designed for an immediate and specialized end seldom provides the experience needed to think imaginatively about unforeseen nontextbook problems. The military academies are slowly recognizing the shortcomings of narrow vocational education. Is the philosophy of the proposed Foreign Service Academy not just as narrow?

Secondly, the proposed academy will presumably be a major and especially prestigious supplier of diplomats and lesser Foreign Service personnel. Is it desirable to have a large percentage of our diplomats coming from a single intellectual environment? Even large universities often find whole departments on intellectual fads which, while perhaps desirable to have some diplomats acquainted with, should not be a common way of thinking for any large percentage of the Foreign Service.

Thirdly, it is hard to imagine how a Government academy could develop any tradition of critical intellectual analysis of present and past foreign policy. How could a Foreign Service Academy free itself from crank accusations that it is not sufficiently doctrinaire in its methods? Michigan's State universities cannot seem to escape intimidation from simplistic rightwing legislators. What would happen if a Communist scholar lectured on campus? Indeed, what would Senator DIRKSEN say if Professor Rostow lectured?

Fourth, the security investigations that would be made of the faculty and the students would reduce the academy to peddling safe ideas. This kind of policy would undoubtedly be forced on the academy as it was forced on the Peace Corps. Its sterilizing effects are well known.

The professional quality of our Foreign Service obviously needs improvement. The problem, I suggest, is not that our country lacks people whose education qualifies them as diplomats and foreign policy makers. The difficulty is that many of these competent people cannot afford to enter or stay in the Foreign Service. Money invested in providing realistic expense allowances for diplomats would open the diplomatic corps to many who cannot now afford this kind of job. To the extent that there is a deficiency in particular skills (such as languages), the Government can make certain that the humanities programs of regular academic institutions can provide these skills. In this regard, Congress might expand the National Defense Education Act to the humanities—not in a narrowly vocational manner as the National Defense Education Act now operates for the physical sciences at the expense of the nonmilitary biological sciences—but in a broad program to stimulate education in all areas.

Respectfully,

JOHN KOZA.

Will More of Our Defense Secrets Go to the Communists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, a most disturbing article by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott in the July 17 issue of the Long Island Press should alert the Congress to immediate action.

Those who are realists know full well that Nehru is a weakling in the face of communism and that he has tolerated known Communists in important government positions. It is astounding that the Kennedy administration should be so naive even to consider revealing our secrets to this great international phony.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES MAY GIVE INDIA KEY DEFENSE SECRETS

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—That expanded military aid agreement the United States is signing with India contains an unprecedented provision for a neutral country—giving her scientists access to vital U.S. defense installations and military secrets.

Arrangements already are underway by White House assistants to bring 50 Indian scientists here this fall to familiarize them with the development and operation of top-secret rocket launching and radar systems.

Under terms of this still-classified agreement, the Defense Department will roll out the red carpet for the Indian scientists and make available to them the most sensitive details of the Army's Nike-Hercules antiaircraft missile system, the Air Force's ground-to-air communication systems, and other vital details of U.S. radar developments.

The security clearance of these visiting scientists—the vanguard of several hundred others to follow—is being left up to the government of Prime Minister Nehru—despite strenuous objections by Pentagon security officials.

They warn that tremendous security risks are involved because the Indian Government permits known Communists to hold key scientific posts and to work in crucial defense installations.

Also citing the extremely close ties between scientific groups in India and Russia, the Defense security officials noted that under the U.S.-India pact there are no effective bars against the Indian scientists' passing on knowledge they gain in this country to Soviet Russia.

Squarely in line with this backstage Pentagon fear is the fact that a high-level Indian military mission is enroute to Moscow to discuss a similar military agreement with the Soviet. Also, a large group of Indian scientists, among them some slated to come here, recently returned from an extended tour of Russia.

Senate Armed Services Committee Members, headed by Senator Richard Russell, Democrat of Georgia, are planning to summon Deputy Assistant Defense Secretary William P. Bundy, who drafted the Indian agreement, to question him about these disbriefed on the India air program.

The Senators also contemplate interrogatthe controversial jet fighter sale to Yugoslavia in 1960–61, will be grilled particularly on why he failed to transmit this information to the congressional committees he briefed on the India air program.

The Senators also contemplate interrogating Bundy and other administration officials about a suppressed Intelligence report that the Nehru government is considering permanently surrendering the original target of Red Chinese border aggression.

According to this intelligence document, top members of Nehru's regime favor formally acknowledging Chinese sovereignty over some 15,000 miles of the Aksai Chin area in northeastern Ladakh. This is the region where Peiping has built a strategic road linking its Sinkiang Province with conquered Tibet.

In return for this reputed backdown—which is directly counter to the announced policy of India—Nehru would seek concessions elsewhere as part of a broad settlement of the long-pending frontier dispute with the Communists.

In recent weeks Premier Chou En-Lai is known to have made to Delhi overtures for a border deal. Senate Armed Services Committeemen want to know how this development may affect this country's huge military air program to India.

They are especially bent on ascertaining whether disclosing vital U.S. military secrets to India really is essential to stem Red Chinese aggression, or if the Indian scientists are being brought here as part of an elaborate plan of a small group of administration policymakers to build India into a so-called third force military power in southeast Asia.

The State Department is picking up the tab for those Indian political leaders touring the United States in support of more aid for India. One of the officials is S. N. Dwivedy, deputy chairman of the Praja Socialist Party. He is saying that a realinement of political forces is certain after Prime Minister Nehru steps out.

According to Dwivedy, if the conservative wing of the dominant Congress Party gains control, the Praja Socialists will soon become the major opposition party. If this happens it will pave the way for the return of former Defense Minister Khrishna Menon, the ousted leftist U.S.-hating intimate of Nehru. Menon still is a key adviser of Nehru, according to intelligence.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week we commemorated Captive Nations Week. I indicated to the Members throughout the period the tremendous nationwide interest that has been generated in this year's observance.

Not only did the programs receive the active participation of millions of American citizens, but the press of our country, recognizing the moral righteousness of the cause of captive nations helped direct attention of the public to this most vital question.

I place in the RECORD at this point two editorials which are typical of nationwide press comment. The first is from the Indianapolis News, of Monday, July 15, and the second from the Dallas Morning News, of Wednesday, July 17:

[From the Indianapolis News, July 15, 1963]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

This is Captive Nations Week in Indiana.

Pursuant to a resolution passed this year by the legislature, our State devotes the third week in July to commemoration of the cause of freedom behind the Iron Curtain.

In the words of that historic resolution—the first on record adopted by any State—"It is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive."

Captive Nations Week is a small contribution by Hoosiers to this cause. It is intended to demonstrate that the people of Indiana are committed to the belief that freedom is as precious for others as for ourselves, and that we have not abandoned Eastern Europe or China or Cuba to their Communist captors.

This week's observances in Indiana stress bipartisan solidarity on this score. Gov. Matthew Welsh has issued a proclamation declaring Captive Nations Week officially in effect. Mayor Albert Losche, honorary chairman of the Indiana Captive Nations group, has done likewise. Congressman DONALD BRUCE participated in yesterday's opening ceremonies on Monument Circle, and Treasurer of State Robert Hughes will participate in those tomorrow evening at the World War Memorial.

Indianapolis citizens can be proud that they are helping lead the way in affirming the common fate of liberty throughout the world. If we concede the perpetual slavery of the Communist captives, we are surrendering not only a timeles moral principle, but our own strategic well-being as well.

To win the cold war, the West must adopt a strategy of the offensive. This means pushing back the frontiers of slavery, and extending the boundaries of freedom.

As with every great accomplishment, this one must begin with a firm and unwavering commitment to the ultimate goal. Captive Nations Week, obviously, is only a beginning point in a Western strategy of victory over communism. But it is a beginning fraught with hope—for freedom and for the security of our Nation.

[From the Dallas-Morning News, July 17, 1963]

CAPTIVE NATIONS

The proclamation by President Kennedy on Captive Nations Week is so inoffensive to the Iron Curtain slave masters that it has enlisted a barrage of strong protests from anti-Communists here at home.

What makes these people particularly angry is that the President has made it clear that he was not at all enthusiastic about issuing even a mildly worded proclamation and that he would not have issued one at all if Congress did not require that he go through the formalities.

In 1959 both Houses of Congress adopted a unanimous, joint resolution calling on the President to set aside Captive Nations Week every year. The resolution specifically called for a strong condemnation of communism.

It pledged that the United States would dedicate its efforts to liberating the people of the captive nations, to assisting slaves behind the Iron Curtain in the overthrow of their masters. It went so far as to single out those oppressors by name.

Twice President Eisenhower carried out the spirit of this resolution by issuing strongly worded proclamations which caused the Kremlin considerable embarrassment and reportedly sent Premier Khrushchev into a rage.

But Mr. Kennedy doesn't like to do that sort of thing. His three proclamations have been mildly worded, inoffensive statements which Representative THOMAS M. PELLY, Republican, of Washington, has described as "dry, brittle recitals of the facts of existence of captive nations."

In none of Mr. Kennedy's proclamations has there been any direct mention of who the oppressors of the captive nations are. No reference to communism. Not a word about the Soviet Union, Red China, or Cuba.

If Mr. Kennedy had issued such an inoffensive to the Reds—statement only once, it might be passed off lightly as a miscalculation. But three times he has issued such a statement, and each time over the strong protest of numerous groups which have called for tougher statements.

There can be only one conclusion: Mr. Kennedy's proclamations have been conscious, studied efforts to avoid offending the Soviets and their cohorts.

This year, almost as if he wanted to rub salt into the wounds, Mr. Kennedy took the occasion of the Independence Day weekend to send a message to Premier Khrushchev pledging his efforts to continue cooperating toward the solution of the problems which divide us. This message was sent out at almost the same time that the President's captive nations proclamation was released. The message to Khrushchev was given far greater fanfare by the White House and in the Nation's press.

It is difficult to understand these actions if the President and this Nation are truly dedicated to the preservation and extension of freedom. How continued efforts to placate and avoid condemning the enemy can promote that goal is hard to understand. The President, or someone else, should explain.

An Excellent Argument for the Enactment of H.R. 545

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the Washington Post of July 8, 1963, concerning the case of Charles Bernstein and his conviction for murder.

H.R. 545 would abolish capital punishment in all Federal jurisdictions except for treason and except for offenses committed under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. As the Post points out, if Bernstein had been executed there would be no point in arguing the merits of his conviction.

The article follows:

MARGIN FOR ERROR

There are surely some lessons to be learned from the case of Charles Bernstein, convicted of murder and sentenced to die in the electric chair in 1932, pardoned by President Truman in 1945 and made the beneficiary of an indemnification bill introduced by Senator KEFAUVER and currently before the U.S. Senate. Bernstein's unhappy history is an interesting one.

He was convicted of unlawful entry in New York City at the age of 18 and sent to a reformatory. He was convicted of robbery in Minneapolis and served 9 years in Stillwater Penitentiary before being released upon the recommendation of his prosecutor, Floyd Olson, subsequently Governor of Minnesota, who became convinced that the conviction had resulted from mistaken identity. He was convicted in Philadelphia on a charge of carrying a concealed weapon.

With this unsavory record, Bernstein was indicted for the shotgun murder of a gambler named Milton Henry on a Washington street early on the morning of April 21, 1932. Convicted and sentenced to death, he spent 8 years in prison, 2 of them in a death cell. On several occasions, he was reprieved moments before electrocution. In 1940 President Roosevelt commuted his sentence to the time already served. In 1945, President Truman gave him a full and unconditional pardon.

The Presidential pardon did not assert that Bernstein was innocent. It was based, apparently, on serious doubts respecting the validity of his conviction—doubts which grew out of the dubious character of a witness who identified him as having been at the scene of the crime, out of contradictory testimony concerning him and out of the inadequacy of the case presented in his behalf by a court-appointed attorney. The Department of Justice continues, as in the past, to be unwilling to endorse Senator KEFAUVER'S bill to compensate Bernstein in the amount of $25,000.

Two morals can be drawn from this story. It illustrates dramatically, we think, the peril that an irremediable injustice will result from the infliction of capital punishment. Had Bernstein been electrocuted, there would have been no opportunity to recognize the infirmities in his trial or to argue about compensating him for a dreadful wrong.

The second moral is more subtle. Released from prison, Bernstein has led during the 18 ensuing years a law-abiding and useful life. He is at present a respected employee of the Agriculture Department. He affords a living illustration of the hope, the possibility, that human beings, no matter how steeped in crime, may be redeemed and rehabilitated. In the face of such an instance of redemption and rehabilitation, can society ever justify a condemnation to death?

Tender, Loving Index

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have been pleased to observe the manner in which my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona, the Honorable GEORGE F. SENNER, JR., has gone about his job of representing the people of the new Third District of Arizona since he first came to Washington last January. I have particularly noted the fact that he studies issues and votes on the basis of his own judgment and convictions. The gentleman from Arizona, Congressman SENNER, is obviously nobody's rubberstamp.

However, this is not the impression given readers of that eminent journal of ultraconservative bias, the Dan Smoot Report. In a recent issue that publication rated the voting records of the Members of Congress, and it seems, the gentleman from Arizona, Congressman SENNER, did not rank too high. In fact, he received a rating of zero. Noting this fact, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SENNER] wrote a report for his constituents which I think deserves the attention of all who find their names occasionally on Mr. Smoot's tender, loving index. The report follows:

I recently learned that I flunked a test administered by that illustrious gentleman, Dan Smoot.

For those of you who may not know him, Mr. Smoot is a Texan who publishes a weekly magazine called the Dan Smoot Report, and conducts a weekly news analysis broadcast on radio and television. He is a self-styled guardian of the Constitution, although there is some question as to which constitution Mr. Smoot is guarding.

In his May 27 report, Mr. Smoot listed recorded rollcall votes on several pieces of legislation with this explanation: "Rollcall tabulations in this report are unique in that we try to select only those votes which reflect a stand for or against constitutional principles." To clarify matters, Mr. Smoot carefully defines a liberal as one who votes against what he considers to be constitutional principles. By implication, therefore, a Smoot conservative is one who votes for Smoot's constitutional principles.

It appears that out of 535 Congressmen there are only 58 who voted for Mr. Smoot's constitution every time. The rest were either on his side just part of the time or else opposed his ideas every single time as I did—along with 148 other Congressmen.

The real significance of Dan Smoot and his report is that he represents a certain type of fuzzy thinking that unfortunately exists in America today. For this reason, I believe a useful purpose can be served by examining some of the issues selected by Mr. Smoot to test the patriotism of those men and women elected to Congress by the people of America.

SILVER LEGISLATION (H.R. 5389)

Basically, this bill withdraws silver backing of paper currency. According to Smoot, "This bill to demonetize silver certificates would create a greater drain on our gold reserve, and speed arrival of the day when foreigners may decide to wreck our entire economy by foreclosing on the gold in our monetary reserve." Anyone voting for the bill was a liberal and an anticonstitutionalist, which therefore included 258 Representatives and 68 Senators.

What the Texas wizard either deliberately failed to mention or simply did not know was that the free world cannot supply enough silver for our coin mintage needs. Therefore, unless this legislation had passed it would soon have become necessary to purchase silver from Iron Curtain countries. Apparently, therefore, Mr. Smoot must believe that the Constitution—his Constitution—requires this country to give aid and comfort to the Communists by purchasing their silver with our gold for this monetary silver certificate.

Incidentally, in voting for this bill, I found myself on the same side of the fence as such noted "liberals" as JOHN RHODES, Senator KARL MUNDT, Senator HARRY BYRD, Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, Congressman JOEL BROYHILL, Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, and Senator JOHN TOWER.

RULES COMMITTEE (H. RES. 5)

Permanent enlargement of the House Rules Committee by two members. According to Mr. Smoot, "The sole purpose was to give totalitarian liberals a majority, thus handicaping conservative opposition to administration proposals."

Assuming his reasoning to be accurate, which it wasn't, then Mr. Smoot has labeled all 145 members of the Republican conference as "totalitarian liberals" since that group voted unanimously to enlarge the committee by two members, providing the composition was 9 Democrats and 6 Republicans.

Furthermore, Smoot's frightening assumption that one small group should determine what legislation the body of elected Representatives will or will not be permitted to consider, in my opinion refutes his stated belief in American constitutional principles.

Detailed Explanation of the Interest Equalization Tax Proposal of the Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting in the RECORD, for the information of the Members of Congress and the interested public, a detailed explanation of the interest equalization tax proposal of the administration along with other supporting information on this proposal. I would like to point out that the detailed explanation is dated July 18 and since that time there have been three Treasury releases relating to the original proposal which I am also including. These three releases contain certain modifications in the original proposal which are self-explanatory.

As you know, this tax is being proposed so as to help alleviate our continuing very serious balance-of-payments problem. It is a part of a coordinated series of actions on the part of the administration to correct our balance-of-payments deficit. Although I am personally opposed to the increase in the discount rate by the Federal Reserve System, I am in complete accord with the equalization tax proposal and other parts of this coordinated program.

DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THE INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX

1. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE TAX

The proposed interest equalization tax is a special excise tax to be imposed through the end of 1965 on the acquisition of foreign stock, securities, or obligations, other than those specifically exempted. The tax is payable by all U.S. persons, including organizations exempt from Federal income tax. It is based on the actual value of the interest acquired; in the case of debt securities or obligations, the rate of tax will vary with the period remaining until maturity. The tax applies to portfolio purchases of foreign securities, whether representing new or already outstanding issues, and whether the acquisition is effected in the United States or abroad. It does not apply, however, to purchases of securities presently held by Americans.

The tax will not generally be applicable to direct investments by U.S. persons in overseas subsidiaries or affiliates, nor will it apply to any indebtedness payable upon demand or maturing in less than 3 years. Moreover, loans made by commercial banks in the ordinary course of their banking business will be exempted. The tax will not be applied to purchases of securities issued by international organizations of which the United States is a member, governments of countries considered to be less developed, and corporations whose principal activities are centered in less developed countries.

The tax is not a stamp tax. A U.S. person who acquires any foreign stock or debt obligation will be required to file a return and pay the tax at the time of filing. The first of such returns will be due at the end of the first full calendar month following the end of the calendar quarter in which implementing legislation is enacted and will cover all prior acquisitions subject to its provisions. Returns thereafter will be due at the end of the calendar month following each calendar quarter in which a U.S. person makes any acquisition subject to the legislation.

The tax is applicable to acquisitions occurring after the date of the President's message in which it was proposed. Since an acquisition is deemed to occur when the purchaser first becomes unconditionally obligated to buy, the tax does not apply to purchase commitments made on the open market on or before the date of the President's message, or to other purchases which the buyer on that date was unconditionally obligated to make. Substantial evidence will be required, however, to demonstrate the existence of such an obligation. The tax is also inapplicable to acquisitions made within 60 days after the date of the President's message if the foreign stock or debt obligation acquired was covered by a registration statement filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission within 90 days prior to the date of the President's message.

This tax will not be deductible for Federal income-tax purposes, but will be included in the adjusted basis of the foreign stock or debt obligation acquired.

2. RATE AND COMPUTATION OF TAX

The tax is based upon the actual value of the interest acquired, actual value being determined under principles established by the Treasury regulations pertaining to the documentary stamp tax on original issues of stock. Under these rules, the price agreed upon by parties dealing at arm's length in a transaction subject to no special conditions constitutes actual value. (See Treasury Regulation § 47.4301-1(b)(2)(ii).)

In the case of stock or other equity interests, the rate of tax is 15 percent. In the case of debt obligations, the rate of tax is a percentage varying in accordance with the period remaining before maturity, as follows:

Maturity and tax rate

	Percent
At least 3, but less than 3½ years	2.75
At least 3½, but less than 4½ years	3.55
At least 4½, but less than 5½ years	4.35
At least 5½, but less than 6½ years	5.10
At least 6½, but less than 7½ years	5.80
At least 7½, but less than 8½ years	6.50
At least 8½, but less than 9½ years	7.10
At least 9½, but less than 10½ years	7.70
At least 10½, but less than 11½ years	8.30
At least 11½, but less than 13½ years	9.10
At least 13½, but less than 16½ years	10.30
At least 16½, but less than 18½ years	11.85
At least 18½, but less than 21½ years	12.25
At least 21½, but less than 23½ years	13.05
At least 23½, but less than 26½ years	13.75
At least 26½, but less than 28½ years	14.35
At least 28½ years or more	15.00

In determining the rate of tax applicable to the acquisition of an obligation, the actual period of time beginning with the date of acquisition and ending at maturity is taken into account. The maturity of an obligation is deemed to be the latest date on which, under its terms, the amount payable to the holder of such obligation may remain outstanding. Thus, for example, the 13.75 percent rate applies if payment is not absolutely required in less than 23½ years. Where an obligation is renewable without affirmative action manifesting consent on the part of the holder, the period to maturity is considered to include any renewal period. Any extension of the term of an existing obligation through affirmative action on the part of the holder will be regarded as the acquisition of a new debt obligation with a remaining period to maturity equal to the remaining life of the old obligation plus the extension period.

The computation of the tax may be illustrated by the following examples:

Example 1

On June 1, 1964, A, a U.S. citizen, purchases from B, a nonresident alien, 20 year bonds of X, a foreign government, having an actual value of $20,000. The bonds mature on December 31, 1974, and therefore have a remaining period to maturity of 10 years and 7 months. Assuming that the transaction is not exempt, A would incur a tax of 8.30 percent of the actual value of the bonds or $1,660.

Example 2

The facts are the same as in example (1) except that, under the terms of the bonds, the obligation is automatically renewable for an additional period of 10 years if the holder does not demand payment within 30 days following the elapse of the initial term. The period to maturity is deemed to include the renewal period of 10 years. Accordingly, assuming that the transaction is not exempt, A would incur a tax of 12.25 percent of the actual value of the bonds or $2,500.

Example 3

In 1962, C, a domestic corporation, acquires from Y, a foreign corporation, 5-year promissory notes of Y with a face value of $17,500. In 1965, C surrenders the notes to Y in exchange for new 30-year bonds of Y. The new bonds have an actual value of $18,000. The period to maturity is deemed to include the entire period to maturity of the new bonds, or 30 years. Accordingly, assuming that the transaction is not exempt, C will incur a tax of 15 percent of the actual value of the new bonds or $2,700.

Example 4

In January of 1964, D, a U.S. citizen, acquires from Z, a foreign corporation, on original issue, its 15-year bonds, having an actual value of $10,000. Under the terms of the indenture securing the issue of bonds, a sinking fund is to be accumulated by Z and used at the end of each year to retire bonds to be selected by lot. The bonds are considered to have a maturity of 15 years. Accordingly, assuming that the transaction is not exempt, D would incur a tax of 10.30 percent of the actual value of the bonds or $1,030.

3. PERSONS SUBJECT TO THE TAX

Every U.S. citizen, every resident individual or partnership, and every domestic corporation, estate or trust is subject to the tax. These terms have the meaning already assigned to them by the Internal Revenue Code; such persons are generally referred to as U.S. persons. Determination of liability for the tax is made as of the time of acquisition, and later changes in status have no effect. As set forth in paragraph 7, however, foreign stock or debt obligations cannot be acquired free of tax from a person who has not been a U.S. person throughout his entire period of ownership of such interest or continuously since the date of the President's message.

These rules may be illustrated by the following examples:

Example 1

In 1964, A, a U.S. trust, all the beneficiaries of which are nonresident aliens, acquires stock in N, a foreign corporation. Assuming that the transaction is not exempt, A is subject to tax.

Example 2

On June 1, 1964, B, a citizen and resident of foreign country X, acquires bonds of foreign corporation O. On July 1, 1964, B becomes a resident of the United States and on July 15, 1964, acquires additional bonds of O. The June 1, 1964, acquisition of bonds by B is not subject to tax, and no tax is payable by B upon becoming a U.S. resident. However, assuming that the transaction is not exempt, the July 15, 1964, acquisition is subject to tax.

4. INTERESTS THE ACQUISITION OF WHICH IS SUBJECT TO TAX

The tax applies to the acquisition of any stock, security or other debt obligation of any international organization, foreign government (including any agency or political subdivision thereof), foreign corporation, partnership, estate or trust, or a nonresident alien individual, unless acquisition of the stock or obligation is covered by an exemption described in paragraph 5 or such transaction is an excluded acquisition described in paragraph 7. The status of the shareholders of a foreign corporation, members of a foreign partnership or beneficiaries of a foreign estate or trust is irrelevant for this purpose. The tax applies to the acquisition of any stock or obligation, whether or not negotiable and whether or not represented by a certificate or other writing, including any shares representing beneficial interest in an organization which would be taxable as a corporation under the provisions of section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code if subject to U.S. tax. Limited partnership interests would be treated as stock.

Acquisition of a depository receipt or other evidence of interest in any of the foregoing is treated as an acquisition of the underlying asset. Options, warrants and rights to acquire foreign stock or obligations are subject to tax unless received in a distribution which is not considered a taxable acquisition, as described in paragraph 6.

5. INTERESTS THE ACQUISITION OF WHICH ARE EXEMPT FROM TAX

Exemptions from the tax are provided for acquisitions of interests which do not fall within the area of long-term capital outflows to which the tax is designed to apply. These exemptions relate to the type of interest acquired.

Short-term indebtedness: The tax does not apply to the acquisition of any indebtedness payable upon demand or within 3 years of the date of acquisition. Thus, acquisition of a long-term obligation may qualify under this exemption if the obligation is due or overdue (and therefore payable upon demand) when acquired or payable within 3 years thereafter. The rules for fixing the period to maturity in order to determine the applicable tax rate, set forth in paragraph 2, also apply in determining whether an obligation is payable within 3 years. Accordingly, where an obligation is automatically renewable without affirmative action on the part of the holder, it is not considered an exempted short-term indebtedness unless the entire unexpired term, including any renewal periods, totals less than 3 years.

Commercial bank loans: Also exempted from the tax are acquisitions representing loans made for commercial purposes by banks in the ordinary course of their banking business. This exemption applies even if the maturity of the loan exceeds the minimum 3-year period. It is irrelevant whether the loan is evidenced by a note or other evidence of indebtedness. The exemption does not extend, however, to investment banks, trust companies or others not regularly engaged in a commercial banking business. Where a person is engaged both in the commercial banking business and in other businesses or activities, only those transactions related solely to the commercial banking business are exempt.

Required reserves of insurance companies: An acquisition of foreign stock or debt obligations is exempt from the tax if made by a corporation in the normal course of an insurance business conducted in one or more foreign countries (and not with the intent to sell such interests or offer them for sale to any U.S. person), to the extent that the interests acquired are, or would have been, required to be held in connection with such business by application to such business of foreign laws which were in force on the date of the President's message. Thus, a company insuring risks in a foreign country which requires the holding of reserves relating to such risks in local securities or obligations would be permitted to acquire free of tax the holdings necessary to meet such requirement with respect to its business. The exemption extends, however, only to the extent that the foreign country does not, after the date of the President's message, enact more stringent reserve or holding requirements. The test is not the amount of holdings on the date of the President's message; if, by applying the foreign law in effect on such date, increased local holdings are, or would have been, required (for example, to reflect higher levels of insurance in force), acquisitions necessary to achieve the needed increase are exempted. If, however, the increased holdings are required by changes in the applicable foreign law, acquisitions designed to meet the changed requirement are not exempt from the tax.

Direct investment: The tax does not apply to the acquisition of a direct investment in a foreign subsidiary or affiliate. Under this exemption, any acquisition of the stock or debt obligations of a foreign corporation is free of the tax if the U.S. person immediately following the acquisition owns at least 10 percent of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote. The 10 percent test is applied without regard to the attribution rules prescribed by various provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. The exemption for direct investment applies to purchases of stock or obligations of the foreign corporation from third parties as well as loans and capital contributions made directly to it.

An acquisition qualifying as a direct investment is denied the exemption, however, if the foreign corporation is formed or availed of by the U.S. person for the purpose of acquiring any stock or obligation which could be subject to tax if acquired directly, unless the foreign corporation makes such acquisition: (a) in the normal course of a commercial banking, securities underwriting or brokerage business conducted in one or more foreign countries; or (b) in the normal course of an insurance business conducted in one or more foreign countries, to the extent that the interests acquired are, or would have been required to be held in connection with such business by application to such business of foreign laws which were in force on the date of the President's message. This rule is designed to prevent avoidance of the proposed tax by indirect acquisitions through foreign affiliates, while leaving free of tax investment in affiliates which acquire securities interests in the normal course of their active business activities.

An acquisition otherwise qualifying as a direct investment loses its exemption as such if made with the intent of selling or offering for sale to any U.S. person any stock or obligation acquired. This rule will prevent avoidance of the tax through a combination of the direct investment exemption and the exclusion from the tax of later acquisitions by other U.S. persons purchasing from the direct investor.

The principles set forth in this section may be illustrated by the following examples:

Example 1

On January 13, 1964, A, a U.S. citizen, acquires 100 shares of the only class of stock of foreign corporation N, which immediately thereafter has a total of 1,000 shares outstanding. N acquires no stock nor any obligations having a maturity of 3 years or more. A's acquisition of the 100 shares of N stock is exempt from tax as the acquisition of a direct investment.

Example 2

The facts are the same as in example (1), except that later in 1964, A lends N $100,000, taking a 5-year promissory note in return. A's acquisition of the indebtedness of N is exempt from tax as the acquisition of a direct investment.

Example 3

The facts are the same as in example (1), except that later in 1964 A purchases from R, a nonresident alien, an additional 50 shares of the stock of N. A's acquisition of the 50 shares is exempt from tax as the acquisition of a direct investment.

Example 4

The facts are the same as in example (1), except that N is a foreign personal holding company, engaged solely in investing and trading in stock and obligations of foreign persons. Since N is availed of by A for the purpose of acquiring interests which would be subject to tax if acquired directly by A, A's acquisition of the 100 shares of N stock is not exempt as the acquisition of a direct investment.

Example 5

The facts are the same as in example (1), except that N acquires 100 percent of the voting stock of foreign corporation O, which acquires no stock or obligations of foreign persons. A's acquisition of the 100 shares of N stock is exempt from tax as the acquisition of a direct investment, since the interest acquired by N in O would, if acquired directly by A, be exempt from tax as the acquisition of a direct investment.

International organizations: The tax is also inapplicable to acquisitions of obligations of international organizations of which the United States is a member. This exemption does not extend to purchases of obligations of foreign persons, even though these obligations are acquired from an international organization of which the United States is a member.

Less developed countries: The tax is not applicable to the acquisition of obligations issued or guaranteed by the government of a less developed country or an agency or subdivision of such a government. Nor is it applicable to stock or obligations of a corporation which, during its last annual accounting period prior to the acquisition, meets the definition of a "less developed country corporation" in section 955(c) of the Internal Revenue Code by reason of conducting an active business in countries designated as less developed for purposes of this tax. This includes companies which meet the standards of section 955(c)(2) by reason of their deriving income from aircraft or vessels registered under the laws of a designated country. The exemption would also be available for new issues of stock or obligations of a corporation which establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary or his delegate that it has met these tests for a period of 60 days prior to the issuance of such stock or obligations and that it may reasonably be expected to continue to meet such tests for such period as the Secretary or his delegate may deem appropriate.

The countries to be considered less developed countries for the purposes of this exemption will be designated in an Executive order to be issued by the President. For the interim period prior to the issuance of an order under the new legislation, all countries designated as less developed by Executive Order No. 11071, dated December 27, 1962, will be considered to be less developed for purposes of this tax. This includes all countries, and oversea territories and possessions of countries (other than countries within the Sino-Soviet bloc) except the following: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany (Federal Republic), Hong Kong, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of South Africa, San Marino, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and United Kingdom.

The designation of a country as a less developed country could be terminated by a further Executive order after 30 days' notice to the Congress. Any termination will not affect the treatment of acquisitions occurring prior to the issuance of the terminating Executive order.

6. TAXABLE ACQUISITIONS

In general, any acquisition of stock or debt obligations of a foreign issuer or obligor will be subject to tax unless specifically exempted. It is irrelevant whether, for Federal income tax purposes, the transaction in which such interest is acquired would be characterized as a sale or exchange, a contribution to capital, a loan, or otherwise. The fact that the acquisition occurs as part of a transaction which is tax free for Federal income tax purposes does not mean that it is exempt from this tax. A contribution to the capital of a foreign corporation will be considered an acquisition of a stock interest in such corporation, whether or not any new shares or certificates are issued. A contribution of foreign stock or obligations to the capital of a domestic corporation constitutes a taxable acquisition by such corporation. The pledge or mortgage of stock or obligations as security for a debt will not be considered an acquisition by the pledgee or mortgagee, but any subsequent foreclosure, collection or purchase will constitute a taxable acquisition.

When a U.S. person acquires an option, warrant or right to acquire foreign stock or obligations, the acquisition is limited to the option, warrant or right itself; and tax is computed on the actual value of that interest alone, at the rate applicable to the stock or obligations which may be acquired on exercise. A later exercise is considered a separately taxable acquisition; and the tax is then computed on the actual value of the interest then acquired, less the value of the option, warrant or right previously taxed. Conversion of an obligation into stock of the same issuer will be considered an acquisition subject to tax, but the amount will be reduced by the amount of tax appropriate to the acquisition of the obligation.

The distribution as a dividend of stock or obligations, or rights to acquire the same, will not be considered an acquisition. This is true whether or not such distribution is tax free for Federal income tax purposes. In addition, the tax will not be payable upon the receipt by a domestic corporation of stock or obligations in a foreign corporation, or its distribution of such stock or obligations to its shareholders, pursuant to a reorganization described in section 368(a) of the Code. These rules will permit the continued acquisition of foreign securities in cases where no outflow of capital from the United States is involved.

Gifts, legacies, bequests and similar donative transfers will not be treated as taxable acquisitions.

The fact that the acquiring person is an underwriter, dealer or other person engaged in the distribution of securities will not exempt him from tax. Thus, if an underwriter makes a firm purchase of securities the acquisition of which is subject to tax, this constitutes a taxable acquisition, even though the acquisition constitutes part of an underwriting distribution which contemplates the resale of the securities by the underwriter. (An exclusion in the case of resales to foreigners is set forth in paragraph 7. Subsequent acquisitions by Americans in the distribution process would not bear the tax under the rules relating to nontaxability of acquisitions from other American persons, described in paragraph 7. Exclusion of brokers and agents' transactions is also described in paragraph 7.)

If any security is acquired on behalf of a U.S. person by a nominee, the U.S. person is liable for the tax. Any acquisition by a U.S. person will be deemed to be for his own account and not as a nominee unless the person furnishes adequate proof that the acquisition was for the account of another person, whether a U.S. person or a foreigner.

To prevent avoidance of the tax through interposition of foreign entities, the transfer of cash or other property by a U.S. person to a foreign trust or partnership will be considered the acquisition of a taxable interest, unless it is first established to the satisfaction of the Secretary or his delegate that the foreign trust or partnership will not acquire stock, securities or obligations, the direct acquisition of which by the U.S. person would give rise to the tax.

The rules set forth in this section may be illustrated by the following examples:

Example 1

In 1964, A, a U.S. citizen, purchases for $1,000 warrants entitling him to purchase at any time within 2 years 100 shares of the common stock of M, a foreign corporation, at a total price of $10,000. Assuming that the transaction is not exempt, the acquisition of the warrants by A is subject to tax based upon the actual value of the warrants ($1,000 if A was dealing at arm's length and no special conditions affected the transaction).

Example 2

The facts are the same as in example (1), except that later in 1964, A exercises the warrants. The shares acquired on exercise have an actual value at that time of $12,000. Assuming that the transaction is not exempt, the acquisition of shares of M stock by A is subject to tax based upon the actual value of the shares at the time of their acquisition ($12,000), less the actual value of the warrants at the time of their acquisition ($1,000) or $11,000.

Example 3

B, a domestic corporation, receives as a dividend distribution from foreign corporation N rights to acquire the stock of foreign corporation O. B's acquisition of these rights is not a taxable acquisition.

Example 4

C, a U.S. citizen, is a stockholder in domestic corporation P. Pursuant to agreement, foreign corporation R acquires all of the stock of P in return for voting stock of R, in a transaction which qualifies as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code. P distributes the voting stock of R to C in exchange for his stock in P. Prior to the reorganization, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue issues a ruling under section 367 of the Internal Revenue Code that the exchange pursuant to the reorganization was not in pursuance of a plan having as one of its principal purposes the avoidance of Federal income taxes. Neither the acquisition by P nor the acquisition by C of the voting stock of R is considered a taxable acquisition.

Date of acquisition: An acquisition is deemed to occur when a U.S. person first becomes unconditionally obligated to acquire the stock or debt obligation involved. In the normal open market purchase, this occurs on the trade date, that is, the date when the order to purchase is executed. It is irrelevant when legal title passes to the acquiring person, when certificates or other evidence of interest are delivered, or when any payment or other performance by the purchaser occurs. If the obligation of the U.S. person to acquire the interest is subject to conditions precedent which are more than mere nominal conditions, the acquisition will not be deemed to occur until those conditions have been satisfied. For example, if the obligation of a U.S. lender to purchase promissory notes of a foreign corporation is subject to the purchaser's receipt on the closing date of an opinion of counsel that the notes are duly issued and binding obligations of the issuer, the acquisition will not be deemed to occur until that opinion has been delivered.

7. NONTAXABLE ACQUISITIONS

An acquisition will not be subject to tax if it constitutes merely a broker's or agent's transaction, if the acquisition is from another U.S. person, or if it is made by an underwriter or dealer for resale to foreigners as part of an underwriting distribution.

Brokers' and nominees' transactions: The tax would not apply to the acquisition by a broker or his nominee of foreign stock or securities solely for the purpose of enabling the broker to sell or accept delivery of the stock or securities on behalf of his customer. A transfer into the name of a selling agent, such as a bank, would generally be subject to tax, although no liability would be incurred if a certificate or other evidence of interest is merely delivered to an agent who acquires no legal title or other interest in the underlying stock or security. An underwriter acting only on a "best efforts" basis therefore will not bear the tax. Several technical exemptions will be made in the case of transfers of legal title without change in beneficial ownership. These rules generally follow those applied under the stock and securities transfer taxes.

Acquisition from another U.S. person: An acquisition of stock or debt obligations by a U.S. person from another person who has been a U.S. person during the entire period of his ownership of the stock or debt obligations (or continuously since the date of the President's message) will not be subject to tax. In determining whether he is exempted from tax by this rule, the purchaser will be entitled to rely upon a certificate supplied to him, attesting to the prior U.S. ownership. This certificate is to be executed either by the former owner or by the nominee of the former owner.

The signature must be guaranteed by a bank or member of the National Association of Securities Dealers. Where the certificate is executed by a nominee, it will not be necessary to reveal the name of the actual owner to the purchaser; but the nominee will be required to maintain adequate records to identify the U.S. person for whose account the securities were held and to establish such owner's U.S. citizenship, residence or incorporation during his period of ownership. While it is anticipated that the certificate in the great majority of cases will be delivered to the purchaser at the time of delivery of the related security, it could be delivered within any reasonable period of time thereafter. Temporary forms of certificates which the Treasury Department will accept on an interim basis will be made available promptly by the Internal Revenue Service.

The effect of this rule will be to exempt from the tax stock and debt obligations which are held by U.S. persons on the date of the President's message, and to assure that only one acquisition tax will be paid on such interests thereafter acquired, so long as continuous U.S. ownership is maintained. A person who has not maintained his status as a U.S. person during the entire period of his ownership of a security (or continuously since July 18, 1963) would be unable to execute the certificate referred to above; this rule is intended to prevent abuse of the U.S. exemption through changes in residence status or place of incorporation.

Brokers, dealers and their nominees will be permitted under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate to utilize simplified certificate procedures where a large volume of transactions executed through other brokers or dealers are involved.

Anyone executing a false certificate will be liable for the tax that would otherwise have been collected from the purchaser upon the acquisition and to criminal and civil penalties. The purchaser, however, will still be absolved of any tax liability unless he has actual knowledge of fraud committed in the execution of the certificate.

Underwriters or dealers reselling to foreigners: Any U.S. underwriter or dealer who resells foreign stock or securities to foreigners, as part of the distribution of a new issue offered to the public, will be exempted from tax otherwise payable upon his acquisition of the stock or securities. Any person claiming this exemption will be required to report his acquisition, specify the manner in which such stock or securities were distributed, and attach to his appropriate return certificates of American ownership covering such stock or securities, executed by the underwriter or any dealer participating in the distribution and selling the interests to any person other than a U.S. person. Thus, for example, an underwriter, as part of an underwriting, may sell stock to a U.S. dealer who buys them for his own account. The underwriter is tentatively subject to the acquisition tax and may properly execute and deliver to the dealer a certificate of American ownership covering such stock. If the dealer does not in turn deliver a certificate of American ownership when he resells the stock, he may execute such a certificate with respect to the stock and return it to the underwriter. The underwriter may then claim exemption by filing the proper return and attaching the dealer's certificate. The dealer remains exempt from tax by virtue of the certificate of American ownership received from the underwriter.

In general, any resale by an underwriter or dealer will be subject to this rule if made within the period of time provided in the underwriting agreement for the distribution of the underwritten issue.

Payment of tax must, however, be made by the underwriter or dealer upon filing of the return covering the period during which his acquisition occurred if the conditions for exemption have not then been fulfilled; and sales will not be considered to be part of the distribution of the issue unless it can be clearly established that the stock or securities sold are part of the seller's allotment or participation.

8. EFFECTIVE DATE

As previously indicated the tax will be applicable to acquisitions occurring after the date of the President's message, an acquisition being deemed to take place when a binding commitment is made to acquire the interest involved. The tax will not be imposed, however, on acquisitions of stock or securities covered by a registration statement (or, in the case of an open-end investment company, a posteffective amendment) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on, or within 90 days prior to, the date of the President's message where such acquisitions occur within 60 days after the date of the President's message. This rule relates only to the number of shares or face amount of indebtedness set forth in the registration as of the date of the President's message; if the number of shares or face amount of indebtedness covered by the registration statement is increased by amendments filed after that date, none of such interests may be acquired free of tax. Other amendments to the registration statement will not affect the taxability of acquisitions.

This provision is designed to avoid hardship to foreign issuers with public offerings of securities in an advanced stage of preparation. The rules providing cutoff dates are designed to prevent abuse of the exception, either through reactivation of old filings of registration statements subsequently "put on the shelf" or in cases where a long-term exemption might otherwise be achieved under a registration statement contemplating a continuing public offering over a substantial period of time (as might be the case, for example, under a registration of shares offered by a foreign investment company).

9. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Returns and payment of tax: Every U.S. person making an acquisition of foreign stock or debt obligations which is subject to tax will be required to report that transaction by filing a return. In addition, a return will be required with respect to transactions which do not bear the tax because of prior American ownership or because of the exemption for interests resold by underwriters or dealers to foreigners. Returns will not be required with respect to interests the acquisition of which is exempt as described in paragraph 5 or with respect to brokers' or similar transactions described in paragraph 7.

The first of such returns will be required to be filed on or before the last day of the first full calendar month following the end of the calendar quarter in which implementing legislation is enacted and will cover all transactions subject to the legislation occurring on or before the last day of such calendar quarter. Thereafter, returns will be required to be filed on or before the last day of the calendar month following the end of the calendar quarter in which an acquisition is made. All acquisitions for the covered quarter may be reported in the same return. Payment of any tax due on transactions reported in the return must accompany it. If the person filing the return has received any Certificate of American Ownership and claims exemption from tax on a transaction by reason of the prior American ownership shown in such certificate, the certificate must accompany the return. As described in paragraph 7, a certificate must also be submitted when an underwriter or dealer claims exemption by reason of resale to a foreigner.

Administrative provisions: Provision will be made for the application of the civil and criminal penalties for the failure to file returns, filing of fraudulent returns, the willful failure to file a return or to pay tax, etc., which are provided in the case of other Federal taxes. Interest on underpayment or nonpayment of the tax will also be collectible. The period of limitations for assessing the tax or for filing a claim for refund of taxes paid will be comparable to that provided in the case of Federal income taxes.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., July 20, 1963.

July 19 remains the effective date of the interest equalization tax, recommended by President Kennedy, on purchases of all foreign securities outside of the United States, the Treasury said today.

Following the President's message on July 18, the Treasury announced a delay to August 16 as the date from which purchases of outstanding foreign securities would be subject to the rules of the proposed tax, if those purchases were effected on U.S. national securities exchange registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The delay does not apply to transactions carried out on foreign securities exchanges nor to transactions in the United States or elsewhere which are not carried out through U.S. registered securities exchanges. The recommended effective date of the proposed tax on such transactions, and for taxable newly issued foreign securities purchased by American investors, remains July 19.

The Treasury and representatives of the exchanges are currently developing the detailed procedures involved in applying the rules of the proposed tax to transactions on these U.S. exchanges.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., July 21, 1963.

JOINT CANADIAN-UNITED STATES STATEMENT

Representatives of Canada and the United States met in Washington during the weekend to appraise the impact on the Canadian financial markets of the proposed U.S. "interest equalization tax."

The two Governments recognize the need for effective action to improve the balance-of-payments positions of both countries and both are equally determined that such action shall not impair the intimate economic relationships between the two countries, nor impede the growth essential for both economies.

For many years the capital markets of the two countries have been closely interconnected, and U.S. exports of capital to Canada have financed a substantial portion of the Canadian current account deficit with the United States. This need continues. A portion of these flows must be supplied through the sale of new issues of Canadian securities in American markets. United States officials had considered that ample flows for these needs would continue under the proposed "interest equalization tax." However, Canadian representatives stated that this would require a very substantial rise in the entire Canadian interest rate structure. It was recognized by both governments that such a development would be undersirable in the present economic circumstances.

In the light of this situation U.S. officials agreed that the draft legislation to be submitted to the Congress would include a provision authorizing a procedure under which the President could modify the application of the tax by the establishment from time to time of exemptions, which he could make either unlimited or limited in amount. The President would thus have the flexibility to permit tax-free purchases of new issues needed to maintain the unimpeded flow of trade and payments between the two countries, and to take care of exceptional situations that might arise in the case of other countries. U.S. officials made clear that this did not modify their proposals regarding the taxation of transactions in outstanding securities; over the past year such transactions between Canada and the United States have not been a major factor.

The Canadian authorities stated that it would not be the desire or intention of Canada to increase her foreign exchange reserves through the proceeds of borrowings in the United States, and it is the hope and expectation of both Governments that by maintaining close consultation it will prove possible in practice to have an unlimited exemption for Canada without adverse effects on the United States.

It was agreed that active consultations would continue to strengthen the close economic relations between the two countries and at the same time facilitate measures for making the maximum practicable contribution to economic expansion and the strength and stability of both currencies.

The conversations which were conducted in the U.S. Treasury on Saturday and Sunday included for Canada, Ambassador Charles S. A. Ritchie; Louis Rasminsky, Governor of the Bank of Canada; A. F. W. Plumptre, Assistant Deputy Minister of Finance; and A. E. Ritchie, Assistant Under Secretary of State for External Affairs; for the United States, Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury; George Ball, Under Secretary of State; Robert V. Roosa, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs; and Stanley Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., July 18, 1963.

The Treasury Department announced today that purchasers of foreign securities traded on a national securities exchange registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission would not be subject to the interest equalization tax proposed by the President in his message to the Congress today on purchases made on such exchanges prior to and including August 16, 1963.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., July 19, 1963.

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX

BACKGROUND

The President today announced a series of coordinated actions to reinforce the administration's program to correct the U.S. balance-of-payments deficits, including a request for an interest equalization tax, to be effective July 19, 1963. This special temporary excise tax would remain in effect through 1965. The Federal Reserve System has also announced an increase of one-half percent in the discount rate and a rise in the ceiling interest rate permitted to be paid by banks on time deposits.

The move by the Federal Reserve System should, without constricting credit generally, increase short-term interest rates in the United States relative to those abroad and thus help to dampen the outflow of short-term funds from the United States. During 1962, that outflow amounted to $0.5 billion on recorded account; and unrecorded transactions showed a further loss of $1.0 billion, the bulk of which is believed to represent short-term capital. The short-term capital outflow has continued in substantial volume so far this year.

A parallel reinforcing measure, upon which congressional action has been requested, involves a special interest equalization tax applicable to certain portfolio transactions that entail longer term capital movements from the United States. The pressure of the heavy flow of domestic private savings into the U.S. capital market, combined with our highly developed and efficient market facilities, have been reflected in a level of long-term borrowing costs in this country far below those prevailing in most industrialized countries abroad. These domestic savings are consequently also overflowing abroad in large volume. It is not expected that longer term borrowing costs in this country will change appreciably following the change in the discount rate and related short-term market rates, given this ample supply of domestic savings.

At the same time, however, the long-term rates appropriate to domestic needs invite a volume of securities sales in the United States by foreigners that places heavy strains on our balance of payments. In 1962 $1.1 billion of new foreign long-term securities were sold to U.S. interests; and sales of new foreign securities in the U.S. market are running at a substantially higher rate this year. Purchases of outstanding foreign bonds and equities by U.S. interests have also been large and have substantially increased in 1963.

The administration for some time has pointed out that a portion of these foreign needs for capital now met from U.S. sources might more appropriately be satisfied in the borrower's own market or by countries with balance of payments surpluses. The imposition of the proposed tax will encourage this process by tending to equalize costs of longer-term financing in the United States and in markets abroad, reducing the incentive to raise capital in the United States simply to take advantage of a possible interest cost saving. The tax, to be applied to purchases by U.S. interests of foreign securities sold by foreigners, would introduce a differential of approximately 1 percent between capital costs of domestic and foreign borrowers seeking funds in the U.S. market.

The tax will thus complement the action of the Federal Reserve System designed to influence short-term rates, without impeding access to the American market by foreigners unable to find longer-term funds available on reasonable terms elsewhere nor preventing purchase of foreign securities by American interests. Allocation of funds for investment in foreign securities and the determination of securities to be offered in the U.S. market would continue to be the result of market prices and decisions. Accordingly, the interest equalization tax serves domestic and international needs in a way that supports the essential freedom of our trading and financial markets, and fulfills our special responsibilities at the center of the financial system of the free world. By relying on the uniform and nondiscriminatory application of an excise tax, this method of influencing aggregate American purchases of foreign securities assures that selection among issues will be freely made on the basis of the same considerations that would prevail if the entire structure of long-term interest rates were raised by 1 percent.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE TAX

The interest equalization tax would be a special temporary excise tax, to remain in effect through 1965, imposed on the acquisition of stock, securities or other obligations of foreign issuers or depositary receipts or other evidence of interest in, or rights to acquire, such interests. The tax would be payable by all U.S. citizens, residents, and corporations, including organizations exempt from Federal income taxes. The tax would apply to portfolio purchases of stock or debt securities issued by foreign corporations, governments, or other persons, whether such securities represented new or already outstanding issues and whether the acquisition was effected in the United States or abroad. It would not apply, however, to purchases of interests presently held by Americans.

The tax would not be applicable to direct investments by U.S. persons in oversea subsidiaries or affiliates, nor would it apply to acquisition of any indebtedness payable upon demand or maturing in less than 3 years. Moreover, loans made by commercial banks in the ordinary course of their banking busines would be exempted. The tax would not be applied to purchases of securities issued by international organizations of which the United States is a member, governments of countries considered to be less developed, and corporations whose principal activities are centered in less developed countries. An underwriter or realer would be exempted from the tax on acquisitions of stock or obligations resold to foreigners as part of the underwriting of a new issue.

The tax would be applied to acquisitions occurring after the date of the President's message. It would not apply to purchase commitments made on the open market on or before that date or to other purchases which the buyer on that date was unconditionally obligated to make. Exemption from the tax would also be provided for purchases made within 60 days after the date of the President's message if the security purchased were covered by a registration statement filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission within 90 days prior to the date of the President's message.

RATE OF TAX

The tax, which would be based on the value of the security acquired, would be imposed at the rate of 15 percent in the case of stock. In the case of debt securities, the rate of tax would be geared to the remaining period to maturity, ranging from 2.75 percent to 15 percent, as follows:

Maturity and tax rate

	Percent
At least 3 years, but less than 3½ years	2.75
At least 3½ years, but less than 4½ years	3.55
At least 4½ years, but less than 5½ years	4.35
At least 5½ years, but less than 6½ years	5.10
At least 6½ years, but less than 7½ years	5.80
At least 7½ years, but less than 8½ years	6.50
At least 8½ years, but less than 9½ years	7.10
At least 9½ years, but less than 10½ years	7.70
At least 10½ years, but less than 11½ years	8.30
At least 11½ years, but less than 13½ years	9.10
At least 13½ years, but less than 16½ years	10.30
At least 16½ years, but less than 18½ years	11.35
At least 18½ years, but less than 21½ years	12.25
At least 21½ years, but less than 23½ years	13.05
At least 23½ years, but less than 26½ years	13.75
At least 26½ years, but less than 28½ years	14.35
At least 28½ years or more	15.00

The tax would not be deductible for Federal income tax purposes but would be included as an item of cost in the tax basis for the stock or obligation acquired.

LIABILITY FOR THE TAX

The U.S. person making a taxable acquisition would be liable for the tax, which would be collected through the filing of returns. The first of such returns would be due at the end of the first full calendar month following the end of the calendar quarter in which legislation imposing the tax is enacted and would cover all prior acquisitions subject to the legislation. Returns would thereafter be due at the end of the calendar month following each calendar quarter in which a U.S. person made any acquisition. This would not be a stamp tax; no obligation to compute or collect the tax would be imposed on the issuer or seller, or any underwriter, dealer, broker, or transfer or deposit agent (except with respect to his own purchases).

EXCLUSION OF SECURITIES PREVIOUSLY HELD BY AMERICANS

An acquisition from another U.S. person would not be subject to tax. To permit tracing of securities covered by this exclusion, a U.S. transferor would execute a certificate attesting that he was a U.S. citizen, resident or corporation during the period of his ownership of the security. A nominee would be permitted to attest that the security had been held for the account of a U.S. person if such nominee kept adequate records to identify the actual owner of the securities and such owner's U.S. citizenship, residence or incorporation. The signature on any certificate would be required to be guaranteed by a bank or member of the National Association of Securities Dealers. In determining his liability for the tax, a purchaser would be entitled to rely on any such certificate. While the certificate might be delivered along with the security in most cases, it could be delivered within a reasonable time thereafter.

There are attached temporary forms of certificates, together with instructions and sample filled-in forms, which the Treasury Department will accept in fulfillment of these requirements pending enactment of the legislation by the Congress and issuance of regulations and forms thereunder. These interim forms will be made available promptly by the Internal Revenue Service, and facsimile reproductions conforming to the requirements of Revenue Procedure 61-31, 1960-2 Cum. Bull. 1003, will be accepted.

EXPLANATION OF EXEMPTIONS

As indicated above, no acquisition would be subject to the tax if the obligation acquired is payable upon demand or within 3 years of its acquisition. Most trade financing transactions will fall within this exception. In addition, the exemption of loans made by commercial banks in the ordinary course of their banking business will permit tax-free trade financing on a longer term basis.

Direct investments in oversea subsidiaries and affiliates would be exempted from the tax. A direct investor would be defined as one who owns at least 10 percent of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock of a foreign corporation entitled to vote. If a U.S. person qualified as a direct investor, his acquisition of both stock and debt securities of the foreign corporation would be exempted. This exemption would be denied, however, if the foreign corporation were formed or availed of by a U.S. person for the purpose of acquiring securities which would be subject to tax if acquired directly, unless the foreign corporation acquired the securities in the normal course of a commercial banking, securities underwriting, or brokerage business conducted in one or more foreign countries. Insurance companies would be exempted from tax on the acquisition of foreign securities in the normal course of a foreign insurance business carried on either directly or through subsidiaries, to the extent that the securities acquired are, or would have been, required to be held in connection with such business by application to such business of foreign laws which were in force on the date of the President's message.

Purchases of securities issued by any international organization of which the United States is a member would not bear the tax. This would exempt purchases by Americans of the obligations of such organizations as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Inter-American Development Bank.

The exemption for acquisition of securities issued by governments of less-developed countries would include purchases of securities issued by any corporation with the guarantee of such a government, as well as securities of political subdivisions.

The exemption for purchases of securities issued by corporations operating in less-developed countries would apply to any corporation which for its last annual accounting period prior to the acquisition by the U.S. person had conformed to the definition of a "less-developed country corporation" in section 955(c) of the Internal Revenue Code, by reason of conducting an active business in one or more countries designated as less developed for purposes of this tax. The exemption would also be made available for the securities of any foreign corporation which established to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that it had met these standards for a period of at least 60 days prior to issuance of its securities and might reasonably be expected to continue to meet them for such period as the Secretary or his delegate may deem appropriate to carry out the intent of this exemption.

The countries which would be considered less developed for this purpose would be designated in an Executive order to be issued by the President. For the interim period prior to the issuance of this Executive order, all countries designated by Executive Order No. 11071 dated December 27, 1962, as less developed countries for purposes of the Revenue Act of 1962, would be considered less developed countries. This includes all countries, and oversea territories and possessions of countries (other than countries within the Sino-Soviet bloc), except the following: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany (Federal Republic), Hong Kong, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of South Africa, San Marino, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and United Kingdom.

The designation of a country could be terminated by further Executive order, but such termination would not affect acquisitions of securities occurring prior to issuance of the Executive order.

FORM 3625
(July 1963)
U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

CERTIFICATE OF AMERICAN OWNERSHIP
INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX
(See instructions on reverse)

Name of transferor	Address of transferor	Social security number or employers identification number if any

The foregoing hereby certifies that he was the actual onwer of:

Number of shares or face amount of security	Certificate number if any	Name of issuer or obligor	Class of stock or description of security

From: Date of acquisition or July 18, 1963, whichever is later	To: Date of transfer

And that during all of this time he was a U.S.—
☐Citizen ☐Resident ☐Corporation ☐Trust or ☐Estate

Signature (if corporation, partnership, trust or estate, give title)	Date
Signature guarantee (see instructions)	Date

INSTRUCTIONS

NOTE.—The term "foreign securities" as used herein means stock, securities, or other obligations of foreign issuers or obligors or depositary receipts or other evidence of interest in, or rights to acquire, such interests.)

Purpose: The Congress is considering proposed legislation which would impose a tax on purchases and certain other acquisitions of foreign securities by U.S. citizens, residents, and other U.S. persons, including tax-exempt organizations.

The proposed tax, which would be effective July 19, 1963, does not apply to the purchase or other acquisition of securities from U.S. citizens, residents or other persons who had such a domestic status either during the entire period of their ownership or continuously since July 18, 1963.

This certificate is designed to provide information needed to determine whether the purchase or other acquisition of the foreign securities qualifies for exemption from the tax.

Who may execute certificate: This form may not be executed by anyone other than a transferor of foreign securities who was a U.S. citizen, resident, or other U.S. person throughout the period of his ownership or continuously since July 18, 1963.

Who must secure the certificate: This form or an acceptable substitute (see below) properly completed must be secured by the purchaser of the foreign securities from the seller if he wishes to claim exemption from the tax on the transaction and has not secured a certificate from the nominee of the seller.

When to file: The certificate should be retained until the Congress acts upon the proposed legislation. At that time further instructions will be issued by the Treasury Department.

Signature guarantee: The signature guarantee must be executed by a bank or a member of the National Association of Securities Dealers.

Substitute forms: Substitutes for the form will be accepted provided they contain all the information required by the form and are certified in the same manner.

Nominee: This form may not be executed by a nominee. Certifications to acquire exemption from the tax on the transfer of foreign securities held by nominees are to be made on form 3626.

[Example]

Form 3625
(July 1963)
U.S TREASURY DEPARTMENT
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

CERTIFICATE OF AMERICAN OWNERSHIP
INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX
(See instructions on reverse)

Name of transferor	Address of transferor	Social security number or employers identification number, if any
Ajax Securities Corp.	39 North Broadway, New York, N.Y.	64-1816829

The foregoing hereby certifies that he was the actual owner of:

Number of shares or face amount of security	Certificate number if any	Name of issuer or obligor	Class of stock or description of security
$100,000	72-135-72-234	Foreign Widgets, Inc.	5½ percent 1st maturity bonds of 1972.

From: Date of acquisition or July 18, 1963, whichever is later
July 18, 1963

To: Date of transfer
July 30, 1963

And that during all of this time he was a U.S.—
☐ Citizen ☐ Resident ☐ Corporation ☐ Trust or ☐ Estate

Signature (If corporation, partnership, trust or estate, give title)
Ajax Securities Corp. by John Drinker, President
Date Aug. 5, 1963

Signature guarantee (see instructions)
Dealer & Co. by L. R. Dealer, Secretary
Date Aug. 5, 1963

Form 3626
(July 1963)
U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

CERTIFICATE OF AMERICAN OWNERSHIP BY NOMINEE
INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX
(See instructions on reverse)

Name of nominee	Address of nominee	Social security number or employers identification number if any

The foregoing hereby certifies that (1) he is a registered nominee under sec. 4351(a) of the Internal Revenue Code and (2) that, on the date of transfer indicated below, he held, as nominee for the actual owner, the following securities:

Number of shares or face amount of security	Certificate number, if any	Name of issuer or obligor	Class of stock or description or security

And (3) that the person for whom he was acting as nominee actually owned these securities:

From: Date of acquisition or July 18, 1963, whichever is later

To: Date of transfer

And (4) that during all of this time such person was a U.S.—
☐ Citizen ☐ Resident ☐ Corporation ☐ Trust or ☐ Estate

Signature (If corporation, partnership, trust, or estate, give title)
Date

Signature guarantee (see instructions)
Date

INSTRUCTIONS

(NOTE.—The term "foreign securities" as used herein means stock, securities or other obligations of foreign issuers or obligors or depositary receipts or other evidence of interest in, or rights to acquire, such interests.)

Purpose: The Congress is considering proposed legislation which would impose a tax on purchases and certain other acquisitions of foreign securities by U.S. citizens, residents, and other U.S. persons, including tax exempt organizations.

The proposed tax which would be effective July 19, 1963, does not apply to the purchase or other acquisition of securities from U.S. citizens, residents or other persons who had such a domestic status either during the entire period of their ownership or continuously since July 18, 1963.

This certificate is designed to provide information needed to determine whether the purchase or other acquisition of the foreign securities qualifies for exemption from the tax.

Who May Execute Certificate: This form may not be executed by anyone other than a registered nominee acting for a seller of foreign securities who was a U.S. citizen, resident or other U.S. person throughout the period of his ownership or continuously since July 18, 1963. While a nominee executing this form need not identify the actual owner, he should maintain sufficient records to support the statements certified herein.

Who Must Secure the Certificate: This form or an acceptable substitute (see below) properly completed must be secured by the purchaser of the foreign securities if he wishes to claim exemption from the tax on the transaction and has not secured a certificate from the seller.

When to File: The certificate should be retained until the Congress acts upon the proposed legislation. At that time further instructions will be issued by the Treasury Department.

Signature Guarantee: The signature guarantee must be executed by a bank or a member of the National Association of Securities Dealers.

Substitute Forms: Substitutes for the form will be accepted provided they contain all the information required by the form.

Actual Owners: This form may not be executed by the actual owner of the foreign securities being transferred. Certification by the actual owner should be made on form 3625.

[Example]

Form 3626
(July 1963)
U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

CERTIFICATE OF AMERICAN OWNERSHIP BY NOMINEE
INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX
(See instructions on reverse)

Name of nominee	Address of nominee	Social security number, or Employers identification number if any
Member, Inc.	222 South Wall St., Chicago, Ill.	64-2334232

The foregoing hereby certifies that (1) he is a registered nominee under sec. 4351(a) of the Internal Revenue Code and (2) that, on the date of transfer indicated below, he held, as nominee for the actual owner, the following securities:

Number of shares or face amount of security	Certificate number, if any	Name of issuer or obligor	Class of stock or description of security
300	LZ-23-456	Widgets, Inc.	Common stock

And (3) that the person for whom he was acting as nominee actually owned these securities:

From: Date of acquisition or July 18, 1963, whichever is later
July 30, 1963

To: Date of transfer
Aug. 30, 1963

And (4) that during all of this time such person was a U.S.—
☐ citizen ☐ resident ☐ corporation ☐ Trust or ☐ estate

Signature (If corporation, partnership, trust, or estate, give title)
Member, Inc., by Ralph Miller, Vice President
Date Sept. 4, 1963

Signature guarantee (See instructions)
National Bank of New York, by Henry Roe, Vice President
Date Sept. 4, 1963

Exercise in Futility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call my colleagues' attention to a most revealing article that will appear in the August issue of Reader's Digest. The article is written by Charles Stevenson and is entitled, "Let's Stop Sending U.S. Dollars To Aid Our Enemies."

Mr. Stevenson very vividly points out some of the problems confronting our foreign aid program.

I have pointed out time and again the fallacy of the argument that foreign aid is needed in the fight against communism. On the contrary, U.S. aid to Communist governments is most harmful to American interests as well as to the interests of the Communist enslaved peoples.

Such aid helps Communist leaders to strengthen their oppressive regimes and to consolidate their personal dictatorships. In so doing it lengthens and worsens the misery and agony of the people forced to live in the Communist-ruled nations.

It makes their slavery look permanent and it breaks, perhaps beyond repair, their hopes for liberation and their faith in the United States as leader of the free world and as champion of democracy. Furthermore, it enhances the Communist-controlled governments and puts them in an improved economic position enabling them to compete more favorably against American interests and the free enterprise system, to say nothing of the adverse effect on our unfavorable balance of payments. This is certainly an exercise in futility.

I commend the article to my colleagues and include it in my remarks:

LET'S STOP SENDING U.S. DOLLARS TO AID OUR ENEMIES

(By Charles Stevenson)

Once more the annual battle over foreign-aid appropriations is stirring passions in Congress. Amid the strongest criticisms yet from taxpayers, amid repeated allegations of waste and misuse of funds, our legislators are being prodded to cut deeply into the $4.5 billion which President Kennedy insists they must vote to see the Agency for International Development (AID) through another year.

But it's time to face up to an important fact: Simply reducing appropriations won't cure what's wrong with an aid organization which is in more trouble than ever after going through 10 different administrators, 5 major reorganizations, and more than $100 billion in taxes.

"The United States has yet to develop an intelligible theory of foreign aid," says Dr. Hans Morgenthau, who heads Chicago University's renowned Center for the Study of American Foreign Policy. "None of our objectives has been achieved," says Eugene Black, recently retired president of the World Bank. "Soviet influence remains at high tide. Our dispensations of money have won us neither gratitude nor affection, but more often grumbling dissatisfaction."

Chairman OTTO E. PASSMAN, of the House Appropriations Committee, who is closest to the woe, sums it all up after a thousand hours of official hearings. "The trouble," says PASSMAN, "is that too much of our foreign aid has deteriorated into a subsidy of Communist takeover. And the spenders are so power hungry, they so withhold the truth from the public, they are so beyond the normal controls of Congress, that there seems no way to confine assistance to helping people help themselves unless we kill the entire operation and begin over."

The record carries its own proof. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, looked at the Government's books to discover that even in the face of yearly budget trimming by Congress, the authorities haven't been able to spend as much aid money as they've been given in any year since 1958. Yet, crying poverty, they quietly accumulate funds from several different appropriations, of which the current request represents just a part. Then they earmark this money as obligations for future spending. Senator BYRD has discovered that the unexpended balances from previous appropriations have soared from $11,787 million in 1958 to $21,273 million in June 1963—enough to keep the aid administrators going for many more years even if they never get another cent from Congress.

In dishing out aid money, the spenders give slight heed to Congress or even to their own handpicked advisers. An example is Gen. Lucius D. Clay's proaid group which President Kennedy named to advise about reforms. The committee reported to the President: "The United States should not aid a foreign government in establishing government-owned industries which compete with existing private endeavors. We should not extend aid which is inconsistent with our beliefs, democratic tradition, and knowledge of economic organization and consequences."

The committee opposed any such ideas as having the United States advance $512 million to start building a $1,883,766,000 Government-owned steel plant for India. We already are handing over up to $775 million a year—some $3 billion since 1960—to keep India's socialistic experimentations afloat, while that country's healthy private enterprises mark time waiting for a bureaucracy to grant permits for their every expansion scheme. As for this steel plant, 150 technicians, appointed by AID to investigate in India, reported back that they had been unable to prove that the venture is feasible.

Nevertheless, President Kennedy anounced his support for the government plant; retired Ambassador to India, Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith had said that "by this procedure we will not arouse suspicions that we seek to mold Indian economic policy to our own image."

Even more disturbing is our aiders' persistence in siphoning subsidies into Poland and Yugoslavia.

"When we help a Communist form of government we are undermining the security of our own country," Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, of Ohio, protested last year on the Senate floor. Others agreed. Over administration objections, Congress last August forbade sending more than food to any country that is part of the Communist conspiracy.

Yet, 3 months later, we extended Marshal Tito $136,700,000 in aid—just about as much as he received in the previous year. "Oh, but most of this was food for peace," I was told at AID headquarters in Washington. "And it wasn't assistance. Tito paid for that food."

The trouble is, such purchases lack reality. For example, over the past 9 years, we've given Tito cotton, oils, and wheat, which cost us $901 million. Most of this is not U.S.-owned surplus: a broker buys the grain the Yugoslavs want on the Chicago Exchange when they want it and we pay for it. We then pay the freight to seaboard. There we pay for storage. Then in most cases we pay shipping costs to Yugoslavia, where Tito markets the wheat for his own Government's profit.

Tito pays the United States only in part, and then by crediting to us some Yugoslav paper dinars. We can't take these dinars out of Yugoslavia. By agreement we pass 90 percent of the money back to the Yugoslav Government, either as gifts or as loans repayable only in more blocked dinars, for Tito to spend on developing his country's airports, highways, mines, papermills, railroads and canals. We may use the remaining 10 percent to maintain our Belgrade Embassy. About all we get out of the arrangement is the privilege of keeping a U.S. Information Agency reading room in Belgrade.

Tito tells his people—and we don't contradict him—that he receives nothing free from the United States; he pays for what he gets. As our bounty has flowed in to bolster his sagging economy, he has assailed the United States for seeking international controls of atomic blasting when Russia is in a testing mood. He has supported Russia's policy on Berlin. He votes with the Communist bloc at the U.N. He spearheads anti-Western movements among African and Asian nations.

It's much the same with Poland. We sent Ambassador Jacob Beam to woo Poland away from Moscow with gifts. And although Beam reported back to the State Department that the Poles had "perhaps fallen into the habit of considering our economic cooperation as a matter of right" and returned here almost 2 years ago to admit failure, our Government has refused to stop funneling aid to Polish communism. It has answered Congress growing anger at this policy by supplementing $61 million in cash aid in the last 7 years with $672-million worth of agricultural surplus commodities, $81 million of it in the last 12 months.

Our diplomats in Warsaw say that except for our food there would be Polish breadlines. Indeed, not only has Food for Peace prevented a possible explosion in Poland; a House committee has now found that receipt of our agricultural commodities by Poland allows it to export food to other bloc members, thus helping the Soviet conspiracy to solve its most awesome internal problem. What we do has so eased the pressures on Russia to feed its dependent states that it is able now to use its own wheat to spearhead its infiltration of Latin America.

Meanwhile, our help to the Poles has enabled them to send $13-million worth of aid to Castro's Cuba and $15-million worth to North Vietnam, reportedly including arms useful in guerrilla operations against our own soldiers in South Vietnam. It enables the Poles to aid East Germany, whose economy is in a shambles because its largest industries have been meshed with Soviet and Czech endeavors in turning out rockets and nuclear arms. In last year's Berlin crisis Poland showed her gratitude to us by mobilizing her armed forces to support Soviet threats.

In country after country, the record shows, our officials have encouraged aid which helps communism more than it helps us. A report by the House Committee on Government Operations tells how "the U.S. team in Cambodia made a deliberate determination to finance and construct two radio stations which when completed became an adjunct to a Chinese Communist gift to the Cambodian Government of a radio broadcasting complex." When a subordinate passed along his discovery that United States financed materials were being used in the construction of a Russian-built hospital in Cambodia, the report states, an AID superior caused the man to be transferred, given an unsatisfactory efficiency rating, and ultimately fired.

In June 1959 the Government of Burma wanted help from the United States to build a road linking Rangoon with Mandalay. Engineering firms sent to investigate reported back that the kind of road the Burmese wanted was economically unfeasible. No agreement was reached.

Then, in March 1962, Gen. Ne Win took over Burma, established a military dictatorship and jailed his predecessor.

He kicked out the Ford Foundation and the Asia Foundation because they represented private enterprise, in spite of the fact that they were spending $12 million of private funds on the most effective agricultural and educational development programs in the country. He is nationalizing the economy. He denounced capitalism as "the pernicious economic system in which man exploits man." He canceled extensive English-teaching programs which had been sponsored for years by Americans and British in a land where English was the language of educated people. He prohibited Burmese from coming to America as Fulbright scholars. He has also invited in Chinese Communist technicians, management and assistance projects.

Now, with Ne Win's transition complete, we are giving him military equipment at a rate of $10 million a year, although this doesn't show on any aid books. And last spring, on top of another $21 million of assorted assistance for 1963, AID announced it was going ahead with the first 42-mile leg of the Rangoon-Mandalay highway, although no agreement has yet been reached on the feasibility of the rest of the road.

Congressional alarm is also mounting over assistance given to countries which expropriate private property. Last summer our legislators stipulated by law that assistance must be cut off from any country which seized U.S. investments. But by late fall so little was being done that Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, charged that "specific instructions had gone out from the State Department to our representatives abroad to soft-pedal this amendment." Not until 6 months after enactment of the amendment (and a week beyond the congressional deadline for required enforcement) did the State Department finally get around to suspending AID projects that cost us $25 million in Ceylon, which had seized American oil properties without compensation so they could be used to market Soviet petroleum products. Food for peace shipments to Ceylon still continue—with most payments returned to the Ceylon Government to be used for further economic development.

The United States solved the problem of Brazil's seizure of an American-owned telephone company by dangling the prospect of more millions if she paid for the property. Then with the new aid flowing in—$398 million over the next 21 months—Brazil has been able not only to pay for the seized properties but to nationalize still more, and enter into a trade pact with Russia.

Congress is on record as opposing aid to countries which "live on our aid while they channel their own resources into arms from Russia." Yet this is exactly what is happening in the case of the United Arab Republic. Ever since 1956, Col. Gamel Abdel Nasser has been mortgaging the better part of his exportable cotton crop to the Soviet bloc as payment for more than $100 million a year in arms and other assistance. The purpose: an incessant war of subversion and violence aimed at taking over the 90 million inhabitants of the Arab world and alienating them from the United States and the imperialist Western nations. He has confiscated Egypt's industries and taken over virtually everything in the country which represented foreign private investment.

What have we done about this? Why, we have continued to pay Nasser every year. In the last 5 years our aid has doubled, tripled, quadrupled. The effect has been to subsidize Nasser, to keep his economy going so he could hand over some of the chief resources of his country to the Soviets for their arms and help in agitating against us and independent Arabs.

Our 1962 direct economic assistance to Nasser—$224,100,000—outdistanced anything we did for anyone in the world except India, Pakistan and, because of earthquake reconstruction, Chile. We treated him better than Turkey, our desperately poor fighting partner. We gave him far more than we gave all the friendly Arab nations put together. In addition, in just the first 6 months of fiscal 1963, we agreed to have him buy another $546 million worth of food-for-peace commodities with Egyptian currency. This is more than anybody else in the world received and it brings Nasser's food-for-peace assistance alone to more than $1 billion.

These commodities are sold on the Egyptian market for currency, which when paid to us is mostly turned back to Nasser to meet his budget deficits and build more state-owned factories. Our aid enabled him in a single gesture to distribute a $43-million dividend to 1,500,000 factory and government workers as profit shares and bonuses so as to convince the people that his state ownership did indeed provide them with more prosperity than imperialistic private investments from abroad.

The Egyptian people know nothing about our assistance. "Assistance?, What assistance?" Nasser says. "I pay you for what I get, don't I?"

Last year, when news of our latest aid filtered around the Mediterranean, other Arab leaders reacted with such apoplectic amazement that our Ambassador to the United Arab Republic, John A. Badeau, had to race around by plane in an attempt to placate them.

"But we are your allies," they said. "You are underwriting the Egyptian-Soviet conquest of the Middle East. Now Nasser will have more resources than ever with which to undermine us."

Our officials said such fears were groundless. Yet within weeks the first of 40 new Mig fighting planes arrived in Egypt from Russia. Our aid enabled Nasser to go into a Yemen war with 18,000 troops, then 20,000, then 28,000 by daily airlifts in Russian-supplied planes. Our aid means funds which enable his Voice of Cairo radio to goad the officers, soldiers and students of Saudi Arabia and Jordan to overthrow Saud and Hussein, the chiefs of those two countries. "How long are you going to tolerate them?" the Voice shouts. "Overthorw these lackeys who have sold their honor and dignity and who cooperate with the arch enemies of the Arabs—the English, the Americans, the Jews."

"These are the words that we are subsidizing," Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, recently told the Senate. "What kind of policy is that for the people of the United States who are dedicated to promoting peace in the world?"

But still the aid flows in.

Small wonder then that Algeria's Premier Ahmed Ben Bella, whom Nasser eggs on, can fly directly to Cuba after talking aid terms in Washington, and there demand that we abandon our Guantanamo Naval Base. Small wonder that on arriving home Ben Bella can say: "Algeria will have a socialism á la Castro. No power in the world can prevent our country's advance on this road." Small wonder, indeed. Our aid to him—$91,800,000 in the past year—makes it possible.

The same sort of appeasement adds to our woe in Indonesia, the world's fifth most populous nation. We were responsible for the formation of Indonesia; after World War II we threatened to deny Marshall plan aid to the Dutch unless they gave up their control of these East Indies. But Indonesia's President Sukarno also coveted grandeur and Dutch West New Guinea, a primitive land of Negroid Papuans, 1,800 miles from his own capital but adjacent to Australian territory. So while he has negelected his economy and poured the wealth from his tin mines and rubber plantations into Russia to pay for Mig fighters, long-range bombers, guided missiles and submarines, we have pumped $787,300,000 in gifts into the country. We've trained doctors and dentists for a population which suffers for lack of medical care, only to see Sukarno draft them so he could have a standing army of 250,000 When his emerging industries slowed to 20 percent of normal production for want of exchange with which to import repair and maintenance parts, we advanced emergency millions so he could buy these parts from abroad.

"Sukarno's no Communist," I was told both in Washington and Djakarta. "He only wants to bring West New Guinea into Indonesia, and he must. Otherwise his revolution is incomplete."

Have our efforts strengthened our position in Asia? Already dispatches indicate worries that Sukarno is setting up in West New Guinea the same sort of outpost against adjacent Australian-held territories as Castro has established against us in Cuba. He has threatened to use his military force, the most potent in southeast Asia, if independent Malaya, Singapore and the British dependencies on British Borneo carry out their announced plan to join in an anti-Communist federation come August 31. In the presence of the titular head of the Chinese-Communist state, he has signed a manifesto calling for enforcement of Red China's major policies in Asia; the Chinese in return have vowed to support Sukarno's cause against Malaysia.

Because of this strange compulsion of our officials to pour fuel on burning problems, instead of trying to put out the fires, we have exported more dollars than our private enterprise can bring back from overseas investments and trade. Faith in our currency has declined due to our increasing deficits at home and abroad. Our gold supply has dwindled dangerously.

This is admitted by our Commerce Department. Our Government is so worried that it has sent ambassadors literally begging past and present foreign beneficiaries of our charity to help us out—to at least let us sell to American tourists there is a small part of the currency we have acquired in exchange for Food for Peace. But what was the answer? No. And this from Burma, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Poland, and Yugoslavia.

Seeking some way to stop the run on gold, the Commerce Department is now discouraging European investments by American private enterprise. "We have put up a caution light on investment in the developed countries," says Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, "because of our balance-of-payment difficulties."

Yet the administration in the face of all this wants a bigger aid appropriation this year; and Secretary of State Dean Rusk says that anyone who tries to cut the requested amounts will be cooperating with Communist global strategy.

Is it not time to ask ourselves why?

Is it not time to consider the advice of Chairman George Champion, of New York's Chase Manhattan Bank? He would have us and the other friendly capital-supplying nations coordinate our aid through an independent bankingtype organization staffed by professionals from the world of banking and private enterprise. Such a multinational approach has also been proposed by experts like retired World Bank President Black and Herbert V. Prochnow, former Deputy Undersecretary of State for Economic Affairs.

The means for getting such an operation underway already exists within the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, in which most Western nations and Japan participate. All that's needed is for Congress not to be content with cutting aid appropriations, but to order a phaseout of our current aid operations and establish a special joint congressional committee which can at last start working toward a new order.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).